FEB 23 1949

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 94—PART 10

MARCH 8, 1948, TO MAY 10, 1948

(PAGES A1437 TO A2880)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered to the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, our distinguished former Secretary of State. I think it is very appropriate at this time, when we are discussing the European recovery plan, to have this able, statesmanlike, and brilliant address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wherever thoughtful men and women gather tonight, it is certain there will be some discussion of our foreign relations. It is certain, too, that they will give expression to the fears and uncertainties that today disturb the peace-loving people of the world.

Our fears and uncertainties may be exaggerated as a result of the heated debates in the Assembly of the United Nations, where the Soviet representatives have indulged in much needless name-calling and have provoked bitter replies. But even though we may consider the bitter speeches unfortunate, I think it well that the people should know what is the attitude of the great powers on controversial questions rather than have those discussions cloaked in secrecy.

There can be no bipartisan foreign policy in this country unless members of both political parties are fully informed as to what are our policies and as to our relations with other governments. It is essential, too, that representatives of the political party out of power be informed before policies are determined and not after policies have been announced, when they must either support the policies or be charged with giving aid to a foreign government.

There can be no truly American policy unless the American people are kept informed. It is fine to applaud Decatur's patriotic declaration, "My country, right or wrong," but the men who must fight the wars of America would like to see their country right rather than wrong.

If the American people are given facts—not propaganda—they will reach an intelligent conclusion, make their views known, and our Government will be responsibe to the will of the people.

I make no apology for the contribution I have made toward the policy of making known our foreign policies to those who fight the wars and pay the bills. At the same time I realize that publicity as to our peace-making efforts places upon us, as private citizens, a great responsibility. It is our duty to demand of men in public office as well as the representatives of the press and the radio, that in speaking of events affecting our foreign relations, they should strive for accuracy and should appeal to reason instead of to emotions. The history of the two World Wars shows it is difficult to educate the American people as to the necessity for war, but it is more difficult to uneducate them.

This presents a real problem. The first Tuesday of November next year we will have a Presidential election. In the months ahead of us there will be many political speeches. I can think of nothing more unfortunate than our foreign policies being made a partisan issue and the two great political parties competing for the very doubtful honor of having urged the most belligerent policy toward a foreign government. The situation requires that those in position of leadership urge that our foreign policy should not be made a political issue, and urge that Americans show we can discuss our relations with other governments without trying to arouse the prejudices and passions of the people.

We must be tolerant; we must avoid abusive name-calling, but we must keep our people informed. In that spirit I wish to talk of a few of our problems.

After approximately 2 years of constant struggle treaties were ratified with the five lesser states of the Axis. The Soviets have prevented any progress toward a settlement with Austria. At Potsdam some of the German problems were decided. Since then some of those agreements have been violated by the Soviets. The meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers held in April 1947, for the purpose of considering the German treaty resulted in no agreements.

Another meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers will be held this month. It is entirely possible that the Soviets may conclude that world opinion is such that they cannot justify a repetition of what occurred at Moscow last April. If they reach that conclusion they will make the best possible settlement with Austria and they may even make a gesture toward the German treaty. But it will be only a gesture. It will probably take the form of a directive to the deputies to report back to the Ministers a draft of a treaty containing such agreements as can be reached and a list of the questions in disagreement, which list will include all the important questions.

For 2 years we have vainly pleaded for an Austrian settlement because it would make possible the withdrawal of the Soviet armies of occupation not only from Austria but from the satellite states where they are kept on the theory that it is necessary to protect the lines of communication to Austria. An occupation army is an idle army, and an idle army is often a bad army. But the very reason that prompted us to urge a settlement with Austria is the reason the Soviets opposed the settlement.

Should there be an Austrian settlement, many people will be so happy that they may be misled into thinking that a German treaty is in sight. It will not be in sight unless we are prepared to grant the Soviet demand to permit them to participate with the other three members of the Council in the management of all industries in the Ruhr, including particularly coal and steel, and unless we are willing to grant their demand for $10,000,000,000 reparations.

We cannot agree to jointly participate with the Soviets in the management of the Ruhr industries. There are many reasons, but it is enough to say we have been unable to administer jointly with them any project in Germany, Austria, the Balkans, or Korea. Certainly we could not successfully administer German industries when such administration would demand daily decisions as to the allocation of products of such industries and relations with employees. There would be constant disagreement and constant irritation that would endanger the peace.

At Potsdam, the Soviets abandoned their demand for $10,000,000,000 in reparations and made a settlement. They cannot now violate their agreement and return to their former demand.

It has been 2½ years since Germany capitulated. It is essential for the recovery of Germany and for the recovery of Europe that the German people know their fate and be allowed to start work rebuilding their country instead of relying upon relief from the United States.

There can be no early settlement with Germany unless we abandon the procedure we followed in the Council of Foreign Ministers in the negotiations of the five treaties now ratified. I proposed the Council of Foreign Ministers in order to hasten and not delay the return to peaceful conditions in Europe. In June 1945, no one could anticipate that the Soviets would favor a continuance of chaotic conditions in Europe in order to accomplish political objectives.

We wanted to get along with the Soviets, and at that time there was excuse for our cooperative proposal, but in the light of our experience with the five treaties, during the last 2½ years, there is no excuse for our following the same course with the German treaty. I repeat the statement of the old Indian chief: "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me."

The disagreements between us in connection with Germany are much greater than those involved in the five treaties heretofore ratified. Under the procedure of the Council of foreign ministers, the Soviets will insist that there shall be no peace conference until unanimous agreement is reached on

all those questions regarded by them as basic questions. The United States, favoring a peace conference in order that the smaller nations may participate, will be under constant pressure to make concessions in order to hold a peace conference. The Soviets, being opposed to a peace conference and being in favor of delay, will simply veto the calling of a conference.

Even should France, Britain, and the United States, in the interest of peace, make concessions that finally met the demands of the Soviets, we must remember that the Soviets take the position that they are not bound by recommendations of a peace conference. That means that any modification or addition recommended by the peace conference would have to secure the unanimous agreement of the four members of the Council of Foreign Ministers.

It requires but a statement of the facts to show that our disagreements in the Council may be for years and may be forever. But conditions in Europe do not permit the continuance of the chaotic situation in Germany for years or forever. Therefore, I have proposed that we should now insist that a peace conference be called for early in 1948.

We would urge all allied governments to attend the conference. We would ask that each of the four members of the Council of Foreign Ministers prepare tentative drafts of a treaty and submit them to the peace conference.

The peace conference then would proceed through committees created by it to draft a treaty. Decisions should be by a two-thirds vote, including two-thirds of the nations that made substantial contributions to the prosecution of the war. We must not seek to dictate to the conference. We must be willing, as I stated at the Paris Peace Conference, to be bound by any recommendation adopted by a two-thirds vote of the members of the conference.

Because there is no way of forcing any government to sign a peace treaty, we should not adopt a take-it-or-leave-it attitude, but should honestly try to reach a unanimous agreement. However, if it is impossible to reach unanimity, we should do everything in our power to induce the Soviet Government to go along with two-thirds of their allies. If they refuse to do so, then the other allied nations should go ahead without them. This would not be making a separate peace. It would simply be saying that no one nation can veto peace on earth.

If we follow this procedure now, we will be hastening the peace and certainly will be giving to the smaller nations that fought in the war, the opportunity they have demanded, to participate in the peace.

If we do not follow this procedure now, the probabilities are that at the end of a year or so, we will be forced to resort to it, or we will permit the Soviets to veto in the Council recommendations adopted by two-thirds or more of the Allied Nations.

I have not the time to discuss all the possible consequences should the Soviets refuse to agree to an immediate peace conference. I have previously discussed many of them. It is my conviction that when the Soviets see that the rest of the Allied Nations intend to proceed with a settlement with Germany, after making many protests, they will attend the peace conference and make the best settlement possible from their viewpoint. They do not now want to be isolated from the rest of the Allied Nations.

However, objection is made that if the Allied Nations, other than the Soviet Union, should ratify a treaty with Germany, it would mean that while the Soviets would permanently retain a large army in eastern Germany, all Allied troops would be withdrawn from western Germany. That withdrawal does not necessarily follow. Two years ago I proposed what is called the 40-year treaty to be entered into by us with the Soviet Union, Britain, and France, under which Allied troops would remain in Germany in order to make sure that there would be no repetition of the rearmament of Germany that occurred after the last war. I wanted to give assurance to Europe against a rearmed Germany. I wanted, particularly, to give assurance to the Soviet Union, whose representatives at that time were expressing fear of Germany as the reason for their actions in the Balkan states.

When I made that proposal to Generalissimo Stalin on December 24, 1945, he told me, "If you make that fight, you can rely on my support." I am confident that at the moment he was sincere. Later he changed his mind. Why, I do not know.

If the Soviets fail to agree to a German settlement and fail to agree to our 40-year treaty, then the other three nations should enter into such a treaty to prevent the rearmament of Germany. The Soviets would then know that there would be fulfillment of the pledge I made at Stuttgart: That so long as other occupation troops are in Germany, the troops of the United States will be there.

A treaty with Germany, however, is not necessary to insure the return to Germany of prisoners of war. We must not permit the prisoners taken by Allied forces to become the forgotten men. It is clear that under the language of the Geneva Convention governments should return prisoners of war as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities. It is now 2½ years since the end of hostilities in Europe, and the ugly truth is that prisoners of war are being held in Allied countries in order to force them to work.

Early in 1946 I insisted on returning to Germany and Italy those prisoners held in the United States. Some of the persons in this country for whom they were working resorted to political pressure to keep them, but by the fall of 1946, the last of the prisoners who had been held in the United States were returned to their homes. However, human selfishness is the same the world over and our experience enables us to appreciate the pressures that are being placed upon other governments to hold this slave labor.

During the last days of the war so many German soldiers surrendered to our forces that we could not take care of them and turned over to France more than half a million prisoners. In the summer of 1946 I presented to French officials, in an informal way, our request that these prisoners taken by us be returned to Germany. Upon request, I delayed formal action until December 2, when our Government called upon France, Belgium, and Luxemburg to return prisoners held on our account, asking that the program be concluded by October 1 of this year. Belgium and Luxemburg indicated their willingness to return them even before that date. France did not do so. In April of this year, at Moscow, the foreign ministers reached an agreement that all prisoners should be returned by the end of 1948. That is 3½ years after the end of hostilities and certainly is not in compliance with the Geneva Convention provision. I assume, however, that our representatives could not secure a better agreement. Now the important thing is at least to see that this agreement is complied with.

France has made headway. However, it is estimated that 380,000 German prisoners will remain in France as of November 30, 1947. That means during the following 13 months they will have to return approximately 30,000 per month. They are not doing that now.

Belgium has 11,000 left and will have repatriated them by January 1.

Britain's program calls for the return of all prisoners by October 1948. Today they have approximately 280,000 in the United Kingdom and Middle East and are repatriating them at the rate of about 18,000 per month. It appears they will keep their schedule.

At Moscow, in April 1947, Mr. Molotov stated the Soviets had returned 1,003,973 and had remaining in Soviet territory 890,532 German prisoners. Soviet authorities in Berlin claim that since April 1947, 62,000 have been returned. However, some of our authorities in Berlin estimate that the number has been nearer 30,000. Taking the Soviet figure of 10,000 a month, it means that if that rate is continued, it will take the Soviets more than 7 years to return to Germany their German prisoners of war. Therefore, I want the people to watch the fulfillment of the program.

The situation as to Japanese prisoners presents an entirely different question. The United States took the initiative in issuing the Potsdam declaration, which pledged that "Japanese military forces, after being completely disarmed, shall be permitted to return to their homes with the opportunity of leading peaceful and productive lives." Obviously that was intended to encourage the Japanese to surrender.

At that time the Soviets had not declared war against Japan, but when they did enter the war they announced that they adhered to the Potsdam declaration. Therefore, they are bound by the pledge I have quoted. Instead of permitting the Japanese prisoners of war to return to their homes, they took hundreds of thousands of them to Russia. No one knows exactly how many Japanese prisoners of war are being held in Russia. But Mr. Sebald, of General MacArthur's staff, announced before the Allied Council on October 29 that in October the number still remaining in Soviet-controlled Russia was 761,000 and in Manchuria 67,000 making a total of 828,000. Estimates of the Japanese Foreign Office do not differ materially from our figures. Every day the Soviets hold them as prisoners, it is an inexcusable violation of a solemn pledge.

General MacArthur has made frequent demands for the return of the Japanese but his demands have not been complied with. Because the Potsdam declaration was issued upon the initiative of the United States, our good faith is involved. It is the solemn duty of our Government to formally call upon Generalissimo Stalin to immediately return these Japanese prisoners. We must let the world know that this violation by the Soviet Union of a solemn pledge is not condoned by the United States.

In view of what I have said, you may ask if I still cling to my policy of patience as well as firmness and whether I think it possible for us to get along with the Soviets. To both questions I answer "Yes." Certainly we must try to do so, and we must be certain that if all efforts to cooperate fail, the world will realize that the responsibility for the consequences does not rest upon the American people.

As we try to get along with them, we must do it with full understanding of what they have done and what they probably will do. At best I think of them as most people think of a neighbor who deliberately makes himself unpleasant. He allows his chickens to enter your wife's garden and scratch up her flowers. He allows his boy to bat a baseball through your window. He pays no attention to your protests and, in general, makes himself disagreeable.

But the neighbor owns his house and you own yours. You are a peaceful citizen; you do not get a gun and declare war upon him. You finally take him to court and you continue to pray that he will mend his ways. We must follow the same course with the Soviets. You may have lost some confidence in the effectiveness of the United Nations, but I am confident the members of the House of Bishops still believe in the efficacy of prayer.

I have warned that most of the difficulties and dangers confronting us are due to the expansion policies of the Soviets. Nevertheless, I do want to live in peace and I want to be just to the Soviets and therefore I want to plead for tolerance.

I am deeply concerned with the state of mind, at times bordering on hysteria, that ascribes to our former ally, the Soviet Republic, all the ills and errors which two world wars have brought. No country has suffered more from the wars of our generation than have the Russian people. And suffering people are not always reasonable people. The Soviets are not the first or the only people who have thought that suffering gives the right to make others suffer.

The Soviet leaders pursue policies which we believe inimical to the peace of the world and the principles of the United Nations. We must firmly resist those policies and do what we can to maintain the rule of law in the world. But we should not forget what their people have been through and not lightly assume that the Soviet leaders, despite their blustering, bad manners, and abuse, want war. If we were cravenly to yield to their blustering I have no doubt that they would continue their blustering and bulldozing tactics until we, with other nations, did make firm resistance.

While we must firmly and unequivocally resist Soviet aggression, we must act so that it is clear to all that we are defenders of the rule of law and not competitors with the Soviets for world domination. And what is even more important, we must not assume that our only responsibility to the world is to save it from the Soviets.

The world—our world—the world from which we cannot isolate ourselves, is suffering from economic want and despair. If we do our part to restore the world to economic health the danger of Soviet aggression will be greatly reduced. If we fail to do our part to restore economic health in the world there will be ever-increasing danger of aggression and totalitarianism.

We are rightly concerned about the survival of our way of life in the world. But we have learned that our way of life cannot survive in isolation. We are a part of western civilization. Our ancestors brought with them the precious heritage of European civilization, and to this day European thought and science have contributed greatly to American progress.

Even the discovery of atomic energy is due in large part to the pioneering work of European scientists, and our moral and religious ideals are not indigenous with us. Were it not for our great European heritage the House of Bishops would not be meeting here today. We have fought two wars in Europe to preserve the common civilization. In helping to restore the shattered economic life of Europe we are helping to restore what is vital to our own way of life.

We should, without delay, provide relief for the countries of western Europe. Later, when the Congress has had an opportunity to consider the report of its various committees, it can determine the extent of aid we can afford for reconstruction purposes.

What aid we can provide should be furnished with full realization of the facts. When a man tells us that we can ship to Europe the needed supplies of food and such commodities as steel and coal without effecting prices at home, he may be eloquent, but he is not convincing.

If we grant adequate aid, our domestic supply of some materials will be short and prices correspondingly higher. If we now permit prices to go higher, then when labor contracts expire in the spring, we must expect wage increases. That will mean still higher prices. Because this is true, we must restore some controls. We submitted to price controls and rationing to win the war; we should be willing to submit to some modified controls in order to preserve the peace. To effectively aid others, we must put our own house in order and keep it in order.

The aid we furnish for reconstruction must be on a different basis from relief. We must make only such loans and grants as will translate themselves into increased production. When the immediate needs of the people of western Europe are relieved, I am confident they will work to increase production so that it will be unnecessary for us to make further appropriations for relief.

The reconstruction program will call for the most careful consideration of the Congress. We must aid not only Europe, but China and Korea. We must help generously, but we must remember there is a limit beyond which we cannot go without weakening our own economy.

America must remain strong if Americans are to remain free.

If a choice ever has to be made between providing long-term economic aid to Europe and providing funds for the national defense, there must be no question that our first duty is to provide for our armed services. Freedom-loving people throughout the world are just as much interested as are the American people in our maintaining our military strength. If we reduce our armed forces our reconstruction program may not be of much help to Europe.

It has been necessary to disclose to the American people that the hope of free and effective cooperation between the American people and the Soviet people to which we looked forward at the close of the war has not been realized and probably cannot be realized for some time. Our leaders and their leaders differ widely and deeply. Only time and tolerance and the return of the world to economic health can restore or reconcile the fundamental differences between the Soviets and ourselves. But we must always leave open the gates of understanding.

We should make it clear that we are raising no iron curtain on our side. We are drawing no final or permanent lines between our world and the Soviet world, for whether we like it or not, we do live in one world.

In this world there have always been differences between peoples, and differences to the degree to which people have been able to cooperate with one another. But some cooperation is better than no cooperation.

Our task is to be effective wherever we can and to the extent we can, at home and abroad. By the grace of God we are the strongest power on earth. That strength we must use to restore health in the world.

In the end the survival of this Republic depends upon its strength, not upon its material strength alone, but upon its moral strength and its moral unity. And the survival of our way of life depends upon our ability, with God's help, to unite people in the cause of common freedom and common well-being.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] on February 29, at Indianapolis, Ind., at a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is good to be here in Indianapolis tonight to honor with you two great Democratic Presidents of the United States, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

In this year of political crisis we must go forward for our cause. We are under constant and bitter attack both from the right and the left—attacks designed both to destroy and confuse. But we can take heart that we have as our leader still another great American President, Harry S. Truman.

The problems we face in 1948 are possibly the most serious in the history of our Nation. Certainly no President ever had to face crises of greater magnitude and in greater number.

But as we go forth in the campaign of 1948 we can be sure of two basic factors of greatest importance to the Democratic Party:

We have the man—Harry S. Truman.

We have the issues.

In addition you here in Indiana have something else of almost equal importance:

You have the organization.

You have demonstrated your ability to get out the vote.

A year ago, under active Democratic leadership the party was flexing its muscles in Indiana, gathering its strength for the victorious fight in the November elections—a sweep that placed the Democratic Party in a stronger position within the State than ever before.

I had an analysis made of the vote in Indiana and that survey showed that you are now stronger than you were after the Roosevelt landslide in 1932. Out of 102 towns and cities you have taken control of a majority of them—something unprecedented in a State the Republicans claim as normally theirs.

The secret was organization.

The secret was good, strong liberal candidates, men who stood for the plain people.

The secret was hard work in county, ward, and precinct.

Now, in this national campaign year, you stand on the threshold of still another sweeping victory—a victory for which the campaign of last fall prepared you. Within your organization you have pushed the cause of youth; and the young blood in your organization has made you vigorous and strong.

You have good leaders. Above all you have faith in the Democratic Party as the party of the plain people, the party that stands for a program of progressive liberalism, not only in the past, not only in the days of Jefferson and Jackson, Wilson and Roosevelt, but today, and in the future.

I have said we have the issues. I want to talk to you a little tonight about these issues in this year's Presidential campaign.

The Republican Party will have to run on its record this year, no matter how much it prefers to run on promises.

The record is the record of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. It has been a peculiar Congress. It has had a lot of tricky screen formations and hidden ball plays, but it hasn't gained much ground.

Basically it has been a destructive Congress. The Republicans have sat on the sidelines so long and thrown rocks that they have forgotten that the majority party is also supposed to get something done.

Mostly the Eightieth Congress has sounded like one long Lincoln Day speech and the speeches must have caused the great emancipator to wince in shame. For he liked and trusted the plain people and distrusted monopolies and privilege. Abraham Lincoln would have thought he had dropped in at the wrong dinner if he could have heard Senator TAFT and Congressman MARTIN orating on February 12, 1948.

I can think of no better way to evaluate the Republican Congress and to measure the

integrity of the Republican Party than to contrast their 1944 platform with the bitter diatribes they hurled at President Truman after his State of the Union message this year.

The Republicans criticized every step in that program of the President. They said the world would probably end immediately if any of them were put into practice.

Therein lies the basic weakness of the Republican Party. It pays lip service to good ideas in its platform, but it gets the trembles and a big lump in its throat when it comes time to do something about them.

In the State of the Union Message the President asked for the expansion of social security. The Republicans said they wanted the same thing in their 1944 platform. But only recently the GOP Congress actually brought out a bill to maintain the status quo in social security.

The President wanted to improve the Nation's health. That's in the 1944 GOP platform, too. But the Republican-controlled Congress merely argues which of several health bills not to pass.

The President wants adequate and decent housing. Believe it or not, the Republicans said the same thing in 1944. But they never seem to want housing enough to do anything about it.

Protection and development of natural resources, aid to the farmer, soil conservation, rural electrification, curbing of monopoly, a strong national defense, relief and rehabilitation of foreign nations, all these things were in that 1944 platform and in the President's State of the Union message.

Not only did the Republicans fail to do anything about the promises they made in 1944 when they took control of Congress, but in addition they assailed the President for asking them to keep their promises.

Another example of the negative approach of the Republican Congress was its promise when it convened that they would open with a prayer and close with a probe.

Well, they have probed and probed, and sought not so long ago to prove that it was Pearl Harbor which bombed the Japs, not the Japs who attacked Pearl Harbor. Their probers could have accomplished more by praying.

Now these Republicans seek to say that inflation is ended because of a few pennies relief in commodities.

These excited prophets would have us believe that inflation has ended.

Actually the facts belie the statement.

The price of butter in retail stores in Washington today is 86 cents per pound. Steak is 73 to 76 cents per pound. Butter has come down slightly. So has meat. Flour is down a few pennies too.

Let me recall the prices in June 1946, just before price controls were killed under the leadership of Senators TAFT and WHERRY.

Steak was 45 cents per pound. Butter was 51 cents per pound. Eggs now selling for 61 cents a dozen were then 45 cents per dozen. Frying chickens were then selling for 49 cents per pound.

There has been some relief. Welcome relief. But prices are still sky high, still far above a sound level.

Yet this is heralded as the end of inflation.

Nothing is said of the fact that all the conditions of inflation are still present.

Nothing is said by these prophets of the sudden and unexplained boost in the price of semifinished steel which will increase the cost of thousands of items from automobiles to hairpins. Thus the already dangerously high cost of living will be still further increased, and any addition to the present high prices, will hurt our citizens who already find prices going up faster than their incomes.

More seriously, the price rise in steel is likely to be cited as an argument for wage adjustments which will continue the inflationary spiral.

Thus, the break in the commodity market, as dramatic as it was, did not mark the end of inflation, it merely gave some slight temporary relief.

Inflation cannot be ended by high-sounding phrases. It cannot be ended by the futile wording of a weak and weaseling anti-inflation law which has the effect of slapping a tiger's paw and telling him, "Don't eat the nice little lamb."

With the fact of the rise in prices instituted without warning by the steel barons firmly in mind, let us consider what inflation has cost the Nation since mid 1946.

By the end of 1947, higher prices cost the American consumer about 25 percent more for goods and services than it did in the spring of 1946. Thus American consumers spending at an annual rate of $172,000,000,000 in the fourth quarter of 1947 received goods and services approximately equal to those he received in the second quarter of 1946 for only $138,000,000,000.

In other words, the American consumer in the fourth quarter of 1947 paid about $9,000,000,000 more than he paid in the spring of 1946 for the same things.

The cost of inflation to the American public on an annual basis is $35,000,000,000. This would have paid the estimated cost of the European recovery program twice over in a year.

And now added to the already staggering cost is the further increase in the basic product—steel. And steel is a bellwether to practically all other industry. We have not yet seen the end of inflation. The President realizes this and has already taken action to get all the facts concerning this price increase. But the Republican "road block" Congress will do little or nothing to correct the situation.

The eventual solution lies in our hands—elect a liberal, progressive Congress to implement President Truman's program. That's the way we'll get things done.

Recently the whip of the Senate, Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, the Nebraska mortician, who claims the credit for embalming price controls, made a speech in which he explained high prices and inflation.

I want you to listen carefully to what Senator WHERRY said, so that everything will be clear to you.

He said: "I am more convinced today than ever that high prices themselves are the surest cure for high prices."

These are the sound words of a sound Republican. The way to put out a fire is to pour gasoline on it.

After regaling the country with samples of this type of thinking, the Republicans are now solemnly telling the country that we are in danger of a governmental coup, that mysterious and evil groups are trying to ridicule and discredit Congress.

Perhaps every Republican who tells that story should look in the mirror and repeat to himself 10 times the immortal words of Senator WHERRY, "* * * high prices themselves are the best cure for high prices * * *."

Senators TAFT and WHERRY have been conconducting a running debate as to which should get credit for killing price controls and starting inflation.

I say let them share it, although in all fairness to Senator TAFT and his Presidential candidacy he should be given credit for all of the activities of the Eightieth Congress, since he has been its boss.

It's record is TAFT's record, and the record of the Republican Party.

Senator TAFT's inflation and Senator TAFT's do-nothingism will hang like an albatross around the neck of any Republican candidate.

This year's political picture has been changed from that of recent years by the entrance into the Presidential race of a third party devoted to the candidacy of Henry Wallace.

America has grown strong under a two-party system while other nations have suffered from governments run by weak coalitions of splinter parties.

A third party has as much place in American politics as does a third party on a honeymoon.

If Henry Wallace and his supporters go through with their campaign, I feel that they will either waste their votes, or possibly do what true liberals would not wish to do, give aid and comfort to reactionary candidates. And I might add that I do not consider true liberals those who hold that abject appeasement to Communist expansion is a part of liberalism. The President's foreign policy is liberal, and I believe it offers the only hope we now have for a lasting peace.

I hope that in the end all true liberals will unite where they belong, behind the candidacy of Harry S. Truman. For a Democratic vote this year will not be wasted. A Democratic vote will be a vote for a strong and workable program of real liberalism at home and abroad—a program that will go into full effect not in some remote future day, but on January 1, 1949.

These are too critical times to postpone settlement of the issue of liberalism versus reaction to some remote time; for it can be resolved for liberalism this year by a vote for Harry S. Truman.

There is only one complete, workable domestic program before the Nation.

That is the program of President Truman.

He has outlined in plain and simple words the steps we must take to halt our dangerous march toward an economic crash, to put our economy on a sound long-range basis, and to work out in the world a lasting and decent peace.

President Truman is our leader for practical, progressive liberalism.

But a bitter campaign lies ahead.

The Republicans have already resorted to personal invective to try to cover up their own miserable failure in the Eightieth Congress.

Our job is to keep hammering away on the issues. For, as you can see, we do have the issues.

We have the man—Harry S. Truman. He has shown himself unswerving in the service of the people. He has shown courage when courage was needed. He has proved himself not only a man to carry out the great liberal programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt but he has added a great program of his own.

I repeat you have the organization with which you can win in Indiana. You have the strength, the power, and the youth and energy. It remains for you to exercise that power.

If each of you sees to it that the facts are taken to the people in every county, ward, and precinct we will win. If all the voters are registered now and vote when November rolls around, we will win.

There are now, according to a recent statement of the Bureau of the Census, more than 94,000,000 persons in this country eligible to vote. In 1946 only 34,000,000 persons voted. About 18,000,000 votes took control of the Congress.

Less than two-thirds of the voting population took control of the American Congress in the most crucial period of our history. It must not happen again.

It will not happen if you work in 1948 as you worked in 1947. If you do we can all face the future with confidence.

The November election will bring an end to Republican reaction and inaction.

It will send a Democratic Congress to Capitol Hill.

It will return Harry S. Truman to the White House.

It will return the whole Government of the United States to the people.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by the Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, at the Jefferson-Jackson dinner in Newark, N. J., on February 19, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight the National Democratic Party is redeclaring its firm purpose to protect and preserve for every citizen of this country the great social and economic gains made during 15 years of Democratic leadership.

In gatherings, such as this throughout the Nation, we are reasserting the fundamental principles of our party, and we are rededicating those principles to the continued progress and prosperity of this Nation.

I believe it particularly appropriate that at this same time we pay joint honor to Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, as well as to those other statesmen who molded our party doctrines and purpose, and who contributed so immeasurably to the spiritual and material growth of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson's sane philosophies and truths are deeply imbedded in our system of Government. He endeavored continually to convince Americans how vital it was, even as it is today, to defend stanchly their basic liberties and standards of free endeavor.

Jackson, too, was an outstanding advocate of human rights, and his ideals and work ably complemented the achievements of Jefferson. He brought to the leadership of the Nation and party vigor and resoluteness of purpose.

It is well to remember that in the annals of our party history, the accomplishments of these men, and their notable contributions to our system of Government, were the results of unceasing and steadfast devotion to country.

Thomas Jefferson said that "the whole art of government consists in the art of being honest," and upon this truth, the Democratic Party has consistently and conscientiously based its pattern of service and its policy measures.

The history of Democratic leadership amply supports our assertion of accomplishment.

We are entitled to particular satisfaction with the social and economic progress of this country during the past 15 years of Democratic administration.

The 15 years that have passed since our party assumed the responsibilities of Government cannot dim the recollection of the economic disorder that prevailed at that time. Nor do they allow us to forget that our present social and economic achievements have, in a large part, been accomplished only through hard and continuous fighting by the Democratic administration against bitter opposition.

Fifteen years ago we were in the depths of a depression for which the then incumbent administration had not the slightest remedy. Twelve million workers were vainly seeking jobs, while factories were closing their doors. Businesses were failing at the rate of over 30,000 a year. Most great industries were operating at fractional capacity.

In this extremity, the speedy and courageous action of a Democratic administration brought to a halt the worst depression of modern times. It took dynamic leadership, with great vision, to appraise properly the weaknesses of the old system and to compel their elimination.

In 1933 we had two huge tasks to accomplish: First, to halt the deflationary trend which had been under way since 1929; and second, to develop a balanced and expanding economy, based upon the maintenance of a high volume of production and of purchasing power. To gain these ends, the entire level of employment and incomes had to be greatly increased, along with the over-all business activity, and at the same time a repetition of the speculative unbalance which had developed in 1929 had to be prevented.

Shortly after the new Democratic administration took office and began a constructive expansion program, the national income started rising. By the end of the year, income payments were 20 percent higher than in March 1933. With the rise in purchasing power, retail trade immediately began to increase and a general business improvement spread over the country. The industrial production rate started to climb, employment began to increase, people began to spend more money, and the improvement became cumulative.

Inspired Democratic leadership gave a discouraged people a new hope and a new sense of responsibility for the social and economic welfare of their fellowmen. Through aggressive action, the administration achieved lasting benefits for unemployment and old-age security, for the protection of individuals against unjust practices, for the safeguarding of our banking system, for the expansion of credit facilities which were not available to banks, railroads, and other private industries, for the improvement of our agricultural resources, and for the healthy and strong development of our entire national economy.

The wage earner's position had been strengthened by national recognition of the rights of workmen to bargain collectively with their employers.

Laws enacted for the regulation of security offerings, requiring sellers to reveal the facts about new security issues, have done much to protect people against misrepresentation in this field.

Agriculture has been placed in a stronger position by legislation for the conservation of the soil and for the encouragement of better farming practices. The strengthening of our agricultural industry brought welcome dividends during the war, when our farms yielded one-third more food than before the war despite shortages of equipment and manpower.

The insurance of bank deposits under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has provided protection against a repetition of the bank failure tragedy of 1933.

These and other measures inaugurated during the Democratic administration have given a new sense of economic security to our people and have enormously contributed to our record peacetime level of business activity and to our present high standard of living.

We must not forget, either, the farsighted steps taken to provide for the military preparedness of our Nation—steps taken against stubborn opposition—which nevertheless proved our salvation.

During World War II we came nearer than ever before to learning our true strength and our national capabilities. These factors of strength supplied the men and materials for the greatest all-out war effort in history. When called upon to give vital assistance in protecting the very core of modern civilization, the United States not only out-produced the rest of the world but at the same time maintained its own national standards of living.

Our wartime strength could not have developed without an essentially strong foundation. Under the recovery measures taken by the Democratic administration, the health of our economic structure has been steadily improving since early 1933. The steel industry, as an important example, turned out only 1,000,000 tons of ingots in March 1933, but it raised its output to over 4,000,000 tons per month at the outbreak of war in August 1939, and to 7,000,000 tons per month when we entered the war in December 1941. And now, in time of peace, it has reached the total of 7,460,000 tons per month.

The victory over our enemies precipitated the tremendous peacetime problems of demobilization and reconversion—problems which were no less vital to our national security than those faced—and solved—in wartime.

The problems of peace and postwar transition fell on the shoulders of President Truman. He has borne his heavy responsibilities, the heaviest in the world, with outstanding courage and skill.

Of foremost concern, certainly foremost in the minds of their families, was the return to civilian life of more than 12,000,000 members of our armed services. The swift and orderly discharge of our servicemen and women, their return to peaceful pursuits, and their absorption into our economy, are accomplishments of which we can be proud.

The industrial changeover from war to peacetime production was completed more rapidly than anyone dared predict. War contracts were quickly settled and war plants were speedily cleared for a volume of civilian output never before equaled.

At present, with our economy again soundly established on a peacetime basis, we find that the total personal incomes are now running at an annual rate of over $200,000,000,000, as compared with $49,000,000,000 in 1932.

Workers in manufacturing industries now average $1.27 an hour, or $51 in weekly earnings. In March 1933 their average earnings were $15 a week and 41 cents an hour. And they felt lucky to even get that.

Corporate earnings have likewise shown an enormous improvement since the dark days of 15 years ago. In 1932 corporations showed a deficit of over $3,000,000,000, but by 1934 they had moved into the black, and profits rose sharply in succeeding years, until in 1947 they are estimated at $17,000,000,000, after taxes.

These comparisons in dollar terms are in part due to the present high price levels. But comparisons on a purely physical basis tell the same story. Perhaps the best measure of economic welfare is the number of people employed. This figure in recent months reached the unprecedented total of 60 million. In 1933 the average number of employed was only 39,000,000 persons.

The output of our manufacturing and mining industries has been at the highest levels in our peacetime history, and far above the prewar level. The index of industrial production reached 191 in December 1947, as compared with the depression low of 54 reached in March 1933.

This present business activity is a tribute to the vitality of the American system of free enterprise. But it is also the product of wise policy and prudent management on the part of this administration under the leadership of President Harry S. Truman.

Our fiscal policies have been closely related to those in the economic field. Our purpose is to practice economy in Government and to maintain the revenues at a level sufficient to secure a balanced budget and provide for debt reduction.

As Secretary of the Treasury, I feel that the financial integrity of our Government must always be a first consideration. Particularly so with a Government debt, largely war-created, of $255,000,000,000. Under such circumstances it is not only the financial integrity of the Government which is at stake, but the soundness of the whole economy. This Government's fiscal policies are irrevocably

wrapped up in the entire financial structure of our country.

It has been estimated that in the current fiscal year, which ends on next June 30, the surplus of Federal receipts over expenditures will amount to $7,500,000,000. However, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended that $3,000,000,000 of this amount should be earmarked for application on the European recovery program. If this is done the amount of surplus remaining to be applied on the debt would be reduced to $4,500,000,000.

We have been using this surplus, as it accumulates, for debt retirement in the manner in which it would be most effective, and we shall continue to do so.

The President's budget estimates for the fiscal year 1949 show receipts of $44,500,000,000 and a surplus of $4,800,000,000 in that fiscal year to apply toward further reductions in the debt.

On the expenditures' side, the President has pared the budget to the minimum which he considers consistent with the country's domestic and international responsibilities.

Expenditures are estimated at $39,700,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. Seventy-nine percent of the estimated expenditures for fiscal 1949 are war related—they either reflect the direct costs of war, the aftermath of war, or our efforts to prevent a future war.

In this category, we have expenditures for national defense which amount to $11,000,000,000, or 28 percent of the total budget. It would be possible, of course, to cut this amount, but I do not believe that the Congress will want to take this step at the expense of our national security.

Expenditures for international-aid programs also come in this category, and total $7,000,000,000, or 18 percent of the total budget. This is the amount which has been determined as the necessary requirement for the period ending with the fiscal year on June 30, 1949. Any adjustments made in timing by the Congress would not materially change the end result for the fiscal year.

Veterans' benefits amount to $6,000,000,000, or 15 percent of the budget. They represent an obligation which we owe to those persons who made great personal sacrifices for the Nation during the war. It is an obligation for which a Democratic Congress has already provided by legislation, and certainly none of us want to propose that any of this legislation be repealed.

The other two items which enter into the war-cost category are $5,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt, and $2,000,000,000 for tax refunds. These are financial obligations of the Government which it must meet.

In analyzing the Government's peacetime operations, we find that 16 percent, or $6,200,000,000, of the budget covers expenditures to finance the Government's programs in many broad areas, such as social welfare, agriculture, natural resources, and transportation and communication. These programs include expenditures for public assistance, for flood control, for soil conservation, for reclamation, for State-aid to highways, for development of rivers and harbors, and for atomic energy.

These programs include activities which the Government must perform in order to conserve our natural resources. More importantly, however, they finance functions which the Government is obligated to perform in conserving our human resources—for programs which contribute to the health and well-being of the American people and which have long been a part of the Democratic platform.

Any reduction in these programs would be false economy.

The remainder of the budget, that which is left for the operational costs of the Government, is not relatively large, amounting as it does to only 5 percent, or $2,100,000,000. This amount covers the Congress and the Executive Office. It includes Treasury activities in collecting taxes, administering the public debt, and keeping the Government's books, and the expenditures of various other agencies. To cut large sums out of this group would be a difficult undertaking.

As a matter of fact, any cuts in this budget will be difficult if we are not to jeopardize our national defense, ignore our national welfare, or threaten our efforts to attain world peace.

Finally let me call your attention to the policies of President Truman and your administration in the field of foreign affairs. As Democrats and as citizens of these United States we can be thankful for the leadership that has brought about an unprecedented unanimity of opinion in this country in our dealings with other nations.

Our international policy is essentially an American policy and it represents the views and the wishes of the Nation.

Looking toward the future the task of Democratic leadership is clear. Under the continued guidance of President Harry S. Truman, we will direct our policies toward developing a balanced and expanding economy. We must maintain a high volume of purchasing power to provide a broad market for the products of industry and agriculture. We must insure that business profits remain at adequate levels to provide a steadily expanding industrial capacity, and that the capital markets function smoothly in financing our business expansion.

We must provide for the development of our human and material resources, to the end that we may continue as a Nation of high living standards and high productivity.

The aims and purposes of the Democratic Party can be eloquently summed up in the words of President Truman: "We seek a peaceful world, a prosperous world, a free world, a world of good neighbors, living on terms of equality and mutual respect."

The Need for Compulsory Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I issued recently in relation to compulsory arbitration being necessary to protect the public interest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Since I came to the Senate in 1939 I have submitted numerous recommendations on ways and means of protecting the national welfare, particularly in times of national emergency. The coming of the atomic age has impressed upon all of us the need for such machinery to handle any challenge that may confront us.

What we need now is to anticipate every challenge which may confront America, to foresee every emergency that we can predict with vision. This means that we must have a Government under law that will be equal to any emergency that may develop in the atomic age. By Government under law I mean we must have legal machinery duly authorized, carefully planned, which will be ready to go into motion instantaneously in order to effectively mobilize the brains, the courage, the vision, the facilities, the assets, the manpower, and the industrial power of America.

One such item of our legal machinery should be, as I have suggested many times, compulsory-arbitration machinery. Under such provision there would be no strikes in government or in any industrial activities which government certifies as vital for the protection of 145,000,000 American people. Industrial activities that are vital include public utilities, like railroads, telephone, telegraph, electricity, gas, plus atomic energy plants, key Nation-wide industry, and other plants. In every one of these interests, the public interest is the paramount thing.

CRISIS IN ATOMIC PLANTS

What brings this immediately to mind is the threatened work stoppage of some 900 atomic plant workers at Oak Ridge, Tenn. I have followed with deep concern developments there. I note that the union has indicated that it will comply with the President's request to stay on the job until March 19th. I believe, however, that it is absolutely intolerable and inexcusable that we should rely on luck or hope that union officers will somehow have enough respect for their Nation's needs, to continue uninterrupted work on atomic energy plants. Director Cyrus Ching of the United States Conciliation Service has indicated that an Oak Ridge stoppage will have grave national implications.

Even though such a stoppage would be disastrous, we apparently continue to place all our faith in pious hopes that union leaders will respect their patriotic obligations. We cannot long continue on such a basis, because we have noted time and again in the past when union leaders, particularly racketeering leaders, have irresponsibly ignored the welfare of the American people and have ordered work stoppages in important defense plants.

PAST AMENDMENT FOR ARBITRATION

Now that the European crisis is deepening and that continued American defense production is absolutely necessary, we should, I believe, take action to establish compulsory arbitration in all atomic energy plants. I had previously sponsored a compulsory arbitration amendment to what was then known as the Case labor bill, but the Senate unfortunately turned this amendment down.

SUBMITTAL OF THIS STATEMENT TO COMMITTEE

I am now submitting this statement urging compulsory arbitration to Senator BALL as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, asking his group's earnest consideration of my suggestion and study of this problem.

LACK OF REAL ALTERNATIVE

Opponents of compulsory arbitration have never offered any reasonable alternative to it as insurance against reckless stoppages. All they have apparently relied upon is their own wishful thinking that somehow, in some way, voluntary conciliation and arbitration would be enough. The national defense needs of the American people cannot rely on such wishful thinking. We cannot allow Uncle Sam to be made Uncle Sucker.

No one is more reluctant than I to ask for Government intervention through the medium of compulsory arbitration, but there is no possible sure alternative, if we are to have any guarantee whatsoever that our defense production will not be sabotaged.

The present situation is an open invitation to every Communist agent, fellow traveler, and provocator in the United States to concentrate agitation activities on atomic workers in order to cause work stoppages, knowing that they can easily wreck all voluntary conciliation and voluntary arbitration efforts.

Even if the potential Oak Ridge stoppage is successfully averted, we have no guaran-

tee whatsoever that similar stoppages will not occur in the future. On the contrary, Communist agents and racketeers may simply want to hold their fire, that is, to postpone actual mass shut-downs until America gets into a defense crisis, at which time, we will be caught helpless without any compulsory arbitration machinery.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION ONLY A LAST RESORT

I personally have felt that government, insofar as possible, should stay out of business affairs and labor affairs, but when it comes to the security of 145,000,000 people in the atomic age, I believe that it is necessary that government establish machinery for compulsory arbitration. Such machinery would be used to prevent work stoppage in a national defense plant, particularly plants working in connection with atomic energy and which could be so certified by the President.

The present situation in which the American people are helpless to prevent strikes in key plants, enheartens all the enemies of democracy at home and throughout the world, and shows that at least in this instance, we lack the foresight and the hindsight to protect ourselves and all that we hold dear.

Comments by Philip W. Porter on Rent Control and on the Speech of Hon. Harry P. Cain, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Philip Porter of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, bearing on the subject of rent control, and dealing especially with the diligent efforts of Senator CAIN in that field.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTER ON SENATOR CAIN—SPONSOR OF RENT CONTROL EXTENSION BILL PRESENTS FINE LOGIC—FOR ABOLITION OF WARTIME HANG-OVER

(By Philip W. Porter)

One day last week I let fly with a lot of words denouncing that socialistic abomination, rent control, and explaining why it was perpetuating the housing shortage, rather than curing it. Since that time I have studied the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20 and read the 3-hour speech of Senator HARRY P. CAIN (Republican of Washington), who managed the Senate bill which seeks to extend this last wartime control through April 1949. It is one of the darndest things I ever read.

Throughout a most able presentation Senator CAIN made the complete argument against rent control. It was so able that two other Senators E. H. MOORE (Republican, of Oklahoma) and SPESSARD L. HOLLAND (Democrat, of Florida), said he had convinced them the controls were evil. It revealed CAIN, the subcommittee chairman, to be completely out of sympathy with this control. The most he could say of it was that the administration and the leaders of Congress had decided there should be an extension, and he was hoping the Federal Housing Expediter's Office would administer the bill's intent toward gradual decontrol better in 1948 than it had in 1947.

In fact, Senator CAIN did on the Housing Expediter's Office one of the neatest jobs of hide peeling a Federal Bureau I have ever read. He said it had been proved beyond doubt that this agency had flagrantly violated the intent of Congress, had set up its own interpretations of the law, had acted as a propagandist for the idea of permanent rent control, had resisted local boards' recommendations for decontrol and had even permitted publication of a nonsensical pamphlet by its administrator in region 8, Ward Cox, which indicated that rent control dated back to Adam and Eve.

CAIN said the Housing Expediter promised to be a good boy now, however, after the committee indicated it would not confirm his temporary appointment unless he behaved.

This merely proves further what has long been known that in many sections of the country, including this area, this particular bureau has devoted a good share of its effort to trying to persuade all tenants that they had a God-given right to live at half fare in a landlord's premises, and in every respect trying to continue its own enforcement job indefinitely, instead of gradually tapering off a wartime need which long ago ceased to exist.

I don't intend to argue the matter further today. Let Senator CAIN do it in his own language:

"One of the cruelest iniquities of rent control has been the freezing in of the stay-at-home families who moved in while veterans were in service. It has frozen out the returning servicemen. Truly, the returning veteran and his family have been the greatest victims of rent control. * * * We believe the best way in which a veteran can be helped to find a home for rent is to provide a reasonable selection of rental vacancies—in all rent ranges and in all communities. Those vacancies can only be provided by the redistribution of existing housing space not efficiently used or by new rental construction. Rent control has acted as a barrier to either course. * * *"

VETERANS SUFFER

"Any rent-control act we pass will violate the rights of certain groups of people in our economy. History tells us that such controls have been detrimental to every nation in the world which has ever tried them. * * * If we pass a law for 1948, when we gather again there will be fewer rental vacancies in America than there are now, and there are approximately 30 percent less today than there were in 1940. "Whoever thought up the idea that a veteran, somehow, at the average age of 21 or less, was possessed of sufficient money to buy himself a new house, however well intentioned he was, did to veterans everywhere the greatest injustice I have ever yet encountered. On the average the veteran is not yet qualified to buy a home, and * * * tens of thousands of those who have bought homes as a result of the national policy of a new house for everybody are going to have their mortgages foreclosed * * * and have to start all over again. * * *

"Between 1940 and 1946 almost 3,000,000 living units became occupied by one or two persons instead of by larger families. * * * The housing is still there. * * * Our present widely accepted shortage of housing space * * * are shortages of units available for rent. * * * There is no member of the committee who does not wish that we could rid the Nation of rent controls today."

Thus the manager of the Senate bill demolished the reason for rent control and denounced his own bill as a grave injustice. No one took the floor to dispute him. Yet the Senate passed the bill and kicked it along to the House. Why? Politics. Lack of guts. This is a Presidential election year, and the matter is a hot potato. A Pontius Pilate attitude—"this is wrong, but we better not try to right it this year." So the shortage will continue for another year.

There is still an infinitesimal chance that the House may let the controls die at the end of 30 days. The Members would do so if they heard from enough folks at home—the veterans, the small houseowner who has been renting half his double house. There are millions of them. They are the ones who are getting "gypped."

Tidelands Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Tidelands Suits," from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of March 4 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE TIDELANDS SUITS

Attorney General Clark told a joint congressional committee Wednesday that the Federal Government plans additional suits against other States to establish Federal ownership of their tidelands. Such actions were contemplated specifically, he added, against Texas and Louisiana, but two or three other Gulf States might possibly be made defendants. That includes all the Gulf States. The present administration's attack on the tidal-lands front thus is shifted to the deep South.

Meanwhile, there have been reports that some of the other States now joined in defense may be given assurances against Federal molestation in this field. Doubtless their attorneys general and other authorities will bear in mind that one administration's promises under this head are not binding upon future administrations bent on expanding the Federal jurisdiction and power.

The practically solid front of the States against the attack upon constitutional rights and powers they have enjoyed from the Republic's beginning apparently is causing uneasiness in some high Washington places. That was indicated first by assurances that the Supreme Court's ruling in the California case did not affect the sister commonwealths. Attempts to split the States' defense front make it plainer.

The testimony of the Federal Attorney General that other suits now are being planned should have the effect of tightening and strengthening the unity of the States on this vitally important front. Unless they hold together and fight unitedly to defeat the Federal drive to nullify constitutional rights recognized for more than a century, they face the open threat of attack one by one, by ambitious Federal administrations which cannot be bound by promises or compromise agreements of their predecessors.

All this emphasizes the necessity of their fighting shoulder to shoulder on the congressional battlefield where the issue already is joined. Previous legislation confirming their long-established rights in this matter was vetoed by Mr. Truman. Its reenactment not only should be pressed with all possible vigor and unity at this session, but it should be fortified against another possible veto, by muster and solid organization of two-thirds majorities in each House.

That should not be too difficult if the congressional representatives of the States in Senate and House that the success of this attack upon the rights of States, as constitutionally defined and so long maintained, must invite and encourage other invasions in other fields. The ultimate objective is a practically complete centralization of governmental powers in Washington, opening the way to eventual totalitarian rule whose results have been demonstrated in central and eastern Europe within our own time.

Salary Legislation Affecting Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, one of my valued constituents is Mr. Jesse V. Horton, who is first vice president of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. On March 5 Mr. Horton appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and made a statement with reference to pending salary legislation affecting postal employees. Mr. Horton's statement was so objective and fair, and contained so much factual data of interest and importance, that I desire to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of these remarks. Mr. Horton's statement is as follows:

As spokesman for the National Association of Postal Supervisors, I desire to join with the other postal organizations in urging the early passage of salary legislation which will enable postal employees to meet adequately the greatly increased living costs and we believe that such a cost-of-living increase should be at least $800 per annum.

During the past week you gentlemen have heard the problems of the clerk and carrier groups which comprise more than 200,000 postal employees whose present salaries have a range of $2,100 to $3,100 per annum. Our group, the postal supervisors, supervise and direct the work performed by the clerks and carriers and numbers only approximately 15,000 employees, but our problems are much more complex. Postal supervisory salaries in the field service range from $3,200 to $3,300 per annum at second-class offices and from $3,500 to $7,100 at first-class offices. Through increases granted by the Seventy-ninth Congress, postal supervisors received salary increases of 17 to 45.8 percent over salaries in effect prior to July 1, 1945, as compared to 47.7 for clerks and carriers, and as much as 57.7 to 69.4 percent for supervisors in the inspection and railway-mail services for whom it is obvious that a more equitable basis was used in fixing percentage increases in past legislation. Postal supervisors in the lower percentage groups received not only less than other postal employees, but in many cases far less also than those with a comparable salary range in other Government services. These salary inconsistencies have been simple to prove, time and again, to anyone's complete satisfaction, but corrective action has been extremely difficult to secure during the 3 years since the enactment of Public Laws 134 and 386.

For quick, easy reference, I have extended and brought down to date a simple analysis which was originally presented by representatives of the Post Office Department at the Senate hearings on June 8 to 13, 1945.

Maximum pay schedules for comparable supervisory positions, 1925–48

	Inspector in charge	Railway mail service				
		Division superintendent	Assistant division superintendent	Chief clerk (district superintendent)	Assistant chief clerk (assistant division superintendent)	Clerk in charge
Start:						
July 1, 1925	$4,500	$4,500	$3,600	$3,300	$2,800	$2,700
Aug. 16, 1935	6,400	4,500	3,600	3,300	2,800	2,700
Aug. 16, 1936	6,400	5,400	4,600	4,100	3,500	2,700
July 12, 1941	6,400	5,800	4,800	4,100	3,600	2,700
Sept. 25, 1944	6,400	6,200	5,400	4,600	3,800	2,700
July 1, 1945	6,700	6,700	5,700	5,000	4,200	3,500
Jan. 1, 1946	7,100	7,100	6,100	5,400	4,600	3,900
Increase	2,600	2,600	2,500	2,100	1,800	1,200
Percent	57.7	57.7	69.4	63.8	64.2	44.4

OTHER FEDERAL SERVICES

	CAF-13	CAF-12	CAF-10	CAF-9	CAF-8	CAF-7
Start:						
July 1, 1925		$4,600	$3,500	$3,200	$2,900	$2,600
July 3, 1930	$5,600	5,400	4,100	3,800	3,500	3,200
July 1, 1945	7,070	6,020	4,630	4,300	3,970	3,640
July 1, 1946	8,060	6,862	5,278	4,902	4,526	4,150
Increase	2,460	2,262	1,778	1,702	1,626	1,550
Percent	43.9	49.2	50.7	53.2	56.1	59.6

POST OFFICE SUPERVISORS

	Assistant postmaster	Superintendent of division	Assistant superintendent	General foreman	Foreman	Clerk in charge
Start:						
July 1, 1925	$4,700	$4,500	$3,700	$3,100	$2,700	$2,600
July 1, 1945	5,300	5,100	4,100	3,500	3,200	3,100
Jan. 1, 1946	5,700	5,500	4,500	3,900	3,600	3,500
Increase	1,000	1,000	800	800	900	900
Percent	21.3	22.2	21.6	25.5	33.3	34.6

Summarizing the above tables, you will see that in 1925 the inspector in charge received $200 less than the assistant postmaster cited, yet by 1946 his salary had risen $1,600 more than that of the assistant postmaster; the division superintendent railway mail service received the same salary as the superintendent of a division in the post office in 1925, yet in 1946 he was receiving $1,600 more than the post-office supervisor; the assistant superintendent railway mail service in 1925 received $100 less than the assistant in the post office, but in 1946 he was receiving $1,600 more; in 1925 the chief clerk railway mail service received $200 more than the general foreman (then junior assistant superintendent) in the post office, but by 1946 he was receiving $1,600 more; the assistant chief clerk railway mail service received $100 more in 1925 than the foreman in the post office, yet by 1946 he was receiving $1,000 more; and in 1925 the clerk in charge railway mail service received $100 more than the clerk in charge (then junior foreman) in the post office, but by 1946 he was receiving $400 more. This is most certainly a very unfair rate of progression for the postal supervisor, for whom no uniform plan of relative salary increases with the duties and responsibilities of their positions has been followed.

In making these comparisons, we wish to emphasize that the salaries of the supervisors in the inspection and railway mail services are fully justified. In fact, they now merit another upward revision, in view of present conditions. However, the point we desire to make clear is that postal supervisors' salaries have lagged behind and have not kept pace with those other supervisors with comparable responsibilities.

Here are four specific examples:

The general superintendent of finance in one of the largest post offices with receipts of more than $130,000,000 is accountable for the handling of more than $1,000,000,000 in postal and money-order funds, postal savings, and bond sales each year, pays an annual premium of $65 out of his own pocket on a surety bond of $50,000, has more than 1,000 employees under his supervision, yet receives a salary of only $6,100. In other Federal bureaus, an executive with comparable responsibility would receive $9,000 or more.

The superintendent of outgoing mails at another large office with receipts of more than $85,000,000 has more than 9,500 employees, including 270 supervisors, under his supervision and is responsible for all of the operations involving the prompt handling for dispatch or delivery of more than 8,000,000 pieces of mail daily, yet his salary is only $5,100, whereas a comparable executive in other Federal services would also rate $9,000 or more.

A superintendent of mails in an office with receipts of $500,000 in a city of 75,000 population has more than 75 employees under his supervision and is responsible for all operations involving the distribution, dispatch, and delivery of more than 50,000 pieces of mail each day, receives a salary of $4,100, while a comparable executive in other Federal services would receive $5,000 or more.

In fact, in the entire field post office service, consisting of more than 300,000 postal employees, there are only 2 supervisors who receive the maximum salary of $7,100 per annum, and only 13 whose annual salaries are more than $6,000. This is in marked contrast with 379 high-bracket employees in the State Department and 545 in the Commerce Department as shown in a report by the House Appropriations Committee just a week ago today. This same proportion of top-grade positions exists in other govern-

mental departments, such as Treasury, Civil Service Commission, Social Security, Veterans' Administration, etc. Please bear in mind that these are the top supervisory positions. The initial supervisory grade at all first-class offices is only $3,500, the next $3,600, and the third position at offices with receipts up to $5,000,000 is only $3,700, thus requiring two promotions after the initial one to advance only $200 in annual salary. At many first-class offices with receipts up to $500,000, three promotions would not ordinarily occur in the lifetime of a supervisor. These are strong arguments in support of our often asserted contention for a wider salary gap between the highest paid clerk or carrier and the lowest paid supervisor.

In previous salary increases by Congress, there has been a pronounced tendency to apply flat salary increases based on providing adequate salaries for the two principal groups, the clerks and carriers, and while this policy has been beneficial to the mail handlers and other lower salary groups, it has been detrimental to the supervisors by decreasing their proportionate salaries. For example, the salary of a foreman in 1920 was $2,300 and in 1948 it is $3,600, an increase of $1,300 or 56.5 percent; the salary of a superintendent of registry in 1920 was $4,000 and in 1948 it is $5,100, an increase of $1,100 or 27.5 percent; while the $1,800 top salary of a clerk or carrier in 1920 has increased to $3,100 in 1948, an increase of $1,300 or 72.2 percent.

You have heard testimony that many employees are compelled to augment their earnings through outside part-time employment and the additional pay for overtime performed has brought extra pay to practically all employees except supervisors, who are not permitted to accept part-time outside employment or to engage in business, nor are they paid for overtime.

An assistant postmaster at a second-class office with receipts of $18,000 in a city of 3,000 persons has more than 12 employees under his supervision and is responsible for the prompt and efficient operation of all financial and mail-handling activities. His salary is only $3,200 per annum, which is only $100 higher than clerks and carriers whom he supervises and whose overtime earnings during the year cause their total pay to exceed that of the assistant postmaster.

Supervisors in the custodial service are responsible for the maintenance and servicing of Federal buildings used by the postal service and their salaries are materially less than those of other supervisors with comparable responsibilities in other postal work, as well as those in public and office buildings outside the Federal service. For example, a foreman of laborers with 30 or more employees under his supervision is paid $3,000, as compared with a foreman in mail-handling operations supervising the same sized group at $3,600. Similar inequities exist throughout the custodial supervisory schedules.

I would call attention to the motor-vehicle service and, for just an example, point out one case among others in the motor-vehicle service whereby a supervisor is indeed underpaid, when consideration is given to his duties and responsibilities as well as the knowledge and experience he must have in his line to render efficient service. I refer to the chief mechanic in the motor-vehicle service. I have in mind a chief mechanic and not in the largest office either. This particular chief mechanic supervises approximately 50 mechanics and is required to direct the overhauling and reconditioning of 770 trucks, most of them not of recent manufacture. Not only must the chief mechanic have a thorough knowledge of motortruck repairing, he has to supervise work performed by carpenters, blacksmiths, tire vulcanizers, painters, tinsmiths, and others whose skill is required to keep a large fleet of trucks in good operating condition.

His salary is $3,800—only $200 more than the mechanics in charge who work under his supervision. The latter are not considered supervisors, and consequently are entitled to overtime pay, which results in some cases where the take-home pay of the chief mechanic is less than the mechanics in charge. The chief mechanic's case should be corrected and a $5,000 salary is the least he should be receiving.

We feel that Congress is interested in making the postal service attractive as a career as it cannot be maintained on a highly efficient base with an ever-changing personnel. We have been encouraged in this belief as never before by the intense interest which you and members of your committee have manifested in your visits to many post offices during the past year, to familiarize yourselves at first hand with actual prevailing conditions. You can therefore readily realize that it is not only essential that entrance salaries be adequate to attract desirable employees, but that thereafter there must be sufficient incentive to remain and develop in the service, as well as prepare for and willingly assume supervisory responsibilities.

Prime factors in providing and maintaining this incentive are, (1) security in tenure, which we have, (2) reasonable retirement benefits, which have just been provided, for which we thank you gentlemen most sincerely, and (3) salaries commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of supervisory positions, which only the Congress can provide. So that postal supervisors may be restored to their former status as compared with other postal and governmental workers, it is urgently recommended, first, that the pertinent sections of Public Law 134 be amended as we have been suggesting for more than 3 years, and secondly, that future permanent salary adjustments be made on a percentage basis, proportionate to the highest clerk or carrier salary, thereby preserving the proper differential between salaries which are deemed justified for supervisory positions.

I am submitting with this testimony a proposed bill which would effect adequate corrective measures, together with a brief showing justification for the specific salaries which we believe to be just and proper for each position and grade of post office. Surely, postal supervisors have received the short end of salary legislation during the past 3 years and this loyal group of employees throughout the entire country earnestly request your favorable consideration of this proposal.

Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I extend the final installment of the article written by Jerry Kluttz with reference to the new Civil Service Retirement Act:

If he does not leave a widow or children, his beneficiary will receive, in the form of a lump-sum payment, everything in the fund to the employee's credit, with interest, regardless of how long the worker was employed.

If the deceased person leaves a survivor entitled to an immediate annuity, or a future annuity at age 50, the question of a lump-sum payment of an unexpended balance cannot arise until we see, after all survivorship payments are made, whether anything remains in the fund.

If the employee dies, leaving a widow or other survivor, or both, entitled to any benefit, there will not be a lump-sum payment due anyone if the annuities which are paid wipe out the total credited to the deceased worker. If, however, there is any balance left because the survivors' payments cease—on account of remarriage or death, for instance—that unexpended balance will go to the beneficiary or the estate.

It could happen that a survivorship benefit set aside for future payment may never be paid simply because the right to the benefit ceases before the due date (by death, or marriage, perhaps). In such case, the amount remaining in the fund will become payable in a lump sum.

Lump sums may be payable to the beneficiaries of people who die after retirement, too. The conditions of eligibility and payment will be similar to those just described. In any event, it can be expected that if all the annuities paid out on the basis of any one employee's service do not equal the amount to the employee's credit in the fund at his death, an unexpended balance will exist and it will be payable to his beneficiary or his estate.

CLAIMS MUST BE FILED

It should be remembered, however, in regard to all annuities, balances and benefits under both the old and the new laws, that no payments are awarded automatically; claims must be filed with the Civil Service Commission to start the ball rolling.

It is very important that every employee make out a designation of beneficiary form. They are available from agency personnel offices. Anyone may be named the beneficiary to get the money remaining in a deceased employee's or annuitant's retirement account—parent, wife, brother, daughter, a business acquaintance, a friend, or a religious, social, or educational group. It should be realized that if no one is named beneficiary, any lump sum which may be payable will go to the administrator or executor of the estate or to the next of kin, in that order.

The Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act has simplified the refund and redeposit proposition, too. Here are a few of the key things we need to remember about this now:

If a person leaves or is separated from the Government with less than 20 years of civilian service to his credit, and before becoming eligible for optional retirement, he can get a refund of the money to his credit in the fund. If he served more than 1 year, he will also get the interest on his deductions; if he served 1 year or less, no interest will be paid.

We do not count military service in computing this 20-year period for refund purposes.

If a person has served 20 years or more in Federal civilian work, he is not entitled to a refund of his account money; he is entitled to an annuity at age 62.

If a separated person has over 5 years' but less than 20 years' civilian service to his credit, he has a choice of either taking a refund or leaving the money in the system for annuity purposes.

If a person leaves the service and takes his refund, and then returns to the Government, he is not required to repay the money he withdrew, but it is definitely to his advantage to do so.

If such a person wishes to repay his refunded money, there will be an interest charge.

NO MORE TONTINE CHARGE

The old tontine bugaboo is gone at last. That dollar-a-month assessment which used to be set aside from the employee's account exists no more. The tontine provisions will apply in the cases of persons separated before this law becomes effective, but after that

date everything that goes into the employee's account stays there to his personal credit.

The Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act says that the only reason for returning a retired employee over age 60 to Government work is because of the acute need of his special qualifications. If it is arranged to reemploy such a person, his annuity will continue to be paid to him, and an amount equal to the annuity he is getting will be deducted from his salary. No service credit will be given for the period of reemployment, and no retirement deductions will be made.

Annuitants under 60 years of age may be reemployed in the Government under the usual civil-service conditions governing appointment and reinstatement.

So far as voluntary contributions to the fund are concerned, the 1948 act simplified the method of computing just how much more annuity is being purchased when we put in our extra money. As an example of how this works out now, in the case of a person retiring at 60, every $100 he has credited to the voluntary-contribution account (including the interest which his contributions earn) will increase his annuity by $8. The amount of additional annuity grows at the rate of 20 cents a year. The figure for the person retiring at 63, therefore, is $8.60. The following table shows the increases in 5-year stages:

Growth of annuity for each $100 in the contribution account:	*Age of retiring employee*
$7	55
$8	60
$9	65
$10	70

Voluntary contributions purchase additional life annuities which are payable only to the employee who makes the contributions.

Annuities used to accrue on a day-to-day basis; this has been changed to a monthly basis. The effect of this is that if an annuity stops before the end of any month (because of the death of the annuitant, for example) there will not be any accrued unpaid annuity due the beneficiary for that part of the month which passed before the annuity terminated. Any unpaid annuity due (full months) upon the death of an annuitant goes to his beneficiary. Any unpaid annuity due upon the termination of an annuity to a survivor (because of remarriage, attainment of age 18, etc.) will go to the survivor, or to the survivor's estate if he has passed on.

The new act increased the annuity of those already on the retirement rolls by 25 percent, or $300, whichever is less. The retired person has the choice, however, of taking the increase or of keeping his old rate and naming his wife to receive upon his death an annuity equal to one-half of what he is getting under the old law. The amount the wife gets, though, cannot exceed $600. A married female annuitant has the same right to name her husband as survivor-annuitant.

The following table illustrates annuities computed under the basic formula when all payments have been made:

Highest 5-year average salary	Years of creditable service						
	5	10	15	20	25	30	35
$1,500	$200	$400	$600	$800	$1,000	$1,200	$1,200
$2,000	225	450	675	900	1,125	1,350	1,575
$2,500	250	500	750	1,000	1,250	1,500	1,750
$3,500	300	600	900	1,200	1,500	1,800	2,100
$4,000	325	650	975	1,300	1,625	1,950	2,275
$5,000	375	750	1,125	1,500	1,875	2,250	2,625
$7,500	563	1,125	1,688	2,250	2,813	3,375	3,938
$10,000	750	1,500	2,250	3,000	3,750	4,500	5,250

The annual annuity is paid in 12 equal monthly installments computed to the nearest whole dollar; some of the above figures, therefore, are exact, while some are round figures close to the exact amount.

The Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to the so-called force bill, from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of March 1.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAMAGES OVERLOOKED

In its leading editorial of Sunday, February 22, the New York Times discussed the Truman-proposed FEPC force bill. Said that influential northern contemporary in part:

"We do not believe a Federal law could force the FEPC ideal on communities in which majority opinion ran otherwise. * * * A Federal FEPC with power to investigate, recommend, and conciliate but no power to enforce might get further than one with a policeman's club. The problem is not insoluble. Evolution works toward its solution. * * * It is a pity that in this political year the issue should be degenerating into a question of who is going to get what bloc of votes."

It is that degeneration, of course, which has generated the pressure for enactment of the FEPC iniquity. In actual practical fact this force bill constitutes a political bid for minority-group votes and all Americans who have studied the circumstances surrounding the drive—save perhaps the sentimentalists—recognize and frankly acknowledge that fact.

But there are fundamental issues raised by the proposed FEPC witch hunt, thought police, and the other force bills against the South which seemingly escape northern notice. One is their undertaking to break down constitutionally guaranteed rights and powers of the States. Every such encroachment weakens the framework of our Federal Constitution and invites new invasions. The very concentration of all powers in the Federal Government against which the founding fathers tried to set up permanent safeguards by specific division of powers is being attempted by bills like these. They contain the seeds of a completely centralized police state of the totalitarian order. That is a danger which concerns Americans of all states and sanctions.

The FEPC bill goes further and contemplates flagrant invasion of individual rights. The right of an individual American engaged in legitimate private business to select employees best suited for its successful conduct has been undoubted and unchallenged for more than a century of our national life. Its preservation, as millions in the South now directly threatened with its deprivation are convinced, is a must if there is to be preservation of any individual rights in this country. For history shows that destruction of one such right opens the way for destruction of others. Federally dictated employment in legitimate private businesses not only would violate an individual—and constitutional—right which most Americans hold fundamental. Its inevitable abuse would weaken respect for law and probably destroy friendly interracial relations in communities where majority opinion ran otherwise and where, as the New York Times points out, no such coercive Federal law could be enforced.

Practical Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Practical Proposals," published in the Lafayette (Ind.) Courier-Journal of February 17, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICAL PROPOSALS

The proposal of Indiana's Senator CAPEHART for a sort of international RFC to administer European aid, as a substitute for the Marshall plan, is attracting much favorable attention.

Above all, the Senator is insisting upon a business-like method of assistance, instead of socialistic government spending. This insistence recommends itself. There are no two ways about it. There must be business in European aid if we are to stabilize our own economy and also the economic standards of the nations we seek to help.

Whether or not Senator CAPEHART'S plan will be accepted, it is certain to exert a wholesome influence. He has pointed out that the Marshall plan nations, whom we are being asked to help to the tune of $17,000,000,000, in money and materials, now possess gold, dollars, and dollar investments in this country totaling $13,600,000,000 in known holdings, while there is strong evidence that other billions are held secretly in other countries. Under CAPEHART'S plan of extending credit loans, the participating countries could utilize the credit of these investments in order to assist in their own recovery.

The countries in question are asked to invest in themselves just as we are asked to invest in them. That is entirely logical. This and other phases of the Capehart program should be considered. He offers the business approach of a practical businessman. These elements are too often lacking in such matters, but are sorely needed.

Some Claims Filed With Alien Property Custodian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the larger debt and title claims which have been filed with the Alien Property Custodian:

SCHEDULE B.—*Debt claims*

Claiman.	Debtor	Amount alleged to be owed
J. P. Morgan & Co	German Government	$91,305,600.00
Do	do	59,633,400.00
Do	Austrian or German Government	20,000,000.00
Rudolf Steiner	Conversion Office for German Foreign Debts	344,800.00
Stanco, Inc	Dresdner Bank	255,489.30
Bank of America N. T. & S. Association	Vereinigte Stahlwerke, A. G	992,251.37
Guaranty Trust of New York	Mannesmanrochren-Werke, Dusseldorf	176,738.80
Lee Higginson & Co	Royal Hungarian Government, "Futura"	} 1,133,364.71
Do	Hungarian Cooperative Society Trading Co., Ltd	
Claus Light	German Government	8,000,000.00
John Henry and Dora Kahn	Deutsche Bank	172,549.03
Joseph Z. Dalinda	Edgar William Brandt	1,390,000.00
Standard Vacuum Oil Co	Dai-Ichi Ginkold	439,843.75
Franz Oppenheimer	Deutsche Bank	663,421.23
Siegfried Bieber	Berliner Handels Ges	286,303.00
Broadway Exchange Corp	Hamburg American Line-North German Lloyd	353,819.83
General Petroleum Corp	Mitsui & Co., Ltd	[1] 1,159,920.74
Guaranty Trust Co. of New York	Norddeutscher	4,587,925.00
Bank of America	Commerz Bank	1,315,274.38
Do	Franz B. Lehmann et al. Deutsche Bank, H. Albert de Bary & Co	2,112,181.57
Do	Dresdner Bank and for Handels Trust West, N. V	1,066,160.47
Do	German Government	2,283,979.24
Do	Vereinigte Stahlwerke: Dusseldorf; Amsterdansche Liquidatickas	992,251.37
Maj. William L. Luxton	Deutsche Reiche Bank	2,000,000.00
Manufacturers Trust Co	Fried Krupp, A. G	928,495.89
Do	Reiches Kredit Ges, A. G	845,792.70
Do	Deutsche Bank	2,379,557.79
Do	Berliner Handels-Gesellschaft	984,230.19
Do	Dresdner Bank—Deutsche S. A. Bank	2,119,433.09
Do	Commerz Bank A. G	1,380,830.29
Warde C. Hiberly	Yoshitomoshima et al	416,509.31
Honkong & Shanghai Bank Corp	Lloyd Trietino Societa A. di. N	200,000.00
Do	Yokohamo Specie Bank, Ltd	373,805.35
Hermann Hummell	I. G. Farbenindustrie	250,000.00
International Silk Guild, Inc	Shingei Corp.; Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha; Mitsui & Co., Ltd.; Hara & Co.; Katakura & Co.; Japan Cotton & Silk Trading Co.; Gunze Silk Corp.; Asachi Silk Co., Ltd.; Bank of Taiwan; Bank of Japan; Mitsui Bank, Ltd.; Sumito Bank, Ltd.; Yokohoma Specie Bank; Bank of Chosen, Ltd.; Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd.; Yokohoma Specie Bank, Ltd.; Sumitonio Bank, Ltd.	578,425.60
Japan Cotton & Silk Trading Co	Yokohoma Specie Bank, Ltd., New York	500,000.00
Shirley Johnson	German Government	800,000.00
National City Bank of New York	Bank of Taiwan, Ltd	16,694,726.44
Do	Yokohoma Specie Bank, Ltd., New York	5,230,438.54
Do	Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd	6,318,185.46
Do	Banks of Japan	2,412,395.00
National Shawmut Bank of Boston	Vereinigte Stahlwerke, A. G. (Aktik-Pars)	585,338.67
Do	Reichs—Kredit Ges., A. G	735,996.89
Do	Dresdner Bank of Berlin	1,562,891.14
Do	Deutsche Bank Filiale, Dresden	1,448,607.99
Do	Commerz Bank of Berlin	1,176,726.23
Do	Fried, Krupp, A. G	1,098,587.00
Do	do	1,098,587.00
Do	Fried, Krupp, A. G. Deutsche Bank, Dresdner Bank, Reichs-Kredit, Ges	1,098,587.00
Do	Krupp, Fried, Grusonwerke, A. G	1,098,587.00
Do	do	1,098,587.00
Do	Deutsche Bank, Dresdner Bank, Reichs-Kredit, Ges	1,098,587.00
Do	do	1,098,587.00
Do	Hardy & Co., Reichs, Kredit, Ges	1,098,587.00
Do	Fried, Krupp, A. G	1,098,587.00
Do	Deutsche Bank, Kaiserlaytory Filiale Stuttgart	1,448,607.99
Do	Darmstadter und National Bank, K. G. a. A	1,562,891.14
Do	Fried, Krupp, A. G	1,098,587.00
Do	do	1,098,587.00
Do	Deutsche Bank	1,448,607.99
Do	Dresdner Bank	1,562,891.14
Do	Fried, Krupp, Grusonwerke, A. G	1,098,587.00
New York Trust Co	Cementia Holding, A. G.; Unjarische Allgemeine Kredit Bank	1,237,335.37
Wilhelm Roth	I. G. Farbenindustrie, A. G	442,000.00
Silesian-American Corp	Bergwerke Gessel-Schaft, Georg von Geischels Erber	3,216,130.18
61 Broadway Corp	Hamburg American German Lines	595,972.16
Erie M. Warburg	Brinekmann, Wirtz & Co	1,955,495.53

[1] Including interest.

SCHEDULE C.—*List of larger title claims based on claimants' valuation*

Name	Amount	Description of property
Aktiebolaget Vargos	$120,375.00	Bank account.
Ater Forsakinga Aktiebolget.	201,230.00	Stock in Pilot Reinsurance Co. of New York.
Ernest E. Bing	60,960.00	Apartment building, bank deposit.
Grete Blas	50,000.00	Bank account, bonds, mortgage certificates.
Charles Bruening Co., Inc.	85,146.16	Overpayment on patent royalties.
Forsakringsaktiebolaget	176,250.00	Stock in Pilot Reinsurance Co. of New York.
General Aniline & Film Corp.	12,193,190.98	Loss on General Aniline Film's holdings in I. G. Chemie.

SCHEDULE C.—*List of larger title claims based on claimants' valuation*—Continued

Name	Amount	Description of property
Societe de Prospection	$411,000.00	Royalties under patent license contract.
SA des Ateliers Brullie Freres.	90,000.00	Royalties under patent license contract.
Societe des Usines Chimiques Rhone Poulenc.	333,255.00	Do.
Hope & Co. Continental Handels Bank.	349,771.02	Stock in American Potash Chemical Corp.
Hermann H. Kind	89,074.11	Stock certificates.
Carl Schreiner	107,187.76	Proceeds liquidation stock of Pilot Reinsurance Co of New York.
Shanghai Power Co	920,456.39	Cash.

SCHEDULE C.—*List of larger title claims based on claimants' valuation*—Continued

Name	Amount	Description of property
Brandjorsokrimeaktiebolaget Veritas Svenska.	$215,781.00	Stock in Pilot Reinsurance Co. of New York.
W. Sobernheim	137,624.12	Securities.
Shanghai Power Co	211,318.51	Cash.
James F. Egan	187,179.74	5,000 shares of American Potash & Chemical Corp.
Jean Jobert	150,000.00	Copyrighted royalties and copyright interests in music cartel.
Societe Rodiaceta	2,500,000.00	Royalties under patent license contracts.
Compagnies Reunies des Glaces.	190,000.00	Do.

SCHEDULE C.—*List of larger title claims based on claimants' valuation*—Continued

Name	Amount	Description of property
Hans Biederbach	$68,405.48	Cash in bank account.
Everett Arion	62,000.00	Capital stock of H. Molsen & Co.; accounts payable and receivable bank accounts, and cash.
Fanny Palmer	100,000.00	Fruit and vegetable land with improvements and cash.
Establissments & Laboratories Georges.	51,033.94	Two United States patents and interest in agreement with Standard Chemical Products, Inc.
Bruno Carl Reinicke	250,000.00	Life and remainder interest in trust fund.
Bank Waedenswil	100,000.00	Stock in Kalio, Inc.
Leo Zittman	148,000.00	Credits, Chase National Bank and Federal Reserve Bank, New York; National City Bank of New York.
Sterling Carr	66,892.65	Bank deposit.
Combined Investment Corp.	187,500.00	125,000 shares American Wine Corp.
Alexander C. Dencks	62,000.00	Funds liquidation L. Heumann Co., Inc.
Frank A. Chambers	184,111.42	Interest under will of Anna von Zedlitz.
Nagamo Kaku	75,000.00	Stock in Fuji Trading Co.
H. M. Garibaldi	170,453.23	$2,400 annuity plus life interest in testamentary trust.
Karl Wurth	77,484.03	Cash and "all other vested assets."
Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corp.	70,000.00	Lien on steel tubing.
Louis Pieroni	192,000.00	Proceeds liquidation of property, shares in building trust; partnership interest, securities.
Homer L. Loomis	152,000.00	Attorney's lien.
Annette Schlubach	105,000.00	Stock in Central American Plantation Corp.
Shinzaburo Sumida	70,000.00	Stock in T. Sumida & Co.
Daizo Sumida	50,000.00	Do.
Ina Luisa Gurau	165,000.00	Cash legacy.
Eiler Moltke Hultfeldt.	50,000.00	Interest in 3 trust funds.
Industrielle Maatschappij Activit N. V.	136,000.00	Royalties under patent license contract.
Ruth Francke	200,000.00	800 shares of stock, Buffalo Electro Chemical Corp.
Ottilie Francke Muller	200,000.00	Interest in an estate.
Title Guaranty & Trust Co., temporary administrator, estate of Emma A. C. H. Schraeder	86,000.00	Do.
Elektro Kemisk A/S	1,500,000.00	Patents and accrued royalties.
Hermine K. Hassencamp.	58,000.00	Cash.
Ellen Biddle von Stackelberg.	166,000.00	Securities.
L. Z. von Vietinghoff	175,000.00	Securities and cash.
Banco de Sicilia	173,000.00	Securities, cash, and realty.
Max Philippsohn	67,000.00	Cash.
Yuri Yajima	100,000.00	Securities.
Otto Haas	560,000.00	Stock in Resinous Products & Chemical Corp.
David Kamerman	70,000.00	Attorney's lien.
Dr. Leonardo Cerini	50,000.00	Stock in R. A. C. E. Inc.
Irene Albert	493,000.00	Stock in Resinous & Chemical Corp.
Servo-Frein Newandre S. A.	82,400.00	Royalties under patent license agreement.
Superflexit	97,337.71	Royalties for use of invention.
Ford Motor Co	63,345.57	Right of offset against a vested claim.
Helmut Legerlotz	500,000.00	Patent royalties.

SCHEDULE C.—*List of larger title claims based on claimants' valuation*—Continued

Name	Amount	Description of property
Nordisk Insulin Laboratorium.	$600,000.00	Royalties under patent license agreement.
Societe des Usines Chimique Rhone Poulenc.	170,606.00	Royalties under patent license contract.
Maria J. von Tongeren Boers.	54,618.15	Do.
Societe Anonyme de Manufacture et Produits Chimiques de St. Gobain.	190,000.00	Do.
Latvian Cargo & Passenger Steamship Line.	1,184,187.01	Proceeds derived from Latvian ships by way of earnings and money in bank.
Nils Erik Lenander	75,000.00	Royalties under agreement for sale of patents.

NOTE.—In the previous list, two claims appeared in the name of Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corp. In fact, only one claim has been filed, but an amendment to the original claim resulted in two claims being reported; whereas, there is only one claim and the amendment merely relates to the value of the property claimed. Accordingly, only one claim appears on the above list in the name of Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corp.

Laughing With Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial printed in the February 26 issue of the Bessemer Herald, of Bessemer, Mich., on the subject of the humor book written by our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAUGHING WITH CONGRESS

One of the busiest and ablest men in Congress is Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Like every servant of the people of a sovereign State in the Upper Chamber, he became depressed because there was nothing much but gloom overshadowing all the affairs of the legislative branch of the Government. He decided to see what he could do about it—and so he worked nights on the job at his home writing a book to which he gave the title Laughing With Congress. It made a hit in Washington because it helped to raise the morale of statesmen on Capitol Hill and the public.

One of the opening laughs in this book of nearly 250 pages was a remark by Mark Twain: "Suppose you were an idiot, and suppose you were a Member of Congress; but I repeat myself."

Then he tells how Americans became amusement mad years ago—which prompted the Milwaukee Journal to remark, "and we suppose that's the only reason we don't lynch the present Congress."

Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, was asked by one of his constituents while he was home about the salaries of Congressmen. His neighbor said to BARKLEY, "I see you fellows in Congress increased your salary." The Senator replied, "Yes, Uncle Jack, they did; but I voted against it." BARKLEY said that his old friend looked him straight in the eye for about 5 minutes, and said, "You are just a darn fool."

One day your correspondent came upon Will Rogers talking to Speaker Longworth in a corridor in the Capitol and he stopped to listen while Will was convincing the Speaker that the Indian race was superior to the white. And another time he listened to public addresses by Will Rogers, and even though he was only a humorist he was always regarded as one of the smartest men that lived in his time. What Will said years ago is a very serious fact today, i. e., "I tell you folks, all politics is applesauce."

Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., tells of an experience: "After finishing a speech that lasted about 45 minutes, I came down into the audience where I met an oldster who said: 'Well, young feller, I guess you'll do. But,' he continued, 'You ain't half as good as your pa, and you never will be.'" To which young Bob replied, "I know that probably better than anybody else in the world, but why?" And the citizen said, "One trouble with you is that you don't talk long enough."

Senator TOBEY interrupted Senator TAFT to ask permission to speak "for a moment, if the Senator would permit me to do so."

TAFT asked, "How long will it take the Senator from New Hampshire to make his statement?" Mr. TOBEY replied: "About 5 minutes, and I assure the Senator it's worth the price."

Senator Wheeler once interrupted Senator VANDENBERG and remarked: "The Senator is a great lawyer and he knows." Mr. VANDENBERG retorted: "The Senator from Montana must not be sarcastic, one of my virtues is that I am not a lawyer."

The people in Washington have shown a lot of enthusiasm over Senator WILEY's discovery that there has been plenty of "Laughing With Congress" through the years. As a matter of fact he has brought a lot of Members of the two branches of Congress out of the doldrums, with his book.

Two Points for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Points for Congress," published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of February 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO POINTS FOR CONGRESS

Debate on the European recovery program is about to start now that the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee has produced its bill. Nearly every important personage or organization has had its say for or against helping Europeans help themselves. One of the latest reports, called An American Program of European Economic Cooperation, was published by the Committee for Economic Development.

"Loans should be truly loans," it said. Gifts should be gifts and currency transactions just that. If this is to be so, why not have all the loans under the plan handled by our Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of just the initial appropriation? This is Senator CAPEHART'S proposal, and it makes sense. No

other Government agency is better equipped to handle this phase of the program. Also if the 16 nations set up RFC's of their own, they would have more control over the financing of private industrial expansion as well as a direct financial stake in every loan that was made. For Mr. CAPEHART proposes that their American investments be used as matching capital for each RFC's revolving fund.

The CED's report also briefly mentions that "the program must be consistent with the objectives of the United Nations and contribute to its success." Everybody is being brief about the UN these days. Mr. Truman seems to have completely forgotten about it. But if our national administration were now making vigorous moves to strengthen the UN by eliminating the veto and creating a military force to carry out its decisions, there would be hope that the recovery program could eventually become a truly United Nations project, instead of solely an American show. We should make every effort now to create a UN, with or without Russia, that can become the real organizer of international cooperation not only economic but military, social, and political.

These two points should be carefully considered by Congress in its deliberations over the European recovery program. One promises greatest success with less money in promoting European recovery. The other promises a strong, workable, and democratic UN capable of keeping pace with justice and preventing aggression anywhere in the world.

Pensions at Sixty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Wheeling Intelligencer, of Wheeling, W. Va., for March 3, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENSIONS AT 60

United States Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, Republican, of West Virginia, has come out in favor of optional old-age pensions at the age of 60 years. He would change the present United States social-security system to make such retirements possible. No one would be compelled to quit work at the age of 60, but those who were worn out or ill at that age would have the privilege of doing so.

As it is now, so-called social security at the age of 65 years is hardly any security at all, as actuarial statistics will reveal. Many thousands of those who work a lifetime and expect to retire at the age of 65 never reach that age, or at best survive but a year or two.

If there is any value at all in social security it is not altogether in removing elderly persons from the care of the State or their children and grandchildren, but in crowning a human life with the glory of unworried leisure in the sunset years when the voyage into the Great Beyond becomes nearer and nearer. Vouchsafing to all human beings this privilege of recounting the vicissitudes and joys of a life worthily spent and in contemplating what lies beyond the grave is a priceless boon.

There is no doubt that Senator REVERCOMB'S proposal will have a tremendous national appeal. It is just such consideration of the elderly and needy that is worthy of the highest idealism of the America that we love. Not all persons are equally endowed with physical resources to carry them much beyond the age of 65. Quite the reverse is the case. Nor are all persons buffeted and worn in the same degree by the ups and downs of life. Some find it easy to make a living and save up funds for a rainy day. Others, equally willing, equally industrious, find it difficult. In some cases, a single false step, a single accident, will destroy the savings of a lifetime.

If all young persons realized how swiftly the years roll by from 20 to 60 or even 50, they would start life out by purchasing an annuity and keeping it up through the years. But at 20, life seems limitless and, to many youngsters, the age of 50 or 60 or even 40 seems a dim and distant event to be met when it remotely arrives. Yet the pageant of the years actually is as swift as the unrolling of a motion picture as each fleeting instant of time is here and gone to return no more.

Who knows how much the Nation would gain by setting the pension retirement age at 60 rather than 65? Give these elderly people the time and unworried leisure to study the state of the world in the light of their experiences, and the whole Nation might be the gainer from their ideas. On the other hand there are many who like to work and find it a joy and pleasure because at 65, 70, 75, and even 80 years they are not so physically or mentally worn as to prevent their daily, habitual toil. But these are the exceptions, and while they set a noble pattern, they are not the rule.

There is nothing which so sadly reflects on civilization as to see any elderly person, man or woman, in shameful and sorrowful want in the declining years. The physical penalties of advancing age are enough to bear without adding to it the terrors of poverty.

We, here on earth are not the final judges of any human career. We cannot possibly arrive at all the facts and impulses that actuate a human heart. The world cannot rightly go blithely by and place the aged upon a shelf or shove them aside to shift for themselves. An elderly man or woman, passing the few last remaining years in comfort and free from want ought to be the crowning glory of our civilization, however it may be attained, whether by Government pensions to which the beneficiary has long contributed, or by similar provisions through the cooperation of the employer, or by foresight to privately purchase an annuity through the years.

Therefore many in West Virginia will think that Senator REVERCOMB deserves their gratitude for advancing this proposal and giving to it all the prestige of his high office. Others in other States, too, will be grateful to him.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated March 5, 1948, from John Breckinridge, addressed to me, dealing with the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, together with a portion of a statement made by Hugh W. Taylor with respect to trade-agreement negotiations with Mexico on burley and dark-leaf tobacco.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPE BALLARD & LOOS,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1948.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: With reference to my recent letters to you concerning the lack of appropriate safeguards in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the serious danger of injury to domestic producers inherent in any extension of that act without appropriate safeguarding amendments, I want to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Hugh W. Taylor, speaking for the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, February 25, 1948, before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

This tobacco association is an export association and in the past has been one of the stanch supporters of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. They have finally discovered that there is nothing reciprocal about trade agreements negotiated by the State Department and have concluded that the reciprocal trade agreements program as administered by the State Department is a farce on the American public and should not be continued. He specifically states that his association believes that all existing reciprocal trade agreements should be terminated.

I am enclosing a part of Mr. Taylor's testimony which I think you and your committee should study very carefully. It provides an excellent example of how even exporters and those who have in the past wholeheartedly supported the reciprocal trade agreements program are beginning to see through the State Department deception and to realize the fact that the State Department tariff cutting has never been intended to be reciprocal and never will be reciprocal. Certainly under such circumstances the authority for such a deceptive program of unilateral tariff cutting should not be extended. I would like to quote just briefly from what Mr. Taylor says on behalf of tobacco growers in answer to a question from Chairman Edminster:

"Yes, sir, I think we would be better off without them (reciprocal trade agreements) because when we get a situation like that, the rates of duty would then be back in the hands of Congress, and I think Congress is much more sympathetic to the attitude of the people than the people who negotiate trade agreements."

Mr. Taylor's full testimony is available at the Committee for Reciprocity Information and I believe it will be of interest to you. I believe it would be very enlightening and very thought producing to all of the people in the United States who have any interest in the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

HEARING ON TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS WITH MEXICO

TESTIMONY OF HUGH W. TAYLOR, BURLEY AND DARK-LEAF TOBACCO EXPORT ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C. (IN PART)

Those who export tobacco from this country to Mexico feel, and I believe have stated that belief, that they expect that the present rate will cause a decrease of about 50 percent in the amount of tobacco, particularly burley, which we will export from the United States to Mexico. Now, in total quantity in relation to total supply, that is not in itself a matter of serious consequence, but we have trade agreements with a large number of

countries in South America and Europe scattered out what we think is due reason and just cause places an additional duty on tobacco, which, in effect, more than doubles the original duty, then every other country in the world with which you have a trade agreement could, under similar conditions and with the same argument, possibly do the same thing; and in that case we feel that trade agreements are entirely unstable, and if they are unstable, they have very little value.

We have discussed the matter with our producers and with our exporters, and we feel—and we came to this conclusion very reluctantly because of the producers of burley tobacco, flue-cured tobacco, fire-cured, and dark air-cured, as well as the exporters of those types and warehousemen who sell those types have, as you gentlemen know, in the past supported the principle of reciprocal trade agreements.

I would like to stress the word "reciprocal." However, we feel that if under the provisions of the trade agreements we have slight protection, which the present situation in Mexico indicates that we have under trade agreements, then we feel, and we have been reluctantly forced to the conclusion, that it would be better for us as a practical course if we had no trade agreements.

* * * * *

Mr. GREGG. Would you advocate that rather than accept increased rates so far as your business is concerned, the agreement be denounced and the Mexican Government left perfectly free to fix any rate it wished on tobacco, we in turn withdrawing concessions to them in the current agreement? That would be one of the alternatives that might result.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is right.

Mr. GREGG. Would that be the type of thing that would appeal to your industry?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. I am speaking from the tobacco point of view, that we are going to lose our trade, and if that is the case, why have an agreement with them? You see, it isn't only Mexico that has the tobacco trade. That isn't the only thing.

While this I am going to say now has nothing to do with Mexico itself, you remember when they went to Geneva last year just about the time the people got to Geneva and maybe a little bit before or maybe later, I don't know the exact date, but at least soon after that we had a situation whereby the greatest market in the world for American tobacco suddenly upped its duty rate by about 50 percent for the express purpose of refusing imports of tobacco from this country. That was stated as the reason.

It was stated as the reason to save dollars. Well, there wasn't anything very much said about that.

* * * * *

Then you follow that up a short time later with Mexico with a 40 percent ad valorem rate of duty. That makes the tobacco growers of this country wonder whether or not their Government really has very much interest in them other than a couple of billion dollars they get out of excise and other revenue or whether they have any great interest in protecting markets for tobacco which have been built up over about 300 years, in fact, tobacco was first produced in this country for purposes of export, and throughout the whole period from 1620 on down to the present time the export trade in tobacco has been of tremendous importance, not only to the producers, but to the general economy of the United States as a whole.

Now, between the two wars we lost very heavily in our export business, largely through erection of trade barriers and currency manipulations and barter and one thing and another. After the war everything was going to be different, but now we have a series of happenings which lead us to believe that we could wind up in a worse position so far as our export trade is concerned than we were before World War II.

So we just wonder where we go from here without us getting in these agreements some protection for the industry. You remember that at Geneva we cut the rate on tobacco coming into this country to all the countries of the world. We feel that that is a good thing to do provided other people do the same. In other words, provided it is reciprocal.

However, when we cut our duties and other people raised their duties, we can't see where there is anything reciprocal in it.

Mr. GREGG. Would you prefer if the Mexicans had invoked a clause in their agreement which permits them to place a quota on your product rather than take this unilateral action?

Mr. TAYLOR. It would depend on what the quota was. That I couldn't say, of course. We don't know until they would impose a quota what the effect would be, you see.

Mr. GREGG. I was thinking of it as a method. They have a right to do that under the terms of the agreement, and that is the normal device.

Mr. TAYLOR. That, from a tobacco grower's point of view is, we think, one of the weaknesses in trade agreements that we make a trade agreement, and then we make some provisions in it; in fact, we make so many provisions in it that anybody can do nearly anything he wants, provided he wants to do it bad enough. In other words, it doesn't lend any great stability to the trade which you build up.

Mr. GREGG. Thank you.

Mr. GAY. Mr. Taylor, referring again to your reluctant conclusion, do you feel that none of the trade agreements which this country has entered into for the past 12 or 14 years have been of value to the tobacco industry?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir; I don't.

Mr. GAY. You don't?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir; I don't think they have. Now, you mean, has our trade expanded under those agreements or have we held our own under them?

Mr. GAY. Or have you possibly gone back at a less rapid pace than you would have otherwise?

Mr. TAYLOR. We went back.

Chairman EDMINSTER. At a less rapid pace? I am not sure you understand what he said.

Mr. GAY. If you lost, did you lose at possibly a less rapid rate of loss than you otherwise would have?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, you can only judge that by what happened previously. Then there was a gain, as I see it. That is something you can't calculate, because you have no equation for it.

Chairman EDMINSTER. Mr. Taylor, you keep alluding to a preference for no agreement at all with Mexico or with any other country, rather than to have any agreement in which they raised their rates.

Now, do you really think that the tobacco growers of this country would be better off if all such agreements were canceled, all concessions we now have in trade agreements, therefore, were canceled?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Chairman EDMINSTER. You think the growers would be better off than if the agreements contained in effect, including an agreement in which there was some increase in the rates?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, I think we would be better off without them because when we get a situation like that, the rates of duty would then be back in the hands of Congress, and I think Congress is much more sympathetic to the attitude of the people than the people who negotiate trade agreements. That is speaking very frankly. So that in a situation like this with Mexico if they said, "Certainly, we are going to do so and so," Congress would turn around and say, "We are going to do so and so, too."

So that you have a situation there where you have people elected by the people who would be taking care of the situation rather than people who are more indirectly the servants of the people.

Chairman EDMINSTER. What your answer comes to in effect, if my powers of reasoning are any good this morning, simply this:

That you think that with the agreements all canceled, there would be more pressure put upon these countries to enter into new arrangements or make new concessions that would be better for the tobacco export trade.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is right.

Chairman EDMINSTER. Than the treatment they would be currently getting under these agreements.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Chairman EDMINSTER. That is what you are saying.

Mr. TAYLOR. We can't see where we have got very much under trade agreements.

Civil Government for Pacific Trust Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles published in the Manila Evening News, one on February 10 and one on February 11, 1948, both dealing with the necessity for establishing some type of civil government in the trust islands in the Pacific.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manila Evening News of February 10, 1948]

UNITED STATES SENATE BODY PLANS ON-THE-SPOT STUDY OF MICRONESIA CONDITIONS

(By Hamilton Faron)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—The islands of Micronesia, scene of some of the hottest fighting in the Pacific war, may be visited by a Senate committee to determine what form of government they should have.

The committee, in addition to deciding upon a form of government complying with "local customs," plans also to study economic and social needs of the people scattered throughout the area.

Senate authority to make the trip has been asked by Senator CORDON, Republican, Oregon, a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

He suggested in a resolution submitted to the Senate for approval that the committee study—

1. The peoples, customs, laws, economies, resources, and governments.

2. The interrelation and the natural or appropriate integration of such areas.

3. Measures designed to advance the security and well-being of the peoples and economies.

4. Such other matters relating to such areas as the committee may deem appropriate.

Included in the area proposed for study are the islands formerly under Japanese control under a League of Nations mandate after the First World War. They are the Marshalls, Carolines, Marianas, and Palaus.

The islands now are under trusteeship of the United States. The Navy is responsible for their administration.

Legislation to establish basic laws for the islands under civil administration has been under consideration by the Navy and Interior Departments and is expected to be submitted to Congress soon.

But spokesmen for the Senate committee said its members feel that Congress should defer action until the committee has gathered first-hand information.

Tentatively, the committee plans, if the Cordon resolution is approved, to send its members out into the Pacific for personal visits to all of the major islands. As now drawn, the plan calls for experts in agricultural, mineral, ethnic, civil government, and social matters to accompany the Senators.

Working from a base somewhere in the vast area—a water expanse larger than the United States—the committee members and experts would spread out over the territory. Thus, as subcommittees, they would be able to conduct studies of problems of each island group.

Development of the fishing industry is expected to be given major consideration. One matter to be considered would be lowering of tariffs on fishery products sent from the islands to the United States. A Micronesian recovery plan might come within the scope of the studies. Under the Japanese mandate before World War II, the islands operated under an oriental economy—low wages and low costs. Now, under United States control, wages remained low, but costs have increased. Most of the islands' towns and villages were destroyed during the war. Their industries suffered, but have made some moves toward recovery.

In addition to the first-hand study of Micronesian problems, some members of the committee say it might be advisable for Senators to go on to Japan. There, they suggest, the committee could discuss Micronesian problems with Japanese officials who served as administrators of the island' groups prior to the war.

[From the Manila Evening News of February 11, 1948]

WASHINGTON TODAY

(By Paul B. McGee)

WASHINGTON, February 10 (Special).—The suggestion that a United States Senate committee be constituted to investigate the islands of Micronesia opens some interesting possibilities as far as the Philippines are concerned.

Whatever happens to the Marshalls, Marianas, Carolines, and Palaus is going to affect the Philippines, and the new republic will probably ask friendly consultation in any eventual disposition of the islands.

The islands were under Japanese mandate between the two world wars. Behind a pre-Russian iron curtain, Japan made the islands a series of stationary aircraft carriers and staging areas from which the lightning thrusts against the Philippines and southeast Asia were mounted early in the last war.

As these islands represent a very direct threat to the southern Philippines, in a strategic sense, the Philippines will likely be sensitive to plans for their future disposition. Too many people remember too well how Jap planes appeared from those islands for the Philippines to be complacent about their future use.

The islands are now under United States trusteeship, and are being administered by the United States Navy. However, their disposition, as far as the UN is concerned, may not be final, as some of the other major powers seem less than fully satisfied over their present status. It is unlikely that the United States would ever agree to any other disposition of bases which cost so much United States blood and treasure to capture in the long haul back to the Philippines, and it is certain the Philippines would raise a considerable voice if any other disposition were contemplated.

However, it is the economic possibilities of the islands which intrigue thoughtful members of the Filipino community in Washington. If their development is undertaken as a UN project, what better base than the Philippines to expedite that development? There is no other country with modern facilities so close.

And with the United States and the Philippines in complete accord on joint defense plans, it is probable that the United States would look with a kindlier eye on Philippine assistance in developing Micronesia than the proffered assistance of any other nation.

It is known that the Japanese developed the fishing industry of these necklace-like atolls to a very considerable degree. The growth of a Filipino offshore fishing industry would be fostered considerably by these Micronesian fishing grounds, if they were available. There are other industries possible in Micronesia also, including fertilizer and some other developments which could interest Filipino entrepreneurs if they were available for exploitation.

It must be emphasized that these possibilities have hardly entered the realm of speculation yet. Nonetheless, the islands of Micronesia represent some interesting possibilities, as far as the Philippines are concerned, and you can bet your last peseta that the Philippine foreign office will be keeping an eye peeled on developments throughout the area.

Unified Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unified Regulation," published in the New York Times of February 28, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIFIED REGULATION

A special committee of the country's rail executives, appointed by the Association of American Railroads to study the problem, has filed a report urging the establishment of a single agency to regulate all types of interstate commerce.

The proposal itself is not a new one. This is the first time, however, that the railroads have officially expressed their approval of the idea. The report of the special committee, which was headed by J. M. Symes, a vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, declares: "The divided authority and responsibility under our present national transportation policy * * * are not helpful to coordination of the various forms of transportation now serving the public. If maximum progress is to be made in the coordination of transportation and a healthy, well-balanced system developed, all forms of interstate for-hire transportation should be under one regulatory body."

Actually, the adoption of a single agency or department of this kind would not represent a change of policy, but rather a method of implementing the policy laid down in the last major piece of legislation in this field, the Transportation Act of 1940. The first amendment to the then existing law contained in that measure was a new declaration of national transportation policy. That declaration reads in part: "It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each * * * all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States. * * *"

If the basic objective of national transportation policy is coordination, as this declaration clearly indicates, then the idea of a coordinating agency would seem to be a wholly natural and logical corollary.

Reduction of Force of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1948.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans, Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is in reply to your letter of March 3, 1948, transmitting a resolution relating to the present reduction in force program of the Veterans' Administration, which resolution was adopted on the mentioned date by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in executive session.

I regret that I am unable to comply with the request in the resolution to hold the program in abeyance pending a detailed study of the matter by the committee. Prompt action is required because sufficient funds in the appropriation for salaries and expenses are not available to the Veterans' Administration for the balance of fiscal year 1948 to continue current operations with the present number of employees. Moreover, prompt reduction is indicated in order that we may enter fiscal year 1949 with the number of employees for which funds will be available if there is appropriated for salaries and expenses the amount requested by the Veterans' Administration in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1949 which have been submitted to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CARL H. GRAY, Jr., *Administrator.*

Some Help for the Poor Postman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul Gallico from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of March 5, 1948:

THINKING ALOUD
(By Paul Gallico)
SOME HELP FOR THE POOR POSTMAN

Whom do I write to in Congress, please, to see about getting some help for the poor postman? The postman is wretchedly underpaid.

I understand there is a bill pending in Congress, lost somewhere in committee, to give postal employees a cost-of-living increase, but nobody does anything about it. Why not? And whom do I see about getting some action on this? It's my money. I'm willing to spend some of it to see that the mail carrier and other employees get a decent living wage. How do I get anybody to listen to me?

Why do I care? Because I think it's a dirty trick that the last citizens to be considered for relief and wage increases when prices go up are those civil servants who work for the postal service. We take them too much for granted. The mail is always in front of the door in the morning, so why worry about the folks who get it there? This is my own private crusade I am waging because I feel like it.

The mailman, you know, can't strike. He signs a piece of paper when he takes his job giving up that right. That's civil service. He gets certain other benefits in exchange, but he has no way of calling it forcibly to your attention that he needs more money to live on and needs it badly.

Can you imagine the chaos if the Nation had to go a month, or a week, or even a couple of days, without mail service? What a holler there would be. How you would kick and scream and yell and look into the matter of the wages of postal employees; and when you saw how little they were getting, you would shout clear down to Washington for Congress to vote them a fair wage and end the strike.

Do you have to have a strike to do that? Is that the only way anybody can get a square shake? Because if it is, the postman is sunk.

Why couldn't one donate 15 minutes, or a half hour out of an entire year to the guys and gals who handle such a vital adjunct to your daily life? That and a 3-cent stamp. That's all it would take. No dough. Just the time it takes to sit down and write a letter to your Congressman saying in effect, "Hey, brother Congressman: This is John W. Taxpayer and Voter speaking. How about cutting out the politics and the stalling and the phony economizing and getting busy on paying your postal employees enough to live on like human beings instead of poor relations?"

There are at least four bills proposing to give the letter carriers and their associates, the clerks and handlers, a cost-of-living increase. Those bills are still kicking around in committee, neglected, or being passed over by men who don't have to worry about paying the rent or the grocer or sending kids to school or dressing them decently. Talk, talk, yattatta-yattatta, talk.

And in the meantime the wives of the post-office folk grow gray-headed trying to make both ends meet, something which has statistically been shown to be impossible. With current prices they cannot live on what they earn. Fear and worry are their constant house guests.

There must be more people outside of the postal service who give a hoot about this besides myself. Come on. Speak up for these forgotten people. Or if you are not a letter writer, why not clip this column, write "Me, too" on the bottom, sign your name, and mail it to your Congressman or Senator. The work of 2 or 3 minutes.

When the mailman came in the morning you'd be able to say, "Hey, I wrote to Congress today to hurry up and give you more dough." He would give you a big smile, and a handshake, and "Thank you." You'd feel wonderful all day. So would he.

Overcoming Group Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the newspaper Il Progresso Italo-Americano on June 29, which was awarded the first prize in a contest, conducted by the Common Council for American Unity for the best editorial in a foreign language newspaper in the United States on the subject of overcoming group prejudice:

REMOVE THE BLIGHT ON AMERICA

There are three main requirements of our country's fulfilling its great responsibilities in promoting world reconstruction and preserving peace. These three vital requirements are: The maintenance of a healthy national economy, continually invigorating our democratic way of life, and the solidification of our national unity. Upon examination, it will be found that these three distinct factors are intertwined beyond separation in the life of the people.

However, there is one element around which these three prerequisites revolve. That element is the question of racialism—race prejudice and hatred. We know of no other social question which involves as much, and which cuts so completely across, our country's welfare and the world's future. Every single manifestation of discrimination on account of race, national origin, or religion hurts America's economic life, saps the vitality of our democratic foundations and institutions, and dangerously disrupts our national unity. Every action in any part of the country rooted in racial prejudice and conceived in bigotry and intolerance is a blow against the entire American people and the fundamental interests of all other nations dedicated to economic reconstruction and peace.

OUR TRUE GREATNESS

The basic source of America's national strength lies in the unity, not only of its geographical sections and 48 States, but above all of its component human elements of diverse national, racial, and religious origins. Here is a rich variety of cultures, ideals, ideas, talents, capacities, and aspirations mingled and merged into one new and distinct national and social pattern. This is America. Here is the why and wherefore of our Nation's unity, vitality, accomplishments, and bright prospects of progress. And by the same token, here is the most dangerously vulnerable spot in the body-politic of the American people. Those who would divide our country along the lines of color, creed, or national origin would ruin its present and future. What we have done in America in welding under one banner and common ideals, men and women from all climes, of all creeds and colors, is a model for older continents—for a world in despair and misery. To spread bigotry in our midst, to peddle anti-Semitism, to discriminate against human beings because of the color of their skin, or to put up economic or social handicaps against someone because he speaks with an accent, or happened to be born in another land is the surest way of undermining America and tearing her asunder beyond repair.

Whether they realize it or not, that is precisely the fatal blow some inhabitants of our country are striking against America when they resort to race hatred, to hostility toward their countrymen of a different faith, and to petty persecution and disgusting discrimination against those who may have been born in Italy or the Ukraine, or whose accent may not be Yankee-pure or of the crystal-clear below the Mason and Dixon's line variety. When such bigots engage in their thoroughly un-American propaganda and practices, they not only hurt some particular individuals at home but injure beyond measure the good name and moral prestige of the whole American people abroad.

ARMING OUR ENEMIES

In Italy, in France, in England, in China, and in Latin America the main weapon, the most effective argument of the demagogues against the United States is the manifestation of race prejudice in our country. Of course, individuals of this ilk engage in terrible slanders and exaggerations. Yet, even the slightest manifestation of race hatred in our country is an opening for dangerous infection, since it provides just the fuel demanded by those who want to inflame world opinion against our Nation. It must be frankly stated that throughout Europe and the Old World, the most sinister and telling method of discrediting America's motives and policies is the pointing of a finger of guilt at our Nation for abominable crimes like lynching or reprehensive economic and social practices based on national prejudices and antagonisms in the United States.

With even the best democratic foreign policy, America will never be able to win the peoples of other lands for world reconstruction and peace as long as we do not seriously set about to uproot every vestige and discard every practice of race hatred, religious prejudice, and national discrimination at home. It is painfully significant that the one section of our country where racialism is rampant, where lynching now and then rears its ugly head, has the highest rate of illiteracy and illness and the lowest level of poverty. Nothing makes more difficult good government and broad participation of the people in political life than does race prejudice.

Laws against race prejudices? Fine. A Fair Employment Practice Commission? Sure. But valuable as these are, *preventive* rather than punitive measures will be decisive. Our schools, churches, labor unions, cultural bodies, press, and radio must be aroused and mobilized for an unceasing drive against this ghastly blight on the good name of our Nation—against this serious, but not insuperable, obstacle to America's fulfilling its historic destiny.

Let's Watch Our Step on How We Use Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like at this time to present an address made in New York Friday, March 5, 1948, by Mr. Gardner (Mike) Cowles, editor and publisher of Look magazine, and publisher of the Des Moines Register and Tribune. Mr. Cowles is also associated with his brother John Cowles, in ownership of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, and is president of the Cowles Broadcasting Co., which owns and operates radio stations KRNT, in Des Moines, Iowa; WNAX, in Yankton, S. Dak.; WCOP, in Boston, Mass.; and WOL in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Cowles was the principal speaker at the 1948 advertising awards dinner at which a gold medal for outstanding service to advertising during 1947 was presented to Theodore S. (Ted) Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, Inc., Washington, D. C.

The subject of the address was, Let's Watch Our Step on How We Use Advertising. The text follows:

I am proud and pleased to be on this program because it gives me a chance to help honor Ted Repplier—and in honoring him to pay a richly deserved tribute to the Advertising Council, to comment on the superb job advertising did during the war, and to make an observation or two in the discussion now going on in business circles as to just what part national advertising can and should play in helping the American people understand and appreciate our freedoms.

Ted and I have one special bond—we both spent the war fighting our way through red tape in Washington. Ted started with Ray Rubicam in the War Manpower Agency under Paul McNutt, until Ted became head of the Washington office of the War Advertising Council in the spring of 1943.

I was the first head of the domestic branch of the Office of War Information—an agency then made up mainly of a conglomeration of sincere but starry-eyed writers and other ideological zealots who regarded an advertising man with about the same respect you might give a medicine man or a barker at a sideshow.

Those of you who were not in Washington during the first few months following Pearl Harbor will never realize how near advertising came to being banned entirely during the war. At the first intergovernment meeting I attended after Roosevelt persuaded me to take the OWI job, two very top New Deal officials argued that the Treasury should immediately disallow all advertising as a legitimate business expense, since advertising, they said, is just a waste and a luxury which had no excuse for existing, particularly in wartime.

I honestly believe that if the War Advertising Council had not come into being to show Washington officials how advertising could help convert the country to war—help inform the people on the vital war themes—help the Government quickly activate public opinion—if the War Advertising Council had not been on hand with its plans—I truly believe advertising would have been substantially blacked out during the war.

This would have destroyed our advertising agencies. This would have ruined our radio stations, our magazines, our newspapers. But it almost happened.

Whoever thought up and worked out the network time-allocation plan under which commercial sponsors gave up a minute or two of their time out of each program for vital war themes—deserves the blessing of all of us interested in advertising. That plan sold Washington on the job advertising could do. And soon afterward Washington learned the extreme value of the sponsored public-service advertising in the magazines and newspapers.

If advertising had not been allowed to help during the war, the Government would have been obliged to force the public by legislation to do the necessary things. Compulsion wasn't needed because advertising did the job through persuasion. In other words, advertising in a vital degree helped us win the war and still hold on to most of our traditional, voluntary, democratic ways.

Hundreds of the country's top advertising men have devoted weeks and months to the Advertising Council—but certainly the four men who have been chairmen—first Chet LaRoche, then Harold Thomas, then Jim Young, and now Charlie Mortimer, deserve our special thanks. They made the Council succeed. Before the end of the war, they had convinced even most of the rabid New Dealers of the value of advertising—those same New Dealers who had wanted to outlaw advertising after Pearl Harbor.

These New Dealers who looked down their noses at advertising with such confident rectitude, remind me sadly of the story of the young Oxford don who did not seem to be participating in the war. At a party in London an ardently patriotic officer turned to him and said: "What are you contributing to victory?"

The don replied: "Sir, I am the civilization which you are fighting to save."

Some businessmen are critical of the fact that the Advertising Council didn't disband with the end of the war or at least after the reconversion period. Advertising in peacetime, they argue, has only one function—to sell goods. The Council, they say, is giving it jobs which should be done in other ways—not through sponsored advertising of individual companies.

These businessmen are right when they say advertising's primary function is to sell goods—and it is well for all of us to keep that in mind—but we need also to think about the importance of advertising in our whole American scheme.

We don't want to lose either our economic freedoms or our political freedoms. Free speech and the concept of a free press have developed so strongly in America, in my opinion, because our information media—our newspapers, our magazines, our radio stations—have remained in private hands. We need to remember that advertising, coming from thousands of different private companies from coast to coast, supports these information media. They, in turn, by keeping the public informed, make democracy possible.

This important relationship of the advertising of private business to our privately owned newspapars, magazines and radio stations seemed to me so vital to the functioning of our democracy, that even in wartime, I opposed the creation of a giant Federal Government advertising fund, which so many agency men favored.

I did not want then, nor do I want now, to see the Government directing, or curbing, or dominating the advertising of this country.

I favored the continuation of the Advertising Council after the end of the war because I felt its program, if properly limited and handled with care, could be a real public service which would build the reputation of advertising in the general public's mind. But I think the council will always have to be on guard for fear more and more Government officials will come to believe that they have the right to expect, or even demand, space and time sponsored by individual private companies for the promotion of every kind of Governmen' proposal.

Wisely, the advertising council has put together a carefully balanced advisory board of businessmen, labor executives, educators, housewives, and editors to decide what themes deserve support. The plan is working well, but I hope the council proceeds with extreme caution. Even though in the final analysis it is the large advertisers who are footing the bill, the council's decisions must be strictly in the interest of the general public and not in the interest of any group.

I realize American business needs to do a much better public relations job. I realize advertising can very well help do this job at the plant level or the local community level. But the multitudinous proposals in recent years from the NAM and the chamber of commerce that big business as one group launch a giant national advertising campaign to sell the American people on the free enterprise system, have always worried me. I have always feared such campaigns would so smack of special pleading by big business that they would fail of their objective and might bring in their wake some crackdown on advertising.

I hope the forthcoming campaign of the ANA, the four A's, and the council on the merits of our free American system will not appear to the man in the street as an attempt to retard any improvements in the system. I don't want to see advertising get identified in the public's mind as a tool of big business used to maintain the status quo and prevent even desirable change.

Just this week a union official testified before the FCC that the radio networks are so dependent upon the advertising of big business that the networks should not be trusted to express their own editorial opinions over the air. That union official was actually smearing advertising.

I want advertising to be known by the man in the street as a friend—a useful friend who gets him lower prices by helping achieve mass distribution and selling. I do not want advertising to become identified as a special club or device of big business used selfishly to protect or promote the ideas of just one element or group in our economy.

Some of you may think I am seeing ghosts under the bed. But the Internal Revenue Bureau in the past 5 years has questioned the deductibility of institutional advertising expense for tax purposes. To be sure the latest ruling says any advertising, no matter its content, is deductible so long as the amount expended is reasonable. But the Bureau has before made a different decision and could reverse itself again.

As taxpayers and citizens, holding as we do diverse and conflicting views on many political issues, personalities, and candidates, we would be the first to protest if giants in advertising could be so foolish as to use their financial power in the political field through advertising expenditures. And we could depend on it that others would move immediately for legislative curbs that would hurt the innocent as well as the guilty.

The pattern for such curbs would require no research. The British Labor Government has proposed an arbitrary limit of 50 percent of advertising expenditures as a deductible item for tax purposes.

I believe distortion in the use of advertising in the United States could easily become a great danger. The responsibility is ours if we believe intelligent units of our business structure are capable of self-regulation and do not need control from Washington.

I do not rule out the availability of advertising for political purposes of whatever nature. But I want to see it purchased as a commodity or service by an established political organization, just as campaign committees purchase railroad tickets and rent auditoriums for speakers and candidates.

We expect the small minority, primarily interested in tearing down America by crippling our mass-production technique, to be savage in its attacks on advertising.

But when advertising is performing its proper function in our economy, we need have no fear of restrictive or punitive legislation on either State or National level.

If we make the public constantly aware that advertising is as vital as electricity, machines, telephones, and boxcars in giving the United States its tremendous industrial and economic strength—if we keep advertising in its proper role as the master salesman of goods and services benefiting the whole public—then we become immune to attacks, regardless the source.

This is all so very fundamental. But may I remind you, in this era of overwhelming problems for nations and individuals, there is a haven of safety in fundamentals.

Thirtieth Anniversary of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I made to the Lithuanian-American Information Center, of 233 Broadway, New York City, commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

February 16, 1948, is the thirtieth anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

During the few short years that followed the signing, Lithuanians not only in their own homeland but all over the world celebrated with unrestrained joy this great day. Lithuania was a proud nation, her people of great culture, and imbued with a spirit of independence that boded well for the infant Republic.

From 1918 until 1940, Lithuanians were happy in the knowledge that they were free and independent. Then, in violation of a solemn agreement, Russia took over Lithuania—to the despair of a great people. Then Germany liberated Lithuania from the Russians—and later Russia again liberated Lithuania from the Germans. I speak advisedly when I use the word "liberated," because liberation in this instance meant the destruction of all that the people of Lithuania held dear. Deportation, murder, rape, imprisonment, slavery—that is what liberation by the Russians and Germans meant to the people of Lithuania.

Liberty-loving Americans, millions of them foreign-born—those who believe in liberty without the playing of power politics—Americans who for years have fought to hold their own liberty and independence and who today are fighting the evils of communism, fascism, and all forms of "isms" except Americanism, both at home and abroad—hope and pray with the liberty-loving Lithuanians that the day is not far away when once again out of the ashes of oppression will arise a new, free, and independent Lithuania—once more taking its place beside the democratic nations of the world.

Electioneering in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 8, 1948:

ELECTIONEERING IN ITALY

It is the tactics of counteraction to Soviet aggression that will count in the great West-Russian grapple. And tactics involve priorities—priorities which should be determined by the limitations of American resources, the significance of menaced situations, and the timetable. Use of influence in the right place at the right time is axiomatic. Looking over the world today, this newspaper feels that Italy, key to the Mediterranean, is the live front in the cold war. Italy is locked in an electoral struggle, and international communism is concentrating upon it. All reports that come to this office conclude on the grim note that the communized popular front, after having been on the defensive till a couple of months ago, may triumph when the Italians go to the polls on April 18. The De Gasperi government has not been able to match the aggressiveness that Communist leader Togliatti, backed by Moscow, has imparted into his campaign.

Time must be taken out of the present preoccupation with our own election to cope with the threat to the free world in Italy. April comes before November, and what happens in Italy in April is of the highest consequence to all fighters for liberty, particularly Americans. Without a doubt the consequences of a Togliatti victory in Italy would be reflected in our nominations and in our own election. How could it be otherwise? A Togliatti victory would mean that the Italians by their own volition had dragged the iron curtain to the west and opened their country to Moscow's rule. The implications of any such revolution should be well pondered. Not only would the Mediterranean be severed; the map of Europe would be changed. And in present circumstances this would mean a dagger into the heart of Marshall Europe while it is aborning.

This country simply cannot afford to lose Italy. Nor can Italy afford to lose America. But it will be too late to do anything about a Communist victory after the event. To be sure, such a victory in present circumstances would be a demonstration of what Professor Namier calls "Caesarian democracy." But that explanation would not justify action in the eyes of the American people. There would be no disposition to come to the aid of a people who had simply exchanged black for red slavery. This, it seems to us, should be made known to the Italian people. It should be a contribution to the electioneering that this country should embark upon in Italy—to let them know exactly where we stand, so that no illusions are entertained by the voting population.

Of course, there is need also to show Italy that our policy is still sympathetic with Italy's desire to return to the family of nations with self-respect. This newspaper opposed the ratification of the peace treaty with Italy both because of the changed world situation and because certain clauses were, in our opinion, unjust. The Administration chose the path of ratification. At the same time enough evidence of good will has been shown in the amelioration of the treaty provisions. Italy's case for admission to the United Nations has been pressed over Soviet opposition. Italy's colonial aspirations have had sympathetic attention. These matters, along with the unsettled question of Trieste, should be reviewed for the Italian people, and reopened in the Security Council. Congress and the Latin-American nations could help by some action to relieve the pressure of population caused by the piling up of unused quotas. But, over and above all, there must be left with the Italian people the plain reminder that a Soviet-dictated vote against the Marshall plan—which would be what a vote for Togliatti would amount to—would mean a sacrifice of the benefits of the Marshall plan. For Togliatti's apparent headway seems to be due not only to his new patriotic pose but also to his assurances that the Italian people would get the same aid from America no matter how they voted.

Information Concerning Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter concerning steel:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letter of February 10, 1948, to Administrator Larson, has been referred to this office for reply. We note you are interested in learning if there are any idle iron- and steel-producing facilities anywhere that could be used in providing the oil industry with additional steel.

The Government blast furnaces at Houston and Daingerfield, Tex., are both in active production to help serve the needs in Texas and surrounding areas with pig iron. We have also recently disposed of the Government blast furnace at Rusk, Tex., to McCrossin & Co., of New York. This company is actively engaged in completing this furnace and making every effort to get it into early production of additional pig iron. While we do not know to whom this pig iron is being shipped or to what purpose it is being used, it is our assumption that considerable of this tonnage finds its way indirectly into the oil industry.

You also ask in your letter who, besides Kaiser, has bought steel plants. Disposals of iron and steel plants and facilities have been made to subsidiaries of United States Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., subsidiaries of American Rolling Mill Co., Inland Steel Co., Pittsburgh Steel Co., Republic Steel Corp., Alan Wood Steel Co., Col-

orado Fuel & Iron Corp., Babcock & Wilcox Tube Co., Timken Roller Bearing Co., Brown Fence & Wire Co., Pacific Tube Co, Plymouth Steel Co., Wallington Tube Co., Superior Drawn Steel Co., Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Corp., International Detrola Corp., Granite City Steel Co., Jessop Steel Co., Koppers Co., Inc., Tennessee Products Corp., Associated Iron & Metals Co., and California Scrap Iron Co. The above list of companies includes large and small companies.

Disposal has been made of steel, gray-iron, and malleable-iron foundries to a large number of foundry companies. We still have available for disposal a steel foundry at St. Louis, Mo., adjoining the foundry of Key Co., the wartime operator, which company supplies the oil industry with heavy tonnages of special machined castings. Disposal has also been made of several steel-forging plants to various companies engaged in that line of manufacture. As of February 16, 1948, disposals had been made of 113 projects out of a total of 150 projects covering iron and steel plants and facilities owned by the Government. The major part of the 37 projects remaining for disposal, included under iron and steel plants and facilities, are currently under active negotiation.

Referring to your question as to what are the plans of the steel industry to make enough steel for not only the oil industry but also other industries, we are not furnished such information by the steel industry. However, according to press reports the steel industry is expending i excess of $1,000,000,000 to improve steel supply and distribution through an expansion and modernization program including coke, pig iron, ingot, semi-finished, and finished steel products.

We are pleased to furnish the above information and will be glad to furnish any further available information you may request.

Sincerely yours,

M. L. GODMAN,
Deputy Administrator,
Office of Real Property Disposal.

Who Gets Our National Income?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C.:

WHO GETS OUR NATIONAL INCOME?—SOME HARD FACTS ABOUT SOFT THEORIES

Father Keller is director of the bureau of economic research of the University of Notre Dame, consulting economist for the American Economic Foundation of New York City, and one of the Nation's leading exponents of simplified presentation of economics for the layman.

This article summarizes his new study entitled "The National Income and Its Distribution," a recent publication of the bureau of economic research. It is a follow-up study to Father Keller's well-known Study of the Physical Assets, Sometimes Called Wealth, of the United States. The foreword to that study states the purpose of the bureau's research: "This research has been one object—to find the truth about our material existence (using official governmental data) and to translate this truth into words so simple that anyone could understand it.")

(By Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C.)

"The rich get richer * * * and the poor get children."

Not too many years ago that was a jest mouthed by every vaudevillian from New York's Palace to Punxatawney's Bijou Theater. Americans listened and laughed; and believed.

The fact is that it's not true. At least not wholly. Our birth rate continues to develop in a manner consistent with the needs of a healthy, vigorous Nation. But as for the rich getting richer, well, as Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

In 1917 "the rich," that is Americans with a personal annual income of $25,000 or more, were getting 7 percent of the Nation's entire income (after Federal taxes). By 1928 their share had risen to 11 percent. But in the latest available year, 1944, it is down to 1 percent.

Lest this be considered a statistical illusion, done with percentages, consider the actual amounts: In 1928, close to $9,000,000,000. In 1944, less than 2,000,000,000.

On the other hand, Americans making under $5,000 a year have been unmistakably increasing their share of the Nation's income. In 1917, this group (to which most of us belong), was getting 87 percent of the total United States personal income. By the year 1929, this had dropped to 77 percent. But in 1944, it reached the peak figure of 90 percent. This increase of 3 percent in 27 years doesn't tell the whole story. Look at the volume: In 1917, $47,000,000,000; in 1944, $140,000,000,000, a gain in one generation of almost another hundred billion dollars for the poor.

Meanwhile, an interesting thing has been happening to the middle group, the people whose annual income is over $5,000 but under $25,000. They have progressed from a low of 6 percent of the Nation's income in 1917 to a high of 12 percent just before the depression set in, to 9 percent in 1944. And their volume is up from $3,000,000,000 in 1917 to thirteen billions in 1944.

These facts completely discredit the common belief that a few wealthy individuals receive most of the national income, while the majority of the people receive the minor share. This, the legend continues, leaves insufficient purchasing power in the hands of the majority of consumers, with the result that they are unable to buy the goods and services they have produced. And this in turn, is supposed to be the main cause of depressions.

But if, as stated before, the spendable income of the wealthy class in 1944 was $2,000,000,000, and consumer expenditures in that year amounted to $90,000,000,000, it is obvious that the two billions of the well-heeled could hardly account for the purchase of ninety billions of goods and services.

A little common-sense observation would quickly disclose that the vast amounts of goods and services cannot be consumed by a few wealthy people.

The figures reveal some other interesting facts about this wealthy class. For instance, those with incomes above $25,000 are largely a workers' class, since 67.5 percent of their total income was in payment for personal labor. And what huge proportion of the total United States income from interest, dividends, and rent would you guess this wealthy class to have received? Three and one-half percent.

If we are to believe those who tell us that 60 families own most of America, we are then also forced to believe that these 60 are being cheated out of their proper earnings, for they are obviously sharing (with thousands of other wealthy people) only 3½ percent of all the interest, dividends, and rent collected in this country, and 1 percent of the national income.

Since 1929, labor has received an increasing share of the national income, while the owners (mostly other workers) of the "tools" (machinery, plants, etc.) have received a declining share of total national income.

While national income increased 93 percent from 1929 to 1946, labor payments rose 110 percent, and wages and salaries rose 107 percent. But corporate dividends during the same period not only made no gain, they actually fell by 14 percent. This decrease was speeded up during the war by increased taxes, rent ceilings, and declining interest rates.

From 1929 to 1945 practically all of the increase in national income went to workers in increased labor payments. Furthermore, in 1929 labor payments accounted for 82 percent of income paid out; in 1945 they accounted for 90 percent.

This is important because, taking our economy as a whole, it shows that the main item of cost of production of all goods and services is labor cost (90 percent), while cost for the use of tools is a relatively minor cost (6 percent).

AND NOW, A FEW FACTS ABOUT PROFITS

Unfortunately profits have come to mean something bad since Karl Marx said they were taken away from labor by the capitalists. Actually, just as wages are that part of the selling price collected from the costumer for the use of the workers' human energy, profit is that part of the selling price collected for the use of the tools.

Even under communism and socialism, these tool payments exist. Russia borrows money from its people to buy tools and pays them about 7 percent a year for the use of the money, which is the same as saying for the use of the tools.

There is greater ignorance about the amount of payment for the use of tools (profits). According to a Nation-wide survey of white-collar and manual workers made in May 1946, by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N. J.—

Sixty percent of the employees thought the average manufacturer in peacetime made 25 percent or more profit;

Eleven percent of the employees thought profits exceeded 50 percent.

Only 11 percent guessed the actual profit—10 percent or less.

The same 60 percent who thought profits exceeded 25 percent thought that 10 percent would be a fair rate of profit.

Actually, during the past 20 years, corporate profits paid out to individuals have averaged a little more than 2 cents out of every sales dollar. Even in 1946, the year of highest corporate profits on record, profits of all manufacturing corporations averaged 5 cents out of the sales dollar, which was less than 1940–41; trade corporations averaged 3.3 cents which was less than some years of the depression. The average for all corporations was 4.7 cents.

Compare this actuality of 4.7 percent profit with the fact that most of the above-mentioned workers believed profits to run 10 percent or more, and most of these people thought profits were higher than 25 percent.

If the workers of the Nation are furnished with an abundance of good tools, they can turn out an abundance of goods and services at low prices.

It is no accident that the American worker has the highest standard of living of any worker in the world and in the history of the world. He has this high standard of living mainly because he works with labor-aiding tools.

The American worker gets the tools he uses from individuals who do not spend all of

their income for consumer goods and services, but save part of their income and invest it in tools.

In this country, most of the tools were accumulated in the 30 years prior to 1929. During the period 1920–1930—the period of greatest expansion in new and better tools—new capital issues averaged $6,000,000,000 a year.

Most of the savings which made possible these new and better tools came from those in the income bracket of $5,000 and over. This was possible because the Government did not take their savings in taxes, but permitted these savings to be invested in business.

In 1933, however, a new tax policy was adopted in this country. It was based on the mature economy and planned scarcity theory, which maintained that our national economy had too many tools due to a maldistribution of national income by which too much income went to the upper classes, and therefore into savings and not enough into purchasing power.

In line with this theory, the Government adopted the policy of taking in taxes a large part of the savings of those in the income bracket $5,000 and over, and especially those in the income bracket, $25,000 and over.

Funds, therefore, were simply siphoned from the private capital market to the Government. Private investment practically ceased. From 1933 to 1945, new capital issues averaged less than half a billion dollars a year.

For the first time in our history—during the period 1930–40—our economy went backward instead of forward.

The national tool account (capital) fell 19.4 percent from 1930 to 1940. Those who suffered most were the workers, because the result of such tax policy could have been nothing but continued economic stagnation.

This actually was the case. Evidence is the fact that in 1940, after Government expenditure of these savings taken in taxation, the country was still in depression. And there still were 7,000,000 workers unemployed.

It would have been much better if these savings had been permitted to remain in the hands of individuals, to be used to create more and better labor-aiding tools—the vital ingredient of our unmatchable standard of living.

Today the former exponents of the planned scarcity economy have shifted ground completely; they now advocate an expanding economy, for example—labor's demand for increased steel capacity. Unfortunately, they don't say where the funds will come from for this "expansion for full employment." They advocate continuance of the extremely high income taxes on those incomes which in the past have accounted for new tools. And they also demand an increasing share of profits which today are the important private source for new tools. Therefore, they logically must advocate that business expansion be made from Government funds.

This is socialism. One needs look no farther than Great Britain and France to see what that kind of socialism has done for the working people.

Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I extend the third installment of the article written by Jerry Kluttz with reference to the new Civil Service Retirement Act:

So, on to Option 2 of these new survivorship benefits. This plan is open only to unmarried employees (men and women) who retire under the age and optional provisions of the law and those who are entitled to a 25-year-service annuity after involuntary separation.

Under Option 2, the retired worker gets a reduced annuity (scaled down according to the following table), and the individual he designates as his survivor gets payments amounting to 50 percent of the reduced annuity which the former employee was getting. Payments to the named survivor will continue from the time the former employee dies until the survivor dies.

OPTION 2—*Joint and survivorship*

Survivor-annuitant	Percent of full rate payable to retiring employee	Rate payable to survivor-annuitant
	Percent	
Older, or within 5 years of retiree's age.	90	½ of 90 percent rate.
5, but less than 10 years younger.	85	½ of 85 percent rate.
10, but less than 15 years younger.	80	½ of 80 percent rate.
15, but less than 20 years younger.	75	½ of 75 percent rate.
20, but less than 25 years younger.	70	½ of 70 percent rate.
25 or more years younger	60	½ of 60 percent rate

If it so happens that the named survivor under this Option 2 is also qualified to receive an annuity through the benefits accorded him as a child of the deceased annuitant, that survivor will be paid the amount coming to him under the Option 2 arrangement, and the other payments will be discontinued, or vice versa. Both annuities cannot be paid.

CONDITIONS OF OPTION 2

There are two requirements to be met under this plan: (a) The retiree must be in good health—as evidenced by a physical examination taken when he retires—and (b) the named survivor must have an "insurable interest" in the retired person. Anyone who would suffer a financial loss in the event of the retired employee's death could be considered as having an "insurable interest" in the former employee. Dependent relatives would qualify, of course.

There are about 1,128,000 men among our members of the Civil Service Retirement System. It has been estimated that around 850,000 of these men are married. From this hasty figuring we may deduce that we have a great many people in our midst who are—or soon will be—deeply interested in the new widows' and children's benefits that have been established under the new retirement law.

Under the old law, the widow of a deceased retired employee could receive an annuity only if her husband had named her as his survivor-annuitant when he retired. She had no annuity protection at all if her husband died while he was still employed. The same was true of a surviving child of an employee. The benefits under the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act protects the widows and the children of both active employees and annuitants.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

Before going into these new benefits specifically, it should be explained that for these purposes the widow must have been married to the worker or annuitant for at least 2 years before his death, or be the mother of his child born during the marriage. A child, to be eligible for the new benefits, must be unmarried and under the age of 18 or, if over 18, incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability. No benefits are payable unless the employee has completed at least 5 years of civilian service at the time of his death.

First, let us take the case of the man who dies while in active service. The man, in our example, leaves his widow, but no children who could qualify for annuity benefits. His widow will receive an annuity when she reaches the age of 50, or, if she is already past 50 at the time of the employee's death, she gets the annuity immediately. It will be paid to her until she dies or remarries.

In the case of a deceased employee who leaves a widow and a child, if the child is entitled to an annuity, so also is the widow entitled to an immediate annuity. The one benefit brings the other, so to speak, and the widow's age is immaterial. The widow will get monthly checks (based on the existence of the child) until she dies, remarries, or reaches age 50. This isn't the end, however, for if the widow hasn't remarried, she will be entitled to get the regular widow's annuity commencing at age 50, as outlined above. In this way, the payments will be continuous in some cases.

In both instances, the amount paid to the widow will be 50 percent of the annuity the husband had earned by the time he died. If the husband had made voluntary contributions to the fund to purchase additional annuity for himself, the exact amount of his contributions (with interest) will go to his beneficiary or to his estate.

EMPLOYEE'S SURVIVING CHILDREN

Now for the children's annuities. If the father dies while in active service and leaves both a widow and children, each child will receive an immediate annuity. This annuity will be one of the following, whichever is the least: (1) 25 percent of the amount which would have been due the father; (2) $360; or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $900 by the number of surviving children.

If, however, the father dies as a widower, or the mother dies as a widow, then each surviving child will receive an immediate annuity amounting to one of the following, whichever is the least: (1) 50 percent of the amount which would have been due the parent; (2) $480; or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $1,200 by the number of children entitled to annuities.

We have discussed the special annuity benefits to the widows and children of persons who die while in active service; now let us take up the benefits to the survivors of the employees retiring after this law becomes effective. The following comments apply to all such annuitants (including those involuntarily separated after 25 years) except those receiving discontinued service annuity payments after 5 or more years of employment.

Suppose we consider a retired employee who dies and leaves a widow but no children who qualify for annuity benefits. His widow will get an annuity beginning at her age 50 if he provided one for her when he retired by naming her as his survivor-annuitant. That will be the only way this widow can get an annuity based on the Government service performed by her husband.

If the deceased annuitant leaves a widow and one or more children who are entitled to benefits, the widow will be in line (like the widow of the man who died in active service) for a monthly check based on the existence of the offspring; she gets this benefit until she dies, remarries, or reaches age 50. This widow's annuity will be equal to 50 percent of her husband's basic annuity (excluding any portion thereof purchased by voluntary contributions).

ANNUITANT'S SURVIVING CHILDREN

We've been talking about the annuity checks which are drawn in the widow's favor; now we shall discuss the benefits payable to the surviving children of annuitants.

When the annuitant is survived by both his widow and a child (or children), the child who qualifies for such benefit with respect to age and dependency will receive an immediate annuity consisting of one of the following, whichever is the least: (1) 50 percent of the annuity payable to the widow; (2) $360; or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $900 by the number of children involved.

When an annuitant dies as a widow or widower (the other spouse being deceased), each surviving child gets payments immediately. Each child will be entitled to one of the following, whichever is the least: (1) 50 percent of the basic annuity the deceased person was entitled to; (2) $480, or (3) the amount obtained by dividing $1,200 by the number of children involved.

All payments to children are made to their legal guardians (if any have been appointed), or to the widows or other persons having the care and custody of the children.

TERMINATION AND RECOMPUTATION OF BENEFITS

Children's benefits terminate when the children reach age 18 (unless physically or mentally incapable of self-support), marry, or die. In cases in which several individuals (children, or widow-and-child combinations) are receiving survivor benefits, when the benefit to any one of the children ceases or the widow dies, the payments to the remaining children are recomputed on the basis of the new number of survivors involved.

When an employee member of the retirement system dies there will be money in the fund to his credit. Whether it can be paid right away to the beneficiary he has named (or to his estate) depends on whether he leaves a surviving widow or children entitled to immediate or future annuity payments.

Milwaukee Journal Gives Sentiments of All Loyal Americans on Dr. Condon Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent controversy between the Committee on Un-American Activities and Dr. Edward U. Condon are of grave concern to every loyal American. This controversy is a double-edged sword, so to speak. That Dr. Condon has been flippant about his association is commonly known. That the Committee on Un-American Activities leaped before it had needed evidence is also known.

About the most worthy articles I have read on this subject appeared in the Milwaukee Journal, the leading newspaper in Wisconsin. These two articles express the sentiments of all good loyal Americans, and under unanimous consent, I include them in the RECORD.

WHAT DR. CONDON FORGOT

In connection with our effort to analyze the Thomas Un-American Activities Subcommittee report on Dr. Condon as thoroughly as we could, we tried to check up on whether the American-Soviet Science Society is a Communist-front organization. The subcommittee report says that it is. Dr. Condon was on the executive committee of that society and the subcommittee says he used his influence to get subordinates in the Federal Bureau of Standards to join the organization.

The evidence that we were able to get on the American-Soviet Science Society certainly is not conclusive. The society got funds from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1946 and has received other tributes to its respectability. On the other hand, one reliable source accused the society of perpetrating various scientific hoaxes and of trying to give Russian scientists credit to which they were not entitled.

The society has had the names of many distinguished American scientists, of whose loyalty there can be no doubt, on its roster. One observer commented, however, that if a Communist-front organization is going to be of any real use to Communists here or abroad, it must keep up the appearance of respectability. It is an old Communist trick to lure sincere and innocent persons into an organization with a deceptive title and an ostensibly proper purpose—to flatter these innocents with honor and attention so that their prestige will help cover up the true nature of the outfit.

The American-Soviet Science Society may be innocent of subversive activity or intent. But Dr. Condon's case shows how easily a man of apparently high reputation and ability may injure his reputation and impair his own effectiveness by carelessness in his affiliations and associations. When a man has brought honor to his name, his very prestige brings with it great responsibility to those who respect him. His words and his example bear weight. When he lends his name to a cause or gives his friendship to an individual he influences many others to approve the cause or the individual without investigation.

There's an important warning here, then, for all persons who assume position of influence and leadership, even in highly restricted and specialized fields. There is a warning here also for Americans who are prone to follow the leader blindly, without finding out where he is trying to lead them and whether he knows the way.

CONDON CASE, AN ATOM BOMB

It is pretty hard to tell yet who was hurt most and how severely when the House Un-American Activities Subcommittee touched off its bomb under Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Federal Bureau of Standards. The smoke hasn't all cleared and the casualties haven't been counted.

In substance, the subcommittee condemned Dr. Condon as either a knave or a fool. It branded him the "weakest link in our atomic security." And, by very pointed innuendo at least, it implied that he has been "playing Stalin's game" and having possible connections with an "espionage ring."

Having thus convicted Dr. Condon, the subcommittee suggested that it is now up to him, the Commerce Department, and President Truman to prove that the charges are false. That is a rather unusual order of procedure.

Within a matter of hours it developed that the committee had not obtained all available information concerning the investigation conducted by a Department of Commerce loyalty board, which unanimously cleared Dr. Condon of disloyalty. Subsequent dispatches indicate that the subcommittee, although quoting many paragraphs from a secret FBI report to show that Dr. Condon consorted with persons who might be suspected of Russian sympathies, failed to include a statement from the same FBI report to the effect that no evidence of disloyalty or subversive activities had been discovered.

Now Chairman THOMAS comments that "the committee has no evidence that Dr. Condon is disloyal" but has ample evidence that the scientist has been inexcusably indiscreet. That is bad enough and may be grounds for removal. But it is certainly a long way short of treasonable activities implied in the report publicized by the subcommittee.

It is vital to the security of this nation, in the present state of world affairs, that every untrustworthy person be removed from any government post where he could imperil American interests. Regardless of suspicion, doubt, or sympathy, the case of Dr. Condon should be thoroughly sifted. If the committee, in spite of its blunders and apparent bias, has here exposed a case where a government official has carelessly disregarded discretion or responsibility, the committee deserves commendation.

On the other hand, if it is finally shown that the committee acted prematurely and irresponsibly, without due search and regard for available facts, or if it is shown that facts known to the subcommittee were suppressed or distorted to bolster the case against Dr. Condon, infinite harm has been done. That would only aid those who consistently cry "witch hunt" to every effort at exposing Communists and Communist sympathizers. Sloppy work on the part of the committee would play directly into the hands of the very people the committee is trying to combat.

Dr. Condon, by the associations he has not denied, certainly set himself up as a very foolish man. We believe that this foolishness, plus the publicity given the whole affair, has destroyed his usefulness as a public employee. He ought to resign and go into private work. This is true on the basis of his own actions, regardless of errors the committee may have made.

On the other hand, the way the subcommittee handled the matter has placed it under a cloud too. The un-American activities committee is now asking for greater sums for continued inquiries. If it is to do the important work of combating Communist infiltration, then it must do the job in ways that are above question and are always defensible in fact.

Poor Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gazette and Bulletin, Williamsport, Pa., of March 5, 1948:

POOR INVESTMENT

Only very foolish persons would continue to invest their money in a business year after year if it cost them money instead of earned money for them. The American people are not regarded as foolish, yet for the past 14 years they, through the Federal Government, have been doing that very thing in TVA. What's more, President Truman now wants $4,000,000 more to start a project that will cost $54,000,000 before being completed.

Government propaganda would have us believe that TVA is a wonderful thing and should be expanded. It is supposed to be so much better than the business managed power companies. In painting such glowing pictures of the TVA the propagandists are careful to avoid reference to the financial background. They tell about TVA rates being lower than those of the electric industry,

but they do not mention that interest default alone for the past 14 years totals not less than $120,000,000, which the taxpayers of the Nation have had to make up.

They boast that 1947 was the most successful year in TVA history, but ignore the fact that up to June 15, 1947, the Federal Government had turned over to it more than $814,000,000. The interest on that sum at 2½ percent, which is the rate for long-term Government borrowing, was $20,350,000 for 1947. TVA in its most successful year of 1947 had only $6,900,000 available from its operations to meet this interest obligation. What's worse it didn't even pay that sum, instead it paid $565,000. The remainder had to come from the pockets of the investors, the taxpayers of America.

Keep in mind, too, that in addition to all the subsidies TVA receives, it does not pay any taxes. It makes payments in lieu of taxes, but the sum is nowhere near what private enterprise would pay on the same size operation. TVA reports that it added some $30,000,000 of new property in 1947, but its hand-outs in lieu of taxes was some $300,000 less than in 1946.

Now the President wants $4,000,000 to start construction of a steam plant that will cost $54,000,000 before finished. To think that all this started as a project for navigation and flood control.

It is no wonder that so many Americans today are counting the weeks until they can vote out of office this wasteful Federal bureaucracy. They are unlikely to turn to Wallace and his socialistic views if they see the failure of the TVA.

Antilynching Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, along with the extension of my own remarks, I am including an editorial which first appeared some days ago in the Washington Post. This splendid editorial was copied by the Atlanta Journal. It is this editorial copied and commented upon in the Atlanta Journal that I am having made a part of the RECORD.

These statements of the Post are so true and their conclusions so inescapable that I hope the Republican Members of this Congress will read them and profit thereby.

THE ANTILYNCHING BILL IS A FRAUD AND A MENACE

No newspaper of the American press is more highy respected than the Washington Post. That is because the Post is honest and valiant, and speaks its well-informed mind. Independent of the partisanship of politics, it is staunchly liberal in its economic and social thinking and has taken an important part in the governmental reforms and advancements of the past 15 years. But the Post is no docile dupe of the tricksters of politics in their schemes to win votes by appeals to ignorance and prejudice and racial or religious sentiments and emotions. Published in the Capital, amid the tides and cross-currents of the stream of Government, it is in position to discern the phonies of legislation and does not fail to take advantage of its especial opportunities.

The Post brands the Case antilynching bill a fraud and a menace in an editorial published March 2. We reprint the article herewith and commend it to our readers as the best analysis yet made of the sorry sop dished out to the Negro voters of the so-called doubtful States:

"Fifty years ago lynching was a grave problem in the United States. All during the 1890's mob murders were about as common as gang slayings became in the 1930's. In the single year of 1892 a total of 225 persons met death at the hands of murderers conspiring among themselves to take the law into their own hands. One hundred of the victims were white men. Lynching has been by no means confined to the colored race. Indeed, it was the customary method of inflicting punishment on horse thieves and cattle rustlers in the early days of the West. Since the 1920's, however, the number of white men lynched has been negligible, and last year the Tuskegee institute recorded only one lynching of a Negro.

"It is a sorry anachronism that just as the Southern States have almost completed the job of wiping out this disgusting crime Congress should be considering a bill to make the preventing of lynching a Federal responsibility. Half a century ago the use of Federal power against lynchers might have been justified by the tragic failure of the States to protect their citizens. Now most of the States have completely mastered the problem without any help from Washington, and we doubt that the Case antilynching bill would add in any way to the safety of citizens.

"This measure, which is about to be pushed through the House of Representatives, would transfer to the Federal courts the prosecution of lynchers and of local officials failing to protect prisoners or to move against mobs after a lynching has occurred. But trials would still be held before local juries, and it is probable that resentment against Federal intervention would complicate instead of easing the problem of securing convictions of accused mobsters. To be sure, there is another provision in the Case bill making every county, town, and other governmental subdivision responsible for any lynching in its jurisdiction. But this resort to the despicable doctrine of mass guilt because of the area in which one happens to live is so repugnant to democratic principles as to make the bill unpalatable to thousands who are devoted to civil rights in the North as well as the South.

"We cannot help thinking that this vote-catching venture has no place in the present session of Congress. Its effect is to arouse animosities at a time when there is urgent need for national unity. The lynching menace has already been put down, and we trust that the last vestige of it will soon disappear. Our problem today is the rise of a tyranny that seeks to destroy all civil rights, whether protected by State or Federal law. In the face of that menace we need to be mobilizing our strength—not to be opening old sores or frittering away energies on problems that have already been solved."

Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have stated publicly many times that I had never known or worked with finer people as a whole than the postal employees. I have also publicly stated that in my opinion no group of people were rendering more effective and efficient service with less remuneration than those employed in the postal service. The attached editorial from the issue of the Zanesville (Ohio) Times-Recorder of March 3, 1948, expresses most logically the position which I take regarding a pay increase for these employees and I desire herewith to submit it as part of the record in favor of pay-increase legislation:

FAIR PLAY FOR THE MAILMAN

The efficiency of the United States postal service is a matter of concern to virtually every person in this country. That efficiency is now seriously threatened because of the shamefully low pay of the postal employees. They deserve better treatment not only on this ground but as a matter of plain justice.

These employees make up a group of faithful workers who have patiently borne the unfairness in pay. They are not threatening to strike and could not consider that alternative. But there is a limit to human endurance and the clear fact is they cannot meet their living costs under the present conditions. The morale of the service is being undermined and there is increasing difficulty in the enlistment of efficient workers into the service.

Since 1939 or since the start of the rise in living costs the postal employees have received total pay increases of only about 35 percent. In that time the pay of industrial workers has been just about doubled, while national income, industrial profits, farm income, and the like have increased still more. The last pay advance for the postal workers was more than 2 years ago. At that time the Associated Press wholesale price index of 35 basic commodities stood at less than 113 with 100 as the 1926 average. On the latest report adjusted to the recent price declines, this index stood at approximately 186.

In this period of rapid living cost advances the postal employees have gained nothing. The situation has produced bills in both the Senate and the House which are designed to remove the injustice to a fair extent. Under these measures the numerous classifications of the employees and their pay would be given consideration. If no other workable method can be found there ought to be some adjustment in postal rates to provide the funds for this urgently needed compensation.

The responsibility for this action falls upon Congress. It can maintain the efficiency of this service to the public and will be held accountable if nothing is done. It should get busy and deal justly with a neglected group of public servants.

Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I extend the second installment of the article written by Jerry Kluttz with reference to the new Civil Service Retirement Act. It follows:

When we have a case in which some part of the employee's Federal career was in work for

which no deductions were made for retirement purposes, that person's annuity will naturally be somewhat lower than that of the person who has made all required deposits.

The individual who is short on paid-up service, however, can correct that situation by making a deposit in the fund. The payment required will consist of the proper amount of deductions with interest.

It used to be very difficult to compute the annuity earned by a person who had a mixed service consisting of periods when he did not contribute to the retirement fund, and when he did contribute to the fund. Now, that computation, too, is much easier. We compute the annuity which the person would have been entitled to if all his service since August 1, 1920, had been covered by deductions, and then reduce that figure by one-tenth of the amount of the required payment.

That isn't as complicated as it sounds. Here is an example of how it works:

Example: Average salary for best 5 years is $3,000, 30 years' service, but no deductions taken during six of those years; assuming that a $400 deposit in the fund is required to get full service credit.

Take 1 percent of the salary	$30
Add $25	25
	55
Multiply by years of service	×30
Full annuity	1,650
Less 1/10 of $400	−40
Annuity	1,610

The deposit needed to cover past service for which no deductions were made will be the original percentage deduction of salary (2½, 3½, 5 or 6 percent, depending on when the service occurred), plus the interest thereon.

The new law requires that any person retiring in the future who has taken a refund at any time in his career and has not redeposited the money in the fund since his return to a job under the Retirement Act, must make this payment, with interest, before he can be given credit for that earlier service. The following illustrates the effect of not redepositing a refund:

Example: Average salary for best 5 years is $3,000; 30 years' service, but person took a refund for nine of these years, and did not repay the money to the fund:

Take 1 percent of the salary	$30
Add $25	25
	55
Multiply by 21 years	×21
Annuity	1,155

Veterans should keep in mind when figuring their retirement income that they need not make any payment to the fund to receive full credit for their military service. All military time is computed according to the basic formula just as though salary deductions had been made for that period of their Federal service. In figuring the best 5-year annual salary, the military pay rate can be used if desired. Persons carried on leave or furlough from Federal civilian jobs during military duty can apply either the military rate or the civilian rate.

There is one qualification, covering all annuities: In any case, the annuity may not exceed 80 percent of the average salary for the highest five consecutive years of service. In this rule, of course, we are considering the regular annuity earned by pay-roll deductions (and deposits), and not the extra annuity which can be purchased by voluntary contributions to the fund.

ANNUITY IN 55–30 CASES

Let's consider for a minute those people who leave the service prior to the usual retirement age and take a reduced annuity.

This refers to the 30-year workers who decide to retire under the age 55 option. These folks get a break under the new conditions; the amount of reduction from a full annuity will not be as great in the future as in the past.

What we do in these cases is figure the regular annuity, using the basic formula, and then cut it down. For the 30-year man who retires any time from age 55 to age 60, we figure his normal annuity and then reduce it at the rate of one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month (3 percent for each full year) he is under age 60.

Formula for getting the reduced annuity in 55–30 cases.

Example: Age 55; the full annuity, computed from the basic formula, is $2,000.

From the full annuity	$2,000
Deduct 15 percent (3 percent per year for 5 years under age 60)	300
Reduced annuity	1,700

The foregoing formula is used also in computing the reduced annuity payable to an employee with 25 or more years of service who is involuntarily separated from the rolls after April 1, 1948, not for cause or on charges of misconduct or delinquency. The annuity in such case starts immediately upon separation, regardless of the age of the employee. The rate of reduction from a full annuity is the same as in a 55–30 case (3 percent per year under age 60).

The annuities of persons with 25 or more years of service who left the rolls, as described above, between June 30, 1947, and April 1 this year will be computed as under all the old retirement provisions except for this one point: Their basic annuities will be computed as in the past, and then the new plan of 3 percent per year reduction for age under 60 will be applied to get the reduced annuity payable.

PERSONS SEPARATED AFTER APRIL 1, 1948

Employees with five or more years of civilian service who are separated after the effective date of the new law and before they attain the full or optional retirement age, will be entitled to an annuity at age 62 computed on the basis of the new formula. If such an employee takes a refund, this discontinued service annuity is forfeited, as stated earlier in this pamphlet.

The Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act does not allow us to compute annuities under the new, more liberal plan for those employees with five or more years of service who are separated from the rolls between January 24, 1942 (the act of that date added the discontinued service annuity provision to the retirement program) and the effective date of this act. Persons in this category retain the rights and benefits offered under the old law.

Among the interesting features of the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act are the new survivorship benefits. The old "forfeiture" and "joint and survivorship" retirement plans are out; we have in their stead two survivorship principles under the new law which we call the "joint-and-survivorship options". The first is limited to husbands, and the second is open to any unmarried employee. An employee is not allowed to decide which option he wants to use until he retires, so for most members of our system there is plenty of time to think this over.

HUSBAND'S OPTION

Let's take up the husband's special benefit first; we can call this "Option 1". We have a married man—a retiring employee—and he wants to provide security for his wife after he dies. By taking this Option 1 he will receive 90 percent of the regular full annuity to which he is entitled, less three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year (if any) his wife is under age 60 at the time the husband retires.

In the case of a wife who is 47, but not yet 48, when her husband retires, for example, this difference-in-age reduction will result in the retired man's getting an income amounting to 81 percent of a full annuity (which is the initial 90-percent rate reduced by three-fourths of 1 percent annually for 12 full years), and the wife's getting a survivorship annuity equal to 50 percent of the full annuity beginning at her age 50. Her payments start immediately upon the husband's death if she has already reached 50 when he passes on. This annuity to the widow will be paid until her death or remarriage.

In connection with this proposition of reducing the retired man's annuity according to the wife's age, there is a section in the new law that says the man's reduced annuity will in no case be under 75 percent of a full annuity.

The Option 1 arrangement is available to married males retiring under any plan (including those involuntarily separated after 25 years) except the annuity plan based on discontinued service after five or more years of employment.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

When the Taft-Hartley Act finally became law, many people hoped it would solve at least the worst union problems. But a series of hearings by a House Labor Subcommittee reveals that practically nothing has been done on a major issue.

It is the complicated question of the jurisdictional strike. It is doubtful whether any other labor practice has done more to annoy the general public. The jurisdictional strike has always seemed indefensible to the man in the street.

This kind of dispute is not between a union and an employer over wages and working conditions. It is simply a fight between two unions over which will have control of the workers. The employer usually has nothing to do with it.

The particular jurisdictional strike that the subcommittee is investigating has been going on for 17 months. It involves an argument in Hollywood over who will make the stage props for movie productions.

The strike involves well over 40 unions, most of them affiliated with the A. F. of L. The majority are united against one organization with the lengthy title "The International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees."

The argument began in September 1946. Within a few weeks, most of the unions found themselves on the outside looking in at the stage hands. The result was a prolonged strike that resulted in losses for everybody.

The subcommittee hearing hasn't shed any particularly new light on the situation. The stage hands claim that their rivals—banded together in an outfit called the Conference of Studio Unions—are dominated by Communists.

The Conference unions claims that the stage hands have remained in the studios only by an undercover deal with the producers. Solomon himself, in all his glory, would be unable to make a confident decision on either charge.

But one thing is certain: For 17 months, thousands of skilled workers have been walking the streets of Los Angeles without a job.

And they are unemployed only because union heads cannot get together and decide which will control.

It is even more depressing to realize that all of the unions belong to the same organization. They are all affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. This is a quarrel between brothers, not a fight between rivals.

The federation made one half-hearted attempt to settle the strike before it started. Three A. F. of L vice presidents tried to arbitrate the dispute. But their efforts broke down, and the strike burst out anyway.

There is an important lesson in this for all labor leaders. They have been unable to get together on this question. If they cannot make some kind of a settlement soon, Congress will do it for them.

The congressional solution will be unpleasant. It will be disliked by everyone involved, including the legislators who vote for it. But if the labor leaders cannot solve the problem themselves, Congress will have to act.

The public can understand and sympathize with a strike for higher wages and better working conditions. We all want to get along in this world. But the public cannot understand and sympathize with a strike just to decide which labor leaders will have power over a group of workers.

Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow in Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the agitation and pressure that is being brought to bear upon Congress for the enactment of a law to provide Federal funds for aid to education, I think there are two or three considerations that should challenge our attention.

In the first place, pressure groups have been organized and propaganda has been inspired and broadcast among the Members of Congress in an attempt to force us to vote for Federal aid to education. Some have even written letters threatening to vote and work against the reelection of the present Members of Congress, unless we support the pending measures. Of course, such letters are beneath the dignity of what we have a right to expect of the teaching profession. As one who comes from a family of school teachers in the humblest positions in the grade schools to college professors, I am interested in the welfare of the teachers and the best interests of our public school system. I am sure that it is difficult in these times of emergencies for those in the teaching profession to consider the problem objectively. Human nature is prone to suggest the "me" in all relief and appropriation measures. But the high standing of the teaching profession demands that other considerations transcend personal interests and that the decision be based upon most worthy and lofty grounds.

Little do I think that those among the teachers who cherish an enviable reputation for leadership will inspire propaganda or be instrumental, directly or indirectly, in causing organizations and others to attempt to pressure Congress to pass a bill that will mean comparatively little in dollars and cents in the way of an increase in salaries to the average individual teacher.

Of course, there are implications involved, and these must be recognized. If the program is in keeping with our American traditions and ideologies, that is one thing. If, on the other hand, it is not consistent with our American ideals, of local self-government of our public schools, or at most with their management and control by the several States, that is something else.

The best thinkers in the teaching profession with whom I have discussed this proposal, have insisted that they cannot conscientiously favor any program that will vest in the Commissioner of Education of the United States, or in a central authority at Washington, any control of our public school system. They have stated further that, so far as they are concerned, they have used every effort to avoid such a possibility. They have referred me, in almost every instance, to our program of providing Federal funds in the field of vocational education. They have used that as an example and apparently it is to them sufficient proof of the use of Federal funds to aid our public schools without the possibility of losing local control.

The argument has been persuasive, but not altogether conclusive, and I have witnessed the fact that in practically every instance where Federal funds are distributed, the local units of government or individuals or groups of individuals, have been required to submit to some restrictions, regulations, and dictation. Agreement to the exercise of authority has been demanded as a condition precedent. In other words, in order to obtain the Federal funds, almost universally it has become necessary that the recipient do or abstain from doing certain things. This is tantamount to saying that our plan of action, our operations, our individual programs are to that extent dictated from Washington. It is another way of getting the people to submit to orders, regulations, and dictations of men, rather than to laws made by the representatives of the people. It is ever a lurking danger and should be a sufficient warning to all of us in the consideration of any new program, which involves a wide distribution of Federal funds, the taxpayers' money, that has been collected into the Treasury of the United States.

The shining example referred to by the educators in the field of vocational training should be explored. In this connection, I have recently read an article which appears in the February 1948 edition of the American Vocational Journal entitled "Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow in Vocational Education." This article was written by Mr. C. M. Miller, the director of the Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, who has served as such director for more than 25 years consecutively, which bespeaks his knowledge and authority on the subject to which he has addressed himself.

There are a number of very pungent statements in Mr. Miller's article. In connection with the audits made by representatives of the United States Commissioner of Education, in order to establish entitlement of the States and schools of any particular State for participation in vocational-education funds, Mr. Miller says:

> Audits by unsympathetic auditors can result in Federal control and domination of the most damaging kind.

In another instance, Mr. Miller observes:

> It is no secret that the Commissioner has lost no opportunity to foment chief State school officers and other school administrators against the plan of having vocational education administered and supervised by specialists. It is no secret that in certain States where the Commissioner has greatest influence the pattern for State supervision follows very closely the plan his office has developed.

I quote further from Mr. Miller's article:

> It is a matter of common knowleige that more money was appropriated by the Eightieth Congress for the administration of vocational education than was ever appropriated before. It is no secret that part of that appropriation is being used for purposes that yield no dividends to the administration of vocational education.

In speaking of the new plan inaugurated in the Office of the Commissioner of Education in his article, Mr. Miller says:

> The new plan provides for almost complete Federal control and a minimum of professional service.

It is my considered judgment, and that of many Members of Congress with whom I have discussed this subject that Mr. Miller's article is timely and should be quoted in full for the benefit of all interested in vocational education. It shows what can happen and what he says has happened in this field, simply because, under the law, it provides for appropriations of Federal funds to be spent in the States, and those given the power to distribute the same, exercise authority in directing the programs in which the money shall be used. Hence, I quote the entire article, as follows:

YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

(By C. M. Miller, director, Kansas State Board for Vocational Education)

Your committee conferred on me a great honor when it invited me to speak to you this evening. It is an honor no man would despise, for I realize with you that the American Vocational Association is the most effective organization of its kind in the world. It is effective and strong because it has a program which has attracted the attention and support of millions of friends, many of whom are themselves members of great organizations and see the value of a sound program of vocational education.

When a surveyer goes forth to survey a field he locates a marker of a previous survey and then surveys back just far enough to get his direction for going forward.

I ask, therefore, that you suffer me to pause briefly to assemble and present my credentials, for no one man can speak meaningfully concerning these matters except that he erect for himself a sort of sounding board of experience from which he may evaluate

the past, appreciate the present, and anticipate the future.

It happened that when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed, I was principal of one of our county high schools and responsible for the intellectual and vocational development of about 300 Kansas farm boys and girls for the complicated business of living. They were somewhat more mature than average high school students, and I had a sort of vague and ill-defined idea that the traditional school did not afford what they needed. It certainly did not afford all they needed.

It was natural, therefore, that I should be in the first meeting of high school principals called together at the State capitol to make plans for implementing the new vocational act, and my school was one of the very first approved. It is still the biggest little high school in our State.

A few years later the State board for vocational education was looking for someone to serve as State director of the sickly and emaciated little program of vocational education. They gave me the job until they could find someone, and many of my friends went into mourning. They thought I had let down my net on the wrong side of the boat. That was 25 years, 6 months, and 15 days ago, and they haven't found anyone yet, unless it has happened since I left home. I relate this bit of personal history to bring to your attention the fact that I have seen vocational education grow from middle or late infancy through adolescence and come into adulthood.

We are assembled here to the end that in adulthood vocational education may grow more robust, more vigorous, and more useful.

When the Smith-Hughes Act was passed there were, and are, three great teacher-training institutions in this country. One is on the west coast, one on the east coast, and one in about the middle. All of them were, and are, doing a good job of training teachers for the schools of this country. All of them had dreamed of a day when there would be Federal money available for the training of teachers, for they recognized, as many of us did, and still do, that inadequately trained teachers is a weak link in our educational system.

Accordingly they looked upon the Smith-Hughes Act as a partial answer to their prayers. Here was Federal money for the training of teachers, and, of course, they expected a large share of it, for weren't they recognized as the outstanding teacher-training institutions in this country?

But when the law was interpreted they found that it was available only to schools "under public supervision and control." They did not qualify, and here was a disheartening blow. And as if to add insult to injury, they had to see a great part of the money apportioned to land-grant colleges, and land-grant colleges in that day were not considered educationally respectable in the area of teacher training. To these great and justly proud institutions that was heresy of the highest order. That was academic wormwood and gall.

Small wonder, then, that no help or encouragement for vocational education has come out of those great institutions. Small wonder that school administrators who come under the influence of these institutions are exposed to a negative attitude toward vocational education.

There may be some who will feel that my reference to these institutions is petty complaining. To any who may feel so I can only say you have not followed accurately and understandingly the development of vocational education in this country. What I relate concerning them is a very practical situation that has persisted through the years, and our most severe and persistent critics have come out of these institutions.

We in vocational education do not resent the attitude of these institutions. Indeed, we believe they may have served the total cause of education more effectively than if they had welcomed the arrival of vocational education with wide open arms. They have caused vocational education to justify its every step. And any new idea or program that affects so intimately the lives of as many people as are affected by vocational education should be required to justify itself. Furthermore, our critics served us well, for they have cemented us together in a common cause.

We in vocational education hasten to say that in spite of this negative influence, a great majority of school administrators have thrown the weight of their positions and influence and resources without reservation into the development of vocational education to serve the needs of their communities and of the country. To these we find it difficult to adequately express our appreciation. Vocational education could not have developed without their help. Even as well established as it is, it cannot survive or develop further without their support, and we covet that support.

But, as was the case of Antonio Stradivarius, who said, "God could not have made Stradivari violins without Antonio," these same fine school administrators could not have developed a sound program of vocational education without men and women especially trained in the many areas of vocational education. It consists of several rather highly specialized fields and cannot function except under the administration and supervision of specialists.

School administrators are called upon to deal with a great variety of problems. Their training and their experience are of necessity too general to deal with the special problems in any area of education, including vocational education.

A chool administrator finds it uneasy going, for instance, when called upon to make the necessary arrangements with labor and employers in setting up a program for training plumbers and machinists. Likewise, he finds himself out of his element when he attemps to develop the teaching content for a class of boys in vocational agriculture. Still greater would be his embarrassment if he attempted to arrange a class for adult farmers in feeding a dairy herd. He doesn't know the techniques, he doesn't speak the language. He would be ill at ease in their presence. These are jobs for specialists.

We are thoroughly convinced that vocational education in the areas in which it functions is a great national, as well as community, asset. If for no other reason we want to see it prosper as an instrument of national security.

In thumbing the pages of the history of vocational education, we come again to the enactment of the Smith-Hughes law, and you will recall that it provided for a Federal Board for Vocational Education consisting of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, the Commissioner of Education, and three citizens appointed by the President and representing labor, agriculture, and industry.

The machinery set up for the administration of vocational education under the Board consisted of a director who was assisted by a chief of each of the services of agriculture, homemaking, and trade and industrial education. They, in turn, were assisted by four regional agents in each of the services.

Under this administrative arrangement, but without chart or compass, a program of vocational education was developed around the regional agent and in cooperation with the States that served this country exceedingly well, within the limits of funds, in both war and peace; in depression and prosperity.

Cooperation with the States is the keynote of the Smith-Hughes Act. It seeks to avoid Federal domination and the Board used every means and device within its power to make it truly a cooperative effort.

The regional agent was the contact person between the State program and the Federal Government. He knew the strength and weakness of the program in every State in his region. He knew the State director and supervisors in each State in his region, and they knew him. By reason of this intimate, first-hand knowledge of the program and this professional friendship, he was able to render the professional assistance necessary to strengthen the weak spots in the program of any State.

There were times, of course, when we in the States did not see eye to eye with the regional agent on every problem, but the result of our discussions was a composite judgment which was better because of original lack of agreement. His information, experience, and counsel always resulted in better performance in the total program. Quite naturally, there were occasional instances of mildly unpleasant relations between regional agents and State people, but occasional irritations of personalities cannot be entirely eliminated in any system. By and large, the regional agent system worked and got the job done with a negligible lack of harmony. Not only were Federal and State relations pleasant, but State and local relations were highly satisfactory under the regional-agent plan.

The work of the region revolved around this regional agent, and State relationship, and a national development was the regional conference. These regional conferences served a highly useful purpose, for by means of the discussions which were the natural result of a dozen States meeting in conference, the development of the best in standards and practices and the elimination of the less useful were accelerated. The regional conference gave substance and meaning and direction to the entire program.

But a regional conference, the agenda for which do not stem from the problems of the region as recognized by the regional agent and the States within the region, is only half a conference, or even less. It works from the outside in, which is the wrong direction.

Furthermore, the regional agent audited the accounts of the State board and having intimate knowledge of every program within the State made it possible for him to audit not loosely, but strictly and constructively within the spirit of the law. A law so flexible as a vocational education law must be interpreted understandingly and flexibly if it is to cover the great variety of situations intended. If it is to be useful and effective, it must be audited by someone who understands the spirit and purpose, as well as the letter of the law. Audits by unsympathetic auditors can result in Federal control and domination of the most damaging kind. Under the proposed auditing division it will cost 35 to 50 thousand dollars annually to do much less well what has been accomplished every year for 30 years by regional agents. They did it as an incidental to their professional visits.

But there came a new day, and the functions of the Federal Board for Vocational Education were transferred to the Office of Education in 1933, and the Commissioner of Education became, in effect, the Federal Board. From that time forward vocational education has had a new and increasingly difficult fight for its existence. Efforts have constantly been made to integrate vocational education into the total program so completely that it would lose both its identity and its usefulness.

Everyone in vocational education who has found his stride knows that no one is at his best in any area or on any level of education until he has developed for himself a philosophy of education which includes everything that happens to boys and girls from kindergarten through college. We in vocational education want no less of effort spent in other areas of education. We recognize the urgent need for better educational opportunity in all areas and on all levels. We do not pretend to serve all educational needs. We do not understand, however, why educators in other areas should oppose or seek

to hinder the further development of the admittedly important area of vocational education.

What we want—and, indeed, must have—is that vocational education be treated as one of the special areas and that it be kept vocational. What we want—and, indeed, must have—is that standards be maintained which will bear the close scrutiny of workers in the vocations for which we are called upon to train. To attempt to train for the skilled trades in a set-up that does not meet the approval of the best tradesmen in a given trade is folly and suicide. To attempt to train boys in agriculture in a situation that does not have the respect of the best farmers in the community is the surest way I know to defeat the purpose of vocational agriculture. To attempt to train for any vocation in a set-up that does not command the respect of the best workers in that vocation is the very worst of educational administration and practice.

Standards in vocational education which have been developed through the years, largely by the trial-and-error method, must and shall be maintained. We cannot compromise in that particular, for to do so is to betray those whom we would serve. Since the transfer of the functions of the Federal Board for Vocational Education to the Commissioner of Education, there have been constant attempts from every angle to change practices, policies, and standards, thereby frustrating and breaking down the entire program.

Vocations change, and we are often called upon to train for new vocations. Specific training within a vocation may change. Methods of instruction may be improved. But there are certain fundamental philosophies that we dare not vacate. There are certain standards from which we must not recede. There are certain principles we cannot compromise. Among them is the well-established principle of requiring that vocational teachers be occupationally competent and that they be supervised by occupationally competent people. Another is that the training situation approximate as accurately as possible actual wage-earning job conditions. Still another is that learners be segregated with respect to the vocation for which training is to be accomplished.

It is no secret that the commissioner has lost no opportunity to foment chief State school officers and other school administrators against the plan of having vocational education administered and supervised by specialists. It is no secret that in certain States where the commissioner has greatest influence the pattern for State supervision follows very closely the plan his office has developed.

If the plan for administration, direction, and supervision by others than specialists prevails, we may as well admit that vocational education has reached the zenith, and the road from here on is down hill.

It is no secret that no increase in appropriations under the George-Barden Act would have been made except for the fine work you State people did in cooperation with the American Vocational Association in bringing to the attention of the Congress the very urgent need for additional funds. And as a direct result of that effort there is reason to hope we may even get the full amount authorized in the George-Barden Act in our next appropriation.

It is a matter of common knowledge that more money was appropriated by the Eightieth Congress for the administration of vocational education than was ever appropriated before. It is no secret that part of that appropriation is being used for purposes that yield no dividends to the administration of vocational education.

Through the years an impressive company of stars has ascended into the vocational education firmament. Some have descended behind yonder west horizon; some are still luminous but descending; some are ascending, but have not reached their zenith. A few "shooting stars" have ascended and shone with great light for a time and have then gravitated into other orbits. A few stars, alas, have lost their lustre ere they set.

We name only a few of those who have played the leads. Time will not erase from the pages of vocational-education history such names as Prosser, Allen, Wright, Cooley, Hambrecht, O'Leary, Dennis, Quigley, Mobley, Fife, Greiber, Baylor, Amidon, Fallgatter, Small, Getman, Brown, Hobdy, Woods. This list could be extended, and I realize the hazard of naming them at all for some deserving person will be missed.

But among those named, a large share of the credit goes to Dr. J. C. Wright for holding the ship on its course after the administrative functions of vocational education were transferred to the Commissioner of Education. Because of his rich experience, his alertness, his patience, his unshakable faith, his educational statesmanship, and because he was enlisted in a cause and not merely employed on a job, he was able to hold fast without giving ground. And because he recognized it to be the function of his office to cooperate with the States rather than dictate to them, he was able to maintain high standards and a high morale in his staff.

In spite of constant attempts to dilute by integration, in spite of constant fomentation of the numerically small but vocal minority of school administrators against the administrative arrangement, we in the States were not too painfully conscious of an interruption in the whole program, so long as Dr. Wright continued as assistant commissioner in charge.

But as time marched on, retirement age caught upon Dr. Wright and he was called upon to pass the torch to other hands. As the time for Dr. Wright's retirement approached, speculation was rife among State people as to whom his successor would be.

We had just come through a great war in which vocational education had been called upon to train millions of workers in both civilian and military personnel. We had seen how important vocational education is to our country in war as well as in peace. We knew that by training the workers necessary to produce war materials and food, vocational education had saved the lives of thousands of American boys and had materially hastened the end of the war. Heaven help us if we were called upon in the present state of administrative chaos to duplicate the National Defense and War Production training program which was done so well beginning in 1940 and continuing through the war. We knew how much vocational education was needed to retain for peacetime vocations. We were anxious that it go on uninterrupted.

When the appointment of Dr. Gregory to succeed Dr. Wright was announced at our Buffalo convention in February 1946 it met with rather general approval. One of the first things I did when I returned to my office was to write Dr. Studebaker a letter complimenting him on the appointment. I also wrote to Dr. Gregory congratulating him and pledging to support him in the further development of a sound program of vocational education.

But what we did not know was that a plan was already in the making which would almost completely demoralize the administration of vocational education and impair the fine relationships between the Office of Education and the States in the administration of vocational education.

We recognize the fact that the Office of Education has a great responsibility in administering so important a program as that of vocational education. We recognize the legal right of Dr. Studebaker and his staff to hand to the States any plan they choose, within the law, for the administration of vocational education. But, inasmuch as the program functions in the States, and through the cooperation of the States, we believe it would have resulted in much better relations if the States had been at least informed that a change was in the making. We do not understand why, if the plan were considered legitimate, it could not have been discussed with the States before it was put into effect.

For the sake of emphasis, I repeat that cooperation with the States was a central theme of the Smith-Hughes Act, and that cooperation was a motivating force in the minds of the men who implemented the act and administered it through its first 29 years of existence. All acts supplemental to the Smith-Hughes Act have referred to it for basic cooperative administration.

We do not resent change simply because it is change, nor do we resist change if we can be convinced that change makes for improvement. We do not even resent not being consulted in the development of the new plan. What we do resent is that we were called together in group conferences and handed an entirely new plan, effective as of that date, August 1, 1946, which we did not like at the time and which has resulted in less than a year and a half, in almost completely demoralizing the staff of the Office of Education, and destroying the fine relations that had existed for so long between the States and the Office of Education.

Never in my experience have I seen the morale of the Vocational Division of the Office of Education so low. Never in my experience has it been so difficult to get professional service from the Office of Education. We in the North Central States get an occasional visit from a man designated as field representative. He is a fine man. He had been our regional agent in agriculture for many years. He knows agriculture and has rendered valuable professional service in that area. He does now, and we like to have him come. But he has been forced to pretend to give the same service in the other areas of trade and industrial education, homemaking education, business education, and guidance, as well as teacher training in all services. Just as any other man would be, he is helpless and useless to us except in his special field of agricultural education. Never in my experience has this country paid so much for so little in the administration of vocational education.

It is a matter of record that the new arrangement costs from three to four times as much for administration as the old lan. Under the old plan we got results. Under the new plan we get only confusion and chaos. Never in my experience have the members of the staff of the United States Office been so silenced as now. They are not free to express their views on any matter of administration policy. Even the chiefs of the services are not allowed to communicate directly with State directors or supervisors concerning any administrative matter. They prepare such official correspondence for the signature of the assistant commissioner—a policy uselessly slow and cumbersome and inadequate.

Among other objectionable features, the new plan sets up an elaborate program planning committee. We in the States believe the program should be planned in the States, and by the States, and for the States, as has been done so effectively for 29 years previous to August 1, 1946, with such professional assistance as they need from the Office of Education.

Vocational education functions in Wichita and Kansas City and Tonganoxie and Buffalo and San Francisco and Los Angeles and Milwaukee and Boston and Atlanta; not in Washington. It functions in the cities and towns and rural areas; not in Washington. It functions where the boys and girls and men and women are, and not in Washington.

The new plan eliminates the regional agent. To us the regional agent has been the key person. He has been the person who gave

the professional help we needed. It eliminates the regional conference as it has been developed through the years, and a pitifully inadequate substitute has been forced on the States.

The new plan provides for almost complete Federal control and a minimum of professional services. What we need is a minimum of Federal control and a maximum of professional assistance.

It is not easy for me to say what I'm about to say, for the other day down at Wichita the folks for whom I work—my staff and the Kansas Vocational Association—presented me with a bound volume of testimonial letters which are in recognition of my 25 years of effort in vocational education in Kansas. Even your president and your executive secretary extended themselves, as did many of you, to say something nice. Of course, I appreciated it more than I can tell.

But there was a letter in that volume from a man with whom I find myself at great odds in the matter of administration and supervision of vocational education. That man has been my friend through the years and I've been his friend. I cherish his friendship, for someone has said: "He who has a thousand friends has not a friend to spare, but he who has an enemy will meet him everywhere." But I find myself in such violent disagreement with him that conscience goads me into bringing to you as nearly the true situation as I am able to do, regardless of friendship.

For more than a year, as chairman of your Joint Committee of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education and the American Vocational Association, I've gone all out in my efforts to discover what motivated this revolutionary change in administrative set-up. With your support, I've been trying to get it modified. I've been trying to find out why the whole policy has been changed from one of Federal-State cooperation to one of Federal domination and control. It disturbed me no end, for I'd gone about telling our people that in vocational education there was a minimum of Federal control and that such control as the Federal Government exercised was necessary to a healthy, useful program. The new plan gives the lie to all I've believed and preached. If it was so good for vocational education, why the great secrecy?

After we had sort of regained consciousness after the atomic pronouncement of August 1, 1946, we began to protest against the new order which was so unsatisfactory to the States.

We had several conferences with Dr. Gregory. We wanted a modification of the new plan. We wanted one that would work. We wanted one in which we could work.

Dr. Gregory was not unfriendly but uncompromising. He had sought no counsel. He wanted none. He would counterance no interference. It was his plan and he would see it through, regardless of what the States wanted. We do not believe him when he tells us it is entirely his plan. We believe it is the brain child of another man but since he insists that it is his, and since it is so notoriously bad, we give him the credit. He was sure he could get the increased funds necessary to put the plan into effect. He appears to feel that he knows more about what vocational education needs than all the vocational educational people of all the States combined. We got exactly nowhere.

It isn't difficult to believe that Dr. Gregory had accepted the appointment as assistant commissioner—a fine promotion for him—on the condition that he accept full responsibility for the new plan, for it fits perfectly into the pattern the commissioner had sought to establish from the beginning of his administration. It cuts the pattern for integrating vocational education into the whole program of education to the extent of completely losing its identity and putting it under the administration and supervision of men and women untrained in the areas in which they would supervise. That would be fatal to vocational education and would betray the boys and girls and men and women who should be benefited.

When we realized complete failure to get any consideration from Dr. Gregory, we sought conference, through our executive secretary, Dr. Dennis, with Dr. Studebaker, but were brushed off.

We were so deeply concerned about the future of vocational education that, failing in our attempt to get a conference with Dr. Studebaker, we sought a conference with the Honorable Mr. Ewing, Director of the Federal Security Agency. We were granted a conference on September 11, 1947. Mr. Ewing received us graciously and listened intently. He asked many constructive questions obviously for the purpose of getting the information he needed. As a result of our conference, we have a high regard for Mr. Ewing's intelligence and integrity, but we were disappointed when our executive secretary, Dr. Dennis, received a letter from him recently in which he asked that we give the new plan further trial. We are unwilling to give it further trial because of what we have seen happen to vocational education in th 17 months it has been in effect.

We do not believe Mr. Ewing will resent our continued efforts to correct what is to us a very great wrong.

It is my opinion that the Commissioner and his assistant, the Director of the Division of Vocational Education, have entirely lost the confidence of the vocational people of this country. We cannot go forward constructively unless they can recapture that confidence and bring order out of the chaos that exists. They are entirely out of sympathy with what we in the States think is good administration in vocational education.

I do not know whether there is a man or woman among you who will go along with me, but because this situation is so intolerable, I'm calling on you to join with your American Vocational Association in seeking congressional approval of some administrative arrangements for vocational education which will function in the States, as well as in Washington, and which will make it possible for us to serve the boys and girls and men and women for whom the vocational acts were intended.

I do not believe Congress will appropriate funds for the promotion of vocational education and then fail to provide an administrative set-up that will assure their expenditure for the purposes for which they are appropriated.

Earlier in this discussion, I said the American Vocational Association is the most effective organization of its kind in the world. I repeat it, for I believe it. Its effectiveness lies in the fact that it is a team. It is not merely 25,000 individuals, but a team 25,000 strong. It is effective because every member of the team has a host of friends, many of whom are themselves members of great national organizations, eager to support a sound program of vocational education. They look to the American Vocational Association for leadership and seek opportunities to lend a hand. The membership of the American Vocational Association believes that the strength of the pack is the wolf, and the strength of the wolf is the pack.

To the end that we may continue to function effectively in the interest of a bigger and more useful and better administered program of vocational education for both youth and adults in this country, I appeal to you to continue as a team.

I do not know an organization in which there has been less evidence of selfishness. Seldom have I seen any evidence of any individual seeking selfish ends. Seldom have I known anyone in it to be a candidate for office. The office has always sought the individual best suited to do the work at hand. It should always be so. In my opinion, no person who is an avowed candidate for office in it should be elected. I consider it unethical and unprofessional, and not in the interest of the pack for any person to seek an office in an organization of this kind. Let the organization decide its direction and determine the work to be done, and then let it choose from its membership the most logical person.

We are of necessity made up of members representing a considerable variety of services, but that fact does not need to lead us into the development of pressure groups which could detract our attention from the real issue. In my opinion, it is a deplorable situation when two or more of these groups band together to trade voting power in electing officers or deciding issues.

In every big-league game, one man at the time carries the ball and all the others of the team run interference for him. You are in the big league. You are playing for big stakes. You are playing with the destiny of a big program. You are playing with the destiny of thousands of youth and adults, and maybe with the destiny of civilization, itself, for it was education in this country that won the war for the democracies. If the peace is secured, it will be education in this country that makes it secure.

Vocational education is a vital part of the total program of education. For the sake of national security let us keep it strong.

How will you play your part in this big-league game? Are you willing to run interference for the fellow who is carrying the ball, or must you carry the ball?

Vocational education stands at the crossroads. If it turns to the right, it crosses the threshold of the greatest peacetime opportunity it has ever had to serve both youth and adults of this country. If it turns left, we may as well pause with uncovered heads and saddened hearts and erect a marker for posterity. On it we should inscribe, "Here lies the remains of what was a great and useful program of vocational education. It died at the hands of men who injected into its veins an overdose of a harmless appearing substance called integration."

Fort Worth International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article of Walter R. Humphrey:

TAKING SIDES

Well, Congress has decided to take sides.

By deleting an item for Federal aid to the Fort Worth International Airport, it has overruled the CAA, which had put the field in its program.

It took the action as the result of a plea by a municipal competitor.

Economy is all right, but partisanship isn't.

Dallas wouldn't oppose using the same funds at the Everman site, but it carried its campaign against Fort Worth to the extent of sacrificing the field Fort Worth preferred and found to be best for all purposes.

It doesn't make sense for the House to penalize one city to the benefit of another.

Dallas' dog-in-the-manger tactics on this project were admittedly selfish. That's Dallas' privilege.

But for the United States House of Representatives to take sides and damage Fort Worth while giving Dallas every break, all against the recommendations of the Federal Government's own airport development agency, is, at best, not on the side of statesmanship.

It is, on the other hand, partisan and discriminatory.

More Money for the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this week we are asked to vote on new and larger appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I have been informed that the staggering sum of $200,000 is being asked to maintain this committee in the power to which it has become accustomed. This is just double the amount granted last year to the same committee and is larger than any sum ever granted to a single committee by this House, so far as I can learn, in one lump.

This Republican Congress has talked about economy. Yet the authorizations for special investigations in the first session of the Eightieth Congress almost equaled the authorizations for the same purpose in the entire Seventy-ninth Congress.

OVER $1,000,000 AUTHORIZED

In the biennium of the Seventy-ninth Congress, with many highly important investigations under way, the total of authorizations for special and select committees totaled $1,270,219.19, of which the economical Democratic chairman actually spent only $836,455.71.

In the first half of the Eightieth Congress, under the Reorganization Act which was supposed to do away with special and select committees, the same Republican Congress which wiped out many essential services of the executive agencies provided a total of $1,043,704.03 for special investigations in the period between January 3 and July 25, 1947.

I have no doubt but that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, can inform us up to the minute how much of this vast sum remains to the credit of the various committees.

10 PERCENT FOR UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The Un-American Activities Committee received approximately 10 percent of this million-dollar jackpot, and I presume that the members of that committee have been able to persuade the Committee on House Administration, the watchdogs of our own budget, that somehow their achievements justify doubling the amount for 1948.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think that on this side we are justified in asking some searching questions.

One of the questions in my mind is this: If this House actually turns over the tremendous sum of $200,000 to the Committee on Un-American Activities, should not the Republican National Committee be forced to report that amount as a contribution and expenditure?

Is there any conceivable reason why this committee, which has repeatedly lent its prestige, its staff, and its files to the Republican campaign managers, should ask for $200,000 in a campaign year except to expand its facilities for helping the Republican campaign?

House Resolution 484 was introduced on February 26, less than 2 weeks ago. So far as I can learn, no hearings were held on the proposal; yet the Committee on House Administration followed the recommendations of its subcommittee and, without any idea of what justification can be brought forward for the allocation of such a huge sum, Members will be asked to vote on this privileged resolution under a rule which does not even require that time be given to the opponents.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that no Member of this House can properly discharge his duties under such circumstances, even though my confidence in the fairness of the committee chairman makes me confident that he will give the opponents a chance to be heard.

NOT JUSTIFIED BY PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, nothing in the past history of the committee justifies the appropriation of such a huge sum.

By the adoption of the rule which made this committee a standing legislative committee unique in history, the Congress created a Frankenstein which could destroy its creator.

Mr. Speaker, how many of the Members of this House—and, as far as that is concerned, of the other House—know that this committee presumes to investigate the Members of Congress and to maintain individual folders on Members?

Mr. Speaker, it could easily be that you yourself have a folder in the committee files filled with clippings from newspapers, old letterheads, speeches, and what not.

I am not saying that such a folder exists.

What I am saying is that such folders have been set up on Members of this House, without their knowledge, and that the contents have been made known to their opponents, to newspapers, and to campaign committees.

Furthermore, there are very good grounds for believing that when the special committee actually had prepared a report on Fascist sympathizers, and after the copy was in type, the report was scrapped and the type destroyed.

ANTICLIMAX

A sure sign of preparations for making a new request for funds is the release of sensational charges against some public figure.

Last week such charges, lurid and sensational but lacking substance or credibility, were made against Dr. Edward U. Condon, one of the most distinguished scientists America has ever produced.

There was an effect of anticlimax when the public discovered that the letter from the Federal Bureau of Investigation on which the charges relied for effect had been deliberately misquoted by omitting the sentence which absolved Dr. Condon of any unbecoming conduct.

It is to be hoped that Dr. Condon will not suffer any harm from this attack, except that some mud sticks in some minds.

It is unlikely that intelligent men should have any confidence in a committee capable of such a publicity stunt.

IT CAN HAPPEN TO ANY ONE OF US

The terrifying thing is that this could happen to any one of us, or to any other citizen of the United States, at the whim of a few paid employees of this Congress—for when those wild charges were made concerning Dr. Condon the chairman of the committee was ill at Army Medical Center.

The Members of this House know nothing about the employees of this committee except the little told in newspaper stories.

We demand that the executive agencies set high standards for their employees. There are elaborate examinations, followed by personal and loyalty investigations.

The more specialized the job the tighter the restrictions. It would be difficult to find anywhere a body of more highly skilled investigators than the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They are required to have the highest personal attributes, and to be well grounded in law, accounting, criminology, and, as their specialization increases, added skills to suit special assignments. They continue to attend classes all the time they are employed by the FBI.

Does this committee have any such standards?

WHO KNOWS THE ANSWER?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer my own question, and I doubt that any Member of the House can answer it. We simply do not know.

There are many things we do not know.

It has been charged repeatedly that the committee is establishing a vast blacklist; that it has more than a million names now on such a blacklist, which it will supply on request to potential employers.

Is it true? I don't know.

We know that the committee has a flair for showmanship; most observers agree that the Hollywood hearings last fall, during the congressional recess, constituted the best show ever staged in Congress.

But are the American people putting up tax money to stage shows? It was a show, yes; but it was not a dignified show, and it reflected little credit on the democratic processes on which our Government is founded.

Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps too much to hope that this appropriation can be completely defeated; but it is not too much to hope that it can be sent back to committee for revision—for revision downward,

far downward, and for open hearings to justify the granting of any further funds.

So far as I can discern, there is nothing in the committee's past record to justify any appropriation whatever. I do not believe that such a committee can be justified as an adjunct of this Congress. It is contrary to all tradition to maintain a permanent investigating committee. As one example, in spite of the inconvenience caused to the succeeding committee, and in spite of the fact that the problem is always the same, neither House of Congress has ever contemplated the maintenance of a standing committee to investigate campaign expenditures. It was recognized that such a committee could become a dangerous pol'tical weapon.

The same principles should apply here.

A committee is the creature of this House. It should always be responsible and responsive to its creator. In theory, perhaps, this Committee on Un-American Activities remains dependent on the House which created it. In practice, by its peremptory attitudes, by its aura of fear and arbitrary procedures, by its irresponsible approach to the fearsome problems of democratic freedoms, and by its secrecy, it has already achieved a frightening, a terrifying, independence of action. It is a law to itself.

Let us give pause, now, and take stock of what we have done, before it is too late, and we find ourselves helpless before the power of this committee.

I am inserting here, to illustrate the kind of loose charges tossed about by the committee and how they reflect on the dignity of the House, a newspaper article from the conservative and respectable Washington Evening Star of Friday, March 5, 1948:

THE ISSUE, DR. CONDON SAYS, IS COMPETENCE OF OUR CENSORS—SECURITY SHOULD BE ENFORCED BY SCIENTISTS, NOT THE UNINFORMED, BUREAU HEAD ASSERTS

(Dr. Edward U. Condon, under fire of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, freely gave his views on science and security to Star science writer Henry in the following interview.)

(By Thomas R. Henry)

It is high time that smearing of American scientists with insinuations of disloyalty by persons with no capacity at all to form any judgments on the value of scientific information be stopped, Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, who is now under fire of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, said in an interview today.

The logical end of such a situation, he said, will be the refusal of competent men to work on Government projects and a serious crippling of scientific progress along many lines in this country.

Scientists, he said, should be the judges of what information on nuclear research should be kept secret, using their own best discretion and perhaps laying down the law to their colleagues. Otherwise, he asserted, security is in the hands of the uninformed.

Dr. Condon cited incidents of acquaintances who appear to have been treated by Government investigators in a fashion which would have done credit to Hitler's SS in Germany.

This placing of science at the over-all control of ignoramuses, he explained, is precisely what Germany did just before and in the early days of the last war. The result—some of her foremost young scientists got out of the country and played a big part in American production of the atomic bomb.

That, he says again, is what Japan did. Japanese scientists made fundamental contributions during the war in fields which had no military application, simply because the atmosphere created around them was such that they could not work on war projects. The world gained, but the loss to the country was incalculable.

Here, Dr. Condon says, is the issue, transcending in importance the remote possibility that some disloyal or stupid scientist might let slip some bit of information important to a potential enemy.

"The time has come," he said, "to raise hell about it—because of the national weakness that is bound to result from such a Government policy. The issue I would like to make is the question of the strength of the United States."

LET SCIENTISTS DECIDE SECRECY

It is perfectly obvious, Dr. Condon said, that some scientific developments, particularly in the line of atomic fission, should be kept secret.

"But this business of secrecy," he said, "should be handled with great caution by people who know what they are doing. I do not think that in the field of atomic fission it should be governed by people who don't even know what an atom is."

It is absurd, he explained, to try to keep secret from anybody what is published freely in a French technical journal.

But from 1939 on, he explained, the small group of nuclear physicists in the United States voluntarily kept secret a great deal about atomic fission while they carried on an apparently hopeless fight to interest military authorities. That the secret was well kept without any compulsion of any kind was evident from the final outcome—the manufacture of an atomic bomb. He does not advocate, he said, that the matter of restricted information be left entirely to the judgment of the individual, but it should be decided by men capable of deciding whether a revelation could possibly be of any material aid to the enemy. And, Dr. Condon feels, the restrictions should be as few as are consistent with national interests.

Even with essentially complete exchange of fundamental scientific research, he feels, America probably would benefit.

The fact is, he told me, that "America is not particularly strong in fundamental science and never has been. It is, however, strong in technology and industrial production. If a policy of excessive secrecy grows up everybody will play the same game and this country will be decidedly the loser. As it is at present we can be reasonably sure of making the practical application of a basic science idea first, regardless of where it originates. We are the ones who can rush into production."

Nobody knows how much secrecy is being kept over the basic research in other countries. Dr. Condon noted, however, that on a recent visit to the Oak Ridge, Tenn., establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission, he saw issues of fairly recent Russian physical journals in the library. It is not to be supposed that the Russians revealed all they knew but the fact remains that they did give out full details of the synchrotron, potentially the most powerful of all atom smashers, some time before the same idea evolved in the United States.

BASIC SCIENCE INTERNATIONAL

"Just now," he said, "if an American scientist has acquaintances outside the United States that very fact seems to be sufficient to smear him with the charge of disloyalty. It so happens that I have acquaintances in many countries, including some in Russia. I would not reveal to any of them anything I happened to know which could possibly be detrimental to the security of the United States. But, by and large, basic science is an international business. It cannot be anything else."

The first announcement of the atomic bomb, Dr. Condon pointed out, focused American attention on a subject that few comprehended. As a result the very word "atom" has come to have a magical significance quite without justification. Some feel that anything published about it is a revelation to a potential enemy. Actually very little of the work in nuclear physics has any bearing on national security, he said.

A good example, Dr. Condon went on, is the Atomic Physics Division of the Bureau of Standards. Some researches in progress may, or may not, be secret. The greatest part of the work, however, lies in fields where there is not the slightest excuse for secrecy and which was in progress long before the war. It deals with fundamental electronics and radiation.

DR. KETTERING QUOTED

Dr. Condon quotes Dr. Charles L. Kettering, of the General Motors Co.: "When you lock the doors of the laboratory you are likely to lock out more than you lock in."

He showed a letter just received from a friend discharged from a certain Government establishment without warning and without any charges against him because somebody had raised a question of his loyalty. This particular man had worked on some of the most secret of war projects. He wrote Dr. Condon that just now "American methods are being followed with Nazis and Nazi methods with Americans."

The whole field, Dr. Condon said, is not an issue of rightist or leftist, but of common sense—leaving judgment as to what should be kept secret in the hands of men who know what is significant in a technical field.

JUDGMENT BY UNINFORMED

"One of our great national weaknesses," he said, "is that we don't rely on our professional people. Folks who know nothing about a subject demand a right to judge."

The present American policy with regard to publication in the field of nuclear physics, Dr. Condon said, is very good. Physical journals contain a vast amount of technical information which cannot possibly be of advantage to anybody devising offensive weapons but which is of enormous value to workers everywhere for development of peacetime applications.

Experts of the Atomic Energy Commission, he said, use very good judgment in releasing these reports and scientific editors use good judgment in printing them. They constitute bread on the waters.

STAR CONDEMNS ACTION EDITORIALLY

I am including also an editorial from the Star for Saturday, March 6, carrying Mr. Henry's comments a step farther:

THE CONDON CASE

At this stage of the controversy over the criticism which has been made of Dr. Edward U. Condon, director of the Bureau of Standards, one should be wary of leaping to conclusions. There are at least three conclusions, however, which seem clearly indicated and which can safely be drawn.

One is that there should be a full public investigation of the accusations against Dr. Condon.

This is essential because of the importance of the position held by Dr. Condon and because the published evidence against him, while one-sided and highly inconclusive, is still enough, standing alone, to raise doubt as to the wisdom of retaining him in a key position affecting our national security.

The second conclusion is that this public investigation should be conducted by the

Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and not by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the latter group.

The House group should step out of the picture because its subcommittee has handled the Condon case in such a way as to destroy confidence in any findings it might make, even after a public hearing. The essential facts supporting this contention are that the subcommittee on March 1 published its blast against Dr. Condon without giving him an opportunity to be heard in self-defense, that the subcommittee's report did not disclose that the Department of Commerce loyalty board had exonerated Dr. Condon of disloyalty, and that, by omitting a significant sentence, the subcommittee statement gave an inaccurate picture of an FBI report on Dr. Condon. A further reason is that the Atomic Energy Committee is the congressional agency most directly concerned with atomic security, and should therefore take jurisdiction of this important matter.

The third conclusion is that the Department of Commerce has acted properly in refusing to make its confidential file on the Condon loyalty investigation available to the House committee.

This refusal is justified on the same ground as the refusal to turn this information over to persons accused of disloyalty—namely, that the life of the loyalty program depends upon keeping secret the identity of individuals and other sources of information drawn on by the loyalty boards. When one considers some of the irresponsible performances of the House Committee on Un-American Activities it would be unwise, not to say downright foolish, to suppose that confidential loyalty information, once in its possession, would long remain secret.

As for other conclusions, especially any conclusion as to the loyalty or discretion of Dr. Condon, judgment should be suspended until after the public hearing has been held.

POST CARRIES THROUGH TO LOGICAL CONCLUSION

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the Washington Post on Friday, March 5, which carries through to its logical conclusion the position assumed part way by the Star. It will be borne in mind that it was the Post which first made public the fact that a vital part of the FBI letter on which the committee made its case against Dr. Condon was deliberately omitted.

DEFAMING CHARACTER

The irresponsibility of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is illustrated anew in the extravagant charges made against Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. It is worth examining these charges in some detail and with dispassionate detachment for the sake of the insight they afford into the committee's morals and tactics. The Condon case offers abundant proof, we think, that the Committee on Un-American Activities has become an embarrassing liability to Congress, a threat to the rights of citizens who are its victims and actually a handicap to the maintenance of effective security in the sensitive agencies of the Federal Government.

Let us look first at the way—the typical way—in which the charges against Dr. Condon were made. They emanated from a contrivedly theatrical subcommittee meeting held by the side of the chairman's hospital sickbed and were released without even taking time to refer them to the committee as a whole. The justification offered for this haste was urgency—although there was nothing in these charges that the chairman did not divulge at least by innuendo last summer. They were made in such haste, indeed, that the committee never found time even to question Dr. Condon himself, although he had long ago requested a chance to appear before it.

Now let us turn to the nature of the charges. They were sensational in the extreme—sensational and so vague as to be virtually meaningless. They implied, without directly asserting, that Dr. Condon was engaged in espionage activities, that he constituted a menace to the security of the Nation's atomic secrets. Then, after having stated the case with such extravagance and having done irreparable injury to Dr. Condon's reputation, the subcommittee retreated from its original position and declared it was accusing the scientist of nothing more than indiscretion in some of his personal associations.

And what of the basis for these charges? Well, they were based principally upon a letter from J. Edgar Hoover to W. Averell Harriman which declares that Dr. Condon was in contact with "an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944." Rather, it is based on part of this letter. For Representative Thomas, the subcommittee chairman, has now acknowledged that his report neglected—inadvertently, he says—to include a sentence from the Hoover letter asserting Dr. Condon's contact with the alleged spy constituted no evidence of disloyalty whatever.

So far as Dr. Condon's discretion as distinct from his loyalty is concerned, this is clearly not within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is in the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce. Secretary Harriman appears to be satisfied with the Director of his Bureau of Standards, and the American public can have confidence, we think, that the former Ambassador to Russia is quite as alert to the dangers of indiscretion as Mr. THOMAS.

Secretary Harriman has satisfied himself, too, as to Dr. Condon's loyalty. For Dr. Condon himself asked the Secretary to have an exhaustive investigation made of his character and conduct. The result of that investigation was a unanimous report by the Commerce Department loyalty board that "no reasonable grounds exist for believing that Dr. Condon is disloyal to the Government of the United States." This report, it seems to us, is the definitive answer to the Thomas committee's demand for Dr. Condon's immediate dismissal or an explanation of why he is being retained. The explanation is altogether clear. What is still to be explained—what Congress owes it to the American people to explain without delay—is why it permits a committee acting in its name so meanly and groundlessly to defame an American citizen.

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, when the Taft-Hartley bill was passed, certain individuals who, for many years, had been exploiting the workingman in order to advance their own selfish motives began to yell that this was a slave-labor bill and that it would put the working men and women in chains.

At first some few laboring men who had been taught to follow their leaders without really thinking for themselves also started yelling slave-labor bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, almost a year has now elapsed since this legislation became law and the mail which I am receiving from the working men and women themselves proves to me that the dire calamities and forebodings which were supposed to happen to them has not happened at all. For instance, I have had several letters from miners and they say that so far they cannot see where any slave labor is attached to this legislation. They state that for the first time in their lives they can get up in a meeting and have their say without fear of being fired by either their union boss or the operator. They say that also for the first time in their lives they will see a financial statement and know what their leaders do with the money which they pay in the way of dues and assessments. That is a full accounting of the funds. These miners realize that they can strike any time they choose. No one can make them go to work if they do not want to go and no one can compel them to stay on the job if they want to go home. Their wages have not been cut, in fact, they have been increased and all in all those who were supposed to be chained to their jobs find that conditions are the same or better than they were before the bill was passed. They realize that they cannot be discriminated against by the operator or their union leaders and that the only reason for which they may be fired from the union is for nonpayment of dues. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that these men have found out the truth regarding this piece of legislation. At the time it was passed I sent out an analysis of the bill wherein I stated that the legislation was not antilabor but only anticertain labor leaders and certain operators who were in the movement for their own selfish reasons. This law protects the miner from both these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, it has been definitely proved that Communists who had infiltrated into certain labor unions are gradually but surely being driven out. If the Taft-Hartley law accomplishes no other purpose than that of protecting honest loyal patriotic workers, who rightfully belong in trade unions, from the Communists who would only destroy the gains made by the working men and women of America, then the legislation has justified its existence.

It seems to me that the real test as to whether or not the Taft-Hartley law is a slave-labor law is for each one of us to ask ourselves this question: What do I want to do as an American citizen and a laboring man which this legislation prevents me from doing? If anyone can show me wherein this legislation interferes with his own personal desires or forces him to do anything against his own free will and accord, then I will take back everything which I have said. If the Taft-Hartley law was against labor I would be one of the first to oppose it.

Religion and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, that noble American Fiorello H. LaGuardia died with "his boots on" fighting for the little people in this country. He knew what effects there would be from a substantial increase in rents. Many religious leaders joined him in his efforts to keep a strong rent-control law during the housing shortage. Here is what they said:

Rev. Cameron P. Hall, cosecretary, industries relations division, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America:

I am keenly concerned over what is at stake in the extension of rent control.

Rev. Nicholas Pidhorecky, chancelor, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America:

Fully endorse your efforts to influence Congress to extend rent control.

Rev. D. Lambert Dunne, OSB, St. Mary's Abbey, Newark, N. J.:

Success to the project.

Rev. E. Harold Smith, Corpus Christi Parish, New York City:

Am in complete agreement on necessity of retaining rent control.

Rev. Dr. D. de Sola Pool, Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, New York City:

I altogether share the concern of the National Fair Rent Committee about the maintenance of rent controls.

Rabbi Israel M. Goldman, president, Rabbinical Assembly of America:

In behalf Rabbinical Assembly of America comprising 400 rabbis serving in every part United States wish to express fullest support for your work and endorse efforts of a National Fair Rent Committee to get Congress to pass extension of effective rent control. Immediately authorize you speak in our name. Call on us for any service we can render.

Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, president Northern Baptist Convention:

Heartily in accord with your purpose.

Rabbi Julius March, chairman commission on justice and peace, Central Conference of American Rabbis:

Please be assured of profound interest and hearty cooperation of organization I represent in work of your committee. Would appreciate being kept advised of developments and of how we can serve.

Rev. Mark A. Dawber, executive secretary, Home Missions Council of North America:

We are thoroughly behind you in this attempt to control rents at this time.

Bishop John S. Stamm, board of bishops, Evangelical United Brethren Church:

I agree with you that there ought to be some continued regulation of rent control until a more adequate supply of houses can be provided.

Rev. William J. Gordon, OSA, lecturer, school of social science, Catholic University of America:

I would like to go on record as being deeply in sympathy with the sentiments you expressed on rent control.

Dr. Elizabeth Morrissy, professor of economics, College of Notre Dame.

Rev. Albert W. Palmer, moderator, General Council of Congregational Christian Churches.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

John M. Robsion: "Mountain Congressman"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following with respect to the late JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky.

Someone has defined immortality as the quality of being remembered affectionately long after one's life has ended.

Limited as this interpretation of a great word may be, it nevertheless touches a responsive chord in all hearts. We want to be remembered, knowing that we must live our lives worthily so as to be deserving of remembrance.

Such a man was our late colleague JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky.

Tall and broad shouldered, "he walked with kings without losing the common touch." I shall never forget his impressive figure and his swinging stride as he moved through the corridors and the aisles of this House with an earthly grace as genuine as the rolling hills of his native State.

Like another great American, he was born in a log cabin. His was not the restlessness of those who are bred in the artificial environment of huge cities. He was rooted in the soil, deriving from it the strength and tranquillity and elemental wisdom of Nature itself. Never did he lose himself in the fears and confusions which torment those who have lost contact with the source of their being. Through good times and bad, in fair weather and dark tempest, he made his way with the dignity of a man.

His father was a Union soldier in the War Between the States. His mother was Mary Hyland Robsion. As both of his parents died when he was a boy, John Robsion had to depend upon his own sturdy initiative, developing that sense of responsibility which later on paid such well-earned dividends in the service he rendered to his State and Nation.

He worked his way through school, graduating from National Normal University, Lebanon, Ohio, and Northern University, Ada, Ohio. He also studied at Centre College and at Holbrook College, Knoxville.

As a young man he taught a Sunday-school class and was a teacher in public schools in the Kentucky mountains and at Union College, Barbourville. He began the practice of law at Barbourville. In 1911 he was elected president of the First National Bank, Barbourville. In 1916, 1928, 1936, and 1940, he was a delegate to the Republican National Convention. In 1928, he managed the Hoover campaign in his State.

"Long John" was a Republican from a normally Democratic State. In view of this fact, the measure of his ability may be gaged from his almost continuous service in the Congress of the United States from 1918 until the night of February 17, 1948, when he passed on in his sleep.

The "Tall Sycamore of Barbourville" was a shrewd politician, ruthless with opponents, but thoughtful of friends. He had the sharp talent for cutting through to a point, but with a twinkle in his eye as he did it.

Once he met the editor of a newspaper in his territory which opposed him. JOHN ROBSION shook hands with his foe and then said: "You come out once a week, and my voice, which, without a megaphone, covers a wider space than your circulation territory, can be raised as often as the occasion demands it."

Prophetic were the words he uttered early this year. "The primary this summer and the election this fall will be my last race. I considered not running again, but a lot of young upstarts have been saying I was slipping. I am going back to Barbourville and show them. I feel good, but sometimes I get awfully tired."

ROBSION campaigned as an isolationist, a prohibitionist, and as a labor supporter. He was one of the few Republicans able to hold his congressional post during the high tide of Democratic popularity.

Chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, he was also the ranking Republican on the following House Committees: Roads, Education, Revision of Laws, Pensions, and Judiciary.

It was on the latter assignment that I worked with the veteran lawmaker and came to appreciate the value of his experience, his integrity, and the homespun humanness that made him so likable.

In the words of Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, Democratic Party whip in the House, "He was a hard fighter for the things he believed in."

As Senator COOPER commented, "He was never defeated in 13 races for the House, because he held, more than any other person I've known, the complete loyalty, respect, and affection of his people."

And so JOHN ROBSION joins the honor roll of those who have finished their work in this House of Representatives, to go on, as I believe, to that higher tribunal where his record of service in behalf of his fellow men and for his God will merit eternal happiness.

Cherished by the living, who will remember him, and welcomed by the Creator who gave him to us for awhile, his immortality is now complete.

Palestine Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over Station WOR, Friday, March 5, 1948:

The one definite impression that did emerge from Warren Austin's statements before the Security Council is that the United States has retreated from the healthy leadership it had first provided in the General Assembly debates which led to the recommendation of partition for Palestine. Even the UN delegates skilled in the fine art of innuendo so dear to the diplomatic heart were themselves confused and uncertain as to what the United States position was now.

At least this is clear. The American statement leaves all the lead questions unanswered. Its many generalities, qualifications, and obscurities leave the United States plenty of room to go in many directions. It can go forward or backward, up or down, and still say, "That is what we meant in the first place." It is hardly what one would expect from a nation which took the lead in the advocacy of partition last fall. The statement is a far cry from the forthright declarations made by Herschel Johnson concerning the partition plan. Then, there was no mistaking our position. We openly recognized all the pertinent facts that favored the partition plan; we openly recognized the existence of Arab hostility and we likewise accepted the fact that force may be necessary to implement the recommendation of the General Assembly.

Unlike the United States approach last fall, the statements made by Ambassador Austin last week have absolutely no ring of leadership. It appears that the United States' reception of the UN Commission's request for an international police force was a spineless, blurred attempt to confuse the issue. On the one hand, the United States says that force can be used only to enforce peace in the Holy Land, but that force cannot be used to enforce partition. Does that mean that if partition cannot be effectuated peaceably then partition is to be discarded? It was patently clear that partition could not be put into effect with Arab consent. The United States itself recognized that condition last fall. In not only voting for partition, but in openly lobbying for its acceptance, there was an explicit consent to support partition by all and every means. What did the United States mean last fall and what does it mean now?

Any child can tell you there is no peace in Palestine, and that the absence of peace is a threat to international peace and that the sorry conditions in Palestine are the result of the Arab refusal to accept partition.

What brought Palestine to its present disturbance? The Jews of Palestine had consented to the compromise which was actually a compromise of a compromise. Jewish Palestine was to have been all of Palestine which included Transjordan. Then Transjordan was taken away in 1922, and the Jews were asked to accept partition, which they did. Again they have been asked to accept a further partition, and again, in reasonableness, they accepted. The Arabs of Palestine, led by the pro-Nazi ex-grand mufti of Jerusalem and the Arab sovereignties, have brought death into the Holy Land, making a great cry of nationalism. Transjordan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, Egypt have their sovereignty. They are independent nations now only because an Allied victory in 1917 freed them from the Turkish Empire. Palestine at that time was specifically exempt and set aside for Jewish settlement. The Arabs of Palestine, by the partition plan, are being offered independence and sovereignty, qualities of statehood they never had before.

But now the Arabs fight, with British contrivance and United States nonresistance. Despite Britain's promise to keep law and order in Palestine, despite the 100,000 troops she has in that area, in her calculated way she permitted acts of aggression by the Arabs directed against the Jews. She openly disregarded the United Nations injunction to open a port for Jewish immigration by February 1. She refused to permit the commission of five, selected by member nations, to set up shop in Palestine in time to make certain that Palestine would be a going concern before the British left.

It was known that the British would not retreat gracefully, but it was not generally known that she would proceed by intrigue and councils of war with Arab leaders to so confuse the issue, to let blood so freely, that she could go back to the UN, pleading the unworkability of partition, even before partition had been tried. Brushing aside all her own open evidence of guilt, Britain has the temerity to place the responsibility for terror on the Jewish agency for Palestine.

It had been hoped that with British and United States firmness squarely and without compromise placed before the Arabs, the Arab spokesmen like the ex-grand mufti of Jerusalem would understand fully the futility of opposition.

But the real joker in the deck was the United States. After the leadership, the earnest and affirmative and direct statements, plus Presidential pressure, which the United States gave in the partition debates, it is almost impossible to believe the evidence now spread before us that the State Department favors the wrecking of the partition plan. We kept ominously silent when troops from Syria and Lebanon and Transjordan crossed the borders into Palestine. I quote directly from the text of the UN Palestine Commission's first report to the Security Council, submitted on February 16: "Arab morale is considered to have risen steadily as a result of these reinforcements."

We did nothing to recall to the British her own responsibilities in maintaining law and order. We saw no reason to bring acts of Arab aggression to the attention of the UN, though we did not hesitate to carry the issues of Greece, Iran, and Korea to the UN and to take leadership in the ensuing discussions. While President Truman did plead with some of the Arab leaders to use restraint, it was purely a private conversation and in no way helped to allay the deliberately inflamed passions of the Arab populations.

These are some of the things we did not do. What we did instead was to place an embargo on arms to the Middle East. That is not only adding injury to injury but irony as well. As the report to the Security Council affirms, the Arabs are receiving arms and armed men from surrounding territories. The British admit sending arms to Arab countries and defend it on the ground of contractual obligations. Arms from the United States can go to Pakistan and Iran, countries openly favoring the Arabs. We know these arms are being routed to Palestine. But the State Department sees fit to bar the Jews from such purchases from the United States while making it possible for the Arabs to arm at will. It almost appears as if our State Department had grown two heads, one nodding ineffectually to the idea of partition and the other voicing a great big welcome to the invading Arabs. In short, we behaved as if the only way to work out the puzzle was to cut pieces that do not fit.

Now comes Austin's statement, pale, inconclusive, evasive and shy. How will the Arabs react now with this further evidence of retreat from center? Can they not rightfully conclude that their threats and their raids and their shedding of blood have borne for them the desired fruit? Had we taken positive action the question would not have been thrown back to the UN.

As is, exactly what was planned by partition opponents has come to pass. Colombia formally proposed that the Security Council convene a special session of the General Assembly to reconsider last fall's decision on partition. Naturally. Step by step, by British refusal to cooperate and keep law and order, by United States pussyfooting and imposition of the arms embargo, by the refusal of Britain to permit a militia to be set up, by deliberately allowing Arab passions and hopes to soar, it seems as if it were secretly hoped that an impasse would be reached and reconsideration asked. Can we spell out one affirmative act on the part of the United States or any other member nation, for that matter, that pointed to a determination that partition was conclusive? Did anybody really try?

But now Ambassador Austin talks about enforcing the peace but not enforcing partition. He hid behind the commas and the periods of the protocol. Ambassador Austin was silent on every remedy that could be applied, sanctions, expulsions, force with reference to the Palestine situation. He recited instead the niceties of the protocol, as if death waits for protocol. Austin stated, "The Security Council is authorized to take forceful measures with respect to Palestine to remove a threat to international peace." What is happening in Palestine but just such a threat to international peace? He states further: "The Charter of the UN does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement whether it is pursuant to a recommendation of the General Assembly or of the Council itself." What is any settlement emanating from the UN but a political settlement?

Ambassador Austin proposes further that the Big Five nations on the Council constitute a special committee to consider whether such a threat exists. Another committee. We have had committee piled upon committee until the very issue is being smothered for lack of air. Another proposal Ambassador Austin makes is that this thousandth and one committee negotiate with Arabs, Jews, and Britain to gain acquiescence to partition. This delaying maneuver is as obvious as a hanging petticoat. All through the debates prior to the recommendation, negotiations, the very same plea for acquiescence was made over and over and over again. If the negotiations failed then, how much more certain are their failure now, with the pulpy attitude of the United States in full parade. The Arabs recognize that their bluster is on the way to success. It's more than just silly even to talk about their yielding to verbal persuasion.

Mr. Gromyko, in his discussion of the Commission report put his finger on the heart of the mischief. "No great power," he said, "should hide behind a committee." He urged instead "direct negotiations" between the Big Five and that a determination of the issue could be reached within 10 to 15 days.

But what we can make of Mr. Austin's statements is that our way must be the devious and delayed route.

It all amounts to this: The strong voice of the United States has departed from the issue, leaving only the dry, unaccented tones of the international lawyer. The mighty, the moral, the superior United States refuses to stand up and be counted. The steady hand with which it pursued the General Assembly debates is palsied. Moral conviction has departed; in its place we find the mutter-

ing apologetic retreat of one who fears that perhaps a little while ago he revealed he had too much heart.

Finally, despite United States back-tracking, regardless of British perfidy and Arab infamy the Jewish state will be. The Jewish Agency, with unflinching determination and courage, will set up the new state of Judeau on schedule. It will only be the degree of sacrifice of blood and death.

Mr. Average Citizen Reports on Conditions in Germany and the Opportunities Available to the Voice of America Program There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I call attention herewith to a letter recently received from a friend of mine out in Hecla, S. Dak.

Mr. Beck has recently returned from a visit in Germany. His observations in Germany indicate that the Russians are doing their best to recruit Communists in Germany and he points out the opportunity existing there for our United States Information Service to refute the slanderous falsehoods of Communist propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to observe that this South Dakota traveler feels that the Marshall plan, if properly augmented by collateral action, merits the approval of America.

Mr. Beck's brief but informative letler follows:

HECLA, S. DAK., *March 2, 1948.*

Mr. KARL E. MUNDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MUNDT: I have just returned from my visit to Germany about three weeks ago. I had a very enjoyable trip but found conditions much worse than I had expected they would be. However, my folks live in the small country villages and the conditions there are somewhat better than in the larger cities, but the food and clothing situation is hard as is also the housing problem, but we hope things will get better soon.

I talked to all kinds of people over there and I found that the people are not for communism but they hear so much rotten broadcasting being done by the Russians. The Russians, through their broadcasts try to lead the German people to believe that they are doing everything for them and that the United States is doing nothing for them.

I think it would be well if the Voice of America could be heard more over there to let the people know where their help is really coming from. I think money spent for this purpose would be well spent. I favor the Marshall plan for the people over there to help them get back on their feet and get self supporting again.

Many thanks for your trouble in helping me get my papers all lined up and making it possible for me to make the trip.

Respectfully yours,

CARL E. BECK.

Address of Hon. Glenn Davis, of Wisconsin, at the Oklahoma State Young Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding younger Members of the House of Representatives addressed the Oklahoma State Young Republican Convention in my home city of Tulsa, March 6, 1948. The address itself was a worthy effort and was an inspiration to all who heard it, and should be appreciated by the other Members of Congress, as being a forthright and intellectual discourse.

Our colleague, the one who delivered this address, Representative GLENN DAVIS, of the Second District of Wisconsin, a veteran of World War II, was recently selected by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States as one of the 10 outstanding young men of the Nation. I therefore, by unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, am pleased to have Representative DAVIS' address reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, which is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Young Republicans, Republican friends, it is with pleasure and gratification that I come here to the Young Republican Convention of the State of Oklahoma. Anyone standing here, as I am, looking out over this fine audience of young Oklahoma Republicans can understand the source of that pleasure.

We Wisconsin Republicans have further reason for gratification and pleasure when we think of Oklahoma. Two years ago, Oklahoma sent the principal speaker to Wisconsin's State Democratic Convention. He was a big man; he promised big things for Wisconsin Democrats; in a speech that dripped with big gobs of sorghum molasses.

Why should Wisconsin Republicans be gratified about that? Just this—that as a result of the election which followed the visit of Oklahoma's Kerr, Wisconsin, for the first time in 40 years, now have a solidly Republican delegation in both Houses of Congress. Our 10 Wisconsin Republican Congressmen constitute the largest solid Republican delegation in the House. In that same election Wisconsin voters elected every Republican candidate for State office; 91 percent of all Republican candidates for county office, and overwhelming Republican majorities in both Houses of the State legislature. Among the Democrats who went down in defeat was the Congressman from Milwaukee who presided on the day that Governor Kerr spoke in Wisconsin.

I don't think that the Governor intended to help us Wisconsin Republicans get elected, any more than I came down here to help any Oklahoma Democrats get elected, and I want to assure you, I didn't come down here for that. I like your Oklahoma Republicans too well. I like the three outstanding Republicans who represent Oklahoma in Congress and I like the kind of Republicans I have met here today.

I hope that Senator MOORE can be prevailed upon to return to the Senate seat which he has filled with such distinction for the past 6 years. Senator MOORE exemplifies the kind of man who, sincerely believing in the Jeffersonian liberalism about which the New Dealers like to boast, has found a home in the party of practical, working, everyday liberalism, the Republican Party. If Senator MOORE cannot be persuaded to run again, I hope you young Republicans will get behind some good young Oklahoma Republican who believes in the great principles of this esteemed man and our Grand Old Party to carry on the fight against the excesses of new dealism.

I hope, too, that you will send GEORGE SCHWABE, of the first district and ROSS RIZLEY, of the eighth district, back to the House of Representatives. GEORGE is generally recognized as one of the outstanding sophomore Republicans in the House. He is skilled in legislative procedure, a skill gained in the school of local, State, and national lawmaking experience. He is hard working, reliable, and a sound Republican. In his work on the powerful Appropriations Committee his is a voice of authority on such matters as Indian affairs, mining, reclamation, patents, labor policy, and social security.

I need not tell you that only trusted leaders of their party obtain positions on the House's most powerful committee, the Committee on Rules. I needn't tell you more about ROSS RIZLEY than to say that he is an influential member of that committee and that he serves also on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The only criticism I can make about Oklahoma Republican Representatives in Congress is this—there just aren't enough of them. Oklahoma needs more Congressmen of their caliber and the Nation needs more such men in Congress.

Let me say this, I am looking to you—you Young Republicans—to see to it that your present Republican Congressmen are returned and that you send more Republicans, preferably some of you Young Republicans here tonight, to Washington with them. 1948 is the year you should do it—1948 is the year you can do it.

Deprived of the leadership of the master politician of this generation, the heterogenous elements which have supported the New Deal are now sloughing off into separate, quarreling factions. As I said, the head is gone; the southern rump is in open revolt; the left wing tail which has been wagging the donkey, has been partially severed. But we cannot and ought not depend upon Democratic disorganization in planning our campaign for victory. Nor need we do so. We Republicans can point to solid achievements in the short time we have controlled the National Legislature.

First, we have ended deficit financing. Once again the Federal Government is in the black. In 1947 the Republican Congress pared the President's budget $2,750,000,000. This was done without the slightest bit of cooperation from, and indeed in spite of the Democratic heads of the executive agencies. And let me tell you here and now it is a tough and well-nigh impossible task to do a competent and intelligent job in cutting appropriations in the face of opposition on the part of the executive departments.

Again this year GEORGE SCHWABE's Appropriation Committee is meeting the same kind of opposition. Last year the Republican Congress established a committee on reorganization of the executive departments. This group of 12 outstanding men, with former President Hoover as chairman, has been given the job of submitting to Congress in January 1949, a plan for reorganization and reduction of the existing and duplicating Federal agencies. This plan, based upon the investigations now in progress, will offer us a real chance of returning to something like normal

Federal spending and normal efficiency in the Federal service once more. It will accomplish that purpose only if it has the support of a President and a Congress sympathetically and courageously inclined to put it into effect against the kind of opposition which bureaucracy has shown in the past 2 years it can give to any sincere attempt at economy in Federal Government.

I don't believe I need to tell you folks here that in describing that kind of a President and that kind of a Congress, I am referring to the Republican President and the Republican Congress that I expect to see installed in 1949.

We Republicans can point to two determined efforts to alleviate the Federal tax burden during 1947, efforts which were foiled by high-handed Presidential vetoes. A new attempt is being made in 1948. This time we are going to have the votes to do it, veto or no veto, and if Harry Truman wants to add a third tax veto to his record, and keep that record consistent, as the taxing-est, spending-est President in our history, that is all right with us.

We Republicans can point with pride to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947—the Taft-Hartley law—which called a halt to the drift toward boss government by the leaders of big labor. This was overwhelmingly enacted over a grossly political Presidential veto, and if the New Dealers want to make an issue of that in 1948, that, too, will be all right with us.

For 14 years a willful minority was able to block every attempt to remedy the apparent and obvious iniquities of the original Wagner Act.

The leaders of big labor had a hammerlock on the individual workingmen and on the American public, and they grimly held onto their grip.

The manner in which they have smeared and blackened the Taft-Hartley law is typical of their tactics. It is significant that when the Institute for Opinion Research conducted a poll among laboring men, union and nonunion, on the question "Do you favor the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law," nearly 75 percent answered in the affirmative. But when the same type of working people were asked to express their opinion of the 10 most important provisions of the law, without being designated as such, the majority of those working people expressed an opinion favorable to every one of the 10 most important provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. In other words, they were in favor of the Taft-Hartley law but because of the smoke screen which has been thrown up by their irresponcible leadership they didn't know they were in favor of it.

The Republican Congress passed a resolution to amend the Constitution to limit the tenure of the President to two terms. This proposed amendment is now in the process of ratification by the States. It was an "indispensable" New Deal President who saw fit to break this unwritten provision.

The Republican Congress enacted a law for unification of the armed forces. This is something the New Dealers talked about for 15 years, but only talked about for fear some brassed or braided toes might be stepped on.

We are now in the process of producing a workable European recovery program. The nebulous Marshall idea, under Republican craftsmanship, is gradually assuming form, substance, and practicability. Oh, yes, you hear the old bureaucratic left-wing cry of "do nothing" and "too slow," but let it be said with pride that the Republican Congress is meeting in Washington to legislate—it has resumed the function conceived by our founding fathers. The New Deal bureaucratic philosophy of legislation, that legislative enactments should simply state broad, high-sounding objectives, that money should be appropriated, and that some bureau should be set up to attempt to fulfill those objectives by dictatorial decrees—thank Heaven, and thank the Republicans—no longer prevails. This Congress is dedicated to the purpose of government by law and not by decree, government by representatives of the people, and not by appointed bureaucrats.

Thorough legislative deliberations by the elected representatives of the people—this is the essence of practical liberalism. Its contrast with bureaucratic decree based on the dreamy deliberations of appointed and self-perpetuating brain-trusters spells the difference between practical liberalism and bureaucratic despotism. This latter method of governing—the New Deal Method—certainly is neither Jeffersonian nor liberal. The chief claim of liberalism of these exponents is their liberality with the taxpayers' money.

Yes, the Republican Party has been the party of real, practical liberalism. It was conceived and born on a great fundamental humanitarian issue. It has given us civil service, basic antitrust legislation, pure-food laws, the homestead laws which provided land for those who would develop it, gave the right to vote to all citizens, established the first Federal Department of Agriculture, gave us the Morrill Act, donating land for agricultural and mechanical arts colleges, it sponsored the development of the first transcontinental railroads, created the first Bureau of Labor which now is the Department of Labor, passed the first labor-dispute conciliation law, gave to the world the open-door policy in China, passed the uniform bankruptcy law, sponsored the building of the Panama Canal, passed the Reclamation Act of 1902 which was our first Federal effort to conserve and develop natural resources, set up the Forestry Service, created the first Children's Bureau for the protection of the health and welfare of young America, created the Federal Farm Board, Federal Land banks, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that later played leading parts in bringing this Nation out of agricultural and industrial depression. It also was a Republican Congress that approved woman suffrage, and the only States that voted against that constitutional amendment were States in which the Democratic Party had solid control of the legislatures. There have been many other Republican monuments of progress over the years, and it is significant that when we as a party have failed in national elections, it is because we have failed to be the party of aggressive, practical, liberal action. Our party lost to Cleveland because it turned its back on the liberal reform movement led by Wisconsin's Carl Schurz. It lost to Wilson in 1912 because it turned its back on the program of Theodore Roosevelt. Republican voters elected the second Roosevelt by their votes in 1932 because conservative Republican leaders misunderstood Republican victories of 1924 and 1928. It was when the realization of the danger of a great bureaucracy to our liberal principles dawned on liberal-minded Republicans that they began to come back home into the Republican party. This movement really began in 1938 but was delayed in its culmination from 1940 to 1946 by a period of grave international crisis. The tide turned in 1946, and nothing can stop the tide from coming in, in 1948.

It is not enough that we shall elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress this year. In accordance with principles of sound administration—Republican administration—many of the functions now performed by the Federal Government will be returned to the States and local governments where they belong and where they can be much more efficiently administered. It is therefore important that Republican governors and Republican legislatures shall sit in the State houses and that Republican officeholders shall occupy the county courthouses throughout the Nation. This job of restoring the functions of Government to the elected representatives of the people must be done by agents who are in sympathy with that objective—by Republican officeholders.

We young Republicans have a great opportunity and a great responsibility in this year of 1948.

First, we must make ourselves heard in party councils. Our success as young Republicans is not measured alone by the size of our membership rolls or the fact that we have live working organizations in a great many of the States. It must be measured also by the number of young Republicans who are members of county Republican committees, State Republican committees, and are in attendance and take active parts in county, district, State, and National Republican conventions. We are an integral part of the Republican organization. Our identity as young Republicans is significant as a meeting ground and as a training school for our work in the senior councils of the party.

Secondly, we can and ought to seek public office and work for the election of competent young Republican candidates to public service. Political campaigning and political office-holding is a hard lot, discouraging at times and often unappreciated, but it is a job that young people are admirably fitted by youth, energy, and spirit to perform. The enthusiasm that can be generated for a young competent Republican candidate will get more votes than big campaign funds, and will bring a firmer foundation for the long-term success of our party.

Thirdly, Young Republicans can have lasting effect on our party and its program by taking leadership in a year-round program of political education and discussion. The old timers just sort of peter out after the election is over, and they can't be induced to any party activity until the election is hard upon them again. A youthful group of Republican workers with the initiative and the public spiritedness to make theirs a year-round program will soon find that they are the leaders of their party and that their party has become the leading party in their community.

Fourthly, the Young Republicans must leaven our party with practical liberalism. By illustration, I have attempted to show that when our party lost its liberalism, it lost elections. Young people don't lend themselves to regimentation by bureaucratic government, to corruptness, to lethargy, to protracted incompetence' A political party must either keep up with the times by listening to the voices of its youthful members or it must expect the fate of the Republican Party in 1932 and of the Democratic Party in 1948. The Republican Party will win this year. It is the responsibility of the Young Republicans to keep it fit to continue to govern in the years that lie ahead.

Why We Need a Two-Year Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to continue rent control for two more years, rather than one, because that is the earliest date by which we can reasonably expect some easing from

the present acute housing shortage. During the past year the housing industry did an excellent job of building about 835,000 new houses or apartments. But this has far from relieved the critical housing shortage which is directly responsible for the upward pressure on the rental price of housing. This shortage can best be illustrated by citing the fact that about 2,500,000 married couples live with other families. This is about a 50-percent increase over the number of families living doubled up in 1940. This shortage is emphasized by the lack of normal construction during the war years, by the increase in the number of marriages, and by the great shifts in population from rural areas to cities. Shortage is most acute and has its greatest impact on low-income families and new families started by veterans. Large numbers of families do not have enough space to give their children decent accommodations.

Because 2 years is the earliest, we can expect the construction of homes to even start to ease the current extreme shortage of houses, it is highly important that the protection of rent controls be continued for 2 years. A short-term extension for only 1 year defeats itself in a number of ways. The gravest weakness resulting from a 1-year extension comes from a lack of compliance with the law. The closer the expiration date of the law, the greater is the hesitancy of a tenant to call to the attention of the authorities violations of the law because of fear of blacklistings, evictions, or other retaliations by landlords. It is hard to conceive a greater fear than that of having no place to live. It is therefore highly important that these safeguards be retained during the period when there is virtually no chance of removing the threat of soaring rents caused by the acute housing shortage.

Knifing the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence waterway has been of major concern to the people of Minnesota for over two decades, and it is a well-established fact that the economic future of Minnesota and other Midwest States depends upon its construction. Now our hopes have been blasted again by the recent action of the Senate to shelve the seaway for another session. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the March 1 edition of the Minneapolis Star-Journal. This editorial, entitled "Knifing the Seaway," reflects the sentiments of the greater majority of Minnesota people and their disappointment in the Senate's decision:

KNIFING THE SEAWAY

The Senate has scuttled the St. Lawrence seaway plan by sending it back to committee. Thus the national welfare again has been subordinated to a number of sectional and industrial interests.

America grows short of fuel. Petroleum and coal are limited in quantity. But water is an inexhaustible resource. It is near criminal to allow it to go to waste down the St. Lawrence River when it could be harnessed for use in power plants.

The port of New York is overcrowded. It is foolish to concentrate so much shipping in one vulnerable harbor. Opening the St. Lawrence seaway would give the United States and Canada dozens of new ocean ports.

Lobbies opposed to the seaway must know they are fighting only a delaying battle. The logic of this new transportation avenue is so strong that eventual construction appears inevitable. One of the arguments used against it in the Senate was that this is not the time, with labor and materials scarce, to undertake the project.

That is true. But the bill was merely an authorization. The seaway should be authorized now so that preliminary engineering may be undertaken. Construction could wait until the next period of low employment.

Interior America has supported projects which benefited other sections. Some of them, as the Panama Canal, directly put this inland area at a disadvantage. Now the ports of New York and New Orleans, aided by other selfish groups, have pulled enough strings to upset the seaway bill.

But it will be back.

Salmon Trap Site Bills Should Not Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for February 26 noting some—but by no means all—of the arguments against Alaska salmon trap site bills now pending in the Congress. I am sure that most Alaskans will agree with the position of the Herald Tribune:

THE ALASKAN SALMON TRAP BILL

Advocates of statehood for Alaska, we believe, are rather certain to find additional arguments for their cause in the provisions of the Alaska salmon trap bill, introduced in Congress in June 1947. Joint hearings on the bill (S. 1446 and H. R. 3859) were completed before Senate and House subcommittees on January 30 last. At the hearings the bill was opposed by Mr. E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate from Alaska, by attorneys for Alaskan natives, and by representatives of fishermen's unions and municipalities comprising native as well as white members. The Association on American Indian Affairs has strongly fought the bill, claiming that its enactment would strip thousands of Alaskan Indians of their resources and would reduce them—as well as many nonnatives—to poverty by establishing for the benefit of absentee interests a form of exclusive fishing rights.

The salmon fisheries of Alaska are a great industry. In 1 year they place in hands of fishermen more than $20,000,000 and bring a much larger sum to commercial canneries. It is rightly argued, we think, that the present bill is injurious to the Territory from several important angles. From a long-range standpoint it threatens the continuation of Alaska's huge salmon supply by legalizing and encouraging a method of fishing which conservationists oppose. From Indians of a staple occupation, without their consent, without proper compensation, and without the provisions of any economic a short-range standpoint, it would deprive alternative.

That so vital an interest of Alaska as its great salmon fisheries should be in the power of legislators thousands of miles away from a salmon or a salmon trap is, we believe, a most valid reason why the future of Alaska should properly be in the lawmaking hands of those who live there. If the Alaska salmon trap bill comes up for passage in Congress, we shall hope to see it defeated.

Oleo Forces on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article published in the February 25 issue of Hoard's Dairyman, published at Fort Atkinson, Wis.:

Once again the oleo manufacturers are on the march. It is the same well beaten trail they have taken to every congressional session. They have one purpose and one purpose only in mind: to sell oleo as butter.

So that we may properly appreciate the tremendous amount of money they are spending and how dangerous the situation has become, we quote from a pamphlet, Modern Margarine, published by the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers:

"Margarine's advertising in Life, Parents', and American Weekly, with their combined 40,698,000 readers—plus advertising to 31,141 teachers, 111,406 doctors, and other thought leaders, plus the millions of messages carried for margarine by newspapers, magazines, trade and professional journals, and radio as a result of industry public releases, plus the tremendous amount of margarine advertising by individual manufacturers, will reach, inform, and shape the opinions of consumers in every community."

Oleo interests have poured millions into this fight over the years and there is no doubt that they intend to get back every cent that they have invested. And they can do it. All that is necessary is to abolish the tax on oleo colored to imitate butter and they will be on easy street, with fantastic markets and profits. Who will foot the bill? You and every other dairy farmer in the country.

When restaurants, hotels, and consumers can take the wrapper off a pound of oleo and set it on the table as butter, sales of butter will drop and the price of milk will go down with the butter market. Frankly, it will hit us right square in the pocketbook and continue to hit us until the day we die.

New readers of Hoard's Dairyman will ask, "What's the fuss all about?" It's simply this. Oleo is reported to have been developed in France about 1870. It was then composed largely of beef fat churned with milk. Later, as its use spread to the United States, vegetable oils such as coconut oil, palm oil, cottonseed oil, and, finally, soybean oil gradually replaced the animal fats. During the history of oleo manufacture and sale in this country, however, the manufacturers have never been satisfied to sell their product on its own merits. From the very early days

down through to present times, they have constantly striven by one means or another to sell their product as butter.

To help prevent this deliberate fraud, years ago a law was passed by Congress to tax yellow oleo at the rate of 10 cents a pound. Oleo that stood on its own feet and sold on its own merits was taxed only at one-quarter cent a pound. Certainly there is nothing prohibitive or restrictive in the one-quarter cent tax. There is a tax on fraud, however, and that is what the oleo interests want lifted.

They are clever, and they have millions of dollars at their disposal to sell their plan. The campaign outlined above is obviously a very costly one. Here are some of their arguments:

"The tax is discriminatory." The one-quarter-cent tax on the legitimate product selling on its own merits and in its own clothes is not discriminatory. The 10-cent tax on yellow oleo does discriminate against fraud. Police discriminate against dishonesty, too. The tax is imposed to promote just competition. Ford and Chevrolet do not put a Packard or Cadillac front on their cars. Ford and Chevrolet sell cars on their outstanding merit, not on the reputation and standing of Packard and Cadillac. Yellow is the trade-mark of butter and as such has a right to preserve its identity. Oleo should identify itself, too.

"Oleo is naturally yellow. We must take the color out to keep from paying a tax." This is an old dodge that has been dragged out as a pry to get the legislation changed. When it was profitable to make oleo out of coconut oil, the yellow color was not a factor, and yet the oleo boys still cried to high heaven to be allowed to color their product butter yellow. It is worth their money to include a yellow fat just to use it as a wedge in Congress. When it becomes more profitable to use coconut oil again, they will use it. Their claim to the public is that they have a low-price, edible spread.

"Oleo is a product of the farm. The tax pits farm against farm." To a minor degree this is true at the present time when oleo makers are using home-produced oils. The oleo interests have trapped the cottonseed and soybean people into going along with them until the full story is told. Years ago cottonseed interests were very much in the saddle with oleo. They found, however, in 1940, for example, oleo used $3,830,000 in cottonseed oil while farmers used $29,301,000 in cottonseed cake and meal. Now the soybean interests are following in cotton's footsteps. If they will check up on their markets, they will find that in 1942 their income from oleo amounted to about $8,000,000. In contrast, the value of soybean meal fed to dairy cows amounted to $34,000,000.

Regardless of the foregoing comparisons, however, there is still no moral justification for allowing oleo to defraud the public and profit on the good name of butter. Let oleo make its own reputation under its own color and identity.

"Oleo is a wholesome food." So what? Ford and Chevrolet are excellent cars, too. They still sell on their own merits and in their own clothes.

"The tax is 'horse and buggy' legislation." So is the Constitution of the United States.

"Butter is colored yellow and isn't even required to state that fact on the carton." If it is desirable to state that butter is artificially colored, why not? We have nothing to hide. Yellow is added at certain seasons to give the product a uniform color. Butter has always been yellow and always will be. Yellow is the natural color of butter and has been so, long before the Frenchman who made oleo was born. Every person in America recognizes that fact and a yellow spread for bread is automatically presumed to be butter. Even today, people are being fed a yellow spread in restaurants and hotels and they assume they are getting butter when it is, in reality, yellow-colored oleo. That is the lowest form of out-and-out fraud. Tax repeal will throw open the gates to extend that fraud.

Oleo interests have done a fine job of confusing State and Federal legislation. Most of the high taxes on oleo arise within the various States. State laws must not be confused with the straight one-quarter cent tax on legitimate oleo and the 10-cent tax on butter-yellow oleo. The present battle is solely on the national level.

We hope that we have briefly outlined our stand for the retention of the present 10-cent tax on oleo colored to resemble butter. If there are any further questions, we will be happy to receive them and help to clarify an issue purposely muddled by the oleo interests.

What must be done immediately, however, is to offset the results of the oleo propaganda. Many Congressmen are wavering to the side of oleo. They are not fully informed and have not had an expression from you back home. We have many new and inexperienced Congressmen who do not have all the facts. They are extremely price conscious, and butter has received undue attention as a barometer of prices. They forget or don't know that it takes about 1 hour of labor to produce a pound of butter.

There is real danger today as never before. Several bills are in the hopper in Washington. They are following the oleo line and will allow oleo to perpetrate its fraud completely unfettered from any source in Washington.

It is extremely unfortunate that we must take time out to battle off an attack such as this. Heaven only knows we have enough to do without going through this scrap. Anything worth while is worth fighting for, however, and everyone of us must voice our opinions now before it is too late and we can do nothing but sit back and watch the milk check shrink.

Our Cockeyed Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the above title, there appears an editorial in the Daily Oklahoman, of Oklahoma City, Okla., one of the leading Democratic newspapers of the Southwest. I think the attitude and position of this largest newspaper in Oklahoma is deserving of our serious consideration, and is illustrative of the thinking of a vast number of our people on the subject of rent control. Hence I quote the entire editorial and commend it to your reading:

OUR COCKEYED RENT CONTROL

With Congress poised to do something this week about extension of rent controls, it is opportune to call attention of lawmakers to the cockeyed two-level rent system that regulations have developed.

Take the case of many a duplex in Oklahoma City. One side may rent for $50 because it is controlled while the other side may bring $100 or up for the simple reason it is uncontrolled. There is little or no mystery why this crazy situation has developed. The side that had been owner-occupied prior to being rented out had no controls on it. So to make up for low rent on the controlled side, the owner leased the uncontrolled side for all the traffic would bear. Hence, the anomaly of identical and adjoining housing with a 100-percent rent differential.

Even controlled properties are constantly being decontrolled as owners take advantage of every loophole to bring up their substandard rental income. Large apartments and duplexes as well as older houses under rent controls are divided into smaller apartments which automatically removes them from any regulation.

Why are property owners doing this? The Federal Government's own statistics give the obvious answer. The food index is up 116 percent from prewar; rents as a whole are up 10 percent. The property owner is sick and tired of being the cost of living whipping boy. And he is doing what he has every moral and legal right to do when he attempts to bring his income somewhat more into line with other inflationary costs and prices.

But this still fails to make John Jones feel any better about his $100 per month duplex quarters while Sam Smith on the other side of the wall, gets away for $50 per month. Jones is paying the penalty for the continued governmental folly of trying to ration housing scarcity.

Compulsory Peacetime Universal Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss today the subject of compulsory peacetime universal military conscription now before Congress. While every effort has been made to get around using the words "compulsory" and "peacetime military conscription," when we take off the apple polish the fact remains that what the armed services want and what the country will get if this bill becomes a law is compulsory peacetime universal military conscription. They propose "peacetime conscription" and "compulsory military training" of from 6 to 12 months for every physically fit American boy 18 years old. They propose to take 850,000 of these boys each year out of their homes, off the farm, out of schools and colleges, out of factories and trade schools, or wherever they may be for that purpose. Let us have no misunderstanding about that.

While there are many other grounds of opposition to this bill, I shall discuss the proposed law only from a hard-boiled national defense strictly military preparedness point of view. At some future date I shall discuss the cost of such a training program.

I have been a member of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee since January 1937. This is my twelfth year as a member of that subcommittee and my second year as its chairman. I have a letter in my files written by Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, dated November 5, 1943, asking me to come to his office and discuss the Manhattan project. The

Manhattan project was the code name for the Oak Ridge plant where the uranium was produced for the first atom bombs. I gathered more or less information from that time on until April 1945 when together with a few others I spent 2 days going through the plant at Oak Ridge. I was appointed by the Speaker as a congressional observer on the two tests at Bikini and saw the first test at about 20 miles and the second one from 9½ miles away. I boarded 16 ships after the first test and made a detailed study of the damage both to ships and equipment so that I have some knowledge of the power and destruction of the atomic bomb, what it means, and its relation to national defense.

I shall begin by stating that I am emphatically opposed to compulsory peacetime universal military conscription. I base that opposition upon my study of our needs of national defense and my experience as above stated. While there are many other reasons for opposition, I am basing my opposition today solely upon national defense grounds. I take the position that compulsory peacetime universal military conscription will not only fail to give us adequate national defense but will be a detriment rather than a help to national defense.

WE MUST HAVE A REGULAR ARMED FORCE TO MEET THE FIRST IMPACT OF A POSSIBLE ATTACK

Regardless of whether we have compulsory peacetime universal military conscription, everyone agrees we must have a regular full-time armed force to meet the first impact of a possible attack. In my judgment, the armed services' plans are sound along this line. Such a force should consist of the following:

A. A primary armed force such as we have now—Air, Navy, and Army—to meet the first impact of an attack, such force to consist of, first, a modern, well-equipped Air Force; second, a modern, well-equipped two-ocean Navy, including a Marine Corps; and, third, a land or ground Army—well-equipped with the latest weapons.

B. In addition to the above full-time force we should have a Reserve component. This component, presently being resurveyed in all aspects by the Office of National Defense, is now made up as follows:

1. A National Guard.

2. An Organized Reserve of both officers and men. This force must be well-equipped with the latest weapons to the extent that we can do so from a peacetime financial point of view.

C. I am firmly convinced that the Air Force, the Navy, and Marines can obtain their required manpower by voluntary enlistments. There is no reason why the ground forces should not do the same if they will eliminate autocratic Army brass methods. However, if voluntary enlistments do fail, then I would suggest a selective-service system to get the men to make up the difference between the manpower requirements and the voluntary enlistments.

After the above Regular full-time armed forces and Reserve components, our national defense depends primarily upon:

OUR INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY AND A PLANNED MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAM

If there is anything that the past World War demonstrated it is that our real emergency or wartime national defense depends primarily—

A. Upon the productive capacity of our industries.

B. Upon our ability to convert that productive capacity from a peacetime to a wartime production in the shortest possible time; and

C. Upon a civilian manpower-training program that will—

1. Train men to produce modern weapons with which to fight.

2. Provide an emergency or wartime military manpower-training program which will furnish a trained man in an emergency for every weapon from a rifle to a tank, plane, or ship as fast as that weapon rolls off the production line with a margin of safety.

I want to discuss items A and B together. Everyone agrees that production of modern weapons was and is the most important item of national defense. In World War II the war-production record and particularly the speed with which industry converted from a peacetime to a wartime production was the miracle of the century. It amazed everyone. I spent many months studying production of ordnance, powder, explosives, and armorplate, including weeks going through factories of the Nation. I appreciate the handicaps we labored under and just what was done. The job could not have been done without the cooperation of both labor and management. They wrote a most brilliant record of war production, a record which will be difficult to surpass or equal in the future when we take into consideration the handicaps we had to begin with.

SPEED UP CONVERSION FROM PEACETIME TO WARTIME PRODUCTION

However, we can do much to speed up production by making preparations now for that production. Let me give you one example of what I mean, of one instance where production was speeded up by something that was done to help it along. Hon. Louis Johnson was Under Secretary of War and in charge of production at the time. He asked our committee for $16,000,000 for educational orders on the production of several national defense items. After some difficulties he got that $16,000,000. We were told that the Garand rifle had two and one-half times the fire power of the old Springfield or Enfield at least for a short time. We were manufacturing a few of these Garand rifles a month by hand. A part of this $16,000,000 was used to tool up Springfield Armory and to tool up and put educational orders into Winchester Arms factory. As a result, instead of making a few rifles a month by hand at Springfield, we were able to make 200 rifles a day with one shift and 500 a day with three shifts. We had men educated to make rifles at Winchester Arms. The factory was tooled up ready to go into a speed-up production program. As a result the Garand rifle ceased to be short of supply. While we were not able to hand each man a Garand rifle when he came into the Army, every man, I am told, was given a Garand rifle as he got aboard a ship if he was supposed to have one. In my judgment, credit goes to the Honorable Louis Johnson, Under Secretary of War, for his foresightedness in recommending and obtaining that comparatively small sum of $16,000,000 for educational orders. Much can be done along that line in speeding up the conversion of industry from a peacetime to a wartime status.

MANPOWER TRAINING

I have already discussed the importance of training men in times of peace to make the weapons of war by the way of educational orders. This civilian manpower-training program or part of that program is just as important if not more so than the training of men to handle or fight with those weapons after they are manufactured. I would place under this program all civilian research work, the training of young scientists in both fundamental and applied research and other similar items. Dr. Vannevar Bush, the noted research specialist, has repeatedly said that Germany lost the war because she did not keep up on fundamental research. We must have the best coordinated program we can get. I do not want to go into the question of organization or under whose control this work is to be done, except to say that naturally it would have to be done in close cooperation with the national defense authorities.

I now want to discuss the last item of national defense and that is "Compulsory peacetime universal military conscription." After an adequate weapon production program, the next important step in our national defense is to have an—

EFFECTIVE, ADEQUATE, EMERGENCY MILITARY MANPOWER-TRAINING PROGRAM

Perhaps the most technical of all technical training is in the Air Corps. Training a high-school or college graduate as a pilot or a navigator who can set a plane down on a spit of an island in any part of the Pacific; training a bombardier who can drop a bomb from 6 miles in the air and hit an airplane carrier or other target; to train meteorologists and weather men who can accurately forecast flying weather; to train mechanics to keep the planes, engines, radar, and other equipment in repair, these and hundreds of other required skills make the Air Corps personnel the most technical of all technical services.

I have heard Gen. H. H. Arnold, wartime Chief of the Air Forces, and other air officials say repeatedly that despite our deficiencies during the past world war, there never was a time when the Air Corps training program was not ahead of the production program. It will be recalled that some 50,000 young men who were supposed to be trained as pilots were transferred to the infantry and other services.

On June 6, 1945, General Arnold in testifying before the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee as to their postwar personnel training program—see page 187 of the

committee hearings on 1946 appropriation bill—made the following statement:

General ARNOLD. You can, however, train personnel faster than you can build equipment. If you have the development and research and production planned, then you need only turn the article into production. It takes time, but, if you have the factories, you can get the articles. As far as training is concerned, if you have the basic personnel it is simpler to train personnel than to get equipment. But back of everything must be production; the personnel is normally ahead of the equipment.

Again, on the same page, he testified:

In the postwar military policy we must have the proper kind of schools with suitable equipment so you have the essential and substantial nucleus. Then you can expand in personnel like we expanded from about 24,500 Air Force in December 1941 to nearly 390,000 in April of this year.

INFANTRY TRAINING

The same holds for infantry training. It will be recalled that during the war considerable criticism was heard because the War Department was taking 18-year-old boys from the farms, cities, schools, colleges, and other walks of life. After a few weeks of training they were sent into combat. Many of these boys became casualties and the Army was severely criticized because it was felt that they had not had adequate training. On May 28, 1945, Maj. Gen. James G. Christiansen, Chief of Ground Force Staff, United States Army, testified before our committee. It will be recalled that Lt. Gen. Leslie J. McNair, formerly in charge of ground force training, had been killed in Europe by gunfire of his own men. I questioned General Christiansen regarding this training program. It will also be recalled that at first these young men had been given only 13 weeks' training before being sent overseas and into combat. Later this was changed to 17 weeks. Many of us felt that was not adequate training. Yet here is the actual testimony of General Christiansen giving the War Department policy on the matter—see pages 133, 134, and 135 of same hearing:

Mr. ENGEL. Now, how long does it take to train an infantry soldier? I am talking of taking a boy right off the farm or out of the gas station or store, and making a soldier out of him so that he can go into combat.

General CHRISTIANSEN. Let me put our experience with that in two ways. To train an individual to be an infantry soldier, we found 17 weeks in the RTC developed the man so that as an individual he could go into a combat organization and fight as a part of that combat organization effectively.

Mr. ENGEL. Does that mean 17 weeks of actual training, or 17 weeks from the time he is inducted?

General CHRISTIANSEN. Seventeen weeks of actual training from the day he started.

Mr. ENGEL. After he is sent around here, there, and yonder, and is finally assigned to the actual training course, 17 weeks from that time on?

General CHRISTIANSEN. That is right.

Mr. ENGEL. And he will do what—fit into what?

General CHRISTIANSEN. He will fit into a fighting organization. Let us say we have a company in a regiment here [indicating] and that company is complete all except 10 men who have been casualties; we can put 10 individuals into that organization and fit them in and have an organization ready to fight.

Mr. ENGEL. What chance has that boy with an experienced man in the enemy forces in hand-to-hand combat with bayonets, rifle butts, and so forth?

General CHRISTIANSEN. He probably would have just as much chance as the other man, and possibly a little bit more, because he has not been tired out. The soldier gets tired after fighting for a while.

Mr. ENGEL. Do you mean to tell me that a boy who has had only 17 weeks' training can learn how to fight with the bayonet in hand-to-hand combat and know all the tricks to go with it as well as an enemy who has been at it for a couple of years?

General CHRISTIANSEN. Yes; I think he can. Normally, after they have been out—a soldier may have been fighting for a long while and never have fought with the bayonet.

Mr. ENGEL. No; but he keeps on practicing; they keep on giving him the training?

General CHRISTIANSEN. Not when he is in combat—very little when he is in combat. He has a particular job to do and he will do that when he is in combat. He may never—if he has been 2 years in the Army—he may never have used the bayonet at all.

Mr. ENGEL. You mean if he has been in the service for 2 years in combat, that they do not keep up with bayonet training at all?

General CHRISTIANSEN. They keep up with training when they can.

* * * * *

General CHRISTIANSEN. Our plan, what we were last working on was 17 weeks of training when they would be ready to go. Then they were given a furlough, went into a replacement depot, were shipped overseas, placed in a replacement depot over there, and quite possibly might have gone into a unit with no additional training except a few days they may have gotten in the replacement depot. We set up our replacement depots so that, if we kept a man any length of time at all, he went on with his training; but it would be entirely possible for men who had had just 17 weeks to have been put into a unit that was close to the enemy.

Mr. ENGEL. Well, there were some put in there who were not in service for 17 weeks, were there not—originally?

GENERAL CHRISTIANSEN. Yes. To go back a little further, when we first started in—this was several years ago—we had 13 weeks of training in RTC. We found this was not enough so we boosted that some 2 years ago, to 17 weeks of training. Our experience, from all the reports we have had, from people who used these replacements in action, was that the 17-weeks replacement was fully capable as an individual replacement.

GENERAL-PURPOSE TRAINING

Billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money was wasted and is being wasted in training Army manpower. Some of this waste was not justified even in wartime. Ask any veterans at a veterans' meeting just how much time he spent in training that he did not use. Why do we have to train a man for 6 months or a year to become a truck driver when we have thousands of experienced truck drivers in civilian life and when a few weeks' training will actually train him even in the Army? I was at the Signal Corps training center at Monmouth, N. J., recently. Walkie-talkie men were trained in a few weeks. Radar, telephone, radio, and other skills were taught in a comparatively short time. Cooks, mechanics, and others were similarly trained in a short time at other places. Such training added to what they already had in civilian life enabled them to work under the supervision of the trained men we already had.

There is an old saying that the proof of the pudding lies in the eating. Let us assume for the sake of argument that we had passed the compulsory peacetime universal military conscription bill in 1920 and from 1920 to 1940 we had trained each year 850,000 young men. Let us assume that we had trained during that period a total of 17,000,000 young men. Here is the $64 question: "Just what would we have done with them when the emergency came, how many would we have called out, what would we have given them to fight with and how many would we have had to retrain?

This conscription plan is just as fallacious as was the oratorical cry of William Jennings Bryan during the Wilson administration that "a million young men would spring to arms overnight." We found when the time came and we would find now there were no arms to spring to. We would not have dared to call them from the civilian production of food and weapons into the armed services until we had produced weapons with which to arm them. We would have had to retrain 80 percent of them and would have to do so again.

Now, as then, we would have to use that manpower to produce the food, ammunition, arms, planes, weapons, tanks, and thousands of other weapons of warfare. We would have to call them out gradually and train them in modern weapons so we could have a trained man for every weapon as it rolled off the assembly line. This is all the more true as weapons become more complicated and more efficient. No nation can keep an army of 17,000,000, 10,000,000, 8,000,000, 5,000,000, or even 3,000,000 men equipped with modern weapons without going broke and using up its supply of strategic materials and without imposing a ruinous tax levy on the great number of people in all income groups and especially in the low-income group which needs tax relief so badly. No nation can do all this and still take care of the veterans of past wars as they should be taken care of.

Before voting for compulsory peacetime universal military conscription, ask yourself that $64 question: Just what would you do with these millions of trained men when the emergency came and what would you give them to fight with? How many would you have to retrain? I asked this question of two lieutenant generals who testified before our committee on compulsory universal military conscription in 1947, and there was no answer. I asked the same question of members of the national defense committee of the American Legion several years ago, who were brought with Army planes at taxpayers' expense all the way from the State of Wyoming and Oklahoma to Orlando and Eglund Field, Fla., where a few of us saw testing of experimental weapons. They did not answer the question.

FRANCE AND BELGIUM HAD COMPULSORY PEACETIME UNIVERSAL MILITARY CONSCRIPTION BEFORE WORLD WAR II; ENGLAND DID NOT HAVE COMPULSORY TRAINING

France and Belgium had compulsory peacetime universal military conscription before World War II. The German tanks went through France and Belgium like lightning despite the tremendous trained manpower they had, because that

manpower had no modern weapons. If France and Belgium had used the money she spent on the Maginot line, plus 80 percent of the money she wasted on compulsory military training on modern equipment including tanks, planes, research and development they would not have been wiped out in a few weeks by the German Army. England did not have compulsory peacetime universal military training and was fighting and defending her island empire long after France and Belgium were compelled to surrender, because England did spend some money on modern planes and had a modern air force instead of wasting her resources as France and Belgium did on compulsory peacetime universal military conscription. That fact together with the fact that she was an island nation enabled her to go on. There is no doubt but what the German Army would have crossed the English channel and landed had England not had a modern air fighting force. As Churchill said, "Never did so many owe so much to so few." Those few would have been impotent without modern weapons.

CONSCRIPTION AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

The proponents of compulsory peacetime universal military conscription have used the atomic bomb as a propaganda weapon with considerable effect. They would have us believe that in case of another war, millions of our people would be destroyed by this weapon; that every city and village would become a Nagasaki or a Hiroshima. They would have us believe that compulsory peacetime universal military conscription, or as they call it, universal military training, would save us from all this destruction of life and property.

If there is any one thing that makes compulsory peacetime universal military conscription obsolete, it is the atomic bomb. It did not and could not have saved Nagasaki or Hiroshima and it would not save us in case of war. I have already given some of my experiences with regard to the development of the atomic bomb. I boarded 16 ships after the first above-water test at Bikini. I examined every piece of equipment on those ships from bow to stern taking notes on the damage done. The captain of each ship took me through his ship pointing out the damage that was done to the ship. I boarded the targetship *Nevada*, then boarded a ship at approximately 1,200 yards, 2,400 yards, and 3,600 yards from the *Nevada* trying to circumscribe the circle or area of serious damage. I stood on the searchlight platform of the steamship *Panamint*, a communications ship. This ship had aboard all the scientific observers with the exception of a few who were on the President's Evaluation Committee. It also had aboard practically all the foreign observers. I was aboard the ship with these men for some 40 days. When the second or underwater test was made, we were, according to the captain of the *Panamint*, between the 9- and 10-mile circle. I had a pair of 16-power German naval field glasses I had brought back with me from Germany after World War I.

After the test each scientist and observer on my ship made a short statement as to what they saw. That statement was transcribed, corrected, and then mimeographed. I have copies of these statements. During the trip between the two tests the scientists and observers gave lectures. I heard and have copies of these lectures. I consider this information the most important I have ever gathered. I mention this so you can determine whether or not I have had an opportunity of obtaining information regarding the force of this weapon. Scientists measure the power of this weapon by comparing it to TNT. I shall not comment on that phase. The bomb was set between the 29,000-ton battleship *Arkansas* and the 33,000-ton carrier *Saratoga*. I saw the *Arkansas* and *Saratoga* when the bomb went off. When the cloud lifted this 29,000-ton battleship had disappeared and was gone. According to my notes at 4:10 in the afternoon, the 33,000-ton carrier *Saratoga*, which had been listing badly, sank. Several days later I was aboard a smaller ship alongside the 45,000-ton battleship *Nagato*, which had been the pride of the Jap Navy. The water was then washing over her decks and she sank that night. The German cruiser *Prince Eugen*, which I had boarded, sank 6 months after, to the surprise of everyone. Army transports, destroyers, and subs went down. The column of water was 2,136 feet in diameter, 5,000 feet high, and mushroomed out to a much greater distance above the column. Thousands of tons of water came down and filled every ship in the large area with radioactive water. Nothing could have lived aboard these ships. All this was done, I am told, with an amount of explosive that a man could carry in one hand. I repeat that if there is anything that makes compulsory, peacetime, universal, military conscription of large masses of men obsolete, it is the atomic bomb.

The day of great concentration of manpower such as we had in the past World War is gone. A group of planes loaded with atomic bombs could destroy Camp Meade, Md.; Camp Dix, N. J.; Fort Davis and Camp Edwards, Mass., and Indiantown Gap with one bomb each. No compulsory peacetime universal military conscription could save any nation from the atomic bomb in case of war. Compulsory peacetime universal military conscription is as obsolete as a civil-war cannon. This is a scientific age. The next war will be scientific warfare. I have always supported and shall continue to support a sound national-defense program. I am opposed to compulsory peacetime universal military conscription because it is fundamentally unsound and will only result in a waste of manpower which may lose the next war. It will destroy the productive capacity of our industries without giving us the highly technical trained men which a modern national defense requires. What we need is not millions of half-trained men but a smaller group of highly-trained men, equipped with the most modern weapons. What we need is to keep up in front with both fundamental and applied scientific research. What we need is a getting together, call it an alliance of whatever you want to call it, but a joining together of all those nations who believe, as we do, in free movement, to form a joint defense against any outlaw nation who threatens war and the use of the atomic bomb. What we need is a joint defense with a joint balance of military power so great that no one outlaw nation will dare to attack any one of the joint free nations. Within a short time I shall address the House again on our foreign-aid program and its relation to our national defense.

Fuel Shortages Increase Columbia's Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by W. D. B. Dodson from the Oregonian for February 29, 1948:

FUEL SHORTAGES INCREASE COLUMBIA'S VALUE—AS COAL AND OIL RESERVES DIMINISH, PROSPECTS FOR THE GREATER UTILIZATION OF RIVER'S POWER POTENTIAL IMPROVE

(By W. D. B. Dodson, consultant, Portland Chamber of Commerce)

Midwestern oil shortages are chilling homes and bringing serious demands for gasoline rationing. Northern California is in the throes of an acute power shortage. Power problems are increasing in many other sections of the United States.

Industry's capacity to expand is nearing its limits, if it has not reached them, in some localities where ordinary, present power-generating capabilities have been thoroughly exploited.

What, then, are the situation and outlook in the Columbia Basin? Briefly, the present situation could be improved. The outlook is unexcelled. But before conclusions can be reached, some basic facts are necessary to understand the potentialities of the Columbia basin, as compared with the rest of the United States.

Foremost is the fact that the Columbia River at The Dalles—selected because no power project can be constructed in the main stem below Bonneville dam, and passing the Army Corps of Engineers' plans for multiple-purpose dams in the Willamette basin—has a measurable flow of somewhat under 150,000,000 acre-feet, a reduction from the 150,000,000 acre-feet of thirty-odd years ago. The reduction, of more interest to hydrologists than to laymen because any drying up of the river is a remote possibility, may be due to climatic changes in the Inland Empire or, in part, because of extensive irrigation in southern Idaho.

Coal production in the United States was approximately 603,000,000 tons of bituminous and lignite and 57,000,000 tons of anthracite in 1947, according to bureau of mines estimates. Experts figure the average consumption of coal in electric power plants is 4.5 tons per kilowatt-year, based on assumed 80-percent load factor for the generating plant.

Using these figures for computation and accepting the total hydroelectric generating capacity of the Columbia Basin, the Columbia's power potential is the equivalent of 135,000,000 tons of coal per year. In other words, right now we are allowing something like 100,000,000 tons of coal per year to burn up when we let the present unharnessed flow

of water from the Columbia Basin enter the Pacific without using it.

In 1947 the Bureau of Mines estimated petroleum production at 1,845,000,000 barrels, possibly 2,000,000,000 barrels. Various sources say the proven oil reserves do not exceed 20,000,000,000 barrels, or 10 years' supply if annual consumption holds to 2,000,000,000 barrels a year, which it undoubtedly will.

Average consumption of oil in electric-generating plants is about 18 barrels per kilowatt-year, which would make energy in the Columbia River equivalent to some 540,000,000 barrels of oil per year.

Oregon's average residential consumption of electrical energy last year was 2,895 kilowatt-hours from the five largest privately owned plants. In Washington consumption averaged 3,060 kilowatt-hours from the three largest privately owned plants. By way of comparison, the national residential average was 1,298 kilowatt-hours.

Some farm homes, where pumps and minor mechanical devices are driven by electricity, use as much as 12,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

JOBS SEEN POSSIBLE FOR 4,500,000 WORKERS

If the Columbia Basin had 5,000,000 homes and the average electric consumption was set at 12,000 kilowatt-hours per year—a not unlikely figure considering high farm requirements and increased home power use of the last few years—the total needed would be approximately 7,000,000 kilowatts per year computed without regard to off hours and peak loading.

With all of the Columbia basin hydroenergy harnessed, this would leave approximately 23,000,000 kilowatts per year available for industry. Average consumption of energy by industry in the United States runs slightly above 5 kilowatts per industrial worker and may reach 6 kilowatts in the near future. On the basis of 5 kilowatt-hours, there would be enough industrial energy to employ 4,500,000 people.

There is a potential of approximately 10,000,000 kilowatts in the trunk of the Columbia below the Canadian border and in the Snake River below Lewiston. All developments in this section could be reached by barges from the sea through proper construction of dams. As dams are constructed, pooled water will be available for barge transportation of bulk raw materials at rates as low as 3 mills per ton-mile, and possibly lower.

When Col. T. M. Robins, ex-division engineer of the Army engineers, made an exhaustive survey of the Columbia Basin, he found the ton-mile rail rate between Portland and Lewiston was about 27 mills for all commodities and all distances. The average rail rate for the Nation at that time was 11 mills a ton-mile.

The cost of hauling ore from Duluth to Ohio, with return cargoes of coal, was then 1 mill a ton-mile. On the Mississippi, where adequate channels have been provided and modern, economical terminal facilities are used, costs have gone as low as 3 mills per ton-mile.

This illustrates the tremendous value, from an industrial viewpoint, of getting factories located on the trunk of the Columbia and lower Snake, where they could be served by modern, efficient barges in transporting bulk raw materials.

There is no other known place in the world where cheap transportation of this type can be made available to large low-cost power plants for use of industry at such sites. Thus, from the aspect of low-cost energy and potential low-cost transportation to industrial sites, the Columbia stands supreme.

The upward trend in consumption of cheap electric energy for industrial production is very marked.

In the electrochemical, electrometallurgical, abrasive and kindred lines of industry, volume of cheap energy is essential. Each year, these operations are expanding. Some experts forecast that cheap hydroelectrical energy will become an enormous industrial factor in the near future.

Coal is rising in cost through increased wages; oil is becoming scarcer in the United States, resulting in constantly higher prices and longer hauls. A nation holding and wishing to keep the lead position now occupied by the United States in power-consuming industries perforce must give profound attention to the quantities and costs of hydroelectric energy.

The diversified mineral and metal substances used in this rapidly expanding industry are widely scattered. Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast industries are bringing raw materials from Cuba, the Caribbean islands, South America, Mexico, Central America, and elsewhere. Chromite, for example, is brought from South Africa and Turkey.

The Columbia River's ports, in addition to our own ores, have access to everything on the rim of the Pacific basin practically on a water-haul basis.

Alaska has an area of 586,000 square miles and, while only limited exploratory work has been done there, many raw materials valuable for industrial reduction have been found. There is little doubt that, as the area is explored more completely, Alaska will offer the same variety and volume of raw materials found by the Russians in eastern Siberia.

In the past, mining operations for everything except precious metals have been confined to areas close to the coast because of high transportation costs in Alaska. As the transportation problem is solved, this area will become exceedingly important as a source of supply for industries on the Columbia.

The Russians probably will continue to export certain raw materials found in eastern Siberia until they have developed their own industries to consume them. No one knows—the Kremlin excepted—the exact quantity of various minerals and metals revealed in intensive exploratory and development work the Soviet is carrying on in Siberia, but all experts agree a tremendous quantity undoubtedly is being brought to light.

China, including Sinkiang and Manchuria, has a greater area than the United States, containing deposits of practically all metals and minerals needed in electric reduction processes.

Some lie in Manchuria, near seaports. A large amount is in the Yangtze Kiang Basin, where cheap transportation is available, and in southern China, where it may be barged to the coast. Hainan Island has been proved to contain considerable iron ore. Japan shipped huge quantities of coal from Manchuria and some lower grades of iron.

Korea has a diversity of metals and minerals in its northern half and will gladly export them after the Soviet turns that section loose.

RIM OF PACIFIC SOURCE OF NEEDED MATERIALS

The Philippines have many materials of the type under consideration. Chromite has been shipped for several years from central Luzon. Manganese has been found in Luzon's northern section. One of the central islands has been producing from a rich deposit of iron ore for several years and, as exploration and development progress, it is inevitable that the Philippines will have many metals and minerals, some in appreciable volume.

Java and Sumatra have proved themselves capable of producing great varieties. On Billitin Island, between Java and Sumatra, 25,000,000 tons of high-grade bauxite have been found. After peace is established between the Dutch and Indonesians and capital is permitted to explore and produce, there is no doubt in the world that volumes of ore will be made available.

In the Federated Malay States tin is the outstanding product, but other metals and minerals have been discovered. As exploratory work continues in Borneo, unquestionably metals will be found in the rough areas.

Indochina and Siam are proven producers for certain lines of materials needed. Burma and India also will offer quantities of such raw materials.

To sum up, around the rim of the Pacific we have countries offering quantities of every metal and mineral that ever will be needed for large-scale industrial operations on the Columbia.

If we make our power available at generating cost along the Columbia and lower Snake, served by cheap barge, rail, and highway transportation, we have the most remarkable combination of conditions for this type of production that may be found in America.

Our steamship lines operating from the Columbia as a rule go forth heavily loaded with lumber, wheat, flour, and other products, and return light. Shipment of raw materials for processing as return cargo would constitute a wonderfully balanced steamship service.

Alaska is planning to develop five large pulp mills with a capacity of 1,200,000 tons annually on a perpetual basis. If we are awake, we will establish Alaskan steamship connections which ultimately must operate on the same cost level as other American-flag coastwise lines.

Economic progress of the United States has been due largely to immense and unprecedented development of those natural resources found in the Nation's area. Our average industrial worker produces materially more than could 50 human beings working with their bare hands.

As the prices of fuels advance or natural resources become scarce, the attraction of hydroelectrical power increases. The heaviest cost factor in a hydro plant is almost perpetual in endurance, giving it an added value compared with fuel plants. So far as man can foresee, the flow of the average stream, while it may fluctuate or even diminish to a limited degree, is perpetual.

HYDRO POWER VALUE RISING THROUGHOUT WORLD

Throughout the world hydro power is becoming a vastly important industrial asset. Norway led with some splendid examples. Germany was harnessing this energy rapidly before the World Wars. The Soviet has surveyed and is planning the most extensive hydroelectric development program for industry that is known today. American experts have found a potential of 10,000,000 kilowatts in the Yangtze gorges below Chungking and plans are under way to develop it for Chinese industry. India has been making progress in utilizing waters flowing from the Himalayas for industrial use.

On the whole North American Continent, and perhaps in the Western Hemisphere, there is no hydro powerhouse comparable to the Columbia Basin, a stream second to the Mississippi, draining an area only one-fifth as great. It rises in the highest mountains of the continent, dashes through deep, narrow gorges and canyons, and is favored by a most remarkable annual precipitation.

If we—and the American people as a whole—are awake, this must become one of the greatest industrial centers of the Nation. When our country faces others using cheap hydroelectric power in a growing line of industries, and has to compete on a hard-cost basis, it is appalling to think that the Columbia Basin will not be put upon an honest-cost basis for its power use to help protect American industry. National defense, as well as proper employment, is involved.

It is my profound conviction that we should work feverishly toward harnessing this vast flow of wasting energy.

If we of the Columbia Basin feel that we are a real part of the United States, if we regard progress as a true American practice, if we want Oregon to take its proper place with California and Washington in building a powerful Pacific seaboard, this issue must be met seriously. Trivial and diversionary issues must be by-passed. Sound data must be assembled and a program of real American action adopted.

Setting Out False Harbor Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress a most interesting editorial by Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, of the Tulsa Tribune, appearing in the edition of that newspaper February 28, 1948:

SETTING OUT FALSE HARBOR LIGHTS

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

The boys who made our Continental Army began to drill on the village greens as apprehension rose because the people were taxed beyond endurance. The Americans of that time didn't like to be pushed about. Liberty or death was their rally cry.

The Governors who represented His Majesty, the English crown, were dull fellows. They had never acquired the ingenious technique used today by phony intellectuals to lure gullible liberals to wreck our freedoms.

Pirates used to put out false harbor lights to lure ships to shoals where cargoes could be plundered. It was not a pretty trick. But it is played today by rascals who lure teachers, preachers, and uplifters to fall for the fake.

Paul Revere rode through "every Middlesex village and farm" shouting "The Red Coats are coming." The Red Coats. Our enemies were dressed for exactly what they were. They were not Trojan horses.

Wearing such names as "Liberty," "Freedom," "American," "Defenders of Democracy," "Sons of the Republic," our enemies appear to be innocent of sinister attack upon our national life. They not only appear to be innocent of evil but by their names they are alluring. They seem to define the very cause every true citizen could wish to champion, the very rights and freedoms that our colonial forefathers fought for, the individual and the collective rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution.

Well-meaning citizens, none too enlightened and none too alert, always eager to join some noble crusade, fall over each other to lend their names to these agencies that are designed and directed to end the American way of life.

Here is a perfect example of how the trick is played. How fool professors and preachers, knowing no better, lend themselves to the destruction of everything that Washington made and bequeathed us. They lend themselves to disunion, to destroy the very thing that Abraham Lincoln lived to conserve.

A Statement of American Educators. Sounds perfectly simple and good, doesn't it? America is the best-educated country on earth. We have great educators. Some of the most useful and purposeful public men we have had to help us enlighten our people and to enlarge our lives have been our educators.

So when we hear that the American educators have a statement to make, people, particularly the purposeful-minded uplifters are eager to know what the statement is and how to join the crusade of American educators.

A new Nation-wide Communist front is being hatched. It will be called a Statement of American Educators.

President Truman and Attorney General Tom Clark within a few weeks will receive an appeal to remove from the Government's list of subversive organizations the 11 so-called Marxist schools which the Department of Justice found to be adjuncts of the Communist Party.

The plea will be in the form of an open letter with a statement bearing the names of professors and administrators from universities throughout the country.

The statement will speak in lofty terms of "academic freedom" and "our national ideal of freedom of thought."

But the catch is this: The whole deal has been cooked up by the Communist schools themselves.

As bait, the names of 12 professors are affixed to letters now making the academic rounds collecting signatures to the Statement of American Educators. Replies are to be addressed to Prof. Lyman R. Bradley, 575 Avenue of the Americas, New York 11, N. Y.

Omitted from the letter is the fact that No. 575 is the headquarters of the Jefferson School, chief of the Communist Party's training schools listed in the Clark report. Omitted also is the fact that Professor Bradley (New York University), is chairman of the board of trustees of the Jefferson School, Communist school headquarters.

Nor is this mentioned: Three more of the 12 are trustees of the Jefferson School—Prof. Dorothy Brewster, Columbia; Prof. Margaret Schlauch, New York University; and Prof. Dirk J. Struik, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. One is a former trustee—Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch, Columbia—and one is an instructor there—Philip S. Foner, who was dismissed from City College in 1941 as a secret member of the Communist Party.

A seventh professor of the 12—F. O. Matthiessen, Harvard, is trustee of the Samuel Adams School in Boston, another of those cited as Communist.

The letter signed by the 12 professors is addressed "Dear Colleague."

"As educators," it begins, "we are perhaps more sensitive than some of our fellow Americans to the social and political implications of events and actions taking place today. We could not call ourselves responsible members of the teaching profession were this not so."

Then it asks for their signatures to the prepared statement.

Citing the Jefferson School as an example, the statement holds that the 11 schools are victimized by thought control, and thought police simply because they are teaching the philosophy of Marxism.

The Jefferson School was set up by the Communist Party to teach, not theoretical Marxism, but revolutionary Stalinist-Marxism.

According to the prepared statement, "the right to study Marxism" is being "denied by arbitrary government fiat." The fact is that no one has even suggested closing down these schools. They were included in the Clark subversive list as a guide for helping Government agencies to determine whether any of their employees are Communists.

One of the signers of the come-on letter is Prof. Colston E. Warne (Amherst), who last November resigned a Federal job in protest against President Truman's loyalty check. A fine outfit, these educators.

We knew whom we were fighting when our enemies wore red coats. But it is difficult to fight the enemy among us who hides the red beneath his coat. Our educators are supposed to be smart. Smart enough to find the bacteria foe under the microscope. Smart enough to find the chemical elements that can be employed for our benefit and to warn us of the elements that may destroy us. Well, if they are smart enough for that they should be smart enough to find the intrigue, the hypocrisies, and the falsehoods in those who masquerade behind false fronts. They should be smart enough to reveal and not conceal the subtle attacks upon our freedoms. They should be smart enough to warn the poor goons who haven't enough perception to detect false harbor lights.

He is a pretty pathetic preacher or teacher who can be so misled by the false use of noble names and terms that he lends himself to strengthen forces that are opposed to the only humanitarian constitutional forms that ever wove the spirit of the Golden Rule into the fabric of a people's flag.

The art of outrage that gave this Nation birth is beginning to return to the awakening conscience of the people. We are not going to endure these deceptions much longer. We are going to put in Washington a National Government which will prosecute the Reds beneath the coats as in the beginning we fought, fair and open, the red that was on the coat. Then again, as in the beginning of our national life, we will trust our schools, our colleges, and our churches to be the fortresses of our freedoms.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, if one wishes to know the Arabs' side of the tremendously important Palestine controversy; if one wishes to read perhaps the most notable speech delivered in this country within the last several months, then let me respectfully submit that one must read the magnificent and factual address of Mr. El-Khouri, Syrian statesman, before the Security Council on Tuesday, February 24, 1948.

Ninety-five percent of the Congress and of the American people who know the facts and the issues of this controversy are ready to admit that we have made a terrible mistake. Honest nations, like honest men, admit their mistakes and seek to correct them and to mitigate injuries resulting from their errors. Our position in the United Nations Assembly on the Palestine matter is wholly untenable. We are seeking to meddle with the sovereignty and with vested rights of an ancient and honorable race without any moral or legal justification whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have not been told the facts. They have not heard the Arabs' side of the case. It is high time that we opened our eyes. For the sake of history, in order that this Congress and the American people may know something of the issues involved, I have obtained permission to insert in

the RECORD the address of Mr. El-Khouri. Let me recommend it to the careful reading of every American patriot. The address follows:

Mr. EL-KHOURI (Syria). As has already been stated by the representative of the United States, the documents under discussion today are three. The first is the resolution of the General Assembly on the partition plan, and the second and third are the first report and the special report, respectively, of the Palestine Commission. I shall begin my statement by making a short analysis of the General Assembly's resolution and of the conditions in which it was adopted.

Having disposed of all the items on its agenda for its second session, the General Assembly was detained for a few days for the discussion of the only really complex item on that agenda, Palestine. Under the pressure of time, the General Assembly advanced and adopted in a rush its resolution of November 29, giving no attention to the proposals which were submitted for more adequate and more pacific solutions.

It did not care even to discuss and vote upon the legal contentions frequently and repeatedly submitted by various delegations with a view to obtaining, under article 96 of the Charter, an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice, although this demand for an advisory opinion was discussed and defeated in the ad hoc committee by a close vote of 21 to 20, and would, therefore, in the circumstances, have been an appropriate matter to be discussed and voted upon by the General Assembly.

Three meetings were scheduled for November 26 in order to terminate discussion of this item and to vote upon it. But when, during the morning meeting, the sponsors of the partition plan realized that certain representatives had declared in their speeches that they would vote against the resolution and that others had declared their intention of abstaining, they maneuvered to adjourn the afternoon meeting and to cancel the evening meeting. They realized, it seems, that their scheme would be definitely rejected if put to the vote on that day. Through a suggestion by the president and a vote of 24 to 20 they canceled the evening meeting also. In this way they secured a 2-day recess, fixing the next meeting for Friday, November 28.

In the meantime influence was being vigorously brought to bear on the governments of certain member states in an attempt to change their attitude and to have them give affirmative votes instead of negative votes or abstentions. The maneuvers were completed on November 29, and certain states were brought into line. Other delegations which had declared their intention of abstaining were also won over. There is no doubt whatsoever that had the delegations been left to vote according to their declarations at the meeting of November 26 the partition scheme would have been condemned to failure.

After the resolution was passed by that artificial majority it was subjected to severe and caustic criticism by the world press and many impartial jurists. Twenty-four delegations, representing two-thirds of the total population of the member states of the United Nations amounting to about 1,000,000,000 inhabitants, refused to support the resolution by flatly rejecting it or by refusing the vote for it. Many representatives, even of those who supported the scheme, discredited and condemned it severely.

Aware of its incapacity to enforce such an aggressive measure, the General Assembly shifted the burden of its implementation onto the Security Council. The Security Council, therefore, is seized by a request from the General Assembly—

(a) to take the necessary measures as provided for in the plan for the future government of Palestine and its implementation—and here, instead of leaving the Security Council to exercise its functions as contained in the Charter, the General Assembly leaves the Security Council to exercise such functions as exist in the plan of partition;

(b) to consider, if circumstances during the transitional period require such consideration, whether the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to peace. If it decides that such a threat does exist, and, in order to maintain international peace and security, it should, under articles 39 and 41 of the Charter, supplement the authorization of the General Assembly by taking certain measures to empower the United Nations Commission, as provided for in the resolution, to exercise in Palestine the functions which are designated and assigned to it by the resolution; and

(c) to determine what constitutes breach of the peace or act of aggression, in accordance with article 39, or any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged by this resolution.

The recommendations in paragraphs (b) and (c) in the resolution are put in the phraseology of instructions as to the definition or interpretation of the threat to the peace and as to what the Security Council should do in backing the functions assigned to the Commission.

Such instructions, as outlined in the two paragraphs of the resolution referred to above, cannot be of any effect on the Security Council in the exercise of its duties, since the functions of the Security Council are limitatively defined in the Charter. The resolutions of the General Assembly may not in any way add to, delete from, or modify those functions. What concerns us here is the first paragraph, which contains a request to take measures for the implementation of the resolution as a whole.

The Security Council is an independent organ of the United Nations, endowed with complete liberty to act within the provisions of the Charter, irrespective of any recommendations or instructions given to it by any other body. The recommendations of the General Assembly, therefore, are legitimately subject to reconsideration by the Security Council, to be scrutinized as to their correctness and their compliance with the powers assigned to the General Assembly and to the Security Council by the Charter.

The General Assembly is not infallible. Like any other body seized with public affairs, it is liable to commit blunders. Especially is this true in such a case as the Palestine problem, one party to which are the Zionists, who are backed by a most gigantic and powerful organization with ramifications in every country, possessing the means to exert their influence in all the capitals of the member states. The more sinister is this influence when we remember that their ambitions are backed by two of the biggest powers represented in the United Nations.

For these and other reasons many members were overtaken by an erroneous political conception of the matter, thus bypassing all legal and juridical aspects of the case. They gave no weight whatsoever to the sacred pledges in the United Nations Charter, nor to the historical background of the situation, nor even to the fundamental principles of international law and human rights.

In their support of the resolution, they relied on the report of seven members of the Special Committee on Palestine who sojourned in Palestine for a few weeks, during which they came in contact with the Jewish agency and obtained from it all the information which that agency wished to give them—and withal the special desires of that agency in reference to their aspirations for Palestine.

The result was the issuance of that partition scheme, which comprised all the absurdities and violations of rights that could be imagined. Those seven persons surpassed in their generosity toward the Jews the terms of the Balfour Declaration and the limits of the act of the mandate.

With all its injustices and illegalities, the mandate defined the Jewish grant in Palestine only as a national home in Palestine. The General Assembly by its resolution and the other recommendations of the majority of the committee actually gave the Jews a sovereign state. Furthermore, the mandate reserved certain rights to the Arabs as the majority inhabitants of the country, stating that the Jewish immigration to Palestine should not prejudice the rights and position of the Arabs (art. 6 of the mandate). The resolution of the General Assembly and the partition plan overrode this reservation. It prejudiced both the rights and the position of the Arabs by depriving them of sovereign rights in two-thirds of the area of their country.

The mandate envisaged the integrity of Palestine. It referred, in its last article, to one government in Palestine which would assume authority at the termination of the mandate. The General Assembly resolution violated this basic principle by envisaging the creation of two separate governments.

The partition scheme put half a million Arabs in the Jewish state, along with half a million Jews, at the same time allowing unlimited Jewish immigration to that state so as to allow the Jews to become an overwhelming majority there and to compel the Arabs to be driven out of their own homes.

The city of Jaffa was taken out of the Jewish state and annexed to the Arab state, but it was placed in the enclave surrounded by the Jewish state, without any land connection with the Arab state. Even the land properties surrounding it were kept in the Jewish state. Such conditions condemn that city to sure fatality.

If the Jewish minority, which represents one-third of the population in Palestine, were unjustly to be given the right of self-determination, separately from the Arab majority, the same distorted and arbitrary process should apply to the Arab minority within the Jewish state; and, consequently, the Jewish state itself should now be partitioned between Jews and Arabs.

Since the early part of the seventh century—or for 1,300 years—the Arabs of Palestine have been continuously enjoying independence, being an integral part of the Arab and Ottoman Empires successively. They were never treated as subjugated people. During the last four centuries they have shared in all the rights and duties of free nationals on an equal footing with the Turks and other Arabs of the Ottoman Empire. It cannot be expected of these Arabs now, having rebelled against their own government in the past to secure their national entity and independence, to capitulate meekly and humbly to Jewish domination. They cannot be accused of aggression if they defend their natural rights by opposing the superimposition of a foreign sovereignty on their own fatherland, forcing them to bow submissively before the Jewish masters.

The General Assembly is not intended to be a central government of the world empowered with unlimited authority to create states and to violate the integrity of countries. Nor is it allowed to impose government regimes under specified constitutional forms, nor to dictate economic unions between states nor to detach territories and cities and put them under permanent trusteeships. It is not legally entitled to appoint commissions, delegating to them powers and prerogatives which the General Assembly itself does not possess.

Finally, it has no right to ask the Security Council to take charge of the implementation of an illegal resolution.

The General Assembly is bound to act within the limits of the Charter provisions; it is not free to act arbitrarily or capriciously.

The Charter is an international treaty which must be respected by all its signatories.

Palestine is a mandated territory, and its question cannot be treated beyond the stipulations governing mandated territories. Such territories can only be declared independent and left free to determine their regime of government through a constituent assembly representing all the population. In the case of the population of such territories attaining maturity for independence, they will be helped by applying the trusteeship system, by virtue of a trusteeship agreement concluded in accordance with article 79 of the Charter. The newly invented measures adopted by that artificial majority of the General Assembly not only violate the letter and spirit of the Charter, but neither can they find even a fictitious justification, resting on any historical precedent, any existing practice, or any elementary rule of common sense.

The partition of India was cited as an example. That partition, however, was accomplished by mutual consent of both parties—majority and minority—who are both original inhabitants of the country and neither of them foreign and intruding newcomers, as in the case of Palestine.

Democracy is defined as the government of the people, where the wishes of the majority should prevail and the political and social rights of the minority should be guaranteed and lawfully protected. Under this rule the right of self-determination is to be exercised by the freely expressed and openly exhibited wishes of the majority. This is the principle universally respected by all countries and applying actually or potentially to all. Why must the Palestinians alone make an exception to this fundamental rule of human society? Is it because foreign groups of Jews do not wish to live peacefully with the Arabs? With what right does a foreign religious minority dictate its wishes upon the majority of the lawful owners of the country in determining the political and social organism of that country?

I say religious minority—and stress that word "religious," to emphasize the fact that Judaism is only a religion. Nobody can deny that the Jews of today are composed of numerous races and nationalities, converted to the Jewish faith during the past centuries over all the world. The adherents of this faith comprise all colors, from the dark Negro to the blond Scandinavian. By no means can they claim to be a race, being components of all races of the world, just like the Christians or Moslems. I need not repeat here what I and other speakers have stressed in the General Assembly and in all committees relating to the history of the Jews of eastern Europe and their racial origin. Anyone who desires to know the facts may easily read them in the Jewish Encyclopedia in the library of the United Nations here at Lake Success.

Furthermore, the Jews of today are nationals of various States. None of them is without a nationality or stateless. This applies even to those who emigrated to Palestine during the last 25 years. Many of them still hold their former certificates of nationality and refuse to be naturalized as Palestinian citizens. We learned that out of the 700,000 Jews in Palestine, only about 250,000 Jews hold citizenship of that country.

Jews who are in the displaced-persons camps in Europe may easily return to their homes where, as it is claimed, sound democracy prevails and will be welcome there, as the representatives of these States declared here in their speeches. If they are not war criminals, there could be no imaginable objection to their repatriation. Their desire to go to Palestine, incited and kept aflame by Zionist agents, is not justified on the basis of humanitarian considerations. Rather, it rests on political objectives which ought to be sharply condemned by the United Nations as a scheme for disturbing the peace and creating feuds in the friendly relationships of the member states.

The General Assembly in its resolution tacitly recognized Judaism as a special nationality for the Jews of the world. It permitted United States of America citizens to appear before its organs to represent the Jews of Palestine and advocate their case. In this connection, it is interesting to reflect here on the statement made by Mr. Shertok before the ad hoc committee. While referring to the hypothetical Arab return to Spain, Mr. Shertok stated that the Jewish women anywhere tell their children about the ancient Jewish glories of Palestine and that they kindle in their hearts the hope of returning there. He spoke of circles of Jewish youth who study the language and sing the songs of Palestine and learn the crafts useful for immigration to that country. This is a very significant confession to come from a Zionist leader.

This desire of the Jews to go to Palestine and revive their remote history, however, does not give them any right to that country with which they had no connection for 20 centuries. Coveting does not create right. Even in the Ten Commandments they are prohibited to covet. They had better be advised to give up this fantastic dream and assimilate with their compatriots, wherever they are. One cannot be properly loyal to two nationalities, any more than he can serve two masters or worship two gods.

This Jewish nationality, recognized for world Jewry by the General Assembly, tacitly recognized, may lead to very serious repercussions to the Jews themselves. The establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine intensifies the misunderstandings already existing between the Jews and their compatriots in other places, and may lead to sad consequences which are likely to create intricate problems and lay new and heavy burdens on the shoulders of the United Nations.

I spoke before on the limitations of the General Assembly in relation to the Security Council. The General Assembly is also limited in authority and capacity in relation to the mandatory. The United Kingdom, as mandatory of Palestine, requested the General Assembly merely to make recommendations as to the future government of that country.

It is obvious that the United Kingdom did not act under its obligations to help the inhabitants of Palestine to attain independence by creating, during the long period of its mandate, the necessary governmental organs able to assume power; nor had it submitted an agreement under article 79 of the Charter for a further delay to complete its obligations. Its behavior in this respect was not in conformity with the provisions of its mandate nor with the stipulations of the Charter.

The General Assembly in that case was expected to make the requested recommendations to the United Kingdom under the limitations of its authority as specified in the Charter. I called the attention of the General Assembly to these points, first by a letter to the Secretary-General on April 10, 1947, and later in a detailed speech in the General Assembly in which I denied the competence of the General Assembly to do more than that. But instead of adhering to the precepts of the Charter, the General Assembly exceeded the limits of its authority and issued a resolution undermining all the sacred principles of justice and equity.

Being aware that the lawful owners of Palestine will not accept this violation of their vital rights and are likely to oppose it by force, and acknowledging that it has no authority to enforce it upon them, the General Assembly threw off the burden onto the shoulders of the Security Council, requesting it to take the responsibility of its implementation.

The proper procedure for the Security Council is to study this resolution and determine whether it is justified in taking this charge upon itself.

In the first place, the recommendations of the General Assembly are not imperative on those to whom they are addressed. We have numerous precedents during the short past life of the General Assembly: The Indo-South African dispute, the Balkan situation, the Interim Committee, the Korean question, the admission of new members. The most recent instance is the veto practice, in which the representative of the Soviet Union on December 19, 1947, refused even to include the recommendations of the General Assembly in the agenda of the Security Council, and declared that he would oppose any discussion or decision on the subject.

Although I represent a nonpermanent member in the Security Council and cannot obstruct decision by the privilege of the veto, I am entitled to discuss and remind.

The Security Council is requested by the General Assembly to endorse a commission of five members nominated by the President, who by so doing bypassed rule 82 of the rules of procedure concerning elections by secret ballot. This Commission will be exercising an illegal and usurped authority. Its members are called to replace the mandatory power during the transitory period by promulgating regulations, establishing councils of governments, appointing high commands of militia forces, supervising the military activities, convoying forces from the Security Council, exercising sovereign authority in Palestine and so on, without being trustees holding a trusteeship agreement, which is the only way by which the General Assembly may create any authority on non-self-governing territories.

In such circumstances the Security Council cannot back the application of this illegally constituted Commission.

The sponsors of the partition scheme cited article 22 of the Charter as justifying the creation of this Commission. This article reads:

"The General Assembly may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions."

It is to be asked here: Is the administration of any country, one of the functions of the General Assembly, to be delegated to a subsidiary organ? These functions are defined in the Charter, and none of them refers even tacitly to such authority, except the trusteeship system in chapter XII, which was not applied in this case.

They also quoted articles 10 and 14 of the Charter which read respectively:

Article 10: "The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter, and * * * may make recommendations to the members of the United Nations or to the Security Council, or to both, on any such questions or matters."

It is obvious from article 10 that the competence of the General Assembly is limited to discussing and making recommendations within the scope of the Charter, but not outside of that scope.

Article 14: "* * * the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

Article 14 authorizes the General Assembly to recommend peaceful adjustments and peaceful settlements within the limits of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, not to recommend measures of a warlike nature, challenging the Arabs in particular and the Moslem world in general to resort to arms in self-defense. Further, the

General Assembly is authorized to make recommendations with respect to the pacific settlement of disputes, as outlined in chapter VI of the Charter. However, the recommendations of the General Assembly stated that articles 39 and 41 of the Charter should be applied, these articles appearing in chapter VII. This means that the General Assembly is making recommendations not for a peaceful settlement, but for enforcement, which the General Assembly is not entitled to do.

The purposes of the United Nations are to develop friendly relations among the nations and remove threats to peace (article 1), not create threats to peace and hostile relations among nations.

Again let us examine another phase of the partition scheme relating to the arbitrary act of the General Assembly in the matter of the economic union, enforced on the two states which are to be given birth by the recommendations of the General Assembly if they are to be adopted by the member nations.

We would like to know whether the General Assembly in this instance is or is not acting in conformity with the Charter when it recommends the creating of a perpetual body to administer and implement an economic union between two supposedly independent and sovereign states, thus jeopardizing and negating the real independence and sovereignty of both states.

It is also conditioned that the recognition of independence to each of the two states and the appropriation of a share of the common revenues depend on acceptance of the economic union as framed by the resolution. The state which does not acquiesce in this economic union will be deprived of its part of the incomes from the principal sources of taxation, and denied the right of independence. Three members are to be appointed by the Economic and Social Council, vested with the decisive vote in the Board of the Economic Union. I wonder if there is any provision in the Charter to make such a momentous recommendation binding on any people or state to which it is dictated. No nation is presumed to accept such recommendation and to capitulate to such measures violating the primary basis of sovereignty and investing in a group of foreigners such wide authority over the revenues of the country against the will of the majority of the people.

Would the Security Council be justified in recognizing the commission of five and the so-called Board of Economic Union, or in backing and enforcing their plans? I do not believe that the Security Council can do so as long as it remains loyal and faithful to the pledges in the Charter.

Moreover, the city of Jerusalem is subjected to a permanent, false trusteeship regime without a trustee and without a trusteeship agreement. The fact that this city contains holy places does not justify the deprivation of its inhabitants from the political freedom enjoyed by other human beings of the democratic world. In fact, not only Jerusalem but many other places in Palestine are considered as holy, especially by the Christian world. It would have been enough to safeguard the holy shrines wherever they are found and leave the capital of Palestine free from political and social discriminations.

Further, the status proposed by the recommendation of the general assembly for the city of Jerusalem has no justification in the charter. Neither the general assembly in nominating the governor nor the trusteeship council in taking any action in that respect would be in the right path of loyalty to their functions as defined in the charter.

The general assembly recognized the economic union of the two states as inevitable and indispensable, while it considered the political union in a unitary state under federation or cantonization as not possible in view of the strained relations between the two peoples. Yet, if the political union is not possible in practice, the economic union is necessarily destined to the same fate.

The United Kingdom, after an experience of 30 years in Palestine, found that the mandate, in its prescribed conditions, was unworkable because of that provision which gives the Jews a national home in Palestine. It is to be noted that the new scheme of giving them a sovereign independent state in Palestine will be more unworkable and more impossible of implementation, leading to the same impasse which forced the United Kingdom to refuse participation in the enforcement of this scheme. The United Kingdom, profiting by the experience of the past, and cautioned by the certain knowledge of the tragic results which are sure to accrue from imposing the partition plan, took the only logical decision under the circumstances.

The same attitude based on a sound apprehension of the situation, led all the states of the Orient represented in the United Nations to oppose the scheme or refrain from supporting it. All those representative states of Asia, the largest continent of the globe, were unanimous in refusing to support the partition plan. Those states include the neighboring Arab states of the Near East, of which Palestine is the main gate.

The delegations of the states which abstained from or rejected the partition plan were explicitly on the opposing side. It is factually very significant that the votes which favored this unhappy resolution, favor not only a third of the aggregate population of the member states, numbering about 500,000,000, but also a third, numbering about 1,000,000,000, which is least affected directly or vitally in the vicissitudes of the future of Palestine or in the implications of the partition scheme. Moreover, no member state has yet adopted the recommendations addressed to it in this resolution.

To the eastern nations Palestine is a symbol of the struggle between power politics and international democracy, between the old order in which Asiatic and African peoples were considered legitimate objects of exploitation by the western powers, and a new order which seeks equality of sovereignty among all nations and all peoples within their own areas. In view of all these facts, it follows that the representatives who voted against partition or who refrained from giving it their support cannot be held responsible for the implementation of a scheme which they consider invalid, illegal, immoral, unjust, and violating the principles of the United Nations Charter.

In advocating the partition plan it was said that it was the only way out and that any other plan would need force for its execution. But we have submitted another plan for a unitary state of Palestine in which all citizens would participate in the assumption of rights and duties on a democratic basis of equality. We were told that the Jews do not wish to be a minority. We said that they should not count themselves a religious party and so remain a minority. In the democratic way of life there should be no discrimination as to religion. Political and social parties would be formed regardless of faith or race. In this case Arabs and Jews would intermingle and work together in the interest of the country. The political parties would be open to Moslems, Christians, and Jews. The party with the majority of votes would form the government, it being understood that all minorities, whether political, religious, or otherwise, would be guaranteed their constitutional rights. The unitary state is the only right and just solution, while partition is wrong and unjust. If the use of force is necessary for either one of them, it would have been normal to apply force to uphold justice rather than to enforce injustice. The use of force for a just cause may be justified, but its use to support an unlawful cause and flagrant aggression is a criminal action.

It was alleged by the representatives of some big powers in the General Assembly that, in dealing with such political questions as that of Palestine, no weight should be given to legal or historical aspects. This presumption was also echoed by some representatives of small states, endeavoring to justify the distortion of the concepts of justice and the right path of international law.

In connection with this dangerous practice, I quote here an appeal issued recently, on October 4, 1947, by the American Society of International Law, as follows:

"Society is experiencing a profound shock today in observing the tendency of states to put policy before law and to shape their conduct in ways which are contemptuous of standards established by international law. The welfare of civilization depends upon the determination of the peoples of every land to oppose such tendencies at whatever cost."

Had the General Assembly accepted our repeatedly submitted demands to obtain an advisory opinion on the legal aspects of the problem of Palestine, it would have received advice substantiating this indisputable doctrine expressed by the American Society of International Law. But justice cannot be expected from authors of injustice, and legality in an illegal act cannot be sought from the same persons who have committed that illegal act.

The General Assembly adopted a resolution on November 20, 1947, on the proposal of the Australian delegation, urging the need for greater use by the United Nations and its organs of the International Court of Justice, recommending that important points of law, which have arisen in the course of the activities of the United Nations organs and involving questions of principle which it is desirable to have settled, including in particular, points of law relating to the interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations, should be referred to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion.

This is a case where the legality of the terms of the mandate and the competence of the General Assembly are sharply contested. Many delegations expressed their doubts as to the legality of the proposal for partition and denounced it as contrary to the provisions of the Charter. In spite of the formal proposal to request an advisory legal opinion from the court on this important issue, the General Assembly bypassed the demand without even discussing it and putting it to vote.

The Moslems of the world, numbering about 400,000,000 in Asia, Africa, and eastern Europe, being good believers in the three great founders of monotheistic religions—Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed—consider Palestine a Holy Land and look to Jewish, Christian, and Moslem shrines as sacred places to be preserved and honored. They have reverently guarded them throughout the last 13 centuries of Islamic sway in Palestine. They cannot suffer a Jewish domination of these holy places for the simple reason that the Jews do not believe in the holiness of Christian and Moslem shrines, being unbelievers in Mohammed and Jesus Christ and their faiths. This is an aspect of very great importance to oriental Christians and Moslems and should be so to all believers throughout the world. The reaction on puritan Moslems and Christians of forcibly erecting a sole Jewish authority over those holy places should be seriously borne in mind, considering the sad results which this reaction is likely to entail.

The people of the seven states of the Arab League are especially affected by inserting into their midst an alien state composed of a people whose wide ambitions of aggrandizement are well known to all the world. Palestine is surrounded by Arab countries and

is intimately related to them by racial, linguistic, religious, political, cultural, economic, social, and sentimental unity, and has been for the last 13 centuries sharing with them the same destiny within the Arab and Ottoman Empires.

It is natural that these Arabs should consider the driving of such a foreign wedge into the heart of their land a flagrant aggression against the vital basis of their existence. They feel obliged to plunge headlong into opposing this scheme in a struggle of life and death. They are quite convinced that world Jewry, backed by some imperialistic powers, is resolved to lay this bridgehead on their coast, to step over it and dominate the economics of the east. The Arabs will be the first victims of this horrible plot. The Zionist leaders are telling their followers that this solution is only the first step toward their much wider program. The terrorists are even fighting against those of their coreligionists who accepted this solution.

The Palestine Arabs, their confidence in the justice of the United Nations having received this shock by having that spearhead thrust into their heart, feel now that they have no other choice but to resort to self-defense in repelling this frightful danger.

Nobody with any sense of justice can blame the Arabs for being frightened by this situation threatening their existence, or for struggling desperately for their lives against this abominable aggression. The Security Council, constituted to preserve peace which is based on right and justice, is expected to act on these principles and redress the unfortunate error hastily committed by the General Assembly under the pressure of time combined with the tremendous pressure exercised by the Zionists, who, in the words of one of their prominent leaders, Dr. Silver, boasted: "This generation of Jews drove an empire behind barbed wires and forced a decision from the United Nations."

If this boast reflects what was going on in the General Assembly and elsewhere, it would be superfluous for me to comment on the implications.

I am hopeful that the members of the Security Council will treat this momentous question in a manner which will confirm the confidence of the world in our integrity and loyalty to the principles of justice and law upon which our Charter is founded.

The nations whose representatives met in San Francisco constituted by this Charter a universal society of mankind uniting the civilized, democratic, peace-loving nations. We understand by "civilized nations" those which have adopted the doctrine that there are universal standards of law, of right, and of justice, which all rational men are bound to acknowledge and respect. If we disrespect this doctrine we are violating the pledges which we have taken under that sacred international treaty.

Under these principles which are binding on each member of the United Nations, the actions of the Security Council in the Palestine question must be governed by the conviction that the partition plan embodied in the recommendations of the General Assembly is illegal, unjust, and in conflict with international law and with the vital rights of the original inhabitants of Palestine.

This is not an Arab-Jewish issue, nor one of East and West. It is much more fundamental and serious. It is an issue between blind emotions and reason, between natural rights and false rights acquired under false pretenses and in an unlawful manner, between the orderly processes of international law and the jungle rules of power politics, between principles and expediency. The Arabs represented in the United Nations are challenging the mighty powers of the world to show them wherein the demands of their brethren in Palestine are inconsistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter. Conversely, they demand to know how the Zionist aspirations for a state in Palestine can possibly be reconciled or be consistent with the historic facts, with the fundamental principles of law, with democracy and, finally, with the very Charter which we have adopted as our constitution. If we make an exception of Palestine, fully realizing that the Zionist demand for partition of that country is unconstitutional and contrary to the Charter, then we have committed a serious mistake and a serious wrong, and we have established an evil precedent. It is a precedent that can easily turn against us and devour us. No one will or can respect an unjust decision by judges who are fully convinced of its injustice and who have on more than one occasion admitted this, pleading special circumstances and political expediency. Let us not play with fire. The precedent of the Palestine partition is more serious than any political situation that can conceivably arise from annulling it.

I have received letters from different prominent people in the United States assuring me that this precedent would lead other elements, even in the United States, to demand partition and the right to exercise self-determination. There are elements in the United States, such as the Negroes, who would be ready to do this. Not alone in the United States, but in every state in the world, there are certain elements who would be ready to profit by this precedent and use it for their own purposes.

In spite of the invalidity of the partition scheme, of its being so far removed from the precepts of right and justice, and of the impracticability of its implementation, we find the Zionists and their backers, in these days, frequently claiming that the honor and prestige of the United Nations depend upon the implementation of this scheme. They say that, unless it is carried out by force, this international Organization will collapse. They fervently urged the dispatch of an international force to Palestine.

This is a wholly false claim. The General Assembly merely gave an opinion. It offered a solution the right or wrong of which could not be determined without its first being submitted to the interested parties. Its execution must depend on whether or not they accept it. The General Assembly of the United Nations is not infallible; its recommendations are not mandatory. Furthermore, it was led astray by the false reports which the Zionists were feeding it. The General Assembly did not make a decision on this subject; it only recommended that the United Kingdom and other member nations adopt the proposed solution. Not one of them has done so as yet.

The honor and prestige of the United Nations do not depend on the execution of its recommendations. They depend rather on its sense of justice, its uprightness, and its respect for the rights of the peoples. It will surely collapse if it deviates from law and justice, if its recommendations are in violation of right and justice, and, if it endeavors to force an unjust decision.

The wise men of old said: "The state is a garden; its fence is justice." Certainly the fence of the United Nations should be justice, which would keep it from being run down; not persistence in wrong and injustice.

The wise men of old also said: "To return to the right is better than to persist in the wrong." If we therefore wish truly to serve the United Nations and to save its prestige, it is our duty to turn it off the wrong path, and not to collude with it in its persistence in injustice and gross blunders.

The Zionists demanded of the members of the United Nations that they pass the partition scheme. They assured the members that the Arabs would accept it; that the Arabs would not be able to resist; that the Arabs were bluffing; and that, even if they did resist and refused to comply with it, the Zionists by themselves would be able to stop them. The Zionists, in other words, challenged the Arabs, and the Arabs appear to have accepted the Zionist challenge. It now appears that those assurances given by the Zionists are worthless. The Arabs have flatly rejected the partition scheme and are determined to oppose it. It is only right and proper that those who gave the assurances should alone bear the consequences. It is only right and proper that the United Nations reconsider its decision, which was based on those false promises.

The Zionists today are urging the powers to organize a world invasion against Palestine, not unlike the old religious invasion which took place nine centuries ago to deliver the Holy Land from Moslem rule and to establish in its place a Christian rule. The only difference between the two invasions is that the former was in favor of Christianity, while the latter is in favor of the Jews. In the former, the Christian world rose to defend its holy places, and to deliver them from the Moslems, who revered those holy places and held them just as sacred as Christians did. Is it possible that today the Christian world is seeking to deliver these same holy places from their rightful guardians and to give them to those who are not their rightful guardians? Is it logical for our present civilization, which has denounced the old crusades, to approve, and back the Jewish crusade in the twentieth century? The old crusade was in response to an appeal by the Pope, and the Zionists today are trying to revive this notion to satisfy their own irrational aspirations.

In the Security Council there are at present five states represented—two permanent members and three nonpermanent members—which did not approve the partition scheme, and it is not likely that they will now accept the responsibility of carrying out this partition by force. Others voted for it only on the understanding that it was merely a recommendation to the member nations to adopt it. No steps can be taken before this adoption is constitutionally effected by the nations to which the recommendations of the General Assembly were addressed.

In the face of this recommendation, the Arabs, on their part, can do no less than any nation faced by a similar situation would do for the integrity of their country and their national identity. They now put their trust in the General Assembly and the Security Council to reconsider this resolution.

I now come to the reports under discussion. However, before speaking on the contents of the two reports submitted by the Palestine Commission, I feel that it is necessary again to call attention to the two contentions which I raised at a previous meeting against the method of setting up this Commission, and to the invalidity of the partition plan at this advanced stage.

The first contention is that the formation of the Palestine Commission was inconsistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which state in rule 82 that all elections in the General Assembly shall be taken by secret ballot and that there shall be no nominations. The resolution of the General Assembly recommended that "the members represented on this Commission shall be elected by the General Assembly" (pt. 1, sec. B (1)).

Realizing that the members of the Palestine Commission were not elected by secret ballot in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on November 29, in accordance with the rule quoted above, but that they were only nominated by the President of the General Assembly in flagrant violation of that rule, which definitely prohibits nominations in all elections of the General Assembly, it is obvious that the setting up of this Commission was out of order, and consequently its members are not competent to

take up the functions assigned to it. It cannot be argued that no objections were made at the time to the nominations, since silence in the face of an illegal act does not make that act legal. The rules of procedure were designed to obviate the abuse of complete freedom of vote by eliminating nominations.

The second contention is based on the text of the General Assembly resolution, which reads:

"The General Assembly recommends to the United Kingdom, as the mandatory power for Palestine, and to all other member states of the United Nations, the adoption and implementation, with regard to the future government of Palestine, of the plan of partition with economic union."

According to my understanding of this text, I consider that the General Assembly did not finally decide on the partition plan, which it knows it has no right to do, but only recommended to the United Kingdom and to all the other member states of the United Nations to adopt and implement the partition plan with economic union. The General Assembly prepared this plan and made recommendations to the member nations to adopt it if they agreed thereto. It would follow that this plan was to be presented to all the member nations, where it would undergo the usual formalities of adoption. Nothing of this sort has been done by any of the nations as yet. It cannot be pretended that the vote of the delegations in the meeting of November 29 stands for the formal adoption of the plan by the member nations. The General Assembly voted unanimously on resolutions regarding narcotics and traffic in women and children, and on other resolutions which were based on similar recommendations, but their adoption was subject to formal acceptance by the respective governments of the member states.

I solicited the opinion of some illustrious jurists in this country on this contention, and they affirmed my understanding of this issue as just stated. One of them added that the implementation of this plan assuredly requires the use of military force by the member states, and that the acceptance of such a responsibility renders acquiescence by the governments of at least two-thirds of the member nations necessary.

It is to be noted also that the voters for the resolution voted only to recommend to the member nations to adopt the plan, as is clearly stated in the resolution itself, and nothing more. It was left to the various governments to exercise their liberty to accept or turn down the responsibility accruing from the enforcement of this plan. Under these circumstances it seems to be clear that nothing can be done before the adoption of the plan by the required majority of the member nations through their formal processes.

In view of these considerations there is nothing to justify the stand taken by some that the prestige of the United Nations will collapse if the General Assembly's resolution is rejected. Such a claim is, indeed, the creation of false propaganda intended merely to bolster the position of those who are trying by aggression to materialize their fantastic and capricious dream.

I ask the Security Council therefore to take a clear stand on these two contentions before we proceed to examine the substance of the two reports submitted by the commission to the Security Council.

I ask this because it is the only just and forthright way to stop the serious trouble which has broken out in the Holy Land and which might conceivably lead to the threatening of world peace. Nor can I see how any blame can be laid on the Arabs in this bloody controversy.

For the Arabs of Palestine, by the partition plan itself, are driven into a state of absolute despair. They believe that their fate, by virtue of this plan itself, is to be condemned to extermination. Under such fright there is little wonder if they resolve to die in the struggle for the defense of their very existence. They consider that it would be better to perish bravely in the field of honor than to wait like cowards for their gradual annihilation. I am quite positive this is their firm conviction.

In Palestine, about half the number of the Arabs are left within the borders of the Jewish state, dependent on the mercy of their enemies, who intend to brush them aside and settle their new immigrants in their homes. With this disastrous fate awaiting them, they cannot be blamed for becoming agitated and driven to struggle for their lives.

The Arabs are not opposing any legitimate authority; they are combatting their executioners, upon whom they look as foreign invaders coming to rob them of their patrimony and life.

The Jews have been violently rebelling against the lawful authority of their benevolent patrons and benefactors, the mandatory power—the United Kingdom. They have committed most horrible crimes in their atrocious rebellion, and have put the whole country under a reign of terror for the last 3 years. The Zionists of the United States have not only refused to condemn the horrors committed in Palestine but have tacitly approved them, using them as a club over the head of Britain, declaring that the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts every time British arsenals, jails, railroads, or banks are blown up sky high.

Prior to November 29 the Arabs were not fighting the British or Zionists in Palestine. On the other hand, all the disturbances, disorders, and atrocities which took place were committed by the Zionists. In the eyes of the Arabs and in the eyes of international law and equity, the Zionists are the aggressors, and have been for the last 30 years. The resolution of the General Assembly itself, therefore, may be truly said to be responsible for the present disturbances in which the Arabs and Jews are involved.

The demand addressed by the commission to the Security Council to provide and dispatch to Palestine a considerable or adequate international force to suppress any opposition to the implementation of the recommendations of the General Assembly has no justification in the Charter of the United Nations. I fail to find in this Charter any text which implies, directly or indirectly, that the General Assembly has the authority to enforce its own recommendations by military force. If this were to be the case, then the recommendations would cease to be recommendations and would become orders or governmental laws.

The General Assembly is not a world government. It is not vested with executive power over the peoples of the world. Had it been a central government of the world, it would have been required to execute its orders and make its laws respected. But it is obvious that the General Assembly is not a government. It only gives advice, and the parties to whom advice is addressed accept it when it is rightful and just, and when it does not impair their fundamental rights.

If the recommendations are not accepted, it will have no effect on the prestige of the United Nations, for a government which fails to observe its own laws may collapse, but not an international organization composed of individual sovereign nations, as the General Assembly is, which is not in any sense a government.

The use of international force by the Security Council is clearly defined in the chapter devoted to this topic, where it is laid down when and how such a force is used and what steps should be taken by the Security Council to accomplish its purpose.

Chapter VII is the part of the Charter dealing with this question. We do not find in it, or anywhere else in the Charter, the least reference to the use of force by the Security Council or by the General Assembly for the preserving of public order in any country. The use of force is allowed to the Security Council only for the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security by suppressing aggression by one state against another. I say international, and not local, peace and order in any country. Public order has been disturbed and continues to be so in Greece, north China, India, Pakistan, and elsewhere on a very large scale. Nobody thought of applying to the Security Council for military help to keep law and order in any of those territories. The Security Council is requested by the General Assembly to act in the case of Palestine within its capacity as defined in this chapter. Any request by the General Assembly or by any other organ beyond that capacity is inacceptable.

Consequently, the application of the Commission for international force under the present conditions has no justification in the functions of the Security Council and should be rejected. Furthermore, it cannot be claimed that any situation or dispute is hereby brought to the attention of the Security Council against any state, in accordance with article 35 of the Charter referred to above. No application of this nature exists, allowing the Security Council to take steps in the matter.

It is equally obvious that no measures of sanction or otherwise could be taken against any state under chapter VII by the Security Council before being seized of a formal accusation made by a competent party, and before an examination of the complaint is made in the presence of both sides, with a view to substantiating the accusation.

The Skim-Milk Cow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, did you ever see a skim-milk cow? What, you did not? Well, do not be alarmed because I never heard of any person who did, but when I hear some of these Broadway farmers say that changing the law on colored oleo would cut the cost of living it makes me wonder if they believe that farmers have such critters in their barns. That is actually what the farmers would have to have in order to make the oleo claims come true.

Here is why. A cow produces milk and its byproduct butterfat in one operation. The milk is sold in liquid form and the butterfat is sold to make butter. The farmer by selling both products at a fair price makes both ends meet and it is impossible to produce the one without the other. Nature fixes that fact and no law will change it.

Now suppose the oleo law is repealed and colored oleo is sold all over the Nation as imitation butter. Then a lot of people would be fooled because they might not know the difference. Some individuals would eat oleo thinking it was butter—particularly in restaurants where the patrons never see the original package. That would interfere seriously and in an unfair way with the market for

butter. If the oleo manufacturers were as successful as they hope to be, the market for butter would be greatly reduced. This would cause the price of butterfat to go down—but the cow being a dumb creature would not realize her butterfat labors were surplus and would go right on producing it—that is, all the cows except those skim milk cows with the new look whose whereabouts are known only to the boys on the Great White Way—and it would continue to cost the farmer the same amount of money to produce milk and the butterfat. Since the farmers' cost would not be changed—and since he would lose the market for his butterfat—he would be forced, in order to make both ends meet, to add the loss on his butterfat to the price of his milk.

This would cause the price of milk to be increased to such heights that each consumer of milk would pay as much for milk alone as he formerly paid for both the milk and the butterfat. The price to the consumer for oleo would also be higher because more people would be buying it—the increased demand would raise the price. The consumer would not like that—paying more for oleo when they thought they were going to get it cheaper—and paying more for milk. The truth is the consumers would continue to pay for the butterfat without getting it.

Of course, the dairy farmers could stop the country from getting into this hole by switching to some of those new-fangled efficiency-minded skim-milk cows who would save the farmer the expense of producing butterfat—but did you ever see one? This is about the way it looks to me:

UDDER NONSENSE

The skim-milk cow and the oleo cat
Got along fine without butterfat.
The reason they did was plain to be seen—
The skim-milk cow didn't give cream.
She didn't give cream—so there was no butter.
The oleo cat really liked that udder.
The trouble is—you should know by now—
There ain't no such thing as a skim-milk cow.

Since skim-milk cows do not exist a change in the law would not cut the consumers total cost for dairy products. If the public were told the truth, they would learn that the tax complained of does not apply to uncolored oleo. Because of this 90 percent of all oleo sold last year did not pay the tax. It would thus be impossible for any change in the law to bring about any substantial cut in the over-all price. Actually the repeal of the law would cause uncolored oleo to be taken off the market. Then the only oleo which would be offered would be oleo artificially colored to imitate butter. The oleo manufacturers would demand a higher price for this article even though the cost of coloring is negligible—and coloring adds nothing to the quality. It just fools a lot of people, and the public would be forced to pay a higher price for being fooled.

If the present law works any injustice, it is in permitting the coloring of oleo to imitate butter on payment of a tax. In those circumstances it is not a tax but a license fee for selling an imitation product. If there is going to be any change in this law, it should be aimed in the direction of protecting the public against deception and the farmer from unfair competition by preventing oleo manufacturers from infringing on butter's trade-mark—its yellow color.

Since so much butter is consumed in restaurants and elsewhere by consumers who never see the original carton, a labeling requirement is not adequate to the situation. The public and the producer would be best protected by laws preventing manufacturers from artificially coloring oleo to imitate butter. However, this law need only be temporary—temporary until the New Deal hybrid mechanics can put their skim-milk cows on the market. But until that time comes the public should realize that dairy cows produce butterfat and that if it is not sold as butterfat the price of milk would be increased to make up the difference.

Palestine: A Reasonable Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Palestine is causing great concern. On February 26, Mr. Jacob Panken, justice of the Domestic Relations Court of the city of New York wrote a letter to the New York Times on this subject. The Times carried it in its issue of March 6. Under leave to extend I include it as part of my remarks as a valuable contribution to the current discussion in this important matter:

FOR A BINATIONAL PALESTINE—EFFORTS BY UN URGED FOR SETTING UP A UNITED GOVERNMENT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The recommendation by the General Assembly to the Security Council of the United Nations for the partition of Palestine was a mistake. First, because, though it was only a recommendation, Arabs and Jews alike assumed that recommendation to be a binding decision of the United Nations.

The United Nations, as well as our own Government, should have made it crystal clear that the resolution of the General Assembly was nothing more than a recommendation, which might or might not be accepted by the Security Council. As to whether or not the proposed partition is workable, that is a different story.

It would seem, from Senator Austin's address to the United Nations on February 24, that our Government is doubtful as to the workability of the partition plan, at least without military forces to enforce the partition. That doubt is shared by the representatives of other governments and by many people throughout the world, and by many Jews, too.

The United Nations Charter does not empower that body to set up new states. It certainly is not politic for the United Nations to set up new states when such a move threatens the peace of extended areas of the world. If the United Nations is to redeem the hope which inspired its formation, and which man has long longed for—that is, a one-world relationship—certainly the splitting up of entities into smaller entities is not the way to go about it.

Palestine presents a problem which must be solved. The sane solution, it would seem, was to work for understanding between Jews and Arabs; to unite them, rather than to divide them; to build as an entity, rather than to attempt to build it by division. That was not done.

Jews who wish to establish a cultural center in Palestine should be given the right to do so.

On September 28, 1947, the New York Times published a letter by Dr. Judah L. Magnes. He cautioned and warned against partition or the creation of a separate Jewish state in Palestine. What he proposed was a united government, in which both Jews and Arabs participate as citizens. Many agreed with him. Now many more see eye to eye with him.

It would seem that our Government and the United Nations now at long last have doubts as to the practicability of a forced partition in Palestine. Hotheads among the Jews will insist upon a separate entity. Hotheads in the Arab area will oppose it as strongly as it is contended for by the Jews.

The United Nations has sufficient influence on public opinion to compel an agreement for a conference of Jews and Arabs. At such conference the possibility of establishing peace in the troubled land, and to lay the groundwork for a prosperous Palestine and peace in the Middle East, is possible.

It seems certain now that the only possible way to carry out partition of Palestine is to use military force. The United Nations has no such military forces. And time is of the essence.

It does not sit right in my mind to see soldiers, American or those of other countries, sent into Asia to compel by force the establishment of states. It runs counter to all we Americans stand for. We certainly do not want to impose upon people forms of government which are not acceptable to them. If the inhabitants of Palestine desire partition, let them say so by a plebiscite.

Immediate action by the United Nations is imperative to prevent further bloodshed.

JACOB PANKEN,
Justice, Domestic Relations Court of the City of New York.

NEW YORK, *February 26, 1948.*

Displaced Persons Problem Must Be Solved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to set forth within my remarks a resolution of the Americanization League of America, Milwaukee, Wis., pertaining to displaced persons.

As set forth in this resolution, the dire straits to which these unfortunate people have been subjected must be ended swiftly in the interests of humanity, not to say the release from the expenditure which has been made in their behalf since the end of the war.

Following is the resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICANIZATION LEAGUE OF AMERICA ON THE SUBJECT OF DISPLACED PERSONS LEGISLATION PENDING IN CONGRESS

Whereas nearly 3 years after VE-day 850,000 persons of the approximately 12,000,000

found in the various Nazi concentration camps throughout Europe are still in the various detention camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy. Six hundred thousand of them in the American zones; and

Whereas $400,000 per day or more than $400,000,000 has been paid by the American taxpayers since VE-day to maintain displaced persons in European detention camps; and

Whereas these men, women, and children, victims of Nazi barbarism and terror, do not wish to and cannot return to their homes of origin now in the Soviet sphere of influence, because they fear oppression for political or religious reasons; and

Whereas the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the United Nations as a whole have officially declared that no people would be forced to return to their homelands against their will; and

Whereas the policy of maintaining displaced persons in concentration-like camps is a crime against the unfortunate displaced nationals of our allies; a heavy financial drain on the United States Treasury; a threat to the position of the United States as a world power; and a danger to world peace; and

Whereas during the 1940–46 war period only 15 percent of the total world immigration quota was used; in other words the United States lost 914,762 prospective citizens in that period; and

Whereas there are now two bills in Congress which if passed would solve this acute international emergency caused by the displaced-persons problems, to wit:

H. R. 2910 introduced by Representative WILLIAM G. STRATTON, of Illinois, and its companion bill S. 1563 sponsored by several outstanding Members of the United States Senate; these bills would permit 400,000 of the displaced persons to enter the United States in a period of 4 years at the rate of 100,000 per year; and

Whereas the total of 400,000 would equal less than half the number of quota immigrants who could have legally come here during the war years, but did not do so because of the war; H. R. 2910 would be temporary emergency legislation; it would cease to operate after the 4-year period; it would in no way violate the protective restrictions of the general immigration law which screens immigrants on the basis of health, morals, economic status, and specified political beliefs; and

Whereas extensive hearings were held on H. R. 2910 in the House Subcommittee on Immigration and on its companion bill in the respective committee of the Senate during the first session of the Eightieth Congress and was supported before these committees by outstanding leaders in and out of the Government, including representatives of the AFL and CIO and said resolutions have been favorably reported by the respective subcommittees of both Houses of Congress; and

Whereas it is the consensus of the people supporting this measure that it should be passed on the grounds of "economy, humanity, and the furtherance of world peace" and that it "will not have any adverse bearing on the American workman"; and

Whereas the displaced persons will not take homes away from veterans and other Americans, since they would be housed by relatives or friends who would not sublet rooms to strangers; and

Whereas Congress today is searching for ways and means of reducing Government expenditures in order to give the overburdened taxpayers relief from heavy taxation and the removal of the displaced persons from the relief rolls affords an opportunity to reduce Government spending by more than $130,000,000 per year; and

Whereas among the displaced persons are found many highly skilled persons of whom there is a dire shortage in the United States, e. g., agricultural workers, teachers, physicians and dentists, nurses, domestics, construction workers, etc., and all the skills of the displaced persons is now being wasted since these persons are not permitted to be gainfully employed in their present status but would be self-supporting if given the opportunity; and

Whereas France, Belgium, Denmark, Australia, Canada, and England have taken over large numbers of displaced persons for permanent settlement in their countries, and other countries are watching and waiting to see what the United States will do in this matter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Americanization League of America urges the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to pass H. R. 2910 and S. 1563 before the conclusion of the Eightieth Congress.

AMERICANIZATION LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
JOHN E. KALUPA, *Secretary*.

Address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, on Placing a Wreath on the John Ericcson Statue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on the occasion of placing a wreath on the John Ericsson statue.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today it is my great privilege and high honor on behalf of another generation of grateful Americans to place a wreath at the foot of the Washington monument to John Ericsson.

Eighty-six years ago today, March 9, 1948, occurred an important event in history. On that date the "Mistress of the Seas," the Confederate ironclad ram, the *Merrimac*, which had raised havoc with the Union Fleet, was engaged in decisive battle and stopped in its campaign of annihilation by "the cheese box on a raft," the turret equipped *Monitor*, the brain child of the Swedish inventor and builder, John Ericsson.

That day naval warfare was revolutionized and an ending to wood-constructed fighting craft. Had John Ericsson achieved nothing more in his long useful life, he still would have been a famous man, for the technical victory of the *Monitor* over the *Merrimac* in a crucial moment in history scrapped the wooden navies of the world and made him immortal. He built the first propeller-driven cruiser for the United States Navy, mounting a heavy gun of his own design and with a range finder of his own invention. His was the first propeller boat which crossed the Atlantic.

His wife complained, with understanding and good natured jealousy, that his first love was the steam engine and well for humanity and transportation progress that it was. For doubtless his greatest contribution to society was the perfection of the early steam engine. His steam locomotive, the "Novelty," developed almost side by side with Stephenson's "Rocket," revolutionized commerce. The fast destroyer with its submarine gun was his invention.

John Ericsson was born in Sweden but became a naturalized citizen of the United States, where he died at the ripe old age of 86.

He was a child prodigy. At nine he constructed a saw mill; at 14 he had command of 600 men working on the scenic Göta Canal which connects the North Sea and the Baltic. Before he was of age he was an expert mechanical draftsman and chart designer.

This beautiful monument where we are privileged to pay honor to one of the really great souls of history was erected in his honor and unveiled May 29, 1926, in the presence of the President of the United States and the Crown Prince of Sweden.

There is no more beautiful spot in all the world than the location of this monument. Close by is the world famous Lincoln Memorial standing there in all of its silent glory. On the other side is the Potomac with its cargoes of freight and traffic utilizing the devices which he created and paying hourly tribute to the inventive genius of Ericsson.

Joseph A. Haniphy, late principal of the John Ericsson Junior High School in Greenpoint, Brooklyn, where the Monitor was built in 100 days, sums up his qualities in a song his pupils often sang:

"Rugged, sincere, exact, a restless mind
A hater of all shams and things untrue
Stern, unbending, man of seething brain
Great engineer, his life an epic struggle
And to its honored end, genius and worker."

Greater Fort Worth International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of March 7, 1948:

DALLAS' DOG IN THE MANGER ROLE

Fort Worth has been rather amused for several weeks by the frantic, almost fanatical efforts of Dallas to prevent the building of a new airport which we need, want, and have voted bonds for, and which deffinitely is going to be built.

The Greater Fort Worth International Airport is strictly a Fort Worth project. At first it was to be located south of Fort Worth, and considerable land was bought for the purpose. Dallas raised no objection to that.

Then it was found that considerable money could be saved by locating the new airport east of the city, by further developing an existing airport on which more than $1,500,000 already has been spent.

When the switch in sites was announced, Dallas became frightened—scared stiff that Fort Worth had hatched a sinister plot to steal its aviation business. Nothing of the sort was contemplated, of course, but Dallas had the jitters, anyway.

Fort Worth's airport development plans quite naturally contemplated some Federal aid. Oblivious to the fact that its own Love Field already had received some $5,000,000 in Federal aid, and was seeking more, Dallas folks set out to block any similar assistance being given Fort Worth.

Fort Worth was not too surprised at this. We long ago became used to having Dallas

claim everything in sight, but this was one of the few times the folks over there had taken a dog-in-the-manger attitude and tried to block a purely Fort Worth project.

Dallas newspapers took up the cudgels for dear old big D. They literally frothed at the mouth over the prospect of Fort Worth getting a nice, new airport. They took the matter right up to Congress.

Crying their hearts out for national economy, they begged Congress to rip out of the pending airport authorization bill the amount which had been earmarked for Fort Worth's project.

Representative WILSON, of Dallas, presented the plea, much to the delight of Republican Members of the House. Here was a Democrat from Texas pleading for a reduction in President Truman's budget. It was just what the Republicans wanted. Of course, they would vote to delete the Fort Worth item—and they did, to the tune of 66 Republicans and 5 Democrats.

So over in big D now there is great rejoicing. They are singing from the roof tops and dancing in the streets. And why not? Haven't Fort Worth's ears been pinned back? Hasn't Forth Worth been thwarted?

The folks over there should know by now that Fort Worth is not easily thwarted. The Greater Fort Worth International Airport is going to be built. Make no mistake about that. What happened in Washington Friday will not balk or appreciably delay its construction.

Fort Worth will continue the effort to obtain Federal aid on the project, as a matter of simple right and justice. Congress is in the process of appropriating $37,000,000 for airport development throughout the country. Fort Worth taxpayers will pay their share of the taxes to provide for this expense, just as they already are paying their share of the $5,000,000 which was spent on Love Field during the war in contrast to the $64,000 spent on Meacham Field.

Fort Worth does not begrudge any Federal aid the Dallas airport has received. We're glad they got it. We're for aviation development everywhere.

Nor does Fort Worth begrudge Dallas the fun she is having today. Dallas has won a skirmish, and a little celebration is to be expected. Fort Worth's celebration will come when the major battle has been won and the building of its super airport has been completed, as logically and inevitably it will be.

Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions passed by the Private Mackall Post, Disabled American Veterans, Berlin, Germany:

OUR FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

We, the members and officers of the Private Mackall Post, Disabled American Veterans, Berlin, Germany, recalling that while the Nazi domination of Europe crept on, the United States followed a policy of isolationism until it was too late to halt this aggression without total war, a war in which we sacrificed hundreds of thousands of lives of our own American youth and created a debt which in our age will never be paid.

When war was declared by the United States we became allied with a political system, communism, that was formerly allied with the political system we fought and defeated. Communism today is as great a menace to the United States and the rest of the world as any system yet known.

The Cominform took the advantage of this alliance with the democracies of the world to infiltrate her trained communistic agents from Moscow into every country of the world and their governments, including our own. As the Red armies moved westward across Europe they cleared the way for their Communist agents to step in and force upon those countries, formerly occupied by the Nazi armies, the communistic form of government.

If communism dominates European economy it will in turn bring a halt to world free trade. It will bring chaos and ruin to our Western Hemisphere's economy, which will have supply but not the demand. It will bring on one of the worst economical collapses in the history of the world.

Ninety percent of the members of the Private Mackall Post, Disabled American Veterans, were wounded by enemies of democracy. They fought their way into Berlin from the beaches of Sicily and Normandy, and are not in sympathy with any of the Nazi or communistic doctrines. If the American people could visualize the devastation of war and form a picture of our great Nation falling prey to the domination or occupation of either a Nazi or communistic form of government the psychological effect would be amazing.

If we may speak for the 15,000,000 veterans of World War II, as we speak our own thoughts, we would rather have funds appropriated now to defeat communism and establish a stable world economy. This can be accomplished at a far less cost to the American people now than at a later date when another sacrifice of lives might be necessary.

In our opinion we do not believe the people of Europe will ever bow down to communism. Those who do will be food Communists and will never follow communistic doctrines if they are able to obtain a sufficient standard of living by other means. The only reason some countries of Europe are now Communist followers is that they are encircled and occupied by Russia.

RESOLUTION

"We, the members and officers of the Private MacKall Post, Disabled American Veterans, Berlin, Germany, taking into consideration the facts in the afore-mentioned article, do hereby accept these articles and resolve to request action before the national headquarters of the Disabled American Veterans, Cincinnati, Ohio, and before the House and Senate of the United States of America, for passage and implementation of legislation pertaining to the precepts set forth in this resolution: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That when a system, totalitarian and dictatorial in policy, threatens the freedom of men, we feel that it is not unconstitutional to outlaw such a system in a democracy.

"Under the present and past world military conditions, it has been proven that our armed forces have been inadequately prepared and equipped to instantly defend the United States in time of war. If adequate precautionary measures are not taken at this time, we predict that in the event another conflict starts, our forces will be equally inadequate. Therefore, we are in favor of universal military training.

"We are in complete accordance with the European recovery program. We feel that we are in a better position to see the needs of Europe than the American people in the States. If communism acquires complete control of the European economy, it will in turn control world economy, disrupting United States economy as well. The European recovery program would definitely revive Europe as well as counteract communism."

The signatures and names of the officers and members of the Private Mackall Post Disabled American Veterans, Berlin, Germany, appearing herein have read and voted on the aforementioned article and resolution:

Marcus G. Cameron, Deputy Chief of Staff to National Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Durham, N. C.; Kenneth E. Hopkins, Post Commander, Belwood, Pa.; Richard F. Bryant, Senior Vice Commander, Tucson, Ariz.; John J. Kaletka, Junior Vice Commander, Kearny, N. J.; W. J. Collier, Post Adjutant, Rochester, N. Y.; Charles K. Rose, Sergeant at Arms, Ragsdale, Ind.; Hermann F. Moller, Chairman, German Youth Activities, Springfield Gardens, Long Island, N. Y.; Eugene Grasso, Post Chaplain, Hollis, N. Y.; George Stringer, Chairman, Publicity Committee, Peace Dale, R. I.; Otis R. Grady, Hugo, Okla.; Anthony De Milio, Ossining, N. Y.; John E. Shaffer, Altoona, Pa.; Wayne D. Upchurch, San Francisco, Calif.; Hilmer V. Haag, Chicago, Ill.

Federal Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech by Hon. Lothair Teetor, State Representative from Wayne County, Ind., and a former colleague of mine in the Indiana House of Representatives. It was delivered at the Annual Economic Conference, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.:

Before it is possible to discuss Federal taxation, either in kind or amount, it is necessary for us to decide what kind of a Federal Government we want. If we want a highly centralized government that assumes the responsibility that has heretofore been reserved for State and local governments—if we want a government that regulates and controls the complex economy of the Nation—if we want a government that assures everyone a good living regardless of individual preparation, initiative, or desire to work—if we want the planned economy that leads to socialism and government ownership of business, then we have a very good tax law now and we had better not change it.

If, however, we want strong State and local government—if we want to encourage individual initiative by recognizing and rewarding ability—if we want Americans to continue to stand on their own two feet and assume individual responsibility—if we want a minimum of Federal control and regulation—if we sincerely believe in the principle of free competitive enterprise—if we want government to be the servant of the people, not their master, then we can and should change our Federal tax laws, and the sooner the better.

I am going to assume that most Americans want the kind of Federal Government I described last.

If I am right in my appraisal of the basic thinking of Americans, then it is essential that we have a Federal budget that reduces to a minimum, or eliminates entirely, every expenditure that encourages centralized and bureaucratic government, or assumes financial responsibility for functions that can be better administered by State and local governments. And further, that Federal tax law shall provide the opportunity to save and the incentive to work, to invest, and to risk. Neither our Federal budget nor our Federal tax law come within gunshot of meeting these conditions.

The miracles of American production and the American standard of living were not built on the kind of tax structure and tax philosophy now in force. They were not built on it, and they cannot continue to live on it.

The tax program of the National Association of Manufacturers consists of three closely related parts:

First, adequate capital formation to provide for greater production, better jobs, more pay, and higher living standards for all the people.

Second, tax reduction itself, of a kind and in an amount that will provide tax relief where it is most needed, release income for capital formation and reinvigorate the economic incentives to work, to save, to invest, and to venture.

And third, budget reduction of a size to make possible the necessary tax reduction within the framework of a balanced budget and a minimum of $2,500,000,000 annual debt retirement.

The exact provisions for tax reduction that we recommend for priority enactment are:

1. Revision of the individual income-tax rate scale by establishing a new rate schedule, normal tax and surtax combined, starting at 12 percent (in lieu of the present 19 percent combined rate) and progressing to a top rate of 50 percent on taxable income in excess of $100,000. This is the 12-50 plan. We should know it by that name. The program also recommends two additional provisions, to be adopted along with the 12-50 rate scale. These would:

2. Allow deductions from taxable income not to exceed $500 for life-insurance premiums paid by the taxpayer each year on his own life, and

3. Remove the present 5-percent limitation on deductions now permitted for medical expenses, while retaining the present total limitations for such expenses of $1,250 for single persons and $2,500 for married persons. The ultimate result of these provisions, where taxpayers take reasonable advantage of both the life-insurance and medical features, would be a reduction of as much as 60 percent in the lowest income bracket and a minimum of 40 percent throughout all income brackets.

That is our recommendation for quick enactment. It represents a reduction in Federal income of $7,000,000,000.

This boom we're in is not going to bust because of any buyers' strike or shortage of purchasing power—if it does crack up, it will be because of the shortage of venture capital which is rapidly becoming the most serious economic problem of the Nation. Half a loaf of tax reduction is not going to remedy this malnutrition of the Nation's economy.

Why do we know that we are confronted with the capital formation crisis? Well, first we know it because it is evident that a sound and enduring solution of the present economic ills of the Nation—shortages, high and rising prices, fear of further inflation and of restoration of controls—can be had only through more production. And, production just doesn't happen, except as a result of capital formation.

Let's look at the record. Authoritative data covering the period 1869 through 1930 show that over those 60 years about one-fifth of the Nation's total production was devoted, decade after decade, to investment. At the end of that period, the net contribution of capital formation was eight times as much production as at the beginning—the result of an average rate of increase of production of 3.8 percent a year, compounded annually.

The record of those six decades has not been approached by any other nation operating under any system of enterprise. But the record of the next decade, 1928-1938, is equally significant—the other way around. In not one of those years did capital formation reach one-fifth of the national output. Even more significantly, this was the first decade since the Civil War when the level of the Nation's production did not advance. Without an adequate supply of capital, the American people did not prosper, and jobs were in distressingly short supply.

Department of Commerce figures show us that the deficiency in capital formation since 1930 is $125,000,000,000. We do not have to make all of it up. Machines that would have been bought 10 years ago had capital been available would already have been worn out and obsolete by now. Moreover, it will take time to accumulate capital—time during which more machines will wear out or become superannuated. When we make every reasonable allowance for these factors, we find that the very minimum deficit to be made up stands at about $30,000,000,000.

Obviously, however, we cannot replace all of this deficiency at one stroke. We can do it within a reasonable time—say, 5 years. In addition, we should aim to resume the "plowback" into capital formation, as an average of about one-fifth of our gross national product, which would be $36,000,000,000 a year at the present rate. Our total capital requirement thus becomes $42,000,000,000 this year—$6,000,000,000 for prior-year replacement and $36,000,000,000 as new capital. Allowing for the growth of total product which adequate capital brings, a growth which, historically, has been about 3.8 percent per year, the total capital need would rise to nearly $48,000,000,000 in 1951 and to more than $50,000,000,000 in 1956.

Against this need there is now a substantial amount of saving and capital formation. Despite the present tax laws, our economy generates huge quantities of capital under prosperous conditions. Business reserves, the savings of individuals and institutions in the form of insurance premiums, payments on debt, and so on, amount to large totals. On the other hand, because of the tax laws, we are faced with the certainty that there will be a serious deficiency in that area of saving and capital formation which is most necessary to continued growth. This is the area of venture capital.

In order that there may be the kind of expansion we all want, there must be a continuous extension of our economic and business activities into new fields. We must keep pushing at the frontiers and boundaries of our technology, our resources, and our skills. Otherwise we shall stop growing. The instrument with which we shall widen our economic horizon is venture capital, created out of savings which someone is willing to risk. This kind of development cannot be financed out of first-mortgage bonds, or debentures, or bank credits. It cannot be financed, except in very small part, out of the savings of the low-income groups. There are, in fact, only two sources from which we may expect the bulk of the necessary venture capital. These are retained corporate earnings and savings from the middle and upper incomes.

There must be more tax revision eventually than we are now asking for. There must be further reduction of the individual income tax, a substantial lowering of the corporation tax, a correction of excise tax inequalities, and less severe taxation of gifts and estates. There should be something done about the situation of married taxpayers in community property and in noncommunity property States and about double taxation of dividends, but not now, not before or at the expense of prior enactment of the 12-50 plan.

Now we come to the third and final point of our program, the budgetary framework for effecting the tax reductions we recommend. A study of the fiscal year 1949 budget prospects by the NAM Government Spending Committee demonstrates the feasibility of a $31,000,000,000 budget in fiscal year 1949, and discloses that the margin between expenditures and revenues should be no less than $10,000,000,000, and maybe several billion dollars more. A $10,000,000,000 margin is enough to permit enactment of the 12-50 rate scale, plus the life insurance and medical features, and still leave a minimum of $2,500,000,000 for debt retirement.

Now, let me summarize. We started with, "What kind of a government do we want?" If we want a centralized, socialistic, police state, then we should continue the tax philosophy and the tax rates we now have. England is giving us a perfect example of where that philosophy will lead us and what it will do to our industries.

If on the other hand we believe that Americans are still willing to assume the individual responsibility that is the price of freedom and want this country to continue the growth that has been the miracle of this age, then taxes, particularly individual income taxes, must be drastically reduced immediately, so there may be an accumulation of savings so necessary for capital formation in our free competitive enterprise nation. New products, new industries, new jobs, higher standards of living, are the products of venture capital. The supply of such capital is drying up.

The subject of taxes is the most important subject before the American people today, although it is not so recognized by far too many people.

The kind of superficial, economic thinking that has characterized the American scene in recent years will solve nothing. Only the use of sound economic common sense and courageous action in Washington will assure the future progress of America.

Address by Mrs. Pearl S. Buck at Gandhi Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its high literary worth, its great historical significance, and its heartfelt meaning, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Pearl S. Buck at the Gandhi memorial held in Washington on February 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gandhi is dead. His ashes are scattered in the waters and over the earth of India. The indomitable frame, the fearless spirit, the long years, the high purposes, all were ended so easily. It was over in one instant. The shot of a gun and only silence is left, silence and a handful of ashes. It is no

wonder that the ignorant, the stupid, the inventors of atom bombs, the generals, the captains, the sergeants, the little soldiers, are the lovers of violence. All that they fear, all that they hate, all who rebel against them, can be so easily ended. The movement of a finger upon a trigger, upon a button, a flash, a blast, and all that remains are silence and ashes. Today a million can be killed as easily as a thousand, a thousand as easily as one.

Gandhi was only one. His voice was single, always gentle, always reasoning. It was the voice of conscience in our turbulent life. He was right, he knew he was right, we all knew he was right. The man who killed him knew he was right. However long the follies of the violent continue they but prove that Gandhi was right. Nonviolence is the only common sense for human beings. We die so easily. Our bodies are soft and unprotected. The brain, the heart, the soul, are perilously lodged. We cannot wait for peace to be made, for arguments to be settled, for the quarrelsomeness of selfish men to subside. Before that settlement comes, life is over. At all costs, Gandhi said, we must refuse to use violence. Resist to the very end, he said, but without violence.

To a world confusing violence with power, these words seem too simple to be true. Yet truth is always simple. Men wind confusions and entanglements because they are afraid of simple truth. But truth is not changed. It is still simple. It is more fundamental than the atom itself.

The world longs for goodness. The people search for righteousness. There is no weapon, no bomb so powerful, as the force of a great good spirit. India will live and become great in our world, only as her people use this priceless force, the force of nonviolence, which the life of Gandhi exemplified for them. In that personal example was Gandhi's secret. He did what he told others to do. When people saw that this was true, they believed in him. The measure of a man's greatness is the extent to which he justifies by his own life the faith of the people in him. Gandhi has done his part. It now remains for the people of India to take upon themselves his world leadership for nonviolence.

Indeed, it is the only way in which they can fulfill the promise of their greatness. Of violence the world is sick. By hatreds and quarrels we are surfeited and poisoned. The hearts of the people turn away from the noise of militarists and warmongers. We long for the peacemakers. No war brings peace, for violence only brings more violence. We need a new revolution, the revolution which Gandhi carried on, in the midst of a world rent by violence. Oh, India, dare to be worthy of your Gandhi!

Conditions in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Spain?" by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning. It pertains to the question now being considered by the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPAIN?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

In his opening oratory for the Marshall plan the other day, Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG covered a lot of territory. But he forgot something.

His speech as a whole was a rip-snorting call for cash which, he declared, we must spend in Europe right away to save it from communism. Such a weeping and wailing you never heard, as he unfolded his tale of what maybe will happen unless we cough up seventeen thousand million dollars for the Marshall plan, or ERP.

But read that speech (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 1, 1948, pages 1915–1920, inclusive) upside down, sideways, backwards, or even forwards and you find still the same old gap.

HOW ABOUT SPAIN?

When he is weeping and wailing for Britain, the distinguished orator makes the very Senate walls to tremble.

When he delivers an apostrophe to France, his hair comes down across his noble forehead to make the ladies in the gallery shudder with excitement.

When he calls on his able colleagues to ponder the fate of Luxemburg, his visage is stern as an Old Testament prophet's.

BUT HOW ABOUT SPAIN?

The Senator, who used to be an isolationist himself back when the going was easy, can put scorn and fury into his observations upon detractors who cannot accept his projects.

His very kindest touch toward them, is to call their faith in the admonitions of Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe, "folly."

No longer can the U. S. A. mind its own business, so he says, but must rush out and mind the world's.

BUT WHAT ABOUT SPAIN?

Ah, there the great man falls silent and stays silent. He can name you in a flash the 16 nations that are qualified to ride the ERP gravy train, and they are:

Austria, Greece, Norway, Switzerland, Belgium, Iceland, Portugal, Turkey, Denmark, Ireland, Sweden, United Kingdom, France, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, in his order of identification.

These are the sweet 16 he would shower with blessings at the expense of the United States taxpayers.

Why? How did these qualify? What makes them deserve our bounty? You will find it hard to explain the rule. The rule is surely not mere friendship. For Italy fought us in the recent war and Germany, which is also on this free-loading sucker list, is also supposed to have just been our enemy. So was Austria.

Ireland was a neutral; Portugal the same; so was Switzerland; so were Turkey and Iceland; England an ally; so were the remainder, in varying degree.

Enemies, neutrals, allies—all in the mixed bag.

SO HOW ABOUT SPAIN?

This writer has just had a long, puzzled look at a full-page study of United States financial aid to countries the whole world 'round, as published in, of all things, last Sunday's Brooklyn Eagle.

The survey was put together by Lewis E. Davids, B. S., M. B. A.—all from official and authoritative sources which are listed along with the figures so they can be checked and verified.

They show that, since 1914, the United States has let the nations of the world run up with it a bill totaling $85,454,481,931. The Marshall ERP plan is yet to be added to that.

Eighty-five thousand million dollars plus in debts now outstanding to us from 61 nations—some of which still survive, some of which have vanished.

Missing from the list of debtors is Spain. We had a little war with Spain right around the turn of the century, and in the mid-1930's we let the Communists sucker us into a deal that almost kicked Spain to pieces.

It's time we made that up, for if United States troops ever have to go back to Europe, we'll need Spain, and badly. Stalin wants Spain. He almost got Spain in 1936. He will get Spain yet, if we continue making fools of ourselves about the Spaniards.

Now is the time for the great United States of America to apologize to Spain and start over. How about Senator VANDENBERG, with his justly famous oratory, to make the apology?

He's the great voice on foreign policy. Here's a chance to use his talents on a job vital to the national welfare.

Senator VANDENBERG, how about Spain?

The United States Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., for March 6, 1948:

THE UNITED STATES LOOKS AHEAD

We have tried to make the point that the United States needs more armed might, and especially air power, than she has available to meet the foreseeable contingencies arising from continuing Soviet expansion.

But force alone will not be enough. Wisdom also is necessary, for our civilization is confronted by a triple challenge, of which Russia is only a parcel and symptom—the challenge of world war, class struggle and despotism. If they could be answered by words the answers would be peace, plenty, and freedom.

1. The most urgent and terrible of the trio is recurrent world war. It is obviously a problem which western civilization must solve if it wants to keep going. The nation which knows the answer can lead the world. Let us not overlook the fact that the Soviet Union has a solution. It is the only one which has ever worked—for a time. It is the ancient solution of peace by world conquest, as practiced or attempted by Alexander, Augustus Caesar, Napoleon, and Hitler.

If Europe is faced with the alternative of fighting Russia or being subjugated by her, there is no certainty that she will choose war. But America would, and Europe might be a battlefield in the end if not in the beginning, as happened in the last war.

The world, and especially Europe, is interested in what plan, if any, the United States has to prevent world wars. The League of Nations was our plan after the First World War, the United Nations after the Second. The League of Nations was a failure and the United Nations has not been a success. The United States suggested a plan for world-wide control of atomic energy which had some of the attributes of an organization calculated to keep world peace, but it died a-borning.

Former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson has said that peace cannot be achieved "until the world finds a way toward the necessary government of the whole." The challenge still faces the world—will peace come

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

through world government or world conquest? Russia has her answer ready. Where is ours?

2. The second phase of the triple threat to our age arises from the spectacle of poverty in the midst of plenty and has its outcome in the class struggle. Again, Russia has her answer ready. It is the old Marxian solution of achieving classlessness by doing away with all classes except the lowest. It has not worked out too convincingly, since Russia now has a new upper class of bureaucrats. But it is an answer which appeals to the poor and dispossessed of Greece and China, for example, particularly in its land-division aspect.

We contend that capitalism can beat communism at both production and distribution. We can prove it by contrast of our living standard with that of Russia. The world, however, will make allowance for the fact that Russia moved from an age of oriental ignorance and serfdom into an age of world wars, and it will not overlook the fact that America, which has enjoyed comparative peace and enlightenment, possesses extremes of wealth and poverty, together with class and race antagonisms.

This means that we cannot take capitalism for granted, but must prove its superiority daily. It means less monopoly and more competition, lower prices and a higher standard of living for most of us, fewer incomes in the highest and lowest brackets and more in the middle ones. If any nation can solve the problem of poverty in the midst of plenty, we can. But capitalism for domestic consumption must be kept in good working order, and capitalism for export may take some adapting to compete with communism in other lands and among other people.

3. The third challenge is despotism, whose weapon is totalitarianism. Here we are on firmest ground. The answer is the kind of freedom which our Constitution and laws keep alive. Communism cannot hope to compete with us in this. The Soviet system is an anachronism as much out of place in our age as a tyrannosaurus would be on Main Street.

The Goddess of Liberty came to us from Athens and Jerusalem, through the deserts of northern Africa and the forests of northern Europe, by way of Rome, Paris, and London; but she is at home here. There are many in the world who, pressed by hunger or fear, will disown her. But there will always be those who, having looked in her eyes, would rather die with her than live without her. She is sweeter than plenty and dearer than peace. Communism can offer no substitute for her.

The United States should concentrate upon the main challenges of our time. History calls on her to exhibit a combination of force and wisdom which is unique but not impossible.

President Truman and 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

President Truman is the stand-out contender today for the title "Champion Optimist of 1948." Possibly he can't claim the world championship, but at least he is on top in the United States and Canada. There just isn't any opposition.

He eased himself into that slot late yesterday, when the formal announcement was made that he is a candidate for reelection. It came through the office of J. HOWARD MCGRATH, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Of course it was to be expected. So far the northern Democrats have failed to produce any alternative. Furthermore, it is usual for a party in power to grant the President a crack at a second term in the White House.

But the timing of the announcement can hardly be called masterly. At the very least it served to irritate members of his party now regarding Mr. Truman with a jaundiced eye. This is no time to rub salt in an open wound.

The President, of course, may have felt that his announcement had to be made. He may have considered it necessary to "scotch" rumors started by Dixie Democrats. They were to the effect that he was ready to announce his retirement from public life.

Naturally this kind of talk could be killed only by a public announcement. But some of his advisers feel that the announcement should have been withheld temporarily. They are afraid that it may touch off a bad reaction.

At the moment the Southerners are close to an open revolt on the civil-rights program. They have made it very clear that they will not go along. But so far, only a few have taken an irrevocable stand against Mr. Truman.

His announced candidacy for renomination and reelection may, and probably will, force that irrevocable stand. The same drastic effect might have been avoided had he waited until the civil-rights controversy was settled.

McGrath, in making the announcement, was forced to add fuel to the flames. He said that the President is still standing on the civil-rights program. This, of course, will not make the southerners feel any better.

Their first reactions were sharp and bitter. Representative RIVERS, of South Carolina, called the civil-rights program a betrayal of his people. He said they want nothing more to do with Mr. Truman.

Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, said the South will put up its own candidate in the forthcoming elections. A three-cornered race might well throw the contest into the House of Representatives, where anything could happen.

In other words, the Democratic Party is now so openly divided that only a miracle could save President Truman. Miracles, of course, are always possible. But for some reason they rarely occur in an election year.

President Truman must feel like a man standing in a red-hot skillet. No matter which way he jumps, either his fingers or his feet get burned. He can neither abandon nor push his civil-rights program without meeting disaster.

It is in strange contrast to his situation a few weeks ago, when party leaders thought his prospects were better than fair. It is doubtful whether the political stock of any other President ever took such a rapid nose dive.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle emphasizes the vital role which the House must play in the consideration of legislation to authorize a European recovery program. It quite correctly points out that we must consider not only the needs of the peoples to be aided and their capacity and willingness to assist in the rehabilitation of their own economies, but equally the needs of our own people and the capacity of this Nation to respond without jeopardy to its own solvency and progress.

We have recently witnessed a tragic illustration of callous disregard for the welfare of our own citizens when the Office of International Trade authorized shipment of 600,000 barrels of fuel oil to foreign countries beyond their stated requirements at a time when our own people in many communities were shivering in their homes or thrown out of work from their factories because of the serious domestic shortage. Insofar as we are able to do so by legislation we must devise ways and means of preventing such administration of a law for succor and recovery as will produce similar inexcusable results.

That is another reason why the machinery set up to implement any legislative decision is of such vital importance. Then, of course, after our work is complete, the method of selection of those who are to administer the program must leave no doubt that the very best talent available, regardless of political affiliation, has been tapped for this assignment of such gigantic significance to the welfare of our own Nation and the peace of the entire world.

The editorial follows:

HOUSE ROLE VITAL

Walter Lippmann this morning suggested that the House in considering the European recovery plan should defer to the Senate as the body chiefly responsible for foreign affairs, and do little tinkering with the plan the Senate favors.

We disagree with Mr. Lippmann on this question. We think his logic and conception of the roles of each house in the situation are poor.

The Senate does have some special responsibilities in foreign affairs, and its judgment of what is needed abroad and the general principles on which we should give aid may be entitled to the special deference Mr. Lippmann suggests.

But a vital aspect of the whole undertaking is the capacity of the United States to furnish what seems to be necessary and the extent to which our own economy can shoulder the burden it will impose.

The House as the body in which appropriations of money originate therefore should have from the Senate a similar deference on what the country can stand.

It should know more about the capacity of the country, about the tax burden it can stand, than the Senate. And the Senate's proposals should be modified to the extent that the House, recognizing our inescapable duty to help European recovery, judges it wise.

The burden will have to be borne by the American people as a whole. The whole Congress therefore must decide, taking all the implications into consideration, how far we can go: The Senate judging foreign need, the House judging our capacity; and the two together reaching a compromise that balances our obligation and our capacity at a proper point.

The House has a vital and major responsibility which it cannot avoid.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor:

PERPETUATING A WRONG

The principal price control which is left from the war period is rent control. It is to be extended.

Rent control, when other prices remain uncontrolled, is wrong from every point of view except that of selfish tenants and greedy office seekers or office holders.

Rent control, without other prices controlled, is discriminatory. It takes from one group—landlords—the rights which all other groups enjoy.

Everything a landlord buys has increased in price, yet the landlord cannot raise his rents, except for partial relief provided in the controls—relief which is granted by bureaucrats more sympathetic to controls than to landlords, and relief which is all bound up in red tape. The landlord must humble himself by begging for such relief, and even then it is limited by the controls.

The landlord's taxes are up. His repair bills are up. The cost of replacements or improvements are up. If he provides furniture and fixtures, their cost is up. The value of his property is up, but not its return. The cost of fuel is up. Yet, the landlord is supposed to charge the same old rent he charged before the war. If he asks for even the temporary and limited relief the controls provide, he is suspected of ulterior motives.

The most disturbing factor in all this is the supineness with which Americans accept and approve such discrimination. Landlords cannot be accused of a combination in restriction of trade; in other words, monopoly. There are millions of them and they are not organized. They cannot be condemned as speculators, dealing in other people's woe to their own profit. Even the potential sale of their properties is harmed by the rent controls.

Landlords have been pictured always as hard-headed individuals who have no concern for the rights of tenants. Actually, a lot more landlords always have taken a beating than is true of tenants. Many, many tenants are far from angels. Because they are not organized landlords have simply done a poor job of telling the world about their troubles, whereas tenants are always complaining in public.

Rent controls have impeded new home construction, particularly rental properties. Somebody wants to build tenements in Concord. They go into plans and costs very carefully, and then figure what rents must be to yield only a fair return upon the proposed investment. Then they compare this rental figure with prevailing rents, which are frozen. The latter are too low to make it practical to build the tenements. The competition from low rents thus impedes new construction.

Quite a lot of families are living in Government subsidized rents built to provide homes for low-income families. But these families no longer are low-income families. Yet they are not compelled to move from their subsidized rents to make way for the people of fixed incomes, who, like landlords, are in the worst plight when there is inflation.

A lot of people are living in rents they would not occupy if there were not rent controls. In short, they are getting more than they could afford except that Uncle Sam freezes rents and thus gives them something for nothing at the expense of landlords. If rents were not controlled, people would seek rents comparable with their incomes.

A lot of people continue to rent who should have been building or buying their own homes. While rent controls last they are getting something for nothing, and incidentally contributing nothing to expansion in the number of housing units in this country, though they have the means to do so.

Another governmental policy than rent control has upset the rental scene. That is the comparatively low tax on long-term (anything owned more than 6 months) capital gains. People can pay lower taxes by buying and selling things like homes and multifamily houses than in any other way. So there has been a terrific sale and resale of real property, with an accompanying terrific dislocation of families as they have had to move.

Democrats and Republicans alike are vying for the vote of American tenants. The landlord is in a tough spot. He is left no choice, for Wallace is even worse. That is the way it gets for everyone, sooner or later, when state socialism takes over. Even the vote a man has comes to count for nothing, not even a protest.

Sentiments of New Jersey Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, at a very recent date the New Jersey Polish American Congress assembled at their annual convention at the Polish National Home, Elizabeth, N. J. Among the most important topics under discussion during the convention was the barbarous treatment and gross injustice to which their brave motherland, Poland, has been and is being subjected.

There are no finer American citizens, no braver, and no more honorable people than those who make up membership in the Polish American Congress. Their sentiments are entitled to our respect.

At the conclusion of the convention the congress issued a statement over the signature of its president, Mr. Edward Kozmor of Jersey City, which I include herewith in my extension of remarks:

We respectfully advise that the following resolution was unanimously adopted by Americans assembled at an annual convention of the New Jersey Polish American Congress on Sunday, February 8, 1948, at the Polish National Home, Elizabeth, N. J.:

"We wish to remind the world that on September 1, 1939, when the German barbarians invaded Poland, there was only one boundary question. Poland's boundaries were violated by the Germans. The whole world stood up in arms because the boundaries of one nation were violated by force and brutality of another nation.

"England and France declared war because this violation of a principle challenged international morality, the principle that the boundaries of every country are a sacred responsibility of the whole world.

"Already two-thirds of Europe with a population exceeding that of the United States is encoiled by the Red octopus, while in the remaining fringe of free Europe a gigantic ideological struggle is going on between the forces of democracy and the forces of totalitarianism.

"The sins of Yalta are haunting the peacemakers. Impotent under the veto to prevent aggression or redress wrongs, UN is bound sooner or later to go on the rocks.

"Poland sold into Russian bondage at Yalta by her own allies, is barred from presenting her case before UN. Although it is well known that Poland's pseudo delegates at UN are quislings, headed by the arch quisling Oscar Lange, nothing is being done about it. It is clear that without the rejection of Yalta from which flows an unending stream of evil, no peace can emerge from UN.

"Every problem is being placed on the agenda of UN except the most pressing one—the complete and speedy removal of Russian troops, secret police, and puppet governments from territories not held by Russia before the war.

"The international situation has reached a most crucial moment. It is bad. Little hope if any is seen for peace. Nurtured by Moscow the cancerous growth of communism is spreading. It is painfully evident that Russia is playing an evil role in the postwar world.

"What astonishes democratic elements in Europe is not Russian aggression but the failure of our American statesmen to summon enough courage to call off the Soviet bluff about American imperialism by turning the tables to point an accusing finger at the only instigator of a new war—Soviet Russia.

"The Polish-American Congress of New Jersey maintains that the grave crisis in international relations is due not only to the reactionary and imperialistic policies of the Soviet Government, but also to the past grave mistakes, illusions, and laxity on the part of the democracies. The roots of the ominous crisis are to be traced directly to Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. These three cornerstones of a self-deceiving policy of appeasement mark the growth of a rabid Soviet imperialism: The convention welcomes the awakening of the forces of democracy which took place at this late hour. The convention asks that the Administration and the Congress of the United States keep a vigilant and alert eye upon the disruptive machinations of the Kremlin clique. Specially, since the Soviet Government never kept a single agreement, pact, or treaty in good faith, and never will, the convention cautions that only a firm American policy based on real guaranties bears a promise of security for the whole world.

"The New Jersey Polish-American Congress in convention today warns that the irresponsible armaments of Russia and her satellites will leave the United States wholly disarmed in the face of a determined aggressor. We declare, therefore, that we support any steps taken by our administration toward America's military preparedness.

"We, the Polish-American Congress, will continue championing the rights of Poland and her people among our fellow citizens and those who influence public opinion.

"We shall, above all, stand guard over our heritage of democracy, and will with all our power endeavor to instill in that portion of our nation which we represent, a militant opposition to communistic infiltration.

More than 6,000,000 people of Polish ancestry, true and loyal American citizens, are deeply grieved over the tragic plight of their compatriots and the scandalous and unjust treatment of Poland and her people.

"The commitments and agreements made by this Government's representatives at

Yalta were made without the knowledge or consent of Congress and in direct contradiction to the Constitution of the United States. These decisions were made also without the knowledge or consent of the Polish Government or the Polish people and therefore cannot be binding, they should not be allowed to stand.

"Franklin D. Roosevelt in a sublime moment during the dark days of the war proclaimed that 'Poland is the inspiration of nations.'

"We declare, that the pledge of the nations to Poland, their ally, has been broken. As a political compromise Poland was delivered to Communistic Russia to have her people decimated by starvation, torture and exile, her religion desecrated, her institutions debased and her freedom extinguished.

"We further declare, that the issue of Justice for Poland is no longer a mere political problem but a moral test of the faith and efficacy of the United Nations.

"Thus it cannot be belittled, decried nor beguiled, for it stands upright and sacred like the cross of Calvary to challenge the good faith of the entire world.

"We solemnly appeal to our fellow Americans and to the citizens of all civilized countries to stand by and adhere to collective responsibility for Poland. This is a test of international morality.

"We heartily declare that no structure of world peace can be founded on the quagmire of any subjugated nation, especially when that nation as Poland will fight for freedom unto death."

EDWARD KOZMOR,
President.

Wallace, Browder, and Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release by Edgar A. Mowrer:

WALLACE, BROWDER, AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

No American politician has ever more skillfully doubletalked than Henry A. Wallace. You just cannot pin him down. He wants all Europe united in a single rehabilitation plan to cost $50,000,000,000. But he also wants the United States and Russia to come to an understanding dividing the world into sphere of influence, and so forth.

Wallace wants the United States to return to the Roosevelt policy. We should be friendly to the progressive governments of eastern Europe. We should encourage economic democracy.

It sounds wonderful, so long as you don't exactly say what you mean. Mr. Wallace never does.

To get definitions the American voter has to go elsewhere. Where has he heard talk like this before?

I suggest that he open and read the latest pamphlet by Communist Earl Browder, former head of the American Communist Party. It is called World Communism and United States Foreign Policy.

Strangely enough, the pamphlet is one long appeal for the United States to return to the Roosevelt wartime policy of friendly cooperation with the Soviet Union.

You see, it was like this:

Although Roosevelt's America represented imperialism and Stalin represented socialism, the wartime partnership between the two was progressive. It was progressive because it permitted the peaceful transition to socialism. America, Browder admits, is not yet ready for progress into socialism. But by supporting Stalin rather than Churchill, Roosevelt played a progressive role.

Thanks to him, the countries liberated by the Soviet Union were able to continue their wartime unity against Hitler in "national governments of a new democracy." The Communists played such a leading role in the resistance movements that, according to Browder (p. 13) "Roosevelt, as the Chief Executive of the United States of America, early in 1944 publicly expressed his opinion that it was desirable for Communists to be included in all governments that were being provisionally established for the liberated countries."

The pattern established at Tehran and Yalta of coalition governments supporting programs transitional to socialism with nationalization of key industries as a central feature was one of the foundation stones of a long-term peace. In accepting it, Roosevelt, according to Browder, was not deliberately working for socialism. He knew he could not prevent socialism or stop Russia. He was just an enlightened imperialist. For—according to Browder—he chose survival of America as the ally of a powerful socialist system, rather than assimilation into triumphant Hitlerite imperialism. Whereas Churchill wanted only a limited alliance with the Soviet Union, Roosevelt realized that American capitalism could not survive another war.

The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, these constitute a reversal of the Roosevelt policy. Naturally, they are going to fail. Browder solemnly appeals to Walter Lippmann for an irrefutable demonstration of this fact.

"The sooner this is recognized and America returns to the Roosevelt plan, the less painful and costly it will be for America." And so for Browder.

What the Roosevelt plan entails has just been once more demonstrated in Czechoslovakia. The last lights of freedom in eastern Europe have gone out. What Earl Browder calls a "progressive regime," a "coalition government," a "new democracy" turns out in practice to mean Communist oppression enforced by terror.

Which brings me back to Henry Wallace.

Earl Browder does not mind terror. He believes in the enforced dictatorship of a small group in the name of the masses. He wants complete socialism. He thinks that if he can dupe the Americans into helping Stalin promote it faster, so much the worse for the American ~upes.

The point is that Henry Wallace talks just like Earl Browder. He, too, believes that the Soviet Union is an "economic democracy." He, too, speaks of the "liberation" of the eastern European countries like Czechoslovakia. I have heard him.

Above all, Wallace wants a return to the Roosevelt policy of cooperation with the Soviet Union.

In his testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, our former Vice President stated:

"I am not familiar with the Communist approach. I don't follow the Communist literature."

Really, Mr. Wallace?

Then it would be interesting if the Presidential candidate, Wallace, would explain to the American people, how it comes that he advocates approximately the same foreign policy as Earl Browder in approximately the same words—and whether these words mean the same to him as they do to the American Communist Party.

Political Magic Can't Alter Simple Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a stanch believer in the principle of allowing the natural forces of economics to adjust themselves rather than having Federal authority attempt the impossible, and now my friend the gentleman from Oregon, Hon. Ralph T. Moore, in an article in the Oregon Voter of January 31, 1948, has written so well on this subject that I commend his article to the Congress and ask permission to quote it here, as follows:

POLITICAL MAGIC CAN'T ALTER SIMPLE FACT
(By Ralph T. Moore)

A columnist of national repute cites the plight of a certain ex-GI Federal worker and his family in the Nation's Capital to insinuate that Congress is to blame for high prices. A strange mixture of sentiment and economics is used to depict Congressional alliance with trivials while the people suffer. The implication is that Congress must deliver the goods in 1948 or else.

Here again is the manifestation of subtle Marxist philosophy so cleverly inculcated during the past decade. It is that government can arbitrarily endow the citizen with guaranteed enjoyment of living essentials heretofore thought obtainable only through diligent individual endeavor; that government should use taxing power to confiscate the fruits of the industrious in order to supply the deficiencies of the indolent; that legislation can be enacted to cure every economic ill; that monopoly, though a work of the devil in private hands, becomes righteous when administered by government; that an individual, incompetent in private enterprise, miraculously becomes endowed with divine wisdom when he enters the Federal service. Would that the latter theorem were true. How simple our problems would then become.

The truth is that the Congress can do little to regulate inflation under our Constitution. The war experience and western Europe's current situation bear out the fact that legislation aimed at intimate economic controls is disappointingly ineffective. One might as well pass a law prohibiting winter snow storms as to attempt control of public buying habits by statute. It is beyond the power of Congress or any other governing body short of absolute dictatorship to furnish the rheostatic controls over the flow of commerce that would insure balance between buying power and goods supply. Drastic use of Federal authority to force artificial adjustment always results in severe economic disruption with accompanying unemployment and general misery for the people. The Congress was wise in facing realities by adopting voluntary controls to insure the unimpaired functioning of the natural law of supply and demand.

The whole Marxist philosophy with its centralized controls and industrial socialization trips over one basic fallacy. It presumes a static economy with known, constant values whereas modern economy is extremely dynamic with widely fluctuating values and unpredictable developments. In order to effectuate Marxist policies it is first necessary to ruthlessly suppress the factors causing dynamics in economy. This inevitably leads to development stagnation and dissipation

of industrial power and explains the inability of Marxism to successfully compete with democracy. And yet there are many who would have us adopt Marxist doctrines as substitute for our system of free enterprise.

It will be exquisite cruelty to mislead the public into believing that the Congress holds the key to inflation. Only those intent on destruction of American institutions and the exotic enslavement of the people or whose motive is personal political aggrandizement would deliberately advocate such a deceit. The salvation of the great middle class of white-collar workers and those with modest incomes, the backbone of the Nation, lies solely in greater production of goods, greater efficiency in industrial techniques, and lower Government costs No amount of political incantation or medicine-man hocus-pocus can alter this simple fact in the slightest degree.

Resolution of United Jewish Appeal of Greater Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the letter that I have received from Benjamin Olanoff, chairman, resolutions committee, United Jewish Appeal of Greater Lynn, Mass., enclosing the resolution adopted by the citizens of Greater Lynn, Mass., on Sunday evening, February 29, 1948, at the Jewish Community Center, Lynn, Mass.:

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL
OF GREATER LYNN,
Lynn, Mass., March 8, 1948.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution adopted by more than 1,000 citizens of our community, at a public meeting held Sunday evening, February 29, 1948.

We respectfully urge your earnest consideration of this publicly expressed desire of our group, and hope you will do all in your power to bring to a full realization the centuries-old prayer of the people of Israel.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN OLANOFF,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTION

We, the citizens of Greater Lynn, Mass., assembled at a public meeting on Sunday evening, February 29, 1948, at the Jewish Community Center, Lynn, to deliberate upon the present critical situation in Palestine, view with deep emotion, profound shock, and disappointment the events which have transpired since the United Nations decision on November 29, 1947, to establish a Jewish national state in Palestine.

Whereas the United Nations Commission for Palestine is now dealing with the knotty problem of implementation of the Assembly's decision in the face of British sabotage and British obstruction; and

Whereas the continuance of Mufti-engineered outbreaks in Palestine, as well as the open defiance of Arab states, which are members of the United Nations, constitute a serious menace to world peace; and

Whereas the United States Government, whose leadership and initiative were so vital in bringing about the United Nations, decision, has become vacillating and indecisive; and

Whereas the United Nations Commission on Implementation is pressing for the organization of an international force:

Now, therefore, we, the citizens of Greater Lynn, do ask the United States Government, President Harry S. Truman, and the State Department in Washington to support and initiate the following measures with urgent speed:

(1) To reaffirm and reassert the leadership held in the United Nations by boldly upholding the United Nations resolution on Palestine.

(2) To modify the embargo on arms, so as to make available implements of defense for the Haganah, the Jewish defense force.

(3) To take the initiative in urging upon the Security Council of the United Nations the formation of an international armed force to implement the partition plan for a Jewish state in Palestine, and to maintain law and order in the Holy Land.

(4) To give stern warning to the Arab states, members of the United Nations, calling upon them to put an end to the sabotage of the United Nations' decision.

(5) To declare to the British Government that as long as Great Britain remains in Palestine she must act in defense of public law and of the United Nations' decision.

(6) To protest Great Britain's failure to abide by the decision of the United Nations to open a port in Tel Aviv for immediate Jewish immigration.

(7) To speak out with moral authority and decisiveness, and to do all things necessary to bring about a wholesome respect for the decisions of the United Nations, to the end that order may be brought out of chaos in Palestine, and peace and security to a troubled world, bearing in mind that unchecked defiance of any decision of the United Nations will be the beginning of a process of disintegration for the United Nations, the great hope of the world for peace and justice for all.

Prominent Attorney Testifies for American Bar Association on Tidelands and Submerged Land Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of John D. McCall, of Dallas, Tex., in behalf of the American Bar Association before joint meeting of Senate and House Judiciary Committees on February 27, 1948, considering S. 1988, the tidelands and submerged land bill:

My name is John D. McCall. I am a lawyer, and I reside in Dallas, Tex. I am appearing as the representative of the American Bar Association, having been so designated by its president, Mr. Tappen Gregory, as authorized by its house of delegates. With the permission of your committee, I will first read the resolution adopted by the Association and will then proceed with this statement.

The house of delegates of the American Bar Association at its midwinter meeting in Chicago on February 23, 1948, by unanimous vote, adopted a composite resolution, in three severable parts as follows:

RESOLUTION REGARDING TIDELANDS CASE

I

"Be it resolved, That the house of delegates of the American Bar Association approves and urges the adoption of S. 1988 offered in the Senate of the United States on January 16, 1948, at the second session of the Eightieth Congress entitled 'A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources'; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, to other Members of Congress, and to the President of the United States."

II

"Be it resolved, That the house of delegates of the American Bar Association in approving and urging the adoption of S. 1988 is opposed to any compromise or amended measure which may be offered which would have the effect of quitclaiming or relinquishing everything within the 3-mile offshore belt, except the minerals therein; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, to other Members of Congress, and to the President of the United States."

III

Be it resolved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, That the President of the Association, or someone designated by him, is hereby authorized to appear before, or to submit a statement to, the appropriate committees of Congress in support of S. 1988, and in opposition to amendments thereto or to other bills which may be introduced in Congress to accomplish the compromise referred to in the second resolution.

This action by the association was taken after mature consideration. A resolution favoring such action was introduced at its Cleveland meeting in September 1947. The resolution as introduced was referred to the association's committee on resolutions. After a series of hearings and deliberation by the committee, the resolution was reported back to the assembly with recommendation that a special committee be appointed by the president to consider the subject matter, with instructions to make a report to the midwinter meeting of the house of delegates. Under authority by the house of delegates, the president appointed a special committee comprised of the following: James L. Shepherd, Jr., chairman; William A. Daugherty; James T. Finlen, Jr.; Gurney E. Newlin; and Alvin Richards.

The special committee filed its report with the house of delegates this week, urging the adoption of the three resolutions (which for convenience will be considered as the resolution), and you may consider it as the formal and definitive action of the American Bar Association.

You are entitled to know from any lawyer-witness whether either he or his clients have a substantial interest in the subject matter of proposed legislation. Although such interest would by no means disqualify the witness, the disclosure is proper. To dispose of the question immediately, I do not own and have never owned or represented owners of petroleum rights under submerged lands. It is true that I have been supporting the efforts of the Governor of my State, the Honorable Beauford Jester, and our attorney general, the Honorable Price Daniel, the Texas State Bar, and other groups to obtain the passage of this legislation. My interest was challenged, not primarily because California and other coast States would be deprived of their oil rights, distressing though that be, but

because under the new doctrine announced by the Supreme Court in the California case all rights of States and their grantees in lands under navigable waters, littoral and inland, were imperiled, and because for the first time the right had been proclaimed in the Federal Government to take property needed for defense without paying for it. To a lawyer interested in the conservation of our water resources, the integrity of water rights, and in municipal and corporate finance, the logical application and probable expansion of the doctrine is deplorable.

The constitution of the American Bar Association prohibits its activity in matters of general governmental policy, nonlegal in character. It would not be competent for the association to adopt a resolution favoring legislation essentially political, but as pointed out by the special committee: (a) the association had in 1945 urged Congress to pass legislation relinquishing title or claim to submerged offshore lands in the several States (which legislation was vetoed by the President); (b) a number of local and State bar associations had adopted resolutions urging remedial action by Congress; (c) the members of the special committee felt that the association is entitled "to comment on the character of reasoning under which the Supreme Court reached the result that the Federal Government has 'paramount rights, and full dominion and power over' these offshore areas 'an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil,' and that we as lawyers should comment on this new and novel Federal theory of paramount power to take mineral resources regardless of 'bare legal title' or 'mere property ownership' "; and (d) "on questions involving our basic theory of government, particularly in connection with the relation between the States and the Federal Government, it seems to us that the lawyers have a special duty to comment on anything which appears to be a radical departure from the situation as it has maintained and been recognized in one way or another since this Nation was founded."

The doors of congressional committees have ever been open to representatives of the bar of this country in such circumstances.

Many able arguments have been submitted to your committee in support of Senate bill 1988. I hesitate to detain you with repetition, but it seems imperative that I state, briefly as possible, why the opinion in the California Tidelands case has precipitated this rather unusual interest in our association and certain important considerations which we think would justify your approval of legislation designed to restore what the lawyers of this country are wont to feel has been the status quo for a century and a half.

Since the effect of the Pollard case (*Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan*, 3 Howard 212) has been so ably presented to your committee by other witnesses, I shall pretermit a discussion of it, except to say that it has been cited with approval by 52 subsequent Supreme Court decisions, 244 Federal and State Court decisions, and has been consistently followed for 100 years without a dissent.

Generally, the Pollard case and subsequent cases have been considered as ample authority for the conclusion that all lands under navigable waters and all rights therein are the property of the State in which such waters are situated (*Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240), *Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1), and *The Abby Dodge* (233 U. S. 166).)

The limitation of the reasoning of the Pollard case to inland waters is contrary to the interpretation of the breadth of that rule as applied in subsequent cases by the Supreme Court. As stated by that Court in *Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1 (52)):

"The maritime belt is that part of the sea which in contradistinction to the open sea is under the sway of the riparian States, which can exclusively reserve the fishery * * * for their own citizens, whether fish or pearls or amber or other products of the sea."

The history of this rule as shown in the cases and text writers indicates that at common law it began with the sovereign's ownership of the adjoining sea and was extended to inland waters as "arms of the sea," thus forming one rule of ownership applicable to all navigable waters without any distinction as to whether inland or seaward (see Gould on Waters (3d ed. 1900); *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Peters, 367); *Weber* v. *Board of Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall 57), and *Illinois Central R. R. Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), the Great Lakes case).

In view of the discussions by many early writers, the references in many early cases and documents, it is difficult to see how the Court reached the conclusion that the original colonies did not own some area seaward from their shores.

For example, the 1584 Raleigh Grant conveyed the "royalties * * * as well marine as other within the saide landes * * * or the seas thereunto adjoining."

The 1611 Virginia Charter granted the soil, minerals, etc., "both * * * upon the main, and also within said islands and seas adjoining."

Similar expressions appear in the other colonial charters and patents.

Immediately following the formation of the original States, many of them commenced and continued to enact legislation exercising rights of ownership and jurisdiction in the marginal sea, one example being the 1798 act of the Rhode Island General Assembly prohibiting any person from keeping more than two lobster pots "upon or within 3 miles of any of the shores of the State." (See other charters and other examples as set forth in appendix "E" to brief of the State of California filed in the Supreme Court.)

We feel that there is ample authority for the proposition that the respective States did have ownership to some extent in the adjoining marginal seas, and that even though the precise breadth of the seaward area of the States may not have been called into question in the early days, the 3-mile limit was more the nature of an establishment as a minimum and what had been unsettled was only the extent or the breadth of ownership and not the fact of ownership. As stated by Mr. Justice Reed in the dissenting opinion:

"There were, of course * * * variations in the claims of the sovereignty, jurisdiction, or ownership among the nations of the world. As early as 1793, Jefferson, as Secretary of State, in a communication to the British Minister, said that the territorial protection of the United States would be extended three geographical miles and added:

"This distance can admit of no opposition, as it is recognized by treaties between some of the powers with whom we are connected in commerce and navigation, and is as little, or less, than is claimed by any of them on their own coasts."

In concluding its opinion, the Supreme Court in the California case said:

"We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission."

At the Cleveland meeting of the American Bar Association in supporting the resolution on this subject, I remarked that rather than upset the entire field of jurisprudence to accomplish its rather limited primary objective, perhaps it would have been better for the Government to proceed directly against California's oil under another precedent which was not cited by the Government. I refer to the case of Ahab against Naboth—First Kings, chapter 21—wherein it is shown that Naboth had a very fine vineyard hard by the palace of King Ahab, and that Ahab desired and coveted Naboth's vineyard. The case is not on all fours with the California case. A point of difference is that before Ahab had Naboth killed so as to create an escheat of title to the King, he first offered to buy the property from Naboth.

The American Bar Association believes that Congress should enact such legislation for many reasons, among which the following are included:

(1) The Supreme Court in this case holds that California does not own the seaward areas within its boundaries, contrary to principles established in a long line of prior decisions by the Court. This ruling will no doubt be applied to other States. An act of Congress removing the effect of the decision is necessary to confirm and establish State ownership, which has been thought to exist since the days of the Colonies. Under the authority of the case itself, Congress has the power to take such action.

(2) The case holds that the United States has paramount rights and authority in such seaward areas, including dominion over its resources. This is a new concept, a Federal power superior to title; it gives without ownership, the right to appropriate resources without compensation.

(3) While the Government in this case did not assert rights in inland waters such as bays, lakes, and inlets, neither the opinion nor the decree entered in the case defines inland waters with the result that in many cases it would be impossible to determine where a State ownership ends and Federal paramount rights begin.

(4) While the Government made no claim in the California case to inland waters, the opinion of the Court refers to State ownership thereof as a qualified ownership, thus casting doubt upon the title of the States to such waterways and the soil and resources thereunder. Federal legislation is needed to quiet State ownership of inland waters as against Federal claims.

(5) By reason of the theory of the opinion that the Federal Government has the "paramount right" to the resources in the open sea within the limits of the littoral States because it may need these resources for national defense or to conduct foreign relations, State ownership of inland waters and public lands and private ownership of upland areas and their resources may be questioned later. If need can determine paramount rights in the first case, it is an easy second step for the courts to hold that need can determine ownership in the latter cases.

(6) The new concept that the Federal Government has the paramount right to take property without compensation because it may need that property in discharging its duty to defend the country and conduct its foreign relations, can have no logical end except that the Federal Government may take over all property, public and private, in the United States when some public official such as the Secretary of National Defense, for example, may say that the Government needs this property in carrying out these duties. Under this theory, the Federal Government could nationalize all of the coal mines, the coal deposits, all of the iron mines, and mine ore deposits, all oil and gas fields and all other prospective oil and gas producing areas, and indeed all of the natural resources of the country, without paying the owners therefor, wholly in disregard of the fifth amendment.

(7) The basic philosophy underlying the majority opinion in the California case is

the inherent sovereignty doctrine, heretofore applied to external affairs, that the Federal Government has inherent sovereign powers as a nation, not dependent upon an express or implied grant in the Constitution. This is the first case in which such doctrine has been applied to purely internal affairs and to relative rights and powers of the Nation and of the States over lands within their borders. So applied, the rule is at variance with the historic background and the political philosophy upon which the Federal Government was founded and with the express provisions of the tenth amendment. The inherent sovereignty doctrine lays the foundation for converting the Federal Government into a super-state, not dependent for its powers upon the Constitution, and therefore not subject to the checks and balances contained in that document.

The Constitution, article I, section 7, paragraph 17, specifies the land within the several States over which the Federal Government may exercise authority: "such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance by Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States, and * * * over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards and other needful buildings."

The exercise of exclusive Federal authority in these seaward areas, historically and legally theretofore recognized as within the boundaries of the several States, runs counter to the whole theory of the union of the sovereign States. Ownership by the States of these seaward areas, heretofore recognized, has never interfered with the paramount rights of the Federal Government; and such ownership if now confirmed and established in the States, would not interfere with such paramount rights of the Federal Government.

(8) In its opinion, the Supreme Court said: "That the political agencies of this Nation both claim and exercise broad dominion and control over our 3-mile marginal belt is now a settled fact * * * and this assertion of National dominion over the 3-mile belt is binding upon this court."

This presents a new concept of constitutional powers, or rather the lack of power of the Supreme Court. The Court, by taking jurisdiction in this case, assumed that it had the power to settle a dispute between the Federal Government and a State as to the ownership of property within a State. It then denies that power by its statement that the assertion of national dominion by the Executive Department of the Federal Government is binding on the Supreme Court. If this be true, there is no forum to which a State or individual can resort for protection against the assertion of titles or rights in property by the executive department of the Federal Government. While this statement was applied to the 3-mile belt, admittedly that area was within the boundaries of the State of California and the doctrine would have equal application anywhere within the boundaries of California and hence within the boundaries of any State.

Fortunately, if the Congress should feel in good conscience that this legislation should be passed, it may proceed with the unusual assurance that the constitutionality of its act has already been forecast by the Supreme Court in the California Tidelands case.

The American Bar Association, its president, and its representative are grateful to you for the privilege you have made available to us and for your patient attention. We feel that in the forum of the Congress of the United States our case is in good hands.

America Needs MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of taking part in a national hook-up broadcast concerning General MacArthur's announcement, from Tokyo, that he would accept the nomination for President of the United States if called by the American people. His complete statement follows:

I have been informed that petitions have been filed at Madison and signed by many of my fellow citizens of Wisconsin, presenting my name to the electorate for consideration at the primary, April 6.

I am deeply grateful for this spontaneous display of friendly confidence. No man could fail to be profoundly stirred by such a public movement in this hour of momentous import—national, international, temporal, and spiritual.

While it seems unnecessary for me to repeat I do not actively seek or covet any office and have no plans for leaving my post in Japan, I can say, and with due humility, that I would be recreant to all my concepts of good citizenship were I to shrink, because of hazards and responsibilities involved, from accepting any public duty to which I might be called by the American people.

I was asked on this broadcast, first the question, "How do I know that General MacArthur is a Republican or a Democrat?" I replied that he is definitely a Republican and cited the letter he wrote to the Young Republicans on December 22, 1947, and which they released in their recent drive to enlist the university students in the Republican Party. A part of General MacArthur's letter reads as follows:

The Republican Party is peculiarly well fitted vigorously to espouse this laudable purpose to further arouse in the youthful mind the all-important concept of public responsibility, for the Republican Party has never deviated from the proposition that all political power resides in the people. It has never failed in its staunch advocacy for the maximum of personal freedom and individual responsibility, and has tenaciously held as a principle inviolate—equality of opportunity.

This statement to the Young Republicans and his statement from Tokyo indicating he would accept "any public duty to which he might be called by the American people," should dispel all doubt as to his party affiliations.

A second question was asked, "What prompted General MacArthur to make his announcement at this time?" I replied in substance that he has been urged by his many friends in this country to make a definite statement as to his availability. The Wisconsin and the Nebraska primaries on April 6 and 13, respectively, were also a further reason for making his announcement. I am also convinced that the danger of impending war and the difficulties with Russia had much to do with his statement. General MacArthur has been the only man who knows how to deal with Russia. He did not permit them to dominate the situation in Japan.

There may be many people who do not like a military man for President, but with the darkening clouds of war upon our horizon, they well know that General MacArthur would not deviate from his principles that communism has no place in our Government.

I was further asked, "Would the people accept a military man as President of the United States?" I replied, that of the 32 Presidents, 13 had military careers; 9 attained the rank of general. They were as follows: George Washington, James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, Franklin Pierce, Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, and Benjamin Harrison. William McKinley was a major, Theodore Roosevelt a colonel, and the present occupant of the White House is a major in the Reserve Corps. I further stated that I thought it was unsound to support a man for President just because he is a military figure, but that it would be more unsound to oppose someone, who is in every way qualified, because he shows great military leadership.

General MacArthur served in two world wars. In the First World War, he received 13 decorations for gallantry under fire. There were seven citations for valor. He was the youngest Chief of Staff of the United States Army. He commanded the famous Rainbow Division and received the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism against a determined enemy. He served two terms as Chief of Staff, under two different Presidents. His past experience in Washington has given him knowledge and insight into all types of foreign diplomatic affairs.

The moderator further asked me, "Why do you think General MacArthur would be a good President of this country?" I quoted Senator VANDENBERG, who wrote an article in Collier's magazine on February 12, 1944, entitled "Why I Am for MacArthur for President," when he said:

I know that MacArthur is the embodiment of loyalty to our American destinies at any cost. The proof stands on the records. I know that he is as devoid of political entanglements as he was of reinforcements at Bataan. I know that he would come to the White House with no thought or purpose except to serve America at home and abroad in the climax of his devoted career. Any racketeers of any sort would last about 1 minute in his presence. I know that he has never shirked a tough job in his life or compromised with it. He is granite in the face of duty. I know that his training and experience produce an integrity of character which will persist in any assignment he accepts. I would like to vote for integrity of character. It means more to me than a thousand campaign promises. Isn't that what America needs? He has the know-how because he has dealt with government all his life. More than any other Presidential possibility he would be elected as a great unifying American, who would win his country's unified support by deserving it. Although MacArthur has been a soldier all his life, I never knew a man in whom spiritual values are more predominant. He is definitely more than a soldier. This is important because the family hearthstone means more to us in our ideology than battlefields, and

it means infinitely more to him. He once said, at a reunion of his Rainbow Division, "No one deserves peace as much as a soldier, for he must pay the greatest penalty in war." Further quoting Senator VANDENBERG: "I repeat that spiritual values rule his mind. This blossoms in every speech he has ever made and in every statement he ever uttered. I recall his thrilling, sanctified radio message from the hard-pressed Phillippines, to the little church in Arkansas where he was confirmed as a boy. The message sent on a beleaguered Easter morning—a message eloquently suggesting that we need God on our side in this titanic struggle, and humbly asking for His aid. I have lasting consolation and assurance in this simple Christian's reliance upon divine grace. That is the kind of a President I want, Mr. Editor. I believe General MacArthur has what it takes in full measure. He has maturity and vast experience. If nominated he will be elected. If elected he will bring a great mind, a great heart, a great capacity, and a great devotion to the proud leadership of a great Nation."

He is a magnetic personality—a born leader of men. He has vision, courage, and understands human nature. He is by tradition, ability, character, and experience, qualified to be President. He is an outstanding figure in public life. He is a statesman and a diplomat. He has the courage of his convictions.

The General states he wants to be a candidate of the people. I am receiving hundreds of letters indicating that the General would be just such a candidate. His support will come from the grass roots and not from political leaders. It is my opinion that his announcement of availability will give the green light, which will be a signal for the formation of thousands of MacArthur-for-President Clubs.

We cannot overlook the fact that all indications point to a deadlock between Taft and Dewey at the convention. The people will turn to this great American, General MacArthur. He is the one man that the democratic South can support and not lose force. They want to shelve the politicians, while it is yet within their power to do so. They want a man who has the moral courage of nonpartisan leadership; a man of sterling diplomatic qualities, firm in his belief in democracy, strong in Christian stability, with a mind that grasps and holds firmly the solutions of our economic problems; who shows the strength and ability of unselfish leadership in domestic problems and world affairs, and whose words of wisdom will give hope and security to every American. This man is Douglas MacArthur—not a politician. He has responded to the call of the people. The people will respond to General MacArthur.

Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress Clarence Hancock was an urbane veteran of many a campaign; but even so he always had time for a word and a quip.

Clarence Hancock had a rare capacity of self-integration, an acceptance of the world as he found it without undue passion; yet he was a just and kind man, not blind or resigned to the injustices plain to be seen, but persuaded rather of the ultimate improvement of man without scolding from him.

Clarence Hancock's capacity for self-abnegation was proved by his withdrawal from public life at the height of his popularity and seniority without bitterness or qualms. His memory will be treasured by all who knew him, and his influence will endure even after the memory of his personal appearance has dimmed and faded.

Korean Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News:

KEEPING THE KOREAN RECORD CLEAR

The calling of Korean elections for May 9 is a victory for American policy and an assertion of United Nations authority. But, because of Soviet imperialism, self-government is not in sight for all of that unhappy land.

Because Russia refuses to permit a UN-supervised election in her occupation zone of north Korea, a minority of the Little Assembly questions the wisdom of going ahead with the polling plan. The vote was 31 to 2, with 11 abstaining—and the Soviet 6 boycotting. In our judgment, the UN could not have revoked its election order without branding itself a puppet of Red dictation and setting a precedent for future impotence.

Of course, minority fears that the election will prolong the present division of Korea are justified. But there is no way to prevent that, short of war to oust the Russians from north Korea or withdrawal of American and UN authority from south Korea to permit unification of the entire country under a Red police state.

The practical question is whether 20,000,000 people in the south should be denied self-government because 10,000,000 fellow countrymen in the north are unfortunate enough to be enslaved by a foreign power. The answer is too obvious for serious debate.

If the United States had any imperialistic itch or desire for indefinite military occupation there, as charged by the Red propagandists, it would not have turned over to the UN the responsibility for Korean freedom. If it wanted to exercise improper influence, it would not have insisted on free secret-ballot full-suffrage elections under UN supervision. Finally, if it wished to prolong division of the country or to penalize residents of the Soviet zone, it would not have insisted that one-third of the National Assembly seats be reserved for north Koreans until they are free to elect representatives.

Washington has much to answer for in Korea, particularly for the blunder of inviting Red dictatorship to share temporary occupation responsibility in the first place. But Americans may be proud of the continuing efforts of their Government to win independence and self-government for Korea through the UN.

The greater the threat of a Soviet-provoked war in the Far East, the more important it is for the United States to keep the record clear on the Red source of aggression in strategic Korea.

Should United States Support Partition of Palestine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith insert in the RECORD my remarks on the question of should the United States support partition? This question was discussed by Representative LAWRENCE SMITH and myself over Columbia network on Monday, March 8. The negative view was taken by Representative SMITH and the affirmative by myself.

I have listened with a good deal of incredulity to my dear colleague, Representative SMITH, in his recitation of fables about the Palestine issue.

Thirty-three nations at the General Assembly last fall weighed all the facts, cut through the passions and prejudices, and, yes, fables, and decided that the only practical, workable solution for Palestine and its conflicting interests was partition.

It would be interesting to review briefly the stories that have gone the rounds about United States security in relation to the Middle East. For many years, it was said we must not disturb the Arab temper because if we do, the Arabs will fall into the arms of Russia. It was not considered cricket to point out that the feudal society of the Arab world was such that it meant the erasure of the Arab pashas, emirs, and chieftans were the Arab world to turn to Russia. That myth was exploded when Russia joined the United States in voting for partition. There were no Russian arms for the Arabs to fall into.

Following partition, another myth went the rounds. This time, the version was that a Jewish state would turn to Russia. Nobody said why that must be. It was recited as a fact, not as the baseless assumption. You could not wither that assumption by pointing out that the Jewish economy, based on intensive cultivation of the soil, by development of industry, peopled in large percentage by those who had suffered from the totalitarianism of their native lands, had no room for Communist ideology. The percentage of Communists in Palestine in proportion to its population is certainly no greater than Communists in the United States. Palestine is the scene of a growing, expanding economy where the seeds of communism can hardly find nourishing soil. It should not be difficult to keep in mind that the largest percentage of DP's now seeking entry into Palestine are those who refuse to return to Russian dominated countries like Poland, Rumania, and Hungary.

That story subsided, but another has arisen to take its place, as my colleague points out. If, the story goes, an international police force is sent to Palestine to implement partition, then Russia will have her forces in the Middle East, and nothing and nobody thereafter will be able to dislodge them. This too is recited as a fact. The composition of such an international police force has not as yet even taken form. It may

be manned by small nations. Or, its complexion may be such, if formed, as to have arms from some countries and personnel from others, so as not to upset any military balance. In any event it will be a multi-controlled force and certainly not dominated by any one power. If permitted, thousands of young Jews, the world over, would go to Palestine to fight. On the other hand, let us consider the posibility of the complete retreat from enforcement of the Palestine partition plan. The Arab insurrections will continue, encouraged by the negative UN approach. The Jews of Palestine, already forced into two compromises, will most definitely not accept a third. The bloodshed and chaos will continue. We must face the possibility of Russia, in that event, sending in troops on the pretext of keeping the peace since UN would not act, the United States would not act, and Britain has withdrawn. That would be a pretty kettle of fish with Russian troops under her own authority and without international control to supervise movements and maneuvers right in the heart of the whole strategic area of the Middle East. Does my colleague prefer that alternative?

Please let me assure my listeners that my colleague and other opponents of partition do not have a monopoly on concern for United States security. Are we really concerned about oil? Nonsense. The State Department well knows that King Ibn Saud is not revoking his oil concessions. He stated so. In all the disturbances, not one threat or suggestion of a threat has come from Ibn Saud to cancel these concessions (which, incidentally have brought undreamed of profits to the Arabian-American Oil Co.). He knows, as we do, the potency of the American dollar. And only the American dollar can satisfy him. Not British pounds and not Russian rubles. Ibn Saud is not going to give up the airports and the rail-lines that United States has built for him in his kingdom nor the revenue which these concessions bring him.

Actually, in time of war, the oil would serve little purpose, since safeguarding its transportation from that distant point would prove a wasteful, futile maneuver, devouring manpower, money, and military equipment which could be put to better use. In fact, my colleague, Representative SMITH, in discussing this very issue on the floor of the House on January 22 of this year quoted from an editorial in the Washington Star which stated: "There is still a lot of oil underground in this country, but military authorities are loath to lean completely on this natural supply. Therefore there is increasing interest in the development of a synthetic oil industry that will guarantee enough oil for military purposes in any emergency. Mr. Forrestal stressed the importance of building up such an auxiliary source, so that this country would be wholly independent of any foreign supply for the fuel."

In their concern for national security, the opponents of partition overlook one basic fact and that is that the one stabilizing and dependable factor that can exist in the Middle East is a Jewish state which with its science and agriculture and industrialization can serve the United States best in that area if the need ever arises. In World War II, this is actually what did happen. The Jews of Palestine fought with the Allies, supplied the Levant command with matériel vitally needed and helped turn the tide against the Axis in this crucial area. The record of the Arabs, on the other hand, is one of revolt, apathy, pro-Axis sympathy and propaganda, not to mention the ugly word of blackmail, and the machinations of the ex-Grand Mufti who organized the Arab brigade to fight American troops.

My good friend, Representative SMITH from Wisconsin says there should be reconsideration of the whole subject with reference to the International Court at the Hague. Of course, there have been considerations and reconsiderations and negotiations and renegotiations ad nauseum. At best, he would further muddy the waters or have the UN indulge in further dodging and stalling the issue. He says there is war in the Holy Land. I agree. I ask that he tell that to Warren Austin. Certainly war is such a denial of peace as to recommend implementation of the partition decision by force by the UN. But my colleague is worried about protocol and the break-down of the UN. Too much insistance upon formalities may result in the failure to act decisively and thus scuttle the UN. The failure of partition would mean that we are to have no faith in the plighted word.

The fault does not lie with the partition plan. Had the United Nations, collectively and the United States and Great Britain, individually, and as member nations, given concrete evidence of their sincere determination to support partition, the bloodshed and chaos in Palestine would have been avoided. That sincerity and determination have yet to make themselves evident. When and if they do, stability and peace can and will return to the Middle East.

Economic Sanctions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which appeared in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on March 5, 1948, by Mr. Thomas Dorgan, clerk, superior court, civil business, Suffolk County, Boston, Mass.:

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

To the EDITOR OF THE POST:

SIR: I am sending a copy of your splendid editorial Economic Sanctions to Washington so that it will get into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is no wonder the rank and file of the American people are confused, and getting "fed up." "The United States armed Japan for the eventual attack on Pearl Harbor" was well said.

You cannot get friendly with a system that is out to conquer the world. We all know now that there is a tournament of insincerity by the agents of the Kremlin. The great St. Augustine, one of the most influential philosophers who ever lived, explains in his little masterpiece The Confessions that the turning point in his intellectual career was when he first began to disengage the reality of things from the trickery of words. How the rank and file of the American people got fooled by the trickery of words! Remember the way the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms were glamorized to the world, that another garden of Eden was in the making? What has happened to the two documents—they were just simply words.

I was severely criticized by some of the great intellectuals when in 1935 I introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature the Hitler resolution, condemning him for his brutal acts against mankind.

I was also criticized when I filed the teachers oath law of 1935, to stop the flow of communism into our schools and colleges. Now, it is catching up with us. Hitler was a piker in comparison to Stalin. Hitler notified when he was going to take over, but Stalin just creeps upon them, with his famous Russian "T" formation.

You cannot get friendly with a criminal or with a totalitarian system that is out to conquer the world by force and violence.

I have stated time and time again—communism is the greatest "con game" the world has ever known. As you well stated in your constructive editorial, economic sanctions is the weapon.

THOMAS DORGAN.
Clerk, Suffolk Superior Civil Court.

Poem by Horace C. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, here at the Nation's Capitol we have a lovable Alabamian who is a well-known poet. His poems speak for themselves. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a poem written by our Horace C. Carlisle and a letter written by Mr. A. C. Phelps to this gentleman.

THE QUACK POLITICIAN'S SUPREME OPPORTUNITY

The quack politician's supreme opportunity
Comes when the whole country's perplexed
With chaos, bewilderment, strife, and disunity—
When every man's asking, "What's next?"
He feels less concern for his Nation's futurity,
Endangered by Nation-wide crime,
Than for his own covetous present security,
In this base, atomic-bomb time.
The quack politician sees no impropriety
In charging the statesman, whose place
He's seeking, with all the ills cursing society,
And causing disastrous disgrace—
He boastfully claims to possess the sagacity
To end "youth delinquency," and
He pictures himself as the man with capacity
To drive greed and graft from the land.
The quack politician blames those in authority
In Congress for all our distress—
He claims that he can, with his superiority,
Make Congress a world-wide success—
His promises, tho, are puffed up with futility—
In Congress the country now needs
Experienced statesmen, of proven ability,
Who can back their pledges with deeds.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 3, 1948.*

Mr. HORACE C. CARLISLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARLISLE: Have been a little slow in acknowledging your grand gift of copy of a Poetic Version of the Gettysburg Address and To the Congress of the Country. These are tops.

I vote you poet laureate of the Congress. And you can have the job as long as you like.

I have had the feeling for quite some time, without knowing too much about poetry, that we must have more evidence of it in every walk of life. It's an infallible barometer as to how goes the welfare of the Nation. Certainly the proceedings of the Congress, if they had a poem of yours up front, would be given a buoyancy and understanding which they all too often haven't a trace of, to me, who sees the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD almost daily.

Again a sincere and grateful thanks to you, Mr. Carlisle. You can count me a regular reader of the works of Horace C. Carlisle, poet laureate.

Appreciatingly,

A. C. PHELPS.

Palestine a Potential Source of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address I delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on March 8, of the series "In My Opinion." The subject, Should the United Nations Enforce the Partition of Palestine?

Should the United Nations enforce partition of Palestine? My answer is "No." Enforcement of partition means war and the destruction of the United Nations. It was established to promote peace not war. Nailed to the masthead of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter is a provision "To maintain international peace and security * * * in conformity with the principles of justice and international law." Here is proof that the maintenance of justice and peace are prime objectives of the UN Organization.

The Assembly action was only a recommendation and not a final decision. It must be implemented by the Security Council. As a direct result of the recommendation there is increased conflict between Arab and Jew—in fact, they are actually at war.

Unfortunately the Truman administration, under pressure, assumed, and was assured that adoption of the resolution would settle the problem—that both Jew and Arab would accept it without equivocation. This assumption has proved completely false in view of subsequent events. During the debate it was said: "Pass this resolution and the use of force will not be necessary." The facts have proved that statement false.

It is clear that enforcement of partition would require a considerable military force recruited from the United States and Soviet Russia. Is this what we want? Is this preventing war? Can we say that the implementation of partition by force of arms is a peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law? Obviously not. The delegates to the United Nations have been fooled. So have the great majority of the people of the United States. There is no surer way to scuttle the United Nations than to insist upon partition.

High, also, on the masthead of United Nations Purposes and Principles, section 2 of article 1, is the provision for the development of friendly relations among nations "based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples." The people in Palestine have been denied this basic right of self-determination, and we fought two wars for that principle.

Further, enforcement should not be attempted because the United Nations has no legal right to do so. It lacks jurisdiction to decree partition because it does not hold the subject matter. This is a simple, but basic, legal principle.

From the standpoint of our own national security, it would be most unwise to enforce partition. We are spending billions of dollars to stop communism all over the world. Is it not the height of folly to invite Russia to join us in a venture which puts them on the Mediterranean and adjacent to our invaluable rights to Middle East oil? President Truman, who is presently cautious about partition, has undoubtedly recognized this fact.

Proponents of partition charge that if the Security Council fails to authorize implementation it will mean the end of the United Nations because it will show that it is impotent to enforce its own decisions. It should be recognized, however, that the UN has failed to enforce other decrees. For example, the Balkan Committee did not succeed in its effort to stop aggression in Greece.

The Korean Commission, recently, reported its failure to complete its work because Russia refused to cooperate. The UN failed to iron out differences between Egypt and Britain. These are only a few instances of failure to enforce decisions. So the Palestine partition matter is in no different category. There has been no recommendation that the Security Council organize an armed force to implement the decisions I have mentioned, so why risk a war in the Middle East: why risk a loss of our needed oil supply in that area; why imperil economic recovery in Europe, Greece, Turkey, and China; and why, above all things, precipitate the destruction of the United Nations, which will happen if force is used to impose partition in Palestine.

There is a way out:

1. Reconsideration by the Assembly of its recommendation to partition.

2. Seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, and conciliation as provided by the UN Charter.

3. If negotiation and conciliation fail, then refer the matter to the International Court of Justice, under article 36. Our personal disputes are settled in this manner so why not disputes between people?

Russian Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
KANSAS STATE COUNCIL,
Hays, Kans., February 29, 1948.

Hon. WINT SMITH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: I do not presume to be an expert on foreign affairs, but believe the time has come when we must call a halt to Russian expansion. It is about 5 minutes to 12 now for all of western Europe.

We made the greatest mistake in the world right after the war was over when we permitted Russia to set up a puppet government in Poland. We should not have demobilized our armies and scrapped our air bases until a stable democratic government was established in all of eastern Europe. But we sat idly by and let Russia have her way without serious protest until they were about to gobble up Greece and Turkey.

If we allow them to take Finland, Italy and France will be next. Then what will we do? Turn over western Germany and let them complete the conquest of all Europe? Spain and Portugal would be helpless. With all of Europe under the heel of Russia, in the course of a few years they would be ready to defy the world and get away with it. Are we going to sit idly by and let communism rule and ruin the whole world?

The time has come for us to say to Russia, "Not one foot further. If you make one more move to enslave the rest of Europe, we will loose a shower of atomic bombs on Moscow." Force is the only language Joe Stalin understands.

We do not need to invade a foot of Russian soil. Just give them one taste of atomic bombing and then tell them to stop their campaign to enslave the world or we will give them another shower of bombs. We can do this now and get results. If we wait 5 years, they will be strong enough to answer our challenge, probably with equal force and make world war III more horrible and more costly than World War II.

They may have a few atom bombs now, but we have superior planes and a supply of bombs they cannot match at this time, and they know it. They are playing for time, and will not defy us today, if we prove to them that we mean business. In a few years it will be too late.

I know that Secretary Marshall's hands were tied in the conferences he participated in, by a lot of secret agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and silly concessions which should never have been made at Potsdam. In fact, there should never have been a Potsdam meeting. We should have driven on to Berlin and into eastern Germany without halting west of Berlin and waiting for Russia to move in.

We should have finished the Pacific war, without Russia coming in 15 days before it was over and now claiming all the territory she wants, which, incidentally means all of China eventually, unless we call a halt, by bombing Moscow now, and then demanding that Russia pull out of Korea and Manchuria and give those peoples the choice of the kind of government they want.

A few dozen bombs today will save what is left of Europe and the Orient, but in a few more years, we may not be able to save even the Western Hemisphere, with all the resources at our command. We must take the long-range view of the situation and stave off future disaster by acting now.

In 5 or 10 years Stalin will likely be out of the picture. It is not probable that he will have a successor, immediate or future, who will be as unprincipled or impossible to get along with as he is. Russian diplomacy has reached the bottom of the scale of decency, honesty is nonexistent, as you well know. Future dictators will never match the diabolical cunning of the greatest arch-enemy of decent society the world has ever seen, not excepting Hitler or Genghis Kahn.

Very truly yours,
HERMAN J. THOLEN,
Chairman, Historical Committee.

The Responsibilities of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend, along with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, Hon. CLYDE R. HOEY and the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER, and many leading citizens of Washington, the thirty-eighth annual anniversary dinner of the Federation of Citizens Associations at the Mayflower Hotel.

On this occasion our colleague in the House, Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS of New Jersey, was the principal speaker. I ask that his address, Mr. Speaker, on

the Responsibilities of Citizenship be extended in the RECORD.

The address follows:

When I received your gracious invitation to address you on this occasion I was overcome by the compliment which went with it, and I felt that I could hardly qualify as worthy to address such an illustrious and representative group of citizens. But in spite of my recognition of my shortcomings I had the temerity to accept and when asked to name my topic, I selected The Responsibilities of Citizenship. I certainly had courage when I selected this title and I am afraid I failed to consider my serious limitations in attempting to handle such a tremendous subject.

The responsibilities of citizenship have always been something real and very important to me during my whole life, but I have been more impressed than ever by these responsibilities since beginning the study, about a year ago, of the problem of home rule and reorganization of the District of Columbia. I have frequently thought, during the course of these studies, of this interesting and highly important question, what the people of the District of Columbia would do with home rule if all of a sudden they had placed on their shoulders the grave responsibilities of active and responsible citizenship.

A citizen enjoys a certain reciprocity of rights against, and duties toward, the community in which he lives. On the one hand, he has the right to cooperate in public decisions as a member of a political unit. In modern democracies the individual has the right to participate—primarily as voter, elector, and representative—in democratic forms of government. The American citizen also has certain civil rights, apart altogether from his social status, which are set forth in the first ten and the fourteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. On the other hand, he has the duty of sharing in public burdens, chiefly military service and taxation.

At a time when the democratic way of life, with its emphasis on the individual rather than the state, is being seriously challenged by totalitarian concepts, it is the duty of the American citizen to translate the democratic ideal into practical reality.

These two elements of the modern concept of citizenship—rights and duties—are mutually interdependent. The citizen will continue to enjoy his civil rights and liberties to the extent that he continues to perform his civic duties. Insofar as he fails to exercise or is denied his right to vote or disregards the conduct of public affairs or is delinquent in bearing his fair share of public burdens or ignores the denial of civil rights and political liberties to any of his fellow citizens, thus far will these privileges tend to atrophy and the full potential of American citizenship fall short of attainment.

Elihu Root once said in a lecture at Yale in 1907, on the subject, The Citizen's Part in Government:

"The art of self-government does not come to men by nature. It has to be learned; facility in it has to be acquired by practice. * * * Men must be willing to sacrifice something of their own apparent individual interests for the larger interests of city, State, country; and without that willingness, successful popular government is impossible."

I was an undergraduate at Yale University at the time Mr. Root made that address and I attended the three lectures which that great American statesman gave on the responsibilities of citizenship. I heard what he had to say and I cannot emphasize too strongly the truth of the quotation which I have just made. Let me repeat: "The art of self-government does not come to men by nature. It has to be learned"; and, my friends, the process of education is a long one and is not easy.

Self-government by people is an easy thing to talk about; it is an easy thing to think about; it is an easy thing to approve of, but it is a mighty hard thing to put into operation. We all believe, from the bottom of our hearts, in the precious freedom and liberty which people of our great Republic enjoy in the selection of those who shall administer their government, and the right to change them if they do not suit them. But, like every other good thing which we may acquire in life, our system of democratic government may be abused and the abuse of self-government is something to be looked upon with horror because it is the antithesis of liberty. Woodrow Wilson once said that George Washington believed implicitly that "liberty is the privilege of maturity of self-control, of self-mastery, and a thoughtful care for righteous dealings." People who wish to govern themselves and so enjoy the liberties of a free democracy must approach the problem in an unselfish and self-sacrificing manner. There is no place in our form of government for men of arrogance who wish to rule; they must be humble and approach their responsibilities as servants and not as rulers of the people. The essence of self-government is self-sacrifice and a willingness, as good and true citizens, to serve one's community for the benefit of all the other citizens.

It is when we find in our American system of government the boss and the intense partisan control that our liberties are put in jeopardy and we become the subjects of a benevolent despotism. I have heard it said by thinking men that a benevolent boss is probably the best form of government, but such a philosophy is as false as the philosophy that might makes right. A benevolent boss has no place in our democratic way of life and the history of our governmental institutions proves that the people do not tolerate such a state of affairs for long.

I do not want anyone to think that I do not heartily approve of our two-party system of government. To my mind it is the only method by which true liberty can be secured and our Constitution preserved; but the majority who may be in control of Government should never under any circumstances stifle the voice and the opinions, the demands and the pleas, and the constitutional rights of the minority. No nation can become great and strong by stifling and ignoring the rights of minorities; it would become a house divided against itself and be doomed to fall.

In the long run citizens under our system of government secure the type of government they desire and as a result, if their Government is lax, extravagant, venal, or inadequate, the citizens alone are to blame. Of course, that cannot be said of the people in the District of Columbia because under the form of government which is presently in force here, the people themselves have no choice or selection of those who shall manage their affairs, nor can they by the action of the ballot dismiss from their government anyone who does not measure up to their standards. And so I believe that people who have the right to select their government officials have no right to complain about them, especially if the citizens neglected their duties on election day.

In our American system, political campaigns are a most interesting phenomena. There are many earnest men and women who seek public office who speak plainly and to the point on the great questions of the day in an effort to explain their position and impress the people of the soundness of their views, but there are too many candidates for public office today who resort to appeals to passion and to the statement of half-truths or the distortion of facts and who try to impress and fool the people into supporting them.

As one of our great statesmen and jurists, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes once said:

"Demagoguery will always have a certain influence, and the remedy is to be found not in repression or impatient denunciation, but in the multiplication of men of intelligence who love justice and cannot be stampeded."

There the Chief Justice has pointed out one of the greatest responsibilities of citizenship. The citizen of today must think; he must make up his own mind, and study what the answers are and the best solutions are to be adopted in wrestling with the momentous international as well as domestic problems facing our Nation. It is the responsibility of citizens to separate the chaff from the wheat in an intelligent and open manner, and in that way discourage the faker and make it unhealthy for the notoriety-seeker and the troublemaker to carry on. It is a great encouragement to me to find an increasing interest being shown by the people in these problems and they assume a most intelligent approach to them. They recognize more than ever before that their representatives must have something "on the ball," to employ the vernacular, and be able to lend sound judgment and progressive thought. I think the people today are becoming more and more aware that they will secure a higher standard in government by letting their representatives know that they themselves are actively engaged in forming opinions on the questions of the hour.

Responsibilities of citizenship involve active participation in the deliberations of the politicians. Citizens should attend meetings where national and local affairs are discussed, and, in addition, enter into the discussions. A citizen who has a real sense of the value of his citizenship should express himself in definite terms about the various questions of the day. Of course, this means a certain amount of work; it does take up some time, but after all is said and done, the welfare of the citizen himself is involved and the very future of the Nation is affected. Having had some very definite experience in the operations of government in a small community I can testify with authority as to the effect that the opinions of citizens have in bringing about honest, free, and high-principled government.

If our efforts are not in vain and the citizens of the District of Columbia should have the opportunity to vote and select their own city council to manage their affairs as provided in the so-called home-rule bill, I cannot help but wonder what kind of citizens will present themselves as candidates for office. If the people of this community will be content with mediocre candidates and elect them to public office, they will have a mediocre government, but if men and women of character, who have a sincere desire to serve the community, come forward and stand for office there will be a first-class form of government which might well be a model for the whole country. That is the great responsibility of citizenship which would fall on the shoulders of the people of this city and it is a greater responsibility than any other group of Americans has had before. The spotlight of publicity will be focused on this Capital City of the Nation and the whole country, if not the world, will be looking to see what you would do with the liberties conferred on you American citizens in the management of your own affairs.

Let me quote once again from Elihu Root when he spoke to the New York Chamber of Commerce in 1912. He said:

"Self-governing people must have the spirit which makes them self-controlled, which makes man competent and willing to govern his impulses by the rule of declared principle. And more than that, men in a

self-governed democracy must have a love of liberty that means not merely one's own liberty but others' liberty."

Once more this great statesman in ringing words said something which we should have engraved on our hearts. No truer thing has ever been said than that people who wish to govern themselves must have a spirit that makes them self-controlled and in addition, must have "a love of liberty that means not merely one's own liberty but others' liberty." That is the cornerstone for the building of good government which is only another way of saying the building of good citizenship. The people of this community, as well as every community, who expect to have their own form of government and to elect their own people to manage it, must have that great respect for other people's points of view, must recognize the high principles of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of worship, and must be honest in their ambitions to achieve a high goal of competent citizenship.

I quote to you once again from Chief Justice Hughes:

"The desire to know the truth and to deal fairly with men and measures is of the essence of good citizenship. The most dangerous foes of democratic government are those who seek through special privilege to pervert it to selfish uses, and those who, by reckless, untruthful, and inflammatory utterances, corrupt the public sentiment."

It is the responsibility of citizens to be ever alert to corrupting influences from within and without their government, and such alertness can be brought about only by an active and intelligent interest in knowing how the affairs of the community are being administered; it is only in this way that the sacred heritage of freedom can be safeguarded and continued as a live thing.

Someone has said: "Democracy never dies; it perishes through neglect," and that perhaps is the most serious indictment which could be brought against any group of citizens in the United States of America. If we neglect to exercise our privileges of citizenship, if we neglect our responsibilities of citizenship, if we neglect the glory of being an American citizen, our nation may easily lose its position in the world, and with it will go our chance to bring peace to a stricken humanity. We must all resolve to guide and guard our heritage and prove to the world that democracy is a real live and progressive thing because all those participating in its joys and privileges are fully aware of the responsibilities that go with it.

The Communist March in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of Monday, March 8, 1948:

ON BEING TOO LATE

Nearly 10 years ago General MacArthur wrote a letter to the late William Allen White which will bear repeating today.

At the time the MacArthur letter was written we were groping for a measure of national unity and awareness to cope with the Axis menace. There was the distressingly familiar division of counsel, the unwillingness to face up to the imminence of war, the attempt to kid ourselves into believing that we could have guns and butter, too. Then, as now, the paralyzing weight of wishful thinking was a major obstacle to preparing this Nation for the war which threatened us, and it was in that setting that General MacArthur wrote:

"The history of failure in war can almost be summed up in two words: Too late. Too late in comprehending the deadly purpose of a potential enemy; too late in realizing the mortal danger; too late in preparedness; too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance; too late in standing with one's friends. Victory in war results from no mysterious alchemy or wizardry but depends entirely upon the concentration of superior force at the critical points of combat. To face an adversary in detail has been the prayer of every conqueror in history. It is the secret of the past successes of the Axis Powers in this war. It is their main hope for continued and ultimate victory. The greatest strategic mistake in all history will be made if America fails to recognize the vital moment, if she permits again the writing of that fatal epitaph: Too late."

Surely these words have a significant application to the world scene today. One by one the nations of Europe are being toppled by the new aggression. Those of our friends that remain on their feet are in serious danger of being overrun.

And what are we doing? As time slips away from us, we argue and wrangle over what to do. A former Vice President would keep us from doing anything to resist effectively the Communist march across Europe. In the Senate the pointless debate drags on, and one Senator goes so far as to attack the Marshall plan on the fantastic ground that it is a "brazen and preposterous scheme for the world-wide redistribution of wealth." Others point to the elements of uncertainty in the plan, and would take the supreme risk of doing nothing rather than the calculated risk which General Marshall advocates.

It is hard to say how much longer we can go on like this. But there can be no doubt that we are in serious danger of being too late, of kicking our opportunity around until the day arrives when all hope of stopping the Communists will be gone.

The Late Honorable Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our late and distinguished colleague Clarence E. Hancock was possessed of many qualities about which those who knew him longer and more intimately have spoken, but I shall long remember him as a gentleman to whom one could always turn for the warmth of friendship, the sage advice, and the kindly guidance that springs from a heart and mind long dedicated to the service of his fellowman. He aided me on many an occasion and manifested deep and intelligent interest in the necessary work of the revision of the laws, in which activity I had more opportunities to meet with, come to know and to appraise him. He was a great man and contributed much to the strength of our legislative process and our Government. We all shall miss him. I will—very much.

Eduard Benes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 8, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial appearing in the current issue of the Christian Advocate, entitled "Acquainted With Grief":

ACQUAINTED WITH GRIEF

In all the world today there is no statesman more deserving of the respect and prayerful sympathy of Christian people than Eduard Benes, president of Czechoslovakia.

These lines are being written at the very moment that the iron curtain is being rung down on the honored Czech. Exactly what has happened inside the ancient palace at Prague is not known, and may never be, but of one thing we are perfectly sure: the soul of Eduard Benes is unsullied.

It was as a young university student in Prague, almost half a century ago, that the youthful Benes came under the magic spell and kindling personality of Thomas G. Masaryk. That great scholar and patriot found in Eduard a lad whose spirit was like unto his own, and within the space of a few months an affection had developed between them that continued to the day the older man laid his burden down in death.

The Hapsburgs of Austria were, in that day, the masters of ancient Bohemia, and their heel was heavy upon the liberty-loving people. Inside the University of Prague the fires of freedom blazed brightly, even though they had to be hidden, and the aging professor and the flowering young philosopher spent long evenings planning and dreaming of Czechoslovakian independence.

Every tyranny depends upon ruthlessness and espionage, and the student-patriot was a daring youth who took great risks. As a consequence he was compelled to flee for his life and, like many another refugee, he went to France and enrolled in the universities, first at Paris and then at Dijon. Soon articles bearing his name started to appear in the Czech press. Then other expatriates began hunting him out, and within the space of a few years he came to be known as one of the independence leaders. All the time he kept in touch with his old mentor and was guided by Dr. Masaryk in both his academic work and his struggle for Czechoslovakian independence.

In the meantime the young man became a master in the fields of philosophy, government, economics, and history. A skilled linguist, and endowed with a robust body, he seemed driven by an insatiable thirst for work.

World War I broke out when Eduard Benes was 30 years of age. By this time he was giving promise of an unusual career as a scholar, and he might have settled down in a teaching post in any one of a score of universities, for his writings and other activities had brought him to the attention of thoughtful men on both sides of the Atlantic.

Czechoslovakian independence was the passion of his life, however, and though he had settled his scores with the Hapsburgs sufficiently to permit him to teach in the University of Prague, he laid his career upon his country's altar, allied himself once more with Thomas Masaryk, and threw himself into an underground movement which aimed at the little nation's deliverance.

The story of Czech devotion to the Allied cause in World War I is one of the epics of

that struggle. The thousands of young men who fought or contrived their way through the German lines and into Allied uniforms wrote a chapter of European history that will never lose its luster. The Czech army that fought its way across three continents and emerged among the victors at the last had one of the most brilliant achievements in the military history of the continent.

The friendship that existed between Woodrow Wilson and Thomas Masaryk proved to be one of the determining factors in the fashioning of the new republic, once the war was over. It is an open secret that the American President had a large part in drafting the general outlines of the Czechoslovakian constitution. Both Masaryk and Benes had been compelled to flee for their lives in 1915, and the United States had offered asylum.

Almost in a father-and-son relationship the two patriots labored through those early years of the infant Nation, the older man serving as President, and the younger as Foreign Minister. Benes, though only 34 years of age, won world-wide popularity almost immediately, and has never lost his hold upon the confidence of the great world governments. In 30 years of public life he never betrayed an ally, he never failed a friend, he never deserted a righteous cause, and he never lost his hold upon the affections of the Czechoslovakian people. When the news came out a few days ago that tragedy had overtaken his government, men and women wept openly on the streets because of their beloved President.

It was in 1934 that he succeeded Professor Masaryk as President of the Republic, and without altering the traditions of the young nation or in any way departing from the trust committed to him by his old teacher, Eduard Benes began gradually to strengthen the internal structure of the Government, and to lay strategic plans for its economic and educational development.

In 1938 Czechoslovakia felt the first savage blows of the Hitler machine. Sudetenland, one of the rich agricultural provinces of the nation, was inhabited by considerable numbers of Germans. They had occupied their acres for many generations, were undisturbed in their customs, their religion, and their economic interests. Their representatives in the National Government were shown every courtesy and accorded every right. But they provided Hitler with his occasion, and the German war machine was poised for the blow when Czechoslovakia, deserted by her western allies, was compelled to submit. A year later all the nation fell, and Benes was again compelled to go into exile.

Again he began to operate through an underground organization, and again he captivated the imagination and affection of his beloved people. They knew there was good reason for hope as long as Benes was alive.

In 1945 the dauntless leader was back in Prague again, and at the task of rebuilding the Government out of the ruins left behind in the wake of the war. And ruins they were. For political reasons which seem indefensible, the Americans under Gen. George Patton were required to stand still just outside the Czech border, in order to give Russian troops sufficient time to battle their way into the city of Prague. In the meantime, the remnants of the German Army left behind in Czechoslovakia, and refusing to accept the German order to lay down their arms, went on an orgy of killing. There was fighting in John Hus Square, and the city hall was badly damaged.

The confusion of the postwar days, the skillful propaganda of the Communists, the vacillating and uncertain policies of the Allies, had the effect of splitting Czechoslovakia up into sharply antagonistic factions. But one figure loomed large above all contenders. The popularity of President Benes grew while the political life of the nation disintegrated. As late as 6 months ago every political party in the land was vowing its unalterable loyalty to the beloved leader.

"My beloved nation will never perish and will survive, in glory, all the terrors of hell," Eduard Benes said in his farewell message when he fled for London in 1938, and without a doubt those same words would be upon his lips again in 1948 if it were possible for him to speak.

A loyal Roman Catholic, he believes in religious liberty and has been an undeviating friend of that cause throughout his entire public career. A thoroughly trained mind, and an enlightened conscience, he would have led his people to a series of monumental achievements if he had been given an opportunity.

We stand in tribute to a great patriot in this dark hour.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying to know that the House Committee on Agriculture is now having hearings on the question of the removal of the tax on oleomargarine.

Under date of February 26, 1948, I spoke at length in the House on this subject. My speech appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1793.

I now present for inclusion in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of South Carolina under date of March 4:

Resolution memoralizing Congress to repeal the 10 cents per pound Federal tax on oleomargarine and to enact a tax of one-quarter of 1 cent per pound on oleomargarine

Whereas the sale of oleomargarine is now taxed by Federal statute at the rate of one-quarter of a cent per pound for white, or colorless margarine, and at the rate of 10 cents per pound for colored margarine, which legislation was enacted and is maintained by dairy-pressure groups from the North and Midwest sections of the United States; and

Whereas there is now pending before the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States a bill proposing to repeal the present law and to enact a flat tax of one-quarter of 1 cent per pound on all oleomargarine; and

Whereas some 5,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine per year are consumed and used yearly in this State, purchased primarily by low-salaried groups and individuals unable to pay high prices for butter; and

Whereas the adoption by Congress of the above-cited legislation would result in a saving to South Carolina taxpayers of taxes conservatively estimated at in excess of $200,000 per year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the South Carolina delegation in Congress be urged to lend their influence and efforts toward the enactment by Congress of the above legislation known as H. R. 5292; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the South Carolina delegation in the United States House of Representatives and Senate.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the house of representatives.

JAMES E. HUNTER, Jr.,
Clerk of the House.

I also include an editorial from Life magazine of March 8, 1948:

MARGARINE VERSUS BUTTER—A GOOD FIGHT TO GET IN ON

There's a good fight shaping up in Congress in which all American housewives have a stake. If their side wins they can save at least $6,000,000 a year on grocery bills and an estimated 88,000,000 woman-hours a year in the kitchen. The country would also save 52,000,000 bushels of grain, which could be exported to a hungry world instead of being fed to cows and churned into butter. At least that is what the makers of oleomargarine figure. Even if they exaggerate, there is no doubt that their side in this fight is the side of the housewife, of justice and of common sense.

For the first time in over 60 years the margarine makers have a fighting chance to reduce or repeal the discriminatory taxes on margarine which have been imposed on consumers by the butter lobby. Margarine is the only modern case of a perfectly respectable commodity being taxed directly by the United States Government just to keep down its sales for the benefit of a rival product. In addition to this direct tax a licensing law keeps half of all grocers from handling margarine; the sale of colored margarine is prohibited entirely in 23 States; and the United States Army and Navy are forbidden by law to use any kind of margarine, as are the public hospitals, jails, etc., of 17 States.

In spite of this the per capita consumption of margarine has gradually gone up, especially since 1940. Such is the achievement of the patient margarine makers, whose product, made from vegetable oils instead of milk, is no less nutritious than butter, and whose prices, despite the tax handicap, are a whole lot lower. Most housewives who can get margarine for 30 cents or 40 cents aren't going to pay 90 cents for butter, even if they have to waste time mixing in the color. So the tax is just a senseless penalty and an empty monument to the power of the butter lobby.

Whether you like margarine or not, you must agree that this is a fairly outrageous situation. When the first antimargarine tax was passed in 1886, there were enough fraudulent margarine makers to lend a slight pro bono publico flavor to the legislation. That hasn't been true for years. The butter lobby's main argument for the tax nowadays is that dairy farming is a great national asset. Representative MURRAY of Wisconsin brings a toy Holstein into the House, describes the miraculous food-producing powers of her species, and calls her "the foster mother of the human race." No doubt she is all of that, but the soybean and the cottonseed are productive little assets too. Indeed, the soybean has recently been winning more new congressional friends than the cow. And this year the soybean and cotton seed Congressmen, sparked by a Republican freshman from Indiana named MITCHELL, who used to peddle margarine from a truck, have organized a lobby which is as loud and enthusiastic as the butter lobby is quiet and smooth. They have been promised hearings on some of the many justice-to-margarine bills now in the House Agriculture Committee. This committee is dairy-dominated and has smothered many such bills before. It may smother them again but, as we say, there is a fighting chance. So if you are tired of having margarine discriminated against, write to your own Congressman or to Representative EDWARD MITCHELL. Incidentally, did you know that in the wintertime butter is artificially colored too?

And I include a recent editorial from the Charlotte Observer:

MARGARINE AND HEALTH

The question of which is the more nourishing and healthful, especially for children, has been brought into the butter versus margarine battle, which is a fight for and against the elimination of special Federal taxes designed to discourage the use of oleomargarine as a substitute for butter.

Some of those interested in having the unfair and unjustifiable restrictions on margarine continued have advanced the argument that butter contains some exclusive growth-promoting element. The margarine interests have pointed out that the claim is based upon experiments with rats in the Netherlands years ago and that the conclusions "have never been confirmed in this country nor abroad."

On the other hand, the February 7 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association contains an article by two Chicago physicians and a noted scientist who collaborated in a special study in fat nutrition, which assures the housewife that margarine is as good for growing children as butter.

These authorities assure the mothers that, so far as the two fats are concerned, children eating margarine will grow just as fast, be just as healthy, and have just as good red blood counts and hemoglobin determinations as those who eat butter.

These findings resulted from a special study conducted at two Chicago institutions by Harry Leichenger, M. D., George Eisenberg, M. D., and Anton J. Carlson, Ph. D., M. S., the last an eminent University of Chicago physiologist.

But it is not because Congress believes butter is more healthful than margarine that heavy special taxes are imposed on the latter and not applied to butter. The only reason the special tax was ever imposed years ago and has been continued ever since was the pressure of northern dairy interests who demanded Federal protection against the competition of the southern product, made principally from cottonseed oil but now made also from soybeans.

The special tax on margarine for the benefit of the dairy interests, as this newspaper has contended, is no more justifiable or defensible than a special Federal tax on cotton goods designed to discourage their use in competition with wool and rayon.

Reciprocal Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of March 8, 1948, on the importance of reenactment of the reciprocal trade program developed under the guidance of Hon. Cordell Hull, of Tennessee:

RENEW THE HULL ACT

President Truman last week urged renewal of the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for another 3 years. The measure will expire in June unless Congress votes its extension. Congressional leaders were reported as cool to the President's proposal. The public should help them change their minds.

The reciprocal trade program, under which the Government grants reductions in tariffs to nations willing to accord matching opportunities to American products in their markets, is in line with the effort for postwar reconstruction. Its usefulness will not have been outlived in 3 years.

Indeed, it is only realistic for a nation which, like the United States, is lending heavily abroad to help keep international trade channels open so that present borrowers may become future payers of debts. There is only one way America can collect for the goods it is now sending abroad. That is to take goods when others have them to offer on advantageous terms.

The reciprocal-trade program is anathema to some Members of Congress because it deprives them of the exercise of that old political custom of logrolling as this applied to tariff making. One result of logrolling was that it caused many tariffs to mount, not because of public interest but because legislators offered their support for others' demands for high tariffs in exchange for support for their own.

Now the United States has put itself on record before the whole world as seeking means to increase the flow of world trade. Its leadership led to the Geneva Conference last summer, which, in turn, led to the Havana meeting now working to draft a Charter for an International Trade Organization. Failure to renew the Reciprocal Trade Act not only would be a severe blow to the ITO program but would damage American prestige as a world leader.

Reservists Retirement Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my great interest in H. R. 2744, the Reservists' retirement bill. Passage of this excellent program is absolutely necessary, in my judgment, if we are to avoid severe attrition in the Reserves and an expensive turn-over of officers in the peacetime years.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would pay untold dividends in the future and would also, in a sense, partially cancel a debt which we owe to the Reserve Corps. It would be a fitting recognition of the services rendered by this group of citizens who do so much in both peace and war.

These men are the citizen soldiers and sailors who take themselves away from their busy economic, social, and family life to prepare themselves in time of peace to defend this country in time of emergency. Very few people realize the time and energy devoted by the Reservists to their peacetime training. While others are enjoying their leisure time these men are training and keeping themselves physically fit for military duty.

A small percentage of these reservists receive token pay in the way of drill pay, which hardly covers the cost of transportation to and from the armory for such drills. A vast majority receive no financial compensation whatever, except when on active duty. This bill would in a small way partially compensate Reservists after long years of service in the Reserve for their expenses and the economic losses they have suffered as a result of their Reserve activities.

The measure would materially assist this country in being able to maintain and operate an adequate National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps. Continuity of service for a reasonably long period of time is necessary in the Organized Reserve Corps if we are to have properly organized and properly trained units ready for mobilization in time of a national emergency. Time is going to be the greatest factor in the opening phases of any future conflict. It is essential that we do not allow the civilian components of our armed forces to become so weak that they become ineffective.

Through passage of this bill we would also obtain a better qualified component of enlisted men and officers. It would provide an incentive to stay in the Reserve components of the armed forces for a long period of time. The Reservist would also have the incentive to adequately and properly perform the required training in addition to attending active duty camps and active duty schools. We would thereby be provided with the assurance that the Reservists of the future would be much better prepared to meet the requirements of a national emergency than ever before.

The Regular Army, the Regular Navy, the Regular Air Force and the Regular Marine Corps are but one element in our defense structure. Upon the Army Reservists and other civilian components hinge the efficiency of the regular services in repelling aggression. We in Congress must provide the necessary incentives for peacetime training. Let us not hesitate in the speedy enactment of H. R. 2744.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the letter I have just received from my good friend Mr. Max Slepin, of Philadelphia, who has recently completed a survey in Palestine of the conditions which confront the Jewish people who are so valiantly fighting for a homeland. Mr. Slepin is a veteran of both World Wars with an outstanding combat record in the one just ended, and I value his opinions as those of a great patriot and a great American. His letter follows:

TEL AVIV, PALESTINE,
February 25, 1948.

DEAR PAUL: Greetings from Palestine. I have been all over this land. Am writing this from Kjer Deram in the Negev (that part of the Negev which the United Nations decreed to be Arab). Have been along the Syrian and Transjordan borders in Upper Galilee—sailed on the Jordan River and the Sea of Galilee—been to Haifa, Jerusalem, Tel Aviv,

and Jaffa. Have been shot at several times: at Tiberius, at Rishamiya, and below Beerook Itzhak. Have talked to government officials, Jewish Agency officials, Arabs, and the boys and girls (those wonderful boys and girls) of the Palmach and the Haganah.

Mine eyes have seen the glory of ever so many places well known in the lore of biblical history; my feet have trod on sacred and hallowed soil; I have sailed on the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee; I have flown over this land. Paul, the Jews and the Palestinian Arabs can get along in peace and each eke out here the kind of a life they both and each want. It's the outsiders—the Arab gangsters in the pay (they are all mercenaries) of the Mufti and the Hussein family, from Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Transjordan, and Egypt who are stirring up all this trouble, aided and abetted by the British. It pleases British policy to have this land without an established law and order of justice rather than of force. She can only profit by confusion and strife. Hence she is backing the Arab—openly and behind the scenes—with arms, with restrictions, with propaganda, and by murder.

I predict, Paul, that this land will be either the start of a strong and successful United Nations that will assure the peace and better world for which we fought to establish—or it will prove the spark that will ignite the world into World War III and destruction.

I don't feel that England wants peace.

Where do we stand?

Sholom.

MAX SLEPIN.

Service to the Veterans Should Not Be Jeopardized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the reduction in the number of employees of the Veterans' Administration by eighty-five hundred, effective March 26, 1948, should not be permitted.

Evidence has been presented before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to prove that, statements of the Veterans' Administration to the contrary, medical services to disabled veterans would be curtailed under the plan. This must not happen.

Veterans throughout the country are disturbed over this new proposal and so are many nonveterans who feel that for the sake of saving a few dollars the welfare of those who saved us from the enemy a few years back will be jeopardized.

As a sample of a large number of resolutions I have received on the subject, I include, as part of my remarks, a resolution adopted on February 16, 1948, by the United Veterans Council of Providence, R. I.:

Resolution expressing dissatisfaction of the members with issues affecting the fulfillment of the provisions of the GI bill of rights

Whereas the local as well as national press has recently released information to the effect that 6,810 employees will be released from the 13 branch offices of the VA and a total of 8,500 from the entire VA, which includes about 1,650 in the central-office force. This all done to keep within the provisions made in the 1949 budget of $6,100,000,000; and

Whereas the foregoing cut affects the Providence regional office to the extent of 56 employees, mostly in adjudication, rehabilitation, and contact and will of course result in deferred training programs as well as backlogs in compensation payments on disabilities allowed by adjudication and subsistence payments contingent upon registration records, all of which immediately affect the veterans of this area; and

Whereas the allocation of employees for the branch areas was determined by the veteran population of the respective States, and the branch offices in turn delegated to allocate and assign employees to the States, has resulted in local injustice; and

Whereas the original allocation for the Providence office was based upon the veteran population of Rhode Island, and did not provide for the men coming under this jurisdiction from the four lower counties of the State of Massachusetts, would justify an investigation of the situation with a view to establishing an equity for the Providence area; and

Whereas the program of rehabilitation has progressed to a point that permits conservative estimate of time and expenditure to complete its provisions and reductions in said division will seriously affect all veterans in training; disabled and able-bodied; and

Whereas a plan of redistribution of employees in divisions whose work is waning among divisions where needs exist and conserving all employees available in divisions where backlogs exist due to curtailment and release of employees is necessary. This is to include in every instance veterans whose experience qualifies them to continue in the service even in a lower-paid bracket, to continue in service; and

Whereas provisions made for the classification of employees on indefinite qualifications worked out by employees themselves and never standardized do not insure the highest standards and should be supplemented by direction and specific review of Central Office Personnel Office whose evaluation of the human issues would reveal the seasonal rise and fall of the respective elements of the work; and

Whereas the loan guarantee program has been acknowledged in astounding default the complex program should be revised and directed as well as controlled by Central Office or an agency specifically charged with the responsibility and not left to local application of various State laws governing ownership. To remove the confusion that prevails to the point that veterans question the safety of the present plan and default at will; and

Whereas the care of disabled veterans is now being jeopardized because of an over-organized administrative unit handling the administration of legislation passed by Congress in the interest of veterans, also because of a far-sighted Congress refusing to appropriate unlimited funds to maintain said unnecessary administrative force: Be it

Resolved, That the United Veterans' Council protest against the announced cut in personnel until such study is made of the situation in Rhode Island as mentioned in this resolution; and

Further, That a study be made by a disinterested committee named by Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., or his representative in Washington of all points mentioned in this resolution with a view to aiding all the States in problems of a similar nature; and

Further, That reduction in personnel include first superficial activities which might be idealistic in the perfection of old-line, long-established agencies of Government but not justified in the intensive program of the Veterans' Administration, now at the peak of work parallel with any war activity staffed generously to meet any emergency; and

Further, That divisions of the Veterans' Administration serving the veteran in a direct way be adequately manned to do the job and not permitted to have delay through uncontrolled backlogs which withhold from him his rights; and

Further, That consideration be given the plan to have the post office receive insurance premiums, since many of them are already paid by money order, thereby causing extra expense to the veteran and again to the collecting office receipting for same; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the congressional delegation of this State and to Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as well as to national commanders of the respective units of this United Council, that they may have the data herein as basic requirements for the perfection of the program now confronting General Gray as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to whom the original of the resolution bearing the signature of the officers of each organization will be sent; and

Further, That United States civil service be recentralized to area control and relieve employees of personnel section in regional agency offices of this duty to allow full time for local matters of personnel.

Adopted as read and signed by the officers present.

SQUIRE GREENHALGH,
American Legion.
THADDEUS M. KRAUS,
Veterans of Foreign Wars.
CHARLES R. LOMBARDI,
Disabled American Veterans.
EDWIN L. CLARK,
Spanish War Veterans.
RALPH M. LEWIS,
American Veterans of World War II.
EVERETT LEVINSON,
Jewish War Veterans.
JAMES C. SCOTT,
Marine Corps League.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *February 16, 1948.*

Pay Increases for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER R. JONES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 3, I appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in support of legislation which I have introduced, namely, H. R. 4727 and H. R. 4773, which would give our worthy postal and Federal employees a much-needed increase in salary of $800 per year. Since making my statement before the committee, I have received a letter which I wish had been in my hands earlier for presentation to the committee. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter received from Mrs. Wilma E. Wilson, of Seattle, Wash., who writes feelingly on a condition confronting thousands of loyal, dependable, and diligent Federal Government workers and their families

who are looking to this Congress for assistance and relief in meeting the emergency problem of inadequate pay and high costs of living:

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 1, 1948.*

Hon. HOMER R. JONES,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please, sir, consider favorably the post-office bill giving postal workers the additional $800 take-home pay.

We, the families of postal employees, have been waiting a long time for our men to bring home a pay check that will permit us to pay our monthly bills and leave us just a little to save for emergencies.

The other raise didn't even cover the increased cost of living at the time it was given, and in spite of statistics to the contrary, we have had no drop in the over-all cost of living in Washington State. Commodities went down in price in a very few instances but have risen even higher than they were before the market drop. Increases in freight rates, fuel oil, coal, gas, food, clothing, even doctor and hospital costs have put us with our backs to the wall and have made it impossible to live in any sort of even modest comfort. Local real-estate taxes and assessments are increasing, too.

Our savings are gone. No prospect of new equipment to replace worn-out things in our homes. No new car to replace the worn-out junk heaps that cost 4 to 5 times as much to repair as they did in 1940. No vacation away from home; we spend ours in the back yard surrounded by other back yards. No neighborhood movies at 50 cents each—$2 for a family of four. No new clothing. Only the cheapest food to keep us going, not what we like but what we can pay for.

I don't like to cry about it too much as I know that you get it on every side, but my husband went to work for the Post Office Department at the age of 19 and has been there for 28 years. He brings home $55 a week and he is better paid than most. How, in heaven's name, can a family live on that amount these days?

Thank you for what you have done and for what you can do to help us now.

Sincerely,

WILMA E. WILSON.

What Does H. R. 2873 Do to the Columbia River Power Rate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been many charges and countercharges regarding the effects of the House-enacted version of H. R. 2873 upon existing and contemplated multiple-purpose Federal projects. Because the main effort in my fight of many years for the sound financing and repayment of these projects has been in the direction of presenting the facts regarding them, I have caused to be made a rather extensive study of this problem. I am happy to present the result of this study at this time, for the information of all who have a genuine interest in sound development of our reimbursable Federal projects.

I hope those who have had an active part in pushing amendments to the reclamation acts will study these remarks carefully. If their conclusions are the same as mine, they will agree with me that this ill-advised, ill-timed piece of legislation should be buried deep underground until such time as we can achieve a more reasonable and practical approach to the entire subject.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT—EFFECT OF HOUSE ENACTED H. R. 2873 ON ANNUAL FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS

The Rockwell bill as enacted by the House of Representatives on January 23, 1948, contains so many ambiguities that a definitive statement as to its effect on the pay-out of the Columbia Basin project cannot be made. In attempting to appraise the effect of the bill it is necessary to make assumptions on major points and to ignore smaller ones, although the latter may ultimately affect the results.

An understanding of the effect of the enacted bill requires, first, an examination of certain points of the existing law and the existing payout plan for the project. The present reclamation law requires that the landowners make their payments within a maximum period of 40 years beginning after a developmental period of not to exceed 10 years. The landowners thus have a maximum period of 50 years after water is made available. The present law does not fix any specific period for the repayment of the power investment or for the repayment of the irrigation subsidy—that is the amount of costs allocated to irrigation, but in excess of the ability of the landowners to repay and thus assigned to be repaid from power revenues.

The plan of pay-out for the project under present laws has been fixed in a memorandum of understanding entered into by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration. Under this agreement, the pay-out period ends with fiscal year 2017, which is 50 years after water is made available to the last block of land in 1967. In other words, the over-all pay-out period is controlled by the 50-year water users' repayment period in the existing law. However, this period ending with 2017 applies to the repayment of the power investment, and the subsidy determined on the basis of the 1940 cost estimates of the irrigation works. Any additional subsidy resulting from costs in excess of those 1940 estimates for the irrigation works is to be repaid by an extension of the pay-out period beyond fiscal year 2017. Current cost estimates indicate an increase in the cost of irrigation of about $96,000,000 over 1940 estimates and this would require a 15-year extension of the pay-out period for the irrigation works beyond 2017.

In the Rockwell bill as recommended by the Public Lands Committee—but not as enacted by the House—there was a so-called "extension" of the repayment period from 50 years to 78 years. Inasmuch as existing law fixes no specific period for power or subsidy repayment, it is incorrect to think of the recommended bill as extending the period. However, 78 years would represent an extension in comparison with past practice of the Bureau of Reclamation which has been to follow a 50-year period. In the case of the Columbia Basin project, under present pay-out procedures, the basic period is 50 years even though the over-all period is 75 years. This results from the fact that the period of construction covers 25 years. The one exception to the basic 50-year concept is the aforesaid extension beyond 2017 for additional irrigation subsidy.

Under the present pay-out plan the payments are applied first to repaying the power investment, inasmuch as it is by agreement interest bearing. The power investment is paid off in 1974, which is 33 years, beginning with 1942, the first year in which the main generators started producing power. After 1974 the annual payments are applied toward repayment of the irrigation subsidy. At the same time, of course, the land owners are making payments toward their agreed share of the repayment obligation which has been fixed at an average of $85 per acre.

As stated above, the bill as reported fixed 78 years as the repayment period for power. In the bill as enacted in the House, the period has been cut to 50 years from the date each power feature becomes revenue producing, or the useful life of the feature, whichever is the shorter. In the bill as reported, the subsidy would have to be repaid within 50 years "insofar as practicable."

The changes in the repayment period in the bill as enacted as compared with the existing law result in materially collapsing or shortening the permissible repayment period. The relative timing of power and irrigation features can also operate quite adversely under the provisions of the bill as enacted by the House. It is theoretically possible, if for some reason a block of land was delayed for a number of years, to require that the subsidy alotted to that block of land be completely repaid from power before water was even delivered to it. Conversely it is theoretically possible if the power development were delayed sufficiently long after the irrigation development that the subsidy would have to be repaid before the power development became revenue producing. These situations arise out of the fact that under the bill as enacted in the House the subsidy must be repaid within 50 years from the time water was brought on each block of land, or 50 years from the time each power feature becomes revenue producing, whichever is shorter. This is the most serious feature of the enacted bill as regards the burden imposed upon power revenues. It requires repayment of:

(a) Power and subsidy in the same 50-year period if both start together;

(b) Power and subsidy in the same 50-year period if power starts first; or

(c) Subsidy in less than 50 years of power operations if irrigation starts first, and power in 50 years after power starts.

In other words, the bill as enacted does not permit the over-all 75-year period presently agreed upon, nor would it permit extension beyond those 75 years for additional subsidy due to costs in excess of the 1940 estimates for specific irrigation works.

Under the present pay-out agreement, the annual financial requirements for

the project as shown by column 4 of schedule C–2 are $9,332,570 for 1952 and subsequent years, with annual payments of $6,200,000 to $9,000,000 for the interim years, 1948 to 1951, inclusive. The requirements under the terms of the House enacted Rockwell bill have been estimated to be $12,310,000 per year, an increase of $2,977,430, or 32 percent, beginning in 1952 if the scheduled payments for the interim years 1948 to 1951, inclusive, are also increased about one-third. This is on the basis of a pay-out period ending with fiscal year 2001, which is 50 years after 1951, when the last generator is scheduled to go into service. This assumes that the bill as enacted permits a pay-out period of 50 years after the last generator becomes revenue producing.

If, on the other hand, the bill as enacted means that the entire pay-out must be made in 50 years beginning with 1942, when the first main generator became revenue producing, the pay-out period would end with 1991 and the annual requirement beginning with 1952 would be $14,650,000, an increase of $5,317,430, or 57 percent, if in addition the payments were increased about 55 percent in the interim years 1948 to 1951, inclusive. This latter interpretation would be on the assumption that the project has only one power feature and it became revenue producing in 1942. This appears to be an extreme view. It may be possible to construe the act as considering each generator a power feature and on that basis the pay-out period could end with fiscal year 2001.

Appropriations for Maintenance, Bureau of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a statement made by me on March 8, 1948, before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Bureau of Ships budget, Department of the Navy:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am concerned over the ability of the Bureau of Ships to discharge its heavy obligations to the citizens of this Nation in these critical days of world unrest if the recommendations as appearing on pages 748 to 750 inclusive, of the budget of the United States Government transmitted to the Congress by the President are approved by this committee and later enacted into law. It is that great concern which causes me to appear here today to discuss with you the recommended appropriations for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," and particularly those parts of that appropriation dealing with "Maintenance of active fleet," "Maintenance of Reserve Fleet," and "Maintenance and operation of Shore Establishment," as appearing in the budget estimates of the Department of the Navy.

I come before you in an extremely peculiar role. I am an ardent believer in a policy of Government which will result in reduction of costs of operation of the various departments, bureaus, and agencies which go to make up our Government. I do not believe that we should permit extravagance in the expenditure of our tax dollars, no matter how important may be the program which those tax dollars support. Extravagance is waste, and I believe in the principle which dominates this Congress that waste must be eliminated and that substantial reductions in the cost of Government must be achieved. I am well aware that this belief and desire prevails in this important committee, and I want to assure the members, and you Mr. Chairman, that I recognize and espouse this program promulgated by the majority of the Congress which will reestablish reasonable bounds on Federal spending.

I am willing, however, Mr. Chairman, to court the possibility of misunderstanding as to my true position and concern with regard to proper Government thrift by bringing to your attention certain facts which may not clearly be established in the record of your hearings. They are facts I believe you, in your position, would like to know, for these facts have an important bearing on our national defense establishment.

All of us are well aware of the great unrest in the world. None of us can foresee what the future may bring, but it is my conviction, a belief which I am sure is shared fully by this committee, that prudence and wisdom dictate that the Congress not dissipate the tremendous fighting strength which we built up during the war by failure at this critical juncture to provide sufficient funds properly to safeguard our national investment.

Every legislator knows the tendency by governmental agencies to pad budget estimates in anticipation of congressional cuts. It has been done for years and we have seen considerable evidence that it has been done again in advancing appropriation proposals for the 1949 fiscal year.

It is noteworthy, therefore that in dealing with the agency in which I am particularly concerned at this time, the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department, the Bureau of the Budget was restrained in this practice and submitted estimates on the Bureau of Ships' needs which while attempting to be accurate and fair were severely cautious, and frugal to the point of being detrimental to the good of the service and the welfare of the Nation.

It is the duty of the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department to maintain, repair, and overhaul our vast Navy fleet, both active and inactive. To carry out its material responsibilities the Navy Department requested $710,727,000 which subsequently was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to $323,843,000. The latter amount covers some $8,000,000 for communications expenses which previously were paid from other appropriations. Thus, the effective amount for the Bureau is $315,843,000. You will note that this amount represents a decrease below 1948 appropriations of about $70,000,000. Expressed percentagewise, this will mean approximately an 18 percent reduction in funds provided to maintain and improve the same fleet, both active and inactive, provided for in 1948. Costs of maintenance have not decreased, but have in fact increased on a scale comparable to the price and cost inflation reflected everywhere throughout our national economy. There is a further obligation against any Bureau of Ships appropriation made for fiscal 1949 of about $15,000,000 due to the recent wage increases.

I should like to point out that this reduction for the Bureau of Ships estimates over 1948 appropriations is approximately 18 percent, whereas the comparable figures for the Navy Department as a whole show no essential decrease. You will observe, too, Mr. Chairman, that this particular Bureau sustains the largest reduction in estimates, percentagewise, of any of the major naval functions.

It is important to note that we have invested in our active fleet nearly $7,000,000,000. These are the ships in commission upon which we must depend for defensive purposes and these ships should be maintained in full fighting condition.

In addition to these ships, we have another fleet, commonly classified as the inactive, or "moth ball" fleet, in which we have invested another $9,000,000,000. These are the ships which have been placed in a reserve status, but which would bring us up to our full wartime strength in the event of an emergency.

Please note that this total investment of $16,000,000,000 is protected by only a $129,050,000 maintenance fund. I believe you will agree, Mr. Chairman, for any businessman will agree, that this is a small sum indeed to spend to keep in adequate repair and operation a fleet representing so large an investment.

I remember that in the course of last year's hearing on this subject it was argued that the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department had, in addition to the then new appropriations approved by the Bureau of the Budget, a carry-over appropriation from former appropriations. The amount was approximately $264,000,000. If the same argument is advanced again this year, the estimated carry-over appropriations from 1947 and 1948 into 1949 amounts to only $209,000,000.

Attesting, Mr. Chairman and members, to the sincerity and accuracy of the Bureau of Ship's operations is the fact that today its civilian field complement has been reduced 73 percent from the wartime peak, whereas the total reduction for the Navy is only 56 percent. The civilian force in the Bureau itself has been reduced 48 percent, as compared to a total reduction of but 35 percent for the entire Navy Department.

All of us recognize, Mr. Chairman, that national security demands that we not relax our material maintenance and improvement. But, Mr. Chairman, the budget estimates for fiscal 1949 for the Bureau of Ships are some $119,000,000 less than appropriated in 1947, and about $70,000,000 less than appropriated in 1948. Among the reductions there is a decrease of 5 percent for the Naval Reserve, but more startling, Mr. Chairman, in the face of our national need for maintaining sufficient scientific research and development the present budget estimates suggest a 34-percent decrease in funds for this activity. There are only minor funds provided specifically for alternations or improvements to the fleet.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we must look at the immediate future and maintain the strength represented in our vast active and inactive fleet. I believe we must keep in readiness those weapons now available to us and be prepared to use them in the event an emergency should arise.

There is no need for me to advise you, gentlemen, that a Navy fleet is expensive to maintain. You are well aware that unless its guns, its engines, and its other facilities are in first-class condition at all times, it is not a potent instrument for defense. Minimum standards of maintenance are not adequate provision for even a minimum program of national defense, for deterioration in material condition dissipates our defensive abilities and invites dissolution of our entire naval program.

As I have already pointed out, the Bureau of Ships has imposed sharp personnel reductions in preparing for and operating under the limitations of the 1948 appropriation. I believe the Bureau is to be commended for its spirit in carrying out the desire of the Congress in effecting past economies and for its apparent willingness to attempt further savings. However, it is a responsibility of this Congress to pass judgment upon the wisdom of any reductions. In

my opinion, there is no wisdom in a program of appropriations which will necessitate further sharp reductions in civilian personnel for this agency as a result of the reductions made in salary allowance estimates for the Bureau.

On January 1, 1948, the Bureau of Ships had in Washington only 2,022 employed as compared with 2,150 civilians in October of 1941, about 2 months before Pearl Harbor. Comparisons made on the same dates covering civilian employees engaged in actual maintenance and repair work, including all categories of skilled technicians, in the navy yards throughout the country, indicate the seriousness of the reduction even more sharply. On October 1, 1941, Portsmouth Yard had 10,250; January 1, 1948, Portsmouth had only 5,369. Boston had in 1941, 20,458; in 1948, 9,411. New York, 22,690 against 10,828; Philadelphia 22,308 against 9,264; Norfolk 25,924 against 10,064; Charleston 10,688 against 6,531; Long Beach was not in existence in 1941 and in January of this year had 7,630; San Francisco was not in existence in 1941 and in 1948 had 7,315; Mare Island in 1941 had 22,839 and on January 1, 1948 had 10,765; Puget Sound, 15,857 in 1941 against 8,804 in 1948; and Pearl Harbor, 8,371 on October 1, 1941 against 6,000 even on January 1, 1948. Mr. Chairman, on October 1, 1941, a few months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the total civilian personnel employed by the Bureau of Ships was 159,385. The responsibilities of this Bureau have increased tremendously in that intervening period and the present force allowances will not permit the Bureau to carry out properly the development and maintenance responsibilities which are the Bureau's if further cuts are permitted and confirmed.

Mr. Chairman and members, consider that this agency today has under its control the maintenance of almost 3,100 naval ships of all types with a tonnage of nearly 8,500,000 and that it is meeting its responsibilities with a civilian complement almost identical to that of October 1941 when it had only 800 ships with a total tonnage of 2,400,000.

In the period of World War II all of us learned to appreciate the value and necessity of logistics. Our Navy fleet today is based on logistic findings with the types of vessels dictated by the requirements of efficient operation.

Certainly, this maintenance appropriation which last year was little more than 2 percent in comparison to our naval investment in ships, to carry on the vital and essential task of maintaining and operating our Navy fleet, merits reconsideration of its need.

To my personal and certain knowledge, based on intimate relationship with one of our great navy yards located in the city of Bremerton in the State of Washington, there is a backlog of unfinished work on our naval vessels accumulating steadily and rapidly. We must soon reach a time when deterioration will set in, both in our active fleet and in the inactive fleet. We can avoid this only by making proper provisions both in funds and personnel, to protect the investment the American taxpayer has in our naval fleet and in the defense and security program of the Nation.

Reductions effected in the Bureau of Ships budget, Mr. Chairman, affect more than the naval shipyards. Rescissions in that budget affect employment in private shipyards as well. They affect civilian component manufacturers who fabricate equipment for the Navy. This is a serious matter, Mr. Chairman.

I mentioned before that approximately $15,000,000 must be absorbed in this year's budget allowances for wage increases created since the last appropriations. Unless this amount is added to the present estimates, severe cuts must be made in civilian personnel which will result in the loss of skilled technical personnel who are essential to our national defense. Necessity will cause them to seek other employment, and the effect of Navy reductions having already worked detrimentally to the private shipyards, that employment cannot be shifted to the private yards. The essential trained, skilled technical personnel are lost irretrievably to the industry and to the navy yards. You cannot train efficient shipyard workers overnight. There is an obvious minimum of personnel which must be maintained at a navy yard to insure efficient operation. As in a manufacturing plant, if the number is too small, overhead increases unit costs inordinately. The Congress must take these and related facts, Mr. Chairman, into account in considering the appropriation for the Bureau of Ships if we are to avoid dissipation of those trained workers who, in the event of any emergency, will constitute the indispensable nucleus around which an expanded program must be built.

Mr. Chairman, it may appear presumptuous for me to attempt to suggest to this committee than an increase of not less than $50,000,000 should be applied to the budget items appearing in categories 1, 2, and 6 of the designation "Obligations by activities" appearing on page 748 of the Budget. However, in reply to a formal inquiry directed to the Bureau of Ships, the following table was furnished which indicates $400,000,000 to be the proper total for a desirable standard of maintenance and a reasonable program of continuing improvements.

Appropriation, "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1949"

	Present budget	Proposed
Maintenance of active fleet	$110,300,000	$136,000,000
Maintenance of reserve fleet	18,750,000	26,000,000
Miscellaneous operating costs	4,984,000	5,000,000
Electronics	47,150,000	56,000,000
Research and development	30,350,000	45,000,000
Maintenance and operation of shore establishment	103,309,000	120,000,000
Naval Reserve	9,000,000	12,000,000
Total	323,843,000	400,000,000

The increase of approximately $26,000,000 in maintenance of the Active Fleet would be devoted to bettering the standards of repair and undertaking a few of the most urgent alterations to improve ships. A small amount would be used for improving the stock position of necessary materials which now are depleted.

The increase of some $7,000,000 in maintenance of the Reserve Fleet would permit undertaking overhauls of those ships which require the correction of defects existing at the time they were laid up.

Approximately $9,000,000 would be added to the procurement of electronics gear in order to provide modern equipment so that the Navy may hold its own in this field.

The additional $15,000,000 for research and development would permit an expansion of activity in the most important fields. It would not cover all the requirements which are considered of major importance.

The addition of about $17,000,000 in maintenance and operation of the shore establishment is a necessary sum to match the additions made for the Active and Reserve Fleets.

The additional $3,000,000 for the Naval Reserve would permit a partial equipment of armories for improved training and would allow an increase in the standard of maintenance in ships assigned for training the Naval Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, in submitting this table in reply to my question, I am aware that Admiral Mills may appear to be acting beyond the customary limitation imposed in such appropriation matters. His action, however, is entirely proper and appropriate, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as Admiral Mills cannot bring this testimony to you in more elaborate form unless formal inquiry is initiated by this committee. I want respectfully and seriously to urge that you recall Admiral Mills and request his comments on the total import and burden of my statement, particularly for the purpose of bringing more adequately to your attention the significance of this suggested increase in the light of current prevailing conditions of maintenance and operation in the respective Navy shipyards and shore establishments and in the interest of our national defense. I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that you and your committee will weigh all the facts in this situation and that in the process of your further consideration you will come to the conclusion that the Bureau of Ships, both as to maintenance and salaries and shore establishments, has presented estimates inadequate to our national welfare and inconsistent with any program of true economy.

Texas Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Texas' laws affecting veterans, their dependents, and their organizations, compiled by my friend, DeWitt T. Kirby, national service officer and department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, post-office box 85, Waco, Tex.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and, therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Texas veterans' laws will come to their attention.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A State allowance is provided for the burial of Civil War pensioners. A warrant for $100 may be paid to heirs or legal representatives of the deceased veteran.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Members of the armed forces, regardless of the statutory requirement that they must be at least 21 years of age, if unmarried, in order to make a will, may make such wills and provision is made for proof of such wills.

Oaths, and so forth, made by members of the armed forces outside the United States are acknowledged.

The commission to take a deposition may be addressed to, executed and re-

turned by any commissioned officer in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Members of the armed forces are eligible to vote without the requirement of paying poll tax.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

A Veterans' Affairs Commission has been created to administer oaths in connection with claims for benefits, aid veterans, their relatives, beneficiaries, and dependents with claims and render all types of service to veterans and dependents. Field assistants are stationed at the regional offices or facilities of the Veterans' Administration throughout the State.

Certified copies of public records are furnished free to veterans or their heirs to support claims against the United States.

The State registry shall issue, free of cost to any veteran, his widow, orphan, or other descendants, a photostatic copy of any record filed in the Bureau of Vital Statistics, and not otherwise prohibited by law, when such record is to be used in the settlement of a claim against the Government.

Official discharge papers are recorded by county clerks without charge. The fee for recording discharge papers is made a charge on the county.

County service officers assist veterans in presenting claims, securing hospitalization, and so forth.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

County school trustees are authorized to contract with the State board for vocational education to maintain special schools for veterans of World War II.

Graduates of certain law schools are admitted to the bar without examination if application is made within 1 year after discharge from the armed forces.

Tuition benefits are available to veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Veterans, their widows, or dependents shall be employed, wherever practical, in the operation of the soldiers' and sailors' home.

Leaves of absence are granted public employees with reemployment upon completion of service in the armed forces.

Leaves of absence are granted State and district officers during service in the armed forces, with waiver of emoluments.

Preference is given in all State departments to veterans who have been resident in the State for 10 years.

Preference of employment is given in all State agencies and upon public works to veterans of any war.

Benefit rights are preserved under the municipal pension system and under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Reinstatement in labor unions is provided without payment of back dues.

Justices of the court of civil appeals are reinstated upon termination of service in the armed forces.

Veterans must be given priority in the construction of State buildings.

GUARDIANSHIP

Notice of filing of accounts and certain other proceedings affecting the estate of a beneficiary of the Veterans' Administration must be given to the Administration.

Provision is made for the appointment of a guardian of a minor, a person of unsound mind, a habitual drunkard, or other person, where it is necessary that a guardian be appointed to receive funds or money due such person from the Federal Government.

HOMES

Confederate veterans and their wives may be admitted to the Confederate home.

Spanish-American and World War veterans and their wives may be admitted to the soldiers' and sailors' home.

Wives or widows of Confederate soldiers may be admitted to the Confederate Woman's Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Priority and preferential rights are extended to World War I veterans in admission to the American Legion Memorial Sanatorium (tuberculosis hospital).

Provision is made for temporary commitment of those believed to be mentally ill to United States facilities without jury trial.

Patients may be transferred from State hospitals to Veterans' Administration hospitals.

INSURANCE-POLICY PROTECTION

The board of insurance commissioners shall value insurance policies of a substandard or extrahazardous contract and where warranted charge extra reserves thereon. Extra premiums must be charged, where warranted, because of extra risk.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Provision has been made for the adoption of service medals and service ribbons for Texans serving in World War II.

PENSIONS

A pension of $150 a month is payable to Civil War veterans married and living with wife; $100 to unmarried veterans or widowers; $50 to the widow of such veteran.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Building and loan associations, State banks, life-insurance companies, savings and loan associations, banks, insurance companies, and other corporations or organizations may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

A commission has been established to administer certain funds for the benefit of aged and indigent Spanish-American war veterans.

A postwar economic planning commission has been created with certain duties.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Cigarettes may be sold in military posts, camps, or unit exchanges free from State tax.

Veterans are exempt from payment of poll tax before voting during calendar year of discharge.

Disabled veterans of foreign wars are exempt from payment of poll tax.

Dentists are exempt from payment of annual registration fee during active military service.

Registered architects are exempt from payment of annual license fees during active service in the armed forces.

Hairdressers or cosmetologists are entitled to a renewal of license without examination within 1 years after discharge from the armed forces.

Pharmacists are entitled to renewal of registration after service in the armed forces.

Veterans' organizations are not required to obtain a license or post bond when engaging in the operation of employment or labor agencies.

Payment of interest and penalties accruing on State and county ad valorem taxes is exempted during service in the armed forces.

TRANSPORTATION PRIVILEGES

Common carriers may grant free transportation to veterans of the Civil, Spanish-American, and Indian Wars, their wives and widows.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

An appropriation of $4,968.15 has been made to the Department of Texas of the United Spanish War Veterans covering the balance of the fund now in the State treasury deposited by the United States in 1898.

The Secretary of State is prohibited from issuing to any corporation any charter using to any corporation any charter using the words "veteran," "legion," "foreign," "Spanish," "disabled," "war," "World War," or the abbreviations of such words without the written approval of some congressionally recognized veterans' organization in whose name the prohibited word appears. Any charter formerly issued must be canceled unless such organization amends its name in the manner provided.

Veterans' organizations are not required to obtain a license or post bond when engaging in operation of employment or labor agencies.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the Texas Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

Many of the 65 DAV chapters in the State maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains full-time national service officers at the various Veterans' Administration regional offices in the State, as follows: Five, under the direction of Lewis J. Murphy, at Dallas; four, under the direction of Walter D. Hardin, at San Antonio; three, under the direction of Robert O. Pugh, at Houston; three, under the direction of Pat Smith, at Lubbock; and three, under the direction of DeWitt T. Kirby, at the VA center, Waco.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation, Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942, active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE-TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become National Service Officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by eighteen more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer—business manager— of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 18th St. NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department of legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitatons and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

The service program and outstanding accomplishments of the DAV make me very proud to be an active member of that organization. I am sure its aims and purposes merit the consideration and support of the entire country.

Housing Research at Columbia University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great deficiencies in our approach to housing has been the limited availability of research. This is essential to seek to reduce costs, to inform us as to the size of the housing problem and as the foundation of a comprehensive housing program. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which provides such a program has as an important component the item or research. It is encouraging that Columbia University, which is in my district, has engaged in a major effort to supply this need. Following is an editorial on the subject explaining the work to be undertaken:

A NEW STEP AT COLUMBIA

Announcement by Dr. Fackenthal of the formation of an Institute for Urban Land Use and Housing Studies at Columbia University coincides with increased public interest everywhere in the planning function

in our cities, and with continued irritation over the tardiness with which we are coming to grips with the housing shortage. The $100,000 grant made to the institute by the Rockefeller Foundation and the contribution that Columbia University itself will make to the studies will be well spent if the research can be translated into practical action.

Dr. Ernest M. Fisher, who will be director of the institute, is a consultant to the Library of Congress on housing, and is on the Census Bureau's advisory committee on a census of housing for 1950. He is professor of urban land economics at Columbia. The institute will cross the lines of several branches of study at the university, including economics, architecture, sociology, law, public administration, business, planning, and housing.

As Dr. Fackenthal says, "The years bring sweeping changes in the character of different areas of a great city," and in most cases these changes "are merely permitted to happen without understanding of the forces which bring them to pass." Research will aim at a more systematic and effective use of real estate in cities and villages. The institute will at the same time be a source of objective facts on problems which have usually been dealt with only by governmental agencies or by privately financed groups that often had an ax of their own to grind. We look forward with interest to the results of what can be a most useful and productive study.

Reduction in Rent for Reduction in Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, every effort has been made in the discussions on rent control to protect landlords against any loss of income, to insure them against loss because of increased operation costs. But, in general, landlords have been most arduous in reducing their own costs of operation. In fact, landlords in every section of the Nation have developed practices which automatically reduce their costs. They have virtually eliminated the formerly accepted practice of decorating apartments and houses every year. They have reduced janitor services, eliminated refuse disposal and forced tenants to pay the cost of water, lights, gas, and heat.

Let me give you one specific example which has become common in every community: A family was paying $50 a month rent for an apartment. The landlord obtained an increase of $5 per month on the basis of increased costs of operation. At the same time, the landlord reduced the services he formerly provided. He eliminated not only decoration, but repairs. The cost is not much, but it amounts to a minimum of $2 per month which the tenant has to pay. Then the landlord refused to pay for the electricity. The cost was passed on to the tenant. It is only a few dollars a month, but added to the cost of repairs, decoration and other items of maintenance, it amounts to nearly $10 a month. In other words, the tenant must now pay $65 per month, instead of the $50 he paid before.

The present act—Housing and Rent Act of 1947—protects tenants against such reductions of services, and it also provides 15 different grounds on which a landlord could apply for an increase in rent. But if provisions are made to protect the landlord from reductions in income, at the same time, the law must protect tenants against reductions in services which amount to an increase in rent. In other words, when landlords reduce services, rents must be reduced to meet the increased cost.

Oleo and Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from Hoard's Dairyman, leading agricultural newspaper published in my district:

OLEO AND SOYBEANS

In the interest of honesty and commercial morality, the present tax of 10 cents a pound on yellow oleomargarine must be maintained. Indeed, properly, it should be increased to make it impossible for this product to masquerade as butter.

Dairymen are willing to accept the results of honest competition, but they protest that yellow oleomargarine is a substitute so cunningly devised and colored that it cannot be detected except by scientific experts, and for this reason cannot be considered honest competition.

This question of deceit is the major reason why consumers as well as producers should support the present Federal law. As has been true through the years, the two dozen manufacturers of oleomargarine have sought to confuse the issue. They seek to set farmer against farmer on the basis of self-interest and have induced some representatives of the soybean industry to front for them and argue for the repeal of the Federal law taxing yellow oleomargarine.

What are the facts as to self-interest of the grower of soybeans? As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." Here is what we find, based on records from the United States Department of Agriculture:

The farm price of soybeans in 1946 was $2.57, and 80 percent of the production was crushed for oil and meal. The grower received not quite two-thirds of the wholesale value of the resulting oil and meal. On the bushel basis he received slightly under 18 cents for the soybean oil used in oleomargarine; $1.11 for the soybean oil used in paints, shortening compounds, etc.; and $1.28 for soybean meal.

What is the grower's major interest and most important market? Is it the 18 cents a bushel from soybean oil used in oleomargarine or the $1.28 he receives from the soybean meal purchased by the dairyman?

The self-interest of the soybean farmer, if nothing else, should lead him to support protection against dishonest competition in dairy markets. Good dairy prices are a vital factor in conserving the future price of soybeans.

New York Young Republicans Favor Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution concerning residential rent control indicates the concern of Republicans with this pressing problem in the New York area. I have always believed that the basic principles of Lincoln, the founding father of the Republican Party, require flexibility in our democracy. Such flexibility recognizes that rent control does not mean the end of the free-enterprise system. Public emergencies must be met if the need requires it; and this will rather preserve our democracy.

Resolution concerning residential rent control

The following resolutions pertaining to residential rent control were duly adopted by the New York Young Republican Club at a meeting held on February 19, 1948:

"Whereas the present Federal Housing and Rent Act of 1947 expires by its terms on February 29, 1948, and the shortage of residential housing which caused the emergency leading to the enactment of that statute continues without substantial abatement; and

"Whereas said Federal Housing and Rent Act of 1947 was inadequate as a protection to tenants in many respects; and

"Whereas the proposed Ives-Baldwin bill (S. 2015) appears to provide for more adequate tenant protection than that afforded by the Federal Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and if adopted will extend adequate rent control over most residential rents to July 1, 1949; and

"Whereas the Ives-Baldwin bill at present fails to give adequate protection to tenants in noncooperative apartment houses insofar as it does not prohibit the landlord from selling apartments therein and thereby subjecting the tenants therein to eviction without their consent: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the New York Young Republican Club favors the adoption of the said Ives-Baldwin bill (S. 2015) without further delay; and be it further

"Resolved, That the New York Young Republican Club favors the amendment of said bill to provide adequate protection to tenants in apartment houses which are not bona fide cooperatives."

Cleveland Company Praises Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the March 1948 issue of the International Teamster:

CLEVELAND COMPANY PRAISES UNIONS — ARE SOURCE OF SKILLS NATION NEEDS, SAYS CONTRACTOR

Not many companies in these days go out of their way to praise organized labor. When

one does it is news. Making such news is the H. K. Ferguson Co., of Cleveland, industrial engineers and builders.

In a greeting to its employees, Executive Vice President O. F. Sieder said:

"You are a union man and we are a union contractor. You are happy to hold a card. For our part we are happy with our union relationships—which go back many years and extend to all parts of the country.

"In these days when it seems to be fashionable to attack unions for all kinds of things—for everything from communism to inflation—we want to go on record with a few facts:

"1. The unions are a source of the skills the country needs to continue the building of our national industrial plants.

"2. They have helped to establish high standards of skill in the construction industry.

"3. They have helped to promote America's high standard of living—one of the modern wonders of the world.

"4. They are a partner with management in keeping America industrially strong and, therefore, safe and free in a troubled world.

"These things are important because they affect our industrial life as a nation. Our own best interests—as well as the needs of the whole world—require that we produce more and work harder than we did in 1947.

"For our part, we, as management, hope to improve our job supervision, to see that the complicated tasks of designing plants, buying material, and scheduling work is done better, cheaper, and more efficiently than before. In short, our goal is to make the Ferguson Co. a better organization for its employees and its customers.

"We know you will do your part. We expect that you will provide a fair day's work and give us—in return for fair wages and working conditions—the full measure of the skill and labor of which you are justly proud.

"After all—we're all on the same team and have the same goal. That goal is to provide our customers with factories and plants and buildings of high quality at fair and reasonable costs. That is our job—yours and ours—and the better it is done, the greater the satisfaction in terms of full employment and steady income for all of us.

"And so, to you as an individual building-trades mechanic and collectively as a union, we are glad you are working with us."

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the thoughts expressed by the executive vice president of one of the outstanding industrial engineering and building firms, as set forth in this article, will be an incentive to others who seek more amicable labor-management relations and increased production. Such relationship between management and labor is extremely significant because it shows clearly that high production can be attained when each recognizes the just rights of the other.

Missouri River Basin Project—Report of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 24 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Report of Progress—Missouri River Basin Project," delivered by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the Farm and Home Week Conference, at Minot, N. Dak., on February 9, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF PROGRESS—MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Once each year for 4 years I have come to North Dakota to discuss the development of the Missouri River Basin.

The first time I came out here, the Missouri River Basin plan was but a dream; the second time, it had begun to take form and substance; the third, we were preparing to begin the job authorized by the Congress, and the fourth time, this time, I am happy to report great activity and substantial progress.

This substantial progress actually includes construction work on 7 dams, 2 power plants, and 588 miles of transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the building of 5 dams and 3 local flood-control projects by the Army Corps of Engineers.

It takes large sums of money to harness the Missouri and put it to work. But the benefits that will accrue will make this investment one of the soundest that Uncle Sam has ever made.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, authorizing the Missouri River Basin project—a coordinated plan of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers—was signed by the President on December 22, 1944. The first funds made available for the Missouri Basin program were appropriated less than 2½ years ago. The regular Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1946 carried a total of $3,200,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies of the Department of the Interior for beginning action on the program. Interior Department appropriations to date for the Missouri River basin project total $54,880,300. Initial appropriations for the Corps of Engineers portion of work in the basin in the same period of time amounted to $1,452,000. To date, appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers part of the plan have totaled $83,197,125. We see, therefore, that a grand total of $138,077,425 has been made available for work on the Pick-Sloan plan, enough for a most substantial start.

Actually, only 2 years have elapsed since the Congress appropriated construction funds and, in that period, contracts have been awarded by the Bureau of Reclamation for seven structures, including Kortes Dam and power plant on the North Platte River in Wyoming; Angostura Dam on the Cheyenne River in South Dakota; Enders Dam on the Republican River in Nebraska, also the Cambridge Diversion Dam of the same unit, in Nebraska; Boysen Dam and power plant on the Big Horn River, in Wyoming; Heart Butte Dam on the Heart River, in North Dakota; and Medicine Creek Dam in Nebraska.

Similar progress has been made by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Construction is under way on Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Fort Randall Dam in South Dakota, both on the main stem of the Missouri River; Harlan County Dam on the Republican River in Nebraska; Cherry Creek Dam in Colorado; and Kanopolis Dam on the Smoky Hill River in Kansas. Work is going forward by the Army Corps of Engineers on local flood-protection projects for Council Bluffs, Iowa; Omaha, Nebr.; and the Missouri River agricultural levee.

Throughout the length and breadth of the Missouri River Basin the Bureau of Reclamation also is engaged in the many activities required to bring other units of the developmental plan to the construction stage.

North Dakota is one of the fortunate States which will have a major share in the Missouri River Basin development.

Preliminary work is in progress as well in your State on Cannonball Dam of the Cannonball River unit and Dickinson Dam of the Heart River unit. Dickinson Dam, near the town bearing the same name, will provide storage for municipal use as well as irrigation. Negotiations with the city of Dickinson have been nearly completed. All that remains is the execution of a repayment contract. The Bureau of Reclamation anticipates that both the Cannonball Dam and Dickinson Dam will reach the construction stage during 1948.

You, through your Governor, who represents you on the important Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee, have the opportunity and responsibility of keeping this project geared to State and local needs.

I have considerable direct interest in the success of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. This year I am chairman of the parent committee, the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee, which meets in Washington once each month.

As the work load builds up in a particular basin, we establish a committee to operate directly in the basin and to deal directly with problems regarding the work of the Federal agencies. Only relatively major problems or policies are brought before the Federal committee. In this way, the basin program can be maintained on a grass-roots basis.

The Missouri Basin plan approved by the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944 did not profess to be the beginning and end of all plans. It did establish a basic pattern for the Missouri River Basin which can be supplemented and modified to fit changing needs. The Department of the Interior, through the Missouri Basin Field Committee, plans periodically to reevaluate the Missouri Basin plan so that the program will, through succeeding years, produce maximum benefits for all the people of the region, not only in providing irrigation water, low-cost hydroelectric power, and controlling floods, but in furnishing the many other benefits that can come to the basin residents directly and indirectly from the program.

Translation of coordinated planning into effective execution of the Missouri Basin program requires continuing collaboration of a far more extensive scale than has heretofore been attempted in a natural-resources management operation. Since 1945 the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee has effectively coordinated the activities of five major Federal executive agencies interested in the developmental program, including the Departments of Interior, War, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission. Five governors, representing the 10 Missouri Basin States, have taken an active part in the monthly meetings of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee, permitting effective representation of the interests and rights of the States in the development of their watersheds. Governor Aandahl, of North Dakota, is a member of that committee, and his counsel and advice have contributed much to the progress made by the committee in the definite formulation of a unified program, participated in by Federal, State, and local agencies.

Successful coordination of the Department's program in the Basin is achieved through the Interior Missouri Basin Field Committee, established by the Secretary in May 1946. W. G. Sloan, well known to you as the coauthor of the Pick-Sloan plan, the popularly accepted designation for the Reclamation-Army engineers' developmental program, is chairman of the field committee. Meetings are held each month to achieve full

coordination of the activities of the participating Interior agencies.

The Geological Survey presents emphatic evidence of the underlying importance of coordinated planning and activity on the part of Interior agencies. The Geologic Branch of the Geological Survey is making further investigations of the mineral resources in the Basin. The long-range objective of the National Park Service is to develop a recreational land-use plan so as to obtain the best use from scenic, archeological, historical, and recreational resources of the Basin. The effects of the development program on existing and future fish and wildlife resources are being determined by the Fish and Wildlife Service. A comprehensive analysis of the extent and nature of the Indian's involvement in the Missouri Basin project is being made by the Office of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Land Management is determining how the economy of lands to be irrigated through the development program can best be integrated with adjoining public range lands. The Cadastral Branch of this agency is offering a practical immediate service through the relocation and retracing of all section lines on Missouri Basin units.

Residents of this section of North Dakota naturally have a greater special interest in the Missouri-Souris unit, destined to be one of the largest reclamation projects in the United States. Commissioner of Reclamation Michael W. Straus, speaking before a group of Minot businessmen less than 6 months ago, emphasized that a tremendous but not impossible task faces the Bureau of Reclamation in bringing the Missouri-Souris unit to the point where actual construction can begin.

When the Missouri-Souris unit was made a part of the Missouri River Basin project, the Bureau of Reclamation was fully aware that it would take months of intensive effort to complete the myriad preliminary studies and intensive investigations required. The Missouri-Souris unit offers the greatest challenge of any development contained in the Missouri Basin project and at the same time it offers the greatest potential reward.

Due to the immensity of the acreage involved, it is impractical to study the Missouri-Souris unit in its entirety. Therefore a sample process has been instituted, or in other words, block areas representative of larger subdivisions have been selected. These blocks contain no more than 10 to 15 percent of the total area. Detailed studies on each selected block, conducted as if each area were a project in itself, will be made.

The first phase of this program, the collection of basic data, has been in progress for the past 2 years. From the first funds made available by Congress in 1945 for the Missouri River Basin project, $100,000 was allocated to the Missouri-Souris unit. The nature, scope, and importance of this unit, and the wide diversity of problems were thus early recognized.

Substantial progress has been made in securing basic data and in assembling and analyzing the material so that it can be used to the best advantage. A report summarizing the detailed findings is needed before the first major construction can be initiated. The foundation on which the Missouri-Souris unit is to be built must be firm, for here lies much of the future wealth of your State.

North Dakota has, indeed, a vital stake in the basin-wide program. Of the approximately 5,000,000 acres to come under irrigation in the seven States of the basin, it is estimated that about 27 percent, or one and one-quarter million acres are in North Dakota. North Dakota has an equally significant interest in the production of low-cost power, a major phase of the Missouri River Basin project. In 1947 a decision was reached, in which the Bureau of Reclamation participated, as to the number and size of generators to be installed by the Corps of Engineers in the Garrison and Fort Randall power plants. The two plants together will have a capacity that is about six times the total present generating capacity in the State of North Dakota. Power from two generating units in the Garrison plant, totaling 128,000 kilowatts, is expected to be available in 1953.

The production of low-cost hydroelectric power will probably mean more to the people of North Dakota than to any other State in the basin. Recently the Rural Electrification Administration reported that South and North Dakota rank 47th and 48th on the roll of States in the percentage of their farms electrified through central service. As of June 30, 1947, 18.2 percent of South Dakota farms were receiving electricity through either REA-financed or private lines. The figure for North Dakota was 15.6 percent.

The Bureau of Reclamation is directly concerned with the production, transmission, and sale of electric power in the Missouri River Basin. The Bureau was designated by the Secretary of the Interior as the agency in the Department of the Interior responsible for marketing electric power produced by Federal generating plants located in the Missouri Basin. The designation by the Secretary followed the delegation to the Department of the Interior, under the Flood Control Act of 1944, of the responsibility for marketing electric power from projects of the Army engineers, including those to be built in the basin.

Lines have been constructed by the Bureau extending to the east from Fort Peck as far as Glendive, Mont., and south to Miles City, Mont. A second line is now being constructed from Fort Peck to Williston, N. Dak., thence to Beulah and to the Garrison dam site which is now under construction by the Corps of Engineers.

Power from Fort Peck power plant, marketed by the Bureau of Reclamation, is becoming increasingly important as a source of supply for REA cooperatives. Five cooperatives, four in Montana and one in North Dakota, the Williams Electric Cooperative, near Williston, are now receiving service from this source. Fourteen other cooperatives can obtain service as soon as their facilities permit. Eleven of these 14 cooperatives are expected to begin taking Fort Peck power by July; of these, 1 is a Montana cooperative and the remaining 10 are in North and South Dakota. These cooperatives are:

McKenzie Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Mountrail Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
West Plains Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Oliver Mercer Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Mor-Gran-Sou Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Burke-Divide Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Slope Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Capital Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Kem Electric Cooperative, North Dakota.
Moreau-Grand Electric Inc., South Dakota.

The Bureau of Reclamation awarded a contract late in 1946 for the construction of a power transmission line from the Fort Peck power plant through Williston and Beulah to Garrison Dam site. Fort Peck power delivered to Garrison will be used by the Corps of Engineers during the construction of Garrison Dam. Service to REA and private utility loads will be made through Beulah and Williston substations. After completion of Garrison Dam and power plant the high-voltage line will be a part of the backbone transmission grid connecting the Missouri River Basin power plants as well as continuing to serve the urban and rural areas in western North Dakota.

Power is essential to the success of the Missouri River Basin development. Production of low-cost hydroelectric power will help return to the Government a major part of the construction costs. The availability of low-cost power is the turning point in the feasibility of many of the irrigation units of the Missouri River Basin project. But there is still another important reason for developing an abundance of low-cost power in the basin. Power benefits the economy of the entire region. The availability and use of low-cost power, distributed to the ultimate consumer through the facilities of cooperatives, municipalities, or private utilities, brings to the farmer, the city dweller, and the merchant the benefits, the conveniences, and the many advantages that can only be achieved through the more universal and widespread use of electricity.

The development of the Nation's power resources in our Pacific Northwest is an example of how the availability of low-cost power can completely revolutionize the economic phases of a region. That area had little development of electro-chemical and electro-metallurgical industries until the Bonneville-Grand Coulee plants were constructed. Every region has its bank of national resources, some of which cannot be developed without an adequate supply of power. As you know, the development of national resources and the establishment of industries have a tremendous effect on all factors of your economic life. Low-cost power has encouraged the establishment of many new industries in the Northwest. Materials from the primary industries, such as aluminum and chemicals, have encouraged the expansion of others using these materials. Greater employment has resulted and new large pay rolls have expanded markets all over the Northwest. New population in Oregon and Washington has been attracted to the region by this industrial advancement.

According to the Census Bureau's report of October 30, 1947, gains in the Northwest region since 1940 amount to 34 percent as compared with the national average growth of 9 percent.

Low-cost power is the magnet that attracts and holds industry in the Northwest. What has happened there in the way of population growth and greater spread of employment can happen right here in your part of the Missouri River Basin.

I have reported briefly to you on the progress of the development of the Missouri River basin. As I have said before, we have started a big job, one which will not be completed in a few years. We cannot complete the job without your help. One hundred and forty million people in the United States are not going to make an investment o their money to develop the resources of an area in which the local people do not recognize the values of that development. You have already shown your interest by the help you have given in the 3 years since the enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The extent of that help is measured in terms of major works now under construction—Heart River Dam, Angostura Dam, Enders, Boysen, Kortes, and Medicine Creek. During 1948, construction is scheduled to begin on other units of the Missouri basin project in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado.

The Missouri River Basin project is your agricultural insurance policy. Its dams placed on strategic tributaries will control the river and save its waters rolling by you for your use, so that the years of abundance will multiply and the years of disaster will diminish.

By looking the question squarely in the face, as Major Powell advised North Dakota statesmen some 60 years ago, you have helped make secure the welfare of not just yourself, or your region, but of the whole Nation.

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] delivered a very able address last night at the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum in Philadelphia, on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objections, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Taft-Hartley Act was written for only one purpose—to establish justice and equality in labor-management relations. Such justice and equality is absolutely essential if we are to find the way to capital-labor peace, as justice in international relations is the key to world peace. It was not a new law, but a revision of elaborate existing laws, such as the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which were so one-sided that they conferred on labor union leaders arbitrary power over all but the largest employers, and, even more important, over their own members. These former laws were written on sound principles to correct excessive power formerly exercised by employers, but they were so sweeping and so broadly construed that they gave no one, employer, public, or workman any remedy whatever against the acts of labor union leaders, no matter how arbitrary and unjust those acts might be.

I sat through the hearings in 1939 and heard the Wagner Act denounced by William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, more violently than by any employer because there was no justice, even between unions. I think that no such perversions of justice have ever occurred in the United States as were perpetrated by the first Labor Relations Board under that act.

Furthermore, the arbitrary power given to labor union leaders led to the making of such unreasonable demands by a few unreasonable leaders that strikes were inevitable, and in 1946 seriously interfered with the recovery and rehabilitation of our peacetime economy.

It was for these reasons that the people demanded reform and that Congress passed the bill over the President's veto by a vote of 331 to 83 in the House and 68 to 25 in the Senate, nearly all the Republicans and more than half the Democrats in Congress voting to override. There could have been no such vote, except that the Congressmen and Senators knew that their constituents demanded a return to justice in labor relations.

The revision of the law was not inspired by any idea of vengeance or any prejudice against labor unions. The committee which reported the bill was largely pro-labor, and the pro-labor members took the position that labor itself would be benefited by a correction of the abuses which had arisen. We held long hearings and our attorneys drafted the new law with instructions to correct only those matters where abuses were shown to exist.

The new act is based on the same two basic principles as the former laws, principles which I believe are the essential basic rights of labor—essential also to liberty and equality for all. First, the employer must recognize the union and deal solely with the representative chosen by a majority of his employees. This was the principle of the Wagner Act and is retained unimpaired. I believe there can only be equality if employees can deal as one unit, and if the employer is deprived of any power to deal with thousands of his men one at a time.

The second principle is the right to call a strike whenever it proves impossible, after a contract has expired, to reach an agreement with the employer regarding wages, hours, or working conditions. If this principle is violated, there must be at least compulsory arbitration, and that will soon amount to Government-wage fixing. That would require price-fixing and all the other controls of a totalitarian state which destroy a free economy and freedom itself.

Only in one case in this law do we limit the basic right to strike after notice is given. That is where the national safety or health is endangered, and even then only for a brief period while the Government attempts to work out a settlement. It does not seem unreasonable to ask employer and men to maintain the status quo for 80 days, rather than to subject the whole people to danger or disease.

The new act attempts to restore equal bargaining power so that when the employer meets the union representative across the table, neither will feel that he can make an unreasonable demand and obtain any Government support to back him up. The Wagner Act was completely one-sided, and the Board was necessarily forced into an anti-employer position.

We left unchanged the right of the union to complain against unfair labor practices by the employer as defined in the Wagner Act. We have, however, created also unfair labor practices on the part of the unions, and made the National Labor Relations Board a judicial body to hold the scales equal between the parties. We separated the prosecuting and judicial functions of the Board so that the concept of justice might return to Government action in this field.

We corrected many administrative procedures for the same purpose of securing justice and equality. We restored freedom of speech, both to employer and to employee.

Since the whole basis of the law is free collective bargaining leading to contracts between employers and unions, if there is to be equality, we had to make unions responsible on their contracts and also responsible for their acts under the same general rules of agency as apply to all other organizations.

The act makes jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts unfair labor practices, and makes the union responsible for damage resulting from these practices. No witness appeared before our committee to defend these types of racketeering strikes. Even in this case we did not restore the old power of employers to go into court and obtain injunctions. Injunctions against this type of strike can only be obtained by the Government. The law has had a very beneficial effect in this field and apparently has reduced the number of these kinds of strikes. The number of strikes during the last half of 1947 was only half the number in the corresponding months of 1946.

Because our law was drawn to meet specific abuses testified to before the committee, we found when we had completed the law that it contained more provisions intended to give protection to the individual employee, both union and nonunion, against arbitrary action by labor-union officers, than there were to give justice to the employer. A list of such provisions makes a bill of rights for employees. I list them.

1. A union shop cannot be imposed on any employee unless a majority of the employees vote for it.

2. Even then, a man, who is willing to pay his dues, cannot be excluded from a job because the union arbitrarily refuses to admit him, or fires him after he is admitted. Unless we had changed the law, men could not work at their chosen occupations except by favor of labor-union leaders, no matter how excellent their work might be.

3. The closed shop is entirely forbidden. That is, a man does not have to be a member of the union when first employed, but only after 30 days where a union shop has been established by vote.

4. The Board is given power to prohibit excessive or discriminatory dues.

5. Unions are required to file financial reports with their members and an account of their methods of election and procedure. Eighty-five percent of union members favor the provision.

6. Employees cannot be coerced by a labor union to join or not to join the union.

7. Dues may not be checked off from an employee's wages unless he has filed a written consent.

8. If a welfare fund is established, of course out of funds which otherwise could have been paid in wages, the employee is entitled to have these funds treated as trust funds, properly supervised and audited, and administered equally for his benefit.

9. Union members are entitled to prevent the use of their dues, contributed for union purposes, to defeat candidates whom they may favor in any national election.

It is fair to say that for the first time Congress has interested itself in protecting the liberties of the individual workman, subject, of course, always to his being bound by a majority vote in choosing the representative who makes the contract for wages, hours, or working conditions.

WHAT THE ACT DOES NOT DO

The act does not in any way limit the legitimate rights of labor unions or any of the rights upon which they have laid stress in the past.

1. The talk about a slave labor bill is ridiculous when you read the express provision of the act which says that "nothing shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act, nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service without his consent." The right to quit is absolutely unimpaired. The restraints of the act are directed entirely at the acts of unions acting through their officers. What has really upset some of the more vociferous of the union leaders is not the enslavement of their men but the very reasonable restraints on their hitherto unrestrained and arbitrary power over both men and the public.

There is certainly a marked distinction between this law and that demanded by President Truman in 1946. He asked for authority to seize the railroads and the mines, and draft all the workmen—and the labor leaders—into the Army, on such terms as he might see fit to impose. He could have marched men to camp or make them work without compensation under Army officers. He tried to rush the bill through in a single night, and I take some credit for interposing the objection which killed the bill.

2. The act does not require any man to work for a wage fixed by the Government or by compulsory arbitration.

3. The act does not deprive the unions of any right of collective bargaining conferred by the Wagner Act. The five employer unfair labor practices contained in section 8 of the original Wagner Act are repeated in the same language in the new act. Therefore, the rights of the unions to collectively bargain and to insist upon recognition are unimpaired.

4. There is nothing in the act which restores in any way the right of individual employers to go to Federal courts and secure injunctions against strikes. The employer, like the union, can appeal to the National

Labor Relations Board to prevent unfair labor practices, but injunctions can be granted only upon application by the Government.

5. No restraint is imposed upon Nation-wide bargaining even thought it be in the nature of a monopoly.

Unions today are contesting the provision which says that "no corporation or labor union shall make any contribution or expenditure in connection with a political campaign." This has long been the law in the case of corporations, and it seems just as applicable to labor unions as to corporations. No corporation ought to be able to take its stockholder's money contributed for business purposes and use it to oppose a candidate whom the stockholder may favor. No union ought to take dues contributed for labor-union purposes and use it to defeat a candidate whom the individual union member may favor. Money to be used for political purposes ought to be frankly solicited from those willing to contribute for that purpose.

Of course, there is no attempt to limit the freedom of speech of labor-union leaders any more than of corporation executives. They can take all the part they wish to in political campaigns as far as the laws of libel will permit. The law confers extensive privileges on labor unions to represent the economic interests of all employees. Minority members of unions are compelled to go along with their unions as representing their economic interests. They should not be compelled to make the unions their political agents and forced to contribute money for that purpose.

As the actual provisions of the new Labor Act have come to be known, opposition has steadily decreased. Countless labor-union members have found that it is a good thing for them. Labor-union leaders sincerely interested only in improving the economic condition of their men testify that they are in no way handicapped by the provisions of this act. The rights of unions are carefully preserved. The propaganda against the law has lost its pep. The only vigorous protestants are those few who find their own arbitrary power curbed over small employers and over their own members.

Senator Hatch's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean of Saturday, March 6, 1948, entitled "Senator HATCH's Message." The editorial was inspired by an address on the United Nations delivered by the Senator from New Mexico at Nashville. I congratulate the Senator. He made a fine impression in my State, and his message was well received, as is shown by the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HATCH'S MESSAGE

Senator HATCH'S United Nations speech here went courageously to the heart of the problem of international peace. It expressed a point of view that must be commonly accepted if we are to succeed.

Pious hopes and vague longings for peace are not enough. We cannot survive if we content ourselves with an international debating society and try to salve our feelings by shouting dirty names and accusations at other nations.

The United Nations has had considerable success in handling some international disputes, just as the old League of Nations did. Yet the new organizations seems as inevitably doomed to failure as the former if it fails to develop the strength and authority necessary to enforce peace.

It is not enough, according to Senator HATCH, that there is a world court to which international disputes may be submitted for arbitration when a majority of the member nations decide it is necessary. Under our present system two nations involved in a dispute over boundaries or interests cannot go before the court without the permission of the other nations. That must be changed so that every dispute becomes the court's business.

If we are to have this type of international law enforcement, Senator HATCH reasons, we must have the police power to make it effective. Thus far we have not been able to agree on the composition and disposition of this international police force. The chief bar to agreement has been the reluctance of all member nations—ourselves included—to surrender one whit of national sovereignty.

Yet we cannot, he believes, have the assurance of peace without that surrender. It is a bitter pill for us to swallow. In the wake of wars there is always an aggravation of nationalism. Eager as are individual citizens to doff their uniforms and return to the pursuits of peace, they all retain a strong loyalty to their national sovereignty and a firm conviction that it must be upheld by force against all threats. Some of us get into the habit of viewing with alarm and seeing dangers that do not exist.

It is in this uncongenial atmosphere that we must surrender a part of our sovereignty. One thing working in favor of the step is the terrible hatred and horror of war which comes from first-hand experience.

We do not have to consult fiction thrillers to know how terrible the next war would be. The guarded and sober language of scientists and doctors and military leaders states the facts for us. It is doubtful whether either side in a future conflict can avoid almost equal destruction. Decisive victory will be impossible. Complete loss of all national sovereignty is an almost certain result.

Voluntary and partial surrender of sovereignty seems a much more convenient price to pay by contrast. In the face of such a choice, we can even look forward without too much fear to the day when no nation will have an armed force of its own, when we shall instead only supply our quota of troops to the international police force.

That is the way Senator HATCH thinks. That is the way a great many of the people of the world must think before we can have peace.

The group to which the Senator delivered his address here is to be commended for its efforts in that direction. The Nashville United Nations Association has been growing steadily since the war. It has done much to make the community aware of international affairs and the organization which is trying to arrange them for peace. It works through and with many other groups. The speakers it has brought here during the year have been effective. Its program has reached adult discussion groups as well as all the school children of the community.

Nashville's significance in the world picture was dramatized at the association's annual meeting when foreign students were introduced by countries. More than half the nations of the United Nations were represented, as well as several not yet members of the world organization. The distinctive native costumes added a true international flavor to the occasion.

Much as the association is to be congratulated on the success of its work dur'ng the year, the message which Senator HATCH brought offered a challenge to redoubled activity during the coming year.

Justice for Postmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justice for Postmen," from the Nashville Banner of Friday, March 5, 1948. The editorial points out that our postmen have been overlooked long enough. I am for them, and I hope we can give them relief.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE FOR POSTMEN

Ask yourself what unit of the Federal establishment you contact daily; the unit serving you day in and day out, as it serves every citizen and family in the Nation. The answer is the postal service.

Ask yourself what servant, a career man in Federal employ, renders regular, faithful, uncomplaining service of a type you see and of a type benefiting you directly. The answer is the postman.

Ask yourself what branch of service in the Federal establishment has been most overlooked in the matter of fair compensation for service rendered. The answer is the postal service.

Oh, yes; they got a raise in 1946—a horizontal increase of $400—the first such adjustment in 25 years. That wiped out a bit of the personal deficit that had been accruing during the years when mounting costs of living squeezed them on one side while frozen salaries squeezed them from the other. But it still left the rate of compensation deplorably lower than other branches of public service comparable in importance, and vastly under the rate of pay current for faithful daily work in other fields.

Postal employees, letter carriers, et cetera, are not overpaid. They are underpaid.

Adjustment of their salary schedules to a living wage level commensurate to need and service rendered can be made by act of Congress. It entails no curtailment of the necessary and justified drive for economy in government. There are enough agencies of Government operating in excess of need and spending billions in excess of need, to cut where necessary and raise where justified, and still trim billions from the Truman budget.

The Postal Department, where these employees are concerned, is not featherbedding or otherwise wasting money. It is false economy to hold these employees to an untenable minimum and maintain dead weight, excess units of the Federal establishment at a grandiloquent level out of all keeping with their usefulness.

Now in congressional committee are bills—too long bottled up—providing relief for these postal employees. Those bills should be voted. They should be passed. Justice demands it, and a good way to assure it would be to write your Congressman now.

The South and the President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement issued yesterday by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator OVERTON today issued the following statement:

"Harry Truman has cast the die. He has crossed the Rubicon. He is marching on the Southland with the battle cry of social, political, and economic equality of the Negro and the white man.

"The fight is on. War has been openly declared by the chieftain of the National Democratic Party against the traditions and Caucasianism of the South.

"It may be said that the Republican Party advocates the same treatment of the South. It is one thing, however, to be fired upon openly by an avowed enemy and another thing for a friend and benefactor to lie in ambush to assail you.

"The South is the bulwark of national democracy. Without its support, the National Democratic Party will meet certain defeat. It will be a salutary lesson for the National Democratic Party to have the South assert its manhood. We shall not be called upon to fight with bayonets as did our fathers. We can wage a successful campaign with the ballots.

"The time to begin to act is now. I hope that all the papers of Louisiana, dailies and weeklies, will begin and continue the conflict to preserve our Caucasianism, our traditions, our hopes, and our pride. They are largely the molders of public opinion. They should find a fertile field in which to work because the Louisianian, both of English and French descent, regardless of religion or political faction, abhors the apotheosis of the Negro. The agitation by the press should be followed by meetings in every parish and community and by resolutions of political and civic organizations. We should see to it that the legislature that convenes in May will enact such legislation as will admit of the popular vote declaring its opposition to the attempted spoliation of the South by northern negrophiles by selecting a candidate for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency of their own choosing."

Western Europe Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely editorial in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of March 8, 1948, concerning the rapidly increasing threat of Communist domination emphasized by the most recent seizure of Czechoslovakia by the Soviets. The editorial follows:

WESTERN EUROPE UNION

The Soviet seizure of Czechoslovakia undoubtedly did achieve one useful purpose in behalf of the democratic cause. It solidified quickly differing elements and clashing opinions to form at last an agreement on a union of the western European countries. With the hot breath of communism almost literally on their necks, delegates at the western powers conference resolved their differences.

It was this rapidly increasing threat of Communist domination of all Europe that finally brought about a general agreement. As the American Ambassador Lewis Douglas said in London: "Within the past 10 days there has been made more progress than in the preceding 3 years." The western group, including Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, agreed on the principles of a 50-year pact. This includes mutual armed defense. Agreement was also reached upon the internationalization of the Ruhr, and upon a plan of cooperation to use western Germany's assets in the Marshall plan.

Even as the agreement was reached, the danger of a spreading Red tide over all of Europe increased. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Polish Minister, writing in the Telegram yesterday, said Czechoslovakia was seized by the Reds as an arsenal. He predicted the Russians would make an all-out attack on France and Italy this spring. Finland, he said, "will fall to Russia sooner or later," and will be used by the Russians as the basis of their Scandinavian operations. "Russia is now an aggressor as terrifying as Hitler ever was," he said.

It is to be regretted, of course, that it took so long for the western European nations, especially France, to wake up to the fact that it is Russia, not Germany, that is now the world's foe. When Winston Churchill spoke at Fulton, Mo., 2 years ago, he envisioned, with remarkable clarity, the events which have taken place. In some quarters, he was roundly denounced for even suggesting the existence of an iron curtain, and an aggressive part by Russia. France, having been devastated twice by Germany in a quarter century, was understandably reluctant to see a revived Germany, or a Ruhr which might produce coal to help her old foe. Despite Churchill's warning, France opposed various plans which included the strengthening of Germany in any way. Even the American offer of a 40-year antiaggression pact to restrain German militarism did not calm French fears.

Now, at last, events have moved so rapidly in Europe that it has become obvious to all that Russia is as terrifying as was Hitler. That seizure of Czechoslovakia may go down in history as the day when the world really woke up to the Soviet danger. At least it brought about a quick agreement on a western Europe union.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1947, the Committee on Universal Military Training of Students for Democratic Action, student division of Americans for Democratic Action, submitted a comprehensive report to its national board. I have been requested to insert an abstract of this report in the RECORD, and, therefore, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include the same.

The report follows:

Students for Democratic Action is fully aware of the danger that Soviet expansion in Europe presents to the world, and we have given our support to numerous measures aimed at checking the advance of Russian imperialism. We do not favor unilateral disarmament by the United States. We have given complete support to the European recovery program without political strings, not only as a humanitarian measure but in the belief that economic aid can help establish a political climate in which the peoples of Europe will choose democratic processes rather than the police state to meet their economic and social problems.

Universal military training would weaken rather than strengthen America; it would produce a false sense of security in this country, and detract attention from the need to produce the kind of meaningful answers to the problems of preserving world peace which the Marshall plan envisages. "There is no military defense against atomic bombs and none is to be expected," states Dr. Albert Einstein and eight other atomic scientists. Almost every important military leader has emphasized the terrible swiftness of the next war; Admiral Halsey asserted "the next war probably will not last 6 months." Yet the War Department would have us rely on an army of half-trained boys, who the President's Advisory Commission admits could not be prepared for combat and fully mobilized in less than a year after the start of a new war. As Maj. Gen. John S. Wood, wartime commander of the famous Fourth Armored Division, pointed out, UMT "will not produce a single unit ready to fight or a single fighting man for immediate use." The enormous cost of UMT (between two and four billion dollars every year) would lead to cuts in appropriations for the vital branches of our armed forces and thus weaken our military power, at the same time that the military training program would produce a Maginot line psychology in this country.

We are told that universal military training will teach democracy to American youth. But the Army, by its very nature, is the type example of an undemocratic institution. Orders are handed down from above, and the trainee is taught obedience, not questioning; his entire life becomes a regimented routine. "The Army forces every man in it to go backward," states Maj. William Baker, Chief of the Neuropsychiatric Service at Fort Wright. "He's given an allowance, is told when to eat, when to sleep, when to get up. He has to throw away all the rules he's learned in growing up and adopt a whole new set." An even more flagrant example of the "democracy" the Army teaches than its officer caste system is the Army's policy of segregating Negro troops from whites. The Towe bill on UMT makes no provision against segregation, and Representative TOWE refused to permit any antisegregation amendments to his bill; there are no Negroes in the Fort Knox experimental UMT unit.

Instead of placing our main emphasis on working constructively to maintain peace, we would add to war hysteria by conscripting our youth and would tend to assume that American military might alone would be sufficient to guarantee world peace. Col. John Thomas Taylor, national legislative representative of the strongly pro-UMT American Legion, states flatly, "No one has ever made the statement that UMT would be an effective preventative of war. It would help us prepare for war."

We are told the placing American boys in the Army will result in a great improvement in the Nation's health. But the important years for forming strong bodies are your childhood years; if we were to spend a small fraction of the annual cost of UMT on hospital facilities and health insurance, we would get an immensely greater return on our investment. Moreover, the Army takes a terrible toll in venereal disease and psychoneurosis. In the peacetime year of 1939, the incidence of venereal disease for civilians was 5.1 cases per thousand, for the Army 29.6 cases per thousand. Nor is psychoneurosis merely the result of combat fatigue; less than half of the psychoneurotic dischargees during World War II never saw combat. In the peacetime year of 1939, 299.1 civilians per hundred thousand were admitted to mental hospitals, while 950 soldiers per hundred thousand entered mental institutions.

We have witnessed the greatly enhanced power of the military in this country in recent years. Expanded ROTC programs, the fight for military control of atomic energy, and the large number of military figures in important public positions are all evidences of this growth. The Navy Industrial Association and the Army Ordnance Association link big industry to the military. A congressional investigation into the Army's lobby on UMT found that they had gone "beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress, and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending before the Congress." If the Towe bill is passed, the power of the military will extend to control of the education of every young person in the country.

The National Education Association, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Farm Bureau Federation, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the American Federation of Labor are among the organizations opposed to UMT.

In place of the Towe bill, we of Students for Democratic Action advocate the following program:

1. Adequate armed forces should be maintained through voluntary enlistment.

2. The armed forces should be democratized by the abolition of the caste system and segregation.

3. The full amount requested for the European recovery program should be authorized by this session of Congress, and the measure should be passed without damaging political restrictions.

4. Continued attempts at multilateral world disarmament should be made through the United Nations.

5. The funds now proposed for UMT should be allocated to improving the educational, housing, and health facilities of this country.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "For a Nation-Wide Exposé of Public Housing!" by Clarke Daniel, advisory director member, public-housing committee, Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington. This should be of special interest to all who are concerned about the housing shortage:

FOR A NATION-WIDE EXPOSÉ OF PUBLIC HOUSING

(By Clarke Daniel, advisory director member, public housing committee, Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington)

Using our study and comparison here in Washington as a springboard, let's inaugurate an exposition of the waste, extravagances, excessive costs, maladministration, and unsound building practices of public housing in cities throughout the United States. Let's educate the people to the fact that public housing spends more money than private enterprise to develop projects and that public housing deteriorates in most cases far more rapidly than do private projects. Let's point out to the home owner that his local taxes are higher because public housing does not pay full taxes, yet all municipal services must be supplied, and that every time a new project is added his local tax goes up just that much. Let's reveal that appropriations of millions in annual Federal subsidies to make up the deficits of local housing authorities add that much to Federal taxes; that the economic rents of public housing are generally higher than private rents for comparable accommodations in spite of subsidies. Few citizens realize what public housing is doing to the country. Unfortunately, many builders and real estate men don't fully appreciate the consequences.

The Stoddert Dwellings public housing project (located on Ridge Road near Minnesota Avenue in southeast Washington, D. C.) would be correctly classified as substandard, poorly constructed, improperly ventilated, cold and damp housing. No the project is not 30 or 40 years old. The first units were not completed until January 1942 but all were finished by March 1942. Yet last September a complete overhauling job was necessary on practically every unit. Typical of the repairs required were replacement of the sills, centergirder, joists and subflooring. The principal reason for the rapid deterioration is that Stoddert Dwellings were constructed without regard to sound building practice or District of Columbia building codes. The erection of the units too close to the ground prevented proper ventilation and resulted in decay of the substructure. In addition the grade was such as to impound water under the units.

Builders throughout the country are working feverishly to produce the housing for which there is a demand and yet it is necessary to use valuable materials to repair projects improperly constructed under the direction of the public housers. Tenants interviewed on the site described their homes as "cold and damp," stated it was possible "to hear every time the neighbors in the next apartment sneezed" due to the cardboard-style walls and further said, in reply to questioning as to the possibility of sale of the units: "We wouldn't buy these houses even if we had a chance to do so, and don't want any of our friends to get stuck with them. We are going to tell any prospective buyer just how we feel." Drainage around some of the houses was obtained by means of ditches in the backyards. The resulting stagnation caused a highly disagreeable odor. This condition has now to a certain extent been remedied.

One of our association committee members conducted the staff of the Senate Expenditures Committee on a tour of public housing in the District of Columbia and compared private housing developments built at approximately the same time with the public. During the tour of Stoddert Dwellings many workmen were repairing the buildings. One was asked, "Do you think that after the repairs are made they will last for 35 years?" He replied, "How can they—I ask you how can they. Naturally you will have the same trouble again in a few years because the defects have not been remedied." A spokesman for the National Capital Housing Authority on the site answered the same question differently by stating "I believe so" (meaning in his opinion they would hold up for 35 years). The NCHA representative pointed with pride to the aluminum used to reface the lower part of the structures and said it didn't cost anything because it was obtained from the Federal Public Housing Authority through War Assets Administration. It was significant that a member of the Senate Expenditures Committee staff then remarked that whether it came from war assets or not it still had been paid for by the taxpayer.

Stoddert Dwellings was constructed under authority of the Lanham Act. The total cost for 200 of these units was $908,000. Financing is over a period of 35 years. The rents were set up on the basis that the project would last 35 years. Yet after only 6 years of existence, the first major overhaul job has already been completed and anyone inspecting Stoddert Dwellings will be immediately convinced that it will not last anything like 35 years. The shorter the life, the greater the loss to the taxpayer and the Federal Treasury. Typical of the extravagance surrounding Stoddert Dwellings was an expense item of $9,493.59 for field inspection.

If there were no inspection it would be difficult to believe these houses would be in worse condition today. However, a most satisfactory inspection could have been obtained for only a fraction of the amount spent.

Permanent public housing was the classification assigned to Stoddert Dwellings in December 1943 by John Ihlder, executive officer of the National Capital Housing Authority, in his official Government Directory of Public Housing in the District of Columbia. Now that they have deteriorated to substandard housing he contends they were only a temporary war measure. He maintains this position even though the contract for their construction was awarded months before Pearl Harbor; notwithstanding their excessive cost; and even though the rents were set up on the basis that the project would last 35 years. He further excused himself of blame by stating that the general shortage of building materials at the time of construction caused present-day conditions. This cannot be considered a legitimate excuse because inspection of the project clearly proves it was the method of construction and not the materials which caused the deterioration.

In addition, the Greenway Apartments located just across the street were also constructed in 1941 by private enterprise at a substantially less cost per room than Stoddert Dwellings. Greenway units are modern, brick, first rate, fireproof, centrally heated structures with many architectural refinements and appointments and are in excellent condition today. Stoddert Dwellings are little better than frame shacks although the construction cost was $1,107 per room, whereas Greenway was built for $849 per room. Why should the NCHA be permitted to justify the excessive cost and improper construction of Stoddert Dwellings as a national defense measure when a private builder erected substantially superior accommodations across the street in the same year at a much lower cost? Greenway Apartments have distinctive architectural design and many refinements such as parquet floors, tile baths, casement windows, and attractively landscaped grounds. Stoddert Dwellings has been the scene of many fires and is constructed with inferior materials throughout.

Comparisons such as Stoddert Dwellings and Greenway are possible in every city where

public housing is located. We have made numerous similar comparisons here in Washington. With Congress now seriously considering authorizing the appropriation of $7,000,000,000 more to be spent on public housing we should attempt to wake the people up before it is too late. A service will be rendered to the Nation if we can prevent passage of this gigantic measure to plunge the country into state socialism. Probably the best way to stop the WET bill would be to show how the previous sums appropriated for public housing have been squandered. This can be done by builders and real-estate men in all communities of 100,000 and over by contrasting public and private housing. It will be of little value, however, unless wide publicity can be given to your findings in your local papers. Then let the Washington home builders have a copy of your report. Here are a number of suggestions to be used in contrasting public and private housing and in exposing the deficiencies of the former:

1. In making selections of projects to compare, be sure that the circumstances surrounding the public and private project are similar; construction should be in the same year; if possible they should be located adjacent to each other but if this is not possible they should not be more than a few blocks apart.

2. Contrast the construction costs. In each case we studied the public-housing costs were much higher and if allowances were made for the difference in the type of accommodations furnished, public housing costs were noticeably higher. You will, of course, have no difficulty in obtaining cost break-downs of private developments. If you run into trouble with the public housers when you request the same information from them, we will be glad to cooperate. The cost of public housing is an open public record and you should have no trouble.

3. Compare the rents of the private project with that of the public. In the latter be sure to add the proper amount necessary to cover tax-exemption, subsidy, and 60-year amortization (35 years in the case of Lanham Act Housing and on which there is no subsidy). In many instances, public housing is heated by individual space heaters and, therefore, the price of the coal should be added to the rent. Also, make allowance for the type of accomodations received. Our surveys show public and private housing rents to be about the same if allowance is made for tax-exemption, subsidy, and 60-year financing, yet the public-housing units are far inferior.

4. Invite attention to excessive architect and inspection fees as well as to other questionable expenditures. For example, the architect's fee for the 796 units in the Greenway private-housing project was $10,000 whereas the architect's fee for the 313 unit Frederick Douglass public-housing project was $61,000.

5. Publicize the disregard of minimum building, health, and sanitary codes in the construction of public housing. This can be done most effectively by comparing the condition today of the respective public and private projects built at the same time. The indifference toward building codes has in most instances resulted in the walls separating from the floor, leaking walls, rotting floor joists, and many other examples of deterioration.

6. After your findings are complete, plan to conduct a party of leading citizens on a tour of inspection of the projects so that your effort will bear fruit and the investigation will receive public attention. Here in Washington we took the Senate Expenditures Committee staff on the tour and made our findings public in a letter to Senator AIKEN, chairman of the committee.

To further illustrate the type of comparison suggested, let's contrast two other projects here in Washington which were part of our survey. They are the Skyland Terrace private-housing development, and the Frederick Douglass public-housing project.

Skyland Terrace was constructed in 1939 (in Washington 1939 building costs were about the same as in 1941; 1940 costs were higher than 1939 or 1941), is of good grade brick, has a central heating plant, and is in excellent condition today. The cost of construction per rental room was $1,035.74, which includes the land, the shopping center, the tenants' recreation room, and landscaping. The project is amortized on a 25-year basis. In addition to being built to District of Columbia code requirements and in accordance with sound engineering and construction principles, there are many refinements and fixtures of quality such as parquet floors, tile baths, fully equipped kitchens, large airy rooms, distinctive styling and architecture, and most attractive landscaping. Our inspection group was unable to detect the need of any repair work whatsoever at this time. There was no evidence of leaking walls inside or brick separating from the cement on the outside. An excellent job of maintenance was apparent. The unit visited, which was selected at random, had been most satisfactory, according to the tenants and they had no complaints. It was a two-bedroom apartment renting for $64 per month. This figure included heat and water but not electricity. Although financed over 25 years, it is obvious that this development will continue as well above standard housing for much longer than 25 years.

Only a few blocks from Skyland Terrace is the public housing project known as Frederick Douglass. Constructed in 1941, the apartments are chiefly of frame with some half masonry buildings. There are 313 units in all and the cost was $1,120 per rental room, including land. Amortization is for a period of 60 years. On approaching these apartments it was immediately apparent that the grounds were not properly maintained and all units were in need of paint. Most of them were very badly in need of paint.

Tenants said that the rooms were quite drafty. This was undoubtedly due to no weather stripping and dislocated windows. In the unit inspected (again chosen at random) the floor beams on the first floor were apparently sagging at the outside walls, causing floors to separate from walls. The plaster was in lamentable condition. There was need of complete interior overhauling. These findings make it impossible for the maintenance fund to care for the project. The fund is only adequate to rebuild one-third in 60 years whereas the present down-grade trend would indicate that in all likelihood it would have to be more than rebuilt completely in 60 years. Typical of the extravagances in the construction of Frederick Douglass was an architect's and engineering fee of $61,000 paid for plans and specifications. This fee is over and above the cost of a fully staffed architectural and engineering group maintained by the public housing authority. No central heating is provided and space heaters are used in the living room. All utilities are furnished but not heat. This necessitates each tenant purchasing his own coal. A two-bedroom unit rents for $40.50. Conversation with the tenant of the unit which was inspected indicated that the cost of coal per month on a year-around basis would be approximately $5 per month. This would bring the rent to $45.50. To this must be added other amounts for tax exemption, Federal subsidy, and 60-year amortization and thus the rent would be the $64 or above received by Skyland Terrace for the same amount of space for a unit built over a year earlier by private enterprise. Although the rent is greater, the accommodations are nothing like comparable. Most tragic of all is that even these subsidized-tax-exempt rents were set up on a 60-year basis and the units can't possibly maintain these rents for anything like 60 years. After being in existence only 6 years (54 to go), Frederick Douglass is rapidly becoming a slum area and no doubt within a few more years it will be just as bad as the slums which the public housers have claimed they would eliminate It was on the basis that slums would be cleared and not created that they were given large sums of public money.

Summarizing, you have Skyland Terrace, a private development in excellent condition today, having been built in 1939 at substantially less cost per room than the Frederick Douglass public-housing project of vastly inferior construction, built over a year later, which needs a complete overhauling job.

In addition to being economically unsound, public housing has drained off materials critically needed for private-enterprise housing. We've started the ball rolling here in Washington to expose public housing. How about keeping it going?

Help From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of March 8, 1948, which contains very sensible comments upon the Federal program of extending aid to American air transportation.

I am pleased very much to note this recognition of my efforts and those of other Massachusetts Members of Congress in helping to secure this valuable assistance for the Worcester Airport.

The editorial follows:

HELP FROM WASHINGTON

Passage by Congress of an appropriations bill containing $252,000 for the Worcester Airport is a good reminder of how Federal, State, and city governments can work together. Air transportation is important to Worcester primarily because it can mean better communication with the outside world. It is important to the State as one step in a State-wide system of improved air transportation.

But as much as anything, it is important to the Federal Government. Of all forms of transportation, that by air is most characterized by the phrase "interstate." It is a rare air line that does not schedule routes crossing State lines. The interest of the Federal Government is in air safety (the more airports the better), defense (again airports needed in all sections of the country) and expansion of civil aviation to improve our commerce.

Without Federal and State aid cities would find it difficult in a period of rising costs to build their own airports. All three would suffer. The programs of welfare, highways, school lunches, and hospitals also come to mind as example of city-State-Federal cooperation.

Much verbiage has been tossed about concerning States' rights. Of course it is still an issue, as is evidenced by the difference of opinion over education and antilynching. It is true also that the Constitution reserved to the States all powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government. However, history moves on and most people now

realize that conditions have changed and that Federal intrusion on local affairs is not necessarily evil in every case.

Together with the evidence this program offers that "States' rights" can have different meanings in different cases, it also shows once again the value of careful planning. Worcester earned its Federal aid, with a minimum of delay, because it was prepared with a master plan. It is pleasant to find something like this which can be commended right down the line—from the distant offices in Washington to the airport commission at home.

Reduction in Force of Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Stars and Stripes of March 1, 1948:

A MEANINGLESS QUARREL

Another example of the drastic effects of executive interference with congressional functions was furnished last week when official Washington broke out in a new rash over reductions in force in the Veterans' Administration. On the heels of an announcement by Administrator Carl Gray that 8,500 VA employees would be fired or demoted because he does not have enough money to operate, Chairman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of the House Veterans' Committee, called a series of meetings to discuss the situation. Gray was requested to withhold action. He replied in effect that it was too late, that the train had left. Arguments over appropriations developed on the House floor where the pot called the kettle black, and, in general, the lid blew off as the new boss of the veterans' agency reached the end of his honeymoon of 3 months and is going to have to tangle with the committees of the Congress whose job it is to see that veterans and their dependents are properly protected.

It is the view of organized veterans that there are a lot of elements involved in the fracas, and that they go back a long way. While it is proper to discuss some of them, we are more interested in cures than in causes. If there is maladministration at the seat of the trouble, a house cleaning is in order. If the laws are at fault, they should be modified. If it is a question only of money shortages, as we suspect, a deficiency appropriation should be voted, and nobody should be permitted to refuse arbitrarily to seek added funds. A proper administration of the statutes and adequate service to veterans and their dependents is of paramount importance, regardless of cost.

Back over the years there is no doubt whatever that there has been considerable overstaffing in the Veterans' Administration. We can remember the day when many a clerk or stenographer was running all over the place looking for something to do or was finding a place to kill time, and even higher-ups were taxed to keep busy. That was during days of planned bureaucracy when jobs meant votes and the VA had to go along with other departments in furnishing placements, but with the coming of a new war and millions of additional claimants, all of that became water over the dam, and, not only were thousands of temporary war service employees brought in, but space was at a premium and decentralization was the order of the day. Doubtless there was too much of a spread, too many new offices set up throughout the country, yet the purpose was to contact beneficiaries with the least inconvenience to them. A costly process, mistakes made were those of the heart and were not deliberate, so they can be forgiven, but they led to additional supervisory jobs and a lot of hiring about which complaint is offered.

Now, attempts are made to cut costs by recentralizing, and losses of personnel give rise to objections because cuts appear necessary to fit the pattern of appropriations. In an agency as large as the VA there are constant turnovers in employment. The job is not a simple one because this is one of the biggest departments of the Government, and going through all of those maneuvers that are aimed at higher efficiency is as unpopular as it is consequential.

In the Congress the Appropriations Committee chairman says that there is plenty of money, that his group made no reductions. * * * We seem to recall that the VA was reduced last year by $39,000,000 at his insistence and that, even though the Senate restored $20,000,000, it was directed that this amount go to the medical section with the result that $40,000,000 was lost to the administrative branch. Facts have a way of speaking for themselves and cannot be disputed.

Unfortunately, it is the result of parsimony that is disastrous. Although the Veterans' Administration had nearly seven and a half billion dollars for the fiscal year ending in June, all but $900,000,000 went to direct benefits. The $900,000,000 had to do for hospitals and personnel and for every other such function and did not leave enough to pay administrative costs, so attempts are now being made to reduce the work force on a basis of work loads. Unless something is done about it, and quickly, branch offices must be closed, personnel cut back with a consequent break-down in morale and an impairment of efficiency in all facilities.

Veterans' preference will be placed in jeopardy because it will mean that employees with 25 to 30 years of experience will be let out or reduced in grade and salary while less experienced veterans with equal ability but less knowledge will be held and there will come a serious loss of service to beneficiaries. Already personnel on rating boards is being cut down, vocational guidance is suffering, delays in adjudication are manifesting themselves with greater frequency and criticism is piling upon criticism. That old backlog of work about which so much was heard only a few months ago will build up fast again, and utter chaos will result with the veteran claimants again caught right in the middle.

There are two cures to the whole mess, and only two. It is senseless for the Veterans' Administrator to continue to insist upon cut-backs without going to the Congress and asking for more money. He is only doing his job by ordering his hatchet men to stop spending money he is not going to get. He is consistent and businesslike in planning personnel reductions to fit the appropriations he knows he will get for 1948–49 but the bill carrying future allowances has not yet had Senate action, and the care of veterans is his first concern. He should go to Capitol Hill, frankly state his needs, explain his work load, and demand more money. The people he must serve did not elect to go to war or to die. The protection of veterans and their dependents is just as much a part of the cost of war as the guns that won it, and General Gray must make that indelibly clear to the legislators.

Another cure is up to the Congress. The VA tells the Budget Bureau what it needs. That executive department looks over the requests and regularly does its knife work before the VA budget gets to Congress. It works on over-all demands, not on what the Veterans' Administration says it needs, and the VA thereafter must keep its mouth shut. Insofar as agencies like the VA and defense departments are concerned, the Congress should have the full facts and know their every requirement with all of the reasons. Only then can it act intelligently and prevent the sort of thing now going on. We believe that the legislators, who are directly responsible to the people, would use their intelligence; if they do not, the voters could do something about it and Appropriations chairmen could not hide behind bushes.

This budget business is a complicated matter. Hirings and firings are a necessary evil. Curtailments are often a nasty necessity, but the barbs can be taken out of the current mess if the full facts are made known. It looks as if both the Congress and Administrator Gray are on the pan. Both owe it to their war veteran charges to get off of it with the least possible delay. There is no need here for a meaningless quarrel over a condition that prompt action can avoid.

The GI Housing Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Kiplinger magazine for March 1948:

THE GI HOUSING DREAM

To get a roof overhead, 1,000,000 veterans have hocked their future for more than $5,000,000,000 in GI home loans. In the next 10 years some 7,000,000 more ex-GI's are expected to follow suit to the tune of $45,000,000,000 more. This tremendous credit load, if overturned or rudely shaken, could spell disaster for the United States economy.

Critics of the Government's GI lending program glumly prophesy: "Today's GI dreamhouse is tomorrow's debt-ridden doghouse. When the inevitable depression strikes the veteran won't be able to meet his monthly payments. He'll have to move out or stay in and dare eviction. Either way the Veterans' Administration will become a super-HOLC—the greatest landlord of them all—and Uncle Sam will have to foot the bill."

Boosters of the program dissent. Because of the expected demand for housing for years to come, they foresee little or no drop in the value of GI homes. They point out that more than half of the average monthly amortization payments represent the GI's equity in his new home, that each year progressively increases his determination to fulfill the mortgage.

Critics say that at today's high prices the GI home buyer has been more or less rooked, and that the loan program is therefore a "gyp." Many boosters of the program admit the rooking, but say the program is no more than a gamble. Either the veteran continues to double up with relatives or he chances saddling the future with a price-watered house. Neither faction denies the explosive aspects of the situation.

As to who's to blame, Washington accuses greedy builders and negligent private lenders. Builders and lenders retort that it's the red tape and meddling restrictions of Federal agencies. Labor accuses profiteering materials makers, and in turn is blamed because of high labor costs and sloppy workmanship.

All the charges have some degree of truth. The veteran, desperate for decent shelter—at $50 or less a month—is a pawn on the chessboard of supply and demand. All the elements that go into the building of a house are making the most of a seller's market at his expense.

Back in the summer of 1944, Congress, as an incentive to the boys in uniform, approved a series of readjustment benefits for when they returned. These benefits were proclaimed as the GI bill of rights. That title in itself was a bit of flimflam, because millions of veterans got the idea that these rights were due them free, no strings attached.

Disillusionment set in when discharged GI's rushed to banks for the money with which to build homes. Banks tried to explain that the GI loan wasn't a cash hand-out at all, but only the Government's way of saying it would guarantee the ex-GI's credit for a limited amount, provided the bank considered him a good risk for an equal amount.

Even veterans who understood this felt they were being double-talked out of their war-earned rights because of red tape. At first, relatively few GI's were able to hurdle the cumbersome loan procedure. And many of those able to get loans were hooked by builders demanding under-the-table bonuses.

The original GI bill of rights set the Government's credit risk at 50 percent of the loan up to a total risk of $2,000 on a home sold at reasonable normal value. Four months after VJ-day, Congress yielded to pressure from veterans and builders and raised its guaranty to $4,000, also permitting ex-GI's to buy housing for reasonable value on the ground that normal prewar housing was no longer available.

This liberalizing in effect lifted the lid on housing prices despite price controls. There were too many ways to get around price ceilings and around the minimum building standards supposedly enforced by Government agents. VA's panel of independent appraisers too often played ball with builders.

When controls went off, the price of housing zoomed again. As a result, the Government's $4,000 guaranty was added to the normal prewar house price. House-hungry veterans frantically bid each other up. Some veteran leaders believe Congress made its basic error in not limiting purchases of at least new houses to veterans who could prove need, not just credit worthiness. They believe that by enormously increasing housing demand without increasing the supply, Uncle Sam gave the veterans a hollow benefit.

Today the average cost to the veteran is more than $9,900 for a house in Washington, D. C., more than $8,000 in New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, almost $7,000 in Chicago and St. Louis. Across the Nation the average, urban and rural, is $6,747.

And the ex-GI is not getting his money's worth in terms of physical property. Builders have skimped on materials, labor on workmanship. Government pressure to speed building despite materials shortages gave rise to a large number of new houses built with green lumber, other inferior materials, and substitutes. The VA found builders ignoring plans and specifications on which the sale price was appraised. They were getting away with it, said the VA, because lending agencies were negligent in inspecting the premises during home construction. Complaints are still pouring in to the VA.

In buying a house at today's high prices, the veteran signs a pledge to make his inflation-based payments over the next 25 years, come what may. Government and veteran leaders have openly worried about the future. The American Legion wants Congress to set up a Veterans' Home Loan Corporation to prepare for any unforeseen financial calamity.

Even the banks and other private lenders have grown disturbed about what the veteran is (not) getting for his money. More lenders are demanding down payments before granting a GI loan—a violation of the spirit of the loan program and a clear-cut indication that the bankers feel the houses are overpriced.

In some areas, particularly in rural and small communities, GI loans have bogged down for lack of lender activity. This is due partly to the overpriced housing, partly to the strange action of Congress last year in forbidding RFC to buy GI-loan mortgages while permitting an RFC affiliate to continue buying FHA mortgages. Freezing of the main secondary market for GI loans paralyzed the GI-loan activity of small banks with limited funds.

Veterans' organizations are demanding action from Congress to increase the flow of GI loans, directly from the Government if necessary. At the same time the veteran's lobby is pressuring for safeguards against the potential debacle being built up by these loans. The veterans are bitter. First, over their difficulty in getting the GI loans; then, in finding that they are not getting their money's worth in housing even when they get loans.

A high Washington housing official sums up the GI-loan program this way: "Sure, it's a gyp. Both veteran and Uncle Sam will have to stand financial loss some day. But it's also a gamble, a chance for the veteran to keep his family together, to provide space for his children. If the veteran has to buy housing now, the gyp is worth the gamble."

But if they can avoid it, ex-GI's are urged not to take the gamble. VA, FHA, and veterans' leaders alike say: "Wait. You have 10 years to make use of the GI loan. Sweat it out for better-priced, better-built homes later on."

A Reflection of Our Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the West Virginia Petroleum Association at Wheeling, W. Va., on March 9, 1948:

A REFLECTION OF OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

It is an extreme pleasure for me to be afforded the opportunity of addressing the West Virginia Petroleum Association. When "Skeet" Farley extended your kind invitation I was particularly delighted to accept. I shall always remember "Skeet" as one of the State's greatest football players. I am happy to see him, together with many other school friends, advancing with prosperous industries of West Virginia. We are living in a great State. Our natural resources are abundant and our industries are increasing and expanding. May we all move forward with free and individual enterprise to greater achievement for our Mountain State and to the increased prosperity and happiness of all our people.

Petroleum is a very strategic mineral in world affairs. It is indispensable to our present civilization and is a compelling factor in our foreign relations. Continental United States possesses about 30 percent of the known world reserves in oil, yet our production is now over 60 percent of the world's yearly consumption. Should this trend continue, we would be a "have not" Nation and forced to import our oil supplies. This might be a dangerous problem for our national defense as well as a serious industrial handicap. Competition for control of the rich oil lands in the Middle East is an important element today in the tension between the United States and Soviet Russia.

We are living in an era when the foreign policies of our Government not only directly affect our daily lives but substantially determine the future security of our Nation.

Almost within the period of one generation our great Nation has been able to quickly mobilize tremendous armed forces and unlimited food supplies to insure victory in two world wars. History has recorded nothing comparable to our courageous and unconquerable legions.

On both occasions military aggression was definitely stopped. But how far have we been powerful? Is our contribution to civilization only measured by force? The answer is a sorrowful one. We Americans have been tremendously strong in mobilization and combat and just as weak in diplomacy. We have quit at the last shot and tragically neglected to follow through with firm diplomatic agreements. The result is world chaos.

All of us are well aware that in the last year we have exported some $2,000,000,000 worth of our food products for European relief. We know that this is largely the reason for our high cost of living. We also know that Russia is rapidly extending her western boundary in Europe and infiltrating her doctrine of communism deeper into the countries of western Europe and—yes—even into our own country. However, few of us know why. We have known but little of our foreign policies.

The President of the United States has the right to initiate all negotiations with foreign nations and to declare foreign policy. Although foreign treaties must be confirmed by the Senate, it is a fact almost all foreign policies are formulated by Executive agreements.

Our Constitution gives Congress little power in foreign affairs. Almost the only check by Congress in foreign policies is to refuse to appropriate the funds required, and, in my opinion, this power should be carefully exercised.

Since the adoption of the United Nations Charter, the President's power over foreign policies has been increased. He has complete power to direct the American representatives in the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The President has been extended additional power by the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act and now has authority to reduce tariff rates without the consent of the Congress. In October 1947 the President executed trade agreements that reduced tariff rates on handmade glassware from 45 percent to 30 percent, which may be enough to destroy this great industry.

Yes; the President of the United States can make commitments on foreign policy without consulting the representatives of the people and far too many commitments have been made in the past few years that actually endanger the security of our Nation and hamper our domestic economy. I have before me a copy of the Atlantic Charter, dated August 14, 1941. Incidentally, the source of the copy is the British Library of Information:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have met at sea.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked,

and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed on the following declaration:

" 'The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

" 'First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

" 'Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

" 'Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.' "

The war against Germany was won militarily but the declarations of the Atlantic Charter have become almost worthless. Its policies have failed. We have not delivered freedom to the conquered European countries. We defeated the enemy but we have not restored self-government to these small countries which have been deprived of their sovereign rights.

The freedom-loving people of Poland sent thousands of their trained soldiers to aid France. Six months after Poland fell, 12,000 trained Polish fliers went to the aid of England. Yet Poland has been deprived of the right of self-government and is dominated by Russia.

Russia has also been permitted to deprive the little Republic of Lithuania of her freedom and to deport many of her liberty-loving people into Siberia and to destroy the industries of these self-governing people.

At Yalta in 1945, dangerous concessions were granted to Russia in parts of Manchuria and Korea and the strategic Kurile Islands. We must be ever mindful that our potential dangers from the Pacific area are just as great as those from Europe.

Russia's recent move into Czechoslovakia was timely but not unexpected and makes the eighth eastern European country to be reduced to a Russian satellite. This is another striking example of our appeasement with Russia. Even in military strategy, General Patton's army was ordered not to go farther eastward into Czechoslovakia because this little country was a part of Russia's plan.

Czechoslovakia is a small country of 12,000,000 people who had prospered under the principles of freedom until seized by Hitler. The nation had progressed industrially and had many small and prosperous industries.

Russia did not send armies to capture Czechoslovakia. She sent her agents among the people and compromised with her, so to speak, nationalized her industries, and created a police state subject to orders from the Kremlin.

In addition to the lesson of appeasement in foreign policy we may learn another truth from this seizure of Czechoslovakia-and that is a nation cannot compromise with communism without ultimately becoming enslaved.

In August 1945, the Potsdam agreement was executed as a result of the conference of the President, the Prime Minister, and Generalissimo Stalin. By the terms of the agreement, all of Germany has been largely transformed from the industrial center of Europe to an agricultural state. Russia has removed most of Germany's industrial plants and equipment from eastern Germany. You will recall that the American Army was ordered not to enter Berlin but to stand-by for the Russians, thereby giving Russia additional influence in Europe's fate.

Most certainly Germany should have been deprived of her war powers but it is difficult to help with the reconstruction of Europe and at the same time force Germany into an agricultural nation. Russia's plan is to keep Germany strictly agricultural and by the Potsdam agreement we have, in effect, acquiesced to such a plan. It is now costing us $800,000,000 a year to aid the German people. It would seem that we have won the European war, permitted Russia to have most of the reparations and are now asking our people to replace what Russia has taken.

Apparently our State Department is willing to agree to any terms to appease Russia and at the same time has little regard for the American taxpayers in asking for $17,000,000,000 to rebuild Europe.

In sponsoring foreign relief we hear much about the starving people of Europe. It is true that conditions are serious with these war-stricken people. However, our own people should have the true picture. As a matter of fact our foreign-aid program is not a relief program as advertised. The poor people of Europe get little from the millions we send. The money and the food we ship to Europe goes directly to the European governments to strengthen them politically and militarily. Most of our relief food is sold in black markets and public markets and is never given to the war-stricken people as we have been led to believe.

It is vital that the governments of western Europe should be strengthened and that western Europe should be rehabilitated. However, I am absolutely opposed to any foreign aid unless it be administered by top businessmen of the United States. Certainly the same department that joined in the foreign policies that I have outlined should not be allowed to spend more billions for uncertain aid and at the same time ruin our domestic economy. Any further European aid must be wisely and efficiently administered.

Europeans will not attempt to build factories and buy machinery as long as they believe there is danger that Russia will possess them. Neither will they start in business as long as they believe the United States will construct their factories for them.

The time has come for our Government to be firm with Russia and to be definite and economical with our European aid. Our domestic economy cannot bear the burden of the yearly purchase of $2,000,000,000 worth of food products by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This practice must be drastically curtailed. We must not send any more blank checks to Europe. Let us send top American businessmen to help these European countries. After these men have made business-like requisitions our foreign-aid funds should be small in comparison to the amounts presently requested.

Under such a plan, our domestic food markets would not be depleted and our prices would approach normality. The people of Europe would realize that it was time to do more for themselves and the continuous relief program could be transformed into actual reconstruction.

Religious Teaching in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Clifford B. Ward:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

Mrs. Eugene Meyer, wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, has an article in the current issue of Reader's Digest entitled, "Should the Churches Invade the School?" I would like her to write instead on the question, "Should God Be Allowed To Invade The Schools?"

All, or certainly a majority of Americans are agreed that the public schools of this country should not be controlled by any denominational or sectarian church, but it is difficult to support the growing contention that God should be barred from American education.

Yet God is being barred, except as He can sometimes sneak in the side door. References to Him are very casual, almost in the manner that someone would pay lipservice in Africa to local folklore.

It is considered a crime nowadays to let children grow up without knowing about the romantic impulses of birds and bees. We must know how the birds and bees got here, but we must not investigate as part of education how man got here, how the earth got here or how the Universe got here.

But although it is offensive to teach affirmatively in a public school that God is the primary cause of all matter, it is not considered offensive for someone to teach that God is not the primary cause of all matter. If you lack faith in God and preach negatively that there is no God, you can be protected under the spurious application of the principle of academic freedom, but if you have faith in God and teach affirmatively the reverse of the proposition you are likely to be accused of aiding the church to invade the schools.

We are in a very incongruous position in this country with respect to public-school education. We don't know exactly where we start and stop. The State bows to the church when it exempts from taxation all religious property. It bows to the church when it runs sewers, water mains, and electric lights to religious institutions. It bows to the church when it allows church services to be held on battleships and on Army reservations. It bows to the church when the Army and Navy use tax money to keep chaplains on the Army and Navy pay rolls. It bows to the church when it employs a chaplain, at State expense, to say a daily prayer at the sessions of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives. It bows to the church when it respects the great religious feasts of Christianity, such as Christmas and Easter. But it does not know whether it should stand for the singing of Christmas carols in the public schools and it does not know whether children should be allowed released time in schools for religious instruction.

What the constitutional fathers may have meant in full, we are not certain, but we do know that the founding fathers wanted to assure religious liberty in this country so that every man might worship as he pleases. We also are certain that they wanted as a means of protecting this civil freedom to allow no establishment in this country of a state church as there is in England, where Anglicanism is the state religion; in some countries where Lutheranism was the state religion; and in some Latin countries where Catholicism is the state religion. But the mere fact that the founding fathers took great pains to protect the rights of individuals to worship God as they please indicates that the fathers placed a great value on both God and religion.

Because of the extensions of this philosophy we now have a situation where many

graduates from public schools, at least in certain parts of the country, graduate knowing something about Napoleon, Julius Caesar, Seneca, and all the other great human figures of the past but nothing about Jesus Christ, either as a historical figure or as a divine figure. They have a right to say to themselves upon graduation, "Christ must have been a myth or an unimportant figure, else my schooling would have included some knowledge about Him."

We ought to keep churches from improperly invading public schools, but it is blasphemous to attempt keeping God out of them.

Courthouse in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING COURTHOUSE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BY THE STATUTORY COMMITTEE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 80, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

MARCH 8, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: This report is made to Congress pursuant to provisions of Public Law 80, Eightieth Congress, approved May 29, 1947, as amended in Public Law 271, Eightieth Congress, chapter 361, approved July 30, 1947, by the committee designated therein. Plans have been prepared under the direction of the committee for the construction of a courthouse in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. These plans are in sufficient detail to fully portray the size, character, and scope of the project and have been approved by the committee.

The project has been presented to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and has been approved by it as to the exact location of the building on the site. The project also has been presented to the Commission of Fine Arts and it has approved the design of the building.

The estimated cost of the building, including all elements and specifically including the amount of $2,420,000 established in section 4 of the applicable law as the value of the site, is $18,665,000. Of this sum, $370,000 previously has been appropriated by Congress. This limit is based upon levels of construction costs prevailing as of March 1, 1948.

In submitting this report to Congress, the committee again calls to the attention of the Congress the serious urgency of providing a new courthouse at the earliest practicable date. For more than 10 years the need has been serious but within the past few years the business of the courts has grown to such an extent that the work is being seriously impaired by lack of proper facilities. This need has been called to the attention of Congress on a number of occasions and is believed it will be recognized. However, the committee begs leave to be granted hearings as to the extent and seriousness of the need if any question should arise with regard to the immediate authorization and appropriation for the construction of the building.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD M. STEPHENS,
Acting Chief Justice, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

BOLITHA J. LAWS,
Chief Justice, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

JAMES M. PROCTOR,
Associate Justice, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

C. R. YOUNG,
Commissioner, District of Columbia.

W. E. REYNOLDS,
Commissioner of Public Buildings.

DAVID LYNN,
Architect of the Capitol.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, just recently the editor of the Los Angeles Daily News asked the Members of Congress from the districts included in Los Angeles County to write a short editorial giving their individual views of the Marshall plan.

I am pleased to present herewith the editorial which I wrote and which was published in the Los Angeles Daily News of March 1, 1948:

MANCHESTER BODDY

Perhaps no issue before the American public has been so widely investigated, explained and debated as the Marshall plan. Practically every Member of Congress had an opportunity to study the implications and problems involved in it at first hand, both in Europe and behind closed doors in official Washington. There has been ample time for deliberation and mature consideration. Soon the hour will strike when our Representatives in Congress must stand where all can see them and vote in support of or for the defeat of the Marshall plan.

Today we hear from the Honorable WILLIS W. BRADLEY, Member of Congress from Los Angeles County's Eighteenth District. Representative BRADLEY, a Republican, is serving his first term in Congress, to which he was elected in November 1946. A graduate of the United States Naval Academy, and a retired Naval officer, Representative BRADLEY holds the Congressional Medal of Honor, served with distinction in both world wars.

If you agree or disagree with Congressman BRADLEY write to him, not to the editor. This is your opportunity to help democracy work.—M. B.

"Probably the most difficult legislation to confront Congress is the so-called Marshall plan—officially the European recovery plan.

"It is difficult, because it is not founded on easily ascertainable facts. Rather, it rests largely on sympathy, fear of communism, propaganda, need of outlets for American goods of many categories, and the desire of our current national administration to bolster European governments with which it is on good terms.

"It is difficult, because its very terms may create an international sponge to absorb our revenues for a generation or more to come.

"It is difficult, because, once established for Europe, the idea will spread to other parts of the world and the 'White Man's Burden' of British Empire days may be transformed into an 'Old Man of the Mountain' sitting on the shoulders of American taxpayers and strangling their every move toward a better life in the United States.

"I would not have you think that I am against all aid to war-torn nations. Quite the contrary, I favor such aid—but I cannot escape the thought that my first duty is to the people of my own country rather than toward the leveling of living standards of the world—a feat which I fear will be all too successful in pulling our level down close to that of the average European rather than in raising his standard to approximate our own.

"Our plans, as indicated in the temporary aid program voted last December, really contemplate very little direct relief to the cold or to the hungry. Basically, they aim at getting material to governments—material which these governments may use or sell to bolster their own economy.

"When one questions whether we can afford the vast relief program, he is met with the standard reply that 'We can't afford not to have it.' Then he is confronted with all sorts of statements of the terrible things which will happen to us if we refuse to go along with our global planners. In the meantime, the propaganda mills grind out their fantastic statements which lead foreign nations to believe that we have committed ourselves to their aid for at least another 4 years, and that any reduction in State Department plans for relief would be bad faith on the part of the United States.

"I am convinced that we have built up an ecenomy which requires a certain export trade to keep our factories in large-scale operation and our people fully employed.

"I am convinced that foreign peoples do not have means to buy these exports and that we should give or lend enough to tide them over while they have an opportunity to recover their economic fortunes. I know there is no certainty that they will so recover and I appreciate that we cannot buy our own goods indefinitely merely to keep up foreign trade. That would seem like trying to lift one's self by his bootstraps. However, I think the reward is worth the risk we take and I am willing to take a few chances in our struggle for a prosperous America.

"I do not favor a long-term commitment. One Congress cannot legally commit another—even contractual obligations cannot bind a Congress to make appropriations. Congressional approval of any plan exceeding 1 year will be only a breeder of trouble—an excuse for the vilification of Congress and of the American people for bad faith in the event we should cut down on either the time or the money expected over an extended program.

"I favor only what we can afford without wrecking the financial structure of the United States or saddling vast new debts on our children. They are going to have enough troubles of their own without having more of our global dogooders' debts to pay through sweat and privation.

"Let's help where we can, but let's never forget that the United States is the world's last bulwark of government based on the initiative, the dignity, and the equality of opportunity of the common man.

"If we fall, either in peace or war, the acceptance of the individual as the unit in national life is almost certain to be replaced by the theory of the state as the base of government, with the individual dropping

back into those days of subservience when he was nothing, and the King of France could say, in truth, 'The state? I am the state.'

A Former Republican Michigan Governor Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a heroic, eloquent, and picturesque former citizen of Michigan—and a former Governor—now living in Georgia, agrees with the suggestion that Republicans seize the opportunity to break into the democratically solid South, and writes the editor of the Detroit Free Press, as follows:

POULAN, GA., *March 5, 1948.*

DEAR EDITOR, DETROIT FREE PRESS: In a recent editorial you took issue lightly with Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN for his suggestion that the Republicans nominate somebody for President who would be acceptable to Southerners and ease up on civil rights.

To my mind that proposal of his is one of the most hopeful ideas to come out of Washington in some time.

The civil-rights cleavage is critical. We are pouring out millions to stop communism in China. We are pouring out billions to stop communism in Europe. In this country, to stop communism eating at our vitals, can we not show one grain of common sense?

Remember the massacre at Fort Mackinac? Democrats and Republicans have used the civil-rights issue through a string of decades for a political football. In 1948 the Communists have picked it up and are playing it as their game of lacrosse. We know what they are up to. And we can block them if we will.

The Republican Party has the chance of its lifetime if it follows the advice of Congressman HOFFMAN and Booker T. Washington.

Speaking before the National Education Association in Madison, Wis., the great Negro leader said:

"Brains, property, and character for the Negro will settle the question of civil rights. The best course to pursue in regard to the civil rights bill in the South is to let it alone. Let it alone and it will settle itself.

"Good school teachers and plenty of money to pay them will be more potent in settling the race question than many civil rights and investigating committees."

The Atlanta Constitution comments the other day: "Had the National Government taken Booker T. Washington's advice then and spent more money educating and less time, in election years, exploiting the Negro, the latter would be immeasurably better off today."

That adds up to something for the Republicans and the Nation to ponder.

I hope that Mr. HOFFMAN will keep right on pounding away with his idea. It is the way. Postpone coercion and offer a candidate acceptable to the South—preferably VANDENBERG, with a strong program of Federal aid for basic education. Intolerance breeds unendingly in the swamps of ignorance. Coercive Federal laws are impotent, except to make the mire deeper. Education—an all-out program of basic education for both whites and Negroes—will ditch and drain off the source of injustice and danger.

We are spending billions to speed recovery for the world's sake and our own in 16 foreign nations—all this against the flaming background of what we ourselves are suffering today from failure to extend such help to our own South 80 years ago.

A Congressman from South Carolina shouted at his Republican colleagues the other day: "You are losing your first real chance since the War Between the States to make friends with the South." He, too, is right so far. We have a chance at least, after 80 painful years, to retrieve a tragic error. It is a marvelous opportunity that we ought to seize upon with earnest gratitude to God and make the occasion of a national special thanksgiving.

CHASE S. OSBORN,
Former Governor of Michigan.

Interruption of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that I have been the most regular attendant at the hearings on the Marshall plan before my committee. Considering this by far the most important issue confronting us today it has afforded me pleasure to devote practically my entire time to it during this session with the sincere hope of thereby contributing toward the preservation of peace, the saving of our civilization, and the prevention of the slaughter of our little sons and unborn grandsons on the battlefields of a future war. Since it so directly concerns the welfare, the future well-being and way of life of every single man, woman, and child in this Nation, I was delighted to so perform what I considered my first and most immediate duty to my constituents even though it necessitated my falling woefully behind with nonurgent routine.

It was my sincere hope to continue this active interest and be thoroughly qualified to contribute my bit toward the handling of this legislation when it reaches the floor and its passage by the House. However, I regret that I am now confronted with unexpected, last-minute opposition. While I hope and believe it is not serious, as you know candidates against incumbent Congressmen who vote their convictions are now frequently backed and well financed by strange and powerful forces operating from outside our districts. Some of their leaders are not always interested in the best interests of this country and entertain no desire for representation of the entire cross section of its people but wish to dominate and control the Congress for their own selfish purposes.

Furthermore, the value of my 12 years' seniority means so much to all concerned that I consider it my duty to my country and my constituents to preserve it for them when opposition occurs, regardless of the importance of the duties which must be temporarily laid aside. However, before proceeding to the performance of this duty it is, of course, mandatory that I clear up this accumulation of routine. Consequently, my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee have been good enough to permit me to leave my proxy with either of the three Democrats senior to me, and I have requested a pair on votes in this body with a Republican friend whose regular attendance is similarly prevented and who generally votes opposite to me. Therefore, nothing will be lost except my voice. I am very grateful for the statement of one of my colleagues on the committee, "PETE, I am mighty glad you secured that proxy, but I hate terribly to lose your voice."

To illustrate my seniority, there are only 80 of the 435 Members of the House with longer service. It is even now known that 10 of these will not serve in the next Congress and this number will undoubtedly prove to be considerably larger.

I appreciate deeply the many expressions of regret by good friends on both sides of the aisle who are so well aware of my interest in our foreign policy, which will so greatly influence the maintenance of our standard of living, our way of life in the future, and the preservation of peace. Tears of appreciation almost came to my eyes when a senior colleague whom I regard as one of the ablest Members of the House said, "Pete, I am just as sorry as I can be of your opposition, which I simply do not understand, because I think among all the Members of the House you are the one man whose record entitles you to never have opposition."

It is unfortunate for one who works as diligently as I and most of you take pleasure in doing to be so called from our labors at such a critical moment in the history of the world. To illustrate, I quote headlines from the front page of Tuesday's Washington Post:

"VANDENBERG calls on Senate for swift approval of ERP to head off war"; "Condon associating with alleged spies, anti-Red unit charges"; Congressional board sees war threatening—urges twelve billion for air supremacy"; "GOP warned of danger in tax slash"; Czech voting delay hinted by minister"; "Fate of UMT in balance today on Capitol Hill."

The following day the first page of the same paper recorded these headlines:

"Economic aid not enough BALL declares"; "VANDENBERG still keeping foot in door"; "Antilynch bill clears House group"; "All Finnish parties agree to negotiate with Russians."

Few, other than we from the South, are disturbed by the President's civil-rights program, the passage of which simply must not occur since it would not be for the best interest of either race. However, we are all greatly disturbed by the Communist threat in Europe and Asia and most of us realize the necessity of doing everything possible to curb it. I warn you, however, my colleagues, that it is not only in Europe that this threat exists. Instead there are entirely too many thoroughly intelligent people in our own

country who are deliberately contributing thereto. Frankly, I gave former Vice President Wallace credit for being sincere until his recent testimony before our committee. It was so completely down the party line, however, that I now labor under no such delusion. I am very much afraid that he constitutes a menace much more serious than we have realized which it behooves us to combat in every possible way. One way in which this can be done is by the defeat of candidates backed by any organization in which pinks and fellow travelers enjoy influence.

I cordially invite my opponents, one of whom I am confident is so backed, to fully explain to the excellent people of my district, than whom there are no better people in the world, why they believe it would be beneficial to them and to our country to substitute their natural inexperience for my 12 years' experience here where seniority is more valuable than anywhere else in the world.

While I regret that I must be denied the privilege of seeing much of you ladies and gentlemen in the immediate future, I look forward with keen interest and pleasure to a continuation of our work together after the election.

Violence Was Inevitable in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Jorge Garcit Granados, formerly Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States and a member of the United Nations Special Commission on Palestine, which appeared in the February 1948 issue of United Nations World:

VIOLENCE WAS INEVITABLE IN PALESTINE

(By Jorge Garcia Granados, Guatemalan Ambassador to the United States)

Those who know my work on the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, and who have followed my efforts to put the committee's majority recommendation into effect now frequently ask me:

"In view of the bloodshed in the Holy Land do you still think that you were right in advocating the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states?"

To such and similar questions I have an unequivocal answer. Nothing can alter my belief that partition provides the best possible solution for the Palestine problem. Recent events in the Holy Land, however regrettable, cannot shake this conviction.

I hope it will not sound callous when I say that we on the UN Palestine Committee always expected a violent reaction to partition. In our closed meetings we discussed the probability of bloodshed as, indeed, we realized that such a major operation cannot be accomplished without spilling some blood in the process.

Great political decisions involving the birth of nations are usually accompanied by violence. There was bitterness and ambuscade in the wake of Ireland's partition. A veritable blood bath and indescribable misery followed the partition of India.

We had to accept this same price in Palestine, too, always hoping that the fighting would be sporadic and confined to the area immediately affected by the UN's decision. We had faith in the statesmanship of the neighboring Arab countries, themselves members of the United Nations. We could never for a moment believe that they would violate the Charter or rebel against the decision of the General Assembly.

During my mission to Palestine as Gautemala's delegate to UNSCOP I had exceptional opportunity to acquaint myself with the real sentiment of the people of Palestine and I made the most of it. I talked with Arab and Jew in all walks of life. I held clandestine conferences with leading members of the Jewish underground as well as with leaders of the Arab Higher Committee. I stopped to talk with Fellahin (Arab peasants) leading their donkeys to Jerusalem on the road Jesus once traveled. I have joined in endless discussions with young Jewish colonists in their settlements. I know first hand that the vast majority of the Palestinian people want peace and tranquillity.

It is usually taken for granted that the Jewish community accepts the UN decision without opposition. It is similarly believed that all the Arabs of Palestine will oppose it to the end. Neither contention is completely true. A majority within the Jewish Agency now accepts the decision of the General Assembly and stands ready to implement it on the deadline. But there are important elements even within the Jewish community which may as yet complicate the execution of the plan. This possibility was revealed to me when I visited Menahim Beigen, commander in chief of the underground organization, Irgun Zwai Leumi, and in various conferences with members of the Stern group.

My meeting with Beigen had all the earmarks of a detective thriller. I was clandestinely approached by one of his lieutenants who invited me in his chief's name to conference "somewhere in Tel Aviv." I agreed eagerly and was taken in a roundabout way to an apartment in the all-Jewish city where Beigen was waiting for me.

I had seen his picture before, but the man who now confronted me looked different. I was told that Beigen submits to plastic surgery to change his face from time to time, thus preventing recognition by agents of the government's criminal investigation division. There is a huge price on his head. Beigen told me his organization exists only to fight the British on the issue of Jewish immigration into the Holy Land. He made me understand that once the bars to immigration are lifted, Irgun will have outlived its usefulness.

There is no political cohesion within Irgun itself. Its members represent all shades of political opinion, ranging from left-wing socialism to middle-of-the-road democracy and to views far right of center. Beigen himself is a military leader and not a politician. But even if he knew how to do it, he could not polarize his heterogeneous forces into one solid political party. I am convinced that partition will see the dissolution of Irgun, its members joining the various political parties in the new Jewish assembly.

The Stern group represents a different problem. Although small in number and composed of young hotheads (most of them in their teens), the organization has a hazy but definite political philosophy, which is in opposition to partition. The Sternists dream of a Jewish state extending far beyond the present borders of Palestine, incorporating Trans-Jordan as well. They might, therefore, continue their underground struggle, posing a delicate police problem for the new Jewish state.

The Arabs form a similarly divided community. I would like to state with all the emphasis at my command that not all Arabs are committed to a bitter-end opposition to partition. There are many moderate, level-headed men among the Arab leaders unaffected by the rantings and threats of the Grand Mufti and ready to cooperate in carrying out the UN's decision. I know these men personally, virtually all of them, and I have their solemn words to this effect. Nothing would be gained by enumerating here their names or their affiliations. I would merely be exposing them to the venom and the assassins of the Mufti who never hesitates to eliminate his opponents by whatever means, fair or foul. One of the leaders of this moderate group, Ragheb Bey Nashashibi, recently paid with his life for his opposition to the Mufti's grandiloquent plot. His murder has made his surviving friends doubly cautious.

Far beyond this group of Arab politicians, one can find moderation on all levels. Overshadowed by the alarming news of bloodshed are the innumerable friendship and nonaggression pacts concluded between individual Arab and Jewish communities. They are sacred covenants in the best tradition of the Near East. In most instances the initiative for these covenants originated with the Arabs, in defiance of orders they received from the professional trouble makers. I do not doubt that in the end this peaceful majority will prevail and impose peace on the recalcitrant minority.

Of course, far more is needed than individual covenants and occasional friendship pacts, concluded in an improvised manner and affecting but small local regions of the Holy Land. As I see it, each community has its own responsibilities in the present situation. Only when all of them become conscious of their particular responsibilities and act on them accordingly will peace be truly restored to the Holy Land.

The first and, for the time being, major responsibility rests with the British. I do not go along with those who level blanket accusations against the British administration and indiscriminately raise charges of sabotage against it. I realize that Britain needs the friendship of all Arabs, both within and without Palestine, and has to maintain a position of neutrality in the present situation when protection of the Jews might appear to be partisan intervention on their behalf. I am also told that His Majesty's Government, for urgent domestic reasons, tries to keep British casualties at a minimum and is reluctant to expose its forces to large-scale attacks.

But the presence of Britain in Palestine is a political reality the consequences of which no one can ignore. The present disturbances occur in an area which is entrusted to the care of the United Kingdom. When I raised this point in conversations with Sir Alexander Cadogan he assured me that Britain is both able and willing to maintain law and order in the Holy Land. There are at present at least 80,000 British troops in Palestine excellently equipped, battle trained, familiar with the terrain and the specific nature of their duties. In addition, there are various police forces under British command long used to joint operations with the military.

In these circumstances I am amazed to hear that the roads of Palestine are no longer safe even for convoys carrying essential supplies to distant colonies. I know those roads. I have traveled them myself. They can be patrolled both on the ground and from the air and kept open against the scattered guerrillas who now make them impassable.

The British responsibility is clear-cut: it is the maintenance of law and order until

the date when this responsibility will be assumed by the United Nations.

The responsibility of the UN is inherent in the decision of the General Assembly and in the obligation which its execution imposes upon the international organization. In order to be able to carry out the Assembly's instructions I think the United Nations must pursue the following course:

First of all, it must immediately begin the formation of the Jewish and Arab militias provided for in the Assembly's resolution, to be ready in time to take over police functions from Britain.

Second, it must immediately begin negotiations with representatives of the moderate Arab groups to prevent ensuing chaos in the Arab vacuum that will be created by Britain's withdrawal.

Third, it must in all its dealings with the Palestine problem show absolute and resolute firmness and energy, to convince all hotheads both in Palestine and abroad that it means business and that nothing can be gained by trying to terrorize the United Nations.

I purposely placed the formation of the Jewish and Arab militias at the top of the list. Law and order must have an unbroken continuity in the Holy Land if partition is to become an accomplished fact on October 1, 1948. If no large-scale invasion from abroad develops, these militias will be sufficient to maintain order, and also to cope with guerrilla forces which might try to cross into Palestine.

The organization of these militias must be the first task of the UN's five-man Palestine Commission. Their arming should present no difficulty. The embargo which the United States placed on the shipment of arms to Jews and Arabs cannot extend to shipments to an agency of the United Nations, and indeed, I have reason to believe that the necessary weapons and ammunition will be promptly forthcoming from the United States once they are applied for by the UN Commission.

No doubt the Jews will receive these arms eagerly. If common sense prevails, the Arabs, too, will accept them. However, should the Arabs refuse to cooperate with the UN in the establishment of their militia, the United Nations Commission must at once ask the Security Council to create one of its own for immediate duty in the new Arab state. No hiatus can be tolerated when it comes to the maintenance of order anywhere in the Holy Land.

The UN Commission knows as well as I do the identity of those Arab leaders who stand ready to form a government of their own in the new Arab state—provided they are offered the unconditional and effective protection of the United Nations, not merely against abuses, but also against attempts on their lives.

No precautionary measures must be overlooked to protect the safety of these Arab leaders. I am convinced that the present power of the Mufti is largely due to the fact that the killings of the past, including the cowardly murder of Nashashibi, went unpunished. Even after Nashashibi's murder, his friends failed to receive adequate protection from the authorities. The UN cannot continue this practice. It must convince all extremists, both those who fight with the Mufti on sincere religious grounds, and those who serve him in fear of their own lives, that the United Nations means business.

In all these activities the United Nations must show meticulous impartiality. It can tolerate no excesses whether they be perpetrated by Arabs or by Jews.

Although I dislike contemplating the possibility, what will happen in case of an organized invasion by member states of the Arab League?

In such an event the Security Council will be obliged to act at once under the provisions of the Charter which contains explicit instructions for dealing with aggressors. The United Nations will then invoke economic sanctions against the violators of the Charter and, if such steps prove insufficient, call on its members to place at its disposal the necessary forces needed for military sanctions on land, from the air, and at sea.

The risk involved in such an irresponsible step was fully appreciated at the conference of the Arab states held in Cairo in early December 1947. It was then decided to refrain from participation in an invasion of Palestine, but to aid the Palestine Arabs with arms and volunteers in their fight against partition. It will be left to the UN Commission to deal with this contingency. I, for one, firmly believe that the respective militias of the new states will be sufficient to cope with this eventuality.

Whatever the future has in store for Palestine, renascent under the wings of the United Nations, it is now up to the UN to prevent it from becoming a fatal impediment to the execution of its own resolution. Palestine is no longer an Arab or a Jewish problem. It is the problem of the United Nations whose prestige and, indeed, whole future is at stake. There can be no retreat from the decision of November 30, 1947. No compromise is possible. From now on the United Nations must go forward with unfaltering steps if it is to prove to the world that it can make up its mind and make its decisions stick.

Foreign Policy Stumbles Toward War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by John S. Knight:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY STUMBLES TOWARD WAR

Just what is our foreign policy?

If anyone, including President Truman, can give a clear and convincing explanation, we should like to hear it.

The truth is that we are day-to-day improvisers laboring under the delusion that a few more billions scattered here and there will meet any emergency that arises.

When men of good faith met at San Francisco to draft the charter for the United Nations, there was genuine optimism that nations of the world could work together for world peace and economic security.

It was more than a mere hope. The idealistic pledges and public statements made by world leaders, feeble as they sound in retrospect, provided a workable basis from which to launch a new era of mutual trust and confidence.

The folly and tragic price of war was fully exposed. Civilization was doomed if nations continued to claw at each other's throats instead of learning how to live together as neighbors in peaceful trade and commerce.

RUSSIA SPOILED DREAM OF PEACE

The San Francisco conference was a commendable beginning. Its deliberations and conclusions were heralded in every land stricken by the ravages of war. The charter was as warming to the souls of peace-loving peoples everywhere as the first spring days to the heart of a small boy at the end of a dreary winter.

Then Russia spoiled our dream. By obstructionist tactics and a seemingly endless series of vetoes, the Russian delegates to the UN deliberately sabotaged the most constructive appeal to reason in modern civilization.

Her motives? There are varying explanations, but the one most widely accepted is the conviction held by Marshal Stalin and members of the Politburo that the capitalist and totalitarian systems cannot both endure in the same world.

Russia's plans are said to be based upon world conquest, either by ideological infiltration, military action, or both. It is a revolting and feudalistic concept, but it is a plan.

How was Russia, long a third-rate power, emboldened to pursue such a terroristic policy?

The record will show that her rise as one of the two dominant powers in the world today came through the military, economic, and political assistance furnished by the United States.

On the basis of Russia's stubborn resistance to Hitler's armies, the military aid was fully justified. There was, however, no justification for the political concessions made by Franklin D. Roosevelt to Marshal Stalin at Tehran and Yalta.

The seeds of world war III were planted when Roosevelt, a tired and ill man, yielded to Stalin's demands for most of the Balkans and the strategic Kurile Islands.

AMERICA SHIVERS AT SOVIET THREAT

Where do we stand today?

I am afraid we have been thrown into a paroxysm of fear by Russia's bullying threats. In fact, in an effort to check her expansion, we hasten the building of more plants for the production of atomic weapons, increase our air power, and agitate for universal military training.

On the political side, we have beamed the Voice of America into middle and eastern Europe.

Congress voted $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey under the questionable Truman doctrine. It is currently considering spending $17,000,000,000 more to implement the Marshall plan, and on Wednesday last the President recommended an additional appropriation of $570,000,000 for China.

As the result of this fear-inspired spending orgy, how far have we progressed?

With the exception of reconstituting our air force and the progress that has been made in atomic research, the answer is that we have made exactly no progress at all.

The scattergun political barrage fired by our State Department finds few targets and the thick Russian hide seems impervious to the occasional stray pellets that may find their mark.

Where do we go from here?

In the absence of a shrewdly calculated and well-coordinated foreign-policy program, it is likely that we shall continue to muddle along and stumble, when least expected, into another world war.

Thus far, nothing better has been devised than a continuance and expansion of the policies that have failed so dismally in the past.

By way of explanation:

1. The Truman doctrine has been completely ineffective in Greece. It was sold to Congress as a means of "containing" Russia. We have "contained" the Russians so well that guerrilla forces in the hills have increased from 13,000 to 20,000. The Greek army virtually refuses to fight and the Greek

Government is yowling for American troops and more money.

So Mr. Truman is prepared to recommend that the Greeks be sent $200,000,000 more for military aid plus $150,000,000 for additional economic aid under the Marshall plan.

2. Billions have been wasted in China supporting the corrupt and feudalistic regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. Millions of dollars of UNRRA supplies found their way into China's black markets.

So, Mr. Truman now proposes that we give the Chinese another $570,000,000 to help Chiang ward off the Communists. The best informed experts on China say it is impossible to calculate the astronomical sums that would be needed to stabilize China.

But at the urging of the help-China bloc in Congress, the President is willing to waste $570,000,000 of American money in what he privately admits is a "half-measure." His object is to win votes for the Marshall plan by taking care of the help-China boys.

3. When Great Britain thought it had found a way to compose the Palestine situation, our President wrecked that settlement by demanding the immediate entry of 100,000 Jews into that strife-torn land.

His appeal was admittedly political in order to help elect Jim Mead and Herbert Lehman as Governor and Senator in New York State.

As Britain realized that the Palestine question was to be made a political football in the United States, she announced her intention to withdraw and a United Nations decision to partition Palestine was taken at our urging.

As the hour for British withdrawal approaches, there is no United Nations force to preserve the peace in Palestine and the problem is being thrown squarely into our lap.

The President is now thoroughly frightened at the prospect of a bloody war between the Arabs and the Jews. His cabinet advisers, including Defense Secretary Forrestal, see the possible loss of huge oil reserves. The State Department knows that any United Nations protective force would necessarily include Russian troops and has cold chills at the very thought.

Will American troops be sent to Palestine? The possibility is very real. That is the price we may have to pay because President Truman, Governor Dewey, Senator Taft, and a host of lesser lights from both political parties placed Zionist votes ahead of their country's interest.

4. The $3,750,000,000 that we loaned to England in 1946 will be exhausted by May. The Daily News favored that loan as an outright gift because we believed it was not too much to pay for economic rehabilitation of our closest friend and ally.

But, as Winston Churchill said last week, "the socialistic planners have miscalculated and mismanaged everything. They keep the British bulldog running around after his own tail till he is dizzy, and then wonder that he cannot keep the wolf from the door."

Now we are to help Great Britain again. This time she is scheduled to get the lion's share of Marshall plan funds.

What sound reason have we to believe that the billions to come will not be frittered away on the same socialistic schemes as the billions they have already received?

MARSHALL PLAN OBJECTIVES VAGUE

By this time, it should be fairly obvious that our "Uncle Sugar" policy cannot go on forever.

The Marshall plan has been presented to the American people as a calculated risk.

A calculated risk for what? Rebuilding Europe's economy or winning the cold war with Russia?

Our Government is delightfully vague on that particular point. The plan is being sold as a two-way cure for Europe's ills but it is winning us no friends in the rest of the world who naturally wonder why Uncle is neglecting them.

During the testimony on the Marshall plan, one of our Representatives objected to placing any conditions on the loan that would offend these proud and sensitive people.

Proud and sensitive my eye. They are about as proud and sensitive as a poor credit risk trying to make a loan at the bank.

The art of diplomacy as practiced by many great Presidents and Secretaries of State has now deteriorated to the point where we hesitate to incur anyone's ill will and can't say "No," even when we are right.

When will the American people wake up?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief summary of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, which is being distributed by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEW SIMPLE FACTS ABOUT THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

(By Mrs. Margaret K. Taylor[1])

What interest, it may be asked, have the dairy farmers, represented by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, in the Taft-Hartley Act?

Their interest is identical with the interest of countless other individuals and groups in America who urged Congress to enact labor reforms. They believe that the Taft-Hartley Act will produce better employer-employee relations and benefit the Nation. They ask that it remain on the statutes, unamended, to be given the test of time.

The Wagner Act (the National Labor Relations Act) was enacted by Congress in 1935 after only 2 days debate. It remained on the statutes for 12 years without change. In the early days businessmen opposed it as bitterly as labor leaders now oppose the Taft-Hartley Act, which is an amendment to the earlier law. Yet the basic points of the earlier law still endure.

The important new provisions of the National Labor Relations Act have been in effect only since August 23, 1947. Employers in general have thus far had little occasion to utilize these provisions, because organized labor has not made it necessary.

The law should not be tampered with until it has been well tried out.

The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation urged that the Congress enact the Taft-Hartley bill. Labor leaders opposed it and the great labor unions are now committed by their convention resolutions to defeat each Member of Congress who voted for the bill. In other words there will be a continuing effort on the part of labor leaders to scuttle the law before it has a chance to function. We who supported it are bound to defend it. The only way that the propaganda of the labor leaders can be counteracted is by informing ourselves, the membership of labor unions, and the public in general on the issues involved. We have this obligation to perform on the side of fair play, and for our own welfare and that of the Nation.

To start with, there are two simple questions to which we should know the answers:

1. Why do union members oppose the Taft-Hartley Act?

The membership of labor unions oppose the act because they do not know the facts and because their leadership has misled them. This has been proved by public opinion polls which showed that overwhelming majorities of working people approved the important clauses of the act when put to them one by one. But when these same working people are asked about the Taft-Hartley Act as such, they vote just as decisively against it. In other words they do not know what is in the act.

2. Why do union leaders oppose the Taft-Hartley Act?

The leadership of labor unions oppose the act because they know that it weakens their control over the individual union members. Labor leaders know that the Wagner Act freed the workingman from the domination of the employer; and that the Taft-Hartley law has freed him from the domination of union bosses. The last part the bosses do not like.

The facts are that not a single word has been omitted from the "rights-of-employees" section of the Wagner Act. Every unfair employer labor practice in the Wagner Act is still in effect. In addition, the Taft-Hartley law presents to the workingman many new rights and privileges.

Some of these new benefits in the Taft-Hartley Act are:

1. Protection from union threats and violence: It is made unlawful for a union to threaten or coerce employees to join a union just as it was made unlawful for an employer to threaten or coerce employees to keep them out of unions.

2. Right to work: Employers and union leaders cannot get together and make contracts under which employees have to join a union and pay dues to it. Such contracts are unlawful unless a majority of the employees, by secret ballot, approve them.

3. Relief from high initiation fees: Unions cannot charge initiation fees in excess of amounts which the National Labor Relations Board decides are reasonable (if the union is to enjoy the privileges of a union shop).

4. Ban on compulsory check-off: No union member's due can be deducted by employers without written permission by the individual employee.

5. Right of employee to present grievances: The individual employee can present to the employer his own grievances, thus eliminating the chance of union boss inspired discharge for arbitrary or unfair reasons.

6. Union's bargaining must be in good faith: It is made an unfair labor practice to strike instead of following the grievance procedure. One of the duties of the new Federal Conciliation and Mediation Service set up under the law is to persuade unions, before calling strikes, to permit employees to vote, by secret ballot, on whether to strike or to accept the employer's last offer.

7. Jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts outlawed: These troubles must be submitted to the National Labor Relations Board to be settled by peaceful means.

8. Unions suable for breach of contract: In theory contracts were binding upon both

[1] Mrs. Taylor is educational director of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. This leaflet summarizes a statement at the federation's thirty-first annual convention, St. Louis, Mo., November 5, 1947.

unions and employers, but under laws in some States the individual members of the union had to be named. Now the employee benefits because he is freed from personal liability in Federal courts for breach of contract or other unlawful union acts. The union is suable.

9. Featherbedding prohibited: This practice—under which employees receive pay which is not earned because the employer is forced to hire more men than are needed to do the job—is prohibited. It gives the employee the right to do a fair day's work.

10. Protection from abuses of health and welfare funds: Money paid by employees for pensions and annuities must be kept in a separate trust fund with a representative of the employer as well as the union on the board of trustees. (Except for funds set up before Jan. 1, 1947.)

11. Supervisors and foremen not employees: The National Labor Relations Board cannot recognize foremen and supervisors as employees. They are a part of management and cannot become members of a union with employees.

12. Ban on political contributions: Union leaders are forbidden to make political use of members' funds. This places unions in the same category as corporations and cooperative associations under Federal law.

13. Financial reports required: Union leaders must supply members annually with financial reports showing receipts and disbursements. They must also report names of labor-union officials and representatives who receive $5,000 or more salary.

14. Communist affidavits required: Unions must file affidavits that their officers are not Communists if they are to be treated as labor organizations under the new law.

To Sustain the United Nations General Assembly Is To Do Justice in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the emphasis upon "inexorable facts," of the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1948, is an accurate picture of the situation. The fact is that world peace will be seriously undermined if the resolution of the UN General Assembly is not sustained and implemented in Palestine. It must be remembered that this resolution was the decision of 33 nations voting affirmatively that partition was the only just solution in Palestine and that the resolution was taken at the request of Great Britain, the mandatory power. It is justice itself that is on trial in Palestine:

THE INEXORABLE FACTS

There is some slight reason to believe that the inexorable facts of the Palestine tragedy are at last coming home to the statesmen, of the small powers as well as of the great, who have so long and so assiduously sought to evade them. The easy expedients have all in turn collapsed. It is no longer possible to stand off and advise the British how to do what nobody else was willing to do themselves. The General Assembly recommendation of last fall, insofar as it rested only upon its own moral force, is a failure. The American straddle, attempted through Mr. Austin's statement last month, fell flat. The mandate regime, fast crumbling to pieces, will be at an end in a little more than 2 months, and a thousand concrete questions of administration—who will pay the police or the postmen, who will provide food shipments, who will run the water supply or the communications lines—are all unanswered.

In a long session last Friday the Security Council referred the problem to the informal conversations of the great powers. The Council neither rejected the idea of another effort at conciliation between Jews and Arabs nor categorically committed itself to the enforcement of partition; the resolution itself was weak and the corridors at Lake Success were still full of the haunting notion that something, miraculously, might still turn up to save everybody from doing anything effective. But, weak as it was, the resolution itself did carry a dawning sense of the fact that in case no miracles happen, something will have to be done. Mr. Arthur Creech-Jones is discovered to have departed suddenly for London, conceivably carrying this thought with him. The State Department is at least aware by now that something more than fine-spun legalism is required. Yesterday's first meeting for informal consultation was brief; but at any rate the great powers are meeting, free from the immediate pressure of violent publicity, aware that something is expected of them and equally aware that they cannot escape either the moral responsibility or the practical consequences of mere inaction.

A good many of the facts in Palestine are today beyond control by Lake Success, by the Arab League, by the Jewish Agency, or by any capital. The British cannot be made to carry the burden any longer. Only by extermination (which the world would not permit) can a self-governing Jewish community be prevented from appearing in Palestine; equally, only a war of extermination could now eject the Arabs from the large share of Palestine which they retain. The only question now is the extent to which the United Nations can retain general control over the situation, or how far paralysis at Lake Success will allow these developments to advance in chaos and bloodshed in Palestine. Had the United States recognized the facts 2 weeks ago and spoken strongly for a clear-cut decision on partition and the force to back it up, the problem would now be simpler. As it is, we have put ourselves largely in the hands of the Russians and are dependent on whatever initiatives Mr. Gromyko may produce in the informal conversations. But even Mr. Gromyko cannot alter facts by which all are bound and which are forcing action upon all.

Air Force Is America's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech I made on March 5, over radio stations WBAB, in Atlantic City, and WSNJ, in Bridgeton, N. J.:

"On August 6, 1945, an airplane bearing the insignia of the United States Army Air Forces dropped an atom bomb on Hiroshima. Militarily speaking, at that same hour, the security frontiers of all nations disappeared from the map. National defense, in the traditional sense, is no longer possible. More devastating weapons, and more competent weapon carriers than those which struck Hiroshima are in existence. The cycle of history has turned upon itself and once again civilization stands vulnerable to annihilation.

"Joint action for peace by all major nations alone can meet our modern dilemma. Determined and continuous effort in the United Nations must not be abandoned while the slightest ray of hope remains. In the meantime, an alternative plan to maintain a balance of peace must be contrived in the name of the free world.

"World War III, if it comes, will be a sudden and indiscriminate attack on our cities, our factories, our transportation lines, our communication centers, and water supply, and, more important than all else, upon our lives. It will be more extensive than the attack on Hiroshima. There will be no time, as in World War I and World War II, for mobilization. The only defense will be swift and more devastating retaliatory attack.

"To defend ourselves in the age of atomic bombs, of radioactive dust, of bacterial warfare, and guided missiles—to mention some of the new and terrible weapons—we must have air power that is supreme. We cannot have less if we are to discourage attack or, if attacked, to defend ourselves."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not my language. I wish it were. It is a dramatic—yes, even an explosive—statement, but it is not an exaggerated one. It is saying in better phrasing than I have used what I have been trying to say both in and out of Congress since the end of the war, and no language of my own tonight would be as significant and as clear as the statement I have just spoken, which is the preface to the report of the Congressional Aviation Board to the Congress, released on the night of March 1.

Some weeks ago I had the privilege to speak in Vineland on the policies involved in universal military training. I said then that it was perfectly apparent that we were living in a new age, and that the national security of the United States was completely related to our air policy.

It is the tragedy of this generation that instead of enjoying the peace, instead of enjoying the bright new world of tomorrow, which was promised us during the war, we live, all of us, under a sense of impending doom. It is difficult, indeed, not to be discouraged—to say that our efforts toward world peace have failed—to give up the glorious hope that we had in the United Nations. But we must overcome this discouragement. We must continue to exercise every bit of our ingenuity and power to support and implement the decisions of the United Nations. We must be patient, even though the temptation to be impatient is almost overwhelming. But at the very same time that we are exerting every effort in the cause of peace, it is folly to pretend that we live in security, and we must be prepared.

That preparation, as I have said so many times before, must put major emphasis on the air power of the Nation. Large masses of men trained to march and countermarch; reliance upon the fire power of the battleship, is as unrealistic in the days since Hiroshima and Nagasaki as to go back to the bow and arrow.

It is just as obvious that there will always be a need for the Army and Navy, but it would be a fatal mistake not to realize that the future defense of the United States is not technically a defense at all, but the power to deliver attack with swift and devastating force.

"Air power is the total ability of a nation to capitalize on the medium of fight."

It is encouraging that the committee has conceived our policy on this broad base.

There should be much less talk of war, much less threatening or blustering from our so-called diplomats, and the immediate strengthening of our air power. In short, let us follow the injunction of Theodore Roosevelt, "Speak softly and carry a big stick."

Vandenberg Presses GOP To Vote Aid by April 18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which I was delighted to observe as the lead article in the Washington Post this morning. This is particularly true in view of my remarks in this body Monday.

VANDENBERG PRESSES GOP TO VOTE AID BY APRIL 18—CAN AFFECT ITALIAN ELECTIONS, HE SAYS; EATON, WHERRY AIM AT SPEEDY PASSAGE

(By Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr.)

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG enlisted the help of Republican leaders of the House and Senate yesterday to speed passage of the European recovery bill.

By nightfall there were signs that their combined pressure was beginning to work, although the Senate spent another day of listening to speeches without voting on a single amendment.

Here is what happened:

1. In the morning VANDENBERG met with Speaker MARTIN, Majority Leader HALLECK, and Chairman EATON of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to impress the need of quick action upon them. From what others said later, it was apparent that he had warned them of the disastrous consequences if the bill should not be passed before the Italian elections on April 18.

2. Later, after a 2½-hour meeting with the Speaker and with Republican members of this committee, Eaton said his objective was to get the bill passed by April 10, in time "to have a psychological effect on the Italian election." Eaton said his committee may reconsider its earlier decision, which he called a tentative one, to wrap up military aid to China, Greece, and Turkey into a single-package bill with ERP. He announced that his committee would start writing a bill on Thursday.

3. Speaker MARTIN told reporters: "We are going to do everything we can to expedite the bill, and we are going to work overtime to get it ready."

4. On the Senate Floor the Republican whip, Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, said the Senate would hold night sessions, Thursday and Friday and would meet all day Saturday if necessary to pass the bill.

Two other appeals for speed were heard on the Senate side of the Capitol. Secretary of Commerce Harriman, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, said the delay in passing ERP might make American aid too late to keep communism from overrunning western Europe.

"Time is running against us," Harriman said. "Delay is causing serious repercussions."

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican of Vermont, told the Senate that "the alternative of the extinction of civilization in Europe is as sure as anything can be" if American help fails to come.

"My plea is for speed in this matter," he said. "There is a deadline set. That deadline is April 18, when the Italian nation holds its elections. That country has made a brave endeavor to meet in letter and spirit the fundamental requirements on which this bill is based.

"The slow progress of this bill is a mutual and international calamity. Hour by hour, day by day, April 18 is hurrying toward us. We cannot delay its implacable advance. We must not fail to do our part long before it reaches us."

Failure To Find a Home for DP's Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appalling lack of action with respect to acceptance by the United States of a fair share of the displaced persons is a cause for great dismay to those who see the great moral issue involved. This issue is no less than our willingness to give sanctuary to those who refuse to return to places of origin, where they justly fear for their very bodies and souls. The following article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1948, makes an eloquent plea for clear sight on this problem, upon which action is long overdue:

CAN'T CONGRESS SEE?

The unanimity among those who have worked with displaced persons or have seen and talked to them is in striking contrast to the inertia, indifference and outright hostility which holds back congressional action. Committees from the Congress return from Europe crying for action. Individuals, even some who went full of prejudice, return from the camps echoing the cry in reports to America.

Audiences at last week's Herald Tribune High School forum held two displaced persons' reports. Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, speaking from first-hand Army experience, sketched the background, present status, and tragically uncertain future of the refugees. William H. Sudduth, chairman of the Committee to Aid Heidelberg Students, presented some of the displaced youths he has helped to bring here on student visas. The marks of tragic experience overlaid with a bright, new glow of hope in the faces of these students caught the imagination, stirred anger at the thought that hope might yet be extinguished for them, wholly denied to others like them.

The impact of first-hand reports on public opinion has been great. Public desire for significant action has, if we may gage it by Nation-wide movements to prepare a place here for the refugees, far outdistanced congressional willingness to take even half-hearted action. Our lawmakers need to exercise their imaginations, to see the problem as one actually determining the lives of fine and proud individuals. One wishes that the dramatic response of the forum audience to the youngest of Mr. Sudduth's students could be repeated in Congress. The lad, Peter Sudduth Forshee, his origins lost, his age probably 4, merely sang "America" so clearly that the farthest radios heard. But he spoke most eloquently of all for these people we do not know, who have suffered in ways we do not comprehend, and who, given the chance, could sing "My country 'tis of thee" from new depths of loyalty.

If the undertones of this incident require too much of lawmakers' imaginations, there are still Colonel Sage's report and dozens more. Never, he says, were men so completely indoctrinated against totalitarianism as those of the displaced who, having lived through the war as slave laborers or prisoners of the Nazis, could not return to their homes when liberated. Their homes had been incorporated into the Russian hegemony. There is no possible future for these refugees except resettlement abroad. It is time that something—be it human sympathy or statesmen's responsibility—waked Congress to the need to offer a real solution of their problem.

Let's Have Show-Down With Communists Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article written by Robert M. Grannis, which appeared in the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle on Sunday, March 7, 1948:

LET'S HAVE SHOW-DOWN WITH COMMUNISTS NOW—SHOULD BE IN NAME OF PEACE AND NOT MERELY TO COMBAT SOVIET DOCTRINE

(By Robert M. Grannis)

When a man has been a champ for a long time it is only human for him to coast. He takes it for granted he is immune to a sucker punch. Then while he's busy admiring the muscles of yesteryear, someone comes along and knocks him flat on his back and the champ wakes up with a big foot on his chest.

Uncle Sam is like that now, as I see it, and too many of the wrong people are aware of it, both home and abroad. Take Joe Stalin, for example. He is so scared of us and our atom bomb and Marshall plan that his hatchet men are flooding Europe like water through a broken dam.

And here at home his Red brethren are swarming through holes in Uncle Sam's domestic armor and making normally sane-minded folks appear as confused schoolboys. The local followers of the Moscow line are dumb like foxes and have developed an annoying habit of calling us to find we're bluffing a lot of the time. Every time they catch us empty-handed they get new recruits or drive more and more hair-trigger thinkers into the Wallace camp.

WALLACE GAINS GROUND

Which reminds me the surest way to wake up some morning without a roof over your head is to pitch your tent in the Wallace camp. Nevertheless, he's gaining ground like a scared rabbit. To prove this statement all you have to do—as I did—is to talk to people along the Atlantic seaboard between New York and Florida.

What's happening in America is painfully evident but not to the right people. The Communists and the followers of Henry Wallace are trying to upset our national applecart by trying to peddle the idea that there are only two paths where an American citizen can walk—the extreme right or the extreme left. Eventually this line of reasoning would force a show-down and one side or the other would win.

There isn't much choice between the extreme left and the extreme right for my money. They are both poison. I've always

felt that moderation is the thing, a blending of all the ingredients that make up American thinking—acknowledging that one can be on the right and be partly right or on the left and be partly right.

I'd like to see the middle ground the meeting place, whereas the Red boys want to use it for the battleground. Divide and conquer is their motto all the way, and it always will be.

The United States is overloaded with all or nothing people who are making it tougher and tougher for a decent man to make a living and prosper according to his lights. People everywhere are dashing over cliffs because some demagogue tells them it is a good idea.

Is there any answer to this year of crisis? I think there is. But we'll never find it until we lose our Narcissus complex. We are not what we used to be and never will be again. Times, customs, and people have changed. We have to take the change in stride and absorb it without losing our identity.

I'm in favor of an all-out show-down with Russia now—in the name of peace and not on the principle there is no room in the world for communism. Matter of fact, a lot of darned fools think it is swell. We have got to be big enough to take the initiative and close the gap between the East and the West, or fight.

We must make it clear we're willing to fight to stop aggression. It isn't clear now. Being free with dollars and words isn't enough. Party politics will have to go by the board.

And at home? Remember this is a democracy made up of all shades of thinking which to work must blend together. The burden of proof is on us to show there is no need for or room for the Red shade. But before we can prove that we must first plug up the holes in our armor and practice democracy in all things, instead of covering some phases with mere talk.

We must make the Commies here look more and more ridiculous as time goes on, and they will die a natural death. But where we catch them in the act—a disloyal act—we must be ruthless instead of letting the word "democracy" serve as their club over us. Now is a good time to walk together in the middle and live long and prosper. And believe me, once we achieve a balance you won't find a Red in the middle—you just won't find him at all.

Racial Riders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 6, 1948:

RACIAL RIDERS

The House Appropriations Committee has acted wisely in striking down an attempt by one of its subcommittees to use the device of appropriation bill riders as a weapon against segregation in the South.

Under the subcommittee's rider, some $173,000,000 to be provided for such things as hospital construction, vocational rehabilitation, and education would be withheld from States which permit segregation in employment and in schools. In other words, if the Southern States wanted to share in these Federal funds, to which they would have contributed by payment of taxes, they would have to do away with the segregation practices at which the rider is aimed.

The full committee, by a vote of 25 to 6, struck out the rider, and wisely so. For it is idle to suppose that the problems raised by racial discrimination can or should be dealt with in any such manner as this.

In the first place, it is a mistake to think that the Southern States can be coerced into abandoning segregation through the device of withholding funds. If the rider were to be adopted its only result would be fewer schools, hospitals, and so forth, in the States where these facilities are needed most, by white and colored alike. Secondly, if the question of segregation in some States is a proper subject of Federal regulation, which is exceedingly doubtful, then the matter should be approached directly and openly, not through any such devious method as that set out in the subcommittee rider.

Some House leaders are reported to have said privately that it would be good politics to push the rider through when the bill comes to a vote on the floor. And it may be that it would enable the Republicans to pick up some Negro votes in States like New York and Illinois. Assuming this to be true, however, there is ample reason to believe that the partisan advantage gained by the Republicans would be more than offset by the damage done to the long-range effort to secure a better deal for the Negro in the South.

Our People Know What Is Going On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I receive many letters from the people of my congressional district which indicate conclusively that our people know what is going on. They now understand fully that the New Deal philosophy of planned economy means the ultimate and certain destruction of our American form of government. They can see where the camel has gotten his nose under the tent in several places, and they want every precaution taken to see that he gets no further. They know that all this paternalism that has been preached to the American people, and administered to them in the form of sugar-coated pills and bribery during the past 15 years, is leading straight to statism of some vile sort. It looks innocent at the beginning. Then a little authority is given to the bureaucrats, and they exercise control through Executive orders, directives, and virtual manifestoes.

The people now understand that the New Deal crowd apparently believes in government by men instead of by law, which is exactly what our forefathers would no longer tolerate when they came to this New World, and with which they were so familiar in the European countries from whence they came.

First, the do-gooders try to make the people believe that they want to benefit the less fortunate among our people. They inspire class hatred. Then they apply palliatives, socialistic indoctrinations, and, finally, under false leadership, communism might take over our Government.

For example, one of our clear-thinking and outstanding citizens of my district, who lives in a small town, has voluntarily written me his views. I am pleased to quote his letter in full:

MARCH 5, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: I think that the anti-lynching bill is another step in the Congress taking away the rights of States to look after their own business.

It would be just as logical for Congress to pass an anti-horse-thief law or an antipick-pocket law. Congress spends too much time messing with the business of the States.

This applies also with the educational bill. Just as sure as the National Government starts a school program some fellow like Wallace or Roosevelt will control and dictate the textbooks and the teachers, and we are then well on the road to communism.

Look at the communism that has been and is being taught in all of the colleges. Teachers College in ——— University has turned out thousands of teachers who are red or pink.

Why collect the taxes in the States and return it to an educational department of the State from which it came? Every State has the means to take care of their own schools.

A large majority of the big men of our country come from the rural schools. Let's keep those schools as they are, so that we may have more of that kind of men.

Vandenberg Plea Exposes Marshall Plan Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, March 6, 1948:

VANDENBERG PLEA EXPOSES MARSHALL PLAN WEAKNESS

I have long admired Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan as one of the two or three ablest men gracing the upper House of Congress.

He enjoys such unusual popularity with his colleagues of both parties that he is known as the "Senator's Senator."

VANDENBERG is virtually the only Member of the Senate who can pack the galleries whenever he delivers a major speech. He is a warmly precise orator and his deeply intoned phrases ring with a conviction reminiscent of the late Senator Borah at his best.

I think, however, that when VANDENBERG speaks in support of the Marshall plan his oratorical powers are more persuading than the meat of his text.

Here are a few statements taken from his speech of this week opening the debate on European recovery which do not seem to be supported by the facts:

"This country," said VANDENBERG, "must light the beacon of freedom in a world menaced by aggressive communism."

No one can deny that "aggressive communism" is on the march, but the implication that we have been tardy in "lighting the beacon of freedom" is preposterous. Senator VANDENBERG helped "light the beacon" at the

United Nations conference in San Francisco. No other country or combination of nations has done as much, either morally or financially, to support the cause of freedom everywhere as has the United States.

The Senator tells us that "Czechoslovakia already has been gutted by subversive conquest and the kindred fate of brave little Finland hangs in the balance."

The inference here is that we might have saved Czechoslovakia from the Russians and that prompt passage of the Marshall plan can still protect Finland from "aggressive communism."

The facts are that nothing we might have done, excepting only a declaration of war against Russia, could have stopped the Communists from taking over the Benes government in Czechoslovakia.

The facts are that nothing we can do now short of war will guarantee the freedom of Finland if the Russians decide the time is ripe for further conquest.

TRUMAN DOCTRINE CHARTS DEFECTS

Senator VANDENBERG'S phrase making reminds us of the arguments made in behalf of the Truman doctrine just one short year ago. We were told then that $400,000,000 was a small price to pay for "containing" Russia in Greece and Turkey.

At that time I endeavored to point out the fallacy of stopping communism with dollars and predicted that the $400,000,000 voted for the Truman doctrine was but the initial ante in the international poker game.

I said also that neither the money nor the presence of an American mission in Greece would prevent Russia from moving into both Greece and Turkey whenever she felt such a coup would be in her interest.

The correctness of the first prediction was borne out this week when the administration proposals for giving $275,000,000 more to Greece and Turkey were favored by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and won support from Senator TAFT, the Republican leader.

When the additional $275,000,000 has been exhausted, a cry will be heard for more and, as usual, Congress will vote it.

Nor is the drain upon our resources to stop there. Senator TAFT has now joined the "help China" bloc and states that he can see no reason why China should not get as much as Greece and Turkey.

So the tidy little sum of $570,000,000 is being earmarked for nonmilitary aid to Chiang Kai-shek. From our experience in the past, this gesture of good will toward China will be about as effective as giving every Chinaman a dollar bill for Christmas.

As Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampsire says, "The $570,000,000 economic-aid program to China will go down the drain unless Chiang Kai-shek gets the combat supplies he needs."

POLICY WOBBLES IN ALL DIRECTIONS

Our main difficulty is that we have no concerted program of action but ride ridiculously in all directions at the same time.

The $570,000,000 for China is labeled as nonmilitary aid. The additional $275,000,000 for Greece and Turkey is requested for military aid.

One hundred American Army tanks are being loaded at Brooklyn for shipment to Turkey. Yet Senator BRIDGES complains that not a single combat plane or bomber has been delivered to the Chinese since August 1946.

The poverty of our diplomacy is such that we have abandoned all efforts to reach an accord with Russia. Our previous failures in that direction are discouraging, to be sure, but the hope of finding a basis of understanding must never be permitted to die.

If our State Department and military experts are convinced that war with Russia is inevitable, the course we are following is even more preposterous.

Is anyone so utterly naive as to believe that bales of American money and a tiny force of technical advisers in Greece could stop a Russian military thrust?

If we intend to fight, why didn't we demand suitable air bases in Greece and Turkey as a condition of the loan?

Are we such innocents as to be convinced that $570,000,000 more for China in nonmilitary aid will mean the success of Chiang Kai-shek's efforts to hold off the Communists?

Why are we so chary of demanding that the Marshall plan money be subject to conditions that will prove beneficial to the recipients as well as to ourselves? Is it because, as one State Department official stated, "We must do nothing to offend these proud and sensitive people?"

Air bases located strategically in the area covered by the 16 Marshall plan nations might ruffle the feelings of a few diplomats and politicians, but American air power could also save their necks.

The only way to stop Russian expansion in Europe is to draw a boundary line and warn Stalin to stay on the other side.

GOP SUPPORT INSURES PASSAGE

Now that most of the Republicans in Congress, including those with Presidential ambitions, have swung over to the Marshall plan, it is certain to pass substantially as proposed.

I predict that it will prove no more than a temporary palliative, that the money will go down the drain as fast or faster than did the British loan of $3,250,000,000.

The plan will fail because, as Senator VANDENBERG unwittingly stated in romancing with the dictionary, it is an "adventure" which in our judgment lacks the practical considerations that might make it a passable success.

Bernard Baruch was right when he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the European recovery program would be futile unless the participating nations showed a "readiness to stand up and fight for their independence and freedom."

To date, that "readiness" is not apparent.

Our country is suffering from lack of direction and firmness of purpose. Henry Wallace touched the inherent weakness in Harry Truman when he said in connection with the Palestine problem, "Truman talks like a Jew and acts like an Arab."

The President has, on rare occasions, shown symptoms of statesmanship but, given a little time, he invariably reverts to the level of a Missouri politician.

It is tragic indeed that in one of the most difficult periods of our national history, we should have a President of such mediocre quality.

There are times such as this when we have our doubts about Congress, too.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Rent Controls Benefit in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly convinced that, in the long run, rent controls benefit in reverse.

The New Deal crowd, those who are determined against all odds to exercise paternalistic domination over our citizens and their economy, are actually doing a great disservice to the very people they profess to aid. That was the strategy employed by Napoleon Bonaparte, and has been the technique used by dictators and tyrants. It is the device of the Communists themselves. They always try to appeal to the misfortunes and sympathies of the less-privileged groups. They tell them how they are going to help them, and then the benefit is always in reverse.

With reference to rent control, I think anyone who knows the program and the manner of its administration, will understand that it has, in some instances, given the property owners and real-estate men the opportunity to oppress the very people whom the rent-control authorities profess to help.

I have heard of many situations similar to the one described in a letter which I have just received from one of my constituents. I quote from this letter, in order that it may be clearly seen that the rent-control program is operating in reverse, and is positively detrimental to many whom it is supposed to benefit, and results in actually benefiting the property owners, enabling them to take unfair advantage of the people who must have houses:

TULSA, OKLA., *March 6, 1948.*

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: I have told you before, but I would like to repeat, that from a personal mercenary standpoint, I do not care whether rent controls are continued or not. In fact, I am sure I can make more money with rent controls in effect, and at the expense of the unfortunate victims of the act.

Here is the point I am referring to, and I do hope that you or someone will be able to show the Congress why every country that has kept rent controls has wound up with nothing to rent.

Let us assume that you and I own some five-room houses that were bought originally as a rental-property investment. The OPA now has an area rent level (here in Tulsa) of $25 to $45 per month on five-room houses, the exact ceiling depending on how much furniture and utilities we furnish.

Real estate has been my main life work since 1929 here in Tulsa, and I will guarantee you that it is possible to sell a five-room house at this time for $7,500 without even showing it to the prospective buyer if you can furnish him sufficient guarantee that it is an average livable place. Many 5-room houses are selling as high as $15,000 to $18,000.

A person paying one-half the purchase price as a down payment will usually demand not over 4½ to 5 percent interest on the loan carried back. If you will let a person have the same house, who can only pay 5 percent or 10 percent down, he will pay from 6 percent to 10 percent interest on the loan carried back.

You can see that we would be absolute idiots to rent our houses for even the $45 rate. The least we would have to take would be 5 percent down payment and 7 percent interest on the balance for a period of from 1 to 30 years before we demanded the principal or foreclosure; and at a sale price of $7,500 we would have $40 to $45 and the other bird would be paying the taxes, insurance, maintenance, and assuming the responsibility. * * * Thousands of property owners will never again have faith in a promise from Congress, especially a promise to decontrol their properties, as was promised in the 1947 act.

The Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Frank C. Waldrop, commenting on my extension of remarks in the RECORD of March 2, which appeared in the Times-Herald on March 4, 1948:

THE RECORD

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Believe it or not, there are still some people around here who quibble about the facts which show that nobody can be a Communist and a good citizen of the United States of America or any other country except Soviet Russia.

Of those who quibble, the few who attempt to explain their stall generally base it on the claim that they have no proof of Communist aims and aspirations in the world.

That, obviously, is boloney, for the proof has been piling up in plain sight for anybody to see, these 30 years past. But still, just to cover the point again, anybody who wants a few facts to look in the face should get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, March 2, 1948.

There, on page A1286, he will find some material submitted by Representative W. KINGSLAND MACY (Republican), of New York, which ought to penetrate even Henry Wallace's concrete skull, if Wallace had the honesty to let facts meet him face to face.

The material mentioned is a series of declarations by high Soviet officials, through their new version of the old Communist International, the central party organization which laid down rules of guidance for the Communist Parties in different countries, to direct these parties along courses most effective for Russia.

This new version is called the Communist information bureau, and in the Communist jargon, this has been shortened to Cominform as the old title was cut down to Comintern.

The gent who laid down the law for the Cominform in this case was A. Zhdanov, the bright young man of the politburo, the ruling cabinet of all communism, under Stalin. This Zhdanov is supposed to be Stalin's successor to the supreme post of power when old (69) Joe kicks the bucket.

Following Zhdanov, a series of other party big shots issued their own variants upon the main theme, but all came back to a central point, that:

The struggle for the world today is between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Only one can win. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is out to win and every Communist everywhere has a flat duty to do what he is told, to be sure of the Red victory.

In making his point, Zhdanov describes the United States, its people and its Government, in language more insulting than even Hitler used. No thanks for our saving Russia's neck. No gratitude for all those billions in lend-lease. No flicker of appreciation for Roosevelt's abject surrenders to Stalin at Yalta and Truman's further surrenders to Stalin at Potsdam.

Just cold, ruthless, one-way declaration of a naked struggle for power, today, and to hell with yesterday. That's the Communist program, set forth in 16 columns of fine print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all filled with abuse and vilification of the United States.

Said Mr. MACY in explaining why he put this amazingly clear and candid blueprint for world war into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The articles leave no doubt that the international Communist movement considers the United States to be the chief stumbling block to world-wide Communist control and as such is to be made the chief target of attack by Communists throughout the world, including the United States Communists.
* * *

"I would like to call particular attention to the admission by Soviet Leader Malenkov that the Soviet Union maintains social and political contacts with organizations in other countries through which it strengthens the international influence of the Soviet Union."

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as Mr. MACY further pointed out, is widely circulated in school and college libraries all over the United States. This material here mentioned, is therefore now available for national study and analysis.

It will be interesting to see how many college professors draw on it as an unquestionable source of material from which to build a judgment on communism, its aims and aspirations in the world.

For years the professors have been ducking that problem.

When cornered, they usually fall back on the story that "all the literature on the Comintern and Communist world aims is old, prewar, and out of date."

That alibi no longer will work. This is all material dating from November 10, 1947. And damning.

Gerald L. K. Smith Goes Berserk Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I found on my desk yesterday, as many other Members of the House no doubt did, a communication dated March 4, 1948, over the signature of the scurrilously hatemongering Gerald L. K. Smith. The statement is maliciously vicious. It is invidiously libelous. Like the filthy outpourings of a psychoneurotic, it pretends that the author loves everybody, while stirring up hatred against all.

For the benefit of those who may read that statement and not know the facts, I answer his charges in the order in which he makes them:

First. No self-respecting American, Christian or Jew, is in favor of appeasement of Stalin. American Jews, like all other good Americans, were opposed to appeasement at Munich. They are more vigorously opposed to appeasement at the Kremlin. Negotiations for peace with honor, but with firm opposition to aggrandizement, is not appeasement.

Second. No American, Christian or Jew, has urged the sending of munitions and arms to the Jewish underground in Palestine. We forthrightly demand that munitions and arms be sent to the Jewish militia in Palestine, so that peaceful Arabs and Jews alike may be defended against the unprovoked piratical attacks of Arab brigands.

Third. No Jew, American, or Palestinian, asks that a single American boy be sent to Palestine by this country. All that the civilized world asks is that the men, women, and children in Palestine be given the opportunity and the wherewithal to defend themselves.

A new state should be proclaimed at once in Palestine. It should be recognized by our Government, and it should be encouraged in every possible way to establish a democracy that will be a bulwark against aggression and against communism.

To Save the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the House on the Palestine question and urged the immediate lifting of the arms embargo which our Government announced on December 5 last. I pointed out the problem that would on May 15 next confront the Zionists in Palestine when Great Britain surrenders its mandate. I am pleased to include in my remarks herein a forthright editorial which appeared on this subject in the New York Times on March 8, 1948, and which reads as follows:

TO SAVE THE PEACE

On May 15 Britain will give up her Palestine mandate and withdraw her troops from the Holy Land. Unless the United Nations acts decisively before that date this withdrawal will certainly be followed by disaster. The United Nations is now in the position of having issued the partition decree and having taken no steps to enforce it. The tragedy of Palestine will therefore be a shattering blow to the UN as well as to world peace. Yet in the face of this grim fact the Security Council on Friday voted a delay of at least 10 days by referring the matter to the permanent members of the Council. No postponement of the evacuation date of May 15 was included.

We do not believe 10 days should be needed or ought to be wasted while blood flows in Palestine and the situation there steadily degenerates. We believe two steps can be and should be taken, immediately, by the Security Council and member governments which may avert the impending calamity: (1) The United Nations should forthwith urge the British mandatory power to grant Haganah, the Jewish militia in Palestine, a de jure status in place of the de facto status already reluctantly accorded. After all, the Zionists, whose lives are now in danger, are in Palestine because of British cooperation. The barest good faith demands that they be allowed to protect themselves. We believe Britain could ill afford to ignore this recommendation of UN, and that she will rise in the world's good opinion if she follows the wise and humane course. (2) We believe that the United Nations should urge the United States and other UN member countries to lift any embargo they may have placed on the supply of arms to the legal Zionist

militia, and that they, too, under the pressure of this world recommendation, will act accordingly.

These steps will not relieve the United Nations of the ultimate responsibility for policing Palestine and for protecting it against invasion from without. Haganah, however, officially recognized and supplied, may be able to hold the line until further help can be organized or until the Arab dissenters realize that they cannot defy the power and public opinion of the rest of the world. But action must be swift. The lives of many people, the prestige of the United Nations and peace itself depend on this decision.

Our Lend-Lease Built Up Russian Fishing Industry To Compete With Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the folly of our lend-lease program seems to be demonstrated in many ways. The New Deal program of giving our substance to foreigners, and especially to foreign governments whose ideologies are diametrically opposed to ours, is now operating adversely to the best interests of our own citizens. It served to build up governments and foreign competitors, much to our present dismay and embarrassment. For example, the following newspaper article, with a Portland, Oreg., date line, published in the Wall Street Journal of February 27, 1948, shows what lend-lease to Russia has done and is doing to our American fishing industry. I quote the newspaper item:

BIGGEST UNITED STATES FISHING SHIP TO SAIL FOR BERING SEA; FACES RUSSIAN RIVALRY

PORTLAND, OREG.—The Pacific Explorer, the Nation's largest deep-sea fishing vessel, is preparing to sail from Seattle for the Bering Sea to catch king crab, bottom fish, and other species, canners report.

Northwest sources expect the ship may run into Russian competition as that nation was given 10 cannery ships and 7 refrigerated fisheries ships through lend-lease. The possibility that Russia may have obtained Japanese ships and gear and built ships of her own is also mentioned. Japanese fishermen were very active in those waters before the war.

Previous American efforts in the area were limited. For the past 2 years nearly all king crab reaching Pacific ports has been sold fresh. A successful expedition would make canned king crab available. The ship is able to can and store more than 3,500 tons of seafood. Nick Nez, of Seattle, is owner of the *Pacific Explorer*.

An intelligent constituent of mine, a lifelong Democrat and a good American, sent me this newspaper clipping to which he attached his own words in the following language: "O Lord, how long. Only by the grace of Republican western isolation Congressmen who have delayed the Marshall plan have we escaped having billions of 'aid' to Czechoslovakia from falling in the hands of that great and good 'democracy' (Russia). Let's send them some more lend-lease; they are our 'good allies.' Mr. R. is the authority for that."

The longer the give-away Marshall plan is postponed and action thereon delayed, the more truth we are able to ascertain, and perhaps the more money we will save, and eventually the greater good that will result to the European countries, from their being forced to rely upon their own resources.

It is deplorable to contemplate that our lend-lease built up the Russian fishing industry to compete with Americans. It is even more deplorable to contemplate what a large percentage of all financial aid furnished by the United States to the European nations, since the shooting war was over, has found its way into Russia and Russian satellite countries. Our program has been likened by many to pouring sand in a rat hole. It is building up foreign governments in competition with our own. Most deplorable of all, by advocating and following this course, the New Dealers have weakened our own resourcefulness and apparently will impoverish our people and Government until we would be no stronger than the foreign governments. The whole program seriously endangers our economy, and, at the same time, tends to build up Russian competition with the American industries.

Raise in Ceiling and Raise in Subsistence Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, in order to completely understand the implications of the passage of the so-called raise in subsistence and raise in ceiling legislation, which are amendments to the original so-called GI bill of rights, we must review the pertinent provisions of the original legislation—Public Law 346.

Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, makes provision for the payment of subsistence allowances in the amount of $65 per month if without dependents, and $90 per month if with dependents, to veterans who are enrolled in a course of either institutional or on-the-job training. This allowance has been referred to as a cost-of-living allowance.

From the effective date of Public Law 346 until the effective date of Public Law 679 there was no limit placed on the amount a trainee could earn and still draw his subsistence allowance. As a result of certain abuses which obtained without a ceiling, Public Law 679 was enacted, which placed ceilings of $175 per month if without dependents, and $200 per month if with dependents, which meant that if the combined amount of salary or other income plus the subsistence allowance amounted to more than the ceiling figure, the subsistence would be reduced by the amount which the total exceeded the ceiling. An example of the way the ceiling works is to be found in the case of a veteran trainee who is without dependents and whose ceiling is $175 per month; when the total income of this trainee exceeds $175 per month by $25 then his subsistence would be cut to $40 per month instead of $65. When this veteran's income reaches $240 per month—175 plus 65—then he would lose all subsistence payments.

As a result of the higher cost of living which now obtains as compared with the cost of living at the time Public Law 346 was passed and with due regard to the fact that a trainee engaged in a full-time institutional course has little if any time to earn money in addition to his subsistence allowance, the Eightieth Congress enacted into law Public Law 411, which grants increases in subsistence allowances to those who are engaged in full-time institutional training. Under Public Law 411 the subsistence payments are raised from $65 per month to $75 for a trainee without dependents; from $90 to $105 if with one dependent; and from $90 to $120 if with more than one dependent. Public Law 411 does not provide any increase in subsistence to those engaged in part-time institutional work.

Since Public Law 377, first session, Eightieth Congress, defines institutional-on-the-farm training as full-time educational work for the purpose of subsistence and tuition payments, it was felt that trainees engaged in this program should have been granted the increase in subsistence that was granted to other institutional trainees under Public Law 411. When 411 was passed in the House, it was with the full understanding on the part of members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that the institutional-on-the-farm trainees would be included in the raise in subsistence. Because of a contradictory understanding in the Senate, the Veterans' Administration Solicitor ruled that trainees in this category did not qualify for the increase.

S. 1393, which provides for raising the ceiling on the amount a trainee can earn and still be entitled to his subsistence allowance, was in conference between the House and Senate at the time the Solicitor's ruling was effected. Since S. 1393 proposed to amend the same section of the basic law, Public Law 346, an amendment to this bill to correct 411 so as to include the farm trainees in the raise in subsistence was held to be germane and was finally agreed to in conference.

The conference amendment to S. 1393 does not grant the same amount of increase to the farm trainees as is granted to full-time institutional trainees, since the farm trainees only spend approximately one-fourth of a normal full-class time-load in class. They do, however, receive one-fourth of the increase that is granted under Public Law 411. This amendment also includes all part-time institutional trainees on a proportional basis, which means that trainees who spend part of their time in classroom work and part of their time on other work will be paid a partial increase in

subsistence allowance in direct proportion to the amount of time spent in classroom work.

As a result of the work done in conference on S. 1393, all veterans taking training under the GI bill of rights will be entitled to all benefits accruing as a result of the raised ceilings, regardless of the type training they are taking.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Paul E. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the Democratic State committee, today called on the New York congressional delegation and the public to back a bipartisan and humanitarian revolt against biased Republican legislation blocking the rescue of displaced persons from a living death in Europe by admission to the United States.

Denouncing the Revercomb bill, approved by the Republican-dominated Senate Judiciary Committee, Mr. Fitzpatrick termed it totally inadequate, biased in its screening provisions, and a reversal of this Nation's foreign policy, amounting to recognition of Soviet conquests of the Baltic states.

In his statement, Mr. Fitzpatrick stressed that the "revolt" in Congress has enlisted Republicans as well as Democrats, and that admittance of 400,000, four times the number proposed by the Revercomb bill, was first called for by President Truman.

Mr. Fitzpatrick's statement follows:

Today in European camps there are 1,300,000 displaced persons, homeless and unwanted, half of them women and children, four-fifths of them Christians, and all victims of religious, political, or nationalistic persecution.

The Revercomb bill, approved by the Republican-dominated Senate Judiciary Committee, will accomplish nothing. Its screening provisions mix occupational and housing restrictions with deliberate racism. There can be no other motive behind the Revercomb bill limiting immigrants to those in Germany, Austria, and Italy in December 1945 than to bar Jewish refugees from Poland in 1946. Also, by specifying that half of those admitted must be from the Baltic states, the Revercomb bill reverses our foreign policy by recognizing Soviet conquests.

No wonder Republicans as well as Democrats have refused to support this measure. I urge strongly upon the New York congressional delegation, Democratic and Republican, and on all citizens, to back this bipartisan and humanitarian move to defeat the Revercomb bill.

The needed legislation must be in line with proposals first advanced by President Truman, with liberal screening provisions, providing for the admission of 400,000 displaced persons in the next 4 years. This total would be less than half the number of quota immigrants who could have legally entered this country between 1939 and 1945, but were prevented because of the war. Bipartisan and humanitarian drives in both Houses of Congress deserve the wholehearted support of all of us.

Selfishly, it is to our own interest, for among the victims are skilled and unskilled, farm and domestic workers, nurses and doctors who would help fill our needs as useful citizens. It is also a sacred duty. We saved them from Nazi domination. We cannot abandon them to a continued living death or Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that most of the Members of Congress recognized the fact that none of us would be here today if there had been restrictions against immigration when our ancestors left their foreign homes for these shores.

Mikolajczyk Describes the Bloody Mechanism of the Soviet Polish Police State and the Soviet Way for Free Elections in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks two additional articles as set forth in the Milwaukee Sentinel of the tragic loss of liberty in Poland as described by the former Prime Minister, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk.

The articles follow:

POLAND SWINDLED ON COAL BY RUSSIA

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XXII)

Russia's economic enslavement of Poland began at the command appearance of the Polish provisional government in Moscow in August 1945, only a month after the Americans and British had left the Potsdam Conference more or less content that they had insured the future freedom of our country.

On the second night of our Moscow talks, three Polish Communists, who had been placed high in the provisional government by Stalin, agreed to give the USSR a 51 percent share in the ownership and mangemaent of the properties we had acquired in the area which Potsdam had ruled must be administered only by the Polish Government.

The Poles who bowed to this demand were President Bierut, Hilary Minc, Minister of Industry and Commerce, and Foreign Minister Zygmunt Modzelewski.

OBJECTS TO DEAL

"I'll never agree to this," I told them, and then I received support from a wholly unexpected source. Prime Minister Osobka-Morawski had not been invited to attend the session of the night before. The snub hurt his vanity. He strongly objected to the deal and, for once, Russia offered a counterproposal.

It demanded 12,000,000 tons of Polish coal per year during the Red Army's occupation of Germany. That meant most of our coal. At first Molotov insisted that no charge be made for the coal, but after much argument it was agreed that Russia would pay the bare cost of mining it, which was between $5 and $6 a ton.

However, after Osobka-Morawski officially signed the agreement we discovered that Minc had permitted the Russians to insert a clause whereby they had to pay only $2.25 a ton. We had been offered $12 a ton—later $16—by Denmark and Sweden.

I stormed at this robbery but was accused of trying to break Soviet-Polish relations. I reminded them that the Swedish were willing to give us 100,000,000 kroner of credit in advance, and that from this we could obtain the transport, food, tools and electrical supplies our country so desperately needed in its rehabilitation program.

DISMISSED LIKE VASSALS

I told them that we had now agreed to pay the U. S. S. R.—which should be paying us—the equivalent of $100,000,000 a year.

But it was useless. The thing had been done. We were dismissed like vassals and told to go back to Warsaw.

The political enslavement of Poland had progressed since we left. The Communists had set up Communist parties with the same names as the established independent parties of Poland, or had seized control of the top positions of those parties.

My own Peasant Party had a rival of the same name, but Communist. And it was in this atmosphere of tremendous political disorder and bewilderment that I left Poland to attend the formation meeting of UN's food and agricultural organization in Quebec.

The chairman of my party, Wincenty Witos, died while I was abroad. Upon my return to Poland in November 1945 I completed the task of reorganizing the Peasant Party so as to separate it from the Communist group of the same name.

The day after that meeting, Wladislaw Kojder, a member of our executive committee, was dragged from his home by security police. His body was found in a nearby woods with 30 bullets in it.

Upon my return to Warsaw after that Krakow meeting, I learned also that 500 members of the Polish Peasant Party—as we now called ourselves—had been arrested at Tarnobrzeg.

The security policy killed our general secretary, Boleslaw Scibiorek. A year later and on the eve of the fixed election, they started a "trial" in which they attempted to prove that we ourselves had ordered the illegal Polish underground to murder Scibiorek. They treacherously involved Madam Dmochowska, an employee of the United States Embassy.

At least seven complete Polish villages were burned because their people refused to become Communists.

THOUSANDS MURDERED

Security police stations became torture houses for hundreds of thousands of Poles arrested for believing in the lofty precepts laid down by the Americans and British and agreed to by Stalin. Untold thousands were murdered.

A bare summary of these arrests, killings, and other examples of political terror, which I turned over to Ambassadors of the Big Three as early as January 1947 filled more than 400 pages.

Since its "liberation" by the Red Army, Poland has had two experiences with balloting. From the time of the Atlantic Charter to Potsdam, the leaders of the Allies spoke of "free elections." But in Poland's case its only two attempts to vote freely have been frustrated by Communists.

The referendum of June 30, 1946, was primarily a pretext to avert that part of the Yalta agreement which called for a free and unfettered election in Poland. The Communist-dominated Polish Provisional Government picked three questions on which the people could express their sentiments. The Government planned to take the results of the balloting and say to the United States and Britain: "You see, why should we be forced to hold an election? Everybody in

the country agrees on these fundamental issues."

Here are the questions which were asked in the three-question referendum:

1. Are you in favor of the abolishment of the Senate?

2. Are you for making permament through the future Constitution the economic system instituted by the land-reform and nationalization of the basic industries with maintenance of the rights of private enterprise?

3. Are you for the Polish western frontiers as fixed on the Baltic and on the Oder and Neisse?

The Communists felt that the Polish Peasant Party as well as all other independents would vote "Yes" because we did not wish to sound reactionary.

I decided to vote "No" on the No. 1 question, and urged this course upon my party as a "protest against political terror, against dissolving local units of the Polish Peasant Party, against false arrests and censorship." Our slogan was, "If you vote 'Yes' on the first question you are giving a vote of confidence to the provisional government."

On the day of the referendum the people of Poland went to the polls. They voted "Yes" overwhelmingly in response to questions No. 2 and No. 3.

But question No. 1 was now the big issue.

COUNTED BY INDEPENDENTS

In Krakow, a group of fellow travelers assigned to count the ballots became so frightened at what the ballots showed that they simply ran from the central counting office—and independents took over, counted the votes, and sent the results to Warsaw before the fellow travelers returned.

These results reached print in official announcements, which is the reason the Communist propaganda mills proclaimed Krakow a "reactionary town which must be punished."

Brave commissions were able to save their ballot boxes in parts of 14 of the 16 provinces of Poland. These boxes represented 2,805 districts. On the matter of question No. 1 they showed: No, 83.54 percent; yes, 16.46 percent.

The provisional government announced the official result after 10 days. Their count on question No. 1, they said, showed: No, 32 percent; yes, 68 percent.

Under threat of immediate suspension, we were forced to print the official announcement in Gazeta Ludowa.

In the meantime I had been able to show foreign correspondents thousands of ballots, partly burned, which the security police had seized and thrown away—because they contained the word "No" in response to the first question.

In the end, the Communists—operating on direct orders from the Kremlin—had to steal the election.

STALIN DICTATED POLISH VOTE RESULTS

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Installment XXIII)

The exact mathematical outcome of Poland's free and unfettered election of January 1947 was arranged by Josef Stalin at the Kremlin on August 28, 1946.

Stalin fixed the date of the election. He fixed the exact number of votes which he would permit each of the Polish political parties to receive. And he fixed the explanation which the Polish Government must put forward in event of protests.

SOCIALIST PREMIER

His orders were given to Jacob Berman, chief of the Polish Politburo; Wladyslaw Gomulka, first vice premier of Poland and general secretary of the Communist Party in Poland; President Boleslaw Bierut, communistic head of the National Council; Edward Osobka-Morawski, the Communist-sponsored Socialist who then was Prime Minister of the Polish provisional government; Stanislaw Szwalbe, Vice President of Poland; and Josef Cyrankiewicz, general secretary of the corrupted Polish Socialist Party.

Cyrankiewicz, it was decided, would be made Prime Minister of the new government and a member of the Politburo—the shadow government which is really ruling Poland today. His appointment would appease elements of the Socialist government in Britain and France, for Cyrankiewicz was professedly a Socialist.

Stalin ruled at this meeting that no matter how many votes were cast in favor of Polish Peasant Party candidates it must be announced that we attracted only 10 percent of the total cast.

PAPER PROTEST

One of the Socialists spoke up and asked, "But what about the American and British? What will they do?"

"Don't worry about the Americans and British," Stalin said. "There will be no war about elections. They will make a protest, but this will only be a paper protest.

"You will reject this protest and issue continuous propaganda to the effect that Mikolajczyk's party lost because he associated himself with the criminal underground, turned pro-German by opposing the new western boundaries of Poland, is a conservative who wishes to back the capitalists and land owners, and is a foreign agent for intelligence and capitalism.

"If you repeat these charges enough, some of the people in the United States and Britain will believe you, and they won't join in the protest their government will make."

GETS REAL FIGURES

Stalin then dismissed them, after ordering them to send him—secretly—the real figures on the election.

On September 18, over my protests and those of the United States and British Governments, the Communist-nominated provisional Parliament servilely passed an election law which provided:

1. The western areas would have greater proportionate representation in the forthcoming elected parliament;

2. Any Pole suspected of previous collaboration with the Germans, or current collaboration with the criminal underground, would be deprived of the vote.

That sounded reasonable enough to the outer world, but we knew there was a secret side to each clause. We knew that a member of Parliament would be chosen from every 20,000 inhabitants of the western areas (as opposed to one MP for every 12,000 in the more populous sections of Poland).

The people of western Poland in all classes had become completely dependent on the Communist administration and therefore would be more malleable than the franchised voters in that part of Poland where a measure of private enterprise still existed.

We agreed with point No. 2, on its face value. But we demanded that the "suspected" be given a fair hearing in advance and by competent judges.

But this law gave the right of election commissioners to be the sole judge in this matter.

We later produced incontrovertible evidence that in some villages as much as 70 percent of the eligible population was deprived of the vote, and, in countless cases, Polish Peasant Party candidates were scratched off the ballot by these commissioners.

I cast my vote in a polling place on Marszalkowska Street in Warsaw. I stood in a queue for 2 hours, while Communists marched past and spat on me. Then one of my friends called several members of the foreign press. When they appeared with their cameramen the Communists faded away, the door of the polling place opened, and the line began to move.

BARRED IN 11 AREAS

An area of Poland inhabited by 5,342,000 people (22 percent) was not given alternate candidates because the only opposition—our list of candidates—had been ruled invalid. We were barred in 11 of the 52 constituencies in the country. Thus 76 of the 444 members of Parliament gained office in uncontested balloting

But they still had to steal the election.

At the closing of the polls, the commissioners—acting on orders enforced by the presence of the security police—systematically burned all those Polish Peasant Party ballots in excess of 10 percent.

The official announcement, abiding by Stalin's ruling, stated that the "Government-bloc" candidates had attracted 90 percent of the people's votes. We had attracted 10 percent, the statement said.

And then, to their hot embarrassment, the Polish Communists were obliged to report secretly to Stalin that their efforts—which constituted the vilest fraud in recent history—had failed. They had to tell this master architect of the crime that the Polish Peasant Party candidates had polled 74 percent of all the votes cast.

Thus did a wholly terrorized people gloriously prove their political maturity and their unquenchable determination to be free.

THE AFTERMATH

Here is what happened to Poland after the election.

As Stalin predicted, the Americans and British protested. And, as he demanded, those protests were ignored. Molotov bluntly told Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, United States Ambassador, that Russia would not enter into any Big Three arrangement to investigate conditions in Poland "because that would constitute a violation of Polish sovereignty."

Britain, after a formal protest which was similarly ignored, then did a remarkable thing. It invited what BBC hailed as the "cream of the Polish judiciary" to tour England.

POLES JOKE AT BID

The embittered people of Poland made a joke of this invitation.

"England must need advice on how to falsify an election," they said.

At first the Polish Peasant Party, which had been given 27 of the new Parliament's 444 seats, agreed to boycott the first session. But then I realized that Parliament afforded us our only opportunity to speak our minds, and that perhaps some of our protests and sentiments might reach the outside world.

So we went to the opening of Parliament.

LOSES FIRST MOVE

My first set-back in the new Parliament was the defeat of my motion that the election of the speaker be secret. Then I rose to protest the wording of the oath which the new President would take. It made no mention of God.

The meeting was recessed for a short time for a star-chamber session, in which we were not invited. When it reopened, it was announced that the words "so help me God" had been added to the oath. God's aid was now being invoked not for free Poland but for Communist rule of Poland.

SPEECH CENSORED

And the next day the controlled press stated that Catholic and Communist members of Parliament had insisted that God's name be mentioned in the oath. My own speech was censored completely.

The fight between the church and the Communists is the last open struggle left in Poland today.

The body of Poland has been cruelly crushed. Its heart and soul remain untrampled. What has happened to Poland has not killed the will of its people to gain the freedom that was not only promised them by solemn pacts but is abundantly due them as human beings.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement by Samuel B. Pettengill. Mr. Pettengill is a Democrat and a former Member of the House of Representatives from Indiana. The statement follows:

PEACE-LOVING MENACE

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

Senator VANDENBERG opened the debate on the Marshall plan with almost the same language that was used for the United Nations Charter, the Bretton Woods plan, the loan to England, etc., saying, "This will determine our fate for generations." It will, he says, take Europe "completely off the dole at the end of the adventure." We have heard that before.

It is time to cut out the flowery promises and get down to brass tacks. The American people want to know that some hard-boiled Americans are going to run the Marshall program, and not have more billions dissipated in a world-wide WPA, run either by bleeding hearts or left-wing Quislings who need UNRRA money to build up Stalin.

They want a foreign policy that they can understand. The Marshall plan is advocated as a weapon in the "cold war" against Russia, yet the author of the plan, Secretary Marshall, said it is "not directed against any country or doctrine." Russia was, in fact, invited to come in, and President Truman sent Secretary Marshall to China to induce Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists to get together.

TIME TO GET SENSIBLE

Yes; it is time to get down to earth about America's billions. Since the war in Europe ended, we have already given to the 16 countries in the Marshall plan $11,724,000,000. Now another $17,000,000,000. That's $38,000,000,000 since the war. Last March $400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey. Now, Marshall says we must add $275,000,000 to that, and $570,000,000 to China, and a sweating Congressman shouts, "We have failed Indonesia!" And the Latin Americans, who live on an average of $2.50 a week, will be next in line. Where will it stop? How much longer can we go on in this drunken profligate fashion?

Secretary of Commerce Harriman has just now informed us that "Russia is a greater menace than Hitler was." He was a long time waking up. He went there as our Ambassador in October in 1943.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has just issued a report that the "Communists have one goal—world revolution." Rip Van Winkle has had a good snooze. The Dies committee told us the same thing 10 years ago, but the administration laughed at that.

The warning flags have been flying since 1919, at least, when Lenin said: "The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states is unthinkable. * * * A series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

Despite the red flag of danger, we gave Russia $11,260,343,603 in lend-lease. Even since the war ended we gave her $168,000,000. And since the war, $301,000,000 to Yugoslavia, $174,000,000 to Czechoslovakia, $349,000,000 to Poland, and lesser sums to Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania. Billions thrown away—swallowed up by the great peace-loving greater menace than Hitler.

ASLEEP AT SWITCH

Was everybody in Washington asleep at the switch? Billions to build up Russia and her satellites; more billions to stop Stalin's forward march; UNRRA, Export-Import loans, and gifts of war-surplus materials were made to the same peace-loving menace. And Poland, Finland, the Baltic countries, Manchuria, etc., were sacrificed to this peace-loving menace. Our leaders drove through all traffic lights.

Don't say this is beating old straw. It isn't. It is in this year's campaign. If the Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg stand against Russia is right, Roosevelt was wrong. Wallace says Roosevelt was right.

Not counting our own war costs, we have poured $73,000,000,000 into Europe and Asia, and may pour in $17,000,000,000 more on two foreign policies, diametrically opposed. Our statesmen's education comes high.

Are High Taxes Deflationary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from a constituent of mine, Mr. Arthur Hugh Jenkins, of Jenkintown, Pa.:

DEAR MR. MCCONNELL: Could not something be done to explode the absurd delusion that high taxes are deflationary because they soak up purchasing power?

In fact, the real effect is exactly the opposite of this.

It is true that each taxpayer's purchasing power is reduced for a few weeks or months when he pays an excessive tax. But at the same time it puts on him the strongest possible pressure to increase his earnings for the future.

He pushes up the selling price of whatever he has for sale—goods or services—just as far and as fast as he can.

What applies to one taxpayer applies to the whole body of taxpayers. With most of the population pushing in the one direction—upward—salaries, prices, and wages must and do go up.

That is inflation; and high taxes, or the high cost of government, is the real cause of it.

The very first step to limit inflation (it can't be stopped as yet) is to reduce taxes; high taxes are violently inflationary.

The high cost of today's living is the direct and inevitable result of the high cost of government since 1933, and we are simply deluding ourselves if we suppose that anything can be done about the first until the second is fixed.

A Bill To Amend Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a factual summary, prepared by myself, of the provisions of H. R. 5751, which I introduced this week to amend the present old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act.

Time and experience have revealed injustices and shortcomings in the old-age and survivors' insurance law. Some of the defects in this law are exceedingly bad—even absurd—and should be corrected immediately.

These will be corrected in time, because, judging from my mail, the people are demanding their correction. I am hopeful that the present Congress will wipe out some of the absurd injustices and shortcomings of the old-age and survivors' insurance law.

My bill, H. R. 5751, provides that coverage by old-age and survivors' insurance shall be extended to all self-employed persons other than those in agriculture; that employees of nonprofit and membership organizations shall be permitted to enjoy the benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance; and that employees of States, counties and cities, and their subdivisions, shall be covered and protected by old-age and survivors' insurance.

My bill, H. R. 5751, provides, in compliance with constitutional limitations, that workers of States and their subdivisions may be brought under the benefits of this old-age insurance by means of voluntary compacts entered into between the States and the Federal Government. In the cases of certain State, county, and city groups which have pension systems of their own, such as teachers, policemen, and firemen, the question of whether these groups are to be included or excluded under old-age and survivors' insurance is left to the decision of the individual States. Thus groups of employees with their own pension system in effect will have the say as to whether they wish to be included under old-age and survivors' insurance.

I have excluded agricultural classes from my bill, H. R. 5751, only for the reason that administration of this insurance system for farm groups is complex, and I feel the details of their inclusion under old-age and survivors' insurance should be worked out by Congressmen with a background of farm experience, which I lack. I am hopeful farm Congressmen will endeavor to do this in the not distant future.

Extension of old-age and survivors' insurance coverage is highly desirable for two reasons:

Firstly, it will eliminate the injustice now done to thousands who by shifting

from "covered" to "uncovered" employment lose all benefits.

Today the store or factory worker who has paid into the pension fund for up to 9 years and 9 months may lose all rights to benefits and also all the money he has paid for this insurance, whenever he shifts from his "covered" employment to the "uncovered" status of being a self-employed person, to engage in farming or to accept a State, county, or city job.

Also, it is fundamentally sound that eventually everyone should be brought under old-age and survivors' insurance. Under this insurance everyone will pay in his young earning years for the monthly insurance pension benefits he receives in old age. Eventually this system, if broadened to include everyone, will free taxpayers from the heavy burden of State-administered old-age assistance, which in the last fiscal year cost $910,000,000, and the cost of which is increasing annually by leaps and bounds.

My bill, H. R. 5751, increases the monthly pensions payable under old-age and survivors' insurance by about 40 percent.

H. R. 5751 increases the formula for figuring basic pension rates from the present 40 percent of the first $50 and 10 percent of the next $200 to 40 percent of the first $100 and 10 percent of the next $150.

The formula means that the monthly pensions of persons coming under old-age and survivors insurance will be increased $15 to $21 a month for single persons and $22 to $31.50 a month for married couples.

The question will be asked: Can this be done without endangering the financial soundness of old-age and survivors' insurance reserves? I believe it can be.

The old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund on February 29 of this year contained a balance of $9,641,000,000. This balance during the past year has been increasing at a rate of more than $100,000,000 a month, or about a billion and a quarter dollars a year.

In the last fiscal year the old-age and survivors' insurance fund had receipts of $1,623,000,000 and disbursements of only $466,400,000. Had the higher pension rates I propose in my bill, H. R. 5751, been in effect throughout last year, receipts of the fund, I figure, still would have been almost $900,000,000 greater than its disbursements.

In 1939, when the present rates of pension payments were adopted, estimates were made by both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee as to the effect of these present rates on the reserve fund.

At that time, the House Ways and Means Committee estimated that by 1955 the fund, under the present rates, would have a balance on hand of $7,752,000,000 and the Senate Finance Committee estimated this balance by 1955 would be $6,871,000,000. As a matter of fact, in 1948, that balance is $9,641,000,000 and will be, at its present rate of growth, about $15,000,000,000 by 1955 or about double the most optimistic estimate made at the time the present pension schedule was adopted.

On the basis of these figures, it would seem that substantially higher monthly pensions can be paid by old-age and survivors' insurance without injury to the long-range soundness of old-age pension reserves.

My bill, H. R. 5751, increases the amount a person can earn as wages while receiving benefits from the present $15.99 to $50.

The present $14.99 limit on monthly earnings of beneficiaries is, in my opinion, entirely inadequate, and, therefore, I propose that it be raised to $50. The $50 figure was chosen because it will permit persons over 65 to work approximately 1 day a week without loss of pension benefits. This will implement their pensions, which are low even under my proposed increase, and at the same time be a great help to many businesses which experience one busy or peak day a week. The printing and publishing industry is an excellent example, as are retail stores of businesses which have job openings for 1 day a week workers.

My bill, H. R. 5751, lowers the eligibility age for women from 65 to 60 years. Lowering the qualifying age of women from 65 to 60 while maintaining the present age limit of 65 for men, recognizes new principles in social insurance, namely, that wives normally, are approximately 5 years younger than their husbands and that women's earning powers and opportunities for employment are not as great in later life as those of men.

PROTECTS VETERANS

My bill, H. R. 5751, provides that those who served in the active military and naval service of the United States during the period from September 15, 1940, to July 25, 1947, will be credited with quarters of coverage equal to their period of actual service, and for the purpose of determining benefits will be considered to have earned $160 during each calendar month or portion thereof of such service. No greater injustice was done members of the armed forces than the depriving them of old-age and survivors' insurance credits for the years they were in the service of their country. The ones who stayed home received these credits while those who went into the armed service lost them. This clause in H. R. 5751 proposes to restore these credits. The service rendered by the veteran, while in the armed forces, was a service to the whole people, not just that portion of the population that happens to be under social security. Therefore, my bill, H. R. 5751, proposes that when these veterans become eligible for benefits at the age of 65, the Federal Government shall reimburse the old-age and survivors' fund the proportionate amount of such benefits that result from this provision of the bill. A preliminary estimate of the cost of this to the Federal Government indicates that it will be approximately $1,500,000,000. However, payment of this sum will be spread over a long period of years, probably 40 to 60 years. I do not believe that the cost will be more than $40,000,000 in the peak years, and certainly far less during most years. I have asked the Social Security department to prepare a detailed estimate of the cost of this proposal.

I submit this summary of H. R. 5751 in the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give this bill serious study and that something will be done this session of Congress to correct injustices and inadequacies in the present old-age and survivors' insurance law.

Remove Federal Taxes on Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the statement which I made before the House Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday, March 9, 1948:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as the author of H. R. 5243, one of the bills pending before your committee to remove all Federal taxes on oleomargarine, I am glad to appear before you in support of this and other bills for the same purpose. This is a punitive tax and, if there was ever any justification for it, it no longer exists. You have had ample testimony going into various phases of the matter and I shall be brief in my remarks. I want you to know that Illinois ranks first among the 48 States in the production of margarine. In 1895 there were 17 factories making margarine in the United States, 5 of which were in Illinois; as of May 1, 1947, 9 of the Nation's 45 margarine factories were in Illinois. The use of margarine was greatly increased during and following World War II because it required few ration points and was low in price. Total United States production in 1946 was more than 550,000,000 pounds; Illinois produced over 175,000,000, or 32 percent of that amount. The year 1947 may be a record one for margarine; by the end of last June approximately 331,000,000 pounds—of which 322,000,000 were for domestic consumption—had been produced, an amount greater than the 319,000,000 pounds produced in all of 1940, and 26.6 percent above the 261,000,000 pounds produced for domestic consumption during the first half of 1946.

In accordance with Federal regulation all margarine, which has for a long time fulfilled the requirements of the United States Pure Food and Drug Administration, is now fortified with a minimum of 9,000 United States pharmaceutical units of vitamin A. Many brands contain 15,000 units; the amount is always printed on the package and is subject to Federal assay at all times. Margarine is endorsed both by the National Research Council's food and nutrition board and by the American Medical Association as a good product from a nutritional standpoint, and today it supplies from 25 to 33 percent of the table spread consumed in this country.

Margarine provides a market for two important Illinois farm products; one-sixth of each pound is pasteurized and cultured skim milk, used for improving flavor, and four-fifths is fat, about 99 percent of which is vegetable oil. The prefix "oleo," which applied to the animal fats originally used, is therefore misleading when used in reference to the modern product. A vegetable oil of great importance in margarine manufacture

comes from another product in which Illinois leads the Nation, soybeans. In 1946 margarine consumed 201,000,000 pounds or the equivalent of 23,928,571 bushels, which was about 36 percent of Illinois soybean production. In that year 43 percent of all fats and oils in margarine was soybean oil.

Thus the margarine industry provides employment for Illinois workers and a market for Illinois farm products, and gives the State first place in another field, the production of a low-cost, nutritious fat which helps to maintain national energy and well-being. America's actual need for the visible fats, included among the "basic seven" foods recommended for daily use by the Government, is large enough to support a far greater production of both margarine and butter than we have ever known in the past.

The foregoing information is all factual. It is taken from the October 1947 issue of the Illinois Business Review, which is published by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research College of Commerce of the University of Illinois.

I can see no reason why the people of Illinois should be compelled to pay a tax to the Federal Government on food produced in their State, when that tax is purely a punitive tax. The State of Illinois does not penalize the user of oleomargarine. If other States want to deprive their citizens of the use of this wholesome product that is their business, and yet States like Wisconsin are not able to completely enforce the punitive tax of 15 percent, because I know from personal experience that people from Wisconsin go over the Illinois line and buy oleomargarine and take it back for consumption in Wisconsin. I am informed that some of the producers of butter sell their butter and then buy oleomargarine for their own personal consumption because of the difference in price.

Someone has referred to the leadership that is supposed to represent the dairy industry. I believe that leadership would do well to increase the use of dairy products through research, advertising, and salesmanship. If they were to do that, it would not be necessary for them to seek punitive taxation to prevent another product from being sold as cheaply as possible in order to benefit a large number of people. One of the members of the committee yesterday referred to the fact that the removal of this tax would mean only $10 a year per family. I am here to say that $10 a year means quite a bit to a number of families in the United States. I have people in my congressional district to whom $10 means a lot.

This is not a matter that should be decided on a sectional basis or on a prejudiced basis. This is a matter which should be decided upon its merits. There is a rapid increase in the production of soybeans and other vegetable oil producing plants which provide a very substantial return to farmers. It cannot be said that the removal of the Federal tax on oleomargarine will be injurious to farmers. I do not believe that it will even injure dairy farmers. It may not even affect the amount of butter used. But even so, there are other outlets for milk. I do not believe at the present time that the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota can keep up with the cheese production. Cheeses which formerly came from abroad are now being made in great quantities in Wisconsin and Minnesota, and if I may say so at this time, I believe that both of those States produce cheeses equal or superior to those which we formerly obtained from abroad. It is high time that the dairy industry of those States take care of the new markets which they have developed for milk and milk products.

Gentlemen, I hope that this committee will report out favorably one of the bills which will eliminate Federal interference and punitive taxation of the oleomargarine industry.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a letter dated March 8, 1948, signed by Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, addressed to the members of the Eightieth Congress, reaffirming the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to H. R. 4278, the universal military training bill, for the United States.

The letter is as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1948.

To All Members of the Eightieth Congress:

This is to advise that the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with respect to universal military training remains unchanged. Over a long period of years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has championed and demanded the adoption of a system of universal military training for the United States.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars in its 1947 national encampment, held last September in Cleveland, Ohio, reaffirmed its traditional stand in favor of universal military training and unanimously endorsed a bill identified as H. R. 4278, now pending on the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives. It is urgently requested in view of the present world situation that immediate action be taken by the Congress to expedite the prompt passage of H. R. 4278.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service.

The Late Clarence Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, while not a colleague in the Congress, it has been my privilege to know Clarence Hancock for perhaps 20 years. From his friends in Syracuse, many of whom I know intimately, from his friends all over New York State and over the country generally, never have I heard any but held him in high regard and warm affection. If he had any enemies, I have never heard any ever say anything ill of him.

Most of my colleagues from New York served with the Congressman from the Thirty-Sixth District in the House a number of terms and, therefore, what they have to say will count ever so much more than I, as a neophyte, who never had the good fortune to be here with him. I deem it an honor, as a friend, an admirer, and a coparty worker, to add a word to what I know will so much more eloquently be said by others.

Labor's Thirty-fifth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 4, was the thirty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Department of Labor.

Then, for the first time in our Nation's history, a great man and a great President caused the establishment of a portfolio for labor within his Cabinet.

President Woodrow Wilson was the first of a long line of Presidents to give full, complete, and perfect expression to and in recognition of the dignity of labor.

The first Secretary to hold that high office was himself a trade-union man and a Member of this House before he was appointed to that high office.

The ability with which the Honorable William B. Wilson organized that Department of Government and the manner in which he discharged the duties of that high office will forever be a shining light in the history of the labor movement in our country.

Mr. Speaker, we now have another great Secretary of Labor.

He, too, was a Member of this Congress before his elevation to high Cabinet position. He was serving the State of Washington in the Senate of the United States when he became the Secretary of Labor July 1, 1945.

In celebration of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the founding of his Department, Secretary Schwellenbach made an address.

It was a great address. It was one that has met the approval and acclaim of every Member of this House.

The speech was unique in one particular. There was nothing of the bureaucrat in what Lewis Schwellenbach had to say—no grasp for more and more governmental powers and control over organized labor, State employment, nor other services.

There was no suggestions made for abrogating the rights of States—nor for greater and more centralization of power in the Federal Government in any manner.

It was and is a clear, concise outline of the true purposes, objectives, and functions of a great governmental department, expressed in simple language by a great administrator and statesman.

There is not a Member of this House—on either side of the aisle—that can find fault with the aims of the United States Department of Labor in dealings with any organized labor movements as outlined by Lewis Schwellenbach in the next to the closing paragraph of that memorable address.

Nor is there any who will disagree with his closing paragraph in which he said:

We know that we of the people and that we of the Department of Labor must go forward steadily.

We are on the right road. Let us go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, in order that all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can absorb the beauty of the American way of life expressed in that labor speech on that great labor anniversary, I am offering it for inclusion in the RECORD today and as part of my remarks:

ADDRESS BY HON. LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH, SECRETARY OF LABOR

We of the Department of Labor are meeting here tonight with some of our friends from labor and management on account of a birthday—the thirty-fifth birthday of the Department. I do not propose, however, to use this occasion as an excuse for the recitation of history. History can be glorious or dull or important, according to whose history you are talking about.

The history of the Department of Labor has considerable significance, not in the fact that the Department has survived this long as an institution, but because it has stuck to its original purpose to protect wage-earners, as stated in the act of Congress of 1913 creating it, and because it has had a lot of good effect on a lot of people.

In the executive branch of the Federal Government I and my Department represent 60,000,000 people. This includes all the wage earners of the country, the 45,000,000 who don't belong to labor unions as well as the 15,000,000 who do so.

Further than that, the Department works for the benefit of all interests and areas of the country, the same as any other part of the Government. There is considerable misunderstanding about this point, and I would like to repeat and underline the best statement on this subject that I have heard. It was made by the first Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, a trade-union officer and a Congressman before he went into Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet. In his first annual report, Secretary Wilson said of the Department:

"It was created in the interest of the welfare of all the wage earners of the United States, whether organized or unorganized. In the execution of that purpose the element of fairness to every interest is of equal importance, and the Department has in fact made fairness between wage earner and wage earner, between wage earner and employer, between employer and employer, and between each and the public as a whole the supreme motive and purpose of its activities."

To me there is no paradox in being in a Department which is wholly impartial, which in fact must be impartial if its functions are to be properly carried out, and in having the same department charged with speaking for the interests of a specific group of people. I can illustrate this best by talking about some of our major functions. The Department of Labor is one of the chief fact-finding and fact-reporting agencies of the Government. It is engaged in administration of most of the important Federal labor laws. It is also an agency of consultation open to citizens of any business or any occupation. Duties such as these must be fulfilled at all time in the light of the broadest national interest—free from any possible bias.

When the 1913 law created the Department, another major function was added. The Department was created to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." Under this mandate, it is the duty of the Department to exercise constant vigilance to see that labor advances along with the rest of the country, toward peace and prosperity. It is the Department's duty to formulate and suggest legislation, and to analyze and consider the national trends and developments.

The philosophy of the Department is that the national well-being as well as the well-being of wage earners must always be taken into account. The points of view of labor, of management, and of the public all are utilized in planning and carrying out the labor programs of the Nation. We realize the simple fact that perhaps some of our critics do not, that labor conditions and labor relations affect everybody in the country.

The Department of Labor realizes that it is operating in a dynamic and growing Nation. The Department cannot be static if it is to meet the duties and obligations set up in its charter.

The Department has not been static. Its responsibilities and duties have grown tremendously in its 35 years. Whereas in 1913, we were concerned largely with programs designed to relieve distressed conditions among wage earners, our activities go much further today in dealing with labor as an economic force which vitally affects our national well-being.

During this period, Congress has enacted legislation and established agencies to handle many new responsibilities which were unheard of in 1913. The Federal Government has created a Federal-State system of public-employment offices on a Nation-wide basis; it has provided for State unemployment compensation; it has established machinery for dealing with problems growing out of labor relations, and it has developed standards involving wages and hours of work.

The Employment Act of 1946 clearly recognizes as a matter of national policy and economic health, that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means * * * to foster and promote free, competitive enterprise and * * * conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The labor functions developed in the Department of Labor, and in other agencies as well, involve management, labor, and public interests. In carrying out its responsibilities, the Department employs experts in all of the fields with which it deals. These experts are drawn from all walks of life and include individuals who have had experience in the labor field. We do this just as the Justice Department employs numerous eminent lawyers and the Department of Commerce competent business executives. This does not mean that we act as special pleaders. The Department, like the Departments of Justice and Commerce, is an instrument of Government created and governed by the laws of the land and it is operated in the public interest.

Incidentally, I was requested by a congressional committee recently to report how many of the policy officials of the Department came from the ranks of organized labor. I was a bit disappointed when I had to report that of 21 officials concerned with policy only 3 had had active working experience within the trade-union movement. I wish we had more.

I have chosen to make my part in this commemoration one of looking into our present and future usefulness rather than toward the achievements of the past. We have a major problem in maintaining and building our small Department, which now employs only about 4,000 persons, to the point where it can service the expanding needs and problems of the country.

Experience of the past demonstrates conclusively to me that modern labor laws, such as the Walsh-Healey Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Davis-Bacon Act harmed no honest and productive citizen and in fact benefited all groups—employers, workers, and consumers. Modern labor legislation is a hallmark of civilization, and the loss of it or the lack of it could only mean lower living standards and a step back toward the industrial jungles of 100 years ago.

We must bring up to date and perfect our laws—Federal, State, and local—to improve our living standards and our working standards to help our way of life through better production and better utilization of energy.

We have another big goal ahead in the improvement of our fact-finding and informational facilities, in the Department of Labor and out, which aid our organized and unorganized workers and employers in their jobs in the industry of the Nation; in helping men to connect with jobs, and to cushion the economic shock that comes to everyone when one job ends and another must be sought.

In the Department's 35 years of life, this country has made giant strides industrially, and perhaps it is necessary, if we are to gage the possibilities of the future, that we note some of the long-range progress with which we, in this lifetime, have been associated. For instance, the productivity rate of the country has increased by an average of 3 percent a year, measured in output per man-hour of labor. That means we have more than doubled our productivity in the last 35 years. In the same period, earnings of factory workers, measured in purchasing power, have likewise increased by slightly more than 100 percent. In actual dollars, the increase in earnings has been much more—from an average of $11 in 1913 to more than $50 in 1948, but more than half of this 35-year gain has been lost through price increases which have consistently out-run wage gains.

Even so, this is a good record but there are other parts of the picture, other groups of workers who have not fared nearly as well. It is in these areas that all of our industrial elements must cooperate if we are to maintain and improve a balanced standard of living in this country.

It should be noted that the net gains in real earnings of workers, 1948 as compared with 1913, include a much shorter workweek. In 1913 hours averaged around 50 per week. Currently the actual workweek is around 40 hours. This is important to all of us for the studies in productivity show that in most occupations the shorter workweek is more efficient and economical. In addition, it makes for a better life for the workers and their families. At the present time, full employment has also helped by reducing the amount of part-time work, maintaining large-volume production, lowering overhead costs of employers by full utilization of plants, and generally strengthening the economic basis of high wage levels.

In these 35 years, also, real progress has been made in the development of a national labor policy and in the understanding of all the people of the country of the need for a system of free collective bargaining to insure a national balance and a proper distribution of the fruits of the labor and management genius of this country.

The Nation-wide recognition of collective bargaining, in law and public opinion, has mostly occurred in my lifetime and yours. It has developed out of the conditions of industry and the changes in the structure of our Nation's economy. I think the Department properly can claim some credit for assisting in this evolutionary development which will continue far beyond the horizons we now see.

In these 35 years we have successfully waged two great wars, and American labor, with guidance and help from the Department, has produced the weapons and munitions which enabled our armed forces to prevail over powerful enemies. And since the shooting stopped in August of 1945, the Department has taken vigorous steps to help preserve international peace and understanding. We have begun a definite effort aimed to provide American labor a voice in international cooperation, and participation in the United Nations and its related organi-

zations. Through the Department's Office of International Affairs, cooperating with the Department of State, and a special advisory committee of trade-union leaders, the Department is bringing labor closer to our foreign policy. This channel of communication and information works both ways and is another instance of our constant effort to serve the general welfare.

Our economy and our development in the future will be as dynamic as it has been in the past. There is simple reason for this. We cannot develop, we cannot even live adequately, if our economy and our Government and our standards of living lapse into a static phase of any considerable duration.

Many of our goals for the future are well defined. The changes I have been describing do not insure everyone the opportunity to earn a good life. We have made great progress in industrial safety, with the cooperation of the States and many groups outside the Federal Government. But we know we have only scratched the surface as long as 2,000,000 persons are injured every year in industrial accidents. We have made great progress through the Fair Labor Standards Act in eliminating sweatshop wages, but we know that economic events have outrun that law's standards. The Federal wage floor of 40 cents an hour must be raised to 75 cents. We know that there is a great field in the development and use of better technique of human and industrial relations, and a program to develop and spread knowledge of such techniques is before Congress. Government facilities in the field of labor-management relationships can and should be improved greatly, and at the same time we must develop support for more free collective bargaining. Security against the hazards of old age, sickness, and unemployment must be extended and strengthened. We need more knowledge of the nature and the operations of the economy of our country, knowledge that can be gained by research, which is essential both to the improvement of business operation and the welfare of wage earners.

We know that we of the people and we of the Department of Labor must go forward steadily. We are on the right road. Let us go ahead.

The Crisis in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday evening with a small group of people I attended a meeting where a very interesting discussion took place. Present at that meeting was the former Ambassador from Czechoslovakia, Mr. Juraj Slavik, who made a most interesting statement concerning conditions in his unfortunate country. I asked his permission to insert his written statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I now ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before telling you, ladies and gentlemen, what has happened in Czechoslovakia, allow me to pay a tribute to a great Czechoslovak patriot who sacrificed his life for his country and democracy, Jan Masaryk. When I made my statement to the press last Wednesday, I told the American public and the world that President Benes acted under terrific pressure and duress. I did not mention Jan Masaryk, but I could not believe that he, whose popularity was—for his human behavior and approach to people—nearly as great as his father's and whose heroic stand in the Munich crisis and during the war was a source of inspiration and strength to the entire nation, could serve a totalitarian regime and be in agreement with terror, violence, and dictatorship of a minority. I must say that I could not explain his behavior, and his American friends were bewildered by some of his statements—but I was sure Jan Masaryk could not freely serve a totalitarian, dictatorial regime. I was sure that he was planning something to help his nation and democracy. I was confident that he had a great aim. I thought perhaps that President Benes asked him to stay on for a while because he wanted to have inside information, so as to know what was happening in the so-called government. Those who know Jan Masaryk know that he was a witty man and that he spoke sometimes in a satirical way. But now he has spoken freely and very plainly. He proved to be a great Czechoslovak patriot and a true son of a great father. He has helped his nation to realize what really has happened in Czechoslovakia and to prove to all Czechoslovaks that men cannot live as slaves. His death is a reminder to all free men and women, a reminder which shall prove to be as significant as was Munich before the last crucifixion of my nation. A reminder that the life and freedom of all nations must be preserved. Masaryk made his sacrifice 2 days after the ninety-eighth anniversary of his great father's birthday. He certainly consulted his great father spiritually as to what was his duty to democracy and freedom. As he had told a foreign diplomat that he considered himself a prisoner and that he was not responsible for what he was doing or saying. Czechoslovak patriots throughout the world are standing before a great and fateful decision. They will consult the memory of Thomas Masaryk and his son Jan Masaryk, and I have no doubts they will be able to find the only possible answer.

And now let me tell you something about Czechoslovakia.

It is rather a widely known fact that Czechoslovakia has had a very old and well-founded democratic tradition. Even before we—after centuries of oppression and foreign domination—became a free country, we were a genuinely democratic Nation. The Hussite revolution in the fifteenth century was not only a religious movement, it was also a democratic and social revolution. T. G. Masaryk gave the newborn Czechoslovak state after the First World War a strong democratic basis, the constitution was patterned after that of the United States, the "four freedoms" were genuinely observed, and the minorities—not only racial, but social and political—enjoyed all the rights possible—Czechoslovakia was culturally and socially far advanced, the population intelligent and well educated in politics, self-conscious, greatly devoted to independence and freedom. All these are rather well-known facts and I do not want to reiterate them.

The Czechs and Slovaks, in the Second World War, went through a terrible and devastating ordeal, Although they resisted courageousy the Nazi oppression and especially the Nazi ideology, the moral and spiritual destruction affected the nation and brought profound changes in the minds of my countrymen. They remembered Munich well and the sacrifice of democratic Czechoslovakia. In prisons and concentration camps, in the underground, in the liberation movement abroad—there was a spirit of cooperation and unity of all national forces. We had before the war a strong Communist movement in Czechoslovakia. The Slavic sympathies of the Czechs and Slovaks, who have a strong slavonic tradition, idealistic and messianistic, the fact that the Communists were very active in the resistance movement against naziism, and the partisans opposing the German invader were mostly under Russian command, that Czechoslovakia was virtually liberated by the Red Army—even increased the force of communism in my country.

It is a well-known phenomenon, that in all countries affected by a war—even if they are victorious, the political tendency goes to the left. So it was in Czechoslovakia as well as in other European countries. The Communists emerged from the first—really free elections—as the strongest party—with 38 percent of the votes. But the remaining 62 percent voted for democratic parties—even when—especially in the social democratic party—there were Communist sympathisers or men who were for a close collaboration with the Communists.

The Communists pretended that they are a genuinely democratic movement. They were—together with the other parties—in the national front, we had no opposition in the government and parliament and behaved rather as if they would democratically agree on all their problems in parliamentary manner.

All the visitors who came to this country in the last few months agreed that the Communists would lose in the forthcoming elections. Even those, very close to the Communists, were definite on this question. Nobody suspected that the elections could not be freely held. Many of the visitors—especially members of non-Communist parties even expressed their concern that the Communists could, in such situation try to make a bid for power (tour de force) to maintain their positions in the government and their influence in the national front.

But not one of the visitors considered as possible a putsch or a revolutionary move before the elections. They told me that it is impossible in a country where the national forces are so disciplined and organized. President Benes told the Catholic bishops 2 months ago when they visited him in Prague, that the situation in Czechoslovakia is quite different from that of our neighbors. He alluded to Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, etc. In those countries there were dictatorships before the war, or during the war, and a totalitarian regime of the right—as Benes said—can easily turn to a dictatorship of the left—les extremes se touchent. But it is very unlikely that a traditionally democratic nation could turn totalitarian without defending successfuly its democratic beiefs.

But as it is very often in such situations—the democrats, followers and disciples of Thomas Masaryk and Eduard Benes—thought in democratic terms, believed in the efficiency of democratic methods and did not suspect the opponents and enemies of democracy to be able and willing to use police force and methods of revolutionary character, totalitarian and Hitlerite methods, so well known to the Czechs and Slovaks. In the democratic parties, there were thousands and thousands of men and women who were very able organizers of resistance against the Germans, both in the underground, at home, and in the liberation movement abroad. They had confidence that they would be able to organize a defensive action in any situation. The Communists themselves pretended very definitely that they are for the national front set up in Kosice after the liberation, and would loyally cooperate even after the elections with the other political parties, organized in postwar Czechoslovakia with their consent.

Nevertheless, the Czechoslovak democrats were frightened that the Communists had in their hands some of the Government posts which could be dangerous to democracy.

They were especially in control of the Ministry of the Interior, and they tried from the beginning to get control of the labor movement. Those were the forces which they really used to overthrow democracy and to establish a one-party dictatorial regime. When the Democrats decided to stop the Communists from taking over the last remaining non-Communists posts in the police force, it was too late to act. The Communists succeeded by well-known methods of violence, disruption of the non-Communist forces and by destroying all liberties so as to take over the entire government of the state. Why did the Communists decide to act now, before the elections? The reasons have an internal and an external background. As I told you already, they could not allow their Democratic opponents to win the elections. Secondly, they were pushed by their Soviet masters to assure for Soviet Russia a reliable territory, purged of all "unreliable" elements—to have, in event of war, a prepared defensive wall It is clear to me that if the Democrats had not reacted and tried to resist the Communist putsch would have been perhaps delayed for some days, but not prevented. The Communist coup succeeded against the will of a great majority of the Czechs and Slovaks. The Czechoslovak "man in the street" did not react because he was not even aware of what actual importance the happenings were. The Democrats considered some of the top Communist leaders as rather nice men. We always believed that our Communists were different from Communists in other countries. But there is no doubt that the "nice" Communists, the cooperative and moderate ones, must act in situations like this rather more violently than the reliable or violent Communists. It is in the nature of a totalitarian movement that the entire machine acts on orders of fuhrers and commanders. The methods are frighteningly the same as the methods of Hitler in Germany and in the occupied countries. After the seizure of power follows a purge, destruction, and disruption of all democratic forces—a "Gleichschaltung" of body and soul. There will be perhaps elections in Czechoslovakia, but only one-party elections—even those weaklings or ambitious men who are cooperating with the Communists now will be purged in due time if they should prove not to be reliable to the Communists.

The nation at home is not able for the time being to resist the totalitarian forces—armed with submachine guns and rifles. But the heroic behavior of the students, of the persecuted patriots, and now the tragic fate of Masaryk proves that the love of democracy and freedom is alive in the nation.

Now—to end my speech—I would like to repeat what I said in my statement a week ago. President Benes—it must be now clear to the world—acted under terrible duress and terror. The inside story of his resistance to the terror is not yet fully disclosed. But it is clear to me that he was faced by Soviet might as well as by the rifles of militiamen and the police. It is obvious that Gottwald acted more violently and brutally than Hitler to Hacha. I believe the correspondent who told us that the Soviet armies were ready to march into Czechoslovakia from Austria and Germany. I don't doubt that vice commissar Zorin put in force all the Soviet might to crush little democratic Czechoslovakia. I am sure that Benes was betrayed by the leaders of the until then reliable Czechoslovak Army. You can imagine what a tragedy it was when President Benes saw his best friends and followers being expelled from all posts, when his disciples and spokesmen were arrested and deprived of their personal freedom and became a prey for the executioners. I am terrible sorry for Dr. Benes now—when he lost his best friend Jan Masaryk and when his truest disciple and spokesman, Dr. Drtina was nearly killed.

President Dr. Benes was betrayed and threatened by terrible violence. He is a virtual prisoner. He was not allowed to speak to the nation and does not fulfill his presidential prerogatives and duties. We will certainly know in some days more about the terrible tragedy which occurred in the Prague castle.

You can realize, ladies and gentlemen, why I resigned and why we—living in the free countries, must act according to our own consciences. I believe in my nation. I firmly believe in the saying that "after the tempest of wrath has passed, the rule of thy country will return to thee, Czech people." I have a sacred faith that the immortal slogan of President Masaryk, "Truth will prevail," will again prove victorious. And I know that there will be again "a free Czechoslovakia in a free Europe."

European Recovery Program and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the American Legion is one of the great forces in our Nation for security and unity. When its national commander voices officially the objectives of the Legion, he not only represents the viewpoint of the thousands of veterans of both world wars enrolled in its ranks but he commands the attention and consideration of all loyal Americans.

Because it typified to me the patriotic American position on two outstanding questions of the day, namely, the European recovery program and universal military training, I have secured a copy of the address delivered by National Commander James F. O'Neil at the War Memorial in Baltimore City, on the occasion of his annual visit March 3, and ask permission that a portion of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that as many as possible of our citizens may have an opportunity to read and consider the views on these two momentous questions of the commander of this great national organization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My appearance here today is on serious business. It is concerned with the determined quest of the American Legion for enduring peace.

We have a program this year whose primary objective is to keep America always American. That means keeping this great country of ours always free and always secure. We need every ounce of strength we can muster in fighting for this program.

We of the American Legion recognize 1948 for what it is—a year of momentous decision. We know that if a national catastrophe is in store for America in the next few years it will be directly due to the failure in 1948 of our national leadership to follow a course of wisdom and ordinary prudence. I say this because time is America's most precious commodity today. We can buy a lot of things with our dollars. But we can never buy time and we are working under the immutable timetable of fate.

Through their services in two great wars, members of the American Legion have acquired a sense of realism to guide their thinking. Factual appraisal of realities—not wishful thinking—is behind our programs.

This is especially true of our thinking on the future safety of our Nation. We have marshaled our best realism, our most searching analysis and our deepest devotion to the problem of our national security. We have come up after long and honest study with a carefully worked out program for a modern defense establishment for our country, built around the framework of universal military training. We believe it is the most practical, most democratic, most effective and least expensive plan for national security in this perilous period that has yet been advanced.

We need UMT first because it must supply the trained manpower that our modern security needs demand. The atomic bomb has not made mass armies obsolete. It has only made raw recruits obsolete. It has made necessary trained armies and trained reserves in greater numbers than ever before in all history. Future wars will be fought by highly trained men who must not only know how to use the complex, scientific weapons of the atomic age but also how to defend against them. The greatest asset of any nation in the future will lie in its advance accumulation of scientists, technicians, engineers, specialists, and other kinds of military experts. And remember too, that for every one of these trained aces there must be as least 15 less-trained men to support them. It now takes, for instance, a crew of 18 men to keep 1 jet plane in operation.

The main function of UMT will be of course to locate and to develop the young men who are qualified for specialized training. Talented young men will get the opportunity for higher education with Government assistance under UMT which they might not get otherwise. UMT will be under civilian control. Trainees will not be members of armed forces or even subject to court martial. They will be students in schools of applied military sciences. It will be one of the greatest boosts for raising the general standard of education and of physical and moral welfare in all our history.

On this framework of UMT, providing a continually replenished reservoir of trained reservists for our armed forces, the American Legion would build a modern streamlined defense establishment. One phase of that program already has been achieved. That is unification at the top, of the armed forces. Our program further calls for the best air force in the world. We know that air power is peace power today as never before. A second place air force will not win, any more than the second best hand in poker.

We've got to have a continually modernized Navy with an adequate regular force, component parts, civilian components and citizen reserve, equal at all times to the task of defeating any other navy or combination of navies. This must be supported by a strong and healthy American merchant marine.

We must have a highly trained adequate Regular Army, capable of rapid expansion in any emergency through its UMT-fed reserve components.

We must encourage and expand scientific research and development in all fields of technology so that our weapons and our techniques shall at all times keep in step with progress.

We've got to have stock piling of strategic materials, industrial mobilization planning and an American department of world intelligence that can keep us informed in advance of major developments.

Many other factors must be considered in our security planning. Our national security commission has done a splendid job in drafting a practical blueprint for this must job.

Now let us look reality squarely in the face.

Ahead of us today lies either peace—on honorable terms—or war which may wreck civilization as we know it. The American Legion is supporting heartily every peace effort of our Government. It is solidly behind the ideal of the United Nations Organization. But it realizes that the United Nations now in its cradle stage needs above all else the umbrella of invincible American strength under which to grow into its adult role capable of banishing war forever, for which it has been designed.

We are backing energetically the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of western Europe in order to arrest further encroachments of expanding communism led by an aggressive Soviet Russia which has shown nothing but enmity toward this country and our peace efforts.

A weak America cannot lead the world to enduring peace. The American Legion is fighting for UMT because it would make this country strong and we've got to lead from strength to get anywhere in this business of building a lasting peace.

Unless and until war is banished by a total federation of all nations, America remains inevitably the object of the first large-scale attack of any future war. We are the last stronghold of freedom and as such the subject of the hate of every element of tyranny in the world. Let us not become a lost stronghold of freedom through lack of ordinary foresight and common sense.

The handwriting on the wall of fate is plain. The next war will bring the horrors of the battlefields right to our own doorsteps. If we invite world war III through our weakness and folly, then assuredly the war will be fought right here in these United States. That means an atomic war here at home.

I do not believe our people have as yet appreciated the horrifying potentialities of this new atomic age. My words may sound fantastic. I assure you they are not figments of imagination. They deal with unvarnished realities—brute facts with which we are confronted today.

Have you ever given thought to the fact that today we are no longer dealing with man-killing weapons in warfare?

Today we are dealing with nation-killing weapons.

Get the grim import of that phrase—nation-killing weapons. There is a tragic urgency in that statement.

It means we must scrap all of our defense concepts based on man-killing weapons. We're up against something brand new—something so big, so ghastly, and so potent, that the individual no longer is a target as such. Nations are now the targets. War has evolved into a mass stage. It now calls for mass action and carries the penalty of mass deaths for errors in judgment.

With the appearance of all these new weapons, the picture of national defense has undergone a radical change. Defense now means more than the warding off of an attack. Today defense means also holding a nation together under the new and terrifying first blows that may not be wholly averted. Our populace has never in modern times felt the murderous, physical shock of war in the midst of its women and children. Our only hope of holding the Nation together under such conditions, while at the same time carrying out retaliation against the enemy, lies in a militarily-trained citizenry. This is one of the functions for which UMT has been designed.

All this may sound to you like a pipe dream out of a dime novel. But I beg of you to take it seriously. The United States could today unleash such a horror on any other nation. But mark this—a Presidential commission of outstanding civilian leaders has set January 1, 1952 as the deadline for our immunity against an atomic attack. That was the President's Air Policy Advisory Commission. Its report, released only last month, solemnly warned, and I quote: "It would be an unreasonable risk for our present planning purposes to assume that other nations will not have atomic weapons in quantity by 1952."

This Commission also said that it would be unwise in planning our national defense establishment to assume that other nations will not have planes and missiles capable of delivering a sustained attack on the mainland of the United States by 1952.

So here we have the fact established that the new weapons of warfare have a most decisive potential and that our time margin for preparation is running short. We are a doomed Nation if we blithely make our own atomic bomb a Maginot line behind which to loll in assumed safety. We must bear in mind that the new weapons are decisive in nature only insofar as the operators of them can get the most out of them. We do not even have the operators in depth today to operate those weapons. It is going to be the nation with the greatest mass know-how which will win the next war.

The South Reacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and most enlightening editorial entitled "The South Reacts," published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 12, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUTH REACTS

If the proverbial man from Mars were to read the fulminations of certain southern Congressmen and Governors against the President's message on civil rights, they might be justified in thinking that the people who live below Mason and Dixon's line were a pretty violent and unneighborly lot.

But it would be as unfair to type the South in terms of its "wool hats" as it would be to judge the North by those who whip up race riots. Contrariwise, it would be ingenuous indeed to assume that the courageous white Southerners who sit on boards of Negro betterment societies are anything more than pioneers.

In between stands a solid core of kindly, deeply religious, decent people who live face to face with one of the world's most difficult racial problems in these times of turmoil. It is they who hold the future of the South. Many of them are troubled by the President's message. Why?

First, they feel themselves (and the majority of Negroes) culturally and emotionally unready for an erasure of segregation lines. Many believe deeply that solution lies in both races keeping to themselves.

Second, they are a proud people. Although made sick at heart by a lynching, they resent any assumption that they can't put their own house in order.

Third, in areas where uneducated and politically inexperienced Negroes equal or outnumber the whites, they frankly fear a shift in power.

Fourth, while respecting Mr. Truman's humanitarianism, they suspect that in timing and uncompromising scope his message was designed to win Negro and ultraliberal northern votes at what they consider the South's expense. They are unwilling that he realize on such a bargain—certainly not too cheaply.

We don't know what the South will do politically about all this—probably less than is threatened now. But nine southern governors have just signed an agreement to set up regional progressional schools for Negroes as well as for whites. It would be well to put that into focus along with some of the rantings. The picture needs both for proper perspective.

Colorado Couple Opposes So-Called Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter from a man and his wife in Denver, Colo., which I hope every Member of Congress will read.

The matter referred to follows:

DENVER, COLO., *March 3, 1940.*

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: We are happy to note that you are numbered among those opposing the civil-rights program.

Here in Denver we have already had a sample of what will take place throughout America if the Communists are successful in pushing their legislation through Congress.

This is a crucial hour in American history, and we only hope you will continue to refuse to compromise on this issue.

We want you to know that we are praying for your success.

Very truly yours.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me on March 5, 1948:

Ladies and gentlemen, as your Congressman, I have always tried to keep you informed of my views on the vital issues confronting us as a nation. And for this reason I want to talk to you this evening on the subject of communism and its threat to the people of our country.

The Communist movement in the United States began to manifest itself in 1919. Since then it has changed its name and its

party line whenever expedient and tactical. But always it comes back to fundamentals and bills itself as the party of marxism. And as such it stands for the destruction of our American form of government; it stands for the destruction of free enterprise; the destruction of free labor; and it stands for the creation of a "Soviet of the United States" and ultimate world revolution.

In establishing the party's illegal character in 1942 the then Attorney General Biddle, based his findings on the contents of the same Communist publications which today are being sold and circulated in party circles throughout the United States. The American Communist, like the leopard, cannot change his spots. The records of the American Communists conclusively proves their true feelings. In the prewar days when they were allied with Hitler they marched on Washington protesting selective service and lend lease, shouting "The Yanks are not coming." The American Peace Mobilization picketed the White House until the day before the Nazis marched into Russia and then within less than a month reconverted it into the American People's Mobilization; demanded all out production and started the chant for the Second Front. We are all witnessing the same tactics today, since Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach advocated outlawing the Communist Party. The Communists have been mobilizing, promoting mass meetings, sending telegrams and letters to exert pressure on Congress. Members of Congress are well aware of Communists starting their pressure campaigns by an avalanche of mail, which follows the party line.

The size of the Communist Party is relatively unimportant because of the enthusiasm and iron-clad discipline under which Communists operate. In this connection it might be of interest to observe that in 1917 when the Communists overthrew the Russian Government there was 1 Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia. In the United States today there is 1 Communist for every 1,814 persons in this country. These are figures from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. These figures should be given serious consideration by every thoughtful American.

It is an established fact that the Communists have developed one of the greatest propaganda machines the world has ever known. They have been able to penetrate and infiltrate many respectable and reputable organizations. They capitalize upon ill-founded charges associating known, honest, progressive liberals with left-wing causes. The honest liberal and progressive should be alert to this for it is the consensus that the Communists' most effective foes can be the real liberals and progressives who understand their devious and insidious methods.

Particularly, I wish to speak to you about Communists in the labor movement. I am firmly convinced that the great masses of union men and women are patriotic American citizens, interested chiefly in the welfare of their country and in security for their families and themselves. They have nothing but disgust and contempt for a Communist. In those instances where Communists have taken control of unions, it has been because too many union men and women have been outwitted, outmaneuvered, and outwaited by Communists. The Communists are notorious for prolonging meetings so that the membership will not attend, thereby permitting their minority to vote funds, pass resolutions, and adopt action programs which the rank and file must follow. As stated before they have never relied on numerical strength to dominate any organization. And this is true of labor groups. Through infiltration tactics they have in too many instances captured positions of authority. It is a Communist boast that with 5 percent of the membership, Communists, with their organizational ability and discipline, can control the union. That the Communists feel themselves ordained for a special mission in penetrating labor is revealed by the statement made by Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, "No trade union or people's organization," he said, "Not even the great CIO could long remain progressive if it were to exclude or to attack Communists." Controlled unions contribute heavily to the various party fronts and causes. They, in turn serve as fronts for various propaganda schemes. They can picket consulates and Government offices with practiced skill. When conditions warrant, strikes can be provoked so as to create the atmosphere of unrest, in which, as we all have come to know, communism thrives. And, finally, if party policy so dictates, they actually sabotage essential production, which, in turn endangers the public welfare.

Until recently, the average American was inclined to dismiss such maneuverings as something foreign to his life, but the tremendous power of Communists who have entrenched themselves in certain unions permits no such complacency. Many a businessman, as well as the union workers employed by him, have learned from experience, that these moves do affect their lives vitally. Many an industrialist has come to realize that his difficulties may not arise from his own employees, who usually cooperate with him, but rather from outside Communist influence controlling his local union. That Communists have attained top positions in labor is painfully evident from a number of irresponsible strikes which swept the Nation not so long ago. I am sure you will agree with me that there are ample evidences of the abuse of power by certain left-wing labor leaders.

Since the war the Nation has experienced many discords spiralling into a war of nerves with many foreseeing the threat of economic revolution. These and other eruptions of the period have jangled the people into a sense of insecurity and filled them with forebodings for their future. To be sure there are many underlying economic causes but the monopoly of labor which forces men out of their jobs at the whim of an industry-wide union czar in my opinion is one of the major factors. Although only a small proportion of union leaders are Communists; nevertheless, those who have infiltrated into the labor movement exercise a power out of all proportion to their numbers. It is the steel band of an organized minority forged in the furnace of greed for power and tempered in the laws written primarily in the same spirit. The freeing of labor from Communist control and the holding of its despoilers within and without to strict accountability is one of the fundamental economic adjustments required to relieve the Nation of its present dangerous unrest.

Since October 1946 a number of alien Communist labor leaders have been arrested. This fact together with the Justice Department's arrest on March 1 of Irving Potash, one of the most prominent Communist labor leaders in the United States and recently released from Ellis Island on $5,000 bail, indicating the matter is pending once more raises two sharp and persistent questions concerning the American labor movement. How strong is Communist influence today in United States labor? Is its strength and influence rising or falling? This is best answered by the recent overwhelming victory of the Wallace leftists in a recent election. Many observers regard this victory as of primary importance and believe as a result of it that the leftist tide is rising in the United States. There is no doubt but that this victory has stimulated the Communists' efforts throughout the country. Even while I am speaking to you the Communists are picketing the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington protesting the arrest of noncitizen Communists that are now being held at Ellis Island. In my own district in Baltimore they are concentrating and working for my defeat in the coming election.

I am an American. I stand for all of the things that made America the leading Nation of the world: free enterprise, personal rights, and the welfare of labor. But when the activities of labor are misdirected by leaders who are loyal to a foreign government and whose very actions and affiliations indicate their intention to destroy our democracy I feel it is necessary for me to place the struggle before you in order that you may take your stand for or against American ideals. Under our democratic form of government these very groups that are picketing a branch of our great Government claim and expect protection under the very Constitution which they would destroy. I assure you ladies and gentlemen I consider their opposition a challenge between the democratic way of life and that of the Communist. I do not wish nor seek the support of persons following the Communist line.

To meet the menace of communism the first need is to get the facts before the American public. Now that their aims and objectives are being exposed the Communists are working feverishly to build up what they term a quarter-million-dollar defense fund to place ads in papers, to publish pamphlets, to buy radio time. They know that today it is a fight to the finish.

I believe in the common sense and good judgment of the American people. I believe all they need is the truth on this issue and any other issue for that matter and they will reach a decision that will contribute to the welfare of the Nation. Once her people get the facts America is too shrewd, too sensible, to come up with the wrong answer. We have no need for Communists here. Our system of government is one that has taken us on the fastest run of accomplishments in the world's history. We may need slight "overhaulings" from time to time, but it is still the best Government ever conceived by man and with God's help I for one intend to do everything within my power to uphold and preserve it.

Extension of Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a letter I received from the Honorable Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., a former Member of this body, and now mayor of Baltimore and chairman of the standing committee on legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors, in regard to the necessity for action by Congress to extend the rent control law, and suggesting that several additions be made to the Senate bill, S. 2182. I have referred these suggestions to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which now has the bill under consideration, and hope they will receive favorable consideration.

The letter referred to follows:

CITY OF BALTIMORE, *March 9, 1948.*

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARMATZ: It has been called to my attention that Chairman JESSE WOLCOTT, of the House Banking and Cur-

rency Committee, has indicated his intention of postponing consideration of rent-control legislation until the latter part of this month.

I view with alarm the complacency of this distinguished Member of Congress. Unless quick and forceful action is taken by the House, I fear the country will be without adequate rent control on April 1. To extend the present law temporarily for another month instead of passing proper legislation would in my opinion be inexcusable. Such dilatory action would demoralize tenants, landlords, and the Rent Administrator's staff, alike. As mayor of Baltimore, and as chairman of the standing Committee of Legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors, I urge Congress to pass, without further delay, the Senate bill extending rent control.

The United States Conference of Mayors in its annual meeting on February 18, passed a resolution in favor of continuance of effective rent controls. Disturbed by the delay in the House yesterday, I notified all of the mayors throughout the country, reminding them of the resolution in favor of rent control adopted at the conference, pointing out the necessity for speedy and resolute action, and requesting that they inform their Congressmen of their concern over the rent-control crisis.

The Baltimore City Council has just passed a hastily prepared ordinance to provide stop-gap local rent control in case the Congress fails to legislate. Without discussing the grave constitutional questions raised by this bill, I wish to say that I am hesitant to sign the local bill if it should indicate that the city of Baltimore desires to take on a function heretofore so adequately handled by the Federal Government.

Rent control in the present circumstances is clearly a function of the Federal Government. I am certain that all city officials throughout the country join me in urging Congress to meet its obligations in a forthright and statesmanlike manner.

The cities have neither the finances nor the experienced staff to take on this burden.

With the addition of the few points discussed below, I think the Senate bill (S. 2182) will provide adequate rent control.

The mayors of America are daily faced with the housing shortage. They know from acute personal experience how bad the situation is. The demand for rental housing, which was not caused by rent control as claimed by many, will not be met by new construction for several years. In the meantime rent controls must be continued.

Adequate enforcement sanctions: No law can really be effective without adequate sanctions to enforce it. Under the Senate bill the only means of enforcing the law available to the rent administrator is to seek a court injunction to restrain any landlord who has already violated the law from doing it again. While injunctive relief is useful in properly administering a regulatory law, to leave the rent administrator with no other sanction is reprehensible. A court injunction is no deterrent to a landlord who desires to illegally evict his tenant. To ask a court to enjoin a landlord from unlawfully evicting other tenants in the future is no help to a tenant who is already in the street. The lack of good faith on the part of the landlord in evictions cannot be shown in many cases until after the tenant is evicted.

If Congress wants to provide an adequate rent control law it must authorize the rent administrator to refer cases of willful and flagrant violations to the Department of Justice for possible criminal prosecution. This was the unanimous recommendation of the full Senate Banking and Currency Committee. This provision was stricken out by the Senate on a voice vote. I do not believe the Senate considered the matter in all of its implications.

The rent administrator should also be provided with the authority to bring treble damage actions for rent overcharges in cases where the tenant fails to bring such a suit on his own after a reasonable period. The Senate bill leaves this remedy entirely in the hands of the tenants. Very few tenants' suits were brought during the life of the present law. The national rent administrator testified that this remedy was ineffective to prevent wide-scale violation of the present act. I strongly urge the inclusion of this provision.

Selection of local advisory boards: A majority of the local advisory boards were stacked with landlords. I think these boards should be representative of the diverse interests of the community as the law provided. While I think these boards should act in an advisory capacity only, I say in answer to those who demand local autonomy that these boards should be appointed on the recommendation of the individual mayors of the Nation. We know our local conditions much better than the governors and we are much more personally concerned that the boards be properly constituted. I do not ask for unlimited local autonomy—earlier in this letter, I indicated that I thought rent control was a Federal responsibility. But insofar as a Federal program can properly reflect local participation I think it should. The law would go a lot further in providing for local autonomy if the mayors were allowed to recommend appointments to these boards. I am sure my views on this point are shared by the great majority of mayors throughout the country.

In conclusion, as mayor of Baltimore, as chairman of the standing committee on legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors, and as a former Member of Congress, I urge the Congress to preserve our last safeguard against a terrible inflation. Speedy enactment of the Senate bill with the added features I have suggested, is of the utmost importance. I trust the Congress will not fail us.

With assurances of respect and esteem, I remain

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor.

Sometimes I Wonder If Congress Is Sufficiently Diligent in Caring for the Economic Well-Being of Our Own People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that it has been a long time since I last addressed myself to a question not before this House, I am deeply appreciative of the courtesy extended by each and every one of my colleagues for permitting me to do so today.

I am going to ask that you indulge me and let me speak on the so-called Marshall plan as comprehended in S. 2202.

While it is a fact that that bill is not before us, there is one infamous provision of that plan that is patently and with certainty before the good people of the First District of Alabama.

That provision has to do with chartering, transferring, or in any manner making disposal to foreign countries of some 300 vessels of the United States merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the Marshall plan, I would have you know that there is not a single man, woman, or child in the First District of Alabama who is not favorable to succoring the intolerably hungry, cold, and ill-clad people in foreign lands.

They are of one mind with me in feeling that we should provide these people with necessitous food, fuel, raiment, and shelter—and until better days come to their lands.

Moreover, they are willing that we in Congress should provide at no cost whatever things which are indispensable to human life.

Moreover, they are agreed that the Government of the United States should pay the cost of freighting our donations of these necessities to the friendly people of other lands; but they are tired of being made suckers by the internationalists in our State Department who are seemingly willing to give anything or everything in America away to foreign people and foreign governments.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if this Congress is sufficiently diligent in protecting the national interests and the economic well being of our own American people.

Certainly it is high time that we in Congress make up our minds whether to return to the policy of securing our own national economy and domestic interests or to follow the policy of international altruism laid down by the "do-gooders" in various executive departments of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, under the so-called Marshall plan S. 2202—and among other cockeyed provisions of that bill—is one provision with respect to merchant ships.

That provision contemplates the transfer or bestowal by charter or otherwise 300 of our merchant fleet to foreign countries.

When turned over to foreigners these ships will be used not alone to haul our gifts of food and other goods to the foreign people, but to compete with our own ships in all oceanic trade.

Thus, it is proposed that in addition to the billions of dollars worth of goods that we are to give the foreigners, that we should pay them cash money to haul our gifts in the American ships which we give them.

Mr. Speaker, that just does not make sense to me in any man's language.

That is a policy of far too much devotion to the interests of foreign and one of too little regard for our own.

I do not have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the many years I personally spent on the merchant marine and fisheries committee of this House, laboring to reestablish an American merchant marine.

Mr. Speaker, you know of the action programs which I instituted to get ever-increasing appropriations—better labor laws and better working conditions, and better living quarters built into these hulls for the men who would man those ships.

Well, at long last I thought we had gotten to a point where American seamen, shipping in American bottoms, operated by American ship owners and operators, at American rates of pay, could haul American cargoes to the four points of the compass, all under the American flag.

Well, Mr. Speaker, after years of struggle in the Congress, we built the ships. They were designed so that our American seamen would enjoy higher standards of living and comfort in their long, hazardous voyages through the seven seas.

Yes; we paid for these United States Government-owned ships with American taxpayers' moneys, collected from the wages of all our people.

While that was going on my people in Mobile, working on their own, built greater docks. They improved harbor facilities, shipyards, ship-repair plants, wharves, cranes, drydocks, and what not, with their own money and savings.

Yes, and my people down in Mobile built private cargo vessels, with their own hard-earned savings, and they manned them every one with an American crew and paid standard American rates of wages to all their seamen.

Now comes the "world planners," the "international altruists," and "do gooders" in the State Department, telling us in Congress how to implement the Marshall plan.

Without regard to American interests, they want to give these ships which constitute a part of our own merchant fleet away or charter them to foreigners—and why?

Because the American wages which our own Waterman Steamship Corp., and other Mobile shipping companies pay, the good food they serve and other general conditions which under laws enacted by this Congress they afford to their seamen—have tended to increase operating and rate charges above those which would prevail if the "furriners" manned and operated the ships.

Now, if the foreigners themselves had built the ships and paid for them—and manned them with their own crews and even paid substandard if not un-American rates of starvation wages to their crews and our ships could not compete—that would be one thing.

But it is unthinkable that our Government should give or charter away 300 governmentally owned vessels of our merchant marine fleet—and throw 20,000 of our own seamen out of work—and cause them and their families to suffer in order to send, without cost, wheat, corn, rye, barley, coal, clothing, and what not, to the impoverished in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, under date of March 6, I wrote the Honorable William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, the Honorable Phil Murray, president of the CIO, each a letter wherein I expressed my viewpoint with respect to the Marshall plan's proposal to transfer these ships.

I know that they are both of one mind with me in their desires to protect our own seamen and that both the CIO maritime committee, as well as the A. F. of L. support my stand.

I have today received Mr. Green's answer to my letter. His response—characteristic of his every word and act through these long years—is replete with factual expressions based solely on honor, decency, and justice to our own, as well as foreign interests.

It is the thoughtful, studied expression of a great American, spoken like an American and in an American way.

Mr. Green says he is against that proposal and so is FRANK BOYKIN.

I hope every Member of this House will join me in that opposition.

In order that every Member of the House can read that letter, I am submitting it herewith for publication in the RECORD:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1948.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in thorough accord with the point of view expressed in your letter dated March 6th and in the recommendations you made. There seems to be no justifiable or good reason for the transfer of vessels to foreign countries to be manned by seamen in these foreign countries for the purpose of transferring goods and material abroad in order to help these nations under the Marshall plan. Such action would result in curtailing employment for our own seamen. Surely it is not the purpose of Congress to create unemployment among our own American workers when we are trying to help distressed, starving people in Europe.

Our legislative representatives have been requested to call upon Members in the Senate, acquaint them with our views on this matter and to ask them to support the amendment which will be offered by Senator Brewster to S. 2202, as referred to in your letter.

As additional information, may I advise you that when I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of the Marshall plan, I specifically recommended that the provision in the bill which provided for the transfer of American ships to foreign countries, be stricken from the bill. It was my impression that the members of the committee favored such action but notwithstanding this, I noticed there is included in S. 2202 a section which provides for the transfer of 300 ships to foreign countries to be manned by seamen in foreign countries as a part of the Marshall plan. We are against it and will do everything in our power to have this provision stricken from the bill.

I am glad to note your point of view in this matter which you make clear in your communication as being in accord with our point of view.

Very truly yours,

W. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Italian Immigration Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will provide for an increase in the annual immigration quota for Italy for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950, by simply utilizing the unused Italian quotas for the past 10 years.

Representing a district in which there are many Italians, I naturally have learned to know them and I hold them in the highest respect. During the recent war I found them to be Americans first, and their loyalty was unquestioned. I dare say that in no part of my district is there a greater percentage of home owners than is represented by the people of Italian descent. So I unhesitatingly recommend the legislation which I am sponsoring.

The Italian quota is 5,802 immigrants a year. During the war years, naturally, this quota was suspended, with the result that approximately 34,000 Italians were blocked from entry into the United States. This bill provides for their entry in 1949 and 1950, and would fall in a category similar to the legislation now under consideration with regard to permitting large numbers of displaced persons to enter the United States. It is based primarily upon our desire to help solve the problems with which Italy is faced today, to help alleviate the suffering due to the tragic conditions there as well as in other parts of Europe.

I believe this legislation will be an encouragement to Italy as a demonstration that we are sincere in our protestations of sympathy and eagerness to help her retain her democracy, which is at stake today due to the inroads of communism. It will also help our country because the Italians are industrious, excellent workers; many of them skilled in various trades and professions. They will not be a drag on our economy, but, rather, an incentive to our progress. Most of them will be relatives of Italian-American citizens, with whom they can live.

The bill does not ask that immigration regulations and requirements be relaxed. Let us take no chances on letting any more Communists into the United States. Every application should be carefully scrutinized and every applicant, in order to be admitted, should meet the requirements that will make him an acceptable citizen of our country.

I believe this to be a fair and equitable proposal, and I urge Congress to give it favorable consideration.

A Change in Our Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

A growing rumor spreading through Washington points to an abrupt change in American foreign policy. It is based on the belief that there is no further possibility of conciliating Russia on a live and let live basis.

The rumor—and so far it is only a rumor—asserts that President Truman is going to take a strong hand in foreign relations. His advisers, it is said, are due for a severe shake-up. The President is dissatisfied.

Events of the past few weeks have aggravated the situation. One after another the Soviet Union has taken over the nations of eastern Europe. Its victories can be counted in the 10's; ours can hardly be found.

The death, by suicide or otherwise, of Jan Masaryk may be the match that touches off the new policy. For, however he died, there can be no doubt that it was tied directly to the creeping force that has just taken over Czechoslovakia.

At any rate, there can be little doubt that drastic action is needed. The world is tottering so perilously on the brink of catastrophe that half-way measures are almost criminal. Aggression must be stopped now or it will be too late.

Those who claim that a new policy is in the offing believe it will begin with direct warnings to Russia. In other words, the Soviets will be told off in no uncertain language. It will be a put-up or shut-up proposition.

Those around the President who are urging such a course admit that it runs the risk of ending in war. But they claim that the risk is already so close there is little real difference in the odds. They think there is nothing to lose.

On the other hand, they believe there is much to gain. They say there is the possibility that the Soviet Union will back down when confronted with a stern, blunt warning. Only this way can the danger of war be turned from our shores.

At present, the line between peace and war is dangerously thin. The Soviet Union has gobbled up so many small countries, that the iron curtain is now placed on the edge of territory we consider vital to our interests.

The key points at the moment are France and Italy. If the Soviet Union moves into either nation we would have little choice. We would have to resist or get out of Europe altogether. We could no longer make a pretense of influence.

In this situation, it is claimed, the President is ready to abandon all other issues and concentrate on world peace. This is something that cannot be obtained by sitting supinely back while the Soviet Union walks away with the prize.

Since the end of the war our attitude toward Russia has undergone a considerable change. At the beginning we tried every possible compromise and means of conciliation. We found that it didn't work out in a single case.

Gradually we stiffened, but we always yielded just enough to insure a Soviet victory. Now the watchword may be: "No more yielding. Russia must be stopped." Possibly it will work. Only the future can tell.

Should the President embark on such a program—and should it work—it may well be the stroke that recovers his lost political fortunes. He would certainly earn the gratitude of his fellow citizens, if not most of the people of the world.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement made by me on the equal rights amendment before the Subcommittee on the Judiciary:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I come before you to support Senate Joint Resolution 76, known as the equal rights amendment.

This amendment has been before every Congress since 1923. During that time there have been 25 hearings before congressional committees and subcommittes and in 1944 both major parties favored the amendment in their platforms.

The Republican platform read, and I quote:

"We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women.

"We favor job opportunities in the postwar world open to men and women alike without discrimination in rate of pay because of sex."

The Democrat platform read as follows:

"We favor legislation assuring equal pay for equal work regardless of sex.

"We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women."

It would seem as though action on this amendment were long overdue in view of these facts.

The women of my home State are overwhelmingly in favor of this amendment and the Republican women of the State federation, numbering 55,000 members, in a meeting held at Albany on March 10, 1947, passed a resolution in which they said:

"We earnestly urge that Senate Joint Resolution 76 (equal rights amendment) be reported out and that our Republican Representatives vote favorably upon it."

As a woman, I feel that we are well able today to take our place beside our men on an equal footing. I have no illusions that it will all be plain sailing, I realize full well that we will have to take the rough with the smooth and I think we are willing and able to do just that.

A great deal has been made of the so-called physical and biological handicaps of women and of the necessity that these create for certain protective legislation. I cannot agree with this view. I believe that women are, on the whole, stronger physically than men. The life expectancy of women in the United States is about 5 years greater than that of men.

Much is made of the hazard and handicap of maternity. This, again, is exaggerated. Maternity is not a disease; it is a natural and a perfectly normal function. Women in industry and labor should be allowed maternity bonuses and benefits for the necessary time that they have to absent themselves.

There is just as good and better reason for maternity bonuses as for soldier bonuses, and this in no way conflicts with the idea of equality.

The great and crying need for the amendment is to insure equal pay for equal work This has not been fully established and never will be until this amendment is passed.

The present laws prohibiting the employment of women in certain industries and night work mitigates strongly against them. What a farce it is not to allow women to run elevators at night, at higher pay; or to wait on tables at night when trays are lighter and tips higher, and then to allow them to do the heavy cleaning in offices at low pay all through the night.

No; women neither need nor want protective legislation. They want to be free to work as equals, asking for no special privileges but insisting on equality of opportunity and pay. We no longer expect or want men to give up their seats to us in crowded streetcars at the end of a hard day's work. The women of today are prepared to stand on their own feet and earn their own way without fear or favor.

We are ready to face the challenge of the New World, and on the whole we believe that the bright side of freedom and equality far outweigh the special privileges and courtesies which, at best, were only accorded to the few.

This amendment may do away with some clinging vines and may spoil the fun of those who have been exploiting women and to whose interest it is to keep them on a lower wage scale, but it is another step forward on the road of freedom. For that reason, and also to keep faith with the people of the whole country who were promised this amendment by both major parties in their platforms in 1944, I urge your committee to do everything possible to see that this amendment be written into the Constitution:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification."

Price Criteria in Licensing Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. HOMER R. JONES, OF WASHINGTON, TO THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS, UNITED STATES SENATE, RE PRICE CRITERIA IN LICENSING EXPORTS, MARCH 10, 1948

Mr. Chairman, for a period of some 4 years, during the recent war, the people of this Nation submitted to economic restrictions foreign to the fundamental concepts of our system and extremely irksome to a country endowed with a highly developed sense of personal liberty and rights.

They did it willingly in the national interest. They realized, as we all did, that individuality had to be submerged in order to concentrate our energies and production might for common security.

By mutual agreement, our people put aside normal ambitions and the privileges guaranteed them to accept regimentation deemed necessary for the achievement of victory over their common enemy.

They were told what to eat, what they could wear, how far they could drive their cars, how much money they could make, and at what jobs they could work.

This they did with a minimum of agitation and ill-feeling. In fact, one of the remarkable things was the cooperation they displayed and the cheerful and patriotic manner in which they accepted a mode of living so opposed to our hereditary beliefs and principles.

In a few more months it will be 3 years since the last shot of the war was fired. They have been painful months in many respects, for a sick world has not made our problems easy.

As they did during the war, the people of this Nation recognize certain contributions they must make toward world recovery. They have indicated and displayed their

willingness and desire to share with others the fruits of their labor and production. They have spent billions—and contemplate the expenditure of additional similar sums—to help put the world back on its feet.

They are not hollering about this, either. They know certain restrictions must remain in effect until world recovery is more than just a symbol and a goal.

I have never seen this truth more clearly demonstrated than in the past few weeks before Congress. It has been proven here and before committees of the House which, like yourselves, are concerned with the policies and regulations governing our important foreign trade.

In these committees I have heard the people most concerned—those who are engaged in the export trade and whose source of livelihood is its continuation, accept, almost without dissent, the necessity for restricting exportation of certain commodities in short supply.

Bear in mind that these people are saying to us:

"We admit the necessity and desirability of limiting exports in certain items. We think it is in the interests of the domestic economy to do this. We know it means a lower business volume for us, with less profit, but we subscribe to the principles involved."

Then, why are we all here to bring to the attention of Congress this important matter?

It is simply because Government, through clumsy, cumbersome and poorly conceived policy, not only imposes these restrictions, but administers them in such a manner that business just cannot operate.

All these gentlemen ask from their government is a clearly defined administrative policy in the matter of export controls. What they want is simplification and competent administrators within the Office of International Trade who, by the application of common sense and with sympathy toward the problems controls necessarily create, can do this job as painlessly as possible with a minimum of delay and confusion.

What they want, too, is the opportunity to stay in business and protect the investment, experience and effort involved in their individual enterprises.

They are here because Government regulations and policies are so confusing and so unreasonable that business is placed in serious jeopardy.

You have heard adequate testimony about the affects of the new regulations, which are so particularly unpalatable to the businessmen engaged in foreign trade.

I'm sure you have satisfied yourselves that the use of price criteria, at least as applied under Bulletin 431, places the small merchant exporter in an unfair competitive position.

And I believe you will agree that to turn our $16,000,000,000 annual export trade over to foreign governments, as the Office of International Trade proposes and is doing, is little short of criminal.

It is up to this committee and the Congress to correct these evils. If it cannot be done by reasonable persuasion with those responsible for formulation of export policies and administering them, then it must be done by legislation. It must be done for the protection of $16,000,000,000 worth of American business, the national economy, and for the veteran and small-business man who has no champion but Congress.

In my office files are hundreds of letters from exporters in my own district. Some of them are absolutely against the wall. They can get orders for merchandise, they can secure supplies to ship, but they can't get Government permission, in the form of an export license, to complete the transaction.

I know of cases where some of these men have merchandise in warehouses, on which they pay rent and against which some of them have bank loans. The Government has made frozen assets of this merchandise, if, indeed, you can call the merchandise assets.

It is my personal conviction that Bulletin 431 with its unreasonable and officious demands on business, should be repealed immediately by whatever method is necessary.

It is my further conviction that industry, itself, should be invited to help write the regulations under which it will operate. We have done this before and it has worked fairly and efficiently.

It is my further belief that what the Office of International Trade needs is a few good administrators, backed by experience and common sense and not motivated alone by untried, unsound, and impractical theories.

Under the law, the Department of Commerce is delegated the authority and responsibility, among other things, to "promote foreign and domestic commerce." It fails to say anything about ruining businessmen engaged in foreign trade, or to impose regulations so arbitrary and restrictive that business hasn't a gambler's chance of survival.

If the administrators of the Office of International Trade desire to do things "by the book," then let them follow the book that directs them to promote trade.

I'm sure the interests of this country will be served better by protecting, encouraging, and fostering the thousands of small businesses dependent on exports.

If the administrative branch of our Government finds it impossible to operate under this principle, then let's draw them a picture and lay down the proper procedure to attain this objective.

Palestine—Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 a committee was organized for justice and peace in the Holy Land. Distinguished American citizens have joined in an effort to prevent partition on the ground that it may ultimately lead to war and thereby jeopardize the very existence of the United Nations Organization. It is an issue that should be removed from American domestic politics, which was, perhaps, responsible for the action by Government leaders in this country to force the partition resolution through the United Nations Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that wide coverage and publicity was given to the formation of this committee, except in one or two instances it was apparently censored by the press. In order that the people of this country might be fully informed, I include as part of my remarks a news article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 3. I subscribe wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker, to the statement of purposes upon which this organization came into being.

The article follows:

NEW COMMITTEE OPPOSES UN'S PALESTINE PLAN—VIRGINIA GILDERSLEEVE HEADS GROUP URGING ASSEMBLY TO RECONSIDER PARTITION

(By Jack Werkley)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—A new element was introduced into the Palestine controversy with the formation here today of the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land.

The committee opposes enforcement of the proposed United Nations partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states for a reconsideration by the UN General Assembly of its partition plan.

An immediate appeal by the UN Security Council to both Arabs and Jews to cease fire in the Palestine fighting is suggested by the committee. The cease-fire agreement would prevail pending reconsideration of the case by the General Assembly and reference of the controversy to the International Court of Justice.

Miss Virginia C. Gildersleeve, dean-emeritus of Barnard College was elected chairman at the organization meeting here today. Henry Sloane Coffin, president-emeritus of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, was named vice chairman. Kermit Roosevelt, of Washington, a grandson of Theodore Roosevelt, was named executive director.

UNITED STATES POSITION BACKED

The nucleus of the organization is a National Council of 100 members, including a number of well-known American churchmen and educators, many of whom have lived and worked in the countries of the Middle East.

Miss Gildersleeve said at a press conference today that the committee has had insufficient time to adopt specific stands on a number of questions involved in the Palestine problem.

She made clear, however, that the committee shares the view of the American Government, as stated before the Security Council last Tuesday, that the UN has no legal authority to use force to guarantee partition of Palestine since the partition plan was simply a recommendation of the General Assembly.

Miss Gildersleeve, Mr. Roosevelt, and other committee members asserted the committee's belief that the Palestine problem must be solved through conciliation or some sort of compromise agreeable to both the Arabs and the Jews.

The committee members held that efforts to reach an amicable settlement of the Palestine problem had not been exhausted through the long years of negotiation and conflict in the Holy Land.

MEET WITH MARSHALL

Miss Gildersleeve said she was unable to say what solution of the Palestine problem the committee had in mind. A number of solutions had been suggested, she said, but since there still was no stand on this by the committee, only personal views could be expressed. The chairman and other members present withheld their views on this phase at the press conference.

Earlier, Miss Gildersleeve, Mr. Roosevelt, and three other members of the organization called on Secretary of State George C. Marshall at the State Department. Miss Gildersleeve said the Secretary "listened with interest" to the committee's plan and to personal expressions of views, "but, naturally, we did not expect him to make any statement."

The other committee members who met with Mr. Marshall were the Reverend Daniel Bliss, minister of the Second Congregational Church, of Greenwich, Conn., and president of the board of trustees of the International College of Beirut, Lebanon; the Reverend James K. Quay, vice president of the Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton; and Dr. Carleton Coon, professor of anthropology at Harvard University.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

The committee presented to Mr. Marshall the following statement of its purposes, which was handed to the press:

"The aims of the committee are:

"1. To bring peace with justice to the Holy Land;

"2. To further the best interests of all Jews, Christians, and Moslems in the Near and Middle East;

"3. To foster friendly relations among the peoples of the three faiths throughout the world;

"4. To strengthen the United Nations.

"These aims can be accomplished only by solutions which conform to the United Nations Charter, to international law, and to democratic principles. We believe the following steps should be taken immediately:

"1. The Security Council should appeal to both sides 'to cease fire' pending reconsideration by the General Assembly of its recommendations concerning Palestine and reference of the case to the International Court of Justice as provided in the United Nations Charter.

"2. The Palestine question should be removed as an issue in American domestic politics by adoption of a bipartisan policy.

"3. The United Nations should act rapidly to find homes for displaced persons, and the United States should adopt legislation to admit its full share."

Temporary offices of the committee are at 1107 I Street NW., Washington.

COUNCIL MEMBERS LISTED

The secretary of the organization is the Reverend Garland Evans Hopkins, associate foreign secretary of the Methodist Church.

Members of the national council also included Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister emeritus, Riverside Church, New York; Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, of Baltimore; Rev. Dr. Henry Pitney Van Reusen, president, Union Theological Seminary; Earl Bunting, chairman of the board, National Association of Manufacturers; Dr. Paul Hutchinson, editor, The Christian Century; William Ernest Hocking, professor emeritus, Harvard University.

Also Harold Lamb, author; Representative Lawrence H. Smith, Republican, of Wisconsin; Rev. Dr. Wynn C. Fairfield, general secretary, Foreign Missions Conference of North America; Rev. Dr. Albert E. Day, pastor, Mount Vernon Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore; Dr. George W. Sadler, foreign secretary, Southern Baptist Convention; Nelson V. Russell, president, Carroll College; Walter A. Groves, president, Center College; Rev. Dr. Fred Field Goodsell, executive vice president, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; Dr. Herrick B. Young, secretary, Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church, United States of America.

Also, Dr. Bayard S. Dodge, president emeritus, American University of Beirut; Dr. John A. Wilson, director of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago; Dr. Walter L. Wright, Jr., professor of Oriental languages, Princeton University; Rev. Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, dean emeritus, Drew Theological Seminary; Dr. Allen O. Whipple, clinical director, Memorial Hospital, New York; Dr. Ralph Cooper Hutchinson, president, Lafayette College.

Also, Rev. Dr. Charles T. Bridgeman, Trinity Church, New York; Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, professor of geology, Harvard University; Carroll Binder, editorial-page editor, the Minneapolis Star-Journal; Harold H. Fisher, chairman, Hoover Institute; and Gloria M. Wysner, secretary, Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

A Loophole in Our Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I understand that shortly a tax-revision bill will be offered in the House. The tax staff is already working out the details of the bill. Although we were promised by the majority a complete overhauling of the tax law, I imagine that it will be more or less patchwork in view of the fact that an early adjournment of Congress is contemplated. Certainly with a Presidential election in the offing there will be no attempt to tax farm cooperatives.

However, there is a loophole—or should I say a breach as big as a barn door—in the tax law that should be closed. It has to do with nonresident aliens who trade on our stock and commodity markets but who escape taxation on profits derived from speculation on stocks, securities, and commodities on American exchanges and which would be considered taxable income for an American citizen. Nor do these nonresident aliens pay any tax on capital gains. Legislation eliminating this situation should have a great appeal to the Republican majority for the reason that it would produce substantial revenue for the Government without the loss of a single vote.

An article in America, a Catholic review of the week, under date of March 6, 1948, focuses attention on this unfair and discriminatory feature of the tax law. The article follows:

A LOOPHOLE IN THE TAX LAWS

People close to financial and market circles have long been aware of an unfair, and perhaps dangerous, loophole in our tax laws. It concerns those known as nonresident aliens. In the section of the United States Code that covers the taxing of such people (title 26, No. 211), we find that those "engaged in trade or business within the United States" are fully taxed. But the joker is the following sentence: "Such phrase does not include the effecting of transactions in the United States in stocks, securities, or commodities through a resident broker, commission agent, or custodian" (26:211; a, 3, b).

So a nonresident alien who is playing the stock market falls under the paragraph covering the taxation of those "not engaged in trade or business." And here you find another joker: they are taxable on a long list of things (dividends, rents, etc.), but no mention is made of capital gains. And there you have the complete loophole—an engraved invitation to a wealthy foreigner to engage in pure speculation on the American market. As a matter of fact, it is known that a small wealthy group has made, and still is making, large profits in this fashion—all tax-free. Vitally necessary, therefore, is the proposal of Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, that we plug this gap in our laws. He is quoted in an AP dispatch from Washington (dated February 20) as saying: "This discrimination seems to me of particular importance today as we are about to commence consideration of the European recovery program." We fail, however, to see why Senator LODGE would have his proposal apply only to aliens who "stay in this country more than 90 days." A good portion, maybe a majority, of these people do their operating from a base in Europe, and only their money or their agent touches our shores. Why not apply the principle of reciprocity? No American could get away with this in a European market. Finally, to suggest a fruitful line of inquiry, we ask: Is there possibly any connection between this matter and the sudden, mysterious "breaks" in the markets that puzzle us at times?

Peace in the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Dr. James G. McDonald to the New York Herald Tribune, dated March 3, 1948:

PEACE IN THE HOLY LAND—MR. M'DONALD DISSENTS FROM THE GILDERSLEEVE REPORT

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

My reading in the New York Herald Tribune today of the statement of the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land and the explanation of the chairman, Miss Virginia C. Gildersleeve, has left me with a feeling of amazement and consternation; amazement that the group of American educators and religious leaders who have endorsed the new committee should ignore the realities of the Palestine problem and basic Christian interests in the Middle East; and consternation that these leaders should in the name of "peace and justice" invite the United Nations to commit suicide by yielding to Arab aggression and to Arab threats of war.

The sponsors of the committee are quoted as contending that "the Palestine problem must be solved through conciliation or some sort of compromise agreeable to both the Arabs and the Jews." This is tantamount to asking the Jews to surrender their hopes and their rights in Palestine. The Arab leaders when they appeared to give testimony before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry (of which I was one of the American members) were unanimous and unyielding in their demand that the Jews should relinquish all special rights or claims to such rights in Palestine. Unashamedly, these Arab leaders demanded the scrapping of the Balfour Declaration with its clear and solemn pledge to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish homeland in Palestine. They demanded, too, the scrapping of the League of Nations mandate which incorporated the Balfour pledge and which had made that pledge the international law of the civilized world for three decades. In short, the Arab spokesmen would agree to nothing less than that the Jews become a helpless and defenseless minority in their historic, their promised homeland. In the 2 years since the Anglo-American Committee concluded its hearings, Arab intransigence has not diminished. Instead, if that were possible, it has increased.

In view of this Arab defiance, the call of the committee for compromise agreeable to both the Arabs and the Jews must have the effect of bringing pressure to bear upon the Jews to yield to Arab intransigence. How such pressure can contribute toward peace and justice in the Holy Land is a mystery which neither the committee's statement nor the explanation of its chairman does anything to clear up. The amazing fact is that the committee and its sponsors could have so completely disregarded the obvious pro-Arab effect of their call for compromise.

Similarly, the committee ignores the miracle of re-creation which the Jews have worked in Palestine under the mandate and the beneficent effect of that re-creation upon the welfare and the feelings of the masses of the Arabs in the country. That the Arab worker and peasant are not unaware of the benefits of Jewish enterprise, modern techniques, and devotion to the land is evidenced by the fact that in the recent outbreaks of

violence the masses of the Palestinian Arabs have had little or no part. On the contrary, the Arab attacks have been spearheaded by guerrillas or members "on leave" of the armed forces from across the frontiers. Surely if the rank and file of Palestine Arabs were as violently anti-Jewish as their self-appointed leader, there would be no need—since the Arabs outnumber the Jews two to one—for assistance from Syria, Iraq, and other neighboring Arab states.

Among the sponsors of the new committee is such a large proportion, if not a majority, of Protestant religious leaders that the reader naturally concludes that Christian interests in Palestine and the Middle East would be advanced by the proposed surrender to the Arabs. Precisely, the opposite would be the more likely result of such un-Christian sacrifice of the Jews to Arab fanatical nationalism.

During the investigation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in Palestine and the neighboring Arab states, we were given many opportunities to hear either in open session or private interviews, the opinions of Christian leaders. Of all these leaders none impressed me as deeply as did the patriarch of the Maronites. This venerable head of one of the most important Christian sects in the Middle East was unqualified in his support of the Zionist aspirations in Palestine and in his denunciation of those Moslem leaders whom he charged were, in the name of Arab nationalism, preparing the way for a frontal attack upon Christianity in that area.

The patriarch's statement made to me in the presence of his advisers was in substance as follows: "In Palestine the Zionists are synonymous with rebirth and fertility; the Arabs have been synonymous with aridity and decay. The only menace to Christianity in this part of the world is from the success of inflamed Moslem nationalists. Tell your American Christian friends this truth about the danger which threatens Christianity here." Very respectfully I suggest to the Christian leaders sponsoring the new committee that they take account of the patriarch's warning.

Recently one of the official organs of the Church of England, "The Record," put the case incontrovertibly: "There can be no impartiality between right and wrong, between justice and injustice. * * * The only consistent course would be for the UN to declare the Jews as allies and defenders of the world conscience. The Haganah might logically be appointed as the international force in Palestine."

In all fairness is not this approach at once more realistic and Christian than that of the new committee, which by urging appeasement of Arab aggression, invites the United Nations to commit suicide?

JAMES G. MCDONALD.

NEW YORK, *March 3, 1948*.

Termed "Red Spy Associate"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there should be no question about our Government employing those who do not believe in our form of government. I am including a very timely editorial by Spencer Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel Tribune of Bowling Green, Ohio:

TERMED "RED SPY ASSOCIATE"

That "a man is known by the company he keeps" has a basis of fact in human nature; and, in view of the actions of Soviet Russia since victory was won in World War II, and the attitude of our Government against communism, a scientist who cares to hold a Government job and is acute enough to perform his duties should have enough common sense and such a recognition of propriety as to avoid personal relations with representatives of communism. He should keep himself free of any suspicion of wittingly or unknowingly "giving aid and comfort to the enemy."

That is the way we feel about Dr. Edward U. Condon, who is under suspicion of the House Un-American Activities subcommittee. It charges this "top atomic scientist" with associating with alleged Soviet spies and labels him as "one of the weakest links in our economic security." He is head of the National Bureau of Standards.

It may well be that Dr. Condon is entirely blameless in his loyalty to America and is not himself infected with communism, as are some people of high reputation. It is easy to understand that he might enjoy himself especially in the company of other scientists, even Russian. His own statements indicate surprise that his possible loyalty is questioned.

But he should have kept himself above suspicion at a time when Soviet Russia is causing the downfall of free governments and is engaged in a "cold war" with ours. "Birds of a feather flock together" applies not only to those of common interest in knowledge but may also apply to those of kindred ideologies of government.

One who behaves suspiciously in war is likely to be court-martialed. A spy certainly never has any hesitancy to lie. His ability to make others believe his pretensions is what makes him valuable. One who behaves suspiciously in Government work should be given full opportunity to defend himself; but it should not be necessary for the Government to convict him. If the suspicion still exists, he should not be kept on the job where he may do harm.

We have no patience with those who would outlaw the Communist Party, because such power, if exercised and upheld by the courts, would be highly dangerous to all our liberties; but we would permit no Communist to become or remain a Government employee; and we would fire anyone who has a tincture of "red." The State Department is shown by Fulton Lewis, the CKLW radio commentator, to have had some of its secrets disclosed by "red" or "pink" employees. Let us not take chances of losing our liberties by Red fifth columnists.

John Marshall Robsion: "Here Was a Man to Hold Against the World, a Man To Match the Mountains and the Sea"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 17, JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, in Barbourville, Ky., at the home of a friend, passed away.

Told by his physician that his heart was in a weakened condition and that he should not see visitors, he would not deny the people who loved him and they came to him to the very last.

JOHN M. ROBSION was a great Kentuckian, an illustrious American.

In him death chose a shining mark. His hold upon the affections and confidence of his people was unequaled by any man who preceded him in the Congress from eastern Kentucky. By years of unselfish service he earned and held the boundless trust, the devoted friendship, and abiding love of his people.

I first knew him as a lawyer in 1908, while he and I were attorneys in the neighboring towns of Jellico, Tenn., and Barbourville, Ky. He was an able lawyer. Learned in the law, he had what lawyers term a "legal mind." Instinctively, he went to the heart of a lawsuit. Before a jury he was irresistible. He knew human nature, was a master of the logic of the human heart, and spoke the language of his people.

Before his journey ended he walked with the great of this earth, but he never lost the common touch. With pride he referred to the fact that his father was a tenant farmer and that as a boy and as a young man he knew what it was to eat his bread in the sweat of his face. What was the source of his strength? He is the answer to that question.

He sprang from the plain whence have come the world's immortals, from the ranks of the red-blooded, rugged, middle class. As a boy he attended the common schools; as a young man he taught school and with his earnings completed his literary and legal education.

He was diligent in his business and did with his might whatever his hand found to do. He knew that in every controversy, political or legal, the determinative, controlling factors are living men and women.

I knew him for more than 40 years. He was eminently successful as a lawyer. There was no better trial lawyer in Kentucky. He was a forceful and effective speaker. Whether in the courtroom, on the stump, or in the Congress, he was a foeman worthy of any man's steel. He had few equals and no superior. He made a living for himself and loved ones. He did more. He made a life that was a benediction to all who came within its radiance. The world is better for his having lived in it. He lived a full life. Devoted to his family, loyal to his friends, a great, fearless public servant, no abler nor more popular man ever represented his people in Congress.

He was a stateman. He loved his congressional duties, and brought to their performance a wide knowledge of public affairs.

He was never defeated in his races for the House. Elected in November 1918 to the Sixty-sixth Congress he was five times reelected to the Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, and Seventy-first Congress. He was appointed to the United States Senate on January 9, 1930 to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Frederick

M. Sockett. He was elected to the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses, serving in the Congress more than a quarter of a century, during which time this country fought two world wars.

A member of the committee on committees, the national Republican congressional committee, the steering committee of his party in the House, and the Committee on the Judiciary, he played a large part in formulating and guiding the policies of his party and in writing the laws of the land.

A devout and consistent member of the Christian Church, for years a Sunday-school teacher, he was a constant student of the Bible. On more than one occasion, on going to his office here in Washington I found him deeply engrossed in the study of the Bible. His knowledge of it was profound. He was especially fond of reciting the twenty-third Psalm and delighted in dwelling on its beauty and majesty, its faith and promise.

He gave himself without stint to the performance of his duties as a Congressman. No service to his people was too small to enlist his best efforts. No task was too great for him to tackle. He put his heart and mind into his work. He mastered every subject. In his discussion of legislation he was able always to give reasons for his stand on any measure. He carried on a voluminous correspondence with his people, answering every letter he received.

He had many visitors from his State. I never saw a man more considerate or kindly in taking care of a constituent. They were under his watchcare and devotion from the time they entered his office until they departed. He loved and served them with all his mind, heart, strength, and soul.

For 25 years he wove into the warp and woof of national legislation the very fiber of his mind and soul. At his death he was engaged as the chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws in the revision of the United States Code. So far as he finished this work, it will be his monument.

He was ever alert to the interests of the veterans and to the welfare of the working people. All the people had in him an advocate and champion ever zealous in their service.

His sympathetic understanding gave him the key that unlocked human hearts. Kentuckians welcomed him into their heart of hearts and into their homes.

He had a great fund of human interest stories with which he illustrated his discourse and arguments. He was apt in illustration, keen in perception. His industry was tireless. His whole life was characterized by his eagerness to learn and his ability to grow. He was wise in the ways of the world. No dreamer was he. His wisdom increased with the years. His was the homely, homey philosophy of the common man.

With him the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. From his boyhood till the last summons came "he increased in stature and wisdom."

The truth, the wisdom, the imagery of the Bible ran through his discourse and through his speeches like threads of gold through cloth of silver.

In 1940, I attended the opening of the Republican campaign in Somerset, Ky. While waiting for my train, Judge R. C. Tartar, a devoted friend of Representative ROBSION, stated to me that ROBSION never lost a friend and was always making new friends. He then related the following incident. He said, "I was driving down a country road during one of ROBSION'S campaigns and noticed someone had written with a red pencil on one of ROBSION'S pictures posted on a tree near the roadside. I was curious to see what the writing was so I got out of my car and walked over to the picture: These are the words that had been written on the picture—'JOHN M. ROBSION, the same today, yesterday and forever,'" Judge Tartar then said, "Those words so aptly characterized the man and the deathless love his people cherished for him, I took it down, framed it and hung it on the wall in my office."

As he lay in state in Barbourville on the day of the funeral thousands of friends from all parts of Kentucky and from the farthest reaches of his district passed in an endless procession and gazed for the last time on his face. And as they looked on the tender peace that dwelt on the face of their dead friend, strong men wept as if they had stood by the lifeless form of their father or mother.

He left surviving him, his devoted widow, his son, Maj. John M. Robsion, an attorney of Louisville, Ky., and his daughter, Mrs. Henry Gordon Edmunds, of Washington, D. C.

JOHN M. ROBSION is not dead. He lives in the hearts of his loved ones, in the memory and affections of his friends who are legion, and in his good works that live after him.

At the height of his fame, his mind unimpaired, he glided gently out at ebb of tide.

He went as he would have chosen to go, not after a lingering illness of weakness and pain, but at the close of a day's work, in the faith and the courage of Tennyson's deathless words:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me,
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark,
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark.

For tho' from out our bourne of time and place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

Margarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, within a few days, I hope we will have the opportunity to vote in the House upon legislation to remove the Federal tax which is now levied upon margarine.

On August 2, 1886, President Grover Cleveland signed the bill placing a tax upon oleomargarine, and since that time, for 62 years, the people of the United States have paid a discriminatory tax upon a product which has come to be one of the staple articles of food in the American home. I do not know if there was a justification for this discriminatory tax when it was imposed in 1886. No justification exists now for continuing to impose this discriminatory tax on margarine. In 1886 the butter manufacturers may have found it difficult to sell all the butter they made at a profit. Such is not the case today. Butter is so scarce today that it brings close to $1 per pound. The price is so high that a large percentage of the American people actually cannot afford to buy it. Margarine sells at approximately half the price of butter after the tax is added. If the butter manufacturers wanted this Federal tax originally to destroy the competition of margarine, the tax has long since ceased to perform that function. There is so much difference in the prices of the two articles now that the margarine tax does not even tend to eliminate competition resulting from the sale of margarine. The Federal tax raises the cost of margarine to the consumer, but does not prevent its sale. What housewife who would refuse to pay 42 cents per pound for margarine is going to pay 80 cents to $1 per pound for butter? The fact is, there is so much difference in the price range of the two articles, that this Federal tax no longer affects the competition. It simply adds to the cost of the margarine which the customer is going to buy anyway.

The butter people say it should be taxed because it is artificially colored. If that is the case, then creamery butter should be taxed too, because it also is artificially colored.

Margarine has its origin on the farm. Cottonseed oil, peanut oil, and soybean oil, are among its ingredients. It is as much a farm product as butter is, and it is unjust to tax one farm product for the benefit of another which is untaxed.

I have heard it said that margarine is a synthetic or artificial product, and that it is a vegetable imitation of an animal product. It is true, of course, that margarine is made from vegetable oils, and that it resembles butter. It can just as truthfully be said however, that Crisco and other vegetable shortenings are made from vegetable oils, and that they resemble an animal product, namely hog

lard. Yet I have never heard anyone advocate a tax on these vegetable shortenings for that reason. It would be as fair, I think, for those who produce strained honey to assert that the sirup makers ought to pay a tax on sirup, because they have manufactured an article which competes with the natural product.

Boiled down, it amounts to this, that butter and margarine are two agricultural products, competing with each other in different price ranges, and a tax on either will not affect its sale, but simply adds to the price which the consumer must pay.

Margarine is clean. It is wholesome. It affords a market to the farmer for his products. It is a moderately priced spread, and is liked and enjoyed by millions of people. This tax upon it is an unjust imposition upon those who use it. It adds to the high cost of living. It is a discriminatory tax upon food, and it is the only such tax I know of. I cannot understand why we have borne it so patiently for 62 years. I have signed a petition to bring this legislation to the floor of the House, and I urge that every other Member do likewise so that this discriminatory tax may be removed.

What Does It Mean To Be an American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Knoxville Journal, published at Knoxville, Tenn.

This article is written by Mr. E. E. Patton, a very prominent Knoxville citizen and ex-mayor of that city, and is entitled "Ancient Greeks Had Effective Method of Ridding Nation of Troublemakers."

I recommend the article for reading by those who are interested in Americanism as it presents itself to us in this day.

Mr. Patton quotes from a poem which was read before the Manhattan Chapter of the D. A. R. on the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding. This poem rings clear of the spirit of Americanism, and it is fitting that it should have been read before so fine a patriotic group of ladies as comprise cur D. A. R.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANCIENT GREEKS HAD EFFECTIVE METHOD OF RIDDING NATION OF TROUBLEMAKERS

(By E. E. Patton)

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said
This is my own, my native land?"

The ancient Greeks had a method by which they could get rid of troublemakers and objectionable characters. They could hold an election of the qualified voters, and if a majority could be obtained, they could banish or ostracize a man—that is, they could send him out of the country. They voted by writing the name of the objectionable one on an oyster shell, which in the Greek was ostrakon. There might have been some injustices done, but I sometimes wish that we might have such a system here. We could ship some of our local Communists back to the land of Joey Stleensik. It would be perfectly satisfactory for them to be Communists over there, but not over here.

During World War I several applicants were examined in Federal court in Knoxville on their applications to become American citizens. Because of the war the Attorney General was just a little more careful than on ordinary occasions. One question that was asked of all applicants was this: "In the event of war between the United States and the country from which you came, would you fight for the United States?" This question was put to a young Armenian and he answered it with two words, "Most gladly." No one could doubt his sincerity or suspect that he would ever betray this country.

But what does it mean to be an American? This can perhaps be better answered by a foreigner than by a native American who has never known what injustice and oppression are.

Our Government has been forced to go through its various departments in Washington with a fine-tooth comb and rid our governmental service of those who are disloyal to our form of government. There is no criticism of this except from a few crack-brains who are more loyal to some dictatorial foreign government than they are to our own. The only criticism that loyal Americans could possibly make is that it has been too long delayed.

Strictly speaking, all of us are foreigners, and our loyalty is not to be measured by the length of time that our ancestors have been here but by how loyal and patriotic they have been and how loyal and patriotic we are today. That is the standard by which we are to be measured.

But it is all too true that countless thousands have come to our shores within recent years and after being here about 6 months would get a bath, change their names and begin an agitation and form a conspiracy to destroy our present form of government. The lamentable thing about it all is that in far too many instances our courts have condoned this very thing by permitting these governmental saboteurs to remain in this country.

But what does it mean to be an American? The friends and enemies of the Daughters of the American Revolution will admit that they are patriotic and want to see this government preserved in its present form. In 1923 a poem was read before the Manhattan Chapter of the D. A. R., on the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding; and this poem will give a compelling idea of what it means to be an American:

"What does it mean to be an American?
Around a foreign group the question ran—
I strive to answer it the best I can.
What does it mean? I look across the years.
I see them come—but through a mist of tears,
Our gallant forbears, full of hopes and fears.
I see them leave behind, for conscience's sake,
The homes they loved, the ties so hard to break,
Their questing, wandering, westward way to take.
I see them face and fight the wilderness,
And from its wildness wrest and win success.
I see them take their living from the soil,
The man and woman joined in homely toil—
Where then they planted, now our heart roots coil.
I see them build their homes, their house of prayer,
And when its bell rings out upon the air
I see them kneel in simple worship there.
I hear the drums of War's alarum beat.
I see them seize their arms, rise to their feet
Their enemies'—and Liberty's—to meet.
I see great cities rise, a nation grow,
To whose breast Earth's eager pilgrims go!
To be an American—is to be one
In whom these brave inheritances run—
A worthy daughter or a noble son.
And ye, who seek America today,
To succor you, to wipe your tears away,
Must come as they came, in that older day!
Their questing made a noble pilgrimage,
Their daring wrote a bright, illuminated page—
Their dreaming is our country's heritage!
New pilgrims from the land beyond the sea,
If true Americans you wish to be,
Take them to be your pattern, reverently.
Forget the Old World wrongs and tyranny,
Reject the new, base use of Liberty—
Read well the page they wrote in history.
Each tablet and each monument mark well
That we, remembering, have raised to tell
How they were victors—how here they fell!
Bow your uncovered heads in reverence deep
Beside the honored places where they sleep—
The memory of their deeds forever keep!
Learn to respect, all ye who cannot share
The brave inheritance we proudly wear
As heirs of those who lie so silent there!
They dreamed and dared—and died, when need arose;
In true American their red blood flows!
Who fail to honor it, we call our country's foes.
Around a foreign group the question ran:
What does it mean to be an American?
And I have answered it the best I can."

—*Roselle M. Montgomery.*

If doubts come to you about the honor, honesty, integrity, and fair dealing of your country, read the last three pages of A Man Without a Country; that will heal you and cure you of any doubts.

Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Oh, little people of the ravished plain,
No longer free of purpose, but the prey
Of new aggression, bending to the rain
Of man-made tumult in your storm-dark day. * * *
The world can hold no sunrise while the sun
Goes down behind your hills, which once you trod
In cheerful self-reliance, everyone
Pledged to his daily labor, and to God—
The world can know no honor, while the thrust
Has reached your breast. Dishonorable sword
Of cunning perfidy, which does to death
The broken body of the plighted word.
We bow in shame before the fact—and yet
You are not conquered * * * still the vital spark
Burns on to future freedom, while you set
Its focus and its flame within the dark.
You are not conquered while your lips intone
The ancient Credo of your living faith—
Your hearts have set to music, like my own,
One challenge * * * "Give us liberty or death."

Alice Garland Steele.

Standards for Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an article which appeared in the March 1948 edition of the Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, written by Hon. Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., United States district judge, district of Massachusetts.

At every attempt to revise the procedure applicable to congressional investigations, one or more Members charge the supporters of such legislation with communism. I am certain that no one will have the temerity to accuse the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, or any of its officers or members, of being Communists or Communist sympathizers, nor can anyone charge Judge Wyzanski with being a Communist or a Communist sympathizer. Judge Wyzanski is a graduate of the Harvard Law School, has served as solicitor of the Department of Labor, as Special Assistant to the Attorney General, and as special counsel for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. He has lectured on Government at Harvard and has been an overseer of Harvard University since 1943. He is a member of the Council of the American Law Institute and a member of the Joint Committee on Continuing Legal Education. His article follows:

STANDARDS FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Ever since the first congressional investigation—begun in 1792 and involving St. Clair, the Governor of the Northwest Territory—there has been vigorous public debate on the scope, methods, and effectiveness of congressional inquiries. As far back as 1832, John Quincy Adams raised a question which is still undetermined: Can Congress rightly inquire into a private person's political belief? And as comparatively recently as April 6, 1924, Mr. Justice Holmes, in a private letter to Sir Frederick Pollock, was expressing doubts as to whether the chief effect of congressional investigations was not to foster "a belief too readily accepted that public men generally are corrupt."

So far Congress has never seriously entertained a measure for the reform or limitation of congressional committees, although there have been many procedural bills introduced, of which the latest is H. R. 4564, Eightieth Congress, first session, introduced by Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, November 24, 1947. The aversion to these reform measures is due in part to a justified belief that most investigations are satisfactory and those that are unsatisfactory could be cured not by differences in rules but only by differences in men and in the time they spend in preparing for hearings. However, objection may also be due in part to the extraordinary advantages which the present system gives to individual members of Congress. These advantages find illustration in the persons of the present President of the United States and the senior Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The failure of Congress to reform itself is not however a weakness peculiar to the legislature. Few institutions—be they courts, bar associations, administrative agencies, labor unions or stock exchanges—are quite so sensitive to their shortcomings and their need of reform as are outsiders. As Acton reminded us, "All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

In the absence of congressional initiative the disinterested public may properly review the situation—taking into account first the legal foundation of congressional inquiries and the present procedure and then considering what are asserted to be the abuses of the present system and what if any reforms are worth attempting.

Since *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135 (1927)) there has been no doubt that either House of Congress has power, through its own process, to compel a private individual to appear before it or one of its committees and give testimony needed to enable it to exercise a legislative function given to it under the Constitution. Prior to 1927 the drift was the other way. While the leading case, *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168 (1880) could be explained, as Van Devanter, J., subsequently showed, as resting on the narrow ground that there Congress was inquiring of a matter which was pending in the courts and concerning which no valid legislation could be had, Miller, J.'s opinion breathed an air of hostility to congressional investigations. Indeed, from Prof. Fairman's researches, we now know that Miller simultaneously wrote a private correspondent that in 1880 "the majority of the court was prepared to decide that no power" existed "to compel by punishment witnesses to appear and answer questions which may throw light on the legislative duties of those bodies." Miller himself thought "the public has been much abused, the time of legislative bodies uselessly consumed and rights of the citizen ruthlessly invaded under the now familiar pretext of legislative investigation and that it is time that it was understood that courts and grand juries are the only inquisitions into crime in this country. I do not recognize that Congress is the grand inquest of the Nation."

Despite the breadth of Van Devanter, J.'s opinion in Daugherty's case and Butler, J.'s opinion in *Sinclair* v. *United States* (279 U. S. 263), it has, however, been suggested, as, for example, in the dissenting opinion in *United States* v. *Josephson* (C. C. A. 2, Dec. 9, 1947, and in a note in 47 Columbia Law Review 416) that there are legal limitations which a court would impose upon congressional inquiries. What are these possible limitations?

Of the limitations which do exist, one that is obvious in theory, though perhaps not in practice, is that the investigator is limited to compelling testimony, which is, as Second United States Code, section 192, puts it, "pertinent to the question under inquiry." That is, a witness cannot be criminally punished in a court, and cannot be held by a House of Congress for contempt (see *Sinclair* v. U. S., 279 U. S. 263, 296–297), if he refuses to answer a question which is not pertinent to the inquiry being conducted by the House or one of its committees and the issue of pertinency is ultimately a question of law which a court, not Congress or a jury, may be required to resolve (Sinclair's case, pp. 296–299). Moreover, the burden of proving relevancy is on the prosecution (Sinclair case). One difficulty with applying this doctrine in practice is that in every examination, whether by lawyers in court or by Congressmen in committee, so many questions are preliminary and intended merely as a foundation for an ultimate direct hit at the target that it is customary to leave to the tribunal of inquiry wide discretion in determining relevancy. Almost never is its discretion on such determinations disturbed. Moreover, in congressional inquiries the standard by which relevancy is to be ascertained must necessarily be the relatively vague text of a resolution rather than the allegations of a court complaint. Although it has been suggested that a resolution may be so vague that no standard of pertinency is supplied, and hence no compulsion to testify can be brought to bear on a witness, this suggestion has never been embodied in a majority opinion of any court.

Is it beyond its power for Congress to compel testimony on a subject as to which in the absence of an amendment to the Constitution only the States can legislate? That there is such a limitation upon the Australian dominion legislative body was held by the Privy Council per Lord Haldane in *Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Australia* v. *Colonial Sugar Refining Co.* (1914, A. C. 237, P. C. 1913). But I doubt whether such a limitation exists in the United States because, as now interpreted, our Constitution does not divide all subjects into two categories, one for the Nation and another for the States, but instead allows Congress to use a granted power to reach many matters which may be primarily of local concern. Examples are the Harrison Narcotic Act, the Social Security Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act. If we suppose, for instance, that Congress began an inquiry into divorce laws, could any court be confident that the information gathered would not serve a usefu. purpose in connection with a statute under the full faith and credit clause or in connection with tax law problems, such as joint returns, deductions or treatment of alimony?

Is it beyond its power for Congress to compel testimony on a subject as to which Congress is inhibited by the first amendment and similar provisions of the Bill of Rights? As a matter of fact, we know that Congress has compelled testimony about changes of opinion expressed by the press (see, for example, United States lobby investigation hearings, p. 3729) and organized activity leading to petitions to the legislature (see, for example, *Francis E. Townsend* v. *United States* (95 F. (2d) 352 (App. D. C. 1938), cert. den. 303, U. S. 664 (1938)). And if Congress were not permitted to compel testimony about the exercise of the various liberties such as speech, press, assembly, and worship, Congress would be handicapped in framing constitutional legislation. Moreover, the courts would be handicapped in discovering the factual basis which was alleged to warrant legislative limits on liberties. Is not a broad factual inquiry a suitable way of determining whether danger is "clear and present"?

Is it beyond its power for Congress to compel testimony when Congress has not specifically indicated that it proposes to use the testimony in connection with legislation? To this question the answer is categorically "No"; Congress has power even though it does not expressly avow the type of legislation, if any, it is considering enacting. *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135, 177–178).

We now come to the more difficult question whether Congress has the power to compel testimony in a ventilating investigation where its purpose is not to enact legislation but solely to expose facts and opinions to a public view. It is important to state at the outset that it is almost incredible that such a question can arise in practice. Almost every imaginable investigation will include as one of its declared primary purposes an inquiry as to how existing laws are working, or what laws might be passed, or how appropriations have been spent, or what appropriations might be made, or what other legislative action should be pursued. And it is unlikely that a congressional committee would ever avow that it had only a ventilating objective. However, if a committee did avow this was its sole purpose or if (as Clark C. J. seems to have done in Josephson's case on the basis of the committee's history), a court found that was its sole objective, then the issue of congressional ventilating power would be squarely raised. On that issue there are clear statements by the Supreme

Court unfavorable to Congress. *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168, 190; *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135, 173–174, 176). Moreover a general right of inquiry into private affairs has never been favored even by those scholars who regarded the informing function of a legislature as even more worthy of protection than the legislating function.

A limitation which does exist is that under the fifth amendment to the Constitution the witness cannot be required to testify as to any matter which will incriminate him unless he is relieved from Federal prosecution for the matter concerning which he testifies. (*Emery's case* (107 Mass. 72), (applying to a State legislative inquiry); *Counselman* v. *Hitchcock* (142 U. S. 547), (applying to an ICC investigation.)) The relieving statute which is now on the books (act of Jan. 24, 1862, c. 11, 12 Stat. 333; R. S. sec. 859; 28 U. S. C. sec. 634) unlike its predecessor (sec. 2 of act of Jan. 24, 1857, c. 19, 11 Stat. 155, 156), does not give that relief but only prevents the use of the witness' own testimony in prosecuting him. It has been vigorously contended that, as the statutes now stand, a witness in a congressional inquiry cannot be required to give testimony that will incriminate him (compare 3 Hinds Precedents 907, item No. 2447). But, of course, if he answers without claiming his privilege, his testimony may be used against him. (*United States* v. *DeLorenzo*, 151 F. (2d) 122, 125 (C. C. A. 2).)

Another limitation which now exists is that under the fourth amendment to the Constitution the witness cannot be compelled to respond to a subpena duces tecum which is unreasonably broad. (See *Hale* v. *Henkel* (201 U. S. 43, 76). However, the standard for determining reasonable breadth has been so liberalized in recent cases involving subpenas from administrative agencies (compare *Oklahoma Press* v. *Walling* (327) U. S. 186)) that it is unlikely that a subpena from a congressional committee will be condemned as unreasonably broad. (Compare Senator Norris, 74th Cong., 2nd sess., RECORD 4094, March 20, 1936).

While it is not clearly established, it would appear that there is no limitation upon requiring a witness to testify as to hearsay. The hearsay rule was created for tribunals where cross-examination was a recognized right and where there was a substantial risk that inexperienced laymen would be misled. Even in courts the hearsay rule is no longer rigidly insisted upon. It is commonly dispensed with in statutes creating administrative agencies which, as Judge Learned Hand said, act upon the kind of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in serious affairs. (*N. L. R. B.* v. *Remington Rand Inc.*, 94 F. (2d) 862, 873 (C. C. A. 2).) And it has no place in congressional inquiries, for, as Professor Frankfurter wrote in Congressional Investigations, Hands Off, 38 New Republic 324, 331, "Rules of evidence are but tools. These tools vary with the nature of the issues and the nature of the tribunal seeking facts."

There may exist some limitations of the type called privileged communications. Thus Mr. Samuel Seabury proposed a modified form of attorney-client privilege (33 Col. L. Rev. 1, 3), and Senator Norris recognized a husband-wife privilege (74th Cong., 2d sess., RECORD 4094), and Mrs. Douglas' bill H. R. 4564 even proposes that newspapermen should have a limited privilege of nondisclosure. (Cf. 8 Wigmore, Evidence, § 2286, note 7 and supplement.) More interesting, however, is whether there is anything like a State secret or official information beyond congressional reach.

Where the secret is known only to the President and his Cabinet or (as in the case of Mr. Grew's diary) to one of his Ambassadors, it is arguable that the privilege belongs to the Executive and can be released only by the President, or with his consent. That was President Grant's view. (See, Nevins, Hamilton Fish, pp. 812–825.) And Professor Corwin says that Congress has in fact never subpenaed a member of the Cabinet and has never addressed except by way of courteous request an inquiry to the Secretary of State. (Cf. Corwin, President: Office and Powers, 444–445. See 11 U. of Chi. L. Rev. 142.) Where the secret is known to a lesser official the privilege probably belongs to the Nation as a whole. It can certainly be released by a statute of Congress. Probably it can be released by one House acting alone or by a committee, since secrets of that lower dignity are often released by action of a subordinate executive officer and hence ought to be releasable by a Member of Congress. Where the secret is a judicial secret such as the proceedings of a judicial conference preparatory to writing an opinion, it may be that there is a privilege belonging to the judiciary, but that has not been decided, and might turn on whether the investigation were with a view to legislation or to impeachment.

It has been sometimes suggested that there is a privilege of or right to privacy so that private affairs need not be disclosed except when private conduct has made, encouraged or shielded official malfeasance. But if the investigation is for a legislative purpose and the question relates to a matter pertinent to the investigation the point that the answer will elicit information about private affairs is not a valid objection. (*Sinclair* v. *United States*, supra, 292–294.) Even if the right to be let alone is "the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men" (see Brandeis J., dissenting in *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438, 478–489)) that right does not stand athwart a relevant question in an authorized investigation.

A related, but as yet undecided point, is whether a witness can be compelled to state not the facts of his private business but his personal belief. Several types of questions of belief might be asked. A witness, particularly an expert, might be pressed for his opinion on a certain assumed set of facts—for example, on whether in the light of statistical data he is of opinion that an economic depression is likely to occur within the year. Such a question would plainly seem to require an answer.

A closer type of question is whether the witness is a member of a certain political party or believes in a certain political creed. As to this type of question the immediate doubt is whether a man's political adherence or personal belief is relevant to the particular congressional resolution of inquiry under which the committee is acting. But suppose the political adherence or belief is relevant. Can the question be resisted on a claim of privilege? In a letter to the Herald Tribune the editor of the New Yorker has eloquently contended that "the essence of our political theory in this country is that a man's conscience shall be a private, and not a public, affair and that only his deeds and words shall be open to survey, to censure, and to punishment." Is that contention fully sustainable? What if the witness has been nominated to the Interstate Commerce Commission and Congress investigating his qualifications for that bipartisan tribunal asks him to what political party he belongs? Perhaps the example is not entirely fair—it is a question put to a witness who may have elected to abandon his privilege by accepting a nomination; moreover, it is a question less about inward belief than outward behavior in joining a group. Take then the case of an alien appearing before the Immigration Committee of the House who is asked if he believes in the assassination of public officers or the overthrow of government by force and violence, or polygamy. Cannot Congress enact legislation making naturalization or immigration turn upon a person's belief? (See 8 U. S. C. secs. 705 and 136 (f). But compare *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U. S. 118, 132 note 8, 171, 181.) And, if so, cannot a committee considering naturalization or immigration legislation ask questions about a witness' belief? In short, may we not expect a majority of the courts to hold that Congress has a right to ask a witness his political belief or even his theological belief (but see 8 Wigmore, Evidence, sec. 2213), where it is pertinent to a resolution and where the inquiry relates to a field in which Congress can validly make legislative distinctions upon the basis of an individual's political or religious adherence or belief?

Let me turn now from the narrow questions of privilege to the broad problem of abuses which are asserted to characterize congressional inquiries. Some of those abuses—such as browbeating of witnesses and resort by the investigator to unfair newspaper publicity—are the kind of evil which may exist, unfortunately, in any tribunal, no matter what its rules, when unworthy men hold office. We must not forget that even courts have been presided over by undignified, intemperate, hectoring, even corrupt judges. After all, Jeffreys was a judge. But it is sometimes claimed that no court has a record which is so consistently below the standard of fairness as has Congress. Reference is made to the excesss of the lobby investigation described by John T. Flynn in Harper's magazine for August 1930 and Walter Lippmann in the Forum for September 1930 and to current practices of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the War Investigating Committee. Undoubtedly there are people who in view of these abuses want Congress to abandon or sharply curtail the practice of compelling private persons to testify in legislative investigations.

Some of these persons temperamentally have a strong sense of privacy or have a feeling that dignity and decorum are among the highest values. But to them the fundamental answer is that the democratic process is an open process in which we have deliberately chosen to sacrifice a large measure of the privacy, dignity, and decorum which characterizes other types of society in order to have in Pericles' words, "discussion and the knowledge that is gained from discussion" (Thuc. II, 40). Congressional investigations are only one, if an extreme example of our belief that exposure is the surest guard not only against official corruption and bureaucratic waste, inefficiency, and rigidity but against private malpractices, divisive movements, and antisocial tendencies in the body politic. That this confidence in legislative investigations as a prophylactic is not absurd is demonstrated to some extent by the difference in the strength and survival quality of democracy in English-speaking countries where such investigations are encouraged and continental countries where they have been held within close bounds (Cf. Ehrman, 11 U. of Chi. L. R. 1, 117). Perhaps France would have been better off if the Stavisky scandal had been investigated rather than hushed up.

Others who want Congress to curtail these legislative investigations regard them as chiefly platforms for aspiring politicians, not ground work for understanding difficult problems. The viewpoint of these critics has perhaps been most effectively put by Senator G. W. Pepper, Family Quarrels, page 173. His experience led him to believe that Senators learned almost nothing from compelling private persons to testify on topics as to which legislation was being considered, and that the best way for a Senator to make up his mind was for him like a lawyer preparing a brief to dig in a library for the real facts. However, I am inclined to believe that his views reflect the habits of an unusually bookish type of Senator and Congressman.

Most politicians play by ear. When they rely on their eyes they tend to act at sight of a newspaper not sight of a scholarly book or a statistical abstract. As James Scott Reston of the New York Times remarked, "Senators, as is well known, are great questioners, and like to say, with Mr. Kipling:

"'I keep six honest serving men.
(They taught me all I knew.)
Their names are What, and Why and When,
And How and Where and Who.'"

Moreover, even if all Members of Congress were prepared to gain their personal knowledge of a subject from studies in the Library of Congress it does not follow that the intellectual development which they would thereby acquire would by itself warrant legislation. Every type of government, and especially a democracy, relies upon the creation of a favorable public opinion for the acceptance and thus the enforcement of new legislation. And there is no more legitimate way of making the public sympathetic with new legislation than to let them participate vicariously in their representatives' experiences in hearing the alleged evils and the alleged panaceas. Even as unfriendly a witness as Mr. Wiggin of the Chase National Bank confessed to the Senate Banking Committee that investigations educate the public. (Pecora, Wall Street Under Oath, pp. 186-187 (1939).)

A third group who want Congress to curtail legislative investigations propose not that investigations should be abandoned but that they should be handled by disinterested qualified commissions—either existing administrative agencies, like the ICC, SEC, and FTC, or special ad hoc commissions, like the industrial commission set up by President Wilson, the Wickersham Commission on Law Enforcement and on Prohibition created by President Hoover, or the TNEC established by the action of both Houses of Congress during President F. D. Roosevelt's administration. This suggestion of ad hoc commissions is pressed particularly by those who admire the accomplishments of royal commissions functioning in the United Kingdom (cf. Frankfurter, the Public and Its Government). No doubt there is much to be said for the greater expertness, efficiency, sense of relevancy, and dignity of a commission. And it would frequently be fortunate if a commission investigation were preferred to a congressional procedure. But it is too much to expect that such a preference will always be exercised. There are certain topics which are essentially more suitable for a legislative than for a lay committee—for example, alleged corruption, favoritism or inefficiency affecting public business. Here visitatorial power should be exercised by the body which levies the taxes and appropriates the money to keep the executive departments running (Pepper, Family Quarrels, p. 177). And there are other topics on which it is quite justifiable to secure the public attention and newspaper, radio, and motion-picture publicity which Congress commands and which commissions generally cannot—and usually do not want to—attract. Examples, in my view, were the two investigations in the 1930's of the stock market and of the munitions industry. Both cut so deep into our fundamental policy, one in the realm of finance, the other in the realm of foreign affairs, that it was desirable to choose a tribunal of inquiry which would have the maximum continuous public attention. It would not, in my opinion, have been desirable for the Nation to proceed to enact legislation on stock exchanges or on neutrality if the country as a whole had been kept abreast of testimony only to the extent shall I say that it was kept abreast of the hearings before the Wickersham Commission, an able, dignified but colorless body.

If it be conceded that it is desirable that there should be a continuance of the practice of compelling private persons to testify before congressional committees on matters upon which legislation may be adopted, the question remains as to what reforms should be instituted.

Should there be a wider ambit of judicial review? No sensible person supposes that an injunction now lies against a congressional committee (Cf. *Hearst* v. *Black*, 87 F. (2d) 68 (Ct. of App. D. C.)) any more than it does against an administrative agency (Cf. *Myers* v. *Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp.*, 303 U. S. 41) to prevent it from continuing an inquiry or using testimony. But it has been suggested that a witness who believes he is being subjected to an improper question or search or other abuse should have a review instanter before a court. This and, indeed, any other broadening of judicial review seem to me ill-advised remedies. A witness in a trial court is not allowed thus to interrupt the progress of a case by appealing a ruling on evidence or procedure; if he feels strongly the justice of his position, he can defy the trial court and challenge its ruling in a contempt proceeding; but if his objection is minor or of doubtful validity his interest in an immediate determination has never been thought to outweigh the court's interest in prompt disposal of its business. And this familiar rule of court practice seems equally fair for legislative investigations. Moreover, the suggestion of a broadened judicial review of legislative investigations is founded upon a not universally shared view that the power of judges should be extended because they are ultimately the surest guardians of our liberty. After all it was a judge who told us "it must be remembered that legislatures are ultimate guardians of the liberties and welfare of the people in quite as great a degree as the courts" (Holmes, J., in *Mo. K. & T. R. Co.* v. *May*, 194 U. S. 267, 270). Furthermore, judges cannot be unmindful of Senator Pepper's caveat that if courts should interfere too often there would be constant tension and quarreling between two great divisions of our Government. As Senator Pepper reminds the courts "Joseph's brethren plotted to get rid of him for having a dream of supervisory authority" (Pepper, Family Quarrels, p. 173.)

Should Congress enact curative legislation addressed to the alleged abuses of congressional investigations? A serious objection to the suggestion of statutory reform is that probably no practical statute can be devised which will reach some of the most serious abuses. As Walter Lippmann observed, these abuses are not to be "solved by an ingenious idea" for to some extent they are a reflection of the "mores of the Nation" (84 Forum 129, 132). They are also a reflection of the shortcomings of individual legislators who pervert for publicity's sake, or some like ulterior objective, a procedural device which is not inherently unfair. And yet even if all abuses cannot be reached by a statute, if Congress enacted legislation which sought to cure only a few glaring evils, its action might not only accomplish those specific cures but might by demonstrating its awareness of the necessity of congressional self-restraint have a salutary effect on practices not specifically outlawed. Congressmen, better than most people, know that a statute is more than a sovereign's command enforced by a sanction; it is also an educational force going beyond the letter of the statute book; it sets in motion new trends which form new social patterns.

Looked at in that educational light, a statute might well stipulate as minimum standards for a legislative inquiry that a witness called before a congressional committee of inquiry would have the rights (a) to have counsel present, (b) to file a written statement before the hearing concluded and (c) to have an accurate record kept of his own testimony.

The right of a witness to have counsel present to assist him is almost universal in our system. The only important exception is in grand jury proceedings to which, it should be remembered, only witnesses and not prospective defendants are usually summoned. Secrecy and refusal to admit counsel there have an understandable purpose (Cf. *In re Kittle* (180 Fed. 946, 967, S. D. N. Y.)). But in congressional inquiries a witness should have a lawyer at his elbow not only so that he may whisper to his client claims of privilege but so that he may by his mere presence serve to remind the committee of investigation of the high standards which the legal profession seeks to maintain in all tribunals. All of us who sit in seats of authority know that not the least of the restraints upon us is the unspoken judgment of our peers.

The right of a person to file a brief written statement at the conclusion of his testimony or at the conclusion of testimony of a witness who had commented on him adversely ought also to be recognized. C. K. Allen, the warden of Rhodes House, Oxford, in his little volume on Democracy and the Individual has put the point well: "audi alteram partem is a fundamental law of democracy" (p. 67). The filing of a written statement is by now such a customary device in congressional hearings that its use is not only recognized but encouraged by section 133 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812, 831). Nor is there any danger that a statement filed at the conclusion of the witness' or of another's testimony will in some way hinder a disclosure of evidence—as congressional investigators might fear—give Congress or the public an initially erroneous slant on the topics being inquired into. Indeed, the right to file a statement before a congressional committee at the times I have suggested finds a compelling analogy in the right to make a statement accorded to a defendant in a criminal case even in the eighteenth century when he could not be a witness on his own behalf (9 Holdsworth History of Law, 195-196, 229).

A statute or a congressional rule should recognize that the record of a witness' testimony including both questions and answers should not be edited. The only justification of a written record of a witness' examination is the preservation of a truthful report. The habit of editing testimony in a congressional investigation has been carried over from two situations where editing may perhaps be justified: The editing by a Congressman of his speeches on the floor, and the editing by the head of a department of his offhand remarks before an appropriations or like committee. But such editing should not be permitted where the report covers testimony of witnesses who are compelled under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. And reporters ought not to be asked to break their obligation of fidelity by Congressmen who seek to alter the record to put themselves in a better light than they deserve.

If a statute gave a witness these rights to have counsel present, to file a written statement before the hearing concluded, and to have an accurate record of his testimony, it would go as far as seems to me practical at the present time. There are other possible reforms, however, which seem to me worth mentioning, not because I believe they should be codified now, but because I propose that they should be studied by committees established by this and other bar associations.

One possible reform is that a private person should not be compelled to testify in camera unless the majority of the committee explicitly rules that the public interest requires that the testimony shall be kept secret. Of course, this would not preclude a witness from voluntarily submitting to a secret examination. And in view of the proviso that I have stated it would not preclude a majority of a committee from requiring that the examination be kept secret in cases where on

mature reflection it seemed to them warranted.

Another more important reform would be that a witness should not be compelled to testify unless there is present at least one member of the committee who is not doing the principal interrogating. The most serious browbeating of witnesses has generally occurred when there has been no one except the interrogator to whom the witness could appeal. We all are aware of the extent to which an enthusiastic and hostile examiner may go unless he is occasionally reminded by a presiding officer that the witness also has rights. If the examiner before the congressional committee is a lawyer who is not a Member of Congress, it would be sufficient for the witness to have one Member of Congress present to whom he can appeal directly for a restraining ruling. If the principal examiner is himself a Member of Congress, the presence of another Member of Congress would afford some protection to the witness.

In any serious claim of privilege the witness ought to have the right by motion to urge his points before the committee as a whole and get their considered ruling, after listening to argument by the witness' counsel.

A fourth possible reform would be that a person who has been adversely criticized by a witness before the committee should have the right to file with the committee a limited number of written interrogatories which, unless the committee by majority vote otherwise directed, should be answered in writing by the hostile witness. This type of written interrogatory would not delay and confuse, as cross-examination might delay and confuse, the investigation. It would not impose a more onerous burden on the critical witness than he would have to undergo in civil litigation in the courts. And it would give the offended person a reasonable chance to procure relevant evidence to meet the criticism. As a matter of fact, this proposal falls short of what some other commentators have thought desirable. In his article in the New Republic in 1924 Professor Frankfurter wrote that "of course, the essential decencies must be observed, namely, opportunity for cross-examination must be afforded to those who are investigated or to those representing issues under investigation." (38 New Republic, 324, 331.) And Senator HATCH has recently (Christian Science Monitor, Friday, December 19, 1947, p. 24) proposed that "persons whose reputations are brought into question in any way should be permitted to prepare written questions to develop whatever points may be desired."

A fifth possible reform is that no private person should be compelled to testify unless a majority of the committee approves of the issuance of a subpena to him. The expenditure of time and money incurred in attending a hearing is always a burden. It is a burden which in appropriate cases must be borne if government is to function at its highest level. But the burden of going to Washington and of having one's affairs exposed to a pitiless blaze of publicity ought not to be imposed on the unwilling unless there is substantial ground for believing that there will be a corresponding benefit. It is difficult for any investigator to judge fairly this issue of relative burden and benefit in an investigation in which he is interested. That is why in ordinary criminal cases the fourth amendment prohibits a search or seizure unless a disinterested official, not himself an investigator, finds there is probable cause. While the letter of that clause of the fourth amendment does not apply to a congressional committee, it would seem in accord with its policy, and in accord with the policy of civil litigation that allows a subpena to be quashed by a judge, that in congressional investigations subpenas to private persons should require the vote of a majority of a committee.

Let me restate that in my view none of these five possible reforms of (a) open hearings, (b) presence of a Congressman other than the principal interrogator, (c) motions addressed to the whole committee, (d) filing of interrogatories, and (e) concurrence of a majority of the committee in issuing subpenas ought to be immediately codified in a statute or congressional rule. In my judgment, they and other similar proposals ought to be considered in the light of the actual workings of congressional committees by committees on congressional investigations to be appointed by bar associations. The mere creation of such bar committees would have a salutary effect in alerting Members of Congress to the abuses of the present system and in mobilizing professional opinion to guide Congress and the public to sensible solutions. In the long run, it might conceivably appear that the use of these watchdogs had obviated the need of erecting boundary marks or fences; and even if that happy consequence did not follow, it is at least possible that it would be sufficient if the bar associations proposed not an ironclad statutory scheme but a limited statute on interrogatory procedure and what might be called canons of behavior for legislative and like committees of inquiry. If such a pattern of conduct were widely endorsed by the best professional opinion, it might be as effective as judicial decrees and legislative enactments in bringing about fair play. It would create a standard to which a witness might repair. It would be a moral force constantly felt in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest step that this Congress can take in preserving American liberties and American democracy is to give immediate and serious consideration to revising its procedure for the conduct of congressional investigations.

Public Opinion Survey With Reference to the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under a unanimous-consent request, I am inserting a very important letter in the RECORD written by Frank E. Gannett, president of the Gannett Newspapers, with reference not only to his views relating to the Marshall plan and other phases of foreign relief but also the results of a survey made by the Committee for Constitutional Government.

I have great confidence in the views of Mr. Frank Gannett, because I have known him for the past half century. He has had a world-wide experience as an observer of conditions; therefore, his views on foreign relations are of the greatest importance.

It is evident as the sunlight of truth is turned into the dark and devious scheme known as the Marshall plan that it will be resisted by every patriotic person in the country.

Mr. Gannett's letter and the survey, to which I have referred, follow:

THE GANNETT NEWSPAPERS,
Rochester, N. Y., March 5, 1948.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: Seldom has there been before Congress an issue as important to the future of America as the Marshall plan.

Some eminent persons have discussed the question. We are familiar with the arguments that have been advanced. And I hope you will not be misled by the propaganda that has been let loose upon the Nation

These facts cannot be overlooked:

1. No amount of money that we may pour into Europe can stop the spread of communism.

2. The large sums that we have poured into Czechoslovakia through UNRRA did not save that country; the Government was taken over by a minority—38 percent.

3. We have, according to the President, spent $15,000,000,000 in Europe. To what advantage?

4. We are now asked to send more money, or war material, or men, to Greece. Will the begging never end? Are we already in World War III in Greece?

5. Five hundred million dollars are now asked for China. I was in China last summer, and became convinced that money cannot save the Chinese Government.

6. Our resources are not limitless. We can raise these staggering sums from only two sources: From additional taxes upon the overburdened taxpayers, or by running the printing press, causing inflation and reducing the value of our dollar.

7. Do you realize what $1,000,000,000 is? If we printed a dollar every minute of the day and night, it would take 2,000 years to print $1,000,000,000. To print $17,000,000,000 would require 33,000 years.

8. Anyone who reads the financial pages today sees alarming, dangerous symptoms and signs of an approaching depression. It is no time to spend—or commit ourselves to spend—billions in Europe, when we face a serious financial problem here at home.

9. With the Russian situation very tense, it is time to put our own house in order, to make America prosperous and strong enough to save itself. Only then can it hope to help the world. We must not weaken ourselves with costly and futile efforts in any direction.

10. Of course, we want to do all we can to relieve hunger and suffering anywhere, but we cannot feed all the world or give all people freedom and liberty. History proves one can't buy democracy or peace.

11. Stalin and Poland ostensibly oppose the Marshall plan; probably because in their devious thinking they know that their opposition will further its adoption, which, in reality, they may favor. Moscow knows that the most dangerous thing for America is to overspend itself into inflation. We will not be very smart if we allow Moscow, by reverse English, to jockey us into a losing position which she would like us to take.

12. Propagandists claim that a majority of Americans favor the Marshall plan. That is not true, when a cross section of the people are given an opportunity to say exactly what kind of aid and how much they have in mind for Europe.

The Committee for Constitutional Government circulated a questionnaire to 50,000 lawyers, 50,000 physicians, and to thousands of the committee's supporters in all of the 48 States. The first 3,017 returns were tabulated and analyzed, and furnish a clue as to the widespread attitude of informed and thoughtful people.

I hope you can take time to read the enclosed enlightening analysis of these opinion returns made by Dr. Williford I. King, economics professor emeritus of New York University and onetime president of the American Statistical Association.

Respectfully,

FRANK E. GANNETT.

HIGH LIGHTS OF OPINION ON THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM AS REFLECTED IN THE ANALYSIS OF NATION-WIDE POLL OF EDUCATED AMERICANS

Nine to 1 against $17,000,000,000 4-year commitment.

Three to 1 against $6,800,000,000 in 15 months.

Four to 1 against advances to governments; favor advances mainly or solely to private enterprises.

Ten to 1 in favor of requiring foreign governments to pledge their assets to secure loans.

Twenty to 1 would restrict use of loans and require governments to guarantee loans to their citizens.

Twenty-one to 1 against subsidizing European socialism.

Only 26 to 33 percent believe loans will retard Soviet's westward push.

Seventy-two percent would confine loans to private enterprises.

Seventy-two percent would require repayment in American dollars.

Five out of 8 would confine aid to relieving hunger and distress.

Nine out of 10 would require reduction of Federal spending equivalent to appropriations for foreign aid.

WHAT EDUCATED AMERICANS THINK ABOUT THE MARSHALL PLAN

In January 1948 the Committee for Constitutional Government sent out to many thousands of physicians and lawyers, and to other thousands of its own friends and supporters a questionnaire designed to ascertain their views concerning the Marshall plan for European relief. To date, more than 3,000 people have taken the trouble to fill in answers to some or all of the 19 questions asked. In numerous cases, the answers were so qualified that it was impossible to include them in the tabulation. In many instances, some of the queries were left unanswered. The numerical analysis of the returns which is presented below necessarily deals solely with those who gave definite, unequivocal answers to the questions as propounded. What is shown by the votes of those people who had clear-cut ideas on the particular queries which they answered? Here are the results:

1. Do you favor giving or lending to or in western European nations, over a 4-year period, some sum such as the $17,000,000,000 proposed under the Marshall plan? Yes, 263; no, 2,491.

The vote is more than 9 to 1 against any such long-term commitment.

2. Do you favor giving or lending a smaller sum? Yes, 1,323; no, 934.

Fifty-nine percent of those returning definite votes favored giving some relief to Europe, but, as one would naturally expect, the 1,323 persons favoring such a policy had various ideas as to the amounts to be disbursed. The votes of those 480 mentioning specific sum were distributed as follows:

	Votes
Under $5,000,000,000	205
$5,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000	199
$10,000,000,000 or over	76
Total	480

The sentiment of the voters is decidedly in favor of keeping the 4-year-aid total below $10,000,000,000.

3a. Do you think that the commitment should be made for 15 months only and for $6,800,000,000? Yes, 528; no, 1,664.

The proposal to send to Europe $6,800,000,000 in 15 months is rejected by more than three-fourths of those having definite views on the subject.

3b. Do you think that the 15 months' commitment should be for—

	Votes
Less than $2,000,000,000?	88
$2,000,000,000 to $3,900,000,000?	230
$4,000,000,000 or over?	377
Total	695

Of the 1987 voters who expressed definite opinions on the 15 months' commitment, only 695, or 35 percent, favored giving any considerable aid. Of this 35 percent, somewhat more than half favored sending $4,000,000,000 or more.

4a. If you favor making gifts or loans, do you believe that the money should be advanced to governments? Yes, 431; no, 1,751.

4b. If loans are extended, ought the advances to be made mainly or solely to private enterprise? Yes, 1,578; no, 365.

Those having definite opinions voted 4 to 1 against advancing money to governments, and in favor of confining mainly or solely to private enterprise any loans which may be made.

5. If governments receiving aid have assets such as oil reserves or American securities, should they be required to pledge these for moneys advanced Yes, 2,387; no, 222.

The vote is more than 10 to 1 for compelling foreign governments possessing valuable governmental assets to secure their loans by pledging these assets. Note that this vote does not necessarily endorse any confiscation of assets owned by private citizens.

6a. Should the money be loaned without strings Yes, 121; no, 2,441.

6b. Should we as lenders impose restrictions on the use of any money advanced? Yes, 2,493; no, 114.

By a vote of more than 20 to 1, those having definite opinions hold that we should regulate the use of any money lent to Europe. The "no strings" idea receives scanty support indeed.

7. Should money be lent to socialistic governments which by rationing, regimentation, and restrictive measures are producing industrial stagnation and stifling food production? Yes, 121; no, 2,602.

The vote to bar lending money to socialistic governments engaged in regimenting their citizens is more than 21 to 1, a very close approach to unanimity, European governments qualifying for aid under this limitation would be few in number.

8. Should we make loans mainly on the hypothesis that the use of the money will retard or block Russia's advance into western Europe? Yes, 685; no, 1,910.

9. Do you feel that a loan, if made, will actually tend to block the advance of communism? Yes, 805; no, 1,660.

Only 26 percent of those expressing definite views believe that the Marshall plan is likely to retard or stop the advance of the Russian "bear" into western Europe; only 33 percent think that it will tend to block the onward march of communism.

10. Should money be advanced solely to private concerns the legitimate business activities of which are not seriously hampered by government controls? Yes, 1,633; no, 645.

Of those having clear-cut views, 72 percent favor confining monetary advances to private concerns not seriously hampered by governmental controls. This ruling would, of course, bar loans to industries controlled by government.

11. Should we lend only to private concerns which it seems probable will repay the loans when they fall due? Yes, 1,593; no, 656.

12. Should we require each government to participate in or guarantee part of every loan to one of its citizens? Yes, 1,441; no, 705.

Seventy-one percent of those expressing definite views believe that we ought to have at least a reasonable chance of getting our money back. They are not ready to "kiss it good-bye." Two out of three voters believe that we should reinforce this possibility by requiring each foreign government to underwrite at least partially, the loans made to its citizens.

13a. Should we require that all loans be repaid in American dollars? Yes, 1,572; no, 602.

13b. Would payment in the currency of the recipient country be acceptable? Yes, 277; no, 1,203.

Seventy-two percent of the clear-cut votes were cast in favor of requiring that money lent be repaid in American dollars. However, 159 voters out of 2,420, or approximately 1 in 15, believes that payments in goods would constitute a satisfactory settlement. Only one voter in five feels that payment in the currency of the borrowing country should be permissible.

14. Should we supply food and other materials, as emergency gifts, to overcome hunger and distress, and limit our aid to this? Should so limit aid, 1,559. Should not so limit aid, 956.

Five out of eight of those stating definite opinions believe that any aid sent should be confined to relieving hunger and distress.

15. Should it be required that for every dollar appropriated for European aid a dollar reduction in the Federal Government's domestic expenditures be made to forestall inflation and higher taxes? Yes, 2,335. No, 245.

More than nine-tenths of those voters taking definite stands insist that every dollar appropriated for European aid be offset by a dollar reduction in domestic Federal expenditures. Clearly, increased governmental spending is not favored by this group.

On the other hand, they do favor the extension of emergency aid to those people in western Europe who are hungry and cold.

As noted above, of those voting definitely more than 80 percent believed that loans should be made solely to private concerns. Typical comments of those holding this point of view are as follows:

"I think it is essential that all business recovery be handled by private loans to producing concerns or individuals in the various countries on a business basis. Of course, meantime, we should observe question No. 14, supplying emergency gifts." (J. S. T.)

"I believe the loans are essential in our own interests, provided they are managed on strictly business principles, controlled by men of proved business experience and integrity. The ideal way would be for the loans to be made by private firms to private firms as far as possible. Governments should be kept out of the picture as much as is practical." (G. H. F.)

Many of those voting feel that any lending done should be by private concerns and not by our Government. Typical expressions of this point of view run as follows:

"Capital financing of European countries, or citizens, should be done by private United States capital and not by the Government." (D. E. C.)

"I would like to have governments encourage loans from private concerns to private concerns without interference. I am also in favor of decreased Federal expenditures." (A. H.)

"The American Government has no right or authority to tax the American people to raise funds to throw away, give away, or to lend to anyone. If foreign governments or foreign corporations wish to borrow, they should borrow from private corporations who can name the terms upon which the loan is made." (C. R. H.)

"I am opposed to Government loans, for they have a tendency to become political and are seldom successful. When England loaned money to our country in its early beginnings, it was to private enterprise and these loans helped build up the country and were fully repaid. I have observed that the English loans are usually by individuals or companies organized for the purpose, and that they continue to be to private enterprise." (C. A. W.)

Many of those making comments believe that we should not give charity, but should only help the Europeans to help themselves. For example:

"No money should be given or loaned except to make their nations self-supporting." (W. F. G.)

"I believe we should have a recovery program and not just a relief program. However, I think its administration should be by a separate agency and every dollar ought to be made to do full duty." (R. E. O.)

"A policy which aims at helping them help themselves should be tried, for perhaps a year, to give them a chance to show their good faith." (A. E. B.)

Other commentators emphasize the importance of careful administration of any funds sent abroad. Thus:

"My idea is to give, since they will probably not pay back anyway, a reasonable amount for the following purposes:

"1. Food and supplies to alleviate suffering to some extent, carefully regulated, so that it will get to the people, instead of the politicans.

"2. Money, material, and machinery direct to associations and business firms, where it is believed that it will help them build up their own economy, and help them help themselves." (D. W. W.)

"Peace cannot be obtained, or communism stopped solely by the use of money or through the activities of governmental bureaus; more depends on the administration of a loan or gift than on the amount in dollars and cents." (B. S. B.)

"The aid should be administered along business lines, not through the executive branch nor the State Department." (A. M. H.)

A widespread opinion is that aid to Europe should be extended strictly on a charitable basis. Examples of this point of view are:

"If the people of any country are, for some reason other than the fact that they do not want to or will not work, in dire need of help to keep from starving or freezing, then there is every reason why the people of the rest of the world (not only the people of the United States) should aid them by and through private charities, existing or created for that purpose. This charity should not, however, be a continuing thing, supporting the people in idleness, but only on an emergency basis in the same manner as after a major disaster, such as earthquake, fire, or flood, and until such time as they are able to help themselves." (E. L. F.)

"I favor making gifts of food and other materials to foreign governments for the purpose of overcoming hunger and distress. I favor making loans to private enterprises for the purpose of restoring the productive facilities of the country involved and making it self-supporting." (G. M. J.)

"My sympathy goes out to the poor peoples of Europe and Asia. However, short of strictly emergency gifts to alleviate hunger and actual distress, I'm in favor of making all such donations through agencies entirely familiar with needs, and in position to control distribution of the actual gifts." (H. S. G.)

Others believe that, in general, charity breeds mainly future trouble, and that Uncle Sam has neither the right nor the duty to play Santa Claus. Here are some samples of this point of view:

"I am definitely in favor of aiding the destitute and needy, even at risk to ourselves; but I am opposed to the role of Santa Claus to the entire world, with little expectation of surviving ourselves, or at least escaping a greatly reduced standard of living in America. Industrial rehabilitation should be left to the people of Europe." (J. E. M.)

"My previous experience as to giving has been that it does not help recipients, and that it creates an envious, jealous attitude." (E. W. H.)

"I do not believe the United States has any authority under the Constitution to tax Americans to give or lend money to foreign countries, even for charitable purposes. If the United States is to help Europe it should be through the Red Cross and voluntary contributions. Supporting foreign countries is not a function of the United States Government." (M. A. R.)

"I favor democratic government at home first, and, after and when we have satisfactory samples here, then let's try and spread it." (J. W. K.)

The general conclusion must be that the type of European relief plan advocated by those replying to the questionnaire is something radically different from General Marshall's idea of the correct procedure for rehabilitating western Europe and preventing the spread of communism.

WILLFORD I. KING,
Chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Government.
FEBRUARY 28, 1948.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Crown Hill Citizen, dated February 27, 1948, together with excerpts of letters received by me from my constituents. They follow:

RENT CONTROL

The vast majority of the residents of Crown Hill (over 90 percent) are renters.

On February 19 the National Apartment Owners Association placed a full page advertisement in one of our daily papers trying to sell us the idea of writing our representatives in Congress requesting them to terminate rent control. This advertisement is a gross insult to our intelligence and as such is and should be deeply resented. As to the contents of the advertisement, it has no precedent for misstatements, misrepresentation of purported facts or juggling of statistics. The unmitigated nerve of those who would publish such tripe is only matched by their greed.

As there are two sides to everything, let us examine rent control from both sides. The landlord group are agitating for an end to controls and claiming that they will voluntarily police their own industry and keep rents within reason. That is very, very silly. In the first place, if they are content to have rents kept within reason, they have no quarrel with a law that compels them to do just that. In the second place, who is to determine what is reasonable; and in the third place, without a law they, the landlord group, have no means to restrain any owner who is not satisfied with a reasonable rental from kicking out his GI tenants today and renting to profiteers and black marketeers at an advance of two, three, or more hundred percent. That is not a guess. It is the record of just what happened in the few hours we were without controls.

The landlord group claim that they are not making a return on their investments. Well, gentlemen, just what return are the ex-GI's making on the investment of 4 years of the best part of their lives devoted to protecting your property? And what about the debt you owe to the widows and children of those who gave their lives to protect your property? Would you kick them out in the street tomorrow because they could not stand to have their rents doubled or trebled? If it were not for these same GI's, you would have no headache over rent control; you would have nothing to rent, as your properties would be occupied by those that they fought and you would be working for them.

Make no mistake about public sentiment and do not, such of you as to whom this applies, let your ruthless greed delude you into thinking you will be permitted to make an unrestrained killing due to the housing shortage while there are any ex-GI's living in converted garages, chicken coops, and dog houses, or that you will be permitted to kick out in the streets such as are lucky enough to have an apartment in order to make way for war profiteers who can afford to pay a 200-percent advance in rent.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS ON RENT CONTROL

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 27, 1947.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am an old woman 73½ years with only $55-a-month pension. I am a very good manager and can live very comfortably if rents do not go over 15 percent higher. * * * It would be impossible for me to find a new place if I should be evicted, so please do what you can to save all of us old pensioners from being put on the street.

Mrs. KATIE D. COX.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 3, 1947.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am writing you in regard to our rents. Since July 1 my rent has been increased from $18 a month to $3 a day. * * * Now I beg of you in tears, what can I do? I have lived in this small hotel for 10 years. * * * Now he comes along and hands us a notice to pay $3 a day or get out. Where can I go? I am 67 years old and alone. What can I do, and all I have is a pension. Please, oh please, help me. I have walked the streets days and night, and I can't find any other shelter. What can I do? I must also eat something. I do feel like jumping out of my window, and there are so many like me.

Mrs. GRACE HOWSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 20, 1948.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: A woman I knew—80 years of age—was picked up on the street and taken to the hospital, where she passed away a few days later with a heart attack. She had been tramping the streets 3 weeks looking for a room and would have been evicted in another week. Cannot something be done so that tenants can be protected?

Mrs. GRACE M. LINNEY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 25, 1948.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am living in an apartment house where there are eight other pensioners. One almost blind, but it is wonderful how she does all her own work. * * * Now, Mrs. DOUGLAS, why don't some of those men that don't seem to care to do anything about rent control, this thing that don't seem to bother them, * * * just stop and think these questions over. If I

am without family and money, where would I go? How would I live? We receive $60 a month, and I am very grateful, but one cannot buy anything outside of bare necessities.

MRS. MABEL E. HOLLINGSWORTH.

APRIL 24, 1947.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am pleading with you not to raise the rent control this and next year. I am a disabled veteran and can't afford a raise in rent.

HARLAND A. MCCLINE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 27, 1947.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Here at the University of Southern California we are engaged in a huge petition campaign to have rent controls left at their present level. We feel that it is extremely important to student veterans that rentals do not rise beyond what it is reasonable to pay. If rent controls are lifted or removed it may mean that thousands of veterans will be forced to quit school and seek employment in order to keep a roof over their heads.

JESSE UNRICH,
Student Housing Chairman and Veterans' Representative, TROVETS, U. S. C.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 16, 1948.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am asking you to do something about the rents. * * * My husband is old and we can just about make ends meet the high price of foods. There is nothing left for clothes and shoes. * * * Please help us old folks.

MRS. ARTHUR HITE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 18, 1947.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am a disabled veteran of World War II. I am receiving rehabilitation under Public Law 16. * * * I am married and have a baby boy. Even a general increase in rents is jeopardy in the cost of living to both myself and many other small people. When rent control went off my rent rose 100 percent. Even if I paid it, I would still be filled with fear that we would be evicted. Abolition of fear is included in the Atlantic Charter. We fought a war against it, but still it exists and in our own United States. And the irony of this whole thing, Representative DOUGLAS, is that the guy who saved these houses, buildings, and stores is the veteran who is homeless.

BERNARD F. COTTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 10, 1948.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I am writing to you because I am frightened that the new rent-control bill will leave us 15 percenters unprotected * * * something I just cannot understand. Why are we to be penalized for something Congress forces us into? I am sure no one signed voluntarily. It was presented to us and we signed. There was no choice in the matter. To many of us the increase was a great burden and, particularly in our case, we had just painted our apartment at our own expense which made our rent $10 a month higher, right there. Furthermore, Congress allowed the increases to go into effect 8 months before the old rent-control bill actually expired.

This hardly seemed fair but we were willing to accept it in order to safeguard the security of a roof over our heads. My husband is a veteran and we are trying to get back into a normal life again but how is this possible when we are faced with the fear of who knows what if we are not covered also in the new bill?

MRS. LILLIAN W. FREEDMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 24, 1948.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I hope you will consider the helplessness of tenants in the approaching expiration of rent control, and do something in our behalf that will allow us to go on living.

To appease the landlady I met her overceiling demands more than half way, but this has proved not enough to insure undisturbed tenancy if Government control is lifted.

Would that something could be enacted easing the landlords' claims of hardship and still protect well behaved tenants from eviction. It is hard enough to pay the rent (I am paying over the 15 percent increase allowed), but eviction with no place to go is appalling and disastrous to one's mental and physical condition and has a destructive effect on the United States when this condition is prevalent throughout the country.

MRS. E. G. WOODBRIDGE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 22, 1947.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: We permanent guests in hotels in Los Angeles are facing a problem. The hotel where I have lived for 10 years has given all permanent guests a verbal notice that we will be taken off permanent rates and put on daily, transient rates * * * I am a middle-aged woman. I work for the telephone company and I am a Spanish-American War widow with a small pension. I get a very modest wage at the telephone company, and I cannot afford such a raise and there is no place to go in Los Angeles.

MRS. ROSALIE WOLFSBERG.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: As you know, shop girls, waitresses, pensioners, and clerks are the one most affected and who can least afford these raises. * * * It would be a simple matter if they could go elsewhere but such is not the case as space is not available.

EARL W. FRASE.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Since 1930 I have lived at the ——— Hotel and for the last several years I have been paying $18.50 per month but today I received a formal notice that my rent will be $2 a day and that I will be on a transient basis. This will be an advance of over 2,000 percent. * * * There are over 100 people living in the ——— Hotel and they have all received similar notices.

ALBERT G. LATHER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *January 29, 1947.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I, myself, am elderly as are a great many others in this locality and have a very limited amount to spend monthly for total expense. To us in the limited-income group a rent increase would be almost tragic. A rent increase is not needed to give owners of apartment houses at least adequate income return. Occupancy of all apartment houses has been 100 percent and yet the owners claim hardship. If a greater net income than ever before is a hardship then count me a Republican.

JOSEPH HELLER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: I plead to you please to use your influence to continue rent control, for if this protection is removed, it will cause many of us earning small salaries, also single people living in one room, to be evicted.

Miss MARIAN JENNESS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *December 7, 1947.*

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: We older ones can't pay big rents. * * * It's horrible to think about.

MRS. JULIA NASH.

Max Friedman, Philanthropist and Esteemed Leader, Wins High Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Max Friedman, of Knoxville, Tenn., is a noble character, a great and generous citizen leader. On March 3, 1948, more than 300 leading citizens of Knoxville paid high tribute to this fine citizen and to his outstanding work at a testimonial dinner at the Heska Amuna Synagogue. The occasion was the dedication of a grove of 1,000 trees to Mr. Friedman which will be planted in Palestine. I had the honor of saying a few words on this memorable occasion. My address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens, we are gathered here tonight to do honor to an outstanding citizen of the city of Knoxville and of the State of Tennessee. We have come to offer him our thanks for being what he is. We want him to know what he means to us. When we think of Max Friedman we think of kindness, of integrity, of tolerance, of a widespread love for all mankind. This gathering is a tribute to those qualities which he has demonstrated year after year in countless services to his community. It is not only his deeds of helpfulness which we value, but the spirit in which they have been rendered.

But it is not alone to express our appreciation that we have met here tonight. We have come to renew our faith and courage. At a time when the peace we hoped for seems far off; when the air is filled with bitter condemnations; when greed, self-seeking, and the desire for power too often seem to prevail over consideration for the general welfare; it is good to know that there are men in the world like Max Friedman. So long as there is even one such man whom we can know, can speak with day by day, and see before us, we can dare to hope. For if there is one man of that sort, of course there must be others. We can dare to believe that the spirit of such men and women will eventually triumph because their way of life is right and good.

APPRECIATED BY ALL CLASSES

Max Friedman came to this community from South Carolina 29 years ago. He has built himself into our life through his great love for people—for all people, rich and poor, Jew and non-Jew. He has done this so well that it is said that his Scotch friends call him McFriedman, his Irish friends know him as Mick Friedman, and to the Negro he is Max Freedom. Faith in his fellow man has been the keynote of his life, a faith which refuses to falter in the face of disappointment or occasional betrayal. His attitude toward mankind is well expressed by these verses, written many years ago by Lydia Child:

"And though I've learned some souls are base,
I would not, therefore, hate the race;
I still would bless my fellow men,
And trust them, though deceived again.
God help me still to kindly view
The world that I am passing through."

It has been said that "good will is the mightiest practical force in the universe." Max Friedman has put this force to work in countless community activities. He has

served on the boards of the Shrine Crippled Children's Hospital, of the Salvation Army, and as chairman of the United Jewish Appeal. He has worked as a member of the Brandeis Foundation to establish the Brandeis camp at Hendersonville, N. C. The needs of the helpless, the sick, and the sorrowing have never been presented to him in vain. He has given of his time, his energy, and his funds with an open hand and, what is more important, an understanding heart.

Max Friedman has shown a keen interest in the cultural affairs of this city. For example, as a member of the board of the Knoxville Symphony Orchestra Association, he has helped to bring the rich heritage of music to this community.

The respect and honor in which he is held by his own people are evidenced by the fact that he has served as a trustee of Beth-El Temple and as past president of his synagogue and of the Jewish community center.

All through his life he has cared for his own with a deep and tender love. His beautiful devotion to his wife, whom he sometimes fondly calls his black-eyed Suzie, and to his daughters, and their devotion to him, are well known in Knoxville. I will tell you a little story that some of you may already know. When his last granddaughter was born, he went around the hospital bragging so much that people asked to see the "Max Friedman" baby instead of the Epstein baby. When his grandson was born, he called up his friends in great excitement and said that at last he had a son.

ZIONIST WORK OUTSTANDING

This devotion to his family is part and parcel of his love for the whole Jewish race and his deep desire that they shall find a homeland in Palestine. This has led to his activity in several Zionist organizations, to which he has given his wholehearted support.

The 1,000 trees to be planted and dedicated to Max Friedman are symbolic of the faith of Jews all over the world of their ability to make a success of the Jewish homeland. I feel that this country must back up the decision of the UN Assembly in establishing the independent Jewish state. Pending the time when the UN can have a military police, the embargo should be lifted so Jews in Palestine will have an even chance of defending themselves.

Nor has the broadening range of his sympathies been limited to the needs of his own race. The same feeling of love and brotherhood has led him into participation in groups which stress the concept of the world-wide brotherhood of man. This wider view was expressed by George Moore when he said, "After all, there is but one race—humanity." It is not surprising, therefore, that we find that Max Friedman is a thirty-second degree Mason, Scottish Rite; that he is a past monarch of Amra Grotto; and that he is cochairman for Tennessee of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

I have mentioned these various activities in which Max Friedman has played a part, not for the sake of cataloging his good works. You who hear me could doubtless add dozens of other undertakings to this list, and tell a hundred anecdotes of his kindness and thoughtfulness. I have tried to show you a process of growth—a continual widening of outlook, which is much needed in the world today. The core of world stability lies in the selfless devotion of a happy home. But devotion that goes no further than the family circle, or a small group of friends and associates, is self-limiting and in the end tends to become self-centered. The circle must become wider and wider until finally it embraces the needs and aspirations, the hopes and fears of all the peoples of the earth.

These qualities of good will, of integrity, and breadth of vision are nowhere more greatly needed than in the field of politics. Henry Adams once cynically wrote: "Politics is the systematic mobilization of hate." To some men and in some places that may be true. It was true of the Nazis. It is true in the vitriolic outpourings of current Soviet propaganda, in which the United States is daily vilified. But such an attitude is the complete negation of democracy and the democratic process.

To function successfully, democracy must seek to bring about the systematic mobilization of good will. Political activity should be carried on constructively and dynamically. Name calling and back biting should not be a part of political campaigns. Those who offer themselves as candidates should not be compelled to toughen their hides against an onslaught of calumny and abuse.

The American people do not really like that sort of thing. Occasionally they may be swept off their feet by a demagog, but by and large our people stand for fair play and good sportsmanship. The response which is spontaneously given to good faith and friendliness is very evident when we consider the recent election of Max Friedman to the Knoxville City Council. Without making a campaign, he was swept into office because the people loved him and knew that he loved them. They knew he would be upright and just in public office. They liked his ways.

The life of Max Friedman is a symbol—a symbol of the worth of individual personality, and also of the tradition we cherish about America—that it is the land of opportunity, where individual abilities meet a warm response. His life illustrates the words of the Psalmist: "The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree; he shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon."

MR. FRIEDMAN'S WHOLESOME INFLUENCE IN POLITICS

Max Friedman is a good influence in politics. He has stood for good things. He has encouraged men of caliber to take part in public affairs. We need many more like him. We need and must have a general awareness on the part of our citizens of the importance of their participation in political activity. It should be recognized as the hallmark of good citizenship.

You see, politics is a two-way street. Those in office have the duty of informing and leading the people. In turn, the people must constantly make their desires known. Good legislation will be enacted if citizens generally are interested and alert. Special interest legislation will be passed if the people are indifferent, or if they do not understand the issues, or if they adopt the attitude that politics are dirty and they will have nothing to do with them. We cannot afford any of these things today. The problems before us—both domestic and international—are of too critical a nature.

Each day the horizon darkens. World trade as a whole increased in 1947 over 1946, but the last half of the year saw a general tightening of trade restrictions following the suspension of free sterling convertibility by Great Britain only a month after it had been put into effect. We awoke to the fact that recovery was proceeding, more slowly than we had hoped, and with greater difficulty.

A grave deterioration in international political relations has taken place. Obstructive tactics on the part of Russia have been succeeded by a renewed expansionism. As tension has mounted the future of the United Nations has become more doubtful. Tragedy prevails in Palestine. China is in chaos. Civil war rages in Greece. Only a few relatively bright spots can be found, such as the rapid recovery taking place in the Philippines and economic conditions in some Latin-American countries, in Switzerland, Sweden, and a few others.

MORAL FORCE FOR PEACE NEEDED

Underlying these economic and political maladjustments lies a deeper difficulty. It is moral. The world is in the mess in which it finds itself today because understanding and spiritual growth has not kept pace with the new challenges thrust upon us. The nations have thrust aside the moral qualities I have been talking about. Efforts toward systematic mobilization of good will have broken down.

No enduring peace will come into being that is not built on respect for the rights of others, on freedom not force, on cooperation not coercion, on mutual confidence and a scrupulous regard for promises given. A whole series of international bodies have been created since the end of the war. There is the International Monetary Fund. There is the Export-Import Bank. There is the United Nations itself, with all its specialized agencies—the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Labor Organization, to name only a few. We have international organization in the field of aviation, in control of narcotics, in the compilation of statistics, and a host of other matters. These bodies are of the greatest importance. Many of them are doing work of outstanding value. So it is not organizations that are needed. It is the moral force to make them work.

The United States has gone to greater lengths than any nation has ever done in the course of history in attempting to bring about a better state of affairs. We have offered to place the atomic bomb under international control, provided other nations would agree to measures necessary to secure adequate inspection and supervision. Out of our abundance we have given generous support to the various international bodies which have been set up. We have sent public and private aid in large amounts to war-devastated nations. We signed agreements at Geneva in October 1947 providing for tariff reductions of a most sweeping nature.

But let us not be self-righteous. It was incumbent upon us to do these things because we are the one Nation which has emerged from the war wealthy, with production facilities enormously expanded, and with our land unscarred by the destruction of war. Self-interest has mingled with altruism in motivating our actions. Special interests have, in some cases, used their monopoly positions to profit at the expense of the poor and helpless. We have made some mistakes which have caused other nations to question our motives.

Nevertheless, we have wished and we do wish, to act in friendship. We want to help in the task of world rehabilitation and reconstruction but we do not want to be imposed upon. Nor are we willing to play the role of appeaser to any totalitarianism nor to condone the use of force by large powers against smaller powers.

THE SPIRIT OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY

There are some who say we should cease sending help to Europe. They insist that we should stop playing Santa Claus to the world and they call our efforts to help the countries of western Europe back to a self-supporting basis "operation rat hole." Yet it is evident that the United States is the one Nation in the whole world which is today able to exert a decisive influence toward the achievement of economic stability. It is evident that without our help the whole continent of Europe and perhaps a good part of Asia also will fall under Communist domination.

It is evident that only we can provide food for the hungry and succor for the homeless. Without appropriate action on our part, the shackles of international trade can-

not be unbound, international exchange become stabilized, or productive capacity be restored on the continent of Europe with reasonable dispatch. We cannot fail to do our part. But other nations, too, must act in a spirit of friendliness and must carry their share of the burden on our efforts will not avail.

In the early pioneer days of our own country, great hardships were endured. But always people were ready to help one another. Whether it was the building of a log house, the birth of a child, or the construction of a church or school, everyone turned his hand to the task. Neighbor assisted neighbor. The plan for European aid was devised in this spirit, taking into account the more complicated economic problems involved. The door was open to all nations wishing to participate. The plan was based on the idea of assisting the war-torn nations to help themselves.

Those who view the recovery plan solely as a bulwark against communism or as a means to rebuilding our foreign market, have failed to understand the motives of the American people, the same motives which have led to the sending of friendship trains, to the shipment of countless CARE packages, to the aid sent to the children of Europe, to the funds in aid of displaced persons and many another voluntary outpouring. A real desire to help and to do our part is latent in the hearts of our people, just as a desire to do their part and to build for world peace is latent in the hearts of people of other lands. We must find ways of building on these desires, of utilizing unused spiritual capacities as well as unused economic capacities.

THE SPIRIT OF HELPING

It is not enough for us to send food and machinery, fertilizer and seeds to prostrate Europe. The spirit in which it is done is also important—perhaps all important. That is one of the lessons we can learn from the life of Max Friedman. The good work which he has done has been done in such a way as to bring a response from others. It has produced more brotherhood in the world, not less. It has stimulated others to action and has caused knotty problems to melt away.

We should not haggle over our aid to Europe, nor pare it down to a minimal amount, nor throw harsh words at those whom we wish to help. We should not leave them in fear that we may later change our minds and our policy. We should take vigorous steps to stabilize our own domestic economy, which is a matter of such grave concern to the whole world. On the other hand, we should not give the impression that we can endlessly or without limit support the economies of other countries, nor that we can, or intend, to solve their problems for them. With mutual self-respect we must build together for the future. We must preserve that faith in our fellowman which Max Friedman has so successfully put into practice. We must help our fellowmen to justify that faith.

It is good to be able to say these things in Max Friedman's presence. Perhaps he has not realized all that he has stood for in our minds. But after all it is not words that count most. The record of a man's activities and achievements speaks louder than any words of praise can do. The record of Max Friedman is well known to all of you. It is well that we should pause in our busy lives to pay tribute to such a record. I am happy and proud to have a part in such an occasion.

In closing I would like to read you a few lines by Henry Van Dyke which I think express better than I have been able to do the things which we feel Max Friedman has accomplished throughout his life. The poem is called Four Things.

"Four things a man must learn to do,
If he would keep his record true
To think without confusion clearly;
To love his fellowmen sincerely;
To act from honest motives purely;
To trust in God and Heaven securely."

Let us each go out from here when we leave tonight, resolved that we too will practice these four things in our homes, in our community, and that we will apply them in our national and international dealings. Thus we will build together a better world.

Raw Water Can Kill You!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert an article, "Raw Water Can Kill You!" by J. D. Ratcliff, from the Coronet magazine.

RAW WATER CAN KILL YOU!

(By J. D. Ratcliff)

Ordinary faucet water comes in several forms—hot and cold, hard and soft, and deadly poisonous. Today a good portion of the American people are living on the very brink of disaster, for this poisonous kind of water is stealing silently into their homes.

In other lands Egypt's dreadful visitation of cholera, China's human sacrifice to typhoid, may seem remote to us. But during the war America's urban populations shot upward while vital improvements to water-supply systems were greatly reduced. As a result, a single slip today might let loose epidemic death upon communities everywhere.

Right now 79,000,000 Americans are drinking water from antiquated supply systems. But municipal authorities are reluctant to act, since citizens are supposed to dislike the bond issues generally required to pay for a safe water supply. Obviously these authorities reason that a man would rather risk illness and death than have his tax rate hoisted a few pennies.

In many instances the country's water plants are little better than old-oaken-bucket systems. Many rivers, creeks, ponds, and lakes which supply drinking water are simply open sewers. Unpleasant as the thought may be, one town drinks sewage from the next up-river town; it, in turn, dumps its own wastes in the stream to slake the thirst of people downstream.

Coastal towns, which pour sewage into the ocean, have one slight advantage: They don't drink the water they help to contaminate—at worst, they merely soil the shore areas which might offer healthful recreation. Los Angeles has done this on a grand scale. As a result, 10 miles of her beaches have been closed to swimmers as unsafe.

New York is an even worse offender. The city empties 500,000,000 gallons of raw or inadequately treated sewage into the harbor each day. Result? The water is so contaminated that scores of profitable oyster beds in nearby waters have been abandoned. Plant and animal life has been destroyed to a point where New York Harbor today is virtually a biological desert. Even the hardy teredo—the "shipworm," which withstands almost anything—can't live here.

Waters at nearby beaches are so contaminated that swimming is risky. Bacterial counts at Coney Island, for example, show 24,000 sewage germs per quart. For comparison, note that the State health department considers 51 sewage bacteria per quart the maximum allowable in public swimming pools.

An alarming situation? It is indeed—particularly when we remember that safe drinking water and safe sewage disposal are minimum sanitary requirements for every family. Yet when unpleasant facts are presented, everyone has a tendency to assume that they don't concern him. The next town may have bad water, but not his.

The United States Public Health Service takes a healthy swipe at such self-delusion. In a Nation-wide survey made last year, it noted that thousands of water and sewage plants were in bad shape before the war. With labor and materials critically short for 4 years, many of them fell into ramshackle condition.

The survey disclosed that 100,000,000 people—70 percent of the Nation—require better water and sewerage service immediately. The job is a big one. It will cost $7,800,000,000—or the approximate value of common stocks in all United States railroads. Of this staggering sum, $2,200,000,000 must be spent for safer water supplies; $3,700,000,000 for sewerage facilities; the balance for waste disposal and disposal plants.

Perhaps we think this expenditure can wait. But many communities have waited—too long. Kaysville, Utah, is a case in point. The water supply was inadequately guarded, and there were too few checks on bacterial contaminations. Eventually, sewage got into the system and was piped into homes. One hundred and seventeen people fell ill with typhoid.

The same thing happened at Washington Crossing, N. J., when someone dug a cesspool too near the wells from which the town drew its water. There were 17 cases of typhoid, and 2 deaths.

Mitchell, Ind., had an explosive outbreak of dysentery—310 cases—when the water supply was inadequately purified; and a slip in plant operation gave Gadsden, Ala., some 10,000 cases of gastroenteritis.

Do such things happen only in small towns? Look at a typhoid outbreak in Washington, D. C. Eight people contracted the disease after drinking water from a well. A blindfolded public-health man could have found the cause: a box privy 25 feet away.

Perhaps you associate such primitive sanitary arrangements with the Ozarks or the Kentucky hills. But open outhouses are still used by one out of every nine people in the Nation's Capital.

These incidents are random examples of 70-odd outbreaks of water-borne diseases that have occurred since 1940. They aren't cited to indicate that you risk disease or death every time you draw water from the kitchen tap. But they do shout one message: hundreds of towns have decrepit water-supply systems, with inadequate safeguards for health.

Not one person in a thousand knows what goes on at his local water plant. The citizen may boast about his parks, municipal buildings, industries—but knows nothing about the purity of the water drunk by himself, his wife, and children. If clear water issues from taps in his home he is satisfied.

If faucets deliver an occasional tadpole or bit of organic matter—as they frequently do in some cities—he is alarmed. But the truth is this: clear water can be just as grossly contaminated as obviously dirty water.

Some cities do nothing to the water in their supply systems. They drink creek, well or pond water. The ways in which creek and pond might become contaminated are apparent. But everyone thinks of well water as safe. Yet Harrodsburg, Ky., didn't find it so. Wells became contaminated and 106 people came down with typhoid. Nine of them died.

One of the safest rules for a community to follow is this: chlorine should be added to water, no matter what the source of supply. This biting erosive gas has the magical power to murder microbes, even though it is added to water in the most minute amounts. People sometimes complain about the unpleasant taste—but that taste denotes safety.

Most epidemics occur where people think they have safe, pure water. When the source is such a highly contaminated stream as the Ohio—a little better than an open sewer for a thousand of its 1,283 miles—water suppliers are on a night-and-day alert. Water treatment becomes an elaborate procedure.

Water is held on an average of 4 hours in settling tanks to allow silt to sink. Then it is filtered either by fast mechanical filters or slow sand filters. This step removes up to 98 percent of the bacteria present. A chlorine solution added to the filtered water takes care of the rest.

Despite such precautions, microbes will slip past, as happened in the Ohio Valley in 1930. A disease marked by diarrhea and abdominal cramps struck tens of thousands of people. It was diagnosed as intestinal influenza—a good way of saying that physicians did not know what it was.

Accidental and mechanical troubles sometimes occur in pumping plants, sending contaminated water into municipal systems. When this occurs, officials rush to the radio to drone the message "Boil water"; and to the long-distance telephone to order typhoid vaccine. Such a slip occurred in Rochester, N. Y.; 35,000 people became ill.

If the picture seems too black, note that some cities have done fine jobs in providing pure water, such as Wheeling, W. Va., which draws supplies from the upper Ohio, a dumping ground for the Pittsburgh area.

Wheeling wisely recognized a point forgotten in many communities; each year it would face increasing contamination. So the city laid long-range plans, kept its plant in a state of flux. Today Wheeling uses almost all the purification steps that are known—and provides top-grade water to its citizens.

The wisdom of such procedure can be appreciated by looking at the type of havoc that water spreads. In the Orient, cholera is the chief danger; in this country, it is typhoid and paratyphoid—the disease which accounted for 86 percent of all deaths in the Spanish-American War; and which invalided home 31,000 British troops during the Boer War. At the turn of the century, typhoid killed more than 30,000 Americans a year.

Drinking water also spreads amoebic dysentery (which made a deadly pass at Chicago during the Century of Progress Exposition there), bacillary dysentery, and a less-serious disease, gastroenteritis. Swimming in polluted water causes eye, ear, nose, and throat infections.

New evidence indicates that polluted water may be a prime source of infantile paralysis. Years ago researchers noted the tendency of this disease to follow "river valley patterns." More lately they have collected evidence indicating the virus is contained in intestinal discharges.

One group of workers, checking a branch sewer in Charleston, S. C., discovered enough virus passed through each minute to give polio to 18,000 monkeys. A trunk sewer in New York was checked—one which serviced 600,000 people. In this vast group, there were but four known cases of polio—yet virus was easily recovered from the sewer. If this virus remained safely confined to sewers there would be no cause for alarm. But it doesn't. Sewers have to empty somewhere.

So far, evidence that sewage spreads polio is circumstantial. But last summer in Wilmington, Del., six children got the disease. Three had been wading near a sewer mouth. In Perrysburg, Ohio, children swam in a contaminated creek—and came down with polio.

At times our water supply is contaminated by criminally careless individuals. One Washington suburb which mushroomed during the war built a sewerage system, emptied it into a creek from which a town of 25,000 only a dozen miles away drew drinking water.

Any community would rise in wrath against the well-poisoner who caused sickness and death. Yet we tolerate the grand-scale water-poisoning practiced by our cities.

A coldly practical person might argue against an increase in a city's bonded indebtedness when the chief beneficiaries would be strangers in down-river towns. Many States have circumvented this attitude by demanding that all towns treat sewage to render it harmless. In other instances, States have banded in regional groups to insure pure water for their people. Yet at the same time, six States have no agencies to enforce their laws governing waste disposal.

The ultimate solution, of course, would be to turn Nation-wide control over to the Federal Government. Surgeon General Thomas Parran, of the United States Public Health Service, sums up the case: "The American people should not continue to tolerate the present gross pollution of public waters."

Industry also shares responsibility for stream contamination, which has killed off wildlife, blighted recreation areas, and endangered water supplies. Acid wastes from industry corrode dams, hasten rusting of boats, damage bridge piers. Yet in dozens of instances where an industry, wishing to be a good neighbor, has built its own sewage-disposal plant, the city has taxed the plant as a capital improvement.

A number of cities which have built large disposal plants have found ways of making them pay part of their cost. Gas which bubbles off collector tanks is used to provide heat and power for the plant. Other alert cities collect organic wastes from tanks, sterilize the wastes, bag them and sell them as fertilizers.

The job facing the Nation in supplying people with two basic essentials of decent life—good water and safe sewage disposal—is enormous. We boast of gleaming bathrooms, yet 1,000,000 American homes are still served by privies. Another 800,000 homes lack even this primitive convenience. Even so, the danger in rural areas is dwarfed by problems facing large cities and industrialized areas.

New York may proudly talk of its vast aqueduct system which brings water from the Catskills, 100 miles away, but it still needs a billion dollars' worth of disposal plants. Detroit must spend $150,000,000, Pittsburgh and Allegheny County $80,000,000, and Philadelphia a whopping $450,000,000.

To delay these jobs is to court disaster. The price for a limping home-building program is discomfort; for a delayed road-construction program, inconvenience. But for failure to provide pure water and safe sewage disposal, the penalty is disease and death.

A Letter on Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid, a powerful, and a timely article entitled "A Letter on Anti-Semitism," by Jacques Maritain, appearing in the February 27, 1948, issue of the Commonweal. It is an affirmative condemnation of anti-Semitism but is equally applicable to any other form of bigotry.

A LETTER ON ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Jacques Maritain)

(The following is the text sent from Rome to Dr. Pierre Visseur, of the International Council of Christians and Jews, to be communicated to the Congress which took place at Seelisberg.—The Editors.)

With great regret at not being able to be present at the Seelisberg Congress, I beg you to transmit to its members my most fervent wishes for the success of their work. Wholeheartedly I associate myself with the aims of the Congress. The struggle against anti-Semitism is a fundamental duty for consciences and it is a primordial necessity for the moral health of what we have left of civilization. I hope fervently that the Congress will furnish a new impulse in this struggle and that it will propose practical measures to make it effective in Europe and in America. It is not enough that a certain number of Christians save our honor through heroic testimony, as we have seen them do in the abominable years from which only now we are partly issuing, and which have left humanity with wounds long years will not cure. To save our honor is a sad, bitter consolation, a consolation which would end by becoming entirely worthless should we not succeed, finally, and really, in overcoming the shameful evil against which we protest.

So long as a world which adheres to Christian civilization is not cured of anti-Semitism, it will drag with it a sin which will stand between it and recovery. For the Jews ever remain beloved for the sake of their forefathers, and it is the mystery itself of the economy of Redemption—before which Saint Paul fell to his knees—that racist hatred and prejudices attack. Nazism bared to our sight the true face of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism hides behind an infinite variety of masks and pretexts—but in truth it is Jesus Christ whom it seeks to strike, striking at His race.

Six million Jews have been liquidated in Europe. Other human masses have been deliberately exterminated, and by the millions also, in the name of Lebensraum, or by political cruelty. They put the Jews to death through hatred of them as a people and because they wanted to wipe their race from the face of the earth. And this bestial hatred had eyes that could see beyond natural things. For truly it was the chosen quality of the Jews, truly it was Moses and the Prophets in the Jews, that the persecutors were persecuting. It was the Savior who came from the Jewish people Whom the persecutors hated. It was Israel's dignity, into which the Catholic Church prays God to permit all nations to enter, that the persecutors insulted in the bodies of those despised Jews whom they treated as the vermin of the world. It is our God they buffeted and flagellated in His human lineage, before, openly, they persecuted Him in His church.

Strangely wise and informed hatred, more perspicacious than the uncertain love in our hearts. Until that day foretold by St. Paul when the synagogue and the church shall be reconciled, and which will be for the world as a resurrection from the dead, the two have been united as the object of this demonic hatred. Just as Christianity was hated for its Jewish origins, Israel was hated for its belief in original sin and in redemption, and for the Christian pity which sprang from it. According to the profound observation made by the Jewish writer, Maurice Samuel, it is not because they killed Christ, it is because they gave Christ to the world, that Hitler's antisemitic rage dragged the Jews over all the roads of Europe, through excrement and blood, and tore children from their mothers, from that moment deprived even of their names and undertook to drive an entire race into despair.

And so without even knowing that it was so, Israel has been pursued by that same

hatred which pursued also and previously Jesus Christ. Its Messiah made it, in the image of Himself, sorrowful and abject—before He shall make it in the image of Himself, one day, in light. Sanguinary first fruits of that plenitude of Israel of which Christians, if they look into their heart, can decipher, the visible portents in the sequence of abominable events of which the memory will burn us ever, and which already are taking their place in the oubliettes of the survivors' indifference. Strange companions, Jews and Christians have walked together along the way of Calvary. The great and mysterious fact is that Israel's tribulations more and more distinctly have taken the form of the Cross.

Will the Christians understand? That is the question which now arises. How long still will they sleep? For how long still will many of them repudiate, in fact, St. Paul's teaching which instructs us that we have been grafted on the olive tree of Israel, and that we have become, with Israel, participants of the roots and the sap of that olive tree? "Spiritually we are all Semites," said Pope Pius XI. Before being a problem of blood, of physical life and death for the Jews, antisemitism is a problem of the spirit, of the spiritual life and death for Christians. Israel has a long habit of suffering and of persecution, it has borne them through the centuries; it expects them the while it fears them; it is well aware that its God, Who compels it to walk through the abyss, will lift it high above the abyss, and then plunge it into the abyss once again and lift it high above it once again. It is a thing strangely moving, and highly conducive to our looking back upon our own past in a spirit of humiliation—Christians of the Gentile race—to contemplate the sort of tragic sereneness with which a Jew, who has meditated upon the history of his people, speaks to us his certainty that Israel will never find either rest or pity.

But there is something that the anti-Semitic fury wounds and irremediably corrupts, and that is the Christian conscience. The despair of those who killed themselves because injustice triumphed itself is an image of a thing still more terrible: the corruption of the human soul within those who persecuted, and the gulf of perversion into which they risk hurling the human race. If Plato and St. Thomas Aquinas are right when they say that it is better to suffer unjustly than criminally to make others suffer, and that the evil in the executioners is worse than the evil suffered by the victims, then we are obliged to conclude that the ravages caused by racism in the heart of the racists and the anti-Semites have been even more abominable than the tortures they inflicted upon a multitude of innocents.

Insofar as a man yields to the prejudices of race and to that sort of modified anti-Semitism which, the while it deplores the masacres yet finds for them some excuse, and approves—with a transcendent political resignation to the doom of others—the laws, the customs, the habits of discrimination, and is all the more abject in that it takes shelter in good conscience, that man renders himself spiritually the accomplice of the demons whom the executioners obey. It is not only in order that the iniquity which weighs upon the innocents shall cease, it is also for its own salvation, and for the recovery of the world, that the Christian conscience must free itself of racist and anti-Semitic leprosy.

Through a shameful phenomenon, which our miserable human state amply suffices to explain, it is a fact that the extermination of millions of Jews, the gas chambers and the tortures of the death camps, have not been enough to awaken the conscience of the nations, and fire them with final horror for the racist principle. Far from it. On the contrary the virus has spread, under a more or less attenuated form, and the memory of that immense outbreak of murder and rape kindles in an appreciable number of honorable personages—with a wise distrust of, and a prudent disgust for the victims—mental excitement and rationalized passions which find expression and relief in a cold hostility, and in economic and political recriminations, doubtless not in pogroms and in assassinations, which the smell of blood has hiddenly and treacherously stimulated.

In many countries of the Old and New World anti-Semitism is growing; Hitler's lesson has made its way in men's minds. The old excuses are still available; we find a truly noble jealousy toward returned competitors (since not all the Jews are dead, those who remain, obviously, must live, and to live they must exert their professions, consequently Gentiles have nothing left to eat). We find such and such Jews taking part in political activities to which we object (as if they alone were responsible for such activities, and as if they alone made up the totality of Jews). People watch the Jews; and this oriented attention is in itself a psychological victory for racist propaganda and for the racist crimes.

As I brought out in another study, "once you route in a certain determined direction peoples' attention, they will notice immediately, once their attention has thus been focused, all sorts of accidental data which serve as excuse for spontaneous sysematization, no matter how absurd it may be. Repeat, using all the methods of intensive propaganda, that the inhabitants of Fifth Avenue are thieves, and other New Yorkers will end by noticing—how extraordinary—that such and such a citizen, of whom they have reason to complain, lives precisely on Fifth Avenue. And such and such another citizen, equally disliked, as a fact, does also. Meanwhile objectionable personages who annoy us in other regions of the city escape all notice, of course, since they are out of the visual range which has been fixed for us. At the end of a few months you will have been able to create an anti-Fifth-Avenueism as reasonable and as clearly confirmed as anti-Semitism." [1]

Now, once again in the course of world history, the fundamental elements in the question of Israel's position among the nations have been profoundly altered. In our day the question has entered a new phase. For who among the Jews were more assimilated than the German Jews? And yet it was in Germany that the anti-Semitic fury burst out with unequaled ferocity. Faced with the bankruptcy of assimilation, the Jewish conscience turned in despair to the promised land. The movement which is urging the survivors of the Jewish masses of central Europe, horrified by the abominations that they have suffered and haunted by the clamor of their dead, toward Palestine is an historical phenomenon—and it is irresistible. In one form or another, and implying agreement (which in itself does not seem to be impossible) with the Arab inhabitants of the land, it appears that the solution of a Hebrew state in Palestine, inevitably, will be the next solution attempted by the angel of an ever-sorrowful and frustrated history.

However necessary and justified this solution may be, we must not hide from ourselves the fact that it risks being exploited by anti-Semitism to the harm of the Jewish citizens of other nations. We shall have to make people understand that the existence of a Jewish state no more separates from their respective nationalities Jews who are members of other states, than the existence of an Irish state separates the Irish people in America from their American nationality. To cover anti-Semitic prejudices there will be a new crop of invalid pretexts to add to the invalid pretexts which drag about everywhere, and we shall have to refute these new ones as we have the old. But the clearest rational arguments will never be effective since they face a collective and irrational psychosis drawing its strength from its very irrationality. That which is better and higher than reason, alone is capable of descending into the underground world of unreason, and of mastering it.

And here there stands before us the peculiar responsibility of the Christian conscience: it alone can free the soul from the poison of anti-Semitism, if aware truly of its own spirit, and if it truly carries into the substance of man's history the understanding and the testimony of its faith in Israel's mystery.

In this brief note I do not take up the political and social implications of Israel's problem. However real they may be, they remain secondary in relation to their spiritual implications. It is of these latter that I should like to say a few words in conclusion. I am convinced in this connection that a great labor of meditation and of inner purification is required now of Christians. If they draw their nourishment from Saint Paul's doctrine, they will understand the spiritual significance of anti-Semitism, and at the same time they will understand the mysterious solidarity which links them to the elder race. It is in communion with this race, in spite of everything, that they invoke the patriarchs and prophets, and each day pray with the words of David on their lips, professing Him as come whom the synagogue has not recognized and still awaits, and professing Him who, born of a virgin of Israel, and a Jew Himself "through inborn excellence," "par excellence de nature," Whose Apostles and first martyrs were Jews, nourishing the church of the Jews and of the Gentiles with their Jewish blood poured forth for Christ. They will understand that they must not only sweep out like refuse, wherever unhappily there are still people who believe in them, slanderous legends such as the stories of ritual murder and such forgeries as the Protocols of Zion, but also that they will have most attentively to revise and purify their own language into which a routine, not always innocent, and in any case singularly careless of rigor and exactness, has allowed to creep absurd expressions such as that of the "Deicide Race," or a fashion, more racist than Christian, of narrating the story of the Passion so that it arouses hatred among Christian children for their Jewish school fellows, or translations of the phrase "perfidia Judaica," in the Good Friday liturgy, which are not more than vulgar misreadings, for in the language of the church this word signifies "unbelief" and not "perfidiousness." [2]

They will understand that their very manner of approaching the problems created by the Diaspora must be fraternal, and lead them to comprehend in depth, thanks to a sufficiently complete and scrupulous information—and to understand from within, thanks to the experience of conature that love carries with it—the anguish and the debate of the Jewish conscience, torn between the obligation of keeping its identity and the will to obtain for Jews the justice and equality due all men.

Then, Christians of the gentile race will be able to enter a little into the mystery, and not only in theory, but in a real and practical manner—were it only to suffer in their turn because they do so, as several have recently suffered under the Nazi persecutions—into the mystery of that people which stumbled that they be saved and through whose disobedience they obtained mercy, and whom God continues to reserve for Himself. And

[1] Le Droit Raciste et la vraie signification du Racisme, New York, 25 Janvier 1943 (Pour le Justice, New York, la Maison Francaise, 1945, ch. XXV).

[2] Cf. John M. Oesterreicher, Pro Perfidis Judaeis. Theological Studies, March 1947.

then not only will they have barred anti-Semitism from seeking in the lower, permanent barbarian depths of the human soul any false religious pretext, but they will have done their part to prepare that coming reintegration, which St. Paul announced, and which, for Israel, according to the word of Corneliusà Lapide, will not be a conversion but a fulfillment, and will recall to life a lukewarm world.

The Condon Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a telegram received from a number of faculty members and students at the University of Minnesota. I have been informed by members of the committee referred to that a public hearing will be held on this matter within approximately 2 weeks.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 10, 1948.*
The Honorable GEORGE MacKINNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned citizens of the State of Minnesota respectfully request that you, as our Representative, ask the Congress to investigate the circumstances surrounding the recent Condon case. We desire specifically that Congress ascertain whether the Un-American Activities Committee had at the time of issuance of its report any valid evidence indicating that Dr. E. U. Condon is unfit to serve this country in his present office. If it appears that the committee lacked such evidence, we urge that Congress pass a resolution clearing Dr. Condon's name and that Congress censure the Committee on Un-American Activities. We further strongly urge that in keeping with American traditions, Congress subject the proceedings of this committee to the safeguards of justice which are provided for individuals in courts of law.

This letter was circulated among the staff and others associated with the University of Minnesota. Original with additional signatures follows by mail. Please release to press.

Clifford Kirkpatrick, William P. Jensen, Gaylord W. Anderson, John H. Williams, Everett Fraser, Charles T. Duncan, W. D. Armstrong, Edwin Emery, C. J. Watson, D. D. Janson, William T. Peyton, E. J. Lofgren, Horace Die, L. William Sleator, Jr., Ray Amberg, Edward P. Ney, F. G. Wallace, Frank Oppenheimer, E. M. Slider, John T. Tate, Allan H. Brown, R. B. Thorness, William S. Cooper, J. S. Dumner, Harlan P. Banks, A. Orville, Dal Starke, R. Hathaway, Charles Bird, Saul L. Cohen, John J. Bittner, Stefan A. Reisenfeld, G. B. Heisig, Arthur Borak, Leo G. Rigler, Wilhelm Stenstrom, Graham B. Hovey, Mary Jean Hovey, Warren C. Engstrom, John R. McLeod, Howard Sandvik, Lois S. Rolke, A. W. Frick, William Rolke, Mary Johnson, Ray Pearson, William J. Balamut, Jerome C. Johnson, D. Milton Kvanbeck, Gaylor Peterson, Francis Macknikowski, E. J. Johnson, E. A. Glarborg, W. T. Leland, John H. Erickson, Don H. Dooley, Robert C. Jensen, Dean Donaldson, Gloria J. Olson, Tom Flinn, Max M. Kampelman, Stanley R. Cohn, Ralph D. Casey, Marjorie Kreidberg, Walter A. Sanborn, Jr., Stanley C. Sorensen, James R. O'Ryan, Elwin Shaughnessy, Robert J. Hohman, Edmond G. Franklin, Benjamin M. Gurley, J. Edward Gerald, E. H. Ford, George S. Hage, Mitchell V. Charnley, Elizabeth Quast, Dorthy Stromswold, Mary Otto, Bryant Kearl, Gordon A. Babine, Jonathan Eyler, Otto W. Quale, Fred C. Kildow, Lewis S. Patterson, Gareth D. Hiebert, Charles Sweningsen, Bob Eddy, William C. Crowley, Donald N. Ferguson, Mary Malcolm, Thelma Hunter, Blanche Kendall, James Aliferis, Paul S. Ivory, Paul M. Oberg, Clyde Stephens, William Lindsay, Roy Schuessler, Gertrude Hull, Earl V. Rymer, Charles Norman Kelber, William R. Stratton, Raymond O. Grumbo, Wallace D. Ward, George E. Schafer, C. N. Wall, Jerome Joseph, Fred Edeskuty, Charles E. Porter, Jr., Andrew J. Galambos, John M. Roberts, Joseph H. Greenberg, Harold P. Winchester, Berry Campbell, Edward Berryman, Clayton Huggett, Franz H. Rathmann, Donald R. Blumer, Lois G. Nordhausen, David Rotenberg, Robert M. L. Lindquist, K. E. Neumier, Jr., E. E. Melby, Harriet J. Schmitt, Arlene Garry, Miles S. Kersten, O. M. Bjeldanes, James J. Fisette, William J. Lipscomb, Jr., Bryce L. Crawford, Hervey H. Barber, Richard T. Arnold, Alfred R. Pray, G. D. O'Brien, M. C. Sneed, O. H. Johnson, W. A. Lindeke, E. J. Meehan, R. M. Dodson, C. F. Koelsch, P. R. O'Connor, Robert Loomingston, Charles L. Critchfield, E. B. Pierce, E. L. Gasteiger, Joseph Valasek, B. B. McInteer, Jr., Phyllis S. Freier, Carl E. Bleil, F. E. Christensen, Richard E. Halsted, Raphael B. Levine, Olga M. Schuster, James L. Wanvig, Peter C. Andrews, Herbert C. Davis, James E. Gottlieb, Sam B. Davis, Robert A. Dworsky, Donald M. Fraser, Robert C. McClure, Wm. B. Lockhart, W. E. Mussman, Horace E. Read, Henry L. McClintock, Edward S. Bade, Millicent Purdy, William J. Kraker, Stanley V. Kinyon, Maynard E. Pirsig, Jean L. Critchfield, Haym Druglak, Erik Hakanson, Cyrus P. Barnum, Jr., Joel Bitman, Rex Neihof, Mrs. Richard Hollister, Julaine Doran, Robert E. Schofield, Max Robinson, John Linsley.

Rent-Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, in studying the Senate hearings on rent control, I found the statement of Senator WAGNER the most penetrating and understanding analysis of rent-control legislation which has yet been presented on this subject.

The following is a summary of this statement:

Family life in America will face a crisis if Congress does not pass an effective rent-control law. Under the present weak law which ends on February 29, 1948, tenants, confronted with the imminent termination of rent control, have no alternative but to yield to pressure from landlords for exorbitant and illegal rent increases. Family life cannot long remain stable under the anxiety and strain created by this situation. Evictions in the present acute housing shortage mean homeless people. Exorbitant rent increases mean a denial of the necessities of life—milk and medical care for children.

Rent control is the last line of defense against a disastrous inflation. The grave question now before the Congress is whether this last remaining safeguard against chaos shall be strengthened or destroyed. On this decision, which must be made this month, hinges not only the security of American family life but also the effectiveness of the Marshall plan and through it world peace. Tenants must be given security of tenure. For this reason the extension of an effective rent-control law for 2 years is most essential.

The Housing Expediter should again be given authority to issue regulations requiring adequate notice to both tenants and local area rent offices. His regulations should provide for adequate stays of eviction in those cases beyond the control of the tenant.

Provisions in the present law are so inadequate as to discredit law enforcement generally as well as the administration of this particular act. The Congress should restore in full the criminal and civil enforcement sanctions which were provided in the Emergency Price Control Act. Under the new law willful violation of the act should be punishable as a crime by the usual fines and imprisonment provided by Federal law. The passage of S. 2014 will again provide protection to the several million persons whose accommodations were decontrolled by the terms of the present law.

One of the major defects of the 1947 act is its failure to specify definite administrative standards for the Housing Expediter to follow in his administration of the act. This defect has caused confusion both to the Housing Expediter and the local advisory boards. It also raises serious questions as to the constitutionality of the act.

I submit such expressions as: "inequities" and "hardships because of the inadequacies of the maximum rent," the standards contained in the present act, are too vague to serve as useful guides for local boards and the Housing Expediter. These terms cannot be objectively defined and can mean one thing to an association of real-estate men, another to a group of tenants, yet another to the Housing Expediter. Such vague terms serve as a constant threat to the validity of the law on constitutional grounds. The legislative history of the present law gave no clarification to these expressions.

In contrast to these meaningless standards the Emergency Price Control Act, which would be reenacted by S. 2014, contains definite standards to guide the national Rent Administrator. Furthermore, these standards have been tested fully and upheld by the United States Supreme Court.

I wish to place myself squarely on record in opposition to giving the local boards authority to decide such important questions as decontrol and general rent increase for a rent-control area. In the first place I think such a delegation of authority would cast grave doubt on the constitutionality of the legislation. Such a risk should be avoided; especially since other sound reasons exist for not taking this step. In the second place experience under the present act has shown that local advisory boards are not equipped to determine questions of broad basic policy. They neither have the time nor facilities adequate to do so.

The proponents of local board autonomy have referred to local draft boards under the Selective Service System and War Price and Rationing Boards as examples of successful delegation of authority to the local level. These advocates ask, "Why can't local rent advisory boards be given the equivalent authority regarding rent control?" The an-

swer is that they can and should be given equivalent authority, but as I shall explain below this does not mean that the local boards can be given unlimited authority concerning such matters as decontrol and a general rent increase in a rent-control area—the most basic questions in the Federal rent-control program.

Local draft boards and war price and rationing boards were given no authority to determine questions of broad policy concerning the operation of the selective-service system or the wartime rationing and price-control program. These boards administered the details of these Federal programs in their respective communities under careful supervision and in accordance with detailed instructions and regulation. Such boards might be more aptly compared with the local area rent directors under the present Federal rent-control program, who in a similar way administer the details of the Federal rent-control program under detailed instructions and specific regulations.

As a substitute for the present confused status of these local advisory boards, I suggest that they be authorized to make recommendations which are to be fully considered by the Rent Administrator. The new law should provide that the Housing Expediter is to pass on the recommendations submitted to him within a reasonable time after full investigation of the economic and other facts involved and to state fully his reasons for either accepting or rejecting them. The Administrator should not be bound by them. In other words the Housing Expediter should not be made a "rubber stamp," and the local boards should not be made to assume an unreasonable burden. To require the local boards to determine broad policy questions on rent control would be in my opinion an evasion by the Congress of its legislative responsibility.

In the new legislation adequate provision should be made to insure that the local advisory boards are fully representative of the conflicting interests in the community they are expected to serve. It now appears that the great majority of local advisory boards are heavily weighed by landlord, real estate, and financial interests. The new law should specify that landlords, tenants, and the general public should be fully represented.

I urge the committee to correct the bad mistake which Congress made last year in passing the present weak law. I also urge the committee to report a bill, such as S. 2014, giving the Housing Expediter adequate authority to enforce rent ceilings, to protect tenants from insidious extortion and from eviction and to permit veterans to obtain housing for their families without paying exhorbitant rent increases. I ask that the new law have adequate administrative standards such as those provided by S. 2014 and that local advisory boards be permitted to perform a proper advisory function. If Congress acts wisely we can avoid the disaster of a frightful inflation.

Effigy Mounds National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, Iowa is world-famed as the agricultural center of our Nation. It is less widely known for its great natural beauty, although it is richly endowed with historical landmarks and picturesque scenery. The most picturesque scenery in the State is found in the northeastern counties and especially along the bluffs of the upper Mississippi River. Among the outstanding points of interest in this locality are the so-called Effigy Mounds—the ancient burial places of prehistoric Indians. The State of Iowa has purchased this area and has graciously offered it as a gift to the Federal Government for the establishment of a national monument.

In this connection, I include with my remarks a letter of date March 9, 1948, addressed to me by Mr. G. L. Ziemer, the director of the State Conservation Commission of Iowa, setting out the present status of the project:

STATE CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
Des Moines, Iowa, March 9, 1948.

The Honorable HENRY O. TALLE,
Representative in Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TALLE: The State of Iowa is offering to the Federal Government a gift of 1,000 acres in northeast Iowa for the establishment of the Effigy Mounds National Monument.

Northeast Iowa, Clayton and Allamakee Counties, have groups of prehistoric Indian mounds known as the animal-shaped or effigy mounds. Horace M. Albright, former Director of the National Park Service, in his report dated February 16, 1932, stated, "The preservation of such mounds, while there is still time to save them, will be of infinite value to posterity * * * within this area can be found Indian mounds of national interest * * * mounds of this type would add to the completeness of the prehistoric remains that are being protected in our existing national monument system."

The State conservation commission requested the National Park Service to inspect the area and outline proposed boundaries. In 1934, in accordance with their recommendations, acquisition was begun. By September of 1947 a total of 1,204.39 acres had been purchased.

By action of the forty-ninth general assembly only 1,000 acres may be offered to the Federal Government for the establishment of the Effigy Mounds National Monument, at this time—the remainder being held until such time as State legislative approval may be secured authorizing the gift of the remaining 204.39 acres.

The executive council on February 2, 1948, approved the action of the commission recommending the gift of the land for this purpose, and formal patent is being issued.

The commission has been advised by the National Park Service that the gift will be accepted and the monument established as soon as legalities can be completed.

Examination of patent and abstracts by the Solicitor's office in Washington, D. C., may require some time, thereby delaying early Presidential proclamation.

At this time there appears to be no other obstacles in the way of acceptance of this gift by the Federal Government, and this letter is written to apprise you of the present status of this transaction.

Yours very truly,

G. L. ZIEMER,
State Conservation Director.

Mr. Speaker, in contributing this unique area as a national park, Iowa cordially invites the Nation to enjoy the beauty and hospitality of the Hawkeye State.

Valedictory by the Public Printer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a farewell address delivered by Mr. Augustus E. Giegengack, the Public Printer, to the officials of the Government Printing Office on March 9 last.

I am informed by the Government Printing Office that Mr. Giegengack's address will make about three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $213.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAREWELL TALK BY THE PUBLIC PRINTER TO THE OFFICIALS OF THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, MARCH 9, 1948

It has been said, I think by Bill Shakespeare, that the past is the prologue to the future. This means, I suppose, that history repeats itself. We should, therefore, study what has happened in the past if we are to predict with a reasonable degree of accuracy what will happen in the future. With these thoughts in mind, I can think of no better time than the present to review some of the things we have accomplished by working together as a team during the past 13 years and 8 months.

I believe the records will show that during this period we have exercised an effective, positive leadership in the printing field and that we have striven to develop and maintain high standards of efficiency as well as frank and friendly relationships with Congress, with the several Federal establishments, with the printing industry, with the general public, and with our own personnel. The changes in policy that we have inaugurated have been calculated to transform an antiquated Government printing establishment which we found in 1934 into the great, modern, well-integrated service organization we have today.

Let us mention some of the steps we have taken to arrive at our present position.

NEW BUILDING AND WAREHOUSE

The first was a vigorous and tough campaign for authorization and for the necessary funds to construct our modern printing plant and warehouse system that enabled us to handle expeditiously and efficiently, with the aid of the printing industry, the great volume of Government printing and binding that was demanded during the war.

COST-FINDING SURVEY

We then made a cost-finding survey and installed a complete system of cost accounting, thus making it possible for the first time to charge Congress and the Federal departments and agencies the exact costs entering into the production of each printing and binding job they ordered. I am certain that there isn't one among us who isn't familiar with the pleas that have been made for accuracy in reporting the facts we need to keep our cost accounts and our cost controls in proper shape for intelligent use. But few of us realize the tremendous savings that we have been able to accomplish by knowing our costs and thereby being in a position to determine the most economical manner in which each job can be produced.

MODERNIZATION OF EQUIPMENT

Next was the modernization and streamlining of our physical equipment by replacing obsolete machinery and equipment and by completely overhauling and rearranging other machinery and equipment.

DIVISION OF PERSONNEL CREATED

It was in January 1939, by Administrative Order No. 1, that we created a Division of Personnel and definitely fixed the responsibility for carrying out of civil-service laws, rules, and regulations and for otherwise proper handling of our personnel. Speaking of personnel, let's not overlook the fact that it was we, through a campaign waged in 1936, who were successful in obtaining for the employees of the Government Printing Office for the first time the benefits of the Federal sick-leave laws. It would be hard to estimate the number of employees who are happier and healthier, in a better financial position, and—yes—maybe alive as a result of our training in safety procedures.

In thinking of training programs, it would be difficult to overestimate the value that has accrued to the Office from our job-methods training program, our foreman conferences, in which we discussed management methods, and similar programs and conferences too numerous to mention here.

We must look to the Personnel Division for guidance and heed their advice in the handling of our employees. One of the things that I have seen most often in the transcripts covering our personnel conferences has been the admonition to all supervisors to treat the employees for whom they are responsible as they, the supervisors, would like to be treated. If we bear this thought in mind, our relations with our employees will cause us little, if any, trouble.

Let me also remind you that the Director of Personnel, Mr. Hipsley, and his assistants have certain very definite limitations under the law as to what they can and cannot do. So you must bear in mind that if a new employee you get doesn't meet your expectations, or your recommendation to demote or to dismiss a particular employee isn't acted upon as quickly as you would like, it is due to these laws, rules, and regulations designed for the greater good of the greater number and not to any desire on the part of Mr. Hipsley or his assistants to disregard your recommendation.

DIRECTOR OF TYPOGRAPHY AND DESIGN

One of the first new positions we created was that of Director of Typography and Design. It was set up especially to aid in the production of printing of better design and with better art work, as well as to advise Congress and other Federal establishments upon economies to be obtained through better planning of projected publications and to place specifically the responsibility for handling the production of special art in printing and binding.

Our annual report for 1947, beginning on page 143, is well worth reading, if we ever have any doubts as to the wisdom of the action we took in setting up that new position.

NEW PLANNING SET-UP

On April 16, 1943, by Administrative Order No. 14, which was issued to effect control over planning, production, procurement, and delivery of printing and to fix responsibility for the completion of work within the time specified by the Government Printing Office in line with the requirements of the agency requisitioning printing, four planning divisions were created.

They were created with the knowledge that they were to be the heart of our organization. It has been said that a dollar well spent in planning will save 10 in production, and I am confident that our records will prove that to be true in the Government Printing Office. You can't have a beautiful house or building without an architect. You can't have a satisfactory printing job economically produced without proper plans and specifications. These were the thoughts underlying the promulgation of the order creating the planning divisions. I hope they will never be forgotten or their importance overlooked. I suggest that all of us reread and become thoroughly familiar with that part of our annual report for 1947 which covers well the activities of our planning divisions.

Speaking of our annual report for 1947, I think each and every one of us can be justifiably proud of it, as it shows what can be accomplished by a group working together as a team during the most difficult years in our history.

RELATIONS WITH DEPARTMENTS

At the time the responsibility for producing the printing for the Government was entrusted to us, our relationships with the departments and with the printing industry were at a low ebb. The best and clearest illustration of the seriousness of problems that arise as a result of poor relations between the Government Printing Office and the departments or agencies is the case of the Patent Office's attempt to transfer all patent work from the Government Printing Office to a commercial printer. The first indication that we had of the seriousness of the situation was the appearance of the following paragraph in a report of the House Committee on Appropriations on a Commerce Department appropriation bill:

"At the request of the committee made during the course of the hearings on the appropriations for the Patent Office last year, the Commissioner of Patents submitted to the committee the results of a study made on the matter of cost of printing patent specifications and the Official Gazette. It appears that by the use of certain offset methods of printing, savings could be made in excess of $100,000 in the annual printing bill of this Bureau. A responsible private firm in business in Washington for over 20 years has made an offer to do this work by use of offset printing methods at the savings indicated. * * * It is sincerely hoped by the committee that this whole problem of use of new printing methods will be given an early consideration by the Joint Committee on Printing in order that economies running into hundreds of thousands of dollars annually can be accomplished. A reduction of $100,000 in the budget estimate is recommended in the expectation that a saving of not less than this sum may eventuate from such action as may be taken."

I am sure the employees of the Patents Section, whose jobs were at stake, will recall the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Printing on this subject, and I know Mr. Lecraw, Mr. Broderick, Mr. Ritter, and those of us in the Public Printer's office will recall the many gallons of midnight oil we burned in preparing for the hearings that resulted in the retention of the work in the Government Printing Office, where the Patent Office has received better service than it could possibly have gotten anywhere else and where thousands of dollars have been saved for the taxpayers.

As the newsboy would say, you can read all about it in the printed hearings or even in greater detail in the Public Printer's Annual Report for 1938.

That our contacts with the departments and agencies are now on a high plane and a friendly basis is indicated by the many letters we receive thanking us for the service we render and by the further fact that on June 24, 1947, the Medal of Merit Board recognized the outstanding service of the Government Printing Office to the Nation by awarding the Certificate of Merit to your Public Printer.

RELATIONS WITH INDUSTRY

So much for the relationships existing between us and our customer departments. Let's now take a look at how the industry regarded us. The following, taken from a letter addressed to a Member of Congress, is a typical illustration of the attacks that were being made upon us by individuals and organizations representing commercial printers:

"At the meeting of the members of the Printers' Board of Trade held yesterday, I was asked to call your attention to the volume of printing which is being produced for use in this area by the Government Printing Office in Washington.

"When the Government Printing Office was established, it was generally accepted and for many years it was the policy for it to print only material such as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, money orders, and other Government documents and publications. Now, however, all sorts of forms and miscellaneous printed matter which is used in local areas are being produced by the printing department. We feel that this is a discrimination against the wage earners in this territory and against the employers who have heavy investments and who are paying large sums of taxes for the support of Federal departments and services. Moreover, other industries do not lose as a result of Government competition, and purchases of supplies in local areas are made through local merchants and manufacturers.

"We therefore hope that you will support the effort that is being made to correct this situation so that the printing industry in my city may not be discriminated against."

Needless to say, attacks of this kind imposed burdens upon the front office and took real cooperation—in the form of jobs produced efficiently, economically, and expeditiously—from every unit in the Office, thus making available the facts that would bat them down. That the burdens were overcome and the facts were made available is amply illustrated by the many complimentary statements about the Government Printing Office made since by representatives of industry, the following resolution being typical:

"Whereas the Honorable A. E. Giegengack, Public Printer of the United States, for many years has symbolized the importance of the graphic arts industry in a position of eminence in the National Capital at Washington; and

"Whereas the demand for printing necessary to the prosecution of the war requires the use of the facilities of the Government Printing Office and those of the commercial printing industry, all of which have been most efficiently coordinated under the direction of the Public Printer; and

"Whereas, in his solution of the problem of employing the equipment and services of the commercial printing industry in conjunction with those of the Government Printing Office, thus synchronizing the productive capacity of the Nation, he has established a system of impartial treatment to all; and

"Whereas, while he is not unmindful of the dignity of his high office and its major responsibilities, he has retained with cordial friendliness 'the common touch' and a personal pride in having been a competent and respected member of the rank and file of craftsmen: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Graphic Arts Industry of Greater New York and vicinity, as represented by more than 1,000 persons assembled February 16, 1943, in the Hotel Biltmore, New York, extends cordial greetings to the Honorable A. E. Giegengack, Public Printer of the United States, and records its gratitude for his distinguished service to the industry and for the substantial contribution he is making to the national war effort through the efficient use of the skilled personnel and the modern equipment of the graphic arts, both in the Government Printing Office at Washington and in the commercial plants of the Nation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman and members of the Joint Committee on Printing, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and to the Honorable A. E. Giegengack at Washington."

The relationships existing between the Office and the printing industry are now on a more friendly and mutually helpful basis than they have been at any other time in the history of the Office. I am depending upon our research program, as outlined in our 1947 annual report, to maintain those relationships. You will note in rereading the program that we have stressed the importance of studying with industry their management methods with the object of eliminating outmoded procedures and techniques and bringing into use modern methods of selection, training, placement, and compensation of personnel. We are definitely committed to undertake in the immediate future, with the aid and assistance of trained engineers, employed by the industry, a research testing program that will, we hope, enable the printing industry to select initial trainees who are most likely to succeed in their chosen field. I consider this program of paramount importance if we are to move forward in the printing industry.

Of the three M's, manpower has been much more neglected than either machinery or money. I believe that the greatest advances in the next decade will come in the field of human engineering, and I trust that in this pioneer testing program every one of us called upon will do his utmost to make the undertaking a success. As I have said, the Office is committed to this program. Let us not disappoint our partners in the industry.

PRAISE BY OTHERS

The departments and the industry are not alone in saying complimentary things about the work of the Government Printing Office. Many quotations could be given, but I have selected two to illustrate the point. On page 13 of the report of the House Committee on Appropriations dealing with the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1943, the following appears:

"The committee desires to commend the 'board of directors of the Government Printing Office' (the Joint Committee on Printing), the Public Printer, and their respective staffs and organizations for the expedition and efficiency attending the management of the Government Printing Office and the procurement of Government printing in commercial channels. The printing requirements for the war agencies and the agencies supplementing them are extensive and urgent. It is fortunate, indeed, that the Public Printer in this critical period is a man of long and successful experience in commercial printing, fortified with sound judgment, vision, and a patriotic zeal for protecting the interest of the United States. He has the loyal support and confidence of his personnel, and the Government Printing Office is an outstanding example of an agency clicking in carrying on its war-assignment load."

As a further illustration of the attitude of Congress toward the Public Printer and the Government Printing Office, we find the statement made by Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, during the hearings held by the Boren subcommittee in 1943 on brand names and newsprint (see p. 1082):

"I might say, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Wolverton, and for the record, as perhaps the one practical printer on the committee, Mr. Giegengack and his assistant, Mr. Deviny, have the reputation in the commercial printing world of being two of the greatest authorities in America on matters pertaining to printing; and it seems to me peculiar that, with men of their ability and their capacity available, we do not take advantage of placing them in supreme authority to pass upon these printing problems of the Federal Government. I am satisfied in my own mind that the suggestions made by the chairman as to centralization of authority and legislation, with teeth in it, that would give these gentlemen an opportunity to pass on the need for public printing and control the volume and the amount of it would result in saving of millions of dollars a year to the taxpayers of this country."

And then, too, we are particularly proud of the quotation you will find on page 2678 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 16, 1944, in the remarks of the Honorable Emmett O'Neal, of the Appropriations Committee:

"The Government Printing Office is a truly remarkable institution and one that every citizen in this country can be proud of."

IMPROVEMENTS IN PRODUCTION DIVISIONS

Up to this point we have been talking about the improvements we have made in our buildings, in our equipment, in our organizational set-up, and of the changes in our policies that have resulted in better relations between us and the other Federal departments and agencies and between us and the printing industry. We have not said anything so far about the improvements that we have made in our production divisions, improvements far beyond the mere addition of new and more modern equipment and its rearrangement.

A comparison of the Composing Division and how it operates today, under Mr. Reaves, with what it was in July 1934 is amazing, even to us who have watched its progress. Our Platemaking Division, under Mr. McLean, is, I am certain, the most modern and efficient in the country.

Our Presswork Division, under Mr. Adams, is one of the finest I have ever seen, and it will, I believe, do a job as quickly, as efficiently, and as economically as any pressroom in the country having the same or similar equipment.

When we come to the bindery we also see real improvement. You would hardly recognize the streamlined, efficiently organized unit it is today, under Tom Maloney, as the disorganized, scattered-around, miscellaneous, unconnected units that made up our bindery in 1934. And you may know of the enthusiastic current drive that is now being made in the bindery, spearheaded by the bindery officials and our consultant on methods and procedures, Mr. Lecraw, to equal or better commercial prices and production time on those operations which up to now have caused criticism of the Government Printing Office.

DOCUMENTS DIVISION

In talking about improvements in divisions, I must not overlook our Documents Division, under Mr. Cromwell and Roy Eastin. Last month was the greatest in volume in the 53-year history of the sale of Government publications by the Superintendent of Documents, and he handled this record-breaking business with 37 fewer employees than he had a year ago. Since 1945, all the employees of this office, along with all other Government employees, received two salary increases, yet the unit cost of selling Government publications is lower today than it was in 1945, and service is faster than ever before. I think this is a record equaled by few organizations, public or private.

BUSINESS SIDE OF OPERATIONS

One of the first impressions that I received of the Government Printing Office from the inside was the lack of attention given at that time to the business side of its operations. It struck me that the entire emphasis was upon getting out a job for the customer who was making the most noise, without reference to costs, proper methods of production, and the schedules of other jobs badly needed by our customers who were not making a noise. I knew that operating on this basis was extremely costly and generally unsatisfactory to the agencies who had a right to expect better service from a service organization.

I make these statements without any reflection whatsoever upon the officials and employees I found here on the job. They were doing the best they could with their training and experience and under conditions then existing.

EMPHASIS ON STAFF FUNCTIONS

Up to now we have enumerated many of the changes that we have made since 1934. But we have not named specifically one of the important things we did—the strengthening of the business side of staff functions. We referred to many of these functions individually when we recalled the creation of our Personnel Division, our planning divisions, cost surveys, cost controls, etc. But I want to emphasize the importance of the step we took when we definitely determined to pay more attention to our business operations or to place equal emphasis on the staff and line functions. One of our first steps in doing this, you will recall, was the dividing of the Office into two parts for management purposes, each headed by an official who reported directly to the Public Printer. It was at that time that we created the office of Administrative Assistant to the Public Printer (a title later changed to Executive Officer) for the reasons we very clearly outlined in the Public Printer's Annual Report for 1938. I should add here that, as head of the Government Printing Office, I was very fortunate in having the advice and wholehearted cooperation of Russ Herrell, our Executive Officer, whose knowledge of the Government Printing Office, its needs and problems, and whose steady loyalty to me and to the highest principles of public service were of invaluable assistance to me as Public Printer, both in the years of peace and the years of war.

BETTER PAY FOR SUPERVISORS

One of the things which increased the interest in the business management of the Office and made us realize more keenly the responsibilities of a supervisor was the action we took in increasing the established rates of pay for all supervisory positions. I have never regretted this action, although on occasion it looked as though it would get me impeached, and I am still occasionally called on to defend it. The explanations I made when I took this action are good today. I will quote them:

"When I became Public Printer and began to look into the affairs of the Office, I was shocked to find that supervisors with heavy responsibilities were paid little more than the employees at the case, the bench, and the machine. The wages of the supervisors were in no way comparable to those paid outside, and in most cases were below those in other Government offices for work of equal importance. Indeed, some foremen and assistant foremen drew pay which was regularly less than that of workers under them when overtime was considered.

"There was small incentive for men with supervisory ability to burden themselves with responsibility. We were fortunate to get and to keep men who were willing to assume the burden of operating so large a plant as ours for so small a margin of pay over what they might have earned by working at their trades. I repeat, these were pay equalizations long overdue. They resulted from extensive studies of a special committee appointed to analyze and to compare the pay, duties, and responsibilities of these jobs with similar positions both in the Federal service and in commercial plants."

You will recall that at that time a foreman was drawing $3,600, and a superintendent only $4,600.

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

The coordination of our four fine production divisions, under the Production Manager, Mr. Smith, and his assistants, Mr. Broderick, Mr. Underwood, and Mr. Baumann, and their close cooperation with the planning divisions, gave us the results that amply

justify the praise we have received. It was the work of the planning and production divisions, backed and supported by our service divisions, including Personnel, under Mr. Hipsley and Mr. Havener; Tests and Technical Control, under Mr. Kantrowitz and Mr. Spencer; Purchase, under our old pal, Bill Cassiday, and Danny Campbell; Maintenance, under Mr. Anderson and Mr. Van Allen; Accounts, under Mr. Cristofane, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Vanarsdell, and our paymaster, Mr. Perkins; Delivery, under Mr. Starr and Mr. Brown; and Housekeeping, under Mr. Wright; and more recently the Field Service Division, under Mr. McWhorter, that produced the work which justified the President in giving us the Certificate of Merit I mentioned a few minutes ago. The certificate reads, in part, as follows:

"The President of the United States of America awards this Certificate of Merit to Augustus Edward Giegengack for outstanding fidelity and meritorious conduct in aid of the war effort against the common enemies of the United States and its Allies in World War II."

In accepting this Certificate of Merit, I said:

"Although this certificate carries my name as the recipient of the award, I feel that I merely hold it in custody for the 7,000 employees of the Government Printing Office, and I am proud to accept it in their behalf. Their efforts made the award possible. It was they who made up the task force which accomplished the objective. Their share in the honor is greater than mine, and my chief satisfaction today is that I have received this recognition as their representative."

I want to thank you sincerely for your support, for your loyalty, and for your untiring efforts in making our team the success that it has been and is. I want to thank you with all the sincerity at my command, and I say it with the conviction that you know it comes from the very depths of my heart.

PLANNING DIVISIONS

We started out today by saying we would look to the past in an effort to determine some of the things we should keep in mind for the future. First and foremost, we must always remember that it is our duty to see that Congress and the departments and agencies receive the services they need at the lowest possible cost. That is the firm foundation on which we must build. If we have that and make certain that our contacts with all who come to us for service are handled intelligently and courteously, we need never fear that our relationships with Congress and the departments will fall to the level of 1934.

If we are to remain on a sound foundation, we must not relax our efforts to keep our plant and equipment modern and adequate and our operations integrated to the *n*th degree. In these matters we must look to, and I think we can depend upon, our consultant on methods and procedures, Mr. Anderson, our Mechanical Superintendent, and our Production Manager. We must see that no unnecessary operations are performed, that the force is held to the minimum necessary to accomplish the work in hand, that established standards of production are met, and that costs are kept within bounds. In these matters, the heads of the divisions involved, the foremen or section heads, and the comptroller must work as a team.

All our efforts go for naught, however, if, as I have said, our contacts with our customers aren't intelligently and efficiently handled. In other words, we must see that our customers get what they want, when they want it, and at a price that is right, or we must intelligently explain to them why we are not in a position to give them the service they want. We have placed this important responsibility upon the broad shoulders of Phil Cole, who has Mr. Morsberger, Mr. Merold, Mr. Tribble, Mr. Mortimer, and Mr. Hill, and many other able and qualified assistants to help him. We must also look to Mr. Cole and his group to see that the jobs we do are properly planned and scheduled. We must ask and expect, and I know we will get, the wholehearted cooperation of the production divisions in meeting specifications and schedules that have been set up. We must never for a moment even toy with the idea of permitting our scheduling and planning to degenerate into the inadequate thing it was in 1934—that is, if we want to hold up our heads as being members of an efficient, progressive organization.

REASONS FOR LEAVING

There are many, many important things we should keep in mind if our team is to improve or even hold our present position. I have mentioned only a few of them—some of the thoughts that I have considered to be the most important. There are other suggestions made in the volume covering the part we played in the war effort, entitled "Public Printing in Peace and War" and in our annual report for 1947. If we will devote our efforts to the tasks that lie ahead as closely, as loyally, and as untiringly as we have in the past, I have no fears for the future of the Government Printing Office and feel that I can leave it in your hands, confident of the fact that it will do even a better job in the future than it has in the past.

With this conviction, I addressed, under date of March 9, the following letter to the President of the United States:

MARCH 9, 1948.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with sincere regret that I have reached the decision to ask you to accept my resignation as Public Printer of the United States, effective March 15, 1948. I take this action because my duty to my family demands that I increase my income substantially above the salary fixed by Congress for the position under a law passed 20 years ago.

It has been a privilege to serve our Government during the last 13½ years under Mr. Roosevelt and yourself, and I shall always recall with pleasure many happy associations and experiences. These were climaxed by your award to me of the Certificate of Merit for outstanding fidelity and meritorious conduct in aid of the war effort. This recognition and the many compliments the Government Printing Office has received from congressional leaders, heads of Federal agencies, and leaders in the printing industry cause me to feel that the financial sacrifices that have been involved and the occasional discouraging handicaps encountered in trying to do an efficient job have not been without their compensations.

The Government Printing Office is a great organization and is doing a real job for the taxpayer. I leave it with reluctance and with sincere thanks to you for the opportunity you have given me to be of service and for your cooperation and support. You have my best wishes for a continuance of your personal happiness and success. If at any time I may be of service to you in any way, please call upon me.

Most respectfully yours,
A. E. GIEGENGACK.

His reply is as follows:

MARCH 9, 1948.

DEAR GUS: In view of the reasons outlined in your letter of March 9, I reluctantly accept your resignation as Public Printer, effective March 15, 1948.

You have held the position longer than any other Public Printer. I know that in the future you will be able to view with a great deal of personal satisfaction your career in the public service. From my own experience in the Senate, as a member of the Committee on Printing and as chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, I am well aware of the confidence the members had in you as a loyal, efficient public servant, who had the respect and support of the committees and of the entire printing industry.

It is with deep regret that I see you leave the Government service. You take with you my very best wishes for the future.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

This, therefore, is my last official meeting with you, my executives. We have worked hard together to do a job. I think we have done a job that we can all be proud of. I want to thank you again for the support you have given me. I hope that you will always be my friends, and I wish you health and happiness in the future.

Time for Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very strong and impartially written editorial by Dr. Raymond Moley, under his column Perspective. The editorial is entitled "Time for Statesmanship," and appeared in the March 15 issue of Newsweek.

It is critical of the President's civil rights message to the Congress. Mr. Moley says some very pointed and thought-provoking things, and since his viewpoint is that of one who does not live in the South, it is perhaps even more valuable at this time as an editorial which coldly and without feeling or bias analyzes the message in the light of present conditions.

I wish everybody in the United States of America could read this editorial. It also criticizes the report of the so-called Civil Rights Committee, appointed by the President in 1946, and which filed a report in 1947 entitled "To Secure These Rights."

It is effectively pointed out by Mr. Moley that the report within itself is but a cheap criticism of the South. He emphasizes the fact that the committee was ex parte and the report was ex parte, that the committee was composed of people who know nothing about the southern problems, and that the finding was preconceived.

The effect of Mr. Moley's criticism of the report but emphasizes the hate and malice that permeated the committee in its entirety, and forces the conclusions that it was made for no purpose on earth except to abuse the South and its great patriotic citizenship.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVE

TIME FOR STATESMANSHIP

(By Raymond Moley)

The crisis in the South created by the President's civil-rights message calls for more

than mutual recrimination and retaliation. The President could hardly have been more inept in the manner and timing of raising this issue. But there is a constructive way out, if cool heads on both sides can prevail.

The acute phase of the trouble started with the appointment in late 1946 of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. The crisis appeared with the publication of the committee's report in late 1947. The President's message last month substantially adopted the committee's recommendations.

No one can quarrel with the humane objectives involved. No decent person, North or South, condones lynching or favors injustice, brutality, or bigotry. Almost everyone wants more qualified people to vote. And few will deny the desirability of fair employment, better housing, and sound medical care for all.

The committee and the President seem to have forgotten that the South's problem is not a pure question of logic and law. It involves a sense of bitter history and of personal and sectional pride. A good illustration of the ineptitude of the committee is its apparent approval of the civil-rights legislation passed between 1866 and 1875. This program, as every reader of history knows, was the creation of a radical Republican Congress inflamed by post-bellum passion. It was designed to humiliate and degrade a defeated enemy. It was a measure of Carthaginian peace. No broad-minded northerners should want to recall that program or the sordid atmosphere of those dreadful years.

The timing of the report and message could hardly have been worse. The President is left open to the suspicion that he has yielded to those who advise him that at all costs he must win the political support of northern cities and that the South has no option except to vote for him. Thus, a blinding political fog is thrown over a grave issue of broad national welfare. The whole affair cannot but handicap the enlightened leaders in the South and add power to demagogs and clowns.

The committee was ex parte and the report was ex parte. The committee was largely composed of northerners who will be regarded in the South as unfamiliar with southern problems. The preconceptions of its members are apparent on every one of the 178 pages of the report.

The report shoots the works. Practically every controversial racial issue which has rocked Congress in 20 years is included. In tone it is an unmitigated indictment of the South. In arrangement it is an affront, because the very first of its recommendations is for the imposition of a Federal police system penetrating into every corner of the South. It speaks again and again of our sister States in insufferably condescending terms: "It is a sound policy to use the idealism and prestige of our whole people to check the wayward tendencies of a part of them." The report recommends the withholding of Federal grants in aid to force sovereign and taxpaying States to obey.

It only grudgingly admits gains, although gains have been significant. Lynching has, in fact, almost disappeared. The figures are 64 in 1921, 3 in 1939, and less than 6 annually since then. The poll tax and the white primary have been disappearing rapidly.

The constructive approach to this problem is to invoke the principle of regionalism. The President should have used this principle a year ago but it is still not too late. He should call a conference of all southern governors, Senators, Congressmen, and possibly college presidents and other leaders. He should then say that in the interest of national unity and of the demand of international efforts for equal rights, the progress toward legal, political, and economic equality should be accelerated by joint action. He should say, further, that the Federal Government will help, not force, this effort. In short, the President would be well advised to lay this problem in the hands of the enlightened leaders of the South.

The most persistent of traditions can be unmade. But traditions cannot be changed by threats or outside pressure.

Post Offices and Federal Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on post offices and Federal buildings which I have transcribed to some 30 radio stations in the State of Washington. My reason for making this request is that I conceive the subject to be important, and of interest to every Senator.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is HARRY CAIN, Washington State's junior Senator, speaking from his office in your Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C.

As suggested last week, I want tonight to talk about post offices. Admittedly, many of you will consider this to be a strange and uninteresting subject, but many communities in general throughout the State, and 25 cities in particular, have a current and continuing interest in and with the subject.

Like most people, I would rather say yes than no to the wishes of friends whom I like and communities which I respect. I should like to say to the 25 cities which have been led to believe that they are soon to benefit from newly constructed post offices and Federal buildings that their hopes will come true, but I must inform them tonight that they won't secure the post offices and Federal buildings in the immediate future, and I want to tell them why.

In the Senate of the United States every Senator is practically a king. Regardless of any national policy, an individual Senator can say and do what he wants to do and say. Sometimes a Senator is publicized throughout America for talking about or working for something which he knows from the beginning he either won't get or isn't entitled to.

In the latter part of last December, the senior Senator from Washington State introduced 25 bills which would have resulted in the authorization of funds for the construction of 25 post offices and Federal buildings if the legislation had been approved by the committee to which it was referred and by the Congress. I have no intention of being critical of the motives which led your senior Senator to introduce the legislation. He is and always will be completely responsible for whatever course of action he sees fit to pursue. I only mention him by title because he introduced the legislation and because the legislation came to me for consideration and action.

Most of you probably know that the Senate has a Public Works Committee. In this committee there are several subcommittees. One of these is the Subcommittee on Public Buildings, and your junior Senator has been its chairman since he came to the Senate in January of 1947. My associates on that committee are Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Democrat, of California, and Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware. This subcommittee on Public Buildings concerns itself with passing on the merits of legislation which is intended to construct public buildings anywhere throughout the United States.

When the bills in question were introduced in December they were referred to my subcommittee, and immediately forwarded to the Federal agencies having an interest in the legislation. The bills were examined by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Federal Works Agency, and by the Post Office Department. In due time the departments reported to my committee in writing that there was no present justification for approving the legislation. After the reports had been received a public hearing was held and testimony was taken not only from the Federal bureaus in question but from others who had an interest in the legislation. For the reason that the senior Senator from Washington State was ill, it was not possible for him to appear in support of his 25 bills. A member of his staff submitted for the RECORD several hundred telegrams and letters which had been received by the senior Senator from public officials and from interested lay bodies in the communities to be affected by the legislation. After listening to and studying the testimony and evidence, the subcommittee voted to deny every one of the 25 bills. Each of these bills was designed to achieve the same purpose. Each bill recommended that a particular sum of money for each of the 25 Washington State communities be authorized to select a site, prepare plans, and construct a post office or Federal building. The total of the sums required to construct the buildings in 25 Washington State communities amounted to $11,695,000.

There must obviously be a sound reason for turning down any proposal which is submitted to a committee of the United States Senate. Because of the importance of the problem of post office buildings construction, not only to the State of Washington but to the Nation, I hope to convince everyone who listens tonight and everyone who reads this broadcast of the validity of the reasons which required that I and my two subcommittee associates should deny the post office and Federal building bills which were before us. After I am through, I will deeply appreciate any observations you may care to make if you find the slightest fault with our position.

Before going further, I had better enumerate the cities and towns in Washington State which would have benefited from post offices and Federal buildings if the legislation in question had passed the Public Works Committee, the Congress of the United States, and been signed by the President. It makes me sort of homesick even to list the names of communities which I visit and live in all too seldom. There are Chelan, Cashmere, Aberdeen, Elma, and Olympia; others are Vashon, Gig Harbor, Port Orchard, Silverdale, and Poulsbo; then we have Kirkland, Seattle, West Seattle, and Tacoma; following these are Vancouver, Ephrata, Bellingham, Sequim, and Moses Lake; then, last but certainly not least, we have Kennewick, Grandview, South Bend, Burlington, and Enumclaw. These communities are situated throughout your 39 counties. They cover Washington State like a blanket. Regardless of their size, all of the 25 cities are important American communities. If they are not going to get what they want, they are deserving of a full answer to cover the reasons why their dreams and hopes will not be realized just now.

Until I was forced to study the post office and Federal building construction problem, I had not the slightest idea as to how such buildings were authorized. I take for granted that you have had almost no information on the subject. All of us probably

assumed that some Senator or Congressman exerted his influence and a post office resulted from his energetic action. Once upon a time this was actually the way post offices and Federal buildings were built, but that was a long time ago.

Prior to 1926, more than 20 years ago, individual Congressmen and Senators introduced bills to construct post offices and Federal buildings in their communities and States and the buildings became possible if the sponsors had sufficient influence to get enough votes to approve their measure. All kinds of logical trouble and confusion resulted from this practice. Buildings were constructed in places where they should not be and they were not constructed in cities where they were the most sorely needed. The Congress spent a lot of time in trying to design and adopt a Federal building and post-office policy which was reasonable and fair. In 1926 an act was passed which bore the title "The Public Buildings Construction Act of 1926." In substance this legislation declared that a determination of where post offices should be situated and constructed would become the responsibility of the Postmaster General and the Public Buildings Administrator. It was thought then and surely remains a fact today that a public-buildings program is meaningless and senseless unless those in charge of construction and activities are charged with rendering decisions on where construction should be undertaken. In no other way can a balanced program be either designed or achieved.

Under the Public Buildings Construction Act of 1926, it was provided that within the limits of lump-sum appropriations made by the Congress, sites were to be selected, plans were to be made, and buildings constructed. Under this act it was required that once a project was selected and commenced it must be completed. It was not possible to either select and purchase a site or to simply draw plans to accommodate a building to be constructed in the future on any particular site.

This act of 1926 has worked extremely well. Since its passage, no post offices or Federal buildings have resulted from private bills introduced by individual Senators or Congressmen. The Congress concerned itself with providing appropriations from which the Postmaster General and Public Buildings Administrator could select projects and carry out a public-building program.

For obvious reasons, no post offices or Federal buildings were constructed during most of the war period. No single such structure has been erected in America since 1942.

Now that the war has been out of the way for several years, one would think that America ought to undertake a large-scale program for post offices and Federal buildings. There are several sound reasons why this construction should not be undertaken at this time. Construction costs are at an all-time high and America enjoys full employment. If we undertake a large-scale building program, prices would be driven higher because public construction would compete with private building for money, materials, and men. No lump-sum appropriation has been included within the Federal budget, which your Congress is now considering, for the simple reason that the President and the Congress think that this is not the time to undertake large-scale public-works programs. Both Democrats and Republicans agree on this subject.

All of us recognize that hundreds of post offices and Federal buildings are imperatively needed throughout the country. You probably haven't known that there are more than 4,000 post offices with annual receipts of more than $10,000 which are situated in rented facilities. Every one of these situations is deserving of its own building. In addition to this problem, we are faced with many communities which have long since outlived the usefulness of accommodations which are being used. In your large cities of Seattle and Tacoma, the need for new Federal buildings and post offices is extremely pressing. The Postmaster General has told me that there are more than a hundred such pressing needs throughout the Nation. It is estimated that it would take approximately $300,000,000 to satisfy the emergency cases with which the Postmaster General is confronted. The Congress, through its Public Works Committees of both House and Senate, is trying to find a solution for the question, How can America satisfy its Federal building and post office need? There is pending before my subcommittee a bill which provides part of an answer. This bill would authorize $32,000,000 with which sites are to be selected and plans made by the Postmaster General and the Public Buildings Administrator against the time when construction can be undertaken. It takes from 18 months to 2 years to acquire a site and design a plan for a given post office or Federal building. We shall endeavor to do first things first. If this bill passes the Congress, as there is good reason to believe that it will, some of the communities in Washington State will have sites purchased and plans made. I am only one of many who will urge the adoption of the legislation because that legislation intelligently takes into consideration the post office and Federal building requirements of our day.

Sorry but my time is up.

There is more to say about post offices than time will permit me to conclude tonight. I will finish the story next week, at the same time, and on the same station. Until then, good luck.

Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Church and State" appearing in the Washington Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCH AND STATE

"Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

These quoted words are from the first amendment to the Constitution, and they are made applicable to State governing bodies in the fourteenth amendment. What do the words mean?

On the face of the Supreme Court's latest interpretation, the doors of the public schools have been closed to any form of religious instruction. It would appear that the ban extends even to such a thing as the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. If this is true, if the court has gone to such an extreme in the enforced separation of church and state, then it is a matter which ought to be of the utmost concern in an age in which the old spiritual guides are crumbling under the impact of materialistic philosophy.

The particular case before the court involved a course of religious instruction given in the schools of Champaign, Ill. Its validity under the Constitution had been affirmed by the Illinois Supreme Court. But the highest court, dividing 8 to 1, has struck it down.

These are the facts: Under the Champaign program pupils are supplied by their teachers with cards on which parents may indicate whether or not they desire religious instruction to be given their children. It is entirely voluntary. There is no compulsion whatsoever. The program is interdenominational in character and is not supported by taxation, the salaries of the participating Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish instructors being paid by Champaign's Council on Religious Education. The program is informative in character and is not of a proselytical nature.

An atheist mother, complaining that her son was embarrassed because, at her direction, he did not attend the religious class, appealed to the courts. And the Supreme Court, on the basis of these facts, has decided that the program transgresses the constitutional ban on the "establishment of religion."

Justice Reed's dissent was strong and persuasive. "From the * * * language of the opinions," he said, "I can only deduce that religious instruction of public-school children during school hours is prohibited. The history of American education is against such an interpretation of the first amendment." Justice Jackson joined the majority, but he had misgivings. Expressing regret that the Court had not been more careful in circumscribing its decision, he pointed out that the effect of the ruling is not only to ban the particular program in Champaign, but also "to ban every form of teaching which suggests or recognizes that there is a God." Other disturbing questions arise. Is it now unconstitutional for children to sing Christmas carols at school plays? What about the chaplains in the Military Establishment, or the compulsory religious services at Annapolis and West Point? Must these things go, too?

It is not the layman's function to challenge the correctness, as a matter of law, of what the court has done. But it is proper for the layman to appraise as best he can the practical effect of the decision on the world in which he lives.

The first amendment was adopted in the light of conditions which do not exist in this country today. It was written by men whose ancestors were familiar with religious persecution. Many of them had come to this country to escape it. If the founding fathers erected a wall between church and state in fear of dominance of the latter by the former, it cannot be said that, in their time, the fear was without basis.

But that was more than a century and a half ago. Today's world is an entirely different one. The influence of religion is much weaker now than it was then. And we are the worse because of it. In our day religious instruction is disappearing from too many American homes. The position of the church is weakening. And one may well believe that these things, in part at least, are responsible for such disturbing trends as the turn away from the old concept of family life, the deplorable picture of one in three marriages ending in divorce, the futile, fevered quest for happiness in material things, the groping by hundreds of thousands of people for some higher standards, some better guides to live by. It is not by sheer accident that Joshua Loth Liebman's Peace of Mind still leads the nonfictional best-seller list nearly 2 years after its publication.

In dealing with economic and political questions the members of this Supreme Court have never viewed the Constitution as being rigid and inflexible. On the contrary, and rightly so, they have treated this great charter as being a flexible thing, intended by its authors to be susceptible of appropriate adaptation to meet changing conditions and changed times. Why, then, in a matter af-

fecting the separation of church and state, should it be applied so narrowly and so rigidly? What has become of that flexibility without which no constitution can serve the continuing needs of a people?

The great challenge to the freedoms which we know and which the Constitution would safeguard does not come from religion or any teaching of religion. It comes from the advance of a Communist philosophy which, as practiced, is the antithesis of religious, doctrine—an advance which is facilitated by our own embracement of materialism at the expense of the things of the spirit. In this setting it is neither necessary nor reasonable to erect an insuperable barrier to the kind of religious instruction that was practiced in Champaign. Would it not be much better for us if, instead of forbidding appropriate religious instruction in the schools, we were to encourage it in every reasonable way? If one's answer to this question is in the affirmative, then it must be most earnestly hoped that the Supreme Court will not let this decision stand as the law of the land.

Wallace's Theories Challenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wallace's Theories Challenged," written by Jefferson Jones, editor of the Bozeman Daily Chronicle, of Bozeman, Mont.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE'S THEORIES CHALLENGED

If the only reason for Premier Stalin's postwar policy is fear of American imperialism, it is unlikely that he would have O. K.'d the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia. If he had any regard for the American third party that would guarantee peace by giving him free rein, he probably would not have embarrassed that third party by this aggressive act.

The third party has every reason to be embarrassed, for President Benes gave the Communists as free a rein as was possible and still preserve a semblance of parliamentary democracy, and the Russian-directed Communists showed their appreciation by seizing complete control of the Czech Government.

There was a bit of window-dressing to justify the Communists' action. But even they didn't seem to take it very seriously. The Communist-led police searched the National Socialist Party headquarters for several hours on the first day of the uprising and discovered documents supposedly revealing a conspiracy of armed revolt against the state.

The Communists' subsequent actions were not what would be used to quell a revolt against the status quo. In the first place, they destroyed the status quo. They did such things as turn the legal owners out of factories and other business places and replaced them with "national managers." This scarcely comes under the head of defense measures.

There seems to have been no bitter opposition to the Communists in Czechoslovakia so long as they operated within the framework of the Republic and permitted some democratic freedoms. As president Benes said, "It is clear to me that socialism is a way of life desired by an overwhelming part of our nation." But he added, "I believe that with socialism a certain measure of freedom and unity is possible, and that these are vital principles to all in our national life."

But that did not square with Communist policy. It was not enough to have the bigger popular vote and majority control of the Cabinet and Parliament. The pattern of terror and tyranny had to be repeated, for communism seems to know no other way. So free Czechoslovakia is no more.

Czechoslovakia did not oppose Russia. She was a neighbor and an ally. She was not militaristic or imperialistic or capitalistic. She did not threaten or demand. Her only sins were independence and freedom. In short, she was about what Henry Wallace and the third party would have this country become as a means of insuring peace.

It seems to us that Czechoslovakia's fate is a challenge to Mr. Wallace and his theories. Thus far he has parried the challenge by saying, "It is impossible to know what the truth is from the American press." The American press can endure the insult. But the insult is no answer to give the voters whose support Mr. Wallace is seeking.

A policy of softness and subservience cost Czechoslovakia her freedom. Would the same policy satisfy Russia and preserve freedom in the rest of Europe if the United States should adopt it? That is a question which Mr. Wallace must answer honestly if he is to justify the claim that his political gospel holds the key to world peace.

Address of Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, Before Pine Bluff Chamber of Commerce, Pine Bluff, Ark., March 5, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD a copy of a speech made by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Army Engineers, at a flood-control meeting held in Pine Bluff, Ark., on Friday, March 5.

But first I should like to say that I believe this was the greatest gathering of its kind ever held in any State. It was jointly sponsored by the Pine Bluff Chamber of Commerce and the Pine Bluff unit of the Arkansas Basin Association, under the able leadership of Henry Trotter and T. R. Green, president and secretary, respectively, of the chamber of commerce; and George Makris, president of the Pine Bluff flood-control group. It was attended by more than 500 representatives of flood-control groups throughout the State of Arkansas, as well as representatives of the Army engineers from Dallas, Vicksburg, Tulsa, and Little Rock.

The Honorable C. Hamilton Moses served as master of ceremonies on all occasions.

At the conclusion of General Wheeler's speech, Gov. Ben Laney presented him with an honorary membership as an Arkansas Traveler.

Others participating in the meeting were County Judge Wiley C. Rountree, who welcomed the visitors on behalf of Jefferson County; Mayor George Steed, speaking for the city of Pine Bluff; and Emmett Sanders, former mayor of Pine Bluff and a director of the Arkansas Basin Association.

Among those attending the meeting from Washington were my very able colleague, EARL WILSON, of Indiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Public Works Committee; H. K. Thatcher, representative of the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission; and myself.

Representatives of the Army engineers included Col. Henry Hutchins, Jr., division engineer of Dallas; Col. R. G. Lovett, district engineer of Vicksburg; Lt. Col. William T. Cassidy, Vicksburg; O. W. Baxter, member of the Mississippi River Commission; Col. G. E. Galloway, district engineer at Little Rock; with his assistant, James P. Miller; and M. W. DeGeer, representing the Tulsa district engineer.

Other outstanding leaders of the flood-control program in Arkansas included Stinckney Meeks, of Dardanelle, president of the Arkansas Basin Association; Reece Caudle, former president of the organization; Clarence Byrns, of Fort Smith, editor of the Southwest American; former Congressman David D. Terry and Hendrix Lackey, of Little Rock; and one who is known as the "grandfather" of the program, W. N. Trulock, of Pine Bluff.

On Saturday, March 6, 44 men vitally interested in development of the lower Arkansas from Pine Bluff to the Mississippi toured the 73 miles to the river's mouth by barge as guests of Col. R. G. Lovett, district engineer of Vicksburg, Miss., under whose responsibility falls that portion of the Arkansas River which flows from Pine Bluff to the Mississippi.

General Wheeler's speech, which was received with heartiest enthusiasm, is as follows:

It is a pleasure to be here in Pine Bluff, to meet with friends from the cities, the agricultural areas along the Arkansas and Mississippi Rivers, and the Grand Prairie—all representing a region closely allied with the water problems which engage the active attention of the Corps of Engineers.

I am especially pleased to visit the city. As a trade center for a large area of alluvial valley, near the head of Mississippi River backwater, and on a historic navigation route, Pine Bluff is recognized as an important city long connected with river-control work. We in the Corps of Engineers are keenly aware of your past difficulties with your rivers and streams. We know your problems and assure you that our organization will assist you to the limits of our authority and of funds made available.

Over a period of years, the scope of civil work assigned to the Corps of Engineers has been broadened by Congress through a general realization that problems of navigation, flood control, drainage, hydroelectric power, water supply from surface waters, and bank stabilization are often inextricably related. Originally, Congress appropriated river-work funds for navigation improvement only. It was not until 1917 that such funds were specifically authorized for flood-control work. This authorization was for work on the lower Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers. The

present concept of Federal responsibility for flood control on a national scale was established in the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936. In December 1944, it was officially established by Congress that major drainage is an integral part of flood control.

Under the Flood Control Act of 1928, flood-control work on the lower Mississippi River was made a major project under the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission, whose president is an engineer officer serving simultaneously as president of the commission and as division engineer of the lower Mississippi Valley division. To achieve its purpose, such a project necessarily entails work on a part of the Mississippi River's tributary waters—the Yazoo, the Red, the Arkansas, and others. On the Arkansas River, for example, the over-all alluvial Mississippi Valley project provides for protection from floods by means of levees, floodwalls, bank stabilization, and channel improvements in and along the river insofar as it is affected by backwater from the Mississippi River. The over-all project provides also for bank protection, channel improvement, contraction works, and dredging necessary to securing a navigable channel 12 feet deep and 300 feet wide along the Mississippi River.

One phase of the lower Mississippi River project has resulted in a 12- to 15-foot reduction of maximum stages on the main stream in the vicinity of the mouth of the Arkansas. I refer to the 16 cut-offs made in the Mississippi's channel between Memphis, Tenn., and Angola, La. In addition, these cut-offs have shortened the river distance 151.8 miles and eliminated the necessity for several floodways previously considered for the Tensas Basin in southeastern Arkansas and Louisiana. In lieu of such floodways, the main Mississippi River levees, and those on the Arkansas, are being raised and strengthened to the extent necessary to confine the project flood.

The main features of the Mississippi River project, including the Morganza and Atchafalaya floodways have been—and are being—pushed to completion as rapidly as funds are available. As a consequence of work already completed, the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River has enjoyed 21 years—its longest respite—from general direct overflow. I need not emphasize to you how the alluvial lands in Arkansas and the other alluvial States have prospered because of this protection. It has been estimated that during this 21-year period of no general overflow, the benefits, as measured by the elimination of flood damages, have approached $5,000,000,000.

In the areas of the Arkansas River Basin which lie generally upstream from Pine Bluff, problems also have been met and are being solved. Many of you here today have been active in this work for many years. You know the uphill fight that has been waged, and the job remaining to be done before the goal of adequate flood protection, dependable navigation, adequate drainage, supplemental water supplies, increased production of hydroelectric power, and bank stabilization is achieved.

Yes, progress has been made. At your request, the Congress has, over a long period, directed the Chief of Engineers to study the problems of the area, and to report to Congress on the advisability of constructing improvement works. Many of these reports have been made, and at this time we are preparing additional ones. Acting on the studied recommendations of the Corps of Engineers, Congress has approved work for the Arkansas River Basin that comprises a comprehensive plan of development. The plan involves the construction of levees, reservoirs, locks and dams, bank revetment, and channel improvement. The plan is the result of many years of careful study, and has been approved by Congress in several acts dating from 1936. There are 28 reservoirs in this comprehensive plan. Of these 28 planned reservoirs, 22 have about 8,500,000 acre-feet of total storage allocated specifically for flood control. The other six reservoirs are designed primarily for navigation, hydroelectric power, and sediment control and have a little over 1,000,000 acre-feet of storage.

Two of the reservoirs in this group of 28 are located in Colorado and New Mexico; the remaining 26 are in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas.

Each of the reservoirs planned for construction on the tributary streams of the Arkansas which contain flood-control storage will give an exceedingly high degree of flood protection to areas in which they are located. In all, approximately 1,500,000 acres of land will receive protection from these projects. In addition, these reservoirs, like those in other major watersheds, will have a valuable effect in increasing the factor of safety of the levee system along the lower Mississippi River.

The comprehensive plan authorized for the Arkansas Basin provides also for additional flood-control work in the form of levees and other types of local protection projects. A total of 32 such projects have been approved for construction. These works will give complete protection to the leveed areas—areas comprised largely of agricultural lands but including such important cities as Hutchinson and Witchita, Kans.; Tulsa and Oklahoma City, Okla.; and Fort Smith, Van Buren, and Little Rock, Ark.

Regarding navigation, the provision for a dependable navigation route on the Arkansas River and its tributaries is an integral part of the plan approved for the basin's full development. Of the total of 28 reservoirs I have mentioned, the storage in 8 reservoirs would be reserved in whole or in part for navigation. A number of them would provide storage for sediment control; one would provide water for lockage uses along the Verdigris River in Oklahoma; and four on the main stem would provide navigation pools in conjunction with the generation of hydroelectric power. In addition to these reservoirs, the plan provides for canals, channel cut-offs and enlargements, and 23 locks and dams. Together, these works would provide a 9-foot channel extending from a point on the Verdigris River near Tulsa, Okla., along the general route of the Arkansas River through Arkansas to the Mississippi River.

An essential part of the navigation plan is the stabilization of the river banks. There is little need for me to tell a group as experienced in such matters as you that bank stabilization for navigation will also curtail in large measure the scourge of losing valuable lands through rapidly caving river banks. Also, local protection projects will be given added security against destruction by recession of banks.

The navigation part of the comprehensive plan is designed to remedy those conditions which render the stream unsuited for navigation at this time. The dependable navigation route contemplated would have an over-all tributary area that includes all or parts of Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, and Arkansas. Through interconnecting waterways, this large area—with a population of approximately 4,000,000—would be linked with the extensive Mississippi River system, with the Great Lakes, and with the Gulf of Mexico.

The area that would thus be provided with dependable out-bound river traffic under the approved plan is rich in natural resources—in petroleum, minerals, fertile soils, and timber. And Arkansas occupies an important place in providing these essential resources. Anthracite coal in the western part of the State; bauxite in the center of the State; cotton and other crops in the alluvial areas in the southwest; rice and other irrigated crops in the Grand Prairie; and livestock, truck crops, and miscellaneous produce across the entire State form major contributions to the national economy.

Though only a part of the State's over-all production would utilize the proposed waterway, improved navigation on the Arkansas River would be of immense aid to its extensive range of industry. On commodities that would move by water—and I name only a few—studies made in 1941 show a potential savings of over $2 a ton on oil and oil products; $3.32 a ton on canned goods; $1.10 a ton on bauxite; $2.32 a ton on cotton; and $1.34 a ton on rice. On all tonnage considered prospective to the stream, if navigable, an average saving of $2.17 a ton would be realized, according to the 1941 study.

Then, too, the comprehensive plan provides benefits other than flood control, navigation, and bank stabilization. In the western areas, irrigation is provided where practicable. For the reservoirs, provision is made for the development of hydroelectric power where feasible and economically justifiable. Such reservoirs included in the plan at this time would provide an ultimate installation of 1,192,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power.

This comprehensive plan we are discussing is a plan approved by the Congress. Progress already has been made in bringing the designed projects into being. Of the 22 reservoir projects containing flood control, 7 are essentially completed, 6 are under construction, and detailed planning is under way on others.

Of the approved local protection projects, 17 have been completed or are under construction, and additional ones are expected to be undertaken during the coming fiscal year.

The development of the Arkansas River for navigation, and a large portion of its development for hydroelectric power generation, were approved by Congress in the River and Harbor Act of 1946. However, the same bill that approved this development also limited congressional appropriations of project funds to $55,000,000. Consequently, at the present time, the development of the Arkansas for navigation beyond that amount is dependent upon further authorization and appropriations by Congress.

As most of you know, flood fighting is primarily the responsibility of local interests. The engineer districts furnish personnel and equipment during high river stages to coordinate and supervise the protection of life and property and to assist in rescue work. Repairs to damaged levees have been made in this area since passage of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928. More than $2,000,000 have been expended for such repairs and for high-water maintenance of streams in Arkansas under the emergency repair authority for tributaries of the Mississippi River. Of this amount, more than $1,000,000 were spent as a result of the devastating floods of 1943. In addition, substantial amounts have been expended in Arkansas from special emergency repair appropriations made by Congress—following the 1945 flood over $800,000 were made available for such work in the White River Basin alone. Following those floods, the Corps of Engineers also supervised the troops assigned to repair the roads that had been damaged.

So far, I have discussed only the approved comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin so far as the Corps of Engineers is directly responsible. I would be negligent if I failed to mention the work of other established agencies of the State and Federal Governments. As an example, the program of the Corps of Engineers is closely allied with the program of the Department of Agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service is now contemplating a study of the lower Arkansas River, and I am certain it will develop the best possible program for preservation of soil, production of crops, and aid to flood control in the smaller areas where it is not feasible to construct projects such as those included in our comprehensive plan.

I have purposely mentioned only plans that have been approved by Congress. This

is not to be construed as meaning the overall, comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin is completed. It isn't. Rather, it is considered a plan flexible to an extent which allows modifications and additions to meet new conditions.

For example, in the important rice-producing Grand Prairie region there is need for a supplemental water supply. The Corps of Engineers is making a study of this region—which, as you know, comprises the area between the White River, Bayou Meto, and Wattensaw Bayou. The study is designed particularly to determine three major issues: (1) The feasibility of flood control on Bayou Meto, with special emphasis regarding the elimination of pooling behind the Arkansas River levee when it is necessary that the floodgates at the mouth of the bayou be closed; (2) the need for, and the possible resource of, irrigation water; (3) methods and costs of solving the local drainage problem in its current state, and, if and when, an adequate supply of additional water is created for rice cultivation.

The surveys required for this study are well under way. In these studies is included the necessary work preliminary to reaching a reliable decision regarding the feasibility of obtaining additional water from the White River, Bayou Meto, and Wattensaw Bayou, and by diversion from the Arkansas River. Arrangements are being made with the United States Geological Survey for conducting a survey of deep and shallow wells during the spring of this year and for a survey of surface reservoirs necessary to determine the acreage currently supplied from this source and the possibility of expansion. This report is expected to be submitted to the Washington office in July of this year.

Some among you are particularly interested in the developments in the White River Basin. At the present time there are eight reservoirs approved for construction in this basin. The Norfork Reservoir is completed with one hydroelectric-power unit in operation. The second unit is now being installed. The Clearwater Reservoir should be in operation before another flood season arrives. The Bull Shoals Reservoir—one of the largest of the multiple-purpose projects—is under construction. Twelve local protection projects have been authorized—of which four have been completed and construction is in progress on one other. Upon completion of the authorized projects a high degree of protection will be afforded the valley, a large amount of hydroelectric power will be generated, recreational facilities will be provided, and the stream flow increased to aid navigation in the lower reaches.

In areas of the United States where farming has been the long established occupation and the facilities for handling farm production are available, there are hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile soil that can be brought into production by economically sound major drainage improvements. This phase of flood control is not new, and we have long recognized that improved drainage in this and other areas is a natural complement of flood control. The Congress has recognized this situation, and in section 2 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 specifically placed channel and major drainage improvements under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. Accordingly, major drainage improvements are eligible for authorization as Federal projects if the benefits to be derived are in excess of the estimated costs. In examinations and surveys assigned to our district and division engineers, careful consideration is given to this important phase of flood-control work.

Our studies in this field, as in all other flood-control work, are fully coordinated with the activities of the Department of Agriculture in the field of drainage and land conservation. The two departments have established procedures to insure that the work of each complements the other without conflict or duplication.

In conclusion, I again congratulate you upon your efforts to advance the development of a vast and valuable area of our country. And I again pay tribute to the wise actions of Congress in providing for projects so sorely needed. And yet I would leave with you the reality of the fact that though we have progressed, much work—hard work—lies ahead. Together we can and will reach our ultimate goals.

A Stir in the Southland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a well and positively expressed editorial from a very prominent weekly paper published in Tiptonville, Tenn., the Lake County Banner.

The editorial is entitled "A Stir in the Southland," and forcefully points out that the President's 10-point civil-rights program has been received poorly in the South. It proceeds to criticize the program as being poorly timed, and as a thing which would sow dissension in America at a time when we should be paying more attention to the activities of Russia.

I commend it as good reading to those who are interested in another southern viewpoint.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STIR IN THE SOUTHLAND

The South has tabbed President Truman's 10-point program of civil rights for what it is—a tawdry, reprehensible form of political chicanery. It is a lover's bouquet tossed to the fluid minority groups of the North—with their coats of many colors—bidding their support in the forthcoming national election. Its timing was of the very worst, sowing dissension in America at a time when President Truman and the Nation at large had best have its eyes leveled full upon the activities of Joe Stalin and his communistic ogres in their suspicious and altogether alarming machinations in engulfing Europe under the yoke in colossal mouthfuls.

The only good which could come of the Truman dogma is an outcome which we still cannot believe will happen. It would be the best thing for the South that could ever happen if—providing Truman is the Democratic nominee with his 10 points mortised into the platform (those parts of it which are not passed in this Congress)—the Southland were to assert some independence and individuality, and positively refrain from giving the Democratic Party nominee one solitary electoral vote. And, we reiterate, this we will have to see before we believe.

In blind adherence to the name and banner of the Democratic Party, the South has been enticed and dragged all over the gamut of political creed and dogma. If we have at times appeared ludicrous and subservient, we are now charged with a part of the cost of our singleness of loyalty, and we will be only asking for more of the same if we continue passively to heel.

If principles for the sake of principles are not going to be abandoned in this Nation entirely, sacrificed at the feet of brash opportunism, then this is one time for the Southland to cast itself for a principle and rally to a new standard. Truman has cast his lot as a trade-out opportunist.

A moment's speculation as to what would come about in the South if the whole 10 points—antilynch, abolition of all segregation, discard of the poll tax, and setting up a Department of Justice corps to ride over us with a harsh whip—were to be enacted at one time and en masse, the first and immediate result would be anarchy and tragic bloodshed within the South. There would be the greatest rift in national unity since 1860—and would Joe Stalin chortle.

Time and time alone can accomplish social revolution and adjustment. The Southland feels the more wronged because it is trying to solve its problems, and in fact has taken some long steps quite recently.

President Roosevelt presided at the interment of States' rights as a policy and principle of the Democratic Party. And he took some potshots at individual rights, too. But he did not flout any particular section. He had a sympathy and a faith in the South. Even so, he swung the pendulum of governmental practice farther than it should probably have been swung in the direction of centralized power and edict over States and citizens.

Now this Nation is racing headlong, and the direction of the progress is nothing but alarming. What this country needs is less tempo in Washington—to let the turbid social and economic waters of the Nation's mass settle themselves into some sort of independent order.

For every action, it is a physical law that there should be a reaction, and, while a diet of liberalism was no doubt in order in the thirties, by all odds of sanity, let's leaven it now with a little reaction in the direction of conservatism.

New York Times Compliments Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest public servants of our generation is Mr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service. His annual report is receiving notice throughout the country as evidenced by the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on March 7:

The annual report of Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, is an encouraging one. It shows not only that the tide has turned in the vital matter of preserving the Nation's most valuable resources. It also shows that business, educational, and religious leaders have joined the campaign. The battle is far from a complete victory, but no longer is there a struggle to convince a majority of citizens that soil conservation is essential and economically profitable. Since 1935 more than 1,900 soil-conservation districts covering a billion acres have been organized and administered by farmers.

An idea of the magnitude of the work can be seen in the fact that soil-conservation officials and experiment-station fieldmen surveyed 31,747,421 acres of farm land in 1946.

Member farmers of a district ask for the surveys, which include kinds of soil, slope, degree of erosion, and recommendations for the wisest use of land resources. The report says, "The conservation of our remaining productive land is still our most urgent farm problem. The proper use and treatment of land is the base on which other phases of our agricultural program must rest. Improved breeds and varieties; hybrid seed, insect and disease control; better machinery and more efficient cultural methods; scientific feeding, grazing and management of livestock; and improved marketing practices are of but temporary value to the farmer who is losing his soil and wasting his water. The land—productive land—is basic."

Soil conservation is a world problem. There are about 4,000,000,000 acres of immediately arable land. Its productivity in many large areas is only fair to medium. The world's population is increasing at the rate of 20,000,000 annually. The present report is an important document in recounting progress to date in soil conservation and outlining the needs of the future. Furthermore, it represents a milestone in the career of a man who has devoted a lifetime to a long uphill fight.

Case for the Democratic Party in 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], entitled "Case for the Democratic Party in 1948," delivered on March 9, 1948, before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have asked me here to Philadelphia to speak on the general subject of the case for the Democratic Party in 1948.

It is a broad subject—and the way it is phrased, a defensive one.

The Democratic Party is not on the defensive.

There is no reason for it to be so. The record made by the Democratic Party over 16 years of its leadership speaks for itself.

Only yesterday, when I left the White House, I issued a statement that Harry Truman would accept the Democratic nomination.

The Republicans on the right, and Communists and other third-party elements on the left, would have us believe that the Democratic Party is confused and cannot unite on either issues or a candidate.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The President's declaration of yesterday gives the lie to all such self-serving propaganda.

President Truman has shown himself unswerving in the service of the people.

He has shown courage.

He has not allowed political considerations to affect his decisions for the good of all the people.

He has proved himself not only a man to carry out the great liberal programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt but he has added a great program of his own.

President Truman has placed country before self, duty above politics, humanity before the materialistic, and he will bring us to the goal of a lasting peace abroad and domestic security at home.

He will be the Democratic nominee in 1948 and will be returned to the White House in November by a vast upsurge of voters who are interested in a government of progressive liberalism.

As I review the record, the Republicans hope to present their case for consideration by American voters based on a slogan rather than on a program or record of performance.

Their case is best summed up in their adopted slogan "Save what's left"—a slogan printed on balloons so it can be blown up with hot air. Let us see what they want to save. Let us see who saved what.

The last year the Republicans had a President was in 1932.

Gross national production in that year was $58,000,000,000. In 1946, under Democratic administration, gross national production rose to $230,000,000,000.

This is an increase in production since 1932 of 130 percent.

Shall we cut back to $58,000,000,000 to save what's left?

And what about profits during these years—since profits are the major yardstick of the GOP?

In 1932 corporate profits after taxes were in the red. The loss after taxes was $3,500,000,000. In 1936 corporate profits after taxes were $12,500,000,000.

In 1947 profits rolled in at an annual rate of $17,000,000,000, after taxes.

Shall we go back to 1932 from the record-breaking profits of 1947? Shall we go back to a $3,500,000,000 annual loss just to "save what's left"?

This slogan shows the lack of responsibility that marks the political scene in this year of 1948 by the party bidding for power.

Responsibility is a big word, and it takes big men to live up to its meaning.

There can be no fumbling with words; no straddling of fences when all of us face up to today's grave national issues—both foreign and domestic.

The Democratic Party has demonstrated conclusively that it is the party of the workingman. And the workingman knows the Republican Party is not sincere in telling him he is better off with many of his rights taken away from him.

We know the Democratic administration's stand on civil rights. We know its stand on housing. We know where it stands on minimum wages, on social security, and agriculture.

We know where it stands on aid to small business, on soil reclamation, and health insurance.

We know, because it has the responsibility of carrying out programs already in existence. It has the responsibility of assessing shortcomings in these programs and asking for new legislation to expand in the areas where the present laws fall short of the goal.

In the foreign field it is the Democratic Party that must face up to the manifold crises that day by day get more and more serious.

A Republican candidate can say in a prepared speech:

"Throw out all the policies of the present administration—lock, stock, and barrel."

Does he mean throw out the Marshall plan too? Does he mean abandon Europe?

He can say "Set up a United States of Europe," ignoring the facts in the case; ignoring the fact that there are customs barriers between these states and ignoring the fact that his own party—the Republican Party, if there should happen to be any doubt—is historically opposed to lowering tariff barriers? He says set up a "United States of Europe." He doesn't have the responsibility to see that job through.

Let us check the irresponsible statements of other GOP candidates.

One, for instance, in a Lincoln Day speech at St. Paul, said: "The term bipartisan foreign policy is incorrect."

This candidate disagrees with the present foreign policy. He would cripple the Marshall plan and rewrite the entire United Nations charter. Is this responsibility? He can advocate these things because what he says is not applicable to day-by-day events. He does not need to keep silent on any phase of the world crisis for he has no administrative responsibility.

We have had, and still have, a bipartisan foreign policy and I pray that it continues. We must realize that the world cannot long continue half free and half slave—half starving and half well fed. Either we help Europe to her feet or she will inevitably drag us down to her own economic level. Our bipartisan foreign policy recognizes these economic facts.

Much of the Republican leadership in Congress has been steadily showing that its political course is governed largely by the dead hand of isolationism.

But there are more votes on the side of assuming world leadership—the world leadership that has been thrust upon us. So some Republicans reluctantly pay lip service to the principle of the European Recovery Program, but at the same moment move to cripple it by withholding the funds necessary to make it work.

The purpose, of course, is political.

But politics cannot, and must not, be the reason for a major change in foreign policy.

And a party that rationalizes all of its actions on the simple premise of vote getting cannot measure up to the responsibility of government.

Which brings me to the subject of the third party.

This year's political picture has been changed from that of recent years by the entrance into the Presidential race of a third party.

America has grown strong under the two-party system, while other nations have suffered from governments formed by weak coalitions of splinter parties.

This is particularly true in this year of 1948, when the mantle of world leadership which has fallen on our shoulders makes this one of the most crucial periods in history.

Here again we see irresponsibility raising its head. A Henry Wallace can preach impractical liberalism, knowing that his action is not in the true interest of liberalism but merely an aid to reactionaries.

A Henry Wallace can condemn the bipartisan foreign policy and offer nothing more than abject appeasement to the forces of Godless communism.

A Henry Wallace can condone the enslavement of a Hungary and a Czechoslovakia, rationalizing the loss of a nation's liberty by a series of words that mean nothing.

No party bearing the real responsibility of government can flout the national conscience so glibly, can excuse a foreign power so meekly, can abase it so completely before an alien ideology.

Responsibility in government calls for the preservation of liberty and assurance to all freedom-loving peoples of the right to govern themselves, free from outside interference.

A Henry Wallace can deny the facts of history. He can deny responsibility on the one hand and lay it upon the Democratic Party with the other.

Basically this is the position of the opposition from the right and the opposition from the left.

They do not need to be responsible. They need only say what is politically expedient at the moment, ignoring the situation, the facts, and history.

A Democratic vote this year will be a vote for a strong, workable program of real liberalism at home and abroad, a program to go into effect when the Eighty-first Congress comes into being.

A third party vote will give aid and comfort to the reactionaries.

I have dealt briefly with the problem of responsibility in foreign affairs. I would like to return to the domestic situation.

The Democratic administration has definite responsibility to carry out existing laws.

But the Republican Congress also has responsibility.

It has the responsibility, for instance, to carry out promises made in its party platform of 1944, when the Republican Party solemnly went on record in favor of expansion of social security. Let us see how the Republicans carried out the responsibilities laid upon themselves by their own promises:

The Republican majority of the House of Representatives voted to take away unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors' insurance benefits from about three-quarters of a million citizens.

A decision of the Supreme Court held that these persons were entitled to such benefits. In an effort to void this decision the Republican majority had to pass a special law. It called this measure a bill to maintain the status quo with regard to social security.

Naturally any bill labeled as preserving the status quo, and blocking progress, was a cinch to be passed by the Republican majority. But actually the bill does not preserve the status quo. It was a step backward for three quarters of a million Americans who long for some form of security for their old age.

The Republicans had the responsibility for broadening the base of social security because they had accepted it in their 1944 platform. But once again Republican performance gives the lie to promise.

In November when President Truman called the Congress into special session, the Republican majority had the responsibility of carrying out the solid 10-point program he outlined in his message to curb inflation or of enacting a workable program of their own.

What did they do to live up to that responsibility?

Instead of facing up to the facts the Congress proceeded to speculate in the political futures market. They sent to the President a completely inadequate bill.

The President pointed out that the bill was weak and unworkable and included only 3 of the 10 points he had asked to be covered. And these were 3 points of comparatively minor importance.

The Republicans sought to duck responsibility.

The President did not.

Then came the commodity price break.

Republicans claimed they had solved inflation by doing nothing. The market, they said, had adjusted itself. One Senator chortled gleefully:

"High prices themselves are the surest cure for high prices."

The Republican National Committee released statements hailing the end of high prices.

What has happened?

There has been a few pennies relief in some commodities. But clothing is as high as ever. So is furniture. Durable goods have shown no reduction.

Then came the real blow to the Republican claims for responsibility for the end of inflation. The price of semifinished steel rose by $5 a ton. They claimed it wouldn't mean anything to the consumer. They claimed it wouldn't mean that wage earners might claim a new wage adjustment that would tend to send the price spiral still higher.

They refused to admit, until pressed, that it would increase profits in steel by an estimated $28,000,000 annually.

This was the result of the so-called end of inflation for which the Republicans claimed credit.

But inflation is not yet ended.

Thus the case for the Democratic Party becomes increasingly clear.

It has the only workable anti-inflation program.

It is the only liberal party.

It is the only party that promises leadership for the progressive, human programs necessary for the happiness and welfare of the Nation.

It is the only party that has shown world leadership.

It is the only party that has accepted responsibility in good times and in bad.

It has accepted the mantle of leadership and has lived up to the demands.

Its leaders have been honest and hard working.

And the head of the party is a man who has shown the stature for world leadership.

He is the President of the United States.

Harry S. Truman, Democrat.

State Versus Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "State Versus Federal Taxes," from the Nashville Banner of March 10. This is a thought-provoking article, and in this day is especially apropos. It reminds us that the "least taxed are the happiest," just as those are best governed who are "least governed." It also reminds us that the present burden of taxation cannot continue.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE VERSUS FEDERAL TAXES

Samuel B. Pettengill discussed on this page the other day the matter of Federal grants-in-aid, and how the States are bled for the cash which—taken to Washington in the form of taxes—thereupon is given to the States as grants-in-aid for this and that.

Further enlightenment on the same subject is published by Manufacturers Record, in the March issue, showing that for every dollar the average American taxpayer pays to his State government, he pays about $7 to support the Federal operation.

The ratio varies with each State, but in every case (in the so-called poor States, as in the wealthier ones) the taxpayer's prorata share of the Federal burden exceeds greatly the cost of the State's own government. In the South, for example, the average tax outlay to the Federal Government is 4.13 times the outlay for the State government.

For example, the cost of State government in Tennessee is put at $79,000,000. Tennessee sends in taxes to the Federal Government $389,000,000. Both bills are met by Tennessee taxpayers.

Others of the 16 Southern States compare as follows:

	Cost of Federal Government	Cost of State government
Alabama	$282,000,000	$85,000,000
Arkansas	127,000,000	66,000,000
Florida	460,000,000	122,000,000
Georgia	444,000,000	99,000,000
Kentucky	329,000,000	83,000,000
Louisiana	329,000,000	128,000,000
Maryland	543,000,000	66,000,000
Mississippi	115,000,000	65,000,000
Missouri	1,119,000,000	121,000,000
North Carolina	520,000,000	177,000,000
Oklahoma	290,000,000	119,000,000
South Carolina	218,000,000	73,000,000
Texas	1,214,000,000	228,000,000
Virginia	488,000,000	96,000,000
West Virginia	226,000,000	73,000,000

Yet there still are those who contend that the Federal Government can do for the States—by subsidy, etc.—better than the States can do for themselves.

President's Civil Rights Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 12 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on Thursday, March 11, 1948, by my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], on the subject of the President's civil rights message.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Alabamians, Alabama today faces a momentous decision: Will we leave the Democratic Party?

This is a decision of such importance to all of us that I cannot—as your Senator for 10 years in the National Government—sit silent here in Washington while this question is being determined.

It is my responsibility to you, the people I serve, to speak out—and to translate my words and my feelings into action. The action open to me is to ask you to send me as one of your delegates to the Democratic National Convention that I may do all in my power to insure that the South receives full recognition and fair treatment.

You know my opposition to the measures proposed in the President's civil-rights message. I have always opposed these measures. I support the principle of States' rights. I will continue to fight these measures with all the power at my command. The first speech I made as your Senator in the United States Senate was against the antilynching bill. And the longest speech I have made in the Senate was against the FEPC bill.

The President does not speak for the Democratic Party in the message. Most of the questions raised and measures proposed in the message were before the Democratic convention which met last in Chicago. That convention, with due regard for the feelings of the South and in fairness to all, adopted a plank in the Democratic platform on the questions raised acceptable to the South.

The Democratic Party in the past has recognized that the South has its own peculiar,

local problems which lie in the very depths of our southern civilization. The Democratic Party has recognized that the South must be permitted to solve these problems in its own way. The Democratic Party has not in the past tried to cram down our throats measures which the South will never willingly accept.

The Democratic Party in the past has resolved its differences in the Democratic National Convention. I believe that we can do so again. Surely the consideration accorded us in the past dictates that the South take its cause to our long-time friends and fellow Democrats in the Democratic National Convention—the only authoritative voice and organ of the Democratic Party.

The measures embodied in the President's message can be put into effect only if they be passed by both Houses of Congress. In the House and the Senate southern Representatives and southern Senators, through the years, have prevented the passage of these measures. If the South should leave the Democratic Party we would but weaken the very arm with which we battle these measures in the House and Senate. As the Representatives and Senators of a third party, representing only a section of our country, only 11 out of the 48 States of the Union, we could not hope to exercise the power and the influence that we do today as the members of the great national Democratic Party, with membership and support and strength in every one of the 48 States. We could not speak with the authority that we do today.

What chance would there be for Representatives and Senators from the South to be once more the chairmen of the great and powerful committees of the two Houses of Congress? When, if ever again, could we hope to see a Will Bankhead, from Alabama, as the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or an Oscar W. Underwood as the leader of the United States Senate? When, if ever again, could the South hope to exercise that power, that influence, that authority in the direction of our Government that has permitted her to play such a commanding role in our country's affairs? For the South to leave the Democratic Party is to yield the substance for the shadow, to surrender the strength and usefulness of the chain for the weakness of the link.

But we are told that if the South will leave the Democratic Party we can throw the election of the Presidency into the House of Representatives. Even if such a thing were possible, we know a Republican House such as we have today would elect a Republican President. But if the Republicans did not have control of the House, what assurance have we that we could persuade or inveigle the House to select a man of our choosing? Would not our very sectionalism be used against us to our own undoing? Would not we find the North, the East, and the West locked in common purpose that we, a relatively small minority, should not dictate or determine the selection? As experienced and practical men and women, we know that there would be no election by the House of Representatives. What better guarantee that the election would not get to the House of Representatives than the fact that the Democratic Party, one of the two great political parties, was split asunder?

We know what happened to the Republican Party in 1912, split between the forces of Teddy Roosevelt and those of William Howard Taft. The Democratic Party won readily.

To split the Democratic Party would so discourage and impair the forces of the party, so weaken and render ineffective the opposition to the Republican Party, as to insure certain victory by the Republican Party.

And what has the South to expect from the Republican Party. I entered the Congress when Calvin Coolidge was President and served through the administration of Herbert Hoover. I bear witness tonight that the South received no consideration at the hands of the Republican Party. Tariff impositions, freight rate discriminations, unjust taxation, financial policies made heavier the South's burdens and riveted even tighter the chains that bound us in economic dependence to the North and to the East, increasing the tribute that the South was forced to pay to the wealth and enrichment of those sections.

In 1928 Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas left the Democratic Party and voted the Republican ticket for Herbert Hoover. And yet not a single southern man or woman sat in the Cabinet during the entire Hoover administration. The Cabinet today presents quite a contrast—the Assistant to the President, John R. Steelman, native son of Arkansas and recently college professor at Montevallo, Ala.; Secretary of State, that great soldier-statesman, George C. Marshall, a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute and by choice today a Virginian; Attorney General of the United States, Tom Clark, from Texas; Secretary of the Interior, Julius Krug, for the past 15 years a citizen of our neighboring State of Tennessee—4 of the 10 Cabinet places.

Just a few days ago the spokesman for the Republican Party, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Honorable Carroll Reece, declared—

"Its (the Republican Party's) Members in Congress have given almost unanimous support to antipoll tax and antilynching bills, and to proposals for the establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission. Though they have been prevented from enacting such laws nationally—because of Democratic opposition—Republicans have given concrete evidence of their sincerity by definite action in the field of State legislation."

Mr. Reece then boasted that the FEPC laws in the four States which now have them were passed by Republican legislatures.

Surely neither you nor I, nor any Alabama Democrat, has any place in the Republican Party, and there is no reason why we should act to insure victory for the Republican Party.

Our place must be in the Democratic Party—the party that has meant so much to Alabama.

We know all that the Democratic Party program has done for the Alabama farmer, with soil conservation, support prices, adequate credits, rural electricity, and reduced tenancy; for the industrial worker, with decent hours of work, minimum wages, and jobs; for the businessman, with insured bank deposits, protection from monopoly, and removal of discriminations in freight rates; for all our people, with social security, with TVA, with funds for hospitals and health centers, vocational education, school lunches, schoolhouses, roads, airports, city halls, and great public works; with the development now in progress of Alabama's waterways, the Chattahoochee, the Coosa-Alabama, the Tennessee-Tombigbee.

During 1 year, 1946, 10,000 new buildings were constructed in the South to house manufacturing enterprises. Under the program of the Democratic Party, the cash income of the farmers of Alabama increases from some $60,000,000 a year to nearly $400,000,000 the past year. In Alabama the per capita income increases nearly five times, while the national per capita income increased only three times. Under the program of the Democratic Party, Alabama has, indeed, entered into that fairer and better day, of which we long dreamed. We cannot forget that many of the benefits and blessings of this better day can be lost to us under a Republican administration.

Some who urge us to leave the Democratic Party are not real or sincere Democrats. They have not believed in the principles of Jefferson and Jackson, of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. They have not approved the Democratic Party's program for the advancement of our people. The Democratic Party could not give the people TVA, REA, social security, farm prices, insured bank deposits, and the other great measures without stepping on some toes. Some who have not believed in the party or its program have not had the forthrightness or the courage to openly oppose the party. They now seize upon the disagreements and dissatisfactions of the hour and seek to encompass the defeat, if not the destruction, of the party by dividing it.

There are those who cannot see or who refuse to see the true picture in the world today, the threat to peace and the threat to America.

We build the peace or war will come—war that will consume our people with fire and death, sear the earth, leave behind the shattered buildings and blackened ruins of our cities, engulfing all that is beautiful and free, and destroying God's rich blessings.

Those who cannot see or who will not see the true picture are like those who could not see or who refused to see the awful menace of Adolf Hitler and the Japanese war lords.

There are some who even play with the fellow travelers, bed with them and make common cause with them in attacking the bipartisan foreign policy of our country. They give comfort to Russia. They abet communism while Russia's aggression and Russia's stubborn refusal to cooperate under the United Nations Charter impedes the building of the peace of the world at every turn, and moves the world toward war.

The hope for the peace of the world lies in the strength of the United States, the unity of our people, and the leadership of our country. Only if America remains strong—strong in our domestic economy, strong in our armed might, strong in the unity, the determination, and the will of our people—can we hope that Russia will change her course and be willing to come to agreement for the peace of the world.

The Communists and their fellow travelers, and those who play their game, would sow confusion, promote discord and confound disagreement. They would separate us, they would divide us, they would turn us one against the other. They would split us into many parties and factions, just as they did in those European nations that have fallen their prey. They would destroy our strength. They would make us weak—weak at home and weak abroad—so weak that the other peace-loving nations would be afraid to rely upon us or our commitments, would be afraid to associate themselves with us or work with us or follow our leadership for the building of the peace.

If you and I—as Democrats, as Americans—are to play our full part to prevent another and far more horrible war, if we are to play our full part for the building of the peace, if we are to keep faith with our American youth who died in the hope of a better world, if we are to be true to our children and those to follow after them, we cannot separate, we cannot divide, we cannot turn the one against the other. We must close ranks and march all one way, united in our party, united in our efforts, united in our will for the building of the peace of the world.

Civil Rights and State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the

following letter, which I have received from Harriet G. Lewis, 129 Hickory Street, Hot Springs, Ark., and the accompanying text of a broadcast by Samuel B. Pettengill over American Broadcasting Co. network, Sunday, February 29, 1948.

The Honorable W. F. NORRELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORRELL: In case that you did not hear this broadcast or have not yet seen it in print, I am enclosing a copy of the script.

I think it is very pertinent, especially the section on the wretched conditions in Washington, D. C. I hope that this fine speech will reach the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

And speaking of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reminds me to thank you again for the pleasure and profit its regular receipt is giving me.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,

HARRIET G. LEWIS.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND STATE RIGHTS

(Text of broadcast by Samuel B. Pettengill over ABC network, Sunday, Feb. 29, 1948)

You have been hearing a lot about Mr. Truman's civil-rights message to Congress and the reaction to it, especially in the Southern States.

I don't suppose many of you have had the chance to read the President's message clear through, or the report of his Civil Rights Committee of 15 upon which his message was based.

You may be glad to have some facts and light on the subject. I said "light"—not heat. I will not be a party to stirring up any feelings on this matter. All my life I have practiced racial and religious tolerance. As a Member of Congress, I nominated Catholic, Protestant, and Jew to such places as West Point and Annapolis. But, back of today's heated discussion are principles of sound government as well as the rights of individuals.

There are two parts to this question: Civil rights and State rights.

Both are important. A man loyal to the Constitution might vote for many things as a member of a State legislature which he would not vote for as a Member of Congress.

This very human question of civil rights has become a political football—kicked around by both Republican and administration party leaders.

What I object to—and I think a league of honest men objects to—is the almost complete lack of sincerity with which the matter is being tossed into the mad scramble for the votes of minority groups.

SHORN OF POLITICAL QUACKERY

If the Man of Galilee were advising us, would He toss this question into the arena of party politics? He said: "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another." I know of no case where He asked a political boss to take over in the delicate field of human relationships. One man, Ghandhi, in India, did more for racial tolerance and the civil rights of the downtrodden than all the law books of India put together.

A British viceroy wrote Ghandhi: "In one Province I have 50,000 troops and riots. Where you are, I have one man—and peace."

The great Negro scientist, George Washington Carver, the great educator, Booker T. Washington, the sportsmanship of Joe Louis, and the Brooklyn Dodgers putting Jackie Robinson in a big league baseball uniform have done more to ease social tension than any law that Congress can pass.

Now let us see how much sincerity there is in the partisan, political approach to this question.

DEPLORABLE WASTE OF TIME

Let us take the brutal crime of murder called lynching. The President, and Republican leaders, are going to, at least, go through the motions of stopping lynching by Federal law.

With the country facing questions of staggering importance, with Europe and Asia falling apart, Congress is going to take time out, for perhaps weeks on end, in going through the motion of forcing the passage of a Federal antilynching law.

Is this to stop lynching?

When you hear the figures I shall give you, I believe you will say that the real purpose is not to stop lynching, but to stop another party from getting votes. Meantime, sectional feeling will run high and the unity of the Nation will be torn in two. This will be welcome news to cunning men in foreign capitals.

ONE LYNCHING IN 1947

Let us look at the record of lynchings in this country during the past 50 years. You will find them in the World Almanac for 1948, page 451:

In 1900 there were 115 lynchings; in 1910 there were 76; in 1920, 61; in 1930, 21; in 1940, 5; in 1944, 2; in 1945, only 1 lynching; in 1946, 6; in 1947, again, only 1 lynching.

These figures show the growth of public opinion, north and south, east and west (and let me say that only 6 States in the 48 have been wholly free of this crime). The figures show that lynching has practically disappeared in America without any Federal antilynching law.

Yet there are other crimes—staggering in number. But are the political crusaders for a Federal antilynching law, to be forced down the throats of the Southern States, are they hot and bothered about Federal laws to punish other crimes all around them? No. Why? Because they don't see any votes in beating the political tom-toms about these other crimes.

Compare these other crimes, Nation-wide, in 1946, with lynchings:

Murder and manslaughter, 8,444; lynchings, 6.
Rape, 12,117; lynchings, 6.
Robbery, 62,782; lynchings, 6.
Automobile theft, 229,920; lynchings, 6.
Burglary, 357,991; lynchings, 6.
Larceny, 941,738; lynchings, 6.

In New York City, where most of the agitation for a Federal antilynching law comes from, there were in 1946 325 murders, 14,525 felonies, and a total of 697,734 crimes reported to the police. That is for one city in one year. In the entire United States, with 140,000,000 people, there were 6 lynchings.

Did not these robbed and murdered men and raped women have some civil rights?

Do not the men beaten up by goon-squads in labor riots in northern cities also have some civil rights—the right to work?

But who weeps political crocodile tears for them?

Yet Congress is going to try to pass a Federal antilynching law to cure six lynchings when New York City had 697,734 crimes.

In the light of the facts I have given you, this Federal antilynching bill must strike you like using the 18-inch guns of a battleship to kill a wolf.

WILL THE VOTERS BE FOOLED?

I do not know how many voters will be fooled by all this noise, but I believe the number will be small when they know the facts.

One of the great objectives of our National Union—so stated in the preamble to the Constitution—is to "insure domestic tranquillity." With the Nation, and the world, in their present critical condition, would great and sincere statesmen inflame sectional feeling by a public auction for votes on an essentially local matter?

It is important to all of us that the Federal Government retain the respect and affection of the American people. It can do so only by limiting its activities to essentially national affairs. When it attempts to invade the field traditionally assigned to State and local governments, which they know best how to handle, and sends its detectives and snoopers to prosecute citizens in every police court, the Federal Government loses prestige. Federal prohibition should have taught us that. State and local officials dumped the whole problem on to Washington, D. C., until every Federal courtroom was loaded down and cheapened by a crowd of bootleggers, and law enforcement became a joke.

It is sound and humane public opinion that we need—not more law. The only law that counts is what the public will back up. You solve nothing in this matter by turning it over to the Federal Government. Conditions in Washington, D. C., where the Federal Government is supreme, prove that conclusively. The government of the city of Washington is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government.

WASHINGTON'S SORRY RECORD

From the standpoint of crime, slums, disease, crowded schools, and racial discrimination, Washington, D. C., has a record scarcely exceeded by any city of its size in the Union. I pointed this out 10 years ago in my book, Jefferson, the Forgotten Man.

President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights says of Washington, D. C.: "It is a graphic illustration of a failure of democracy. * * * The situation that exists in the District of Columbia * * * is intolerable."

Yet, ex officio, President Truman is the mayor of Washington, and, ex officio, Congress is its board of aldermen. Do you think a government with this dismal record in its own Capital is going to improve civil rights in every county and State of the American Union?

Read Matthew 7, verse 5: "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

BRANDEIS WARNED THE NATION

That great judge, and my personal friend, Louis D. Brandeis, of the United States Supreme Court, said the Federal Government already does too many things too poorly to take on the doing of more things. He said: "The United States * * * has bitten off more than it can chew. It should go back to the Federation idea, letting each State evolve a policy and develop itself." This great judge and humanitarian saw this clearly, years ago, when the burdens on the Federal Government were a tiny fraction of what they are today.

So you see, my friends, how much political bunk there is in this appeal to Federal force to solve local and individual problems. Why should we always appeal to the force of government and never to the souls and spirits of men?

President Coolidge had something to say on this subject that is worth repeating. He said:

"There is no way by which we can substitute the authority of law for the virtue of man. The real reforms which society is seeking will come as a result of our religious convictions, or they will not come at all."

This crusade against lynching and for civil rights is a job for the home, the school, and the church, and not for the mailed fist of big government in a wild stampede across the barriers and limits of the American Constitution.

WELL STATED IN POTSDAM

Now listen to this: The Potsdam agreement for the government of Germany, signed by President Truman in the summer of 1945, set forth at least one sound principle. That was that the local governments

and states of what was once the German Republic should be restored to their former powers over their own affairs. Here is the exact language: "The administration in Germany should be directed toward the decentralization of the political structure and the development of local responsibility. To this end, local self-government shall be restored throughout Germany on democratic principles. * * *"

The men who wrote that must have read the Constitution of the United States. It was sound doctrine. Hitler rose to his evil power over 70,000,000 people largely through destroying the German states and concentrating all power, political and economic, in Berlin. The time then came when no one dared oppose him for fear of losing some government contract, or export or import license, or some subsidy, or tax exemption. But pay day came. The bill was paid, in part, by 300,000 young Americans who will never see the blue sky over their homes again. And the liberty-loving people of Czechoslovakia are paying again for that same mistake.

THE IRONY OF POLITICS

Yet, it is the irony of politics that the same Administration in Washington that insisted on restoring "State rights" that a dictator had destroyed in Germany, is bent on further destroying State rights in America. What right of self-government do Saxony and Bavaria have that Virginia and Texas do not have?

Some of the same methods that Hitler used are proposed here. In international power politics they are what we now call economic sanctions, legal penalties, such as the withdrawal of Federal subsidies, or the use of the Federal taxing power on States that don't go along.

The President's Civil Rights Committee recommends that such weapons be placed in the hands of the Federal Government. I can think of nothing better designed to promote bitterness and disunity in this Nation.

This threat has moved so calm and moderate a man as Senator BYRD of Virginia to say: "If such coercion becomes a reality. * * * I pray God that Virginia will lead the Southern States in renouncing for all time every dollar of Federal aid."

NEED NOT RESORT TO FORCE

Why this resort to force, the coercion of centralized power? A league of honest men would resist every attempt to rob us of our heritage—one unique in all history—a country where political power is divided among the Nation, the States, counties, cities, and towns—and because power is so divided and limited, a land where men have been free.

There is a way to foster and promote civil rights in this country. It is not the political way. It is by education and public opinion formed in church and school and home. We have the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, yet a poll shows that one-third of our people never heard of the Bill of Rights; another third could not identify it; and only one in five has a reasonably accurate understanding of this bulwark of human liberty.

Now, here is something constructive to do: Let our schools cut out some of their frills and do-dads and teach the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Let the spirit of every high-school boy and girl be warmed and ennobled by a study of Judge Norton's book, or some similar book, on the American Constitution and the Rights of Man. Let the Golden Rule be taught to children in every church and practiced everywhere. When that job is done, and done well, we shall have a league of honest men and there will be little crime or cruelty left.

As Woodrow Wilson said: "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. * * * Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

Program and Policies of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the action taken at the eighty-first annual session of the National Grange at Columbus, Ohio, together with some extracts from the annual message of National Master Albert S. Goss on the subject The Grange Plans for the Future.

There being no objection, the summary and extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE TAKEN AT THE EIGHTY-FIRST ANNUAL SESSION AT COLUMBUS, OHIO, NOVEMBER 12–21, 1947

Reconstruction in war-torn lands and the laying of a sound foundation for a strong and prosperous American agriculture were emphasized at the eighty-first annual session of the National Grange in Columbus, Ohio. The delegates from 37 States pledged the united efforts of more than 800,000 members to aiding European recovery, but emphasized that Europe must rely chiefly on a vigorous program of self-help.

The principle that agriculture must follow a program of abundant production was reaffirmed and emphasized as the only sound method for combating the threat of inflation. Artificial government price controls were opposed as not providing a sound solution to the threat of inflation.

Resolutions adopted placed especial emphasis on the need for increased cooperation, and elimination of duplication, among Federal, State, and county agencies serving farmers. The Grange urged increased emphasis on making agricultural agencies more directly responsive to the needs and wishes of farmers.

The more than 18,000 candidates receiving the seventh degree established a new record, exceeding the previous record by approximately 5,500. Seven classes received the highest degree in Grange ritualism.

GRANGE AGRICULTURAL POLICY

A stable, prosperous, and expanding American agriculture is essential to a sound and prosperous national economy. So dependent and interdependent is each upon the other that without either, both must suffer. That is the keynote of a comprehensive statement of policy adopted by the National Grange annual session in Columbus.

The Grange insists that it is the responsibility of business and labor to adopt such policies as will provide sustained abundant production in industry and full employment. The Grange supports measures which will help stabilize production in industry without impairment to our private-enterprise system and democracy.

Since farmers provide consumers with an abundant supply of food and other agricultural commodities, an honest equity for agriculture would assure farmers a fair price for what they produce. If this is done, it will be a potent factor in maintaining a high level of employment and prosperity in the Nation.

The objectives which the Grange seeks for agriculture are:

1. The abundant production of farm commodities at prices which are fair to both producers and consumers.
2. The preservation of the family-owned and operated farm unit.
3. The conservation and most efficient use of our basic soil, water, forestry and mineral resources.
4. A constantly rising standard of living for all farm families.
5. The opportunity for youth to climb the ladder to farm ownership and security.
6. A marketing and price structure that will maintain agriculture on a satisfactory self-sustaining and stable basis.
7. Farm control of all programs designed to aid agriculture.

THE GRANGE FAVORS

Modernization of the parity formula.

Cooperative farmer marketing and purchasing associations.

A multiple price system for commodities that can use it.

Marketing agreements and quotas where necessary and practical.

Price supports at levels protecting farmers against disaster prices.

Maximum farmer control of farm programs and administration.

Preservation and strengthening of the family-operated farm.

The farm credit system under an independent bipartisan board.

State and local control of all educational funds.

Better pay for teachers.

Development of self-liquidating hydroelectric projects.

Continued development of a comprehensive farm-to-market road system.

Continuation of the farm labor placement program.

Personal income taxes on a broad base.

Legislation to make the Extension Service financially and politically independent of any farm organization.

Extension of old-age and retirement benefits to farmers and farm workers.

Improved hospital facilities, especially for rural areas.

Cooperative efforts to promote rural health programs.

Releveling of farm land after strip mining and gold dredging.

Amendment of the rural-electrification law to include rural telephone service.

An educational program on the evils of alcohol; local option for communities that want it.

Greater control of speculative trading in farm commodities.

Improved leasing arrangements between tenants and landowners.

Land-use regulations to protect natural resources.

International commodity agreements.

Improvement of international trade relations to facilitate an expanding exchange of goods.

International cooperation to stabilize farm prices in world markets.

The Marshall plan, with adequate self-help stipulations.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE OPPOSES

Any effort or program designed to put an unjust tax upon cooperatives.

Federal control of education.

Importation of any food products which fail to meet the pure-food standards of this country.

Tax reductions before debt reduction, and then only as greater economies in government make it possible.

Use of Federal funds for toll roads.

Admission to statehood of any area outside continental North America.

Repeal of the acreage limitation in the reclamation law.

Peacetime military conscription.

Distribution of obscene and objectionable movies.

Socialized medicine.

Return of price control and rationing except as a last resort.

Daylight-saving time.

Consolidation of the Extension Service and the Soil Conservation Service.

THE GRANGE GUIDEPOSTS

The three Grange guideposts adopted several years ago have been widely accepted as fundamentally sound. They have become the yardstick by which the Grange measures the soundness of legislative and economic proposals.

Reaffirmed at Columbus, the Grange guideposts are:

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth; or anything which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression, both physical and economic.

Applied to everyday problems, this means the Nation must continue to produce a balanced abundance; must prevent monopolies in agriculture, industry, or labor, which restrict production in order to enhance prices; must see that reasonable compensation is made possible for those who earn it; and must do this under the private-enterprise system, which provides an opportunity for everyone to develop his own talents and earn compensation in accordance with his ability, energy, and contribution to the general welfare.

THE GRANGE PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

(Extracts from annual address of National Master Albert S. Goss, Columbus, Ohio)

The hope of the world is now dependent upon our willingness and ability to aid Europe in getting back on its feet so that it can again become self-supporting and produce the wealth upon which all prosperity rests. * * * However, we have a definite right and obligation to demand certain standards of performance as the price of extending aid.

One of our most serious domestic problems is the continual drain on our soils largely through erosion. While we have made wonderful progress in soil conservation as compared with the past, we must recognize that a system which pays cash bonuses to farmers for doing what good farmers ought to do, anyway, and which does not reach the landowners who persist in allowing their soils to wash away, can hardly be considered the basis for a sound, permanent program.

Profit sharing among industry, labor, and the consuming public presents the possibility of finding a stopping point in a steadily rising price structure, and turning the upward trend in the opposite direction.

The Grange has always recognized the need for consideration of the problems of our young people. We are continually impressed with the ability of young people to develop and carry out their own programs if they are given the chance.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 13 (legislative day of Monday, February 2), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Marshall plan broadcast by me over Station KSL, of Salt Lake City, on February 17, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This talk is not to be one dealing with arguments for or against what is called the Marshall plan but merely a chat of background and in relation to the development of the ideas behind the plan.

General Marshall's address at Harvard which became responsible for the naming of the plan the Marshall plan was not a bolt from the great blue sky. In fact, it appeared so commonplace to the reporter that the American press was slow in discovering that General Marshall had made a great pronouncement. The European press, and especially England, responded to his speech before our press did. I was in Europe at the time General Marshall made his speech. There was another speech containing most of the ideas in the General's speech delivered in May, a month before General Marshall spoke at Harvard, in Cleveland, Miss., by Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State. It contained the principles of recovery through united effort. But long before either of these talks, the theory of attempting to keep chaos out of the conquered nations and those countries that had suffered as a result of the war, was a theme of many persons. UNRRA had as its objective not only the idea of relief but the notion of united effort so that one nation might not take advantage of another and buy competitively in the markets of the world in such a way as to bring about a rise in prices which might be disastrous to the whole world. The need for several types of unity have always been expressed.

During the war we talked about winning the war and winning the peace. During the war we attained one unity on paper—that of bringing about the Charter of the United Nations. The International Labor Organization functioned throughout the war. The United Nations Food and Agricultural Constitution was adopted—the idea behind it being the theory of the inter-dependence of nations and the overcoming of starvation and food scarcities throughout the world. We may go back even before this time to the meetings of the International Labor Organization in Philadelphia in 1944 while the war was at its worst. The representatives of fifty-odd nations adopted a peace plan based upon the fundamental theory that starvation anywhere affected the lives of people everywhere. Then we may go back further than that to the establishment of the International Labor Organization after the First World War at which time its constitution was based upon the theory that peace can only prevail when the world has a standard of living sufficient to maintain the needs of man. And then we can go back even further—back so far indeed that we discover that the theory of unity, interdependence of nations, and the notion of mutual helpfulness as a benefit to all has been with us for centuries.

After World War I, came the great revolutions in India and China and Russia. There was a unity in these revolutions even, because basically all of them were revolutions against starvation.

Let me give you two simple inidents relating to these great revolutions. In India, China, and Russia, before the First World War, there were great populations, 85 percent of whom were all small farmers providing food for themselves and their families and as many of their neighbors as they could reach. Starvation was an accepted condition. All three peoples had become fatalists in assuming that someone must starve every year. I know something of this terrible fatalism which holds a people when they assume that nature is so much against them, that it is inevitable when suffering continues, because I got to Japan to witness the last great starvation period there and I went through China during such a period there. The people took everything for granted. They didn't protest against what was taking place. They accepted it and they uttered, "There is no help for it.' Now the great revolutions of India, China, and Russia are marked first of all by the desire to free all of the people from this fatalistic approach to their condition and all of the leaders of these revolutions took the stand that conditions can be made better. In other words, the dawning of the theory of progress had at last reached them and the notion brought out by so many of our founding fathers when our Constitution was set up that man has a right to pursue happiness to the extent that he can live free from want. Thus, the whole world now has accepted a theory of mutual helpfulness so that the Marshall plan merely echoes that theory.

The other incident I want to tell about these three great revolutions is what took place in Russia. At the beginning of the First World War, 85 percent of the Russian people used all their time and their energy to produce food for the entire population and great numbers died each year of starvation. Russia is still not free from want, but by the time of the Second World War, she had made improvements in cultivation and in transportation to the extent that it took only 68 percent of her people to feed the entire population. Thus, in Russia 25,000,000 people were released from this agricultural work. I think that, without doubt, those 25,000,000 people became the straw that broke Hitler's back in the war between Russia and Germany in the Second World War.

The Marshall plan, therefore, is an answer to what has been the striving of the nations since the First World War—the realization that nations must help one another, that prosperity makes more prosperity and that chaos and want produce more want. You see everyone is talking today about the two worlds instead of one world. But economically, there will be only one world no matter what takes place politically, and if only half of the world trades with itself instead of the whole, we can only be half as well off as we will when the whole is producing for the benefit of all.

The studies which have been produced to give us the right ideas of what should be done under the Marshall plan constitute probably one of the greatest studies ever carried on by any nation. In general, what do we hope to produce? From now on this is what I hope to see produced. Others may sum up in different ways. I hope that western Europe will realize that she must unite, at least economically, in order to benefit herself.

That brings us to what took place when the possibilities of the Marshall plan dawned on the people of Europe. The 16 nations came together. Some of them were not belligerents. Some were countries like Ireland and Sweden, but they were all hit by the war, and they can all be benefited. The second thing we want to accomplish is the realization that prosperity anywhere helps prosperity everywhere. Then we will destroy the nationalistic feelings engendered by the nations trying to take advantage by embargoes, by high tariffs, and by restrictions on trade. Such actions always lead to the type of competition that stresses the belief that our neighbors are living better than we are and that we want to destroy their well-being by fostering the spirit of envy. The thing that we want to do is to have a Christlike spirit and rejoice in our neighbors' success and know that we, too, will go forward if they do.

Third, I want to see a period of real peace wherein men plan for peace instead of for

war. I would like to see disproved the old prophecy uttered by one of the characters in Sophocles' Greek drama of ancient times wherein he said "men always unite for war but never for peace." I would like to see men unite for peace so that children can grow up without fear and give their lives to productive enrichment of their own and their country's welfare instead of putting so much of their energies into the processes of destruction.

Now, of course, the practical-minded among us will say that that is pure idealism and, therefore, bunk. Well, if the practical-minded want to condemn idealism, that is all right with me, but I would like them to give the idealist a chance just to try his theories once or twice. Christianity may have made a mess of things, but the life of Christ and the teachings of Jesus are still the most idealistic things in the world and by all odds the most successful. Let us take the good for once and build on it. You have all tried it in your lives and found it pays. Do you think it is time for nations to try it? I think that it is worth while.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, how can this country support a program of foreign aid and at the same time protect our American interests? The answer to this question, in part, is to accelerate development of western resources.

By speeding up irrigation of western land and providing additional water supplies to areas now suffering shortages, we can provide food to help carry forward the Marshall plan at the same time that we strengthen our own economic foundations. For even when the world emergency has ceased, we will need these additional croplands to maintain a good living for our own people.

At the rate that the topsoil of American farm lands is vanishing—at some half million acres a year—and our population is increasing—at one to two million a year—we are going to need full conservation and development of potential agricultural lands.

There are 43,000,000 acres of land in the West which are considered irrigable. Only about half of that acreage is now served with water. These are lands that can grow greater quantities of food to feed us and hungry people in other countries.

You may well ask how many of these acres can be irrigated in time to aid the Marshall plan?

It is estimated that the span of the European recovery program is approximately 5 years—that is, it will run through 1952.

A preliminary analysis of reclamation, irrigation, and multiple-purpose projects now under construction, or that can be placed under construction, was submitted to the western subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by Commissioner Michael W. Straus of the Bureau of Reclamation on December 1, 1947. This was an accelerated program based on the assumption of removing all restrictions on construction of project works and settlement of new reclamation areas.

After critically reviewing this preliminary analysis, the western subcommittee has arrived at a program based on present operating conditions and practices. Acreages to be made available under this revised program would be somewhat less than 4,000,000 acres. The total cost of the accelerated program is estimated at $847,000,000. This revised program, although smaller than the preliminary estimate, is one which the subcommittee feels can be accomplished within established Reclamation procedure and on the basis of an attainable speed-up in the usual construction and settlement schedules.

Translated into tonnage, this program would increase production on reclamation-served lands by an estimated total of 13,000,000 tons in the years 1948–52. This yield would be in addition to the annual volume of crops now raised on existing projects. In 1946 reclamation-served lands, totaling 4,396,581 acres, produced over 15,000,000 tons of crops valued at a half billion dollars. If we accelerate the development of irrigation projects according to the suggested program, we can expect the production on reclamation lands to rise to nearly 21,000,000 tons in 1952, or a total for the 5-year period of 91,000,000 tons.

Food and forage are, of course, not the only gain from an accelerated program of western development. Water stored in reclamation reserviors is a source of hydroelectric power. Industrial production in the areas will be accelerated by existing and additional power capacity that can be brought in during this period. The present installed capacity of 2,200,000 kilowatts on reclamation projects could be raised to a total of 5,500,000 kilowatts by June 30, 1953.

Some of the additional power capacity is essential to the operation of the irrigation projects and to the processing and manufacturing plants that handle the agricultural products of reclamation areas. The remaining low-cost power will contribute to the European recovery program by facilitating the manufacture of other products, increasing the processing of minerals and serving commercial and domestic needs. In addition to irrigation and power, such an accelerated western development program will offer greater supply of industrial and domestic water supplies. This is a most important factor in States like California where increasing population and industrial development is a constant drain on municipal water systems.

You may be questioning the advisability of building these projects under the present shortage of materials. As I pointed out, this revised program has been drafted on the basis of current condition. Construction equipment needed for this program would be primarily large earth-moving equipment not readily adapted to other uses. Requirements for lumber and reinforcing steel would be small in comparison with total production of these commodities.

Money spent for reclamation developments is a sound investment in American agricultural and industrial enterprise, which repays huge dividends in new productive wealth. Furthermore, these dollars, or the major part of them, are reimbursable to the United States Treasury. And, in addition, to the repayments for irrigation construction made by water and power users, the Federal Treasury also receives other revenues in the form of taxes made possible by increased production of goods and services in once arid and semiarid sections of the country. This increased production is permanent.

Thus, by accelerating work on reclamation projects to produce more food, now we will be storing up multiple benefits for ourselves and for future generations of Americans.

Storage of water in reclamation projects will protect our farmers from the ravages of both floods and droughts. I have been greatly concerned by predictions of coming droughts. We turn to the river discharge records to find that droughts as severe as those of the early 1930's may reasonably be expected. Extreme droughts in Africa, Asia, Europe, Australia, not to mention our own Southwest, indicate that we may be entering such a period.

Already we have had ample warnings of the effect of limited water supplies on our established agricultural regions. Even now, many of our western communities are stunted in their growth because they do not have enough water. Hundreds of thousands of acres of productive western lands will revert to desert if they fail to receive life-saving and life-maintaining waters. At the present time, great western cities, dependent on water storage for their supplies of low-cost hydroelectric power, are acutely short of electrical energy for industrial and domestic needs.

Down in our beautiful Central Valley of California, farmers are looking hopefully to the time when there will be water to protect their lands and to assure them of continued abundant crops. It will be small comfort to us or to you who also depend on California for many foods, to celebrate the completion of the Central Valley project in the far distant future when our rich agricultural lands have long since reverted to desert.

I mentioned the great need for increased production to care for our greater population. Western communities are bulging at the seams, because a great many young men have followed the advice of Horace Greeley and migrated west to build their homes. To give these young Americans their chance to make a living, whether it is on an irrigated farm or in a town dependent on reclamation projects for its water and power, we must speed western development through construction of reclamation multiple-purpose projects.

In addition to irrigation of lands and development of hydroelectric power, these projects offer the multiple benefits of flood control, domestic and industrial water supplies, silt control, preservation of wildlife, and creation of recreational areas.

Reclamation benefits are not confined to the region in which a project is built. Have you ever stopped to think how an irrigation project in California, Utah, North Dakota, or some other far-distant State affects national economy? Many people in other States have jobs supplying materials to build these projects; many others are kept busy manufacturing articles for the permanent new western markets which are opened in the settlement and development of lands that once were considered useless and not worthy of habitation.

And most important of all to us now, these irrigated lands put meat on our table, serve us with winter fruits and vegetables, and supply us with sugar from western sugar beets.

There is concrete evidence that the European recovery program can be furthered through the increase of irrigation developments in the West.

In conclusion, I remind you that money used now to expedite the building of reclamation irrigation and multiple-purpose projects to aid the European recovery program will make a permanent contribution to the economy of this great country.

As a Christian Nation, we are committed to the humanitarian principles of helping those less fortunate than ourselves. As a wise and provident Nation, we cannot wantonly neglect to speed conservation and natural resource development measures which will serve this and future generations of Americans.

For Peace, Not War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, international, as well as national, preparedness is the soundest guaranty of achieving peace and freedom from the nervous tension and paralyzing fear which now grips the free nations of the world.

For that reason it is encouraging to note the comparative ease with which the western European democracies have been able to reach an accord on many matters of mutual concern. Each knows that no one alone is powerful enough to withstand the march of an aggressor. Each knows, too, if there were ever doubt, that this march is under way. Only a firm, resolute stand will stem the tide.

In this day of shrunken oceans and contracted plains our country, much as we might wish otherwise, has the same concern in halting Russian expansion before the lights of freedom flicker out. That is why we can take heart from this demonstration of unity in the cause of self-preservation and peace exhibited by these sister nations.

The importance of this development is emphasized in the accompanying editorials from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, and the Washington Sunday Star:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle]

FOR PEACE, NOT WAR

Steps toward practical union of the free Western powers of Europe, as indicated by the six-power conference in London and the five-power conference in Brussels, have been denounced by Russia as moves toward war, but as the New York Herald Tribune points out, "it is precisely because it is not a preparation for war that the Kremlin fears it."

From all indications, Russia is bracing herself for war; what will inevitably throw her off balance is a united recovery policy of her opponents in pursuit of a sound peace. As has been pointed out frequently, Russia thrives on poverty, chaos, anarchy, despair. She is helpless against prosperity, contentment, political stability.

Her system cannot compete with free enterprise at its best. And as the nations of Europe move toward working agreements that will utilize their common resources and bring about a common rise of prosperity, Russia sees a kind of competition that cannot be overcome by denunciations, propaganda, or threats of war.

It was remarkable, too, how rapidly these conferences reached agreements when free from the obstructive tactics of the Russians. Internationalization of the Ruhr, economic merger of the American, British, and French zones, defensive and trade union of the western Europe Low Countries and integration of all into a large-scale democratic entity, including the United States—all this is much nearer today than it was a week ago.

Moscow may see it as a line-up for possible war; we on this side will prefer to see it as a foundation for long-term peace.

One other fact that must be faced is that the developments of these various conferences virtually end all hope of practical cooperation with Russia in the reorganization of Europe for peace. We and our allies must go ahead with our own formula for the restoration of our parts of Germany and for the revival of trade.

Russia is free to join, of course, if she wishes to do so. We will continue to operate within the United Nations. But we can no longer be deterred by the iron curtain nor by fears of Russian opposition from achieving the goals to which we were pledged in the war.

[From the Washington Sunday Star]

WEST EUROPE GETS TOGETHER

The speed with which the Brussels Conference attained its objective of working out a regional pact is an apt illustration of the old saying: "Where there's a will, there's a way."

At this diplomatic gathering representatives of five contiguous nations of western Europe have drafted a regional pact binding the signatories to cooperative action on a scale hitherto deemed impracticable by all save a few idealists. Since the delegates spoke for their respective governments and appear to be backed solidly by prevalent public opinion in their homelands, there is every prospect that, within a week, the draft will be ratified in treaty form.

Thenceforth, Britain, France, and the Benelux combination of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg will be associated in a manner hitherto thought possible only through federation. Indeed, the new association will be termed the Western European Union; because it is frankly envisioned as the nucleus to which the other nations of that part of Europe eventually will adhere.

The outstanding feature of the instrument will be a mutual defense treaty providing for well-coordinated military action in the event of an emergency affecting any of its members. But, from a long-range viewpoint, the economic and cultural phases are of great potential significance. They denote a determined effort to harmonize divergent national economies, reconcile currency difficulties, and develop colonial areas on a cooperative basis. Culturally, bilateral agreements will be worked out to foster the free exchange of ideas and the promotion of mutual understanding between the respective peoples.

The motivation behind all this is, of course, the overshadowing menace of aggressive communism spearheaded by Moscow. Faced by a common peril, the surviving free societies of western Europe are following the counsel of Benjamin Franklin to the members of the Continental Congress when he told them, under similar perilous circumstances, that "we had best hang together or we shall assuredly hang separately."

Another thing to be remembered is that this novel experiment in international association has behind it the earnest backing of the United States. Without American support, even the united strength of the five signatories and their aggregate 100,000,000 of citizens would be unable to stand up to Communist aggression. But a West European Union so obviously favors our vital interests that American support should and probably will be forthcoming.

As for international communism, its fierce hostility to the project has already been trumpeted from every Red rostrum, with Moscow leading in denunciation. What the Communist reaction may be in deeds remains to be seen.

Problem of Paraplegics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 14, 1948:

PROBLEM OF PARAPLEGICS SOLVED BY PROJECT HERE—YOUNG PARALYZED VETERANS, TRAINED AS WATCHMAKERS, WILL FIND GOOD JOBS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

In one of the most unusual sporting events ever held in Madison Square Garden, two teams of paralyzed veterans met last Wednesday on the basketball court. Playing in wheel chairs, they not only amazed the large crowd with their dexterity, but impressed upon the audience that although paralysis may mean the loss of the power of sensation and motion in the lower extremities, it does not mean a loss of spirit.

Paralyzed as a result of spinal-cord injuries, this group of men and the other 2,600 paraplegic veterans of World War II present one of the most difficult of all rehabilitation problems. Such cases in World War I usually died within a year from kidney infections, but those infections now can be controlled largely by streptomycin, penicillin, sulfa drugs, and new surgical techniques.

Through intensive rehabilitation programs in military and veterans' hospitals, more than half of the paraplegics disabled in service have been taught to walk with the aid of crutches and braces, and have left VA hospitals ready for jobs or further vocational training.

Typical of such cases is Wilbur Woodman, a 27-year-old paraplegic from Bellingham, Mass., who is attending the Joseph Bulova

School of Watchmaking in Woodside, Queens. When hospitalized at the big Cushing VA Hospital at Framingham, Mass., Woodman was one of the busiest men in the ward. He received physical therapy to prevent his muscles from wasting away, exercise to strengthen his upper extremities, shoulder girdle and upper torso in preparation for crutch walking, and aptitude tests to determine the sort of work he could do with his disability. Later he was fitted for braces and taught to walk on his lifeless legs with the aid of crutches.

ABILITIES WERE TESTED

When his testing was completed, Mr. Woodman began to spend several hours daily in the hospital's watch-repair shop. The instructors did not plan to make him a finished watch repairman. They were interested in finding out if he had the necessary finger dexterity, mechanical aptitude, and patience, and, most of all, if he liked watch repairing. When they were convinced that he did, arrangements were made for him to enroll in the Bulova School with 46 other veteran paraplegics.

When Mr. Woodman and his group have completed their course as skilled watch repairmen next winter, they will encounter no difficulty in finding highly paid employment, for more than 1,500 requests from all parts of the United States have come in for these splendidly trained craftsmen. The total cost of their training at the Bulova School is their subsistence allowances, which will amount to $35,000 a year for the entire group, but had they remained in hospitals for the next year alone, the cost of their care would have been well over $200,000.

The courage to leave the security and comfort of a hospital after several years is not dependent upon the ability to walk or physical skills alone. Many of the problems of everyday living, which seem simple to the nondisabled person, present complex obstacles that challenge the ingenuity and courage of the severely physically disabled. As a result, hundreds of disabled veterans, although they have reached maximum rehabilitation in the hospital, lack the necessary confidence to try life on their own.

That they can live independently, even in this, the world's largest and most highly geared community, however, has been demonstrated by the 31 paraplegic veterans now living at Rego Park, Queens, while attending the Bulova School.

When these men were accepted as students at the Bulova School, the Veterans' Administration presented their problems to such agencies as the Queens County Council of Community Agencies, Community Service Society, Jewish Family Services, Catholic Charities, Central Chapter of the Queens American Red Cross and the New York City Housing Authority.

It was not charity that the VA sought for them, but the same information and advice any newcomer to a community needs. They needed to feel a part of the community and have the security that comes with belonging to a group, for this was their first postwar experience outside hospitals. Most of the group, 19 of whom were accompanied by their wives, had never been in New York before.

Before their arrival, 21 three-room apartments, then under construction by the New York City Housing Authority, were adapted to their specific use. Steps at the side of the one-story dwellings were replaced by ramps, doors were widened to accommodate a wheel chair, and space was provided alongside the ramps for parking the hand-operated cars many of the paraplegics drive.

The Queens Red Cross helped to find and install furniture that was simple and relatively inexpensive. Both rent and furniture are well within most family budgets, which must also cover food, clothes, upkeep of a car, and recreation. Each man receives a maximum of $360 a month disability compensation, plus subsistence pay of $105 to $120 a month for married men and $75 a month for single men without dependents. Single men live three to an apartment, and housekeepers found by the community agencies come in daily to prepare meals and care for their bachelor apartments.

Going to school in New York means much more than just attending classes, and the paraplegic veterans are no exception. They and their families want to see the sights. The Queens Red Cross Home Service has furnished information services checking up on parking, accommodations, prices and schedules for theaters, films, sporting events, and tourist attractions. At first the agency transported the men to swimming pools, but once having learned their way around, they preferred to go on their own.

Soon after their arrival the wife of one veteran had an unusual problem. She was a Protestant, her husband Jewish, and her husband's friend, a paraplegic who lived with them, a Catholic. On their first Sunday in the new home the friend said he "felt uncomfortable about missing mass." As a result, a community canvass was made of the most easily negotiated entrances of churches in the neighborhood, and arrangements were made to have ushers or church attendants wheel the chairs up and down steps that do not have ramps. The three of them, as well as most of the other members of the group, are now regular attendants at religious services.

APARTMENTS SCATTERED

To avoid any thought of segregation, the 21 paraplegic apartments are scattered among the 360 dwellings in the Rego Park development. Through their mutual interests, however, the group is bound together. Each Friday night they meet informally in the project's nursery school building for dinner, recreation, comparison of school progress and discussion of mutual problems and interests and future plans.

The group at Rego Park has resulted from the far-sighted policies of the Veterans' Administration, an industrial organization, and a public-spirited community. Together they have shown that social and personal as well as medical and vocational rehabilitation is possible for even the most severely handicapped.

The problems that they have shown can be solved are faced not only by the 2,600 paraplegics disabled in service, but by hundreds of others, both veterans and civilians, who have suffered similar disabilities as the result of accidents and disease. Although half of the war-service paraplegics have been discharged from VA hospitals, the case load in the VA's six paraplegic centers has not decreased by a single case, as those rehabilitated have been replaced by new cases resulting from peacetime accidents.

To many present at last Wednesday's basketball game in Madison Square Garden, the stars were the paralyzed men who played in the game. However, the small group of enthusiastic rooters from Rego Park and from neighboring VA hospitals, who sat on the sidelines as spectators, also were winning in their own battle to lead independent lives.

Palestine, a New Spain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the following article from the Nation of March 13, 1948, which sounds a grave warning to all of us:

PALESTINE, A NEW SPAIN?

Whether or not Palestine, like Spain before it, is to be the victim of the immorality of the big powers, and in the end touch off a new conflagration, will be evident on Tuesday when the permanent members of the Security Council report whether they have agreed to a formula for implementing the resolution of the General Assembly. One thing is certain: After they have reported, the United States will not be able to hide its real attitude toward partition behind the screen of double-talk which has until now surrounded its statements to the Security Council. This is the meaning of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on March 5.

Much depends on the President. The big-power consultations will prove fruitful only if Mr. Truman finds the courage to overrule the State Department's policy and issue a new directive placing this country squarely behind action to insure implementation. If he fails to do so, we shall be courting what we say we want to avoid—Russian penetration of the Middle East. As long as the present directive stands, no agreement for implementation will be reached, and the Soviet Union may emerge as the only big power favoring the General Assembly's resolution. The State Department's Russian experts may attribute this to Moscow's expansionist interests; but to large sections of world opinion the Soviet Union, on this question, will appear as the moral victor.

Nor will a retreat from partition bring peace to Palestine. Dr. Abba Hillel Silver told the Security Council that the Jews would establish the Jewish state in accordance with the Assembly's resolution without the aid of the UN if need be. When they do, they will invoke the sympathy and help of peoples throughout the world, and even of governments. The ensuing struggle could well become the first battle of a new war.

As the situation stood a week ago, the United States, France, and China openly advocated an attempt at conciliation, which means revision. Even the defeat of the paragraph in the American resolution calling for conciliation was not accepted as final by the United States delegation. A statement issued after the vote insisted that the language of the resolution as adopted "is broad enough to comprehend points B and C of the second paragraph of the original resolution"—point C being the deleted reference to conciliation and point B the request to consider whether or not the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to international peace and securiy.

The British, despite their abstention from the vote, continue their campaign against partition, and have refused to join the consultations. A further avenue of retreat from the partition resolution was offered by Mr. Creech Jones, Britain's Colonial Secretary, who told the Security Council that the threat to peace and security was inherent in the partition resolution and would continue as long as the resolution stood. China and France joined the chorus. Dr. Tsiang said that neither peace nor partition could be imposed by force. France charged the Jewish population of Palestine with coresponsibility for violence and accused the Jewish Agency of making no serious attempt to stop acts amounting "practically to organized assassination."

In spite of all these ominous words, there is nothing in the present Palestine situation which did not exist last fall when the President directed the United States to support partition. As far back as October 31, when the first American plan for implementation was presented, Herschel Johnson told a press conference that if the Arabs resisted partition, there was no reason why the Jewish state could not be set up and the Arab area turned

over to the Trusteeship Council. On November 22 he told the Ad Hoc Committee on Palestine, "We do not say we anticipate no trouble." And on November 25 he voted for the Danish amendment which specified that "the Security Council should determine as a threat to peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression in accordance with article 39 of the Charter, any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged by this resolution."

Since November 29, when partition was adopted, the press has headlined daily reports of armed Arab defiance of the UN resolution. The Commission on Palestine made these charges specific in its two reports to the Security Council. But so far the United States has ignored the charges. Nor has it paid any direct attention to the commission's request for a non-Palestinian force to maintain internal order. Instead of taking a position consistent with its own commitments and the expressed opinions of its delegates when partition was voted, it has invented equivocal formulas to cover its retreat. This straddling must be stopped—and the President can stop it. If the present big-power talks are not to end in a new stalemate, Mr. Truman should demand that the British end their sabotage and that the arms embargo be extended to the Arab states within the Arab league; he should promise United States participation in the arming of the Jewish militia and United States approval of a small-power international force made up of existing contingents, with big-power support guaranteed in the event of external aggression. These steps are the necessary prerequisite to any action in support of partition. They must be taken quickly or they will be too late and the hope of peace will be lost.

I am also inserting a very pointed editorial from the Washington Post of Friday, March 12:

PALESTINE MUDDLE

While the clock ticks away to the May 15 deadline, the United Nations stalemate on Palestine continues. This week it has been marked by a slight tiff between the American and Soviet delegates. Mr. Gromyko actually sought to give the impression that the United States had turned its back on partition. Mr. Austin, with some asperity, corrected him, though the only mistake that Mr. Gromyko made was anatomical. The United States has turned its side on partition, not its back. And Micawber-like, it hopes that something will turn up [now that the Soviet has put its foot down on formal conciliation] to make partition acceptable to Arab and Jew without strife.

Nothing is in sight that looks like providing this hoped-for result. The Jews are going ahead with their plans for setting up a state in conformity with the Assembly's recommendation. And the Arabs are preparing to stop them. It is said that at Lake Success the Lebanese have suggested a federal Arab-Jew state, a solution that conforms with the minority report of the Palestine Commission. Till a matter of minutes before the Assembly vote on partition was taken, the Arabs would have nothing to do with either the majority (i. e., partition) or minority report, and then gave a word of support for federation in principle. It was then too late to consider it. It is even later now. The Jews won't listen to federation, and we doubt whether the Arabs in Palestine will. For Arab moderates have either fled or been killed by the Nazi-minded mufti gang and any independence of the Arab League that might have been expected of Emir Abdullah in adjacent Trans-Jordan appears to be ruled out by the lack of outside leadership and encouragement.

Nor is there any sign that the British will remain in Palestine in case nothing has turned up to solve the Palestine dilemma. If the United States is acting the part of Micawber, Britain is an inverted Micawber, waiting to turn something down. Implementation of partition with economic union has been denied by British obstruction, as, for instance, in the opening of a port, as recommended, so that the Jews can get supplies and weapons. Even the London Times, in commenting on the British order that the partition commission will not be allowed to land until 14 days before the dropping of the mandate, viz, May 1, is constrained to say, "The ban seems to be unnecessarily restrictive." More of this criticism is bound to be heard during the Commons debate on Palestine which started yesterday.

During this debate memories may go back to the debate of 1937, when the British Government at first espoused the partition of the Peel commission. The plan was then dropped. Mr. Churchill wrote, "Even this scheme, had it been put into force vigorously and promptly, would have been better than the hopeless indecision which followed. His Majesty's Government showed themselves unable to make up their minds." And Mr. Amery indicted the British Government for allowing partition "to peter out in the shoals and sands of hesitation." The same shoals have engulfed action in implementing partition with economic union (which, incidentally, was a feasible route to federation), with the United States Government in the same state of vacillation as the British were in 1937, and the British refusing to cooperate in carrying out the Assembly recommendation. Some action must come soon. At least it should take the form of a resolution at Lake Success that arms must be made available to Jews as well as Arabs, so that when the showdown came, the nations will not be accused of actually helping the Arabs to defy an Assembly recommendation.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLETCHER: I have just read an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Religion and rent control."

If religion is to brought to bear on this legislation, I believe the Bible and not some men's opinions should be sought as authority.

The Bible record shows that God placed certain safeguards about private property such as, "Thou shalt not steal," a law to protect the little man not the king who had armies at his command, but the little man who looks to God for his protection. Also, in the Decalogue we find, "Thou shalt not covet they neighbor's house", specifically a guard against anyone holding another man's property against his will.

Consider the story of Naboth's vineyard and the condemnation of Ahab by God's prophet Elijah.

Rent control does not affect the big apartment holder who through legal loopholes is able to make his property show a profit, but it destroys the small property owner who has saved and built something that would help to care for him in the days when he would no longer be able to work. Rent control has destroyed his investment and his property has been stolen by unjust laws. Rent control has made it impossible for him to live in peace and rent to someone that would be compatible. Rent control has brought fear to the thrifty Americans who supply the rental housing for 80 percent of the tenants of this country. Rent control has placed the honest man or woman in jeopardy of legal adventurers who with the backing of the Federal Government can sue for and collect triple damage from the man who through ignorance of an unintelligible directive from some incompetent rent director becomes a violator of some regulation he knew nothing about.

I believe that if religion is to be brought into this matter, we should consider justice as the ground work for any legislation and that it should be justice to all.

Every rent control law written has been written with penalties for violations by the landlord, but no penalties for violations by the tenants or the administrators.

The Federal Government in confiscating private property by rent control should be warned by what happened to Ahab as King of Israel. Remember that God's judgment did not come until Ahab took Naboth's vineyard.

Sincerely,

Rev. WALLACE J. MURPHY.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I still think the position of Congress on rent control is the most cowardly thing I ever saw. Seriously, I really hate to think that my Government would treat its own people in such a cowardly fashion. I think it is so cowardly because relatively the number of landlords is small compared to the number of tenants. Knowing that, I think Congress is deliberately sacrificing the minority group for votes from the majority faction. Everyone knows that taxes have gone up, that repairs are needed, but still the landlord or owner is required to charge the same rental as in 1941. Just how he is supposed to live, I know not. That is not my idea of democracy. That is not what we so blandly call the American way of life. I know that rentals are scarce, but so is food, steel, lumber, and many other things. I know, too, that tenants have received three or four increases in wages in order to meet the high cost of living since 1941. If it's so important to keep down the cost of rentals (and at the same time make no effort to control other prices) then why can't we subsidize the landlords just like we have done for years for the farmers and many other minority classes.

I have no rentals under OPA. I have never had any. I hope I never shall have any. I will never have any if I can avoid it. So it is not a cent to me personally, but it is obviously unfair to some old people I know. Everything they have saved during their entire lives, everything they have on earth is tied up in little rentals (one of which they occupy), and then get the large sum of $37.50 per month for the other three rentals. That makes the grand total of $112.50 per month, from which must come taxes, repairs, water rent, garbage collection, etc., and from the pittance that is left they must live. That was the same condition that existed in 1941, yet their living expenses, by Government figures, are now 185 percent as compared to 1941. At the same time new apartments, no larger than theirs, not so well located, and

unfurnished, are renting now with no OPA for $75 per month. Where is there justice in that? The only reason is votes for those rascals who place their personal aggrandizement and political fortunes above the decent welfare of the very people they are supposed to represent and protect.

Well, I know you can't do it alone. I know you see the injustice. I know that's all that will be done, but I had to get it off my chest; 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and I am still mad. Counting to 10 does no good when I think of the deception that has been practiced upon the owners of rental property, for the sole and only reason that they don't have enough votes.

Very sincerely yours,

A CONSTITUENT.

Government Can Be Best Employer as Well as Biggest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 5, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a transcript of my testimony before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in behalf of a pay raise for Federal employees:

EXCERPT FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SUBCOMMITTEE TO CONSIDER PAYING INCREASES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES (H. R. 4752), MARCH 4, 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. We will be glad to hear with respect to this matter from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TENTH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we who serve with Chairman REES know he is one of the most gracious, just, and tolerant men in the Congress.

Before making my statement I think you will allow me, as a Texan, to brag a little bit. We Texans usually do. We are very proud of the fact that this committee has two of our ablest men from Texas on it, Congressman LYLE and Congressman COMBS, and we know that out of the work of this committee will come a just and fair decision.

I am not here for the purpose of pressuring or insisting on any particular type of legislation. I came here in a democratic way to talk to you about the situation I find in my own little district. I represent the Tenth Congressional District of Texas.

GOVERNMENT IS ONE OF BIGGEST EMPLOYERS

In that district the Federal Government is one of the biggest single employers. We have one of the two central accounting post offices for the entire State located in the capital, Austin, and we have one of the two Internal Revenue offices for the State located there. We have a large civil employment in some military establishments in that area, as well as many other Federal agencies.

When I was at home Christmas I asked the employees and their organizations to prepare for me some actual budgets and to give to me exact data on the increased cost of living, and how it was working out for them.

I would like to ask the chairman and the committee for permission to include in my remarks two or three brief excerpts of budgets sent to me by these employees as a result of my request.

Mr. REES. Without objection, they will be included.

EMPLOYEES OPERATE AS A TEAM

Mr. JOHNSON. Fifteen years ago our post office in Austin, having approximately 500 employees, received a rating of 56. Ten years later that rating was improved to 79. Four months ago we had a postmaster resign to take a job with the War Department Foreign Service, and he left the office with a rating of 99. The latest rating, under our new postmaster is 98. That group of 500 employees operates as a team. They have determined to bring to the Federal service the loyalty and efficiency that private business demands and gets.

The average budget presented to me by the representative groups of employees shows that the average governmental employee has $3.48 left out of his pay after the barest necessities have been paid for.

YEAR AGO, $1,200; NOW, $32 IN THE RED

One of my rural carriers presented the situation pretty graphically to me. He said: "A year and a half ago I had $1,200 in the bank. The enclosed statement from the bank, received today, will tell the story of how badly this increase is needed by the employees, of which I am average." And he attached a note from his banker, saying, "Our books show your account overdrawn $32.36."

Day by day the sincere voices of a loyal group of Federal employees are being raised in growing desperation for a cause so close to their own well-being; a cause that, if not won in the near future, can mean only extreme financial insecurity in the days ahead.

We can go even further. We can be selfish in granting these pay raises to the extent that we want to encourage high-caliber personnel to stay in the Federal service. At a time when civilian employers are in a position to offer more attractive wage scales to trained men and women, it is fitting that we become jealous of our employees whom we have trained through the years to be sound and skilled workers.

We have hundreds of such skilled workers in my district. All of them—the rural carriers, the weatherman, the Agriculture Department people, the postal clerks, the Bureau of Internal Revenue personnel, the postmasters, the Army's civilian personnel, and all the others—are doing a fine job. They deserve a decent standard of living.

I believe while the Federal Government is one of the biggest employers in my district that it can be the best employer in the district, and I have no doubt but what the reputation which you have made in the years gone by will be continued by this committee. It is the reputation of a just and reasonable employer.

I felt that this committee could act very wisely by bringing out legislation providing for substantial salary increases.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. Thank you, Mr. JOHNSON.

Let me ask one question. As you know, we are expected to submit these proposals to the Bureau of the Budget, and we have a report from the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this very bill which has been submitted, and the report is practically the same and the reply which I have before me is dated February 10, and it says:

"Reference is made to your letter of January 27, 1948, with respect to the bill"—it happened to be the one I submitted but it is the same because we are considering all proposals before this committee. "You are advised in view of the position taken by the President on this subject as set forth in his budget message of January 12, 1948, to the Congress, that the enactment of this measure would not at this time be in accordance with the program of the President."

I take it from that that you do not go along with the views of the Bureau of the Budget in connection with this proposed legislation?

POLICY-MAKING POWER RESERVED TO CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I have frequently found that my views are not in accord with the views of the administration or of the President. Congress is a legislative body, and we must remain so. In connection with our legislative deliberations, I want to get the advice of those in the Executive Department as well as the advice of the accountants and the others they have down there in the Budget, but I reserve to the legislative branch of the Government, of which I am a Member, the right to policy-making power.

I think it is a very short-sighted view to say that hundreds of thousands of little people who have been the victims of inflation, from which we are all suffering at the moment, cannot have their salaries increased because it happens not to be in accord with the views of the Budget Director.

Mr. REES. Thank you, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. LYLE. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. REES. Yes, sir. Let me say that Mr. LYLE, also of Texas, is one of the distinguished members of the committee.

Mr. LYLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I never flinch at such a compliment.

Mr. JOHNSON, do you not think that the Bureau of the Budget was influenced somewhat by the threat of the Knutson bill to cut taxes possibly $6,500,000,000, and a ceiling being set on the legislative budget? Do you not think that they thought that this bill, which might run into a $2,000,000,000 increase, might run headlong into that sort of thing, and it might not jibe when put on an adding machine?

Mr. JOHNSON. I should think that it is unlikely that any of the conversations of the last few months in the Congress are unknown to the Budget, and I am sure that its officials have given consideration to the policies of the party in power.

Mr. LYLE. I might say to you, Mr. JOHNSON, it is quite refreshing to have so many Members of Congress come before us and ask that these salaries be increased, many of them $1,000 across the board, which would run around $2,000,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. I always get inspiration and stimulation from association with my colleagues, and this is no exception. I hope that all the Federal employees, scattered throughout the country, will also get benefits as a result of our deliberations.

Mr. TWYMAN. May I ask the witness a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. REES. Certainly.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. JOHNSON, the postal employees would benefit by tax reduction, and you subscribe to the viewpoint, do you not, that a lot of other people do, namely, that they would like to have a reduction in their personal income tax?

NOT CONSIDERING TAX BILL

Mr. JOHNSON. I don't understand we are considering a tax bill here, but I shouldn't want to give everybody a tax reduction and not extend it to the postal employees, if that is the question.

Mr. TWYMAN. Our distinguished colleague from Texas brought up the matter of an income-tax reduction which we hope to put through, and, of course, that benefits postal workers because it would increase their take-home pay, which has been discussed here so frequently.

Mr. JOHNSON. So I am informed.

Mr. REES. I take it you are not opposed to a reduction in taxes, are you?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; I would favor a reduction of a kind and of a type. I am not here to speak on any specific tax bill. I might say that I don't favor the Knutson bill, however.

Mr. REES. Is the gentleman opposed to a 30-percent reduction in taxes?

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman is opposed to a material reduction in taxes that would go to a small number of people in the main. Most of us are for the little folks, and I think, if you will confine your deliberations to the necessity of increasing the salaries of Federal employees, you can rely on the Ways and Means Committee to go as far in tax reduction as would suit the pleasure of some of you. I have not found any reluctance on the part of the Ways and Means Committee to give prompt and adequate, and I should say far-reaching, consideration to tax reduction.

Mr. REES. What I had in mind was not at all the bill as comes out of the Ways and Means Committee; that was not what influenced us.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to state to the committee that I feel that the average Federal employee is entitled to a salary increase, but in order to get that increase I do not advocate the passage of the Knutson bill.

Mr. REES. Thank you, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. LYLE. Of course, Mr. Chairman, $6,500,000,000 would have to come from some other place.

Mr. REES. I wouldn't subscribe to that statement.

Mr. LYLE. You can only add up, if two and two equals four, but when it comes out that two and two equals six, it always excites me. What I am getting at, Mr. Chairman, is this: Unquestionably the need for increased salaries is not determined by the amount of money available, but ultimately the amount of money available will determine what is allowed.

Mr. JOHNSON. The ability to pay those increased salaries will be determined by the amount of money available.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REES. We appreciate your statement, Mr. JOHNSON.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and to provide adequate appropriations for the preservation of the security of the nation, by the creation of the world's strongest Air Force and Air National Guard and for the creation of a national science foundation for scientific research, to make available scientific discoveries and knowledge for the information and guidance of officials responsible for our national security.

Whereas in World War II the value and importance of the Regular Air Force and Air National Guard as component parts of our national defense, and security program were demonstrated, and in the development of said Air Force, the need for scientific study in the field of science related to national defense and security was demonstrated and continues to exist: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the world's strongest Regular Air Force and Air National Guard and to provide for an adequate appropriation of funds to permit this to be done; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a National Science Foundation, with the appropriation of sufficient funds to encourage scientific research to be conducted which shall be made available to the directors of the armed forces and insure national security in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 12, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 19, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so called, facilitating the construction of housing for veterans of World War II and others

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so called, facilitating the construction of housing for veterans of World War II and others, as provided therein, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, February 19, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolutions memorializing Congress to increase the amount of benefits now authorized by Federal law on account of the aid to dependent children program

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the amount of benefits to recipients of aid now authorized under the laws of the United States on account of the aid to dependent children program, so called; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the state secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In Senate, adopted, February 10, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 16, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolutions memorializing Congress to double the amount of benefits now authorized by Federal law on account of old-age assistance rendered by the several States to their eligible inhabitants

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation resulting in doubling the amount of benefits now authorized by Federal law on account of old-age assistance rendered by the several States to their eligible inhabitants; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress and to Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted, February 10, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 16, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Displaced-Persons Legislation Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last session, hearings were held on the Stratton bill, which called for the admission of four hundred thousand displaced persons to the United States.

This legislation is still pending in committee and I believe that it is the hope of a great majority of the Members of Congress that if an opportunity is given them, they will vote favorably on the so-called Stratton bill, H. R. 2910.

Millions of acres of land in America could be placed in productive cultivation by families who today are living in want and poverty in war-devastated countries.

I am hereby submitting an editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, on this legislation:

DISPLACED PERSONS LEGISLATION NOW

A step has finally been taken in the Senate—though a rather little step—toward admitting to the United States some of the millions in Europe dispossessed and homeless as a result of the war's upheaval.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, by a vote of 10 to 1, has reported favorably a bill to permit entry of 50,000 displaced persons a year for the next 2 years. They would be outside regular immigration quotas.

The bill is far from what Congress has been urged to approve. The Stratton proposal, which has been widely supported, would let 100,000 persons a year for 4 years come into the United States. And even that number—a total of 400,000—would take care of only a small part of Europe's displaced persons.

But the bill favorably reported by the Senate committee is at least a step toward acceptance of our obligation toward these people, victims either of Nazi or Communist aggression. Many of them, in fact, are victims of both. Torn away from their homes first by the Nazis, they now fear to return because red forces have gained control in their native lands.

The Senate committee, while approving the bill, included ample safeguards in it. Half of those admitted must be persons whose native land has been annexed by a foreign power (i. e., Russia). Half of them must be farmers and must be employed on farms here. All of them must have assurance of

housing and jobs in this country, without displacing American citizens.

There is an international responsibility to see that new homes are found for these displaced persons, and the United States should share that responsibility. Even the 400,000 urged under the Stratton bill would be fewer than the immigration quotas unused during the war period. There is no serious question about our ability to assimilate them.

We recall again President Truman's pointed appeal in his message to Congress last July, urging that action be taken. He said:

"These are people who oppose totalitarian rule, and who because of their burning faith in the principles of freedom and democracy have suffered untold privation and hardship. Because they are opposed to communism, they have staunchly resisted all efforts to return them to Communist controlled areas. * * * We should admit a substantial number as immigrants and join in giving them a chance at decent and self-supporting lives."

The Dead Can Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 14, 1948:

THE DEAD CAN SPEAK

As the Senate neared the end of its ERP debate there were many arguments for passage, some old, some new. One of the new ones was a dead man in Prague, who, by the savage irony of these days, was being accorded a public funeral yesterday. Jan Masaryk was dead. It is altogether immaterial whether he killed himself or whether another hand did the deed. In either case he was murdered, as the liberties of his country were murdered. In either case the power to take his life and the power to take his country's liberties came from outside Czechoslovakia.

Jan Masaryk was a modest man who bore a great name. The name was one that even the conquerors of Czechoslovakia, and their collaborators, dared not attempt to disgrace. Therefore they were compelled to put the burden of the suicide—if suicide it was—on persons other than themselves. They were compelled to tell the Czech public that Jan Masaryk died because his actions had been criticized in foreign newspapers. How far this explanation was accepted we cannot at this distance tell. But we may well believe that the Czech people, who remembered the light of liberty because they so recently walked in it, will understand what happened and why it happened. A dead man, out of the agony that brought him to his death, can sometimes speak more eloquently than one yet alive.

The United States Senators who refused yesterday to permit a reduction of funds to finance the European recovery plan would naturally have Czechoslovakia, and this dead man, in their thoughts. They would recall that the government in which this dead man had been Foreign Minister had wished to accept what was then called the Marshall plan and to face toward the western horizon. They would recall that this acceptance was withdrawn after the Communist Premier and the non-Communist Foreign Minister had been summoned to Moscow and told what they could and could not do. They would realize that if Moscow could lay down similar terms to a French Government or to an Italian Government it would do so, and that only the lack of power prevents it from doing so.

Jan Masaryk, who had many friends in this country, who was known and loved here, could not appear before a Senate committee, could not hold himself ready to testify in behalf of ERP. He could not show his bruised and broken body as a bit of evidence in the case of freedom versus tyranny. And yet, in his death, he spoke. He spoke for democracy. He spoke for freedom. He spoke for an ancient people who have known both freedom and tyranny. He spoke for justice. He spoke for the dignity of man. He spoke for things seen and unseen. There was the march of armies in his unheard voice. There was a Declaration of Independence—the independence of death. There was a Gettysburg Address—death could say what life could not, that government of the people, by the people, and for the people should not perish from the earth.

This message from the dead was not warlike. Jan Masaryk knew that his country could not oppose the military might of Russia. The message was: Build up democracy; believe in democracy; know that when democracy seems to fall it does not perish. The message was that when one man dies democracy does not die, when one nation goes under a cloud the cloud will someday pass.

Jan Masaryk, in death, spoke for the Marshall plan, for the ERP. What is this message that he left us? Simply this, that democracy is an instinct born in modern man. Nowhere has modern man willingly voted to drop democracy. Nowhere when democracy has been dropped has the pretense of it been abandoned. In Hitler's Germany, in Franco's Spain, in Stalin's Russia, the pretense has been that the dictator does the will of the people. No dictator has dared say that the people should have no will. No one has dared say that the people's will and the people's good should be disregarded. The dictatorial hypocrisy in every case has been compelled to pay lip service to the truths that Lincoln uttered at Gettysburg and that Jefferson put into the Declaration.

The Marshall plan came before the Senate with this inspiration of faith behind it. It is this faith that the men in the Kremlin fear, for if the faith prevails they will not prevail and their system will not prevail. It was in this faith that Jan Masaryk laid down his life. In this act of his the members of the United States Senate could again read that democracy is not something historical, that it lives in men's hearts, that men still care enough about it to suffer for it the torments of the damned and to die for it. There are arguments of facts, there are arguments of figures, but the final argument is that of the pure and sacrificial emotion. This is the argument that Jan Masaryk presented. What we hope to do with our dollars he did, in his final splendid moment, with his heart's blood.

A Blessed Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 Hibernians everywhere will do homage to their patron St. Patrick, and as fitting tributes to a great race, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the March issue of the National Hibernian entitled "St. Patrick's Day 1948" and a poem titled "Valor of the Celt," written in the midst of World War II, by James Patrick McGovern, a distinguished member of the District of Columbia bar and a former Army captain in the First World War, who is also a special Washington correspondent of the Arizona Daily Sun:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1948

The Apostle of Ireland was a man of peace. To the highly civilized but extremely warlike pagan Gaels he brought faith in the Prince of Peace. He conquered warriors without shedding blood. The secret of his successful mission is needed today as much as it was ever needed in the history of the human race.

Just as the foundation of World War II was laid at Versailles in 1919, so the foundation of future war is being laid today. * * * St. Patrick was no appeaser. He knew exactly what he believed, and what he believed he clearly preached. We should formulate our aims with similar precision, in order that men of good will in all parts of the world may know them and accept them and work for their fulfillment. St. Patrick prayed. So should we. Even as we pray, we shall be guided toward the wise, the unselfish, the successful way of peace.

VALOR OF THE CELT

What mean the neutral mandates of today
As long as Irish hearts, not laws, hold sway?
Two thousand years ago the Celts were bold
To prove their valor, never since grown cold;
For centuries their sons have heard drums roll
Abroad and home, and won the hero's scroll.

Who can recount each deed, recall each name,
Enrolling Irish warriors in halls of fame?
Their spirit on every front has never ceased
To be among the Allies a buoyant yeast.
The race itself stands now with vision clear
An international and stalwart peer.

No mortal power can cloud fair Ireland's brow;
As her men always fought, so they fight now;
They fill the foremost ranks where danger lies,
Spurred by the valorous will which death defies;
Impelled by native love for soil that's free,
Dauntless wherever they meet with tyranny.

For many flags, by land, in sky, on sea,
The Celtic race fulfills its destiny;
A hundred ships of war slip down the ways,
Each christened in an Irish martyr's praise;
And untold shrines in foreign, distant parts
Will keep Old Erin warm within true hearts.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

George Grant Has Always Served, and Served Well (His Record in Review)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, which appeared in the Troy (Ala.) Herald of February 22, 1948:

EDITORIAL FROM TROY (ALA.) HERALD

A quarter of a century ago a young man, who was born about 30 miles from Troy, selected this city in which to begin the prac-

tice of law. From that very day he has been a constructive influence in the activities and development of this section.

He immediately aligned himself with Troy's civic organizations, working for the betterment and upbuilding of Troy and Pike County. He served for many years as secretary of the Troy Kiwanis Club and was also its vice president and president.

Realizing the need of a chamber of commerce, he became instrumental in the organization of the junior chamber of commerce and served without remuneration as its secretary. He was chosen commander of the local Legion post, then vice State commander and later served as State commander of the Legion. Over a period of many years he has given freely of his time and talents to many worthwhile undertakings in our city and county.

As State commander of the American Legion, he sponsored and set in operation a State department of aviation, which resulted in many of the Legion posts working with the Government in building up our great air force. Always an exponent of clean sports, he was the first president of the Dixie Amateur Baseball League and later was named president of the Alabama-Florida Baseball League.

For several years he was employed by the national organization of the Legion and Legion auxiliary to develop the child welfare program in the State of Alabama. In the early days of the State department of public welfare, he worked with the director and personnel of the department in appearing before civic clubs and county boards of commissioners urging the establishment of welfare units in their various counties. Upon the completion of this work, he had made such an outstanding record that his services were sought by the national organization of the Legion and Legion auxiliary to do the same work in the State of Oregon. Feeling, however, that he should return to his law practice after having served his own State for months, he was compelled to decline this offer to do this work in another State.

This man served several terms as national secretary of a college organization; he served as solicitor for Pike County by appointment of three different circuit solicitors; and for almost 10 years was chairman of the Pike County Democratic Executive Committee and for one term was a member of the State Democratic Executive Committee.

The man who was thus grounded, through applied service and a keen interest in public affairs, was soon called by the people to a larger service as their Representative in Congress. As you have probably surmised—he is GEORGE GRANT.

When GEORGE was elected to Congress he immediately sought a place on the Agriculture Committee of the House because he realized that a great majority of the people of his district, either directly or indirectly, derive their livelihood from farming. He, being a new Member of Congress, and this being a major committee, it was impossible to secure such a committee assignment at that time. He saw service on the Roads Committee, where he aided in developing legislation which has contributed substantially in the development of good roads in Alabama. Recognizing the national importance of adequate highways, he worked diligently for Federal aid for their construction and maintenance. Knowing full well that agriculture was the backbone of the Nation's economy—and particularly of the economy of the Second District of Alabama, he continued his efforts to obtain a place on the Committee on Agriculture and later was named to this important committee by a majority vote of the House Ways and Means Committee. To accept this place he cheerfully surrendered his pending appointment to the chairmanship of another committee of the House.

Having the natural curiosity of a country boy, GEORGE always wants to know what makes the watch tick. To find out, he has gone out into the field and studied agriculture right on the plowed ground. He has visited with and made many trips of investigation with county agricultutural agents and other leaders of agriculture. When there was criticism of the old Farm Security Administration, GEORGE visited many of their projects and learned first-hand what they were actually doing. In similar fashion he has gone into the field to observe the fine work of the soil-conservation program and two years ago he passed up an opportunity for vacation in order to make a complete study of the cotton situation throughout the Cotton Belt.

Congressman GRANT served on the subcommittee of the House that wrote the amendments to the rural electrification laws which make it possible for rural users of electricity to obtain funds for the construction of transmission lines at low interest rates. The work of this committee contributed immensely to the rapid expansion of the REA system and brought the boon of cheap electricity into thousands of farm homes, thus relieving the men and women of the farms of much killing drudgery. Being intensely interested in making electricity available to every farm home, GEORGE GRANT'S work in support of this splendid program is a continuing one.

The greatest problem now facing American agriculture is the adoption of a comprehensive long-range agricultural program. Last fall the House Committee on Agriculture of the Congress, after holding extensive hearings in Washington, visited other sections of the country to study the farmers' problems. Congressman GRANT was successful in having this committee meet in Montgomery, which was the only place that committee hearings were held in the Southeast.

GEORGE GRANT has supported legislation sponsored by labor organizations when he believed such legislation was right. He has opposed legislation sponsored by opponents of labor when he believed such legislation was wrong. His voting record will disclose that he has always held the interests of the whole people to be above the interests of any group. He has not slavishly followed any selfish leadership insofar as partisan legislation is concerned but has always considered primarily and sincerely the best interests of all the people of the Second District—labor, agriculture, industry, the professions, and the so-called white-collar worker.

Congressman GRANT firmly believes that agriculture is the basis of our economy and that if we have a prosperous agriculture we will in turn have a prosperous labor, a prosperous industry, a more generous measure of prosperity for all.

He has long been an advocate of preparedness and feels that if this country had been adequately prepared it probably would not have had to become engaged in World War I and World War II and when the terrible emergency which preceded and followed the United States entry into World War II arose, GEORGE GRANT stood steadfast behind the sterling leadership of the lamented Franklin D. Roosevelt and supported his program, which steered this Nation successfully through that dreadful conflict.

After we became engaged in the last World War, many anxious parents appealed to their Congressmen for aid of many and varied kinds. Intead of taking the position that such requests were entirely a matter for the War and Navy Departments to handle, GEORGE GRANT'S attitude was that it was not for him to say whether any certain service person should be transferred or discharged, but such a request deserved official consideration and all such requests were sympathetically and courteously handled regardless of who made them. His position was that while it was the responsibility of the branch of the service involved to decide what should be done in such cases, it was his duty to call these matters, when directed to him, to the particular department's attention and see that they were given proper consideration.

While work upon the Montgomery Veterans Hospital had been started when GEORGE GRANT was elected, he has vigorously worked to secure enlargement of quarters and expansion of facilities so that the veterans of this section might always receive proper care.

He has long been an advocate of air power and his interest in Maxwell and Gunter Fields has been a continuous one. He assisted in securing airfields for the Navy at Foley and Brewton and an Army airfield at Troy.

Working with Army and Navy officials, he assisted in formulating plans for the establishment of other fields and other defense installations in the South, several of which were scheduled to be located in the second district. The end of the war stopped the development of this program.

When it was decided to establish a holding and reconsignment depot in the Southeast, Congressman GRANT was active in helping to secure this asset for Alabama and when the choice of a site narrowed down to three locations within the State, he was very helpful in having it placed at Montgomery.

When the regional offices of the Farm Security Administration throughout the country were abolished, he was instrumental in securing the removal of the State office to Montgomery.

To help the deserving and to recognize merit, GEORGE GRANT has given many orphan boys, and other deserving young men, appointments to West Point and Annapolis.

While we are proud of GEORGE'S love and loyalty to Troy, he has been a real district Congressman. Realizing that Montgomery was not only the capital of the State but by far the largest city in his district, he, after each congressional adjournment, opened an office in Montgomery staffed by an efficient force, to better serve the people of the whole district.

While he and his family have resided in Troy following each congressional adjournment, he has visited among the people of each county. Any chamber of commerce in his district can attest to his genuine willingness to help with their problems. Any group—municipal or county officials, or representatives of organizations—or individuals asking GEORGE GRANT'S assistance have always received it unstintedly and promptly. He has never spared himself in the service of the people he represents. Thousands of persons throughout the district who have contacted him concerning matters of importance to them in Washington will attest to his energetic service in their behalf. No one ever calls on him in vain and his efforts to be helpful are always wholehearted and generally resultful. The entrance to his office is an open door, both in theory and in practice. Every individual or organization in his district is always welcome. Fact is, GEORGE has no private office, as the door to his office has never been closed.

After the end of the recent war, many servicemen were critical of the slow pace of demobilization and with the permission of General Marshall, who was Chief of Staff, GEORGE GRANT, with other Congressmen, visited separation centers in this country in order to see just what was happening. A few bottlenecks were found and reported and the Army corrected them just as soon as possible.

We would not say that each vote cast by Congressman GRANT throughout the years of his service would be the one that we would have cast; however, it would be unfair to single out for criticism one, or a few of his votes, out of the thousands he has cast.

He has thoroughly studied the question of old-age pensions and has long taken the position that the Federal Government should not discriminate against Alabama, or any other State because such State is unable to match Federal funds, but that the aged persons of all the States should stand equal before their Federal Government. Because the State of Alabama is unable to match Federal funds, is no reason why Alabama's aged citizens should be discriminated against. While he, and Representatives of like belief, have not thus far been able to change this law basically, they were successful at the last session of Congress in obtaining an additional $5 per month for citizens of all the States.

GEORGE GRANT firmly believes that the school children of Alabama should have an equal opportunity with all the children of the Nation for an education and has been active in bipartisan support of Federal aid to education—along the same basis as highway aid—with allocation and distribution of funds left up to the individual States, counties, and communities.

GEORGE GRANT has been active in efforts to improve housing conditions for veterans and others needing homes. He supported legislation to provide better hospital facilities, especially in the small towns and rural communities. He is working energetically with others in Washington to substantially reduce the high cost of living.

GEORGE GRANT has consistently supported all constructive legislation prepared for the benefit of our former soldiers and sailors. Being a veteran himself, he understands their problems, shares their hopes, and has labored long and diligently in their behalf.

GEORGE GRANT enjoys the confidence and respect of his colleagues. Only last year he was selected by the Democratic leadership as zone whip, representing the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

GEORGE GRANT is not a grandstand player—not one to introduce a bill in Congress, for instance, just to get his name in the papers. He shares the popular viewpoint that too many bills are introduced in Congress as it is. Nine thousand seven hundred and forty-five bills were introduced in both Houses of the Seventy-ninth Congress, of which only 733 became public law.

GEORGE GRANT assures the Second District of his vast experience, a wide knowledge of the job and, what is more important, a thorough knowledge of the war background against which so much of today's legislation is drawn. He guarantees a proven, sympathetic, intelligent understanding of the political thinking of our people.

GEORGE GRANT is unassuming and modest. He believes in hard work and is still plain "GEORGE GRANT" to thousands of friends and acquaintances throughout the district and the State.

A Congressman's term of office is for 2 years only. His worth and usefulness to his district, State, and Nation can be gained only by seniority. Congressman GRANT now holds high rank on the Agriculture Committee. His prestige is increasing and on the basis of his record and hard work he thoroughly deserves reelection.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and petitions:

ROY L. VINGERS POST, NO. 52,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
La Crosse, Wis., March 11, 1948.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENSON: On behalf of the membership of the Roy L. Vingers Post, No. 52, the American Legion, La Crosse, Wis., the enclosed petition's endorsement of universal military training is forwarded for your consideration. Additional petitions have been circulated and will bring additional support for this measure.

Accordingly, we respectfully recommend your endorsement of the universal military training bill when placed on record.

Sincerely,
GEORGE M. HETHERINGTON,
Commander.

PETITION

Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON:

Peace is worth striving for. Therefore we, citizens of the United States and voters, urge you, our Representative in the Eightieth Congress of the United States, to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training.

Ralph V. Steele, Selma Dettinger, Clarence B. Sexauer, Stella Burt, Kenneth J. Kuebler, Arthur W. Lange, John Blenka, William Merinzie, Robert Sexauer, Charles Jolivette, Frank L. Olson, George Strittmatter, Helmer E. Hanson, J. L. Grangaard, W. W. Morrison, Myron D. Savage, Angus A. Berg, La Crosse, Wis.; George W. Reed, Onalaska, Wis.; James E. Knothe, Donice Knothe, Genevieve Dunn, William R. Finn, Mary Finn, Catherine Finn, Jean Horschak, Bette Lewinski, Rita Knothe, Barbara Bracken, Mathew C. Burgmaier, Mrs. M. Burgmaier, Mrs. John D. Albrecht, La Crosse, Wis.; Mrs. Robert Albrecht, Viraqua, Wis.; Richard Albrecht, Mrs. Albert Leisgang, Albert Leisgang, John D. Albrecht, Jr., E. R. Schwanbeck, Sr., Mrs. E. R. Schwanbeck, Sr., Gerald D. Shanley, Mrs. Gerald D. Shanley, E. R. Schwanbeck, Jr., Zita M. Schwanbeck, Mrs. E. R. Schwanbeck, Jr., Mrs. Ralph N. Schwanbeck, Ralph Schwanbeck, Joe Bakalais, Roger Knutson, Gail West, L. L. Zimmerman, La Crosse, Wis.; E. McKinney, West La Crosse, Wis.; J. Spears, W. Crivits, A. Loomis, M. Evenson, E. Blashaski, George Kerr, Arthur Schaller, Roy Schultz, W. Bentzen, W. J. Ford, William Spah, Jack Lyngdal, J. G. Fossum, Earl Kohner, Albert Gerth, G. Gilbert, Emil Bjerstedt, A. J. Krismir, J. O. Akervold, Mrs. T. J. Keenan, T. J. Keenan, George W. Burmester, Mrs. Lucille Knothe, La Crosse, Wis.

PETITION

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON:

Peace is worth striving for. Therefore, we, citizens of the United States and voters, urge you, our Representative in the Eightieth Congress of the United States, to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training.

Harvey B. Mann, Oscar L. Ready, Ralph Halverson, La Crosse, Wis.; Herbert Erdmann, Hokab, Minn.; George Herber, Archie Downey, Henry Kessel, W. P. O'Connor, Sherman J. Lennon, Clifford L. Gates, D. M. G. Darus, Daniel C. Brown, Wm. Krause, Fred J. Valentine, James C. Haggerty, G. J. Froegel, Ross G. Copper, Karl Dembleben, La Crosse, Wis.; Kenneth Botches, Robert Holverson, Houston, Minn.; Raymond Olson, R. Kroner, W. J. Hoffman, Mrs. Gus Rose, C. H. Greeley, George G. Voight, S. B. Lillis, Gust Kanellakis, Herb Selbo, C. McDonald, M. G. Olson, R. J. Henninger, W. N. Hotchkiss, Gene Roon, John L. Hofweber, L. J. Seaton, J. E. Heraty, M. D., Loretta B. Streicher, W. H. Shay, Frances Orton, Paul J. Gavin, La Crosse, Wis.

Report "Hidden" by United States Reveals Waste in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Trohan from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

REPORT "HIDDEN" BY UNITED STATES REVEALS WASTE IN GREECE

(By Walter Trohan)

A confidential report to the State Department and the White House tells how the Greeks are getting along on the $300,000,000 received from the United States last year.

The report has been suppressed by the administration for fear it might have an adverse influence on the administration's drive for the Marshall plan and on the administration proposal to increase Greek aid by $200,000,000.

GREEK WASTE REVEALED

The inside story of American aid to Greece reveals trebling of the government pay roll, tax dodging by the rich, bribery and corruption, and Greek waste and extravagance.

The report was prepared by a member of the American mission to Greece, which is in charge of the spending of the $300,000,000 voted in response to administration insistence that the spread of communism be halted in the eastern Mediterranean.

The tenor of the report is that the Greeks now have two words for all situations—"Yankee dollars." The report emphasizes the vast cost of running the Greek Government.

"One item is the luxury of a king who receives $40,000 a month in salary and expenses, almost $500,000 a year," the report said. "Almost his sole duty is to appoint a prime minister when the Government fails."

The report advised that there were 50,000 Government employees in 1939 and there are now 90,000 in Government service and 60,000 in quasi Government posts. "Most of them work only 3 or 4 hours a day," according to the report. "Some show up only to get their pay."

The report said it is estimated that one-half the entire population is on the Government pay roll, receiving pensions or Government aid. Almost one-third of the Government budget of about $320,000,000 goes to pensions and welfare, it was said.

Another heavy item of expense, according to the report, is the maintenance of 32 embassies and 47 consulates.

"One wonders why it is necessary for a nation with a population equal to New York City, with almost no export trade and little possibility of increasing it to spend millions of dollars for embassies and consulates all over the world," the report said.

SHIPPING EVADES TAXES

The report said Greek shipping interests evade taxes by sailing their vessels under the flag of Panama and by buying ships under the name of a Canadian corporation. It was estimated, according to the report, that

Greek shipowners made a net profit last year of more than $100,000,000, or a third of the amount given the country by the United States.

Unpopularity of the American missions after it urged taxation was detailed in the report.

The report concluded that the mission is doing a good job despite the criticism and the expenditure of the $300,000,000 will be justified if communism is kept out of Greece.

Citizens' Food Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, last fall, with the aid of a soap salesman, the President conducted a noisy and highly unsuccessful campaign to tell the people of this country what they should eat. As I recall, it was proposed that we eat no meat on Tuesday and no poultry on Thursday and one slice of bread less on each other day. After awhile the managers of this campaign learned that Thanksgiving was on Thursday, so they gave a special dispensation which permitted us to have our traditional turkey. Then they discovered that we had too many chickens and turkeys anyhow, and they abandoned that part of the program altogether. Later the soap man folded his tents and silently departed, and the program left the front pages.

But nothing is harder to squelch than a growing Government bureau. I have with me today evidence that the program is still spending the taxpayers' money to tell taxpayers how to eat, and doing it in a manner which almost guarantees that the poor taxpayer will not even get the message.

Mr. Bill Vennard is a friend of mine who runs the Carbon County News, a weekly newspaper in Red Lodge, Mont. He has sent to me the seven newspaper mats and proofs which I have in my hand. He received these in the mail from the Citizens' Food Committee, the address of which is Executive Office of the President. Each of these mats describe a "peace plate," one to be served each day of the week. I will not read them to you. I will keep them in my office, however, and if anyone is interested in recipes—such as the Tuesday peace plate called "blushing bunny"—I will be glad to help him out.

I am not a newspaperman, but I do know a little about the conditions under which the seventy-odd newspapers in my district operate. They are short of paper, short of help, and long on advertising. Some of them have to refuse advertising in order to maintain a proper balance between ads and editorial material. Anyone connected with the newspaper business—even in the remote category of a Government agency publicist—should be aware of this fact. These double-column mats—seven for each week—have almost no chance of being printed, even if they were a great deal more interesting than they are. The American people have already ignored this program out of existence. If we must continue to spend money on food conservation, I think the administration could figure out a more useful way to spend it.

But, so long as the current administration is in power, and so long as it continues to toss billions of dollars to Europe with which foreigners may invade our home markets to compete with our own consumers, so long as the Democrats follow the tax and tax, spend and spend program, until that is changed the American housewife doesn't need to be told to save food. She has a hard time buying the food she wants under the inflationary conditions which have been the result of 16 years of New Deal easy-money rule.

I include for the RECORD the very ably stated opinion of Editor Vennar, who is one newspaperman the Citizens Food Committee can take off its mailing lists right now.

THE CARBON COUNTY NEWS,
Red Lodge, Mont., February 28, 1948.
Representative WESLEY A. D'EWART,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Maybe I'm a little out of line on this, and, again, I might not be, but the enclosed publicity from the Citizens Food Committee burns me up. This isn't the only one that I've received. I've been getting them a couple of times a month if I remember rightly, and my recollection is that this outfit went out of business several months ago when Luckman resigned.

Is it true that once a Government bureau gets started it never stops? It seems that way to me on this bunch of junk, and as long as I'm a taxpayer I would much prefer to give the money outright in food or wheat than have some Government bureau keep sending me this stuff when it should have folded its tent and gone home months ago.

The amount of publicity this bureau sent out at the beginning was terrific. I never saw anything as big for the war-bond drives—and most of it was purely a waste of money.

Won't you try to shut off this committee? It's wasting my good money and I hate like hell to be paying for a bunch of damn foolishness like this.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. VENNARD,
Publisher, the News.

District of Columbia Law Connection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the observations which I made last week on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, I alluded to the necessity for greater attention to the whole question of air-mail subsidies, and the fact that the Solicitor for the Post Office Department found it necessary in the public interest to file an intervening petition in a case pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board in which an order had already been entered which appeared to be at variance with the public interest.

I was, therefore, interested in the following excerpt from the Washington Merry-Go-Round which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, March 12, 1948, which has some bearing on the pending matter:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW CONNECTION

When hard-hitting Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, begins his probe of the Civil Aeronautics Board he is expected, among other things, to take more than passing notice of a certain Washington law firm.

That firm is Gambrell & White, attorneys for Eastern Airlines. A member of that firm from 1941 up until a few weeks ago was John E. Branch, son of charming Commissioner Harllee Branch of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Senator FERGUSON'S committee is also expected to delve into any interesting reasons which may lie behind the fact that the same Harllee Branch voted against giving Colonial Airlines the right to fly between New York and Washington—which, of course, would be in direct competition with Eastern Airlines, which his son represents.

Colonial has an air-safety record of no fatalities in 18 years, was recommended by the CAB examiner to operate the New York-Washington route. But Harllee Branch's vote swung the decision against Colonial to National Airlines—even though its pilots are out on strike.

NOTE.—Young Branch was retained by Eastern Airlines' law firm in 1941 shortly after he graduated from law school. Then, as the fight between Eastern and Colonial reached a climax, he was made a partner in 1945. With his father's resignation from the CAB a few weeks ago, young Branch's connection with the law firm ended.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

REGISTER OF DEEDS, JUNEAU COUNTY,
Mauston, Wis., March 11, 1948.
Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I am writing you at this time, asking that you use your good offices to your utmost in opposing the present attempt to abolish the tax on oleomargine.

Realizing that the administration has advocated that the tax be repealed, it may be somewhat difficult to oppose the measure, however the facts are all on the side of retention of the present tax, or even an increase in the present tax.

How the Department of Agriculture of the United States can advocate the repeal of this tax is beyond my comprehension. This same Department has spent billions in the past decade, encouraging farmers to get acreage into grass crops, in order to conserve the soil. The Soil Conservation Service right now is active in every county in Wisconsin, and I presume in every county in the United States, advocating more grass farming, more land under grass, strip farming, and other measures directed toward saving the top soil in the United States.

Just what they intend doing with all this alfalfa, bromegrass, lodino clover, sweetclover, and the other crops which they have been advocating, after they have wrecked the dairy industry, I don't know. A cow is the only animal which can live and produce on a diet of about 80-percent grasses; and by nature a cow gives milk, from which all dairy products come. How they can reconcile their present stand with their preachings of the past years is a mystery, and one of those things which can only be understood by swivel-chair farmers.

Now along comes the same Department, favoring an industry, which claims to use products of farms, the raising of which is the worst enemy of soil conservation that is possible, asking for the repeal of the tax on margarines, "to help the little fellow." I wonder who they think they are talking about. How about the "little fellow" who has his life's earnings tied up in a dairy plant, barns, etc., in order to produce the product which they are trying to force off the market. Could the "little fellow" they talk about be Swift & Co., Armour & Co., General Foods, Kraft Cheese Co., and some other little fellows? Or could it be some of the "little fellows" who gather the coconuts?

Can it be that a department can be sincere in its objectives in two such clearly opposite stands as they have taken in view of soils? Is it possible that this Department of Agriculture has reversed its stand and is now advocating soil-eroding crops, after its program of soil conservation?

If this so-called butter substitute is so far superior to the natural product, why are its manufacturers trying by every means, fair or foul, to imitate butter, the product which has become a staple on American dinner tables? I am sure that very few dairy farmers would object to a pink margarine, or a blue margarine, so they could go about selling their product on its own merits, rather than attempting to muscle in on a market established by diligent hard work by dairy farmers in this Nation for years and years.

Please, with all the facilities at your command, get on this bill, or bills, and see that such a thing as repeal of the tax on margarines is never passed. Might it not be good strategy to introduce a bill to increase the tax at this time?

Yours very truly,

LAWRENCE LARSON.

Palestine Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the purported attempt on the part of the State Department to retract from previous participation in the move to partition Palestine, an article in the Sunday Star, March 14, by Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., entitled "Four Steps Suggested as Policy on Palestine," is particularly timely and appears to me to be good advice. The introduction to the article states that Dr. Penrose was a teacher at American University at Beirut for several years before the recent war. During the war he served with the Office of Strategic Services in the Middle East. He is assuming his new duties as head of the university in the coming fall. Under leave to extend my remarks, I beg leave to quote the article:

FOUR STEPS SUGGESTED AS POLICY ON PALESTINE—UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP PROPOSED IN ESTABLISHING DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION BASED ON JUSTICE, WISDOM, AND HUMANITY

(Dr. Penrose was a teacher at American University at Beirut for several years before the recent war. During the war he served with the Office of Strategic Services in the Middle East. He is assuming his new duties as head of the university in the coming fall.)

(By Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., president-elect of American University at Beirut, Lebanon)

Partition of Palestine into Zionist and Arab States, as recommended by the General Assembly of the United Nations last November 29, is a proposal founded in neither justice, humanity, nor wisdom. Its implementation would constitute a negation of the principles of democracy and self-determination—principles which were given highest endorsement in the Atlantic Charter formula by which many of these same United Nations fought the last war.

Bloodshed and embarrassment have thus far been the results of the Assembly recommendation. At this writing the Security Council of the UN is awaiting suggestions from the Big Five as to how or whether an effort is to be made to impose the partition plan or to seek a more reasonable solution for what has become known as the Palestine problem.

FOUR-PART SOLUTION

But is there a solution which can be championed with dignity and be supported as a revised American policy before the United Nations with assurance that it embodies wisdom, justice, and humanity? There is such a solution but it will require real courage and no delay to effect it. It will require a candid admission of the errors of poorly informed policy and a resolute recognition of the fact that halfway measures and compromises proposed in haste and voted under pressure are no way to a decision which can be either successful or permanent. The solution involves four steps.

The partition recommendation was obviously based upon a conviction by the United Nations and the United States that both Arabs and Zionists would more or less peaceably accept such a conclusion to the discussion. Any other assumption must necessarily imply that the United Nations was seeking bloodshed rather than the peace which it was designed to insure. But it has become painfully evident that the assumption was mistaken, the conviction in error. General Assembly reconsideration of the partition recommendation on these grounds is step No. 1.

STEPS 2 AND 3

Step No. 2 involves reference to the World Court of the disputed question concerning the legal right of the United Nations to partition any country in direct opposition to the obvious wishes of the majority of the inhabitants. Such reference failed earlier by one vote to pass in committee, and that failure was directly attributable to a parliamentary error on the part of its secretary. He called for what proved to be the deciding vote of the presiding nation, Australia, in its alphabetical order rather than in last place, as was proper under the circumstances. Australia's early "no" would, under committee procedure, almost certainly have been an abstention had Delegate Evatt known that his vote would make the final score 21–20. The question would then have been referred to the plenary session of the Assembly, where reference to the Court would most probably have been voted.

Pending decision by the Court on this vital question and others allied to it, the third step should be to establish Palestine as a United Nations trusteeship, freezing the status quo under United Nations control in place of the British mandate. This would permit time for the United Nations controlling organization to study deeply and at leisure all the factors which must be considered in any just and lasting determination of the national status of Palestine. Such a trusteeship would, moreover, afford opportunity for an appropriate organ of the United Nations to endeavor to exercise that fundamental function for which the UN Organization was created, namely, to achieve a pacific settlement through conciliation of the disputing parties.

HUMANE FACTOR LACKING

An essential fourth step, which should be taken simultaneously with these other actions, would be to open immediately the doors of members of the United Nations to immigration of displaced Jews, in whatever proportions the member nations can accept. So far as the United States is concerned, the Stratton bill should be passed without further delay. Within the limits of agreed quotas a technique of establishing and permitting preferences of destination among the immigrants should be worked out. Thus, the problem of the displaced European Jews would be placed in its proper context as a world problem rather than as simply a constituent factor adding complexity to the puzzle of Palestine.

In the light of humane principle three considerations pertinent to partition immediately present themselves. First, the living space in Palestine in which refuge was supposedly to be found for at least half a million additional Jews was cut to an area with about half the size and nearly three times the population of the State of Vermont. Second, the acceptable living space for 1,200,000 Arabs now living in Palestine was also approximately halved, with the least fertile, mountainous areas being reserved for them—a curious reversal of the Biblical situation. Third, as Dr. Judah Magnes, president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, pointed out last September, neither Arabs nor Jews have any intention of accepting partition as a final solution.

"Partition," wrote Dr. Magnes, "will not stop the terrorist activities of Jewish groups. To the tension and warfare which now exist partition will add the Arab front, which hitherto has been quiescent. Partition will arouse the resentment of large numbers of Jews, of almost all the Arabs of Palestine, and of the Arab world." Events are proving this great Jew a prophet, who, as usual, is not without honor save in his own country.

But let us look even further at the current situation. Three separated segments of Palestine are assigned to the Jews, with all connecting roads, water mains, and power lines passing through Arab territory. A more perfect means of rendering the Jewish state defenseless could hardly be devised, and it may be taken for granted that the Arabs will capitalize upon it in an attempt to solve the Zionist problem once and for all. The argument that the same sort of division will separate the Arabs is superficial. Palestine is itself a very small segment of a very large Arab world and all Arab segments except the island of Jaffa abut upon Arab states.

The Arabs of Palestine can expect with confidence the assistance, moral and physical, of some 300,000,000 Moslems from Pakistan to Morocco. Even if 500,000 additional Jews could be taken into Palestine at once the total Jewish population would only approximate that of the Arabs now there. It may be taken for granted that without major military protection by the United Nations the Jewish groups will eventually be eliminated in the course of what might well become a bloody jihad, or holy war. Of course, the large Jewish groups living elsewhere in the Arab world could not be protected at all.

UN FORCE UNREALISTIC

No favor would be done the stricken Jews of Europe by sending them to Palestine for elimination. At best they would be condemned to a constant, bitter, bloody struggle for existence, in the face of which the requirement for refuge would be intensified rather than eliminated. It is unrealistic in the extreme to suppose that a military force from the United Nations would long serve adequately to protect them. Let Americans ask themselves, as the British have obviously done, if they would care to sacrifice their own soldiers in such a futile cause.

There is another humane consideration which ought to have alert attention in America, though it is rarely mentioned. The establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine may be found to wreak serious harm to American Jewry, which has never itself shown any marked desire to move to Palestine though it has generously supported the efforts of others so to do.

If the Zionist state is successfully established, where will rest the allegiance of Jews who are American citizens? The question has been pointed up by the case of Rabbi Korff, an American arrested in Paris for planning to place revisionist bombs in London. It is again to the fore in the Zionist efforts to recruit American Jews for service against the Arabs. Most American Jews would undoubtedly prefer to remain Americans, but the problem of divided loyalty becomes real when religious belief is metamorphosed into nationality. The American Government does not recognize dual citizenship.

OMINOUS PRECEDENT SET

But more sinister than the official dilemma would be the occasion which it could automatically provide for the overt manifestation of an anti-Semitism which is only too strong even now in a relatively latent state. In this regard it may well be said that Zionism is the most serious enemy to American Jewry which exists today.

And here let there be an end, once and for all, to the absurd charge so often and so easily made by Zionists that all opponents of Zionism are anti-Jewish in sentiment. Millions of Jews themselves are opponents of Zionism and deeply disturbed at what may be eventual world reaction to the Zionist course.

From a standpoint of much more than the Palestine problem alone, an ominous conclusion implicit in the partition recommendation must be openly recognized. Briefly, it is that racial, national, or religious minorities who can be found, by almost any method of gerrymandering, to possess a majority of the population in a segregated area, have a right here established by the United Nations to seek recognition as an independent state. A look at certain areas of the United States in the light of this principle could give one pause, but let us keep our eyes still on the Middle East which is peculiarly sensitive in this regard. It contains four areas which stand out in sharp relief: Macedonia, Azerbaijan, Kurdistan, and Armenia.

Since the days of the Near East relief most Americans have forgotten the Armenians who, at the end of World War I, sought with near success to obtain American support for the reestablishment of their ancient kingdom at the expense of Turkey. The Turks have not forgotten, nor have the Armenians, nor, it may be assumed, have the Russians.

Locate on the map the area which prior to World War I was most heavily populated by Armenians. Aside from what is today the Armenian Soviet Republic which borders both Turkey and Iran, it spreads over the better part of eastern Turkey. An Armenian state, built under the Russian aegis to include the Turkish provinces of Kars and Ardahan, might well be the beginning of a middle-eastern ring of puppet states similar to those behind the iron curtain in eastern Europe. Its neighbors would be, very naturally, Azerbaijan and Kurdistan.

Lest there be an idea that this problem is merely academic, it should be known that there is throughout the Middle East a strong Armenian nationalist movement. It is spearheaded by an extremist group whose spiritual home is Erivan in the Armenian Soviet Republic.

RUSSO-GERMAN DEAL

It is to be noted with interest that both Russia and the United States supported the Palestine partition proposal. At least one, if not both nations, could conceivably feel morally bound on the basis of the Palestine precedent to support the claims of an Armenian, a Kurdish and an Azerbaijanian group seeking recognition of their nationhood before the United Nations.

If there should be any doubt concerning Russian intentions in the Middle East, it should be effectively dispelled by the recent publication of the proposed terms of agreement between Soviet Russia and the Axis powers at the end of November, 1940. The original German draft, outlining future spheres of influence for the four powers, described Russian "territorial aspirations" as centering "south of the national territory of the Soviet Union in the direction of the Indian Ocean." The Russians wished this to be amended to include specific recognition "that the area south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf is recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union."

In view of what has been said above, it does not seem the part of wisdom for the United States to establish in the world's eyes its support of that very policy which could most easily be followed by Russia in order properly to set the stage for thus fulfilling these "aspirations."

Nor does it seem wise, by the same token, for the United States to antagonize the Moslem world, which alone would remain as a barrier between such a drive and the sea, be it Mediterranean or Persian. Yet this is what the United States has done in supporting the partition of Palestine.

RUSSIA EYES ARABIAN OIL

It may be argued that Russia is courting similar unpopularity by its support of partition. If the possibilities regarding Russian policy which have just been mentioned are valid, it would be obvious at once that such unpopularity had been discounted in advance as a minor element in a more far-reaching Soviet policy. But even more to the point is the fact that a sufficient undermining of the American position in the Arab world would attain a Russian goal to be prized far more by Russia than the dubious blessing of a slight increase in Soviet popularity, never likely to be excessive in the strongly religious Arab world. This goal would be the denial of Arabian oil as a positive factor in the implementation of the Marshall plan. The Cominform has not been reticent in expressing its intent to combat that program by every means available. The fact that Arabia is counted upon to supply almost all the oil requirements of the Marshall plan has not been overlooked in Russia. Neither has the fact been overlooked by Russia that this oil supply depends upon American maintenance not only of production in Saudi Arabia but of an extremely vulnerable network of pipe lines, storage facilities, and refineries in other parts of the Arab world.

Small wonder is it that other nations are beginning to doubt the sanity of American foreign policy. They cannot understand how a nation can possibly support simultaneously two opposing courses of action, tearing down with the left hand what it is striving mightily to accomplish with the right. Yet this is what the United States is doing by its support of partition and of the Marshall plan.

Roger Nash Baldwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 at page 2357 of the RECORD, I spoke about the Communist-front connections of Roger Nash Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, in connection with his opposition to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. I have received a letter of protest from Mr. Baldwin and he requests me in fairness to him to insert his letter in the RECORD.

I am glad to do this. However, I cannot understand Mr. Baldwin's statement that as to his personal connections with Communist fronts, he ceased cooperation with the nonpolitical Communist fronts in 1939—but he fails to say anything about the political fronts of the Communist Party when all such fronts, in order to be effective at all, had to be political in nature. I assume he wants us to believe that he continued his membership and connections with the political fronts of the Communist Party.

Aside from his stated views, I cannot take him seriously in his denouncement of the Communist Party and its political fronts, because as late as August 21, 1941, he, at the request of Carl Reeve, city secretary of the Communist Party of Philadelphia, provided an attorney from the ACLU to defend Communists charged with fraud violations of the election laws of Pennsylvania and sent telegrams to the police and the attorney general of Pennsylvania, protesting their arrests of the Communists. He also was among the signers of the petition for the release of Earl Browder from Atlanta Penitentiary in 1942.

I would like for Mr. Baldwin, who wrote in the Harvard Yearbook of 1935 that Communism Is the Goal to cite one instance where the ACLU has defended a single person of the so-called "right."

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York City, March 11, 1948.

Mr. E. E. COX,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COX: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 8 (page 2357) you inserted a purported list of my associations with Communists in an effort to discredit an official communication from the ACLU opposing an unprecedented appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The list is old, running back to the 1930's, and the selected connections, many false, have no relation whatever to the American Civil Liberties Union. That organization was cleared years ago by Chairman Dies of the Un-American Activities Committee of any Communist control. He said (extracts from Transcript of Proceedings of Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, October 23, 1939): "This committee found last year, in its reports, there was not any evidence that the American Civil Liberties Union was a Communist organization."

Further, the union by formal resolution in 1940 excluded Communists and fellow

travelers from its staff and directing committees, and expelled the one Communist member, who had joined the party after becoming a member.

As to my personal connections with Communist fronts, I ceased any cooperation whatever in what were nonpolitical agencies immediately upon the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939. That demonstrated the total insincerity of Communist professions of loyalty to democracy.

I am anti-Communist in the light of all the events since 1939. To dig up an old and distorted record totally misrepresents my present views and connections, and conveys an entirely false impression of the character of the Civil Liberties Union, in whose behalf I, with other officers, addressed you.

I trust that in fairness you will insert this letter in the RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER N. BALDWIN.

Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 15, 1948:

TAX CUTS

By scaling down the income-tax reductions voted by the House, the Senate Finance Committee hopes to win enough votes to insure passage of a tax-reduction program over a possible veto. However, objections to tax reduction at this time are not removed by the simple expedient of reducing the amount of the proposed cut by about $1,700,000,000. The major argument is the matter of timing. The Senate bill as well as the bill passed by the House is open to objection on this score. The timing is bad for two reasons, which we emphasized when commenting on the House bill: (1) we are still in the midst of a fight against inflation, and (2) we do not yet know the cost of ERP and other foreign-aid programs.

Since passage of the House bill nothing has occurred to weaken the cogency of these arguments. On the contrary, the events of recent weeks have underlined the importance of pursuing a cautious policy of wait-and-see. In our opinion, the recent drop in food prices provides no new arguments in favor of slashing taxes. For there is as yet no evidence that it will be followed by a general and permanent lowering of prices and living costs. Moreover, even if prices in general were to drop substantially, Government revenues would likewise fall and the surpluses available for tax reduction purposes would accordingly shrink.

But the most cogent argument for deferring any sweeping tax cut is the fact that we do not know how much the Government may be called upon to spend to implement our foreign policy. Every day comes word of new crises, political and economic, that force us to revise estimates of the scope and probable cost of efforts to assist world recovery and arrest the spread of communism.

In the recent state of world affairs, it would be shortsighted to try to adjust our foreign-aid program to allow for tax cuts of the proportions contemplated. Instead, it is essential in the national interest to make liberal allowance for unforeseen emergency demands that might absorb overnight the budgetary surpluses that tax-reduction advocates so confidently anticipate. The least that could be done would be to postpone further consideration of the bill until the latter part of the present session, when the demands upon the Treasury should be somewhat clearer than they are today.

Meals for Millions Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the western subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has just issued its final report. This was made as a result of hearings last summer in the principal cities of the West. As a member of that committee I can truthfully state that we spent many hours in hearings and in deliberations on the various subjects under consideration. Among our committee's recommendations is this one, which should not be overlooked and which, to me, is very important:

To mitigate the effect of high prices, the committee feels consumer action and assistance are absolutely necessary, including:

(a) More intelligent consumer shopping, use of substitutes, cooperation in food saving drives;

(b) Greater funds for Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics to make more consumer information and assistance available and to promote education on nutrition, meal planning, food substitution, etc.;

(c) Encouragement of farmers' markets and other marketing methods which reduce the cost of distribution, especially of perishable food products.

In all of the cities and areas which we covered we found one condition prevalent. It was the appalling waste of essential vegetables, fruits, and other farm crops due to lack of proper conservation methods and means of utilizing byproducts. It would take volumes to cover all the reports we received on this subject. We were told by a representative of one of the largest vegetable canners in the United States that every year there were tremendous losses due to lack of suitable methods for conserving the vegetables.

I bring to your attention a specific example of what one person has done to utilize waste products to good advantage. Mr. Clifford E. Clinton, one of the leading and most successful restaurateurs in Los Angeles, has been instrumental in organizing a nonprofit foundation called the Meals for Millions Foundation, which has as its sole purpose the manufacture and distribution to the needy of a multipurpose food which is a byproduct of soybeans. It utilizes the residue of soybeans left after the extraction of the oil for industrial purposes. It is available in great quantities for human consumption through a new process which makes it palatable. As a protein food, it provides in cheap form those nutritive essentials commonly consumed in expensive and scarce meat, milk, and eggs. Fortified with essential minerals and vitamins in cheap, abundant, and synthetic form, it supplies precisely those nutritive essentials usually lacking in the diets of the world's hungry people.

No other single food, regardless of cost, contains all these essentials. It is the lack of proteins, vitamins, and minerals, that prevents many relief diets, based on cereals and vegetables, from rehabilitating hungry people to the point where they are self-sustaining and have a sense of well-being and incentive to do a good day's work.

Members of the western subcommittee sampled this multi-purpose food when we were in Los Angeles, and to our surprise we found it quite palatable. We tried it in our own home and it was very satisfactory.

Inasmuch as there are millions starving throughout the world, it is un-Christian as well as impractical that we allow the source of such a product as this to go to waste when it can be utilized to save lives. Here is a method already established, by which we can go a long way toward solving the problem of feeding the world without wrecking our own economy through exporting the foodstuffs of which we are short, particularly wheat, corn, and meat, and thus maintaining the high cost of living here at home.

Our committee has given much thought to this important subject. The Meals for Millions Foundation multi-purpose food has great possibilities. Surely the same plan can be applied to many other types of foods and their byproducts which are now going to waste.

Let us be sensible as well as humanitarian. We know we cannot feed the world beefsteaks and hot biscuits. But we can, at amazingly low cost, give them this nutritious food, and at the same time, relieve the pressure on food at home, thereby reducing the cost of living.

FEPC Is Not Communistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] said that FEPC was Communist doctrine, and that wherever the people have voted on it they have turned it down.

In addition to New York State, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Indiana have adopted similar legislation. Careful research indicates that there is no record of a single State wherein such legislation was submitted to the people of the State for action by referendum or otherwise. Those other States which have considered and are still considering this legislation are doing so through the medium of their duly elected legislators.

In New York State the law was passed unanimously by its assembly, and by a vote of 49 to 6 by its Senate. Every complexion of political thought, as well as every type of community, both rural and urban, was represented in that State

legislature. If that is the kind of communism the gentleman is afraid of, I say let us have more of it.

We would soon find ourselves in a fine mess, if every time the Communist party adopted the doctrine of the progressive and liberal thinkers of this country, we retreated into the shell of reaction. The Bill of Rights must be maintained in full force, even if it also protects Communists. Let us always remember that name-calling makes nothing bad, except perhaps the name-caller. As reasonable-minded men and women we should be able to weigh the merits or demerits of legislation, regardless of the fact that a small minority of its supporters may very properly be in disfavor.

Any Commie Can Cheer for the Wallace Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Cummings:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of March 9, 1948]

ANY COMMIE CAN CHEER FOR THE WALLACE PLATFORM

(By John M. Cummings)

YORK, PA., March 8.—They revived the old party name in this town yesterday—the Progressive Party—and they gave it a new mission—Mission to Moscow.

This is the new party, the third party, and in Pennsylvania Henry A. Wallace is its candidate for President. Delegates came here from all over the State to witness the rebirth or revival of a name that lingered on from the days of Theodore Roosevelt and the elder La Follette until it was scuttled by the younger La Follettes in Wisconsin, its last stronghold, a year or so ago.

A thousand or more delegates, eager for action, many of them verging on the fanatical in their devotion to a foreign ideology, filled the auditorium and the gymnasium of a high school. They had cheers for Wallace, their prophet, and they had boos for President Truman and for any and all, Democrat or Republican, who believe the interests of this country should come before the interests of Russia.

They adopted a platform at this convention. It was prepared by a resolutions committee headed by Thomas Fitzpatrick, who hails from Pittsburgh and who is international representative of the United Electrical Workers, CIO. Mr. Fitzpatrick performed another important office. He sounded the keynote, and as he sounded off he tossed a few barbs in the direction of the gentlemen of the press.

It seems the press has been unfair to Mr. Fitzpatrick. The few times he was given a square deal caused him to lie awake at night pondering the nature of the offense he committed to warrant such treatment.

We want to be fair to Mr. Fitzpatrick. We want to be kind and considerate. So we say, in all seriousness, the platform prepared under his guidance, and the keynote speech he delivered could not have adhered closer to the Moscow line had they been written either in the Kremlin or the editorial sanctum of the Daily Worker in New York.

Through the platform the convention expressed its opposition to the Marshall plan and to any action of the American Government intended to halt the spread of communism. Naturally it denounced the Taft-Hartley Act as slave-labor legislation and in their hatred of President Truman, the Wallaceites could find in his veto of the measure only token opposition.

The big play in the direction of the Soviet was reserved for a special resolution, attached, shirt-tail fashion, to the platform. It urged that this country destroy its present stock pile of atomic bombs.

Atomic weapons left "in the control of the military and of industrialist monopolies," the resolution related, threaten the destruction of the whole of humanity.

This is the Moscow line from start to finish. It is the old line to weaken this country and make it easy prey for Russian aggression.

You'll find in the platform and in the speeches of Mr. Wallace the usual pious pleas for peace. And in addition, says the platform, there must be rehabilitation of the countries made victims of Axis aggression.

Not a word of Russian aggression, of the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia, of the threat to the Fnnish Govgrnment.

This then, in the realm of international affairs, is the platform on which Henry Wallace stands, the platform of the Progressive Party of Pennsylvania. It ought to be enough to cause such Progressives as Theodore Roosevelt and the elder La Follette to twist and squirm in their graves.

Grinning Henry Wallace is a professed apostle of peace. If the lad from the tall corn of Iowa is willing to stand on the kind of platform adopted here yesterday he could hardly be described as being for peace at any price. He is for peace at Soviet Russia's price. That's a little too costly for most Americans.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

There is an uneasiness all over the United States. It is reflected in the radio comment. It is reflected in the sharp statements from men in high place in Washington. Red communism is on the loose. We snoozed through the earlier conquests of Soviet Russia. Not until Czechoslovakia was swept behind the iron curtain did we bestir ourselves. Now we are asking questions. Will Italy fall to the Red terror next month? Can the Pope possibly be so helpless in that country, seat of Roman Catholicism, where officially the population is 95.8 percent Catholic? Can the France of St. Louis and St. Joan of Arc, of Our Lady of Lourdes tumble before the Soviet monster? Cannot General DeGaulle prevent a red coup?

Time will answer these questions. But time is running fast. It may be later than we think. The question that affects the lives of so many Americans is this: If France and Italy fall how long before Red communism makes an attempt in the New World? There are still some in this country who see through the rose-colored glasses of Henry Wallace. "Joseph Stalin has no designs on this country." Hogwash!

Communism is 100 years old this very year. The founder of present-day communism is Nicolay Lenin. Lenin's views on world conquest are incorporated in the "Thesis on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International." This provision is familiar to every American Communist. And we quote from the ablest foe communism has in America, J. Edgar Hoover, the much maligned chief of the famous FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice.

Let us quote this thesis from the Communist International:

"In all countries, even the freest, 'legal and peaceful' in the sense that the class struggle is less acute in them, the time has fully matured when it is absolutely necessary for every Communist Party member, systematically to combine legal with illegal work, legal with illegal organization * * * It is necessary for all Communist parties to form illegal organization. * * * Illegal work is particularly necessary in the Army, the Navy, and the police."

Last night we were reading a communication from Mr. Hoover in which he repeats a statement he made before a special committee of the House of Representatives a year ago. We suggested that persons who read this newspaper who feel a friendly feeling to communism (and the number may be greater than you think) peruse these lines from Mr. Hoover, of the FBI:

"My feelings concerning the Communist Party in the United States are well known. I have not hesitated over the years to express my concern and apprehension. As a consequence its professional smear brigades have conducted a relentless assault against the FBI. I do not mind such attacks. What has been disillusioning is the manner in which they have been able to enlist support from apparently well-meaning but thoroughly duped persons."

That is J. Edgar Hoover, who is in the best position in the United States to know whether communism is a threat to America. It is not just a far-away ideology that we can ignore by repeating to ourselves with pious ejacuations and sweet thoughts the over and over refrain. "It cannot happen here." It can happen here. The strangest thing in the world is that after Czechoslovakia fell to Hitler a decade ago now it has fallen to Stalin. And for his desire for world power Stalin is more dangerous. Because he has duped some very great personages of this world by his suave manner and oily tongue in the last 8 years since we made that pact with Red Russia.

Make no mistake. The Communist movement began in the United States in 1919. Since then it has changed its name and its party line whenever expedient and tactical. But always it has come back to the fundamentals and bills itself as the party of Marxism-Leninism. As such it stands for the destruction of our American form of government.

And Henry Wallace, gullible, visionary Henry Wallace is its mouthpiece, whether he knows it or not. It is the most contradictory happening in this world. Henry, son of a Harding Cabinet member, is a plain, rather homely Iowa boy. He got to be of the inner circle in the Franklin Roosevelt administration. He was Secretary of Agriculture, then Vice President. The spirit of Franklin Roosevelt in the world beyond the veil—if spirits can weep—should be drowned in tears at the tragic state of world affairs since Tehran and Yalta. We cannot recall the dead Roosevelt to tell us what to do. We can listen to men such as Edgar Hoover before it is too late and the cancer that is communism breaks out even in this inland city of St. Joseph with its peaceful labor circles and its intellectual staffs of our schools to whom has been given the guidance of our youth.

The Marshall-ERP Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee—or some member of that committee—if they have any information from London as to when the House is expected to pass the Marshall-ERP plan.

I make this request, because it is evident London does have advance information as the exact deadlines for passing this legislation in the United States Congress.

For example, the March 6, 1948 issue of the London Economist, internationally known financial publication stated in its lead article that the Marshall-ERP plan would be passed by the United States Senate by the end of last week. That is, Mr. Speaker, this London, England, publication announced last Monday that the United States Senate would have completed its action—and favorably—on the MERP plan by last Saturday. That is more definite information than I find any Member of either the Senate or the House had at that time.

So, again I ask the chairman or any member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee: What is the deadline for passage of MERP in the House as set by London?

Labor-Management Relations and the Encyclicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address entitled "Labor-Management Relations and the Encyclicals," delivered by the Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., associate editor of America and executive editor of the Catholic Mind, before the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, Boston, Mass., March 2, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a good time to stand back and take a long look at industrial relations in this country. Compared with 1946, the year just passed has been one of relative peace between labor and management, and that peace still endures. The question is, is this peace really peace, or is it only a lull between storms?

Those who sponsored the Lea Act, the Hobbs Act, the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act, as well as the authors of the fifty-odd labor laws passed by the States during recent years, would like the public to believe that the calm which presently prevails is the result of these legislative endeavors and may be expected to continue. But Mr. William Green, president of the A. F. of L., warned not long ago that the coming of spring might coincide with the outbreak of industrial warfare on a vast and alarming scale. On a matter of this kind, Mr. Green's opinion is not one to be lightly dismissed.

Certainly, one can argue that all this new labor legislation has been only a minor factor in the comparative quiet reigning at the moment in the market place. There are more likely explanations. In the first place, labor and management have been living under contracts signed before the Taft-Hartley Act took effect, and these contracts are only now beginning to expire. In the second place, neither of the parties had much stomach for a fight the past year. Many labor unions had not yet recovered from the long-drawn-out battles of 1946; and the corporations, with a lot of easy money to be made, were determined to avoid stoppages which would cut into profits. Both sides were willing to settle second-round wage negotiations without a fight, but it is doubtful whether either labor or management regarded these adjustments as harbingers of peace. They merely maintained the undeclared truce which followed the postwar strikes; and truces are often as not followed by war, not peace.

There is nothing, then, in the present situation which warrants complacency. To grasp at simple solutions for complex problems is a well-known weakness of human nature. Despite last disillusionment, we still call for a law whenever trouble threatens, and, once the law has been passed, settle back comfortably as if the devil in the body social or economic had been exorcized. Then, when the explosion comes, we are caught unprepared and society suffers.

You cannot make a people moral by law, although laws can help. The way of salvation still lives through the hearts and minds of individuals and groups. Until these are changed, until there is reformation from within, all the laws in the world will not stop the evils which plague us.

This is especially true of industrial relations. As Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., told the Congress of American Industry last December in New York:

"I do not mean to discount the importance of labor legislation; but, conceding its importance, we must grant that it is but one of a number of trees in a very large forest.

"In other words, you can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can quarrel.

"You can legislate the conditions under which management and labor can maintain an armed truce.

"You can even legislate the conditions under which management and labor can enjoy a negative sort of peace without fighting at all.

"But you cannot legislate harmony into the hearts of men."

The great thinkers and moral leaders who wrote Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno would agree with that. Indeed, they anticipated the chairman of the board of General Foods by a good many years. Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI were not averse to some laws in the field of industrial relations; they even recommended that certain ones be passed and praised governments which had tried sincerely to cope with the problem. But they pointed out that there could be no lasting reform, no enduring peace, until employers and workers had undergone a change of heart and had begun to practice in the market place the moral principles they learned in church. "All that we have taught about reconstructing and perfecting the social order," wrote Pope Pius XI, "can in nowise be brought to pass without a reform of manners."

This, then, is the church's first word to labor and management. To labor and management alike, she says in effect: "Put aside the hatreds and suspicions of the past. Curb the greed that is in all of us, and the lust for power and riches. Let there be between you no unseemly rivalry; for the survival of the fittest is the law of the jungle, not the law of human life. In working together with brotherly affection, in the practice of charity and respect for the rights and dignity of one another, in concern for the general welfare as well as for your own legitimate interests, you will find at once a fitting material reward for your joint endeavors and the blessing of Almighty God. The business of making a living is not separate from the business of saving one's soul."

Nor does the church stop there. She must not be content with exhorting workers and employers to live Christian lives; she must explain the moral principles which have reference to economic life and show how they are to be applied.

It is here probably that the encyclicals have made their greatest contribution to good relations between labor and management. Most workers and most businessmen are men of good will; they want to do the right thing, the socially-approved thing, the thing that squares with their consciences. But what the right thing is often remains obscure; they need the same sort of moral guidance for economics that they already enjoy for education, marriage and other human activities. This is what Leo XIII, Pius XI and the present Holy Father have attempted to provide. Fundamental to their teaching are the following six principles:

1. God made the material world for the use of all men. It is a means which men must employ in order to achieve their goal in this life, which is the service and love of God, and thereby attain their final purpose, which is union with God for all eternity. To human beings, therefore, God gave a mind and a pair of hands, whereby they can change raw materials into clothes and food and shelter and everything else needed to sustain life on earth.

2. Fundamental to the best use of material things and in harmony with man's dignity, need for development and natural propensities is the institution of private property. The church is not opposed to all public ownership—wherever under private ownership property does not serve its natural purpose, or does so only with great dangers to the general welfare, she justifies it—but she teaches that society best conforms to the divine order and to material progress in which private ownership is widely diffused. History confirms this.

3. Although the church defends the right to private property, she insists that its use must be social. In other words, men are not free to use their property as they see fit, to do with it what they please. They must have regard for the needs and rights of others and for the general welfare. It is the duty of the state, according to circumstances, to determine more specifically the general obligation binding owners to the social use of their property. The more complex and organized a society becomes, the more pressing is this duty. In contemporary terms, the traditional Christian concept of property lies midway between the extremes of laissez-faire capitalism, which minimizes social responsibility, and collectivism, which exaggerates it.

4. Workingmen are entitled to a living family wage. This is a minimum postulate of the natural law, an application of the general principle that the material riches of the world are meant by God to sustain the whole human race. The doctrine of the minimum wage supposes on the part

of the worker the performance of his job with reasonable efficiency, and on the part of the employer ability to pay. Where, however, inability to pay is a direct result of managerial inefficiency, the employer is not excused from his obligation to pay a living wage. If he cannot do so because of unfair competitive or other evil conditions in the industry, he is obliged to join with other decent employers to effectuate needed reforms. The living wage, it should be noted, is a minimum. Workers have a right also to share in the benefits of technological progress. Their standard of living ought to keep pace with the advancing material wealth of society.

The laws of the various States regarding corporations are scarcely consistent with this moral approach to wages. Legally, corporate management has as its prime responsibility the welfare of the corporation's stockholders. This means that before all else it is bound to make a profit and pay dividends on stock. To this rule there are, as far as workers are concerned, only two exceptions: Corporations engaged in interstate commerce have a prior obligation to pay a minimum wage under the terms of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and corporations which have contracts with labor unions are obliged to meet the terms of the contract before there can be any question of profits and return on capital. From a moral point of view, however, the first charge on capital is a living wage (which is considerably in excess of the legal minimum established by the Fair Labor Standards Act) and only after this obligation has been discharged are the stockholders entitled to a return on investment. Until terms of incorporation are revised to express this doctrine, managements will continue to be torn between legal duty and moral obligation.

5. Just as there is a natural tendency among employers to form trade associations for their mutual benefit, so there is a natural tendency among workers to form trade-unions and engage in collective bargaining. For this reason, among others, the church teaches that the right of free association comes from God. Where the need arises, this right may be regulated in its use, but not abridged, by the state. This is another illustration of how the church, insisting on the traditional Christian approach to economic affairs, finds herself caught in a crossfire between totalitarian zealots on the one side, who insist, as in Soviet Russia, that private societies are the creation of the state and totally subordinate to it, and the rugged disciples of ultraindividualistic laissez faire capitalism on the other. In passing, it is interesting and important to remark that the right of free association is logically included among those "unalienable rights" mentioned in the Declaration of Independence, one of the many indications that our country was built on a Christian foundation.

6. Since employers and workers are mutually dependent on each other, the relationship between them ought to be characterized by a spirit of teamwork. Admittedly, there is a conflict of interests over distribution of the income from production, the bigger the part going to workers in the form of wages the smaller the part going to capital in the form of dividends, and vice versa. But there is such a thing as a fair division of the returns, which can be determined by applying moral and economic criteria. Once this has been arrived at, the clash of interests disappears. Furthermore, the question of sharing corporate income affects only the short-term interests of labor and management. In the long run, what is to the advantage of the one is also to the advantage of the other. Excessively high profits and excessively high wages are both bad for business. The one dries up effective economic demand; the other hinders necessary capital expenditures. If this were more clearly understood by both labor and management, the distribution of the proceeds of production would be less a source of rivalry than it is now.

To emphasize the cooperative nature of the relationship between workers and employers, Pope Pius XI recommended that the wage contract be broadened in the direction of a partnership contract. This could be done by enlarging the area of collective bargaining, by granting to workers some share in the management, or profits or ownership, of the business. Indeed, with a view to bringing employers and workers closer together, he suggested the formation of self-governing bodies—industry councils, vocational groups—on which they would be equally represented. Without in any way destroying the identity of participating labor unions and trade associations, these councils would concern themselves with the healthy functioning of the industry and, on the national level, with the well-being of the whole economy.

The importance of this last suggestion can scarcely be exaggerated. Everywhere today the pendulum is swinging from the exaggerated individualism of the last century to an equally exaggerated collectivism. The state is assuming dangerously expanded economic functions because private groups, lacking organization and purpose, are unable to perform them. We must raise buffers between the individual and the state to prevent the state from absorbing the individual. The answer to contemporary collectivism is not a return to the atomized individualism of the pre-Civil War era; it is the creation of an organic economic society in which private groups are given, under the supervision of the state, public responsibilities. This is the only type of democratic decentralization of industry which is practical today. If such groups are instituted, we can confidently expect (1) an end to class warfare and (2) a stop to the steady trend toward some kind of state capitalism, or state socialism.

In broad outline, such is the middle way which the Popes have charted for our times. It is a way consistent both with Christian sentiment and principle and with our democratic ideals. It promises industrial peace because it removes the chief causes of class strife. It safeguards democracy because it provides a method of planning without enlarging the sphere of government. And it strengthens private property, without which freedom cannot long endure, by subjecting ownership to social discipline. Surely a system which claims such advantages merits the attention and study of all of us.

The Antilynching Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial entitled "Antilynching Bill," from the March 2, 1948, issue of the Washington Post, and the reply to this editorial made by Leslie S. Perry, legislative representative, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Washington, D. C., which letter appeared in the Washington Post of March 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial and the reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 2, 1948]

ANTILYNCHING BILL

Fifty years ago lynching was a grave problem in the United States. All during the 1890's mob murders were about as common as gang slayings became in the 1930's. In the single year of 1892 a total of 255 persons met death at the hands of murderers conspiring among themselves to take the law into their own hands. One hundred of the victims were white men. Lynching has been by no means confined to the colored race. Indeed, it was the customary method of inflicting punishment on horse thieves and cattle rustlers in the early days of the West. Since the 1920's, however, the number of white men lynched has been negligible, and last year the Tuskegee Institute recorded only one lynching of a Negro.

It is a sorry anachronism that just as the Southern States have almost completed the job of wiping out this disgusting crime Congress should be considering a bill to make the prevention of lynching a Federal responsibility. Half a century ago the use of Federal power against lynchers might have been justified by the tragic failure of the States to protect their citizens. Now most of the States have completely mastered the problem without any help from Washington, and we doubt that the Case antilynching bill would add in any way to the safety of citizens.

This measure, which is about to be pushed through the House of Representatives, would transfer to the Federal courts the prosecution of lynchers and of local officials failing to protect prisoners or to move against mobs after a lynching has occurred. But trials would still be held before local juries, and it is probable that resentment against Federal intervention would complicate instead of easing the problem of securing convictions of accused mobsters. To be sure, there is another provision in the Case bill making every county, town, and other governmental subdivision responsible for any lynching in its jurisdiction. But this resort to the despicable doctrine of mass guilt because of the area in which one happens to live is so repugnant to democratic principles as to make the bill unpalatable to thousands who are devoted to civil rights in the North as well as the South.

We cannot help thinking that this vote-catching venture has no place in the present session of Congress. Its effect is to arouse animosities at a time when there is urgent need for national unity. The lynching menace has already been put down, and we trust that the last vestige of it will soon disappear. Our problem today is the rise of a tyranny that seeks to destroy all civil rights, whether protected by State or Federal law. In the face of that menace we need to be mobilizing our strength—not to be opening old sores or frittering away energies on problems that have already been solved.

[From the Washington Post of March 11, 1948]

ANTILYNCHING BILL

Generally we find ourselves in substantial agreement with the Washington Post editorials and questions of civil and human rights. However, we take sharp exception to your editorial of March 2 on lynching in which you describe the Case antilynching bill as a sorry anachronism because the lynching menace has already been put down.

From beginning to end the editorial shows a truly remarkable lack of understanding of (1) the prevalence of lynchings or threats of lynchings, and (2) the deadly strictures they produce in the economic, political, and

social life of not only the majority of Negroes in the South, but also of an increasingly large number of well-intentioned whites.

Public lynchings by large crowds with great publicity have been the exception rather than the rule in recent years. The technique has changed. Today these terrorists operate in small bands with secrecy and dispatch. Every year many Negroes in the South simply disappear. The Federal Government has no authority to investigate these cases; local officials won't.

Local law-enforcement officers have developed a sort of personalized style of lynching. Drew Pearson, in his column of March 1, gave three typical cases arising in a Mississippi town in February. We have similar recent cases from other Southern States in which the officer tries to justify cold-blooded killings on the all too usual ground that the Negro prisoner tried to overpower him.

The Washington Post makes capital of the fact that there was only one known lynching during 1947. It does not seem to understand, however, that the reason there were probably not many more is because Negroes, knowing that they are without Federal protection, refrain from exercising basic civil rights which will incur the wrath of the anti-Negro forces in the South.

The public press has given wide publicity to the fact that not 1 of the 400 Negro registered voters in Wrightsville, Ga., dared cast a ballot in the county primary election on March 3 after the Ku Klux Klan had paraded the night before and Grand Dragon Green had declared that "blood will flow." Not so widely known, however, are instances such as that which occurred in Smithville, Ga., on January 28, where a representative of the State legislature stood guard at the polls with a shotgun and threatened, "If a 'nigger' votes in this election he'll be a dead 'nigger'." Our informant, who does not want his name disclosed for fear of his own safety, wrote, "I am a white man myself, but I see in this kind of thing a threat to my own rights, for as long as a man at the polls with a gun can keep one man from voting he can keep any man from voting."

The scar that a previous lynching leaves on the economic life of the Negro is usually deep and lasting. Let me cite an example. In the 1940 Presidential election a few Negro citizens of Brownsville, Tenn., attempted to vote. The body of one of them was found a few days later in the river. Several others "disappeared." No one was prosecuted. Four years later the National Labor Relations Board scheduled an election in a certain plant in Brownsville to determine whether the employees desired a labor union to represent them. All of the nonsupervisory employees were Negroes. The night before the election the chief of police, along with other prominent local citizens, visited the Negro employees most active in organizing the union, told them that a CIO union was not wanted in town, and warned them that there might be a repetition of the 1940 lynching. The next morning not a single employee showed up to cast a ballot.

The Washington Post was unstinting in its praise of the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. Yet, oddly enough, the heart of the committee's recommendations dealt with strengthening the right to safety and security of the person. It summed up the present situation in the following words: "The threat of lynching always hangs over the head of the southern Negro; the knowledge that a misinterpreted word or action can lead to death is a dreadful burden."

The Washington Post is either for civil rights or against civil rights. And if it's for, then it must perforce favor the Case anti-lynching bill.

LESLIE S. PERRY,
Legislative Representative, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Washington.

Viers Mill Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune of Friday, March 12, 1948, on the Viers Mill Village project:

VIERS MILL PROJECT

The congressional probe of the Viers Mill Village may well serve a useful purpose, regardless of what the outcome, by focusing the public's attention on the veterans' housing plight and the Government's woefully inadequate measures to give the veterans a break.

Thousands of veterans who got out of the service 2 and 3 years ago were young men who got married during the war and others who wanted to get married. They all faced the one great problem—finding a home. These servicemen were fed up with foxholes and hard bunks in tiers of four deep in the below-decks compartment of some destroyer or amphibious craft. They wanted their own homes.

They wanted a vested interest in America; and for their own and the Nation's sake, it would have been the best thing that ever happened if veterans had been given an opportunity to buy small homes at reasonable cost. The Nation met the problem with the GI loans. These loans permit veterans to buy who otherwise couldn't. But it's a dubious privilege.

As Commissioner Brooke Johns pointed out on the Viers Mill houses, the GI loan is $8,700, payable in 25 years; and over that period the veterans' actual payments will amount to $16,600. The sum of $16,600 is a lot of money to pay for a house valued at $8,700. The situation becomes much worse if it is true, as Commissioner Johns contends, that the houses actually are overvalued and should be appraised at no more than $5,600.

A few years from now, when the real-estate market is deflated back to normal, the value of the Viers Mill houses, along with other values everywhere, will drop substantially. It's entirely conceivable that the value may drop to $3,500, leaving many home owners with mortgages more than twice the value of their homes.

For these reasons the GI loans are not the veterans' bonanza that might be supposed.

Furthermore, this GI loan business is generally resented by builders and financing institutions, and they have combined to push the Veterans' Administration around. After all, the VA is pretty helpless. It can pester the builder but it can't do much more. The average veteran seeking VA help gets bogged down in red tape and finally gives up in desperation.

In one particular case called to our attention, a veteran complained to the VA of the workmanship in a nearby Virginia house he had contracted to buy. The builder got on his high horse and demanded an apology, then tried to renege on the promise to sell. A VA appraiser went to the house at the request of the veteran, and submitted a report that criticized the workmanship and recommended the withholding of $1,000 pending proper performance of the work. The veteran felt he had been vindicated. But later, although no improvements had been made, the same appraiser visited the house in company with the builder, and found the workmanship acceptable. An amended recommendation to this effect was sent to the VA The veteran did not get his complaints satisfied, and he felt bitterly that the VA had let him down.

No one can say at this time whether the veterans are being overcharged or not at the Viers Mill Village. But it's time that Congress did something to show the veterans that this GI loan plan is something that is intended to help the veteran, and not a scheme to help builders and loan institutions get rich quickly.

Vets Find a Way To Buy Homes at Naylor Gardens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of the inspiring stories of the day is that whereby a group of veterans went together and took over the large housing project in southeast Washington known as Naylor Gardens. Because the story may help veterans elsewhere to get more adequate housing, I have asked permission to place it in the RECORD, and do so at this time:

NAYLOR GARDENS HOUSING CO-OP SET UP BY VETERANS OF TWO WARS

(By Malcolm Lamborne, Jr., in the Washington Evening Star, February 28, 1948)

Youthful enthusiasm and the wisdom that comes with age have teamed up in the country's first large veterans' housing cooperative—Naylor Gardens residences in Southeast Washington.

It's a combination that promises to stand as a monument to a new experiment in veteran owned and operated housing.

The 748-unit project became the property of the Veterans' Cooperative Housing Association this month when 34-year-old Graves H. Wilson, co-op president, presented a $512,500 check to the Government. This was a 10-percent down payment on the development, built by the Government in 1943 for $6,587,000 and declared surplus late in 1945.

The brief ceremony in the office of the Public Housing Administration marked the culmination of a program started more than 2 years ago by a group of Washington area veterans, most of them members of the American Veterans of World War II.

Early in their negotiations the young veterans called on older men, veterans of World War I, for advice and assistance, and the combination has been paying dividends ever since. The development is now run by a nine-man board whose ages range from 25 to over 50 years. They serve without pay.

Today 428 of the 748 units are owned by co-op members. Titles to the remainder are held by the association. Nonmember tenants have been given assurance they can remain in apartments so long as there is rent control. These tenants now pay rent to the association, which, in turn, makes monthly payments on the purchase price to the Government. Co-op officials estimate it will take about 30 years to pay off Uncle Sam.

Of the 428 units sold to veterans, about 200 are still to be occupied by co-op members. It is worthy of note that veterans were ready to pay the $50 membership fee in the co-op and make a down payment of 20 percent on apartments—even though they were not sure when they could move in.

FIFTEEN VACANCIES A MONTH

Walter W. Kreimann, administrative assistant to the board and a former Army flier in the Pacific, reports, however, that vacancies average about 15 a month and, accordingly, families are moving in regularly.

What are the attractions at Naylor Gardens? Association officials cite the following:

Interest rates of only 3 percent, monthly payments from $59.50 to $80, depending on the size of apartments (this includes interest and principal payments, fuel, light, and janitor service); an opportunity for a home at about half the price of a detached dwelling (prices range from $6,750 for one bedroom units to $8,450 for a three-bedroom apartment); recreation facilities, nearby shopping centers and good public transportation.

CALLED LONG-TIME PROJECT

John A. Densford, veteran of two wars and chairman of the membership committee, commented recently: "We are trying to build a long-time project at Naylor Gardens." He said he was sold on the idea of a cooperative community only last year when several young men approached him on lending them a hand. Mr. Densford is regional educational director for the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Densford heads the committee which has the important job of screening all applications to buy into the development. The co-op insists veterans be financially able to make a 20 percent down payment without borrowing the money; that their total indebtedness not exceed twice their annual income and that they have annual income of $2,400 at least.

Mr. Wilson says the co-op's "basic philosophy" is to provide World War II veterans "first rate living accommodations at a reasonable cost, along with the benefits of cooperative ownership—all on a long-range basis."

Confirmation of State Titles to Submerged Lands and Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from the testimony of M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania, in the course of the joint hearings before subcommittees of the Senate and House judiciary committees on S. 1988, H. R. 5273, and similar proposals, to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within their boundaries:

As the representative of Hon. James H. Duff, Governor, and of Hon. T. McKeen Chidsey, attorney general, of Pennsylvania, I desire to make this statement on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in support of Senate bill 1988, H. R. 5273 (GRAHAM, Pennsylvania), and other Senate and House proposals which, if enacted, would confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, and would provide for the use and control of such lands and resources.

It is especially important that we bear in mind that the proposed legislation is not designed to take away from the Federal Government any right, title, or interest which, according to long-established principles, it has always possessed or now possesses. On the contrary, the sole object of the legislation is to confirm the basic law of the land respecting the ownership of real property and to resolve, once and for all, a question of policy which has arisen involving Federal-State relationships.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in its recent decision in the case of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), decided June 23, 1947, has ventured, in effect, to charge California and all other coastal States with being little more than squatters in having exercised, since July 4, 1776, or since their respective admissions to the Union, rights of ownership as to the submerged lands within their boundaries. The Court did not hold expressly that the Federal Government is the owner of, or has fee simple title to, the submerged coastal lands. What the Court did say, in effect, was that it could not find that the Original Thirteen States or California own the submerged coastal lands within their boundaries. The decision, therefore, did not purport to be made on the basis of title or ownership in the United States. The Court waved aside the question of ownership, saying:

"The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands under the marginal sea. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of mere property."

The decision was based on the entirely novel legal theory, unsupported by any constitutional provision, statute, or judicial precedent, that the Federal Government, having a paramount constitutional right, responsibility and power in relation to national defense and international relations, thereby has the right to take and control property and resources in submerged coastal lands without lease or any clear title as owner, and without compensation.

Never before was it asserted and held that exercise by the Federal Government of responsibility to defend and protect the Nation can ripen into rights heretofore identified with ownership of the lands defended and protected. Are we to believe that Chief Justice Marshall was wrong and that all other Justices of the Supreme Court since his time, up to the present Court, were wrong? It was clear to them, at least, that the Federal Government did not acquire any rights in or under navigable waters within State boundaries except the paramount rights and responsibilities regarding the regulation of commerce and navigation and the defense of the territorial waters and the Nation, and that these Federal powers and responsibilities did not carry with them any cession, either express or implied, of territory or of public or private property.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania perceives that, unless the United States Senate and House of Representatives take prompt measures to counteract the national-dominion doctrine pronounced in United States against California, that doctrine can very well constitute one of the most serious threats to the rights and property of the States ever conceived. As pointed out by Mr. Justice Reed in his dissenting opinion, that doctrine could extend to "every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation."

If, in the exercise of the power of national defense, the United States can take oil in the marginal sea, by a claim tantamount to ownership though called by the nebulous term "dominion," that same power may extend to minerals under the waters of lakes and rivers. We should not be misguided by the apparent caution of the Court in admitting that State dominion over lands under inland navigable waters "finds some argument for its support." The decision is calculated, in the natural course of events, to throw a cloud over the ownership status of submerged lands in the Great Lakes and even in the inland lakes and rivers.

Carried to its logical conclusion, in accordance with the doctrine in United States against California, the exercise of the power of national defense can be extended to the appropriation or control not only of the gas, oil, and coal in Pennsylvania's more than 758,000 acres of submerged lands but also of all or any part of the vast coal reserve, estimated in 1945 to be nearly 69,000,000,000 tons. For example, the Federal authorities might consider it essential, for the national defense, to order the conservation or taking of the 15,782,000,000 tons of anthracite coal (almost exclusively found in Pennsylvania), without compensation therefor.

Pennsylvania, its political subdivisions, and persons who have expended enormous sums of money in full reliance upon the recognized rule of State ownership of its submerged lands are threatened with a grave injustice by any decision from which it may be inferred that Pennsylvania does not own its submerged lands and the resources therein. A similar injustice, differing only in degree, is threatened to all the other coastal States, if not to every State which has any navigable waters.

The Federal Government cannot rightfully deny the proprietary interests of Pennsylvania in the submerged lands within its boundaries. The tenth amendment to the Constitution has always been construed as confirming the understanding of the people, at the time the Constitution was adopted, that powers and rights not granted to the United States were reserved to the States or to the people, and that the sovereign powers vested in the State governments by their respective constitutions remained unaltered and unimpaired.

Furthermore, the Thirteen Original States, in forming the Union, attached importance to the vesting of power in the Congress to protect them as well as the Union from prejudicial claims. The Congress has the power, not only "to dispose and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States" (art. IV, sec. 3, clause 2), but also to take such action as may be necessary to guarantee that the claims of any State shall not be prejudiced by any construction of the Constitution. The second half of clause 2 in section 3 of article IV provides that "nothing in this Constitution shall be construed to prejudice claims of the United States or any particular State."

If, therefore, the Constitution did not convey any property to the Federal Government, that is, delegate, any proprietary interest in the submerged lands within State boundaries, and it did not, and if the Constitution did not prohibit such proprietary interest in the States, and it did not, then such proprietary interest is necessarily reserved to the States or to the people.

Moreover, if the courts of the United States, including the Supreme Court, do not have the power to legislate or establish new laws granting to the Federal Government rights not clearly delegated by the Constitution, and they do not have such power, and if the Congress has the constitutional power to establish the laws respecting property within the United States, and if need be to confirm the rights of the States and the people respecting such property so that their rightful claims shall not be prejudiced, and the Congress does have such power, then the Congress has every competence to enact S. 1988 or similar legislation to confirm and forever establish the proprietary rights which the States do now and always did possess as to lands and resources in or beneath navigable and other waters within their boundaries.

The position of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the present matter is ably stated by Mr. Justice Reed in his dissenting opinion in the California case:

"The original States were sovereignties in their own right, possessed of so much of the land underneath the adjacent seas as was generally recognized to be under their jurisdiction. The scope of their jurisdiction and the boundaries of their lands were coterminus. Any part of that territory which had not passed from their ownership by existing valid grants were and remained public lands of the respective States."

Certain comments have been made in these hearings which would imply that, now that the Supreme Court has spoken, California—and, by the same token, other States—can no longer contend that they have any proprietary right in their submerged lands beneath coastal waters. Pennsylvania, for its part, cannot accept any such implication. By all the laws of logic and of the principles underlying judicial decisions, we say that it is open to question whether the Supreme Court has decided any question of ownership.

The Court in the California case did not decide that the Federal Government had any proprietary right in the property in question (that is, the submerged lands and the resources therein), but very clearly refused to decide such a thing even though the Government had expressly contended for such a decision. Consequently, since the Court made no final decision on the point at issue—the justiciable controversy on the basis of which it took jurisdiction—the Congress may well consider that the Court's declarations on the question of ownership do not constitute a decision on that question

Therefore, since the Court's statement regarding ownership of the lands was not an integral part of the real decision in the case and, according to the Court itself, the question of ownership was immaterial in the face of what it called capacities transcending those of a mere property owner—then the pronouncement (or rather, half-pronouncement) by the Court regarding ownership was merely dictum and not decision—even though cited in decisive terms.

In one way or another, several times during these hearings, the question has been asked whether the decision in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation* has not settled the issue regarding the transfer of sovereignty direct from the English Crown to the United States. The Treaty of Peace of 1783 was made with the Thirteen Original States, and not with the Continental Congress or a United States. In the light of the Articles of Confederation then existing, article I of the treaty constituted an acknowledgment by the Crown that each of the States specifically named was a free, sovereign, and independent State. The treaty was not made with the collective body which we now have under the Constitution and under the formal title "United States" for the simple reason that it did not exist. Moreover, any use of the expression "United States" in the treaty of 1783 could have reference only to the so-called United States as defined in the Articles of Confederation.

Assistance to Elementary Schools, H. R. 5502

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, H. R. 5502 was introduced to meet numerous objections that have been advanced to the various bills proposing financial assistance to our elementary schools. Since the introduction of H. R. 5502 I have received many favorable comments on its provisions and have noted some comment in the press throughout the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks I include one of the most comprehensive analyses that has come to my attention. This appeared on March 11, 1948, as a letter to the editor of the Minnetonka Herald, Wayzata, Minn., and the Deephaven Argus from Mrs. Helen Rusten, one of the outstanding leaders in my district. Her observations on public questions uniformly reflect thorough study and sound judgment. She states in her letter that her observations are based on the newspaper report of the bill. As to this, I wish to say that she has accurately judged every provision of the bill she commented on and the historical background she cites in support of the proposal is also accurate and includes many of the factors that motivated my proposing this measure to assist all the elementary schools of our Nation.

To the EDITOR:

Your editorial of February 28, regarding Mr. MACKINNON'S Federal-aid-to-education bill, ignores certain pertinent facts about the needs of education and the role of the Federal Government in regard to it.

Federal aid to education is not new. Before the Constitution was drawn up, the Ordinance of 1785 gave support to elementary and secondary schools. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which stated schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged, provided for aid to education through land grants. George Washington, in his first message to Congress, stressed the importance of education, and indicated that the Congress should be concerned with its promotion. He later recommended the establishment of a National University. Thomas Jefferson renewed this recommendation when he became President. Since no mention of it was made in the Constitution, control of education is vested in the States, where it rightfully belongs.

The Federal Government, however, has continued through the years its support of education in various ways. Since 1917 we have had Federal aid for agricultural and vocational training. These programs have been highly effective in the high schools of our State, and could not have been carried on without Federal aid. The Permanent School Fund in Minnesota which was derived from Federal land grants, now contains about $120,000,000. Last year the income from this fund provided $11 for each pupil in the State.

During the depression years the National Government set up the NYA program. This was strongly opposed by educators since it completely bypassed the States and had direct Federal control.

There are many reasons why Federal support of education, properly channeled through the States, is necessary.

1. We have a national economy, not a State economy. Many large corporations that pay their Federal taxes in one State have made their profits in another. Consequently the Federal Government would not necessarily be taking from the efficient State and giving to the inefficient ones.

2. The Federal Government has preempted most of the taxing power. About 80 percent of the country's tax dollar now goes to Washington. If schools are to meet even minimum standards some of this money will have to be returned to the States.

Few realize the seriousness of our educational problems today. Unfortunately, it is not Mr. MACKINNON'S Minneapolis constituents that are "educationally ill," as your article stated, but the entire country.

In our secondary schools 1 teacher in 10 is teaching on a substandard certificate. The ratio is 1 to 7 in the elementary schools.

It is estimated that in the next 5 years approximately 600,000 more teachers than the normal supply will be needed, when the normal retirement rate, the increased enrollment rate, and the replacement of those teaching on emergency certificates is taken into consideration. However, in 1947 only 2,908 students were graduated from 4-year elementary courses in 19 States, which represents about 36 percent of the colleges of the country. This shows the great discrepancy between the supply and the demand.

All indications point to the fact that the situation will become worse, especially in elementary schools, under existing conditions. Real incomes of teachers today are less than in 1939, building programs are at least 10 years behind schedule, to mention a few of the problems.

I am unable to definitely comment on Mr. MACKINNON'S proposals since copies of the bill are not yet obtainable. However, from the brief report in the Minneapolis Tribune, I believe it may have real merit and obviously it is a fresh approach to an old problem. Mr. MACKINNON appears to recognize the need of financial aid in this crisis, as well as the dangers of Federal control and the necessity of safeguarding against it. He therefore has worked out a plan whereby there would be necessary only a very minimum of accounting to the Federal Government.

HELEN RUSTEN.

Study Comparisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have included an editorial which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., on Thursday morning, December 4, 1947, in which tribute was paid to the work of J. Frederick Richardson, coordinator of information of the House of Representatives.

The reputation of this great newspaper is known throughout the Nation. Its editor was so impressed with the comparisons made by Mr. Richardson of the benefits accrued to individuals under our American system of government with those obtainable in communistic and Fascist states that he not only carried his analysis in the news section of the paper, but referred to the value of that work prominently on the editorial page. Likewise, a reporter asked two dozen and more people from very walk of life their reaction to these studies. He gave a generous amount of space in recording the thoughts of the people interviewed.

The wide circulation of this newspaper in the Midsouth brought this splendid comparison to hundreds of thousands of people. Later, one of the associate editors of the Commercial Appeal used this material at Columbia University in discussing Americanism before selected editors throughout the United States.

This is truly Americanism in action. I am glad that a representative of the House of Representatives should have been able to so wisely and so well serve a great newspaper in giving this information to so many in such a splendid way.

The editorial is herewith reproduced:

STUDY COMPARISONS

Elsewhere in this edition of the Commercial Appeal there is published a second comparison of benefits accruing to individuals under the American system of government with the few obtainable in Communist and Fascist states. The first appeared yesterday. Publication has been made in conformity with the Commercial Appeal's belief that only an enlightened and awakened America can equip itself adequately to meet the threat of Communist aggression.

The comparisons were prepared by J. Frederick Richardson, Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives. It is his duty to provide House Members with such factual information as will better enable them to meet legislative responsibilities. The country used by Mr. Richardson as an example of that in which conditions under communism prevail is Russia. The comparisons were published in a recent edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and are so informative that it is the Commercial Appeal's hope that every reader will not only study them but save them for future reference.

In a note accompanying his comparisons, Mr. Richardson pointed out:

"The national conscience, under free government of laws, is the composite conscience of all its individual citizens. It operates through the process of proposal, disagreement, discussion, and compromise.

"Under a centralized government by men there is no national conscience—only the will of those in control of the state.

"A philosopher of the seventeenth century defined the function of government perfectly when he wrote:

" 'The last end of the state is not to dominate men, nor to restrain them by fear; rather it is so to free each man from fear that he may live and act with full security and without injury to himself or his neighbor.

" 'The end of the state, I repeat, is not to make rational beings into brute beasts and machines. It is to enable their bodies and their minds to function safely. It is to lead men to live by, and to exercise a free reason that they may not waste their strength in hatred, anger and guile, nor act unfairly toward one another. Thus the end of the state is really liberty.' "

The end of the state—liberty—is attained under the American form of government to a degree infinitely greater than under any other form of government enjoyed by or attained by man.

It is utterly inconceivable that any American would want to exchange his form of government for the brutal and repressive governments of either communism or fascism. Tragically enough, too many are working in behalf of such a change, and they are the most dangerous of all our enemies.

The Commercial Appeal, does not believe that the House of Representatives could make a greater immediate contribution to American security than by making possible the widespread circulation of the Richardson comparisons. It should authorize the Public Printer to reproduce them in such quantities as will enable every House Member to distribute them to the schools and civic organizations of his or her constituency.

An understanding and knowing America cannot go wrong, nor can it ever be defeated.

Camp Haan, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the department executive committee of the American Legion, department of California, has just adopted a resolution in which it is urged that Camp Haan, Calif., be converted to a national cemetery for the purpose of furnishing additional grave space for our honored dead.

I am pleased to present the resolution herewith for the information of all Members of Congress:

NEW NATIONAL CEMETERY

Whereas space for the burial of veterans in national cemeteries in California is almost filled; and

Whereas Camp Haan, near March Field, has been declared surplus and is being dismantled; and

Whereas Camp Haan has many miles of paved highways, a good, dependable water supply, piped to all parts of the camp, complete and suitable fences already installed, and many other improvements, all of which are Government property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress be memorialized to devote the facilities and a suitable area of Camp Haan to the purposes of a national cemetery for our honored dead; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the California Members of Congress and to the press.

Adopted by the American Legion, department of California, in executive committee meeting assembled, February 21–22, 1948, San Diego, Calif.

You and Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the March 15, 1948, issue of Forbes, the magazine of business, contains an article which I prepared on the subject of the relations between the businessman and the Congressman, particularly in this election year.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU AND YOUR CONGRESSMAN

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

This year will be a memorable one for every American businessman—and for every Congressman. Four hundred and thirty-five Representatives and 32 Senators—men and women whose actions vitally affect business—will be up for election in November, as will the next occupant of the White House.

The congressional agenda is jammed full of legislation impacting business: Tax legislation, labor, social security, etc. It is vital, therefore, now more than ever, that you as a businessman take a good look at your Congress and your Congressmen, and that you keep looking at them as often and continuously as opportunity permits.

Businessmen generally tend to be too lethargic about their representatives. But never forget that it's up to you, as a businessman, to fight to keep in Congress men who are not inimical to business.

Too many businessmen are not sufficiently concerned, actively concerned, about their Congress. And yet, unless they wake up and stir themselves, they run the risk of seeing our cherished free-enterprise system go by the board.

There's an old saying that "if you don't make Congress your own business, soon you may not have a business of your own."

You can be sure that antibusiness forces are watching your Congressmen and peppering them with all sorts of propaganda and pressure. You can be sure that the men who do not believe in the free system of private enterprise and initiative are seeking to influence, not only the outcome of legislation which will be up before this session, but to influence the polls in November in the choice of Representatives, Senators, and President.

For one thing, much of the Nation's labor leadership is out to repeal the so-called slave-labor law, which is actually a law designed to set aright the balance in the industrial picture, to place labor, management, and the public on an equal plane, and assure a fair break for all. This law is the No. 1 target of these labor leaders.

It will take the united strength of enlightened businessmen, of agriculture, of the honest rank-and-file of labor, and of the public to antidote the poison spread by the anti-free-enterprise forces if we are to preserve this labor law, refine it and perfect it, as well as to pass other legislation vital to our American system.

Here, then, are the fronts on which you, as a businessman, can be in contact with your Representative and Senators:

1. When you read your newspapers, your magazines, and listen to your radio, it's up to you to be alert to news of Congress and, in particular, of your two United States Senators and your Representative. There's no more excuse for a businessman not knowing the names, characters, and activities of his legislators than for his not knowing the names of his own subordinates or associates, no one of whom has more effect on his welfare than his legislators in Washington.

2. In your local chamber of commerce, board of trade, fraternal organization, American Legion post, or other group, it's up to you to see that the resolutions which are passed, by which you convey the organization's views to Washington, are sound, sensible, well-timed, and logical, in the American spirit and for the benefit of the American way. Often these organizations may ask to have your Congressman deliver an address. On these occasions particularly it is your duty and your right to size up your Congressman, to feel out how able a servant he is for free enterprise, and to impact him with your personal views, based on your experience and considered judgment.

3. Another front on which you are in contact with your Congressman is when you contact him directly to present your judgments on specific legislation. Here you should have standards of businesslike brevity, logic, courtesy, accuracy in specifying the name and number of legislation, and

willingness to understand your Congressman's point of view as well as merely to express your own.

CONGRESSMAN LAST RESORT

4. Before writing your Congressman for assistance in matters dealing with Government agencies, you should, wherever possible, exhaust all channels by which you can secure satisfaction from the agency by yourself. Many times a businessman only prejudices his case by needlessly calling on his Congressman first, attempting to use influence to secure some decision even before the agency has had any preliminary dealing with the businessman. Your Congressman will be glad to help you where you feel you have been done an injustice, or when you have not been given satisfaction by the agency, but his powers are limited basically by the fact that he serves in one branch of Government while the executive branch is entirely separate and distinct.

5. You are in contact with your Congressman most often through your own thinking processes. This is the universal front. It consists of your day-to-day judgments as you read your papers, as you read your Congressman's speeches, as you write letters to him on legislation or on your business affairs.

Now, how can you appraise whether your Congressman deserves reelection? Also, how can you size up potential candidates who have never served in Congress before? Here are some suggested guides: Some are more important than others. But when you find the answers to these questions, when you weigh the different standards according to their importance, you will have a far more complete picture of your Congressman than the average voter has. And you'll be better able to ensure the prosperity of your business and of all American business.

1. Is your Congressman, or the potential candidate, honest, sincere, of unimpeachable integrity, untainted with any past scandal, with an unmarred record of serving his community, his State or Nation?

2. Is he a sincere advocate of free enterprise, or does he, for example, give tell-tale clues as to his real feelings in opposition to our way of life? Does he talk continuously about big business, monopoly capital, business profiteers, etc., attempting to smear men of enterprise?

3. Does he handle his correspondence with the public speedily, efficiently, satisfactorily?

4. Does he consult with you, with other businessmen and with the public, either by letters, phone calls or, preferably, by visits back home as often as possible, seeking sincerely to get the benefit of the public's point of view?

5. Is he a real leader and molder of both public and congressional opinion, or is he content to be a mere follower?

6. Is he concerned with the needs of the America of tomorrow, of future generations yet unborn, rather than being preoccupied with merely satisfying the needs and demands of today?

7. Does he display independence in judgment and action, or merely follow like a Charlie McCarthy, the dictates of this or that pressure group back home? In this independence, does he show himself most concerned with the welfare of all the people, rather than the benefit of this or that special interest group?

8. Does he have the necessary parliamentary skills, the tact, the charm, the poise, with which to achieve his and your objectives and the objectives of the American people?

9. Does he introduce constructive legislation and follow through on it with all his ability and resources?

10. Is he diligent in attending committee meetings, in working on committee reports, in helping to write party or committee policy statements that are based on extensive and detailed study?

These are some of the questions which you as businessmen might well ask about your Representative and two Senators.

Understanding of your Congressman requires knowledge of your Congressman, which in turn requires patient study. It may be a long and tedious process, but if you pursue it diligently it will pay dividends.

Restore Federal Meat-Inspection Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last year I opposed the provision in the agriculture appropriation bill which, in my opinion, destroys the independence of the Federal meat-inspection program.

In addition to placing a financial burden on the meat packers which they must pass on to the consumer, the fee system imposed by Congress will bring about conditions which are well described in an editorial which was recently published in the Butcher Workman, official organ of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America.

Under leave to do so, I include the editorial with my remarks:

A GERM-LADEN KNIFE

A few days before the adjournment of the most reactionary Congress this Nation had ever assembled in its legislative halls, a germ-laden knife was plunged into the back of every consumer of meat products in the United States. The appropriation for United States Government meat inspection, which has safeguarded the health of the American people for the past 41 years, was slashed approximately $11,000,000.

Shortly after the turn of the present century, the then young novelist, Upton Sinclair, overnight sprang into national prominence when his first successful book, The Jungle, was published. Sinclair informed an unsuspecting world of the filthy conditions under which livestock was slaughtered and processed by American meat packers. Tubercular hogs and cattle as well as livestock affected with many other human communicable diseases were slaughtered and sent through avenues of distribution for human consumption.

Even hundreds of soldiers who fought in the Spanish-American War were poisoned and died of the ptomaine and filth these packers stuffed into tin cans and sold to the Government as food for men who were fighting and dying in the Philippines.

Out of it all came the Federal Meat Inspection law, and with it came the most sanitary and modern meat packing plants in the world.

The cost of administering Federal Meat Inspection has always been and always should be borne by the United States Government. The gentlemen who graced the July-adjourned national Congress can be compared in many respects with cheaters and chiselers. Many of them had pet bills which were lagging in the committees to which they were assigned. They wanted money for soil conservation, school lunches, etc.

When it seemed impossible for them to secure these appropriations, they manipulate through a putrid horse-trading policy to divert some of the appropriations for Federal meat inspection to their own pet legislative schemes; and in this we repeat again, a germ-laden knife was driven into the back of every consumer of meat products in the United States.

The millions of dollars which were slashed from the Federal meat inspection appropriations went for soil conservation and school lunches. At the same time, this additional cost of Federal meat inspection was saddled upon the backs of the meat packers themselves which is an abominable betrayal of everything making for cleanliness in an industry that must have, above all other things, white sanitation.

While representatives of the American Meat Institute appeared before the congressional committee in opposition to the contemplated slash in Federal meat inspection funds, nevertheless, it is interesting to note that Congressman DIRKSEN, who is supposed to be close to the meat-packing industry, was particularly concerned in accomplishing the diversion of these white funds.

If the Federal Government will not continue to pay the full freight of Federal meat inspection, then the law might just as well be repealed because filth and slime and disease will again creep into the products of the great meat-packing industry.

The Federal meat inspector must always be an independent Federal officer. He must never be compelled to depend upon the owner of the plant to which he has been assigned to pay his salary. He must never be compelled to court the good will of packing-plant owners to keep his job. He must always remain comparable to an FBI agent in Federal meat inspection.

If meat packers must or are even permitted to pay for their own inspection, then the independence of these Federal men of honor is lost. The inspector, under the disease-laden congressional arrangement, will become nothing more than an employee of the packers. Such an arrangement is unthinkable and has the possibility of leading again to filth and slime and possible death to hundreds of innocent people because of insanitation.

To compel meat packers to pay for their own inspection, forgetting all else, will put out of business many small packers. The owner of one concern advised us that under the new arrangement, his inspection cost for the next year will exceed $12,500.

It is paradoxical that a good portion of the slashed Federal Inspection appropriations will go toward lunch funds: and it is within the realm of reasonable thinking that with the school lunches will also go the germs of tuberculosis and many other microbic murders.

Every meat packer throughout the Nation, large and small, and every decent-thinking citizen in the United States should protest that the most modern and sanitary meat packing plants throughout the world must be preserved. They cannot be preserved with private or semiprivate inspection.

The germ-laden knife that was driven into the back of the meat-consuming public, if not remedied immediately when Congress is again called into session, may prove in reality to be the first step back to the jungle.

Southern Governors' Civil Rights Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the Southern Governors' Con-

ference assembled in Washington and adopted a most momentous resolution which is calculated to make history, not only in the Democratic Party, but in the Nation. It has far-reaching implications.

For the past several decades the South and the Democratic Party have been synonymous in the political affairs of the Nation. Because the South was always regarded as solidly Democratic there has been an ever-growing tendency for the party leaders to take it for granted. Its will, its wishes, its rights, have therefore not been considered, notwithstanding the fact that that beautiful section of our Nation known as the Southland, for many years furnished the leadership, not only of the Democratic Party, but of the Nation, and has possibly contributed more than any other section of the country to the upbuilding and maintenance of the Democratic principles of Government in these United States. Because of the fact that she could be taken for granted during these past years, she has received practically no recognition in the national party affairs. In fact, it might well be said, as I have said before, that about the only representation the South got in national affairs and in the Democratic Party, was that which was guaranteed to it by the Constitution of the United States, namely, representation in the Congress itself.

And while it is true that in Democratic administrations the South has furnished some leadership in national affairs, that was by reason of that constitutional guaranty of representation which it had in the Congress. In other words, that leadership came from the fact that the South has kept its representatives in the Congress long enough for them to have sufficient seniority to occupy positions of leadership as committee chairmen.

Now the South has again awakened. President Truman and his advisers in the party, following the line of taking the South for granted, have attempted to ram the so-called civil-rights program down our collective throats. Neither a Democratic, nor for that matter a Republican President, has ever heretofore made such vicious recommendations to the Congress, ignoring the sovereignty of not only the South, but all other States of the Union.

It must be apparent to all concerned from this resolution that the South is determined in its efforts that this situation shall not continue. This resolution following as it does a resolution with somewhat similar implications adopted by 76 Members of the House branch of the Congress from the South several weeks ago, and the more recent organization of 21 Members of the Senate side of the Congress, is indicative of the fact that the South has taken its stand firmly on this matter of States' rights.

The text of the resolution adopted by the conference of southern governors Saturday follows:

Resolved by the Conference of Southern Governors in meeting assembled in Washington this 13th day of March 1948:

1. That we go on record as repudiating the present national leadership of the Democratic Party in sponsoring the so-called civil-rights program;

2. That we recommend to the people of the Southern States that they fight to the last ditch to prevent the nomination of any candidate for President or Vice President who advocates such invasions of State sovereignty as those proposed in the said program; and we pledge our influence in our respective States to the objectives that the delegates to the national convention will support and fight for a positive declaration for States' rights in the party platform and will support only candidates for President and Vice President who entertain similar views;

3. That we recommend to the people of the Southern States that if the National Democratic Party should nominate any candidate who advocates such invasions of State sovereignty as those proposed in the said program, they shall see to it that the Electoral College votes of their States are not cast for such nominees; and we pledge our influence in our respective States to this end.

POLITICAL ACTION ADVISED

Resolved further, That in order to carry out the foregoing recommendations, we urge that the people of the respective Southern States, with due regard to the time available and the local circumstances, take all effective political action possible, which may include some or all of the following:

(a) The adoption and transmission to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee of a resolution by the State conventions or the authorized body of the State Democratic Party expressing the opposition of the party in the State to the usurpation and infringement of the sovereignty of the States of the Union required by the enactment of any portion of the so-called civil-rights program; an outright declaration that the party within the State will not support the candidacy of any candidate for the Democratic nomination for President or Vice President who is in sympathy with the same; a clear statement of their belief that the principles involved are above and beyond personalities and parties and cannot be surrendered under any circumstances; and their determination to do everything possible to see that the electoral vote of the State shall not be cast for candidates who do not have the same belief.

(b) The instruction by the respective State conventions of their delegates to the national convention to propose and work for the adoption of a plank in the national party platform unholding the sovereignty of the several States of the Union, and opposing the enactment of such invasions of that sovereignty as the proposed FECP law, the proposed antilynching law, the proposed antipoll tax law, and Federal laws interfering with State and local laws relating to the separation of the races, and any other laws violating State sovereignty.

WANT TWO-THIRDS RULE RESTORED

(c) The instruction by the respective State conventions of their delegates to the national convention to propose and work for the restoration of the two-thirds rule.

(d) That the Democratic State organizations which send delegates to the National Democratic Convention do so with advance notice in writing to the national convention, given before the delegates take any part therein, containing the terms and reservations prescribed by the State convention upon which the said delegates shall participate in the national convention.

(e) The deferring by State conventions of the nomination of their electors for President and Vice President until after the holding of the national convention.

(f) The adoption of a resolution by the respective State conventions pledging their electors to vote only for candidates in the electoral college not in sympathy with such violations of in the sovereignty of the States of the Union as those required by the so-called civil-rights program.

(g) The adoption by the respective State conventions of a resolution providing that the electors for President and Vice President shall be pledged to cast their electoral ballots in the electoral college as requested to do by the party's State convention of State executive committee.

CAUCUS OF ELECTORS URGED

(h) A caucus of the Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of the Southern States so that they can take concerted action in the electoral college if necessary.

(i) The holding of the party leaders in the Southern States of conferences for the purpose of developing and carrying out direct, positive, effective, and aggressive joint action, in order that the political strength of the South will be exerted to the fullest in national party councils and in the national convention.

Resolved further, That the State conventions take action to provide that the Democratic Party in the respective States shall continue to function as such on all other levels, including the election of local, county, and State officials, and United States Senators and Congressmen, without regard to the action which may be taken in the State in reference to the election of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors.

Resolved further, That we recognize and commend the efforts of our Senators and Representatives in the National Congress who have fought, and are engaged in fighting, the so-called civil-rights program, and we urge them to carry on their fight to the end, with the assurance that our people are standing firmly and irrevocably behind them.

Election Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a letter I have recently received outlining the reasons why the electoral college system should be changed.

Some weeks ago, as the author of two of the pending resolutions for changing our obsolete electoral college system, I wrote to a select group of political scientists asking each one to give me his best ideas on this important and timely subject. One of the most interesting replies I have received is from Dr. Gritz Morstein-Marx, author of the President and His Staff Services, the most authoritative study yet made of the operation of the Presidential office.

I should like to call particular attention to the following quotation from his very able letter:

One of the principal effects of the electoral college is to concentrate the campaign efforts of our great political parties on particular geographic areas of pivotal significance and to deflect their attention from other much larger areas. In some of these other areas, the domination of one party is thus virtually unchallenged and unchallengeable. Such party monopoly breeds inertia and irresponsibility. The virtues of

free competition and the distrust of monopoly are deeply ingrained in our economic thinking. There is neither merit nor consistency in the reversal of our attitudes with respect to the political consequences of the electoral college.

I do not mean to imply that the institution of the electoral college is the sole foundation of party monopoly. Other factors enter the picture, too. But within the range of corrective action, everything should be done to secure for our Nation conditions conducive to vigorous political competition so that our representative system will continue to gain in health and vigor.

The letter on the electoral college system from Dr. Fritz Morstein-Marx follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1948.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: In response to your request of January 26, I shall attempt briefly to state my views on the particular points which you have put before various political scientists. For your convenience I shall group my comments in the form of answers to the questions you have formulated, taking up each question in the order in which it is listed in your letter. I probably need not say that my remarks, in harmony with your request, reflect only my own opinions and therefore in no way indicate an official position on the part of the agency I have the privilege of serving at this time.

1. Has the present electoral college system served to carry out the purposes envisioned by the framers of our Constitution?

The small assembly of wise and audacious men who framed our Constitution was not in complete agreement on all of the features of the political system they bestowed upon posterity. It is hence difficult to speak with assurance of their motives as a body. No definitive study has been made to show exactly how they expected the electoral college to operate, and how far they were united in their expectations. Such a study would have to seek its basis in a great variety of materials—records of proceedings, diary entries, personal notes, and private correspondence. There is a good deal of justification, however, for assuming that a majority of the founding fathers, in endorsing the idea of the electoral college, disclosed certain misgivings they entertained about demagogic excesses of untrammeled popular choice. The drift of political developments in the United States, in subsequent generations, has moved consistently away from this premise. In short, the assumptions about the wisdom of indirect election as a safegard of prudence and a check on passion have neither been borne out as valid nor played a practical role in the evolution of our political life.

2. Would you regard the continuation of the present electoral college system as desirable or undesirable? In either case, please specify the reasons.

The institution of the electoral college, as a recent student of the subject put it, "has been under criticism almost ever since it was first put into operation."[1] A growing body of informed opinion supports the view that "the abolition of the useless electoral college is a constitutional reform long overdue,"[2] to quote another student. Indeed, the electoral college has not only been declared superfluous but also been assailed as a source of potentially dangerous consequences. In the words of one writer on the electoral college, "this capacity for evil is inherent in its make-up."[3] Similar judgments have been expressed by thoughtful participants in the political process. Recently, for instance, Representative CELLER, of New York spoke of the electoral college as "unnecessary, awkard, mischief-breeding."[4] Legislative discussion of constitutional remedies goes back far into the past. Nevertheless, though criticism of the present system has been continuously mounting, proposals for remedial action by Congress have always come to naught in the face of lingering objections, mostly addressed to specific features of these sometimes unduly ambitious projects.[5]

As the illuminating testimony recently offered before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary demonstrates, many reasons may be cited to substantiate the conclusion that the electoral college in its present form is undesirable. I am in agreement with this conclusion. Without intending to distract from the persuasiveness of other reasons, I here prefer to base my own position solely on one reason which I regard as primary and paramount. This reason may be stated as the disservice rendered our system of government by the encouragement the electoral college gives to unhealthful restraint of free political competition. One of the principal effects of the electoral college is to concentrate the campaign efforts of our great political parties on particular geographic areas of pivotal significance and to deflect their attention from other much larger areas. In some of these other areas, the domination of one party is thus virtually unchallenged and unchallengeable. Such party monopoly breeds inertia and irresponsibility. The virtues of free competition and the distrust of monopoly are deeply ingrained in our economic thinking. There is neither merit nor consistency in the reversal of our attitudes with respect to the political consequences of the electoral college.

I do not mean to imply that the institution of the electoral college is the sole foundation of party monopoly. Other factors enter the picture, too. But within the range of corrective action, everything should be done to secure for our Nation conditions conducive to vigorous political competition so that our representative system will continue to gain in health and vigor.[6]

3. What would be the effects of a new system which more adequately reflected the popular vote?

Again, to review all the prospective effects of a revised system would be a large undertaking. To my way of thinking, the overwhelming factor would be a positive one—the gain in political invigoration of American party government.

4. Of the various alternatives for changing the system (you will find the text of five alternative proposals on pages 1 to 6 of the enclosed Judiciary Subcommittee hearings), which would you prefer, and why?

The various alternatives currently under consideration are not too far apart, except for the one embodied in proposed House Joint Resolution No. 106. This last alternative, which in effect appears to treat each State as one undivided plural vote, I would not be able to endorse, on the grounds outlined earlier. The difference between the requirement of a majority and the requirement of a plurality for election many reduce itself to the tactical consideration of greater chances for legislative backing. Generally speaking, and aside from such tactical considerations, I would place a premium on a system that is self-enforceable as far as possible, and correspondingly reduces the need for ultimate electoral determinations on the part of Congress.

5. What interests or institutions might be injured, or might regard themselves as being injured, by a change in the system?

As the testimony offered before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary makes plain, all proponents of reform are fully alive to the array of possible sources of antagonism. I see no need for amplifying the scope of their conjecture. There is only one point I should like to stress specifically. It has sometimes been contended that a change in the method of Presidential election so as to express more accurately the popular vote might prove a burden on our two-party system by causing a proliferation of minor parties. This contention, while seemingly plausible, has never been proved, nor has it been scrutinized closely enough to warrant its acceptance. The cohesive strength of our two major parties is not essentially dependent on the present mechanics of the electoral college. It is largely dependent on the vitality arising within each major party. Conversely, the growth of minor parties is not principally affected by purely electoral arrangements.

---

[1] Frank P. Huddle, the Electoral College, Editorial Research Reports, vol. II, No. 6 (Aug. 18, 1944), p. 99.

[2] Joseph E. Kallenbach, Recent Proposals To Reform the Electoral College System, American Political Science Review, vol. 30 October 1936), p. 928.

[3] Charles Sumner Lobingier, Obsolete Features of Our Federal Constitution, S. Doc. No. 100, 73d Cong., 2d sess., presented by Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska, January 4, 1934, p. 19.

[4] Extension of Remarks of Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, June 15, 1944, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, vol. 90, p. A3036.

[5] For an indication of the difference of opinion on an earlier resolution pressed in the Senate by the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, see the Senate debate of May 16, 1934, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 78, pp. 8935 ff. For a later statement of the pros and cons, see Congressional Digest, vol. 20, No. 3 (March 1944), pp. 67 ff., and vol. 23, Nos. 6–7 (June–July 1944), pp. 168 ff. A recent review of the subject is to be found in Joseph Jackson, Survey of the Electoral College in the Political System of the United States, S. Doc. No. 97, 79th Cong., 1st sess., presented by Senator CARL A. HATCH, of New Mexico, November 6, 1945.

[6] It may be pointed out in passing that State legislation, on the whole, has left undefined the responsibility of electors to cast their ballot for the candidates of their own political party. A recent study shows that only two States, California and Oregon, have enacted legislation imposing a duty upon electors to vote for the candidates of the political party which they represent. Only Oregon exacts from an elector a pledge that he vote for his party's nominees for President and Vice President. United States Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, State Law Index, Nomination and Election of Presidential Electors Together with such Instructions as are Imposed upon them by State Laws (Aug. 15, 1944), page 22. What is more important, the electoral college at certain times apparently tends to raise the odds against which one or the other major party has to work in order to capture the presidency. A careful student has reported that, "with the political line-up as it had developed up to 1936, and not allowing for any shifts since then in the relation of the national to State votes, the two-party popular vote would have had to be between 52 and 53 percent Democratic to bring enough States into the Democratic electoral column for the Democratic candidate to win. This is essentially the relation between the popular and the electoral vote that prevailed when Woodrow Wilson was elected for a second term in 1916 by a two-party popular vote of 52 percent and an electoral vote of 277. Louis H. Bean, Ballot Behavior: A Study of Presidential Elections, Public Affairs Press (Washington, 1946), page 41. The disadvantage of one major party here reported for a particular period could turn into a corresponding disadvantage for the other major party in a different period.

In brief, I consider it extremely unlikely that a revision of the present electoral college along the lines here envisaged will bring forth, to any politically hazardous degree, a sprouting of minor parties sapping the strength from our two-party system.

You are free to use these notes as you see fit.

Sincerely yours,

FRITZ MORSTEIN MARX.

Forest Republican Endorses Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Forest Republican of Tionesta, Pa., ably edited by Rear Adm. James Kepler Davis, retired, endorses the European recovery program in an editorial in the issue of March 11. The editorial follows:

There are honest differences of opinion as to the workability of the Marshall plan often referred to in Congress as the European recovery program.

Henry Hazlett's challenging book, Will Dollars Save the World, briefed in the January Reader's Digest, leans heavily on the thesis that Europe's ills will not be cured by dollars and by a large-scale capital modernization program supported by the United States. Rather, contends Hazlett, the European nations should abandon the artificial economic controls that have grown up since 1914, lower tariffs, push currency reforms and go to work.

These views are reflected in varying degrees in Congress, particularly in the House and among those standing close to Senator TAFT. We are also impressed that our good neighbor the Oil City Derrick stands vigorously for a go slowly policy for European aid.

Others advocate carrying out at least as much of the Marshall plan as the $5,300,000,000 proposed by Senator VANDENBERG for the first year. Among supporters for this course are many Senators close to Senator VANDENBERG, Governor Dewey, Harold Stassen, the conservative Saturday Evening Post, and our own tough-minded and hard-hitting Governor Duff.

The problem is so vastly complex and depends upon so much information that could never be available to the individual, that it is believed to be a hopeless task for one not especially trained in geopolitics to soundly evaluate the merits of the plan. It is not surprising that there appears to exist honest differences of opinion among distinguished individuals and publications.

However, we believe that there is one piece of information which is firmly established, and perhaps from this one bit of international intelligence can be deduced a sound course of action for the individual to take regardless of the unfathomable intricacies of the main problem.

Joe Stalin and his "politico bureau" pals clearly do not want the Marshall plan to succeed. They are now engaged in an all-out offensive to check and stifle the plan and to nullify any other course which holds forth promise for European recovery.

If the Soviet hierarchy believed that the Marshall plan would ultimately bring disaster to the United States surely they would not so oppose it.

Therefore, the Forest Republican urges full support for the Marshall plan free from defeatist amendments and clear of any crippling reduction of funds appropriated to carry it on.

Letter to President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter sent to President Truman in respect to his attitude in civil rights.

[Constantine Consistory No. 25, A. A. S. R. F. M., N. M. J., U. S. A., Inc. (Prince Hall affiliation), Valley of Indianapolis, Orient of Indiana]

MARCH 2, 1948.

His Excellency the Honorable
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of America,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Constantine Consistory No. 25, A. A. S. R. F. M., N. M. J., U. S. A., Inc. (Prince Hall affiliation) deeply appreciate your official actions in favor of full civil rights to all citizens of the United States of America. The execution of your program will be the greatest advancement of democracy in this country since the emancipation of slaves and bestowing the right to vote upon women. Such an expansion of the application of the principles of equality will make it impossible for communism or any other un-American ideals of government to get a foothold in our great country.

We are proud of the firm, courageous, and intelligent way you face and combat the foes of this righteous movement. The time will come when the significance of your actions will be understood more completely and appreciated more greatly than it is today.

You are right. The foes of your program are wrong. You demonstrate greatness. They demonstrate smallness. You are not afraid for all men to be free. They are. You have faith in all humanity. They don't. You know that if democracy continues to hesitate, to doubt the righteousness and wisdom of applying itself to all people right now, it not only stultifies itself before the whole world but the security of government of the people, by the people, and for the people is greatly threatened at the most inopportune time in all history.

God bless you in your good work. We believe that He will keep you steadfast and crown your civil-rights program with victory.

As an additional token of our appreciation enclosed herewith is an invitation extended to you to attend our annual grande affaire on March 6, 1948. Also a program.

Very respectfully yours,

ILL. CLARENCE C. SMITH,
Commander in Chief.

Poland, Outpost of Western Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the European recovery program is receiving close consideration both in the Senate and the House, it is well for our Members to be informed about countries which have already been subjugated by the Government at Moscow. I wish to call to your attention an address delivered by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, a noted author and foreign correspondent, which he delivered over radio station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., as the guest of the Polish American Congress, Inc., western Massachusetts branch. The subject of his remarks is Poland, Outpost of Western Culture.

POLAND, OUTPOST OF WESTERN CULTURE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Poland is located in eastern Europe. But it belongs to the west by virtue of religion, culture, and tradition. Its place is not behind any Soviet iron curtain. For it has nothing in common with Russian absolutism, whether that absolutism is expressed in the despotism of the czars or in Stalin's tyranny. Its ideals are those of the American Revolution, for which two of its greatest sons, Kosciusko and Pulaski fought, for which the latter laid down his life.

It is Poland's tragedy today that it is represented in international affairs by men who have no right to speak for the Polish people, who are mere passive agents of the Kremlin. The voice of Oscar Lange and other representatives of the Communist-dominated Polish regime in the United Nations is not the voice of Poland, but a gramophone record of the voice of Stalin.

The formal revival of the Comintern, that international association of Communist parties, with its program of stirring up civil and class war and its implacable hatred of America, took place recently on Polish soil. But the majority of the Polish people, deeply patriotic and attached to their religious faith, abhor the very word "communism" so intensely that the Communist Party in Poland does not dare to sail under its true colors, but calls itself the Workers' Party. A tragic sequence of events delivered Poland bound hand and foot to the totalitarian east. But the hearts of the Polish people are with the freedom-loving west.

Poland's adherence to the Catholic faith tended to make it a cultural as well as a political outpost of western and Latin Europe against Greek Orthodox Russia and Mohammedan Turkey. It is interesting that as far back as the sixteenth century a leading Polish thinker and publicist, Piotr Skarga, pronounced a reasoned judgment against the absolutism which was characteristic of the Russian czars and Turkish sultans of the time. What Skarga said on this subject was good liberal doctrine for much later times:

"Human reason provides the monarch and the kind with counsel and laws limiting and defining his power, and helping his judgment, that he may not err, and become a wicked tyrant. We praise not such a monarchy as is found among the Turks, the Tartars, and the Muscovites, which has a lawless domination, but such a monarchy as is supported by just laws and wise counsel and has its power reduced and defined by righteous codes."

In this same sixteenth century, one of the most brilliant periods of Polish history, the knowledge of Latin was almost universal among the Polish educated classes. State documents, histories, even private letters, were composed in Latin. Poland was consequently familiar with the great prose writers and poets of Rome, and this strengthened its sense of association with Latin and western civilization.

Polish architecture, as well as Polish thought, reflects strong western influence. One can find in Polish cathedrals and palaces fine example of the Gothic style in the

churches of Cracow and Torun, of baroque architecture in Lvov and Wilno.

Poland more than once acted as a shield for western Europe against the threat of invasion from the east. The most conspicuous Polish feat of arms was the rescue of Vienna from the Turks by the timely action of the Polish warrior king, Jan Sobieski, in 1683. A spirited painting of this battle by a Polish artist hangs in the Vatican museum.

The Poles sometimes saved others. They could not save their national independence and the country, after the desperate resistance of Kosciusko and other patriots, was partitioned between Russia, Austria, and Prussia in the latter part of the nineteenth century. But the Poles never stopped fighting for their liberty. And their fight was always animated by those ideals of human liberty which are the peculiar characteristic of west European and North American civilization.

Kosciusko, a friend and correspondent of Jefferson and Lafayette, shared and practiced the humanitarian ideals of the American and French Revolutions. It was his belief that Poland's national resurrection could only be accomplished on a basis of full liberty and equality before the law. He emancipated the serfs on his estate long before serfdom was generally abolished in eastern Europe.

The limited autonomy which Poland had enjoyed under Alexander I was swept away by the stern autocrat, Nicholas I, after the great national revolt of 1830–31, when the Polish insurgent armies held the field for a long time against the greatly superior Russian forces. But Poland's cultural and spiritual ties with the west were strengthened after this defeat.

For many thousands of Poles emigrated, not only men who had taken part in the revolt but great poets like Mickiewicz, Krasinski and Slowacki and Poland's immortal musical genius, Frederic Chopin. He perhaps ranks with the astronomer Copernicus as one of Poland's two greatest contributions to world culture. When Chopin died his fellow-musician, the famous composer Robert Schumann said: "The soul of music has passed away from the world." And on another occasion Schumann spoke of Chopin's music, suffused with nationalist passion, as "cannon hidden beneath flowers" and suggested that if the Russian Tsar knew what an enemy threatened him, even in the simple melodies of the mazurkas, he would ban this music.

Chopin spoke in the universal language of music. Especially in his stately and brilliant polonaises and in his crashing revolutionary etude even foreigners who knew little of Polish history could feel the tragedy of Poland's national suppression and the stormy demand for resurgence and resurrection.

Poles in foreign lands, while remaining true to their national cause, often took part in the struggles for liberation of other peoples and based their faith in Poland's cause on universal ideals of liberty and justice. Pulaski gave his life in the American Revolution. One cannot feel that America's signature of the infamous Yalta agreement, which bartered away Poland's independence and territorial integrity was a worthy return to Pulaski's memory.

The great poet Adam-Mickiewicz once declared that a man's fatherland is where evil is to be resisted. He put his own principle into practice by taking part in the early Italian struggle for liberty and unity. He died as romantically as his fellow-poet Byron, trying to raise Polish recruits for the struggle against Russia at the time of the Crimean War. The Danish author Georg Brandes speaks of meeting Polish soldiers of fortune who had fought wherever there was a blow to be struck for freedom or against Russia.

Poland's ties with France became especially strong during this time when the national culture flourished in exile. America and Britain also became acquainted with the Polish struggle for liberty through Poles who emigrated to those countries. The western orientation of Poland's culture became more and more pronounced.

Liberation and the fulfillment of the ideal of a free and independent Polish Republic came at the end of the First World War. Disaster, subjugation, and a more brutal partition between Russia and Germany marked the beginning of the second great world conflict of our time.

Britain and France entered the Second World War ostensibly to defend Poland's freedom and territorial integrity. Both were supinely and callously sacrificed on the altar of appeasement and power politics at Yalta. For Poland the late war has been a defeat in victory. Its historic boundaries have been shifted in the crudest and most arbitrary fashion. Power is in the hands of men whose loyalty is to the Kremlin, not to the people of Poland.

Just as after 1830, but on a much larger scale, there is an uprooting and migration of Poles who will not live in their country until it becomes truly free. If there were tens of thousands of such refugees a hundred years ago, there are hundreds of thousands now.

There have been times in the past when the partition and subjugation of Poland seemed a permanent accomplished fact, backed as it was by the military might of the Russian, German, and Austrian Empires. But what must have seemed to many devout Poles a miracle occurred in 1918. A free Poland was reborn. This memory should afford hope and confidence in the dark days of the present, when Stalin's agents are able to rule Poland temporarily by the familiar Communist technique of mingled terrorism and propaganda. It is not easy to pierce behind the iron curtain to the true thoughts and feelings of the Polish people. But I believe there is eternal truth and validity in the words of the famous Polish patriot Mochnacki:

"When the foreigner's government is gentle, the Poles rise up because they can; when it is severe they rise up because they must. Nothing will accommodate them to the ruin of their fatherland, and moderation no more than cruelty."

Poland's sufferings and struggles have often brought expressions of eloquent sympathy from foreigners. One of the truest and most eloquent of these statements was voiced during the war by the British publicist F. A. Voight, who, with a foresight rare at that time, fought against the handing of Poland and Yugoslavia to Stalin on a silver platter:

"The questions are not, Shall Poland's eastern border be shifted westward? Shall she lose her eastern territories or, losing them, acquire western territories at the expense of Germany? The question is, Shall Poland exist?

"Beyond this there is another question. Shall Europe exist, the Europe we have known and hope to know again, the Europe for which the war is being fought, the Europe which alone gives the war any meaning, the Europe that is neither anarchy nor servitude, the Europe that is a balanced and integrated whole, the Europe that is so much more than a geographical expression, Europe the stronghold of the Greco-Roman and Christian heritage? That is the question."

That is the kind of Europe America is dedicated to help create under the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan. In that kind of Europe there will be an honored place for a free Poland, always the outpost of western culture and civilization in eastern Europe.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article, an editorial, and certain letters:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

CONGRESSMAN SEES ERRORS IN REPORT ON COSTS—KENNEDY CALLS STATEMENT BY MELVIN H. BAKER WHOLLY UNRELIABLE

WASHINGTON, March 13.—Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, today attacked as wholly unreliable last week's statement by Melvin H. Baker, chairman of the Construction Industry Information Committee, that private builders in 1947 provided new homes in proper proportion for families in every income group except the lowest tenth and the highest fifth.

Mr. KENNEDY said the major errors in the committee's statement arose from the use of Bureau of Labor Statistics data on construction costs.

"These costs, as I understand them, are simply based on the builder's running guess as to his cash outlay for construction alone. They include neither the cost of land, installation of utilities, nor such overhead costs as advertising and sales expense, nor profit. These items probably add $2,000 or $3,000 to the BLS figures in most cases on today's market."

The Massachusetts representative also asserted that a reasonable basis of the amount a family could afford to pay for a house was only twice their average income, not two and one-half times, as Mr. Baker had assumed.

He also attacked the use of national averages to reach conclusions on over-all housing needs, pointing out that in some parts of the country both building costs and incomes are relatively high and in others relatively low.

"A valid analysis of the housing market, broken down by price and income groups, can only be made on a local basis," Representative KENNEDY said. He cited facts from a recent study in Boston which concluded "with the least expensive of the average new small homes being built in the area for sale from $8,000 up, 23 percent of the families can afford new housing. This to say," he continued, "the cheapest homes now being produced by local builders hardly reach the richest quarter of the families in the Boston area. All the evidence I have seen from other localities would seem to indicate the Boston picture is typical.

"Only a relatively small number of new houses are priced at $8,000. There is also the question of homes for rent—today's most urgent need. Only 10 percent of the new houses in Boston are for rent.

"Mr. Baker's figures are so patently ridiculous they hardly need refutation. But the public and Congress should know that this indefensible document is a fair sample of the research currently employed by the real-estate and builders' lobby in a campaign that has only one purpose—sabotage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill or anything like it.

"Instead of hysterical tirades calling everyone who supports public housing a Communist, including Senator TAFT, they are now trying to prove what a wonderful job they are doing providing homes for everybody who needs one.

"If Mr. Baker's statistics are a fair indication of the integrity and intelligence of the newly formed Construction Industry Information Committee, then I frankly put more reliance on the emotional outbursts of Arthur Binns and Herbert U. Nelson, however, misguided.

"Such figures must have come as quite a shock to some of the veterans I know personally, who can't afford anything recently constructed in their own towns, even though their own incomes may be $4,000 or $5,000. I should think they might have wired Mr. Baker to put them on the application list, but I fear they had better not derive too much hope and comfort from these widely publicized figures for the committee's statistics are outrageously unscientific and so glaringly and shamelessly inaccurate."

[From the Boston Globe of February 24, 1948]

HOUSING ONCE MORE

The approach of the Congress to the problem of national housing needs, particularly veterans' housing needs, has resembled, to date, the proceedings in Chancery of the case of Jarndyce and Jarndyce, in Bleak House. There have been inexhaustible inquiries, mountains of reports, tons of statistical data, rivers of testimony, hearings whose total consumed time would run easily into thousands of days, and millions of speeches at the national level, at the State level, at the local level, at grand assemblies, at small banquets, and only a wise Providence knows how many at informal gatherings.

Meantime, the housing problem remains, if not where it was when a President now dead launched his first appeal to Congress for action back in 1944, at least pretty close to that earlier status, if population increases be taken into account.

President Truman has now forwarded to Congress the latest proposals for dealing with this ageing problem. He wants better enforced rent controls, expansion of insurance authority to speed rental property building, a 5-year program for the Housing Authority, a better allocation of building materials, further extension of credit aids, and a number of ot er moves proved useful thus far. Whether Congress will respond to clamant public need and put through a real housing program, or again lend ear to those Chancery pleaders for delay and evasion—the lobby—remains to be seen. If Congressman JOHN KENNEDY has his say, there will be action. He has fought a good fight to end this national scandal. Every New England Member of Congress would do well to support his struggle to extricate the problem from verbal glue and selfish political hobbles.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New Rochelle, N. Y., February 24, 1948.

The COCHAIRMEN,
National Veterans Housing Conference,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The present housing crisis is a problem of great importance to the citizens in general and to the veterans in particular.

I believe that the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will be an important step in helping to solve this problem.

I want to congratulate you for organizing the conference of representatives of your veterans' organizations on February 29 and March 1, 1948. I want to assure you that you have my full support.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY W. CHURCH,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., February 10, 1948.

Mr. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
National Veterans' Housing
Conference, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: In reply to your letter of February 2, 1948, with regard to the necessity for immediate congressional action on low-rent housing, allow me to quote from my statement to the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing at its hearing in New York City on November 12, 1947.

"The housing emergency in New York City is still undeniably acute. The city still needs the full amount of anticipated Federal public housing money required to finance the 20,000 units expected to be built under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

* * * * *

"The city is here asking Congress for the absolute minimum to cope with a postwar legacy far beyond the resources and capacity of local governments. We have already strained our credit to the limit and reduced other requirements to demonstrate our sincerity. The State has gone a long way to help. Congress should not let us down when we ask for so little."

I am transmitting a copy of this statement for your information.

Whatever efforts the National Veterans' Housing Conference may realize in this same regard certainly will be a step in the right direction.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM O'DWYER, *Mayor.*

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Gary, Ind., February 25, 1948.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KENNEDY: I regret that Gary will be unable to send any veteran delegates to the housing conference. However, we are highly sympathetic to any program to help supply the housing needs of this country.

In addition to having a housing shortage, Gary, like many other cities, has a problem of slum clearance. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill seems to us to offer a large measure of aid in both these directions.

As mayor of the city of Gary, I am very glad to lend my endorsement to this bill and will be very happy to help aid its passage.

Very truly yours,

EUGENE H. SWARTZ,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

PERTH AMBOY, N. J.,
February 20, 1948.

NATIONAL VETERANS HOUSING CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention Mr. Timothy J. Reardon, Jr., executive secretary.)

DEAR MR. REARDON: The Board of Commissioners of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J., wish to inform you that they are wholeheartedly in support of the aims and purposes of the National Veterans' Housing Conference to be held February 29 and March 1 in Washington, D. C.

As municipal officials, the board of commissioners is well aware that housing is our most serious domestic problem. Millions of veterans and nonveterans alike are in need of low-cost homes, and the purpose of the conference is to secure legislation which will provide homes for both. In the more than 2 years that have passed since the end of the war, there has been much talk but little action to meet the appalling housing situation. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is the only comprehensive measure now pending before Congress. It is designed to bring decent homes to millions of Americans, but it will not pass without united action by the citizenry of the country.

We congratulate the veterans for taking the initiative in obtaining the united action needed to secure the passage of this housing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. DELANEY, *Mayor.*

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
South Bend, Ind., February 20, 1948.

Mr. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
National Veterans Housing Conference,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: I have just returned from the United States conference of mayors in New York City and want you to know that this Administration wishes to endorse the TEW housing bill.

It will be almost impossible for us to send veteran-delegates to represent this city at the housing conference on February 29, 1948, but you can be assured of our cooperation.

I remain

Yours very truly,

GEORGE A. SCHOCK, *Mayor.*

Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

OLEO NEEDS RELIEF

After suffering from special taxes for decades, oleomargarine seems to be on the verge of receiving relief from unfair penalizing of a wholesome food. Hope seems to be seen from the avalanche of protests pouring into Government quarters, including congressional circles, with demand that the unjust taxes be removed. With 18 bills before the national lawmakers providing for the repeal, the agricultural committee of the House of Representatives will have cause to recognize a cross-country wave of opposition to the oleo levies. The committee began hearings on the proposed legislation this week. It will receive an abundance of evidence as to why the special taxes should be eliminated.

Sentiment in many areas is strong for repealing this taxation, judging by a statement by Congressman POAGE of Texas, author of one of the bills providing for repeal. He voiced the view of the repeal advocates by asserting that "it is utterly unsound to tax any wholesome food to the benefit of another. It is the only Federal special tax on the statute books levied against a wholesome food." The Texas Congressman accompanied his blast against the tax penalty with prediction that all of the 11 Democratic members of the Agricultural Committee will vote to repeal it. With only three of the Republican members voting with them, the relief which is long past due will be assured if Mr. POAGE's prediction is correct.

The old contention that oleo was colored and sold as butter, causing consumers to be cheated, was long ago cracked. Even should there be such practice nowadays regarding oleo, butter or other products, the food regulations would take care of it satisfactorily. Manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers are unjustly punished by oleo taxes, which are astoundingly heavy and numerous.

If the food on which this unnecessary tax is imposed were unwholesome and unworthy, there would be reason for punishing those making and handling it, but the situation is just the opposite. Oleomargarine carries the labels of vitamin contents and other ingredients that warrant its recommendation as a good food item, whose production in larger volume would benefit the country's food supply and help the farmers as well as consumers.

A lobby of northern dairy interests reputedly was responsible for the first special tax against margarine. Doubtless those and other interests, for reasons of their own, want it continued and increased. Farmers and many other citizens, including numerous housewives, want the use of oleo given further spread. So do multitudes who like its taste as well as its color.

Winning the fight against the oleo tax burden won't be accomplished easily, for as the Associated Press reported from Washington when what is rather facetiously termed "the battle of the bread" had spread:

"In one corner is the old slugger—butter; in the other the challenger, oleo. The referee is Congress. On the sidelines are the millions who like a spread on their bread."

May the referee in this contest detect all the blows and render decision according to the majority of good points scored. Oleo will be declared the winner if majority opinion is given the credit it seems to deserve. This would right an old wrong.

Poland and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are from Massachusetts are particularly interested in a broadcast over Station WSPR, in Springfield, Mass., by Prof. Frank Nowak, of Boston University.

I am sure, however, that persons interested in the future of Poland throughout the United States will be glad to have the opportunity to read the views of this distinguished scholar on the subject of Poland and Peace, which was presented on one of the programs of the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress, Inc.

POLAND AND PEACE

(By Prof. Frank Nowak, University of Boston and Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy)

American moral and political leadership in world affairs reached unprecedented heights in World War I when Woodrow Wilson with great sincerity and high purpose formulated the objectives of the war in his famous program of Fourteen Points and clearly enunciated the prerequisites of a lasting peace.

This program and these elementary principles rallied the nations of the world, great and small, to the cause of "making the world safe for democracy." The victory was won but lasting peace was not achieved because the Great Powers betrayed these principles and refused to use the League of Nations for the purposes intended.

In the Second World War amid chaos, destruction, and despair, President Roosevelt again rallied world opinion by appealing to the Wilsonian program. With Winston Churchill in 1941 he proclaimed the ideals of the Atlantic Charter, renouncing aggression, confirming the principles of self-determination of nations, and recognizing the right of peoples to choose their own form of government in pursuit of the so-called "four freedoms."

On January 1, 1942, 26 nations, including the Soviet Union, subscribed to the "Common program of purposes and principles embodied in the joint declaration known as the Atlantic Charter" and gave their pledge "To defend life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands and in other lands."

The first great test of the Atlantic Charter involved the independence and territorial integrity of Poland. Stalin, who desperately needed allies and lend-lease supplies, gave solemn assurance to Britain and America on November 6, 1942, that he wanted a "strong, and independent Poland." Said he, "We have not nor can we have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are waiting for our help. Our aim is to help these peoples in their struggles for liberation from Hitler's tyranny and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they think fit, with absolute freedom. No interference of any kind with their domestic affairs is possible."

Taking Stalin at his word, the United States and Great Britain sent lend-lease materials to Russia without stint. We all rightly admired the valiant resistance of the Russian people to foreign invasion and were wont to believe in and justify every word and act of Stalin himself despite his famous dictum of 1913 that "Words must have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

Winston Churchill, too, was a willing believer in the honor and integrity of Stalin although a short 4 years earlier the same Winston Churchill had correctly analyzed the Communist sense of honor in these very words: "Communism is not only a creed, it is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions, he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. No faith need be, indeed, may be kept with non-Communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of statesmen is to be used for their ruin. Then, when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence, from revolt to private assassination, must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy, and once the apparatus of power is in their hands all opposition must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken."

It seems that both Roosevelt and Churchill had great confidence in their ability to convert Stalin to their point of view by a policy of patience and appeasement.

By 1944, as the powers became more confident of victory over Hitler, their enthusiasm for the Atlantic Charter waned and at Dumbarton Oaks the three big powers seemed ready to preserve the peace primarily by agreement among themselves.

At Yalta in 1945 Stalin achieved his greatest triumph for he convinced the ailing President of the United States and Winston Churchill that they should renounce their moral leadership and recognize the immoral aggression of totalitarian communism. Once again Poland was the touchstone of the sincerity and good faith of the Big Three. They chose to betray the Atlantic Charter by appeasing Stalin. The appeasement was as shameful as it was unnecessary. It resulted not only in the partition of the territory of a friendly ally but in a total loss of Polish independence. The Polish people were in no way represented at the bargaining table. Poland was sold down the river and it is today a slave state crushed and exploited by a foreign dictatorship no whit less brutal and dangerous than was Nazi Germany.

The tragedy of it is that at Yalta the democracies of the world lost the peace and prepared the way for enslavement of half Europe and a large part of Asia by Communist forces.

Speaking in May 1945, Winston Churchill practically acknowledged the mistake made at Yalta when he said, "There would be little use in punishing the Hitlerites for their crimes if law and justice did not rule and if totalitarian and police governments were to take the place of the German invaders. We seek nothing for ourselves. But we must make sure that those causes which we fought for find recognition at the peace table in fact as well as word, and above all me must labor that the world organization which the United Nations are creating at San Francisco does not become an idle name, does not become a shield for the strong and a mockery for the weak." But again at San Francisco the Polish people had no voice; instead Stalin spoke for Poland through his puppets.

The compromise of elementary principles of justice in world affairs is fatal to world peace. It is no longer possible to play fast and loose with fundamental truth, good faith, and international law. It is our sacred obligation, if we seek to regain moral leadership, to do all in our power to bring about not only the withdrawal of Soviet troops from occupied territories but also the puppet regimes by insisting upon the fulfillment of the pledge of unfettered elections under United Nations supervision.

If Russia believes, in the words of Goebbels, that "What matters is not who is right but who wins," then no amount of appeasement, compromise, or argument can be of any avail. Stalin professes to recognize no moral or legal responsibility and believes, apparently, that power rests not on responsibility, but on authority. If this analysis is correct, he can be stopped only by superior show of force. Such a display of superior power by the United Nations or a group of nations acting for the United Nations will prove more efficacious in avoiding war and insuring peace than can all the sentimental policies of weak appeasement.

The ultimate fate of Poland, too, will depend not so much on Russia or Germany but upon the collective conscience of the United Nations under the moral leadership of nations who recognize that in the modern world peace and slavery are incompatible and who are willing to take the calculated risk of enforcing peace on the basis of justice and respect for law.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have received an interesting letter commenting on the Marshall, or European recovery plan, from a brilliant student of Chicago University, James C. Fenstermaker, son of J. Ralph Fenstermaker, an old friend of mine and president of Hugh J. Baker and Co., of Indianapolis. The letter is so logical and its arguments are so impressive that I think it is worthy of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that all Members of Congress will read it and give their thought to his fine presentation of the subject. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1948.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am a citizen residing officially in Indianapolis and had the privi-

lege of voting for you during your last election. My reason for writing is simple. I am tired of watching our Nation lose more "face" year after year in the eyes of other nations. For the past 30 years our country has pursued a policy of a mouse. Internal bickerings between groups in this country caused us to refrain from entering the League of Nations in 1920. We condoned the Hoare-Laval agreements in 1934 and 1935 and 1936. We sent scrap iron and steel to Japan as late as 1940; at the same time we appropriated one hundred millions for Chinese relief and aid. Now we again sent four hundred millions to France which was to be used for reconstruction but which simply went down the drain because it was immediately nullified by strikes. Now we sent three hundred million to help Greece. We told her Government that she was the bulwark against the spread of communism in the Balkan Nations. Greece told us, "You just keep sending in money, no questions asked, and we will run our own affairs, otherwise, we may have to let the Russians in." If that isn't blackmail on a world scale, what is it? Incidentally, the three hundred millions are gone and Greece has not succeeded in one offensive yet that means anything. We also shipped to her 50 long-range artillery. Of these, some 20 are in use, the rest are residing in Greek warehouses, still to be uncrated, I hear.

Now comes the Marshall plan. Senator VANDENBERG states that we must send all sixteen billions into Europe and we must allow them "free controls" over it. We must not intercede and interfere with the internal affairs of those nations. Now I agree with the fine Senator from the State of Michigan. Let's let them have the first year's allotment of the sixteen billions, but let's make it very clear to them that some real progress must be shown at the end of that time. If reasonable progress is not shown, then let's step in and see what good reasons have prevented them from achieving the goal, set up for the first year's allocation. If there are no good reasonable grounds for failure, then scale that next year's appropriation down accordingly. In other words, let's be reasonable, but let's use some common sense, too, and get tough, if absolutely necessary.

Let's regain the faith in ourselves which made us great and at the same time restore the faith of the world in our now confused economic and political policies. War is pretty terrible, but a policy of cowardice, which results in our own loss of freedom and faith, is far more costly, in the final analysis. And if we show real courage now and be fair with the other nations of our war-devastated and hungry world, success of a United Nations is not improbable at all. Indeed, it has a wonderful chance for success.

Sir, I would greatly appreciate a reply if you have the time. Is my position tenable and reasonable, or isn't it?

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. FENSTERMAKER.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, everyone recognizes that Sumner Welles is one of the outstanding statesmen of America. All of us ought to pay a great deal more attention to his wisdom and vision in connection with our foreign policy and the course of action which this Nation ought to take in the future.

For this reason I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, with the hope that we shall soon begin to re-form our wavering and disintegrating policy with reference to Palestine and our present conduct in the United Nations:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY HELD GRAVELY IN NEED OF CONSISTENCY—WELLES SAYS OUR VACILLATING COURSE ON PALESTINE IS UNDERMINING WORLD'S CONFIDENCE IN UNITED STATES, WHICH BIPARTISAN EFFORTS HAD BUILT UP

(By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State)

Two years ago I wrote in this column on the virtues of dependability in foreign policy. Consistency in American policy can, however, no longer be regarded merely as a valuable asset. It has become an imperative necessity. It is futile for us to think that we can reach our objectives unless other nations are convinced that American policy is dependable.

Dependability in foreign policy is tantamount to good credit in the dealings between individuals. It means that others know with certainty that you are able and determined to live up to your announced commitments.

From the time when the United States emerged as a great power it has never, except for brief periods, pursued a foreign policy that was consistent. It is for that reason, notwithstanding the transformation of the United States into the greatest power of the world, that this Nation's influence in world affairs has only rarely been commensurate with its resources and strength.

At the end of the First World War the United States, under Woodrow Wilson, enforced upon a reluctant Europe the most advanced form of international organization that had yet been conceived, and peace treaties which, with all of their defects, were more enlightened than they would otherwise have been.

Within 12 months the United States entirely changed its policy. It withdrew into isolation. By its withdrawal it destroyed the foundation that was indispensable if the European countries were to succeed with the new order they had been persuaded to adopt.

EUROPE WAS SKEPTICAL

It is hardly surprising that skepticism was paramount in Europe when the United States once more undertook to assume world leadership at the end of the Second World War. It was only because leaders of both political parties in this country, outstanding among them Franklin Roosevelt and ARTHUR VANDENBERG, forged a national, rather than a partisan, foreign policy, that the foreign disbelief in the reliability of the United States, that had prevailed for a generation, was gradually dispelled.

But these doubts, unfortunately, have once more been raised by the vacillations that have marked our course during the last 2 years.

There is little to be gained by insisting that we have no responsibility for the international crisis we now confront. It is enough to recognize that the United States faces the gravest threat that it has known during its existence as an independent Nation.

We are proposing to offer the nations of western and southern Europe the only means by which they can reconstruct their economies and gain renewed political, social, and material strength. The assistance contemplated under the European recovery program is indispensable if the Soviet Union is to be prevented from extending its control to the shores of the Atlantic.

But no thinking observer believes that economic assistance alone is going to be enough. What is equally essential is that the peoples of Great Britain, France, and Italy, of the smaller European countries, and also of the republics of the Western Hemisphere, are sure that the announced policy of the United States will be carried out in every one of its implications, and that they will be supported by the United States in any effort they may make to resist Communist aggression.

EUROPE IN FRONT LINES

The European countries are in the front lines. We cannot expect resistance from them unless they are confident that they can count upon the United States, and unless they know that the United States means what it says.

This is a time when an unequivocal declaration of intent upon our part, the armed force to back it up, and a foreign policy which is subject to no charge of vacillation, will be the surest way to keep the peace.

Yet at this very moment the United States, by its feeble and inconsistent course in the United Nations, has again shaken world confidence in the dependability of its policy. After having exerted all of its influence to get the United Nations Assembly to decide upon the partition of Palestine, the United States subsequently reversed itself and by its timid indecision has halted all action.

How can it be expected that such nations as the Scandinavian countries, directly exposed to Soviet pressure; Greece and Turkey, with Soviet armies at their gates; or Italy, about to pass through the most critical period of the postwar years, can have unquestioning confidence in the value of American assurances after such an example of disastrous inconsistency?

We fortunately have at this moment an exceptionally able and far-sighted Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate. The Senate, however, under constitutional system, cannot direct policy. That is the responsibility of the Executive. Until the present Executive learns that, no matter how desirable the objectives of our foreign policy may be, the achievement of those objections will be gravely impeded unless there is faith in the reliability of the United States, the conduct of this country's foreign policy will suffer from handicaps that may well prove to be fatal.

Open the Door, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Open the Door, America," by David Lawrence, appearing in the March 7 issue of the United States News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN THE DOOR, AMERICA

(By David Lawrence)

There's a closed door to which the American people have the key.

It's a door that shuts out human beings—suffering men, women, and children without homes.

It's a door behind which selfishness lurks and materialism hides.

It's a door which needs to be opened because, by doing so, the humane soul of America will be liberated.

Has the awfulness of war left us repentant? The millions whose sons have been spared are grateful. But do they ask what they can do now to acknowledge the good fortune which divine providence bestowed upon them?

The essence of this life is service. The whole philosophy under which Christianity is professed is that man is brother to man. The life and teachings of Jesus spell one thought above all others—that all of us owe a solemn duty to each other to help, to befriend, to share our worldly goods to the end that suffering may be alleviated.

It is the whole basis of charity, of philanthropy, of civic welfare. In fact, we have prided ourselves in America for generations that we sympathize with oppressed peoples everywhere and that we give a haven of refuge to those who have been the victims of political persecution.

If individually we answer, "Yes" to the cry. "Am I my brother's keeper?" then collectively we do likewise.

There are homeless people abroad. Their miserable plight is indescribable. Are we closing the door of our hearts to them? And why?

Is it possible that we think our material possessions might be diminished slightly? Are we afraid of competition from a small number who might enter the ranks of our gainfully employed? Or are we merely allergic to all who may be foreign—as if God drew boundary lines and delegated selfish power to us to keep His children from moving to places where crops are abundant and natural resources are more than adequate for those who already abide in green pastures?

Do we have the right of absolute ownership to these lands and resources or do we serve as trustees who some day must answer to our Maker and give an accounting of what we have done during our brief existence?

It is a matter of simple humanity or simple selfishness.

Here is a chance to help. Hundreds of thousands of persons in Europe have been displaced by war. We should read the facts, and then ask ourselves whether we are ready to recognize our duty as responsible individuals—as human beings responsible for what we do with our power and our possessions.

There's an organization known as the National Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. In one of its leaflets is given the essential facts which every American should know. It says:

"1. Two years after the war there are still some 850,000 people in Europe who live in detention camps.

"2. These men, women, and children are the displaced persons—the survivors of Nazi concentration camps. They are victims of all forms of religious and political persecution, of barbarism, and Nazi terror.

"3. They represent almost all religions. Some 80 percent are Christians of various denominations; 20 percent are Jews.

"4. Most of the displaced persons are natives of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Others come from Finland, Yugoslavia, Greece, France, and various other European countries.

"5. More than 50 percent of the displaced persons are women and children. There are 150,000 children below the age of 17. Of these 70,000 are estimated to be under 6 years of age.

"6. The displaced persons' most cherished desire is to start a new life in a country where there is freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of movement.

"7. Since VE-day, 11,000,000 displaced persons have been repatriated. But the remaining 850,000 cannot be returned to their original places of residence.

"8. These people do not wish to and cannot return to their homes of origin because they fear oppression for religious, racial, or political reasons.

"9. The Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France officially declared that no people would be forced to return to their homelands against their will. The United Nations has endorsed the same principle.

"10. Unless reasonably quick action is taken for the permanent resettlement of displaced persons, these people may form the nucleus of an international relief problem of long duration.

"11. By remaining in central Europe, they may become a source of international discord. All thinking men and women are aware that the plight of displaced persons constitutes one of the gravest cancers gnawing at the peace so dearly won.

"12. The United Nations established the International Refugee Organization to deal with the displaced persons' problem. Its charter is signed by the United States. But the IRO cannot solve the problem unless immigrant-receiving countries make special provisions to receive a fair share of displaced persons.

"13. The United States, as a leader in international affairs, must take the first step in this direction. The rest of the world would follow suit.

"14. In the 1920's the United States Congress passed immigration laws which permit 154,000 quota immigrants to enter this country annually.

"15. During the 1940-46 war period only 15 percent of the total world quota was used. In other words, the United States lost 914,762 people who could have entered this country legally and whom we were ready and prepared to received.

"16. The United States is one of the few countries that has not been ravaged by war. It has been estimated that a fair share of displaced persons to enter the United States would be about 400,000. This number would equal less than half of the number of quotas that were not used during the war years.

"17. Having lived under the brutal tyranny of dictatorship and totalitarianism, the displaced persons can truly value the ideals of democracy and the principles on which this country was founded.

"18. The displaced persons, like any other groups of immigrants, would be screened by Federal authorities before permission to enter this country is granted. No person advocating the overthrow of the Government by violence, no anarchist or criminal could enter the United States.

"19. No displaced person entering the United States could become a public charge. Every individual, corporation, or agency sponsoring a displaced person must furnish an affidavit to that effect.

"20. The bulk of the displaced persons are workers. There are some 177,000 farm-hands among them; some 20,000 are housemaids. Many are skilled workers; some are professionals; others still are business people.

"21. There is a great shortage of farm labor and domestic service in the United States. New immigrants who are not workers tend to open noncompetitive-business shops. A recent study in a metropolitan city showed that each refugee enterpreneur in business created a job for seven Americans.

"2. The displaced persons will not take homes away from veterans and other Americans. They would be housed by relatives or friends who would not sublet rooms to strangers.

"23. Some of the organizations which have gone on record as favoring the admittance of a fair share of displaced persons to this country are: The National Catholic Welfare Conference; The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; the American Jewish Committee; The American Jewish Conference; The Congress of Individual Organizations; The American Federation of Labor; The National Conference of Union Labor Legionnaires; The United Council of American Veteran Organizations; and many other civic, educational, and religious groups.

"24. In his state of the Union message, delivered before Congress on January 6, 1947, President Harry S. Truman said: '* * * I do not think that the United States has done its part. Only about 5,000 of them have entered this country since May 1946 * * * definite assistance in the form of new legislation is needed. I urge the Congress to turn its attention to this world problem in an effort to find ways whereby we can fulfill our responsibilities to these thousands of homeless and suffering refugees of all faiths.'"

How many Americans know these facts?

How many will take the little time and make the effort to tell their Representatives in Congress that America should open its door to some of these homeless people? It's not a difficult chore to do.

For in opening the door to these displaced persons, America will be opening her heart.

Maybe then, as we pray for peace, for contentment, for a better world, God will listen. For we cannot expect to receive the blessings of life if we do not give of ourselves in service to others.

Mikolajczyk and the Failure of a Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for the consideration of the Members of Congress the following address delivered by William Henry Chamberlin on the radio program of the Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish-American Congress, Inc. Mr. Chamberlin is a noted news analyst, lecturer, and magazine writer. The topic of his address is timely in view of the recent developments in Czechoslovakia and the approaching troubles in Finland. All Americans are interested in the portrayal of Polish political conditions which, under a free Poland, would be largely in the hands of former Prime Minister Stanislaw Mikolajczyk.

Mr. Chamberlin's address is entitled "Mikolajczyk and the Failure of a Policy."

MIKOLAJCZYK AND THE FAILURE OF A POLICY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The picture of Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Polish peasant leader, kissing the hand of his wife after he had successfully escaped to London appeared on the front pages of many American newspapers. Even newspaper readers who knew little of Polish politics could appreciate the human appeal of this scene. A courageous patriot had fought for liberty in his native country as long as there was any possibility of open struggle and then had eluded the political gangsters who were eager to bump him off. Every decent person in the Western World felt better when it became known, after a period of suspense, that Mikolajczyk had escaped.

This feeling was reflected in the loud cheers that greeted the news of his impending arrival in England in the House of Commons. There may well have been a feeling of shame, as well as of relief, in these cheers. For Mikolajczyk is a symbol, and

very nearly was a victim of a bankrupt Anglo-American policy of appeasing Stalin at any price.

Both Great Britain and the United States bear a share of responsibility for the sorry plight of Poland today, a country with unnatural and unhistorical frontiers, ruled by a made-in-Moscow, Communist-dominated regime. Poland's decision to fight rather than compromise on such issues as the so-called corridor and Danzig was certainly influenced by the British assurance on March 31, 1939, of "all support in its power" against aggression. This assurance was broadened and made more specific in the Anglo-Soviet Agreement of Mutual Assistance, signed on the eve of the outbreak of the war, on August 25, 1939.

The war aims which America professed, notably the assurances of self-determination for all peoples in the Atlantic Charter, should certainly have held good for Poland, the first nation to take up arms against Hitler. But under the pressure of supposed wartime expediency the American and British Governments first surrendered the principle of Polish territorial integrity, then accepted what have now proved to be worthless Soviet promises about "free and unfettered elections" in Poland and respect for Polish independence within changed frontiers.

It was through Mikolajczyk that Soviet good faith was put to the test. The experiment very nearly cost him his life. It was agreed at the Yalta Conference of the Big Three in February 1945, that almost half of Poland should be ceded to the Soviet Union. Poland was to receive so-called compensation in the shape of German territory in the west for its loss in the east.

At the same time the existing provisional government in Poland, a purely Soviet creation of Red Quislings, was, in the words of the Yalta pact, "to be reorganized on a broader democratic basis, with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad." The question of participation of democratic leaders inside Poland was summarily disposed of when the Soviet authorities, violating a safe conduct, arrested all the surviving prominent members of the Polish nationalist underground movement.

The question of participation on the part of Poles living abroad posed an agonizing dilemma for Mikolajczyk, who had been Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-exile in London until the latter part of 1944, and for other Polish patriots abroad. Against participation it could be argued that the Yalta agreement was an illegal and unjust settlement of vital issues affecting Poland without consulting anyone qualified to speak for Poland, that the territorial mutilation of the country should not be accepted, that Soviet promises of free and unfettered elections were not to be trusted. These considerations were decisive for the majority of the members of the Polish Government-in-exile.

On the other hand, and this consideration doubtless influenced Mikolajczyk's decision to return to Poland, Poles who remained in exile could not hope to take a direct part in their country's reconstruction, at least in the immediate future. Perhaps there was a faint chance that American and British diplomatic influence could help to prevent the transformation of Poland into a Communist police state. Himself the son of a farm worker, the lifelong leader of the democratic Peasant Party, Mikolajczyk could not very plausibly be represented as a fascist or an aristocrat.

This question whether to reject Yalta lock stock and barrel or to return to Poland and try to make the best of a very bad situation was one on which honorable men could honorably differ. The issue now is only of historical importance. For Mikolajczyk's experience proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that there is no possibility of free, independent, peaceful political opposition activity under the dictatorship which has been imposed on Poland by its present Communist masters.

Mikolajczyk went to Poland as Second Vice-Premier and Minister of Agriculture. From the beginning he must have realized that he faced an almost hopeless struggle. The political police, which possessed arbitrary powers of arresting and banishing people to concentration camps, was completely under Communist control. The Peasant Party was persecuted in every possible way. Its meetings were broken up; its active members were arrested and often tortured; its newspapers were suppressed.

The election that was held in January 1947 was described as a fraudulent farce by practically every independent correspondent who watched the proceedings. A wave of terrorism preceded the voting and there was no pretense of safeguarding either the secrecy of the ballot or the honest counting of the votes.

With all means of legal political struggle blocked, with a new wave of terrorist repression going on in other Communist-dominated states, such as Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary, with mounting evidence that his own arrest and execution or assassination were probable Mikolajczyk decided that his life outside Poland would be more useful than his death in Poland. His retreat was an honorable retreat, only undertaken after he had done everything in his power for freedom and democracy in Poland. It marks the end of the illusion that the Communist lion and the democratic lamb could or would lie down peacefully together.

Mikolajczyk has now reached this country. It is to be hoped that he will find time to write his memoirs. His story of what actually happened in Poland since its so-called liberation will be informative and authoritative. He should have interesting things to tell about how the leaders of the American and British Governments, behind closed doors, double-crossed the Polish people and betrayed their professed war aims in pursuing the utopian mirage of appeasing Stalin.

After Mikolajczyk's experience there can be no hope that the Communist grip on Poland can be broken by peaceful means, by free expression of the people's will at the ballot box. What is in store for that unfortunate country is an intensification of totalitarian terror, aimed at destroying the last remains of independent political and intellectual life, at converting Poland into an eighteenth Soviet Republic.

This attempt will fail in the face of the determination the Polish people have shown to be free, in the face of the unshaken and unshakable devotion of the Polish people to their patriotic and religious ideals. Meanwhile there are several things America should do as a kind of atonement for the wrong which was inflicted on the Polish national cause with the acquiescence of the American Government.

First, the Yalta Agreement, which was never submitted for the approval of Congress, should be formally repudiated and annulled by the American Government. It is a recognized principle in law and equity that a contract which has been systematically violated by one of the partners is not binding on the other. Yalta was widely interpreted in this country as a kind of bargain, a surrender of large historic Polish territories in the east in return for German territory in the west and an assurance that the Polish people, within new boundaries, should be free to choose their own form of government. But the Soviet side of the bargain has conspicuously not been kept. Soviet military control of Poland has been unscrupulously used to ferret out and destroy Polish patriotic organizations and to clamp down on the country a dictatorship headed by trained Moscow agents. If America would formally repudiate the Yalta agreement, already rendered null and void by Soviet bad faith, if it would affirm Poland's right to Lvov and Wilno and other territory of which that country was robbed there would be a wave of heartening encouragement for those underground forces which, we may be sure, still exist in Poland, and are working for the country's ultimate freedom from Russian and Communist domination.

We should also open our hearts and consciences in the matter of the European DP's. There are at least a million human being, Poles, Balts, Jews, Ukrainians, Russians, Yugoslavs, who are men and women without a country because they will not return to lands which are under totalitarian tyranny. During the war immigration to this country was largely suspended. Without in the least endangering our own economic stability, we could certainly admit a large and fair share of these unfortunate stranded victims of a war which unfortunately has left Europe half slave and half free.

I think there should be a definite priority for DP's who fought for the United Nations' cause during the war. The great majority of these are Poles, formerly members of the army of General Anders and of other Polish military units. Men who fought against one type of totalitarianism and who are political refugees from another type could be counted on, in the great majority, to be good American citizens, to appreciate and cherish the liberty under law which they would find in this country.

The Communist wave which has temporarily submerged Poland and other east European countries and which is beating at the United States itself raises important moral issues. Communist propagandists and apologists are hard at work all the time, trying to defame and discredit democracy.

To this propaganda offensive there is an easy and overwhelming answer. In the Soviet Union, so grotesquely misrepresented as the paradise of the so-called common man, there are more slaves than there were in the United States when Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation. The most probable figure for the unfortunate human beings who are slaves of the Soviet political police, the most mercilessly exploited class in the world, working unlimited hours for a bare subsistence pittance, watched by armed guards and ferocious dogs, is eight or ten million. A recent book by two Russian experts on the subject, David Dallin and Boris Nicolaevsky, gives the location of no less than 125 slave reservations in Russia, areas which are being developed solely or largely with slave labor. We should miss no opportunity to hammer home officially and privately in the Social and Economic Commission of the United Nations and elsewhere, that the Soviet Union is the greatest slave state in history. That is the decisive reply, final and unanswerable, to Communist propaganda against American institutions and the American way of life.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects which is of widespread discussion in the newspapers and over the radio concerns existing taxes on margarine. Congressmen are receiving many letters

daily, setting forth the requests of housewives that this unfair tax be eliminated. I believe Members of Congress will be interested in a recent radio address by a highly regarded and well-known commentator, Hubert W. Kregeloh, of Station WSPR, at Springfield, Mass. His statement follows and is entitled "Discrimination Against Margarine":

The cost of living is sometimes unnecessarily high because powerful special interests are in a position to influence Government to legislate in their favor rather than in the interest of the people. The latter often must pay a high price in money, inconvenience, and inefficiency. The culprits are found in every group. We have industrial, labor, agricultural, and real-estate lobbies—all out to corner the biggest possible hunk of the national economic pie for themselves with complete indifference to the interests of everybody else, all threatening the politicians with dire reprisals if they do not get their way, all seeking to confuse the public as to their motives.

One battle involving unfair special interest pressure, which has just broken out with renewed fury, is the struggle of the margarine producers against governmental discrimination prompted by the successful manipulations of the powerful dairy lobby. Largely unknown to the general public, this struggle has been going on for about half a century in the United States. It is a fantastic story of greed and intrigue—one which, most people would probably think, could not occur in our free enterprise democracy. Yet the dry fact remains that for several decades State and Federal authorities have combined to keep margarine off the American market, to deal the manufacturers, sellers, and consumers of margarine so many chicaneries and obstacles that it is surprising they didn't throw in the sponge long ago.

But now, the high cost of living and the exorbitant price of butter have provided the margarine industry with perhaps their best chance to enlist public and congressional support in their fight against the unyielding dairy lobby. Very shortly Congress will be called upon to alleviate the maliciously created and entirely unnecessary plight of the margarine industry. Now is therefore the time for interested consumers, particularly housewives, to make their wishes known to their Representatives in Congress. The dairy lobby is going to fight its usual vigorous and cleverly prepared battle behind the scene. Their efforts may prevail again unless public pressure is unmistakably strong.

On the margarine side, the offensive has been launched by the American Margarine Manufacturers, the National Cotton Council, and the American Soybean Association—the vegetable fats in margarine being chiefly derived from soybean and cottonseed oil.

These three parties are acting in their own interest, of course. In order to make money they want to sell more margarine, just as—for the same reason—the dairy farmers want us to eat butter, and butter only. Only it so happens that the interest of the margarine industry is also the interest of the American consumer.

The very word "margarine" releases in the dairy farmer reactions comparable to what goes on in Mr. Molotov when you say "bourgeois monopoly—capitalist." Here is the problem in a nutshell:

Margarine tastes as good as butter and medical scientists say it will do everything for you, from the standpoint of nutrition, that butter can do. Moreover, it could be sold, were it not for artificial restrictions, at about half the cost of butter and still yield a reasonable profit to manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers. To eliminate this competition, the dairy farmers have done three things, and have done them successfully for decades. First, they have engaged in a mischievous campaign designed to discredit margarine and to make the public groundlessly suspicious of the product. Second, they have used their political influence to have a heavy tax placed on margarine, so that the price in the store would be needlessly high. Third, they have caused the authorities to hamstring the industry with so many restrictions and regulations that production has been limited and sales obstructed. In four States out of the 48, reports the Industrial Surveys Co., of New York, "regulations are so deliberately complicated that practically no margarine at all is sold."

The campaign to discredit the product is now finally folding up. More and more people understand that margarine is tasty, nutritious and is produced under strictly sanitary conditions. Industrial Surveys Co. reports that more than four out of five of all American families now use at least some margarine in their homes. The survey, published on January 28, revealed that almost 32,000,000 families, or more than 80 percent of the Nation's total, now include margarine among their purchases. This compares with approximately 65 percent of American families 2 years ago. Indeed, the figures are even more impressive if one bears in mind that in four States taxes and red tape keep the sale of the product to practically nil. Eliminating these four States and using only the families of the other 44, Industrial Surveys found that in fact 88 percent of the households are consumers of margarine.

For years, scientists have conducted laboratory tests with butter and margarine on rats and mice—with the result that no difference in food value was found. In its current issue, Time magazine reports on the findings of an experiment conducted by three eminent medical scientists of Chicago on human beings. The magazine states that the doctors picked two orphan asylums where diets could be strictly controlled. In one institution, 160 children were given only margarine—for bread, on vegetables, and in pastry and frying. In another institution, of 107 children, only butter was used. The three scientists have just reported the results of the 2-year test in the Journal of the American Medical Association. They found there was no real difference between the two groups of children—in height, weight, or hemoglobin and red cell count. General health seemed to favor the margarine boys and girls, but the doctors warned that other variables probably were responsible for the slight difference. Their conclusion was this: "Whether the greater part of the fat of the diet is derived from vegetable or animal sources has no effect on growth and health * * * Margarine is a good source of table fat in growing children."

At a recent Congressional hearing, a representative of the radio industry said the trouble with Petrillo, boss of the American Federation of Musicians, was that he is determined to uninvent the phonograph. Many a dairy lobbyist agrees wholeheartedly with this statement, where Petrillo is concerned. Yet his furious efforts to uninvent margarine, as far as the United States is affected, are just as harmful and absurd. We run here once again into the old, old story of the double standard.

In their fight to keep margarine from American tables, the dairy lobby resorted to another handy trick, based on the popularity of the yellow color for butter. They got the authorities to slap an astronomically high tax on colored, or yellow, margarine. This helps to restrict the sale of the product in two ways. First, the price difference between yellow margarine and butter had become too insignificant before the rapid rise of the latter, to tempt the consumer to buy a product regarding which there still existed some prejudice. Second, the sale of the much cheaper white margarine suffered because the housewife neither liked the pale color herself nor cared to listen to complaints from other members of the family. Of course, there is an alternative. The housewife can mix the coloring into the white margarine herself, but the extra chore involved is frequently a deterrent. The reason housewives want their margarine colored yellow is that yellow is an appetizing and traditional color for a spread for bread. Butter itself is artificially colored yellow (with the same harmless coloring material used in margarine) during several months of the year and is naturally yellow only when cattle are pasture fed. Further, butter is the only food product employing artificial coloring which is not required to so state on the package.

In an editorial today, praising Governor Dewey and the New York Legislature for suspending the prohibition against use of margarine in public institutions in that State, the New York Times writes that the battle to free margarine from unfair and discriminatory restrictions that have existed since 1886 is, however, still far from won. Only Congress can rectify that injustice which burdens most of all those who can least afford to buy butter at present prices and which adds to the labor of busy housewives who now have to color their margarine in their own kitchens. Congress has all the facts it needs on this question, but has it also the courage and the common sense to act? asks the Times.

The price problem mentioned in the editorial is today the crux of the dispute. Whether or not one wishes to believe the protestations of the dairy lobby that present butter prices and profits are entirely reasonable is beside the point. The point is that millions of Americans, squeezed by the high cost of living generally, just cannot afford to purchase butter at present prices. These people should be given the opportunity of buying margarine under the conditions and at the low prices the industry is willing to offer once it is freed from taxes and chicanery. Otherwise there is danger that many families in the lower income brackets cannot include in their diet the amount of fats necessary for the maintenance of good health. And it might be brought out in this connection that neither butter nor any other food is taxed by the Federal Government.

Recently in Washington W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, former Ambassador to Moscow, and one of our millionaires, said: "I've been eating margarine since the war, and I can't tell the difference from butter. I'm surprised that people pay a dollar a pound for butter."

Summing it up, it is high time that the stranglehold of the selfish dairy lobby on our pocketbooks is broken. If the dairy farmers don't like the prospect that margarine is bought in larger quantities, that is just too bad. Free competition and the availability of more and more value for one's money should be the essence of our free-enterprise system. The dairy farmers should defend themselves—not through political pressure to ban the competition, but by seeking means to bring down the price of butter. In the meantime, the American housewife will do well to tell Congress she wants to have the discriminatory taxes and restrictions on margarine removed in 1948.

Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to speak to the third annual meeting of the National Commit-

tee for Traffic Safety, which met in the city of Washington on Friday last.

This committee was formed 3 years ago upon the request of the President of the United States.

There is no more pressing problem in our country than the need to control accidents on the streets and highways. This committee includes in its membership, representatives from every walk of life. The committee has developed a unity of action and is making real progress.

At the request of some of my colleagues, I am inserting my remarks in the RECORD that some of the history and the objectives of this strong committee may be more generally known.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary for me to remind you that these are serious days. Our country is faced with problems much greater than actual war imposed. The eyes of the entire world are looking toward this great country, this powerful Government, and to the people you and I represent. There is hunger, anxiety, panic, hardships, desperation, privation, war, and threat of war throughout most of the world.

On Capitol Hill at this very hour the question is being debated as to how far this country shall go in sharing its wealth to turn back the selfishness, the aggressiveness, and the forward march of a social and political philosophy so out of keeping with our own.

Perhaps some of you may have the feeling that traffic safety is an unusual subject for a Representative in Congress to be discussing—especially in these days when such vital and important problems must be considered if America is to go forward.

To me it is a perfectly natural thing to be discussing safety here. Sincerely, I believe that there are few, if any, problems facing our Nation more vital or more important than to stop the needless annual slaughter of 100,000 Americans, the injury of 10,000,000 more, involving as well an economic loss of more than $6,000,000,000 a year.

Expressed in dollars and cents, this $6,000,000,000 is, in round figures, the amount of money suggested for use by this country in the first year of the European Recovery Program.

Does the country want to continue to see 100,000 lives lost each year by accidents that could be prevented? Is this what we are willing to endure merely because it takes a little time and effort to prevent it? I do not believe so.

I do not believe—I refuse to believe—that a country known around the world for its humanitarian instincts is willing to see one-tenth of a million of its citizens struck down needlessly each year, and another 10,000,000 injured, shrugged off as something that cannot be helped.

It can be helped!

If 100,000 men, women, and children died in 1 year of some dreaded disease, that medical science knew how to prevent, you can be sure that we would soon see to it that steps were taken to prevent it.

We know how to prevent accidents. We know it after more than 30 years of research and experiment by the National Safety Council and other safety organizations. But we cannot wipe out this national scourge of accidental death and injury until the American people use and apply the remedies we have available.

So, today every public official of whatever level, every citizen no matter where he lives or what he does, must join in a great united effort to cut this accident toll. We must make America a land of the safe as well as a land of the free.

This National Committee for Traffic Safety was formed as a committee of the National Council at the 1943 Congress to consider postwar traffic and safety planning. In a year the committee decided that it could do more effective work as an independent group, and such became its status in October 1944, under the name of the National Committee for Postwar Traffic Safety. Forty national organizations then constituted the committee.

In April 1945 the word "postwar" was dropped. Until the end of 1946, the National Safety Council provided the staff, facilities, and principal financing of the committee. Last year your group began functioning under independent financing based upon voluntary contributions of the member organizations.

In the recommendations of the Highway Safety Conference there was a proposal for three national committees, of equal and independent status, to develop the President's national program. One of these was to be represented by Federal departments. One was to include the associations of State officials, and the other civic, professional, and commercial groups constituting the body of organized public support for traffic safety. It was then suggested in the President's action program that an expanding national committee for traffic safety might constitute this third organization.

Your committee took immediate steps to this end and you have expanded from 40 national organizations to 85 national organizations, and so, then, this greater number is recognized as the National Group Coordinating National Support for the President's Recommendations.

I dare say that few of you realize that the national organizations, represented by you, sitting in this luncheon room this noon, have in these 85 groups a total of 145,376 State and local clubs or units. Without eliminating duplications, the aggregate group membership of those organizations represented by you number 115,984,287 people.

Your 85 organizations publish 99 monthly magazines or bulletins with a reader circulation of over 20,000,000. You have represented in this National Committee for Traffic Safety the greatest potential force ever rallied to the support of one cause.

But I challenge you today that, as great as this potential power is, none of you and none of us realized the power of this combined safety organization. If the proponents of universal military training had this much power behind that piece of legislation, it would pass both Houses of the Congress and be signed by the President in a single day.

If those who seek funds for the recovery of Europe had this support, the money would have been available a half year ago. If those who feel that this country should have the strongest and hardest-hitting Air Force known to science and to the brains of man, the planes and all that go with them would be already in the air. Even still greater experiments and studies would be on the drawing board.

Never have I seen such power behind an unselfish, humanitarian, and universal appeal.

Indeed, progress has been made in the last quarter of a century in controlling accidents. The traffic fatality rate per mile has dropped steadily since the President's conference. Those States which are really active in public support have a much better record in 1947 than those in which there is no organized, coordinated public-support function.

The 27 active public-support States have a fatality rate of 7.6 per mile. The national average is 8.6. The 21 States without organized public support show a rate of 8.9.

While public support cannot claim all the credit, I do feel that official and organized support goes a long way in the development of the favorable trend. What I am trying to say is that this national committee with its tremendous membership, its outstanding leadership, with its technical engineers, its representatives from every walk of life—which include labor, law, medicine, the parent-teacher organizations, automobile associations, the National Safety Council, the Boy and Girl Scout movements, the women's clubs, the veterans' organizations, municipal and public works associations, insurance companies, railroads, coal, iron, steel, the Red Cross, civil engineers, newspapers, the chiefs of police, the letter carriers, to mention but a few—are only scratching the surface when it comes to a forceful, driving, intelligent movement to reduce to a minimum the accidents on the streets and highways of this great, free country.

Would that I had the power to inspire you to go back to your own organizations and to your own respective sections of the country to take up a real evangelistic campaign to save our country from this needless waste of precious human life.

And, now, may I, in utter simplicity, draw from my own experience two illustrations to show first how each of you can wield tremendous power in your communities, and, second, the importance of planning your safety program and thoroughly working the plan.

I had served 4 years as a traffic judge when my constituents urged that I announce my candidacy for the place of fire and police commissioner. They elected me to that office by a vote which gave me confidence to do the job ahead. Cliff Penland, a pioneer in public safety, a Tennessean by birth, but educated in the safety field at Rochester, N. Y., was brought to Memphis by a group who had voluntarily taken upon themselves the task of promoting public safety.

They had come a long way with their limited means and with few supporting personnel. His work had been taken over by the chamber of commerce and was rapidly expanding. A fortnight after I took the oath of office, he came to my office to get my views as a newly elected police commissioner. But in a quiet, methodical way, and with a clear-cut demonstration of full and complete knowledge and adequate preparation, he did more, he sold me on the importance of public safety. After an hour, he had positively inspired me to undertake a complete remodeling of our enforcement facilities. As well he gave me vision for the future. I shall never grow tired in expressing my appreciation for this interview. We made the necessary physical changes. We appropriated more money for more manpower. We improved the physical facilities. We were the first city south of the Ohio River to put in a police radio system, accepted in due time the two-way radio system, established an accident-prevention bureau in the police department, sent our men to Northwestern and to Yale and to the FBI Academy, attended regularly the National Safety Council congresses, sought the counsel of able traffic engineers, made several city-wide traffic surveys, established a violations bureau in connection with the municipal court. Without recounting further so much that is old to you, in developing a well-rounded safety program, we went on to win the first prize in the National Safety Council's safety contest in 1937, in competition with cities not only in our own population class but with cities regardless of population.

What one man did to inform and to challenge a responsible municipal officer can be done by each of you if you will but make the effort.

While I was commissioner of public safety, the city of Memphis established the first automobile compulsory inspection stations in the world. We required an examination of the safety devices of all automobiles three times each year. That was done during the very depth of the depression when every citizen counted pennies, much less dollars.

I recognized the value of such a program to the saving of human life. At the same time I felt that there would accrue a very definite economic value. It was necessary to reconcile needed ordinances and to pass others. A fee of $1 was fixed to cover the three inspections. When the matter was mentioned to the automobile dealers and repair people, there was immediate objection. Even the automobile clubs and some of the safety organizations were not enthusiastic. Some private citizens thought it was but another move to tax the owner of an automobile.

So, then, began the slow process of molding public opinion. We met with small groups of all of these organizations to which I have made reference. We had conferences with the public press and the radio. We trained the attendants with great thoroughness; we equipped them with distinctive white uniforms and drilled them by day and by night in the fundamentals of courtesy. For a week or 10 days we planned and publicized a gala opening. On the morning the station opened, representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, from labor unions, schools, luncheon clubs, service clubs, and every organization of any consequence, were invited to sit on the platform and participate in a brief ceremony presided over by the mayor of the city. When the band struck up a lively tune, the ribbon was cut, and a long line of municipal automobiles began to pass through the inspection lanes.

The troubles were over. The public had accepted an innovation. The public would dare any administration to abolish the practice now.

I have always maintained that the public will go along with you if your safety program is sound and you take the people into your confidence.

The newspapers of the country will give unlimited space to any safety program in any local community and in any State subdivision if it is intelligently, practically, and constantly presented. The radio will extend itself if those offering safety programs will use good, common, horse sense in developing an attractive program to which people will listen. Public officials will support your program if you are constantly alert, cooperative, helpful, and intelligent in your presentation.

Local officials sometimes change frequently. Your selling campaign must be a continuing one. It should be one not of antagonism, unless your public officials are without reason or responsibility. Then, should it be necessary, you have the popular cause and the votes to take care of them.

We have the power unlimited. Will we use it?

Surely, there is much to be done. I feel, as you do, that our country has the character, the intelligence, the resources, and the genius to ever remain great. But, in closing, we must be reminded that our country has been strong because we have been a Christian Nation.

Some years ago on an Easter morning I took my younger son and one of his pals, an English boy temporarily residing in this country, to a sunrise meeting at Arlington National Cemetery. As we sat there in that beautiful amphitheater among some 35,000 people, we watched the sun break over the horizon in the East.

The services were about to begin. In the distance the Knights Templar were marching to their places behind a military band which was playing softly Onward Christian Soldiers.

Almost instantly there appeared at the box immediately to the right of the speaker's stand an old man in uniform, on the arm of a handsome young military aide. The old gentleman's overcoat, so seldom used, was much too large to protect the frail body on which it hung. Without a spoken word every man, woman, and child in that vast audience rose quietly.

This great old soldier stood erect and cast his eyes from left to right, and, almost in painful silence, minutes seemed to pass as he stood looking over that throng of people. He sat down. I could not help but think that he was acknowledging humbly the quiet recognition of his fellow countrymen for his marvelous leadership in the last war.

I said to these two boys: "You have been privileged to participate in a most dramatic scene. That was Gen. John J. Pershing, the General of the Armies. We just stood in recognition of our admiration, respect, and love for a great soldier. In a moment we shall stand again, but this time in recognition of the great Prince of Peace."

My friends, in deep humility and with earnest sincerity, we must—as individuals—and as a Nation—stand up for the great teachings brought by the Saviour of the world.

We must have the heart and the vision and the will to build our country greater upon the fundamental teachings of the one who gave us the two great commandments: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."

There is a reverence about a campaign to save lives. Let us stand up and use the power unlimited from on high.

Poland: Victim of Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, one of the best writers and speakers on the subject of Poland is William Henry Chamberlin, a well-known American commentator, author, and lecturer. In remarks recently given by him on the winter program of the Polish American Congress, Inc., Western Massachusetts Branch, over the facilities of Station WSPR, at Springfield, Mass., he set forth vividly the failures of the representatives of the United States and Great Britain at their meeting with Stalin at Yalta. The European recovery program is part of the price we are paying on account of the Yalta agreement. Mr. Chamberlin's remarks are entitled "Poland: Victim of Appeasement." They are as follows:

POLAND: VICTIM OF APPEASEMENT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The Polish people are the flesh-and-blood victims of a policy of appeasing Stalin at any cost, followed during the war by the American and British Governments, to the grave detriment of American and British national interests. Poland entered the unequal struggle against Hitler, all the more unequal because Stalin acted as Hitler's ally and stabbed the Polish armies in the back while they were engaged with the Germans on the front, with specific assurance of British support.

The British Government, as early as March 31, 1939, assured the Polish Government "all support in its power" against aggression. This assurance was broadened and made more specific in the Anglo-Polish agreement of mutual assistance, signed on August 25, 1939. There were no specific United States treaty commitments to Poland. But the four freedoms and the Atlantic charter, America's professed war aims, and the principle, often announced by our State, of not recognizing territorial changes brought about by force were certainly compromised by the tragic sequence of events in Poland. These events began with a brutal new partition of Poland between Nazi Germany and Communist Russia and ended with the incorporation of Poland, under an unrepresentative government and most unwillingly, into the ranks of the Russian satellite states. To free Poland and to undo the evil heritage of appeasement, as expressed in the Yalta agreement, should be a main objective of American policy in Europe.

After the tide of war on the eastern front turned decisively in Russia's favor in 1943 and 1944 the Soviet Government drove forward relentlessly toward the achievement of two objectives in Poland. The first was the imposition on the Polish people of a made-in-Moscow administration, with veteran Comintern agents like Bierut, Radkiewicz, Gomulka, and Berman holding key positions. The second was to seal Poland's dependence on Russia by deforming the country's boundaries, taking away the eastern half of the country and giving Poland for the time being German territory in the West. The possibility that this territory may be returned to Germany in a new partition of Poland is a useful carrot for cunning and devious Soviet diplomacy to dangle before the noses of German nationalists.

The realization of Stalin's ambitions at the expense of Poland was greatly aided by the weak appeasement policies of the western democracies. As early as the spring of 1942 the British Government which had urged Poland to enter the war, was apparently willing to give away Poland's eastern provinces as part of the price of Soviet alliance. The United States Government at that time stood firmly by the principles of the Atlantic Charter and successfully opposed this suggestion.

But somehow American political force and influence on the international scene illogically declined as American military power increased. Harry Hopkins and other amateur negotiators who were sent to Moscow seemed to be obsessed with the curious idea that the United States was accepting, not conferring, a favor in pouring $11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease munitions, food, and supplies into Russia. There was never any attempt to link up these shipments with the observance by the Soviet Government of its moral and legal obligation to respect the political independence and territorial integrity of Poland.

The first definite acquiescence in the territorial mutilation of Poland was given at the Tehran Conference, in the latter part of 1943. After this conference, Winston Churchill openly spoke in Parliament in favor of the so-called Curzon line as the eastern frontier of Poland and put strong pressure on the Polish Government to accept this proposal.

Meanwhile President Roosevelt maintained a sphinx-like silence on the subject of Poland. He gave an ostentatiously warm greeting to the Prime Minister of the Polish Government, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, when the latter visited Washington in June 1944. Roosevelt suggested that by personal intervention with Stalin he could obtain for Poland Lwow and perhaps Wilno. When Mikolajczyk, who took Roosevelt's good faith seriously, raised this question in Moscow in October, Molotov bluntly told him that Roosevelt at Tehran, months before the suggestion about Lwow and Wilno in Washington in June, had accepted the Curzon line as the Polish frontier. A desperate appeal

from Mikolajczyk to Roosevelt remained without reply until the election in November 1944 was over. When the reply came it was completely noncommittal as to the questions which Mikolajczyk had asked.

Mikolajczyk twice went to Moscow in an effort to reach an honorable agreement with the Soviet leaders. But no such agreement was to be had. On one occasion he asked Churchill what guaranty there would be that the remainder of Poland would remain free if the territory east of the Curzon line should be ceded to Russia. Churchill assured him of the support of Britain and the United States. But this support, as later events would show, was an extremely weak reed on which to lean.

While pressure on the harassed Polish Government was intensified and backstairs negotiations were preparing the way for the final betrayal of Polish independence at Yalta, the people of Poland gave one last heroic testimonial of their will to be free. This was the Warsaw uprising of August and September 1944. On the eve of the uprising the Soviet armies were sweeping across the plains of Poland. As they approached the Polish capital and the Vistula River, appeals in Polish from the Moscow radio station poured out. No less than 11 such appeals were monitored in Great Britain and all called for immediate uprising.

Mikolajczyk was in Moscow at that time and Stalin assured him the Red army would be in Warsaw by August 6. It is against this background that one must judge the decision of the commander of the underground army, General Komorowski (also known under his pseudonym of Bor) to give the signal for an all-out uprising.

At first the revolt was remarkably successful. The old-city area and many public buildings were taken. It was a genuine people's war. A large part of the Warsaw civilian population, men, women, even children joined in.

Every people that took part in the later war has its record of deeds of exceptional heroism. But there was probably no collectively braver action in the course of the whole war than this 2-month struggle of an imperfectly armed guerilla army and a largely unarmed civilian population against a powerful German garrison, equipped with airplanes, tanks, and artillery. It was the most glorious and most terrible of all Warsaw's uneven fights for freedom. In the end the city was almost completely destroyed, block by block. Tens of thousands of people lost their lives. The remnants of Komorowski's forces surrendered after they had exhausted their last reserves of ammunition, foodstuffs and medical supplies.

The sudden stopping of the Russian advance after the outbreak of the uprising and the Soviet refusal for weeks to permit American and British airplanes to use nearby Soviet air bases in order to support the insurgents raises the suspicion that the Soviet rulers deliberately provoked the revolt with promises of support which was never forthcoming in order to destroy a large part of Poland's patriotic underground fighters.

The climax of appeasement was reached at the Yalta Conference of the Big Three in February 1945. The Chinese observe the anniversary of a date when their government accepted oppressive demands by Japan as national humiliation day. The anniversary of the signature of the Yalta agreement, February 11, should be observed as a national humiliation day in America and Britain.

The war was professedly being fought for the self-determination of all peoples. The Polish people had been fighting on the anti-Nazi side from the first day of the war. Yet none who spoke for the Polish people was even admitted to a conference which made vitally important decisions about Poland's boundaries and form of government. The representative Polish Government in London which had acted as a loyal ally throughout the war, which enjoyed the support of almost all Poles and people of Polish origin who could express a free opinion, was brushed aside as nonexistent. The large part of Poland which lay to the east of the so-called Curzon line was assigned to Russia without any consultation of the wishes of the inhabitants. The Red quisling regime in Poland which existed only by virtue of Soviet bayonets was provisionally recognized, with the face-saving declaration that it should be reorganized, with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. This new government was to be pledged "to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot."

The Yalta agreement is completely indefensible on any moral grounds. It was a crude violation of the ideals and principles of American foreign policy. The argument that the Yalta terms had to be signed because otherwise Stalin might have quit the war in a huff will not stand a moment's serious examination. Stalin needed our aid much more than we needed his. Had the western democracies stood firm on the Atlantic Charter and made it clear that they would recognize no government except the legitimate one in London until free elections could be held in Poland the Soviet dictator would, in all probability, have come to a reasonable agreement.

It was the weakness of the democracies that encouraged the Soviet rulers to violate, almost from the moment it was signed, the promises in the Yalta agreement about free and unfettered elections. Patriotic leaders of the Polish underground were treacherously arrested after they emerged from hiding under safe conduct. The election, when it was finally held in January 1947, was a fraudulent farce.

Blatant Soviet disregard for the Yalta agreement has destroyed any moral validity it might have had for the American people. Twice Americans had shed their blood for wars which started in eastern Europe, one in Serbia, one in Poland. We cannot, in national self-interest, be indifferent to what happens in that part of the world. We must strive for a free Poland as an integral part of a free Europe.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Economic Council Review of Books on the subject of universal military training:

My allusion, last month, to the proposed permanent system of conscripting young Americans has brought me some letters that are frightening in their ignorant trustfulness. A typical one expresses resignation to the sad necessity since President Conant, of Harvard, "has examined the test at Fort Knox and approves it in every detail" and therefore supports the bill now pending in Congress. (I know nothing about President Conant's statement, myself. It is hard to see how an honest person could make such a statement and it is incredible that one in President Conant's position, knowing the trust that many Americans so lamentably place in publicized names, could make it publicly.)

Permanent conscription of Americans must destroy fundamental American law and change the future of mankind. It is monstrous frivolity to decide such a question on anyone's say-so, on guesses about unknowable future events, on Gallup polls and journalists' slants, and a public-relations expert's show-window test put on (with human beings) as a propaganda stunt apparently to influence the persons compelled to pay for it.

This question demands ordinary good judgment. It requires the use of reason, which God gives to men—not to sheep. Ordinary good judgment, used by every normal person during his every waking hour, is a rational deduction from past experience.

Past experience with universal military training is ample, verified, unquestionable, and very recent history. Every grade school child would know it if American children were not conscripted; obviously compulsory State schooling cannot teach its little conscript the unbiased truth about conscription. Free schools could do that—and did, within my memory. In this country, however, anyone can still learn the facts about universal military training in a few hours with a good encyclopedia. In simple honesty, nobody can express any opinion about universal military training until he knows these facts.

I have space only to indicate their outline. The details that I can't give you are important—important to you, and your learning them is your job. Here is a quick sketch:

Universal military training began in France in 1793, when George Washington was President for the second time and French Socialists defeated Jefferson's premature attempt to take the American Revolution to Europe. The reactionary French Socialists imitated pagan antiquity. (See Bastiat's The Law.) The ancient Greeks, notably the communist Spartans, had UMT for the ruling classes. The Roman Republic conquered the known world, including Greece, with the Roman legions composed of volunteers, but later the Roman Emperors reverted to conscription in their then-reactionary tyranny that destroyed the Roman Empire. (This is admirably sketched in Haskell's The New Deal in Old Rome, and I wish the Foundation for Economic Education or the Committee for Constitutional Government would reprint that book.)

While Europe revived through the Dark and Middle Ages, military service was voluntary; in feudalism, it was a class privilege. Volunteers created the modern nations and made them great (i. e., military) powers. France was a great power, and the United States no power at all, when Jefferson and Lafayette attempted a French revolution. When French Socialists defeated it (somewhat as the Bolsheviks overthrew Kerensky and defeated the Russian revolution), the Socialists reverted to Roman imperial conscription; and they made in universal, the levee en masse. By distorting the revolutionary American assertion of human equality and combining the distortion with socialism, they invented modern totalitarianism. Essential to totalitarianism is UMT. That is the military system now proposed for the United States.

It has existed in Europe only since 1793. Experience with it is therefore recent, fully documented, unquestionable, and easily accessible to Americans. (Though it is unknown in American schools.)

What are the results of UMT? In France, the enthusiasm for liberty aroused in Frenchmen by the American example carried the conscripts through 20 years of glorious victory. Cheering for freedom and for their

merciless tyrant, Napoleon, they conquered all Europe, and collapsed. France has never recovered; as a great power, France ended in 1814. The French have had UMT ever since, and have never won another war. England and the United States saved France in the First World War but not in the Second.

The Prussians copied UMT from Napoleon. The thoroughly drilled, goose-stepping Prussians, armed with quick-firing rifles invented in England and improved and mass produced in the United States, had such unheard-of and terrifying fire power against troops not so well armed that they won two whirlwind wars, of a few months each (1866 and 1870). They defeated France. The Germans have had UMT ever since and have never won another war.

England and the United States have never had UMT. England never had conscription in wartime until this century; volunteers made the British Empire.

Japan has had UMT since the eighth century. In 1904 the Japanese made a surprise raid on Russia, seized Port Arthur, and won the battle of Tsushima. The Czar's government, hampered by logistics and seriously endangered internally by the attempted revolution of 1904–5, accepted President Theodore Roosevelt's offer of mediation and ceded some territory to Japan by the Treaty of Portsmouth (New Hampshire). Japan continued the 1,100-year-old system of UMT, equipped the conscripts thoroughly and lavishly with every weapon of modern mechanized warfare, and has never won a modern war.

(Just one detail: Late in the recent war, the Japanese High Command tried to untrain its troops, sending them through special camps for quick courses under orders to act without orders. This paradox was a pathetically bewildered effort to compel men to act voluntarily, to force them to be self-reliant soldiers who would think and act on their own initiative in battle, as the Americans were doing.)

I think that the obvious world situation imperatively requires these United States to continue to be the world's strongest military power, not for a decade but for an indefinite time to come. I believe that Americans must fight more than one future war against the world's reactionary States; and I know that if this country loses a war or destroys American constitutional law, humane civilization ceases to exist. My own judgment, derived from the known facts, is that modern military power cannot possibly be maintained by a military method as old in principle as ancient Sparta, which in its modern totalitarian (universal) form has failed every country that has used it.

And I think that every American's patriotic duty and self-interest demand that he learn the facts, form his own judgment, and express it vigorously, now.

You will find the best short history of military conscription in this country, and of its logical (but as yet brief) extension to labor conscription, which is slavery, on pages 86–90 of a most important book, Total War and the Constitution, by Edward S. Corwin, McCormick professor of jurisprudence, emeritus, Princeton University.

With millions of other Americans, you and I know that the Constitution of these States and their Federation is the legal protection of American life, of our property, our homes, our liberty, and our actual lives. We know that, without this Constitution, the United States of America could not have existed, and that, without it now, each of us would be at the mercy of merciless force and cruelty, as German subjects were under Hitler's lawless regime and as Russian subjects are under Stalin's.

Nothing is as precious to Americans as the Constitution, for every value in our lives, and our lives themselves, depend upon it. The Constitution has been the safety in which Americans lived, a safety which Americans who were born in it took for granted as if it were the air they breathed, the solid ground underfoot.

An uneasiness began 12 years ago when Americans felt, as they had not since 1860, a threat to the Constitution. Then an unprecedented thing occurred; for the first time, Congress heard a spontaneous roar from the whole country, from the people who never had spoken before, shouting "No!" to the court packing plan. The uneasiness continues. Who has not said that this act of Congress, that Executive edict, is unconstitutional? Who hasn't heard the farmer, the taxi driver, the "man in the street" muttering that he can't figure out how they think it's constitutional? Countless thousands are reading the Federal Constitution for the first time in their lives. But in the present jungle of legalities, how can any layman—indeed, any average lawyer—know what has been done to it?

Is the American Constitution still sound? Is constitutional law still firmly the citizen's protection? If it is not, how has it been weakened? What damage has been done to it? What must Americans do to restore it? What actions taken in ignorance or by treacherous design will wreck it completely and leave you and me defenseless?

Total war and the Constitution answers these questions. Great learning, intelligence, wisdom are packed into this small book; it is one to read and reread, not with effort to grasp its meaning but for the expansion of its meaning in your own thought. This book shows you the changes made in the structure and powers of American government since 1860, especially since 1914, and the effect of these changes on the civil law that once protected an American citizen's human rights.

This is not a book for the fabulous ostrich, who, when in danger, prefers self-deception to self-defense. It is not for the good fellow who'll tell you he always looks on the bright side, fatuously imagining that "Don't worry; things will work out all right," is optimism. This book is for the genuine optimist who wants to know the truth and, when in danger, thinks and acts, knowing that right action always defeats wrong action.

You need not know law to understand Total War and the Constitution. The writer's intelligence is so easily the master of the abstruse subject and of the emotions which the facts arouse, that he makes them clear to any literate persons and even lightens his tone of just moderation with illuminating flashes of wit. For example, this is his comment on a certain precedent destructive of civil rights: "I am reminded of the Vermont farmer who was asked if he believed in baptism by immersion. 'Sure,' he said. 'I've seen it done.'"

The book comprises five lectures which Dr. Corwin gave at the University of Michigan. The fourth, Total Peace and the Constitution, deals with the Charter of the United Nations as its provisions demolish American law. The final one, the Postwar Constitution, describes the tottering wreck of the Constitution that remains and shows how little is left of due process of law, how nearly you and I are now exposed to lawless rule by personal whim.

Dr. Corwin concludes: "I dislike to end on so portentous a note. Yet surely the first requisite to a solution of difficulties is recognition of their seriousness. In the present case, as in all others in which conditions challenge men's courage and intellectual candor, Bishop Butler's famous words, spoken two centuries ago, remain applicable: 'Things and actions are what they are and the consequences will be what they will be; why, then, should we desire to be deceived?'"

If you desire to be deceived, I can name offhand a hundred books that will deceive you pleasantly. If you desire to protect your family, yourself, your country, read Total War and the Constitution and recognize the seriousness of the difficulties. These are times when the only safety is in facing danger and taking risks.

Perhaps I should point out that this book's description of the demolition of American law under the impact of war does not imply that war causes it. Of course, war is human action; it is the actions of numbers of persons in groups, as a baseball game is the action of 18 persons in two groups. The cause of human actions, whether in war, baseball, law, or politics, is the view of reality which the persons acting believe to be the true view.

I regret that in a few instances Dr. Corwin uses the word "democracy" when another word would be more strictly accurate, and he writes one phrase with which I disagree. You will be amused by the very idea of my disagreeing with Dr. Corwin about law; that's all right. The phrase is, "sovereignty [of Government] which is the source of law."

This is like saying, "Thomas Edison, who is the source of electric light." Government, the political state, is nothing but an organized group of persons, as the Edison Co. is; nothing is in the state that isn't in the persons; and no person, or group of persons, is a source of law. A person is a generator of energy, energy generated and controlled by his will; but he does not make even the laws of mechanical physics according to which his own physical energy operates. If Congressmen, or the voters who elect them, were the source of law, they could make it unlawful for the earth to revolve or for men to imagine what they cannot see.

Human beings can discover laws, principles existing in the universe; they can make forms conforming to these principles and use these forms as means of satisfying human needs and desires. As Edison discovered a principle existing in the nature of things and made the means which operate (according to that principle) to light a room when I press a button, so men can discover principles existing in the nature of man—principles called "moral" but nevertheless natural principles—and legislators can make legal forms which persons can use to protect natural human rights (life, individual self-control, ownership) and to maintain justice in human relationships.

Also, legislators can—and in the present state of human ignorance, usually they do—make legal forms that do not conform to natural moral principles: statutes that are legal but not lawful, so-called laws that men cannot use because, like defective wiring, they are means by which the principles operate to burn down the house instead of to light it. Legislators make this error in the mistaken belief that "sovereignty [is] the source of law." And by this error they destroy their states, the people living in these states, and themselves—as Hitler did, as all tyrants do.

Human beings are not the source of law, as they are not the source of electricity or gravitation. The only name for the source of law is God, the Creator of all things and all life.

It seems to me so essential that you read Total War and the Constitution that I would not suggest a rival for your attention even had I found a book to rival it. I haven't. Not that I haven't tried; the shrillness that you hear in my references to universities come from my reading so many of their books.

You may recall that in The Road to Serfdom Dr. Hayek devoted six pages of the chapter, The Totalitarians in Our Midst, to Dr. Edward Hallett Carr, Wilson professor of international politics at College University of Wales. Citing Professor Carr's book, Twenty Years Crisis, Dr. Hayek wrote that Professor Carr "confessed himself an adherent of 'the historical school of realism [which] had its home in Germany and [whose] developments can be traced through the great names of Hegel and Marx.' A realist, he explains, is 'one who makes morality a function of poli-

tics' and who 'cannot logically accept any standard of value save that of fact.' This realism is contrasted, in truly German fashion, with the utopian thought dating from the eighteenth century 'which was essentially individualistic. * * *' But the old morals with their abstract general principles must disappear. * * * That without abstract general principles merit becomes solely a matter of arbitrary opinion and that international treaties, if they are not morally binding, have no meaning whatever, does not seem to bother Professor Carr."

Professor Carr's current book is The Soviet Impact on the Western World, a title engaging anyone's interest today. The Macmillan Co. says, truthfully, that Professor Carr "has been an important influence on international thinking." I met recently a man who years ago was a reader for a German publisher; he reported that a certain manuscript was false in its facts and implications, and the publisher refused it. Another publisher accepted it and made a killing in the market—and in other ways. The book was Mein Kampf. What would be the result, I wonder, if all publishers recognized that they are morally responsible persons?

The Soviet Impact on the Western World is a typical instance of the influence that is coming from many sources in American universities now. Its tone is judicial, detached, impartial. Professor Carr introduces it as "an attempt to investigate, not the merits or demerits of the Soviet achievement, but the extent of its significance for western civilization." (Did you notice that word "achievement"?)

The contents of this book are worthless, but its method should interest you. "After 1918 the high tide of democracy ebbed with bewildering rapidity. It became commonplace to say that democracy had failed to solve social and economic problems and that political democracy was not enough." President Wilson had "thrown the word 'democracy' into the international arena" and his influence established democracies throughout Europe. "The sequel provided little incentive * * * to invoke the slogan of democracy." Yet "Marshal Stalin, consciously or unconsciously usurping Woodrow Wilson's role, once more placed democracy in the forefront of allied war aims. The missionary role which had been filled in the First World War by American democracy and Woodrow Wilson had passed in the Second World War to Soviet democracy and Marshal Stalin. In 1919 democratic institutions on the model of western democracy were installed in many countries; in 1945 the new political institutions which *arose* (my italics) in eastern Europe [and] had arisen earlier in parts of China conformed, though rather less slavishly, to the Soviet pattern.

"The challenge thus boldly thrown into the international area * * * had been announced * * * by Lenin himself." Professor Carr quotes Lenin himself:

"Proletarian democracy is a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy; the Soviet power is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois Republic." "The Soviet democracy is the maximum of democracy for the workers and peasants; at the same time it means a break with bourgeois democracy and the rise of a new universal-historical type of democracy, namely, proletarian democracy or the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Well, there you have the method. Try to get a grip on its slipperiness. You can't say that democracy isn't the rule of the majority; it is. You can't say that "rule" isn't dictatorship; it is. You can't say that workers and peasants (farmers, in the United States only) aren't the majority; they are. Then what is the most democratic democracy?

Always judicial, objective, Professor Carr clarifies the idea. "Confusion of thought is often caused by the habit common among [western] politicians and writers of defining democracy * * * as 'self-government' or 'government by consent.' What these terms define is not democracy, but anarchy. Government of some kind is necessary in the common interest precisely because men will not govern themsleves. 'Government by consent' is a contradiction in terms; for the purpose of government is to compel people to do what they would not do of their own volition." Professor Carr has never heard of American constitutional law?

In sum, this typical—repeat, typical—"intellectual" book says goodbye to human rights. "The age of individualism now drawing to its close stands in history as an oasis between the totalitarianism of the medieval church and empire and the new totalitarianism of the modern world." "All but the blind and the incurable" see that "the forces of disintegration latent in individualism" can't stand against the Soviet impact. Perhaps the new totalitarian democracy may be a synthesis of individualism and Soviet democracy. "The danger for the English speaking world lies perhaps most of all in its lack of flexibility." "Much will depend on the support which the Soviet Union indirectly derives from those men and women in the Western World who, diagnosing the evils of western society, believe that some of the ideas latent in the Bolshevik revolution * * * can be invoked to cure them. That [this belief] has some validity hardly anyone will any longer care to deny."

The Professor Carrs are legion. If anything is more inexplicable than the fact that rich American capitalists support and subsidize them and even respect them, it is that these intellectuals prepare their own countries, open the doors, pave the way, spread down the red carpet and welcome with joy the arrival of the Soviet democracy, whose announced intention and first act—invariably, without a single exception in 20 countries—is to kill these welcoming intellectuals. This extermination is ordained: Lenin himself said, "The intellectuals will always betray a revolution" and in Soviet "law" it is a crime punished by death "to be suspected of lack of sympathy for the revolution."

Why do they do it when there are so many means of suicide that are cleaner and far less painful? But, I must admit, not murderous.

Total War and the Constitution, by Edward S. Corwin. Alfred A. Knopf, 501 Madison Avenue, New York 22. 182 pp. index. $2.50.

The Soviet Impact on the Western World, by Edward Hallett Carr. The Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, 113 pp. $2.

In April Rose Wilder Lane will review a book favorable to U. M. T. (Note: N. E. C. has as yet taken no position on the U. M. T.)

Russian Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, the ruthless hand of barbaric totalitarianism in aggressive advancement of its hideous ideology has lowered the iron curtain again. Devoid of hope and shut off from the light of truth, Czechoslovakia gropes in the blackness of despair. Gallant Finland is being innoculated with Dr. Stalin's needle of contamination. Inevitably she will succumb to the virus.

The juggernaut rolls on unimpeded and almost unchallenged. The democracies of western Europe have been reached on the Kremlin's agenda while America marks time. We must lend a helping hand to those who struggle in desperation to stand by the side of the great democracy of the west or we shall stand or fall alone.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by Mrs. Charlotte von Beuningen, a citizen of Holland and former head of the Dutch Red Cross. This letter was addressed to Mr. E. H. Lane, of Altavista, Va. The fine and constructive spirit of this letter commends it to every Member of Congress:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 23, 1948.*

DEAR MR. LANE: We have been traveling about so much that it is only now that I can answer your letter of January 29.

I am writing about Holland because it is my own country and having lived there right through the war, the German occupation and the years after, I know what is going on there. I know also that what is going on there is going on all over Europe and that this means great danger for the European democracies and for the United States.

Much of Europe's reconstruction depends on the Marshall plan and on the material help of America. But even the Marshall plan will fail if, together with material aid, America does not export to Europe a dynamic self-sustaining new spirit, the ideology of a God-inspired democracy that will be an answer to war in the future. Old Europe is so worn out by war, enemy occupation, and the groove of traditions that it needs above everything an ideology which will give a high enough incentive for living, that will unite husband and wife, parents and children, management and labor, nation and nation, and make every one of us listen to God again and obey Him. William Penn said: "Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants." If freedom is to last we need a pattern of inspired democracy that makes it more dynamic and effective than any form of organized materialism.

In Holland immediately after the liberation people began very energetically to work on the reconstruction of our country. Many bridges over our big rivers that were blown up by the Germans have been rebuilt, broken roads reconstructed, dikes mended, all the flooded land made dry again; plans to rebuild the bombed areas and the stricken towns are ready. Three or four families live cheerfully in one-family houses because they know our Government is going to make every possible effort to rebuild the stricken areas.

But now a sort of apathy and hopelessness has got in because of lack of material. We cannot rebuild houses without brick or wood or steel or cement or other building materials. We have remade our dikes and the land is ready to cultivate again but there is no fertilizer, no good seed to plant. Our workmen and our farmers are ready to work but it is difficult to do a maximum day's work on indigestible bread made of a mixture of potatoes and second-rate substitutes for wheat, hardly any butter or margarine or fat, very little meat and sugar, etc. Wages are very high but we have so little food and textiles that people are unable to buy food, clothes, or household linen for their families. After their work they come back to crowded houses that are badly heated because there is no coal.

All this is breeding discontent, lack of energy, and hopelessness which holds back the speedy reconstruction of our nation and is a fertile ground for ideologies creeping in which are dangerous to democracy.

I believe that America, land of pioneers and warm-hearted people whose truly great men all listened to God and depended on Him, can give Europe a spiritual lead that will make their direly needed material help so effective that it will unite the European democracies into a stronghold for its democratic free way of life.

Yours sincerely,

LOTTY VON BEUNINGEN.

Dr. Hugh H. Bennett Speaks of Soil Conservation and Its Relationship to the American Economy Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio interview between myself and Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service. Dr. Bennett is generally known as "the father of soil conservation," and his reputation is world wide. Only recently he was awarded the Collum gold medal by the American Geographical Society for outstanding original contributions to knowledge of the earth, its land and water and inhabitants. The interview, carried by a number of Texas stations, follows:

Mr. FISHER. I have asked you to take part of this program, Dr. Bennett, because I believe soil conservation is one of the most important matters before us today—in my part of Texas as well as all over the country.

Dr. BENNETT. I am glad, Congressman FISHER, to have this opportunity to discuss soil conservation. We have done a lot of conservation work, but I think I should point out that the big job is still ahead of us.

Mr. FISHER. Well, I know you can give us much helpful information and advice. Everybody knows you are the leading authority in the field of soil conservation. And, as I recall, you have made some first-hand studies of our land conditions in west Texas.

Dr. BENNETT. Yes, I have. My first work in Texas began back in 1906, in connection with a soil survey of Robertson County. Since then I have worked in many other counties in the State, and at one time or another I have either worked in or been in every county in the State. This has covered a period of some 40 years. My first experience in your part of Texas was in connection with soil survey work some 25 years ago—in the Edwards Plateau section.

We have found that erosion is quite general in many parts of Texas, even on some of the grazing land where ranching has not always been managed as well as it might have been.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, sir—I can see that you have done some looking around in my country, all right, Dr. Bennett. I know for a fact that what you say about erosion and the need for better range management is quite true. That's why I'm anxious for every landowner in my country to hear more about soil and water conservation, and to continue their interest in helping that good work along—for their own gain as well as for the public good.

I have traveled across the country a great deal, and have observed some of the damage that has been taking place on our farm and ranch lands elsewhere. It has been disturbing to a good many people who have come to realize how important sustained agricultural production is to our national welfare. It is disturbing to see anything cutting into our production of food and fiber at this time, when the demands on us are so great from all over the world.

So I wish you would tell us briefly just where we stand now, as far as our good, productive land is concerned. * * *

Dr. BENNETT. Well, in the first place, Congressman, we don't have any too much really good land left. Unfortunately, we have allowed around half of our cropland here in the United States to be damaged in some degree by erosion. Millions of acres have been ruined for any further practical crop production, and other millions of acres have been seriously damaged. Moreover, millions of acres of grazing land have been damaged by this same wasteful process.

So we find ourselves today all too close to the danger line with respect to our supply of agricultural land. And about 85 percent of that part of our crop and grazing land which is still subject to impoverishing erosion is still lacking the protection of effective soil-conservation treatment.

Mr. FISHER. Some of that damaged land is to be found in Texas, isn't it, Dr. Bennett?

Dr. BENNETT. Oh, yes; I am sorry to say. Too much of it. No part of the country has escaped. Erosion surveys by the Soil Conservation Service show that something like half of both the cropland and grazing land of Texas has been seriously affected by erosion.

All of this damage and waste is unnecessary; it can be stopped in a very practical way with sound soil conservation and proper land use. And it would certainly pay us to get this conservation work done as quickly as possible, because the cost of uncontrolled erosion throughout the Nation amounts to more than a billion dollars a year—that is, in such measurable items as direct cost to farmers and ranchers, contributions to flood damage, silting of reservoirs and ditches, and so on, not to mention such other costs as reduced income and purchasing power of farmers and ranchers, and a narrowed tax base. We are still losing at least 500,000 acres of cropland every year, with a still larger number damaged in some degree.

Mr. FISHER. I am sure this is something that any thinking man or woman will agree we should do something about without delay. I know what you are going to say, Dr. Bennett—that we are doing something about it. But I imagine you'll agree that we still are not doing nearly enough.

Just how is the soil-conservation program coming along, anyway?

Dr. BENNETT. Wonderfully well, Congressman FISHER—better than I ever expected to see as recently as 15 years ago. And you are absolutely right—I think we are still not moving nearly fast enough. But we do now have a great and successful program actively under way throughout the United States.

Our work is being done through and in cooperation with soil-conservation districts, organized by the landowners under State laws, and supervised by farmers elected by their neighbors. The Soil Conservation Service is helping the districts get the job done mainly by supplying technical help. All this is being done at the request of the district supervisors.

Mr. FISHER. These soil-conservation districts are a mighty fine thing, Dr. Bennett: We have a lot of them down in my country. I checked up on them the other day and was gratified to find that there are 13 soil-conservation districts in my congressional district alone. These 13 districts take in nearly 9,000,000 acres, I believe it is, in 22 of our 27 counties. Maybe they'll all be in districts before very long.

Dr. BENNETT. I hope so, Congressman, because farmers and ranchers everywhere are finding their soil-conservation districts to be the best means ever devised for getting this important job done. There are nearly 2,000 districts in the 48 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. They cover more than a billion acres and more than three-fourths of all the farms in the country. Texas alone had 143 districts, including about 127,000,000 acres, or 75 percent of the State, on the first of January.

The important point, of course, is that much good soil- and water-conservation work is being done. Up to the first of this year, in soil-conservation districts alone, the Soil Conservation Service had helped the districts prepare more than 500,000 complete farm- and ranch-conservation plans, covering nearly 150,000,000 acres. And considerably more than 75,000,000 acres already have had the planned work applied. Those figures do not include many additional millions of acres planned and treated under other programs in which our Service has taken part.

Mr. FISHER. That's a real showing by the country's progressive farmers and ranchers, all right. And it indicates to me that any money we've appropriated for this soil conservation assistance has been spent to good advantage. * * * Do you have any figures for my country on that sheet of paper there, Dr. Bennett?

Dr. BENNETT. I do, Clark. I see that in the 10 of your districts where we have cooperated so far, there have been 2,800 conservation farm and ranch plans prepared, covering 2⅓ million acres, with more than a million acres already completely treated on January 1 this year.

The conservation treatment has included such measures as range seeding, water development, contour planting, construction of terraces, strip cropping, and planting cover crops.

Mr. FISHER. I know you've also been doing some important flood-control work in my country * * * You know that is something I'm especially interested in, too, because I had something to do with this as a member of the old flood-control committee.

Mr. BENNETT. And it's a highly important part of the whole soil conservation undertaking, Congressman FISHER. The middle Colorado River watershed is one of 11 projects in which the Soil Conservation Service is engaged in special flood control operations. The area authorized for work in this watershed totals some 4,500,000 acres, as I recall; and work is now under way in Brown, Coleman, Concho, McCulloch, Mason, Menard, Mills, San Saba, and Schleicher Counties—on 446,000 acres. Kendall, Runnels, and Sutton Counties also are in this authorized flood control project area.

The work here includes terracing, establishing grassed waterways, diversions, farm ponds, seeding badly eroded acres that contribute to runoff and heavy silt loads, building major gully-control structures and retention dikes, and roadside erosion control work as it affects flood flows.

Flood control surveys also have been resumed in the Concho River Watershed, looking to congressional authorization for similar work. This survey includes Coke, Irion, Runnels, Sterling, Tom Green, and part of Concho and Schleicher counties.

Mr. FISHER. We're mighty glad to see this good work going ahead that way, Dr. Bennett. It's something that is bound to benefit everybody. Of course, we can say the same thing for all this soil conservation work, can't we?

Dr. BENNETT. That's right. Practical, scientific soil conservation—which deals with each important tract of land according to its needs and capabilities—benefits the people on the land, business and professional people in town, our schools and churches, and the State and Nation. I could cite numerous examples. Many of them have come to my attention from your west Texas country.

We could talk with the O'Harrows, for example, near Eldorado in the Eldorado-Divide Soil Conservation District. They would tell us how, by stocking at a rate which allowed the range grasses to improve, they were able in just a few years to bring back a blanket of native forage grasses and overcome bitterweed infestation which had been taking a heavy toll of their sheep. Or I could cite Tommy Humble at Sterling City, in the North Concho Soil Conservation District. He would tell how proper stocking had produced a larger total yield and is making him more money from his sheep than by heavy stocking. And Joe Vanderstucken of Sonora, in the Edwards Plateau Soil Conservation District, who would say that soil depletion is just as bad as pests like bitterweed in causing small calf, kid, and lamb crops, high death losses, large feed bills, and so on.

I wish there was time to mention some of the many other outstanding returns from soil conservation work which have been reported from your west Texas country.

Mr. FISHER. I don't think there is any question any more about the effectiveness and the value of the kind of soil conservation work you have been telling us about, Dr. Bennett. And I hope there are not many—if any—people in my country who don't appreciate the importance of soil conservation and want to see it put into effect 100 percent on our farm and ranch lands. The big job now is for us all to pull together in working for that goal.

Plain People in Our Embassies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. DORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the South Carolina Weekly, Joe Mulieri, editor:

WE NEED PLAIN FOLKS IN OUR EMBASSIES ABROAD

The reign of terror seems to be raging once again in Europe. Russia is on the march, and we are afraid that perhaps the Great War didn't accomplish much. We sent a lot of guys from South Carolina and every State in the Union to be killed only to swap six for a half dozen. We got rid of Hitler and took on Joe Stalin.

Our alliance with Russia during the war was a matter of expediency. It should have been regarded as such all of the time. Stalin didn't fight on our side to save the world for democracy. He fought to save the world for communism.

The fact that the situation is "bad" and "serious" in Europe is not an opinion expressed by the South Carolina Weekly. It is the opinion of Secretary of State Marshall.

Marshall went further than just saying that. He appealed to the American people to remain calm and cool headed.

How much of this is political propaganda and how much of it is the honest-to-goodness truth, we are not in a position to say because we don't know. We don't know how close we are to another destructive war.

But we do know this:

We should quit pussyfooting in Washington. We should quit playing politics. It's a sad commentary on the boys that went over there and never returned home.

It's time that we took positive action. And this does not necessarily mean to drop an atom bomb on Moscow. It means that we have got to make up our mind as to whether we are going to effectively render help to the people of Europe who believe in democracy now or forget about it and suffer the consequences.

The South Carolina Weekly is bold enough to suggest at the same time that we do a little house cleaning in Washington and get rid of some of our diplomats in the State Department.

Instead of sending millionaires to represent the United States in the capitals of Europe, send some plain folks, folks who do not have to make the rounds of all the cocktail parties from 5 o'clock on in the evening. Send folks who would get around and see just how effective our aid is administered to the people.

Those of us who were overseas know for a fact that often American goods were distributed to the people not in the name of American generosity but in the name of the local Communist Party. We have been tolerating that kind of bunk for a long time.

Who would these plain, down-to-earth folks that the South Carolina Weekly would send to our embassies over the world be?

They would be the former GI's who served months in Rome, Athens, Vienna, Prague, Berlin, and thousands and thousands of other cities and towns of Europe. They didn't fraternize with the local nobility.

They went around and got acquainted with plain folks and local conditions.

Some of these former GI's perhaps would not look as elegant in tails as some of our trained diplomats do, but they would do a job in executing the Marshall plan if we ever decide to put it in effect.

TVA a World Model After 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority is now under investigation by a Senate committee. Escar Thompson, a most capable and fair news observer who is the Associated Press writer at Knoxville, Tenn., gives his impression of the TVA in an article for the Washington Post for March 15. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article:

"ABUSED" TVA A WORLD MODEL AFTER 15 YEARS

(By Escar Thompson)

KNOXVILLE, TENN., March 13.—The Tennessee Valley Authority, nearing its fifteenth anniversary, is serving as a blueprint for similar power and flood-control developments in other lands.

Since VJ-day more than 300 foreigners, among them government leaders, engineers, scientists, and writers, have visited the project. Most of them were studying the program with an eye to adapting some phase of it to their own countries.

At least three other countries have begun work or made plans for projects similar to TVA. In each instance a former employee of the authority is in charge.

India has begun work on a power agency on the Damodar River, with W. L. Voorduin, a former TVA engineer, in charge. Peru has a dam-building program under direction of Barton Jones. Plans have been drawn for a vast development on the Jordan River in Palestine, with James Hays, another former TVA engineer, as chief engineer.

A junior TVA is nearing completion in the hills of Puerto Rico. It will furnish one-seventh of the island's power, replacing imported oil.

RELENTLESS FOE

TVA will be 15 years old in May. The years have been stormy ones, with prospects of no immediate change in that respect.

For one thing, TVA now goes to a Republican Congress for operating funds. For another, Tennessee's Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, long a bitter foe of the TVA directorate, has made clear his determination to continue to oppose TVA on policy matters, particularly fiscal ones.

MCKELLAR for years has unsuccessfully sponsored legislation to require TVA to return its power revenues to the Treasury. TVA officials argue that this would deprive the agency of financial flexibility, which they contend is vital to successful operation of the power program.

A Senate Public Works Subcommittee is scheduled to open hearings Monday on MCKELLAR'S latest bill. This not only embraces the financial provision, but also would give the TVA administration a thorough overhauling.

One accusation leveled at the Authority is that it is a socialistic experiment bent on encroaching upon private enterprise. The Authority's official answer is summed up by Director James P. Pope this way:

"All of TVA's functions are devoted to the service of the people in their private and community undertakings. They are to assist the farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer, and all others engaged in private enterprise. The dams, the power plants, navigation locks, floodgates, and all other facilities are only a means to that end."

NO. 1 POWER PLANT

Before he stepped down as TVA chairman to become head of the Atomic Energy Commission, David E. Lilienthal said the Authority had passed from the 'first phase"—the dramatic dam-building program—to its "second phase."

His successor, Gordon R. Clapp, amplifying this, says: "We now have the tools with which to make full utilization of the Valley's natural resources—and this is the payoff from dam-building."

TVA was created by a 1933 congressional act which charged it with harnessing the Tennessee River for flood control, power, and navigational purposes. The Authority was given broad powers to coordinate and develop resources—the soil, minerals, forests, and industries—of the Tennessee Valley. This is an area of more than 40,000 square miles, with 4,000,000 persons.

Its power program has developed so rapidly that today the Authority is the largest single producer of electric current in the United States. It provided more than 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power last year for 800,000 consumers.

TVA has a variety of contractual relations with 22 privately owned power companies, providing for interconnection of facilities, for interchange, and purchase of the power and for mutual emergency stand-by services.

During the 1947 fiscal year, the Authority delivered 1,126,600,000 kilowatt-hours of power by interchange to private utilities and sold 1,042,400,000 kilowatt-hours to them. It received 449,500,000 kilowatt-hours by interchange and bought 13,100,000 kilowatt-hours.

Among major utility systems with which TVA is interconnected are Alabama Power Co., Georgia Power Co., Arkansas Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Appalachian Electric Power Co., Carolina Power & Light Co., Louisville Gas & Electric Co., and Kentucky Utilities Co.

CURB ON OHIO

TVA estimates the city of Chattanooga has been spared $23,000,000 in flood damages in the last 4 years through regulation of the Tennessee River during the winter rainy season.

It also maintains that in event of a major flood on the lower Ohio River, its system of dams would reduce flood heights by at least 2 feet between Cairo, Ill., and the mouth of the Arkansas River. It says this 2-foot reduction is worth $200,000,000 in protection along the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

The nine major dams on the Tennessee River form a 630-mile channel from Knoxville to the Ohio River which will accommodate vessels of 9-foot draft. Last year more than 340,000,000 ton-miles of freight were handled on this channel.

The Tennessee, transformed from a swift, uncontrolled stream into a series of lakes, now connects with a 10,000-mile inland waterway system. This provides cheap transportation over which grain from the Midwest, automobiles and other manufactured products from the North and East and oil and petroleum products from Louisiana move into the valley.

Th net cost of TVA to the Federal Government as of June 30, 1947, totals $791,325,000. Of this amount, $348,239,240 is charged to the power system, on which the Authority reports gross revenues of $259,887,000.

TVA claims its power operations have produced a net profit of $92,566,000 after deducting operating expenses of $157,233,000, net interest of $4,088,000, and special amortization of electric-plant acquisition adjustments of $6,000,000.

Cheap electricity, plus an intense rural electrification program, have combined to increase TVA's power revenues from an estimated $15,000,000 in 1940 to $44,000,000 last fiscal year.

The Authority reported a net power income of $21,200,000 last year. The private-power interests disputed this figure, contending TVA's power costs were hidden and that the agency actually operated at an overall deficit.

The Menace Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Catholic Action of the South:

THE MENACE GROWS

If the latest Communist coup that made a tragic victim of Czechoslovakia is causing wide concern in international political and economic circles, it is just as much a matter of grave anxiety for any Christian who realizes the effect on religion of the kiss of death from communism in any country.

Red ideologies don't permit any others to coexist or to be held by anybody wherever communism holds sway, least of all the teachings of Christ. In the light of that realization today, we can recall with bitter irony the fulsome writings in the American press of not many years ago, when Russia and her tyrants and their ideologies were being vociferously touted as "democratic."

Not since the days of Munich has the whole outlook been so depressing and foreboding, and not since the days of the invasions of the barbarians have Christianity and Christian civilization faced such a menace as they do now with the relentless advance of Red tyranny like the spectral figure of death, swinging with deadly effects on religion and liberty, the sickle and the hammer. Yesterday it was Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Austria, today the land of the Czechs and the fearful Finns. Tomorrow? Who knows—Italy, China, France, Spain?

Many of us, evidently, are much concerned about the political implications of Russia's move, and justly so, but let us not for a moment forget the inevitable death that accompanies the lengthening shadow of the Kremlin—death for all Christian concepts, ideals, and principles. The latter, we should recall, are inextricably bound up with our own ideas of democracy, respect for the human individual and his rights, and true freedom. Uproot these and man is left tragically at the mercy of the tyrant, the despoiler of liberty, and the exploiter of human beings.

During these momentous times we should root ourselves and our fellow men in these great basic Christian principles that are the foundation of Christian civilization and all that is worth while for man in this world. A greater appreciation of these things will make us more determined to hold onto them against all subverters.

Appropriation for Bonneville Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Subcommittee on Appropriations in regard to Bonneville Power Administration's requests:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee in support of items included in the supplemental estimates submitted to the Congress on January 22, 1948, for the Bonneville Power Administration. There are eight items in these requests totaling $725,000 of direct appropriations and $1,475,000 for contract authorizations. Of these eight items, three are of prime importance to my district in the State of Washington, namely, "Grand Coulee—Snohomish, No. 2," "Grand Coulee—Columbia, No. 3," and an item of $200,000 in direct appropriations for "Operation and maintenance." It is obvious, however, that all eight items are important as a group and that no individual item can be advanced or removed without affecting the intent and the purpose of the whole.

Mr. Chairman, Congress, as you are well aware, has provided four additional generators at Grand Coulee through the regular 1948 supply bill and the third supplemental bill. The capacity of Grand Coulee plant as of December 1947, according to information I have received from the consulting engineer of the Bonneville Power Administration, amounted to 1,410,000 kilowatts. Under the generator schedule approved in these recent supply bills to which I have referred, the capacity at Grand Coulee will be 1,650,000 kilowatts by December of 1948 and 2,010,000 kilowatts by the peak period of 1949. To avoid wasting this provided additional capacity at Grand Coulee, the transmission capability must match the generator capability. If this is accomplished, the power revenues will be increased from $23,700,000 in the fiscal year 1948 to $26,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. according to estimates supplied me by the consulting engineer of the Power Administration. The purpose of this current supplemental estimate is, of course, to accelerate line construction in order to carry this provided generation to power shortage areas.

This is of supreme importance, Mr. Chairman and members, to the city of Seattle and the immediately surrounding area of the Pacific Northwest, including the city of Tacoma. This area is one of the areas of greater shortage as indicated in a report of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee. I should like, Mr. Chairman, at this point to include in my remarks a statement issued recently by that committee, together with a table showing the estimates of new generating capacity need in the Northwest by 1956. I shall not read this statement and schedule, but I desire permission to include it with my own statement at this point.

"PACIFIC NORTHWEST UTILITIES CONFERENCE COMMITTEE STATEMENT

"The electric power requirements of the Pacific Northwest today exceed the safe operating capacity of the existing plant and are increasing at a rate beyond any construction schedule of Federal generating facilities. Even though the approved Federal power projects are completed as rapidly as physically possible, the installed capacity will not catch up with the estimated power requirements of the area until 1954.

"The people of the Northwest are facing a disastrous shortage of an essential element of regional growth. A shortage of electric power cannot be prevented. It has already begun. If the Northwest is to enjoy an orderly development, adequate electric power generating and transmission facilities must be created in a consistent program.

"It is obvious that we are now in a position such that new large power-using customers coming to the territory would not only jeopardize their own opportunities to continue to operate but would also deprive present customers of power supply. Therefore, failure to provide additional Federal generating capacity will retard the development of the area.

"The urgency of the need demands that available money and effort be concentrated on bringing into production, at the earliest possible moment, those Federal generating projects which are most susceptible of prompt completion—together with the related transmission lines and substations. Loss of a year in the completion of any of these projects due to the inadequacy of construction funds would be costly to the economy of both the Nation and the people of the region.

"Each and every electric distribution system in the region is carrying unprecedented responsibilities in connection with the major expansion of its facilities, and the immediate foreseeable power needs of the Pacific Northwest can be met only if the Federal Government likewise recognizes its public utility status and responsibilities as a major supplier of electricity at wholesale in the region.

"This is particularly important because the Federal Government through its program of multiple-purpose dams has preempted the development of the Pacific Northwest's greatest power-producing stream, the Columbia River. Thus the Federal Government has a direct responsibility to the people of the Northwest to carry forward its power supply projects. In view of these immediate problems we urge:

"1. That the Administrator and the Congress approve a level of expenditures sufficient to bring to completion presently authorized projects for the production of power as rapidly as physically possible.

"2. That a distinction in budget making be recognized between ordinary public works

and the Pacific Northwest Federal power development program of the United States Army Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Bonneville Power Administration.

"3. That the national administration plan its expenditures for Columbia River power development in such a way as to coordinate to the fullest the necessary construction of generating projects with each other and with the construction of transmission and substation facilities to the end that each of these authorized projects supplements and makes for use of the other.

"An estimate of need prepared by this group early this year has been given wide publicity. New load studies just completed and attached hereto confirm these earlier estimates.

"Adopted at conference in Tacoma, Wash., January 6, 1948.

"Pacific Power & Light Co., Paul B. McKee, President; Portland General Electric Co., James H. Polhemus, President; Mountain States Power Co., Z. E. Merrill, President, Allan A. Smith, General Counsel; City of Seattle, Department of Lighting, W. C. Snow, Assistant Superintendent; Puget Sound Power & Light Co., H. C. Webb, Vice President; Washington Water Power Co., K. M. Robinson, President; Northwest Public Power Association, C. T. Hurd, President; City of Tacoma, Department of Public Utilities, C. A. Erdahl, Commissioner, J. Frank Ward, Superintendent Light Division."

New generating capacity needed in the Northwest to 1956

December	Increase in load each year, in kilowatts	Kilowatts of generating capacity ordered	Additional kilowatts of new capacity required		Additional kilowatts required, Federal projects
			Annual	Cumulative	
1947			214,000	[1] 214,000	214,000
1948	397,000	[2] 240,000	157,000	371,000	371,000
1949	345,000	[3] 360,000	−15,000	[4] 356,000	356,000
1950	336,000		336,000	692,000	587,000
1951	312,000		312,000	1,004,000	899,000
1952	242,000		242,000	1,246,000	961,000
1953	323,000		325,000	1,569,000	1,284,000
1954	258,000		258,000	1,827,000	1,542,000
1955	305,000		305,000	2,132,000	1,847,000
1956	300,000		300,000	2,432,000	1,967,000

[1] Includes estimated deficiency of 94,000 kilowatts for western group plus 1 additional Coulee unit of 120,000 kilowatts for reserve.

[2] Eighth and ninth units at Grand Coulee, 120,000 kilowatts each.

[3] Tenth, eleventh, and twelfth units at Grand Coulee, 120,000 kilowatts each.

[4] While additional Coulee units would partially take care of necessary peaking, they would not supply the energy required to carry the load without additional upstream storage. The following additional capacity is contemplated for installation:

	Kilowatts
Pacific Power & Light Co., Ariel Dam (1950)	45,000
City of Seattle:	
Gorge (1950)	60,000
Ross (1952)	180,000
Ross (1956)	180,000
Total	465,000

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to deal more specifically with the three items I have referred to which have a direct bearing on power capacities in my own district, the First District of the State of Washington, embodying the city of Seattle and Kitsap County.

The first of these items is Grand Coulee-Snohomish No. 2. You are aware, no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that Grand Coulee-Snohomish Line No. 1 has been under construction for the past 2 years, having been approved in the 1947 and 1948 supply bills. No. 1 line is scheduled, I believe, for completion in October 1949. The supplemental item, including cash and contract authorization allowances, is to cover engineering and the advance purchase of conductors for No. 2 line to assure deliveries in a time that will not interfere with the completion of Line No. 1.

In order to save some $6,000,000, these two lines through the mountains and through the heavily timbered sections of the Northwest have been placed on a single steel-support structure. By such construction double width right-of-way is saved and double cost of clearing is avoided. It is extremely dangerous to attempt to erect the second set of conductors on the same towers.

The purpose of the item in the President's supplemental totaling $400,000, $350,000 of which is for contract authorization, is to purchase and erect 93 miles of conductors on the double-circuit system.

The condition of the load in the Puget Sound area is such that No. 2 circuit must be completed by the peak-load period of 1950. Placing the Coulee-Snohomish item in the supplemental will save 3 to 5 months' time in ordering material which will amount to a year's difference in the date of energization. If the erection of the two sets of circuits is not timed together it will be necessary in 1950 to remove No. 1 circuit from service, thereby resulting in loss of revenue of $3,150,000. This item from any angle is fully justified for inclusion in the supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, with reference now to Grand Coulee-Columbia No. 3, this facility is primarily intended to meet the expanding needs of the Hanford atomic plant. However, this circuit will be tied into the two existing Coulee-Covington circuits. The capability into the Covington-Renton-Seattle area will be materially increased. Grand Coulee-Columbia No. 3 is a vital necessity to improving the capability into the Seattle area. This line has been fully endorsed by both the private and public agencies supplying the Seattle area.

In order to accelerate construction of the needed power facilities included in this estimate, personnel has to be provided to handle this amount of advanced construction. From inquiry, I understand that this operation item is the minimum consistent with safe operation. There is no controversy, I am sure, involving this item, Mr. Chairman.

Grand Coulee, Mr. Chairman, being a multiple-purpose dam, power and reclamation are inseparable in your considerations. Fundamentally, my district is concerned mainly with power.

It goes without saying, Mr. Chairman, that building dams is not enough as far as power is concerned unless also there is built the necessary transmission lines, main substations, and feeder lines.

I should like to quote, Mr. Chairman, from the present Bonneville Act: "* * * it is to encourage the most widespread use of electric energy, consistent with sound business principles, at the lowest possible rates to consumers, with preference to public bodies and cooperatives. * * *" To carry out this law to the letter, Mr. Chairman, it is fundamentally necessary to provide full appropriations for completion of facilities as requested in the supplemental budget before you. I earnestly urge upon you and the honorable members of this committee favorable action on these eight items.

Item	Cash	Contract authorized
(a) Grand Coulee-Snohomish, No. 2	$50,000	$350,000
(b) Grand Coulee-Columbia, No. 3	50,000	600,000
(c) Holcomb-Naselle Junction	145,000	0
(d) Troutdale transformer, No. 3	80,000	0
(e) Forest Grove-Salem	50,000	250,000
(f) Midway-Benton	50,000	275,000
(g) Midway substation	100,000	0
(h) Operation and maintenance	200,000	0
Total	725,000	1,475,000

Development of the Arkansas River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 5754, which will permit the Corps of Engineers to plan for the development of the Arkansas River Basin under the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946. I hope this bill is adopted and made a part of the omnibus River and Harbor Act of this year.

In connection with this, I include as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette published at Little Rock, Ark., in the issue dated Tuesday, March 9, 1948:

RESTLESS RIVER

The Arkansas was high but not raging when the Corps of Engineers took a bargeload of guests on an inspection tour of the flood protection works from Pine Bluff to Yancopin. But there was plenty of evidence to support the statement of Col. R. G. Lovett, the Vicksburg district engineer, who told the party that the river is probably more difficult to control than any other stream on earth.

By present drainage rights, the Arkansas "owns" about 188,000 square miles, embracing part of the Rockies, a vast stretch of western plain, and a big chunk of the Gulf Coastal plain. It also holds claim, through original ownership, to a large acreage in southeast Arkansas and eastern Louisiana which it is no longer allowed to cross.

Twice in its history the Arkansas has broken away from the Mississippi, and flowed independently into the Gulf of Mexico. The Atchafalaya today follows a channel that the Arkansas made. The lower Ouachita, the Black, the lower Red, Bayou Bartholomew, Bayou Macon, and other large streams use courses that the Arkansas chose to abandon. The Arkansas has shifted its mouth up and down the Mississippi from lower Louisiana to its present confluence. Most of the bayous and lakes from Little Rock southeastward to the White and Mississippi once formed parts of the various courses of the Arkansas.

The greatest part of the alluvial soil that covers the plain from Little Rock southeastward came from Arkansas River waters. The stream now annually carries some 112,000,000 tons of sediment past Little Rock, contributing a high percentage of the total load of the Mississippi. The Arkansas, like the larger stream, has reached grade, no longer cutting its bed deeper but thrusting its force against the land at the sides. There is no naturally implanted big rock to resist the Arkansas throughout the alluvial plain from Little Rock to the Gulf.

The harried river, imprisoned in its buried valley, flowing three times faster than the Mississippi, coils, loops, and gnashes through the soft earth of the plain. It is trying to assert its original ownership.

The Arkansas figures prominently in control of the lower Mississippi. Eastern Louisiana as well as southeast Arkansas depends on engineer works that have been constructed along the lower Arkansas. The comprehensive program for regulating the stream system has an importance that extends far beyond the valley itself. It deserves a top priority on any list of regional projects to be carried out in the foreseeable future.

Cotton Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from the Sixth District of Wisconsin, who, on the floor of Congress and in a statement to the press, on last Tuesday made charges against "certain big interests" in forcing up cotton prices and further said that cotton prices "continue to mount" despite indications of oversupply.

I should like to make it clear to the Members that I do not represent any interests except that of the people, but that I am from Louisiana, a cotton-producing State, and represent the Second Congressional District, which contains the Port of New Orleans, one of the leading cotton ports of the world, and that the cotton industry is an important part of our life. There are people in my district who produce cotton. There are others who gin it, warehouse it, merchandise it, transport it and who manufacture it into consumer goods. Likewise New Orleans is the home of one of the Nation's great commodity exchanges. The business of cotton is, therefore, a principal business of my district involving the livelihood and welfare of many thousands of people.

Representative KEEFE stated:

> It is clear that the present high price of raw cotton is being maintained by huge speculators who see in the proposed Government purchases of cotton an opportunity for another colossal clean-up.

He criticized the Government for "projecting itself into the commodity picture and making huge commitments. The boys on the inside get wind in time to clean up on the market."

Representative KEEFE further said:

> As a member of the House Subcommittee on deficiency that will no doubt conduct the hearings on the estimates for appropriations, I want it distinctly understood now that this cotton export program is going to be thoroughly checked into. I, for one, do not intend to be a party to promoting Government buying on domestically produced commodities at inflated prices made possible by the controls exercised by speculators in commodity futures.

It appears quite evident that the gentelman from Wisconsin is lacking in information as to the true cotton situation. I might be inclined to agree with him in the opinion that it is unfortunate for the Government to project itself into the commodity picture and make huge commitments, whether this be true or otherwise.

However, in the present world situation, it appears necessary for the Government to make these purchases if the European recovery program is to be carried out.

Mr. KEEFE's comments that "certain big interests" are forcing up cotton prices seems entirely at variance with the facts of the situation. It so happens that there is a world-wide shortage of cotton supplies and consumption during the past few years has not only used up the production of those years, but has eaten into the world's reserved supply. Cotton prices presently prevailing are little, if any, in excess of the parity price set by the United States Government as in its opinion reflecting a proper price for the producers of cotton. Prices for future delivery months average well below parity. Under such conditions it is very difficult to understand how any well informed person could make the statements that cotton prices are inflated by controls exercised by huge speculators in commodity futures.

Inasmuch as Representative KEEFE comes from Wisconsin, which is a dairying State, I believe that his comments on the proposed removal of the most unjust tax on oleomargarine which heavily penalizes the producers of cotton seed in favor of the producers of butter would perhaps be more interesting and based on a sounder grasp of facts.

Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently, I introduced H. R. 5711, a bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration. The purpose of this bill is to put the unemployment insurance tax paid by railroad companies on a merit rating or sliding scale basis, conditioned on the size of the reserve fund balance each year, without in any respect changing the benefits now provided. This would extend to the railroad industry substantially the same treatment accorded every other employer in the country with respect to unemployment under the various State and Federal social security systems.

The considerations upon which this bill is based may be outlined as follows:

First. The railroad industry has its own unemployment insurance system administered under a Federal fund by the Railroad Retirement Board. All other employers who are covered by unemployment insurance come under State or Territorial systems.

Second. The bill makes no changes whatsoever in the unemployment benefits now provided by law for railroad employees, nor does it affect the Railroad Retirement Act. The amendments adopted by the Congress in 1946, which greatly increased the unemployment benefits and provided an entirely new system of sickness, accident, and maternity benefits, are not changed by this bill in any respect. While these increased unemployment benefits increased the cost of unemployment insurance for the railroad industry, the provisions of the bill insure adequate funds to meet the cost thereof at all times. No rights of any railroad employee are changed by this bill.

Third. Railroad employees contribute nothing to the railroad unemployment-insurance fund. Railroad companies are presently taxed a flat 3 percent of pay roll on wages up to $300 per month. While the maximum tax rate for unemployment insurance outside the railroad industry is 3 percent on wages up to $3,000 per year, because of merit or experience rating now in effect in 50 of the 51 State and territorial funds, the actual minimum rate that applies varies from complete forgiveness to 1½ percent. In 9 of the jurisdictions when an adequate balance is maintained in the fund the employer is granted complete forgiveness of taxes; in 15 States he is required to pay one-half of 1 percent or less; in 10 States he must pay 1 percent; and in 10 other States the rate varies from 1 to ½ of 1 percent. Thus, in 44 jurisdictions the minimum rate varies downward from 1 percent to complete forgiveness. Where Congress itself has established unemployment insurance systems—District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska—the minimum rates provided are 1/10 of 1 percent for the District of Columbia and complete forgiveness for the other 2. It will be noted that even if the maximum rate of 3 percent applied in all of these jurisdictions the 3 percent flat rate applied to railroads is still 20 percent higher in total amount because it is applied to $300 per month ($3,600) of salary, while the State rates apply to only $3,000 per year of salary.

Fourth. The merit or sliding scale of tax provided in the bill, H. R. 5711, ranges from a minimum of ½ of 1 percent when the balance in the fund, as determined by the Board, is $350,000,000 or more, to a maximum of 3 percent when the balance is less than $150,000,000. The complete table is as follows:

If the balance to the credit of the railroad unemployment insurance account as of the close of business on September 30 of any year, as determined by the Board, is—	The rate with respect to compensation paid during the next succeeding calendar year shall be—
$350,000,000 or more	½ percent
$300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000	1 percent.
$250,000,000 or more but less than $300,000,000	1½ percent.
$200,000,000 or more but less than $250,000,000	2 percent.
$150,000,000 or more but less than $200,000,000	2½ percent.
Less than $150,000,000	3 percent.

Fifth. There is no question but that this sliding scale of rates will be adequate to insure the solvency of the railroad unemployment-insurance system at all times. The adjustment of the tax would be automatic, and would reach the full 3 percent if the balance in the reserve account should fall as low as $150,000,000. The railroads have been paying the 3-percent rate since the act became effective in 1939, which has resulted in a huge and unnecessary surplus. The graduated scale of rates would gradually reduce this swollen surplus without in any way endangering the soundness of the unemployment-insurance system. There is absolutely no reason for maintaining such a high reserve and depriving railroad companies of such huge sums of money.

Sixth. The excessiveness of the 3-percent rate can be best shown by contrasting it with the expenditures under the act from the time of its enactment up to the present. From the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, the total benefit disbursements amounted to $114,194,456, or an average of $14,278,307 per year. As of January 1 this year, the balance in the reserve fund amounted to $913,636,041, and if the flat 3-percent rate is continued, this reserve will approximate $1,000,000,000 by the end of this year, or more than eight times the total amount of all benefits paid out since the passage of the act.

For the first 6 months of the present fiscal year—July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947—when the new and increased benefits adopted last year were in effect, the total benefit disbursements amounted to $27,352,804. If this rate of disbursements were extended for a full year, it would result in an approximate cost of $55,000,000. The interest on the surplus in the reserve fund brings in an income to the account of something over $15,000,000 a year at the present time—$15,374,911 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1947—and a rate of ½ of 1 percent of pay rolls would produce at least another $20,000,000 a year, or a total of at least $35,000,000 a year. On this basis, only $20,000,000 would be required from the surplus to pay the new benefits for a full year. At this rate the surplus in the fund would carry the benefits for many years to come, and even if the cost of the benefits ran as much as $100,000,000 a year, which is quite unlikely, it would still carry the benefits along for a number of years before it would become necessary to apply the increased tax rate under the graduated scale.

It will be noted that railroads cannot shut down completely like steel and automobile plants, but are required by law and public convenience and necessity to continue in operation, and, therefore, their unemployment could not conceivably be so great in any period of time as to endanger the fund as provided in the bill.

Seventh. In the fiscal year 1946–47, the total income to the railroad unemployment fund from taxes, interest and adjustments, amounted to $141,770,000, more than in any previous year, and twice as much as was collected in 1940–41. In fact, this was $103,395,000 more than the benefit disbursements for the fiscal year 1946–47.

Eighth. Experience has shown that the rate of 3 percent grossly excessive and an unnecessary burden upon the railroads. It has produced, in less than 10 years' time, a surplus of approximately $1,000,000,000, which, in effect, has deprived the railroads of money which might rightfully have been spent for improved service, reduction of debt, increased employment, and other operating expenses.

Ninth. It must be borne in mind that any system of unemployment insurance provided exclusively for railroad employees must, in the final analysis, be supported and paid for by the public, as the costs to the carriers are inevitably reflected in the level of railroad rates. Any tax which builds up such a huge and uncalled for surplus as exists at present is certainly an unjustified addition to the total cost of transportation.

Tenth. The bill, H. R. 5711, will insure sufficient funds to meet the costs of the railroad unemployment system at all times in the future, and, in effect, give to railroad industry the same consideration given all other employers in the country. It provides no refunds of the excessive tax heretofore collected, but simply proposes to adjust the tax rate on a fair and equitable basis in relation to the demands upon the fund, with sufficient safeguards to maintain its solvency in the future.

Eleventh. In changing to a sliding scale of taxation, it would be necessary to change the formula by which the amount necessary for administration of the unemployment fund is fixed. The bill provides for this by allocating to the administration fund from the taxes collected, an amount equal to 2/10 of 1 percent of the total compensation upon which collections are based. From past experience this is more than adequate for administrative purposes.

Twelfth. The bill would also direct the Railroad Retirement Board to keep its records in the future in such manner as might afford a basis for the determination by the Congress of the advisability of prescribing a system of individual merit rating for railroad companies as against an industry-wide system.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the New York Times of March 13, 1948:

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

This is a fateful week for Palestine—and for the peace of the world. By March 15 we should know whether the United Nations shall henceforth be regarded merely as an international debating society, whose decisions and considered judgments may be lightly shunted aside, or whether it is to be an effective instrument for the settlement of disputes—and the hope of mankind. By March 15 the Great Powers are scheduled to report to the Security Council on the results of their consultations regarding Palestine and to make recommendations "regarding the guidance and instructions which the Council might usefully give to the Palestine Commission with a view of implementing the (partition) resolution of the General Assembly." It is our firm conviction that upon those recommendations, and upon the subsequent action to be taken by the Security Council, rests the future of international organization to preserve and maintain peace.

The issue is clear. On November 29, 1947—after many months of earnest investigation, deliberation, and debate, and despite repeated Arab threats of war—the General Assembly of the United Nations voted to partition Palestine into separate Arab and Jewish states with an economic union, and with an international regime for Jerusalem. Since that time, Arab states, encouraged by the Mandatory Government's failure to maintain law and order in Palestine, have committed acts of armed aggression against the Jewish community in the hope of intimidating the United Nations into reversing its judgment. Now the United Nations must choose one of two paths: It can carry out its own decision vigorously and forthrightly by using the enforcement machinery provided by the United Nations Charter—and thereby preserve its own prestige and effectiveness for the future; or it can permit the aggressive acts of a few Arab rulers to upset the results of combined world statesmanship—and thereby commit suicide.

These are the two paths and there is no other. All talks of renewing attempts to "reconcile" the Arabs and the Jews, after innumerable and fruitless efforts at reconciliation over a period of 30 years, is wholly unrealistic. The chief spokesman of our own Government underscored this fact at the General Assembly of the United Nations last November.

What do those who are again talking about "reconciliation" really mean? Certainly not an understanding between Jews and Arabs based upon historic rights and international guarantees. The Arabs have time and again refused even to discuss such a settlement. If the Arab spokesmen have convinced us of anything, it is that they are absolutely intransigent with regard to any Palestine solution which in some way meets Jewish needs and rights. Obviously, those who now speak of "reconciliation" mean something quite different. What they have in mind is the whittling down of the United Nations partition decision—to the further detriment of the Jews. This unworthy objective is being advertised as "an attempt to compromise."

In this connection it should be pointed out that the Jews do not base their claim to Palestine upon the UN's partition decision, but upon a long series of international commitments originating with the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate, and upon thousands of years of history. The decision of November 29, 1947, fell far short of meeting what the Jews regard as their historic rights. They acceded to the UN's compromise solution, which involved great sacrifices on the part of the Jewish people, but which they were prepared to accept as a way out of a dangerous international impasse.

To represent the UN's decision as the Jewish solution, on the theory that the Jews should be expected to consent to a further curtailment of their rights, is not only unfair to a long-suffering people but completely destructive of confidence in the United Nations.

It is with a sense of deep disappointment that we have observed the role that our own Government has played with respect to Palestine during the past weeks. We had hoped for the same clear-cut and energetic presentation of the traditional United States policy as was put forward in the final crucial meetings of the General Assembly. Instead, we have found indecision where decisiveness was called for, evasiveness where forthrightness was demanded, acquiescence in procedures which can only produce delay where speed was essential. Surely it cannot be the intention of our Government to destroy, by a series of diplomatic maneuvers, the very UN decision of which it was the chief architect.

We now look to our Government once again to assume leadership on this question and to insure a just outcome. We respectfully urge

that the following action be taken immediately:

1. That the United States Representative in the discussions of the permanent members of the Security Council take an unequivocal stand for the earliest implementation of the United Nations decisions of November 29, 1947, and favor the dispatching of an international force to Palestine to help maintain the peace and to enable the UN commission to carry on the work of implementation which was assigned to it;

2. That our Government urge the immediate organization and equipment of the Jewish militia, which is provided for in the United Nations decision; and

3. That our Government immediately revise its present embargo on arms, so that the defenders of the Jewish community—and of the United Nations decision—may be enabled to resist acts of aggression threatening their lives and their homes.

Time is running out.

American Christian Palestine Committee, New York, N. Y.: Prof. James Luther Adams, Dean Alfange, Maxwell Anderson, Rev. Waldemar Argow, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, Roger N. Baldwin, George Biddle, Dr. L. M. Birkhead, Manchester Boddy, Dr. John W. Bradbury, Dr. Dwight J. Bradley, Rt. Rev. Patrick C. Brennan, United States Senator Owen Brewster, VanWyck Brooks, Rev. Emory S. Bucke, Prof. Henry M. Busch, Frank W. Buxton, Walter Chandler, Prof. Emmanuel Chapman, Mayor Stanley Church, Rev. Karl M. Chworowsky, Bartley C. Crum, Dr. Clark Walker Cummings, Jonathan Daniels, Rev. John W. Darr, Jr., Dean Raimundo De Ovles, United States Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas, Prof. Albert Einstein, Dr. Samuel A. Eliot, Rev. Don Frank Fenn, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Father George B. Ford, Prof. Carl J. Friedrich, Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, Frank Gervasi, William Green, John Gunther, Hon. John Gutknecht, Prof. Paul L. Hanna, Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Very Rev. Robert Hatch, Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, Rev. David R. Hunter, Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, United States Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Dr. Edgar DeWitt Jones, Dean Frederick D. Kershner, Dr. Elisha A. King, Freda Kirchwey, John A. Lapp, Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, Dean Howard M. LeSourd, Rev. Donald G. Lothrop, Dr. Thomas Mann, Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, Dr. Oscar E. Maurer, Hon. James M. Mead, Rt. Rev. Arthur W. Moulton, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Lewis Mumford, Mayor Vincent J. Murphy, Alan Burr Overstreet, Prof. Harry A. Overstreet, Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Hon. Ferdinand Pecora, Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, Rev. Wendell Phillips, Hon. Frank A. Picard, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Prof. Harris Franklin Rall, Quentin Reynolds, Rev. Wallace W. Robbins, Dr. Harold W. Ruopp, Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, Dr. H. Shelton Smith, Robert E. Smith, Dean Claude W. Sprouse, Donald Ogden Stewart, Prof. William L. Stidger, Rex Stout, Prof. Paul Tillich, Rev. Earl Hollier Tomlin, Prof. Mark Van Doren, Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, J. Raymond Walsh, Dr. Howard B. Warren, Dr. George Ross Wells, Rear Adm. R. D. Workman, United States Navy (retired).

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter embodying a resolution:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION
OF COOPERATIVES,
Madison, Wis., March 12, 1948.

Representative WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: At the regular board meeting held yesterday, March 11, 1948, the board of directors passed the following resolution which is part of this letter:

"Whereas removing taxes on oleomargarine and allowing this substitute product to be colored like genuine butter will lead to the ruin of the butter industry and undermine the economic position of the entire dairy industry of which butter production is an important branch; and

"Whereas coloring oleomargarine and providing color free of charge to make it possible and easy to appear as butter is misrepresentation and consequently a fraud on the consumer; and

"Whereas it is the duty of the Congress and the Government to safeguard the interests of a legitimate product against the surreptitious and underhanded competition of a substitute product: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives, mindful of the interests both of the dairy farmer and the consumer, go on record as vigorously opposing any change whatever in the laws, rules, and regulations which presently govern the sale, the taxing, and the coloring of oleomargarine."

The oleomararine question is of great importance to the Wisconsin dairy farmer, especially when overproduction will again appear on the market because milk will have to be converted into other products than butter. We are just wondering why oleomargarine cannot be sold on its own merits without appearing as butter. There are many bread spreads on the market, but none are colored yellow.

Cooperatively yours,

ERICH LENZ,
Executive Secretary.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from a constituent in Hannibal, Mo., relative to rent control, which is typical of numerous letters from other parts of my district:

HANNIBAL, MO., *January 21, 1948.*

Hon. S. W. (WAT) ARNOLD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I have just read your statement of views on the continuation of rent controls as published in last evening's Hannibal Courier-Post. In my opinion you are correct in your position and I am with you 100 percent.

More than once, I have heard tenants say, "It is cheaper to rent than to own property. Why should I build, or buy?" These tenants have further stated, "Let the landlord do the worrying, and pay the bills." And these statements made in rent-control areas. The housing program will never go forward to meet the needs, as long as these conditions maintain.

However, in my opinion, this is not the worst aspect of the rent-control program. To me it is the most discriminatory piece of legislation Congress has on the books. A few areas here and there with control. Elsewhere the sky is the limit. Even in rent-control areas, there are notable discriminations. A party said to me just last week, "After my husband passed away a few months ago, I decided to rent my home. I was surprised to find there was no rent ceiling on my home. I am getting good rent." Landlords who complied with rent controls all through the war, still strapped down to controls even though maintenance costs have soared tremendously.

If a certain class of our citizens must provide houses for other classes to live in, they should have adequate returns on their investments. Then the Government should be fair and treat all sections of the Nation alike. I would say with you, "Take off rent controls." If Congress refuses, then clamp it on all the Nation alike. However it is my opinion, that such control would result in the greatest ban ever on the housing problem.

Very truly yours,

Rev. F. M. BAKER (Retired).

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a most thoughtful editorial from the March 10 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

I feel that whoever wrote this editorial certainly pointed up the question which surrounds our national defense problem.

The editorial follows:

OUR MILITARY WEAKNESS

It is a good thing that the public hearings planned by the Senate Armed Services Committee apparently will deal with more than the single question of the need for universal military training. For in the present state of the world we ought to be thinking very seriously about a great deal more than this one controversial matter.

To say that the subject of UMT is controversial is not to imply a belief that there is any merit to most of the objections raised against it. On the contrary, most of the

objections, in the light of the world as it is today, are downright silly.

There is some substance to the objection—or perhaps one might better say the fear—that the cost of UMT would be taken out of the funds needed by other military arms. Senator TAFT is one of those who has said that UMT, if adopted, will be financed on this basis. And if that is true—if it is necessary that the Army, Navy, or Air Force, already short of funds, be cut back still further to pay for UMT—then it is probable that, from the standpoint of our over-all defensive strength, adoption of UMT would do more harm than good. But this, of course, is neither necessary nor true. If Senator TAFT cannot see the threat to our security that is building up in the world, if he wants to treat the budget as our greatest problem, that is his privilege. But the Congress does not have to follow him down that disastrous blind alley. And if Congress adopts a UMT program it can and should insist that it be paid for without any further weakening of the other branches of our military establishment.

Of even greater weight, however, is the strong probability that UMT, whatever hope it may once have offered, would fall far short today of meeting our minimum requirements for national security.

In the light of political considerations, it may be that it is futile to ask for more than a UMT program. It ought to be made perfectly clear, however, that in the immediate future, at least, there is no security for the United States in UMT. There is danger that adoption of UMT would lull the people into believing that the country is safe. That is not true, and we should guard against any such false psychology.

The danger today is the danger of war with Russia. And if war should come soon it would find us tragically weak. We are short of men in the armed services. For the Army, Congress authorized 669,000 men, the budget provided funds for 560,000, and the actual strength is 552,000. The comparable figures for the Air Force are 382,000 authorized, 362,000 budgeted, and 346,000 actually enrolled. For the Navy it is 664,000 authorized, 526,000 budgeted, and 476,000 enrolled.

All of this means that the volunteer system has fallen down, and this deficiency in manpower cannot be made good through UMT since it does not extend to active service. In a word, our available men are spread around the world. We are strong nowhere and weak everywhere. That is a dangerous, a very dangerous situation for a country facing the risk of war with a nation possessing the actual, as distinguished from potential, military power of the Soviet Union.

When Senator GURNEY'S committee begins its hearings these are aspects of our problem which ought to be explored as fully as possible. If this Government—and that includes the Congress, the military establishment and the administration—really wants the people of this country to support adequate military preparedness it ought to put the facts before them.

Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 9, 1948

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, before the Minnesota Employers' Association, Minneapolis, Minn., January 30, 1948:

When I was invited several months ago to address this meeting concerning the Taft-Hartley law, it became a "must" on my calendar, for this State has long been recognized as one of those where the people believe in the principle that industrial relations are human relations. The rest of the Nation is indebted to you for that—and for projecting that realization into the Halls of Congress through those of your representatives who have had so large a part in translating it into this new, and, I believe, epochal legislation.

Because they are human relations that must have always in mind the unlimited problems that arise from human reactions, any law that attempts to deal with them must either do a full and complete job on the complex subject, that will define and control the rights and responsibilities of all concerned within the area it attempts to cover, or it must merely point to the general principles and leave their application to the wisdom, judgment, and good faith of those into whose hands the administration of the law may be placed.

In the Taft-Hartley law, the Congress has adopted the first of these approaches, and under the leadership and guidance of those who undertook to sponsor the legislation, has given us a rule book that bids fair to accomplish, in large measure, its objective of preventing interference with the free flow of commerce because of labor disputes, by promoting the resolution of such disputes through the highly desirable process of collective bargaining.

To do this was not easy, and the law is not a simple one in its context. Its meaning and application cannot be gleaned in a single reading, for here is reflected the knowledge and experience gained in 12 years of application of the Wagner Act, and the expert correction of the principles and practices that developed under it to the detriment of the public welfare, and at the same time, those that had proved their worthiness.

When the Wagner Act was passed, the conditions then existing generally in industry demanded it as a corrective. The man who worked for wages was just as human as the man who signed his pay check. He occupied a well-defined place in the economic scheme of things, but he was helpless to protect himself against the employer whose main objective was to produce for little and sell for much, and who had little patience with the employee who sought an increasing return for his own effort, in order to keep up with the standards that were being constantly elevated. He was faced with the proposition that he must either take what the boss offered, or look for more money in a different job, if he could find one. It was as much as his job was worth if he objected to anything.

With this situation before it in a depression time, when jobs were scarce and unemployment on the increase, and with employers tending to exploit those who were working with the club of possible unemployment, Congress brought the Wagner Act into existence. It was aimed at the correction of the evils on the employer side. It did not envisage the swing of the pendulum to the other extreme, and the exploiting of the employers, and the public, to say nothing of the individual employee, by the labor organizations that had gained controlling power under the beneficent protection of the act. But such a swing did come. Many labor organizations found themselves in positions of such economic power that employers were forced to bow to their demands, regardless of the justness of them, or suffer boycotts, strikes, and other economic penalties that were as unconscionable as many of the pre-Wagner Act employer practices.

In that climate, the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act and generally attributed to Mr. HARTLEY, of New Jersey; to Senator TAFT, of Ohio; and to your own good Senator, JOE BALL; was made law over the veto of the President, and by it there was laid in the lap of the American public, a piece of administrative machinery which, I believe, will prove to be the foundation of an era of constructive and intelligent labor-management relationship of which many of us have dreamed and hoped for, but which we believed never could be accomplished. It is not a piece of machinery which is of the Simon Legree type and it does not confer benefits exclusively upon one class of public and impose burdens on another. It distributes both the benefits and the responsibilities so that none of those affected by it is without his fair share of both.

It has been interesting to note that the hue and cry that the Taft-Hartley Act is a union-busting, slave-labor act seems to have completely disappeared and it is gratifying to see that the dire predictions that employers would insist upon utilizing it as a medium for the elimination of unions from their plants have completely failed to materialize.

This act definitely imposes heavy responsibilities upon both management and labor, to see that it functions in accordance with its stated purpose which well can be reduced to the simple statement: "The protection of commerce through the elimination of destructive labor disputes by the process of collective bargaining."

It recognizes that labor is a pillar of our economic structure and that labor must be allowed a full voice in the administration of our economic welfare. It recognizes that labor, like capital, can only effectively participate in this through its freely chosen spokesmen or representatives—and that labor must be given the fullest protection in selecting its spokesmen, without fear of offending its employer, and thereby visiting reprisals on itself—and without being veered away from action by promises of reward if it guides itself by the wishes of the employer—and so, because the prohibitions of the Wagner Act had been found to be sound and effective as a means of insuring this unhampered freedom of choice, those prohibitions—termed "unfair labor practices"—still apply to the employer in his relations with his employees. The charges—except as to the closed shop—are interpretative only and, in the main, cover those things that could have been found to be inherent in the old Wagner Act, had the old Board seen fit to apply them. For instance, the freedom to choose a labor organization would be expected to carry with it the converse of freedom to refrain from choosing; but in an abundance of caution, Congress has written that freedom in today's law. The provision concerning the right of the employer to talk to his employees about unions—to criticize them or to praise them, is inherent also, so long as there is absent any coercion, threat, or promise of reward. The only departure here from the Board's established rule, is the isolation of such free speech, and the prohibition against using it as part of a pattern of unfair labor practices.

The employer still may not create or dominate a labor organization among his people. He still may not discriminate against an employee because of his affiliation or lack of affiliation with a labor organization—except under a valid union-shop agreement—and he may not refuse to bargain with the union that is the choice of a majority of those of his employees in an appropriate unit.

But, because the pendulum had swung to the other extreme and the scheme of things had been thrown out of balance by the recently acquired power of the unions and by the too frequent abuse of that power, the Congress, having effectively restrained the employers from misusing their economic force, extended its survey to techniques and practices of labor organizations that have, in the past, given rise to complaints of both individual employees and employers, and that have provided the bases of labor disputes that interfere with the free flow of commerce; and after selecting those which seemed most flagrant and unjustifiable, Congress has turned to the labor organizations and said to them: "Thou shalt not do these things, for they, too, are unfair labor practices."

Not only has Congress said that these acts on the part of labor organizations are beyond the pale, but as to certain of them, which are predicated on strikes, inciting to strike, or refusals to perform certain required duties, it has decreed that such conduct must be stopped as soon as it becomes the subject of a complaint. It has mandated the Board, through the general counsel, to go into the United States district court and petition for an injunction restraining the continuance of such conduct whenever a charge is filed alleging the commission of such prescribed acts. The general counsel has no discretion if, on investigating the charge, he has reasonable cause to believe that the facts are true, and that a complaint should issue. He must go forward with the injunction proceedings forthwith, if the case is one that is within the jurisdiction of the Board.

But perhaps the most far-reaching feature of the act is the broad power given the general counsel to seek an injunction within his discretion, and the United States district court to grant it, in any case where an unfair labor practice has been charged against either an employer or a labor organization and a complaint has issued. The act does not attempt to define an area within which this discretion may be used but the very nature of the provision seems to fix its limitation.

Few persons will argue that labor relations can be regulated by injunction, any more than that labor contracts can be written by legislation. I cannot believe this provision was ever intended to be utilized as a means to preliminary cease-and-desist orders whenever an employer and a labor organization became involved in a dispute, and one or the other of them is being discarded. It is too powerful and sharp a weapon to be weakened and dulled by indiscriminate usage. It must be reserved for those occasions when a substantial segment of the public welfare is at stake, or where palpable unlawful acts, resulting in physical injury or loss of property or life are being threatened or actually taking place and for those rare cases that are "sui generis."

We have had many requests to invoke this process, but few occasions to do so. In two cases, the discretionary petition was combined with those falling within the mandatory provision and in one, filed only yesterday, for the first time the petition was bottomed wholly on an unfair-labor-practice charge outside the mandatory group. This last petition emphasizes another feature that may have been overlooked. All the injunctions that have been sought up to now have been directed to labor organizations to restrain them from secondary boycotts, featherbedding, striking to force the closed-shop issue and such, but this one, sought at the instance of a union acting for a quarter of a million employees, is directed to the General Motors Corp. on a refusal-to-bargain charge, to restrain unilateral action being taken on a matter to which that corporation had committed itself to bargain. The rule truly cuts both ways—and any person against whom a charge is filed, may, if the circumstances justify it, find himself the subject of an injunction proceeding. All of which is a further reason why the greatest degree of care must be used under this authority, lest we find ourselves trying our cases, at least in part, through the medium of injunction proceedings in the United States district courts instead of the board that has been created for that purpose. No one wants to see that happen, and I, least of all.

It is impossible, in one session, to cover all the things on which title I of the act touches, but Washington being so far away from so many of you and, at best, something of a mystery to most people as to what happens there, and why, I think some explanation of what the new National Labor Relations Board is and how it works is probably justified. Under the Wagner Act, the three-man Board was the National Labor Relations Board. It controlled all phases of the work, and the pay, assignments, promotions and discharges of every person on the rolls. It selected the cases it desired to prosecute before itself. It heard its agents present the prosecution and it finally decided the case on the merits. In every sense, it was "prosecutor, jury, and judge," although it must be noted that from the beginning much effort was made to segregate these functions among noncoordinated groups. However, this condition existed and it was not a healthy one. To correct this, the Congress has now drawn a sharp line between the judicial functions, and the investigative and prosecuting functions. It has rested the judicial functions exclusively within the Board, made up of five members, and a staff of trial examiners, who sit as trial judges, with the Board as a sort of court of last resort. The Board has no other function to perform.

On the other hand, it has created an independent office, filled by Presidential appointment, known as the general counsel, in which the incumbent acts with finality in the determination of whether a charge of an unfair labor practice is to be prosecuted, and on what theory it is to be prosecuted. The general counsel has sole and exclusive supervision and direction of the personnel in the field where these charges are made, investigated, and prosecuted, and he has sole and exclusive direction and supervision of the activities of all the attorneys, both in and out of Washington—except those who are attached to the staffs of the individual Board members as their advisers. These are conferred on him by the statute, and in these areas, his decisions are final. It is a new experiment in administrative agencies. I know of no other in which there is anything even remotely resembling it, for the general counsel and the Board are truly independent of each other, although in the same agency.

As soon as the act had been passed and the general counsel had been selected, the members of the Board, recognizing the congressional intent that their functions henceforth must be confined to the judicial area of activities, voluntarily conveyed to the general counsel by formal delegation, practically all the authority theretofore exercised by the Board and not vested in the general counsel by specific language of the act, which was outside the jurisdictional functions. It was a complete cleavage of jurisdiction and an absolute separation of the judicial from the prosecution side. They delegated to the general counsel the business of conducting all investigations, hearings, and elections, and the making of original decisions in matters pertaining to representation, reserving to themselves only the right to hear and decide appeals in representation matters on which the office of the general counsel had acted; and they delegated to the general counsel full and final supervision and direction of all the administrative functions of the agency, so that now perhaps 80 percent of the personnel and activities of the agency, as well as the final disposition of all unfair labor practice matters, up to the point of litigating them before a trial examiner, rests in the general counsel exclusively. In this way the criticism that the Board is a combination of prosecutor, jury, and judge has been extinguished, and the Board takes its position as a purely quasi judicial tribunal having no other functions or duties than to decide the cases that come to it through the independent office of the general counsel.

The general counsel is considerably more than a law officer and, unlike most general counsels, he not only does not act as a legal adviser to the Board; he is barred from so doing. For legal counsel, the Board must look to its own Solicitor.

As I have stated, it is the duty of the general counsel to determine whether a charge has merit and when he has determined that an unfair labor practice has been committed, to issue a complaint and, if it is indicated, to proceed in the district court to obtain the injunctions that are authorized by the law. His decision in these regards is final, except, of course, that sometimes the courts do not agree with him as to whether an injunction is indicated, and then the court's decision becomes final.

The field organizational structure has been changed only internally and, because this act has thrown a burden on us involving an estimated 60,000-case program, each office is in the middle of an expansion program to make possible the prompt processing of the matters that come before us.

Not only do we have the broad additional field of unfair labor practices by labor organizations, the injunction proceedings that must be given priority, and the determination of jurisdictional disputes that have resulted in work stoppages, but our basic jurisdiction has been greatly broadened. As a single example, the building and construction industry, over which in the past, the old Board refused to exercise jurisdiction, is now fully within the area of our operations—and, because of radical differences between the various State labor laws and ours, we are barred from ceding to State agencies, jurisdiction over cases they formerly handled, in every instance where the State law is inconsistent with ours, or its application is inconsistent. These alone will serve to almost double the over-all load the agency will have to carry.

Then, too, whereas we formerly had only two types of elections, one of those being the rare employer petition that was permitted only when two competing unions were claiming to represent the employees, now we have five.

The old representation petition by a labor organization seeking, for the first time, to represent employees, remains unchanged; but now the employer is privileged, whenever any labor organization makes a demand for recognition, to petition the Board to hold an election to determine the validity of that organization's claim. He no longer is required to wait until two labor organizations are making simultaneous demands on him. The effect of this should be to restrain ambitious unions engaged in organizational campaigns from making premature or nuisance demands, because, when an election is held at the request of the employer, if the union should lose, there cannot be another election for 12 months. If a union really expects to represent those employees, it probably wouldn't take a chance on such an election under those circumstances until reasonably ready for the test. A year of waiting could completely ruin its chances.

Then there is the case where a union has been in a plant for a long time and no other union has attempted to invade it, but the employees have become dissatisfied with their representation. Up until the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted, there was no way

in which the employees could raise the issue or take steps to rid themselves of an unwelcome union. Now, however, if 30 percent of them petition the Board for an election to determine whether the employees want to continue to be represented by the incumbent union, the law provides that such an election shall be held unless there is some legitimate bar to it; and if it is held, and a majority vote to oust the union, its authority to represent the employees is automatically terminated. If the vote fails, however, that result is tantamount to a recertification for a year, for here, again, there may not be another election for 12 months.

There is also the matter of the union shop. I take it it is unnecessary for me to comment on the fact that the closed shop which provides that none but union men may be employed is no longer permitted; and the union shop, which permits an employer to hire anyone he pleases, provided he becomes a member of the union after 30 days' employment, may be incorporated in a contract only when that has been agreed to by the affirmative vote, in a secret election, of a majority of all the employees who would be affected by such a provision.

I have been asked many times why it would not be proper, where there has always been a closed shop or a union shop in the plant and the men are all accustomed to it, to just go on and renew the old arrangements which, in the past, have never been objectionable. The answer to that is that the law forbids it. It may seem to be a short cut, but, in this case, it is a short cut which inevitably will lead to trouble.

The execution of a closed-shop contract and the enforcement of any of its requirements, is an unfair labor practice with which both the employer and the union can be charged if they indulge in it; and the union might be jeopardizing its very existence if the Board should find that such conduct constituted a violation of section 8 (a) (2) of the act, which prohibits the employer to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization, or to contribute financial or other support to it.

Obviously, if an employee should be discharged under the provisions of such an illegal contract at the request of the union, not only would the employer be required to reinstate him, but both the employer and the union could be made subject to the requirement that they make the discharged employee whole for whatever pay he had lost. It makes no difference upon what ground the union may demand such a discharge. The same holds true with reference to a union shop contract that has been entered into without the formality of the election that I have referred to. From all of which, I think I am justified in repeating that this short cut can lead only to headaches.

The affirmative vote of the employees in favor of a union shop contract does not automatically incorporate such a provision in whatever contract you may negotiate with the unions. It simply legitimatizes negotiations between the employer, and the union, for the inclusion of a union shop provision in the contract and, I would say, tends to bring it into the area of subjects on which one may not refuse to bargain. After it has been included, the only basis upon which you may discharge a man at the insistence of the union is when he has failed to pay his periodic dues and initiation fees. The question has not been decided, but I doubt seriously that even failure to pay fines and assessments levied against him would justify such a discharge. The union may expel an employee from membership for any reason it sees fit within the allowable limits of its constitution and by-laws, but it cannot cause his discharge except for the one reason I have mentioned.

As to the application of this law, there has not yet been time to carry many of its points through to decision. It has, however, been clearly determined that the union which has not filed its financial data with the Secretary of Labor and distributed its financial statement to its members and filed the non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board, has no standing. It may not file a petition for representation and have it processed, but, by the same token, if it has a valid contract executed prior to the Taft-Hartley Act, it may not be ousted from its position as bargaining representative until its contract has expired. It may not file charges of unfair labor practices and have complaints issued on them, and it may not even file petitions for union shop elections.

If an employer should be confronted by a claim of representation from a noncomplying union, he cannot obtain an election through Board processes, for the Board will not conduct an election with a noncomplying union on the ballot except in the case of the decertification election, and there, if the union should win, it gains nothing beyond its status quo.

In short, for all practical purposes, the noncomplying union does not exist before this board, except when it becomes the subject of an unfair labor-practice charge.

As to the principles that have grown out of such application of the law as we have been able to make up to this time, we have few decisions of the Board, and none of them bearing directly on complaints brought under this act, and none by the courts except scattered decisions of the district courts either granting or denying petitions for injunctions brought about by the mandatory provisions of the act. In those cases where these injunctions have been denied, the courts uniformly have recognized their right to issue injunctions if the factual circumstances are such as to justify them and to bring them within the court's concept of the meaning of the specific provision of the act under which the complaint is drawn. Thus, in one case, where an injunction has been denied, it was because the court conceived that the act complained of took place prior to the effective date of the act and that there was no continuing conduct which stretched over and beyond that date. On this premise no one can quarrel with the decision of the court, although it was the contention—and, incidentally, a contention supported by the trial examiner who ultimately heard the case on the merits—that the conduct complained of did extend beyond the effective date of the act. In still another case very recently decided in New York, the court again differed with the general counsel as to the meaning of the facts and denied the injunctive relief prayed for in a secondary boycott case, because, he said, the facts disclosed that the principal company with whom the union had a quarrel and the one that was subjected to the boycott were not wholly independent of each other but were allies and that, therefore, the element of neutrality was not present. But on the other hand, where there was no question concerning the facts, the courts have recognized that the power of injunction does rest with them and, in several instances, have granted it in broad terms and have restrained the union complained about from further illegal conduct.

The fact that the injunctive power exists has, I believe, gone far as a deterrent to strike action and boycotts that otherwise well might have presented extremely serious problems in various parts of the country. It has acted as an urge to both the unions and the employers to find a peaceful basis for the settlement of their differences rather than to resort to the destructive and wasteful strike or lockout techniques. The statistics of the day are significant. To be sure, some economists will attribute the marked decline during the last 6 months of 1947 in man-days lost through strike action to economic factors rather than to the deterring force of the Taft-Hartley Act. They may be correct but we cannot help but feel that the Taft-Hartley Act has had at least a little to do with it. Jurisdictional disputes that normally would have resulted in long and protracted strikes and loss of production have been marked by a highly cooperative attitude on the part of the unions involved to settle them without permitting them to get to the Board under the procedures that are provided for in the act. Although a fair number of such disputes have been brought to our attention, none has reached the point where the Board has had to take action, and in only one of them has there been a substantial work stoppage, if we leave out of consideration the well-known dispute of long- standing in Hollywood.

We have heard much about boycotting the Board, but it is of considerable interest that hardly a week goes by that several of those who have been loud in their protestation do not begin their efforts to comply with the requirements of the act pertaining to the filing of their financial data and their non-Communist affidavits. Union after union has cleaned house of Communist officers in order to take advantage of the act, the most recent being the ILGWU, the United Furniture Workers, which has been a notorious left-wing organization in the CIO, and the United Shoe Workers of the CIO. Of course, there are some three or four of the large organizations which have declared themselves as unalterably in opposition to the act, and have taken the boycott stand with reference to it, either out of principle or because of their inability to comply. Those are matters which only time will adjust or settle. But in the main, labor seems to be reaching a realization that this act was, in fact, built for that huge and important part of our economic structure which is recognized as free American labor.

Thus far, I have tried to confine myself to the hard and factual conditions that are brought to the surface by this act. They may not be particularly interesting from a forensic point of view, but they are terribly important when an employer or a union official is contemplating his rights, and his responsibilities, and his liabilities, under this act. The responsibility placed on all these parties is responsibility for maintaining the free and uninterrupted production of goods and flow of commerce in the United States. That is the purpose of this act. While the medium for sustaining this responsibility is generally referred to as the process of collective bargaining, actually it goes deeper and is bottomed on your over-all industrial relations. Collective bargaining, as the ultimate in industrial relations, goes far beyond merely sitting at a table, jockeying for position, squeezing out the last drop of concession, and finally arriving at an agreement because you are convinced there is nothing more to be wrung from the other side. Collective bargaining really begins the minute a man goes on your pay roll and is assigned to a job. Collective bargaining is only a part of the human relations which must be successfully conducted if technical collective bargaining is to produce anything of a satisfactory nature to either side.

Not so long ago, I sat in a meeting where the subject of industrial relations was the topic under discussion. One of the gentlemen present is the head of a large industrial organization whose employer relations are the envy of most of those who know him or his concern. He dwelt, not on the subject of achieving industrial peace by the process of constantly raising wages, important as a satisfactory wage is in every plant, but on the proposition that, far and above the question of wages in importance is the matter of creating and maintaining in the employee a sincere sense of his human dignity, and a realization in that employee that topside recognizes his importance in the over-all picture. The fact that a man can run a machine and produce something on it skillfully

and well gives him an important place in the structure of the human and mechanical machine that turns out the product the company has to sell. When that has been accomplished, from the sweeper to the master mechanic, you have created an atmosphere of human dignity that makes collective bargaining more pleasant, more satisfactory, and more profitable to all concerned, for then both sides of the table have a common ground on which to stand.

There is great wisdom in what this man said. Those of us who have been close to many cases have seen the difference it makes. It is wisdom which, if carried into the job from day to day, and definitely if carried to the bargaining table, will almost inevitably produce substantial dividends in more ways than are reflected in the balance sheet.

This may sound like preaching—and I don't like to preach—for we all know that at times collective bargaining as we have experienced it, can be annoying and irksome. At times the fellow on the other side of the table has seemed to be impossible; but collective bargaining has become an institution in American industry, where the subjects are within the appropriate realm for negotiation. It must be expected that employers will have their own ideas of what they want and what they are entitled to. If the employees can be taken into your confidence so that they can feel that they know something about your problems, too—it will make a real difference in what they think.

This doesn't mean that by this type of relationship the employees will be soft and complacent to all the employer's wishes. They don't want to be dominated—and the law goes far to discourage domination. But they do respond to being "in the know" about what the business is doing. When they are, the can much more readily understand why a bargaining-conference proposal can or cannot be entertained. Too, if you know your subject, it is so easy to discuss it intelligently and fairly. Try applying that to the whole area of labor relations and collective bargaining and watch it work.

I wish I had the time to do more than just touch the highlights of the Taft-Hartley Act. But it is much too broad for more than that. I do commend it to you and to the labor organizations with whom you work. It is fair, it is balanced, and so long as all concerned will observe the principles for which that act stands, I can see nothing in our economic picture but better times ahead.

Argonne National Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the attention of every Member of this House a resolution adopted by the Hinsdale Women's Republican Club, of Hinsdale, Ill. The taking by condemnation of private property for public purposes should never be permitted without thorough consideration and the opportunity of persons affected thereby to voice their objections.

The request for a hearing by a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is reasonable and should be complied with as promptly as possible.

The resolution follows:

We, members of the Hinsdale Women's Republican Club, urge the continued development of atomic research. We believe this is best accomplished by using the present Argonne National Laboratory.

We believe there is documentary evidence to prove that it is not necesary to establish a new site. The present site, according to a letter written by Secretary of War Patterson, "has unique advantages which have not been duplicated elsewhere."

Whereas for the past year citizens of our DuPage County have appealed to Congress to protect home owners from being evicted or threatened with condemnation proceedings to make way for a new Argonne National Laboratory site; and

Whereas we disapprove the methods used by our elected officials and bureaucrats to deprive our citizens of their constitutional rights and object to the wasteful spending of millions of dollars to purchase and equip a new Argonne National Laboratory site by these same bureaucrats and officials merely to appease Cook County politicians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, we, members of the Hinsdale Women's Republican Club, request Congress to insist that their duly appointed subcommittee shall hold a hearing on the above issue at once.

Mrs. JOHN B. LAMSON.

Hungarian Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by my colleague the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of the Fourth District of Connecticut, before the American Hungarian Federation at Hunter College Auditorium in New York City, Sunday evening, March 14, 1948:

Today we commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Hungarian war of liberation. This gallant country, which for 1,000 years defended western civilization against the unceasing attacks of eastern hordes, has once again been enslaved by barbaric forces from the east.

It is, therefore, particularly appropriate that we should gather here today to refresh our recollection and to gain inspiration for the hard struggle ahead. For there is no question that, as we assemble here to celebrate freedom, the forces of tyranny which we fought World War II to destroy are charging down upon the free peoples of the earth with ominous rapidity. We are faced with mighty problems—problems which change and grow with each passing hour. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, I can assure you that we in the Congress are mindful of our solemn responsibilities. I know that, as in the past, the people of America will rise to this portentous challenge.

It is indeed a formidable challenge, since the forces of tyranny operate on every front and in every aspect of our lives. The theory of dialectical materialism, which is the basis for the Marxian philosophy, is the very antithesis of the Christian concept of individual freedom and the dignity of man. Russian communism, stretching its evil tentacles throughout the world, is attempting to promote a lack of faith in our own fundamental doctrine of freedom. They do this by all manner of insidious methods, in our schools and in our colleges in an effort to undermine the very foundations of American life and in order to compromise American destiny by demoralizing the men and women of the future. The Communists operate by peaceful means when they find it useful and with violence when necessary. They are conducting a continuous assault in the United States and all over the world on Christianity, on western culture, on individual liberty, on private property, and on all that felicitous aggregation of spiritual amenities without which life would have little meaning. They believe that man lives by bread alone; but they give him no bread. We know that he does not, but under our system bread and a great deal more than that are abundantly available.

And so this solemn occasion should serve not only as a tribute to a great and historical event but also as a touchstone for future action.

The ideals symbolized by the Hungarian war of liberation found eloquent expression in the speeches of the great Hungarian leader, Louis Kossuth. Sometime after the defeat of the forces of liberation by the Austrians and Russians, Kossuth came to America. Arriving in December 1851, he was received in New York with triumphal honors. There were meetings and demonstrations, and Kossuth rode through the streets on horseback with American military escort. He was awarded the signal honor of addressing the Congress in Washington. At a congressional banquet in Kossuth's honor in which Daniel Webster took an important part and which was held under the chairmanship of William Rufus King, then Vice President of the United States, Mr. King introduced Kossuth and said that "Hungary had proved herself worthy to be free." In answering this introduction, Kossuth replied with all his characteristic power and pathos. His words were so prophetic, they are so timely almost a hundred years later, that I am going to take the liberty of quoting them to you:

"I most fervently thank you for the acknowledgment that my country has proved worthy to be free. * * * I feel proud of my Nation's character, heroism, love of freedom and vitality, and I bow with reverential awe before the decree of Providence which has placed my country in a position such that without its restoration to independence, there is no possibility for freedom and independence of nations on the European Continent. We will live free or die like men; but should my people be doomed to die, it will be the first whose death will not be recorded a suicide but as a martyrdom for the world. * * * But I look to the future with confidence. * * * Now matters stand thus: That either the Continent of Europe has no future at all, or its future is American republicanism. * * * I am aware that this future is vehemently resisted by the bayonets of absolutism, but I know that though bayonets may give a defense, they guarantee no seat for a prince. I trust in the future of my native land, because I know that it is worthy to have one. * * * and whatever may be my personal fate, so much I know, that my country will preserve to you and your glorious land an everlasting gratitude."

To make the parallel more complete, let me remind you that Hungary's hastily recruited forces had defeated the Austrian Army and would have suceeded in its noble mission had it not been for the Russian steamroller.

Kossuth stressed the community of interests which linked America to Hungary. He understood that even then the destruction of freedom in Hungary was something to which

the American people could not be indifferent. Today, almost 100 years after Kossuth spoke these words, we know with a shattering certainty that the fate of the United States is inextricably tied in with the fate of Hungary and with the fate of the other nations languishing behind the iron curtain. We know that although we do not live in one world politically we do live in one world economically and strategically. We know that a world contracted by science must be united by freedom if peace is to prevail. We know that the Russian political juggernaut is insatiable. We know that it is determined to extend its predatory power over the whole world. We know that the fate of America hangs in the balance. We know that the final capture of the Hungarian government last year was one more step in the Kremlin's effort to capture the government of the United States.

We shall do well to heed the words of Louis Kossuth. We shall do well to recognize the natural community of interests which he emphasized and then it is imperative that we pass from the realm of recognition into the sphere of action. Time is short. Time is running against us.

It is not my intention to lament over the dead past. Our preoccupation is the urgent present. The future is now. It may be useful, however, to point out that the action by which Soviet Russia has been able to subjugate eastern Europe was made possible largely because of our confusion and hesitation at a time when we had in our hands all the weapons with which to forge a viable pattern for peace. Although the peace is not yet 3 years old, a generation of historical events, based largely on our own ineptitude, has passed since the cessation of hostilities. The seeds of future struggle were sown while the war was still in progress. The victory itself was pregnant with mortal conflict. We must come to our senses before it is too late. We must deal with the challenge as it is presented to us in all its manifestations and on all fronts. We must recognize that although the American military establishment must be substantially strengthened, although economic aid must quickly be given to the countries which have not yet been submerged by Soviet aggression, although the information and cultural program of the State Department must be improved and accentuated and enlarged, these are not the only weapons available to us in our fight for freedom. We must learn to operate in that twilight zone of action in which the Communists excel. We must devise means to meet the onslaughts of internal aggression. We must concoct methods to neutralize the Communist use of extralegal means in their efforts to capture legally constituted governments. We must recognize the grim realities of the Communist tactics instead of seeking refuge in the foggy notion that we should not intervene in the internal affairs of other countries. We must intervene to protect these countries against intervention—against Soviet domination. Here too we can borrow from Louis Kossuth. He wanted the United States to declare that when an absolutist power endangers another state's independence America would intervene. This principle was labeled the policy of "intervention for nonintervention." He was way ahead of his day. He was, alas, ahead even of ours.

One of the tragic ironies of our time is that we have appeased Soviet Russia largely because of the fear of the atom bomb which we possess while she, having as far as we know no atom bomb, continues her depredations apparently unafraid. It is a rather humiliating paradox that while we, with our vast industrial power, shrink from effective action, the Russians, with their millions of war casualties and their countless acres of devastation, have conquered millions of people and acquired large and valuable territories. They have learned how to use freedom in order to destroy it. They pervert our laws, our forms, and our conventions in order to do away with them.

In Hungary, of course, the Soviet conquest was made possible largely because of the presence of the Soviet Army. Here it was external aggression in the first stages and internal aggression in the end. In 1945, the Hungarians voted overwhelmingly against communism. Who can wonder that this repository of western culture, these descendants of Louis Kossuth should be steadfast in their love of freedom? Who can wonder that they should have struggled to complete the liberation started by Louis Kossuth 100 years ago?

Even if these vital precepts of freedom had not been so deeply ingrained in the hearts of these civilized people, the Russian occupation would have impelled them to cast their ballots against their Soviet oppressors. The brutality of the Russian Army in Hungary was almost beyond belief. In the appendix to a book entitled "Hungary, the Unwilling Satellite," by John Flournoy Montgomery, former United States Minister to Hungary, there is an official Swiss report of the Russian invasion of Hungary in the spring of 1945. Among other items of unspeakable cruelty and horror which are reliably reported, there is this passage:

"Rape is causing the greatest suffering to the Hungarian population. Violations are so general—from the age of 10 up to 70 years—that few women in Hungary escape this fate. Acts of incredible brutality have been registered. Many women prefer to commit suicide in order to escape monstrosities. Even now, when order is more or less reestablished, Russian soldiers will watch houses where women live and raid them at night, knocking down anybody who opposes them. The women generally are not killed, but kept for several hours, if not for days, before being liberated. Misery is increased by the sad fact that many of the Russian soldiers are ill and medicines in Hungary are completely missing. Cases have been reported where Russian women serving in the Red Army or in the Russian police force have been guilty of rape. Men have been beaten up by such women for not having submitted themselves to their wishes."

Who can doubt that the same thing would happen in America if the Russians were to extend their power across the Atlantic?

It seems almost superfluous to point out that the peace treaty imposed on Hungary by Soviet Russia was one more step leading to the enslavement of that country. I vehemently opposed this treaty although I realized that since the Russian Army was in Hungary as an occupying force there was little that we could do to achieve a just peace. Nevertheless, it represented an almost complete abandonment of the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter, and it may be said that it contributed substantially to the elimination of the four freedoms so loudly proclaimed at the time. The reparations payments to Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia saddled on Hungary are, because of the runaway inflation, four or five times the published figure of $300,000,000. Because of Russian opposition international control over the mouth of the Danube was not provided for in the treaty. Thus, although it is stated that navigation on the Danube is to be free, Russia, now a riparian state, has full control. Hungary is, therefore, compelled to rely almost exclusively on Soviet Russia for her economic life. Although under Article 21 of the treaty "Hungarian prisoners of war are to be repatriated as soon as possible in accordance with arrangements agreed upon by the individual powers detaining them and Hungary," no formal agreements have been effected and thousands of Hungarian prisoners are still detained in Russia under the most deplorable living conditions. No provision was made in the treaty for the release and return of Hungarian deportees and internees still being used as slave labor in the Soviet Union. Thus Hungary became the unwilling satellite of Stalin's Russia just as a scant few years ago she became the unwilling satellite of Hitler's Germany.

In addition to our acquiescence in this pernicious treaty dictated by the Kremlin we have in most of our other dealings with the Soviet Union allowed ourselves to be jostled from one Munich to another until now we have reached the point when we must either make a stand or run the risk of extinction. There is very little time left. There is almost no margin for error. There is no room for timidity or excessive caution.

While we cling to the diplomatic forms and amenities of the nineteenth century, Soviet Russia weaves her relentless web of intrigue and violence in every part of the world where she can obtain a foothold. While we debate and ponder, while we argue and thrash about, Soviet Russia, sure of her objective, pushes ruthlessly on. The fate of Hungary will be the fate of America unless we wake up and wake up now. Had we only known it, our own survival as a Nation was threatened when our leaders allowed Poland to be sold down the river at Yalta; our own national security was jeopardized at Teheran and Potsdam; our own safety was compromised in the Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, and Italian peace treaties.

Though it is almost impossible accurately to assess the complex currents of history, I believe that it is safe to say that the present world crisis is due in large part to the political immaturity with which our leaders have handled world affairs during recent years. We must grow up first in order to survive. We must mature in time to avoid destruction by our own handiwork. Although we still have the greatest industrial potential which the world has ever seen, it will be of very limited value to us unless we know where we are going and what we want to achieve. Although we have displayed unprecedented inventive genius in the creation and development of modern weapons and of many clever and useful devices which add to the comfort and the joy of living, they will be of no value to us unless we quickly perceive the challenge and step into the breach.

Even the atom bomb will move to the measure of men's thoughts. We must think strongly and clearly and calmly and quickly. And then we must act. We must put our faith rather in the concepts on which America grew to greatness than on the material wealth which we have acquired in the process. We must demonstrate, as we did in the recent war, that our constitutional republic is not a self-indulgent, pleasure-loving rich man living on the capital accumulated by his forefathers but rather that it is a dynamic, surging, onward-thrusting force containing within its present actions the seeds of its future growth.

The genius of America in a sense is that we are in a perpetual state of revolution. The flexibilities, ambiguities, and confusions of our system of government sometimes seem slow and inadequate to deal with emergencies. We are apt to grow impatient in times of crisis. And yet it is out of these very uncertainties that we have been able to distill the spark which has propelled us on the victorious adventures which we have undertaken. I feel sure that that spark is still alive. It is simmering under the surface along with the apprehension and doubt which haunt the American people at this time. We must ignite that spark in order that western civilization shall survive.

We must roll back the iron curtain. In that task we will be assisted by the people

of Hungary with whom we have so many indissoluble ties. We are tied to them because many Hungarians came to this country and have contributed their industry, their talents, and their love of freedom to the great fabric of America. We are tied to the people of Hungary because for so many centuries they have stood for the freedom of which we are now the principal defenders. We are tied to the people of Hungary because to a considerable extent their destiny is a part of our destiny. If we do not take action, their fate will be our fate.

These are, indeed, times which try men's souls. It is sad that so soon after a terrible war we should be faced with such grave events. It is sad but it is also a good time to be alive. It is also a glorious opportunity for progress and enlightment and the achievement of some of the goals for which men have yearned during long centuries of despotism. It is a challenge worthy of our mettle. It is a challenge not just to be brave in battle but to be steadfast in our principles. It is not merely a challenge to physical courage—it is also a challenge to moral fortitude. It is not just a challenge to our military strategists—it is a challenge to our intellectual capacities, to our culture, to our education, and to our church.

One of the greatest forces for freedom in Hungary is the church with which, as in Poland, the Communists have rather avoided open conflict. The Communists are aware that this is a spiritual challenge. We must realize it, too. We must realize that the iconoclasm, the nihilism and the moral degradation which communism symbolizes are the very negation of Christianity. We must realize that everything which we value is at stake.

Let us heed the words of Louis Kossuth. Let us remember the heroism of the Americans who fought in our struggle for independence, of the Hungarians who for many generations have been fighting for freedom and of those who died for freedom in World War II.

Let us not forget the people who having recently experienced the brutality of Nazi oppression are now suffering the cruelty and horror of the Soviet nightmare.

Let us say to ourselves: "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

Let us sound the clarion call to freedom.

And then, mighty in our faith, sure of our sacred objectives, we shall lead the freedom-loving people of this prostrate planet out of the wilderness of doubt, defeatism, and despair, and onto the broad sunlit plain of liberty and peace.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech which I delivered over the stations in my district concerning the Marshall plan:

I should like to discuss with you the European recovery program—or the Marshall plan—the name by which this program is most generally referred. I doubt if there has ever been a subject before Congress of such magnitude. Certainly in time of peace this Nation has never confronted a bigger issue. Seldom, if ever, have the people been faced with peacetime foreign policy so intimately connected with their individual security and well-being.

World conditions are more unsettled today than in 1939. Twice as many people are being crushed under the iron heel of the Soviet dictator than were subjugated by Hitler when France and England declared war on Germany in 1939. Half of Europe and a large part of Asia have had their people enslaved and their governments destroyed by the relentless aggression of the rulers from Moscow. History has moved swiftly since the end of World War II—almost too swiftly to fully comprehend the significance of it all. Only one thing is certain—Russian aggression has supplanted Nazi aggression. But it is much bigger, it is much broader, and it is more insidious and dangerous to the liberties of people everywhere on earth. Thus, we are faced with the cold stark fact that Stalin is as great, if not a greater, menace to the peace and stability of the world than Hitler was 10 years ago. What can we do about this menace? What should we do about it? These are the problems that confront the Congress of the United States at this moment, and certainly they directly concern every citizen of the United States as well.

If we could satisfactorily solve the problem of expanding communism with an expenditure of $20,000,000,000 spread over the next few years, very few of our citizens would object. If we knew that by spending American dollars in foreign countries we could stop any further march by the rulers of Russia, it would undoubtedly be money well spent. But whether there is any assurance that we may be successful in such a program presents one of the most difficult and yet one of the most crucial issues this country has ever been called upon to decide. The deeper it is explored the more complicated it becomes.

First of all, let us see exactly what the Marshall plan is intended to accomplish and the manner in which it is to operate. It provides for an expenditure on the part of this country of approximately $17,000,000,000 with $6,800,000,000 for the first 15-month period which commences April 1, 1948. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recommended the expenditure of $5,300,000,000 for the first 12 months. These funds are to be made available to the governments of 16 nations in western Europe, as follows: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. The intent of legislation is that by these expenditures the 16 countries involved will be able to regain their normal levels of production and thus become self-supporting. It is contended, although no one sponsoring the legislation wishes to say so directly, that when the seventeen billions of our money has been expended for these purposes, no further money from us will be required. It should be noted at this point that the aid to which I have been referring for western Europe does not include a proposal of $570,000,000 for China and $275,000,000 additional for Greece and Turkey during the current year.

It is also contended that when these 16 nations of Western Europe have regained their economic strength it will discourage Russian aggression and thus prevent the taking over of these countries by the Communists within their own borders. This brief summary pretty well covers the over-all objectives of the plan.

It should be emphasized that the Marshall plan does not contemplate any military aid or assistance to the 16 countries of western Europe. None of them will be any stronger from a military standpoint so far as this program is concerned. We are not giving these nations guns or airplanes or implements of war with which to prevent further inroads by Russia. Not a dollar of the money will be spent for military preparedness in western Europe. It can be asserted, therefore, that so far as military strength is concerned, western Europe will be as weak a year or 3 years from now as it is today. Now, what about central or middle Europe—I mean those countries that are already under Russsian domination or practically so. Such countries as Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, and the latest victims—Czechoslovakia and Finland. Does the Marshall plan provide any economic assistance for the forces that are fighting communism in these subjugated countries? Not one cent. In each of these dominated countries Russia has the opposition of millions of patriotic people. But these people are powerless because the forces of communism control the police and the military and thus subjugate the majority.

We have given Greece and Turkey money to fight communism within their borders but not 1 cent for Finland or Poland, or any of the other countries behind the iron curtain. Where is our consistency in dealing with this problem of opposing Russian communism? If we can justify spending money in Greece for economic and military assistance how can we fairly and consistently refuse to extend the same type of assistance to the anti-Communist forces of Finland and Poland who are doing their utmost to stop this tyranny.

The American people are being led to believe that if the Marshall plan is a success we will have solved the problem of expanding communism in Europe. But this is not the truth. It is hardly half the truth. Because if the $17,000,000,000 which we propose to spend in western Europe in the next few years keeps those countries from going communistic—we still have remaining for our solution a still bigger problem—what to do about the countries that already have been engulfed by the Red scourge. To free these subjugated countries can reasonably be expected to cost as much if not more than the Marshall plan itself.

We are dealing with only half of the problem. It can never be solved nor can the peace and security of that hemisphere ever be established with middle and western Europe half slave and half free.

Thus the American citizen may well ponder the wisdom of the decisions being made by those in control of our foreign policy. Since the end of the war we have let the Russians go their own way. We have haphazardly spent $20,000,000,000 since VJ-day for relief and rehabilitation around the world—while the Russians were pursuing—without opposition—their program of subjugating other governments.

About a year ago it was decided to change our policy with respect to Russia—to oppose instead of appease. By that time Stalin had made considerable inroad in central Europe and was moving rapidly toward western Europe. But these moves by Stalin caused no alarm on the part of our statesmen. Instead we directed our efforts toward opposing Russian aggression with a $350,000,000 program in Greece and Turkey. Nothing was done about middle Europe. Nothing was done about China or the Far East. We were going to lick communism and stop its forward march by attacking it in the one isolated area of Greece and Turkey. That was a year ago. Today, we propose to attack communism in western Europe—avoiding for the time being at least any consideration of central Europe. Today, we are again directing our attention to China with a $570,000,000 program, without military assistance. Less than 2 years ago, General Marshall, now our Secretary of State, returned from China and said the situation was hopeless there. But we had already spent $1,500,000,000 in a futile effort to help China. Now we are going back with a half a billion for the next year. General Mac-

Arthur and General Wedemeyer say the Chinese need military assistance in addition to economic aid. General Marshall says they need no military help.

Thus we are becoming involved in three separate areas of the world in our attack on communism, by four separate and distinct methods—in Turkey we extend military assistance only; in Greece we extend both economic and military assistance; in Europe we extend economic assistance only to 16 western countries but give no assistance, economic or otherwise, to central Europe; in China we grant economic assistance only.

How can any intelligent American citizen make any sense from such a program? How can he have any confidence in it? It is a jig-saw pattern without head or tail. It is based entirely upon speculation, guessing and wishful thinking. It is a program that is half military and half economic. It is sticking our chin out at a time when our own military power is weaker than at any time since the end of World War II.

If we are going around the world to solve the economic and military problems of other nations and other hemispheres, we ought at least be prepared to defend ourselves from any military attack. Today we are not prepared. We are woefully weak in air power and it has been conservatively estimated by experts that it will cost this country at least $5,000,000,000 per year to rebuild and maintain the kind of an air force we ought to have in the world of today.

I have discussed the effect and intent of our foreign aid program, in other countries. I now want to refer to the impact upon our own economy and the stability of our own Government.

Bear in mind that every dollar sent overseas is sent at the direct sacrifice of some American citizen. The money can only come from one source—public taxation and hence from the wage earner and the rank and file citizen of the United States. To what extent and for what period we can absorb the giving away of billions of our own resources depends in direct proportion upon the extent that our own citizens can or will make this sacrifice. From 1929 until the beginning of World War II we had annually from five to twelve million American citizens unemployed. Then the war came and everyone went to work. Since the war there has been little unemployment because we are engaged in such a tremendous production program to satisfy the demands of foreign countries. Chances are we will have unemployment again in the not distant future and when we do, our Government ought to be in a position to meet it. We might very well have need for the resources we are so lavishly spreading around the world today.

In addition to possible future unemployment problems which we may have in this country, there are many unsolved social and economic problems which should have our immediate attention. There is the problem of social security and old-age pensions. Millions of people in the United States today who have reached retirement age are compelled to live on allotments which are lower than the standards of some of the foreign countries to which we are extending aid. No American couple can live decently or adequately on $40 a month. Yet millions of Americans today are struggling on what is hardly a bare existence. In spite of this deplorable situation, Congress has done nothing to solve it.

Then there is the problem of an adequate housing program. Thousands of our returned war veterans are still living in trailers or in other forms of temporary housing or are crowded in with relatives. Those who are fortunate enough to have finances necessary to build a home are prevented from doing so by shortages of building materials and supplies caused by shipment of these resources to foreign countries.

There are many other vital domestic programs too numerous to mention which have been held back or entirely discarded in favor of aid to foreign countries.

Last but not least, there is the increasing cost of living. When we give a billion dollars to a foreign country it is shipped abroad in the form of natural or manufactured resources. It is sent in the form of wheat, steel, oil, cotton, machinery, and various manufactured products. The shipment of large quantities of these resources naturally creates shortages in supply in this country. Whenever there is a shortage or scarcity in a given commodity, prices tend to rise. Thus our generosity abroad is reflected in the day-to-day living costs of every American citizen. Your grocery bill and the cost of other things you buy next month is directly affected by the amount we have shipped to foreign countries this month. During the next 12 months it is estimated that our total cost of foreign aid, including the cost of maintaining the occupied areas of Germany and Japan, will amount to over $9,000,000,000.

Ten years ago we could have run the entire Federal Government for 2 years on that amount of money. For the next fiscal year our total national budget for foreign and domestic purposes will approximate $45,000,000,000. What does it mean to you? It means that you are giving at least 25 cents out of every dollar you earn to support the Federal Government. Add this to your other expenses and the increasing difficulty of making both ends meet can be easily understood. Day by day it is becoming more apparent that we will be called upon to finance and support the social, economic, and military problems of the rest of the world. Each grant we make brings forth a new request from some new source. No nation in world history has been able to withstand such an impact. Where, when, and how this policy will end is indeed a question that merits your deepest consideration.

Condon Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, since the subcommittee report on Dr. Condon has not been printed, I include a copy, under leave to extend my remarks, so I may send it to a number of my constituents who are concerned with this matter.

The report follows:

REPORT TO THE FULL COMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

(Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS, chairman; Hon. RICHARD B. VAIL, Hon. JOHN S. WOOD, members of subcommittee)

When the Committee on Un-American Activities was reorganized in January 1947, it adopted an eight-point program of investigation. The fourth point of that program stated: "Those groups and movements who are trying to dissipate our atomic-bomb know-how for the benefit of a foreign power will have the undivided attention of our committee agents, as well as those who are seeking to weaken other aspects of our national security." While your subcommittee is fully aware that it is not our responsibility to detect and counter the espionage activities of foreign countries in the United States, nevertheless in our continuing investigation of the extent and character of communism here, we necessarily have to check on the activities of Soviet agents, because of the integration and tie-up between so-called domestic Communist activities and that of the official Soviet Government.

That the Soviet Union and her satellite nations have been desperately attempting to not only secure our complete atomic know-how, but also to weaken or destroy our hold of this important knowledge, is plainly evident to this subcommittee. As the full committee is aware, for over a year now, agents of the committee have been assigned to special investigations in this field and while their investigation is not yet completed, the subcommittee feels that it should submit a preliminary report, particularly on one aspect of this matter which is of such importance that it demands immediate attention. It has to do with Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. From the evidence at hand, it appears that Dr. Condon is one of the weakest links in our atomic security. In substantiation of this statement, the subcommittee respectfully submits the following information:

PERSONAL HISTORY AND EDUCATION OF DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, was born at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on March 2, 1902. On November 9, 1922, he married Emilie Honzek, an American-born woman of Czechoslovakian descent. Dr. Condon is a graduate of the University of California, having received an A. B. degree from that institution in 1924, and a Ph. D. in 1926. During the years 1926 and 1927, Condon studied at the Universities of Munich and Gottingen in Germany. In 1928, Dr. Condon was a lecturer on physics at Columbia University in New York City. In 1929, Condon was a professor of physics at Princeton University, and during the years 1930 and 1937, he was associate director of the physics department at the institution. From September 1937, through November 4, 1945, Dr. Condon was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. While with the Westinghouse Laboratories where he was employed as director, Condon was a consultant on war-research projects, being performed at the radiation laboratories of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., and the University of California, at Berkeley, Calif. Condon is principally regarded as a theoretical physicist which involves radar, nuclear physics, radio-active tracers, mass spectroscopy and the elastic properties of metals. On November 5, 1945, Dr. Edward U. Condon was appointed Director of the National Bureau of Standards. Dr. Condon was recommended by Henry A. Wallace, who was then Secretary of Commerce. The Bureau of Standards is a bureau in the Department of Commerce.

In addition to the employment mentioned above, it should be noted that during the year 1940, Condon was a member of the National Defense Research Committee and that during the year 1941, he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research. During the Seventy-ninth Congress, Dr. Condon was scientific adviser to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy. In July 1946 Dr. Condon was a member of the President's Evaluation Committee which was formed for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom-bomb test made at Bikini Atoll. Condon has also served as an adviser to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

INFORMATION REGARDING THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The National Bureau of Standards is the principal agency of the Federal Government

for research in physics, mathematics, chemicals, and engineering. It acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards and serves Government and industry in an advisory capacity on any scientific and technical matters in the physical sciences. The Bureau's direct appropriations for the fiscal year totaled approximately $6,800,000, which was supplemented by approximately $10,800,000 in funds transferred by the Army, Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census, and other Federal agencies.

The bulk of the Bureau's work is conducted at its laboratories in Washington, D. C. However, it has several field testing stations located at various points within the United States and its Territorial possessions. Included in the research work presently being conducted by the Bureau of Standards is the field of radio propagation, which relates to guided missiles. In conducting its radio propagation activities, the Bureau of Standards maintains field stations at Sterling, Va.; Adak, Alaska; Punnene, Maui, T. H.; Palmyra Island; Guam Island; Trinidad, British West Indies; and Las Cruces, White Sands proving ground, N. Mex. Research projects engaged in by the Bureau of Standards at the present time concern atomic energy, radar proximity fuses, instrument-landing systems, and radiosonde. During the year 1947, the Bureau of Standards conducted research work on classified projects for the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

With reference to the work performed under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission, it should be noted that the background for this activity extends to the early years of the twentieth century, for in the atomic energy field, the National Bureau of Standards has had the responsibility for conducting basic research associated with the scientific standards, the physical constances and properties of substances and methods of measurement and instrumentation. The atomic-bomb project itself originated in the Bureau in 1939.

Other national defense work carried on by the Bureau of Standards during the year 1947, particularly for the Army and Navy, consisted of basic studies of the properties of electro-magnetic radiation in connection with communication and radar activities, the development of related instrumentation, and radio-propagation research. The Bureau also conducted special research regarding jet fuels, the design and construction of new types of optical-range finders and methods of retarding gun erosion.

The Bureau of Standards is one of the most important national defense research organizations in the United States. Because of this, it has become the target of espionage agents of numerous foreign powers.

The subcommittee has in its possession a list of employees of the National Bureau of Standards who have been cleared by the Atomic Energy Commisison to perform work on atomic projects. Because of the fact that this list contains restricted data, it is not being included in this report. However, it is to be noted that when this list was issued at the end of November 1947, the name of Dr. Edward U. Condon was carried in a pending status. This list contains the names of all of those persons who are qualified to work on atomic energy projects from a loyalty standpoint. The fact that the name of the Director of the Bureau of Standards was carried in a pending status by the Atomic Energy Commission as late as November 1947, becomes a matter of serious concern to us when it is recalled that he had, as early as 1941, held several important positions in the United States Government which related to the development of atomic energy. For instance, in 1941, he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research, and in July 1946 he was a member of the President's Evaluation Committee which, as stated previously in this report, was formed for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom-bomb test made at Bikini Atoll.

It is of interest to note that in May 1947 Dr. Condon reorganized the Bureau of Standards and set up 14 separate divisions. Despite the fact that he had not been cleared to perform work on atomic energy projects for the Atomic Energy Commission, he appointed himself head of the Atomic Physics Division, one of the divisions involved in the reorganization.

That the Atomic Energy Commission had reason to doubt the loyalty of Dr. Condon, is evidenced by a letter, the original of which the subcommittee has in its possession, which letter was dated July 11, 1946, and is addressed to a Member of Congress, who at that time was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. This letter was written by a person who held a high post in the security division of the Manhattan project, and who is now a ranking official of the Atomic Energy Commission. The first paragraph of this letter is quoted in part as follows:

"Attached is a very hurried attempt which may be of some help. Unfortunately, the ——— group has loaded me down in preparation for Friday's meeting. May I suggest that you demand Dr. Condon's record of the FBI. It would be enlightening."

The associations of Dr. Condon and his wife have been cause for great concern to the agencies charged with the security of the United States. Dr. Condon, knowingly or unknowingly, entertained and associated with persons who are alleged Soviet espionage agents, and persons now reported to be under investigation by a Federal grand jury. So serious have Dr. Condon's associations been, that on May 15, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sent a confidential letter to W. Averill Harriman, Secretary of Commerce. The letter is quoted in part as follows:

"The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.

"Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among those are Mrs. Joseph Winiewize, wife of the Polish Ambassador; Virginia Woerk, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy; Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy; and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United Nations.

"Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American Soviet Science Society during the time it was known as Science Committee of the National American Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.

"Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Joliet Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was ex-secretary of the American Svoiet Society. It is known that in February 1947, Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.

"It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that in March 1947 Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.

"Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Cromov, First Secretary of the Soviet Embassy, who has since returned to Russia. Mrs. Emily Condon applied for passports for European travel in 1926, and passport for travel to Russia in 1945. Passports were withdrawn, Condon issued passport 276319 on October 11, 1946, to travel and study in Germany, France, Holland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Great Britain, Denmark, and Switzerland. He applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia, which was issued but was later canceled by the Army."

There are other instances in which Dr. Condon and his wife have been guests at the home of persons who are attached to the embassies of Soviet satellite nations. Also present were the representatives of official Soviet agencies.

We have previously stated herein that the Bureau of Standards, because of its importance to the national defense, has become a focal point for espionage agents attached to foreign governments. For a great many years, the Bureau of Standards has been visited by representatives of many foreign governments.

In order to accommodate foreign visitors, shortly after his own appointment as Director of the Bureau of Standards, Dr. Condon appointed Demetry I. Vinogradoff, a Russian-born scientist, as the liaison representative of the Bureau. Vinogradoff, prior to his affiliation with the Bureau of Standards, was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. During the wartime years, he was in charge of liaison between the Westinghouse Electric Co. and the representatives of the Soviet Purchasing Commission.

During the period July 1946 through March 31, 1947, a total of 238 visitors and 64 delegates from foreign nations, including Russia and Poland, visited the National Bureau of Standards. During this period, a total of 39 Russians and three Polish nationals visited the Bureau. Among these visitors, were the Naval Attaché and the Assistant Naval Attaché of the Russian Embassy, and three representatives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Since March 1947, a total of 666 persons representing foreign governments have visited the Bureau. Very few Russians or Russian satellite nations, representatives are included in this number. The reason for the decline in the number of Russian visitors to the Bureau of Standards is unknown to this subcommittee. However, it should be noted that during the month of December 1946, Demetry I. Vinogradoff, liaison office of the Bureau of Standards, made arrangements with F. T. Orekhov, the first Secretary of the Russian Embassy in Washington, D. C., to discuss the problem of exchanging books, pamphlets, and other written material. The arrangements for the discussion were made by Vinogradoff at the request of Dr. Condon, and it was agreed that the discussion between Orekhov and Vinogradoff would be informal because, otherwise, it would be necessary to obtain a clearance from the State Department.

It is also known that Vinogradoff has been in close touch with Capt. A. F. Belikov, Assistant Naval Attaché of the Russian Embassy.

Your subcommittee would like to point out to the full committee that the exchange of scientific material with the Soviet Union is a one-way street, and that our Government is pursuing a dangerous and foolish policy of making scientific data available to the Soviet Union, since they will not permit us to inspect any of their bureaus, nor will they exchange any information with us. Early last year, the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS, disclosed that the Soviet Union, acting through its fronts, had secured hundreds of thousands of patents from our patent office and our present investigation along these lines reveals that even today they are continuing to order thousands of patents. We are convinced from the information we have that what the Soviet Union is actually doing is setting up her own patent bureau

by obtaining all of ours, at the rate of 10 and 25 cents each. We should like to point out that the Russian Government has refused to give the United States a single patent since 1928.

Your subcommittee, by a very diligent investigation, has determined that Dr. Condon has in the past 5 years been in personal contact and communication with a number of individuals who are American citizens, but who are members of the Communist Party. There is no evidence in our possession that Dr. Condon is a member of the Communist Party, however, but as a member of the executive committee of the American-Soviet Science Society, which is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and which was recently cited as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark, he has lent his name and influence to one of the principal Communist endeavors in the United States.

The extent to which he has aided and abetted this Communist front is illustrated by the following letter, dated March 7, 1946, addressed to certain employees of the National Bureau of Standards, by Samuel Gelfan, for the membership committee of the American-Soviet Science Society:

AMERICAN-SOVIET SCIENCE SOCIETY,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, INC.,
New York 16, N. Y., March 7, 1946.

———— ————,
National Bureau of Standards,
United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ————: It has been suggested by Dr. Condon, who is a member of our executive committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same.

We are, therefore, enclosing a brief statement concerning the objectives and activity of our organization, and under separate cover are also mailing you a copy of our last bulletin.

Sincerely yours,
SAMUEL GELFAN,
For the Membership Committee.

In response to this letter, 10 scientists of the Bureau of Standards joined this subversive organization. The subcommittee is cognizant, however, of the implied pressure which Dr. Condon, as Director of the Bureau, applied to his subordinates, and therefore it should not necessarily reflect upon these 10 employees. It does, however, indicate the dangerous extremes to which Dr. Condon has gone in an effort to cooperate with Communist forces in the United States.

Speaking before the Fifth Annual Scientific Institute March 5, 1946, Dr. Condon stated, in speaking of Russia:

"We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed ours to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because she is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war."

This subcommittee is in possession of no evidence or information which indicates that the Soviet Government has in the past, or will in the future permit the scientists of the United States in their laboratories or to make available to them any information of any scientific importance. Any Government official who is not aware that the Soviet Union is bent upon the Stalinization of the world, is not qualified to hold a strategic position which affects the security of the United States

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In considering the case of Dr. Condon, we wish to emphasize that what is involved is not a question of freedom of speech or research. The ruthless rush of Stalin through Europe, in the opinion of this subcommittee necessitates a revision of the policy and thinking of this Government and the people of the United States, regarding communism. We should bear in mind, that the Government is charged not only with the administration of public affairs, but it is also charged with the security of the people and the institutions of the United States. Whether we like it or not, we are engaged in a great epochal struggle; not a struggle with guns, because the Communists don't fight that way. They didn't take over Czechoslovakia with guns, they merely employed the strategy of getting a few men in the government and then a few more, and then they took over the entire government without firing a single shot or calling out a single regiment of soldiers.

They are conducting exactly the same kind of campaign in other countries. In this country they haven't gotten as far as they have in Czechoslovakia, but they got pretty far, because they got a man as Vice President of the United States, and he is now their candidate for President, and he is the same man who recommended Dr. Condon as Director of the Bureau of Standards.

It is the unanimous opinion of this subcommittee that Dr. Condon should either be removed or a statement should be forthcoming from the Secretary of Commerce, setting forth the reasons why he has retained Dr. Condon, in view of the derogatory information which he has had before him.

We further recommend that the full committee address a communication to the President of the United States calling to his attention the fact that the situation as regards Dr. Condon is not an isolated one, but that there are other Government officials in strategic positions who are playing Stalin's game to the detriment of the United States. It should also be pointed out to the President that the evidence before our subcommittee and the evidence which we are sure should be available to him, indicates very strongly that there is in operation at the present time in the United States an extensive Soviet espionage ring, and to permit this ring to continue, in view of the high atomic prizes which they are seeking, is folly, and can only lead to ultimate disaster.

We recommend that all of the evidence in the committee's possession be forwarded to the President for his consideration.

Unwarranted Attack on Rivers and Harbors Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there came across my desk a mimeographed bulletin put out by the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce, which violently criticized the action of this House in attempting to provide for the Nation's welfare by the judicious use of Federal funds for the prevention of devastating floods, the improvement of our channels of waterborne commerce and the development of our river resources.

This document, designated Bulletin No. 11, entitled "Federal Spending Facts," and dated March 10, 1948, severly criticized the House and its Committee on Appropriations for the amounts of money included in the civil functions bill passed in this body last week and now pending before the Senate. In contrast to the action of the committee members and the people's Representatives in this body, the writers of this bulletin have taken the attitude that anything which costs money is an apparent waste, regardless of need.

They seemed to take the attitude that we should command the flood waters of the Ohio, the Willamette and the Republican Rivers to stand still until Congress is ready to appropriate money to halt them. We are to order the silt not to fill the harbors of New York, New Orleans, and Galveston until we think it is the proper time to clear them out. We should not provide for new electric power generation until some distant future date, even though entire States like California are being browned out for lack of water and the power it could provide.

For the edification of our membership, the writers of this bulletin have undertaken to scold us for trying to meet the barest minimum needs of the Nation—which we did by paring $131,042,889 from the budget estimates of the President. They have criticized the fact the civil functions bill was still $104,000,000 greater than the 1948 appropriations, ignoring the fact that, since costs have risen the past 12 months, this appropriation actually will purchase less in river and harbor construction than last year's.

But the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce have singled out the one feature of river and harbor construction which actually repays its cost to the Federal Treasury, with interest, for its main attack. That, of course, is the incidental power features which help finance many of our most important river-control projects. In so doing, the bulletin makes statements for which I seriously doubt there is any proof and which should be resented by the members of the committee which heard and wrote that bill, as well as by all Members of this House.

Here is an example:

> Also not taken into account are interest charged during construction and expenditures which will be made by the Interior Department for transmission facilities for those projects where power development is involved.

The association here has refused to take into account that both the power-generation facilities and the transmission facilities will be repaid to the Government at full interest-bearing rates. There is no loss to the Treasury for these amounts.

Another example:

> The McNary Dam (which, by the way, is listed as a Rivers and Harbors navigation project although primarily a power project) was estimated in 1945 to involve a cost of $49,470,000. (N. B.—Parentheses theirs.)

The association overlooks the fact that McNary Dam, on the lower Columbia River, is primarily a navigation and flood-control dam and secondarily a power dam. But that secondary power just happens to be the feature which will return the major cost to the Treasury, at interest. Would the association prefer

not to have this income and have the entire cost of the dam be not reimbursable?

The association blandly ignores the fact that each year McNary Dam remains uncompleted costs the Government something like $16,000,000 in power revenues and interest which will accrue to the Treasury the first 12 months the generators hum.

The association complains that original estimates of the cost of public-works projects are almost always low. Naturally, costs have risen since the war above the prewar estimates. That has happened to private construction, but if the steel industry were to abandon its current expansion program merely because costs have risen, the price of scarce steel would rise still higher. How would that benefit anyone?

Again, the bulletin makes the baldly unsupported charge that "the plain truth is that scores of those projects—especially in the field of public power—have been repeatedly criticized by independent engineers of recognized competence as economically unsound with costs outweighing anticipated benefits."

If the association has any evidence at all to support this charge with regard to any project listed in the civil-functions bill, which I very seriously doubt, they have an obligation to present that evidence to the congressional committees immediately. I find no such evidence submitted to the House committee in its recent hearings. I think the members of the House committee on both sides of the aisle have reason to resent any insinuation that they are blindly pouring out money for projects which have not been properly justified.

Next the bulletin brings in the inevitable snide remark about nontaxpaying public-power enterprises. Of course, the writers knew full well that every Federal power plant brings in revenue which repays its full investment to the Government at normal rates of interest. In addition each of these plants supplies energy to private industries which pay taxes to the Government.

In the States of Washington and Oregon alone, for instance, the new private industries served by two great dams—Bonneville and Grand Coulee—have already paid more money in taxes into the Federal Treasury than the cost of appropriations for those projects since they were started. Without that power, those industries would not exist.

The bulletin concludes with six questions which it presumes to ask the Senators who now are considering this same bill in committee in the other House. Since the association has asked the questions, I am going to answer them right here and then the Members of Congress can take their choice.

Question: Was the President's Council of Economic Advisers right in advising a curbing of public-works construction under present inflationary conditions?

Answer: The Council was right if you insert the word "nonessential" or "nonwealth producing." The Council stated also "businessmen should defer expansion that does not immediately augment production." That is the criterion, not whether something costs money but whether it is essential to the interest and economy of the Nation at this time. Many public works are not, such as new Federal buildings, post offices, monuments, and memorials. But every project included in the civil-functions bill for 1949 is essential in the light of today's immediate needs otherwise, I am sure our committee would not have approved them.

Question: If so, then is Congress justified in undertaking a public-works program in 1949 which far exceeds that of any prewar year?

Answer: Congress is responsible for undertaking any public works which are needed at the time when they are needed. Congress never should undertake superfluous public works; it never should refuse essential ones.

Question: If we are going to disregard the advice of the Council of Economic Advisers in such important matters, is it not a needless expense to continue the Council?

Answer: You may have something there, since this is one of the few times this association has been known to heed its advice.

Question: Even assuming H. R. 5524 public-works projects to be economically sound—which is seriously questioned—should they be carried on in this period of full employment and national prosperity?

Answer: This has been answered by the first two replies. I agree, leaf raking and such projects—which I never consider to be sound—can await a depression which I hope we never again have.

Question: If we proceed with record-breaking public construction programs now, what are we headed for if a depression comes? Even costlier programs? If so, how shall we get the tax funds in depression times to pay for them?

Answer: Again begging its own question, the association presumes a depression will come; presumes business should wait until people cannot afford development of their resources before they develop them; presumes the only object of a public works project can be to spend money. I deny all three assumptions.

Question: Is it not in the public interest for Congress to reevaluate the economic soundness of all currently authorized public works projects, and to deauthorize those which fail to measure up to sound engineering standards?

Answer: Congress does this regularly, in its annual hearings on appropriations for these projects. A resolution introduced by me last fall, House Concurrent Resolution 123, was made virtually unnecessary by action of House Appropriations Committee Chairman TABER in ordering an audit of the books of every major Federal public works agency. There are also bills pending in the Public Works Committee to deauthorize certain projects, which will be heard and decision made in the light of the best available evidence.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate subcommittee handling the civil functions bill is doing a thorough and careful job of reviewing the work of the House. Between the two bodies we have two or three dozen men experienced in reviewing these projects and these budgets. I do not know of a wastrel or a spendthrift among them. I had the privilege of appearing before the Senate committee last week. The Senators on that committee know their business and they know what is best for the country. The greatest engineers in the world—the United States Army engineers—have been requir to justify every dollar in their budgets.

I do not think these Representatives and these Senators and these Army engineers have to take this kind of abuse from any amateur budget experts.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a great speech by Ira C. Eaker, lieutenant general, United States Army, retired, on national security. I wish every American could read and heed the warnings sounded by this wise man who contributed so much to our victory in World War II.

We have felt deeply General Eaker's loss to the Air Corps. However, in retirement he is more able to champion the all-important cause of making our Nation aware of the danger we face in allowing ourselves to become weak in the air than he ever possibly could have been while on active duty.

General Eaker was the first one to tell us that having the second best Air Force was just like having the second best poker hand.

No fighting son of Texas has contributed more tangibly to victory than General Eaker. He was transferred from the Infantry to the Air Corps in November 1917 and found a small, untrained, poorly-equipped organization, looked upon by the General Staff as the Army's stepchild. At that time many felt aviation was a passing fancy destined to failure and impractical for use in war. Among the men who championed air warfare through its unpopular days during and after World War I, no one was more ardent or active than he. He has seen the United States Army Air Forces develop the mightiest fleet of bombers, fighters, and carriers in the history of the world, and he has held positions of responsibility through the years of that development which make him truly a pioneer of the air. Now he views our Nation allowing itself to become weak in the air, and he protests vigorously.

Among General Eaker's achievements are the good-will flight around South America in 1926, the world endurance flight record as chief pilot of the *Question Mark* in 1929, the first transcontinental blind flight with instruments in 1936, leading the first Allied heavy bombing raid on Europe in August 1942, and leading the first shuttle bombing mission to Russia in 1944. He served as air officer of the Philippine Islands in 1921, was ad-

jutant of Mitchell Field from 1922 to 1924, commanded the Twentieth Pursuit Group in 1941, the Eighth Bomber Command in 1942, the Eighth Air Forces in England in 1943, and the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces in 1944.

In addition to holding the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, and Silver Star, he has been decorated by the United Kingdom, Russia, Brazil, Yugoslavia, Peru, Venezuela, Bolivia, and Chile.

General Eaker's speech follows:

When a military man talks about national security, there is always danger some will say he is a warmonger. Last year I was addressing a group in a great western city, discussing a topic which had been assigned me, A Brief Look at Two Wars, the Last One and the Next One.

When I announced the subject, a paid heckler got up and said, "There you go, you military men talking about war; that's what causes war."

I said to him that it had never occurred to me when the minister preaches about sin that he is encouraging sin; or when the doctor talks about disease, that he is promoting disease, but of this I was certain: Of all the men in the world, the man who hates war most is the man who has to fight it.

One of the prime reasons for my retirement from the military service after 30 years was so that I could call a spade a spade, a Communist a Communist, and a traitor a traitor without fear of embarrassment to the War Department or the administration. I wanted the freedom of a private, patriotic citizen in a free country.

I believe this land of ours never stood in greater peril than it stands today.

I believe Russia plans to attack our country. When? When her dictator thinks he can win.

I believe we have the greatest fifth column in this country any nation ever harbored, and I know a fifth column is one of the most powerful weapons in warfare.

Filled with these dark forebodings, therefore, I intend at every opportunity to warn our great people of their danger. I have given much thought and study to the theme of national security. Here for what it is worth are some of my ideas on this subject. I do not ask you to agree. If it starts you thinking on the subject, I shall be satisfied.

National security is the prime concern of every citizen, and this is true not entirely from patriotic motives. If this fair land of ours is overrun by the minions of a Red dictator, our savings, our money, our religion, our freedom—all is gone. We shall finish our days in slavery.

It was Rudyard Kipling, I believe, who said:

"I keep six honest serving men
(They taught me all I knew);
Their names are What and Why and When
And How and Where and Who."

Let us ask ourselves some pertinent questions about our safety, about world events today, about our strength and our defenses and our plans, and see if we can work out reasonable answers.

Is our security jeopardized? Are we in danger?

In our lifetime, in one generation, we have fought two world wars to destroy tyrannies and bring peace to the world. Yet, the most powerful tyranny which ever cursed mankind rides today unchecked, growing more threatening and more powerful hour by hour, day by day.

Stalin said last year that communism and free enterprise, their economic system and ours, could not exist together in the world. His stooges have called our President and General Marshall warmongers. His hirelings have overrun the Balkan states, eastern Germany, and lately Czechoslovakia, and now threaten Finland and China. The Red menace is on the march westward. Russian representatives have been at great pains to make certain that the United Nations fail in all efforts for world peace. Russia maintains now, 2 years after the war and with no enemies which threaten her, the largest land army and the largest air force in the world. She does not maintain this mighty military machine for defense, for no one threatens her security. She maintains these forces for conquest and aggression. Today more than a million Russians are on foreign soil, holding a hundred million foreign people in abject slavery.

Although he helped to destroy Hitler, Stalin is following Hitler's military dogma as set forth in Mein Kampf, chapter by chapter, and verse by verse. We are now in the political warfare stage—the war of nerves—the so-called cold war. By the German calendar in 1936, it may be 3 to 5 years before the shooting starts in the third world war. But, as General Eisenhower said, "Wars, being stupid, start stupidly." Many things could happen to start the shooting sooner.

This much is certain, the United States is the only power which has the might to stop the Red conquest of the western world. Hence, the Russians will attack us when they think they can get a cheap victory, when they think they can win. They will never attack us if we stay powerful and strong and show the determination for swift counterattack. As long as we maintain the ability to destroy Russian industrial capacity immediately after she attacks us we are safe from attack. So it is wrong to say that the initiative lies with Russia. Really, the initiative lies with us.

Can the United Nations protect us?

Did it protect Czechoslovakia? Will it save Finland? Obviously the United Nations cannot enforce world peace until it has a military component with the power to carry out its decisions.

I believe we should not abandon hope for the United Nations; that may be the eventual solution to world peace. Let us remember that our own governmental organization has been over 150 years on trial, and we are still changing it. Our Congress passes new laws amending it almost daily. It would be sheerest folly now, however, to rely alone on the United Nations for our security. What can give us reasonable safety?

Our safety lies in our strength. Strong men do not fear attacks from bullies and braggarts. Nobody goes around punching Joe Louis on the nose.

Defensive strength is a compound of many things. First, there must be a national consciousness of our danger, of the kind of world we live in; there must be a national determination to maintain our freedom—to foot the bill, pay the price, whatever it is.

Next, there must be sound planning and whole-hearted cooperation by all the branches of government involved. The importance of planning wisely and in time can be illustrated by the fate of France in 1940.

When the mad Nazis started on the march, France realized her peril. Her senile leaders decided to build a Maginot line for their protection. She spent half a billion dollars on this fortification along her northern frontier which proved worthless when put to test. The Germans ruptured or by-passed it in a few hours and France fell to 300,000 Germans when she had 3,000,000 men under arms—antiquated arms.

If the French leaders had built a few hundred fighter bombers, at a fraction of the cost of the Maginot Line, she could have cut to ribbons those German mechanized columns which destroyed her in 1940. How do I know this? When we invaded southern France in 1944, we destroyed in a few days in the Rhone Valley, with less than 100 fighter bombers, more German armor, tanks, and mechanized artillery than Germany used in the conquest of France.

War of a size to affect us adversely is a compound of two prime ingredients—a vast manpower which may become hostile and a tremendous industrial capacity for building modern weapons. Aside from our own country, there are only three areas on earth where these two conditions coexist. One such area is in western Europe whence so many wars have sprung; another is in eastern Asia and the adjoining islands, the home of the yellow races. The third such area is in the land mass of central Asia—the home of the Russians.

From each of these areas draw great circle courses on any globe, representing the earth's surface, to the industrial centers of the United States (for our greatest danger flows from weapons which will travel through the air), and you will see that all those flight paths, the war paths of the future, will pass over or near the Arctic areas. That is what we mean by the concept of the Arctic frontier. That is why we now know where our warning services, our radar nets and defenses must be concentrated in the future.

We must provide the right weapons and avoid such errors as the French made in 1940. We can easily bankrupt ourselves on obsolete methods and weapons which will give us little security in the future.

A sound, balanced, national defensive force will be a compound of three elements under single direction. A naval force to block the long-range submarine threat; a highly mobile paratroop land Army with the power and speed to destroy the airborne invader; and a long-range Air Force with the speed and power and range to deliver enough atomic bombs to destroy the enemies' industrial centers, his war-making potential.

The first wise step to a sound security our Congress took last year when it unified the three principal armed services—land, sea, and air. National defense is not three problems, it is one problem. Unification has now been legally provided for. The job of actual unification and harmonious relations now must be carried out.

We shall never, however, provide ample, effective security unless our Congress provides sufficient funds. Last year and this current year Congress has provided about one-half of the minimum requirement.

Under public pressure, both the President and the Congress appointed able committees to work out a national aviation policy and program. Both committees have now rendered their reports. Both reports stress the same conclusions. These two reports should be studied by every citizen, but above all, these reports should be approved and carried out by the Congress.

One prime element of national security is now being neglected by our law makers. That concerns universal training, commonly called UMT. In 30 years of military service I never saw a man who was not benefited by military service except those wounded or lost in battle. It is the only sure and democratic method I know about which will provide the necessary manpower in time to meet the requirements for national security.

What will the next war be like?

There are some predictions about the next conflict which can be made now with certainty.

First, it will come with little warning and with a destructive power never approached in any previous conflict. It will be Hiroshima magnified a thousand times. Every large industrial center in the United States will look and feel like the people of Hiroshima felt that August morning in 1945.

The United States will be the first target in the next full-scale war. The working people, the factories, and rail centers will be hit first. It will not be soldier against soldier or airman against airman. All that is

past. It will be atom bomb against industrial center—explosive against masses of people.

Every war has introduced new weapons and new techniques. In the First World War it was the submarine, the tank, poison gas, and the stalemate of trench warfare. In the Second World War it was mechanization—the mechanized column support by the Stuka bomber, plus mass destruction of industry by long-range bombers.

In the third world war the new technique will be a short, sharp bombardment by atomic weapons—long-range bombers dropping atomic bombs or long-range guided missiles with atomic war heads—followed closely by air-borne invasion.

The time element we now know has largely gone from warfare. In 1944 the Germans lifted the curtain on the war of the future. Their V–2 could travel for 280 miles, 70,000 feet above the earth at a speed of 3,000 miles per hour, and deliver a ton of explosive with considerable accuracy on British targets.

By 1950 it is probable and by 1955 it is certain that any of the great industrial nations can produce the weapon of the future, the long-range guided missile which can travel six to seven thousand miles, perhaps in less than an hour and deliver 20 tons of explosive or an atom war head with exact accuracy.

When that time comes, as you can see, the time element will have gone from warfare. Never again will we have 2 years in which to gear our great potential of manpower and industrial resources from pursuits of peace to requirements of war.

It is now fairly apparent that we shall have no allies with the power and in the right place to hold or delay the enemy while we get ready. There is every indication that we shall have to carry all or most of the load next time.

Under these sober estimates and frightening responsibilities, what must we do?

We must realize our danger and marshal all our resources to meet it. We must have a sound plan and carry it out swiftly and with diligence and resolution.

We must make certain our manpower and industrial resources are ready to turn at a moment's notice from peaceful pursuits to all-out war. That requires universal training and plans for industrial mobilization.

We must have a stock pile of atom bombs and the bombers to carry them instantly to the industrial centers of the enemy the moment he shows his hand.

We must have a Navy competent to keep the sea lanes open and destroy the submarine menace. We must have our own land Army ready to move by air to hold our own bases and destroy the enemy air-borne invaders.

We must have a civil populace trained to the new requirements of the new war. A disciplined, ably led people with plans for civil defense well worked out and thoroughly tried out. Such a people will not panic. An untrained, undisciplined people will not have the courage and stamina to withstand the first shock of world war III.

We must make certain we have the best weapon first. At the moment we are falling behind. We are not putting enough effort nor enough dollars into experimentation and research. The side which has the new weapon first and in ample quantities will win the next war.

We must never underestimate our opponent. There are more Russians than Americans. The Russians beat the Germans because they were bigger and tougher, worked harder and fought harder. They are ruthless; they have little or no regard for human life; their standards of living are much lower, which means they can do more with less. Germany underestimated Russia and the Russians and lost. We must never make that fatal error.

We must fight the new war, if unhappily it is forced upon us, our way, not their way. Russia is strongest on the ground. She has the largest and most powerful land army in the world. No nation can invade Russia on the ground. Napoleon couldn't; Hitler couldn't; it can't be done. If she could induce us to fight a land campaign in Europe or Asia, the conclusion is certain. We should lose. That is inevitable. If she strikes, we must retaliate with mass destruction, through the air, of her war-making capacity. That will pull the fangs of the snake.

We must now and constantly watch for fifth-column activity. Russia is spending vast sums inside our country today undoubtedly to promote hatred, disunity, labor trouble, and civil strife. That is one of her prime and preliminary weapons. It worked for Germany in Austria and France; it worked recently for Russia in Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, and it is being used effectively in Greece and China. Let us watch for it here and make certain it never helps in the conquest of our land. It represents our greatest present danger.

Finally, we need to teach a brand of patriotism to our children which will cause them to put love of country first; which will lead all our people to put national interest above selfish, personal interest. There have been many evidences since the war that such a program has been too long delayed.

This briefly outlines the emergency and the principal things we must do or we shall all spend our final days in slavery. I am afraid you will have occasion to remember this prediction. I hope not. Our fate, the fate of our freedom, lies with you, with all our people. Only a united effort and eternal vigilance can save us. Failing this effort and the vigilance, history will one day record of this last stronghold of human rights that America was once the land of the free. In that event, this will be our epitaph: "They did not deserve their freedom; they had not the good sense nor stout hearts to defend it."

Not Settled Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged to include the two editorials below. Freedom requires that there be a separation of church and state. But freedom, itself, derives power and meaning from objective religion. Certainly no atheist is free since he is enslaved by materialism. This question will return.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of March 11, 1948]

CHURCH AND STATE

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

These quoted words are from the first amendment to the Constitution, and they are made applicable to State governing bodies in the fourteenth amendment. What do the words mean?

On the face of the Supreme Court's latest interpretation, the doors of the public schools have been closed to any form of religious instruction. It would appear that the ban extends even to such a thing as the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. If this is true, if the Court has gone to such an extreme in the enforced separation of church and state, then it is a matter which ought to be of the utmost concern in an age in which the old spiritual guides are crumbling under the impact of materialistic philosophy.

The particular case before the Court involved a course of religious instruction given in the schools of Champaign, Ill. Its validity under the Constitution had been affirmed by the Illinois Supreme Court. But the highest Court, dividing 8 to 1, has struck it down.

These are the facts: Under the Champaign program pupils are supplied by their teachers with cards on which parents may indicate whether or not they desire religious instruction to be given their children. It is entirely voluntary. There is no compulsion whatsoever. The program is interdenominational in character and is not supported by taxation, the salaries of the participating Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish instructors being paid by Champaign's Council on Religious Education. The program is informative in character, and is not of a proselytical nature.

An atheist mother, complaining that her son was embarrassed because, at her direction, he did not attend the religious class, appealed to the courts. And the Supreme Court, on the basis of these facts, has decided that the program transgresses the constitutional ban on the "establishment of religion."

Justice Reed's dissent was strong and persuasive. "From the * * * language of the opinions," he said, "I can only deduce that religious instruction of public-school children during school hours is prohibited. The history of American education is against such an interpretation of the first amendment." Justice Jackson joined the majority, but he had misgivings. Expressing regret that the court had not been more careful in circumscribing its decision, he pointed out that the effect of the ruling is not only to ban the particular program in Champaign, but also "to ban every form of teaching which suggests or recognizes that there is a God." Other disturbing questions arise. Is it now unconstitutional for children to sing Christmas carols at school plays? What about the chaplains in the Military Establishment, or the compulsory religious services at Annapolis and West Point? Must these things go, too?

It is not the layman's function to challenge the correctness, as a matter of law, of what the court has done. But it is proper for the layman to appraise as best he can the practical effect of the decision on the world in which he lives.

The first amendment was adopted in the light of conditions which do not exist in this country today. It was written by men whose ancestors were familiar with religious persecution. Many of them had come to this country to escape it. If the founding fathers erected a wall between church and state in fear of dominance of the latter by the former, it cannot be said that in their time the fear was without basis.

But that was more than a century and a half ago. Today's world is an entirely different one. The influence of religion is much weaker now than it was then. And we are the worse because of it. In our day religious instruction is disappearing from too many American homes. The position of the church is weakening. And one may well believe that these things, in part at least, are responsible for such disturbing trends as the turn away from the old concept of family life, the deplorable picture of one in three marriages ending in divorce, the futile, fevered quest for happiness in material things, the groping by hundreds of thousands of people for some higher standards, some better guides, to live by. It is not by sheer accident that Joshua Loth Liebman's Peace of Mind still leads the nonfictional best seller list nearly 2 years after its publication.

In dealing with economic and political questions, the members of this Supreme Court have never viewed the Constitution as being rigid and inflexible. On the contrary, and rightly so, they have treated this great charter as being a flexible thing, intended by its authors to be susceptible of appropriate adaptation to meet changing conditions and changed times. Why then, in a matter affecting the separation of church and state should it be applied so narrowly and so rigidly? What has become of that flexibility without which no constitution can serve the continuing needs of a people?

The great challenge to the freedoms which we know and which the Constitution would safeguard does not come from religion or any teaching of religion. It comes from the advance of a Communist philosophy which, as practiced, is the antithesis of religious doctrine—an advance which is facilitated by our own embracement of materialism at the expense of the things of the spirit. In this setting, it is neither necessary nor reasonable to erect an insuperable barrier to the kind of religious instruction that was practiced in Champaign. Would it not be much better for us if, instead of forbidding appropriate religious instruction in the schools, we were to encourage it in every reasonable way? If one's answer to this question is in the affirmative, then it must be most earnestly hoped that the Supreme Court will not let this decision stand as the law of the land.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald, of Monday, March 15, 1948]

CHURCH AND STATE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now by 8 to 1, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that religious education in the public schools of the American Republic is unconstitutional. The decision is flat, sweeping, and nobody knows where it will lead.

Mr. Justice Jackson, in support of the verdict, said that the decision could be used as the basis of ordering from tax-supported classrooms not only religious songs, texts, and direct instruction, but also to forbid discussion of art, literature, or architecture that touch on religion.

Thus the Supreme Court can be called on to deny that an American child shall, in a tax-supported school, look on a picture of Raphael's Madonna or study a drawing of the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul that dominates the ridge along Wisconsin Avenue, here in Washington, D. C., and which is commonly known to all of us as the National Cathedral.

All this, because the first amendment to the Constitution reads that:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Let's see how the Supreme Court has dealt with other parts of that amendment. It has decided that the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances is not as flat and sweeping a declaration as it seems.

Go down in the streets and start a mass meeting and you'll find out that a license from the city government is required. No matter how peaceable your intention, you have to get a license and if you don't get it, you can be arrested.

Go within 500 feet of any embassy here in town carrying a placard and the cops will grab you.

Congress, says the Constitution, can make no law abridging the freedom of the press. Yet, Congress has passed many such laws. The press is not free to fix its own terms as to working conditions, wages, or hours. It is not free of liabilities for any false statements it publishes.

The freedom of the press is hedged in hundreds of ways, by Supreme Court interpretations of all kinds of laws.

The same, as to freedom of speech. Your freedom to say what you please, where you please, how you please, is definitely clipped by laws that any attorney will warn you about if you ask.

The second amendment to the Constitution says:

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

But you just try wearing a pistol without police authority right here in Washington, D. C., and find out how fast your constitutional rights carry you off to the jug.

The United States Constitution has been in force since 1789. The two amendments above quoted have been in force since 1791. Their language has not changed in all those years.

It is queer indeed that not until 1948 did the Supreme Court find occasion to say that the prohibition against laws respecting an establishment of religion must go so far that children in tax-supported schools may be forbid to look at a painting or hear a song that has religious significance.

The court has found the language of the Constitution flexible enough to support laws regulating the right of people to carry weapons, to speak, to assemble peaceably, and to publish their thoughts.

Surely the very rule that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion can be read from the other direction to say that no law shall forbid the teachers telling the children about religious things if they wish, or if the community in which they live so wants.

Queer, indeed, Mr. Justice Reed, the lone member of the court who dissented from the majority opinion, said from the bench it was so sweeping a judgment it could even forbid schools to excuse children from classes to attend religious meetings entirely off the school premises.

Does common sense hold with any such judgment?

If it does, the court would be morally and logically bound to follow on until every criminal can defy the law and carry a pistol when and where he pleases, until speech and press openly inflame treason and overthrow of the Government, and until mobs run riot up and down the highways.

Is that the line our Supreme Court is now going to follow? Under the logic of this 8–1 decision, it is bound to do so.

Queer, queer thinking. Something is surely loose in the world that was not here before. The Constitution surely was never meant to be read in any such way. The rule forbidding legislation on religious matters, surely was meant to protect people against enforced religious attitudes.

Yet here the Supreme Court enforces a religious attitude. The attitude it enforces is the attitude of atheism and antireligion.

It not only denies teachers the power to force religious information on children. It forbids them to give that information. We are into something here that every thinking man and woman had better examine closely, again and again.

Pay Increases for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, understanding very well what rising prices resulting from the removal of price control have meant for all civil servants, I introduced a bill last year, H. R. 3285, to provide additional compensation, straight across the board, for all employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is considering, at this time, pay increases for postal employees.

I pray that the committee will speedily report out this legislation with a recommendation that a cost-of-living salary increase of not less than $800 a year be granted, retroactive to January 1, 1948.

We must not trade upon the fact that the post-office employees are as conscientious and loyal as any citizen and worker in America. They must have money now, literally, to buy the food and the shoe leather they need to do their work and to buy food and shoes and clothes and housing for their families.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this economic injustice to the postal workers continue and expect that their efficiency will continue to be standard for all regularity and reliability, as it has always been since the days of Benjamin Franklin, the founder of the United States postal service.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include my testimony before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

REMARKS OF HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS ON H. R. 4775 BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE MARCH 5, 1948

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has before it for consideration some 20 bills providing for much-needed pay increases to a group of Federal employees whose salary level has never been a true measure of their importance in the smooth functioning of a normal, everyday life of our country.

I speak of the postal workers whom "Neither hail nor rain nor snow nor gloom of night" stays from their appointed rounds.

According to the latest fiscal figures available as of June 30, 1947, the average basic salary of post-office clerks and supervisors was $2,816 and that of city letter carriers $2,729. For substitute postal workers the annual wage considerably lower—$2,257 for substitute post-office clerks, and $2,190 for substitute carriers.

Salaries paid to postal clerks and city letter carriers—who comprise the bulk of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department start at $2,100 per annum, and advance in 11 stages, of $100 per year, to $3,100 as a maximum. There is provision for three additional meritorious service grades carrying with them $100 increases per annum, and granted at intervals of 3, 5, and 7 years. To date no field service employee has been advanced to the meritorious grade so that possible wage increase may be eliminated from consideration.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics City Worker's Family Budget, the estimated total average cost of a budget for a family of four in Los Angeles, Calif., in June 1947 was $3,251, and in San Francisco, $3,317. Compare these figures with the average basic salaries for postal workers for the same period which varied from $2,190 to $2,816. Almost 50 percent of all postal employees receive less than $3,000 per annum.

Even the top grade of $3,100 for post-office clerks which is achieved after 11 years of service is below the BLS estimated budget for a city worker's family in two California cities in June 1947.

Remember that the budget figures I quoted refer to June 1947. Since that time, as we

all know, prices have increased to such alarming proportions, and with it the cost of living, that mid-1947 figures are practically antiquated.

Postal employees have testified before this committee that in terms of the purchasing power of the 1939 dollars, the present entrance salary of $2,100 (before withholding taxes and retirement deductions) is grossly inadequate. In terms of 1948 purchasing power it is even more so.

Increases of $480, $500, $600, $800, and $1,000 have been proposed. I hold with my colleague from California who has introduced H. R. 4775, that $800 is the minimum increase that should be granted the postal employees and that it should be retroactive to January 1, 1948. Even if the $1,000 increase is granted and a total weekly dollar salary of $73.38 results, the total salary in terms of 1939 dollars will be only $42.80, or about 58 percent of the 1939 purchasing power.

Not only are the actual salaries, even the proposed salaries, too low to maintain a decent American standard of living, but two further points are startling and significant from the public interest point of view:

1. The tremendous increase in indebtedness of postal employees as based on reports from 11 of their own credit unions. By the close of the calendar year 1947, the number of borrowers had increased 46 percent over 1945, and the actual loans had increased more than 120 percent.

2. The tremendous turn-over in post office personnel who find it increasingly difficult to maintain proper standards and continue to work for the post office.

This represents not only a distinct financial loss to the Federal Government which has invested money to train each postal worker, but it results in a lowered morale in a useful and essential public service—one that has been in continuous operation, through changing administrations, through depressions (which we may see again soon) since our country was founded.

Indiana Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my observation that most veterans are not fully informed as to the various rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits that have been granted to them by the great State of Indiana. It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to present the following outline of such laws now in effect, as compiled by Mr. Howard W. Watts, 436–438 K. of P. Building, Indianapolis, 4, Ind., the department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans:

ADOPTION

Children may be adopted out of the Knightstown Soldiers' and Sailors' Children's Home.

AMERICANISM

Any party which advocates the destruction of our Government by force shall not be permitted to have its name on the Indiana election ballots.

ARMISTICE DAY

Armistice Day, November 11, is a State holiday; the Governor shall issue a proclamation annually, setting apart and designating the 11th day of November as Armistice Day and suitable exercises shall be held in public schools of the State. Appropriate exercises shall also be held throughout the State in commemoration of the historical event associated with Armistice Day.

BONUS

The eighty-fifth general assembly enacted legislation to provide for submission of the bonus question for World War II veterans to the voters in the 1948 general election. This plebiscite will be for the information and guidance of the eighty-sixth general assembly in January 1949.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A sum not exceeding $75 will be allowed by the board of commissioners of any county for burial of any veteran, or the wife or widow of such veteran, other than the inmates of the Indiana State Soldiers' Home and, if from actual necessity a burial place was purchased for such veteran, or his wife or widow, an additional allowance of $25 will be made.

Burial ground plot is provided in fourth-class cities.

A division of grave registration provides for permanent registry of war veterans' graves. War-service information is required on burial permits. It is the duty of the township trustee to care for the burial plots of veterans.

Cemetery authorities may not prohibit the setting up of markers for graves of veterans, provided such markers conform to standard markers furnished by the United States.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

A conservator may be appointed for persons serving in the armed forces.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence of members of the armed forces.

Protection is afforded persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces or merchant marine.

Disability of minority for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights has been removed.

Affidavits of residence in divorce actions executed by persons in the armed forces and filed more than 5 days following their execution are valid.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting are provided.

Seeing-eye dogs shall be admitted with their masters to all public conveyances, hotels, lodging places, all places of accommodation, amusement and resort.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Annual appropriations are made to the State Departments of the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the maintenance of service set-ups.

Clerks of circuit court, county auditors and recorders are required to execute papers in connection with the claims for pension, bounty, back pay or prize money for veterans, their widows or orphans, free of charge.

The fee to anyone authorized to administer oaths for administering an oath or giving any official certificate to a veteran, his widow, orphan child, or legal representative, for use in connection with a claim for pension, bounty, prize money, back pay, compensation or gratuity, is limited to 25 cents.

Free copies of public records for wards of the Veterans' Administration, under the Uniform Guardianship Act, are available.

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge.

A Department of Veterans' Affairs has been created to aid and assist veterans. It permits establishment of service officers in districts, counties, cities, supervised by the Director of Veterans' Affairs and the Commission on Veterans' Affairs.

WORLD WAR HISTORY

The board of commissioners in every county in the State is authorized to provide for payment of not to exceed $1,000 for the purpose of printing and binding any history of the activities of such county in and during the World War.

An Indiana War History Commission has been created.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

The soldiers' and sailors' section of the State Free Employment Service is to cooperate with the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division for Rehabilitation of Crippled Soldiers and Sailors.

Veterans' welfare associations are authorized to maintain schools for the education of needy veterans, their widows and orphans.

World War veterans who have taken Federal vocational training courses are entitled to a special examination for a high-school diploma.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is granted to resident children of veterans who died or were disabled while serving in the armed forces between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or as a result thereof, and to resident children of veterans of World War II. Free tuition is provided in Indiana University, Purdue University, Indiana State Teachers College, and Ball State Teachers College.

At Indiana and Purdue Universities, the amount of fees exempted is $30 per semester. Fees exempted for summer session at Indiana University is $15. No fees are exempted for summer session at Purdue University. At Indiana State Teachers College and Ball State Teachers College the amount of fees exempted for the regular school year is $66.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leave of absence are granted for men in fire and police departments of cities and towns inducted into military service with preservation of benefits under the pension laws.

Leaves of absence are granted for public school teachers with preservation of status and contract rights during military service.

Preference is given to veterans, their wives, and widows, for employment in State service under the State personnel act.

Preference is given to disabled veterans in appointments to civil offices.

Preference is given to veterans, their wives, widows, sons, and daughters, and to former pupils, in appointment to or employment in any office or place in the State soldiers' and sailors' children's home.

Preference is given to veterans in employment by fire departments in the various cities.

Benefit rights are preserved under the employment security act.

Retirement benefits of board of health employees serving in the armed forces are protected.

Firemen and policemen must be reinstated in cities of the State following military service.

A soldiers' and sailors' section has been established in the State free employment service to secure suitable employment and fair treatment of the veterans of the World War.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

All power now granted to political subdivisions or municipal corporations to erect memorials to the memory of armed forces of World War I is extended to include memorials to memory of armed forces of World War II.

All rights and privileges now held and enjoyed by Civil War veterans, their widows, and orphans, are extended to veterans of the World War, the Spanish-American War, the war in the Philippines, and the Mexican border service, their widows and orphans.

All rights and privileges now held and enjoyed by veterans of World War I, their wives, widows, and children, are extended to veterans of World War II, their wives, widows, and children.

GUARDIANSHIP

Special provision has been made for guardians of minors to protect rights under contracts of deceased parent.

The Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent or the minor child of a veteran to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Orphans and children of veterans and deceased soldiers are admissible to the soldiers' and sailors' children's home.

Veterans, their wives or widows may be admitted to the State soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

Congress has been memorialized to establish three Veterans' Administration facility hospital centers and to increase to 1,000 beds the capacity of the Indianapolis facility.

HOSPITALS

Authority is provided for the State to convey State lands to the Veterans' Administration or other Federal agencies to be used for hospitals for disabled veterans.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Accommodations for war veterans may be provided for in any memorial building erected by a county containing a city of the second class.

All power now granted to political subdivisions or municipal corporations to erect memorials to memory of armed forces of World War I is extended to include memorials to memory of armed forces of World War II.

Indiana World War Memorial and city, county, and town structures have been provided. Two million five hundred thousand dollars was appropriated in 1945 upon establishment of American Legion national headquarters in Indianapolis.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Counties, townships, cities, and towns are authorized to make annual appropriations to veterans' organizations for the proper observance of Memorial Day.

PROHIBITING DISPLAY OF BANNERS

It is unlawful to display or exhibit at any meeting, gathering or parade, either public or private, any flag, banner, or emblem intended to symbolize a purpose to overthrow the Government of the United States.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Annual listing of veterans and persons now serving in the armed forces of the United States is authorized with maintenance and custody of records.

County commissioners are authorized to expend not more than $1,000 in the publication of county World War histories.

Battle flags commission has been established to assume general charge and custody of all Indiana battle and organizational flags. Additional buildings are planned on the memorial plaza to provide meeting places and headquarters for membership of the armed forces for the keeping of their records, relics, etc.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, trust companies and building and loan associations may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

All benefits now conferred by law on other veterans are now conferred upon veterans of World War II.

Veterans' welfare associations are authorized to provide care, protection, and general welfare for indigent and helpless soldiers, sailors, and marines.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Free hunting, trapping, and fishing permits are extended to veterans.

Military compensation is deductible under personal income-tax act; extension of time is granted for filing returns.

Refund is authorized on liquor permits surrendered by persons entering the armed forces.

Operation of motor vehicles upon expired licenses during World War II by members of the armed forces is authorized.

Transfer of title and extension of authority is granted to a resident to make application for certificate of registration upon written authority of the owner serving in the armed forces.

Certain veterans are exempt from fee for license to vend, hawk, and peddle goods, wares, fruits, and merchandise.

Members of the armed forces up until 2 years following the end of World War II are exempt from poll tax.

Pharmacy license may be renewed within 6 months after discharge from service in the armed forces.

Professional and occupational licenses may be renewed without examination and with reduction in fee following service in the armed forces.

Mortgage indebtedness may be deducted from the assessed value of real estate by residents as of the 1st day of March of either or all of the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 and who failed to file a claim for such deduction because of service in the armed forces.

Exemption is granted from all penalties, demand fees, and interest on taxes; property is not to be sold for taxes during military service.

Certain World War memorial buildings are exempt from property tax.

The National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is exempt from tax so long as same shall remain the property of the United States. (Jurisdiction over the home was subsequently ceded by Congress to the State of Indiana.)

Property of the American Legion and other veteran organizations is exempt from tax.

Stock and property of certain soldiers' and sailors' memorial associations are exempt from tax.

Disabled veterans who are receiving service-connected disability compensation are exempt from poll tax.

A $2,000 personal or real-estate tax exemption is authorized to disabled veterans or their widows who have service-connected disability of 10 percent or more as evidenced by the Veterans' Administration records.

Totally disabled veterans who have served 90 days or more in the armed forces and are worth $5,000 or less, as shown by the tax duplicate are entitled to $1,000 personal or real-estate property tax exemption. Age 62 constitutes the basis of total disability under this law.

Interpretations of the last three tax-exemption laws are as follows:

1. If a disabled veteran appears before the county auditor with a check marked "Compensation" it is prima facie evidence that he has a service-connected disability of 10 percent or more and is entitled to file form No. 12-A prescribed by State board of tax commissioners, and receive $2,000 real estate or personal property tax exemption and poll-tax exemption.

2. If the service-connected disabled veteran is totally disabled he shows the auditor his last letter from the Veterans' Administration, indicating 100 percent disability which, together with his compensation check, entitles him to file Form No. 12, granting him an additional $1,000 personal or real-estate property tax exemption, provided he is worth $5,000 or less as shown by the tax receipt. Such veteran is thus entitled to a total of $3,000 tax exemption.

3. If the disabled veteran presents to the auditor his check marked "Pension," together with his last letter from the Veterans' Administration indicating the amount of pension and the percentage of disability and the two correspond, he then may file form No. 12 and receive $1,000 personal or real estate property tax exemption provided he is worth $5,000 or less as shown on the tax receipt. Thus a veteran drawing nonservice connected pension for total disability is entitled to $1,000 exemption. Should he, in addition, have a service-connected disability of 10 percent or more, as proven by a letter so stating from the Veterans' Administration, he would then be entitled to a $3,000 tax exemption.

4. Service-connected disabled veterans taking vocational training under Public Law 16 draw checks marked "Compensation and Subsistence."

Widows whose husbands died while in service or have since died from service-connected disabilities draw checks marked "Compensation," which is sufficient evidence to allow tax exemption under both laws.

Widows whose husbands had service-connected disabilities of 10 percent or more but died of nonservice disabilities, draw checks marked "Pension." Such widows should secure a letter from the Veterans' Administration showing that their veteran husbands had a service-connected disability of 10 percent or more at time of death, thereby qualifying for the $2,000 tax exemption.

5. The only three checks that are acceptable to the auditor for veterans' tax exemtions are marked under the seal, "Compensation," "Compensation and Subsistence," and "Pension."

6. Checks not acceptable to the auditor are those marked "Subsistence" and "Insurance" or no marking at all.

7. Persons who wish to avail themselves of these tax exemptions should, if they own real estate, exhibit their tax receipt to the auditor. They also should request the auditor to write on the application "poll, personal and real estate" if they desire the exemptions to apply in all three cases.

8. Any person wishing these exemptions shall file between the dates of March 1 and the first Monday in May, inclusive.

9. The act provides "Any person making a false affidavit or statement in an attempt to obtain the benefits of this act, not being entitled thereto, shall upon conviction thereof, be fined in any sum not less than $25 nor more than $100, to which may be added imprisonment for a term of not more than 6 months."

INSURANCE

Misleading statements regarding benefits afforded veterans under war-risk insurance, United States life insurance, or national service life insurance on the part of any person, organization, insurance company, or corporation, are prohibited with penalty of fine from $25 to $100.

VETERAN ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of certain veteran organizations is declared a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not less than $10 and not more than $50.

Annual appropriations are made to the USWV, VFW, and DAV to assist in payment of expenses of annual conventions.

Veterans' organizations are granted the use of State, county, and city World War memorial buildings.

Local units are authorized to make annual appropriations to veterans' organizations for the observance of Memorial Day.

Copies of the county World War I histories may be furnished the post of the American Legion in each county.

Records as to veterans and members of the armed forces maintained by county auditors are available to certain veteran organizations.

Veterans may organize welfare associations to maintain homes, schools, and so forth, for the care, protection, education, and general welfare of needy veterans, their widows, and orphans.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the Indiana Legislature as a result of the combined efforts of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, through its 74 chapters throughout the State, maintains volunteer or part-time service and employment officers, at an annual average membership fee of about $5.

In addition to this service program on a local level, the DAV has four national service officers, under the direction of John H. Weiss, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Indianapolis.

These DAV specially trained experts render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled defenders. Its active membership is made up exclusively of those who have given a part of their bodies or their health in defense of our country in time of war.

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program, under the supervision of my long-time friend, Millard W. Rice, to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans.

I can highly commend the high service standards of the DAV, which make me very proud to be one of its members.

The Congress Should Act at Once To Clear All State Titles to Tide and Submerged Lands Beneath Navigable Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed the Joint Committee on the Judiciary now holding hearings on the State ownership bill, S. 1988, on a subject of vital importance to my district, to the State of Alabama, and all other States in this great Union.

I today supplemented my oral statement with a written argument in brief pointing out the necessity for immediate congressional action with respect to that bill. Desirous of acquainting my every colleague with the importance of that bill, which I hope will shortly be presented to this House for action, I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my written brief:

ARGUMENT IN BRIEF SUPPLEMENTING ORAL STATEMENT MADE BY THE HONORABLE FRANK W. BOYKIN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT, ALABAMA

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the Joint Judiciary Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, my name is FRANK W. BOYKIN, Representative from the First District of Alabama.

I want to thank each and everyone of you for this opportunity of addressing myself to a bill: S. 1988.

I come before your committee seeking no privilege for any vested, corporate, or other interests.

I speak as a Representative to this Congress in behalf of the good people of my First District of the State of Alabama and on this a matter of vital concern to them.

I share with each and every one of them a deep and abiding interest in the question upon which you are holding your hearings today.

That question has to do with "quieting of titles to certain lands" both off shore and within the boundaries of a vast number of States. Among them are the off shore and other lands in my district in the State of Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, the subject question—one of States rights—is one which transcends all others before the people of my State today.

It would be most unseemly for me, a layman, not schooled in the legal profession—to address myself to a question of law—before a body as highly distinguished in jurisprudence as is each and every one of you all.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of law—it is a matter of national policy—a matter of States rights and I hold myself to be a representative of a sovereign State to this our Nation's Congress.

I have the deep-seated conviction that I should talk intimately to you about this strange new bureaucratically fostered idea that looks to the nationalization and even further centralization of powers in Federal departments and bureaus of Government set up here in Washington.

Furthermore, I regard it as my sworn and bounden duty to lay before you the concern of the citizens of my district with respect to the tideland legislation before your committee.

The bill, S. 1988, now under consideration by you gentlemen is a counterpart of House Joint Resolution 123 introduced by myself in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the subject matter before you relevant to the control of the tidewater lands as well as the lands beneath the navigable streams of our State is one of great moment to the people of Alabama—and particularly to my district which comprehends the great Gulf port of Mobile.

It is, however, of but secondary importance when contrasted with a politic and economic program looking to the ever-continuing expansion of centralized and federalized powers which comprehend temporal control over the sacred traditions, customs, and lives as well as the destinies and properties of our people.

This subject although of import to all States in the Union is particularly important to all southern States.

There is distinctly a question of States versus Federal rights bound up in S. 1988, now under hearing.

The political question of the continuing sovereignty of States and Commonwealths of these United States is an issue which transcends all financial and legal considerations involved in the bill under consideration by your committee.

I shall therefore address myself more to the principle of the right of States involved with respect to S. 1988, as I see it, rather than to the provisos of the bill itself.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the historically established right of each State to regulate its own domestic affairs.

This principle has recently and sharply been called into question when a member of the President's Cabinet by an unwarranted and precipitous action cast a cloud upon all titles to tidewater lands and lands under navigable streams in the United States.

It is solely because of the theory advanced by that official and in response to the petition of the people of a majority of all States, that resolution (S. 1988) is now before your committee with their prayer that you remove that cloud from the title of the true owners of these lands, to wit: the State of Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, were it not for that unseemly and undue exercise of administrative power and the still more unseemly bureaucratic desire for ever-increasing centralized and federalistic power, this bill would never have been found necessary.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, were it not for the undue exercise of the Presidential power of veto, the question now before you would have been fully settled by appropriate legislative action taken by the Congress 20 months ago.

For did not the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress and after comprehensive hearings were held fully debate all phases of this issue?

Did not both Houses of the Congress by record vote overwhelmingly pass Joint Resolution 225 which would have quieted and cured these titles, and for all times?

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States is the true voice of its people.

When the Congress with clarity and with finality, spoke on the issue of the nullification of the rights of States to control their seaboard lands—the people themselves spoke.

Did not the vote of their representatives in the Congress speak the wishes of the citizenship? If that be not true then we are no longer a land in which the common needs and the expressions of the majority of people—speaking through Congress—develop all policy and all law.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the veto by the President of Joint Resolution 225 to my mind was an arbitrary, dictatorial exercise of Executive power. Moreover, it was invoked to nullify the enactment by the Congress of a legislative matter executed in direct response to a petition of the people.

Must we reach the conclusion that we, the citizens of the United States, now live under a form of dictatorship—one where the will of the Chief Executive or the Administrative rulings of a central government is to become the only law of the land?

Has the day already dawned when we live under a government by men—and not under a government by law?

In returning Joint Resolution 225 to the Congress of the United States and "without signature," President Truman wrote, in part:

"The Attorney General advises me that the issue now before the Supreme Court has not been heretofore determined * * * the Congress is not an appropriate forum to determine the legal issues before the Court."

"The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while arriving at its decision in the pending case."

Mr. Chairman, hear me now well on this: Here is an instance of legislative action involving the right of the various States to control their own coastal lands and submerged river bottoms. Is this not purely a question of local community interests, and, moreover, purely a question of national policy as reflected in the control of those purely local State interests?

Furthermore, is it not the constitutional and sworn duty of the Congress to legislate on all matters of policy?

Mr. Chairman, it is equally true that it is not the duty of the Supreme Court or any other court in this land to determine matters of policy.

I am authoritatively advised that on more than 50 different occasions the Supreme Court of the United States in its ruling and decisions has * * * upheld the rights of individual States to exercise controls without limitations upon all lands beneath tidewater and navigable waters within the boundaries of such States.

Moreover, the Honorable Gessner T. McCorvey, acting for the attorney general of the State of Alabama, in filing with your committee a comprehensive legal brief, setting forth arguments and citing innumerable instances of legal decisions in justification of the passage of that resolution by the Congress of the United States, was joined by the attorney generals representing 46 other States of the Union.

In addition to the prayer for relief from the cloud upon the titles to our State lands made to your committee and to the Congress by the attorney generals of 46 States were scores of governors, mayors, city attorneys, States' attorneys, officials of publicly owned ports, such as our own Port of Mobile Authority, and State docks authorities. These made either written or oral arguments, or both, before your committee.

These duly elected or appointed public officials of the several States gave to Joint Resolution 225, then pending before your committee, not alone their legal endorsement but their moral as well as economic support and approval to the enactment of that resolution by your committee and by the Congress.

Additionally thereto, favorable action by both Houses of Congress with respect to this matter met with practically the unanimous backing of a large number of nonprofit legal and other private and public organizations.

Notable among these were the American Bar Association, the Conference of Governors of the 48 States, the American Association of Port Authorities, which organization alone represented more than 50 of the Nation's most important harbors.

Additionally thereto were the representatives of 417 American cities, speaking through the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

Despite the veritable arsenal of legal argument advanced by this reputable cross-section of nationally known and recognized authorities—despite the wealth and knowledge and jurisprudence inherent in the great Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress (which recommended the adoption of Joint Resolution 225) despite the overwhelming vote by which that resolution passed both Houses of Congress, President Truman vetoed and rendered ineffective the action of the Congress, and hence of the people themselves, because his personal appointee, the Attorney General of the United States had advised him about a certain case then pending in court.

Mr. Chairman, the chips are down and moreover, Mr. Chairman, they are moving. There are some bugs under them. Let us kick them up and see what is making them move.

What case was it that was before the Court to which the President referred and who instituted it?

It was the "inspired suit" known as the California Tide Water Lands case and the Attorney General himself had instituted the action.

At the instigation of whom, you ask; well, Mr. Chairman, at the instigation of none other than Mr. Harold Ickes, the erstwhile Secretary of the Interior.

What the President did not tell the Congress, when he vetoed that joint resolution—was that the case then before the Court was a "strike suit," that it was instituted by the Attorney General at the instance of that old trouble rouser and rabble rouser, the now totally discredited ex-Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Harold Ickes. He was the very first of a long line of Secretaries of the Interior ever to question the rights of the several States of this great Union, to the exercise of exclusive control over enormously valuable underwater properties located in practically every State in the Union.

In Mr. Harold Ickes' claim as to prior Federal rights first advocated by him he attempted to abrogate the long-recognized control by the States not alone of offshore lands but inland lands, below navigable waters.

Mr. Chairman, this would adversely affect and cloud the title to hundreds of miles of inland submerged river-bottom land in Alabama, inasmuch as they are held on the same legal basis as is tide and other submerged lands.

May I submit observation that the bill, S. 1988, now under consideration, does not convey one single foot of land or anything of any value whatever to any State or any individual or corporation, to which the Federal Government now or ever had any legal or prior claim?

It simply serves to clear and in behalf of all States the title to States properties—from an unwarranted cloud which only recently has been cast upon them.

Mr. Chairman, it is well to remember that the lands in question, even though they be under water, are real estate and that in dealing with these lands, we are dealing with titles to real estate.

Every last man knows that any claim which might be put forth by a Federal official and especially by a member of the President's Cabinet, even though wholly unfounded, will do more than encumber a title—it would render any legal transaction with respect to that land impossible.

The purpose of this legislation is to reestablish clear title by removing the cloud and by removing it in the simplest, most feasible economic and rapid manner, to wit: By release and quitclaim

Time and time again the Supreme Court has repeatedly declared—as a matter of law—that all the submerged land in question belonged to the States.

This prayer made to the committee and to this Congress is that Congress reaffirm these declarations of the Supreme Court and to set the minds of all men at rest with regard to the unwarranted, intemperate, and unjudicious statement made by the ex-Secretary of the Interior.

It is indeed passing strange that I should be here making prayer to the Congress of these United States in behalf of the people of Alabama on a question that was settled when the American Colonies, under the leadership of George Washington, achieved their independence from the British rule.

When Gen. George Washington, as commander-in-chief, led the small Continental Army to memorable victory, each of the Original Thirteen States became, at the conclusion of the Revolution, the absolute owner of all lands beneath tidal waters and the navigable waters within their respective boundaries—except such portions thereof—if any—as had been previously granted out by the former sovereign.

Mr. Chairman, it is an undisputable fact that the original States did not surrender their lands beneath tidal waters and navigable waters to the Federal Government either by the adoption of the Constitution of the United States or otherwise.

I cite as proof complete recognition of that ownership the many instances wherein the Congress of these United States had, at various times, called upon certain States to voluntarily cede or to convey small portions of such lands to the United States for the purpose of National Defense or the improvement of navigation.

Still, there are countless other instances when the United States acquired certain portions thereof by condemnation proceedings.

Moreover, individual States, among them Alabama, have, in many instances, granted or leased portions of their lands beneath tidal and navigable waters to private citizens, but, except for the portion of such lands acquired from them by the United States and by private citizens, the original States today retain absolute title to and the ownership of all such lands within their respective boundaries.

There is of record many instances wherein it is disclosed that the Supreme Court of the United States has held that all States subsequently admitted to the Union became the owners of the land beneath the tide and navigable waters equally with the Original Thirteen States. (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (1845) (3 How. (44 U. S.) 212, 228).)

Hence, it follows that all States of the Union subject to the exception mentioned above are absolute owners of the land beneath both tidal and navigable waters within their respective boundaries.

That historic recognition by the Federal Government of "State ownership" of land beneath tidal and navigable waters by individual States has long existed as a settled fact.

It is a question of established national policy which can in no manner be changed by some transitory Secretary of the Interior or any other public official or department head.

It is and has long existed as a settled rule of constitutional law.

The United States Supreme Court and all other courts which have ever been called upon have uniformly held in a multitude of decisions extending over a period of 100 years that lands of that character belong solely and absolutely to the States.

Mr. Chairman, I am authoritatively advised that there is no single decision to the contrary on record.

Following are excerpts from two of the leading decisions of the United States Supreme Court, which set forth concisely the rule as to tidelands.

Knight v. *U. S. Land Ass'n* ((1891) 142 U S. 161, 183):

"It is the settled rule of law in this court, that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over the soils under the tidewaters of the original States were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty and jurisdiction."

Hardin v. *Jordan* ((1891) 140 U. S. 371, 381):

"With regard to grants of the government for lands bordering on tidewaters it has been distinctly settled that they only extend to highwater mark, and that the title to the shore and lands under water in front of lands so granted enures to the State within which they are situated, if a State has been organized and established there. Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the State—a portion of the royalties belonging thereto and held in trust for the public purposes of navigation and fishery—and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *Goodtitle* v. *Kibbs* (9 How. (50 U. S.) 471); *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. (85 U. S.) 57).)"

That the ownership of States to the soils under the tidewater is not limited to the narrow strip along the coast over which the tide daily ebbs and flows, but includes all lands covered by the waters of the sea within the State boundaries which, in every case, extends to a distance of at least 3 miles from the coast line.

Illinois Central R. R. Co. v. *Illinois* ((1892) 146 U. S. 387, 435):

"It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found."

Martin v. *Waddel* ((1842) 41 U. S. 366, 410):

"For when the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character holds the absolute right to all their navigable waters, and

the soils under them, for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government." (Namely, the rights of regulations incident to the regulations of commerce and navigation.)

"In the Massachusetts case the Court also dealt with the ownership of the submerged land lying between the coast line and the boundary of the State which, in that case, as above stated, was a marine league from the coast. On this point, in referring to the earlier case of *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 381), the Court side (p. 259):

"* * * In that case it was said, that the principle had long been settled in this Court, that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction, unless they have been granted away."

It was upon the basis of the above principle of constitutional law that the existing rule was established.

Mr. Chairman, the State of Alabama, its various legal districts and political subdivisions, the citizens of my district and of Alabama have placed their reliance upon that rule.

Under that rule they have expended enormous sums of money in the development of lands beneath tidal and navigable waters, both along the coast and inland.

Great harbors, ports, docks, and other accouterments of shipping have been constructed in conjunction with a multitude of other public and private improvements.

In Alabama particularly, where geology gave evidence of oil in the submerged lands covered by tidal or navigable waters, leases have been made by the State of Alabama to private citizens for development purposes.

Great sums of money have already been expended over a long period of years in development work by the lessors.

Not only has the State of Alabama, acting in behalf of its citizenship expended vast sums of public money, but the citizens of that State, acting individually as well in cooperation with the citizens of that and other States, have already effected many improvements and expended great sums of money in good faith and in full reliance upon that rule of property set forth by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The United States Government itself has long recognized that title to these lands rested in the States. It has acquiesced in literally hundreds of ways to the ownership of these lands by the State of Alabama.

In the last few years one has heard said that the oil produced from under the coastal States' tidal and submerged river lands should belong to all the people of all States rather than those who happen to have oil within their boundaries.

Mr. Chairman, that is the language of statists and of fellow-travelers. It is not the American doctrine of State rights.

The fallacy of such argument becomes apparent when we consider the great diversity and value of the products other than oil, which are even now or might in the future be taken from out of the submerged lands in Mobile Bay or beneath our navigable rivers.

If the Federal Government should at this later day in the Nation's history—in the spirit of socializing the community interests, or in accordance with the theory of communism—sequester the deposit of oyster shells, sand, gravel (now under lease) which lie on the bottom of Mobile Bay, why not then sequester the oysters from the beds of Chesapeake Bay in the free State of Maryland or those from the oyster beds of the great Commonwealth of Virginia?

Why, then, cannot the Federal Government confiscate the coal from beneath the Susquehanna River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or the iron ore from deposits lying in Lake Superior under the offshore of Minnesota, the natural gas from beneath Lake Erie, and divide those and divers other products between the States that have neither oysters, oyster shells, coal, iron ore, oil, or gas?

Mr. Chairman, since when has the mere filing of a suit in a court of competent jurisdiction, or the fact that there is a suit pending with respect to certain questions of national policy, constituted good and sufficient grounds for the Congress of the United States to suspend all congressional action on an all-important subject to the people until the decision has been handed down by a court.

Could not such a device be invoked to block any pending legislation?

The President vetoed Joint Resolution 225 passed by an overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress, because he advised the Congress "a suit is pending."

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the State of Alabama were to cause a suit to be filed with respect to certain aspects of President Truman's civil-rights message, the antisegregation, poll tax, lynching, and the FEPC bills, that we in the South could depend on President Truman to veto such a bill if it managed to get through this Eightieth Congress, until the suit we instituted was settled by the court.

Gentlemen of the Joint Judiciary Committees, you can be assured that if I thought we had a Chinaman's chance of obtaining the President's veto to any or all of these measures, and for the same reason he vetoed Joint Resolution 225, that it wouldn't take much persuasion to induce a vast majority of southern governors to file suits with respect to the civil-rights bill before the sun goes down this evening.

It is a matter of record that the first time the title of the States to the before-mentioned submerged land was ever questioned by anyone on behalf of the Federal Government was in April 1937, when the first so-called Nye resolution was introduced (S. 2164).

That bill was later withdrawn.

Then Senate Joint Resolution 208 was introduced on August 9, 1937, and subsequent thereto, Senate Joint Resolution 92 was introduced by Senator Nye, and Senate Joint Resolution 83 by Senator Walsh.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding that fact, none of the proponents who claimed prior Federal rights to these lands over the State's title are any longer in Congress of the United States. They have all since been repudiated at the ballot by their people.

Notwithstanding the fact that none of these above-mentioned resolutions was ever finally adopted, the false, erroneous claims set forth by them and those made by other bureaucrats seeking to extend Federal controls over individual States have suceeded in casting a cloud upon the historically recognized State titles to lands below tidal and navigable waters.

The publicity given to the intemperate expressions and wholly unwarranted claims by seemingly responsible officials, and the subsequent fostering and refueling of the issue by pay-roll patriots has resulted in the filing with the United States Secretary of the Interior of a large number of applications for leases upon lands covered by tidal and navigable waters, belonging to the States themselves.

The more particularly damning statement, a statement officially spoken by Harold Ickes, has cast an overburden of doubt upon the validity of the right of the true owner—in this instance—the State of Alabama—to control these lands.

Thus an unwarranted cloud now exists upon the title to real property within that State, and, moreover, within the congressional district which I represent.

I am making prayer that you legally remove such cloud by quit claim or release as provided for in S. 1988.

I am not asking that you release to the State of Alabama any land to which the United States has any claim whatever. I am making respectful prayer to this Congress that they enact resolution (S. 1988) quieting titles of the State of Alabama and all other States of the Union to lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States.

The granting by the Congress of the United States of this petition will be a boon to the people of Alabama. It will serve to clear the titles of immensely important and valuable State, city, and municipal properties from the wholly unwarranted cloud—and in behalf of their true owner.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I regard it as the bounden duty of this Congress to forever and definitely establish the true ownership of the submerged off-coast lands and those within the territorial boundary of the State of Alabama.

We in Alabama, as citizens of this great Union of States, demand that our historically recognized jurisdiction over and the control of the subsoil, and the sea bed and the river bottoms of our State be now sustained by an act of Congress.

We, in the State of Alabama, contend that the use of that property is a question of sovereign State rights. That it is a local affair which so directly affects our coastal communities' life and welfare that it cannot in any conscience be separated from them.

Moreover, we contend that this new doctrine advanced by certain federalistic, bureaucratic officials is violative of both the Federal and State Constitutions.

Our every Alabama seaport town and community, not unlike those of all other States, have State laws and local ordinances controlling the use of our waterfront.

Our State, our counties, our cities, and our citizenship have spent millions of dollars in the development of beaches, recreation centers, parks, highways, and divers other facilities on the ocean shores, for the enjoyment and the convenience of our citizens.

You must not fail to cure the existing defect in their titles.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, may I say that it is inconceivable that under some strange new legal principle of policy making by departmental heads—never heretofore enunciated to our people—that responsible administrative officials should foster the nullification of the vital and local rights and interests of the State of Alabama and its southern Gulf port communities—which purely personal and extra legal ventures—were never submitted for approval or ratification to the Congress of the United States.

If this bill, S. 1988, fails of passage, the true title to every port, dock, beach, and highway fronting the wharves and all improvements made upon filled lands in the 150 years that have passed will all be jeopardized.

Millions of dollars of improvements throughout the Nation—upon which hundreds, if not thousands, of millions of dollars of bonds were issued and outstanding—stand in jeopardy.

These bonds are held by banks, private industries, educational institutions, insurance and other companies. They will be of questionable value until the titles to these lands are once again quieted and made secure to their true owners.

The power of the Congress to resolve this question for all time is crystal clear.

It is the duty of the Congress to act—and to act at once.

It is for the above reasons that the people in my district specifically, the State of Alabama in general, join with all other coastal cities and States with navigable rivers in urging the Congress to pass this legislation.

Let's Have Some Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, now that the Communists have taken over Czechoslovakia and converted it into a Russian puppet state, it is becoming more and more apparent that most of the troubles of Europe—at least as far as communism is concerned—are directly traceable to the secret deals made between Roosevelt and Stalin at Teheran and Yalta, and between Truman and Stalin at Potsdam. Just recently Secretary of State Marshall, who attended the Teheran and Yalta Conferences as the chief military official of the United States during the war, testified before a congressional committee that he knew nothing of the agreements that were made there between Roosevelt and Stalin. It was these agreements which permitted the Russian armies to move into strategic positions in the Balkans and eastern Europe, and made the occupied countries easy prey for Communist domination. It was also at Yalta and Teheran that Russia gained control of Manchukuo, the Kuriles, and a part of Korea, thus threatening the Orient with Communist control. Historians will undoubtedly describe the American participation in the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences as the greatest diplomatic tragedy of all time. Incidentally, it was UNRRA, for which the United States furnished most of the money, that refinanced and rehabilitated Czechoslovakia in readiness for Communist Russia to take over.

COMMUNISM AT HOME

Mr. Speaker, soon after President Truman advised Congress that he would want $570,000,000 additional funds to aid China, and $275,000,000 additional to aid Greece, in the fight against communism, a House Appropriations Subcommittee revealed testimony showing that our own State Department was still heavily infiltrated by Reds, Communists, and fellow travelers, despite all congressional efforts to get such radicals off the Federal pay rolls. Just why the administration should ask for hundreds of millions of dollars to fight communism abroad and then nurture it at home, within the Federal Government itself, is hard to understand. A real house cleaning from top to bottom in the executive branch of the Government seems to be indicated.

WHAT FOREIGN AID COSTS YOU

Mr. Speaker, since World War II we have paid out in foreign aid something over $24,000,000,000. On the basis of the 1940 census, that means $180 for every man, woman, child, and baby in America, or $720 for the average American family of four people. It means the 300,000 people in each congressional district of the United States owe $54,000,000 as their share of the peacetime foreign aid already given out.

Since the Marshall plan will mean at least $25,000,000,000 more to be handed out in foreign aid before it is completed, our total foreign-aid program will amount to $360 for every man, woman, child, and baby in America, or $108,000,000 for each congressional district in America. To find the cost for any city or county multiply $360 by the population of the city or county.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I wish to include the following editorial, Let's Have Some Truth, that appeared in the Illinois State Journal for Wednesday, March 10, 1948:

LET'S HAVE SOME TRUTHS

When Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, pseudo-Republican of Michigan and New Deal leader in the United States Senate in foreign pleadings, prayed ardently a few days ago for immediate passage of the so-called Marshall plan, he premised his reasoning on assumptions that American taxpayers had better heed and analyze closely.

What he implied, in effect, is that every time anyone in Europe or Asia gets in trouble, the United States ought to make the imbroglio an American fight, then pay whatever costs may ensue.

VANDENBERG should have told the Senate and the people of this country that the stratospheric program he wants imposed on American taxpayers did not originate in the mind of Secretary Marshall at all; that instead, it came from Europe, that Marshall was merely a collaborator, that the Marshall speech at Harvard last June whence the plan bloomed was but a way-station stop for a train that had been already made up and was on its way. The Michigander, of course, neglected this bit of information. Also he glossed over the highly debatable point of constitutionality of the whole scheme.

VANDENBERG paid rapt tribute to his diplomatic god, Marshall, and he endeavored to immortalize the Harvard utterance. He conceded that "the responsive effect in Europe was electric." Naturally. Any time plotting socialistic governments see 17 to 20 billion good American dollars coming their way—dollars they can use further to entrench themselves in control—the effect is bound to be electric.

If taxpayers of the United States are going to bear the cost, hereafter, of every foreign turbulence that springs; then, between wars, tax themselves for tribute to blackmailers and call it "peace"—if this is to be the role of this country, then future generations face a bleakness that will menace, if not completely destroy, the civilization of which pygmies of this current decadent generation boast.

VANDENBERG grew mellow as he pleaded for the New Deal scheme. He implored the Truman administration to "search for the best and be satisfied with nothing less" when looking for someone to administer the aid program. If he knows anything, he knows the Truman administration is incapable of putting such a tempting mountain of easy money into other than incompetent, racketeering hands. He chanted that the plan has "amazingly unified support" from the "official voices" of practically every segment of American life. What he didn't confess is that scarcely an American knows what the so-called Marshall plan is, what it will aid, what it will stop, how it will be executed. Certainly few have any notion that it wasn't Secretary Marshall at all who conceived this enormous enterprise, but beggars from abroad.

Americans have been so staggered by catastrophic demands, since the New Deal commenced its Roman holiday, that the people are dizzy. Propaganda from Washington has deliberately falsified the purposes of plans until few people know what to believe. Even though he may be for this huge American gift to people who wouldn't lift a hand for us, VANDENBERG might at least have been honest enough to have related the plan's true history.

Taxpayers of this country are generous. They want to collaborate with everybody on earth who will reciprocate friendship. If the people themselves of neighboring nations are in need, the American impulse is to help; but they are getting vehemently fed up on schemes that contemplate only one-way traffic.

It is to be hoped the Congress will reveal the truth, the whole truth, about this European-New Deal scheme to enrich foreign socialism at American taxpayers' expense. Impartial polls, the professional polls to the contrary notwithstanding, indicate an enormous demand for light. They reveal, also, a deep distrust of the program now in debate. Nor will admissions that the whole enterprise is a gamble help taxpayers' morale. They've been international guinea pigs long enough. Whatever may be done, let strict business rules apply. It is a dull joke to open and close a poker game with prayer.

Admit Polish Soldiers Exiled at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the Polish-American Congress has written to the Congress in support of H. R. 3620, which I introduced on May 26, 1947. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the letter and the enclosure from Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress. He accurately sets forth the justification for H. R. 3620. Let us take this action now to admit these soldiers who fought our fight and who have since been caused to suffer by the betrayal of Yalta.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., March 12, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE MACKINNON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of impending legislative action in the House to admit displaced persons to the United States, we ask for your help in support of H. R. 2910, with an amendment, however, to section 5, so as to include also the members of the Polish Army in exile—our gallant allies, as proposed in H. R. 3620 by Representative MACKINNON.

I have visited displaced-persons camps in the American and British zones of Germany, and I have been deeply moved by the sorry and tragic picture of hundreds of thousands of homeless men, women, and children, whose hopes of returning to the land of their birth were crushed by the Yalta pact, which cut them off from liberty, a legal government, and a free homeland.

On October 11, 1946, I presented Mr. Byrnes, who was then our Secretary of State, in conformance with his request, a first-hand report on conditions in displaced-persons camps as witnessed by a Polish-American Congress delegation, of which I was a member. In January 1947 I sent all our Senators and Congressmen a factual report on the plight of displaced persons in Germany, concluding with the statement that had it not been for the Yalta pact, to which America was

a partner, there would be no displaced-persons problem today. On June 14, 1947, I testified before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization in favor of a revised Stratton bill, which would also embrace homeless pro-allied Polish soldiers, our companions in battle, who fought valiantly for a freedom that failed to materialize.

The Polish-American Congress, with its 6,000,000 members, pleads not only for the cause of Polish displaced civilians and soldiers, but for all displaced persons, of every nationality, race, and creed, who fear returning to their ancestral homelands now ruled by Communist usurpers.

America's moral duty to these homeless and despairing people is clear. Aside from the fact that its chief war aims were justice and humanitarianism, it must accept its share of responsibility for their desperate predicament, the inevitable sequence of the Yalta agreement. Furthermore, to open the gates of America to a fair share of displaced civilians and soldiers is a Christian and an American obligation.

The admission of 400,000 displaced persons of good character at the rate of 100,000 a year would still be less than half of the number that would have entered under the normal immigration quota had there been no war.

Apart from being a life-saving measure to innocent victims of Nazi and Soviet aggression, it would also relieve the burden placed upon the American taxpayer in connection with the maintenance of displaced-persons camps.

Your kind acknowledgment of this letter together with expressions of favorable opinion in a matter so close to the hearts of Americans of Polish descent would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

For the Polish-American Congress:

CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President.*

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF CHARLES ROZMAREK, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC., APPEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON H. R. 2910 ON JUNE 13, 1947

The Polish-American Congress, Inc., organized in 1944 and incorporated under the laws of the State of Illinois, is an organization of national scope, representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent. It is a union of all Polish-American fraternal, civic, religious, cultural, and educational associations, clubs, and groups. Over 1,000 Polish Catholic parishes and all but 2 of the 97 Polish-language daily, weekly, and monthly publications in this country support and closely cooperate with our organization.

We Americans of Polish descent stand united in our opposition to all un-American and undemocratic ideologies. Being fully aware that Communist agents in diplomatic disguise are endeavoring to destroy our American democracy, we erected a moral wall between ourselves and the numerous agents sent to this country from Soviet-dominated Poland. We don't want communism any more than we want nazism or fascism. I am proud to state that among Americans of Polish descent there is only a negligible small number of Communists. Less than 1 percent have become victims of the Communist poison injected through foreign diplomatic channels into our American community.

EYEWITNESS REPORT

Deeply concerned by the fate of displaced persons, I traveled to Europe last fall as the head of a special delegation of the Polish-American Congress which made an on-the-spot investigation of Polish displaced-persons camps in Germany.

On September 11, 1946, we conferred in Paris with our then Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, after which, very courteously assisted by our American military authorities, we undertook an extensive tour of the American and British zones of Germany.

We left Germany shocked by the unspeakable degradation to which displaced Poles are subjected. They live on a plane slightly above that of animals. Their diet consists of 1,250 calories a day in contrast to 1,550 for the Germans and 4,000 for American soldiers.

On October 11, 1946, upon our return to Paris, we submitted to Mr. Byrnes, in compliance with his request, an eye-witness report on the plight of Polish displaced persons in Germany. This first-hand report on the plight of displaced persons was followed in January 1947 by another factual report sent to the Members of the Congress of the United States.

DISPLACED POLES: WHO ARE THEY?

Of the total number of displaced persons in the American, British, and French zones of Germany, the Poles constitute the largest segment.

At the time of my visit to Germany in October 1946, there were about 400,000 displaced Poles, of whom 195,000 were in the American zone alone. These figures include Poles shipped by the Nazis to Germany as slave laborers, former inmates of concentration camps, and almost 30,000 Polish prisoners of war captured by the Germans in 1939.

The eastern European displaced persons, to which H. R. 2910 refers, fought nazism and they suffered from the Germans. They dread communism as much as nazism. It is not propaganda but the cruel persecution of their countrymen and the first-hand experiences of thousands of Poles who escaped from Poland that keeps them from going home. Poland, as you gentlemen are aware, is not free. It is enslaved and occupied by a foreign power.

Their stanch opposition to all forms of totalitarianism aiming at the destruction of democracy would make them the kind of citizens America needs right now when world communism directed from Moscow has set out to destroy us from within before an attempt will be made to destroy us from without.

While we think in terms of the use of displaced persons in our national economy, let us not forget that their present plight is by no means of their own making.

They were forcibly uprooted from their country by the Nazis, but they dreamed of the day when they would be permitted to return to be united with their loved ones. It is because the United States unwittingly agreed at Yalta to the Soviet domination of eastern and central Europe; it is because we did not keep our pledges incorporated in the Atlantic Charter, that they are now people without a country.

We are spending millions, or rather hundreds of millions, of dollars to keep them in idleness and in poverty instead of using their talents and their skills for the good of our own economy and their enthusiasm for democracy, for the strengthening of our democratic forces.

This is why, gentlemen, I most sincerely appeal to you to give your consideration to Representative STRATTON'S bill, H. R. 2910. This salutary measure would alleviate the misery of these unfortunates and at the same time tend to fulfill the obligation of our American Government under the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms.

DISPLACED POLISH SOLDIERS

While we back Representative STRATTON'S bill, we do not endorse it entirely in its present form. We ask that section 5 be amended so that it would also embrace the members of the Polish Army in exile—our gallant fighting allies.

When Britain's fate hung in the balance, they performed daring deeds of bravery over the skies of England. They fought at Narvik, at the Maginot line, and in Tobruk. On the slopes of Monte Cassino alone, 3,600 of them laid down their lives, thus saving the lives of our American boys in Gen. Mark W. Clark's Fifth Army and British lives in the Eighth Army of General Alexander.

These heroes of the biggest battles of the last war, many of whom were decorated with America's highest honors for bravery, are now disarmed and deprived of their military status, placed in camps of the so-called Polish Resettlement Corps.

Is this the reward for the Polish soldiers, who, with our American boys, fought for the cause of freedom and who were the first to fight Germany and the last to cease fire? Is this the reward for men who put their faith in the spoken and written pledges of the United Kingdom and the United States of America? Marked by the Soviet police, slated for labor camps in Siberia, prisons, or gallows if they return—170,000 young, healthy, heroic, and determined human beings are to languish in humid quonset huts of British camps?

These Polish soldiers in Great Britain, Germany or in the Middle East are entitled to come to the United States if only as a reward for the invaluable services they rendered America as our allies. It would in some measure repay them for their fighting and for their services. Their hearts bleed at the thought that they can't return to the kind of Poland for which they had fought. A great many of them come from eastern Poland, which at Yalta, without the consent of the Polish people, was turned over to Soviet Russia as an outright reward for aggression. And in what is left of Poland, there is a Communist government, which owes its allegiance to Moscow. Try to visualize, if you can, our own American boys in the same plight—unable to return home—because a ruthless foreign power, in the guise of a liberator, had occupied their country.

These gallant Polish heroes represent the highest human material from the point of view of any sensible immigration policy. They, like their countrymen in concentration camps, love liberty. Most of them come from sturdy Polish peasant stock, psychologically akin to the American pioneer stock. Our vast areas of the West, the Southwest, Northwest or Alaska should be opened to them for the benefit of our country and our economy. Many of them are highly skilled and seasoned soldiers and it is safe to assume that they would enlist voluntarily into our Army, thus swelling its depleted ranks.

I would urgently suggest that this subcommittee avail itself of the presence of Gen. Mark W. Clark in this country and request his testimony on behalf of the Polish soldiers who fought under his command. Most of them are young people and single. They would certainly find wives in this country, build up families, raise new generations of Americans.

The displaced Polish soldiers and civilians are of the same blood and stock as the 6,000,000 loyal Americans of Polish descent. We cherish the fact that prior to the enactment of the draft law in 1940, over 17 percent of the entire United States Marine Corps—all volunteers—were composed of boys of Polish descent. Our casualty lists are replete with Polish names. We are proud of our record of achievement on the battle and home fronts. Unlike our native Communists who owe their allegiance to a foreign power, we Americans of Polish descent owe our allegiance to only one flag—the glorious Stars and Stripes of the United States of America.

AN INVESTMENT IN JUSTICE

The displaced civilians and soldiers are an American responsibility. Their plight is attributed directly to the Yalta agreement, to which America was a party. In depriving them of the protection of a legal government, of an independent country, of

freedom, of their homes, and of their beloved ones, we are coresponsible for their wretched fate. Theirs is a heart-breaking story. No one can measure the depth of their grief and despair.

The Polish-American Congress, the voice of 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, pleads not only for the cause of Polish displaced civilians and soldiers, but also for all displaced persons of every nationality, race, and creed, who fear returning to homelands now transformed into Soviet lands of slavery.

To insure justice and fair play to all groups, we ask that the admission of homeless DP's and soldiers should be on a prorata basis in direct proportion to the numbers of nationalistic groups.

Aside from purely humanitarian considerations, there are economic reasons that should prompt Congress to allow displaced persons of good character to enter our country.

While doing our share in lightening the burden of their sorrow and in calming their fears, we will at the same time be alleviating the heavy financial burden now borne by the American taxpayer in maintaining them in their present state of idleness and misery.

The United States cannot carry on forever the burden of feeding DP's. A speedy solution to this grave problem is imperative. To permit those who typify the highest moral standards to enter the United States would be the quickest and cheapest solution. Their love of freedom would be the best investment in the future security of America. Because they would be sponsored by responsible individuals and organizations, there need be no fear that they would become public charges.

Our moral duty is to save these people. Let America set a shining example to other countries by throwing wide open its doors to a fair share of these unfortunates. The number who would come in under a revised H. R. 2910, which would also include displaced Polish soldiers, would still be far below the number of immigrants who would have entered the United States had there been no war.

In providing a haven to these homeless civilians and soldiers, God would bless America and the Congress of the United States would receive the gratitude and the approval of the judgment of time.

Remarks of Harry Leeward Katz, Member of the Baltimore Bar and Former Deputy Commissioner of Loans of the State of Maryland, on the Occasion of the Presentation on March 15, 1948, to the Page School, United States Capitol, of a Portrait of the Honorable David J. Laupheimer, Founder of Said Page School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have my remarks inserted in the RECORD I include the address of Mr. Harry L. Katz, member of the Baltimore bar and former deputy commissioner of loans of the State of Maryland, on the occasion of the presentation on March 15, 1948, to the page school, United States Capitol, of the portrait of the Honorable David J. Laupheimer, founder of the said page school.

I feel highly honored to have been requested to act as spokesman for a group of distinguished men and women of the State of Maryland who have come here today to pay their respects to one of Maryland's sons, the Honorable David J. Laupheimer, on this occasion of the presentation of his portrait to the page school—the school which he founded November 1927. The reputation of Mr. Laupheimer in the field of education has been highly noted and widely recognized. In many other fields of human endeavor he has also given generously of his time without remuneration in the service of his fellowman. Since another speaker, I am informed, is to give a brief sketch of the life of Mr. Laupheimer, I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to the giving of a brief history of the founding of the page school.

The history of the school of pages in the United States Capitol, I am advised, has never been clearly set out and there are many conflicting stories on how the school was founded. It, therefore, seems fitting and proper on this occasion to briefly describe the founding of the school.

Previous to November 1927 the problem of the average page boy at the United States Capitol, insofar as obtaining education was concerned, was a most difficult one. His duties required him to be at the United States Capitol at a time of the day when the public schools were in session. He was, therefore, compelled to seek his education outside of the public schools either by engaging a private tutor, an expensive process, or by attending night school, both of which methods unduly prolonged the time required for the completion of the page boy's education.

Some time in 1927, Mr. Laupheimer had come to Washington to see Congressman Thomas Butler, who was then a prominent figure in Congress, and who had served, I am informed, approximately 30 years in the House. He was the father of the late well-known Gen. Smedley Butler, of the United States Marines. Mr. Laupheimer had come to see Congressman Butler seeking aid for the needy family of a veteran of World War I. While in the office of Congressman Butler, a woman entered with her son about 14 years of age. She was seeking an appointment for the boy as a page. After conversing with this woman for a while, Congressman Butler indicated his concern about the boy's education, knowing then that the boy would have to leave public school to accept the appointment as a page. The boy would have to engage a private tutor or attend night school if he were to complete his education. All this took place in the presence of Mr. Laupheimer, who, after the woman and boy departed, began to discuss with Congressman Butler the question as to why there was not provided in the United States Capitol a school for the pages. He pointed out that since the page boys were performing important tasks for both Houses of the Congress of the United States, they were certainly entitled to greater consideration for their educational needs than had heretofore been given them. Congressman Butler was in agreement with this view, and knowing of Mr. Laupheimer's experience as an educator, began to query Mr. Laupheimer as to the feasibility of setting up a school for pages in the United States Capitol. After an exchange of views, Congressman Butler enlisted the aid of Mr. Laupheimer, who was requested to confer with Mr. Bert Kennedy, who was then the Chief Doorkeeper of the House. After Mr. Laupheimer conferred with Mr. Kennedy, the latter became deeply interested and offered his cooperation. Mr. Kennedy thought that the cooperation of the Senate would be most desirable and he was anxious to get the reaction of the Senate side to the plan. Accordingly, Mr. Laupheimer conferred with Major Barry, who was then Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. Major Barry recognized the need for and the great merit in the proposed educational program for the page boys. Major Barry was won over to the plan, but he felt that for its successful adoption the program contemplated ought to have the endorsement of some outstanding United States Senator. Mr. Laupheimer agreed not only to this but went further by suggesting that the Superintendent of Public Schools of the District of Columbia should also endorse the plan.

Mr. Laupheimer accordingly conferred with the then Senator David Reed, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Ballou, then Superintendent of Public Schools of the District of Columbia. Both of these men gave their warm enthusiastic endorsement to the program. Its success was now assured.

Mr. Laupheimer was persuaded to become the first teacher of the page school in the United States Capitol.

Back in those days, the page boys for the House were appointed by the Chief Doorkeeper of the House while the Senators, themselves, appointed the page boys who served in the Senate.

When the school first got under way, its sessions were held at the close of each day's session of Congress. That meant that sometimes school would not begin until an hour late in the evening because of prolonged sessions of the Congress. For that reason very little time for any leisure for the page boys was left. Mr. Laupheimer gave the matter considerable thought. Recreation, he felt, was an important matter in the life of normal boys. One day he assembled all the page boys and put the proposition up to them as to whether they would be willing to attend school before Congress opened its session each day. The hours for attendance of the page school would have to be from 7:30 to 10:15 a. m. The boys heartily endorsed the new hours for the school and gave their hearty approval for their adoption, which was accordingly done.

I need not dwell on that which is well known to you—the expansion of the page school since 1927. Today, it extends its educational facilities not only to a large number of page boys but also to other employees serving the Government in the United States Capitol. Many of the former page boys have taken their places in high and important posts in all fields of endeavor, many of them serving right here in the United States Capitol.

This, in brief, is a short history of the founding of the page school in the United States Capitol. It has been an honor for me to have had the opportunity of narrating it to this school.

Friendship Train Commended by Hawaii Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday March 15, 1948

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution adopted by the Department of Hawaii, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at a regular meeting of the council of administration held in Honolulu, T. H., January 21, 1948

Whereas poverty, hunger, and suffering has befallen the peoples of many nations throughout the world as a result of the

devastation brought upon their countries through the operations of war; and

Whereas the efforts of statesmen and world organizations working to bring about universal peace and prosperity have yet to bear fruition; and

Whereas a humble citizen of our great Nation has originated and successfully fostered a plan to provide immediate relief to the destitute and hunger stricken peoples of Europe, which project has become known throughout the world as the Friendship Train; and

Whereas it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the Department of Hawaii, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that the successful accomplishment of this plan has already and will continue to have tremendous and far-reaching effects in creating and fostering friendship, good will, and understanding in the hearts of millions: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Department of Hawaii, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, hereby records in unanimity its recommendation for the award of the Nobel peace prize to Mr. Drew Pearson in recognition of his contribution to peace and human welfare; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded, requesting support of this endorsement, to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; president, William and Mary College; Ray Brannaman, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars; president, Swarthmore College; president, Johns Hopkins University; dean of department of humanities, University of Copenhagen; chairman, Nobel Peace Foundation; L. A. Sorbonne, rector, college of science and letters, University of Paris; President, Republic of France; Hon. Claude Pepper, United States Senator; Hon. William Langer, United States Senator; Mr. Jonathan Daniels, executive editor, the News and Observer; Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor, University of Chicago; dean of education, social science institute, Stockholm University; Dr. Gilbert Bowles; Drew Pearson; Gregg M. Sinclaire, president, University of Hawaii; Dr. Lenora Bilger, Ph. D., D. Sc., dean of chemistry, University of Hawaii.

A Break for the Housewife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement which I made before the House Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday, March 9, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, I am sure my district never produced either a soybean nor a boll of cotton. The last Staten Island cow of which I had knowledge went to her reward some 10 years ago. But the district I represent does contain some 300,000 people, and as nearly as I can determine, 299,900 of them are users of margarine. It was on their behalf that I introduced my bill to eliminate margarine taxes, and it is on their behalf—not on behalf of any interests—that I am testifying before your committee today.

Please permit me at this point, Mr. Chairman, to pay you my respects for having ordered this hearing. By your action you have demonstrated that you do not regard this committee as solely a committee for the protection of the dairy industry, but rather as a committee on agriculture. I cannot qualify as an expert on agriculture despite the fact that I've been part owner of a Wisconsin farm property for 29 years. I have it on good authority, however, that the term "agriculture" embraces the production of soybeans and cotton as well as the production of cows' milk. More on that anon.

Reverting to this 10 cents per pound Federal tax on colored margarine, let us briefly explore, Mr. Chairman, whom the tax benefits, if there is benefit in it at all.

Does it benefit the public revenue? No. The yield is picayunish. The Treasury Department itself came before this committee yesterday and advocated the tax's elimination.

Does the tax benefit the dairy farmer? No. Despite the tax, margarine sales have increased more than eightfold in the 61 years of the tax's existence, the while butter prices have recently reached the highest points in history.

Does the tax benefit the cotton planter? Obviously no.

Does the tax benefit the soy farmer? Obviously no.

Does the tax benefit the housewife margarine user? Obviously no.

Whom then does the tax benefit? It benefits no one. Therefore, it is a bad tax. Therefore, it should be eliminated. Therefore, this committee should favorably report my bill.

Let us now proceed further, Mr. Chairman, and explore whom the tax harms, if anyone. Mr. Chairman, it does not harm the rich. Dollar-a-pound butter is too small an item in the rich man's budget.

It does not harm the well-to-do who employ a servant. On the latter is unloaded the messy, time-consuming job of coloring the margarine.

Whom then does the tax harm? Mr. Chairman, it harms the great preponderance of American housewives who do their own work—who must take time they can ill-afford from their 14- to 16-hour days to add the color which they and their families want but which has been denied them by stupid class legislation.

Think of next fall, gentlemen of the committee. Think of housewives in every congressional district of the Nation. Will they be thanking their own Congressman for the boon of added leisure? Or will they be damning their Congressman with every stroke of their margarine spoon? Think hard, gentlemen.

This tax, Mr. Chairman, is the only tax which could come before this committee. It is here because the butter lobby, half a century ago, tricked the Congress into safeguarding a special interest at the expense of the national interest.

If this is a committee serving all of agriculture, not a committee serving part of agriculture, if this is a committee to further the interest of scores of millions of medium- and low-income families rather than a committee to further a privileged interest—then it will promptly give the House of Representatives opportunity to express itself on this tax.

Commodity Credit Corporation Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MISSOURI GRAIN, FEED & MILLERS ASSOCIATION,
Higginsville, Mo., February 14, 1948.

Hon. MAX SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCHWABE: It is my understanding that the charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation is now in abeyance and that hearings will be held on the matter of granting a permanent charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is this association's wish and they shall expect you to combat and to lend all efforts in stopping any effort to grant the Commodity Credit Corporation a temporary or permanent charter.

The sooner you get the Government out of business and get some business in the Government, the quicker will our Nation come back to a sound economic condition.

How anyone opposed to communism or socialism could favor or justify the Commodity Credit Corporation's existence is beyond my feeble comprehension as there is no reason or justification whatever for the existence of any such corporation, unless, of course, you want to make America communistic or at least socialistic.

We know that grain and grain products handled by Commodity Credit Corporation are handled at a much larger cost per unit than would be the case if the same commodities were handled by the grain and grain products industry.

I know you will give this matter your attention.

Yours very truly,
D. A. MEINERSHAGEN, *Secretary.*

The Rape of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of February 27, 1948:

THE RAPE OF FREEDOM

All the world stands by doing little or nothing as it watches the rape of Czechoslovakia by Soviet Fascists. To call it rape is to use a mild world for such an atrocity, but the language is deficient in expressions suitable to describe this act of gangsterism. Has the world gone mad to stand by while such outrages occur? Of course, three of the former allies have condemned the Soviet act, but it is still a bit like sitting with one's chin in hand and mouthing pious words while witnessing a big brute beating up a helpless child with a club. Human beings used to go to war to stop things like that. In fact, we did so ourselves in 1914, and again, after we had been attacked ourselves, in 1941. Has the world lost all sense of morality? Is it another manifestation of the psychopathic state of mass mind?

Yet, it is a state of mind and, unfortunately, one that can be explained. It is unfortunate that it can be explained only because the explanation is so shocking. It is that people everywhere are dead tired of war, so tired of war that eternal moral values, even plain decency, are unimportant next to resting up and getting comfortable after the long ordeal of struggle through which the world has so recently passed. All thought

seems gone as to why that war was fought, for now, with an almost identical repetition of the preliminaries to war in 1938 and 1939, the so-called freedom-loving peoples of the world simply sit back and say "Too bad."

There seems to be a certain smug satisfaction in Washington that the Red atrocity in Czechoslovakia will help the Marshall plan. Of course it will help the Marshall plan, but no intelligent citizen ever had any doubts that the Marshall plan was the very least that we had to do to balance the power equation in Europe and defend the cause of freedom. It seems a bit vulgar, however, to derive satisfaction, even of this kind, from the rape of a fine country—a country created, incidentally, by the very western powers which now seem so passive in the face of evil.

We must do much more than the Marshall plan. If we are not mad and outraged already, we had better get our backs up pretty fast. This thing has got to be stopped. We have got to be tough and get tougher. We should be glad our B–29's have been flying into an airdrome in Saudi Arabia, only 4 hours' flying time from the center of Russia's oil resources. We should be glad we have naval strength in the Mediterranean. We should flex our muscles and make our muscles stronger. We must have universal military training if only as a token of our readiness to fight for our principles.

If it wasn't clear a year or more ago, there should be no question by now that the only thing the Soviet bandits respect is power. They have no respect for diplomacy. They are masters of double-talk, borrowing our own most respected words like "liberty" and "freedom" to describe their own tyranny. They use "democracy" only so long as it serves their imperialistic ends when, as in Czechoslovakia, they become their natural selves and resort to brute force.

Any veteran police officer will tell you that you cannot reason with a hardboiled thug. You have to slug him before he slugs you. We are not asking for a declaration of war against Russia, but we are saying that we ought to act like we'd fight over the public abuse of a fine lady like Czechoslovakia. Indeed, many of us would fight for the lady's honor if only given a chance. This foul act casts a shadow upon the flag of every nation which cherishes freedom and decency and honor.

Arkansas Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them by the laws of the State of Arkansas. I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws as compiled by William S. Hoshal, national service officer and department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, who has his office in the Veterans' Administration regional office, Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. Hoshal is a Navy veteran of the North Sea Mine Force in World War I and served 27 months in the South Pacific with the Navy in World War II, along with his four sons.

The outline is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES

County funds are provided to defray burial expenses of Confederate soldiers, sailors, and their widows.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Administration of estates of missing persons, including prisoners of war, has been provided.

Rights established by holders of donation certificates to State lands are protected.

Disability of minority for veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights has been removed.

Statutes of limitation are suspended insofar as they affect persons in the armed forces during World War II and for 6 months thereafter.

ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

County records shall record certificates of discharge free of charge.

Officers or soldiers may deposit discharge papers, descriptive lists, and so forth, in the Bureau of War Records for safekeeping.

$4,500 of liquor tax receipts has been allocated to the Arkansas Service Bureau Fund.

Appointment of a service officer with quarters has been authorized. State veterans' service officers and county service officers are to assist veterans and dependents in securing rights and benefits. The director maintains an office in the War Memorial Building and other offices throughout the State, with appropriations provided.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

Funds have been appropriated for additional subsidy for veterans of World War II who have completed their preprofessional education and who can find no institution in which to pursue their professional training in the State.

Preference rating of 10 percent has been awarded to veterans in examinations for professional and trade licenses.

The following colleges are declared eligible for Federal training programs for veterans: Arkansas State College, Jonesboro; Arkansas State Teachers College; Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, Monticello; Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville; Henderson State Teachers Colege; Third District Agricultural and Mechanical College, Magnolia. Tuition benefits have been awarded to World War veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES

Any honorably discharged war veteran or the widow of such, who competes in any examination given for the purpose of establishing an employment list and who attains a minimum passing grade thereon, shall have five points added to his or her final earned rating; a compensated disabled veteran or one who is over 55 years old and is disabled and is entitled to pension or compensation, or the wife of such disabled veteran who is thereby disqualified for appointment, shall receive 10 points added to his or her final earned rating. The names of the 10-point preference eligibles are placed at the head of the register and are certified before those five-point preference eligibles and eligibles with no preference.

Leaves of absence have been granted for public officers and employees during service in the armed forces.

Preference is granted to veterans of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in examinations for licenses or permits of any profession, trade, or employment in the State.

Benefit rights have been preserved under the teacher retirement system and the Employment Security Act.

Prohibition has been waived against employment of members of his own family during service in the armed forces.

Circuit judges must be reinstated upon termination of military service; also school directors.

Licenses to practice medicine may be renewed following service in the armed forces.

GUARDIANSHIP

Probate courts shall appoint guardians for veterans declared insane when they are in a State or Federal facility or hospital operated solely for treatment of mental diseases.

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or minor child of a veteran to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

The State hospital superintendent is authorized to contract with the Federal Government for the hospitalization of veterans.

Under the Uniform Guardianship Act incompetent veterans may be committed to a Federal hospital.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Veterans have preference in the sale of State-owned lands. Protection of rights has been established by holders of donation certificates to State lands.

MEDALS

War Decoration Commission has adopted a medallion or medal and service ribbons.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit has been granted for time spent in the active service of the United States.

RECORDS

A Bureau of War Records has been provided in the office of the Adjutant General for the deposit of records, relics, etc. for safekeeping.

TAX EXEMPTIONS

Military compensation is exempt from personal income tax.

Reciprocal provision has been made for the operation of motor vehicles owned and operated by servicemen and registered in other States.

Certain veterans are exempt from fees for license to give illustrated lectures, magic-lantern exhibitions, etc. to engage in brokerage or real estate or any other business not prohibited in the State.

Veterans are exempt from fee for peddler's license tax.

Payment of poll taxes is authorized on order of the quorum courts of the various counties for all persons of the county engaged in military or naval service of the United States.

Per capita road taxes have been cancelled against members of the armed forces.

Poll tax assessment and penalty for voting purposes has been waived when a serviceman or discharged veteran returns to his precinct after the expiration of the assessment period.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The improper wearing of any badge, pin or insignia, or using the name of any society, order or organization of the State or incorporated by an act of Congress, or the wearing of official discharged emblems of World Wars I or II, is a misdemeanor with penalty.

Sale of artificial poppies elsewhere than in an established place of business by other than patriotic organizations chartered by act of Congress is unlawful. Profits are to be expended on World War veterans and their dependents.

The State War Memorial (the old State capitol building and grounds) has been dedicated to the use of the American Legion and certain other organizations, with appropriations.

The DAV, which has 17 chapters in the State, maintains part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans. In addition to this State-wide service, the DAV maintains three full-time service officers at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Little Rock.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders. Its congressional charter of limited active membership in the DAV to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war.

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University, Washington, D. C., in 1944 to train 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

National commander of the DAV is John L. Golob of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, who has had 28 years' experience in DAV activities. The national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his assistant.

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant.

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Gold and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter written to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman WOLCOTT, and Senator TOBEY, as chairman, respectively, of the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate, by Francis H. Brownell, chairman of the finance committee of the American Smelting & Refining Co., one of the biggest mining companies in America, in regard to the beneficial effects on our economy of permitting a free market for gold. I have had a bill pending for the last two sessions to accomplish the very purposes mentioned by Mr. Brownell in this letter, dated January 19, 1948. I am glad to note support of this substantial character for this proposal which has received so little attention, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point:

AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO.,
New York, N. Y., January 19, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
and
Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GOLD AND INFLATION

GENTLEMEN: A little known but highly important event of 1947 was the increase in gold stocks of the United States of over $2,000,000,000.

Although the United States stood ready to buy all gold offered at $35 per ounce, United States gold holdings for some years had remained fairly stationary, as is shown by the Daily Statement of the United States Treasury":

As of—	Ounces	Dollars
Jan. 1, 1944	626, 785, 964. 7	21, 937, 508, 765. 15
Jan. 1, 1945	589, 106, 766. 0	20, 618, 736, 810. 04
Jan. 2, 1946	573, 281, 235. 4	20, 064, 843, 237. 30
Jan. 2, 1947	586, 538, 499. 1	20, 528, 847, 466. 97
Dec. 31, 1947	650, 107, 101. 4	22, 753, 748, 547. 47
Increase in 1947	63, 568, 602. 3	2, 224, 901, 080. 50

CAUSE

The cause of the increase in 1947 was the greater demand for dollars plus the new and potent factor of compliance with the request early in 1947 of the International Monetary Fund that member nations should prevent as far as possible the sale of gold at above the $35 level. This automatically diverted to the United States Treasury gold which otherwise would have been sold elsewhere.

Previously, the demand for gold outside the United States was so great as to absorb, at prices well above $35, all gold offered and very little came to the United States Treasury, except United States production, which by law must be sold to the mint. The outside demand still remains.

INFLATIONARY EFFECT

All purchases of gold are ultimately cleared through the Federal Reserve bank, which receives payment from the Treasury in the form of a gold certificate. This gold certificate is not placed in circulation. It is more of the nature of a warehouse receipt than money. But it is counted as money in the sense that the Federal Reserve bank credits the Treasury with the amount as if it were a deposit. The physical gold is stored by the Treasury, but its value is turned into bank-credit money.

The seller of gold deposits the check he receives in payment in his own commercial bank, which, in turn, forwards it to the Federal Reserve. In payment of that check, the Federal Reserve simply gives the forwarding commercial bank a deposit credit on its books of the appropriate amount, which increases accordingly the reserve of the commercial bank. In central Reserve cities a $2,000,000,000 increase in reserves permits an increase of bank credit through loans or discounts to the extent of five times such reserve, or $10,000,000,000. Some of this amount has been used. The potential increase of money due to the purchase of $2,000,000,000 of gold in 1947 may thus be said to be a total of $12,000,000,000.

In his statement to Congress of November 25, 1947, Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said:

"Over the next year the gold inflow is estimated at from two to three billion dollars. Multiplied by six, this would permit an expansion of bank credit of from twelve to eighteen billions."

UNITED STATES GOLD HOLDINGS

The United States now owns about 60 percent, or three-fifths, of the world's monetary gold.

The world mine production, excluding Russia's (which is unknown) of gold in 1946 was about 21,500,000 ounces, worth at $35 per ounce over $750,000,000. The $2,000,000,000 gold bought in 1947 was roughly equivalent to over 2½ years world mine production of gold, excluding that of Russia. Total world monetary stocks (excluding Russian) are about $35,000,000,000, of which the rest of the world owns about $13,000,000,000, and the United States over $22,000,000,000.

In 1947, the United States purchased (in addition to the equivalent of all current mine production) approximately 10 percent of the $13,000,000,000 of previously mined gold in the outside world. If it should continue to buy at the rate of $2,000,000,000 per year and new mine production remains as in 1946, the United States would purchase all the monetary gold in the world outside Russia in approximately 10 years.

Even present holdings of 60 percent of the world's monetary gold would make it difficult for other nations to return to some form of a gold standard unless the United States is prepared to redistribute its holdings to some extent. Certainly it is important that further accumulation by the United States be lessened as much as possible, both for this reason and because of its inflationary effect.

ONE REMEDY

Amend the United States laws so as to—

(1) Rescind the prohibition of ownership of gold by United States citizens.

(2) Permit a free market, both in the United States and elsewhere, for all gold, including United States mine production; and

(3) Leave the present gold policy otherwise unchanged, continuing the obligation of the Treasury to buy gold offered at $35 per ounce.

The demand for gold is such that much, if not all, newly mined or other gold offered for sale would be absorbed by others than

the United States Treasury, just as it was between 1944 and 1947. This automatically cures the inflationary effects of purchasing and will result in more gold being placed in other countries and among the citizens of the United States.

The International Monetary Fund may oppose such a program, but after the experience of 1947 it may reasonably be expected not to do so. However that may be, lessening further accumulation of gold by the United States and stopping present inflationary effects of purchases is much more important ultimately than following the fund's proposal, which, in effect, is rapidly throwing into the United States Treasury not only the equivalent of all newly mined gold but also even greater quantities of gold previously mined.

Respectfully yours,

FRANCIS H. BROWNELL.

Increase of Salaries of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. POTTS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, last evening I made the following radio address on behalf of post-office employees' salary increases over radio station WJZ in New York:

I wish to thank the American Broadcasting Co. for the opportunity to address this audience on legislation that is extremely important to the community and is now pending before the Congress. The question posed by the legislation is: "Do post-office employees need an increase in salary?" My answer is most emphatically "Yes." Some of us, perhaps, give this question very little thought since we are prone to regard the delivery of mail as a constant and everflowing service without asking why or who makes the postal service what it is. I am sure you will agree on reflection that the postal service is one of the most outstanding of Federal agencies; its employees are courteous, industrious, and loyal. We should remember that the postal system is basically, fundamentally, and historically a service to the public. In early colonial days several attempts were made to operate a postal system for the purpose of personal profit. All such attempts failed and the young American Nation determined because of them that a postal system to be successful must be operated by the Government, with service as the one and paramount objective.

The Post Office Department is operated to give good mail service to the American people. Mail service and facilities are provided in every nook and corner of the United States. Such operations are established regardless of any consideration of profit. In fact, there are approximately 42,000 post offices in the Nation and half of that number of necessity conduct their operations at a loss. Do competitive business organizations, such as express and telegraph companies, maintain comparable service? Of course not. They maintain offices and provide service only where such operations produce a profit. The only universal service in America today is the postal service. Millions of people do not have electricity; millions live without running water, without telephone or telegraph, or other similar facilities; millions do not have ready access to public transportation. But every American citizen is provided with mail service. It is the one and only universal service in the United States. One hundred and seventy years of operation have definitely demonstrated two vital factors in the successful conduct of the postal service. First, greater volume promotes lower unit cost and thus more economical operation. Second, the reduction of the number of times a piece of mail is handled reduces the cost of operation. The best and most inexpensive way to handle mail is to deliver it immediately. Delayed appropriations, and therefore curtailed service, are more costly in the final analysis. Adequate appropriations permitting good service consequently promote and produce efficiency in operation. It is the function of the Congress to establish postal rates and provide the appropriations to maintain this public service to the Nation. This same Congress must legislate for the pay and welfare of its employees. Government employees cannot strike for improvements in their working conditions or for salary adjustments. They have no collective-bargaining privileges as have workers in civilian employment. Their only avenue for relief is to appeal to the Congress and to you, the public.

More than 20 bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives proposing salary increases. Some 10 days ago, I appeared before a House Post Office and Civil Service subcommittee in support of a salary increase of $1,000 to afford our postal workers the means of an American standard of living today. I know you will agree with me that we must have an efficient mail service. To bring this about you will agree that we must have contented employees, and that means we must pay them adequately for their labors if we are to expect them to devote a lifetime to postal service.

In speaking with Mr. Shapiro, president of Empire Branch, No. 36, National Association of Letter Carriers, New York City, I am reliably informed that hundreds of veterans of World War II have entered the postal service. Upon the premise of a life job in the office, many have married and started to raise a family. Today, many of them have become disillusioned and stricken with disappointment because they just can't live on $2,100 per year post-office salary. The semimonthly take-home pay for such an employee who is married and has one child is $80.12. That is less than $40 a week. Can we expect him to support a wife and child on that pittance, pay for his letter carrier's uniforms, and shoes, medical and clothing expenses? And, of course, he ought to have the opportunity to save something for a rainy day. Unless an ample pay increase is voted by Congress, more and more former veterans will leave the postal service for more lucrative fields. This labor turnover is costly to the Department and to you citizens and taxpayers because another substitute must be trained to do the work until he becomes adept and experienced, and then the same thing will reoccur. Throughout the recent war, letter carriers and all other postal workers remained loyal to their trust, the postal service. They did not leave their "public" for other jobs that offered the high pay of war years. The letter carriers stood by their routes to assure the proper and speedy delivery of mail from your loved ones in military service. The proper dispatch and delivery of mail is like a religion to these postal employees. Despite the hardships or uncertainties of weather or mechanical break-down of equipment, the mail always goes through because of the zeal and skill of our postal workers.

Do you remember the great snowfall of December 26, 1947? Throughout that eventful day, our gray-clad workers plodded over mounting drifts of snow to bring you that awaited letter or paper—your regular mail. The next morning, with all transportation and services at a standstill and a state of limited emergency declared by the mayor, we found our hard-working regular and substitute letter carriers "breaking the trail" through the 26-inch snowfall * * * to deliver your daily mail. Such valiant service and devotion to duty must not be forgotten. We must not allow them to exist on substandard wages today. The other employees, from the postmaster on down to the mailhandler and custodial employee, likewise service with the same degree of loyalty and diligence. Their job is to handle that letter picked up by the collector at the corner box until it reaches the hands of the delivery carrier on the street of address. Such constant and trustworthy service should not be permitted to go unrewarded.

For if we are to enjoy the benefits of an efficient mail service, then we must establish a salary scale that will attract and hold that type of employee who is worthy of the trust to handle and deliver the United States mail.

Conference of Mayors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert excerpts from statements presented at the 1948 annual conference of the United States conference of mayors, held in New York City, February 16–18, 1948:

STATE REPRESENTATION OF OUR CITIES

STATEMENT BY MAYOR A. P. KAUFMAN, OF ST. LOUIS

Fair representation

Cities must be given fair representation in the law and policy-making bodies of their respective States. According to the Survey Graphic, issue of October 1944, every one of America's ten largest cities lacks proper representation in their State legislatures. Some of them have only half the number of representatives that their populations warrant.. This is the primary reason that cities have received such shabby treatment and have been able to do so little about it.

The organic law of most States provides for periodic redistricting to correct population shifts and to assure all political subdivisions of fair representation. This is a provision far too often honored in the breach than in the observance. Action is generally left up to the legislatures and the incumbents are not freely disposed to make any move that might result in their return to private life. As a result, archaic districting is frozen and rural areas get a disproportionately large representation in our State law-making bodies. Urban dwellers are thus subjected to a modern form of "taxation without representation."

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution forbids the States to "abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." I submit that the privileges of the citizens of our cities are being abridged by the States that deny those persons fair representation in their legislatures. Under-representation may in effect be just as dangerous as no representation at all. Indeed, it may be even more dangerous, because it is apt to lull the average city dweller into a false sense of representation, and thus into complacency; whereas he

would fight to the bitter end any outright denial of representation.

Correcting evils

Perhaps we need the intervention of the Federal Government in those cases, where, year after year, the State refuses to enforce its own provisions to give every citizen fair and equal representation in the legislature. If the Federal Government lacks the power under the fourteenth amendment or other existing Constitutional provisions, then we might well consider amending that great document to give the Federal Government the necessary authority.

Until such time as the States, voluntarily or otherwise, give the urban areas proper representation in their legislative halls, the cities will continue in their strange dual role of being the rich uncle on the paying end and the hat-in-hand beggar on the other.

Our greatest hope for correcting these evils and for restoring the cities of America to their rightful place in the sun lies in the consistent, concerted action of our municipal leaders, acting through such bodies as this United States Conference of Mayors. We are all grateful for the opportunity it affords us to work in unison toward the solution of the problems which bedevil us. And I have every confidence that, despite temporary setbacks and discouragements, in the end our efforts will be crowned with success.

HOME RULE FOR OUR CITIES

STATEMENT BY MAYOR OSCAR F. HOLCOMBE, OF HOUSTON

Home rule

Home Rule for American Cities is my subject—a subject as old as our Nation. I believe it is one on which more has been written and spoken than most any other subject except the weather. It has been a cry and a hope of municipal officials since the inception of our first township.

In general, the term "home rule" is used to refer to local autonomy as distinguished from centralized State control. More comprehensively, home rule embodies and includes three things:

First. The choice of the character of its municipal organization and the right to adopt and amend its form by a free selection of its charter;

Second. The nature and the scope of the municipal service; and

Third. Control of all local activity, whether in carrying out or enforcing State law or municipal regulation with the power vested in the hands of officials elected by a free vote of the community.

In other words, home rule means a free decision as to what the city government shall do and the right to select the organization and its officials who shall perform the service.

Real democracy

We will find very little disagreement with this or any other sound definition of home rule. From speakers' platforms all over the country we will hear sonorous phraseology to the effect that "the city is the cradle of democracy," or that "municipal institutions constitute the strength of free nations." Everyone will agree that city government, in close touch with the daily lives of its people and sensitive to their voice, is about the only real exampleof the democratic process left in the complex maze of alphabetical bureaucracy which has become government. Very few people will have the courage to come out publicly against home rule. Nearly everyone will accord lip service to that principle, but the fact is, it is being whittled down more and more. Only about one-third of our States even have the so-called protection of a constitutional home-rule provision, and even in these better-situated States the whole theory is made into a farce by the continued passage of State laws, sponsored by minority pressure groups, which—and please pardon the crude but descriptive expression—rip the very guts out of local self-government.

"The legislature giveth and the legislature taketh away; blessed be the name of the legislature."

Broadly and nakedly stated, the vital question, as phrased by Justice Cooley, is this: "Whether local self-government is or is not a mere privilege conceded by the legislature in its discretion and which may be withdrawn any time at its pleasure." If cities are to survive the answer to that question must be "No."

Cities cannot claim constitutional rights since the only mention of them in the Constitution of the United States is the declaration of their subservience to the States. Each of the 48 State constitutions sets out the terms under which cities may be created and may live. There is nothing else in history which compares with this complete and absolute dominance of one governmental unit by another. I do not believe that those great and far-seeing men who wrote the Constitution meant to deny the rights of self-determination of peoples, or that they meant to contradict those very principles of democracy for which they had fought and bled. I believe that, at the time the Constitution was written the rights of cities was simply not an issue. Cities as we know them today just did not exist. Ninety-five percent of the people lived on the land and only 5 percent chose to live like rabbits in a warren in those urban centers which served as trading posts for a completely agricultural population.

New picture

Today the picture is quite different. Today more than 56 percent of the Nation's peoples live in cities which have become the production and financial as well as the cultural and educational centers of American life. Seventy-three percent of the Nation's wealth and income now originates in the cities. Yet, these great cities are still the "children" or rather the "step-children" of the State legislatures whose membership is not acquainted with nor responsible to the desires or opinions of the community group. In recent years the relationship has become even more strained, as the complexity of managing modern, fast-growing cities has increased. Now it is the relationship of an unmarried parent to his unloved and unclaimed child, born out of wedlock.

I do not know how it would work in your State, but we have a plan which we are going to try in Texas this year. Our State elections at which our legislators are elected take place this coming summer. We intend to have drafted by a committee from our home-rule cities an additional home-rule amendment which would give to our cities full and complete home rule—not just home rule in name only. This bill will be so drafted that there cannot be any question but what the citizenship of our municipalities can, by their vote, in a democratic way, run their municipal affairs through and by their elective officials. After this bill has been prepared, copies of it will go to all of our home-rule cities, and the city officials in different sections of the State will discuss this bill with the candidates for the legislature from their respective districts and areas. They will endeavor to get a commitment from such candidates as to whether they will support the submission of such constitutional amendment to the voters, and many of the city officials have pledged themselves to give their support only to candidates for the legislature who will support such amendment.

FROM EUROPE

STATEMENT BY GEORGES BIDAULT, MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FRANCE

It is a great privilege for me to speak at the opening of the United States mayors' conference. First of all, I want to emphasize the fact that municipal institutions hold a very important place in France, just as they do in your own country. They have been from the dawn of our history the center of the defense of individual liberty. Take Paris, for instance. She has always been in the vanguard of such a struggle. Not so long ago the National Council of the Resistance, of which I had the honor of being the director, was established in the capital of France, and it is from Paris that the internal struggle for the liberties of its citizens, the independence of the country and the community of civilized peoples was directed against the enemy.

But today other problems face the municipalities. Devastated France has the all-important task of reconstruction. This reconstruction can only be achieved if each city, town, and village goes to work wholeheartedly. The municipal council which have been freely elected have a difficult task to accomplish. They have an entire country to rebuild. You have all understood this tremendous work, and I should like to take this happy occasion to thank all the cities of the United States of America, which in unparalleled spirit of generosity have adopted the ruined cities of France. For us it is a double source of comfort. In the first place a material one, for you facilitated the task facing my unfortunate countrymen. In the second place, and a more important one, we realize that thousands of miles away there are men and women who know that other men and women have lost their homes, have lost everything that they held most dear. They know tht these men and women long to re-create what they loved. In this cruel period is it a great comfort for those who are working for the unity of the world to see that those who have not had to suffer their fate and who have contributed so that the continuation of their misfortunes might come to an end, do not forget those who have been the first to suffer.

STATEMENT BY ALCIDE DE GASPERI, PREMIER OF ITALY

I cherish the memory of your warm welcome to me. It represented clearly the feelings that exist between our two democratic Republics—the feeling of friends who are friends, feeling beyond the range of politics, but which in democratic nations determine politics. After all politics are the expression of the will and sentiments of the people and these are the factors that explain Italo-American policy today.

The other day in Rome, Ambassador Dunn signed with us the treaty between the United States and Italy. I believe the best evidence of the worth of this political agreement can be found in the expression of our people's feelings over the Friendship Train which you recently sent over to us, and I take this opportunity to ask Mayor O'Dwyer, as a distinguished gentleman, in his presence to renew the heartiest thanks of the Italian people to all of his fellow citizens who have tendered such generous aid to Italy in this hour of need and difficulty.

Your aid has been indispensable in bringing us this far. We look now to the Marshall plan as shipwrecked sailors.

I also ask you gentlemen to assure your fellow citizens that in helping us to establish firmly our free democracy, their assistance is not in vain. They set up a buttress which helps to support the structure of world democracy in which the United States is the deciding factor.

NATIONAL SECURITY

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. ORVILLE A. ANDERSON, COMMANDANT OF THE AIR WAR COLLEGE

I have one other closing remark to make. In his retirement, General Eisenhower has stated that the outcome of the next war might be determined in a matter of 60 days. I don't know where he picked the 60 days.

I couldn't pick it, unless I could see the two forces deployed. But let me make one basic assumption. If the enemy prepares for decisive action in this atomic age, and if he has the war heads and if he understands the principles of war, and if at the time he has developed, this favorable situation to himself, and we are in a more or less similar state, as we are today, then I say, I can't see why he should take 60 days.

I can see why Goering might take 60 days. He likes to piecemeal. But the man who understands the decisive nature of concentration in time and space, with the limitations that are imposed on him in the matter of atomic war heads, won't, in my opinion, take 60 days. The period, I think, will be one night, because that would be the proper application of material forces against a nation not prepared to counter. That is the impact that these mass destroying weapons have brought on us. This is the singularly peculiar situation that it has created in America, an insecurity which, by the way, she has never experienced. It is here today. It is the reason why at this particular time America has to recognize that this evolutionary advance in terms of weapons, in terms of range, speed and power to penetrate, has upset the very nature of war to a much higher degree than did World War II.

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH CLARK GREW, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN AND UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Let us remember

Let us remember that bullies do not attack the strong; they attack the weak. Let us remember the boasts of Hitler and Goering and Ribbentrop that Germany would bring England to her knees in short order, because England had allowed her military strength to disintegrate. They simply miscalculated the bulldog tenacity and moral staying power of the Anglo-Saxon race, but it was touch and go all the same. The Japanese boasted that the United States, being militarily weak, could never survive the knock-out blow that was to be given at Pearl Harbor. Again, Japan miscalculated our tremendous potential strength. If another war comes, potential strength and bulldog tenacity and moral staying power may not mean very much. Unless we are militarily prepared to act immediately, the play may be over before the curtain is half up.

It is my considered view that universal military training, in conjunction with other elements in a comprehensive security program, may even in the lifetime of many of us here today, mean the difference between the conquest and totalitarian enslavement of the United States, on the one hand, and, on the other, continued peace and a continuance of our democratic way of life.

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. HAROLD R. BULL, GENERAL STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

With no idea of stimulating an hysterical consideration of your problem or of hasty, ill-conceived action, let us assume the dropping of just one atomic bomb on your city to determine what damage results, what can be done to mitigate the damage, and who does the work. You may imagine the center point of the attack as at any point in your own city. Without striving for too precise evaluation of the effect, the following is a reasonably accurate estimate of damage which will serve the purpose of this discussion.

"A" bomb potency

We'll say that one atomic bomb of 40,000 tons high explosive potency explodes at approximately one-half mile above your selected point, which we will call ground zero.

Within a three-quarter-mile radius of your selected ground zero you may consider the area doomed or totally destroyed. The only conventional structures to survive even in part would be heavy-steel and reinforced-concrete types. Most other buildings in this restricted area would be crumbled to piles of rubble. The general effect throughout the area would be one of general destruction with rubble so scattered as to create one huge pile of debris.

Frame buildings would, of course, be smashed and the entire area would be subjected to immediate conflagration induced mainly by secondary causes.

Within this area the waterpipes throughout the structures would be torn apart so that regardless of the damage to underground mains, water pressure would be lost. Damage to personnel in this three-quarter mile radius will be as devastating as the physical damage—almost total destruction. Survival would be miraculous. Persons exposed to the direct rays will meet instant death from the intense heat. Those shielded from direct heat rays but exposed to gamma rays will receive lethal doses of radiation. Those sheltered from the effects of heat or radio-activity will be subjected to a terrific rain of flying and falling material. Those sheltered from all of these hazards will be subjected to the danger of secondary fires that will follow immediately. Finally, exit from the area will be almost impossible because of the debris and exposure to radio-activity through which any survivor must pass. Within this restricted central zone it appears that we must be reconciled to abandonment with some minor exceptions.

From the irregular fringe of this central zone to a line approximately 2 miles from the ground zero will be an area of heavy damage but an area worthy of immediate post-explosion activity for the purpose of saving life, salvaging property, and containing fires. Within this area almost all frame buildings will be completely destroyed by the blast. Heavy steel reinforced-concrete buildings, such as modern warehouses and heavy industrial buildings, will receive but moderate structural damage. Practically all glass will be broken; top floors would receive heavy damage, but the lower floors would remain structually intact. Industrial machinery would be subject to damage from flying debris, falling buildings, and fires. It is believed that the reserviors of average construction backed up by heavy concrete dams would receive no appreciable injury from the type burst under consideration. However, the falling of radio-active particles might contaminate the water to a harmful extent. Tests would be required in any event.

DAMAGES UNPARALLELED

In this zone underground water mains would in general remain intact; however, above ground, water supply pipes would be twisted and broken in innumerable places, immediately reducing pressure to an ineffective degree for fire-fighting. Damage to steam or hydroelectric plants would depend largely upon the type of construction. Underground power lines would be virtually immune but overhead lines and wiring of all buildings would be ruptured beyond repair and largely destroyed in conflagrations. Telephone and telegraph communications would be subject to general destruction similar to power lines. It is believed that radio-transmitting stations, not destroyed by any explosion, could continue operation, dependent upon supply of power. Portable and emergency radio communication would be feasible to, within, or from this zone. Typical terminal railway stations would be heavily damaged but not destroyed. Operations within a railroad yard would be disrupted mainly because of debris and fire. Subways would probably suffer very little structural damage although operation would be broken through disruption of power, debris at entrances, flooding, etc. Structural damage to streets in this area would be negligible and damage to bridges and tunnels would be slight. Heavy blockage of streets could be expected. Motor vehicles if protected from falling debris, would generally remain mechanically operative. Heavy fire damage throughout this area would be inevitable. Whereas in the inner-central zone post-explosion efforts to combat fire would not be feasible, such efforts would be of the greatest importance in this one to 2-mile zone. The great problem here will be quick mobilization of outside help to confine the general conflagration to that area. There would be considerable screening of personnel from the direct rays due to shadows cast by intervening structures. However, of those in this area exposed to direct rays the injuries from thermal effects will range from severe to moderate burns and many exposed to the rays will have received serious doses of radiation that in some instances will be fatal but in most instances will cause only a severe illness. Throughout this area the blast effect is so severe as to create a high degree of hazard from flying debris.

BLAST DAMAGE

In the zone from 2 to 3 miles out from ground zero, damage will be moderate. Heavy blast damage will be confined to wood-frame buildings and others of very light construction. Brick buildings will sustain moderate damage and heavy type buildings little or no structural damage from the blast. Glass breakage will be considerable. Within this area the greatest danger again is fire. Utilities, particularly water supply, will be vulnerable in proportion to the number of vulnerable type buildings. Underground utilities will be immune to damage, but above ground facilities of power and communication will be disrupted largely by fire. Persons expcsed to direct rays will be slightly burned and the primary radiological danger will be negligible. In this zone the greatest danger to personnel will be from flying debris, fire, and injuries incident to disorder or lack of control. It is in this zone that proper organization and training of the general populace in plans of self-help and prompt and effective operation of a well-planned organization for public safety can be most effective in mitigating the effects of the initial blast. If immediate post-explosion emergency services are properly organized and the population trained, the damage within the 3-mile zone can be substantially confined to that area.

From a radius of 3 miles outward it can be anticipated that all of the damage would be comparatively slight. Scattered damage in a radius from 7 to 8 miles from the ground zero, but beyond the 3-mile zone, will be sufficiently light to leave that area in a condition capable of operating normally and contributing materially to the relief of the inner zones, if a well-organized and disciplined populace have been thoroughly prepared in advance to meet the known contingencies of atomic attack.

From this sketchy outline it appears certain that much can be done by a resolute and public-spirited community to lessen the scope of disaster.

On the other hand such an attack might be a multiple one, or one at ground level; it might be combined with the use of other mass-destruction weapons; it might be in the nature of a saturation air raid with conventional bombs; or it might develop as sabotage by fifth column agents bent on destruction of our industrial strength and our will to carry on. In any case, the problems which will present themselves and our organization to solve those problems would be quite similar. It is an overwhelming task and it must be met in peacetime.

OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

STATEMENT BY BERNARD M. BARUCH

Here is one point I want to make on that, that we are talking all the time about what ought to be done, as if we were at peace, but you know that we are not at peace. You

know that today we have no peace with Germany or Austria. It is only recently we made a peace with Italy. We still have Korea and Japan and the Turkish problem and Greece and many others, and, above all, the overshadowing problem of our relations with a former ally, Russia.

Until we do have peace, the ordinary actions which govern prices will not function. So, in dealing with the problems of the high cost of living and the economic problems that face you, you have to keep in mind that we are not at peace yet, and until we do have peace the ordinary laws of supply and demand and the great individualism and the personal initiative that have made us great, cannot function. They cannot function except in peace.

You have, I know, your greatest difficulty in making your expenditures agree with your budgets. I do not see how you really can make them agree because the ink is hardly dry on the receipts that you get from your taxpayers before the cost of your services and the materials you buy have gone up, so that your budget is immediately out of balance, and that, as I say, cannot be cured at your level. It can only be cured in Washington, and only there if we have peace.

So, I hope everybody will join in what I call "waging peace." I see no reason why we should not have it when the people of the world learn exactly where this country stands. I have great and high hopes of the Marshall plan, but I only have high hopes of it if Europe will help itself. The best thing that Europe can do to help itself is to have some joint union of defense against aggression, in which we should join to help them. I do not see how the people of Europe, who are really digging themselves out quite well, can get back to work or dare to expend their energies, when there is always the threat of war.

I have nothing more to say except to express my appreciation for the opportunity to come here and see what really makes America tick, what has made us the envy of the world and so proud of ourselves. I think the mayors of the country are really the ones who are the bottom base of the whole thing. I thank you and congratulate you.

Racial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a copy of a speech delivered by the Honorable Horace C. Wilkinson, member of the bar of Birmingham, Ala., and a member of one of that city's great law firms.

It was a profound address delivered by a true southerner. He addressed himself, in general, to the all-important question of the segregation of the races.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and every Member of this House realize that the only remaining bulwark in our country against the assimilation of the white race is found in the traditions, customs, and segregation laws of our Southern States.

I am fearful that we in this Congress will shortly be faced with legislating with respect to the question of racial segregation and other aspects of President Truman's civil-rights legislation.

Because of that, among other reasons, I am including the address of this learned southern barrister in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope every Member of this House will read this splendid address of the Honorable Horace C. Wilkinson.

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, members of the Gadsden Kiwanis Club, and friends, I count it a distinct honor to be invited to speak to you today. Some of my adult life has been devoted to a study of faces. I believe that I am able to fairly appraise a man by a study of his face. If my eyes do not deceive me I am among men of initiative, men of character, men who are resolute and determined, men of purpose. I am most happy to be in your midst.

When your invitation was extended to me I was requested to speak on racial relations. I will endeavor to comply with your request. The South is stirred today as it has not been stirred since the sixties. From the Potomac to Key West, from Charleston to El Paso, self-respecting men and women are incensed over Mr. Truman's latest proposal to sell this section for a few Negro votes.

In 1888 the Supreme Court of the United States declared that a civil-rights program similar to the one now sponsored by Mr. Truman was unconstitutional. This decision was rendered by a Republican court in an era when feeling was strong against the South. When the United States Supreme Court declared that this so-called civil rights legislation violated the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States it rendered a judicial—not a political decision.

Mr. Truman's attempt to have enacted legislation he knew was unconstitutional was an effort on his part to have Congress violate the very Constitution that Mr. Truman swore on the Bible he would uphold and defend.

Why is the South so incensed over this effort to put the heel of the black on the neck of the white? Let's get down to fundamentals. Our forefathers recognized that the strength of the Nation depends more upon the race than upon the Government. There are those who would abandon that basic and fundamental proposition. There are those who say social and political equality for the Negro is all right. But they say we must work around to it gradually. That it should come by local action. I do not agree with them. There are others who say that they are for Mr. Truman, but they are opposed to his program. I am about them like the tramp was the bull dog that was wagging his tail and growling at him all the while. I don't know which end to believe. There are those who say the States are too slow, that social and political equality must be conferred on the Negro now by Federal law enforced by Federal authority. I say they are paving the way for the destruction of America. There are those, with whom I agree, who oppose Negro voting and all other forms of social and political equality; who maintain that segregation is indispensable. I shall undertake to state their case.

The State of Massachusetts was the earliest to enact a law against intermarriage between the Indian and the white man. It was entitled "An Act for the Better Preventing of a Spurious or Mixed Issue." Our forefathers, understanding the inferior character of the colored races, refused to permit amalgamation and visited it with the severest penalties of the law. Not all the logic nor the rhapsodies of the new generations of humanitarians who craved equal political and civil rights between the white men and the Indian could convince the bold Saxons who won their independence from Great Britain that it was their duty to adulterate their white blood.

This is no time to adulterate white blood physically, socially, politically, or otherwise. This is no time to base our security on anything save our faith in God and the integrity of the white race.

Human experience teaches that social and political association lead to and will bring about intermarriage between the people of different races. One follows the other as night follows the day. That intermarriage is the Negro's goal is made clear by the writings and speeches of leading equalitarians.

G. A. Borgess writing in the Negro Digest, which is to the Negro as the Reader's Digest is to the white man, scorns any program for the Negro that stops short of intermarriage. He makes that clear in the following language:

"Any step forward in the field of political and social equality, however desirable and imperative, is merely a palliative as compared with the final remedy.

"Nothing will be conclusively done until all is done. All will be done only when the bedrooms open and the two bloods mix freely in many marriages, free from blame and bane.

"If science is trying hard, and hopefully to contrive an artificial heart, I would be at a loss to understand why it should be overbearing or nonsensical to exact from science the lesser miracle of an artificial skin. There should be some means, by innoculation or rays, or other nondescript process to discolor the Negro. * * * A proposition of this kind should be the leading thought of humanitarianism and science in their next phase of growth. * * * Mixed marriages would be insured against racial nemesis by the knowledge that the treatment that was inexpensive and successful for the parent will be no less so for the progeny, with other and less definite differential characteristics of the races merging by-and-by much more easily in the multiple miscegenation of the border zones. This would make a substantial and positive bequest by us to children and grandchildren. The color line should blur almost past recognition in the course of the very next generation."

This statement of the Negro's goal is echoed and approved by every leading anti-segregationist, equalitarian, and Negrophile in America. The President has decided to help the Negro reach his goal. He would aid the Negro by a so-called civil-rights program.

What does it mean?

It simply means that the Negro is seeking to establish the right to intermarry with whites by Federal law. If the Negro can establish that right by Federal law, then he establishes the right to destroy the white race by Federal law. You know, the Negroes know, and Truman knows that if the Federal Government can tell us where we shall eat and with whom to associate, then there is no limit to its power.

If some Federal bureaucrat, under a fair employment practice act, can come into my office and tell me to discharge one of the four ladies who work for me and to employ a Negress in her place, then we have a police state instead of a republic. If the Federal Government can say that a Negro can vote in a party primary over the protest of all of the white members of the party, then we have lost the right to regulate our own affairs. If the Federal Government can make unequals equal, then it is more despotic than Hitler, Stalin, Hirohito, and company. If the Federal Government can say that we shall not keep Negroes out of white hotels, it can say we shall not prevent marriage between Negroes and whites. It is close to that now.

The Federal Government recognizes marriages between whites and blacks as legal in the District of Columbia. The next step is for the Government to say that no State shall prohibit marriage between individuals on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. A provision of that kind has a logical place in a civil-rights program, and a civil-rights program is not complete without a provision of that kind. And that will be the next step when we surrender our birthright. When that happens, good-bye, America.

Segregation is simply the observance of the law of racial purity. Purity of race is a gift

of God. Once destroyed, it can never be redeemed. In the first chapter and twenty-fourth verse of Genesis we read:

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind; and it was so."

Thus was the law of racial purity established in the beginning by divine command that every living thing reproduce after his kind. So long as that law is obeyed, the color line cannot lawfully be crossed. God saw fit to segregate and separate the different races by placing each in different lands. He divided them by color lines as well as by territorial lines so that each race could maintain its racial integrity. All nature obeys the law of everything after its kind. From the giant elephant to the smallest insect, from the majestic condor to the little peewit, all produce after their kind. Even the fruit and vegetable kingdoms obey this law.

The Prophet Jeremiah propounded this interrogatory:

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" (Jeremiah 13: 25).

I am told that if you will watch the handling of hogs in transit, you will see carloads of Duroc Reds, Chester Whites, Black Hampshires, with White Saddlers and Poland China spotted animals unloaded in a large pen for overnight rest. When this is done, the hogs are restless and confused. They squeal and mill around until nightfall. Return the next morning and you will find a peaceful array of sleeping hogs, but the pen now consists of islands of reds, whites, blacks, and spotted hogs, each segregated and sleeping peacefully with their own kind. If an adventuresome hog starts to wander about, he is soon put in his place by the squeak and rancor of the community. It looks like men would have as much sense as a bunch of hogs.

The South's battle for segregation is a battle for the preservation of her white blood; her racial purity; her racial integrity. By the absolute denial of social and political equality to the Negro the South has erected a barrier between the races that can be maintained, which is firm, strong, and which makes the preservation of racial integrity certain and sure. But once we tolerate any form of political or social equality—no matter what the accomplishment of an individual Negro may be—a crack will have been made in the wall of segregation and the wall itself will eventually be breached. Once the social barriers of the South are broken down miscegenation will be prevalent, and in a few years the white man will be lost in the intermingling process of bleaching the Negro.

Some antisegregationists deny that they advocate intermingling and intermarriage of whites and blacks; but the trouble with their denial is that they advocate the very things that bring about that result. Any degree of social or political equality between the races is fatal to the preservation of racial purity. You find a race of mongrels wherever you find social and political equality between different races tolerated. It is only where segregation is observed that racial purity prevails and a mongrel race avoided.

There are a few Negroes who attempt to disguise their secret ambition by saying that they are not seeking intermarriage with whites; that all they want is their "God-given rights as American citizens." In the first place they are not American citizens in fact, regardless of what their legal status may be. They are Afro-American citizens with all of the limitations imposed upon them by the racial constitution of the Negro race. In the next place, their "God-given rights" do not include social or political equality with whites. God never gave the Negro the right to become the social and political equal of the white man. Had he done so He would have given the Negro the right to intermarry with whites, because God recognizes the right of equals to intermarry. Had God given the Negro the right to intermarry with whites He would have given the Negro the right to destroy the white race, because racial purity, once lost, can never be redeemed.

The Constitution of the United States does not give the Negro the right to become the social and political equal of the white man. Had it attempted to do so, it would never have been adopted. All the Constitution does is to protect certain rights the Negro has. It does not purport to confer the right of social and political equality upon him. The trouble with this God-given right claim is that the Negro is attempting by Federal law to get some rights, the right to social and political equality, that both God and the Constitution have denied him. I deny that a Federal politician is more humane than Deity or wiser than the founding fathers of this Republic.

Concretely expressed, we must segregate to survive as a race. If we do not survive as a race then civilization ceases to survive. No Negro has ever shown the capacity to develop a civilization. The Negro has had just as long as the white man to develop a civilization of his own, but not once, since God cursed Canaan, has he built a ship, flown a flag, produced a literature, or suggested a creed. Each race has certain basic traits and characteristics which constitute a racial constitution. Capacity for self-government, capacity to govern others, is no part of the Negro's racial constitution. It is no part of his make-up. Neither can it be. On the basis of the social value of voluntary cooperation we have developed the highest civilization known to man. The Negro is a native of the tropical climate where fruit and nuts are plentiful and where clothing is not required for protection against the winter's cold. The Negro has never been under the necessity of producing anything through voluntary cooperation. The essentials of society in the jungle are few and do not include production, transportation, and marketing of goods. The Negro has never done and will never do anything because of any sense of responsibility to society. He has none. His racial constitution has been fashioned in such a way as to exclude any idea of voluntary cooperation on his part.

Senator Robert Toombs once said:

"This Republic was born of the soul of a race of pioneer white freemen who settled on our continent and built an altar within its forest cathedral to liberty and progress. In the record of man has the Negro ever dreamed this dream?"

The answer is "No." The Negroes' racial constitution will never allow the Negro to become a dreamer of dreams. For this reason it is folly to argue that the white man should share his blood with, or intrust the ideal of his race, to a Negro. It is nothing short of race suicide for him to do so. It is not undemocratic, unchristian, or unkind to preserve the Government as our forefathers made it.

What I have just said must not be understood as indicating that I have no sympathy for a large number of loyal, faithful, southern Negroes who do not share the cravings of the mongrels for social and political equality. These Negroes cannot help being Negroes. They cannot help the limitations imposed on them by God Almighty. They have indicated a willingness to work out their destiny within the framework of their racial constitution and to live in peace and harmony with the white race. But they have no spokesman. They have no entree to the American press. It is the mixed breeds among them who crave social and political equality, who pose as Negro leaders, who have the ear of our politicians and our press.

I have much respect for the Negro woman down my way who said she didn't want her Negro children ruined by sending them to a white folk's school.

We of the South have the greatest affection for thousands of Negroes like that, and they also have a great affection for us.

I like to think of humanity as a great supply train, composed of many sized wagons designed to haul civilization's load. I recognize that it is right that the white race, the big horses, pull the biggest wagon and the heaviest part of the load in the wagon train. We also recognize that some little wagons must be pulled by little mules going along with the big vehicles. The big white horse and the little black mule each has his part. Each has his load to pull. As long as we keep the big white horses hitched to the big wagons and the little black mules to the little wagons they can pull together in their separate places in the column and the wagon train will move forward. If we hitch a big white horse with a little black mule to a heavy wagon, or a little black mule with a big white horse to a light wagon both will work to a disadvantage and the wagon will likely wind up in the ditch. We will protect the little mule's right to pull his little wagon and we will insist that the big horse pull the biggest wagon and the heaviest part of the load.

There is an ancient maxim of law to the effect that one must use his own property so as not to injure another. I think the principle applicable when we come to discussing the rights and privileges a race may exercise and enjoy. No other race has developed a civilization comparable to the white man's civilization. If the white man's onward march will be retarded by social and political equality, it is better for civilization to advance toward the more abundant life than it is for the Negro to have social and political equality. It is much better for all Negroes to remain in a class for retarded scholars than it is for the entire school of humanity to fail to graduate. If the Negro cannot give the world better laws than the the white man has given, no reason appears for Negro participation in lawmaking. If the Negro is not a better administrator than the white man, nothing will be gained by Negro administration. If Negro judges cannot decide more intelligently and more wisely and more fairly than white judges, then we do not need Negro judicial officials. Different races have their respective fields of usefulness and this is also true of individuals. If we make a scientist perform the work of a laborer and the laborer perform the work of a scientist, we ruin both. If we mix milk and ink, the mixture is not fit for food or writing. One fatal mistake the equalitarians make is that they do not count the cost to civilization as a whole of slowing down the march of progress to the Negro's pace because God did not make him brilliant. It is a mistake to believe that hewers of wood and drawers of water can be made the equal of people who carved a continent out of a wilderness.

Some equalitarians claim that Thomas Jefferson wrote the "all men are created equal" provision in the Declaration of Independence, and Negrophiles cite that document in support of their plea for social and political equality of whites and blacks in the United States.

Handled with knowledge and skill our constitutional concept of "equality" can civilize the world. Handled ignorantly or maliciously it can blow human living out of existence and blow man to a level lower than that of the savage.

All or practically all of the founding fathers of this Republic were slave owners. They certainly did not meet and indite a document to say to the world that their slaves were their equals. Equality in the minds of the founding fathers meant that they were just as good white men as their British brothers across the sea. It is a falsification of facts and a prostitution of reason to contend otherwise. This is borne out by the writings of Mr. Jefferson, where he said:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people (Negroes)

are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races equally free, cannot live in the same government."

Mr. Jefferson abhored slavery, but he believed the Negro should be deported to Africa. Lincoln agreed with Jefferson that as a general rule there are but three solutions of two races living with each other—annihilation, emigration, or amalgamation. Jefferson and Lincoln favored emigration and colonization. Jefferson devoted much of his time and personal fortune to the promotion of a scheme to return the Negro to Africa. He organized and sponsored the Colonization Society of Virginia and was instrumental in returning some 10,000 Negroes to Liberia. This was the Thomas Jefferson-Abraham Lincoln brand of segregation. A fixed, permanent separation, ocean wide.

If I am correct in my contention that racial purity is a gift of God and that segregation is essential to its preservation then we must necessarily address ourselves to the question of how segregation may be made permanent.

In looking for a remedy let us not overlook the Constitution of our country. Most of our problems can be worked out within its framework. That document vouchsafes to us protection against the encroachment of Federal executive power on the rights of the State. The remedy is incorporated in the Constitution and cannot be taken from us except by an amendment to the Constitution which cannot be adopted over united southern opposition. That remedy is the electoral college. In the November election we do not vote for President and Vice President. We vote for electors who meet and vote for President and Vice President. These electors are the key to the situation. Our southern electors can make the South heard and respected in the councils of the Nation. All in the world we have to do is to use the bargaining power that is ours by virtue of the Constitution. There are 531 votes in the electoral college. A minimum of 127 of those votes are in the solid South. It is probable that we could increase that number to 170 by capturing some border States. However that may be, we have 127 certain. Take that number from 531 and it leaves 404. It takes 266 votes to elect a President. If the electors from the solid South will stand firm and vote for a competent southerner for President, both Truman and the Republican nominee will have a hard time getting 266 votes out of the 404 remaining. The northern Republicans will be faced with accepting a southern Democrat in the electoral college (for which we might exchange a few jobs), or taking Truman and no jobs, or forcing the election into the House of Representatives.

If the South votes solidly in the House of Representatives we start with 25 percent of the votes. It is a maxim in politics that if you can control 10 percent of the votes you can usually control the results of the election. Northern Republicans will take a southern Democrat any time in preference to Truman. Western Democrats and western Republicans will do the same thing. This simply means that we have the most glorious opportunity we have had since the Civil War to elect a southern man President of the United States. Any way you look at it we have a chance to become the balance of power, and vote under the rooster all the while.

Why shouldn't we use the bargaining power that our forefathers placed in our hands by incorporating it in the Constitution? If we will withhold our electoral vote from both the eastern Democrat and the northern Republicans and let them know that they cannot elect a President without consulting us, and above all that no man can be elected President who is inclined to stick his Federal nose into our State affairs, all will be well in the solid South from a national standpoint.

If I am accused of race prejudice because of my position I want to save my accusers the trouble of proving their case. I admit it. Race prejudice is a form of race pride. I am proud that I am a white man and a member of the white race. I am proud that the white race received the Ten Commandments upon tablets of stone fresh from the hands of God on Sinia's burning summit. I am proud that the white race gave to the world Jesus of Nazareth and his Golden Rule. I am proud that the white race faced King John at Runnymeade and wrung from him Magna Charta and the right of trial by jury. I am proud that the white race sailed the angry Atlantic in a wooden tub and landed at Plymouth Rock and carved a continent out of a wilderness. I am proud that the white race wrote the Declaration of Independence and signed the Constitution of the United States. I am proud that the white race carried our flag to the Halls of Montezuma and the Shores of Tripoli. I am proud that the white race harnessed steam, developed electricity and made its power subject to the will of man. I am proud that the white race made a spark jump out into the night and leap leagues of snarling seas and cry to the shore for help. I am proud that the white race has added the highways of eagles to the paths of men. I am proud that the white race has dotted this universe with houses of worship whose spires stab the skies and whose golden crosses kiss the sun. I am proud that the white race has sent the missionary to the four corners of the earth and is now supporting and maintaining the great missionary movement. I am proud that the white race split the atom and knocked the yellow beast down to where he will not be able to perpetrate his brutalities and cruelties on civilization for a thousand years. I am proud, I am grateful, I am humble, but I am glad that I am a white man, made in the image of God and the object of His love. I am proud that I recognize my responsibility as a trustee of this great heritage and my duty as a trustee to keep inviolate the racial purity and the racial integrity of the white man. This Nation, under God, is entitled to a white party of white people, for white people, by white people. It is entitled to white leadership that will not put the heel of the black on the neck of the white. The South, thank God, can furnish both. We can furnish the party. We can furnish the leader. We can preserve racial integrity now and forever.

The Farmers and So-Called Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the consuming public has been flooded with false propaganda—much of it originating in the Department of Agriculture—leading the consumers to believe that the farmer was rolling in wealth, that he was receiving subsidies at the hands of the consuming taxpayers. The truth is that the farmer has not, within the memory of man, received cost of production. He has fed the consumer for less than it cost him—fed the consumer while he was losing his farm.

The country is flooded with false propaganda of subsidies that the farmer has received. Again the facts are that he has received payments for conserving the soil for future generations of consumers, and the few pennies he has received is not a drop in the bucket, as far as paying the additional expense for conservation is concerned.

A complete answer to some of this false propaganda is given by Rolla M. Myers, secretary-treasurer of the Ohio Marketing Quota Protest Association, Attica, Ohio, in a letter to Clinton P. Anderson. Here is the letter:

FEBRUARY 17, 1948.

Mr. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: It is interesting to note from a news item of the Philadelphia Inquirer as of January 13, 1948, that when you addressed a group of 75,000 farmers at the State farm show held at Harrisburg, Pa., on the night of January 12, you asked the public to support President Truman's recommendation to Congress to continue soil conservation subsidies to the American farmer at a wartime level, in order to have a strong productive agriculture after, as well as during the period of world food shortages.

Now there are several phases of the farm policy of our Federal Government that is not quite clear to me, or to my fellow farmers; to say nothing about the general public, and you might clarify some of these issues by answering some of the questions which are uppermost in the minds of the individual farmer.

How can you expect the public to support the subsidizing of farmers at a time when our economist, the press, and the radio are spreading the propaganda that the farmers are wading in wealth and are responsible for the high cost of living.

Mr. Truman and yourself are recommending that Congress should continue the appropriation of $300,000,000 annually for the benefit of agriculture and the farmer, which is an enormous amount of money in the eyes of the consumer, to be paid direct to the farmer at the expense of Mr. Taxpayer.

Do you think that the decrease of farm labor and farm units of 30 percent over the period from 1910 to 1940 was due to the soil becoming depleted, or was it due to the fact that farm income was out of line with the income of other business and enterprise?

Do you think that the distribution of $300,000,000 a year among the farmers would do the trick and bring back our soil to the point of virgin land?

Is it not a fact that the larger the Department of Agriculture gets from year to year, the more fussy they get about the welfare of the farmer.

Now, I am going to take issue with you and say that the $300,000,000 does not aid agriculture to the extent that you would have the public believe, but it does keep a large aggregate of bureaucrats on the pay roll at the expense of the general taxpayer.

Let us take a few basic facts and figures into consideration and make an analysis of these facts, so that the general public can get a true picture as to the intent and average benefit, as it applies to the individual farmer, or if I have the wrong slant, I would appreciate your correction of my views, and I would gladly pass it on to my farmer friends.

First. We have approximately 6,000,000 farm units in these United States and a few over 6,000 counties in the 48 States.

Second. Since agriculture has experienced the greatest degree of prosperity in the past few years, as stated by your Department and other Government bureaus, and the farmers' income has been an all-time high, it is reasonable to assume that every farmer has been compelled to file an income-tax report and did pay income tax to the Federal Government, even though he might be in the lowest bracket.

Third. You will note on page 1 of form 1040F, schedule of farm income and expenses, column 3, the farmer is required to report all agricultural program payments as money received, which is subject to taxation as well as all other incomes.

Now, we have a right to assume that the farmer, as a whole, pays back to the Federal Government as income tax at least $60,000,000, or 20 percent of the $300,000,000, before he can derive any benefit from these payments.

Fourth. Now, let us break down the benefits as they apply to the smaller units of agriculture. Of the $300,000,000 appropriated for agriculture in the war years and as recommended by President Truman to be continued annually, the farmer would only actually receive $240,000,000 after the Federal income tax is taken out.

If the $240,000,000 were divided equally among the 6,000,000 farm units, each unit would receive $40, or if we would allocate the benefit equally among the 6,000 counties, each county would receive $40,000.

Now, let us take into account the benefits derived from the Government payment out of the $300,000,000 that Congress appropriated for 1947 as it applies to my home county, Seneca County, Ohio.

I would say that we are an average county; our agriculture practices are diversified, as we raise grain, legumes, have many fruit orchards, and produce livestock, dairy, and poultry products.

In 1947, out of the $300,000,000, Ohio's allocation was $7,391,000, of which Seneca County received $135,618.

I obtained from the county AAA office the following statistics, as of Seneca County for 1947.

We have 3,247 farm units in our county and of these units 258,880 acres are under cultivation.

Now if we divide $135,618 among the farm units, each unit would receive $41.77, but if the money was divided pro rata to the cultivated acres each acre would have been benefited 52.4 cents per acre. But since the farmer was placed in the income bracket by prosperity he was compelled to pay back 20 percent of the Government benefit, which reduced the unit allotment to $33.42 or the acreage allotment to 42 cents per acre.

Now, Mr. Anderson, isn't it reasonable to look at an issue from various angles?

Let us see how much more of the consumer's dollar the farmer will have to have to derive the same benefit and to practice soil conservation as set up by your Department from the proposed appropriation.

To get approximately 42 cents an acre across the board on our basic commodities the farmer would have to receive 2 cents a bushel more on wheat, based on an average yield of 20 bushels per acre; 1 cent a bushel more on oats based on an average yield of 40 bushels per acre; 1 cent more on corn based on an average yield of 80 baskets per acre, which is equivalent to 40 bushels of shelled corn; 3 cents per bushel on soy beans based on an average yield of 15 bushels per acre and 40 cents a ton on all legumes based on an average yield of 1 ton per acre.

I am not acquainted with the yield of cotton, tobacco, and rice, but I dare say that the average yield as stated above is low and the increase in price of these basic commodities to be equivalent to the Government benefit payments would never put the price of bread, cereals, meat, dairy, and poultry products out of reach of the consuming public. Now let us look at the benefit from another angle.

The State AAA chairman of Ohio made a statement to the Associated Press as of December 28, 1946, that the $7,391,000 allocated to Ohio for 1947 was to be used for soil conservation, reforestation, conservation of water by digging ponds, and improvement of soil fertility by lime and fertilizer.

Now lime in this locality, cost delivered and spread on the land, is $2.38 per ton and the average application is 2 tons per acre or a cost of $4.76 against 42 cents of Government benefit.

To dig a pond on your farm it would cost from $300 to $600 against an average benefit per farm unit of $33.42.

The Government allowance for tile drains was 40 cents per rod in 1947 against a cost of $45 per thousand for 4-inch tile or $7.42 per rod, plus the cost of digging and laying the tile.

If we took our benefit payments for the purchase of fertilizer, we were paying for 2-12-6 which is the most popular analysis for this community, $35 per ton or a cost of $1.75 per hundredweight and as the majority of farmers put on not less than 200 pounds per acre, we had a cost of $3.50 per acre, against 42 cents as Government benefit.

If we were to practice reforestation and had the trees donated to us I doubt whether the farmer could prepare the ground and plant the tree for less than 10 cents apiece, which would be equivalent to 4 trees per acre.

All in all I would say that the benefit derived from the AAA appropriations would be in proportion to a pound of butter spread over a slice of bread the size of the State of Texas and the fact would still remain that the agency that was furnishing the butter would consider the price too high and the owner of the bread would realize the fact that the spread was too thin to be of any consequence.

There is no doubt in my mind that the publicity the farmer is receiving through the acceptance of subsidies and Government benefit payments has created in the minds of labor hate, mistrust, and misunderstanding, as it appears to them that the farmer is responsible for his high cost of living, and on the other hand the farmer is at swords point with labor, as he feels that labor is responsible for the high cost of the products he has to buy, due to his demand for higher wages and curtailment of production by strikes, and both sides of these issues have been kept alive through Government reports, the radio, and the press and so long as this condition exists it will create a perfect spawning ground for communism.

May I speak for every farmer in this country, we do not want Government dole, and we want to see labor receive a living wage, and as long as our international gamblers can gamble with our grain from the farm, and the State Department lay down the bars of protective tariff our international horse traders will thrive, at the expense of agriculture and labor, and as I see it, your Department can be very instrumental in bringing this about, as you will recall that your Department in preceding months has asked the farmer to curtail production of meat, dairy, and poultry products, so that more grain could be sent to foreign countries, which was bought and paid for with our tax dollars that we lent the foreigners never to be repaid; now when our tax dollars cease to flow into foreign countries as loans, the foreigners will have to ship into this country their agriculture products to pay for the manufactured products we ship to them, then, Mr. Anderson, the Department of Agriculture will establish marketing quotas and penalty tax as they did in 1941 for the American farmer, in order to forestall any surpluses.

I contend that the Agriculture Adjustment Act and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are designed for the internationalist.

AM I RIGHT OR AM I WRONG?

Labor and agriculture must have a floor and a protective tariff, or America will have barons, peons, and peasants.

In closing, may I ask you, as a member of the Cabinet and the Secretary of Agriculture, to conduct your Department in such a way that your constituents will be put on an even keel with all the other segments of our economy, and use the Constitution of the United States as your guide.

A reply from you would be greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

ROLLA M. MYERS.

Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the Protestant statement calling on the Nation to guard separation of church and state:

THE MANIFESTO ISSUED BY THE PROTESTANTS AND OTHER AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

A MANIFESTO

The officers and the widely representative national board of advisers of this organization desire to speak frankly and clearly to the American people concerning the purpose for which this undertaking has been launched. Its single and only purpose is to assure the maintenance of the American principle of separation of church and state upon which the Federal Constitution guarantees religious liberty to all the people and all churches of this Republic.

Protestants and Other Americans United has been called into existence because this principle has been and is being violated, and threatened with further violation, in certain areas and by certain acts of both Government and church. The plain meaning of the first amendment to the Constitution which forbids Congress to make any law respecting an establishment of religion has been obscured by specious propaganda tending to confuse the public mind as to the clear-cut line of separation which this amendment draws between church and state.

We shall endeavor (1) to revive in the public mind a clear understanding of the constitutional basis upon which religious liberty has been guaranteed, (2) to redress the specific violations which have recently come into force, and (3) to resist further encroachments upon this constitutional principle.

DENIES ANY CHURCH IS TARGET

Protestants and Other Americans United does not concern itself with the religious teaching, the forms of worship, or the ecclesiastical organization of the many churches in our country. It is no part of our purpose to propagandize the Protestant faith or any other, nor to criticize or oppose the teaching or internal practices of the Roman Catholic Church or any other. We have no connection or sympathy with any movement that is tinged with religious fanaticism. Our motivation arises solely from our patriotic and religious concern for the maintenance of the separation of church and state under the American form of government.

Nevertheless, the existing situation cannot be dealt with save by frankly taking account of the specific sources from which violations of the first amendment originate. But our undertaking is not primarily directed toward these sources, but toward those agencies of government—local, State, and Federal—which weakly yield to their demands.

Congress and all State legislatures, and all executive and judiciary agencies of government, must be warned that they are playing with fire when they play into the hands of any church which seeks, at any point however marginal, to breach the wall that sharply separates church and state in this country.

The principle of their separation is so firmly established in a long tradition as well as in the Constitution that any tampering with it will tend to light the fires of intolerance and fanaticism which our system of government is designed to prevent.

OPEN FORUM IS REQUESTED

Our operations, therefore, are not inspired by any religious differences but by a common conviction concerning the religious liberty of all faiths. The internal differences which distinguish one church from another have no place on the political level. Their consideration belongs in the open forum which the Constitution has provided for freedom of conscience and the free exchange of opinion. Here all the churches have liberty to worship as they desire, to propagate their own faith, and to maintain such organizations for this purpose as they deem expedient. In the open forum of religious liberty they may meet one another in cooperation or in controversy.

Protestants and Other Americans United has come into existence to defend this open forum of religious liberty against its vitiation by law or the administration of law. The state is forbidden to invade this area. It may not by law or the administration of law accord to any church a status which gives it a special advantage in the wide domain of religious freedom. This is the plain meaning of the first amendment, which forbids Congress to make any law "respecting an establishment of religion"—that is, pertaining to, or leading toward, such an establishment.

The churches on whose behalf we speak ask nothing for themselves in the exercise of their constitutional freedom which they do not willingly grant to and demand for all other churches. They are content to take their place in the open forum of our free society and to flourish or perish by the inherent strength or weakness of their faith. This is cultural and spiritual democracy.

FEARS STATE-CHURCH CONNIVING

For the state to connive with a church which seeks a position of advantage in the forum of religious liberty by creating any interlocking relation between that church and itself is to deny or to curtail the religious liberty of all other churches and to vitiate democracy.

A powerful church, unaccustomed in its own history and tradition to the American ideal of separation of church and state, but flourishing under the religious liberty provided by our form of government, and emboldened by the wide diffusion of a false conception of tolerance, has committed itself in authoritative declarations and by positive acts to a policy plainly subversive of religious liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution.

This church holds and maintains a theory of the relation of church and state which is incompatible with the American ideal. It makes no secret of its intention to secure for itself, if possible, a privileged position in the body politic. In pursuit of this policy, it has already made such gains that the principle of separation of church and state is in peril of nullification by legislatures and courts, and by Federal, State, and local administrations.

One of the long-range purposes of this church is to secure total support for its extensive system of parochial schools from the Public Treasury. Its strategy in furtherance of this purpose is to fracture the constitutional principle at one point after another where the action can be minimized as trivial or disguised as falling within some other category than that of its ultimate intent.

It has begun by demanding that certain marginal services such as bus transportation, free lunches, free textbooks, etc., for its parochial-school pupils be financed by public funds raised by taxation for the public schools.

LEGISLATIVE "BREACHES IN WALL"

Already the legislatures of certain States, yielding to the political pressure of this church, have enacted legislation empowering local school boards to grant these special privileges. The Federal Supreme Court in two decisions has confirmed State legislation which sanctions the use of public-school funds to provide free textbooks for parochial schools (1930), and to transport pupils to such schools (1947).

The four dissenting Justices in the bus transportation case solemnly warned the Nation that these two breaches in the wall separating church and state are only the beginning. "That a third and a fourth breach, and still others, will be attempted, we may be sure," say the dissenting Justices.

Protestants and Other Americans United is determined to assert its full strength to the end that there shall be no more breaches in this wall, that the breaches already made shall be repaired, and that the complete separation of church and state in an undivided State-supported educational system shall be maintained.

On a bolder and more ambitious scale, this same church now demands aid for its schools from the Federal Government. A proposed Federal grant of several hundred million dollars annually in aid of public education, especially in those States whose economic resources are insufficient to provide adequate education for their children, has been before Congress for many years.

Action on this proposal has been held up by the pressure of this church which demands that its parochial schools shall share with the public schools in any such Federal appropriation in an amount proportional to the number of pupils in each school system.

DANGER SEEN IN TWO NEW BILLS

Thus far, Congress has withstood this demand. But two bills have been introduced in that body, one of which completely yields to the church's maximum demand, while the other provides that the funds may be distributed by each State in accordance with its own statutes.

The latter, the so-called Taft bill (S. 472), is a disguised evasion of the issue. It plays directly into the policy of the church which has already secured legislation in 18 States permitting financial aid to parochial schools in one form or another, and in effect invites the States to violate the mandate of the first amendment. The effect of its passage by Congress would encourage and facilitate the church's campaign in these States to widen the initial legislation already enacted in its favor, and to secure similar and even more advanced legislation in all other States.

Protestants and Other Americans United respectfully demands that Congress shall not by such an evasion abdicate its responsibility to defend the Constitution, regardless of political pressure on the part of any sectarian interests which would thus subvert it.

The effect of State-supported church schools would spell the end of our public-school system as it has been established, fostered, and protected for more than a century. To divide State-supported education into sectarian school systems would divide American society itself into hostile sectarian camps, intensify sectarian intolerance, and thrust a religious issue permanently into the political arena from which our Constitution was designed to exclude it.

Next to the Constitution itself, our public-school system has been our strongest bulwark against the development of religious intolerance in our political life.

TAYLOR MISSION CRITICIZED

In the area of diplomacy, also, this same church has made ominous progress in its strategy of winning for itself a position of special privilege in relation to the state. An ambassadorship to the papal head of the church, represented at the time it was set up as a temporary measure, has been in existence for 7 years.

President Truman, in 1946, assured a Protestant delegation that it would be discontinued at an early date. But the powerful political pressure which the heirarchy is able to bring to bear against the fulfillment of this promise plainly makes it necessary that a strong and determined public opinion shall express itself in support of its fulfillment.

We are not deceived by the disguise under which the appointee to this ambassadorship was labeled as the President's personal ambassador. The Pope himself made it perfectly clear in the extraordinary ceremonial by which he received the incumbent that his presence at the Vatican marked a distinct departure from our Government's long established policy. We hold that this ambassadorship constitutes an interlocking of the functions of church and state which is contrary to the principle of their complete separation.

Protestants and Other Americans United, speaking on behalf of an aroused body of American citizens, demands that this un-American ambassadorship to the head of a church be abolished. We resent, on behalf of all non-Roman churches, the privileged access to the ear of the state which this relationship creates.

As patriotic Americans, we call upon all our fellow citizens who cherish the principle of religious liberty which is implemented by the separation of church and state, to join us in condemning this unconstitutional entanglement of a particular church with the American state and in demanding its prompt abrogation.

FOR PUBLIC OPINION CAMPAIGN

Protestants and Other Americans United proposes to carry on a campaign of enlightenment and mobilization of public opinion throughout the Nation until the vital issue which has been raised by these violations and the threat of further violations has been decided by the voice of the people.

The Americanism of the people's representatives in the various branches of Government must be stiffened against the promptings of sentimentalism or the low dictates of political advantage to resist the aggressive activities of those who would subvert the Constitution to their own sectarian interest.

The issue has now become tense in many States and many local communities. In some communities a church-dominated school board has taken parochial schools into the public-school system, with the result that bitter conflict and disorder have ensued, causing shame and disrepute to the whole community.

Such spectacles afford a preview of the situation in which the entire Nation will find itself if these encroachments upon the public school system spread. This is the kind of situation which the founders of the Republic sought to preclude by clear constitutional provision for the separation of church and state.

The free churches of America have been slow in recognizing the gravity of the situation that was developing before their eyes. But they can no longer ignore the fact that their own religious liberty is in peril. Their disposition is such that they desire to have the most friendly and cooperative relations in the areas of social service and personal fellowship with all. They deplore every breach of the democratic amenities that should obtain among churches whose common right to be here is guaranteed by our Constitution.

The enlightened leadership of protestantism has repudiated, and mobilized public

opinion to suppress, one after another of the weird manifestations of religious hatred that have emerged during the past two generations.

SAYS ITS AIM IS TO BAN HATRED

Protestant churches and all free churches are, therefore, reluctant to engage in any overt movement which can be interpreted by hostile critics as a revival of religious intolerance. To impute any such animus to the organization for which we speak is to fortify its spirit and purposes. Its aim is absolutely the opposite. Its purpose is to preclude the resurgence of this evil spirit of intolerance in our body politic.

It sees clearly that unless the actual violations of the principle of separation of church and state are redressed and the threat of further violations removed, the peaceful and friendly relations between the ecclesiastical beneficiary of these violations and the other churches of the land will be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain.

Our controversy is not with any church, Roman Catholic or any other. Our controversy is with those law makers and law administrators who would yield to the demand of any church for a relation to the state which the Constitution forbids.

The effect of the first amendment is to invest the makers and administrators of our laws with the ultimate guardianship of religious liberty and religious tolerance. If they maintain unimpaired the principle of separation of church and state, the churches can continue, as they have done since the founding of this Republic, to live together and face their differences with mutual respect and comity in the open forum of freedom where the rules are tolerance, persuasion, argument, and example.

But if the makers and administrators of our laws allow this principle to be nullified or undermined, upon them will rest the responsibility for lighting the fires of shameful religious resentment and conflict that will inevitably ensue.

WOULD UNITE OPPOSITION

Protestants and Other Americans United has emerged in recognition of the fact that all non-Roman churches, of all faiths, are profoundly concerned over the present threat to religious liberty. Most, if not all of the free churches, have spoken out in official resolutions in condemnation of the current violations of the principle of separation of church and state. But this common concern has need of implementation through a common agency. Though this agency has not been officially created by the churches, we believe it will receive their moral support from its beginning and that their official support will be forthcoming when their conventions or judicatories are in position to take action.

The representative character of those who have been prompted to form this organization will, we believe, commend it to all churches and synagogues as their own instrument for this purpose. Through it, the patriotic and religious citizens throughout the Nation, including those not commonly called Protestant, will be able to bring to bear their prompt and concerted resistance to the encroachments which they condemn with strong words in their resolutions.

Protestants and Other Americans United by no means limits collaboration in this undertaking to Protestants, nor even to religious bodies. Quite the contrary. It bears the name "Protestant" only because the churches of that faith represent by far the largest body of citizens whose religious liberty is jeopardized by such aggressions as those cited above.

SPEARHEAD FOR MOVEMENT

Protestantism realistically accepts the responsibility of leadership inherent in its numerical preponderance, and offers itself as only the spearhead of a movement which embraces all Americans, whatever their faith may be It desires and believes that it will receive the cooperation of churches and citizens of all faiths who cherish the religious liberty of others no less than their own.

We therefore call upon all patriotic citizens who profess the faith of Judaism and who sense the peril to the religious liberty they have uniquely enjoyed under the American Constitution, to join in the announced purposes and activities of this organization, and to accept representation in it.

Similarly, all groups known as fraternal orders, and all citizens who, though professing no church allegiance, believe in the American system of separation of church and state, are invited to join with a united Protestanism which is sinking its own differences in a common effort to make sure that legislatures and executives and courts shall defend the constitutional guaranty of religious liberty against all attempts to subvert it.

We have no doubt that there are many Roman Catholic citizens whose patriotic loyalty to American ideals is sound, intelligent and sincere. These also are invited to join with their fellow Americans in maintaining this vital principle of American democracy.

In this endeavor, we count especially upon the participation of the great body of educators throughout the Nation, regardless of their religious affiliations, whose noble profession will be stultified by further encroachments upon the public school system or by the complacent acceptance of those already in force.

The teaching profession perceives, perhaps more clearly than others, the evil social consequences in the permanent fissioning of American culture which will result from state support of church-controlled education.

FAR-FLUNG DRIVE IS PLANNED

Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State proposes to acquaint the representatives of government, all the way up from the local community through the States to Congress, the Supreme Court and the White House, with the fact that an overwhelming body of public opinion, led by the whole of protestantism, is united in a common purpose to achieve the above objectives, and thus to assure the preservation of the cultural and religious democracy bequeathed by the fathers against any act of Government "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Protestants and Other Americans United plans to cover the Nation by extending its organization into every State, and to bring to the support of each State organization the full strength of the national body in any situation that may arise or in any campaign that may be waged in behalf of our common objectives.

Money in generous amounts will be needed to carry on this Nation-wide undertaking. At least $100,000 should be made available at once.

The treasurer, E. H. De Groot, Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., is now prepared to receive contributions which will provide a headquarters and enable far-flung activities to begin. Checks may be made payable to Protestants and Other Americans United.

On behalf of the officers and national board of advisers of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State. Signed by the committee:

John A. Mackay, president, Princeton Theological Seminary.

Edwin McNeill Poteat, president, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

G. Bromley Oxnam, Bishop of the Methodist Church, New York area, New York City.

Louie D. Newton, president, Southern Baptist Convention.

Charles Clayton Morrison, former editor, the Christian Century.

Same Old Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer for the Abilene Reporter-News, Abilene, Tex., is one of the best.

In the editorial which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, is found the trigger key to the general welfare of this Nation. In my humble opinion it is a masterful presentation and I believe it will be of real interest to the people of this country.

Incidentally, this is the first written material which I have ever placed in the RECORD and it is indicative of my deep appreciation of this article.

The editorial follows:

SAME OLD STORY

There is a term in psychology, the name of which escapes us for the moment, to describe a feeling that everyone has at some time or other—the feeling that you are living again in a moment you have previously experienced. "I have been here before," you feel. "This is where I came in."

Millions of Americans must be having that feeling today, reliving moments they experienced in 1938. Hitler and Mussolini were on the loose, and in the Congress of the United States little men argued and bickered over taking necessary steps to protect this Nation in case war overspread the world. The War Department asked for 5,000 planes and got 500. The Navy asked for improvements to the harbor of Guam and was rebuked for its implied insult to Japan.

We are reliving those moments now. All the responsible agencies of Government, warning of things to come, have united in asking for funds to keep Europe on its feet, so that we won't be without friends when the storm breaks.

The Senate is arguing the bill now. It may be able to pass some sort of measure by April 1, and it may not. The request of the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by an able Republican statesman, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, was considerably toned down before the bill ever reached the Senate. It will be reduced still more by the time the revisionists—called isolationists 10 years ago—get through with it.

Once the Senate's work is done the House must take it up. There will be further delays, further reductions, in that branch. Then the two bills must be brought into harmony and passed finally by both Houses.

All this is being done with a leisureliness that is astounding and frightening, as if the need for haste did not exist, as if we were living back in the good old days when we had no foreign relations to speak of. It is being done while Russia makes haste to see that its evil purposes are achieved before a molasses-slow United States Congress finally makes up its mind to do something.

Yes; we have been this way before. It is familiar territory. The 40,000,000 dead of World War II, if they could speak, might well say, "Let us move over and make room for 100,000,000 more. They will be along presently."

Talk, talk, talk; argue, bargain, and backscratch; swap, barter, and double-cross; disagree, recriminate, and logroll. There's an election coming up and a wrong guess might cost votes, so let's do nothing as long as we can.

Stall, proscrastinate, and turn aside; beef, bellyache, and roar—for dollars are at stake and profits are threatened.

Let's have ourselves a high old time, while three-quarters of the earth's inhabitants live on half or quarter rations. Me and my wife, our son John and his wife, us four and no more.

Go 'way, Mr. Noah; we don't think it's going to rain much anyhow.

"There was a sound of revelry by night * * * the lights shone o'er fair women and brave men * * * music arose with its voluptuous swell * * * but hush; hark; a deep sound strikes like a rising knell * * * did ye not hear it? No; 'twas but the wind * * * on with the dance; let joy be unconfined."

Alabama Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them by the laws of the great State of Alabama.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws as compiled by Robert L. Deal, department commander of the Disabled American Veterans, 3318 Seventeenth Avenue, North, Birmingham, Ala., who will be happy to furnish more specific information as to the application of any such State law:

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney for members of the armed forces, as well as removal of fiduciaries from office during military service.

Wills of persons, executed while in the armed forces, may be admitted to probate.

Disability of minority is removed for all qualified veterans (and their spouses) under the GI bill of rights.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Registration and voting privileges are extended to persons in the armed forces or those discharged therefrom.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

It is the duty of the State service commissioner and his assistants to aid veterans, their relatives, beneficiaries, and dependents with claims against the United States for benefits. The State board of veterans' affairs in the State department of veterans' affairs is authorized to appoint county and district service commissioners.

The adjutant general is authorized to assist all persons residing in Alabama, or other States, having claims against Alabama or the United States for compensation, pension, bounty, back pay, medals, etc., where such claims have arisen out of, or by reason of, service in any of the wars or insurrections concerning the United States or the State of Alabama.

The State service commissioner is authorized to administer oaths in connection with claims for benefits.

Free copies of public records for wards of the Veterans' Administration, under the Uniform Guardianship Act, may be obtained. The State service commissioner is authorized to certify to the correctness of documents in connection with claims for benefits.

Honorable discharges are recorded free of charge by probate judges.

Persons remarried subsequent to divorce are declared valid, notwithstanding divorce decree did not specifically confer on such person the right to remarry.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS, QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Credits may be allowed toward degrees in certain State institutions for subjects taken at accredited out-of-State colleges while serving in the armed forces.

Rehabilitation courses are acceptable as educational requirement of disabled veterans making application for a certificate to practice architecture.

Appropriation has been made for establishment and operation of five additional trade schools.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid has been extended for children of soldiers, sailors, or marines who died while serving in the armed forces or as a result thereof from April 6, 1917 to July 2, 1921, in the amount of $150 maximum for a child per year. An appropriation of $2,400 was made for the fiscal year ending October 1, 1931, and annually through 1942 free tuition was granted in State institutions of secondary or college grade.

Provision has been made for accepting and administering any scholarship fund of $1,250 donated by the American Legion or American Legion Auxiliary, such scholarships to be established in certain State institutions.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leaves of absence are granted State employees in the classified service who enter the armed forces, with preservation of status and reinstatement after termination of such service.

Leaves of absence are granted to teachers who enter the armed forces.

No vacancies may be filled in State, county, and municipal offices which occurred by reason of the absence of incumbents in active service in the armed forces in time of war, with preservation of rights and privileges as to reemployment.

Preference is granted in State civil-service examinations to veterans, their wives, or widows. In case of reduction in force they are the last to be dismissed.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Teachers' Retirement System and the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Provision has been made for the payment of $500 to the widow, minor child, or mother upon death of a member of the police or fire departments who are serving actively in the armed forces.

A second injury trust fund has been established for the benefit of physically handicapped persons who suffer second injuries in the nature of permanent total disability.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian for an incompetent veteran or minor child of a veteran to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

A home is provided for the care of Confederate veterans, their wives and widows.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

PENSIONS

Old-age assistance is extended to Confedate pensioners.

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans and their widows.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, ETC.

Resident World War II veterans are entitled to an exemption of $35 on business or occupational license taxes for a period of 6 years after October 13, 1947, or 6 years after date of discharge.

Tobacco products for use of members of the armed services are exempt from tax.

War-risk insurance, compensation, or pension received by disabled veterans is exempt from income tax.

Veterans who are 25 percent or more disabled are exempt from business or occupational license fees in the amount of $25.

All persons in the armed forces and honorably discharged veterans of World Wars I and II are exempt from payment of all poll taxes accrued or which may accrue.

Professional engineers and land surveyors serving actively in the armed forces are exempt from the required annual renewal of certificates of registration.

No corporate franchise shall be forfeited for nonuse if any of the managing officers of such corporation are serving in the armed forces and provided the corporation has paid all its franchise and other State taxes.

Certificates of registration for architects may be renewed following discharge from the armed forces.

A $2,000 property tax exemption is granted to certain incompetent veterans.

Property of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars is exempt from taxation.

Any disabled World War II veteran to whom a motor vehicle has been issued by the United States is entitled to all license fees and ad valorem taxes on such vehicle for private use.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veteran organizations has been declared a misdemeanor.

Armory privileges are extended to various veteran organizations.

The sum of $1,000 per year is provided for the annual encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Alabama.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the Alabama Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

Most of the 18 DAV chapters in the State maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains four full-time national service officers, under the direction of Wallace I. Reid, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, 400 Lee Street, Montgomery 4, Ala. These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's war-disabled veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation, Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942, active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed

forces of the United States or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before Jan. 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

The national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The National Service Headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the Department of Claims, headed by William E. Tate; the Department on Legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the Department of Public Relations and Employment, headed by my old friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments the DAV Service Headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV National Service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a National-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities are matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turnover record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

I am personally proud to be a life member of the DAV and I urge all other war wounded and disabled veterans to become active members of this service-giving outfit. I am sure the program of the DAV merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

The Race Problem in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Henry W. Grady:

Mr. President, bidden by your invitation to a discussion of the race problem, forbidden by occasion to make a political speech, I appreciate in trying to reconcile orders with propriety the predicament of the little maid who, bidden to learn to swim, was yet adjured, "Now, go, my darling; hang your clothes on a hickory limb, and don't go near the water."

The stoutest apostle of the church, they say, is the missionary, and the missionary, wherever he unfurls his flag, will never find himself in deeper need of unction and address than I, bidden tonight to plant the standard of a Southern Democrat in Boston's banquet hall and discuss the problem of the races in the home of Phillips and of Sumner. But, Mr. President, if a purpose to speak in perfect frankness and sincerity, if earnest understanding of the vast interests involved, if a consecrating sense of what disaster may follow further misunderstanding and estrangement, if these may be counted to steady undisciplined speech and to strengthen an untried arm, then, sir, I find the courage to proceed.

Happy am I that this mission has brought my feet at last to press New England's historic soil and my eyes to the knowledge of her beauty and her thrift. Here, within touch of Plymouth Rock and Bunker Hill, where Webster thundered and Longfellow sang, Emerson thought and Channing preached, here in the cradle of American letters, and almost of American liberty, I hasten to make the obeisance that every American owes New England when first he stands uncovered in her mighty presence. Strange apparition! This stern and unique figure, carved from the ocean and the wilderness, its majesty kindling and growing amid the storms of winters and of wars, until at last the gloom was broken, its beauty disclosed in the sunshine, and the heroic workers rested at its base, while startled kings and emperors gazed and marveled that from the rude touch of this handful, cast on a bleak and unknown shore, should have come the embodied genius of human government and the perfected model of human liberty. God bless the memory of those immortal workers and prosper the fortunes of their living sons and perpetuate the inspirations of their handiwork.

Two years ago, sir, I spoke some words in New York that caught the attention of the North. As I stand here to reiterate, as I have done everywhere, every word I then uttered—to declare that the sentiments I then avowed were universally approved in the South—I realize that the confidence begotten by that speech is largely responsible for my presence here tonight. I should dishonor myself if I betrayed that confidence by uttering one insincere word or by withholding

one essential element of the truth. Apropos of this last, let me confess, Mr. President—before the praise of New England has died on my lips—that I believe the best product of her present life is the procession of 17,000 Vermont Democrats that for 22 years, undiminished by death, unrecruited by birth or conversion, have marched over their rugged hills, cast their Democratic ballots, and gone back home to play for their unregenerate neighbors, and awake to read the record of 25,000 Republican majority. May the God of the helpless and the heroic help them—and may their sturdy tribe increase!

Far to the south, Mr. President, separated from this section by a line, once defined in irrepressible difference, once traced in fratricidal blood, and now, thank God, but a vanishing shadow, lies the fairest and richest domain of this earth. It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. There is centered all that can please or prosper humankind. A perfect climate above a fertile soil yields to the husbandman every product of the temperate zone. There, by night the cotton whitens beneath the stars, and by day the wheat locks the sunshine in its bearded sheaf. In the same field the clover steals the fragrance of the wind, and the tobacco catches the quick aroma of the rains. There, are mountains stored with exhaustless treasures; forests vast and primeval; and rivers that, tumbling or loitering, run wanton to the sea. Of the three essential items of all industries—cotton, iron, and wood—that region has easy control. In cotton, a fixed monopoly; in iron, proven supremacy; in timber, the reserve supply of the Republic. From this assured and permanent advantage, against which artificial conditions cannot much longer prevail, has grown an amazing system of industries. Not maintained by human contrivance of tariff or capital, afar off from the fullest and cheapest source of supply, but resting in Divine assurance, within touch of field and mine and forest; not set amid costly farms from which competition has driven the farmer in despair, but amid cheap and sunny lands, rich with agriculture, to which neither season nor soil has set a limit—this system of industries is mounting to a splendor that shall dazzle and illumine the world.

That, sir, is the picture and the promise of my home—a land better and fairer than I have told you, and yet but fit setting, in its material excellence, for the loyal and gentle quality of its citizenship. Against that, sir, we have New England, recruiting the Republic from its sturdy loins, shaking from its overcrowded hives new swarms of workers and touching this land all over with its energy and its courage. And yet, while in the El Dorado of which I have told you, but 15 percent of lands are cultivated, its mines scarcely touched and its population so scant that, were it set equidistant, the sound of the human voice could not be heard from Virginia to Texas; while on the threshold of nearly every house in New England stands a son, seeking with troubled eyes some new land to which to carry his modest patrimony, the strange fact remains that in 1880 the South had fewer northern-born citizens than she had in 1870—fewer in 1870 than in 1860. Why is this? Why is it, sir, though the sectional line be now but a mist that the breath may dispel, fewer men of the North have crossed it over to the South than when it was crimson with the best blood of the Republic, or even when the slaveholder stood guard every inch of its way?

There can be but one answer. It is the very problem we are now to consider. The key that opens that problem will unlock to the world the fairer half of this Republic, and free the halted feet of thousands whose eyes are already kindled with its beauty. Better than this, it will open the hearts of brothers for 30 years estranged, and clasp in lasting comradeship a million hands now withheld in doubt. Nothing, sir, but this problem, and the suspicions it breeds, hinders a clear understanding and a perfect union. Nothing else stands between us and such love as bound Georgia and Massachusetts at Valley Forge and Yorktown, chastened by the sacrifices of Manassas and Gettysburg, and illumined with the coming of better work and a nobler destiny than was ever wrought with the sword or sought at the cannon's mouth.

If this does not invite your patient hearing tonight, hear one thing more. My people, your brothers in the South—brothers in blood, in destiny, in all that is best in our past and future—are so beset with this problem that their very existence depends upon its right solution. Nor are they wholly to blame for its presence. The slave ships of the Republic sailed from your ports, the slaves worked in our fields. You will not defend the traffic, nor I the institution. But I do hereby declare that in its wise and humane administration, in lifting the slave to heights of which he had not dreamed in his savage home, and giving him a happiness he has not yet found in freedom, our fathers left their sons a saving and excellent heritage. In the storm of war this institution was lost. I thank God as heartily as you do that human slavery is gone forever from the American soil.

But the freed man remains—with him a problem without precedent or parallel. Note its appalling conditions. Two utterly dissimilar races on the same soil, with equal political and civil rights, almost equal in numbers, but terribly unequal in intelligence and responsibility, each pledged against fusion, one for a century in servitude to the other, and freed at last by a desolating war, the experiment sought by neither, but approached by both with doubt—these are the conditions. Under these, adverse at every point, we are required to carry these two races in peace and honor to the end. Never, sir, has such a task been given to mortal stewardship. Never before in this Republic has the white race divided on the right of an alien race. The red man was cut down as a weed, because he hindered the way of the American citizen. The yellow man was shut out of this Republic because he is an alien and inferior. The red man was owner of the land, the yellow man highly civilized and assimilable, but they hindered both sections—and are gone.

But the black man, affecting but one section, is clothed with every privilege of government and pinned to the soil, and my people commanded to make good at any hazard and at any cost, his full and equal heirship of American privilege and prosperity. It matters not that wherever the whites and blacks have touched, in any era or any clime, there has been irreconcilable violence. It matters not that no two races however similar, have lived anywhere at any time on the same soil with equal rights in peace. In spite of these things we are commanded to make good this change of American policy which has not perhaps changed American prejudice—to make certain here what has elsewhere been impossible between whites and blacks—and to reverse, under the very worst conditions, the universal verdict of racial history. And driven, sir, to this superhuman task with an impatience that brooks no delay, a rigor that accepts no excuse, and a suspicion that discourages frankness and sincerity. We do not shrink from this trial. It is so interwoven with our industrial fabric that we cannot disentangle it if we would—so bound up in our honorable obligation to the world that we would not if we could. Can we solve it? The God who gave it into our hands, He alone can know. But this the weakest and wisest of us do know: We cannot solve it with less than your tolerant and patient sympathy—with less than the knowledge that the blood that runs in your veins is our blood, and that when we have done our best, whether the issue be lost or won, we shall feel your strong arms about us and hear the beating of your approving hearts.

The resolute, clear-headed, broad-minded men of the South, the men whose genius made glorious every page of the first 70 years of American history, whose courage and fortitude you tested in 5 years of the fiercest war, whose energy has made bricks without straw and spread splendor amid the ashes of their war-wasted homes—these men wear this problem in their hearts and their brains, by day and by night. They realize, as you cannot, what this problem means—what they owe to this kindly and dependent race—the measure of their debt to the world in whose despite they defended and maintained slavery. And though their feet are hindered in its undergrowth and their march encumbered with its burdens, they have lost neither the patience from which comes clearness nor the faith from which comes courage. Nor, Sir, when in passionate moments is disclosed to them that vague and awful shadow, with its lurid abysses and its crimson stains, into which I pray God they may never go, are they struck with more of apprehension than is needed to complete their consecration.

Such is the temper of my people. But what of the problem itself? Mr. President, we need not go one step further unless you concede right here the people I speak for are as honest, as sensible, and as just as your people, seeking as earnestly as you would in their place, rightly to solve the problem that touches them at every vital point. If you insist that they are ruffians, blindly striving with bludgeon and shotgun to plunder and oppress a race, then I shall sacrifice my self-respect and tax your patience in vain. But admit that they are men of common sense and common honesty, wisely modifying an environment they cannot wholly disregard, guiding and controlling as best they can the vicious and irresponsible of either race, compensating error with frankness and retrieving in patience what they lose in passion, and conscious all the time that wrong means ruin—admit this, and we may reach an understanding tonight.

The President of the United States in his late message to Congress, discussing the plea that the South should be left to solve this problem, asks: "Are they at work upon it? What solution do they offer? When will the black man cast a free ballot? When will he have the civil rights that are his?" I shall not here protest against the partisanry that, for the first time in our history in time of peace, has stamped with the great seal of our Government a stigma upon the people of a great and loyal section, though I gratefully remember that the great dead soldier, who held the helm of state for the 8 stormy years of reconstruction, never found need for such a step, and though there is no personal sacrifice I would not make to remove this cruel and unjust imputation on my people from the archives of my country.

But, sir, backed by a record on every page of which is progress, I venture to make earnest and respectful answer to the questions that are asked. I bespeak your patience, while with vigorous plainness of speech, seeking your judgment rather than your applause, I proceed step by step. We give to the world this year a crop of 7,500,000 bales of cotton, worth $450,000,000, and its cash equivalent in grain, grasses, and fruit. This enormous crop would not have come from the hands of sullen and discontented labor. It comes from peaceful fields, in which laughter and gossip rise above the hum of industry, and contentment runs with the singing plow.

It is claimed that this ignorant labor is defrauded of its just hire. I present the tax books of Georgia, which show that the Negro, 25 years ago a slave, has in Georgia alone $10,000,000 of assessed property, worth twice that much. Does not that record honor him and vindicate his neighbors? What people, penniless, illiterate, has done

so well? For every Afro-American agitator, stirring the strife in which alone he prospers, I can show you a thousand Negroes, happy in their cabin homes, tilling their own land by day, and at night taking from the lips of their children the helpful message their State sends them from the schoolhouse door. And the schoolhouse itself bears testimony. In Georgia we added last year $250,000 to the school fund, making a total of more than $1,000,000—and this in the face of prejudice not yet conquered and of the fact that the whites are assessed for $368,000,000, the blacks for $10,000,000, and yet 49 percent of the beneficiaries are black children—and in the doubt of many wise men if education helps, or can help, our problem. Charleston, with her taxable values cut half in two since 1860, pays more in proportion for public schools than Boston. Although it is easier to give much out of much than little out of little, the South with one-seventh of the taxable property of the country, with relatively larger debt, having received only one-twelfth as much public land, and having back of its tax books none of the half billion of bonds that enrich the North, and though it pays annually $26,000,000 to your section as pensions, yet gives nearly one-sixth of the public-school fund. The South since 1865 has spent $122,000,000 in education, and this year is pledged to $37,000,000 for State and city schools, although the blacks, paying one-thirtieth of the taxes, get nearly one-half of the fund.

Go into our fields and see whites and blacks working side by side, on our buildings in the same squad, in our shops at the same forge. Often the blacks crowd the whites from work, or lower wages because of greater need or simpler habits, and yet are permitted because we want to bar them from no avenue in which their feet are fitted to tread. They could not there be elected orators of the white universities, as they have been here, but they do enter there a hundred useful trades that are closed against them here. We hold it better and wiser to tend the weeds in the garden than to water the exotic in the window. In the South, there are Negro lawyers, teachers, editors, dentists, doctors, preachers, multiplying with the increasing ability of their race to support them. In villages and towns they have their military companies equipped from the armories of the State, their churches and societies built and supported largely by their neighbors. What is the testimony of the courts? In penal legislation we have steadily reduced felonies to misdemeanors, and have led the world in mitigating punishment for crime, that we might save, as far as possible, this dependent race from its own weakness. In our penitentiary record, 60 percent of the prosecutors are Negroes, and in every court the Negro criminal strikes the colored juror, that white men may judge his case. In the North one Negro in every 466 is in jail; in the South only 1 in 1,865. In the North the percentage of Negro prisoners is six times as great as native whites; in the South only four times as great. If prejudice wrongs him in southern courts, the record shows it to be deeper in northern courts.

I assert here, and a bar as intelligent and upright as the bar of Massachusetts will solemnly indorse my assertion, that in the southern courts, from highest to lowest, pleading for life, liberty, or property, the Negro has distinct advantage because he is a Negro, apt to be overreached, oppressed; and that this advantage reaches from the juror in making his verdict to the judge in measuring his sentence. Now, Mr. President, can it be seriously maintained that we are terrorizing the people from whose willing hands come every year $1,000,000,000 of farm crops? or have robbed a people, who 25 years from unrewarded slavery have amassed in one State $20,000,000 of property? or that we intend to oppress the people who are arming every day? or deceive them when we are educating them to the utmost limit of our ability? or outlaw them when we work side by side with them? or reenslave them under legal forms when for their benefit we have even imprudently narrowed the limit of felonies and mitigated the severity of law? My fellow countrymen, as you yourself may sometimes have to appeal to the bar of human judgment for justice and for right, give to my people tonight the fair and unanswerable conclusion of these incontestable facts.

But it is claimed that under this fair seeming there is disorder and violence. This I admit. And there will be until there is one ideal community on earth after which we may pattern. But how widely it is misjudged. It is hard to measure with exactness whatever touches the Negro. His helplessness, his isolation, his century of servitude, these dispose us to emphasize and magnify his wrongs. This disposition, inflamed by prejudice and partisanry, has led to injustice and delusion. Lawless men may ravage a county in Iowa and it is accepted as an incident—in the South a drunken row is declared to be the fixed habit of the community. Regulators may whip vagabonds in Indiana by platoons, and it scarcely arrests attention—a chance collision in the South among relatively the same classes is gravely accepted as evidence that one race is destroying the other. We might as well claim that the Union was ungrateful to the colored soldiers who followed its flag, because a Grand Army post in Connecticut closed its doors to a Negro veteran, as for you to give racial significance to every incident in the South or to accept exceptional grounds as the rule of our society. I am not one of those who becloud American honor with the parade of the outrages of either section, and belie American character by declaring them to be significant and representative. I prefer to maintain that they are neither, and stand for nothing but the passion and the sin of our poor fallen humanity. If society, like a machine, were no stronger than its weakest part, I should despair of both sections. But, knowing that society, sentient and responsible in every fiber, can mend and repair until the whole has the strength of the best, I despair of neither.

These gentlemen who come with me here, knit into Georgia's busy life as they are, never saw, I dare assert, an outrage committed on a Negro. And if they did, not one of you would be swifter to prevent or punish. It is through them, and the men who think with them—making nine-tenths of every southern community—that these two races have been carried thus far with less of violence than would have been possible anywhere else on earth. And in their fairness and courage and steadfastness, more than in all the laws that can be passed or all the bayonets that can be mustered, is the hope of our future.

When will the black cast a free ballot? When ignorance anywhere is not dominated by the will of the intelligent; when the laborer anywhere casts a vote unhindered by his boss; when the vote of the poor anywhere is not influenced by the power of the rich, when the strong and the steadfast do not everywhere control the suffrage of the weak and shiftless—then and not till then will the ballot of the Negro be free. The white people of the South are banded, Mr. President, not in prejudice against the blacks, not in sectional estrangement, not in the hope of political dominion, but in a deep and abiding necessity. Here is this vast ignorant and purchasable vote—clannish, credulous, impulsive, and passionate—tempting every art of the demagog, but insensible to the appeal of the statesman. Wrongly started, in that it was led into alienation from its neighbor and taught to rely on the protection of an outside force, it cannot be merged and lost in the two great parties through logical currents, for it lacks political conviction and even that information on which conviction must be based. It must remain a faction—strong enough in every community to control on the slightest division of the whites. Under that division it becomes the prey of the cunning and unscrupulous of both parties. Its credulity is imposed on, its patience inflamed, its cupidity tempted, its impulses misdirected, and even its superstition made to play its part in a campaign in which every interest of society is jeopardized and every approach to the ballot box debauched. It is against such campaigns as this, the folly and the bitterness and the danger of which every southern community has drunk deeply, that the white people of the South are banded together. Just as you in Massachusetts would be banded if 300,000 black men, not one in a hundred able to read his ballot, banded in a race instinct, holding against you the memory of a century of slavery, taught by your late conquerors to distrust and oppose you, had already travestied legislation from your Statehouse, and in every species of folly or villainy had wasted your substance and exhausted your credit.

But admitting the right of the whites to unite against this tremendous menace, we are challenged with the smallness of our vote. This has long been flippantly charged to be evidence, and has now been solemnly and officially declared to be proof of political turpitude and baseness on our part. Let us see. Virginia, a State now under fierce assault for this alleged crime, in 1888 cast 75 percent of her vote. Massachusetts, the State in which I speak, 60 percent of her vote. Was it suppression in Virginia and natural causes in Massachusett? Last month Virginia cast 69 percent of her vote, and Massachusetts, fighting in every district, cast only 49 percent of hers. If Virginia is condemned because 31 percent of her vote was silent, how shall this State escape in which 51 percent was dumb? Let us enlarge this comparison. The 16 Southern States in 1888 cast 67 percent of their total vote, the 6 New England States but 63 percent of theirs. By what fair rule shall the stigma be put upon one section, while the other escapes? A congressional election in New York last week, with the polling place within touch of every voter, brought out only 6,000 votes of 28,000—and the lack of opposition is assigned as the natural cause. In a district in my State, in which an opposition speech has not been heard in 10 years, and the polling places are miles apart—under the unfair reasoning of which my section has been a constant victim—the small vote is charged to be proof of forcible suppression. In Virginia an average majority of 10,000, under hopeless division of the minority, was raised to 40,000; in Iowa, in the same election, a majority of 32,000 was wiped out and an opposition majority of 8,000 was established. The change of 40,000 votes in Iowa is accepted as political revolution; in Virginia an increase of 30,000 on a safe majority is declared to be proof of political fraud. I charge these facts and figures home, Sir, to the heart and conscience of the American people, who will not assuredly see one section condemned for what another section is excused. If I can drive them through the prejudice of the partisan, and have them read and pondered at the fireside of the citizen, I will rest on the judgment there formed and the verdict there rendered.

It is deplorable, Sir, that in both sections a large percentage of the vote is not regularly cast, but more inexplicable that this should be so in New England than in the South. What invites the Negro to the ballot box? He knows that, of all men, it has promised him most and yielded him least. His first appeal to suffrage was the promise of "40 acres and a mule." His second, the threat that Democratic success meant his reenslavement. Both have proved false in his experience. He looked for a home, and he got the freedman's bank. He fought

under the promise of the loaf, and in victory was denied the crumbs. Discouraged and deceived, he has realized at last that his best friends are his neighbors, with whom his lot is cast, and whose prosperity is bound up in his, and that he has gained nothing in politics to compensate the loss of their confidence and sympathy that is at last his best and his enduring hope. And so, without leaders or organization—and lacking the resolute heroism of my party friends in Vermont that makes their hopeless march over the hills a high and inspiring pilgrimage—he shrewdly measures the occasional agitator, balances his little account with politics, touches up his mule and jogs down the furrow, letting the mad world jog as it will.

The Negro vote can never control in the South, and it would be well if partisans in the North would understand this. I have seen the white people of a State set about by black hosts until their fate seemed sealed. But, sir, some brave man, banding them together, would rise, as Elisha rose in beleaguered Samaria, and touching their eyes with faith, bid them look abroad to see the very air "filled with the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof." If there is any human force that cannot be withstood, it is the power of the banded intelligence and responsibility of a free community. Against it, numbers and corruption cannot prevail. It cannot be forbidden in the law or divorced in force. It is the inalienable right of every free community and the just and righteous safeguard against an ignorant or corrupt suffrage. It is on this, sir, that we rely in the South. Not the cowardly menace of mask or shotgun; but the peaceful majesty of intelligence and responsibility, massed and unified for the protection of its homes and the preservation of its liberty. That, sir, is our reliance and our hope, and against it all the powers of the earth shall not prevail. You may pass force bills, but they will not avail. You may surrender your own liberties to Federal election law; you may submit, in fear of a necessity that does not exist, that the very form of this Government may be changed; this old State that holds in its charter the boast that "it is a free and independent commonwealth"—it may deliver its election machinery into the hands of the Government it helped to create; but never, sir, will a single State of this Union, North or South, be delivered again to the control of an ignorant and inferior race. We wrested our State government from Negro supremacy when the Federal drumbeat rolled closer to the ballot box and Federal bayonets hedged it deeper about than will ever again be permitted in this free Government. But, sir, though the cannon of this Republic thundered in every voting district of the South, we still should find in the mercy of God the means and the courage to prevent its reestablishment.

I regret, sir, that my section, hindered with this problem, stands in seeming estrangement to the North. If, sir, any man will point out to me a path down which the white people of the South divided may walk in peace and honor, I will take that path though I take it alone—for at the end, and nowhere else, I fear, is to be found the full prosperity of my section and the full restoration of this Union. But, sir, if the Negro had not been enfranchised, the South would have been divided and the Republic united. What solution, then, can we offer for this problem? Time alone can disclose it to us. We simply report progress and ask your patience. If the problem be solved at all—and I firmly believe it will, though nowhere else has it been—it will be solved by the people most deeply bound in interest, most deeply pledged in honor to its solution. I had rather see my people render back this question rightly solved than to see them gather all the spoils over which faction has contended since Catiline conspired and Caesar fought.

Meantime we treat the Negro fairly, measuring to him justice in the fullness the strong should give to the weak, and leading him in the steadfast ways of citizenship that he may no longer be the prey of the unscrupulous and the sport of the thoughtless. We open to him every pursuit in which he can prosper, and seek to broaden his training and capacity. We seek to hold his confidence and friendship, and to pin him to the soil with ownership, that he may catch in the fire of his own hearthstone that sense of responsibility the shiftless can never know. And we gather him into that alliance of intelligence and responsibility that, though it now runs close to racial lines, welcomes the responsible and intelligent of any race. By this course, confirmed in our judgment and justified in the progress already made, we hope to progress slowly but surely to the end.

The love we feel for that race you cannot measure nor comprehend. As I attest it here, the spirit of my old black mammy from her home up there looks down to bless, and through the tumult of this night steals the sweet music of her croonings as 30 years ago she held me in her black arms and led me smiling into sleep. This scene vanishes as I speak, and I catch a vision of an old southern home, with its lofty pillars, and its white pigeons fluttering down through the golden air. I see women with strained and anxious faces and children alert yet helpless. I see night come down with its dangers and its apprehensions, and in a big homely room I feel on my tired head the touch of loving hands—now worn and wrinkled, but fairer to me yet than the hands of mortal woman, and stronger yet to lead me than the hands of mortal man—as they lay a mother's blessing there while at her knees, the truest altar I yet have found, I thank God that she is safe in her sanctuary, because her slaves, sentinel in the silent cabin or guard at her chamber door, put a black man's loyalty between her and danger.

I catch another vision. The crisis of battle—a soldier struck, staggering, fallen. I see a slave, scuffling through the smoke, winding his black arms about the fallen form, reckless of the hurtling death, bending his trusty face to catch the words that tremble on the stricken lips, so wrestling meantime with agony that he would lay down his life in his master's stead. I see him by the weary bedside, ministering with uncomplaining patience, praying with all his humble heart that God will lift his master up, until death comes in mercy and in honor to still the soldier's agony and seal the soldier's life. I see him by the open grave, mute, motionless, uncovered, suffering for the death of him who in life fought against his freedom. I see him when the mound is heaped and the great drama of that life is closed, turn away and with downcast eyes and uncertain step start out into new and strange fields, faltering, struggling, but moving on, until his shambling figure is lost in the light of this better and brighter day. And from the grave comes a voice saying: "Follow him! Put your arms about him in his need, even as he put his about me. Be his friend as he was mine." And out into this new world—strange to me as to him, dazzling, bewildering both—I follow! And may God forget my people when they forget him.

Whatever the future may hold for them, whether they plod along in the servitude from which they have never been lifted since the Cyrenian was laid hold upon by the Roman soldiers and made to bear the cross of the fainting Christ; whether they find homes again in Africa, and thus hasten the prophecy of the psalmist who said, "And suddenly Ethiopia shall hold out her hands unto God"; whether, forever dislocated and separated, they remain a weak people beset by stronger, and exist as the Turk, who lives in the jealousy rather than in the conscience of Europe; or whether in this miraculous republic they break through the caste of twenty centuries and, belying universal history, reach the full stature of citizenship, and in peace maintain it, we shall give them uttermost justice and abiding friendship. And whatever we do, into whatever seeming estrangement we may be driven, nothing shall disturb the love we bear this Republic, or mitigate our consecration to its service.

I stand here, Mr. President, to profess no new loyalty. When General Lee, whose heart was the temple of our hopes and whose arm was clothed with our strength, renewed his allegiance to the Government at Appomattox, he spoke from a heart too great to be false, and he spoke for every honest man from Maryland to Texas. From that day to this, Hamilcar has nowhere in the South sworn young Hannibal to hatred and vengeance, but everywhere to loyalty and to love. Witness the soldier standing at the base of a Confederate monument above the graves of his comrades, his empty sleeve tossing in the April wind, adjuring the young men about him to serve as honest and loyal citizens the Government against which their fathers fought. This message, delivered from that sacred presence, has gone home to the hearts of my fellows. And, sir, I declare here, if physical courage be always equal to human aspiration, that they would die, sir, if need be, to restore this Republic their fathers fought to dissolve.

Such, Mr. President, is this problem as we see it; such is the temper in which we approach it; such the progress made. What do we ask of you? First, patience; out of this alone can come perfect work. Second, confidence; in this alone can you judge fairly. Third, sympathy; in this you can help us best. Fourth, give us your sons as hostages. When you plant your capital in millions, send your sons that they may help know how true are our hearts and may help swell the Anglo-Saxon current until it can carry without danger this black infusion. Fifth, loyalty to the Republic—for there is sectionalism in loyalty as in estrangement. This hour little needs the loyalty that is loyal to one section and yet holds the other in enduring suspicion and estrangement. Give us the broad and perfect loyalty that loves and trusts Georgia alike with Massachusetts—that knows no South, no North, no East, no West; but endears with equal and patriotic love every foot of our soil, every State of our Union.

A mighty duty, sir, and a mighty inspiration impels every one of us tonight to lose in patriotic consecration whatever estranges, whatever divides. We, sir, are Americans, and we fight for human liberty. The uplifting force of the American idea is under every throne on earth. France, Brazil—these are our victories. To redeem the earth from kingcraft and oppression—this is our mission. And we shall not fail. God has sown in our soil the seed of his millennial harvest, and he will not lay the sickle to the ripening crop until his full and perfect day has come. Our history, sir, has been a constant and expanding miracle from Plymouth Rock and Jamestown all the way—aye, even from the hour when, from the voiceless and trackless ocean, a new world rose to the sight of the inspired sailor. As we approach the fourth centennial of that stupendous day, when the old world will come to marvel and to learn, amid our gathered treasures, let us resolve to crown the miracles of our past with the spectacle of a Republic compact, united, indissoluble in the bonds of love, loving from the Lakes to the Gulf, the wounds of war healed in every heart as on every hill, serene, and resplendent at the summit of human achievement and earthly glory, blazing out the path, and making clear the way up which all the nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time.

Government Is a Billion-Dollar-a-Year Industry in the State of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes lose sight of the tremendous impact of Federal spending upon the economic life of our States. That impact was recently brought forcibly home by two Wisconsin organizations who are concerned about the future of local and State governments in this era of high governmental spending on the Federal level.

The first article I insert as part of my remarks is an excerpt from a recent radio broadcast sponsored by the Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance. It asks some pertinent questions concerning the impact of spending, and tax collection, by the Federal Government. The second article, with its accompanying table, shows the cost of the President's proposed budget to the people in the several counties of Wisconsin as compared with the State income-tax levy, and was issued by the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce.

TOTAL TAXES IN WISCONSIN

How many people know that Wisconsin has a billion-dollar industry? Yes, it has. That industry is government. Total taxes levied and collected in Wisconsin by all units of government in the 1947 fiscal year amounted to more than $1,000,000,000. Included in this billion-dollar figure are the collections in Wisconsin by the Federal, the State, and the local units of government. The 1947 fiscal year was the fourth year in a row that all governments in this State collected taxes amounting to more than a billion dollars.

In order to get some idea of what a billion dollars means to Wisconsin, let us make a comparison.

We usually think of the farms of Wisconsin as making up a very important part of our State activity. When we have the privilege of traveling about this great State, we see miles and miles of farm land. Dotting the landscape, we see the homes of these thousands of Wisconsin farmers and their families. We see the farm buildings, the great dairy barns, the silos, the tobacco sheds, the world-famous dairy herds.

According to the Wisconsin Crop and Livestock Reporter Wisconsin's gross farm income in 1946—the last year for which figures are available—amounted to just a little over $1,000,000,000. In other words, total Federal, State, and local taxes collected in Wisconsin amounted to about the same as the total gross farm income of this State. It would have taken approximately all the income of all the farmers in Wisconsin to pay Wisconsin's Federal, State, and local tax bill. Of course, other people besides farmers pay taxes. We have drawn this comparison only to give some idea of how important $1,000,000,000 in taxes is to Wisconsin.

Actually, total taxes in this State in 1947 were down a bit from the previous year. Although State and local taxes increased $29,000,000 in 1947, Federal taxes were $112,000,000 less.

Prior to the war years, State and local governments were the major tax collectors in Wisconsin. Now the Federal Government is two and one-third times as important a tax collector in Wisconsin as all the State and local units of government combined. If you want to be exact, Federal-tax collections in Wisconsin last year amounted to over $700,000,000, State and local collections fell just a little short of $300,000,000. With this shift in emphasis from State and local to Federal taxes, the income tax has risen in importance in the total tax picture. The income tax in 1947 took almost two out of every three dollars in Federal, State, and local taxes collected in this State. Here again, the Federal Government, with its high rates on individuals and corporations collected nearly 90 percent of all income taxes in the State.

The State of Wisconsin, with much lower rates on both individuals and corporations than the Federal Government, collected about 10 percent of all income taxes in Wisconsin. These figures were just recently compiled by the Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance.

They raise some very important questions for taxpayers, State legislators, county boards, city councils, and school boards throughout this State.

First of all, it should be obvious that a billion-dollar tax, taken in itself, presents a serious problem for Wisconsin agriculture, labor, industry, and commerce.

Second, high Federal taxes create serious revenue problems for State and local units of government. It is difficult for the State government, the counties, the municipalities, and schools to make tax adjustments against the tremendous pressure of high Federal taxes.

Third, both State and Federal Government expenditures are relying to a large degree upon income-tax yields. The figures indicate that expenditures are geared to high tax yields, which in turn depend upon extremely prosperous times, and to some degree on inflation. They indicate the need for careful study of the questions which will arise when these tax yields fall off.

WHAT PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BUDGET WOULD COST WISCONSIN TAXPAYERS

The budget submitted to Congress by President Truman January 12 calls for the expenditure by the Federal Government of $39,669,000,000 during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949. If enacted as recommended by the President, Wisconsin's share of the $39,669,000,000 proposed expenditures will approximate $892,552,500 on the basis of "income payments to the individuals" in 1946, they equaling 2.25 percent of the national total. To bring the Federal budget closer home to Wisconsin taxpayers, the approximate share to be borne by each county is shown below, the amount being arrived at by using figures showing the amount of normal income tax collected in each county in the year ending June 30, 1947, that being the best available basis.

County	State income tax		County share of proposed Federal expenditures in 1948–49
	Total 1947 collection in county	Percent of State total	
Adams	$12,531	0.02	$179,000
Ashland	141,126	.27	2,410,000
Barron	177,013	.34	3,035,000
Bayfield	42,852	.08	714,000
Brown	1,598,092	3.04	27,134,000
Buffalo	57,094	.11	982,000
Burnett	24,529	.05	446,000
Calumet	187,241	.36	3,213,000
Chippewa	340,942	.65	5,802,000
Clark	189,304	.36	3,213,000
Columbia	356,104	.68	6,069,000
Crawford	86,512	.16	1,428,000
Dane	2,510,052	4.77	42,574,000
Dodge	678,052	1.29	11,514,000
Door	218,223	.41	3,659,000
Douglas	448,111	.85	7,587,000
Dunn	168,681	.32	2,856,000
Eau Claire	$1,066,926	2.02	$18,030,000
Florence	12,614	.02	179,000
Fond du Lac	988,298	1.88	16,780,000
Forest	49,102	.08	803,000
Grant	280,340	.53	4,731,000
Green	308,000	.59	5,266,000
Green Lake	150,631	.29	2,588,000
Iowa	116,968	.22	1,964,000
Iron	72,692	.14	1,250,000
Jackson	60,379	.11	982,000
Jefferson	624,565	1.19	10,621,000
Juneau	70,198	.13	1,160,000
Kenosha	1,112,101	2.11	18,833,000
Kewaunee	126,473	.24	2,142,000
La Crosse	1,164,999	2.21	19,725,000
Lafayette	140,992	.27	2,410,000
Langlade	136,855	.26	2,321,000
Lincoln	253,452	.48	4,284,000
Manitowoc	1,322,636	2.51	22,403,000
Marathon	1,191,202	2.26	20,172,000
Marinette	295,254	.56	4,998,000
Marquette	18,349	.03	268,000
Milwaukee	21,011,155	39.91	356,218,000
Monroe	144,223	.27	2,410,000
Oconto	126,418	.24	2,142,000
Oneida	248,632	.47	4,195,000
Outagamie	1,351,771	2.57	22,939,000
Ozaukee	481,588	.91	8,122,000
Pepin	27,386	.05	446,000
Pierce	90,112	.17	1,517,000
Polk	119,555	.23	2,053,000
Portage	314,732	.60	5,355,000
Price	104,008	.20	1,785,000
Racine	2,392,065	4.54	40,522,000
Richland	92,276	.18	1,607,000
Rock	1,628,885	3.09	27,580,000
Rusk	96,081	.18	1,607,000
St. Croix	165,850	.32	2,856,000
Sauk	388,424	.74	6,605,000
Sawyer	24,212	.05	446,000
Shawano	157,626	.30	2,678,000
Sheboygan	1,442,571	2.74	24,456,000
Taylor	98,334	.19	1,696,000
Trempealeau	88,389	.17	1,517,000
Vernon	109,063	.21	1,874,000
Vilas	48,511	.09	803,000
Walworth	475,299	.90	8,033,000
Washburn	41,854	.08	714,000
Washington	438,213	.83	7,408,000
Waukesha	1,261,849	2.40	21,421,000
Waupaca	260,441	.49	4,374,000
Waushara	40,742	.08	714,000
Winnebago	1,666,396	3.17	28,294,000
Wood	909,057	1.73	15,441,000

Housing and Rent Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, an examination of the bill (S. 2182) now under consideration—this so-called Housing and Rent Act of 1948—indicates that the House Committee on Banking and Currency is neither interested in controlling rents nor checking inflation. If the committee really favored genuine rent control, it would have reported a sound bill instead of this weakened and anemic proposal. For it is obvious that this measure is not designed to control rents—its purpose is to relax and further weaken the few remaining controls over rental housing. The effect of its unworkable and watered-down provisions is to make a mockery and farce of rent control, and it is hypocritical to deceive the millions of tenant families into believing that it will protect them from further rent hikes.

The enactment of this law represents the last chapter of the tragedy whereby

the interests of consumers have been sacrificed on the altar of corporate and landlord profits. During the summer of 1946, a bipartisan coalition in Congress, acting upon the advice of the National Association of Manufacturers and other selfish lobby groups, scuttled the price control program. The result has been ever-increasing consumer prices—the cost of living has increased by over 30 percent during the last 18 months, and the price index for food has gone up by 55 points. Then Congress wrecked the rent control program last session when they adopted the emasculated Wolcott bill, and rents have increased by nearly 10 percent in the last year.

But the real-estate lobby is still not satisfied, and now the Congress finds itself considering this bill which is even weaker and more unworkable than last year's phony rent-control bill. I must admit that the committee has accomplished a miracle in devising a bill which is more objectionable than last year's emasculated rent law. However, the committee has succeeded in achieving the impossible. It has written a bill which makes a pretense of controlling rents while destroying every semblance of this type of control.

Regardless of the claims of the Republican leadership, the over-all effect of this measure is to increase rents on virtually all types of dwelling units. Its fraudulent nature becomes most obvious when one examines its major provisions, and considers their effect. After the enactment of last year's rent law, the only remaining control over scarce building materials in the Government's allocation and priority was the Housing Expediter's authority to limit amusement and recreational construction. This bill completes the wrecking-job performed on the Veterans' Emergency Housing Program by repealing this one control. This will mean that an ever-greater volume of building materials can be diverted to the construction of race tracks and night clubs rather than needed dwelling units to care for the 3,000,000 homeless families of Americans who are now living doubled up with friends and relatives.

The second objectionable feature of this bill is the so-called local-option amendment which permits local advisory boards to decontrol all housing units under their separate jurisdictions, or to grant blanket rent increases. The 1947 law required that such recommendations be approved by the Federal Rent Administrator, thus maintaining some uniformity of Federal rent policy.

Even with this safeguard, however, some 41 rental areas were decontrolled last year, and blanket rent increases were granted in a number of other areas. But S. 2182 strips the Federal Rent Administrator of all authority to prove or disprove the recommendations of local boards, and places final authority in the local advisory boards themselves. This local option amendment means, therefore, that the fate of the tenant is in the hands of local ex officio committees which are, in many communities, completely dominated by the real estate interests of the area. This grant of authority to local boards is accompanied by no standards relating to housing conditions or prevailing rent levels, which means general rent increases and relaxation of controls in many communities where real estate interests are in a position to dictate policy.

This bill also enlarges and extends the voluntary contract clause of last year's law to permit landlords to blackjack tenants, under duress or threat of eviction, into signing leases granting rent increases of 15 percent above the existing ceiling. In addition, all hotels, rooming houses, motor courts, tourist homes, trailers, trailer camps, and all new housing, are decontrolled under the provisions of this so-called rent control bill.

Finally, the enforcement provisions of this measure are completely unworkable. Although rental charges above the ceilings established in control areas are illegal under the law, no means of forcing compliance with the maximum rent ceilings is provided with the exception of court injunctions. No fines or other penalties are provided for violators of the law, and local boards have no power to file suits for recovery of overcharges. The only action permitted, even for recovery of overcharges, must be brought by the tenant himself.

In other words, landlords are free to violate the law with impunity, knowing that the only possible result in case of discovery will be a court order to repay all overcharges in rent. This lack of enforcement authority is an open invitation for violations and abuses of every description, and is enough to nullify any other merits that the bill may have.

To sum up, this measure now under consideration is wholly unsatisfactory, and is worthless as a means of holding the line on rents. It decontrols outright many types of housing now subject to rent ceilings, and opens the door to the decontrol of many areas by local boards. It will allow blanket rent increases by local action, and through leases containing 15 percent rent-increase clauses. Furthermore, all remaining rent regulations after enactment of this bill will be completely unenforceable due to lack of enforcement authority.

Mr. Speaker, this measure will mean higher rents to the 16,000,000 tenant families in America. It will mean sharp cuts in the living standards of 50,000,000 people, and it will encourage further inflation—the rent increases allowed by this bill are a shot in the arm for inflation. Inflation has already made great inroads in the purchasing power and the living standards of the common people. But the only answer offered by the Republican majority to the people's plight is this rent-control bill which will not control rents.

I condemn this betrayal of the consumer in favor of landlord profits. I urge the House to reject this bill, and instruct the House Committee on Banking and Currency to prepare and report a genuine rent-control bill to hold the line on rents. Otherwise, I must vote against this unsound and worthless proposal. I refuse to lend my support to this gigantic hoax which will legalize blanket rent increases for nearly one-half of the total population in the United States.

Palestine Partition—Quinn Resolution Adopted by New York State Legislature in Support of Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we do not know from day to day what the policies of the great powers are in Palestine, it is a solid comfort to know that the Legislature of the State of New York has rallied to the support of the Jewish National Home by adoption of the resolution introduced by the Honorable Elmer F. Quinn of New York City, the minority leader in the State senate.

Under consent, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of the Quinn resolution, which was adopted on February 10:

Senate Resolution 70

Whereas the United Nations has decreed that Palestine shall be partitioned into separate Arab and Jewish states; and

Whereas the Arab nations, in defiance of the decree of the United Nations, have refused to participate in negotiations preparatory or subsequent to the vote on the partition plan; and

Whereas the Arab nations have persistently followed a course of terror and violence designed to nullify and prevent the implementation of the United Nations Palestine decision; and

Whereas the Jews of the world, in a spirit of amity and compromise born of the suffering and persecution which they have endured through the ages, have gratefully accepted and agreed to be bound by the decision of the United Nations on Palestine, although it does not carry out promises made to them in the Balfour declaration; and

Whereas the public press carries daily accounts of unprovoked mass Arab raids and terroristic attacks against the Jewish people in Palestine and the toll of wounded and dead Jewish people continues to mount with unabating intensity; and

Whereas the Arab attacks on the Jews threaten to disturb the peace of the world and the Jewish people should be permitted, assisted, and encouraged to arm and defend themselves against such attacks; and

Whereas this Nation, through its embargo on arms and munitions destined for shipment to the Middle East, has prevented the Jews of Palestine from obtaining the weapons of defense sorely needed by them to resist and defend themselves against the attacks of the Arabs, while the Arabs continue to secure arms and munitions from neighboring Arab and other states; and

Whereas the Honorable William O'Dwyer has openly announced his opposition to the arms embargo and has urged the Government of the United States to cancel the same and to permit the immediate shipment of weapons and munitions to the embattled Jews of Palestine; and

Whereas the people of the State of New York are justifiably disturbed and alarmed over the plight of these defenseless Jews in Palestine and urgently implore the President and the State Department to cancel the arms embargo without further delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the President, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized

to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine who are defending the decision of the United Nations and make possible the immediate shipment of arms and munitions for the defense of the Jewish people of Palestine against the unprovoked acts of aggression and warfare of the Arabs; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk*.

In assembly, February 10, 1948. Concurred in without amendment.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, *Clerk*.

Postal Employees Need a Raise—Radio Address Over Station WJZ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of a radio address I gave last night over radio station WJZ in New York—key station of the American Broadcasting Co. network—in support of a salary increase for postal workers. I want to add that I think all Federal employees need and deserve an increase to maintain American standards in the face of the present high cost of living.

I wish to join with my colleague, Congressman POTTS, in supporting legislation to increase the salaries of our diligent postoffice employees. In discussing their problems with them in my district on the lower East Side of Manhattan, I frequently wonder how they stretch their dollars to cover the high cost of living today. Postal workers were always underpaid. How could they, then, rear a family in any semblance to American standards on their earnings?

It was my happy privilege in 1945 to vote for Public Law No. 134, which granted postal employees their first $400 permanent salary increase in twenty long years. Again, in 1946, to cope with the rising living costs, I voted for Public Law No. 386 for another $400 pay increase. Congress at that time felt those increases in salary would keep our postal people abreast of the times. But have those increases been sufficient? I say most emphatically, No.

With the abolition of price controls and despite the abundance of supply, the cost of living soars steadily month by month. The United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics—often referred to as the BLS—reported on January 1, 1946, the effective date of the last pay raise, that the cost-of-living index for the Nation stood at 129.9.

PRICES UP 58 PERCENT

As of January 15, 1948, just 2 years later, the BLS reports an increase in the over-all cost of living of 29.9 percent. Food prices for the same 2-year period skyrocketed by 48.3 percent.

I, therefore, maintain that our postal and Federal employees are entitled to a salary increase to keep abreast of today's living costs. Economies in Government expenditures must not be extracted from our postal workers in order to balance a budget. Their sacrifices are too numerous and personal to relate here on the difficulty of supporting a family on stationary salaries against runaway food and commodity prices.

To illustrate the hardship that exists, I submit the case of the average top-grade letter carrier with a maximum salary of $3,100 per year, a wife, and two children. His net take-home pay—after deducting for retirement and taxes—is $116.30. That has to last his family for 15 days. Can we then say we are proud of the high salaries paid to our public servants of whom we expect so much?

FORCED TO BORROW

Should it be necessary for a letter carrier, after carrying a heavy mail bag all day in every kind of weather, to have to seek a part-time job somewhere else, so that he can earn enough to augment his post office salary? Should it be necessary for the letter carrier's wife to leave her home daily to earn money with which to help support the family, in the event the husband is not physically able to perform after-hours work? Such conditions are most deplorable, to say the least.

Among the thousands of letters reaching my desk in asking for a salary increase are those relating the sacrifices being made in an effort to live on post office pay. All too often they are faced with no money in the family budget and pay day 5 days off. It means they have to borrow. Having to borrow before each pay day brings unhappiness to the homes of our faithful employees who took this life job on the security that it implied in working for the Government.

It is disgraceful that our employees should have to constantly borrow money and be in debt. Handling, as they do, such vitally important matters as our regular daily mail, we are obligated to assure their welfare; that those working for the Government are not to be considered as paupers, or objects of charity.

NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT SALARY RISE

I cannot refrain from quoting a paragraph from Paul Gallico's column in the New York Journal and American:

"Mailman, you know, cannot strike. He signs a piece of paper when he takes his job giving up that right. That's civil service. He gets certain other benefits in exchange, but he has no way of calling it forcibly to your attention that he needs more money to live on and needs it badly.

"Can you imagine the chaos if the Nation had to go a month, or a week, or even a couple of days without mail service? What a holler there would be. How you would kick and scream and yell and look into the matter of the wages of postal employees, and when you saw how little they were getting you would shout clear down to Washington for Congress to vote them a fair wage and end the strike."

Mr. Gallico hits the nail on the head. Is it not more than enough that our mailman carries heavy loads of mail without, in addition, carrying the never-ending burden of worry—to make ends meet? He should have a clear mind to devote to the proper execution of his duties as is necessary for efficient mail service.

Do you, as employers of the postal workers, consider it fair or good business to neglect to offer good wages to those who handle the world's greatest communications system?

TWENTY-FOUR MILLION LETTERS DAILY

To give you a picture of the magnitude of the postal service, do you know that the largest post office in the world, the New York post office, under the able management of Postmaster Albert Goldman, receives, delivers, and dispatches more than 24,000,000 letters daily; that 5,000 regular and substitute letter carriers bring your mail to your door or office every day with never-ending regularity; that letter carriers apply their skill to effecting delivery of some 66,000 letters received daily without street address; that 32,000 pieces of mail are given directory service to effect delivery to you, the public? Such efficiency must be compensated. We cannot hold good people in important Government jobs on niggardly wages.

President Truman said, when signing the Stevenson retirement bill on February 28: "This bill is one more forward step in strengthening of our Federal service, a step which brings an increased measure of protection and security to those who have chosen to devote their lives to the public service."

The Congress should take heed of the high standard set by the President by raising the salary levels of our hard-working postal employees. They must not be classed as the underprivileged.

Since the accredited BLS reports a 30 percent increase in the cost of living since January 1, 1946—the date of the last postal pay increase—Congress should vote a corresponding salary raise for our deserving postoffice personnel.

I was privileged to record my vote with the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of a $1,000 pay raise for our postal workers. They are too valuable to our daily lives to neglect them, or virtually compel them to resign in quest of a living wage. The House Post Office Committee is still holding hearings. A letter from you, the public, asking for a fair and just salary for postal workers, addressed to the House Post Office Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., will have a tremendous effect. It is your right and privilege to let your wishes be known, by indicating your support for the bill to increase the salaries $1,000 per year.

Observance of Thirtieth Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Independence of Lithuania on February 15, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD the resolution adopted by the Lithuanian-American Council of Societies in New York on February 15, when the thirtieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Lithuania was commemorated in special observances throughout the world.

RESOLUTION

Citizens of New York assembled February 15, 1948, at the Webster Hall in Manhattan to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Lithuania unanimously voted the following resolution:

"We petition the Government of the United States to reconsider its policies and obligations under the Atlantic Charter and other wartime policy declarations.

"It is our firm belief that, in view of the universal violation by Russia of all its international obligations undertaken jointly with the United States, this country should demand that Russia conform its policies to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and withdraw all Soviet forces from Lithuania, Latvia,

Estonia, Poland, and other occupied non-enemy countries.

"We are in full accord with the European recovery program. However, the program will never achieve intended effect as long as Russia holds in subjection European peoples east of the iron curtain, and this consideration demands an end to the secret deals of Yalta.

"We appeal to Members of Congress to enact legislation for effecting the European recovery program and to lift immigration bars in order to admit to this country our fair share of displaced persons from Europe on an equitable pro rata basis among the nationality groups in and out of camps.

"Finally, we express thanks to Governor Dewey and numerous United States Senators, Congressmen, and leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties for their statements dedicated to fulfillment of the aspirations of freedom by the people of Lithuania and other similarly situated peoples."

JOSEPH GLAVECKAS,
Chairman, President of the Lithuanian-American Council of Societies.

DANIEL AVERKA,
Secretary.

America Needs an Offensive Program Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned and alarmed about the expansion of Soviet influence in Europe and Asia. Americans and other free people want to do something about it but we lack a long-range program. The European recovery program and the Truman doctrine of aid to Greece and Turkey are in my opinion necessary measures which will help greatly but a policy for the future and a program looking to the years after the expiration of the European recovery program must be adopted. To those who are looking for a progressive and definite program to stop the encroachment of communism and to preserve peace, I recommend the reading of a feature article by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar of March 9, 1948, which is as follows:

TAKE THE OFFENSIVE AGAINST SOVIETS—(NOT WITH BOMB)

(By Edward J. Meeman)

The men of Moscow and their Communist agents in our part of the world have a purpose, a program, a goal. The purpose is world revolution. The method is to cause doubt, fear and confusion in free countries, to break down our political and economic system by sabotage, and after any country has been so weakened, to walk in with diplomatic or military conquest. The goal is a world government, directed from Moscow.

With what are we meeting this campaign? Do we have an equally definite purpose, program, and goal?

No, we remain on the defensive, though we learned in school that no war is won by a defensive. We allow the Red men to terrorize us with their cries. We do what they want us to do; we succumb to morbid fear, not the healthy fear that galvanizes man into bold action. We allow ourselves to be divided by heated controversies over questions among ourselves which are peanuts when compared with this big question whether the world is to be organized by freemen or by the masters of slaves. We have a program which does not look beyond tomorrow. We have no goal; we just hope that things will somehow turn out right.

Yet our way of life is better than theirs as light is better than darkness, as friendship is better than enmity, as bread is better than a stone. It is worthy of the enthusiasm, the devotion, the planning which the Communists give to their system of darkness, hatred, and hunger.

We cannot win with a moral defensive. We must take the moral offensive.

CHURCHILL'S OFFER

Just before France fell in World War II. Winston Churchill offered her complete union with the British Commonwealth with a common citizenship. It was too late, if it was not too little. But it is the key to the kind of thing we have to do if we are to win.

We need a great idea, a great purpose, a great program, a great goal.

We can find that in the great union—a federation of the countries of the British Commonwealth, western Europe, and the United States—a federation inside the United Nations.

The United Nations is a good thing, but it won't prevent war, or keep our freedom. It was founded when people were under the illusion that Russia would cooperate with the United States and Britain. Since she has shown that she will not, we must face the fact that while we should keep the United Nations, we must find another equally big idea to meet the great need the UN cannot meet. The idea is the great union of the democracies—the nations of western Europe, Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia, and the other nations of the British Commonwealth.

A military alliance between these nations, now proposed, is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. For any nation can walk out on a military alliance. But a permanent union will secure the safety of every member through a common foreign policy and joint defense forces.

POWER AT ITS BIRTH

The instant it is formed, such a union will have such overwhelming military strength that no aggressor would dare attack it. It will have all that it needs or wants, so that no other country need fear attack from it. It would have such vast resources as to make possible a wide area of a prosperity such as the world has never seen. That prosperity would be assured by mutual free trade between the parts—as there is free trade between the States of the United States—by a common citizenship; by a single currency; and by the vast industrial development that protection of law over a wide area would induce.

The United Nations, seeing aggression stopped by the impregnability of this great union, could go about its work of world-wide amelioration.

The inhibitions of our enlightened democracy, of our Christian conscience, will not permit us to drop the atom bomb on Moscow in a preventive war.

But our democractic enlightenment and Christian enthusiasm should impel us to do what we must do if we are to survive—unleash a great counter moral offensive to roll back the tide of communism.

We need an idea that will capture the imagination of the men of the Western World and light a torch that will give hope and inspiration to humanity in every land.

The great union is that idea. It is not too little—it is the most we can do even as it is the least that will guarantee our survival. Let it not come too late.

And any time but now will be too late.

Atheism Wins Over Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial appearing in the Pueblo Star-Journal, of Pueblo, Colo., entitled "Atheism Wins Over Religion." This editorial comments on the recent Supreme Court decision holding that the Bible could not be read in our public schools. I am sure this editorial expresses the sentiments of most American citizens. It follows:

ATHEISM WINS OVER RELIGION

The United States Supreme Court's ruling that any religious reading in the public schools is unconstitutional is certainly putting the Holy Bible in a glass cage, so far as education is concerned. Everyone in school can hereafter look at the Bible, but no one dare read it in school because it would allegedly mix up state and church.

We say "In God we trust," but for anyone to say anything about God in school and to read any passage out of the Bible is likely to offend an atheist or someone else, and therefore should not be done at all, according to the Supreme Court.

So far as atheism is concerned, it is our opinion that a disbeliever in religion is also a disbeliever in our form of government because the two were brought to this country together and the Government guaranteed religious freedom.

But atheism is not a religion and therefore one who is an atheist has nothing to gripe about or to protest when it comes to religious freedom.

The Supreme Court has already handed down rulings permitting the use of public funds for the subsidization of religious schools which are supported by private and church funds. It seems to us that there is great inconsistency in the two decisions. It seems right to use one person's money by taxation to assist in the teaching of another person's religious beliefs, but it is not all right to conduct a religious class in a public school because an atheist objects. Religion is what this country needs more of and if it is to be ignored in public schools, the vast majority of children may grow up without very much religion or faith.

There has never been any disposition that we know of to compel a Catholic student to attend a reading of the Protestant Bible, nor compel a Jewish person to attend any function where a Protestant Bible is read. As we understand it, Catholic students could read and hear Catholic Bibles, Jewish students could do the same, and so can Protestant students. So where is the harm, so long as each student is permitted to read and hear the Bible of his choice?

There is a vast difference between teaching that one's own concept of religious belief should exclude all other beliefs or variations of beliefs, and teaching that all religious beliefs are bona fide so far as each individual is concerned; and that each should be left to choose. But to arbitrarily claim

that all reference to any bible, the reading of any of its passages, or that the telling of any of its stories is contaminating to an atheist and therefore unconstitutional is certainly a far cry from the original conception of the separation of church and state, especially in a country which says "In God we trust."

Until such time as some people can learn that tolerance for religious views and customs is something which must work both ways we may expect there will be strife between certain religious elements.

So far as atheists are concerned, they are free to remain atheists; they are completely devoid of any religious beliefs and therefore have no grounds upon which to object to any use of the Bible in any public school. What America needs is more Bible reading and less atheism and less communism which disowns all religion.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer herewith for inclusion in the RECORD a reprint of a broadcast by veteran news commentator George E. Reedy, over Station WOL on Monday, March 15, 1948, which shows the thinking of some of our news commentators today on the subject of UMT and preparedness:

Events of the past few days have tossed out the window what was once a major issue before Congress. It is the highly controversial universal military training bill which President Truman had near the top of his legislative program.

Passage of the measure now would be merely a pious expression of hope that war is at least 5 or 10 years away. That is what the military experts were estimating a few months ago when they were pressing Congress for action.

Now they feel the Nation is confronted with a grave situation that might easily become a crisis. In the face of this the universal military training bill would be useless. It could not contribute to the country's defense.

Consequently a new concept is arising to take its place. It is the draft, which has been used in three of the wars fought by the United States. Only in this way, the military men argue, can an Army be raised in time for the possible crisis.

So far only one man has mentioned the word out loud and even he used the milder term, "selective service." He is former Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, who called for reenactment of conscription in a speech last Saturday.

Byrnes stressed that he was not basing his appeal on official information. But it is hard to forget that he is a close personal friend of President Truman. At the very least he would be sensitive to the President's thinking.

Officially there has been no indication of an administration desire for reenactment of selective service. Nevertheless the rumors are floating through Congress that it will come. Some of these rumors appear to have a foundation.

From a realistic standpoint some action will have to be taken to strengthen our Army in the near future. The United States is committed to resist Soviet aggression. That commitment is apparently meaningless unless we can back it up with force.

So far, we can argue that Russia hasn't tramped directly on any of our vital interests. We can say the countries she has swallowed have—by and large—been countries that historically were dominated by Russia anyway.

But basically we know those are only arguments to explain our conduct. For each Communist victory brought the Soviet Union within closer striking distance of the democracies of western Europe.

The fall of Czechoslovakia was the blow that made us realize our danger. The Czechs for centuries have been a freedom-loving people. They have had the sympathy of all Americans, in their gallant struggle for liberty.

Now the Communists are in a position to strike at Italy. Should they succeed the Mediterranean will become a closed lake. We will be barred from southern Europe and the Middle East—lands vital to our existence.

Italy is the point at which we must resist. We have little or no choice in the matter. If we are pushed out of that country it will be the same as being pushed out of Europe. The continent will then rapidly become a vast totalitarian state.

To make the necessary resistance, we must have an army. We cannot rely on what we will have a few years from now. We must bank on what can be put in the field at once. It is for that reason that selective service has once more become an issue.

As It Is in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Jackson Daily News, Jackson, Miss., of date of March 14, 1948:

AS IT IS IN NEW YORK

The attention of Senator IRVING IVES, Republican, New York, author of President Truman's South-hating legislation now pending in the Senate, is directed to the following article in the March 9 issue of the New York Journal and American, published in his home city:

"Violence and crime in a number of Harlem and Bronx schools reached a degree today that troubled police and worried officials of the board of education.

"Interracial fights, beatings of children and teachers, hold-ups, shake-downs, and arson were among the offenses reported.

"At one Harlem school, a small fire that was declared by the fire marshal to have been the work of teen-age pupils.

"Police of the Simpson Street station are still seeking the six Negro girls, aged 12 to 14, who last February 11 severely beat their gym teacher, Miss Kate Silverman, setting on her with rulers.

"The attack, in the fourth-floor gym of Public School 60, Stebbins Avenue and East One Hundred and Sixty-third Street, Bronx, was so sudden that Miss Silverman, after several days of convalescence, could not recognize the girls, or even be certain they were pupils of that school."

And that's just one of many incidents daily reported by the New York press showing the result of practicing social equality and breaking down the segregation barriers.

It goes to show that the New York Senator should do some cleaning in his own back yard before attempting to regulate social and political matters in Southern States.

Our Saviour said something about hypocrites who should first cast the beam from their own eyes before attempting to take a mote from a brother's eye.

Polish-American Congress Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in order to insure the wider publicity it deserves, I am pleased to include in the RECORD a radio address explaining the history and objectives of the Polish-American Congress, recently delivered by John A. Stanek, secretary, over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., on the Justice-for-Poland program:

Fellow Americans, as secretary of the Polish-American Congress, representing and unifying 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, I am pleased at this opportunity to address you. I want to tell you briefly about the history and objectives of the Polish-American Congress. More especially, I want to report to you on some of the important activities which are being carried on to further our objectives.

The main purpose of the congress, which was organized in 1944, was to help unify the American war effort and to work for a just, durable peace based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the concept of the four freedoms. Closest to our hearts, after our own American victory, was the restoration of a free, independent, and integral Poland—the land of our forefathers and the first to resist both Nazi and Soviet aggression. We were even then, in 1944, disturbed at the trends in Allied diplomacy which threatened the future of Poland and of all freedom-loving peoples. We saw the dangers in the policy of appeasing Soviet Russia.

Such a realistic attitude was unpopular and unfashionable at a time when we all were filled with the spirit of wartime cooperation. Nevertheless, the Polish-American Congress took the position that continued compromise with Soviet demands would only defeat the idealistic war aims of the truly democratic nations. We maintained that the principles which had given hope to the suffering peoples of the world should not be sacrificed on the altar of wartime expediency. Our warnings were unheeded, but our fears have been justified.

In all of its activities and statements since 1944, the Congress has repeatedly called for adherence to the Atlantic Charter and respect for the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. As many of you know, we have been especially vigorous in our criticism of the Yalta agreement, which gave almost half of Poland's territory to Soviet Russia and set the stage for complete Communist domination of the anti-Communist Polish people.

The once face-saving provision for the Allies in the Yalta agreement was that guaranteeing free and unfettered elections in Poland. But this provision which gave one ray of hope for the preservation of Polish independence was doomed by Allied recognition of a Communist-dominated provisional government. It was finally and ruthlessly violated in January 1947 by means of

political terror, threats, violence, and falsified election results which completely distorted the true wishes of the Polish people. Since then the last remnants of political opposition have been crushed in Poland, and the Communist grip has tightened on all aspects of Polish life.

What has happened in Poland has also occurred in the other countries of central and eastern Europe. Like Poland, they had hoped and expected to regain their freedom after the dark, horrible years of the Second World War. Instead, all of them now find themselves betrayed and lost behind the iron curtain. They are lands of despair and disappointment, where government dictatorship and the dreaded secret police ride roughshod over human rights and all democratic values and concepts. They are countries whose foreign policies are dictated from the Kremlin and whose economic systems are being hammered into the Marxist pattern to serve as obedient links in the Soviet scheme of things.

The tragic loss of liberty in Poland and the other Communist-dominated countries is the result of planned, postwar aggression on the part of Soviet Russia. In concessions and agreements made at Teheran, Yalta, San Francisco, Moscow, Potsdam, and elsewhere, we unwittingly opened the gates and smoothed the way for the Red push. The Communist aggressors took quick advantage of these opportunities and then proceeded to violate all pledges which we had hoped would safeguard the independence and integrity of those nations.

This, briefly, is the background of events against which the Polish-American Congress has functioned since 1944. We have worked continually for the protection of American security and the restoration of freedom elsewhere in the world. We have repeatedly disclosed to the American public the true facts about conditions in Poland and the other enslaved nations. We have maintained constant vigilance, pointing out to the American public and Government the dangers that lurked along our diplomatic path. Finally, we have taken the stand that violations of wartime agreements by Soviet Russia and her satellites have completely destroyed the validity of those agreements as a basis of international relations.

In recent months the congress has intensified and expanded its efforts to inform the American people about the tragedy of Poland and what it means to the United States and the rest of the world. This program will continue to increase in scope and momentum, using all possible media of information to acquaint our fellow Americans with the true state of world affairs.

Main emphasis in the past work of the Polish-American Congress has been on the restoration of a free, independent, and integral Poland. This, of course, is still the ultimate, long-range objective. The force of world events, however, has linked the fate of Poland with the fate of all other enslaved nations.

The congress now guides itself by the principle that the best way to help Poland and all other dominated countries is to take the firm stand against the over-all, subversive forces that threaten freedom everywhere. Convinced that communism has replaced fascism as the active, sinister menace to world security, the congress is now mobilizing its efforts and resources to help strengthen American democracy and check the spread of Communist influence here and abroad.

To accomplish these objectives, the Polish-American Congress has sponsored formation of the Committee to Stop World Communism, which hopes to gain the full support of the American public. This committee is headed by Arthur Bliss Lane, of Washington, D. C., former United States Ambassador to Poland, and Judge Blair F. Gunther, prominent civic leader in Pittsburgh. Composed of representative American leaders in all parts of the country, the committee is launching a Nation-wide program to enlist the support of all groups and individuals who are opposed to tyranny in any form.

Principal aims of the Committee to Stop World Communism are: To arouse the American people to the treachery of communism in Poland and other countries of Europe; to build public opinion in support of policies that will check communism; to unify Americans whose ancestors came from the countries now under the heel of Soviet influence in this fight against the spread of communism here and abroad; to give hope to the democratic forces in Poland and elsewhere through welfare services, information, and moral support; to seek the restoration of independence to Poland—the keystone of Communist domination in Europe—and to all other enslaved nations; to expose and prevent Communist fifth-column infiltration in the United States, especially among various national and labor groups, and, finally, to prevent another war by taking the firm, positive stand that will completely discourage any potential aggressors.

Another important and interesting development in recent activities of the Polish-American Congress was the historic agreement with Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Polish Premier who was marked for death by the Warsaw regime but who escaped to continue the fight for Polish liberty. Officials of the congress last December held a 2-day conference in Chicago with Mr. Mikolajczyk and two of his colleagues in the Presidium of the Polish Peasant Party. This resulted in the now-famous "Chicago Agreement."

Our accord included, among other points, these definite declarations: The bloody Communist dictatorship forced upon Poland calls for unity of all forces to act toward restoration of Polish freedom and for action to combat communism as the greatest menace to the world in general and to the security of the United States.

The Warsaw regime is not the true representative of the Polish nations, but is a foreign agency foisted upon Poland through false elections.

The Yalta pact, in which Poland had no voice, was an evil to begin with, and failure to carry out the provision for free and unfettered elections dealt the final blow and deprived all Poland of independence.

The defense of Poland's western boundaries is the paramount duty, regardless of political convictions. Any rebirth of German imperialism, which would be a danger to Poland, the United States, and the whole world, must be prevented.

In addition, Mr. Mikolajczyk and his colleagues commended the Polish-American Congress for its past work on behalf of Poland, and they expressed the conviction that cooperation between the congress and the true leaders of the Polish Peasant Party will help the cause of Poland in large measure.

As a result of this significant meeting Mr. Mikolajczyk is now cooperating with the Polish-American Congress and the Committee to Stop World Communism. His first major address in this country, sponsored by the committee, was given on January 25, before the capacity audience in the Chicago Civic Opera House, where hundreds were turned away. Since then he has spoken under auspices of a number of the congress' State divisions. In these and other activities Mr. Mikolajczyk is assisting us in our efforts to make the American people realize what has actually happened behind the iron curtain—and what could happen in the rest of Europe, in this country, and throughout the world.

The Polish-American Congress will continue, expand, and intensify these efforts. We shall never relax in our campaign to strengthen American security and oppose those who would undermine it. We shall never relent in our crusade to revive the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the concept of the four freedoms. With God's help, the conscience of mankind will one day restore peace and freedom to Poland and the other manacled nations of the world.

Republican Committee Opposes Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith a resolution of the Republican State Executive Committee of Texas, which speaks for itself. It at least shows that somebody else is opposed to this proposed civil-rights program other than southern Democrats. But this is indicative of something more than party alinement. An investigation would show that a good percentage of the Republicans in Texas were once northern Republicans. They have come South and learned first hand what southerners already knew. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I dare say that the people of the so-called North are not in anywise as enthusiastic for this program as the politicians. Most thinking Americans, whether in the North, South, East, or West, realize the impossibility of achieving the goal of improving the lot of minority groups, such as the Negro, by a legislative miracle. The resolution follows:

Resolution unanimously adopted by the 62 members of the Republican State Executive Committee of the State of Texas at meeting held in Houston, February 16, 1948

The President of the United States has asked of the Congress Federal legislation for a so-called Fair Employment Practices Act, for a Federal antilynching bill, for an anti-poll-tax law, and for Federal legislation forbidding segregation or so-called Jim Crow practices.

The Republicans of Texas, speaking through their State Executive Committee, condemn each and all of the proposed laws because such legislation would constitute serious and flagrant violation of our fundamental principles of local self-government and States' rights, and would dangerously increase the powers of autocratic and centralized Federal Government.

No such legislation could be possibly so drawn as to equitably and fairly apply to States with as divergent social and economic conditions as, for instance, those of the deep South and those of New England.

Such legislation, if enacted, would tend to increase and enhance racial feelings and prejudices in the South, without the slightest corresponding and corrective benefits or advantages.

The results would inevitably be obstruction and delay in the social and economic adjustment being, under the most difficult conditions, gradually but surely worked out in the South.

We appeal to the President to cease using such appeals to racial prejudice for hoped-for political advantage when he full well knows that the proposed legislation, if enacted, could only result in further complications and rendering more difficult of solution the problems involved.

A Crisis in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McDOWELL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

The No. 1 question in Washington today is: What will President Truman tell Congress tomorrow? For the moment, it is a question without an answer. At least only a few people know the answer—and they aren't telling.

President Truman's announcement that he will address both Houses on St. Patrick's day, caught everyone by surprise. Even his legislative leaders and his intimate congressional friends were given no advance notice.

At the moment there is plenty of speculation. Almost anything can be—and is heard in the Halls of Congress. It runs from predictions that he will urge passage of universal military training to predictions that he will call for a draft.

But it should be stressed that it is all speculation. Even those who are doing it will admit that. They are just trying to figure out the possibilities. There are only so many, and they have very different boundaries.

The chief limitation is that in the field of foreign affairs America is skating on thin ice. Mistakes at the moment would be fatal. At this time in our history every decision must be carefully thought out in advance.

Consequently, it is fairly certain the President will not ask Congress for anything he cannot get. It would be disastrous for him to do so. A congressional rebuff of Mr. Truman would be interpreted abroad as a sign that this country is divided.

It is difficult to make even the usual guesses as to what Congress will do at the moment. The present situation has sprung forth full blown within the past few days. There has not been enough time for clear sentiments to jell.

It is highly problematical that Congress would agree to reenact the draft. It would do so only if it were firmly convinced that the Nation is in danger of war. Perhaps Mr. Truman can convince the legislators that danger is present.

The same thing would be true of any proposals to supply military aid to any nation threatened by the Communist advance. Congress would have to be shown that this is a matter of vital military necessity, before taking any such steps.

Just incidentally, the President will have to move very carefully, if he wants to keep the Marshall plan alive. Should what is described as a "grave situation," become a crisis, European relief will become a thing of the past.

Several legislators are already posing a question—and the question is a very proper one. "Why should Congress enact the Marshall plan if the Nation is on the brink of war" they are asking. It will be hard to answer.

The Marshall plan is supposed to be our substitute for a real, down-to-earth shooting war. It was advanced as a method for bringing peace back to the world, by rebuilding shattered Europe. A majority of the Senate has been convinced it is wise.

But it certainly would not be wise to rebuild Europe when we are so close to a war. A war that will shatter it some more. We can do one or the other, but we can't do both. There is no sense in trying to kid ourselves on that score.

It will be a grave moment when the President appears before Congress tomorrow. He will be confronted with some harrowing choices. In the interests of the whole Nation may he call upon all his reserves of wisdom and knowledge when he speaks.

Federal-Aid Highway Program Must Be Continued—H. R. 5863 Filed by Congressman Estes Kefauver Will Make Federal-Aid Program for Federal Highways, Secondary, Rural, and Urban Roads Permanent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, March 15, I filed a bill, H. R. 5863, to make permanent the Federal Aid to Roads Act. The present act, which was passed in 1944, authorized a Federal-aid program for 3 years. This program will expire on June 30, 1948, unless renewed.

The bill which I have filed establishes a permanent Federal-aid highway program. It includes provisions for secondary, rural, farm-to-market, and urban roads, in addition to federally designated highways. Several other provisions are included in the bill which are improvements in the old law. Under leave to extend my remarks, the bill H. R. 5863 is as follows:

A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the construction of highways and rural roads, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise—

The term "construction" means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, and elimination of hazards of railway-grade crossings.

The term "urban area" means an area including and adjacent to a municipality or other urban place, of 5,000 or more, the population of such included municipality or other urban place to be determined by the latest available Federal census. The boundaries of urban areas, as defined herein, will be fixed by the State highway department of each State subject to the approval of the Public Roads Administration.

The term "rural areas" means all areas of the State not included in "urban areas."

The term "secondary and feeder roads" means roads in rural areas, including farm-to-market roads, rural-mail routes, and school-bus routes, and not on the Federal-aid system.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, approved November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $550,000,000 a year: *Provided*, That of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the first of such fiscal years $100,000,000 may be appropriated in accordance with the provisions of this act to become available immediately upon apportionment of the authorization for said fiscal year for the making of surveys and plans and for construction.

SEC. 3. The sum authorized in section 2 for each year shall be available for expenditures as follows:

(a) $225,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

(b) $200,000,000 for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail and public-school bus routes, either outside of municipalities or inside of municipalities of less than 5,000 population: *Provided*, That these funds shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the county supervisors, county commissioners, or other appropriate county road officials in cooperation with the State highway departments and the Commissioner of Public Roads: *Provided further*, That in any State having a population density of more than 200 per square mile, as shown by the latest available Federal census, the said system may be selected by the State highway department with the approval of the Commissioner of Public Roads without regard to included municipal boundaries: *Provided further*, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

(c) $125,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

SEC. 4. After making the deductions for administration, research, and investigations as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, the sums authorized shall be apportioned as follows:

(a) The $225,000,000 per year available for projects on the Federal-aid highway system shall be apportioned among the States as provided in section 21 of the Federal Highway Act.

(b) The $200,000,000 per year available for projects on the secondary and feeder roads shall be apportioned among the States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as shown by the Federal census of 1940; and one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than one-half of 1 percent of each year's allotment under subsection (a) and this subsection. The amount available to each State under section 3 (b) shall, upon the counties of said State complying with law and other requirements, be apportioned to the said counties or to the use of said counties in their road program as herein defined in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each county bears to the total area of the State; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each county bears to the total rural population of all the counties of the State, as shown by the latest Federal census; and one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each county bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the counties of the State.

(c) The $125,000,000 per year available for projects on highways in urban areas shall be apportioned among the States in the ratio

which the population in municipalities and other urban places, of five thousand or more, in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban places, of five thousand or more, in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That Connecticut and Vermont towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status.

(d) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for one year after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if covered by formal agreement with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of a specific project as provided by this act.

SEC. 5. (a) The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by the funds made available under the foregoing provisions of this act shall not exceed 50 percent of the construction cost thereof other than costs of rights-of-way, and as to costs of rights-of-way shall not exceed one-third of such costs: *Provided*, That in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased in each of the three postwar years by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided further*, That the entire construction cost of projects for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings, including the separation or protection of grades at crossings, the reconstruction of existing railroad grade crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds: *Provided further*, That not more than 10 percent of the sums apportioned to any State under the terms of this act for each of such postwar fiscal years shall be used for such railway-highway projects, to be expended in accordance with the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of this section.

(b) Any railway involved in any project for the elimination of hazards of railway-highway crossings paid for in whole or in part from funds made available under this act, shall be liable to the United States for a sum bearing the same ratio to the net benefit received by such railway from such project that the Federal funds expended on such project bear to the total cost of such project. For the purposes of this subsection, the net benefit received by a railway from any such project shall be deemed to be the amount by which the reasonable value of the total benefits received by it from such project exceeds the amount paid by it (including the reasonable value of any property rights contributed by it) toward the cost of such project; and in no case shall the total benefits to any railway or railways be deemed to have a reasonable value in excess of 10 percent of the cost of any such project. The liability of any railway to the United States with respect to any such project may be discharged by paying to the United States, within 6 months after the completion of such project, such amount as the Commissioner of Public Roads determines to be the amount of such liability. Any such determination of the Commissioner shall be made on the basis of recommendations made to him by the State highway department and on the basis of such other information and investigation, if any, as the Commissioner deems necessary or proper. If any such railway has failed so to discharge its liability to the United States with respect to any project within 6 months after the completion thereof, the Commissioner of Public Roads shall request the Attorney General to institute proceedings against such railroad for the recovery of the amount for which it is liable under this subsection. The Attorney General is authorized to bring such proceedings on behalf of the United States in the appropriate district court of the United States, and the United States shall be entitled in such proceedings to recover such sums as it is considered and adjudged by the court that such railway is liable for in the premises. Any amounts paid to or recovered by the United States under this subsection shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. If the Commissioner of Public Roads shall determine that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of projects undertaken pursuant to this act, he may advance to any State from funds heretofore or hereafter made available the Federal share of the cost thereof to enable the State highway department to make prompt payments for work as it progresses: *Provided*, That such State, after June 30, 1948, does not divert to other than highway uses road user revenues in violation of section 12 of the Highway Act of June 18, 1934. The funds so advanced shall be deposited in a special trust account by the State treasurer, or other State official authorized under the laws of the State to receive Federal-aid highways funds, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State highway department for work actually performed in accordance with plans, specifications, and estimates approved by the Public Roads Administration under the provisions of this act. Any unexpended balances of funds so advanced shall be returned to the credit of the appropriation from which the funds have been advanced: *Provided further*, That any advance made to any State under the provisions of this section and not repaid shall be deducted from any apportionment allocated to such State under the provisions of this act for the year next succeeding the year in which such advance is made, and no agreement made in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this act shall be valid for any pro rata share of the cost of construction in excess of such apportionment less such advance.

SEC. 7. There shall be designated within the continental United States a National System of Interstate Highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in total extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. The routes of the National System of Interstate Highways shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, as provided by the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, for the selection of the Federal-aid system. All highways or routes included in the National System of Interstate Highways as finally approved, if not already included in the Federal-aid highway system, shall be added to said system without regard to any mileage limitation.

SEC. 8. With the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, not to exceed 1½ percent of the amount apportioned for any year to any State under the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, except sections 2 and 23 thereof, shall hereafter be used with or without State funds for surveys, plans, engineering, and economic investigations of projects for future construction in such State, on the Federal-aid highway system and extensions thereof within municipalities, on secondary or feeder roads, urban highways or grade-crossing eliminations, and for highway research necessary in connection therewith.

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $25,000,000 for the first postwar fiscal year and a like amount for each of the second and third postwar fiscal years; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $12,500,000 for the first postwar fiscal year and a like amount for each of the second and third postwar fiscal years: *Provided*, That the apportionment for forest highways in Alaska shall be for each year $1,500,000 and that such additional amount as otherwise would have been apportioned to Alaska for each of said years shall be apportioned among those States, including Puerto Rico, whose forest highway apportionment for such year otherwise would be less than 1 percent of the entire apportionment for forest highways for that year.

SEC. 10. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,750,000, to become available at the rate of $4,250,000 a year for each of the three successive postwar fiscal years.

(b) For the construction and maintenance of parkways, to give access to national parks and national monuments, or to become connecting sections of a national parkway plan, over lands to which title has been transferred to the United States by the States or by private individuals, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $30,000,000, to become available at the rate of $10,000,000 a year for each of the three successive postwar fiscal years.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $6,000,000 for the first postwar fiscal year and a like amount for each of the second and third postwar fiscal years: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Public Roads Administration before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Public Roads Administration.

SEC. 11. Federal highway funds shall not be used for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway giving access to an airport (if such airport has been constructed or extended after the date of enactment of this act), or for the reconstruction or relocation of any highway which has been or may be closed or the usefulness of which has been or may be impaired by the location or construction of any airport (if such airport has been constructed or extended after the date of enactment of this act), unless, prior to such extension or construction, as the case may be, the State highway department and the Public Roads Administration have concurred with the officials in charge of the airport that the location of such airport or extension thereof and the consequent reconstruction or relocation of the highway are in the public interest.

SEC. 12. On any highway or street hereafter constructed with Federal aid in any

State, the location, form, and character of informational, regulatory, and warning signs, curb and pavement or other markings, and traffic signals installed or placed by any public authority, or other agency, shall be subject to the approval of the State highway department with the concurrence of the Public Roads Administration; and the Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby directed to concur only in such installations as will promote the safe and efficient utilization of the highways.

SEC. 13. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948."

FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR ANNUAL INCREASE FOR RURAL ROADS

The present law provides for Federal participation to the extent of $500,000,000 annually. The bill which I have filed would increase this amount to $550,000,000. This increase would be added to the appropriation of $150,000,000 which is authorized for projects on principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural-free-delivery-mail and public-school-bus routes either outside municipalities or inside municipalities of less than 5,000 population.

The bill thus would make $225,000,000 available for the Federal-aid highway system, $200,000,000 annually for secondary roads, and $125,000,000 for roads in urban areas. The amounts provided by Federal aid would be matched by State and county contributions.

The bill also undertakes to put in force amendments which I offered when the Federal Aid to Roads Act was up for consideration in 1944.

COUNTY OFFICIALS WILL HAVE MORE AUTHORITY IN PROGRAM

It would change the present law by giving the county road officials the primary say as to how the funds are to be expended on rural roads in their counties. Their program would have to be approved, however, by the State highway department and the Federal Highway Administrator. As matters now stand the plans are prepared by the State highway commission and the county officials have little choice in the final decisions.

RURAL-ROAD FUNDS TO BE DIVIDED EQUALLY BETWEEN COUNTIES

Another provision contained in the bill which I have filed sets up a definite formula for the distribution of rural- and secondary-road funds among the counties of the various States. The formula is based upon area road mileage and population. In this way each county would be assured a fair and equitable distribution and would be assured of receiving its fair and equitable share of the secondary-road fund. The formula for the distribution by the counties is the same as the one used for distribution among the States. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 has met with great success. The States and counties have cooperated fully but only a beginning in road building and improvement has been made. Increased traffic conditions and the necessity of a secondary- and rural-road program and the improvement of roads and streets in municipalities make it imperative that the program be continued and made permanent. This investment in the road system of our country is a necessary undertaking that will pay great dividends.

Today the people are demanding better roads. I wish to congratulate Mr. Thomas McDonald and his associates in the Public Roads Administration and the Roads Committees in Congress on their foresight in advocating a continuing road program. Great highways throughout the country are necessary to handle the increased volume of traffic. Secondary, State, and rural roads are a necessary part of this system. The Federal Government has wisely established the principle of aiding in the construction of these secondary roads. Farmers must have good roads to get their products to market. The people who live in rural sections are entitled to roads that can be traveled at all seasons of the year. They should not be subjected to mud in the winter and dust in the summer. Many small cities and municipalities are suffering because of inadequate streets and highways. Most of the traffic through these cities originates elsewhere, so a Federal problem is involved.

I think the Federal aid to roads program is one of the most worthwhile programs that has been adopted during recent years. The amount to be done is so great that the program must be made permanent.

World Conditions and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include a summary of my recent remarks before the Congregation Shaarei Zedeck at Clinton, Mass., Sunday, March 14, 1948:

WORLD CONDITIONS AND PALESTINE

(Remarks in part of Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN before Congregation Shaarei Zedeck Sunday, March 14, 1948)

Speaking before a largely attended meeting of the Men's Club of the Congregation Shaarei Zedeck, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN deplored the wave of war hysteria which is sweeping the Nation.

"While we cannot possibly minimize the gravity of the international situation, particularly our relations with Russia, it is most unfortunate that those who are seeking to militarize the country—war or no war—and those who are eager to enact the Marshall plan before it has been carefully considered by the Congress, should move at this time to incite the American people into a crisis psychology for war.

The situation is bad enough without making it worse. It might be well to utilize economic measures to check aggression through collective action of the democracies; it might be well to institute a real offensive for peace through cooperation and genuine collective security before adopting rash, hysterical policies which will plunge the whole world into another war. Let us keep our feet on the ground, whatever we do at this juncture. Let us use sound considered judgment in dealing with this disturbing impassé in our relations with the Soviet.

The local Congressman analyzed world conditions at length and traced the steady encroachment by communism and totalitarianism and other un-American forms of collectivism which he declared, "have wrecked the economies and destroyed the hope, incentive and initiative of practically every European nation." "If we yield to this pressure and this trend away from democracy and free enterprise, we will merely invite to the United States the same privation, hardship, want, and low standards which European nations are suffering," he said.

"In country after country," he declared, "freedom is being extinguished. One nation after another is losing its cherished freedom. Most unfortunate and pitiable of all, are those nations which are losing their freedom at their own hands. Whether communism has proceeded too far in these nations to permit the United States to rehabilitate them through present aid proposals is certainly debatable, but assistance we render must be based upon two considerations—first, self-help and their own willingness to throw off the curse of radical social doctrines, and secondly, the capacity of our own Nation to assist without inflicting damage, harm, and detriment to our own productive economy and the health and welfare of our own people."

"Freedom and self-determination do not exist for all people except the Jewish people. Freedom is a great universal natural principle, God-given in character, and an inalienable right of every people and every living human being. That is why in determining and resolving these great world questions we must cling tenaciously to the doctrines and guaranties of the American Constitution as well as our professed war aims. If we really meant what we said when we gave effect to the Atlantic Charter, then we must support the aspirations of every people for freedom and self-determination and that means the Jewish people as well as every other. Our Nation and the United Nations, if it is to be more than mere laughing stock, if it is to be an effective instrument for maintaining the peace, must seek and strive to carry out the basic guaranties of a free world expressed in its charter, and implicit in the sacrifices made in the great war.

"The question of a free Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine is not a new idea. It had the sanction and approval of the American Government and people as long ago as the Balfour declaration which was agreed to solemnly by Great Britain and approved by virtually every nation.

"Let it be said that our own Nation shall never renounce the cause of freedom, that we are ready to send a message of hope, inspiration and assistance to all those struggling to be delivered from oppression, the Jewish people as well as every other.

"These problems are difficult but by no means impossible of solution. Wise, experienced, just statesmen adhering to fundamentals and seeking peace instead of war can work them out and bring the disordered world back to sanity. But there must be a strong vigorous foreign policy which will enunciate clearly and unmistakably to Russia and her puppets that tyranny over others and illegal unconscionable aggression can never and will never be substituted for the rule of law-arbitration, argument, persuasion, justice and the instrumentalities of freedom and civilization."

Congressman PHILBIN also discussed the plight of the displaced persons and European relief measures and present efforts of the Congress to deal with these problems.

Forty-one Members of the Senate and House of Representatives Join in Sending Letter to Secretary of State Marshall on Palestine Situation — Protest Lack of Vigor and Firmness by the United States in Support of Partition Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, 41 Members of the Senate and House have joined in sending a letter to Secretary of State Marshall protesting against activities on the part of the Department of State with reference to the support of the Palestine partition recommendation of the United Nations, and further seek a clarification of the present attitude of the Government toward the Palestine situation. The text of the letter of transmittal and the letter signed by forty-one Members of the Senate and House, as well as the list of signatories, follow:

MARCH 10, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Forty-one Senators and Representatives, members of the Democratic Party, have joined in sending the attached letter to you. They seek a clarification of present United States activities with reference to the Palestine situation.

These Members of Congress have authorized us to transmit the attached letter to you over their names.

With assurances of esteem, we are,
Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.
EMANUEL CELLER,
United States House of Representatives.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: While we are cognizant of your reply to the questions posed by other Members of Congress, we, the undersigned Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, feel the need for further clarification of the present attitude of your Department toward the situation presently existing in Palestine. While your statement is predicated on action of the United Nations, we realize, as you undoubtedly do, that the United Nations is no stronger than the sum of its members, and that it is incumbent upon the leading member nations to initiate action by that body wherever such action is indicated. Our Government has shown its full appreciation of this fact, as witness the initiative taken by it on several occasions where gross abuses called for United Nations action.

From the theoretical viewpoint, your answers might allay the rising fears that the United Nations decision on Palestine is being sabotaged, but the confusion has not been cleared away by the approach which does not attack the heart of the actual conditions existing in Palestine.

The events which have taken place since the United Nations decision have caused us considerable concern. Naturally, the violent opposition of the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem and his adherents is most deplorable, but this was only to be expected. More serious is the attitude of the Arab states, most of them members of the United Nations, who openly engage in acts of aggression against the neighboring country of Palestine. This is seriously emphasized by the Palestine Commission in its report to the Security Council. Similarly, it is most regrettable that the British Government, while refusing to facilitate the execution of the United Nations resolution, and while insisting on its sole and exclusive control of Palestine, is using its power of control in a manner hardly calculated to decrease Arab violence in that country. Again, this has been emphasized by the report to the Security Council.

In addition to the attitude which the United States Government displayed toward Palestine within the framework of the United Nations, we are perplexed by the steps which have or have not been taken by our Government unilaterally. We understand that, without being requested to do so by the United Nations, our Government has prohibited the export of arms to the Middle East, irrespective of whether such arms are to be used to defy the United Nations decision, or on the contrary, to uphold it. We are unable to accept the explanation that this action was taken in the belief that it would discourage armed conflict in Palestine. It is a matter of common knowledge that Arab bands, supported by neighboring Arab states, are supplied out of stocks made available to those states by our own Government in the past, and by the British Government at present. To refuse export licenses to the Jewish defense forces in Palestine could obviously have no other result than to increase the odds against the Jewish defenders of the United Nations decision. We are surprised that such a policy could have been inaugurated by the American Government on its own initiative, and that it is still being maintained.

Reports have reached us of other activities by the United States Government which can hardly be taken as an indication of either a sympathetic or even a neutral attitude toward the problem of implementing the United Nations resolution. We hear that, while refraining from any representation to the British Government in favor of the immediate admission into Palestine of a large number of Jewish immigrants or in favor of opening a Palestine port to Jewish immigration on February 1st, as recommended in the United Nations decision, informal representations by the United States Government have been made to certain foreign governments and to the Jewish agency for Palestine with a view to slowing down such immigration. Another example of what we have in mind are the series of announcements by the Department of State and by the American Consul General in Jerusalem, indicating that the American Government disapproves of individual American citizens joining the Jewish defense force Haganah to defend the Jewish population of Palestine against attack. We do not recall that similar action was taken either in 1914 or in 1940 when thousands of American citizens volunteered to defend what they believed to be the righteous cause of maintaining the freedom of Great Britain, France, Finland, and other countries.

We do not see how steps of this kind, taken by the United States on its own initiative, can be interpreted by either the British or Arab Governments as anything but an indication that American support for the United Nations plan is far from genuine, thus encouraging them to undertake further attempts to overthrow the United Nations decision.

We have noticed with pleasure the recent statements emanating from President Truman and from you to the effect that the United States Government stands by the decision of the United Nations. We would be less than frank, however, if we did not express to you our profound misgivings lest the attitude taken by our Government in the specific cases noted above, rather than facilitate the implementation of that decision, would render this implementation more difficult, thus reflecting on the integrity and the good name of our country.

We wish to point out, as well, that Ambassador Warren Austin's statements before the Security Council did not in any way obviate the necessity for a clarification of the view of the United States on partition. It appeared to make distinctions so fine as to leave unanswered the question of our willingness to participate in the implementation of the partition decision. In tone and approach it seemed to contradict Herschel Johnson's statement last fall before the General Assembly which clearly indicated our recognition of the possibility of using force and indicated as clearly our willingness to do so. Can you clarify for us this seeming contradiction between the two approaches.

We have deemed it our duty to acquaint you with our doubts and misgivings on this score, and we would be very grateful if you could reassure us regarding this matter.

Respectfully yours.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES OF LETTER TO SECRETARY MARSHALL OF MARCH 10, 1948, ON PALESTINE SITUATION

United States Senate: CARL HAYDEN, Arizona; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado; JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana, FRANCIS J. MYERS, Pennsylvania; GLEN H. TAYLOR, Idaho.

House of Representatives: JOE E. BATES, Kentucky; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; SOL BLOOM, New York; WILLIAM T. BYRNE, New York; JOSEPH R. BRYSON, South Carolina; FRANK BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania; CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York; EMANUEL CELLER, New York; JOHN J. DELANEY, New York; JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island; MARTIN GORSKI, Illinois; THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois; EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey, FRANCK R. HAVENNER, California; JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, New York; CHET HOLIFIELD, California; WALTER B. HUBER, Ohio; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, New York; THOMAS J. LANE, Massachusetts; WALTER A. LYNCH, New York; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts; RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana; HUGH A. MEADE, Maryland; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; DONALD L. O'TOOLE, New York; JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, New York; PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Massachusetts; JOHN J. ROONEY, New York; ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, New York; ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois, GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, Michigan.

Anti-Red Group Formed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an article, concerning the organization of an American Jewish League Against Commu-

nism, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on March 15, 1948:

ANTI-RED GROUP FORMED—JEWISH LEAGUE HERE PLANS ON NATIONAL CAMPAIGN

The organization of an American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc., with offices at 220 West Forty-second Street, was announced yesterday by Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, formerly of Temple Emanu-El, Yonkers, N. Y., who is its executive director.

Rabbi Schultz said that opposition to communism had been traditional with "the overwhelming majority of American Jewry." He pointed out that thousands of Zionists were in Soviet concentration camps and that Hebrew religious schools were banned in Russia. He said that a Nation-wide campaign would be carried on by the new organization to instruct American Jews on Communist infiltration tactics.

Atomic Bomb for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Denis M. Hurley, senior partner of the law firm of Hurley, Gray & Kearney, Esqs., attorneys for the Roman Catholic diocese of Brooklyn, New York, at the eleventh annual communion breakfast of the Pasteur Guild, department of hospitals, city of New York, on Sunday, March 7, 1948. The address was broadcast over the municipal broadcasting station, WNYC.

John J. O'Connor, president of the Pasteur Guild acted as toastmaster. Miles McPartland was the chairman. Besides Mr. Hurley, the speakers were: His Excellency, Archbishop J. Francis A. McIntyre, archbishop of Los Angeles, Calif.; Rev. Raymond E. Blust, archdiocesan guild director; Commissioner Edward M. Bernecker, M. D., department of hospitals; and Rev. Joseph Sheehan, director of religious studies, Cardinal Hayes High School.

The text of Mr. Hurley's address follows:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, friends of the Pasteur Guild, over in another hotel in this city, just 11 days ago, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, the outstanding ace among the fliers of World War I, made a speech in connection with a drive of the Protestant Church for funds. On that occasion, Captain Rickenbacker declared that what this country needs most of all is U. S. T., that is, universal spiritual training. There is much sense in that statement and weighty reasons behind it. For, today, every thoughtful man and woman in the United States wonders what is wrong with the world. All of us are concerned with how long the terrible march of the justice of God through human history must continue. We have lived through two world wars. Still there is no peace. Instead there are constant rumors of war. All of us know that we have reached a point in history where there must be peace or there will be chaos. Men and women who are capable of reasoning a problem through, have been trying to find the answer to one big question. What is it, fundamentally, they ask, that has been keeping the nations of the world from achieving a just and lasting peace?

THE ANSWER OF SCIENCE

We know the answer to that big question. There is nothing new or original about our answer. The true answer has just been neglected and forgotten. But, first, let us see how men of learning, of science, and of education approach the problem.

In a new book called The Reach of the Mind, a very matter-of-fact scientist describes some recent laboratory experiments into the unknown powers of the human mind—powers above and beyond the merely physical. This hard-headed man of science arrives at this startling conclusion: "It is shocking but true that we know the atom today better than we know the mind that knows the atom." In other words, our men of science now know more about the secrets of nature than they know about the workings of the human mind that conceived the atomic bomb.

Yet, in an address in New York City just a month ago, David E. Lilienthal, the head of the United States Commission on Atomic Energy, said: "What goes on in people's minds—and in their hearts—is even more important in determining the fateful future than what goes on in atomic energy laboratories."

The prime importance of the mind in fashioning the shape of things to come was emphasized by a late, renowned Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, when he wrote: "To know is not less than to feel. A valid idea is worth a regiment any day." To put it another way, great thoughts can be as powerful as great armies.

So here we have a man of science telling us that today we know more about the ingredients that go to make up the atomic bomb than we know about the operation of the human mind that made the atomic bomb. At the same time we have the Chairman of the United States Commission on Atomic Energy telling us that what goes on in people's minds and in their hearts is more important in shaping the future than all the marvels of atomic research. But how can we ever hope to know what goes on in people's minds and in their hearts unless we have an understanding of the wonders of the human mind at least equal to our understanding of the wonders of atomic energy?

What is the answer of our great educators to that question? What do they tell us? Let the foremost exponent of public education in the United States speak for the educators of the country.

For over a generation, Dr. John Dewey, professor of philosophy at Columbia University, has had more influence on our teachers and on the teaching in our public institutions than any living American. What does he say? Professor Dewey recently declared: "We are uncertain as to where we are going, and where we want to go, and why we are doing what we do." There is an amazing answer for you! It is neither helpful nor hopeful. It is full of uncertainty. No wonder there is confusion in the thinking of our people when there is confusion worse confounded among the leaders of popular education.

Since the attitude of the human mind, its thoughts and ideas, are admittedly of the utmost importance in molding our future, it is imperative for us to know exactly where we are going, where we want to go, and why we are doing what we do. What then is our answer to the big question that is troubling the minds and hearts of people everywhere? Why has that answer been neglected and forgotten?

THE DISEASE AND THE CURE

Less than 4 months ago, the bishops of the United States in a public statement defined the fundamental fallacy of modern thought as the trend toward secularism. Simply stated, secularism is any view of life, or any policy, program, or philosophy which is based upon the premise that God and religion and morality should be ignored or excluded from consideration.

If this diagnosis by the bishops of the United States as to what ails humanity is sound, then the fundamental cause of the uncertainty, confusion, and distress in the world today stems from secularism, from the simple but perfectly obvious fact that men and nations have been ignoring God and excluding religion from their thinking and their planning. According to this diagnosis, the present world unrest is directly attributable to a vital deficiency, to a degeneration of the spirit, to a decay in morals. The disease is lack of spirituality. The medicine is the vitamin known as U. S. T., standing for universal spiritual training. There is only one sure cure that will bring mankind back to sanity, to stability and to peace, and that is a moral remedy, a resurgence of the things of the spirit, a return to God, to religion, and to morality.

That statement will be challenged by some as an easy statement to make and as too impractical and too idealistic. None the less, it is true. Sometimes, the truth is hard to find and when found it is hard to swallow. The remedy prescribed is an ideal difficult of achievement but there can be no alternative. Everything else has been tried. Everything else has failed. As Abraham Lincoln once said "I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go."

The argument for the need of universal spiritual training is not based upon fine-spun theory or wishful thinking but upon hard-headed realism. Every other training program ignores God as the Ultimate Reality. Spiritual leaders have always appealed to men precisely as human beings—and that means as being with a sense of spiritual values. Why, even in our own day, we need only consider the tremendous influence upon his millions of followers exerted by Mahatma Gandhi, the recently assassinated martyr of India. What other appeal did Gandhi have than his appeal to the spiritual yearnings of his people? That is why, from the beginning of time, it has been the religious leaders who have challenged the best in the hearts and minds of men and have thereby changed the face of the earth. That is why, also, in the long history of humanity, the great men, in the true sense of the word great, have always been the spiritual leaders of makind. There can be no doubt of that in our minds.

WHAT IS GREATNESS?

For, looked at coldly, objectively, dispassionately, realistically, if you will, what is the true test of greatness? Have you ever thought that question through to a logical conclusion? When is a man truly great? What have we gleaned from literature, from the biographies of the great? What does history teach us? What have we learned from our own experience of life?

Is money, or education, or military might, or political power the true test of the greatness of a man?

Is money the test? If great wealth or financial power were the test, then a Morgan, a Rockefeller, or a Ford would all be greater men than the poorest of God's poor, St. Francis of Assissi. But we know that that is not so.

Is education or vast learning or great erudition the test? If education were the test, then a Dr. Charles Eliot of Harvard, the man who compiled the famous Five-Foot Shelf of books known as the Harvard Classics, or a Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia, or a Prof. Albert Einstein, of relativity fame, would all be greater men than that illiterate, unlearned fisherman, Simon called Peter. But we know that that is not so.

Is military might the test? If military might were the test, then Hannibal, Caesar, or Napoleon—or coming down to our own day, Marshall, Eisenhower, or MacArthur—would be greater men than the convert, Paul of Tarsus, than the former Spanish soldier, Ignatius Loyola, than the greatest of philosophers and theologians, Thomas Aquinas. But we know that that is not so.

Is political power the test? If political power were the test, then Hitler, Hirohito, Mussolini, and Stalin will go down in history as greater men than the four evangelists, the inspired writers of the Gospels, greater than Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. But we know that that is not so.

Of these great men who are dead, who will long be remembered? Of these great men who are living, who will not soon be forgotten? Strange as it must seem to those who have no understanding of spiritual values, who have, therefore, never learned to take the true measure of a man, only those have come down to us in the world's history as truly great men who in their own day and among their own people were regarded as colossal fools and whose lives were magnificent failures. And the greatest of all these colossal fools and magnificent failures was none other than Our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

SPIRITUAL BOMB FOR PEACE

The greatest force in the world, therefore, is moral force and the greatest power in the world is spiritual power. There is the only great untapped source of energy that can save the world from self-destruction. Yet, it is precisely that tremendous force and that saving power which have been so long neglected and abandoned and forgotten by the advocates of secularism, by those who try so hard to ignore God and to exclude religion from every sphere of human thought and from every range of human activity. Those are the unseen, spiritual atoms, hidden away deep down in the hearts of all men, which are never mentioned, but always shunned by those who preach the doctrine of secularism.

No matter how humble you think you are, no matter how lowly your position in life may be, no matter how inconspicuous you may believe yourself to be in God's great scheme of things, you have within your minds and within your hearts the same elements of force as those which elevated the saints to greatness. You have within your souls the only elements of power that can actually fashion an international brotherhood of men of good will under the sublime standard of the Prince of Peace. Your work, your prayer, your penance, your denial, your sacrament, your sacrifice, your living example, are the tiny but miraculous ingredients out of which there must be forged the mighty instrument of the world's salvation. In your hearts and in the hearts of 140 million others like you, there beats and throbs America's spiritual atomic bomb for peace.

In that day, when all of that pent-up atomic force of the spirit finally bursts forth upon a war-weary world, with a stupendous explosive blast, infinitely more effective than the scientific bomb dropped upon Hiroshima—in that day, with God's help, we shall achieve a just and a lasting peace.

Two weeks ago, in the city of Boston, Archbishop Cushing, in an eloquent and dramatic plea, showed how we might use this greatest of all weapons for peace when he said:

"We must beg God to give us statesmen who are saints, and rulers who are governed by God. Such statesmen will have the moral virtues which all religious leaders agree are needed before peace can be made or can endure.

"In a democracy, you and I are the rulers. Every man is, more truly than we sometimes think, a king. We may be relatively insignificant but we must be magnanimous; we must be big. If we are, then we shall have the moral fiber most needed in these evil days. We shall have minds big enough to plan peace, and hearts big enough to sacrifice for peace. With God's help we shall have peace itself."

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House the following compelling argument for Alaska statehood from the standpoint of national defense made by Gill Robb Wilson in an article written for the New York Herald Tribune and entitled, "Alaska Statehood Urged as Siberian Counter":

Shortly Air Force fighter and bomber units will begin northward movement to Alaska for winter training. This is of long-range as well as immediate significance since it brings extensively together the fateful Arctic and the implement of modern destiny—the airplane.

Almost every crucial era of history has turned upon some special implement. Sometimes these implements were implements of war and sometimes of peace. Sometimes they decided issues between existing nations and sometimes they cleared the way for the founding of new nations.

This column is not the place for a world history in terms of critical implements, but we can mention as examples the Roman ax which swept away the forests of northern Europe, the compass which opened up the sea lanes of the globe, the cannon which sounded the death knell of the medieval state, the generator which fathered the industrial era.

PLANE'S EFFECT IS RIDDLE

We cannot ignore the fact that the airplane's ultimate effect will probably be greater than that of any implement in history. How this effect will regain civilization geographically, politically, economically, or socially is the foremost riddle of our times.

I write of this because prior to World War II no single nation on earth had sought the peace or safety of the world in terms of the airplane. That it would make isolationism an untenable political theory was scorned. That it would become the decisive implement of foreign policy was not recognized by the diplomatic world. That it would give fresh significance to unpromising areas of the earth, such as the Arctic, was ridiculed in the highest places.

Recently Alaska has been much in the news as the strategic rampart of American air power. From American skepticism concerning the significance of this area, progress in thinking has been made until presently the majority of opinion admits the northland to be a new interstice between the two great ideologies of western democracy and Asiatic totalitarianism.

This American attitude concerning Alaska is encouraging but insufficient. The totalitarian viewpoint that its contrasting northland on the Siberian side of the Arctic can be made the seat of an expanding civilization represents a greater initiative than our own. The writer believes that the free western world might lose its life if the Soviet challenge in the northland is not met in kind.

Truly Alaska has had, until recently, an unconquerable remoteness. Now, however, we have a new implement—the airplane. This implement can not only tie Alaska into the rest of the continent but it can bypass the surface barriers which have hitherto made the vast northwestern peninsula unattractive, uncohesive and impenetrable.

If it is pointed out that Alaska, which is seeking statehood, was never more than a frontier because of the cold, the mountains and the swamps, I should like to cite historic examples to challenge that idea.

I hold to the premise that if the implement and the incentive are present any area of the earth can be salvaged to desired human utility.

Holland, for example, is a nation built on land almost totally salvaged from the sea and the marsh. If Alaska be deemed cursed with mountains and cold what of Switzerland and of Norway and Finland? If Alaska be thought of as barren, what of Iceland, where Scandinavian civilization reached its highest political and literary level?

If the great canal could be cut through Panama to connect two oceans, an adequate system of airports can tie together the several distinctive geographic areas of Alaska. If tunnels could be built through the Alps to join the Mediterranean and European plains, are we justified in faltering on the development of the land once called Seward's Folly?

It seems to the writer that there is a possibility that Soviet initiative in Siberia may furnish the challenging incentive needed to keep western civilization on the march and that the airplane will prove to be the implement of that march.

CALLS STATEHOOD NEEDED

If this be true, where is the prophet with enough vision to foresee the reshuffling of world populations, the revitalization of human character, which grows traditionally decadent with ease but strong and purposeful under a new incentive, with its activating implement?

Alaska, under the influence of the airplane, will probably become more a Ponte Vecchio bridging America and Asia than a sullen sentry box on the top of the world. If it should so become, would any State in the Union be more important? If it has a possibility of so becoming, should statesmanship delay the integration of the Territory into the Union?

As the ax to the forests of the Gauls, as the compass to the New World as the cannon to the end of feudalism, as electric power to industrial program, so is the airplane to freedom's north-winging destiny.

F. D. R. and Immortality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial written by the Honorable Robert L. Kern, editor and publisher of the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat, Friday, March 12, 1948:

F. D. R. AND IMMORTALITY

It was bound to happen! The move to debunk Franklin Delano Roosevelt is on, with impetus received from many sources.

Men and women who knew him, and who liked, disliked, or cordially hated him are beginning to speak.

Through their words runs like a defensive argument the theme, "He was mortal, after all. He made mistakes like any other man."

They state, and have facts to prove, that his actions were, on occasion, ill-advised; that he was sometimes outguessed, as at Yalta; that he was arbitrary at times; that he made rash decisions; that he was sometimes unfair and imperious.

Most of what these people say is probably true. But the unalterable fact remains that Franklin D. Roosevelt was a great leader and a great man. He ranks with the most famous statesmen of history—men who also had their faults, and their critics. With them he shares immortality.

When all is said that can be said there remains no effective way to whittle him down in size. His friends and critics admit his statute by trying to minimize it. Their insistence on his mistakes is a self-confessed admission of his greatness.

However one may criticize a mountain, it is impossible to reduce it to a hill. Belittlers, each with his list of flaws, may point its faults and disadvantages, but they cannot lower by so much as an inch's length the height of its snow-capped peak.

To friend and foe, try as they may to disprove it, Roosevelt remains a great man. He was born to leadership and for a long time held his place in the sun. Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt are names which history will record in the enduring hall of fame.

The foolish debunkers would do well to cease their futile struggle against the inevitability of his renown, and allow the President who knew so much of trouble, anxiety, and hate to rest in peace—an ancient and fitting prerogative of the dead.

Worcester Leads the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article by Mr. Fletcher Booraem, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal, which appeared in the Journal on March 6, 1948. Mr. Booraem submits a detailed report and analysis of an original cooperative venture in industrial engineering, that is being carried on by more than 500 Worcester businesses, which is worthy of wider study and adoption.

This plan, that is characterized as the industrial development program of Worcester, Mass., developed out of surveys conducted by the Worcester Committee for Economic Development. This committee, initiated by the chamber of commerce in 1943, made an economic study of the city and its smaller industries, as well as the larger ones. The conclusion reached was that an aggressive program of industrial development must be provided to insure a prosperous postwar future for Worcester.

The outstanding feature of Worcester's economy, which the Committee for Economic Development concentrated on as the best source of future development, was the presence in the city of over 400 manufacturing companies employing less than 50 persons.

The major industries of Worcester all started from similar modest beginnings. The industrial-development program, created for the chamber of commerce by its economic-development committee, therefore stressed a plan of faciliating the growth and promotion of small industries by providing them with skilled engineering counsel in the fields of production, sales, transportation, and foreign trade.

Under the plan, which was made possible by almost tripling the dues income of the chamber of commerce, the industrial bureau was expanded by the addition of four engineers and requisite stenographic personnel. Mr. Wallace T. Montague, one of this country's ablest business executives, vice president of Norton Co., Worcester's largest industry, generously consented to be chairman of the economic-development committee. Mr. John A. Toomey, dynamic manager of the chamber of commerce industrial bureau, was appointed secretary of the committee, and put in charge of its overall direction.

Mr. Toomey is the possessor of enviable personality, industry, and ability, truly representative of the ideal, in the modern sense, of the progressive chamber of commerce executive and he proved to be the spark plug of this program by his unselfish expenditure of time and effort.

Solidly backed by a group of active committeemen of the commerce chamber membership, Mr. Montague and Mr. Toomey have established the program on solid footing; they are to be congratulated in formulating a community service that will, undoubtedly, extend its beneficial influence throughout the industrial development of the United States.

Mr. Booraem's article follows:

INFORMATION CO-OP—BUSINESSMEN SHARE COST OF INDUSTRIAL ADVICE; REAP BROAD BENEFITS—WORCESTER, MASS., PLAN CUTS FREIGHT COSTS, FINDS MARKETS, SPEEDS SHIPPING—IDEA SPREADS TO OTHER CITIES

(By Fletcher Booraem)

WORCESTER, MASS.—Businessmen in other cities might do well to watch Worcester. A cooperative venture here in industrial engineering is paying dividends.

The more than 500 Worcester companies which employ fewer than 50 workers each, along with their bigger brethren, are getting free technical advice that would ordinarily be far out of their financial reach. They're getting up-to-date know-how on such phases of operation as sales, traffic, production and foreign trade. This "information, please" service comes through the local chamber of commerce.

Normally, such technical aid is an expensive proposition. Some industrial engineering firms charge as much as $75 a day for the services of one consultant like the four now maintained by the chamber of commerce for the benefit of Worcester's 659 manufacturers. Industrial tailoring jobs performed by this city's quartet of experts could well cost as high as $5,000 each on the basis of usual industrial engineering fees.

COST SHARED BY BUSINESSMEN

Worcester businessmen share the cost through the fees member industries pay to their chamber of commerce. That body is laying out about $70,000 annually to provide the consulting service available to all. Back in 1945, when laying the groundwork for the new project, the chamber increased membership from 700 to around 1,500 and revenue in dues from $49,000 to $140,000.

The activity of Worcester's four consultants is impressive.

Last year, the four men made 2,153 calls on the 659 industries. They didn't wait to be asked. They just dropped in on a manufacturer and usually before he knew it he was telling them his troubles.

To prove they know a good thing when they see it, Worcester industrialists made 1,016 return visits to the consulting service's offices. In addition, they got the consultants' attention 2,409 times via phone.

Result of all this visiting back and forth was 2,831 services rendered, ranging from digging up a minor statistic to the major overhaul of a factory production line.

EXPERT JUGGLING ACT

All four experts are engaged in something of a juggling act. John P. Cleaver, production consultant, may be rescheduling a plant's production line to get a steadier flow of materials, thereby releasing men for part-time duty elsewhere. But at the same time he'll be working out a materials handling system for another company and also looking for new products for a furniture manufacturer who has a 3-month slack season.

Sales consultant Alfred B. DePasse may be persuading the local art museum to redesign one company's product while he lines up manufacturer's agents in New York for a couple of other firms. Or he'll be advising a client on how to fix minimum retail prices for his products under State fair trade laws and still another about his California sales tax liability.

Traffic expert John T. Floyd, Jr., has perhaps the most hectic job in tackling industries' daily transportation problems. While expediting a shipment to West Virginia, he'll be advising a manufacturer on the best route to Altoona. He'll be finding out when the next heated boxcar leaves for Seattle and whether the next ship for the Philippines sails from Boston or New York.

Foreign trade consultant William Beltz supplies the most dramatic results. Currently he's touring Mexico and South America to look into possible new markets for Worcester industry. Almost 50 companies gave him odd jobs to carry out south of the border, which ranged from finding a new representative to locating an outlet for machine tools.

GOOD NEWS FROM MEXICO

Mr. Beltz is turning in cheering reports for home town business. One Mexican firm is ready to place a $25,000 order with a Worcester sporting gun manufacturer, if it can have exclusive representation in that country. Another company, allied with interests building a new Mexican automobile plant, would like to represent a Worcester roll thread die maker. A third wants to buy 60,000 corsets.

The Mexican trip also revealed what industries would find a poor market in that country. Worcester textile machinery, for instance, might go begging there because French manufacturers sell at lower prices. Swedish saw makers can also quote lower prices than Yankee competitors.

Dollar and cents figures showing results of the consulting service are scarce. Increased sales and profits, with their attendant increase in production and employment, are still in the developing stage.

For instance, the sales expert can only estimate that his efforts to put four Worcester manufacturers in the New York market will add $200,000 to $300,000 to a present $1,000,000 volume. And the production consultant has still to see whether his system for storing paper in a print shop will save an estimated $4 to $8 per order.

SOME IMMEDIATE GAINS

But the consultants can point to some immediate monetary gains. There's the saving of 7 cents per 100 units in the packaging of a paper product. And the labor cost of a plastic product has been cut from 1.59 cents per unit to 1.32 cents through rescheduling an assembly line.

The traffic consultant cities some striking gains. A company shipped hand cream to Canada as a protective coating for factory workers' hands. By changing the description on the invoice and bill of lading from "cosmetics" to "industrial compound," the shipper was saved 10 percent on duty charges and 15 to 20 percent on freight charges.

An electrical manufacturer saved on freight charges—as much as $200 a car—by listing items separately. Some pieces of equipment took a lower rate than others. Packing items in a shipment more closely also cuts freight fees—for instance, nesting metal furniture reduced shipping costs to South Africa by two-thirds. And freight costs on stores fixtures were halved by sending the fixtures knocked down instead of fully assembled.

Speeding shipments through the work of the traffic expert has helped Worcester companies. Delivery in 4 days of a shipment to West Virginia that often took 2 weeks brought repeat orders.

Another plant was kept in operation because the consulting service ferreted out a carload of parts sidetracked under a bridge in Ohio.

Industrial service schemes are spreading. The State of Vermont looked into the Worcester program and now has a consulting staff advising on production, traffic, accounting, and wood fabrication. Lawrence, Mass., has adopted the plan with its chamber of commerce adding industrial relations and retail trade to the other services.

Outside New England, two Ohio cities—Columbus and Dayton—have expressed interest.

PROBLEM OF RETURNING GI'S

Worcester's attention-attracting consulting program was originally inaugurated because officials were worried about absorbing 12,000 returning veterans into their employment set-up. A drop in population from 195,311 in 1930 to 193,694 in 1940 was evidence the city was not an expanding industrial center.

Faced with the possibility of a whopping relief bill if they didn't find jobs for their returning GI's, Worcester businessmen decided the only alternative was to expand their small industry and attract new concerns.

Result of the decision: Recruiting the four consultants to put new life into the old companies and a campaign to get new industries which has netted 82 new firms adding an estimated $5,600,000 to the city's annual pay roll.

Need for New Coinage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to offer a statement by Edward Walsh Mehren, president of the Squirt Co., of Beverly Hills., Calif., which is in my congressional district.

Mr. Mehren is a young businessman who, in my opinion, typifies the kind of business thinking that has made our country great. He has become the spark plug of a Nation-wide campaign—I might say a crusade, Mr. Speaker—to fight inflation by instituting a more modern, convenient, flexible, and economical small-coinage system. He has talked with the leaders of Government here in Washington, legislative and executive, and has received a most heartening response. Legislation to bring this program into being is now in preparation and I commend Mr. Mehren's statement to my colleagues for their consideration. His statement follows:

Seventy years have passed since we have changed the variety of small coins in our United States currency. Yet in that period we have progressed from a simple to a highly industrialized and complex society. A greater variety and quantity of limited price products and services are now available to our people than ever before in history. It is time we reexamined our small coinage to determine if it has adequate flexibility, convenience, and economy for our modern society.

There is evidence on every hand that pricing of limited price commodities is based more on convenience than on value. The proof is the great variety of products grouped at prices of 5 cents, 10 cents, 15 cents, 20 cents, 25 cents, and other multiple nickel points. It is obvious that nickel, dime, quarter, and similar pricing is done for the convenience of both buyer and seller. People on both sides of the store counter do not like to bother with pennies.

Were we to eliminate the nickel, dime, and quarter, and use pennies only, for all sales under a half dollar, prices would be reduced to lower and more reasonable profit levels. There would not be groups of prices then at 5 cents, 10 cents, 15 cents, and other multiple nickel points. Rather, such a penny-coinage system would force prices closer to product values. We would then find most prices at odd-penny amounts. It would then become convenient to price lower in order to save penny-counting trouble and time. But the American people would not tolerate a penny standard. We want convenience and convenience coins to such an extent that we pay more for what we buy. We want to save our time and trouble. So we overpay for convenience and each of us throws many pennies away daily.

For 70 years our small coinage has been limited to the penny, nickel, dime, and quarter. During periods of relative economic stability and fairly constant money values, this coinage system tends to be adequate and economical. If during such a period, a gross overpricing of any product exists—due to pricing at a nickel, dime, etc., for convenience—competition normally forces more quantity, and/or quality for the price, or else the product through lack of sales volume disappears from the market place. Due to habit in packaging, customary price, and other marketing reasons, this may not always take place, and gross overpricing based on convenience coins may last for decades. Hence, the addition of several more convenience coins to the currency would tend to bring pricing in periods of relative stability closer to actual values. The resulting savings to consumers would be significant.

In inflationary periods, our present limited small-coinage system costs the American public billions of dollars annually. When a nickel product can no longer sell for a reasonable profit at a nickel, the price all too frequently jumps to the next convenience coin—a dime. That is a 100-percent price increase—just as bad as an increase from one hundred to two hundred dollars. Ten-cent products jump to fifteen and the parade goes on similarly at any price level. If we had intermediary convenient coins of 7½-cent and 12½-cent value, nickel prices would go to 7½ cents and dime prices would go to 12½ cents instead of 15 cents. And these coins would provide convenient midpoints between 15 and 20 cents, 20 and 25 cents, and elsewhere in our pricing. The effect of the coins would be to slow down an inflationary spiral, and save billions of dollars on the consumer level.

In deflationary periods, our present coins are too limited to permit a gradual retrogression in price levels in the limited-price field. For example, 15-cent items stay at that convenient price until they can profitably be sold at a dime. And they are grossly over-priced for the greatest part of the waiting period. If we had convenient in-between coins, the price would recede from 15 to 12½ cents earlier with consequent healthful impact on the national economy. In-between coins would help accelerate a healthy deflation at all limited and other price levels.

We people should have our Government provide us with three new small coins. These coins should be of 2½ cents, 7½ cents, and 12½ cents denominations. Given these coins, we would, in effect, have the usefulness of a one-half-cent coin without having such a piece; for example, we could pay a one-half-cent sales tax with a 7½-cent coin by getting 7 cents in change. All three coins are required to give us a truly flexible, convenient, economical, small-coinage system.

Given these coins, the American public will save from four to six billion dollars a year through the elimination of gross overpricing of most limited price commodities. The public spends the four to six billions now at a penny or more too much per sale as the price of convenience. The retailer, wholesaler, and manufacturer gets the money—but they do not spend it for more goods as rapidly as would the public. When the public makes the saving, we people will immediately put it back in the flow of money again for more goods. This will enable producer and distributor to make and sell more goods at lower unit costs. The greater volume of goods will require more employment and result in greater pay rolls, more profits and a sounder undertone for our entire economy.

Among the products and services which would be affected in price are newspapers, soft drinks, candy, ice cream cones and bars, milk, coffee, tea, sandwiches, streetcar, bus and subway fares, magazines, the telephone, coin vending machines, sales taxes, beer, packaged nuts, cigars, cigarettes, tobacco, shoe shines, parking meters, postage stamps, and the myriad of limited price products sold in the variety, drug, grocery, and other fields. With more flexible, convenient coins, these products and services will sell at prices closer to value, and in greater volume, with consequent savings to the consumer.

The immediate effect of the addition of these new coins will be deflationary. Prices are at or near the top of the spiral. If these coins were made available tomorrow, hundreds of products could be cut from too high a price based on convenience, downward to a new convenient coin price closer to value. On the basis of my estimate of a $5,000,000,000 annual consumer saving, $11,000,000 per day will be saved the American people when we get the coins. We need that money now to buy more of the necessities of life. The effect of these coins may be to turn our economy toward stability and help avert depression. What this country needs is some 2½-, 7½-, and 12½-cent coins. They would be the device for and symbol of thrift. We need them soon.

Since November 1947, I've been crusading for this new small coinage. I have corresponded with and spoken to thousands and thousands of Americans representing all walks of life—the public, labor, consumers, women, industry, education, government,

and so on. Only one person so far has failed to agree that the proposal is sound or is worthy of serious study, and that man wouldn't take the time to hear me out.

During the past 10 days I have presented my idea to Senators, Congressmen, Senate and House of Representative committee executive clerks, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and other Treasury Department officials, the vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors to the President, to the public in this area by television, and to the press.

Power and Water Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article published in the Berkeley Daily Gazette of March 8, 1948, which shows the effect of the water and power shortage in California in curtailing production and employment over a widespread area.

The people of California, including leaders in industry and labor, are doing what they can to meet their situation. The situation is such, however, as to show the great need for the rapid completion of power and water projects which have been undertaken or proposed in California. The article follows:

RIGID POWER CURBS TAKE HOLD IN NORTH

(By Hal Johnson)

Rigid new power restrictions, aimed at curtailing the use of electricity at least 20 percent, became effective in 46 central and northern California counties today.

Instructions to industries, farms, and business that they must go on a 4-day power week, paved the way for extensive curtailment of employment in manufacturing plants north of the Tehachapi. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. today began notify its customers on which day of the week their power would be shut off.

President Joseph Moore of the California Metal Trade Association called a special session of that organization to discuss the enforced power shortage. The meeting was still in progress late this afternoon. President Thomas S. Neilson of the Berkeley Steel Construction Co. and President George Raitt of the Steel Pipe & Tank Co. of California, both local plants were attending the meeting.

Raitt said today, just before starting to the association meeting that his company had done everything possible already to conserve power short of laying off employees. "If there is no improvement in the power situation, I am afraid it will mean a 4-day working week in many plants. Already it has curtailed our production."

MANUFACTURERS TO ACT

The Berkeley Manufacturers Association holds its March meeting tomorrow evening. President Eugene Jurs said today that the power situation would be discussed. "Our members realize the seriousness of the situation. All of us want to cooperate. The 4-day power week will work extreme hardship on many local plants. It will call for intelligent discussion and for rationing of power available."

Effect of the power cut was reflected immediately in industrial employment in the San Francisco Bay area. Bethlehem shipyard told 2,250 employees to take the day off. They were instructed to return to work tomorrow. Company officials said it apparently would be necessary to order a similar lay-off Wednesday and Friday unless emergency power-generation equipment could be installed.

Approximately 150 machinists at American Can Co.'s tool shop were sent home this morning, but told to report as usual tomorrow. Permanente Metals, near San Jose, was reported to have shut down its phosphate fertilizer operations indefinitely, throwing out of work some 50 persons.

There was no laying off of employees in local plants which have curtailed power and cut production. However, the American Trailer Co. is considering a 4-day week throughout the plant. California Ink Co. was in a huddle this afternoon with P. G. & E. officials.

Labor leaders in San Francisco said today that many dismissals due to power shortage were expected, with employees losing 1 day's pay a week. "It's an emergency," said Al Wynn, head of the Bay Cities Metal Trades Council. "There isn't much we're going to do about it."

He added that a protest would be made to the California Public Utilities Commission and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. on behalf of the employees.

Rain in the valleys and light snow predicted for the mountains late today and tonight were expected to do little more than settle the dust of a vast area in central and northern California, experiencing its worst winter drought in history. The rich San Joaquin Valley, probably the hardest hit of all areas, feared for its beef cattle and fruit industries.

BUY POWER PLANTS

Many valley farmers, rather than take a multimillion-dollar loss in crops for the next two seasons, were investing thousands of dollars in motor generators to keep their pumping machinery going. The heavy purchasing of gas- and Diesel-driven units was reported following the announcement in San Francisco by N. R. Sutherland, vice president of the P. G. & E., of a new system-wide slow-down of power distribution.

To keep their irrigation machinery going during the intervals they are cut off by the power company, farmers, principally raising tree fruit and table grapes were buying motor units costing from $600 to $1,800 each. Some cotton growers, who will be preirrigating later in March and irrigating heavily in June, also were buying heavy-duty engines to drive their pumps.

TRIAL PLAN

Meanwhile a trial plan for the weekly curtailment of power from Bakersfield to Merced was announced by the P. G. & E. The plan calls for banning power usage for 12 hours in specified regions once in a week.

Under the plan, agricultural pumping and industrial use in excess of 500 kilowatts was to be banned from 8 a. m. to 8 p. m. today in Kern County south of the Kern River and during the same hours tomorrow north of the river.

The emergency measure was outlined to 400 farmers and industrialists in Bakersfield Saturday. According to V. C. Redman, Fresno, assistant district manager of the P. G. & E., a meeting with major power users is scheduled in each area of the valley 2 days before the curtailment goes into effect.

However, Redman says the curtailment program is only on a trial basis.

"We'll try it this week and see how it works out," he said.

Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement concerning the Supreme Court decision regarding the Champaign, Ill., school case by Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder to the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., on Sunday evening, March 14, 1948:

It is an American citizen's duty to obey constituted authority; it is an American citizen's privilege, especially in matters of religion and conscience, to offer his testimony to the public when he differs with that authority. Without for one moment questioning the correctness of what the Court has done from the viewpoint of law, I plead a layman's right to offer his interpretation of the application of that decision from a social, educational, and religious point of view.

I wish to make a statement tonight concerning the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court on the Champaign, Ill., school case dealing with the use of public school buildings for the holding of religious education classes during school hours. The Court decided by a vote of 8 to 1 that this practice is a violation of the principle of separation of church and state and reversed the Supreme Court of Illinois.

One of my newspaper friends in telling the story of the case closes with these words, "This is final." Whether this decision in practical application will be the enforced policy of the land, and thereby final, may be determined, it seems to me, by watching how the broad application of the principle involved works out in the total field of American life.

Let us first see clearly what is before us. Mrs. Vashti McCollum has a son who is a student in the Champaign public schools. She is an avowed atheist, which is her American privilege, and she desires that her son have no religious instruction and also not be embarrassed by his refusal to do so. Having followed the case quite closely, I am at present of the opinion that the lady is far more concerned with the spread of atheism than with the constitutional rights of her son.

Mr. Justice Black in presenting the majority opinion of the Court rests his judgment on the principle of the separation of church and state. Holding for the majority, he rules that this separation is violated by using public-school buildings during school hours for religious classes. Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant teachers were provided in Champaign and no child could be enrolled without the written permission of parents or guardians. Everybody, it seems, was satisfied except Mrs. McCollum.

Those of us who oppose her point of view are fundamentally concerned with constitutional government and also with the religious illiteracy of America and the accompanying weakness of our Nation. We have felt that the release-time program, geared to the public opinion of the various communities across the Nation, is one constructive approach to many children whom the churches have difficulty in reaching with any religious training. Some of the country's best-informed educators slowly and gradually evolved this program, now reaching perhaps 2,000,000 children in 2,000 communities. For many of us,

therefore, the real meaning of the Court's decision is the effect it will have on this over-all religious educational effort. According to the press, Justice Jackson and Justice Reed believe it will stop the release-time plan.

Mr. Justice Reed in his minority opinion expresses my point of view and I take my clue for the interpretation of this decision from him. To test the permanent meaning of this decision, let us see some changes that will have to happen if the kind of separation of church and state proposed in this decision obtains in the United States at large.

The most obvious commingling of church and state occurred in this city last Thursday evening when a remarkable, inspiring, and altogether appropriate service of worship was held by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the Washington Federation of Churches in the Washington Cathedral upon the theme of the Churches and the European Recovery Program. Mark you: the European recovery program is a governmental proposition now being debated in the Congress. But it was taken into the Episcopal cathedral. And who presented the matter? The Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall. He called upon the fundamental Christian principles undergirding this Nation for support of the Marshall plan. And who sat on the front row in this Government-worship service? President Harry S. Truman himself. Unless the same principle of the sharp separation of church and state applies to those in highest positions equally with local school boards, I believe this decision is not final. Thursday evening witnessed a commingling of church and state which no small town school building could provide.

What shall we say of the Congress itself? Let us see. If the Court decision becomes the enforced policy of the land, Peter Marshall and James Shera Montgomery should be fired from their positions as chaplains of the Senate and House. Their posts should be abolished and never again should the Congress be opened with prayer. The present practice of daily prayer for God's guidance by ordained ministers of the church is the commingling of church and state far more intimately and on a larger scale than any small town school could provide.

Come with me to the Government Printing Office. In face of the principle of the separation of church and state—and Mr. Justice Frankfurter says it means separation and not something less—the Government Printing Office prints for the Congress the prayers of church ministers, acting as chaplains, as official documents.

Come with me to the Veterans' Administration. Every informed person knows that along with doctors, competent chaplains do more for the recovery and rehabilitation of disabled veterans than anyone else on the staff—but chaplains must go if this sharp interpretation of church-state relationship stands as the enforced policy of the land.

The remarkable chapel at the Naval Academy in Annapolis should be converted into another type of building, all chaplaincy service discontinued and some of us will have preached our last sermon there, if this decision of the Supreme Court becomes the enforced policy of the Nation. The Naval Academy stands for the commingling of church and state as no small city public school in Illinois possibly could do. And what is true at Annapolis is also true at West Point.

And, once more, look with me at the Army and Navy. If this decision is the enforced law of the land, every chaplain should be removed from the armed services. They are ordained ministers of the churches they represent. They are not ordained by the Government and their chaplaincy service is a commingling of church and state on a world scale and more intimately than a small or large city public school ever could be.

Let us pick up a few closing illustrations of the violation of this decision of the Court which should be stopped if this decision becomes the enforced policy of the land. The Government Mint should be forbidden to use "In God We Trust" on our coins. It might offend some atheist. Never again can a minister of the church pray at the inauguration of a President of the United States. That is a commingling of church and state on a national scale such as a little obscure school building holding some religious exercises never could be. Ministers of religion serving as chaplains in jails, penitentiaries, reform schools, Federal and State hospitals should be removed for they violate the principle of this decision. If it only applies to school building's it's trivial and unfair.

Come what will from the side of the state toward the enforcement of this decision and speaking for this one church alone, as long as I am pastor I will do my utmost to keep the United States flag inside this building and in this nave in which we worship, for nothing that concerns the welfare of America is foreign to our religion.

I now repeat the proposition with which I began. Whether this decision in practical application will be the policy of the land, and thereby final, may be determined by watching how the broad application of the principle involved works out in the total field of American life. Why must the cultural pattern of America be changed at this late date when it has been religious at its core since Benjamin Franklin proposed prayer for God's guidance at the Constitutional Convention? It is my sober and studied conviction that this decision, seen in this larger perspective, does not mean the separation of church and state but the separation of religion and state which Mr. Justice Frankfurter says is what we should have. All this in a day when our democracy needs its full historic resources, as General Marshall so earnestly pleaded last Thursday evening.

Every student of this problem knows that the sacred relationship of church and state is capable of flagrant abuse. When abuse comes, the Court should protect all concerned. That's what a court is for. And any church that tries to secure special Government favor should be handled in American fashion. As far as humanly possible, let us separate as institutions of society both church and state but not to the point of separating religion and government. Keeping religion out of government, society, and state is tragedy for democracy.

Let us hope this Court decision will have a minimum of educational disturbance. Let us hope it means at most the removal of religious classes from public-school buildings, though we who agree with Justice Reed are unable to see whose rights are violated in the Champaign plan and we urge the Government to go after the big fish instead of the minnows. Let us pursue a more thorough use of the release-time program. Let the homes and churches of America freshly resolve to teach our children, youth, and adults the Christian way of life more vigorously than ever. Unless these alternatives prevail, the public-school system in this Nation is the real victim of this decision.

I bow to the Court. I appeal to the future.

British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., of March 8, 1948:

LESSONS OF THE BRITISH LOAN

Congress, deep in debate over the amount of money and the initial length of time for such grants to be set under the Marshall plan, will unquestionably view with interest the announcement that last Monday England drew the last one hundred million under the so-called British loan made to her in 1946.

Thus the proceeds of that loan of three billions, seven hundred and fifty millions, which was to have carried Britain over a 3½-year period and to have "put her on her feet economically," have been exhausted in less than 20 months and the economic condition of the British people is really only slightly better than it was when the loan was made.

Some critics might argue superficially, that England's failure to achieve recovery with this initial grant is an evidence of weakness of the entire Marshall plan. That overlooks entirely the possibility of what might have happened to England and to all of Europe, if we had not made this British loan. Communism would unquestionably have a much stronger grip on the Continent than it has and few if any nations would look to us for aid in their extremities. England's continuing difficulties are a cause for disappointment but not for abandonment of peaceful recovery in Europe.

This early exhaustion of Britain's loan does emphasize two points:

The first is that it is fruitless to argue too much over the exact amounts set for aid under the Marshall plan. Changing conditions may make these totals too small, or possibly too large, long before they are exhausted. The best that Congress can do now is to set an estimate, with the practically positive assurance that this estimate will have to be revised later.

A second point is that this estimate cannot be too low or it will discourage and dishearten the nations who are to cooperate with us in promoting recovery under a democratic regime. This is a program of "self-help" for European nations—if they are discouraged by the threat of inadequate financing at the very start of the program, then assuredly it is doomed to failure and the entire investment is unwarranted.

These advances should be surrounded with maximum safeguards which insist and demand full participation and effort by the nations benefited, to work out their own salvation. If they fail to do this then advances should be cut off. On the other hand if they do cooperate their efforts should not be hamstrung for lack of essential finances to bring about the restoration of a healthy and normal economy.

Amendment of Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, in July 1946, the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted H. R. 1362, generally known as the Crosser bill, amending the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts. Since that time the cost of living has increased almost exactly 25 percent. In other words, it would now take 25 percent more than the

insurance payments provided in the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts to buy the quantity of goods and services that we thought we were enabling unemployed, sick, and retired railroad employees to buy with their insurance payments provided by the laws as in 1946.

Railroad employees in active service have been able, in a measure at least, to offset the increasing cost of living by obtaining increases in wage rates. No such relief has been available to those who become unemployed or sick or who have retired. Increased wages have merely enhanced the loss that they suffer when wages stop.

Increased wage rates have, however, operated to increase railroad pay rolls above the levels anticipated in 1946, and since the revenues supporting the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems are measured by pay rolls there have become available funds which ought to be applied without delay to relieving the serious distress that the rising living costs have inflicted on railroad employees who become unemployed or sick or who are retired.

I have introduced a bill to increase the benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by 25 percent. This bill is intended merely to restore the purchasing power of railroad unemployment insurance benefits to the levels we meant to provide when the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted H. R. 1362. At that time it was believed that the benefits provided by H. R. 1362 were all that the available funds could support. The adequacy of the benefits was never considered from any other standpoint. Study is now being given to the question whether the available funds would support more nearly adequate benefits in terms of 1946 purchasing power as well as merely to restore 1946 purchasing power. Should it appear that available funds are adequate for that purpose I shall introduce a bill to accomplish that result.

The distress among retired employees is no less severe than among the sick and the unemployed. Study is likewise being given to the practicability of securing for retired employees some measure of relief. With that purpose in mind I expect to introduce a bill at an early date.

I am authorized to state that this program, which I have outlined, meets with the approval and has the vigorous support of the standard railway labor organizations represented in the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Senator David I. Walsh—A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein some brief remarks I recently made before the Committee on State Administration of the General Court of Massachusetts in support of pending measures providing for the erection of suitable memorials to commemorate the service of my dear, greatly lamented friend of a lifetime, the late Senator David I. Walsh.

Massachusets will ever keep green in her memory the name and noble achievements of this great native son and American patriot who truly gave his life to his country.

It is satisfying to note that the committee broke all precedents for hasty action on this legislation by favorably reporting it immediately after the hearings were closed.

Many distinguished citizens appeared in behalf of the measures. Five former governors and many public officials, judges, representatives of labor, business, women's and other groups comprised a most impressive sponsorship which in fact evidenced the unanimous opinion of the citizens of my historic State.

I must publicly acknowledge the valued and devoted labors of my cherished friend, Judge Thomas H. Connelly, who organized and so very ably led the proponents of this splendid legislation.

The statement above referred to follows:

SENATOR DAVID I. WALSH—GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Chairman, and members, I am highly privileged for the opportunity to appear before you this morning in support of those two measures to commemorate the service of our former distinguished Senator, David I. Walsh. I am conscious of the fact that many persons desire to appear before you this morning in behalf of these most salutary measures and I do not desire to trespass long upon the time of the committee on this occasion. I will therefore be as brief as possible in my statement.

As you probably know, Senator Walsh was a close friend and neighbor of mine in Clinton during my entire life. I was closely associated with him not only as a dear friend but also in public affairs and probably have been in a position to evaluate his great service to our State and Nation as well as anyone. I have the honor to represent the congressional district where Senator Walsh was born, lived, and worked.

There is no question concerning Senator Walsh's monumental stature as a public figure, a great statesman and patriot, a magnetic personality, and one of the great orators of our time. He represented our Commonwealth in various capacities for the greater part of his lifetime, with rare distinction, outstanding ability, sense of proportion, and a compelling public spirit scarcely equaled, never exceeded, in the annals of our Government. I could not begin to enumerate his many accomplishments and achievements in this brief statement but am sure that you and the other members of your distinguished committee are fully cognizant of his magnificent contributions to the cause of sound, progressive government and the well-being of our citizens, particularly those of humble rank and station whom he served so nobly and unselfishly.

Recognizing your knowledge of Senator Walsh's remarkable career, his valued service, the inspiration and help he has given to the poor and lowly, the strong leadership he has furnished to our aspiring citizens in so many vital courses, his humane and forward-looking philosophy, his unremitting labors for our people, his stalwart Americanism, I confidently bespeak your early and favorable consideration of these resolves. I know that you will all want to lead our fellow citizens throughout the State in providing for appropriate memorials to serve as a permanent reminder of the devotion, loyalty, and constructive service of one of Massachusetts' most illustrious sons and one of the truly great Americans of our time—Senator Walsh.

It is therefore most appropriate that suitable memorials should be erected by the State Government fittingly to commemorate the service, devotion, and loyalty of this great American. I feel sure that everyone of you feel as I do that proper recognition should be given to the distinguished career and many public contributions of Senator Walsh and I am very sure you will give the matter careful consideration.

I hope and urge you may favorably report on these measures at a very early date so that plans may be made in accordance with the provisions of this legislation to go forward with memorials provided herein to perpetuate the memory and acknowledge the valued services of our great and lamented former Senator, David I. Walsh, who added so brilliantly to the luster of our beloved Commonwealth.

Japanese-American Awarded Medal of Honor Posthumously

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Army transport *Wilson Victory* was renamed the *Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori* in honor of this American who lost his life in action during the recent war. In connection with my remarks on this subject, as shown in the RECORD of today's proceedings, I insert here the Army's release of March 17, 1946, covering the exploit, the death, and the award of the Medal of Honor in the case of Private Munemori:

JAPANESE-AMERICAN AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR POSTHUMOUSLY

Pfc. Sadao S. Munemori, of Los Angeles, Calif., an American-born combat infantryman of Japanese descent, has been awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously.

A squad leader in the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team, the Japanese-American unit which distinguished itself throughout the Italian campaign and later in Germany, Private Munemori single-handedly destroyed two German machine guns, killed three and wounded two of the gunners, and then gave his life by hurling himself upon an exploding grenade to save the lives of two comrades last April in Italy.

The Nation's highest military award will be presented to his mother, Mrs. Nawa Munemori, of Manzanar, Calif.

On April 5, 1945, the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion launched an offensive along the western slopes of the Appennino Mountains in Italy in an attempt to break a stalemate which had lasted 6 months. The attack on "Hill Georgia," in the vicinity of Seravezza was spearheaded by Company A, Private Munemori's unit. Following a 10-minute artillery barrage on the German positions, the troops of Company A ran toward their objective in an effort to reach advantageous positions before the defenders could recover from the shelling.

As they advanced to within 50 yards of the summit, German machine guns, rifles,

and machine pistols began firing from a series of trenches so constructed as to cover all avenues of approach with heavy fire. Although the early morning darkness made the enemy fire inaccurate, the enemy hurled numerous hand grenades forcing the attackers to seek cover.

Grenade fragments wounded the leader of the foremost squad and Private Munemori, assistant leader, took command. Leading his men carefully through a mine field, private Munemori advanced to within 30 yards of the trenches. One enemy machine gun directly ahead forced the advancing squad to take cover in shallow shell craters.

Private Munemori took six hand grenades and crawled to within 15 yards of the machine gun. He threw the grenades one at a time and wrecked the machine gun, wounding two crew members.

Pfc. Akiri Shishido, of Kohoka, Paia, Maui County, Territory of Hawaii, was a Browning automatic rifleman in the lead squad at the time and Pvt. Jimi Oda, 2523 Orchard Avenue, Ogden, Utah, was assistant automatic rifleman. These two eyewitnesses told the story of their leaders' subsequent actions.

"We advanced nearer the objective until another machine gun opened up right ahead," Private Shishido reported. Private Oda and I scrambled into a shell crater and Private Munemori crawled back and joined us. The Germans began hurling grenades again. Ten or twelve landed near our crater, but we were unhurt by the explosions.

"Private Munemori exclaimed, 'I'm going to get those Germans.' Taking four more grenades, he wormed to within 6 yards of the gun, destroyed the weapon, and killed the three crewmen."

As Private Munemori crawled back toward the crater, more grenades were hurled. One grenade bounced off his helmet and rolled into the shell hole occupied by Privates Shishido and Oda. Private Munemori leaped upon the grenade, covering it with the upper part of his body and hunched his shoulders and bent his head down so the burst would not leak out. The explosion killed him almost instantly. Private Oda escaped with a fragment in his eye, and Private Shishido suffered concussion and partial deafness but their lives were saved. Later the platoon, with the help of a reinforcing platoon, forced the Germans to withdraw from their strategic positions.

Born August 17, 1922, Private Munemori graduated from high school, after which he held a position as a sales clerk. He was inducted into the Army November 2, 1942, from his native city of Los Angeles. His mother and a brother then moved their home to Manzanar, Calif. After basic training at Camp Robinson, Ark., further training qualified him as a cook, supply clerk, ammunition carrier, and finally, as a Browning automatic rifleman. Promotion to private first class came on September 7, 1943. Ordered overseas, Private Munemori arrived in Italy May 8, 1944. Six weeks later, for exemplary conduct in action against the enemy during fighting on the Anzio Beachhead, he was awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge. Prior to his heroic death he had fought in the Rome-Arno, French, and German campaigns.

Following is the official citation:

"Pfc Sadao S. Munemori, an assistant squad leader of Company A, One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, Four Hundred and Forty-Second Regimental Combat Team, fought with great gallantry and intrepidity on April 5, 1945, near Seravezza, Italy.

"When his unit was pinned down by grazing fire from the enemy's strong mountain defense and command of the squad devolved on him with the wounding of its regular leader, he made frontal, one-man attacks through direct fire and knocked out two machine guns with grenades.

"Withdrawing under murderous fire and showers of grenades from other enemy emplacements, he had nearly reached a shell crater occupied by two of his men when an unexploded grenade bounced on his helmit and rolled toward his helpless comrades. He arose into the withering fire, dived for the missile and smothered its blast with his body.

"By his swift, supremely heroic action Private Munemori saved two of his men at the cost of his own life and did much to clear the path for his company's victorious advance."

Increase of Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the interest and affection with which the people hold the postal employees, I should like the membership to read an editorial appearing in the Contra Costa County Gazette of March 1, 1948, entitled "Today's Forgotten Man."

TODAY'S "FORGOTTEN MAN"

Sandwiched in with all the mighty and astute problems of state, buffeted by the Marshall plan, the aid to China, the Greek rebellion, and all the other funnels for tax funds, is a mild and little publicized bill which deserves the immediate attention of Congress.

It is a measure affecting the lives of a minority of Americans, a mighty necessary measure for people who could live next door to you.

We refer to the individuals who in this case, can rightfully be called the "forgotten men of today." They're people you see all the time; people you take for granted. They are the employees of the United States postal service. You know, the mailman who delivers your mail.

Somewhere along the rush for higher wages, for better living conditions, the mailman has been lost in the shuffle. Union members have demanded—and received—more money. The so-called white-collar workers, although they were not represented en masse by hard-hitting unions, exerted sufficient motive for a few more dollars each month.

But the mailman, encased by stringent civil-service regulations which dictated his income and which were based on conditions of 20 years ago, still plods faithfully along, hoping that Congress will pay attention to his request for at least an equal wage, equal to the living costs of today.

Thus far, Congress has seen fit to overlook his requirements. That the cost of living has spiraled, no one will deny. That additional take-home pay has been granted in numerous other fields of employment, is a fact. That the mailman has been overlooked, is a shame!

Congress should not hesitate in granting postal employees an increase in pay. Not all Government employees can be classified as "feeding at the public trough." Congress should act now, on this one measure of urgent necessity, before the Postal Department suddenly finds itself with a number of vacancies to be filled—and no applicants on the waiting list.

Note that the closing paragraph of this editorial calls for immediate action to alleviate the plight of postal workers.

The Italian Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On December 13, 1947, you stated:

"Although the United States is withdrawing its troops from Italy in fulfillment of its obligations under the treaty of peace, this country continues its interest in the preservation of a free and independent Italy. If, in the course of events, it becomes apparent that the freedom and independence of Italy upon which the peace settlement is based are being threatened directly or indirectly, the United States, as a signatory of the peace treaty and as a member of the United Nations, will be obliged to consider what measures would be appropriate for the maintenance of peace and security."

Since that time the tempo of Soviet aggression has been accelerated, Czechoslovakia has succumbed, Finland has received an ultimatum, and there is good reason to believe that the internal situation in Italy has deteriorated to an alarming extent. The Communist Party in Italy has been strengthening its organization and is carrying out an active and widespread propaganda campaign. They are using all manner of means, including large sums of money and ruthless intimidation in order to subject Italy to Soviet domination.

I need hardly point out that if Soviet aggression by means of the Communist Party in Italy is successful, the opportunity which is presented to us to effect European recovery will be severely jeopardized, the national security of the United States will be dangerously compromised, and the peace of the world seriously threatened.

In my opinion, and to use your own words, it has become "apparent that the freedom and independence of Italy upon which the peace settlement is based are being threatened."

I assume, therefore, that in accordance with your statement, the United States is considering "what measures would be appropriate for the maintenance of peace and security." I assume also that this consideration will in due time lead to effective action.

It is not my desire to embarrass you, sir, in the administration of your high office or in the execution of your solemn duties by asking you to reveal to me what steps you are taking and what action you contemplate in this connection.

May I, however, offer some suggestions on certain aspects of this vast and surging problem on which, in my opinion, it is appropriate to take immediate action.

1. Make a public declaration that in the event that antidemocratic forces prevail in the forthcoming election, the United States will be compelled to review its position with respect to any assistance being rendered the

people of Italy whether as a part of the European recovery program or otherwise.

2. Take appropriate steps looking toward a revision of the Italian peace treaty in order that the free territory of Trieste may be returned to Italy in accordance with the original position taken by this Government at the beginning of the Italian peace treaty negotiations.

3. Pursuant to the terms of the Italian peace treaty clarify the position of the United States by stating that our Government favors Italian trusteeship of the pre-Fascist Italian colonies in order that this vital territory shall be available to Italy for settlement and development.

4. Renew our demand to the Security Council of the United Nations that Italy be admitted as a member of that organization. It is obviously unjust that the U. S. S. R., which is responsible for the Draconian peace terms imposed on Italy should visit this further penalty on a hard-working and suffering people.

5. Officially and publicly urge the government of the Soviet Union to renounce her share of the Italian Navy.

6. In order that the Italian Government may have the means to protect itself against internal and external aggression, a revision of the Italian peace treaty should also provide for a larger Italian army, navy, and constabulary than are allowed under the present treaty.

Mr. President, the strategical position of the United States and the peace of the world become more precarious with each passing hour. Surely we know that we cannot strengthen the forces of peace and freedom by allowing ourselves to be pushed indefinitely from one Munich to another. It is not enough to protest after aggressive action has been completed. It is not enough merely to give lip service to the ideals of freedom for which so many Americans have died. We must take preventive action. We must act in advance of the event. We must meet the challenge as it is presented to us in all its aspects.

There is a time for decision. I believe that that time has arrived. We know that our vital interests are involved. We know that freedom is at stake. We know that peace cannot prevail without the faith, the strength, and the declared purpose of our great Republic.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 11, 1948.

Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LODGE: I appreciate very much your letter of March 9, and I am more than happy to have your views on the Italian situation.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

The Case for Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following by Felix Morley from Life magazine:

THE CASE FOR TAFT—HIS INTELLIGENCE, INTEGRITY, AND BULL-HEADED HONESTY WOULD MAKE HIM A PRESIDENT PEOPLE CAN TRUST

(By Felix Morley)

The thirty-fourth President of the United States should be, above all other things, a thoughtful man. ROBERT ALPHONSO TAFT, of Ohio, is thoughtful. He has a mind of real distinction; his whole career is based on extraordinary mental activity.

To some voters and to some politicians these are forbidding virtues in a Presidential candidate. But the superior quality of TAFT'S mind can be put another way, more attractively; it is the way in which the other 95 Senators phrase their respect for him: "When BOB TAFT says something, he knows." And all Americans, even political bosses, respect the man who knows.

Throughout his active political career the senior Senator from Ohio has kept on learning—growing in intellectual stature. His power of mental self-discipline and of intensive application must be appreciated to understand the man. The sense and feel of scholarship are in his bloodstream; he can no more resist the scholar's urge to think a problem through than a more natural politician like the late President Roosevelt could resist the inclination to act on intuition.

It would be a mistake, however, to think of BOB TAFT as a "bookish" person; he has no more in common with the traditional absent-minded professor than with the back-slapping, glad-handing type of politician. Nor, despite his flat, dry voice and precise selection of words, is his manner pedantic. One must study the man closely—observe the height and breadth of forehead, the firm chin, sensitive fingers and, above all, the alert, wide-set and candid eyes, to recognize his distinction.

Yet, although it may sound paradoxical, undoubtedly TAFT'S greatest handicap as a candidate for the Presidential nomination is this unusual intelligence. The thought of the average man is choked by prejudices, ambitions, needs, and other considerations which impede and sometimes overwhelm his ability to reason. But once BOB TAFT tackles a problem no emotion of any kind colors the working of his mind. His intelligence is as indifferent to flattery as it is hostile to stupidity. It is this concentration on ideas which gives the impression that the Senator is cold, aloof, and self-absorbed. Actually there is great warmth and friendliness in his character. His difficulty as a politician is simply his fidelity to the rule of reason.

Fidelity of any sort requires courage. Fidelity to the rule of reason, in a society where reason is so often made the football of emotion, requires courage of a high order. Courage of that quality BOB TAFT has—his bitterest critics do not deny it. But it is by no means certain that his moral courage is any more of a political asset than his intelligence.

The keen political instinct of the American people is well demonstrated by the accuracy of the names which they have accepted for their two major political parties. The principal concern of the Republican Party is very definitely the preservation of our republican form of government, which is not particularly democratic and indeed lays great emphasis on protecting the individual from the ever-possible tyranny of the majority. The major concern of the Democratic Party is obviously the extension of democratic procedures, regardless of whether or not these conform with the somewhat undemocratic principles embodied in the Constitution. Republicans pay lip service to political democracy and Democrats pay lip service to the Republic. But if we are willing to call a spade by that name we must admit that the Republican Party is not primarily interested in extending democracy and that the Democratic Party is not primarily interested in preserving the Federal Republic. It is the achievement of our two-party system that, by the very opposition of forces involved, it has so far served both to extend democracy and to preserve the republican form of representative government.

The fundamentally different character of the two parties accounts for the differences between the party machines and the different character of the candidates these machines select. The real difference between the successful Republican and the successful Democratic boss is the type of organization they seek to perfect. The Democrats make their major concentration—except for the solid South—in big cities, where the sharp contrast between wealth and poverty renders the slogans of democracy more effective. With equal logic the Republicans consider it fundamental to hold for that party the rural areas—again excepting the South—and the smaller towns. Because there is already more democracy in these communities, people there are less likely to vote Democratic. Because the tradition of the Republic is alien to many who live in the big cities, it is more difficult to line up Republican votes in these metropolitan ganglia.

It follows that the ideal Democratic candidate should be something of a demagog, skillful in arousing the sense of injustice and competent in leading the masses. The ideal Republican candidate, on the other hand, must never be a demagog and should not seek to lead beyond the well-defined limits of party discipline. Thus the Democrats are usually most successful when they name candidates who can rally the masses, while the Republicans are in form when they have nominees who are not likely to get out of hand. The Democratic boss is always seeking a peerless leader; the Republican boss wants a competent administrator.

To some Republican chiefs Senator TAFT is an uncertain quantity. Around the Union League there is a good deal of anguished doubt about him. Is he sufficiently regular? Will he take the good advice which Republican bosses are always willing to extend? As I heard one of these king makers put it, "In the last 3 months he hasn't called me up—not once."

It may still be news to some, but there are a number of Republican leaders who think that Taft flirts with socialism; that he is not quite "sound"—meaning thoroughly devoted to the doctrine of laissez faire—in his political and economic theory. There are three counts in this indictment, these being the Senator's sponsorship of those bills favoring Federal aid in education, health, and housing.

A FLOOR UNDER ESSENTIAL THINGS

The underlying pattern of these bills is identical. In each case the Federal Government would be authorized to subsidize State or local authorities anxious to attain certain minimum standards in public education, health, and housing. In each case initiative for improvement is left to the community, and there are careful safeguards against Federal usurpation.

While Senator TAFT admits that some aspects of this legislation qualify the principle of free enterprise, he hotly denies that it is necessarily socialistic for the state to come to the aid of individuals who fall behind in the march of life. "The philosophy of socialism," he says, "is to raise all to the average, which necessarily will bring all others down to the same dead level and take all life and progress out of the system. * * * The extreme philosophy the other way is to 'let the devil take the hindmost' * * * on the theory that in the end general progress will be faster."

Against the philosophy of extreme individualism Senator TAFT makes three points.

First, it is contrary to the humane instincts of a Christian people, which Americans in general are. Second, a nation founded on that principle that all men are equal cannot logically permit any of its children to be deprived of opportunity. Third, education, health, and housing are matters which affect the national welfare and therefore justify intervention by the National Government. The Senator summarized his own attitude on this subject in a notable speech before the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce on January 7, 1946, when he said, "Our policy is to maintain a minimum standard floor under subsistence, education, medical care, and housing. I believe that our people have decided that our productive ability is so great that we will undertake to put a floor under essential things, to give to all a minimum standard of decent living, and to all children a fair opportunity to get a start in life."

TAFT's position as here stated illustrates most clearly his greatest weakness—and his greatest strength. The weakness is a hot temper leading to snap judgments. When he first viewed the Wagner-Ellender bill he called it socialism, nonsense, tommyrot, and various other unpleasant things. But his sense of justice led him to examine the situation more carefully. He then discovered that, while the bill was as bad as he had thought, its intentions were honorable. At once he was seriously interested; for weeks on end he plowed through the stacks of studies made of the housing situation—studies were about all the New Dealers did about housing—and ended by becoming an authority. The Taft researchers (he has the largest staff of research experts of any Congressman) brought him piles of charts, data, figures, books, and clippings, and he dug in with zest. He emerged from his studies with a clear and sensible measure.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Thus BOB TAFT reached his position on social legislation by careful reasoning combined with religious conviction. He is uninfluenced by the fact that there are votes to be gained through Federal spending. His guide is conscience, directed by reason. And once he has determined his line of action, he sticks to it.

This characteristic became apparent to all during the historic fight over the legislation now best known as the Taft-Hartley Act. It is now generally realized that this law in no way circumscribes the right to strike or any other reasonable union activity. Indeed it requires union recognition and, in the Senator's words, "strengthens the principles of collective bargaining rather than weakens them."

The great accomplishment of the Taft-Hartley act is its emphasis on the principle of equity in labor-management relations. Prior to the Wagner act the advantage was on the side of the employer. Under the Wagner Act, as administered by the New Deal, the pendulum swung to the opposite extreme. Union leaders were given powers at least as arbitrary as those possessed by employers in the open-shop days. The excesses to which such favoritism can lead have recently been demonstrated in France, where Communist control of unions brought the country to the verge of civil war. The achievement of Senator TAFT, in the measure which he sponsored in the upper House, was to avert such danger in the United States. Because of its logic, its vision and its emphasis on social justice, this Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 will long be cited as an illustration of statesmanship.

Nevertheless it took courage to sponsor this measure, as well as ability of a very high order to have it enacted over the opposition and veto of a hostile administration. In accepting the challenge Senator TAFT seemed to have committed political suicide. He was warned that he was not only throwing away all hope for the Republican nomination but even jeopardizing his seat in the Senate.

The Senator listened patiently—and went ahead on the course which he knew was in the national interest. First, as usual, he proceeded to make himself an expert on the facts involved. Bothered neither by the warnings of his friends nor by the desperate efforts of union czars to sell the idea that this was a slave-labor bill, he went on to draft the bill he thought the country needed. The public laughed off the efforts, some of them Communist-inspired, to discredit his western trip last fall by picketing. As usual the Communists overplayed their hand. The stick which was to flog BOB TAFT from public life looks pretty weak and worm-eaten now. In less than a year some political prophets have turned to say that the Taft-Hartley Act may actually become a valuable vote-getting asset.

THE CONCEPT OF JUSTICE

Again from a narrow political viewpoint nothing could have seemed more inept than the speech Senator TAFT made in Ohio on October 5, 1946, questioning the Nuremberg trials. The occasion was a conference at Kenyon College on the Heritage of the English-Speaking Peoples. The Senator's thesis was the importance of the concept of justice, that ethical principle which has meant so much to all English-speaking communities. Speaking shortly after the Nazi leaders had been sentenced at Nuremberg, TAFT pointed out that they had been tried under ex post facto law, prohibited on American soil, and he questioned the justice of the whole procedure. He said, "By clothing policy in the forms of legal procedure, we may discredit the whole idea of justice in Europe for years to come."

The crimes of Goering and his associates were so foul that to run any risk of seeming to defend the perpetrators would be impossible except for a man to whom there was vital meaning in the old Roman saying, "Fiat justitia ruat coelum" ("Let justice be done though the heavens fall"). Of course, Senator TAFT did not defend the Nazi leaders. But he did question the legitimacy of a trial in which an American prosecutor argued on a basis forbidden in American courts and in which a Soviet judge sardonically assisted in passing sentence on former allies of the Soviet Union.

That questioning was the hallmark of a real liberal. Among lawyers with high professional standards, doubt as to the justice of the Nuremberg trials is now increasingly voiced. It was the achievement of Senator TAFT to express that doubt at a time when it was politically dangerous and could do him no possible good.

The fearlessness can be seen in all of BOB TAFT's public actions: in his uncompromising opposition to peacetime conscription, in his forthright attacks on price control and all other aspects of governmental regimentation, in the complete frankness and sincerity with which he attacked international arrangements like the Yalta agreement before—not after—their evil character was generally recognized. There is not an issue of any magnitude which he has tried to dodge.

TAFT speaks out particularly when liberty and justice are concerned. Those two aspirations, he has often said, are at the base of the American Republic and must therefore be the base of the Republican program. In 1838, the year that TAFT's grandfather settled in Cincinnati, Abraham Lincoln observed that the purpose of those who built the United States was "to uprear upon its hills and its valleys a political edifice of liberty and equal rights." BOB TAFT likes to quote that passage.

TAFT's habit of rushing in where others fear to tread would be dangerous if he were a bull-headed man. He is saved from the blunders of undue self-assurance not only by his extensive knowledge but by his willingness to listen. In any social group where there is an authority present, it is TAFT's sensible custom to absorb rather than to take over the conversation and expound his own views.

But he does not suffer fools gladly. The criticism which tells most against TAFT is of his brusqueness and his occasional unnecessary rudeness.

MARTHA SUPPLIES AFFABILITY

It is here that his wife has been so helpful to the Senator. Possessed of as keen and quick a mind as her husband's, Martha Taft is also blessed with a personality as warm and radiant as his is cool and aloof. Martha has notably softened Bob's austerity. That she respects and loves her husband profoundly is obvious. That she fears he does not always do himself full justice in human relationships is also apparent. Pride in a husband's attainments would make any wife the more eager to clear away obstacles tending to hide his virtues.

TAFT'S quiet industry and his rather austere life are parts of his heritage. His dour grandfather, Alphonso Taft (Yale 1833), moved from Vermont to Cincinnati in 1838; he prospered in both the law and in politics, becoming Secretary of War and later Attorney General in the Cabinet of President Grant. His second son by his second wife was a jolly giant with a superb judicial mind and a massive appetite for both food and facts: William Howard Taft, the only American who served his country as both President and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

BOB TAFT, the eldest son, inherited the appetite for facts—and for a while it was feared he had the other appetite, too—when he was a baby the family had to inhibit his appetite for oatmeal by first replacing the cream with plain milk and finally by eliminating the sugar, too. ROBERT ALPHONSO, born September 8, 1889, in Cincinnati, grew up as the solemn one in a gay household; he was always trying to interest someone in a game of chess. His boyhood was without particular incident except that he was stung by a jellyfish while swimming in the Pasig River, when his father was Governor General of the Philippines. He first began to attract notice as an almost nonpareil scholar at his Uncle Horace's Taft School in Connecticut; and then he was first all the way through Yale, first in his class all through Harvard Law School. When his father was President he was never one of the gay ones who slid down the White House stairs on the great silver serving trays, but he liked charades and, later, dancing the Boston with brown-eyed Martha Bowers.

Then he settled down to grubbing at the law in Cincinnati, specializing in dry-as-dust technical cases. He was twice rejected (too far-sighted) for the United States Army in 1917 and finally went abroad with Herbert Hoover's American Relief Administration, for which he was decorated by the Polish, Belgian, and Finnish Governments. He never has worn the decorations, any more than he has ever worn the expensive clothes he could afford. For the heritage of his family is that it is a professional family, interested in ideas rather than things, in intellectual rather than material wealth.

BOB TAFT will never become as genial and jovial a personality as his father was. But there is no doubt that in recent months he has schooled himself to be more considerate of others' feelings. This has been markedly shown during the Eightieth Congress. TAFT became chairman of the Republican policy committee, a natural sequel to his chairmanship of the committee on resolutions at the 1944 convention. As chairman of the policy committee it would have been easy for a tactless man to clash with Senator VANDENBERG, to whom the party leadership in

foreign affairs had been entrusted, with Senator WHITE, as floor leader, or with Representative JOE MARTIN, as Speaker of the House. Although there has been calculated effort both to discover and to create such divergencies, they simply have not occurred. Much of the remarkable Republican record in the Eightieth Congress, achieved despite the stubborn resistance of the administration, can be ascribed to the political tact and organizing ability of Senator TAFT. The truest measure of his generalship lies in his numerous victories in spite of the very narrow margin of the Republican majority in the Senate.

In one vital field of national policy—foreign relations—Senator TAFT has exercised considerable restraint over the free expression of his opinions in the recent years of bipartisan foreign policy. He recognizes that foreign policy is largely the function of the executive arm of government, and he has been scrupulous to defer in this area to Senator VANDENBERG, as spokesman of the Republican Party in various international negotiations.

This tactfulness, combined with Senator TAFT's opposition to Roosevelt's foreign policy prior to Pearl Harbor, has given rise to an impression that he is not particularly interested in foreign policy and that he is somewhat isolationist in viewpoint. Both of these criticisms are wholly without substance.

To take the last charge first, it is worth recalling that after the First World War both BOB and Martha Taft advocated American membership in the League of Nations. There is nothing surprising in this. William Howard Taft was pushing for such a world association long before Woodrow Wilson expressed any interest in the matter. Taft, Sr., indeed, was the guiding spirit in the organization, the League To Enforce Peace, which gave President Wilson his strongest support in the matter. In a speech at Cleveland, as far back as May 12, 1915, William Howard Taft said frankly that "we ought to depart from the policy of isolation that heretofore has served us so well." BOB TAFT has always followed his father's thinking in this matter.

Senator TAFT has, however, struck out on numerous occasions against the sham and deceit in foreign policy from which the country is now reaping so sad a harvest of utter disillusion. He deeply resents the scuttling of the Atlantic Charter by the governments which announced it with such righteous fanfare. He criticized the now-apparent defects in the United Nations plan when the first draft of its charter was sketched at Dumbarton Oaks. He has said many times that a peace without justice cannot be a basis for hopeful international cooperation. His "isolationism," in short, seems to boil down to a record of differing pointedly with the Roosevelt foreign policy.

On the western trip which preceded the announcement of his candidacy Senator TAFT devoted one major speech, given before the World Affairs Council of Tacoma on September 25, to the subject of foreign policy. In this he charged bluntly that, "* * * The results of the foreign policy of the administration during the past 3 years have created a situation as bad or worse than that which existed before the war, and have brought the world to a state of economic collapse."

WE ARE NOT IMPERIALISTS

But it is not TAFT's custom to confine himself to negative criticism, no matter how well justified. In this Tacoma speech the Senator listed seven "general principles" which in his opinion should guide the makers of foreign policy during a crisis which is largely of our own making. These principles are as cogent today as they were last September. Lately TAFT has been enlarging on them. The principles and their enlargements can be summarized as follows:

First, TAFT places emphasis on the maintenance of peace "so long as conditions do not threaten the freedom of the people of the United States." He does not think that this principle was upheld by Roosevelt or that it is being upheld by Truman. The use of force as an instrument of national policy is abhorrent to him.

Second. TAFT believes that "our foreign policy should be built around the United Nations, changing the whole emphasis of the Organization to the establishment of law and equal justice under law" He would favor the reorganization of the UN without Russia if no progress can be made otherwise.

Third, "I do not believe we should yield to Russia in any way in its plan for spreading the Communist philosophy."

Fourth, the whole Morgenthau policy and Potsdam plan for Germany was vicious and stupid. If necesary to prevent rearmament, western Germany could be occupied indefinitely. But the crazy program of restricting German production, at a time when every ounce of productive energy is needed, must be abandoned.

Fifth, peace with Japan, restoring self-government to that country, should be concluded without further delay.

Sixth, economic assistance to other nations should be limited to allocations "to specific countries for specific purposes" of reconstruction. "In the long run no nation can live on the bounty of another nation." The European recovery program should not lead us surreptitiously into political alliances.

Seventh, "In this intermediate period we must maintain a strong Army and Navy"—but not by conscription and not for purposes of imperialism. "Somehow our people don't like to boss other people, just as they don't like to be bossed—and so they are not good at the job. We can never make a success of imperialism because we are not imperialists."

In that homely last sentence can be found the essential thought in TAFT's political philosophy, applicable to domestic as well as foreign problems. It is a restatement of James Madison's classic saying that we "rest all our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government." The critical job for Americans is to govern themselves—individually and as a Nation. We are not so sure of maintaining that achievement that we can attempt to run the world.

Nobody knows better than Mr. Truman that TAFT is in a far better position than other Republican aspirants to make mincemeat of the Democratic record.

If proof of this were needed, it was provided by Senator TAFT the night of November 17. That afternoon the President delivered his message to the special session, asking not only for stop-gap aid for western Europe, but also for a 10-point "anti-inflation" program of which no Republican in Congress had any advance information. After only a couple of hours of preparation Senator TAFT went on the air at 10 p. m. the same day and completely demolished the President's jerry-built proposals. There was uproar within and without the party, criticizing TAFT for "shooting from the hip," but the fact remains that his demolition was so thorough that scarcely any further work on the subject remained for his colleagues in Congress. The dream—or nightmare—of OPA resuscitation just faded out.

For some time a gathering wind has been blowing in the direction of TAFT's candidacy, and the party chieftains in every State are well aware of it. Some of them have been pleased by his seeming political blunders. But all of them have been impressed by the consistency with which the apparent blunders have turned out, in retrospect, to be good politics. Less and less one hears the fatuous remark that "TAFT is head and shoulders above the others, but of course he could never be elected." The party which pays much lip service to Lincoln is beginning to realize that Lincoln knew what he was talking about when he said that all of the people can't be fooled all of the time.

Today the American people know that they have been fooled, and badly fooled. They recognize that glib oratory, facile promises, and deceitful leadership led them to their current disillusion. Now, above everything else, they want a President with integrity.

The Republican Party has made many blunders and set up many false gods since Lincoln's day. The Democrats realized, under the New Deal, that their strength lay in Republican ineptitude, and Franklin Roosevelt made the most of it. The Republicans have been less quick to realize that their political opportunity lies in a defense of the American tradition, which is at bottom a liberal tradition, ill-represented by many of the captains of industry who have sought to dominate the party.

The greatest asset of Senator Taft is his real—not spurious—liberalism. The true liberal is not one who rages for free enterprise but one who deeply believes in that central, indivisible core of freedom of which free enterprise is but a single facet. The true liberal is one who hates monopoly, whether exercised by a government, a corporation, or a labor union. The true liberal, in America, believes in the constructive power of intelligence when harnessed to fundamental religious principles. Taft is a true American liberal.

He has not set his heart on the Republican nomination. He has not changed any of his opinions or compromised himself in any way to get it. He knows, and Martha Taft knows, that the effort of candidacy and the responsibility of office if elected are killing strains. And Taft is not naturally a glad-hander. He gets no pleasure from being in the public eye.

But there is in this man, as in every real liberal, a driving force which outweighs personal inclination. It may be called a sense of duty, a desire to fulfill capacity to the utmost, a feeling of responsibility to those who built for living Americans the heritage which is theirs to conserve—or dissipate. The name that is given to this impersonal urge is immaterial. It is sufficient that Taft has it, and that more and more the American people have come to recognize that here is an aspirant for the Presidency whom they can really trust.

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to introduce into the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Democratic executive committee of Whitfield County, Ga.

This resolution expresses clearly the sentiment of the great majority of our people not only in the Seventh District, but throughout Georgia.

The resolution follows:

Whereas Harry S. Truman was elevated to the highest office within the gift of the American people through the Democratic Party and the loyal solid South; and

Whereas for his own selfish political purposes he now seeks to force upon the people of the States, under the false guise of so-called civil rights, a system including the worst features of the secret police of Germany and Russia; and

Whereas, by said program, he is seeking to set up a system of secret agents, inquisitors, and bureaucrats, with headquarters in Washington, to roam at will over the entire United States, and said agents will oppress and persecute the people in their business, social, civil, political, personal, and religious lives, this Truman program even vesting in Negro FEPC agents the power to say which people shall be employed in any private business; and

Whereas this so-called civil-rights program would utterly destroy individual liberty, security, and justice, private enterprise, local self-government, States' rights, and the republican form of government guaranteed by the United States Constitution; and

Whereas the interest of our country as a whole under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution demands the loyalty of all true Americans in every State, regardless of party, section, or personal interest: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Democratic executive committee of Whitfield County, Ga., do hereby go on record as being vigorously opposed to the Truman so-called civil-rights program and hereby strongly commend all southern men and women in and out of public office, as well as those from other sections of the country, who have denounced this iniquitous program for what it really is. We deplore and condemn the aid, comfort, and support given the said Truman program by a few self-seeking politicians.

This Truman program has created the gravest crisis in the South since the dark days of reconstruction. We strongly urge that all true Southern Democrats stand up and be counted against this undemocratic and un-American program; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be given to the press and to the Congressmen and Senators of Georgia and to the Governors of all the Southern States.

Isaac Adams; Charley Deck; Byron Smith; W. B. Strain; James Lupo, Jr.; Jim Bowman; W. C. Douglas; L. P. Moore; Frank Bird; W. C. Bryant; D. I. Self; W. L. Parker; Tom Patterson; Earl Henderson; Harry Baxter; Mrs. Chas. Deck, *Secretary*.

This is to certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Democratic executive committee, Whitfield County, Ga., duly held on March 6, 1948, by an affirmative vote of each member present. This March 6, 1948.

WHITFIELD COUNTY DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
By ISAAC ADAMS, *Chairman*.

Exposing Some Fallacies About DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are too many misconceptions regarding the displaced persons of Europe who survived the horrors of war and persecution under the Nazi regime only to find themselves the inmates of a new type of concentration camp—the displaced persons camps. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Displaced Persons and the International Refugee Organization, I saw for myself last summer that the overwhelming majority of surviving displaced persons are young, skilled, democracy-loving people, who wish to lead productive peaceful lives in a new country. Miss Gene Delano, whose letter to the editor of the Baltimore Sun follows, gives a very able and illuminating answer to some of the accusations which have been made against the displaced persons:

EXPOSING SOME FALLACIES ABOUT DP'S

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—SIR: Having recently returned from over 2 years of continuous work in displaced-persons camps in the British zone of Germany, I am appalled by some of the unfounded arguments used to defeat the Stratton bill, which would allow a fair share of Europe's displaced persons to enter this country. I would like to refute some of the baseless anti-DP statements that I have heard people here make.

I. DISPLACED PERSONS ARE UNWILLING TO WORK

This is fallacious. I do not deny that there are some lazy people in DP camps, just as there are in any community, but they are not the rule. An example is the camp in which I worked for more than a year. It held between 900 and 1,000 persons of Baltic and Polish origin. Of these, over 400 were employed full time in the Volkswagenwerke, a German automobile factory which the British military government operates to produce cars for the occupation forces in the four German zones.

Another 200 DP's from the same camp worked full time to staff a large transit camp through which over 100,000 repatriating Poles traveled in 1 year. Still others worked for a British Army unit stationed near the camp. During my entire stay in the camp, the full-time employment rate of its occupants (with all persons over age 16 considered employable, excepting women with small children and persons certified by doctors as unfit for work) never dropped below 90 percent.

Later I worked in a more isolated camp, where it was more difficult to find jobs for DP's. The employment rate of the 3,000 occupants was nevertheless over 70 percent, mainly because hundreds of them, finding no other employment, cut timber in a near-by forest for the British to alleviate the shortage of building materials in England. With my own eyes I have seen some of these DP's working in the snow in forests with bleeding feet caused by lack of adequate footwear. This is no exaggeration.

II. DISPLACED PERSONS MAY HAVE HARMFUL IDEOLOGIES

The suspicion that DP's may have communistic ideas is senseless. If there are any persons anywhere about whom one can generalize to the point of saying, "These are all anti-Communists," they are the DP's. The only reason that they are still displaced persons, nearly 3 years after VE-day, is that they cannot, or dare not, return to their Communist-dominated homelands. If you could witness a camp visit by a Russian officer, with his escort of military government officials and police to protect him from violence, you would realize that all of the hatred in DP's souls is directed against those whose political ideologies have deprived the Balts and the Poles of the freedom for which they fought.

III. DISPLACED PERSONS HAVE REFUSED INDUCEMENTS TO EMIGRATE TO FREE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

This erroneous notion apparently stems from the fact that 60-day rations were offered in 1946 to Polish DP's to induce them to return home. Many, under the pressure of their starvation diet in Germany, took a chance on repatriation. Later many of them realized their mistake and managed to escape to Germany again.

Never was it necessary to offer any inducement to any D. P. to emigrate to a free country. When the British offered jobs in England for 20,000 DP's in the British zone, I can estimate conservatively that 120,000 DP's made written applications. Many DP's have gone and are clamoring to go to Brazil, Australia, and Canada.

IV. THIS COUNTRY HAS NO ROOM OR JOBS FOR DP'S

While others know more about this than I, the Census Bureau reports that eight Midwestern States have suffered an 800,000 loss in farm population since 1940. And most of the DP's are farmers. They are proud to be farmers. In many of the DP camps they have organized agricultural schools to teach their youngsters to be farmers. They are even working on German farms, helping the people who enslaved them. Does anyone believe that this country cannot use a stock of men and women who know how to farm the hard way, when 800,000 Americans have left the soil?

If Americans could see the DP's cleaning their rooms with brooms they make from twigs gathered in the forests, painting their barracks with brushes they make from blocks of wood and bits of rope, cooking with utensils they make from bits of wrecked airplanes, these same Americans would know that the DP's represent the type of workmen that made this country great. The DP's have the kind of fortitude and ingenuity that our ancestors had, attributes that we are, perhaps, losing as life becomes so easy in the United States of America.

Miss GENE DELANO.

BALTIMORE, *March 4*.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Moshe Shertok, head of the political department of Jewish Agency for Palestine. Also a statement by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. These statements were made before the United Nations Security Council.

The statements follow:

STATEMENT BY MOSHE SHERTOK, HEAD OF THE POLITICAL DEPARTMENT, JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. President and members of the Security Council, Jews throughout the world, and particularly the Jews of Palestine in their grave ordeal, have for many weeks past eagerly awaited the opportunity of bringing their case regarding the present position in Palestine to the direct attention of this high international body. The Jewish Agency is therefore deeply grateful to the Security Council for the privilege accorded it of being seated at this table and enabled to express its views on the subject now under discussion.

It is nearly 3 months since the momentous resolution on Palestine was adopted by the General Assembly. The resolution did not accept the full Jewish claim. Far from it. The Jews had asserted their internationally recognized right to immigration and settlement in all parts of Palestine west of the Jordan, so that upon the formation of a Jewish majority the whole of that territory might become a Jewish state. The Arabs had asked for the complete stoppage of Jewish

immigration and the immediate proclamation of Palestine as an independent Arab state. The Assembly adopted a compromise solution. It did so after exhaustive deliberation which absorbed two of its sessions and the work of a special 11-power committee, altogether a process of 8 months' continuous discussion.

The compromise, as is well known, was to set up two independent states in Palestine—one Jewish, one Arab, to place Jerusalem under international rule; and to maintain the over-all unity of Palestine by linking together the three units in an economic union.

This solution, Mr. President, entailed most far-reaching sacrifices for the Jews. Twenty-five years ago, the closing of Transjordan to Jewish settlement had reduced the area of the Jewish national home to about one-quarter of its original size. The Jews were now expected to part with nearly one-half of the remainder. Moreover, Transjordan having in the meantime become an Arab kingdom, Jewish consent was now sought for the establishment of a second independent Arab state in the country which the Jewish people had for thousands of years regarded as its national patrimony and historic heritage. The separation of Jerusalem from the Jewish state was a particularly painful wrench.

Yet the Jewish Agency, with the support of the overwhelming majority of Palestinian Jews, decided, however, reluctantly to accept the compromise. It bowed to the imposed verdict of the international tribunal. It was able to do so because, though only in one-eighth of the area promised in the Balfour Declaration, the new solution satisfied the Jewish claim to statehood and a place in the family of nations; also because even that limited area contained possibilities of development which opened the way for large-scale settlement; and because, though sovereignty was to be curtailed by the Economic Union, the freedom of the Jewish state to admit as many Jewish immigrants as it found necessary and possible remained unimpaired. It was the combination of these three elements—statehood, the given area, and freedom of immigration—that constituted the irreducible minimum which the Jews accepted, but beyond which they would not go.

What has happened in the course of the 3 months and what is happening today is a determined attempt, in open defiance of international authority, to deny to the Jews even that minimum and to reduce them to a state of political subjection, if not actually to confront them with the menace of physical annihilation. The Arab government, members of the United Nations, are endeavoring to defeat the Assembly's resolution by force of arms. The mandatory power is thwarting the United Nations plan by a policy of noncooperation and is openly tolerating the active obstruction of its implementation.

Mr. President, the Security Council is faced with an open attempt to alter by force the settlement decreed by the Assembly, which the Assembly requested the Council to determine "as a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace, and an act of aggression." The attempt is directly sponsored by the governments of Arab states, members of the United Nations. This assertion hardly stands in need of evidential proof or investigation. It rests on the free admission of the parties concerned. Nor is any research or intelligence work necessary to bring that admission to light. It is shouted from every public platform in the various Arab capitals and blared through all the trumpets of their official propaganda machine. The endeavor of the Arab governments is not limited to the defeat of the United Nations plan; they aim at imposing their own solution, the one which the Assembly has rejected; and they are trying to achieve both ends—the negative and the affirmative—by methods of aggression and violence which are the very negation of the letter and the spirit of the Charter.

The threats of force to resist the partition plan, which were voiced by practically every Arab delegate to the Assembly, are still vivid in memory. The governments concerned are now making every effort to live up to the words of their spokesmen. Even before the session of the Assembly in September 1947, soon after the recommendations of UNSCOP were published, the six Arab governments, members of the United Nations, met in Sofar, Lebanon, and adopted a resolution expressing their determination "to resist the implementation of these recommendations" and undertaking to assist the Arabs of Palestine in "a relentless war" against them, "supplying them with men, funds, and ammunition."

Soon after the Assembly's session, the Prime Ministers of the Arab states held a consultation in Cairo, as a result of which an official announcement was published on December 17, 1947, which declared that "the Arab governments will take decisive measures which will guarantee the defeat of partition," and threatened that they would throw the full force of their armies into the battle until victory is achieved. On the same occasion the Lebanese Prime Minister issued a statement in which he said: "We will never sleep until we save Palestine as an independent Arab unitary state * * * we will supply Palestine * * * with weapons, equipment, and men." The Syrian Prime Minister likewise stated: "The time for speeches is past and the stage of action is at hand; we should all be determined to liberate Palestine by our might and money." On January 15, 1948, the press offices of the Arab League—a league comprising seven Arab governments, of which six are members of the United Nations—disclosed that the league "had recommended that the Arab nations occupy all Palestine with their regular armies when British troops leave Palestine."

The stage of action had, indeed, arrived. Time will not permit a full enumeration of all the activities which received publicity. Members of the Security Council might refer to the Jewish Agency's Memorandum on Arab Aggression, of which they will receive copies. Here only some of the most salient facts will be mentioned. The Arab governments have jointly proceeded to the formation of what is called an Arab army of liberation. They have appointed its high command. In most Arab countries, recruiting offices for volunteers have been opened with official sanction of the governments. In Syria, recruitment and training are under the direct charge of the Ministry of Defense, which issues official notices to regulate it. The Ministry has announced, inter alia, its acceptance of the resignation of army officers volunteering for service in Palestine to fight against partition. Similar resignations are reported from Egypt and Iraq, where the officers were placed in charge of training volunteers. When the first incursion of an armed force from Syria via Lebanon into Palestine occurred on January 9, the press reported that the Ministers of Defense of both countries personally led the convoy, and that the Syrian Defense Minister's car headed the column, the car flying the Syrian flag. Subsequently, on January 14, the Lebanese Defense Minister gave to the Chamber of Deputies in Beirut an eyewitness account of the attack which the force had made on Jewish villages, and in which, incidentally, Mr. President, it suffered a crushing defeat. He added that " all activities, such as the collection of funds, registration and training of volunteers, assembly of arms, etc., are being supervised by himself and the Syrian Defense Minister in accordance with the resolutions of the Prime Ministers' Conference in Cairo."

Since that date several such columns have crossed the frontiers into Palestine as reported by the Mandatory Power to the Commission, all provided with motor transport and all properly equipped and provisioned. The invaders from outside form the backbone of the forces now attacking the Jews in Palestine, attacks in which Palestine Arabs play only a secondary part. All these activities are conducted in conjunction with the Palestine Arab higher committee of which the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem is still the president. It is noteworthy that prominent in the high command and among the district commanders are men who, like the Mufti, spent the war years in Germany helping Hitler. The backbone of the Iraqi contingents are those who fought under Rashid Ali in the pro-Nazi rebellion of 1941. When the leader of an Egyptian contingent arrived in Damascus, he proposed that the contingent be named after a notorious Egyptian Nazi who had died in Germany.

The distinguished delegate of Egypt must be complimented on the extreme moderation and restraint of his expressions when he attempts to describe these aggressive acts, to which his government is a party, as being merely a matter of "noncompliance" with a recommendation of the Assembly. Open and active defiance are the words indicated. Moderation is, indeed, a relative notion. To the Egyptian delegate, the Arab solution for the Palestine problem, which expects the Jews of Palestine to put up with the fate of a crystallized or dwindling minority and console themselves with a paper guaranty of religious toleration, is the very acme of moderation. Such imperviousness to arguments from the other side and refusal to understand the essence of the national movement of another people make the continuation of political discussion futile. It is high time for the representative of the Arab governments to realize that the Jewish people in Palestine will never submit to the status of a minority on sufferance which is the lot of the oriental Jewish communities; that the urge for independence will never be eradicated from Jewish hearts; that the very logic by which one Arab country after another in the Middle East has achieved its national sovereignty makes the Jewish claim to statehood in Palestine indisputable and its realization irresistible; that as long as Arab states continue to resist by force the attainment of the Jewish national goal there can be no peace or stability in the Middle East; and that the long-term interests of all concerned can only be served by mutual adjustment based on equality of status rather than by attempts at suppression and obliteration.

The Jews repudiate, Mr. President, as fantastic and grotesque, the allegation which the Syrian delegate saw fit to repeat here that for the Jews, Palestine is a mere springboard for imperialistic expansion into the whole area of the Middle East. The assertion is fantastic under any circumstances, for it is the very essence of Zionism to concentrate on Palestine and not to create a new dispersal. The assertion is grotesque at a time when all the countries around Palestine are poised to sweep down on it to crush the budding Jewish state out of existence.

It may be idle to try to refute many other outworn shibboleths in the Syrian delegate's speech, for this has been done many a time, apparently to no avail. Only one charge cannot be ignored, for it carries in it poisonous seed which may strike fruitful ground in the Middle East and bear pernicious fruit. It is that the creation of the Jewish state would place Christian and Moslem holy places under Jewish domination, with results too horrible to contemplate. The Syrian delegate's speech was undoubtedly animated by the highest ideals of interreligious peace. The speech will probably be widely read in the Arab countries but there will be no footnote to inform the uninitiated that Jerusalem and Bethlehem are in the international zone, that Hebron (incidentally holy primarily to the Jews) and Nazareth are in the Arab state, and that throughout the area of the Jewish state there is hardly a single Moslem or Christian shrine, in the true sense of the term. As to ordinary churches and mosques,

the delegate of Syria gave the impression that there were many cases of their desecration by Jews. Actually not a single such case is on record anywhere in the world. This is to compare with the riots in Aleppo in December 1947, when all the 12 Jewish synagogues of the city were sacked and burned practically to the ground, invaluable ancient scrolls being consumed in the fire, or with the riots in Cairo in November 1946, where synagogues and churches alike were the target of mob violence. While the Syrian delegate was making his speech, the newspapers of the day carried a picture showing Arab riflemen at the Wailing Wall, the greatest sanctuary of the Jewish people, to which the access of Jewish worshipers is now barred. Such incidents serve as a measure of degeneration of the proverbial Arab chivalry. Other manifestations of it are, on one plane, the forcible extortion of contributions from the Jews of Egypt, Lebanon, and Iraq in support of the antipartition campaign, i. e., of the killing of their kith and kin in Palestine and of the liquidation of the national hope of their people which they so fervently share; and, on another plane, the horrible mutilation of the bodies of Jewish fallen in Palestine and the parading through Arab towns of the cut-off heads of Jewish victims stuck on spikes.

The Arab spokesmen have invested much effort in the contention that the resolution of the Assembly is a mere recommendation. I hope, Mr. President, that though not privileged to represent a member state I may be permitted to make a few comments on this aspect of the problem which specifically concerns the United Kingdom. When the United Kingdom proposed and other powers agreed that the problem of Palestine should be referred to the Assembly, they were fully aware of the powers of this body. They were also fully aware of the fact that Palestine had for 25 years been an international trust. In the face of the announced decision of the mandatory power to terminate the mandate, the General Assembly was fully aware of its responsibilities in regard to this trust and of its power to fill the vacuum created by the liquidation of the mandatory regime. One government goes, another government—the United Nations Commission as agent of the General Assembly—replaces it.

This recommendation of the General Assembly, which was addressed in the first place to the Mandatory Power, was accepted by the Mandatory Power as a decision of that body. I underline the word decision. Speaking in the House of Commons on December 11, 1947, the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Creech-Jones, said:

"The decision of the Assembly is regarded by His Majesty's Government as the decision of a court of international opinion. This is not a grudging acceptance * * * we wish our authority transferred to our successors in an orderly manner. We can only express our hope * * * that the greatest respect will be shown this decision of the international authority."

On December 12, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bevin, declared:

"I am not going and His Majesty's Government are not going to oppose the United Nations decision * * * There is the United Nations decision * * * If my colleagues or I can render any assistance * * * we shall do it."

It may be recalled that when the British Government first referred the question of Palestine to the United Nations, it made no stipulation as to whether and under what terms it would comply with the recommendation. It seemed reasonable to assume, at the time, that whatever the verdict, the United Kingdom would accept it and, as a loyal member of the United Nations, cooperate in its execution. Later, when conditions were put forward, every effort was made by those responsible for the drafting of the plan in the session of the Assembly to meet them. Yet the attitude of the British Government has developed and hardened into one of noncooperation bordering on obstruction.

The British Government declared that it would take no part in the implementation of the plan. Actually, the plan was not based on its enforcement by the Mandatory Power. On the other hand, it insisted that, as long as the mandate lasts, it can suffer no rival authority in Palestine but must alone be responsible for the maintenance of law and order. It has not discharged that responsibility.

One can understand the quandary in which the United Kingdom Government found itself placed as a result of its own attitude. The Arab attack was not directed purely and simply against Jewish lives and Jewish property. Its main target was the policy of the United Nations. To defend Jews against Arab attack meant by implication to defend the policy of the United Nations against those trying to subvert it. From this implication the mandatory administration found itself inhibited. It therefore could not fully maintain law and order. To say the least, its will was paralyzed, its springs of action were braked. At the very inception of the trouble, a senior government official informed the Jewish Agency that police escort could not be provided for interurban transport since "this might be interpreted as British implementation of partition."

In trying to escape the dilemma, the administration evolved a theory of its own neutrality in a conflict between the Jews and Arabs, and in justification of the theory it proceeded to conjure up a spurious equality of guilt as between the attackers and the attacked—between those upholding and those defying the authority of the United Nations. "The Jewish story that the Arabs are the attackers and the Jews the attacked is not tenable," said Sir Alexander Cadogan in the statement to the Commission. "Elements on each side," he went on, "are engaged in attacking or in making reprisals undistinguishable from attacks." But this artificial equality, in the further endeavor of rationalizing British behavior, becomes again an inequality, this time somewhat in favor of the Arab and to the discredit of the Jew. For, so runs the official British account, "the Arabs are determined to show that they will not submit tamely to the United Nations plan of partition; while the Jews are trying to consolidate the advantages gained at the General Assembly."

The fallacy of this analysis was, Mr. President, we believe, fully exposed in the Jewish agency's Memorandum on the Policy of the Mandatory Power in Palestine Since the Adoption of the General Assembly's Resolution, with Particular Reference to Security, submitted to the UN Palestine Commission on February 21, 1948, copies of which were sent to members of the Security Council. It was the Arabs who launched the attack. The Jews acted in self-defense. They expected a strong reaction from the Government, in accordance with its undertaking. This was not forthcoming. On the contrary, Jewish self-defense activities were hampered and disrupted. Searches of arms among the Jews, arrests of Jewish defenders almost under the fire of Arab attack, prohibition of the use by Jews of more effective defense equipment were the order of the day. It was only then that isolated acts of indiscriminate bloodshed on the part of dissident Jewish groups occurred. Although even these came by way of reaction to Arab violence, they were unreservedly condemned by the organized community, but were seized upon by the authorities in justification of their neutrality. On the other hand, the organized Jewish defense organization, the Haganah, found itself constrained by official inaction or by lack of official action to assume the counteroffensive by trying to attack and eliminate enemy strongholds. Its counterattacks have been limited in number and aimed at selected targets. No action of the Haganah was ever motivated by the desire to consolidate the advantages gained from the partition plan, though if there were such action, its purpose would have been to uphold the United Nations' decision and not to resist it. The only act which could by a long stretch of interpretation come under that definition was the refusal of the Jews to follow official advice to evacuate certain parts of Palestine—but this was no consolidation, it was mere maintenance of previously acquired positions, which the Government wanted them to surrender. Throughout, the Jewish plan of campaign was one of defense, that of the Arabs one of aggression. It was only complete political disorientation that could so distort the picture in the eyes of the mandatory Government.

Were the facts to conform with Sir Alexander Cadogan's theory there would have had to be cases of large crowds of armed Jews converging from all sides to wipe out an isolated Arab village, or crossing into Syria, there to disrupt traffic or attack peaceful settlements. Then, and then only, would the acts on both sides indeed become indistinguishable.

There are questions arising from certain aspects of the mandatory's policy and practice to which it is indeed difficult to find an answer. Why are arms distributed to units of the Arab municipal police and withheld from the Jewish? Is it not clear that those arms will be used against the Jews and the United Nations' plan? Why are units of the Arab Legion so stubbornly maintained in or near Jewish areas after their murderous attacks on Jewish traffic and passers-by? Must the Jews be continually subjected to this extreme provocation? Why does the British Government continue to supply arms to the Arab states? Representatives of the British Government have denied that these arms are being used for fighting in Palestine. How can they be sure? And even if this were true, is it not clear that the supply of arms to Arab states at this juncture releases other arms for Palestine? And I should like to add: Why is it that the domination of the entire area of the old city of Jerusalem by Arab bands is tolerated?

The gravest problem of all arises in connection with the continued incursion of Arab armed forces from outside. The government which has shown such a remarkable excess of zeal, vigilance, and efficiency in tracking down and intercepting sea transports of Jewish refugees from Europe, maintains, to all appearances, an attitude of almost complete resignation and helplessness—or indifference—in the face of this steady piecemeal invasion of a territory which is still in its charge. According to the information of the Jewish Agency, so far seven contingents have crossed into Palestine through the northern and eastern frontiers, numbering between them some 4,000 to 4,500 men. They did not infiltrate in small groups; they came each time hundreds of men together, mostly in well-organized convoys of motor trucks. They crossed bridges and traveled along highways. With one or two exceptions their entry was entirely unhindered. Is it conceivable that no advance information could be obtained regarding the movements of these columns and no effective guard could be maintained at the main entrances or crossings? On one occasion the Jewish Agency succeeded in warning the authorities 48 hours in advance of an impending crossing. Yet nothing was done to prevent it and the contingent crossed safely and pitched its tents near a large Arab village where it remained unmolested until the men were presumably posted to various centers.

The administration now admits that certain parts of Palestine are under the virtual control of the commanders of these foreign forces. They are increasingly active in offensive operations. How can the general public then resist the impression that preparations are openly tolerated for the proclamation of Arab rule, local or foreign, over large parts of Palestine, in complete disregard of the United Nations' decision and under conditions of mortal peril to the Jewish population concerned?

The situation, Mr. President, is further aggravated by a process of rapid disintegration of authority which is destructive of discipline. Latent hatreds are given free rein. There have been clear cases of individual Jews being shot in cold blood by British troops and police, and worse excesses are believed to be possible. The very fact that such is the state of feeling creates an untenable situation and contributes an additional reason why the British mandate must be terminated as soon as possible and should certainly not be prolonged beyond the fixed date of May 15.

Despite all the bitter disappointments born of the white paper of 1939, the Jews had hoped that the winding-up of the British mandate would produce a détente in their relations with the mandatory and make possible a friendly separation. These hopes have been tragically falsified by experience. As long as the mandatory government inexorably pursues its present political course, even the slightest revival of mutual confidence seems unthinkable. On the crucial issue of immigration, policy has remained unchanged, and even a clear recommendation of the Assembly for the freeing of a port to allow a substantial immigration has proved of no avail. Only 750 permits per month are available for immigration from Europe, the balance of the quota being devoted to the evacuation of Cyprus. In these circumstances, is it surprising that groups of survivors of the European massacres continue to cross the Mediterranean on their own? What is surprising is that the arrival of these transports, all intercepted, should be set by the honorable spokesman of the United Kingdom as a disturbing factor in the security situation, equal in its damaging effect to that of the incursion of armed Arab forces across the land frontiers—and this at a time when all recent refugee transports let themselves be diverted or transshipped to Cyprus without the slightest disturbance or the least resistance.

The mandatory government has also so far opposed steps being taken in preparation of the Jewish state militia. The British Secretary of State for the Colonies in his statement to the Security Council said that his Government could not agree "to the formation of a militia under the control of the provisional government of the future Jewish state." But nothing of the sort was requested at this stage by the Jewish Agency. The proposal which we put forward to the U. N. Commission on Palestine and which we understand was transmitted to the mandatory government was not for the immediate establishment of a militia to operate independently of British control during the period of the mandate. It was something quite different, namely, that preparations should start now for the setting up of the militia after the termination of the mandate. We suggested that permission should be given for the proper training of a nucleus of the militia, which would take no part in day-to-day defense duties, and that facilities should be given for the acquisition and storing of the necessary equipment. It is these requests that, according to our information, have been refused by representatives of the mandatory government.

This question of the militia and of the forces required for the implementation of the plan in general calls for a clear definition of the Jewish Agency's attitude. We have throughout maintained, first, that the Jews of Palestine are ready to shoulder far-reaching responsibilities in their defense and in the defense of their territory under the plan; second, that in view of the fact that the United Nations authority may be threatened by aggression from outside, an international force is vitally necessary. This attitude remains unchanged. Our experience as a result of the operation of the Haganah in the last 3 months has been definitely encouraging. We have held our ground throughout. Every single attack has been beaten off. We have been assisted by British forces only on special occasions, more often than not after the battle had already been decided in our favor by our own action. In general we have been hampered and impeded in our defense activities by the limitations imposed by the Government. Granted adequate equipment and full freedom of action, we feel hopeful of being able to build up an effective defense force for the Jewish state. To achieve that we require assistance—certainly in arms, possibly in funds during the initial period, but not in men.

On the other hand, there is the problem of the enforcement of the Charter and of the prevention of aggression which is essentially a United Nations responsibility. We have never set the formation of an international force as an indispensable condition for the implementation of the plan. In view of the fact of outside aggression an international force is clearly indicated. Yet if the international force is not established, we shall still be ready to discharge our responsibility, but in that eventuality our need for assistance will be correspondingly greater.

Whatever happens, and even if the worst comes to the worst, the Jews of Palestine will fight for the defense of their lives and their political rights. Their spirit and their capacity have been revealed in the last 3 months.

Time is of the most vital essence. Since we must be ready to assume responsibility upon the termination of the mandate, naturally under the direction of the United Nations Commission, our preparations must begin at once. We have asked the commission for the immediate provision of supplementary arms for our present needs. But apart from the forces engaged at present in day-to-day defense, additional contingents of our people must be organized and commence their training, and arms must be provided for setting up the militia. This would call for the revision of indiscriminate embargoes and for the initiation of an arms policy which would be in harmony with the United Nations plan, namely, the supply of arms to those who are ready to assume defense responsibilities in the implementation of the plan and the denial of arms to those engaged in resisting it. We very respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that the Security Council might consider issuing a call to all member states to adopt such a policy in regard to the sale or supply of arms to Palestine and the neighboring countries, including all countries of the Arab League.

The United Nations Commission, which has been at work since January 9, has already made progress with many aspects of the program of implementation. We are gratified to note their decision, communicated to the Security Council, to proceed with their work, in which the Jewish Agency will be happy to continue its fullest cooperation. One of the most important and urgent tasks of the commission is the formation of a provisional council of government, in regard to which negotiations are in progress.

The possibility that on April 1 the Security Council may have to consider what steps should be taken in regard to the Arab state area if no provisional council has been formed there was anticipated in the resolution and is no reason why a provisional council for the Jewish state should not be established in time.

These are, Mr. President, our observations on the subject of implementation. The distinguished delegate of the United States has introduced a resolution proposing that the Council "accept, subject to the authority of the Security Council under the Charter, the requests addressed by the General Assembly to it in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of the General Assembly resolution," and that it establish a committee comprising the five permanent members of the Council whose functions will be, inter alia, "to consider whether the situation with respect to Palestine constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and to report its conclusions as a matter of urgency to the Council." The Jewish Agency submits, Mr. President, that both steps are patently urgent.

The delegate of the United States also proposed that the same committee should "consult with the Palestine Commission, the mandatory power and representatives of the principal communities of Palestine concerning the implementation of the General Assembly recommendation." In the passage of his address which bears on this particular proposal he explained that the purpose of the Security Council in undertaking this consultation should be to "make every effort to get an agreement on the basis of the General Assembly recommendation for the underlying political difficulty."

The purpose of the consultation, we must confess, is not clear, and the proposal leaves us greatly bewildered. We fear that it may lead to new delays and complications which may jeopardize the implementation of the whole plan and further exacerbate the situation in Palestine. In the past, innumerable attempts were made by the Jewish Agency and some also by the mandatory government—each side, naturally, acting according to its own lights—to explore the possibility of an agreed settlement of the Palestine problem. All these efforts remained fruitless. It was as a result and at the end of this long, laborious, and futile quest for an agreed solution that the question was eventually brought before the United Nations for final adjudication and the partition compromise was adopted by the Assembly as a way out of the difficulty. In recommending to the British Parliament the submission of the question to the United Nations, representatives of the British Government themselves expressed their conviction, based on long experience, that a solution acceptable to both parties was outside the realm of practical politics.

Thus, Mr. Bevin, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, declared in the House of Commons on February 18, 1947, that there was no prospect of reaching any settlement in Palestine "which would be even broadly acceptable to the two communities in Palestine." This view was also expressed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Creech-Jones, in the House of Commons on August 12, 1947, and Sir Alexander Cadogan in the General Assembly on November 26, 1947.

A similar view was very cogently expressed—with remarkable cogency—by the delegate of the United States at the last session of the Assembly, and I would beg leave to quote the relevant passage. Speaking at one of the concluding meetings of the Assembly on November 26, Ambassador Johnson said: "Much has been said during the course of these debates on the desirability and necessity of presenting to the General Assembly a plan which would command the agreement of both the principal protagonists in this situation. I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented, either to this Assembly or to the mandatory government during its long years of tenure, or in any other place, which would meet with

the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No such plan has ever been presented, and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented. If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of this problem, it cannot be done without the use of the knife. Neither the Jews nor the Arabs will ever be completely satisfied with anything we do, and it is just as well to bear that in mind."

It is doubtful whether a change of even one word in this memorable statement is warranted today. Be that as it may, the Jewish Agency feels bound at this stage of the proceedings to make its attitude clear beyond any possible doubt. The partition plan adopted by the Assembly is, to us, the last and final compromise and the irreducible minimum of acceptability. No reduction of Jewish rights under the Assembly's plan, either in territory or in sovereignty, can be accepted by the Jewish people.

Mr. President, the United Nations, through its various organs, has worked hard in grappling with the Palestine problem. The resolution of the Assembly represents the collective wisdom of the international community on this burning issue. Ours is a historic problem and its constructive solution will be a distinct contribution to the success and vitality of the new great international organization. We appeal to the Security Council and to all its members to take such action as falls within their province to translate the Assembly's plan into a reality.

STATEMENT BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER, CHAIRMAN THE AMERICAN SECTION, JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. President and members of the Security Council, the Jewish Agency is grateful for the opportunity to make some additional observations on the subject which is now before the Security Council. We should like to give our reactions to the resolutions which are before this Council bearing upon the reports which were submitted to it by the United Nations Palestine Commission, as well as to comment on certain statements which were made here in the course of the discussions.

In the first place, we should like to comment on the statement which was made by the honorable delegate from Egypt to the effect that "it must be admitted that so far the United Nations' efforts in the study of other solutions than partition have been less than casual. The General Assembly hardly gave any of those solutions a cursory look. The General Assembly did not, either in committee or in plenary session, give any reasonable scope for discussion of any plan but partition."

It should be recalled that the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine submitted to the Assembly two solutions for the Palestine problem, a majority and a minority solution. The minority solution found no support. The Arab states put forward their own proposals. In order to consider all proposals, the ad hoc committee on Palestine appointed two committees, the one to consider the majority report which proposed partition and the other to consider the proposals of the Arab states. Both committees worked for weeks and both submitted separate reports to the ad hoc committee. The delegates of the several Arab states had the fullest opportunity, of which they fully availed themselves, to advocate the proposal which they favored. Many days were consumed in this discussion. When the vote was finally taken the report of the minority committee was decisively rejected.

We submit, therefore, that it is quite inaccurate to state that "the General Assembly did not either in committee or in plenary session give any reasonable scope for discussion of any plan but partition."

The ad hoc committee on Palestine appointed still a third committee—a conciliation subcommittee composed of three members comprising the chairman of the ad hoc committee, the rapporteur of the committee—the representative of Iceland, and the vice chairman of the committee—the representative of Siam. This committee was given full powers to undertake efforts at conciliation between the Jews and the Arabs. Efforts were made by this committee to find a formula other than those of the majority and minority proposals which would be mutually acceptable. According to the testimony of the chairman of this committee, Mr. Evatt, the ground was explored from every possible point of view and "we reached the conclusion that right up to the present time no more could be done." Mr. Thor Thors of Iceland, member of this committee, addressing the Assembly on November 29, just prior to the final vote, declared: "The conciliation subcommittee followed developments closely, both in subcommittee one and in subcommittee two. Unfortunately, the gulf between the two parties was too great then to be bridged by conciliation. The Arabs did not seem to be willing to permit large-scale immigration of Jews and to grant independence to a Jewish state in Palestine. The Jews would not accept anything less than reasonably free immigration and the prospect of independence. Between these different contentions no conciliation could be found during the treatment of the problem by the United Nations. The Arab higher committee was approached by UNSCOP on more than one occasion and was invited to assist in the work of UNSCOP but it refused * * *. Now at the eleventh hour, just when the vote is to take place there are criticisms of the work of the conciliation subcommittee and vague suggestions about a possibility of conciliation. Actually, the conciliation subcommittee tried everything possible, but in vain. Moreover, there has been up to the last few minutes no concrete or specific offer of conciliation or compromise."

In a similar vein the representative of the United States, Ambassador Herschel Johnson, speaking at that same session, declared: "This Palestine problem has been of concern to the world now for the past 30 years. It has been the subject of innumerable inquiries and commissions and all conceivable types of solution have been proposed. As Members know, the Peel Commission in 1937 recommended the partition of Palestine. However, subsequent events prevented definitive action at that time. Since the conclusion of World War II two renewed attempts have been made to solve the Palestine problem. The work of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry of 1946 was followed by conferences in London in which the so-called Grady-Morrison proposals were evolved. There were further conferences in London last winter. Finally, in May of 1947, an inquiry was undertaken under the auspices of the United Nations. During all of these studies the various solutions of the Palestine problem have been given careful consideration. I know from my study of the report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine that it made every effort to arrive at a solution which would be acceptable to both the Jews and the Arabs * * *."

The charge, therefore, which was made here that "so far as the United Nations' efforts in the study of other solutions than partition have been less than casual" is not borne out by the facts.

2. The failure to reach an agreed solution after 30 years of questing and searching for it, so eloquently attested by the events themselves and by the testimony of the distinguished representatives, both of Great Britain and of the United States, which were quoted by the spokesman of the Jewish Agency last week, leads us strongly to question the usefulness of that part of the proposal of the United States delegation which calls upon the Committee of the Security Council to be appointed "to consult with the Palestine Commission, the mandatory power, and representatives of the principal communities of Palestine concerning the implementation of the General Assembly recommendation of November 29, 1947."

This proposal, undoubtedly suggested by commendable motives, may, we fear, cause long and disastrous delays and the stultification of the activities of the United Nations Commission. The honorable delegate of the United Kingdom correctly pointed out the other day that "the untractable problems facing the Palestine Commission are becoming rapidly insoluble as delay is further protracted and as hope recedes that the Commission will be adequately equipped to take up the immense responsibilities imposed upon it." The United States proposal for new consultations introduces anew an element of uncertainty which invariably inhibits conclusive action. It will be seized upon by the opponents of the United Nations decision as another opportunity to reopen the whole question, to force through those solutions which were rejected by the United Nations, or which failed of acceptance time and again on other occasions, or failing in this, to attempt to entangle and prevent all action.

This grave international problem cannot be solved by indecision or postponement. It was indecision and lack of forthrightness on the part of the mandatory of Palestine, "the irresistible operation of feeble councils," to use a phrase of Burke, which led to that grave deterioration in the country which finally forced the mandatory to turn to the United Nations for a final solution of the problem. The United Nations accepted that solemn responsibility and proceeded, earnestly and deliberately, to investigate the problem de novo, to study its history and all of its present implications. It appointed a committee whose members were scrupulously selected for their impartiality and neutrality to make the investigation and to bring in recommendations. After prolonged and serious discussion of their recommendations, the United Nations overwhelmingly accepted the plan to set up two independent states in Palestine, one Jewish and one Arab, within the framework of an economic union, and an international regime in Jerusalem. The nations who voted for this plan fully realized that what they were doing was not just endorsing some abstract idea, or making a recommendation which would then be left suspended in mid air. They were deciding upon a course of action as well as upon a policy. They forthwith appointed a Commission of the United Nations and authorized it to implement their decision, according to a carefully worked out plan of action, and they called upon the Security Council to take the necessary measures to assist it in carrying through the implementation.

The Commission of the UN has already done an enormous amount of effective work in connection with the execution of this plan. The preparatory steps have nearly all been taken. The Commission is now on the eve of taking over its responsibilities in Palestine, as the date of the termination of the mandate on May 15 rapidly approaches. The British Colonial Secretary stated before this body last week that the Palestine Administration is taking all practical steps to terminate its control by May 15 and that the withdrawal forces and stores is already well under way. He further declared on March 2 that "the date of termination of our responsibility is irrevocably fixed."

To raise at this late hour the prospect of new negotiations and consultations between Arabs and Jews on the nature and character of the future government of Palestine is, in

our judgment, to endanger the very object which the United Nations, by its action last November, sought to achieve. In that direction lies neither hope nor promise. That road leads to a quagmire of indecision and inaction. There is but a brief time left, and time is fast running out to chaos and anarchy.

3. We should like to comment also on the statement which was repeated here by the Egyptian delegate to the effect that the decision taken last November was "a mere recommendation to the Egyptian Government."

The action taken by the Assembly was action taken in response to the request of the mandatory power, the only state member of the United Nations having any authority to act in Palestine—a country placed under an international trust. The request was for the solution of the problem of the future government of Palestine. Before taking any action the General Assembly took note of the declaration by the mandatory power that it plans to complete the evacuation of Palestine by August 1, 1948.

The action taken by the General Assembly was a resolution in the form of recommendations to the United Kingdom, as mandatory power for Palestine, and to all other members of the United Nations, for the adoption and implementation, with regard to the future government of Palestine, of the plan of partition with economic union.

While the United Kingdom has refused to accept special responsibility for the implementation of the plan, it has not, as mandatory, rejected the recommended plan. On the contrary, the United Kingdom has officially stated that it accepted the decision of the Assembly and announced its intention to terminate its mandate on May 15, and has further announced its intention and readiness to turn over the administration of Palestine to the United Nations Commission, as envisaged in the recommended plan. The recommended plan is, therefore, no longer a mere recommendation. The mandatory is in process of liquidating its mandate. It has accepted the United Nations plan for Palestine in much the same manner as the states party to the Italian treaty accepted a United Nations plan for the Free Territory of Trieste. On May 15, the only administration in Palestine having any international standing will be the United Nations Commission. If its authority fails there will be no regime of law in Palestine, and anarchy will prevail.

It is for that reason that the Jewish Agency strongly urges immediate action on the United States Government proposal that the Security Council accept the requests addressed by the General Assembly to it in its resolution so as to avoid the unwarranted assumption that there is no legal basis in which law and order may be maintained in Palestine after May 15.

It is regrettable that the necessity exists to remind member nations that it is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations for any member state to use force or the threat of force, or to encourage the use of force or the threat of force to obstruct the carrying out of the plan recommended by the Assembly and accepted by the mandatory power. Unless the member states accept the overwhelming moral authority of a decision which derives from the collective judgment of the United Nations, the great hope which inspired its organization is tragically doomed. What is involved here is far more than a technical legal question. It is a question whether the United Nations is to be an effective instrument for world peace and the salvation of mankind or whether it is to be but an impressive stage setting for actors and supernumeraries busily engaged in a meaningless play of long-winded futility.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that those who would empty the concept of a United Nations resolution of all compelling moral authority are the enemies, not alone of this particular decision of the United Nations, but unconsciously, of the United Nations organization itself.

4. This leads us to an observation on the relation of the Security Council to the implementation of the United Nations decision. Technically, the position which was taken by the distinguished spokesman of the United States delegation and by others, that the Security Council cannot use armed force for the implementation of any decision of the United Nations, but only in cases where it is determined that there exist threats to peace, breaches of the peace, or acts of aggression affecting international peace, may be correct. It may be an important legal and technical distinction to make and we assume that it was made in order to keep the action requested of the Security Council fully within the terms defined by the Charter.

But this legal distinction should not obscure the realities of the situation which should be faced frankly. It is the determined and organized resistance to the decision of the United Nations which has brought about a condition of a breach of peace and a threat to peace in Palestine and has forced the UN Commission to call upon the Security Council for assistance in the discharge of its duty to the General Assembly. The report states that powerful Arab interests, both inside and outside Palestine, are defying the resolution of the General Assembly and are engaged in a deliberate effort to alter by force the settlement envisaged therein. The Commission is further of the opinion that "a basic issue of international order is involved. A dangerous and tragic precedent will have been established if force or the threat of the use of force is to prove an effective deterrent to the will of the United Nations." What the Commission asked for is not an armed force to enforce partition, but "an adequate non-Palestinian force which will assist law-abiding elements in both the Arab and Jewish communities organized under the general direction of the Commission in maintaining order and security in Palestine, and thereby enabling the Commission to carry out the recommendations of the General Assembly." This, we believe, is a fair and pragmatic statement of the issue and in keeping with the legal requirements of the situation.

The role of the Security Council is an integral part of the plan adopted by the United Nations in November. In adopting it, the Assembly of the United Nations relied upon the fullest cooperation of the Security Council. It should not take long for the members of the Security Council to determine the fact that a breach of the peace exists in Palestine and that acts of aggression have taken place. Arab aggression is patent. It is self-confessed. The measure of support which the Security Council will give to the decision of the United Nations in its efforts at implementation will be evidenced by the urgency with which it approaches its task, and by the effective measures which it will take to reestablish a condition of peace in Palestine in which the United Nations Commission can carry out the responsibilities which were entrusted to it. Here again the action of the Security Council on this issue will have far-reaching implications for the effectiveness of United Nations actions on other issues and for the buttressing of the authority and prestige of this great world organization. Failure of the Security Council to comply with the request of the General Assembly to take the necessary measures to empower the Commission to exercise in Palestine the functions which are assigned to it if a threat to peace develops there during the transitional period, and to determine as a threat to the peace any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged in the resolution, would be a serious matter which goes far beyond the Palestine controversy. It concerns the coordination and the effective functioning of the activities of the various organs of the United Nations. The basic thought underlying these two major organs of the United Nations is that they will coordinate their activities and actively support each other. A serious break in the normal workings of this mechanism would inflict an additional blow to the organization of the United Nations. It is our view that the American Government's proposal that the Council accept the request addressed by the General Assembly to it must be the starting point for any effective action by the Security Council in this matter.

5. While the Security Council is deliberating on the request submitted to it by the UN Commission we are pleased to note that the Commission intends to continue with such of the preparatory work essential to the implementation of the recommendations as can be undertaken without the assistance of the Security Council which it requested. We should like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the Jewish militia, whose organization is called for by the plan which was adopted and which will have the responsibility of maintaining law and order in the Jewish State after May 15, has not yet been organized, that its organization is not permitted by the mandatory government prior to the termination of the mandate, and that the request of the UN Commission to permit the preparatory work for the organization of this militia has likewise been denied.

In its report, the UN Commission calls the attention of the Security Council to the fact that "the refusal of the mandatory power to allow the formation of such militia until the termination of the mandate will entail delay in the implementation of the Assembly's plan and renders much more difficult the problem of the security of the Jewish state when the mandate is relinquished." I draw your attention to this statement of the Commission in order that it might serve as a commentary to the statement made by the distinguished spokesman of the United Kingdom delegation on March 2, in which he rejected the accusations that his Government was making the transfer of authority in Palestine as difficult as possible, and was denying assistance to the United Nations. Unfortunately, not only in this most vital question of the militia, but in other essential matters which would have facilitated the coming of the new regime in Palestine the mandatory government has been uncooperative and obstructive. To be sure, it has furnished information of a kind, and it has discusseed with the UN Commission various problems. But the test is not willingness to discuss, but willingness to comply with the urgent requests which were made by the Commission and the United Nations. Thus, the mandatory government refused to open a port to Jewish immigration on February 1, as called for by the decision of the United Nations. It has refused to permit the United Nations Commission to come to Palestine in ample time properly to prepare for its immense duties. It has rejected the plan of a progressive transfer of areas to the Commission's administration. All this, according to the honored delegate of the United Kingdom, because of "specific threats by the Arabs." This would suggest that the mandatory does not have an adequate military force to meet these threats. However, when confronted with the suggestion that the security forces of the mandatory might be supplemented by other forces available in Palestine itself, it has maintained that it alone was responsible for law and order in the country and could not tolerate "the danger of divided responsibility." The delegate of the United Kingdom asserted that "our fervent hope is that this Council will now find a way to secure effective assumption of authority in Palestine by the United Nations when the mandate is terminated." But we most regretfully note that almost every way which is suggested by

the responsible agency of the United Nations is effectively blocked by the mandatory power.

The honorable delegate of the United Kingdom declared last Tuesday that they "cannot participate in any way in the implementation of a scheme which involves the coercion of one of the communities." One is forced to recall that for years Great Britain has implemented a scheme in Palestine of its own making, disapproved of by the League of Nations, condemned by its own leading statesmen, including the distinguished British Colonial Secretary himself, which quite definitely involved the coercion of one of the communities of Palestine. When is coercion not coercion? And under what conditions is conscience to be invoked to approve or disapprove of a political policy?

The Jewish agency appeals to the Security Council and to the members of the United Nations to make earnest representation to the present mandatory Government of Palestine to permit the immediate organization of an adequate Jewish state militia and the preparation for its equipment to protect the lives of the inhabitants of the new Jewish state who are being threatened by forces inside and outside of Palestine who have proclaimed their resolve to defeat by violence the decision of the United Nations and the new Jewish state which the decision envisages. This, we maintain, is an elementary moral obligation of the United Nations in view of the decision which it has taken. It is likewise an elementary moral obligation on the part of those nations who have approved the plan to remove all embargoes on the shipment of arms to the Jewish people of Palestine who have loyally accepted the decision of the United Nations, and to deny such arms to those who are violently resisting it. Surely this is not an unreasonable request. The organization, recognition, and equipment of the Jewish militia is for us of greater urgency than the sending of a non-Palestinian armed force by the Security Council. The Jews of Palestine wish first and foremost to defend themselves but their hands must not be tied. The quicker and the stronger the Jewish militia is permitted to become, the less sizable need be the international force, which the commission has requested.

We are still hoping that there may be no need for prolonged and serious conflict in Palestine. The Jews do not wish war with their neighbors, only peace and cooperation. Within the framework of the plan calling for two independent states joined in an economic union there is definitely the possibility for such peace and cooperation. The national status and independence of each people is guaranteed and their economic cooperation for the good of both is provided for. Partition was not the Jewish solution. It fell far short of the just rights and aspirations of the Jewish people. It was a grievous abridgement of these rights. Nevertheless, reluctantly but loyally, we accepted the decision which appeared fair and reasonable to the United Nations. We still hope that the Arabs of Palestine will likewise accept it and thereby put an end to the scourge of strife and bloodshed which can only do incalculable hurt to both peoples. But in the face of the mounting threats and the incursion of armed bands across the frontiers bent on war, the Jewish people of Palestine is compelled to make all neessary preparation for self-defense. We plead with the United Nations to remove all obstacles in the way. We are carrying out the purposes of the United Nations. We should not be penalized for doing so.

We feel under obligation to make our position unmistakably clear. As far as the Jewish people is concerned, it has accepted the decision of the United Nations. We regard it as binding and it is resolved to move forward in the spirit of that deision. Under the plan there are dates to be met. We must assume that these dates will be met.

We fully respect the authority of the United Nations, but if it is unable to carry out its own decisions and, as a consequence, the Jewish community of Palestine is confronted with the threat of annihilation, it will be compelled by the considerations of sheer survival, not to speak of the preservation of its rights, to take all necessary measures which the situation will call for.

6. In conclusion we should like to comment on the serious strictures which the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom made against the Jewish Agency in his address on March 2. He accused the Jewish Agency of "subordinating moral considerations to political expediency." He charged it with "moral weakness and political ineptitude." The Jewish Agency has not had the experience of running a world empire and so may be pardoned for not having the political aptitude which is possessed by the present political leaders of Great Britain, although it is rumored that there is considerable heresy abroad in the world and in the British Isles themselves, which, perversely enough, questions their infallibility. But surely the eminent spokesman of the United Kingdom, who knows better than most the full story of the attitude of his Government and of his party towards Zionism and Palestine, should be the last man to charge the Jewish Agency with "an equivocal and pusillanimous policy" and with "subordinating moral considerations to political expediency."

Has the honorable Colonial Secretary of Great Britain forgotten the pledges of the British Labor Party on Palestine, and its bitter denunciation of the moral turpitude of the British Government for its failure to fulfill its obligations in Palestine? May I remind him of the resolution adopted by the Labor Party conference in Southport in 1939 on the subject of the white paper policy which this Labor Party has been enforcing in Palestine ever since it came into office:

"This conference endorses the stand taken by the Parliamentary Labor Party against the Government's statement of policy on Palestine. It declares that the white paper, by imposing minority status on the Jews, by departing from the principle of economic absorptive capacity governing Jewish immigration, by making Jewish entry dependent on Arab consent, and by restricting Jewish land settlement, violates the solemn pledges contained in the Balfour Declaration and the mandate. The policy of the white paper represents a further surrender to aggression, places a premium on violence and terror, and is a set-back to the progressive forces among both Arabs and Jews. * * * This conference calls upon the Government to rescind the white paper policy and to reopen the gates of Palestine for Jewish immigration in accordance with the country's economic absorptive capacity." This was in 1939.

Later the British Labor Party reaffirmed its international policy of building Palestine as the Jewish National Home. This was in 1943.

In December 1944, the British Labor Party, on the eve of its election to the Government of Great Britain, declared: "There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish National Home unless we are prepared to let the Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land (Palestine) in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war, and there is an irresistible case for it now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold-blooded, calculated German-Nazi plan to kill all the Jews of Europe." This resolution of the Labor Party went further, even beyond the program of the Zionist movement. I quote: "Here too in Palestine surely is a case on human grounds and to promote a stable settlement for transfers of population. Let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in. Let them be compensated handsomely for their land and let their settlement elsewhere be carefully organized and generously financed. The Arabs have many wide territories of their own, they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales. Indeed, we should reexamine also the possibility of extending the present Palestinian boundaries by agreement with Egypt, Syria, and Transjordan."

Those who solemnly and publicly made these declarations are today the rulers of Great Britain. But since coming into office, they have refused to honor a single one of these promises.

The words of the honorable delegate of the United Kingdom, Mr. Arthur Creech-Jones, which he uttered the other day, fell unpleasantly on the ears of those who heard him in this very city 3 years ago when he declared:

"In building up their National Home they (the Jews) have inflicted no wrong on the inhabitants of Palestine. There has been no scheme of colonization in the whole history of mankind which has been carried through with such care, such scrupulous fairness and consideration for the native population as has been displayed by the Jews." All this, of course, was achieved under the guidance and control of that very Jewish agency which is now being charged with the subordination of moral considerations to political expediency.

"It is clear to us," Mr. Creech-Jones further continued, "that the white-paper policy must be abrogated. It is obvious to us that the restrictions that have been imposed with regard to the development of the national home during recent years must go; that the gates of Palestine must be opened." How is this to be reconciled with the brutal enforcement of the restrictive measures of the white paper which have been carried on by the British Colonial Office?

He further stated: "We are encouraged by the fact that American opinion has made itself heard in regard to the Palestine problem. That will fortify us in our advocation in the House of Commons." But in the House of Commons American public opinion in regard to the Palestine problem is contemptuously derided by the spokesmen of his party as emanating from political pressure in New York City. He concluded by saying: "It will be for us in London to carry on our work in Parliament and elsewhere so that there is no misadventure, so that the white-paper policy is reversed, so that the Jews can be sure that at last their national home is being established firmly and securely and they can realize their own commonwealth, a free nation which can contribute fully and freely to the general life of the whole of mankind." Was there a single echo of all this in the declarations of the honorable spokesman of the United Kingdom delegation on Tuesday last or in any of the recent declarations of his Government? Who then should be charged with moral weakness and with subordinating moral considerations to political expediency?

7. The Jewish Agency has never condoned terrorism. It has deprecated it and denounced it time and again. It has carried on an intensive campaign of education among the Jews of Palestine against it. It took practical steps to combat it, as was acknowledged by the Palestine government, even at the cost of life. The Jewish Agency, be it remembered, has no governmental or police authority. It could not reach the source of the evil which was feeding terrorism in Palestine. That source was the immoral and iniquitous policy of the white paper, a self-willed and unlawful policy decreed by Great Britain. This policy was condemned by the foremost of Great Britain's statesmen. "A plain breach of a solemn obligation," Mr. Churchill called it. "The breaking of all the pledges and promises that have been given

to the Jews," was the way the Right Honorable Leopold Stennett Amery characterized it. And he asked: "Does my right honorable friend believe that these people (the Jews) will be contented to be relegated to the position of a statutory minority, to be denied all hope of giving refuge and relief to their tortured kinsfolk in other countries; that they will wait passively until, in due course, they and the land they created are to be handed over to the Mufti?" The Right Honorable Herbert Stanley Morrison, who is now Lord President of the Council and leader of the House of Commons, indignantly declared: "I cannot accept the view that His Majesty's Government is doing anything other than counterfeiting this business or that it is doing other than breaking its promises and acting dishonorably before the whole of the civilized world."

This lawless policy, which was imposed upon the Jewish people in Palestine at a time when their brothers and sisters were seeking to escape from the hell of Europe where they were threatened with extinction and where 6,000,000 of them ultimately perished, aroused the bitter resentment of the entire population. They came to regard a repressive government as hostile. Resistance flared up. The sharp injustice of seeing thousands of their unfortunate fellow Jews turned away from the shores of Palestine and sent back to concentration camps to resume a life of despair and homelessness inflamed the passions, especially of the youth of Palestine. Is there any wonder then that some of the most intemperate of them resorted to acts which no one condones, which the authoritative organs of our movement have repeatedly condemned and denounced as harmful to the Jewish people, but which everyone in all fairness must try to understand? It is amazing to find not a single word in the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, not a single humble word which would indicate that the policy of government was in any way whatsoever, directly or indirectly, a contributory factor to these tragic acts which we all deplore.

It is amazing, too, to note that not a single word of condemnation was uttered against the acts of violence perpetrated by the Arabs against whom no white paper was ever enforced, who faced no desperate problems of refugeeism and homelessness, and who are now perpetrating acts of terror in Palestine in an effort to defeat the United Nations decision and to persuade the world of its unworkability.

We deeply regret that we have to engage in polemics with the spokesman of the United Kingdom. We have no quarrel with the British people. We had hoped that the chapter of Great Britain's mandatory regime in Palestine would end on a happier note. We regret that this was not to be. We are not unmindful of the sympathetic understanding which our cause has always received among the great masses of the British peoples and among its foremost leaders. If the sad events of the recent dark and turbulent years have introduced an element of controversy and estrangement in our relations we hope that it will prove only temporary. We do not wish to forget the gracious pattern of friendship and esteem which has been woven into the long fabric of the years. We are here critical of a government and of a policy, not of a people. Governments and policies change. The enduring spiritual and intellectual kinship between peoples remain.

Mr. President, the Palestine issue which is before the United Nations is a test case which the whole world is following with utmost concern, for much indeed depends upon its final outcome. Whether justice will finally be done to a sorely tried people whose monumental spiritual achievements made that little land of Palestine the Holy Land of mankind, whether solemn international pledges are truly to be redeemed and whether this international organization which has been built upon the ruins of another such peace organization, wrecked by the failure of the great powers to maintain its authority, will share a similar fate or whether it will in truth become the tree whose fruit will be for the healing of the nations, all this is involved in this issue which is now before you and quite discernible to all who can see beneath the surface of single events into the sweep of great historic processes.

We confidently await your action.

Restraint on Religious Teachings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the United States Supreme Court in the case of Mrs. Vashti McCollum against Board of Education, has just rendered a far reaching and, if enforced, a revolutionary decision pertaining to religious instruction in our public schools, although the taking of the instruction was optional, voluntary, and without coercion or compulsion.

The Supreme Court of the State of Illinois had passed upon the merits of this case, and its validity, under the Constitution, had been affirmed by the Illinois Supreme Court but the United States Supreme Court, the Court of last resort, has disagreed with and overruled the decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois, thus closing the doors of the public schools to any form of religious instruction and education.

In this day "when spiritual guides and concepts are crumbling under the impact of materialism, communism, and materialistic philosophy," it is deplorable that a ban should be placed on relgious training and spritual teachings under the facts as revealed in this case. When an atheist, who is not interested in religious and spiritual values, can intercept and prevent the teachings thereof, then this Nation has forsaken the ideals of our forefathers who landed at Plymouth Rock.

While our Nation is vigorously fighting communism at home as well as abroad its twin sister, atheism, is recognized and given power to strike down the teachings in our public schools of the greatest force, religion, which is the strongest power to kill and destroy communism. Religion is an antidote for communism.

I am including herein the comments of Earl Godwin, the dean of Washington commentators and one of the most outstanding, sound, fearless, reliable, and constructive commentators of our time. His broadcast was over WMAL on March 9, 1948, and he made the following comment:

The Supreme Court of the United States rules that public schools in Champaign, Ill., cannot give religious instruction once a week on a voluntary basis, in answer to a public sentiment in favor of just such instruction. No one has been forced to attend this meager once-a-week class. But one atheist mother in Champaign complained to the local court that her child was embarrassed because he thus became a loner, and an outstanding exception; the child was not permitted by the atheist mother to go and learn for himself.

Lower courts mowed her down. But the Supreme Court by a vote of 8 to 1 said the use of a taxpayers' school building for religious instruction is too close to the church-and-state evil. One Justice, Reed, dissented; another Justice, Jackson, said the Court was going too far, but he seemed to go along with the others when it came to the final score.

And the whole United States of America, which is largely made up of religious-minded families, will wonder what on earth is coming next if the Supreme Court stands in the way of religious instruction in a public school—when it is by no means compulsory. The highest Court has done truth and Americanism a grave disservice, I truly believe.

This ruling will, no doubt, be picked up by low-life atheists from Maine to California and turned to the disadvantages of those who sincerely want to learn truth, which is all there is to the Bible, Moses, Christ, and all the other teachers.

Not being afflicted with the legal mind, it is not within my view to see any relation between the combination of church and state and the voluntary religious classes in a Champaign school. No one has to attend; and the church and state prohibition is based on the evil the colonies had been suffering, and that was the official status of the Church of England and the highly complex relationships which affected men's freedom. That's gone glimmering, and any attempt to make a bogey out of it now is puerile. I believe that lay minds would have said, "Oh, shucks, run along and play with your marbles. The Constitution can't be bothered with one atheist exhibitionist's embarrassment."

If our early Americans had been so churlish about teaching the underlying truths, we never would have been the fine, strong, young Nation we turned out to be. We are losing that character, and one reason is just such wholesale retreats from God and truth as the Supreme Court made in this atheist matter.

It may be legal, but it is not right.

Of course, the Court does not stand in the way of religion taught elsewhere. Now the thing to do is to get out and work all the harder to see to it that the proper instruction, the proper sort of home instruction, is given. Nobody is going to court to stop that.

Problems Pending Before the Eightieth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I made over Station WWJ in Detroit, Mich., on Monday, March 15, 1948:

When concluding my previous broadcast over the facilities of Station WWJ on February second—I promised my audience to discuss further and to give my views on the problems now pending before the Eightieth Congress which will probably adjourn sine die during the first week of July.

There is one important foreign issue now being discussed in the Capital of our Nation. It is the European recovery program, better known as the Marshall plan—or, for those who relish alphabetic soup—the ERP. At the present stage the Senate is working on a bill which would provide approximately $5,300,000,000 for the financing of a plan through which those parts of Europe which have not as yet been "blacked out" by the iron curtain of Soviet Russia—would be rehabilitated and revitalized both economically and politically by the finances and moral assistance provided by our Government. In fact—the Senate has scheduled night sessions on this subject and when the bill is finally enacted into law—it will have a far-reaching effect upon the peace of the world and the American people. The administration has urged a "speed-up program" in order that the people of Italy will know what aid will be forthcoming before the elections which are to be held in that country on April 18.

In the House of Representatives the Committee on Foreign Affairs is just about ready to wind up hearings on a similar measure. However, I shall refrain from discussing in detail the European recovery program at this time, as I am presently busily engaged in compiling data and material which I shall present to the House when the legislation is under consideration.

The fall of Czechoslovakia and the recent events in Finland caused the United States, Great Britain, and France to make a valiant effort to end the chaos and confusion that now prevails in western Europe. Lewis W. Douglas, our Ambassador to Great Britain and a former colleague of mine in Congress, was our representative at this conference. He has just recently returned to this country in order to give a full report to our President, the State Department, as well as the appropriate committees of both the House and Senate. The pact discussed at the conference just consummated will have a far-reaching effect, especially with reference to the agreement reached as to the Ruhr Valley, which, I trust, will for once and all put an end to Russia's desire to acquire this region which is the very backbone of economic stability of western Europe.

However, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We must ever bear in mind that Stalin has already conquered and oppressed two and one-half times more of the earth's surface than did Hitler. Therefore it behooves us to be ever on our guard and prepare to meet any emergency, because, like all dictators, Stalin dreams of a world conquest.

Regardless of how anxious I am to aid the freedom-loving people of Europe, the Far East and Asia, it is my considered opinion that before we appropriate billions of dollars for any program, we should see to it that our domestic economy is placed on an even keel so as to enable us to extend this helping hand to deserving countries without unbalancing our price levels, and without lowering the standards of living of the American people, especially the skilled, unskilled, and the white-collar worker, the small-business man, and our hard-working and efficient municipal, State, and Federal employees whose loyalty and devotion make possible the smooth operation of our systems of government.

It is indeed regrettable that despite many warning signals—the Eightieth Congress, with its Republican majority, is showing complete disregard to President Truman's messages consistently flashing the danger signals before the eyes of the Republican leaders of Congress. These state papers are replete with words of wisdom and warning. Each pertinent point in these messages is as clear and distinguishable as the beacon light along a rocky shore—placed there to warn the unwary and the careless of the dangers of being wrecked on a desolate reef. These are trying times, and truly—our ship of state is being tossed about on stormy seas because the Republican leadership fail to heed the words of warning—and so far these leaders have seen fit to steer a course other than that recommended by our pilot of the ship of state. I say unto you, my friends, that unless this top-heavy Republican-dominated Congress wakes up and compels its leaders to cease steering a course of destruction and following a phantom policy which believes that everything will regulate itself without any legislative check—the dangerously rising tides of high prices and cost of living will soon find our domestic economy wrecked and broken apart upon an economic shoal.

Several weeks ago great excitement was caused throughout the United States by the news that on some stock exchanges prices of a few commodities had shown a downward trend. Newspapers widely speculated about the influence this would exert on the sum totals of the bills you pay at the grocery. It has been maintained by unduly or purposely optimistic people that the "backbone of inflation" was broken and that without any action by the Eightieth Congress our families will spend less on everyday needs.

The Republican majority in Congress jumped on this flimsy excuse for their inactivity and proclaimed that no legislation is needed because prices would regulate themselves. Of course, they were wrong, as they have been wrong on so many other occasions. Big business, the backbone of which is the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, has seen to it that the momentary downward trend did not last. Take for instance our steel corporations—with what haste they raised prices. I venture to prophesy they will not evidence the same haste in meeting the demands of the steel unions for increased wages for the workers.

Incidentally—the testimony of a public-relations man before a Senate committee investigating the black market—was front-page news recently. He boastfully informed a member of that committee that he was able to furnish him with all the steel he needed—at, of course, black-market prices.

I submit that the workers of this country and the small-business man did not have any steel to sell. It is big business that controls the production of steel—and it therefore follows that it is big business that makes possible the black market with reference to that industry. In other words—one of the by-products of big business is the black market in steel which is preventing the small-business man from securing steel and other necessary materials to keep their plants in operation.

I am sorry to have to tell you that even now, after the short interlude of the decisive slump on our stock exchange and probably caused by speculation only—no action is scheduled by the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress which would implement the repeated pleas of President Truman and our Democratic minority to enact legislation which would permit keeping the dollar you earn to be worth a dollar—and not less and less as days go by. Only recently our statisticians were in accord in their prediction of a further rise in living costs.

It seems to me that there is no more important problem facing us now than the enactment of legislation which would stop the already exorbitant profits of big business and keep the upward trend of prices under control. It is astonishing, indeed, how shortsighted are the present "powers that be" who represent the interests of big business on Capitol Hill. The example of the year 1929 should have taught them a lesson and they should know better by now. As sure as the night follows the day—the Republicans are leading us back to the days of "Hoover and ruin"—and they are following the plan of that so-called "great engineer" in his dream of "placing a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage."

As prices rise—you, the wage earners, are being outpriced from the market. As the value of the dollars you earn diminishes—you can buy less. The goods manufactured by big business cannot find consumers and will soon have to be stored away in the warehouses. As the warehouses become full—production will have to be necessarily curtailed. People will be laid off in factories, in wholesale business, and finally in retail stores. Shelves will be full but cash registers will be empty. Profits will fall and unemployment will begin. This is how catastrophe has been brought upon us in the late twenties—and this is how it is now slowly creeping upon us today.

Many Democrats in Congress—and I will frankly tell you that I am one of them—do not spare their efforts in order to warn the Republican leaders in the Eightieth Congress that their inactivity in the economic and social field is bound to cause a break in the "boom" and bring about the inevitable "bust." However, the defenders of big business do not care. They probably are convinced that big business has enough money put away and that the potentates of our industry and farming can live many years on their savings and investments.

But what about the man who is not in that fortunate position and lives with his family on the pay check? What about the man who has to spend all the money he earns? He will be the one whom the "bust" will hit first—who will first lose his job, and whose family will face the hardships or will have to go on a dole as soon as the family provider is laid off.

President Truman's recommendation that the Fair Labor Standards Act be amended and the 40-cent minimum wage now provided—be increased, should be heeded at once. It is not possible for the American people to meet the rising cost of living when the wage structure is based on the false premise of a 40-cent minimum.

Any housewife in America can tell you that the rise in the cost of living and the "take home" pay of their husbands has not been equalized. It is imperative, if we are to prevent inflation and save earnings that have been put aside for a rainy day, that wages should be increased in proportion to the increase of the cost of living.

And now, my friends, let us look at the broader international aspect of the problem I have tried to outline to you.

Europe and Asia—faced with the onward march of imperialistic communism, are looking to a prosperous and strong America for help. We are their only hope. But we need Europe and Asia, too, because where will we sell the goods which are produced in our factories and on our farms in ever increasing tempo—if Soviet Russia brings down the iron curtain over these vast continents where potential consumers of our goods live.

We can extend a helping hand to foreign countries—we can implement the European recovery program—only if we are prosperous and strong. A break-down of our economy, unemployment, curtailed production and curtailed Federal revenue will soon empty the vaults of our Treasury. Can we permit this to happen? If we do—where will we get the money which we want to lend to Europe and Asia in order to place them in a position to buy our products and live a free, democratic way of life?

This is why I want you to understand that the unchecked rise in prices is closely and, indeed, tragically interlocked with the fate of the entire world—with our future security and with the possibility of avoiding a war much more terrible in its consequences and much more costly than the war we have just finished to fight.

I am astonished how little the good people of Detroit—and for that matter—the rest of

the American people—hear about this grave situation from the self-styled liberals, leftists or defenders of the people—as they call themselves—who are now grouped around Mr. Henry A. Wallace. By splitting the ranks of the Democratic Party—they want to make certain the victory of the party behind which big business stands—the Republican Party.

You will look in vain for any program of sound economic control of the dangerous trend so visible in the rising prices—in any of the speeches made by Mr. Wallace and his supporters. All they have to offer you are the worn-out slogans of appeasement of Soviet Russia—used by the Communist Party since time immemorial—except, of course, during the time when Stalin and Hitler were friends and buddies—together raping one smaller European country after another.

It is for this reason that I heartily welcome the declarations of our labor organizations that they are completely opposed to the Presidential candidacy of Henry A. Wallace—and in which they warn their members not to be misled by false liberalism. I thank you.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Labor for March 13, 1948:

CONSCRIPTION HEAT ON; HERSHEY'S BREATH-TAKING PLAN

In a move planned as carefully as a war campaign, the civilian and military heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Force marched up Capitol Hill together this week and, behind the closed doors of the Senate Armed Services Committee, demanded action on peacetime conscription.

The "brass-hat" delegation was headed by James Forrestal, Secretary of National Defense. It was an extraordinary demonstration of militarist mass pressure on Congress. Forrestal and the generals and admirals pointed to events in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere in Europe and the Far East and did their best to scare the committee with hints the war may be just around the corner.

After the doors opened, it was announced that the committee voted unanimously to hold hearings on a universal military training bill, which has been approved by the House Armed Services Committee, and is now before the House Rules Committee, whose chairman is Congressman LEO E. ALLEN, Republican, of Illinois

ALLEN is the target of a bitter campaign to force him to bring the bill out on the House floor, but he has the support of most Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats.

For nearly a month, supporters of peacetime conscription have been trying to get signatures on a petition, to take the UMT bill from the Rules Committee. A total of 218 signatures are needed—and only 26 Members of the House have put their names on the dotted line.

A mass meeting against ALLEN and for the UMT bill was called by an American Legion county commander in ALLEN'S home district. ALLEN was not there, but another midwestern Congressman tells what happened.

The men and women at the conscriptionists' own meeting twice voted down a resolution criticizing ALLEN for holding up the UMT bill.

"That is one more proof of something which has long been evident," said the Midwest Member of Congress. "The pressure for peacetime conscription is terrific, but practically all of it comes from right here in Washington—from the administration, the heads of the military forces, the Legion lobby, and the big-business interests which support them.

"Most of the people back home are still against UMT despite the vast propaganda drive and scare campaign for it."

Conscription of boys is only the start of what the militarists have in mind. That was made clear this week by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, who headed Selective Service during the war and now is director of the office which keeps the wartime draft records.

As selective-service head, Hershey, like everyone else, was supposed to give his full time and effort to winning the war. He and his associates, however, seemed more interested in preparing to put over peacetime conscription after the war.

In protest against this, Hershey's top assistant, Col. Roscoe S. Conkling, scion of a famous old New York State family, resigned from Selective Service and published a blistering denunciation of Hershey's militarist group.

Hershey told a Senate committee this week that he has a breath-taking plan for conscripting everybody—including workers and women. In other words, he is all set to propose a work-or-fight measure.

A blast against peacetime conscription was issued by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado.

"In two World Wars," he said, "the United States demonstrated that it was the mightiest military power of all time. That was no accident.

"American churches and schools, labor unions, productive capacity, and devotion to freedom made us a military power.

"Forgetting this, the United States today is making the grievous mistake of spending three times as much money on its armed forces as on all education, from kindergartens through colleges and universities. The dangers of military fascism are very great in the United States today."

Here's What and Why of Ohio River Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 14, 1948:

HERE'S WHAT AND WHY OF OHIO RIVER PACT—MILLIONS NOW USE WATER THAT WASHES SEWAGE OF GREATER NUMBER—SUBSTANTIAL CLEAN-UP HELD POSSIBLE WITHIN 10 YEARS—LEGAL SET-UP OUTLINED

(By James T. Golden, Jr.)

Just what is this Ohio River compact, this agreement among States that promises to give you purer drinking water, better fishing, more economical boating, and perhaps river transportation before you're 10 years older?

It already has been well publicized that Congress authorized the agreement among Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, Illinois, New York, and Tennessee; that it became definitely effective with Virginia's ratification not many days ago; that a commission of three men from each State and three representing the Federal Government will administer it.

Before outlining the compact it might be well to have a brief look at the conditions which made it necessary. They were well summarized by Hudson Biery, Cincinnati, chairman of the Ohio River Valley Stream Sanitation Compact Conference, in testimony before a congressional committee less than 1 year ago.

Biery quoted three cogent paragraphs from the Ohio River Survey, "a monumental undertaking, the most comprehensive survey ever undertaken in any river valley anywhere in the world," which had been made on authorization of Congress:

"Practically all streams on the Ohio River Basin are polluted by domestic and industrial wastes, while some have severe corrosive characteristics imparted to them by acid mine drainage. The Ohio River proper is polluted to such an extent that 30 public sources of water supply serving about 1,660,000 people are endangered. * * *

"Besides furnishing water for more than 7,000,000 persons and for industrial processes, the streams of the Ohio River Basin are used for the disposal of sewage by some 8,500,000 people, and almost two-thirds of this sewage receives no treatment. Industrial wastes with an oxygen demand equivalent to sewage from almost 10,000,000 additional persons enter the streams. (Oxygen in the waters aids in reducing undesirable elements to harmless or less dangerous substances.)

"Pollution problems are further complicated by the effect of waters containing 1,800,000 tons of acid per year which flow or are pumped from active and abandoned coal mines in the extensive coal fields of the basin.

"Many water supplies, both domestic and industrial, suffer from the effects of these polluting substances and outbreaks of intestinal diseases, apparently water-borne, have occurred following periods of low stream flow. Recreation facilities have been damaged. Fish and other aquatic life have been detrimentally affected. Steamboats, barges, other river craft and structures, pumps, pipe lines, and condensers exposed to acid stream waters have been attacked."

The Public Health Service and the Army engineers, Biery noted, identified and measured every source of pollution of the Ohio River and all its tributaries at the time of the survey and, in most cases, remedial measures have been suggested. The compact now authorizes the Sanitation Commission to require, not merely suggest, remedies.

Looking beyond his own river valley to the Nation as a whole, Biery told the committee: "If the total cost of the stream-sanitation program for the United States is $3,000,000,000 and you legislate Federal aid on a 33-percent basis at $100,000,000 a year, you are launching a national program at the rate of $300,000,000 a year. At this rate we could substantially clean up the whole country in 10 years.

Although the compact gives little direct benefit to Virginia (only one of whose major streams flows to Ohio River tributaries) it is important to her in establishing a strong precedent for a Potomac compact, Biery has pointed out.

The Senate has passed S. 418, the Elston-Spence River clean-up bill, which now is in a subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee. It provides that the United States Public Health Service Act as coordinating agency to work with interstate, State, and local bodies in abating pollution. Another provision is for loans to public bodies, such as cities, and to private industries, at 2 percent a year, for the cost of pollution-elimination installations.

LOANS AND VETO DEBATE

The clause for loans to industry has been meeting some opposition in committee.

Still another provision would allow the Federal Government to sue, after sufficient

warning and public hearings, and with the consent of the State or States, to enforce pollution abatement in interstate waters. Proponents of a strong bill may oppose the clause by which a State veto could bar such suit.

It is expected that representatives of the compacting States will meet about July 1 to formalize the agreement, start the appointive commission in operation, and decide on permanent staff, headquarters, and routine.

Following is a digest of the compact itself:

Preamble: Points out that rapid increase of population and industry has resulted in increasingly serious pollution of waters, and that State cooperation is needed to abate the menace.

STATES PLEDGE LAWS

Article I: The States pledge "faithful cooperation" and enactment of necessary legislation for abatement and control to make the waters "safe and sanitary * * * available for safe and satisfactory use as public and industrial water supplies after reasonable treatment" and adaptable to other legitimate uses, such as recreation.

Article II: The Ohio River Valley water sanitation district is created for the Ohio River and all ultimate tributaries.

Article III: The ORVWS Commission is created as a body corporate.

Article IV: Provides for three citizen commissioners from each State and three Federal commissioners, each State to choose or dismiss its commissioners under its own law, and the commissioners to receive actual expenses but no compensation.

QUORUM IS DEFINED

Article V: Empowers the commission to elect officers and assistants, to fix duties and compensation, to adopt a seal and organize formally, to establish one or more offices within the district, and meet at any time or place, with one or more commissioners from a majority of the member States constituting a quorum. Requires presentation of budget to governors of the States, the keeping of full accounts, and submission of annual reports on or before each December 1. The commission is not to incur obligations before adequate appropriations are made, nor pledge a State's credit except by authority of that State's legislature.

(The next several articles are quoted in full, since they describe most completely the commission's functions):

"ARTICLE VI

"It is recognized by the signatory States that no single standard for the treatment of sewage or industrial wastes is applicable in all parts of the district due to such variable factors as size, flow, location, character, self-purification, and usage of waters within the district. The guiding principle of this compact shall be that pollution by sewage or industrial wastes originating within a signatory State shall not injuriously affect the various uses of the interstate waters as hereinbefore defined.

"All sewage from municipalities or other political subdivision, public or private institutions, or corporations, discharged or permitted to flow into these portions of the Ohio River and its tributary waters which form boundaries between, or are contiguous to, two or more signatory States, or which flow from one signatory State into another signatory State, shall be so treated, within a time reasonable for the construction of the necessary works, as to provide for substantially complete removal of settable solids and the removal of not less than 45 percent of the total suspended solids; provided that in order to protect the public health or to preserve the waters for other legitimate purposes, including those specified in article I, in specific instances such higher degree of treatment shall be used as may be determined to be necessary by the commission after investigation, due notice, and hearing.

"All industrial wastes discharged or permitted to flow into the aforesaid waters shall be modified or treated, within a time reasonable for the construction of the necessary works, in order to protect the public health or to preserve the waters for other legitimate purposes, including those specified in article I, to such degree as may be determined to be necessary by the commission after investigation, due notice and hearing.

"All sewage or industrial wastes discharged or permitted to flow into tributaries of the aforesaid waters situated wholly within one State shall be treated to that extent, if any, which may be necessary to maintain such waters in a sanitary and satisfactory condition at least equal to the condition of the waters of the interstate stream immediately above the confluence.

"The commission is hereby authorized to adopt, prescribe, and promulgate rules, regulations, and standards for administering and enforcing the provisions of this article.

"ARTICLE VII. Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the powers of any signatory State, or to repeal or prevent the enactment of any legislation or the enforcement of any requirement by any signatory State, imposing additional conditions and restrictions to further lessen or prevent the pollution of waters within its jurisdiction.

"ARTICLE VIII

"The commission shall conduct a survey of the territory included within the district, shall study the pollution problems of the district, and shall make a comprehensive report for the prevention or reduction of stream pollution therein. In preparing such report, the commission shall confer with any national or regional planning body which may be established, and any department of the Federal Government authorized to deal with matters relating to the pollution problems of the district. The commission shall draft and recommend to the governors of the various signatory States uniform legislation dealing with the pollution of rivers, streams, and waters and other pollution problems within the district. The commission shall consult with and advise the various States, communities, municipalities, corporations, persons, or other entities with regard to particular problems connected with the pollution of waters, particularly with regard to the construction of plants for the disposal of sewage, industrial, and other waste. The commission shall, more than 1 month prior to any regular meeting of the legislature of any State which is a party thereto, present to the governor of any State its recommendations relating to enactments to be made by any legislature in furthering the intents and purposes of this compact.

"ARTICLE IX

"The commission may from time to time, after investigation and after a hearing, issue an order or orders upon any municipality, corporation, person or other entity discharging sewage or industrial waste into the Ohio River or any other river, stream or water, any part of which constitutes any part of the boundary line between any two or more of the signatory States, or into any stream any part of which flows from any portion of one signatory State through any portion of another signatory State. Any such order or orders may prescribe the date on or before which such discharge shall be wholly or partially discontinued, modified or treated or otherwise disposed of. The commission shall give reasonable notice of the time and place of the hearing to the municipality, corporation or other entity against which such order is proposed. No such order shall go into effect unless and until it receives the assent of at least a majority of the commissioners from each of not less than a majority of signatory States; and no such order upon a municipality, corporation, person or entity in any State shall go into effect unless and until it receives the assent of not less than a majority of the commissioners from such State.

"It shall be the duty of the municipality, corporation, person or other entity to comply with such order issued against it or him by the commission, and any court of general jurisdiction or any United States district court in any of the signatory States shall have the jurisdiction, by mandamus, injunction, specific performance or other form of remedy, to enforce any such order against any municipality, corporation or other entity domiciled or located within such State or whose discharge of the waste takes place within or adjoining such State, or against any employee, department or subdivision of such municipality, corporation, person or other entity; provided, however, such court may review the order and affirm, reverse or modify the same upon any of the grounds customarily applicable in proceedings for court review of administrative decisions. The commission or, at its request, the attorney general or other law enforcing official, shall have power to institute in such court any action for the enforcement of such order.

"ARTICLE X

"The signatory States agree to appropriate for the salaries, office, and other administrative expenses, their proper proportion of the annual budget as determined by the Commission and approved by the governors of the signatory States, one-half of such amount to be prorated among the several States in proportion of their population within the district at the last preceding Federal census, the other half to be prorated in proportion to their land area within the district."

Article XI specifies that the compact becomes effective with ratification of a majority of the State legislatures in the district, that the United States Commissioners shall be appointed by the President, and that nothing in the act or compact shall impair or affect Federal sovereignty or any of its rights or jurisdiction, and reserves the congressional right of amendment or repeal.

WHAT CITY HAS TO DO

The Ohio River Compact means that Cincinnati will have to do something she's been wanting to do—install, with her Hamilton County neighbors, a $25,000,000 sewage-disposal system.

"The citizens of Cincinnati are vitally concerned in cleaning up the Ohio River, an open sewer, because we refine this sewage and drink it," Hudson Biery, a leader in the fight against pollution, has testified.

"Within the 20-mile limits of the Cincinnati pool, created by the locks and dams, we daily dump more than 100,000,000 gallons of untreated sewage, human and industrial. It's a vile-smelling and ugly mess * * * the 450 tons of solids poured into the Cincinnati pool from which we take our drinking water is equal to dropping a dead horse into the river every 3 minutes."

St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks,

I include a splendid and an educational article on St. Patrick written by Regina Madden and appearing in the Boston Sunday Globe of March 14, 1948:

ST. PATRICK WAS A DIPLOMAT, SINCERE, MILD, AND PERSUASIVE—HE ALSO HAD THE BEST POSSIBLE PREPARATION FOR CONVERTING THE IRISH; HE HAD LIVED WITH THEM, KNEW AND LOVED THEM

(By Regina Madden, former president of the Boston Eire Society)

The story of the conversion of Ireland to Christianity should be required reading for every statesman, for in the methods employed by St. Patrick over 1,500 years ago in persuading the Irish people to accept the teachings of Christ can be found a code of diplomacy that has as yet been unrivaled in its effectiveness.

St. Patrick had all the natural endowments of the diplomat—sincerity, mildness, persuasiveness. "O Patrick mild of the sweet voice" was his salutation from Oisin, the bard of the Fian na h-Eireann. He had, too, the best possible preparation for his mission since he had lived among these people and had grown to know them and to respect and love them. So he came to them not as the patronizing representative of a superior foreign culture, but as a friend, bearing the most precious gift he could offer, a simple, humble man, who spoke their language, who knew their way of life, a man whose affection for them was patent.

At every step of his work the saint made use of his knowledge of the people and the life of the country. Since he knew that in democratic Ireland the king or chief holding office was elected by the people because of his high qualities of leadership, he based his plan of procedure on the assumption that if he could persuade the leaders to accept the new religion, his chances of converting the people would be greatly enhanced.

Accordingly, shortly after arriving in Ireland, he set out for Tara, where Laoghaire, the high king, held court. He did not succeed in converting Laoghaire, but so convincing was he in expounding the doctrines of Christianity that he drew many of the king's followers, even some of the court druids, to his religion; and so ingratiating was he in manner that the obdurate old king gave him permission to preach his doctrines throughout the land. The saint now began his missionary travels, following in every district the policy of first approaching the local king. The measure of his success lies in the fact that before his death almost the entire country had been converted to Christianity.

STORY OF STUBBORN SNAKE

The persuasive powers of the saint are reflected in one of the traditional stories relative to the banishing of the snakes from Ireland. According to the story, all the snakes but one, responding to the saint's plea, left the land, but one little fellow was so stubborn that he refused to go until at last the gentle saint promised him that he might return on the morrow. Having obtained the promise, he slipped blithely into Loch Neagh. And to this day, if you lived on the shores of the lake, you would see him stick his head above the water each morning to ask, "Is this the morrow?" But, of course, the morrow lies always ahead, and so there are no snakes in Ireland.

St. Patrick knew human nature and capitalized on his knowledge. He knew, for example, that people in general resent radical changes being made in their way of life, and for that reason he adapted the doctrine of Christianity to the native pattern of life insofar as it was conformable. Instead of abolishing the Brehon laws, he merely purged them of their pagan elements and had them codified. This was not a difficult task because the highly advanced culture of pagan Ireland was closely akin to that of Christian civilization. The essentially Christian virtues, justice, charity, and the like, were the virtues to which the Brehon laws exhorted the people.

In organizing the church, the saint again wisely refrained from trying to force the people into an unfamiliar framework. Instead, he built the structure of the church according to the tribal system, on which the social and political life of the country was based. The area occupied by a clan was made a diocese, each clan having its own bishop, the ecclesiastical equivalent of a tribal chief.

The tact of the saint was once more evidenced in his choice of Armagh as the location for the see, which would be the seat of jurisdiction of the Christian Church in Ireland. Armagh, situated close to the ancient palace of the Clanna Rury, was controversial territory because although it had been in the possession of the Oirghialla for over a century, it lay close to the frontiers of Ulaidh, whose people had never relinquished the hope of one day regaining the seat of their great traditions. By establishing his primatial see in this locality, the saint made of it virtually neutral territory and thus removed a potential threat to peace.

Wherever it was possible, St. Patrick bridged the gaps between the pagan customs of the Irish and the customs of Christianity. When he deprived the people of their pagan celebrations, so that they might feel no loss he arranged great Christian festivals for the same dates. And rather than give unnecessary offense by casting indignity on the sites of their pagan rites, he made these places centers of Christian worship. Again, he dissuaded the people from chanting the old pagan charms, not by drastic banning of the charms but by offering in their stead the more beautiful and impressive litanies and hymns of the new religion.

The saint gave recognition to the great respect the Irish had for learning in establishing monasteries and schools, which increased in numbers until the land was honeycombed with institutions of learning. From these institutions came a great body of written literature, not only Christian literature but the literature of the pre-Christian period as well, for St. Patrick ordered the old folk tales to be written down and preserved for the delight of future generations. His appreciative enjoyment of the stories and poems of the Fian, which held an important place in Irish life, was one of the endearing ties that bound the people to him.

The Ireland in which St. Patrick set foot in 432 was a land of warlike people. The Ireland in which he was laid to rest in 465 was a peaceful country, known to the world as the island of saints and scholars. The change had been brought by the efforts of one man, a diplomat in the service of Christ.

Family Security in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the Family Service Association of America, entitled "Family Security in Danger."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY SECURITY IN DANGER

(The following statement by the Family Service Association of America has recently been carried in newspapers in various parts of the country. This organization is a membership federation of 242 family-service agencies in more than 200 cities. In practically every city these agencies are Red Feather services of their local community chest and in an average year assist approximately 750,000 family members through either direct or indirect services. The family-service agencies once assumed a major part of the burden of helping families in economic distress. They surrendered their responsibility for basic maintenance relief to the Government when Federal and State welfare programs, and the Social Security Act, emerged in the thirties. They now specialize in expert counseling and guidance for persons requiring aid in personal, emotional, and family problems other than those of economic need.)

Despite some price declines, the American ideal of at least minimum subsistence for every family is considerably further from realization than before the war and appears likely to fade still further in 1948. Failure to liberalize and extend State social security and public-assistance programs, plus the eroding effects of inflation on the present level of benefits and grants, has applied a desperate squeeze on a large portion of the 11,000,000 family members receiving some form of governmental assistance.

Many citizens who thought the country had made a good start in protecting its families from genuine want are asking why the country's security measures are apparently indequate in a period of peak employment, high wages, and high profits. In an election year, with strong pressure to reduce taxes, the inclination may be strong to look askance at requests for increased public aid and to make superficial judgment as to the efficiency of welfare administration.

By and large there is good reason to believe that our existing security and welfare programs are being efficiently and ably administered, despite the general scarcity of trained personnel and severe pressure from all sides to keep down administrative costs. Any failures within the system are minute compared to the failure of the public and its legislative representatives to anticipate the present period by increasing social security coverage and making its benefits more elastic. Adequate social security and public assistance should always be designed to protect marginal families against sharp economic swings—either depression or inflation.

From a spot-check report from the most reliable sources, nationally and State-wide, the Family Service Association of America offers the following explanation of the seeming contradiction between national prosperity and increasing economic insecurity among families requiring public aid:

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Although there are nearly 60,000,000 Americans at work today, about 1,600,000 others are unemployed but seeking work. Of these, about 621,000 are currently drawing unemployment insurance while in search of jobs. Because of the high cost of living, many of them now find their benefits too scant to keep their families going.

The weekly unemployment benefits are generally based on the highest earnings of a worker in the preceding year, but may not exceed the statutory maximum. While this maximum has been revised upward in many States during recent months, the cost of living has risen even more sharply. Between September 1945 and September 1947 average weekly earnings in manufacturing industries,

according to the Monthly Labor Review of the United States Department of Labor, rose 24 percent and the index of consumer prices mounted 27 percent. But the average insurance benefit for total unemployment, which totaled $19.11 in September 1945, amounted to only $17.82 in September 1947, a decrease of 7 percent.

THE INSURED AGED AND SURVIVORS

There are now 1,950,000 aged persons, widows, and orphans receiving monthly benefits through the federally administered old-age and survivors' insurance system. Despite the Bureau of Labor Statistics' conservative estimate of a 65-percent increase in prices since 1939, the benefits payable under this insurance have not been revised since that year, when the existing law was passed. An aged couple or a widow with young children may get as little as $10 a month from the insurance, depending largely upon how many years the wage earner contributed through pay-roll deductions and the amount of his wages during these years. The maximum that a beneficiary family can obtain is $85 a month. Actually, as of the end of June 1947, the average monthly amount paid a retired worker and wife was $39.20, a widowed mother and two children $48.70, and two aged parents $26. If these beneficiaries lack savings or other resources their lot is made harder by a provision in the law under which benefits are suspended for any month in which a beneficiary earns more than $14.99 in covered employment.

THE UNINSURED

However inadequate the present programs of unemployment insurance and old-age and survivors' insurance, they do provide some measure of help for those covered. Still, over two-fifths of all American workers are completely excluded from either unemployment or old-age and survivors' insurance—agricultural and domestic workers, public employees, and those of nonprofit organizations, self-employed persons, and others. Under old-age insurance, nearly two in five persons with wage credits from covered employment are neither fully nor currently insured because of shifts from covered to noncovered employment. Furthermore, our social-security program provides no insurance against incapacity or illness, although there is an average of 2,000,000 disabled wage earners in the country each day.

The impoverished, disabled, and helpless from among this mass of uninsured citizens are aided, when eligible, by public assistance from both Federal Government and States. The Federal Government provides matching funds to States for three special groups—dependent children, dependent aged, and the dependent blind, representing in November nearly 4,000,000 people. In addition, 3,000,000 Americans receive Government benefits as aged veterans, disabled veterans, or the widows, orphans, and parents of deceased veterans. For 340,000 other needy cases, representing approximately 700,000 persons who fall into none of these categories, State and local governments, unaided by Washington, provide general assistance, or relief.

Within the last year there have been marked increases in the number of people receiving aid for dependent children, old-age assistance, or general relief. The Social Security Administration attributes the rise in public assistance rolls, in a time of relatively full employment and unprecedented prosperity, partly to the high cost of living and partly to the readjustment of the Nation to peace. Many families with low fixed incomes have found it impossible to subsist without some further help. The character of the labor force has changed, too, with return of veterans, and many older workers, useful in wartime, now find themselves either unneeded or too old to continue. With the decrease in soldiers' allotments and veterans' benefits, which helped many families keep afloat, many other marginal families find themselves in distress.

Not only has the number grown, but the cost of assistance in terms of today's prices has mounted steadily. Unfortunately, the least economically favored States, where the number and burden of the needy is greatest, have been least able to make their assistance adequate. The national average monthly payment for general assistance to a family in June 1947, was $39.18, but while New York State was able to make its average payment $65.55 per family, in Mississippi the average grant was only $10.12.

In view of the above, the Family Service Association of America is convinced that examination of the circumstances in which families dependent on public assistance are living today would be appalling to most citizens with regular employment. The prospect of increasing impoverishment of a large segment of our population should make it apparent that there is no other logical prospect than to meet squarely the need for more adequate public assistance in this inflation year and to move in due haste to strengthen and broaden our social security system as a buttress against the future. To turn our backs now on the country's present welfare needs would be simply to reap a crop of dragon's teeth in more costly social and family problems in another year.

FAMILY SERVICE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
BROOKS POTTER, *President*.
FRANK J. HERTEL, *General Director*.

St. Patrick's Day Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is a day dear to the hearts of men and women of Irish descent wherever they may be. It is the day of St. Patrick, who first brought the Cross of Christianity to Ireland, over 15 centuries ago.

Across America and across the world, those with the blood of the Gael flowing in their veins, will gather in full force. The shamrock will bloom and the pipes will play—and eyes will be moist to the tune of the Wearing of the Green.

It is fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the day of St. Patrick, should be celebrated in America. For Americans of Irish descent have proved their loyalty to the United States, in every war it has fought.

With this thought in mind, I include in the RECORD a tribute to the Irish, by the distinguished radio commentator, George E. Reedy, delivered over Station WOL of the Mutual network, this morning:

This is Saint Patrick's day. Throughout this Nation—and the world—today, wherever Erin's sons and daughters gather, many the heart will be cheered and thrilled, to the echoing feet of the marching Irish.

From New York to San Francisco, the men and women from Tyrone and Cork will be there. There'll be some from Kerry, from Armach, from Sligo and Tipperary, from County Down and Galway, from County Mayo and County Clare. Yes, it's a great day folks.

Who, among us, has not been thrilled by the Irish lullaby? Or those glorious tunes of When Irish Eyes Are Smiling, My Wild Irish Rose, I'll Take You Home Again Kathleen, Mother Machree, and Danny Boy?

I think of Victor Herbert and his immortal compositions, John McCormack, Peter Higgins, and Morton Downey with their magic voices, and the other great Irish men and women, who have enriched and ennobled the life of our Nation.

Irishmen, however, are as versatile as they are vocal. They are born poets, politicians, and tale-tellers. They're as expert with the harp as with the shillelagh. They argue and orate, dance and sing, farm and fight, as their forebears did.

And, speaking of fight; in a diary of the Bohemian campaign of 1620, published in Germany, it is recorded: "The Irish are everywhere considered to be as faithful as they are invincible."

When the North American colonists rebelled against England, according to evidence given before a Parliamentary committee in 1779, one-half of the Revolutionary Army was of Irish birth. Rather more than half of Washington's officers, including 39 of his generals, were Irishmen.

From that time onward, right down to our own days, it is to Irishmen winning wars for other lands, that tributes are paid. In World War II, the Germans learned to their cost, at Tunisia, the meaning of the phrase, "the fighting Irish."

It is of interest, to recall the first reference to Irish soldiers on the Continent, and the French doubt, as to whether they were men or devils. The French were talking of the siege of Boulogne.

In the earlier world war, Ireland's casualties, in proportion to her population, were second only to France. Ireland's casualties in the Second World War will probably never be estimated.

Nor is it likely that history books will ever tell of the Irishmen who died in Norway, while making possible the safe withdrawal of Dutch royalty. There will be few tributes to the Irishmen who died at Dunkirk, in north Africa, in Italy, in France, Belgium, Germany, in Burma, and in the Pacific.

Yes; Irishmen have fought through the centuries, on a thousand blood-bought battlefields, and Irish blood has crimsoned the seven seas.

Yet, Ireland is essentially Irish. The rocky road to Dublin endures in memory. Paddy and his pig survive in commerce. And the persuasive eloquence that put off a queen, is perpetuated in Blarney. Saint Patrick wrote the narrative of his life in the tablets of human hearts. He preached the Gospel of Christianity, and taught among the hills and dales. He made the highways and byways his pulpit. And Erin's sons and daughters in the United States have woven the shamrock into a garland of glory for the Emerald Isle.

Federation of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared in the New York Times on March 9, written by Mr. Clarence K. Streit, and comment on the letter by former Senator Burton K. Wheeler. These two letters deal with the matter of a Federation of Europe. I think they are of great interest and should be brought

to the attention of the Senate and the country.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN OR WORLD UNION—SENATOR WHEELER'S EARLY SUPPORT OF FEDERATION ACKNOWLEDGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The rising tide of talk in the United States in favor of a European federation should make Burton K. Wheeler, former Senator from Montana, very happy indeed. Several years before Governor Dewey, Mr. Wheeler was urging European union. When Congress was going overwhelmingly for the Fulbright and Connally resolutions on world organization, Senator Wheeler was talking European union. He was talking it even before that, when no one else in the United States of his stature was advocating it.

Mr. Churchill and others now advocate western European union as a defense against Soviet Russia. In the years when they were paying no mean tributes to the Kremlin, Senator Wheeler left no doubt that he deemed Moscow a menace to freedom against which western Europe should federate. Unlike many of his present followers, Senator Wheeler was not ambiguous about what he meant by a union of Europe. He did not use the term so loosely that it might mean anything from a bloc or alliance of nations to a real federal union. He made it clear that he had in mind a federal government, such as that of the United States.

In those days Senator Wheeler was generally rated isolationist No. 1, at least in the fear his debating powers inspired in the internationalist camp. Those who were then promising enduring peace if only the United States would enter some kind of world organization did not take so kindly as I did to Senator Wheeler's talk of European union. They thought a shrewd politician was preparing a red herring that might well divert the United States from doing its duty. To them—then—European union seemed Machiavellic isolationism.

For what could appeal more than this to all three pillars of isolationist support—the escapist pillar, the spread-eagle pillar, and the anti-British and Europe pillar? Certainly by a policy of European union we would escape responsibility, while enjoying the satisfaction of either seeing our Federal principles adopted by others or, in the event of a failure, confirming the view that the British and Europeans are hopeless.

Most of the internationalists here who are now urging European rather than trans-Atlantic union have neglected, no doubt, to think this policy through. But if they still favor it, fairness should suggest to them that they apologize to Mr. Wheeler for their past criticisms of him and recognize him as their first prophet.

For my part, I shall continue to urge the United States, to federate with the other democracies. But if it should turn out that European union is all that Secretary Marshall was aiming at when he spoke of federal union in his Utah speech of July 14, 1947, and if Governor Dewey and the other Republican backers of European union get their resolutions through Congress, or in the Republican platform, my regrets will be addressed to the Secretary and to the Republican leadership.

CLARENCE K. STREIT.

WASHINGTON, *February 26, 1948.*

MARCH 10, 1948.

Mr. CLARENCE K. STREIT,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STREIT: I read with a great deal of interest your letter to the New York Times, appearing in the issue of March 9, 1948. It is said that a prophet is without honor in his own land and it is, therefore, something of a satisfaction to gain recognition from so informed a person as yourself wit respect to my attitude toward what I like to call a United States of Europe.

It is true that I have been a stanch advocate of such a union; I believe, to the best of my knowledge, the first public official in this country and one of the first three or four in recent times in the world to urge a union of European states. Of course, when I first urged such a program, Mr. Winston Churchill had not joined some of his fellow Englishmen and I then said that if Britain was reluctant to join (because of possible or fancied short-time trade disadvantages) she could remain out of the political union, but lend her friendly offices to its creation.

I note your criticism of the idea. I do not quarrel with you over your feeling; in fact I respect your own advocacy of a world-wide union of States. But I believe you do me an injustice to infer that either I, or many who have more recently come around to a belief in a federal union of European states, are motivated by what you term "isolationist" thinking. I have felt, and still feel that if the people of Europe could not or would not federate there wasn't much use of talking about a world federation. Any study of history shows that timing is the essence of political development. I am not in theory opposed to an eventual union of all democracies all over the world; it is simply that as a practical man I have long recognized that democracy, so called, cannot be imposed from above; it must grow from within the people. That was the basic concept of our founding fathers—to set up here a government to which all men of good will can repair. By practice and emulation we must show the people of the world that our kind of government offers the greatest good for the greatest number. From the time of our own Revolution to Monroe's statement of political principles for the Western Hemisphere we are concerned with maintaining our own Federal Union; from that time onward, with occasional slips and backtracks, we have helped the idea along in other lands.

Since the First World War I have felt that the time was ripe to help promote a union of European states, starting first along economic lines and gradually and normally broadening the base to include even the concept of sovereignty. It is true that my concept excluded our own United States; not because I looked upon the other states as pariahs, or that we were better than they, but simply because the whole cause of democracy could be jeopardized by putting our kind of political life at the mercy of a number of states still in the kindergarten of what we call democracy. I believe our experience with the United Nations bears out the soundness of this premise. Eventually, if we were to lend our honest aid in a sound, practical way to such a program, not only would we be able to do a far more effective and cheaper job in estopping the sweep of absolutism and totalitarian concepts throughout the world, but we might also—not in my time, nor probably in yours—establish on this war-torn earth a union of the people of the earth.

With all good wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

BURTON K. WHEELER.

Success of Negro Girl in Talent Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 17 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Goldsboro (N. C.) News-Argus giving the result of a contest of amateur talent held by the Goldsboro Junior Chamber of Commerce, in which a Negro girl in competition with a number of white girls was awarded first place by the white audience. Goldsboro is situated in the eastern section of the State, where there is a very large Negro population, but there is complete understanding between the races in that section, as there is throughout North Carolina; and it is always a source of gratification when the white people can be of real service in rendering assistance to worthy and deserving members of the Negro race. It may be said likewise that the Negro race reciprocates most heartily in cooperating with the white race in all worthy endeavors.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE IN MORE THAN IN COLOR

The Goldsboro Junior Chamber of Commerce sponsored an amateur talent show at Goldsboro high-school auditorium the other evening.

Fifty dollars was offered in three prizes. First prize was $25.

There were a number of contestants. Among them was Mattie Hatcher, 15-year-old soprano of Dillard High School about whose singing Goldsboro has heard before. Dillard, you know, is Goldsboro's Negro high school. Judges were not immediately able to decide first-place winner.

It was decided that applause from the audience should decide who got first place. Volume of applause was carefully noted as each contestant was presented.

The auditorium will seat about 1,200 people. Best estimates are that there were more than 700 people in the audience. It was a white audience. White in more than in color.

The audience of Goldsboro white people selected the young Negro girl for the first-place winner and the $25 prize.

The crowd was moved by the power and sincerity of the singing by the girl. A number in the audience asked if the world may not have a budding Marian Anderson in the Goldsboro girl.

More conservative listeners doubted that the singer can become a Marian Anderson but they agreed she has a voice of distinction.

Most impressive, however, was the fairness and freedom from race prejudice displayed by the audience. Other contestants were young white people. Some of them provided real entertainment.

But the young Negro girl showed impressive promise and the white audience was quick to give her her due.

We hope that word of this action will spread widely.

Meantime, Goldsboro has a responsibility as to Mattie Hatcher. Goldsboro should see that she has the chance for training to determine if she can become a singer of national distinction.

International Boondoggling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am

inserting in the RECORD the following article relating to the Marshall plan, the author of which is Henry J. Taylor:

WILL YOU BUY THE MARSHALL PLAN?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

(The price tag is $17,000,000,000, which means an annual load of $862 for every American family by 1951. Here's a stop-look-and-listen article by this noted economist and writer on international affairs.)

Look in your cupboard, coal bin, or clothes closet. There you will see the future workings of the Marshall plan.

Look at the prices in the grocery store. Ask yourself why it is hard to build a house or get a car. What are you paying for milk? For meat? Ponder tonight the connection between the steel famine and your own job security, the oil shortage and this country on wheels, the machinery scarcity and the problem of new production to whip inflation. Now you and I are ready to think about the Marshall plan.

For the Marshall plan—officially known, since Secretary Marshall disavowed that title, as the European recovery program—does not mean dollars. It means goods—mostly the same goods that America itself needs.

Never before in the history of the world has a relief proposal like this subsidy-in-goods been assembled.

It means the difference between the products that 16 European nations (chiefly Britain) believe they need and the products they can produce or buy in the next 4 years—with America donating that difference.

We American people are already paying the bill for the Government's postwar relief programs abroad at the annual rate of $376 per United States family. By this proposal the bill would be built up to $862 per American family by 1951.

Accordingly, the pocketbook, the personal welfare, and the future of every American citizen are directly involved in the question, Will you buy the Marshall plan?

Knowing that every farm, every home, every factory, every pay roll, prices, pensions, taxes, individual security, and the basic stability of the United States are all directly affected, it is up to each of us to be honestly informed and to answer. For now is the time the question must be decided in Congress in accord with the will of the people.

What is our will? Given the facts, we can find our own way to this answer for both our own good and also the good of the hard-pressed world. But we need to know the plain, unvarnished truth. And, at the moment, propaganda rules the roost.

It is not enough to say we want to help Europe—the needy, the heartworn and weary. Everyone agrees about that. In the past years of war unnumbered men have died to give humanity another chance. We who remain cannot say good-by to their efforts—not when we remember that they said good-by to life itself. But to humanity, in the end, it is results—not pronouncements—which count. And in these critical times we cannot indefinitely postpone getting real results from anything we do for relief and recovery abroad.

The war has been over nearly 3 years. After all, something must be wrong with the way we have aided Europe so far, or the gigantic postwar aid already given would have helped more than it has and possibly won us more friends.

Our world-recovery donations ($22,000,000,000 since the end of the war) have failed to achieve their promised objectives. If they had not failed we would not now be called upon to send so many new billions.

But when earlier expenditures fail to deliver promised results, attention is generally distracted from the failures by making new promises and putting the objectives on an even wider base. New labels are sought, new slogans concocted, new arguments advanced. Generalities about the future smother the facts and fiascos of the past.

What are the chief arguments usually advanced for our buying the latest plan now that it is no longer merely an idea with good objectives but has become a specific piece of proposed legislation, presented on an all-or-nothing basis?

1. We must protect western Europe from the Communist menace.

2. Our own economic self-interest (i. e., avoiding a depression) is involved.

3. We can afford to be generous on this scale on a humanitarian basis.

Before we examine the validity of these arguments, let's see how and where the plan really began.

It began in London. I was there when it started. While it was being put together abroad, I journeyed to most countries involved: England, France, Italy, Greece, Switzerland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Holland, and Germany. I went to Paris while it was finally being thrashed out there. I came home and saw it finished in Washington, D. C.

Much of the European story behind the headlines and public speeches has not been told. The facts about the birth of the plan abroad, the inside inter-European commitments and cross-trades, the amazing contradictions in the program itself—all are vital, but smothered. The effect on us in our homes and work places is certainly not clearly understood. So come to London for the real beginning.

In January 1947, British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin notified Secretary Marshall that new large-scale American aid for England was necessary, or Britain would suffer economic collapse by June.

He made a request that was kept "top secret." He asked for the equivalent of $7,500,000,000 over the next 4 years. The 1945 congressional grant of $3,750,000,000 was being consumed at twice the rate anticipated. It was passing through the British economic system without long-term effect.

Bevin's preliminary appeal for a new loan was not made known to either the American or British public. Even the forthcoming crisis itself, forseeable from the inside, was played down until it burst full-blown in July. Meanwhile, this is what was happening:

In a series of January dispatches to London, Secretary Marshall told Bevin that in his opinion Congress would not again appropriate a large, new fund for Britain except possibly as part of a general economic program for European recovery. Congress had objected to the original British loan because it did not represent a rounded European solution.

Throughout February, Bevin replied that the British Government understood this objection, in principle, but—as at the time of the original 1945 grant—England could not wait for such a widespread program.

In London you could see that a feeling of being bogged down permeated the British Foreign Office. Bevin needed action. He got it. He implemented his claim for separate aid by suddenly announcing that Britain was so hard-pressed that she would have to withdraw immediately from Greece.

Bevin ruffled tempers in the State Department, for he announced this in Washington and London at the same time, and publicly. But the American agreement to take Britain's place in Greece (with Turkey later included) and to vote $400,000,000 for this purpose, was the answer.

Revealed March 12 as the Truman doctrine, this was, in fact, a stopgap substitute for new, large, and direct aid for England, which it was clear Congress would not grant.

Prospective British withdrawal from obligations in western Germany, and the assumption of these occupation costs by America, were agreed to at the same time. But this part of the agreement remained "top secret," and announcement was withheld until November.

Nevertheless, British insistence on straight separate aid did not slacken. The pressure was increased throughout the spring, not only on President Truman and Secretary Marshall, but also on most members of the United States Cabinet, and especially on Secretary of the Treasury Snyder. That pressure had reached a climax by June 1.

On June 5 Secretary Marshall made his now famous commencement speech at Harvard. He was speaking primarily to England—a fact fully realized by Bevin but lost on the British and American public alike—when he said, in three sentences, that further large-scale American aid could be expected only as a part of a general coordinated European program. With that, Secretary Marshall dropped the subject. But when Mr. Bevin tagged it the Marshall plan the force of a great American name was lent to the subsequent European proposals.

I was in London when the British Ambassador in Washington confirmed the fears of the British Government that England had lost her priority on American assistance. At that point what has since been called the Marshall plan became really the Bevin plan. It became Secretary Bevin's responsibility to construct an outline for American aid to other countries in such a manner that approximately the same amount of aid would go to Britain as if the separate aid, asked for in January, had been judged agreeable to Congress.

This Mr. Bevin accomplished in the Paris meetings of 16 nations during July, August, and September, which I went to Paris to observe.

Mr. Bevin's January appeal to Secretary Marshall for $5,500,000,000 went into the Paris plan from the outset, and stayed there.

France and Italy objected strenuously to the British proportion. But they played along with England's big long-term proportion in exchange for a "bird-in-hand" understanding that England would support immediate United States stopgap aid for them amounting to $685,000,000.

Mr. Bevin agreed. The British Government went on record with Secretary Marshall as urging $685,000,000 American stopgap aid for France and Italy, $227,000,000 to Italy, $458,000,000 to France. They got $540,000,000 in stopgap aid on December 19.

Now the time has come to act on the long-range presentation—predominantly aid-to-Britain, plus the additional collateral reliefs.

The overshadowing aid-to-Britain feature was kept carefully under wraps, a fact first noted by Washington newspaperman Peter Edson.

Page after page of other statistics are supplied in the official presentation to Congress. But in all the 131 pages, the percentage of American aid allocated to each country and the predominant share scheduled for England are not revealed. It required a separate investigation to obtain for this article the official figures showing where our billions would go country by country.

Here are the facts:

England	$5,348,000,000
France	3,701,000,000
Italy	2,913,000,000
United States-British zone, Germany	2,499,000,000
Holland	2,436,000,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	1,419,000,000
Austria	718,000,000
Denmark	582,000,000
Ireland	497,000,000
Greece	473,000,000
Norway	234,000,000
Portugal	150,000,000
Iceland	38,000,000
Turkey	18,000,000
Total	21,021,000,000

Sweden and Switzerland are in for nothing. Actually they expect a favorable trade balance of about $176,000,000. This means net requests for over $20,000,000,000 from Uncle Sam. The difference between that figure and the announced seventeen billion is to be made up chiefly by the International Bank and Monetary Fund, which is also 80 percent United States taxpayers' money.

England's $5,348,000,000, which is one-third of the seventeen billion in the Marshall plan, is exactly the amount asked for by Bevin in January, 6 months before Marshall attempted to answer England at Harvard University.

That, in brief, is the background of the plan. Now let us consider the arguments advanced for its support.

Is the threat of communism in western Europe a valid argument? If so, Britain's 32 percent share in the funds must be automatically excluded from this claim. No one has even suggested that the British people are on the verge of voting Communist under any circumstances.

This is admittedly and equally true of 9 more among the 15 other countries involved: Ireland, Iceland, Denmark, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland. These represent another $5,000,000,000; a billion dollars to Ireland and Denmark alone.

The Communist problem in two other countries involved, Austria and Greece, is commonly conceded to be military, not economic. This means that anticommunism appeal for us to buy the plan is largely confined to France and Italy, where communism has been consistently losing ground in the grass roots for over 2 years; and western Germany where the last Communist vote was 7 percent; Turkey, 4 percent.

Once revealed on a country-by-country basis the anti-Communist angle in the overall all or nothing $17,000,000,000 presentation takes on a different aspect. And in any case, few military men would care to argue that dollars alone would be effective if the Red Army marched.

What about the argument that America's economic self-interest is involved, that we must export to avoid depression?

We are in a fight against inflation. Yet nothing could be more inflationary than vast exports at public expense, not repaid, striking us squarely in our shortages.

Our exports in 1947 totaled $14,500,000,000, chiefly free. Our balancing imports were $5,500,000,000; an overexport gap of $9,000,000,000. We know, or should know, these exports are abnormal.

Our real trouble today is that the home demand—to say nothing of foreign gifts—is far in excess of our ability to produce.

We need not worry about a falling off in demand for things we can't produce. We should not buy that idea. If there is to be a decrease in our exports—and that appears to be the thing the foreign-relief planners and other prophets of our domestic doom seem to fear—this is the best possible time to absorb the reduction. They should either admit this fact or else not claim they are trying to fight inflation. Both contentions cannot be true. If there is really going to be "boom and bust," all we have to do is ship enough goods abroad for which we won't be paid to assure it. We went on that ride once before—after the last war.

And the argument that we can afford to be this generous on a humanitarian basis? This is the major claim on which the issue must be decided and changes in the commitments made or not made in the plan.

It is the direct cost at home and the results abroad which must be considered.

Our civilization is founded on compassion and charity. The deep and honest desire of the American people is to help people abroad as much as we can within good and generous limits. No other nation in the history of the world has ever regarded the rest of the world in this light. That is another reason why we can be proud we are Americans. But this does not permit continually giving Europe a blank check on our resources or on our lives.

Further, why are we not told clearly a little-known fact about our official charity; namely, that our aid does not actually reach people abroad as a free gift, as millions of Americans suppose?

By and large, the people abroad buy from their governments or middlemen what our Government sends free. They do not receive our gifts as charity. Their governments, and others overseas, pocket the difference. Practically none of the official donations of the United States Government end up as charity to the wretched. That is why so much of our vast aid is unknown to individuals in Europe.

In our own Government, who finally constructed the Marshall plan? Who wrote the President's presentation?

Clark Clifford and Charles Murphy, young White House advisers, did the actual writing. A young task force put the program together, directed by Under Secretary of State Lovett.

"We started to figure this thing out on the back of an envelope, and it got slightly out of hand," explains Charles Kindleberger, 37, a State Department adviser on financial policy.

Earlier reports by the Krug, Harriman, and Nourse committees were purely advisory, and the vital administrative features recommended in the Harriman report were ignored. The names of the actual planners hardly carry national prestige. These are the men in the Washington task force who came up with the final answers: Charles Bonesteel 3d (State), Frank Southard (Treasury), Frederick Northrup (Agriculture), James Boyd (Interior), Philip Kaiser (Labor), Col. Raymond M. Cheseldine (Army Civil Affairs), Thomas Blaisdell (Commerce), Burke Knapp (Federal Reserve), and a special State Department planning group consisting of William Bray, Lincoln Gordon, Ernest Gross, Arthur Kimball, Charles Kindleberger, Paul Nitze, William Phillips, Harold Spiegel, and Walter Surrey. Nearly all are in their thirties. Theirs was the program which was finally taken to Congress with the request for a 4-year commitment and $17,000,000,000—all or nothing.

Will the plan, if adopted, be ably administered? No one can say; but we will have to do better than we have been doing. Look at the way we have handled our No. 1 problem—Germany.

As working people in America, our dole to Germany is costing us about a billion dollars a year.

The Marshall plan countries surrounding Germany—Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, France, Italy—whose economies are interwoven with Germany's productivity, suffer through the German paralysis. So most are among the 16 nations now asking us for aid. With Germany on a dole, they must ask us for a dole, too.

Accordingly, in restoring the productivity of Europe, it is only common sense to begin with Germany—the sector most demoralized and over which we have large control—yet with all safeguards against German rearmament of any kind.

Since we say the Marshall plan is dedicated to European recovery, and Secretary Marshall himself speaks of German peace-production recovery as the crux of the problem, our public may suppose that at last we have changed our original scorched-earth policy in Germany. But fantastic as it may seem, at the same time that one set of hands in one of the 20 separate buildings that house the State Department in Washington was writing the Marshall plan for Congress, another set of hands in another building was writing a new and sweeping directive for further dismantling peace-production machinery in Germany.

In our own western area, over 600 nonwar German industrial plants are now to be dismantled, scrapped, or removed as reparations under this new 1948 dismantling policy. Some 30,000 German workers have been withdrawn from production to carry out this new dismantling program.

The paralysis we are maintaining in Germany hits Italy more seriously than any other country in western Europe. Accordingly, Congress was called upon to vote Italy $227,000,000 stopgap aid in December, and the Marshall plan emphasizes with nearly $3,000,000,000 more, the difficult situation there.

With one hand we choke off German peacetime productivity in the center of Europe and deal out a dole; with the other hand we enlarge the dole to Germany's neighboring countries. It seems one hand doesn't know what the other is doing * * *

Europe's recovery problem is primarily a production problem. Any program we enact, in order to succeed, must be administered here and abroad by hardheaded, realistic, production-minded Americans especially qualified for the gigantic task and operating as a selected agency for this complex effort.

Instead, nine departments are directly involved in a set-up so confused, conflicting, intertwining and unworkable that the official organizational chart itself is utterly bewildering—even to the men who drew it. Said one of them to me, "It looks like Gracie Field's 'biggest aspidistra in the world'."

If we haven't learned anything administratively from the twenty-two billions we've already spent, we had better learn something, and make the necessary administrative changes, before we spend seventeen billion more; an amount equal to practically the entire profits of all American industry here at home last year.

Some form of aid to Europe is doubtless indicated, but is it not reasonable to suggest that any further congressional appropriation be limited to 1 year? We should not be committed for a longer program since we cannot know what our friends abroad may or may not do for their own self-help or what may develop here at home. Further bills can always be passed, when and if needed.

The Marshall plan means $7,000,000,000 of taxes in 1948 from all of us beyond what we would otherwise pay.

Some say that if a billion dollars of the new aid is handled by the International Bank (80 percent United States money), the taxes may be only six billion additional this year. But the plan calls for $6,800,000,000 in the first 15 months. This sum is nearly two-fifths of the total sum paid in personal income taxes by everybody in America this year. It almost equals the incomes taxes paid by all American corporations. It is about 70 percent as large as our entire national defense budget, already voted. Yet it excludes new and forthcoming little Marshall plans for Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and Indonesia, the patterns for which it will establish.

It does not seem to take into account the fact that there is a limit to the number of failures America can absorb.

At some point our leaders failed, or we would not have suffered as we did in the depression. At another point our leaders failed, or we should have been so strong on land and sea and in the air that there could have been no war, and certainly no Pearl Harbor.

Now they fail again if they do not see that the future peace of the world depends on the internal strength of the United States. And they fail yet again if they squander our strength so we are weak when the chips are down.

FORTY-NINE THOUSAND, FOUR HUNDRED TRAINS

The Marshall plan now in debate in Congress, means—free to Europe—13,200 trainloads of coal, 11,800 trainloads of grains, 10,200 trainloads of meat, 4,900 trainloads of

steel in the equivalent of steel ingots, 4,100 trainloads of fats and oils, 3,700 trainloads of sugar, 1,500 trainloads of cotton; 152,000 trucks, 26,000 freight cars, 200 more merchant ships in addition to the 800 we have already given away.

It means $500,000,000 in free American electrical equipment, everything from powerhouses to punch drills; another $500,000,000 in new American oil refineries and pipe lines; $400,000,000 worth of American steel plants; $2,200,000,000 in oil, gasoline, and grease to be shipped free; 1,200,000,000 in iron and steel. Countless thousands of other items are involved. The shipments would begin at once.

So far, only 4 years are included in the plan, and only a part of western Europe. The bill, $17,000,000,000, to be paid by every man and woman who works in America. Other bills that would be set by this pattern: (1) Asia, (2) Latin America, (3) the Middle East, and (4) Indonesia, are yet to be heard from.

Philosophy of a Medical Science Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article entitled "Philosophy of a Medical Science Plan" by Dr. F. L. Feierabend which appeared in the January 3, 1948, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. This article discusses a philosophy and illustrates an understanding on the part of a physician which all our doctors must have if they, together with the Congress and the people of the United States, are to solve the problem of assuring adequate medical care to all of our people.

I am glad to join with Dr. Feierabend in insisting that we must fight with all in our power to protect American medicine from regimentation. I hope that organized medicine in studying the problems will take the broad view which Dr. Feierabend has taken. In so doing it will be realized, I am sure, that only through a national health-insurance plan which guarantees free choice of physician, and which guarantees our doctors their freedom can we solve the problem of medical costs without fear of regimentation.

I urge that the American Medical Association forsake its negative attitude and help in framing national health legislation; I urge that the doctors of America hasten to work with us on such a project, lest in time of economic stress, they and we be confronted with an overwhelming public demand for a system of state medicine under which it would be difficult to escape regimentation and governmental control.

Only two of the great nations of the world are without a national health insurance program—one is Soviet Russia; the other is the United States. Soviet Russia has a system of state medicine. I hope that we in America with the cooperation of our doctors will develop a sound national health insurance system rather than wait for circumstances to force us into the other pattern.

The article is as follows:

PHILOSOPHY OF A MEDICAL SERVICE PLAN

(By F. L. Feierabend, M. D., Kansas City, Mo., secretary, Surgical Care, Inc.)

Even until recently many physicians refused to admit the existence of a social problem in medical care. Today, however, most of them recognize and admit that the distribution of medical care is faulty.

Physicians must recognize the moral implication always associated with any social problem. The responsibility for the solution of this social and moral problem must be accepted by the members of the medical profession, and the acceptance must be made by physicians at the local level. Failure to provide the solution is fraught with grave implications, the nature of which has been suggested by two ugly words—regimentation and socialization. Social and moral problems are not solved negatively. The effective solution must be positive. A plan must be developed whereby adequate medical, surgical, and hospital care is made available to the people at reasonable cost. Practically, the best plan thus far evolved seems to be one that operates on a budgeted prepayment, nonprofit basis. The technical operation is now well established and is actuarially sound.

Many doctors believe that the American Medical Association should provide the solution of this problem. Such an attitude of local physicians is in keeping with the thinking now exhibited by many citizens. This attitude is best described by the slang expression, "let George do it." Regardless of what the problem may be, many persons say, "What is Congress doing about it? Why don't they pass a law?" Such thinking is false, because in the operation of a democracy it is the responsibility of the citizens that all activity possible must begin at the grass-roots level. In recognition of this principle the American Medical Association has not been active in the development of actual operating plans. It has developed Associated Medical Care Plans. This organization will be helpful in promoting, guiding, advising, and consulting but will never act in the capacity of actually developing and operating a plan.

To support this thinking, I quote from "Quadragesimo Anno," the great encyclical on the reconstruction of the social order, written in 1931:

"It is indeed true, as history clearly proves, that owing to the change in social conditions, much that was formerly done by small bodies can nowadays be accomplished only by a large corporation. Nonetheless, just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and to commit to the community at large what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so too it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order for a large and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions that can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies. This is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable, and it retains its full truth today. Of its very nature the true aim of all social activity should be to help individual members of the social body, but never to destroy or absorb them."

This is the principle of subsidiarity which is operative in a democracy.

In the United States the people have enjoyed rights and privileges for so long that these are accepted without thought of their source or the obligations incident to the exercise of them. In the American form of government the true source of rights is clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence: "We believe all men to be created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

This philosophy is in direct contrast with the philosophy of the materialist Karl Marx, whose manifesto is the Bible of communism. Marx teaches that all rights stem from the state. Great care must be exercised if this insidious social disease known as communism does not become epidemic in the United States. Physicians particularly must recognize their responsibilities if democracy is to survive.

In support of the teachings of the founding fathers, which are clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence, and to prove that their primary motive was sound moral philosophy, let me quote from the Declaration of Independence written in 1776 and from the writings of Cardinal Bellarmine, written in 1576:

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776	CARDINAL BELLARMINE, 1576
"All men are created equal; they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.	"All men are equal; not in wisdom or in grace, but in the essence and nature of mankind. Political right is from God, and necessarily inherent in the nature of man.
"To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.	"It is impossible for men to live together without someone to care for the common good. Men must be governed by someone, lest they be willing to perish.
"Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."	"It depends upon the consent of the multitude to constitute over itself a king, consul, or other magistrate. This power is, indeed, from God, but vested in a particular ruler by the council and election of men."

Locke, an Anglo-Saxon, is given credit for being the first to call attention to the idea of consent in government. However, Locke received his idea from Suarez, a Spaniard, writing in 1600, and Bellarmine, an Italian, writing in 1576. Both placed emphasis on the consent of the governed and both gave the same philosophic argument to support the idea. Locke deserves great credit for popularizing this thinking.

Observation of the operation of moral law demonstrates that any violation of moral law invokes a penalty that cannot be avoided. These rights must be exercised with great care, and abuse must be avoided unless one is prepared to pay the price. More specifically these rights include the right to life, bodily integrity, the necessities of existence, the essentials consonant with attaining man's ultimate destiny, the right of association, and the right to possess and use property.

The use and exercise of any of these rights creates obligations and responsibilities. Every right and privilege has its commensurate responsibility. Neglect the responsibility and the right will be lost. As a physician I have rights and privileges. I have the right to expect protection from the state in the exercise of my rights and privileges. This protection, however, may not exceed the protection that is given in the interest of the common good. In the exercise of my rights I must recognize that the implications are dual. In the use of rights or ownership there is a twofold character, individual and social. I must take into account not only my own advantage but also that of the common good. It follows then that the exercise of rights

must be done in the light as they concern me and as they concern the common good. Since I am a social being I must recognize that the rights of common good take precedence over the rights of the individual, when the two are in established conflict.

Exercise of my rights and privileges incurs obligations and duties—duties to my fellowmen. As a physician I have been given special training. This training is highly technical and is possessed by few persons. Am I permitted to use this special gift to promote my own selfish desires? As a social being and a component part of a complex society I must recognize that I have a part in the collective task.

Every physician has the obligation to make his special talent available to all the people. No physician by his own efforts could develop all the information he possesses, even though he were a Solomon and lived a thousand years. He must realize that his knowledge was developed by the collective efforts of the multitude that preceded him and that this knowledge may not be exploited. As a doctor, he serves in the capacity of a steward; he must never forget that some day he will be called on to give an accounting of his stewardship. Generally speaking, when physicians are motivated by selfishness, it is the result of living in a materialistic economy and of the almost complete lack of ethical and philosophic teaching in the schools. More and more doctors are now coming to realize that they are social beings and live in a society that is governed by Christian principles. They are beginning to understand that they cannot neglect their duties and retain their privileges. They are perilously close to reaping the just reward of their social sinfulness and neglect. It is their moral duty to make good medical care available to everybody. Right order dictates that any social duty should be performed by the lower and better qualified group, but it also dictates that the failure of the lower group to recognize and perform its duties makes it mandatory that the higher body provide the answer. By this principle, through their social lethargy and neglect, physicians have invited the social planners to invade their domain and usurp their rights. Are the physicians beginning to understand why the serpent of regimentation has reared its ugly head?

I abhor regimentation and communism, and I will oppose the communistic creed with all my energy. I recognize that the regimentation of the medical profession is only the beginning. It is an insidious promise of something for nothing that has its appeal, but the ultimate cost will be liberty, a price one dares not afford. Benjamin Franklin once said, "He who would sacrifice essential liberty for temporary security deserves neither liberty nor security." It is of much greater importance to prevent totalitarianism than to prevent regimentation of the medical profession. Organized medicine has a tremendous responsibility. If physicians permit the regimentation of the medical profession, they will have provided the lever to break the seal of democracy and permit entrance of totalitarianism. They will have provided the fertile soil on which the seeds of communism will grow.

If this is to be accomplished, they must reject the teachings of the materialist sociologists and return to the teachings of the moral law. They must reject completely the doctrine of the materialist, which teaches that religion and morality is the opium of the people and that man is motivated entirely by instinct. Doctors must avoid this materialistic doctrine or by their acts they will be promoting regimentation. Neglect of social responsibility invites the state to take over with coercion and regimentation.

Statement of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the statement of Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of March 16, 1948, is one of the most important of our time and I commend it to the attention of all Americans. It follows:

The constant advance of the iron curtain across Europe has created a grave crisis in our international relations.

There is no reason for the American people to be other than perfectly calm as we all strive for peace. However, we must do all we can, as individuals, to make America strong and secure in order that we may more effectively promote peace.

As to the details by which we will meet this situation, there may be room for some diversity of views and discussion. But on the determination that we will meet it, and meet it promptly, America is united.

We must build up our military and naval establishments. We must build and maintain a mighty air defense. We must have the strongest navy on the seas. We must make ourselves absolutely supreme in the air and under the seas.

In this issue, where the fate of civilization is at stake, we must spare no effort to be sure of the outcome.

Continuing developments in Europe have made the results of the Italian elections, to be held on April 18, of great concern to all the people of the United States, and, indeed, all people.

A Communist victory would mean communism would rule in the Mediterranean and unquestionably dominate all of Europe. Communism entrenched in Italy would prevent the rehabilitation of that country and destroy the freedom of the people.

As individuals, the people of Italian descent living here have a great opportunity to help save the land of their fathers, and prevent the catastrophe which would result from a Communist victory. They could aid by sending an air-mail letter to their relatives in Italy, pointing out the peril and urging defeat of the Communist party. A 15-cent stamp might turn the tide for peace. It's worth the effort. I trust the people of Italian descent all over America will embrace this opportunity to help stop communism.

How War Might Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop:

HOW WAR MIGHT COME

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The atmosphere in Washington today is no longer a postwar atmosphere. It is, to put it bluntly, a prewar atmosphere. That is not to say that war with the Soviet Union is necessarily either inevitable or imminent. Yet it is now universally admitted that war within the next few months is certainly possible. For it is believed that some sort of show-down is on the way, that for better or for worse the boil will soon be lanced.

The show-down may come anywhere around the vast Soviet perimeter, and at any time. Yet most observers believe that it is most likely to come in Italy, soon after the Italian elections April 18. What happens in Italy next month might lead to some sort of breathing space, at least an armed truce between east and west. Or it might lead to war.

The outcome of the Italian elections, the experts point out, can fall into any one of three categories. It is possible, though unlikely, that the vote for the Communist-controlled People's Front will be less than generally anticipated, perhaps below 35 percent of the total. It is possible, though also unlikely, that the Communist bloc will gain a clear majority. And it is possible, and apparently likely (for this is the result which the Pope, with the Vatican's matchless intelligence service at his disposal, is known to expect) that the pro-Communist vote will be more than 40 percent of the total vote.

If the Communist bloc polls less than 35 percent of the vote, the non-Communists headed by the Christian Democrat Alcide de Gasperi will certainly form a government excluding the Communists and their stooges. The Communists could react to such a government by remaining at least temporarily passive. This is not believed probable. They could resort to direct action, on the pattern of last autumn's strikes and Communist-inspired riots. Most observers in Italy believe that De Gasperi could deal with this challenge, as he dealt with it last autumn. Or, finally, the Communists could refuse to recognize the outcome of the election, and seize the cities in the north where they are strongest. This would be the signal for civil war.

If the Communist bloc wins a clear majority of the vote, the Communist leader, Palmiro Togliatti, using the bought-and-paid-for socialist leader Pietri Nenni as his front man, will take all power. Moscow's politburo will thus become the real master of the Italian people. The mass of Italian non-Communists could accept this outcome. Or they could resist, which would again mean civil war in Italy.

If the Communist bloc wins more than 40 percent of the vote, as both the Vatican and the American Embassy in Rome anticipate, it will be difficult, and perhaps impossible, for De Gasperi to form a government excluding the Communists. The Communists will certainly demand the key ministries of war, justice, and interior. If De Gasperi agrees, that will be the beginning of the end, as recent history has tragically demonstrated. If he refuses, he will be forced into the position of attempting to form a government with the extreme Italian right. The Communists have frequently intimated that in this event their reaction will be to fight—again, a civil war in Italy.

It is some such reasoning as this which has led the experts to conclude that an Italian civil war this spring is, although not certain, by no means improbable, whatever the outcome of the elections. And a civil war in Italy will confront this country with its most crucial decision since the end of World War II.

A clear majority for the Communist bloc in the elections, followed by civil war, would present the United States with an almost impossible moral and political choice. But in the event of a Communist attempt to seize power after polling a minority of the

vote, the American course is already fairly clear.

The experts believe that since the Italian army and the carabinieri are both loyal and efficient, a non-Communist Italian Government could deal with the Communist partisan army, provided material aid were supplied by the United States. It can be assumed that, unless American foreign policy is suddenly totally reversed, such aid will be forthcoming in case of civil war in Italy. However, the experts believe that if Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito recognizes a "free Italian Government" under Togliatti, and sends in Yugoslav troops, either openly or clandestinely, the non-Communists will need more than American supplies. They will need American troops. And all the indications are that, rather than see Italy fall to Moscow, American troops will be sent.

At the very least, this would mean direct American participation in a localized war between east and west. At the most—and it is difficult to see how this final catastrophe could be avoided—it would mean a general war between the Soviet Union and the west. That is why the fact must be bluntly faced that war is now a serious possibility. And the real decision (other than t. decision to appease, which will surely lead to war in the end) does not lie in Washington. It lies in Moscow, whose creatures, however agile and astute, Togliatti and Tito are.

Fear Versus Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I insert an editorial opinion appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times, of Monday, March 15, entitled "Fear Versus Freedom." The editorial bears on a proposal of Secretary of Defense James Forrestal for the establishment of a voluntary system of press censorship. I have been impressed with the clear-thinking appraisal and unbiased interpretation of the writer of the editorial with respect to this proposal and I commend it to the reading of the membership of the House and to the country, as follows:

FEAR VERSUS FREEDOM

When fear dominates men's minds, they lose their sense of perspective. Some Americans are in the grip of fear today. As we watch the moves and counter-moves of diplomatic conflict, some of us tend to think that military security against a possible war is the only thing that matters.

This thought apparently is behind a proposal of Secretary of Defense James Forrestal for the establishment of a voluntary system of press censorship.

Mr. Forrestal recently asked a committee of editors and radio executives to consider his plan. He says there have been leaks of secret military information about technical and scientific projects. He would set up in his department an information advisory unit to which newspapers and other communications media might apply for advice on publication of questionable matter.

No American wants to impair this country's security. No one would deny that there is a certain plausibility about the Forrestal proposal. But these important considerations must be balanced against others which always have been regarded as of paramount importance in these United States.

Freedom of the press exists in our country not for the benefit of the press but for the benefit of the people. Freedom is a part of our heritage, because Americans realize that the very root of democratic self-government is the liberty of its citizens to think and speak and write and read for themselves. The function of a free press is to provide the unrestricted raw material of free political action.

No matter who curtails press freedom, no matter how plausible the pretext, any restraints upon it present a potential danger to democracy which can be justified only when the lack of restraint presents a greater danger. A so-called voluntary censorship can impose restraint just as surely as an overt compulsory censorship.

In wartime we accept censorship because everybody realizes that winning the war comes first. But in peacetime it is much harder to show that impairing freedom will serve democracy better than freedom itself.

Secretary Forrestal's proposal, unfortunately, comes on the heels of events that create a legitimate mistrust that it is part of a growing pattern. American correspondents in Japan recently called attention to another kind of censorship imposed by General MacArthur's headquarters.

Criticism of the American occupation of Japan, according to the correspondents, has been discouraged by rules applying to their accreditation and movements in the Far East. At least one correspondent was denied accreditation because of his antipathy toward American policy. Others have been put on guard by restrictions upon their movements.

According to Hanson W. Baldwin, military commentator for the New York Times, this precedent has now been extended to Europe. Correspondents in Vienna have been informed that the American occupation zone there cannot be utilized as a base for covering other areas not under American military jurisdiction. The effect is to tighten military control over European communications.

Military men always can find reasons for censorship in the name of "security." They consider that to be their job. But a democracy in peacetime cannot afford to leave the final decision to them.

Each small restraint upon freedom may seem justified from the purely military point of view, but many restraints may combine to create an atmosphere of fear which destroys the atmosphere of freedom essential to the institutions of a democracy.

Chairman David E. Lilienthal of the Atomic Energy Commission has pointed out that secrecy and military security are not always the same thing. In a recent address he said:

"Secrecy, applied in a stupid and hysterical and demagogic way, can actually impair and weaken our security. * * * We need ideas if we are to keep our lead (in atomic energy) and increase it. Where will the ideas come from? In what kind of soil do new ideas grow? * * * New ideas require not only inspiration and perspiration, but information."

That is true not only in science, but in politics and all phases of public life. Freedom of information is the soil in which ideas grow.

We hope that the committee which is studying Secretary Forrestal's proposal will not forget that any impairment of freedom can be justified only by the most urgent and unmistakable threat to our security. The fear which dominates some men's minds today cannot be dispelled by creating more fear.

Lithuania's Deserving Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian Aid Association at their recent meeting, held in the Lithuanian Naturalization Club Hall, on Vernon Street, in Worcester, Mass.:

Whereas the 16th day of February 1948 marks the thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic, and her demonstration to the world of her ability of self democratic government and progress; and

Whereas the unlawful by-force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania by Russia and the commitment of atrocities against her people, institutions, and her democratic form of government are continued at the present day; and

Whereas the Soviet Union consistently and unilateraly violated all of the pacts and declarations solemnly undervritten by it, viz: Peace and nonagression pacts with the Baltic States, the Atlantic Charter, Four Freedoms, United Nations Charter, Yalta Declaration, and the Potsdam Agreement: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's unlawful by-force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania and the commitment of atrocities against her people, institutions, and her democratic form of government; be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., petition the Government of the United States of America to repudiate and terminate all secret pacts concluded without the consent or knowledge of the Congress of the United States at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, already unilaterally voided by Russia, and to reassert the principles of the Atlantic Charter by demanding that all Russian military forces, government, and agents be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania and all other European countries now behind the iron curtain and that Lithuania and her people be liberated and that she be restored as a free and independent republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President and Secretary of State of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Congressmen from Massachusetts.

LITHUANIAN AID ASSOCIATION,
MIKAS ZEMAITAITIS, *Chairman.*
JULIUS P. KISKIS, *Secretary.*

Friendship Train for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I wish to include a copy of a very interesting letter that I received from Edward J. Church, executive secretary, Wayne County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 704 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. He suggests a friendship caravan for Poland, as was done for other countries.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should be thinking in terms of peace and of bringing help to all of the nations that were devastated by war. I think that peace can only come by extending our trade and commerce to all nations, not by boycotting trade and commerce, as we are now doing. These nations want to rehabilitate and reconstruct their economy. Some time ago Poland had made an application for a steel-rolling mill, to cost $3,500,000. Secretary Harriman and the Commerce Department disapproved the export license. Czechoslovakia made an application for a $10,000,000 rolling mill. This likewise was disapproved by Secretary of Commerce Harriman. Poland asked for assistance to modernize her coal-mining equipment. This loan likewise has not been approved. How can we say that the door is open to all the nations of the world to work for peace and recovery, when we close the door in their faces?

I blame the military and the monopolists groups for this policy on the part of our Government. I charge that they are deliberately stopping peaceful trade and commerce, and instead are taking us down the road toward militarism and war. I do not want to see our liberties taken away from us and our economic and political life regimented by the military and the monopolists.

Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has recently held extensive hearings on foreign trade and commerce and heard the protests of our business people and exporters against the senseless export regulations that have been imposed upon business.

Our present policy is putting American businessmen in a straitjacket and in order to do business and trade with half of the world, they will be compelled to use British, French, Italian, and German brokers, because they are being denied the right to do business directly with so many nations. This policy will only strengthen the hand of the international cartelists and monopolists, and will funnel all business through their firms. The independent businessman and exporter will have to pay brokerage fees or tribute to the international pirates in order to do business.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is high time that we send friendship caravans to all the nations that were devastated by war. I believe that we should permit the sending of gift packages free of postage from American citizens to the people living in all the countries devastated by war. I believe that we should open the channels of trade and commerce to all the nations devastated by war. Herein lies the road to peace. Our present policy leads to war, depression, and poverty for business people and factory workers alike.

The letter follows:

MARCH 12, 1948.

Secretary of State GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have been requested by some of the organizations in our county to obtain information with reference to the possibility of a friendship caravan to Poland. These groups, whose membership is composed largely of veterans of Polish descent, are willing to start on a local level a friendship caravan similar to the ones conducted for relief to other European countries, however, excluding Poland.

The question in their mind is what guaranty could be given them as to the proper distribution so as the relief supplies would not fall into the hands of the Communists. These posts are to be supported in this endeavor by other Polish groups who today are very much disturbed by the fact that Poland has become the "forgotten country" in the eyes of the Western Hemisphere in regard to rendering any assistance or relief.

We would appreciate an early reply so that if the answer is favorable to this group, they may immediately commence formulating their plans for the caravan.

Thanking you,

Yours very truly,

EDWARD J. CHURCH,
Executive Secretary, Wayne County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Timely Waterway Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal:

TIMELY WATERWAY DEMAND

Among the most important major waterway-improvement projects launched for this section since the war is the Overton lateral canal, paralleling the Red, which will restore navigation for this valley and give the economic structure one of its most stimulating peacetime swings. Although the big undertaking has been given favor at Washington, with several million dollars needed for its building, only $50,000 has been included in the budget, for engineering and planning.

With a view to obtaining an appropriation for commencing construction this year, a group of north Louisiana waterway leaders, especially representatives of the Red River Valley Improvement Association, is at the National Capital this week to join Congressman OVERTON BROOKS in appearing before the House Committee on Civil Works to urge the release of government funds for making a start in building the canal.

Because of the importance of the Overton canal to the Red River Valley, a project that will affect all of the people within its range, no effort should be spared in getting the actual work under way. The group appearing at the hearing in Washington has the support of every citizen who appreciates the importance of water transportation.

The Red River canal, bearing the name of Louisiana's senior Senator as a tribute to him for leadership in the waterways movement, is needed and is assured, but of principal concern right now is the availability of funds with which to begin the construction.

May the plea by the delegation from our valley result in this activity. The demand is timely.

The Passage of a Bill Through the Connecticut General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the members of this Congress I desire to call to their attention the following comprehensive analysis of procedure necessary to effect passage of a bill in the Connecticut Legislature.

The author, Chauncey E. Hutchings, known to all of us from Connecticut as "Hutch," is ideally qualified to present this information, which is based upon many years of intimate knowledge of legislative procedure through his long and honorable service to the State of Connecticut as a representative from the town of Harwinton.

The matter follows:

THE PASSAGE OF A BILL THROUGH THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(By Hon. Chauncey E. Hutchings, representative from the town of Harwinton)

Since the founding of the Connecticut Colony, the invaluable heritage of a free and democratic people, the privilege of the citizen to petition his Government, has been considered an inalienable right. Section 16 of article 1 of the Connecticut Constitution, which grants the sanction of fundamental law to the protection of this principle, provides as follows: "The citizens have a right, in a peaceable manner, to assemble for their common good, and to apply to those invested with the powers of government, for redress of grievances, or other proper purposes, by petition, address, or remonstrance." As the machinery of lawmaking has been developed down through the years, the Connecticut General Assembly has painstakingly honored and respected this right of the individual citizen to make his voice heard and his views considered in its deliberations.

The part played by the individual citizen in the legislative process is not limited to the right of petition. Any citizen, in addition to petitioning the general assembly, may have a bill introduced through a senator or representative. The senator or representative to whom such a request is made may, if he himself supports and endorses the principles of the bill, give it the sanction of his name and support by introducing it as his own bill. If, on the other hand, he does not approve the bill, he will note beside his name the words "by request," which signify that he is introducing the bill at the request of some citizen and that he does not necessarily endorse it himself.

Moreover, the role of the individual citizen extends beyond the initial stages of the legislative process. Any citizen can attend public hearings on legislative bills held by the various committees of the general assembly and there state his opinion and reasons either favoring or opposing specific bills being considered by the said committees.

The general assembly, pursuant to the provisions of our constitution, meets on the Wednesday following the first Monday in January in the odd-numbered years. In the interest of expediency, it adopts a rule establishing a limitation on the time for the introduction of bills and other legislative measures. The rules of the 1947 session set the dead-line as the first Friday in February. Proposed legislation may not be received beyond said date. In order to enable itself to meet any exigencies or emergencies which may arise during the session, however, the general assembly has removed any strait-jacket effect which this rule might have by permitting legislative measures to be raised in its committees at any time during the session.

To assist legislators in the drafting of bills in proper legal form and to insure the consistency of proposed legislation with the provisions of our constitution and its conformity with related statutory sections, the general assembly has established a legislative research department. Many legislators take advantage of this service which has been set up for their convenience and assistance, and often will leave measures which they are to support in this office to be perfected as to statutory language and form or often to be completely drafted. After the bill has been drafted in proper legal form, it is given to the clerk of the house or the clerk of the senate by the sponsoring member, depending on which branch of the assembly the sponsor is a member.

The bill is now officially embarked upon its legislative journey. On the next succeeding legislative day it is read by its title and referred to a suitable committee by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, as the case may be. This is called the first reading of the bill. The bill, at this time, is entered in the legislative journal and is given a number.

An outstanding feature of the Connecticut General Assembly is its use of joint committees, composed of members of both the senate and the house. Members are appointed by the president of the senate and the speaker of the house. The general assembly of 1947 provided for the appointment of 36 such committees. Bills are channeled to these committees by the presiding officer of each legislative branch on the basis of subject matter. Other legislative bodies, including that of the Federal Government, make use of the dual committee system, with separate committees for both house and senate. Such a system brings a duplication of work and of public hearings.

Committee members are chosen for their knowledge or interest in a specialized subject. Farmers are quite naturally qualified for the agriculture committee. A banker would be interested in finance, appropriations, or banks. Teachers, professors, and social workers often provide talent for the education or public welfare and humane institutions committees. Committees generally are composed of 19 members each, representing both majority and minority parties.

The major part of the work of the general assembly is done in committee hearings. This explains why so many bills of a minor or noncontroversial nature are quickly passed by the general assembly without debate. The average member of the legislature cannot familiarize himself with the some two-thousand-three-hundred-and-odd bills that are presented before each session of the legislative body. He therefore generally accepts the judgment of the committee which has considered the bill. The exceptions to this practice arise, of course, in connection with broadly controversial matters which have awakened wide public interest.

When a bill has been received from the clerk of the senate or the house by a committee, the chairman of the committee sets a date for a public hearing. These hearing dates are widely publicized in legislative bulletins and in the press so that interested citizens may make plans to attend.

At the public hearing on the bill, any citizen can support or oppose the proposed measure. Such hearings are often of lively interest, particularly when proponents and opponents for a measure feel strongly about their respective views. Some hearings attract as many as 300 attendants and frequently last for 4 hours.

After the public hearing on a bill has been held the committee then considers it in executive session. Here the "pros" and "cons" of the measure are studied and debated. Finally a vote is taken to render a favorable or an unfavorable report to the general assembly. On the basis of a majority vote the measure is so reported.

A committee, when it has completed action on a bill, will, if it has rendered a favorable report, submit the bill to the Legislative Research Commissioner to make whatever changes may be necessary and to insure its constitutionality, its correctness of phraseology and its consistency with other statutes. The bill is then transmitted, together with the committee's report, to the clerk of the house or senate. If a bill has been unfavorably reported, the committee will submit such bill and report directly to the clerk of the house or senate. For the second time the title of the bill is read before the general assembly with the statement that it has received a favorable or an unfavorable committee report. If it has received the former, it is tabled for the calendar and printing. This means that it will be placed on the daily calendar for action of the general assembly as a whole and that 550 so-called "file" copies of the bill will be printed for use of members of that body. If the bill has received an unfavorable report, it is tabled for the calendar only.

The day after printed copies of the bill, as favorably reported by the committee, are available, the measure is ready for the final action of the general assembly. On that day it is starred for action on the calendar and its title is once again read by the clerk. This is the third reading. A member of the committee which considered the bill makes a report on the bill and moves that the committee's report be accepted and the measure passed. If the measure be routine or noncontroversial, the general assembly will ordinarily approve it without debate. If there is a wide difference of opinion with respect to the bill, however, debate will ensue. This is finally resolved by a vote in which the majority rules. Voting procedure can take four different forms—a voice vote, a standing vote, a roll call vote, or a ballot vote.

Amendments to the bill are in order during the debate and a vote is taken on each amendment. If amendments to any bill are adopted at the time of the third reading, such amendments are approved by the legislative commissioner for constitutionality, correctness of reference, etc., before final action on the amended bill is taken.

After the bill has been passed in one branch of the assembly, it is sent to the other branch where it receives its second reading by the clerk and is placed on the calendar. When it is starred for action it is considered in the same manner as in the branch of the assembly in which it originated. In the event of disagreeing action between the two branches of the general assembly on a bill, a committee on conference is appointed for the purpose of making a compromise.

After passage in either branch following the third reading the bill is held for 1 day for a motion to reconsider. Such motion can only be made by a member in the prevailing vote.

After a bill has been passed by both branches it is delivered to the engrossing clerk who supervises its printing in final form. It is then signed by the engrossing clerk and taken by him, or his assistant, to the president of the senate (lieutenant governor) and to the speaker of the house for their signatures. Engrossed bills must be signed by the presiding officer of each branch in the presence of the engrossing clerk or his assistant. After being properly signed the bill is transmitted to the secretary of the State for presentation to the governor.

The governor may veto a bill while the general assembly is in session by returning it within 5 days to the secretary of the State, together with a statement of his objections. The secretary of the State then takes the bill and the governor's veto message to the house in which the bill originated and formally hands it to the clerk of that body while it is in session. The veto may be overridden, however, by a simple majority vote of both the senate and the house. If, while the general assembly is in session, the governor does not sign a bill 5 days after receiving it, it automatically becomes a law. After adjournment of the general assembly, a bill becomes law unless vetoed by the governor within 15 days after he receives it. If he vetoes the measure, he must file his reasons with the secretary of the State.

Public acts passed by the general assembly and approved by the governor become law on the first day of October following adjournment unless the bill itself specifies a date upon which it shall become effective. Special acts which do not specify an effective date become effective from passage, however, i. e., the date of the governor's approval.

Critics of the legislative process have declared that it is cumbersome and outmoded. They press for more streamlining, quicker action. It is true that the legislative process is a relatively slow one, but it should be stated that it was deliberately designed so by the framers of our constitution. Experience has shown that our system has achieved a balance between individual freedom and governmental efficiency. The legislators are agents delegated by their principals, the voters of this State, to make their laws. The power bestowed upon these agents is a broad one, but the framers of our constitution saw fit to impose safeguards and controls upon it. The individual citizen is given the opportunity to say to his agent, "The course of action which you propose to take will affect me in this way." By implication, he says, "Your agency is not unlimited as to time and duration, so consider these matters well, and weigh them carefully, for I shall not pass upon the benevolence of your intentions in determining whether to extend your agency; I shall consider merely the results which your actions have produced." By establishing a series of checks and balances and by assuring careful consideration of every measure presented before the general assembly, our constitutional forefathers have bequeathed to us a system which insures our individual liberty and at the same time permits the passage of laws to meet our mutual needs and provide for our general welfare. Any change in the safeguards now surrounding the passage of a bill will disturb the delicate balance created by the experience of a democratic people between individual freedom and governmental efficiency. Each, as it now exists, is too important to be sacrificed to the other.

Foster Creek Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER R. JONES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for Army civil functions in reference to Foster Creek Dam on March 16, 1948:

Mr. Chairman and members, I have requested permission to appear before this committee in support of an important project which is a part of the great development of the Columbia Basin.

Foster Creek Dam, as you are aware, is located approximately 50 miles below the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River and was authorized as a project of the United States Army Engineers Corps by the Congress on July 24, 1946. It was a dam that was designed primarily for power production and was scheduled at the time of first authorization to progress concurrently with the other phases of the Columbia Basin development.

Power production is obviously of extreme and primary importance in the development of the total Northwest. It is my opinion that a serious error was made in the House consideration of the supply bill, which is now before your committee. The Bureau of the Budget gave the House committee an impression that no basic construction was to begin on Foster Creek for a year or more. Consequently, the House eliminated all funds for this project, including $583,000, which was in the President's budget to complete the advance planning. Consequently, I, with other Members of the Western States, whose people are directly affected, must rely upon this committee and upon the subsequent action of the Senate to correct a serious error resulting from the inadequate and erroneous recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to burden this committee with the statistics that technically portray this project. I am sure these technical phases can and will be brought to your attention more adequately by others who are better qualified to speak in terms of figures and power potentials than am I. It is my purpose, however, to bring to you those certain portions of the philosophy that lie behind the request that your committee and the Senate reinstate advance planning money for the Foster Creek project. There are phases of this project quite apart from all the figures that give validity to our request which are of primary importance in your consideration.

Out in the State of Washington from a time now lost in antiquity there has existed a vast area comprising 1,500,000 acres of scabland, which by the largest stretch of imagination seemed suitable to the first men who entered this area only for cattle grazing and dry-land farming. Among the early pioneers there were a few, however, who with amazing optimism believed that if water reached this arid waste land a tree could be planted and that it would flourish and grow. Gradually, simple gravity irrigation was introduced in the lower valleys of the Columbia, and where once existed only sage, large orchards appeared which were destined to become some of the greatest fruit producing developments in the entire world. This successful effort provided even larger visions and an ingenious engineer suggested that the ample waters of the Columbia River might be dammed and that the multiple benefits of power and water thus created would reclaim what might otherwise continue to be only a vast and undesirable desert land. The engineer's vision grew in the thoughts of other men until finally the biggest thing ever to be built by man was conceived—the Grand Coulee Dam. The whole Nation's economy was changed. Furthermore, the building of that dam is only one item in the tremendous Columbia Basin project which represents a full-scale attack on that vast plateau of 1,500,000 acres which will provide millions of gallons of water and bring into cultivation an area of new land comparable in size to the State of Connecticut.

Gentlemen, as you are aware, this project has only begun. But already this development has altered not only the face of eastern Washington, but its whole thinking. The natives now speak in terms of a great "inland empire." Tiny hamlets have been transformed from sleepy dry-land farming communities into boisterously thriving western-frontier towns. The citizens look out over that still dry land with hope set high in their faces, for in their eyes they see visions of land stretching for miles, land that is fertile and green and growing. Already small irrigated farms have sprung up on which families, many of them refugees from the dry areas in the north and the central tiers of States, are living in abundance.

Mr. Chairman, in the planning and construction of multiple-purpose projects all beneficial uses of water must be considered including development of natural resources and the protection of the property against floods. The recent great increase in power consumption in the Pacific Northwest has accorded a correspondingly increased importance to hydroelectric power. Fortunately, there is relatively little conflict in water uses of the Columbia River. The general criterion for maximum water utilization for all purposes, whether for power, irrigation, navigation, or flood control is an adequately regulated flow.

Foster Creek was primarily suggested because of the particular protection that could be developed by a dam at this particular site. Electric power is badly needed right now in the Northwest to meet that vast area's great needs.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that if everyone of the concurrently proposed projects were built according to the first economic schedule, the entire schedule would not be finished in time to meet our already well-established power requirements in the area.

Foster Creek Dam will eventually be built at an estimated cost of approximately $172,000,000 and develop 1,024,000 kilowatts. It is needed in addition to McNary, Hungry Horse, and the additional generating capacity that is projected in the final development of the total capacity of Grand Coulee Dam. Power loads in the Northwest are such that all of these dams are required to meet the load and to release the scarce fuel-oil supplies which are being burned to generate power for use in the Northwest as in other parts of the country. Mr. Chairman, 40 percent of the Nation's water-power resources are located in the four States which will be affected by the Columbia Basin development. All of the responsibility for the development of these vast resources falls upon the Federal Government. After development, the responsibility of marketing and distributing the energy on the retail level logically falls to the publicly and privately owned light and power utilities, the Rural Electrification Administration, the municipal power commissions, and the Government.

Some of the gentlemen of this committee had an opportunity during the past year to see through their own eyes this really new country. The Northwest, those of us who call it our home claim proudly, is still unspoiled—and still relatively undeveloped. You can draw your own conclusions, Mr. Chairman and members, as to how such a development as the Columbia Basin project will affect this entire region and the Nation, remembering that the Columbia Basin project itself will contain more land eventually under intensive irrigation than is now cultivated in the entire State of Utah.

Gentlemen, the greatest asset of the Pacific Northwest is the abundance of water, which is directly responsible for its irrigated agriculture, for its rapidly growing forests, and for its potential vast quantities of hydroelectric energy. Although rainfall is plentiful, it is highly seasonal and alone is not a sufficient explanation for the vast water resources, except in the case of the coastal area, where high precipitation is responsible for rapidly growing forests. Of greater importance is topography itself, for the lofty peaks of the Cascade Range and Rocky Mountains intercept the moisture-laden clouds that move in from the ocean and act as a giant refrigerator, holding water in storage in vast snow fields until the spring thaws carry it first to smaller lakes, as well as to man-made reservoirs, and eventually to the valleys below. Gentlemen, we out in Washington want to see that water pass through turbines and take advantage of its falling weight. We have the precipitation, plus high mountain peaks, plus the rapid fall in the Columbia River, which combine to give that region power unlimited. Out in the State of Washington is where this Nation can confidently expect a profitable development if those of us in Congress who possess the power to appropriate are captured by the vision of what can be created.

From the Palisades dam site on the Upper Snake to Bonneville Dam on the lower Columbia, a thousand miles away, there is a drop of 5,550 feet. It would be difficult to exaggerate, Mr. Chairman, the importance to the region of this tremendous weight of falling water. Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam are the first two of a series of multiple-purpose projects, which Congress has authorized and appropriated for to the point of near completion, to be constructed on the river system which will ultimately develop between fifteen and twenty million kilowatts of hydroelectric power, approximately two-fifths of the potential hydroelectric power in the United States. Power from these projects will furnish industry with the lowest rates in the Nation; but soon it will also reclaim many hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile new land.

Finally, we believe these dams will bring water-borne rates and navigation facilities to the very center of that vast inland empire, 500 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Chairman, the job of squeezing every drop of moisture and every ounce of energy out of a river is one of efficient timing, construction, and management. The harnessing of destructive floodwaters which rush past dry land that needs only water to make it prosperous; the prevention of the erosion of precious topsoil; the aid to navigation; the protection of fish life; the supply of water for industrial, mining, and municipal uses; the abatement of pollution—these are all ultimate benefits which can come through proper advance planning and integrated development.

Power on reclamation projects plays a dual role. It makes it possible to pump uphill for irrigation use a large part of the waters of the Columbia. Fifty thousand acres can be irrigated by gravity from the backwaters of this dam. One hundred and ten thousand acres are anticipated to be irrigated by pumping when Foster Creek is completed, and then will require pumping uphill only 200 feet. Energy from the hydroelectric plant provides the necessary power. It makes available low-cost electrical energy with preference to public agencies. At the same time it creates revenues necessary to repay to the Treasury the major part of the cost of the projects, and thereby assists in meeting the pay-out requirements of the reclamation laws. Foster Creek, Mr. Chairman, has no write-off—it pays all the cost through the sale of its power.

The interconnected systems in the Northwest produced more than 17,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy during 1947. Publicly owned plants produced more than eight billions of this, or slightly more than half.

The comprehensive studies of Columbia Basin development, conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation, indicate that full development of the drainage area of this river can increase the power fivefold. When completed

they will remove the yoke of power shortages which today is retarding progress on the whole Pacific coast, and can extend the horizons beyond the immediate future for the Nation as a whole.

The war had a tremendous influence upon the power program in the region. The dams, built in peacetime for peacetime uses, proved a blessing to the Nation in the time of war. By speeding up generator installation schedules, Congress made it possible for Columbia River power to contribute mightily to war production. Columbia River hydropower was the major factor in the region's record production of aluminum—40 percent of all the aluminum pig produced during the war came out of the Northwest—planes and ships, magnesium, calcium carbide, ferroalloys, and other critical war metals and chemicals, not to mention the atomic bomb, which was importantly served by the hydroelectric power from the Grand Coulee and used at Hanford. As a result of this wartime expansion, the Pacific Northwest, at the end of hostilities, found itself with an industrial plant, predicated upon power, that had not been anticipated otherwise for at least 10 years.

Peace brought with it doubts in the minds of many that the region could retain the great industrial development. Events of recent months have proved otherwise and have posed new problems. It is true that cessation of hostilities brought a brief shut-down of most of the major war-born plants and left the Bonneville Power Administration with a surplus of some 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts in 1946. However, rapid reopening of the war plants on a peacetime basis and an almost unbelievable growth in domestic and rural power loads reabsorbed the surplus until today the region, with some 2,700,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, steam and hydro, publicly owned and privately owned, faces an actual power shortage unless new generation and dams go in without interruption. Without exception, both public and private power executives are agreed, Mr. Chairman, on the need for more power. At a meeting in Tacoma, Wash., these executives joined in a statement of policy which has been already submitted to this committee. This statement points out that despite the 750,000 kilowatts of generation now on order for Coulee Dam an additional 1,565,000 kilowatts would be required by November 1, 1956, if power development was to keep abreast with estimated load growth in the region and in advance of the market.

Mr. Chairman, in a presentation of the entire advance program of the power-system development issued by the United States Department of Interior Bonneville Power Administration, it is pointed out that "a public utility must anticipate its future-load situation in order that it will have service available when loads develop. Accordingly, if the Bonneville Power Administration is to carry out its responsibilities, it must plan and program its activities many years in advance. Major multipurpose river projects require 6 to 8 years to construct and several years more for planning and design and to obtain congressional authorization and appropriations. Important features of the planning work include estimating future power requirements, analyzing and scheduling the development of potential power resources, and planning the transmission system to make the power capacity available to load centers." Delay in starting any one phase of the program unbalances the entire development.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard those of us from the West charged in the Congress with trying to get "pork" for our area of the country. Mr. Chairman, we do not want "pork"—we are not asking for gifts from the taxpayers of this Nation. We are simply asking for loans from the Federal Treasury and from the tax dollars of the Nation's men and women, every cent of which will be paid with the exception of those items in the development which should properly be charged off to flood control and navigation, which are not reimbursable under the law. The investment of the people of the United States will be repaid in full. Independent commercial audits of administration books show that the Bonneville Power Administration is already meeting all charges including 2½ percent interest on the investment in power facilities in the Northwest already made and in operation. As of June 30, 1947, there was a healthy surplus almost equal to the surplus anticipated 5 years hence. Pay-out studies show that administration power revenues of an estimated $1,899,000,000 over the repayment period of 50 years will provide about 94 percent of the total funds required to repay the combined reimbursable construction costs and operating costs, including interest, and leave a reasonable margin of approximately $194,000,000 for contingencies.

So, Mr. Chairman and members, we have in the Pacific Northwest a development that is not only an asset in peace and in war to the entire Nation, but also a paying proposition that is undergirding the economy of a vast region. The power from the river is a foundation stone in a growing economy. The expansion of the power resources of the region is demonstrating the importance of an energy base to regional development, for no region can be greater than its power potential or expand more rapidly than its developed-energy base that turns the wheels of its factories, lights its cities and its farms. The greater the development of the power base and the wider the distribution of that power, the greater will be the development of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the Northwest is a region in which there is no oil or natural gas. Other than a nominal amount of coal produced in the State of Washington and the rapidly diminishing supply of byproduct wastewood, the Northwest imports the bulk of its fuels. Power produced from imported fuels is necessarily expensive. Accordingly, water power must be utilized to provide the motive power, light, and heat for the region's homes, farms, stores, and factories.

In its early years the Northwest relied for its energy base upon limited supplies of water power produced on its smaller streams, upon local supplies of medium and low-grade coal, and upon waste fuel from its numerous lumber mills. A generation ago the discovery and production of oil in California led to partial displacement of locally produced coal by imported fuel oils. Some further displacement of locally produced coal also occurred with the importation of high-energy producing coal from the Wyoming and Utah producing areas. Although the remaining deposits of subbituminous coal and lignite are considerable, coal production in the State of Washington has decreased from its peak of about 3,000,000 tons per year to about 1,000,000 tons with a corresponding reduction in the number of operating mines. Consequently the development by the Government within the last decade of the hydro resources of the Columbia River has made available a much-needed supply of low-cost energy. In the Pacific Northwest this new demand can be met only by oil or hydro. Oil is becoming more expensive and only hydro has assured future availability. Development and utilization of regional water power resources in the Northwest will also conserve the entire Nation's fuel resources and constitute a local energy source in the event of national emergency.

In addition, the Nation's electro-process industries are now looking to the Northwest for power to expand their production. Power in abundance at low-cost is not available elsewhere in the United States.

Far-sighted development of the Columbia River can provide the energy base required by essential national industries, and can support a growing population and a balanced and stable regional economy. A strong regional economy will benefit not only the Northwest but will strengthen the national economy and the Alaska and Pacific frontiers. As already indicated, failure to provide the necessary energy base will retard the industrial development of the region and the Nation, with consequent loss of employment opportunities and delay in utilization of the region's natural resources.

Power is primary at Foster Creek, Mr. Chairman, but it is a multiple-purpose project which, aside from its power, is of great importance. Someone has said, Mr. Chairman, that "a well-run irrigation project is agriculture with the weather risk eliminated." No more droughts, no more floods. Water comes to the soil at the time it is needed, especially in the growing season, and in the amount needed. It is almost too good to be true that high water in the Columbia comes precisely during the growing season in June and July. So when farmers need the water the most, the Columbia has it to spare; and when the pumps to the balancing reservoir need power most, a maximum of water is ready to flow down the pentstocks, furnishing cheap secondary power to the giant motors on the pumps.

There may be questions, Mr. Chairman, as to the kind of crops and stock adapted to the project area immediately surrounding Foster Creek. Okanogan County, adjacent to the county in which this dam will be located, is the fourth largest county in the United States. Douglas and Chelan Counties, which will be immediately affected by this construction, together with Okanogan County, today do not produce enough grain and alfalfa to support the 160,000 range cattle which feed during the wetter parts of the year. Consequently, these cattle must be turned to the lower valleys of the Columbia, where irrigation has been extensive enough to provide the essential grains and alfalfa stores to make stock raising profitable. Crops and stock are adapted to this area, if water for irrigation is provided. Types of farming which combine livestock and crop production seem to have greatest promise. On similar dry lands where irrigation is being practiced now in the State of Washington, at least half of the farm land is in alfalfa and other forage crops, about 25 perecent in cereals, and about 25 percent in seeds, fruits, sugar beets, potatoes, and other vegetables. On such projects dairy cattle are the leading stock, although sheep and hogs are also raised. A considerable number of range beef and range sheep are fed on the farms of such projects in the Yakima and Kittitas County valleys.

Mr. Chairman, it lies with this committee, I believe, to determine if and when this project is completed. The attitude of the House, due to the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, I am sorry to admit, was that it did not need to begin until 1951 or later. Consequently, there was no appropriation for the very necessary advance planning and preliminary construction which will give even fair chance of completion by 1954. Delay is expensive, both in loss of potential benefits and detrimental to the power development needed for adequate industrial expansion in the interest of national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I have stressed power and irrigation in terms of peacetime requirements. It is not necessary for me to remind this committee that our Nation is in the mesh of a great world-encompassing struggle for economic and political supremacy. We must think in terms of national defense if we are to successfully assure our national future. Foster Creek is an Army project. In the March issue of the American

magazine, Senator HARRY F. BYRD discusses the United States development of a supersonic tunnel developing wind capacities of 1,000 miles an hour. The Germans before defeat had advanced far in the development of a similar tunnel which developed wind capacities of 7,000 miles an hour. Such a project will take unlimited electric power. Where, Mr. Chairman, in this entire country, can such unlimited power be developed if not in the Columbia Basin? Foster Creek could produce sufficient power to provide the Army with all the electric energy necessary to prosecute its research and construction of such a supersonic facility. The Army needs such power potentials as are possible through immediate construction on Foster Creek if the Army is to assume its full responsibility in the interest of our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, we of the Pacific Northwest are proud of our great natural assets. We want our whole Nation to share in the benefits to be derived from their proper use. One hundred and forty-one years ago Thomas Jefferson stated with prophetic foresight: "I vision a great, free and independent empire on the Columbia River." In more recent years a famous geographer has added the word of science, stating that in no other area on the face of the earth was there to be found the same combination of a large area of fertile land and natural resources, all lying in a region with a stimulating climate. This authority predicted that the Pacific Northwest would become the location of a great new culture in the electric age. That dream has been instrumented by the wisdom of previous Congresses. It is an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, for this Eightieth Congress, acting through the wisdom and foresight of this particular committee, to continue the growth of this vision which will mean so immeasurably much to the Pacific Northwest and the security and defense of the Nation as a whole.

Freedom for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following resolution, requesting freedom for Lithuania, which was unanimously adopted by the parishoners of St. Casimir's Parish in assembly at their parish hall, in Worcester, Mass., on February 15, 1948:

Whereas Russia, by force of arms and in utter violation of all legal and moral laws, continues to occupy the Republic of Lithuania, to deport and imprison Lithuania's nationals, to commit atrocities against the Government and civil population of Lithuania, to systematically destroy Lithuania's democratic form of government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's unlawful by-force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, against Russia's deportation and imprisonment of Lithuania's nationals, against Russia's commitment of atrocities against the Government and civilian population of Lithuania, against Russia's systematic destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government; be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do hereby most fervently petition Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, to use to the utmost, the influence of the Government of the United States of America to the end that all Russian military forces, Government, and all the agents, be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, and that Lithuania and her people be liberated, and Lithuania be restored as a free and independent republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the press.

CONSTANT PAULUKONIS,
Chairman.
JOHN BACINSKAS, Jr.,
Secretary.

Six Months of Taft-Hartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 16, 1948:

SIX MONTHS' TRIAL

Six months after the Taft-Hartley law became effective, the excited predictions that it would prove to be a "slave labor" act remain unfulfilled and obviously wide of the mark. Nowhere in the country is there a slave laborer. Nowhere have the great trade unions which were built in the interest of the worker suffered a diminution of power. Nowhere, except in isolated cases which are clearly the result of special economic conditions, have wages fallen. Collective bargaining still takes place. Unions are still robust. Mr. Green is still the powerful Mr. Green; Mr. Murray still speaks with authority for the CIO; and Mr. Lewis is still Mr. Lewis.

One of the sections of the Taft-Hartley law created a special congressional "watchdog" committee to keep an eye on the way the act worked in practice. This committee has just filed a report on the first 6 months' experience. It finds that strikes, in number, in man-days of idleness, and in total number of workers affected, have steadily declined in each successive month since the law became fully operative last August 22. (It would be claiming too much to attribute this result to the presence of the Taft-Hartley Act on the statute books, but at least the record belies the many predictions that the enactment of the legislation would provoke a tremendous display of industrial unrest.) Furthermore, the committee finds that many threatened jurisdictional strikes are now being settled without necessity of formal action and that the revision in the organization and procedure of the National Labor Relations Board has operated to promote public confidence. On one point in the law, which was vigorously debated at the time of its enactment, the committee "deplores the action of the International Typographical Union in insisting upon a closed shop in violation of the law and recommends to the union that it follow the example of other labor organizations which likewise have had closed shops for many years, and yet availed themselves of the orderly processes of the act to obtain union-shop contracts."

The committee report has nothing to say about that section of the law, prohibiting a union newspaper from commenting on political candidacy, which has just been held unconstitutional by a Federal district court. In our own judgment, there is a clear need here for a prompt revision of the act. But the 6 months' record, on the whole, deserves the committee's appraisal that the law is working "without undue hardships upon employer or employee" and establishing conditions of successful and more even-handed collective bargaining.

Our Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes:

OUR REPRESENTATIVES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It is a continual and intriguing paradox here how the House of Representatives, which is supposedly closest to the people, acts so often less for the general public welfare and more for special interests than the other branch of Congress.

This becomes so clear to those promoting legislation for the general welfare that you frequently hear it said, with a sigh of relief—and of hope: "Thank God for the Senate."

And that comes, too, from such House Members as find themselves so frequently in a helpless minority.

This has been especially true in this Eightieth Congress under Republican management, as manifest by origination in the House of so many measures to break down laws on the books to protect the public interest at the behest of privileged interests, such as utilities, railroads, real-estate interests, and other powerful industrial and financial elements.

Now we have another glaring illustration.

This is in the scheme put over by the House GOP leadership which, if finally sustained, would gut the Federal rent-control law. It would impose full authority on rent increases in the local rent advisory boards, so-called, without protection for the public interest in the veto power hitherto lodged in the Federal Housing Expediter here. Thus it would make a mockery of the law under the guise of extending it.

Unless the Senate insists on its bill in which final authority is maintained in the Housing Expediter here and wins out eventually in the necessary conference on the legislation with the House, then the public will wake up to a wave of rent increases all over the country—and with Congress out of session and nothing to be done about it.

The real-estate lobby put this one over. And it is very much to its interest. In many cases, as can be demonstrated in records here, the local advisory boards are packed for the real-estate interests and landlords, and to the point in some cases where it is almost an open scandal. There the tenant hasn't got a prayer.

Why does the House react this way continually?

Stated in the simplest way, the answer would seem to be found back in the Congressman's home district and in the temptation to pay particular heed to well organized pressure groups of various kinds which, though a minority, are effective because they hold a balance of power. The temptation is especially strong when these are well-entrenched vested interests, strong in the constituency. Because of their contacts, tieups, and resources they can be very effective in elections, especially close elections. They are frequently generous with campaign contributions.

Real-estate interests, like others, are highly organized and well-financed. Their influence politically is shown by their domination of many local rent advisory boards, which are appointed nominally by State governors. When they speak, the politicians jump, and that includes politicians in the higher echelons here in Congress. This is actually minority government contrary to the general public interest.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall over the American Broadcasting Co. entitled "Communism," the twenty-fourth in a series of such broadcasts, on Saturday, February 28, 1948:

You have all heard of Hitler's theory that the big lie is the one which succeeds, if repeated often enough. Well, there is a big lie I want to talk about tonight which has been repeated and repeated and fostered and built up by the Communists, until it has gained very wide acceptance throughout the world. That lie is this: That it was the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky who overthrew the Czar and ended the long and cruel reign of the Romanoffs.

I know that you have heard it. I have run into it constantly. Even well-educated people seem to believe that, at any rate, the Bolsheviks had something to their credit—they had ended the Czarist regime. No matter if they turned out to be dictators and tyrants, themselves, they had brought down the greatest autocracy the modern world had known in the person of Czar Nicholas the Second.

Well, that simply isn't true. It is a demonstrable untruth. There isn't a shred of historical fact in it. What makes this myth all the more remarkable, for its being so widespread, is that millions of people now living are able to remember the events of 1917 and 1918. It isn't like something that happened 40 years ago. But it is so easy to forget something that happened even 31 years ago—the details get so foggy. Particularly when the fogging-up process is helped along by a busy propaganda in the Communist camp that they were the liberators of the Russian people from the chains of the Czarist system.

There is no better time than now—the anniversary week of the events 31 years ago—which overthrew the Czar, to recall the true circumstances.

In the first place, none of the major Bolsheviks, or Communists, were even in Russia, when the thing started. Lenin and Zinoviev were in Switzerland. Lenin had written friends at this time that his generation had no hope of seeing revolution in Russia * * * it would come much later. Trotsky was in New York. Stalin, who at that time was a rather minor figure in the Bolshevik movement—his most important jobs had been robbing banks to replenish the Bolshevik Party coffers—was spending a term in Siberian exile.

If there ever was a revolution which came, almost automatically, through the fault of the criminal incompetence of the rulers, it was this revolution that happened in the last days of February and the first days of March of 1917. Russia was still in the war, then—the First World War—and getting soundly beaten. The Czar, goaded by his almost insanely dictatorial wife—the Czarina—who certainly wore the pants in that royal family—was at the front where he had taken over the supreme military command and made confusion worse confounded. He spoiled almost everything he touched.

There was a general defeatism in the air. Nothing was well organized. The supplies for the front were lacking. Bread was lacking in the cities. The nobles and the courtiers were very uneasy. They saw little or no chance of things getting better, with the Czar so incompetent and so frequently appointing other incompetents in high places. There was much talk about a palace revolution, a revolution by the nobles and the courtiers, to depose the Czar and to install the Grand Duke Michael, a man of some ability and enterprise, as regent. But before they got around to it, strikes began in city factories, with about 130,000 men out. Then bread riots began in St. Petersburg. Ordinarily, now, wherever there are riots you can look beneath the surface and discover Communists. That is true for the most part today. But then, oddly enough, the few leaders of the Bolshevik Party who were still left in St. Petersburg discouraged the idea of strikes as being premature and likely to lead to disaster. They only supported the strikes and riots after they had already broken out. The strikes became more menacing, and the Cossacks were called out. But something very unusual happened. For once, the Cossacks didn't ride through the streets almost joyfully hacking people down. They declared their neutrality and even showed friendliness to the strikers. This was really a turning point. The next turning point, which enraged the populace, was the killing of 140 strikers by cadets. The next day the effect of public opinion was seen when the Preobrazhenski and other regiments of guards revolted and joined what now, very manifestly, was a revolution.

You may well think, now was the time when the Bolsheviks began to come out of the woodwork and take over. Not at all. When the Government went into hiding, when the Czar and his family were arrested and when the Czar signed his abdication papers, the question naturally came up about an interim government. Were the Bolsheviks the leaders here? They were not. One of the oddest things in history happened. A committee from the old Imperial Duma or Parliament was formed. It was composed of Socialists, Liberals, and Conservatives. They dreaded taking over, but there was nothing else for them to do. Down the street a way, the workers' council was meeting. It was called a soviet, because that is the Russian word for council. Later, when the soldiers joined, it became the soldiers' and workers' soviet. They began to have the real veto power over the Duma committee, but they made no move to replace the Duma, even though it had a lot of the elements of the old regime, who would naturally be thought of as royalist and reactionary. The soldiers' and workers' soviet made no move to install a revolutionary government of the workers. They showed no sign that they expected to make this the vanguard of the world Socialist revolution which had been preached by Marx. They welcomed the so-called bourgeoisie into the government.

As I said, the war was still going on with Germany, although a bit feebly. The Germans conceived the idea of injecting all the moral poison they could into the Russian situation, with the idea that they could get an immediate peace. They knew just the man who could go back to Russia and start the cry of "Peace—peace at all costs." They arranged for Lenin, who was in Switzerland, to go through Germany in a sealed car, take ship on the Baltic, and appear in St. Petersburg. The other Bolshevik leaders got amnesty and they hurried to St. Petersburg and Moscow. All this was a month, mind you, after the revolution had succeeded without them.

And what did Lenin say, publicly, when he reached St. Petersburg? He said, "Russia is now the freest country in Europe, where there is no oppression of the masses."

And yet that free government, the first that the Russian people had ever known, was what Lenin and others immediately started out to crush. By this time, the soviet of workers and soldiers had been officially brought into the government. In that coalition government, the man who held the position of minister of war was Alexander Kerensky. He was a very eloquent speaker. His words fired the troops with new enthusiasm and they were able, for a time, to carry on a renewed offensive against the Germans. But the lack of general organization in the country and its supply system halted the offensive and brought on more military defeat.

In this atmosphere of defeat the Bolsheviks were making their first real bid for power. In July, a revolt broke out, which was backed by the Bolsheviks. But they kept under cover themselves. It fizzled out. Lenin had to seek refuge in Finland. Any attempt to renew disturbances, for the time, were checked by the publication of documents which purported to show that Lenin had been the paid agent of the German General Staff, which had him transported across Germany in that sealed train, to do a special job. And the job would not be called a very patriotic job, under any standards of national patriotism. Lenin was later to make good for the Germans and sign the separate peace of Brest-Litovsk.

In August Kerensky become Prime Minister and he convoked an extraordinary national council at Moscow, with representatives of all political parties present, to consider the state of the nation and make plans for a permanent government. The same day that this happened the Bolshevik radicals declared a general strike. To add to the difficulties General Kornilov headed a revolt and began a march on Petrograd. Kerensky beat him on September 14 and on the very next day Kerensky proclaimed the Russian Republic. The next month municipal elections were held throughout Russia and a majority of moderate Socialists were elected. This didn't look like reaction setting in. Lenin and Trotsky were Socialists, too, but they were of the radical fringe that was out to promote the world revolution. They were in no mood to accept the gains of the revolution in Russia—the introduction of a Socialist regime which would be satisfied to have socialism in one country only. No they were out to communize the world and the base of it was going to be this Russia which was still in ferment, still in turmoil, still offering a revolutionary situation, even though it had just gone through one revolution.

On October 20, 1918, a day which almost coincided with the dissolution of the Duma, what they called a "pre-Parliament" met. It decided that general elections all over the country were to be held on November 25.

But before November 25 could roll around Lenin had made his bid for power. He seized the government on November 7. It looked as though he anticipated being beaten at the polls and wanted to forestall it. This same thing has just happened in Czechoslovakia. The apparent reason for the timing of the coup d'état there by which the Communists took over was, they couldn't hope to get elected legally in the elections set for next May.

Kerensky, who had maintained a fairly liberal regime, without benefit of secret police and political murder and exile, had not been able to cope with the extremists who would stop at none of these things themselves. Kerensky tried to rally troops into St. Petersburg—or Petrograd—but Trotsky defeated him and he fled to France.

Once in power, the Bolsheviks apparently didn't much care whether there was a vote or not on November 25. When it was taken, it was discovered that the Russian people had elected a Constituent Assembly with Socialists in the majority. They had 420 seats to only 225 seats for the Bolshevists. That indicated that the seizure of power in Russia by Lenin and Trotsky was against the popular will. The great majority of the people had been for the more moderate socialism which had been represented by the Kerensky coalition government.

You may wonder what happened when the Constituent Assembly, which had been elected after the Bolshevik revolution, tried to meet. It was a pretty cynical performance. The Bolsheviks had armed guards lining the streets leading to the Tauric Palace, where the meeting was to be held. They shot into crowds who supported the Constituent Assembly and who marched with banners and placards toward the palace.

Only the deputies were allowed through the lines. They found the chamber filled with Bolshevik armed guards.

In spite of the attempt to overawe them, the deputies elected Victor Chernov, a moderate Socialist, chairman of the assembly. Chernov, who is still alive and who resides in this country, tells the story in the New Leader, of January 31.

"I delivered my inauguration address," he says, "making vigorous efforts to keep self-control. Every sentence of my speech was met with outcries, some ironical, other spiteful, often buttressed by the brandishing of guns." When the Social Democrat, Tseritelli, arose, they tried to scare him by leveling rifles at him from the gallery and from the floor. Through all this, Lenin lounged in the government box, putting on the air of a man who was bored to death.

The Bolsheviks speakers then took the floor and made provocative speeches so that a brawl might be precipitated and the session closed down under the pretext, but the Socialists would not be provoked. Then the Bolsheviks demanded that their "platform" be passed, without any discussion whatever. When the Socialists refused the Bolshevik deputies walked out in a body and caucussed for several hours, deciding what to do.

The remaining deputies discussed and passed a land bill, the while the soldiers were threatening to clear the hall and while there was booing and shouting from all quarters. The assembly also carried, unanimously, a motion for a republican form of government. In the dawn of a foggy morning, the Constituent Assembly of the Russian Republic recessed until noon.

But this time, not even the deputies could get through. At the door of the Tauric Palace they found soldiers with machine guns and even light artillery. Later that day came the decree of the Bolsheviks that the constituent assembly was dissolved. They had found they could not overawe it, frighten it into doing the Communists' will. So they would not permit the assembly any longer to exist. That ended Russia's first and last democratic parliament. It existed one day.

No—if you ever hear it said that the Communists, at least, did one good thing—they overturned the Czars—don't fall for it. Nail it right there. What they did do was to grind into the mire and into the dust the first democratic liberal government the people of Russia ever had. That's what they overturned, and they have been busy ever since trying to overturn all others like it everywhere in the world.

Power and Water Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article taken from the Oakland Post Enquirer of Saturday, March 6, 1948.

While the article sets forth the conditions which have to do with the shortage of water in California as it affects the interests of sportsmen, it also shows the extent of the shortage and the far-reaching effects it has on the daily lives of all Californians.

The article follows:

DROUGHT IMPERILS CALIFORNIA HUNTING AND FISHING

SACRAMENTO, March 6.—While power agencies and farmers count every drop of water, California's fish and wildlife is confronted with the worst year in decades, the division of fish and game said yesterday.

The commission reported there are plenty of fish in the hatcheries but a shortage of running streams to put them in. They found the greatest deer population in a decade on hand when the drought had robbed them of much of their grazing land.

Steelhead in many cases had not been able to reach spawning grounds because coastal rivers were too shallow or dry. Many of them congregated at the mouths of rivers, like the San Lorenzo, to fall prey to larger fish and sea lions.

Fish rescue work, which normally begins in May or June, is already under way. In San Diego County, rescue work was done as early as January.

To help the salmon run on the San Joaquin, bureau of marine fisheries men are planning a 70-mile detour through irrigation ditches so the fish can migrate.

Another effect of the drought is the resulting increase of pollution. Although the water is less and running slower, relatively the same amount of waste is being poured into streams and rivers.

The division has been told by the Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors that if the drought continues, the county will be closed to all fishing. Other counties may follow this.

Deer in the search of food and water have been forced into farm and residential areas. Yolo, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, Napa, Sanoma and Marin Counties have all reported a sudden overpopulation of deer in the lower regions.

Ducks found no place to land in their usual resting places in the San Joaquin grasslands area. Lack of rain was said to be partly to blame for the death of thousands of ducks at the Woodlands sewer farm ponds.

In an attempt to aid quail, the division, with the help of sportsmen's organizations, is speeding the installation of water-supply units known as "gallinaceous guzzlers." This was being done especially in the south.

The possibility of no deer hunting in September was foreseen. The State board of forestry requested the game commissioners to consider the fact that September was the worst fire month and danger increased as the drought continued.

Law enforcement was expected to grow more difficult as animals concentrated near water sources and tempted illegal taking.

Although a loss in revenue was expected due to the seriousness of the fishing situation, every effort is being made to meet the situation, the division said.

Fish will be planted in lakes although that is not as desirable as stream planting. Rescued fish with nowhere else to go will be placed in five reservoirs which have been designated for that purpose as well as in some private farm ponds.

But in many cases there is not much that can be done. Fish and game is fourth in line for priority to water. Domestic power and agricultural uses all come ahead.

Justice for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial published March 7, 1948, in the newspaper Il Progresso Italo-Americano:

A NEW DEAL FOR ITALY

An historic and fateful election is to be held on April 18 in Italy. The entire world is agreed that the outcome of this election will have enormous consequences for the future of mankind. What is more, since the rape of Czechoslovakia and the reaction of the big democratic powers being limited to a feeble protest after the crime was perpetrated, many have been shaken in their confidence as to the probable results of the Italian elections.

This disturbed feeling is all the more understandable because the Kremlin has three-thousand-five-hundred-odd highly financed agents operating in Italy. These foreign termites are the real rulers of Togliatti's outfit and its appendage under the nominal leadership of that vilest of Quislings, Pietro Nenni. Nor should anyone overlook the fraud, demagogy, and corruption of the Communist wrecking crew in Italy. Under these circumstances, it is easy to understand the seriousness of Premier De Gasperi's recent warning that this may be Italy's last free election.

Precisely because of the acute gravity of this crisis does our country have a chance to render the decisive aid to Italian democracy (and thereby to human liberty and welfare) on this occasion. Several months ago Il Progresso suggested that America sign a treaty of peace, friendship, and commerce with the Italian Republic. We were very

happy to note that our proposal was heeded by the State Department and that subsequently such an Italo-American treaty was agreed upon.

Encouraged by this initial success, we now suggest a program for peace, democracy, and reconstruction directly and specifically affecting the Italian people and their honorable and constructive role in world affairs. Il Progresso urges the American Government to lose no time in espousing and doing everything in its power for executing the following program in behalf of the Italian people as a great nation and in support of the democratic elements and institutions in their Republic.

FOR DEMOCRACY AND PEACE

1. Under the Charter of the United Nations and in line with the provisions of the so-called treaty of peace concluded by the big powers with Italy, the United States should immediately take the initiative and put into motion the machinery for revising this utterly unjust pact. Russia's vicious hostility toward all democratic countries, her sabotage of the United Nations, and the Kremlin's unrelenting drive of aggression westward have created an entirely new world situation—a situation in which there is no longer even the flimsiest excuse for any self-respecting democratic nation to be bound by such a fraudulent pro-Russia pact. Whether Russia agrees or not, let our Government call upon all the signatory powers to join it in the move for such revision. Let the Italian people judge then each nation by its attitude toward this move by America.

2. Let Washington forthwith declare itself in behalf of Italy being assigned the trusteeship—within the framework of the United Nations—over all her pre-Mussolini overseas possessions.

3. It is impermissible to allow the Kremlin horse traders to hold up Italy's immediate admission to the United Nations. If the organic and helpless dependencies of the Russian Empire can hold membership in the United Nations, then surely the sovereign and independent people are entitled to it.

4. Our Government, which has never sought one cent of reparations from Italy and which has already donated close to $2,000,000,000 to Italian relief and reconstruction, should call upon all powers—Russia, Greece, Yugoslavia, France, and England—to renounce every penny of reparation they are now claiming from Italy. Let the Italian people see and learn which nation is against giving up its demand for blood money.

5. The American Government should call upon all signatory powers not to take any ships from the Italian Navy or merchant marine. Nor should our Government permit any country—whether it be ruled by Stalin or Tito—from grabbing any portion of Italy's fleet which rendered such signal services to our cause during the war.

6. Washington should demand that Trieste, as an Italian city, be returned forthwith to Italy. If Tito and Stalin are against it, let Togliatti explain his master's opposition to the Italian people during the elections.

7. Let Washington immediately move to have Tito return to Italy the territory he has plucked from the defenseless Italian Republic. France would also be well advised to act in the same spirit for the sake of world justice and peace.

8. The United States should, through the United Nations and the International Red Cross, call Russia before the tribunal of international justice, and compel her to give an account of what happened to—and hasten the release of—the 80,000 Italian prisoners of war still held by the Soviets. This inhuman and illegal behavior of the Kremlin commissars is an outrage against elementary decency. Our Government should brand it as such and use all its prestige to force the Russians to discontinue this bestial mistreatment of Italians.

9. The above proposals are supplementary to the Marshall plan, of which Italy is to be a principal beneficiary. The entire program outlined above should be given the widest publicity in Italy and throughout the world. Ditto for the replies, the refusal to reply, the acceptance or rejection of them by other nations.

On the broad canvas of world history the Italian people have a great and constructive role to play. Whether they will be given the chance to render such superb services to mankind depends in large measure on two factors: America's readiness to proceed with vigor and dispatch toward finally giving her a just peace and on the results of the April elections. We are confident that if our Government proceeds in line with our suggested program, the Italian people will be vastly encouraged and will speak and vote overwhelmingly for democracy and peace.

Why Prayers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop:

WHY PRAYERS?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The Supreme Court just a few days ago affected every home in America by its 8 to 1 decision on the constitutional clause that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or the free exercise thereof."

The constitutional language was interpreted by the Court to mean that a tax-supported school cannot permit any form of religious instruction on its premises.

The theory on which the Court built that verdict is that church and state must be kept completely separated, under the terms of our Constitution, and tax money, therefore, cannot be used in any way to further the religious purposes.

Well, the United States Military Academy at West Point is a tax-supported institution. Every cadet at the United States Military Academy is required to attend church services every Sunday at a chapel built by tax money, run on tax money, and in attendance, a tax-paid chaplain.

The same is true at the United States Naval Academy.

On every United States ship at sea and on every United States military and naval post and station ashore, tax money goes to build, maintain, and operate a religious institution. Chapels, chaplains, Bibles, altars, hymn books, etc., all are provided with tax money. And if they were not, the people of this Nation would demand that they be.

Yet the Supreme Court said by 8 to 1 that the tax money of the people shall not be used in religious affairs, because a woman out in Champaign, Ill., objected to children in a public school there being given religious instruction on school grounds during school hours.

She professed to be an atheist, and that her son in the school is an atheist, and argued that under the principle of a separate church and a separate state, no tax money could be used in even the remotest way to further religion on premises owned by the state.

She won, too; the Supreme Court, on Monday, March 8, agreed with her by 8 to 1.

Do not make the mistake of thinking the Court's decision is a narrow one bearing merely on the teaching of religion to children in schools.

The problem is that of religion practiced in any degree through the use of tax money, on tax-supported property. So let's go on exploring.

The Constitution says that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Since Congress is forbidden to give religion any authority in law, and since Congress is forbidden to deny religion any authority in law, there just can't be any law one way or the other in the matter of religion.

Congress, under the Constitution, makes its own rules of procedure. The House makes its rules. The Senate makes its rules. And, under the Constitution, those rules have the force of law.

It is well settled, however, that no law of any sort can be enacted that contradicts a clause in the Constitution.

For 159 years it has been the rule in the House that each day's session shall be opened with a prayer. A rule of the House has the effect of law, in fact, is law. A prayer is a religious establishment.

Therefore, plainly, the House of Representatives, in holding a prayer service at the opening of a day's session, is operating under a law respecting an establishment of religion.

The Constitution forbids that, said the Supreme Court last week. The House, therefore, has been operating illegally for the past week and hereafter will be operating illegally until it changes its rules or the Supreme Court changes its views of the Constitution.

Exactly the same logic applies to the Senate.

Our Presidents all take office under law requiring them to swear a solemn oath that they will protect and defend the Constitution. The oath itself reads thus:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

But yet every President from Washington down to Harry Truman has always taken that oath with his hand on the Bible, a religious book. An oath under such conditions is unquestionably "an establishment of religion," and more than that, every President so far as this writer can learn has also added the undeniably religious phrase, "So help me, God," as an unofficial element of his promise.

Can such an oath now be classed as anything except illegal?

Members of the Supreme Court take an oath of office in exactly the same fashion. So does every kind of public official, right on down to witnesses in court trials.

They all swear on the Bible and take their oaths in the sight of God.

And all these things are done in tax-supported institutions, just as much tax-supported as public schools. How can any such procedure now be called legal in view of the court's ruling?

It is now illegal for a child to sing Hark, the Herald Angels Sing, in a tax-supported school at Christmas time. The Supreme Court says so. It is illegal to say, "Our Father, which art in heaven," in a tax-supported school, on tax-supported school grounds.

It is argued by some that it is also illegal to lead a child out of classroom and out on the street beyond the school, to pray during school hours.

How, then, can Congress dare open its proceedings with a prayer and claim to be legal in its day's work thereafter?

The United States of America had better get busy reexamining the Supreme Court and its own sense of responsibility. This is a major issue of our times, the State versus the rest of man. Where do you stand on it?

The Butter Lobby Wins Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 16, 1948:

THE BUTTER LOBBY WINS AGAIN

The House Agriculture Committee has voted, 16 to 10, to shelve all legislation to relieve margarine of Federal taxes. This probably ends any hope of action at this session of Congress. Fifteen Republicans, with one eye on the farmer and the other on the November election, voted with singular show of harmony to keep the margarine taxes, while only one Democrat so voted. At least nine Democrats voted for margarine. The action was taken behind carefully closed doors, and reports varied on whether one Republican had the effrontery to oppose the butter lobby.

Eighteen bills were offered at this session for repeal or easing of margarine taxes. In 1947 there were five such bills. They also were buried in House and Senate Agriculture Committees, to the consuming public's disadvantage and inconvenience. Margarine taxes go back to 1886. In 1897, acting on charges by margarine makers that Congress was using its tax powers to destroy the industry, the Supreme Court upheld the law as being, for appearance at least, "an act for levying taxes," with its primary purpose "assumed to be the raising of revenue." The Treasury at hearings before the House committee a few days ago said, however, that it did not want the taxes, that they were unimportant from a revenue standpoint ($7,000,000 a year), that they interfered with best use of national resources, distorted the competitive position of two domestic industries, and unnecessarily burdened consumers far in excess of the amount paid in taxes. It was the Treasury's view that the taxes should be repealed.

The lengths to which some but not all, or even many—dairymen are willing to go to fight margarine is illustrated by threats received by the Red Cross that dairy farmers would be encouraged to stop supporting Red Cross drives for contributions unless it withdrew a pamphlet that mentioned fortified margarine as being a "fair" food exchange for butter.

The House Agriculture Committee has not acted in the best interests of the American people. The House can rectify its mistake by voting to discharge the measure from committee, but this is probably too much to hope for in 1948.

Farewell Talk by the Public Printer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a farewell talk by Public Printer Giegengack to the employees of the Government Printing Office, delivered on March 12, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have asked you to meet with me for a few minutes at this time, for two reasons. The first is that I could not leave the Government Printing Office without thanking every one of you for your loyalty, your cooperation, and your help in transforming the old, antiquated establishment which I found in 1934 into the modern, well-equipped service organization we have today; second, to review with you some of the things that we have done, and to leave with you a few suggestions that might be helpful to you in solving the problems that you are to meet in the future in your efforts to render Congress and the departments and agencies a service that they can get from no other source. Therein lies your sole hope of job security.

In talking to the executives Tuesday, I emphasized this thought by saying that first and foremost we must always remember that it is our duty to see that Congress and the departments and agencies receive the services they need at the lowest possible cost. That is the firm foundation on which we must build. I added that if we are to remain on this sound foundation we must not relax our efforts to keep our plant and equipment modern and adequate. We must see that no unnecessary operations are performed and that the force is held to the minimum necessary to accomplish the work, that established standards of production are met, and that costs are kept within bounds.

I have devoted 13 years and 8 months of my life to the Government Printing Office—in working with you—and I do want to feel that you are my friends. And as a friend, I want to warn you of the dangers I see from the position I hold that are possibly not apparent to others. Unless all of us keep in mind the basic principle I have just mentioned, there can be no efficient service to the Government and no job security for you.

I know I have given you many pointers on these things before, but I couldn't help feeling then, and do now, that you took them with a grain of salt and with a feeling that I had some personal ax to grind. Now you must realize, every one of you, that what you do or do not do after Monday cannot affect me personally in any manner. As my friends, I therefore hope you will throw your grains of salt away and that for your own sake and for your job security, and last but not least, for your Government, you will keep in mind the things I have said and will say before I say au revoir.

All of us know that we can't do our best unless our working conditions are good, unless we can feel that we are reasonably well compensated for what we do, and unless the relationship existing between us and our supervisors are pleasant. Let us see what we have accomplished together on these three points.

WORKING CONDITIONS

First, let us fix in our minds a picture of some of the old, dilapidated, crowded, poorly arranged buildings, many of which had been condemned as fire hazards, that we were forced to use in those days. I think it was 11 separate and badly connected buildings we had on the site where our present new main building stands. Can you recall the inefficiency that resulted from the long hauls you had to make in order to get a job together in those days? Now let us compare that picture with the picture we have today of our fine new buildings and the efficient arrangement of our work that they permit. True, we are still a little crowded in spots, but we have an additional building program that we hope will relieve those conditions. Notwithstanding a little overcrowding here and there, those of us who have seen other printing plants know that we have working conditions that are unexcelled in the industry—unexcelled not only from the standpoint of efficiency but also from the standpoints of sanitation, health, comfort, and safety. I brought out in our meeting with the executives that as a result of our intensive training program in safety techniques—I think we called it our safety-training program for supervisors—our accident rate has been greatly reduced and many of our employees here are healthier, happier, in a better financial condition and—yes—maybe even alive, as a result of our training in safety. Let all of us keep this important thing in mind, not only for our own personal protection but also for the protection of our families.

WAGE RATES

I mentioned compensation as the second of the three points we must keep in mind if we are to do a good job. A review of our wage rates shows that as a result of the increases we have been able to grant during the 13 years and 8 months I have been with you, every employee in the Office, with the exception of a few in the executive group, is as well or better paid for each hour he actually works than a worker performing similar duties and having similar responsibilities anywhere else in the United States, either in industry or in the other Federal departments and agencies. Please keep in mind that in 1934 the wage rate for a laborer was 66 cents an hour and for a hand compositor $1.26 an hour. These rates have been increased from 66 cents to $1.07 and from $1.26 to $2.12. Regardless of what may have been the rumor in the past to the contrary, this is a goal toward which I have worked, and one that I was particularly glad to reach.

EMPLOYEE AND SUPERVISOR RELATIONSHIP

The third point I have mentioned is the friendly relationship necessary between the employee and his supervisor. We have tried to pick and to train supervisors who are efficient and fair, and I believe we have. I have asked them to treat the employees for whom they are responsible as they, the supervisors, would like to be treated. Of course, in an organization as large as ours, there will unquestionably be occasional friction, occasional misunderstanding and hard feeling, but on the whole, we must have gotten along all right, because our team has done a grand job.

OPERATING COSTS

We have good working conditions, our compensation is good, and our supervisors aren't too bad. What are some of the other things we must keep in mind if we are to make certain that the Government gets its printing at the lowest possible cost—the foundation on which our job security rests? Well, as you

may say, I have mentioned several of them to you before. Remember a meeting we had here in Harding Hall about a year ago? I then told you how our abuse of sick leave was adding to costs and warned that if we weren't more conservative in its use, that it might be curtailed or taken away from us. Have you seen in the papers in the last few days the results of the studies that have been made on this subject with the prediction that that is what is going to happen?

I think we mentioned at the same time that our records did not indicate that we were getting the production that we ought to have from the highly skilled employees we have and the good equipment that has been provided for their use; we referred to our order permitting smoking and suggested that there were reports of apparent abuse. Below-standard production and time lost in the abuse of sick leave or other privileges are, of course, additions to our costs that make our foundation less secure.

In talking to the supervisors along this line, I tried to emphasize that every unnecessary operation must be eliminated. Again may I quote what I said to you on this point a year ago:

"In addition to devoting our full time to our duties and to production, we must give intelligent thought to what we are doing. We should always be on the lookout for easier, simpler, more efficient ways of doing our jobs. We should question every operation we perform to determine whether or not it is essential. If we think it is not essential, we should immediately recommend to our superiors that the operation be eliminated or, if not completely eliminated, that it be modified or changed to accomplish the same results in less time, with less effort, and less expense."

Now that we have the authority to pay for suggestions that save money, won't you redouble your efforts to help the Office find less expensive ways to get our job done?

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS

In talking about job security, I am keenly conscious of the fact that in the last few weeks I have been compelled to approve slight reductions in force in three of our major divisions. It is the most unpleasant duty that I have had to perform, but I would be violating the law if I did not; and I would, in addition, be jeopardizing the positions of many more by increasing our costs by the salaries of employees we did not need. I have made as certain as it is humanly possible that these reductions were as fair as they could be under the law. Notwithstanding these facts there have been rumors that I have been unfair, that the lay-offs were unnecessary and for some sinister and personal reason.

I believe a check will show that the Government Printing Office has dropped under reduction-in-force procedure fewer employees than any other of the major old-line agencies. The reductions that we have made have been due solely to the drop in the incoming volume of work. We all know that salaries have increased. We all know that salary increases necessarily increase the cost of printing. All of us who read the newspapers know that there have been drastic cuts in the appropriations made to the departments who order work from us. It naturally follows that with the departments having less money to spend for printing and binding and our charges for what we do for them being higher, they are able to order less printing and binding. This means less work in the Government Printing Office and, necessarily, fewer employees.

COMMERCIAL PROCUREMENT

But it has been said by some seeking personal gain or by those making an effort, either intentionally or unintentionally, to cause a lack of confidence in the Government Printing Office, in order to further their own ends, that the reduced volume of printing ordered from the Government Printing Office is not the cause of the reduction in force; that there is plenty of printing being ordered and that there would be jobs for everyone on the roll if we did not procure any work from commercial printers. I assure you that such is not the case.

There are two major classes of work that we buy regularly from commercial printers, regardless of the volume of work in the plant.

The first is a type of work we are not equipped to do economically. It is work which can, in the better interests of the Government, be bought from specialty houses. In this class fall fan-fold forms, snap-outs, color work, tabulating cards, and so forth.

The second class is a type of work which we cannot produce in the plant without disrupting already established schedules if we are to comply with the time allowed by the ordering agency for its production.

It has been our policy to do everything we can to build up confidence in the Government Printing Office. The surest way we can destroy that confidence is to fail to keep the promises that we have made to the ordering agencies as to time of job completion. The departments need certain printing jobs to carry out their important functions. If we fail to keep our promises, they will unquestionably seek legislation to give them authority to procure their own printing from commercial sources, and we will not be in a position to oppose such moves successfully.

It was for this reason that the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing directed us to release for commercial procurement any job that could not be produced in the plant in the time allowed by the ordering agency for its production.

MINIMUM LAY-OFFS

I am sure that from this you will clearly see that the two reasons for the reduction in force are increased costs and reduced appropriations. I was glad, and I think many of us should be thankful, that larger reductions have not been necessary. If we keep our costs down and do nothing to cause lack of confidence in our ability to render service, I trust that no further reductions will be necessary. As a matter of fact, it is entirely possible that many of those who have been placed on a year's furlough will be returned to the rolls in the not too distant future. Only yesterday I authorized the recall of two separation letters; and due to resignations, separations, and retirements, which we believe will rapidly increase as soon as the new retirement act becomes effective, it is entirely possible that the great majority of those who have been furloughed will be returned to duty. I sincerely hope so.

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

As I told you when I began this little talk, I had asked you to meet with me for a few minutes for two reasons. The first was to thank you for the help you have given me in the past and the second was to give you a few tips that might help you in the future. I wonder if all of us or even if many of us realize the importance and the magnitude of the job that we have done together. I tried to present it in the little book entitled "Public Printing in Peace and War" that we got out recently. It covers well the part we played in the war effort. I am sure that all of you who have had or will have the opportunity to read it will feel a keen sense of justifiable pride in our wonderful accomplishments during the most difficult years of our national history. That we are not alone in thinking that we have done a good job or that we did a good job together during the last 13 years and 8 months is indicated by the fact that the President awarded us a Certificate of Merit. I am going to read it to you:

"The President of the United States of America awards this Certificate of Merit to Augustus Edward Giegengack for outstanding fidelity and meritorious conduct in aid of the war effort against the common enemies of the United States and its Allies in World War II."

In accepting this Certificate of Merit, I said:

"Although this certificate carries my name as the recipient of the award, I feel that I merely hold it in custody for the 7,000 employees of the Government Printing Office, and I am proud to accept it in their behalf. Their efforts made the award possible. It was they who made up the task force which accomplished the objective. Their share in the honor is greater than mine and my chief satisfaction today is that I have received this recognition as their representative."

I want to thank you sincerely for your support, for your loyalty, and for your untiring efforts in making our team the success that it has been and is. I want to thank you with all the sincerity at my command, and I say it with the conviction that you know it comes from the very depths of my heart.

There are many, many important things we should keep in mind if our team is to improve or even hold our present position. I have mentioned only a few of them—some of the thoughts that I have considered to be the most important. There are other suggestions made in the volume I just mentioned, and in our annual report for 1947. If we will devote our efforts to the tasks that lie ahead as closely, as loyally, and as untiringly as we have in the past I have no fears for the future of the Government Printing Office, and feel that I can leave it in your hands, confident of the fact that it will do even a better job in the future than it has in the past.

LETTER TO PRESIDENT, AND REPLY

With this conviction, I addressed, under date of March 9, the following letter to the President of the United States:

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with sincere regret that I have reached the decision to ask you to accept my resignation as Public Printer of the United States, effective March 15, 1948. I take this action because my duty to my family demands that I increase my income substantially above the salary fixed by Congress for the position under a law passed 20 years ago.

"It has been a privilege to serve our Government during the last 13½ years under Mr. Roosevelt and yourself, and I shall always recall with pleasure many happy associations and experiences. These were climaxed by your award to me of the Certificate of Merit for outstanding fidelity and meritorious conduct in aid of the war effort. This recognition and the many compliments the Government Printing Office has received from congressional leaders, heads of Federal agencies, and leaders in the printing industry cause me to feel that the financial sacrifices that have been involved and the occasional discouraging handicaps encountered in trying to do an efficient job have not been without their compensations.

"The Government Printing Office is a great organization and is doing a real job for the taxpayer. I leave it with reluctance and with sincere thanks to you for the opportunity you have given me to be of service and for your cooperation and support. You have my best wishes for a continuance of your personal happiness and success. If at any time I may be of service to you in any way, please call upon me.

"Most respectfully yours,

"A. E. GIEGENGACK."

His reply is as follows:

"DEAR GUS: In view of the reasons outlined in your letter of March 9, I reluctantly accept,

as tendered, your resignation as Public Printer, effective March 15, 1948.

"You have held the position longer than any other Public Printer. I know that in the future you will be able to view with a great deal of personal satisfaction your career in the public service.

"From my own experience in the Senate as a member of the Committee on Printing and as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, I am well aware of the confidence the committees had in you as a loyal and efficient public servant who had the respect and support of the committees and of the entire printing industry.

"It is with deep regret that I see you leave the Government service. You take with you my very best wishes for the future.

"Very sincerely yours,

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

This, therefore, is my last official meeting with you. We have worked hard together to do a job. I think we have done a job that we can all be proud of.

Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, Before Rhode Island Branch of the American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the semiannual convention of the Rhode Island State branch of the American Federation of Labor last Sunday afternoon, March 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Devine, other officers of and delegates to the semiannual convention of the Rhode Island State branch of the American Federation of Labor, I want to thank you for your kind invitation to attend and address your convention. It is always a pleasure to be in a group of Rhode Island people. It is especially pleasant when the group represents the people of Rhode Island in a special manner like this. I know, from experience, through long years past, that the zealous and hard-working men who make up your convention are sincere in their word and work to advance and improve the economic and social welfare of the people of this State. You are in a sense the heirs of a great number of men who have in the past given long lives of service to this organization and to labor generally. I recall how a one-time secretary of the Woonsocket Federated Union served the labor movement and served it well. He has long since passed away but the effect of his work has not ceased. His ideas and ideals of service to his fellowmen have been passed along, in part to you in the labor movement of today. But in greater part, to his son who today serves his fellow Rhode Islanders as my able colleague in the United States Senate, J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

Your deliberations may well include a mark of remembrance and respect for James McGrath, Martin Cass, Thomas McMahon and the many other fine men whose labors helped to build this movement and this organization for you and for those who will come after you.

I have been reminded that the Rhode Island State branch is nearly half a century old. This is its forty-eighth semiannual convention. I have attended many of those conventions and it has been, and is, indeed, gratifying to me to watch the steady growth of the American Federation of Labor in Rhode Island, and its active interest in not only labor but also community progress.

The officers and members of this convention, I know, are interested in the activities of our Federal Congress. I am sorry to report that they have been far from constructive. I regret to report that the past and the present session have displayed a tremendous surge of reaction, in the endeavor to overcome and wipe out the great social advances made under the leadership of that great American and great President, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. Greedy men concentrate their attention upon the removal of legal limits on profits so that they may soar heavenward, while the working people of America wrestle with the higher cost of living, and those of Europe are prostrate and starving. The Red plague of communism creeps westward over Europe to extinguish the torch of liberty and imperil the very existence of our democracy. Yet the main purpose of these greedy men seems to be to antagonize and break down labor. It may be a backhanded compliment, a sincere recognition of the true importance of the labor movement, that organized labor is the No. 1 enemy against which reaction trains its heaviest guns. Disrupt and disorganize labor, and a great force for progress in this country is destroyed. To accomplish this disruption and disorganization of labor the representatives of reaction have caused the enactment of the so-called Taft-Hartley law.

I voted against this law and I voted to support the President's veto of it. I regret that the Congress overrode the veto and that this law is now on our statute books. I am glad to report that both of your Rhode Island Senators, Senator MCGRATH and myself, joined with Senator PEPPER and some other Senators in sponsoring a bill which would repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. But, frankly, I cannot report encouragingly as to any action being taken on this bill by the present Senate Committee on Labor and Education to which it was referred. The chairman of this committee is Senator TAFT, one of the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley bill itself.

Your Rhode Island Senators also joined with Senator PEPPER in sponsoring a bill raising the minimum-wage standards. I regret that this measure has been referred to the same Senate Committee on Labor and Education and I am advised that the committee does not plan to take any action on it.

This Congress has been lax in considering legislation that would improve conditions for the average American. On the contrary, it has not hestitated to act on legislation such as I have mentioned which would handicap and affect adversely thousands of our working Americans. The Congress has not acted on the strengthening amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. It has not acted on the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill. It has presented report after report on many bills, but no action has been taken at all on the bills themselves.

In this Presidential year labor should and will, I know, take an active part in the coming campaign. But first every labor man and every member of his family eligible to vote should register in our State before June 30 so that they can participate at the polls next November. I cannot too strongly stress the importance of registering before June 30 so that you may vote next November for candidates who have the best interests of all Americans at heart.

Assassination of Mahatma Gandhi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Andrew V. Corry, a citizen of Montana temporarily residing in New Delhi, India, which gives a vivid description of the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi and the wave of grief, horror, and rage which followed the perpetration of the tragedy which has shaken the entire world.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DELHI, INDIA, *February 16, 1948.*

DEAR SENATOR: Mother writes of the enjoyment her voyage is giving her. I have heard from her in Honolulu, Yokohama (and Tokyo), Shanghai, and Hong Kong. I expect to be meeting her at Bombay some time between February 18 and 23. It will be a delight to welcome her.

The picture of the assassination of Gandhi has assumed clearer form in the local press during the last few days. The assassination leaves the people of Delhi—and of India generally—aghast with grief, horror, and rage. I conceive there may be some widespread realization that Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali is right in saying that all, by persisting in their attitude of fratricidal communal hatred, have participated spiritually in the perpetration of what they all recognize as a tragedy for their country.

The old man was walking up to the veranda in the garden of Birla House in Albuquerque Road, New Delhi, where, as you know, he had been living the last several months, to conduct on January 30 his customary evening prayer meeting. A neatly but oddly attired stranger, taking advantage of the old man's faltering progress, suddenly produced a tiny French pistol and shot him four times. Gandhi's granddaughters, who were supporting his frail stooped frame, continued to prop him for a moment, till his enfeebled body sagged under the shock and the loss of blood; the awe-stricken crowd surged forward; he was helped to his bed; and in about half an hour he was dead.

The assassin, Narayan Vinayak Godse by name, a Mahratta by race, was pinioned by the bystanders (among whom the fiscal officer of our embassy happened to be standing, next to the murderer) and he was handed over to the police. Now, the Indian Government, working on the theory that a conspiracy to murder Pandit Nehru and other leaders of the moderate faction of Hindu opinion as well is somehow implicated in the outrage, are investigating the antecedents and affiliations of the killer. He has been a rabid Hindu communalist (one of the fanatic supporters of Hindu special privilege and the sectarian state, and implacably opposed to permitting the enjoyment of full

political and civil rights by members of the minorities, particularly the Moslems, against whose equally communal-minded Moslem League they are in embittered reaction) for over 9 years, the press claims, and is, or was till just now, secretary of the Poona section of the Hindu Mahasabha. That organization and another known as RSSS (Rashtriya Swayam Svak Sangh—the Society of the Selflessly Devoted to the Nation) have not only become more and more violently outspoken in their denunciations of the moderate policy pursued by the present government in the handling of the minority question and the Pakistan problem, but as well have actually been training their followers in the use of arms and inciting them to civil disorders. It is suspected that they have been conspiring against Nehru and the moderates.

It seems incredible to me that Gandhi and Nehru have been so negligently safeguarded. Perhaps this has been due to their personal indifference to safety; or their too confident trust in the loyalty of every part of the populace, which had far too ready access to them; or an idealist's pride in entrusting their safety to the sympathy of the people; or a touch of the vanity that glories in contact with the crowd; or a fatalistic acquiescence in karma which wondrously sustains and remorselessly destroys regardless of the deserts of a man; or an egotistic reliance that the happy stars would always twinkle benignly; or a contemptuous rejection of police surveillance because by it they were reminded of their former subjection to the arm of the British Raj; or because the protection of the police recalled too sickeningly the fact that the despised former rulers had also had on occasion to resort to it. It is anyhow apparent that they did not recognize that the interest of the state and of the people as a whole, whose government they were striving to create and maintain, required them to submit to inconvenient surveillance.

What will come as a result of this piece of pitiful folly? Gandhi's fast of last month shamed the people of Delhi into making a fresh effort to heal the gaping breach between the Hindus and Moslems, if not between the Dominions of India and Pakistan. His death—if the revulsion of popular feeling it has evoked against fanatic communalism sinks deeply into the conscience of this spiritually receptive, reverential, and impressionable people—may yet be the vehicle of common weal. It might utterly discredit communalistic extremes; the initial reaction seems to be that, and the Socialists under Jai Prakash Narain are making use of it already, demanding the dismissal of a Mahasabhaite Minister of Government, Dr. Mookerjee. If it breaks the fatal attractiveness of communalism as a political force, it brings into nearer prospect than before intercommunity and possibly even international harmony in this disastrously partitioned subcontinent. In such case his death would bring about the final victory which I believe he strove for: attainment of self-government, achieved through nonviolence, the mode of self-control.

The theme of his life and death is one that I fancy would have commended itself to treatment by the Greek tragedians. It fascinates me to conjecture how each might have approached it. I can imagine that the Aeschylus of the Prometheus might have taken as the theme of the tragedy the tragic flaw in Gandhi's character which consisted in a too-lofty aspiration in moral judgment. Sophocles—if I may presume to deduce from his Antigone—might have found the tragic conflict in the two adversaries: the tolerant Gandhi, a believer in universal benevolence, and the narrowly "good" fanatic Godse, aware of the danger to his own dear truths which the broader vision of his opponent forces up. Euripides, I make bold to imagine, might have worked the theme which Shaw is quoted as giving when he heard of the death: "It shows how dangerous it is to be too good."

I know that many consider him a saint, and I am sure that his old ashram near Ahmedabad, and perhaps other localities where he spent much time, will burgeon as shrines and he will become the deified figure in a cult, one of the many in the capacious fold of Hinduism. But I do not consider him a mystic, or indeed as a saint in any precise or high sense of the word; his object was in actuality not the pursuit of goodness for itself, or as the mortal's duty to the Creator, or as the means by which the soul matures and the higher nature of man is prepared for its eternal destiny; it was political. He was a good man, though often, I think, catastrophically wrong in his identification of "good" in a political sense, for he surely must bear with Jinnah a part of the responsibility for the partition of India, and his errors of political judgment in 1939–42 weakened, factionalized, and narrowed the political outlook of the congress group which he dominated, depriving of its members of essential experience with political responsibility and paving the way for the rise of influence of socialism and communism in India among the working people, besides creating the most favorable occasions for Jinnah to claim and secure British support for Moslem communalism which finally eventuated in the establishment of Pakistan.

Please give our good wishes to your family, and believe me, with affectionate and loyal interest,

Yours sincerely,

ANDREW.

Social Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Malvina Lindsay which appeared in the Washington Post of March 4, 1948, entitled "Social Milestone," with reference to the status of unwed mothers.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the United States is the most backward country, apparently, of all the countries in the world, according to the Department of Labor, concerning the care received by unwed mothers and illegitimate children. Every foreign country, almost without exception, allows leave of absence all the way from 4 weeks before childbirth to 4 weeks after childbirth, except in the United States. It is done in England, Russia, and all the Scandinavian countries. They did it in Germany and in South American countries. I cannot too forcefully and emphatically bring the subject to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL MILESTONE—UNWED MOTHERS' STATUS

(By Malvina Lindsay)

Several events indicate society is marking another milestone in its slowly enlightening attitude toward unwed mothers and illegitimate children.

One is the inclusion of unmarried women in the maternity leave benefits that Senator WILLIAM LANGER's bill would grant to Federal workers. Another is the movement in this country toward antishame legislation that would remove references to illegitimacy from birth certificates. Still another is the new concern of today's social workers with the problems of unmarried fathers.

It is easy to imagine the amazement of Hester Prynne, of the Scarlet Letter, to these happenings. In fact, "unfortunate" girls of even a few decades ago might find incredible the support physicians and social welfare authorities gave at the hearing on the Langer bill to the inclusion of unmarried mothers in maternity benefits.

This provision of course has stirred up some dispute. Some legislators and executives fear it would encourage illegitimate child-bearing by Government employees who come from environments of lax moral standards. Also, the traditional feeling that society should be stern with the moral transgressor—especially if a woman, and especially if she gets caught—still has a strong grip.

However, as social workers point out, the child is the chief concern of society, and the unmarried mother has far greater financial difficulty than the married one in giving a baby the right start in life. The unmarried mother must also as a rule support her child unaided.

A precedent for not limiting maternity benefits was set by the International Labor Organization in 1919 when it adopted as its third convention the advocacy of maternity leave with pay for all women workers in industry and commerce.

The increase in illegitimacy in recent years, both in this country and Europe, makes the social problem of the child born out of wedlock more compelling. Around 100,000 illegitimate babies are being born annually in the United States. War's upsets have had much to do with this. Britain reports 1 birth in 10 illegitimate. On the European Continent the rate is generally higher. In countries that lost heavily in manpower, as Germany, the number of women left with children to rear is so great that the line of distinction between married and unmarried widows often becomes faint.

The International Council of Women has called for world agreements to safeguard the interests of the vast number of illegitimate children throughout the world. In this country there is growing realization that society in its zeal to punish the mother has denied the child a fair chance in life.

Chief progress in viewpoint has taken place in two fields, legislation and social work. Nine States now issue birth certificates that do not stigmatize a child as illegitimate. The National Association of Women Lawyers is trying to get such legislation extended. The United States Children's Bureau is urging communities to give more aid to unmarried mothers and has suggested a program of action.

Both the Bureau and social workers generally are urging a more understanding approach to the unmarried father. From ignoring his guilt, as in early days, the tendency developed to regard him as proper subject for shotgun discipline. Now, however, instead of being made to feel like a criminal his voluntary cooperation is sought in solving the problem the best way for all concerned. Some authorities on the problem of illegitimacy are advocating special training of men social workers to serve as counselors for unmarried fathers.

But human attitudes toward breakers of moral convention have lagged behind legislative and sociological progress. In many

communities the nameless child and the unwed mother are still pariahs. While such deep-seated feeling is not likely to change quickly, yet the path of modern Hester Prynnes and their Pearls—even those of Arthur Dimmesdales—will be made easier by the economic opportunity and psychological understanding now coming their way.

Josephus Daniels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered at the funeral of the late Josephus Daniels by Bishop W. W. Peele, and editorials on the life of Mr. Daniels.

The address by Bishop Peele and the editorials express in some degree the high mark achieved by the Honorable Josephus Daniels during his rich and full life as an editor, cabinet member, diplomat, churchman, author, historian, and defender of human rights. They also reflect the position of high regard and genuine affection he held in the hearts of people everywhere.

He is described as one of the greatest individual influences for good in North Carolina, a great Southerner, a forthright American, a courageous elder statesman, and a distinguished editor with strong and unshakable convictions.

North Carolina, the South, and the Nation have lost a great and noble citizen, whose long active career adds richly to the history of North Carolina and the Nation.

There being no objection, the address and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HONORABLE JOSEPHUS DANIELS

(By Bishop W. W. Peele)

While I was sitting in the lobby of the hotel in Rocky Mount on Thursday afternoon reading the afternoon paper which carried the account of the death of Mr. Daniels, there came by a man of middle life who had every mark of a hard working man. He paused, glanced at the paper in my hand, and asked, "Is Mr. Daniels dead?" I replied, "Yes, he is gone." "He was one good man," spoke the man as he walked slowly away, every step showing signs of loss and sadness.

A few minutes later I sat in the station waiting to take the train to Richmond. My newspaper was on the seat by my side. There passed a Negro who was working in and around the station. "Boss, may I take a look at your paper?" he asked. "Certainly," I replied. After a moment he laid it down gently on the seat by me and said, "He was sho a good man." And as he walked slowly away, I heard him say, "I just wanted to get one more look at Mr. Joe." I wanted to call him back and ask more about his deep interest in Mr. Daniels, but I felt that he needed to be alone in quietness and think of what had taken place not only to him but to all North Carolinians irrespective of race, color, political, or church affiliations. "He was a good man," so say we all.

Josephus Daniels was born in Washington, N. C., on May 18, 1862, and died at his home, "Wakestone," in Raleigh, N. C., at 1:20 p. m. on Thursday, January 15, 1948. He was past the 85-year mark. That seems a rather long span for one life, but when we consider what achievements are compressed into those 85 years the wonder is how so much was done in so short a time. In all my life I think I have never seen another man who could do so many things so well. Most people touch their generation at only one point. They serve in one field of service. Mr. Daniels had many angles to his life and touched his generation at many places and was master in each area of service. His achievements were so numerous and his attainments so great and manifold that space and time will not permit a complete statement. In all these achievements the personal qualities of the man were the determining factors. The thoroughness with which he did each task, the genial spirit, the wholesome optimism, the winsome attitude—all radiated from his conduct. It is safe to say that North Carolina has never produced another man who served in so many important capacities and along so many constructive lines. He was a most distinguished editor and publisher; exerted so great an influence as a popular lecturer and author. He was an effective moral reformer; a dynamic political leader; a trusted statesman; a successful Ambassador; a world citizen; a devoted and loyal churchman; the first citizen of his beloved Carolina and the Southland; an honored father and husband. Did ever so many opportunities for distinguished service come to any other man? Was any other man among us so well prepared and so willing to use these opportunities as was Mr. Daniels? He was indeed a most unusual man whose gifts and graces were recognized and utilized near and far. His life was a life of excellences—and whatsoever is excellent is eternal. He was calmest when under greatest pressure. He could bring to bear upon his task the power of an "undivided mind," and he could "toil terribly."

There is no need to enlarge upon the superlative contributions of this gifted man, particularly in Edenton Street Church where he was long a devoted member, or in North Carolina where he was known and loved by the multiplied thousands. I should like, however, to make brief reference to at least three marks of this distinguished friend of ours.

The first observation is this: Mr. Daniels loved people. He never allowed any honor, great or small, to separate him from the masses of the people. His first thought seemed always to be for the rank and file, the average man, the teeming masses. As Secretary of the Navy, his principal concern was not for the officers but for the enlisted men.

He was personally always at home with all classes of people. Whether with the President of the United States—any President—or the Cabinet, or ambassadors, Senators or Congressmen, or whether in the rural sections of North Carolina with "Old Codger," he was equally himself—poised, charming, always stimulating and refreshing.

When he built his home some years ago next to the Methodist orphanage he said that he chose this location to be in the high society of the children there, all of whom were so dear to him.

Not only did he love people, but, needless to add, people loved him. Former President Franklin D. Roosevelt always referred to him as "Chief," and it is reported that members of the staff of the paper he edited affectionately knew him as "The Old Man." If, as Emerson insists, the two major elements of friendship are sincerity and tenderness, Mr. Daniels met this test. He knew how to be a friend, and with great sincerity and tenderness he demonstrated this again and again. Rugged though his character was, he could be as gentle as a child.

Early in his life it was realized that when Josephus Daniels took a stand on a question, he intended to defend his position against all comers, regardless of what his position might mean to friend or foe. Nor did the unpopularity of any proposed action deter him for one moment from the course his head and heart dictated. Would that we had today more men, particularly in public life, with such convictions and with the moral courage to stand by their convictions.

Last but not the least of the marks I shall mention is that Mr. Daniels was in the truest sense a great churchman. His faith was firmly founded in the outcome of good and right. He truly believed that right would triumph. Never narrow in his views, he loved his church and was loyal to it to his dying day. He could properly have been called the "lay delegate at large of North Carolina Methodism." He was honored by his church in many ways. He was elected as a delegate to several general conferences and was looking wistfully forward to the next general conference in Boston to which he had been elected.

Probably his valedictory as a churchman—certainly so far as his public appearances were concerned—was given at the recent session of the North Carolina conference at Elizabeth City. He had been asked by the presiding bishop to address the class of young ministers being received into the conference. He said that the invitation humbled him, but that he considered it the greatest honor that had ever come to him in his life. He was, perhaps, the only layman in the conference ever to have been invited to speak on a similar occasion.

The timely and helpful counsel that he gave on that occasion will be long remembered by all who heard him speak. The address, which was widely carried in State papers, was in a sense an autobiography of his own life. He told the young ministers: "Don't be afraid * * * I bid you cast out all fears as you go forth as pastors of people needing a courage that will inspire faith in today and all the tomorrows."

Pursuing his theme, he admonished them: "Don't be afraid to ring out clear and true for unpopular causes even if it cuts across the views and interests of some members of your church.

"Don't be afraid to tell your board of stewards and your congregation that you have come to call sinners to repentance, to comfort the bereaved, to give cheer to the poor, to minister to the sick, to touch the lives of those needing the help of the Gospel. * * *"

These memorable words of his will long live in human hearts because they were spoken by one who himself incarnated their truth in his own life.

I am sure that Mr. Daniels would not have me conclude these brief remarks without paying fitting tribute to her who went by his side, ministering and encouraging him at all times as only a faithful and devoted wife can do. She has preceded him to heaven, but there she awaited his coming until now they are together again. Mrs. Daniels was all that a good wife ought to be and what he achieved is due in large measure to the qualities of her own life.

How shall I conclude? As a friend and former pastor of Mr. Daniels, I might go on and on in speaking of his many virtues. But though my heart prompts me to keep speaking, my mind tells me I must stop.

Let me but add that Josephus Daniels is not dead. "He came to a stream which had no bridge and leaped across." He still lives; he lives as a rich memory in the lives of all who knew him; he lives in the land that Christ has gone to prepare for the faithful; he lives—and he must continue to live—in your heart and mine, stimulating us to follow his example of heroic courage and unswerving faith in God, that the better world for which we all pray and to which we wistfully look forward may be hastened in its coming.

"Green be the turf above thee,
Friend of my better days!
None knew thee but to love thee;
Nor named thee but to praise."

[From the Atlanta Constitution]

THE GREATEST SOUTHERNER

One of the great lights of human rights, of high integrity, and tremendous courage went out yesterday in Raleigh, N. C., when Josephus Daniels died.

It could be said of him, before his last breath, that he was the greatest living southerner. He had earned that title by accomplishments which raised him high above the doers of average deeds.

He was one of the sweetest persons who ever lived; gentle and kind, a Christian gentleman in the fullest sense of the word, abhoring profanity and drink. Hence it was that those who chose to fight him always were surprised to find themselves up against a bare-knuckle battler who never wearied in the fray. His last great appearance was at Warm Springs, Ga., where he spoke at the dedication of the Little White House and grounds as a State park. He spoke for a living democracy, unafraid and never apologetic. His was the one inspiring voice raised on that great day.

He was a newspaper man most of his life, and he was almost 86 when the final call came for him. He had known Grover Cleveland, having worked in Washington as a clerk during the Cleveland administrations. Since that time every Democratic President had called on the fighting North Carolinian for service. Woodrow Wilson made him Secretary of the Navy, and the Navy Department safely escorted more than 2,000,000 soldiers overseas and spent $4,000,000,000 without criticism under his guidance. His assistant during that period was a young man named Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Daniels loved him as a son. To Roosevelt, Daniels was always "Chief."

President Roosevelt appointed him Ambassador to Mexico, and he brought about a great improvement in relations between the two countries and surprised the Mexicans by siding with them in the oil disputes with the American companies.

He returned from the Mexican post to become again the active and crusading editor of the always aggressive paper, the News and Observer. In his eighties he began writing, using a stubby pencil, his memoirs, and three voluminous and valuable contributions to American history appeared before his death. A fourth is believed ready.

He was the conscience of North Carolina, and it was Daniels as much as any man who gave North Carolina's schools, roads, and political system a standard above that of the other Southern States. A fearless champion of people's rights, he never doubted the destiny of the Democratic Party to be the people's party, and he supported it always, as better able to serve the people than anything the Republican Party could produce.

Son of a Confederate soldier, he lived a life rich in deed, in charity, accomplishment, and service, and in death a whole region sorrows and wonders who will take his place in the forefront of those who never weary and who are never afraid to stand forth for the right.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch]

A GREAT SOUTHERNER PASSES

A notable southerner, a forthright American, has passed in the death of Josephus Daniels. He was distinguished in several ways—in achievement, in intellectual vigor, in loyalty to his ideals, and in complete integrity.

Mr. Daniels was called the greatest living southerner in his latter years. He had served as Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson during the First World War and as Ambassador to Mexico under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Furthermore, as editor and publisher of the Raleigh News and Observer, he stood for the sort of independent and courageous journalism that is admired throughout the profession and the Nation.

As a man of strong and unshakable convictions, Mr. Daniels believed in certain policies and principles with which many of his readers may have disagreed. He was, for example, a prohibitionist and he regarded the North Carolina ABC system as a blot on the fair name of Tarheelia. Invariably he referred on the editorial page of the News and Observer to the letters "ABC" as standing for "alcohol brutalizes consumers." There was no more chance of Josephus Daniels' changing his mind on this subject than there was of his coming around to the notion that maybe somewhere, somehow, the Republican Party might manage to present one or two worth-while ideas, or just as he opposed the sale of alcohol at all times and under all circumstances, he was dead against all arguments on behalf of a two-party system in the South. The Democratic Party, in which he had been reared, was good enough for him, and he was not interested in efforts to weaken its control anywhere, any time.

Similarly, Mr. Daniels was ruggedly uninhibited in the presence of the powerful financial interests of North Carolina. He attacked them with gloves off in his editorials whenever the spirit moved him, and he was moved with considerable frequency.

But while he made enemies of a sort with his slashing criticisms, even his victims admired the utter fearlessness with which he invariably expressed himself. When, as Secretary of the Navy, he issued his famous ban against officers' serving liquor on board naval vessels, the country rang with ridicule and sarcasm. The Navy was to be reared on grape juice." "The Navy was being run by an old maid who would have its personnel play ring-around-the-rosey," etc., etc. But time has shown that Secretary Daniels was right, and his order is in force to this day. It was a single example of many which might be cited to show that when he made up his mind, his mind was made up, and no sneers, jibes, or criticisms could make him change it.

Those with whom Mr. Daniels disagreed not only were impressed with his sincerity, but those who knew him personally and who understood the warmth and generosity of his nature invariably loved him. They loved him for his utterly disarming simplicity, his unselfishness, his devotion to his family and his friends. Despite his rugged character, he could be as gentle as a child.

His approachability and his homespun manner were strongly appealing. The people of Mexico knew instinctively that he was their friend, although he couldn't speak Spanish. He was one of our most successful Mexican Ambassadors.

Desipte his 85 years, he was more active than most men half his age. He edited the News and Observer, writing the editorials in longhand, for he never mastered the keyboard of a typewriter. He was in demand for public appearances all over North Carolina, to say nothing of the rest of the country. He was spending what was laughingly called his spare time writing a multivolume series of memoirs, five volumes of which have appeared.

On his last visit to Richmond late in December, he appeared physically and mentally vigorous. He was here for the wedding of an attractive young relative, and he had expected that at least two of his sons would also be here. But none of the sons were able to come, and the father said, with that famous twinkle in his eye, "It looks as if I am the only member of the family who is young enough to make this trip."

Therein, as a matter of fact, lay the secret of much of Josephus Daniels' greatness. His was an ever-youthful, an ever-questioning spirit. He never discarded an idea because it was new. In his life and character were exemplified the intellectual adventuring the democratic pioneering, and the spiritual integrity that have gone into the making of a greater North Carolina, a greater South, and a greater Nation. His was a career to be remembered and cherished by those who come after.

[From the High Point (N. C.) Enterprise]

THE STATE HAS LOST HER GREATEST CITIZEN

Josephus Daniels was the greatest individual influence for the good of North Carolina that the State has ever known.

That statement is not made lightly. We make it only after the most careful consideration. As great as is our personal grief that Mr. Daniels is dead, this editorial is not dictated by emotion or written through tears; it is based on what we have seen with our eyes and heard with our ears during the last quarter of a century, and upon the history of Mr. Daniels' activities before our time.

Over the Nation and over the world he may have been best known as a statesman, a diplomat, and a partisan politician of the highest order. But it was as a newspaperman, a fighting editor, and a youthful liberal until death took him at 85 that North Carolina knew him best. And it is his North Carolina newspaper career that leaves no alternative when one seeks to evaluate individual contributions to the welfare of the State. His led all the rest.

Others may have done more for North Carolina in various fields, among them religion, education, health, racial and industrial relations. Others may have done more in the promotion of clean government and in fighting the cause of the little man, though none now come to mind. But the total of contributions toward a better North Carolina made by no other individual in the history of the State equals his.

Why does North Carolina have what in all probability is the cleanest government of any State in the Union, and one which ranks high in efficiency? Is it because we are better than other people, or more careful in our selection of public servants? Of course not. There may be several contributing factors to that condition, but the greatest of them all has been Josephus Daniels and the Raleigh News and Observer. In his zeal and the zeal of his paper he has upon occasion done injustice to individuals. But more than anything else that zeal has been responsible for the better government of our State.

In his all-out fight for the rights of the little fellow, it is true that on occasion he hit below the belt. As he himself once said, when in a fight he used whatever weapon was at hand. And sometimes he was cruel. But let it never be forgotten for whom, and for what cause, he constantly fought.

Many a time we have disagreed with Josephus Daniels and stated that disagreement as vigorously as we knew how. On occasion he has come around to our way of thinking when facts and developments bore

out the contentions of those of us on the other side. Much more frequently have we been forced to come around to his side. But however confident we may have been at the time that we were right and he was wrong, there has never been a moment that we did not know he was governed by the best of motives and the most sincere convictions.

And now the "Old Man"—North Carolina's finest citizen and most courageous editor and publisher—is dead. To his four sons—especially the three now connected with the paper—falls the task of running that semi-public institution which the News and Observer has become. In the years ahead they probably will make some changes. Gradual changes in typography, for instance, for that is one of the few fields in which Mr. Daniels was not progressively modern. But as a citizen of North Carolina and a small part of the State's journalism—as one of the thousands who feel a partial ownership in Mr. Daniels' newspaper—this we beg of them:

Hold tightly and forever to the traditions the Old Man left us all.

[From the Kinston Daily Free Press]

JOSEPHUS DANIELS

The distinguished editor of the Raleigh News and Observer—the man who refused to grow old in spite of his 85 years—Josephus Daniels has laid down his pen for the last time and answered the call—"Well done, good and faithful servant."

It is hard to realize that this good man will be heard no more and that we will read no more from his facile pen advocacies of morality and upright living.

Josephus Daniels was a statesman, a leader of men. He exemplified the milk of human kindness toward his fellowmen. As Secretary of the Navy he achieved much. He abolished the liquor canteen on board ship. He recognized the rights of the enlisted men and gave them an opportunity to improve their status. As Ambassador to Mexico he was known as the good neighbor. But in his own estimate he was a journalist first. He honored the profession, not that he agreed with his fellowmen or that they agreed with him always, but all who knew him respected him because he had the courage of his convictions. They knew what he stood for, and his editorial advocacies were genuine expressions of his deep convictions.

Josephus Daniels began his newspaper career as an 18-year-old boy, editing a weekly paper in Wilson, N. C. At 19 he and his brother edited a weekly in Kinston which was the forerunner of the Free Press. He went to Raleigh in the early nineties of the last century. In 1894 he bought the News and Observer. It was then a struggling paper of 2,000 circulation. Its circulation today approaches 100,000.

In his personal life he practiced what he preached. He did not use tobacco nor alcoholic beverages. He was a consistent advocate of temperance. In politics his loyalty to the Democratic Party was never questioned.

North Carolina has lost a great Christian citizen. State and national journalism have lost an honorable exponent. Indeed it is hard to think that no more will we have the privilege of seeing the congenial smile and grasping the firm handshake of this good man and fellow scribe. There is sadness in the newspaper offices of North Carolina and in the hearts of the editors and publishers. They share with the sons and loved ones of this distinguished and beloved man a sorrow that is genuine and sincere.

[From the New York Times]

JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Americans whose adult memories go back to the First World War will find it hard to believe that Josephus Daniels was in his eighty-sixth year when death came to him yesterday. Their picture of him was formed when he was President Wilson's Secretary of the Navy, and this picture stuck—a shrewd, kindly man with smiling wrinkles about the eyes, wearing a wrinkled suit, a flowing bow tie and a slouch hat; a man out of an older and more rural America who was entirely at home in this new America. His critics poked fun at him and some denounced him because he took beer and wine out of the fighting ships, because he changed "port" and "starboard" to "left" and "right," and because he was concerned about the common sailor. But when war came, in 1917, the Daniels Navy was found to be in grand fighting trim. He was similarly assailed in 1933, when President Roosevelt sent him as Ambassador to Mexico, but he made warm friends down there and was a principal architect of the existing firm structure of good over-the-border relations

He called himself a sort of "managing editor of the Navy," and was at heart a newspaperman all his working life. He first smelled ink when he was 12, and by getting up early, working late and publishing the truth as he saw it, he made the Raleigh News and Observer not only a power but a property. Like his friend, the late William Jennings Bryan, he was a prohibitionist. His deep religious faith gave him serenity.

His life spanned part of a civil war and two great world conflicts. It linked the present with the best qualities of the past. He was a distinguished statesman and a notable editor, but above all he was a homespun, lovable, profoundly sincere American of a type we greatly need today and can't always seem to find.

Senator Taft's Reply to a Washington Daily News Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter appearing on the editorial page of today's Washington Daily News, written by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in reply to an editorial which had appeared in that newspaper on Tuesday, March 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR TAFT REPLIES TO OUR EDITORIAL

On Tuesday, you published an editorial, "TAFT as a Prophet," in which you criticized my statement that I had no information which leads me to think that the Russians contemplate military aggression at this time any more than during the past 2 years.

In that editorial you quote some things I am supposed to have said. These quotations, as far as I can judge, are taken from a libelous pamphlet published by Mr. Marvin Harrison as part of the CIO-PAC campaign against my reelection in Ohio in 1944. In particular, you say: "On February 16, 1941, he said: 'It is simply fantastic to suppose there is any danger of an attack on the United States by Japan.'"

I never made any such statement at any time, and the Scripps-Howard editor in Cleveland was present when I denied it before the Cleveland City Club where it is suggested that the statement was made. I never ventured to predict anything regarding the far eastern situation, because I had no information and the administration never gave any to Congress.

In the other 1941 quotations, I was discussing the question whether we should enter the war against Germany of our own volition. It was then alleged that the Germans would attack the United States, and I pointed out that invasion of the United States by the German Army was almost an impossible undertaking with the American Navy in control of the Atlantic. Do you question that judgment?

In August and September 1941, after the entrance of Russia into the war, I pointed out that there was much less danger to us than there was in 1940 when the German blitz over England threatened the destruction of that country. Do you question the correctness of that conclusion? As a matter of fact, I don't think President Roosevelt himself would ever have urged our entering the European War if we had not been attacked by Japan. Your entire criticism is really based on the February 16 statement which is not true. I may say that someone gave the New York Times the same information, but they had the courtesy to inquire whether the statement was true before making any use of it.

As to my general statement regarding the threat of Russian military aggression, I do not see how anyone can question the fact that "we have to work on the theory that there is going to be peace." If we conformed all our legislative actions today to the theory that the Russians are contemplating immediate military aggression at this time, the Marshall plan would make no sense. All of our domestic policies must be based on at least the hope that there will be peace.

Whether we hope and expect peace or not, we should, of course, have a military force completely adequate to secure the safety of this country, even if the chance of war is only one in a thousand. Your editors are well aware of the fact that I have advocated a much stronger Air Corps, because I believe that the only possible defense is a complete domination of the air such as we had over Germany and Japan at the end of the war. What I am opposed to is the stirring up of people to wild excitement through deliberately simulated Government propaganda, which produces no real results, instead of going quietly about the practical business of making it possible for this country to remain a free country in a free world.

ROBERT A. TAFT.

The Nuremberg Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. E. C. Deane, a citizen of Arkansas, who for the past 15 months has been associated in the Nuremberg trials in Germany. He writes at some length commenting on the manner in which the trials have been conducted. I believe this information is of particular interest to Members of the Senate, and I ask that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUREMBERG, GERMANY,
February 28, 1948.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Thinking that perhaps you will be interested in the thoughts of an Arkansas citizen upon the Nuremberg trials, particularly in view of the conflicting and somewhat inaccurate news reports which have come out of Nuremberg and Frankfurt-on-the-Main within the past several days, I am taking the liberty of making you a brief report on what I know.

I have spent, since November 1945 a total of 15 months participating in the trials at Nuremberg, and consider that I am as qualified as any man to see these trials in their true light.

Charges that the trials are being conducted in an unfair manner are ridiculous. Every American here, so far as I have ever been able to determine, is intent upon giving the defendants a fair, completely honest trial, and this goes for the prosecution as well as the tribunals sitting in judgment.

That an accused man must not be punished until proved guilty beyond all reasonable doubt, and that the burden of proof must at all times lie with the prosecution, have not been forgotten at Nuremberg.

Charges of unfairness here are insulting to the integrity and decency and Americanism of a good many of us, who as soldiers of our Nation helped in one way or another to free the world of Hitler's tyranny, and who since the end of the war have diligently worked at our occupation assignments in a manner to reflect credit upon our Nation and upon the principles of justice for which America stands.

Having no better accusation to cast in seeking to discredit these trials and the Americans participating in them, some individuals in the United States, including at least one Congressman, have lately dragged out the old red herring and cried "communistic doings." So far as I know, this brand fits none of my acquaintances here. And, I might add, among my acquaintances here are Jim McHaney and Baucom Fulkerson, both of Little Rock. I could run through a long list of Americans at the Nuremberg trials with similar backgrounds, traditions, and sense of justice. We would be completely out of place in a project tinged with red.

My chief, Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, who has been engaged in war crimes prosecution matters since he joined Mr. Justice Jackson's staff in June 1945, has also been criticized lately. Among the more ridiculous and slanderous charges made against him have been those of an Iowa judge, recently departed from Nuremberg, who accused the general of withholding evidence. This judge, incidentally, participated in a judgment which sent eight German generals to prison, two of them for life terms. This judge then turned squarely about face, once the sentences were pronounced, and gave an interview to the Chicago Tribune saying, among other things, "justice has been denied." This is, indeed, an amazing change of face for a man in high judicial position, particularly since he had full opportunity—and, I think, responsibility—to state his thoughts in a dissenting opinion when the judgment was rendered.

There are certain unavoidable conditions in Germany, and no one will deny the fact, which work to the disadvantage of all of us here who are seeking to bring German war criminals to justice. Believe me, every effort is made by the United States Army and by us civilian employees of the Army, to afford the German defense every facility which will enable defense counsel to protect the interest of their clients to the fullest.

As Americans, we take pride in conducting Nuremberg affairs in a democratic manner, because that is the only way in which we know how to act, and besides, we hope by our example to show the Germans a way of justice with which so few of them are familiar.

I am sending letters on this subject to Senator FULBRIGHT and Congressman HARRIS, thinking that perhaps they will also be interested in knowing the feelings of an Arkansas observer at the Nuremberg trials.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. DEANE.

EL DORADO, ARK.

Subsidies for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, as one who sees the danger in prolonged and increased attempts to establish a national housing policy, subsidized by the Federal Government, I wish to include an editorial taken from the Wall Street Journal of March 17:

SUBSIDIES FOR HOUSING

Anyone who has been hopeful of an early end to the innumerable Federal subsidies of the past two decades had better take a look at the report just made by the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing. It can have no other meaning than that the Government should commit itself to domestic grants-in-aid reaching far into the future.

This committee has patently had the services of a master of semantics. It talks about establishing a firm national housing policy that the resources of the Federal Government will be used to provide the aids needed to achieve decent homes for all American families.

That sounds well. Who doesn't want a decent house to live in? Who wouldn't like to see all his fellow citizens decently housed? But why is it more a matter of Government obligation to house the people according to predetermined standards than to provide them with ample food and decent clothing? And how about the little matter of decent employment for everybody?

We submit that there is no more obligation on the Government in the one case than in any of the others. None, that is, unless our people are to accept a collectivist economy as its form of social organization and to endow the Central Government with all the powers it will require to establish and maintain such an order.

This committee sets forth a program skillfully designed to make as many emotional appeals as can be bundled up in it. Slum clearance is included at the rate of $2 from the Federal Treasury to every $1 from a local government. It proposes a special effort to provide houses for paralyzed war veterans, who should, of course, be well taken care of outside of any grandiose housing program.

So long as the Government subsidizes special objectives it will distort the national economy, rendering it necessary to extend its subsidy practices to more and more areas of the country's life. The price-inflationary effect of Government subsidies is only one of their vicious aspects and not even the worst of these. The first and fatal objection to them is that they need only be carried far enough to make a free society impossible.

The Late Nikola D. Petkov, Bulgarian Democratic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, during the trip last summer to Europe of the joint Senate and House committee, of which I had the honor to be co-chairman, we had occasion to see first-hand some of the shocking events that transpired behind the so-called iron curtain in the satellite countries.

We arrived in Bulgaria within about a week after the Bulgarian democratic leader, Nikola Petkov, was executed by hanging in the Sofia jail. The Petkov hanging was one of a series of events of which we received knowledge first-hand, and naturally gave rise in our minds to the question of what sort of patriots these men were in the different "curtain countries," who were being so ruthlessly liquidated.

Upon my return, I immediately made inquiry, through reliable channels, as to Mr. Petkov's background and the story of his life.

I have just received a memorandum which comes to me from completely reliable sources, and which is such an important contribution to this whole distressing situation that we are now seeing repeated almost daily, that I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LATE NIKOLA D. PETKOV, BULGARIAN DEMOCRATIC LEADER

Shortly after midnight on September 23, 1947, Nikola D. Petkov, leader of the Bulgarian opposition Agrarian Party, was executed by hanging in the Sofia jail. As the leader of the largest and most influential political organization in Bulgaria, Petkov was one of the chief creators of the Bulgarian Government which executed him. Unbiased observers are agreed that there has seldom been a more flagrant case of judicial murder by Communists than that of Nikola Petkov. Public opinion throughout the non-Communist world was aroused and shocked by the verdict, many leftist fellow-travelers were robbed of their illusions, and even Communists were placed on the defensive by this complete disregard of objective justice and the severity of the sentence.

Nikola Petkov, born in Sofia in 1898 of a family prominent in Bulgarian politics, was the most outstanding democratic personality Bulgaria has produced in recent years. A man of great moral and physical courage as well as of high principles, he was one of the few people in that part of Europe who could be regarded as a believer in true democracy and in the western concepts of democratic freedoms. Contrary to the allegations of the present Bulgarian regime, Mr. Petkov had a long history of opposition to totalitarianism, whether from the right or from the left. He was an early member of the Bulgarian Agrarian Union, an essentially peasant organization, and after having graduated from the University of Paris, joined the Bulgarian

Agrarian Government of Alexander Stamboliisky in 1923. Following the overthrow of that Government by a rightest coup d'etat in which the present Minister of Electrification and ex-Foreign Minister Kimon Georgiev participated, and during which Mr. Petkov's brother was assassinated, Petkov became an increasingly more important member of the left wing of the Agrarian Party. This wing stood for close friendship with the U. S. S. R. and for the widest measures of democracy. During the German domination of Bulgaria Petkov was repeatedly interned, but during the waning period of German control he was prominent as one of the founders of the first Fatherland Front Government, which originally consisted of Agrarians, Social Democrats, Zvenos, and Communists. A member of the first postwar cabinet, he was one of those who signed the armistice agreement with the Allies in Moscow on October 28, 1944. Later, having become convinced that the Communists were bent on securing the domination of the Fatherland Front coalition, Mr. Petkov led his party into opposition. In the election of November 1946, in coalition with the Social Democrats, his party managed to poll a million and a quarter votes and won 101 seats in Parliament, in spite of nearly every type of intimidation, violence, and fraud by the Communists to influence the results. As editor of the largest Bulgarian newspaper, Petkov boldly and openly criticized governmental policies and the oppressions carried on by the Communist-dominated government. It soon became apparent to the Communists that, despite all their repressive measures, their domination of the country could never be absolute in the totalitarian manner they desired so long as an active opposition continued to exist. In June 1947, following United States ratification of the Bulgarian Peace Treaty by a few hours, the Bulgarian Parliament withdrew Petkov's parliamentary immunity as a deputy and he was thereupon arrested upon leaving the assembly hall. After a farcical trial he was condemned to death on August 16, 1947.

Petkov was charged under the law for the defense of the People's Government with organizing a Fascist coup d'etat to overthrow the Fatherland Front Government; fomenting disorder and sabotage in order to induce foreign powers (read "United States") to intervene in Bulgaria; encouraging resistance to governmental authority; and undermining through his opposition newspaper the fighting efficiency of the Bulgarian army. Although the United States was not mentioned by name during the trial, the veiling was thin and the official press was outspoken in charging Petkov with being an agent of American imperialism. It is significant to note parenthetically that in Bulgaria today mere contact with Americans may be sufficient to cause a Bulgarian to be sent to the gallows. The detailed accusations of Petkov were hinged on confessions extorted from his codefendants, who were charged with military conspiracy. The Fatherland Front regime placed a simple alternative before any of the accused codefendants. He could be subjected to torture to a degree unparalleled even by the Nazis and eventually be executed, or he could confess in a manner incriminating Petkov and his party. The trial itself ran about 8 days and was little short of travesty. Petkov's two principal defense attorneys were arrested by the Bulgarian militia just before the trial. The presiding judge and the attorneys supposedly defending Petkov's fellow-defendants actually did as much prosecuting of Petkov as the State prosecutor himself. The judge himself personally interrogated all defense witnesses in an unconcealed hostile manner and on instances embarked on lengthy and impassioned political tirades attacking the defense witnesses or Petkov himself. All witnesses for the prosecution were treated by him in a friendly and favorable manner, even when they flagrantly forgot their lines and stammered until they were prompted. Before the trial was concluded at least one of the defense witnesses was arrested and imprisoned solely because his testimony had indicated political beliefs at variance with those of the court. It may be added that all three judges, as well as the prosecutor and the assistant prosecutor, were members of the Communist Party. Despite strong remonstrances and efforts by the United States and the United Kingdom in Petkov's behalf, both in Sofia and in Moscow, the Communist regime determined to carry out its sentence, and in the early morning of September 23 he was suddenly hanged without prior notice to anyone, including his closest kin.

Following the conviction and sentence of Petkov, the Bulgarian Parliament passed a bill dissolving Petkov's Agrarian Party, the largest political force in the country, and making it a criminal offense to retain membership in the party or be active in any way on its behalf. Thus finally the Communists obliterated all effective democratic opposition in Bulgaria. By this time the tone of the controlled local press and the public utterances of the regime's leaders had reached a crescendo of truculent hostility toward the United States and the West. Couched in an attitude of righteous indignation at the unjustified interference in Bulgarian internal affairs which they claimed followed Petkov's condemnation, they lashed out in the strongest language against the United States as the leader of international reaction and imperialism.

Petkov was not a reactionary conservative, nor was he hostile to the Soviet Union. He was, on the contrary, a genuine and sincere liberal who strove during his entire life against political oppression, minority dictatorship and privileges for the few. He had always opposed an exclusive Bulgarian alinement and identification of interests with any great power or group of powers. In summary, the official platform of Nikola Petkov and his Agrarian Party was as follows to the very end: (1) Close friendship with all Balkan States, the U. S. S. R., and the western democracies; (2) the restoration of constitutional popular rights; (3) opposition to internal defeatism and reaction; (4) the establishment of a democratically controlled and responsible police force; (5) close cooperation with the Communist Party, but only on the basis of equality and reciprocity; (6) the democratization of education, the economic system and the army; and (7) complete freedom for each political party in Bulgaria to choose and submit its own candidates in free and unfettered elections.

GI Flight Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the question of flight training under the GI bill of rights has been considerably in the news in recent weeks. Many sensational statements have been made, not all of them, I am sorry to say, in strict adherence to the truth.

There has come to my desk an article prepared by Mr. Don V. Seevers, manager of the Texas State Aviation Association, which he has entitled "An Answer to Statements Made by Budget Bureau Representatives in Regard to GI Flight Training." Mr. Seevers is in a position to know what he is talking about, and I think his article will be of considerable interest to many Members of the Senate. I ask, therefore, that it may be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANSWER TO STATEMENTS MADE BY BUDGET BUREAU REPRESENTATIVES IN REGARD TO GI FLIGHT TRAINING

(Prepared by Don V. Seevers, manager, Texas State Aviation Association

According to recent articles in our local press, representatives of the Bureau of the Budget have asked Congress to eliminate certain phases of the veteran's training from the GI bill of rights.

They are reported as questioning the value of ballroom dancing, photography, advertising and—what they term—"sport" flying, as a means of helping the veteran to earn a living.

Concerning the latter category—GI flight training—the Budget Bureau representatives said: "The Government is spending $257,000,000 a year paying for flight training of 118,400 veterans," and that "90 percent of this training serves no occupational purpose," and has "no appreciable value to national defense."

I believe that our already overtaxed public deserves a more detailed explanation of these expenditures than is contained in such a bald, flat statement.

To begin with, it is quite apparent that the economic "experts" employed by our Government bureaus to compile this report, as usual, have very little knowledge of the program under consideration.

Their statement that "90 percent of this training serves no occupational purpose," has obviously been based upon their assumption that a privately licensed pilot cannot make a profitable use of his training.

What they have apparently overlooked is the thousands of privately licensed businessmen who use their ability as pilots to further their business interests through the use of the personal airplane; the traveling salesmen who use their private aircraft to cover their farflug sales territories; the flying farmer; the rancher; the doctors; the oil men; the cattle buyers, and the many other professions now being benefited by the time-saving advantages of the personal airplane.

I have in my files reports of such widely divergent uses of this training as veteran ministers who now fly to other communities to preach; tractor salesmen-mechanics who use the personal plane to fly to farms and ranches on business; and plumbers who fly to trade centers to purchase needed supplies.

These statistical-minded Government employees have apparently based the occupational opportunities of the commercially licensed pilot upon the present job potential of air line, cargo line, and feeder line needs.

They, undoubtedly, are ignorant of the many opportunities presented in the crop-dusting field; civilian flight training; pipe- and toll-line survey and patrol; aerial seeding; aerial advertising and photography. They, quite obviously, are unaware of the many flying jobs now being opened up through the ever-increasing use of executive and functional aircraft by manufacturers and oil companies; forestry patrol and fire combat; nonscheduled perishable food and produce transport; charter services; aerial ambulance services; and the proposed aerial parcel post, to name but a few phases of the

ever-widening field for commercial aircraft use.

The Bureau's statement that this training has no appreciable value to national defense might indicate that they have conveniently forgotten the unquestionably important role the civilian flight schools, flight instructors, and private pilots played in the past war.

Can they so easily have forgotten how our civilian flight schools accepted—and accomplished—the gigantic job of training thousands of military pilots at a time when they were so urgently needed, and at a time when our military air forces were not adequately manned nor equipped for the task?

Are we to believe that they cannot recall the thousands of civilian pilots who, at that critical moment in our history, willingly gave of their personal services, and of their flight equipment, in order that the dangerous gaps in our transport and patrol forces might be filled?

Are we to accept their statement that never again will such a situation arise?

Our governmental figure jugglers have apparently based this conclusion on the recent report by the President's Air Policy Commission, wherein they state that "According to evidence submitted to the Commission, civilian instructors are unlikely to be required for any emergency within the next 15 years because of the availability of World War II pilots."

What the Budget Bureau failed to take into consideration is the fact that all pilots are not instructors, and that the great majority of World War II pilots who might be readily available for another emergency within 15 years—or 5 years, for that matter—will only be those who have remained active as civilian instructors, flight-school operators, or civilian pilots.

Also, if these report-writing Government employees had read further into the air-policy report, they would have found that the Commission urged the maintenance of a strong and healthy aviation industry as highly important to our national security. They would also have found that the construction, maintenance, and operation of airports has been recommended by the Commission.

In a particular reference to personal aviation, the Commission recommended that a healthy personal-plane industry is of value to the Nation, and that it should be encouraged by continuation of funds for airports, navigation facilities and basic improvements in personal-plane design.

In considering whether additional appropriations should presently be made in this direction, the Commission said that they believe that present appropriations to personal aviation, plus the financial assistance being provided through veterans' flight training, is sufficient.

It does not require a pedigreed college graduate to visualize the far-reaching effects the sudden cessation of the flight-training program would have on the aviation industry, as well as the many other allied industries.

The sudden stoppage, or curtailment, of this program would not only critically injure the several thousand flight schools now offering GI flight training but it would actually force a great majority of them out of existence.

Such a move would, therefore, succeed only in further reducing the aviation job opportunities for those thousands of veterans who have already completed their flight training, while at the same time it would deprive many veterans now employed in the industry of their livelihood.

A great percentage of our flight-school operators are veterans. Each of them have large investments in their business. Are we to say that those deserving veteran businessmen shall arbitrarily be thrown out of business, and not only deprived of an honest living but that they shall be forced to suffer irreparable financial losses, merely because a Government bureau has decided that our veterans are not qualified to choose the type of training best suited to their future, or that, in the estimation of these bureaucrats, such training serves no occupational purpose?

We are at a loss to understand how any Government bureau can be possessed of such psychic powers to foresee the future occupational opportunities or beneficial advantages that will be provided the GI flight trainee—or the trainee of any GI training program, for that matter.

The elimination of GI flight schools would have a very definite injurious effect on the aviation industry as a whole.

Many of our now active airports would be closed, thus sabotaging our past and present costly efforts to establish a comprehensive network of landing facilities, which is deemed so necessary to our national security by the President's Commission and the military.

When we take into consideration the fact that a very large percentage of the aircraft and accessories manufactured and sold in the United States during the past 2 years have been bought and used by either the operators of GI flight schools or by veterans who have received their training under the GI program, we can easily understand the great importance of this program to a strong, healthy aviation industry.

The accessories, training equipment, the gasoline and oil, the radio equipment, and the many other services, supplies, and equipment required in the operation of this flight program constitutes a very large and important industry within itself, an industry which, obviously, provides business and job opportunities for many deserving veterans.

Are we to permit such an important sector of our national economic structure to be summarily wiped out in order that some 200,000 Government jobs might be prolonged?

I base that statement on the rather peculiar fact that the GI programs under attack by the VA and abetted by a fellow Government agency, the Budget Bureau, are all short-term programs. The GI flight-training course, for instance, is completed in a few months.

Even now VA employees are active in their efforts to influence veterans, under the guise of "vocational guidance," to apply for 4-year college courses, rather than the shorter training courses of their choice. It has been interesting to note that as the GI's interest in flight training has increased so has the efforts of the VA employees to discredit this program.

It can easily be understood why the VA employee might be interested in enrolling the veteran in the longer 4-year college course, rather than in the shorter, eligibility-consuming program, such as flight training. If, for instance, a major portion of our veterans were to choose such short-term courses, the need for a great number of VA employees would soon expire.

It therefore is to their advantage to prolong this GI training program to its maximum extent.

We can, naturally, understand and sympathize with them in their problem, but we cannot condone the manner in which they are attempting to secure their position.

They are attempting to convince us, the taxpaying public, that their only interest in this matter is the prevention of a useless expenditure of our money.

That, if it were true, would indeed be highly commendable.

Before we summarily condemn these public-spirited public servants, however, let us look carefully into this matter.

According to the representatives of the Budget Bureau, $257,000,000 per year has been spent by the Government in payment for the flight training of 118,400 veterans—an average of $2,170.60 per trainee.

This figure is rather surprising when it is compared with the reported total of only $588,000,000 allegedly spent in all other GI training programs. According to reports, this paid for the training of 1,741,125 veterans enrolled in all other programs than flight training. If this figure is correct it would indicate that an average of only $337.71 had been spent per trainee.

The only conclusion we can draw, if these figures have been reported correctly, is that our VA and Budget Bureau representatives show very little regard for the intelligence of our National Representatives when they ask them to believe that the 1,741,125 on-the-job trainees, in which these veterans draw as much as $110 monthly pay from the Government; and the vocational school and college students, the great majority of whom receive a monthly subsistence of $90, are costing less than one-fifth the amount spent, per student, than is the flight program. It is also noticeable that they failed to mention the fact that these costs, for a great majority of these 1,741,125 trainees, will be repeated for the next 1, 2, and 3 years.

The average training costs are doubly surprising when it is known just how much the various flight courses actually cost the Government.

Here are a few average tuition figures: Private course, complete, $400; commercial-pilot course, complete, $1,850; instructor's course, complete, $400; instrument course, complete, $475; twin-engine pilot's rating course, complete, $475; and the air-line, or air-transport rating (ATR), complete, $425. The word "complete," as used here, indicates that all training supplies, books, equipment, and ground-school courses, have been provided by the flight-school operator and are included in the costs shown.

While it is true that some GI flight trainees receive subsistence while undergoing their training, the percentage is quite small as compared to other training programs, and can, for the moment, be ignored. Obviously, subsistence is an expenditure which would be necessary regardless of the program indulged in by these veterans. Also, quite obviously, the longer the training course, the greater the subsistence costs. This alone explodes part of the money-saving argument of our Government bureaus, who apparently favor the full time, 4-year college course.

If we are to accept the Budget Bureau's statement that "90 percent of this training serves no occupational purpose," we could reasonably assume that that percentage of our veteran trainees are enrolled in private pilot courses. We are at a loss to understand how else they could have arrived at such a percentage—since the holder of a commercial license is certainly qualified to make an occupational use of his training.

If the inference here is that each flight trainee should be guaranteed profitable employment upon the completion of his training, I would like to ask, "How many of our colleges and vocational schools can make, and keep, such a promise to their students?"

For the sake of simplicity, and basing our figures on the inference that 90 percent of our GI flight trainees are enrolled in the private pilot course, let us assume that 90 percent of the flight training costs the Government an average of $425 per student, and that the remaining 10 percent of the veterans are in the top price commercial pilot bracket at an average of $1,850.

Using the reported total of 118,400 flight trainees, we find that these costs represent an average of only $590 per student, or a grand total of only $69,856,000 paid to the flight schools.

Assuming that these figures are closely correct, we find that there is a balance of $187,144,000 which has not been accounted for.

There are, quite naturally, other expenses to be figured into the cost of this program—overhead and subsistence.

The overhead is, of course, the cost of operating the many VA offices, and the salaries of the thousands of public officeholders manning them.

A recent report indicates that the VA now employs some 200,000 persons in the admin-

istration of the GI program—which, as we know, covers many other veterans matters than the training program.

Assuming a high average of $3,000 yearly salary for each VA employee, we arrive at a total salary expenditure of $600,000,000 for the entire administration.

Obviously, only a very small percentage of these VA employees are concerned solely with the flight training program—undoubtedly far less than 5 percent of the total.

In fairness, let us use the 5 percent figure. We find, thus, that the salary costs, which could rightfully be charged against the flight training program, would amount to only $30,000,000 yearly.

This would leave some $157,144,000 to be applied against office rental, maintenance, equipment, travel, correspondence, and subsistence costs.

Are we to believe that the elimination of the flight training program will result in any appreciable reduction of these overhead costs?

Would it appreciably reduce the number of VA employees, or the office space being utilized by this bureau?

I think that our long experience with our Government bureaus will convince us that the answer to those questions is an emphatic "No."

As far as the subsistence costs are concerned, it is foolish to believe that the elimination of this phase of the GI program would effect a saving.

If, as recommended by the VA and the Bureau of the Budget, we are to eliminate short-term courses and enroll all eligible veterans in long-term college courses, it is obvious that these subsistence costs would increase, rather than decrease.

Again I say, the overhead and subsistence costs could not properly be considered as saved were the flight-training program eliminated. Unless all potential veteran flight trainees were barred from participation in the GI program, this money—which we are asked to believe would be a saving to the public—would simply go into other longer, and more costly training programs.

The relatively few VA employees now concerned with the flight-training program, would simply be transferred to other training branches—and the salary costs would remain the same.

By forcing the veteran to enroll in long-term college courses the program would be lengthened, thus requiring the costly maintenance of this Government agency for a longer period of time.

Regarding the question of subsistence, we find that a relatively small percentage of the veterans enrolled in the flight-training program are actually drawing subsistence.

The great majority of these students—a fair percentage might be 75 percent—are employed in a trade or profession, and indulge in their flight training as an after-work, or week-end activity.

In this manner, this training program is affording these veterans, who are honestly trying to provide for themselves and their families, an opportunity to receive some benefit from the GI program. A benefit which otherwise might be denied them—unless, of course, they are content to force the meager existence provided by subsistence, upon their families—while they spend 4 years studying a college course which has the same proportionate chance of assuring them gainful employment as does the flight-training program.

Not only does this program, in this manner, represent an advantage to the veteran, but it also represents a saving of tax money over the long-term college course, where practically 100 percent of the GI students receive subsistence.

A common-sense examination of this matter quickly reveals the weaknesses in the argument put forth by our Government employees, and designed to convince the taxpaying public that the elimination of this particular program would result in a great saving of public taxes.

Such a move would, quite obviously, through a lengthening of the program, require longer employment of these public servants who are now so frantically trying to discredit this program in an effort to insure a longer period of employment for themselves.

Such a move would only result in increased costs through costlier training courses, increased subsistence costs, and greater overhead occasioned by a lengthening of the program.

I have attempted to fairly and reasonably answer the silly job-assuring propaganda issued by our public employees—apparently in an attempt to deprive the veteran of the money originally intended for his use in the training of his choice, in order that it might be channeled into the pockets of these bureaucrats in the form of needless salaries.

Most greatly concerned in this matter, however, is the veteran himself—the apparently forgotten man in these statistical reports issued by our Government bureaus.

Are his rights and desires not to be considered in this matter?

It is a sad commentary on the memory of the American public, that we have such convincing evidence of its forgetfulness of its debt to our once "beloved" veterans, that we now—under the guise of economy—plan to deprive them of their legal and rightful reward for the time taken from their lives in the service of our country.

Are we to become an "Indian giving" nation?

Are we, in a moment of exuberant relief at our victorious deliverance from that conflict, to magnanimously promise these boys this meager reward for their services—only to snatch it from them, even before that war has been officially ended, in order that a few public-office holders, and global-minded politicians, might be benefited?

Are we to sanction the efforts of these suddenly economy-minded public servants who, on the one hand, condone the gift of many billions of dollars to foreign nations, while, on the other, they recommend that bureaucratic strings be put on this small financial reward to which our veterans are rightfully entitled—and to which the veterans themselves are contributing through taxes?

Are we now willing to admit that a group of men, so lacking in ability that they must depend upon government employment for their livelihood, are better qualified to decide the veteran's future than is the veteran himself?

I am not blessed with an exceptional memory, yet it is not so poor that I cannot recall a period—less than three short years ago—when the future of our great Nation depended upon the ability and judgement of these very veterans whom our bureaucrats are now attempting to discredit in the eyes of the taxpaying public.

Rent Control Is Decontrolled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday night I voted against passage of the eunuch rent-control measure because I could not bring myself to be a party to imposing such a fraud on the American public. I so expressed myself on the floor of this House.

In this morning's Washington Post there is an editorial which is in the nature of an epilog to the action taken Tuesday. The Post editorial succinctly sums up the opinions expressed on the floor by the opponents of the emasculated measure as the Committee on Banking and Currency sent it to the floor.

The only thing omitted from the editorial is reference to the futility of consumer lobbying against the activities of the real-estate lobby—it was just 2 weeks ago that nearly 2,000 veterans came to Washington to express the urgent desire of veterans to have real rent control and to get some action on the public housing bill.

Under consent, I am inserting the Post editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

DECONTROLLED

No one should be fooled by what the House of Representatives Tuesday sought to pass off as an extension of rent control. In voting to give local boards complete authority to raise or decontrol rents, the House wrote the end to any effective protection under the law. The action looms worse in the light of the serious question raised by several House Members as to the constitutionality of this extreme delegation of Federal power. NRA, it will be recalled, was thrown out by the Supreme Court on much the same grounds. The net effect on tenants will, of course, be the same whether they are mulcted with or without the new law, but if the extension is declared unconstitutional, the House will have succeeded in shifting the onus for the final destruction to the courts.

What chance there is for strengthening the final measure in conference will depend on how resolutely the Senate conferees stick to their guns. This is the best hope, but it is not a bright one because of the size of the House vote—251 to 132. Indeed, the House decisively rejected the mild Senate bill which, though weak on enforcement, at least maintains the authority of the Housing Expediter to veto irresponsible action by local boards. The House apparently reasoned, illogically, that because some landlords have endured hardships in the past, it is now necessary to penalize all tenants. If the House bill becomes law it can scarcely promote anything but chaos. Many local boards already have been invaded by real-estate interests, and even the boards which try to retain objectivity will be subject to tremendous pressures and will have no uniform standards.

There have been many mistakes in the administration of rent control, and it is futile to argue where they started. The point is that the House had it within its power to effect justice to both landlords and tenants and still maintain the protection that the housing shortage demands. It has failed miserably.

To Get More Enlistments Let's Correct Injustices in Regular Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to the attention of the House a bill which was introduced by me, H. R. 3514,

and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 with respect to reenlistment leave of enlisted men:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (Public Law No. 704, 79th Cong.) is hereby amended by inserting immediately thereafter a proviso as follows: "*Provided*, That reenlistment leave taken prior to the date of enactment of this act shall not be considered as leave taken within the meaning of this act."

Public Law 704, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 6, 1946, known as the Terminal Leave Act, has created injustice to a large number of enlisted men of the armed forces. In effect at least it amounts to a breach of contract by the Government, for it takes from enlisted men reenlistment furloughs given them as inducement for reenlistment under the provisions of laws in effect prior to the enactment of this act.

To correct this injustice I introduced H. R. 3514 on May 19, 1947, which provides that reenlistment leave taken prior to the date of enactment of Public Law 704 shall not be considered as leave taken within the meaning of that act.

However, here is the situation. Under the provisions of War Department Circular 310, dated October 6, 1945, which stemmed from Public Law 72, Seventy-ninth Congress, reenlistment furloughs were offered enlisted men who reenlisted within 20 days of their discharge or who who were discharged for the purpose of immediately enlisting or reenlisting in the service. Clearly, this was an inducement to enlisted men to enlist or reenlist for the purpose of maintaining the strength of the peacetime Regular Army.

Under this promise a great many men reenlisted in the Regular Establishment or enlisted from the wartime forces during the fall of 1945. They took advantage of the financial aspects and the reenlistment furlough which made up the promises held forth.

These men accepted the offer in good faith only to find that Public Law 704, which did not exist at the time of their reenlistment, operated to charge these furloughs against their wartime accrued leave and thus affected the amount of their terminal-leave pay.

In this group were many men of long service in the Army as well as younger men who had only wartime service. With this injustice fresh in their minds, the younger men are doubtful of the value of a career in the armed forces. They are not sure that future promises will not be broken. They are coming to believe that those who did not reenlist received the greater benefit.

These men who accepted the Army's inducement only to find that it was but a flash in the pan with a kick-back detrimental to their own interests are certainly not sold on an Army career. Those men who did not reenlist came out of the service to enjoy the bounties of the GI bill of rights, while those who reenlisted are now charged with the furlough leave which the War Department said was to be given them.

H. R. 3514, if enacted, will remove reenlistment furloughs taken prior to the date of approval of the Terminal Leave Act from the provision of that act as it now stands.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 18 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Thin Ice," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 17, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THIN ICE

Said the bystander to the boy who had just been fished from a hole in the ice:

"You should thank this brave policeman for saving your life."

"I won't know if I'm thankful," chattered the boy, "until after I see what Pop does about my playing hookey."

It seems to us that in relation to its foreign policy our national administration is very much in the position of that boy whose deceits had caught up with him.

It is not so much that there have been mistakes and errors of judgment; our diplomatic corps could have been so many Solomons and still not avoided those. It is rather the attempt to hide the errors, to withhold the facts that might cause the country to condemn a policy before it could be undertaken, to pursue a course long after its bankruptcy was clear, to substitute propaganda for facts.

Senator TAFT is perfectly right that the tragedy of Czechoslovakia took place not days ago but months ago when this Government consented to an arrangement that put that country into Russia's orbit.

Finland faces domination, perhaps extinction. We broke relations with Finland and few voices were raised in protest. Radio commentators and publicists with entree to Washington official circles were denouncing the Finns as a lot of Fascists.

Mr. Byrnes went to the foreign ministers' conference in London and stood fast against the demands of Molotov. Then he went to Moscow and gave Mr. Molotov most of the concessions that he had denied at London. Now he makes a speech telling us that we had better hurry and rearm.

On one day the State Department turns loose documents which will feed anti-Russian feeling and lend support to the ERP program. Then the Secretary of State tells the people they must not get too excited.

We contribute large sums to Great Britain to fight communism and sustain democratic institutions. Then we find that the British Government has belatedly learned that it must purge Communists from its midst.

One could pile up instance on instance. One makeshift is improvised and proclaimed as a policy and all the agencies of propaganda are put behind it. Failure ensues. But failure is not acknowledged. Instead another improvisation is set up on the ruins of the previous one. Then the propaganda begins again.

Goodness knows, this newspaper has not now and never has had any illusions about the Russians. We said they meant to dominate the world by whatever means seemed best to them; we said it when it was not popular to do so. But if at this moment there is danger of war, it comes less from the cold calculations of the Russians than it does from the desperation of our own policymakers.

A successful foreign policy cannot be had until the mistakes of the past are liquidated. They cannot be liquidated until they are acknowledged. And the men responsible will not acknowledge them. They will not come ashore and face the music. They will continue to skate on thin ice even while they shout to us about the danger of doing so.

United Textile Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following copy of my remarks made this morning at the tenth biennial convention of the United Textile Workers of America at the Statler Hotel here in Washington:

Mr. Chairman and fellow workers, I greet you in these words, with a complete understanding of their meaning. The fact that you and I are workers, rather than employees, establishes a common bond between us.

It is my privilege to represent in the Congress a highly industrialized district. Coming from Lawrence, Mass., which is one of the more important textile centers of our Nation, I have been acutely aware, ever since childhood, of the problems of textile workers and of their dependence on the huge mills which dominate the economic life of such a community.

Up to within recent times, textile workers were among the lowest-paid groups in the manufacturing field. As in the case of my home city, a site was chosen, a mill was built, workers were recruited for it, not only from the surrounding countryside, but from foreign countries. The community developed around the mill. The owners had great power, and in many subtle ways they prevented other, and better-paying, industries, from locating in the mill city. The owners wanted cheap labor, with a reserve pool of unemployed to keep the workers in line by holding the fear of replacement over their heads. It was all right with them to set worker against worker and call it competition, because it held wages down. But they did not welcome the presence of other industries which might pay higher wages. And so they kept them out.

In those days children heard of slack times and layoffs as if they were incurable diseases of the textile industry. Few were the children who did not grow up to work, at some time or another, in the mills. Because of the prevailing uncertainty, no one dared to hope for improvement. One was lucky to have a job, and the best way to hold on to it, was not to ask any questions concerning better working conditions or better pay.

By some odd coincidence, in those years during which a President of the United States was to be elected, the fear of losing one's job was intensified. If the Democrats win there will be a depression—this was the whip of fear that was used to scare the people into voting against their own interests. Those who employed this technique conveniently overlooked the fact that under a succession of Republican administrations the mill-worker never got a fair return for his labor. No wonder the owners preferred the cheap labor provided through immigration. They relied on the fact that the immigrants would be grateful for an opportunity which meager as it was, represented an improvement over

the fixed poverty which existed in many European countries.

But the owners forgot that opportunity means the chance to improve one's lot in life. The immigrants and their children, seeing the tremendous productivity of America, of which they were a part, soon realized that they were not getting a proportionate share of the wealth which was being created. They saw that those at the top, ever-greedy for extortionate profits, were gambling with the security of the Nation.

In 1932 the people rebelled and cast off their economic overlords. From that day forward, the progress of the workers, encouraged by the policies of a Democratic administration, has been substantial. It is no longer a question of the individual worker unfairly pitted against the wealth and power of a corporation. The imbalance has been largely corrected because workers, by joining together, have acquired a power of their own which management must consider on nearly even terms.

This convention is a healthy example of labor's new statute on the American scene. During the past 16 years of emancipation your gains have been many, and your morale was high. All this has come about through the development of collective bargaining.

You have advanced a long way since the turbulent days of the 1912 strike at Lawrence which focussed Nation-wide attention on the substandard wages and working conditions in the textile industry. In those days, an unfortunate impression was spread about the country that mill-workers were possessed by some alien and violent ideas. As the passing years have demonstrated, nothing could be further from the truth.

You have made collective bargaining work without hitch or hindrance. For this, both you and management are deserving of praise, because you have worked together as a team.

While other industries have been plagued by labor-management troubles which verged on national crises textile workers and their employers have been able to compromise their differences across the conference table in a manner which proves their mutual sense of responsibility. This is good. It gives us confidence in the future. The pattern of conciliation which you have woven, should be held up as an inspiration to other industries, so that we may have domestic peace with progress.

The United Textile Workers have solved many of their problems but not all. With each passing day the structure and functioning of our national economy is becoming more complex. New problems will arise, requiring delicate adjustments. But as you and management come to know each other better as partners in production the chances of finding a suitable answer for any disagreement constantly improve.

Fundamentally we all believe in our way of life. In spite of its imperfections, it is so clearly superior to all others, that there is no comparison.

The fuel which makes the motor of American society go is free enterprise, which takes the straight road midway between the uneven detours of anarchism and totalitarianism. What this free enterprise means to one American is not exactly what it means to another, but, in varying degrees, we all use it.

Like true freemen we are anxious not to discard our tools and machines, and roads, and motive power, but to improve them. There is a dynamic power in the American system which we must not lose. Unfortunately, that energy for creating the good things of life works in fits and starts. Sometimes, as during the war, it produced as never before. At other times—in the 1930's—it slowed down to a walk. It is this brilliant but uneven performance of our work as a Nation, that we must smooth out for steady and uninterrupted progress.

To improve our industrial system it is necessary to provide a living, annual wage for all those who are willing to work.

All workers, employers, and professional men should organize among their respective groups, so that the rights and responsibilities of all shall be recognized. The principle of collective bargaining is essentially democratic. Being so, it should extend to every person who earns a living.

The millions of Americans who now exist without adequate housing, without medical care, without security in times of unemployment or during old age, constitute a twin challenge to our vaunted efficiency and humanity. In most cases they are the victims of circumstances beyond their control. They get the very short end of a profit system which does not permit necessities to trickle down to those at the bottom.

The failure of those leaders who are so wrapped up in other matters that they do nothing to correct these injustices, might well turn this unanswered challenge into a threat. The displaced persons of our country will not always accept the have-not status assigned to them. Already the agents and fellow-travelers of communism are working on them, pointing to our obvious neglect of the dispossessed, and luring them with promises of bread, to reject our system and supplant it with another.

These are strong words, but the time has come to say them. If we closed our eyes to these realities, we would be faithless to our responsibilities as Americans.

The circulation of blood in the human body must reach the smallest vessels or the whole system will suffer. So it is with our economic system. It cannot be half healthy and half sick. We must be ever alert to cure the small infection before it spreads.

I believe that organized labor knows more about the material needs of the people than any other institution. For that reason, it has a responsibility commensurate with its new power, to work in repairing the small holes in the dike, before the threatening flood waters breach our national unity.

To build a strong America where no honest citizen shall be an outcast—that is the most effective barrier to the infiltrations of communism.

In that effort, labor must play a leading part.

Our forefathers struggled to win the political and religious freedoms which we now enjoy. But, as we of today move forward toward new horizons, we are meeting up with new problems. The solutions to them are not ready made. We must tackle them with the best of our human resources if we are to find the answer to them. If we fail, we cease to be pioneers in the democratic tradition, and shall become slaves living under the lash of dictatorship.

One look at the despairing nations of Europe should convince us that there is little time to lose.

They are wondering if we can help them without weakening our own system.

We shall send them aid so that they will gain strength to resist the bait of communism. We are doing this to protect ourselves against the day when otherwise we might stand alone against a Communist-dominated world.

In the meantime, what about the home-front?

As delegates of the United Textile Workers of America affiliated with the American Federation of Labor I leave you with this challenging thought. Our founding fathers won the struggle for civil liberties. Shall we fail in the struggle to establish a charter for economic liberties?

If we are indifferent to the grim realities of our times, we shall fail.

If, however, we face them honestly and fearlessly with a determination to remove want and fear from our society, we shall succeed.

Free enterprise must be developed to mean opportunity for all, or else.

This is the issue and I am confident that, with the assistance of organized labor, the people of the United States will win through to a greater and stronger future for themselves and this world of humankind.

Amendment to Government Meat Inspection Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on the United States Government Meat Inspection Act, distributed by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

The following editorial appeared in the columns of the Butcher Workman, the official organ of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, American Federation of Labor, which is read by 200,000 members of our union.

The amendment to the United States Government Meat Inspection Act has reflected in the cost of meat products to the consumer and has caused additional cost of operation of many small independent packers, threatening their existence.

The amendment should be repealed.

"A GERM-LADEN KNIFE

"A few days before the adjournment of the most reactionary Congress this Nation had ever assembled in its legislative halls, a germ-laden knife was plunged into the back of every consumer of meat products in the United States. The appropriation for United States Government meat inspection, which has safeguarded the health of the American people for the past 41 years, was slashed approximately $11,000,000.

"Shortly after the turn of the present century, the then young novelist, Upton Sinclair, overnight sprang into national prominence when his first successful book, The Jungle, was published. Sinclair informed an unsuspecting world of the filthy conditions under which livestock was slaughtered and processed by American meat packers. Tubercular hogs and cattle, as well as livestock affected with many other human communicable diseases, were slaughtered and sent through avenues of distribution for human consumption.

"Even hundreds of soldiers who fought in the Spanish-American War were poisoned and died of the ptomaine and filth these packers stuffed into tin cans and sold to the Government as food for men who were fighting and dying in the Philippines.

"Out of it all came the Federal meat-inspection law, and with it came the most sanitary and modern meat-packing plants in the world.

"The cost of administering Federal meat inspection has always been and always should be borne by the United States Government. The gentlemen who graced the July-adjourned National Congress can be compared in many respects with cheaters and chiselers.

Many of them had pet bills which were lagging in the committees to which they were assigned. They wanted money for soil conservation, school lunches, etc.

"When it seemed impossible for them to secure these appropriations, they manipulated through a putrid horse-trading policy to divert some of the appropriations for Federal meat inspection to their own pet legislative schemes; and in this we repeat again, a germ-laden knife was driven into the back of every consumer of meat products in the United States.

"The millions of dollars which were slashed from the Federal meat-inspection appropriations went for soil conservation and school lunches. At the same time, this additional cost of Federal meat inspection was saddled upon the backs of the meat packers themselves which is an abominable betrayal of everything making for cleanliness in an industry that must have, above all other things, white sanitation.

"While representatives of the American Meat Institute appeared before the congressional committee in opposition to the contemplated slash in Federal meat-inspection funds, nevertheless, it is interesting to note that Congressman DIRKSEN, who is supposed to be close to the meat-packing industry, was particularly concerned in accomplishing the diversion of these white funds.

"If the Federal Government will not continue to pay the full freight of Federal meat inspection, then the law might just as well be repealed, because filth and slime and disease will again creep into the products of the great meat-packing industry.

"The Federal meat inspector must always be an independent Federal officer. He must never be compelled to depend upon the owner of the plant to which he has been assigned to pay his salary. He must never be compelled to court the good will of packing-plant owners to keep his job. He must always remain comparable to an FBI agent in Federal meat inspection.

"If meat packers must or are even permitted to pay for their own inspection, then the independence of these Federal men of honor is lost. The inspector, under the disease-laden congressional arrangement, will become nothing more than an employee of the packers. Such an arrangement is unthinkable and has the possibility of leading again to filth and slime and possible death to hundreds of innocent people because of insanitation.

"To compel meat packers to pay for their own inspection, forgetting all else, will put out of business many small packers. The owner of one concern advised us that under the new arrangement, his inspection cost for the next year will exceed $12,500.

"It is paradoxical that a good portion of the slashed Federal inspection appropriations will go toward lunch funds; and it is within the realm of reasonable thinking that with the school lunches will also go the germs of tuberculosis and many other microbic murderers.

"Every meat packer throughout the Nation, large and small, and every decent-thinking citizen in the United States should protest that the most modern and sanitary meat-packing plants throughout the world must be preserved. They cannot be preserved with private or semiprivate inspection.

"The germ-laden knife that was driven into the back of the meat-consuming public, if not remedied immediately when Congress is again called into session, may prove in reality to be the first step back to the jungle."

Again we repeat: This amendment should be repealed.

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA.
CHICAGO, ILL.

Military Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Military Foreign Policy," by Thomas L. Stokes, from the Washington Daily News of March 18, 1948:

MILITARY FOREIGN POLICY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The American people now know the bare and basic truth. That is simply that our foreign policy, as now projected by the administration, is for a "show of force" to try to check Russia's advance by infiltration into western Europe.

This is a military term. It was in military terms that President Truman proposed his new foreign policy to Congress. The military was emphasized when he bolstered another appeal for universal military training, which is not new, by urging revival of temporary selective service, which was new, to build up our strength until such time as universal military training is enacted and operating as an adequate reservoir of trained men.

He also asked for quick approval by the House of the European recovery program, to complete congressional action on that economic rehabilitation measure which up to now has been the basis of our foreign policy as affects the spread of communism.

But the emphasis was on the military. So now we have a military foreign policy proposed. We have reached that stage. It may come as a surprise—if not as a shock—to a great many of our people. But there it is, naked as a bayonet.

Just how we got there, and less than 3 years after the end of the most disastrous war in history and nominally espousing a policy of peace, will be something for the historians to quibble over. It may be found that an influence in our policy was the weight of advice from the military men who have had so important a part in our foreign policy councils since the war, contrary to our tradition. This tendency has been criticized because of the natural inclination of military men, because of their very training, to think of foreign policy in terms of military strategy.

Our proposed new policy was influenced by the advice of military men that the only language Russia's rulers understand is military strength and that Congress must do something quick about providing it, without dilly-dallying over details.

It is difficult to see how anything but war can come ultimately out of a situation where two strong nations arm to the teeth against each other as potential foes and avidly seek allies all around the world, especially such two proud nations, neither inclined to give way before the other, but only to be slowly stirred up to fever heat by each successive move by the other—that is, unless somebody comes to his senses. Before us right now, for instance, is the question whether we are going to make some sort of commitment of military aid to the western European nations which have banded together for mutual protection.

We are far along the road, a road that many look down with horror. It may be too late. But there is one alternative, the one which is our traditional way. That is, in some manner to get about the conference table with the Russians right now and see if something can't be worked out, even if it means, as has been suggested, that President Truman take the initiative, as the leader of the more powerful nation, and ask for a meeting with Joseph Stalin.

We, in our might, can afford to be humble to try to save civilization. Our people certainly want that and, if they want it enough, they can raise their voices, and raise them loudly. The Russian people, too, certainly don't want war.

United Nations Impotent To Enforce Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has been argued with great vehemence that unless the Security Council acts immediately to enforce the recommendation of the General Assembly it will mean the defeat of the United Nations objectives and people will lose faith in it. So that the record may show what the facts are in answer to this argument I submit the following to show that the United Nations has failed in many instances to enforce its decisions. The following extracts from the United Nations Weekly Bulletin are directly in point:

1. The Interim Committee is meeting, but the Russians and their satellite states are boycotting it.

2. The Balkan Committee did not succeed in any way and the events in Greece are the biggest proof of the failure of the United Nations there.

3. Korea is at present being considered by the Interim Committee after the Korean Commission reported its failure and the obstruction of its work by the Reds and Russian troops, the whole matter is being discussed in the Interim Committee so as to refer the matter for reconsideration before the General Assembly.

4. The problems of India and South Africa show that the resolution of the General Assembly in 1946 was disregarded by South Africa, and that when the matter came again before the General Assembly this year the whole proceedings came to nothing. That is a good example to prove to you how the United Nations organization works.

5. There is another problem, the Franco regime, which was brought before the United Nations in 1946, when the Assembly recommended that the said regime be debarred from membership in all United Nations agencies, and that all members of the United Nations should immediately recall their Ambassadors and Ministers from Madrid. The following response was made in 1947 to that resolution: Four states recalled their Ambassadors and Ministers from Madrid, 18 said they had no Ambassadors or Ministers, 30 that they had no diplomatic relations with Spain, and 1 said that it would adhere to the resolution. One state, namely, Argentina, simply refused to comply with the said resolution. It still has diplomatic relations with Franco, and as a reward Argentina was elected as a member of the Security Council in October 1947.

6. The United Nations also failed to adjust the difference between Egypt and Britain. This dispute came before the Security Council in August 1947, and after several weeks of debate the Council was unable to reach

any decision, and it could not proceed any further.

7. The situation in Kashmir between India and Pakistan is very serious. Two thousand persons are being killed daily and several thousands injured. Thousands of houses are being burnt and razed to the ground, and yet the Security Council debated the matter for many weeks and has not up to date been able to reach any satisfactory solution.

8. The refugees and displaced-persons problem: On the 12th of February 1946 the General Assembly adopted a resolution recognizing that the problem of refugees and displaced persons is one of immediate urgency. By a resolution of the same Assembly on the 15th of December 1946 the General Assembly approved the constitution of the International Refugee Organization and urged members of the United Nations "to give the most favorable consideration to receiving each into its territory at the earliest possible time so far as may be practicable for permanent settlement its fair share of the nonrepatriable persons who are the concern of the International Refugee Organization."

The only available figure up to date on the number of refugees was given on the 22d of May 1947, when the number of refugees was given as 879,950. Out of the 57 nations in the United Nations, not more than 20 have responded to the Assembly's resolution, and very few of them really did their share to relieve the refugee problem in Europe. This shows how ineffective this organization is.

From the above it is quite evident that there is no more justification to precipitate a war by enforcing the Palestine recommendation than actual decisions made by the Security Council of the United Nations.

Truman—The Washington Post—and the GSI Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial captioned "Wind it up" this morning, the Washington Post advises your Government and mine to kick GSI out of Government buildings where it is now efficiently operating 40 cafeterias, and render insecure the jobs of more than 1,000 Negroes.

Mr. Truman has encouraged and supported local 471, whose officers first refused to sign anticommunistic affidavits; whose parent organization, the UPW, refuses to comply with the law which calls for the filing of affidavits denying that its officers are Communists or affiliated with organizations whose officers are Communists. Mr. Truman insists that GSI sit down and bargain with the representatives of local 471 which is still maintaining a picket line, although all 40 cafeterias are operating to the satisfaction of the patrons.

The strike would have been settled long ago had the President and the union availed themselves of the Taft-Hartley law which the President said he would support.

The Washington Post has supported Mr. Truman in his method of handling this situation, and one can but wonder as to why it is that the President insists that GSI discriminates against a thousand Negroes who have jobs—and in favor of UPW with the notorious Abram Flaxer as its president, who refuses to deny he is a Communist—and with its negotiator, Bernstein, who testified he had nothing to do with local 471's bargaining.

Sure—"Wind up the strike." The cafeteria workers are on the job—the Federal employees who get their meals in the 40 cafeterias are being served.

The only issue is whether Mr. Truman and the Washington Post can force General Grant III and his cotrustees to ignore the Taft-Hartley law, which Congress passed over Mr. Truman's veto, to sit down and bargain with representatives of a Union (UPW) whose officers will not deny they are Communists or affiliated with Communists.

Mr. Truman yesteday expressed great fear of communism in Europe. Here in Washington he apparently is trying to force loyal Americans who wish to follow the Taft-Hartley law, to cuddle up with those who will not, under oath, deny they are either Communists or associates of communistic organizations.

Let the President and the Washington Post get their noses out of the picture—follow the Taft-Hartley law, and the picket lines will be gone.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a resolution adopted by Local 230, UAW-CIO (Chrysler), of Lynwood, Calif., in opposition to universal military training. I feel that the opinions of this organization, as expressed in the resolution, are deserving of careful consideration by the Congress.

RESOLUTION AGAINST COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Today America's military brass hats, the Hearst press, and the king makers of the American Legion are attempting to force through Congress a bill for universal military conscription. The Universal Military Training Act would give the military absolute control over every citizen and could be used at will to completely militarize our people and place labor under direct military control. It is opposed by the churches of all faiths, educators, all labor organizations, and a great majority of the people.

We are alarmed by the infiltration into all departments of the Federal Government by the military. Today the list of Government heads and lesser officials reads like a military roster.

We are shocked by the revelation that 66 percent of the President's proposed budget for 1948 is for military expenditures; that two-thirds of every tax dollar will be used for the past war and present armaments; that our present expense for the Army and Navy is $26,000,000 daily—a sum almost equal to the entire world's expenditure for the United Nations for a whole year.

We denounce the United States Army's use of taxpayers' money for the carrying on of a high pressure publicity campaign for the passage of legislation for universal military training. At the same time, an atmosphere of fear of attack is being stimulated in order to give support to the idea of a conscripted army.

We agree with statements by the greatest military and scientific minds in America that, in an era of atomic energy, large armies afford no assurance of actual protection against attack. Our only real defense of peace is in our support of the principles of the United Nations.

We believe that UMT would be used as a weapon against labor. Our fears in this regard are not without foundation. We have bitter memories of General MacArthur's brutal attack against the bonus marchers under Herbert Hoover. Many have been the accounts of Army and Reserve Army attacks on hungry and striking workers. And this use of the military against the people is not all ancient history. We do not forget President Truman's threat of conscription and the use of troops to break the railroad strike. Nor do we forget his threat to use the Navy and Coast Guard to break the strike of the Maritime Unions. Even in recent weeks the National Guard was called out in an attempt to break the strike of our brothers and sisters in the lettuce fields of Arizona: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local 230, UAW-CIO (Chrysler) joins with the Los Angeles CIO Council, the California CIO Council and the National Congress of Industrial Organizations in opposing universal military training; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our Senators and Congressmen to actively oppose passage of UMT; demand that the tremendous budget proposed for its promotion be converted for a constructive program for housing, education and health; and work to strengthen the United Nations to make it a real guaranty against World War III; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Los Angeles CIO Council, District Auto Council No. 5, Senators Sheridan Downey and William Knowland, and the following Congressmen from Southern California: Richard M. Nixon, Norris Poulson, Gordon L. McDonough, Donald Jackson, Cecil R. King, Willis P. Bradley, Chet Holifield, Carl Hinshaw, Helen Gahagan Douglas.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the March 17 issue of the Washington Evening Star which expresses my sentiment on the oleo tax question:

THE OLEO GOAT

In voting 16 to 10 to shelve legislation to repeal Federal taxes on oleomargarine, the House Agriculture Committee ought to be thoroughly ashamed of itself. It has voted to prevent Congress as a whole from debating and deciding on the issue. It has voted in favor of the proposition that it is perfectly all right to keep on making a goat of the American consumer as long as the American consumer carries less weight than the butter lobby.

Reason, common sense, the democratic process and simple ordinary fair play have had nothing to do with the committee's action. The only thing that has counted is the dairy industry's selfish, sectional insistence on making a kind of pickpocket out of the Federal Government in order to penalize any American who chooses to buy margarine instead of butter. Although generally conceded to be as agreeable to the taste and at least as nutritious as butter, margarine can be produced more cheaply, and it is therefore such an evil thing to dairymen that they have been browbeating and abusing it in the market place for years past.

More particularly, the American consumers have been browbeaten and abused. For no reason except to "protect" butter, they have had to take their margarine loaded down with iniquitous levies. Any one manufacturing it must pay an annual license fee of $600, and wholesalers and retailers are similarly taxed, with a special high rate on the colored variety. Then, to top everything off, the housewife must pay 10 cents a pound extra if she buys it colored, and a fourth of a cent if she buys it white and goes to the trouble of coloring it herself. Moreover, in addition to these outrageously unjustified Federal taxes, several of the States take sharp bites of their own out of the oleo dollar.

What the House Agriculture Committee has done is to vote for the perpetuation of this public-be-damned situation. It has not had the courage or the sense of fairness to let the repealer proposals get to the floor for a democratic decision. Unless a majority petition can force its hand or unless the test can be brought about by means of a rider to the Senate tax-cut bill, Congress thus will be able to do nothing about the issue until the next regular session. Accordingly, as things look now, the American consumer will continue to pay through the nose for the privilege of eating margarine.

Fair-Employment-Practice Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on Wednesday, March 17, over Mutual Broadcasting network:

Fair-employment-practice legislation is the heart of any civil-rights program. There can be no political freedom without freedom from discrimination in employment. You are not free as long as you can be refused a job or denied promotion on a job because of your race, color, or your religious belief. Under these conditions freedom becomes an empty word, overused by politicians and demagogues.

The objective of fair-employment-practice laws, known as FEPC, is to prohibit the practice of denying jobs and equality in employment for reasons of the color of your skin, the place of your birth, or the religion you practice.

Now, how can anybody quarrel with that proposition? You can't oppose it unless you believe in discrimination. That means that you don't like other people, that you consider yourself superior, that you hate people. There was a man by the name of Hitler who felt that way about people. We fought a big war and paid a big price to rid the world of him and his kind. I admit that we haven't finished the job. There are plenty of his kind around; some of them are considered very respectable today; in fact, so respectable that they even influence our foreign policy and are busy trying to get our country into war.

FEPC can be found in the very cradle of our democracy. FEPC is as American as the Declaration of Independence. When the men who gave birth to this Nation said in that great declaration that all men are created equal they did not say that all men are created equal except Negroes, that all men are created equal except Jews, that all men are created equal except Catholics, that all men are created equal except the foreign born. When they said that all men are created equal they meant that all men are created equal with no exceptions. So that when you refuse employment to people because of race, color, or creed you practice a direct contradiction of the basic American creed, you negate the fundamental concepts of American democracy for which Americans have struggled throughout the life of this Nation

Let us examine the history of FEPC. On March 13, 1941, I introduced the first FEPC bill, H. R. 3994. It was given a hearing before the Judiciary Committee and not reported out. On June 25, 1941, President Roosevelt issued the first executive order establishing a temporary FEPC with limited powers. It was a clear recognition that the Nation in peril needed the services of every man and woman regardless of race, color, or creed. Since then there has been a continued struggle for the establishment of a permanent FEPC, because only by legislation could we make the right of access to jobs a reality for millions of Americans. The temporary FEPC expired soon after the end of the war. I am proud of the part I played in trying to keep it alive for 2 years prior to its expiration. The bipartisan coalition in Congress and President Truman let it die, apparently operating on the theory that we can afford the luxury of equality only in wartime.

In the last Congress I used every parliamentary device at our command to bring about a vote on the bill providing for the establishment of a permanent FEPC. We did not succeed because of the alliance between the Republicans and the southern Democrats. Only as recently as March 8 I introduced an amendment to the Labor Department appropriations bill providing that no funds appropriated as grants shall be paid to any State or educational institution which, because of race, color, or creed, denies equality of educational opportunity or employment. This embodied recent Supreme Court decision on this question. What happened tells you the up-to-date story of FEPC. Mind you, this limited FEPC amendment was offered after President Truman had sent to Congress his civil-rights message in which he asked for FEPC legislation. I can best describe the sincerity of both parties on civil-rights legislation by quoting from the speech I made in support of my amendment. I now read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8:

"Never for a long time have I seen so many Democrats from below the Mason and Dixon's line on the floor as I see this afternoon; and never have I seen so few Republicans in any session of the Eightieth Congress as I see this afternoon.

"This amendment has a history, and I wonder whether it is because of the history of the amendment that I am honored by this distinguished attendance or whether it is because I have doubled my delegation in this House or because the whip was on strike on the Republican side and the Democratic whip was overbusy on the Democratic side calling his southern Members to the floor of the House?

"This amendment is not my product—I wish it were. I would be very proud of it; this amendment is the product of the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KEEFE]. He had this amendment become part of the language of the subcommittee bill and it was proclaimed throughout the Halls of this Congress that for once something was going to be done. Then suddenly a full meeting of the Appropriations Committee took place, and speeches that have been made in public and by the leading candidates for the Presidency on the Republican side were suddenly forgotten. This time Lee did not surrender, it was the followers of Grant who surrendered; and by a vote of 25 to 6, a combined vote of Republicans and Democrats who are here in such great numbers this afternoon, this language was stricken from the bill. Incidentally, I also wonder where are the Truman Democrats this afternoon? The President sent a message to Congress, a civil-rights message. Those who are opposing this civil-rights program are here in good number. Are the other Democrats as mild about Mr. Truman's program as the Republicans have been in the Committee on Appropriations? Why are we, who have consistently fought for civil rights, confronted with this kind of tactics this afternoon? It is because nobody, neither Republicans nor Democrats want this language in this bill; it is because both are rendering lip service on this question of civil rights. I can understand the gentleman from the South fighting civil rights, they have publicly proclaimed their opposition to this type of legislation. They are fighting it and I am fighting them; and it is not just today that we have been fighting over this; it has been throughout the 12 years I have been here.

"The Republicans go out to the country, in the press and on the radio, and tell the people they want this legislation, yet we find them with the southern Democrats in the committee; and the other Democrats are prominent by their absence." The amendment was defeated by a combined Republican-Democratic vote of 119–40.

This brings up to date the history of our efforts to have FEPC enacted. It also tells you why we have been unable to win the fight. I can state that we of the Wallace Party, and those who believe with us, are the only ones who sincerely are carrying the fight for democracy in employment and for the reaffirmation of the Christian and American principle of equality.

The fight for FEPC cannot be separated from the fight for peace. It is an integral part of the same struggle that is going on all over the world for progress and freedom and peace. I don't expect those who support reaction both at home and abroad—I don't expect the bipartisan coalition that put over the Taft-Hartley Act to enslave American labor—I don't expect the bipartisan coalition that is now trying to militarize the youth of our free Nation—I don't expect any of these to support FEPC.

But I do expect the overwhelming majority of Americans who want peace and progress and cherish democracy both at home and abroad to support FEPC. And I now call upon them to make Congress know of their support of this basic American legislation.

Elected Officials Challenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks, I am including an arti-

cle by Mr. Chester D. Tripp of Chicago, which is very interesting. I suggest that every Member of this House read it because it certainly applies to all of us:

A FRIEND OF THE PEOPLE

History bears out the fact that in all democratic experiments, elected leadership must be considered a friend of the people. The people have the vote and it automatically follows that their political choice centers on those individuals they feel will represent their best interests. The historical record is obviously supported in modern times. If anything, there seems to be an increasing tendency for those striving for high position to seek their objectives by capitalizing on the idea that they are the defenders and friends of the people.

The more complicated life becomes, and its complications have certainly increased in the last century, the more pressure is brought to bear on the candidate to say, do and promise what he thinks the people would like to hear. The pressure is so great at times that many men in public life feel they are forced to take positions which they know full well are unsound for the real interests of the people involved. They talk platitudes and promise security and abundance. However, their suggested means to these ends, which we must assume they realize, would lead exactly in the opposite direction if followed. Let me illustrate by an example which we are experiencing today.

We are indulging in a boom at the present time which to the uninitiated is rather stimulating and pleasing, and yet, to a wiser head, knowing the ultimate consequences, it is disturbing in the extreme. No boom in history has ever redounded to the advantage of the people. When the ultimate adjustment is finally made, it is the people who suffer.

The present boom is man made. It is the result of war-induced shortages, and political and social procedures that have developed as a result of the war. I think it is safe to say that it was within the scope of competent leadership to have dampened down if not to have controlled this boom. This is another way of saying that wise leadership could at least have partially fended us against whatever bad effects we, the common man are going to experience in the final pay-off.

As I said, the rudiments of this boom are associated with the war itself, but, there is much more involved at the present time than the consequences of the war. Our economy has been vitally affected by so-called planned programs, to a degree that is almost unbelievable. This planning has proved to be wrong. Our leadership entered the peace period with the strongly intrenched notion that deflation and unemployment were definitely in the offing. As a result of this conception, the national policy was slanted toward raising wages in order to maintain the national purchasing power. It was this combination of circumstances that induced our friends of the people to promulgate that most interesting theory that wages could be raised without inducing a cycle of price advances. Whether this whole concept is the result of ignorance or a desire to tell the people what they would like to hear, is an open question. The fact remains, however, that the great power of our national leadership has preached an economic theory that can only be accounted for on the grounds of demagoguery or grave ignorance of all previous precedent. Our national monetary policy has been almost absurd. Of late months, our leaders have warned us of the boom, but have done absolutely nothing about it even though measures could have been taken through the money market.

All in all, issue after issue has been misappraised and maltreated: We have compromised one condition after another, always to the end advocating procedures acceptable to the common man. "Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceedingly small." If platitudes and decisions primarily meant to please the ears of the people, are fundamentally unsound, the people as usual pay the bill.

On the facts, I think it is clearer than ever that the amplitude of the boom and the probable bust could have been kept within bounds and the procedure necessary to accomplish this is fairly simple. Instead of encouraging spending by increasing the purchasing power, we should have discouraged spending. Instead of preaching tax reduction, that would only increase individual spending, we should have preached continued taxation, tax relief only where that relief would be used to supply tools for the future. Instead of wasting fantastic amounts on so-called European relief, we might have scrutinized this relief and given only where warranted. Certainly this phase of the program should have been taken out of the realm of politics and ideology.

As a matter of fact, there is hardly a thing that we have done in the last two years that has not raised prices, increased personal expenditure, discouraged long-time planning and curtailed the supply of goods in our own market. If the people are finally penalized, seriously for this, they can reflect on the fact that they have listened to arguments that they have enjoyed hearing, and have been encouraged to disregard the simple wisdom and the common sense that should have been at their command.

In closing I would like to quote some words from a keen observer of the process of Government: "The most severe criticism you can level against personal freedom and private enterprise is that they demand more caution. They call for more character, they require more work and will power, they take more self-enterprise, more self-discipline, and more self-reliance than we may possess. One of the major economic challenges of our generation is whether we shall meet these tests so that this Nation may continue to be free economically and politically."

If this is a fair statement of what is demanded of the people, it is doubly true that the same measure in a greater degree should be demanded of our leaders. The real friend of the people in a democracy must be the man who preaches such a doctrine, but the so-called friend of the people in the political sense who tells them only what they would like to hear and who sponsors decisions intriguing in the short range but devastating in the long range, is, in ultimate effect, no friend at all.

CHESTER D. TRIPP.

Veterans Purchase $5,000,000 Naylor Gardens Housing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 12, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the veterans of World War II have finally won the Naylor Gardens Housing project located in Washington, D. C. It has been a long, bitter fight.

Many hundreds of veterans will now find roofs over their heads simply because a group of enthusiastic veterans were determined to acquire the project from the Defense Housing Corporation for the benefit of their comrades who have waited so long for housing accommodations.

The history behind this famous battle was published in the Stars and Stripes, National Tribune, on May 2, 1946, and later reprinted in the official AMVET publication of May 1946.

It is worthy to note in passing that although J. H. Leib, then national legislative director of AMVETS, initiated the movement to secure the Naylor Gardens and later became an incorporator of the association, he nevertheless, adamantly refused to become a director or have anything financially to do with the project—or even seek an apartment for himself. His has been a disinterested service to a worthy cause for which his comrades have reason to be grateful.

The Stars and Stripes article and a story from the Washington Evening Star of February 28, 1948 should be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an example of that which can be accomplished in the interest of community betterment and veteran service when the will to achieve constructive results is present. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper articles to which I have referred are the following:

[From Stars and Stripes, National Tribune, of May 2, 1946]

HOUSING BATTLE WON BY AMVETS—VETERANS' COOPERATIVE SCORES DECISIVE VICTORY IN PURCHASING APARTMENT PROJECT

Seven hundred and forty-eight housing units for veterans.

That became a fact when the sale of $5,000,000 Naylor Gardens to AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, in the District of Columbia, was approved by the Defense Housing Corporation.

Naylor Gardens will go to the Veterans' Cooperative Housing Association, a group given birth by AMVETS last December and headed by Raymond Sawyer, district department commander, and Dayton Harrington, an officer of AMVETS, Post No. 1, in the District.

How was it done?

Purchase of Naylor Gardens was the brain child of J. H. Leib, Frank Scriven, of California, and Raymond Sawyer. It was consummated around a luncheon table and conceived through months of work on Capitol Hill and after arguments pro and con with the Defense Housing Corporation.

The idea was given birth by Leib on December 1, 1945. On December 3 the plan was presented to post No. 1, of the District, for approval and the legal services of Col. William A. Roberts were obtained. On December 7 the legislative director took the story to the Washington Daily News, which ran a headline article announcing AMVETS was endeavoring to purchase the Gardens. Then other papers took up the cudgels on behalf of AMVETS.

Every day Scriven, Leib, and Sawyer bombarded the local papers with press releases, but on December 29 AMVETS suffered the first official set back when the DHC publicly started giving the group the runaround.

AMVETS countered by preparing a bill which Chairman CARTER MANASCO of the Housing Expenditures Committee, introduced, asking that sales of all Government surplus projects be delayed pending decision as to veterans' priorities. Senator LISTER HILL, majority whip of the Senate and a veteran of World War I, was persuaded to introduce a joint bill, which subsequently knocked DHC for the proverbial loop. DHC came back with an announcement that it was prepared to sell, but not to AMVETS.

Again bogged down, AMVETS requested hearings before the Manasco committee. During a stormy session, Leib gained the floor, when Congressman MANASCO interrupted Gen. Luther Gregory, of the War Assets Commission, to give the AMVETS legislative director an opportunity to speak.

Leib appealed to Congress to halt all sales pending clarification of veterans' preference policy. The next day, Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean joined the fight. On a visit to Walter Reed Hospital she had seen a soldier die. Returning home, she read in the papers AMVETS' testimony before Congress. Grieved by what she saw and read, she prepared a series of full-page ads which she ran in all Washington, D. C., papers. She urged that veterans be sold the Garden property. Her assistance was most effective.

Next, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, joined the campaign. She came to AMVETS' defense and introduced legislation to give veterans preference in purchasing Government surplus housing.

With that, the Legion, V. F. W. and D. A. V. joined forces with AMVETS, forming what was virtually a united veteran housing front in the District.

The Rogers bill was introduced March 7, 1946. Approximately 1 month later the Defense Housing Corporation accepted AMVETS' bid. A long, uphill campaign was won. An idea, born at a luncheon table, brought homes to 748 veterans.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 28, 1948]

NAYLOR GARDENS HOUSING CO-OP SET UP BY VETERANS OF TWO WARS

(By Malcolm Lamborne, Jr.)

Youthful enthusiasm and the wisdom that comes with age have teamed up in the country's first large veterans' housing cooperative—Naylor Gardens Residences in Southeast Washington.

It is a combination that promises to stand as a monument to a new experiment in veteran-owned and operated housing.

The 748-unit project became the property of the Veterans' Cooperative Housing Association this month when 34-year-old Graves H. Wilson, co-op president, presented a $512,500 check to the Government. This was a 10-percent down payment on the development, built by the Government in 1943 for $5,587,000 and declared surplus late in 1945.

The brief ceremony in the office of the Public Housing Administration marked the culmination of a program started more than 2 years ago by a group of Washington area veterans, most of them members of the American Veterans of World War II.

Early in their negotiations the young veterans called on older men, veterans of World War I, for advice and assistance, and the combination has been paying dividends ever since. The development is now run by a 9-man board whose ages range from 25 to over 50 years. They serve without pay.

Today 428 of the 748 units are owned by co-op members. Titles to the remainder are held by the association. Nonmember tenants have been given assurance they can remain in apartments so long as there is rent control. These tenants now pay rent to the association which, in turn, makes monthly payments on the purchase price to the Government. Co-op officials estimate it will take about 30 years to pay off Uncle Sam.

Of the 428 units sold to veterans, about 200 are still to be occupied by co-op members. It is worthy of note that veterans were ready to pay the $50 membership fee in the co-op and make a down payment of 20 percent on apartments—even though they were not sure when they could move in.

FIFTEEN VACANCIES A MONTH

Walter W. Kreimann, administrative assistant to the Board and a former Army flyer in the Pacific, reports, however, that vacancies average about 15 a month and, accordingly, families are moving in regularly.

What are the attractions at Naylor Gardens? Association officials cite the following:

Interest rates of only 3 percent, monthly payments from $59.50 to $80, depending on the size of apartments (this includes interest and principal payments, fuel, light, and janitor service); an opportunity for a home at about half the price of a detached dwelling (prices range from $6,750 for one-bedroom units to $8,450 for a three-bedroom apartment); recreation facilities, nearby shopping centers, and good public transportation.

CALLED LONG-TIME PROJECT

John A. Densford, veteran of two wars and chairman of the membership committee, commented recently: "We are trying to build a long-time project at Naylor Gardens." He said he was sold on the idea of a cooperative community only last year when several young men approached him on lending them a hand. Mr. Densford is regional educational director for the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Densford heads the committee which has the important job of screening all applications to buy into the development. The co-op insists veterans be financially able to make a 20-percent down payment without borrowing the money; that their total indebtedness not exceed twice their annual income; and that they have annual income of $2,400 at least.

Mr. Wilson says the co-op's basic philosophy is to provide World War II veterans "first-rate living accommodations at a reasonable cost, along with the benefits of cooperative ownership—all on a long-range basis."

Outlaw the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a resolution adopted by the Ancient Order of Sciots, meeting in the city of Santa Cruz, Calif., in which the outlawing of the Communist Party in the United States is advocated. I feel that the resolution is deserving of consideration by the Members of Congress:

At the supreme session of the Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots, a western organization whose prerequisite to membership is membership in the Masonic fraternity, held November 12, 13, 14, and 15, 1947, in the city of Santa Cruz, State of California, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Congress and the President of the United States be memorialized by the Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States."

The undersigned, as pharaoh and supreme scribe, respectively, of the Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots, have been instructed by the supreme pyramid to forward this resolution to you.

Respectfully yours,

WARREN A. SLOCK,
Pharaoh.

Attest:

WM. VAN DYKE,
Supreme Scribe.

Anniversary of Signing of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a resolution adopted by the Ancient Order of Sciots, meeting in the city of Santa Cruz, Calif., in which the Congress is urged to set aside the 17th of September as a national holiday, in honor of the signing of the Constitution of the United States on that day:

At the supreme session of the Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots, a western organization whose prerequisite to membership is membership in the Masonic Fraternity, held November 12, 13, 14, and 15, 1947, in the city of Santa Cruz, State of California, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas September 17 is the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America and, therefore, marks the birth of the American form of government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Supreme Pyramid, Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots, petition the Congress of the United States and the Legislatures of the State of California and the State of Arizona to have September 17 declared a national and a State holiday."

The undersigned, as pharaoh and supreme scribe, respectively, of the Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots, have been instructed by the supreme pyramid to forward this resolution to you.

Respectfully yours,

WARREN A. SLOCK,
Pharaoh.

Attest:

WM. VAN DYKE,
Supreme Scribe.

Berkeley Springs, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, nestled in a valley within 100 miles of Washington, lies one of America's historic spots.

March 18 of this year will mark the two hundredth anniversary of George Washington's first visit to the town of Bath, now known as Berkeley Springs, the county seat of Morgan County, W. Va. Long before Washington visited this spot, it had become a shrine in the tradition and lore of the Indians. To the Indians, it was a sanctuary known as "healing waters," and the waters blessed by the Great Spirit restored to health those who were sick.

The virtue of these waters were known to all the tribes from the Great Lakes to the Carolinas, and it is well known that the Indians established a standing truce around these springs, that all might be free to enjoy the beneficent provision of the Great Spirit in peace and security.

This peace and security was never desecrated by the Indian.

Two hundred years ago, George Washington, with his surveyor friends, pioneered his way through the beautiful valley of the Patawomekes, and recorded in his diary, "We this day called to see y Fam'd Warm Springs."

Taken from a sketch of The Magic Fountain, First Saga of American Life, by Anita Buchanan Speer, Berkeley Springs, W. Va., we have the following information: Washington's restoration to health, 1761, after a 4 years' illness—rheumatic fever; his lifelong interest, patronage, prestige, and influence, eventually brought about the establishment of a town by the name of Bath, at the famed Warm Springs. Now, town of Bath, Berkeley Springs, Morgan County, W. Va., by the act of the first General Assembly of the State of Virginia in October 1776. Thus, for the welfare of all humanity, the first national shrine of this Indian land of Bimini was perpetuated by the founder and his compatriot Nation builders as the official health center of the new world.

From the time of the early American Indian down to the present, people have traveled to this historic spot and found renewed health and vigor in its healing waters.

The legends and traditions of the town of Bath—Berkeley Springs—through the past 200 years have become nationally known. Visitors from every State in the Union annually visit the springs for the purpose of utilizing the healing effects of its waters.

Books and Motion Pictures Misrepresenting American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter this morning from Miss Naomi Cooley, representing juniors and seniors of the Lee Edwards High School, of Asheville, N. C., which I think should be brought to the attention of the House.

You will observe that she complains of the fact that in all books and movies sent to the Philippines the American youth is shown as a juvenile delinquent. He is pictured as one who disregards the wishes of his parents with a mind bent on disobedience and crime.

I cannot understand how material of this sort could be sent out of this country. Only enemies of America would be interested in publicizing these false and malicious statements. I wonder if there could be a Communist in our Government who is handling this propaganda. I think it should be investigated and proper action taken to see that no more lies are spread abroad about our young people.

The letter to which I refer is as follows:

MARCH 16, 1948.

Hon. MONROE REDDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a member of a committee representing 55 juniors and seniors of Lee Edwards High School in Asheville, N. C., I am writing you in regard to the types of movies, books, and magazines that are being shipped abroad.

Recently, our family and community life class was visited by a widely-known Filipino woman. She is an educator of Public Relations in the Philippines. She informed us on the matter that is being sent to her country. In all books and movies, the American youth is shown as a juvenile delinquent. All that he or she cares for, is going against his parent's wishes; dating, growing up beyond his years, destroying other's property, and numerous other items. All of the magazines are true confession stories which represent the lower class of American youth.

Why is material of this sort being sent to other countries; is there any specific reason for this to go abroad? The United States is a Nation that all people respect and look up to, and we should produce matter that shows us at our best and striving for the best instead of lowering ourselves into unfit characters.

Something should be done to remedy this situation and should be done in the very near future. We should send to other countries matter that is apropos and fitting to the average teen-ager of today in our country.

We would like to know what could be done about this.

Yours sincerely,

NAOMI COOLEY, *Chairman.*

Green-Duwamish River Flood-Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER R. JONES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me today to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., on Green-Duwamish River flood-control project and an editorial from the Seattle Times of Sunday, March 14, 1948, on the same subject:

STATEMENT BY HON. HOMER R. JONES, OF WASHINGTON, ON GREEN-DUWAMISH RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT TO THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I consider it a privilege to be permitted opportunity to appear before an important committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. This organization is important to me and to all the citizens of our country, because it represents the best of democracy in actual practice. Our kind of government is predicated upon the ability of the American people to express themselves through mediums of concerted action such as is inherent in the organization and procedure of this Congress. The people of the many communities here find opportunity to express their local community needs and find listening ears and helpful hands which later will instrument community wishes in terms of action which eventually come directly to the attention of the United States Congress. I can conceive of no better way in which properly our democratic Government can and should function. Therefore, it is a privilege to me to be present not only because I come representing the expressed opinion of the citizens of my community of Seattle on a project which will have important consideration in this committee's deliberations, but equally because my appearance here affords the opportunity to give expression to my high opinion and regard for the great work that has been accomplished by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

I should like, too, to voice a simple tribute to the cooperative effort of another important quasi public organization whose efforts in every regard are closely related to the work of this Congress. I make special reference to the various chambers of commerce who in orderly fashion play an important part in giving more official presentation of community needs. I am aware of the important part that the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, from the city which I represent in the Congress, has played in connection with the project upon which I desire to speak briefly.

Those of us in the city of Seattle and the near environments have for many years been interested in a program for protecting the Green River Valley from disastrous floods and a project which would result in the improvement of the Duwamish River in the interests of navigation. The Seattle Industrial Planning Commission has played an important part under the insistent leadership of Mayor William C. Devin in bringing this project continually to the attention of the valley communities which are directly affected, and to the many community, agricultural, and industrial groups whose combined and coordinated efforts have resulted in favorable recommendation of this project by the district engineer insofar as the flood control features are involved.

The Duwamish River is a continuation of the Green River, the name changing in the lower reaches of the river as it flows into Elliott Bay, one arm of Puget Sound. While the majority of my presentation will deal with the necessity for the flood-control aspects of this project, since the navigation features are located in the immediate vicinity of the industrial area of the city of Seattle, I will discuss first what is eventually desired in the interest of navigation. I am quite aware that this portion of the whole project will be delayed because at this time there has been only inadequate evidence accumulated on river-channel improvement of the Duwamish waterway within the limits of economic feasibility. The city of Seattle has grown rapidly in the years immediately preceding and during the war. Many new industries have been established within the city and its environs. Industrial sites have become expanded at such a rate that now large industries desiring to locate in Seattle find it extremely difficult to acquire space for their plants. The Seattle Planning Commission has been deeply concerned regarding this lack of space and has surveyed repeatedly during recent years the city areas to determine which can be adapted for this industrial purpose. These surveys indicate that the best locality for future industrial expansion is along the Duwamish River—a river which meanders back and forth across a broad valley, cutting into areas which would be admirably suitable for industrial development, reducing the land area to such an extent that industries presently cannot occupy the irregular plots advantageously. The planning commission has tentatively indicated the course which they desire the river to follow and have submitted a plan

to the district engineer of the Department of the Army which would straighten the course of the river and provide adequate opportunities for industrial expansion commensurate with the city of Seattle's ever-increasing needs. As I have already stated, however, this is part of the long-range program for improvement of the Green River Valley and I bring it to the attention of this committee only because it has an important future bearing upon the other aspect of the development which I am sure will secure a more immediate and favorable action by the Congress.

Before the Green River Valley may be fully utilized for either industrial or agricultural purposes, floods, which periodically cover the valley floor, must be controlled. The flood problem has long been recognized by Seattle and the nearby communities, but the magnitude of solving the problem has been beyond the collective financial means of the local agencies. In 1933 and 1935 requests for a preliminary examination recommending a full survey were submitted to the Seattle District of the Corps of Engineers. The basic law establishing the existing Federal flood control policy passed on June 22, 1936, authorized a preliminary examination and survey of the Green River Valley. A preliminary examination report was completed in 1937 and in June of 1938 the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army ordered a detailed survey. Studies of the project were suspended, however, during the war and were not resumed again until the past year. Many of the ideas originally advanced have now been reconsidered and revalued, resulting in a recommendation by Col. L. H. Hewitt, district engineer of the Corps of Engineers, for construction of a flood-control storage dam and reservoir at Eagle Gorge in the upper basin of Green River.

In estimating the flood-control benefits, it was assumed that the existing agricultural economy of that potentially rich valley would not change, except that with flood control more valuable crops could be grown. The principal project benefits, according to the engineer's report—those resulting from flood control—are, therefore, not based upon any speculative change in land utilization from agricultural to industrial use. Those of us in Seattle certainly recognize the possibility of extensive industrial expansion in the lower areas of this valley, however, which may in the future yield greater returns than those to be derived from agriculture. The current study of flood-control benefits has been made on the assumption that the agricultural economy will govern and, consequently, the relocation of the river for improved navigation purposes has not been recommended by the district engineer and will unquestionably be delayed for an indefinite time.

In connection with the Engineer's recommendations, public hearings were held to determine the wishes of local interests. At a hearing in Seattle on the 27th of February 1947, the Eagle Gorge Dam was presented as one of the possibilities for controlling floods in the Green River Valley. Represented at that hearing were all of the principal communities and many governmental agencies—the United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the United States Geological Survey, the State of Washington Department of Conservation and Development, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, the Seattle Engineer Department, and the King County engineer's office. All of these community and agency representatives voiced approval of a storage dam at the Eagle Gorge site.

I am happy to know that the project is well on its way toward realization. We should bear in mind, however, that in reality the project is still in an advanced planning stage and that it has not been reviewed by the Board of Engineers and Chief of Engineers in Washington and has not been adopted nor approved by the United State Congress. I am confident, however, that the Chief of Engineers will recommend it to the Congress and that the Congress will approve this project. After approval, a period of 5 years will be required before completion—2 years will be needed for more detailed site investigations, model studies, design of special features, and preparation of the final contract plans and specifications—3 years will probably be the minimum construction time—and allowing for normal congressional procedures, if everything goes forward from the time of recommendation and approval, the Eagle Gorge Dam could not be completed until at least 1955.

The total estimated cost of the project is $16,000,000, which includes the dam and all of its appurtenances—the reservoir lands, relocation of the Northern Pacific Railroad which presently cuts across the anticipated reservoir area, and relocation of other existing facilities. The total annual cost of the project including interest, amortization of the investment over a period of 50 years, and operation and maintenance expenses has been computed to be approximately $734,000. Of this amount, $80,000 is estimated for operation and maintenance and the remainder is for retirement of the investment.

The total benefits, as far as they can at this time be computed, will amount to approximately $819,000 annually. It is estimated that $465,000 annually will be derived by prevention of tangible flood damages; $314,000 is anticipated from increased agricultural returns, and the commercial estimates of benefits to be derived from the increased flow in the lower channel, which will result from the building of the dam and creation of a large reservoir, is estimated to be $40,000.

It is interesting to note that these computed benefits exceed the project costs by approximately $85,000 a year, without taking into account the benefits which may in the future be derived by changing the present land use from agricultural to industrial and the monetary benefit of any prospective future use of storage for municipal water supplies and irrigation. As I have already stated the primary purpose of the present project is flood control and the project works can be wholly justified by the resulting flood-control benefits alone. In this connection, I should like further to say that damages of large proportions have been suffered in this valley. The floods of 1933 and December of 1946 are the greatest that have occurred in recent times, although last year what was considered a more or less minor flood condition resulted in an estimated monetary loss of more than a million and a quarter dollars. The great flood of 1933 covered about 13,800 acres or more than 21 square miles. The flood in 1946 covered approximately 12,200 acres or nearly 19 square miles. Estimating these damages on a 1947 price basis the property damage and agricultural loss has been more than $3,000,000.

It is further interesting to recognize the present land use in the valley. Crops grown there are those largely associated with truck gardening—asparagus, beans, beets, cherries, table vegetables—although more than 6,000 acres are devoted to pasture and an additional 1,500 acres yearly lie in summer fallow.

[From the Seattle Times of March 14, 1948]

CITY'S INDUSTRIAL GROWTH FACES ONE LESS BARRIER

One of Seattle's most constructive community efforts to advance its industrial and manufacturing resources has taken a significant step forward in the favorable report of the Army engineers on the Green River flood control dam. Here is one answer to those who complain that little, or not enough, is being done to improve this city's industrial picture.

For one deterrent to industrial growth in this area has been the lack of sites suitable for establishment of large manufacturing plants. Land remaining adapted for such use lies to the south of the Green-Duwamish River Valley, where the danger of repeated floods and the winding course of the river hitherto have discouraged development.

This obstacle to industrial progress became apparent many years ago, and both the municipal government and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce sought to overcome it by advocating flood control measures in the Green River valley. It has taken long to bring this project to its present stage. It was necessary to convince United States Army engineers that the project is economically feasible, that its cost would be exceeded by the economic wealth it would later conserve and produce.

Chamber committees undertook to prove this point. In this they were aided by agencies of municipal government, notably by former City Engineer C. L. Wartelle—to whom much credit should go for furtherance of these plans—and to Mayor Devin's industrial development commission. It may be added that all this spadework has been constantly supported editorially by the Times.

As a result of this long endeavor, the Army engineers have now completed a favorable report. On the basis of the data presented to them from these several local sources, they have found the project economically feasible and recommended the construction of a $16,000,000 Green River Dam in Eagle Gorge.

Their report is in the hands of the Chief of Army engineers in Washington, D. C., and the problem now is to expedite its submission to Congress. The next step must be congressional authorization of a more detailed survey and preparation of plans. Beyond that, construction itself must be authorized and Congress must appropriate the required funds.

All this will take time and everything must be done to advance the several steps still to be accomplished. Within 5 years or so, the Columbia River Basin irrigation project will be approaching completion and the new settlement it will invite will provide new markets for manufactured goods. The Green River project must be completed by that time to make new room for the industry the Columbia Basin project will invite.

All the various agencies that have worked together toward this end must continue and redouble their efforts from this point on. Here is Seattle's main chance for industrial advancement.

The Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Evanston, Ill., March 11, 1948.

Hon. RALPH E. CHURCH,
Representative from Illinois, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: I am writing to urge that you use your influence in Congress to prevent a blunder in the settlement of the Palestine question.

The proposed partition of this nation by the United Nations against the will of the Arab population is one of the most outstanding attacks upon the principles of democracy that the postwar period has seen.

The United States is constantly proclaiming the merits of democracy, both at home

and abroad. Accordingly, it ill becomes this Nation to promote any proposals which are contrary to these principles.

Democracy means, of course, rule by the majority of the people, together with safeguards for freedom of speech, of the press, of religion, and the right of opposition parties to exist. In Palestine today, Arabs number at least two-thirds of the population. Thus to thrust down their throats a partition of their country is obviously a violation of the principle of rule by the majority.

By all standards of justice within the family of nations, the Arabs of Palestine should have been recognized as a state in the twenties, or at least as early as the recognition of Iraq in 1930. To hold them in pupilage while an unwelcome immigration policy was thrust upon them has been an international crime.

Furthermore, it would be a grievous mistake for the United States to participate in the sending of American troops to Palestine to enforce the proposed partition. American boys must not be sent to Asia Minor to enforce a travesty upon democracy.

I hope you use your influence to avoid these great mistakes.

With high regards and esteem, I am,

Faithfully yours,

KENNETH COLEGROVE,
Professor of Political Science.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Carlsbad Current-Argus for March 2, 1948:

MARSHALL PLAN

Events in Czechoslovakia and the current talk of a Finnish-Russian pact of friendship and mutual assistance point up more sharply than ever before the need for speed and positive action on the Marshall plan to aid Europe.

The events of the past 2 weeks have a disturbingly familiar look. They tend to show the developing pattern of world war III, and so far it is Soviet Russia that has been the architect of that pattern. As a result, Soviet aggression has encompassed an area much larger than that which was taken by Adolf Hitler at the height of his power.

It is evident that Russian aggression must somehow be stopped, short of war itself. The Marshall plan, as Senator VANDENBERG pointed out to the Senate yesterday, offers a method by which aggressive communism may be halted in western Europe. Marshall plan funds can do much to alleviate the misery and economic difficulty in which the numerous western European nations find themselves today. Communism thrives on despair and hunger, and desperate people of all nationalities will embrace it when nothing else offers them hope.

Objectors point to the cost of the Marshall plan. They tell us the billions of dollars we are about to expend on Europe will place too great a strain upon our own economy. Henry J. Taylor, writing in the Cosmopolitan magazine, says the price tag on the Marshall plan is $17,000,000,000, which means an annual load of $862 for every American family by 1951. Says he:

"The Marshall plan now in debate in Congress means—free to Europe—13,200 trainloads of coal, 11,800 trainloads of grains, 10,200 trainloads of meat, 4,900 trainloads of steel in the equivalent of steel ingots, 4,100 trainloads of fats and oils, 3,700 trainloads of sugar, 1,500 trainloads of cotton, 152,000 trucks, 26,000 freight cars, 200 more merchant ships in addition to the 800 we have already given away.

"It means $500,000,000 in free American electrical equipment, everything from powerhouses to punch drills; another $500,000,000 in new American oil refineries and pipe lines; $400,000,000 worth of American steel plants; $2,200,000 in oil, gasoline, and grease to be shipped free; $1,200,000,000 in iron and steel. Countless thousands of other items are involved. The shipments would begin at once * * *"

This may be true, but it is certain that the cost of European aid will nowhere come near the cost of another war in the appalling destruction of human life and property.

The Marshall plan is our only alternative to another war. Time is growing short. If Europe is to be saved from Russian aggression, the time for action is now. We hope Congress will cast aside party politics and partisan feeling for this one issue and come up with prompt and statesmanlike action to avert the growing danger of a third world war.

Palestine Split Called Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Ruth Colby, representing the International Union for Child Welfare, on March 5, in an address at Milwaukee, Wis., called the partitioning of Palestine one of the most serious political mistakes in our history. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal for March 5:

PALESTINE SPLIT CALLED ERROR—WOMAN WARNS UNITED STATES

Calling the partitioning of Palestine one of the most serious political mistakes in our history, Mrs. Ruth Gabe Colby, representing the International Union for Child Welfare, Thursday warned that the United States was alienating not only 50,000,000 Arabs but the entire Moslem world. Mrs. Colby had returned Tuesday to her home in St. Paul, Minn., after an 8-month tour to study the health of children in Europe, the Near East, and the Far East. She had been a consultant at the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations.

In an interview preceding her talk before the Wauwatosa Woman's Club, she urged reversal of the United Nations decision to partition Palestine and asked for the immediate passage of the Stratton bill, which would allow 400,000 displaced persons to enter the United States in the next 4 years.

NO SOLUTION, SHE SAYS

"Partitioning Palestine is no solution, for if we attempt to enforce it we will bring disaster not only to the Arabs and the Jews but upon all the western powers involved," she declared.

"There is still time to avert disaster if the UN will reverse its decision. If partitioning goes through, at least 8 or 10 nations will withdraw from membership, and the Security Council will be faced with the unpopular if not impossible task of raising an army for Palestine."

Mrs. Colby emphasized that there was no mistaking the intention of Arab leaders "to fight to the last man." Their hope of keeping the conflict local has little chance, as Russia is eagerly waiting to send in troops, she said.

According to Mrs. Colby, the Jews have been misled to believe that only in Palestine lies an opportunity for freedom from persecution. The tragedy of Zionism is that it wrongs not only the Arab people but the Jews as well, she said.

IMPROVEMENT FOR CHILDREN

Conditions for children have improved greatly in Palestine, Mrs. Colby reported. She contended that these efforts should not be lost through the "outrageous demands of one people for absolute sovereignty in a land which belongs to another people."

Before returning to the United States, Mrs. Colby stopped in India.

She said that the tragedy of India was the direct result of the partition and was similar to the situation in Palestine.

Mrs. Colby asked that club women write their Congressmen urging them to back the Stratton bill, that they write to Secretary Marshall asking that the State Department reverse its decision on Palestine and that they concern themselves more actively with the problems of suffering children abroad.

Strike of Cafeteria Workers' Union Should Be Wound Up by Forcing GSI To Yield to Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post has a pointed editorial on the strike of an all-Negro union against Government Services, Inc., which I want to endorse, underscore, and insert in the RECORD under leave.

The kindest thing I can find to say about the attitude of the quasi-Government corporation, GSI, is that their surrender to the union-busting tactics of the majority party of this Congress is incongruous with their position of trust.

All the trustees of GSI are Federal officials. It is their duty to make sure that the workers of the cafeteria have incomes and working conditions which can establish a decent American level of living. As I read the record, they have flagrantly failed to do so, and have lent themselves to a reprehensible union-breaking, wage-depressing campaign more than faintly tinged with race bias. It is time, as the Post says, to wind it up, and I pledge to do everything I can to that end.

The editorial follows:

WIND IT UP

It is utterly absurd that after nearly 11 weeks of bickering the Federal Government should still be unable to settle a strike in its own cafeterias involving a quasi-governmental corporation. Yet this is abundantly the case in the dispute between the CIO Cafeteria and Restaurant Workers and Government Services, Inc. Furthermore, it is

not the wholly private party, in this instance the union, but the corporation run by Government employees, that is now holding up settlement. GSI has turned down flatly a compromise proposed by Federal Conciliator George E. Strong, which was accepted by the union and was termed "reasonable" by Federal Works Administrator Fleming, in whose bailiwick the cafeterias fall. Thus there is the ludicrous spectacle of an organization chartered by the Government to serve Government workers flouting the expressed desire of President Truman to end the strike and rendering fruitless nearly a month of intensive effort by a Government-appointed conciliator.

General Fleming has taken the logical course in serving notice that he may have to end the GSI contract and provide for actual governmental operation of the 42 cafeterias in question. For a recalcitrant corporation should not be permitted any more than a recalcitrant union to thwart the needs of Federal employees for adequate cafeteria service. There are many ways in which GSI could be replaced, though, undoubtedly, there would be some technicalities as to disposition of GSI property in which the Government has an interest. One such means would be a new Government corporation specifically established by Congress to run Federal cafeterias. This, however, would take time, and a simpler way might be merely to accept bids from private companies, several of which have indicated their conviction that they could perform GSI's cafeteria functions more economically and efficiently. Perhaps the serious possibility of competition is precisely what is needed to bring GSI off its high horse.

Soil-Conservation Activities of the Texas Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Dr. Ide P. Trotter, director of the Texas Extension Service, together with other information about the early activities of both the research and extension division of the A. & M. College of Texas regarding soil conservation work. Dr. Trotter advises me that in the 1920's these field workers of the Extension Service were referred to by farmers more often as terracing agents than they were as county agents.

The matter referred to follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1948.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: We are happy to have your letter of March 15, in which you inquire about the early activities of both the research and extension divisions of the A. and M. College of Texas in connection with soil-conservation work. Three of the enclosures described below are copies of some of the reports and publicity which describe briefly the early pioneering in soil conservation work done by the A. and M. College of Texas. They will give you a very good picture of the work done prior to 1933 in both research and extension. The main enclosures accompanying this letter are:

1. A brief history of soil conservation activities of the Texas extension service prior to 1933, by M. R. Bentley, former extension farm engineer.

2. A copy of an article by Paul Franke which was carried in the Acco Press of March 1929.

3. A copy of an article from the September 1937 issue of the Texas Extension Farm News.

Since you inquired about the early work primarily, I am not including any data or material relating to similar work done in soil conservation during the past 15 years. However, I may say that the care and conservation of our soil has always been and still is a very vital part of our entire extension program. We are cooperating to the maximum with all farm organizations and with State and Federal agencies which are interested in such programs.

Texas county extension agents have played a major role in the organization of soil conservation districts and have cooperated in doing so with the Texas soil conservation board. When organization has been completed the county extension agents continue to work closely with the supervisors in the planning and carrying out of the district conservation programs.

We will be happy to give you any additional information you may desire. Please do not hesitate to call on us.

Very truly yours,

IDE P. TROTTER,
Director, Texas Extension Service.

FARM TERRACING HISTORY
(By M. R. Bentley, Extension agricultural engineer)

During the 30-year period preceding 1910 numerous fields, especially in East Texas, were terraced by farmers who moved to Texas from the Southeastern States. After the beginning of the farmer's cooperative demonstration work in 1903, up to about 1911, the field agents gave a few demonstrations of farm terracing, using the work of a few pioneering farmers as a guide to the methods of terracing. In 1911 an act of the State legislature provided the services of an engineer, employed in the civil engineering department of the college, to spend one-half of his time demonstrating terracing to farmers over the State while the other half of his time was devoted to teaching terracing at the college. At about the same time an agent of the farmer's cooperative demonstration work was sent to Mississippi to learn the best methods of terracing for the purpose of instructing other farm demonstration agents about terracing.

The first Texas bulletin on farm terracing was published in August 1912, with R. B. Pearce, instructor in farm terracing in the division of highway and rural engineering of the college, as the author.

With the official joining of the farmer's cooperative demonstration work with the A. and M. College in 1914, a terracing specialist was employed to assist county agents with terracing demonstrations over the State. Since 1914, a terracing specialist, now called extension agricultural engineer, has been employed by the extension service of the A. and M. College to assist with the terracing program.

Since the earliest participation of the college in terracing work in 1912, it has been closely allied with all progress in terracing work both with reference to the amount of work done as well as to the methods and standards adopted. The first available record of the acreage of land terraced per year is for the year 1916. Since then an estimate of the acreage terraced per year has been made.

Acreage terraced or contoured each year in Texas from 1916 to the present

1916	56,486
1917	130,930
1918	239,331
1919	120,966
1920	91,035
1921	130,362
1922	185,095
1923	230,520
1924	318,950
1925	409,745
1926	419,375
1927	494,093
1928	552,022
1929	609,055
1930	925,450
1931	1,031,888
1932	618,428
1933	604,386
Grand total through 1933	7,168,177

NOTE.—These figures are necessarily only estimates and quite likely there are some duplications. On the other hand, each year terracing is done in some counties having no county agents to report estimates, which to some extent will offset probable excesses in estimates due to reporting the reterracing of some areas.

Some terracing has been done in 221 of the 254 counties of Texas. Without referring to the records of the teaching departments of the college, I believe that since the special provision of the legislature in 1911 for the teaching of terracing in the college, that some kind of a course in terracing has been available to students ever since.

On the A. and M. college property, terraces were built on the animal-husbandry farm east of the old horse barn (the site now occupied by the Administration Building) in January of 1916. This was probably the first terracing of any of the college farm. Other fields and pastures of the college land have since been terraced from time to time until now much of the original college farm has been terraced.

DOWN THE BRAZOS TO THE SEA
(By Paul Franke)

All along the Brazos Valley the word is passed, "Get out of the bottoms; the river is over the levee." The message electrifies the countryside. Everywhere there is gross disorder. Hurriedly things are staked down; an attempt is made to round up the livestock; a last minute scramble for valuables. * * * Then the water comes. Trees crash. The torrent growls. A house floats by * * *. And again an angry, swollen river has taken its toll of promising field crops, of hopelessly disorganized plantations, of drowned livestock, of tenants missing in the flood. * * *

It is summer. A prolonged drouth has wilted the crops in the upper watershed of the Brazos to a lifeless yellow. Everything is parched. * * * At last comes a welcome rain—a hard, driving rain of over an inch. Everyone is jubilant because now the thirsty soil will be saturated. * * * But upon examination it is found that moisture has penetrated the ground only a few inches. "I thought that was a heavy rain," everyone says. "Where did all the water go?" they ask. It went down the Brazos to the sea at the rate of 10,000 cubic feet per second valued (according to California and Texas irrigation estimates) at the astounding sum of $1,300,000,000 annually. * * *

A farmer is looking over his farm in West Texas. He notices that even his gentlest slopes are creased with deep gullies. "I'm going to have to do something about those," he observes. "They're getting deeper every

year. Looks like a good bit of dirt is washed away with each rain." It is; a lot more, in fact, than he realizes. If all the top-soil that each year washes down all the rivers of Texas could be recovered, there would be enough to cover 120,000 acres 1 foot deep.

All these things had long been known to A. B. Conner, director, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station. And, what was more, the situation seemed to be getting worse. A prominent Brazos County farmer and merchant is reported recently to have told this story at a banquet: "I have operated the same Brazos Valley farm for 25 years that my father before me farmed for 30 years. Although I believe I am a better farmer than he was, I lost money where he made money. The reason, gentlemen, is that he suffered only three floods in 30 years as compared to 15 in my 25 years."

Why this increase? The yearly records of rainfall show no trend of change in precipitation. That can leave but one answer: The water now comes down the river faster than it did in former years; and the reason it does is due to deforestation and cultivation of the great grasslands of the upper watershed—those obstacles designed by Nature to check the rush of water.

Why not build great dams and reservoirs, students of the situation argued, that would not only hold the water in check but also leave it available for return to the farmer via the irrigation ditch?

Why not, countered Mr. Conner, go a step closer home and hold the rainfall on the land to begin with? Why give it away and then buy it back? A plausible idea.

But Mr. Conner is a practical scientist, not a theorist. He wants to know the how and why of things by actual test and not by supposition. So he decided to start a series of soil-erosion and water-conservation experiments in order to arrive definitely at the fact of the matter.

For a time he was hampered by lack of funds, but finally, when he found available for his use a scant $15,000, he set out to the Spur substation to work out the details of the experiment with R. E. Dickson, his superintendent there.

Upon investigation he and Mr. Dickson discovered that, as far as they knew, no such experiments had ever been attempted before. All the information of value they were able to assemble was got from certain terracing experiments that had been conducted in North Carolina and Missouri.

With practically nothing to guide them, they bought the most modern and accurate of weather and water-measuring instruments and went to work. That was in 1926.

Two types of experiments were decided upon: One, to determine the amount of water run-off and soil erosion; the other, to find out the effect of water conservation on growing crops.

The equipment for the first consisted of a number of small control plats of one-twentieth of an acre area, graded to varying slopes (level, 1, 2, and 3 percent fall), and planted to different crops and grass or left fallow. At the lower end of each plat was a covered concrete pit into which the water and silt could wash, so that after each rain the run-off could be measured and the silt oven-dried and weighed.

The results were astonishing. They showed that at the end of the first year, during which time 25.30 inches of rain had fallen, that on a barren and uncultivated plat with a slope of 2 feet per hundred the washing of oven-dried soil was 41 tons per acre. Other plats eroded to a lesser degree, depending upon the crop; grass lost the least, 11 tons.

During this same period the water run-off on the naked plat was computed to be 44 percent, or 11 inches, which is in itself almost sufficient to grow a crop of milo in west Texas. During one exceptionelly hard rain of 1.6 inches, on July 9, the run-off loss ranged on the different plats from 85 to 93 percent, leaving a moisture in the soil of less than one-fourth of an inch. When it is considered that 25 percent of the rainfall in west Texas comes in scattered showers and is therefore lost by evaporation, the significance of this run-off becomes more apparent.

The second set of experiments were carried on in a 150-acre cotton patch divided into field plats of 10 acres each. On these plats various obstacles (contour rows, terraces of different fall, and dikes) were constructed to determine the best way of holding the water and the subsequent effect on the yield of crops.

The results here were as surprising as those of the control plats. They disclosed that the rainfall could be completely retained and that on plats that were contour terraced and surrounded by dikes the yield was increased by 283 pounds of lint cotton per acre or 40 percent over the plats with no terraces and with rows running downhill.

Innumerable details and figures have been purposely omitted from this article to prevent its becoming too technical and unreadable. Only the high points of the experiments were touched upon; only the widest contrasts drawn. Though the startling facts unearthed by Mr. Conner and his associates are valuable in the extreme, they are as yet incomplete because they have not been carried over a sufficient period of years to strike accurate conclusions.

They have, however, definitely established that:

1. Enormous quantities of valuable water runs off the lands of west Texas with each rain.

2. That this water is of sufficient quantity to cause serious flood damage along the major streams :

3. That an unwarranted amount of sheet washing is rapidly wasting our land.

4. That this erosion carries with it a real danger of causing serious silting trouble in the larger rivers.

5. That erosion and water run-off can be controlled to the benefit of the upper watershed and lower river bottom alike.

As the Associated Press sees it, Mr. Conner and his staff have taken a decided step forward in the conservation of the two very vital resources of agriculture—moisture and soil. It is distinctly a feather in the hat of the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.

Appreciation is also due Congressman JAMES P. BUCHANAN, of Brenham, whose influence was largely responsible for the passage of a bill in Congress creating a Federal appropriation of $160,000 for the carrying on of this noteworthy work. We understand from reliable sources that two more experiments (one in the Gulf coast section, the other in east Texas) are to be conducted in this State.

With stations established in the principal soil regions of the country, studying and testing different terraces, cropping systems and other practices necessary to hold the water and the fertility on the land, the farmer, wherever he may be, will have available a store of information to more intelligently and profitably guide him in his farming operations.

[From Extension Service Farm News, College Station, Tex., September 1937

ARGUMENT STARTED CONSERVATION PROGRAM, SAYS DICKSON

On a very hot day in July 1925 there was a heated discussion between 18 county agricultural agents who were gathered together on the W. F. Shugart farm 8 miles west of Spur, Tex. The discussion was led by John T. Eagan who, at that time, was an extension-district agent of a group of counties in the lower plains region. There was not a man present who would have predicted that the discussion would set in motion the national soil and water conservation program that is now sweeping the country.

AGENTS DISCUSSED TYPES OF TERRACES NEEDED

The subject for that discussion centered around the type of terraces needed in Northwest Texas. No two agents had the same idea of terrace construction, but nearly all of them did agree that terraces, in order to be satisfactory, had to give off an orderly discharge of water.

There were two individuals in the group who were difficult to convince because they had their own definite ideas both in what they had to say and the things they were doing in their own counties. Ed. L. Tanner of Fisher county and John Carmichael of Scurry county were building level terraces. Tanner had built level terraces around sandy knolls in his county that had held all of the water. They were complete rings around the hills, and as he expressed it at the meeting, "The water goes into the ground instead of over the top of the terrace." This statement brought long, loud laughter, and the fight was on.

DISCUSSION BECAME OVERHEATED

The discussion on correct terracing practices became overheated. John T. Eagan turned to a representative of the Texas Experiment Station, an innocent bystander, and asked, "Why can't the experiment stations get this information for us?"

A conference was held at College Station 2 weeks later at the time of the annual farmer's short course with A. B. Conner, director of the Texas Experiment Station, presiding. Plans were made to secure the information requested by Eagan and his 18 county agricultural agents.

RESEARCH AND EXTENSION WORK ARE NOT NEW

This was not the beginning of terracing; it was not the beginning of research. History of ancient agriculture reveals that both research and extension work date back to prehistoric days. With thousands of trained men working on the various phases of the problem of soil and water conservation today, little is being revealed that was not recorded in history, although much was temporarily forgotten. It was the new start on the old problem, however, that has carried through until it now touches practically every American farmer, and is recognized by people in all walks of life as one of the most vital problems confronting the Nation.

The information secured by the Experiment Station during the first 2 years, 1926 and 1927, was startling. It was evident that much could be done, not only in the conservation of soil but in the practical use of rain water as well. Erosion came to a standstill under certain field practices, and crop yields went skyward. The largest rainfall in the history of the station occurred in 1926. All the water that fell on closed level terraces was soaked into the ground. Increased yields were noted not only during 1926 but in the comparatively dry year of 1927.

LARGEST COTTON YIELDS NOT MADE IN WET YEARS

Statistics recorded at the Spur experiment station during the past 20 years show that the largest cotton yields have been made in years following wet years, not in the wet years themselves. This information, together with data secured from the control plats and field areas, all points definitely to the benefits to be derived from the storing of large amounts of water in the ground many months before it is to be used by the growing crops. Rains during the growing period of crops are too frequently accompanied or followed by insect depredations, excessive

plant growth, vigorous weed growth, excessive costs of operation, and hail damage. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the value of preseasonal storage of water in the soil.

BUCHANAN SHOWED INTEREST IN RESULTS

The story of the experiment station findings was told throughout Texas wherever a group interested in farming was gathered. One who showed a great interest in the results was Congressman J. P. BUCHANAN, a good friend of the A. and M. College, and a man enthusiastically interested in Texas agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS INCREASED AND WORK PROGRESSED

In talking with Director Conner, BUCHANAN became convinced that the same studies that were proving so worthwhile for Texas would be of value to the whole country. He introduced a bill into the National Congress in 1928 which carried an appropriation of $165,000 to establish experiment stations at several places in the United States similar to the ones in Texas. These funds were allotted to the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, Bureau of Public Roads, and the Forestry Service. Cooperative work was done between the three divisions.

Preserve Our Railroads for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, the following speech given by Mr. Robert R. Young at the first anniversary dinner of the Federation for Railway Progress, on February 24, 1948, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York:

In celebrating this first birthday of the Federation for Railway Progress, let it be solemnly noted that in this atomic age the railroads may mean more to the Nation's safety than either our Army or Navy.

If we play our cards right, we need never have another war. But the fact remains that twice before we started moving toward distant war and both times we got there.

In the Civil War we learned at first hand that war is hell. This time we will not only learn that war is hell but that hell is thoroughly up to date. Unfortunately, our railroads are not.

City or hamlet, we are fed and warmed by the daily flow of freight cars. Drop 10 bombs on Russia and 90 percent of her far-flung population would go on about their everyday business unaffected and unaware. Let 10 railroad centers in America suffer the same fate and the hungry and panic-stricken will descend upon our farms and villages like a cloud of locusts.

Why then have our railroads, the backbone of our military might, been allowed to decay? Shippers of lumber and grain even now are unable to get cars when needed. Scarcity and price rises result.

Twenty years ago when we were a much smaller Nation and without far-reaching obligations, we had over 2,000,000 freight cars. Now we have only three-quarters as many. Some are over 40 years old. How good is any machine after 40 years of daily use?

With passenger cars the situation is as bad. Twenty years ago we had nearly 50,000 fairly new coaches and pullmans. Now we have little more than half as many. Some are over 50 years of age. They were built to be junked long ago—not to run on and on like the one hoss shay.

Since 1932, a new generation has grown up to be provided for and in those 16 years our railroads have bought less than 200 new passenger cars a year—not one-third as many as had to be junked during those same years.

Only 176 passenger cars were ordered last year by all the 132 railroads in the United States—an average of less than two for each railroad. At this rate it will take 150 years to replace the fleet. Do the railroad presidents intend to run these clanking cars another 150 years?

Decay thus breeds on itself, for under miserly buying the price of a single Pullman car has risen to 100 times that of an automobile. These shiftless buyers now refuse to pay these prices so that it is doubtful that even 176 cars will be ordered during this current year.

The collapse of the American rail passenger service therefore seems as clearly predictable as the mortality tables of an insurance company. Will that dread day be a red-letter day for some totalitarian foe?

The Senate and House Military Affairs Committees, under Republican leadership, know the foregoing facts thoroughly. Yet, they devote their time to arming South American revolutionists, Chinese Nationalists, and to rockets to the moon.

More than 3 years ago, when Government action under the antitrust laws forced the Pullman Co. up for sale, some of us who founded the Federation for Railway Progress offered to buy it and to replace every rolling tenement in its fleet with new private bedroom cars at a cost of more than $500,000,000. Such an order would have permitted volume production at low cost. The railroads would have had to pay no more in rental for the new sleeping-car equipment we offered than they now pay for the old. We would have promoted low-cost travel on a huge scale. Cruise trains would be making the rounds of our national parks. Is it not better to increase employment and spend well-earned vacations in the culture and education of travel than to encourage idleness on relief?

Our proposal was, nevertheless, deliberately blocked by Pullman and the railroads in three-cornered collaboration with the Interstate Commerce Commission. Pullman has long been dominated by the J. P. Morgan bank. The president of the Morgan bank, with all his adverse interests, also sits on the board of the New York Central and fixes its policies, just as the New York Central and the Pennsylvania in turn fix the policies of the Association of American Railroads. And the Association of American Railroads, through its great lobby, exerts influence upon the appointments, policies, and decisions of the ICC.

Despite our far better offer, which had the sympathy of the President of the United States and the friendly intervention of the Department of Justice, the decaying Pullman Co. passed over into a parallel rut deeper than ever—into virtually the same hands previously found to have been illegally in control.

Yet, the ICC was created by Congress away back in 1887, in the days of Rockefeller and of secret rebates, to see that competition, as guaranteed by our Constitution, was preserved in our railroads. That move was promptly countered by Morgan, the elder, who ordered the leading railway presidents into his library and placed upon their necks the yoke of a secret agreement to eliminate competition. That struggle between the people on the one hand and monopoly on the other went on through the decades—Morgan always winning. Not until 1938 was the tide turned when some of us now in the Federation for Railway Progress succeeded in establishing over the heads of the railway presidents the principle of competitive bidding for new issues of securities. That broke the Morgan banking monopoly, opened the business up to other bankers seeking to compete and will go on saving the public and the railroads hundreds of millions of dollars.

The strangulation of competition, as repugnant to honest business as it is to the people, endangers us in many directions. For example, a full quarter of all American exports and imports move through New York Harbor, when other great ports have been made to get along with less than 1 percent. This disproportion has continued through two periods of submarine warfare as well as in peacetime. During World War I, New York's share of all exports reached the astounding figure of 54 percent. Is that why transportation in that war broke down?

Is it desirable to have 25 times the concentration of freight and equipment at New York as at Boston, Charleston, or Savannah when a single atomic bomb might put New York out of business? Does this congestion in New York stem directly from the secret agreement entered into back in 1894 between the Pennsylvania, and the New York Central to protect each other in their traffic against all other railroads? Was it also this agreement—plus the agreement of all other railroads not to compete—which made it so tough for us to get trains through Chicago? Does this monopoly power also account for a mysterious lot of other things, foreign and domestic, about which I wish I had more time to tell you—a power which, no matter how it is attacked by a conscientious and vigorous Department of Justice seems to end up always with a few new seats in the Cabinet.

The ICC has again come to the aid of the railroad cartel by urging upon Congress the railroad-inspired Bulwinkle bill. This bill would enable the railroads to do legally exactly what they have been doing illegally continuously since the meeting in Morgan's library back in 1889—to conspire not to do such things as to install air conditioning or to buy new equipment. Under competition we can expect to get at least one new idea a year from each and every one of our 132 railroads. With only 132 new ideas a year we should have rapid progress. Under the Bulwinkle bill the standard of service of all the members of the AAR can continue to be kept down to the level of the least willing—to that of some Toonerville trolley.

Fortunately the Department of Justice, under Mr. Clark, who is our honored guest here tonight, is opposed to the Bulwinkle bill, and I am hopeful that if it should ever be passed under the powerful sponsorship that it has, President Truman will veto it.

Most railroads, working together in their backwardness, have also dealt negatively with their human assets. Few people know that it was the railroad presidents, dictated to from above, who by industry-wide resistance to progress in working conditions, forced labor defensively, clause by clause, into its feather-bedding demands.

The Federation for Railway Progress proposes to work with labor for such positive goals as—

(a) rapid promotion on merit;

(b) fair and prompt settlement of grievances;

(c) a guaranteed annual wage;

(d) better living conditions for employees when away from home; and

(e) as rapidly as conditions can be made to permit, longer vacations and shorter hours.

With a few noteworthy progressive exceptions, 132 railroad executive staffs are saddled on this country's shippers. If competitive independence can be restored to even a few more of these men it almost certainly will mean a resumption of consolidation. Consolidation of 100 or more weak, noncompeting roads into 15 or 20 great, aggressive, long-haul systems will, by making them financially stronger, enable them to restore hundreds of

discontinued passenger schedules and to run more and faster freight trains. Labor, shippers, travelers, and security holders all will benefit.

President Truman, just a few weeks ago, in his economic report to Congress, said:

"Railroad consolidation * * * though it has shown but little progress after nearly thirty years of study and effort, offers such possibilities of convenience and economy that it should be steadily pursued."

This Nation became great because, as in no other land, every man and his business was free to progress on merit—unrestrained by monopoly, by custom, by class or by oppressive government. Only under the divine spark of competition will man and his works continue to raise themselves on up from the dust. The insistence upon that principle in our railroads will afford this Nation a far greater measure of protection against the threatening populations of the world than will a shrinking, non-competitive transportation system controlled by adverse interests.

To sum up, if we are to meet the transportation needs of peace, much less war, there are four things the Federation for Railway Progress through public opinion must continually stress:

1. The nutrition of our railroads with adequate rates.
2. Their liberation from the chains of non-competitive agreements.
3. The immediate replacement of all outworn equipment, and
4. A positive and progressive attitude toward labor.

This four point program, nutrition, competition, new equipment, and the upbuilding of employee morale, will restore our railroads to the position they once held—that of the greatest and most progressive industry in the most respected Nation in the world.

Then, but not until then, can we sleep in peace.

Texas National Guard Armory Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS*
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the urgent need for providing armories for our National Guard units which are such a necessary and vital part of our national defense system. The State of Texas has a postwar troop allotment of over 30,000 National Guard officers and men which is three times the allotment it had prior to World War II. Texas needs only about 5,000 National Guard men for its own local security.

The Honorable Beauford Jester, Governor of Texas, has recently advised me of the necessity of securing an adequate number of armories in which to train these troops. Inasmuch as a vast majority of these troops are being maintained for the common defense of the United States, the Federal Government should provide for the construction of armories to properly train these men.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4253 if enacted into law would adequately take care of the needs of the National Guard in all of our States. I respectfully urge the leadership of the House of Representatives to expedite the enactment of H. R. 4253.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Gov. Beauford Jester's letter to me regarding the National Guard armory situation in Texas together with some additional information furnished me by Maj. Gen. K. L. Berry, adjutant general of Texas:

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Tex., March 9, 1948.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The State of Texas, in order to cooperate with the Federal Government in providing an adequate national defense, accepted in 1945 a National Guard troop allotment of some 30,000 officers and men. This number is far greater than is needed in this State for local security and is three times the allotment prior to World War II.

The allotment of approximately 10,000 prior to World War II was roughly twice the number needed for local security, and the excess was maintained purely for common defense and on a basis of equity and justice the Federal Government should have borne the cost of providing housing (armories) for the excess. This was never done.

Under the Approved War Department Policies of October 13, 1945, affecting the National Guard of the United States, it was provided that the Federal Government would bear its equitable share of the cost of providing armories. This provision of the policies has never been implemented by law. With the National Guard now far in excess of its strength, both in units and numerical strength, prior to World War II, it is imperative that the National Government keep its promise made in the approved policies, and start an adequate armory construction program.

In Texas we are finding it extremely difficult to reorganize our greatly increased National Guard purely because of lack of armories. We are forced to use cow barns, old and dilapidated sheds of various descriptions and badly deteriorated army installations which are in many cases up to 15 to 20 miles from town. In many cases we use the sheriff's office or a jail cell to store our small arms because the armory building is not safe for storage of such articles.

Neither are such buildings an aid to our recruitment. Members of the Guard have no pride in such facilities nor will prospective recruits join an organization where such eye sores are used as armories.

You are aware that in our great State business is so flourishing that it is impossible to compete in the open market for adequate buildings—buildings which a unit can be proud of. Pride is one of the great driving forces of mankind and a Texan just won't belong to something of which he cannot be proud.

There is now in the Senate a bill, Senate bill 1646, introduced by Senator GURNEY of South Dakota, and in the House H. R. 4253, introduced by Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Either of these bills or a consolidation of them would be acceptable to the State of Texas.

It seems that these bills are being held up pending the report of the Gray board. The armory situation in Texas is critical and it is felt that these bills should be acted upon now. To wait until the Gray report is received will in all probability delay things until next year and the armories are needed now. I feel that as far as the Gray board is concerned the armory program will be noncontroversial. Certainly if we are to have a National Guard of the United States of 682,000, we must have armories.

This matter of providing armories for our National Guard, the largest fighting M-day force in our armed forces, is by far the most important matter facing the National Guard today with the single exception of the appropriations for the fiscal year 1949.

On behalf of the Texas National Guard and our scheme of national defense, I urge you to give this matter of adequate Federal aid in an armory-construction program your active and immediate attention by securing early favorable action on either S. 1646 or H. R. 4253.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I remain,

Most sincerely yours,

BEAUFORD JESTER,
Governor of Texas.

TEXAS NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY SITUATION—JANUARY 1948

(By Maj. Gen. K. L. Berry, adjutant general of Texas)

It has been said that Texas is 47th among the 48 States in State-owned National Guard armories. Whatever its relative national standing the armory situation viewed in the light of local organizational problems is far from encouraging. The problems of personnel and supplies hamper the prompt and complete organization of the Texas National Guard when they are dependent on attractive and efficient armory facilities to house them.

Texas has accepted allocation of 288 National Guard units. The 190 units federally recognized today are housed in warehouses, second stories, barns, and stables in county fair grounds, American Legion halls, obsolete city and county facilities such as old city halls and jails, Quonset huts, and in a few cases some nearby Army camps and air fields. Generally these Federal facilities are much too far from town to attract new recruits, or full attendance when recruited.

The State of Texas owns all or part of the grounds and buildings of only four National Guard installations. Camp Mabry, at Austin, is the home of the USP & DO and part of the clerical staff of the adjutant general. Parts of Camp Hulen at Palacios, and Camp Wolters, at Mineral Wells, are used by National Guard units. The Light Guard armory in Houston, built about 25 years ago, is thoroughly adequate in every way except that it is now in a residential area and has no training grounds at all. That's the crop.

In 1947, the State legislature, which meets every 2 years, appropriated the small sum of $328,918 to the National Guard Armory Board for armory maintenance and rentals for the State fiscal year ending August 31, 1948. The amount was increased to $392,972 for the fiscal year ending August 31, 1949. This increase is intended to provide for the increase in number of units expected by that time. This is an average of $360,945 per year, or 7.2 percent of the national figure of $500,000,000 estimated by Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, as the State's total capital investment in armories, hangars, etc.

The State appropriation bill specifically prohibited the use of any of this money for construction. Actually it has been expended largely for security measures required by the Departments of the Army and Air Force to properly safeguard Government property. The Amory Board continually has representatives on the road making inspections of unit storage space, and trying to locate such space for new local guard units. At the present time there are 15 or 20 potential units, with the officers and men required for Federal recognition, which cannot get authorization to organize because there is no place to house them.

Perhaps the greatest success Texas has recently been having in providing armories for its National Guard units is the Quonset hut arrangement. If a community will construct a Quonset hut armory, consisting of cement floor and Quonset walls and roof, the Armory Board will pay a monthly rental for its use. It is hoped that these rentals may be applied to the building cost, and that eventually the property may be deeded to the State.

Some 25 communities have been or are now negotiating on this proposition. When, as and if an adequate armory is ever erected in the community, this Quonset hut will become a subsidiary facility to it. At present, a single unit hut is 40 feet wide and 120 feet long. After deducting 20 feet in front for offices, and 20 feet in back for supply rooms, the result is a room 40 feet by 80 feet, which can only be used for classrooms, demonstrations, etc. Ten have been built to date.

The cost of constructing one of these Quonset huts is about $14,000. Multiply this figure by the 25 communities which expect to adopt this method and we have a $350,000 possible contribution by the communities, or 7 percent of the national figure. Add this to the average annual State appropriation and we get $710,945, or 12 percent of the national figure. If this were matched by $2 Federal money for each $1 State money, Texas would have nearly $2,500,000 for its armory facilities.

Three obvious deductions may be made from these figures. First, the amount of community money to be expended is problematical. Second, the State appropriations will not build new armories until at least September 1949, if then. Third, Texas does not need for its own protection the 30,110 troops allocated to it. They were accepted in the interest of national security and the Federal Government should in all fairness match the State's contribution for armories by several dollars to each State dollar.

This is the Texas National Guard armory situation today and for 2 years to come—unless something is done. There are several bills now before the Congress, the gist of which is that the Federal Government will spend $500,000,000 at the rate of $50,000,000 a year for 10 years to build armories. The Texas delegation in the Congress should be advised forcefully to support this legislation—to get it out of committee, onto the floor and see that it is passed.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 16, 1948:

TOOTHLESS

Virtually the only remaining resemblance between genuine rent control and what is provided in the extension bill brought forth by the House Banking and Currency Committee is in the name. The House committee seems to have seized upon the weaknesses in the bill passed by the Senate and set out to enlarge them. The most serious is the proviso whereby local boards would be given almost complete authority to raise or decontrol rents irrespective of recommendations of the Housing Expediter. This is only a subtle way of saying that the rent control extension is no control at all. We agree with the protest of Representative MONRONEY: "It is the most sweeping and radical change ever made in rent controls * * *. In effect it grants Federal powers to local boards without any real standards. It could lead to evictions for hundreds of thousands of tenants and raise rents of millions."

In nullifying the authority of the Housing Expediter to approve or reject local rent increases, the bill would remove the last vestige of a unified approach to the housing emergency. For even the most conscientious of local rent control boards would be left to flounder in a sea of contentions without any guideposts for its action. Moreover, such a condition is almost tailor-made for domination by property interests. Indeed, this is precisely what has happened already in some areas, and the only saving grace is the veto now held by the Housing Expediter. Not only would the House bill knock out this veto, but it also would make a complete farce of rent control enforcement.

This is a case in which the theoretical desirability of local autonomy is outweighed by a host of practical objections, the principal of which is the field day it would provide for the organized campaigns of the real estate boards. For there is no more logic in opening the door to discrimination against all tenants than there is in regarding all landlords as a group of money-grabbers. In point of fact, the purpose of rent control is to strike a mean and protect the essential interests of both sides in an emergency situation which Congress, in its failure to enact positive housing legislation, has done precious little to alleviate. We hope that Members of the House anxious to represent all their constituents will reject the one-sided effort of their committee and establish a balance. They could do this by accepting the Senate rent control bill as a basis and concentrating on broadening appeal procedures on behalf of landlords and strengthening enforcement provisions on behalf of tenants.

Mr. Truman's Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the following text of a broadcast made over the ABC network by Mr. Tris Coffin on March 16, the night before Mr. Truman's message to Congress:

Congress—on the eve of President Truman's address to the joint session—is restless and disturbed. The Democrats are uneasy and angry.

After the Democrat Senators met behind closed doors this morning, their leader, ALBEN BARKLEY, grimly faced reporters. He was not in his usual jocular mood. He was asked of the Senators' reaction to the President's message.

BARKLEY replied stiffly, "The President has not informed us of the contents of his message."

Across the Capitol friends of Representative SAM RAYBURN, the House Democratic leader, were loud with complaint. They said, "This is a heck of a way for the President to act. Why doesn't he consult his own elected congressional leaders. We don't know what he's going to do. He may put us on the spot. He's aroused almost a hysteria, and we don't have the answers on the Hill."

At the Democratic National Committee, Chairman McGrath and his aides said lamely they had no information.

Behind the closed doors of the Senate caucus some stormy lines were spoken. BARKLEY pleaded for his colleagues not to prejudge the President before his message. The Kentucky Senator said he assumed Mr. Truman would ask for vastly increased military appropriations and this might mean no tax cut would be possible.

From other sources I learned that Mr. Truman is likely to start his talk painting a gloomy picture of the world, and then go down the line for a whopping budget for the armed services and either universal military training or selective service.

There are three explanations for the White House secrecy and the deliberate building of a crisis by the administration.

The first, or most charitable, is that the United States is throwing its stiffest punch in the game of psychological warfare with Russia. It is to scare the daylights out of the Russians and thus prevent any funny business in Italy, Greece, Trieste, or Germany within the next 30 days. In other words, keep the Red army or satellite troops from going on the rampage. If, at the same time, the American public is worried stiff, that is an unfortunate casualty of the battle of words.

There is no question that the State Department has its fingers crossed on Russian moves in the Mediterranean area. Our experts do not, and I repeat, do not, believe that Russia is ready or equipped to fight a war. If the Russians are convinced any flexing of the muscles and overrunning so-called allied areas will bring on war, they will stop. That is the view of the State Department. This, according to one view, is the reason for scary build-up of crisis.

Actually, to get down to brass tacks, there has not been any unforeseen crisis in the past 6 weeks. Czechoslovakia was a dead dodo—so far as any democratic opposition to Russia is concerned—since the end of the war. The cruel Communist coup in Czechoslovakia might have been held off or tempered, but the Russians began to get itchy fingers when the tension between east and west mounted.

The other view of Mr. Truman's actions is popular on the Hill. It is that the President has come completely under the domination of the military brass, and is being used to start their drive for appropriations and UMT.

The third, and most cynical, outlook is that the President is manufacturing a crisis to cinch his reelection. I frankly don't believe this.

Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that a national council of 100 outstanding Americans have organized themselves into a Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land.

The announced purposes of this committee are:

First. To bring peace with justice to the Holy Land.

Second. To further the best interests of all Jews, Christians, and Moslems in the Near and Middle East.

Third. To foster friendly relations among the peoples of the three faiths throughout the world.

Fourth. To strengthen the United Nations.

A partial list of the distinguished personnel of this committee appears below:

The secretary of the organization is the Reverend Garland Evans Hopkins, associate foreign secretary of the Methodist Church.

Members of the national council included the Reverend Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister emeritus, Riverside Church, New York; Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, of Baltimore; the Reverend Dr. Henry Pitney Van Deusen, president, Union Theological Seminary; Earl Bunting, chairman of the board, National Association of Manufacturers; Dr. Paul Hutchinson, editor, The Christian Century; William Ernest Hocking, professor emeritus, Harvard University.

Also Harold Lamb, author; Representative Lawrence H. Smith, Republican, of Wisconsin; the Reverend Dr. Wynn C. Fairfield, general secretary, Foreign Missions Conference of North America; the Reverend Dr. Albert E. Day, pastor, Mount Vernon Place Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore; Dr. George W. Sadler, foreign secretary, Southern Baptist Convention; Nelson V. Russell, president, Carroll College; Walter A. Groves, president, Centre College; the Reverend Dr. Fred Field Goodsell, executive vice president, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; Dr. Herrick B. Young, secretary, Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church, United States of America.

Also, Dr. Bayard S. Dodge, president emeritus, American University of Beirut; Dr. John A. Wilson, director of the Oriental Institute, University of Chicago; Dr. Walter L. Wright, Jr., professor of Oriental languages, Princeton University; the Reverend Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, dean emeritus, Drew Theological Seminary; Dr. Allen O. Whipple, clinical director, Memorial Hospital, New York; Dr. Ralph Cooper Hutchinson, president, Lafayette College.

Also, the Reverend Dr. Charles T. Bridgeman, Trinity Church, New York; Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, professor of geology, Harvard University; Carroll Binder, editorial-page editor, the Minneapolis Star-Journal; Harold H. Fisher, chairman, Hoover Institute; and Gloria M. Wysner, secretary, Foreign Missions Conference of North America.

I have just received a letter from the Honorable Garland Evans Hopkins, associate secretary to the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church and also secretary to the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land. Mr. Hopkins has written me in part as follows:

BOARD OF MISSIONS AND CHURCH EXTENSION OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
New York, N. Y., March 13, 1948.

The Honorable ED GOSSETT,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GOSSETT: I think it is quite significant that Christian groups, both in Palestine and America, with the exception of a few unofficial committees, are opposed to the partition of Palestine. On February 11 the Committee on Work Among Moslems, the interdenominational group carrying on Protestant work in the Near East, addressed the following letter to President Truman:

"On January 19 the Committee on Work Among Moslems addressed a telegram to you, as follows: 'The Committee on Work Among Moslems of the Foreign Missions Conference strongly urges the continuance of the embargo on arms to the Middle East.'

"Because of the special interests of this committee in Palestine and our deep concern for conditions there, and because, as American citizens, we are aware of the important part which the United States must play in all decisions of the United Nations regarding that country, we send to you for your careful consideration an additional resolution of the committee as follows:

" 'The Committee on Work Among Moslems views with deep concern the growing chaos, hatred, and disillusionment in Palestine resulting from the action of the United Nations to partition Palestine. Since the United States is committed, through the United Nations, to the policy "to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion," we call upon our Government to take steps, even at this late date, to see that this policy is carried out in Palestine.'

"Considering the fact that the Arabs constitute a majority of the population of Palestine, we believe that they have been unjustly treated in the arbitrary partitioning of that country in spite of their protests. We further believe that false hopes have been raised for Jews entering Palestine. Many of them have previously been victims of anti-Jewish atrocities elswhere, and it is exceedingly unwise to lead them to believe that a Jewish state in Palestine, with aggrieved neighbors on its borders, will solve their problems.

"Yours respectfully,
"GLORIA M. WYSNER, *Secretary,*
"Committee on Work Among Moslems."

That this viewpoint is shared by the Christians of Palestine is quite obvious from an Associated Press release appearing in the New York Post and the Home News, Wednesday, March 3, 1948. I am enclosing a reprint of the article.

On March 5, 1948, the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, which is composed of the representatives of 126 denominational Boards of Foreign Missions and which represents the great majority of American Protestants, passed the following resolution:

"The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, viewing with deep concern the growing strife in Palestine, yet recognizing the intricate political character of the question, urges that, in the interests of peace and justice, measures be taken by the United Nations to reconsider the recommendations of the General Assembly of the United Nations regarding Palestine; and that the Security Council appeal to all groups to avoid further hostilities while the question is being reconsidered."

With best personal regards,
Yours sincerely,
GARLAND EVANS HOPKINS,
Associate Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I know that millions of Christian Americans of all faiths will pray that this committee will be successful in its mission to promote justice and peace in the Holy Land.

Tyler Johnston's Good Work on Earth Is Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Tyler Johnston, Turin, Iowa, one of my most esteemed friends, has passed to his reward.

Tyler was a patriot of the highest order, true to our cherished American principles of good government.

He was so common in his habits, so honest in his dealings, and so completely genuine as to make him great in the true measure of man. I share in grief with his bereaved family and a multitude of good old friends.

God rest his soul.

Personnel Disloyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD excerpts from a communication I have received from a former employee in the American occupation zone in Germany whose name I cannot divulge for fear of his victimization. I have every reason to believe in the accuracy of his observations. The communication is a sorry tribute to the type of personnel now representing the United States in Germany. Are we not laying the basis for treachery on a mass scale in that theater of operations?

The excerpts follow:

During a train journey (in Germany) I was assigned to a compartment with two ladies, both of whose husbands were employed in Nurnberg, presumably with the prosecution council there. One lady throughout the trip expressed an extremely vindictive attitude toward the German people, upbraiding various people for passing fruit and candy through the train window to children in the station, making such remarks as (upon viewing the almost total ruin of ———): "These ruins delight me. I hope they died by the thousands! I can never forgive them for what they did to my people."

Such sentiments, of course, in themselves are not sufficient cause for criticism, although they seem to me to be a poor beginning for a just prosecution—and her husband must share her ideas—but, in the course of the trip, she became expansive and made the following statements, to which I would swear witness: "The Russian worker is a happier and luckier man than the American worker." (The lady had never gotten further into America than the Brooklyn Bridge.) "America does not hold the key to the solution of the problems of the world; Russia does." "I don't care if I ever see the United States again; people are too selfish

and insensitive there." And, finally, "If America succeeds in dragging Russia into war, Russia may give her a good lesson."

To continue: Upon arriving in ———, I and three other War Department workers were assigned to a room in the ——— Hotel, pending our final location of work. In the course of an evening's conversation with this group, the following remarks were made by one of the men: "America is the most Fascist nation in the world today." (It was this remark, drawn out of typical party-line vocabulary, that first attracted my attention.) "The reason trials of the thirties were not immoral was because the defendants were enemies of the state. Americans do not know the Russians well enough; American foreign policy is predicated on misinformation and carried out through deliberate amplification of falsehoods. The Communists aren't as bad as we are told."

When I took the man up in an argument, he became very excited, at first defending his points heatedly, then retreating into pacifist lines: "We should get along with Russia and make all the concessions to her she asks in order to preserve peace. The world cannot stand another war." Ultimately, I lost my temper and said, "I am disappointed to find Americans with your attitude working for the War Department," whereupon he flew into a violent rage and said, "Are you threatening me? If you are, I'm warning you that if you try to cause me any trouble, I'll get you into more Dutch than you ever dreamed of."

The above are two specific examples of pro-Communist influence in this command. Iregret that beyond them anything I might add would be based on suspicion or deduction, and I would not risk anyone's security on such terms. However, there are many agencies here which certainly could stand a little investigation. Judge Wennerstrum was entirely correct when he said that there are too many people here whose ideas arise from the prejudices and hates of their European background. When these ideas become channels for pro-Russian thinking, then the matter ceases to be a cause of mere disgust; it becomes an outright peril.

May I express my admiration for your courage in supporting Judge Wennerstrum and for your wholesome and thoroughly American attitude in all other matters.

Agricultural Extension Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have received telegrams from outstanding agricultural leaders of Louisiana protesting against the cut in funds under the stipulations of the agricultural appropriations bill which is presently under consideration by this House. These telegrams refer largely to the reduction under budget estimates of agricultural extension funds and to funds expected by them under the terms of the Hope-Flannagan Act. These agricultural leaders are sincerely interested in our agrarian problems; and I ask unanimous consent to reproduce these telegrams in the RECORD. The telegrams follow:

UNIVERSITY, LA., *March 17, 1948.*

Congressman OVERTON BROOKS:

Will appreciate your support of request for additional agricultural extension funds which are already authorized.

J. G. LEE, Jr.,
Secretary, Louisiana Farm Council.

UNIVERSITY, LA., *March 17, 1948.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge that you support the request for funds for the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service up to the amount authorized in the Bankhead-Flannagan Act.

MALCOLM DOUGHERTY,
President, Louisiana Farm Bureau.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *March 17, 1948.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand effort will be made on floor of House to increase appropriations for Research and Marketing Act and extension programs. These items are of particular importance to cotton because of urgent need for research and education and because projects covering important problems are already developed and ready for immediate initiation. Strongly urge your support of full $19,000,000 for RMA and $4,000,000 for extension as authorized.

HAROLD A. YOUNG,
President, National Cotton Council.

OPELOUSAS, LA., *March 17, 1948.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress:

Urge you support Congressman CANNON's request for additional funds for agricultural extension work.

H. F. YOUNG,
President, Louisiana Sweetpotato Association.

HOMER, LA., *March 17, 1948.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building:

Urge that you support resolution of Representative CANNON of Missouri relative funds for agricultural extension service from Bankhead-Flannagan funds.

GEO. F. WHITE,
President, Louisiana Jersey Cattle and Dairy Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 18, 1948.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation board in session today unanimously adopted following resolution: "We are deeply concerned over failure to include in Agriculture appropriation bill $4,000,000 increment for State extension services previously authorized by law, and failure to include increased funds previously authorized under Hope-Flannagan Research Marketing Act. Especially funds for State experiment stations under title 1. Only 3 of 10 million dollars increment authorized is provided, and all is assigned to Secretary under title 2. All increases authorized under title 1 are denied. If any cuts are to be made they should be proportionately distributed. Records prove effectiveness of decentralization and matching funds for extension education and research. Government gets $2 worth of education and research for every dollar of Federal funds. We respectfully urge Congress to restore these needed funds." Would greatly appreciate your help in restoring these funds in House.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Are Army Wives Subject to the Articles of the Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, a letter this day received from a former member of the Army Air Force calls attention to a situation that exists and has existed in the Army for a long time. The description is so good that I include it under leave to extend my remarks:

Certain commanders in the Army seem to think your wife is also subject to the Articles of War. At one air base, I was in the Air Corps during the war, my wife received a letter from the colonel or his wife just about requiring my wife's presence at some meeting at the Officers' Club. In the note or at the meeting it was stated or implied that the husband's future in the Army would be affected by his wife's presence at this meeting. Roll call was taken at the meeting. I wish I had the letter to my wife, but we threw it away. Probably the same thing is going on in the Army now. I wonder if the Army could worry less about the social life and more about fighting.

Prophecy of Horror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, if it be true that there is no act of man which is not the beginning of a chain of consequences so long that there is no human providence high enough to give us a prospect to the end, then the responsibility for the deplorable condition in which this country finds itself can be traced directly to the acts of those who sold out this country not only at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam but to every commitment in our foreign relations which the present and preceding administration has made.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article from the Wall Street Journal under date of March 18, 1948:

PROPHECY OF HORROR

Taken one by one by themselves the specific recommendations which President Truman made yesterday were an anticlimax. Their importance hardly deserved the emphasis of a Presidential appearance before a joint session of Congress. Certainly there was no occasion for an appearance so clothed in mystery and surprise as to make it appear that their own Government was waging a war of nerves against the American people.

The horrible thing about that message is the sum total of its implications: that the brave new world for which America spent its lives and its treasure is to become an armed camp where force, and only force, speaks with a voice that can be heard.

This newspaper refuses to believe that America wants such a thing or that it need be destined for such a thing. We refuse to believe that a nation conceived in the Christian faith of the great worth of the individual man, and which for a century and a half lived in that faith and pushed it into the dark corners of the world, must now turn about and import for its own torture all the trappings of hell. We refuse to believe America is so dead. We refuse to believe that America will follow leaders who seem to believe that it is. We refuse to believe that America will not find leaders who can express and give force to its ideals.

We take this excerpt from the President's message:

"We have tried to settle the questions arising out of the war on a basis which would permit the establishment of a just peace. You know the obstacles we have encountered. But the record stands as a monument to the good faith and integrity of the democratic nations of the world."

It would be hard to recall a more unctuous half truth.

Was the agreement of Yalta which sold some 100,000,000 people into tyranny a sample of good faith and integrity?

Was the consent of the democratic nations to turn over, in defiance of solemn promises, the people of Yugoslavia to Marshal Tito such a sample? And what shall we say of the democratic nations standing by to watch the rape of Poland?

And if the imposition of Morgenthauism on the people of Germany was an example of good faith and integrity, then the definitions of those terms must be radically altered.

The prodigal use of American force and American dollars to save the world has been tried twice. The world, instead of being saved, is in a mess. And the prescription of the statesmen who helped manage us into the mess is to make force a permanent policy.

Mr. Truman certainly implies that such is the policy he advocates.

Speaking of the recent five-nation agreement in Europe, the President says:

"I am confident that the United States will, by appropriate means, extend to the free nations the support which the situation requires. I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them protect themselves."

Taken in connection with President Truman's other recommendations that certainly means that this country must propose to furnish not only economic aid but military aid. And the aid will not be confined to materials of war.

From whatever point they start, the gentlemen in charge of this Government seem to end up with the expenditure of money and the threat of force.

The Secretary of State proposes that Europe cooperate to remedy its ills. In almost a twinkling that proposal becomes one for the outpouring of American dollars with Europe doing nothing to help itself. And for a period of months nothing was done until the Russians began to move into Czechoslovakia and Finland. Then there is a hurried meeting looking to some show of unity in western Europe, and now we find—without apparent consultation with Congress and without informing the country—we are pledged to military aid.

Certainly we must aid European recovery. And certainly, having done what we have done to the world, we should now do what we can to clean up the mess. But in doing it must we adopt the system and ideals which have impoverished and morally bankrupted Europe? To aid Europe must we embark upon a course which is likely to end up with American boys bombing Europe's cities and killing her people?

It will be said there is no such intention.

But that was exactly what was said when we embarked on a program of lend-lease.

Partly because of our own actions and our own lack of foresight we live now in a world where military weakness is an invitation to destruction.

That this country must remain and be increasingly strong in a military way no one questions. There is legitimate difference of opinion as to the forms that strength is to take.

But there is a greater force than the force of arms; or if there is not the American dream is dead.

Said Mr. Truman:

"The United States has a tremendous responsibility to act according to the measure of our power for good in the world."

That is precisely the case.

We merely raise the question, When do we start?

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the National Guard Association of Massachusetts:

Resolution calling on the Congress to establish a system of universal military training without further delay

Whereas the National Guard Association of the United States, together with the Reserve Officers Association, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled War Veterans and other veterans' organizations, and the War and Navy Departments have consistently advocated the establishment of a system of universal military training to the end that there would not only be assured the greatest possible degree of national security but that such responsibility would be recognized as a common duty, to be shared equally by all; so that the impact of war may never again descend with such severe and unequal burden as befell so many who were first to meet the enemy; and

Whereas the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training, after 6 months of exhaustive study and examination into the broad field of our National Security, and the relation of universal training to such a problem, has brought out a report of profound significance on the subject, in which they urge universal military training as an integral part of our national security establishment on a par with central intelligence, research and development, industrial mobilization, and an adequate regular establishment; and

Whereas this exhaustive study and the unanimous recommendations of the committee, in which it finds there is justified fully such a program in the interest and necessity of our national security, and emphasizes the urgency of such a measure, places great responsibility on the people and the Congress for immediate passage of such an act as the fairest, most equitable, and most economical means of effecting our national security; and

Whereas the mission of the National Guard as an effective component of the M-day force in being would be vitally promoted, the efficiency of the National Guard raised to a high level of training, and its strength maintained so that the National Guard would be able to successfully meets its M-day missions; and

Whereas the findings of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training were fundamentally and substantially those principles long advocated by the organizations above mentioned; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in the Congress to effectuate these studies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Guard Association of Masssachusetts in conference assembled this 10th day of January 1948, at Boston, Mass., reiterates its traditional stand supporting the principle of universal military training, and directs its officers to continue unabated their efforts to obtain the enactment of legislation designed to accomplish this purpose, and that such legislation be given position of first importance for the consideration at this session of the Eightieth Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of this association is directed to forward to each Member of Congress from this Commonwealth a copy of this resolution.

JOHN J. CAREW,
Colonel, C. E., Massachusetts National Guard, Retired; President, National Guard Association of Massachusetts.

Reciprocal Trade Agreement With Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the President can assist his program by not encouraging reciprocal trade agreements with Czechoslovakia, now dominated by the Communists, and I am including a telegram protesting the signing and acceptance announced for Saturday, March 20.

The telegram follows:

MARCH 18, 1948.

GEORGE MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

I am advised that Czechoslovakia is expected to sign the activation of the Geneva agreement on Saturday, March 20, at New York and the State Department will accept the signature as consistent with its program of reciprocal trade. In view of the Marshall plan now before the Congress requesting untold billions to stop communism and the President's message of yesterday with reference to communism it seems ridiculous that the United States should now accept such signature with reference to trade agreements and give to the Communists American dollars to further the march of communism. The State Department should not accept the signature of Czechoslovakia for further aid to communism and I protest any such agreement with Czechoslovakia with reference to carrying forth the reciprocal trade agreements.

Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

One Tax Our Oleo Friends Did Not Ask To Be Repealed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following is from chapter 16, section 2306 of the Internal Revenue Code:

CHAPTER 16
SEC. 2306. IMPORTATION

All oleomargarine imported from foreign countries shall, in addition to any import duty imposed on the same, pay an internal revenue tax of 15 cents per pound, such tax to be represented by coupon stamps as in the case of oleomargarine manufactured in the United States. The stamps shall be affixed and canceled by the owner or importer of the oleomargarine while it is in the custody of the proper customhouse officers; and the oleomargarine shall not pass out of the custody of said officers until the stamps have been so affixed and canceled, but shall be put up in wooden packages, each containing not less than 10 pounds, as prescribed in this chapter for oleomargarine manufactured in the United States, before the stamps are affixed; and the owner or importer of such oleomargarine shall be liable to all the penal provisions of this chapter prescribed for manufacturers of oleomargarine manufactured in the United States. Whenever it is necessary to take any oleomargarine so imported to any place other than the public stores of the United States for the purpose of affixing and canceling such stamps, the collector of customs of the port where such oleomargarine is entered shall designate a bonded warehouse to which it shall be taken under control of such customs officer as such collector may direct.

Import duty on butter is 7 cents per pound up to the first 50,000,000 pounds for certain months. Import duty on oleo is 7 cents per pound. Just which product would you say had had special privilege legislation in view of the above facts?

What does this reveal? It proves that oleo has 15 cents per pound legislative protection if oleo is made from imported oils. The duty on butter imports is 7 cents per pound up to the first 50,000,000 pounds. The duty on oleo imports is 7 cents per pound. This shows that the manufacturers of oleomargarine have a monopoly on the American market.

The dairy industry has not the legislative protection to give it the American market and duties have been reduced on butter, cheese, and the byproducts of butter production. Yet we hear about special privilege legislation.

The Palestine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by former Senator Louis B. Heller, of Brooklyn, at the clubhouse of the Regular Democratic Organization, sixth assembly district, on March 4, 1948, in reference to the Palestine situation:

Only a few short years ago a battered, bloody world breathed a sigh of relief. World War II had ended, and this time there would be peace forever.

The lights went on again; a ray of hope appeared in the sky.

Men like Governor Poletti in Italy and Colonel Keegan in Bavaria were trying to build a foundation of peace and democracy in Europe.

The United Nations was set up, and this time we would not have a phony league of nations.

Tonight we find the world facing another crisis; the threat of world war III hangs over our heads.

I am sure the thoughts of each of you will instinctively turn to Palestine.

I speak tonight not as a Jew but as an American. As a political leader, as a citizen, I have always thought as an American. I have always held, as Al Smith did about Catholics, that in the United States, Jews or Catholics, or Protestants are citizens of this country and no other, and can have no other political identification.

The Jew and the Catholic and the Protestant can have no political loyalty except to our own America.

As a citizen of America who hoped to be a citizen of a united world, I tonight protest the betrayal of Palestine. This dastardly, cowardly bit of political chicanery is a threat to the peace of the world, and I say this, not as a Jew, but as an American citizen and a father who is concerned with the fate of mankind.

The partition of Palestine represents a mandate of the Assembly of the United Nations. It came at the end of a bitter struggle for the Jew, a struggle which saw 6,000,000 annihilated. Those who remained were placed behind barbed wires in displaced persons camps, and lived in misery and filth.

The partition of Palestine offered a partial solution to the suffering Jew.

But the Arabs insist on bloodshed and anarchy, and defy the power and prestige of the United Nations.

And while terror and anarchy dominate the Palestine scene, the callous and brutal British imperialism masquerades as "neutrality."

Hitler becomes a ham actor beside the ruthless and satanic John Bull.

As a citizen of this country, I demand an end to this farce and tonight protest the diabolical, fascistic activities of the British Empire, in stirring up the disorders in Palestine, and threatening the peace of the world.

Let's put an end to these shenanigans. The world cannot afford hypocrisy on this basic international question.

Either the United Nations is an instrumentality of world peace or sham and a fraud.

Having resolved to partition Palestine, the United Nations must now prove its good faith by sending an army or police force to the Middle East to maintain law and order, and to discipline those who have defied the United Nations.

Here, in this country, we must prove good faith too.

America must play the role of leader in world affairs. Our delegation spoke the hearts and minds of millions of fellow Americans when it supported partition.

Today there is only one decision, one policy for our country—to propose the formation of an international army to enforce the mandate which we sponsored. To talk now about "consultation" and "study" is not only to beg the issue, but to expose the cheap politics we are playing behind the scenes with Bevin and company.

This country can't afford to betray the cause of world peace, especially in these troublesome days, when communism is on the rampage.

What countries can have faith in us, if we now turn our backs on Palestine?

Not only have we failed to advocate a world army, but we have even placed an embargo upon the exportation into Palestine of arms and munitions.

What sort of postwar peaceful world are we living in that we should allow murder and bloodshed in Palestine, and deny these people the means to defend themselves, while we turn our backs to this challenge to world peace.

Let me make one point clear.

The United Nations Assembly did not merely decide a dispute between two people. It prescribed a course of international conduct.

It decreed that partition was a measure that made for the peace of the world.

The world must support that decree—and we in America must have the courage to see this decree through to victory.

If this mandate is crippled and destroyed, we might as well liquidate the United Nations.

We here in the sixth assembly district are proud of the record and tradition of the Democratc Party of Roosevelt, Smith, and Lehman.

Our party has always been the champion of the downtrodden, of justice and peace.

We fought a war under the leadership of a great man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who always had his mind set on world peace, as the final objective of our bitter sacrifices.

We cannot stand by now, and see our party, in a passive, dormant role.

We have always moved forward, aggressively and fearlessly.

We can't now walk on leaden legs with the British Empire riding on our back.

And let us cut out all this legalistic baloney, that we favor partition, but the Security Council can't enforce partition.

As a political leader of the Democratic Party of the sixth assembly district, I say to President Truman:

"Wake up and stop pussyfooting. Lift the embargo and direct Mr. Warren Austin to move the United Nations to send a police force—an international army to enforce partition."

Palestine, Mr. President, is not a Jewish problem. It is actually a world problem. It involves the life or death of civilization.

Mr. President, as leader of this great democratic country, we look to you to give expression to the sentiments and thoughts of millions of Americans. This is a show-down that can't be equivocated. The choice is between world peace or world war III. Which will it be, Mr. President?

You can give us the answer in this manner:

Renounce those men who are advising you that "oil" in the Middle East is more important than "blood" in the human body.

Discrimination Against National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of

the National Guard Association of Massachusetts:

Resolution protesting the continued discrimination against the National Guard and the personnel thereof by certain departments of the Federal Government

Whereas during the current year the United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department held that members of the Organized Reserve Corps, the Naval Reserve, Marine Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve were exempt from payment of income tax on an amount up to $1,500 for pay received for performance of military duty prescribed by Federal law but that the personnel of the National Guard of the United States was not so exempted; and

Whereas the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department predicated his ruling on the basis that the National Guard was essentially a State force and therefore not entitled to the exemptions from payment of income tax on pay received from the Federal Government for military service under a War Powers Act, and in so doing, ignores the express provisions of the Federal act of June 16, 1933, which created a new Federal component of the Army of the United States, namely, the National Guard of the United States and which is separate and distinct from the the National Guard of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Guard Association of Massachusetts, in conference assembled this 10th day of January 1948 at Boston, Mass., deplore such discriminations against the National Guard of the United States and hereby directs that the officers of this association contest not only the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department in the matter of a denial of income-tax exemptions in the amount authorized by law, but further direct that in the future, contest all such discriminatory determinations and are empowered to proceed in such manner as they deem necessary and advisable.

JOHN J. CAREW,
Colonel, Massachusetts National Guard, Retired; President, National Guard Association of Massachusetts.

Highway Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Highway Development," delivered by me at the annual meeting of the West Virginia Petroleum Society at Charleston, W. Va., on March 17, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Highway development is a subject which arouses in some of us the desire to vent our wrath upon our highway planners and builders because of some recent nerve-wracking experience in battling through traffic on congested city streets or or overloaded and narrow rural highways. To our farmers it brings vivid recollections of troublesome and costly delays in transporting produce to market over rutted or muddy roads. To our legislators, however, it means an almost continuous struggle to provide sufficient funds to keep abreast of increasing traffic needs. We know only too well how vital our vast network of highways has become to our national progress, and we fully recognize the necessity for continuing our highway development because we know that failure to do so means a definite economic loss of no small proportions. The principal legislative problem in meeting our highway needs is the balancing of that probable economic loss with the limitations imposed by our annual budgets and the physical capacities of our highway organizations to carry the construction work forward.

Our highway system is so commonly accepted today as one of the fundamental necessities of our everyday activities that we sometimes lose sight of the tremendous effort that has gone into its development, and we find it difficult to understand that our Nation, which now leads the world in highway development, had always lagged behind many of the European countries in the evolution of road systems up until the time when the automobile made its place as an accepted means of transportation. The span of years since that time represents less than a quarter of our Nation's life; yet in that comparatively short period we have far outstripped the rest of the civilized world in highway accomplishment.

In the early days of American national life there was general recognition of the value of adequate transportation facilities, since the demands of political unity and common defense and the need for commercial routes to provide for the settlement and economic development of the West gave rise to many proposals for road construction. But the evolution of a highway policy was retarded until late in the nineteenth century mainly because of the doubts and uncertainties as to the responsibilities and powers of government to pursue a positive course of action.

Even in the colonial days before the Revolution, the progress of a community or colony was largely dependent upon its success in solving its transportation problems. The Federal Government, together with the State governments were called upon to provide money for the construction of roads and canals, and large sums for those days were spent in developing those transportation facilities. George Washington displayed a greater measure of foresight in this respect than any others of his generation. He was an engineer and he applied a trained mind to the subject of roadbuilding. The old Indian trails afforded the first access to the West. Washington desired a great highway to bind the East and West together for both military and commercial purposes, but it was not until the time of Henry Clay that Congress, in the exercise of its control over the mail and post roads, undertook the building of a great national highway which was popularly known as the Old National Road. Its official name was the Cumberland Road and it was proposed to extend from Cumberland, Md., to St. Louis, and thence a short distance upstream along the Missouri River. The first of our national highways was thus born in an act of Congress in 1802 and construction was started in 1806.

The cost of this road was astounding, especially when we compare the purchasing power of money in those days with its present-day value. Between Cumberland, Md., and Uniontown, Pa., the cost was almost $10,000 per mile, and between Uniontown and Wheeling it averaged over $13,000 per mile. When the road had advanced as far as Ohio, the West had developed sufficient political strength to bring pressure upon Congress for its completion, and so the road was continued westward through Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The Cumberland Road became the great mail route to Cincinnati and St. Louis and was a major factor in the opening of the West. The total cost of this great undertaking was almost $7,000,000.

In the stagecoach days, steamboat transportation quite naturally superseded the highway wherever practicable and the introduction of the steam railroad diverted national attention from the building of national highways. Furthermore, the attempts of the Federal Government to shoulder the burden of extending its initial venture into a Nation-wide road system soon became entangled in the intricate constitutional debates of the period and in the rising tide of sectionalism. Consequently, with the completion of the Cumberland Road, the Federal Government withdrew from active participation in the provision of road facilities and did not reenter the field to any appreciable extent until 1916.

During the intervening period prior to 1916, responsibility for highway communication rested mainly with the States. In discharging this obligation, the States followed a variety of methods. Some attempted to provide general-purpose roads through State administrative agencies and State funds. Others delegated a portion of the responsibility to counties and townships and still others combined these methods with commercial turnpike operations. One of the characteristics common to road administration until well toward the close of the nineteenth century was the widespread dependence upon statute labor, or working out the road tax as the chief means of support for the roads. As we speed down our smooth, modern highways today in relaxed comfort, it is quite a strain on our imaginations to be told that our grandfathers and perhaps even our fathers once worked out their road tax with pick and shovel attempting to keep this very road in passable condition for wagon traffic.

By the time the automobile graduated from the experimental stage, the States had resumed some semblance of progress in road development and gradual strides were made in establishing effective State road-building organizations. The Federal Government also reentered the field, but only in an educational capacity until 1916, when Congress authorized the first measure providing for Federal aid to the States on a matching basis. This legislation was the initial step in establishing the joint Federal and State highway-development teamwork which has produced the highways of today, but that initial step contained some weaknesses which had to be remedied before the Federal-aid program could get off to a good start.

It was the Congress of 1921 that remedied these weaknesses in the Federal Highway Act which is recognized as the most significant piece of Federal highway legislation in the history of the United States. Under the guidance of that Congress, there was formulated a policy of designating the Federal aid for a coordinated system of important interstate and intercounty roads making up a continuous Nation-wide network which would give widespread benefits all through the United States, and thereby eliminating the tendency to waste Federal funds on widely dispersed and disconnected sections of roads which afforded very little benefit to the public in general. This legislation established the foundation for a truly national road system and directed the efforts of the States with the aid of Federal funds into the evolution of a highway program which combined the important nonsectional interests of the States for a free flow of traffic within their borders together with the Federal interest in through roads to facilitate interstate commerce and to meet the needs of national defense.

Following the passage of the 1921 Highway Act, the succeeding administrations carried forward the new Federal-aid program with such aggressiveness and vigor that by 1930 we had almost met the needs of highway traffic, and I might mention that the highway needs have never since come as close to being fulfilled as they were in that year as the result of the work accomplished under those administrations.

During the depression years of the middle and late thirties vast sums of Federal funds were spent for continuing the road program largely without matching by the States in an effort to create employment. But, in spite of the much larger sums spent, the extravagant administration in power during those years could not maintain the pace of economical and effective accomplishments set by the preceding administrations.

At the time of our entry into the recent world-wide hostilities, we found that the impetus and momentum of the initial program had carried through the wasteful days of the thirties only in some phases of the entire network. The general-purpose roads were able to handle a large share of the wartime traffic, but only by resorting to the expedient of forcing all nonessential traffic off the roads. But the vital roads needed for strategic military purposes and for access to war industries, source of basic materials, and military establishments had apparently not received the attention which was warranted by the knowledge possessed by the inner administration circles at that time. In spite of the dire need for all available manpower and construction equipment for direct military operations, it was necessary during the war years to spend for strategic highways and access roads sums of money about equivalent in size to the amounts used annually for Federal aid in prewar years. This had to be done to make up for lack of coordination with military needs prior to the war. All other highway work except for the most essential maintenance work was laid aside during the war.

The end of the recent war found our highway organizations well prepared to resume construction work that had necessarily been postponed during the war. Plans were ready not only to replace or rehabilitate the roads which had deteriorated because of the heavy pounding of wartime traffic, but also to improve and expand the network of first-class roads which has become one of the major factors in our national progress.

All through the years following the advent of the automobile, our highways have had a difficult time in meeting the needs of our rapidly increasing motor traffic. This may be considered in great part as a tribute to the technological developments of our motor-vehicle industry. Advances in motor-vehicle design affecting the speed, weight, and volume of traffic have called for wider pavements, straightening of roads, reductions in grades, bypassing of congested areas, and various other highway improvements. Our highway engineers and builders have been eminently qualified to meet this challenge within the limits of the administrative direction and financial resources available to them. They have progressively raised their sights in highway planning with the objective of reaching an economical and safe highway design that would keep ahead of the advances in motor-vehicle design. Their task has not been an easy one, because of the rapidity of the development of highway traffic. With all these obstacles and handicaps, we can only marvel that for the Nation as a whole we have today the extensive network of highways that has served us so well both in times of peace and war.

The enforced suspension of highway improvements during the war other than on projects required for military purpose has, however, set back our normal highway development several years, although at the same time our traffic requirements have soared to new record levels. Foreseeing this possibility, Congress wisely passed legislation in 1944 designed to pave the way for immediate resumption of the highway program on an accelerated scale when war emergency conditions were sufficiently relieved. This legislation contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, made available to the States the amount of $500,000,000 for each of the first 3 postwar years, or a total of $1,500,000,000 for the 3-year period. With the funds furnished by the States on the adopted matching basis, this authorization would provide for a total program of $3,000,000,000, which is larger than any previous program for a similar period of time in roadbuilding history. This program was split up into three principal classes: primary highways, secondary highways, and urban highways, with allocations divided among those classes according to formulas established in the act.

This legislation also provided for establishing a national system of interstate highways to be designated by the States and by the Public Roads Administration. This system is designed to connect the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers and to serve the national defense needs of the Nation. Selection of most of the routes embodied in this national system of interstate highways was recently completed. The system now includes a little more than 37,000 miles of highways with a remainder of about 3,000 miles reserved for future selection to permit the addition of connections in some of the larger cities.

Resumption of the highway-building program following the end of the war was somewhat slower than expected because of continued shortages of materials, machinery, and labor and the general unsettled economic conditions caused by the excess of accumulated demands over the immediate capacity of production facilities. The time for obligating the funds authorized for the 3-year highway program has been extended to 1950 and the program in effect has thus been modified to a 4-year program. In the first 2 years of the program, highway construction proceeded rather slowly. In recent months, however, the construction tempo has speeded up and barring any sharp reverses in present economic trends, it may be expected that the present construction level will prevail for some time in the future.

Although we have found that it was not practicable under present conditions to carry forward a national program of the magnitude contemplated in the 1944 Highway Act as speedily as provided for in that act, it has become apparent that we must have additional authorizations for Federal aid in the near future in order to permit orderly planning for the further improvements that are so badly needed. Large as the program contained in the 1944 act may seem by comparison with present levels, we do not have to look any farther than our own immediate highways and city streets to find that additional improvements must be provided for a free flow of highway traffic. Under present economic conditions, we must recognize that too rapid expansion of high-cost roads might place too great a strain on our budget, but on the other hand, we know that the demands for highway improvement are so great that we cannot afford to ignore the economic advantage of further highway development that would be lost if we should call a recess until our budget reaches a more favorable position.

With these thoughts in mind, I introduced in the Senate on January 9, 1948, Senate bill No. 1954 which continues the authorizations for Federal aid in the construction of highways for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 at the rate of $300,000,000 per year. These funds are allocated among the three principal classes of highways in the following manner per year: $150,000,000 for the Federal-aid highway system in rural areas; $75,000,000 for the Federal-aid system in urban areas; and $75,000,000 for secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads. This bill also earmarks not less than 50 percent of the authorizations for primary Federal-aid highways in both urban and rural areas to be applied to highways which are included in the national system of interstate highways, thus assuring that at least half of the Federal funds will be used for highways of greatest national importance. This will also permit up to 50 percent of those funds to be used on other roads in the Federal-aid system, both rural and urban, including roads leading from farming areas to marketing centers. Since the secondary farm-to-market and rural mail roads are established as a feeder system supplementary to but separate from the primary Federal-aid system for the purposes of allocating authorizations, this earmarking of funds for the national-interstate system does not affect the secondary roads and the full allocation of $75,000,000 will be available for this feeder system, including farm-to-market roads.

Senate bill 1954 contemplates that the Federal-aid highway program will be continued essentially on the same terms as at present, except that the total Federal aid is set at a level of $300,000,000 per year for a period of 2 years ending with the fiscal year 1951. This level of Federal aid is set in the nature of a stopgap measure in recognition of actualities encountered in the present postwar program. If the States and the road-builders can show that a higher level can be maintained and if economic conditions should become favorable to such a higher level, I believe that the proposed legislation should be modified accordingly at the proper time. However, should those conditions fail to materialize, I would anticipate that prior to the termination of the proposed program in 1951, we should have ample time to determine definitely the volume and speed of the program needed in the future to meet the Nation's highway traffic needs.

I would like to mention, also, the provision contained in section 3 of Senate bill 1954 which requires that not less than 50 percent of the funds authorized for Federal aid highways shall be used on the national system of interstate highways. I believe that this provision merits serious consideration, since under present conditions we find ourselves in the position of having established a system of highways considered to comprise the top priority highways from the standpoint of national interest, including our defense needs, but at the same time there is no requirement that any Federal funds must be used on the top priority highways. Although, in general, it is recognized that the highways which are most important from the national standpoint may be equally important from the State standpoint, there are some instances where this may not be so, and in such cases it is the duty of the Congress to assure that we make uniform progress on all highways which have top priority from the national standpoint.

This, however, is only the first step in the direction of carrying forward the uncompleted parts of the national interstate system as rapidly as we reasonably can. We must also review the effect of the present State-apportionment formulas upon the rate of building or improving the uncompleted parts of the national system. The present apportionment formulas are based generally upon the relative areas, population, and postal routes of the States, whereas the national system has been selected upon the basis of national importance without any specific relation to the factors of area, population, and postal routes. The funds available to one State under present apportionment formulas may be sufficient for speedier completion of the national system within that State than would be possible in other States. In order to provide for the same rate of progress on the national system in all States, it may, therefore, be necessary to modify the apportionment formulas, insofar as they may apply to the national system. I believe that the interests of the Federal Government in the completion of the national system as uniformly and speedily as practicable are so compelling that a careful

study of this problem by the committee is warranted at this time.

I may say, also, that it is my hope that we can soon set out upon the construction of federally built and federally maintained highways in this country that will be truly a national system of roads.

Hearings on this bill have recently been in progress before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works, of which I am chairman. The testimony at those hearings has included several requests for larger sums than are contained in the bill. I do not know what action the committee will take with regard to the amount of Federal funds for continuing the program at this time. For my part, I ask only that a positive showing of actual need for Federal funds be indisputably established and then I will favor the approval of the amounts so needed with due consideration to the Federal interests involved, including particularly the financial and budgetary aspects. I will, however, strongly resist the influence bred in the last several years of extravagance to provide larger sums than are essential for adequate public service with the resultant waste of the excess funds on unnecessary bureaucratic activities which afford little or no benefit to the public in general. If we are to maintain the national strength which is imperative for our survival as a free people, we must conduct our National Government on a sound, economical, and solvent foundation, and our national activities, such as Federal aid for highway development, must likewise be administered in the same manner.

Need of European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject of my reasons for support of the European recovery program. Certainly the address which we have heard from the President of the United States on the military crisis which our Nation faces confirms the need for the European recovery program as a means of helping prevent a third world war.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST TRY TO PREVENT THE THIRD WORLD WAR—WHY EUROPEAN AID IS NECESSARY

I am grateful for the hundreds of letters which I have received from the people of Wisconsin on the subject of the European recovery program. Housewives, businessmen, farmers, laboring men, ministers, students—folks of every age and group in Wisconsin—thoughtfully wrote on the Marshall plan. Some expressed their judgment for it, some expressed views against it.

In reaching a final decision to vote for the European recovery program, as amended, I carefully considered the communications which had been received. I reviewed the facts which had been brought out in the long hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, evaluated the many reports which had been filed by Government and private groups and finally came to my conclusion.

Now, this report is submitted to my constituents in accordance with my promise to inform them of the reasons for my decision.

As everyone knows, the Senate voted 69 to 17 for enactment of S. 2202, the European recovery program, as amended. It voted to authorize an initial sum of 5.3 billion dollars during the first experimental year for this aid. It has been estimated that around 20 to 40 percent of the aid will be in the form of loans which will be repayable and from 60 to 80 percent will be in the form of outright grants designed to speed European recovery. Countries like Switzerland and Portugal will pay cash for commodities received.

NO FUTURE CONGRESSES CAN BE BOUND

The program authorizes a 4-year plan—the amount after the first year to be determined by future Congresses. The plan is to be administered outside the State Department by an advisory board and an administrator—a kind of traveling supervisor—to superintend the work in Europe. The European administrator and the personnel of the advisory board are to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

It should be noted that we are not making an iron-clad commitment for a 4-year program. Moreover, the Appropriations Committee definitely need not appropriate the full five billion three hundred million, which is merely set as a limit and should not be construed as an invitation to reckless squandering of funds up to the top amount.

WHY DID I SUPPORT THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM?

My reasons for support of the ERP may be summarized as follows:

1. Our own enlightened self-interest requires support of the plan.

2. A rehabilitated Europe is essential if we are to eliminate world unrest. Restless, homeless, hungry, jobless millions breed war.

3. Economic aid is vital to rehabilitation. The European economy cannot recover without American aid.

4. The United States cannot survive alone as a free people in a world of totalitarianism.

5. European recovery program implements the United Nations program to which we are committed.

6. If we do not subscribe to the Marshall plan, we will be inviting complete conquest of the entire continent of Europe by one power which would then menace our peace and security.

Through the program, we may help prevent the holocaust of a third world war which would cost us not only a terrible loss in human life, but less important, hundreds of billions of dollars.

Through the program, too, we may help halt the march of communism throughout the globe, help curb the march of tyranny, of godless materialism, of dictatorship.

THERE IS NO GUARANTY OF SUCCESS

At the outset, it should be made crystal clear that passage of the European recovery program is not an ironclad guaranty of world peace. Our good intentions may prove to be fruitless. There is no assurance whatever that the program will be successful. The program is a speculation, and we should not be lulled into a false sense of security by its passage. The economic program contemplated under the bill may slow up the march of aggression, but it of itself probably cannot completely halt European conquest from behind the iron curtain.

The European recovery program could conceivably turn the tide for peace in Europe. In any event, it should certainly slow up Russian aggression and it should win friends for us so that we will not be alone in a totalitarian world.

It is a gamble but it is a worth-while gamble. If it succeeds completely, it would be worth almost any price. If it succeeds partially—and it certainly should succeed to some degree at least—it is well worth its cost.

SENTIMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO ERP

I am well aware of many of the sentiments which have been presented in opposition to the European recovery program. "Why pour our money down a rat hole?" "Why complicate the staggering tax problems of the American people?" "Why encourage Europe to go on these war sprees in the expectation that Uncle Sam will be sucker enough to support her when the sprees are over?" "Why put our faith in governments which time and again have broken their pledges, repudiated their indebtedness to us?" "Why send supplies to lands which have incredibly wasted in many instances much of the aid we have previously given?" "Why subsidize the socialistic experimentation in many of these 16 European countries receiving the aid?"

I am aware of these sentiments and to a considerable extent I appreciate the underlying feelings. Many of the above opinions are answered, however, in this report.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S ADVICE AGAINST ENTANGLEMENTS

I am aware, too, that we cannot buy friendship with gold. Moreover, the immortal words of George Washington in his Farewell Address of 1789, come to mind:

"The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. * * * Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. * * *

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

AMERICA'S ROLE OF LEADERSHIP

In spite of all this, we are confronted with the fact that news reports every minute and every hour tell of the march of Communism and of the possible approach of war. The Marshall plan is a gamble but I believe it is worth the gamble if we can save the lives of our sons. We are living in the atomic age. America has been precipitated to leadership among the nations, and she must be adequate to the challenges she faces. Every nation today is in every other nations' backyard, for man's ingenuity and inventiveness has contracted space and time.

BACKGROUND SUPPORTS NEED FOR EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

What is the background for the ERP?

1. After the close of the Second World War we cut off lend-lease aid, although not immediately.

2. It became apparent that the world could not make progress toward recovery unless the United States gave assistance.

3. As a consequence, we formed UNRRA, International Refugee Organization, International Bank, etc., in addition to loans and grants to individual nations.

4. Secretary of State Marshall in June 1947 proposed the European recovery program, which was essentially in its original form a suggestion that further aid from the United States to Europe be conditional upon the extent of the efforts which European nations would make to assist themselves.

5. Russia refused to participate in the plan and apparently refused to permit the small European countries, whose policies she influences, to join the program.

6. Delegates from 16 of the European nations, representing 270,000,000 people, met in Paris early in July to carry out the European part of the program.

7. These countries agreed to attempt to stabilize their internal finances and they pledged to cooperate wholeheartedly with their productive capacity and manpower, to take steps to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers and to allocate scarce materials and modernize their equipment.

8. The Harriman committee, headed by the Secretary of Commerce, was set up to determine the limitation within which the United States could safely extend aid to western Europe. This committee of 19 private citizens, representing business, finance, labor, agriculture, research and educational institutions, recommended the Marshall plan as in the best interest of the country.

9. The so-called Krug committee, headed by the Secretary of the Interior, was set up to determine whether or not the Marshall plan would constitute too severe a strain on our natural resources. After analyzing our resources, the committee concluded that we would be able to meet the requirements of a program of foreign aid.

10. The Nourse committee, composed of economists, was set up to study the impact which a program of foreign aid would have on our domestic economy, particularly with reference to our ability to supply dollars and goods. The committee unanimously agreed that we could and should support the European recovery program and that such support would not constitute an undue strain on our domestic economy.

11. Numerous Nation-wide organizations and prominent individuals appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to support the project. Only a few organizations testified in opposition.

12. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, with members from both parties, unanimously recommended for the plan.

AMERICA'S HIGH MOTIVES

America's motives in this program are worthy and sound. She seeks no self-aggrandizement. She seeks only peace and prosperity and freedom for herself and all other peoples. We are told that right motives lead to right action, and selfish motives lead generally to defeat.

Another motive for our acts is that of self-preservation. We are witnessing one of the great eruptive forces in history—the onrush of communism under the leadership of the Russian hierarchy. We have seen similar floods, but because this seems to jeopardize the political and economic concepts of all free people, we feel that aid to those who think somewhat like we do, who have fought for the liberties of the individual—that such aid is really helping ourselves.

EUROPE MUST HELP HERSELF

Will this aid of itself do the job? The answer is definitely "No." The peoples of Europe themselves will have to do the major job. This is, however, reaching out a helping hand. It is providing sustenance for the bodies and encouragement for the minds of these nations that have come through the hell of war. Moreover, it may provide the "push force"—the great stimulant to enable the divided nations of Europe to get together and accomplish the dream of countless statesmen—a free United States of Europe.

The bill contemplates the trial period of 1 year, during which time we will see if our aid, joined with the efforts of the 16 participating European peoples, will result in economic betterment—in political betterment—of those nations which have felt the impact of war. During that time we will see if the Communist impact has been contained—whether there is evidence of a spiritual and political rebirth in these countries; whether liberty and free institutions again seem to flourish; whether there is evidence of real economic and political cooperation between these nations and evidence of renewed financial and economic stability; whether there is a spiritual awakening to the challenge—the real challenge—of communism, which would enslave and which would reverse all the progress that the human race has made.

WE CAN AID ABROAD WHILE REDUCING TAXES

Let me make these additional points:

1. The various reports compiled by Government commissions and groups indicate that America can afford the Marshall plan. Our gross national product in 1947 was over $230,000,000,000, of which only around 8 percent was exported. Even if the House Appropriations Committee votes the full authorized sum of $5,300,000,000 for the first year, we can follow through on this program without doing irreparable damage to our economy.

We can, moreover, enact the pending tax-reduction bill. (I might at this point note the fact that I voted for both previous tax-reduction bills which the President, unfortunately, vetoed.) It has been indicated by Treasury experts that under present rates we can expect a surplus of as much as $6,000,000,000 during the coming fiscal year. We can simultaneously reduce our heavy national debt.

GERMANY WILL BE AIDED FOR PEACEFUL RECOVERY

2. We will be enabling Germany to make her peaceful contribution to the recovery of Europe. It is contemplated that under the European recovery program, as well as our military occupation funds, around $1,200,000,000 will be spent for relief and rehabilitation of Germany.

SUPERVISING PROGRAM'S ADMINISTRATION

3. Whether the hard-earned resources of the American people will be distributed efficiently or whether they will be wasted prodigally depends, of course, on the character of the administration of the program. I will work to help insure that the administration shall be on the highest possible plane, on a businesslike basis. The Senate bill provides that a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation shall be set up to help oversee the administration.

SAFEGUARDS WRITTEN INTO BILL

We have written into the bill numerous safeguards against waste, many of which I have previously recommended. The European nations must, for example, take steps to stabilize their currency, to cooperate in interchange of goods, to make efficient and practical use of their own resources, to facilitate the sale or transfer to the United States of strategic materials that we need for stock piling, to report on the full operation of the program, to promote full production in their own lands. Assistance to any of the participating programs may be terminated if the Administrator determines that any of the countries are not adhering to their terms of agreement or are diverting assistance to purposes other than those provided in the act. Moreover, the Administrator is directed to terminate assistance to any country, whenever, because of changed conditions, such assistance is no longer consistent with the national interests of the United States.

AMERICA MUST BE PREPARED

But our eyes are open even now to all the realities of the world situation. We know we must keep our own powder dry. We must adequately prepare against any national emergency. That is why I have stressed industrial and Government decentralization and a score of other measures to protect our interests. We must, in the words of Teddy Roosevelt, "Speak softly but carry a big stick."

CONCLUSION

The Senate of the United States has taken an historic step. We pray that it shall be proven to be the right step, that it shall protect the interests of our own dear land, of our generations yet unborn and that it shall nobly advance throughout the world the very principles of freedom which gave life to America itself.

American Participation in European Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Participation in European Recovery," delivered by James D. Mooney, president and chairman of the board, Willys-Overland Motors, Toledo, Ohio, at a banquet held by the American Society of Tool Engineers in Cleveland, Ohio, on March 18, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN RECOVERY

(By James D. Mooney, president and chairman of the board, Willys-Overland Motors, Toledo, Ohio)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and gentlemen of the American Society of Tool Engineers, your officers have very kindly, and indulgently, and at some considerable risk, asked me to speak on American participation in European recovery.

I say, "at some considerable risk," because your officers have hit upon a very novel idea in asking somebody like myself to speak on an economic problem, and particularly an economic problem in the international field.

Economic problems, as you gentlemen very well know, resolve themselves very quickly into practical problems of production and distribution; however, these economic problems may lie generally in the fields of food, clothing, shelter, fuel, or transportation. Furthermore, economic problems in the international field resolve themselves immediately into problems of production and distribution, the practical means for whatever we might consider doing about feeding starving people, or keeping them from freezing to death, or encouraging them to get up from the slough of despond and help themselves.

I say, now, that your officers have taken considerable risk in asking an engineer like me, or you, to discuss these problems. We have spent our lives in solving such production and distribution problems, but during the past 20 years it has become fashionable to exclude men like you and me from taking a hand in providing the solutions for economic problems, particularly if they lie in the international field. The idea seems to be that engineers are all right for making war—the country needs engineers for the mass production of ships and planes and guns and ammunition. The country also needs engineers for the use and maintenance of these weapons in the field of military operations, where modern warfare expresses itself in the mass destruction of the enemy's army and navy, and even his civilian population.

But when peace comes, the engineer is shoved aside, in spite of the huge reconstruction problems that present themselves, and in spite of the fact that the engineer, by training and temperament, is more at home in these construction problems, these economic problems, these problems of produc-

tion and distribution, than he is in the field of war.

The engineer has been shoved aside by the politicians and their satellites, men lustful for power and mumblers of ideological abracadabras.

Accordingly, I am very grateful to your officers who have asked me to make some practical observations on European recovery and some suggestions for American participation in European recovery.

I have had many years of experience in the production and distribution of automobiles in Europe, but I want to make it quite clear that I haven't any quick or ready or smart answers to the infinite variety of complicated political and economic problems over there. On the other hand, in the light of this same experience, I do think it is about time for us Americans to agree on certain principles that should guide our participation in European recovery.

My purpose tonight, then, is to identify these principles as a guide to the difficult road that lies ahead.

WE ARE READY TO HELP

I think we can begin by agreeing that we are ready in America to sacrifice deeply, to take a lot of skin off our own comfortable hides in order to contribute generously to European recovery.

We are ready to feed the hungry of Europe.

We are ready to supply Europeans with the machinery and equipment and technical know-how to reconstruct their production facilities.

We are ready to help them with their railroad and highway transportation equipment in order to put their distribution systems in better physical condition.

We are ready to supply or finance the supply of raw materials they need in Europe to feed their production facilities.

So much for what we are ready to do.

AN IDENTIFICATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR HELP

Now, I want to identify some of the principles and conditions under which we should help Europe, or any other part of the world.

First, in anything we do, we should assume that we Americans have a right and an obligation to guard our own country's long-term enlightened self-interest. An old-fashioned, homely way of putting this is, "Charity begins at home."

Second, it is about time for us to drop the use of such threadbare ideological terms as communism, fascism, and socialism, and deal with the international situation in terms of practical power politics. It is about time for us to play ball with the various countries and political power groups who have shown their readiness to play ball with us.

Third, it is a natural corollary of my second point that our occupation forces overseas, whether they are to be considered in Europe or in the Far East, should be maintained only from a strategic military standpoint, and not at all for the purposes of ideology, like making the Germans or Japanese democratic. The American taxpayer is much too "busted" to be able to afford any longer the support of such foolish ideological ventures.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

Fourth, the road to peace during the next several years logically follows the course of our effectively encouraging the development of the production and military strength of the western powers and the political coherence of these western powers. In other words, the road to peace lies in the following direction:

(a) Our maintaining our own production and military strength.

(b) Our assisting our traditional ally, England, and the British Empire to reconstruct her production and military strength.

(c) Our working with the British to reestablish France within the hegemony of western powers.

(d) Our working with the British and French to reestablish German production for the benefit of western Europe and the British Isles.

So much for the political frame within which we should participate in European recovery.

The frame, as you see, is designed for peace. It is based on practical power politics and on the recognition of the obvious fact that the only real threat to our own American peace and the peace of the world today is aggressive, belligerent Russia.

ARREST THE TREND TOWARD STATISM

Next, I want to make to you a recommendation in the field of economics for European and world recovery. The recommendation again will be aimed at insuring world peace and will be based on the recognition of the value of relieving the economic tensions throughout the world. Wars and revolutions are caused principally by hungry bellies.

Before pitching into this recommendation, I want to remind you that most of the countries in Europe, and, as a matter of fact, most of the countries in the world, are operating their economies, their production and distribution schemes, their uses of money with a high degree of state control. You may call it communism or socialism or fascism or new dealism, according to your mood.

The ideological boys began beating the drums for statism shortly after World War I, and the politicians were quick to see the opportunities for consolidating their positions of power in dominating the national life of their respective countries. The movement throughout the world into statism was encouraged by our own so-called New Deal. World War II gave the politicians the golden opportunity of further rationalizing state controls, with the result that the world finds itself today crushed by the consequences of statism, and people everywhere are suffering economic tyranny, ruinous taxes, slick and dishonest money, and general stagnation in production and distribution.

Therefore, I say that an important principle that should guide American participation in European recovery is that our friends in our own Government must take steps, when they ask us to make sacrifices for aid to Europe, to arrest the trend toward statism in our own country, and in the countries to which we loan goods and money.

RETURN TO HONEST MONETARY PRACTICES

Because an extended discussion of statism as it is expressing itself in the strangulation of economic life throughout the world is a topic all by itself, I shall confine myself to one important area in this general field, the area of paper money and gold.

During the past 20 years, the various governments throughout the world, including our own, have broken all the rules of the game for the use of paper money and gold as media of exchange. We find ourselves, therefore, here, and throughout the international field, without these useful instruments with which to reconstruct the production and distribution of the world.

There is no use talking seriously about European or world recovery unless we are ready to step up to a return of honest money. Honest money means that we must abandon the Keynesian theories, the so-called managed currencies, and pegged and dishonest rates for the international exchange of currencies and gold.

We must set up free markets for the conversion of any country's paper money into the paper money of any other country at exchange rates arrived at in open auction markets. Further, as the opening step in the process of stabilizing paper moneys in terms of gold and returning to the gold standard, we must set up free markets for the conversion of paper money into gold at prices for paper money vis-à-vis gold arrived at in open auction markets.

To sum up my remarks on honest money, I want to make this statement with all the emphasis at my command:

A return to honest monetary practices would have more effect on European and world recovery, on the economic life of the world as expressed in production and distribution, than any of the recovery plans under discussion at the present time.

To put it another way: The world is eager and ready to go to work. The labor and tools are available. The management skill is available for planning and putting into operation the production and distribution schemes needed to feed and clothe the peoples of Europe and of the world. But we need honest money to finance the production facilities, and we need honest money to serve again in the field of distribution as a means for facilitating the exchange of goods.

ENLIST SKILLED MANAGEMENT

Now I come to my last general recommendation for the guidance of American participation in European recovery, a recommendation for the management control of such funds as the Congress may make available for recovery.

I need hardly remind you gentlemen who have spent your lives in the fields of management and the creation of productive facilities that no plan or project ever works out any better than the character and capacity of the men you pick to carry it out. Accordingly, my recommendation is that when the administration is set up for the control and use of such American money as may be approved by the Congress, steps should be taken to enlist American skilled management in the effective use of the funds for production and distribution.

Steps should be taken to go outside the fields of bureaucracy in recruiting management skills, because the Government pays its workers badly and does little to attract skilled technical help.

Obviously there would be a practical advantage in dealing with European recovery by subcategories, such as food, industries, distribution, and transportation. This would result, naturally, in the corollary that skilled management in these respective fields should be made part of the administration organization for the most effective and direct use of the money appropriated.

This leads me to the suggestion that our Government consider making management contracts with various American corporations and groups so that the skilled management personnel of industry could function in the various specialized fields, in harmony with the general policies sanctioned by the Congress and executed by the general administration group for the European recovery plan.

CONCLUSION

Well, that's my story, gentlemen. I should like to say by way of conclusion that I hope that our country will continue to discharge its responsibilities in the world situation. We are disturbed and miserable confronting the spectacle of these starving, wanting millions among our neighbors. Among these neighbors in Europe we have countless ties of blood. We admire and respect the traditions of these respective countries. We want to continue to be generous and helpful.

From our own standpoint of American self-interest, we want to be helpful in reconstructing the road back to peace.

We want to participate not only fully but also effectively in European and world recovery.

Federal Buildings and Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of Federal buildings and post offices, which the junior Senator from Washington has transcribed for use over a score of radio stations in Washington State. The address covers a subject which is of general interest to all Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is HARRY CAIN speaking to you from my office in the Senate Office Building in your Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C.

In these days when so much of what we read and hear is thoroughly bad and confusing and frightening, it gives one a tremendous lift and thrill to read of a real peacetime achievement in Washington State. There seems now to be but very little doubt that the bridge across the Narrows between Tacoma and Bremerton which disintegrated and collapsed during a big windstorm on November 7, 1940, will be replaced with a four-lane bridge which will never fall down. This great job of reconstruction is expected to become a reality in 30 months time. You were aware of this good news before I was, but a word of commendation to all who have worked so long and seriously for a new bridge is certainly in order. I was in Tacoma's city hall on the unforgettable day when the bridge disappeared beneath the waters of Puget Sound. I remember reaching the approach to the bridge just as its middle span was on its way to a watery grave. I remember standing beside Clark Eldridge, the chief construction engineer. He was crying like a baby because of the tragedy which was taking place before his eyes. Many another reacted in different ways, but nearly every citizen of Washington State shared his feelings. With a new bridge the different sections of Washington State will be brought more closely together and the bridge will provide a direct line of defense communication between Fort Lewis and the naval base at Bremerton. Out of every tragedy there generally comes a lesson to guide the future. This truism applied with singular aptness to the Narrows Bridge collapse. For a very long time competent engineers have puzzled over the problem of how wide and heavy a bridge must be when its length exceeds a given distance. Because the first Narrows Bridge was too long for its width, it is reasonable to assume that no bridge which is constructed anywhere in the future will fall down for the same reason. The original Narrows Bridge was known throughout America and most of the world because of those features which gained for the bridge the name of "Galloping Gertie." Everybody everywhere will be interested in the coming bridge. It is safe to predict that tourists will come from everywhere to travel over the new structure. Washington citizens have cause to cheer and to take pride from the rebuilding of a loss which, at the time, seemed completely unrecoverable.

I want to finish tonight a discussion concerning post offices which was partly completed last week. For those who didn't hear that broadcast, I should like to summarize what was related in the following fashion:

In late December the senior Senator from Washington introduced in the Senate 25 Federal buildings and post office bills. These bills would authorize a total sum of $11,695,000 to be used in securing sites and constructing post offices and Federal buildings in 25 communities situated throughout Washington State. These bills were referred to me in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Public Works Committee of the Senate. After taking testimony from the Federal agencies having an interest in the proposed legislation, the subcommittee, over my signature, recommended to the full committee that each of the 25 bills be turned down.

Last week I gave the reasons for the negative decision. That I wasn't happy in being required to say no to more than a score of communities within my State, goes without saying. That I had absolutely no other course to pursue was likewise true.

There were three basic reasons for denying the 25 bills. The first was that the President and the Congress agreed some time ago that no large-scale public works programs should be pursued at this time. Everybody within the Congress has been completely aware of this necessary and logical policy.

Reason No. 2: There is no wisdom in undertaking a large-scale public works program when America suffers from high prices and benefits from full employment. If it was decided at this time to construct Federal buildings and post offices all over the Nation, prices would go higher because public construction would compete with private builders for men, materials, and money.

Reason No. 3: The issue of who should be responsible for determining where post offices and Federal buildings are to be located was determined by the Congress a long time ago. In 1926 the Congress decided that the Postmaster General and the Public Buildings Administrator should be held responsible for determining where post offices ought to be located and constructed. If for example, the senior Senator from Washington was permitted to locate post offices where he decided, the same right should, of necessity, be granted to every other Senator and Congressman. Need I focus your attention on the hodgepodge which would follow? Post offices would obviously be built in communities which didn't need them and they wouldn't be constructed in cities and towns where the need was both pressing and obvious.

I said last week, and say again tonight, that America badly needs hundreds of post offices and Federal buildings. Your large cities of Seattle and Tacoma have been in drastic need of additional post-office facilities for years. There are comparable emergency situations in other communities throughout the land. You know that such a need is present, the Congress agrees that this is so, and the Postmaster General wants this needed new construction just as soon as he can get it.

The Postmaster General and the Public Buildings Administrator have a priority list which covers the relative need for construction in practically every American community. When construction appropriations are recommended by the President and approved by the Congress, the required buildings will be constructed in the order of their importance and need. The State of Washington has six cities and towns which are very high on the priority list. These six communities are Dayton, Casmere, Tacoma, South Bend, Marysville, and Seattle. There is every reason to believe that when a public-works program is undertaken these cities will have their obvious requirements satisfied. It seems very clear to me that other communities in Washington State need Federal buildings and post offices. Their degree of need, however, must be balanced against the needs which exist in 47 other States. Our State is entitled to its fair share of anything, but no State is entitled to secure what it wants at the expense of other States who are deserving of equal treatment.

No post offices or Federal buildings have been constructed in America since 1941. Two hundred contracts were awarded in 1940 and 11 contracts were awarded in 1941. The over-all cost of these 211 projects was $21,341,000. In 1940 post offices were constructed in Clarkston, Okanogan, and Omak. In the same year Oregon secured two post offices; Idaho, one; Montana, two; and California, seven. An analysis of the post offices built in every State indicates that our State of Washington kept pace with the rest.

If today isn't the time to construct post offices and Federal buildings in any of the 48 States it is certainly the time to plan for and to get ready for the day when construction is possible. To this end the Public Works Committee is considering a bill which would provide the Postmaster General and Public Buildings Administrator with $32,000,000 with which to secure sites and make plans for future construction. This sum of money is made up of $10,000,000 for completing site acquisitions and the preparation of plans for 198 projects which were previously included in construction programs before the war, but which were deferred because of the war, and $22,000,000 for 250 new projects. If this bill becomes law it will simply mean that a green light or go ahead signal will be given for some 450 importantly required post offices and Federal buildings. The acquisition of land and plans involved will consume a year or 18 months of time. In my considered opinion and in that of a good many other Senators and Representatives, this is the only sound approach which can be made to the problem of how and when can needed post offices and Federal buildings be constructed throughout America. If this approach isn't taken I know that large quantities of unnecessary trouble will be visited upon the Congress for years to come.

In this Eightieth Congress only three bills concerning post offices and Federal buildings have thus far been passed by both Houses of the Congress. Each of these bills called for acquiring a site and making plans. None of the three provided for construction. The bills covered situations in Portland, Oreg.; Huntington, W. Va.; and Omaha, Nebr. Each of the three bills was fully considered and approved by the House before the legislation came to my subcommittee in the Senate. These were reasonable bills. They asked for reasonable things. By way of contrast the 25 bills from my own State were completely unreasonable if considered in the face of the problem which exists throughout the country.

If the omnibus bill to which I have referred fails of passage I shall work with the entire Washington State delegation in designing and offering legislation, after consulting with the Postmaster General and the Public Buildings Administrator, which is designed to get ready to construct post offices in those particular Washington State communities which are most deserving of consideration and action at this time. The Federal authorities have already said that Washington State has six emergency situations. These must first be accommodated before we can ask for post offices in towns and cities where they are wanted but where they are not so badly needed as in other areas in other States.

The substance of this and last week's broadcasts will be sent in letter form to every individual who wrote to ask us to approve the passage of the 25 bills submitted by the senior Senator from Washington. May I say that your inquiries were more than welcome and my letter will attempt to seriously answer your curiosity and interest.

You can well imagine my distress in finding it absolutely necessary to turn down projects which my State wants and mostly needs. How simple it would have been to have recommended the legislation and left it up to others to turn it down on the floor of the United States Senate. I would rather provide you with the facts of life than to fool you for a minute. When you were led to believe that you could get a post office or a Federal building by merely sending wires and letters to the Public Works Committee you were being sadly misled and badly fooled. This legislation never had a chance and I think it my duty to tell you so in unmistakable terms. I hope the omnibus planning bill passes because then we can work in the direction of securing post offices and Federal buildings which demand construction at the earliest possible time. I will let you know what happens to this legislation. Without adequate legislation of the kind we have been discussing, we shall return to that promiscuous system which held out the pork barrel as its only virtue. America and its public buildings program is deserving of a better fate than that.

Flood Control and Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I made today before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the 1948–49 funds of Army engineers for flood control and navigation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON 1948–49 FUNDS OF ARMY ENGINEERS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION

INDEX TO STATEMENT

1. Outline of need for funds: Defense of budget estimates.

2. Flood control:

Construction projects: Williamsport, Punxsutawney, East Branch Clarion, Conemaugh, Sunbury, York, Youghiogheny, Loyalhanna, Latrobe, Johnstown.

Maintenance: York, Youghiogheny, Loyalhanna, Johnstown, Mahoning Creek, Crooked Creek, Tionesta.

Planning: Bear Creek, Turtle Creek, Tyrone, Prompton Reservoir, Shenango Reservoir, Johnsonburg, Dyberry Reservoir.

Transfer of funds to geological survey.

Susquehanna River program: Almond and Sidney Reservoirs, N. Y.; integrated plan for Pennsylvania.

Preliminary examinations and surveys: Need for additional $3,000,000 over budget, Susquehanna, Juniata, Schuylkill, Upper Allegheny projects.

3. Rivers and harbors:

Construction projects: Delaware, Monongahela at Braddock, Pa., and Morgantown, W. Va.; Ohio River at Ironton, Ohio; Schuylkill River and long-range culm removal.

Maintenance: Delaware, Schuylkill, Ohio, Monongahela, Allegheny, Youghiogheny, Erie Harbor.

Preliminary examinations and surveys: Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Buffalo.

Lock operation and care: Ohio, Monongahela, Allegheny.

4. Conclusion: (Jobs are not WPA made-work projects but are necessary to protection of lives and property and promotion of commerce.)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARCH 19, 1948.

There is hardly an area of Pennsylvania whose residents are not acutely aware of the problems arising from our waterways. We have several outstanding ports and harbors in Pennsylvania and the economy of the entire State rests upon continued efficient operation of those ports. At the same time, mountainous Pennsylvania has many areas which are extremely vulnerable to floods, floods which originate up in the mountains and pour down into the valleys causing severe hardship and dislocation and a substantial amount of real suffering and even loss of life.

Maintenance and improvement of our ports and harbors and navigable streams has been a function of government almost as long as we have had a United States. It is only in the past 10 or 12 years, however, under an act of 1936, that the Federal Government has taken on the responsibility of protecting our people, insofar as possible, against floods. Although the Federal Government had for some time prior to 1936 been conducting extensive flood control work in the lower Mississippi Valley area, it was not until the 1936 act that we recognized the necessity for an integrated, national program to check these floods at the source, at the headwaters. We recognized that the States alone could not handle this problem because Pennsylvania, for instance, can do nothing about a flood arising on the Susquehanna in New York State, and Ohio can do nothing by itself to prevent floods arising far up in the Allegheny or in the Monongahela. Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Arkansas, Missouri—these and other states and their people are vitally affected by rain and snow in watersheds far removed from them in my State, just as people in my State are haunted by the spectre of floods starting far from their homes.

I think it is safe to say that as far as Pennsylvanians are concerned, the 1936 flood control act was one of the greatest legislative achievements of the Congress among all of the basic reforms enacted into our social and economic life in the last 16 years.

The committee is now considering what is only the third large-scale waterways appropriation bill since before the war. During the war there were, of course, practically no flood-control projects under construction. The war forced a halt to what, up till then, had been an orderly, integrated program of long-range flood-control programing. Projects under construction in most cases came to a halt and were held in abeyance until after the war. In the meantime, however, floods continued to occur and some areas experienced floods of record size, and so, when the war ended and we were able late in the fiscal 1946 year to begin thinking again about flood control, there was a rush on the part of all localities subject to floods to get their projects into the going stage. As I recall, several score new projects were approved for construction funds along with most of the other projects which had been halted during the war. Most of the new projects which were started prior to July 1, 1946, were urgent, but that did not necessarily mean that others which did not manage to get into that first postwar flood-control appropriation bill were not of equal or greater urgency. Nevertheless, the first postwar bill did set something of a pattern and it has since been somewhat difficult—I should say very difficult—in view of the tremendous cost of the going projects, to get original construction funds for new ones. This bill has a few new projects in it and I sincerely hope the Senate committee will allow them to start.

I think we must bear in mind that because of the long period during the war when no flood-control work was undertaken except that directly connected with the war effort, we are required to try to make up year by year for some of the lost time, regardless of the fact that this means appropriations far in excess of what we might consider normal. These necessary extra appropriations are, in a sense, a cost of the war, just as are the tremendous sums we are spending abroad and to which the Senate gave such overwhelming endorsement just the other night in the vote on the Marshall plan.

Of course, our appropriations for flood control are not going to block communism, but they will do much toward fortifying and strengthening America. They will save American lives, and they will give to Americans in my State and in many other States the feeling of security they must have against the threat of these natural disasters, if they are to make their greatest contribution to the development of our country and the protection of its way of life.

And so I urge that you look at these appropriations requests as presented by the Corps of Engineers from the standpoint of the need rather than from any standpoint of bookkeeping economies—in many cases, false economies, which cost more in the long run than the dollars these economy gestures pretend to save. On these waterways appropriations, we are going to have to do the job eventually anyway, and to stretch out and delay the work from year to year in order to save some dollars out of the budget of any particular year, may be most uneconomical in case these alleged savings prevent the completion in time of projects which could stop floods.

I want to make one further observation before taking up some of the specific projects in Pennsylvania and in neighboring States in which I am interested directly. It is this: practically every Member of Congress who has had any acquaintanceship at all with the work of the Army engineers has, at one time or another, sung the praises of that corps and expressed his complete confidence in their ability. The work of the engineers is such that this confidence is merited. In the House hearings, not only this year, but in previous years, Members of the House Committee seldom missed an opportunity to tell the engineer representatives what a fine job they are doing. In the debate on the House floor on this appropriation, the engineers again came in for fulsome praise, praise as to their conscientiousness and efficiency, and above all, their judgment. This, as I say, occurs almost every year.

And yet, what happened? After telling the engineers how much they respect their judgment, the House committee proceeded to make sizeable cuts in the funds recommended by the engineers, not only for specific projects, but for over-all operations of planning, maintenance, and so on.

As General Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, told this committee just the other day, the recommendations made by his agency were not capricious; they were based on the studied judgment of this able organization. The funds in turn recommended by the Budget Bureau were not high—far from it. In many respects, these were the very barest minimum needs, as General Wheeler pointed out. I personally think the Budget Bureau has been overly severe in its attempts at cutting engineer requests before submitting them to Congress, and I have been making annual pilgrimages to the White House at budget preparation time to urge the President to see to it that Budget Bureau recommendations for waterways work are realistic and not scaled down merely for the benefit

of a so-called economy-minded Congress. It never fails, no matter how economical the President tries to be on waterways expenditures, that attempts are, nevertheless, made—and they often succeed—to cut the budget even when it is substantially a minimum budget. That happened last year particularly.

I would like to suggest to the committee, whose members I know share my high regard for the outstanding Corps of Army Engineers, that they, who are now in a position to do so, translate this regard for the engineers into a vote of confidence in the judgment of the engineers by restoring the funds cut out in the House. I am grateful for the fact that the committee last July followed the course I had urged upon you and undid much of the damage to the waterways programs which would have occurred under the 1948 bill passed by the House. I am sure the residents of Sunbury and Williamsport and Johnsonburg and Ridgeway and St, Marys all appreciate your willingness last year to revoke, to a large extent, the cuts made by the House in appropriations for their projects; I am sure all of Philadelphia, and particularly Philadelphia business and shipping interests which use our port, appreciate what you did to save the Delaware River improvement project from abandonment this year as was contemplated in the House bill. I am sure every one who uses that vast inland waterway traffic artery, the Ohio River, is grateful for what you did last year to assure present funds for the continuation of open channel dredging after the House had refused it. I know everyone in Pennsylvania who looks forward to the day when his own area will be free of floods, was grateful for the substantial increase you provided in advance planning funds after the House had cut them so drastically last year.

This year I am going to ask that you repeat the excellent course you followed on the 1948 fiscal-year appropriation when this committee, with the full support of the Senate, made clear last July that a slogan of economy was not going to be allowed to economize into disaster people who live under the threat of floods or have commerce which depends upon our rivers. I noted with much satisfaction that nearly all of the members of this subcommittee voted against the motion made on the Senate floor last year to recommit the bill and to take out $100,000,000 of the flood-control funds it carried. Had that motion prevailed, I think the Congress would have been guilty of taking a very grave and foolish backward step.

Now, with your permission, I should like to take up some of the specific programs and projects and provisions of the bill under consideration.

Flood control

The House committee was not as severe in its attack on flood control this time as it was last year, but it, nevertheless, recommended some serious reductions which were upheld by the House. Since flood control is a national problem, I cannot in any conscience come before you and insist that all of the Pennsylvania projects get every cent they need and that other projects be cut in order to keep the over-all figure below the President's budget. I think such narrow-minded selfishness is most deplorable. Floods are no respecters of political affiliation. The only ultimate solution to our flood problem is an integrated national program. The engineers have presented one. It deserves support. That means that we play no favorites; that we do not, for instance, assuming the needs are similar, take money away from projects in one part of the country in order to give more to projects in another. It means we must treat them all fairly and objectively.

In my discussion of Pennsylvania projects affected by this bill, I do not presume to say or imply that these projects are the only urgent ones in the country or are deserving of special treatment. They are certainly urgent and I cannot too forcefully testify to the importance of assuring them adequate funds. My purpose in describing them in some detail is to try to give you, from my knowledge of these projects in my State, a picture I think you will find typical of most projects in the President's budget.

1. Williamsport Flood Walls

The total cost of this project is $12,785,800. So far there has been expended on it $5,744,700. The budget for the coming year provided $2,244,400. The House cut this figure by $344,400, or 15 percent, leaving $1,900,000. In its report, the House committee pointed to an estimated $253,000 unobligated balance it believes will be on hand June 30 of this year for carry-over into the next year and points out that this means $2,153,000 available for expenditure in the 1949 fiscal year beginning July 1, which is only about $100,000 less than the proposed budget amount.

Gentlemen, this is double talk. The attempt here is to give the impression that the cut is not important and represents a reduction in operations of only $100,000 or so. Actually, this is not the case; the entire cut of $344,400 would stand and it would materially affect the rate of work on this urgent project. Even if the engineers do, in fact, have an unobligated balance next July 30 of a quarter of a million dollars out of this year's appropriation, there is no evidence whatsoever that they cannot efficiently and economically use that amount plus the full budget amount next year in an expeditious advancement of this extremely urgent project. Quite the contrary. The engineers say the reduction jeopardizes work now under way on the south bank by leaving it subject to damage these added funds could prevent.

In think all I need do is show this committee a booklet I have in my hand depicting what happened in Williamsport and South Williamsport and in the surrounding areas less than 2 years ago while these flood walls were in a state of partial completion but useless in holding off the raging waters of the Susquehanna. Until this project is substantially completed, the flood walls will not really be effective. As the people of Williamsport properly maintain, and as this editorial I have from one of the Williamsport papers makes clear, there is no economy at all in allowing a partially completed flood-protective system to stand unfinished and useless, particularly in view of the fact that we are committed to complete it eventually. The money requested for 1949 will allow for continuation of separate contracts now in force and for the initiation of several new contracts. If this money is granted in full, the project will be advanced from 46 percent of completion as of June 30, 1948, to 63 percent by the close of the June 30, 1949, fiscal year. It is my earnest hope not only that this full appropriation for this year be approved but that a substantially similar appropriation which the engineers contemplate asking for next year may also go through a year from now to bring this project to the point where, by the middle of 1950 or so, the people of Williamsport can begin looking for some real protection from these dikes, with their completion projected at present to the middle of 1952. If the House cut stands, the scheduled start of construction in 1948–49 on the Hagerman's Run pressure conduit and the South Williamsport Railroad alterations would be postponed another year.

Last year the committee restored a $400,000 cut made by the House in funds for this project. What I said at that time about the urgency of this work still holds true. Williamsport in 10 years has had the two worst floods in its history, and I think it is time we prevent scenes such as we are shown in this booklet of the devastation and the suffering and the hardship which came to that Pennsylvania community. The local residents have done their part; they have taxed themselves to pay their share of this project's cost. To prevent a scene such as I have in my hand here of an elderly woman being carried in terror from a rowboat after rescue from her flood-engulfed home is worth some of Uncle Sam's dollars. I, therefore, ask that you restore the full budget amount. The annual cost of this project, amortized over its expected usefulness, is figured at $585,000, whereas the annual benefits, in terms of damage it is expected to prevent in dollars each year, is nearly twice that much, or $991,500. Projects like this are good business.

2. Punxsutawney Dikes

This is another project which has been cut by the House. The budget provided for $1,428,100 and the House has allowed only $1,100,000, or a cut, dollar-wise, of about the same magnitude as Williamsport, but percentagewise, even higher, being nearly 23 percent. In this case, moreover, there will be virtually no carry-over of current-year funds. The entire cost of this project is estimated, as far as Federal funds are concerned, at $3,020,000, which is not excessive when considered in the light of the fact that a single flood in 1936 caused damage amounting to $1,047,000. The budget amount would allow for completion of the work before July 1, 1949. Why the House ever decided to pare the amount down so that the work will drag on into at least another year is a mystery to me, for their report gives no reason for the cut.

Last year, when this project was to have been left out of the flood funds, I appealed to both the House and the Senate committees to set up enough money for a continuation of work on it, and I am pleased that this was done. The project is now so close to completion that I think it would be most cruel to the 4,000 residents of this community in the flood path and to the many industrial and other firms affected, not to provide for expeditious completion. The damage this project will save annually is estimated at $109,500 as against an annual estimated cost of $94,500, which is a good ratio of benefits to cost and more than justifies the expense.

3. East Branch Clarion River

I mentioned earlier the fine assistance this committee gave me last year when I appealed to you to restore this project to the engineers' program for this current fiscal year. As you may recall, the House refused any funds and this committee granted my plea for $1,000,000 to add to the preliminary $500,000 fund previously voted so that the work could get under way in earnest. The project will be 20 percent completed by June 30 of this year and the $2,000,000 sought by the engineers for the coming fiscal year would bring the project, by June 30, 1949, to 43 percent of completion. However, the 15-percent House reduction of $300,000—and this seems to be a magic figure for House reductions this year as it does in so many of these items—would be a hard blow to this hope of having the reservoir within sight of the half-way mark by mid-1949, and completed by mid-1951. Here again, as in all the projects in Pennsylvania, and as in most of those in the country which the engineers are undertaking, the damage it will prevent each year is substantially greater than the amortized annual cost of the project. I think that is good business.

The sooner we get projects of this caliber completed—as long as we're bound to spend the money anyway—the sooner they can be put to work to earn their cost.

4. Other Pennsylvania Flood-Control Construction Projects

The foregoing three projects are the only construction projects under way in the State in which the House cut budget recommenda-

tions. I want this committee to know that I appear here not only to urge that these cuts be restored, but also so that I can make clear that on the other Pennsylvania projects, where the House made no reductions, there is equal justification for the full budget amounts. I feel required to emphasize that here because I have noticed an occasional tendency on the part of the Senate committee, when restoring cuts made in appropriations by the House, to proceed, in turn, to make some cuts of its own in items where the House did not do so.

Please be assured that on the Pennsylvania projects which got by the House unscathed this year there was an abundance of evidence in each case to support the full budget amount. Each of these projects is of utmost urgency to its locality, and the fact that the committee may not have any witnesses scheduled to appear in behalf of some of those projects is no indication that interest is lagging in them.

Unfortunately, and I say this not in criticism of anyone, but rather in criticism only of human nature, there is a tendency to get excited about these projects only when they are in jeopardy and to take them for granted once the House Committee has O. K.'d them for the full budget amount. Since the Senate Committee is in no way bound by the House action, I hasten to say that I give my full and vigorous suport to each project in my State in the bill.

These include the tremendous and tremendously important Conemaugh River Reservoir, which is the key structure in a network of reservoirs to protect Pittsburgh and the entire Ohio River area, and which is to receive $7,875,000; the dikes at Sunbury, which we saved from a severe House cut last year and which are now to receive $1,390,600; completion of the last remaining work on the Codorus Creek project at York, for which a modest $203,100 is provided; completion through expenditure of only $299,200, of the $9,680,000 Youghiogheny River Reservoir above McKeesport and Pittsburgh; completion of the $5,470,000 Loyalhanna Reservoir about 29 miles above Pittsburgh, for which only $276,200 is needed; completion of a small but highly important channel improvement in Westmoreland County at Latrobe, for which only $146,000 is required; and the final work, through an appropriation of only $402,000 on a $9,000,000 project which has helped to make the city of Johnstown the "floodless city" where the much-publicized flood of a half-century ago can be relegated to history and legend with no fear of a recurrence.

Last year I had to come before you to plead for additional funds for many of these projects because the House had treated them badly. This year the House has been fair to these particular projects. I shall be most happy to provide any information the committee may desire on any of these projects for which the House approved the full budget amount in case there is any doubt in the minds of any members of the Senate Committee over the justification of the House approval.

A majority of those I have just cited comprise the finishing touches to very effective and highly appreciated projects now in operation. Those like Youghiogheny and Loyalhanna, for instance, which are part of the network of six reservoirs now operating to protect the Pittsburgh area, and the project at Johnstown and the Codorus Creek project at York, have already, I should say, more than returned their cost to the Government in the Federal income taxes they have saved through the prevention of flood damage. Such damage, as you know, is a deductible item from income tax.

The only new Pennsylvania project from a construction standpoint in this bill is the one at Latrobe. I can assure you that it is well-warranted and the cost of it, $181,000, of which $146,000 is provided in this bill, is relatively modest.

5. Flood-Control Maintenance

The House bill provides the full budget amount of $3,000,000 for maintenance of existing flood-control projects. Of this amount, $141,000 is earmarked for seven Pennsylvania projects. I see no way that this amount can be cut and I certainly hope that the Senate committee will not attempt to cut it. The Pennsylvania projects and their amounts are: York, $10,000; Youghiogheny, $26,000; Loyalhanna, $25,000; Johnstown, $5,000; Mahoning Creek, $25,000; Crooked Creek, $26,000; Tionesta, $24,000.

6. Flood-Control Planning

This was one of the serious victims of the House bill. The total amount was cut 25 percent, from $4,000,000 to $3,000,000. Last year the House committee also made a serious cut of 50 percent in advance planning funds and we succeeded here in restoring much of the money. The Senate committee is to be congratulated for its realistic approach of last year on this item and I urge you to follow the same course this year. The cut recommended by the House last year, as I pointed out to you at that time, would have doomed any significant work on some very important projects in my State, projects which are now coming along very nicely on the planning boards because we succeeded in getting money for them. Among these are the Bear Creek Reservoir to protect Allentown and Bethlehem and the Lehigh Valley, which would have been reduced in this current year from $100,000 to $50,000; the Turtle Creek Reservoir in the western Pennsylvania network; and Tyrone, which received an $81,500 planning appropriation.

In the bill this year, the reduction in planning funds recommended by the House would mean a 22-percent cut in the planning funds available for the Prompton Reservoir on the Lackawaxen River; 20 percent on the Shenango Reservoir on the Shenango River; 30-percent reduction in funds available for Turtle Creek; 37½ percent for Tyrone; and a reduction of 28 percent in funds available for local protective planning work at Johnsonburg in Elk County, a community whose residents still remember with terror a flood in 1942 which caused great suffering and loss of life. The local project there is designed to supplement the protection afforded by the reservoir on the east branch of the Clarion River which I mentioned earlier. Under the budget figure of $4,000,000 for planning and under the House figure of $3,000,000, these projects would work out, in the coming year, as follows:

Budget figure of $4,000,000:	
Prompton Reservoir	$45,000
Shenango Reservoir	50,000
Turtle Creek Reservoir	50,000
Tyrone	40,000
Johnsonburg	7,000
House figure of $3,000,000:	
Prompton Reservoir	$35,000
Shenango Reservoir	40,000
Turtle Creek Reservoir	35,000
Tyrone	25,000
Johnsonburg	5,000

The Bear Creek Reservoir would be given $200,000 for planning work under the bill as it now stands. I support this figure because it will provide for accelerated action on the engineering work so that this project can go into the construction stage at the earliest possible moment. I remember very distinctly the persuasive and convincing arguments of Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, whose district would benefit from this project, when he presented the case in behalf of the original authorization of Bear Creek in the omnibus flood-control bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Mr. WALTER outlined not merely the advantage of such a project, but the absolute necessity for it, and as soon as possible, in terms of the national security. Bethlehem and Allentown and the Lehigh Valley are such prime centers of industrial production that dislocation and idleness of facilities there, due to floods, are intolerable in terms of the national interest, particularly since funds such as we are providing here can speed up the time when those floods can be avoided.

The engineers have earmarked $25,000 for the Dyberry Creek Reservoir, which, with the Prompton Reservoir, makes up much of the proposed program for the Lackawaxen River. I consider this program most important. I introduced a bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress for the authorization of this program on the Lackawaxen, but it became eligible too late for consideration in that term of Congress, for it was introduced just about the time the President was signing the omnibus authorization bill for that term. I have reintroduced the bill in the Eightieth Congress, however, and I am hopeful that the Senate Public Works Committee will act on it soon, preferably without waiting for an omnibus bill, because I would like to see the program on the Lackawaxen made ready as soon as possible for actual construction funds.

7. Transfer of Funds to Geological Survey

There is a relatively small item of $375,000 for transfer to the Geological Survey for stream gaging and special water surveys on civil rights. The House approved it this year, and I don't think I have to take up the time of the Senate committee in describing it in detail because I am confident that you will also approve it. The House action this year was gratifying in view of the fact that last year, on the Interior Department appropriation bill, the House committee reflected indifference to the importance of some of the work of Geological Survey and prohibited the Geological Survey from engaging in any underground water research. Although it was a different subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee which considered the Interior Department bill last year, I think some of you gentlemen were present when I outlined to that subcommittee the details of how that phase of the gaging-streams program operates, and its extreme importance to the States and the municipalities and to industry. Subsequently, the Senate Committee on Appropriations reversed the House last year and removed the prohibition against underground water activities of the Geological Survey. I don't think it was until the House seized upon this function as one it thought it could eliminate that most Members of Congress discovered there was such a thing and what it does. In that respect, the House committee performed a public service in bringing this function to the attention of the Congress, and I think now it is most unlikely that the Geological Survey need fear any congressional amputation of this important part of its program.

In the bill before us it is not the Geological Survey's appropriation which you are deciding on, of course, but merely a small fund used by the engineers to pay the Geological Survey for special work done in connection with flood control. There is another item in the rivers and harbors section of the bill of $125,000 for transfer to the Geological Survey for stream gaging work on navigation projects. I will not repeat testimony on this when I come to rivers and harbors projects, but I want you to know of my full support for that item, too.

8. Flood-Control Projects Outside Pennsylvania

As I said at the beginning of my statement, flood control is a national problem and cannot possibly be considered merely on a strict State-by-State basis. I have gone into the Pennsylvania projects in some detail because I am most familiar with them and can testify on behalf of my constituents on the importance of these projects to individual areas of Pennsylvania. I have enough confidence in the engineers to believe that they are doing

insofar as they can, the same sort of job elsewhere in the country that they are doing in Pennsylvania on flood control, and it is a remarkable job and one which warrants the full confidence of the Congress.

I am not as familiar as I would like to be with some of the projects in this bill in lower New York State on the Susquehanna River or its headwaters, but I am convinced, from the information available to me, that these projects are not merely protection for residents of New York State—protection these people are entitled to have—but they are important, also, to everyone who lives along the Susquehanna down through Pennsylvania. If we can stop these floods on the Susquehanna from starting, that's much better than building dikes along the way to keep them in check. Now, of course, we're going to need diking in spots and additional reservoirs in Pennsylvania. A long-range program for the Susquehanna is now under study, and interest in it throughout the northern Pennsylvania area is keen. Recommendations will eventually be forthcoming on the best methods of providing an integrated Susquehanna program, but in the meantime, since these reservoirs in lower New York State are now under construction, I urge their prompt completion. The House cut the budget recommendations for the East Sidney and Almond Reservoirs by $792,300 and $153,200 respectively, a cut of more than 20 percent in the former case and nearly 10 percent in the latter, and in either case there does not appear to be any substantial carry-over from this year, and so the reason for the cuts is far from clear. Hence, I ask that you restore them.

9. Preliminary Examinations, Surveys, and Contingencies

The House did not touch the budget recommendation of $5,000,000 for this item. I think the budget recommendation is too low and I would like to urge this committee to come forward with a figure approaching $7,917,000 originally asked by the engineers in their request to the Budget Bureau. Last year this committee substantially revised upward the House figure on preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies, revising it upward by about $2,000,000, although the conference bill cut this down a little.

This item covers all of the work done by the district offices at the direction of Congress in surveying the need for new flood-control projects prior to the submission of legislation for authorization of any new projects by the Congress.

I think every Member of Congress who has flood problems in his district or in his State should be vitally concerned over this particular appropriation item, because this fund enables us, through the engineers, to determine whether any particular area is justified in seeking Federal funds for flood control. We all know that not every flood can be prevented. A cloudburst may cause a flood which no amount of Federal aid could prevent. The problem may be one of reforestation or antierosion control rather than flood control. Again, by reason of geography or topography, the construction of adequate protective devices might be so prohibitive in cost in relation to the damage done by floods as to make the project economically unfeasible. They are among the things which the engineers determine under this appropriation item. The engineers are able to get at the facts, but their promptness depends upon the adequacy of their funds.

Members of Congress are always deluged with demands for various types of local and regional flood-control measures, particularly after every flood, and even after floods of minor significance, and unless we can have the engineers in a position to report promptly on the factors involved, on the damage, on the needs, and on some of the engineering difficulties, the people back home are going to be very upset over their do-nothing Congress and Government. Particularly when we are engaged in such widespread activities abroad on behalf of alleviating suffering—these activities abroad are proper and I support them—but inasmuch as we are engaged to the extent that we are in these programs abroad, many of our citizens feel betrayed if they cannot, because of budgetary problems, get reasonably prompt action from their Government on things which directly affect their own lives and safety, for instance, flood control.

Even if we can't build every flood-control project which residents of various localities think is necessary, we can at least provide the engineers with the funds to enable them to make the necessary studies—and make them promptly—in order to provide us with the facts so that we can decide whether a particular proposed project is justified. That is why I ask that you not only approve the full budget amount of $5,000,000 for this item, but that you go further and provide the amount which the engineers think they need to do the kind of job they feel is justified. That would mean an appropriation of $7,917,000.

At present, in Pennsylvania, we have several important project surveys under way which I would like to see expedited as much as possible, and that would mean obtaining the higher figure of nearly $8,000,000. I am sure members of this committee recall reading in the newspapers from time to time of the devastating floods which have been hitting parts of northern Pennsylvania on the east branch and on the west branch of the Susquehanna River. I mentioned earlier the importance of full speed ahead on some of the reservoirs in New York State on the Susquehanna and the fact that there is now underway this study for an integrated system of flood control on the Susquehanna in Pennsylvania. Even under the most advantageous conditions insofar as funds are concerned, it will probably be several years before a report comes out blueprinting such a program. The job is of such magnitude and the engineering problems so difficult and some of the sectional and geographic differences are so strong that when we do get a report, we want it to be a practical report which the entire area can support and which will do the job of curbing these terrible floods. Thus, any delay in the work, because of a shortage of funds, would be most unfortunate, and it would be most unfair to a very large and very important area of Pennsylvania, an area perhaps one-fourth as large as the State itself.

The engineers also have studies underway in their district offices on the Juniata and Schuylkill Rivers, both of which flow through important industrial areas of my State. Any reduction in the budget amount for preliminary examination and surveys would react unfavorably to those studies and, of course, any increase over the budget amount would help speed the work along. There is also a comprehensive review underway in the upper Allegheny area which would be affected in the same way.

In this connection, I would like to cite an incident which demonstrates the importance of adequate funds for plans and surveys. I was the author of the resolution several years ago to provide for this study in the upper Allegheny, particularly in and around Eldred and Bradford. I introduced the resolution following severe floods in 1946. My resolution was adopted and the study got under way late that year. After the engineers had completed their survey work at Bradford, a new and very damaging flood hit the community. You may have seen pictures of it in the newspapers. The new flood was of such severity that the engineers decided they should incorporate in their report the facts dealing with that latest flood. That meant they would require the money to go back and make a resurvey. Only a few thousand dollars was needed, but so close was the budget on which the engineers were working that there was, for a time, great doubt that they could finance the necessary additional study. Fortunately, they were able to scrape together enough to complete that work, and now the report of the district engineer and division engineer, favorable to the project, is down here awaiting action. I hope the action will be prompt. My point is that if the engineers are working on a very tight budget, as this $5,000,000 figure would require them to do, there will undoubtedly be instances in which communities will be required to wait unduly long for completion of studies. Even in cases where the need for flood control is obvious, action must be delayed pending these necessary compilations of facts.

It would be much better all around if the engineers had the money to allow for flexibility in meeting such contingencies, and that is why I ask you to raise the sights here to $7,917,000.

Rivers and harbors

Navigational activities of the Corps of Engineers are not nearly as dramatic as their flood-control work and sometimes we are inclined to ignore their importance. It is pretty hard to get people excited over the dredging of so many tons of material out of a navigation channel or the repair or replacement of a lock and dam, whereas, in connection with flood control, every person in an area which has ever sustained a flood remains flood conscious at all times and is most interested in all developments in respect to flood control. Pittsburghers, for instance, can get excited about a flood occurring anywhere, because they instantly recall their own experiences in 1936 when the flood waters poured into the heart of the downtown area of Pittsburgh and threw that entire industrial city into a state of near collapse. Pittsburghers, and I use Pittsburgh as an example only because their flood experience is so well known, favor adequate appropriations for flood control not only for their own protection but for other areas of the country menaced by floods. This is best illustrated by a Pittsburgh Press editorial a year or so ago urging the Congress to provide sufficient funds for flood control in the mid-West and elsewhere. The editorial cited the fact that largely because of Federal aid, Pittsburgh was virtually flood proof and that what was good for them is equally good for other communities. Pittsburghers, this editorial said, were so grateful for their own protection provided by the Federal Government that they were more than willing to share the expense of building similar reservoirs for citizens in other parts of the country.

There is not the same general acceptance of the necessity for navigation projects of the Federal Government (although there is, of course, in Pittsburgh, because that is an inland waterway port of tremendous importance). But generally, in most of the country where waterways are not navigable, these appropriations are represented as nothing more than "pork" for the benefit of vote-seeking Congressmen in their own districts. This committee of the Senate, of course, knows better. Its members, whether from port areas or not, particularly through their experience on this committee, know of the close connection between our waterways and ocean ports and the general level of prosperity in the country. Hence, reductions in funds for navigation improvements and maintenance, such as contained in this bill, can have a serious effect on our industrial and commercial state of health. I can speak with some authority only on those projects involved here from my State or from adjoining States. My knowledge of these projects and of their importance and my knowledge of the engineers' work on them and

plans for them convince me that they know what they are doing and that they are trying to be fair and are approaching this problem with the best interests of the country at heart. Therefore, although I cannot testify from my own knowledge to the justification for every item in the budget estimate for rivers and harbors, I have seen enough of the engineers' work to be convinced that if they say the projects are necesary and the funds are necessary, then that, generally, is sufficient evidence for me.

As General Wheeler told this committee several days ago, the projects eligible for construction have all been authorized by Congress and only after a thoroughgoing analysis which showed that they are economically justified.

Our foreign and coastwise water traffic is at all-time record levels. Great Lakes and inland-waterway traffic has spurted tremendously and, to take the Ohio River as one example, we have seen traffic there increase from an annual average of 3,000,000,000 ton-miles during the 5 years preceding the war to a 1946 level of 5,000,000,000 ton-miles, or an increase of 66⅔ percent.

This traffic cannot be accommodated if the harbors and the rivers are allowed to become clogged and the channels narrowed. This traffic cannot be accommodated if locks and dams 40 or more years old and obsolete in terms of modern river equipment are not replaced in an orderly fashion. That is why I am most disturbed about some of the cuts made by the House for rivers and harbors construction, maintenance, operation, and care. I think the reductions represent false economy.

A large part of our prosperity today in Pennsylvania, and thus of the Nation, rests on waterway traffic. The most basic industries of steel and coal are dependent upon this artery just as they are on the railroads. My own city of Philadelphia, the Nation's second city, has a tremendous stake in the efficient operation of our port and the efficient operation of that port is jeopardized by this bill as it now stands.

To be specific:

1. Delaware River Improvement

The House, for the second straight year, has eliminated any funds for the continuation of work on the long-range improvement of the Delaware River at Philadelphia. Last year the budget recommended $500,000 for this work and the House refused to provide any money. The Senate, I am happy to say, granted my request and restored the budget amount and this figure was accepted in the conference report and thus work could continue on this project during the current fiscal year. This work currently consists of dredging a portion of the Mantua Creek anchorage to a depth of 35 feet.

The over-all project, estimated to cost $34,900,000, of which $28,161,700 has already been provided, calls for extension of a 37-foot channel from the navy yard to Allegheny Avenue, and enlargement of 37-foot anchorages at Port Richmond, Mantua Creek and Marcus Hook. However, the present appropriation request of $1,051,000 would take the Mantua Creek anchorage only to a depth of 35 feet over the full project width and depth, leaving, after the next fiscal year, the job of deepening the Mantua Creek and Port Richmond anchorages from 35 to 37 feet and similarly deepening from 35 to 37 feet the channel above Philadelphia Navy Yard.

The House, however, cut the figure for this coming year by 100 percent to zero. This, as I said, was the second straight time the House committee and the House apparently decided that Philadelphia's port was not important enough to merit the continuation of work to keep the port in operating condition. I have no idea what prompted the House to this action. Nothing shows in the House hearings to indicate doubt in anyone's mind as to the justification of the work; nothing shows in the House report to explain the cut. When the bill was before the House, not a single voice was raised in protest or in demands for an explanation, and it is one of those deep mysteries I cannot fathom. I was hoping one of more of our six House Members from Philadelphia might interest himself in the issue during the House debate but that does not show anywhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Certainly there could be no political explanation. The entire shipping industry in Philadelphia, the oil industry, the chamber of commerce, the host of other organizations and commercial interests vitally concerned with port activities have all appealed to me to try again this year to save the project as was done last year with the help of this committee.

Our port is one of the most important in the country. Philadelphia traffic on the Delaware during 1946 amounted to 37,151,175 tons. In addition, cargoes in transit over this portion of the Delaware amounted to another 262,234 tons and car-ferry and cross-river traffic to 2,346,602 tons.

The Mantua Creek anchorage, which is the one most directly involved in this item this year, holds a tremendous amount of oil traffic. It is not always practical, as you know, to berth every tanker at the same time and so they must use this anchorage basin until they can get a come-ahead signal. Some of the tankers are pretty big, pretty long, and they swing around there in the anchorage and sometimes swing out into the channel and the situation is most serious and can, in fact, be very dangerous. Nearly all the vessels using the anchorage are loaded with inflammable cargoes. We want no Texas City disaster in Philadelphia and I plead with this committee with all sincerity to help us prevent any such disaster. One solution, of course, if you can call it a solution, would be to reduce the use of Philadelphia as a port and that is no solution at all, particularly in view of the heavy concentration there of oil and other important industries. That, however, seems to be the solution offered us by the House.

The engineers have an orderly plan for the completion of this project entirely by mid-1953, contingent upon the approval of Congress now and in the succeeding years of appropriations substantially equal to that asked for this coming year. If the House were to prevail on this item, cutting out any funds for the Philadelphia port this coming year, that would mean either that appropriations in each of the four succeeding years would have to be subsentially greater than now contemplated or else the project would have to be dragged out for one or more additional years. That is not economy; that is waste. It is particularly wasteful in terms of national well-being and the economic picture, because if commerce through Philadelphia is hampered by lack of funds for port operation, maintenance, and improvement, commerce throughout the Nation suffers, the relationship of our commerce to the Nation being that closely related.

I will discuss later, under the heading of "Maintenance funds," another serious blow to Philadelphia commerce through the House action in reducing the appropriation for harbor maintenance. Right now, however, I want to continue with the rest of the construction items.

2. Monongahela River Locks and Dam No. 2

The present structure in the Monongahela River at Braddock, a few miles above Pittsburgh and right in the heart of one of the heaviest concentrations of steel-manufacturing facilities in the world, was built 42 years ago. It was a fine and adequate lock at that time; it is very much out of date today. River transportation has come a long way in those intervening years. The present lock cannot handle the existing traffic and some of the equipment now coming out will be even harder to accommodate through this lock. The result is extended delay and serious navigational difficulties on what I believe is the most heavily used waterway in the entire world and certainly the greatest coal-hauling waterway. The steel mills depend on the coal and the iron ore they get via these waterways, as well as that shipped in by rail. Steel is perhaps our most critical material today, in terms of our long-range prosperity as well as our foreign policy and our national security.

The Monongahela project call ultimately for expenditure of $9,860,000. So far, about $2,700,000 has been provided and this year the engineers asked for $1,400,000, so that they could make a big dent in the work to be done. The House, for no given reason, used an ax here and brought the figure down to $900,000—a cut of more than one-third. To finish this project by mid-1951 is going to take sizable appropriations in both the 1950 and 1951 fiscal years, according to the present long-range schedule of the engineers, and if we allow this cut to stand, it means those already large appropriations in the two succeeding years are going to have to be just that much larger. I cannot see how we can, with any safety to our basic industrial strength and hence to our security and our economy, prolong this work. In 1946, 14,200,000 tons of traffic moved through this particular set of locks. That is about 40 percent or so of the total traffic volume on the main artery of our inland system—the Ohio—at a point near Ironton, Ohio.

I will come to the Ohio next, including dredging operations at Ironton, which is also involved in the bill this year, but first I would like to say to the committee, and particularly to the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. REVERCOMB, that I am familiar with a project which I understand he is sponsoring and which the House left out. This provides for the replacement of similar obsolete locks built in 1903 far up in the Monongahela near Morgantown which will not today accommodate modern-type barges, so that each barge must be pulled through separately by manual operation. I understand the engineers could economically use $5,100,000 for this project this coming year, if the Congress were to provide it, and I would be most happy to endorse and support such an amount.

3. Ohio River Open-Channel Work

The House was on better behavior on this project this time than it was last year when it eliminated funds completely for the Ohio. This year it granted the full $199,500 budget amount for the further dredging of the John Paul Jones bar, 324 miles below Pittsburgh near Ironton. This work will help to provide a channel of adequate depth and width sufficient so that heavy tows can meet and pass here without distress and danger and delay. I trust that this committee, which agreed to our request to save the project from discontinuance a year ago, will now approve a further extension of life for it in order to promote safety and efficiency on the great inland-waterway system of which the Ohio is a key artery.

4. Schuylkill River

The amount sought by the Engineers this year, $1,295,000 will virtually complete the work of deepening the channel in the Schuylkill from 30 to 33 feet between the mouth of the river at the Delaware River and the Passyunk Avenue Bridge in Philadelphia. There will still be some rock shoals to be removed above the Passyunk Bridge. This work of deepening the channel is of vital importance to Philadelphia trade and industry and will permit tankers, including the large ones, to berth without long delays now necessary in waiting for favorable tides. Traffic here has been tremendous, the volume for 1946 being 12,805,823 tons. The House was fair with us this year and provided the full budget amount for this work and I trust the Senate will do the same. I want you to know of my very close personal interest, as a Philadelphian, in this particular project.

There is another Schuylkill River project in the pending stage, one which is a great favorite of mine since it is designed to give this river a complete face-lifting and remove the accummulations of millions of tons of culm—coal wastes—which now clog it up and make it an eyesore and literally black. At present pace of State cooperation in this multimillion-dollar joint program, the Federal Government should be swinging into the work by 1951 unless we can work out some agreement under which work by the Federal Government could start earlier. The authorization bill provided that State responsibilities of great scope must be met in removing much of the culm in the upper levels and also in preventing the discharge of further wastes into the river before the Federal Government could start. The State is now getting into high gear on its end of the work, but the fact that it has definitely started operations, committing itself to do its share of the work, may provide us with some effective arguments in seeking to move up the date for the Federal Government to start. My purpose in mentioning this project today is so that you will be familiar with it when the first opportunity arises that we can properly seek funds for it.

5. Maintenance

The House cut funds for maintenance of our waterways, that is, normal dredging, from $53,000,000 to $50,000,000. Considered in terms of total amount, this cut would not immediately appear to be significant. I cannot too strongly protest, however, that the effect of this cut, if it is allowed to stand, will be most severe at those places where it hurts the most. I'll explain: The engineers must—they cannot avoid it—do a certain amount of maintenance dredging on all of our navigable streams and in our various harbors. When their funds are cut, they cannot cut each project proportionately, because that would reduce work on some, on many, below an irriducible minimum for safety. Consequently, they continue doing the minimum of work in a great number of places and make up for the cut by large-scale reductions in the work on certain big projects.

Thus this $3,000,000 cut will materially affect the Delaware River and the Schuylkill River and the Ohio River. On the Delaware, for instance, the engineers had intended spending in the coming year about $2,500,000 of their maintenance fund and on the Schuylkill about $1,200,000. These are purely maintenance expenses, not designed to widen or deepen channels, but rather to prevent existing channels from shoaling. In order to do minimum amounts of work elsewhere, they must take money, substantial amounts of it, from these two important traffic arteries. It seems rather silly for us to be spending funds to widen and deepen channels and anchorages on these rivers at one spot or another, to improve navigation and to repair the damage of previous neglect, while allowing shoals to form in the same rivers a short distance away. It is important to remember that any maintenance dredging in those rivers which is not done this coming year, because of penny-pinching, will have to be done in following years, and it will then be a much more sizable job. Removing this stuff before it gets out of hand is much simpler and much cheaper than waiting until you have a thick deposit and then trying to remove it all at once in an emergency attempt to restore shipping channels.

Similarly, the engineers had earmarked $50,000 for maintenance dredging on the Monongahela, $9,000 on the Allegheny, $15,000 on the Youghiogheny, and $139,000 for maintenance work at Erie. All of these programs will suffer from this cut in progressive disproportion according to their size. The engineers cannot provide me with specific figures on how the cut would work out dollarwise on these projects, but they do inform me that when you get a job running $50,000 or up and particularly over $100,000, as in the Erie case and the Delaware and Schuylkill, the reductions will have to be most severe.

Erie Harbor has had a bad time with storms in recent years and there is a necessity to work out means of saving its famed peninsula from erosion threatening to separate it from the mainland. If maintenance work on the harbor itself is allowed to be slowed substantially, the people up there are going to begin to wonder what seems to make them unpopular with Congress. There is no excuse for this maintenance reduction that I can find and so I urge that you restore the full amount in the budget estimate. The House figure is the same as last year's appropriation, but traffic on these waterways is increasing.

6. Examinations, Surveys, and Contingencies

The House cut here amounts to 41 percent, from $3,400,000 to $2,000,000. The original amounts had included $111,000 for the Philadelphia district office, $144,700 for Pittsburgh, and $182,750 for Buffalo. I presume the cut would be apportioned proportionately. This item covers not only the preparation of examinations and surveys on new projects, but, of great significance to trade and commerce, it also covers the collection of valuable commercial statistics. Further, under this item, the engineers enforce the Oil-Pollution Act, which is of close interest to Philadelphia as it is, I am sure, to all ports of oceangoing shipping. Oil pollution and pollution from bilge waste has been a big problem in the Philadelphia port area, and we are making good strides now in enforcing the act and preventing violations, both by educational methods and by prosecution, and I hope the committee will not allow the House cut to stand and to jeopardize this program and the others involved in this item.

7. Operation and Care

The House cut here was from $21,500,000 to $20,000,000. It will affect lock operations on the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio sufficiently, I am informed, to be serious. I have already outlined some of the problems of lock operation due to obsolete equipment. If funds for their operation are cut, the difficulties will be further aggravated. Under the original budget estimate before it was cut in the House, the Monongahela would be allotted $1,078,200, the Allegheny $204,400, and the Ohio $5,900,000. These rivers are life lines of western Pennsylvania and many other States and of national and world trade in the most fundamental of commodities, and the locks are the means of keeping those lines functioning. I urge that you restore the full budget amount.

Conclusion

A final word: The flood-control and rivers-and-harbors projects I have described are not WPA projects, not "made work" to provide employment. They are essential measures for protecting lives and property and industry and for promoting trade and commerce. The funds required are sought on only one basis—a business basis.

The United Nations and Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles regarding the United Nations and Palestine, by Benjamin V. Cohen, formerly counselor of the Department of State, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, March 16 and 17, 1948. I think the articles well deserve reading by Senators and others.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald-Tribune of March 16, 1948]

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PALESTINE

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN STAND WOULD IMPAIR UN'S CHARTER

(By Benjamin V. Cohen, formerly counselor of the Department of State)

The statement made by Senator Austin in the Security Council on February 24 indicates that the State Department doubts the authority of the Security Council to maintain peace in Palestine on the basis of the plan adopted by the General Assembly. The statement seems to go further and to cast doubt on the authority of the Security Council to remove a threat to the peace in any case by requiring the parties to the dispute to accept a political settlement of their differences. Because the issues thus raised affect not only Palestine but the future effectiveness of the United Nations, I feel impelled to express dissent from the apparent implications of that statement. Those implications would go far to make the charter impotent and to relieve the members of the United Nations of any real responsibility thereunder. In these critical days, it is not in our interest or in the interest of freedom and law in the world for us to read the life out of the charter of the United Nations.

Before considering the legal issues, however, I should like to point out that the State Department's present position represents a departure from the approach to the United Nations heretofore taken by President Truman, as well as by Secretary Byrnes and Senator Austin himself. Heretofore the approach of the American Government to the United Nations has been not to inquire what we legally and technically are obligated to do, but what we legally and practically can do, to make the United Nations effective.

When Iran was threatened with aggression in the spring of 1946, Secretary Byrnes did not say we were helpless because the Soviet Union could and would veto anything we proposed, but he solemnly announced that we would defend the purposes, principles, and policies of the United Nations, veto or no veto.

In their addresses before the General Assembly in the fall of 1946, both President Truman and Senator Austin averred that the large States as well as the small States were bound to live up to the obligations they had assumed under the Charter and that the veto did not give them the right to absolve themselves from these obligations.

Heretofore it has been the policy of the United States to seek to realize the great potentialities of the Charter and not to exaggerate and magnify its limitations.

The statement of February 24 admits the authority of the Security Council to remove a threat to international peace and security whether arising from within or without Palestine; but the statement goes far toward undermining the authority of the Security Council to do so by asserting that the Security Council has no authority to enforce partition or any other political settlement.

Certainly the Security Council with the active support of our Government, took a different view when it accepted the responsibilities to be vested in it in relation to the free territory of Trieste under the Italian treaty. In the Trieste case the Security Council recognized that there were situations

in which it could act not only under article 39 with reference to specific threats to the peace but under article 24 which vests in it primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. As is clearly pointed out in the President's recent "Report on the United Nations: 1947," on page 96, the Security Council supported the view expressed by the Secretary-General in a formal legal opinion on this question according to which "the Security Council was not restricted to the specific powers set forth in chapters VI, VII, VIII, and XII of the Charter but was held to have powers commensurate with its responsibilities in the field of the maintenance of international peace and security."

Leaving aside the special circumstances affecting the Palestine situation it is highly disturbing for the future of the United Nations that the State Department in the Austin statement should question, as it seems to question, the authority of the Security Council to impose or enforce a political settlement under article 39 if the Security Council deems such settlement essential to the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security. In a practical world the problem of peace and the problem of settlement are frequently one and inseparable.

Certainly the general language of the charter requires no such unrealistic interpretation. And if we wish the United Nations to live and grow we should avoid abstract interpretations which may seriously hamper the practical efforts of the Security Council to keep the peace. Our own Supreme Court has wisely refused to interpret our own Constitution save as it is necessary to decide concrete cases. It would be equally wise for our State Department to refrain from attempting to limit by broad generalization in advance of controversy the authority of the Security Council to maintain international peace or security.

Under article 39, the authority of the Security Council, in event of a threat to the peace, is to maintain or restore international peace and security; its authority is not limited to the mere stopping of hostilities. There is no need or justification for insisting at this time that the Security Council has authority only to stop fighting or threatened fighting. In the world in which we live, threats to peace and security cannot be removed without regard to the causes which have produced those threats.

Certainly it cannot lightly be assumed that the Security Council must in all cases maintain peace on the basis of the status quo even though the Security Council is convinced and agreed that the status quo has been irreparably destroyed by events, or has become practically intolerable and morally indefensible.

Article 37 of the Charter obligates the parties to a dispute which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security to refer the dispute to the Security Council if they are unable to settle it by peaceful means, and it authorizes the Security Council when it deems that a continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate. If the Security Council does act under this article and its recommendations are not accepted and a breach of peace occurs, it is very unrealistic to believe that the Security Council was intended under article 39 to call upon the members of the United Nations to stop hostilities with no power of any kind or in any circumstance to maintain peace on the basis of its own recommendations.

Article 40 expressly authorizes the Security Council before making recommendations or deciding upon measures under article 39 to call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as the Council deems necessary and appropriate without prejudice to their rights, but the Council is expressly empowered duly to take account of their failure to comply. It would seem strange indeed that the Council should have authority to call upon the parties to comply with provisional measures and not have authority after full deliberation to require continued compliance with those measures or compliance with such other measures as the Council determines to be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Paragraph 7 of article I provides that nothing contained in the Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the Charter. But there is this very important proviso: That this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII. This clearly indicates that when there is an actual threat to international peace the Security Council may even require the settlement of matters claimed to be within the domestic jurisdiction of members. In truth, peace cannot be maintained and war averted without regard to the causes of the threats to the peace.

If the Charter is to live, we must not exalt the letter which killeth and destroy the spirit which giveth life. To paraphrase the words of Chief Justice Marshall, we must remember that the Charter was intended to endure for ages to come, and to be adapted to the various crises in human affairs.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 17, 1948]

THE UNITED NATIONS AND PALESTINE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S RESOLUTION ON PARTITION SHOULD BE SUPPORTED AND IMPLEMENTED

(By Benjamin V. Cohen, formerly counselor of the Department of State)

In attempting to make broad generalizations of doubtful validity, the State Department has thus far neglected to consider very significant aspects of the Palestine case.

The State Department refers to the partition plan as if it were a mere recommendation of the General Assembly. That is a very partial or fragmentary statement of the case. It omits consideration of vital developments of great legal significance.

Palestine is under mandate and to be administered as a sacred trust of civilization. The United Kingdom is the mandatory power for Palestine. It is the only sovereign state, the only member of the United Nations having substantive rights in Palestine. The Charter contemplated, if it did not require, that a mandatory power desiring to retain its mandate should accept a United Nations trusteeship to be worked out by agreement between the mandatory power and the General Assembly. But the United Kingdom, before the United Nations became effective, created an independent state out of Trans-Jordan which was under the Palestine mandate, and sought, unsuccessfully, to devise a settlement for Palestine which would not involve a continuation of the mandate. Failing to devise a settlement, the United Kingdom notified the General Assembly of her intention to abandon the mandate and requested the General Assembly to recommend a solution under article 14 of the charter.

Certainly there can be no question of the authority of the General Assembly under article 14 to make its recommendations for the peaceful adjustment of the Palestine situation as one which if not adjusted is likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations.

To avoid suspicion that its solution might be influenced by the power politics or the domestic political considerations of some of the great powers, the General Assembly excluded the great powers from the Special Commission which it appointed to recommend a solution. The majority of the Special Commission recommended a partition plan with Economic Union. The General Assembly adopted a resolution recommending "to the United Kingdom, as the manadory power for Palestine, and to all other members of the United Nations the adoption and implementation, with regard to the future government of Palestine, of the plan of partition with Economic Union" which is set out at length in the resolution and is a revised form of the plan recommended by the Special Commission.

The resolution took note of the declaration by the mandatory power that it intended to complete its evacuation of Palestine by August 1, 1948. The resolution provided that the administration of Palestine should, as the mandatory power withdrew, be turned over to a United Nations Commission composed of representatives of five member states to be designated by the General Assembly.

While refusing to accept any special responsibility for carrying out the plan, the United Kingdom has officially announced that she will accept the plan, terminate the mandate on May 15, 1948, and turn over the administration to the United Nations Commission. The United Nations Commission has been appointed by the General Assembly and its members have agreed to serve.

At the present time the Security Council therefore is not dealing with a mere recommendation of the General Assembly. It is dealing with a recommendation which has not only been supported by more than two-thirds of the member states voting, but which has been accepted by the mandatory power, the only sovereign state having substantive rights in Palestine. So far as the authority of the Security Council to assist in the implementation of the plan is concerned, the Palestine plan created by the resolution voted by the General Assembly and accepted by the United Kingdom is not essentially different legally from the plan for the free territory of Trieste created by the peace treaty and accepted by Italy. The maintenance of peace in each of these countries is significantly related to the maintenance of international peace and security. Article 24 of the Charter, conferring upon the Security Council primary responsibility for international peace and security, is as much applicable to the one plan as to the other.

The recommended plan for Palestine which has been accepted by the mandatory power provides that only regime of law that will exist for Palestine after May 15, 1948. If that plan is not recognized there will be a legal vacuum in Palestine, and anarchy and terror—an obvious threat to international peace and security—will prevail. The law abhors a vacuum and the principles of the Charter cannot and do not tolerate it. Since the mandatory power has accepted the plan and agreed to transfer its administration to the United Nations Commission, no state has the right to use force or the threat of force, or to encourage the use of force or threat of force, to obstruct its execution. International peace and security cannot be maintained in Palestine except on the basis of a regime of law. And certainly those states which voted for the plan are under a moral obligation to recognize that regime.

If, avoiding legal sophistry, the State Department would devote its efforts to the devising of measures which our Government, and other governments, individually and collectively, might properly take to assist

in the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution on Palestine, we might even at this late date preserve the authority of the United Nations. The time is short for collective action by the Security Council, however desirable that would be. Individual action in support of the General Assembly's resolution and in cooperation with the the United Nations Commission is not unilateral action. Failure of the Security Council to act does not relieve member states of their individual responsibility.

The threat to international peace in Palestine arises in large measure from doubt as to the United Nations Commission's ability to maintain law and order in Palestine while the plan is being implemented. The United Nations Commission needs guidance and assistance in developing a dependable militia to act as its defense arm and to protect it in taking over the administration of Palestine. Nothing in fact has undermined the authority of the United Nations Commission so much as the American arms embargo denying arms to those willing to support the Commission as well as to those threatening to use force to obstruct its work and to destroy its authority. If the United Nations Commission was aided to organize a dependable local militia from those elements willing to support its authority, the need for outside national contingents would be minimized, if not eliminated.

The Jewish militia, the Haganah, is the strongest organized force in Palestine. It is committed to the support of the United Nations Palestine settlement. Properly equipped and directed, and supplemented to some extent by voluntary recruitment from abroad, it should be able to protect the United Nations Commission and on the Commission's behalf maintain order in Palestine. The most urgent need in Palestine is not troops, but a United Nations Commission's command and United Nations' arsenals, for those troops who are ready and willing to subject themselves to the United Nations Commission's command. What is required are practical arrangements between the United Nations Commission and Haganah to assure the supremacy of the United Nations Commission's command and the command's control of the Commission's arsenals. Naturally the command would not wish to use Jewish troops in the Arab State except when necessary to break up concentrations directed against the Jewish State or the Jerusalem area. Of course, the United Nations Commission should be prepared to incorporate into its militia Arab forces which are willing to subject themselves to its command. And it would, of course, be of great moral assistance to the Commission to have a small token international force if such a force could be promptly recruited on a voluntary basis, preferably from the states which are members of the Commission.

If there is to be peace on the basis of law in Palestine, the United Nations Commission, which will on May 15 become the provisional administration of Palestine, should have the support of the Security Council and of all members of the United Nations in carrying out its difficult task. The members of the Council should make it clear that they will assist and not hamper the Commission in implementing the plan and in enforcing law and order. The first step should be to assist and encourage the United Nations Commission to organize a Palestine militia as its defense arm and to provide it with an effective command with adequate arms and equipment. To achieve this and to preserve the authority of the United Nations, the United States can do much if those in our Government charged with the responsibility have the will and resourcefulness to do so.

Detroit Housing Commission Recommends Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of a letter and resolution relative to the legislative program adopted by the Detroit Housing Commission and approved by Mayor Van Antwerp. I am sure that many other large cities face the same problem that we do in the city of Detroit, and these constructive recommendations should be considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and resolution follow:

CITY OF DETROIT,
OFFICE OF DETROIT
HOUSING COMMISSION,
March 17, 1948.

Congressman GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Attached is the legislative program adopted by the Detroit Housing Commission and approved by Mayor Van Antwerp.

I hope this will be helpful to you as we have been told that Congress is now at work on important housing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. INGLIS,
Director-Secretary.

CITY OF DETROIT,
OFFICE OF DETROIT HOUSING COMMISSION,
February 26, 1948.

Honorable COMMON COUNCIL,
City Hall, Detroit, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: We respectfully urge your support of an aggressive legislative program to alleviate the city's critical housing shortage and submit the following facts in support of such a program:

We call to your attention that Detroit's serious housing shortage has not emproved during the past 2 years.

The continuing failure of private enterprise and government—Federal, State, and local—to provide an adequate supply of rental housing for the low and middle-bracket income families is an established fact.

Expansion of public housing in Detroit is at a standstill and units being completed today by private builders are far beyond the economic reach of the average factory worker.

Even the construction of high-priced homes by private builders is today grinding to a stop because of a drying-up of the home-mortgage money market and a shift of investment capital to municipal bonds and other high yield investments.

The last 222 units of the 1,164 units of temporary veterans re-use housing are now being completed and soon will be filled up. This marks the sum total of postwar public housing for Detroit.

More than 61,000 families in Detroit are still living doubled up with relatives in makeshift, unsanitary, substandard dwellings, or in trailers, rooming houses, or tourist cabins.

Other cities, notably New York, have far outdistanced Detroit in supplying low-cost, postwar housing for veterans.

A special survey of the turn-over rate in three temporary city housing projects—Fisher Homes, Catallo Homes, and McKeever Homes—shows that the pressure for housing is getting worse rather than better.

These three city projects consist of 1,568 units of poorly constructed, temporary apartments heated with coal stoves and equipped only with coal-fired cooking stoves and hot water heaters.

There is a serious fire hazard at these projects. They are of flimsy construction, drab and uninviting in appearance and stand on barren mud flats. It is actually slum housing operated by the city for people well able to afford something better.

They are the least desirable city-operated housing projects and the first ones in which a vacancy factor would be noticed in the event that the housing shortage eased even slightly.

Total move-outs from these three projects were as follows:

1945	867
1946	332
1947	240

For January of this year the move-outs from these projects were even below the monthly average for 1947.

No blame should be attached to any governmental agency in Detroit for the bad condition of these three projects.

The Federal Government forced this housing on us during the war; we still need it badly. We are doing the best that can be done with limited funds to maintain it.

A housing survey of Detroit made last April shows a total vacancy of only seven-tenths of 1 percent. Of these only one-tenth of 1 percent were being offered for rent and the other six-tenths for sale.

The tenant selection office of the housing commission receives hundreds of appeals every week from families that are in dire distress as a result of the housing shortage.

Nine out of 10 of these distressed families have to be turned down. It is not a question of money. Most of these families can afford a rent of $40 to $50 a month. It is simply a question of not enough housing.

Consider a typical family that the city cannot provide housing for. The husband is sick and barely hanging onto his job. The wife is pregnant and has two other small children to care for. They are living in a damp, poorly-heated basement room with broken plumbing fixtures.

They produce competent medical evidence that the health of one or more members of the family will be seriously endangered if they remain in their present quarters.

Yet nothing can be done for them. There are war veterans in the same fix that must be taken care of first and there are others who are actually out in the street that must be cared for.

It all adds up to a disgraceful picture of civic neglect and failure by Government to meet the basic needs of its citizens.

What can be done at this point?

We respectfully recommend a legislative housing program to provide these three immediate objectives:

1. Maintain all 6,000 units of temporary housing in operation for at least 3 years and possibly for 5 years, or as long as there is need.

2. Proceed with the construction of the Jeffries and Douglass housing projects, and any further public housing that can possibly be attained within the financial borrowing power of the Federal, State, and city governments.

3. Restore our permanent low-rent federally aided projects to their original purpose of serving low-income families only.

We believe that the most effective piece of Federal legislation to accomplish these ends and also to launch a broad attack on the housing problem generally is the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

There will be a serious effort made in Congress to pass this bill within the next 2 months and we urge the common council to once again go on record in favor of it and to instruct the corporation counsel's legislative representatives to go to work for its adoption.

The public-housing section is the kernel of this bill and it should be kept in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill or enacted as separate legislation.

We also urge endorsement of the Celler bill which would raise the permissible per-room cost of public-housing projects to $1,750 or $2,000 if necessary and would pave the way for the Jeffries and Douglass projects either in their present form or as smaller projects, and recommend that its provisions be incorporated in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

We have asked the city controller to prepare four financing plans for the Jeffries and Douglass projects, as follows:

1. Under present laws with the existing $14,000,000 loan contract and with supplementary help from the city, county, or State governments.

2. Under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner and Celler bills with the existing $14,000,000 loan contract and with city, county, and State funds, if necessary.

3. As a 100-percent city project using either faith and credit, revenue, or mortgage bonds, or any combination of the three.

4. As a combined City-State project, using the method that has been successfully employed in New York to construct eight large postwar low-rent projects.

In the event plan 4 appears feasible, we shall ask you to request the State legislature to submit a housing bond issue to the voters.

Another possibility for obtaining State assistance would be a veterans' housing loan to Detroit from the $50,000,000 veterans' trust fund.

The problem of keeping our 6,000 units of temporary war housing going for another 3 to 5 years is not a simple one.

Under existing legislation we must start tearing this housing down before July 25, 1949—just 16 months from now.

In view of the existing housing shortage and the fact that 3,200 families will be dispossessed by the Lodge and Ford expressway construction during the summer of 1949, the elimination of this temporary war housing in such a short time is unthinkable.

Except for the McKeever project, these temporary structures are on leased land and the leases expire July 25, 1950.

At least one of the owners of this leased land is already exerting pressure for the discontinuance of the Moseley homes—280 dwelling units—so that the land can be cleared for use as a site for a factory.

We have also received grapevine reports that speculators are buying up the land on which our scattered temporary units are located with the view to moving in as slum landlords when the Federal disposal program gets under way after July 25, 1949.

The Miller bill now pending in Congress would postpone the disposition of all permanent Lanham Act housing indefinitely. We urge that this bill be amended to include temporary Lanham Act housing as well and that it be enacted.

In the event this is not done, we urge Federal legislation which would turn this temporary housing over to cities after July 25, 1949, under favorable financial terms which would permit extensive repair and maintenance expenditures.

If this is done we recommend that the common council condemn the land on which these temporary projects are located to permit their use beyond the July 25, 1950, date on which the leases terminate.

We recommend that the common council direct the corporation counsel to start an immediate study of the possibility of condemning this land.

Disposition of this temporary housing should be on favorable financial terms to the city as these structures are reaching the point where they need major repair and maintenance expenditures, and in the case of Fisher, Catallo, McKeever and Valentine Homes—1,918 units—the replacement of coal stoves with gas.

New siding, painting, landscaping, and extensive fire-prevention measures are also needed for much of the temporary war housing.

Your honorable body has already acted on the question of rent control and it appears likely that this important legislation will be extended for another 14 months.

We are anxious to eliminate the high-income families from our permanent low-rent projects and are therefore hopeful that this extension of rent control will not also extend the present Federal protection to the over-income public-housing tenants.

Our request that the State insurance code be amended to permit life-insurance companies to invest in Michigan real estate for more than 10 years is before the governor now.

We hope that this will be acted upon favorably by the coming special session of the legislature.

We also strongly recommend clarifying Federal legislation to guarantee the city a proper tax return on our permanent projects.

Under present Federal law and an adverse interpretation by the comptroller general the city is in serious danger of losing a large share, or all, of the $298,600 of tax revenue the city is now receiving.

We recognize that this will be sharply reduced with the reversion of our permanent projects to low-rent operation, perhaps to a figure of approximately $72,800 per year, but we don't believe this reduction should be nearly as drastic as presently indicated.

Our recommendations to Congress on tax payments are two-fold:

1. That appropriations providing for annual contributions be restricted, in the case of payments in lieu of taxes, by the terms of existing contracts and not by the terms of the original contract.

2. That Congress consider legislating in the broad field of payment in lieu of tax in order to provide a more equitable basis for the subsidies to be supplied by the Federal and local governments which would result in a policy at least as favorable to the local government as that provided under recent PHA policy.

We feel that Congress has completely lost sight of the original theory of subsidy which provides that five-sixths would be made by the Federal Government and one-sixth by local government.

In recent years, the local government has been contributing a subsidy that is nearer five times that of the Federal Government.

Summarizing, we recommend that the following pending and proposed pieces of legislation be endorsed by the common council:

1. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, without crippling amendments.

2. The Celler bill to lift the per room cost of new public housing.

3. The Miller bill, with suggested amendments to postpone disposition of temporary housing.

4. A rent-control bill which does not continue the protection to over-income families in low-rent public housing.

5. A State law similar to that in New York and Illinois providing for assistance to public housing.

6. An amendment to the State insurance act permitting insurance companies to invest in multiple housing developments for an unlimited period.

7. A Federal law to clarify the amount of local taxes that can be collected on housing projects.

8. A Federal law turning temporary projects over to the city on favorable financial terms.

9. Action by the common council to condemn the land now being leased for temporary war housing.

Respectfully submitted.

FINLAY C. ALLAN,
President.

Antilynching Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Times-Picayune, on March 12.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of March 12, 1948]

"TO MAKE IT LEGAL"

Chairman FERGUSON, of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, announced yesterday that his group has begun a redraft of the antilynching bill "to make it legal and effective." He sounds an encouraging note if he means that there are antilynching Senators who are still reluctant to lynch the Constitution. That Federal charter seemingly has fallen into disrepute in certain congressional circles because it operates as a restriction upon extra-legal legislative proposals put forward primarily as bids for pressure-group votes.

If the Senate subcommittee seriously takes the Constitution into its reckoning, it can only propose, in our belief, a Constitutional amendment vesting in the Federal Government the police powers now reserved to the States. That is the Constitutionally prescribed and time-honored way to make such shifts or give the Federal Government new powers. It was used to establish the Federal income tax system, and later to permit the noble experiment with prohibition by coercion. When the latter experiment failed, the enabling Constitutional amendment was duly repealed instead of just being laughed off.

But the congressional mood seemingly has changed and respect for constitutional requirements has faded to the point that few expect Senator FERGUSON'S subcommittee to adopt the constitutional method for extension of Federal police powers to cover the dying evil of lynching in the South. Tuskegee's statisticians could report only one such crime last year, and conceded that several were prevented by State and local authorities. Perhaps the subcommittee could reframe the pending bill to make it apply to lynchings by gangsters in northern cities and to such political incidents as Scotorigio's liquidation in little old New York. But that is not probable either, since it might irritate politically potent pressure-groups and gang leaders in doubtful Northern States.

In any case the Senate subcommittee's undertaking to make the antilynching bill effective and legal ought to arouse lively national interest. If it should serve to create a more active congressional interest in the Federal Constitution, it might do great good.

Why You Cannot Get Ahead as Your Father Did

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

WHY YOU CANNOT GET AHEAD AS YOUR FATHER DID

The United States is being forced toward socialism by a tax revolution of far-reaching consequences.

We have not yet felt fully the deadly impact of this revolution because inflation and the postwar boom have delayed its effects.

But from now on, more and more people will feel its bite. Already it is the dominant element in our economic life. Already it is the major factor in our chances of keeping our jobs and of getting ahead.

Here are some pertinent facts on this tax revolution:

1. THE TAX LOAD THAT OUR NATION CAN SAFELY CARRY HAS LONG SINCE PASSED THE DANGER POINT

Our capitalistic system is in real danger when taxes take more than 20 percent of our national income, or 20 cents out of every income dollar. Beyond that point there are not sufficient dollars left in private hands for capitalistic America to raise the capital required to keep its industry going. So we are right now being nudged further and further into socialism.

For today, taxes take 25 percent of national income, or 25 cents out of every income dollar.

2. THE TAX REVOLUTION HAS UNDERCUT THE INCENTIVES THAT HELP US TO GET AHEAD

The group whose incomes range from $5,000 up now turns over about one-half of its total income to Federal, State, and local tax collectors. Before the war, this group gave the tax collectors one-third of its collective income.

In sharp contrast, the group of people with incomes under $5,000 pays the tax collectors 20 percent of its income for direct and hidden (mostly hidden) taxes—against 18 percent before the war. This lower-bracket group needs immediate tax relief but I believe most sincerely that persons earning less than $5,000 have a very vital reason for also supporting tax relief in the much more heavily hit upper brackets.

As you get ahead, you expect your taxes to go up. Taxes should be levied, in principle, according to ability to pay. But today tax rates rise so sharply that they virtually destroy all incentives to get ahead, to save, and to invest in new and untried enterprises that open up new jobs. The progressive tax idea now carried to punitive extremes has become a destructive tax revolution.

Today the United States, envied by all the world for the wealth it has won under capitalistic incentives, has cut its incentives below those offered by that state whose police methods strike terror into the hearts of all workers.

Soviet Russia rewards successful managers, writers, and scientists better relatively than we do under our present tax system.

A revolution that sweeps away incentives will quickly sweep away our free enterprise economy. The only substitute ever found for free incentive is the whip-and-lash compulsion of the police state. And no police state has ever been able to match the production of a free people with a free economy that gives adequate rewards to individual producers.

3. THE TAX REVOLUTION HITS SQUARELY THE AVERAGE AMERICAN'S CHANCES OF KEEPING A JOB AND OF GETTING AHEAD

If you make less than $5,000 a year you may well ask why you should worry about a tax revolution that seems directed at the comparatively small group, about 10 percent of American families, who make $5,000 a year or more.

The answer, it seems to me, is that risk capital, the money that makes new jobs when invested in growing companies or in new businesses, must come largely from the people making more than $5,000 a year. The others usually cannot afford to take any risks with their savings.

It was the savings of this 10-percent group that made possible the huge growth in American industry and American jobs and our progress in raising American living standards in the years before 1930.

Now the Government is taking so much from the 10-percent group in taxes that they cannot afford to risk any savings they manage to accumulate. Most of their savings now go to insurance companies and savings banks which are barred by law from making risky investments or investments even in seasoned common stocks.

The flow of risk capital from this 10-percent group can only be renewed by reducing their taxes. The result will benefit everyone over the difficult years to come by providing more and steadier employment for all.

The cost of the presently proposed reduction, less than 1 percent of the national income, can well come out of current revenue surplus. It will be repaid manyfold by the new enterprises it will stimulate.

4. JOBS WILL BE LOST IF RISK CAPITAL DOES NOT INCREASE

Unless the flow of risk capital into business can be doubled and trebled in the next few years, business investment in job-making new plans and equipment will drop sharply. The McGraw-Hill survey of prospective capital expenditures, reported in the previous editorial in this series, made that quite clear.

When such a drop in business investment has come in the past, it has brought with it a general slump in business—and unemployment.

As we work through the enormous demand for goods of all kinds built up during the war years, and as the war-accumulated savings of businesses and individuals are spent, it will be harder and harder to keep production and employment at today's high levels.

Then—at the very time that we shall need all our drive to maintain prosperity—we shall be hit by the full impact of the tax revolution.

5. COMPOUNDING THESE TROUBLES IS A TAX SYSTEM AS OUT OF DATE AS AN OXCART

Twenty years ago, when taxes took only 12 cents out of the national-income dollar, our rattletrap tax system was little more than a nuisance. Today, when it takes twice as big a bite, its double taxing of the earnings of investors, its discriminatory excises, and the overlapping of Federal, State, and local levies are a fatal handicap. A new system, a fair system, a rewarding system, is a necessity if American initiative and enterprise are to have a fair chance.

What Congress does now about Federal taxes will bear crucially on our ability to sustain prosperity.

By demanding economy in Government and by redesigning the tax system to stimulate initiative and risk taking, Congress can multiply many times our chances of maintaining full employment and of raising living standards.

By allowing people to save more and by renewing the incentive to risk capital in new enterprises, Congress can actually insure a bigger tax return in the years ahead. More business will result—and pay more taxes.

That is the only way that a free people with a free economy can carry the tax load.

That is the best way that our Government can improve our chances of keeping our jobs and of getting ahead. I suggest that you discuss these vital matters with your chosen representatives in Congress, in your State government, in your local community.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

Development of Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the development of submarines, written by Ansel E. Talbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY IS DEVELOPING SUBMARINES TO TAKE WAR TO FOE'S DOORSTEP—RESEARCH ON ROCKETS AND GUIDED MISSILES SPEEDED ON THEORY THAT UNDERSEA CRAFT COULD TAKE THEM TO EFFECTIVE RANGE IN ANY PART OF GLOBE

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

The United States Navy today is rapidly integrating new and revolutionary weapons into its operations. Submarines and airplanes have thrust sea power into the third dimension. Now Navy strategists are joining these instruments up with the atomic bomb and the guided missile. Their objective is the creation of a global fleet that can control communications on the 70 percent of the earth's surface covered with water, and also extend the Navy's offensive power far inland on every continent.

The major striking forces of the Navy at present consist of two surface-carrier task fleets, one on each coast composed of six carriers backed up by other units. Navy chiefs envision these forces, whose range is constantly being extended by new aircraft and carrier designs, joined in the future by packs of long-range submarines.

Almost impossible to detect by radar and other electronic countermeasures, these submarines will be capable of high underwater speeds and long periods of cruising submerged.

AWAY FROM OUR SHORES

Admiral of the Fleet Chester W. Nimitz has disclosed that a prime function of the Navy is to carry the war to any enemy of this Nation so that it will not be fought on United States soil. One future method of doing this, he said, would be by "submarines projecting guided missiles and rockets."

In the event of war, the Navy would shift these highly mobile carriers and missile-launching submarines off an enemy coast. From these bases, possibly the only ones within striking range available without assault and conquest, the Navy would strike swiftly at centers of enemy power.

Navy strategists believe that mobile surface and undersea carriers employing deception and stealth can make intercontinental weapons out of very fast but relatively short-ranged planes or missiles.

This present Navy concept was implied many years ago by America's prime exponent of sea power, Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, who observed that the "unresting progress of mankind causes a continual change in the weapons." It also bears out Gen. Billy Mitchell, the Nation's outstanding air strategist.

During his bitter controversy about the merit of battleships versus airplanes, General Mitchell wrote that "the tremendous power of submarines is just beginning to be understood." He added:

"Their offensive power is developing. Undoubtedly submarines will be developed into undersea aircraft carriers in addition to their other uses."

A NEW CLASS OF SUBMARINES

The view of Navy chiefs is that large submersible aircraft carriers may have to await atomic propulsion, but a new class of high speed guided-missile launching submarines called SSG's has just been created.

The Navy is devoting a greater percentage of its research and development funds to guided missiles than to any other category of research, according to Rear Adm. Daniel V. Gallery, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Guided Missiles. He is of the opinion that "the guided missile will give the Navy offensive power as never before."

At Chincoteague, Va., the Navy air arm, which holds the present world speed and distance records, has just organized Aircraft Development Squadron 2 (VX-2). It has given this unit the mission of testing and operating pilotless aircraft, guided missiles, and other electronic developments.

At Point Mugu, Calif., missiles of sonic and supersonic speeds developed by Navy scientists are daily hitting targets many miles out to sea.

Some strategists believe that in event of a future world conflict, aircraft and guided missiles may be directed across the North Polar ice cap along air routes which are the shortest ones between North America and the Europe-Asia land mass.

The Navy, which has been exploring the Arctic for almost a century, during the last 2 years has sent both submarines and aircraft carriers cruising under and into the polar ice fields.

Two scientists engaging in the Navy's vast program of research, Dr. John Graham and Dr. John Barghausen, of the applied physics laboratory of Johns Hopkins University, have been investigating Arctic disturbances such as the Aurora Borealis.

These scientists, members of the group that developed the proximity fuse and the Navy's 1,500-mile-an-hour ram jet missile, made this study with the object of discovering what effect such phenomena might have on the performance of guided missiles. Other members are analyzing factors that might interfere with radar and radio in the Arctic.

RUSH NEW ROBOT CALCULATOR

At the Naval Proving Ground at Dahlgren, Va., the Navy is rushing to completion the assembly of a huge calculating machine designed by Prof. Howard H. Aiken of Harvard University. Computations involved in predicting the characteristics of guided missiles will form a major part of the machine's work.

In addition to the SSG guided missile launching class, another new submarine class, designed to serve as mobile radar picket boats and defensive fighter or missile control centers, has been added to Navy nomenclature. The prototype of this class, designated SSR's was inspected a few days ago at Key West, Fla., by President Truman.

In an emergency, a thousand-mile-long picket line composed of numbers of these radar boats could be formed hundreds of miles off the east and west coasts of the United States.

This picket line would be able to detect enemy aircraft winging toward the continental United States from any quarter and to direct defensive measures against them. Troop-carrying submarines are projected, too.

Put Freedom to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Put Freedom to Work," appearing in the Indianapolis Star of March 12.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUT FREEDOM TO WORK

Senator CAPEHART yesterday offered his amendments to the Marshall plan. He proposes to divide European aid into two parts—outright relief and long-term loans. The $2,000,000,000 relief program would be handled on a government-to-government basis, just as Senator VANDENBERG's bill outlined it. But the loan program would be handled by an already proved agency of the American Government, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The American RFC would make loans to 16 European RFC's set up to lend money directly to foreign businesses or government agencies, as does our present RFC program. Loans would thus be on a business-to-business basis instead of a government-to-government one.

And business among the participating nations would be handled in a free-enterprise fashion instead of a wholly government-controlled one. It would be financed by a long-term revolving fund on a dollar-matching basis. The American RFC would put up half, the foreign nations the other half by using credits against foreign investments now safely and uselessly buried in the United States.

The purpose of this provision is clear. It is to make the European recovery program an expression of the most successful economic system in the world today—the free capitalism of America. And why not? If we really believe that free economies do the best job, why should we not insist that the help we offer be given under that best system? We know it works. If it works here, it will work elsewhere.

If the emergency is so great that these RFC's cannot be set up in time to stave off foreign financial collapse, the Congress can authorize an immediate advance of $1,000,000,000 by the RFC as the Vandenberg bill recommends. Then the Capehart amendment can be put into effect shortly thereafter.

The European aid program must have the full confidence of the American people. If it is truly an American plan, it will have that confidence. As Senator CAPEHART put it: "I am for stopping this bully (Russia), too, but I would also like to see it done by hitting him right square in the teeth with a good solid punch of Americanism that would scatter a bit of freedom around this war-tattered globe."

The Drama of ERP in 25 Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people have not yet been told the real drama that led to the Marshall plan.

In desperation the Congress, each Member in his own way has been left to dig out the true facts of the so-called European recovery program. With inadequate tools, no money or time left we must break through the wall of official secrecy and propaganda surrounding this bold Socialist blueprint for all Europe that threatens us and demands still another $17,000,000,000 from the American people.

Inasmuch as the story of our involvement in international intrigue and secret Government manipulation is simply incredible, it cannot be presented without a stage. At this time I propose to give you 25 brief historical acts from the postwar records.

As a prologue I quote from a London daily newspaper to show how freemen are crying out everywhere in Europe against America financing their socialist cabinets which oppress them and which would disappear from the political scene but for the continued American support.

These voices of Europe are not now being heard or heeded because socialist censorship has erected its own iron curtains preventing such voices of freedom from reaching America.

For example, the Daily Express of London says editorially day after day:

There can be no doubt at all about the the Socialists' motive. They realize that Marshall aid may preserve their jerry-built structure of bad administration and crazy economics until the general election comes.

In short, Britain will be spinning out for a few more months the thin web of illusion which the Socialists, in their moral cowardice and conceit, have woven for her (January 16, 1948).

The Marshall plan should not form part of Britain's policy for recovery, because it seeks only to alleviate a symptom of distress. It cannot deal with the underlying cause (February 10, 1948).

To accept Marshall aid is to return to the bad days and bad ways of the loan ($3,750,000,000).

Ever since the collapse of the disastrous American loan policy the hope has been that the Government would not resort to further foreign assistance in order to overcome Britain's difficulties.

One such fatal experience should have sufficed to convince all the Ministers that Britain must stand on her own two feet (January 8, 1948).

The dollars Britain borrowed contributed directly to the price-rise in America. Hence the disastrous balance-sheet.

The dollars of the Marshall plan would have a similar result.

The first step along the path to sanity and recovery will be taken in the day that the British Government, by declining Marshall aid for our country, refrains from boosting prices in the United States (February 11, 1948).

Recovery can begin today, if courage and character prevail among Britain's leaders—and if common sense joins them round the council table (January 16, 1948).

Britain has the resources at home and in her Empire. Given faith, vision, endurance, and toil these resources can be brought into use to restore the old fabric of national prosperity (January 8, 1948).

You have just listened to the most realistic and honest appraisal of the Marshall plan, not from Washington or New York but from England itself. It is unnecessary to remind this House that the national circulation of the Daily Express is 3,789,278 daily. Above all, its readers have voted 4 to 1 approving these editorials and rejecting in toto the Marshall plan. This 4-to-1 opposition in England shows that the British appreciate the evil consequences of the Marshall plan to America herself.

We now present play by play the true drama of the manipulations of the American Government, or how the British Socialists run American foreign policy:

ACT I

End of 1946: The British Socialist Cabinet has nearly exhausted the $3,750,000,000 American loan. England swings much further to the left while the forces of British freedom bitterly expose the use of American funds to advance socialism and defeat liberty.

ACT II

January 1947: Mr. Morgenthau having promised the British at Quebec $6,500,000,000 without strings for so-called recovery, if they would sign the deindustrialization Morgenthau plan for Germany (as we now know from Mr. Cordell Hull's memoirs), Mr. Bevin presses Mr. Marshall to make good this promise. The British are put off.

ACT III

February 1947: The British socialists retaliate. They suddenly announce the withdrawal of British troops from Greece, leaving the whole Near East outflanked. Communist Moscow watches gleefully.

ACT IV

March 12, 1947: Mr. Truman jumps into the frying pan proposing to stop communism from going into Greece and Turkey or from advancing in any other place on the globe. Cost of operations in Greece and Turkey estimated at $2,000,000,000 by 1949. The over-all unlimited.

ACT V

April 1947: Mr. Bevin keeps needling Mr. Marshall for the new American loan without which Socialism in England is doomed. The United States State Department is depressed because it knows that the Congress, having been forced to pay up for the so-called Truman doctrine, will refuse to vote new billions to save the London planners from the inevitable failure of their planned economy.

ACT VI

May 30, 1947: Six days before Mr. Marshall speaks at Harvard, European newspapers tell their readers that once again America will come through with billions for a new European recovery program. It was the British Foreign Office that intimated to these newspapers that the United States State Department had put out such "feelers" in London; also, that it would be easier to get these billions from the Congress if the initiative could come from Europe and not from the State Department.

ACT VII

June 5, 1947: Six days later Mr. Marshall bows to the ruthless pressure of the British Foreign Office now in the hands of skillful socialist manipulators. Without previous consultation, Mr. Marshall announces at Harvard that America will help Europe if they would only get down to work and produce.

ACT VIII

June 6, 1947: The very next day the American people wake up startled to find what Europe had known for some time, that American foreign policy is made in Europe.

Mr. Marshall had no plan, the American people had none.

A sales fraud of amazing proportions was under way. Even the name "The Marshall Plan" invented in Europe.

ACT IX

Mr. Marshall suddenly finds himself the hero of a wholly unexpected success. Again needled by Mr. Bevin, he goes on to tell the whole world that the United States will assist all of Europe, from the Urals to and including the British Isles.

Europe is flabbergasted by the obvious inconsistency of the Marshall policy of helping Soviet Russia and all her Communist satellites with American dollars as compared with Mr. Truman's announced policy of stopping communism by American dollars.

ACT X

June 29, 1947: Mr. Molotov says "No."

ACT XI

July 3-September 22, 1947: After Mr. Molotov's dramatic departure the Paris planners of 16 nations work out a tremendous expansion program of planned economy for western Europe, 1948–51.

Under this European scheme, the American people are invited to foot the bill of $29,000,000,000 in gifts, loans, goods, and services from the American Continent.

The Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Mr. William Clayton pleads with the Paris planners to come to their senses, which they do by asking America for $22,400,000,000 plus a handout of $3,000,000,000 of America's gold from Fort Knox.

ACT XII

Fall of 1947: Unbiased surveys prove conclusively that the proposed European recovery program cannot work. There is neither manpower nor capital investment available to meet the production targets. Also, the suggested time schedule is strictly impossible. And, finally, no world markets could possibly absorb these vastly expanded European exports.

ACT XIII

Fall of 1947: In Washington, the State Department, humiliated by the unworkability of the whole program decides to sell the Marshall plan to an unsuspecting American public as a "stop Russia" measure. All the while the Europeans continue to make trade pacts with Red Moscow.

ACT XIV

Fall of 1947: In Moscow, the Kremlin decides that American financing of western Europe will enable the Marshall countries to help save Russia's sagging economy. Under the Marshall plan the trade between Soviet Europe and western Europe is to be expanded to an unprecedented all-time high, indirectly financed by American billions.

ACT XV

Fall of 1947: By skillful use of the Lenin technique of propaganda, ostensibly opposing what they want most of all to see happen, the Soviet rulers begin a violent smear campaign against the Marshall plan. They say "No" because they mean "Yes." The Kremlin sees that the anti-Russia feeling in America will indirectly pay off by furnishing the Soviets a $15,500,000,000 trade from western Europe during the next 4 years.

Goaded by the propaganda flood of a naive State Department, private opinion in America is taken in by the Soviet deception technique. Leading Republicans fall into the trap.

ACT XVI

Fall of 1947: Feeling that Great Britain is getting the lion's share, France and Italy demand that they be given a stopgap aid from America. Mr. Truman calls the Congress into special session. The interim-aid gift is pressed through the Congress.

ACT XVII

Fall of 1947: Over congressional protest, Mr. Marshall continues to dismantle German factories. In spite of the obvious fact that European recovery cannot possibly succeed without a strong and healthy German peace production, the State Department is still operating a double-track German policy, full of contradictions.

ACT XVIII

January 1948: The unworkable Socialist European recovery program of Paris is forced on the Congress. Political manipulations cut out the $17,000,000,000 figure. A $6,800,000,000 figure, arrived at by pure guess work, is foisted upon the Congress as an all-or-nothing demand.

ACT XIX

January 1948: The United States Government suddenly withdraws from buying in the American commodity markets. Prices drop. However, with prices subsidized, the farmers do not ship their grain or cattle to markets. They know that the alarming Government reports are utterly fictitious.

By dropping out of the commodity market, the administration aims at gaining a double political purpose; first, to frighten the Congressmen from agricultural districts into voting for the European recovery program; and second, to make the hard-pressed American families believe that prices are coming down, so they will not discover soon enough that the billions to State-controlled European recovery program must

lead to an even more treacherous inflation than we already have.

ACT XX

January 1948: The Truman administration decides for the time being to sidestep the insistent European clamor for the $3,000,000,000 gold from the United States Treasury for stabilization of European currencies. That fight is scheduled for a later date. The State Department wants to conquer the Congress by piecemeal methods. Today a crisis; tomorrow a crisis. Always more billions of the taxpayers' money.

ACT XXI

February 1948: The Habana Conference of the International Trade Organization reveals that the Europeans do not intend to work together as promised in Paris. On the contrary, they hope to build economic blocs and protective nationalist tariffs throughout all of western Europe. Led by the British Socialists, all European governments prove to be more interested in their own political power than in a truly European recovery.

ACT XXII

February 1948: The Congress grows restless and suspicious at the mounting, unmistakable evidence of the multiple political fraud, at home and abroad, in connection with the Socialist European recovery program.

ACT XXIII

March 2, 1948: The international food experts of the United Nations disprove and reject the grain figures advanced by the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton Anderson. The world commodity markets are left in chaos; inflation goes on.

ACT XXIV

March 5, 1948: The millions of American families regretfully discover that in spite of the so-called drop in future commodity prices their grocery bills are going up and up. Americans realize that their families, in a month or two, will face economic catastrophe from uninterrupted inflation caused by the Government itself.

ACT XXV

March 1948: Both Houses of Congress are placed under intolerable political pressure to pass the foredoomed European recovery program.

At the same time the State Department planners are themselves growing restless and anxious at the increasing resistance in the House of Representatives against selling America down the river of state socialism at home and abroad.

At last the American people, acting upon what little information they can get, inspired by their fundamental instincts of freedom and righteousness, send waves of protests on to the stage. The fraud is exposed; the actors are put to flight.

The next act of this drama is up to the Congress. Let every Member of this House go to the people for wisdom.

Let me tell you that in my district where the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times are widely read, the people are writing me letters, eight to one, against the Marshall plan. They want to give relief to the suffering, through private agencies, if possible. They want free commerce and trade encouraged and protected, but not socialized and controlled by Government. In line with this they approve the new plan for European recovery which I proposed to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Either we believe in the American concept of freedom, by which we have led the world for generations. And out of which there has come food, shelter, and comfort as never before seen in the world.

Or we deny our faith. We give up our leadership. We fall in line with a socialist world scheme of planned economy and lost liberties. In the end, we ourselves get swallowed up by the pagan statism which now has blacked out huge areas of this world.

I implore my colleagues to act in conformity with their faith in freedom. Let us go out to the American people and find courage anew to confess our faith before the whole world that we Americans believe that free men and women everywhere can rebuild the world much better than the scheming bureaucrats of a pagan state socialism.

The Marshall plan helps to imprison the creative genius of freedom. We must defeat it. Let the Congress enact a recovery program that liberates the world. Then world recovery will not be slow in coming.

The President's Civil Rights Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Courier-Chronicle, of Humboldt, Tenn., which comments sanely and forcefully on the President's recent so-called civil-rights message. This editorial but emphasizes the southern viewpoint as to certain parts of the so-called civil-rights message which was based on the hate, malice, and ill will of the Civil Rights Committee whose report on civil rights is a mendacious monstrosity.

The people of the South know something about their own problems and, as is pointed out in this editorial, both white and colored know the latent evils that exist in such legislation as the report proposes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO EDITOR TALKS PLAINLY TO HIS PEOPLE

President Truman and his Committee on Social Problems have done more recently to fan race hatreds than any one other thing in the last 50 years.

The white people and the Negroes have lived more peacefully in Tennessee in late years than ever before since the reconstruction days, with the colored folks growing more prosperous than they have ever been before. New homes and rebuilt and repaired homes are to be seen in every Negro settlement everywhere in this part of the South, and the white people have noted this prosperity and the efforts of the colored people to better living conditions and have complimented them on their efforts and on their savings.

Now, the President of the United States, following the report of a hand-picked committee, which has shown as little judgment as he has, is making demands for a speedy hop, skip, and jump forward for colored people—a speed that can mean a retardation instead of advancement for the people it is supposed to help.

After the Civil War, the South was prostrate—as poor as the war-torn parts of Europe and other war-damaged continents; had millions of utterly destitute ex-slaves thrown into its lap to provide for and to start on the way to an independent life. And it was remarkable how well these poverty-ridden southerners responded and the progress they made.

When the Confederate veterans got home from war, leaving hundreds of thousands of their brothers in arms buried on battle grounds, they found their homes, farms, factories, railroads, schools and, many times, their churches in ashes or ruins; their slaves freed and without any compensation; their money voided, their savings in material things wasted, their livestock, horses, mules, cows, sheep, hogs, and even their poultry gone. Their only hope of rebuilding was to labor day and night, though nearly every other man was a war cripple, and many were in a low state of health.

The first thing was to make livable their old homes, or to replace them with new ones. Fortunately most of the Negro homes yet stood, and their garden spots were ready to produce.

As soon as homes were in shape for use, old schoolhouses were repaired as best they could be, without money or materials, teachers were selected—not hired—for most of them got only what pittance they could from tuition-paying pupils. Churches were cleaned up and the old preachers went back to their work regardless of money. They knew their folks would do the best they could for them, and they did.

The first year after the surrender, scanty crops were planted, because of lack of seed and horsepower. Much work was done by hand, necessarily. And crops the first year were small, though the need was great.

Most of the ex-slaves did the best they could, depending on their late masters for aid. Some few were enticed away by carpetbaggers, who were here to foment all the trouble they could. They were a swarm of vultures at best. Freedmen's Bureaus were set up by the reconstruction rulers of our country. And they added no little to the troubles of the white people, without any sensible efforts to aid the Negroes. The whole reconstruction scheme was a disgrace to the United States. Waving "the bloody shirt" was a full-time job in the United States Congress.

Instead of helping the South, the Federal Government hurt the late Confederate States in many ways. Neither our National Government nor any European government extended even a friendly hand to the Southern people. Instead, tariff laws, which admitted foreign farm produce free, put a high duty on manufactured products, and the poverty-stunned South, having no manufacturing plants of any account, had to pay robber prices for such things as our people could

find a way to buy. Women and children worked in the fields from sun-up to sundown to produce cotton and other products of field and forest, earning often less than 25 cents per day. The writer himself, born less than a half-dozen years after the surrender, had in the early eighties to work 10 to 14 hours, worming tobacco or hoeing cotton for 25 cents a day. And he was glad to get the job, just to earn something between school terms.

The best friends the Negroes ever had for the first quarter of a century after the close of the civil war, were their old masters and mistresses.

I have seen my mother divide her wardrobe with the colored women who had belonged to her mother and her aunt—garments she herself needed badly enough, to dress them up so they could go to church.

I will never forget one cold, frosty morning back in the late seventies, two of grandmother's ex-slaves, Allen and Mitchell, came to our home, grandmother being there at the time, and when she came out, they showed her their nearly bare feet and said, "Look, Mistress, our foots are on de ground and its mighty cold." Grandmother told the men to go in the kitchen and had the cook to give them some food, and after she was dressed for a trip up town, she told Allen and Mitchell to follow her and she went to the general store and bought them strong shoes, underwear, and heavy coats, suitable for winter wear. Mother gave the boys some side meat, flour, and some coffee, and they went away happy. They had farm produce, but cash-money jobs being scarce, they could not get clothing and flour and coffee.

This country never needed a Freedmen's Bureau, the old ex-Confederate soldiers were all the bureau a worth-while Negro needed. Many men for years after the war would rather have slapped a buzz saw than to harm old family Negroes of the community, or even those of nearby places.

You have heard, "Kick my dog and you kick me." Well, men of the Old South would fight in a real rough way if one should impose on their family Negroes. No; they did not need alien hirelings to protect them. They lacked things, but the white people did too.

Mr. Truman and his advisers better read an editorial from the Negro paper Ebony, which was copied in the March number of Readers' Digest. It tells of the racial problem pretty much as it is. This writer says Negroes who carry a chip on their shoulders all the time are "racists no less than Hitler or Bilbo. For race hatred does not know color lines. It infests Negroes as well as whites." And then he goes on to say, "Certainly the Negro's lot in America is not always a happy one * * * But with all that, is it so terrible to be a Negro in the United States? Certainly not. American Negroes live a more prosperous, more enjoyable, more creative life than at least 90 percent of the world's population. In Italy, China, Palestine, Greece, South Africa, India, in innumerable impoverished nations, there are millions who would gladly change places with the American Negro. Around the globe there are countless persons who are fighting and dying to win a measure of the American Negroes' living standards, his civil right, his every day enjoyment of life."

The editorial quoted is entitled, "Time To Count Our Blessings."

Politicians are merely throwing rocks under the trolley, hoping to profit by arousing trouble in the South and everywhere in America. They want to swing the electoral vote in some doubtful States and they care nothing about the harm they may do a race that has enough troubles without them stirring up the fire.

Did You Happen To See Senator Alexander Wiley?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there appeared in the Times-Herald of March 22, 1948, an article by John White entitled "Did You Happen To See." It is, among other things, a partial review of the recent book, Laughing With Congress, written by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and it incidentally says a few factual things about the Senator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 22, 1948]

DID YOU HAPPEN TO SEE SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY?

People are always laughing at Congress. Will Rogers called it The Capitol Comedy Company of Washington, D. C. People also mock at, despise, ridicule, and deplore Congress.

"If you have a feeble-minded citizen in your community," a newspaper recently editorialized, "put him in the proper institution and cheerfully pay taxes for his support. Don't dodge the issue by sending him to Congress."

A teacher asked a pupil to give examples of uses of pro and con. "Progress and Congress," was the reply.

Said a Senator, John Sharpe Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi: "I'd rather be a dog and bay at the moon than remain in Congress."

Whereupon an unidentified admirer replied that the honorable Senator could be a dog and bay at the moon and also remain in Congress with a good chance of reelection.

People always have laughed at, mocked, despised, ridiculed, and deplored Congress.

"A more weak, bigoted, persecuted, and intolerant set of instruments of malice and every hateful passion were never assembled in a legislative capacity in any age of any land," said a patriot in 1837. (That was when men like Henry Clay and Daniel Webster were Senators.)

Said the humorist Artemus Ward in 1865: "Congress, you won't do. Go home, ye mizzerable devils, go home!"

But Congress somehow endures. Somehow its passes our laws, runs our country, stumbles along.

Gashed by criticism, battered by advice, squashed by pressure groups, threatened, cajoled, reasoned with, lied to, promised, deafened and bored, bored, bored by friends and constituents, it slogs along.

The greatest show on earth.

Senator WILEY, big-armed ALEC who used to earn 15 cents an hour in the back-breaking sawmills of Wisconsin, 11 hours a day, 6 days a week, has written a book, Laughing With Congress. It is in the book stores now. It gives a very fair picture of this peculiar thing called Congress and a very good reason why we should—maybe—laugh with the old thing instead of at it all the time.

Congressmen, too, have been known to laugh—in Congress—at Congress.

ALEC WILEY is a good man to write such a book. On the Hill he is noted for his merriment and his jovial soothing of ruffled feeling and the deep reverence for law and country without which merriment and quick wit are but tinkling cymbals.

And he works hard. As chairman of the important Judiciary Committee, which handles a third of all Senate legislation, he personally reported out 205 bills last session, more than any other man in House or Senate.

He is very religious, hates "synthetic thinking" such as Henry Wallace's cockeyed ideas and often in these days of atom bombs, cold war, and so on he agrees with Abe Lincoln: "I laugh because I must not cry. That is all. That is all."

JOHN WHITE.

The Race Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Professor Analyzes Race Issue," by Philip J. Allen, published in the Washington Post for March 21, 1948. This article is one of the most intelligent and unanswerable presentations of the subject that I have seen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR ANALYZES RACE ISSUE

(By Philip J. Allen, professor, department of sociology, Mary Washington College of the University of Virginia, Fredericksburg, Va.)

There is no nation or tribe in the world that does not consider itself superior and others inferior. This characteristic is called ethnocentrism or tribal egotism.

The ancient Greeks characterized many of the non-Greek peoples as barbarians. In more recent times, efforts have been made to divide mankind into Aryans and non-Aryans.

Many white Americans consider the Negro inferior. They say he is dirty, and immoral, and can't be trusted. But after all, they say, what can one expect; he has the mind of a child.

Let us review a bit of history.

From the time Negro slaves were first brought into this country in 1619, there began to develop two distinct cultures in America, a slave culture and a free one. Negroes were stripped of their native culture and forced into a vegetative life, for their elemental needs were met by their master. So they tended to develop a carefree disposition.

Their intelligence was usually assessed as no higher than a child's. If one tried to meet the master on his own level, by exercising the intelligence of an adult, he might be flogged for impudence. In time the Negro learned that to act like a child and lie like a child would sometimes save him a whipping. So he learned the fine art of lying which became a part of the slave culture.

Moreover, he became curious about many things his master seemed to covet, such as fine clothing and jewelry. Like a child who is curious about the possessions of adults, he began stealing some of these things; and that habit became a part of the slave culture.

Some people claim that immortality and looseness of family bonds are characteristic of many American Negroes. Yet, the Dahomey tribe in Africa, which is found at the center of the old slave-trade region, has a high degree of family unity and family stability. Why isn't the American Negro family equally stable?

Consider that in slavery days American Negroes were bred like cattle. Fine young males were moved from plantation to plantation for breeding purposes. Then, too, on the plantation itself, often several adult males and females were crammed into a single shack. In addition, female Negro servants often served as concubines to the master and his sons. The few Negroes who came in direct contact with the white man's culture, therefore, often absorbed the worst features of that culture.

On those plantations where slaves were encouraged to marry, the man was usually only an occasional visitor to his wife and children. Since he might be sold any day, he did not develop strong bonds toward his children, let alone a sense of family responsibility.

The chief reason for the persistence of all these traits, it seems, is that at emancipation time the two major American cultures, the free white culture and the Negro slave culture, continued moving each in its own direction.

CENSUS PROVES ERROR

There seems to be a widespread misconception that "if Negroes do not quit increasing, they'll soon overrun the whites in America." It is a fact that the proportion of Negroes in our population has been constantly decreasing since the Nation was founded.

Every census report, from the very first in 1790 to 1930, except two (1810 and 1880), shows a lower proportion of Negroes. Thus, while Negroes made up 19.3 percent of our population in 1790, they dropped to 9.7 percent by 1930. Moreover, the Negro family is smaller than the white family in every class studied—professional, business, skilled labor, and unskilled labor.

Negro infants still die at a higher rate than white infants, as do Negro adults compared with white adults. The expectation of life at birth, in the decade 1930–39, was 60.6 years for white males and 50.1 years for nonwhite males. White females had a life expectancy of 64.5 years, against 52.6 years for nonwhite females.

There is an important phenomenon to consider in this connection. While for every 100 females in the white population there are about 100 males, there are only 95 males for every 100 females in the total Negro population. In cities like New York, we find only 62.1 Negro males for every 100 Negro females in the 20–29-year-age group, where it makes the biggest difference as far as sex standards are concerned. This means that about three-eighths of the Negro girls there are not able to find husbands.

How about Negro intelligence? Is it true that Negroes are intellectually inferior to whites? Well, it is true that Negroes have made a poorer showing on some intelligence tests, but the difference in scores is believed to be chiefly due to a difference in opportunity to learn.

Dr. Otto Klineberg, for example, found that the intelligence scores of southern Negro children who moved to New York City improved every year they attended New York City schools, for 4 or 5 years, when their test scores became as good as those of white children of comparable education and social background.

Let it be simply said that there are no tests that can measure natural or inherited ability for the simple reason that there is considerable disagreement among the experts on what is actually inherited. As far as we can judge from the evidence at hand, there is no scientific basis for belief in the superiority of one race over any other on earth.

For a while, some individuals were delighted to learn that the average Negro tended to have a smaller brain than the average white. But when it was also learned that the average white male has a larger brain than the average white female, the whole subject was dropped.

FOLKWAYS FLEXIBLE

The evidence presented so far gives only a part of the picture. Without certain additional facts, an understanding of the race problem is impossible, let alone its solution.

In the realm of social reality, what people believe to be true often counts more than what is actually true. Let us digress for a moment into a bit of sociological jargon.

Culture is made up of the beliefs, customs, and techniques of a people. The customs are divided into "folkways" and "mores." "Folkways" are the conventional ways of acting, which do not carry a high emotional charge, such as eating peas with a fork. To violate any of these folkways might get one criticized mildly, or even ridiculed, but nobody would become violent when he saw another eating his peas with a knife.

But the "mores" are different. They carry a high emotional charge. For example, if the Star-Spangled Banner is being played, the individual dare not remain seated. A man ordinarily dare not go up to his friend's wife in a crowd and kiss her, for he would be violating the family mores. A Negro woman and a white would not walk arm in arm in a southern city. The racial mores do not tolerate such behavior.

Now, the folkways, since they do not carry a heavy emotional charge, can be changed quite easily. A new fad may change them overnight. Moreover, laws may be passed, eliminating some and introducing others. The populace will usually fall in line. But let an attempt be made to legislate within those areas involving the mores, especially if large numbers are compelled to change their mores, and there may be Lucifer to pay.

The mores cannot always be explained rationally. For example, we eat beef, lamb and pork, but we do not eat dog, cat, and mouse. Why not? I do not believe anyone can explain, logically, why pork roast should be any better than dog stew. A dog is cleaner than a pig.

There are some African peoples who will not eat chicken or eggs. Their delicacy is grasshoppers. You revolt at the thought of eating grasshoppers? They revolt at the thought of eating chicken and eggs.

WORDS ARE "BUTTONS"

The fact is that the food mores, like other mores, are woven into the inner fabric of our personality, the weaving having begun even before we were able to understand. They are heavily charged with emotion, and reason cannot touch them. No simple denunciation of them with the glib generality, "prejudice," will dislodge them.

A few years ago a scientist carried out an experiment in "conditioning." He worked with the iris of the eye, whose relaxation and contraction are caused by the amount of light present, and ordinarily are beyond conscious control.

Our friend flashed a light into a man's eye and, at the same time, uttered the word, "Contract." The iris contracted, not because of the word spoken but because of the light. Then he turned off the light and uttered the word, "Relax." Again, the iris relaxed, not because he spoke the word but because he turned off the light.

He repeated this process a number of times, and after a while he quit using the light. He only spoke the word, "Contract." The iris contracted.

He went further. He asked his man to whisper the words to himself, and then simply to think them. The iris contracted when he thought the word "Contract," and it relaxed when he thought the word, "Relax."

That experiment, I say, gives us a real insight into the nature of this thing we call prejudice. Bodily functions which ordinarily lie beyond conscious control get themselves hooked up to specific words, situations, and ideas, so that such words, situations, and ideas later act as buttons to release specific reactions. Consider what happens within the individual when such words and concepts as "race," "Negro," "white man," "Jew," "Catholic," "Protestant," get hooked up with the glands and neutral patterns which release the emotions of fear, anger and hatred. The release takes place pretty much beyond the direct control of the individual.

In brief, the mores tend to be autonomous. They are not subject to immediate and direct rational control by the individual.

A GRADUAL PROCESS

Now, if the mores are that independent of rational control, it is clearly a mistake for Congress to attempt to legislate in those areas where mores are immediately concerned. Suppose Congress should pass a law abolishing the prejudice against eating mice and grasshoppers. Such legislation in the area of the food mores would not make people take to eating mice and grasshoppers. If, moreover, a Federal police force tried to compel people to eat mice and grasshoppers, untold mental and physical illness might result. The mores, in brief, cannot be legislated out of existence.

Is the situation hopeless then? Can't undesirable mores be changed? Yes; they can be changed, but only slowly and by systematic effort in which all our major social institutions cooperate—the family, the school, the church, the state, industry, radio, and the press. Eventually legislative action could be used effectively to gather up the strands of varying individual opinions and set them down in codified form. But legislation in areas concerning the more deeply ingrained mores should not be attempted until the populace has been adequately prepared.

Any attempt to legislate racial mores is a blunder of the greatest magnitude. It is a sad commentary on American politics that so grave and delicate a human problem should have been turned into a political tool.

Having said all this, I hasten to add that I do not desire to be classified with the "standpatters," who want everything in this country to stay as it is. Certainly I believe there is something wrong in a society where little children are born with two strikes against them. And I am not singling out any particular section of the country for special condemnation, least of all the South.

It is true that certain undesirable conditions may exist in some sections of the South. But it is also true that the better educated and more conscientious southern leaders have initiated action to bring about the necessary adjustments.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last night, to millions of listening Americans, a very able and noted commentator and

good American citizen made a great contribution to peace in our times. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF THE NATION

(Broadcast by Walter Winchell)

Mr. and Mrs. United States, good evening: As an ordinary citizen, I want to report to you tonight on the state of our Nation. I am in Washington, 250 miles nearer the news, to get you a report on the state of mind of the men at the helm, and the state of American foreign policy. This is what I have learned:

We will be strong militarily, but we will not be militant. We are not looking for a fight; we are looking for a way to avoid one. We will not lose honor, but we will not lose patience, either.

We Americans hate the Russians so little that we are amazed that they apparently hate us so much. We are seeking understanding, but the first and most important step is for both us and Russia to realize that there has been a very grave misunderstanding.

In two short sentences, this is American foreign policy: We have closed the door of appeasement because we found that it opened the road to war, but because we are determined to stand on our own two feet and off our knees, it most certainly does not mean that we want to stand on anyone else's toes. We want to be strong so we must be fair. If the appeasement policies of Byrnes and Stettinius were unfair to the heart and spirit of the American people, they were also unfair to Stalin. Our own Secretaries of State underestimated the character of the American people just as certainly as Chamberlain underestimated the heart of the British.

Mr. Stalin's agents in America are sending him very erroneous information. Now the really great danger of war is that Stalin will make the same mistake that Hitler made. Washington believes that like Hitler, Marshal Stalin is being misled by his intelligence department. Russian intelligence continually informs Stalin that the American people will not support an American Government which will accept war in defense of democratic principles. The plain truth is that the American people will repudiate any government which achieves armistice at their expense. That is why the United States Government yesterday, along with Great Britain and France, repudiated James Byrnes at Trieste as certainly as Churchill repudiated Chamberlain at Munich.

We have a position, and we do not want Stalin to mistake it, because war is far too terrible to happen by mistake, and because Mr. Stalin is a first-class scholar and has a first-class mind he knows that a nation's history speaks louder than any man's words. Stalin could never misunderstand the American people, if he could be in our Nation's Capital tonight.

Because the spirit of Jefferson, Franklin, Lincoln, and Lee are here.

I believe that if Thomas Jefferson could speak over this microphone tonight to Marshal Josef Stalin in the Kremlin, he could explain the American people, because Jefferson is the father of the soul of our Republic.

This in general is what I believe Thomas Jefferson would say:

Marshal Stalin, the American people believe in political liberty, not only for themselves but for all other people. In this twentieth century these principles have been twice attacked on a world-wide basis and twice the American people have accepted war in their defense.

The American people fought with you for a Russian's right to his Russian home against Adolf Hitler because the Americans believed the principle was even greater than that titanic death struggle.

To that principle they are committed, Marshal Stalin, to their own dead and to the living nations of the world. Neither legally, logically, morally nor militarily can the Americans retreat from that position. Nor do they want to. Nor do they intend to. We are completely committed.

When Hitler was attacking you, all of us announced the "four freedoms." That was a definite, binding offer to all free men to rally to our cause. Because we were fighting for their freedom too. That offer was accepted. Relying on it, many men of other lands laid down their lives for the freedom of our country and yours. By doing that, if for no other reason, we feel they earned freedom for their own.

We, America and Russia, both won, Marshal Stalin, because in the scale of bitter battle the conscience of the world outweighed Hitler's heaviest armor. In good conscience we fought a war together and in good conscience we can build a peace together. But if your heart does not tell you what is in our hearts, your map must tell you what you have put in our minds.

Clearly, the lines of our national safety and the commitments of our national honor have reached the point where they exactly coincide. The line has been reached where we cannot yield on principle without surrendering our national defense.

Marshal Stalin, we believe that it would be just as wrong for the Red army to march through Scandinavia as it was wrong for Hitler's armies to march through your Ukraine. Even from the purely military position of our very unmilitary Nation we could not permit it. With Denmark goes Greenland and we are absolutely and finally pledged to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. We have no choice. We would consider it invasion if there were Russian air bases a short 3 hours from the Canadian coast and only 6 hours from Greenland to Boston

The American President in a speech last week considered telling the five-power alliance that America would come to the assistance of Great Britain, France, and the low countries if they were attacked. Whether or not the President told them they know and you, Mr. Stalin, should know that we will. They are a part of our vital defense, and Scandinavia in the north and Italy in the south is part of the defense of the great alliance.

That means the defense of all democratic countries is part of our own national defense. We could no more ignore an attack on them than we could ignore an attack on Maine, Oregon, or Florida. We, too, have learned the bitter lesson of Munich. We knew that we can avoid no war by turning our heads like cowards if the lash is laid against the backs of the Norwegians, the Danes, and the Swedes, and we know that we shall find no peace in the rattle of any chains on the English or the French. That, Marshall Stalin, is more than one man's opinion. That is the position of the American Government, and it is completely backed by the conscience of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

We want you to understand us and this is only a part of the greater and greater efforts we will make to understand you.

You were brutally treated at Munich, and the magnificent Red Army was held up to scorn. That mistake could never again be made after Stalingrad, and it isn't being made now.

Your military strength is known and respected. We know that you have not only the Red army of 4,000,000 Russians, but that your satellite troops number at least 150 full divisions. Our General Staff has not forgotten the history-making non-stop by two Russian pilots in a Russian bomber in June 1937 from Moscow to San Diego, later landing in a field 6,662 miles in 62 hours and 2 minutes.

We know that your jets are the most modern in the world. And over the North Pole Great Circle Route your bombers are only 3,875 miles from Washington and New York.

We both know the horror and the tragedy of any war. There is no longer such a thing as war between nations. It is a sweeping, common disaster for both their peoples. The first blockbusters which fell on London killed an average of only seven persons. The atomic bomb which fell on Nagasaki killed 178,000. That left more than a hole in the earth, Marshal Stalin, it left a hole in the heart of every civilized man.

That is why we want you to help us define peace as a world policy. We do not want war to be at the mercy of an incident. We believe that honest men talk straight from the shoulder, and that only a fool talks about shooting from the hip. We are throwing around no lighted matches in a powder magazine, Marshal Stalin. We need, and we will seek, your help in preventing an international inferno which could destroy us all.

Once again, Marshal Stalin, this is more than the position of a private American citizen. I have the best of reasons for believing it to be the policy of my country; because we have marked the line from which we can never go back does not mean that there is any limit to the distance we can both go forward—together.

From the Straits of Catalina to the waters of Sandy Hook, our people want no war.

From the waters of the Baltic to the Bering Sea, your people want no war.

Marshal Stalin, we both claim to be democracies, representing the people.

By the will of the people, and the will of God, may we never have to fight each other.

Our national experience has taught us that honor and dignity and integrity are the only foundations for peace. We believe, and we hope that you believe, all nations must find them together, or we will not find them at all.

Even as America arms, as arm she certainly must, we have no intention of taking Russia by the throat.

We are urging you, Marshal Stalin, to take our outstretched hand.

Good night.

The Capehart Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 22 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Tri-County Press, of Polo, Ill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Polo is deeply interested in the Capehart plan because its author, Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, is a graduate of Polo High School. Aside from that, our folks here will be interested in his plan because it is sound. In Marshall's plan our aid would go from our Government to each of the 16 governments over there, a condition our people do not like. When the funds get into the hands of the European governments, its control has been lost; there is no way of knowing whether it would be used wisely or whether it would be squandered. Britain spent a great portion of our first gift-loan for lipstick, moving pictures, and other things

as nonessential. Would other governments do any better?

Senator CAPEHART has come up with an alternative plan that is getting well-deserved attention. He advises to send all relief shipments to the governments, but there his plan ceases to be similar to that of Marshall. CAPEHART wants to have the RFC loan money direct to the businesses that need it. There would be a counterpart of our RFC in each of the 16 nations in Europe, each with Americans on the board. These European RFC's would lend money to industry, business, government, and even to individuals as our own RFC has been doing since the days of Herbert Hoover.

To date our Government has spent $11,000,000,000 for European relief and it hasn't worked, not if conditions are as serious as they are reputed to be by Marshall plan propagandists. Sending $17,000,000,000 more over there under conditions that have existed the last 2 years is little more than folly. It would be "Operation rat hole," as stated by Marshall himself in describing his plan if it were authorized and then failed. The task ought to be undertaken under a plan that has more of a chance to succeed than those that have been used in the past.

Under the Capehart plan the European RFC's would get their money, one-half from dollar investments in the United States, and one-half from our own dollars. Foreign investments now amount to $13,000,000,000 in the United States. That would make a $26,000,000,000 fund. Interest and principal payments made by borrowers in each country would serve as a revolving fund and therefore could be used over and over.

The Capehart plan injects some of the red blood of American free enterprise into the pale economic systems over there. It would give the borrowers a chance to operate free of interference from their own governments. It is a simple application of American principle to the recovery problem in Europe. It is so simple the wonder is that someone had not thought of it before. Under the Marshall plan we are the only ones asked to have confidence in the 16 nations. Under the Capehart plan each of those 16 nations is asked to have the same confidence in their own destiny that we do. The Capehart plan provides the separation from the State Department which Congress is asking. It is being included in Senator VANDENBERG'S report to the Senate, even though the hearings were completed before Senator CAPEHART announced his plan at Peoria last week. It is being given study by those in the forefront of ERP discussions.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram received from Rabbi Morton M. Berman, of Chicago. It is not necessary to comment upon this message. The United States took a position with reference to Palestine which was in line with the historic position of this country endorsed by both political parties. The repudiation of this position places in jeopardy the United Nations organization. If the United Nations is unable to bring about a successful peaceful solution of the Palestine situation, the question arises as to what situation they are capable of solving.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 20, 1948.*
Hon. ROBERT J. TWYMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

The Chicago and Illinois Zionist Emergency Council has authorized me, its chairman, to address the following petition to you:

"The abandonment by the United Nations of its support of the UN resolution to partition Palestine into indepependent Jewish and Arab states is a tragic betrayal not only of the Jewish people, but of America's honor and integrity. It is a death blow struck at the United Nations and the hope it offers for the world's peace. Rejection by the United States of the General Assembly's partition resolution, adoption of which it helped to achieve, renders President Truman's recent declaration of our country's willingness to defend democracy, justice, and freedom for all people a disgraceful, hypocritical gesture. Congress must act to repudiate Truman, Austin, and the State Department's retreat from partition, and their attempted substitution of a UN trusteeship of Palestine. Their action is in defiance of the overwhelming will of the American people. Neither Jews nor Arabs will accept trusteeship, and it will require enforcement by an international police force against both the will of Arabs and Jews. Partition would have meant at least an active cooperation of the Jews in defense of the UN decision. We urge the immediate adoption by Congress of a concurrent resolution reaffirming America's 30-year-old policy on Palestine. We further request that this concurrent resolution declare it to be America's intention to support UN General Assembly's resolution on partition, and that it affirmatively modify the arms embargo to Palestine in order to make possible Jewish defense against a now almost certain blood bath which must follow from the threatened imposition of trusteeship."

CHICAGO ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL,
ILLINOIS ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL,
RABBI MORTON M. BERMAN, *Chairman.*

Oleomargarine Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of the Gallup poll as it appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of March 13. This poll shows that 69 percent of the American public want the taxes on oleomargarine repealed:

AMERICA SPEAKS—SIXTY-NINE PERCENT WANT OLEO TAXES ENDED—FARMERS SPLIT, BUT OTHER GROUPS FAVOR REMOVAL

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 12.—Removal of the special Federal taxes and license fees on margarine is favored by a large majority of American consumers.

A number of bills designed to remove some or all of these levies and licenses have been introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives. This past week the House Agriculture Committee has been holding hearings on the House proposals.

An up-to-the-minute American Institute of Public Opinion survey of adults throughout the country shows that farmers are about evenly divided in their opinion on margarine taxes. All other groups, on the other hand, including manual workers, are overwhelmingly in favor of repealing the Federal levies.

The national cross-section was asked:

"There are now certain taxes and fees which dealers who handle margarine have to pay which they do not have to pay on butter. A bill has been introduced in Congress to do away with these taxes and fees on margarine. Do you favor or oppose this bill?"

MOST SENTIMENT IN WEST

The national results:

	Remove taxes	Keep taxes	No opinion
	Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
National	69	15	16
By occupation:			
Professional and business	78	9	12
White collar	72	13	15
Farmers	39	37	24
Manual workers	75	10	15
By education:			
College	75	15	10
High school	72	13	15
Grammar school	66	16	18
By sex:			
Men	67	18	15
Women	72	11	17
By geographical sections:			
New England and Middle Atlantic	74	11	15
East and West Central	64	20	16
South	68	10	22
West	75	18	7
People using only butter	58	22	20
People using only margarine	84	7	9
People using both	71	13	16

Respondents favoring repeal gave as their reasons: Margarine prices would be lower, no food should be taxed, all discriminatory taxes should be repealed. Those opposing said: Taxes needed to protect dairy industry, for protection from inferior foods, needed to prevent eating places from substituting margarine for butter.

SOME LAWS QUITE OLD

The House committee has before it 18 bills on this controversial issue. Some of the laws on the statute books date back to 1899, the current licenses ranging from $600 a year on margarine manufacturers, to $48 on retailers of colored margarine. There also is a Federal 10-cent-a-pound retail tax on colored margarine and a quarter of a cent tax on a pound of the uncolored variety.

Minnesota Synthetic Rubber Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of March 18, 1948, reporting the valuable contribution of Dr. I. M. Kolthoff, Aurom I. Medalia, and Wesley J. Dale in the synthetic-rubber field while they were attached to the staff of the University of Minnesota. Dr. Kolthoff has an international reputation in the field of analytic chemistry and his work on this process is of the greatest benefit to our Nation and to our

national defense. This is another example of a great contribution being made by the universities of America.

"U" SYNTHETIC TOPS RUBBER—SCIENTIST BARES TESTS—"MINNESOTA RECIPE" WORK STARTED IN 1943

(By Victor Cohn)

A synthetic rubber hailed as "even better" than the natural product has been developed at the University of Minnesota.

A "Minnesota recipe" and method of making the synthetic—called "cumene"—were described Wednesday by Dr. I. M. Kolthoff, university analytical chemistry chief.

The recipe has been tested and modified in industrial laboratories and tried in pilot plants.

TIRES WEAR BETTER

Tire tests, Dr. Kolthoff said, have proved that the synthetic wears better than either natural rubber or any previous synthetic.

The university work was done under Federal contract. Until now details have been secret.

Kolthoff, assisted by Dr. Edward J. Meehan and other university chemists, began rubber research in 1943. Loss of natural rubber supplies from the Pacific made their work "most urgent."

American and German synthetic rubber then were essentially the same.

The American synthetic was called GRS—Government recipe styrene. The German was buna-S.

Ingredients were approximatley 75 percent butadiene—which can be made either from petroleum or alcohol—and 25 percent styrene, a derivative of benzene.

IMPROVES RECIPE

In 1944 Wesley J. Dale, then a Minnesota graduate student, developed an improved recipe, permitting production of rubber at freezing temperature, instead of the usual 122° F.

This meant better quality, because of quicker polymerization (chemical transformation of the ingredients) and more uniform rubber molecules (chemical building blocks).

But cumene was still to come.

Immediately after VE-day, in May 1945, American scientists, including Kolthoff, scoured Germany for facts on German synthetic-rubber progress.

Kolthoff discovered the Germans had developed on a laboratory scale a "redox" system for speeding up the rubber-making process. ("Redox" refers to the chemical processes of oxidation and reduction.)

Back in Minneapolis, Kolthoff and his colleagues combined an improved recipe, the low-temperature production, the German redox system, and a new and more successful catalyst—an agent that gets a chemical process going—to produce the new cumene synthetic.

The polymerization, or transformation, takes place when the mixture is rotated or stirred.

At first the chemists rotated small bottles of their mixture in a constant-temperature tank made from an old bathtub. Since, said Kolthoff, "this kind of rotator, devised by Dr. Meehan, has been widely copied in industrial plants."

In polymerization, the mixture becomes a milky latex, much like the stuff that comes out of natural-rubber trees. The chemist adds an acid, and the latex coagulates into a rubbery mass.

The university work involved long months of tedious experiments.

"We tried some 50 recipes," said Kolthoff. "But it was not exactly trial and error.

"It was more like using chemical horse sense."

Much of the credit, he said, should go to one of his assistants, Aurom I. Medalia, graduate student from Boston.

The United Nations and Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the recent proposal of Warren Austin, chief United States delegate to the United Nations at the direction of President Truman, to scuttle the United Nations partition plan shocked the Nation. It represents a surrender to the threat of force. The League of Nations fell in a similar manner. The threat to the United Nations is so well discussed in an article which appeared in the American Jewish World of March 5, 1948, that I include it under leave to extend my remarks. The author of this article, Rabbi Aronson, is a keen student of international affairs and one of the outstanding intellectual and spiritual leaders in my community.

A FINAL PLEA TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN: "SAVE UN"—OPEN LETTER URGES UNITED STATES BACK PARTITION DECISION

(By Rabbi David Aronson)

DEAR MR. TRUMAN: On February 6 we took the liberty to call your attention to the fact that the zero hour was approaching, the zero hour in Palestine, the zero hour for the United Nations, the zero hour for constructive leadership by the United States, the zero hour for the honor of our Government over which you, Mr. President, are the official guardian.

Since that time the situation gravely worsened. The statement which Warren Austin, chief United States delegate to the UN, presented to the UN Security Council on February 27, not only confused the UN but raised a very serious question in the mind of the average American regarding the trustworthiness and the moral integrity of the present administration, of which you are the official head.

People say, Why waste time in writing this or similar letters? Politics is politics, and that's that. They say that there is no honor among politicians, and that a man loses his soul and his conscience when he attains high position.

A PLEDGE OF HONOR

Frankly, Mr. President, I still cannot take this cynical attitude toward our Government. I am a citizen still naive enough to believe that a man's a man for all that, and that even a President of the United States, confronted as he may be with overwhelming problems, will not quite become so hardened as to ignore his responsibility for a word given, a pledge made, and a project advanced on the strength of which others invested their lives—the kind of responsibility which, among ordinary citizens, is identified with a sense of honor and of personal integrity. I belong to the old die-hards in morality who believe that the standards of decency and honesty are the same for the high and the humble, except that the violation of such standards by those in high position results in more tragic and more extensive consequences.

ZERO HOUR IS HERE

Because I believe these things, I am making this final appeal to you, Mr. Truman. It is final because the zero hour has approached. I appeal to Mr. Truman, the man, who has the power of a President of the United States. I appeal to your ordinary, human common sense and common decency. I do not ask you, as President of the United States, what are the new moral and economic factors in the Palestinian situation discovered since your political party pledged its support in the upbuilding of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. But I do ask you, Mr. Truman, the man, what new moral forces were discovered in the situation since you made that pathetic and moving plea to the British Government for the immediate admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine?

What new moral, economic, or even political factors came to light since the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine, which investigated all the problems of Palestine from every angle, made its unanimous recommendation supporting your humanitarian stand on behalf of the Jewish position in Palestine?

What are the new factors? What are the new factors discovered since the United Nations Commission on Palestine, after a thorough and independent investigation, recommended the partition of Palestine? What are the new factors which would justify the new position taken by our representative at the United Nations Security Council—a position so radically different from the one taken by the United States a few months ago?

I know that your career men in the State Department and the Oil Trust representatives give you all kinds of reports. But, frankly, Mr. Truman, do you believe that there is anything in their reports which was not known to and duly considered by the Anglo-American Commission and the United Nations Commission which recommended partition? Does the sophistry of Mr. Austin appeal to your common sense, as a man, or to your common honesty?

WHAT WILL UNITED STATES DO?

Do you recall, Mr. Truman, that when you asked the second time for the admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine, you even kindly suggested that the United States Government would share in the responsibility of transporting them there? Last week, Mr. Austin, your delegate to the UN, said that the United States Government would cooperate in preserving the peace in Palestine. Suppose those 100,000 for whom you pleaded 2 years ago, and who are still displaced and homeless, try to enter Palestine as soon as the British leave after May 15, will the United States Government cooperate in preserving the peace by escorting the Jewish immigrants or by siding with the Arabs in repulsing their landing?

How can you permit your representative to the UN to ignore so completely the realities of a situation of which you spoke so understandingly and so feelingly time and time before? Forget your career politicians for a moment, Mr. Truman, and your common sense will tell you that they are placing you and our Government in a morally and realistically impossible position.

If the UN follows the logic and implied procrastinations of the United States' new position, the Jewish community in Palestine, disarmed by your embargo on arms, will soon find itself exposed to the massacres organized by Hitler's pal, the ex-Mufti, and to full military attacks by neighboring Arab states armed by British "special treaties." The Jewish community in Palestine, with its back to the wall, fighting not for expansion or empire or exploitation but for its very existence and for the only tiny land it possesses in the world, will defend itself to the very last man if necessary.

BEVIN MADE A MOCKERY

Shall we conclude, therefore, that it was Mr. Bevin who was really the friend and protector of the displaced Jews when he made a mockery of the President of the United States in refusing to honor your request and the unanimous report of the Anglo-American Commission? For had Mr. Bevin admitted

those Jews—most of whom are women, old men, and children—they would now be in mortal danger in Palestine, made defenseless by your embargo on arms to Jews and by Mr. Austin's new position taken in your name. Is that what you really want, Mr. Truman?

I still cannot believe it. I cannot believe that the office of President has completely destroyed all the common sense and decency and fairness of Truman, the man. Hence this plea. Let Truman, the man, tell the President of the United States that neither the security of America nor the peace of the world will ever be attained by the betrayal of trust, the breach of promises, and the sacrificing of a bleeding, broken, and helpless people.

The zero hour is here, Mr. Truman. Save the greatest factor for security that America—or the world—has today. Save the UN by giving force to its decisions. Remove the embargo on arms for all those who stand ready to back the decision of the UN. Let the United States Government cooperate fully with the UN in implementing its decisions.

The little politicians in the State Department have learned nothing and forgotten nothing in the two bloody world wars. But you, Mr. Truman, can rise above them. It is late, very late, but not too late. There is still a chance for you not only to keep faith with Israel but to keep faith with your better self, and to lay a strong and lasting foundation for the ultimate security of America and the peace of the world.

New Life for Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil:

NEW LIFE FOR OLD

During Lent our thoughts turn toward God more often than at other times of the year. We experience a sense of peace even when the world around us is in turmoil.

Our minds and hearts are cleansed. We are more inclined to do the things we ought to do and abstain from the things we ought not to do.

Lent is quite different from the Christmas season, but in some respects it is much the same.

The supreme claim of Christ and his gospel is new life for old. The importance of Jesus to us today is in his power to change and transform our lives and personalities through his grace.

Being a Christian means more than attending church and complying with certain forms. It means becoming a citizen of the kingdom of God. It means obedience to God's laws. It means honesty in business, decency in behavior, kindness to all with whom we come in contact—in short, loving our neighbors as we love ourselves.

God's laws go far beyond human laws. They include more positives and fewer negatives. You may not realize this but it is true. Christians are continually inspired to greater and nobler deeds.

Many of the most challenging, thrilling pages of history are those recording the unselfish acts and heroic sacrifices of Christians.

The true Christian is constantly on the lookout for opportunities to do good. He often creates his own opportunities, as did David Livingstone in Africa and tens of thousands of other Christian missionaries have done since.

The world is greatly disturbed right now, perhaps even more than it was during the war years. People are worried lest there be another war, with all its carnage and bloodshed and misery.

Why is the world in so much trouble? Why are people so worried? Isn't it because so many people have lost their hold on God, forgotten that he is the same yesterday, today, and forever?

Many have never been taught the great fundamental truths of religion. Youngsters have been allowed to go out into the world without realizing that infractions of God's laws bring certain punishment. They have become imbued with the cynical belief that "anything is all right if you can get away with it."

This diabolical philosophy has ruined countless lives and is destroying the foundations of society. Communities, cities, States, nations are no better than the people who live in them. That is why we have so much crime, and are threatened with so many disasters.

Lent is traditionally a period of meditation and sacrifice. It can be the prelude to better conditions in the world if we realize the betterment must start with ourselves.

A Good Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the following editorial, which appeared recently in the Hartford Courant, Hartford, Conn.:

A GOOD LABOR RECORD

The high level to which labor-management relations have risen in New England was recently commended by John W. Gibson, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Speaking in Boston, Mr. Gibson asserted that in man-hours lost through strikes this region was far ahead of the rest of the country. He urged this on the rest of the country as an example to follow: "I believe that maturity in dealings between employer and employees over the years is responsible for this fine record," he said. This record of cooperation persisted during both the war and the postwar years. Nearly 11 percent of the total factory employment in the United States is concentrated in New England, yet the percentage of man-days lost during the past 6 years has consistently been way below that figure. In 1943, for example, it reached a low of 2.8 percent.

The significance of this fact should not be overlooked by either labor or management. Recently two economists of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston made a study of New England's future economic prospects. They pointed out that the greatest single asset possessed by this region was the stability of labor-management relations. "Probably more than anything else," they said, "the region's industrial future depends upon achieving a higher degree of labor-management teamwork than can be obtained elsewhere."

The facts are simple enough. Other regions are closer than we to raw materials. Some became industrialized during the war, and now offer competition to New England industries. New England, and particularly Connecticut, have a heritage of industrial know-how. In addition it has a reservoir of skilled workers, although nowhere near the monopoly it once had. But both of these assets are not worth a tinker's damn if relations between employer and employee are shot through with discord. To remain prosperous New England must continue to have industrial peace and amicable relations between workers and employers.

The splendid record that has been established speaks well for the men who head the labor movement in Connecticut. By and large they are responsible citizens who realize that there is a mutuality of interest between workers and employers in maintaining full employment in this area. Prospective industrialists are as much interested in the labor situation, when establishing a new plant, as in any other single factor. One of New England's best selling points is the fact that labor and management have shown a pronounced desire to settle things around the conference table. It is a record of which to be proud, and one that should be maintained in the interest of both labor and management.

Palestine Turn-About Immoral Abandonment of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the strong, the mighty, the moral United States has thrown its lot in with British betrayal and Arab aggression. The moral conviction has departed. In its place we find weakness and confusion.

What solution does international trusteeship bring with it? Neither peace in the Middle East nor stability. If President Truman's reversal on partition was based on strategic reasons, what validity has such a base when an international force of one kind or another will be essential anyway? If it is the Russian threat the President fears, how does international trusteeship meet this fear any more or any less than did the implementation of partition?

Betrayal has never brought peace. Who is the winner? How can President Truman face the peoples of the United States and of the world with the knowledge that he is responsible for diminishing the authority of the United Nations and the abandonment of a people whose sufferings have not stopped since 1933?

There can be no doubt of its international repercussions. Smaller nations can now see how readily they can be deserted. It strengthens a belief that unbridled acts of aggression spoke more plainly for Mr. Truman than the concepts of honor and decency and a promise solemnly made.

This is a shoddy and underhand turnabout. The United States prestige has suffered an immense set back. What

had been all this previous talk of Warren Austin and the President of the United States, stating that they were still in favor of partition until the surprise statement of last night? Now that such reversal has taken place, it is not so difficult to see how the road back had been traveled by the United States immediately following the partition decision of November 29. Never did the United States show an honest intent in everything it did since that day. We were proud of United States leadership during the General Assembly debate. We are ashamed of it now.

The President forgot his party pledge in the Democratic National Convention. The President set aside the traditional policy of the United States which favored, since 1922, the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. He took it upon himself to call the retreat, to break a promise, betray a trust, and in its place offered nothing that can redeem such betrayal. It is a bitter realization to see the President act without vision and without understanding how immeasurably he has damaged the cause of peace throughout the whole world by undermining the strength of the United Nations.

Such vicious power politics, British perfidy, and Arab destructiveness only increase the degree of bloodshed. The Jewish State will be. No more shameful decision in international politics has ever been made by the United States.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, all over the United States protests are being registered against the unfair Federal tax on margarine. This matter has not been settled at all by the action of the House Committee on Agriculture, which refused to bring this bill to the floor of the House for a vote. One immediate result of that action of the Committee on Agriculture was an increase in the price of butter. We heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] state last Thursday that the next day after the action of the House Committee on Agriculture the butter market went up 8 cents a pound. I have been informed that in one section of the United States butter has gone to $1.02 a pound since the House Committee on Agriculture voted against this legislation.

However, instead of killing this legislation, I believe that action of the Committee on Agriculture will intensify the fight to remove this unfair tax. This fight is going to be carried on, and if the Committee on Agriculture will not pass the bill out so we can vote on it, then the next step to take is to sign discharge petition No. 12, which is on the Speaker's desk and which already has nearly 100 signatures.

Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of the sentiment in favor of this legislation, I attach hereto a letter written to me by the president and secretary of the Stone Mountain Woman's Club in my home district:

STONE MOUNTAIN, GA.,
March 12, 1948.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
Fifth District Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: The Stone Mountain Woman's Club wishes to express our thanks to you for your positive stand against the unfair tax on margarine. It is gratifying to know that you are intensely interested in this issue and that your support has been given so strongly to the bill asking removal of the tax.

We, as club women, are vitally interested in the outcome of this bill and hope that a favorable settlement is near.

Expressing our confidence in your ability and wishing you success in your efforts, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. J. C. JORDAN,
President.
Mrs. C. D. JOHNSON,
Corresponding Secretary.

Address by Bartley C. Crum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Bartley C. Crum, formerly a member of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine and author of Behind the Silken Curtain, delivered in Cleveland on March 10 at the Public Auditorium Music Hall:

I represented the American Government in good faith on the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, where six Britons and six Americans unanimously made recommendations to the British and American Governments for a solution of the Palestine problem. These recommendations were accepted by the President of the United States.

You know that the report and the decisions which we reached have suffered the fate of any other "scrap of paper." No one likes to be a sucker. And I have been trying to figure out what and who in Washington is trying to make suckers of these 12 men and the President of the United States. I think I have come up with some answers.

You may remember that I have pointed the finger at Loy Henderson on a number of occasions, for the way he and other elements in the State Department have consistently sabotaged the program of the Congress and the President of the United States with respect to Palestine.

There is another gentleman in Washington who makes Loy Henderson's operations seem puny indeed.

About 2 weeks ago—February 27—men and women representing 62 national organizations of this country met in an emergency conference called by the American Association for the United Nations.

These 62 organizations include every religious faith, and practically every civic, labor, church, farm, veterans', and women's groups in America. Among them were the Kiwanis Clubs, the Lions International, the A. F. of L. and C. I. O., and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the Junior League, the American Veterans' Committee, the Catholic War Veterans, and many others.

They met to demand that the Government of the United States take positive action to implement the United Nations decision to partition Palestine.

These men and women were talking for millions of Americans who don't like to see their Government welch on its own policies.

They were talking for millions of Americans who had been shocked and shamed by Warren Austin's speech in the Security Council on February 24—when as willing or unwilling spokesman for our foreign policy he took the honor and integrity of this country, rolled it into a bill of shameless legalistic evasions—and threw it to the Anglo-American oil interests.

Americans don't like a welch. They don't like a sell-out.

The American people know that if the Palestine decision is not supported by the United States, the power and the authority of the United Nations is gone. The Palestine policy is our policy—for over two decades both major political parties, the Presidents and both Houses of Congress, have gone on record for the establishment and completion of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. We have pressured Great Britain on many occasions to stick by her agreement to help create that state.

This was our own policy—the policy of the most powerful government in the world. The Russians supported it—they're still supporting it.

But it seems that we have now abandoned it.

It seems that in our policy in the Middle East we are now following the lead of the British Foreign Office.

Many millions of Americans have had grave doubts about our unilateral policy in Greece and Turkey, the avowed purpose of which was to contain the Soviet Union, and for which we have already spent, or committed ourselves to spend, over $625,000,000 of American taxpayers' money.

While the British Labor Government, on the record, has seemingly admitted the bankruptcy of its imperial policies, we are apparently now taking over those same bankrupt imperialistic policies—namely exploitation of the colonial peoples in the Middle East and the perpetuation of feudalism in those areas.

Why?

There are nine Cabinet officers in our Government who are presumed to advise and consult with the President—and the theory of our executive arm of Government is that the President should receive balanced—not biased—advice on questions which affect this Nation.

It must therefore be presumed that prior to November 29, 1947, the President did meet with his entire Cabinet and listened to their arguments and advice—and then decided what any man of decency would decide—that we would keep the promises we had been making for 20 years. And we did vote for partition.

Unquestionably, in making this decision, there was in the mind of the President the sorry and shabby decision we had made—reluctantly—not to support China when Japan seized Manchuria. This was the first step which led to the subsequent conquest of Ethiopia, to the callous betrayal of the Spanish Republic, to Munich, to the destruction of the League of Nations—and inevitably to World War II.

Now we are repeating that sordid and shabby pattern. Why?

Why has our Government suddenly found a new interpretation for the United Nations Charter?

Why is our Government unwilling to take the simple and decisive action that could halt the imminence of war in the Holy Land—a war that will certainly spread—a

war that everyone knows carries the seeds of a new world war?

Why has our Government welched on its own policy in the Palestine decision?

We fear in America the idea of communism. We are seeking to defeat that idea with force throughout the world. Force has never yet and never can defeat an idea. An idea can be met only by a better idea. In the Middle East we should put into effect the political democracy of which we boast—we should help the Arab fellaheen to reach an economic standard which would make that area less of a focal point of political and military conflagration.

You have in Palestine a tiny island of democracy in which the entire community is devoted to the twin concepts of political freedom and economic security. These are also the true American goals. The Jews are bringing these concepts to the Arabs—and in that sense they constitute a threat to feudal Arab rule in the Middle East.

But if the western world wants to survive—if it wants to see our doctrine of political freedom and economic security expanded, then sheer common sense, the simple instinct for survival, makes us of necessity allies with the Jewish community in Palestine. The fact is that if the Jews of Palestine did not exist—and if we want to have democracy in the Middle East—we would have to create the Jews.

Then why have we reversed ourselves on the UN partition decision? It seems there is one man in Washington who has the power to decide this question for all of us—in his own way—without reference to the honor and integrity of our Nation, without reference to the peace or destruction of our world.

That man is the Secretary of Defense, Mr. James Forrestal.

You may well ask, "upon what meat does this our Caesar feed, that he has grown so great?"

The answer is that Mr. Forrestal has found a new diet that even a Caesar might envy. It is oil—Arabian oil.

What has Mr. Forrestal got to do with oil? Isn't he the Secretary of Defense? Is it possible for the Secretary of Defense to have any connection with oil—or any other private business enterprise?

These are good question, my friends. They are strictly to the point.

Mr. Forrestal does indeed sit in the Cabinet of President Truman as the Secretary of Defense—as supreme Chief of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. And the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force use oil.

As Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal sits on the highest policy-making bodies of the Government. He is a member of the National Security Council, consisting of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, which ultimately determine our whole international policy.

Let's grant that Mr. Forrestal quite sincerely believes it all important to our national security that our oil supply in the Middle East should not be jeopardized.

So do the rest of us.

But the question remains: Is it necessary to sink the United Nations in order to accomplish our objectives—oil for ourselves and the oil needed for the Marshall plan? In determining the validity of Mr. Forrestal's judgment it is only fair to consider Mr. Forrestal's background and training.

For Mr. Forrestal has not, and cannot, in public office, rid himself of his past.

For years Mr. Forrestal has been associated with the powerful banking house of Dillon, Read & Co. For the last 3 years before he came to Washington, he was its president.

Dillon, Read & Co. has been up to its ears in oil.

As partner and president of this great banking firm, Mr. Forrestal personally participated in floating large loans for the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. Both of these companies are heavily involved in oil operations in the Middle East—particularly in Saudi Arabia and Bahrein.

Mr. Forrestal's firm organized the American company which bought out the two big Government oil pipe lines from Texas to the East coast, thus tying Dillon, Read into all the big oil companies in this country.

Dillon, Read also floated loans for the Royal Dutch Shell and its subsidiary, the Batavian Petroleum Co. Royal Dutch Shell is involved in Iranian and other Middle Eastern oil fields, and is also partly owned by the British Government in some of its operations.

Mr. Forrestal's successor as president of Dillon, Read, Mr. Charles McCain, came right out of the oil empire's own bank—the Chase National.

In addition, Mr. Forrestal has strong lieutenants and assistants in both the Army and Air Force branches—whose business interests have long coincided with his. It happens that the Assistant Secretary of the Army is now Maj. Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., who was also a member of Mr. Forrestal's banking firm, Dillon, Read, and who shared Mr. Forrestal's intimate relationships with the oil industry.

The Secretary for Air, Mr. Stuart Symington, is also connected by business relations and marriage with families having large holdings of oil stocks.

So when we look at the Defense Secretariat, we find that all three branches—Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as their central director—include men who have had close private interests in the oil industry.

Because of this background, the question naturally arises in the minds of many Americans, when Mr. Forrestal spearheads the lobby against the Palestine partition decision: Is he acting in his capacity of Secretary of Defense, or is he serving the interests of the oil companies with which he is so closely related?

It is an elementary principle of American justice that a judge shall remove himself from any case in which he may have, even remotely, a personal interest, a personal stake.

Does not justice require that the Secretary of Defense instantly and unhesitatingly remove himself from any connection with the Palestine issue, in which the oil companies of this country have an unconcealed interest?

But Mr. Forrestal, far from removing himself, has on the contrary thrown all his enormous power and influence into the fight to secure a reversal of American policy in Palestine.

Perhaps you think his power and influence are exaggerated? Let us examine it carefully, since Mr. Forrestal's effectiveness in public matters rests upon this power and influence, and upon his great skill in operating behind the scenes.

What I am saying is in no sense a personal attack on Mr. Forrestal. But Mr. Forrestal is in a position to determine whether my boy and your boy shall live or die. Because of that fact, as an American citizen, you and I have a right to examine his background and to try to ascertain why he has reached the conclusion he has reached.

Mr. Forrestal's power and influence in Washington are unmatched by any other person of Cabinet rank. Both in the executive branch and with Members of Congress, he has great standing.

To the tremendous power and influence which come from his former association with a great banking firm, Mr. Forrestal has added the power and influence of public office.

As Secretary of Defense, he controls the spending of nearly one-third of the national budget. Mr. Forrestal can decisively affect the awarding of contracts amounting to over $6,000,000,000 a year. This is power.

In his years as Under Secretary of the Navy, then Secretary, and, finally, as chief of all three arms of defense, Mr. Forrestal has built up an impressive relationship with Congress. Unlike most civil servants, who walk with fear and trembling in the sight of Congress, Mr. Forrestal enjoys the unique position of having Congressmen bow to him.

I mean "bow" literally—for when he was elevated from Under Secretary of the Navy to Secretary, in 1944, and went up to appear before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, the members rose to do him honor. Usually, the committee on such occasions examines the nominee as to his fitness for the proposed office. But not Mr. Forrestal. The committee scarcely asked him a question. It acclaimed and approved him. This was dramatic evidence of the fact that Mr. Forrestal was really the master of the occasion—that his power and influence were beyond question.

As Secretary of Defense, Forrestal has another great power—he has access to the secret intelligence services and to what they produce. He can place his own interpretation on what they produce. Very few, if any, men in Congress are in a position to know the full content of the facts Mr. Forrestal obtains through the intelligence services. He has only to utter a phrase or a sentence, in a confidential talk, and his words have the aura of all the intelligence services of the United States. This would be dangerous enough in ordinary times. In times of hysteria, in times such as these when men everywhere are troubled about international affairs, Mr. Forrestal, in his office as Secretary of Defense, is so powerful that he could, if he so desired, raise a rumor to the status of an indubitable and frightening fact.

Mr. Forrestal has one other great advantage, available to almost no other persons of high station in the executive branch of the Government. He is looked upon, in many quarters in Capitol Hill, not as a member of the Democratic Party primarily, but primarily as a great Wall Street man. In other words, his standing is really above that of a man engaged in party politics. While not a mere neuter politically, and while acknowledging that he is a member of the Democratic Party, he really deals with people on the Hill as a member of the powerful financial and industrial class of the United States whose headquarters are in Wall Street. Thus he is able to get things done and to wield influence and to escape criticism, particularly partisan or political criticism, far beyond what most other men in the Government are able to do.

He makes it almost a fetish not to be involved publicly in any controversial matter. This doesn't mean he has never taken part in controversies. But he lets others do the fighting, the contending, in public.

Mr. Forrestal, through his contacts with the press, has attempted to influence the very roots of public opinion in America. Only recently, according to newspaper reports, Mr. Forrestal invited "top Washington newsmen to a hush-hush dinner" to discuss his views and the rumor of his resignation from the Cabinet. Behind such an informal evening of food and wine—and a first-run movie—is the authority of Mr. Forrestal's great public office, his access to secret intelligence reports—all the background which newsmen seek and the source of which they cannot avoid respecting.

Mr. Forrestal has pleaded the case for oil exploitation in the Middle East against exploitation at home. He has personally interceded with Senators and Congressmen on the Palestine issue. He has talked and propagated his—and the oil companies'—point of view on Palestine with top-flight newsmen.

He has even gone so far as to break down the time-honored distinction between private enterprise and Government ownership in this country in his ardent advocacy of the oil companies' Middle East operations.

Speaking to a Senate War Investigating Committee last January, Mr. Forrestal went to the length of suggesting that the Government should buy into the oil companies to preserve the national interest. It is indeed a curious spectacle to find a devoted exponent of private capitalism suggesting that the Government buy into one of the world's great private monopolies.

Why has Mr. Forrestal suggested this extreme departure from the customary thinking of men in and out of Government today? Is it because he really feels there is no longer any line of demarcation between the private interests of the oil companies in the Middle East and the public interests of the Nation? Or is it to ensure the fullest Government support of the every policy of the oil companies, even when these run counter to national policy?

I raise these questions because they reinforce my belief that no public officer has a right to play a major role in policy decisions that may affect his private interests.

It is no secret that major oil companies with interests in the Arab east are lobbying in Washington and in the United Nations—that they are pouring money into the campaign to reverse the American policy and make a shambles of the United Nations.

I do not challenge the right of these great corporations to lobby, though I do question their faith and devotion to the policies of our country. They may feel—mistakenly, I believe—that the Arab threat to their oil interests in the Arab east is serious. A great American statesman, former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, has exposed the fallacy of their fears. "If a new war breaks out," Mr. Welles said, "the Middle Eastern oil resources would certainly not be available to western Europe nor to the United States. Should peace be preserved, since the Arab Governments depend upon the royalties from their oil concessions, they are hardly likely to oppose their exploitation."

It is obvious that an essential part of the rehabilitation of Europe—aside from all political considerations—is a free flow of oil from the Middle East. That free flow of oil from the Middle East can only be assured by peace in the Middle East.

There can only be peace in the Middle East by upholding the decision of the United Nations.

I do challenge the right of a public official—with the enormous powers that belong to the Secretary of Defense—to spearhead the oil lobby. Justifiably or not, it raises suspicion that these companies are being served by and from the most important single office in our Government outside of the President's.

This Nation has had a long and unsavory history of oil mixed with politics. We don't like the mixture. The problems of our foreign policy are too grave, too fraught with peril for our world, to be tainted with the slightest stain or smell of oil.

It is for this reason I challenge Mr. Forrestal's right to sit in judgment on the Palestine issue.

United States Public Works Postwar Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave heretofore granted, I include as an extension of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address delivered by me on March 18, 1948, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at its thirty-ninth annual convention in Washington, D. C.:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC WORKS POSTWAR PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, I appreciate sincerely, your invitation to participate in the activities of this convention, whose objectives are most worthy and laudable. Your organization has, during the years, cooperated with the Congress, the various States and their local subdivisions, in planning, promulgating, and constructing useful river and harbor projects throughout the Nation—projects which are so essential to our welfare and economy.

While I am chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, as a member of the full committee I have the opportunity to sit in on the deliberations of that committee which have to do with all Federal public works and improvements. Your secretary has asked me to discuss with you not only rivers and harbors projects, but other public works coming within the jurisdiction of our committee, which I am glad to do. Other public works are roads, flood control, and public buildings and grounds. However, I will not trespass upon the field of flood control as my colleague, Hon. EARL WILSON, of Indiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, will present that program to you.

The war not only slowed up, but practically stopped, all major public works which were not primarily essential for the prosecution of the war. Notwithstanding the war has been over for 2½ years, the urgent need for housing, particularly housing for veterans, has made it necessary to continue the ban against major programs for public works construction, and we are not yet able to give the green light to many worthy projects which have been held in abeyance for years. Furthermore, the excessive costs of material and scarcity of efficient, trained workers, has further complicated the program. Unfortunately, the unsettled and grave conditions facing us in our attempt to bring order and peace out of chaos in the international picture has made uncertain any extensive program for much needed internal improvements. Since the war ended we have sent abroad over $24,000,000,000 in an endeavor to provide relief and help in the economic rehabilitation of the devastated, war-torn countries of the Old World. We are now embarking upon a new program which will entail a like amount in the next 5-years period. These enormous expenditures and commitments beyond our own domain present almost unsurmountable hurdles to a constructive, long-range program for internal improvements within our own country. However, I hold the belief that if we are to maintain the front-rank position we hold as the one great industrial Nation in the world upholding free enterprise, we must continue to give adequate support to the conservation, development, and full utilization of our own invaluable natural resources. Unless we are strong at home we must be weak in foreign aid. Our first consideration, therefore, should be to maintain our own sound financial structure, utilize our natural resources, build up adequate reserves and stock piles, and protect our own national interests so that we may be able to fulfill our part as a strong, freedom-loving Nation in the family of nations.

With this brief résumé of our position in a war-torn, chaotic world, I will outline briefly the program of public works as it appears to those of us on the Public Works Committee of the House which has jurisdiction over thes important projects.

PUBLIC ROADS

We found, during the war, that adequate public roads were an essential to our war activities. Likewise, in peacetime, they are one of the most important links in the economy of the Nation. The Federal Government has long contributed to the States and their local subdivisions on a 50-50 basis for road construction. With the advent of the automobile and the demand for truck transportation, the program for construction and maintenance of public roads has been a major one. During the year 1947, 7,929 miles of Federal-aid highways of all classes were constructed, as compared with only 2,964 miles in 1946. This was a much curtailed program, however, as in 1941 we constructed 12,936 miles of roads with Federal aid. The total cost of completed projects on the Federal-aid system in 1947 was $142,965,296, and completed secondary roads cost $55,334,860. In money value, the highway program for the year amounted to approximately $1,000,000,000, i. e., $932,362,226 for 24,720 miles of highways. The total payments of the States during the year for work done on Federal-aid highways amounted to $193,634,155.

The Public Works Committee has approved a program for the next 3 years, projected on the needs of speeding up construction to overtake, as far as possible, the lag which was occasioned by the war. The Federal-Aid Highways Act of 1944 authorized appropriations of $500,000,000 annually to aid the States in highway improvement in each of the first 3 postwar fiscal years. This program will expire next year, and our committee has recommended its extension on the same basis. The 1944 act required the designation of a national system of interstate highways not to exceed 40,000 miles in extent, by joint action of the State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Another important phase of our internal economy is public buildings. There was no public building program during the war, and we have not yet been able to lift the ban so that construction may begin on the much-needed buildings for Federal activities throughout the Nation. Except for some minor emergency construction outside the District of Columbia, and the General Accounting Office, the National Institute of Health, buildings at Howard University, the building for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and the Bureau of Standards here in the District, no construction is in progress.

Beginning in 1934, Congress allocated annually $65,000,000 for public buildings. However, in 1940 the Public Buildings Administration was directed to stop all Federal building construction not connected with the national defense program. As a result, some 200 authorized projects were placed in deferred status. In 1943, $500,000 was made available to the Public Buildings Administration for an advanced planning program, and that agency, in collaboration with the Post Office Department, conducted a Nation-wide survey for the purpose of determining future public-building requirements throughout the country. Construction under this program, however, is still held in abeyance. Current studies by the Public Buildings Administration, covering the need for adequate Federal office facilities, indicate critical situations prevailing in practically every State and all of our Territories. Such situations must be corrected at the earliest date practicable.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

In the brief time remaining at my disposal, I want to outline some of the program under consideration by the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, in which you are par-

ticularly interested. My subcommittee recently completed hearings on a number of river and harbor projects throughout the Nation, and we propose to present an omnibus bill to the House for consideration at an early date. This is an authorization bill and will cover some 18 or 20 projects involving an expenditure of approximately $12,000,000.

At the present time the Corps of Engineers has a sizable survey program under way. There are, under preparation in the field or awaiting funds for initiation, 450 survey reports covering additional river and harbor improvements which have been advocated by local interests at various locations throughout the United States. Included among the investigations under way in the field is a comprehensive survey for the further development of the Columbia River Basin and an investigation of a 12-foot navigable channel for the Mississippi River and its major tributaries, including the Ohio River and the Illinois waterway.

There are 42 studies which have been completed in the field and recently acted upon by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, recommending improvements estimated to cost some $25,400,000. In addition, 23 reports have been submitted to Congress since the last River and Harbor Act of 1946.

The authorized river and harbor construction program includes 200 projects on which work has been undertaken although not fully completed, and 76 authorized new river and harbor projects for which no funds have been appropriated by Congress. The latest estimated cost for completing the construction of these improvements is $1,830,000,000. Included among the projects that have been initiated is the McNary Lock and Dam on the Columbia River, now in an early stage of construction, and the project for improvement of the Snake River, which is in the advanced-planning stage of development.

At the present time there are some 1,200 river and harbor projects now actively in force. The construction activity in connection with these projects includes the maintenance of channels and harbor areas, channel control works, breakwater work, snagging and the operation and care of facilities which have been provided in the interest of navigation.

Since April 6, 1802, when an appropriation of $30,000 was made for piers in the Delaware River by the Corps of Engineers, the total funds appropriated through the fiscal year 1948 for river and harbor projects in the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands, amounted to $3,370,000,000.

As you know, the Federal Government has jurisdiction over the improvement and control of navigable waterways by reason of the commerce clause in the Constitution. Under this authority the Government has constructed many multiple-purpose projects, not only for navigation but also for flood control, reclamation, and hydroelectric power. Hydroelectric power is a most important factor in the program by reason of the fact that it brings into the Federal Government revenues from such projects which not only reimburse the Government for the cost of the power facilities, but help to retire the indebtedness for other portions of the improvements, such as reclamation. It has been the policy of the Government, for many years, to retain control over generation of hydro-electric power in such projects, which is a wise one and should be continued. I am a firm believer in private enterprise and hold the view that the Federal Government should not inject itself into commercial operations where private enterprise may carry them forward adequately and successfully. However, it is my view that in these large river developments which have power development as one of the major factors, the ownership and control over the entire project, including power, should be retained by the Federal Government.

The industrial machine of America runs full speed by reason of our oil, coal, and hydroelectric energy. Our coal and oil supply is expendable. According to the American Petroleum Institute, the estimated proven petroleum reserves existing as of last year, were 21,900,000,000 barrels. This Nation is now being placed between the two jaws of the mechanical vise which are being tightened by the screw of increasing domestic demands. No wonder Arabian oil is now receiving international attention. The stated proven reserves in the Middle East are 25 percent higher than the total like United States reserves, and geophysical soundings indicate that the most probable Middle East reserves will be double the present reserves of the United States. Such soundings further indicate that the greatest existing oil pool lies in the area of the Caspian Sea—Russian territory—and extends into and across the Indian Ocean into the East Indies.

Our usable refining capacity is now being operated at the highest obtainable rate, and the industry is making every effort to expand refining facilities. Everything possible is being done to increase refining volume, but this is the easiest part of the over-all problem. The petroleum industry is doing all possible to help in the solution of this problem.

As against our diminishing oil and coal supply, our wealth of hydroelectric energy has only been partially tapped and it will continue as long as the sun shines and water runs. Therefore, it is of first importance that the Federal Government retain its control over this enormous resource which is fundamental to the success of our industrial system. One kilowatt year of hydroelectric power is equivalent to about 15 barrels of oil.

The Bonneville plant during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts, which is equivalent to 8,800,000 barrels. The 15-unit completed Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28,000,000 barrels of oil annually. When McNary Dam is completed, the oil saving will be about 15,500,000 barrels annually. The existing usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions, 5,000,000 barrels will be consumed. From present indications it will be difficult to even secure commitments on 5,000,000 barrels, due to the tight situation on the Pacific coast. The potential power on the Columbia and its tributaries is around 20,000,000 kilowatts, and 18,500,000 kilowatts is now flowing to the sea unused. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be, in round numbers, 290,000,000 barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydropower in our future economy.

We have all shared the hope that now that the war is behind us almost 3 years, we could look forward to an era of peace, good will and economic stability throughout the world. Unfortunately, as evidenced by chaotic world conditions at this very hour, we are confronted with an international crisis of uncertainty and grave portent which challenges the abilities and loyal devotion of all Americans. The peace and stability of the world is hanging in the balance. Out of death and destruction of World War II we want to build a structure for enduring peace which will embrace all the peace-loving nations of the world and make unnecessary another catastrophe such as the one we have just passed through. To accomplish this we cannot forget that our first consideration should be the security and protection of our own Nation, and we must not be lulled into a sense of false security by appeasement and double talk. This is a time when, as Washington said in the dark days at Valley Forge, only Americans should be put on guard. Let us maintain our national defenses, particularly our Air Force and Navy at full strength, so that we may be in a position to meet any eventuality that may arise. It must be admitted that in such a program involving our national security, we must relegate to second place internal improvements and public works which in any way interfere with, or do not contribute to, a national defense program.

In these days of national peril, we must not fail to recognize that this great, liberty-loving Republic was founded upon the solid rock of spiritual values, without which no structure can endure. We have kindled the fires of our faith in justice and liberty for free men down through the years. We must maintain unsullied the defense of our liberties and a free world against the hordes of aggression and tyranny. The world is facing a great moral crusade; the forces of tyranny are pitted against the forces of freedom.

Let us ask divine guidance that there may come out of this great world tragedy through which we have just passed, with its heavy cost of death and destruction, not only the quickening of our faith in patriotic fervor for the preservation of our own liberties and a free world, but a spiritual awakening of the great heart of America to an appreciation of the deep values of life, not measured by monetary standards or sordid motives and desires.

Save the DP's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me on March 18, 1948:

SAVE THE DP'S

The following few sentences are from a letter I received from an inmate of a displaced persons' camp in Austria. "Please, Mr. Celler", he writes, "we are asking you to let us know what your leaders think of our chances to enter the United States of America. We here are locked up in such an enclosure that we do not believe any longer in the possibility of ever being free. We are awaiting your reply for which we thank you in advance."

I'm not retelling a sob story. This is the stuff of despair and frustration. It is we who are not thinking or even feeling honestly. For convenience sake, we have grouped these homeless, driven people under one phrase, "displaced persons" and then shortened that to DP's. Perhaps that is why we have fallen into the callous error of thinking of them as a massed, faceless group. We have lost sight of the fact that each displaced person is a living being, a man, woman, or child with eyes and ears and hands and heart, even as you and I. Each one is an integral part of human destiny. Each one of them could have been you, but for the grace of God, or a brother or father or child. If that is sentimentality, then I proudly embrace that accusation. We are dealing with human beings not with inanimate sticks of furniture that can be indefinitely stored away until they rot. Yet this fruitful, resourceful, God-fearing land of ours will not make room for them.

Six hundred thousand now are a United States responsibility. In 1947, Congress granted $45,000,000 of appropriated funds to the War Department for DP purposes. The total cost to the War Department is $100,000,000 which is paid for by the American taxpayer. But do the moneys thus spent dissipate the problem. Not one whit. The displaced persons continue to live in frustration, without the sense of innate individual dignity, with no meaning in the future and only tragic memory of the past.

There are four ways of approach to the problem:

First, forcible repatriation which means of course sending many back to Communist-dominated countries from whence they fled, there to await an uncertain fate.

Second, closing the camps and turning these victims of the Germans back to the Germans and the German economy. The misery that would follow such a course is plain to see.

Third, indefinite separate maintenance in Germany, Austria and Italy. That is the course we are presently following with its consequent waste of human lives and money.

Fourth, their resettlement in other countries, including the United States. Belgium is taking substantial numbers and so is France and England. Norway has admitted some. Only we among the solvent nations of the world have refused to take our fair share.

The Stratton bill which is locked up in a vice-like grip by the House Judiciary Committee and which has been disregarded by the Senate committee provides for the entrance of 400,000 displaced persons at the rate of 100,000 each year for 4 years. It has been argued in the most perverted, unfeeling, and nonfactual fashion that the admission of 100,000 unfortunate yearly for 4 years would affect our housing, jobs, and would bring into this country undesirable Communists. Let's look at these threats a little more dispassionately. Since 1940, the total immigration permitted by our laws fell short by 914,762 persons. As of June 30, 1946, the war reported deaths in the armed forces from all causes were 396,228. Were this number spared the tragedy of death, would we have said that our economy could not absorb them. Is not the horrible implication clear to all who oppose the admission of 400,000 that we should be glad we have that much more room? Follow that logic to its honest conclusion.

Again, in 1 year in 1945, there were 96,000 accidental deaths. If it's the absorptive capacity of the United States we are concerned with, then let's begin a crusade for a static population which, of course, means race suicide. I cite these figures as an example of how ridiculous have been the arguments advanced against the Stratton bill. If within the immigration laws as they exist today we have admitted the 914,762 persons since 1940, there would have been no outcry. It would have been accepted as the normal trend of events. But, now, when we ask for less than 50 percent of that number in the name of humanity and suffering, we are given fantastic examples of impossible logic.

We know, for instance that there are over 7,000 communities in the United States with a population of little over 1,000. If each such community were to take an equal share, the total number of new residents would be 15 additional persons in each community or five families per year. How would that complicate the job and housing problem of the community? Both the American Federation of Labor and the CIO have testified in favor of the bill, urging its passage without fear the admission of these unfortunates threaten the economic security of the United States. Both organizations have pointed out existing shortages in agricultural workers, construction workers, engineers, and certain types of medical personnel. An UNRRA survey of 228,000 displaced persons revealed that 60,000 were farmers, 18,000 construction workers, 18,000 skilled in mechanical and industrial trades. There were 4,000 engineers, 3,000 physicians and dentists, 4,000 nurses, and 2,000 workers.

As to the Communist threat, I quote from the testimony of Secretary of State Marshall who urged immediate passage of the Stratton bill. "There is a sharp divergence of viewpoint between the Soviet Government and our own as to what course should be pursued. The Soviet viewpoint has been vigorously presented in every possible forum—the central councils of Germany and Austria, the General Assembly of the UN, and the council of foreign ministers, to mention a few. The Soviet viewpoint is that these persons born in areas now subject to the Soviet governmental authority are Russian subjects and under obligation to return to such territory. They demand that we forcibly repatriate the DP's. Our view is that it is against American tradition for us to compel these persons who are now under our authority to return against their will to those or other areas under governments whose political and economic systems they are unwilling to accept."

I quote, as well, from the report of Representative FRANK L. CHELF, Democratic Member of the Fulton special subcommittee which was designated by the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to investigate the displaced persons problem. He states in his written report most emphatically, "As a result of a very thorough, complete, and painstaking investigation into this particular angle of the problem, I am completely convinced that the displaced persons are no more communistic in their views than any loyal red-blooded American living in the United States today."

How could it be otherwise? As of December 31, 1946, there were 278,868 Polish natives in the DP camps, 180,838 Baltic natives, 39,494 Yugoslavians, and 193,332 Jews. All are those who fled from totalitarian rule, who linger on in hardship and despair, rather than submit to the kind of governments now imposed upon the Slavic and Baltic peoples.

One would think that humanitarianism alone would be sufficient reason to pass the Stratton bill, but the United States Congress will not be moved, neither by the cold facts given by the Department of State in favor of the bill, nor by the irrefutable logic of the Labor and Justice Departments which likewise favored the Stratton bill, nor the facts or figures of the War Department or the approval of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., nor the moving pleas of the religious groups, including Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish.

Instead the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on immigration recommended so emasculated a bill as to give rise to the suspicion that it was only a gesture made to answer criticism of inaction.

From the original proposal of the admission of 400,000 DP's in 4 years, 100,000 to be admitted yearly, the new bill proposes the admission of a total of 100,000—50,000 to be admitted each year for 2 years. It recommends that half of the DP's admitted under the bill be those "whose place of origin or country of nationality has been annexed by a foreign power." This, apparently, is an attempt to recognize the annexation by Russia of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It also recognizes politically the annexation by Russia of that portion of Poland east of the Curzon line.

There never has been any treaty or any agreement ratified by the Senate involving such territorial changes. As a matter of fact, we still recognize these three Baltic states as independent and still have their accredited representatives in Washington.

Thus, the natives of Germany, Austria, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, are placed at an unwarranted disadvantage, though they constitute the bulk of the DP's. In short, those who are presently stateless or those who do not want to return to Russian-dominated territory are placed in a secondary position.

The bill further provides that 50 percent must be farmers and be employed on farms in this country. In other words, 50 percent of the DP's are penalized if they are not farmers. We need doctors, dentists, scientists, carpenters, lathers, tailors, plumbers, mechanics, and domestics as well as farmers. Why was a reservation made as against the other groups in favor of one. Ours is a mixed economy and not exclusively either agricultural or industrial.

The bill further permits entry of persons only if they have assurance of housing and jobs in the United States without displacing citizens. Our existing immigration laws already provide that applicants must give guarantee that they will not become public charges. Protection already exists and I cannot see how any declaration of secured homes and job is susceptible of proof. What does displacing a citizen mean? If a job is available, does that provision mean that it must be offered first to a citizen? Does the same apply to available housing? If the immigrant loses his job for any cause is he subject to deportation? I point this out to show how unskilled a job was done in writing the bill. Such an obscure, general provision indicates as well how small was the attempt to secure a workable, just bill.

Moreover, the bill provides that the immigrant must report periodically to certain designated authorities, like some criminal on parole. In this provision, there appears to be a serious constitutional question involved. This may well conflict with the constitutional provision according equal protection of the law to all inhabitants of the land. It is further provided that if the 50,000 quota is not filled for the year, the remaining numbers lapse and are not added to the following year's allotment of 50,000.

Thus we see 50 percent of the 100,000 are to be alloted to the Balts, 50 percent of the balance to the farm workers, leaving but a very limited percentage to all other groups of peoples and occupations. Let us call a spade a spade—Why were the Balts preferred? In this limitation as well as in others there is a deliberate exclusion of Jews. Remember Jews only constitute 20 percent of all DP's. By British perfidy, Arab infamy, and American backtracking on Palestine partition Jews are denied entrance to their national homeland and cannot leave Devil's Island—the DP camp. Where shall they go? Must they die in DP camps?

The bill is not a solution. It is not even an attempt at one. It does not answer the question of why the American taxpayer must continue to pay for keeping large numbers of these victims in camps when the admission of 400,000 in a 4-year period could dissipate the problem without costing the Government even a fraction of the money it pays out today. Under this bill an unhealthy percentage will still remain in our camps; the taxpayer will still carry the burden of their support; the United States will not be taking its fair share, and the rehabilitations of the DP's into useful secure people will still remain an academic problem. When the powerful United States so hems its humanitarianism with restrictions as to render it meaningless, then how will the less-economically favored countries respond?

I believe that very shortly the Departments of State and Justice will testify against the Senate version. Well might they do so. It will be to our everlasting shame were we to lose our proud traditional heritage of asylum to the oppressed and dispossessed. When that day comes, God pity us and forgive us.

Freyberg, Leader in B'nai B'rith, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, many members have heard about the activities of B'nai B'rith. I enclose herewith an excellent statement on the work, aims, and purposes of this outstandingly fine organization by the president of my own lodge:

[From the 1512 Reporter, Washington Heights Lodge, No. 1512, B'nai B'rith, special membership issue, March 1948]

OUR PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

B'nai B'rith is America's largest and oldest Jewish service organization. Promoting the cause of all Jewry throughout its 104 years, its activities are extended not only to our own country, but to 24 nations outside the borders of the United States and Canada. There is not a phase of Jewish life that has not been a direct beneficiary of its ability to help and contribute much from the vast store of experience it has gained over the years. Its membership is comprised of a cross-section of the leaders of Jewry in every community. These men and women have given unstintingly of their time, ability and means, to further the cause of Judaism. B'nai B'rith's success in the past acts as a guaranty for the future.

The magnificent machinery which has been built around B'nai B'rith as a source of power and which enabled it to render such unparalleled service throughout the war, was rapidly converted to meet the peacetime needs of our people and our country. How necessary this was is now quite obvious for today's picture is very grave indeed. Millions of our brethren overseas have been killed by the ruthless forces of fascism, anti-Semitism in America still flourishes. The establishment of a homeland in Palestine is far from becoming an actuality.

B'nai B'rith under the inspirational guidance of its great departed leader Henry Monsky, urged our Government to take the initative in the United Nations for the adoption and implementation of the UN Special Committee on Palestine Majority Report. We will continue to fight for the enforcement of the decision made by the UN so vital to our people.

The war on anti-Semitism is being fought by our Antidefamation League on all fronts. Through press, radio, films, magazines, and other media, the dissemination of all types of educational material are used to combat every undemocratic practice. Through our Hillel Foundations, we are helping to educate our students in the colleges, to their great heritage, and to provide the leadership of tomorrow. Through B'nai B'rith youth organizations all over the country, much is being done to raise the culture standards of our children, and a broad veteran's program still is doing a great job in servicing our war heroes in hospitals throughout the Nation.

To meet these problems, and to perpetuate these services on an ever-increasing scale, the power of Jewry must be mobilized. It is our conviction that we have the moral right to call upon all Jews to join with us, so that accomplishment of our aims may become a reality.

The future belongs to those who prepare for it.

MORRIS H. FREYBERG,
President, B'nai B'rith,
Washington Heights Lodge.

Universal Military Training and the Nation's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include in the RECORD an address made by me before the Nassau Chapter, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Friday, March 19, 1948, at the Cathedral House, Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., on the subject of universal military training and the Nation's security.

The text is as follows:

Mr. President, members of the association, and friends, when first asked to speak to your membership tonight I accepted with pleasure. I realized that it was a compliment and that it would give us an opportunity for an exchange of views which should be mutually helpful.

When Col. Milton Wallach subsequently wrote me in Washington, listing some of the subjects in which you are particularly interested, I welcomed the opportunity even more, since Colonel Wallach's letter emphasized again that you are taking a serious interest in the national security. I do not mean to imply that other chapters are not equally concerned over our national safety. But it is refreshing always to find that the men who supplied so much of the leadership of the military forces during World War II are leading the crusade now for a strong national-security program, including universal military training.

Before going into the broader aspects of national security let me first clear the decks for some of the other subjects in which Colonel Wallach tells me you are actively interested.

INACTIVE-DUTY PAY FOR RESERVE TRAINING

One of these is inactive-duty pay for Reserve training. This measure, I am delighted to report to you, is now on its way to becoming law. We passed it in the House of Representatives on March 9. The proposal had previously been passed by the Senate. The Army favors it, you favor it, and I favor it. In the House we added some minor amendments, which do not go to the substance of the bill at all, but these have to be ironed out in a conference committee. I therefore expect that it will soon go to the President for signature and certainly it is to be anticipated that he will append his signature. As you know, this measure would extend inactive-duty pay to our Army Reserves and Air Force Reserves, on the same basis as that now authorized for members of the National Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Marine Corps Reserve. Here is a policy declaration by the Congress that it regards the Reserve as vital to the Nation's defense. Also, it is a direction to our military administration that the potential strength of the Reserves should be translated into something concrete—into a reality.

NONDISABILITY RETIREMENT PAY

Next, I was informed that you are interested in nondisability retirement pay for Reserve officers as provided in Senate bill 1593 and H. R. 2744. Here again, it is a pleasure to tell you that we passed this measure in the House on March 10. This is part of a sound, long-range program for rebuilding our Reserves and supplying an incentive for superior men to retain their connection with the military services in time of peace. This measure will encourage younger men particularly to qualify for and accept Reserve commissions and continue their Reserve training through the years, thus increasing their value in time of war. I am sure that it will be enacted into law eventually and I certainly shall do everything that I can, with my colleagues on the Senate side, to push for final and favorable action over there.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

As for the 1949 military appropriations bills, I can only tell you that as yet no hearings have been held, and that normally there is no particular pressure for hearings until the decks have been cleared of the more urgent legislative measures. The budget for the fiscal year 1949 makes liberal provision for the military services, and I am quite sure that Members of Congress will approach this problem without partisan bias or any purpose to make political capital out of appropriations for the national security. Just as politics stops or should stop at the water's edge, so it should stop short of any effort to play politics with the national defense.

Until the Appropriations Committees hold their hearings it is impossible to say what will be done about funds for Reserve training. I do know, however, that the committees of Congress, as well as the military services themselves, are greatly concerned over this problem. They realize that the real power of any military establishment lies in its reserves, and that in this atomic age trained reserves are more necessary than ever both for offense and defense.

MILITARY SECURITY COMPLEX PROBLEM FOR UNITED STATES

If our Reserve components are to be rebuilt on an efficient basis and remain efficient adequate provision will have to be made for giving them the training required to fit them into an M-day force. Any unnecessary delay in initiating a broad-scale program for training would be extremely dangerous to our security.

For a country like the United States, dedicated to the ways of peace, military preparedness is a far more complex problem than for a nation with aggressive ambitions. As pointed out by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training—the Compton Commission—a nation bent on conquest can plan in advance for a definite campaign and type of warfare. It chooses its own time, place, and mode of attack, and strikes when it gets ready. The peace-loving nation has no choice except to prepare for every type of surprise attack that might be launched against it. The decision between war and peace rests, unfortunately, with the aggressor.

Air power and the atomic age have made it possible for any nation to be attacked by an aggressor without warning. Bombs may be dropped on any of our cities. I am not disclosing any military secrets in saying that the type of atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima already is obsolete. Instead of a city, an area several times larger than the average city can be destroyed or made unhabitable by a single bomb of later type. And I mean one bomb, not a dozen bombs. But the very existence of such weapons increases our own danger, since it is only a question of time until the aggressor nations possessing necessary raw materials and scientific brains are able to duplicate our achievements in this field.

Civil defense thus becomes important for the first time. Delay in planning and organizing for a war emergency could be disastrous in a country such as ours, with its tremendous concentrations of population.

FREEDOM AT STAKE

That the danger exists is self-evident. The Politburo makes no secret of its purposes. It is working night and day to bring

the free world under the complete domination of Soviet Russia. Czechoslovakia is the seventh country to be taken over since the end of World War II. The tentacles of the Soviet octopus are now reaching into Finland. We see the same pattern developing in China, Korea, Greece, Italy, France, England, and even in our own country. Quislings already are at work attempting to undermine American democracy. They are like rats gnawing at the rope which holds us to our democratic moorings. Unless we find means of dealing with them our country can be destroyed from within as well as from without.

It is not communism alone that threatens us. It is a Bolshevik conspiracy to capture the world for the benefit of the medieval despots who already control the eastern half of Europe and are reaching out now for western Europe and Asia. There is no more freedom or democracy in the totalitarian countries than there is in a jail.

Anyone in America has the right to speak his mind, to move about freely, and to work out his individual destiny in his own way. Within the last 30 days those liberties have been lost to a people who, after World War I, adopted a constitution patterned after our own, and built a new republic dedicated to the freedom and protection of the individual. Now, in Czechoslovakia, all that is swept away. The secret police are in charge. The Red Terror has taken over. The purges have started. Fear has replaced freedom as the guiding principle of daily existence.

If we fought for anything in World War I and World War II, it was for freedom and decency and the right to determine our own destinies by democratic processes, built around free elections and free choice by a free people as between candidates of free political parties dedicated to the same fundamental principles as those whose votes they seek.

That is our heritage. The responsibility for guarding it rests equally on all of us.

FORMULA FOR SECURITY

Some of you have no doubt read the report of the Compton commission, and the more recent Finletter report on Air Power. It is significant that both documents, dealing with the basic problems of national security, embody the conclusions of eminent civilians. The formula was not handed down by military men on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. It was carefully constructed on the basis of a thorough study of all of the factors involved, including the impact of air power and the atomic age of our civilian economy and democratic habits. It is significant also that these two civilian groups concluded unanimously that if this country is to protect itself against the steady advance of totalitarianism we must be prepared to spend more for the national security than we have ever spent before, and to work harder at the job of building our national-security structure.

I personally believe that these two reports between them offer a sound formula for the national security. I believe with the Compton commission that we must have a balanced program, to include strong Regular and Reserve forces, headed by a powerful striking force built around air power. It must include also a coordinated, world-wide intelligence service; an adequate plan for industrial mobilization, a coordinated program for scientific research, and finally a comprehensive program for universal military training. I believe with the Finletter board at the apex of the pyramid we must have the finest Air Force in the world, ready on a moment's notice for action against any enemy who may have the temerity to attack us.

It was the conclusion of the Compton commission that to meet the possibility of a surprise attack with atom bombs we should have trained men everywhere. The commission was thinking of such things as civil defense, fifth columns, sabotage, and possibly airborne invasion.

It is not difficult to imagine the panic that would ensue everywhere if enemy paratroopers were to drop into New York tonight following an atom-bomb attack. Nor is this merely a nightmare or wildly imaginary danger which we can safely disregard. Under the conditions of modern warfare every city, every factory, and every farm in the United States could become a part of the zone of combat. The entire population of any country invaded would not only be actively engaged in the conduct of the war, but become subject to personal attack by the enemy.

WAR WOULD COME SUDDENLY

A sudden, devastating attack from the air on our transportation and industrial centers, assisted by fifth-column attacks on our cities, could also bring about a condition of economic paralysis and so hamper our preparation for war as to make it almost impossible for us to mobilize and equip the forces we should need to win it. Even our Reserves as now organized—or unorganized—could be decimated, demoralized, and defeated by a surprise attack of this character. Concentrated as they are in our great industrial centers, they could be wiped out in large numbers overnight.

It would be the primary purpose of any enemy attacking the United States to immobilize us militarily, industrially, and politically through the force of his initial assault. The fifth columns would have been at work beforehand. On D-day the quislings put away their civilian clothes, don uniforms, seize guns, and become soldiers. That is what happened in Norway when Hitler invaded that country. It happened again in Czechoslovakia when the Communists became soldiers overnight and proceeded to take over that helpless country.

PROBLEM OF THE CITIES

Take New York City alone, or the New York metropolitan area. Think of the millions who, if the city were attacked from the air, would have to be given first aid. There would be problems of evacuation, of fire control, of bomb destruction. There would be traffic problems, police problems, and hundreds of others with which we have never yet had to contend. Suppose the water supply of New York City were cut off by saboteurs or by a bombing attack? Or suppose the water itself were to be poisoned or otherwise contaminated? Suppose, again, that the city were isolated by sea and land, shutting off its food supply? I doubt if there is any man alive who, in his most extravagant thinking, could conceive of the terror and panic and suffering and death that would follow.

Nor is New York alone in susceptibility to attack. The same thing could happen in Philadelphia, or Pittsburgh, or Detroit, or Chicago, or San Francisco, or Los Angeles.

Our capacity for making automobiles, aircraft, and even atom bombs could be largely destroyed in 24 hours.

It is this threat—and not an idle threat, not an abstraction, but the actual threat of a hundred Pearl Harbors directed at the cities of the United States—that makes it necessary to begin at once the training of reserves to take the place of those who already have fought a good fight and now deserve their reward in return to a peaceful country and the opportunity it offers for happiness and achievement.

UNIVERSAL TRAINING, THE SOLUTION

I see no solution for these problems or for the security of the country except universal military training. Unless we have pretrained men like yourselves in every community ready to take their posts of duty, whether in a combat unit or in a civil defense corps, we should be literally helpless in such a situation.

It is true that we have a vast reservoir of trained men at the moment. The 12,000,000 or more men who destroyed nazism and smashed the military power of Japan are today a force that no nation would reckon lightly in estimating our military power. But the "hot" war has been over now for 2½ years. These veterans are getting older day by day. Only in the most extreme emergency could any country justify the recall of these men to fight another war. Even if they were willing, as you men have shown your own willingness to serve, most of the men who fought so well in World War II will have passed the period of their maximum usefulness as soldiers in the next 5 years. Many of them have married, others are in college or beginning new careers, and many others could not pass a physical examination for military service.

Moreover, these men would be needed in their home communities in the event of an atomic war. If they are not available to handle the complex problems of the local community, the community could not function and its people would have no protection.

Universal training is favored by at least 80 percent of our people, by the press of the country, and by all of the larger veterans organizations.

The most recent poll I have seen was taken among high-school students. The Purdue Opinion Poll for Young People conducted the survey. Some 10,000 students of high-school age were asked the question:

"Should or should not some military training be given to all able-bodied young men?"

Similar polls have been taken each year from 1943 through 1947. The latest poll in November 1947 showed 82 percent of the students favoring military training. This was an all-time high. It reflects the realism of youth, their intelligence in appraising the world situation, and a very high degree of patriotism in addition.

NATURE OF OPPOSITION

Opposition to universal military training comes not from the young men who would be inducted for training. It comes almost entirely from special interest minority groups, outright pacifist organizations—and, let us not forget it—poisonous subversive sources. The latter are out to wreck the universal military training proposal at any cost.

Thrown in with these groups, unfortunately, are certain misguided educators who tell us that education is the cure for war, and a better protection against war than planes and ships and guns and trained men.

RESPONSIBILITY OF EDUCATORS

The country has a right to expect more of its educators than this. The men entrusted with the education of our youth should be realists first of all. I do not ask them to tell our children that wars are inevitable. We expect them to carry the torch for the great ideals of peace and brotherhood which always must light the path for civilization. But when crime and criminals walk the earth as they walk the streets of our cities, it is idle to ignore them or try to be nice to them, in the hope that they will turn out to be good people after all.

Precisely as we must have police for our protection at home, we must be on guard against criminality beyond the borders of our own country.

I remind those educators who oppose universal training that prewar Germany was probably the most highly educated country in the world.

But books cannot stop bullets; nor can education protect us against war unless we can educate our enemy as well as ourselves.

We cannot have too much education in the United States. But let us make sure it is education for life and not education for death or slavery or concentration camps.

Now, let me tell you what universal military training really means and what it does not mean. I assume that most of you are generally familiar with the training plan. There are aspects of the subject, however, which tend to be obscured by some of the propaganda directed against universal training.

First of all, under our republican form of Government, all American citizens owe an equal obligation to our country to defend it against all enemies. As part of that obligation, subject to the approval of Congress, they may be required to submit to such training in time of peace as may be considered necessary to prepare them for possible duty in a military emergency.

Universal training would give meaning to that obligation. It is fair and democratic and would apply to all young men alike.

TRAINED OR UNTRAINED?

The only question here is as to whether men who would have to enter the military services in time of war or in any case are to be given any training in advance of a possible call to duty, or whether we are going to take into the military services in a national crisis men who have had no training whatever.

Considering the certainty that we should have little or no warning of an attack, it is almost criminal to think of putting boys in uniform after the attack comes when we have every opportunity now, in time of peace, to give them a start on training for the duties they would have to perform.

There is a moral issue here as well as the very practical problem of patching the roof and reinforcing the walls of the house before it falls down around our heads. We owe it to the youth of the country as well as to their parents to see that they are not wholly unprepared for the kind of warfare that could overtake us at any time, so long as totalitarianism remains unchecked.

UNITED STATES ONLY WORLD POWER RELYING ON VOLUNTEERS

The United States is one of seven nations and the only great nation of the world, including the members of the United Nations, which does not now have some form of compulsory military service. Five of the six exceptions are India, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, all dependencies of the British Empire, and to some extent protected by the United States as well. The sixth is the little Dominican Republic, protected not only by the Monroe Doctrine, but by a string of American defense bases stretching from Bermuda to Trinidad. When you hear people say that for the United States to adopt universal military training would only encourage other nations to do likewise, you can attribute such statements either to ignorance or deliberate disregard for the truth.

TRAINING, NOT SERVICE

The universal military training plan now before Congress does not contemplate compulsory military service in peacetime in the United States. It would provide for training only during a limited period during which trainees would not be subject to service of any kind with the armed services. At the conclusion of the training period the trainees would resume their normal places in the civilian community.

Universal military training under this plan would be expected to improve the physical condition of trainees, teach them the rudiments of military training and discipline, accustom them to working at common tasks with large groups of other men, and give them a start on training for some military speciality or possible duty in time of war with some branch of the military service.

The universal military training plan has no bearing whatever on voluntary recruiting for the armed services, and is not intended to provide men for these services except in a war emergency, or as their newly acquired interests in military life might lead them to enlist.

ALL ARMED SERVICES PARTICIPATE

The plan contemplates the training of approximately 850,000 young men each year for the many types of duty required in time of war. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard would all participate in the training program.

The estimate of 850,000 trainees is arrived at in this manner:

Approximately 1,200,000 young men reach the age of 18 every year. On the basis of experience in World War II it is assumed that 200,000 of these would be found physically unfit for full military duty. Some of them might be used in limited military capacities or might go into other forms of training, but they would not be available for the universal military training program so far as it contemplates military training for duty with the armed services. Another 150,000 normally would enlist in one of the regular services. Deducting these two groups totaling 350,000, leaves a residue of 850,000 who would be available for military training.

CHOICE OF SERVICE

Following registration with the local boards in their home communities, those found physically fit would be inducted for training at the approximate age of 18 or when they finished high school. With their parents' consent those graduating at the age of 17 might begin their training immediately. Others who had not graduated by the time they reached 18 would be permitted to finish high school and take their military training after graduation, but would not be deferred on this account beyond their twentieth birthday.

Wherever possible, depending on the needs of the services and qualifications of the individual, trainees would be permitted to choose the service in which they preferred to be trained.

CIVILIAN CONTROL

A National Security Training Commission, made up of two civilians and one military member, would set the policies and standards of the training program. The members of the commission would be appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. Executive direction of the universal military training program would be in the hands of a civilian executive director responsible to the commission, and full-time civilian inspectors would be employed by the commission to report regularly on the operation of the system and recommend improvements in the training program.

These are the answers to the specious charge that universal military training would militarize the country and give the Army control of all of our young men.

The military services would simply be operating agencies, conducting training for their particular requirements in conformity with the policies laid down by Congress and by this civilian commission. Their performance at all times would be subject to civilian supervision.

MORAL CONTROLS

In addition, an advisory board of between 10 and 25 members, most of whom would be civilians would advise the commission, particularly on all operations pertaining to moral, religious, recreational, educational, and other nonmilitary aspects of the program.

H. R. 4278, known as the Towe bill, and reported to the House by my good friend Congressman TOWE, of New Jersey—stipulates that all training should be carried out on the highest possible moral, religious, and spiritual plane. Disorderly and questionable resorts would be banned from areas around training camps, and penalties would be provided for supplying intoxicants to trainees.

All trainees would be obligated to accept training for 1 year or its equivalent. This does not mean that they would all spend a year in camp. In fact, most of them would not do so.

OPTIONS AFTER 6 MONTHS' TRAINING

As a start, the plan would require them all to take 6 months' continuous training in camp. At the end of this 6 months' period they would be permitted to choose any one of several alternatives for completing their training.

These alternatives, called options, would include:

1. Additional training in the National Security Training Corps for a second period of 6 months, during which qualified men might be sent to service schools and trained as technical specialists or be used to instruct newer inductees in the National Security Training Corps.

2. Voluntary enlistment in any of the regular services, including the Coast Guard.

3. Enlistment in the National Guard or in the Organized Reserves of any of the services.

4. Appointment to the Military, Naval or Coast Guard Academies on the usual terms.

5. Enrollment in Navy or Marine Corps officer procurement programs, or college ROTC or NROTC, plus enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve, under an agreement to accept a reserve commission if offered on completion of the course.

6. Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve of any of the services for whatever term might be prescribed and enrollment in approved technical or specialist training courses in schools, colleges, or universities to be approved by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

7. Enlistment in the Enlisted Reserve Corps for 6 years by trainees who, for any reason, could not choose one of the other alternatives, during which they would be subject to not more than 30 days' additional training in any calendar year.

Provision would also be made for a limited number of scholarships with Federal aid, subject to an agreement on the part of trainees approved for scholarships to serve in the armed forces as required following completion of their studies.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Pay at the rate of $25 a month, to cover incidental expenses in camp, was recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. Pending legislation provides for a pay rate of $30 per month. Considering that trainees would have certain small personal expenses in camp, I personally favor the higher amount.

Under the plan recommended there would be additional allowances in any case for genuine dependency.

Trainees would be entitled to the benefits of the United States Employees Compensation Act while in camp, in case of injury or death.

HOW MEN WOULD BE TRAINED

Each of the several services—Army, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard—would train for its own special needs the inductees assigned to it. The types of training given would naturally vary. Men trained for the Navy would be trained at shore stations, but for ship and shore duty. Those trained by the Army might be classified and trained for the Infantry, Artillery, Armored Force, Engineers, Medical Department, or for any of the Technical or Administrative Services.

In the Army, trainees would receive approximately 11 weeks of so-called basic training, after which they would be assigned to the service branch or specialty for which

they seemed best fitted, and given a start on specialist and unit training for the remainder of the 6 months spent in camp.

Training by the Air Force would be limited to ground training, which includes aircraft maintenance, radio operation, armament and other specialties.

The Air Force would begin the training of men within two weeks for duty as members of ground crews.

DISCIPLINE

As trainees would not be in the military services except for training, they would not be subject to the Articles of War and Army Regulations. Discipline would be enforced through a special code of conduct adapted to the youth and circumstances of the trainees, to be administered by National Security Training Corps courts with broad powers.

There would be specific penalties for more serious offenses. Minor infractions of the code would be dealt with under a demerit system and trainee courts made up of the trainees themselves, thus introducing the principle of self-discipline. Trainees violating State and Federal laws would be turned over to civil authorities for trial.

TRAINEE OVERFLOW AVAILABLE FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

Under this plan it could be reasonably assumed that the National Guard and Organized Reserve could be brought up to authorized strength in a relatively short time and maintained at strength thereafter.

As the trainees entering the National Guard or Organized Reserve would do so only for a single enlistment period, the overflow would supply a continuous stream of trained men who would be available for possible duty in a civil defense corps in their home communities.

While there is no definite plan at the moment for a civil-defense corps, this subject has received serious study in Washington. It is the current conclusion that the job is not one for the military services primarily, but for the States and local communities. This reasoning seems to me to be sound. The logical solution would be to build a civil-defense organization around the framework of existing municipal services and facilities.

There would have to be Federal assistance and provision in addition for moving civil-defense groups from a community not in danger to others where the need may be more acute. In the main, however, I think it can be assumed that most of the members of any civil-defense organization would perform their duties right at home.

Under this plan we would have a training plant and training organizations in continuous operation.

All UMT trainees would receive 1,000 hours of military training, or as much as they now get in 5 years in the National Guard, and far more than they ever could receive in the same time under any other plan.

The military advantage of universal military training—and the program is being urged solely on the ground of military necessity—is that the trainees would have received enough training after operation of UMT over a 5-year period, to allow the mobilization within a year after M-day of combined forces totaling between seven and one-half and eight and one-half million men.

The reduction in training time and the existence of training organizations in full swing at all times would speed up the pace of an offensive against the enemy, reduce the probable total of our casualties, and shorten any war in which we might become involved—all this in addition to the value of the UMT program to civil defense.

The only visible alternatives for universal military training are:

1. To maintain a larger professional military establishment than would be required with universal training. This would be undesirable as well as financially impractical, requiring conscription for service and costing much more than universal military training.

2. To spend comparable amount on training the National Guard and Organized Reserves in a less efficient manner and over a much longer period of time. This program will be less efficient than UMT and would not supply the numbers of trained men that could be obtained under a UMT system, nor would it solve the serious and continuing problem of civil defense.

3. To maintain our Military Establishment at minimum level as at present and trust to the peaceful purposes of other nations. This is a gamble we cannot afford to take.

It is sometimes argued that a UMT program such as that planned would cost too much money. It is estimated that once under way, such a system would cost about $1,750,000,000 a year. It might be less.

This amount approximates the average amount spent in 1 week of World War II. The direct cost of the war—that is, the cost down to VJ-day—was $330,000,000,000. This total represented an average expenditure of two hundred and forty millions per day, or one and seven-tenths billions per week. At the peak of the war, in 1944, we were spending at the rate of $90,000,000,000 per year, or roughly two hundred and forty-seven million per day.

If the operation of a universal training system for the next 10 years should serve to avert another war we should have spent in that time only 5 percent of the cost of World War II, to say nothing of the saving in lives, property destruction, loss of health, and terrorization of the civilian population.

Assuming that a universal military training system would shorten a war by at least 6 months by cutting the time required to train the forces needed to win a war, this in itself might mean a saving of perhaps $45,000,000,000 equal to the cost of operating a UMT system for 25 years.

That saving would be almost equal to the total cost in dollars of World War I to date.

We must remember also that war costs do not end with the end of hostilities. They go on and on, year after year. We are still paying out $11,000,000,000 or more each year for World War II, and statisticians tell us that the peak of these cumulative war costs will not be reached until 1988.

Nor must we ever forget the men who died or were injured, and the suffering in their families that also goes on year after year.

As for those who argue that a UMT system would be equivalent to throwing our youth into a cesspool of immorality and debauchery, I think the best answer lies in the record of the UMT Experimental Unit at Fort Knox, Ky. Although the trainees in this unit are enlisted men in the Regular Army, they are all from the same age group, averaging 18 years of age, and are being trained in accordance with the UMT formula.

The results reported from this experiment have been remarkable in more ways than one. The unit reports a higher average of church attendance by trainees than in civilian life, a greatly stimulated interest in education, and the lowest venereal-disease rate in any comparable group anywhere. The record in this respect compares favorably with that of the CCC camps and is less than one-third that of the Army training camps in 1943, shortly before the mass movement overseas for the Normandy invasion. It is so far below the civilian average as to be considered a rebuke to our civilian communities for not dealing with the problem more effectively than they do.

Secretary of the Army Royall has said that he knows of no single experiment in the field of military training which has been so richly productive of constructive results. Numerous visitors who have inspected the operation of the unit at first hand have praised it in the highest terms.

A civilian advisory committee from the city of Louisville, Ky., appointed a subcommittee on religion, including Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergymen and the executive secretary of the Louisville Council of Churches. The reaction of this group to the results obtained at this experimental unit were unanimously favorable.

The trainees are not mollycoddled or treated like little boys. They would be worked hard and treated as men. But they are treated decently, as young men who want to do right, and are given every opportunity to live wholesome lives and return to their home communities better in every way than when they were inducted.

A few idealistic people tell us that we should look to the United Nations rather than to our own security measures for the protection of the United States. The fact is, of course, that there is no force in existence which can be employed by the United Nations except as member nations like the United States may be called on to provide such a force.

So long as the larger powers of the Security Council of the United Nations are able through the use of the veto to prevent any action which they nay dislike or consider inimical to their own interests, the United Nations will be impotent to deal with wars and threats of war.

Wars are like forest or prairie fires. Once started, it is difficult to prevent them from spreading. The fires have already started and the winds are blowing them in our direction. Almost two-thirds of the world's populations are at war today. There is civil war in China, in India, Palestine, and in Greece. The cold war has brought seven European countries under Soviet domination since VE-day.

This is the reality we face.

We are therefore forced to choose between adopting whatever measures may be necessary for our safety as a people, or the certainty of ultimate conquest and enslavement by the predatory totalitarians in an atomic war of the future.

Failure to take these necessary precautions is equivalent to throwing wide the gates to unlimited invasion by an enemy as ruthless as Germany or Japan. It would be an invitation to concentration camps, secret police, gas chambers, forced labor, mass movements of population, torture, and revolution.

Unless we are to risk everything we have known of freedom, national existence, and human happiness, we must do whatever is necessary to our national salvation.

It is a case of putting first things first.

The peace of appeasement is the peace of enslavement. To be safe we must be strong.

Universal military training is near the top of the highest and demanded priorities for our security as a nation.

Men like yourselves, who have served in uniform and are ready to serve again, have a double responsibility. You have a responsibility to the country but you have a further responsibility to see that others less well informed than yourselves are awakened to the dangers which confront us. You also have a responsibility to make sure that Congress and the country support the military measures you know to be necessary for the country's safety.

In all of these endeavors I pledge you my own help.

Trade With Communistic Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements have been a great detriment to American industry and among those most vitally affected is the hand-glass industry of America. There are numerous plants throughout the country employing many thousands of men, yet the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements would permit the cheap labor of Czechoslovakia to force down the wages and standards of the American workmen. If that were not bad enough, now Czechoslovakia is in the hands of the Russians who will be signing for Czechoslovakia. This will not only further hurt the American worker, but will make Russia stronger in its march of communism. I do not believe the American workman should be hurt by unfair agreements against American labor and much less should the worker be stamped on by the heavy heel of communism. On Thursday last I requested the State Department not to recognize nor take the Russian signature of Czechoslovakia in this vital matter affecting the hundreds of American industries employing millions of workmen and I protested as follows to the State Department on March 18 against this signature:

MARCH 18, 1948.

GEORGE MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

I am advised that Czechoslovakia is expected to sign the activation of the Geneva agreement on Saturday, March 20, at New York, and the State Department will accept the signature as consistent with its program of reciprocal trade. In view of the Marshall plan now before the Congress requesting untold billions to stop communism and the President's message of yesterday with reference to communism, it seems ridiculous that the United States should now accept such signature with reference to trade agreements and give to the Communists American dollars to further the march of communism. The State Department should not accept the signature of Czechoslovakia for further aid to communism, and I protest any such agreement with Czechoslovakia with reference to carrying forth the reciprocal trade agreements.

Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

The State Department advised today that on March 20 the Czechoslovakian Government said it would sign the protocol on March 20 which would go into effect on April 20, 1948, and that the State Department now has a special committee commencing a study of the proposed signature in the light of recent developments in Czechoslovakia.

Now such an agreement would have little meaning with the Communists in control and I believe not only that this study should be continued but this recognition of reciprocal-trade agreements should not be given to the detriment of American labor, let alone that whereby the Communists of the world help to oppress American workers not only in the great hand-glass industry of America but in many other industries throughout the land.

New York Times and New York Herald Tribune Condemn United States-Palestine Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are few newspapers in the United States with the reputations for objectivity and scholarship enjoyed by these two great newspapers. The following editorials which appeared in those newspapers on March 21, 1948, on the subject of Palestine are worthy of the careful reading by every member. They emphasize that the issue is far greater even than Palestine, and that the about face of the administration on Palestine has struck the United Nations its heaviest blow and has materially impaired the prestige of the United States:

[From the New York Times of March 21, 1948]

THE SWITCH ON PALESTINE

There can be little doubt that the partition of Palestine is being blocked by the struggle between the Soviet Union and the western powers. A land once known for milk and honey, now flows with oil, and the homeland of three great religions is having its fate decided by expediency without a sign of the spiritual and ethical considerations which should be determining, at least in that part of the world. Ancient Palestine was once described as "not the land of philosophers, but the home of prophets." It would take a prophet sitting on a rapidly spinning turntable to have foreseen the course which our Government has pursued during these last few months.

Three things need to be said, and to be said at once, concerning the present shift of American policy on Palestine. The first is that it comes as a climax to a series of moves which has seldom been matched, for ineptness, in the handling of any international issue by an American administration. The second is that it is a plain and unmistakable surrender to the threat of force. And the third is that it holds little promise of being able to avoid the very hazards which it is intended to circumvent.

So far as the first point is concerned, it may be said that all of the critical considerations now enumerated by Mr. Austin as reasons for our Government's change of policy—namely, the strength of Arab opposition to the partition plan, the necessity of providing a large international armed force to implement that plan, the reluctance of the small nations and all of the large powers, with the sole exception of Soviet Russia, which has its own objectives in the Mediterranean, to provide that force—were inherent in the situation when the original decision in favor of partition was made last November 29. Nevertheless, it was primarily on the initiative, and under the pressure, of our Government that the decision for partition was adopted. Somewhere along the line there has been a shocking lack of liaison and of common purposes between the American State Department and the American delegation in the United Nations, with the White House itself apparently utterly at sea. Inept, uncertain, and confused, the prestige of American foreign policy has suffered a severe blow in the handling of this issue.

As for the second point—the surrender to the threat of force—it is obviously and admittedly Arab intransigeance that has forced the American Government to change its policy and to bow to Arab threats, and to propose that the whole United Nations retreat with us in the face of Arab scorn and fury. Unfortunately, if this is done, it will not be the first time that the United Nations has had to yield to the threat of force. It has been bludgeoned out of Northern Korea by Soviet Russia and out of the Balkans by Soviet Russias satellites, but each surrender of this kind is a blow to the authority of the United Nations. Meantime, we have played a shabby trick on the Jewish community in Palestine, which put its faith in our promises.

Finally, where does this new decision leave us? It leaves us still under the inexorable necessity of helping to furnish that international armed force which we have been so reluctant to provide. For to maintain what Mr. Austin describes as a temporary trusteeship over the whole of Palestine will certainly require an armed force. It may well require an even larger armed force than would be required for partition, for, as Secretary General Lie notes, the United Nations Special Commission on Palestine drew the conclusion that a trusteeship for Palestine would be fought by two parties instead of one. This is the prospect with which the whole series of moves now culminating in Mr. Austin's announcement leaves us.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1948]

WHY?

There are few Americans who will be able to regard the action of their Government in the case of Palestine without a sinking of the heart. Quite apart from the merits of the partition plan, it is painfully obvious that Mr. Austin's statement to the Security Council on Friday represents either a reversal of the earlier policy of the United States or an acknowledgement that the policy ignored facts which were patent to the most casual observer. Neither alternative is to the credit of the administration.

Mr. Austin contends that the partition plan, proposed by the General Assembly and supported there by the United States, "cannot now be implemented by peaceful means." Certainly this possibility—or, rather, probability—must have been foreseen by the American delegation and the administration from the outset. If so, the United States should have guarded against the various difficulties which Mr. Austin since has raised in the Security Council—legal, political, and military. Failure to do so created only the ghost of a Jewish state under United Nations guaranty, stimulated explosive tensions in the Middle East, and brought death to hundreds, disillusionment to millions. The prestige of UN has received its heaviest blow, and that of the United States has been hard hit. From every standpoint the situation is far worse than when the UN Assembly was originally summoned in special session to deal with the Palestine crisis.

The United States has taken a firm stand in demanding that peace be restored in the Holy Land under a UN trusteeship. This by no means reduces the military responsibilities which the enforcement of partition might have entailed. Indeed, it rather adds to them. The Jews of Palestine have conceded all that was possible toward the achievement of a viable Jewish state; the Arabs have been confirmed in their intransigent opposition to such a state. A UN trusteeship, following immediately upon

Great Britain's announcement of its intention to renounce the mandate conceivably might have provided a transition period in which international authority could have been established in Palestine and an international solution worked out. Now, after an abortive experiment in partition, the UN will have to fight to make itself respected—and fight hard. It will merely inherit Britain's "squalid war" in the Holy Land, made more squalid by opportunities missed and promises unfulfilled.

The people of the United States demand and deserve an explanation of the palpable blunders of American policy in respect to Palestine. There have been many unofficial excuses, references to a changed world picture, to oil, to military weakness, and the like. But no responsible official has openly discussed the practical aspects of the American course in the Middle East nor offered any reasons why that course need be altered so shortly after it was fixed. If such reasons exist they should be frankly discussed, or the United States must bear the obloquy of seeking covert ends at the expense of justice. And this country cannot so tarnish its leadership.

Time for a Stand on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is not only Holy Week to the Christian people but a week of prayer and thanksgiving of the Jewish people in observance of one of its happiest religious festivals—Purim. It commemorates the victory of the followers of the Jewish faith over Haman, the Persian dictator, over 2,000 years ago as recorded in the Bibical Book of Esther. In more recent years it has served as a contemporary celebration over the defeat of Adolph Hitler. There appeared an article by James O. Supple in the Chicago Sun-Times that is most timely, touching on the religious aspects of the Palestine question, and I deem it appropriate during this week of good will and better understanding of the peoples of the world to insert it in the RECORD:

TIME FOR A STAND ON PALESTINE
(By James O. Supple)

In Holy Week, the thoughts of men turn to Palestine, the scene of the birth of the entire Judaeo-Christian heritage. Of late men's thoughts have been turning to Palestine for other reasons—power, politics, the determination of a feudalism to overrule, the attempt of a remnant of a people to establish a national homeland, the very fate of the United Nations.

Surely it is time for all of us to clarify our feelings on the Palestinian issue. Some may wonder why the subject finds its way into a religion column. Actually it is a religious issue just as it is political, economic, and sociological.

Lurking in the back of many minds is the belief that the Christian shrines may be jeopardized by partition. Both the Arabs and the Jews have made it clear such shrines will be protected. In the instance of the Jews, the assurance has considerably more weight, not only because of the reputation of the Jewish agency, but because the Jewish people, aware of the Jewish origin of Christianity, have a pride in it. The history of the Jewish attitude toward Christianity ranks far above that of the Arabs with their long record of fanatical persecution of the Christian people.

UN CHALLENGED

The religious phase of the Palestinian issue involves the American churchgoer. The Gerald L. K. Smith groups have seized upon it as grist for their always-grinding mill. Congressmen, newspaper editors, and others are being flooded with the Smith pamphlets.

Antisemitism can never be divorced from resultant anti-Christianity. Hitler's progressive persecutions of all faiths proved this once and for all time.

The American Christian faiths, too, have another interest in the matter. They through their resolutions, their world order campaigns and their backing of the peace commission of the Federal Council of Churches, have placed their hope for world peace in the United Nations. The UN is being challenged by the opponents of partition both here and abroad.

ANOTHER MUNICH QUERY

This column is not saying that those of the Jewish faith should join any one Zionist organization, but surely in view of the crucial issues involved there should be an attempt through membership to attest to the individual viewpoint, whether for or against. The issue has become too important for lethargy.

The same perhaps should be said of those of Christian faith who to date have largely ignored full implications of the flaunting of the UN partition decision. It can also be said of that section of the American population which is neither Christian nor Jewish. And it can be said of the Jews who have an equal stake in the ultimate decision.

Address of Bartley C. Crum at the 1948 Annual Mass Conference of the Council of Organizations of the United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following exceptionally fine speech by Mr. Bartley C. Crum, a member of the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine:

For too many years now, the Palestine problem has served as a political football for the nations of the world. Promises have been made, and promises have been broken. Hope has been deferred and deferred again. Almost 30 years ago, the League of Nations handed to Great Britain the Palestine mandate, with the specific provision that a Jewish homeland and haven be created there. The whole world knows what has happened since that time. There has been equivocation, procrastination, double-dealing of the most vicious and unholy kind, to thwart the expressed will and determination of the League of Nations. As part of this strategy of delay and further delay, commission after commission has been sent to Palestine to investigate, to recommend, to report to the world. By this time, enough paper and ink have been wasted to sink a fleet of battleships. But now we have come to the end. Further evasion of responsibility, further delay and hesitation, are impossible. We have come to the point where we must decide definitely and unequivocally on the future of a Jewish Palestine.

The United Nations decision on Palestine, the first positive humanitarian act looking toward a just solution of the Palestine problem, constitutes the final casting of the die. And the decision, once made, must be carried out immediately.

It must be carried out for humanitarian reasons. The 700,000 Jews in Palestine cannot be left to their fate. Encircled by hostility and aggression, weakened by pious acts of so-called neutrality on the part of nations which are ostensibly committed to the United Nations decision, these people cannot be deprived of all that they have been working and praying for. Even more than a homeland is at stake for them—their very lives are at stake.

I maintain that the nations of the world have an obligation to these people—an obligation which cannot be evaded, which cannot be delayed, and which cannot be shirked, and I maintain that we have an obligation to the Jews of Europe—the pitiful handful which managed to survive. These people cannot remain on the scene of their greatest tragedy. They cannot till the soil soaked with blood of their brothers. They cannot live in the houses, or work in the factories, still rank with the odor of death and destruction. They have seen enough of death. It has been their intimate neighbor for years. They look to Palestine as they look to life itself, for the chance to build anew, for the chance to forget the past. These are obligations the world owes to the Jews of Palestine and the Jews of Europe. And, even if we should ignore both these obligations, there is a further obligation which we owe to ourselves.

If by chicanery, if by the machinations of private greed and vested interests, the overwhelming decision of the United Nations on the partition of Palestine should somehow be negated, then we are negating all hopes for world peace and security. The United Nations, the sole instrument for international cooperation, looking toward the introduction of justice and reason into the chaotic turmoil of national interests, is either capable of enforcing its decision, or it is doomed to utter futility. And let none of us have any doubt—if the United Nations is doomed we are doomed with it. Palestine is the decisive test. Whether we pass or fail this test will determine the future of the world.

Where does the answer lie? It lies with Great Britain and the United States. Great Britain must carry out its obligation to facilitate the smoothest possible transition of her Palestine Mandate to United Nations trusteeship and partition. Her present course can lead only to the conclusion that she is either attempting to thwart the United Nations or to gratuitously and maliciously make settlement of the Palestine problems as difficult as possible. This course can lead only to the dishonor of Great Britain and to the destruction of the United Nations.

The United States too, has attempted to slough off her responsibility. It is the obligation of our Government to take leadership and to uphold the United Nations' decision. We cannot continue to play on both sides of the fence. We cannot continue to assume an attitude of neutrality where no neutrality is possible. It is not a decent and honorable policy for a government to take refuge behind neutrality when it has pledged itself to uphold the decision of the United Nations. The United Nations voted for partition—and both Great Britain and the United States are under the most solemn obligation to accept the will of the majority to decide in favor of the establishment of a Jewish state. Both Great Britain and the United States are now indulging in a display of legal gymnastics which would have the effect of evading responsibility for implementation and enforcement of the decision of the United Nations.

After voting for the partition of Palestine, our representative, Mr. Warren Austin, has discovered that the Security Council has no legal right under the UN Charter to enforce partition. That this interpretation is contrary to the position taken by the United States on the Trieste problem must be obvious to the legal experts of our State Department.

When the Council of Foreign Ministers decided to internationalize Trieste—claimed by both Italy and Yugoslavia—it was decided that the area should be ruled by a UN governor to be appointed by the Security Council. At that time the foreign ministers of the major powers proposed that units of three armies—the United States, British, and Yugoslav—should maintain law and order until the UN governor took over. It was agreed that the services of the three nations should be utilized by the UN governor as long as they were needed. The motion was argued, with Australia, at that time a Council member, maintaining that the Charter did not allow the Council to assume responsibilities which were not directly connected with the maintenance of peace and security.

It is interesting to note that this is precisely the position now being taken on the Palestine issue by the United States.

When the Trieste problem was argued in the Security Council, Mr. Trygve Lie, the UN Secretary General, pointed out that the Charter does not specifically bar the Security Council from implementing its own political decisions. Mr. Lie also declared that at the San Francisco meeting of the United Nations the open debate on the part of the delegates showed that the Security Council had the right to assume responsibilities not specifically stated in the Charter. Mr. Lie won his argument by a vote of 10 to 0, with Australia abstaining. Both the United States and Syria, the Arab state now presenting the Australian position, voted in favor of Mr. Lie's position.

The quick shift in position by the United States with relation to the Palestine problem is nothing short of astounding. If the UN could authorize a three-nation army to enforce its decision on the Trieste case, why can't that august body take a similar position on Palestine.

The United States must not befuddle the issue with legalisms. It is argued that the three-power international force in Trieste is not a UN force but a group of armed men from three sovereign countries, each army maintaining its own identity.

But the Palestine Commission, which first raised the issue of enforcement of partition with the Security Council, is not requesting a UN force. The Commission has asked for a non-Palestine force to help implement the partition of Palestine. A force of this nature could consist of a foreign legion. It could even consist of an army from a small country. Or it could consist of contingents from any group of large or small armies. This force could be sponsored by the UN or it could be sponsored by one or more nations as was done in the Trieste case.

When the desire for a just settlement was the motivating idea, the powers found a just and workable solution. Trieste is an international area and law is being upheld by the three-power international force.

Let no one assume that the Jewish people in Palestine will allow their case to be argued away by legal experts looking for an out from the decisions taken by their country. The Jewish people ask for an international force solely because they believe that it would act as a restraining force in Palestine. The Arabs are impressed by strength and decision. The indecision now being displayed by the strongest power in the world has encouraged Arab dissidents to attack Jewish settlements and indulge in armed aggression against a peacefully inclined people.

The Jewish people cannot be asked to be patient when they see Arab armies infiltrate into Palestine and organize for an all-out armed attack on the Jewish community. The Haganah, the people's democratic Jewish army of Palestine, is capable of handling any situation that may arise in Palestine, provided the powers do not foist another nonintervention formula upon them. The arms embargo, used against an aggressor, can be an instrument to maintain peace. But when it is used to keep weapons from an army defending itself against unjustified aggression, it becomes another means of befuddling the public and prepares the way for war. While the Arab states are buying arms freely in the world market, the Haganah, which should be the instrument to enforce the decision of the United Nations on partition, is crippled by the United States arms embargo, plus the constant disarming of Haganah men and women by the British administration.

We are indeed living in peculiar times. The peaceful nation is treated as an aggressor. The pro-Nazi Arab marauders become objects of sympathy and aid, both by the British mandatory power and the United States. It is clear that the Arabs and the mandatory power mean to create complete and utter chaos in Palestine. Thus far, in spite of the difficulties created by the British administration, and the encouragement given the Arabs by American inaction, the Haganah—still using the strategy of defensive-offense—has been able to block this attempt.

While I will not minimize the serious situation in Palestine at this moment, it would be untrue to overemphasize the effectiveness of Arab guerrilla operations in the Holy Land. Problems are never simple in Palestine and the plan which the Haganah has formulated to meet any possible contingency is of a complex nature.

Separate plans to meet each local situation must be devised. The main enemy in each of the areas is different. For example, in the Jerusalem area, the Haganah must combat the obstructionism of the British administration. In Galilee the main enemies are the Arab invaders from Syria, and Lebanon. The administration which, as the mandate authority, should prevent Arab guerrillas infiltrating into the country, has not hindered them from freely crossing the border into Palestine. Wherever the guerrillas have been stopped, the Haganah has stopped them—not the British. The British move up to an area only after the Haganah has successfully resisted the aggressors and then they disarm the Haganah.

Jerusalem has been designated by the UN as an international city. In that area, it was the job of the mandate power to maintain law and order. Yet it is in this very territory that the British have for all practical purposes handed over control to the Mufti's agents.

Both the old city of Jerusalem and the triangle which includes the Arab cities of Nablus, Tulkarm, and Jenin are at the present time bases of Arab power. About 2,000 armed Arabs, all infiltrees from outside Palestine, have been permitted to organize their illegal forces in that area. While Creech-Jones, the British minister, takes pride in the reduction of brigandage in that territory since the arrival of Arab bands, he conveniently overlooked the fact that the petty brigands will at all times defer to the more powerful muscle man.

In the city of Jerusalem, we see a strange spectacle. About 1,500 Jews are isolated in the old city and the British commander on the spot must clear with the Arabs before permission is granted to convoy food to the Jews in the area. The British refuse to grant permission to the Haganah to convoy desperately needed food to their fellow citizens in the old city. When the Hadassah Hospital requested an armed escort for their convoys into the old city. The British district commissioner informed them that this delicate matter would have to be studied. The authorities studied the problem for 3 weeks and have as yet not notified the Jews regarding their solution of that difficult problem. The situation in Jerusalem is becoming more intolerable and if the British authorities refuse to enforce law in the city, Haganah will have to perform the necessary police duties.

In the settlement of Kfar Etzion near the Syrian border, the Arabs mounted an attack of over a thousand men, outnumbering the Haganah by a ratio of 10 to 1. The British as usual were aware of the attack and even took the trouble to inform the foreign press of it—but they did nothing to help Haganah battle the invaders from across the Syrian border. After the Haganah had successfully repelled the Arab attack, British ambulances moved in the battle area and helped remove wounded Arabs.

The following day 35 Haganah men who had previously been disarmed by the British and who were bringing medical supplies to the besieged settlement of Kfar Etzion were ambushed and attacked by hundreds of Arab guerillas and were killed to the last man. Again the British were strangely unaware of the battle. The 35 men of the Haganah fought to the last breath. Even the wounded continued to fight. Before they died, they destroyed such small equipment as had escaped the eyes of the British. The last man died touching off a small hand grenade, killing himself and an entire group of attacking Arabs.

This was hailed as a victory for the invading Arabs. One well-known Arab on hearing of this victory said, "If the Jews mean to fight this way, we shall never be able to stand up against them." And that is the spirit motivating the men and women of free Palestine.

In the light of this situation how is neutrality possible? To be neutral in this case means to do nothing, and to do nothing in the face of aggression and in the face of expressed will of the majority of the United Nations, is a negative action which will negate all the precepts of humanity and all that the nations of the world have hoped to create in the United Nations.

Pious hopes that we can avoid force, are chimerical. Arab aggression can only be stemmed by force and the threat of force. Jewish rights to live and build in Palestine can only be abrogated by utter annihilation of the Jewish community there. It is the obligation of the civilized nations of the world to take positive, favorable action to uphold partition and to quell aggression in Palestine. No less will meet the demand of justice.

In the meantime, we, the men and women of America, have our own private obligation—to give support to the United Nations decision on Palestine, to the heroic defenders of the Jewish community and to the hundreds of thousands who are still waiting in shattered Europe, longing for a life of freedom and security in Palestine. You, who are gathered here today, on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal, are taking that action in the most direct and most constructive way, for you are contributing to the success of a Nation-wide effort to restore Palestine as a Jewish haven and a homeland, to care for the Jewish survivors in Europe, and to help resettle them in Palestine. You are also, with your work and your gifts, helping to care for those who come to the United States. You make welcome the stranger to our shores and help protect and defend human rights throughout the world.

I applaud with all my heart your unprecedented effort to raise $250,000,000 in the United States this year. It is an effort which will help strengthen the Jewish community

in Palestine and which will help carry out the United Nations decision. It is an effort that deserves the support of every right-thinking American. It is the one practical, immediate way to assure peace and justice for the Jewish people throughout the world.

Let me say that this is not a problem for the Jewish people alone. It is a problem for all of mankind. For, in the last analysis, more than the future of the Jews of Palestine is involved—more than the future of the Jews is involved—it is in a very fundamental way, the future of the world that we must decide.

How Communists Take Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are spending billions of dollars overseas in the fight against the spread of communism. It behooves us to watch our own doorstep and clean house here also. The following article on how Communists take over appeared in the United States News and World Report for March 12, 1948, and is worthy of careful consideration in connection with this most important problem:

HOW COMMUNISTS TAKE OVER

(Reported from Prague, Paris, and Rome)

First step: Build up fifth column, winning members for party in labor unions, colleges, left-wing groups, government departments, the publishing field.

Second step: Launch propaganda campaign, favoring poor people, factory workers, minorities, Russia, and opposing "big business," "reactionaries," "warmongers."

Third step: Get party members elected to key offices in labor unions and left-wing groups; when necessary, let opposing faction spit off, label it right wing.

Fourth step: Elect Communists to parliament on platform of wide popular appeal, stressing higher wages, lower prices, social security, civil rights, world peace.

Fifth step: Form "popular front" in paliament, through alliance with Socialists, Social Democrats, or other left-wing parties willing to go along.

Sixth step: Obtain key places in government, seeking to control first the police, then public information, later army, foreign policy, and finance.

Seventh step: Uncover "plots against the people" as a means to discredit opposing parties; use Communist-controlled police to seize or threaten opposition leaders.

Eighth step: Carry out orders of high Soviet officials, sent in at psychological moment to direct strategy and drive home idea Communists are backed by Russian power.

Ninth step: Push for full control of government, using threats of general strike, civil war or "protection" by nearby Russian troops to paralyze opposition.

Tenth step: Complete grip on government by purging anti-Communist parties and officeholders, taking over press and radio, and nationalizing industries.

Communism, now in control of Czechoslovakia and putting the squeeze on Finland, is using the same basic pattern to take over country after country in the push across Europe. Events indicate that Italy is next on the Communist time table, then France. The strategy that worked elsewhere is well advanced in both countries.

The pictogram shows, step by step the Communist technique in Europe. It starts with local Communists—often a fifth column led by men trained in Russia. Moscow comes in at the end to see that the seized country is tied closely to the Soviet Union.

By this method the Communists, since the war, have taken control of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Yugoslavia, and now Czechoslavakia. The chain of events is showing up in several other countries, reaching across Europe to the north, south, and west.

In Finland the preliminary steps are over. Moscow's demand for a treaty linking the Finns and Russians completes the pattern. If the demand doesn't succeed, the local Communists may try to upset the present government and take control anyway, counting on help from the Soviet Union if they need it.

In Italy the groundwork has been laid. The Communists are ready for their big attempt to take over. They are in the labor unions, the schools, the farming groups, and all elements of the population. The test will come in a national election April 18. Whether the Communists win or lose, Italy is in for trouble. It may bring civil war that would put the influence of the United States on one side and of Russia on the other.

In France the program is well advanced. Communists are out of the government, but their influence is stronger than it was in some countries already taken over. French Communists control key unions and can tie up the country with strikes. Inflation and shaky finances strengthen their hand. The next Communist move to upset France may come within weeks.

In Britain the Communists are weak. The pattern hasn't even begun to take shape.

In the United States they are weak, too, and they face a different system of government that makes their European pattern useless. To take over the United States, the Communists know that they must devise a new technique.

Legislative Reference Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are constantly using the Legislative Reference Service, headed by our able Director, Ernest S. Griffith, in the Library of Congress. This service is of incalculable assistance to the Members of the Congress, saving them countless hours of research work, making it possible for Members to keep themselves informed on the many problems, including pending legislation, on which the membership has to act.

The reason that Dr. Griffith, in my judgment, is able to do such a fine job, is because he has surrounded himself by an able and outstanding staff. I know the Members of the Congress will be interested in learning something about the men and women who are doing such an excellent piece of work.

I am including with these remarks a short biographical sketch of the senior specialists and analysts, research counsels, and part-time consultants, of the Legislative Reference Service. It will be noted that in a few cases individuals are temporarily on assignment to congressional committees.

BIOGRAPHIES OF PRINCIPAL STAFF MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE (MARCH 1948)

Bernard Brodie, national defense consultant:[1] Ph. D., University of Chicago; Carnegie Fellow, Institute for Advanced Study. In United States Navy, 1941–45; assistant professor, Yale Institute of International Studies; director of studies, National War College. Author: Sea Power in the Machine Age, 1941, 1943; A Layman's Guide to Naval Strategy, 1942; A Guide to Naval Strategy, 1944; The Absolute Weapon, Atomic Power and World Order (editor), 1946.

John Cobb Cooper, Jr., air transport consultant:[1] A. B., Princeton University. Practiced law, Jacksonville, Fla.; vice president, Pan American Airways; now associated with Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J. Member, United States National Commission of Permanent American Aeronautical Commission, 1941–43; vice president, International Air Transport Conference, Havana, 1945; member, first executive committee, International Air Transport Association, 1945. Author: The Right to Fly, 1947.

William Yandell Elliott, senior specialist in international relations:[2] D. Phil., Oxford University. Chairman, department of government, Harvard University; consultant, President's Committee on Administrative Management (1936), National Advisory Defense Committee, and Office of Production Management; director of stockpile and transportation division, and later vice chairman for civilian requirements, War Production Board; member, business advisory council, Department of Commerce. Author: The New British Empire, 1932; The Need for Constitutional Reform, 1935; (with others) The City of Man, 1940.

Hugh Langdon Elsbree, senior specialist in American Government and public administration: Ph. D., Harvard University; Sheldon Traveling Fellow, Paris and Geneva. Research specialist, Federal Power Commission; chairman, department of political science, Dartmouth College; principal business economist, Office of Price Administration; administrative analyst, Bureau of the Budget. Author: Interstate Transmission of Electric Power, 1931.

Fedele Frederick Fauri, senior specialist in social legislation: LL. B., University of Michigan. Practiced law in Michigan; district supervisor and legal counsel, Michigan State Welfare Department; director, Michigan State Department of Social Welfare; member, Social Security Technical Staff and consultant to Ways and Means Committee of House of Representatives, 1945–46. Author: Adoption Laws and Related Court Procedures in Michigan, 1938.

Ernest McKinley Fisher, housing consultant:[1] Ph. D., Northwestern University. Director of education and research, National Association of Real-Estate Boards; professor of real-estate management, University of Michigan; director, division of economics and statistics, Federal Housing Administration; deputy manager, American Bankers Association; consultant to subcommittee of Senate Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee, to Bureau of the Census, and to Defense Housing Coordinator; professor of urban land economics, and director, Institute for Urban Land Use and Housing Studies, Columbia University. Author: Advanced Principles of Real Estate Practice, 1930; European Housing Policies and Principles (with Herbert W. Ratcliff) 1937.

George Barnes Galloway, senior specialist in legislative organization:[2] Ph. D., Brookings Graduate School. Director, bureau of economics, Greater Pennsylvania Council; assistant deputy administrator, National Re-

[1] Part time.

[2] Temporarily acting as staff member of a committee of Congress.

covery Administration; field representative, National Planning Association; consultant on postwar problems, Twentieth Century Fund; staff director, Committee on Organization of Congress, 1945–46. Author: Industrial Planning Under Codes, 1935; A Survey of Institutional Research on American Postwar Problems, 1941; (with others) Planning for America, 1941; Congress at the Crossroads, 1946.

W. Brooke Graves, chief of the State law section: Ph. D., University of Pennsylvania. Head of department of political science, Temple University; professor of political science, Bryn Mawr; chairman, Philadelphia Federal Council of Personnel Administration; consultant, Joint Legislative Committee on Finances of Pennsylvania; Joint State Government Committee; consultant on State constitutional revision. Author: American State Government, 1936, 1941, 1946; Uniform State Action: A Possible Substitute for Centralization, 1934; editor, Our State Legislators, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1938; editor, Intergovernmental Relations in the United States, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1940.

Frank Babbitt Horne, assistant chief, Federal law section: LL. B., Georgetown University, member District Bar and Bar for Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, Library of Congress, 1936 to present, except United States Army 1943–45; assistant chief, Federal law section, since November 1945. Author: Reimbursement of Relief Agencies on N. L. R. B. Back Pay Orders, Georgetown Law Journal, February 1941.

Meyer Jacobstein, economic research counsel: Ph. D., Columbia University. Professor of economics, University of Rochester; labor manager, Stein-Bloch Co., Rochester, N. Y.; member Sixty-eighth to Seventieth Congresses (Thirty-ninth New York district); organizer and president, First National Bank & Trust Co., Rochester, N. Y.; publisher, Rochester Evening Journal and Sunday American; member of research staff, Brookings Institution; director, Senate Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. Author: Effects of the Defense Program on Prices, Wages and Profits, 1941; A National Labor Policy (with Harold W. Metz), 1947.

Thorsten Valentine Kalijarvi, research counsel in international relations: Ph. D., University of Berlin; Hague Academy of International Law; Geneva School of International Studies. Head, department of political science, University of New Hampshire; executive director, New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission; State evacuation officer, 1943; secretary, Post-war Planning and Rehabilitation Committee. Author: The Memel Statute: Its Origin, Legal Nature, and Observation to the Present Day, 1937; Modern World Politics (with others), 1942: chapter on Scandinavia in Twentieth Century Political Thought, Joseph S. Roucek, editor, 1946.

Theodore John Kreps, senior specialist in price economics: Ph. D., Harvard. Professor of business economics, Leland Standford University. Since 1935 has acted as economic adviser or consultant with several Federal government agencies, including Temporary National Economic Committee, Office of Price Administartion, and Board of Economic Warfare. Author: Business and Government under the National Recovery Administration, 1936; Economics of the Sulphuric Acid Industry, 1938; Measurement of Social Performance of Business (Monograph No. 7, Temparary National Economic Committee, Investigation of Concentration of Power), 1940.

Raymond Edward Manning, senior specialist in taxation and fiscal policy: J. D., National University. In Legislative Reference Service since 1924, in State law index section, bill digest section, and economics section, and as research counsel in economics. Secretary, National Tax Association, 1941–46. Author: Postwar Tax Plans for the Federal Government, Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, Committee Print No. 7, 1945; Financing Social Security, Legislative Reference Service, Public Affairs Bulletin, 1946; Federal Excise Taxes, Legislative Reference Service, Public Affairs Bulletin, 1947.

John Rolla Mahoney, senior specialist in conservation and public domain:[2] Ph. D., Harvard. Professor of economics and director of bureau of economic and business research, University of Utah; consultant, Surplus Property Board, 1945; chairman, University of Utah Research Committee. Author: Energy Resources of the West, 1940; The Western Steel Industry, 1944; Economic Changes in Utah During World War II, 1946; A Program of Economic Reform Under Private Enterprise, 1946.

Robert Stephen Oglebay, legal analyst: J. D., University of Indiana. Private practice as an attorney at law; legal writer and editor, Matthew Bender & Co., Inc., Albany, N. Y.; attorney, Advisory Committee on Rules of Civil Procedure, Office of the Marshall of the United States Supreme Court. Author: Collier on Bankruptcy (with James W. Moore), fourteenth edition.

Gustav Peck, senior specialist in labor: Ph. D., Brookings Institution. Member of staff of Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, of Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, and of President Hoover's Committee on Recent Social Trends; executive director, labor advisory board, National Recovery Administration; member, board of Prison Industries Reorganization Administration; wage-hour division and inventory and requisitioning branch, United States Department of Labor; manpower expert, War Production Board; on faculty of Graduate School, American University and of Catholic University of America. Author: Collective Bargaining and Strike Limitation Issue, 1933–46, Legislative Reference Service Public Affairs Bulletin, 1946; Industrial Relations Policy, Legislative Reference Service, Public Affairs Bulletin, 1947.

Howard Samuel Piquet, senior specialist in international trade:[2] Ph. D., Princeton. Member of faculty, Princeton University, New York University, and Graduate School of American University; Chief of Economics Division, United States Tariff Commission; director of investigation, United Nations Interim Committee on Food and Agriculture; special adviser, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Author: Outline of New Deal Legislation, 1933–34, 1934; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Conciliation, June 1945; Functional International Organization, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July 1945.

James Paul Radigan, Jr., chief of the Federal law section, senior specialist in American law: LL. B., Georgetown School of Law. Private law practice; since 1928 with Legislative Reference Service in State law and Federal law sections. Responsible for monthly publication of the Digest of Public General Bills.

John Kerr Rose, geographer: Ph. D., University of Chicago; J. D., George Washington University. Admitted to District of Columbia bar, United States Court of Appeals, and Illinois bar. Senior economic analyst, Rural Electrification Administration; Chief, Resources Development Division, Board of Economic Warfare and Foreign Economic Administration; head economist, Foreign Economic Administration; detained to State Department mission to Korea and Japan; Board of Economic Warfare representative on two committees of Inter-Allied Combined Food Board. Author: Industrial Location and National Policy—Ruralization of Industry, 1942; The World Food Situation, Legislative Reference Service, Public Affairs Bulletin, 1947.

Dorothy Schaffter, research counsel in political science and government: Ph. D., State University of Iowa. Professor of political science, Vassar College; administrative aide to Assistant Executive Director, National Youth Administration; president, Connecticut College for Women; research staff, Committee on Implications of Armed Services Educational Programs, American Council on Education. Author: State Housing Agencies, 1942; What Comes of Training Women for War, 1948.

Francis Orlando Wilcox, senior specialist in international political relations:[2] Ph. D., State University of Iowa; Pol. Sci. D., University of Geneva; fellow of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva, and of Hague Academy of International Law. Chairman of division of social science, University of Louisville; associate chief, Division of Inter-American Activities, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs; administrative analyst, Bureau of the Budget; staff officer, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department. Author: The Ratification of International Conventions, 1935; The Middle West Looks at the War (with W. H. C. Laves), 1940.

Walter William Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture:[2] Ph. D., Harvard. Economist, United States Department of Agriculture; associate professor of agricultural economics, Iowa State College; professor of agricultural economics, University of Wisconsin; assistant chief, requirements and allocations section, War Foods Administration; technical adviser to the United States delegation to UNRRA conference, Atlantic City, 1943. Author: Farm Management Research, 1940–41, prepared by the Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture, 1943; The Farmer in the Second World War, 1947.

Sergius Yakobson, analyst (Russian affairs):[3] Ph. D., University of Berlin. Editor of the Minerva-Jahrbuch der Gelchten Welt, and the Minerva-Jahrbuch der Deutsche Archive; chief librarian, School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London; attached to Royal Institute for Foreign Affairs, Oxford; Slavic Division, Library of Congress. Author: The Library of Congress, Its Russian Program and Activities, 1946; A Preliminary Check List of Russian Dictionaries Published in the U. S. S. R., 1917–42, 1946.

[2] Temporarily acting as staff member of a committee of Congress.

[3] Temporarily assigned to Library of Congress.

Crises Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two articles from the Wall Street Journal of March 19, with reference to continual threats of crises and emergencies at home and abroad. Since we appear to be at the crossroads, it behooves us to "stop, look, and listen":

CRISES UNLIMITED

In his 3 years in the White House President Truman has found four occasions to consider drastic emergency action.

On the occasion of a railroad strike he asked the power to draft workers into the armed service.

When price controls shut off the flow of meat he considered going to the farms to seize cattle.

Last fall he told Congress that the threat of inflation must be met with Government powers to dictate the whole economy.

And on Wednesday he declared that the threat of communism demanded an immediate draft of men as well as a permanent conscription system, which he called universal military training.

Events have proved that three of these so-called crises were only crises within the mind of Mr. Truman. So let's look at the fourth one.

This Russian tyranny, which calls itself communism, is out to dominate the world; no doubt about that.

But one of the ingredients of crisis is surprise and the Russian intentions are scarcely that.

The Russians and their rulers today are exactly the same people with the same program with whom Mr. Truman sat down at Potsdam. There he confirmed the arrangements that sent some 100,000,000 people into tyranny. Then as now the Russians aspired to dominate eastern Germany—providing they could not dominate all of Germany.

The Russians today are exactly the same Russians whose armament program this country assisted under the guise of lend-lease. They are the same Russians whose sympathizers were among the administration advisers. The Russians today are no different than they were on the day that Mr. Truman approved Henry Wallace's pro-Russian speech while Mr. Byrnes was in Paris trying to save what he could from the postwar settlements.

Did Mr. Truman know about the Russians then and still fail to shape a policy to fit what he knew?

Or has Mr. Truman just recently found out about the Russians?

The answer to either question might indeed indicate a crisis, but it would be a crisis far different than Mr. Truman describes.

When these crises are proclaimed they seem always to call for the speedy enactment of measures which the administration previously has recommended but failed to obtain.

This one calls for resumption of the draft and universal military training.

This administration never wanted to give up the draft, and it has worked hard to have Congress approve universal training.

We will not here discuss the merits of universal training standing by itself. We will refer to the circumstances under which it is now urged.

When the fighting ended it should have been perfectly clear that the country would demand abandonment of the draft as quickly as possible. Very recent history showed that the country would be reluctant to accept universal training. This newspaper, among others, called attention to that fact and suggested that in light of it the armed services and the administration think up some substitute recommendations; otherwise it was obvious that the armed services would be progressively weakened in personnel. Nothing was done, and the weakening has taken place.

So if there is a crisis in this respect it is one that was created by the very neglect of the men who now proclaim it.

One might question whether the "crisis" needs universal training or whether universal training needs a crisis.

Universal training standing by itself is one thing. Universal training with the current background is something else.

If we are trying to protect this country we need things more than a large land Army—a Navy and an Air Force that is ready. But if we expect to go about the world opposing our force to the forces of the world's largest land power, then, indeed, we need all the people we can draft— and probably many more.

In other words, a large land Army is a first consideration only if you expect to attack and occupy territory and, as Mr. Royster shows in an article elsewhere on this page, this country, whether or not it knows it, is being asked to endorse a program which will have that end.

For what do we build this proposed force?

Do we expect the Russians to attack us on this continent? Hardly, because they would have to swim to get here.

Do we expect to rescue Finland or Czechoslovakia to whose subjugation we already have been a party?

If the Italians elect a leftist government with the help of the Italian socialists whom we have encouraged, do we expect to tell them they can't have such a government?

What is the present occasion for arming against a tyranny which is now just what it has been for 25 years with the same purposes? The only difference is that it has the chance to execute those purposes. It has that chance only because this country handed it out.

It's not a physical weakness from which this country and other western nations suffer. It's a moral weakness. The infection of totalitarianism has hold of us just as it has hold of the countries of western Europe. Instead of fighting it we have been helping to spread it. Neither dollars nor force will cure it.

We fight communism in Italy. But next door to Italy, in Yugoslavia, we helped impose it. From there it is spreading.

We fight communism in Greece. The danger in Greece hardly would exist without the pressure of armed bands from this same Yugoslavia.

We chase Communists out of the labor unions and the movies. See how many people now condemning Communists were lately cuddling up to Communists. We could call attention to a very prominent lady newspaper columnist.

Let's expose Communists. We're for it. But the totalitarian ideas that the Communists have planted with the aid of a lot of mushy-headed people remain. Not only do they remain but they are actively propagated by people who tell us that is the way to fight communism.

We see one of these totalitarian regimes forming in Britain. But by some curious reasoning we say it is democracy in its highest form. Then suddenly we find that it has some half hundred Communists in its ministry of supply, which is charged with guarding atomic secrets.

Why is little Switzerland which could be bombed to smithereens in a matter of hours not worrying about communism? It is because the Swiss were so strong in their own convictions and they never left the Communists an opening.

To fight communism in Europe we send abroad in our diplomatic corps young men and women who apologize for America.

What should we expect? The people of Europe see the Communist who has the strength of his convictions and it sees Americans who think maybe the Communists are right. Then we try to buy our way with dollars. And when that fails we begin to wind up as though to punch someone in the nose.

This country will not rebuild the morale of the world when it is itself demoralized.

If it were not demoralized it would not scare and if it refused to scare the crisis technique would not work.

It is a hopeful sign that it is no longer working as well as it did.

TRUMAN DOCTRINE: THIRD PHASE—ADMINISTRATION'S DIPLOMACY, ECONOMIC WARFARE HAVE NOT STOPPED RUSSIANS; NOW IT CALLS FOR MILITARY DISPLAY

(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—The Truman doctrine has entered its third phase—the display of America's military strength as a weapon in the undisguised battle with Soviet Russia.

The progression of this doctrine has been relentless. Its progression, indeed, was inevitable once the Government accepted its basic principle. It could progress in no other way unless Russia, its target, were in a moment to change the character of generations.

Setting aside for the time being all questions of the wisdom of the Truman doctrine, it is well to look frankly at this progression and to be forewarned as to what its end is likely to be.

ROLE OF GLOBAL POLICEMAN

The principle now known as the Truman doctrine is, in brief, simply that the United States must undertake the policing of the world against a militant resurgence of barbarism which, this time, is called communism. President Truman, when he first enunciated the doctrine, said the United States must be prepared to fight communism (i. e., Soviet Russia) whenever and wherever it threatened any other country anywhere in the world.

At first the official view was that Russia could be persuaded to abandon its course of expansion and aggression by the use of words, stern protests in diplomatic pcuches or by appeals to the force of world opinion. There was no suggestion initially that we would try to underwrite the economic welfare of Europe and Asia, and certainly none that we would have to turn our own country into an armed camp and flex our military muscles.

SECOND PHASE: ECONOMIC WARFARE

This illusion was brief. Within a year we were considering the second phase: economic warfare. Protests, we were told, were insufficient against a nation that operated on a different moral standard and was unaffected by world opinion. Our task was to build up the economic health of the threatened countries, particularly in Europe, so that full stomachs would resist the lure of communism.

This theory rested on the premise that the struggle between Russia and the United States is solely an economic one, and that Russia's ambition is only to convert other countries to a Marxist economic system.

This idea was the genesis of the Marshall plan, or the European recovery program. Here again, in the beginning the cost of ERP was to be measured in dollars alone; the suggestion (by Senator TAFT) that ERP would mean belt-tightening at home was denied by President Truman and the State Department. Only gradually was it admitted that ERP meant less food, less steel, less oil, less of everything for the public at home.

NOW ITS ERP AND ARMS

Even then it was argued that it was cheaper than rearmament. Which is better, the administration asked, $15,000,000,000 for ERP or $50,000,000,000 for guns and planes? The intended implication was that the one was alternative for the other. Among Washington officialdom the crushing answer delivered to anyone who questioned ERP was to ask whether the questioner preferred ERP or rearmament and war. Dollars would save the world.

No one would recognize, at least publicly, that Russia's expansion was militant conquest of an old familiar sort, although it has been blueprinted as clearly in Communist documents as Hitler's plans were in Mein Kampf. Once we undertook to be the pro-

tector of the whole world, to seek a sort of Pax Americana, there could be no choice of weapons.

This week the administration recognized the relentlessness of the progression. It asked the country to take the next step. President Truman said that a show of military strength must be met with similar strength. "Measures for economic rehabilitation," he said, "are not enough." He asked for a draft army.

What is the next progression? There is nothing in the President's message about the use of this armed force; it is, presumably, merely to be displayed unless we are ourselves attacked. Nothing is said about an armament program. The dollar cost of the draft Army will be relatively small. At both the State and Defense Departments there is a prompt denial of any suggestion of military involvement "unless we are pushed into it."

SHADOWS OF THE FUTURE?

Yet foreshadows lie across Mr. Truman's words. Commenting on the new five-power European defense pact, he had this to say:

"This development deserves our full support. I am confident that the United States will, by appropriate means, extend to the free nations the support which the situation requires. I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them to do so."

What is "full support"? What are "appropriate means"? What support is it that the "situation requires"? President Truman also has said that neither diplomatic protests nor economic aid are by themselves enough.

We are admittedly at an unhappy crossroads. Whichever way we choose will be full of dangers. But we should not be fooled about the hazards of the way, and the administration ought not to try to lead us down the way of its choosing by luring us with misleading signposts, as it has done so far. We have a right to know where we are going.

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by East Point Post, No. 51, the American Legion, of East Point, Ga.:

Whereas the President of the United States has transmitted his recommendations for civil-rights program to the Eightieth Congress of the United States, second session, and has recommended that the Congress at this session enact legislation toward the following specific objectives outlined in part below:

1. Establishing a permanent Commission on Civil Rights, a joint congressional Committee on Civil Rights and a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.

2. Strengthening existing civil-rights statutes.

3. Providing Federal protection against lynching.

4. Protecting more adequately the right to vote.

5. Establishing a Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent unfair discrimination in employment.

6. Prohibiting segregation in interstate transportation facilities; and

Whereas the attempted creation of the fifth proposed civil right recommended is unconstitutional because this is beyond the delegated legislative power of the Federal Government, and is therefore in violation of the fifth amendment, the tenth amendment, the first amendment, the thirteenth amendment, and the sixth amendment of the Constitution; and

Whereas the first, second, third, and fourth recommendations on human rights are unconstitutional because they take away States rights essential to the liberty of a free people to govern their own internal affairs by imposing arbitrary restraints on freedom of equal protection of the law; and

Whereas the alleged humanitarian and democratic purpose of this proposed rights legislation is a fraudulent cloak to conceal its communistic purpose and if enacted into law would destroy Constitutional liberty, bring about industrial chaos, mongrelization of the races, and advance international communism which would eventually destroy the American way of life; and

Whereas members of this post lost limbs and were maimed in wars to preserve our democratic country.

Whereas in a nation where unity is so vital now to help reconstruct a world torn by strife and dissention and the ever-increasing threat of communism that seeks to destroy us, we the members of the American Legion Post No. 51, East Point, Ga., call on our able Senators and Congressmen from this great State to give their all in physical and mental strength in fighting this proposed rights program so detrimental to the welfare of all the people of our State.

EAST POINT AMERICAN LEGION
POST, NO. 51,
E. M. LOYLESS, *Commander.*

Soviet Communism Today — A Graphic Account of What It Does to Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein an article from the American Bar Association Journal of March 1948 entitled "Soviet Communism Today—A Graphic Account of What It Does to Lawyers":

SOVIET COMMUNISM TODAY—A GRAPHIC ACCOUNT OF WHAT IT DOES TO LAWYERS

"Law in Bulgaria will henceforth be practiced on a collective basis," was the announcement in Free Bulgaria. "This is the salient reform introduced in Bulgarian legal life by the new law on attorneys at law, published in No. 257 of the November 5, 1947, issue of the State Gazette." The statement continues:

"The new law exhaustively regulates the conditions under which one shall be able to practice the legal profession. Following, on the whole, the pattern of the old law, it contains stipulations regarding the way in which one can become a lawyer, obligatory legal apprenticeship, the organization of the members of the bar, lawyers' collectives, work, duties and rights, their disciplinary and penal responsibility. Reforms have been introduced in all these phases of legal life, but the radical change is contained in articles 30–38 of the law, regulating lawyers' collectives.

"These articles stipulate that a lawyer cannot exercise his profession if he is not a member of a lawyers' collective, except in places where the number of practicing lawyers is less than six. Lawyers' collectives shall be freely formed. The number of lawyers forming a collective cannot be less than three at inhabited places with a total of less than 10 practicing lawyers; less than 5, at places with up to 50 lawyers, and less than 10 where the total number of lawyers is more than 50. In Sofia the minimum of lawyers that will go to make a collective will be 15.

"The collective shall be a juridical person, which must be approved by the lawyers' council (bar association) and registered with the latter. The collective, however, shall not be subject to taxation; its members shall pay their taxes individually in accordance with their respective income.

"The lawyers' council may assign new members to a collective, or transfer lawyers from one collective to another when it finds important reasons therefore. The decision of the lawyers' council is subject to appeal before a committee composed of the president and public prosecutor of the regional court and two representatives of the lawyers' council elected by the latter.

"The collective shall be represented by its secretary or his deputy who shall both be elected for one judicial year by the general meeting of the collective which shall notify their names to the lawyers' council."

THE COLLECTIVE DEALS WITH CLIENTS AND COLLECTS ALL FEES

The individual lawyer is left with no contact with clients; the secretary of the collective handles all that. All fees for legal services are paid to the collective. The statement says:

"Only the secretary or his deputy shall contract with the clients. They shall endeavor to obtain an even distribution of the work among the members of the collective, taking into account their respective qualifications. When a client expressly points out a lawyer whom he wants to entrust with his work, he shall pay an additional remuneration in favor of the collective, determined under a separate table. The same rule applies to legal adviserships.

"All remunerations shall be paid to the collective's treasury. Every lawyer shall receive the sums which shall thus have been paid for the work done by him, after deducting a certain amount to meet the common needs of the collective and another 20 percent to be distributed among all members of the collective. By unanimous decision of all members, the distribution of sums from the collective's treasury can be effected in a different manner; such a decision can be amended by a vote of three-fourths of the total number of members.

"The collective's general meeting shall vote its internal rules and regulations, which will be approved by the lawyers' council. It shall take decisions on all questions regarding the collective's activity. It shall be called together by the secretary on the latter's own initiative or at the request of at least one-quarter of the members. The general meeting, by argumented decision of the majority, shall admit new members to the collective. In case of refusal, the interested parties shall be able to appeal the decision before the lawyers' council within a period of 2 weeks. The council's decision is final. The general meeting can, by decision of three-quarters of all members, expel members from the collective when they do not carry out conscientiously the work with which they have been charged, or disturb the life of the collective. The decisions of the general meeting can be appealed against before the lawyers' council which has the final say."

RIGID CONTROL AS TO WHO MAY BE LAWYERS

Many classes of persons are proscribed from being members of the bar at all, even in a collective. Plenary control is kept by government; names may be stricken from the list. The statement continues:

"Other important changes introduced by the new law pertain to the qualifications entitling a person to exercise the lawyer's profession. The list of reasons which disqualify a person from being a lawyer has been amplified. Thus, in addition to those cases in which a person was heretofore disqualified from exercising the profession of a lawyer, the following have been added: Persons condemned for murder, under the law on the people's court, under the law of the defense of the people's government, the law on supplies and prices, as well as persons convicted to strict imprisonment, though they may have been exempted from punishment through pardon, a conditional sentence, rehabilitation or prescription; persons who beside their lawyer's profession exercise personally or through third persons another profession which is their chief occupation, or which is incompatible with the profession of a lawyer; persons who have a bad reputation or a disgraceful name at the courts, in the lawyers' college or in society, and persons manifesting Fascist tendencies.

"The law further stipulates that all persons who have acquired the right to practice the legal profession under the laws existing heretofore, except those sentenced under the various laws enumerated in the preceding paragraph, shall retain their rights.

"After the publication of the law, a commission consisting of the president and the public prosecutor of the regional court in the central city of the region, or their deputies, a member of the same court, two lawyers delegated by the lawyers' council, a member of the regional FF committee and a representative of the respective county FF committee shall make a pronouncement as to which lawyers registered with the lawyers' council before the publication of the new law possess the required qualifications and shall order all those who do not possess them to be struck out from the list of lawyers.

"A lawyer whose name has been deleted from the list of lawyers, can ask for new inscription after the expiration of a period of 3 years.

"The stipulations regarding lawyers' collectives shall come into force 3 months after the publication in the State Gazette of the order by which the minister of justice shall put them into effect.

"Within a period of 1 month after the publication of the order, those lawyers who have agreed to form a collective must file a collective petition to the lawyers' council for the confirmation and registration of the collective. During the same term lawyers who have failed to join a collective must file petitions to that effect.

"Every lawyer must present to the secretary of the collective a list of all contracts which he has concluded with his clients, indicating what sums are still due under them. These contracts remain effective, but all sums due under them shall be paid to the treasury of the collective."

BOOKS THAT ARE INFORMATIVE AS TO COMMUNISM IN ACTION

If members of our association will pursue further their studies as to what Communists and communism do in actual practice to universities and schools, churches, cultural organizations, labor unions, political parties, governments, and all classes of the people, several recent volumes are objective and illuminating.

Martin Ebon's World Communism Today (New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Co. January 26, 1948. $4.50. Pages viii, 536) is a careful and judicious chronicle, nation-by-nation, of what the ascendancy of Soviet communism has meant and done. France is shown to be the "key to the West"; the United States is "target number one" in brutal aggressions aimed at world domination. Mr. Ebon is an editor and writer who has worked for OWI and the State Department; his point of view appears to be that of the non-Communist left. His presentation of crucial facts should alarm those of us who are still quiescent, because his conclusion from abundant evidence is that

"All Communist practices in use anywhere on the globe are being applied and perfected inside the United States. This country is so large, so highly industrialized and complex, that Communist organizational machineries in America are more widely expanded and carefully perfected than anywhere else."

Another book worth reading without delay is I Saw Poland Betrayed, by Arthur Bliss Lane (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co. February 9, 1948. $3.50. Pages, 344). Lane was the stalwart American Ambassador to Poland, who resigned his career post last year because he was so disturbed by what he saw Communists do to Poland and the Poles that he would not stay in the diplomatic service and keep silent. Drew Middleton has characterized this as an excellent account of the development and cruel workings of a police state.

For broader coverage of information, a third volume chock full of competent and objective reporting of details is Hal Lehrman's Russia's Europe (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., December 1947, $3.75, pp. 341). Lehrman had been an experienced reporter for a dozen years for many magazines and newspapers, including the Associated Press, and is said to have been the first accredited correspondent admitted to the Balkan countries. He started with a predisposition toward Russian ascendancy in eastern Europe, but his views were changed by what he saw Communists do to helpless peoples. For a monumental account of the origins and philosophies of Soviet communism, and of the career of its leader, the best factual work, although hardly unbiased, is Leon Trotsky's Stalin: An Appraisal of the Man and His Influence (New York: Harper & Bros., 1946). Going further back in the history of communism to Karl Marx, as viewed by those who knew him, a challenging book is the Red Prussian, by Leopold Schwarzschild (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1947, $4, pp. 422), which was reviewed in our August 1947 issue (33 A. B. A. J. 809). The most enjoyable but devastating analysis of communism thus far written remains George Orwell's Animal Farm (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1947. $1.75. pp. 118), which exemplifies the brilliant manner in which British writers of the Labor Party have dissected the fallacies of communism in down-to-earth language and analogy.

For those who would read the most authoritative statement for American Communists as to what they say their program and objectives are as to this country, the New York Herald-Tribune recently published a 12-column statement by William Z. Foster, leader of the Communist Party. Foster stated that American Communists uphold the Constitution of the United States, but that "under present political conditions in this country the United States Constitution requires many vital democratic amendments, including * * * the abolition of the present conservative and paralyzing system of Government checks and balances, and so forth."

America appears to be momentarily at the crossroads as to what to do to combat Communists and communism without sacrificing essential American principles. Doubt and concern are expressed by many as to how far legislation should go. There seems to be agreement on "exposure" and "publicity" as weapons, and on public understanding of what communism means and would do to our country. At this stage of the discussion a prime duty and opportunity of lawyers everywhere appears to be to "think on these things" and so to inform themselves that they can do their part in reasoned and demonstrative arguments against the totalitarian menace.

One question may be posed: If the Communists constitute an authentic and lawful American political party, why is it libelous, as some courts have held, to call a man a Communist if he is not provably one? Is it libelous to call a man a Democrat? Or a Republican? The facts reliably reported in the above books may supply an answer to the first question.—W. L. R.

LAWYERS' VIEWS SOUGHT AS TO LAWS TO CURB COMMUNIST PARTY

Under the chairmanship of Congressman RICHARD M. NIXON, California lawyer, whose district includes a part of Los Angeles County, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities began on February 5 a series of hearings to obtain views and recommendations concerning the adequacy of present laws for combating subversive political organizations, the true character of the activities of the Communist Party and its agents, the constitutional questions which might be involved in further legislation in view of the Supreme Court decisions in the *Schneiderman Case* (320 U. S. 118, 136, 139), and the *Barnette Case* (319 U. S. 624), and the desirable form and scope of any such legislation.

The subcommittee sought, among the first, to obtain the appearance and advice of lawyers who, by their work in the American Bar Association and their experience in the profession, were regarded as having special qualifications to speak on the subject. Among those invited were Robert R. Milam, of Florida, chairman of our association's committee on the bill of rights; Walter M. Bastian, of the District of Columbia, treasurer of our association; and Louis Waldman, of New York, attorney for numerous labor unions, chairman of our association's committee on American citizenship. As our association had not, through the house of delegates, taken action on the matters to be discussed, these officials qualified their appearance and testimony by the understanding that they gave their individual views and were not speaking in any sense for the association or for their committees. Attorney General Tom C. Clark preceded them on the stand. Officers of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia were also invited by the subcommittee.

Consensus emerging from the early hearings

The consensus during the first 2 days of hearings appeared to be that further legislation is needed, that exposure of Communist organizations and those who are members of them or act with them is preferable to suppression, that it seems to be unwise at this time to outlaw the Communist Party and drive it underground, that the strengthening of the laws requiring that foreign agents and Communist organizations register and file full information is necessary, and that great care should be taken to do no violence to constitutional rights of persons or to legitimate American political parties and public opinion organizations. The views voted by the New York State Bar Association on January 24, as reported elsewhere in this issue, were cited.

Attorney General Clark submitted a specific program for strengthening legislation.

Donald R. Richberg, of the District of Columbia Bar, proposed to make illegal all secret political organizations (those which do not register). Louis Waldman urged Federal and State laws to require that any candidate for office who is nominated or endorsed by a totalitarian organization shall file a statement rejecting this support or saying that he "accepts the principles and policies of such organization."

Statement by Robert R. Milam before the committee

Mr. Milam and Mr. Bastian generally favored full publicity as to who are Communists, rather than outlawry, and recommended the strengthening of registration requirements. Lawyers from the Bar Association of the District of Columbia advised in effect that circulated matter by any organization of the suspect kind be deemed to be un-American if it does not support and advocate the American form of constitutional government, and that any such literature should be required to be labeled and circulated as un-American.

"Communism aims to overthrow our form of government," said Mr. Milam. He continued, in part:

"Communism is an agency of a foreign power actively scheming to weaken and then destroy democratic government in the United States and elsewhere. It is an international conspiracy to that end. It infiltrates its members into labor unions and key industries. Its purpose is to disrupt and disable and finally destroy our way of life. It teaches loyalty to Russia and treachery to this Nation. A small group of suspicious, able, ruthless men completely control the party. In reality communism is a dictatorial rule by this small group of ambitious men. The true Communist has no loyalty to this Nation. He does the bidding without question of this group which controls Russia and is attempting to establish eventually a totalitarian dictatorship in all countries.

"When this fact is faced, then the necessity of protecting to the fullest extent our form of government, upon which alone rests our civil liberties, overshadows any specious claim of an individual to a right to undermine the Government or to conduct subversive activity in defiance of the laws of the land under some such guise as freedom of speech or of the press. That communism in operation destroys the civil rights of a whole people is too plain to be denied."

John Foster Dulles, of the New York bar, advised the committee that a distinction should be carefully drawn and observed between (1) Communists who follow the party line, do the bidding of agents of Soviet communism, and are guilty of what is treason to America; and (2) Communists who are such because of discontent or sense of injustice as to some conditions in America, and are thereby driven into left-wing affiliations in protest or in hope of improving conditions. Mr. Dulles said he was not yet certain what legislative measures should be devised. Arthur Garfield Hays jocularly suggested that all Communists should be identified and exposed by requiring them to wear fur hats, high boots, and long beards.

Many of the lawyers who appeared before the committee stressed the difficulties and dangers inherent in restrictive legislation aimed at communism and Communists—the danger of imposing undue restrictions upon public-opinion organizations which carry on their activities in full support of American institutions, the danger of curbing unduly the functioning of the American system of political parties without preventing Communists from changing deceitfully the names of their organizations or going underground.

The Wealth of 33 Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I include in the extension of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Robert R. Doane, chairman of the World Assets Audit Association, Inc., which appeared in Dun's Review for March 1948:

THE WEALTH OF 33 NATIONS

(By Robert R. Doane, chairman, World Assets Audit Association, Inc.)

The whole of what we still call civilization is today facing one of the most crucial economic crises of history. Which means, of course, that the business interests of our own and of other countries are also facing a critical situation. The magnitude and nature of this trouble, therefore, are of paramount concern to all of us. And any instrumentality or device that can be found that may be helpful in facilitating a better understanding of the situation becomes more than speculative interest.

The first thing the banker, the reorganization executive, or the receiver looks for when called in to examine the affairs of an enterprise in trouble is an over-all inventory of the situation. This inventory, of course, includes a balance sheet and its accompanying income statement. The investigator must know what the liabilities are, and he must know the resources available with which to meet them. Such a procedure is not only axiomatic but a vital part of the normal logistics of practical affairs.

Although the current international situation quite clearly calls for a most careful balance sheet study, none has as yet been produced. Unfortunately none of the leading governments, including our own, is in a good position to demand such auditorial statements either directly or indirectly through the agency of the United Nations, due to the simple fact that none of these governments maintains currently a full, balanced accounting covering its entire national economy.

Our own Government, for example, while engaging in much accounting and rendering of voluminous reports, has nowhere available an over-all consolidated balance sheet covering its own strictly governmental financial operations, to say nothing of such an accounting for the national economy as a whole. Amazing as it may seem, and in direct violation of statutory provisions by act of Congress in 1850 and in 1902, calling for a regular decennial census of wealth, public debt, and taxation, we have not engaged in such a census of our tangible assets for over the past quarter of a century, the last census estimates being for 1922. And this curious omission has occurred during the most crucial period of our economic history. The wealthiest country on earth, with more at stake economically than any other nation, does not provide sufficient funds through its Congress to undertake a complete census.

Whenever insufficient comprehensive analysis of a given situation is permitted to exist, it becomes relatively easy for widely differing views to be advanced, eacn view purporting to represent the very heart and true nature of the crisis, either present or impending. Under such conditions, any school of thought may make profitable use of the various opposing points of view merely by preventing the true character and magnitude of the situation from being brought into the full light of day. Under such conditions a great many of the most heterogeneous elements are simply enumerated without proper effort being made to coordinate them into a systematic explanation. This sort of condition, as long as it can be maintained, is duck soup for the politician.

Postwar Europe and the United States—Per capita comparisons

[In United States dollars, International Monetary Fund parity of exchange equivalents]

NATIONS REPRESENTED IN PARIS CONFERENCE ON MARSHALL PLAN

	War losses and costs	National wealth (1946)	Gross national product (1946)	Annual surplus or deficit (1946)	Estimated relief needs (fiscal year ending 1948)
United Kingdom	$2,905	$2,119	$944	−$87	$56
France	2,737	1,082	417	−75	45
Italy	2,489	437	60	−28	20
Sweden	2,358	2,090	843	194	22
Norway	1,222	1,613	563	−178	16
Denmark	400	1,500	645	24	53
Iceland	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Netherlands	667	753	368	−103	68
Belgium	952	952	586	38	36
Luxemburg	2,500	1,335	550	0	60
Switzerland	------	3,182	791	91	------
Portugal	------	732	163	40	------
Greece	385	380	46	−50	65
Turkey	------	370	79	13	------
Austria	307	714	81	−68	36
Eire	------	1,333	384	25	------
Germany (western)	7,225	1,291	100	−7	22
Total	2,886	1,109	348	30	31

NONPARTICIPATING NATIONS

U. S. S. R.	$1,602	$1,465	$316	$54	------
Byelorussian S. S. R.	[2]	[2]	[1]	[1]	------
Ukrainian S. S. R.	[2]	[2]	[1]	[1]	------
Estonia	3,040	1,000	295	24	------
Latvia	1,900	1,000	261	26	------
Lithuania	1,077	667	167	16	------
Finland	298	1,053	176	−96	$45
Poland	1,352	460	111	10	18
Czechoslovakia	1,385	769	260	22	28
Hungary	151	538	53	−16	13
Bulgaria	246	580	101	−22	------
Rumania	[1]	545	89	9	------
Yugoslavia	565	494	74	−14	12
Albania	455	545	91	−24	24
Spain	------	1,582	239	65	------
Germany (eastern)	[3]	1,659	100	10	[1]
Total	1,182	1,281	251	38	4
Total 32 nations	1,956	1,202	295	7	16
United States	3,227	3,548	1,442	112	------
Grand total	2,200	1,652	515	27	13

[1] No data.
[2] Data included in figure above.
[3] Contained in unapportioned total figure given under western Germany above.

NOTES.—Compiled by World Assets Audit Association, Inc.; population totals used for per capita figures are from the Statistical Office of the United Nations.

War losses and costs: United Nations Documents E/156 and A/147; reports of the research staff, American University, Washington, D. C.; and U. S. State Department study by C. J. Hoxter, Feb. 24, 1947.

National wealth: Includes all private productive, public, institutional, and individual consumer physical assets, exclusive of inventories.

Gross national products: Includes total receipts from operations. (For national aggregates, in dollar equivalents, see national income table, p. 22, column 3.) Annual surplus or deficit: Difference between total receipts from operations and total costs of operations. (See national income table, p. 22, column 10.)

Estimated relief needs: Committee of European Economic Cooperation, vol. I, general report, and vol. II, technical reports. For nonparticipating nations, as reported in United Nations document E/576, E/288 Rev. 1, and interim report No. 1.

The effect of all this, of course, is that the public finds itself more or less bewildered, and is left to draw the conclusion that the world crisis is such an extremely complicated problem that no clear explanation can ever be given of it.

To meet the need for a full functional appraisal of world resources, an organization was formed a year ago, as an agency independent of government and politics, to bring together methods of study and techniques in economic accounting and analysis as applied to an extensive body of data worked out over a period of years. While no attempt has yet been made to attack this entire problem on the scale it really demands, a limited exploration has thus far been productive of quite illuminating results, some of which are here reproduced in the accompanying tabulations.

These reports, while reasonably authentic in themselves, are not in any way intended for use as a final blueprint for recovery and world rehabilitation, but they do disclose, it is believed, the advantages of this type of approach, and the proportionate magnitude of the actual task that today lies before the world community of nations, and of our relationship to this task.

The results of World War II are just beginning to astonish an already astonish-proof world. In the confusion of issues and problems it is difficult to secure a clear conception of what has happened, to say nothing of what may be expected to happen.

AMERICAN WEALTH

The idea has long prevailed, and quite frequently in highest political quarters, that the fabulous wealth of the United States is equal to or even in excess of the entire combined wealth of the remainder of the world. And this exalted misconception has been manifest even more particularly of the popular notion as to the income of the American people.

As long as we naively look upon American wealth as the world's great contingent reserve to be drawn upon after every world political debauchery, we are likely to pay a rather high price for our valor of ignorance. Yet when we actually find ourselves living in a world where the active civilized working population has expended nearly $2,000,000,000,000 on warfare in a single generation, or 30 years, in order to destroy nearly one-third of its productive physical wealth, it appears about time that we sat down and began taking a sober accounting of things.

To this end, the accompanying tabulations speak for themselves. The form and the content of the accounting attempted here are adopted solely for purposes of providing convenient geographic groupings and have no legal or political significance. The findings represent an assaying of basic available authentic data, which are subject to later official modification.

(In the accompanying tables, values in national currencies have been converted to United States dollars on the basis of official parities for 1946. Where rates were not established by the International Monetary Fund, the official Central Bank rates have been employed. For France, the conversion to dollars was based on the official rate of 119 francs to the dollar, in effect up to January 26, 1948. If instead the present fixed rate of 214 francs to the dollar had been used, the dollar quantities here given for France would be reduced nearly half.

(In making comparisons between countries on the basis of official exchange rates, consideration must be given throughout to the fact that these do not necessarily reflect relative purchasing power of the various currencies.—Editorial note.)

Comparative functional analysis of the national income of European nations and the United States, year 1946

[In millions of United States dollars, IMF parity of exchange equivalents]

	Receipts from private sources (1)	Receipts from Government sources (2)	Total receipts from operations (3)	Cost of purchases from other countries (4)	Cost of non-Government wages and salaries (5)	Cost of productive physical assets (6)	Cost of Government including wages (7)	Cost of net rent, interest, and profits (8)	Total costs of operations (9)	Current annual surplus or deficit (10)
Nations represented in Paris Conference on Marshall plan:										
United Kingdom	$30,971	$13,589	$44,560	$6,697	$18,010	$1,930	$12,778	$9,228	$48,643	−$4,083
France	12,646	3,542	16,188	461	7,284	1,000	2,434	7,902	19,081	−2,893
Italy	1,951	799	2,750	1,619	1,100	480	355	495	4,049	−1,299
Sweden	4,672	978	5,650	301	2,260	320	893	578	4,352	1,298
Norway	1,245	500	1,745	789	872	120	326	191	2,298	−553
Denmark	2,262	316	2,578	520	1,287	120	245	309	2,481	97
Iceland	130	20	150	49	50	3	18	18	138	12
Netherlands	1,330	2,090	3,420	1,739	1,013	168	1,249	210	4,379	−959
Belgium	4,699	227	4,926	1,640	1,970	240	169	591	4,610	316
Luxemburg	105	60	165	5	89	20	46	5	165	0
Switzerland	2,441	160	2,601	286	1,040	276	77	520	2,199	402
Portugal	1,277	59	1,336	119	400	140	80	267	1,006	330
Greece	262	98	360	375	144	72	94	72	757	−397
Turkey	1,149	351	1,500	45	450	140	320	300	1,255	245
Austria	284	281	565	348	282	120	253	39	1,042	−477
Eire	940	213	1,153	164	461	120	204	49	998	155
Germany (western)	2,928	1,607	4,535	545	2,365	1,400	547	(1)	4,857	−322
Total	69,292	24,890	94,182	15,702	39,077	6,669	20,088	20,774	102,310	−8,128
Nonparticipating nations:										
U. S. S. R.	3,516	57,474	60,990	503	43,455	3,537	3,050	----------	50,545	10,445
Byelorussian S. S. R.	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	----------	(1)	(1)
Ukrainian S. S. R.	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	----------	(1)	(1)
Estonia	161	134	295	11	96	30	134	----------	271	24
Latvia	330	191	521	19	195	65	191	----------	470	51
Lithuania	330	170	500	13	208	60	170	----------	451	49
Finland	469	201	670	288	335	200	209	1	1,033	−363
Poland	2,267	393	2,660	792	966	300	358	3	2,419	241
Czechoslovakia	2,091	1,284	3,375	835	1,128	360	758	12	3,093	282
Hungary	242	248	490	156	245	180	58	3	642	−152
Bulgaria	444	256	700	124	350	120	256	5	855	−155
Roumania	1,314	151	1,465	180	737	260	133	10	1,320	145
Yugoslavia	1,125	75	1,200	508	600	240	73	5	1,426	−226
Albania	99	1	100	35	72	18	1	----------	126	−26
Spain	5,185	1,208	6,393	79	1,917	360	1,016	1,278	4,650	1,743
Germany (eastern)	1,863	182	2,045	163	1,098	480	104	(1)	1,845	200
Total	19,436	61,968	81,404	3,706	51,402	6,210	6,511	1,317	69,146	12,258
Total 32 nations	88,728	86,858	175,586	19,408	90,479	12,879	26,599	22,091	171,456	4,130
United States	173,025	30,654	203,679	4,968	95,887	12,435	50,202	24,441	187,933	15,746
Grand total	261,753	117,512	379,265	24,376	186,366	25,314	76,801	46,532	359,389	19,876

[1] No data.

NOTES.—Compiled by World Assets Audit Association, Inc., from statistics of the United Nations, the Bank for International Settlements, and the U.S. Department of Commerce. The functional operations statement includes income received from direct productive operations only, and not from investments in other countries. This report represents the application of the "short form" analysis to the various national economy accounts. National income at "factor cost," adjusted on a gross-product basis to include depreciation and depletion, is employed throughout.

(1) Difference between column 2 and column 3. (2) As reported by the various governments. (3) Gross national product. (4) Imports as reported in Statesman's Yearbook. (5) Wages and salaries in private enterprise only. (6) Depreciation, depletion, and in some cases, obsolescence and amortization. (7) Total government revenue: taxes, license fees, etc. (8) Net rent, net interest, dividends, and profits withdrawn. (9) Total of the 5 major elements of cost. (10) Difference between total receipts and total costs.

Comparative balance sheet of European nations and the United States, year 1946

[In millions of United States dollars, IMF parity of exchange equivalents]

	Current assets	Current liabilities	Net working capital	Claims assets	Physical assets	Total assets	Long-term liabilities	Net worth
Nations represented in Paris Conference on Marshall plan:								
United Kingdom	$21,384	$16,954	$4,430	$78,200	$100,000	$178,200	$99,800	$78,400
France	8,892	6,669	2,223	32,100	42,000	74,100	14,100	60,000
Italy	3,300	3,340	−40	13,400	20,000	33,400	41,100	−7,700
Sweden	5,112	2,931	2,181	28,600	14,000	42,600	2,800	39,800
Norway	913	674	239	3,300	5,000	8,300	1,300	7,000
Denmark	1,067	202	865	5,700	6,000	11,700	300	11,403
Iceland	33	9	24	100	200	300	100	200
Netherlands	2,156	1,832	324	12,600	7,000	19,600	4,800	14,800
Belgium	2,431	2,025	406	14,500	8,000	22,500	5,100	17,400
Luxemburg	107	87	20	572	400	972	300	672
Switzerland	4,323	1,179	3,144	25,300	14,000	39,300	2,000	37,300
Portugal	1,859	507	1,352	10,900	6,000	16,900	300	16,600
Greece	550	500	50	2,000	3,000	5,000	300	4,700
Turkey	1,276	848	428	4,600	7,000	11,600	1,100	10,500
Austria	627	830	−203	700	5,000	5,700	10,400	−4,700
Eire	726	198	528	2,600	4,000	6,600	300	6,300
Germany (western)	[2]	[2]	[2]	39,000	58,600	97,600	150,000	−52,400
Total	54,756	38,785	15,971	274,172	300,200	574,372	334,100	240,272
Nonparticipating nations:								
U. S. S. R.	37,235	25,755	11,480	55,500	283,000	338,500	16,006	322,494
Byelorussian S. S. R.	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Ukrainian S. S. R.	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Estonia	128	115	13	170	1,000	1,170	1,500	−330
Latvia	253	207	46	300	2,000	2,300	3,000	−700
Lithuania	284	216	68	400	2,000	2,400	3,500	−1,100
Finland	737	303	434	2,700	4,060	6,700	1,000	5,700
Poland	2,013	3,096	−1,083	7,300	11,000	18,300	21,000	−2,700
Czechoslovakia	1,837	1,131	706	6,700	10,000	16,700	2,000	14,700
Hungary	913	1,748	−835	3,300	5,000	8,300	19,000	−10,700
Bulgaria	748	870	−122	2,800	4,000	6,800	2,000	4,800
Rumania	1,496	1,635	−139	4,600	9,000	13,600	5,000	8,600
Yugoslavia	1,463	665	798	5,300	8,000	13,300	13,000	300
Albania	110	240	−130	400	600	1,000	2,000	−1,000
Spain	8,760	1,801	6,959	33,600	42,400	76,000	7,000	69,000
Germany (eastern)	[2]	[2]	[2]	22,600	34,000	56,600	10,000	46,600
Total	55,977	37,782	18,195	145,670	416,000	561,670	106,006	455,664
Total, 32 nations	110,733	76,567	34,166	419,842	716,200	1,136,042	440,106	695,936
United States	355,100	200,500	154,600	707,200	501,000	1,208,200	866,500	341,700
Grand total	465,833	277,067	188,766	1,127,042	1,217,200	2,344,242	1,306,606	1,037,636

[1] Data included in figure above.
[2] No data.

NOTES.—Compiled by World Assets Audit Association, Inc., from a more detailed functional additive statement of accounts. This is not a consolidated balance sheet. Current assets: Includes cash on hand and in banks, receivables, and inventories. Current liabilities: Includes all accounts currently payable. Claims assets: Includes all public and private long-term obligations. Physical assets: Includes all private productive, public, institutional, and individual consumer physical assets, exclusive of inventories. Long-term liabilities: Includes all private and public long-term obligations and tentative reparations claims.

Can Laymen Practice Law in a Federal Court?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the 23 who voted against H. R. 3214 which was a good bill except for the amendment which would permit laymen to practice law in the Federal court. It is unfortunate that the bill was brought up on the floor of the House as it was, so that the Members were not given a complete understanding of what was contained in the bill. Otherwise it is my opinion that it would not have passed the House without an amendment which would have stricken the provision in question. I am incorporating in the RECORD a copy of an article of the Chicago Bar Association Record of February 1948 which discusses the matter, and I am hopeful that the Senate will take steps to remedy what otherwise might be a great mistake:

CAN LAYMEN PRACTICE LAW IN A FEDERAL COURT?

The answer to this startling question is "Yes," if H. R. 3214 with the amendments adopted by the House, passes the Senate during the present session of Congress and becomes law.

As most lawyers know, H. R. 3214 without amendment represents the considered opinion of the Joint Committee on the Judiciary that title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary" requires revision. Among other reforms, this bill gives the United States Tax Court the status of a Federal court.

In 1942, when the Board of Tax Appeals was changed in name to the Tax Court of the United States, it remained an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government. This bill changes the Tax Court from an administrative agency in the executive branch to an actual court. The work of the Tax Court is extremely important and this bill quite properly gives the court a standing as a Federal court, which is well deserved by its reputation. Its procedure will in the main be the same as in the Federal district courts. It will have power to punish by contempt and all other attributes of a court of the United States. It will be a part of the judicial, rather than the executive branch of the Government. As such, the new Tax Court should be freely empowered to prescribe rules governing the requirements for admission to practice before it, as are the other courts of the United States.

However, the following amendment, which would permit laymen to practice before this new Federal court, was made to the bill just before it passed the House on July 7, 1947:

"No qualified person shall be denied admission to practice before such court (the new Tax Court) because of his failure to be a member of any profession or calling." (Sec. 2560, p. 157, lines 12–14 of the bill.)

Several bar associations opposed the amendment, but the bill as so amended was submitted to vote in the House under suspension of the rules and debate was limited. The advocates of the amendment used the strategem of adding it to a bill otherwise commended by the legal profession. Members of the House were forced to vote either for or against the entire bill as so amended. Since apart from this amendment, the bill had the approval of the Federal bench and the bar generally, and since the Members voting were apparently unaware of the implications of this amendment, the bill passed the House by a vote of 342 to 23.

This amendment raises no question as to what persons should be allowed to prepare Federal income tax returns, give tax advice, or conduct negotiations for taxpayers before the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The question raised is, Should Congress require a Federal court to admit laymen to try cases before it?

WHY SHOULDN'T LAYMEN PRACTICE IN A FEDERAL COURT?

1. Fundamentally, the public at large is protected against unqualified practitioners by stringent educational and moral requirements made by the bar of every State in licensing lawyers to practice law. The public would not be protected in any comparable way against the laymen who would be admitted to practice before the new Federal Tax Court.

2. Every lawyer who has prepared and tried a case in any court knows that to do a passa-

ble job for his client the lawyer requires a thorough knowledge of the rules of evidence, the art of pleading, and the techniques of trial procedure. He also knows that no layman, lacking a legal education and some practical trial experience, could possibly be qualified to represent a litigant in court in any case. This applied to the new Federal Tax Court, as to all other courts.

3. Every State imposes strict control over the practice of lawyers as well as their admission to the bar, either by statute or judicial rule. The universality of this control demonstrates the public need for it.

4. All presently established Federal courts likewise prevent laymen from practicing before them. There is no logical or practical basis for a different practice in the new Federal Tax Court.

5. No convincing reason can be given why a layman cannot try a tax case in a Federal district court if he is permitted to practice in the Tax Court after it becomes a Federal court with substantially identical powers and rules of procedure.

6. Traditionally, the Federal courts have left matters of discipline to the State courts and have generally disbarred practitioners only where they have already been disbarred by their own State courts. This control would be completely lacking as to lay practitioners in the new Tax Court should H. R. 3214, as amended, become law, and such lay practitioners, who are not admitted to practice before State courts, would not be subject to the ethical and moral standards of the bar and could not easily be disciplined for misconduct outside of court.

THE LAYMEN'S ARGUMENT

The argument advanced by laymen in behalf of the amendment is that they have always been permitted to appear before the Board of Tax Appeals (and later the present Tax Court), and thus the amendment merely continues an important privilege which they have always had. This argument has three defects:

1. Under H. R. 3214, the Tax Court would become an actual Federal Court, and as such should be left free (as are other courts) to make its own rules with reference to requirements for admission to practice before it.

2. Laymen have only infrequently tried cases in the Tax Court since it was renamed in 1942; less than 5 percent of the total of approximately 3,000 cases decided during that 5-year period were tried by lay-practitioners. Not one of the nonlawyers admitted to practice in the last 5 years has appeared in the trial of a case. This suggests that the privilege the laymen have enjoyed of appearing before this administrative body in the past has not been important, even to them.

3. Laymen always have the right to appear as expert witnesses in the trial of any case and they have exercised this right frequently in Tax Court cases. No license is necessary to exercise this right.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

The amendment permitting laymen to practice in this new Federal court passed easily in the House under limited debate, in spite of formal protests by several bar associations.

The Senate is now considering the bill, and will probably pass it as amended, unless not only other bar associations, but great numbers of individual lawyers as well, express opposition to amended section 2560 at once to their own Senators and Representatives, and to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which is now considering the entire bill. The committee consists of the following Senators:

Republicans: ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman, Wisconsin; WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, West Virginia; E. H. MOORE, Oklahoma; FORREST C. DONNELL, Missouri; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Kentucky.

Democrats: PAT MCCARRAN, Nevada; HARLEY M. KILGORE, West Virginia; JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington; J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; J. HOWARD MCGRATH, Rhode Island.

Since H. R. 3214 constitutes a complete revision of the Federal Judicial Code, with many desirable improvements, those opposed to the amendment made by section 2560 which permits laymen to practice law in a Federal court should be careful to confine their objections to that portion of section 2560 above quoted.

The Myth of Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Hanson W. Baldwin which appeared in the January 1948 issue of Foreign Affairs:

THE MYTH OF SECURITY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

There is a basic paradox in coupling the word "defense" with modern military means and methods. The atomic bomb, the long-range plane, the giant missile have demolished so many security concepts that defense, measured by any military yardstick, has become chiefly a reflex of retaliation. In a search for defense, men have broken the boundaries of space and solved many of the mysteries of nature. But, ironically, they have made themselves less secure than before. The rise of nation-states, the growth of populations, the industrial revolution and a new technological revolution have made war total. Defense is completely incompatible with the realities of modern warfare, and if it dominates the military thinking of a nation it is a term synonymous with defeat. No theory of limited liability, of defensive strategy or tactics, can win the war of tomorrow.

Man's attempts to limit the destructiveness and outlaw some of the horror of war are not likely to succeed unless power is linked to reality. The great general problem of the twentieth century, as of all past centuries, is to harness justice with power, idealism with realism. Moral factors—the ebb and flow of intangible forces, the surge of national wills, the things of the spirit, man's consciousness of right and wrong—are realities and cannot be omitted from any reckoning of power which pretends to be trustworthy. But the fact remains that though moral scruples, embodied in such international laws as the divided peoples of the earth have come to accept, may serve as deterrents to aggressor nations, the fear of a swift counter punch—retaliation in kind—is in the present state of affairs the weightiest argument against aggression. The American military problem is how to land that counter punch. That is the problem of defense, and it obviously has many aspects.

But before the strategic problem confronting the United States can even be posed, Americans must examine and dismiss some of the errors and half-truths that color our military thinking. There can be no understanding of the military problem unless we rid our minds of some of the shibboleths that cluster around it. The following pages are an attempt to clear away certain of the fallacies which encumber discussions of military problems in the United States, and to suggest some of the lessons which may justifiably be drawn from recent military history. Though so restricted an analysis will not provide answers to the American strategical problem, it may help make the nature of that problem clear.[1]

The first fallacy:

As a people we are prone to wishful thinking, and lack the long view of history. The fallacy that underlies so much of our over-optimism, and hence our moods of disillusion, is the assumption that we can get peace overnight and cheaply—by declaring ourselves in favor of it. But unfortunately there is no evidence in history (or in the behavior of men today) for the belief that the millennium is just around the corner. Permanent peace—a world without war—has been the goal of generations; it is "a consummation devoutly to be wished." But there seems no likelihood that war will be abolished in our generation, or, indeed, for many generations to come. Peace is a process of education, and man learns slowly. Each succeeding generation, it seems, must relearn some of the bitter lessons of the past. There is progress. The United Nations—weak though it may be—is stronger than was the League of Nations. There is no reason for absolute despair. The scope of modern war and the horror of its instruments of devastation are, in themselves, a check upon its inception. Yet no nation is ready to build its policy upon that foundation alone.

The second fallacy:

The assertion that "We were unprepared" has been applied, with almost monotonous repetition, to the state of American armed forces before World War I, before World War II, in fact before all our wars. But the statement is sophistry. For what were we unprepared? Preparedness is relative, not absolute; there are degrees of preparedness. Before the Second World War this Nation had a navy equal to any and the best long-range bomber in the world; the National Guard had been federalized, conscription had started, and the factories of the country already had commenced the manufacture of war orders. Nevertheless, we were of course, "unprepared" for the war that developed. We shall always be similarly unprepared; for there is no such thing as absolute preparedness and it is futile to strive for it. Germany, for instance, was prepared for the Polish campaign, but not for the war she got. Not even totalitarian states—much less democracies—can indulge in the luxury of absolute preparedness in time of peace. Complete preparedness is a will o'the wisp; it has led any country which attempted to achieve it to destruction.

The third fallacy:

The beguiling belief that "A strong army and navy will prevent war" is the twin of the "unpreparedness" argument. The assertion that armaments mean security is denied by all history. There is no such thing as security from war. The greatest armaments—those of Sparta, Persia, Macedonia, Rome, Carthage, France, Germany, Japan, Russia—have never brought either inviolability against attack or certainty of victory. The greater the armaments, the greater the temptation to embark upon an imperialistic war and to strive for "absolute" preparedness—which is likely to mean casting the rest of the world in the role of potential enemies. Merely because there is no safety in flabby weakness does not make it necessary to fly to the opposite extreme and seek safety in excessive armaments. Excessive

[1] This article is adapted from the introductory chapter of the author's book, entitled "The Price of Power," scheduled for publication in the spring by Harper & Bros. for the Council on Foreign Relations.

military weakness can invite attack; excessive military strength can precipitate war. There is a happy mean in armaments as in politics.

The fourth fallacy:

This, the fallacy that disarmament means insecurity,[2] is the corollary of the foregoing. It stems from a distorted view of the history of the 1920's, a view always popular to chauvinistic opinion which has found wide acceptance during the present postwar crisis. In this view, the gallant and idealistic United States was the dupe of clever international politicians, and was hornswoggled out of its rightful power at the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921. The Washington Conference, in fact, halted a rapidly growing naval race between the United States and Britain, and formalized for the United States a position of naval parity with Britain—an inestimable gain, for it provided a foundation for the subsequent naval partnership between the two countries. The Washington conference did, however, give Japan virtual strategic hegemony over the western Pacific, though our error in this regard was more political than military. It was compounded by our failure to enter the League of Nations, which so disastrously cramped the effectiveness of that organization and nullified the political, psychological, and military results achieved by the armaments limitations conferences.

The limitation of armaments does not, of course, mean insecurity—unless a great power indulges in disarmament unilaterally, which we have never done. Limitation of armaments will not end war, for armaments are not the primary cause of war, but rather surface evidence of a deeper infection in the body politic, international or national. But excessive armaments, particularly races in armaments, do add to the multiple frictions which bring on war, and though arms limitation will not abolish war, it does tend to limit its frequency and scope—which is no minor goal.

The fifth fallacy:

This is the fallacy that "The United States will be the first area to be attacked in any future war." This glib assertion—which is another half-truth—has had popular acceptance now for a quarter of a century, though it has not yet been proved valid. Postwar military prophets after World War I warned that the next war would bring the weight of enemy attack first upon American soil. They were wrong. Unless United States diplomacy becomes utterly bankrupt they may well be entirely wrong again, for the basis of our whole past strategy has been, of course, to fight our wars overseas. And the object of our diplomacy (as applied to strategy) has been to ensure that there would be bases overseas for the United States, whence our military power could be applied to the enemy, and to gain allies so that we would not fight the war alone. The technological revolution in weapons and the great range of the plane and the missile which will make transoceanic attack feasible enhance the possibility that a future world war will begin with an attack upon American cities. But though our cities may be among the first places to be attacked in any future war, no potential enemy could possibly afford to neglect the danger spots nearer his own borders from which we might launch attacks against him. So long as the United States possesses allies and bases overseas, the objective of any enemy must be neutralization or conquest of those positions. A concurrent attack upon the continental United States would be, of course, possible, but our own advantage would be considerable so long as we possessed positions overseas and the enemy did not.

The sixth fallacy:

This is the fallacy that invasion of the United States is now possible. Neither now nor in the foreseeable future is the large-scale physical invasion of the continental United States by troops probable. Today it is virtually impossible. Invading forces can come to the United States only by sea or air, and distance and geography—though foreshortened in the air age—still have strategical and, above all, logistical meaning. Only at the Bering Strait, where Alaska abuts closely to the land-mass of Eurasia, are the distances separating us from potential enemies small enough to permit the large-scale transport of armies by air. And even in Alaska and the contiguous coast of Asia, communications are so difficult and climate so severe that large-scale airborne operations would be exceedingly hazardous. So long as we control the sea and the air no large-scale physical invasion, like the Normandy invasion or the other amphibious and airborne operations made famous during the last war, are possible. Small-scale airborne operations—involving the transportation of regiments or even a division of men—might be accomplished, though without air superiority they would be very difficult.

The history of airborne operations attests to their complexity, and the ocean distances that still separate us from potential enemies make any large-scale invasion through the air impossible in the immediate future, whether or not the enemy enjoys air superiority. In the more distant future they will be exceedingly difficult, though not impossible. The danger of invasion of our shores by large bodies of armed men is not a major problem of this Nation. Yet such are the range, flexibility, and speed of modern weapons that invasion by troops may not be necessary to future conquest. In the century of the atomic bomb, supersonic missiles, long-range jet planes, and high-speed submarines, the strategic problem for the United States is not defense against invasion, but protection against assault.

Set in this frame and stripped of some trappings of myth and half-truth, the dimensions of the United States strategic problem in the atomic age come into clearer perspective. Yet that problem cannot be stated even in general terms until we have first considered some of the broad lessons taught us—with blood and mourning, tears and sweat and misery—in World War II.

The war did not develop new principles. For the principles of war—that is, the broad "rules" of the art of fighting—are immutable; "their interpretation and application will vary greatly, but their substance is the same."[3] Hannibal annihilated the legions of Rome in the perfect battle at Cannae in 216 B. C. Eisenhower, using precisely the same tactic of the double envelopment, crushed the last cohesive German armies of the west in the Battle of the Ruhr in 1945. Many air enthusiasts, bred on the doctrines of Douhet, Mitchell, and Seversky, have claimed that strategic bombardment or air attack upon cities, civilian populations, and factories introduces a new principle of war in that it focuses military effort upon the civilian rather than the military populations of the warring nations. But pressure behind the military lines has been an old tactic of warfare since the days when Attila the Hun and Genghis Khan ravaged, burned, and looted Europe. The naval blockade is an indirect form of such pressure; the siege and sack of walled cities in the Middle Ages, Sherman's march through Georgia, and Sheridan's devastation of the Shenandoah Valley are all examples of precisely the same tactic that the air age has adopted—the application of military power to civilian and behind-the-line installations. The instruments have changed, and the plane and the atomic bomb have extended the potential area of devastation of the scourged and ravaged earth to the infinite; but the principle of ruthlessness is still the same.

Despite the universality of military principles, it is well to recall that war still is and always has been an art, not a science. It includes, adumbrates, and transcends all sciences. Yet military operations are not scientific. They cannot be marshalled in the exact phalanx of equations, particularly in this era of total war, when they include not merely the clash of armed men but the activity of the entire population of the belligerents. The inexact and the intangible are as much a part of modern war as the finite. It is necessary to emphasize this at a time of technological revolution in warfare, lest we tend to think of future war solely in impersonal, "push-button" terms. Science and the armed forces must, of course, be closely harnessed, but war remains an unscientific occupation. Like genius, it represents an infinite capacity for taking pains; yet the art of taking pains can lead to its own confusion. The Germanic cult of precision and the propensity of the Prussians for trying to give detailed, practical application to vast and cloudy generalities (viz, some of the mumbo-jumbo produced in the name geopolitics) have not been without influence in the United States.

With such reservations, we may list a few of the major strategical lessons of World War II.

First, victory in modern war is no longer won by the big battalions but by the big factories. This has been increasingly true since the industrial revolution; Forrest's "To git thar fustest with the mostest" now must be amended "To git thar fustest with the mostest fire power." The Russian front in the last war would seem to refute this lesson, and it is true that massed manpower still can be a factor in military strength. But the Russians used masses of men not through choice but because of necessity. Men in great numbers substituted for machines and fire power, in which the Russians were relatively weak. Even so, the masses of men used on the Russian front were probably less dense in proportion to the extent of that front than the numbers used in the west, and the Russian quantitative superiority in manpower could never have overcome the armaments without the powerful intervention—primarily with fire power—of the western allies. The mass army (with manpower as the yardstick of strength) has declined steadily in importance, and the technological revolution in weapons of the last few years has accelerated the trend.

Our victory in World War II was primarily and fundamentally an industrial victory, a victory in which the factories of America supplied not only our own armies but the forces of our allies. The United States was, irrefutably, the "arsenal of democracy"; the statistics of our industrial effort are Gargantuan, unprecedented. It used to be said, for instance, that a nation must fight a war with the navy it possessed at the outbreak, so complex and so difficult is the construction of men-of-war. Yet we produced during World War II fleets that completely dwarfed our prewar Navy; the naval and mercantile ships that went down our ways easily exceeded the combined tonnage of all the fleets of the world. Our factories produced by far the greatest air force in history and gave us an army more thoroughly equipped than any

[2] The popular word disarmament is of course loosely and incorrectly applied. Real disarmament never has been considered seriously at any of the so-called disarmament conferences and never has been practiced by any major nation, except when imposed by victor upon vanquished. Disarmament belongs to the millennium; but limitation of armaments is a practical possibility of today.

[3] Wallace Goforth, in an address to l'Institut Militaire de Quebec, June 1947.

that had ever gone forth to battle. And we shipped to our allies, over thousands of miles of sea, the equivalent in dollar value of enough military equipment to outfit completely 2,000 infantry divisions—more divisions, by far, than there were in all the world. In short, the big factories of America won the Second World War.

Incidental to the growing importance of industrial strength which made massed machines rather than massed manpower the determinant of victory, was the decline in importance of generalship (though not of leadership). Generals and admirals (though particularly generals) became—at least in the highest ranks—general managers rather than tacticians and strategists. Particularly in the early days of the war, before the industrial output of war matériel had risen to such unprecedented peaks, there was still a premium on skill in maneuver and on a nice sense of terrain and timing. Rommel, who did much with little, exemplified this dying art of generalship perhaps better than any other individual of World War II. But for the most part, the higher ranking generals had to be a combination of politician, personnel director, inventory clerk, and general manager. Once the big factories of America had outstripped the factories of the Axis, the Allies could scarcely have lost the war no matter what mistakes in generalship were made. After 1943, there was no single American general or admiral of whom it might be said—as it was said of Jellicoe at Jutland—that he could "lose the war in an afternoon." Industrial strength is a major factor in military power and a major measure of national power in the modern world.

Second, the continental United States is not only arsenal and supply base, but is now the main operating base for our armed forces. This development will be speeded as the range of weapons increases. During the war our entire global strategy was directed from Washington; headquarters was not on horseback, as in Napoleon's or Lee's day, or in the field at all. Our B–29 Superfortresses were directed strategically and sometimes even tactically from Washington. The Navy's floating-base system, which uses supply ships, floating machine ships, barracks ships, etc., to support the combatant ships, was prepared and provisioned and supplied in the continental United States. More and more as the war progressed, not only supplies but operations tended to stem outward from the United States to the foci of fighting. As transoceanic, transpolar, and ultimately around-the-world ranges are achieved, the continental United States will become more and more completely the main operating base of our armed forces as well as their manufacturing and supply base.

Third, the offense has so far outstripped the defence that our strategic concepts have been altered fundamentally. This superiority of offense over defense, which reversed the trend of World War I, when the machine gun and trench-system locked the fighting fronts in bloody stalemate, became apparent almost as soon as World War II commenced. The basic theory of blitzkrieg is movement. The Germans maintained their mobility (which neither Allies nor Germans had been able to do a quarter century before) by coupling fire power to the plane-tank spearhead. As the war developed, and the bomber came into its frightful heritage, the offense gained even greater ascendancy. By skillful choice of terrain, prodigious feats of fortification, and very careful use of maneuver and counterattack, a nation fighting a defensive war might hope—for a time—to ward off its enemy's ground attacks, but there was little hope of averting bombing assaults. At one time during the war the ascendancy of the offensive seemed to be checked by the development of the antitank gun, radar, and other equipment, but it became more and more pronounced in the closing years with the introduction of the robot V–1 flying bomb, the supersonic V–2, the submarine with schnorchel and high underwater speed, and the atomic bomb.

These last weapons heralded the technological revolution through which we are passing, and foreshadow the nature of the next war. The evolution thus scarcely begun has developed with considerable rapidity. Weapons will, in the next three decades, approach the ultimate in range, power, and speed. Clearly forecast on the world's proving grounds and in its laboratories are supersonic transoceanic missiles; high-speed submersibles with rocket-firing facilities (the first true submersibles in history, able to cross the oceans under water); biological poisons; radioactive dusts; gases far more toxic than the German Tabun wartime series (which outmoded all previously known war gases); and more atomic bombs. These and other frightful agents of destruction have conferred upon the offense a great and growing lead over the defense. The coming long-range missiles have in particular altered all American strategical concepts.

The United States is now more vulnerable to assault than ever before. For the first time in history we have live frontiers—frontiers of the air through which missiles may move across the pole or across the seas at supersonic speeds, frontiers of the underseas, whence modern and unseen leviathans may launch devastating attack upon our coasts. These live frontiers, and the increasing lead of the offense, seem to make the problem of American defense hopeless of solution, if the word defense is used in its old, narrow sense. The best and only defense against atomic bombs, long-range, globe-girdling planes, intercontinental missiles and induced plagues would appear to be a strong offense—the threat of worse blows against the enemy homeland than any the enemy can deliver against us. This means reorientation of our traditional American military policy to an offensive concept and the maintenance of a completely equipped mobile force ready for instant action.

Fourth, modern war is total far beyond the imagination of even those who coined the phrase. The totality of effort of the United States and of all other major nations that participated in the Second World War far exceeded national efforts in any preceding wars. The trend has been inevitable since the advent of the industrial revolution. The growing importance of the factories put a wartime premium upon the men behind the lines. Then the plane made possible the attaque brusquée upon homes, factories, and civilian morale, and made the civilian a part of the war machine. Missiles and atomic bombs accelerate these trends. In the next war, labor as well as fighting power will probably be drafted; every phase of national effort that does not contribute to victory will probably be eliminated. Total war means total effort, and the preparations for it must be as far-reaching as the execution of the blueprint. Consequently, the effects of total war transcend the period of hostilities; they wrench and distort and twist the body politic and the body economic not only after a war (as we are now seeing) but they necessitate peacetime measures of preparation which also affect the entire state.

These "lessons," tentative and subject to perennial reexamination though they may be, delimit and define the nature of the modern American strategical problem. The frame of experience in which the American strategic problem in the atomic age is set compels us to confront the greatest and most puzzling paradox in our military or political history. It can be best stated in the form of three statements and ancillary questions:

1. We have seen that the continental United States is now not only the manufacturing arsenal and supply base of any American military effort, but is also the main operating base of our armed forces. Because of this triple importance—especially because of the value of mass industry to war effort—it is more important than ever before in history to protect the continental United States against assault. Yet we have also seen that, because of the technological revolution and the ascendancy of the offensive, the United States is now more vulnerable than ever before in history. How, then, do we defend the continental United States?

2. Offense today is by far the best defense. But how can we develop in peacetime, in a peace-loving, nonimperialist democracy, an offensive force of suitable type, ready for instant action?

3. The atomic bomb and the age of total war make mandatory an increase in military efficiency. This logically means a redirection of all phases of national life toward military strength and the extension of the influence of the military into all phases of life. Yet, how can we thus increase military efficiency without weakening our democracy? How can we prepare for total war without becoming a garrison state and destroying the very qualities and virtues and principles we originally aimed to save?

This is the paradox, this is the problem we must now set out to solve.

Good News for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1948:

GOOD NEWS ON CHINA

The House Foreign Affairs Committee deserves praise for the excellent judgment it has shown in drawing plans for aid to the Chinese. While there is no real change in policy involved in the proposal for $150,000,000 in direct military aid, the proposal for $420,000,000 in economic aid includes a provision that has great possibilities. This provision would enable the Secretary of State to use from 5 to 10 percent of the $420,000,000 for a rural reconstruction and rehabilitation program, provided that he can make an agreement with the Chinese Government to have this program directed by an independent commission, composed of three Chinese and two Americans.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee recognized that the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek must win popular support in rural areas before it can have any hope of defeating the Reds. The members of the committee were able to see the heart of the Chinese problem despite all that has happened to obscure it. They acted accordingly. Their essential idea is thoroughly sound. The detailed suggestion they made can be improved if there is enough opportunity for further study of what they suggest. One improvement would be to increase the amount offered to aid China's peasants. Another—perhaps an essential one—would be to provide that the sum given could be used for no other purpose than rural recon-

struction and rehabilitation. This would make it difficult for reactionaries in Nanking to try to divert the entire $420,000,000 to projects that have nothing to do with the welfare of the Chinese people.

The essential point, however, is that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has drawn a plan for China that includes a proposal in line with the European recovery program, instead of being contradictory to that program. The committee, in essence, suggests that efforts to kill Communists are not enough in China. Its members want to meet the Chinese problems as this newspaper has urged for years, by offering the Chinese a superior alternative to communism, one which will mobilize public opinion for a real fight against the danger. In addition—and this is most cheering—the committee members have a specific plan to carry out what they propose.

Voice of America Broadcasts Are Penetrating Russia's Iron Curtain—"Earwitness" Report Demonstrates Effectiveness of State Department's Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I desire to call to the attention of the country and the Congress a letter recently written by Rabbie Karl Richter, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for the letters column of the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader. It provides dramatic evidence of the fact that the so-called Voice of America broadcasts of the United States Information Service abroad are being heard behind the iron curtain. It indicates clearly that this Congress should appropriate more rather than less money for this important program if we are to win this cold war without letting it degenerate into a hot war of shooting and killing. It is an unsolicited pat on the back for this new Government information service. It should be studied carefully by those who have let themselves be misled into believing that there are no radio receiving sets in Europe and that it is impossible for anybody behind the iron curtain to know what is being broadcast by the Voice of America.

VOICE OF AMERICA WIDELY DISCUSSED IN EUROPE

To the EDITOR OF THE ARGUS-LEADER:

I have recently come across an article written by the well-known reporter, Hans Habe, in the Palestinian newspaper, Jedioth Chadaschoth. This article contains an eyewitness account of the effect which the broadcasts of the Voice of America have upon the people living behind the iron curtain in eastern Europe. Since Hans Habe has a good reputation for accurate reporting, I thought that your readers might be interested in some of his observations. Habe tells that he conducted a poll in different countries to find out more about the number of people who listen regularly to the Voice of America. The result exceeded all his expectations and would, as he says, undoubtedly surprise the Members of Congress who are not too keen about appropriating sufficient funds for this broadcasting program.

Although it is impossible to determine the exact number of listeners, insiders estimate it as being at least as high as the number of people who secretly listened to the British Broadcasting Co. during the war. There is no broadcast of the Voice of America which is not being discussed in the coffee houses and restaurants of Budapest, Bucharest, Sofia, and Warsaw within 24 hours. Wherever American newspapers are permitted, they have to be purchased on the black market a few hours after publication. Although in the countries of eastern Europe relatively few people know English, we find that the Parisian edition of the New York Herald Tribune has up to 1,500 subscribers in some cities. In a prominent coffee house in Prague, American newspapers had to be returned personally to the headwaiter, because otherwise, they would all have been stolen in a very short time.

Pro-American demonstrations are not unusual. When recently the ambassadors of the four big powers were invited to a harvest festival in the famous wine-growing district of Tokay, Hungary, the assembled populace brought an ovation of 10 minutes to the American representative, which embarrassed the spnosors of the affair greatly. In a movie house at Bucharest, Rumania, the lights had to be turned on when an audience did not stop applauding a picture of General Marshall which had appeared on the screen. At the University of Sofia, Bulgaria, such a large number of students tried to enroll in a course on American literature that the authorities tried to discover a political demonstration in this unusual literary enthusiasm.

All these reports seem to indicate that the United States still has a great "reservoir of good will," to use the famous expression of the late Wendell Willkie, in the countries beyond the iron curtain. Propaganda is a strong weapon which should be used wisely and effectively by our political leaders.

RABBI KARL RICHTER.

SIOUX FALLS.

Who Advises the Advisers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the magazine Newsweek of March 1, 1948, by Mr. Henry Hazlitt entitled "Who Advises the Advisers?" Mr. Hazlitt is recognized as one of the foremost and one of the soundest economists in the United States.

The editorial follows:

WHO ADVISES THE ADVISERS?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In this column of January 12, concerning the one hundredth anniversary of the Communist Manifesto, incidental attention was called to the striking similarity between the theory in that document that capital accumulation, the use of machinery, increases "the burden of labor" and "forces wages down almost everywhere," and this sentence from the second annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers: "The accumulations of capital over the years have in fact involved deprivations of the rank-and-file worker."

It ought not to be necessary at this late day to point out why this Marxist doctrine is nonsensical. It is not the worker, but the capitalist, who is deprived of that much current consumption when the latter puts aside savings to invest them. And the effect of this investment, as illustrated above all in America, has been enormously to increase the quantity and improve the quality of the tools at the disposal of the worker, enormously to increase his productivity, and hence enormously to increase his wages and the goods available for all of us as consumers.

The real question we have to ask ourselves is how such an unadulterated Marxist doctrine got into the report of the Economic Advisers. This was no accidental sentence. It was part of a report which reveals throughout an underlying distrust of precisely that "free competitive enterprise" system which the council was specifically created by law to "foster and promote."

Neither is the slurring reference in the report to "the so-called free market" accidental. Neither is the doctrine—also Marxist in origin—that the "cream" of American industrial production has "in large measure gone to the relatively few"; that the rest have been "subsisting on skim milk"; that the small number of the well-to-do will not be able to absorb the possible output of consumers' goods; nor can they go on indefinitely accumulating ownership of the surplus above their consumption needs and investing it in ever-enlarging plant for future expansion of goods for some restricted part of the population." This is blandly written in an official document in the United States of 1948 which has achieved the greatest mass market in human history for food, clothing, automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and a thousand luxuries and refinements that a king could not have dreamed of owning a century ago.

This annual report of the economic advisers must be read in connection with the recent Economic Report of the President, which under the law the advisers "assist and advise" him in preparing. In neither is there any serious grappling with the central economic problem that now confronts the country—inflation. The word, of course, appears often enough. But nowhere is there any frank admission that the dominant cause of inflation has been the tripling of the Nation's money supply—its currency and bank credit—since the outbreak of the war. The references to inflation are self-contradictory. "The nature of the inflation from which we are suffering," says the President at one point, "arises in part from the total excess of buying power over the available supply of goods." But a few pages farther on he demands "enough buying power to absorb the output," and declares: "For balanced expansion, our economy requires a larger flow of income to consumers." In other words, more inflation.

Throughout both reports the blame for almost everything that has gone wrong or could go wrong is by implication put on the American businessman. "I strongly urged businessmen," writes Mr. Truman, "to bring prices into line. * * * Business should reduce prices wherever possible." And so on. Yet he does not complain that farm prices are too high, though the official statistics show that farm prices had risen in the week his report was issued 208 percent above 1939, whereas manufactured products were up only 96 percent.

The Council of Economic Advisers has dissipated whatever reputation for detachment or objectivity it may once have enjoyed. It now apparently regards its function as no better than that of providing, at the taxpayers' expense, a "scientific" veneer for Candidate Truman's campaign arguments.

Honor to Private Munemori

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the week, the Army paid proper honor to one of America's heroic war dead when the USAT Wilson Victory was renamed the USAT Sadao Munemori. Today, the New York Herald Tribune in commenting on this official action pointed out the travesty upon America's sense of justice, that the mother of the winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor is unable to become a citizen of the United States under present law.

H. R. 5004, which I introduced earlier in this session will correct this condition, within the express intent of the national origins quota provisions of the 1924 Immigration Act. Under the provisions of this bill, immigration from the Far East will be limited to only a few hundred a year more than are now allowed, surely a small price to pay for the removal of a long-standing inequity and the increased good will which will result. The Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee expects to hold hearings soon on this bill.

H. R. 5004 will bring long-overdue justice to men and women who have long lived honorably among us, and can make a substantial contribution to the building of support for American policy in the Far East. It is high time we eliminated from our immigration and naturalization laws those elements which fatten Communist propaganda and weaken American leadership of world democracy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday, March 19, 1948.

HONOR TO PRIVATE MUNEMORI

The Army has honored the memory of a war hero by changing the name of the transport *Wilson Victory* to *Private Sadao S. Munemori*. This honor to a soldier of enemy ancestry killed in action with the 442d Regimental Combat team in Italy is a logical sequel to the earlier posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor. A plaque presented Tuesday to the master of the Army transport which now bears his name describes the circumstances of the award. Command of a squad pinned down by enemy fire having devolved upon him, he made several one-man frontal attacks, knocking out two machine guns with hand grenades. As he withdrew, a grenade bounced off his helmet, rolled toward a crater sheltering his men. He arose into the withering fire, dived for the missile and smothered its blast with his own body. By his swift, supremely heroic action, Private Munemori saved two of his men at the cost of his own life and did much to clear the path for his company's victorious advance.

Reading this account, Americans applaud the honors tendered him. But there is still one matter to be cleared before the country will have discharged its full obligation. His mother is not now, nor can she become under current laws, an American citizen. Special congressional action to permit her naturalization would be the fitting final testimony to an American family whose loyalty has met the supreme test.

The record of Private Munemori suggests also that it is time the United States went the full way to allow quota immigration from all countries alike. In 1946 annual quota admission to 100 Filipinos and 100 natives of India was granted; the year before similar recognition was given the Chinese. An invidious ban now applies to only a few Asiastic peoples. Congressman WALTER H. JUDD has introduced a measure to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples and to afford the privilege of becoming naturalized citizens to all immigrants having a right to permanent residence. A quota of 100 should not frighten even west-coast patriots. The bill should be enacted as a measure of even justice.

Unions and Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, when the Taft-Hartley bill was before the House there were some of us who realized that section 304 was unconstitutional.

The following is an editorial from the Washington Post of March 17, 1948:

UNIONS AND ELECTIONS

If section 304 of the Taft-Hartley Act means what Judge Ben Moore of the Federal district court has interpreted it to mean, we have no doubt that his finding that it is unconstitutional will stand. The judge concluded that Congress has "prohibited absolutely all activities of any person or group at elections." Of course, he was referring to unions and their officials, but even so, his language was very sweeping. The chief question which the Supreme Court will have to decide, on appeal, is whether Judge Ben Moore has accurately interpreted the statute.

What Congress did was to make it unlawful for corporations and labor unions "to make a contribution or expenditure" in connection with any national election. Since labor unions are composite entities, Judge Moore concluded, they can make no move which does not involve some expenditure. Consequently, they would be forbidden to do any act in connection with an election, and this he views as "an unconstitutional abridgment of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly."

This view is sharply at variance, however, with the meaning given to section 304 by Senator TAFT, coauthor of the bill which became the Taft-Hartley law. Instead of forbidding all union activity in connection with an election, Mr. TAFT said the measure would leave unions free to publish political newspapers if they were financed by subscriptions or contributions for that purpose and not by union dues. In other words, he thought the provision left the unions freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly, except that they could not spend for electioneering dues collected for collective-bargaining purposes. That view of the provision is further buttressed by the strong presumption that Congress had no intention of encroaching upon the Bill of Rights.

Apparently the Department of Justice was responsible in considerable measure for the view Judge Moore took of the law. According to the judge's opinion, the Government attorneys conceded that Congress had attempted to abridge the freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment and then tried to justify that encroachment as a legitimate exercise of Congress' power to control the manner of holding elections. To us this seems to argue against the constitutionality of section 304 rather than for it. We can scarcely conceive of the Department of Justice telling the court that an act of Congress curtails freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights and then asking the Court in all sincerity to uphold such an invasion.

Now that the case is going to the Supreme Court it is especially important that the crux of the issue be more cogently presented. For if it is unconstitutional to restrict the expenditure of corporate and union funds for political activity, a few strategically located corporation and union officials will exercise a powerful influence upon our choice of public officials.

Alaska Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Monopoly at Alaska's Throat" by Richard L. Neuberger which appeared in the March 13, 1948, issue of the Nation:

MONOPOLY AT ALASKA'S THROAT
(By Richard L. Neuberger)

SEATTLE, March 2.—Monopolies are now an announced target of the administration. One of the worst should be easy to hit in a fatal spot. This is the Alaskan shipping monopoly, which drains the Territory's pioneer economy by levying the highest ocean freight rates charged by any ships under the American flag. Of all monopolies it is the most vulnerable to administration attack because it operates under the approval and protection of the Federal Maritime Commission. Indeed, the Commission could end it tomorrow—and a majority on the Commission are President Truman's appointees. If the administration wants to do something about monopoly, the tight little monopoly which dominates Alaskan shipping to the detriment of Alaska is the place to begin.

Living costs in Alaska are from 38 to 116 percent higher than in the United States, according to the distance from Seattle. Freight rates are behind these sky-high inflationary prices. It costs $26 to ship a ton of fresh vegetables the 1,400 miles from Seattle to the Alaskan port of Cordova; the rate from San Juan to New York City, an equal distance, is $10.80.

The benefits from these exorbitant Alaskan rates are confined virtually to one Seattle family. In 1946 Congress authorized a lavish north Pacific shipping subsidy: Government vessels could be rented for $1 a year, with free hull insurance included. The Maritime Commission then decided that Gilbert W. Skinner was to be the principal beneficiary of this Federal largess. Three companies were chosen to receive the subsidy—Alaska Steamship Co., Northland Transportation Co., and Alaska Transportation Co., all based in Seattle. Skinner, Seattle's leading salmon broker, is president of Alaska Steam, and he and his son control two-thirds of Northland Transportation. Alaska Steam and Northland were to operate 21 boats, Alaska Transportation 4. Only Alaska Steam was authorized to call at the main Alaskan ports of Seward and Whittier, where all freight for the vast interior is discharged.

Many generations of Americans have dreamed of the development of Alaska. In the last speech he ever delivered standing on

his feet Franklin D. Roosevelt, from the bridge of a destroyer, prophesied the opening of a "new land of opportunity in the north." Instead, Alaska has been garroted in a collar of high freight rates fitted by this one-family shipping monopoly—a monopoly established with the connivance of the United States Government.

Only Alaska Steam can put in at Kodiak Island. Residents of Kodiak pay $27 a ton to get washing machines, radios, and fresh meat transported from Seattle, though Mr. Skinner's friends in the salmon industry can send their product to Seattle for only $12. "High transportation rates are responsible, more than any other one factor," declares George Sundborg, manager of the Alaskan Development Board, "for the economic backwardness of Alaska and for a cost-of-living level so high as to discourage settlement and make colonization impossible."

A 33-year-old veteran of Grenfell's Labrador expeditions named Phil Briggs thought he had the answer. He would take cargo out of the British Columbia seaport of Prince Rupert, 700 miles north of Seattle. During the war, when Japanese troops crouched in the Aleutians, the American Army developed Prince Rupert as its chief Alaskan supply base. Briggs would haul an automobile from Prince Rupert to Petersburg for approximately half the toll from Seattle.

Clearly this was a threat to Skinner's supremacy in Alaskan waters, and the Maritime Commission sprang to his aid. Although Congress had made the north Pacific subsidy available to any American-flag line, and Briggs was operating under the Stars and Stripes, the Maritime Commission barely acknowledged his letter requesting participation in the subsidy. This meant that Briggs would have to buy his own boats and carry his own hull insurance—and compete against companies getting both items out of the United States Treasury.

Canadian vessels operating out of Prince Rupert might crack the Skinner monopoly except for one fact. A clause in the Maritime Act denies Alaskans the right to use Canadian ships for freight or passenger service between Prince Rupert and Alaska. Since American ports on the Great Lakes and the Atlantic are free to use Canadian shipping, this is direct discrimination against Alaska, and Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, and Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska, have introduced legislation to end it. The Maritime Commission has advised against passage of the Butler-Bartlett bill. This advice was done up in the familiar patriotic wrappings: The American merchant marine must not be imperiled. Although Canadian boats seem to constitute a threat to American interests, the Maritime Commission says nothing about Gilbert W. Skinner's operation of the yacht *Corsair* under the flag of Panama as a luxury cruise vessel.

The United States Supreme Court has ruled that if Alaska were a State, the law denying its people the use of Canadian ships would be unconstitutional. Only a Territory may be thus discriminated against. This may explain why Seattle business interests favor statehood for Hawaii but not for Alaska.

With the collaboration of the Maritime Commission, Skinner and his associates juggle rates to fit their own convenience. Not long ago Alaska Steam reduced by 75 percent the freight on insulating cork. The Alaska Development Board contends this was done primarily because Skinner and his partners are constructing a cold-storage plant on the Alaskan Peninsula. On the same day that it lowered the rate on cork, Alaska Steam hoisted the freight on flour to Fairbanks from $2.33 a hundredweight to $3.81. Fairbanks housewives, when they buy bread, are subsidizing Skinner's cold-storage plant.

During the war Alaskans noted that the many congressional committees which visited the Territory, if they came by sea, almost invariably traveled on Canadian boats because they furnished better service, food, and accommodations than the American boats. Congress and the Maritime Commission have teamed up to deny these amenities to the people of Alaska. "Federal law keeps out Canadian competition," says Gov. Ernest Gruening. "By restricting the subsidy, the Maritime Commission keeps out United States competition. Alaska is left to the mercy of the Seattle companies, which really means Gilbert W. Skinner and his enterprises."

American voters should know how an agency of their Government helps to keep Alaska a wilderness. A cannery at Kodiak pays $10 a ton in freight tolls on wire to repair its salmon traps. A homesteader on the same island pays $17 freight on a ton of wire to string a fence. The average Alaskan family must spend approximately $450 a year in ocean freight on its food alone.

A group of ex-GI's hopefully founded a cooperative colony at Chilkoot Barracks, Alaska's oldest military post. They were acclaimed in many periodicals as twentieth-century pioneers. They planned to establish a shipping service between Juneau, the Alaskan capital, and Haines, a port leading to the famous Alcan Highway. Today the colony is falling apart. Its 30-year-old founder, Steve Larsson Homer, is night clerk in a dingy hotel in Portland, Oreg. "We had a natural transportation route to the Alaskan interior," he said. "But the lumber companies wouldn't give us a contract to transport their products. They said they were afraid Alaska Steam would learn of it and refuse to serve them. They said they were at the mercy of Alaska Steam."

Alaska Steam fares well with the generous Federal subsidy. During a 4-month period its revenue was $5,400,000 and its operating expenses $3,700,000. As long as the Maritime Commission refuses to honor subsidy requests from American companies based at Portland or Prince Rupert, Seattle steamship corporations can deal with Alaska as cavalierly as they wish. Rates are hiked summarily; boat schedules altered overnight.

In 1946 a strike of A. F. of L. checkers shut down the port of Seattle for more than 70 days. Alaskan hospitals ran out of drugs and had no fuel oil on days when it was 50 degrees below zero. Alaskan children had no Christmas toys. The Maritime Commission was quick to hoist antilabor pennants, forgetting that it was responsible for the lack of alternative shipping routes through Portland and Prince Rupert.

Many devices are employed to keep Alaska in the grip of one of the tightest existing monopolies. Statehood would give Alaska two Senators acting in Alaska's interests. Recently a "prominent Alaskan," heading the "Alaska" delegation to a Pacific Northwest Chamber of Commerce conference on Alaskan problems, said the people of the Territory did not really want statehood—in spite of a decisive referendum favoring statehood more than a year ago. The "prominent Alaskan" turned out to be a resident of a fashionable Seattle suburb.

To break the grip of the shipping monopoly on Alaska, only two steps are required: (1) Make Canadian ships available for the Alaskan trade; and (2) extend the Federal subsidy to companies operating out of Portland and Prince Rupert. The Maritime Commission can recommend the first step to Congress. It can undertake the second step itself. It can also give permission to some operator besides Gilbert W. Skinner to serve the ports on the Gulf of Alaska. So long as the Commission supports the shipping oligarchy to which it has delivered over the people of Alaska, it is hard to take at face value the many strictures against monopoly contained in the President's message on the state of the Union.

Let New Americans Write Neighbors in Native Lands Truth About Life Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, constant prayer and the expenditure of 15 cents, the cost of an airmail stamp, may save the world from the chaos and despair of another armed conflict. There are so many millions of first or second generation Americans in this country with close ties of family and friendship overseas that if they would each assume the responsibility of writing one letter abroad, it would represent a tide difficult for an aggressor to overcome. They know, as perhaps those who have been here longer do not equally appreciate, the incomparable blessings of our form of government and our economic system.

At the moment this is, of course, most pressing in Italy, where the crucial character of the April 18 elections cannot be overemphasized.

Dr. John R. Williams, an eminent physician of Rochester, N. Y., has suggested concerted effort along these lines. His plan has been printed in the Rochester, N. Y., Democrat and Chronicle, together with a timely editorial endorsing this idea, both of which, under leave to extend my remarks, are set forth below, together with a table showing the population of eastern European countries and the number of immigrants from these countries now living in the United States. This last number would be greatly swelled, of course, by adding those who were born in this country of parents who came here from overseas.

LET NEW AMERICANS WRITE NEIGHBORS IN NATIVE LANDS TRUTH ABOUT LIFE HERE

(A suggestion by Dr. John R. Williams)

At the present moment the people of the whole world are profoundly agitated by the alarming stories which pass across national boundaries from one people to another. Much of this purposeful propaganda is offset by counter propaganda which leads only to doubt, confusion, and destruction.

In those countries where there is neither freedom of assembly nor of the press, truth is not likely to prevail. The continuance in power of any government is dependent upon popular support. Dictatorships succumb when populations revolt. Accordingly, the tremendous power of controlled propaganda is nowhere more fully realized than in those countries which invoke strict censorship over world news.

The radio has served to a limited degree as an offset, but organized, centralized propaganda of any sort is so open to suspicion that its value may well be questioned. It is conceivable that an individual and more intimate approach to the dissemination of truthful news would be more effective.

The population of the 11 European countries which have now come under Russian domination is in excess of 96 millions. If to this be added those of Greece and Italy, numbering more than 53 millions, it will be evident that Russia has achieved or is gaining a formidable domination over the lives of more than 150,000,000 people.

The propriety or the wisdom of Russia's action is not under discussion. Our concern is that they know the truth about the United States.

The vital question is, Do the peoples of these countries understand the implications of what has transpired? Are they really familiar with the objectives of the United Nations? The United States more than any other country in the world is a polyglot nation. Blended into American citizenship are large representations from these dominated countries.

These people come here of their own volition and are as free to return to their native lands. Upon them are placed no restraints of travel, assembly, speech or employment. Their conduct and security are regulated by the same laws which govern all other American citizens. They soon form their own ideas about the worth of the American way of life.

The great majority of them have friends and relatives in their homelands with whom they keep a personal contact. The large volume of mail, money orders and packages of food and clothing which daily leave the Rochester post office attests this fact.

The vast number of people in the United States similarly concerned can scarcely be appreciated. There are now resident in this country upwards of 4,000,000 native-born from these 13 eastern European countries and probably three times that number were the second generation to be included. Certainly there are not less than 10,000,000 people among us gravely concerned over the fate of their loved ones and their homelands.

If a substantial number of these foreign-born and their kin were to write letters to their people giving their impressions of America, of its social and political philosophy, its opportunities for education, self-help, and advancement it might prove to be an effective means of assuaging the fears engendered by the vicious rumors and false reports which, we have reason to believe, are now being circulated.

Conversely, it is possible that we in America are not getting a true picture of what is happening abroad, so divergent are the stories that reach us. Accordingly, our foreign friends should be encouraged to write us in return and in the same spirit of good will.

To promote peace and mutual understanding is the duty of everyone. In these trying days it is a moral obligation. If it were impressed upon our foreign-born friends that they could be powerful emissaries for peace and if they would wholeheartedly cooperate an overwhelming message of good will to the distracted nations of Europe would soon be launched.

It may yet fall to the common man to save civilization from moral and physical destruction.

PERTINENT, PRACTICAL

In another place in this paper today Dr. John R. Williams makes a pertinent and highly practical suggestion.

He urges that Americans from countries now overrun by totalitarian force or propaganda, or threatened with such overrunning, increase their personal letters to their former neighbors and relatives abroad.

The purpose of sending more letters would be to counteract the distorted view of American life that is being given these nations by totalitarian propagandists.

These new pioneers know from experience what life here is, and their personal letters would have an effect if they were increased in number.

The table with his article reveals the large number of these new pioneers. If each group made an effort to increase personal letters sent abroad the effect might be considerable.

Most of these nationalities are intensely loyal to the land that has given them new opportunities; most of them too have some form of social organization which keeps alive an interest in the customs of their native lands.

These organizations could help with the idea; or, conceivably, a national sponsoring committee of large membership, perhaps a million, could spread the word to the hundreds of thousands throughout the country.

Sounds like a good, practical idea. It could be as effective if it caught on as the Friendship Train, which began with just such a suggestion.

FROM MANY LANDS

Table showing population of countries of eastern Europe and number of immigrants from each now residing in the United States

[Data from 1940 census and 1947 World Almanac]

Country	Population	Immigrants
Finland	3,887,217	117,210
Poland	23,622,334	993,479
Esthonia	1,134,000	(?)
Latvia	1,950,000	18,636
Lithuania	2,879,000	165,771
Rumania	15,686,153	115,940
Bulgaria	6,549,664	8,888
Yugoslavia	16,200,000	161,093
Czechoslovakia	14,447,000	319,971
Hungary	9,106,252	290,228
Albania	1,003,124	(?)
Italy	45,800,000	1,623,580
Greece	7,788,000	163,252

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which I have received from the Casimir Pulaski Mutual Aid Society, in my district, urging the speedy enactment of legislation to permit a substantial number of displaced persons to come to the United States as immigrants:

Hon. AIME J. FORAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The United States of America today is in great need of farmers and domestic help. There is also a great shortage of homes which indicates clearly the lack of carpenters and builders. The type of immigrant who is able to perform these services was unable to come to these shores during the several years of the World War II.

In western Europe today there are thousands of people who are unable to return to their homelands. Some of them were German prisoners of war, some slave workers. A great many of these, the so-called displaced persons, were members of the Allied military forces, fighting on the side of the United States and Great Britain and, because of that, there is no room for them anywhere in Europe except in the German concentration camps or in Stalin's Siberia. And unless immediate assistance is given to these so-called displaced persons, most of them will find themselves in the forced labor battalions in Soviet Russia.

These displaced persons have implicit faith and trust in these United States as the only country to which they can turn with confidence, seeking aid and assistance—and the United States of America can give them a chance to earn their livelihood by increasing the immigration quotas for the various countries taken over by Russia.

These displaced persons may be placed on our farms, in our factories and forests where they could help to raise food and build homes needed so badly here. It is our deep conviction that the displaced persons are fully entitled to and deserve our assistance. Let us give them not only a most careful rationing of Christian charity but let us do it speedily. The freedom-loving people of the United States have always prided themselves on their willingness to provide homes for the persecuted people. It is evident that now the displaced persons and refugees no longer have any place to go.

Wherefore, we, the undersigned, urge you to work for a speedy passage of a law permitting a substantial number of displaced persons to come to these United States as immigrants.

We firmly believe that 1 year's delay will be most detrimental to the displaced persons.

Respectfully submitted.

CASIMIR PULASKI MUTUAL AID SOCIETY.
ALBERT J. KORZEN, *President.*
STEPHEN J. NOWAK, *Secretary.*
MARCH 1, 1948.

Republicans and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by my colleague from California, Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON, on Lincoln's Day in South Norwalk, Fairfield County, Conn.:

REPUBLICANS AND WORLD PEACE

Ladies and gentlemen, I am frankly interested in appearing before the people of this congressional district to discuss some of the public problems facing us on this Lincoln's day in 1948. For 4 years I sat beside Clare Luce in the Military Affairs Committee of the House. I admired her keen mind and her capacity for getting at the heart of a public problem. During the war we had many important questions submitted to our committee and I am glad to say that our decision of what to do practically always coincided. When Clare decided not to seek reelection, you sent us another fine Representative in JOHN DAVIS LODGE. He is one of the ablest in an unusually fine class of new Republicans who entered this Congress. The people of this district have good reason to be proud of the man they sent to us by their votes in the 1946 election. Mr. LODGE has the intellectual equipment and the discriminating judgment that characterizes Congressmen who are really statesmen.

I am one of those who believes that Congressmen are usually a reflection of their constituents. Consequently, I knew you must be good people to have sent two such excellent representatives to us as Mr. LODGE and Mrs. Luce, and therefore was pleased to accept the invitation to speak to the Republicans of Norwalk.

Consequently, you can readily understand that it is a pleasure for me to be with you tonight to celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the father of the Republican Party, and, with Washington, the greatest man our country has produced.

I come from the western fringe of our country. We have had a migration unparalleled in the history of the world. Since 1940 we have received about 3,000,000 people into California and they are still pouring in at the rate of 25,000 per month. We have had the problems of the Nation in our State and Gov. Earl Warren has handled the situation in a masterful manner.

I do not profess to know the answer to the stupendous problems facing the Nation. What I have to say to you tonight will not be any dogmatic comments on how to solve these vexing and grave questions that face us. My ambition is to be able to stimulate your minds to thinking about those fundamental issues that this generation must solve if the world is to be secure and our children and their children may not be destroyed. It may be that my experience and observations as a Member of Congress may give me a slightly better insight into the crisis we are facing. Perhaps I can suggest some course of action that our party can take that will not only help us win the next election but help stabilize the world and win the peace.

It is my theory that elections are won by giving the electors some great issue and our proposed solution of it in such manner as to appeal to their imagination and their inherent desire to have a part in the solution of great public questions. I have great faith in the combined judgment of the American people, providing they are given the facts and have the time for contemplation and study. This faith is bolstered by the record of our people in California in voting on initiative and referendum propositions. Not once have they made a bad decision in the initiative, although this method of legislation has been on our books for over 30 years. The reason is that they are properly informed as to the issues they vote on in a pamphlet on the propositions. They have time to think about the problem and with the help of discussion on the platform and the radio and in the press they have always at the ballot box come out with the right answer for the public good.

Lincoln in the years preceding and in 1860 saw the big issue at stake. He realized that it was the preservation of the Union. He was not diverted to other collateral and minor issues but kept his eye on the basic problem of that time—How can the Nation be preserved? Through his perseverance and because of his sense of proportion and by virtue of his leadership, the Nation was preserved. Today we have a United States of America, the strongest Nation in the world; the most representative of its people; the Nation where we have the greatest personal freedom; the one that offers the individual unparalled opportunity for wealth, education, culture, and so forth. Without Lincoln's leadership, we might today have a group of Balkan American States.

Pursuing for a moment my thought that great campaigns are won by the party or the candidate who appeals to the imagination of the people and who personifies their desire to meet and solve the great questions of the day, I will mention a few such campaigns. McKinley in 1896 went to the Presidency on the "Full Dinner Pail" slogan. It implied that he and his party would fill the dinner pail of the workers of America, which was made partially empty by the Democratic depression of 1893. Theodore Roosevelt went into the Presidency in 1904 with the slogan of "Conservation of Our National Resources," something that would appeal to the imagination and public spirit and pride of every voter. Wilson was victorious in his "New Freedom" campaign in 1912. There was implied in that crusade the idea that the Americans were minus some of the freedoms to which they were entitled, and that Wilson and his party would supply them. Of course, in that triangular fight Wilson walked in because the other two were fighting a political civil war. In 1928 we had the Hoover cry of "Two Cars in Every Garage and Two Chickens in Every Pot." That implied that our party, if successful, would give every citizen plenty of the good things of life. In 1932 Franklin Roosevelt went in on the slogan a "New Deal," which implied that the voters had gotten a raw deal by a depression caused by the Republican administration, and that he would give them a new deal. Of course, the depression was caused by forces, set in motion by the World War, that no one could control. Despite the fact that the Roosevelt administration increased our national debt $23,500,000,000 by 1940, the fact is that the depression was never solved until World War II broke out and furnished men work in defense industries. It took a war, with all its tragedies, for the Democratic administration, to lick that depression, although other countries had gotten out of it in the middle thirties.

Over 30 months have passed and yet we seem further from a peace settlement than we were in the months following the cessation of the war.

It is my firm conviction that we are facing as critical a period today as did Lincoln in 1860. Our very physical security is in danger; our political and social system is at stake.

Why do I make the statement that this hour is as critical as the period that faced Lincoln in 1860? In order to understand my viewpoint, it is necessary for us to take our bearings as of this date. From our knowledge of the recent war when compared with the First World War, it is obvious that a modern war is very devastating. We can look at this in several ways and by various comparisons see what is facing us unless we find a way to live in security and peace. The bonded debt, due to the First World War, was roughly $25,000,000,000. The bonded debt at the end of this war was $269,000,000,000. In a short space of 25 years war has increased in cost over 10 times. As we all know, it penetrated every crossroads and every community in the United States. Our precarious economic situation today is harassed by the staggering bonded debt hanging over our heads. If we are to keep faith with the millions who invested their savings in promises of the United States to repay their money with a low rate of interest it will be a hard struggle for a long time.

More graphic is the increase in destructive power of modern armaments. The destructive capacity of various types of weapons increased from 10 to 100 times in a quarter of a century elapsing between these two great wars. The fire power of one single airplane in this war, of which we had thousands, was greater than that of the whole squadron of which I was a member in 1918. Just as the curtain was about to drop ending the Pacific war, we had a prevue of the devastation and ruin that we might expect if another war should fall upon the earth. Through the ingenuity and the audacity of the Americans, atomic power was harnessed and controlled. Two small bombs devastated two entire cities and killed directly and as a result of radioactive atomic energy hundreds of thousands of people. It has been my interesting, as well as gruesome, experience to fly low over Hiroshima and Nagasaki and thereby get a graphic visual idea of what two small bombs could do. I have visited every badly devastated city in the world except Warsaw, and it is hard to realize the utter desolation and ruin caused by the pounding of the American and Allied air forces in the last war unless one has seen it. Also we should remember that the world is a small world and still shrinking. We also recognize that the world is round and that aircraft and missiles can go in any direction over all obstacles. There are no longer any barriers of oceans, climates, mountains, and even distances are being shrunk and annihilated rapidly. The trouble spots of the world are roughly in the area from the 30° north latitude up over the top of the world. No one today is immune from attack. You are no safer here in Connecticut today than we are in California, nor are those who live in the center of the country any more safe or immune from attack, should war befall us, than we who live on the fringes of the country. Remember, every weapon of today, even though secret now, will soon be the property of other nations.

These are all matters that are well known. They are likewise matters that we must not put out of our mind as these factors must be considered when we are considering our security and how to fashion a world plan that will give us real and lasting security.

The result is that there is only one way of making a real security system. There is only one way in which America and its sister nations can live in the civilized manner contemplated by the Christian and every other religion, that is, in harmony, and as brothers in one great family. That is by finding a way to have collective security, by working out a means whereby the nations can join together and evolve and develop a system of law to settle their disputes, by legal mechanisms to carry out the plan and keep potential aggressors within bounds.

What very few people seem to realize, or at least are willing to admit, is that to obtain peace which will be lasting requires as great ability, as much sacrifice, and as much perseverance as to wage a war.

President William McKinley, on the day he was assassinated in Buffalo, N. Y., in September 1901, made this statement, that the victories of peace are more important and far reaching than the victories of war. In fact, no war is a victory unless it results in a just and lasting peace. That is why our war in 1918 was a mere mockery. Those of us who came out of that struggle felt that we actually had participated in a war to end war. Our victory was dissipated because we did not have the national determination or the will to make a workable and a lasting peace. Instead of bringing peace to the nations of the world it laid the seeds for the Second World War, far more devastating than the first one.

I want to emphasize as hard as I can that while we may drift into a war, and I think we drifted into the Japanese war, you cannot drift into a stable and lasting peace. That requires ingenuity; it requires negotiation; it requires statesmanship; it requires patience; it requires the determination and zeal of a fanatic to bring the harmonizing and conflicting opinions of the various peoples of the world into a working unit for a peaceful and law-abiding world.

Why have we not accomplished more in the past 2 years? During the course of the war a basis was laid for an international organization. The United Nations was organized, largely under the leadership of the Americans. Unfortunately, some very bad mistakes were made. We had a number of pronouncements during and immediately following the war laying down certain broad principles. These were somewhat similar in their general nature and purpose to our Declaration of Independence. Every one of you here knows that the Declaration of Independence only became worth something and meant something to the generation which laid down those principles and to all succeeding generations because we later wrote a workable, practical, and effective Constitution.

One of the reasons we are having so much trouble and uncertainty today, and it was impressed on me particularly this summer, was the fact that one of the great allies apparently is not yet ready to enter into negotiations and the agreements which are essential if we are to implement the United

Nations so as to make it an effective world organization. It was a terrible disappointment to my colleagues and to myself, as we traveled across Europe and into Asia this last summer, comparing the situation of 1947 with that of 1945 when we also were in Europe. During that 2¼ years, it seemed like the controversies existing between the ideologies to the east of Germany and those to the west had intensified. Part of this was due to the fact that one of the belligerents had violated the spirit and the letter of some of the agreements that had been made. For instance, it was solemnly agreed that every liberated country such as Poland, Rumania, Austria, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and so forth, should have the right to hold a free election and select the government and the officials of its choice. Were they accorded this right? We all know they were not. Why? Because one of the belligerents, by means of penetration, coercion, underhanded political methods, controlled and domineered the elections. They were not elections giving a free choice like we have in America. They were elections which were really fake elections. They went through the forms of an election, but long before the votes were counted, the dominant power knew what group would be installed as the rulers of the country. Part of that tragic result is due to the fact that we did not insist upon a free election in Poland. I only say part of it. Perhaps we were outmaneuvered, but at any rate the very idea of freely elected, autonomous governments which were contemplated by our agreements fell by the wayside.

The election in Greece, where we have interposed objections as well as practically intervention, illustrates the point in reverse. It is obvious that if a country, such as those mentioned, held an election and it was in fact a free election, at which the people not only chose their form of government, but also their officials, this decision by them should not be undermined by any other power. The issue in Greece is not whether communism shall be permitted in Greece. Under the doctrine that we have agreed to that each country shall have the type of government and political structure that it chooses, we could not object if the Greeks chose the Communist form of government so long as this did not interfere with their neighbors. The election in Greece was observed and certified by a commission of the United Nations. The certificate stated that a free election was held at which about 80 percent of the voters participated. Greece chose a monarchy. That is not the type of government that we would choose in America. But so long as it was their free choice, they have a perfect right to have that type of government. We know that outside influences are trying to penetrate into Greece and upset the very election which was certified as being a free election in Greece. The issue is: Are the allies, and each of them, who laid down these basic principles going to stand by their agreements. The very basis of law is the sanctity of contracts. The very basis of friendly and cooperative dealings among countries is the observance, in the utmost good faith, of their agreements. I think we are going into a hysteria over communism. Communism is not the question. The question is whether good faith shall be practiced among the nations of the world. Naturally if the nations of the world are to unite into a family of nations with the necessary mechanisms to handle international problems and to settle international disputes, it must be understood that they will abide by the decrees of this body and by the decisions of its tribunals or of its courts; otherwise the whole organization is a mere mockery. This applies equally to agreements made at the various conferences such as Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam.

We cannot dwell too much on the mistakes that have been made. They are behind us. The question now is what can we, and what should we, do today? Also, the question is what part can our party, the Republican Party, play in bringing about the peace and stability that the world requires for its future safety and happiness?

You must remember that in the matter of making agreements and treaties the President of the United States proposes, but the Congress of the United States, and more particularly the Senate of the United States, disposes. In other words, Congress has the duty and the power to say what shall be done. This Congress is a Republican Congress and, therefore, has the power to shape our foreign policy. In my humble judgment, some of the greatest principles laid down, which should be carried out in our efforts to bring peace, were laid down by Republicans. I doubt if any three men played a bigger part in bringing about the organization of the United Nations than Senator VANDENBERG, Representative CHARLES EATON, and Harold Stassen. VANDENBERG first advanced the simple idea of peace with justice. Have we had that? We most certainly have not. Twelve countries have been overrun in the ideological race that is proceeding from one of our large allies and moving toward the Atlantic seaboard of Europe. We know that the governments in most of those countries are not the free choice of the people therein. We know from our knowledge of the form of government they have that in a few years the poor people who think they are getting a democratic government will wake up and find that they are the mere puppets of a small group of power-hungry dictators. We have tremendous volumes of evidence as to what these poor people may expect. What shall we do? We must have the patience of a Job and the wisdom of a Solomon to bring order out of this chaotic world. We must continue to negotiate—continue to indicate—to the world that we are anxious to make the United Nations work and to bring safety and security to the world, especially to the small nations who cannot protect themselves.

One of the ways to do this is through strength. A strong America in a military sense; a sound America in a financial sense; a united America in its determination that it shall finally evolve a plan to bring world peace which will lead us toward our goal. The Republican Party has a record almost 50 years long in the steps that it has taken trying to bring about peace and law and order in the world. When we captured the Philippines, we were charged with being imperialists. President McKinley made the statement in substance that when the Filipinos were able to handle their liberty we would grant it to them. About 50 years later—1946—they were granted their liberty as a free and sovereign country. That act was one of the most significant things ever done by a great country, namely, to turn loose a small country and let it become an independent member of the family of nations with full and complete sovereignty. Before this was accomplished, we spent billions trying to help the Filipinos develop their economy, develop their education, and train their people in self-government.

In 1908 we founded the Court of International Justice, largely under the leadership of a great American, and also a Republican, Elihu Root. This tribunal has done a great deal to point the way whereby international disputes can be resolved through the judicial process. In 1922, following the World War which we thought was so devastating, we sponsored a disarmament conference. Many people looking backward have scoffed at this conference. To me it was one of the most significant steps, moving in the direction of peace, ever taken by a great nation. At that time many men felt that great armaments might provoke a war. Therefore, we proposed to scale down the armaments of the world. We called this naval conference of the great naval powers of the world. Presiding at this conference was a great Republican, Charles Evans Hughes, then Secretary of State. He laid down the principle for the reduction of naval armaments, worked out on an equitable basis by the representatives of the various nations involved. But most significant of all, he came out flatfooted and stated that America would scale down more than anyone else and at that time when he made the statement, he made the offer on behalf of the United States to scale down our armaments at once, giving the amount of tonnage we would sink. We did exactly this but later Japan, to her sorrow failed to live up to her agreements.

Then in 1928 we passed the Kellogg-Briand Pact. This pact provided that the participants would use every other method to try to avoid a war, except waging war, in trying to settle international disputes. Unfortunately, there was not the machinery to implement that noble statement of principle. But I want to point out to you that it was really a statement in principle by ourselves and eight other nations that war was outlawed as a method of settling international disputes. The nations paid no attention to it when later disputes arose, but nevertheless it was a noble statement of principle and no responsible statesman in the world dared criticize or ridicule that pronouncement. That pronouncement is one of the basis on which the criminal war crimes cases are being tried. Today we face a greater necessity for the outlawing of war than ever before.

One of the things that I believe we should do, and I feel certain that the leaders of our party agree with my viewpoint, is to maintain our military strength. Paradoxical as it may seem our words at the International Conference table have greater validity, more persuasion and more potency if those with whom we deal know that we are strong in a military sense. Almost in direct proportion to our strength which includes our industrial and financial strength as well and the determination and will of the American people that they will fight, if necessary, for the principles they espouse are our statements and actions convincing to those with whom we must deal. We have come forward with a plan to outlaw atomic power or rather to control it so that it will not be used for the destruction of human beings or of the property of individuals and nations. We have done everything possible to bring about a concordance or compromise of our views in order that the necessary peace treaties may be written. Still we have no peace because one ally does not seem to want peace now.

The devastation in Europe is such that it will take generations for some of the countries to be rebuilt. There were some in the Democratic Party that wished to destroy Germany and reduce her to an agricultural nation. However, we have learned by bitter experience that this is an unattainable and a hideous proposal. Little Poland, which is far poorer in resources than Germany, illustrates that it is impossible to crush and obliterate a race. Two or three times she has been exterminated as a political entity but each time she came back to claim her national existence. Today she is under a cloud but it may not be long before she will again be a vigorous member of the family of nations. Germany, although the criminal, and should be punished and had been and will be, is the key to the economic salvation of Europe. We must allow her to build back her economic strength so long as her military potential is kept obliterated and subdued. The other nations with whom we fought side by side have at least a partial claim on our guidance and help. You cannot get up and walk away from millions of people who face starvation, ruin, and disappointment. Lincoln did not do that in the

Civil War. He had the courage to take the steps necessary to fight out the issue of whether the Nation should be united or severed in twain. Thank God he had the foresight to see that there was only one way to handle the situation, that was to fight to victory and preserve the Nation. He was beset by rising prices, inflation, and by an abounding group of critics telling him how to run the war and run the Government.

I am one of those who believes that as a practical matter looking into the dismal, chaotic, and destructive future that is before us, that we must support some plan for the rehabilitation of the countries of Europe. It is a gamble we must take for our own security. Knowing all the dangers that might beset us, I believe our people would think that we were imprudent and unstatesmanlike not to try to develop those who will be our friends in the event of trouble. Furthermore, we have the alternative to consider—if the Soviets have overrun 12 countries in the short space of 2 years, what reason have we to believe that they have reached the end of their expansion? Their best ally in trying to capture a country by ideological penetration is chaos, uncertainty, hunger, and want. In such a field the medicine man preaching peculiar but plausible doctrines makes the most progress.

Of course, we cannot foresee the difficulties that may be in our path. Naturally, the road to stability in the world will be rugged, difficult, and disappointing. Why not learn something from our own history? After obtaining our independence we wrote the Articles of Confederation. They proved to be impotent. We wrote a new Constitution. However, at the time it was signed those who were the leaders in the Convention, and especially Washington, were not at all certain that it would be a success. You remember how he looked across the hall where he had presided and noticed on the opposite wall a picture of the sun? He made the statement with reference to the Constitution that as he looked at the sun on the opposite wall which the artist had painted he was not certain whether it was a rising or a setting sun, but he hoped that it would be a rising sun. We had our difficulties with the Constitution as to its meaning, as to whether it bound the States into an inseparable and eternal Union. Finally, after over 70 years under the Constitution, we had to fight a bitter Civil War to determine whether or not the United States of America consisted of a group of States which were inseparable and bound together into an eternal and perpetual Union. Is there any reason to think that the United Nations will have a smooth road? But, my friends, if we take the other course, each nation tries to live unto itself, you know what the future has in store. You know that bloodshed and suffering will follow just as sure as the Second World War followed the First. Our party can play a mighty part in bringing about the start toward this stable world. We have already done a great deal. We have a glorious backlog of 50 years of effort in trying to bring about stability in the world and to reduce it to a world of law and order. Our opponents have been in power for 16 years. They never solved the depression which they were placed in power to solve.

The war came—half of which I believe was avoidable. I merely mention this because you all know that if America had not furnished Japan with the scrap iron, the oil, and the cotton required to build her war machine she never could have waged a war such as she did. The Democratic Party is torn with dissension. The Democratic Party has no cohesive program to build a more stable future as its leaders are at loggerheads as to what should be done.

Another matter that we must consider seriously and which should furnish the background for our thinking is this: About 11,000,000 men and women finally were called to the colors. Three hundred thousand of these perished in the awful struggle. Over a million were wounded, some for life. Seven million or 8,000,000 more lost from 2 to 5 years out of their careers whether they were school boys or young men entering some vocation or profession. I have met and talked to them in all parts of the world. I find that without dissent the one thing that they want more than any other thing is that those in charge of our Government find some way to avoid a repetition of the terrible war in which they participated. That was our wish in 1918 as we heard the last gun fired on the western front. We firmly believed that that war was so devastating that we would never have another. All these men want is that we find some way to end that organized institution of murder which we call war and bring about peace. If we approach our job in a Lincoln-like manner, if we adhere to the fundamentals and realize that only in one way can we practice Christianity in the world and banish the murder we call war and that is to build the mechanism and the sentiment that will support international security and international law—then we can build peace. Our men in public life have the ability.

We are standing on the edge of a new era in the world's history. It could be the darkest age in the entire history of the world. We now have the capacity to destroy civilization and destroy the human race. Whether we will it or not we are placed in the driver's seat as the one great, strong, and relatively unharmed Nation in the world. Ours is the job today to furnish the leadership that will lead the nations of the world out of the morass of ruin and uncertainty which many of them face. This age could likewise be the greatest in all the history of the human race. Since the history of man first started men have hoped and prayed and worked for a peaceful world but it still seems to elude them. Curiously, as man becomes more civilized and has more physical comforts it seems that he becomes more destructive and more warlike. We now have the chance, with the world in the mood that it now finds itself, to furnish the leadership and the statesmanship to build a peaceful world.

That is the great challenge as I see it that the Republican Party has before it today. They can be the instrument selected by the American people to bring that day of universal peace that men of all ages have prayed for and looked for. The tragic thing is that those who today must make the decisions will never know whether or not their work was adequate to lay the pattern of a prolonged and perhaps a permanent peace. Nevertheless, they should not falter in their determination to help build the fabric and the highway over which we must travel to get to that promised day. I believe with the statesmanship we have in our party, with the record we have behind us, that we have the capacity to bring the golden age of peace. This generation is the one that must start the job. This generation must lay the foundation for peace on earth, good will toward men. Was ever any generation blessed with a greater opportunity or a more interesting and pleasant job? Do you think that our people if they recognize what they could do with a slight sacrifice, and the proper support of capable officials, would object to making that sacrifice? As I understand the opinion of our people, if they feel that we are honest, that we are determined, that we have the intelligence to understand the implications involved in developing stable world peace, we will win their support. Irrespective of that, we have been commissioned by you to handle this job. You would disown us, throw us to the wolves, if we did not have the courage to follow the light as we saw it and do our part to eliminate from the face of the earth that terrible scourge known as war.

Some minor problems face the American people but unless we solve this overpowering problem they will not amount to anything. We have inflation, we have high prices, we have the high cost of living. These seem to be adjusting themselves by the economic forces which are partially at play today. Only if we insure America against war will we have the plenty that our people want and the opportunity which they deserve. So I say to you—I believe that the Republican Party is the one instrument that can bring world peace and plenty. You and I will have a glorious but minor part in that achievement if we do our best to carry out those fundamental principles that we believe will bring us security and peace in this old troubled world of ours. In that way we can show our devotion to Lincoln.

Dean Pound Explodes Misrepresentations About China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, after 4 years of unremitting organized and slanderous propaganda against the present leaders of China, more and more light is beginning to break through. Dean Roscoe Pound, of Harvard Law School, is a man who commands universal respect for his great ability, shrewdness of observation, and sound judgment. He is now working in Nanking, with the Chinese Ministry of Justice, helping develop modern legal codes and procedures. One who is on the inside looking out knows a good deal more about a situation than those on the outside looking in. Dean Pound's observation and views cannot be refuted or ignored.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the Harvard Law School Record of March 2, 1948:

POUND DECLARES CHINA MISREPRESENTED IN UNITED STATES—GIVES HIS OWN VIEWS

(In response to a request by the Record, Dean Roscoe Pound, now working in Nanking, China, with the Chinese Ministry of Justice, has submitted some first-hand observations of the problems facing that country during the present reconstruction period.)

I doubt whether people in the United States realize the difficulties under which China labored for 100 years before the Second World War, and the consequent inherited difficulties which hamper the national government in its endeavors at reconstruction after 8 years of Japanese occupation of the greater and richer part of the country and 13 years of a Japanese regime in Manchuria. From 1838 when British insistence on the opium trade with India brought on the opium war of 1840, the history of China is one of continuous aggressive pressure from European powers and Japan, with constant loss of territory, exaction of heavy indemnities, cessions of ports, and unequal treaties. Constant rebellions were a natural consequence.

From 1895 to 1911 there was a chronic state of local rebellion culminating in the revolution as a result of which the republic was set up in 1912. The central government,

after 15 years of struggle finally became strongly established in 1927. But the Japanese set up a puppet regime in 1932 in Manchuria, brought on a war with the republic in 1937, and were not dislodged from the occupied areas till August of 1945. The excellent work of the decade 1927–37 was largely undone by the Japanese, and the Communists keep up the condition of rebellion and civil war which had obtained for a century.

UNITED STATES PRESS DISTORTS PICTURE

It is no wonder that conditions in China today are not ideal. They are far from ideal in any country. But there is by no means the general condition of demoralization, corruption, and inefficiency which is portrayed in American newspapers. The gravity of news from abroad increases with the square of the distance. In the clippings from the American press which my friends send me from time to time I can't recognize the land in which I am living. There is no censorship of the press. The English and American papers in Shanghai and the Chinese papers in Nanking, which I see every day, are as critical of the government as they like and are allowed a liberty in time of civil war which I do not think for a moment we in America would tolerate under like circumstances. The strikes here are no more than seems to be normal all over the world except that student strikes are conducted by university students, not confined to high schools and grade schools as with us. The authorities are very patient with them even when the pretexts are trivial.

Anything that calls itself liberal is supposed to be privileged. I read in the American papers of a prevailing and intense hatred of America here. Nothing could be more false. The Chinese do not forget the time when Russia, France, and Germany claimed lease or cession of ports and territory and mining and railway rights, when Port Arthur was seized by Russia, Kiaochow by Germany, and Kwangchow-wan by France, when British troops landed on Wei-hai-wei and enlarged the concession of Kiu-lung. All except America claimed their spheres of influence. They remember how China was saved from partition by John Hay, Secretary of State, in 1899, initiating the open door policy in order to maintain the integrity of China. All the Chinese (Communists excepted) recognize Americans as the one people who have never had aggressive designs against them; as the one people in whom experience has taught them to have confidence.

COALITION GOVERNMENT PROBLEM

Much is said in American newspapers about exclusion of liberal parties from the Government, the necessity of admitting minority parties to a share in the Government, and the imperative need of a coalition government. When one sees the actual political situation here, such things sound more like a Gilbert and Sullivan opera than like the pratical conduct of government in a democratic republic. No one complained that Republicans were excluded from a share in the Government during the long administration of President Roosevelt. I do not suppose even Harry Bridges would say that Mr. Wallace ought at once to be given a place in President Truman's Cabinet. I note that the Prohibition Party has been resuscitated. But it won't claim that a certain number of seats in Congress should be allowed to it as a minority party.

The truth is that the minority parties (of which there are many) are made up of leaders with no substantial following. This was brought out strikingly in the late elections. The majority party withdrew its candidates in a number of districts in order to give the minority parties a free hand. But the voters did not want the minority leader candidates. Others were nominated by petition and were elected instead. Now the minority parties claim that those who were elected in the constitutional manner should be required to resign and the minority party candidates seated in their places. And yet those who are not willing to abide by the results of the election claim to be the arch promoters of democracy. In truth, there is no Communist Party in China generally as a political party in the American sense. There are scattered Communist agitators and conspirators here and there, and in the north there are Communist armies led by generals who recall the old war-lord governors whom the National Government, after 15 years of struggle, finally overthrew.

There is much abuse of the Kuomintang (National People's Party) in America, ignoring the task it has had before it and the difficulties of a democratic policy in China today. Despite all difficulties it has built up a strong progressive government. Democracy here has to operate under profound political indifference of a large mass of the population, brought up for generations to believe in revolt rather than ballot as the remedy for grievances. This indifference is not easy to overcome. Indeed, indifference to elections on the part of a considerable proportion of the population is not unknown in America. But of those who understand and are zealous for a modern democratic republic the overwhelming majority are supporters of the National Government.

CHARACTER OF OFFICIALS

Moreover, from personal observation I can testify to the high character of the Chinese officials as a class. I have met personally a great many and have had immediate contacts with not a few. I have found them well trained, cultivated, hard-working, and conscientious. Very many have been educated in Europe or America or both. They have high ideals and are zealous for effectively realizing them. They have done great things for general popular education.

At this point I must speak especially of Dr. Chen Li-fu, Minister of Organization and head of the Kuomintang. He is well known for deep love of the country and its people, thoroughly acquainted with its problems, zealous in search of satisfactory solutions, and possessed of the ability and determination to do what is needful toward improving conditions disarranged by war and long hostile occupation, and to build for the future. Withal, he is a thoughtful, conscientious, diligent scholar. His book, Philosophy of Life, which is now being published in translation in New York, has had wide circulation and influence, over 250,000 copies of the Chinese version having been sold.

Especially he will long be known and honored for his work when Minister of Education. He took office in the trying time of war with Japan, and under every difficulty provided subsidies for refugee students and teachers, aid for the ill and indigent, and work for those in need of jobs. He organized removal of educational institutions from occupied regions to the interior. He introduced pensions for the workers in education. During his term he reduced illiteracy from 75 percent of the population to about 50 percent. He made the educational system more completely national and fixed reasonable standards for professorships and curricula in higher education.

Of those with whom I have been more immediately associated I might name Sun Fo, vice president of the Republic, educated at Columbia, a true statesman of genuinely liberal outlook; Tai Chi-tao, president of the Examining Yuan, one of the disciples of Sun Yat-sen, well grounded on both western and Chinese learning; Gen. Pai Chung-hsi, minister of national defense; Dr. Chu Cheng, president of the Judical Yuan, zealous to adapt the interpretation and application of the codes to the life and traditional culture of the Chinese people, whose brochure on the reconstruction of the Chinese system of law is in the Harvard law school library; Dr. Hsieh Kwan-sheng, minister of justice, docteur en droit of the University of Paris, author of a history of Chinese law, a scholar, a wise administrator, with vision as to the future of Chinese law; Dr. Chu Chia-hua, minister of education, educated in Germany, an energetic administrator of comprehensive vision, thoroughly aware of the needs of legal education for which he is doing much; Dr. Wang Chung-hui, the well known translator of the German civil code into English, a jurist of world-wide repute; Judge Yun-kuan Kuo, president of the high court at Shanghai, who, finding on his dockets 120 cases a year involving the conflicts of laws, studied Beale's cases on the conflict of laws along with the continental treatises. All of these are well-trained men of experience and of marked general culture as well as proficiency in their immediate tasks. They would stand out among officials, law officers, and judges in any land. Such men are a standing refutation of what I read in American newspapers as to public men in China.

And here let me say a word about the President. As I have seen him, he is a man of tenacious purpose, firm, industrious, of good sense, talking little but asking questions straight to the mark and going to the bottom of things, zealous to effect a reconstruction of the country after its many vicissitudes, and with genuine desire to establish a practical, not a mere paper, democratic national government along realistically conceived lines.

IMPROVEMENT REMARKABLE

When I came to Nanking in June of 1946, the government was just getting back from 8 years of temporary establishment at Chungking while all of eastern China was in hostile occupation. At that time the capital had been stripped bare. When I returned a year later the improvement was remarkable. Means of transportation which had been destroyed have been replaced, buildings have been rebuilt, houses left as empty shells have been refurbished, new houses and buildings are going up on every side. The Chinese are an exceptionally industrious people. On every hand they are at work busily restoring patiently and effectively although with grievously limited means and facilities.

Restoration of educational institutions has been a hard task. To speak only of the institutions of higher learning, when the war ended 18 of 19 national universities and 19 private universities (almost all) were in temporary locations in the mountainous west, and gradually came back to find themselves stripped of libraries, laboratory equipment, and furniture, and with buildings at least in need of repair and usually of restoration. To keep these institutions going during the war was a notable feat and to restore them rapidly has been no less a feat. Keeping the administration of justice going, making improvements in organization and procedure, and conducting an experimental court to try out the code of procedure were no less remarkable achievements. When the Ministry of Justice got back from Chungking, in less than a year from the Japanese surrender, it had the machinery of justice moving again except in Communist-held areas.

Doing all this and much more, it has been necessary to provide for the host of war orphans and for a host of refugees liberated by the Communists by driving them from their homes, destroying their crops and stripping them of everything they had. The Chinese people are responding nobly to these added burdens.

MODERN CONSTITUTION

On the political side, a modern constitution, not a mere copy of any other, but with much in the way of original contribution and tied to Chinese conditions and traditional culture, was adopted in 1946 and took effect at the end of 1947. It is based on three

principles laid down by Sun Yat-sen, the founder of the republic, namely, a unitary government, guaranteed individual rights, and a service rather than a police state, which was well developed. There is provision for final judicial interpretation of the constitution and securing of the rights guaranteed by the bill of rights.

The first elections have been held under the constitution, and, at any rate, the machinery of constitutional government has been started. I hear complaints from America about the small proportion who voted. But voting was a new idea to the mass of the people. Banners across streets and trucks with streamers, as well as posters and loud speakers could not bring out a large number who were perfectly satisfied with the government. An intelligent Chinese tells me that many with whom he talked seemed to feel that if they were satisfied there was no need to vote. Only if one were dissatisfied did he need go to that trouble.

But I read in American accounts of China that the Government is doing nothing for the peasants. On the contrary, it is doing the most practical thing for them in furthering improved methods of agriculture with the help of American advisers. Here, too, remarkable progress has been made. It should be remembered that the percentage of farm tenancy is less in China than in the United States. Before any radical change in the system of ownership, there is need to set law and order, finance, industry, and transportation on a firm basis and undo the damage done in the 8 years of Japanese occupation and subsequent Communist "liberation."

LEGAL SYSTEM

China has excellent codes, and many able and well-trained legal scholars able to interpret and apply them, but with legal education held up or hindered by 8 years of war on Chinese soil, needs many more well-trained judges and lawyers than the schools have been able to turn out. Also there is a real problem of adapting modern codes on the continental European model to Chinese life, modes of thought and environment. The question of comparative law or history as a basis of Chinese law of today is discussed in a paper I have written for the Harvard Law Review. Again there is need of making the judicial organization, which is excellent as a paper scheme, achieve its full possibilities in action. Accordingly, I have advised a program in five parts: surveys; conferences; the preparation by an organization, on the general model of the American Law Institute, of an exposition of Chinese law for use in law teaching, in interpretation and application of the codes, and as a guide for practitioners; a survey and appraisal of legal education and ascertainment of its needs; and study of the organization of the practicing profession and what may be needed in that connection.

Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of March 1, 1948, is an appeal to the conscience of Congress. It is to be hoped that the present Congress will understand at long last the very necessity of passing the Stratton bill:

FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

How much longer will it take for Congress to get back to the displaced persons' problem?

More than 100 national organizations—veteran, religious, civic, government, welfare—favor emergency legislation to ease their plight, the majority backing the Stratton bill to admit 100,000 DP's a year for 4 years. The justice of this is self-evident. There are 850,000 men, women and children in the German, Austrian, and Italian camps, mostly from Poland, the Baltic States and eastern Europe. Under our archaic quota system, no reasonable numbers could ever be rescued by us because nearly two-thirds of the quotas are still set aside for Great Britain and Germany. Thus the honorable solution lies with emergency measures. As Secretary Marshall summed it up in the House hearings last July: "If we practice what we preach, if we admit a substantial number of these people as immigrants * * * we will also confirm our moral leadership and demonstrate that we are not retreating behind the Atlantic Ocean."

That many people are clearly fed up with the timid men of Congress whose xenophobia has obstructed action on any DP bill is pointed up by the grass roots movement in half a dozen States in the North and Middle West in favor of action on this question. It is hard to believe that Congress can ignore, or wants to ignore, this local sentiment. Moreover, members of the congressional subcommittee who visited the DP camps last fall have said that "most of these people * * * will be an asset, and not a liability, to the Western World." The present session is nearly 2 months old. The House has cleared its decks for action on many questions. This is one human question which deserves attention.

UMT-ERP, Draft, and Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., sets out some common sense thinking regarding our present international and domestic problems.

The Gary Post-Tribune, a strong advocate for tax reduction, rightfully classifies this legislation as secondary matter now, considering the critcial development in our foreign situation.

Each Member of the House should read the thoughts set out in the following editorial:

President Truman made a good start yesterday in his effort to meet the Russian threat. He called for the immediate passage of the European recovery plan legislation and this is being hurried and will doubtless become a law within a few days. He called for passage of the universal military training bill and for a revival of some form of selective service.

There is a great deal of opposition to UMT and we doubt that Congress will pass the bill. In taking this stand we think it has good ground. The purpose of the bill is to provide for long-term training and has no relationship to the present emergency. Later on it or some similar bill may fit into the picture, but for the time being UMT will not make us militarily more fit to meet Russian aggression.

However, a return to selective service will do that, and in asking for a revival of some form of the draft the President appears to have made a correct appraisal of our needs. Our services are short of men and are unable to secure them through voluntary enlistment, so if they are to be brought up to the strength the crisis requires the draft must be resorted to.

At this time no one can foresee what forces will be needed to meet the Russian threat, but we must prepare to meet that threat no matter what it will be. The President spoke the truth about Russia and our only criticism of him is that he did not speak sooner and probably did not ask for all the legislation Congress should provide.

What we must keep constantly in mind now is that we must do all that is needed to make us strong enough to meet the Russian threat no matter what it may be. In doing so we have our best chance of preventing war. A big increase in our military strength may not keep us out of war, but it offers the only chance we have to escape another devastating conflict.

That being true, we cannot afford halfway measures. Nor can we afford delay. It is the business of Congress and the President to make all the necessary moves now to put this country on a war basis. This does not necessarily mean, unless Russia so wills it, that we must rebuild our disintegrated military machine to the old scale. But it does mean that we should make all the preliminary moves to provide the kind and size of fighting force the developing situation calls for.

Chiefly this means that until this emergency passes we must forget about secondary matters and think chiefly of our security and the measures necessary for its continuance. It will be too bad if we have to give up tax reduction but our future is vastly more important than this popular measure.

Some critics say the President's speeches were political and to a degree they may have been, but they did tell the truth about our danger and about Russia's attitude. And that is all that matters now.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT MADE BY C. A. WEYGANDT, OF THE OHIO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, TO OHIO'S CONGRESSMEN IN THE SPEAKER'S DINING ROOM OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT WASHINGTON, D. C., ON MARCH 3, 1948, ON THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Honorable Congressmen, farmers of the Midwest have become alarmed and aroused at the onward march of communism throughout the world, and the tremendous cost involved in an uncertain program designed to arrest the further spread of communistic influence over western Europe. This has caused the farmer to use every means possible to learn the true facts, such as the radio, the press, consultation with high Government officials, and particularly the testimony presented to the committees in Congress so that he can get a true appraisal of the whole problem.

The farmers, after diligent search and study, have concluded that help must be

given to western Europe in a sufficient amount and quick enough to effectively stop the destructive onward march of communism. Farmers are no longer isolationists. They believe we are faced with the stark reality of war or peace in no uncertain terms. We will no longer sit back, rest on our laurels, and expect the world to go by our door. We believe that communism in all its deadly peril, unchecked, would not hesitate to walk right into our door. The place to stop communism is in Europe, and the time is now. Communism should never be allowed to get a foothold in America.

Farmers are not unwilling to pay their fair share in helping to feed hungry people of the world, to buy farm machinery and fertilizer whereby they can help themselves to a more abundant living. Farmers are generally opposed to doles or relief. We believe that only a minimum amount should be spent for relief and that only to assist western Europe until they can become self-supporting. Recovery is what we want, not relief.

Farmers pay their taxes the hard way, that is, by the sweat of their brow. They are opposed to wastage in any form. They want reasonable safeguards placed around this huge expenditure of money so that it will be used wisely, yet they do not want to see it too restricted that it will prevent a good job being done. We want to see a workable and effective program developed and carried out. We believe that conditions demand prompt action. If it is true that a European recovery program stands between war and peace, then the responsibility rests upon the Congress to act quick enough and well enough to save 145,000,000 of our citizens from the horrors of another war. We farmers of the Midwest have the confidence in the good judgment and wisdom of our Congressmen that they will act before it is too late.

Farmers have never failed to produce food when called upon by their Government; they will work long hours with a shortage of machinery again if necessary to stamp out the scourge of communism. We want the door kept open at all times between our State Department and all other countries for continuing peaceful negotiations.

To the farmers another war is unthinkable. Delay is inexcusable; get the Marshall plan working at once. Let's face the cold, unpleasant facts with firmness and a conviction that freedom-loving people will not be made slaves and trampled under foot by godless and cruel governments.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein Mr. George E. Sokolsky's March 19, 1948, column from the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald, which, to me, is a very pertinent article:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

The record ought to be kept very straight in these days of alarms and excitements. A historical error can never be corrected; it sets up a chain of events which moves in the direction set by the error until it wears itself out, or is diverted by other events or is stopped by force.

Among a free people, those who participated in the errors must be held responsible for them. It may be pleasant for those who built reputations and made political profit by making mistakes to have us forget what they did and said when the going was smooth.

However, now that their mistakes are being uncovered, they shout, "Stop thief!" We have to assume that those who supported Roosevelt's policy at Tehran and Yalta and Truman's policy at Potsdam, and such trivia as Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods, are responsible for our present misfortunes. It will avail them nothing, for they face the facts of their own incompetence. There is no longer any cover-up.

Therefore, when Jimmy Byrnes or George Marshall or Averell Harriman gets terribly excited about the evils of the Russians, I challenge them to deny the charge that they were accessories before the event, that they condoned in advance the rape of European civilization by Stalin, that Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, in advance, consented to the despoliation of our allies and the countries we liberated. At Potsdam, President Truman joined in these operations.

Now, were these men and others to confess their sins, were they to assume moral responsibility for what they did, even if they pleaded ignorance, it would be possible to forgive them while pitying the country that fell into their hands.

But when they deliberately reverse themselves and, shouting louder than anyone else, demand a war to correct their errors, we must say to them that if it is another war they managed to get for us, we may have no alternative but to offer our sons as sacrifices, but we want better, more competent, and more truthful managers. We cannot trust those who lied to us.

On February 13, 1945, it was reported that War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes returned to Washington from Yalta and disclosed that President Roosevelt proposed the formula for the solution of the Polish question, Mr. Byrnes did not say that he, Byrnes, opposed that solution nor did he tell us then that other arrangements were made there, even an arrangement making Soviet Russia the successor to Japan's rights and privileges in Manchuria in direct violation of our treaties with China since 1844 and constantly renewed.

Mr. Byrnes said nothing about that. Nor did General Marshall or Averell Harriman, or any of the ex-New Deal commentators who are trying to run General Eisenhower on the Democratic ticket as part of a war scare.

On June 15, 1945, General Eisenhower told a press conference in Paris that so far as he is concerned, there is nothing to indicate that cooperation with the Russians is impossible.

He said that "peace lies with all the peoples of the world, not just for the moment with some political leader." I never quite knew how the people would produce peace unless they did it through their political leaders in control of their government.

The fact is that they have not produced a peace, nor a peace treaty, nor a formula for peace, and they are all again talking about another war as though it were seasonal, like Easter or Christmas.

As for General Eisenhower's belief in our ability to cooperate with the Russians in June 1945, he said that after Tehran and Yalta, and he must have known in his position what was done at those conferences, or perhaps he was as deceived as Mr. Hull seems to have been.

At any rate, those who connived at Tehran and Yalta and those who condoned and defended Tehran and Yalta ought not to be believed. They are not to be trusted.

Until we get a new and undefiled leadership, there is no need of alarms, excursions, and incitements.

If Soviet Russia chooses to make war on us, let her not face those who helped Stalin to deceive the American people.

Fort Gadsden National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a measure to create the Fort Gadsden National Monument, in the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla. Rich in history, this area should be preserved for posterity. I have visited old Fort Gadsden, walked along its earthworks, seen its long abandoned graves, climbed the earthen mounds which some say were watch mounds and others say are Indian burial mounds. I have stood in its crater where 300 defenders were blasted into eternity by the explosion of its powder magazine.

W. T. Cash, State librarian and authority on Florida history, says in his Story of Florida:

Col. Edward Nicholls, whom Jackson drove out of Pensacola, later in 1814, sailed up the Apalachicola and a short distance from the stream built a fort for the protection of the Indian allies of the British. Later he strengthened the fort and supplied it with munitions of war.

Colonel Nicholls, whatever were his intentions, had done the Seminoles and their Creek allies a vast amount of harm. The fort he built them was worse than useless to their cause, for the Indians, not liking the close confinement of garrison duty, would not remain in it. Seeing its value for their protection, fugitive Negroes living in the Apalachcola River region were soon occupying the fort the red men had failed to use, and not only making trouble for the whites, but for the Indians as well. It is but correct to say that the Negro Fort, as it was called after the blacks came to occupy it, was an indirect cause of the first Seminole War in Florida and the punishment the Indians received on account of it.

Indians resented the Negroes taking over their fort and requested its return.

Their request went unheeded and, supplied with ammunition, as the fort was, James Parton is doubtless right when he avers that all the Indians in North America could not have taken it.

Nevertheless for all the strength of the Negro Fort, its existence was soon to end.

The Negro Fort became a menace to the American frontier, and numbers of crimes were committed by the Negroes, who depended upon the fort for their protection.

The United States Government, as well as American citizens on the Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers made considerable use of the Apalachicola River, and when it found that the navigation of that river was menaced by the Negro Fort, the American Government gave orders for its destruction. Colonel Clinch was dispatched overland to attack the fort and gunboats were ordered to proceed up the Apalachicola Rive to join in its siege. Soon after action was opened, a hot shot from an American gunboat on July 27, 1816, struck a powder magazine within the fort, and not only destroyed the work, but killed or wounded most of its 334 occupants.

Diplomacy, Old and New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in these troublous times our Nation and its people should be extremely alert to the accomplishments and weaknesses of our representatives in foreign lands. One of the chief reasons for the present state of the world is the fact that in most parts of the world we had mediocre if not incompetent representatives in the most critical part of our Nation's history.

Now more than ever we must separate and distinguish the good from the bad in our foreign service. We must search how our foreign representatives rate with not only our own people but with the people of nations wherein they are carrying on our work. In this critical hour it is a revelation to learn from one nation of the high standing of our Ambassador and his work. That nation is Australia and the Ambassador is Robert Butler.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article from an Australian newsman which appeared widespread throughout "the land down under." I recommend that every Member of Congress read this article. It would be gratifying to our Nation if more such reports were made in other lands. Mr. Speaker, I insert this article in the RECORD for all to see:

DIPLOMACY, OLD AND NEW
(By Alwyn L. Powell)

Apart from diplomatic relations between countries there is the ticklish business of diplomatic relations between diplomats. Fortunately countries do not have personalities, but foreign representatives too often do. It is a strange paradox that in some countries where the best relations exist they are not so adequately expressed by their representatives; or that when unfriendly terms do exist the sequence of note writing eventuates in a strange friendship.

In this regard Australia and America are doubly fortunate. There has never been anything but a friendly regard for each other's country. There may have been criticism, a little jealousy, a little condenscension, but no more than between big and little brothers. And now there is nothing but complete friendliness and teamwork between its representatives here. Ambassador Butler and Foreign Minister Dr. Evatt like each other. Mr. Butler and Dr. Evatt work well together.

There is a new-style diplomacy aboard. The old-style ambassador, with his artful nuances of fact, his secret closetings with couriers bearing sealed letters, his formal and veiled notes, his game of hints, gestures, and expressions, is gone. No longer can Otto von Bismarck say: "Nobody, not even the most rabid of democrats, can imagine without actual knowledge, all the emptiness and quackery that passes for diplomacy." Today all this is out. The best diplomacy is honest, straightforwardness, hard thinking, and hard talking. Once, if you spoke the truth to a diplomat he would not believe you. Today he generally knows whether you are telling the truth or not, because he has probably heard it before.

Since Australia and America raised their foreign representation to Embassy status there has been a marked change in effort to create better understanding; to provide more knowledge in detail. There has been a stimulus on the part of every citizen, of course, to know more. There are more reasons for being interested. What Mr. Butler and Dr. Evatt have been doing is providing more momentum for that stimulus. They have shown that they can get along as well as any one would hope to. And a lot of people have seen this. Dr. Evatt has a wide group of admirers. If he seems to think this American is smart, intelligent, friendly, and cooperative—well, people will take his word for it and go on from there.

Dr. Evatt publicly stated recently: "Mr. Butler has not only shown that he is a friend of the Australians but has revealed that he is keenly aware of the importance of closer relationships between our two peoples. The United States Government has now ratified the South Pacific Commission. During the Canberra conference, at which the constitution of the commission was drafted, Mr. Butler was most helpful and demonstrated his keen interest in Australia's position and responsibilities in the Pacific."

A diplomatic statement? Yes—under the new style of diplomacy it was diplomatic because it was true. Every Canberra pressman will remember the South Pacific Conference. To them the United States and Australian representatives were the most interesting because in this part of the world those are the only two countries that seem to matter in Pacific affairs. It was then that Dr. Evatt and Mr. Butler came under the glare of the cynical spotlight of the political correspondents. The burning light revealed not a crack or a flaw.

The friendship that some would have called forced, opportune, or perhaps faked was shown to be genuine. Later the correspondents noticed the frequency with which this was expressed. Dr. Evatt has been many times a visitor and guest at the American Embassy. It goes even further than that. Mrs. Butler and Mrs. Evatt are firm friends and Catherine and Dr. Evatt's daughter display a natural fondness for each other. An American home-loving man and his family have moved in, to be welcomed by an Australian of the same type.

Not only were the correspondents at first a little sceptical but other diplomats in Canberra's Corps were a little bewildered. This international statesman, Dr. Evatt, was reputed to have been a little difficult to understand, a little hard to get to know. They were interested in Mr. Butler's secret of success. Was it because Australia was seeking special friendliness from the United States? What was the intrigue behind these frequent visits and public appearances and statements? These members of the diplomatic corps, in looking for the truth failed to recognize it staring them in the face. These foreign representatives had not recognized open appreciation was the result of open cooperation. They had not learned that in the hard school of international politics today a straightforward conversation brought more understanding than all the veiled explanation hand-delivered on white vellum through chancery doors. Even in the modern city of Canberra many of the diplomats were still dwelling in the old world.

Into the first American Embassy in Australia had come a type of diplomat that, to Canberra, was something new.

To understand more than the over-all reason why these two foreign-relations men get along, it is only necessary to look at their characters. Mr. Butler has never had any trouble getting along with people; he is always genuinely interested in meeting somebody, discovering and discussing their interests. He has brought to Australia with him that broad grin of the jovial midwesterners who are so closely allied in nature to the average rural Australian. He is a man who has had such a wide diversion of interests and activities, and on such a large scale, that he is able to grasp situations speedily and accurately. His acumen has enabled him to understand Australia's political situation, to summarize it, and place everything in its position in perspective. He has not done this merely by sitting in Canberra, but he has made visits to all corners of the continent to assess, quietly, the value of what he has been told, and in a land of hospitality Mr. Butler has shown he appreciates it so much that his hospitality most certainly equals that he has been given.

Dr. Evatt too has a career sculptured not in small dimensions. Where Mr. Butler has earned the respect of the world of the engineer, Dr. Evatt has earned the respect of the lawyer and political scientists. His early career as a lawyer soon developed into his appointment as high court judge. Desiring to go further and feeling that the political labor group represented the medium through which he could express his thought best he eventually became Australia's Foreign Minister. Maintaining his scholastic repute he has gone far in the United Nations Assembly where, as he had done before in the labor group, he vigorously represented the rights of the smaller man.

These two men have developed in stature through the university of achievement. Both graduates are now teaching others a lesson of straightforward, straight thinking diplomacy. It is doing Australian-American relations a lot of good.

Sarajevo Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial, "Sarajevo Incident," appearing in the Washington Post of March 22, 1948, relating to the trial and persecution by the Communist-controlled government of Yugoslavia, of another spiritual leader of his flock, Rt. Rev. Varava Nastich, the Orthodox bishop of Bosnia.

Like the persecution of Archbishop Stepinats, it presents to us the viciousness of communism and that it is the enemy of all religions. It also conveys to us as the extraordinary courage of these great churchmen who would rather face death or imprisonment than to fail to perform their duty to God and to mankind.

Those among us who oppose the United States taking effective affirmative action to stop the progress of atheistic communism might well stop, look, and listen, and learn the lessons the persecution of these two brave churchmen conveys to us, as well as the persecutions resulting in the death and imprisonment of millions of other persons, some known to us, but most of them unknown.

SARAJEVO INCIDENT

Through a leak in the iron curtain comes the news of another propaganda trial in

Titoslavia. The victim in this case was the Rt. Rev. Varnava Nastich, the Orthodox bishop of Bosnia. The general pattern of the trial at Sarajevo followed that of the trials of the Croatian Roman Catholic Archbishop Stepinats and the Chetnik leader Mihailovitch. That is to say, Bishop Nastich was accussed of treason against the regime.

What made the case different was that the bishop in the courtroom boldly admitted the specific charges against him. He acknowledged that he had preached against Communist tyranny, that he had denounced the Communists for having kept the UNRRA supplies for themselves, and that he had expressed the hope that an American Army would come to liberate Yugoslavia. In this, said the bishop, "I spoke what all the people are speaking, feeling and desiring." He went on:

"I believe with people here and everywhere that that war between America and the Soviets is inevitable. But rest assured the Soviets will lose that war. I know that our people will meet the American Army with cheers."

The bishop also refused to deny that he had been in communication with the remnant of the Chetniks, which is still holding out in the mountains of Pracha and Rogatzia, and which, according to some accounts, has been greatly strengthened by deserters from Tito's conscript armies. When the bishop referred to them as brave men ready to lay down their lives for their people, there was a demonstration, and the presiding judge, the Montenegrin, Masan Radonich, angrily ordered the spectators cleared from the courtroom. Bishop Nastich was denied the right to make any further speech in his own defense. He was sentenced to 11 years at hard labor, which, under the conditions existing in the slave camps, is probably equivalent to a sentence of death.

That he was permitted to go as far as he did is probably to be explained by the ignorance and ineptitude of his judges. Reports of the bishop's defiance are said to have spread rapidly from mouth to mouth. Thus as propaganda the trial recoiled on its authors. Incidentally, Bishop Nastich is an American by birth, a native of Gary, Ind. About a year ago he was elected to the episcopate of the Serbian Orthodox Church, and afterward sent to Sarajevo as successor to the Metropolitan Simonich, who was slain by the Croatian Ustachi under the German occupation. It was apparently the purpose of the regime to represent him as an agent of the American imperialists, but the result was apparently opposite to the intention.

Alabama and Negro Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Anniston (Ala.) Star of March 14, 1948:

ALABAMA AND NEGRO EDUCATION

It is encouraging to note that so distinguished a Member of the United States Senate as ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, has given his endorsement to the proposed establishment in the Southern States of a group of regional colleges and universities for the higher education of both Negro and white students. He himself studied at Augsburg College in Minneapolis, pursued his studies in law at the University of Michigan, and received his LL. B. degree at the University of Wisconsin. Thus he becomes entitled to speak with some authority on regional educational values.

In view of their low per capita income, it has been impossible for Southern States individually to finance educational institutions that equal the better colleges and universities in the East and West. For while it is a well-known fact that some of the oldest universities in the country originated in the South; after the war between the States their growth was greatly retarded. As a consequence southerners have been compelled to spend millions of dollars for the higher education of their sons and daughters in other American regions.

But if we act cooperatively, as has been proposed by the governors of the Southern States, we can put an end to this dependence and, in time, build up as fine a system of higher education for our own boys and girls as now obtains in any other part of the world. We say this advisedly, because the South today is growing more rapidly than any other American region, both in population and in wealth, while most of the privately endowed institutions of the North upon which we have had to depend for many years are encountering ever-increasing financial difficulties.

It is unfortunate, however, as stated in Washington last Friday by Governor Caldwell of Florida, that this question of regional education in the South should have come up for consideration in the Congress at a time when the so-called civil rights program is being fostered by both of the great American political parties. Yet there is no essential connection whatsoever between the two questions. Senator WILEY and others so stated before a meeting of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Friday, although it might help to solve a "perplexing problem," as the Senator averred.

Segregation is an issue on which the majority race in the South will not compromise. Nevertheless, every year more white persons are recognizing that it is to the best interest of both races that the Negro be given equal educational opportunity. Accordingly, for several years in this State the advantage of regionalism has been given expression through a State appropriation to establish scholarships to enable Alabama Negroes to pursue graduate studies in colleges and universities where segregation does not obtain.

During the years 1946–47 alone the State helped defray the expenses of some 88 Negro graduate students at some of the best universities in the United States, including Yale, Northwestern, Harvard, Southern California, Michigan, Illinois, Chicago, Ohio State, Columbia, Massachusetts Tech, and New York, not to mention such fine exclusively Negro schools as Atlanta, Howard, and Meharry. In addition to this, the State also makes an appropriation to Tuskegee, a privately endowed Alabama school for Negroes, for graduate work in specialized studies.

But Alabama is not satisfied merely to help educate its Negro citizens by sending them to other States. On the other hand, the State school board in recent years has been appropriating proportionately more for the colored schools than for the white schools. The increase in the public schools during the 1946–47 school year amounted to 464.4 percent for the total school enrollment, or 437.6 per number of Negro pupils in daily attendance. And as a result of the recent ratification of the education amendment to the State constitution, the record for this year will be proportionately better.

It is in the field of higher education for Negroes, however, that Alabama has made the best record. Relatively poor as we are, we now are able to boast of the fact that at Montgomery we have the largest Negro teachers college in the United States. This school now is an A-rating, 4-year college that confers the Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees in education. The A. and M. school at Normal, near Huntsville, also has been given college status with A rating. Both schools compare more than favorably with Tuskegee, a much older school, with respect to the number of Doctor of Philosophy professors.

The following summary tells the story of the growth of these three schools very graphically: Enrollment for the regular year 1937–38 was 2,420; for 1947–48 it is 5,110, the relative figures for the summer school being: 1937 enrollment 2,637 and for 1947 it was 5,937. The number of degrees granted increased from 226 in 1937–38 to 666 in 1947. Faculties increased from 187 in 1937 to 351 in 1947–48. In 1937–38 the salary range was $666 to $3,000; today it is $1,350 to $5,000. The value of property and equipment has increased during the same period from $5,470,363 to $9,503,994. The statutory appropriation has enhanced from $93,000 to $752,505, an increase of 709 percent; and the capital outlay by the State, which was nothing in 1937, was $920,278 last year.

Yet, there are some politically minded Negroes in the United States today who are rebelling against the idea of segregation. But it is significant that about one-half of those here in Alabama who were given the option of enrolling in nonsegregation schools in the North under scholarships from this State, elected to attend the exclusively Negro schools in the South. These schools now existing here and the proposed regional schools will give the Negro an opportunity to show what he can do by himself and to disprove the fallacious idea that the white man's brain is inherently superior to his. Indeed, it is through education from the grammar school to the university for whites and blacks alike that the problems now besetting the two peoples in their interracial relations must needs be settled. It cannot be done by force of law.

The People's Mandate to Congress Still Holds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Melrose (Mass.) Free Press of March 18, 1948. At this particular time when congressional attention is so largely focused upon international affairs, it is well for us to remember that the people are still very much concerned over the domestic situation. The editorial follows:

THE PEOPLE'S MANDATE TO CONGRESS STILL HOLDS

George Peck, whose column, the American Way, appears regularly in many papers, opened recently by saying that "historical records show that no nation can long endure and be prosperous and free when taxes take as high as 25 percent of the national income." He then goes on to show that the Government tax take, Federal, State, and local, sums up to about 30 percent of our 1947 national income.

Part of the political technique of our national administration since March of 1933

has been, and is, to keep events moving so fast that the people and the Congress get used to the confusion, the alarms, to crisis piled on crisis, one emergency treading on the heels of another, so that things of highest moment, events and circumstances affecting our very national salvation and survival, things which would have appalled the Nation a generation ago, have become commonplace, everyday occurrences. In this set-up Federal spending and extravagance find a soft bed in which to lie.

Thus it has become the order of the day, applied not with diminishing but augmented force, as shown by President Truman's budgets, that every proposal emanating from the bureaucracy-controlled administration, must be backed by colossal money grants from Congress. The people from whose pockets these billions in taxes are being extracted, became inured during wartime to spendings transcending imagination in amount, to which they patriotically acquiesced. But with war's end, Federal spending did not fall back to prewar New Deal spendthrift standards, or lack of standards, but is now being maintained at an extravagant level which the Nation's revenue yielding sources cannot long continue to withstand.

"Disaster lies ahead," says Mr. Peck, "if we let our Federal Government continue to spend our money in peacetime at anything like the present rate. * * * I have no desire to live in a slave state, and that is the goal to which the United States is heading if a halt is not made to reckless, extravagant, Government spending." To which we would add that the financial collapse of the United States is exactly the eventuality Moscow-backed communism in this land of ours—the same communism which the American Government essays to halt in Europe with billions of American taxpayers' dollars—would like to see happen here, provided, however, that Moscow has then extracted all Moscow can get out of America while this Nation is yet solvent and prosperous. Communism's plan to weaken and undermine is admirably served and strengthened by Government waste and extravagance of our resources, both financial and material.

The issue and responsibility is squarely up to the present Congress, which now knows full well that no lessening of extravagance can be looked for from the bureaucratic administration. President Truman's budgets, his tax-reduction vetoes, and his message on the state of the Union, with its vast program of socialistic ingredients, show plainly enough which way the White House financial weathervane points. Nothing but spendthrifting for emolument of bureaucracy can be looked for from the administration. The people's mandate of November 1946, bade Congress save the state from bureaucracy. The mandate still holds.

High Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House today another example of the administration's lack of faith with the American people in dealing with the high cost of living.

Despite promises to the public to help bring price relief to consumers, the administration has contributed to the price spiral by its purchasing policies. It cannot help the consumer obtain lower prices when it is actively working to the opposite effect.

Every time there is a prospect of a surplus and a corresponding price drop in a certain commodity, such as sugar, a Federal agency intervenes, buys up the surplus, createst a shortage, and drives the price up again. The Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation are the principal offenders.

At the same time, administration spokesmen claim that unspecified big business is responsible for high costs. The Commodity Credit Corporation is one of the biggest businesses in the commodity market today and plays an essential part in price fluctuations.

In dealing with the sugar problem the administration has artificially created such a shortage, while ignoring the effect of this policy on the pocketbook of every American housewife.

The manipulation of the sugar market is well described by Arthur T. Joyce in an article in the March 15 issue of Bakers Weekly, which I ask be reproduced in the RECORD at this point.

MEET MARKET MANIPULATOR NO. 1: YOUR GOVERNMENT—HOW THE WORLD'S BIGGEST SUGAR BUYER PROMOTES HIGHER, NOT LOWER, PRICES

(By Arthur T. Joyce, director, Washington Bureau, Bakers Weekly)

If there is any one ideal to which the present administration has consistently paid at least lip service, it is that food prices should be held as low as possible.

The stage managers have given us a pretty picture. On the one side we have President Truman in the shining armor of St. George carrying a banner proclaiming the fight against inflation as the helpless housewife cowers in the shadows. On the other, the horrendous dragon labeled "Big Business" gorges its profit-swollen belly on high prices.

Events of the past few weeks, especially when studied in conjunction with policies of the past year, suggest that Washington's widely advertised theatrical performance has about as much relationship to facts and the truth as an old-fashioned medicine show.

On January 2, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under the law passed by Congress last summer, announced the sugar quota for domestic consumption for the current calendar year. He set this figure at 7,800,000 tons. This figure was substantially lower than the 8,500,000 tons which had been recommended to the Secretary by the industrial users sugar committee, representing bakers, confectioners, and other converters in December. There was a gradual decline in sugar prices during the next 8 weeks until, on February 26, the Department slashed this quota by 300,000 tons to 7,500,000. In other words, it is evident that the Government acted to create an artificial shortage for the purpose of increasing prices.

Just prior to this action, the Department had announced the purchase of 1,000,000 tons of Cuban sugar for Army and foreign distribution; the agreed price was 4 cents per pound, although a decline in world sugar prices had brought quotations down at that time to 3.75 cents.

This manipulation of available supply to create an artificial shortage and bolster prices seems a strange course indeed for an administration which has consistently proclaimed that controls should be maintained in order to prevent business interests from taking advantage of a free market to limit supply and force prices up.

This apparent inconsistency is blindly ignored as the Department declares that it is ready to make still further revisions in its quotas for civilian use if necessary to protect domestic producers against possible surpluses.

The result is the imposition of higher costs on bakers and other industrial users, and, both directly and indirectly on the American housewife. Let's see just how it's done.

In writing the Sugar Act of 1948, as with all sugar legislation, Congress shows a tender solicitude for the domestic cane and beet producers. The result is the allowance of wide latitude to the Department of Agriculture's Sugar Branch. That agency, it would appear, exercises its authority to the benefit of offshore producers in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and South America, as well as our own politically potent growers. In fact, everyone else benefits at the expense of the American consumer. The law, of course, requires due consideration of the interests of "the general public" who too often is identified as "the forgotten man."

A brief résumé of the Government's policies and operations in sugar during the past year reveals a number of wrong guesses that might well have cost any mere hireling of private industry his job. In Government, however, such a record no way precludes demands for still greater authority.

Early last year, Congress held hearings to determine whether the wartime sugar control program of OPA should be continued until October 31, 1947, or extended to March 31, 1948. The administration fought stubbornly for the later date, arguing that extension was vitally necessary to protect the people against high sugar prices. Experts in the sugar trade argued that continued controls were unnecessary. The decision of Congress was to end all controls not later than October 31, 1947; but with the Secretary of Agriculture allowed to relinquish certain controls earlier if possible. In June 1947, Congress, by cutting the remaining appropriations for OPA, virtually forced the Secretary of Agriculture to eliminate household rationing, followed later by the dropping of industrial rationing. Price controls continued to October 31.

As of that date, the price of standard fine granulated sugar was $8.40 per hundred pounds. The administration's fears proved unfounded—when price controls expired, the price of sugar did not go up. On July 1, 1947, trading was resumed on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exhange, with the avowed blessing of a government which (tongue in cheek?) indicated it was glad to be out of the sugar business. On the opening day, May 1948 futures were traded at the equivalent of $6.75 duty-paid New York. At the end of the month it was down to $5.95, and reached $5.53 on August 21. This placed the market for future delivery at a point actually 79 cents per hundred pounds lower than the Government-fixed price on the basis of raw sugars.

Reacting to various influences, there was a tremendous movement of sugar during September and October that sent May futures up to $6.22 duty-paid on October 31. Persistent rumors finally proved correct, and, as of January 1, 1948, the duty on Cuban sugars was reduced from 75 cents to 50 cents per hundred pounds. This has resulted in the anomalous situation where we have spot trading on raw sugars (in free market) at $5.05 cost and freight, plus a duty of 50 cents for a total price of $5.55, which is 77 points under the Commodity Credit Corporation price of $6.32. In the meantime, granulated sugar has gone down from $8.40 less 2 percent to $7.75 less 2 percent for cane and $7.55 for beet sugar.

Incidentally, the International Emergency Food Council on last December 16 announced that it would make no recommendations for international distribution of sugar in 1948. This was because it felt that there was ample

sugar to meet all requirements likely to materialize in view of the difficult exchange position of many countries.

On the world market, a declining trend has been in effect ever since last summer. In fact, world raws dropped from a high of around 15 cents per pound during the war to a low of 3¾ cents last December. On January 15, the May position sold at $3.65 f. o. b. Cuba (New York Exchange). On January 24, word leaked out that Chief James A. Marshall of USDA's sugar section was planning to go to Cuba to buy up world supplies for use by the Army and in occupation areas. The amounts rumored starting at 200,000 tons, eventually rose to 1,000,000 tons plus supplementary reservations for use under the Marshall plan (which has of course not yet received congressional sanction). On February 11, formal announcement was made of the purchase of the million tons at a price of 4 cents per pound at Cuban ports. An additional 420,000 tons was set aside for future purchase at a price not under 4.965 cents. This action effectively stopped the downward trend that had carried world sugar to 3.75 cents.

In the face of the facts which are difficult for the layman to follow, but which are familiar to every sugar expert, it is obvious that the United States Department of Agriculture has been following a policy of doing everything possible to check the decline in the sugar market and, furthermore, to advance it materially. On the record there is reason to fear that this policy will be followed to promote still higher prices.

The Government, as the world's largest buyer of sugar, is playing the weird role of manipulating the market to force itself to pay more. Skipping the legal question as to the Department's right to buy sugar under the Marshall plan, which has not yet passed Congress, what kind of economics is it to force the world price of sugar up, especially since all such purchases will be made from foreign countries? Incidentally, not only American consumers but the poor people of France, Belgium, Italy, and other countries must pay more for the sugar they now consume as the result of these activities.

To return again to the most recent example of calculated manipulation: The Government set the domestic quota for this year at 7,800,000 tons on January 2; on February 26, for no reason except to stiffen sagging prices, this quota was cut to 7,500,000 tons. A further cut for the same purpose can be made at any time. The chances are it will be—unless the American buyer decides it's time to call a halt and does something about it.

The arbitrary authority granted under the Sugar Act invites abuse; the ultimate responsibility rests with Congress which wrote the law to suit the whims of a small but powerful farm-pressure group. However, an aroused public opinion can well insist that there be limits to the extent to which Government officials use those powers to force substantially higher prices than the supply-demand situation justifies. The cost of indifference comes high.

Italy in the Shadow of Hammer and Sickle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. L. Sulzberger:

[From the New York Times magazine of March 21, 1948]

ITALY IN THE SHADOW OF HAMMER AND SICKLE—COMMUNISTS BACKED BY MOSCOW MAKE A BOLD BID FOR POWER IN A LAND FREED BY WESTERN ARMS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

VENICE.—One of the loudest boasts of Benito Mussolini, a renegade Marxist himself, was that he had eliminated communism in Italy. And yet, during the 3 years since the Italian Peninsula was liberated, the most powerful Communist Party in Europe outside of the Soviet Union has grown up. This party, openly supported by Moscow, is so strong that it may wreck the European balance of power when Italy goes to the polls on April 18.

How did this happen?

Certain fundamental reasons are indisputable. First, Italy was obviously due for a political change; one of the Allies' war aims was the overthrow of Mussolini's fascism. Second, the Italian people were lethargic and politically sterile after more than 20 years of dictatorship, secret police, and the absence of competition between parties. Third, the western allies, who actually liberated Italy, had no concrete political and social program to offer the Italians. Fourth, Moscow had such a program and, in addition, had brilliant and carefully schooled men to present it.

The United Nations' victory created a vacuum in Italy that was not merely strategic but also political. Such a situation was ideal for some sort of ideological penetration. But we were either indifferent to or failed to recognize Italy's importance, and because we lacked a program for Italy's reconstruction we are at least partly responsible for communism's success in Italy.

The evidence is ample. Here are some of the things we did and failed to do.

As the Fifth and Eighth Armies swept northward over the Appenines in 1945, the United States and Britain acted as though they were politically naive; they seemed to assume that a people accustomed to intellectual serfdom could suddenly practice democracy.

The liberators never broke up the medieval share-cropping agricultural system which had impoverished the Italian peasants. They made only meager efforts to bring about social equalization by the establishment of a fair-play formula and minimal socialization.

The political figures supported by the western allies were often confused, and occasionally tainted with fascism. Thus the courageous but inept Ferruccio Parri was elevated from obscurity to the premiership and dropped back into anonymity. The Fascist provincial governors in towns such as Campobasso, who had reigned in security for years under the Blackshirts, continued in hospitable and charming power.

Although the United States and Canada are among the world's greatest paper producers, only a modicum of newsprint and poster material was sent to advertise what the free democratic program meant. Only a few experts of high political caliber were encouraged to foster the philosophy of the American Constitution. Whatever his capabilities, the man chosen as military governor of Italy was stigmatized by the cynical Italian slogan, "Give us more spaghetti and less Poletti."

Supremely confident of the outstanding virtues of their own democratic system, which the continent of Europe had never experienced except in books, the Washington strategists allowed Italy to be commonly regarded as a defeated enemy country, populated by Fascists, poor aristocrats, picturesque peasants, minor crooks, innumerable relatives of Italo-American families, and art experts.

In contrast to American indifference and lack of planning, the Russians acted decisively from the first possible moment. Early in 1944 Moscow recognized the Badoglio government without prior consultation with western capitals. This assisted the entry into the Italian Government of the newly re-created Communist Party. This, in turn, facilitated gradual Communist penetration.

In this atmosphere, a handful of veteran Italian Communist exiles were helped to return to Italy. This brave and ruthless group who had lived through the Spanish civil war—Palmiro Togliatti, Fausto Longo, Mauro Scoccimarro, Giuseppe di Vittorio, and Velio Spano—knew and understood Marxian ideology. They also knew and understood Italians; they recognized that they were working with a disillusioned population, including many erstwhile Fascists wishing to change political shirts to obtain protective coloration.

Togliatti, the secretary-general of Italy's Communist Party, returned to Italy from Russia with a fresh Moscow viewpoint and with a carefully planned Communist program which he unfolded, step by step. He skillfully maneuvered his way to power, became a cabinet minister and, with the aid of his fellow-Comintern veterans, spread doctrines basically inimical to men of the British and American Armies which had chased Mussolini and the Germans from Italy.

The Soviet mission to assist Russian displaced persons arrived in Italy. It included NKVD officers, who intrigued and propagandized to such a degree that in the end the Allied Control Commission had to cancel their travel permits.

The Soviet Union quietly shipped thousands of tons of paper and billions of lire to Italy to foster its elemental propaganda campaign.

As the pattern developed, Italy's Communists perfected the establishment of so-called front organizations. They took control of the labor movement which the Allies sought to foster in the wake of Mussolini's corporative state, making party-line groups of both the Federation of Labor and the agricultural workers combine called the Confederterra. They infiltrated a non-Catholic cooperative group, called Lega Nazionale della Cooperative" and the national Partisans organizations, the ANPI.

They established the Communist Youth Movement, the MGC, similar to the Russian Comsomol organization. They promoted the Unione Donne d'Italia, the women's association headed not only by the wives of Togliatti and Longo but also by Giuliana Nenni, spouse of the left-wing Socialist leader.

Eventually, the Communists hypnotized the Socialist Party and permitted Giuseppe Saragat's independent right-wing faction to split off. They established a secret army called the Apparat, which, controlled by Longo and built around former wartime partisan nuclei, probably numbers more than 75,000 men by now organized into military units.

Italy after her liberation was ripe for such a positive and disciplined political movement. It was an ideal situation for the realization of Stalin's watchword. "There are no fortresses that cannot be taken by Bolshevik audacity."

If in a mechanized political movement of the sort that took place in Italy any individuals can be credited for the party's success, the most effective have been Togliatti and Longo. After the April 18 elections they may become two of the most important men in Europe.

I remember when Togliatti (then known as Ercoli) first arrived in Naples. He joined a group fostered by the Allies and known as the junta, which was designed to begin

the process of democratizing the Italian people.

Togliatti, far better than the Allies, knew his future movements. Behind his affable, quiet exterior he concealed one of the toughest and ablest political brains of this generation. Born in 1893, he had been educated as a lawyer and became a Socialist shortly after the First World War. He assumed leadership of the Italian Communist Party (already driven underground by Mussolini) in 1926 and had to flee for his life.

From then on he devoted himself fanatically to his political task, living in Moscow, Paris, and Madrid. He actually became a Soviet citizen and could still, if he wished, produce a Soviet passport. He was one of the principal leaders of the Comintern and a member of its executive committee, and its Mediterranean expert.

Togliatti became—and still is—a close personal friend of Stalin. During the Spanish civil war he represented supreme Kremlin authority in Madrid. He was taken prisoner there as the civil war ended in March 1939. Republicans broke into the prison and permitted him to flee to Moscow. There he remained until Anglo-Americans gave him a visa to liberated Italy in March 1944.

Longo, known as Galli when he fought in the underground against Mussolini, is Togliatti's right-hand man. Longo was inspector general of all international brigades in Spain, while Togliatti was Stalin's political spokesman. Also a Soviet citizen (when he wishes to be) Longo is a graduate of Moscow's first-class Frunze Military Academy. It is no accident that today he commands the Communist military secret army in Italy, and in a Communist government at Rome would almost certainly be Minister of War.

Today Italy's Communist Party is the largest in the world in proportion to the total voting population. From nothing it expanded to 50,000 in 1944. By early 1945 it claimed 385,000 in liberated portions of the country. Two years later it had grown to 2,168,470 members. Today it has nearly 2,500,000 members.

This strength is organized on the same traditional pyramidal lines (what used to be called the Fuehrer prinzip in Germany) as that of the U. S. S. R. There are 91 regional Communist federations in Italy and these are subdivided into 8,632 sections. Each section is again subdivided into cells of 50 to 100 members, of which there are now more than 35,000. Each cell contains its own agitation and propaganda group, which receives pamphlet material and directions from Rome. These are similar to the directives passed out in Moscow in the Agitator's Notebook to the Soviets' Agitprop locals.

The actual power of Italian communism is held by a 3-man secretariat and a 22-man directorate elected by the 57-man central committee. The directorate is comparable to the usual international Communist politburo. It is assisted by a group known as the organization committee and by a high control commission.

The secretariat comprises Togliatti, Longo, and Pietro Secchia. The directorate includes, besides these three, Scoccimarro, financial expert; Eduardo d'Onofrio, propaganda expert; Umberto Terracini, president of the constituent assembly; di Vittorio, labor boss; Girolamo Licausi, Sicily's boss; Dr. Eugenio Reale; and Rita Montagnana, Togliatti's wife and head of the Italian Women's Union.

Italian communism is powerfully financed. Not only are funds gathered by party rallies and dues but also by "subscriptions" blackmailed out of industrialists with guilty Fascist consciences or black-market restaurateurs or manufacturers paying bribes to avoid costly strikes.

Mussolini's personal fortune, the so-called Dongo treasure, worth more than 10,000,000,000 lire, was reputedly thrown into the party fund by the Communist Partisans who captured the Duce. When the Yugoslavs briefly occupied Trieste, they bartered captured lire for dinars and turned over those lire to Togliatti. Continual assistance of a financial sort is rumored to come from the U. S. S. R.

How solid the Communist financial position is can be seen by the reported fact that the party is planning to spend 3,000,000,000 lire on the coming elections in three northern provinces alone.

Are the Italian Communists armed? Longo's Apparat is supposed to have direct liaison with the neighboring Yugoslav "Ozna." But perhaps the best answer to the armament question is the fact that the Government in one 10-day seizure of illegally hidden arms found machine pistols, submachine guns, machine guns, mortars, land mines, and thousands of rounds of ammunition. These stores were found in comparatively small but well assorted quantities. If this much was uncovered in 10 days, how much is left?

Today, the political zero hour for liberated Italy, Togliatti's immense Communist machine is ubiquitous. Hammer and sickle signs are painted on thousands of walls from Venice's mouldy Grand Canal and Siena's Piazza del Duomo, to the Roman Forum and the bustling harbor of Naples.

Masquerading in some townships as the filial offspring of Garibaldi and in others as the clandestine supporter of the monarchy, communism is advertising its wares in chameleonlike displays.

To a bewildered, overpopulated, impoverished, ruined, and disillusioned nation communism is being offered as a cure-all and palliative. The unemployed are told it means jobs. The religious are told it means tolerance. The hungry are told it means food. The nationalists are told it means resurgence.

In every mountain village or seaboard fishing hamlet industrious organizers are preaching the new gospel. The discontented are told, "Vote for us. If you are dissatisfied give us a chance to prove our worth." Curiously enough, thousands of Italians figure they might as well try communism. It cannot be worse than the prevailing system. If they don't like it they can vote in something else.

They tried fascism. They never were able to vote it out of office.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a letter received from a constituent, James I. Sherwood.

While I agree that the facts submitted are correct, I cannot agree as to his conclusion on the European recovery program which, in his letter, he calls the Marshall plan.

Mr. Sherwood is interested in government and is one of our most persistent writers regarding those matters which he has so strongly in mind.

Hon. HOMER RAMEY,
Congressman of Toledo, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: It is not the duty nor is it the mission in life for Americans to rebuild the economy and prosperity of European nations at the expense of our taxpayers.

Congress has no legal right or authority to tax for aid beyond the jurisdiction boundaries of the United States.

To prove these statements above let us refer to the great wisdom of Thomas Jefferson, the great intellectual, inventor, and President for two terms of the United States.

Jefferson said: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

Jefferson said: "Economy in public expense that labor be lightly burdened." That knocks out the Marshall plan (so-called to stop Russia, instead of Hitler Germany).

Why not have a Marshall plan at home?

Certain officials and foreign dominated newspapers and citizens, who want high prices to continue know how to save Europe. Of greater importance and need is a program by Americans for America, to preserve, protect, and promote the safety, welfare, and happiness of Americans, shielding them from un-American socialism, from luxury spending, and from foreign influenced officials (like Marshall and New Deal VANDENBERG of Michigan), and New York financiers and English dominated citizens along the Atlantic coast of America.

After World War I we loaned and gave to Germany $3,000,000,000 to sort of help Germany to pay reparations to Britain and France, and to tide Germany over some hard knocks in their economy.

That money and resources from America did not stop Germany from soon becoming another armed camp and she started World War II with our own money.

We may be going over the same grounds under the Marshall plan, only on a larger scale and with more at stake—it may involve us in another war also.

Why not stay at home. George Washington and Jefferson were truly Americans, and papers like the Blade would call them isolationists now. If so I would consider an honest American of greater influence than a foreign dominated English-American, who are now advocating the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan shall cost the city of Toledo a total of $40,250,000.

The Marshall plan shall cost every person in the United States $150.

The Marshall plan shall cost each family in the United States about $600.

Since World War II ended we have spent $9,000,000,000 in Europe. Marshall now wants to spend $17,000,000,000 more, that, with interest, shall amount to $20,000,000,000.

If England is so long in economy, why does she pay (Joe Lewis), $80,000 for prize boxing shows, and about $200,000 for the new Princess and husband, recently married in England, a year? And if Britain is so poor why does she add more expense by sending war vessels to the Falklands?

JAMES J. SHERWOOD.

MARCH 6, 1948.

The Late Gov. James Lukens McConaughy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I deem it a privilege to include a talk made on Sunday, March 14, 1948, over Station WDRC, Hartford, Conn., by Republican State Central Committee Chairman Harold E. Mitchell. The sentiments expressed in this talk and the devotion that prevails so patently throughout indicate also my

own feelings for our beloved Governor, James Lukens McConaughy, who passed away so unexpectedly on Sunday, March 7:

As the announcer has informed you, I am to make a report to Connecticut. I will do that, but it will be a report on a man, a man whom I knew, a man whom I loved.

You knew and admired him as Governor McConaughy. I knew him as the warm-hearted, laughing, happy Jim—plain, simple Jim. He would not want me to deliver a eulogy—he wanted no pomp and ceremony wherever he was concerned.

Yet I am sure he would not mind if I tell you why I cared for him with an affection that went far beyond ordinary friendship. Ours was not the usual association of political leaders—no words I can use can describe our relationship—it was a beautiful experience the like of which I had never known and never can hope to know again. My own life is immeasurably richer because he made it so.

Great honors came his way; he walked in lofty places; he broke bread with the affluent and powerful throughout the world. Yet Jim was so genuinely of the people that he could never think of himself except as one of the humblest of God's servants. Everything about him was humble simplicity. With all his honors, with all his accomplishments, with all his abilities, he could never be brought to parade his attainments at any time. Only a few weeks ago at the Rotary Club in Hartford when we attended together he insisted upon sitting with the membership as a visitor rather than to sit at the head table.

Jim was plain as homespun, solid as the rocks of the Litchfield hills which he loved so well, ordinary as the rest of us ordinary people in his Connecticut.

In the strength and beauty of his character, in the depth and breadth of his love for his fellowman, in his disregard for personal consequences in pursuing the right as he saw it, in his raw courage, there were the characteristics of the Lincoln who was Jim's idol. Jim's interest in the oppressed people everywhere, his understanding of their problems, was no casual opportunism—it arose out of his deep personal concern for the welfare of all the people.

I remember so well when Jim was lieutenant governor in 1939 and I was just a young member of the general assembly. I used to marvel at his keen power of analysis and perception and his great common sense. It was then I thought he would be a great governor should the opportunity ever arise.

I remember when he did become governor and problems of a magnitude that had not existed in Connecticut for many, many years were laid on his desk. As he did with all problems, he faced them squarely with never a thought of evasion or avoidance. With judgment and foresight and quiet leadership he solved the problems even though he knew he was risking momentary unpopularity.

I know how the petty, vicious personal attacks hurt him. Personal attacks that went far beyond the bounds of political decency. He took them all, and when I used to call him and tell him I wanted to return these attacks, he would tell me kindly but firmly, "These will be forgotten when the people understand the rightness of the course and I have faith in the understanding of the people of Connecticut."

Events have borne out his faith. The people were just beginning to appreciate his integrity, his judgment and his foresight. That is why his name will never die in our State. That is why the little children and the parents of children will give thanks in years to come that he was the Chief Executive at the vital moment when the State had to plan and provide for the future. That is why those who need a helping hand from the State are indebted to him. That is why his name will never pass from memory.

But you know these facts. You know of his academic career, you know something of his magnificent war record so important to the Nation yet largely unknown even today. May I tell some of the little things that showed his true greatness?

He was sternly just even with himself. When some Wesleyan graduate of many years ago hears this he will appreciate why he had a $5 fine returned to him. This graduate doesn't know today. This student had neglected to make an application for a special examination on time and the college rules imposed a penalty of $5 for the neglect.

The student asked to have the fine remitted and told President McConaughy of the reasons for his failure to make the application. The student was given a lecture on the virtues of being prompt. The student paid the fine, but as the student went out President McConaughy realized that he, the president, had failed to apply for his motor vehicle registration in time and so might lose the license plate which he treasured. A call to the motor vehicle department explaining the delay got the license plate.

The next day the student received a letter enclosing a $5 check. The letter signed by President McConaughy said "for reasons which you will never know, the amount of your penalty is being returned to you."

Jim was thoughtful. Do you remember his radio talk from his home in Cornwall that memorable night in November 1946 when he was elected governor by an overwhelming majority? That talk will never be found in the archives of oratory, but without rehearsal and without notes he spoke his thanks and his determination to give his all to the State. Do you remember too that he mentioned by name his townspeople, his family—everyone who had worked with him?

Jim was deeply appreciative. There was the night he came to Hartford, to Republican headquarters to join the men and women who had campaigned shoulder to shoulder with him and who were jubilant and rejoicing. They waited and waited for his car to make the trip from Cornwall. Well past the appointed time he had not arrived and they began a discreet search. Jim was found, and in Hartford. He was at the Bond Annex surrounded by maids, bellhops, elevator boys, and waitresses. He had lived at the Annex during his campaign. And at the moment of victory, when the great of his party awaited his arrival at headquarters, Jim bypassed them to bring an unusual honor, a real distinction to the folks, his folks, at the hotel.

I remember so well his first formal dinner after he and Mrs. McConaughy moved into the executive residence. The linen was spread. The State silver was on the table. Crystal was at every place. At the head of the table sat Jim, beaming, happy, contented because around him, his guests at his first formal dinner as Governor were the clerks and secretaries and stenographers and messengers and close friends who had shared the burden of the campaign with him.

Others, more distinguished perhaps, more fortunate in worldly goods and worldly places, later sat at that same table, but never was Jim happier than that night when he had his own folks around him.

He loved to be called Jim. That was no affectation. He could wear the mantle of his office becomingly. He always upheld the dignity of his office. But somehow he was always Jim. The name fitted him as comfortably—and as appropriately—as an old glove. Big Jim, some called him. And he liked that, too. He laughed so heartily when someone sent him boxes of book matches with Big Jim printed on the cover. Gifts like that, little gifts, like the matches, like the miniature Republican elephants on his desk, delighted him. They meant a lot, because Jim knew they were gifts from the heart.

Jim was essentially a family man. It was wonderful to see his devotion, his love, his pride in his family. His grandchildren were a source of constant delight to him and hardly a day went by that he did not relate some anecdote about them. I think too that Jim was more thrilled by the sight of Mrs. McConaughy's published stories than by any of the great honors bestowed upon himself.

Jim loved children. I know the greatest pleasures of his working days at the capitol came when young children, singly or in groups, came in to visit him. He loved telling them about their State and they were quickly at ease in the knowledge that this great man was their understanding friend. On his sixtieth birthday he received several cakes at a luncheon we had for him. He wouldn't let them be cut, but insisted that they be sent out to the Children's Village so that the children could share in his birthday. Characteristically he didn't send the cakes, he delivered them personally. Then there was the morning that he was leaving the executive residence for an important commission meeting when he answered a phone call from an unknown person. It was a mother grief-stricken over her child who was missing. Instantly the affairs of state were set aside. All that mattered was that mother and child. Instead of asking someone else to do it, Jim sat at the phone, got the search going at once and then reassured the mother that the forces of the State were at work to find the child. The child was found soon. Jim was very late for the commission meeting—few people ever knew why.

Jim was a great leader. He was not the type of leader who deliberately attracted attention to himself. He believed in getting people together, analyzing the facts, and then guiding the discussion to the right conclusion. His greatest characteristic was his insistence upon giving credit for good actions to others. Many, many times, he should have received acclaims, but he intentionally stood aside so that others would receive their due.

At the same time he was ever willing, too willing, I thought at times, to take the blame solely upon his shoulders for actions which were unpopular. This willingness to take the sole blame obscured for a while his true greatness.

Jim never ducked or postponed a problem or a responsibility. Many times he could have taken an easier course so far as he personally was concerned. But his integrity was so great that he would not allow himself to sidestep. I can't recall any Governor who was faced with more difficult problems where the solution inevitably had to be temporarily unpopular.

It is because of men like Jim that the government of our State of Connecticut is so well run, so free from petty politics, so spotlessly free from the taint of graft and corruption. If more Americans believed as sincerely as Jim did in his conviction that all men should actively participate in government we would never need have a fear for our future.

Jim himself said: "With all the temptations, dangers, and degradations that besets it, politics is still, I think, the noblest career that man can choose."

Jim believed this and, believing it, gave of himself unstintingly to the people of Connecticut. I know better than most that it was his devotion to his duty that brought on his untimely passing. From the depths of his deeply religious nature, he drew on strength through long days and nights until there was no more.

Jim was a true pioneering American who sturdily faced the future unafraid, with vision and indomitable courage.

In the plain, beautiful simplicity of his character and in the exquisite qualities of his manhood and statesmanship, there was the real Jim McConaughy. You, the people of Connecticut, have suffered a loss not yet fully understood.

Always, I shall be waiting to hear that little chuckle of his at the end of a story well told. Always there will be a part of my heart that holds the perfect memory of one whom I loved, and so Jim,

"Goodnight. Ensured release,
Imperishable peace,
Have these for yours.
While sky and sea and land
And earth's foundations stand
And heaven endures."

Our Irish Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by J. Vincent Keogh, United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Brooklyn on March 17, 1948:

Mr. Toastmaster, Right Reverend Monsignor, Mr. President, fellow officers and members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Brooklyn, their families, friends, and fellow Brooklynites, cead mile failte—a hundred thousand welcomes to you in Gaelic—in honor of De Valera, a great Irishman who chose to spend this St. Patrick's Day in this great country of his birth.

I have wondered whether we should indict J. C. and A. W. Hare, who about the Irish said, according to Maude Van Buren in Quotations for Special Occasions, "Every Irishman has a potato in his head."

My instinctive reply to this vilification is: "Better a potato in these days of the high cost of living, than feathers in his head." I know that you will agree with me that if the Hares did say it, that they said it out of pure envy of the Irish.

And there is no time like St. Patrick's night to note why all others have reason to envy us—the sparkling, scintillating, sentimental, the practical, imaginative, successful, the blessed, at times, cussed—the pleasant, the perfect, the real—the royal Irish. This is our day. This our night. We shall enjoy ourselves in our Irish way.

Let us shut out of this famous Brooklyn Irish castle—the Columbus Club—all the world, the world of will you help this worthy cause?; the world of you must do it—but better; the world in which we all live 365 days a year, but in leap year 366 days.

This 17th day of March is our day. In this leap year it is our 366th day—our St. Patrick's day. We shall live it and enjoy it—knowing that enjoying is as much our heritage as loving Ireland is, and loving all who came from there, or who are related to any who might even a long time ago have seen the fair land.

"Far are the Gaelic tribes and wide
Scattered round earth on every side and assert their will
They aim at all things—Rise or fall
Succeed or perish—but through all love Erin still."

On this day we love Eire, and particularly St. Patrick, about whom the poet wrote:

"You've heard, I suppose, long ago how the snakes, in a manner most antic
Were marched to the County Mayo and Trundled there into the Atlantic.

We Celts need have no phobia or defense mechanism about the sons and daughters of the American Revolution or the Mayflower descendants, when we realize that St. Patrick was born in 387 and, although sent to Ireland as a captive slave, so well adjusted himself to his new surroundings that he soon befriended enough people to arrange his escape. However, once back home he pined for the "ould country" and to Ireland he returned—wits might say from slave to saint—but the Bard wrote:

" 'Twas on the top of that high mount St. Patrick preached a sermon
He drove the frogs into the bogs and banished all the vermin."

The Irish in America may well this day refresh their memories of the real McCoy myths and the legends, knowledge of which will better help them smile through the other 364 or 5 days. For instance, the story of O'Donaghue, hero of Killarney, who lives at the bottom of the lake in a gorgeous fashion and in the company of congenial friends. Every 7 years in the summer he comes to the surface of the lake, makes a journey from one end to the other on the back of a white stallion, in an armor of gold and a helmet that glitters with diamonds. Blessings are showered upon everyone who is fortunate enough to see him. If a girl should catch a glimpse of him she is sure to be married within the year. Scores of natives claim actually to have seen him and half the population believe in his 7-year visits, you remember—or perhaps you know O'Donohue. We Irish may be difficult to understand under all circumstances but we can put our hands to our ears—no matter where nor when—and hear the plaintive music of such poetry as:

"Oft, in the stilly night,
Ere slumber's chain has bound me,
Fond memory brings the light
Of other days around me:
The smiles, the tears of boyhood's years,
The words of love then spoken;
The eyes that shone,
Now dimm'd and gone,
The cheerful hearts now broken.

"When I remember all
The friends, so link'd together,
I've seen around me fall
Like leaves in wintry weather,
I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet-hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed.
Thus, in the stilly night.
Ere slumber's chain has bound me.
Sad memory brings the light
Of other days around me."

Thomas Moore thus memorialized our delicate but real, our deep and sincere sentimentality.

We do not know the author of the legend that tells us that long ago there were two giants, the giant of Glengariff and the giant of Killarney. They were very jealous of each other and were continually boasting of their valor and strength. Finally the giant of Killarney decided to go over to Glengariff and see for himself. Disguised as a monk he crossed the divide, went down to the village and was directed to the house of his enemy. The giant of Glengariff, hearing of the approaching visit, became very much frightened and hastily made himself a cradle. Lying down in it his wife tucked him in and when the giant of Killarney arrived he saw a lady sitting on a three-legged stool knitting and lulling a baby to sleep. As he approached she said: "Hush, you spalpeen, lest ye wake the baby" and she continued to sing a slumber song in a soft sweet voice. "Let's see your baby," whispered the giant of Killarney. When she lifted the blanket gently and he saw the child, he started back over the mountain as fast as his long legs could carry him. "If the baby's as big as that, how big must the old man be?" he said.

Surely, we all know that when you go to the gap of Dunloe you pass John Lynch's haunted house. He was a land agent sent up from Dublin to collect the rents. Since none of the tenants had any money, he evicted them all. Having no tenants, he was without a job, so he came to America, but through the influence of the Irish in New York, he was not permitted to land. When he returned to Ireland he was so much depressed by the black looks of his neighbors, that he committed suicide. Once more, through the same good influence, he was shut out of both heaven and hell. Finally, the devil took pity on him and gave him some fagots and matches and told him to go back to Killarney and start his own fire. So every night at midnight you can see a light in John Lynch's house in Killarney. "Did you ever see the light?" a native was once asked. "Bless ye, no: I'm never up that late," he answered.

Ah for the days of legends instead of contemporary days of wars of nerves. Headlines reflecting international bluffs and bluffers fade as dust—as old stuff—because we have long lived with the allegory of the giant's causeway. The legend runs that it is the work of a real giant. Fin McCoul was the champion warrior of all Ireland. He was much distressed to learn that a certain Scotch giant was given to boasting that he could swim the Channel and give Fin a "drubbing" only he did not want to get wet. So Fin built the causeway across the Channel so that the braggart might have no further excuse for not coming over to make good his boast. A fight ensued in which Fin, of course, was the victor.

Let any bewiskered, bespectacled ogre today come out of the East, by way of Siberia or Flushing Meadows, we in this country will have no fear—because we descendants of Fin McCoul will apply the classic legend—and like our forebear will once and for all call the bluff. Tonight we honor St. Patrick and we toast the day. Having celebrated it—we can not only face a new morrow but, more important—we can help our neighbors face it. Because we bring with confidence that is contagious our practical imaginative artistry of living—an Irish heritage which we love and to which we shall 'ere be true.

"The savage loves his native shore,
Though rude the soil and chill the air;
Then well may Erin's sons adore
Their isle which nature formed so fair.
What flood reflects a shore so sweet
As Shannon great, or pastoral bann,
Or who a friend or foe—can meet
So generous as an Irishman."

Way to Peace Requires UN Amendment on Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an article

written to the Toledo Blade by Morrison R. Van Cleve, one of the outstanding thinkers and writers of our country. The article is indeed pertinent to events of today.

WAY TO PEACE REQUIRES UN AMENDMENT ON SOVEREIGNTY

To the EDITOR OF THE BLADE:

I have read with interest the review in the Toledo Blade of James P. Warburg's book, Put Yourself in Marshall's Place. It is a good review of a good book. I should like to comment further on the book.

After a keen analysis of the causes of growing conflict between the United States and Russia, and thoughtful proposals for alleviating it, Mr. Warburg writes, "The important thing to remember to realize is that this two-sided policy of taking out insurance against war is the road to war."

Their insurance is a threat to us, and vice versa. The author reviews the difficulties and frustrations revealed in the deliberations of the UN Security Council and Assembly, and then states, "All these flow directly from two sources—the imperfect basic concept of the UN, and the growing tension between its two most powerful members."

Then two sentences further on, "There can never be lasting peace in a world in which the highest authority rests in the sovereign nation state. Unless the concept of national sovereignty is superseded by the idea of world government, the two great centers of power will always tend to come into conflict."

This goes to the root of the matter. The only hope of permanent peace lies in a renouncing through an amended UN Charter by each nation of the right to wage war; consent to the merging of this traditional sovereign right into a UN police-power sovereignty, accompanied by world disarmament; and the enactment of world laws applicable to individuals.

Our State Department and UN representatives should be urged to propose a new convention as provided in article 109 of the charter for the purpose of reconstructing the UN into a limited world government with powers to enact and enforce world law adequate to maintain peace. Such powers are not provided by the present charter.

MORRISON R. VAN CLEVE,
President,
Toledo Chapter, World Federalists.

America Meets the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune]

HENRY IN DREAMLAND

Judged by the published summaries thereof Henry Wallace's testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee the other day must have grieved his judicious friends. To his confused thinking as illustrated by his own words, the postwar policies of his own country and its Government have been utterly wrong practically ever since the war's end and worsen with time. If another war should come, the guilt of its instigation as he sees it, would rest upon the United States.

Russia on the contrary is to his imagining a practically sinless, innocent victim of Washington's evil courses. He avowed his belief, for example, that there is no threat of Russian domination of western Europe now. Asked whether Russia was not intervening in the affairs of European countries, he dodged with the statement that no one can determine the extent to which Russia was intervening in her satellite countries because it is "impossible to get the truth from the American press."

As for the Marshall European recovery plan, he branded it an invasion of the political and economic freedom of western Europe, aimed at restoring the economic domination of Europe by Germany, and a layer of the foundations for war. Turning to Palestine, he charged that the slaughter of Jewish prisoners there was a direct result of the Truman doctrine of containing world communism.

Reverting to Russia the sinless, he averred that its attitude toward the United States would change once it were persuaded that the United States was not planning an invasion. Curiously—but of course naturally enough, he overlooked the fact that a country which has weakened its military and naval forces to a point endangering its own safety could hardly invade a remote and heavily armed Russia even if it were in aggressive mood.

In almost every detail, we gather, Mr. Wallace supported the Kremlin's position. Asked to cite any difference between his objections to the European recovery plan and those offered by Soviet Russia, he professed to be unfamiliar with the Communist approach and therefore unable to discuss it.

The Wallace testimony reveals a curious mentality. A member of the American Socialist Party's national executive committee suggested in an interview in the Midwest, that Mr. Wallace uses a double standard of morality in judging Russia's weaknesses. Our own surmise would be that he is dwelling for the time being at least in a sort of mental dreamland closely resembling Alice's fantastic Wonderland—and bearing very slight if any resemblance to present-day facts and realities.

[From the New Orleans (La.) States]

TRUMAN PROGRAM AIMED AT PEACE

President Truman's request for a draft law to fill out our armed forces to the required complement to keep them in tiptop shape and for universal military training can easily be misconstrued.

These are preparations for war.

They are preparations for peace.

While it is true that we could not fight a war today, we could get ready for a war within 6 months. Russia cannot war now, nor would Russia be more ready in a year, barring acquisition of the atom bomb.

Military analysts, economists, and other students of the international situation are agreed that Russia doesn't want a war now, and that the Soviet cannot fight a war now. United States News and World Report estimates that even should the situation continue to deteriorate at its present continued pace war is from 5 to 15 years off.

There is one way, however, to halt Russian aggression. And that is to be fully prepared for any eventuality. It will cost money, but it will not cost as much as a war in just money alone. And that is not taking into account the broken homes, the fatherless children, the sapping of the Nation's best manpower, which is the seed of our future greatness and growth.

Speeches and censure will not stop Stalin. The only thing the Russians respect is strength. And strength is the only thing that will stop them.

National strength calls for an Air Force second to none.

National strength calls for a Navy second to none.

National strength calls for an Army second to none in equipment, training, and weapons.

These things we must have if we hope to stop Russia. These, and mutual-defense pacts with the nations which are our friends. Such treaties would not only warn Russia, but would also serve as a measure of guaranty that part of the $5,300,000,000 European recovery plan will not end up in Russian hands simply by seizure.

Russia deals in power and strength. Stalin will not start anything he isn't sure of finishing successfully. Full preparedness is our best bet for continued peace.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item]

AMERICA MEETS THE ISSUE

"I believe that we have reached a point at which the position of the United States should be made unmistakably clear."

With these words, President Truman summed up the entire purpose and contents of his momentous address yesterday to the Congress, the American people, and the world at large.

Today there can be few persons who fail to understand clearly what the President was talking about. His personal appraisal of the present world crisis voiced a number of conclusions which many citizens of this country have long since reached. But in thus reflecting a strong measure of public opinion, Mr. Truman made it official. In language remarkable for its clarity and bluntness, he invested these mutual conclusions with the dignity of a national policy.

Step by step, the President reviewed the developments that have occurred since war's end 3 years past. The United States, together with the other democracies, has made every effort "to find a secure basis for peace through negotiation and agreement. * * * The record stands as a monument to the good faith and integrity of the democratic nations of the world."

Why have these efforts failed? For one reason alone. "The situation in the world today * * * is chiefly due to the fact that one nation has not only refused to cooperate in the establishment of a just and honorable peace but—even worse—has actively sought to prevent it."

Mr. Truman did not rely on implication to make his point. "Since the close of hostilities," he said, "the Soviet Union and its agents have destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in eastern and central Europe. It is this ruthless course of action, and the clear design to extend it to the remaining free nations of Europe, that have brought about the critical situation in Europe today."

Neither the American people, thus warned of the dangers to this Nation inherent in the Soviet design, nor the Kremlin, put on notice that the United States recognizes this ruthlessness for what it is, can ignore the gravity of these remaks.

It is because of this situation, said the President, that "the time has come when the free men and women of the world must face the threat to their liberty squarely and courageously. The United States has a tremendous responsibility to act according to the measure of our power for good in the world. We have learned that we must earn the peace we seek just as we earned victory in war, not by wishful thinking but by realistic effort."

This effort, as defined by the President, now includes three major objectives. Not one appears open to serious question.

First, the European recovery program must be forged as rapidly as possible. "Time is now of critical importance," Mr. Truman said, while paying tribute to the Senate's

decisive action on Sunday and asking that the House move with like speed. For the Soviets it is "a major obstacle to their designs to subjugate the free community of Europe. They do not want the United States to help Europe. They do not even want the 16 cooperating countries to help themselves."

Second, a law to authorize universal training must be enacted promptly. So long as communism threatens the very existence of democracy, the United States must remain strong. UMT would be unmistakable evidence to all the world of our determination to back the will to peace with the strength for peace.

Third, a temporary revival of the draft is needed to maintain the armed forces at their authorized strength until UMT is solidly established. Voluntary enlistments are not doing the job, although our forces have been cut to the absolute minimum consistent with security abroad and at home.

These steps, while of immediate necessity, cannot cover every contingency that may arise in the near or distant future. By limiting himself to these three specific proposals, the President may possibly have undershot the mark. But his determination that the United States shall not be caught short in the uncertain days that lie ahead, was amply shown when he declared that "we must be prepared to pay the price of peace, or assuredly we shall pay the price of war."

If the tenor of Mr. Truman's address was grave, there was compensation in its underlying optimism. In Europe itself the ERP nations are speeding deliberations on economic unification. As the President spoke, England, France, and the three Benelux countries affixed their signatures to a 50-year agreement providing for a common defense against aggression. Here at home reports of the Key West meeting of the Chiefs of Staff, discussed below at length, indicated that an over-all military defense program was being readied for presentation to Congress some time next week.

Indeed, these developments must have encouraged the President to seize the issue and confront it boldly. His words are certain to provide inspiration to free peoples everywhere, and to spur western Europe on to united action, and if there remains any possibility that the masters in the Kremlin can be influenced by actions other than their own, then surely Mr. Truman's forthright approach will have some salutary effect behind the iron curtain.

The American people have no cause to give way to hysteria. On the contrary, President Truman has cleared the air of ambiguity, indecision, and wishful thinking. The Nation's course is clear. The individuals who go to make up the Nation have but to put their shoulders to the wheel to carry this land forward with firmness of purpose and abiding confidence in our ability to meet the issue.

With the Chief Executive, we believe that "with God's help, we shall succeed."

Louisiana Yams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

FAIR DEAL FOR YAMS

Unreasonable favoritism for California citrus fruits and against Louisiana sweetpotatoes seems to be strongly indicated by reports from Washington that plans for domestic and foreign relief by our Government exclude the nutritious and delectable yam. This policy is provoking some sharp protests and criticisms, which appear to be justified.

The presumed favoritism is being noted in connection with the surplus commodity policy, smiling upon the California products, including raisins, prunes canned citrus no more desirable than the Louisiana sweetpotatoes. Many there are who will certify that yams are equal if not superior to the products for which Federal millions are being spent under the surplus-commodity policy of the Department of Agriculture. The Department's program is claimed to have these main objectives: Stabilization of prices by removal of surplus products; distribution of the surpluses to schools and other institutions classed as nonprofit institutions; fostering broader markets in the future. The plan calls for huge purchases of surplus food products but, without explanation satisfactory to the Louisiana yam fraternity.

With a view to having the Government play fair with the sweetpotatoes, J. F. Dezauche, of Opelousas, one of the Louisiana sweetpotato centers, expressed himself in a letter published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune, reading:

"The press recently carried the story of the distribution on the school-lunch program of some 6,400 tons of raisins. Many of them found their way into States that have a surplus of canned sweetpotatoes.

"I am calling this to the attention of the Senators and Representatives of 22 States which are commercial producers of sweetpotatoes. Many of these States have a surplus right now of canned sweetpotatoes which we have been unable to sell to the school-lunch program, or the various relief agencies or the Army for overseas relief.

"Many of these Congressmen are familiar with the efforts of the industry to sell these. We have had the support and leadership of such Senators as OVERTON and ELLENDER, of Louisiana; TYDINGS and O'CONOR, of Maryland; MAYBANK, of South Carolina; PEPPER, of Florida; SPARKMAN, of Alabama; GEORGE, of Georgia; CAPEHART, of Indiana; CAPPER, of Kansas; MCKELLAR, of Tennessee; and others; also of many Representatives from Louisiana, Maryland, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Alabama, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and other States.

"Won't they all now get behind this industry and see if we can't sell the surplus of canned sweetpotatoes that we have and also get sweetpotatoes recognized as a good food for feeding the world?

"I suggest a call to Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Louisiana; Representatives HENRY D. LARCADE, JR., of Louisiana; EDWARD MILLER, of Maryland; STEPHEN PACE, of Georgia, for the purpose of presenting an organized front in behalf of sweetpotatoes.

"I know that you agree with us that sweetpotatoes should be included in the domestic and foreign relief plans."

Surely there can be no good reason offered Louisiana sweetpotato growers and sellers for the Government's policy excluding the yam from the relief plans, those at home as well as those abroad. The policy should be changed. Protests from the sweetpotato industry should become so powerful that the Government authorities having to do with such matters will recognize the error and remedy the situation so that the production of sweetpotatoes in Louisiana and other States will not be discouraged and curtailed on account of unfriendly Federal action. Yams are suitable for the relief program, and their exclusion from food supplies paid for with money furnished by the Nation's taxpayers should be blocked. The delicious yam deserves more friendly attention. Evidently those spurning this choice product know little or nothing about the Louisiana sweetpotato.

Drought in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, very few people realize the seriousness of the present drought in California. Added to this drought we have a further threat in the form of legislation sponsored by the Department of the Interior and the State of Arizona to take away from California water which she claims is justly bers. We have asked that that question of water rights be settled in the Supreme Court, and legislation has been introduced to that end.

Not only is southern California hit with lack of water, but the entire State of California is suffering, and I am inserting in the RECORD news releases from Los Angeles which will show how we in southern California are offering aid to the drought-stricken sections in central and northern California.

The city of Los Angeles, through its department of water and power, today came to the aid of electricity-short northern and central California.

Almost the full output of the Seal Beach and Alameda steam plants, and a portion of the energy generated at the Harbor steam plant, which is surplus at this season of the year with the winter peak passed, is flowing from the municipal system for transmission to the farmers of the San Joaquin Valley.

The department, it was announced by General Manager and Chief Engineer Samuel B. Morris, is supplying 115,000 kilowatts of surplus power. This is in addition to 20,000 kilowatts generated in the steam plant of Glendale's municipal electric system, which the department has been delivering to the north since the first of the year. This is sufficient power for the needs of an average city of 500,000 population.

Deliveries for the relief of the northern and central sections of the State, it was announced, will amount to 2,910,000 kilowatthours of energy daily. This is the approximate limit of the quantity that can be supplied, because of limitations of interconnection facilities. The energy is transmitted over the lines of the Southern California Edison Co. to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the north.

To continue deliveries to the neighboring areas of the State, it was stated by Charles P. Garman, chief electrical engineer, will require the burning of 225,000 barrels of fuel oil monthly. The Department is now negotiating with oil companies for purchases of this fuel, and exploring possibility of using gas as fuel to as large an extent as possible to save oil.

In order to use the energy supplied by the Los Angeles municipal utility the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. had to resume its normal frequency of 60 cycles, which means, that clocks in the north will again run on time.

Surplus electric energy from the city's municipal system was made available to the north following week-end conferences with engineers of the Public Utilities Commission, the Edison Co., and the P. G. & E.

The conferees explored all possibilities to find methods of transmitting the energy.

The State utility commission has made no request for a brown-out in Los Angeles, Mr. Morris stated, and there will be no need for curtailment of local use of electricity.

Los ANGELES, March 9.—Transmission of power from the Los Angeles municipally owned electric system to the central and northern sections of California is proceeding satisfactorily, General Manager Samuel B. Morris reported to the board of water and power commissioners today.

Temporarily, transmission is being accomplished by isolating one of the Department of Water and Power's huge generating units at Hoover Dam, and operating it in parallel with the system of the Southern California Edison Co., for direct transmission north over that firm's high-voltage transmission line to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The 135,000 kilowatts of surplus energy being handled by the interconnecting lines is the practical limit with existing transmission facilities.

The Hoover Dam power flowing north is being replaced by energy generated at the Department of Water and Power's Alameda, Seal Beach, and harbor steam plants. Engineers are planning installation of a large transformer bank in Los Angeles, which can temporarily tie together the systems of the city and the Southern California Edison, in order that the Hoover Dam unit can be returned to the city's system and the surplus energy generated by steam can be transmitted directly into the Edison system by parallel operation.

Ability of the municipal utility to continue supplying surplus power for relief of the electricity-starved North is dependent upon securing adequate supplies of fuel, Chief Electrical Engineer Charles P. Garman stated. The steam plant generation to provide the surplus power uses fuel oil at the rate of 225,000 barrels monthly. The Department is attempting to purchase the oil, or to buy surplus natural gas as a substitute fuel for generation.

General Manager Morris informed the Board that E. F. McNaughton, chief engineer of the State public-utilities commission, had told the Department management that need of power for pumping by the farmers of the San Joaquin Valley is particularly critical. He quoted McNaughton that it is no longer a matter of saving seasonal crops, but of saving the vineyards and orchards that represent a lifetime of work and care and that are now threatened with complete destruction.

Steel for the Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have recently received:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF DOMESTIC COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your request of March 10, relative to the production of oil casing and tubing.

Separate statistics for casing and tubing are not available. The production of "oil company goods" which is comprised principally of casing and drill pipe was approximately 1,500,000 tons last year and we believe that 1948 output will be at least as great. Barring labor stoppages in or affecting the steel industry, some slight increase in the supply is to be anticipated in the normal course of events and further increases may result from the operation of the voluntary industry agreements program under Public Law 395. Since the petroleum industry requirements under the program are not yet firmed, we would rather not venture a percentage estimate at this time.

Under the voluntary agreements program we are directing our attention to a few major areas of greatest public importance including the field of petroleum industry equipment. The industry is currently engaged in establishing and justifying its steel requirements through its own advisory committee. This statement of requirements, after joint review by this Department and the Department of the Interior, will be presented to the Steel Industry Advisory Committee. Upon agreement as to its appropriateness the latter committee would arrange with the steel industry for the meeting of the requirements.

The extent to which industry requirements for casing and tubing are justified and agreed to will be the primary determinant of the increase in production of these items in 1948. The determination will also cover the extent to which any increased output is met by the allocation of new steel, the use of steel previously going to less critical areas, and the diversion of steel from less badly needed products within the industry. A more satisfactory estimate of this year's production will be possible after the determination of these questions.

I hope this will be satisfactory and that you will continue to call on the Department whenever we can be of service.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. MCCOY,
Director, Office of Domestic Commerce.

GI Boondoggling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post of February 25, 1948]

GI BOONDOGGLING

Director of the Budget Webb says that more than $200,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is being spent for so-called educational purposes under the GI bill of rights on "pure hobbies" that serve no occupational purpose, such as sport flying and ballroom dancing. More than 118,000 veterans are taking flight-training courses at Government expense, and according to Mr. Webb, 90 percent of the program is unjustified. Ballroom-dancing courses costing more than $400 are also popular, one dance studio guaranteeing to make a veteran "the darling of the stag line" within "a few magic hours."

Granted that it is often difficult to differentiate between instruction that equips a man for making a living and instruction that merely equips him to enjoy a variety of social diversions, it does seem to us that a line has to be drawn somewhere. Congress should at least take cognizance of these charges of frivolous dissipation of public funds, not only for the sake of veterans who are wasting time that could be spent in acquiring more useful and profitable training, but also for the sake of the public whose tax burdens our legislators are so anxious to lighten.

[From the Washington Post of March 17, 1948]

FLIGHT TRAINING

While it is perfectly proper to protest specific abuses of veterans' training under the GI bill of rights, it is futile at this juncture to debate the purpose of the GI bill itself. Whatever Congress originally intended, the fact is that a tremendous training operation has grown up. Although some of this training is not strictly related to vocational pursuits, much of it is serious and worth while despite the existence of so-called "frill studies."

A considerable cry has been raised against flight training. We were inclined ourselves to agree with the protest. However, on second examination, we believe that the fact that 118,000 veterans are enrolled in such courses is not so alarming as it at first seems. Obviously, only a small proportion of these men intend to become professional pilots. But, as the American Veterans of World War II pointed out the other day, such training does contribute to the national security by providing a reservoir of men "possessed of a broader and richer understanding of aviation and its problems." Certainly it adds to the understanding of the necessary scope of air defense and promotes the interest which aviation must have if it is to expand. Moreover, the training program is the nucleus of several thousand small airports, and as a practical political matter it would be extremely difficult to lop these off.

A Move for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of March 16, 1948:

A MOVE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, ROY E. JAMES SPEAKS FOR THE "LITTLE PEOPLE OF THE PACIFIC"

Roy E. James, retiring Monday as Chief of the Interior Department's Pacific branch, has called attention anew to the unfulfilled pledges of civil government for the Pacific islands.

His final act as a member of the United States Department of the Interior adds another to his many services to the peoples of the Pacific.

He sees in the development of the Pacific peoples under the American flag and the experience they will gain in local self-government a positive factor in counteracting communism.

He points out that the Russian propagandists are "working night and day to convince the peoples of the Pacific that our aim is to dominate them and hold them in subjugation politically and economically."

He points specifically to the examples of Guam and American Samoa.

Guam has been in the sovereignty of the United States for 50 years.

A half century ago by treaty the United States pledged itself to define the civil rights and political status of the Guamanians.

This has never been done. For one reason or another, on one pretext after another, local self-government for Guam has been delayed and denied.

Also under the American flag for a half century have been the people of American

Samoa. For them local self-government has been denied and they have remained under naval administration. With no criticism of the Navy, the fact is that no military administration can be other than paternalistic. It allows scant latitude for individual exercise of civil rights as outlined in the United States Constitution.

Mr. James is no stranger to the Pacific, nor is he a stranger to naval government of these Pacific islands peoples.

In fact, during World War II he served as a naval government officer in the Pacific area and is particularly familiar with the situation in the Marianas.

His interest and prestige in Pacific affairs was shown when he was designated as a member of the United States delegation to the South Seas Conference at Canberra, Australia in 1947. He served also as an adviser to the United States delegation of the United Nations during the recent discussion on dependent areas.

Mr. James has resigned from the Interior Department to run for Congress in Pennsylvania's Twentieth District. He is a Republican.

His departure from the Interior Department is a loss to the Pacific, the loss of a man personally familiar with the area constant in his interest and untiring in his energetic efforts to promote the welfare of the small Pacific tribes and groups under the American flag and under American protection and American responsibility.

If the Twentieth District of Pennsylvania sends Roy E. James to Congress the present loss to the Pacific will be at least partly reclaimed. For as a Member of Congress he will be in position to exert his interest and energy on behalf of these Pacific peoples.

Now Cordell Hull Laments "Unconditional Surrender"—14 Republican Congressmen Challenged Him on It When Action Could Have Saved Thousands of American Boys and Prevented Spread of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in March 1944 a group of 14 Republican Congressmen wrote Secretary of State Cordell Hull a letter.

The letter challenged the Secretary to explain Unconditional Surrender. It urged that the administration reveal the terms acceptable for German surrender as an incentive to capitulation.

The Congressmen sending that letter were braving the wrath of war emotionalism. They were putting the lives of American boys ahead of politics.

But their appeal got a polite brush-off and nothing more. Now, Mr. Hull, in his memoirs, declares that he opposed "Unconditional surrender." Now he condemns it saying, "It became a weapon in the hands of Nazi propagandists."

Mr. Hull adds that "the principle logically required the victor nations to be ready to take over every phase of the national and local governments of the conquered countries," and Hull now points out that he opposed that angle.

Someone might well inquire why Mr. Hull did not make some constructive use of the appeal by these 14 Republicans if he was so vigorously opposed to unconditional surrender.

Others high up in the administration during the war have likewise lately publicly expressed their displeasure over the stupidity of unconditional surrender.

But all these former high officials were silent when speaking out could have saved thousands of American lives. All were silent when action would have prevented the Communist triumph caused by the barbaric destruction of Germany and Japan.

The letter written by the Congressmen follows; also the summary reply from Secretary of State Cordell Hull:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 21, 1944.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As direct representatives of several million Americans in the Congress of the United States, we have a solemn responsibility to these people. Especially is this true during a war in which both the lives and the savings of many of them will be destroyed by the war activities of their Government.

Many of these patriotic Americans are asking us pertinent questions about this conflict which we can answer adequately only if the executive branch will cooperate and give us the necessary factual information.

Specifically, among others, we are asked this question: "What are we fighting for?"

It is not sufficient to inform these anxious loved ones that, as they already know, we are fighting Japan because of the Pearl Harbor attack, and Germany because the responsible authorities determined the Nazi military program a threat to our Nation. They know that our entrance into this conflict was not the time to determine the peace terms that we would eventually offer our defeated enemies.

We have been at war, however, well over 2 years. The war effort and the program for the defeat of Germany seem sufficiently advanced to determine terms for a vanquished Germany. If the declaration labeled "unconditional surrender" is still the official objective, some elaboration of that phrase is in order. Does it mean extermination of the German people and utter destruction of their country? If not, what does it mean?

Shouldn't the American people, who carry the burdens of this war, be advised of the conditions which the German nation must accept to secure a cessation of hostilities?

It has been suggested that the German people, learning those terms, might possibly overthrow their war leaders.

Do not the thousands of American boys who are scheduled to die in invasions have the right to know the aims of the peace for which their lives are to be sacrificed?

We want no secret or vital military information, nor details on special problems on which the Government of the United States cannot appropriately or realistically commit itself at this time. But we do request now the answer to the question that, spoken or unspoken, is in the mind of every American today: What are we fighting for? What conditions must be brought about to secure a cessation of bloodshed and tragedy in Europe?

Our soldiers, their fathers, mothers, wives, sweethearts, and children want to know now. They are asking us these questions. What answer shall we give them?

Respectfully yours,

W. P. ELMER, Missouri; HOWARD BUFFETT, Nebraska; EDWARD O. MCCOWEN, Ohio; MAX SCHWABE, Missouri; WILLIAM C. COLE, Missouri; WAT ARNOLD, Missouri; HUBERT S. ELLIS, West Virginia; FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming; HENDERSON H. CARSON, Ohio; C. A. JOHNSON, Illinois; ERRETT SCRIVNER, Kansas; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; WALTER E. BREHM, Ohio; ED. ROWE, Ohio.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 29, 1944.

The Honorable HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BUFFETT: I have received your letter of March 22, 1944, enclosing a communication of March 21 signed by you and several other Members of the House of Representatives. In this communication you inquire "What are we fighting for?" and regarding unconditional surrender.

The first question was discussed fully and answered fully in an address which I delivered some time ago entitled "The War and Human Freedom." I enclose a copy of that address, in the belief that its broad treatment will be more useful to you and your constituents than a brief reply.

On the subject of unconditional surrender the President in a message to Congress, dated August 25, 1943, said in part:

"Except for the responsible Fascist leaders, the people of the Axis need not fear unconditional surrender to the United Nations. I have said that we shall bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick in the areas liberated by the United Nations. We have done so, under lend-lease, in north Africa. We are doing so in Sicily. We shall continue to do so in other areas, as they are liberated, to prevent economic break-down and to aid the liberated peoples to produce and help themselves. We shall provide these necessary civilian supplies in support of our military operations and as a matter of simple humanity. The people of Axis-controlled areas may be assured that when they agree to unconditional surrender they will not be trading Axis despotism for ruin under the United Nations."

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. Truman and the Congressional Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of March 18, 1948, by Roscoe Drummond:

STATE OF THE NATION
MR. TRUMAN AND THE CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman must know by now that he stands in acute need of repairing his relations with the Democratic and Republican leaders in Congress.

The problem is not political; it is personal. It has little to do with differences over policy between the White House and Capitol Hill. It has to do with the President's long failure to consult with his own legislative chiefs and with those of the majority, his failure to invite cooperation when cooperation might be readily forthcoming, his failure to inform the congressional spokesmen of his purposes and intentions when information would be a minimum courtesy.

Obviously, the fact that the President is dealing with an opposition majority makes his problem more difficult, but because it is more difficult it is not less important. For a long time now congressional leaders have known less about what Mr. Truman was going to do next, even when it concerned Congress, than the White House ushers.

The issue is not primarily one of politics; it is one of tact, consideration, and awareness that in the field of foreign policy at least the White House cannot expect bipartisan support in Congress unless there are bipartisan relations between the White House and Congress.

The inept circumstances through which Mr. Truman brought about this week's special joint session of Congress climaxes months of such incidents which leave the Republican leaders baffled but unhurt, and the Democratic leaders aggrieved and indignant.

The late Monday afternoon flash from the White House that Mr. Truman would address Congress Wednesday found Senate President VANDENBERG, Senate Minority Leader BARKLEY, Speaker MARTIN, and House Minority Leader RAYBURN completely in the dark. When their legislative colleagues asked them what was up, they had to admit they knew no more than the elevator boy, that they hadn't been consulted, that they hadn't been informed.

The President tried to repair some of the damage the next day. Tuesday afternoon he announced that the legislative leaders would meet at the White House Wednesday at 11 a. m. to go over the speech. Two hours later the meeting was called off. Senator VANDENBERG telephoned Mr. Truman that the meeting conflicted with an important session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

But there was more to it than that. Senator VANDENBERG told the President candidly that the scheduled legislative conference just 90 minutes before delivery of the address would give a "wrong impression" and would serve no useful purpose. Senator VANDENBERG and the other leaders were aware that the White House session was a last-minute gesture, that it was not for purposes of counsel or consultation, that they would simply sit in front of the President's desk and listen to him read what he would be reading to them an hour later from the rostrum of the House. That is why they "begged off," since they did not want to be made to collaborate in creating the false impression that they had been consulted about the message or questions involving American policy in Europe when, in fact, they had not been consulted.

The result is that the President is perpetually weakening his position with Congress. By consulting in advance with the congressional leaders he could pave the way for the best possible reception of what undoubtedly will be a completely nonpartisan speech. By failing to consult in advance, he has missed the opportunity to get the advice and consent of the leaders and has contributed to creating an impression that the legislative leaders are cool toward his address, when in point of fact they are no more than uninformed.

One is reminded of the way Minority Leader BARKLEY is reported to have phrased his own weary complaint of the way Mr. Truman has for months kept the leaders of his own party in the dark. He compared the President to the pitcher and the legislative leaders to the catcher of a baseball team. He said that he gets no signals from the pitcher who throws what he wants without letting his battery mate know what's coming. He says it's like a night game with somebody having turned off the lights.

The simple fact is that Mr. Truman has got to do better at practicing bipartisan cooperation on foreign policy from the White House if he expects to get the bipartisan support from Congress.

Construction of an Adequate Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 17, 1948, Mr. John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, appeared before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to testify on the critical problems confronting this Nation in the matter of the construction and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine. Most people are prone to forget that an adequate merchant marine is essential to our national security and economy. Mr. Green is to be commended for his able presentation of the problems and issues in this regard, and his recommendations to the Congress for appropriate action. His statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first, I desire to commend you and thank you for calling this public hearing.

Men of good will throughout the world are anxiously seeking peace. All of us in this Nation sincerely hope that ways can be found for mankind to live in harmony and security, and to enjoy the fruits of our productive toil.

All of us recognize that a properly balanced world trade—the orderly flow and exchange of goods and service between peoples—is a path to peace. No nation has a greater stake in world trade than the United States. We are the greatest producing Nation in the world. The products of our mills and factories are sold throughout the world.

In turn, we are the greatest consuming Nation in the world. We buy from almost every nation—and our entire economy is dependent upon the continued import of the raw materials which we transform into automobiles, radios, stoves, and refrigerators. For example, it requires the importation of 300 varieties of materials to enable us to produce automobiles, some of which such as tin are virtually unobtainable in this country.

The continued existence of our way of life, the continued development of ever higher standards of living depend upon the continuance and expansion of world trade. In normal peacetime years, approximately 10 percent of our production goes into world markets. This export business can represent the difference between maximum employment, when it exists, or the unemployment of millions of American workers when it disappears. There is a demonstrable, mathematical link between American prosperity and world trade—the one falling or rising with the other.

Our share of world trade, our access to world markets and our access to supplies of raw material can be and are affected by the state of our American merchant marine. We have learned through long experience that it is sound wisdom for us to develop trade routes operated by American ships in the interest of the American economy.

In these troubled days when war is at a pause but peace has not begun, you are wise to review the entire question of the American merchant marine. You are wise, indeed, to review it in all its phases, from the building of the ships to their ultimate operation in the Nation's interest.

The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, obviously, has its prime interest in the building of American ships. As craftsmen in it, we have studied the industry. We know its history, its value, and its faults.

The American shipbuilding industry today is in a crisis as grave as any it has ever faced. Men with almost a quarter of a century of seniority and with all the skill and know-how those years have brought them, are being laid off in the shipyards—for lack of work. Thousands of the younger men who were trained with intensive effort and at tremendous cost during the war have already left the industry—probably never to return.

Here are the figures:

In prewar 1939, the annual average employment of shipbuilders employed in new construction was 45,000.

The war emergency lifted the shipyard level of employment to the high of an annual average of 1,225,000 in 1943.

As of last December, based on the latest official figures available, it is estimated that less than 30,000 men were engaged in new ship construction in the private shipyards of the United States. Another 60,000 were employed in repair and reconversion—a dwindling field of employment as the conversion of war-used vessels is completed.

Quite obviously, no one—and certainly not the Shipbuilders' Union—believes that we should attempt to maintain the wartime level of employment in the shipyards.

But, I do not believe there is anyone in this country who would advance the argument that a shipbuilding industry should not be maintained.

The level of the industry to be maintained and the degree of Government support in maintaining it, may be open to debate.

Almost exactly a year ago—on March 11, 1947—President Truman, declaring that the United States "faces critical problems in connection with the construction, modernization, and maintenance of an adequate fleet of passenger and freight vessels," named an advisory committee to study the merchant-marine situation.

The President pointed out, and again I quote:

"Even before the war we had few passenger vessels. When we entered the war, we shifted to the construction of mass-produced cargo ships, in order to carry America's great production of war material overseas. We used all our prewar passenger vessels, one-third of which were more than 20 years old, as transports or fleet auxiliaries. Some of these were sunk or badly damaged, and many others were so drastically altered for war use that their complete reconversion to peacetime needs is not economically justified.

"Although our present need is primarily for passenger ships, our ship-construction program as a whole merits careful consideration. As an important element of national security in connection with preparation for expansion in case of emergency, it is essential that shipbuilding skills be maintained by shipbuilders through an orderly replacement program of all types of vessels. Latest technological developments must be incorporated into our future cargo and combination cargo-and-passenger vessels, as well as into passenger liners, if the United States is to maintain a well-balanced, modern merchant fleet to meet trade as well as security requirements."

The President asked for recommendations of the number of vessels to be constructed annually, as he put it, "under a stable, long-range program."

Members of that committee were K. T. Keller, chairman; Marion B. Folsom, vice chairman; Andrew W. Robertson, James B. Black, and E. L. Cochrane.

The distinguished members of this advisory committee certainly are not visionaries nor alarmists. On November 1 they

submitted a report. It was a report with which the shipbuilders' union does not agree in every detail. We have referred to their recommendations as minimum recommendations.

It is deeply shocking to us that even these minimum recommendations have been ignored by President Truman. We wonder what has happened in the period between March a year ago and January of this year. We wonder why the President, as of last March, was concerned with the establishment of a balanced and modern merchant fleet in the interest of not only commerce and trade but national security while, as of this January, he chooses to recommend to the Congress a budget of only $15,320,000 for new ship construction.

I would like particularly to commend the advisory committee report to your attention. It gives a factual, authentic, and virtually complete picture of the American merchant marine situation.

It delves deeply into the needs of this Nation—both for peacetime operation and for the possible crisis of world emergency.

And because of the impartiality of the members of the committee, it makes clear, in a manner beyond the ability of any interested parties, the critical need of a shipbuilding and ship operating program in this country.

With the exception of a modest tanker program, new shipbuilding is almost nonexistent. As of January 1 there were just 26 seagoing vessels under construction in American yards. Every one of these is scheduled to be completed by August 1. There are on order 13 to 15 tankers. Except for this there is no shipbuilding in the United States. Instead of the long-range program which President Truman suggested and which his committee recommended on the basis of its investigation, there is no program whatsoever.

Our merchant fleet continues to disintegrate rather than build toward a level in keeping with our position of leadership in world trade.

While we allow our merchant fleet to deteriorate, other nations are racing to rebuild theirs, not to prewar levels but to new high levels of efficiency and capacity. British merchant ship construction had been resumed even before the war ended. Despite recent cut-backs in steel allocations, the British today are building new ships in greater volume than prewar. Canada, which had virtually no new shipbuilding industry before the war, is now reported to be engaged in the construction of $115,000,000 worth of new ships.

The United States is definitely in seventh place in new ship construction, and, if unofficial reports of Russian building are correct, it is in eighth place. We trail behind Great Britain, France, Sweden, Holland, Italy, and the British dominions. Our construction represents only three and four-tenths percent of the total world ship construction.

It is a common delusion that we need little, if any, shipbuilding because of the tremendous number of ships built during the war. We have approximately 1,200 ships in our laid-up fleet. These ships were war expendables. They were designed and built to meet an emergency. They are not suitable for peacetime operation in competitive trade. The chart we show as exhibit A makes the difference between a peace-designed and a war-designed ship readily understandable.

Even if we thought we could afford the luxury of using these war expendables for our peacetime merchant marine, we would face the early prospect of an obsolete, as well as inefficient, fleet.

We made almost exactly that same mistake after World War I. We depended then upon ships that had been built for war use or had been taken from the defeated nations as war reparations. Our shipbuilding industry then, as it has today, was allowed to languish. By 1939 our merchant fleet was 79 percent obsolete as against 40 percent of the world fleet which was 20 years or more old. In 1939, because of our neglect, we had only 15 ships of 14 knots or more speed against 1,000 with speeds of less than 12 knots.

By 1938, this Nation was able to handle less than 28 percent of its export-import tonnage in its own ships. Here, too, it ranked seventh, trailing Germany, Japan, Italy, Great Britain, Norway and France.

We fell behind because we failed—just as we are failing today—to build modern, competitive ships for peacetime trade.

With all due consideration for the rights of our neighbors in the world of nations, it is estimated that the United States should carry 50 percent of its own world trade tonnage in ships of its own flag.

This division would be equitable in view of our predominant position both in production and consumption. It would give the essential protection of our market routes and our material sources. And it would maintain the minimum fleet of merchant ships essential to our national security.

The United States, within a single generation, has twice suffered the costly experience of finding its merchant fleet inadequate for the minimum needs of national defense.

In World War I we poured millions upon millions of dollars into the construction of what was called a bridge of ships to carry men and material to the battlefields. We threw up shipyards almost overnight, desperately mobilized manpower and engaged in costly training programs.

When that war was over, we forgot about shipbuilding. We tied up our war-built hulks—and I might remind you that some of them are still tied up to rust and rot where we left them.

The shipbuilding industry fell into a decline from which it did not recover until the so-called pump-priming experiments of the New Deal when President Roosevelt launched a program to restore our Navy as well as its civilian auxiliary.

It was not until 1936 that Congress adopted the statement of policy contained in Public Law No. 835, establishing the principle that this Nation should have a merchant marine.

Unfortunately, as we emerge from World War II, that policy seems to have been forgotten.

Once more we poured dollars into the hasty construction of shipyards. The report of the Surplus Property Administration to Congress January 31, 1946, shows a Government investment of $1,013,000,000 in construction or expansion of shipyards.

Our Union has been unable to find—and it is likely that no one knows—how many millions of dollars were spent in the hasty training of men to work on the construction of the ships so vitally needed to protect our Nation.

It is impossible to estimate how much money was wasted—and more important—how much time was lost because we lacked an adequate fleet of auxiliary vessels and because we lacked the trained and skilled men to build ships.

Fortunately, because of the beginnings made back in 1936, there existed a corps of trained men to give leadership to the new workers—there existed experienced management to guide the construction of the new yards and the production of the ships—and there existed a nucleus of facilities which could be expanded to meet the emergency.

Congress has received, time and again, the statements of military men, both Army and Navy, that the delay in providing sea transport for men and material was costly in the death toll of our military forces—that it delayed the ultimate victory of our Nation.

Now, gentlemen, we are today precisely where we were in 1921. The war is over. A vast fleet of war-built vessels is on hand. Our world competitors are building up fleets of modern vessels to engage in world trade, to supplement their naval forces.

And our shipbuilding is coming to a dead halt.

Are we going to repeat the mistake of World War I?

Twice we have learned that we cannot depend upon the transport facilities of any possible combination of allies when we are thrust into a war. Perhaps we are rich enough to ignore the cost of that dependence, and I refer to the report that we paid, in transport charges for our troops, from five to seven times over the $80,000,000 cost of the Queen Mary when we hired it during this last war.

We are not rich enough—and we can never be rich enough—to afford the loss of life which results from delay in providing transportation in time of emergency.

It is not my intention to counsel you on the gravity of the world situation today. (And I understand the President, himself, will speak to you on that subject this afternoon.) All of us hope that the fears and confusions of today can be cleared away so that the world can live in peace.

We should, and must, plan for peace. But in planning for peace, we cannot avoid the basic questions of national security.

In this question of planning and preparation we come, necessarily, to the question of how the planning is to be done and who is to do it.

A passenger liner, a tanker, a freighter—no oceangoing vessel is like an automobile which can be built and put on display in a showroom until a purchaser comes along and buys it. Ships can only be built when they are needed for specific purposes.

In the free exercise of the private-enterprise system, it might be that the profitable shipping lies in the transportation of banana boats. In that case, the private ship operators will buy and operate banana boats. It might be tankers or it might be bulk-cargo carriers.

We cannot complain that these operators seek out and develop the fields of transportation in which they can make a profit.

But those fields are not necessarily the fields which will provide the United States with a balanced merchant marine fleet adaptable to the Nation's needs in time of emergency—or even in terms of the over-all peacetime economy of the Nation.

Obviously, there must be Government planning and Government assistance in the development and operation of a merchant marine. There must be an over-all plan and program built upon the basic needs of the Nation.

There must be, if necessary, the authority to direct materials, machinery, and steel into ship construction, where that construction is essential to the Nation's interest.

The shipbuilding industry is not a flexible industry whose production can be regulated by the day-to-day shift in demand. It is a ponderous, slow-moving industry which demands a continuous flow of business in order to maintain an orderly level of production.

In the past the industry has suffered from a feast-or-famine practice that has added extravagantly to its costs. It is elementary that the overhead costs of an idle shipyard carry on and must, some place, be added to the cost of ships when ships are built in the yard.

I submit IUMSWA exhibit C as evidence of the peak and valley record of the industry through two wars. An orderly, planned program of construction would level out those peaks and valleys and would go far to reduce the cost of shipbuilding.

Just as important as maintaining a stable industry is the problem of maintaining a core of experienced, skilled, and trained shipyard

workers. Those peaks and valleys of production also mean peaks and valleys of employment in the industry.

Possibly you can afford the luxury of laying up a shipyard, of greasing and rustproofing its machines and equipment against the day of future need.

You cannot rustproof the skill and know-how of the workers. There is no way of letting them go jobless and hungry in the intervals between ship construction. As they find jobs lacking in shipbuilding, they drift away to other industry, they find jobs that give them security and continued employment. And they refuse to return to a trade where they do not know from day to day whether they will be employed.

These skills, this know-how we have found to be of utmost importance in time of emergency. We simply cannot afford to lose these men from the industry.

There is a minimum core of experienced men that must be maintained in the shipyards. Our estimate is that this number cannot fall below 150,000 if the industry is to be maintained on a basis that will meet peacetime needs and which will permit its expansion in case of emergency.

This figure is for the private shipbuilding and repair yards only and does not include another 100,000 men who should be employed in navy yards. (Exhibit D.)

I want to repeat that there are, by the latest figures, less than 90,000 men employed in the private yards and that the work they are doing will be finished before the summer ends.

In the interests of maintaining the necessary minimum of employment, of keeping in operation the necessary number of shipyards and of providing a balanced American merchant marine, there should be started—at once—a program of 59 vessels (exhibit D).

In preparing our recommendation, we have taken into special consideration the need for large, fast, luxury passenger liners—a category in which this Nation trails almost every maritime nation of the world.

We do not have, under the American flag, a single ship which can give peacetime competition to the *Queen Mary*, the *Queen Elizabeth*, or a dozen other foreign ships. And, of course, we do not have a single American ship which, in case of emergency, could be converted into a troop carrier as effective as the *Queen Mary*.

Our minimum recommendation is for the construction of 26 C-3 type vessels, the 'round-the-world type cargo-passenger combination ship; 6 C-3 improved type; 11 passenger boats to range up to the superliner classification; 1 superliner; 7 passenger-cargo boats; 2 coastal ships; 2 Alaskan trade ships; 2 sea trains and 2 of what we once called mystery ships. I think there is no great need of mystery any longer. These two would be special oceangoing ore carriers to transport vital ore stock piles.

We recognize that a program of this magnitude cannot be left to the investment of private capital. Obviously, it will require Government assistance, as well as Government planning.

IUMSWA does not propose to argue what an appropriate subsidy should be for the construction and operation of an adequate merchant marine. We estimate the subsidy cost for a balanced fleet to be less than $50,000,000 before the recapture that would apply against profits made in operation of the ships.

We point out that this figure is modest in comparison to the $134,000,000 that was spent on Federal road building in 1942 and even to the $80,000,000 Federal subsidy for potatoes in 1946. (Exhibit E).

We need these new ships and we need them now to balance our merchant fleet—to keep it abreast of the world development.

And we need a planned and continuing program of replacement to keep our fleet alive, modern, competitive, and profitable, as well as to maintain a continuing shipbuilding industry.

The normal replacement program for American ships, as shown in our exhibit F for typical years, would serve this purpose.

The program we advocate would enable the United States to take its proper place of leadership in the development of world trade; its proper place of leadership in the striving of mankind for peace and abundance. It would give us security against world emergency—a security which, in itself, tends to prevent occurrence of the emergency.

Mississippi Legislature Memorializes Congress on Development of Pat Harrison Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a concurrent resolution unanimously passed by both houses of the Mississippi Legislature memorializing the Congress on the development of the Pat Harrison waterway, a project which I am sponsoring here, and urging action thereon.

The resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Federal Congress of the need for the development of the Pat Harrison waterway, and urging action thereon

Whereas in 1825 the Legislature of the State of Mississippi memorialized Congress on the subject of the development of the Pascagoula River and its tributaries for navigation; and

Whereas the need for this development, that has existed for more than a century, is more acute today than ever before; and

Whereas the economic and social welfare of southeast Mississippi would be greatly promoted by the canalization of the Pascagoula, Leaf, and Chickasawhay Rivers and Tallahala Creek; and

Whereas the military importance of this waterway is recognized by competent authorities; and

Whereas the people of the several counties drained by these streams seek the establishment of 9-foot barge channels serving the cities of Hattiesburg, Laurel, Meridian, and points between these communities and the Gulf: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the importance of this public work to industry, agriculture, and distributive business of Mississippi be once more called to the attention of the President of the United States, and the Senate and the House of Representatives, and action urged thereon; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these concurrent resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States district engineer office, and to the Mississippi delegation in Congress with the request that this project be advanced with every means at their command.

Adopted by the house of representatives, January 7, 1948.

D. WILLIAM SIEVERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate, January 13, 1948.

SAM E. LUMPKIN,
President of the Senate.

A Program for Better Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House, the immediate, urgent need for action on the subject of old-age pensions. Each year since I first came to the House of Representatives, a number of us have been trying to get favorable consideration on this subject. Time after time we have argued on the floor that this Nation is fully able to pay a pension to our elder citizens sufficient to provide a decent American standard of living. In view of our recent history is there one among us who will as much as question this fact? I say again we are fully able to pay such a pension.

Second. I will say that we are not paying such a pension. I ask also if there is one Member of this House that will say that we are paying such a pension? I am sure there is not. Now, if we are able to pay such a pension, and if we are not paying it, why, may I ask, are we not doing it? Has it not been brought before the House time after time during every session, yes, almost during every month of every session of the House as long as I have been a Member? Notwithstanding these admitted facts, we have gone along, financed a war that cost in the hundreds of billions, paid out for relief and support of our neighbor countries to the tune of multiplied tens of billions, and today we find ourselves paying a far more inadequate pension than we were back before the war started. I say this, because even though there have been slight token increases, the cost of living has been so great that the pensions of today are less adequate to meet the needs of our deserving citizens than they were back before the war. Mr. Speaker, we should do something about this question during this session.

WE DO HAVE A PROGRAM IN THIS HOUSE

More than 120 of us have signed a friendly declaration to the Committee on Ways and Means setting forth what we consider the plain and reasonable facts in this matter. Then we ask the committee to let us have a bill to provide a clean Federal old-age pension of at least $60 per month to take the place of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act. We realize that there will not be opportunity to undertake a complete overhaul of the social-security program. We can, however, substitute a reasonable old-age pension for old-age assistance and let the remainder of the social-security program wait until there is an opportunity to go into it thoroughly. The need for the better old-age pension is too great, Mr. Speaker, for this matter to go over. It is a crime against our fair history to permit our deserving elders to famish for food, live in squalor, and die from diseases that come from malnutrition or are otherwise preventable, while we boast of our great wealth and cry our tears over the

unfortunates of other lands. Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker, I am not decrying our interests in being a good neighbor to other peoples throughout the world. But I am decrying our inaction in this matter of providing a decent pension for our own worthy American elders. There are two things I wish to ask specifically:

First. I trust that every Member who has not joined us in this united, friendly, and reasonable campaign for a better pension will do so now. See either Representative LANDIS who carries our friendly request for the majority or Representative MORRIS for the minority. We each and everyone can do at least this much for those who have given us, should I not say their all, and our all?

Second. I trust the honorable Committee on Ways and Means will give full and fair consideration to this important matter at their earliest convenience.

I Am a Texan!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert C. Ruark, in the Houston Press of March 8, 1948:

I AM A TEXAN

(By Robert C. Ruark, in the Houston Press, March 8, 1948)

Today I am a Texan, podner. I'm a roper and a fighter and a wild-horse rider, and a right fair windmill hand. I got cattle in the bank and oil in the ground, and my hat is wider and whiter than any little old hat you ever did see.

Yes, sir, amigo, we got the biggest old State and the prettiest little girls and the brightest old sun and the wettest old rain you ever saw; even our Lone Star Monument is taller than the one in Washington, if you count the base. It's got to be taller than the one in Washington because, after all, the Union joined us. We didn't need the Union—never did.

The State of Texas is bounded by the United States—an insignificant colony we saved from defeat in the last war. We could have won it sooner if we hadn't a-been all dragged down with the other 47 States.

What with Oveta running the Wacs and Nimitz running the Navy and the whole Air Force working out of our State, it's a wonder we didn't sue for a separate peace. Why, we got Jesse Jones and Amon Carter and George Kelley and Sammy Baugh and Pappy O'Daniel and H. R. Cullen and Glenn McCarthy and the big King ranch.

We got the Gulf of Mexico and Rio Grande and the ship channel all the way up from Galveston, and Ann Sheridan. We got the oil and the ships and the grass and the meat and the grapefruits and the watermelons and the wheat and the cotton. Boy, what we ain't got we don't need.

We still got the Texas navy, just in case we ever want it handy, and we got the Texas Rangers. We got spurs that jingle jangle jingle and we wear pick-toed boots and five-gallon hats with our store clothes; everybody's rich in Texas. Shoot the other three million.

It won't take any talent to get rich in Texas, podner. You just bore a little old hole in the ground and the oil spurts up, and then all you have to do is go buy a diamond ring and a pair of hand-tooled boots and six or eight Cadillacs and then wait for some more oil to come shooting up out of the hole.

Or else you ketch an old cow-brute and throw her down and carve your initials on her flank, and bymeby you got a herd and everybody knows about the price of rump roast. Git along, little dogie, and come home to papa with a million dollars tied to your tail.

We got the tenderest steaks and the biggest shrimp and the hottest barbecue and the most fiery peppers and the most indigestible chili. We wash our feet in Bourbon whisky and we slick down our hair with vintage bear grease.

We can holler louder than a love-struck coyote with a full moon working on his vocal chords, and we're always about half ready to play, for money, marbles, or nuggets. Shoot the next four million.

Texas women grow taller and stand straighter and their lips are redder and their eyes are brighter than any other women's in the world. Their hair piles higher and their legs sprout slimmer and their sweaters look trimmer. Also there seems to be a lot more of them.

Well, the music is louder and the streets are wider and the sunsets are prettier and the moon is bigger and the race horses run faster. The bird dogs are smarter and the fish bite better.

Our clover is knee-high to a tall steer, the alfalfa is collar-bone high to a tall giraffe, and the crap games are high as the sky. Even our sky is higher than other people's sky. It's just Texas.

Yes, sir, podner. We got the finest old boys with the truest old hearts and the openest old hands of any State in the Union, and I ain't just whistlin' Dixie. Yes, sir.

Three days in this town and I got a bow in my legs, adventure in my soul and Texas in my blood. Slap the silver-mounted, hand-tooled, gold-embossed saddle on the pinto, Slim, and ring up the horizon. Old Buck is a-aimin' to canter off into the sunset. I mean he's flat ready to ride.

Oleomargarine Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Agriculture Committee has met in executive session and adopted a motion to appoint a subcommittee of five to study oleomargarine taxes and report to the full committee by December 31, 1948. It is difficult for me to understand what additional research and investigation is required in order to understand this matter. The answer to this problem can be obtained from any housewife in the United States, namely, that a perfectly respectable commodity should not be taxed directly by the Federal Government. I trust that not 1 cent of the taxpayers' money will be used by this subcommittee to carry on this study. If the committee really wishes to perform a public service, it will carry on the investigation as to the reason why butter prices have risen 7 and 8 cents per pound recently and why for the past several years it has sold at such a high price that the ordinary person could not buy it—only a small part of said cost in my opinion having gone to the American farmer.

Mississippi Legislature Opposes the President's Civil Rights Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a concurrent resolution unanimously passed by both houses of the Mississippi Legislature on the question of President Truman's civil-rights program. The resolution is as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

A concurrent resolution endorsing and commending the action taken by the Mississippi State Democratic Executive Committee on March 1, 1948, in the creation of a people's committee and a campaign committee to open headquarters, solicit contributions, disseminate information vital to the electorate of Mississippi, to insure the election of delegates to the Philadelphia National Democratic Convention in 1948, who will uphold States' rights, as guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, with a view to the election of such Presidential electors this year as will vote in the electoral college only for candidates for President and Vice President who stand unalterably for States' rights as opposed to the so-called civil rights recommended by President Truman

Whereas it is the sense and conviction of this, the legislative branch of government of the State of Mississippi that our Federal Government is one of permissive powers, with residual powers remaining in the respective individual States of which it is comprised, as guaranteed by articles IX and X of the Federal Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas these fundamental principles guarantee forever to the individual States, rights of local self-government thus retained until changed by amendment of this, the greatest constitutional instrument ever devised by the mind of man for his government, in accordance with orderly processes by the people in the manner therein provided and not by Presidential order or manifesto; and

Whereas it is the sense and conviction of this, the legislative branch of government of the State of Mississippi that the actions taken on March 1, 1948, by the Mississippi State Democratic Executive Committee are praiseworthy, commendable, and worthy of our wholehearted support and endorsement: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Mississippi State Democratic Executive Committee be and it is hereby commended and wholeheartedly endorsed in its action taken on March 1, 1948, in the creation of a people's committee and campaign committee, to open headquarters, solicit and receive contributions, disseminate information vital to the electorate of Mississippi, to insure the election of delegates to the Philadelphia National Democratic Convention in 1948 who will uphold States' rights, as guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, with

a view to the election of such Presidential electors this year as will vote in the electoral college only for candidates for President and Vice President who stand unalterably for States' rights as opposed to the so-called civil rights, recommended by President Truman; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be sent, by the secretary of the senate, to each member of the Mississippi delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the senate, March 2, 1948.

SAM E. LUMPKIN,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives, March 3, 1948.

WALTER SILLERS,
Speaker of the House of Represenatives.

Public Service Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, we have recently had brought to our attention the inequities that prevail relating to public service broadcasting programs; and I am bringing to the attention of the Congress some comments which have been released by the Federated Press and, also, some comments which were expressed into the radio division of Variety, Wednesday, March 17, 1948.

The procedure that embraces the recently adopted program Opinion-Aire, has all the appearance of a rigged program and, as such, certainly does not comply with the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission, to wit: "Public interest, convenience, and necessity." It does occur to me that a program of this character should be operated as a strict public service program. If the allegations set forth in the releases attached herewith are correct, then, in my opinion, it is incumbent upon the Federal Communications Commission to see that the Mutual Broadcasting System corrects its program. It certainly is indicated that affiliated stations would be vitally interested in the correction or elimination of a rigged or pointed public service program.

[From Federated Press, Washington, D. C. of March 3, 1948]

SHISHKIN CRITICIZES MUTUAL PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAM

WASHINGTON.—A plan of the Mutual Broadcasting System to put on a new sustaining "opinion-aire" show run by one R. L. Rayhawk has brought a swift message of protest from A. F. of L. economist Boris Shishkin, it has been learned here.

Mutual has not publicly announced its projected opinion program, but a report to that effect did not sit right with union officials here who know Rayhawk, and Shishkin wrote Mutual what he thought of the idea—that it is no good.

In the fall of 1946 Mutual arranged to have this same Rayhawk take a few minutes after the regular American Forum of the Air broadcast to give the public results of a telephone poll taken during the debate. Listeners in a different city each week were asked to phone a certain number and give their opinions on the topic under discussion.

On November 26, Rayhawk (billed as a public opinion analyst) gave a highly biased introduction to the topic, Are Closed Shop Agreements Desirable? He then reported that Pittsburgh listeners were voting 5 to 1 against the closed shop, on his supposedly impartial survey of public opinion.

The so-called opinion-aire stated with the assumption that telephones were fairly divided among the homes of Pittsburgh residents, workers, middle class and uppercrust alike. Second, Rayhawk based his percentages on opinions expressed before the program was over and both sides had been heard.

Finally, his so-called analysis did not tell how many people had voted, but gave percentages only. Perhaps only 50 personal friends of the participants in the discussion telephoned their votes to the station.

Not only were Rayhawk's statistical methods so dishonest, but his presentation of the subject was slanted so far in an antilabor direction that Theodore Granik, chairman of the forum program, protested to the network. Rayhawk was dropped after four programs.

After 15 months, Mutual apparently hoped that the smell had died away, but Shishkin has remembered it.

[From Variety of March 17, 1948]

SOLON-SHUNNED MB: "OPINION-AIRE," SLIGHTLY BATTERED, FINALLY DEBUTS

WASHINGTON, March 16.—After several false starts, Mutual's new forum-type sustainer "Opinion-Aire" will make its official debut on the Mutual ether tomorrow (Wednesday) night at 10 p. m., but question among webmen here is whether it's worth the migraine it has caused them. Show was due to preem March 3 to replace Ted Granik's 20-year-old American Forum of the Air, but ran into trouble almost at once.

Format of the show, pretested by Mutual over a year ago, has drawn refusals from a score of Capitol Hill solons and other biggies approached to appear on it, and even more serious charges by C. I. O. and A. F. of L. officials that the telephone listeners' poll tacked to the end of the program is unscientific and capable of being rigged.

First protests came in November 1946, when Dr. R. L. Rayhawk, public opinion analyst of Sullivan & Rayhawk, tagged a telephone poll of the end of an American Forum show discussing the pros and cons of the closed shop. He promptly put his foot in it with the labor men by editorializing his findings as follows: "Pittsburghers have just successfully overcome appalling difficulties that would have discouraged a less courageous city during a recent electrical power strike by an independent union which was seeking among other things a closed shop." (Pittsburghers had just voted five-to-one on Rayhawk's telephone poll against the closed shop.)

Boris Shishkin, A. F. of L. economist, who had appeared on the November 1946 Forum show, formally protested airing of Opinion-Aire with the Rayhawk poll to Mutual last week. Shishkin's letter claimed Rayhawk assumed telephones were evenly divided among workers, residents, middle and upper classes; his poll did not tell how many people voted but gave percentages only; it was based on opinions expressed before the program was over and both sides had been heard. Twenty-five telephone calls from personal friends of an Opinion-Aire participant could throw the poll off, it was claimed. C. I. O. assistant publicity chief, Henry Fleisher, and Secretary-Treasurer Jim Carey voiced oral protests on the format of the show.

RAYHAWK ON PAN

Tomorrow night's program is the more surprising therefore since it will pit C.I.O. attorney, Frank Donner, against Ray Smethurst, general counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, in a discussion of the Taft-Hartley Act. As a condition of appearing, however, both sides are reported to have asked for and apparently are due to get from Mutual a list of the cities Rayhawk intends to poll. And both protagonists probably intend to get their backers to phones in those towns, a fact which won't sit well with the already vocal critics of the poll technique. These critics say the Rayhawk method is O. K. in a popularity or talent contest, but is no way to accurately represent cross-section of public opinion.

Mutual's headaches began in earnest when it fixed on a discussion of the pros and cons of the Third Party for the show's abortive March 3 preem. Some 20 personages, including neophyte Senator Charles Stennis, Democrat, Mississippi, former Minneapolis Mayor Hubert Humphreys, Leon Henderson, Paul Porter, and several other VIP's, stiff-armed invites to mix with Senator Glenn Taylor, Democrat, Idaho, Henry Wallace's Vice Presidential candidate. And Taylor only agreed to appear, it was reported, if he could pick the towns to be polled by Rayhawk. After 2 weeks of frantic phoning, Mutual Producer Hollis Seavey dropped the third-party issue as a forum topic.

Another obvious reason for the reluctance of public men to appear on Opinion-Aire is the courtroom technique in which speakers have their own opposing attorneys, and must submit to rigorous cross-examination with no holds barred. The poll is the final straw which keeps the solons off in droves.

However, Mutual is reported considering slapping a suit against a New York tele outfit which reputedly has lifted much of the Opinion-Aire format whole cloth for video. Apparently, the net feels the show "may not be good but it's my own."

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most common subjects that comes to my desk through the mail is the all-important one of communism.

The people back home cannot understand why we spend billions of dollars to stop communism in Europe and apparently take no official action to stop it in the United States.

These good people back home cannot understand why Congress should be prohibited by Executive order from getting a copy of all loyalty proceedings.

Recently Mr. Phil Zimmerman of Topeka, Kans., a loyal patriotic citizen sent me the following:

"America is invaded! Enemy agents blasting at the foundations of our Republic, feel safe and secure while the Marshall opinion in the Aaron Burr case is permitted to stand. There must be an answer!

The United States Constitution must not protect its destroyers!"

PHIL E. ZIMMERMAN.

TOPEKA, KANS.

The Overton Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE OVERTON CANAL

In going to Washington to appear before a congressional group in the interest of Red River Valley waterway improvements, particularly the Overton lateral canal, a party of representative businessmen of the Shreveport area is contributing time and effort to a program of far-reaching importance to this section.

The members of the delegation are especially seeking funds for the canal, a mammoth project already authorized by the National Government but so far without any funds for planning or initial construction. Some time ago $50,000 for planning activities was approved but congressional action making it effective was denied. With this condition facing the canal program, the waterway enthusiasts who went to the National Capital in response to exhortation by leaders in the Red River Valley program are presenting facts to the congressional group conducting a hearing and to others who might be of assistance in getting the project started without much longer delay.

These citizens are making an excellent contribution for the benefit of the people in the valley, for the Overton lateral canal is a project which bears promise of inestimable value to our community and area through increased commerce, expanded industry, and other activities stimulated by this mammoth waterway development.

The Labor-Management Relations Act: The First 200 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address on the subject The Labor Management Relations Act: The First 200 Days, by Mr. Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. This address was delivered by Mr. Herzog before the Industrial Relations Conference of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at Chicago, Ill., March 18, 1948. I feel that it is well worthy of the consideration of the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT—THE FIRST 200 DAYS

Almost 7 months have passed since the Labor Management Relations Act became the law of the land. At the end of the first half-year, the members of the National Labor Relations Board were asked how effectively they thought title I of the new statute was working in practice. There was only one honest answer possible: It is too early to tell. That is the answer that the Board gave.

This may seem strange, because we are supposed to be experts on the subject. But the paradox is more apparent than real. The more a man knows, or is supposed to know about anything, and the greater his responsibility, the less ready he should be to express an off-hand opinion about it. Experts, even if they be only alleged experts, are too well aware of the difficulty of the questions that face them to be ready to furnish definitive answers until they have had ample experience. The Board members' experience to date has not been ample enough to justify our expressing value judgments or recommending amendments. These still are pioneering days.

To be sure we have pushed back the frontier already. But as I describe the foothills that the Board has so far traversed, remember—as the Board must every day—that the mountains lie ahead. With your cooperation and that of labor, we wil cross them rapidly, and I hope successfully, in the days to come. For we are pledged to give the act the most effective administration possible. That pledge will be kept.

It is my purpose today to speak, not of the law and of its possible merits or demerits, but of what the Board has been doing under that law since August 22, 1947. You realize, I am sure, that the most dramatic activities of the agency to date have been those of the general counsel, the independent officer created by Congress to supervise activities in the regional offices and to investigate and prosecute charges of unfair labor practice. He and his agents initiate action; the Board only acts at the end of the assembly line. So far, therefore, few election cases and no unfair labor practice cases brought solely under the new law have reached the stage where the Board members can grapple with the principal problems that it presents.

The fact remains, however, that the Board members, as well as the general counsel, have been applying the provisions of the new act for the past 200 days. And although many questions still arise that require no different answers than would have been given under the original Wagner Act, the issues that have called for our most careful consideration have been those that are colored by the impact of the amended statute.

The first task was to lay the groundwork for its efficient administration. New procedural rules had to be promulgated. The internal structure of the agency required complete overhauling, in order to comply with the congressional mandate that its investigating and judicial functions be segregated. Plans had to be laid for the expansion and reallocation of the staff. Most of this was done between June and August 1947, so that the regional offices could be ready, as they were, to receive cases filed under the new law on the very day that it became effective.

By special agreement with the general counsel, and in order to comply with the spirit of the statute as well as its letter, the Board members delegated to him certain powers over field personnel, representation cases, and applications for discretionary injunctions which they might possibly have retained for themselves. This arrangement has worked well so far and has made for a common-sense allocation of responsibility. The delegation has been upheld in the only court test to date. A Federal judge recently sustained the Board members' view that the power to seek discretionary injunctions under section 10 (j), while vested by statute in the Board itself, is properly delegable to the general counsel.

During these early months, much of the Board's energy has been devoted to interpreting and applying sections 9 (f) and (h) of the new law. These sections require labor organizations to file financial statements and non-Communist affidavits as a condition of invoking the jurisdiction of the Board. By March 1, 140 international and 4,300 local unions—AFL, CIO, and independent—had filed the necessary affidavits. Although it is true that the constitutionality of the weapon selected by Congress is now at issue in the courts, no one who reads of the recent consequences of Communist infiltration into European trade unions can question the critical importance of the target at which Congress aimed that weapon. In a series of decisions applying section 9 (h), the Board has been implementing the congressional purpose of eradicating whatever Communist influences may be present in a few segments of the American labor movement.

We began early in October with a decision that the statute did not require that non-Communist affidavits be filed by the officers of the parent federations, the AFL and CIO, in order to permit the Board to proceed with cases brought by those of their international and local affiliates whose officers had filed. The practical effect of this decision was to encourage local and international officers to comply with section 9 (h) and utilize the facilities of the Board, and also to throw the spotlight of publicity on those who were unwilling or unable to do so.

This ruling was quickly followed by others, holding that the Board would not continue the investigation af any representation case, although filed before the effective date of the new act, if the petitioning union had not complied with section 9 (f) and (h); that we would not place a noncomplying intervenor on a ballot; and, in a case that gave us pause, that we would not put the name of a noncomplying union on the ballot even in a case initiated by an employer's petition. A month ago, however, the Board dealt otherwise with a petition for decertification, filed by employees who desired an opportunity to unseat an incumbent noncomplying union. We held that the name of that union could, indeed must, be placed on the ballot, lest their own noncompliance immunize labor organizations against decertification.

In unfair labor practice cases the Board's policy has been somewhat different. The Taft-Hartley Act bars the issuance of new complaints pursuant to charges filed by noncomplying unions, but it does not bar the Board from continuing to process their cases in which complaint issued before August 22, 1947. The Board has continued to decide many such cases on the merits, and to issue appropriate remedial orders exactly as though the charging unions were in compliance—with one exception. As a matter of policy, we have declined to order employers to bargain in the future with any union that continues out of compliance. But once union officers have filed the required affidavits, it is not the Board's function to inquire into their truthfulness; Congress has assigned that duty to the Department of Justice and the courts.

With basic administrative and compliance questions out of the way, the Board members were able, during the second hundred days, to concentrate on many substantive questions arising under the new statute. Clearly, the full meaning and practical effect of the most controversial sections of the act—those involving unfair labor practices by unions—will not be revealed until many cases brought by the general counsel under section 8 (b) have passed through the Board's hands and those of the courts. Four hundred and twenty such cases have been filed to date. Meanwhile, however, the Board has had ample opportunity to apply or construe other provisions of the act. Sometimes we were able to pass upon them squarely in representation cases filed since August. In a few situations it became either necessary or desirable to apply provisions of

the new law to unfair labor practice cases that arose and were tried under the old.

Let me mention a few examples: We have held that attorneys employed by an insurance company and time-study men are both "professional employees," entitled to bargaining rights in a wholly separate unit. We have declined to proceed further with any representation cases or general cease-and-desist orders involving foremen, but have held that the Board may still remedy discrimination that was direct against individual supervisors before the effective date of the act. We have held, by majority vote, that factory inspectors are neither supervisors nor professional employees, and may in some situations be placed in a rank-and-file unit. We have found that watchmen who lack all disciplinary powers are nevertheless plant guards within the meaning of the act, and therefore not eligible to be represented by an affiliated union. We have held certain news-deliverers to be independent contractors, and hence, pursuant to section 2 (3), not employees within the meaning of the amended act.

The Board has not yet discovered the precise extent to which it is now precluded by section 8 (c)—commonly known as the free-speech amendment—from considering as evidence of unfair labor practices, whether charged against employers or against unions, statements that had probative value under the original Wagner Act. There is no doubt that the law has been modified; by applying the new section in several old unfair labor practice cases, we have recently found it necessary to reverse a number of trial examiners' intermediate reports.

The Board members have just issued two opinions intended to implement another new provision of the law. Before 1947, when the Board found that an employer had dominated or interfered with a labor organization, we directed him to cease and desist from those practices if the union was an AFL or CIO affiliate; if the organization was unaffiliated, however, the Board also directed its disestablishment. Congress directed that this disparity of treatment end. From now on the Board will disestablish unions only when there is compelling proof of employer domination; this remedy will be applied identically to affiliated as well as unaffiliated unions. If, on the other hand, the record only supports a finding of employer assistance, the Board will merely order that the employer cease such assistance in the future—again regardless of whether the labor organization is affiliated or unaffiliated.

We hope to answer several other difficult questions during the next few weeks. One relates to an employer's obligation to bargain collectively concerning a pension and retirement plan, a subject similar to that on which the general counsel recently issued a complaint and sought an injunction in the courts. The Board is also preparing to decide whether section 9 (b) (2) of the amended act requires us to conduct an election in every case in which a craft union seeks to carve a group of skilled employees out of an existent industrial union. The issue has been sharply presented in the basic steel industry. We must also determine shortly whether section 14 (b) of the act was intended to prohibit the National Board from conducting any election to authorize a union-shop in States where local law prohibits security agreements.

All of these questions are intensely interesting; no one of them is easy. I regret that the limitations imposed upon a quasi judicial officer bar me from discussing them further or even hinting at what the Board is likely to do. Many of our fellow citizens will disagree with the decisions made in these situations; the Board members, conscious of their own fallibility, expect nothing else. We can only hope that, while we are unlikely to be entirely right in any of these cases, we will be found more than half right in all of them.

Although the Board must often concentrate on issues of this magnitude, the growing case-load requires that our attention constantly be diverted to the less stimulating, but equally important, task of turning out a steady flow of decisions in relatively routine matters. We have not yet solved this quantitative problem, or eliminated the aggravating delays that are its by-product. About 4,000 cases were pending when we closed the books on the Wagner Act in August; 60 percent of these are now out of the way. Since then, however, 12,500 new cases have poured into the regional offices. The February intake of 4,500 cases established a new 12-year record. Many of these will soon inundate the Board in Washington.

Fortunately for the five Board members, although not for the 19 regional offices that must process them, over three-quarters of the incoming cases involve requests for election to authorize the union shop; most of these are conducted by consent and require no action in Washington.[1] But a substantial number of the remaining cases, charges of unfair labor practice and petitions for elections to select or reject bargaining representatives, will ultimately require decisions by the Board itself.[2] We are struggling to evolve techniques to expedite the process of decision, because we know that justice delayed is justice denied, especially in the volatile field of labor relations.

There are some hopeful signs. Since January we have been handling routine cases through panels composed of three Board members, thanks to a helpful provision in the statute. There is every assurance that Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to permit us to enlarge the staff. We are also greatly encouraged by the recent agreement between the AFL building trade-unions and the national contractors' associations. This agreement, stimulated by the act and encouraged by the Board and the general counsel, seems likely to provide voluntary techniques for the peaceful solution of jurisdictional disputes in the building-construction industry, without requiring Board intervention except in the most unusual situations.

Despite these encouraging developments, there is still a limit to what five men can do, because they are precluded, by conscience as well as by statute, from delegating their judicial functions beyond a certain point. Short cuts are desirable; so is careful Board consideration of the contentions of the parties to every case. The need for both creates the dilemma that faces us. Unfortunately we must share that dilemma with American employers and labor organizations, for they are the victims of the Board's delays. We will welcome any solution, whatever the source; candor requires me to say that we have not yet found a satisfactory one ourselves.

---

[1] About 3,500 such petitions were filed in February alone. The Board has estimated that 30,000 may be expected in the coming fiscal year, but that they will drop off thereafter. In 979 of the 993 union-shop elections held during January, a majority voted to authorize a union shop. Participation has been uniformly high, averaging 88 percent of those eligible.

[2] During the first 6 months, approximately 2,800 petitions for representation elections were filed. Nine percent of these were employer petitions; another 9 percent were petitions by employees to decertify incumbent unions.

Almost 2,000 charges of unfair labor practice have been filed since August 22, 1947—1,550 of these, constituting 1,120 actual cases, were brought against employers. Of the 420 cases filed against unions, one-third included charges that secondary boycotts were being committed. So far the general counsel has issued complaints in 42 instances, 18 against employers, and 24 against unions. Thirteen injunctions have been sought in the courts.

The difficulty results largely from the fact that industry and labor find it necessary to bring so many of their problems to the Board's attention. The day will come, I hope, when that trend will be reversed, and they will deal so rationally and so habitually with one another that neither will feel impelled to call upon Government except in rare and grave situations. I have no illusions that this will occur tomorrow, but it is a goal toward which all of us, the Board included, should constantly turn our eyes. Law is necessary not only to control some habits among men, but also to engender others. At one point in the history of American industrial relations, Congress thought it desirable to control or engender habits of one sort; at another point, it has directed its primary attention to the restriction or stimulation of quite different ones.

Whatever the momentary objective, it is our duty—yours and mine, and that of the representatives of labor—to adjust our habits to the existing decision of the chosen representatives of the people. That was your obligation under the Wagner Act; it has become labor's duty, as well as yours, under the new statute. To the extent that segments of industry may not have fulfilled that obligation wholeheartedly from 1935 to 1947, industry should not be too surprised if segments of labor seek to better the instruction in 1948. This, too, will pass, and the sooner it passes the better. Labor, as a matter of self-interest as well as good citizenship, will surely want to give the new law a fair trial.

Industry, having won many of its legislative objectives, now has an equally great responsibility. You are in a position to accelerate the pace of organized labor's adjustment to the changed conditions, although perhaps not its acquiescence in all of them. You can seize that opportunity by using the new provisions of law with discretion and restraint, and by dealing freely and frankly with your employees and with their representatives. This means more than listening when they bring their problems to you; it also means telling them what your own problems are. The more men understand other men's anxieties and aspirations, the greater the prospect of their reaching a wise and peaceful solution of their common problems. Such understanding is a condition, and also a product, of successful collective bargaining. The more successful that bargaining, the less occasion there will be for you, or for labor, to invoke the processes of the National Labor Relations Board or any other agency of Government. That is a consummation devoutly to be wished, not only by industry and labor, but also by the Board. Then, and probably only then, will we be in a position to give prompt enough answers to those questions that are so critical or so controversial that the Board must always be expected to intercede.

Under the Labor-Management Relations Act, as under the Wagner Act, Congress has declared the policy of the United States to be the encouragement of collective bargaining. Some other policies of the original act were modified in 1947, because Congress believed that certain abuses required correction as much as collective bargaining continued to need encouragement. It is the Board's duty to implement both purposes with equal vigor. We must not only continue to foster collective bargaining; we must also enforce the new rules under which it is to be sought, conducted, and secured. When the Board dedicated itself to this task 200 days ago, my colleagues and I realized, to use the language of one of the voyagers on the Mayflower, that—

"The difficulties were many, but not invincible. For though there were many of them likely, yet they were not certain; it might be sundry of the things feared might never befall; others, by provident care and

the use of good means, might in a great measure be prevented; and all of them, by fortitude and patience, might either be borne or overcome." [3]

Holifield Denounces Palestine Partition Reversal and Introduces Resolution To Lift Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the reversal of our position on the partition of Palestine as announced by our delegate to the United Nations, Warren Austin, has shocked people all over the world. Not only Zionist and non-Zionist Jewry, but millions who fear the effect of the decision on the United Nations.

This abrupt reversal of our former position, which was in favor of partition, betrays our lack of leadership and consistency in foreign policy. Someone has blundered badly, and I believe that history will prove that we have abandoned a policy toward Palestine which has been substantiated after 25 years of negotiation, by 21 fact-finding commissions, Republican and Democratic Party policies, Presidential proclamations, numerous congressional resolutions, and finally by United Nations approval through action of its General Assembly.

Why has this reversal occurred? In my opinion this change of policy has been made on the grounds of international political expediency and not as a result of ethical or spiritual considerations or obligations. Our President, our State Department, and our delegate to the United Nations apparently acted in concert on this matter. Explanations are due the American people who have supported for 25 years the policy of a national home for the Jew in Palestine. If our policy makers have secret information which caused them to reverse their position, secret information which justifies their position, then this information must be publicly revealed or confidence in their leadership will not exist.

Three factors seem evident to most of us:

First. This shift in policy without consultation with the leaders of Zionism, congressional leaders, or the official UN Palestine Commission, comes as a climax to a series of moves on the Palestine problem which has never been matched for bungling ineptness in the handling of an international problem. Never has our foreign policy seemed so inconsistent.

Second. Our new position seems to give us no assurance of an advantage over the calculated risks of our former position on partition.

Third. Our shift in position seems to be a plain and unmistakable yielding to the threat of force. Our prestige and more important perhaps, the prestige of the United Nations, has been terribly damaged.

In regard to the first factor, our sudden shift of policy, there seems to be no apparent justification. The steps which established our former policy are these: The long record of mandate violations by the British, report of commission after commission, most of them in favor of a Palestine national home, Presidential and congressional support, financial support from world Jewry to the struggling Zionists who were pioneering in the reclamation of a desert land, and finally our action in support of partition in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

And then our slide back down the hill we had so laboriously climbed—the hill which we had struggled for 25 years to climb, only to lose in a 30-minute statement of reversal by Mr. Austin before the Council of International Representatives.

Now, as to the second factor cited, the change in position gives us no advantage over our former position. We are still faced with the necessity of participating in an international police force to enforce trusteeship. In fact, we are faced with the opposition of both Jew and Arab to trusteeship. If this opposition is adamant as seems likely, we may have to furnish a larger armed force, as we may have to fight both Arab and Jew. This point was made very plain by Secretary Lie in his notes on the report of the United Nation's Special Commission on Palestine. We are faced with the same urgency in regard to time due to the British withdrawal of May 15. We are faced with the same potential massacre of unarmed Jews by armed Arabs. It becomes more imperative than ever that our arms embargo be lifted to give the Palestinian Jews the chance for survival through self-defense.

In view of the blundering reversal announced, we must be realistic and not expect a second reversal to our former position, desirable as it would be. The best program seems to be a Nation-wide demand to lift the arms embargo for immediate protection and the delegation of an international contingent of armed forces from the signatory nations to enforce immediate peace. I am introducing a resolution today which provides for lifting the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war to the Jewish militia when formed, the Jewish agency for Palestine and, or the United Nation's Palestine Commission or its designee. We must stop the slaughter in Palestine immediately and establish civil peace. Once this is accomplished we have the right to expect a period of time in which the trusteeship will be obligated to enforce the status quo as to property rights.

During this period we must renew again the fight for our original objectives. I offer this course in desperation because I see no practical chance of a second reversal. I condemn with all my strength the vacillating and weak procedure demonstrated in the reversal of our position on the partition of Palestine. It is the last and culminating blunder of a weak and confused leadership. I shall continue my years of devotion and support to the cause of a national home for the Jews in Palestine.

We come to the third factor cited, the reasons behind the reversal of the partition policy. Mr. Austin enumerated them as being the strength of Arab opposition, the necessity of an international police force to enforce partition, and the reluctance of the other powers—excepting Russia—to furnish the implementation force. Without analyzing these three reasons at this time, we all know that the same conditions cited, existed on November 29, 1947, when the original decision on Palestine partition was made. Notwithstanding these conditions, we had used our prestige and influence for partition. Either we were right then, or terribly wrong. If we were right, we should have stood by the original position. If we were wrong, the fact becomes self-evident—our State Department and UN delegate made a horrible blunder which proves their incompetency. A demonstration has been made of lack of proper liaison between the State Department, the UN delegate, and the President, which is inexcusable. The result has been a loss of confidence in our policy makers, at home, and a terrible blow to the prestige and integrity of our foreign policy abroad. The effect on the prestige of the United Nations may be decisive in deciding its life or death. For the United Nations to be humiliated by backing down from its considered majority decision by the use or threat of use of force by a few thousand nomadic Arab tribesmen, is climatic in its confession of weakness. For the United Nations to retreat in the face of Arab scorn, is to acknowledge to the world that the United Nations is a farce and a sham, that its deliberations are without point and its decisions meaningless. This is so appalling in its significance when applied to the future success and function of the United Nations, that if it is allowed to stand unchallenged, we might as well forget the hope of collective security as envisaged in the Charter. If we have reached this stage of hopelessness in the function of an international organization for peaceful multilateral solution of world problems, our people should be informed at once. We should then turn immediately to the only alternative—military strength and power alliances with as many nations as possible. We should not depend on a functionless and emasculated United Nations but revert to the law of the international jungle, and prepare for the inevitable death struggle.

If we have reached this stage of absolute repudiation of all hopes for the success of the United Nations and universal peace through world law, judgment, and enforcement, then we must explore the only alternative that I have mentioned, that is, military strength.

What does this mean? It means military expenditures in peacetime on a scale of which we have never dreamed. It means the total regimentation of our people and our economy for war. It means the loss of personal liberty and the loss of the free-enterprise system in industry; because industry, civilian population, and the military class of manpower must all be regimented for the

[3] William Bradford. History of Plimoth Plantation. (Seventeenth Century Manuscript, first published by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1899.)

future type of atomic warfare. For basic self-protection and in the hopes of partial survival as individuals and as a Nation, we will be forced to regiment away all the liberties we now have and become totalitarian ourselves in order to fight an antagonistic and totalitarian enemy. This is the alternative to a functioning United Nations. This is why every move should be toward strengthening collective security through international peaceful cooperation in the United Nations.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article and statement:

[From the New York Times]

CARDINAL DOUGHERTY CALLS PEACETIME UMT MENACE TO HEALTH AND MORALITY OF YOUTH

PHILADELPHIA, March 18—Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, ranking prelate of the Catholic Church in this country, declared today he is unalterably opposed to peacetime universal military training.

The spiritual leader of a million Catholics in the Philadelphia Archdiocese stated the following reasons:

"First, it is against the traditions of this country.

"Second, where it is in existence is precisely where most wars have taken place.

"Third—said training would remove young men, at a critical age, from their home surroundings and safeguards.

"Fourth, it would throw them with all their inexperience and without adequate safeguard, into frightful temptations calculated to undermine their morality and physical health.

"Fifth, experience shows that even military officers are frequently corrupt and a bad example to those under them.

"Sixth, venereal disease would rise in a frightful degree and break down the health of future fathers of families.

"Seventh, the expense of universal military training would involve annually millions, if not billions, of dollars to be paid by the taxpayers.

"Eighth, there seems to be no need in this country of universal military training, which is boosted most by soldiers, particularly Army officers, who covet promotion and higher salaries.

"Finally, the chances are that hereafter battles will be fought in the air, rather than on foot; and in that case large armies will not be needed."

Cardinal Dougherty also observed that "certain groups are opposed in conscience to war and consequently to preparations to war; and this is not only true of Quakers but also of many mothers of other religious beliefs."

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, NOVEMBER 18, 1947

The executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America reaffirms its opposition to the establishment by the United States at this time of a system of compulsory universal military training.

The constituent communions of the federal council, insofar as they have expressed their judgment on this issue, are opposed to the adoption by Congress of legislation providing for compulsory military training. Reports that have come to us indicate that 10 national religious assemblies have taken action opposing such training. Certain other national religious assemblies have discussed the question without a vote being taken. To the best of our knowledge no one of our constituent communions has supported compulsory universal military training. The actions here referred to are not to be construed as necessarily reflecting a unanimous judgment of the communions in question. There are differences of opinion both within the churches and among ourselves.

It is apparent, however, that despite these differences of opinion, and despite our full recognition of the need for adequate military defense, any effort to establish now a system of compulsory universal military training will meet with widespread opposition both within our churches and among a majority of the members of the federal council's executive committee for religious and moral reasons and on deep-seated grounds of Americanism.

We are keenly aware of the tensions currently existing in the world today. We also recognize that military power is exercising a strong influence in the shaping of international policy. We believe, however, that the fear of war can best be allayed and the risk of war can best be diminished by accelerating the economic and social recovery of Europe and Asia.

The European recovery program now before Congress offers the United States an unexcelled opportunity to strengthen the foundations of democracy in the West and to improve the economic and social well-being of the Western World. We believe that substantial and adequate aid to Asia is a necessary corollary to aid to Europe. We are convinced, therefore, that the European recovery program and the implementing of a like program for Asia constitute a priority in American foreign policy. The resources and energies of our Nation should not now be diverted from this primary task of reconstruction.

Moreover, such of our constituent bodies as have opposed compulsory universal military training deplore the determination of this issue as a gesture of military power in the midst of the present tensions in international relations. It is believed that to depart from traditional American policy by inaugurating at this time a system of compulsory universal military training would contribute to the further deterioration of the present situation.

There is opposition among the churches to the Government assuming responsibility for indoctrination and discipline in the matter of citizenship since it has been the genius of our democracy to rely upon the home, the church, and the school for such training. There are also grave doubts with regard to the moral consequences of taking immature youths from their normal relationships in family, church, and community and putting them into an abnormal community.

Finally, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in biennial session in Seattle, in December 1946, supported the announced purpose of our Government to work for a comprehensive system of disarmament. * * * Little, if any, progress has been achieved in implementing the provisions of the General Assembly's resolution on principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments. We wish to foster no illusions regarding the early likelihood of accomplishing the ends embodied in this resolution. We believe, however, that if our Nation were now to reverse the military policy to which, in peacetime, it has adhered from the days of its foundation, in favor of a system of compulsory universal military training, the effect would be further to jeopardize the possibility of regulating and reducing armaments by international agreement.

Problems of Former Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address regarding the problems of former servicemen, by Gael Sullivan, delivered on March 18, 1948, and broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co. network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The other day I read two letters of a sort familiar to all parents. They were full of the rambling news which sons write their fathers when they are separated. My oldest son wrote that he had won his letter in basketball. My younger boy said he had won his letter in hockey. You parents who are listening know that letters like these leave a warm glow that is familiar to all of us. Yet these letters did not leave me with a warm glow. They left me with a chill of foreboding. For these letters arrived on the day when the lights of freedom were dimmed in Czechoslovakia and the iron curtain was moved one more country westward. My boys are 15 and 17 years old. I don't want either of them to be a veteran like their father. I want them to visit Italy and France as students or tourists, not as combat soldiers. And I don't want them to go through some other experiences their father has had. I don't want them to live through an era of desperate struggle, through an economic depression at home, while another war festers in a sick world economy.

Those are the things I thought about on that day when Communist aggression gobbled up another nation—in this case a nation still scarred with the wounds left by another totalitarian conqueror. I thought about the surging tide of events which has swept about us since the guns of global war were silenced in 1945. I remembered the first wonderful days of what we called peace. I remembered the flowery speeches about the glorious victory we had won—about the brave, new world we had created in the fiery furnace of war.

Today the fruits of victory are as ashes. For events show us plainly that there is no real victory to be won by force of arms alone. No one wins in a shooting war. The one we call the victor is actually only the one who has escaped defeat. When we win a war we win only a chance for survival. The real struggle is the struggle that occurs in the postwar period. The crucial battle is the battle for peace. We have not yet won that battle. Nor have we lost it. But we are in a period of touch-and-go for the future.

Tonight I speak to veterans—as a veteran. Tonight I speak to parents—as a parent. Tonight I speak to all American citizens—as an American citizen. I believe we all seek the same goals. Peace. Security. A decent place to live. A chance to save a little money.

A chance to raise our children decently—not just your children or my children—but all of the chidlren in this Nation. A chance that these children can live lives of peace and security.

Whether we achieve those goals is largely a political problem. You and I as voters are shareholders in America. The President and the Congress we elect are our board of directors. The actions they take determine whether or not we realize our dreams and reach our goals of peace and security. The action they take determines whether we have economic strength and stability at home, or whether we have the same boom-and-bust cycle which followed the last war. The action they take determines whether we follow a positive program toward a peace of freedom and justice, or whether we drift in a sickening world toward another war.

Let's take a good, hard-headed look at where we stand today. Peace. Achieving a real peace is a tougher job after World War II than it was after World War I. True, we have the experience of knowing about the mistakes after World War I, which paved the way for World War II. This time we must avoid those mistakes. This time our problems are greater. Europe is in greater chaos than it was after the last war. Our problems of reconversion to a peacetime economy at home are many times greater than they were after the last war.

One reason is that we face the question of how far toward the so-called normal peacetime economy we dare to move. For after the last war our enemies were beaten.

Now we find an ally which fought with us against the Nazi totalitarianism is itself emerging as a totalitarian threat to democratic freedom. This former ally does not hesitate to use force and terror to subjugate free peoples. And we have in our own country voices which urge us toward a foreign policy which would lose us the peace. Republican isolationists have emerged under a new title. They are revisionists. They would revise the European recovery program into something that would be too little and too late. They would revise our military preparedness program until it is a program of military unpreparedness. They would bottle up the universal training program that President Truman again asked only last Wednesday. They would lull us with magazine articles that make blueprints seem weapons and which give the impression that guided missiles can be used as occupation troops. They would tell us that you can operate bombers and mop up enemy strongpoints on the ground without trained men. Any veteran knows that this is pure buncombe.

There are other voices which attack our foreign policy and oppose our military preparedness. They believe the Russians can do no wrong. They say we must weaken our defenses while Russia builds up a powerful striking force. They say that if appeasement cannot win us peace then we must resort to abasement. Recently these forces held a parade in York, Pa., to honor their Presidential candidate, Henry Wallace. York newspapers report that there was not one American flag in that parade. Not one person carried the flag to which you and I are proud to pledge allegiance, which many of us defended with our very lives. I do not think we want to take their advice on foreign policy.

Winning the peace will not be easy. The European recovery program will require some sacrifices on our part. But it will give decent, freedom-loving peoples the tools with which to rebuild free nations to resist the westward flow of communism. And it will prove to the world that Americans are not deserting those who fought with them in the battle for freedom.

But let us face the cold facts. Money alone will not buy us the peace. Eating a little less food will not buy us the peace. The greatest deterrent to military attack upon us is keeping ourselves so strong that no one will dare attack us. That costs money—and more than money. It means that many people will have to sacrifice some of their time. It means that this Nation will have to adopt some form of universal peacetime training, and revive some form of selective service. And all this on a scale larger than the present Reserve organization, made up of many who fought in one war, and set up as preparedness against another one. The President made that clear in his message to Congress Wednesday

As a parent, let me say this to parents. You may have to face this choice: One year of peacetime universal training for your son, as insurance for peace, or untrained, front-line service for your son as a combat soldier in an age of atomic and biological warfare. I'll take peacetime training for my boys. Won't you? I don't want their athletic letters to be replaced by those fearful letters M I A—missing in action.

I am convinced that the only way we can avoid war is by keeping ourselves strong at home and by helping our friends abroad. That is President Truman's program. His defense program has been crippled by the Republican Congress. The European recovery program has been the victim of a congressional slow-down at the very moment of a Communist expansion speed-up. And the strength we need at home must be more than merely military strength.

We must maintain our economic good health. We must avoid a depression and continue our present high-level economy.

Today, as the result of a Democratic administration, we have climbed from the Hoover depression to record levels of production, employment, and national income.

The President offers the only positive program to continue this high level of production and to expand it even further. He offers the only positive program to curb the Republican inflation which threatens to push our economy toward another crash. It is here that the Republican-controlled Congress does not even trouble to hide its opposition to the President or to apologize for its actions.

The goals we spoke of earlier—we are close to reaching them. But the present Republican Congress stands as a road block to hold us off.

Economic security: We cannot have security if the failure to curb high prices brings us an economic crash.

A decent place to live: Millions lack decent housing. Some lack it because they can never afford decent housing unless the Government helps them. But millions more lack it because they were veterans. They came home from the Army and found that all the places to live had been filled up.

President Truman proposes a housing program to help these veterans get a decent place to live—not at today's inflationary Republican prices—but at decent, fair prices that a veteran can afford. The Republican Congress gives lip service to the goal of decent housing, but it does nothing to get it.

A chance to save a little money: How many families—how many veterans have seen their life savings eaten up by high prices.

A chance to raise our children decently and to let them live lives of peace and security. The President has a program to raise our educational level. He has a program which will offer better medical care for all of the Nation. The Republican Congress once again acts as a road block. They attack the President's proposals. They say that it is socialistic to give all children a chance for a decent education. They say it is socialistic for the plain people to have adequate medical care.

I say it is working democracy to accomplish these goals. And I say that the refusal of the Republican Congress to pass housing legislation, to pass educational legislation, to pass health legislation is government for the privileged few.

I say let's stop having overprivileged and underprivileged. Let"s make every American a privileged American—privileged to a chance to reach our common goals of peace, security and a decent and normal life in a decent and normal home in a decent and normal world.

I mentioned that the goals of veterans are no different from the goals of the rest of us. That is all to the good, because we now have nearly 19,000,000 veterans, and virtually all of them are of voting age. It would be an unhealthy condition indeed if we veterans considered ourselves a special group of the population.

Why did we merge with the rest of the Nation so fast after we took off our uniform? The reason is the program voted by the Democratic Congress to see that veterans received decent care and treatment instead of the medical scandals of the Republican regime after the last war.

The Democratic Congress voted to give them education and training instead of the tear-gas barrage with which a Republican President and a Republican general greeted the bonus marchers in the hot summer of 1932.

Two and a half million veterans are receiving educational or job training aid right now.

Veterans have been given financial aid to start new businesses and to start buying a home. All in all, veterans are as well off as the rest of us and as bad off as the rest of us except in the field of housing where the Republican controlled Congress has stymied the President's program.

The fox-hole vote is not a vote for special privilege for those who know how it feels to live in a fox-hole. Perhaps the fox-hole vote is a little stronger for the same goals than the vote of its elders. The more they have seen of war the more they desire peace. The more they have seen of war the more they support the President's program for military preparedness. The longer the life ahead of them the more they long for security. And with the knowledge of what this country has done in war they have a firm confidence of what we can do in peace.

They are not afraid of the future. They are not afraid to meet problems with action. They want to shape the future, not await it with fear and trembling.

Our President has seen war at first-hand. He has seen us lose the peace after a war. He has seen government for privilege bring our great Nation to economic chaos. That is why our President is determined that we shall not repeat these mistakes. That is why our President is not afraid to lead the fight to avoid these disasters by positive action.

People who believe in our universal goals of peace and security and a fair deal for all Americans will not be afraid to follow him, be they veterans, parents, or just plain, everyday taxpaying citizens.

In November his victory will be their victory.

Comments on the Marshall Plan by Brig. Gen. Brice P. Disque, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from

Brig. Gen. Brice P. Disque, retired, addressed to Mr. Frank E. Gannett, publisher of the Gannett newspapers, entitled "Some Comments on the Marshall Plan."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME COMMENTS RE THE MARSHALL PLAN

To the EDITOR:

My interest in the Marshall plan is my own country's welfare. In expressing my uncompromising opposition to the plan, herewith are some views which are based upon a fair first-hand knowledge of Europe, Asia, and all of the Western Hemisphere. History has been my avocation for half a century. For more than 20 years I was an officer in the Regular Army and had service in three wars. Since World War I, I have held a Reserve Corps commission, while also for 30 years managed some quite important business concerns. My experiences included the management of a concern engaged in trading and finance in 28 foreign countries. Those are my qualifications, in addition to being completely free from fear of any personal gain or losses regardless of what may come of the mess in which the country finds itself.

About a year ago we heard something to the effect that there was a Truman doctrine. Some rather superficial thinkers compared it to the Monroe Doctrine.

The difference between the originators of those two ideas is that for 125 years the Monroe Doctrine has been respected and enforced. In 1 year Truman the doctrinaire has seen his bluff called in two notorious instances.

There we have a measure of the decline in American leadership to a new low. Are we becoming a nation of mice? May our country soon find a man who will quietly say to Stalin: "Stop. If you don't, we will hit you with everything that we have. This is a 24-hour notice."

I believe that our people would approve, even in their present ignorance of what the State Department knows and should tell them. If they knew the truth, as all citizens of a republic are entitled to know it, I am confident of their approval. They would know that such action was in their interests; that the price of inaction may be disaster.

The Marshall plan is inaction insofar as the needs of the hour are concerned.

Was the promulgation of that Truman doctrine just another irresponsible outburst of a muddled or angry man who happened to be in a position to entangle this Nation, or was it a carefully considered and responsible statement of the spokesman of this most powerful Nation on earth?

Presumably Mr. Truman had conclusive evidence that the behavior of Stalin and his bullies, past, present, and prospective, was inimical to the safety and welfare of the United States. Only the most superficial demagogic mind could throw such a bombshell into the world affairs irresponsibly.

Therefore, I feel that we not only have the right to, but, in all decency and common sense, are compelled to regard Russia as a serious menace and act accordingly.

The only other possible conclusion is that someone who posed as the spokesman for this country, in one or more of the still unreported secret agreements made with Stalin, consented to Russian expansion as we are seeing it take form. If that is the situation, then what sense does the so-called Truman doctrine make?

The Marshall plan is a weak government's idea of how to stop a bully by indirect methods which have not a chance of success. The inevitable end result is bound to be our participation in another European war after we are further and dangerously weakened and after we have given to Russia precious time needed for her to develop strength.

Most of us who grew up in this country can recall that at some time in our youth there was a bully in the neighborhood. Largely through sheer bluffing that gradually took form as one boy after another showed fear, the bully got about everything he wanted.

Then a day came when a lad showed up who had confidence in himself and who did not like to be bullied. The inevitable contest followed and the bully was dethroned.

The young hero did not rid the community of that bully by bribing the fearful boys, he knew that they had proven that they were ineffective and so he himself administered the only treatment that dethrones bullies, a good quick sock on the jaw or wherever it hurts most.

The Marshall plan is a cheap and ineffective attempt to bribe others to do what America knows must be done to Russia but what our fearful leaders are afraid to tell us that we must do.

Americans of this generation, situated to enjoy all of the blessings of this great Republic, including the freedom for the individual and relatively fabulous standard of living, all created by previous and hardier generations, are sinking deeper every month into a miserable existence. We are living on the fat produced by our fathers.

We have been under a definite governmental clique for 15 years. That clique have exercised more authority, more continuously, than we have ever seen before. They have created one crisis after another. Whether those crises were manipulated or the results of stupidity, we have had to endure them.

Is it not about time that someone stated the obvious and pointed directly to the cause and then cleaned house? The answer is so simple; of course, the governing clique simply are responsible; they have been in charge.

If there is a case of more and greater fumbling, or deliberate sabotage of the Republic (only history will decide which), it is not recorded in history. Now those fumblers have us on the verge of bankruptcy at a time when they have rendered a war with Russia as the alternative to having the communistic snake wrap its coils around all of the nations of Europe and Asia.

What a record. Yet that clique of very mediocre men now call for opening the flow of more of our lifeblood, on what they call a gamble, to try to bribe what is left in Europe to do what they cannot and only we can do—stop Russia.

There is not a shred of evidence that the billions we already have poured into Europe has even slowed down the Russian aggressions. There is nothing in the history of the economic or political history of Europe to justify calling the Marshall plan even a calculated risk.

The truth is that neither Europe nor Great Britain can hope to carry on in world trade in the future with anything like the advantages of past times. Too many of their markets are gone forever because of the very natural industrial growth of areas where they used to trade manufactured products for needed food and raw materials.

No amount of United States dollars can reverse that trend. It will continue to develop adversely to Europe. The only hope for a reasonable existence in Europe is to federate and "take in each other's washing." Our money may give them a few months' respite, but it also may delay their own decisions which are vital to their future. Only Europeans can solve that problem. Nothing in European history justifies optimism.

Most Congressmen and Senators have no clear thought on the subject of the Marshall plan, and if they could talk personally with each of their constituents, they would learn that they do not know what it is all about and are so confused that they will not applaud or disapprove.

Yet every man in Congress and the President is sworn to uphold the Constitution, and there is no such power in that document as would authorize those men to spend a dollar of tax-collected money for a foreign country.

Furthermore they know that, if the fantastic sums asked for ERP had to be raised, as they should be, by sale of securities direct to American investors, then probably not 5 percent of the sum could be raised.

So we will extract the funds in taxes that the people would not exchange for securities of the nations in the breadline. We have fallen pretty far and deep into a charm from which this Republic probably never will extricate itself.

Can any good come of it? Of course not, and all history stands witness to that negative answer.

The Marshall plan is but one more of the man-made emergencies that have bedeviled our country since the New Deal intellectuals began to make us over. Their abysmal ignorance of history (it is more charitable to say it that way rather than call them traitors) led them into one experiment after another in utter blindness to the potential chain repercussions. What a price we have paid!

The fantastic ERP is but another of those wild schemes and it is well that some of us yell, "Stop!" Why? Because every experience of mankind—thousands of experiments over thousands of years—prove beyond all doubt that no good can come of it and possible fatal damage to our own country may well be the end result.

Those who suggest $17,000,000,000 as the cost know that it is not. They conceal about an equal amount for collateral purposes.

I am opposed to ERP because I am certain that it means the end of freedom as we have enjoyed it in America. To me one great and vital ingredient of freedom is to keep and use for myself what I produce. Another is to save in my productive years in the confidence that a dollar saved will still be a dollar when I need it in old age. We have just about destroyed that idea already.

They say that we ought to feed Europe; we cannot. They never had enough and yet they continue to breed like rabbits. With all of the dead of this latest war, there are 14,000,000 more people now in Europe than in 1938.

Some say bring the surplus population over here. That is silly and one superficial look at world population trends versus arable acres would convince anyone who will think.

We are heading for a world population that in the year 2000 will have but 1½ acres of arable land per person for food and 2½ acres is considered necessary for health.

We are the inheritors of the first experience of mankind in true freedom for the individual. Why haven't we the intelligence and morality to conserve it?

First Abraham, then Moses, and then Christ tried to show the human race that to get the most out of life man must be free and that freemen tolerate no ruler.

Those three great leaders had divine vision and knew that no human being or group could be sufficiently endowed with wisdom as to regulate the lives of other humans.

But until our ancestors laid down the foundations of this Republic, no society ever elected to be free. People everywhere preferred to be led and fed, regardless of the frugality of their existence. That is the history of all the world and very particularly of Europe.

Except for our country famine has been a normal recurrence everywhere and yet there never was a time or place in which men, had they valued freedom sufficiently and paid the price, could not have moved out of their near animal existence into the kind of life we had in the United States during the nineteenth century.

We became great, powerful, and built a fabulous standard of living because from the beginning we insisted upon being free. We adopted a republic rather than a democracy

because our builders knew that all of the democracies of history were tyrants in the hands of the majority. There was no security or freedom for minorities.

The great difference, and the fundamental reason why we cannot help Europe by ERP is that over there they never have been free because they do not have it in them to do so.

For the only time in history, our people founded a nation by and for themselves. They would have none of the pagan idea that they needed someone to take care of them. They upset all previous notions about government and made one without power over them, jealously conceding merely enough authority to keep order and represent them in foreign relations.

Sitting around the table at the birth of the United States was the most interesting and competent group ever assembled on this earth. There were statesmen, practical producers, pioneers, students of history, jurists, and experts experienced in European governments and with a mature understanding of how they worked. Those men knew that the more government a people had the more depressing human existence became.

So we passed through a century of the greatest experiment in all history. The results are not questioned. But today the system is questioned and men ignorant of history are confused.

We have been breaking down the system since the direct election of Senators and the imposition of the personal income tax. The destruction has been accelerated since 1932, until one can hardly recognize the original republic; all based upon tortured interpretations of the "general welfare" clause in the Constitution. If the new breed of intellectuals who have imposed these new and strange ideas are right, then obviously the Constitution needed but one sentence to define the powers of Congress: The general welfare clause.

I believe that all of these things have come about, first, because of the unmoral qualities of recent national leaders, who in turn never would have become leaders except that the moral qualities of a majority of the voters have become so diluted that they, in their ignorance of the fatal results, wanted leaders who would make life easy for them. Voters who do not put freedom first.

Is there any other answer to the phenomena that the masses who pack themselves in huge cities vote for the new (but as old as time) idea, while those outside, where men can and do survive and prosper on their own efforts, oppose such changes?

What has all of this got to do with ERP? Well, to me it means that we are traveling so rapidly toward a loss of freedom in our own country that the best service we can render to mankind is to repent, go to work, and set our own house in order, and prove that we have a better system.

Europe has fewer human beings than Asia, and Africa has a considerable population. We cannot discriminate on any moral grounds, and if we gave them our country, they would be back where they now are in 5 years. They do not want freedom. Do we?

One of the silly reasons advanced for ERP is to stop the spread of communism. No one despises the ruthless gangster government of the Russians more than I do, and, with my country sound and morally healthy, I have no fear of that current world nuisance.

I do not know how the gangsters running Russia feel about our aid to Europe. They are too devious for me. But were I Stalin it would give me much satisfaction to see the United States open up another vein to accelerate the bleeding process. The results are what he probably wants.

If the system of the Soviets is as rotten, impracticable, and inhuman as I believe, then it cannot spread and enslave any people who are worth saving. They will prove their worth or otherwise by their own acts. We cannot do that for them.

If we really do want to recover our freedom and go on toward our destiny, we must stop this nonsense of world boondoggling and get down to the job of rebuilding our own structure and morality.

We can understand such a job, and if we think at all, we know that no man or group of men are wise enough to diagnose Europe's disease, prescribe treatment, or to administer the medicine, even if we could furnish enough.

Let anyone who has read what is here ask himself how he would go about doing what the Marshall plan proposes. In doing so just keep in mind that you probably are a better man than any of those who will spend your money. They cannot even keep Communists out of our Government, Communists who daily steal records and orders for the Kremlin.

Let us quit trying to harness the universe and recognize that these characters who now strut across the stage are no wiser than the other fellow on the street. The only difference is that they do not know how stupid they are and what damage they are doing. Marshall demands "all or nothing." I am for nothing.

Very sincerely yours,

BRICE P. DISQUE,
Brigadier General, Retired.

Religious Education in Public Schools—Decision of Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, both of which appeared March 9, 1948, the first entitled "Strictly Separate," from the St. Louis Star-Times, the second entitled "A Victory for Freedom," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Each of the editorials relates to the decision of the Supreme Court handed down on March 8, 1948, in the case of People of State of Illinois ex rel Vashti McCollum.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of March 9, 1948]

STRICTLY SEPARATE

Of all the decisions to come from the Supreme Court this term, probably none will draw more discussion and emotional upset than that which holds that public schools may not be used to assist religious education. This is a subject within the area of man's most personal possession, his faith, and both convictions and prejudices are sharply drawn here.

Yet in the cold light of legality the majority of the Court—this was an 8–to–1 decision—will have to be endorsed. Under the peculiar Champaign system for integrating religious instruction into the school curriculum, the constitutional violation was plain.

Here religious classes were offered within the schools, and parents were solicited to permit their children to attend them. Those who did were relieved from their secular school duties for that period. Those who did not were required to continue at those duties. Some freedom of choice was given; the courses offered were interdenominational, Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish. But if freedom of religion as it is written into the Constitution is to mean anything, then it must mean freedom of no religion, too. It is not enough to say that a man may be a Buddhist or a Mohammedan or a Christian or a Jew without let or hindrance; it is also necessary to say that he may be an agnostic or an atheist and that the state must do nothing to promote someone else's belief above his nonbelief.

As Justice Black said in his decision—and there can be no recalling of his vague Klan background, for he was joined by Protestant, Catholic, and Jew—"Here not only are the State's tax-supported public-school buildings used for the dissemination of religious doctrines. The State also affords sectarian groups an invaluable aid in that it helps to provide pupils for their religious classes through use of the State's compulsory public school machinery. This is not separation of church and state."

This decision could be too broadly interpreted if it is forgotten that it was tailored specifically to the somewhat unusual Champaign conditions. Justice Reed pointed to some of the dangers in that direction when he dissented because he felt the ruling might be used to strike out even that religious education very loosely tied to the schools. Justice Jackson pointed out some others when he argued that the decision should not open the way to objections against the teaching of church architecture in art classes, for example, or of sacred music in music classes. Certainly there must be no loose reading of the opinion to make it an antireligious document.

Within its own bounds, however, it defines a necessary separation between church and state. Those whose immediate tendency is to object had better read it carefully and then remember all the ills that can follow when those two institutions are bound in too-tight alliance.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 9, 1948]

A VICTORY FOR FREEDOM

Because she is a woman with the courage of her convictions, Mrs. Vashti McCollum, of Champaign, Ill., has won a great victory in the United States Supreme Court. She has won her battle against use of the public-school facilities for religious instruction and she has won it with the support of eight Justices. Only Stanley Reed did not agree.

This all but unanimous endorsement of Mrs. McCollum's successful appeal to the highest court is no measure of the long, hard, and persistent fight she had to make to win in the end.

This decision is a victory for the separation of church and state in the United States. It is in the high tradition of James Madison, who led the fight for this constitutional principle in the Bill of Rights. Madison and Jefferson knew, as did others of their time, that "there cannot be freedom of religion guaranteed by the state and also intervention by the church in the state's domain or dependence on the state's largess."

Mrs. McCollum's victory is a victory for freedom of conscience, without which there can be no freedom of religion. She is not a Catholic, a Protestant, or a Jew. She does not belong to any one of the many denominational sects. She is a freethinker, sometimes called an atheist. It was her argument that the Bill of Rights' separation of church and state protects her in her efforts to train her children in freethinking just as much as it protects those in denominations with membership running into the millions.

She made her case first before the school board of her community. She was put down pretty much as a nuisance, if not a crank. She was not deterred by the school board's brush-off or local criticism or raised eyebrows in university circles. When the State Supreme Court ruled unanimously against

her, she went right on to Washington. After her appeal to the Supreme Court, several denominational and civil-rights groups, including the Synagogue Council of America, filed supporting briefs as friends of the Court. Yet it was still one mother's case, carried to the highest tribunal because of her intense devotion to freedom of thought.

If the 8-to-1 majority tends to minimize Mrs. McCollum's uphill struggle, it happily emphasizes how right she was all along.

In recent years, the Supreme Court has split time after time on vital civil-rights issues and in all too many cases it has decided against a soundly based claim of an individual citizen. This time, on the highly controversial issue of religious instruction as part of education, it lacks only one Justice of being unanimous.

Hugo Black, who wrote the Court's decision, went straight to the heart of the question. Describing the Champaign system (employed in varying forms in hundreds of cities and towns), he said that the use of public schools for religious classes was "beyond all question a utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public-school system to aid religious groups to spread their faith."

It can only be regretted that Justice Black did not see the issue as clearly in the New Jersey school-bus case, whose majority opinion he also wrote. In that 5-to-4 decision, just a year ago, he found no breach of the wall between church and state in the use of tax funds to reimburse the fare of parochial-school pupils.

Either he has changed his views or he thinks that a little mixing of church and state is all right. The latter certainly is the view of Justice Reed, who does not like the McCollum decision because it raises a bar against practically all forms of religious instruction in connection with school systems.

We prefer to think that the Supreme Court has learned a lot from the sound criticism of the New Jersey decision in the press, in law reviews, and indeed in religious circles. We prefer to think that the McCollum case is not only the latest word but also a revised judgment. We prefer to think that it will be followed by decisions which will reverse the New Jersey decision and earlier decisions permitting the use of tax funds to pay for school books for church schools and otherwise to support church schools. We prefer to think this, notwithstanding Justice Black's pains to harmonize the McCollum and New Jersey decision.

A particularly pleasing aspect of the decision is the position of Chief Justice Vinson. For what appears to be the first time in his two terms on the bench, he has, in a non-unanimous case, voted to uphold the claim of a citizen that a civil right has been violated. The Vinson score is now 1 to 17 in 18 of such cases.

It is Justice Rutledge who is entitled to more satisfaction than any other member over the McCollum victory. His stanch dissent in the New Jersey bus-fare case was an appeal to the future. Justice Black wrote the McCollum decision, but it was foretold by Wiley Rutledge.

Unity of Scandinavian Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a statement which I prepared on the subject Scandinavian Collective Security.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCANDINAVIAN COLLECTIVE SECURITY

I am deeply interested in following the reports of the talks held in Stockholm by the Premiers of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, regarding the threat presented by the march of communism across the continent of Europe. I have been hoping that the three Scandinavian countries could set an inspiring example for all the rest of Europe by establishing even closer ties of collective security than have been established by the Brussels pact.

It is essential, I believe, to recognize that economic unity, military unity, and political unity are all phases of the same collective-security problem these days.

The Communist threat is made not only as a matter of external aggression but as a matter of internal revolution. It is essential, therefore, I believe, that all of the western European countries unite on all three bases that I have mentioned, economic, political, and military.

I am well aware of the traditional neutrality policy which is dear to the hearts of the Scandinavian peoples. Certainly, however, the experience of the Second World War, when Norway and Denmark were invaded, and Sweden was spared only by the whim of a dictator, shows that when absolutism confronts democracy neutrality is a mere pious hope which dictators can smash at their will and which they certainly do not respect.

I would not presume, as United States Senator, to tell the three Scandinavian countries, which are situated after all practically in the lion's mouth, how they should act; nevertheless, it is an obvious fact that these three countries, which are tied so closely by similar tongue, similar culture, similar devotion to democracy and countless other similarities, could put into practice all of the dreams of mankind's greatest statesmen for a federated unity of all of western Europe and could thus present a well-understood answer to the Communist threat.

Neutrality is no longer possible in a contracted world. I believe that each democratic nation has an obligation to work as closely as possible with the other democratic nations. In union there is strength.

Talk is cheap; words of friendship, however sincere, as expressed between European nations mean virtually nothing to the planners in the Kremlin. Action for political unity, for collective security, are what the Russians will understand.

I hope the Scandinavian countries will join with Great Britain, France, Luxemburg, Holland, Belgium, Ireland, Switzerland, to create an effective union.

If this is done a great step forward will be taken. Without vision there is nothing ahead for Europe but a repetition of Europe's past history. America, who has in two wars given of her blood and substance, hopes the statesmanship of Europe will prove adequate to this challenge. It is time for greatness.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the the following statement of Bishop W. A. Lawrence, of Massachusetts:

I often see the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training (headed by Dr. Carl T. Compton) quoted as favorable to UMT. But such persons including the President seem to me to completely overlook the fact that this Commission actually expressed many doubts both as to the wisdom and the effectiveness of such a program. For instance, the Commission says quite frankly, "We do not advocate universal military training as a panacea which of itself will give us security. We do not give it priority over any of the other elements we have set forth of an integrated national defense program." "Our first requirement is a mobile striking force. This force would have to consist of highly trained professional soldiers and fliers." * * * Our second line of defense is comprised of Regular Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines; that is, our established armed services, not a reservoir of partially trained men.

The Commission, in calling for a broad, continuous and intensive program of scientific research and development, industrial mobilization, and stock piling of critical materials, actually presents an over-all program in which universal military training appears only of relatively minor importance. Indeed, the Commission emphasizes the fatal error which might accompany universal military training by saying: "We realize that there may be danger, if our country puts universal military training into effect, that it will therefore be lulled into a feeling of false security. * * * If the introduction of UMT should have such an indirect effect of weakening rather than strengthening the other elements of our national security, then our Commission is of the firm opinion that the adoption of universal military training would be a mistake and would diminish rather than increase our national security."

Another precaution which they urge is that, "In making our plans for national defense, we take realistic account of the financial ability of the country to support the measures that are considered necessary." The Commission then goes on to say, "Universal military training should not be undertaken at all unless the citizens of this country understand that it has value only as part of a program that will demand the expenditure of a much larger proportion of our national income than we have ever allocated for national defense in peacetime."

Popular polls are also quoted as being favorable to universal military training, but if the question is phrased so as to offer the choice between spending $3,000,000,000 in educational facilities or in universal military training, the vote is heavily against universal military training.

As to the recent Czechoslovakia coup, that seems to me to have been given prominence out of all proportion to its significance. Way back last summer, when Czechoslovakia first accepted, and then, under pressure from the Soviet, later refused the invitation to have a part in the European recovery program, we certainly knew that they were within the sphere of Russian influence and should have recognized that they were under Russian domination. The recent coup was but the visible demonstration of what really took place some time ago.

I make special mention of these practical aspects because I have discovered that when people feel strongly on any matter, they are apt to argue with more heat than enlightenment.

Before we rush into a program of military training for American youth, it is certainly well that we should consider seriously and thoroughly such questions as: Have we proved that universal military training provides national security? (It has not proved to do so, with other countries.) Are we convinced

that this is the best way to spend $3,000,000,000 a year in defense? If so, are we ready to take a complete departure from a national philosophy which has always rejected such compulsory service except in periods of dire emergency? And finally, are we sure that our economy can carry the over-all cost of security program of which universal military training is only a part, and, as the Compton commission states, only a small and lesser part?

All these are questions which every citizen must consider, but a Christian has the additional responsibility to decide further questions: Is universal military training an asset or detriment in the building of Christian character and a Christian nation? Will it, in the long run, help or hinder the building of "Peace on earth, good will among men." Is it a matter of choice or of compulsion; and if the latter, what is the basis of our necessity? Can it be squared with the teaching and principles of Jesus Christ? Is this the most constructive and Christian step we can take at this time in our international relations?

What about strengthening the United Nations? Certainly we should not be stampeded into hasty action under pressure from the President, but should consider these very important matters with deliberation and balanced judgment.

W. A. LAWRENCE.

Universal Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on universal compulsory military training by the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BY THE FIRST PRESIDENCY OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

Press reports have for some months indicated that a determined effort is in making to establish in this country a compulsory universal military training designed to draw into military training and service the entire youth of the Nation. We had hoped that mature reflection might lead the proponents of such a policy to abandon it. We have felt and still feel that such a policy would carry with it the gravest dangers to our Republic.

It now appears that the proponents of the policy have persuaded the administration to adopt it in what, on its face, is a modified form. We deeply regret this, because we dislike to find ourselves under the necessity of opposing any policy so sponsored. However, we are so persuaded of the rightfulness of our position, and we regard the policy so threatening to the true purposes for which this Government was set up, as set forth in the great preamble to the Constitution, that we are constrained respectfully to invite your attention to the following considerations:

1. By taking our sons at the most impressionable age of their adolescence and putting them into Army camps under rigorous military discipline, we shall seriously endanger their initiative, thereby impairing one of the essential elements of American citizenship. While on its face the suggested plan might not seem to visualize the Army-camp training, yet there seems little doubt that our military leaders contemplate such a period, with similar recurring periods after the boys are placed in the Reserves.

2. By taking our boys from their homes we shall deprive them of parental guidance and control at this important period of their youth, and there is no substitute for the care and love of a mother for a young son.

3. We shall take them out of school and suffer their minds to be directed in other channels so that very many of them after leaving the Army will never return to finish their schooling, thus over a few years materially reducing the literacy of the whole Nation.

4. We shall give opportunity to teach our sons not only the way to kill but also, in too many cases, the desire to kill, thereby increasing lawlessness and disorder, to the consequent upsetting of the stability of our national society. God said at Sinai, "Thou shalt not kill."

5. We shall take them from the refining, ennobling, character-building atmosphere of the home and place them under a drastic discipline in an environment that is hostile to most of the finer and nobler things of home and of life.

6. We shall make our sons the victims of systematized allurements to gamble, to drink, to smoke, to swear, to associate with lewd women; to be selfish, idle, irresponsible, save under restraint of force; to be common, coarse, and vulgar—all contrary to and destructive of the American home.

7. We shall deprive our sons of an adequate religious training and activity during their training years, for the religious element of army life is both inadequate and ineffective.

8. We shall put them where they may be indoctrinated with a wholly un-American view of the aims and purposes of their individual lives, and of the life of the whole people and Nation, which are founded on the ways of peace, whereas they will be taught to believe in the ways of war.

9. We shall take them away from all participation in the means and measures of production to the economic loss of the whole Nation.

10. We shall lay them open to wholly erroneous ideas of their duties to themselves, to their family, and to society in the matter of independence, self-sufficiency, individual initiative, and what we have come to call American manhood.

11. We shall subject them to encouragement in a belief that they can always live off the labors of others through the Government or otherwise.

12. We shall make possible their building into a military caste which from all human experience bodes ill for that equality and unity which must always characterize the citizenry of a republic.

13. By creating an immense standing army, we shall create to our liberties and free institutions a threat foreseen and condemned by the founders of the Republic, and by the people of this country from that time till now. Great standing armies have always been the tools of ambitious dictators to the destruction of freedom.

14. By the creation of a great war machine, we shall invite and tempt the waging of war against foreign countries, upon little or no provocation; for the possession of great military power always breeds thirst for domination, for empire, and for a rule by might not right.

15. By building a huge armed establishment, we shall belie our protestations of peace and peaceful intent and force other nations to a like course of militarism, so placing upon the peoples of the earth crushing burdens of taxation that with their present tax load will hardly be bearable, and that will gravely threaten our social, economic, and governmental systems.

16. We shall make of the whole earth one great military camp whose separate armies, headed by war-minded officers, will never rest till they are at one another's throats in what will be the most terrible contest the world has ever seen.

17. All the advantages for the protection of the country offered by a standing army may be obtained by the National Guard system, which has proved so effective in the past, and which is unattended by the evils of entire mobilization.

Responsive to the ancient wisdom "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," obedient to the divine message that heralded the birth of Jesus the Christ, the Savior and Redeemer of the world, "Peace on earth, good will toward men," and knowing that our Constitution and the Government set up under it were inspired of God and should be preserved to the blessing not only of our own citizenry but, as an example, to the blessing of all the world, we have the honor respectfully to urge that you do your utmost to defeat any plan designed to bring about the compulsory military service of our citizenry. Should it be urged that our complete armament is necessary for our safety, it may be confidently replied that a proper foreign policy, implemented by an effective diplomacy can avert the dangers that are feared. What this country needs and what the world needs, is a will for peace, not war. God will help our efforts to bring this about.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE ALBERT SMITH,
J. REUBEN CLARK, JR.
DAVID O. MCKAY,
The First Presidency.

Lynching and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article entitled "Lynching and Politics," by John W. Scoville, economist, of Detroit, Mich. I do not know the writer personally. His article is one of the most fair and enlightening ones on the subject that has come to my attention recently. The article calls for common justice and for strict adherence to the Constitution of the United States. I recognize it as a voice calling out in the wilderness.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNCHING AND POLITICS

(By John W. Scoville, economist, Detroit, Mich.)

With a world on fire, with great domestic problems, some Congressmen and the President take time off to advocate the passage of a Federal antilynch law. This is not a case of locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. It is locking the door after the horse died. What are the facts about lynching? In 1901 there were 130 lynchings in this country. Ten years later there were 67. In 1923 there were 33. In 1946 there were six. In 1944 there were only two lynchings, and in 1945 there was only one. Lynchings have declined progressively for 50 years.

until now there are practically no lynchings, and this progress was made without any help from Federal laws.

But there are about 8,000 murders each year. The punishment of crime is a job for the States and cities, except as to crimes against the Federal Government, such as robbing the mails, counterfeiting, etc. The States have practically eliminated lynchings. Why then this agitation for a Federal law? President Truman and many of the politicians in the North wish to have the support of the northern Negro voters. They are fishing for this support by advocating a Federal antilynch law. The proponents of such a law are not reformers, actuated by civic virtue and high moral purpose. They are cheap politicians of the baser sort.

I wrote to a Senator who was spearheading a movement to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting, and I pointed out that our Constitution reserves to the States the right to determine the qualifications of voters. In his reply he stated that he thought such a law would be constitutional. In my second letter I said: "You did not answer my question. My question is: What article in the United States Constitution gives Congress power to determine the qualifications of voters?" To that letter I received no reply. I never will, for Congress has no authority in the matter. Instead of waving a red flag before the people in the South by passing a Federal antilynching law, we should commend the southern people for having practically eliminated the disgraceful practice of lynching. Dueling used to be common practice. But it was not eliminated by legislation. We attempted to do away with the use of alcohol by law. The attempt failed. Social progress cannot be advanced much through legislation. It results from the gradual changes in public opinion. Congress should not pass an antilynching law, first because our United States Constitution gives Congress no authority to do this, and secondly because no such law is needed.

Those who advocate such a law proclaim that they are more interested in being elected to a political office than in preserving and defending the Constitution of the United States. To destroy the Constitution is to overthrow the Government of the United States. The Communists are not the only ones who seek to overthrow our Government.

The Capehart Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senate Rejects Capehart Plan," from the Palladium-Item of Richmond, Ind., of March 15, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE REJECTS CAPEHART PLAN

Senator CAPEHART believes the American system of free enterprise works and gets results. So does every intelligent American.

That is one reason why we have been able to give billions of dollars to foreign nations that do not have our system. So far our foreign aid is estimated to be somewhere between fifteen and twenty billion dollars.

Because Senator CAPEHART knows the American system is a workable one, he asked the Senate to amend the Marshall plan.

The Senate, however, voted down Senator CAPEHART'S proposal and adopted the Marshall plan by a vote of 67 to 17.

Secretary of State Marshall proposes to give 16 European nations billions of dollars to get them back on their feet economically and to aid their sufferers.

His plan simply is a subsidy again to prime the old, worn-out European system. Although we already have given between fifteen and twenty billion dollars to these countries, there have been no results.

Senator CAPEHART proposed to make our system of free enterprise available to these countries.

First, he proposed to give them $2,000,000,000 to be used for outright relief.

Then he would loan them money to put their commerce and industry in operation.

But Senator CAPEHART did not intend to loan this money to the foreign governments. Their politicians would not be able to parcel it out in a socialistic manner as they have done in the past.

He proposed to offer these nations a plan to use the free-enterprise system. He reasons that if it has done wonders for us, why should it not do likewise for the down-and-out nations.

He proposed that these nations set up reconstruction finance corporations in their countries. These corporations would deal with our own Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Then if a foreign businessman or an industrialist needed money, he would apply to his own reconstruction finance corporation for a loan. He would not go to the politicians of his country.

The loan would not be doled out by the government. The loan would be made on a business basis. The European businessman would be making his loan in a manner similar to the way in which it is done in our country.

With this credit, the businessman could go into the markets to make purchases. He could make the needed extension in his plant or in his operatons. His actions would not be controlled by the Government.

Where would the money come from for the European reconstruction finance corporations? In the first place, our own Reconstruction Finance Corporation would purchase not less than 50 percent of the stock.

But what is more important, the European nations would put up the other half. That would make them partners in the risk. That would teach them to depend upon themselves in the job of working out their salvation.

Senator CAPEHART said the 16 European nations that are in the Marshall plan have dollar holdings in our own country in excess of $13,000,000,000.

They are not as poor as they want us to believe they are.

Under the Capehart plan the European nations would have invested in their own recovery. That would have given them the chance to use the free-enterprise system which has made us the richest nation in the world.

The Capehart plan was the answer to the socialistic schemes which thus far have failed to restore Europe. It would have made our system, which is successful, available to the Europeans.

The plan protected our interests, but at the same time it gave the Europeans a workable plan.

The Marshall plan simply keeps the old, faltering socialistic European system alive. Politicians will continue to dole out the money to their favorites.

Instead of striking at socialism, the Marshall plan simply perpetuates it because the $17,000,000,000 will be controlled by the governments.

The Capehart plan did not give the governments a chance to handle the loans in a socialistic manner.

It put financial aid on a free, business basis.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, March 21, 1948, appears a message to the Congress of the United States in as strong, vigorous, and courageous language as I think has been written. I feel that the editorial deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I believe it speaks the heart, the mind, and the will of America. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO THE CONGRESS

The Russian threat which today confronts the Congress has been months in the making. The crisis has come suddenly and swiftly. With the brutal murder of Czechoslovakia and the threat overhanging Finland the menace to all the free peoples of Europe becomes immediate and unmistakable.

The threat to this country is that the United States may become an island of freedom in a world of communism—without trade, friends or allies. The questions have all been put. The answers are clear. As a Nation of freedom-loving people we must act swiftly, with all our resources, to halt communism and preserve liberty wherever there are peoples who would be free.

What we would urge upon the Congress is the crying need of speed. The issue has become one of days, perhaps hours. The decisions of this country cannot be immediately conveyed to our friends abroad. To make their significance clear to a whole people will take weeks. The Italian election falls on April 18. The general strike by the Communists of France is threatened for the month of May. The resolve of the United States to stand by its friends should be made known at the first possible moment.

The legislative program is clear:

First stands the prompt passage of ERP, to enable the democracies to help themselves economically. The Senate has acted by overwhelming vote. We plead with the House to do its utmost in the next few days to prevent the delays of debate and of conference. No doubt the House could improve the bill if time permitted. But the measure is sound and sufficient as it stands. Every hour matters. Our Representatives could find no better way to demonstrate their statesmanship than by placing first things first, foregoing radical change and restricting debate in order that the voice of America may reach the critical areas of Europe at the earliest possible moment.

Second is the revival of the draft. Nothing could so hearten our friends or better clarify the warning to Russia as this downright assertion of military power. There are various approaches. The immediate resolve must be plain.

We are confident that the American people will wholeheartedly back the Congress in these vital acts. The risks inherent in the resolve to halt communism, cost what it may, are obvious. But so also is the fact that American resolve and power, thus displayed, are the one best hope of peace.

This country has never been afraid of its destiny. From the days of the first colonists in the forests of Massachusetts and Vir-

ginia, through the pioneering across the Alleghenies, to the great trek to the Pacific, Americans have welcomed hazard and adventure. They surely will not now turn back from the greatest challenge they have yet faced.

Preparedness Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Again Reveals Quality of Boldness," written by Mr. Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of Sunday, March 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN AGAIN REVEALS QUALITY OF BOLDNESS—PREPAREDNESS PROPOSALS IN THE FACE OF SOVIET THREAT MATCH HIS ACTION IN RAIL AND COAL STRIKES—POLITICAL EFFECTS IGNORED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—The President is a politician by training and predeliction, but when certain basic beliefs of his are challenged in quarters however powerful he disregards immediate political considerations and meets the challenge head-on. His preparedness proposals to Congress this week against the mounting threat of Soviet Russian aggression is the third revelation since Mr. Truman became President of this element in his character. The other two were his request for powers to draft the striking railroad employees in 1946 and his determined and successful prosecution of John L. Lewis the same year.

In many other instances the President has shown the usual disposition of a professional politician to compromise and contrive himself out of difficulties. But in these three he has invited comparisons with Grover Cleveland, although historians will hardly detect a general similarity between the two Presidents as administrators.

Cleveland, in every critical moment—on the issue with Great Britain over Venezuela, on the monetary division in his own party, on the personal charges against him during his first candidacy in 1884 and in the great Pullman strike—at once adopted a firm position regardless of the counsels of compromisers. Mr. Truman, in an effort to get along with Henry A. Wallace, permitted him to make the Madison Square Garden speech in 1947 that ran counter to his own foreign policy.

ATTEMPTED CONCILIATION

In the timing and breadth of his civil rights program there was more than a trace of attempted conciliation of Mr. Wallace. In his speech on the state of the Union last January the President included every conceivable lure to catch votes, regardless of the capacity of the public exchequer to redeem his promises.

But on the three occasions noted Mr. Truman deliberately adopted courses which managing politicians—the State and city bosses—would never recommend, especially to a White House incumbent who is a candidate. And two of these courses—in the railroad strike and the case of John L. Lewis—were his own in the sense that those of his advisers who favored them did not have to argue their desirability.

Very naturally and properly the President took much counsel before he went to Congress this week to call for "full support" by all "appropriate" means of the five-nation alliance in western Europe and for a temporary revival of the draft. The plan for universal military training has long had his support, grounded in his personal inclination and experience. Also, Mr. Truman, after he approved the concept of the European recovery plan, never doubted that prompt congressional approval was essential to its prospects.

But to make an implicit request for military backing of the five-nation alliance by the United States, and to ask for a renewal of the draft in any form, in what is called peacetime and a year of general elections, had to be preceded by a very courageous decision. This was that such actions at any early date are necessary to the national security and cannot wait on personal or party politics, even though the situation with Russia might be stalled along until after the general elections.

RISKS OF ACTION

In so deciding Mr. Truman took no professional political advice at all; he did not need any. He knew full well that Congress would balk unhappily at what he was to propose; that Mr. Wallace and his followers would be greatly encouraged in their effort to fix on the President the label of "warmonger" and to stimulate fear and pacificism in this country. He realized also the risk of rejection by Congress of military proposals thus openly made, and that the effects of this on Soviet policy and our national security would make the world situation much graver.

But Mr. Truman's information—from his intelligence agents and from his diplomatic and military deputies and experts—led him to adopt their conclusion that the risks of action were far less than those of inaction, and to decide that in any event they must be taken in discharge of his oath of office. He may have mused, as he looked at the long faces of the professional politicians, that boldness which involves partisan political hazards has often been approved by the American people despite the apparent popularity of timidity and compromise.

SENSE OF CRISIS

At any rate, the counsels he followed spring from a sense of national crisis in which the motives of election politics could not be permitted to intrude. And in adopting these counsels the President merged his stand with those of men who are not running for anything—Marshall, Forrestal, Bradley, Denfeld, Spaatz, Eisenhower as examples—and who in such matters acknowledge no obligation to think of effects on vote getting.

When Mr. Truman made up his mind to take this stand before Congress, it seemed to many who watched and listened that he had attained the serenity which comes with the sense of a hard duty done. Once a public leader in high office comes to that mood he is inclined to expand the area of bold action. Clearly it was in this spirit that the President withdrew approval of the partition of Palestine—a plan his military advisers always opposed as a provocation to world war.

This mood may also explain why the President interpolated in his speech to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York City the same night the scornful, even contemptuous, passage about Mr. Wallace. On previous occasions he has followed the usual practice of professional politicians in making conciliatory comment about his former Cabinet minister and holding open the party door. But when, without even awaiting Mr. Wallace's measured statement on his message to Congress, the President said he did not want and would not have his support and that of his Communists at the price required, he implied he would not turn back in that sector.

ON RAIL AND MINE ISSUES

This is the way Mr. Truman reacted to the challenge of the railway strikers and to the defiance of the Federal courts by Mr. Lewis. When he set out for the Capitol on the day he broke the strike, the President carried two speeches—one to use if the strike had been called off before he spoke, the other if it had not. But it is significant of his mood in comparable circumstances that in both versions he asked for power to draft the railway strikers into the Army so they could be forced to run the trains. And when presentation of the facts of Mr. Lewis' defiance of legal process was made to him by the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General, the President unhesitatingly and promptly told them to fight this thing through to a finish.

Whatever history's estimate of his Presidency may be, and whatever his tenure in office, Mr. Truman in these instances has shown himself capable of making hard decisions and carrying them out firmly.

River and Harbor Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the projects committee to the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 20, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the President, your projects committee met on March 18, 1948, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 39 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, reclamation-irrigation, water and soil conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 13 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $194,050,700. Ten proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on seven proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports on such surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find eight proposals which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects

for subsequent authorization. Of the proposals investigated, we find one is without necessary data or sponsorship to enable the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion on its worth. However, we desire to give the application sympathetic consideration, and, if possible, offer to the proponents the services of this Congress in reaching a solution of their problems. We have, therefore, not classified this project but have suggested that the Secretary communicate with the applicants concerned and request additional data, upon receipt of which further consideration will be given to their proposal.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

Your committee has been impressed by the widespread public interest in and support of a sizable Federal program of public improvements for navigation, flood control, reclamation and related water and land resource development. In its report last year the projects committee emphasized the justification for the appropriation of adequate sums for the orderly prosecution of a balanced, long-range program of public works for such purposes. It is heartening to know that the Congress of the United States has heeded the urgings of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and other organizations supporting an adequate program for resource development. The substantial sums appropriated last July for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers provided for undertaking the largest river and harbor and flood control program ever directed by the Congress of the United States. Also, the recent substantial supplemental appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation is further evidence of the favorable consideration that is being given to accelerating the postwar programs of resource development.

The projects committee reaffirms its view that those projects included in the backlog now authorized, which are particularly important and of immediate and material benefit to industry, agriculture, commerce or the welfare of the people, should be carried forward as expeditiously as may be compatible with the financial ability of the Nation. It endorses the wishes of representative groups and individuals for the early completion of the many pending studies of additional projects advocated so that those works found to be economically justified may be authorized and eligible for appropriation and construction. It is the sense of the committee that in general recommended projects should be authorized without undue delay upon completion of the appropriate agency's reports.

The committee is concerned by the deterioration in numerous completed Federal projects in that maintenance and operation, due to lack of adequate funds, have been curtailed to a degree destructive of the original intent of Congress. It is the belief of this committee that the agency whose duty it is to maintain and/or operate any completed public work should recommend sufficient funds for adequate maintenance and operation of the facility and that the Congress of the United States should appropriate such funds.

In conclusion, your committee recommends that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress vigorously support the prosecution of a substantial Federal program of resource development in this postwar era of peace and prosperity in order that our country may continue to be strong throughout the uncertain years ahead.

Respectfully submitted.

SID SIMPSON, *Chairman.*

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time, upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application.)

Class I—Project endorsed

Endorsed: This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
684-R	New Orleans tidewater channel (following route recommended by Division Engineer Maj. Gen. R. W. Crawford).	Louisiana	Lower Mississipp Valley.
709-R	Upper Monongahela River, modernization of existing navigation facilities	West Virginia and Pennsylvania	Ohio River.
738	Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
741	Boston Harbor, to provide extension of Boston Harbor anchorage area (President Roads)	Massachusetts	New England.
742	Boston Harbor, extension of 40-foot inner harbor channel	do	Do.
746	Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor (completion of Eastern Branch channel)	Virginia	North Atlantic
747	Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor (deepening and widening channel in Southern Branch)	do	Do.
748	Norfolk and Newport News Harbors (disposal area adjacent Craney Island)	do	Do.
752	Tunungwant Creek, Bradford flood protection	Pennsylvania	Ohio River.
756	Gathright Reservoir and Falling Spring reregulating dam on Jackson River	Virginia	North Atlantic.
757	Dillon Reservoir	Ohio	Ohio River.
759	Optima Reservoir	Oklahoma	Southwestern.
763	Lucky Peak Reservoir	Idaho	North Pacific.

Class II—Projects classified as meritorious

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and open for further considerati by the committee.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
209-R-2	Red River of the North, drainage basin	Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota.	Upper Mississippi Valley.
427-R-2	Green River, flood control	Washington	North Pacific.
715-R	Passaic River, flood control	New Jersey	North Atlantic.
731-R	Provincetown Harbor	Massachusetts	New England.
750	Pigeon River (issuance of power license)	Minnesota	Great Lakes.
753	Flood control, Barbourville	Kentucky	Ohio River.
754	Flood control, Pineville	do	Do.
755	Flood control, Cumberland	do	Do.
758	Beardstown local flood protection	Illinois	Great Lakes.
761	Flood control in Florida	Florida	South Atlantic.

Class III—Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes the Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite the report of its investigation and survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to classification by the Congress.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
735-R	Kaskaskia River (dam at Shelbyville)	Illinois	Upper Mississippi Valley.
736	Taylor's Creek improvement	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
744	Oregon Inlet	do	Do.
745	Masonboro Inlet	do	Do.
749	Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor (improvement of Eastern Branch)	Virginia	North Atlantic.
750	Hudson River, 35-foot channel, New York to Albany	New York	Do.
760	Cotulla Dam	Texas	Southwestern.

Class IV—Projects recommended for survey

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
728-R	Morehead City Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
737	Wallace Channel maintenance (15 feet, mean low water)	do	Do.
739	North Little Rock flood control and drainage improvements	Arkansas	Southwestern.
740	Annisquam River	Massachusetts	New England.
743	Weymouth Fore River	do	Do.
764	Stony Brook (St. James) Harbor	New York	North Atlantic.
765	Plymouth Harbor	Massachusetts	New England.
766	James River	Virginia	North Atlantic.

Untimely Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter written by Hyman H. Bookbinder, of New York, which appeared in the Washington Post of March 22, 1948:

The decision of the Senate Finance Committee to approve a $4,800,000,000 income-tax cut is another sad reminder that a Presidential election year is hardly the appropriate time for realistic consideration of our domestic and foreign needs. The same Congress which takes every pain to cut down appropriations for vital governmental activities and which is so careful to weigh heavily any outlay for foreign relief is apparently prepared unblushingly to adopt a major tax-reduction program. It is to be hoped that the Senate will reject the committee recommendations and work out a substantially improved tax program. If it does not, it is to be hoped that the President will forget what year it is and give the bill a resounding veto.

The Senate committee recommendations represent only a minor modification of the Knutson bill passed earlier this year by the House. Both versions, like the bills passed last year, still merit the appraisal of "the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time."

This is not the time for heavy tax reduction. The aspect of the inflationary potential in such a reduction has received rather adequate attention. But there is another consideration—perhaps more psychological than economic—which demands care in our tax policies. I refer to our obligations under the Marshall plan. While Europe waits impatiently we quibble over the precise amounts to be allotted. Will it not be quite clear to them, as it should be to us at home, that a major consideration in paring down ERP funds is to permit the widest possible margin for tax relief?

To skimp on funds and then reduce taxes will be an action that freedom-loving people all over the world should not be expected to understand or appreciate. There is no way, of course, of determining for certain what good our money will do abroad. It may even do harm. But there is good reason to hope that our aid may rebuild Europe and prevent war. A few billions now may well prevent the expenditure later of hundreds of billions, let along broken lives, homes, and nations.

If the timing is bad, the nature of the proposed tax reduction is even worse. Although the proposal seems to give the greatest relief to the lowest-income groups, a more careful examination reveals that, like the original Knutson bill last year, it provides a terrific bonanza for the highest brackets and very little for the lowest groups. This may seem strange for a bill that would reduce taxes by 12.6 percent for those in the lowest brackets and only 5 for those in the highest brackets. A little arithmetic, however, yields the following results for a taxpayer with wife and two children.

Net income	Spendable income (after taxes)		
	Present	Senate proposal	Percent increase
$2,400	$2,324	$2,400	3.3
$3,000	2,810	2,900	3.2
$5,000	4,411	4,568	3.5
$10,000	8,138	8,639	6.2
$50,000	26,000	33,423	28.6
$500,000	93,400	141,323	51.3

The Senate committee recommendations would increase "take-home" pay for the lowest income groups by 2 or 3 percent, but by as much as 51 percent in the highest brackets. No small part of this incongruous result is due to the income-splitting feature of the proposal. There may be good reason for giving this lopsided type of relief—I have yet to be convinced—but it should be made clear to the American people that the present bills in Congress do give that type of relief. The common impression that the greatest relief is going to low income groups should be disspelled.

If the time is propitious for any tax relief at this time, it must be given solely to those who have been hardest hit by the rapid rise in the cost of living. All that is needed is an increase in exemptions. Such a tax reform would be understandable to our people at home and to the millions abroad who wait desperately for our actions to help them.

HYMAN H. BOOKBINDER.

NEW YORK.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Statehood for Hawaii," published in the March 23, 1948, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

During the last 13 years five congressional committees have visited the Hawaiian Islands and examined the qualifications of their 500,000 citizens for statehood. The majority of these committeemen have voted favorably for such action. Latest to report is Senator GUY CORDON, of Oregon. There seems to be little necessity for the extended hearings which Senator BUTLER, chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, has in view, and certainly little reason for delay—if hearings are to be held—in beginning them. The favorable House action of last summer will be nullified unless favorable Senate action is also taken at this term of the Eightieth Congress.

Hawaii would be a new State of which all Americans could be proud. In these beautiful islands east has met west in a mingling of races and cultures that has been good for both. Its citizens are orderly, prosperous, and progressive. Fast transportation has made invalid one of the former principal arguments against admission—the distance from the mainland. That 2,400 miles is only 7 hours as the fast transport planes fly. Over 85 percent of its estimated 520,000 inhabitants are citizens of the United States. The noncitizens are mostly elderly or middle-aged Japanese who have spent most of their adult lives in the islands and would be citizens did our laws not bar them from taking the oath. They proved during the war that noncitizenship was not a bar to loyalty.

In the House debate last summer Representative WELCH, of California, expressed the basic principle that should motivate debate on the Hawaiian statehood issue, and on the question, too, of some of our other offshore possessions, such as Guam, Samoa, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. He said: "The granting of statehood to Hawaii will be a notice to freemen everywhere that wherever the American flag flies democracy shall prevail."

Legislation for Gold Star Wives and Their Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Nation has been generous in providing educational and training benefits for the veterans of World War II. I think it was proper to assist these men and women who had their schooling interrupted by service in the armed forces,

and the Nation as a whole will be benefited due to the fact that these individuals have acquired skills and professions which will enable them to render more valuable services.

The widows and children of our deceased servicemen have not been provided for so generously. In most instances, the war widow has one or two small children to support and on a pension of $78 per month for herself and child, her problem appears impossible of solution during these periods of high prices. They have had to resort to using family savings which they had hoped to use for their children's education.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have observed the fine manner in which the officers of the Gold Star Wives of America have represented these war widows. I wish to commend Mrs. Marie Jordan, founder and past national president of the Gold Star Wives and present executive director, for her efforts in successfully organizing this group and for presenting the group's views on legislation to members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Other officers of the Gold Star Wives have been most helpful, and I trust Mrs. Ruth Dutcher, national president, and the other officers will be successful in their continued efforts to provide some measure of security for widows and children of deceased servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that all of us desire to see our children properly educated and cared for. Those men who were killed in World War II cannot, of course, fulfill this desire, but we who did return from the service can provide the legislation which will assist these widows and children. I will continue to support the legislation I introduced during the first session of the Eightieth Congress to provide educational benefits to these dependents of deceased servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the results of a national survey made by the national headquarters of the Gold Star Wives of America, 505 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., regarding the present financial difficulties of our war widows and their children:

RESULTS OF NATIONAL SURVEY

Approximately 1,000 war widows filled out questionnaires and mailed them in to National headquarters of the Gold Star Wives in New York City to complete the first Nationwide survey of the tribulations and the hopes of the women whose husbands fought and died in World War II.

Returns were received from 45 of the 48 States, from which 42 percent of the widows were living in cities of over 250,000, 24 percent in cities of under 250,000, and 34 percent in small towns.

The average age of the widow of World War II is 28 years. If she is working, her weekly earnings average $33 per week.

Although most of the women without children are employed, only 21 percent of the widows with children are working outside the home. Of that 21 percent, 15 percent are employed full time, and 6 percent part time. The other 79 percent are of the opinion that they will not go to work until their children are older.

The average total monthly income (from all sources, including Government compensation, national service life insurance, social security, and salary) of the women with no children is $213 per month. The average total monthly income of a war widow with one child is $44 less than that amount—$169 per month. Here it must be pointed out that these averages include salary or wages earned by the widow. A widow not working, of course, would receive $60 per month from the Government for herself; and $18 per month for her first child. In addition those war widows who were listed as beneficiaries receive insurance benefits ranging up to $55.10 per month. Social-security benefits may range from a few dollars only up to about $40 for widow with one child. (Many war widows have been denied social-security benefits because of certain technicalities in the present law.)

Applying the figures received to an approximate total of 105,000 war widows, the survey revealed that 81,750 war widows throughout the country feel that they would benefit through taking the educational advantages of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944—if those benefits are extended to war widows in this Congress. Of this number, the greatest majority—a total of 52,650—which to enroll for a quick occupational training course. (See table I below.)

A surprisingly large number of war widows—77,700 of them—were found to be desirous of the opportunity of obtaining Government guaranteed loans. Most of these women, a total of 57,750, are looking forward to the security which owning their own homes would provide. (See table II below.)

Present ages of all gold-star children were tabulated from the survey in order to determine the number of children who would be of college age during each year. Approximately 1,000 are of college age at the present time. Table III (below) shows the number of children who will attain college age each year until 1965, and the estimated cost to the Government if up to 4 years of college were granted to all the children of men who died in service.

Much of the information compiled has already been presented to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

TABLE I.—*Number of war widows throughout United States who would take advantage of educational benefits if made available*

	Number of war widows		Total
	Without children	With children	
1. Quick occupational training course	23,500	29,150	52,650
2. Full college course leading to degree	9,000	4,950	13,950
3. Complete college begun previously	8,000	7,150	15,150
Total seeking educational benefits	40,500	41,250	81,750
4. Would not take any advantage of educational benefits under bill	9,500	13,750	23,250
Total war widows	50,000	55,000	105,000

TABLE II.—*War widows interested in obtaining Government-guaranteed loans*

Number who desire opportunity of obtaining small loans to—	
1. Go into business	19,950
2. Purchase their own homes	57,750
Total desiring loan privilege of GI bill	77,700
3. Would not take advantage of loan benefits	27,300
Total war widows	105,000

TABLE III.—*Number of "Gold Star" children who will attain college age each year from 1948 to 1965 and estimated cost to Government for each year*

Present age of children	Number of children in each age group	Year in which children will attain college age	Estimated cost per year for granting college training
18 years	1,000	1948	$3,500,000
17 years	1,000	1949	3,500,000
16 years	1,000	1950	3,500,000
15 years	1,000	1951	3,500,000
14 years	1,000	1952	3,500,000
13 years	2,000	1953	7,000,000
12 years	2,000	1954	7,000,000
11 years	3,000	1955	10,500,000
10 years	3,000	1956	10,500,000
9 years	3,000	1957	10,500,000
8 years	6,000	1958	21,000,000
7 years	6,000	1959	21,000,000
6 years	7,000	1960	24,500,000
5 years	11,000	1961	38,500,000
4 years	20,000	1962	70,000,000
3 years	16,000	1963	56,000,000
2 years	15,000	1964	52,500,000
1 year	1,000	1965	3,500,000
Total number of gold-star children	100,000	Total estimated cost of H. R. 2106	350,000,000

Federal Aid for Schools Will Strengthen America at the Roots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest short statements on the purpose of education I ever heard was that of my old friend in the Department of Agriculture, Dr. Will W. Alexander. He put it about like this: "A man cannot live long enough to learn all he has to know just to live. Some things he must inherit from the race." It is this effort by society to provide for the survival needs of its youth by transmitting human experience that produces our vast educational system. We must not let anything happen to it. It has been brought to our attention over and over again that many localities cannot provide adequately, on available revenues, for a proper educational standard. The Federal Government must come to their assistance. The importance of mass education in the creation and maintenance of a sound society is well stated by Woodrow Wilson in these words:

When I look back on the processes of history, when I survey the genesis of America, I see this written on every page: That the nations are renewed from the bottom, not from the top; that the genius that springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the growth and energy of the people. Everything I know about history, every bit of experience and observation that has contributed to my thought has confirmed me in the conviction that the real wisdom of human life is compounded out of the experience of ordinary men. The utility, the vitality, the fruitage of life does not come from the top to the bottom; it cames like the natural growth of a great tree, from the soil, up through the trunk into the branches to the foilage and

the fruit. The great struggling unknown masses of the men who are the base of everything, are the dynamic force that is lifting the levels of society. A nation is as great and only as great, as her rank and file.

Little Totalitarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Committee on Ways and Means felt it necessary to adopt the following resolution:

Whereas the Department of State has drafted and sponsored a charter for an international trade organization; and

Whereas this proposed charter has been presented to a large number of other nations and its acceptance by them has been urged by the officials of the State Department; and

Whereas the effort and leadership in this undertaking on the part of the executive branch of the United States Government could be interpreted by other nations as an assurance of acceptance on the part of the legislative branch of the United States Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That any action of the President or the Department of State prior to the consideration by Congress of the International Trade Organization shall not, insofar as the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is concerned, be construed as a commitment by the United States to accept all or any of the provisions of the proposed charter.

This charter, if submitted to the Ways and Means Committee, will receive, solely on its merits, the same careful attention and consideration given to any measure brought before it.

Following the adoption of that resolution the Wall Street Journal carried the following editorial, which pointed out the timeliness of that action and the worth of the committee's resolution:

LITTLE TOTALITARIANS

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives did a very useful thing when it passed a resolution serving notice that any international trade organization approved at the Habana Conference, now in its final stages, will have to be ratified by Congress before it becomes binding on this country.

Mr. Cromley of this newspaper's staff recently wrote from Habana that there really were two conferences at Habana. There were the official sessions which gave lip service to the cause of removing restrictions to the movement of goods from one country to another. But there were unofficial, behind-the-scenes sessions which were virtually a school teaching new methods of controlling and channeling international commerce.

The result of this is that the ITO Charter is likely to come out of Habana expressing some noble aspirations but at the same time so full of exceptions that the net result is to make respectable the very restrictive practices which it started out to abolish.

So long as large trading nations—the outstanding example is Great Britain—insist on retaining a centrally managed economy there can be no free movement of goods. To believe that there can be is no more sensible than to believe you can quarantine your house and still allow people to come and go as they please. Internal economic controls require external controls; centrally controlled production requires centrally controlled importing and exporting.

From these experiments in totalitarianism there is a more immediate danger. That danger is that they will be an obstacle to the unity of action which western Europe must have if it is to save itself either with or without American assistance.

It is all very well for foreign ministers to meet and sign solemn agreements of cooperation, and we do not mean to say that it is not a hopeful sign. But how much cooperation can there be among nations which live behind an economic iron curtain which is lifted only to contribute to the ideas and purposes of the central planners?

The Russian idea of cooperation is for other nations to do as the Russians tell them. And from the Russians' point of view they are absolutely logical; if they did anything else they would have to make concessions and the concessions would be bound to interfere with what the Russians had planned. So they brook no such nonsense.

In its program of management Britain must attempt to protect its currency and to use that currency as an instrument of management. So we read in the New York Times of Friday in a Paris dispatch from its able correspondent, Mr. Hoffman:

"A growing body of opinion in the State Department and in the continental governments sees the British struggle to defend sterling as the greatest menace, outside communism itself, to the success of the European recovery program."

Unless these experiments in little totalitarianism are abandoned, the power that is expert in totalitarian methods, and which is ruthless enough to use them, will take over. Not all the dollars and men in America will stop or even delay the process.

Green-Duwamish River Flood-Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF HOMER R. JONES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT, STATE OF WASHINGTON, ON GREEN-DUWAMISH RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT TO THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 18, 1948

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I consider it a privilege to be permitted opportunity to appear before an important committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. This organization is important to me and to all the citizens of our country because it represents the best of democracy in actual practice. Our kind of government is predicated upon the ability of the American people to express themselves through mediums of concerted action such as is inherent in the organization and procedure of this congress. The people of the many communities here find opportunity to express their local community needs and find listening ears and helpful hands which later will instrument community wishes in terms of action which eventually come directly to the attention of the United States Congress. I can conceive of no better way in which properly our democratic government can and should function. Therefore, it is a privilege to me to be present, not only because I come representing the expressed opinion of the citizens of my community of Seattle on a project which will have important consideration in this committee's deliberations, but equally because my appearance here affords the opportunity to give expression to my high opinion and regard for the great work that has been accomplished by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

I should like, too, to voice a simple tribute to the cooperative effort of another important quasi-public organization whose efforts in every regard are closely related to the work of this Congress. I make special reference to the various chambers of commerce who in orderly fashion play an important part in giving more official presentation of community needs. I am aware of the important part that the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, from the city which I represent in the Congress, has played in connection with the project upon which I desire to speak briefly.

Those of us in the city of Seattle and the near environments have for many years been interested in a program for protecting the Green River Valley from disastrous floods and a project which would result in the improvement of the Duwamish River in the interests of navigation. The Duwamish River is a continuation of the Green River, the name changing in the lower reaches of the river as it flows into Elliott Bay, one arm of Puget Sound. While the majority of my presentation will deal with the necessity for the flood-control aspects of this project, since the navigation features are located in the immediate vicinity of the industrial area of the city of Seattle, I will discuss first what is eventually desired in the interest of navigation. I am quite aware that this portion of the whole project will be delayed because at this time there has been only inadequate evidence accumulated on river channel improvement of the Duwamish waterway within the limits of economic feasibility. The city of Seattle has grown rapidly in the years immediately preceding and during the war. Many new industries have been established within the city and its environs. Industrial sites have become expanded at such a rate that now large industries desiring to locate in Seattle find it extremely difficult to acquire space for their plants. The Seattle Planning Commission has been deeply concerned regarding this lack of space and has surveyed repeatedly during recent years the city areas to determine which can be adapted for this industrial purpose. The Seattle Industrial Planning Commission has played an important part under the insistent leadership of Mayor William C. Devin in bringing this project continually to the attention of the valley communities which are directly affected, and to the many community, agricultural, and industrial groups whose combined and coordinated efforts have resulted in favorable recommendation of this project by the district engineer insofar as the flood-control features are involved.

These surveys indicate that the best locality for future industrial expansion is along the Duwamish River, a river which meanders back and forth across a broad valley, cutting into areas which would be admirably suitable for industrial development, reducing the land area to such an extent that industries presently cannot occupy the irregular plots advantageously. The Planning Commission has tentatively indicated the course which they desire the river to follow and have submitted a plan to the district engineer of the Department of the Army which would straighten the course of the river and provide adequate opportunities for industrial expansion commensurate with the city of Seattle's ever-increasing needs. As I have already stated, however, this is part of the long-range program for improvement of the

Green River Valley, and I bring it to the attention of this committee only because it has an important future bearing upon the other aspect of the development which I am sure will secure a more immediate and favorable action by the Congress.

Before the Green River Valley may be fully utilized for either industrial or agricultural purposes, floods, which periodically cover the valley floor, must be controlled. The flood problem has long been recognized by Seattle and the nearby communities, but the magnitude of solving the problem has been beyond the collective financial means of the local agencies. In 1933 and 1935 requests for a preliminary examination recommending a full survey were submitted to the Seattle district of the Corps of Engineers. The basic law establishing the existing Federal flood-control policy passed on June 22, 1936, authorized a preliminary examination and survey of the Green River Valley. A preliminary examination report was completed in 1937, and in June of 1938 the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army ordered a detailed survey. Studies of the project were suspended, however, during the war, and were not resumed again until the past year. Many of the ideas originally advanced have now been reconsidered and revalued, resulting in a recommendation by Col. L. H. Hewitt, district engineer of the Corps of Engineers, for construction of a flood-control storage dam and reservoir at Eagle Gorge in the upper basin of Green River.

In estimating the flood-control benefits, it was assumed that the existing agricultural economy of that potentially rich valley would not change, except that with flood control more valuable crops could be grown. The principal project benefits, according to the engineer's report—those resulting from flood control—are, therefore, not based upon any speculative change in land utilization from agricultural to industrial use. Those of us in Seattle certainly recognize the possibility of extensive industrial expansion in the lower areas of this valley, however, which may in the future yield greater returns than those to be derived from agriculture. The current study of flood-control benefits has been made on the assumption that the agricultural economy will govern and, consequently, the relocation of the river for improved navigation purposes has not been recommended by the district engineer and will unquestionably be delayed for an indefinite time.

In connection with the engineer's recommendations, public hearings were held to determine the wishes of local interests. At a hearing in Seattle on the 27th of February 1947, the Eagle Gorge Dam was presented as one of the possibilities for controlling floods in the Green River Valley. Represented at that hearing were all of the principal communities and many governmental agencies—the United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the United States Geological Survey, the State of Washington Department of Conservation and Development, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, the Seattle Engineer Department, and the King County Engineer's Office. All of these community and agency representatives voiced approval of a storage dam at the Eagle Gorge site.

I am happy to know that the project is well on its way toward realization. We should bear in mind, however, that in reality the project is still in an advanced planning stage, and that it has not been reviewed by the Board of Engineers and Chief of Engineers in Washington, and has not been adopted nor approved by the United States Congress. I am confident, however, that the Chief of Engineers will recommend it to the Congress and that the Congress will approve this project. After approval, a period of 5 years will be required before completion—2 years will be needed for more detailed site investigations, model studies, design of special features, and preparation of the final contract plans and specifications—3 years will probably be the minimum construction time—and allowing for normal congressional procedures, if everything goes forward from the time of recommendation and approval, the Eagle Gorge Dam could not be completed until at least 1955.

The total estimated cost of the project is $16,000,000, which includes the dam and all of its appurtenances—the reservoir lands, relocation of the Northern Pacific Railroad, which presently cuts across the anticipated reservoir area, and relocation of other existing facilities. The total annual cost of the project, including interest, amortization of the investment over a period of 50 years, and operation and maintenance expenses has been computed to be approximately $734,000. Of this amount, $80,000 is estimated for operation and maintenance and the remainder is for retirement of the investment.

The total benefits, as far as they can at this time be computed, will amount to approximately $819,000 annually. It is estimated that $465,000 annually will be derived by prevention of tangible flood damages. Three hundred and fourteen thousand dollars is anticipated from increased agricultural returns, and the commercial estimates of benefits to be derived from the increased flow in the lower channel, which will result from the building of the dam and creation of a large reservoir, is estimated to be $40,000.

It is interesting to note that these computed benefits exceed the project costs by approximately $85,000 a year, without taking into account the benefits which may in the future be derived by changing the present land use from agricultural to industrial and the monetary benefit of any prospective future use of storage for municipal water supplies and irrigation. As I have already stated, the primary purpose of the present project is flood control, and the project works can be wholly justified by the resulting flood-control benefits alone. In this connection, I should like further to say that damages of large proportions have been suffered in this valley. The floods of 1933 and December of 1946 are the greatest that have occurred in recent times, although last year what was considered a more or less minor flood condition resulted in an estimated monetary loss of more than a million and a quarter dollars. The great flood in 1933 covered about 13,800 acres, or more than 21 square miles. The flood in 1946 covered approximately 12,200 acres, or nearly 19 square miles. Estimating these damages on a 1947 price basis, the property damage and agricultural loss has been more than $3,000,000.

It is further interesting to recognize the present land use in the valley. Crops grown there are those largely associated with truck gardening—asparagus, beans, beets, cherries, table vegetables—although more than 6,000 acres are devoted to pasture and an additional 1,500 acres yearly lie in summer fallow. When flood protection is afforded changes would most certainly occur in the use of the valley land. Area of brushland would be reduced by half, pasture would be reduced by at least one-third, and acreages of other low-yield crops would be reduced. On the other hand acreages in bulbs, truck, berries, and other high yield would be increased. In fact, no one can accurately foretell just what the crop pattern would eventually become. But based on opinions of agricultural experts familiar with the area as to its eventual and probable use, it has been estimated that net annual rates from these lands would increase from the present $707,000 to $1,787,000. The difference is $1,080,000. This is obviously a great monetary benefit to be derived from completion of this project.

There are other benefits. The Green River furnishes a perfect spawning ground for both commercial and sports fish. The present spawning areas are in the waters between Auburn and Newaukum Creek and in the Big Soos Creek where the State of Washington now operates a 25-pond hatchery, the largest now operated by the State. The salmon spawned in these areas contribute substantially to the Puget Sound commercial catch and the steelhead and trout hatched in the area make Green River one of the best sports-fishing streams in the region. The Washington State Department of Fisheries estimated that the wholesale value of commercial salmon originating in Green River amounted to more than $400,000 in 1946. This value would be substantially increased when the project is completed and a sustained flow is preserved in the lower Duwamish River.

I should speak some few words about the dam and control works in this connection, particularly as they are designed to provide a desirable flow in all seasons. The dam has been designed slightly curved in places. The length along its crest will be 640 feet—at the bottom, 100 feet. The ungated spillway has been designed to pass a flood of 145,000 second-feet. The outlet works consists of a 20-foot-diameter concrete-lined tunnel. At its downstream end are three 102-inch regulating valves which will permit passage of bank-full flows during early phases of any storm, so that most of the reservoir capacity will remain for store-crest flows. This is of extreme importance with reference to fisheries. Under existing conditions summer stream flow sometimes becomes so small that the fish population—returning salmon and steelhead, growing fingerlings, and trout are killed in great numbers.

Particularly in the dry summer period, the damage is aggravated by pollution resulting from sewage and industrial water in the valley downstream from the town of Auburn. This polluted condition is of extreme detriment to the sport-fish population of the stream. The proposed reservoir has sufficient storage to supply continuously at least 110 second-feet from March until September in the dryest year of record without interfering with its use for flood control.

It is a multiple-purpose dam contemplated, you see, with a reservoir ideally suited for use in connection not only with its primary purposes of flood control, but for municipal water supplies, irrigation, and conservation, as well. The only benefit not anticipated, in fact, is power generation, the limited height of the dam and fall being inadequate to supply sufficient head for generating purposes.

I have appreciated this opportunity to speak in hopeful support of the ultimate construction of this project, and express my deep gratitude to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for having afforded me the opportunity.

[From the Seattle Times of March 14, 1948]

CITY'S INDUSTRIAL GROWTH FACES ONE LESS BARRIER

One of Seattle's most constructive community efforts to advance its industrial and manufacturing resources has taken a significant step forward in the favorable report of the Army engineers on the Green River flood-control dam. Here is one answer to those who complain that little, or not enough, is being done to improve this city's industrial picture.

For one deterrent to industrial growth in this area has been the lack of sites suitable for establishment of large manufacturing plants. Land remaining adapted for such use lies to the south of the Green-Duwamish River Valley, where the danger of repeated floods and the winding course of the river hitherto have discouraged development.

This obstacle to industrial progress became apparent many years ago, and both

the municipal government and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce sought to overcome it by advocating flood-control measures in the Green River Valley. It has taken long to bring this project to its present stage. It was necessary to convince United States Army engineers that the project is economically feasible, that its cost would be exceeded by the economic wealth it would later conserve and produce.

Chamber committees undertook to prove this point. In this they were aided by agencies of municipal government, notably by former City Engineer C. L. Wartelle—to whom much credit should go for furtherance of these plans—and to Mayor Devin's industrial development commission. It may be added that all this spadework has been constantly supported editorially by the Times.

As a result of this long endeavor, the Army engineers have now completed a favorable report. On the basis of the data presented to them from these several local sources, they have found the project economically feasible and recommended the construction of a $16,000,000 Green River Dam in Eagle Gorge.

Their report is in the hands of the Chief of Army Engineers in Washington, D. C., and the problem now is to expedite its submission to Congress. The next step must be congressional authorization of a more detailed survey and preparation of plans. Beyond that, construction itself must be authorized and Congress must appropriate the required funds.

All this will take time and everything must be done to advance the several steps still to be accomplished. Within 5 years or so, the Columbia River Basin irrigation project will be approaching completion and the new settlement it will invite will provide new markets for manufactured goods. The Green River project must be completed by that time to make new room for the industry the Columbia Basin project will invite.

All the various agencies that have worked together toward this end must continue and redouble their efforts from this point on. Here is Seattle's main chance for industrial advancement.

Peace Demands Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., on Saturday, March 20, 1948:

PEACE DEMANDS UNITY

Russia's aggressive menace to freedom has reached a point where it can be met in only two ways by the United States. One is the Communist-isolationist way of appeasing and ignoring. The other way is to be tough and stay tough until Russia is ready to be reasonable.

Most Americans, including those in Government, have slowly and reluctantly come to realize that the second choice is necessary and, if peace is to be preserved, inevitable. For 2 years our Government tried patience and concession. These only provoked Soviet leaders to further excesses.

Then last June, with the announcement of the Marshall plan, America began to abandon her passive role. Since then our Government's words to the Kremlin have been increasingly blunt. But bluntness has not stopped Russian aggression either, for the very good reason that our tough policy was only a policy of words.

So the program that President Truman outlined in his speech to Congress was as necessary and inevitable as the policy to which the Government is committed. It is not a complete program, but at least it would give the basic minimum of substance to support our strong words.

It appears that the timing of the President's speech was dictated less by Russia's recent actions than by the actions of five friendly states, Great Britain, France, and the Benelux nations. As Mr. Truman pointed out, those five states were signing a 50-year agreement for economic cooperation and mutual defense at the time of his speech to Congress.

The President could not at that moment commit the United States to military as well as economic aid for those countries. But it is clear that democratic unity abroad is meaningless without American support. The encouragement that Mr. Truman's message obviously gave five governments may encourage others to speed toward the hoped-for goal of a united non-Communist Europe.

We are coming into perilous months during which political disunity on foreign policy could be a fatal weakness. Stalin is doubtless counting on our disunity. Hitler did. He thought that it would immobilize America while he conquered Europe and the world. He thought our wartime Presidential election would divide us and weaken our prosecution of the war. He was wrong. We were united on foreign policy then, and we can be again.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Army and Navy Journal of March 6, 1948, under the heading entitled "For the Attention of Congress":

In his last report as Chief of Staff of the Army, General Marshall described UMT as one of the legs of the three-legged stool upon which our national security rests. As Secretary of State dealing with the ruthless Soviet aggressor, which knows no deterrent other than force, and aware of the fears of the western European nations that they may be subverted into Moscow satellites as most of the Balkan states, and more recently Czechoslovakia, have been, and Finland is about to be, he has told the Congress that our bulwark against communistic invasion would be strengthened immeasurably if our youth be allowed to undergo military training. The mere passage of a law so providing, supplementing as it would do the Marshall plan and the economic and military aid to Greece, Turkey, and China, would lend greater force to the Secretary's representations and protests to the Soviet Government, and would stiffen the resistance of nations to communistic threats and maneuvers. In short, there would be general recognition that the United States was instructing its manpower for its own security and to this end to arrest the brutal march of communism, and the mere authority for such instruction of itself would cause Stalin to halt in the execution of his designs; the more so since the countries still free would feel that trained reinforcements from the United States would be available to support their resistance. It is true UMT would be costly—Secretary Forrestal estimates the expenditure for next year at half a billion dollars, and two billions for each of the following 2 years, and after that three billions annually. But when such expenditures, which would contribute so largely to the achievement and maintenance of democratic peace, are compared with the cost of war, and, worse than that, with the loss of our liberty, they obviously would be negligible. In the House passage of the UMT bill, which was unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee, has been held up by the failure of the Rules Committee to report a rule for its consideration, and the responsibility for the failure falls upon the shoulders of the obstructionist chairman, Representative LEO E. ALLEN, of Galena, Ill. It would seem that Mr. ALLEN and his supporters are more concerned over their own fortunes in this Presidential-election year than they are for our security and our stoppage of communism. The views of veterans of our wars, keenly appreciative of the value of military training as a method by which their lives were saved, and the benefit to their health which is insured, as well as the revelations of public-opinion polls, establish that the country wants UMT. Congress should enact such legislation in this crucial period so that the hands of Secretary Marshall shall be strengthened in his efforts to save liberty abroad and to maintain securely the American way of life at home.

Read the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I Saw Poland Betrayed, written by President Roosevelt's representative to Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, is an eye-witness account of the deception and betrayal of that valiant people. In that deception and betrayal of Poland, President Roosevelt and the New Deal administration played an ignoble part.

The Ave Maria, published at Notre Dame, Ind., describes this volume as "a blazing indictment of the selling of Poland down the river."

The Ave Maria, in its issue a few days ago, recommends the reading of this volume and its story of the "disgraceful" Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin parley.

The Ave Maria's editorial follows:

READ THE TRUTH

Those of our readers who are still inclined to look upon the treatment accorded Poland by the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin parley as anything short of disgraceful, will do themselves an enlightening service by reading I Saw Poland Betrayed, published last week and authored by Arthur Bliss Lane, first United States Ambassador to postwar Poland. His volume is a blazing indictment of the selling of Poland down the river. It is a graphic and authentically documented array of international misdeeds. Furthermore, Mr. Lane is a career-diplomat, with 30 years' experience in the service. He is far better informed than were the handpicked English and American groups who made the 2-week

jaunts through planned areas in the company of Red officials, and returned to praise the Red deliverance of Poland from German oppression—so eloquently but untruthfully described by Winston Churchill in these pages recently (February 21, 1948). Not so Mr. Lane, who confessed:

"I could see no difference between Hitler's and Stalin's aims. Both were after world domination. I could not see the difference, which so-called liberals in the United States often claim to see, between the methods of the two tyrants. They were exactly the same—suppression of personal liberty; terrorism by the police; sickening propaganda that the totalitarian state is democratic."

Jewish Survival in Palestine Requires Immediate Lifting of the Arms Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the face of political shabbiness which has been displayed by the United States in the UN on the Palestine question, the people of the United States must act affirmatively to deny this act of desertion. It is imperative that the people of the United States now speak through their duly elected representatives in Congress as the democratic expression of their own sense of fair play.

To that end I am this day offering a bill to lift the arms embargo imposed against the shipment of arms to Palestine by the Department of State which acted unilaterally and autocratically in such imposition. If the United States leadership has abdicated under threats and violence of the Arab chieftains, then the voice of the people of the United States must be made unmistakably clear. We have not hesitated to send arms elsewhere, notably to Greece and Turkey, but we appear perfectly willing to permit the Jews of Palestine to be defenseless against Arab aggression. The State Department was not willing to aid the Jews when they tried to defend the UN decision. It was intent, instead, as the events of the past few weeks prove, upon doing what it could to break a solemn international resolution. All this was done in secrecy. Neither the people nor their Representatives in Congress were taken into confidence. Such dismissal of public opinion and wishes is intolerable in a democracy.

In all conscience, we must act now to stop murder. Unarmed, the Jewish community in Palestine cannot defend itself against Arab violence which has received so much encouragement from the United States desertion of its previous commitment. We do not bar any other peoples of democratic complexion fighting for their lives and for their freedom from buying arms and ammunition in the United States. Why do we visit this penalty on the most defenseless of all people, the Jews of Palestine? What I am asking for is exactly what we did in the case of the Irish patriots fighting for an Irish Free State.

Reuther After Reds in CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday George Reedy, prominent radio commentator, had a provocative broadcast over radio station WOL, Washington. He pointed out that some labor unions are purging their members who have adhered to the Communist line. This is a wise move on the part of Walter Reuther who is leading this fight and who is deserving of commendation for his efforts. Mr. Reedy says "that under the vigorous leadership of Walter Reuther, left-wingers have been driven from all positions of power" in the United Automobile Workers. Hats off to Mr. Reuther.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including the Reedy broadcast:

A new era was opened up over the week end for American workers fighting communism in their unions. It wasn't a sensational development. But it can have far-reaching effects that will clear up many bad labor situations.

The action was taken by a local union of the CIO United Electrical Workers. The members, by a solid majority, voted to get out of their national organization. Instead, they decided to affiliate with the United Automobile Workers.

The importance of the move is that it may well set a precedent. And the precedent will answer one of the toughest problems that faces American workers. It is: Where can they go if their union leadership is leftist, and they can't remove it?

In the past there has been no answer at all. They have either had to shut up—or get out of the union altogether. Neither course provided any effective means of fighting pinkish labor leaders.

Left-wingers in the unions have become past masters at the art of staying in power. They have learned how to entrench themselves even against the will of the majority. And once they are entrenched, they are almost impossible to remove.

Consequently, men who wanted to work under union contracts in some industries, have found themselves just out of luck. Either they have had to accept leaders of questionable political beliefs, or they have had to find a job somewhere else.

The top leadership of the United Automobile Workers, however, is completely free of any Communist taint. Under the vigorous leadership of Walter Reuther, left-wingers have been driven from all positions of power.

The automobile workers could well become a haven for union men who are dissatisfied with their present organizations. It would be smart unionism on Reuther's part, and it would be a real contribution to driving Communists out of the labor movement.

There are some indications that other unions are planning to follow the lead of the New York local. The whole thing may wind up in a complete realinement of forces, that would be healthy for the entire Nation.

The past 2 years have given definite indications that American workers do not want to be led by Communists. Wherever they have been given the chance, they have cleaned out their unions. The result has been defeat after defeat for the leftists.

The automobile workers' union is a case in point. It wasn't too long ago when its leadership was shot through with "pinkos." Reuther took the issue to the membership, and fought it out in the open. The result was a complete and overwhelming victory.

The anti-Communists in the maritime unions are still fighting it out. But they now have the edge, where just a little while past they were on the losing end. Again, it was a case of bringing the thing out in the open where it could be looked at.

In some unions, however, the situation seems to be almost hopeless. The membership has been hog-tied and cannot get rid of their leaders. Their only chance is to follow the example of the New York electrical workers.

Of course, there will be howls that some unions are stepping on the toes of others. But the howls won't be taken too seriously. American workers will know from where they originate—and just how much they should be considered.

California Power Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 11, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, as you all must know by this time, California has a drought, and a very severe one. If something does not happen soon, and I do not mean only rain, we in California will need relief and rehabilitation.

The situation is acute not only in agriculture but in industry as well. Workers have been forced into unpaid idleness because there is no power to run their machines. At this moment even table water is rationed in Los Angeles.

In time of emergency the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. blames everyone but themselves. Of course, the lack of rain is the immediate cause of the shortage of power. But there are more immediate far-reaching causes if we look into the past activities of the P. G. & E.

The following statement, which I ask be placed in the RECORD, by Mr. C. J. Haggerty, secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, places the responsibility for the appalling situation squarely where it belongs:

STATEMENT ON POWER SHORTAGE

(By C. J. Haggerty, secretary)

The California State Federation of Labor believes in seeing this crisis in its true colors. Our power shortage has causes other than the failure of rain. And there are other remedies to be taken besides praying for rain. We object to the attempt by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to blame labor and the Reclamation Bureau and almost anybody but themselves for this power shortage.

We object to leaving the responsibility for seeing us through this crisis in the hands of the very private utility that is more responsible than any other agency for our trouble. No agency outside the Government itself should be in charge, and we ask this public utilities commission to assume its responsibilities at once.

Our view grows out of long and hard experience. We have always stood for full, integrated development of our water resources. From 1920, through the 1930's, the bitter opposition of the P. G. & E. to this development is a matter of public knowledge. Some of its expenditures to block developments are filed with your commission, and its methods, both open and concealed, of accomplishing

its purposes are recorded in the investigations of the California Legislature and the Federal Power Commission.

The P. G. & E. tried to block the entire Central Valley project at the start. Failing that, it has tried to block about every appropriation to carry it out. It blocked appropriations for transmission lines for the fiscal year 1947, which would be ready now if only it had kept its hands off.

The P. G. & E. has opposed the construction of the Antioch Steam Plant. James P. Black, president of the company, has many times opposed this before various congressional appropriations committees. In one of the hearings he stated:

"There is no need and no justification for any expenditure for transmission lines or switch yards beyond Shasta substation 25 miles below Shasta Dam where project power is now being delivered to the company under a contract executed in September 1943."

Mr. Black complained about the Bureau's refusal to extend this contract, which was negotiated between the Bureau of Reclamation and the P. G. & E. on September 23, 1943, and will expire on March 31, this year, and is the contract under which the Bureau is now delivering Shasta power to the P. G. & E. This contract contains language to the effect that the Bureau and the P. G. & E. agree to endeavor in every way to fulfill the conditions of the reclamation law with regard to giving preference to public agencies on power that is generated at Shasta.

Mr. Black states today that no such stipulation is in that contract. Nevertheless, one article in that contract states as follows:

"During the term of this contract, and in order to meet the existing war emergency, the parties agree (without establishing a permanent policy in respect to the distribution of power in the United States) that they will endeavor to carry out the provisions of the reclamation law providing that preference be given public agencies and cooperatives in the lease or sale of Government power, by mutual agreement supplementary to the contract, if, as, and when the occasion may require."

Mr. Black also states there is no provision of reclamation law which provides for this preference of treatment for public agencies. We wish to refer to section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Act of 1939, which states as follows:

"Any sale of electric power or lease of power privileges made by the secretary in connection with the operation of any project shall be for such period, not to exceed 40 years, and at such rate as in his judgment will produce power revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operations and maintenance costs, interest on an appropriate share of the construction investment at not less than 3 percent per annum, and such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper: *Provided further*, That in said sale or lease, preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies, and also to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and any amendments thereof."

The P. G. & E. raises a phony cry of "duplication" to block public transmission lines. If we read the New York Journal of Commerce rightly, as quoted Monday in the San Francisco News, the P. G. & E. regularly tells Congress not to build public lines, because it will come to your Commission, raise money, build the lines itself, then collect from the California rate payers. It calls that procedure "duplication," and that is one reason why we are in trouble today.

Next time the P. G. & E. cries "duplication" to Congress in order to stop the development of public power in our State, we predict a horse-laugh will go up in California that will be heard in Washington without the aid of an ear trumpet.

As recently as September 25, 1947, William G. B. Euler, vice president and general manager of the P. G. & E., was very optimistic about his company's ability to handle any emergency which might develop. At that time he stated as follows:

"Despite the combined difficulties of an exceptionally dry year, unprecedented demands for power, and war caused delays in the company's expansion, Pacific Gas & Electric is meeting the challenge of serving dependable power in northern and central California. All regular customers are being served full power needs and we expect to continue maintaining such service. Furthermore, we are accepting orders and delivering service to all new applicants.

"To help assure adequate electricity for our regular customers we temporarily have curtailed service to three large surplus power users who for 16 to 20 years have enjoyed the advantage of purchasing surplus power at rates less than half those paid by regular industrial customers. To obtain these low rates, surplus users' contracts provide that service shall be curtailed or suspended when surplus power is not available."

A month later, the P. G. & E. boldly asserted:

"The P. G. & E. has kept pace with the growth and development in the 89,000 square miles it serves throughout northern and central California * * * now the P. G. & E. is preparing for still greater growth and development * * * so there will be adequate electricity and gas for the continued growth and prosperity of northern and central California."

The seriousness of the present situation, as far as labor is concerned, is evidenced by the unemployment that is being caused.

The Metal Trades Council had 10,000 of its members laid off on March 8, and another 5,000 the next day. If the proposed system of arbitrarily ordering reductions in the days factories may operate is enforced by the company, then 8,000 members of the Allied Printing Trades in San Francisco and 2,500 in Oakland will suffer loss of employment. Close to 2,000 bottlers and brewery workers have already experienced forced unemployment.

We are now in the process of making an extensive survey to ascertain exactly how many workers will be forced to quit work through no fault of their own. It is plain that such arbitrary regulation of power by a private company can work inequitably upon industry as well as upon the workers.

But all blame aside, the California State Federation of Labor desires to make certain specific proposals to meet the immediate situation. We ask:

1. That you order the P. G. & E. to transmit power generated by the taxpayers' money—which doesn't cost the company a cent—to transmit that power at cost and without extracting any profit from farmers, industry, and householders. The people of northern California are entitled to learn from personal experience what really cheap public power means.

We believe that your Commission has the authority to proceed on the above basis, and refer you to Deering's Acts—6386—section 13, paragraphs b and c, section 28, paragraph a et sequitur, and sections 30, 31, 36, 60, 61, 64, and 65. It is our opinion that a study of these sections will clearly establish authority for the Commission to act as suggested.

We ask:

2. That you order the P. G. & E., as a public utility of California, to comply with the Federal reclamation law which requires priority and preference in power distribution for public agencies, and that you insist the company shall end its defiance of Congress and of the people.

We ask:

3. That you terminate the arbitrary allocations of power by a private company pulling switches when and where it pleases, and that, instead, you assume full and immediate responsibility. We want a public agency in charge which will recognize legal priorities of public agencies and establish proper preferences, so that the farmers, laborers, and industries shall not suffer, while favored consumers continue in their use of power that cannot be justified before the public in the face of the present crisis.

In the East a group of distinguished citizens are reviving the great principles of public conservation of resources laid down by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot nearly 50 years ago. They say:

"We reaffirm the principles, upheld by the highest courts for generations, that the utility business is essentially a public business however owned, and that corporations authorized by the people to conduct this business for private profits must be subject to effective regulation as will assure adequate service on a legitimate cost basis."

The California State Federation of Labor demands that the Public Utilities Commission exercise its full authority under law, that it remove responsibility in this crisis from the hands of the very company that helped to get us into it, and that from now on it give us a true conservation program in California.

Truman Program Is Popular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 23 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of March 8, 1948, contained an article entitled "Truman Program Is Popular," by Ralph W. Page. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN PROGRAM IS POPULAR

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—It has become the fashion in Washington to discount President Truman's chances of reelection and even the probability of his being renominated. This is based upon the obvious disaffection in three substantial groups: (1) The Communists and wild radicals, (2) the white-supremacy brigade in the South, and (3) the New Deal architects of Roosevelt's social betterment programs.

More cautious observers question the ability of the leaders of these disgruntled groups to maintain these revolts or control the popular vote.

This is based upon the position taken by the President on the political issues. In almost every case he is in line not only with the interests of the country, but with popular opinion.

Particularly he is championing the European recovery program, strong military preparedness, admission of displaced refugees from communism, civil liberties, reciprocal trade agreements, an International Trade Organization, energetic conservation of national resources, a prompt and effective housing program, vigorous methods to halt inflation, increase in the minimum wage, and extension of social security.

These measures undoubtedly meet the approval of a majority of the voters. Except

for the civil liberties proposals, there is no appreciable opposition.

What militates against the President in Democratic circles is his lack of dramatic leadership and appeasement of the industrial dynasties and the Roosevelt haters.

It is manifest that he suffers in comparison with the personal power and political skill of Roosevelt. But it is doubtful that even Roosevelt could have forced or persuaded this hostile Congress to follow the Democratic line. The most preposterous contention conceivable is that Henry Wallace could have done so.

The complaint remains that the President has replaced the old Roosevelt lieutenants with personnel more acceptable to financial and industrial circles. This personnel in itself is capable and in nowise exerting any appreciable "reactionary" influences. Marshall, Royall, Forrestal, Lovett, Snyder, and the rest of them are tending strictly and efficiently to their business.

But this has gained no adherents in corporate circles, and has dissipated the cohesive fervor of the liberals, including the Americans for Democratic Action, whose convention in Philadelphia was aptly called "the government in exile."

Still, on balance, it is difficult to believe that the rank and file will desert the President and his program.

Salvation Army Maintenance Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following address of the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., on a special broadcast program dedicated to the 1948 Maintenance Appeal of the Salvation Army in New York City, February 15:

A few days ago in Times Square a plainly dressed woman stopped to drop a $5 bill into a Salvation Army cannister.

"I wish it was more," she said, when the Salvation Army cadet thanked her. "After what you people did for my brother, we'd all about given up—he just wasn't any good until—well, I don't know how you people did it but you got him straightened out. He's working steady now—he's gone back to his wife—why, I guess we all feel like we owe a lot to the Salvation Army."

Other people, too, have explained why they are contributing to the Salvation Army maintenance appeal.

"Just a small token of appreciation of what you did for servicemen during the war," wrote an anonymous ex-GI.

"Because of the way you helped a neighbor who was in trouble," another letter said.

A veteran of an earlier war wrote, "This is my twenty-eighth annual installment to help pay for the doughnuts I ate in France in 1918."

Of course, there are thousands of contributors who have never so much as tasted a Salvation Army doughnut. They have their reasons, not quite as personal, but just as strong. From the practical point of view, Salvation Army is an extremely good investment. Its work with children and young people is a strong force against juvenile delinquency. Its prison bureaus help keep men and women on the path that leads to a life of responsible, useful citizens. In its men's social centers each year hundreds of homeless, unemployed drifters are given good food and shelter, wholesome recreation and the self-respect that comes from working to pay for what they receive. Its family service bureau, its foster home service for dependent children, its day nursery, its vocational guidance bureau—to put it bluntly, these and many other institutions and services operated by the Salvation Army, save New York City, directly and indirectly, a lot of money.

These are sound reasons for supporting the Salvation Army, but beyond them lies something much deeper and less tangible—the grateful affection we all feel for men and women who all day, every day, throughout their lives put their beliefs not only into words but into deeds.

The men and women of the Salvation Army are not self-righteously bent on reforming the world or the individual. They are friends, sympathetic and often very wise, ready to help wherever help is needed. I have been told that the Salvation Army operates in almost every country of the globe. If the countries could themselves be ruled by the Salvation Army's simplicity and good will which sees people not as members of nations or races but as human beings, ready to become friends, the future of the world would be far brighter than it is today.

I am sure that you who are listening to this broadcast will feel that you too have reasons for doing what many of us have already done. I'm sure you will want to give your fullest support to the Salvation Army's 1948 maintenance appeal.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert the following article which appeared in the newspaper, the Brooklyn Eagle, on March 7, 1948 and which was written by my distinguished colleague in the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREW L. SOMERS]. I believe this article to be of extreme importance and should be given serious consideration by all the Members because it has created such a sensation by putting the finger on the force which will finally decide the Palestine issue. Congressman SOMERS is more than qualified as an expert on this problem of Palestine as he is one of the founders and also a co-chairman of the American League for a Free Palestine and has given of his leadership and vision for many years in an attempt to find a solution to this confusing and internationally important issue. Congressman SOMERS clearly shows that it is not by diplomacy or legal debate that we will settle this sore issue, but that the resolve and stamina of the Hebrew people themselves who are fighting for their nation will finally be the deciding factor. On behalf of all of my colleagues I want to express my sincere thanks to our distinguished Member in having cut through the enormous confusion and verbiage surrounding this problem and at last put the searchlight of truth on the true solution.

The article, entitled "Alone and Unaided Hebrews Will Guarantee Victory in Palestine," follows:

(By Representative ANDREW L. SOMERS, Tenth Congressional District)

May 15 is the D-day selected for Palestine by the Anglo-Arab plotters. This is destruction day, devastation day, when the Nazi-Mufti and his bands, British-armed and, in some cases, British-officered, are supposed to sweep Palestine of its 800,000 Hebrew citizens.

Full knowledge of this plot is in every statesman's possession. May 15 is the date for British to yield the mandate, when she can disclaim responsibility for the terrible massacre which, for some diabolical reason, she is fomenting. Yet the world watches and international machinery appears to be paralyzed.

Already the little country has, in the past 10 weeks, been subjected to warfare that has brought death to 1,000 and has wounded 4,000. In proportion to the population of the United States, these casualties are equivalent to 100,000 Americans killed and 400,000 wounded. And, in addition to the population of Palestine, the safety of 1,000,000 Jews in the Middle Eastern Arab countries is hanging by a thread. In Europe 250,000 Hebrew DP's are still behind barbed wire, while another 1,000,000 live in the semi-twilight of pogrom-ridden lands, dreaming only of the promised land.

It is true that in Palestine today there is death, betrayal, agony, and martyrdom. But also there is hope. Hope and victory for the Hebrews move forward on two firm legs—the courage of the Hebrew people and the support of American citizens. If this confidence concerning Palestine were based on faith in international morality or on the belief that Ernest Bevin will call off his Arab bands, then this would be wishful thinking indeed. But, on the contrary, this assurance rests on the most realistic appraisal of the forces involved, discounting completely the remote possibility that any United Nations action will be taken in time.

NOT ONE WAS SAVED

Long ago the Hebrew people stopped listening to the drone of international discussions in their behalf. They had the bitter experience of the Evian Conference, the Bermuda Conference, the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry. Not one Jew was saved, not one house was built in Palestine, not one acre was irrigated, by these and similar diplomatic devices. Possibly these conferences were planned in good faith, but they were all perverted into instruments of cruel delay. And, thus far, the United Nations attempt to solve this world problem has turned Lake Success into a bog of legalisms, wrangles and suspicions. Today the Hebrews expect nothing from diplomats, resolutions, commissions of inquiry, and the like.

They rely on themselves. Everything which exists in Palestine today stands as a monument to their efforts and initiative. The fact that there are almost 800,000 pioneers in Palestine is proof of their indestructible will to survive, for thousands of these arrived via the underground railways of the Haganah and Irgun, braving dangerous odds in running the illegal British blockade. And the fact that the United Nations even considered the Palestine case was not because the British Colonial Office suddenly felt twinges of conscience, but because the British military in Palestine and Englishmen at home were keenly aware of the power of Hebrew resistance.

As World War II unfolded, it became increasingly clear to me that if the Jew were to survive in the world of Hitler, Stalin, and the British Empire, he must be armed by something more than a spiritual heritage, scientific genius and artistic talent. He would have to stand for his rights as every

other modern people were preparing to do—he would have to resurrect the warrior Hebrew of the Bible.

CALLED FOR ARMY

On November 28, 1941, 9 days before Pearl Harbor, I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for the immediate formation of a Jewish army—a unit where stateless and Palestinian Jews could enlist to fight Hitler. I was anxious to see this happen, not only because of the situation in Europe, but also because I felt that historically it might some day be necessary for these people to defend themselves against the Arabs or the British or both.

After considerable pressure and argument, the British were persuaded to create a Palestinian regiment which performed so brilliantly in the early north African campaigns against Rommel that it was enlarged to a brigade, 30,000 strong, which ultimately fought the costly Italian campaign and finally broke through to German soil. The veterans of the Jewish brigade are now in Palestine, the backbone of the Hebrew underground. They must become the nucleus of the national army of the Hebrew republic.

The fact that it is no longer cheap to kill Jews will save Palestine today. In Europe, Hitler murdered 6,000,000—at a profit. But in Palestine, the British learned to respect the fact that to kill a Jew meant killing an Englishman. This new will to resist was made very clear to the UN Commission on Palestine last week when a Palestinian leader told the five-nation board:

"We are a nation seeking to harm no one, but we do possess adequate force and an unfaltering determination to prevent any repetition of the extermination campaigns carried out against us in Europe. It may be that Arabs and Englishmen will kill thousands of our people. But this means war, because thousands of Arabs and Englishmen will also die. Already there have been three Arabs to every two Hebrew casualties in Palestine."

FORMIDABLE FIGHTING FORCE

Properly armed, the Hebrew militia of Palestine will constitute the most formidable fighting force in the Middle East. The Arab mercenaries, however numerous, will be puny and insignificant compared with a Hebrew force seasoned in modern technical warfare. Such a military force would be a most valuable American ally in this area. (We must never forget that the Arabs collaborated with Mussolini and Hitler throughout the last war.)

The support of American citizens—the second leg on which Hebrew victory must stand—has been mounting steadily. Over 3 years ago I was roundly criticized for urging American citizens to give financial support, and the Government to give moral support, to Hebrew underground fighters. Today these fighters are emerging from the underground and every Congressman has received hundreds of letters demanding that the Government permit the sending of arms to the Hebrew defenders of the Holy Land.

The Government of the United States has indicated its readiness to make available armaments and equipment to Hebrew Palestine upon the UN Commission's request. Undoubtedly several other governments will take the same position.

There can be no doubt that the current State Department arms embargo is one-sided in effect, since it puts the penalty on the victim. However, merely raising the arms embargo today would not be enough to stop the Anglo-Arab aggression since actual delivery of arms to the Hebrews would be prevented by the British as long as they are in control. This is no time to indulge in noble but futile gestures.

ORGANIZING MILITIA

In Washington today, serious consideration is being given to the immediate organization of a Palestinian militia so that the Hebrews will not be unprotected after May 15. If our Government recognizes some form of Hebrew provisional government at once, we will automatically recognize its armed force—the Hebrew militia. It seems patent that this course would be tantamount to lifting the arms embargo on Palestine without giving Arab aggressors the benefit of access to American arms.

A United States Army mission is now in order. Neither Palestinians nor Americans want American troops in Palestine. A United States military mission could assist in planning and setting up a modern defense establishment. We have given similar consultative military assistance to the Philippines, Greece, and Turkey and we should extend it to Palestine.

I venture that the Mufti's massacre of the Hebrew population will be stopped, and that we will witness the Hebrews taking the offensive against their would-be assassins with the fullest backing of American public sentiment and United States assistance.

It is to the advantage of the United States to support the building of a beachhead for democracy in the Middle East. The great cry that a Hebrew Palestine will jeopardize our oil supply is vicious and false propaganda which will hurt America's long-range interests. Only if progress comes to the Middle East and genuine political and economic freedom spreads from Palestine to the Arab states can we stop paying tribute to feudal and barbaric Arab kings, and start trading on a businesslike and decent basis.

The fact that in actively backing the Hebrew nation we save the United Nations and sustain American honor provides two additional reasons which have overwhelming weight with the American people.

Cutting clean across and through all the arduous discussions and the panaceas, I reiterate that the thing to do now is for the Hebrews to organize a Hebrew provisional government at once. Such a government can be assured recognition by the United States and by the United Nations.

I would also like to insert at the same time some excerpts from a letter received by Congressman SOMERS from a Jewish woman in Brooklyn about this article.

DEAR MR. SOMERS: I am a Jewish woman 55 years old. I was born in New York City. My parents were American citizens. I am not an educated woman. I did not go to college, but I possess intelligence. I have been in contact with some of the best people but none of these people loved the United States more than my parents, my family and I do. I read everything in the papers. I am most interested in the men that represent our Government.

What you write here in the Sunday Eagle about the Jews in Palestine—you not only speak the truth but you describe the true spirit of the Jewish people.

Red Cross Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert an address by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, February 13, opening the 1948 Red Cross campaign.

The address is as follows:

The Red Cross is the greatest mother in the world. And, like any good mother it gives to all of its children equal care, it treats them all with equal deference and interest and respect.

The Red Cross never plays favorites. It never turns the cold shoulder of discrimination. It never takes sides. It never asks questions.

For those who need the many and varied services which the Red Cross extends, there are no forms to fill out—no questionnaires to fill in. You do not have to put down the place of worship which you attend upon the Sabbath day, or the country of origin of your maternal grandfather, or the particular pigment of your skin. The Red Cross doesn't ask your race or creed or color, because the Red Cross doesn't care.

The Red Cross has a helping hand for all who need it—whenever they need it—wherever they need it. If you are ill or wounded or the victim of an accident, the Red Cross is your friend. If forest fire has gutted your house or flood carried away your home—the Red Cross is your friend. If you must have a nurse's care, or a pint of plasma or a serum injection, the Red Cross is your friend. The Red Cross asks your need—not your creed—and its heart is big enough for all humanity.

And that, my fellow Red Crossers, is the reason I like the Red Cross so much. That is the reason I am always ready to yield to the Red Cross whatever it may demand of my services and my time. That is why I deem it such a privilege to be a member of this all-American team which is gathered here this afternoon.

Together at this luncheon, I see rabbis of the Hebrew faith breaking bread with Protestant ministers and Roman Catholic priests. Together, in this distinguished gathering, are ladies and gentlemen whose ancestors migrated to this country from nearly every corner of every continent upon this earth. Together here today, men with the so-called military viewpoint are finding common cause with leaders from civilian life.

Spokesmen for labor are sitting on the same side of the table with men who manage our great corporations.

Rivals in business and competitors in commerce are seated elbow to elbow. Yes, and unless my ears and eyes deceive me, Democrats and Republicans are mobilizing here today without a single thought for the political consequences of what they do and what they say. Everyone is working in a great and common cause—together.

Both labor and business have a stake in the Red Cross. As Jacob Potofsky, general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, has said, "Working men and women everywhere have a particular stake in the success of the American Red Cross campaign for 1948. Of all sections of the population they are usually the first to suffer from misfortune. The American Red Cross has always come to the rescue where their health and welfare are concerned."

Yes, the Red Cross rises above partisan disputes and differences in background and belief. It towers above our petty prejudices. In all the lay world, there is no more sincere expression of man's natural striving for brotherhood. In all America, there is no finer example of the power of getting together and pulling together for the mutual benefit of all concerned.

That is why I am so happy to be here with you all today, and so confident that this 1948 mobilization will result in resounding success.

Together—we will far exceed our goals.

Eamon de Valera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, the citizens of our National Capital will be hosts at a reception and dinner to Eamon de Valera, former Prime Minister of Ireland, who is returning to his homeland after a memorable visit to the western part of the United States. In the circumstances, I deem it appropriate to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Sun Man Tells of St. Patrick and Valorous Celts," which appeared in the Arizona Daily Sun on March 17:

SUN MAN TELLS OF ST. PATRICK AND VALOROUS CELTS

The following was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Monday, March 15, by Congressman RICHARD HARLESS:

"On March 17, Hibernians everywhere will do homage to their Patron St. Patrick, and, as fitting tribute to a great race, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the March issue of the National Hibernian, entitled 'St. Patrick's Day 1948,' and a poem, titled 'Valor of the Celt,' written in the midst of World War II by James Patrick McGovern, a distinguished member of the District of Columbia Bar and a former Army captain in the First World War, who is also a special Washington correspondent of the Arizona Daily Sun:

"'ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1948

"'The Apostle of Ireland was a man of peace. To the highly civilized but extremely warlike pagan Gaels he brought faith in the Prince of Peace. He conquered warriors without shedding blood. The secret of his successful mission is needed today as much as it was ever needed in the history of the human race.

"'Just as the foundation of World War II was laid at Versailles in 1919, so the foundation of future war is being laid today. * * * St. Patrick was no appeaser. He knew exactly what he believed, and what he believed he clearly preached. We should formulate our aims with similar precision, in order that men of good will in all parts of the world may know them and accept them and work for their fulfillment. St. Patrick prayed. So should we. Even as we pray we shall be guided toward the wise, the unselfish, the successful way of peace.'

"'VALOR OF THE CELT

"'What mean the neutral mandates of today
As long as Irish hearts, not laws, hold sway?
Two thousand years ago the Celts were bold
To prove their valor, never since grown cold;
For centuries their sons have heard drums roll
Abroad and home, and won the hero's scroll.

"'Who can recount each deed, recall each name,
Enrolling Irish warriors in halls of fame?
Their spirit on every front has never ceased
To be among the Allies a buoyant yeast.
The race itself stands now with vision clear
An international and stalwart peer.

"'No mortal power can cloud fair Ireland's brow;
As her men always fought, so they fight now;
They fill the foremost ranks where danger lies,
Spurred by the valorous will which death defies;
Impelled by native love for soil that's free,
Dauntless wherever they meet with tyranny.

"'For many flags, by land, in sky, on sea,
The Celtic race fulfills its destiny;
A hundred ships of war slip down the ways,
Each christened in an Irish martyr's praise;
And untold shrines in foreign, distant parts
Will keep Old Erin warm within true hearts.
—*James Patrick McGovern.*'"

Need for Federal Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill introduced in the House by Mr. MUNDT—H. R. 3990—which must eventually receive serious consideration by the Congress. Health and sanitation matters in our country must not be considered as problems which can be delayed. Death strikes with a sudden hand when an epidemic breaks out in some remote quarter of our country. Epidemics resulting from lack of sanitation and proper pollution control can be averted if the provisions of Mr. MUNDT'S bill are enacted into Federal law. In this connection, I should like to include as a part of my remarks a statement made by Mrs. Francis Morgan, of Bremerton, Wash., before the Resolutions Commitee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in connection with a resolution which she submitted endorsing this particular bill. I want to urge upon my colleagues their earnest study of the measure in the hope that it will early be reported to the floor and receive favorable action from this body.

STATEMENT OF MRS. FRANCIS MORGAN ON POLLUTION TO THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MARCH 19, 1948

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, every traveler across this broad continent becomes weary after a time with looking out of his train-car windows watching the telephone poles dart backward out of his straining vision, and with seeing the "sameness" of the countryside hour after hour as scores of shabby little railroad towns and miles of smudgy, refuse-cluttered track right-of-ways fly past—especially, if the trip is made in the drab, grey days of late winter. Usually, then, the traveler picks up that modern St. Christopher of all travelers, the pocket-size magazine tucked in the seat, and out of sheer boredom begins to read.

This was my experience across the country from the State of Washington on my way here to attend this annual meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. The first article in my magazine which caught my eye was entitled "Raw Water Can Kill You." It took me only 10 minutes or less to read the article in its entirety, but from then on the shabby towns, the dirty right-of-ways, the filthy-looking rivers, and the debris-soiled shores of countless lakes took on a new and consuming significance.

I thought of my home, the city of Bremerton, out in the State of Washington, on what the chambers of commerce there call "Beautiful Puget Sound." I thought of the tons of raw, untreated, and disinfected dumpage which pollutes and soils the beaches of our once-magnificent inland sea. I thought of our spoiled oyster beds, and sand-spits of the back bays which teemed once with clams and crabs and which today are becoming virtually biological deserts except for the hardy scavenger snails and jellyfish. I remembered what fun it once was to plunge into the cold, invigorating water of the sound, and I thought with regret how dangerously foolish it would be to swim there now when bacterial counts show thousands of sewage germs per quart and one can see the contamination of inadequate sewage treatment on every hand. And I thought, too, this alarming condition is more or less everywhere in my country and not simply in Puget Sound and the little city of Bremerton.

One hundred million people—70 percent of the Nation—require better water and sewerage service immediately. The United States Public Health Service has taken a healthy swipe at the problem by publicizing numerous surveys and estimates of costs of correction. It has estimated that it will cost $7,800,000,000—or the approximate value of common stocks in all the United States railroads to solve our national problem of pollution. Of this staggering sum, more than two billion must be spent for safer water supplies; more than three and a half billion are needed for sewage facilities; and the balance for waste and disposal plants.

Too many citizens are content to believe that such deplorable sanitary and health conditions may exist in New York, San Francisco, Bremerton, Wash., or Podunk, Ga.—but not in "my home town." And too many citizens are prone to believe that this expenditure can be delayed. Yes, we can wait, for we have already in many areas of our country waited too long. Egypt was on the waiting list centuries ago and history records its dreadful visitation of cholera. China is on the waiting list, too, and its astounding human sacrifice to typhoid every year is so commonly known and accepted that our American newspapers carry the story of its epidemics on the back page or not at all.

Recent agitation on the part of individuals and civic groups in my community—and I am happy that I have had a part in this worthy effort—is beginning to produce some corrective results. The State of Washington has an established pollution-control commission, and it has an adequate law empowering this commission to make rules and regulations governing the control of pollution of all waters in the State. The law further prohibits the intentional pollution of our rivers, lakes, and salt-water beaches, and provides for substantial penalties for violations.

Under the duress of alarm resulting from visible damage to our beaches in the Seattle, Bremerton, and Port Orchard areas, and the knowledge that swimming is no longer safe, and that the taking and eating of otherwise excellent seafoods is extremely unwise, the Commission has made many extensive studies and bacteriological counts. In April of 1946, the City Council of Bremerton instructed its engineer to determine the approximate cost of an engineering survey for sewage disposal and to prepare a preliminary call for bids for approval of the city. Inability of the city to secure cooperation from the Navy Department as to the responsibility of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and from the United States Government in connection with the Federal Housing Authority both of which contribute greatly to our problem, resulted in the effort for correction being limited almost entirely to repeated conferences.

Our Congressman, HOMER R. JONES, and our Senators, HARRY P. CAIN and WARREN E. MAGNUSON, have all taken an active interest in securing consideration of the Federal responsibility in the matter. The Navy Department, according to assurances given by the Secretary himself, is recommending a

contract authorization to the United States Congress in the amount of $150,000 to cover the Navy's share of any correction program. Because of the damage done to the fish and sea life of the Sound, the House Committee on Marine and Fisheries is willing, further, to give consideration to our problem. But even if we are successful in Bremerton and Seattle in alleviating our local situation, pollution of the waters generally will continue from scores of infected dumpages emanating from the many little towns and industrial communities both to the north and to the south of our area.

It is a Federal problem—at least, one in which Federal and State and local government funds should cooperate in solving. The proper and most advantageous point of beginning is with the Federal Government. Two bills have been introduced in the United States Congress—S. 418 in the Senate and H. R. 3990 introduced by Mr. MUNDT in the House. These bills should be given earnest and immediate consideration, for they provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and the Federal Works Agency under the general administration of the Surgeon General of the United States.

I should like to recommend that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress go on record by resolution memorializing Congress for quick favorable action on this legislation, and if it is permissible at this time I should like to introduce a resolution to that effect. If such legislation were enacted into the law, the enormous job facing our Nation in supplying people with two basic essentials of decent life—good water and safe sewage disposal—would be greatly facilitated. To delay even the smallest positive action in this direction is to court ultimate disaster. People across the country are demanding tangible assistance from their Government in providing justifiable public works. The price for a limping home-building program is discomfort; for a delayed construction program, inconvenience; for beneficial improvement of our waterways and harbors and reclamation of our arid lands, simple postponement to another day. But for failure to provide pure water and safe sewage disposal, the penalty is certain disease and probable death.

1947 Columbia River Salmon Pack Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregon Journal of March 17, 1948:

1947 COLUMBIA RIVER SALMON PACK INCREASES

ASTORIA, March 17.—Canned-salmon production on the Columbia during 1947 was 40 percent higher than in 1946 and was surpassed in only 4 years since 1930.

The first complete report on canned-fish output of the last year, made by the Pacific Fisherman, gave the 1947 salmon pack of all species as 347,306 cases. This represents a gain of 138,000 cases, 48 one-pound cans to the case, over the 1946 pack of 209,471 cases.

The 1947 pack is approximately half of the canned-salmon production of 1883, the greatest year on the Columbia, when almost 700,000 cases were put up, besides huge quantities of salt fish, very little of which is turned out any more.

Because of the high price of salmon, the 1947 pack was the most valuable in history, bringing more than $7,000,000 at current prices.

The Portland Fish Co. packed 30,208 cases. The Columbia River Packers' Association, Inc., put up the most canned salmon, reporting a pack of 140,159 cases. In second place is the Union Fishermen's Cooperative Packing Co., with 51,121 cases.

Seufert Bros. cannery at The Dalles put 15,728 cases; Paragon Packing Co., Astoria, 25,540 cases; New England Fish Co., 13,500 cases; Keystone Packing Co., Ilwaco, Wash., 11,142 cases; Barbey Packing Co., Astoria, 8,114 cases; Chinook Packing Co., Chinook, Wash., 21,979 cases. Only these firms remain of the 56 firms which once canned salmon on the Columbia.

The 1947 pack was featured by heavy increase in Silverside canning.

Fancy and choice Chinook production went up from 140,315 cases in 1946 to 202,856 cases; standards and pale from 19,557 to 47,462.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

We the members of the First Congregational Church of Albuquerque, N. Mex., assembled to consider our Christian responsibility to the people of Europe and the peace of the world, being convinced that the European recovery program can be one of history's most momentous affirmations of faith in the curative power of freedom and the creative capacity of free men, do hereby affirm—

Our confidence in the peoples of Europe who are making earnest efforts at self-help.

Our willingness to undertake such limitations and sacrifices as may be necessary for world reconstruction.

Our active support of the constructive principles of the European recovery program.

Further, we submit the following considerations with respect to the European recovery program. These essentials we believe must characterize this program:

1. It must be financially adequate to promote the recovery of Europe.

2. Every effort should be made to make it clear to all nations that no nation need suffer by reason of this program and that the United States has no desire to encroach on the political life or sovereignty of any nation.

3. We believe that this program will justify itself before the world if it can be made to demonstrate "That freedom and prosperity, hand in hand, can be stably sustained in the western democratic world."

4. This program should be used to encourage every possible development of joint responsibility and cooperation among the nations of western Europe.

C. WALKER HAYES,
Chairman, Social Action Committee.

Dated this 22d day of February 1948.

Edyth K. Murray, Jean Marsh, C. Otto Lirsh, Mrs. B. C. Reed, Mrs. H. T. deBooz, Mrs. O. I. Langseth, Mrs. E. T. Kemper, Mrs. J. H. Paine, Jennie M. Paine, Mrs. T. E. Jones, Hilda J. Spies, C. Richard Murray, Clarence E. Parr.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and petition:

THE AMERICAN LEGION
ROY L. VINGERS POST, NO. 52,
La Crosse, Wis., March 19, 1948.

Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVENSON: Enclosed is an additional petition which was circulated in the city of La Crosse for the purpose of endorsement of the universal military training measure. Your endorsement of this measure is highly indicative of your foresight and ability to analyze the world situation.

Many of the signers of this petition are former servicemen as well as school teachers and mothers of eligible trainees, but all recognize a duty to country in this hour of approaching crisis. We all recognize that we will not have the element of time for preparedness in the next conflict.

Cordially yours,
EDWARD F. BARTL,
Adjutant.

PETITION

To Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON:

Peace is worth striving for. Therefore, we, citizens of the United States and voters, urge you, our Representative in the Eightieth Congress of the United States, to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training.

Arnold C. Wuir, William J. Heck, Clyde E. Fish, Richard Wolfe, Wilford Buchholtz, Alton G. Erichson, Albert Schroeder, Reay Ross, Mike Leary, La Crosse, Wis.; Andell Senn, Hokah, Minn.; Margarete Brauer, Emma Petrick, Francis W. Netwall, Richard Johnson, Merlin Cloutier, John H. Buschmann, La Crosse, Wis.; Wilbur W. Spreiter, Onalaska, Wis.; Harvey H. Wehrenberg, James R. Stephans, George E. Fitzsimmons, Howard Hagen, Solven Johnson, Kenneth Opdahl, La Crosse, Wis.

Clyde V. Allen, B. O. Fredrickson, Carl Betz, W. B. Johnson, C. H. Knothe, Ira P. Gerbracht, Russell J. Sieger, Ray Highberg, Harry B. Man, Berne Bernstein, Mrs. H. B. Collette, Sig T. Bakke, W. E. Haugland, Ray R. Fredrickson, Charles E. Knoblauch, Robert F. Counts, Leonard N. Adsik, Donald H. Starch, Alfred O. Schlicht, Stuart F. Brokaw, Jr., F. E. Fredrickson, La Crosse, Wis.; A. W. Herdrich, Onalaska, Wis.; Roger M. Larson, Sparta, Wis.; C. L. Dexter, Mrs. Clare S. Otto, L. B. Foley, Lyle Ustby, George R. Sill, R. J. Foster, Carlton F. Hemleben, D. P. Moran, Arvella A. Gautsch, Byron E. Thiel, Royal B. Dankellong, La Crosse, Wis.; Eleanor L. Rustad, Black River Falls, Wis.; Ruth A. Schneider, Alma, Wis.; Lydia C. Dahlen, Elizabeth M. Fregin, La Crosse, Wis.; John J. Zalonik, Alma, Wis.; Julian Johnson, Holmen, Wis.; Harry H. Meyer, Elmer J. Amborn, Bangor, Wis.; H. H. Harder, Mundoro, Wis.; A. E. Mueske, Charles Moers, G. F. Bilskemper, M. Fredrickson, C. Fortney, Stephen S. Cyemanick, Mrs. A. E. Mueske, William L. Mason, Percy T. Woolley, Wm. Lawrence, La Crosse, Wis.; Leonard Stolsmark, Onalaska, Wis.; P. M. Van Tassel, Sparta, Wis.; H. E. Abeud, Independence, Wis.; James W. Wetzel, Leslie V.

Dix, R. G. McGuire, L. A. Waedelich, E. Wallace Evans, M. J. Mosser, E. Kwaterski, John L. Strike, La Crosse, Wis.

Nick P. Engler, Appleton, Wis.; G. D. Scott, R. P. McLeod, M. B. Scherich, W. L. Butterwick, H. R. Wheeloch, C. H. Stokke, D. L. Anderegg, A. Livingston, Amy Bach, Lola Beitler, William Baker, Elizabeth Brady, Catherine Brady, Olive L. Cook, Elva B. Shields, Olga B. Thiel, Clara K. Siepert, George McHetherington, Thomas W. Pitman, Anne Roche, Alvin Mikelson, E. J. Smith, C. H. Stald, M. Sutton, Walter Weigent, Adele Watkins, C. F. Evans, Wm. H. Schertzach, Robert Roellig, June Kvoff, Meta M. Jonas, Marion Cremer, Ruth Strozinsky, F. W. Edwards, Anne Martin, Herman A. Glenz, Helen Braatz, Augusta De Florin, L. E. Jenkins, Othelia Brown, Peter L. Fransen, Jean Marcomb, Viola E. Wallace, Ella Claire Bleakley, Elizabeth Evans, George A. Jiracek, Laurence F. Hackett, C. E. Ford, S. F. Brokaw, E. M. Saterbak, La Crosse, Wis.; C. M. Whitney, Stoddard, Wis.; T. J. McDonald, L. J. Harris, Henrietta Grant, Jessie E. Norris, Ed Beranek, Margaret A. Knutson, Doris A. Ness, Kathryn S. Doty, Verna M. Lueck, Marjorie L. Keegan, La Verne Hintgen, Mabel M Brandau, Helen Anderson, Jean Tommerson, Kathleen Stanley, A. D. Zimmerlakl, Irma Rideout, Raguhill Skaar, Ruth Runnestrand, M. Lucia Weiss, Arthur F. Hemmerlein, Edward Stangl, William Domke, Marie Hanson, A. W. Young, Martha Fay Shuman, Agnes Strornstad, D. R Kinney, Myrtle Altman, Leora Ellsworth, Elizabeth Bernatz, Mrs. Nellie Soules, Arlene Boyle, Elsa Burgehardt, Nancy Hyde, John B. Coleman, E. L. Schreiber, E. C. Hasse, James A. Becker, Harold H. Hawkins, Clinton S Knutson, La Crosse, Wis.

Melvin J. Noth, Frank J. Davy, Arnold R. Pinski, Grant O. Bjergum, Donald O. Larsen, Chester C. Hegmer, Mrs. L. Midtlien, Mrs. Daniel Larsen, Mrs. Elizabeth Britting, Mrs. Bonita Weiland, A. Gilbertson, Erwin B. Hauser, Iver Johnson, Julia Maier, Philip S. Day, Warren Webb, Jerome A. Jarstad, Clarence Hoch, Otis Pullman, Ed J. Bakalars, W. M. Gregor, George V. Scholler, Roy Sandvigen, Pete I. Peterson, Frank Geller, Harry C. Welch, George A. Skogen, Martin Olson, C. G. Sutherland, P. W. Shult, P. V. Hielich, Thomas Hayes, Clifford Lee, John Hartung, James M. Doyle, Frank Rendler, Ray Hayes, Jos. A. Schnurer, Ora M. Ready, Robert Ormsby, A. J. Holberg, R. C. Gilbertson, M. Brophy, P. K. Gunde, Gerald Turnipseed, R. H. Herbert, Fred Miller, John J. Ablan, Earl H. Michener, Paul Snyder, William J. Butler, Allen Barris, C. H. Williams, Lurrie Strong, Robert Marx, G. McDonald, E. Ehrsam, Philip Dyer, William Olsen, Gaston L. Davidson, Paul Wuest, John Darling, Jr., Maynard Johnson, H. C. Holmen, Robt. Clarkin, LeRoy Stode.

William R. Bartel, S. Grebner, R. W. Swanbeck, Joe Tikal, D. Chase, John R. Thomas, Edward Young, Ben J. Johnson, Geo. Rimker, James Ott, Charles Weigent, Bob Bott, George L. Hovind, Richard Wuensch, Frank Pretasky, Carl Schroeder, C. W. Staddler, Joseph O. Skarie, Theodore W. Lapitz, Ray D. Karney, J. LaFrency, J. A. Weiland, A. J. Steinmetz, Walter Gisleson, Joseph E. Wisland, Albert Wistler, Paul P. Antony, A. P. Evans, E. N. Evenson, E. L. Scanlan, Maydell M. Stelle, Elizabeth Scanlan, Cleo Weber, J. J. Bauman, O. W. Gaarder, Paul Miller, C. B. Varco, Mrs. C. L. Morrissey, Stella Peterson, Irene Vogel, Herold Walters, J. L. Robinson, Thomas Stancil, LaCrosse, Wis.; Lennie Nelson, Bangor, Wis.; W. G. Fischer, Felix Hale, Arthur D. Leighton, Frank Rigelsby, Jr., Ray R. Hanhardt, Richard Moseley, Florence Hanhardt, Tomily Regelsky, Jr., J. A. Templeton, Randolph Crawford, Billy S. Armand, H. H. Schroeder, Ray Wuensch, George E. Smith, Ray Czechowicz, Marilyn Rice, Charles W. Hall, Audrey Bell, George Dummer, Alice Calleni, Bernice Whiteman, Joseph J. O'Connor, L. A. Keizer, A. J. Stortz, Harry D. Johnson, LaCrosse, Wis.; Mrs. Harry D. Johnson, Bangor, Wis.; C. C. Tank, La Crosse, Wis.

The Skouras Brothers—Outstanding Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one of the glories of our country is the opportunity it gives to merit and hard work. The Skouras brothers, Spyros, Charles, and George, are outstanding examples of the success of this American philosophy. Following is an article on Spyros Skouras, chairman of the New York City Committee for the American Overseas Aid-United Nations Appeal for Children Drive, scheduled to start April 26, from the New York Post and Home News of March 22, 1948:

ONE CHILD IN EVERY THREE NEEDS HELP
(By Wambly Bald)

"It is going to be a people's movement."

Spyros P. Skouras, the silver-haired president of Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp., spread his hands emotionally before him. His manner was smooth, pleasant and restrained; but it contained a sharp urgency when he discussed the need for feeding the world's hungry children.

The movie executive was making direct reference to his participation in the American Overseas Aid-United Nations Appeal for Children drive which is scheduled to start April 26.

As chairman of the New York City committee, he is already devoting a large part of his busy day to mobilizing volunteers from commerce and industry, labor, schools, and churches, and participating officialdom.

"And I really mean it will be a people's movement," continued the dynamic and eager-voiced Skouras, long famous as a humanitarian and once head of Greek War Relief. "The AOA-UNAC campaign will start with a parade of 60,000 school children and 100 bands. We will try to mobilize 50,000 women to go directly to homes so that we can bring food and some clothes and medicines to starving children all over the world."

Seated behind his desk in one of the sumptuous film company offices at 444 West Fifty-sixth Street, Skouras placed a new long cigar in his holder and continued:

"Nearly a quarter of a billion children under the age of 15 are living on the borderline of starvation. That means one child in about every three children alive today. That is terrible, a terrible tragedy."

ALL WORK TOGETHER AS WORLD CITIZENS

The AOA-UNAC drive was organized at the urgent request of our Government and with the active support of the State Department, he said. Twenty-five major voluntary foreign-relief agencies are combining with the UN group to administer the assembled funds. Or, as Skouras expressed it: "We are all working together as world citizens toward a common objective."

Skouras, whose name has figured prominently in drives for the Red Cross, war bonds, American Brotherhood Foundation, United Jewish Appeal, and the National Arthritis Research Foundation, did a herculean job with the Greek War Relief Association, whose head he became on November 8, 1940. In 6 weeks he visited 50 cities, and in the first 3 months raised $4,000,000. By VJ-day his organization had collected over $30,000,000 in money and in kind, and was largely responsible for getting gifts from the Canadian and American Governments worth an additional $100,000,000.

THE BROTHERS SKOURAS FOLLOWED THE ALGER PATTERN

The vigorous Skouras, who manages to combine humanitarism with his own executive job, is nearly always at his desk at 8 a. m. and rarely leaves before 7 p. m. Many evenings he's out making speeches for different causes, and as his home is in Mamaroneck, N. Y., that leaves him little time for recreation or sleep. He keeps fit by playing golf on Sundays, taking steam baths and massages on weekdays and, as he puts it: "I keep busy every day. That makes me feel wonderful."

Spyros Skouras, whose career follows the Horatio Alger pattern, is seldom mentioned without reference to his two brothers, Charles and George, also topmen in the movie industry.

The brothers arrived here from Greece in their teens and settled in St. Louis as bus boys. By saving their hard-earned money, they bought a nickelodeon and called it the Olympia, after Mt. Olympus, near their home town in Greece. With their industry and hard business heads, they were soon owning and operating a spreading chain of theaters. They continued to expand, and today the Skouras chain spreads over the country.

"I owe a great deal to the United States," said 54-year-old Spyros Skouras, who still speaks with a marked accent. "I came here as an immigrant boy, and it gave me everything." He remembers with pride that before he was in this country one week he had already mastered the words of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

He remembers his birthplace, a farm on the shore of the Ionian Sea, where he started life as one of 10 children.

"The farm was near a little village called Skourahorian, and it was named after my grandfather who fought in the revolution of 1821," he said. "My parents' home was open to everybody in need. Especially my mother, and she was a great early influence on me because she was always trying to help people. She was a real one-woman social service bureau."

HIS FIVE CHILDREN BEAR METRICAL CLASSICAL NAMES

Before leaving Greece for the United States he began to study for the priesthood. But when he arrived in St. Louis, economic pressure quickly changed his plans. It was while working as a bus boy during the day that he studied English and business methods at a commercial college; and there he met Saroula Bruiglia, a St. Louis woman of Italian-American parentage who was to become his wife. They have five children, three daughters euphoniously named Daphne, Diana, and Dionysia, and two boys, Spyros Jr. and Plato.

Skouras' hobby, interestingly enough, is the movies.

In his Mamaroneck home the attic has been converted into a miniature theater. Here neighbors are invited, especially youngsters who are grateful to the man they fondly call "Uncle Spyros." He himself will sometimes see a half dozen pictures over a week end.

He is also a first-nighter at the theater; and being an effusive and gregarious personality, he invariably has a group of friends with him. Enjoying the role of host, he also likes to call up a good restaurant and make reservations for 25 or 50. He is something of a gourmet, with a special fondness for Greek cheeses and lamb-and-rice, but his drinking is moderate.

HIS GREATEST HAPPINESS, HE FINDS, IS—PEOPLE

"I love people," he said, his round, smiling face now taking on an effulgency; "they are my greatest happiness."

He has a habit of greeting people by their first names. Very often, with a newcomer, he'll quickly want to know: "By the way, what is your first name?" And this is generally followed by an offer of a big Havana cigar.

Skouras' reading mainly is current fiction; he likes the concerts and opera, and the only indoor card game he cares about is gin rummy. He is a member of the Greek Orthodox Church and is on the board of the New York Greek Cathedral.

Help to Western European Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from Mr. Herman Cone, of Greensboro, N. C.:

CONE MILLS CORP.,
Greensboro, N. C., March 16, 1948.

Congressman CARL T. DURHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CARL: About a year ago I took a trip to Germany at the invitation of Secretary of War Patterson, and spent about 3 weeks over there, together with a group of businessmen who came from all over the United States. We were sent over to make observations and make suggestions to General Clay, and report our findings to Secretary Patterson on our return.

In the short time we spent in Germany we, of course, could not learn all the answers. Personally, I received one very definite impression, and that was that Russia was not interested in seeing western Europe put back on its feet. More than that, it seemed to me that Russia was doing everything it could to throw a monkey wrench in the wheels of progress. I believe my observations were correct, and that subsequent events have confirmed them.

I am far from a war monger, and I am certainly no military expert, but I believe that there are some steps that this country should take immediately in order to guarantee our survival.

It seems to me that we should encourage the western Europe alliance. If this alliance is to grow into strength and become what Bevin calls the Western Union, we must give its founders and Russia conviction that we will attack and defeat Russia if she attacks them, whether across their borders or by the now-familiar underground route, and we must help our friends to the conviction that they will not starve nor be denied assistance to regain the productivity essential to military strength.

Nothing will give them and Russia these convictions short of all the following things.

Prompt consummation of a treaty of mutual defense between the United States and the western Europe alliance.

Prompt adoption and revelation of a military program which rapidly will make us and our friends strong enough to defeat Russia if we have to. My presumption is that we must keep a highly specialized striking force on a war footing—air, sea, and ground; that we must manufacture air and other matériel (for ourselves and our friends) in ever-increasing effectiveness and in great volume; that we must prepare air and marine bases at the best striking points for a war against Russia; that we must do many other necessary things to make our striking force great and quickly available; and that we must appropriate the funds that these things will require.

I don't presume to know how we should go about helping our friends to increase their striking force and defensive force; but I am convinced we must do it. Among them, I include the Japanese and south Koreans, who I believe are natural allies for action against the Russians in the Far East, and whose countries would afford striking bases for such action.

Declaration of policy by the United States and the Western Europe Alliance as follows: The United States and the Alliance will not permit the invasion of any democratic country in Europe nor the substitution of non-democratic government for democratic government in any country of Europe. I believe this policy in due course should be extended to (a) restoration of the right of the peoples of the Balkans, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland to choose their own forms of government and (b) eviction of the Russians from Germany, Austria, Manchuria, and Korea—to be discussed and declared after the strength of the United States and its friends becomes clearly preponderant. Free access of our European friends to the productions of these countries is essential to the nutrition and productivity of western Europe.

Immediate economic help to western Europe in large volume to be continued until she can get on her feet economically and militarily. Without this, the other steps will be futile—Italy will fall, and then the rest of Europe step by step—and our enemy will stretch from Bering Straits to Lisbon—and probably to the Indian Ocean and Mid-Africa. In that way, we will fight Russia whether we want to or not; for she will feel that she can whip us. Without prompt economic help, there is the serious danger that Italy will fall next month—out of despair of food and of any salvation—and the fall of Italy will set up the fall of France.

These statements are dogmatic and call for checking. In checking them, bear in mind that Europe has lived for a year in hopes of the Marshall plan and of American support against Russia. If these hopes be removed, it seems to me that shock and despair will destroy the will to resist.

The instrument for economic help is the Vandenberg bill. Before Czechoslovakia, there were many who honestly doubted the wisdom of the bill, or thought it went too far, or doubted its urgency. With the Czech coup d'etat behind us and the crucial Italian election just ahead of us, many must be reviewing their erstwhile doubts. But now no one can doubt the urgency of the decision. Either we act now, or time runs out, and the power of decision passes from our hands.

Still there are many who object to this or that feature of the bill and think they could improve on certain passages of it. Which is more important, action in time or prompt improvement of a section of the bill that some of us do not like in its present form? or complete and time-consuming rewriting, for some of us who would prefer a different approach, although with like ultimate effect? It seems to me that urgency is the more important, particularly considering that the remedy of amendment will still be there, after the enactment.

If our objection is to the amount, I believe the stream we cross is a Rubicon. For, although the bill promises nothing beyond 12 months, it seems to me it is implicit that we would not commence the program, nor ask the 16 nations to risk Russia's ire by accepting it, unless we intend to go through with the full 4 years. So, if we take the first step, I think we must be reconciled to putting up the full 17 billion, provided our friends play their part in accordance with the rule and spirit of the joint enterprise—except that it may be pared down if prices decline or if European production increases faster than the experts predicted.

I think some repayment is to be expected, for some of the operations financed will be exchange-producing operations (such as manufacture of cotton and wool into textiles for re-export), and some of the 16 nations should pull their current operating balances out of the red. But I try not to stress this in my own mind; because there are so many unpredictables.

I put greater stress on the argument that the costs of this program will be much less than the increase in military expenditures that would result from the omission of this program.

We must study out and resolutely adopt, with no waste of time, policies toward the Far East that will strengthen us there and strengthen our friends there.

Unfortunately the problems there have been handled so secretively that the American people and Congress do not have the elements for a decision.

I think our insistence must be on prompt and thorough study of the facts and frank disclosure of them and an early decision. But we must recognize that this regrettably will take some time; and so I think we must insist that our actions in respect of Europe, and particularly the Vandenberg bill, be taken forthwith, without awaiting the decisions in respect of the Far East.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

HERMAN CONE.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of March 18, 1948:

IS THIS A "RUBBER-STAMP" CONGRESS?

President Truman has asked Congress to extend again for another 3 years the fraudulent and injurious Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which was concocted by the socialistic New Deal in 1934 and which, unless Congress servilely interferes, will expire on June 12 of this year.

This being a Republican Congress, and the Republican Party having been since its inception the advocate of the protective tariff system, the traditional guardian of American free enterprise, and in many respects the promoter of our industrial progress, it is hardly conceivable—especially in a Presidential election year—that Congress will again abdicate its constitutional powers and duties and continue to serve abjectly as a mere tool of Executive dictatorship.

For such has been the history and the practice under the New Deal's tariff procedures.

The original trade-agreements law was sponsored by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a Democratic devotee of the obsolete British free-trade theories which Great Britain itself had abandoned when the doctrinaire Mr. Hull imported them—duty free—into his own country.

The act, as drafted by the New Deal bureaucracy, and approved by the original rubber-stamp Congress, violates the Constitution in two respects.

It authorizes the executive branch of the Government to reduce, but not to increase,

tariffs by 50 percent by negotiation with foreign countries, so that successive reductions may whittle an import duty away entirely.

A tariff schedule is a revenue measure, and the Constitution requires that all revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives.

By accepting the act in 1934, the lower House of Congress lawlessly abdicated one of its most important duties.

The act also provides that trade agreements negotiated by the Executive shall become effective when merely signed by the President, hence no review or veto can be exercised.

Yet these agreements are treaties by their very nature, and the Constitution commands that all treaties be submitted to the Senate and be ratified by the upper House of Congress.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was thus a nullification of representative government and an unmistakable step toward totalitarian government by Executive order.

On constitutional grounds, therefore, it is the duty of Congress to permit the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to die a natural death, just as it will be political wisdom and political honesty for the Republican Party to reestablish its sound historical position in our domestic economy.

Furthermore, every segment of our economy, and every section of the country, is vitally affected by this question.

The tariff system has already been arbitrarily riddled by the New Deal.

Small manufacturers in every field, and agriculture in every aspect, have had their protection bartered away without fair hearings, without any real or adequate consideration of their needs, and without any appeal to any tribunal of justice.

They have suffered.

The abnormal displacements and disturbances of world war have deferred the full consequences of the New Deal's planned economy—but it would be utter folly to assume that this kind of protection is any substitute for national policy.

As one of its major efforts in post-war reconstruction the Republican Party should restore the protective tariff system and give our farmers, our small producers and especially our highly paid labor the rights and benefits of law—and lawfulness.

How to Sovietize a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News and World Report for March 26, 1948:

HOW A NATION IS SOVIETIZED

(Reported from Prague)

Communist technique for taking over is getting a new test. Action committees, built into all organizations, do the job. They're tight little groups of tested Communists. Private employers lose out, workers take over when signal is given. Then comes the purge to nail down the change. A modern nation can be taken over in 15 days.

How it feels to be taken over by the Communists is graphically illustrated by events in Czechoslovakia. In 15 crucial days, a nation that offered the individual freedoms that go along with democracy was turned into a smoothly operating Communist dictatorship.

A day-to-day account shows how it was done, who got hurt, who came to power. The account is based upon actual reports from Prague. It offers a vivid, if only partial, story of Communist methods, Communist objectives.

The story really starts in the months of careful Communist preparation. Action committees—membership secret—of trusted Communists have been built into all organizations from factories to orchestras. It is around these committees that the revolution turns in its initial stages. As President Eduard Benes agrees to appoint a Cabinet dominated by Communists, the signal for action is given from Communist headquarters.

First day: Action committees move quickly to take over. In a shoe factory, for example, 24 executives are locked out. Workers become bosses. It is the same in factory after factory. The head waiter in one hotel is the manager next day. In another hotel, the porter is manager. Business is topsy-turvy.

Police already are controlled by Communists. Courts now are taken over by Communists moving into the Ministry of Justice. A purge of the civil service begins immediately. Radio, already Government controlled, is devoted to Communist propaganda.

Second day: Arrest of opposition leaders begins. Rejoicing is ordered by the Minister of the Interior, with flags to be flown and pictures of Russia's Premier Stalin to be displayed in public places. There is absolute censorship of all newspapers. Opposition newspapers are taken over by action committtees and turned into Communist publications. Private employers continue to be "bounced" from their positions by action committees made up of their employees. The Communists begin lining up a National Front in Parliament to push through any new laws that the Government requests.

Third day: The new Cabinet is sworn in. Arrests and purges continue, especially in Slovakia, where anti-Communist strength is greatest. The Government warns that all persons in Slovakia who have spoken publicly against the state will be prosecuted.

Sovietizing of education begins. Wholesale firing of non-Communist teachers is ordered. Fifty professors are fired from Prague University. Special textbooks are planned. Communist indoctrination is to be taught in all grades. Pictures of Premier Stalin must hang in all schoolrooms.

The Minister of Justice announces a sweeping reform of the judicial system. Many judges are fired. Communists are appointed in their place.

Fourth day: A committee is formed to purge all political parties of reactionaries. Forced labor is decreed for those dismissed from their jobs for political reasons. Purge victims are to be assigned to labor battalions in mines, lumber camps and on farms and construction projects.

The journalistic purge is intensified. Twenty-seven foreign correspondents are banned from Czechoslovakia.

Fifth day: The Government reveals that action committees have unofficially nationalized nearly 1,500 enterprises, although a nationalization bill hasn't even been drafted.

The first treason trial is announced. Dr. Joseph Lettrich, former chairman of the Slovak Democratic Party, is to be tried for high treason.

Sixth day: Central control of all action committees by radio edict begins. Plans to postpone elections until late summer or early autumn are announced.

Seventh day: For the first time the Government defines the authority of the action committees. They are supreme organs on cultural and political matters. Their chief function is to cleanse all the opposition parties.

Sentences of all persons tried for wartime collaboration with the Germans will be reviewed. Those who were acquitted will be tried again.

Eighth day: The legal purge gains momentum. One district action committee suspends all lawyers who defended alleged collaborators and black marketeers in the people's courts set up in 1945.

Total of 82 newspapermen have been expelled from the Journalists Union. That means they are banned from the profession.

Ninth day: Communists get definite control of parliament by lining up 220 of 300 deputies on their side. The Socialist Party expels its secretary-general.

Thirty-one professors are dismissed from Charles University. All schools are ordered to hold Soviet-Czech friendship celebrations.

Tenth day: Nationalization plans are revealed. All wholesale and foreign trade is to be taken over by the Government. Retail firms employing more than 50 persons also are to be nationalized. Only the smaller companies are to be left in private hands.

A purge of the armed forces is begun, under the personal direction of the Communist Party's secretary-general, Rudolph Slansky.

Ten Social Democrats are expelled from parliament.

Lawyers are required to pledge loyalty to the new regime within 1 week or be excluded from the practice of law.

Eleventh day: The Government seals the Czechoslovakian borders, warns that any attempt to leave the country without permission will be considered a crime.

The Czechoslovakian Medical Association is dissolved. All doctors will be required to join the Communist-controlled Confederation of Labor.

Twelfth day: A Communist Party membership drive begins. Party members are to visit all non-Communist citizens during this week and report daily on the members gained.

Thirteenth day: The Social Democratic Party says it will hold a new convention soon to "undo mistakes" made at the November convention. A new executive committee will be chosen, a new program drafted.

Anti-Communist writers and poets are expelled from the Syndicate of Authors.

Fourteenth day: Parliament convenes for the first time since the coup. Only about half the opposition shows up.

Fifteenth day: A cowed parliament rubber-stamps the government's program, including nationalization of most industry, lower taxes for small shopkeepers and peasants, insurance for all, credit for farmers, and land reform.

The government announces that the chairman of the National Socialist Party has committed suicide in prison, after having confessed to espionage and implicating several others.

All that remains to be done now is a mopping-up operation to wipe out the last remnants of opposition. A top Communist official promises full extermination of all enemies of the regime.

Sequel to the story already is unfolding. The political phase in Czechoslovakia is almost over. The economic phase now begins.

The Communist plan is to make Czechoslovakia an arsenal of heavy industry for Russia and her satellites. Heretofore, most of the country's trade has been with the West. Now that is to be changed.

Production of heavy machinery, needed by the Russian bloc, is scheduled to be tripled. But the output of textiles, ceramics, glassware—the big items in trade with the west—is to be deliberately cut back. The change over will be gradual. It will take several years. But, when it is completed, Czechoslovakia's valuable industries and skills, the best in eastern Europe, will be 100 percent harnessed to Russia and her satellites.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has just been brought to my attention by my good friend, Millard W. Rice, National Director of Public Relations and Employment for the Disabled American Veterans, that his organization, through its some 1,450 chapters throughout the United States, as revealed in the columns of the DAV semimonthly newspaper, recently conducted a nation-wide survey, the results of which were of such intense interest to me that I want to bring them to the attention of the Members of the Congress and all of my constituents.

The survey was made in a most impartial manner by the chapter officials, who were instructed not to identify themselves, and the questionnaires did not in any way identify the DAV. Both relatives and non-relatives were questioned, and this brought another important revelation.

It is important to note that nonrelatives feel as strongly as relatives on the subject of greater benefits for war-disabled veterans and their dependents.

The first question was, "Do you think the Government is doing too much for veterans generally?" Eighty-three percent of the relatives replied that they did not think so, and 77 percent of the nonrelatives did not think so, either.

Ninety-two percent of the relatives and 84 percent of the nonrelatives were of the opinion that more should be done for the disabled veteran.

To the next question, "Should a disabled veteran be given special consideration in employment?" 99 percent of the relatives and 90 percent of the nonrelatives think so.

"What veterans' organization is devoted exclusively to the interests of the disabled veteran?" was the next question. Seventy-two percent of the relatives and 53 percent of the nonrelatives named the DAV.

Less than 50 percent of both relatives and nonrelatives were aware of the benefits this Nation provides for its disabled veterans. Only 45 percent of all those questioned thought the disabled veteran was successfully rehabilitated and readjusted. Ten percent of the relatives and 22 percent of the nonrelatives thought disabled war veterans receive benefits from the Government automatically, which is of course not true.

A large majority of those questioned strongly favored a program of dependency allowances for the family of the disabled veteran.

All of us are concerned about the high cost of living, but rising food and living costs hurt one group of people much more than others—that group is our disabled veterans. The veteran's welfare, and the welfare of his family, is actually being jeopardized by runaway prices. The disabled veteran and his family who rely to a great extent on fixed Government income are being forced to reduce greatly their standard of living, which at best is none too good.

Food prices, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, increased in 56 large cities by 3.6 percent on the average between mid-November 1947 and mid-January 1948, bringing the retail food price index up to 209.7 percent of the 1935–39 average, 45 percent higher than in June 1946.

While it is true we increased compensation and pension rates in 1946 by 20 percent, food costs have risen more than 97 percent since 1941 and the over-all cost of living has risen more than 64 percent. It is estimated that an average family of four should have an income of $3,458 annually to maintain a decent existence standard in Washington, D. C. The present annual income of the totally disabled veteran is but $1,656.

It is ironical that the only group of American citizens that is not encouraged to get married and have children is that composed of those who sacrificed parts of their bodies or their health in the armed forces of our country in time of war.

I am informed that DAV National Service Officers on duty at the various Regional Offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country are being flooded with requests from disabled veterans to reopen their case files, in the hope that they may get increased compensation from the Government. The 100 percent disabled veteran draws $138 per month. It is estimated that 75 percent of the disabled veterans of World War I and 50 percent of the disabled veterans of World War II have dependents. The latter group is constantly increasing because these young veterans are getting married at a rapid rate and, of course, are raising families. What normal American family today can live on that kind of income?

Disabled veterans whose incomes are static can meet these increasing living prices only by dipping into previous savings or by purchasing and consuming less good, or less expensive, food. Increasing food prices almost inevitably result in decreasing standards of living for disabled veterans whose incomes are derived exclusively or primarily from disability compensation payments.

Allowances were granted to the dependents of a man in uniform by the government. The wife and four children of a man in uniform drew $140, while the soldier—assuming he was a private—was drawing $28—or a net income to this family of $168 per month. This same veteran returns to his family totally disabled and now receives $138 per month!

Congress has recognized these increasing living costs by providing increased subsistence allowances for trainees, with extra increases for those who have dependents, under the provisions of Public Laws 16 and 346.

Allowances were provided for the the dependents of nonveterans under the Social Security Act in 1935, as well as under the Railroad Retirement Act, and very recently under the new Civil Service Retirement Act amendments, for the dependents of deceased Federal employees.

Inconsistently and inequitably, Congress has continued to fail to recognize the need for allowances for the dependents of compensated disabled veterans, certainly much more essential and justifiable.

House bill No. 2716, now pending in the Eightieth Congress, would provide dependency allowances for the disabled veteran and his dependents, and would do much to ease the plight in which they find themselves because of present conditions. Under the provisions of this bill a totally disabled veteran would be granted an allowance of $30 per month if he has a wife; for a wife and one child, $50; for a wife and two children, $65, plus $15 for each additional child. These amounts would be prorated for the partially disabled in the same ratio which the degree of the veteran's service-connected disability bears to total disability.

Because he cannot work, a totally disabled veteran must depend entirely on his compensation from the Government. Those who are partially disabled can count on only limited income from employment.

The DAV's request for legislative help for disabled veterans is a modest one. It will take only a little time and effort on the part of those interested in this problem to make possible a better life for those who gave so much.

It was sometime after the First World War before Congress gave much consideration to the matter of granting assistance to the dependents of veterans.

I introduced the first bill in Congress that would provide a pension to a World War widow who had children. This was early in 1931. My bill provided that a World War widow with one child should be entitled to a pension of $30 per month and $6 for each additional child. While my bill was not passed, the fairness of its principles were recognized and approved by veterans organizations and soon thereafter, a bill embodying the principles of my bill became a law. By reason of this legislation, dependent widows of nearly all World War veterans and their children are today receiving pensions as dependents of one who fought for his country.

The bill that I am seeking to discuss in this address is set up on somewhat the same principle. It was Lincoln who said in effect that we must assist him who bore the brunt of the battle in the heat of the day and his widow and orphans.

During the 24 years that I have been serving in the Congress it has been my earnest desire to cooperate with all of the congressionally chartered veteran organizations to secure the passage of equitable, beneficial legislation for veterans and their dependents.

For many years I have observed the fine work that has been carried on by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans. More recently I note, with added pleasure, the splendid efforts of the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS) in behalf of the large group of veterans of that conflict.

All of these congressionally chartered veteran organizations are doing a splendid job to promote the welfare of all veterans and their dependents. Outstanding contributions are being made by each of them to promote better citizenship not only among our veteran population, but the country as a whole. Their child-welfare programs are well worth while—and the promotion of sports activities and a proper conception of good citizenship among our youth is surely praiseworthy.

The record already made by these veteran organizations warrants the support of every good citizen. Surely every eligible veteran owes it to himself and to his family to become active in one or more of these outfits.

We must not forget those who gave a part of their bodies or their health as a result of their service in our country's wars. Adequate provisions and opportunities should by all means be provided for the disabled veterans and they must not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes—as an assurance that America's young men will, in the future, be ever ready to come to the defense of our freedom-loving country.

Crisis in Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial that appeared in the Indianapolis Star, issue of March 18, 1948:

CRISIS IN LEADERSHIP

President Truman correctly stated that "we have reached a point at which the position of the United States should be made unmistakably clear." But beyond the fact that for the first time he publicly named Soviet Russia as a threat to world liberty, he added nothing new to tell Russia, western Europe, or the people of the United States just what our position is.

Shall we fight to stop aggression? Where shall we draw the line with Russia? How shall we back up Mr. Truman's tough words with force? The President did not say.

Mr. Truman asks passage of the European recovery program. That is assured anyway. He asks for universal military training. That program is useless if the crisis is now, it is no good at any time anyway. And the revival of the draft is both untimely and unnecessary now.

To build our military strength quickly we should do something Mr. Truman never even mentioned; create the most powerful air force in the world. That is the quickest, cheapest, and most effective way to show Soviet Russia that we have the will and the power to meet any threat on a moment's notice with paralyzing power. If we are going to spend $2,000,000,000 more for military strength it would be better to spend it all on the air forces than to spend a penny of it on universal military training.

UMT as outlined by the Army's own program is nothing but a gigantic boondoggle, a glorified CCC camp. Its graduates would still have to be drafted and retrained. And it would not get into operation for a long time anyway. As for the revival of the draft, that would dislocate the lives of thousands of Americans without adding any immediate power to our Army. The armed services can fill their ranks with volunteer professional soldiers by providing more realistic training, less "chicken" and greater opportunity for advancement.

Nor did Mr. Truman do anything but pay lip service to the "powerful forces for freedom, justice, and peace represented by the United Nations." Here was his chance to demand the elimination of the veto power and the arming of the UN with military force. But he apparently believes that the UN is through and beyond repair and wants the United States to go it alone in protecting the world. He is content to stick to old-fashioned power politics.

The great crisis for America is not only the crisis in western Europe. It is the crisis of our own leadership. Mr. Truman just does not have the answers. He has outlined a dangerous situation and failed to present bold, imaginative and workable measures to combat it. Congress will have to do it for him.

Preserving Nation's Shrines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. McGARVEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Enquirer:

PRESERVING NATION'S SHRINES

The tour of 14 Congressmen through historical landmarks in the midcity area raises hopes that there may be action in this session of Congress to establish a national shrine, as part of the national park system.

Philadelphians have every right to be proud that this section of the city maintains such monuments of the Nation's birth and development as Independence Hall, Congress Hall, the American Philosophical Society and Carpenter's Hall. No other city has so many sites of comparable significance in our early history.

Other spots have been allowed to reach a deplorable condition, and some of the blame for this must be borne by Philadelphians of this and preceding generations. Because of negligence, the house where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence and the home of Benjamin Franklin have been torn down.

But the entire area where great men labored to draw up a charter for lasting political liberty belongs not only to Philadelphia but to the entire Nation. In fact, as one visiting Congressman indicated, it may well belong to the whole freedom-loving world.

It seems fitting that the Federal Government should take over the job of maintaining and preserving these shrines. Philadelphia, and the country, would gain by such a move.

Play-by-Play Account of American Failures in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the first detailed recital I have seen of the astounding story of how the United States has in one decade all but thrown away the enormous strength and good will accumulated during the previous 100 years of wise and sound handling of American relations with Asia.

Apparently few in our Government seemed even to realize what they were doing when they played fast and loose with the foundation stone of our Pacific policy—maintaining an independent and strong China, friendly to the United States. We long ago reached the place where heroic efforts, at great cost to ourselves, must be made to retrieve, if possible, the ground lost.

In the immediate future, China's fate depends on what the United States does or fails to do. In the long run, our own fate in no small degree will depend upon what happens in China—whether the Chinese are to stay free and on our side, or will be forced in despair into the Soviet camp.

The article is reprinted from Fortune magazine for February 1948:

THE TYRANNOUS DECADE—HOW 10 YEARS OF AMERICAN-CHINESE HISTORY BECAME MORE POWERFUL THAN THE MEN WHO MADE IT

(By Herrymon Maurer)

In all the noisy public debate about China, one fact has gone unnoticed: for a hundred years the United States was interested not just in the side-show survival of an ancient race but in the peaceful night's sleep of generations of Americans. It was only simple prudence to keep this Asiatic archstone out of foreign hands, whether the country was run by a collection of scholars, an empress dowager, a bunch of war lords, or a party of would-be democrats. This policy of the Open Door—the only long-term foreign policy besides the Monroe Doctrine the United States ever had—was cut to pieces in just 10 years, a decade of tyrannous history that has molded United States-Chinese dealings into a now set pattern.

How did it come to pass that an American Secretary of State, pleading for an anti-Communist program in Europe, could, as he did, balk at taking money that Congress actually wanted to give him to fight communism in China? The explanation is the 10-year history itself; its grip held fast. This article is an attempt to condense it into something like a newsreel of a decade of United States-Chinese fiasco Let the film be re-run quickly, beginning with a sequence dated December 1937.

DECEMBER 1937: PRELUDE

Ten years ago, when the Japanese were in the first small phase of their big scheme of conquest, they were tormented by worry over how far the United States would let them go. They knew the gossip of United States "China hands": that the China war and the

China Government would fold by the next spring. But they remembered the knuckle drubbing, sharp although ineffective, that Henry L. Stimson had given them when they took over Manchuria in 1931.

The Japanese took pains to find out how far they could go. First, they demanded of the American Embassy in Nanking that the U. S. gunboat *Panay* be moved to a chosen spot to avoid possible accidents. Next, they followed the course of the vessel to its new anchorage, identified it from a patrol boat after it had been moored. Then, they attacked it from the air and sank it, together with two Standard Vacuum ships.

The Japanese found out what they wanted: the Americans did not intend to do anything about the war. Cordell Hull warmly advised the United States public to keep its shirt on—it had shown small disposition to take it off—accepted promptly Japanese regrets, and let 3 months pass before sending in the bill for damages. His concerns were the concerns of most Americans—how to keep everything American far, far out of war's way. The State Department carefully instructed its consular and embassy personnel to run away from hostilities; evacuate whenever necessary, and don't let Americans join up with either side. Claire Chennault, new air adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, was advised to get out of China and threatened with legal action if he did not. Such enthusiastic neutrality was highly encouraging to Japan.

This anxious unconcern set the pattern for the decade that followed. China was given little thought. The policy carefully built up by John Hay, Charles Evans Hughes, and Henry L. Stimson was quietly pushed aside at the first sign of its costing the United States so much as an uncomfortable night's sleep.

SUMMER, 1940: EMOTIONAL ALLIANCE

Americans, of course, were warmly attached to China; the attachment was highly emotional. China was the brave, little Belgium of World War II. It had unflinching Chiang Kai-shek, glamorous Mme. Chiang. It was to be lauded in the press, aided by way of China relief dinners, and prayed for in church. There was no question that China was angelic (even Communist sympathizers, bemused by a united front, wrote rhapsodically about the Central Government); no question that Japan was diabolic. To be on the side of the angels without paying the costs of admission, the State Department fabricated a new and original policy, expressed by the term moral aid. That this produced nothing more than protests over the bombing of United States property and occasional protests over bombing of open cities, did not yet discourage the Chinese, who took it as a harbinger of aid to come.

In the summer of 1940, China hit her first great crisis. The high enthusiasm of the early years was dwindling, and the nation's energies were beginning to concentrate on simple survival. The Japanese seized on the fall of France as a chance to start wangling their way into northern Indochina and on the battle for Britain as a chance to blackmail Churchill into closing the Burma Road. China was isolated. While Americans cheered Chinese resistance, Chinese officials calculated desperately the chances of their country's survival, and whispered to each other their fears that an armistice might be necessary. But Chiang refused to waver. He would stake everything on the United States.

United States diplomacy in those days still had some traditional content. Ambassador Nelson T. Johnson sat with Chiang in the Generalissimo's house while bombs fell about them into Chungking. He brought promises of all aid short of war. Chiang made no demands, showed no disappointment. Johnson, amiable, scholarly, reticent about another country's business, discussed China no more with Chiang than Chiang discussed the United States with him. There was a sense of common aim and danger.

A little aid had already begun to arrive. Washington reacted emotionally to the puppet government of Wang Ching-wei in March 1940 and made Chungking a semipolitical loan of $20,000,000,000. When Japan occupied northern Indochina in September there was a remembrance of $25,000,000,000. In October, Churchill reopened the Burma Road. Early in 1941 there were enthusiastic special envoys: James Roosevelt, Daniel Arnstein for the Burma Road, Owen Lattimore for advice to Chiang. Lauchlin Currie for advice to Roosevelt. In March there was the promise of lend-lease to China.

There followed great days of promise, hope, and excitement. Claire Chennault had rushed back to the United States to get planes and men for his volunteer Flying Tigers. He talked a hundred P–40's out of an old friend who was vice president at Curtiss-Wright, persuaded Roosevelt to direct the services to release reserve flyers, and enlisted ground personnel, picked nearly 300 men, and worked out a deal with William Pawley whereby the $400,000 proceeds of his suit for commissions on Curtiss-Wright sales in the Far East were used to set up an assembly plant at Rangoon.

During the same spring, 1941, T. V. Soong, with the help of Thomas G. Corcoran, set up a corporation, China Defense Supplies, Inc., to handle lend-lease. Relations with Lauchlin Currie, on whom Harry Hopkins had placed the China end of lend-lease, were cordial. Currie made midnight calls to get munitions purchased in Canada past the United States border, and William S. Youngman, Jr., and Whiting Willauer began a 4-year search for material. China Defense Supplies went after spare parts for the Flying Tigers, a railroad to parallel the Burma Road, rushed 500 British trucks and a shipment of Canadian Bren guns out of the country before ships could be preempted for other areas.

In Manila, Joseph Alsop, who had resigned from the Navy to join Chennault, talked three tons of spare P–40 parts out of General MacArthur, and PBY transportation for them out of Admiral Hart. In Washington an embargo was put on steel and oil for Japan in the summer of 1941 and Japanese assets were frozen. The American-British-Chinese-Dutch alliance stiffened throughout the entire Pacific, Japan would either have to fight, give in, or slowly starve.

Thereupon the Japanese Army moved into southern Indochina, the first clear threat to countries other than China. Conversations began with the Japanese in Washington; Nomura and Kurusu suggested that the Japanese Army would move back into northern Indochina if the freeze and the embargo were lifted. It became clear that only United States acquiescence in Japan's plan of conquest would remove the danger of war, and that acquiescence would break the loose A-B-C-D alliance. T. V. Soong darted in and out of the White House, Hu Shih talked hard with the President and gave him a formal letter from Chiang, saying in substance that China could survive no more concessions to Japan. On November 26, Secretary Hull handed the Japanese envoys the United States decision: a general settlement only if Japan withdrew from China and Indochina and recognized the Chiang government. Eleven days later Japan attacked the United States. (It was not known until after the war that the Japanese would have attacked even if the United States had been willing to make concessions. Captured documents indicate that the Japanese wanted either war or complete appeasement.)

War came in. The United States and the Chinese Government became allies, but the United States soon began to dislike the Government as emotionally as it once used to applaud it. What provoked this shift? How could a national attitude swing 180 degrees? Essentially, it was a headlong collision of two cultures, shown on the one hand by a division of military counsel and on the other by a cooling off of diplomatic relations.

DECEMBER 1941: UNEASY ALLIANCE

For a moment at the beginning of the collision, December 7, 1941, Chungking took heart that it was no longer alone. The moment was brief. The immediate consequence of war was a calling in of all war supplies en route to China. Within a few months Burma fell, cutting off supplies altogether, save those that could be flown over the Burma Hump. To fly supplies in, even in the fractional quantities needed to keep China going, required more thought and effort than the United States was willing to devote in the face of the competition for supplies between the United States, British, the Russian Armies. T. V. Soong begged Roosevelt for 100 cargo planes, which would have duplicated Burma Road tonnages. He won his point, over the objection of Gen. H. H. Arnold, but he lost most of his planes through a last-minute diversion to Alaska. Navy Secretary Frank Knox put the United States preoccupation into a slogan: "Hitler first." All the Chinese could do was wait.

The wait was long. A part of what was decided at the Casablanca conference, January 1943, was disclosed to Chiang—little aid for China—and he indicated that 6 years was a long time and that he could not hold out much longer. He wanted more air supply, along with an amphibious assault to clear Burma and open the road. In May came the conference on strategy. Foreign Minister T. V. Sobng said that China couldn't hold out. No change in plan. In August it was the first Quebec conference. T. V. Soong spoke again. No change: the British wanted no diversion of matériel from the western Mediterranean. In November it was the Cairo conference, at which Chiang himself was present. President Roosevelt was in excellent warm humor. There was no difficulty over formal United States support for the return of Manchuria to China. Not at all. Roosevelt even assured Chiang that he would support China's sovereignty over Hong Kong. (Prime Minister Churchill took issue with this benevolent disposition of other persons' property. The President jocularly suggested that he would take it up with the King. The Prime Minister observed firmly that the King cannot give away the King's property.) Chiang left Cairo believing that at long last the amphibious attack on Burma was at hand. No. Shortly thereafter the landing craft assembled in India were shunted off to the Mediterranean theater.

Meanwhile supplies were coming by air into China in insufficient quantity to meet the plans of any single commander. In 1943 began a three-way competition that put further strain on the relations of Americans and Chinese. Early in 1942, Joseph Stilwell had been appointed Chief of Staff to Chiang Kai-shek at Chiang's own request—a position in which he gave counsel, took charge of lend-lease, but could not order around the Chinese armies. Claire Chennault had been made Commanding General of the Fourteenth Air Force, successor to his Flying Tigers. Chennault was attacking Japanese coast and river shipping, supply centers, and troop concentrations, Stilwell, whom the Japanese had chased out of Burma in 1942, was training Chinese troops and hoping to drive a road back into China. He believed that Chennault had spent tremendous amounts of Hump tonnage recklessly stretching his forward air bases into east China. Chennault believed Stilwell was playing politics at the expense of the Chinese Army, which the air bases were supporting, and that he was wasting effort in

northern Burma. For their part the Chinese supported Chennault, and called out, besides, for supplies and transport for their own troops, rotting all along the front.

In this situation a new factor appeared in the late spring of 1944: A group of B-29 bombers, which began eating up tremendous weights of bombs, gasoline, and spare parts. Competition intensified again. Chennault warned that he was short of bombs and ammunition in the face of probable Japanese attack through East China. Stilwell did not believe such an attack would develop, and the two men were at bitter odds when the fateful summer of 1944 arrived. The Chinese were unhappy, particularly with Stilwell's control of lend-lease. Britain and Russia, they said, handle their own supplies; why can't we?

The upshot of 2½ years of alliance was a confusion of command and very little aid to the Chinese Army itself.

While military relations were souring, so were diplomatic. The Chinese were dismayed by the collapse of the prestige of western arms. Westerners were edgy; they found it difficult to admit that their own unpreparedness in Asia was the cause of Japan's military success; they began to insist that the Japanese had not been fighting in China during the last 4 years but merely preparing; and the warm will of earlier days turned cold. A Chinese military mission took up residence in Washington; no one came to visit it. Brig. Gen. John Magruder, head of the first United States military mission in China, returned from Chungking to speak disparagingly of Chinese military organizations. When Chiang offered to send extra divisions into Burma, London turned him down. The State Department proposed that Americans act as paymasters for the Chinese Army in administering a $500,000,000 loan granted in 1942.

Not for the Chinese any longer the sop of good publicity. The strain of war had increased corruption in China and weakened reform, and it was less easy to sing a song of 1940. There were no longer any great air raids to catch attention. Furthermore, the Communist Party line on China had changed—Russia's interest in keeping Japan busy with China disappeared when the United States came into the war—and changed with it were the reports of prominent journalist sympathizers. As life in China became grayer and as prices went higher, Americans began talking about graft and disunity, and speculating over the dark danger of Chinese imperialism after the war. They talked more feverishly about what they thought the Chinese thought.

There was one great moral gesture, the announcement of the ending of extraterritoriality, to which Chinese reaction was immediate. The news reached Chungking on October 10, 1942, when the city had put on its best clothes and decked its streets with lanterns and green branches in honor of Chinese Independence Day. A crowd of 80,000 had gathered in the center of the city. Suddenly and unexpectedly Chiang Kai-shek appeared and, smiling, read the announcement. Great cheers came from the crowd; someone in the street proposed a resolution of thanks to the United States; it was greeted by another wave of cheers; and the motion was carried.

Wendell Willkie, who had been in Chungking that month, reported that there was in China a great reservoir of admiration and affection for the United States, but that the reservoir was leaking fast. He said that the United States had talked about production, but that some of the Allies had seen very few American arms.

The reservoir leaked fast. The trouble was too few supplies, but it was also too many advisers. The United States Government blithely decided that all 4,000-year-old China needed was an army of United States experts to put everything right: if you didn't know where to send a man, you sent him to China to make a survey. President Roosevelt looked at China—he knew all about it from his grandfather—and became jaunty because it was so easy to fix the country up. The Burma Road became a place where a modern-day missionary met all his friends. Sometimes the men were any rate but first, but they produced the biggest-scale intercultural contact in Chinese history.

Such an invasion was something new to United States policy in China, once based on the idea that proper international action (somewhat like pioneer life in the United States) calls for aid if a friend's house is burning, or if his larder is bare, but for no discussion of the deficiencies of his personal life. The new policy put very little aid in the hands of the Chinese but handed them a large quantity of advice. (A great mistake: playing with the internal affairs of foreign countries requires a willingness to spend money and, if necessary, lives, without quarreling over costs.) Too polite for their own good, many Chinese did not object. But inevitably friction increased.

For one thing, the adivce was not well followed. Ideas were conceived in English; attempts to execute them were made in Chinese. Chinese culture, slow-moving for centuries, could not speed up its powers of adaptation. Nothing in China changed so much as the new advisers thought it should, and the advisers became critical. They found much in China to criticize. There were poverty and hardship, diseased bodies, night soil. Most farmers were illiterate; they were probably superstitious; they had no movies or radios and lived in flimsy houses with earthen floors. The American, not in anger but in sympathy, transferred to the Chinese all his own notions of good main-street life. Something must be wrong, the Americans concluded, with a government that could let its people live like that.

One look at the government disclosed still more to criticize: little democracy and something not a little like dictatorship. The sole legal party, the Kuomintang, had lost most of its enthusiasm for reform. The government was the same government, lauded as late as 1941, but it was now preoccupied with such basic questions as the problem of the survival of armies in the face of an enemy, and the problem of its own survival, exposed to the maneuvers of semiautonomous generals and provincial groups and already so bankrupted by war that it could finance its armies only by printing money. It was worried over the Communists in the North, who had split the liberal movement in 1922 and the Kuomintang in 1927, who had ceased spending their major effort against the Japanese, and who now seemed intent on splitting the whole of China.

A series of conclusions began to form in the minds of many Americans—journalists, officers, and embassy men: namely, that a plot against the people existed on the part of the Chinese Government, which was hopelessly corrupt, not fighting the war, and not interested in fighting it. The Americans believed the government was interested only in keeping power, in garnering strength against the Communists and blockading them. The Americans noted that the Communists, on the other hand, talked for the people and against the landlords, and failed to note that the cry of landlordism is a Communist technique of action in China, not a serious approach to the prime problems of Chinese reform. They noted that Communists were efficient in organization and noisy about democracy, and failed to look behind the efficiency of organization or the attractiveness of the slogans. They noted carefully that the Communists denied all ties to Russia, and failed to note that the agrarian reformers were continuing to tell each other—in books, speeches, conversations—that all strength came from association with Russia ("The cooperation of the Chinese Communist party with the United States is a temporary strategy," party resolution, adopted 1944). This deception was made easier by the widespread good will for Russia among all Americans.

Out of a myriad of unconnected or even contradictory facts, the Americans in Chungking had to draw a point of view in order to make decisions and get on with their work. Once a point of view had been established, they examined only such facts of Chinese life, government, and war as filtered through the grid of prejudice. Truth was made subsidiary to the will to believe and to the unwillingness to believe. But the point of view, unfortunately, could be nothing other than the prejudices of initial American reaction to China. These, inevitably, were similar to the prejudices of American businessmen and missionaries for more than a century. (It took several generations of missionaries to make a small start at ridding themselves of the idea that they always knew what was best for China.)

SUMMER, 1944: THE CRISIS

In the critical summer of 1944, emotion, still the essence of the American reaction to China, almost became United States policy. It came closer to breaking China than 7 years of war.

By the time the first damp heat settled upon Chungking, it was generally believed among Americans that the Chinese Communist Party was not a Communist Party but an independent popular movement that could be won to loyalty to the United States. It was an article of faith that aid to the Central Government strengthened the wrong people—the conservatives. Conservatives in China are men who want to take as few western ideas as necessary and keep as many Chinese ideas as possible. The liberals believe China should amalgamate her ancient ways with western ways. Many of the liberals tried to tell Americans that no aid was weakening them and buttressing the conservatives, who were saying that China had been thrown into turmoil without getting anything for it. But Americans by this time were discrediting some of the very group that uncritically admired them, and creating great confusion in the minds of the rest. American bias weakened the government in the eyes of many liberals, and it even pushed some of the more gullible toward the Communist Party, upon which was the stamp of United States approval, both by word of mouth and through the agency of the OWI, later to become the USIS, which reprinted stories from the United States and Chinese press that were either lukewarm toward the Chinese Government or cordial to the Chinese Communists. The Chinese Government, weak in public relations and overpolite in the face of western criticism, found it difficult to counter such propaganda.

Three groups of American actors took parts in the crisis. First came the military—Chennault and Stilwell agreed on nothing, to be sure, but Stilwell had the say on where lend-lease should go; he was the generalissimo's chief of staff; he had the ear of Washington. And Stilwell was convinced that the Chinese war effort was tied up, not because of war exhaustion but because of anticommunism. As early as 1942 he wanted to arm Communists, march them across China, and put them into the fighting in Burma. Now he advocated arming the Communists and putting them and government forces under United States leadership.

The Embassy, the second group, was headed by Clarence Gauss, who had come up in 1941 from consul general at Shanghai to become Ambassador. He was working in accord

with the prevalent State Department attitude—persuade Chiang that Chungking had to reach agreement with the Communists. He aimed to be very courteous and very correct, to be respected for frankness. He did not seek popularity with the Government; indeed, he took a low view of its ability to survive. The Government itself paid more attention to the spate of such Washington-dispatched special envoys as Vice President Henry Wallace.

The third group lived in one of the most bizarre journalistic institutions in the world, the Chungking Press Hostel, where they were housed by the Chinese Government and fed by the United States Army. This group, singularly cohesive, had abandoned an early uncritical faith in Chiang's Government in favor of an admiration for the Chinese Communists, a transference abetted by the restrictions and exasperations under which they lived and worked, remote from the war in Europe, even from the war in the Pacific, necessarily assigned for long periods. Besides, the hostel had the ability to do what no other Americans in China could do—talk out loud. Whatever it sent out the world would hear. It hatched up little journalistic plots, disliked actively any progovernment newsmen, and put all newcomers, who passed through in swarms, through intensive indoctrination.

In the midst of this rising clamor against the government and in behalf of the Communists, the Japanese, reassured by a nonaggression pact with Russia in March 1944, moved 10 divisions from Manchuria to the China front—without encountering opposition in Communist-held China—and launched an attack that cut through east China, overrunning Chennault's air bases and threatening to cut all China in two. Confusion and despair settled upon Chungking. The chief undertaking of Stilwell's staff was a publicly discussed plan for the evacuation of the city. Stilwell himself remained at the front in Burma. There were no general war plans at all. There were 13 different and uncoordinated United States civilian and military intelligence agencies. Members of the Embassy and members of the government were on no better than formal speaking terms. The Chinese did not know American plans, did not know what supplies were available. In the field the Chinese armies were melting away.

In Washington, President Roosevelt suddenly took dismay at the thought of at least a million Japanese soldiers released from the battleground in China. He called in a military officer and personal representative, former Secretary of War Patrick J. Hurley, and dispatched him to Chungking along with Donald Nelson. His orders: to uphold the government and keep its army in the field; to straighten out differences between querulous Stilwell and displeased Chiang—on the surface the question of the extent of Stilwell's authority, but fundamentally that of arming the Communists. On September 6, when the Japanese offensive was far advanced, Hurley and Nelson arrived in Chungking, in company with Stilwell, whom they had picked up on the way.

Hurley had been in China in 1931, and he had firm views on United States policy; he went to work with great energy. He disagreed with Ambassador Gauss, criticized him by cable to Roosevelt, began lecturing military officers, embassy officials, and newsmen. Simultaneously he began negotiations with Chiang, to whom he took an immediate liking, about the position of Stilwell. Chiang reluctantly agreed to make Stilwell field commander of all the armed forces in China. He agreed to the various attributes and authorities of the command. Hurley drew up a command chart, which both Stilwell and Chiang corrected and approved. Final and formal agreement was yet to be reached.

When the Stilwell storm broke one day late in September 1944 this document was under discussion at the generalissimo's house in the mountains. Present were Chiang, T. V. Soong, Wang Shih-chieh, and other members of Chiang's Cabinet and staff. General Chu Shih-ming interpreted.

An orderly came into the room and spoke to Chiang.

Chiang said to Hurley that Stilwell was outside; that he had invited him in, but that Stilwell wished to see Hurley first.

Outside on the porch, Stilwell handed Hurley a message for Chiang sent by Roosevelt from the second Quebec conference, through the War Department. It was in effect an ultimatum: United States aid would be withdrawn unless Chiang gave Stilwell exactly what Stilwell wanted.

Hurley said to Stilwell that he was on the point of obtaining what the President requested, and that an agreement even on details was at hand.

Stilwell said that the message must be delivered.

Hurley suggested that he himself explain the message to Chiang. The agreement otherwise might be disrupted.

Stilwell insisted that he was instructed to deliver the message in person.

The two men went back into the meeting. Stilwell announced that he had a message from the President of the United States to the President of China. He handed the message to General Chu.

In an effort to prevent public recital Hurley walked over to General Chu, about to start translating, and suggested that the Generalissimo would save time for himself and the meeting if he read the translation. Thereupon Hurley handed the translation to Chiang.

Chiang read the message. The muscles of his face tightened. He reached for his teacup and put the cover on top of it.

Stilwell asked whether that meant the meeting was closed.

Chiang's secretary said that the Generalissimo wished to be alone. Everyone moved out.

This quiet scene was the great political storm of 1944. In the next few days Hurley attempted to reconcile Chiang to Stilwell. After each conversation he dispatched an aide-mémoire to Roosevelt, showing each to Stilwell before he sent it. Chiang was strongly resentful; the Americans, he said, wanted to take full command of the entire situation in China. He said emphatically that it was he who was running China.

On October 13, Stilwell proposed written concessions to iron out the impasse. Too late. Chiang had made up his mind. He angrily and dramatically refused to have anything more to do with Stilwell, no matter what the United States did. "Anybody," he said, "but not Stilwell."

Hurley went to his quarters to draft a cable to Roosevelt. In earlier cables he had indicated that the command was deadlocked at the top, with every army retreating, and that to break the deadlock he could not remove Chiang. He showed these cables to Stilwell, who said, "You're destroying me," and suggested alterations. At 2 a. m. Hurley wrote the final cable. The men, he said, are personally incompatible. The war is being lost. If the United States is defeated in China, all the angels in heaven swearing that Stilwell was right will have no effect on the verdict of history. He recommended Stilwell's withdrawal. At 6 a. m. he showed the cable to Stilwell. Stilwell was recalled. Hurley felt he had hit the low point of his career and said, "I have failed."

Several weeks later Ambassador Gauss resigned, a victim of White House diplomacy: too much had been done over his head. Roosevelt, in fact, was given to complaining that the State Department wouldn't react and occasionally called the Department names. He much preferred his special envoys. United States dealings with China regularly bypassed the Department and consequently had little continuing attention. White House diplomacy prevented, to be sure, the emergence of a formal anti-Chiang policy from the State Department. How much it encouraged the formation of irresponsible State Department opinion cannot be judged. Most United States-Chinese relations were simply let happen.

NOVEMBER 1944: MORE AID, LESS ADVICE

For a while the very violence of the Stilwell affair eased the air. During the 10 months following, there appeared some of the few bright spots of the 10 cloudy years. The armies held and then began to grow in strength. The government proposed specific measures of reform; liberals found a stronger voice in its councils. The official contact of Chinese and Americans became measurably more cordial. The soon-forgotten reasons for this improvement: more aid, less advice.

The Stilwell Road was opened; a pipeline was completed. Particularly important, the B–29's were withdrawn, freeing needed supplies. More matériel and more airplanes to transport it were sent to China. Monthly tonnage over the Burma Hump began to mount. By June, 1945, it hit 80,000 tons, in addition to 10,000 tons over the road and 13,000 through the pipeline. It became possible to plan an autumn, 1945, drive through South China into Canton. The United States was playing its cards for money.

As supplies went up, political advice went down. Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, Chiang Kai-shek's new Chief of Staff, locked up the file of the Stilwell affair, declined to be informed about it, and refused to talk politics. He insisted that United States opposite numbers meet with Chinese opposite numbers, that there be no United States secrecy about materials and plans. The Chinese showed indications of willing cooperation. When Wedemeyer asked for reinforcements from government troops in the north, the reinforcements were promptly dispatched. (Yet it was these troops that the new China hands supposed the government to be using simply for encircling the Communists.)

Ambassador Hurley, meanwhile, spent more effort being friendly to the Chinese Government than in being critical. He tried a one-man flyer at solving the Kuomintang-Communist schism, met rebuffs on both sides, and, although he took Stalin's word that the Communists lacked Moscow backing, thereafter refused to tolerate talk that the United States should arm the government's opponents. In fact, he started a campaign to reverse the entire trend of American opinion in China. In this campaign he had the advantage of his own understanding of traditional United States-China policy; he had the disadvantage of the entrenched body of prejudice of other Americans, to which he reacted with not a little fire. He summoned meetings of all United States agencies in China—military, economic, diplomatic, and intelligence—and lectured the assembled representatives until they became disgruntled, irate, and, in some cases, sincerely aghast. Few men were convinced. Some relapsed into silence—in Hurley's presence; others refused to agree and were promptly recalled.

But when the lid was clamped on in China, steam blew off at home. The men Hurley got rid of went to Department of State desks in Washington and insisted more strongly than ever on the correctness of their anti-Chiang notions. And when Hurley returned for a visit to Washington in the winter of 1945, the late George Atcheson, Jr., then acting head of embassy, dispatched an argument for arming the Communists with which every official of the embassy agreed. (The same George Atcheson, later transferred to Tokyo, responded to the direction of MacArthur with enthusiasm and ran skillful interference for

the occupation against Communist maneuvers in Japan before he was lost in a plane in the Pacific.

Things were more serene in Chungking during the winter of 1944–45, but they were considerably more troubled in Washington. Manchuria had suddenly become a great and secret word in the State, War, and Navy Departments. The new China hands were for any influence in Manchuria except that of the government it belonged to. Even men once anxious to get supplies to China now thought complacently of Russian influence in China's Manchuria; it would be a token of United States-Russian cooperation; it would encourage the Chinese to domestic reform. There was strong talk, sotto voce, from the State Department about forcing Chungking to terms with the Chinese Communists. There was wide agreement that China needed a Tito in the form of Communist leader Mao Tse-tung, instead of a Mihailovich in the form of Chiang Kai-shek. There was a new force in the world, experts pointed out, and the world's future depended on warm Russian-American cooperation.

Out of this atmosphere came the February 1945 secret agreement at Yalta between Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt. This was the worst blow of all to postwar peace and unity in China. It pulled Russia into the Asia war, permanently detached Outer Mongolia from China, and gave to Russia rights she had seized in Manchuria before the Japanese seized them from her in 1904: A preeminent interest in the port of Dairen and the two main Manchurian railways, and control of the naval base of Port Arthur. The agreement required China, not represented at the conference, to come to terms on these points with Russia.

This amazing document not only upset the previous agreement at Cairo but cut to pieces whatever was left of traditional Far East policy, never before formally disowned. It was a trade of territory that did not belong to the United States for a Russian promise of participation in a war in which Russia would, in any case, be anxious to participate. A note from Truman, containing its provisions, reached Chungking at the end of June 1945, and Foreign Minister T. V. Soong and, a little later, Information Minister Wang Shih-chieh, went off to Moscow to the thankless job of negotiating a treaty they were already compelled to sign. They wrung out a few extra concessions, particularly a statement that Russia would recognize and support only the Central Government, but, back home, they could not mention the Yalta agreement out loud: Russia was not yet at war with Japan.

This pill had just been forced down the Chinese throat when the anti-Chiang group produced still another. At the end of July, there was dispatched to Chungking for urgent discussion with Chiang a United States plan proposed by General Stilwell: The landing of his Tenth Army north of Shanghai, the supply of arms to a million Chinese Communists, the capture of Shanghai, and the clearing of the Yangtze Valley—a great coup for the Chinese Communists. As soon as Chiang saw the plan, he became enraged and refused to see any American for days.

Precisely at this turn General Wedemeyer found himself forced to consider the imminence of final victory. He took stock and immediately after VJ-day presented a set of proposals to Chiang. A vacuum existed; the question was who should fill it and how it should be filled. MacArthur's first general order had directed Wedemeyer to move central government troops for the reoccupation of Manchuria and North China and for the acceptance of the Japanese surrender. Wedemeyer added together all the elements in Manchuria: Russians, Chinese, Communists, Japanese arms. He saw the impossibility of filling the vacuum with forces available.

First he recommended that Chiang himself request a five-power guardianship by China, Britain, France, Russia, and the United States over Manchuria to prevent unilateral action on the part of any nation or group, the guardianship to end whenever the central government requested.

The Generalissimo did not accept the idea. For one thing, he had hopes that the Russians would stick to their word in the agreement reached on the basis of the Yalta decision: Support of the central government. In particular, he realized the blow to China's prestige if she admitted the need for a guardianship.

Wedemeyer next recommended that seven United States divisions be sent in to aid in the surrender. To this Chiang readily agreed. The idea was sent to the joint chiefs of staff, who sent it to MacArthur. MacArthur, facing the entry into Japan, said "no."

AUGUST 1945: AFTERMATH

The great chance for the unification of China had passed. Troops already in China were busy handling 3,000,000 repatriates. Soon Communists armed by the Russians with Japanese arms appeared on all sides. Soon the civil war began in hard earnest.

The last sequence of the United States-China newsreel was all anticlimax. The war had been won. China, jubilant, her good will warm, welcomed Americans as partners in a better future. Admiral Kincaid took the United States fleet into Shanghai, a city that had just become Chinese for the first time in a hundred years, while Chiang Kai-shek refused even to talk to a British admiral in Chungking. "I asked America to cooperate," he pointed out. At war's end the United States still had a great opportunity in China.

It was an opportunity to pull together a stricken country, not by giving advice but by giving aid. It was an opportunity to stop lecturing and start discussing, as one equal with another, principles of freedom of speech, person, and press—ideas with appeal for Chinese, who have inclined toward a maximum of freedom from government. The United States had not seized this opportunity earlier—it had used principles to damn the Chinese Government rather than save it. Now it threw the opportunity away.

It threw it away silently. There were United States troops in China, charged by international agreement to aid Chinese forces in receiving the Japanese surrender, and there were cries in the United States to bring the boys back home. The State Department made no comment and forbade its Ambassador in China to make one. There were the brushes and jockeyings of the coming full-scale civil war: no comment. T. V. Soong was in Washington seeking aid for China: no comment. The press talked about civil war, the venal Chiang Government, and asked what America was doing in China anyway: no comment.

Into this silence there finally erupted Patrick Hurley, home from China for discussions with the State Department. In progress was a public statement; in progress also was a private disagreement between the Ambassador, not a man to hold his tongue, and the functionaries of the State Department, never a group to change its mind rapidly. Nettled, Hurley suddenly lost patience, resigned his post, charged that he and the country's China policy had been sabotaged by State Department career men. The resulting Senate investigation brought angry words from Hurley; from Secretary Byrnes it brought a promise that the State Department would really say something. From Truman it brought the dispatch of the Marshall mission. And it brought China into public and therefore political controversy.

What was finally said openly to new emissary Gen. George Marshall was in some ways the same as what had been said secretly by President Roosevelt to old Ambassador Hurley: Support the Chinese Government, but try to effect a coalition between it and the Chinese Communists. But in one vital respect it was new: Give no aid to the government unless it settles its differences with the Communists. Secretary Byrnes tried lamely to insist that this had been the policy all along, and made to newsmen a statement appallingly provincial to come from a United States Secretary of State: "I think that some of our arrangements made with Soong (who is a very able fellow) have made for difficulties. I can just imagine Soong dropping in on Chiang after one of his trips to Washington and saying, 'Well, I have just got another $500,000,000 * * *.' And I can see Chiang saying, 'The hell you say * * *,' and then calling in the Communists and telling them that there was no need to talk any further; that they would have to come to terms or else. There's a lot of human nature in the Chinese."

Byrnes and his men seemed to think in terms of fixing up China by combining a government of a rather corrupt political machine with a group of high-minded agrarian reformers in a sort of Pendergast-Farmers Union deal. They were actually insisting that a government friendly to the United States be forced to terms with an armed rebellion friendly to Russia. The Marshall mission failed, therefore, before it began; the very statement of its purpose was the statement of the inevitability of its failure.

It took a long time for the failure to be recognized, and even when the facts of failure were recognized, the causes of it were not. Marshall set out with great dignity, integrity, and firmness to work for unity. He went to China with an open mind; he was at once surrounded by Americans—officials, officers, journalists—whose minds were closed. One of his bedside books was Thunder Out of China, written by Stilwell admirers Theodore H. White and Annalee Jacoby. Marshall not only had an impossible problem to solve; he had to try to solve it under the burden of an impossible conception of the Chinese politics. And the Chinese Government, too Chinese to argue or make objections, raised no cry of warning. Chiang said only that he had been dealing with the Communists for 20 years, but that Marshall wanted to try: so we'll try.

Unity did not come. Now the Central Government would renege, now the Communists. The Communists would make use of truces for troop movements, even ask for truces when their military position became unexpectedly weak. Marshall's only possible pressure was pressure on the Central Government: The holding back of an air program, the holding back of ammunition to fit the United States guns with which the Chinese were equipped. Nobody in Washington seemed to object that pressure was one-sided. Clarence Gauss warned against giving China political loans, and, after he was resettled in the Export-Import Bank, insisted on project-by-project clearances for the $500,000,000 credit proposed at the end of the war. The State Department's John Carter Vincent, as late as January 1947, was emphasizing that the United States must support progress, not the status quo.

Precisely at this time the United States was weakening men it itself considered progressive. United States pressure had put Gen. Chen Cheng into his position as Minister of War in 1944. He wanted army reform, and used as an argument United States insistence that cutting down the size of the Army was prerequisite to United States aid. He got rid of 250,000 officers and the men under them. Suddenly, however, on the renewal of civil war after one of the periods of truce, General Marshall stopped all United States aid. Chen Cheng immediately lost

influence, almost lost his job. Fellow generals criticized him sharply: "You wanted an efficient army, not an inefficient one. Now you haven't even got an inefficient one to fight the Communists." It was not until the summer of 1947, when soldiers in Manchuria were almost out of bullets, that Chen Cheng received aid from United States Army surplus.

United States pressure on the Central Government was effective in that it gave the Communists reason for negotiating without any thought of reaching agreement. Only Russia could apply pressure on the Communists. Instead she gave aid, particularly arms of Japanese manufacture. Yet confronted with evidence that the Communists were indeed Communists, United States policy still refused to believe. The fact did not fit the point of view.

The Communists, of course, had a great advantage over the central government; they had only to destroy cities, mines, industries, and railroads to weaken the government while the government had to stretch out its forces in all directions to guard what remained. Yet the myth continued that it was particularly important for the United States to win the allegiance of an independent revolutionary movement in China. When Marshall finally admitted the failure of his mission he still was convinced that there must be a liberal element in the Chinese Communist Party, that a group existed to which the United States could effectively appeal. This misconception may have been due in part to the blandishments of Communist negotiators, but in far greater part it arose from the political climate of America-in-China. The failure, however, did not change the climate. Marshall came home bitter. He was bitter not about ideas Americans had about China but about the ideas that Chinese had about China. In China he had suffered the first great failure in his life.

Thereafter United States policy, when it found time to glance at China, saw a confusion that existed largely in its own mind. Some men wanted to send advisers to China but no money; others wanted to send money but could not see how to get the advisers. Some said give no help to China so that Russia will be disliked because she does give it; others said, do not worry, if the United States doesn't have enough to help China, neither does Russia. About all the State Department could decide on was keeping private a public report for which Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer had been sent to China.

Little effort was made to clear this confusion away. Policy makers made no more effort than Hull had made in 1937 to examine the old policy of Hay, Hughes, and Stimson. For 10 years the old policy had been scuttled whenever it came in conflict with any other desire or even whim, so that it survived only as a waterlogged relic. The policy was upheld when it involved no price; it was easy to promise Manchuria back to China. It was upheld verbally when it involved other countries: It was for the sake of British, Dutch, and United States territory, as well as of Chinese, that Hull refused to bend to Japan in 1941. But it was pushed aside whenever anything else came along; whether Russian interests in Manchuria, or American desires to redo the Chinese Government.

Behind the last 10 years of war, diplomacy, and civil strife lies the centuries-old collision of an antique civilization, forever juvenescent yet always decadent beyond the understanding of younger peoples, with the brash efficiency of the West. The 10 years have climaxed the hundreds; in terms of its impact upon both China and the United States this short stretch of time, this brief secon added to an eon, has lasted longer than whole generations. Whether the whole of Asia stands or falls before the impact of the messianic nationalism of Russian communism, whether the United States wins or loses an entire continent as ally in its battle for basic liberties, this heavy question hangs on what happened between China and the United States during a period of brief but unbearably intense contact. The failure of this stretch of history, made the more conspicuous by the few bright spots in it, has at length become apparent. Yet the problem of China as it concerns the United States is today literally in the grip of the history of the past decade. What the United States did during those years in China is still a rigid determiner of actions, attitudes, decisions. The question is whether the grip can yet be broken. For the Chinese there is hope only of another miracle of empty-handed resistance. For the Americans there is hope only for a miraculous overthrow of a tyrannous 10 years of history in favor of an older policy that the 10 years themselves overthrew.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

NOT ENOUGH

If we had been in the House gallery for President Truman's appearance yesterday, we would have risen with the rest and made the Chamber ring. The President spoke for nearly all of us, regardless of race or party, in his indictment of Russian expansion. And he lost his measured Missouri speech and achieved a height of emotion entirely alien to his usual address. It is no wonder he was given an ovation without precedent during his period in office, and shared in by both sides of the Congress.

The Nation stands at a decisive moment in history. It must decide—if it is not just to muddle along—upon a moral and military frontier. And it must implement itself to defend that frontier against the one aggressor, Russia. This was understood by the Nation prior to the President's address, and the President himself further clarified the crisis in his stirring opening remarks. But he left the frontier only hazily designated, and his program for implementing America's position is not sufficiently drastic to meet a situation already almost out of hand.

In fact, his No. 1 and No. 2 suggestions contain nothing whatever that is new. He is already on record for prompt action on the European-recovery plan and for universal military training. He has now merely used the crisis to reinforce his campaign for measures under consideration. Only his proposal for revival of selective service is new and fully in keeping with the crisis, and even in that case we have no indication that the draft is requested for anything more than bringing the armed services to their already authorized strength. (The Army is 119,000 short of the 669,000 strength authorized; the Navy and Air Forces are both using all their available funds, and thus cannot campaign to reach their authorized strengths—552,000 for the Navy, 401,000 for the Air Force.

This page is fully in accord with the President's position in regard to the Marshall plan, but sees that plan as going through in the main anyhow and feels the President wasted much of his power yesterday by concentrating on it. On the other hand, why all this to-do about a universal-service program which couldn't possibly get us into a position for war even over a period of years, since it takes teen-age boys and trains them inadequately?

Why in the name of heaven couldn't Mr. Truman have given us, and Congress, the exact dimensions of an army, a navy, and an air force capable of carrying on an atomic-age war against Russia—forces to be raised and organized immediately?

It seems to us that what was lacking in the President's speech was frankness. The proposal for the draft was well enough, so far as it goes. Our lack of manpower for even the authorized services is utterly ridiculous, and the need should be met by selective service if it cannot be met otherwise. But the requirements in this critical moment of history go far beyond the strengths decided upon when conditions looked comparatively happy at the end of the fighting in World War II. Technology has moved apace and the dangers have moved apace. And America must have immediate power if it is not to expose world democracy, including itself, to extinction.

Some Comments on the Recommendations of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the report of the congressional Aviation Policy Board has received wide public attention. As it had not been expected that this Board would attempt to pass on the broad questions usually referred to as the sea-air bill and the chosen-instrument bill, it is with some surprise that one finds a recommendation in the Board's report, in derogation of the views of the sea-air proponents.

Since no representatives of steamship lines were heard, so far as is known to me, it would seem that in the interest of equal treatment of all carriers that the Board's recommendation be placed in its proper perspective. The Board's recommendation does not agree with the conclusions of the President's Air Policy Commission nor with the recommendations of its own professional staff.

My action in including, under permission, some comments of the sea-air committee should not be construed as a judgment pro or con but rather a desire to secure the widest possible dissemination of the views of those interested in sea-air transportation since it does appear that their views have not been heard by the Aviation Policy Board.

I have high regard for the official of the American Airlines mentioned—and do not express any personal opinion on the accuracy or inaccuracy of statements hereafter attributed to any person—and I suggest that it is in the interest of all parties concerned with the extension of air transport to permit the widest possible airing of conflicting points of view between present air carriers and sea-air advocates so that the most desirable solution may be arrived

at in the interest of American security and of the rights of the traveling public.

SOME COMMENTS ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

The action and finding of the temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board in relation to the sea-air question were reached in "star chamber" proceedings from which American shipowners were excluded and were thus deprived of an opportunity to present their case. (The actual recommendation was concerning "carriers other than air carriers." The sea-air question is a different and specialized issue, but it is automatically although incorrectly included.) Not only that, but the shipowners were misled into believing that the Board would neither consider nor report on the question. Again American Citizen Shipowners have been retarded in their fight for the right to operate aircraft over their own ocean routes—a right which the United States freely grants to foreigners.

1. Shipowners were told that the sea-air question would not be considered.

When Congress created this temporary Board, it was understood that the Board would neither consider nor report upon the sea-air question.

Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, one of the conferees on the bill establishing this Board, stated on the floor of the House (p. 9749, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 22, 1947):

"The temporary joint board authorized by the bill is not to consider nor report on the broad questions commonly referred to as the sea-air bill and the chosen-instrument bill."

This was later confirmed by members of the Board.

2. "Star chamber" secrecy prevented the shipowners from finding out that they were being deceived.

The Sea-Air Committee made diligent inquiries concerning the desirability of presenting the sea-air issue and was repeatedly told that the question was not going to be considered by the Board.

On February 6, Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, chairman of the congressional board, told a representative of the steamship lines that his Board would not consider or report upon either the chosen-instrument or the sea-air questions.

3. Under these circumstances, questions of fair play and ethics necessarily arise.

Leading the list of noncongressional members of this transportation subcommittee was Ralph Damon, president of American Airlines and director of American Overseas Airlines.

Mr. Damon has a direct financial interest in the congressional board's findings on the sea-air question.

Pan American and American have long been among the leaders in the fight to keep the steamship lines out of the air.

When, contrary to public advices, the sea-air question was considered, Mr. Damon could with complete propriety have disqualified himself. Otherwise the steamship lines should have been afforded at least an equal opportunity to advance their interests before the board.

4. But Mr. Damon did participate.

The board's professional staff made a recommendation favorable to Sea Air.

Mr. Damon submitted a completely self-serving recommendation which would have permanently blocked the steamship lines and preserved the Airline monopoly.

No steamship representative was permitted to even know that these proceedings were going on.

In our opinion, it would be difficult to conceive of a more complete abandonment of the normal standards of ethics and fair play.

After reading the above background story, compare the recommendations of—

THE PRESIDENT'S AIR POLICY COMMISSION

(P. 116, Survival in the Air Age)

1. The President's Air Policy Commission (after extensive public hearings and based on a voluminous record) recommended the following:

"We believe, * * *, that individual progressive surface carriers, desirous of developing air transport as a part of a coordinated service, should not be automatically prevented from such action simply on the grounds that they are surface carriers—as now appears from the record to be the case. We recommend that the Congress enact legislation clarifying these two points."

THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

2. The professional staff of the Congressional Board, after a careful study of the extensive factual record produced by the President's Commission and by the House Committee hearings of last May, made the following recommendation:

"That, in considering applications from surface carriers for participation in air transportation, the Civil Aeronautics Board base its decisions on the merits of the particular case from the standpoint of public convenience and necessity."

MR. RALPH DAMON, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN AIRLINES AND DIRECTOR OF AMERICAN OVERSEAS AIRLINES

3. Mr. Damon, obviously basing his recommendation upon the same arguments reviewed and rejected by both the President's Commission and the board's own staff, and which have been factually refuted by the sea-air committee many times, recommended the following:

"That the present status of the Cvil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to participation in air transport of other forms of transport be reaffirmed, and that the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) be advised that its policy there under is in accordance with the intent of the act."

THE CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD'S FINAL RECOMMENDATION

(No. 36, p. 27)

4. The congressional board, with but slight changes (perhaps without a full disclosure to them of the above story) adopted Mr. Damon's recommendation in the following language:

"The board does not recommend any change be made at this time in the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to participation in air transportation by carriers other than air carriers."

This recommendation of the congressional aviation policy board, if approved by Congress, will result in material damage to our merchant marine and will seriously impair our national security.

We hope that Congress will not only disregard this recommendation, so obviously inspired by and designed to serve selfish interests, but will take affirmative action to reject it.

The complete text of recommendation made by Board's staff, and alternate recommendation made by Mr. Ralph S. Damon, president of American Airlines:

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That, in considering applications from surface carriers for participation in air transportation, the Civil Aeronautics Board base its decisions on the merits of the particular case from the standpoint of public convenience and necessity.

There are numerous conflicts of interpretation regarding intent of the Civil Aeronautics Act with respect to surface carrier participation in air transport operations. Owing to air transportation's importance to national security, the public interest requires that all our resources be brought to bear on sound and rapid development of the industry. To exclude any carrier or group of carriers from contributing to this development per se is not in the public interest. The Board believes, therefore, that surface carriers should not be arbitrarily excluded from participating in air transport development and that each such application be considered on its individual merits in meeting the tests of "fit, willing, and able," "public convenience and necessity," and of its effective contribution to air transport development. Clarification of the language of the Civil Aeronautics Act is desirable.

ALTERNATE RECOMMENDATION BY MR. DAMON

That the present status of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to participation in air transport of other forms of transport be reaffirmed, and that the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) be advised that its policy thereunder is in accordance with the intent of the act.

Traditional intent of the Congress in the nineteenth century, and specifically by the Panama Canal Act of 1905, the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and the General Transportation Act of 1940, indicates the desire to promote in the public interest the fullest freedom of competition between various modes of transport, so that each mode is free to develop its own markets and methods without restraint inspired to protect the vested interest of any other form.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has recently declared that under the Civil Aeronautics Act a surface carrier applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity has the same status as any other applicant and that its decision must be made on the basis of the public interest. The above proposal would merely affirm that this was the intent of Congress.

In the case of mergers and consolidations of air lines with rail or steamship operators, however, the CAB under the act must find that the acquisition will actually be a supplement to its surface operations before the merger and consolidation can be approved. This is comparable to provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and Motor Carrier Act. The above proposal would also reaffirm that as the intent of Congress.

What Mr. Damon says about the Transportation Act of 1940 is not true. The policy section of the act of 1940 for example says: "It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation * * * all to the end of * * * coordinating * * * a * * * transportation system by water, highway, rail, as well as other means."

Mr. Damon's reference to a recent decision of the Civil Aeronautics Act (Docket 2411) is contrary to the facts. In Docket 2411 the CAB was considering whether compliance with the allegedly restrictive provisions of section 408 was required of a steamship line applying under 401. The decision read in part: "* * * we no longer hold that such compliance can be considered as a legal condition to the grant of a certificate." But the CAB promptly erected the same obstacle in different form in the next paragraph which read: "This does not mean, however, that the policy of the proviso cannot or should not be considered as one of the standards which guides the Board."

This is legalistic double-talk, and it certainly does not spell out equality of status for steamship lines as against air lines.

Mr. Damon is completely out of order in his reference to the Interstate Commerce Act. In the first place, the sea-air question involves foreign trade—neither the Interstate Commerce Act nor the Motor Carrier Act can be applied to or compared with foreign trade conditions or foreign competition; and in the

second place, the word "supplemental" does not appear in either the Interstate Commerce Act or the Motor Carrier Act nor does it appear in the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The Palestine Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, calm reflection discloses no more than first impression regarding a justification for the foreign policy or lack thereof which the administration has followed in dealing with the Palestine problem.

When our representative announced a few weeks ago that the position of the United States was that the United Nations should intervene to keep the peace, but not to enforce partition in Palestine, that was the beginning of the end. It was obvious that this legislative distinction constituted a difference more theoretical than real. It was the dispute over partition which occasioned the bloodshed and threat to world peace. This same threat exists today.

Now, like a bolt out of the blue, comes the shocking announcement of a complete reversal of position. It is baldly stated that we will no longer back partition. Our representative asks that the decision, unanimously arrived at after weeks of debate, be set at naught and that we go back where we started.

Our path is difficult, he says. Therefore we will not pursue it.

The very least that we and the country are entitled to be told is what condition has developed since, under our leadership, the vote was cast supporting partition, which did not exist at that time. Were we wrong then? Or now? Or perhaps both times? Unless the President and Secretary of State furnish the answer to these questions, they place this Nation in a most unfavorable light before the bar of world opinion.

One cannot escape the conviction that some undisclosed factor has occasioned this sudden about-face. The President should furnish facts to replace surmise and rumor. "No comment" will no longer suffice in the face of apparent valid charges of back-tracking, ineptness, weakness, and indeed bad faith. Even frank admission of error is preferable to the existing unexplained underknuckling to the threat of force by Hitler's tool, the infamous Mufti and his Arab gangsters.

Unauthenticated whispers that come to us concern oil and increased evidence of expanding Russian aggression. It is said we cannot afford to offend Syria, Saudi-Arabia and their neighbors for fear our oil supply will be shut off. Principle must yield to expediency, it is argued. We must be realistic, it is claimed.

The answers to this specious and utterly unprincipled reasoning are obvious.

In the first place, the Arab nations need our dollars more than we need their oil. No other nation has anything remotely comparable in value to offer them. Least of all Russia, with an exportable surplus virtually limited to furs. Having spent some time in Bahrein and Basra, I can assure you furs are as appropriate to those countries as a high lace collar to a chorus girl.

Secondly, this country is leaning on a slender reed indeed, if its chief reliance as a source of oil is the tenuously held Middle East, unprotected and unpoliced breeding place of sabotage and intrigue. Within 24 hours any one of the great powers, including Russia and ourselves, could render utterly useless for years this source of oil supply.

Finally, it may possibly not be naive to inquire whether we have reached a state of national materialistic callousness where commercial oil is to be allowed to lubricate the wheels of government to such an extent as to blind us to considerations like national and international honor, the preservation of the spiritual and religious heritage of a great people, and the prevention of bloodshed among innocent noncombatant women and children.

As to Russia's interest in the Middle East, that was well known to us when last November, certainly not in haste, we took a firm stand in the General Assembly of the United Nations. It is incredible that our diplomatic representatives interpreted Russia's vote with us on Palestine partitioning as any reversal of her policy of obstruction and obfuscation of the issues.

We have in no way obviated this situation by the present suggestion of a United Nations trusteeship. At best, that would amount only to a substitution of the Jews for the Arabs as the militant opponents of a solution. At worst, it would mean that those seeking a settlement in strife-torn Palestine would be faced by war from both Jewish and Arab sectors since the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine found that "a trusteeship for Palestine would be fought by two parties instead of one."

Either a policy of consistency or inconsistency on our part will equally require an international force for its implementation. We have in no way excluded Russia by this device. All we have done is to give her the chance to argue with plausibility that we are the ones who prefer hostility to cooperation.

In the face of this sorry spectacle, what are we in Congress to do to try to salvage a modicum of national self-respect?

First, we can protest, probably to no avail.

Second, we should urge that the strongest representations be made to Great Britain to honor her agreement to open a port for the entrance of homeless Jews from Europe.

Third, we should emphatically insist that our representative in the United Nations press for the grant of de jure as well as de facto status to the Haganah, the official military organization of the Jews in Palestine.

Fourth, we should pass immediately a measure directing the administration to lift the embargo it has placed on the shipment of arms to Palestine. If we are going to desert our previous commitment, it is inconceivable that we will compound the crime by longer pursuing a policy which we know results in permitting the Arab majority to arm to the teeth with British, French, yes, and our own United States military equipment, clandestinely furnished, while denying to the Jewish minority any weapons or ammunition with which to defend themselves or their homes.

Nothing we do now can atone for the loss of prestige both our Nation and the United Nations have suffered by our inexcusable bungling inanity. The steps herein outlined represent the minimum of our obligations under the unfortunate and unfavorable circumstances which now confront us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the New York Herald Tribune and the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

WHY?

There are few Americans who will be able to regard the action of their Government in the case of Palestine without a sinking of the heart. Quite apart from the merits of the partition plan, it is painfully obvious that Mr. Austin's statement to the Security Council on Friday represents either a reversal of the earlier policy of the United States or an acknowledgment that the policy ignored facts which were patent to the most casual observer. Neither alternative is to the credit of the administration.

Mr. Austin contends that the partition plan, proposed by the General Assembly and supported there by the United States, "cannot now be implemented by peaceful means." Certainly this possibility—or rather, probability—must have been foreseen by the American delegation and the administration from the outset. If so, the United States should have guarded against the various difficulties which Mr. Austin since has raised in the Security Council—legal, political, and military. Failure to do so created only the ghost of a Jewish state under United Nations guaranty, stimulated explosive tensions in the Middle East and brought death to hundreds, disillusionment to millions. The prestige of UN has received its heaviest blow, and that of the United States has been hard hit. From every standpoint the situation is far worse than when the UN Assembly was orginally summoned in special session to deal with the Palestine crisis.

The United States has taken a firm stand in demanding that peace be restored in the Holy Land under a UN trusteeship. This by no means reduces the military responsibilities which the enforcement of partition might have entailed. Indeed, it rather adds to them. The Jews of Palestine have conceded all that was possible toward the achievement of a viable Jewish state; the Arabs have been confirmed in their intransigent opposition to such a state. A UN trusteeship, following immediately upon Great Britain's announcement of its intention to renounce the mandate conceivably might have provided a transition period in which international authority could have been established in Palestine and an international solution worked out. Now, after an abortive experiment in partition, the UN will have to fight to make itself respected—and fight hard. It will merely inherit Britain's "squalid war" in the Holy Land, made more squalid by opportunities missed and promises unfulfilled.

The people of the United States demand and deserve an explanation of the palpable blunders of American policy in respect to Palestine. There have been many unofficial

excuses, references to a changed world picture, to oil, to military weakness, and the like. But no responsible official has openly discussed the practical aspects of the American course in the Middle East nor offered any reasons why that course need be altered so shortly after it was fixed. If such reasons exist they should be frankly discussed, or the United States must bear the obloquy of seeking covert ends at the expense of justice. And this country cannot so tarnish its leadership.

[From the Rochester Times-Union]

UNITED STATES ABANDONS PARTITION; REFUGEE ISSUE REMAINS

The United States has urged the United Nations to give up the Palestine partition project. That leaves the immigration issue hanging in the air, pending a doubtful agreement between Jews and Arabs.

This country got into the dispute officially when President Truman urged the mandatory power, Great Britain, to admit 100,000 Jews above the meager quota she had fixed.

Unwilling to do this, Great Britain announced intent to abandon the Palestine mandate, thus throwing the matter into the lap of the United Nations.

A UN Palestine Commission was appointed. This recommended partition. Arab opposition in Palestine, backed by the Arab League, led the UN Commission to ask the Security Council for a force to supervise partition.

At this point the United States began to back water. Mr. Austin told the Security Council that our Government was not willing to endorse use of force.

The fact that Russia backed the UN commission request for a security force became embarrassing rather than helpful from the United States viewpoint.

Oil has also figured. The European recovery program calls for much oil. The United States has none to spare.

The Arab states have no great military power. But for the United States to demand rights of way for pipe lines and unrestricted operation of oil fields in territory of those states would be highly embarrassing for a government which has so strongly emphasized defense of nations' freedom.

So now our Government has scuttled partition and proposed a trusteeship for Palestine, whatever that means.

If it means Jewish refugees will still be kept out, then the United States will have copied Great Britain in sidetracking a moral issue for "reasons of state."

It must not be forgotten that there are still hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees. Where are they to go? Is it right for the nations which beat Hitler to abandon those who fled from his hideous persecution?

That's an issue which will not down, just because it is a moral issue, even if politics figured in the administration's original proposals.

Grants-in-Aid Under Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Be it resolved by the council of the village of Milford, Ohio, That—

Whereas council of the village of Milford, Clermont and Hamilton Counties, Ohio, desires to go on record as favoring legislation for grants-in-aid as originally written in the Barkley-Taft bill, S. 418;

Whereas the village of Milford, Ohio, is located on the Little Miami River, a tributary of the Ohio River, and within the basin of the compact prohibiting pollution of the Ohio River and its tributaries, and said municipality is desirous of installing a complete sewage disposal system and treatment plant: Therefore be it

Resolved by council of the village of Milford, Ohio, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the proper legislative bodies.

Adopted the 16th day of March 1948.

A. G. AIKEN,
President of Council.

Attest:

A. E. SNYDER, *Clerk.*

The Peace Gathering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal:

THE PEACE GATHERING

The peace treaty figuratively signed by members of Louisiana's congressional delegation should have the approval of their constituents because their unified efforts can bring benefits to the home folks that could not be expected if the delegation's personnel was bitterly divided

The principle involved in the peace gathering at Washington, which Congressman OVERTON BROOKS of our district sponsored with excellent judgment, is no different than that which is evident in cooperative assurances and gestures following State and local political controversies in which opponents too often give way to stinging bitterness and animosity.

Keynoter at the dinner at which the proverbial hatchet was replaced by a pipe of peace was Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, who was among those in the delegation who spoke some harsh words during the recent Louisiana primary, in which Congressmen DOMENGEAUX and HÉBERT also gave expression to sharp and sensational views. Voicing the opinion that seemed to motivate all who participated in the get-together function, Senator OVERTON asserted in effect:

"In union there is strength. Unless Louisiana's delegation works together on legislation and other Federal matters affecting our State, Louisiana will suffer. Any bitter feelings that may have developed and any animosities should be forgotten, and as substitute there should be unity of thought and action for the State's best welfare."

The informal pledge given by all members of the delegation—Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON was the only one absent and not represented—was in accord with the views presented by Senator OVERTON. "Let bygone be bygones" was the keynote of sentiments expressed at the peace-seeking affair, with Mr. BROOKS, who was deservedly praised for his leadership in arranging for the program, sounding a warning, well based, that Louisiana would suffer from lack of harmony in the delegation's ranks at the National Capital, and wisely suggested that State politics be left at the State line.

There come many matters before Congress with bearing on the welfare of the people of Louisiana. These matters can be more satisfactorily considered when the Senators and Congressmen of the State work together for their constituency. Flood control, agricultural progress, industrial and commercial advancement, and many other questions are presented affecting the future of Louisiana. To obtain the most helpful results, the solons from this State must present a united front, as far as possible. Naturally they will not think the same on all proposals and programs, but even when divided in views they should not be warring among themselves and planting seed of destructive discord and division. Cooperative efforts should be the watchwords if the best results for Louisiana citizens are to be obtained by the State's Senators and Congressmen.

Congressman BROOKS had a timely thought when he envisioned the recent treaty of peace, and the members of the Louisiana delegation showed sincere regard for those whom they represent when they decided to let bygones be bygones and to work together in Congress for the public benefit.

Premier Mikolajczyk Speaks for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on Washington's birthday, February 22, 1948, former Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk addressed 3,000 residents of the Connecticut Valley at a great mass meeting in the beautiful municipal auditorium at Springfield, Mass. Because I have been requested to make available to all persons interested in freedom for Poland my remarks on that afternoon, including my introduction of this famous world leader, I am presenting them to the Members of Congress for their consideration herewith.

Mr. Mikolajczyk spoke both in English and in Polish. In his native language, he aroused his audience to a high pitch of excitement and interest. All who attended that meeting and heard him speak will long remember this statesman and ordinary citizen from a Polish farm who unfolded the horrors of present-day life in Poland and the dangers which may some day confront the United States.

My remarks follow:

Mr. Chairman, members of the clergy, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a privilege indeed for me to speak to this great audience for a few minutes and then to introduce one of the world leaders of our generation. I am glad that he has the opportunity, while a refugee from his native land, to visit some of the communities in Pioneer Valley, the great farming and industrial section of western Massachusetts, extending along both banks of the great Connecticut River from Vermont and New Hampshire on the north to Connecticut on the south. Here he will find many thousands of Americans of his own racial background. Many of them came here directly from their homes overseas, while others are one or two generations removed from Europe. Today they are all freedom-loving Americans, occupying responsible places in every one of our communities, leaders in our professional, business, and industrial life, and active in the civic affairs of the cities and towns in which they live.

It is sometimes difficult for a young, free-born American boy or girl to understand the everlasting conflicts of European places and nations. Here, in Pioneer Valley, we have thousands of American citizens who are of those peoples and those nations. The Russians, the Poles, the Germans, the Austrians, the Scandinavians, the French, the Greeks, the Italians, the Portuguese, the English, the Scotch, and the Irish not only live peacefully together—they intermarry, they attend the same schools, read the same histories, play the same games, and seek to improve the conditions under which all of their fellow Americans live. They have as their goal the highest possible standard of living for all. They have deep-seated within them both love and pride of country. Above all other things, they have faith in Divine guidance.

Why is it that several thousand Russians can live in the heart of Springfield, in the midst of Poles and Greeks and French and English and Irish neighbors at a time when the nations from which these races sprung are fighting and squabbling among themselves? To know and to understand what has happened in the United States in the last 300 years seems proof positive that there is a solution for international troubles. Nations, like groups of people, can and must live in peace and in friendship throughout the world.

I am sure that our guest speaker knows the great debt owed by the United States to the men and women of Poland. From the days of General Kosciusko, whose statue rises above the plains at West Point, at the great Military Academy, on which he started construction, American history is filled with the names of Poles who fought and, in many cases, died for our country. In many of the communities in Pioneer Valley our guest speaker would be both surprised and pleased to note the large number of Polish family names on the rolls of honor of the men and women who were in the service of the United States during World War II. He would be proud and sad, just as we are, as he noted many gold stars opposite those names. In religion, and in art, they have furnished many outstanding leaders in American life. In fact, some months ago, I heard one of the most talented younger American pianists at the great National Gallery of Art in Washington in a recital. She was Miss Sylvia Zaremba, of Chicopee.

It has been my good fortune to have the opportunity to appoint to the great Military and Naval Academies at West Point and Annapolis many fine young men from this congressional district. The first lad of Polish descent whom I appointed to Annapolis was Charles Slater, of Northampton. I never met a finer or a brighter character. He was the first of my appointees to lose his life in the service of the United States. He perished when his ship went down while in action with the Japanese in a great naval engagement in the Pacific. Every man on the ship perished.

Because of my deep interest in the men in our own services, I have been particularly anxious that, in the admission of nationals of other countries for the purpose of becoming citizens of the United States, full opportunity should be given to the men and women of Poland and other European countries who fought in the armies of our allies during World War II. More than 100,000 Polish men are displaced persons or refugees in various nations of Europe, unable to return to their homeland safely. That is their firm belief. Great Britain has given them shelter and some pay while keeping them in military status. It seems to me that we, the people of the United States, owe them something more. In 1945, I flew over Mount Cassino in Italy and saw the ruins of the famous monastery on the heights and the new town under construction with American funds close by. After a long bombardment, our soldiers attacked this monastery and were repulsed. Further heavy air and ground bombardments followed and ultimately Polish troops captured Mount Cassino and opened the gateway to Rome to the allied armies operating in Italy. Four thousand five hundred Polish soldiers lie in graves on that and other mountainsides—graves which might be occupied today by an equal number of young American soldiers except that these Polish troops were fighting by their side. Many Americans are interested in permitting victims of the recent war to enter the United States on a more liberal basis than our present immigration laws permit. I have introduced a bill which would give this opportunity first to men like the Polish veterans who served alongside of American troops and fought in the same battles and for the same principles.

However, it is not sufficient to furnish new opportunities in the United States for a favored few who have suffered in the recent war. We must strive for the far greater goal of a world enjoying permanent peace. While its immediate aims are far different, one of the moving factors behind the Marshall plan or the European recovery plan, as it is known in Congress, is this desire to secure peace among all nations. I intend to vote for the European recovery program. I am sure a majority of you favor it. World War II proved that the Allies failed to build on solid foundations after World War I. We must not make that mistake again. Even if we must delay our own full recovery from this war for 3 or 4 years, we must spare the time and make the effort in order to save the lives of our American youth.

INTRODUCTION OF FORMER PRIME MINISTER OF POLISH GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK

Our guest speaker of this afternoon is the most important personage among the Polish people today. He is the leader in their struggle for freedom. The Western Massachusetts Branch of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., has performed a distinct public service in securing his presence to deliver the address for this meeting.

For me it is always most interesting and helpful to know something of the background of a speaker. Our guest was born July 18, 1901, in Germany. His father was a Polish national who was working in the German coal mines at that time. Within a few years his family returned to their native province of Poznan, which was then under German rule.

He enlisted in the Polish Army when 18 years old and started fighting against the Germans in order to enforce the provisions of the Versailles Peace Conference that gave Poznan Province to Poland. In 1920 he fought under General Pilsudski as a private in a war against Russia, to secure the return of the Ukraine. Our guest was discharged from the Army on account of wounds and returned to his father's farm.

He became very active in the right wing of the Peasant Party. He advanced to county supervisor, membership in the provincial legislature, and from 1930 to 1935—membership in the Polish Parliament.

In the meantime, he had been editor of a farmers' weekly and the first president of the Association for Peasant Youth of Western Poland. After he was graduated from the university he had first operated his father's small farm and later took it over and increased its size substantially. He has worked on a farm since he was 7 years old, and is, therefore, fully qualified for membership in the farm group.

After General Pilsudski died in 1934, the Government of Poland changed in character, and an authoritarian constitution was adopted in April 1935. In 1937, our speaker became the president of the Peasant Party. When the war started in 1939, he fought as a private in the defense of Warsaw against the Germans. He escaped to Hungary where he was interned. He then escaped to France, where General Sikorski had raised a Polish Army, and a Polish National Council had been formed for the duration of the war under President Paderewski. Our guest was named the latter's deputy vice chairman; and, upon President Paderewski's death, he became president of the national council, which had then moved to London because of the collapse of France. The Polish Army escaped to England after the fight in Flanders.

General Sikorski became prime minister; and, in 1941, our guest speaker was appointed deputy prime minister and minister of the interior in General Sikorski's cabinet. Perhaps, it was fortunate for him that, as minister of the interior, he was in charge of the operation of the Polish underground, which was most active and most helpful to the Allied cause. I was interested to learn that at this stage in his career our guest speaker was called the Polish J. Edgar Hoover.

General Sikorski was killed in a plane crash in 1943, and on July 14 our guest speaker was named prime minister of a new coalition government-in-exile. At this time there was a serious quarrel between Russia and Poland over their boundaries. As prime minister, our guest visited Moscow and Washington and endeavored to reach settlement with the Russian Government to no avail. Then came the disastrous uprising of the Polish patriots of Warsaw, following instructions from the Moscow radio.

In October 1944, he took part in a conference with Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden with Russian officials in Moscow. It was apparent that, regardless of the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter, Marshal Stalin intended to keep about half of Poland, which in turn might have its borders extended into German territory. As a result of this inconclusive conference, our guest speaker resigned together with the members of his cabinet.

In June 1945, he returned to Poland. He wished to help the Polish people and, therefore, assumed the duties of vice premier and minister of agriculture in the Provisional Polish Government at Warsaw. In January 1947, he resigned in protest because of the false returns in the Polish election. While his party undoubtedly cast 85 percent of the votes, the election was regulated in such a way that, in accordance with orders from Moscow, the Peasant Party was given representation on the basis of having cast about 10 percent of the total votes. He remained leader of the opposition and fought courageously against the Communist-dominated government. By October 1947, the situation had become so grave that he found it necessary to escape from Poland. He did so through the underground connections which he had built up during the war. If he had remained in Poland, he would undoubtedly have been tried by a special court and sentenced to death without a fair trial. He reached the British zone in Germany and was flown to London. It took him 12 days to make good his escape from Warsaw to London. Today he is the recognized leader of the Peasant Party of Poland and could, undoubtedly, become either president or prime minister, as he wished, if a free election were possible. He is an authority on the subject of international relations, an informed diplomat, and one of the few great world leaders of 1948.

It is my esteemed privilege and great pleasure to introduce to you Poland's greatest citizen, former Prime Minister Stanislaw Mikolajczyk.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith the reactions of two of the large daily newspapers of my district to the message of the President of the United States delivered on March 17, 1948.

I believe that the editorial expressions set forth represent the attitude of the great majority of the residents of the Eighteenth District of California.

[Editorial from the Long Beach Press-Telegram of March 17, 1948]

THREAT OF WAR UNIFIES AMERICANS FOR DEFENSE

In the presence of a threat of a third world war, every citizen of the United States is under a compelling obligation to think only as an American. The war may not come. The more nearly complete is the unity of the American people the less is the danger of war. The United States faces a potential enemy that respects superior strength and nothing else. To weaken in the face of such a foe is to invite attack.

The President of the United States is vested by the Constitution with first responsibility in conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs and in national defense. In the performance of this constitutional duty of his high office, President Truman today laid before Congress the record of Russia's persistent obstruction of the work of the United Nations. He laid before Congress the record of the Soviet Union's prevention of the establishment of peace, which long ago should have ended World War II.

The President laid before Congress the record of destruction, by the Soviet Union and its agents, of the independence and democratic governments of a number of nations in eastern and central Europe. Russia, under Stalin, has been doing what Germany did under Hitler. It is later than Americans have been willing to recognize. An hour of destiny is near.

Everybody in retrospect speaks with contempt of Chamberlain's surrender at Munich. That is easy and meaningless. Nothing is gained by it. What counts is that free peoples and their leaders see clearly in prospect and act wisely. Czechoslovakia was the immediate victim of Munich. It was partitioned and then overrun. The Republic of Czechoslovakia now has been killed—by Red hands. It is part of the Soviet Union's "ruthless course of action," to quote today's Presidential message. "The clear design to extend it to the remaining free nations of Europe has brought about the critical situation in Europe today," he said.

The world is at Munich again. It does not have to surrender again to a plundering, murderous dictatorship. If it had resisted Hitler in time he might have been halted without World War II. If it resists the Kremlin in time, it may save Finland, Sweden, Norway, and the rest of western Europe. It may save Britain, western Africa, one of the gates to the Americas, and the Western Hemisphere. And, foremost in the thoughts of this people, timely action may save the United States from the terrible ordeal of another armed conflict.

As Commander in Chief of the armed forces, the President asks Congress for universal military training and temporary draft law for the emergency. He asks for swift congressional action on economic relief to strengthen Europe. He asks for support of the five western European nations which have entered into a pact for common defense.

The Government of the United States is divided politically. The people are similarly divided. They will not be seriously divided on a program to protect America, even though this is an election year. Nearly 140,000,000 of them are ready to back up their President and Congress. Let those charged with responsibility put aside all other considerations and agree quickly on a program for the Nation's protection.

[Editorial from the Long Beach Independent of March 18, 1948]

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

When the President calls a joint session of the House of Representatives and Senate it is of world-wide importance. It is his way of emphasizing an event of crisis. His speech of yesterday is being studied by leaders of ever nation on earth. He has asked Congress to mobilize this Nation for possible war. If we fail to follow his recommendations, we tell those nations we are not ready to fight for the liberties in which we believe.

All fathers and mothers shudder at the thought of war. They shudder at the thought of their sons spending a year or two in the armed forces when they should be in college. This has always been true in this country. The result has been that in each war we have had to send poorly trained men to fight because we were unprepared, and lives have been unnecessarily sacrificed. We have in past wars had time to mobilize because France and England held off the enemy while we tried to make up for lost time.

If there should be another war, no one can stand between us and the enemy. France and Britain, with all other European nations, would be overrun long before we could get help to them. Our armed forces are not being maintained under the voluntary enlistment plan. We Americans are not military minded. We hate war and we dislike a military machine. But disliking a job does not keep people from working for food. It should not keep them from working to preserve their liberty.

We have read some of the reports on the committees set up by the President to report on universal military training. These committees are not unanimous in their thinking. The chief objection is that it might take so much money it would not leave enough for the technical development of our defense. No one can deny the tremendous expense that would be involved. But there is no expense so great that we cannot afford to make ourselves safe. As the President said, it is "far safer to act than to hesitate."

This writer has questioned the need of universal military training. But the pattern of Russia is becoming so clearly that of subjugation of all free people, it is apparent we can no longer wait to prepare. We must build our Air Force and Navy to again hold supremacy. We must have a trained ground force to protect our own shores, and, if necessary, consolidate our positions in Europe and elsewhere throughout the world. It is clear this cannot be done by a voluntary force, just as it was proved a failure in the last two wars.

We as a people are always hopeful that disaster will never strike us. But it has struck us twice in our lifetime. We were fortunate to emerge with our freedom each time. Our apathy and refusal to face unpleasant facts has been our weakness. We act only after disaster strikes us. It is probable we might have escaped two wars had we been mobilized when the danger became apparent. It is probable we will escape another war if we mobilize and show we are strong. If we fail, it will be an invitation to aggressors to step on us. This will mean eventual disaster.

The President spoke on advice given him by his and our military leaders and those who know best what is happening. If we disregard their advice, we will be as unwise as if we ignored the advice of a surgeon who said an operation was necessary for a ruptured appendix. We must now act to prepare ourselves as our military advisers tell us is necessary. Or we serve notice on Russia that she has nothing to fear from us. Russia will then know the door is wide open for world conquest and the abolition of freedom for man everywhere.—L. A. C.

Palestine Turn-About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record as condemning the action of our Government in reversing its position on the partition of Palestine. I condemn that action for two reasons. First, it constitutes a reversal of a traditional United States policy which since 1922 has favored the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. The retreat from that position on the part of our Government constitutes a breach of faith to the thousands of Jewish people who have long worked and waited for a national homeland. It is a shameful and underhanded turn-about and causes irreparable injury and damage to American prestige. Secondly, the retreat from the decision for partition is an inexcusable surrender to the threat of aggression. It is obvious and admitted that Arab intransigeance has forced the American Government to change its policy and has caused us to recommend that the United Nations retreat also.

This, of course, is a further weakening of the authority and power of the United Nations. Unfortunately it will not be the first time that the United Nations has had to yield to the threats of force. It has been bludgeoned out of Northern Korea by Soviet Russia and out of the Balkans by Soviet Russian satellites. Each surrender of this kind is a blow to the authority of the United Nations and lessens the respect and good will which the other people of the world have previously had for us. Those of us who have believed in the basic fairness of the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine and worked for its creation will not despair. This presents a tremendous obstacle but one that can be overcome.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post entitled "Palestine Turn-About":

PALESTINE TURN-ABOUT

Palestine, which last October France's delegate said was "most particularly urgent," is now to go back to the General Assembly for reconsideration. Mr. Austin proposes that the UN partition plan be shelved and the

area put under a temporary UN trusteeship, rather than let nonaction create a vacuum in Palestine when the British pull out on May 15, and offer a temptation to Soviet Russia. The proposal, which will doubtless be accepted, is at least an honest recognition that nothing can be accomplished by reliance upon present means.

Partition with economic union, which conformed with the majority report of the UN Palestine Commission, was recommended last November by the Assembly. In view of the widening gulf between Arab and Jew and the clash of their cultures—there seemed no other solution in sight—just as there was no other solution in the cases of Ireland and India. We still feel it would have been realized if action had been swift and resolute. The United States voted for the plan, and, moreover, envisaged enforcement as well as—contrary to what Mr. Austin said last Friday—piecemeal implementation. But no enforcement was forthcoming, even diplomatic. On the contrary, all effort in the State Department and outside it seemed to be dedicated to the task of junking the UN decision. American diplomatic officers stayed in Washington instead of going back to their posts in the Middle East in order to wage the campaign. Thus the Security Council, to which the enforcement issue was referred in February, found itself confronted with American noncooperation. Conciliation was then tried, but only in a half-hearted way, and without the aid of the British or the Russians, who declined to join in conciliation. For the time being, therefore, there was no option but to confess that the task was impossible.

Of course, the United States knew this when in February it communicated to the Security Council its decision not to enforce partition. And the other nations knew it. All the fol de rol from February 24 on was an American maneuver to scuttle partition—and it added farce to tragedy. The effect was that faith in America's leadership and in America's moral position was rapidly being undermined in the United Nations.

Both leadership and moral position are badly in need of repair, and this task must now engage all Americans of good will. One way would be to take the lead in settling the DP problem for good and all at the same time that the Assembly is shelving the partition plan. The other way would be to lay by the heels the whole Mufti gang in Palestine. As long as the Mufti, one of Hitler's closest collaborators, is allowed to tyrannize over the Arabs in Palestine, no Arab moderate will be able to live, let alone negotiate. The men who staged the anti-British riots in the thirties and became Nazi agents during the war are now running affairs in Arab Palestine, and they must feel confirmed in their intransigeance.

Negotiation of a settlement, presumably, will be the on-the-spot goal of the trustees, who, with Soviet Russia outside the Trusteeship Council, will probably be Anglo-American. The two powers also have a common interest in safeguarding their strategic, i. e., oil, interests in the Middle East. Both considerations require a friendly population in the Middle East, Jews as well as Arabs. The Palestinian Jews, who served the Allied cause well and most helpfully in both world wars, will not cooperate if they are allowed to believe that intransigeance is the only road to satisfaction. The Arabs may or may not cooperate. They never have; and reports from the Middle East say that the initial jubilation over the Austin speech has given place to hedging. It is evident that in handling both Jews and Arabs the trustees will need more troops than would have been necessary for implementing the partition plan.

It is still our belief that one of these days the problem is bound to make our policy-makers wish they had grasped the nettle instead of setting it aside. At any rate, the same "hopeless indecision," in Mr. Churchill's words, which was exhibited at the last attempt at solution in 1937 had this effect upon the British. In that time Palestine has grown from a local to a world problem the ominousness of which cannot yet be gaged. It is always later in Palestine than is realized in the foreign offices, and it is so late now that by the time the new decision is underwritten by the UN, there may be a whittling down of trustee willingness to do more than hold Jerusalem.

Federation for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

FEDERATION FOR FREEDOM

The visibly growing movement among the governments and peoples of western Europe toward federation for freedom and economic cooperation is welcomed, it goes without saying, by free and freedom-loving peoples everywhere. A timely preview of its potential benefits to Europe and to the world is supplied by the United States News and World Report of March 19 through statistical graphs.

That publication bases its calculations on an ultimate line-up of 15 nations in a United Western Europe: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, western Germany, Belgium, The Netherlands, France, Luxemburg, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Italy, Britain, Eire and western Austria. That group would have a total population of 247,000,000 as compared with 310,000,000 for Russia and her satellites. It would have a cropland area of 176,691,000 acres compared with 785,460,000 acres for the communized domain.

But industrially it would far surpass Stalin's hastily grabbed empire, producing annually 30,300,000 metric tons of steel to Stalin's 18,400,000 tons; 365,000,000 tons of coal to Stalin's 222,000,000; 11,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power to Stalin's 5,500,000,000. The production figures cited are those for 1947, with the Ruhr far below normal output. Western Europe's rail transportation facilities would be vastly superior to those of the Communist dictator.

Militarily, Stalin has a decided edge at the moment, but in respect of mineral resources, western Europe is well stocked with the exception of its deficiency of oil supply. Western Europe's people are better educated than are the bulk of Stalin's subjects and are rated among the world's most highly skilled. Unity would give them a very marked advantage by this comparison.

In brief, the potentials of a United Western Europe, supported by and cooperating with the United States, are great enough, if developed, to insure the survival of freedom in Europe and civilization throughout the free world. There are, of course, great difficulties to be overcome before the proposed federation can be completed, and pending their mastery this Nation must carry a heavy load. The alternative, it is fairly evident by now, would be piecemeal Communist subjugation of western Europe by the methods adopted by Hitler and copied by Stalin. Its menace to the United States, to human freedom, and world peace would be immensely graver than any now existing.

Backers of Truman on Draft Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Fort Myers News-Press, a newspaper published in my district, showing the reaction to President Truman's message delivered to Congress on Wednesday, March 17, 1948:

FORT MYERS BACKS TRUMAN ON DRAFT PROPOSALS, WOULD CALL SOVIET BLUFF

(By John Maker)

A representative cross section of Fort Myers citizens gave wholehearted approval yesterday to President Truman's proposals for temporary revival of the draft, universal military training, and speedy economic aid to Europe. The consensus was that the Soviet Union's "bluff" should be called now and that the United States should be prepared in case military action is necessary.

The nearest thing to criticism came from Councilman L. H. Blouch, who did not hear all of the President's address. He said it was "timely but I do not believe it went far enough."

"I think we ought to adopt all three of Mr. Truman's suggestions," said Guy M. Strayhorn, chairman of the draft board during World War II. "It looks as though universal military training is necessary if we are going to be prepared. I am willing to take the word of the President and his advisers that we need to increase the size of the Army at this time and it seems selective service is the way to do it."

Strayhorn said he and W. B. Seabrook, only other member of the wartime draft board still in Lee County, had been asked recently if they would serve again. He said both had declined, holding it would be better if others served.

Other comment:

H. J. Faires, barber: "Stalin is worse than Hitler. I believe we should get prepared just as we did before the last war."

Harry Stringfellow, chairman of the county commission: "I think it's high time to stiffen up toward Russia and it ought to have been done sooner. If that's done, I think the Russians will go back into their hole. A fellow will keep on bluffing as long as he can get away with it."

Joe Ansley, American Legion commander: "I am 100 percent in agreement. Universal military training is one of the objectives of the national organization. The local post endorsed and circulated petitions here supporting the measure."

Mrs. Jean Hill, president of the Women's Community Club and mother of sons 8 and 10: "I'm in favor of military training. We don't want to fool around and have another Munich. I believe in doing something quickly. I'm sick of Congress fooling around with the Marshall plan while the Russians are doing whatever they please."

Jim Roan, 17, president of the senior class at Fort Myers High School: "It's a good thing. Something should be done to stop Russia. All the boys to whom I have talked today are ready and willing to go."

S. E. McLaughlin, president of the Merchants Association and an ordained Baptist minister: "Most everybody agrees that we should be prepared. We should be ready this time. We don't want to be caught napping again. I imagine that the draft is the only

way to build up sufficient armed strength and it looks as though we will need it. I believe we can conserve the lives of our boys in considerable numbers if we stand ready and don't have to get ready after the war has started as we did the last time."

A. W. Harris, president of the chamber of commerce: "We are not armed sufficiently. We should have more men trained. We are not prepared to take care of Russia at the present time and we should be."

Ed Simpson, school board member: "I am thoroughly in accord with everything he advocated. It is time we strengthened ourselves. The army is not up to peacetime standards. Selective service is necessary but we should have universal training as soon as possible."

Carl Heuck, county agriculture agent: "I am thoroughly in favor of military training. It looks as if the only thing the Russians understand is force."

John S. Baker, Negro undertaker: "I'm 100 percent with him. It was one of the best talks he ever made. Preparedness is what we need. I don't like Russia's attitude and we shouldn't wait until they shoot first. Several other fellows heard the President's speech and all seemed to favor it."

Opinions of the Folks at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, Mr. Speaker, in order to obtain a cross section of the opinion of the people of my State, I am asking them for an expression of their views on subjects of great importance which will still come before the Eightieth Congress. The following is the letter and questionnaire I am submitting to them:

DEAR FRIEND: Being fully aware of the thought of the people throughout the State of Arizona are giving to our vital national issues in these crucial moments, I am writing this letter to you and asking you to answer certain questions relative to important issues now facing the Congress of the United States. The subjects treated in this questionnaire have yet to be acted upon by the Eightieth Congress.

I know that you have been thinking about these matters, and I would sincerely appreciate your views on them. It is not necessary for you to sign your name to this questionnaire if you do not wish to do so. If you so desire, you may sign, and I will hold your name confidential. However, I sincerely hope that you will answer these questions and mail this questionnaire to me at your earliest convenience.

1. Do you think the present rate of taxation is fair and reasonable? Yes ☐ No ☐

(a) Are you in favor of lowering taxes for all groups? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) Are you in favor of lowering taxes for the lower income tax group only? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Do you understand the Marshall plan? Yes ☐ No ☐

(a) Assuming you understand the Marshall plan, do you think it is a guaranty for peace? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) Are you opposed to the Marshall plan? Yes ☐ No ☐

(c) Do you believe we can afford the Marshall plan? Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Are you in favor of strengthening our national defense? Yes ☐ No ☐

(a) Are you in favor of compulsory military training at this time? Yes ☐ No ☐

(b) Do you prefer the American Legion plan, which provides for training in colleges, National Guard, and summer camps? Yes ☐ No ☐

(c) Are you in favor of an immediate draft in line with the recent suggestion of President Truman? Yes ☐ No ☐

(d) Are you in favor of a larger Air Force? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Are you in favor of Federal aid to education? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Are you in favor of a return to rationing and price control? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Are you in favor of a world government with sufficient power and military strength to enforce peace? Yes ☐ No ☐

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. HARLESS,
Member of Congress, Arizona.

Your occupation _____.
Comments _____.

The War Nobody Wants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by David Lawrence entitled "The War Nobody Wants," which appeared in the March 26, 1948, issue of the United States News and World Report.

This editorial should be required reading for every literate person in America:

THE WAR NOBODY WANTS
(By David Lawrence)

The Russian people, suffering still from the effects of a terrible war, do not want to fight again.

The American people do not want war.

Yet the talk is again about a war that seems to be just around the corner.

Peoples do not want war. They felt that way in 1914 and in 1939, too.

What then brings on these mass movements of human beings to a war that nobody wants and nobody really wins?

Governments that act as spokesmen for vast populations bear the basic responsibility.

Governments can lead unwilling peoples to war by telling them their safety is imperiled.

Governments really believe this. They become sincerely convinced that only brute strength can conquer evil forces alined against them.

What we have here is the fear complex that has goaded many a government and many a people into an unpopular war.

We do not want to fight the Russians but we fear that, if we let them continue their aggression, they will attack us.

This is a fear based on the logic of history, of experience with ambitious rulers from time immemorial.

PACIFISM NO ANSWER

It is hard to fly in the face of logic. That's why pacifism is no answer. To refuse to prepare for war, to refuse to be ready to fight if an aggressor nation starts coming your way, is to court disaster.

But the mere possession of the means to fight does not justify a determination to use only that means to prevent a fight.

The philosophy which argues that building up a big military machine scares the other fellow into submission is fallacious. It may apply to two completely unmatched nations, but it cannot apply to two powers which have certain advantages of strategic position geographically and of resources, so as to make the outcome of war itself appear to be doubtful.

The Russian people can be propagandized into war with the United States on the ground that America plans to attack them. They can be told that it is a war of survival for them—and there are many Communist leaders who really feel that no middle ground exists as between communism and capitalism and that the battle between them for survival is inevitable.

There came a message from our Ambassador in Moscow, himself a military man, saying that if Congress would only pass the universal military training law, this was a language the Russians can understand.

That message epitomizes the entire military concept.

THE ILLUSIONS OF PREPAREDNESS

For decades and decades military men have argued that military preparedness prevents wars. This is an illusion. What it does, of course, is to help win wars that couldn't be won if there were no adequate preparedness.

But to say that a standing military force ever prevented a war is to deceive oneself. For generations standing armies in Europe have been a factor in postponing wars only until another nation could build up a rival army or its equivalent in naval power.

Military preparedness, to be sure, is absolutely imperative when there is no other kind of preparedness to prevent war.

Must America build up her armed forces because she is bankrupt of intellectual ideas that could prevent war by any other means?

For a time it was believed that the coming of the atomic bomb would frighten the world into trying to find some other way besides brute force to solve its disputes.

But though we have the atomic bomb, the Russians may believe we will not use it. Or else they think they have adequate weapons of counterattack, such as bacteriological warfare, which could scare us into not using the bomb. Or maybe they, too, already have the atomic bomb.

There is no end to the labyrinth of mental corridors we get into when we try to rationalize why another nation isn't frightened by our threats of force but sets about finding a way to become equally strong in a military sense.

When will the world discover that war is not a mysterious disease, that its germ of origin has long ago been isolated, and that the only cure for the epidemic of war is to give reason the chance it never really has had to compete on equal terms with military force as a preventive influence?

Reason encompasses the spiritual power to apply conscience to all disputes. It means self-restraint, a curbing of national passions often brought to fever heat by governmental pronouncements. Above all, it requires a dispassionate self-analysis which sees stubborn pride as a poison that too often prevents an understanding between nations.

Peace cannot come when nations do not talk respectfully, earnestly, honestly to each other.

It is a favorite excuse in Washington that we have done everything possible either to appease the Russians or to reason with them.

But have we?

Negotiation based on a fear complex gets nowhere. We have distrusted Russia, and the Russians have distrusted us. Have we made every effort to find formula for removing that distrust?

If the distrust is justified, have we used every vehicle of expression to argue the case?

Is conversion impossible among human beings who are convinced of the righteousness of their own cause, or have we learned nothing from the Prince of Peace?

It seems incredible that we should assume that everything our Government has done is 100 percent right and everything the Russian Government has done is 100 percent wrong.

There comes a time, of course, when bungling diplomacy leaves a nation in a situation from which war seems the only way out.

But it is never too late to try to stop a war.

MORAL FORCE NEEDED, TOO

It would be tragic indeed if American policy were limited solely to the course outlined in President Truman's message to Congress last week. The President was right in denouncing Russian aggression. But are there no words we can also say quietly through the channels of an intelligent diplomacy so that a formula for possible settlement may be developed? Have we no resourceful diplomats any more? Has Russia none either?

We must not allow the situation to drift during the next few months or years with each nation making hostile faces at the other and ultimately fighting it out because some incident touches national honor and provokes bloodshed.

If ever there was a time for the exercise of moral force, it is now. Moral force means the use of powers of reason and commonsense—the will to see the other fellow's viewpoint especially if he, too, is governed by by a fear complex about us and the will to give concrete examples of sincerity, good will, and unselfish purpose.

MOBILIZING THE CONSCIENCES OF MEN

If the two nations have the will to peace they can avoid war. But pride and false notions of what really is nationalism must not keep us from seeking and obeying the guidance of God. Conscience has not vanished from the globe. We and the Russians have among us people who know the difference between right and wrong.

Can we not mobilize the consciences of men to sit in judgment in our disputes and find a way to resolve them? Is man so deficient in intelligence or ingenuity that he can no longer use his head and must resort to his fists to settle differences of opinion?

What, then, to do about it?

Let the President ask the Russian Government to appoint a mission of outstanding citizens to come to Washington. Let the American Government appoint a mission of outstanding citizens to go to Moscow.

Let's start from scratch. Let's not condemn reason in advance by saying it is futile. It will be natural for each side to continue military preparedness. That's inevitable. But can we not hope that intelligent human beings will brush aside pride and try to find a way to make military conflict unnecessary, especially if both sides approach the problem sincerely and honestly and give evidence of mutual good faith?

It's worth a trial.

We owe it to the people of both countries whose sons will have to be sacrificed if we fail to prevent war.

The Indian Sign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Black River Falls Banner-Journal by Charles R. Lowe Cloud:

THE INDIAN SIGN

Last Sunday night we had sign from cloud. There will be another war near future, we don't have to wait longer. We know that every nationality don't like to the United States, we see in newspaper most every day since Second World War in August 1945. Raymond Minor is in the Army somewhere cross ocean with the United States Army. He send some money to his mother, Mrs. Sam Little Soldier, told her they must have religion worship to God and prepare that are going to have fight again next a few months from now. We don't know when this will be but not very long to wait.

The political party campaign fighting going on at the same time our soldier fight with the other nation. This was we know the Indian sign for another war, and I hate to see them, but I suppose we have to, we cannot help it. We know that Uncle Sam loans some money Billions and Billions dollars every nationality cross ocean, and armys outfit too, and they are getting ready to fight us. They use that outfit to give from Uncle Sam. (Charles R. Lowe Cloud, Black River Falls Banner-Journal.)

Thin Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of Commerce of March 17, 1948:

THIN MARKETS

Something must be done about the present thinness of the country's chief commodity futures markets—and must be done quickly if the best interests of the consumer, the farmer, and the economy as a whole are to be served.

Erratic price fluctuations in the futures markets—either up or down—as they have been witnessed during the past few weeks, and particularly since the resumption of Government flour buying last week, are economically unsound. But even more to the point, they are unnecessary.

Developments and sales volumes which normally should cause only minor price fluctuations, are now frequently pushing these markets up or down as much as the exchanges permit for a single trading day. This tends to immobilize these markets when they are most urgently needed.

And all because the administration, in its search for an alibi for last year's sharp grain and food price advances, hit upon the speculation in these markets as a convenient scapegoat and launched an ill-advised campaign to drive this outside participation out of them by trying to hang the stigma of unpatriotism on all outsider deals.

The existence of broad and smoothly functioning futures markets was never more vital than at present.

There are at least three major factors in the picture today which may cause a high degree of price uncertainty over the next few months. They are the international situation, the uncertainty over the domestic business outlook, and the probability that the marketing of large 1948 agricultural crops may pose greater problems than during the last 2 years.

It is in situations like these that futures markets—if functioning freely—could exert an important stabilizing effect on day-to-day price fluctuations. A large volume of trading in the futures markets will tend to flatten out rather than exaggerate price movements. There are exceptions to this rule, but they apply only if the situation confronting a market is so clear-cut that only one interpretation is possible. That was the case last summer, but is not likely to prevail this year.

It is the joint responsibility of the administration and Congress to restore the futures exchanges to their normal efficiency. Both have committed blunders with respect to these exchanges: the administration by forcing grain margins higher and preventing the Chicago Board of Trade from lowering them again when the time appeared ripe for such a step; and Congress by authorizing publication of the names of commodity traders which played directly into the hands of the administration in its campaign to discredit the exchanges.

Any program for the restoration of the futures exchanges to their rightful and necessary place in the country's marketing organizations should include three steps:

1. Recognition of the useful role played by speculation in commodity trading;

2. Return of full authority over margins to the Chicago Board of Trade and the other grain exchanges. Legally they never lost this authority, of course, but de facto the administration forced them to relinquish it; and

3. Restoration of full secrecy over private transactions on the futures markets by proper congressional action.

Government attempts to establish the Department of Agriculture as final authority over commodity margins should immediately be dropped. Agitation for such mandatory Government control over margins was the direct outgrowth of the administration's attack on futures markets last fall but during all this time the administration failed to make a case for such a move.

Administration and Congress must realize that refusal to help in rebuilding the futures markets may have serious repercussions on agricultural prices during the 1948 marketing season.

We had a taste of this during the February grain nose-dive when the thinness of the futures markets—resulting, as it did, in a series of daily limit declines—seriously upset the cash grain business.

Another step that would go a long way toward restoring more normal trading conditions in the grain markets would be the transfer of purchases for export from the Commodity Credit Corporation to private trade channels. After the blundering in connection with the resumption of CCC flour buying last week and the market gyrations caused by it, the case for keeping purchases for exports in Government hands has been further weakened.

Private Property—The Taproot of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a simple yet basic fundamental truth was expressed by the editor of the Evansville Review, Evansville, Wis., on March 18, when he called attention to the fact that there is a basic difference between our American form of government

and those which profess socialism and communism. This theme cannot be reiterated too much at a time when the world is threatened by the forces of totalitarianism. In the European recovery program that will soon be considered by this body we have failed to stand up and fight for this very basic and fundamental truth. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial in question:

THE TAPROOT OF FREEDOM

There is only one basic difference between the American system of government and the governments of those countries suffering from varying degrees of dictatorship. That difference is the right, protected by law, of private ownership of property. Private property is the tap root of freedom.

It is impossible to abolish private ownership of property for some without ultimately destroying it for all. And once it has been destroyed, a central government becomes boss for the simple reason that it is the sole employer and sole property owner.

Oppression follows automatically when a people, stripped of property, must rely blindly on a government to run with a free rein by men who need no longer recognize antitrust laws, labor unions, or anything else—men who can abandon the constitutional trappings of a free country because they are bigger than the law by right of might.

Total control is always the dream of ruthless men. The ultimate in total control is total government. The one thing standing in the path of total government in the United States is the private ownership of property vested in millions of American citizens. It must ever remain so.

Historical Background of the Third Minnesota District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the geographical location of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota being situated on both sides of the Mississippi River gives it a unique historical background. That portion west of the Mississippi came from France as part of the Louisiana Purchase and that portion east of the Mississippi River and north from the confluence of the St. Croix River came from England originally as part of the grant to the Virginia Colony. At many times in our history the sections were under different governments. I have referred to this fact previously, but recently the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune for February 29, 1948, sets forth the many different governments under which these two areas were governed. They are as follows:

WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI

France, 1671 to 1763.
Spain, 1762 to 1800.
France, 1800 to 1803.
District of Louisiana, 1804.
Louisiana Territory, 1805 to 1812.
Missouri Territory, 1812 to 1821.
Unorganized, 1821 to 1834.
Michigan Territory, 1834 to 1836.
Wisconsin Territory, 1836 to 1838.
Iowa Territory, 1838 to 1846.
Unorganized, 1846 to 1849.

EAST OF THE MISSISSIPPI

Claimed by Virginia, 1609 to 1784.
England, 1763 to 1783.
Northwest Territory, 1787 to 1800.
Indiana Territory, 1800 to 1809.
Illinois Territory, 1809 to 1818.
Michigan Territory, 1818 to 1836.
Wisconsin Territory, 1836 to 1848.
Minnesota Territory, 1849 to 1858.
State of Minnesota, 1858.

From 1609 until the establishment of the Minnesota Territory, this region lived under 13 different governments and at no time were they definitely the same government except for a 4-year interval from 1834 to 1838 when both areas were included for 2-year intervals with the Michigan Territory and then the Wisconsin Territory. To date there have been 20 changes in the governments of this area. It is a unique history.

Our Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a statement regarding our military government in Germany.

For some time I have tried to find out what lies behind the brazen curtain which hides the activities of our so-called military government in Germany. The lining of this curtain is red plush, muffling the crass stupidity of some of our administrative officials, and more particularly the far-from-stupid machinations of Communist sympathizers who have wormed their way into American agencies and bureaus.

Very recently I talked with some experienced observers who have just returned from our occupation areas and who are in position to advise me of the facts. These facts should be known to every American. They affect the honor and standing of our country, our national security, and the pocketbook of every individual citizen.

Many of us have assumed that the policy for destroying industry in central Europe—called the Morganthau plan—was abandoned some months ago. Our commander in Germany, Gen. Lucius Clay, has received several well-publicized directives ordering fundamental changes in the original blueprint for that plan, known as GSC Order No. 1067. These new directives have told General Clay to impress upon the German people the advantages of the free-enterprise system, while leaving up to them a choice of economic and political systems. However, there is a great deal of evidence to show that these directives are window-dressing only, and that no effort is being made to demonstrate to the German people the practical workings of political or economic freedom. In fact, there is a story, believed by many in Washington to be true, that General Clay not long ago threatened to resign from the Army in order to be at liberty to tell exactly the kind of directives marked "top secret" which the Department of State expected him to put into effect. This agrees with the report I have from those who just returned from Germany.

We ought not to overlook the fact that policy for our occupation zones is made and laid down by our State Department, which means the White House, of course. The United States Army acting as occupation force, is merely an instrument of the executive branch of the United States Government. Congress, however, can control the acts of this instrument through our power over the pursestrings of the Treasury. We not only can, but must call a halt when we are given good reason to believe that the power of our Government and our country is being misused to the damage of our prestige and to the weakening of our security.

Today, with the events in Czechoslovakia still headlined in every newspaper, and similar aggressive acts of the Soviet Union in Finland to appear in tomorrow's papers, it is our first duty to find out what our representatives are doing on the front line of our defense area in Germany.

I am told that very few Germans are aware that the free-enterprise system is still the economic basis of the United States. On the contrary, a number of Germans who have undertaken the difficult task of holding local office under the occupation, have been repeatedly advised by top American authorities there that the long-range planners in Washington had fully expected the German people to adopt socialism after their liberation from Nazi rule. Apparently everything possible is being done to make this long-range prediction come true. In spite of the fact that German voters in election after election under our supervision have rejected the Socialist candidates and programs, our authorities in many instances have arbitrarily set aside the democratically elected conservative officials, and installed Socialists and even Communists in their places. There is widespread feeling among the Germans that our occupation authorities are doing all they can to discourage German individuals and groups which stand for the same ideals of self-government that the United States represents. In plain words more Communists were put in power by the United States authorities than have ever been elected by German voters.

Newspapers and other publications in Germany are under the direct supervision of our occupation authorities. That is, they are governed by the directives issued through the Assistant Secretariat of State for Occupied Areas. There is no freedom of the press in Germany. Far from favoring a rigidly conservative policy, however, a check on the publications permitted in our zone shows that

almost nothing has been published about the actual facts of American life, the advantages of the free-enterprise system and the practical workings of a free political system.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me March 17, 1948, at the eighty-first annual St. Patrick's Day banquet of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies' Auxiliary, in Cleveland, Ohio, which was broadcast over radio station WGAR, Cleveland:

We join today in this universal homage to that great patron saint of the Irish, our own St. Patrick. We are gathered here to refresh in our minds and hearts the memory of him and of his labors, to catch if we can some spark of the love and faith which produced such labors, such fidelity, such zeal in the saint himself, and in the whole Irish nation which followed his footsteps.

It is more than 1,500 years since Patrick, captured by pagan Irish, was brought to Ireland to work as a shepherd tending the flocks on the hillsides. There are few of you, if any at all, here before me today who do not know the story of Patrick as well as I—the long nights on the hillsides he spent in pondering on the pagan blindness of the splendid race of the Gael who were his captors and knew not Christ; the dreams he dreamt that he might one day bring to them the gift of God's grace and the sweetness of His love; his escape, and the long years of study in the seminaries of the continent; his consecration and his return again as bishop to Ireland; the long years of missionary labors among princes and people the length and breadth of the Emerald Island.

"By their fruits ye shall know them—and the fruits of Patrick's labors are written large in the pages of Christian history. That little island set in the Irish Sea was fertile soil for the planting of Patrick. The seed that he planted now blooms in every land and clime beneath the sun. That little island with its less than 4,000,000 souls has been, through all the centuries since, the seed ground of holiness and learning and missionary zeal and devotion to the cause of right.

The Island of Saints and Scholars, it came to be called even within a generation of Patrick's death. The churches he built, the schools and monasteries that he founded, multiplied over the land until it seemed there was no longer room to contain them and they overflowed onto the continent of Europe.

Like bees from the hive, the hosts of Irish missionaries swarming from the monasteries and the schools of Erin's Isle, bore with them to distant shores the faith and the lore with which the island was filled; with knowledge secular and divine they became the counselors of kings and emperors, teachers of whole nations.

There was Columbanus who founded monasteries in France and Switzerland and Italy; there was St. Fursa doing the same throughout France; and there was Fridolin, apostle of Switzerland, who built monasteries and schools in Upper Saxony, Alsace, Strasbourg, and Switzerland; and Donatus in northern Italy and a whole litany of others.

Even to our own day the flood continues to pour forth to every land under the sun. Irish priests carrying the message of Christ and of Patrick work today in Australia and in South Africa, in Alaska and in the Congo, in Shanghai and in Baghdad. From the earliest of them venturing across the channel into continental Europe, to the latest young priest from Maynooth setting sail for a parish in the backlands of Australia, they are the fruit of Patrick's planting.

And not only priests and missionaries, but millions of the faithful Irish laity as well, have streamed out from that tiny island carrying with them into their new homes beyond the seas, the faith their fathers received from St. Patrick, to America, to Canada, to Australia, to South Africa, yes, to South America. They have gone, and the faith and the church and the school always went with them. What a harvest has come from St. Patrick's planting!

It will not be held amiss by other equally brave men that the Irish people in America and their descendants point with pride to the glorious record of their valiant sons and daughters, who have written a very brilliant page in the history of our beloved country.

Men and women of Irish descent in the past war have lived up to the enviable traditions for bravery and heroism, for daring, initiative and glorious sacrifice set for them by their forefathers, whether they served in the humblest or the highest position in the forces of our country, in the air, on land, on the sea, or under the sea.

From the days of gentle St. Patrick, who brought the light of Christianity to a land even in those pagan days, a civilized nation, to our present time, the Irish race has played a part in world history out of all proportion to their comparatively small numbers. When Christian civilization was all but destroyed by the barbarian invasion of other days, Ireland became the sanctuary and refuge of learning and culture, when to know the Greek language was a sure indication that the scholar was either an Irishman or had had an Irish teacher.

And it became the historic role of Irishmen to bring back to the continent of Europe the light which had almost disappeared to relight the lamps of civilization. Ireland, the land of saints and scholars may have to reassume her ancient role in this distracted times, when men have attempted to substitute might for right, to substitute material progress and advancement for spiritual values, of which they are oftentimes ignorant. Strong forces have attempted to put out the lights in heaven and to replace them with the false gods of greed, power, and materialism.

There was a time in history when Ireland remained outside the path of the conqueror; the Roman legions overran the Continent and dominated even Britain. They did not cross the Irish Sea and Ireland was left free to develop its own civilization; its own native culture; its own illustrious schools. After the downfall of Rome, it was to Ireland that the civilized world looked for spiritual and intellectual succor.

The Irish always had a genius for spiritual values. In their entire history they have opposed the false philosophies of materialism which have often distorted men's sense of proportion.

Driven from their native hearth, from conditions forced upon them and fostered by the unjust aggressor, Irishmen have spread throughout the world and carried with them the same love of liberty and justice, the same hatred of oppression, the same reckless pursuit of an ideal, the same love of culture and learning, characteristic of their entire history.

The Irish are not invaders, not greedy of other nations' territory but they have ever been willing despite the cost to fight the battle of freedom for themselves as well as for others.

Volumes have been written on the Irish soldier all over the world; Owen Roe O'Neill; Leopold O'Donnell, Prime Minister of Spain; Ambrose O'Higgins, and his son, Bernardo; Alexander O'Reilly, governor of Habana; founders of many South American Republics; Charles Gavin Duffy, Prime Minister of Australia; Maurice MacMahon, second President of the Third Republic of France; Zachary Taylor, Mead, MacCooke, Phil Kearney, Gen. Phil Sheridan, considered by Grant to rank with the great commanders in history.

From the year 1000 down to our own times, Irishmen have fought in what seemed a hopeless cause and against terrific odds for the very principles of liberty and justice upon which the American Nation was founded. But theirs was a lost cause at home except that they kept aglow their love and enthusiasm for their country, for liberty, for decency wherever they might be.

America welcomed these exiles and was repaid many times for that welcome.

The war of the Revolution might well be considered an Irish war. The Irish poured into this country from Maine to Georgia. From 1700 to 1789 more Irish came here than any European people.

Michael O'Brien, in his book called A Hidden Phase of American History, tells us that prior to the Revolution there were nearly 100,000 native-born Irish living in the Colonies. The late Speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly, Joseph Gallaway, claimed that half of Washington's army was not only Irish but actually native-born Irish.

Custis Washington, the adopted son of the Father of our Country, wrote that "The aid we received from Irish Catholics in the struggle for independence was essential to our ultimate success in the war of independence. Ireland furnished 100 men for every single man furnished by any other foreign nation; let America bear eternal gratitude to Irishmen."

And when the Federal Union was threatened by civil strife in 1861, 150,000 Irish gave their best in brain and brawn and blood to maintain the bonds that bind all our States into one great social, political, and economic entity.

It isn't necessary to go into more detail. In the words of a former President, Theodore Roosevelt, "In every walk of life men of Irish blood have stood and now stand preeminent as statesmen and soldiers on the bench, at the bar, and in business. They are doing their full share toward the artistic and literary development of the country."

As we glory today, and justifiably so, because of the attributes and deeds of St. Patrick, of our Irish forebears and Ireland, during its long history, it is shocking to reflect on the world situation. Between war and peace is our predicament today—when the passions aroused during the war have not yet been abated and when periodic flare-ups like the flash fires following a major conflagration still occur. There is major trouble in China, Korea, in Indochina, in Palestine, in Czechoslovakia, in Italy, in France, in Finland—trouble it seems wherever Communist influence can reach.

Is it any wonder that we have been bewildered, disheartened, and confused? We have been bewildered, disheartened, and confused because it appears that the ideals for which our boys fought and died have been compromised and are in serious danger of being compromised further. We are disturbed by the signs that leaders of nations find it expedient to yield to necessity, that they find it to their best interests to sacrifice ideals to so-called practical necessity. A perfect example of this was the timid yielding of Edward Benes of Czechoslovakia.

That is why I welcomed the forthright statement of the President today. His declaration was as momentous as Roosevelt's quarantine speech. I cannot agree with those Members of Congress who claim that the President is creating a crisis. It is the Soviets, by their ruthless robberies, who have created the crisis.

I am especially happy that he has officially denounced the "Soviet destruction of the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in eastern and central Europe."

For several years I have been calling attention to the apparent complacency, amounting almost to acquiescence of our Government in the face of Russia's absorption of Lithuania, Esthonia, and Latvia, and their practical domination of Poland.

I was rather disappointed, however, not to hear any specific mention of our impotent air power.

We have appropriated $11,000,000,000 but it is poorly distributed among our armed forces.

We need to reallocate our defense money so that the Air Forces may more rapidly be brought to fighting strength.

Much more money should be allotted to aviation research, so that we may avail ourselves of the latest developments in areodynamics.

Certainly, President Truman has shown courage and leadership in his declaration, "There is some risk involved in action—there always is, but there is far more risk in failure to act."

I am reminded, in this connection of the remarks of Winston Churchill that "It is not always given to the wisest of men or nations to know at every moment where their true interests lie, but even the humblest and simplest can see from day to day where their duty lies." How true that is, yet how unfortunate that that able statesman and the leaders of the British Empire were not motivated by such high ideals when in 1920 they caused the morally indefensible partition of Ireland to be perpetrated upon those freedom-loving people. And so divided Ireland looks forward patiently to the day when moral reckoning will bring to the Emerald Isle a free and undivided country.

Neither this nation nor any other nation should contribute to retard that day.

The great powers thought they were consulting their best interests in the thirties when they connived at the open defiance of international law. History, which has recorded World War II, has mocked their worldly wisdom. Peace can only be secure under the moral law that comes from God, a law from which no nation, no more than any man, can claim exemption.

Every attempt so far by foreign ministers and nations to agree upon a peace settlement seems to have ended in failure. We are confronted with the ideology which makes the state supreme over the individual, opposing the Christian ideology that recognizes the dignity of man, as a creature of God.

Surely we must realize that the invasions of the Russian Bear are not moved, as Soviet apologists claim, by a simple desire to maintain friendly neighbors against possible military aggression or economic strife. They aim to fulfill their satanic purpose of world domination and to substitute the atheistic doctrines of Lenin in place of the moral law of God, to which every sane person, regardless of religious affiliation, adheres.

Do not be deceived; there is no religious freedom as we know it, in Russia or behind the iron curtain. Religious freedom exists to the same extent that a beast of prey enjoys freedom after a hunter has chased it from the forest into a pen—freedom just until the hunter can move in at an opportune time and deprive it of its limited freedom.

Other freedoms the Russian people have none. In Moscow I saw children 11 and 12 years old working on precision instruments in factories—elderly women firing large boilers—carrying heavy buckets to and fro—collective farms where old women did most of the work. I saw their caste system, the peasants' market. I can still recall the filthy odor—old decrepit men and women—one old woman in tattered clothes holding a long dead fish—others with a roll, a half loaf of bread, a trinket here and there—all wanting to barter.

In Moscow a young and talented girl, a member of the VOX (cultural society) was our guide on one occasion. As we drove along the street one of my colleagues asked: "Young lady, to what church to you belong?" The young lady looked at him rather scornfully and replied, "I don't belong to any church. I don't believe in God." It is indicative of the training of the youth.

On another occasion, as the guest of an American, we saw the Kremlin, wide avenues, the modern buildings and subway. One of my colleagues stated: "They seem to have everything. Is there anything we have that they don't have?" The reply was quick. "Yes; freedom."

In nations behind the iron curtain the atmosphere of secrecy, of fear, and of terror was so great that it was almost palpable—I sensed it wherever I went and in conversations with everyone with whom I spoke.

I saw not only the plight of the Russian people, I saw the plight of many of the displaced persons in Europe. The Wiley bill presently under consideration in the Senate, to provide haven in this country during the next 2 years, for 100,000 of these unfortunate people, falls far short of the aims of the National Catholic Resettlement Council and Protestant and Jewish agencies which are working vigorously to make preparations to absorb these people without disrupting our own economy. The Wiley bill is very narrow and restrictive. For example, it is unfair to the Poles because, of the 100,000 persons who would be admitted to this country, 50 percent must come from countries which are now under the actual control of Russia. Poland is under the domination of Russia, yet it is technically an independent country, and therefore would be precluded from participating in 50 percent of the quota.

I thank God when I turn from the vision of complete totalitarianism to the freedom of the Irish who are able to aspire to such lofty heights as their government recently expressed in their memorial to Pope Pius XII when their Prime Minister stated last week that they would be guided in their work by the teachings of Christ and would strive for the maintenance of a social order based securely on Christian principles.

Under the severest handicaps imposed by tyranny and persecution Ireland has managed to build on its own soil a nation which today proudly holds up its head among the great ones of the world. If there were time, what proud episodes there are to tell, even of the present day.

There would be the story of the recent war, when two of the most powerful nations of the world demanded from the Irish that they deny succor or sanctuary to any enemy fleeing to them for shelter. It was a request foreign to all the teachings and the practice of the Christian tradition. The right of asylum has ever been sacred in the Christian world. The courageous and Christian reply of the leader of St. Patrick's nation went ringing into the ears of all the world. It was a reply given with neither an army nor a navy to back him up, but only Christian principle and the sense of right and justice supported by a people truly Christian. "Will we deny shelter and sanctuary to those who come to us for refuge? That is a decision that the Irish people will make for themselves when the time comes. And when it is made it will be decided by what justice, charity, and the honor of the Irish people demands."

Or we could tell of the stream of relief supplies that have been flowing out of Ireland into the war-ravaged countries of Europe, free gifts of a Christian nation. Although the Irish people have had to tighten their belts themselves for 7 years past, they have still found enough supplies to send shipload after shipload to Holland, Denmark, France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Germany. Thanks to the steadfast refusal of Soviet Russia to agree to their admission, Eire is not a member of the United Nations; but they have shipped in proportion to their national income more food and supplies to distressed Europeans than the quota assigned by the UNRRA Charter to the members of the United Nations.

Such charity adds a new jewel to Ireland's emerald-studded crown. Such charity reminds us that the Irish have never set great store by the things most men consider the signs of worldly success. It was Patrick Pearce, writing just before Easter week 30 years ago in Ireland, who put it this way, and I think it expresses the true Christian spirit of St. Patrick's people:

"I have squandered the splendid years
That the Lord God gave to my youth
In attempting impossible things—
Deeming them alone worth the toil—
Lord, if I had the years,
I would squander them over again,
Aye! fling them from me!
For this have I heard in my heart:
That a man should scatter, not hoard,
Should do the deed of today
Nor take heed of tomorrow's ills;
Shall not bargain or huxter with God—
Or was it a jest of Christ's,
And is this my sin before men:
To have taken Him at His word."

The sons and daughters of Patrick have taken Christ at His word. "You have not here a lasting city," Patrick told them long ago on the word of Christ. And they have believed it and acted on it. They know that they and every other people are but on the road to another and better life beyond. So they have refused to become engrossed in the things of time or to set their hearts on mere material things.

"By this shall all men know that you are My disciples: that you have love, one for another." They have believed and taken Christ at His word. Because they have, the world, the modern world, cynical, embittered, disillusioned, looks with amazement at the spectacle of a whole nation standing on justice and right, refusing to exchange for the charity of Christ the calculating hate and vindictiveness of material power, at a Christian people that insists on being Christians, even though it be out of fashion with many of the wise, the sophisticated, and the powerful of this world.

"Learn of Me," said Christ, and they have taken Him at His word. In a world that insists upon keeping up with the Joneses, Irish mothers have kept one eye on Mary, and Irish fathers one eye on Joseph, with the other eye on Christ, our Lord. Patrick planted well, and God has given the increase.

We are here under the patronage of St. Patrick to celebrate his feast and to pay homage to his memory. But this celebration would be an empty thing, and we would be wasting our time if we did not take from it a renewed resolve to measure up to the courageous heritage he has left us. God knows there is need today for a resurgence of the true Christian and Irish spirit. Surely there is need today for a new generation of Irish missionaries to carry the spirit of Christ to our own pagans of America and the world. We need once again a host of saints and scholars. We need people who know their Christian faith and have the courage to act as Christians.

In political life we need men and women who are informed about current issues and about the Christian principles involved. We

need, in a word, men and women who know what is right and can rebuke what is wrong, men and women undeceived by sham and show and fakery and propaganda; who can stand, and will stand up for righteousness. We need men and women with the true and traditional Irish charity and generosity, who will give of their time and their talents to make the various circles in which they move—political, professional, economic, social, and domestic—Christian in deed as well as in name.

God grant that the Irish community in Cleveland, while remaining truly American in every best sense of the word, may be also another island of saints and scholars, spreading into every field of community activity the knowledge and faith and love and generosity which they have received as a sacred patrimony from St. Patrick. We may be sure of our courageous patron's assistance in our effort to spread his spirit. As the old favorite song has it:

"For thousands of years, in smiles and in tears,
Our saint has been with us, our shield and our stay,
Ne'er had the children more brave or true-hearted
Than those he sees here on St. Patrick's Day."

It Ought To Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the West Union Record, West Union, W. Va., published and edited by Walter Stuart.

The editorial follows:

IT OUGHT TO BE DEFEATED

"If the whole Congress consents to this preliminary consignment of American resources to Europe, and later supinely approves of the total expenditures proposed under the Marshall plan, the debt and tax burdens of the American people will be increased by $17,000,000,000 within the next 4 years.

"Every American is going to be poorer if the Marshall plan is approved, the Government will be weaker and may become impotent in international affairs, and the country will have a lower living standard and may ultimately become impoverished.

"The Marshall plan, the most futile and wasteful 'nstrument of governmental expenditure ever considered by any nation in the history of the world, ought to be defeated in the 'nterests of the American people.

"If the American Congress does not have a sufficient sense of patriotic responsibility to perform this duty in behalf of the American people, a sufficient upsurge of national protest against the incapacity of Congress becomes a matter of utmost necessity." (From an editorial in the Baltimore News-Post.)

There should be such a protest by the people of this country against the Marshall plan that Congress would speedily reject the plan by an overwhelming vote. If the people realized just what the plan is and what it will likely mean to this country they would hold indignation meetings in every community throughout the land and adopt resolutions demanding that Congress defeat the plan.

The Marshall plan is the most preposterous and outrageous thing that has ever been submitted to the consideration of the American Congress. If it is adopted and carried out according to the specifications of its authors and sponsors and if it does not wreck this Nation, there is nothing that can wreck it, or, at least nothing fatal to our national welfare that anybody can foresee as likely to happen within the next generation.

Even if we were out of debt it would be foolish to commit ourselves to any such obligation as is involved in the Marshall plan. But inasmuch as we are in debt to the amount of more than two hundred and fifty thousand million dollars and the annual cost of government is around forty thousand million dollars, nothing could be more senseless and outrageous than for us to pledge ourselves to spend some five thousand million dollars a year for the next 4 years to help the governments of 16 European countries to fight communism. The sponsors of the Marshall plan are not advocating its adoption for the purpose of feeding and clothing the hungry and naked people of Europe, but for the purpose of fighting communism.

We cannot stop communism or any other ism by the use of money. If the people of Europe are for sale, we had better keep our money on this side of the ocean, attend strictly to our own business, and let the people of Europe alone. The Baltimore News-Post very truly says:

"The Marshall plan is a futile instrument for the accomplishment of its purported purpose, for if the beneficiary European nations are only to be persuaded against communism by the device of purchase, then they have the morals of mercenaries and will always be purchasable by the highest bidder."

If the primary purpose of the Marshall plan is to fight communism, as its sponsors avow, it may be the means of involving us in another war. As long as the plan is used for the purpose of fighting communism, the danger of war, like a Damocles sword, will constantly threaten us.

This country should help to feed and clothe the distressed people of Europe to the extent of its ability to do so without doing violence to its own economy. Nobody could object to that. But it should not give a dollar to any European government to fight communism or to fight any other ism or ideology.

Let us give of our food and of our clothing what we reasonably can give, and let us give no more than that. But we should not pledge ourselves to give any definite amount each year through a definite period of years.

We had better throw our money into the Atlantic Ocean than to give it to any of those rotten European governments.

Write to your Representatives in Washington and urge them to vote against the Marshall plan. Tell them they need not expect your votes next fall if they vote for the Marshall plan.

Exiled Polish Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a communication that was transmitted to me by some of the Polish-American leaders in the United States and which comes from a number of exiled Polish soldiers who are presently in England. A great many of these valiant soldiers desire to come to the United States. I am sure that every Member of Congress will be deeply moved by reading this communication from those who have been exiled from their native land. Numerous signatures were affixed to this communication which have been omitted from the printing.

The communication follows:

THE VOICE OF THE FORMER MEMBERS OF THE POLISH FORCES, STAYING IN HODGEMOOR CAMP, NEAR AMERSHAM, BUCKS (ENGLAND)

With a genuine joy we welcome heartily a magnanimous motion of Mr. Johnson Lodge in the matter of 143,000 of the former members of the Polish forces, who—as the above-said motion provides—should be allowed to immigrate to the United States of America with their families.

The news about that and about all the activity connected with it has brought us some alleviation.

As combatants of the Second World War, we were the first struggling ones against the barbarous Hitlerism for freedom, justice, and peace in Europe and all the world.

In spite of our sacrifices, the purpose for which we struggled was not reached.

The lives of millions in Poland and abroad were lost in vain, the majority of survivors found it still impossible to go back to their own country, ruled still by the enemy.

After the eight long years of our soldiers' exile, we cannot return to our country, to our people—our dearest mothers, wives, and children. Our country has been presented to our enemy.

The deed of this transaction has been a most shameful document of the twentieth century, and is a disgraceful burden for the politicians of the western democracies.

But we are highly convinced that the war is not over, indeed, and it is our task to fight for freedom, for victory.

We take our staying in this country as a very provisional one, not only because of economic difficulties of Great Britain itself, that cannot be propitious to any foreigner living on this island, but because we find a commandment in the history of our nation—the way of a fighter for Poland's freedom leads through the United States. We want to follow our heroes, Kosciuszko and Pulaski. We want to be with you and to be able, when the moment comes, to fight for freedom of ours and of yours.

History sometimes comes back.

When taking under consideration the possibilities of immigration of some 143,000 of the Polish soldiers with their families to the United States let us remind especially some aspects of its—

1. The first one—a political one—these 143,000 of the Polish soldiers, they are the most proved anti-Communists; they prefer to relinquish their return home as they know that their country is quite overrun by the Communists.

The great majority of them are the former Russians' political prisoners or people once deported—between 1939 and 1941—inside the Asiatic Russia for political reasons.

Thus, this 143,000 of the former Polish soldiers with their families could bring some good knowledge about Soviet Russia—its regime, its life, its "democracy."

Such a knowledge should not go in vain. Today they could balance the harmful influence of the Communist propaganda; tomorrow they could be very useful as the former soldiers who fought in different war theaters in the last great war.

2. The other aspect is: The former Polish soldiers represent people of all professions. As to the population of our country, they are in its 70 percent farmers (owners of the small agricultural property, some 70 percent of those 143,000 with their families may be very suitable for the United States, especially as they have in their plans to develop agriculture in some vast parts of the country.

Others, being not farmers, would be also quite certainly profitable for their new country.

That is an aspect of economics.

3. The last one is an ideological one. The eyes of all so-called small nations are still turned to you. The magnanimous admission of those homeless would strengthen the attitude of nations (even behind the iron curtain), in effect giving the United States the position of the power as well economically, militarily and morally, the first in the world.

We sincerely believe that the United States only are able to do this—to build a new, better world, to free it from the diabolic power of the communism.

It is necessary to save the deed of Christ from Communist flood, that wants to build in place of Holy Cross—Lenin's-Stalin's monument.

We believe that the spirits of great Jefferson, Washington, and Lincoln, who shaped the mind of the American Nation, who gave the great American Constitution, will inspire today your great Nation.

We believe in American genius.

And from far we send to you our soldier's appeal: "Help us and we will help you in the struggle that is going on, the struggle for the world and the men."

We are much obliged to: Mr. Johnson Lodge, Dr. Pfeifer, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Gruszka, and all these Congressmen and Senators and all the people of America that fully appreciate the injury that touched our country.

We are waiting and we expect that the help will come in time; the help worth the freedom-loving, great nation.

(Numerous signatures.)

Address of Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the address given by one of my constituents, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and an honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil. Dr. Thorning is an advocate of liberty and democracy, who for many years warned the citizens of the United States about the deceit and bad faith of the Marxist totalitarians. At the same time, he has furnished splendid leadership in our development of friendship with the other American Republics, as well as of good understanding and cooperation with the people of the Iberian Peninsula. It is a pleasure to note that this adopted son of Maryland has been nationally and internationally recognized for his uprightness, foresight, and courage. Since he resides in my district, I am particularly happy that he has again been invited to offer the invocation on Pan-American Day, April 14, 1948.

The report of Dr. Thorning's speech which I propose is taken from the Catholic Review, Baltimore, Md.:

Addressing the Maryland State Knights of Columbus at their annual communion breakfast in the Alcazar, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning declared that "in our campaign of self-defense against totalitarian Marxism the other American Republics are our best friends." Dr. Thorning, who is pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and associate editor of the Americas, pointed out that the other Americas, geographically and economically, represent a stronghold and a storehouse of vital supplies.

OIL MEANS MUCH FOR US

He said Venezuela constitutes "the only important source of unexploited oil in the Western Hemisphere and, consequently, if other petroleum fields were suddenly cut off from the United States, South American fuel would have to service a large part of our air and surface fleets."

Dr. Thorning, who is also associate editor of World Affairs, a Washington quarterly, said that "too many of our citizens fail to realize how much we owed to our good neighbors in World War II. Do we all remember that indispensable metals, like tungsten, tin, and vanadium, were shipped to us throughout the conflict?"

POINTS OUT OUR DEPENDENCE

"Do we recall that South American drugs saved the lives of our soldiers and sailors? Do we appreciate the fact that our communications system depended upon the quartz crystal of Brazil? Can we forget that wheat, meat, and hides were made available to our allies by the other American Republics? These were valuable contributions to our success over Nazi-fascism. We need the same and, possibly, more generous cooperation in order to survive in a world which is rapidly being swallowed up by slavery.

"The most important feature of this wartime collaboration was the corridor of victory in northeast Brazil. This section, devoted to huge landing fields and supply depots, was the funnel which poured planes, munitions and technicians to critical fronts in Africa and Asia. It is not too much to claim that the corridor of victory meant the difference between success and failure for our allies at Cairo and Stalingrad."

PRAISES TWO DIPLOMATS

"It should be emphasized that the Brazilians were willing to provide this highway of triumph because of the expert diplomacy of the Honorable J. H. Jefferson Caffery, the first United States Ambassador in Brazil to learn Portuguese. With Mr. Caffery throughout this important epoch was his loyal coworker, the Honorable Walter J. Donnelly, now United States Ambassador to Venezuela, the country which holds our great oil reserve.

"It is heartening to know that Ambassador Caffery in Paris and Ambassador Donnelly in Caracas are placed most strategically for the best interests of liberty and democracy in the current crisis. Men are more important than machines in our duel with the new totalitarians."

England and France Reduce Armies and Construction, Australia Decides Against Universal Military Training, While United States Considers Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "The American Crusade." It will be interesting to the mothers and fathers of America to learn that many of the nations the administration proposes to save from communism have decided to reduce their armies, stop armament construction, and decided against universal military training while the United States considers the draft.

The editorial follows:

THE AMERICAN CRUSADE

It did not require Mr. Truman's speech to induce our recent allies to nominate the United States by acclamation to assume the whole job of fighting any wars which the future might hold. They had already noted that Mr. Truman, Secretary Marshall, the generals, and the usual calamity shouters of the press and the eastern internationalist set had worked themselves up into an uncommonly big sweat.

On March 2 General Marshall appeared before a closed session of the Senate Armed Services Committee urging prompt enactment of the universal military training program. On the following day the Australian Information Bureau thought the occasion suitable to announce that the Australian Government had turned down recommendations of Army Minister Cyril Chambers and 13 generals that at least 6 months' military training be adopted. It was stated that if the Australian people did not want to prepare themselves for war, neither compulsory training nor a voluntary scheme could make them do so.

Australia, of course, has the example of the last war to demonstrate that America can be counted upon to defend the antipodes, as well as the present evidence provided by Truman, Marshall, former Justice Roberts, and all of the others screaming for peacetime conscription, that the Washington administration intends to impose all of the sacrifices of money and bloodletting on the American people.

Then there is Britain, much closer to the firing line than the United States. Britain has just ordered the army cut by 207,000 within the next year, has stopped all new naval construction, and has cut its naval appropriation to $614,000,000 for the coming year. Why not? Truman proposes in his budget to spend four billion one hundred and sixty-six million on the American Navy in the same period.

Even as staunch an advocate of British sea power as Winston Churchill, a former first lord of the admiralty, was almost willing to approve the naval cut, for, as he noted, "there never was in time of peace a British Navy which had so few possible naval foes and so many powerful naval friends."

France would like to have a token army of about 600,000 men if we are willing to equip it. Premier Schuman has announced that the shortage of manpower would necessitate discontinuance of the manufacture of certain types of military equipment. This has been followed by reports that the United States has promised France complete equipment for 20 divisions. Such an arrangement was indicated in Truman's statement that we must support European countries against Communist control. The recommendation of the congressional air policy board to build up an enormous air force capable of defending not only this country but "those free allied governments with which it is joined for mutual defense" amounted to the same thing.

Now Truman in his speech and Marshall in a new appearance before the Senate Armed Services Committee have reinforced these other nations in their determination to let us carry the ball on all of the plays. If we're suckers enough to want to play it that way, why should they bother?

Faith in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, at this particular time when it is so easy for us to become jittery and apprehensive as we stand on the threshold of an uncertain tomorrow, I have run across an editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News of March 18, 1948, and since it brings such a welcome message of faith and hope, I append it under leave to extend these remarks. The editorial follows:

FAITH IN AMERICA

Too many Americans who should be walking erect and proud in the knowledge of their Nation's great strength are disposed to be fearful that something terrible is about to happen to this country. They have an idea that Russia is more powerful than the United States and that this country is wandering in a maze and expecting some calamity to happen.

Anyway we look at it the United States is the richest and most powerful Nation in the world and its people enjoy the greatest opportunities, the most liberty, and the highest standard of living. Moscow with its breadlines hardly appears in a position to war against a great nation, except in a war of nerves where it can frighten small unprotected countries by rattling the sabers of great armed forces. This country does not have huge hordes of conscripts ready to goostep into a neighbor land, or swarms of secret police to harry and browbeat citizens. It does, however, have some Communists and fellow trevelers who should be deported to the breadlines of Russia.

In every basic way America is stronger by far than any possible competitor. In aviation this country has more commercial planes than the rest of the world combined, and more licensed pilots. American pursuit planes are the fastest in the world and American bombers of longer range and more powerful than those of any other country. In all phases of research for new weapons our country is far ahead and the fact that America not only has the formula for the atomic bomb, but knows how to manufacture and discharge that horrible weapon would make any nation, no matter how powerful, think a long time before arousing us to a fever pitch of war.

The world hasn't reached the stage at which an aggressor nation can push buttons and destroy another nation without warning. Probably that time will never come despite the outgiving of some of the wild-dream scientists.

America is still America, the land of abundance and liberty, the land of hope and opportunity; and it will remain such as long as its citizens demand honest and loyal service from the men they elect to public office. Friends of communism would have us believe that this country is going to pieces, and would persuade the people that little or nothing can be done about it. We should beware of such false friends and not be deceived by them. Wars and rumors of wars will only serve to bind the people of this Republic together in a tie that cannot be broken. Let's not sell our country short, but be on the alert for those people who would.

The Ways and Means Committee Proclaims Its Position

JOINT EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

AND

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] be permitted to jointly extend their respective remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that each of them be permitted to include with his own remarks extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. There being no objection, the unanimous consent of the membership is granted.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the Members constituting the majority of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means have learned from that which has appeared in the public prints that representatives of the State Department have been engaged for some time in carrying on negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland, and Habana, Cuba, with diplomatic representatives of several other countries with a view to the perfecting of certain international agreements which will affect directly and indirectly the revenues of the United States, the protection of which rests initially with the members of this committee.

Fearing that the representatives of these various other countries may be led to believe that the State Department in its representations to each of them is speaking with the authority and the assent of each of the other branches of our Government, these in addition to the Executive Department, of which it is a part, the committee, for the purpose of forestalling what some might regard a moral obligation on the part of the legislative branch of our Government to accept without qualification whatever agreements the State Department may consummate, has determined to clarify and redeclare to the world its constitutional responsibilities.

For the purpose of protecting and defending the legislative prerogative of the said Ways and Means Committee and the Congress, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] submitted a resolution to the membership of that committee, the text of which is the following:

Whereas the Department of State has drafted and sponsored a charter for an International Trade Organization; and

Whereas this proposed charter has been presented to a large number of other nations and its acceptance by them has been urged by the officials of the State Department; and

Whereas the effort and leadership in this undertaking on the part of the executive branch of the United States Government could be interpreted by other nations as an assurance of acceptance on the part of the legislative branch of the United States Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That any action of the President or the Department of State prior to the consideration by Congress of the International Trade Organization shall not, insofar as the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is concerned, be construed as a commitment by the United States to accept all or any of the provisions of the proposed charter.

This charter, if submitted to the Ways and Means Committee, will receive, solely on its merits, the same careful attention and consideration given to any measure brought before it.

By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that sometime ago, when the House of Representatives had under consideration a measure which would have effected the tariff on wool, the Congress of the United States was greatly embarrassed in the exercise of its legislative prerogative as a consequence of certain utterances of the Honorable Will Clayton, then an Assistant Secretary of State, of which the following constitutes an example:

If we at this time, when we are actually negotiating with other countries at Geneva for the lowering of trade barriers, raise new barriers as this bill proposes, we stand convicted of insincerity.

As the Chief Executive of our country, acting through his Secretary of State and other officials of the State Department, has his constitutional functions to perform; likewise, and under the same constitutional authority, the Congress also has certain prerogatives which it cannot, and must not surrender or forego under the lash of supposed moral obligations, this resolution was devised and adopted in the Ways and Means Committee on a roll call vote of 15 to 7. In taking this most timely action this legislative agency of the Congress reiterates its determination to perform its legislative function without the hindrance or embarrassment which silence at this crucial moment might entail.

By the very terms of the resolution, the members of the committee seek to put forever at rest any doubts that may ever have existed, during the days of legislative "rubber stamping," or since, in respect to whether or not the Committee on Ways and Means intends to rise to its high constitutional responsibilities in the consideration of all legislation that may properly come before it. In this spirit, the committee will proceed to the consideration of the various trade agreements negotiated at Geneva and the charter of the International Trade Organization and arrive at decisions in respect to each as the Constitution contemplates.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, as the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee do not share the fears or apprehensions of those who constitute the majority, and do not desire to be placed in the position of acquiescing in the issuance of a proclamation of legislative authority which the Constitution itself clearly preserves, a counter resolution was prepared by the gentleman

from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and offered as a substitute for the Gearhart resolution.

This substitute resolution, failing of passage on a roll-call vote of 15 to 7, is the following:

SUBSTITUTE COMMITTEE RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY THE MINORITY MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Whereas peace, freedom, and world trade are inseparable; and

Whereas the foreign relations of the United States, political and economic, are indivisible; and

Whereas the executive departments have taken the initiative in promoting the preparation and negotiation of a charter for an international trade organization now about to be concluded at Habana; and

Whereas the proposed ITO Charter would provide a code of economic conduct for the development of international commerce among the democratic nations of the world and for the prevention of economic warfare; and

Whereas the expansion of trade and commerce among free nations is an essential corollary to the economic recovery program now being considered in the Congress: Be it, therefore,

Resolved, That the President be urged to complete the negotiations for an international trade organization with the greatest dispatch, and that the proposed charter be submitted to the Congress at the earliest practicable date for approval in accordance with the Constitution.

Diplomacy and Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, from letters received from my constituents since Mr. Truman's speech to the Congress on March 17, I know everyone is grossly concerned about the world situation. To have another draft along with all the disruptions involved, a return of Government controls, forced upon us again in order to be successful in carrying out our proposed program, is a future every American abhors. The worry and anxiety which faces our membership is terrific. The future of our youth and our Nation is in a very precarious position. Our present administration has a lot to feel responsible for and to account for. The money involved in the provisions of the European recovery program, plus the expansion of our armed forces, with the possibility of the cost of a third world war, added to our present national debt, are inconceivable. In the face of such a program we must decide the all important question which is, Are we able to do all these things and still remain strong enough to stop the spread of communism, not only abroad but right here at home? This is a must, for if we cannot keep strong economically and militarily here, all is lost. I agree with our Speaker that Good Friday can well be spent attending church services and asking God for guidance in these critical times.

If we mean what we say, as Mr. Lippmann states in the following article, it is high time that Secretary Marshall and his advisers place our strength where it will be effective. A flimsy and weak foreign policy to date has resulted in confusion and chaos. Let us not bite off more than we can chew, but select the most strategic points, do it firmly and with a confidence that will stop for all time this Russian bluff. Handled properly and with dignity, I believe it can be done without firing a shot. That is my prayer at this Eastertide.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

DIPLOMACY AND STRATEGY

Even if all the military measures now proposed were taken promptly—selective service, universal military training, an expansion of the Air Force, a revival of military lend-lease to western Europe, and unhesitating support of the Italian Government—the situation would not be in hand without a revision and reorganization of our diplomatic policy. Strategical considerations are now paramount in the test of power which the Kremlin has decided upon, and in the show-down which is coming. That means that we can no longer afford the policy of general containment by indirect pressure and inconclusive subsidies and indecisive intervention all around the vast periphery from Germany through the Middle East to China. For we can never be strong enough everywhere to make such a policy successful.

At the zenith of our military power in the Second World War, and when we had powerful allies, it was necessary to make strategical choices as to where our military effort should be concentrated. Today it is even more essential that we choose the positions which can be secured, and our power committed and invested, with the greatest economy of force and with the best prospect of exerting the greatest pressure on the Soviet Union itself.

Our diplomatic strategy has to be fitted to the fact that we must cross the oceans before we can exert military pressure; to the fact that we can never hope to equal the military manpower of the Communists coalition; to the fact that our military superiority is in extremely complicated and cumbersome engines of war; to our command of the sea; and to the political realities—which are that in the whole periphery in Europe and Asia we are confronted almost everywhere with uncertainty and bad risks.

We cannot know how much the western Germans can be relied upon should Russia offer Germany the prizes and inducements that Russia alone can offer Germany. We may know what Chiang Kai-shek would like to do; we cannot count securely on what he will be able to do. We cannot have any firm confidence as to whether the Arab League would hold together, or what the states that belong to it would do, if they were put to the test, and had to deal with Stalin and Molotov rather than with the British Foreign Office and Mr. Bevin.

Therefore, though the positions in western Europe were consolidated, the great periphery would still be soft and dangerous. Our present policy in this periphery is no more than a haphazard series of entanglements and improvisations, entered into without a strategical plan as a result of conflicting pressures within the State Department and Congress, and upon them. It is time that Secretary Marshall took the view that diplomacy under existing conditions is not a matter of international conferences and public relations but ultimately and essentially what it was when, as Chief of Staff, he played a leading part in the grand decisions as to when, where, and how the military resources of the coalition would be allocated and deployed.

For the conflict with the Soviet Union is now primarily a struggle for strategical advantage in anticipation of a military showdown. Whether the struggle will end in war may depend on accidents, intrigue, and provocation which no one in Moscow or Washington may be able to foresee or to control. But insfar as this strategical struggle is still controllable, the outcome will surely depend on what, when the show-down comes, is the balance of power.

In reviewing our diplomatic policy our overriding interest is to avoid exhausting entanglements where no immediate decision can be had, and to concentrate the greatest force at those selected points which can be made secure and can be used.

It is reasonable to ask ourselves, then, whether, all things considered, Japan is not the most economical, reliable, and advantageous point at which to concentrate in the Far East. It is evident that the world conflict cannot be decided in China; China is much too remote from the vital centers of Russia and of the United States. Japan is a position from which Soviet Siberia, Manchuria, Korea, and north China can be dominated by a relatively moderate investment of strategic air power. Japan is, we can assume, fairly and unquestionably in our hands. It would then appear to be wise to concentrate our effort there until the fundamental world conflict with Russia has been settled.

Germany, viewed as a problem of global strategy, cannot, I submit, be treated as a military asset. For there is no certainty whatsoever that a reconstructed western Germany would have any ideological qualms about making an alliance with Russia. The precedents of history and the logic of the present situation are a warning that this is precisely what might happen. The actions of the German Communists and of many German nationalists point unmistakably to it.

Therefore, though western Germany would be integrated into the European recovery program, both for the sake of Germany and of Europe, it should be our settled policy to be prepared for a political turnabout in Germany. It should be made quite plain to the German nation that if once again they make a deal with Russia, or even begin to make the first moves toward such a deal, this will be an act of aggression against the West which will be met by summary action. For though our ground forces could not hold the Red army at the Elbe, it is quite within our power to make western Germany a military wilderness. What has been reconstructed with difficulty can be destroyed with ease. The knowledge that this is what we could and would do should suffice to offset the temptations which Russia can offer and the pressure which she can exert.

In the Middle East our main and immediate concern must be to make secure those selected positions from which we could not be dislodged, where we are not based upon the shifting sands of oriental courts, chieftains, and politicians. These positions will evidently be those which are readily accessible by sea, the coastal regions of the Mediterranean and of the Persian Gulf.

They should be firmly secured and developed, no reliance being placed for supplies or military support upon the turbulent interior of the Middle East which is beyond the immediate reach of any military pressure we can exert except by long-range strategic bombardment. Concentration at selected points should enable us to hold the strategic approaches to southern and central Russia, and to deny to Russia any profitable exploitation of the oil or the politics or the geography of the Middle East.

All this would be a stern policy, to be undertaken only if we really mean what we say, that the situation is in fact so serious

that it cannot be dabbled with safely any longer. The situation is unmistakably as serious as that. The stakes of the game are enormous, and it cannot be played successfully at this late stage without making decisions of the highest consequences and at great risk.

Europe as Seen by Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a member of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid, known as the Herter committee, that visited Europe during the summer and early fall of 1947. The committee made a careful study of the needs of western Europe to determine what aid should be given under the Marshall plan.

After a 6 weeks' tour of western Europe I returned to the United States with certain definite impressions and conclusions. These were given publicity by the Courier-Post newspapers of Camden, N. J. Under the unanimous consent granted by the House, I am setting forth these news articles as a part of these remarks in the hope that they may be of some aid in assisting those of my colleagues who have not had the privilege of visiting these countries in understanding the existing conditions.

These articles do not touch details of the kind and quantity of materials so necessary for recovery in these countries. Such matters and the more intimate details have been left for treatment by the several reports of the committee which have been prepared after the most careful consideration of the committee and its distinguished staff of assistants. The attention of the House is directed to these reports. The basic material contained in the reports has been gathered from every possible source of a dependable character and may be relied upon to the fullest extent.

The following articles while not dealing with the quantities and kind of material necessary for the rehabilitation of the distressed countries of Europe, yet, they do set forth basic conditions existing in those countries that must be taken into consideration in formulating any plan of recovery for Europe:

EUROPE AS SEEN BY WOLVERTON—POURING OF UNITED STATES WEALTH CANNOT SOLVE ALL PROBLEMS OF WAR-TORN NATIONS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of a series of interviews with Congressman WOLVERTON. Tomorrow he will discuss the conditions he found in France.)

Merely filling Europe's empty stomach is not going to solve the problems now racking the Old World.

That is the reaction of Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, back in Camden today after a 6-week tour of war-stricken Europe.

WOLVERTON was a member of a special congressional committee on Foreign aid, appointed to make a study of the needs of western Europe to determine what aid should be given under the Marshall plan.

"The world, frankly, is in a mess," said the Camden Congressman today. "Make no mistake about that."

"I confess dismay as I look back over the uncertainty and the threatening conditions I have witnessed.

"People everywhere look to the United States for help. As someone has said, the whole world is holding out its palms for us to fill.

"Of course we cannot feed the whole world, nor can we save the whole world, nor can we by all the effort that we might make, greatly change conditions throughout the world.

"Furthermore, in every land the people themselves must solve many of their problems. We can give them help in many ways. We can set an example for them. We can encourage them.

"But we must not think that all their problems can be cured by simply pouring billions into the countries that seek our aid. Such widespread, extensive giving—as has been suggested by some—will only tend to weaken America without permanently benefiting those who need our help.

"The whole matter requires careful thought and consideration."

STUDY IN SEPTEMBER

"It was a rare privilege to be a member of the select congressional committee on foreign aid. The Committee of Eighteen with its staff of technicians left New York August 27 and returned October 9.

"The committee was appointed by the Speaker of the House in accordance with a resolution passed by the House for the purpose of making a detailed study of the needs of England and the countries of western Europe, with particular reference to food and raw materials with which to reestablish its industries, and, thereby speed return to normal conditions so that world trade might be revived.

"The trip to Southampton on the *Queen Mary* was utilized to carry on conferences and studies of the problems with which we would be confronted in the several countries. The countries which were the basis of our studies consisted of England, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Switzerland, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Trieste, Greece, and Turkey.

"To facilitate the work of the committee and make a more detailed study than would otherwise have been possible, the committee was divided into groups and each was specially assigned to different groups of countries.

"Thus, one group was assigned to England, another to Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia, a third to France, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, and Switzerland.

"I was chairman of this latter group which was composed of four members. A fourth group was assigned to Italy, Trieste, Greece, and Turkey, and, to these several committees was added a fifth to make a close study of agricultural conditions in each of the countries.

"In each of the countries we met and held conferences with the heads of government, statesmen, ambassadors, ministers, and leading men of the various countries. These included businessmen, bankers, manufacturers, labor leaders, representatives of shipping, transport, and agriculture.

"And, in an effort to obtain a complete picture we visited the working people, the farmers and the average citizen in their homes to observe not only living conditions, but, to get an understanding of their viewpoint.

"In addition to these contacts we also conferred with the political leaders in all the several parties to learn something of their plans and party programs.

"Therefore, although the visit to these countries was relatively short, 6 weeks, yet, we think that we were able to get an over-all picture that will be helpful to the Congress when it considers the question of emergency foreign aid and what, if anything, should be done under the so-called Marshall plan.

"During our visit to Europe the committee also has had a staff working in this country on a careful study of what our national resources are at this time, and, what, if any, surpluses exist, so that we may be better able to determine what help may be given abroad without injuring our own American economy.

"For after all there is a limit to what America can do in relieving the conditions of need that exist not only in western Europe, but, also throughout the world."

EUROPE AS SEEN BY WOLVERTON—STABILITY OF CONTINENT RESTS UPON ECONOMY OF A CONFUSED FRANCE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of a series of interviews with Congressman WOLVERTON, just back from Europe. Tomorrow he will tell of England's resolute battle to remain solvent.)

Upon the economy of France rests the stability of the whole of Western Europe.

That is the most pertinent impression of the confused conditions on the continent brought home by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON from a 6-week tour of Europe with a special congressional committee.

The committee was appointed by the Speaker of the House to study the needs of western Europe in order to gage what aid the United States shall give under the Marshall plan.

"France is the pivotal state," declared WOLVERTON today. "The conditions there are reflected in all of the surrounding countries, and how France goes, so will go the rest, especially Italy."

FRENCH THRONG CAFES

"And France is in a state of confused uncertainty.

"It looks to the United States for limitless help, without seeming to be too anxious to help herself.

"On the surface, France seems to be fast returning to normal. People throng the places of amusement and the cafes. They seem well dressed and not starving.

"But underneath there is a tense spirit of doubt and uncertainty. The whole economic set-up has been slow to start recovering.

"Farmers have planted 25 percent less grain than normal because they consider the price the Government has set is inadequate.

"Economic recovery has been hampered by lack of fuel and raw materials. And France is running out of American dollars with which to buy them."

MUST BALANCE BUDGET

"The greatest need in France is for domestic remedies, which we cannot help attain.

"France needs to balance its budget. It must apply the brakes to the inflation of the franc. And it should cut deeply into the topheavy staffs of Government employees.

"There seems to be no incentive for the average man to save. Always in the past, the Frenchman has been noted for being thrifty. He always put something in the sock.

"Today, with the franc so unstable, the Frenchman spends his money as fast as he makes it. Farmers, however, are putting their money in cattle, and this has added to the need for more grain, with the smaller planting already contributing to the grain shortage.

"One of the chief reasons for the uncertain conditions, in my opinion, is that the Government is weak because it is a coalition government.

"The tax system needs revision so that there will be a more fair spread of the burden. The farmers and professional people are given preferences which should be abolished."

AWARE OF TENSION

WOLVERTON said he heard less talk of a third world war in Paris than he does in Washington.

"But France is very aware of the growing differences between the United States and Russia. And in the event of trouble, they see themselves caught in the middle," he said.

"The average Frenchman seems to feel that 'anything is apt to happen' and the dissatisfaction and uncertainty which prevail in France are the very things on which communism feeds.

"Communists control the labor unions and have the largest representation in the national assembly, though that body is so divided among several parties, none has a clear command."

WOLVERTON declared the United States will have to help Europe. But just how much aid will be recommended by the committee with which he studied European needs, WOLVERTON declared he was not at liberty to say.

"The committee is now studying all the voluminous reports we received abroad, and will meet November 6 to draw up recommendations," he explained. "We agreed among ourselves not to talk about aid in definite amounts before then."

ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT PARLEY

WOLVERTON was enthusiastic about the work done by the 16-nation conference which met in Paris to determine what they could do to help themselves before asking the United States for aid under the Marshall plan.

"I think this conference was one of the most important events since the war," WOLVERTON declared. "For the first time these western European nations were attempting to combine and solve their economic problems together. It laid the foundation for solving all the problems of Europe."

WOLVERTON said the subcommittee which he headed, and which was assigned to study conditions in France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, was fortunate in being in Paris while the 16-nation conference was in session.

The Congressmen, he said, thus were able to talk with the heads of the various governments concerned with Europe's plight and with American experts who attended.

"We brought back two trunks packed with findings which we will present to Congress." WOLVERTON reported, "and I think our presence in Paris also helped give the delegates there an opportunity to get something of the more practical side of the problem from the point of view of how Congress would react to their requests."

EUROPE AS SEEN BY WOLVERTON—CAMDEN CONGRESSMAN LAUDS BRITAIN FOR EFFORTS TO SOLVE OWN PROBLEMS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the third of a series of interviews with Congressman WOLVERTON, just returned from Europe. Tomorrow he will tell of conditions in Germany.)

"Of all the countries in war-torn Europe which seek aid from America, England is doing the most to help itself, in the spirit of the Marshall plan."

That evaluation on hands across the ocean, importuning hands across the ocean, was made by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, freshly returned from a 6-week tour of Europe.

The Camden Congressman was chairman of a subcommittee of the special congressional committee of 18, appointed to gage on the scene, Europe's ability to help itself, before further United States aid is extended.

"In considering what, if any, further aid should be extended to the countries of the world, to meet the present food crisis or, to supplement the underlying purpose of the Marshall plan, it is not only important, but extremely necessary to give serious and careful consideration to the needs of England," said WOLVERTON.

HOLDS STRATEGIC POSITION

"England occupies a world position of such strategic importance that no plan can prove worth while in the final analysis that does not give consideration to the situation in which England is now involved. It has widespread domain, with colonies throughout the world. It has a foreign trade with all nations.

"This, together with the fact that it has a financial status as a world power, creates a situation that involves so many countries, even beyond its own dominion, that it is impossible to ignore its relationship to a revival of world trade or settlement of the many problems growing out of World War II.

"There is no doubt that England today is facing a crisis. The Labor government, under Prime Minister Attlee, is struggling hard to meet the challenge.

"Unfortunately, it has not recognized, or acted as promptly as it should, in meeting and handling the growing problems. The result is that an austere program has now become necessary.

"And, let there be no doubt in the mind of anyone that it is really austere. The controls on food, clothing, fuel, and other necessities of life are even more strict than during the war.

"The sacrifices that result from such a program fall hardest upon the working class. There is naturally much grumbling upon the part of the workers, especially because of the fact that they elected the Labor government to power and did so on the slogan, 'Vote Labor—get what you want.'

"However, notwithstanding the disappointment that has come as a result of more severe controls instead of lesser controls, they are taking their medicine like soldiers. Their willingness to accept additional sacrifices is amazing and certainly to their credit."

DISSATISFACTION GROWING

"How long this attitude upon the part of the people will continue remains to be seen. There is evidence of a growing dissatisfaction with the present government. People are beginning to feel that it is inefficient, although acknowledging its good intent.

"Its program of nationalization of industries was a most pretentious one. Already the banks, railroads, and coal mines have been nationalized. The iron and steel industry was to be next in the fulfillment of the party program. However, it would now seem that the program for further nationalization of industries will be held up. This creates an issue between the right and left wings of the Labor Party. The latter is pressing for further nationalization.

"It would seem that Labor Party leaders are cognizant of some justification of the charge of inefficiency that is being increasingly leveled at them, as they have made, during the last 2 weeks, many radical changes in important ministerial posts. The most important was to make Sir Stafford Cripps head of several departments, as a national economic administrator, to increase production in all lines of activity.

"If he does not succeed then there is no one in the Labor government who could accomplish it. He is undoubtedly the smartest and best equipped minister in the present Cabinet."

The average Britisher is taking this new program of austerity with all the courage he exhibited at the time of Dunkirk, the Congressman reports.

"The Englishman is showing the marvelous bulldog tenacity for which he is famous. Unlike other countries of Europe, where they seem to take limitless help from us for granted, the British are straining every fiber to keep solvent.

"They're a proud people. It bothers them to realize that once dominant in foreign trade, and the money center of the world, they are now in the role of suppliant.

"But they are determined to muddle through, with or without aid from us. Their national slogan now is work and dispel want."

NEED MORE PRODUCTION

"Britain can only come through by increased production, which she can sell abroad. She is dependent upon this foreign trade for money to go into the world's markets to buy the very food she must have to exist.

"England has never raised enough food to feed herself.

"The question now facing Congress, and it's the most important question since the war, is how far can we go in helping England and the rest of the world, without jeopardizing our own economy?

"And just how much, if any, help we must give to prevent the collapse of democracy where it still exists in Europe.

"There is no question that our own present high prices have been affected by all the food we have been pouring into Europe.

"What Congress must decide is how far we can continue to go, how much more we can add to the $20,000,000,000 we've already given, before it wrecks our economic stability.

"We can't go on indefinitely financing the whole world without grave detriment to our own financial life.

"England realizes this more clearly than any other foreign nation. Of them all she has the most realistic viewpoint on American aid and is not letting up for an instant the battle to keep her own head above water."

HOME CONSUMPTION CUT

"To increase her production, and to pour all her goods into the export trade in an effort to build up her dollar exchange has meant cutting home consumption to the barest essentials.

"As I said, rationing is stricter there now than during the war. People are wearing clothes that are years old, and this is true of people of every class.

"It is most impressive how universally the restrictions and the rationing are obeyed. They may gripe and be grim about their frayed cuffs, and the lack of meat and butter on the table, but every class is adhering to the restrictions, with little of the black market evasions noticeable elsewhere.

"Britain is putting up a brave fight. She deserves to win it."

EUROPE AS SEEN BY WOLVERTON—WHAT SHALL BE DONE WITH GERMANY IS BIGGEST PROBLEM FACING EUROPE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fourth of a series of interviews with Congressman WOLVERTON. The concluding article will appear Monday.)

The most troublesome question awaiting decision today in Europe is "What shall be done with Germany?"

So believes Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, after a summer in Europe investigating conditions with a congressional committee appointed to determine how far-reaching the American program of aid shall be.

"Upon the proper solution of this question," said WOLVERTON, "depends the future welfare not only of the German people but, in large measure, the people of western and central Europe."

TRADE GREATLY AFFECTED

"The economic importance of Germany was never more generally recognized than today as the countries of Europe struggle to regain their former economic and financial stability.

"In normal peacetimes the economic welfare of all of Europe is so intimately connected with the industrial production, normally carried on in Germany, that to be denied its advantages at this time sorely cripples economic recovery in all European countries. The dependence of these countries upon Germany was never more forcibly recognized than at the present time when trade with Germany cannot be carried on under existing conditions.

"It was a great mistake to ever assume that Germany could or should be reduced to a pastoral country.

"A desire for punishment was the basis of this suggested policy. Of course, the desire to punish was natural when consideration is given to the ravages of war as conducted by the Nazis, but, justifiable though it may seem, already sufficient experience has been gained, in the effort to carry out this policy, to demonstrate that it cannot be done without seriously interfering with the recovery in all the other countries of Europe."

FEARFUL OF FUTURE

"In addition to the desire to mete out punishment was an additional reason, namely, fear that an industrialized Germany would become a menace to the future peace and security of surrounding nations. While this was a particularly potent reason that actuated many in their insistence that Germany be reduced to a pastoral state, particularly France, yet, that feeling of fear is rapidly disappearing.

"It is now being recognized that Allied controls over raw materials and the types of industry to be carried on can create all the security that is necessary to prevent Germany ever again becoming a military menace.

"Furthermore, there is a very practical situation that must be considered, namely, that unless Germany is permitted to manufacture the products that in the past have formed the basis of its foreign trade, it will not be able to buy the food and other necessities of life it must have, and, which in the past have been procured in large measure from other countries.

"Thus, without money to pay for its purchases it would continue to be dependent upon the United States and Great Britain to supply the necessities of life. This would continue to be a drain upon our taxpayers. The burden would be not only continuous, but, even greater, as Great Britain finds it necessary to relinquish its assistance owing to its financial inability to carry on.

"Therefore, unless the American people are willing to accept the continuing responsibility of feeding Germany, or at least, that portion which comes within its zone of authority, there must be a change in the present policy so as to permit a larger industrialization of Germany."

DIVISION OF AUTHORITY

"Unfortunately, the division of authority between United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia, whereby each has its own zone of control, has created many problems that have added to the difficulties of proper administration.

"In this division of territory between the four nations the Russians have been given the eastern portion of Germany which has heretofore been the bread and food producing section together with some industrial and manufacturing centers, the British received the northern or maritime portion together with the coal mines of the Ruhr Valley and some industrial sections, the French, the Saar Basin, with its coal deposits and industries.

"The United States, as expressed by some, has received the scenery."

"It has proven difficult to get unity of action through a control centered in four nations," said Congressman WOLVERTON. "The United States and Great Britain have been cooperative in their respective zones and these are controlled on a more or less bizonal basis. The French have not been as cooperative as they should have been. The Russians have been even more difficult to get along with.

"It is very unfortunate that there was not a centralized control in Germany such as General MacArthur has exercised in Japan. If such had been the case German problems could have been more easily solved to the betterment of all concerned, and similar progress made, as in Japan under General MacArthur.

"The German people are anxious and willing to work. The leaders in the Nazi movement have been quite generally disposed of either by death or long terms of imprisonment. The rank and file of the Nazi party have been less severely dealt with. Each has been punished according to the importance of the part he played in the Nazi party.

"Great progress has been made in the United States zone in establishing governments, based on democratic principles in the several states coming within its territorial zone. In all of these states the government is carried on by Germans who were not identified with the Nazi party. Of course, the United States military authorities continue to have oversight or control to insure fulfillment of military requirements."

FOOD SITUATION SERIOUS

"The food situation in Germany is serious. Germany never did, even in normal times, produce all the food its people consumed. Today, the situation is more serious because of Russia having control of the food-producing section of Germany, and being unwilling to share its responsibility in feeding the Germans and other displaced persons who have found their way into the United States and British zones.

"In addition to this is the further handicap that the crops that can be utilized in these two zones were greatly curtailed as a result of the freeze last winter that destroyed to a large extent the winter wheat.

"Also the droughts the past summer were the most extensive and severe in many years. In one instance it was said the conditions were worse than in any year since 1833.

"The food problem so far as the United States is concerned is extremely difficult. It seems as if every displaced person from all parts of Europe seeks the care and protection of the United States. The result has been tremendous increase in the population within the American zone. All of this requires more and more food to be supplied by us to them.

"The situation is so critical that something must be done to remedy it or the continual feeding of these people, and fulfilling our many other obligations in other countries, will have a serious effect on our own American economy.

"Today, America is faced with one of the most serious situations that it has been called upon to deal with since the war ended. It includes problems of statesmanship, and questions of finance and a determination of how far our Nation can continue to help without seriously affecting our own American economy, and the welfare of our people."

EUROPE AS SEEN BY WOLVERTON—SCANDINAVIA IS LONE BRIGHT SPOT IN SHADOWS OF DARK CONTINENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fifth and final article in a series of interviews with Congressman WOLVERTON on the European situation as it pertains to American aid.)

The popular picture of Europe today is a gaunt, bedraggled wench in a ragged cloth sack, begging hungrily for succor.

There are moments, however, when she appears as a plump, pleasant, normal person with a cheerful smile.

In a series of four interviews, Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, just home from a congressional investigation of food needs abroad, has drawn a rather grim over-all picture of the state of agriculture and industry in western Europe.

Today, reviewing conditions in Scandinavia and the Low Countries, his tone is more optimistic.

NOT A TRUE PICTURE

"In drawing a picture of the conditions of western Europe there is a tendency upon the part of some to make it appear as a place of total darkness and shadows," said WOLVERTON.

"This is not a true picture. There are lights as well as shadows. In some instances the conditions are such as to call for the use of bright colors rather than dark.

"Too often we measure all of western Europe by the conditions that prevail in some of the countries. There is no doubt that France, Italy, and Greece are among the dark spots. England likewise is not without its overshadowing clouds. But all of the Scandinavian countries, including Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and even Finland, are far from dark spots in the picture.

"Belgium and Holland, although showing the results of a ravaging and cruel war, are far from dark spots. They have problems that to them are serious, but they are facing them with the indomitable spirit that has always characterized these people. They, together with the Scandinavian countries, have a spirit to overcome difficulties that must be admired."

A WILLINGNESS TO WORK

"In all of these countries there is the willingness to work and work hard. They recognize that production is an absolute necessity if they are to solve their difficulties, and that the will to work and work hard to what gives production. Therefore the people of these countries are working and working hard.

"Belgium and Holland, which suffered more than any of the others, have made a remarkable comeback. But they have now gone as far as it seems possible without some outside aid. It is particularly noteworthy that these two nations as well as the Scandinavian countries do not look for aid in the form of gifts but of loans that can and will be repaid.

"They all have stable governments with strong men at the helm. Their fiscal affairs are on as a sound basis as could be expected. Their financial policy is one to ecourage confidence in their ultimate ability to weather the storm. And above all, they recognize the necessity to work and they are doing so.

"The countries of Luxemburg and Switzerland are the particularly bright spots in this whole picture. They have the strength that comes from a strong government, their fiscal affairs and financial policies are sound and businesslike, and the people believe in work and do work. If some of the nations that are not so well off as these two now are would follow their example, much good would result, and many of the problems with which they are struggling would be greatly diminished."

AS AN ECONOMIC UNIT

"It is extremely encouraging to note that Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg have tentatively agreed upon a union or trade arrangement between the three countries by which the economy of each country is made to fit into the economy of each of the others. This enables these three countries to work together as an economic unit. The advantages of such an agreement are so apparent that it is hoped that the scope of the agreement will be increased to include other countries of western Europe. If this is the result, it will be of outstanding value in promoting

the early rehabilitation of the countries participating in such an arrangement.

"It is regrettable that in drawing this picture of the western and southern portion of Europe that the conditions are such in Italy and Greece as to require them to be pictured with shadows and threatening clouds. Uncertainty hovers over both of them.

"All of this arises from the instability of their government, with finances at a low ebb, fiscal policies that are not sound, and no definite sign that the government has the support of the majority of the people.

"The men who are in the government of these two nations are all aware of the handicaps with which they are confronted, but they are striving with resolute courage to meet and solve the problems of their respective nations. Both of these nations are in need. They hope that aid will come to assist them in their struggle to maintain a democratic form of government."

UNITED STATES HAS PROBLEMS, TOO

"The committee, of which I am chairman, had the good fortune to be in Paris during the closing sessions of the 16-nation conference. This brought us directly in touch with the questions under consideration by that body. It enabled us to express at the most critical time of the conference, views with respect to the Marshall plan that left no doubt that America expects the nations of Europe to help themselves, as far as it is within their power to do so, and not depend entirely upon the United States to carry the load.

"At appropriate times and places we let representatives of nations participating in the conference know that the United States had problems as well as they.

"The idea was too prevalent among some of the nations that America is a land of milk and honey, with no limit to its capacity to give aid. In this connection it was pointed out by members of our committee that the United States had the largest national debt $260,000,000,000 of any nation in the world; that we still had the high wartime taxes, the tremendous expense in caring for our service men and their dependents, the great need of our old folks; that the high cost of living in the United States was in large measure due to the great quantities of grain, food products, consumer goods, fuel and other consumer goods being sent from the United States to foreign nations.

"All of this was mentioned, together with the fact that there was a limit to our national resources and our financial ability.

"I am of the opinion that the committee performed a worth while service in speaking frankly of our own difficulties and problems. Furthermore, I believe that some of the foreign representatives now have a better understanding of how many of our American citizens feel with respect to the need of taking into consideration the effect that continuous aid to foreign countries would have upon our own economy and the welfare of our own people."

A PROMISING STEP

"However, the 16-nation conference was one of the most promising steps yet taken by foreign nations in dealing with the subject of their needs, the extent of their ability to meet their own needs, and what could be done by themselves without outside aid from the United States.

"It put emphasis upon the thought that they should do something for themselves and for each other and not simply look to America for aid.

"The work of the Select Congressional Committee on Foreign Aid was not completed by the studies made by it in the several countries I have mentioned in these interviews.

"Our work also requires a study of our own American resources; what, if any surpluses do exist; to what extent further aid should, or, could, be given without destroying or seriously affecting our own stability, and upon what terms any contemplated aid should be extended, and how it should be supervised to make certain that there is no waste and that the objects or purpose of the aid are fully carried out.

"The final report of the committee and its conclusions, suggestions, or recommendations is to be considered by the full committee at a series of conferences to be held in Washington commencing November 6."

TOO MUCH AT STAKE

"It is expected that the report will be completed in time for its use at the joint hearings of the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committee to be held November 10 in Washington.

"The members of the committee are fully appreciative of the importance of the work assigned to them by the Congress. The final action of Congress will be important not only from the standpoint of foreign nations but also from our own as well. It is a subject that has had, and must continue to have, the most careful and conscientious study. It cannot be treated lightly nor in a small partisan way. Too much is at stake."

The above word picture of Europe is of things seen and heard as a result of traveling hundreds of miles and talking with people in different walks of life. It covered visits to large cities, small towns, industrial centers, and farming communities. The conversations were with those high in government circles, manufacturers, economists, financiers, political leaders, and likewise with workers, labor leaders, farmers, and the more obscure citizens who make up the rank and file of every country. It is presented unprejudiced and with no desire other than to correctly portray the actual conditions as they came to my attention in the countries visited.

It is hoped that these brief and sketchy remarks will give some understanding of the underlying conditions and be of some assistance in arriving at a solution of the perplexing problem of European recovery.

Recognizing the Great Architect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Recognizing the Great Architect," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, potentate of Salaam Temple at the Master Mason's night of the Paterson Link of the Order of the Golden Chain, Thursday, February 12, 1948.

The more than 5 years I have spent in the United States Senate convince me that unless we, as a people, redeem our morals, rebuild our character, and recognize the mandates of our God differently than we have been and are doing, we will not have the fiber and the courage to do the things necessary to accomplish the preservation of individual freedom in its true sense.

Words in this life mean little unless they are followed through by acts that are in keeping with the meaning of the words.

I am sure all who have an opportunity to read this speech will be benefited by it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNIZING THE GREAT ARCHITECT

There is a gloomy outlook in the world today. Defeatism, lack of hope and faith has made its mark upon many of our fellowmen. World strife has caused many to lose hope for future happiness and peace.

One of our contemporary philosophers recently declared that the break up of the Roman Empire was an historical incident of minor importance compared to what is happening in the world today. "We are witnessing the liquidation of the modern world. The decay," he continues, "began when man begot faith in his own self-sufficiency, and discarded the Great Architect of the Universe. The miseries, anguish, hunger, and despair of the people of the world are the inevitable result of this fallacy."

We must face facts. We must face this gloomy outlook, but we need to keep our perspective and remember that there have been other sombre moments in the history of man when the portents of disaster seemed to indicate universal calamity.

Listen to this statement, published in Harper's Weekly on October 10, 1857:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not in many years—not in the lifetime of most men who will read this paper—has there been such a grave and deep apprehension. Never has the future seemed so incalculable as at the present time.

"In France the political cauldron seethes and hub-bubs with uncertainty; Russia hangs, as usual, like a dark and silent cloud over the horizon of Europe, while all the resources and energies of the British Empire are sorely tried and are yet to be tried more sorely in keeping with the deadly Indian insurrection and with distressed conditions in China."

This was not written in 1948; it was written 90 years ago. During the "gloomy" future foreseen by the writer in 1857, the world continued to progress—faith and hope continued to stir men's souls and minds.

Great economic progress has been made in the world during those 90 years. The world would, of course, be immeasurably better off today than it is if our spiritual gains had kept step with our economic advances. Those dark and foreboding clouds of 90 years ago were dispelled by men of faith, hope, and courage, who demonstrated that man develops latent powers which overcome seemingly insurmountable difficulties.

The same characteristics of faith, hope, and courage can and will triumph in the future if we keep close to realities and do not substitute false gods for the Great Architect of the universe.

It was the will and courage of one man that led the world from confusion, despair, and darkness of Dunkirk. Winston Churchill sparked the spirit of freedom and decency that electrified men of honor who conquered the Germans and the Japs.

It was this spirit that helped Washington hold together his little band of patriots at Valley Forge and thus made us a free people.

When Washington's troops retook Philadelphia in the Revolutionary War, instead of engaging in revelry he and 300 of his men celebrated this great victory by attending religious services conducted by a masonic lodge.

A great historian asserts that our civilization can escape suicide only by returning to the practice of faith in God. How truly he reflects the basic concept of the teachings of freemasonry: Faith in God and man; belief in the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man.

That is the essence of freemasonry. That is why freemasonry has stood the test of time. That is why freemasonry has been and is a humanizing world force. There has been a spiritual thread running for centuries through the life of our craft binding us together and making us a mighty and constructive force for good.

It is this spiritual thread—this spirit of hope and faith that can lead us from the gloom of today's outlook to a brighter and greater place in world history. But we must regain what we have lost.

Our forefathers built on this continent a civilization which for prestige, wealth, and power, has no equal in the annals of history. Our material success has brought with it hazards of great magnitude. In our gains we have suffered important losses.

We have lost in a large measure that assurance of faith in divine guidance which was such a powerful factor in the lives of those pioneers who laid the foundation of America. It was divine guidance that gave them faith and courage to push forward the frontiers of world commerce and thus increase the living standards of all peoples.

Sadly lacking—but not without hope of reviving—are those religious convictions that put granite into the character of our forefathers.

There were many disappointments in 1947 as in previous years. However, the year was not without its achievements. Our production reached an all-time peak. There were jobs for all who wanted to work; there were bumper crops; and the national income was fabulous.

In world affairs peace agreements were signed with Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. An inter-American defense agreement was ratified. India has become independent and Burma is free.

There were other significant changes. The clash between Russia and the United States that brought anxiety and fear to the world will, in my opinion, yield to our new and positive policy which is creating hope in western Europe and consternation in Russia and in her satellite states; and too, Russia has been exposed to the world for what she is—an imperialistic, bloodthirsty, double-crossing nation grasping for world domination—and forcing others' decline.

The Italian foreign minister recently said:

"When a nation remains faithful to the ideals of freedom of the spirit, there is no final sunset for its people."

We have witnessed the "final sunset" of such godless men as Hitler, Mussolini, and their bloodthirsty followers. We, or our children, will witness, I believe, the "final sunset" of Stalin and his fellow tryants.

While we must not overlook stark realities, world problems, however, cannot be solved by despair. They can only be surmounted by faith, hope, and charity, and a steadfast determination not to compromise further the basic principles with that godless ideology called communism.

Americans know that there must be a world order and a world community, and that this Nation must, within the limits of its resources and financial means, take leadership in building it. That is our Nation's destiny and we cannot avoid the responsibility.

Freemasonry through its members and by its moral insight and spiritual fellowship is helping to build that great and essential edifice.

We must, therefore, look forward with high hopes and not be rendered impotent by despair. We must not give way to fears, but boldly face and master them.

Hope and faith are the motivating forces that have kept the human race progressing in spite of floods, pestilence, and wars. The men of faith and hope are the salt of the earth. Even if some of our hopes end in disillusionment, it is better to hope magnificently than to wallow in despair. Let us dare to hope and work for a better future.

We will do well to remember that this is both a changing and a continuing world. There will be countless changes for the betterment of mankind, but basic principles are steadfast. Basic principles are the constants in human affairs. The tangible changes, but the intangibles remain. The detailed care of babies changes with increasing knowledge, but mother love is as eternal as the Rock of Ages.

The years have brought swift changes in the American scene, but high, honorable, and patriotic public service remains now as in the time of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, the keystone of the Republic's vitality and power.

As Masons and as private citizens we must be steadfast in our demand that all public servants render honorable and efficient service regardless of creeds or party affiliations.

When the peoples of the world recognize God as the Great Architect of the Universe, as we Freemasons must; when they practice the brotherly love advocated by our fraternity, then and only then will the world withstand the winds of adversity. Then and only then will the dissent and strife melt into one harmonious note, symbolized by the square and compass which we Masons so proudly display.

The President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last night I participated in a debate and discussion on America's Town Meeting of the Air, the subject being, Should the President's civil-rights program be adopted? Appearing in the affirmative were the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and Mr. Roger Baldwin, chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union. The negative was represented by Mr. Donald Richberg, former chairman of the NRA, and myself. The program originated in New York, and was broadcast throughout the country over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my opening statement in connection with the debate and discussion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

While Mr. Baldwin glosses over the President's civil-rights program with some general statements we all know that in effect it provides for a Federal law against poll tax as a requirement for voting; a Federal law to send Federal agents into the States to punish citizens and communities for lynchings—only one of which occurred in all the United States last year as against numerous gang murders; a Federal law to say whom a man in a supposed private enterprise system may hire or whom a labor union of freemen shall take into membership; and other Federal invasions of rights clearly belonging to the States.

This program in every respect is unconstitutional, unwise, and unworkable and certainly should not be adopted in a free land of free citizens possessed of freedoms of choice.

When the founding fathers wrote the great agreement by which the States bound themselves together in a union for the good of all, they very wisely established a dual government—two spheres of government—one Federal, one State. The more limited sphere was the Federal, for it had only the powers expressly granted to it. All other powers were reserved by express terms of the Constitution to the States and to the people.

If we still believe in the Constitution and in this dual system of government—and I do believe in both—let us see where belong these powers that some now seek for the Federal Government.

First. The power to fix qualifications of voters belongs to the States. It is specifically provided in the Constitution.

Second. The power to maintain law and order within a State belongs to that State. It is nowhere in the Constitution granted to the Federal Government and therefore remains in the State.

Third. The right to run one's own business and to hire whom he wants belongs to the individual citizen.

Everyone knows that this proposed program is but a political football that is put into play every 4 years and to a lesser degree every 2 years to try to influence the Negro vote. Despite expression of lofty ideals that, unfortunately, is the case and everyone knows it.

May I illustrate this point by asking why all the furor over poll-tax requirements for voting and no concern over the much worse property test? Why so much concern to send hoards of Federal agents scouring through the States to punish one lynching a year while ignoring gang murders, many of them resulting from lack of proper police protection and many going unpunished because of apparent indifference. I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Sun of March 19, 1948, regarding the Scottoriggio killing here in this city on election day 1946—presumably almost in sight of city policemen. The great city of New York and State of New York have let this scandalous killing go unpunished, but there is no indignant insistence upon Federal help to solve this case and to punish the citizens and the city of New York for this disgraceful crime. Why no outcry for the many gang murders yearly? Why no outcry for the race riots which, by the way, nearly always occur elsewhere than in the South? Why no insistence for equal treatment for our Indians, the Mexicans, the Puerto Ricans right here in New York, and for the other so badly underprivileged here in this great metropolis as pictured so clearly and so understandingly in two of your own books: East River, and a Tree Grows in Brooklyn?

Oh, could we but follow the teachings of one so much wiser than we who said: "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in they brother's eyes, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

Understand me, I do not claim that we in the South, where exists this great problem of two races living together, have solved it. But I do say that we have made remarkable progress. We are moving fast. Legislation such as this to force us can only slow up the progress we are making.

The greatest Negro leader that America has ever produced was Booker T. Washington. He said: "Brains, opportunity, and character for the Negro will settle the question of civil rights." The best course to pursue in regard to the civil-rights bill in the South is to let it alone. Let it alone and it will settle itself.

"Good schools, teachers," he said, "and plenty of money to pay them will be more potent in settling the race question than many civil rights and investigating committees." This was good advice when Booker T. Washington gave it, and it is good advice today.

If you want to help us in the South solve the race question, give us Federal aid for education so that we can give the boys and girls of the South, both white and black, a fair educational opportunity. Let us have our regional schools that we are trying to set up. Give us Federal aid for expanding our hospitals, medical centers, health clinics, and our public health services so that disease can be eliminated from among both the white and the black. Give us an adequate housing program so that our people, both colored and white, may have decent places to live. In short, give us the things for which Booker T. Washington argued and worked.

Official Visit to My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, in asking unanimous consent that I be granted a leave of absence for 6 days to attend to official business in my district, I might mention that I have made it a policy to make a quarterly tour of my district so as to report first-hand to my constituents on my activities here in our Nation's Capital.

So that there will be a record as to my whereabouts during the 6 days that I will be absent from my duties here in Washington, I am inserting in the RECORD my itinerary covering the 6-day period of March 29 through April 3, inclusive:

MARCH 29, 1948

Monroe, all day; office, 120 Walnut Street.

MARCH 30, 1948

Rayville, 9 a. m.; courthouse or railroad.
Winnsboro, 11 a. m.; courthouse.
Harrisonburg, 12:30 p. m.; courthouse.
Ferriday, 2 p. m.; Ferriday Drug Store.
St. Joseph, 4 p. m.; courthouse.
Tallulah, 7 p. m.; courthouse.

MARCH 31, 1948

Lake Providence, 9 a. m.; courthouse.
Oak Grove, 11 a. m.; courthouse.
Bastrop, 1 p. m.; courthouse.
Farmerville, 4 p. m.; courthouse.

APRIL 1, 1948

Columbia, 11 a. m.; courthouse.

APRIL 2, 1948

Jonesboro, 11 a. m.; courthouse.

APRIL 3, 1948

Bernice, 11 a. m.; mayor's office.
Ruston, 2 p. m.; courthouse.

RADIO

March 31, KTRY, 1:45 to 2:15 p. m., Bastrop.
April 1, KNOE, 7 to 7:30 a. m., Monroe.
April 1, KNOE, 7:30 to 8 p. m., Monroe.
April 3, KRUS, 1 to 1:30 p. m., Ruston.

Palestine Reversal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a lead editorial which appeared in the Manchester Evening Leader of March 22 entitled "Palestine Reversal." This editorial is particularly interesting and challenging in view of recent happenings.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALESTINE REVERSAL

The United States, which was responsible in large measure for the proposal for partition of Palestine, has now reversed itself by the recommendation that partition be abandoned in favor of a trusteeship plan.

Americans have a right to be concerned about the effect upon our prestige of this reversal. This is especially so since such action is taken without the approval of Congress, even though it has the same practical effect as making or breaking a treaty. There are pertinent questions demanding answer.

1. Why is the plan now cast aside which we championed less than 4 months ago? If there were good arguments in favor of it then, what has happened to them since? If there are valid reasons for not having partition, why did we advocate it originally?

We cannot have been right both times. Nothing has happened in these 4 months that could not have been anticipated. British withdrawal, Arab violence, oil requirements, all these were known last November. Our see-saw type of policy can serve us no good.

2. What confidence do we inspire other nations to have in the stability of our policies and the integrity of our word? Won't they feel that if we can reverse ourselves in so short a time in this instance, we can do so again whenever we deem it expedient?

Russia is granted a rare opportunity to appear very righteous at our expense. Its representatives can shake their heads hypocritically as they say that they cannot understand America's lack of reliability—that their country, after all, was prepared to honor the vote it gave last November.

Newspapers describe accurately the consequences of our act when they refer to the "shock and surprise" spread throughout the U. N. by our proposal. We have succeeded only in undermining confidence in ourselves.

3. Have we strengthened our world position by this move? Not if it means lesser assurance among our allies. We have shown weakness, for our move will be interpreted as appeasement of the Arabs and fear of Russia.

4. Have we contributed to world peace? An emphatic "No!" The United Nations has been dealt a serious blow. Already we are charged with betrayal of the United Nations as well as of the Jewish people of Palestine.

Increased bloodshed will flow from our act. The Arabs, having learned that a program of violence benefits them, will continue it. They dare not change, lest the idea of partition be reinstituted with the return of calm.

The Jews of Palestine, feeling deserted, will decide that they can place their trust in nothing except their own efforts. They will turn from defensive action to an aggressive struggle for the state which they hold to be theirs.

5. Has America bettered its national defenses? No, because the oil was available to us regardless. The Arab leaders both coveted our dollars and feared Russian intrusion. They no more desire Communist agents in their midst than we do, for that would be the end of their personal power.

Turning back from partition will be no simple matter. As much will have to be undone as remained to be done. The road back will be filled with both bitter warfare and unforgiving recrimination.

What then has our Nation gained to compensate for all that we have lost? Gloom is the general mood at the United Nations. It might well be.

Selling Out the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD two editorials which appeared in the Jamestown (N. Y.) Shopping Guide of March 25, 1948:

WHAT IT WILL COST YOU

Since 1914, when the United States started out to adopt foreign countries, planners have squandered $85,454,481,931 abroad. Eighty-five thousand million dollars plus debts now outstanding to us from 61 nations—some of which still survive, some of which have vanished.

The latest Marshall plan, disowned by General Marshall, now called the European recovery plan—ERP—was formulated by Socialist Bevin and passed by the Senate without changing an "i" or "t." This would pour $21,021,000,000 more into England and 15 smaller countries. Planners advise that it had only a 50–50 chance of winning, that it is a gamble.

Congressman DANIEL A. REED states this will cost the people of this congressional district $21,000,000, enough money to erect 40 modern schoolhouses, or provide 6 hospitals costing $3,500,000 each, or 30,000 homes for veterans. All this enormous expense will be in addition to all taxes you now pay.

The money is equal to all the profits of all American industry last year.

We American people are already paying the bill for the Government's postwar relief programs abroad at the annual rate of $376 per United States family. By this proposal the bill would be built up to $862 per American family by 1951.

It means $7,000,000,000 a year added to our staggering taxes.

It is two-fifths of the total sum paid in personal income taxes by everybody in the United States this year.

It nearly equals the income taxes paid by all our corporations.

It does not take into account the number of failures the United States can absorb from the same leadership which led to the place we are.

This list, long suppressed, until revealed by probing Senators, shows where American taxpayer money will go for the next 4 years:

England	$5,348,000,000
France	3,701,000,000
Italy	2,913,000,000
United States-British Zone, Germany	2,499,000,000
Holland	2,436,000,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	1,419,000,000
Austria	713,000,000
Denmark	582,000,000
Ireland	497,000,000
Greece	473,000,000
Norway	234,000,000
Portugal	150,000,000
Iceland	38,000,000
Turkey	18,000,000
Total	21,021,000,000

Enemies, neutrals, allies—all in the mixed bag.

The above nations are known to hoard more than $35,000,000,000. No move was made by planners to unlock and make available these hoarded sums.

England has a secret deal with Russia, and much of the material passing to England may, like previous aids, end up in Moscow.

Let's see; what is the address of that party Uncle Sam is to apply to for aid when he is brought down to the level of the foreign nations he is helping?

SO YOU WANT LOWER TAXES?

Typical of the fuzzy thinking of the day is that revealed by G. A. Price, president of Westinghouse Electric, who is also member of the propaganda agency, National Council of the Committee for the Marshall Plan, written by British Socialist Bevin, as the latest streamlined aid-to-Britain plan.

As head of a manufacturing company Mr. Price is greatly worried about the tax burden borne by his company and its stockholders. He has written a letter to them telling them all about it. Their company paid nearly $56,000,000 last year to the Federal Treasury in taxes, 10 times as much as was exacted in 1939.

"We are entering the third year of peace," according to Mr. Price, "and it seems reasonable to expect a substantial reduction in Government spending."

The Government takes 38 percent of the company's profits before the stockholders get anything, and then taxes the dividends as if they had not already been taxed once. Where, he asks, is the country going to get the money for the industrial expansion that makes employment and prosperity when the Government makes saving impossible?

Mr. Price signed up for the Marshall plan and thereby did what he could to make certain that there would be no substantial reduction in Government spending next year or in any future year in which the plan operates. Doesn't he know that the seventeen billions will have to be collected in taxes?

The knowledge that such an enormous sum is being sent abroad will provide an effective and politically unanswerable argument to those demanding economy in domestic spending. Anybody smart enough to head a big corporation ought to have the sense to know that a Congress which tosses seventeen billions to foreigners cannot turn down requests for domestic expenditures.

Mr. Price concludes his letter to his stockholders with this question: "Why not tell your Senators and Representatives in Congress how you feel about this joint problem of unnecessary Government spending and double taxation?"

Any of the stockholders who accept the suggestion should save enough paper and ink to write a letter to Mr. Price in Pittsburgh, asking him how he thinks taxes can be reduced if he gets his Marshall plan to increase Government spending.

Of the $6,800,000,000 planners hope to ship to 16 foreign countries, $5,300,000,000 goes to England, where there is no Communist menace, which will reduce the taxes British pay by that amount.

The Marshall plan would cost each American family $376 this year, and $862 in 1951. Mr. Price's company slogan is, "Every house needs Westinghouse." How does he expect to get steel to furnish our homes, and how does he expect Americans who carry this extra tax to buy anything? Or, has he, like a lot of other businessmen, overlooked those points?

Saving Our Industries Is Everybody's Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on March 18, 1948:

SAVING OUR INDUSTRIES IS EVERYBODY'S JOB

With permission, the Evening Tribune reprinted from the Daily News Record of New York in the past 3 days an excellent article on wool manufacturing in the South. Its writer, Murray E. Wyche, chief of the Atlanta, Ga., bureau of Fairchilds Publications, stated that New England's wool manufacturing industry not only is threatening to follow the cotton textile industry into the South but that the migration already has begun. The sole question now in the minds of most observers is how rapidly the shift of the center of that industry from New England to the South will be completed. The article abounded in factual information about reported advantages of that section, the many wool-textile plants already there, those that have transferred recently from the North, and the concerted campaign to induce others to follow. Nobody who read it could fail to be impressed.

Because Lawrence is dependent principally on its great woolen and worsted industry, the Daily News Record article has tremendous interest and importance to this city and its people. Also, the contents form a challenge to the community to do everything within reason to avert possible adverse effects of this new trend, which was unknown previously to the local public.

This situation constitutes an excellent opportunity for the new, revitalized Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce to demonstrate the strong leadership naturally to be expected from it and should become that organization's top project. A thorough study should be made, close contact with the local industrial leaders established, and the most helpful coordination and cooperation provided. The solid support of the city government in all possible ways should be forthcoming without question. Textile workers and their labor unions should understand also that their full employment may be at stake and, if possible, they should endeavor to further improve the harmonious relations with employers that have existed for many years. Members of the legislature should resolve to support bills favorable to the textile industry and oppose harmful measures tending to make the South more attractive to it

In addition to its local efforts, the Chamber of Commerce should seek to arouse chambers, legislatures, and municipal governments all over New England to the impending danger of the loss of important manufacturing establishments and thereby aid in creating a sectional campaign along lines of self-preservation. This part of the United States allowed the cotton-textile industry to slip away, but should inaugurate now a vigorous battle to retain the valuable woolen and worsted manufacturing industry in which New England holds national preeminence.

As far as greater Lawrence alone is concerned, a high executive of one of the worsted mills here has said that this community can retain the industry if it so desires. Greater Lawrence should so will it and act accordingly without delay.

IRVING E. ROGERS,
Publisher.

European Shipping Has Had Its ERP—The United States Has Already Given the European Nations 800 Large Ocean Vessels To Assist Shipping Recovery—Why 200 More?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for some of us who desire to support the European recovery program to understand why the Committee on Foreign Affairs has included in its proposed recovery program for Europe the transfer of an additional 200 American ships to European nations.

Although the committee has made a most laudable effort to provide a worthwhile bill, yet, it seems to me it has made a most grievous error in including in its bill a transfer of 200 American ships to European nations which have already received from this country 800 large ocean vessels, in an effort upon our part to build up their depleted fleets.

It seems to me that European shipping has already had its ERP. Our Nation has met its moral obligation to aid in the rebuilding of the merchant fleets of our wartime allies by the transfer up to March 1 of over 800 large ocean vessels

aggregating an excess of 8,000,000 dead-weight tons. As a result of these transfers and of expanded shipbuilding programs, the ERP nations today have considerably more large ocean-going vessels than they had before the war. If other industries in western Europe had similar recoveries there would be no need for any European recovery program today.

American shipping and shipbuilding in contrast has suffered a serious decline. Because of these transfers and European launchings, the American bulk-cargo fleet in foreign trade has declined from 1,500 vessels last July to less than 900 today. This has meant large-scale unemployment amongst seamen, ship-repair workers, and has affected a host of industries related to shipping and shipbuilding.

It is important to point out that the exceptional revival of the European merchant fleets in regard to large vessels has been obscured by the tendency of our State Department to emphasize overall tonnage figures. It is true that the European fleets are deficient in certain types of vessels, largely small vessels for short trades and passenger vessels. We have no vessels of this type available for sale to these nations. Nor will the transfer of additional vessels of the 10,000-ton category compensate for the lack of these particular types of vessels.

Further transfers of large vessels will, however, result in the immediate lay-up of at least an equal number of vessels operating under the American flag injuring the long-range prospects of the American merchant marine, reducing the revenue to the United States Treasury from charter, hire, taxes, and so forth, and causing additional wide-scale unemployment in the maritime industry.

I have received Secretary of State Marshall's letter of February 17 to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I am at a loss to understand the logic of the State Department in this matter. The State Department says that there is 14,000,000 dead-weight tons of vessels idle in our laid-up fleet and urges, since the American operators have no demand for these vessels, that we transfer some to foreign flags. The precise reason that American operators cannot utilize these vessels is the numerous transfers that have already been made. Further transfers will proportionally reduce the number of vessels now active that American operators can economically employ. The logic of the State Department followed to its conclusion will lead to the complete destruction of the American merchant marine.

The Secretary of State points out that our present merchant marine is nearly at the level suggested by the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine. Accordingly, the Department suggests that we do not concern ourselves with the additional 900 vessels that we are now operating in the bulk trades. Yet at this very moment the United States Maritime Commission is conducting an investigation into the possibilities of a permanent American tramp shipping fleet. Naturally, if we destroy all possibility of the operation of such a fleet by the charter of additional vessels to foreign flags, the predictions of the State Department and the President's Advisory Committee will come true. I know, however, that our maritime workers, our shipowners, our shipbuilders, and the majority of the American people are not willing to set their sights at a goal which will reduce the American merchant marine to a point where it will carry but a small proportion of our foreign trade.

The Secretary of State says that the sale of our surplus vessels will produce revenue to the United States Government and reduce the cost of the foreign assistance program. Since most of the sales to date have been on credit and since the chartered terms in regard to the 200 vessels whose charter the House Foreign Affairs Committee has authorized is uncertain, I find that the net result will be a loss rather than a gain in revenue. At the present time, American operators of these vessels are returning to the Treasury in the form of charter, hire and taxes millions of dollars each month. In regard to the increased cost of foreign assistance programs should the Congress refuse to transfer further vessels, I have watched the extravagant estimates of certain agencies which originally totaled as high as $600,000,000 reduced as more and more facts were brought to light until we are told today that the alleged saving would be in the neighborhood of $100,000,000. I seriously doubt whether there would be any savings to this Nation.

The estimates in regard to savings flowing from the charter of 200 vessels fail to take into account the revenues now derived from the operation of a like number of ships under the American flag, the charter hire, the taxes, the earnings of seamen, and the general beneficial economic results that flow to a large number of industries and areas of our country. The estimates fail to take into account the increased cost of unemployment insurance for our maritime workers and the wasteful dissipation of a skilled maritime labor force built up during the war at a cost of over $225,000,000 which would result from further transfers.

Moreover, there is substantial evidence to show that at least some of the European nations do not think the proposed charters are necessary or advisable. The influential Norwegian Journal of Commerce and Shipping published in Oslo, and certainly the Norwegians should know about shipping if anybody does, states that these charters are not necessary. The Norwegian newspaper claims that estimates prepared last year in regard to the need for additional vessels fail to take into account the increased speed and capacity of most of the European merchant fleets and the large amount of tonnage now available under Latin-American, near eastern, and other flags. At no given time has the State Department presented data as to who, if anybody, wants these vessels, and as to how the 200 vessels would be distributed amongst the various recipient nations. There is indeed cause to believe that the need for further transfers rests solely in the collective minds of our State Department.

The Senate has on two different occasions voted unanimously to bar further transfer of American vessels. Less than 2 months ago this House, by a unanimous vote, took a like position. The action of the Senate and our prior action was based on sound reasoning. The proposals of the State Department, as embodied in the bill brought forth by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, on the other hand will seriously overtonnage the world merchant fleet with large vessels permanently impairing the opportunities for the development of the American merchant marine and the American shipbuilding industry.

I urge the Members of the House to reaffirm their previous decision and to eliminate the proposal contained in the bill to charter 200 vessels to foreign flags. I further urge the Members of the House to join with the Senate in providing that a reasonable proportion—a minimum of 50 percent—of the commodities to be exported under the European recovery program from the country be carried on American bottoms.

The Power of the Purse and Bleeding the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Power of the Purse," dated March 2, 1948, by Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill, and also an article entitled "Bleeding the States" dated March 4, 1948, by the same author.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF THE PURSE

When the Russian Government repudiated its obligations to its people, it gave a 100-ruble Government bond to everyone who had a 300-ruble bond. This wiped out two-thirds of its debt.

But, if a Russian owed the Government, was he permitted to pay his debt by paying only one-third? No, indeed. The Soviet Supreme Court has just decided that he must pay his debt in full—at par—at face value, ruble for ruble. No discount to Ivan.

All banks in Russia are Government-owned. If Ivan had a deposit in a Russian bank—that is, if the bank owed him, Ivan had to take a fraction of the rubles owed him. But, if Ivan owed the bank, he must pay in full. When Stalin is the debtor, he pays so many cents on the dollar. When Ivan is the debtor, he pays dollar for dollar. So Ivan gets it in the neck coming and going. You just can't win in Russia.

How would you like to live in Russia? When Stalin decided to pay his debts at a huge discount, the propaganda from behind the iron curtain said the repudiation was hailed with loud cries of joy. Do you believe it?

Well, that's what happens under one-man government.

I notice, with regret, that President Truman said the other day: "Conditions are too grave in the world at this time to put a Congress in control of the purse strings of this country."

That is an astonishing statement. Let us hope it was a slip of the tongue. But no one can blink the fact that the President's public acts show he is thinking along that line. He has twice vetoed bills passed by Congress to reduce your taxes. Moreover, immense pressure is being applied to Congress by Mr. Truman's departments and bureaus to prevent it from reducing Federal spending.

The power of the purse consists of two things: Income by taxes; outgo by appropriations.

The Constitution puts both of these powers in Congress—subject only to veto. And no tax bill was ever vetoed in American history until Mr. Roosevelt tried it. He failed. But Mr. Truman has twice made his veto stick. That is, he has twice overruled a majority in Congress on its power over the purse.

When our British forebears finally wrested the power of the purse from the King, and lodged it in Parliament, government for the first time ceased to be the master of men, and became their servant.

Who pays the bill? Plain-spoken President Thomas I. Parkinson, of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, says that total life insurance today is $191,000,000,000 but that it will buy less than the $117,000,000,000 in force in 1940. That is, the American people have increased their insurance by over $74,000,000,000, but are less secure than they were 8 years ago.

Does this interest you?

When the thrifty can't get ahead, who can? Why do you pay more insurance premiums and get less real insurance? In large part, because you have lost control of the purse, and your Uncle Sam has gone on a binge.

As a fighting American out Iowa way, Mr. J. H. Chapman says Uncle Sam proposes to spend $30,000,000 in Iowa on education, when Iowa is in the black with a cash surplus of $100,000,000, and Uncle Sam is in the red with a debt of $256,000,000,000. Does that make sense to you?

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

BLEEDING THE STATES

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, has prepared a valuable table. It shows how much money the Federal Government takes out of each State; how much each State government spends; and the ratio between the two amounts.

This table goes to the very heart of important questions. For one thing, it shows the nonsense about Federal aid. From the money standpoint, the Federal Government does not "aid" a single State in the Union. On the contrary, the enormous cost of supporting the Federal Government is a direct burden on the people and business of every State.

To give a few examples:

Uncle Sam takes out of Senator BRIDGES' home State of New Hampshire $95,000,000. This is over five times the cost of running the New Hampshire government.

Uncle Sam takes from the President's home State of Missouri $1,119,000,000, which is over nine times what Missouri spends.

He takes from Ohio $2,495,000,000, which is eight times what Ohio spends.

He takes from Georgia $444,000,000, which is over four times what Georgia spends.

Mississippi is the poorest State in the Union. Mississippi spends $65,000,000, but Uncle Sam takes out of Mississippi $115,000,000, 75 percent more than Mississippi spends.

For other States, see page 1403 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18.

These figures prove two things. First, there is no such thing as "Federal aid." There ain't no such animal. Every dollar the United States spends in any State as Federal aid or subsidies comes out of that State in Federal taxes, and is then sent back—less the political brokerage fee charged in Washington, which Senator HARRY F. BYRD estimates to be not less than 20 percent. This is some fee for you to pay to somebody you don't know for handling your money.

The second thing these figures prove is that if Federal taxes were cut even 10 percent there would be left in the States—as a source of State revenue—more than enough to educate their children, pay their school teachers, and do for themselves most of the things the power-drunk Government on the Potomac proposes to do locally for them.

These figures have been broken down, with fair accuracy, for each county in each State. This brings the matter right home. The National Association of State Chambers of Commerce has made this break-down, county by county.

For example, if the President's budget of $39,000,000,000 goes through Congress without reduction (and President Truman says all talk of reducing it is "just conversation"), my home county of St. Joseph, Ind., will pay into Washington, D. C., $51,482,253. But the total of all local and State property taxes in that county is only $7,056,550.

In short, the Federal Government takes out of my county over seven times what the county and all its local governments collect in property taxes for their own use. If the Federal Government reduced its take by 10 percent, or $5,000,000, my home folks would have $5,000,000 more to spend on themselves, or on their schools, roads, parks, etc.

If you want the figure for your own county, write to your State chamber of commerce.

Federal aid is a fake. Bring government back home.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

The President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 24 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on March 5, 1948, a telegram signed by 21 Senators from 11 Southern States was sent to the president of the Mutual Broadcasting System requesting time to answer a series of broadcasts supporting the report of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 5, 1948.*

Mr. EDGAR KOBAK,
President, Mutual Broadcasting System, New York, N. Y.:

This telegram has reference to the series of broadcasts entitled "To Secure These Rights" now being carried over the Mutual System. The undersigned Senators of the United States are opposed to the legislation recommended in the report of the President's Committee being dramatized in this series, as are millions of American people whom we represent. The definition of what constitutes a civil right or where the alleged right of one citizen invades the right of another is highly controversial. In the present circumstances this is a political issue. We do not have available the professional talent of a large broadcasting chain to dramatize the presentation of our opposition to the report of the President's Commission, but we do wish to have accorded to us time equal to that used by this program to present our views. We are familiar with the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission on programs presented as a public service, but decided to present our request to you. In view of the fact so many of your outlets are located in our States we feel you will gladly comply with our request. You may direct your reply to the first signer of this telegram at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; KENNETH MCKELLAR, Tennessee; WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia; TOM CONNALLY, Texas; HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia; JOHN H. OVERTON, Louisiana; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana; LISTER HILL, Alabama; TOM STEWART, Tennessee; W. LEE O'DANIEL, Texas; BURNET R. MAYBANK, South Carolina; JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; CLYDE R. HOEY, North Carolina; OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Florida; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Virginia; JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama; WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD, North Carolina; JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on March 6 a telegram was received from the vice president of the Mutual Broadcasting System graciously acceding to our request for time. I ask unanimous consent to have that telegram printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 6, 1948.*

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Senate Office Building:

In answer to your telegram to the Mutual network, we will be glad to make network facilities available to your group for the presentation of its views on the civil-rights issue referred to in your telegram. We will call your office Monday to work out arrangements for the program.

ROBERT D. SWEZEY,
Vice President and General Manager, Mutual Broadcasting System.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the first broadcast in opposition to the misnamed civil-rights program was carried over the Mutual network last night, March 23, 1948. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and I appeared on the program. I undertook to deal with the general subject. Inasmuch as only three of the many proposals contained in the report have been the subject of committee action in one House of the Congress, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] addressed himself to the anti-poll-tax bill, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] dealt with the proposed anti-lynch bill, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] discussed the FEPC legislation. I ask unanimous consent that all these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL WRONGS LABELED CIVIL RIGHTS

(Address by Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia)

The slogan, "Civil rights," is appealing. The report of President Truman's Commission bears an attractive label. All Americans believe in the protection of individual rights and liberties. I would advise you, however, to look the President's gift horse in the mouth. It will be well for every citizen everywhere who is truly interested in individual rights and liberties to carefully examine the contents of this package labeled "Civil rights." Otherwise you will find after delivery that you have been badly cheated. An examination will reveal that under the guise of protecting the rights of various minority groups the enforcement of the Commission's recommendations will have the effect of wiping out the rights of the States and seriously impairing some of your individual rights which have long been considered sacred.

What about this Commission and the reasons behind their unusual presentation? The Commission was a carefully selected body. The views of the individual members, as well as those of the professional staff who prepared the report, were generally known before their selection. No outstanding authority on the Constitution and the constitutional rights was a member. It is therefore no surprise that the report embraces and approves every suggestion and theory brought forward by professional agitators whose vocation it is to represent the various minority pressure groups here in the National Capital.

The report frankly admits that its conclusions are in the main directed at the southern States. It proposes by Federal fiat to revolutionize the political, economic, and social relations between the whites and the Negroes in the South to make them conform to the views of the President and his Commission.

In the effort to intimidate the Congress into enacting their proposals into law they are bringing into full play the power of political pressure of well-organized minority groups. Though the recommendations will do more to disturb racial relations than anything suggested by Thad Stevens or Charles Sumner in the tragic era of reconstruction, not a single person whose views are truly representative of southern majority opinion was appointed to the Commission. Not an open hearing was held in any State at which a governor or other responsible official or citizen was permitted to testify. No record of any evidence justifying the extreme conclusions and the vicious sanctions demanded against innocent and helpless southern people has been made public. We are told that unless we supinely submit to having our lives and social order completely refashioned to the whim and fancy of reformers and zealots representing the minority pressure groups, that our old people are to be denied pensions, our sick and afflicted are to be refused medical care, the education of our children is to be crippled; we are not to be permitted to share in any beneficial activities of our Federal Government.

In spite of this condign punishment, we are to be compelled to continue to pay Federal taxes and defend our country just as anyone else. This is the sweeping verdict of a hand-picked jury, reached in what amounted to star-chamber sessions. We appeal from that verdict to the sense of decency and fair play of the American people.

We submit that the white people of the South, though widely misunderstood and oft maligned, have some few rights as American citizens.

To those of you who are tempted to turn away from this issue with a shrug and a "let those southerners squirm," let me point out that many phases of this drastic program directly affect you and your rights. If it is enacted into law, the everyday life of all citizens will be in some measure regulated and controlled by Federal bureaus and bureaucrats in Washington. If Federal power strikes down the individuality of any one State or group of States, the rights of your State will be invaded. If Federal law creates an entirely new right for a member of a minority group at the expense of an inalienable right of any other citizen, your security in the enjoyment of your right is endangered. The passage of these laws will strip the once-proud States of this Union of their last remaining rights and reduce them to a state of abject vassalage to Washington. Local self-government will become a mere fiction. Hordes of new Federal employees—to be supported by already-overburdened taxpayers—will swarm over the country as Federal policemen to enforce these drastic laws. The Federal Government cannot embark upon such a program without concentrating police powers. Any such centralization will inevitably lead to complete regimentation and to that disastrous loss of personal liberties which marks the centralized police state.

Our Federal Constitution reserves to the several States and to the people all powers not specifically given to the Federal Government. This dual system of government has caused America to grow great and strong. The States of the Union have served as 48 laboratories. In these laboratories we have tested new ideas and made the adjustments necessary to meet the varying needs of the people of different sections of our country without that violence to State and individual rights which over-all Federal action always entails.

The fundamental rights guaranteed to the individual citizen by our Federal Constitution are those of life, liberty, and property. This guaranty protects all citizens, whether members of minorities or so-called majorities. Efforts to twist or distort these constitutional rights so as to penalize one citizen for the benefit of another is a dangerous procedure. Let me warn those of the so-called minorities that if they accomplish their purpose and pass these bills they are certain to create a Frankenstein which will eventually destroy them.

Let us consider how this program will affect your rights if you happen to belong to what the President's Commission regards as a majority group. In substance, they advance the remarkable proposition that in this democracy members of the majority must be deprived of rights long considered as inalienable to enable minority citizens to enjoy newly created rights. The average citizen will be startled to know that in the view of this Commission he has no right to choose his associates in business or in pleasure, in the education of his children, or in any or all of his common everyday relations. The President's Commission holds that the right of choosing one's own associates should be denied the ordinary garden-variety American citizen who cannot claim to be a member of a minority group.

If their wishes are attained, the Federal police power is to be invoked to compel one American citizen either to employ or work with or associate with other American citizens not of his choosing. If the poor garden-variety fellow refuses to accept, in the most intimate associations of life, some person selected for him by a petty Federal official he is to be sent to Federal prison. What has become of the right of the garden-variety American if such laws are enacted? We contend that it is unfair, unjust, and violative of the individual rights guaranteed by our Constitution to create these new rights for minority groups. It amounts to special privileges for minorities at the cost of rights long possessed by other individual Americans.

An effort has been made to create the impression that the white people of the South claim civil rights greater than those conceded Negroes. This is untrue. The enlightened southerner believes in equality in administration of the law for all citizens without regard to race or creed. We do, however, insist upon the right that we regard as sacred and inalienable of choosing our own associates. We believe that the rights of no person has been violated so long as the members of both races, white and Negro, may maintain restaurants, hotels, swimming pools, where they may enjoy the right to associate only with members of their own race. We believe that white parents have a right to have their children associate in the schools with white children and be taught by white teachers. We believe that the Negro is entitled to his schools and to Negro teachers.

The southern whites have a pride of race. They resent the efforts to employ the power of the Federal Government to force Negro children into the white schools. We believe our Negro citizens have a pride of race which will cause them to resent the efforts to take away from them the individuality of their schools and the opportunities of their teachers.

Before you condemn our view, I ask you to consider the fact that the solution of a racial problem is one thing in a community where the population is 5 percent Negro and 95 percent white, and quite a different proposition in another community where 50 percent of the people are Negroes and 50 percent are white. The southerner is often accused of bigotry and intolerance because of his views. Bear in mind that while we do insist upon the right to build our own social order, based on our own experiences, we do not constantly assail the people of other States for holding a different view.

For example, under the constitution and laws of the State of New Jersey no State funds are available to schools unless they compel the intermingling of the races in the classrooms. Failure to serve Negroes and whites together in the hotels, restaurants, and all other public places is a violation of the criminal statutes of that State. If a proprietor of a skating rink or a swimming pool undertakes to cater to any special group or race he is subject to both civil suit and criminal punishment.

A recent news article carried a story to the effect that the white girl students of a school were insisting that the Negro boy students of that institution attend their school dances. There is of course no law in New Jersey against the intermarriage of the races such as we have in all of the Southern States. In frankness, the New Jersey social pattern is offensive to the South. Any policy of solving the grave racial problem of this Nation by absorbing the Negro race through the process of amalgamation is abhorrent to us. Wherever this solution has been applied, degeneration has followed. We consider it a crime against our civilization and a sin against nature's God. I am sure that we feel as strongly about the New Jersey system as the people of New Jersey could feel about ours. But I have never heard of a southern Congressman undertaking to pass Federal legislation to repeal these New Jersey laws.

I would be the last to claim that every detail of our racial relations has been perfectly handled. But our progress has been steady and great, and any effort to compel radical changes by Federal legislation will do irreparable injury. The solution of our problem has been an immense task, undertaken under tremendous difficulties.

Let those who would be critical of the paucity of our educational and health facilities and economic opportunities for our Negro citizens bear in mind the great disparity existing as well between the opportunities and the health and educational fa-

cilities of the southern white people as compared with those of more favored areas. We have long taxed ourselves more heavily in proportion to our means to provide these facilities for white and black alike than have the people of any other section. We are going ahead in spite of our handicaps. The greatest of these has been our economic situation—not social or racial problems. Within the lifetime of people living today the South suffered complete defeat in the most destructive war ever fought on this continent. No other American States have suffered comparably from the devastation of invasion, or lost anything like as much manpower and wealth. We did not share in the prosperity which followed in the wake of the War Between the States. We lived under the bayonets of victorious armies for 12 years, and since that time have suffered as a people, both black and white, the most severe forms of economic exploitation. It was 1940—80 years—before the tax values in my own State of Georgia reached the taxable values of the tragic year of 1860. We had no Marshall plan or other form of relief. Instead we were weighted down with punitive legislation. It has been a long and tedious process to pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps.

We have shared with the Negro, only recently freed from enslavement, the meager blessings of our poverty. We have paid a fearful penalty for having held to the institution of slavery after it was no longer profitable in the North. We have paid a fearful price for undertaking over 80 years ago to leave the Union. We accepted the verdict of that war in good faith, and ever since have had to grapple with a problem of greater complexity and magnitude than was ever thrust upon any other people in human history. We feel that we are entitled to better treatment at the hands of our fellow Americans than to be kicked as a political football in every election year, and to have our good name constantly bartered by political auctioneers in bidding for votes.

We have assumed our responsibilities in both war and peace since 1865 without complaint, believing in and cleaving to the Constitution that our forebears had so large a part in fashioning. We appeal to all of those in every section who still believe that that Constitution is the ark of the covenant of our liberties. Do not be deceived by platitudes, propaganda, or appeals to prejudice into a course which will threaten the blessings of our system and the individual liberties of all of our people.

POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

(Address by Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK, of South Carolina)

Any Federal legislation calling for the repeal of any poll-tax laws in the several States is clearly unconstitutional. The right of qualifications for suffrage is a matter for the States and has been so since the founding of the Government. It justly should remain so.

Both political parties felt their responsibility under the Constitution of the United States to leave this poll-tax matter alone for the several States to handle under section 2, article I of the Constitution, which was written in 1787. As a matter of fact, in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, it is reiterated. As you know, this amendment was ratified in 1913, and allows United States Senators to be elected by direct popular vote—an exceptional point in that it appears again in this second place in the Constitution.

Should the Congress of the United States pass legislation concerning this tax as a voting qualification, it could, by this same precedent, determine all of the voting qualifications in any or all of the various States.

The Constitution under which we now live has done a great work in building a nation and holding it together. It has been good enough to tide us over all kinds of troubles. It is satisfactory for all the problems of today. Our future prosperity and safety require that we let it alone.

It is still true that the qualification for suffrage is, under constitutional government in America, a question for the individual States. If we are tiring of this healthy constitutional principle and wish to further amend the Constitution such action will, in my humble opinion, provide an opening wedge by which the Congress could drive even deeper into the sovereign sanctity of State rights.

The problem before us is not whether the poll tax is right or wrong. It is clearly a point of constitutionality. If it is a law which should be abolished, it is the constitutional right of the residents of the individual States to so determine. I am happy to note that there is a spreading tendency for the States themselves to do away with this tax. It remains in effect today in only seven States. There is growing sentiment for its repeal in even these few remaining States.

In my State of South Carolina, for instance, the constitution states that the tax is an educational one and is to be used for educational purposes within the State. The poll tax is a part of the revenue for the operation of all the public schools in South Carolina.

It is interesting to note, at this point, that the poll tax was first levied in South Carolina in 1702 as an act of the general assembly to make Charles Town defensible. It seems that in those days the trouble was with the Indians. They resorted to revenue by a pole—then spelled p-o-l-e—for the defense of Charles Town. Now, for a dollar a year, we are forced to defend our constitutional rights.

I would like to further observe that the poll tax is not levied today on women or anyone over the age of 60. It is not levied on anyone who takes an oath that he is not able to pay the tax. This leaves only about 30 percent of the voters who pay this one dollar a year, nonretroactive tax.

Under no stretch of the imagination can I see how the levying of a poll tax could in any way restrict the suffrage of voters.

Let's face the reality of this blown-up, exaggerated iniquity. For the privilege of smoking a pack of cigarettes we pay more than 7 cents in State and Federal taxes. For the privilege of providing a part of the educational facilities for our children—and in many cases it is the only tax paid—about 30 percent of our people pay $1 per year, which is less than 2 cents a week in the form of a poll tax.

It is not for the retention of the poll tax that we oppose this legislation. It is the serious departure from governmental principles involved—a clear invasion of the liberties of the American people. It is a process designed by and for politicians—politicians who would create political turmoil for their own benefit at the expense of an already overly abused South—a South which has been a political prisoner of war since 1865. It is time we repatriated our displaced sovereign rights without the ill-advised aid of vote-conscious meddlers.

ANTILYNCHING BILL

(Address by Hon. CLYDE R. HOEY, of North Carolina)

Every good citizen in America is opposed to lynching. This is especially true in the South, where every good citizen is not only passively against it, but affirmatively interested in doing something about it, and as a result of this vigorous and wholesome attitude lynching is now practically extinct. It has been outlawed by public opinion and the people and the officials cooperate fully in an effort to completely stamp it out.

Every State in the Union has a strong law against lynching and these laws are better enforced than any other criminal statutes. Let's examine the record. In 1892 there were 255 lynchings in the United States—100 white and 155 colored. The crimes for which men were lynched ranged all the way from horse stealing and cattle rustling to murder and rape. Twenty-nine years later, in 1921, the number of lynchings had been reduced to 64 and in 1947 there was just one lynching and yet they want a Federal law to prevent lynching.

Think about it—out of 145,000,000 people in the United States, only one person was lynched last year. There has not been a lynching in my State of North Carolina for 22 years. What other criminal statute, State or Federal, has been so well obeyed. While there was only one lynching last year there were over 13,000 murders, over 12,000 rapes, and over 1,500,000 serious crimes, denominated as felonies, committed in the United States. That means that there was an average of 36 murders and 33 rapes every day last year, and three felonies every minute throughout the year.

Have you heard any demand from the Committee on Civil Rights that the Federal Government do anything about this—although many of these crimes were the most brutal and revolting ever committed in our land.

The State is responsible for maintaining order and enforcing all laws within its borders, except for the violation of laws dealing with Federal functions and agencies, like post-office offenses, counterfeiting money, failure to pay Federal taxes, interstate-commerce violations, and other similar crimes. Lynching does not belong in any of these categories.

The Washington Post, a great liberal newspaper, says that it is a rather sorry spectacle for the Congress to be considering a bill to make the prevention of lynching a Federal responsibility when the Southern States have almost completed the job of wiping out this disgusting crime.

The arguments for a Federal law are not impressive. The purpose of a law is to prevent the commission of an offense and to punish the offender. A mob bent on lynching would not be deterred by a Federal law—it can only be stopped by local officials. If it may be said that it is difficult to convict members of the mob under State law, that difficulty would likewise obtain under the Federal law, because the trial would be held in the same State and with the same people serving on the jury. Presently the mob cases are nearly always moved to another county for trial. The difficulty of obtaining convictions under the Federal law would be greater because of the natural resentment against outside Federal interference in the affairs of the State. This resentment would be enhanced by the fact that the proposed Federal law would penalize the innocent taxpayers of the county where the lynching occurred by making them pay large sums to the family of the victim regardless of how guilty he was or how dastardly the crime committed. This law would reverse all precedents by punishing the innocent.

Ten years ago the late great Senator William E. Borah, a sturdy defender of civil rights, in discussing a proposed antilynch bill, said:

"When I read of the terrible things that happened in the South after the Civil War, I wonder now how the South has done such remarkable work in the way of recovery. * * * With all the hatred, the animosity,

and the agony which came to the people, it is amazing to me that the crime of lynching has been gradually dying out. The people of the South have made a record of which they have a right to be proud. We could not improve upon what has been done. Why should we interfere now?"

The proposals of the Civil Rights Committee invade the rights of every sovereign State in the Nation. It would result in supplanting cooperative good will by coercive ill will. The passage of this measure would make the task more difficult and add immeasurably to the burden of every man in the South who is seeking to obtain equality of opportunity for the Negro race, and secure fairness and justice for the Negro in all the relations of life.

FEPC LEGISLATION

(Address by Hon. LISTER HILL, of Alabama)

The FEPC bill should be called a bill to destroy civil rights.

Under the guise of preventing discrimination in employment the bill actually contains the weapons for the complete destruction of many civil rights.

In the United States freedom of contract, freedom for a man to choose those who work for him or work with him, to exercise his own judgment in selecting those who occupy for him places of trust or responsibility, and a man's right to sell his services to whomever he will, are guaranteed us in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

Under FEPC these freedoms—the very foundation stones of our American political and economic system—would be denied.

Under the broad powers of the bill, failure to comply with the regulations laid down by the FEPC would be punishable by fine and even imprisonment. And that most precious of civil rights—the right of trial by jury—would be denied.

Under the inquiries and investigations directed by the bill, business would be vexed and harassed to the point where orderly plant management and efficient production would be impossible.

The small businessman, already overburdened, would encounter new regulations, investigations, hearings, and appeals far beyond his time, his energy, or his finances.

Labor organizations would be subject to interference and supervision of their internal affairs. The worker could not feel secure in his job. Employment and promotion based on merit would be superseded by governmental decrees, and the worker would be moved to look with distrust and suspicion on his fellow workers.

The bill actually takes away rights from the majority and gives special privilege to the minority.

Suppose a small plant employs 50 men. Ten of them can be identified with a minority group. If the employer has to lay off 8 men, would he be likely to discharge any of the 10 men who could claim discrimination—whether it existed or not—take the case to the commission and into the courts, causing the employer great expense and possible punishment?

You and I know that the natural thing for the employer to do would be to avoid trouble and lay off eight of the average Americans who could not claim discrimination, even if they were better workmen than the employees who belonged to a minority group.

At a time when maximum production is so needed to fight inflation and keep our economy strong, the bill would create fear and suspicion, friction and division, in the business houses, plants, and factories of America.

It would weaken and imperil our national security at an hour of danger—a time when the peace of the world depends on America's strength.

The Atomic Energy Commission would be seriously handicapped in checking the loyalty of its employees. Companies manufacturing the most secret military equipment could not seek the information necessary to prevent disloyalty and sabotage.

The bill is an invitation to sabotage.

Presented with the antipoll tax bill and the antilynching bill, it is simply a political device for attracting votes.

It would obstruct the States in the substantial progress they are making in solving the question of discrimination.

The final result of this bill would be to substitute the edict of remote government for the personal judgment of the individual in matters of delicate human relationships and social customs—to bring thought control to the economic life of the United States.

The American people, with their love of freedom and their devotion to the rights of the individual, surely will not permit the FEPC bill to become law.

Italian National Election, April 18, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the telegram that I have received from Mr. Patrick H. Pignato, president, Columbian Club, Inc., East Boston, Mass., with reference to a letter sent to Mr. Matthew Connolly, executive secretary to the President, by Governors Councilor Patrick J. McDonough, concerning the election in Italy on April 18, 1948:

EAST BOSTON, MASS, *March 23, 1948.*

Hon. THOMAS LANE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Following is a copy of a letter sent to Matthew Connolly, executive secretary to the President:

"DEAR MR. CONNOLLY: A group of prominent and influential citizens of Italian ancestry in my district are planning an Italian edition of a local newspaper to be flown to Italy on or about April 8, 1948, in time to be distributed and digested by thousands of Italian citizens before the national election April 18, 1948. This special edition, printed entirely in Italian would contain statements from these Italian-Americans who are leaders in the industrial, professional, and public life of our community, appealing to Italian citizenry to vote against communism. It would also contain biographical sketches of these prominent citizens, stating their successes under our democratic system of government here in the United States. The Italian Council in Boston and local representatives of United States Army here in Boston have been contacted and are enthused and have assured their cooperation. Furthermore, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing will be contacted to enlist his support. Your cooperation is sought with a view to obtaining not only clearance from the State Department for the carrying out of this praiseworthy undertaking but possibly assistance in defraying the cost of air freight and the distribution of the copies of the special edition at the receiving point. Because of the importance of this matter and with appreciation of the time element involved it is hoped that you will be able to give this your personal and immediate attention so that these public-spirited citizens may go ahead with their plans at the earliest possible moment. With best wishes, Governors Councilor Patrick J. McDonough. Submitted at the request of Patrick H. Pignato, president, Columbian Club, Inc., care of East Boston Times, 2 Lexington Street, East Boston, Mass."

Your personal interest in this matter will be greatly appreciated by all peace-loving Americans concerned in the present European problem as affected by the communistic trend in Italy.

PATRICK H. PIGNATO.

Tax-Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote today to favor the passage of the Senate version of the tax-reduction bill. It is by no means the measure I would have preferred. It does, however, reflect my conviction that taxes on individual incomes can and should be reduced.

The bill, as amended by the Senate, brings the overall cut within what I believe to be reasonable limits, and consistent action by Congress on domestic appropriations will not lead to deficit financing. I am not persuaded that a reduction in taxes on individual incomes is inconsistent with either the desire or action of this body to increase our military strength.

It is not a wise policy to place the responsibility for financing foreign aid and military appropriations entirely, or largely, on individual income taxes. Increase in budget estimates resulting from our present foreign policy should be met with a revision upward of corporate taxes, including excess-profits taxes.

It is not at all accurate to say that the American people have not suffered and have not carried a heavy burden as a result of our participation in World War II. The American people were fortunate enough, thank God, to have not suffered a scorched-earth attack, but their contributions in an enthusiastic output of men and materials was largely responsible for our past victory at arms. They have accepted with faith and determination the great responsibilities of helping reshape and rebuild a world for peace. To me it is unconscionable to fail to recognize this opportunity of giving a small measure of relief to the individual who pays income taxes.

I think it is unfortunate that this bill undertakes to adopt by Federal legislation the tax benefits for all States which arise out of the basic principles of community property. It is unquestionably an invasion of State prerogatives. I can, however, understand that the Representatives of thirty-odd non-community-property States will not, politically speaking, miss this opportunity to include these provisions.

The provision in this bill correcting the unfortunate mistake of 1942 with reference to estate and gift taxes is but

a just recognition of the basic principles of community property.

I believe that the President would be wise in accepting this bill. If he finds it necessary—and he probably will—to propose additional taxes to finance our preparedness program, I hope that he will make recommendations which will place the burden of taxes upon high and excessive profits of corporations that will unquestionably receive a large share of the money spent in such a program.

TVA Unit Farm Method Makes Farms Pay Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article, written by T. B. Hutcheson, dean of agriculture, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and appearing in the Progressive Farmer of March 1948:

TVA "UNIT FARM METHOD" MAKES FARMS PAY BETTER

(By T. B. Hutcheson, dean of agriculture, VPI)

In the final analysis, the chief aim of all agriculture is simply better farm management. It then follows that good farmers are those who say, "I will first find out the accumulated results of research—research in soils, plants, animals, and economics—and then apply this knowledge in operating my own farm under its specific conditions." So the TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) and the several States constituting the Tennessee Valley area adopted the unit-farm and area demonstration method as the best way to develop and save the agricultural resources of the region.

The first big step in the development of this program was this: An agreement was made between TVA, the land-grant colleges of the region, and the United States Department of Agriculture that all the agricultural projects of the region would be conducted through and in cooperation with the State agricultural colleges. This agreement did two things:

1. It released and made available research and experience for use on the project.
2. It placed responsibility for the action programs in the hands of local authorities.

"UNIT FARM DEMONSTRATORS"

The unit farm and area test demonstrations were first inaugurated in nine southwest Virginia counties in the Tennessee River watershed in the spring of 1935, and since then have expanded to other parts of the State. Now over 3,200 Virginia farmers are actively participating in the program. The aim is to place at least one complete farm unit demonstration in every community of the region. Wherever a majority of farmers in a natural community or small watershed become unit farm demonstrators and work together for community improvement then this is called an area demonstration.

"Unit farm demonstrators" are chosen by the farmers of the communities they are to serve. Each such demonstrator agrees to operate his farm, insofar as practicable, in a manner that will put into operation the best findings of the agricultural experiment station and the teachings of his agricultural extension division. The county agent and his staff become the contact agent between the unit farm demonstrator and his agricultural college. They bring through specialists information and help that may seem necessary in developing his program.

HOW DEMONSTRATORS ARE HELPED

A long-time plan is first designed to make the best use of every acre. Rotations are worked out which serve the needs of the major farm enterprises. For example, if the farm is to be devoted to dairying, rotations are arranged to produce enough legume hay, silage, bedding, and grain for the animals to be kept. In working out these rotations, No. 1 attention is given to protection against erosion. One of the cardinal principles of the TVA cooperative program is: "Flooding of streams and silting of reservoirs is best prevented by keeping green roots in the soil as much of the time as possible." Fertilizer and liming policies are worked out for the entire farm. Decisions are made as to types, breeds, and strains of livestock to be kept, and a feeding program is planned making maximum use of home-grown products.

Varieties of all crops to be grown are chosen, and the farmer is encouraged to grow some improved seed, at least for home use. As time goes on, plans are made for new buildings, improved machinery, and better field arrangement. Home improvement is also emphasized, and the whole family takes part in the program. Of course, the real purpose of such demonstrations is to develop local leadership and teach improved farm and home management practices, not only to the demonstrators, but through them to their neighbors. One of the requirements of a "unit farm demonstrator" is that he keep a farm record book showing receipts and expenses as well as other pertinent data for his farm. At the end of the year, these books are carefully analyzed by an expert accountant and this analysis is used as a basis for future recommendations.

INCREASED YIELDS AND PROFITS

Perhaps the value of this type of program can be best shown by the chart below based on records kept on several hundred typical demonstration farms during the past 10 years.

During the 10-year period row crops have decreased 10 percent, with a corresponding increase in pastures and hay. Other effects of the extension-TVA program in the watershed counties of southwest Virginia since 1935 are:

1. Increase in farmers fertilizing pastures from 2 percent to 75 percent.
2. Increase of 14,000 cattle (half beef, half dairy).
3. More barn-hay driers have been installed in southwest Virginia than in all the rest of the State.
4. When the Progressive Farmer and the VPI Extension Service picked families in this area for Master Farm Family awards in 1947 all chosen were unit farm demonstrators.

Probably the most significant development of this entire cooperative program has been the spread of improved practices from the farms of demonstrators to their neighbors. This has resulted in:

1. Greater pride in accomplishment.
2. More enthusiasm for farming.
3. More community spirit.
4. General feeling of optimism based on past success.

WHAT UNIT FARMERS SAY

It has also shown that the first step in the improvement of agriculture in any community is the building of the soil to a point where it will support a profitable agriculture. Farmers are about right when they say, "It doesn't make much difference what varieties of crops you plant or what kind of animals you keep so long as your land is poor." After the soil has been improved, the records show that successful farming depends upon a combination of well-balanced efficiency factors such as size of business, production efficiency of crops and animals, labor efficiency, and balance of proper enterprises.

The following typical voluntary letters from TVA unit demonstrators give an idea of what the farmers themselves think of the work and how it has helped them:

"Besides being a great benefit to me, I feel that this demonstration has helped 25 to 30 other farmers who have visited my farm and seen the results of cooperating in this Extension-TVA program."—L. D. B.

"I don't say it boastfully, but my farm now stands out in this community, and most of the credit is due to carrying out the whole demonstration as planned with our county agent, and the use of plenty of lime and fertilizer."—S. C. T.

"The farm unit demonstrations throughout this county are doing more to prove to the farmers the value and adequate use of phosphate and lime than anything I have seen in the county since I started farming."—M. C. B.

"It is January 1 and my cattle haven't been fed the first time this winter. Yet they are fat enough for market. Fertilized pastures make this possible."—E. B.

"This program has meant much to me and my neighbors in proving the value of good farm practices and use of more phosphate, potash, and lime. I like strip-cropping better than terraces."—A. L. C.

"Commie" Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Cumberland News, of Cumberland, Md., on March 23, 1948:

REPRESENTATIVE BEALL MAKES HIMSELF CLEAR ON "COMMIE" ACTIVITIES

If any doubt had existed as to how Representative J. GLENN BEALL viewed the activities of communistic elements in this country it has been removed in his announcement to again seek the Republican nomination for a fourth term in Congress from the Sixth Maryland District.

Representative BEALL has expressed himself with such force as to make it clear that he considers the existence, in government, of employees who are considered "fences" for the Kremlin one of the major dangers confronting the American people. And he does not intend that it will continue if he can help it. Those who have watched the spread of communism in other parts of the world and who have looked with a feeling of uneasiness on the bold attempts of "pinks" to entrench themselves in America will take comfort in the fact that Congressman BEALL is fully cognizant of a situation that could very easily, if permitted to go unchecked, bring untold grief to Americans.

Representative BEALL has been collaborating with Republican groups in Congress in a relentless campaign to cleanse the Government of communistic stooges. They have succeeded in having removed from the State Department, for instance, a number of communistic sympathizers only to find they have been reemployed in some other bureaus. It is hardly possible that this could have been done without the knowledge of the White

House. But when it is considered that fellow travelers have been permitted to find their way into Government circles over a period of 15 years, with the sanction and encouragement of those in control, at Washington, what can the American people expect now?

Representative BEALL, in making his candidacy announcement, placed his views on communism above everything else. He shunted to a secondary position his record of achievements in Congress, both for the Nation and for his Sixth District constituents, although they are of such a beneficial nature to all classes and sections they could very well have taken precedence.

But he is determined not to stand idly by while those in sympathy with the Kremlin doctrine tighten their hold in the United States. It is gratifying to know that he is bending every effort to wrench loose whatever grips unworthies might have on the Government in order to make certain the freedoms we have been privileged to enjoy and to treasure since the birth of our country are made more secure.

Address at Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered at the communion breakfast of the Valadolid Council of the Knights of Columbus on Sunday, March 21, 1948, at Odd Fellows Hall, Lynn, Mass.:

Reverend Fathers and members of Council No. 70, Knights of Columbus, and friends, they say that a Presidential election year is always filled with uncertainty.

Applied to 1948, that is most certainly an understatement.

A few weeks ago, the commodity market broke. Day after day the quotations dropped. Most of you, as breadwinners of families, followed the plunging figures with considerable satisfaction for it seemed to herald the much-desired drop in the cost of living. Such did not happen, but your attention was diverted from this disappointment by a political upset which took place in the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of New York City. Here, in a well-organized Democratic district, a member of a minor local party who wasn't given a chance won decisively. The fact that this man happened to be a friend of Henry Wallace, who also has political ambitions, pushed this story into the top headlines. Editorial writers and commentators had a field day trying to account for such a stunning victory.

Some professed to see in it a national trend toward Wallace. Others claimed that Jewish Democrats had turned away from their party because it had not moved with sufficient speed to implement the partition of Palestine. The Negro voter, too, had changed horses because, though much was said about extending civil liberties to his race, nothing was done about it. And so it went, as political experts tried to explain the overturn in terms of the shift of disaffected elements.

But of all the reasons advanced, the most obvious one was overlooked. Both the Democrats and the Republicans took the outcome for granted, relying on past performances. On the other hand, the small party that was ignored—organized. They brought in solicitors from outside the district—they went from house to house asking people to vote for their candidate. They even carried them to the polls.

The moral of this story is that a minority—knowing what it wants—and how to get it—by putting in time and effort, can overcome the indifferent majority.

I bring this point up because we stand at a critical crossroads in our history. It seems to me that we of this generation are always coming up against crises of some kind or another, and there is in all of us a desperate yearning for a real peace in which we can live normal lives. But we have been born into a period of revolution in which men must catch up with the adjustments required by the machine age which they themselves have invented. In many parts of the world, men in their bewilderment are turning their backs on their Christian faith and are accepting the hearsay of Communist materialism. They are asking for slavery without realizing that it is slavery. And when they wake up, it is too late to escape.

The few men in the Kremlin who are directing this movement are absolute dictators. They are so serious in their purpose that, even though a Russian makes a harmless wisecrack about the regime, or its leaders, he goes to jail for a lengthy stay.

These dictators are intent on winning a complete victory over the minds and hearts of men. To this end, they distort every fact, and by every means of propaganda, blackmail, and terror, they are undermining the foundations of civilization.

Who would ever think that a solidly Catholic country like Italy would ever be threatened, from within, by this modern menace.

Yet all of us anticipate with alarm the results of the elections to be held in Italy on April 18.

Such is the measure of their devilishly effective technique.

They glibly promise wholesale land reforms, even pointing out to the poor Italian farmer the individual piece they are going to give him, right there on the map for him to see. They forget to tell him that they have already promised that same piece of land to other farmers.

In order to overcome the heart-warming appeal of American aid, they say that the Americans are stupid enough to keep on sending material help, even though the country goes Communist.

They assure the people that they will not disturb their religion. The Vatican, however, knows otherwise. Aware of the danger, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, has repeatedly urged every Catholic to vote, emphasizing that he who does not vote commits a grave sin. The clergy from the pulpits are explaining why Catholics should not vote for Communists. The lay organization, called Catholic Action, is organizing meetings, issuing posters, and working for the cause of the Christian Democratic Party. In addition to the above-mentioned activities are the recently formed civil committees which are the offspring of Catholic Action, and whose function is to make certain that the voters go to the polls. Some bishops have even gone so far as to instruct the clergy that absolution must be denied to avowed Communists.

I mention these facts to show the seriousness for all Catholics of a Communist seizure of the Government in Italy.

The fall of Czechoslovakia came as a great shock to most Americans because it was done without the immediate aid of a single Soviet soldier.

It revealed, in dramatic fashion, the successful Russian tactics of boring from within and using the very privileges granted by a democracy to destroy it.

It is the classic example of the Trojan horse, streamlined to fit modern conditions. It is a realistic warning to all Americans.

Agitated by fear, there are some Americans who would curtail our fundamental civil liberties, thinking that this might serve as a road block to protect us from communism. Such cannot be, for in trying to stop communism in this manner we would burden ourselves with the yoke of fascism.

No, my friends, we cannot do this. But we can face up to communism with an alert and informed citizenry who will nail every Communist trick, no matter how camouflaged, at its very inception.

This will require a constant vigilance on our part.

The tragedy of Czechoslovakia shows how the Communists infiltrate a large group like a labor union and use this as a means to work themselves into the government. There they manage to secure the cabinet position which supervises domestic security and has control over the police. Then, the other members of the government are charged with conspiracy. On this pretext, the Communist-dominated security forces take over, and the purge of freedom begins.

In the United States they have, at times, wormed themselves into controlling positions in certain labor unions. This they have done because they always show up at union meetings, whereas many members, through indifference, stay home. The Communists know the book of parliamentary law by heart. They use every device to forestall majority action and prolong the meetings until many members in weariness go home, and the Communist minority becomes a majority of those remaining. The Communists win because they employ every stratagem, and because they never give up.

In our country they will attempt to divide and conquer. Playing race against race, creed against creed, and workers against employers, they plan to take over as a result of the general confusion.

As we gird ourselves to resist this infiltration, we must know, clearly, the meaning of our Christian democracy and the benefits it has brought to our lives, so that we may expose the Communist-inspired rumors that will be circulated among us. In order to prepare ourselves to meet this challenge, I suggest that you get copies of the booklets to be issued by the American Legion on April 1 "giving the actual margins of superiority of American life in terms of individual rights, freedoms, automobiles, food, refrigerators, and many other things which are considered American necessities but are luxuries elsewhere."

These carry the endorsements of President Truman and the leaders of labor, business, and our major church denominations.

In the fight to protect ourselves from the spreading cancer of communism, we must be strong in our democratic beliefs. With Christian faith and with the know-how of freemen, we shall search out the presence of communism no matter where it is hidden. Once we are able to definitely diagnose the Communist cells as such, we shall root them out by focusing the X-ray of public opinion on them.

Detect communism early, and it can be cured.

As Americans, and as Catholics, we cannot fail to answer the summons to democratic action.

Award of Merit to Bishop Bernard J. Sheil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include

an address which was delivered by Mr. Roy I. Levinson, president of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers of Chicago, at the annual patriotic dinner on February 28, on the occasion of the presentation of an award of merit to Bishop Bernard J. Sheil:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, Rabbi Berman, ladies and gentlemen, can we in any more fitting manner bring to a climax this historic Brotherhood Week than by honoring Bishop Bernard J. Sheil?

Brotherhood Week emphasizes many hopes and aspirations which the Decalogue Society of Lawyers share with Bishop Sheil. These can well be summarized in one sentence. We strive to bring to the tear-stained hope of all humanity equal justice and opportunity without discrimination as to race or creed or color. This is brotherhood.

There is something innate in the character of Bishop Sheil that constrains him to be of service to his fellow man; that makes him rise in righteous indignation with the strength of a giant when he sees downtrodden and helpless beings imposed upon. He has shown great compassion for and understanding of the underprivileged in the industrial areas back of the yards in Chicago and everywhere. He has unceasingly battled to place human rights above property rights. He has brought to the problem of juvenile delinquency the inspiration and idealism of the Catholic Youth Organization, which opens wide its doors to gentile and Jew, to all the sons and daughters of men regardless of color or religion. We have been greatly impressed by his tremendous courage and dynamic force.

As we grow older our convictions grow stronger that the life blood of democracy is an enlightened citizenry. The hope of liberty and freedom depends upon educating the masses. Ignorance, the food upon which tyranny feeds, is the poison from which democracy dies.

Bishop Sheil has made great strides in combating ignorance by furthering education in many ways. Among other advances on the educational front he founded the Sheil School of Social Studies and the Lewis College of Science and Technology, where complete training for aviation and engineering is emphasized. He established a center to assist displaced Japanese with their relocation, vocational, and academic problems. He launched a CYO residence for young women, community centers, boys' camps, mercy missions, and a large number of other worth-while cultural, social, and athletic enterprises.

Notwithstanding all that he and like-minded men and organizations of good will have done, we are profoundly concerned by the fact that the specter of religious and racial intolerance is again rearing its head in many parts of the world, including our own beloved country.

The revival of these dangerous symptoms throughout the world at this time has brought undue suffering to large groups of our fellow humans. We deplore the fact that those common and inalienable rights which have long been recognized and accepted throughout the civilized world as the precious heritage of mankind are being ruthlessly disregarded.

Bishop Sheil is continuously appealing for the elimination of these dangerous manifestations, and is effectively voicing his protests against the wrongs to which these innocent victims are being subjected. His idealism inspires an ever-increasing demand for culture, economic and religious freedom as is illustrated by typical quotations from his utterances which I planned to quote to you, but on second thought have inserted, for the record, in your program of this evening.

His famous utterances are more than the mere stone, brick, mortar, and cement with which we build our homes. His words are also the inspiration that has helped the community to build in our hearts, for the world around us, a symbolic structure for all mankind that is just and right, radiating good fellowship throughout the world—and in doing this he has added warmth and friendliness to "the house I live in."

This house I live in is the beneficiary of his moral instructions for practical purposes so essential to the duties and responsibilities of useful citizens. Even in our beloved America, selfishness, greed, corruption, and materialism have brought hardship into the lives of countless millions.

If we as a people had nothing to build upon but the passions and greed of humanity; if we could visualize nothing beyond the material desires of some of the nations and exploiters of the world and the pettiness of their leaders, we should have a feeling of utter despair. But because we believe in the law of progress; because we believe that every fortress that society has erected to protect and preserve civilization will be maintained; because there are in this world institutions of intelligence, understanding and good will; men like Bishop Sheil who maintain ideals above all mortal passions of men; and because we believe that in the recesses of the world's heart there are preserved the fundamental ideals of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we cannot despair but must continue to fight the forces of bigotry and reaction.

And now Bishop Sheil, with sincere wishes for your health, happiness, and a long life, it is my honor to present to you, for your distinguished service to citizenship through moral, physical, and spiritual development of our youth; for your forthright leadership in the fight against bigotry, reaction, and greed; for your stalwart championing of the cause of minorities and the underprivileged; for your vigorous defense of civil rights; for your notable contribution to education and enlightenment; for your devoted labors for social progress, justice, and the brotherhood of man, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers award for the year 1947.

Transfer of American Ships Is Unthinkable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the transfer of American ships to foreign interests, industries, individuals, nations, or powers as part of the economic recovery program is unthinkable. It should not be permitted. The issue is presented to us in the foreign aid bill by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives. The Senate of the United States voted unanimously against this proposal and struck the proposal out of the bill, but the House committee has restored it. The action taken by the Senate was identical with the action of the House and Senate very recently when they enacted Senate Joint Resolution 173, which received the approval of the President on February 27, 1948.

I have stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my unalterable opposition to this procedure and I shall try to avoid repeating here the reasons formerly advanced by me; I refer to the Appendix of the RECORD, pages A540, A736, and A867.

I feel that I would be untrue to my convictions if I failed to express my opposition and my reasons therefor. My convictions are based upon my study of problems affecting our American merchant marine throughout my entire service in Congress, extending from July 3, 1918, to the present, and particularly since April 1921, when I became a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the House. For a time, I served under very able chairmen of the Republican Party, including among others the present senior Senator from Maine and majority leader in the Senate, the Honorable WALLACE A. WHITE.

In 1933 I became chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the House, and was privileged to assist in preparing the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which passed the House in 1935, was rewritten and amended in the Senate in the closing hours of Congress in 1936, and approved by the President on June 29, 1936.

That act represents the studied opinion, careful study, and best thought of the Members of the Congress in 1935 and 1936. They realized that a merchant marine was essential to the national defense, for the promotion of trade, and for our general welfare. They knew an American merchant marine was essential and that immediate action was necessary.

I mention these facts to emphasize my unalterable opinion that, as said by Representative BRADLEY, of California, foreign transfers would be suicidal. I am so positive in that view that if the recovery program bill as it reaches the House for a final vote contains the transfer as recommended in the bill reported to the House by the Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall be compelled to vote against the bill.

I am unalterably opposed to the proposal for the reason that I long ago reached the conviction that if America had possessed an adequate merchant marine in 1914 and the years immediately following that we would never have been drawn into World War I. I had previously made the statement also that if we had possessed an adequate merchant marine in 1938 and the years following we would never have become involved in World War II.

I am so unalterably convinced of the truth of these statements that as much as I would like to follow the leadership of President Truman and his great Secretary of State, I am compelled to say that if the provision inserted in the House is retained in the bill when it comes to a final vote, I must vote against the bill. My nearly 30 years of study, thought, and research enters into this conviction.

I am very much gratified to find that my views are completely in accord with remarks by Representative BRADLEY, of California; BOGGS, of Louisiana; BOYKIN, of Alabama; and others who have addressed themselves on the subject.

In a letter dated February 11, 1948, from Secretary of Defense Forrestal to Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, as quoted from State Department press release, No. 126, of February 17, 1948, beginning on page 4, appears the following:

It is not my aim to give you the impression that the charter or transfer of title of 500 vessels, or of any lesser number, will be completely without impact on our own military strength. There will undoubtedly be some effect but it is my opinion that we stand to gain more by such charter or transfer, from an over-all national security standpoint, than we stand to lose.

The above statement was widely quoted in the press and in Congress as authoritative testimony in support of the further large-scale transfer of ships to foreign countries including the Marshall-plan nations in addition to the substantial number of American vessels already transferred.

The United States Maritime Commission, charged by law with the promotion and protection of the American merchant marine, expressed itself on the subject very fully. It said:

The Commission fears that the statement in question will be highly prejudicial to the American merchant marine and, therefore, to the national defense, if permitted to stand unchallenged and unqualified. The Commission's judgment is based on its considered opinion that the statement is to be questioned mainly for the two following reasons:

First, the succeeding paragraph in Mr. Forrestal's statement quotes the following from a recent memorandum of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "It is entirely possible that greater ultimate military advantage might in fact be achieved by such use of some of the reserve tonnage now than would result by holding it idle for possible future use under war emergency conditions."

This quotation confirms, if any confirmation were needed, that the Secretary of Defense apparently saw the issue solely as a choice between two alternatives, i. e., transfer foreign or immobilization in the reserve fleets. This is erroneous. Barring a large increase in American exports under the Marshall plan compared to the record year of 1947, an event that nobody expects to take place, any American flag vessels transferred to foreign countries will either directly or indirectly come from the operating fleet. If they are initially transferred from the reserve fleets, an even greater number of American operating vessels will be returned to the reserve fleets for lack of cargoes and due to the severe break in freight rates which the mobilization of a large number of additional vessels from the reserve fleets is bound to cause. (This matter is discussed on pages 27 and 28 of the brief attached to our letter to you of March 4, 1948.)

We believe that the Joint Chiefs of Staff as well as the Secretary of Defense would be willing to reconsider their position that we stand to gain more by such charter or transfer from an over-all national security standpoint, than we stand to lose, if their attention is drawn to the fact that the ransferred vessels, regardless whether they are taken from among operating or laid-up ships will in all cases in the end reduce our active fleet rather than our idle fleet.

Second, it seems equally obvious from Mr. Forrestal's statement that he has confined his examination solely to the potential national defense value of the idle vessels proper.

In doing so, and aside from the aforementioned fact that vessel transfers would not be at the expense of the idle fleet but the operating fleet, the statement seems to overlook the fact that the harmful effect on the American merchant marine of the transfer foreign of a given number of additional ships is not at all confined to the loss of those vessels proper, i. e., the mere subtraction of that number of vessels.

This situation, too, is discussed in the Commission's brief sent to you on March 4, 1948, where it is pointed out (p. 5) that:

"Our concern over the proposed turning over of additional American ships to other nations is due even more to the threat to the ships which we would keep, than to the loss of those which we would give up, although the loss of employment for American crews and operators and the shrinking of the number of ships available for a future emergency, are serious enough. Even more important, however, is the certainty that another fleet of large American dry cargo ships turned over to foreign countries, joining the huge fleets of merchant ships already operating and those now being constructed in Europe's shipyards, within a few years at the most will bring about a surplus of cargo tonnage that in the depression of the world freight market which will result irrespective of the general world economic situation, the survival of the American merchant marine in operation will be gravely threatened." (This subject is discussed in greater detail beginning on p. 28 of the brief.)

This Commission cannot pit its judgment of vessels in our reserve fleets against the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or of the Secretary of Defense. However, the Commission is not only wholly within its jurisdiction but in fact duty-bound to point out (a) that the ships which the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff state are worth less to us in our reserve fleets than in foreign hands, would not come from our reserve fleets at all but in reality from our operating fleet, and (b) that apart from the defense value of the transferred ships proper there must be taken into account the effect of the transfer on the rest of our operating merchant marine.

In the final analysis, our national security needs not only ships but trained officers and crews and experienced operators as well, together with the numerous auxiliary services depending on a large merchant fleet in operation. If the choice were to lie solely between several hundred idle ships in the reserve fleets and the same number in the hands of the European nations, the question might be debatable. However, since the choice is between operation of these several hundred ships under the American flag by American operators, manned by American officers and crews, or operation of the same ships by foreign operators with foreign crews, the direct and immediate national defense value of American flag operation is obvious, particularly in an international situation such as the present.

The Maritime Commission, in opposing transfers foreign, has said:

As of March 1, 1948, the Maritime Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, had approved the sale for foreign-flag operation of a total of 1,141 large war-built Government-owned ships. The Commission has also sold under other statutes 23 large nonwar-built ships for foreign-flag operation. These figures do not include vessels of less than 1,500 gross tons. In addition, the Commission from July 1, 1945, to February 29, 1948, approved under sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act of 1916, the sale and/or transfer for foreign-flag operation of 340 large, privately owned older merchant vessels over 1,000 gross tons each.

It will thus appear to be and is a fact that since the end of the war in Europe, no fewer than 1,504 large American ships have been turned over to foreign nations, most of them by the United States Maritime Commission, others with its approval. By far, the greatest proportion of these vessels consisted of large war-built dry-cargo ships and tankers of over 10,000 merchant dead-weight tons each, sold by the Commission.

These figures prove beyond any peradventure the immense contribution made by the United States since the war to the restoration of foreign merchant fleets and the role which the Maritime Commission has played in this unprecedented act of economic cooperation. They furnish proof, if it were necessary, of the sincerity of the Commission's recommendation against the enactment of European recovery legislation which would in whole or in part override the prohibition which has just been enacted into law, against any further sale or any charter of Government-owned vessels to noncitizens. The carefully considered recommendation of the Maritime Commission is based on the unanimous conviction of the Commission that the immediate and long damage wrought on the American merchant marine and on the American shipbuilding industry by further transfer of Government-owned vessels to noncitizens would far exceed the very limited short-term advantages which may be gained for such transfers.

The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries were controlled by the same conviction when they reported very recently and unanimously Senate Joint Resolution 173, which was approved by the President on February 27, 1948.

The United States Maritime Commission recently reported that the American Merchant Marine approaches a most critical period. The Members of the Senate and House committees of the Congress felt the same way when they reported unanimously Senate Joint Resolution 173. The Congress evidently felt the same way, and there is nothing that has occurred since the action by the Congress on Senate Joint Resolution 173 to alter the opinion previously held when they unanimously enacted Senate Joint Resolution 173 into law.

The Maritime Commission reported recently:

During October 1947, the last month for which the statistics of the Bureau of the Census are available, the over-all participation of United States flag shipping in our seagoing foreign trade dropped below 50 percent for the first time since before World War II; in the dry cargo field it dropped to 47.2 percent. Statistics when available for later months, are expected to reveal further steady reductions in American-flag participation in the carrying of our foreign trade. Moreover, this downward trend will continue in view of the progressive restoration and expansion of foreign merchant fleets. The present huge foreign shipbuilding program is entirely unmatched in this country. It goes without saying that the proposed additional transfers of American ships, whether by sale or charter, would play havoc with American shipping and its participation in overseas trade.

Finally, the Commission said that it was convinced that even if the vessel transfers proposed were not enacted, the

present and indicated further decline of the American Merchant Marine would be accelerated by preferences which will be accorded the merchant marines of the participating nations in the movement of economic and cargoes under the bill unless participation of the American Merchant Marine in this movement is protected.

The Commission says:

> In this manner this Commission believes that the European recovery program can be implemented and administered for the greatest benefit of the participating nations as well as for the United States without bringing irreparable harm to a vital sector of the American economy and defense: The American merchant marine.

I have studied the problems of the American merchant marine for 50 years, almost 30 of which were spent in the Congress of the United States, and almost 27 as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I say without any doubt of the truth of my statement that the judgments expressed by the United States Maritime Commission and recited above are absolutely true, and that the continued existence of an American merchant marine is imperative for our national defense, for the promotion of our commerce and trade, and essential to the retirement of the enormous debt which now burdens the Nation.

Unrealistic promises have been made to the taxpayer of supposed benefits to accrue from the foreign transfers but while promising to the taxpayer various benefits, the proponents of transfers fail to tell the taxpayer about the harmful consequences which will follow the transfers.

The shipping losses of the 16 nations have already been fully recovered except in vessel types of which we have no surplus. The facts are that despite the transfer of huge fleets of American ships and a record volume of ship construction abroad, we find that not only do they not need more of our surplus ships in order to rehabilitate their fleets, but they are actually assured of a huge increase without the transfer of a single additional American ship.

The disappearance of German and Japanese shipping is argued as justifying the need for a large expansion of the fleets of the 16 nations, but the truth is that the disappearance of these ships has left no "vacuum" because German and Japanese trade disappeared with the ships, while numerous countries outside the 16 nations have greatly enlarged their merchant fleets and others have created entirely new merchant fleets, thus more than making up for whatever loss of carrying capacity, if any, which may have resulted from the disappearance of the German and Japanese merchant fleets.

Alleged dollar savings on transportation will result in no saving to the American taxpayer and will not reduce the cost of the aid program to the American people, but through loss of taxes and charter hire will actually increase it. The proposal that idle ships now rusting in our reserve fleets and not wanted by the American shipping industry may be used to help the 16 nations save dollars is a fallacy, for whether the ships are transferred from the operating or the reserve fleets really mean hauling down the American flag on operating ships and substituting foreign flags and foreign crews and operators. This will cause the idle fleets to become larger instead of smaller. We have done our part. Over 1,500 American ships have been transferred to foreign nations within less than than 2 years, most of them at prices substantially below their construction cost to the United States and below construction costs abroad.

It is not the shipping of the 16 nations which needs help to survive. It is the American merchant marine which needs protection. The American merchant marine has been a stepchild long enough, and it is high time that something was done for it. The chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the House is holding extensive hearings to work out policies of replacement and operation which will solve our problems, but that takes time and this Congress should not pursue a course in the meantime which will make solutions more difficult. It will be remembered that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 set a goal of 50 new ships a year as replacements. It was then regarded as an ambitious plan, but the program was dropped for the wartime emergency construction work and has not been resumed.

I greatly regret that the officials of the State Department pursue the plan to make these transfers even after the Secretary of State has been advised by the Maritime Commission that the transfer will be contrary to the vital interests of a United States merchant marine which the Maritime Commission is charged by law to develop, maintain, and encourage.

It is indeed fortunate that the American Legion is made up of men who have borne the burden of battle and are more clear visioned than the men in the State Department. They are protesting against the transfer. The President's Committee on Foreign Aid under the chairmanship of Secretary of Commerce Harriman has found that Europe needs no more dry-cargo ships, that a surplus of such ships is already building up, and that we cannot afford to allow our tramp fleet to disappear. The Harriman committee has proposed that any further transfer of ships should be contingent on a reduction of European shipbuilding, but all such construction is for vessel types of which we have no surplus. Necessarily any reduction in shipbuilding by the 16 nations would only mean a short postponement, and the interference in the national economies of the 16 nations would be widely resented and very difficult, if not impossible, to enforce.

We must be extremely careful that we shall not endanger our national defense in the future and weaken our economy. We have twice found ourselves without the bridge across which to carry troops and supplies to foreign ports and shores, and we must take care lest we find ourselves again without the bridge when the survival of this Nation and of our friends and alllies may again depend on our ability to move troops and cargoes across the ocean. We hope that time may never come, but we must be ready. We should think in terms of preparedness. We do not want war, but if anyone else wishes war, we must be strong. I implore Members of the House to amend the bill and strike out all authority provided in the pending bill to transfer ships by sale or charter. To each of you I can only say, "Quit you like men—be strong."

The Eightieth Congress and Its Shortcomings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, some sessions of Congress have been called liberal, progressive, others conservative, reactionary. The Eightieth Congress will have to move mighty fast in order not to go down in history as the retrogressive Congress.

It is amazing how backward this Congress has been in its thinking and acting. We have done nothing constructive except to appropriate money. If there was ever a time that Congress could give to the people dynamic, sound, constructive, democratic leadership, it was during this period. Our bewildered, chaotic people have looked in vain to their Capitol and have found a leadership even more bewildered, even more chaotic.

Take, for instance, the ridiculous Taft-Hartley bill. It was supposed to stop the new deal communism of the National Labor Relations Act. Once again we stepped backwards. The Norris-LaGuardia Act was a product of and duly signed by the Hoover Administration on March 23, 1932.

A low mark in statesmanship as regards the Jewish people was the infamous Balfour Declaration. We have gone that one better. Today, our double talk on Palestine has placed Uncle Sam in the unenviable position of staging a pogrom in the Holy Land.

On and on I could cite retrogressions of such a general nature but specifically, let us consider the so-called Civil Rights Program. We are arguing today, most bitterly, about matters that previous Congresses, Administrations and Supreme Court decisions have already taken stands on. The only progressive measure that has passed this House in this Eightieth Congress has been the Bender anti-poll tax bill. That's nothing to boast about. The first poll-tax bill was passed October 13, 1942.

The Republican leadership has been recorded in the Negro Republican press as promising that the Case antilynching bill would be brought up March 16. That, not only was an untruth as events have shown, but we know that it is extremely doubtful now that it will be brought up at all except as a last minute political maneuver just before the national conventions and too late for the

Senate to act on. The Republican leadership could not play a more ghastly political trick. Backwards we have stepped again. The first antilynching bill passed this House on January 26, 1922.

We have diabolically taken away every single civil right granted to the Negro people during World War II. Today, there is no FEPC, rigid segregation in the armed forces, diabolically planned elimination of all Negroes in the WAC's and WAVES, likewise in the Nurses Corps of the Army and Navy.

I charged on the floor last year and was refuted. I charge today and I state facts from the office of the Secretary of the Navy. There is only one Negro nurse and 20,000 Negro men in the Navy.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that within three short years of VE-day we, formerly the most liked, have become the most hated nation in the world? We are hypocrites and the world knows it. There is not any Marshall plan or Truman doctrine large enough to whitewash our hypocrisy. True, the world is hungry for bread, but also for democracy. The stature of the common man has reached such heights that he is willing to starve and be free rather than eat and depend on hypocrisy. By every right of heritage our democracy should easily appeal to all of the peoples of the earth.

YOU CANNOT HAVE A SUCCESSFUL BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY BACKED UP WITH A BIPARTISAN JIM CROW POLICY

The Marshall plan is not going to stop communism or any other ism. I guarantee, and you know, that the American plan, however, will turn back any ism because it is the best way of life. But we are not living according to the American plan. We talk democracy abroad and fail to practice it here. Former Secretary of State Byrnes demanded free elections in Rumania while poor whites and Negroes could not vote in South Carolina. We are riled about the Czech coup and we do nothing about the Ku Klux Klan terror in Johnson County, Ga. We question Jan Masaryk's death while we allow Mrs. Rosa Lee Ingram and her two sons to be slaughtered in Americus, Ga.

What is the stumbling block? Is it the so-called solid South? Or are some of the northerners and southerners just using that out-worn phrase to rationalize their individual cowardice, bigotry and hypocrisy?

I know and you know that there are plenty of Republicans, men from the South and likewise men in the capitals below the Mason and Dixon's line, who are disgusted with the maniacal rantings of the cheap demagogues. Thank God, due to them, the solid South is disappearing and because of that, a solid America can be born for the first time since Fort Sumter was fired upon.

Those who shout the most represent the least. In an election in my district in which I was unopposed, more votes were cast for me than those which elected the entire congressional delegations from two Southern States. How can anybody who represents 2 percent of his district talk about the solid South or the solid North?

I would like to insert an editorial entitled "Let's Think Twice" from the February 1948 issue of the Tom Tom, a college newspaper published in Decatur, Miss., written by a World War II veteran and member of one of the oldest and most prominent families of that State.

LET'S THINK TWICE

There are a few people in the South who believe that the South is being picked upon by all northerners; that we are about to be destroyed by the ever encroaching powers of the Federal Government; and that the United States Supreme Court, the greatest judiciary body in the world, is determined to barter our rights and institutions for the favor of a mongrel minority. These beliefs and others are merely the key to the door of destruction for ourselves through an economic drought and self-styled old fashioned culture. The fact that they are becoming louder and more pronounced at this time, probably because of its being election year, gives one who thinks seriously about the future cause for grave concern.

Long ago, Sir Francis Bacon saw fit to write his famous Idols of the Cave in which he foresaw the danger in certain obstacles threatening human progress. He referred to the peculiar mental or physical composition of each individual, his birth, childhood, education, social, and economic status. Bacon would have us beware of our individual biases. He ascertained that men have a tendency to become attached to particular theories and practices and to render tenacious allegiance long after logical basis for the continuance of these beliefs and practices have disappeared. It was long ago, also, that the great China resented the ways of the other parts of the world and built a great wall around the country to prevent the people from being exposed to the ways of other people. It is well known that China stayed within that wall until their doom was sealed. Would our political leaders have us believe that we must also build a wall around the South to protect our sacred principles? Wouldn't this wall of ignorance and prejudices bring the same result to the people of the South?

One is tempted either to doubt a speaker's sincerity or to question the seriousness of the thinking he has done on the issue in the face of such utterances as, "The people of the South have their backs to the wall"; "We have been pushed as far as we can go"; "The South that we know is being swept to its destruction, and this by its own party." Indeed, one is inclined to wonder if such a speaker is not seeking to appease certain groups throughout the South. Certainly, he is concerning himself with only minor issues, which in view of what faces America today is unworthy of the statesmanship which the South produced in the days when our Nation was going through the process of establishment.

America can in the future look at the America of 1948 and say, "There was a strong America—an America that was fighting to preserve peace throughout the world and was being looked upon for leadership through perilous times by a majority of the peoples of the world." What will be their conclusion as to America's response to that demand for leadership? The year of 1948 for America is a year of decision. Shall we concern ourselves with local issues or shall we look upon broader fields where our judgment and resources and sympathy are in need to save the plight of millions of innocent people? Maybe the way advocated by certain southern politicians is the right way. Maybe? However, there is another way, should we not stick to that way until we can get favorable answers to questions like:

Didn't 48 States give up their sovereignity to make the United States possible? If so, what sovereignty does Mississippi still hold?

What is the southern way of life?

Is it better than the American way of life?

Can you give the Negro a square deal and yet keep him out of politics?

Isn't just government derived from the consent of the governed?

How long can we, under God, continue our States-rights hypocrisy?

I would like to insert from the Tupelo (Miss.) Daily Journal an editorial entitled "Whomever We Elect, Let's Do It Honestly":

WHOMEVER WE ELECT, LET'S DO IT HONESTLY

Four years ago while 3,000 Lee County youths were absent battling foreign dictators the people who remained at home bought and sold their votes—the basis of America's democracy—like so many surplus potatoes.

Four years ago the people of Lee County conducted "politics as usual" without any thought of preserving at home the democracy for which their sons were fighting abroad.

But today those 3,000 youths are home. And the soldiers and sailors who have seen the results of a people's selling their freedom are likely to exert every effort possible to obtain honest primaries in our county this summer for the first time in years.

Year after year the tradition of dishonesty has grown in Lee County elections until now many persons find no wrong in the very deeds that our soldiers have seen doom other peoples to slavery.

Buying and selling of votes, dishonest counting of election returns, disappearance of ballot boxes, pressure tactics to obtain contributions from county suppliers, bribery, pay-offs, corruption of officials who were reasonably honest at the time of their election.

These are the traditions which have grown with the years and in varying degrees of seriousness face us today.

Four years ago an official in Lee County bought his way into office. Months passed without his showing results from the money he was spending. A citizen complained.

Responded this little dictator, while 3,000 Lee County boys were fighting to save democracy: "I bought this office and it is mine. I will run it like I please. What I do is none of your business."

Such is the election tradition that has grown in Lee County while a careless public slept.

We do not imply that all those now in office bought votes or participated in any type of irregular activity.

We do not imply that those who won acted in all cases differently from those who lost. For the tradition of dishonest elections has grown so strong in our county that often winner and loser alike have indulged in practices which each, at heart, must condemn.

We do not imply that even those who consistently have bought votes or benefited from crooked counts approve of the system which has made such deeds appear as a requisite for election in our county.

In fact, we do not imply that the candidates were even aware of some of the crookedness done in their behalf. Often their supporters—in some instances staunch church and community leaders in other respects—have taken the lead in Lee County political activities which according to every law on the statute books must be called dishonest.

Our only concern in Lee County's primaries this summer is that every man who wants to go before the people seeking election shall feel secure in the knowledge that he will not have to buy his way to win; that the votes will be counted as they are cast; and that the people, themselves, will show a new strength of character which will prevent their participating in many of the dishonest political tricks which have so commonly been practiced here in the past.

The Journal does not intend to become involved in personalities during this summer's campaigns. The voters know the candidates as well as we.

But we do intend to urge upon voters in every way we can the necessity for starting a

new tradition of honesty in Lee County election by supporting in every instance the man each feels is best qualified for the job regardless of bribes or pressure or cash offers for votes.

We believe that there are thousands of citizens who, regardless of their political affiliations, have a similar desire to see democracy return to Lee County in the form of honest elections in which every candidate has a fair chance and every vote counts the same.

If there be such groups, now is the time for them to step forward and reestablish democracy in local elections before we become so accustomed to the ways of crooked politics that we accept dishonesty in county government as the natural way of life.

I would like to insert an editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Informer, which is sold throughout the State, entitled "No, Thank You."

NO, THANK YOU, MR. CULLEN

Roy Hugh Cullen, a Houston philantropist extraordinary, has issued a public invitation to Negroes through the press, inviting them to tell the Democratic national administration and the Republican Congress that they do not wish Federal statutes passed outlawing the poll tax, Jim Crowism, and lynching, or the passage of a fair-employment-practice act. The reasons given are the friendship of southern whites, the loss of freedom under the Bill of Rights, and encroachment upon States' rights.

Negroes decline the invitation of Mr. Cullen, without thanks to him who extends it. Mr. Cullen's invitation is like telling a drowning man in the ocean to order the people on the rescue ship to cease throwing rope to help the man, either because of the repeated failure to reach him, or because the rope might hit him in the eye. Negroes are hopelessly fettered by the laws and practices of Mr. Cullen and his friends in the South, and have no hope of escaping except through Federal legislation.

It is still true that beggars can't be choosers, Negroes who have been begging for the type of legislation recommended by President Truman are in no position to reject it because it may be offered for political reasons. Instead of insulting the intelligence of Negroes, any promise to pass legislation to break the present fetters is accepted avidly as a fulcrum to be used for achieving the deed.

We are trying to tell Mr. Cullen that the President's message is in answer to the insistent petition of southern Negroes. The common interest of Negroes in the South is to hasten the fruition of the President's message into law, and there are no honest Negroes in the South who would even think of asking that the passage of the laws be stopped.

We grant that there may be sufficient laws in the Southern States to give the protection promised by the Federal statutes. But unfortunately for Mr. Cullen's invitation, he and those who administer those laws of the South have had 80 years to make them accomplish the purpose, without any beneficial success to Negroes. Therefore, Negroes have no faith in the enforcement of laws in the South to give them citizenship rights.

Frankly, Negroes are not interested in States' rights as understood by Mr. Cullen. If any rights now enjoyed under the Bill of Rights will be lost through the enactment of the suggestions in the President's message, the Negroes are willing to take a chance on such loss.

We hate further to upset Mr. Cullen and his friends at a time when they are clearly so beside themselves with fear and concern, but it is our duty to suggest to them that Mr. Cullen does not speak for the majority of the southern whites.

We doubt seriously that Mr. Cullen speaks for labor in the South. We know he doesn't speak for the Catholics in the South, the Catholics having quietly but firmly anticipated the President's message to a great extent already. He doesn't speak for a vast army of college students and youngsters ranging from 18 to 30 in his own group in the South.

Neither does he know that the man in the street has changed his point of view markedly in the last 5 years regarding the things that Mr. Cullen is striving to maintain. If leaders like Mr. Cullen would stand aside and let the masses really express their current views, it might be that we would not need much of this Federal law.

More significantly Mr. Cullen has overlooked the fact that few of the reputable daily papers of the South have cared, since the President's message, to stultify themselves by contending for the things that Mr. Cullen is representing in his article.

Now, let's look at the record of Mr. Cullen and those who have run the South since the emancipation of Negroes to which he alludes in his message. It may be observed that if the Emancipation Proclamation gave Negroes their liberty and constitutional rights, the predecessors of Mr. Cullen took them away in the reconstruction period.

It may further be noted that within the 80 years since Negroes have been emancipated, not a single Southern State has passed a civil-rights statute. This fact alone kills any suggestion that Negroes should voluntarily ask the Federal Government to leave their rights in the hands of Southern States.

The rights of Negroes in the South have received lip service and nothing else. No Southern State has apprehended and convicted a lyncher.

But we do not here choose to plead the prejudiced exploitations we have suffered, we prefer to point out to Mr. Cullen the terrible cost of race discrimination to the South itself.

It has led the South, which professes democratic ideals, to deny those ideals repeatedly, in order to justify and continue their exploitation. It has made of the South's religion a monstrous hyprocrisy.

No, we aren't going to ask that no Federal laws be passed to grant us the rights of the Constitution.

As we have told Mr. Cullen before, we cannot accept donations of money as sufficient earnest of friendship in this cause of freedom. To us the right to be men, with the freedom and privileges of the Constitution is greater than any benefits we may get from charity.

If Mr. Cullen is correct in saying that the present situation is a challenge to us, then we choose to meet that challenge by doing everything we can to bring about the realization of the President's message to Congress in which he asks the abolition of the poll tax, the abolition of Jimcrowism, and passage of an antilynch bill, and the establishment of fair-employment-practice acts.

Finally, we are not concerned with what the Labor News may or may not have said of Mr. Cullen, but we are persuaded that he will find no honest Negro in the South who will deny that he wants most heartily to have the President's message to Congress enacted into law at the earliest date.

Despite the word "final" above, we cannot close without correcting one other error in Mr. Cullen's statement. Lynchings have not diminished appreciably in the South. What has really happened is that since the agitation for a Federal antilynch bill has become so pointed, there has been a conspiracy in the South between the leaders to cover up and play down lynchings.

We will cite for Mr. Cullen any time he wants them facts and figures to show where lynchings have taken place, where sheriffs have gone to the scene; and where a whole community has known of the lynching, which was shared in by 20 or 30 men, but still it was not reported in any daily papers in the community or anywhere near. Also, how many Negroes are being lynched by use of judicial processes. Police officers and sheriffs are shooting Negroes, whom they have taken in their cars to carry to jail, and then claiming that the Negroes were resisting arrest, though they had been quelled and taken into custody. Let anybody examine the cases that used to be reported as lynching in the southern papers, and then compare them with the situations that are turned up now, and they will find that the incidents are the same but the treatment is just different by agreement of the South.

Unfortunately, the Tuskegee people continue to report only those lynchings that are so described in the daily papers. So if the daily papers do not call them lynchings, then the statistics will not refer to them as lynchings.

I would like to insert an editorial from the national organ of the IBPOE, entitled "Politicians Get Busy":

POLITICIANS GET BUSY

(By Charles E. Hall, grand statistician)

This is the open season for professional politicians to present their customary performances on the great American stage for the instruction, entertainment, and often for the beguilement of the voting public. Already an unusual number of white and colored barnstormers are dusting off their antique scenery sets and trying out new acts with which they hope to influence the voters in the approaching national election.

Many of these practicing politicians, in their self-seeking activities, fail to realize that intelligent people, white and black, whether in New York, Alabama, Michigan, Georgia, Illinois, Texas, California, Oklahoma, or elsewhere, will not long follow any cause their awakened conscience does not approve, or in which they do not agree in general. The brand of political bunkum dished out a few years ago by bombastic orators no longer appeals to an intelligent voter, and the old stuff should be discarded at once and the new acts should be carefully censored.

In every section of our country thinking men and women are looking for economic, political, and religious freedom and security, and the national pendulum is rapidly swinging in that direction, despite the threats of certain southern Governors to revolt from their party unless their national leaders go on record against the proposed anti-poll-tax, antilynching, and antidiscrimination legislation. If these disciples of hate would remove the film from over their eyes and study the electoral vote cast in Presidential elections for the past 20 years or longer, they would find that the 167 electoral votes of the South have not counted for much.

In 1932, 1936, and 1940 the Democratic ticket would have won without any or all of the Southern States, and in 1944 only one southern electoral vote was needed. In 1912 Wilson would have won without the electoral votes of Dixie. And of course the South has not contributed largely if at all to the election of the numerous Republican Presidents we have had since the party was founded or organized with the possible exception of 1928 when a Catholic received the Democratic nomination. Even then Hoover would have won easily over Smith without the 104 electoral votes of the 10 revolting southern States. It appears that the southern governors are out on a limb in their demand that the civil-rights program as announced be withdrawn or emasculated and that their vicious propaganda will cost their party the electoral votes of at least three southern or border States.

Naturally, some of the colored citizens who live in Dixie are somewhat disturbed but many of them while patiently awaiting the dawn of a new era have concentrated upon

securing economic security, as in Texas, for instance. In this State, where Elkdom is forging to the front and where there are almost a million Negro inhabitants living in all but 15 of the 254 counties their progress is typical of that being made in most other Southern States. If the farm acreage owned in Texas by Negro operators were placed acre to acre it would make a strip 1 mile wide reaching from Galveston to Boston, Mass., or 2,012 miles, the shortest railroad route between the two cities.

Between the years 1940 and 1945 their farm ownership increased from 38 to 48 percent while the value of their land and buildings increased by more than $10,000,000 during the 5 years. And in 1940 our Texas families occupied more owned dwelling units than were reported for any other State.

No; I am afraid that as long as 98 percent of the people, black and white, do not vote, that regardless of how loud the so-called spokesmen shout, thinking people will know that they do not represent the solid South.

THE TRUTH OF IT IS IN 40 YEARS, EXCEPT FOR WOODROW WILSON, EVERY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES COULD HAVE BEEN ELECTED WITHOUT ONE VOTE FROM THE SO-CALLED SOLID SOUTH

Very few of the real citizens of the solid South are represented. Ten million poll-tax victims have no voice to speak for them. Demagogs do not reflect the opinions of such people as Dr. Frank Graham, of North Carolina; Homer Rainey, of Texas; Lillian Smith and Helen Mankin, of Georgia; Supreme Court Justice Black, of Alabama; the late Dr. Redmond, of Mississippi; and others that I could mention. As soon as the poll tax is abolished, the 98 percent will then be represented. Right-thinking white and 15,000,000 Negroes are becoming increasingly critical of the Republican leadership of this Congress. Only one thing will stop this as far as the House of Representatives is concerned:

PASSAGE OF THE ANTILYNCHING BILL BEFORE APRIL 15, WHICH WILL GIVE THE SENATE AMPLE TIME TO WORK ON IT

While it is true that lynching officially dropped to only one last year, may I say that unofficially the total will never be known. May I read you a statement from an outstanding citizen of the State involved. A statement which, by the way, a few days ago was called untrue.

New patterns of lynching and recent outbursts of police brutalities are spreading terror among Mississippi Negroes. This new terror is unmistakably linked to the emotion arising out of the discussions of the President's recent civil-liberties recommendations to Congress.

In Jackson, Miss., the capital city of the State, on Saturday night, February 21, J. V. Williams, a young Negro veteran, was arrested in a Negro cafe in the heart of downtown Jackson on charge of drunkenness. After being placed under arrest, he was pushed out into the street by the arresting officer who, on the pretense that he was attempting to escape, shot him in the hip. After he was shot, the arresting officer and several others attracted to the scene beat him brutally as his pleas for mercy could be heard by people attracted to the scene. In the large crowd gathered there, being the closing of the shopping day, included many Negro people. After throwing the wounded and brutally beaten man into an awaiting police car, the officers, using their pistols, threatened and drove all Negroes away from the scene and out of that section of the street.

On Friday, February 13, Leroy McGowan, a one-armed Negro veteran, ran when he was called by a police officer allegedly for drunkenness. This one-armed veteran was overtaken by the officer who began brutally beating him and was joined by some 16 uniformed policemen. After the veteran had been brutally beaten and was lying unconscious in a pool of blood at the corner of Amite and North Farish Streets, one of the police officers turned him over and stood on his good arm while a white civilian went out and, using his feet, attempted to turn him over to see if he was dead.

The new forms of lynching may be illustrated in these cases. At Kosciusko, Miss., on Monday, February 2, George Thomas, a young Negro, was shot to death by a Kosciusko policeman who reported that he was called to arrest him for attempting to force himself into a white home on the Kosciusko highway. The officer said that en route to the jail, the man tried to overpower him causing him to shoot him. He was shot three times, once through the arm, through the lower body, and one bullet pierced the heart causing instant death.

The killing of this man at Kosciusko is directly connected with an incident reported at Kosciusko on that day. Lacey Futch, a young Negro veteran and employee of a Jackson wholesale firm, was reported a victim of a Kosciusko mob on Monday, February 2, after his employer was called to come to Kosciusko and get the truck which he was driving which had been deserted there. When the report that Futch had been a victim of a mob at Kosciusko reached Jackson, his wife and his mother and news gathering agencies called the law enforcement officers at Kosciusko, Belzoni, and Durant, in an effort to ascertain the facts regarding Futch. These sources were informed by the law enforcing agencies that no incident of any kind involving Negro and white people had occurred at either place at any time recently.

On Friday, Futch, still being missing, his wife and mother went to the Hines County and Jackson, Miss., law-enforcement officers and the Jackson Federal Bureau of Investigation requesting aid in locating Futch. On Sunday, Futch made his way to Jackson and to his family bearing evidence of brutal beating. He reported his escape from the small group of white men who were searching for him and stated that there was another Negro man involved in the incident leading to the mob attempt. The incident being a fight that Futch had with a white man. The Negro who was killed by the Kosciusko policeman is unmistakably the other Negro referred to by Futch who was riding on the truck at the time of the incident.

At Edwards, Miss., in Hines County, 25 miles from the capital city, on November 15, Walter Palmer, a young Negro veteran was arrested at a party about midnight. En-route to the jail, he was killed by the arresting officer. His clothing shows that he was shot in the back. The officer reported that he attempted to turn upon him, causing him, to shoot him.

No preliminary hearings or indictments or official investigations have been made in either of these cases.

The greater significance as respects to these incidents lies in the fact of an apparent effort to suppress the news concerning such incidents. In the case of the killing of the man at Kosciusko and of the Futch incident, nothing was printed in the newspapers of the area. One week later, however, a brief mention of the shooting in Kosciusko was reported.

In the case of the police brutalities in Jackson on Saturday, February 21, nothing appeared in the two daily papers although the large crowd attracted to the scene caused extensive tie-ups throughout the downtown area of the city.

Let us come back to that one human life. During the recent special session, an eminent Member of the majority said that even if the hundreds of millions of dollars to be sent to France and Italy saved only one human life, it would be worth it. Even if the passage of the anti-lynching bill saves only one human life in America, it will be worth it.

I speak for 15,000,000 people whose friends number many millions more. We are saying to the Republican-dominated Congress, "Stop kidding us! No more campaign promises! Deeds!" Why, the Congressmen from the South are much more honest than those from the North and, strangely, have done more. The only civil-rights laws enacted in many years, was done so by a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President, June 4, 1946. That was Public Law 396 which states:

If a State maintains separate schools for minority and for majority races, no funds made available pursuant to this act shall be paid or disbursed to it unless a just and equitable distribution is made within the State, for the benefit of such minority races, of funds paid to it under this act.

This was the result of an amendment proposed by me on this floor on February 20, 1946.

Now we have come to the period of The Great Crisis. Two billion, who can either be our enemies or our friends, look askance at the kind of democracy we practice in America and are saying, "If that's what you want to force on us, no thanks."

Sure, we have the atom bomb but it cannot kill two billion people. Or maybe some of our leaders would like to try. Away with the Marshall plan, Truman doctrine, Mason and Dixon's line, the North, the South, black and white, and let the American plan have a chance. Let us practice at home what we preach abroad.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

It is our belief that in this winter of 1947–48, the United States is faced with the responsibility and the pressing necessity to prevent mass starvation and to aid in restoring the normal economic life of the war-ravaged nations of Europe cooperating in the Marshall plan. We believe that this is "the immediate and pressing challenge to our belief in freedom and prosperity" and that "it is our simple duty as neighbors to take a generous part in helping these great people to help themselves." Therefore, we urge our duly elected representa-

tives in the Congress to cast a favorable vote on legislation designed, in the light of Secretary of State Marshall's proposal, to fulfill the needs of a sound European recovery program.

Stella Trane Jackson, Mrs. Benno W. Meyer, Mrs. J. G. Elston, Mrs. R. G. Miner, Mrs. J. M. Cohen, Mrs. Harold L. Kraus, Mrs. A. W. Bartheld, Mrs. W. M. Roscoe, Mrs. George Nixon, Mrs. W. N. Sanders, Mrs. D. O. Coate, Mrs. E. W. Crosby, Mrs. O. J. Oyen, Mrs. B. A. Spangler, La Crosse, Wis.; Mrs. A. W. Hendrich, Onalaska, Wis.; Mrs. Frank H. Burgess, Mrs. J. W. Bibby, Mrs. Kathryn Feinberg, Mrs. L. A. Waidelich, M. M. Trowbridge, Rexford Mitchell, Mrs. E. N. Nelson, Mrs. W. E. Zube, Mrs. Wm. L. Stiles, La Crosse, Wis.; Mrs. Harry Garbers, Bangor, Wis.; Mrs. V. S. Keppel, Holmen, Wis.; Mrs. Fred Baumgartner, Sr., Mrs. Herman Monte, Mrs. Lydia Gunn, La Crosse, Wis.; Lucinda M. Kenneda, Mrs. Oscar Sjolander, Mrs. Harold Johnson, Holmen, Wis.; Mrs. R. E. Hanson, Miss Mabel Larson, Mrs. Anna Lee, Mrs. Clara Laumann, Mrs. Wm. Schultz, La Crosse, Wis.; Mrs. Wm. Blankley, Mrs. Susie Hensel, Onalaska, Wis.; Jessie E. Caldwell, Fred W. Hyslop, La Crosse, Wis.

Russian-United States Trade Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, because of the current interest in the amount of trade carried on between Russia and the United States, and the desirability of exact information on the subject, I have had gathered the latest available information. The charts which I include under leave to extend my remarks were prepared in the Department of Commerce, Special Programs Branch, Areas Division, Office of International Trade, from basic data of the Bureau of Census, February 1948:

Monthly shipments of lend-lease and relief supplies from the United States to U. S. S. R. in 1947

[Millions and tenths of millions of dollars]

Month	Lend-lease [1]	Relief shipments		
		UNRRA [2]	Private	Total
1947:				
January	4.7	5.9	0.7	6.7
February	3.2	6.2	.2	6.4
March	1.4	3.6	.1	3.7
April	1.8	4.1	(3)	4.1
May	3.6	10.1	.4	10.6
June	.1	1.3	.1	1.4
July	1.2	.7	.1	.8
August		(3)	.1	.1
September	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
October	.1	(3)	.1	.2
November	.1	.1	.1	.1
December	(3)	(3)	.1	.1
Total	16.3	32.1	2.2	34.2

[1] Title to these exports was transferred before Jan. 10, 1947, under loan agreement; shipments were delayed awaiting Russian transportation arrangements.
[2] Shipments after Mar. 31, 1947, the cut-off date for United States contributions, include supplies delivered to UNRRA previous to that date but awaiting shipment, and subsequent purchases made with funds available to UNRRA not subject to United States control.
[3] Less than $50,000.

United States exports to and imports from U. S. S. R., annual 1936–38 average and 1941–47

[Millions of dollars]

Period	Exports, including reexports		General imports (total)
	Total	Cash-purchase [1]	
1936-38 (average)	49	49	25
1941	108	107	30
1942	1,425	64	25
1943	2,995	10	30
1944	3,473	4	50
1945	1,838	5	54
1946	358	53	101
1947, total	150	99	77
January to March	48	22	11
April to June	44	22	21
July to September	23	21	26
October to December	35	34	18

[1] Represents total exports, excluding lend-lease and relief shipments.

United States trade with U. S. S. R., by commodity groups and principal commodities, 1938 and January to December 1947

[Value in millions and tenths of millions of dollars]

Group and commodity	Quarterly, 1947				Annual	
	January to March	April to June	July to September	October to December	1938	1947
Exports, including reexports, total [1]	47.7	44.0	22.8	35.0	69.7	149.5
Lend-lease shipments	9.3	5.5	1.2	.2	-----	16.3
UNRRA shipments	15.7	15.5	.7	.1	-----	32.1
Private relief	1.0	.5	.2	.3	-----	2.2
Cash purchase	21.7	22.0	20.7	34.4	-----	98.9
Foodstuffs	2.8	.9	(2)	.1	(2)	3.8
Canned meats [3]	2.7	.5	(2)	(2)	-----	3.1
Tobacco, unmanufactured	.4	-----	.7	-----	-----	1.2
Textiles and textile manufactures	.5	.9	.5	.4	(2)	2.2
Cordage, except of cotton or jute	(2)	.6	.5	.3	(2)	1.4
Nonmetallic minerals	.7	1.8	1.9	.9	5.8	5.2
Petroleum and products	.2	1.4	1.7	.2	3.1	3.5
Carbon or graphite products	.2	.1	.1	.3	[4] 1.9	.6
Metals and manufactures	6.9	6.0	2.1	2.0	12.2	17.0
Iron and steel-mill products	6.1	5.2	2.0	1.9	6.7	15.3
Iron and steel advanced manufactures	.3	.5	.1	.1	1.0	.9
Copper insulated wire and cable	.4	.1	-----	(2)	(2)	.4
Machinery and vehicles	32.1	32.1	16.3	28.8	49.4	109.3
Electrical machinery and apparatus	5.9	5.1	3.3	5.7	3.4	20.0
Generators, accessories and parts	1.3	1.1	.1	.2	(2)	2.7
Transforming or converting apparatus	.6	.5	.9	1.2	.1	3.2
Transmission and distribution apparatus	.7	.7	.9	1.3	.2	3.7
Motors, starters, and controllers	1.7	1.2	.4	1.2	.6	4.5
Industrial machinery	23.6	24.7	10.9	21.8	40.2	81.1
Power-generating, and parts [5]	1.8	2.9	.1	.6	.9	5.5
Construction and conveying	2.0	2.1	2.1	4.4	.1	10.7
Mining, well, and pumping	5.5	4.1	2.0	6.2	.9	17.8
Metal-working	7.3	6.0	4.2	6.0	35.0	23.4
Tractors and parts	.9	1.2	.1	(2)	(2)	2.2
Motor trucks, busses, and chassis, new	.5	.5	.1	.2	.1	1.3
Merchant vessels	.7	-----	.6	-----	.2	1.2
Freight cars, over 10-ton capacity	-----	.2	1.1	.6	-----	1.8
Laundry soap	1.2	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.2
All other exports, including total reexports [6]	3.1	2.3	1.3	2.8	2.3	9.6
General imports, total [7]	11.3	21.3	26.6	18.0	23.5	77.1
Foodstuffs	(2)	.7	.2	.7	1.4	1.6
Sausage casings	-----	.3	.2	.4	.4	.9
Sturgeon roe	(2)	.5	(2)	.3	.2	.8
Crab meat, sauce, and paste	-----	-----	-----	-----	.5	-----
Furs, undressed	4.8	[8] 11.8	17.3	7.6	12.1	41.5
Persian lamb and caracul [9]	3.2	.3	10.6	3.8	6.7	17.9
Furs, dressed and manufactured	(2)	.3	.3	1.0	.9	1.7
Licorice root	(2)	(2)	(2)	.1	.3	.4
Tobacco, cigarette leaf, unstemmed	2.0	1.1	1.2	-----	.3	4.2
Textile fibers and manufactures	1.0	.7	1.2	1.8	1.6	4.7
Cotton linters	.2	.3	.8	.6	.1	1.9
Cotton waste	.1	.1	.3	.4	(2)	.9
Woven fabrics of flax, hemp, and ramie	(2)	(2)	(2)	.1	1.0	.3
Wool, unmanufactured	.5	.2	-----	.4	-----	1.0
Sulfite wood pulp, unbleached	-----	.3	(2)	.2	-----	.5
Coal, anthracite	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.1	-----
Diamonds, cut but not set	-----	.1	.4	.4	(2)	.9
Metals and manufactures	3.3	5.9	5.5	5.4	3.6	20.0
Manganese ore	1.9	2.3	1.4	2.2	2.7	7.7
Chrome ore or chromite	.9	1.4	4.0	2.8	-----	9.0
Platinum and platinum combinations	.5	1.2	-----	-----	1.0	1.8
All other imports	.2	.3	.5	.8	2.2	1.6

[1] This total and commodity detail includes lend-lease, relief, and commercial shipments.
[2] Less than $50,000.
[3] Mainly tushonka, sausage, and pork.
[4] Mainly electrodes for furnace or electrolytic work.
[5] Mainly steam and Diesel locomotives.
[6] Includes "private relief" shipments shown above.
[7] Imports for consumption in 1938.
[8] Mainly squirrel, marmot, and hare.
[9] Includes some goat- and kid-skin furs in 1938.

Foregoing from Bureau of Census statistics, February 1948.

Farm Prices Versus Consumer Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House Resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the House on the progress of research activities in connection with the spread of prices on farm commodities between the producer and the consumer. I had originally contemplated introducing a resolution to enable the committee on agriculture to conduct an investigation of this subject but am now advised that some progress along the lines referred to above is being made under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1087).

My inquiry is prompted largely by the fact that, according to a survey recently conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, while retail prices on staple food commodities dropped in February, following the decline in the commodities market, prices on some fruits and vegetables increased. As a California fruit producer, and as the representative of a district which produces large quantities of fruit and vegetable crops, I am deeply concerned. I know from personal experience, as well as from a close contact with California agricultural problems, that the farmers in my State, particularly those producing highly specialized fruit products, are suffering from extremely low prices.

The survey conducted by the Department of Agriculture in January is interesting. However, it is also interesting to note that in February, as I indicated previously, many fruit and vegetable prices increased while other food prices were declining. Needless to say, the farmer received little or no benefit from these increases.

WASHINGTON RETAIL STORE SURVEY—JANUARY 12, 13, 1948

Although retail prices are high on most food items many individual commodities are priced relatively low. Chief examples of the lower-priced commodities are apples, pears, and citrus which are at present bringing farmers relatively low returns. In conducting a spot survey of Washington, D. C., wholesalers and retailers it was observed that, as a rule, the retail prices on these items are also relatively low. Retail margins are usually higher on fresh fruits and vegetables than for other foods, generally because of waste and spoilage losses and because most fresh produce items are not easily adapted to self-service, and labor costs for servicing store customers is a significant cost item. Spoilage, waste, and mark-down losses are not eliminated from the retail margins shown in this statement.

Considerable variation in retail prices was noted. Western Delicious apples, for instance, varied in price from 3 pounds for 29 cents (9.7 cents per pound) to 17 cents per pound. Lower apple prices were usually found in well managed, efficient, independent super markets and national chain store outlets, while higher apple prices were found at small neighborhood independent outlets and at the specialized fruit stores. The average retail margin on Western Delicious and Western Winesap apples was around 25 percent of retail which cannot be considered abnormally high. Western Rome Beauty apples, on the other hand, were priced at the wholesale level at 5.7 cents per pound and 3 of 10 stores checked, which carried this variety, were retailing them at 2 pounds for 21 cents, 2 pounds for 23 cents, and 2 pounds for 25 cents. These price differentials are large and the retail margin calculated on this basis approximates 50 percent. Obviously, these observations do not constitute a representative sample of the whole city.

Wide variation in retail prices of pears (Anjou and Bosc) was noted, ranging from 20 cents per pound to 3 pounds for 29 cents. The average sales margin, though, was only 17.9 percent of the retail price which cannot be considered abnormally high due to the perishability of this fruit.

Florida oranges of comparable size varied from 6.5 to 4.4 cents per pound and the calculated sales margin averaged 41 percent. The most common size of California Navel oranges varied from 49 to 75 cents per dozen—a significant range although resulting in an average sales margin of only 29 percent. Tangerines are highly perishable, but even this factor may not justify the average retail margin of approximately 67 percent charged for this item at the time of this survey. This is apparently an illustration of an item on which the market price is depressed to a point where the wholesale price hardly covers the cost of packing and shipment and yet the retail price fails to drop to a corresponding low level.

A similar situation was found on carrots. The wholesale price had been around $11 a crate, a couple of weeks earlier, according to trade sources, and then dropped to $5 to $7 per crate. However, many stores dropped their retail price from 17 cents per bunch to only 15 cents per bunch. One independent retailer said, "I like to keep my prices fairly steady. When carrots were high I lost a cent on every bunch, and now I am making up for these losses by charging a relatively high price in relation to the market."

Wholesalers expressed lively interest in the survey. They wondered why the market news service for the Washington market had been discontinued, and they also thought the Government should publicize retail and wholesale prices as a service to consumers and the trade in order to move surplus items into consumption and add flexibility to retail price variations.

Retailers lamented high prices in general. "Too high," they frequently said. Commodities on which retailers were being squeezed, such as butter and bacon, were frequently mentioned as current headaches. One independent District grocery store operator in a very low income area said he could not make any money now with high prices. "A few years ago," he said, "I bought neck bones for 3½ cents a pound and sold them for a nickel a pound, and now they cost me 34 cents a pound, and I sell them for 37 cents. You can see what happens to my percentage."

Carrots, lettuce, Idaho potatoes, and tomatoes all had wide price variations. On the other hand, green beans, grapefruit, and Maine potatoes were more or less uniformly priced.

Margins appeared extraordinarily high on tangerines, topped carrots, and larger California oranges.

Prices varied less on dairy products, eggs, and meat. An independent was consistently high on these products, and a chain store was consistently low. Average margins were not high on these items.

Summarizing, it seems safe to say that the fresh fruit and vegetable department usually absorbs considerable price play in the retail stores, that is, opportunities are more plentiful in that department for taking large margins unnoticed by store patrons than in other departments. Consumers are more likely to follow market value in meats and dairy products, leaving the alert retailer more opportunity for skilled merchandising and latitude for wider price variations in the fresh fruit and vegetable line.

Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the two following petitions, protesting against the continuance of the excise tax on certain necessities:

PORTSMOUTH, OHIO, *November 4, 1947.*
To Whom It May Concern:

We, the undersigned, being purchasers of such baby necessities as baby oil, baby talcum powder, etc., do protest against paying the 20-percent excise tax on such necessities, and beg that it be removed.

Charlie Rose, Mrs. Wm. James, Luther Boggs, Wallace R. Bryan, Everett Ray Massey, Sciotoville, Ohio; Jean Wray Henson, Portsmouth, Ohio; Garrett King, Mrs. David W. Swick, Sciotoville, Ohio; Kenneth D. Fox, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Mrs. Charles H. Hall, Mrs. James W. Falls, Sciotoville, Ohio; Estel Jarvis, South Webster, Ohio; Paul Church, Sciotoville, Ohio; Mrs. Carl Akers, South Webster, Ohio; Mrs. Ira M. Coriell, Jr., Mrs. Owen Moorehead, Ray Blankenship, Mrs. Paul Suter, W. G. Harr, Dariel Willis, Dorothy Kluie, Sciotoville, Ohio; Arnold Bussey, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Mrs. Ed. Spray, Ray E. Kronk, Cecil Parker, Jr. R. Evans, Marion Bennett, Sciotoville, Ohio; Mrs. N. T. Munach, Oak Hill, Ohio; Mrs. Allen R. Patterson, Portsmouth, Ohio; Charles E. Jones, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Ralph R. Buck, Mrs. W. C. Gammon, Mrs. John Boggs, Ella Mack, Mildred Orthmeyer, Mrs. Robert Luster, Sciotoville, Ohio; Carroll Burchett, Portsmouth, Ohio; Ralph Marsh, Mrs. Francis Boyer, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Mrs. C. C. Thomson, Sciotoville, Ohio; William Goodan, South Webster, Ohio; Alfred H. Smith, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Edward Holsinger, Mrs. Firman Wiehle, Sciotoville, Ohio; Strother Rankin, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Rosa Jarrell, South Webster, Ohio; Betty Szafran, Cleveland, Ohio; Paul Dever, Sciotoville, Ohio; Harry F. Willis, Ancel Wheeler, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Joseph Sloan, Lucasville, Ohio; Margaret Dutiel, Sciotoville, Ohio; Sadie Jones, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Mildred Miller, Rushtown, Ohio; Leonard L. Jenkins, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Ralph E. Short, Sciotoville, Ohio.

PORTSMOUTH, OHIO, *January 6, 1948.*
To Whom It May Concern:

We, the undersigned, being purchasers of such baby necessities as baby oil, baby talcum powder, etc., do protest against paying the 20-percent excise tax on such necessities, and beg that it be removed:

Mrs. W. B. Hanes, Sciotoville, Ohio; Mrs. L. L. Jenkins, Wheelersburg, Ohio; David Mougey, Sciotoville, Ohio; Mr. and Mrs. C. Bandy, South Webster,

Ohio; Mrs. W. H. Russell, Mrs. R. David Swick, Portsmouth, Ohio; Mrs. Paul Spradlin, Lucasville, Ohio, Orville York, Wheelersburg, Ohio; George Coriell, Sciotoville, Ohio; R. K. Stockner, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Paul E. Rase, Minford, Ohio; Mrs. Tom Colvin, Lewis J. Martin, David W. Swick, Sciotoville, Ohio; Mrs. Maxine Wood, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Ralph O'Dell, Clarence Jenkins, Richard Allen, Sciotoville, Ohio; Gerald Daniels, Ray Blankenship, Portsmouth, Ohio; Mrs. John Bennett, Sciotoville, Ohio; R. R. Jenkins, Portsmouth, Ohio; Mrs. David Mougey, Sciotoville, Ohio; Clarence Malone, South Webster, Ohio; Mrs. F. A. Grubb, Miss Ruth Hill, Sciotoville, Ohio; Charles E. Roe, Mrs. Virgil Ashley, Wheelersburg, Ohio; Albert W. Davisson, Sciotoville, Ohio; Ralph Bussler, Maxine Bussler, Portsmouth, Ohio; Herman Reed, Doris Gahm, Sciotoville, Ohio; Mrs. Oscar C. Taylor, South Webster, Ohio; Donald McClave, Sciotoville, Ohio; Paul Spradlin, Lucasville, Ohio; Elmer Shope, South Webster, Ohio; Virgil H. Donley, Sciotoville, Ohio; Herman O. Gearheart, Portsmouth, Ohio; W. J. O'Connor, Bellevue, Ky.; W. J. Cook, Mrs. Leonard Gannon, Sciotoville, Ohio; Mrs. Myrtle Stockham, Minford, Ohio; Charles Raymond Howell, Betty Jane Fraley, Clarence O'Dell, Sciotoville, Ohio.

Sale of American Ships to Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the following correspondence I have received on the subject of transfer, charter, or sale of American ships to foreign nations as contemplated in the foreign-assistance bill now being considered by the Congress:

SHIPOWNERS' ASSOCIATION OF
THE PACIFIC COAST,
San Francisco, Calif., March 8, 1948.

Hon. HOMER R. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This association is in full accord with the objectives of the European recovery program. However, we request your attention to and assistance with one phase of this program. We are certain that you do not favor the Marshall plan at the expense of economic disaster to an industry directly connected with the national security of the United States, and which will include the unemployment of a sizable segment of American maritime labor.

The European recovery program, as proposed by the State Department, calls for the transfer by sale and charter of 500 American flag vessels to the 16 participating nations. These 500 vessels represent approximately 5,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping, an amount equal to one-half of our entire merchant marine before the war, twice the tonnage employed exclusively in our foreign trade prior to the war, and approximately one-half of our present privately owned shipping fleet. Section 11 (a) of Senate bill 2202, to implement the Marshall plan, would allow chartering of 300 vessels. If either of these proposals is allowed to be included in the final passage of the Marshall plan, it will be the most damaging legislation to the American merchant marine since Congress in 1858 granted mail-contract subsidies to a British flag line.

Economy is the most important reason suggested in the European recovery program proposals for the turning over of these ships to foreign control; viz, that the cost of transporting relief and rehabilitation cargoes would thereby be reduced. Numerous loose estimates of savings have been offered, completely unsupported by their authors. Regardless of actual figures, we are unequivocably opposed to the theory of sacrificing such a vital asset of the United States merely to accomplish a temporary expedient—which would result in an approximate saving of only 1 percent of the total estimated cost of the European recovery program.

In this connection, we would like to direct your attention to excerpts from the November 1947 report of the Committee on Foreign Aid under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Commerce (the so-called Harriman committee):

"The United States needs an active merchant marine for national defense and we must not create conditions in which that merchant marine cannot survive" (p. H–6).

"The limited financial savings are not sufficient to justify the drain on United States resources for national defense which such transfers would involve" (p. H–8).

Furthermore, we quote the following from House Report No. 1417 to accompany Joint Resolution 332 (February 23, 1948), extending certain authorities of the Maritime Commission:

"In this connection, the committee is also of the opinion that the transfer of ships to foreign nations, as has been suggested in connection with the proposed European recovery program, is wholly inadvisable. The committee feels that neither the Maritime Commission nor any other agency should attempt to charter, sell, or transfer title to any person who is not a citizen of this country, nor to any foreign government. To do so would not be in the interest of the United States, nor of the shipping industry, nor of the thousands of seamen and workers who are engaged in maritime employment."

We earnestly request your consideration of the fact that the shipping phases of the European recovery program, as proposed by the State Department, are diametrically opposed to the policies of the Congress relative to the American merchant marine, as set forth in the preamble of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (as well as in previous and subsequent merchant marine legislation). The policy of this Nation, as determined by the Congress, has been to develop and promote an American merchant marine adequate to serve the Nation in time of peace, and in time of war as a military auxiliary. However, the State Department proposals, would not only return the American merchant marine to its pre-1936 status, but would create out of the existing American flag tonnage the low-cost foreign flag tonnage which would in the future either push the American flag off the seas or necessitate increased subsidies paid to American lines to maintain a minimum of national defense shipping.

It would be much more in line with existing congressional policy for American shipping to be given every possible opportunity to establish its operations on a permanent postwar basis. There has been too little consideration given to the potentialities of American shipping in light of the United States' present world leadership. History has shown that decades of a strong British merchant marine coincided with, and were a part of British world leadership. It has also shown that the power and prestige of nations are directly dependent upon the size, scope and condition of their merchant fleets. It is quite clear to us that this Nation, in view of its new international role, needs a strong merchant marine with all of its attendant benefits in peace and in war. The United States cannot allow American-flag shipping in world-trade routes to be smothered by foreign competition, with that competition made possible by the very ships which were the miracle of wartime production in the United States.

This Association, along with other members of the industry, and hand in hand with American labor, cannot stand idly by and see this splendid American flag merchant fleet disbanded, resulting in unemployment of thousands of trained personnel needed to man the ships, operate them, repair them and build them. These American citizens will need an economic recovery plan of their own if unemployment is forced upon them.

Very truly yours,
SHIPOWNERS ASSOCIATION OF THE
PACIFIC COAST,
R. W. MYERS, *President.*

Hon. HOMER R. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you in reference to the European recovery plan, namely, the Marshall plan. In sections VII and VIII of this plan it is contemplated to transfer 500 American vessels to the 16 favored nations which are to receive relief under the above plan.

I appeal to you to protest this part of the plan, namely, sections VII and VIII, on account of it seriously sabotaging the United States merchant marine and actually placing at least 30,000 seagoing personnel out of positions that they might be able to fill if the ships were kept under the American flag, in addition to the many shoreside positions connected with ships that are under the American flag, namely the operation, storing, and repairs, etc. These shoreside positions amount to many millions of dollars, and the yearly pay roll for the seagoing personnel amounts to approximately $150,000,000, which means business and employment for many men.

I am vitally interested that we keep a No. 1 merchant marine and not let it disappear like it did after World War I, at the cost of lives of some of our best young men at the start of World War II, which would have been prevented if we had had an efficient merchant marine and Navy. The United States merchant marine should be kept up second to none and not have the same thing happen as happened before, when World War II started and found us with an obsolete merchant marine. This should have been a lesson, but evidently the same thing is proposed in the Marshall plan that would put the American merchant marine back in exactly the same category as what happened after World War I. Let us keep our merchant marine and the men who are operating it intact.

Furthermore, there are several Maritime Commission schools located in the United States, one of which is at Alameda, Calif., and one at Kings Point on the East coast, that are training United States seamen (see copy enclosed). What for? When they have finished training, where do they go? Back on the beach, or to look for a position and none to be found? If the United States Congress gives all the ships away, there will be no positions for them after they have finished training.

The other parts of the European recovery plan, with the exception of sections VII and VIII, I am in agreement with, but I do not believe that we should put approximately 50,000 United States citizens out of work and in the same category as the people over in Europe are now, in order to have this plan

go through as it now stands, for starving people are the same in one country as they are in another.

I respectfully request that you vote this part of the European recovery plan (Marshall plan) out for the good of the merchant marine and the American citizens that operate the ships.

Respectfully,

M. D. MACRAE.

SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION OF NORTH AMERICA.

Subject: Marshall plan and American shipping.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: According to preliminary reports released in various national magazines and newspapers, it is contemplated that practically all the proposed relief cargoes going to Europe under the Marshall plan will be carried in foreign bottoms. As a matter of fact, it is stated that American ships will only carry about 5 percent of all the relief cargo.

We are amazed at this proposal, and our organization composed of 60,000 seamen, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, on a Nation-wide scale is on record protesting strongly against this proposed plan. We feel, as American seamen, that American ships should be entitled to carry the major portion of these cargoes to Europe and Asia due to the fact that these relief cargoes, which will be bought with United States taxpayers' money, will be a gift. It is not a loan, as we understand it, so consequently the American taxpayers will foot the bills and we can see no reason why American seamen should not be protected to the extent that these cargoes are carried in American bottoms.

As you no doubt are aware, the American merchant marine is rapidly dwindling. Hundreds of American ships are laid up in various creeks and bays in the United States, leaving thousands of American seamen and shipyard workers idle. Foreign countries have been given American ships outright or have been able to buy American tonnage on favorable terms. These same countries which have been given American ships, immediately put the same ships in competition with American ships out of American ports. They naturally are in the position to underbid the American shipowners on the freight market due to the fact that, first of all, they can run their ships much cheaper; they can repair their vessels in the cheapest yards; they carry less crews than American ships, and pay at the best, less than half of what American seamen earn.

As a result of this, these foreign nations are exploiting the merchant seamen by hiring them under coolie conditions. Besides, under the critical conditions facing this Nation, the American merchant marine should not be sold or given away because some of the countries who are receiving American tonnage might use these ships against this country in case of a war.

It is absolutely criminal the way the American merchant marine has been depleted, and the ones responsible for that in Washington, D. C., will some day be held responsible by the American public.

We are not opposed to the Marshall plan to help the needy people in Europe and Asia, but we are definitely opposed to allowing these relief cargoes to go in anything else but American bottoms and we are definitely opposed to any plan which gives away the American merchant marine.

We request that you use everything in your power as a Representative of the American people to protect the American merchant marine.

Very truly yours,

HARRY LUNDEBERG, *President.*

FEBRUARY 19, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Shipyard and metal trades craftsmen of the Pacific Coast States, represented by the following-named metal trades councils: Bay Cities, San Francisco, Calif.; Bellingham, Wash.; Bremerton, Wash.; Everett, Wash.; Cowlitz, Longview, Wash.; Mare Island Navy Yard, Vallejo, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Seattle, Wash.; Tacoma, Wash.; southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Hanford atomic, Pasco, Wash.; through the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council, are not opposed to the Marshall plan, in principle, but strenuously object to that section of the plan that will effectuate the transfer of vessels to European countries. Our craftsmen worked night and day, 7 days a week, during the critical period between 1941 and 1946 to build the largest merchant fleet in the world's history. All that production has been in vain if the vessels are transferred to foreign governments. Pacific coast shipyards are now idle. The repair, conversion, and maintenance of the 500 vessels, if placed in operation under the American flag would create employment for at least 100,000 American metal-trades craftsmen and a similar number of other trades that are necessary for supplying, loading, and sailing of said vessels. The importance of those vessels to our Navy as auxiliaries must not be overlooked. Our Nation is still in a state of emergency. Let us not be shortsighted or hasty. We respectfully urge your committee to delete that part of the plan which will authorize the transfer of our vessels and place our country in jeopardy.

THOMAS A. ROTELL,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer,
Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council.

NATIONAL MARITIME UNION OF AMERICA.

Re transfer and sale of American ships to foreign operators and countries.

Mr. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The National Maritime Union of America, C. I. O., represents 90,000 working American seamen. This 90,000 is some 70 percent of the total unlicensed personnel at present employed in the American merchant marine. But the problem posed in this letter affects all other maritime unions with equal force.

At the present time American seamen face a grave situation. In all ports throughout the United States, thousands are unemployed for long periods of time because of the decline in American shipping. Considering the fact that the average yearly work of all American seamen under peak conditions is around 8 months a year, his plight during unemployment periods, particularly now, with the soaring cost of living, can readily be seen. His earnings do not provide a margin for unemployment periods. Even with the unemployment insurance, which is limited, the American seaman, together with his family, faces critical conditions.

For these reasons, it is with great concern that we note in the press and radio and other sources of communication, that considerable agitation has been carried on for the transfer and sale of American ships to foreign countries, including even Germany and Japan, former enemies, with whom the American seaman had many bitter and costly experiences. Recent figures show the astounding fact that under the 1946 Ship Sales Act, 1,074 American ships have been sold outright to foreign operators. In addition to this large number, hundreds of American vessels have been transferred to Honduran and Panamanian flags. In most cases, these transfers were made to dummy corporations. Actually, the ships were controlled by American interests, with the profits from this cheaper operation accruing to these interests. These profits have been gained as a result of a serious weakening of the American merchant marine and the spreading of unemployment among American seamen, and the New York Herald Tribune on November 12 openly stated that this type of transfer was motivated by cheap labor costs.

We are sure that the American merchant marine and the American seamen are well known to you. During the entire course of the war, not a single ship was delayed. A bridge of ships to our armies was maintained. Thousands of American seamen lost their lives, and those that survived returned time and time again.

American seamen ask no special privileges but they believe they are entitled to equal consideration with all other citizens. They support wholeheartedly the principle of relief being given to the hungry in every country, based on the enunciated policy of helping all countries help themselves, without interference in the sovereignty of the recipient nations. But American seamen cannot understand, nor will they support, a relief program that causes unemployment for themselves, with all the misery that such unemployment entails.

European seamen are aware too of these transfers, particularly to the flags of Latin-American nations. Scandinavian seamen's unions have recently refused to allow any of their members to man these vessels, and this position, according to our advices, will spread to other European maritime groups.

The unemployment situation is serious enough to a point where American seamen are asking their unions to act to protect the jobs they fought for. Maritime unions are keenly responsive to the needs of their people, and if relief is not forthcoming from Government in the form of stopping all transfers to foreign flags and insuring that all relief supplies will be carried in American bottoms, then the National Maritime Union, in concert with other maritime unions, will be forced, through picket lines and other direct and positive action, to block such transfers and to prevent the sale and transfer of any American vessel to foreign flags.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH CURRAN, *President.*

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I find myself constrained to vote against the bill for tax reduction. Six weeks ago I cast my vote for H. R. 4790. World events during this period have caused me to reverse my position. I take this time to explain my reasons for so doing.

I have always been unalterably opposed to deficit financing. I am convinced that the basic underlying cause of our present inflation is the long period of deficit financing in this country from 1932 until 1946. Deficit financing cannot be helped in time of war. It certainly can be avoided in time of peace, especially under present conditions with a large national income.

Many who favor this bill maintain that we can reduce taxes by $5,000,000,000,

meet all our obligations at home and abroad, and make a substantial payment on our debt. I cannot agree with this point of view under present world conditions.

In the last 6 weeks, we have learned that several billion dollars will be required within the near future if we are to regain the air supremacy of the world. In my thinking, air supremacy is a "must." In these same 6 weeks, we have seen the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia. This took place in spite of the fact that we were assured by our Ambassador to Czechoslovakia that that country could never fall to Communist domination because of its deep-rooted democratic traditions. In these same 6 weeks, we have taken a position that we will help our freedom-loving friends who stand up and resist the Communist march. In the near future, this can lead to costly American aid to the present governments of Italy, France, Norway, or other freedom-loving nations.

In January we were told that our expenses for national defense for the next fiscal year would amount to $11,000,000,000 and our expenses for international aid would amount to $7,000,000,000. As of today, I feel sure that these expenses will be nearer fourteen and five-tenths and nine and five-tenths billions, an increase of practically $6,000,000,000. This more than offsets the proposed tax cut.

I favor the provision of this bill which permits husband and wife to split the family income. Since in certain States this privilege is available to the citizens, it is only proper that it should be made available in all States. I favor the provisions of this bill which give special consideration to the aged and the blind. This is only fair human treatment for a segment of our society which can no longer provide for itself. If the bill went only this far, I would vote for it.

One strong argument for tax reduction is that it will bring more risk capital into production and thereby sustain over-all tax revenues. I respectfully point out that corporate taxes and personal capital gains taxes are in no way affected by the legislation before us and I do not feel that the reduction in individual income taxes will seriously stimulate risk capital.

There are those who say that if tax-rate reduction should lead to deficit financing, the Congress could immediately restore the cuts. I cannot vote for tax reduction today with the feeling that taxes will be raised right after the election. I am fully aware that this is an election year and I would like to go before the people of my district and say, "I helped to cut your taxes." I know that they would all welcome tax relief and so would I as an individual. In spite of this, I think that the security of my country and the cause of freedom are so seriously threatened that we must all be willing to continue the burden of high taxes. I, therefore, feel constrained to vote against tax reduction. The people of my district will soon have an opportunity to approve or disapprove my action. In the meantime, I can live with my own conscience.

Shipping Aspects of the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER R. JONES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement issued by the National Federation of American Shipping on the subject of increasing the competitive foreign fleets by charter, sale, or loan of American vessels as contemplated in the economic assistance bill considered by the Congress:

Because of meager information, we have until now refrained from making any comments concerning the shipping aspects of the Marshall plan. On September 5, 1947, Paris announced that the Marine Transport Committee had completed the final draft of a report. Not until October 22, however, did a copy of this draft come officially into the hands of the federation, notwithstanding daily requests. It is regrettable that basic industries vitally affected by any agreement reached, are not brought into close consultation.

Many parts of the draft report are not clear. Explanations are still being sought from shipping experts representing these nations by State Department representatives, but any received have not been made available.

We will comment on only certain outstanding features of the draft report, reserving further comment until more information is available.

SIZE OF PRESENT FLEET DRY-CARGO SHIPS OF PARTICIPATING NATIONS

The following table from the draft report gives the comparative distribution of deadweight tonnage of dry-cargo ships by size groups in 1938 and in 1947:

[Tonnage figures in millions]

Size group	1938		1947	
	Deadweight tonnage	Percent	Deadweight tonnage	Percent
500 to 1,599 gross register tonnage	3.3	9	2.1	7
1,600 to 4,999 gross register tonnage	14.2	39	7.1	24
5,000 gross register tonnage and over	18.6	52	20.0	69
Total	36.1	100	29.2	100

From this it is apparent that while there is a deficit of 8,300,000 tons of vessels below 5,000 gross tons, there is on the other hand 1,400,000 tons more ships larger than 5,000 tons. To this surplus should be added 1,240,000 tons of the larger type dry-cargo ships delivered from our war-built fleet and under construction in shipyards of participating nations on March 31, 1947—total excess 2,640,000 tons. This is the type vessel which would be supplied if additional ships were made available to them from our war-built fleet, and would further enhance their competitive position in international trade. It is generally understood that the deficit of tonnage required by the participating countries is of shallow draft or special design particularly adapted for European coastal and nearby services. This unquestionably accounts in part for the reluctance, if not the refusal, of these nations to curtail their shipbuilding programs. The other reason is the necessity for revival of shipbuilding as an essential industry of these countries, the shipbuilding capacity of which in 1938 represented 75 percent of the total shipbuilding capacity of the world.

Table 4 of the draft report projects the fleet of the participating nations at the end of 1951 at 7,400,000 tons greater than they possessed at the end of 1938. There is an interesting inference (par. 14) that the participating nations expect to inherit a greater part of the trade formerly serviced by German and Japanese ships. It is not clear why this should be, while the United States is asked to provide ships from its war-built fleet, and heavy exports of short-supply steel, machinery, and other shipbuilding materials. The draft report projects a postwar fleet of the participating nations at the end of 1951 of more than a million tons in excess of the aggregate of their prewar fleet and the former German fleet. The German and Japanese export trades have been destroyed and there is great uncertainty as to their resumption.

We should not be misled by the following statement at paragraph 27:

"The participating countries currently own only 40 percent of the world tonnage (compared with 60 percent before the war). Forty-five percent of the world's dry-cargo tonnage is now owned by the United States."

The projected postwar fleet of the participating nations (table 4) of 53,600,000 tons is more than 70 percent of our estimate of the postwar active world fleet (72,000,000 tons). The United States fleet in 1939 (including domestic services) amounted to 9,300,000 tons with a world active fleet of 78,000,000 tons (12 percent). While the Maritime Commission projects a United States postwar fleet of approximately 11,400,000 deadweight tons of shipping in active operation, a majority of the industry feel this estimate to be optimistic and that we will not have a larger participation in world shipping than prewar, unless some plan is carried through to assist in meeting severe competition in both the domestic and foreign trades.

The report forecasts that certain United States tonnage will be made available in the amount of 3,000,000 deadweight tons. At other places in the report it is stated that this tonnage is included in the various estimates and schedules. Since the computation of the report data, there has actually been delivered or finally approved for sale to these participating nations more than 2,000,000 deadweight tons of ships from our war-built fleet.

The report (par. 9) stresses the great proportion of dry cargo vessels in the fleets of the participating nations which are more than 25 years of age as compared with their pre-war fleets and states that this old tonnage "represents a problem of obsolescence which tends to retard the pace" of the recovery of their shipping position. Twenty years of age is recognized as the period where overage begins. It necessarily varies with particular vessels and trades and services. An analysis of the fleets of these nations (table 2) will show the same percentage (30 percent) of dry cargo vessels over 20 years of age in their 1938 fleet as in their present 1947 fleet, to which new vessels are being constantly added. In forecasting their fleets in future years, the report states that the countries have "for the most part assumed a high rate of obsolescence." We assume this means the early retirement of aging ships.

PASSENGER STEAMSHIPS

The Marshall plan also contemplates construction of approximately 15,500,000 deadweight tons of merchant shipping in shipyards of participating nations during the

4-year period. No doubt a substantial part is for the purpose of overcoming the small-vessel deficit. It is interesting, however, that included in the 15,500,000 tons are a number of large passenger vessels which are building to restore North Atlantic, South African, Australian, and Indian services. Just to mention a few:

The *Caronia*, of 34,000 gross tons, to cost the equivalent of $14,000,000, launched October 30 for the Cunard Line and christened by Princess Elizabeth.

Two other Cunard postwar liners, the *Mauretania* and *Parthia*, have recently gone into service.

Undergoing trials: The new *Willem Ruys* for Rotterdam Lloyd Line of 21,500 tons—accommodations for 842 passengers.

Under construction: Two new Castle liners, the *Pretoria Castle* and the *Edinburgh Castle*, each over 28,000 tons. These will give the Union Castle the second largest passenger fleet in the world—the Cunard-White Star being first.

The United States fleet is sadly deficient in such vessels and none is building in American shipyards. United States shipowners have so far found it impossible under existing economic conditions to contract for passenger steamships badly needed for passenger services and as reserve military transports.

In 1939 the United States passenger ship fleet consisted of 127 active vessels of approximately 1,000,000 gross tons. Today there are only 39 similar steamships of about 350,000 gross tons in operation.

COST OF PERFORMING SHIPPING SERVICES BY DOLLAR TONNAGE

Table 9 gives the estimated cost to participating nations of securing shipping services by vessels to be paid in dollar currency for the years 1948 to 1951 as $1,220,000,000. It states that this includes western Germany.

It is somewhat difficult to understand why the United States should provide dollar currency to the participating nations to cover the transportation of commodities to western Germany while under control of American military occupation forces. The figures are also understood to include over $400,000,000 ocean-freight charges, which, it is estimated, will be earned by the United States liner services operating to these 16 nations. These are services of regularly established American lines operating at all times to these areas. While it may be part of a monetary funding consideration, it has no relation to American shipping services under the Marshall plan. The draft report estimate is understood to include necessary dollar exchange for the payment (in excess of $200,000,000) to foreign-flag vessels which demand dollar currency. These vessels are substantially of Canadian and Panamanian flag, and certain of the latter are owned by Greek nationals. It does not appear fair to ask the United States to provide the funds for this purpose, nor to include them in the so-called dollar freight costs which the public will naturally assume is to cover American-flag shipping services incident to the Marshall plan.

Eliminating these extraneous items, and even if we are willing to agree to their suggestion that our tramp fleet of dry-cargo vessels on the North Atlantic should be reduced to elimination by 1951, the estimate appears excessive. The estimated gross dollar freight costs of United States tramps computed in the report as of mid-1947 was based upon ocean freight rates in these trades during the first half of the current year. These rates have now declined about 25 percent from a general average of, say, $12 to a general average of, say, $9.

If the tramp estimate is accordingly reduced and if other inapplicable items are eliminated, the projected cost of dollar freights for bulk-carrier operations will be reduced to about $400,000,000. If we contemplate the transference of all of this bulk-cargo business to vessels of foreign flag (or to vessels provided by us to be operated with foreign crews of the participating nations), we must still take into account their requirement of dollar exchange to cover disbursements in American ports for fuel, food, and stores not available in these European countries, and for other port charges and minor operating-cost items. Such port disbursements will equal a minimum of 25 percent of the aggregate, and the estimate for the carriage of bulk cargoes on a net dollar basis is reduced to $300,000,000. Contrasting this with the total cost involved in the Marshall plan, it will be seen that a saving of something less than 2 percent of the Marshall-plan expenditure would require the immediate retirement of all American vessels not normally operating in this trade, and the immediate beaching of thousands of American officers and seamen. Even this would not include the expenses incident to withdrawing the vessels, surveying and inventorying, transporting foreign crews to United States ports, with perhaps unemployment and social-security benefits for American seamen. Nor does it cover the further consideration that western Germany is included—an area which should certainly be served by United States ships while under control of our military.

GENERAL

The shipping industry is deeply interested in the proper concepts of the Marshall plan, which it understands is intended to provide for assistance to these countries to regain their economic footing. It is not understood as intended to lift them industrially to positions substantially superior to their prewar conditions. We question whether we are justified at some risk to our own economy—present and future—in increasing the competitive foreign fleets substantially above their 1938 position. We realize that it may be contended that the increase in population of these countries of some 10 percent—approximately 24,000,000 persons—and a substantial loss of income from overseas investments, might justify such action. The increase in population of the United States for the same period was 11.1 percent. We believe, however, that if the United States provides aid designed to allow them to regain their former position, both the participating countries and the United States could then proceed free and fair competition—to which the report makes reference—to subsequently build their industries, their living standards and their prosperity to any height their energy and ingeniousness make possible. This would in no sense restrict the participating countries while it might permit the United States to gain a position in international trade more compatible with its position in world affairs and one which it has not in the past, nor did it in 1938 occupy, when we carried less than 30 percent of our own commerce. As a leader in the United Nations, the United States has a large responsibility in international affairs which cannot be properly discharged if we are weak upon the seas and of doubtful ability to provide logistical transport support for our military forces. This is the time when we should carefully consider our two experiences in 1917 and 1941.

How Does a War Widow Live?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James R. Miller, as published in This Week magazine of March 21, 1948:

HOW DOES A WAR WIDOW LIVE?

(By James R. Miller)

This is a report on 60,000 women—the widows of World War II who have not remarried and who have dependent children. As you read it, ask yourself how you would manage in their place. And ask yourself if it is a report you would want to pass on to the husbands who didn't come back.

Most of these women are in trouble. Losing their husbands was bad enough. Now, alone, they are confronted with the task of being homemakers, substitute fathers and often breadwinners as well. Their incomes from pensions and GI insurance are not enough to support them decently. They face a real dilemma: If they stay home, they stay broke. And if they take jobs, what will happen to their kids?

If you want to see how persistent and threatening these problems can be for a widow and her family, take a look at the Carders, of Auburndale, Long Island. Sam Carder was a major in the Air Force and was killed in France in the summer of 1944. Martha, his widow, is a striking black-haired, blue-eyed woman of 32. She has been left with four daughters, aged 7, 8, 11, and 13.

During the war Sam's letters came regularly to Martha. Then one day they stopped. Martha started to worry.

"I tried to tell myself that no news was good news," she says. She called the War Department. They knew nothing. In desperation she asked a friend, bound for England, to check up on Sam. Before he could report back, the fateful telegram came. Sam was dead.

You don't just suddenly accept the fact that you're a widow. It's more like getting used to a knife in your side. And it doesn't take much imagination to see how a shock like that equips a woman for the job of taking over the management of a fatherless family.

But somehow they had to live. And so Martha, like other war widows, had to take stock. The monthly Government pension for a widow alone is $60. With one child she gets $18 more, and there's another $15.60 for each additional child. Nine-tenths of the husbands who died in the war—including Major Carder—carried GI insurance, worth another $55 a month for 20 years. Thus a widow with two children has a total monthly income of $148.60. Martha Carder, with four children, had $179.80 a month—$2,157.60 per year. A little more than a dollar a day for herself and for each of her daughters.

She got one break. A sympathetic colonel at Fort Totten, near her home, allowed her for some months to continue buying food at the commissary But when the war was over, a new commandant, bound by peacetime regulations, put a stop to this. Martha was on her own.

At this point she couldn't even think of taking a job. Her older children were still terribly depressed by their father's death, and one of them, Joan, was down with rheumatic fever. Martha's only recourse was to dig deep—dangerously deep—into her savings. A year and a half later, in October 1946, the kids were in good enough shape so that Martha felt she could go to work. Her only experience was her years as a housewife. There was no time or money to be spent on training. She took a job selling hats in the Long Island branch of a big specialty shop. Her total monthly income is now $320. That's a lot better than $180, but it's not enough to keep this family of five going. As a result, Martha still draws on her savings every month. She can't keep that up much longer, and she doesn't know what to do about it.

LOOK AT THE BUDGET

Cut expenses? Look at her monthly budget: Rent $75, meat and groceries $130 (that's 86 cents per person per day); milk $25, light and gas $9, phone $5. These are fixed expenses. They add up to $244, which leaves $76 to pay for clothes, medical care, entertainment and incidentals, and run the 1940 car which Martha has kept because her job is 10 miles from home.

No matter where you look, it's hard to see how she could economize further. She has no help. She does her own house cleaning on Sundays. She washes and irons at night or early in the morning before going to work. Recently she spent most of 2 days making over old skirts for all four children. She is, in short, doing absolutely everything she can to help herself.

The worst of it is that in order to do so much work, in and out of the house, she is forced to neglect the children. "I suppose I'm with them about 3 hours a day," she says. "We have breakfast together at 7 and then they go to school and I go to the store. They come home and make their own lunch, and at 3:30, when school is out, they come back and do little chores like making the beds and dusting chairs.

"Then if it's nice, they go out and play until I get home around six-thirty. I get supper and then we fool around until bedtime. Once in a while we go to a movie.

"I've been working Saturdays, too, because of the overtime pay, so they're by themselves all day. The older ones are getting more responsible all the time, but you can't expect them to police the others every minute, so they get into a lot of trouble—you know, falling down, or fighting."

Martha Carder describes most of the tribulations with resigned good humor. Sometimes, though, there's no use trying to. "I get these phone calls at the store—Mary or Joan sobbing and telling me something awful has happened and won't I please come home. It's never anything really awful, but they think it is and one of these days it could be.

"Once in a while I get angry. The other night the kids wanted to know if we couldn't have a steak. Lord knows it had been months since I'd bought one. So I said, 'We can't, but we're going to,' and I went out to buy one. Four dollars! But I couldn't go back without it. And butter a dollar a pound and eggs a dollar a dozen.

"It makes me mad, too, to hear some of the things that are said about me. I've been criticized for not dressing well enough and for dressing too well. What am I supposed to do? I don't buy many clothes, but I have to look decent at the store and I'd want to anyway.

PARKING TICKETS

"And now I'm beginning to get tickets for leaving my car out at night. There isn't a garage anywhere near here that will take it for anything I can pay. I left a note on the windshield the other night, saying, 'Dear Policeman: I can't put this in my living room.' "

Subsiding, shaking her head a little, she says, "Then there's sickness. Sometimes when the older kids have had colds, I've left them alone. The truant officer got after me for that. We had quite a talk. But last month Annie had to have her tonsils out. Between the doctor and the hospital it cost almost a hundred dollars and I had to stay home for 2 weeks. If things like that happen often enough, I'll be out of money and out of a job.

"Of course, the most frightening thing of all—I don't even dare think of this—is that something might happen to me. As long as I'm around and keep my health, I suppose we'll manage somehow. But if I weren't here, I don't know what would happen to the girls. I don't know of a soul who could take them. I just try not to believe it ever could happen. But I can't forget it entirely.

"It's a little like it was during the war, you know. I never believed then—I never let myself believe—that Sam wouldn't come back."

ONE WAY OUT

Some war widows have found a way out of their dilemma by remarrying, and often happily. But it's not a solution anyone else has a right to recommend. Obviously, the idea has occurred to Martha Carder. She has no illusions, however, about her chances. She is unusually attractive, and so are her children, but there are few men who want to take on a family of five.

Neither Martha's family nor Sam's is in any position to help her. Some of her acquaintances have urged her to ask the Red Cross or the State welfare agencies for aid. But like most self-respecting persons, she'll run through every cent of her savings before she asks for charity or relief.

"I'm doing the best I can," she says, "but when it's a choice between saving and spending for something the kids really need—like Annie's operation—then I spend. I can't help it."

By this time, you may be wondering what goes on here, whether anyone cares about these widows and whether anything is going to be done about them.

It has now become quite clear that something is wrong when an able-bodied veteran, married or single, who may never have seen service outside the States, is entitled to more help than the wife and children of a man who was killed.

In addition, the widows themselves are becoming more vocal. Last July two of them, Frances Nelson and Mary De Van, appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to state their case. They pointed out that the war widow has no priority on housing, is not entitled to a GI loan, is not eligible for education benefits or job training, is no longer permitted to use service dispensaries or commissaries. They reminded Congressmen that the Servicemen's Leave Act does not permit her to get her husband's accrued leave pay, that the only recent law benefiting the war widow is one entitling her to a refund on income-tax payments her husband made between December 7, 1941, and January of this year.

Evidence of this kind has inspired dozens of Congressmen to propose scores of bills to help the widows and children. Most of the bills fall into four categories: loan privileges, medical care, educational and training benefits, or higher pensions.

TOO FEW, TOO LATE

The loan proposals would authorize Government-guaranteed loans to widows who want to buy homes or start new businesses. That's fine for widows with such ambitious plans. But how would it help a Martha Carder? She'd be foolish to incur the debt for a new home, and she has no experience that would warrant her starting a business.

How about letting the widows and children in on VA medical care? It sounds good, but the Veterans' Administration doesn't even have enough hospitals, doctors and nurses to take care of the regular GI load.

Some of the education bills would provide college tuition and subsistence for all children of the men who died in the war. But most of the kids are young. They wouldn't reap the benefits of such bills for another 8, 10, or 12 years. A college education that far away butters no parsnips today.

The bills providing education or job training for widows would be a real help to those who expect to work for years. But again, that's only one group, and no immediate help even to one.

Plainly, the fault of all these bills is that they help too few or they help too late. The only kind of bill that faces the problem squarely is the kind that provides for increased pensions. Cash. Now.

THIS WOULD HELP

One of the most-discussed of these bills is H. R. 3748, introduced last year by Representative FRANK MATHEWS of New Jersey. It provides that a widow alone shall receive $75 a month (instead of $60), then $40 more for the first child and $20 for each additional child. For the average family involved—a widow and two children—the monthly pension total would be $135 instead of the current $93.60. Not a lot, but enough to make a difference.

Bills of this kind are given a stiff workout in the hearings of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The main objection, of course, is their ultimate cost. If we assume again that the average war widow in our total of 60,000 has two children, we will find that the total pension paid annually today comes to $67,000,000.

Now if H. R. 3748 becomes a law, that annual total would be increased by about $30,000,000. To be sure, the cost would decrease each year as the children grew up, but it is still a whale of a lot of money to ask an economy-minded Congress for. There are plenty of men on the hill who would say, "We simply can't afford it. The war cost us three hundred and fifty billion and the VA is already spending eight billion a year."

THEY GAVE THE MOST

How about arguments in favor of the bill? During those hearings in July, Mrs. Frances Nelson showed that the money spent in one year for subsistence allowances for veterans in school and in training (almost $2,000,000,000) would pay the entire cost of H. R. 3748 for 40 years. She added, "This is just as surely a war debt as the payments for guns and tanks and ships. Large corporations presented their bills and were promptly paid. Veterans who fought and returned are being shown gratitude. This is all as it should be. But—it includes in the smallest degree those men who gave the most."

In other words, if we acknowledge our greatest war debt is to those who lost their lives, then—if we are paying any debts at all—we are obliged to pay theirs, on time and in full. There can be no doubt that the least they would have expected for their sacrifice is that we who survived take good care of their wives and children.

What are the possibilities for legislation of the kind we have talked about?

Lately the big veterans' organizations have shown growing concern for these families. The main provisions of H. R. 3748 have been officially endorsed in hearings by representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans and the AMVETS.

WHAT ARE THE CHANCES?

Even so, the prospects for the bill are not bright. H. R. 3748, like many other such bills, has been reported out of committee. Committee members think that if it came to a vote it would pass overwhelmingly. But it's one thing to report a bill out and another to get it onto the voting calendar. Bills get onto the floor at the pleasure of party leaders. One of these men, when asked recently what he thought of the chances for a bill like H. R. 3748, said that of course he could make no commitments for the January session.

"I can assure you, though," he added, "that we are not unmindful of the needs of war widows and we want to do all we can for them."

That could be. Martha Carder and a great many other widows will be waiting to see. And every so often while waiting, Mrs. Carder will look at the small silver plaque that hangs over her mantelpiece. It was sent to her by the men in her husband's squadron, and it says, "In memory of Maj. Samuel Carder, who gave his life that his children and ours might live in freedom."

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, a vigorous attack on the proposed program of universal military training, as a serious threat to the Nation's morals and to the future of America's youth, was delivered by His Excellency Archbishop Cushing last Friday in an address before the First Friday Club in Detroit. His Excellency's dynamic message follows in full:

I am delighted to be with you at this magnificent meeting. The fame of your organization, of its interest in youth and its generosity to youth projects has been reported to me from numerous sources and I have looked forward to being with you.

It would be pleasant to indulge in the pleasantries which are customary on occasions like this, to give an informal after-dinner speech. I have always envied those who can regale a large audience with witty stories and inspire them with offhand, brilliant remarks. But you are busy men and your time is limited—and I have come a considerable distance to bring you a message. Your committee graciously suggested that I might have something of importance to say to you and I do not intend to abuse your hospitality by wasting your time.

You are interested in youth, first of all in Catholic youth but no less really in young people of every group. So am I. Your interest in the welfare of youth is part the reason why you are banded together in this organization which is at once devotional, social, and philanthropic. My interest in youth has its channel for action through the office I hold as Episcopal chairman of the National Catholic Welfare Conference Youth Section. Many of you are fathers of families; others are the older brothers, the uncles, the grandparents or otherwise the patrons of boys and girls. As an archbishop, I am charged with the responsibility for educational, charitable, recreational, and spiritual programing for the young people in a diocese of well over 1,000,000 souls; as a priest I know that the children of the flock are always closest to God's will for each place and generation. As Americans, you and I, all of us, are keenly aware that the ultimate well-being, the true prosperity and strength of our people are bound up with the well-being of our young people and the provision we make for them and for their future.

YOUTH, THE HOPE OF AMERICA

I state these things by way of background to what I wish to say to you today. We are agreed that our young people are the most important people in the world. With due regard for the rights and privileges of the aged, the mature, and the others of older generations, it remains true that first place should be given in the plans of the state and in the prayers of the church to those who are just starting out—to the young people of the flock. The reason, I repeat, is that our young people are the most important assets we have in the world. The state thinks so when it is looking for citizens to defend it. Industry thinks so when it is looking for fresh blood to revitalize it. The church thinks so all the time. So do I. So do you.

Here in America youth traditionally have had a privileged place. The youth of America are the envy of the world. Whatever their racial or religious background, our young people are in a more favorable position than their cousins in any part of the Old World. They are in this favorable position not because of any extraordinary, special merits of their own, but because of something that America has traditionally done for them. America has been a blessed land for the young; with all our mistakes, with all our irregularities, with all our unsolved social problems—I still think it safe to say that no nation on earth has ever given its young people so prominent a place in its social scheme of things and such abundant opportunities to enjoy that place.

And America has been richly rewarded for this wise and generous attitude toward the young. Other nations view their coming generations with fear and misgiving because of the disillusionments and the difficulties which woefully mistaken national policies have created for the young. They fear the forms which resentment may take among young people who are without patriotic faith, material hopes, or social charity because of the utter defeat of political and military schemes which were concocted by an older generation without reference to the interests of the young people who would come after them in their respective nations.

But here in America our young people are the joyful hope of our future. The hope of America is only temporarily in diplomats and in generals. Its permanent plans for security are in the young, especially in those of our youth who have inherited out of the past all the best that the many nations of mankind have to offer for the building of a better future. The strength of America is derived from the national genius for uniting into a single powerful community all the best traditions of the varied races and groups which are elsewhere divided and pitted one against the other.

AIM FOR UNITED COMMUNITY

Like the Catholic Church, so America delights in differences once essential unities are established. The beauty of America, like that of the church, is the beauty of powerful unity in the midst of proud varieties.

The eventual historians of America's greatness will find it impossible to decide which peoples made the greatest contribution to the building of America and the formation of her spirit. It would be impossible to discuss the foundations of American greatness without reference to the early and continuing influence on our national spirit of Spanish chivalry, of French vision, of English practical genius, of German integrity, and of Dutch sobriety. Other nations came here later than the sons and daughters of Spain, France, England, Germany, Holland, and the others, yet again it would be impossible to understand the epic of America without reference to the contribution to American greatness that they also have made. Surely the American character would be very different from what it now is were it not for the piety and industry of the Polish people, the Lithuanians, the Russians, and the other peoples of the Christian east. America needed and has been grateful for the spiritual and physical energies released into the life stream of our history by the Irish, the Scotch, the Jews, the Mediterranean peoples of Greece, Italy, Portugal, and the Nordic peoples of Scandinavia and Denmark. Our land has been made better because of the contributions of Latin Americans, African Negroes, and orientals. In the very diversity of our racial strains and in the harmony of their blend, lies the secret of America's greatness.

We must teach that to our young people. We cannot aspire in our lifetime to teach the whole world how to live as one. We cannot even hope to unite all at once the entire United States. But in a city like Detroit or in a city like Boston, where many nationalities, races, and traditions live, work, and play side by side, we have a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate to all the world the power of Catholic faith and American idealism to forego a single, healthy, united community out of groups which would otherwise be in constant conflict and suffer disastrous divisions.

PHILOSOPHIES UNDERMINING YOUTH

Unless religion and Americanism do the work of teaching our young people how to keep their differences without being destroyed by them, how to get along with one another in a humane, healthy fashion, other philosophies than those of Christianity and democracy are going to make a strong bid for the work of forming our future youth. One such philosophy is communism, the designs of which on the education and the guidance of the young are no longer any secret. Another, oddly enough, is currently offered as a defense against communism. It is to this latter proposal that I direct your attention this noon. I refer to the plans, widely defended and diligently propagandized, for the universal, permanent, and compulsory military training of our young people. I raise this question with great caution. I know how many good and thoughtful citizens are in favor, in one degree or another, of proposals of this kind. I know, too, that others, less good Americans and less thoughtful, may be opposed for a variety of reasons, some of them perhaps unworthy, to all such proposals. But, in any case, I could not speak as a friend of young people to a group devoted to the interest of the young without asking you to be vigilantly on guard against certain aspects of permanent compulsory peacetime military service.

Legislative proposals seeking to provide such a military program for all our young have long since been drawn up. The pressure for their enactment is enormous and is constantly increasing. Powerful newspaper chains and military groups are presently engaged in an all-out effort to intimidate, stampede, bewilder, or bludgeon, if they cannot coax the American people into support of these proposals. It may be that some of you already sympathize with the arguments being advanced—but, again as one devoted to the interest of youth and speaking to an audience of like devotion, I earnestly recommend that you weigh this question far, far more carefully than you may hitherto have done.

This very week—in fact, yesterday's mail—brought a profoundly disturbing report on the progressive militarization of America. Everyone knows that militarism, whether in Prussia, in Russia, or here, leads both to war and to loss of freedom. Everyone knows, too, that militarism has been in every epoch a principal cause of the break-down of civilizations. Impelled by fears inspired by these two facts, a group of citizens, including statesmen, scientists, educators, clergy, and others, among them the president of the University of Detroit, have published this factual report on the growth of militarism in these United States. It describes and documents the increasing influence of military men in American foreign affairs, the entrance of the military into the realms of American diplomacy, the staggering extent of military encroachments on national economy, the increasing and unhealthy influence of strictly military considerations in the field of science, the expanding interference of military control and military objectives in the whole field of education, the ambitions of the military to move into industry and labor, and the astounding growth of military pressure and power in the area of public relations. This is a report which will amaze many people who have fallen behind in their acquaintance with current affairs on the extremely impor-

tant levels where American institutions and policies are made and unmade.

MILITARY PLAN TO DOMINATE LIVES

Our present interest is arrested by what this report has to say concerning expanding American militarism in relationship to youth. From this report, as from many other sources, it becomes clear that the military plan even greater control over the lives and destinies of the American people—and the principal channel of that control they hope to establish through the universal military training of the young. They make no effort to conceal their entry into the field of youth training as frank competitors with the traditional American agencies for the formation of the young: the church, the school, and the home. The report on the growth of militarism quotes authoritative Army circles as asserting that the Army is the only organization equipped to develop personality, character, and manhood in our boys—and as boasting that under universal military training the Army will be the better able to do this because it will have control of the boy 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Catholic men, interested in the betterment of our American boys, I raise two questions: Is that assertion true? And do we welcome, as the sole pattern of personality, character and manhood, the type of training that militarism provides? Have the church, the school, and the family let American down in this matter of the Christian and democratic development of our young people? Is the Army the only school of citizenship, of national security, or decent manhood? To all these questions I answer: positively not.

There have been occasions in the past when conscription was needed here in the United States. On those occasions the National Government stated the existence and the nature of the emergency and American fathers and mothers gladly loaned their sons—and recently even their daughters—in order to meet the emergency. But save for those who died, perhaps martyrs since they served freely, parents and communities did no more than loan their sons to the military and to the Government. Should any new emergency arise—if any emergency now exists, the American people need only be told what it is and why their sons are needed and they will respond as they have always responded: generously, loyally, without criticism.

But these proposals for peacetime military training are something very new in America and very different. They quite frankly avow that their objectives are not merely national defense—but the development in accordance with a preconceived pattern of the physical, spiritual, religious, and moral fiber of our young men. Does anybody seriously think that the Army is the best place for the physical, religious, and moral training of Catholic or other American youth? That is a strange doctrine for America. It is a new idea for America—but it is not a new idea in the world.

UNSUCCESSFUL EXPERIMENTS IN EUROPE

This idea was tried in Italy. Mussolini said that universal military training would give the youth of Italy the stamp of nobility. I ask you if our young people should envy the fate of Italian youth. Hitler said that compulsory military service for every one would give each man a ground for pride in his citizenship. I ask you what grounds for pride are left to the cheated youth of Germany. The war lords of Europe have been telling their people for generations that universal military training was needed for their protection and for the development of a strong citizenry. The fact that every country in Europe, except tiny Luxemburg, has had years of peacetime conscription did not prevent Hitler from attacking conscript Poland, conscript France, the conscript armies of the Low Countries or the conscript army of Soviet Russia. The fact is that Europe, far from being made strong by universal military training, was bled white by this paralyzing system—bled so white that the Cardinal Gasparri once described compulsory peacetime military training as the curse of Europe and the source of uncounted evils on that unhappy continent.

I ask you gentlemen as citizens to weigh carefully what the effects of permanently entrenched militarism may be on American democratic institutions. If it be true that such proposals are in the interest of democracy, why did the Allied Control Council begin their work of rebuilding democracy in Germany by outlawing universal military training in that country which has suffered so much from militarism? Why did General MacArthur order the abolition of peacetime military training among the Japanese as a first step in the creation of democracy in Japan?

I ask you as taxpayers to discover what this radical and far-reaching venture would cost us in terms of dollars and cents. There are those who assert, and they appear prepared to back up their assertions, that the cost of this program will be between three and five billion dollars per year; the President's Commission admitted that a minimum program according to their hearts' desire would cost almost two billion. In this mad world of frenzied finance $3,000,000,000 per year for the military education of boys in their teens may not seem overwhelming, but let me suggest some of the social improvements that could be obtained for half of our youth and which, to my way of thinking, would be more in the interest of American young people than military conscription. There are over 80 counties here in the State of Michigan; the total counties in all the 48 States is, of course, enormous. But with the annual cost of compulsory peacetime military service it would be possible:

SUGGESTS CONSTRUCTIVE PROJECTS

1. To construct a 10-room modern school building in every county in the United States each year;

2. To construct a $50,000 library in every county in the United States each year;

3. To construct annually a $150,000 hospital in each county;

4. To employ 10 full-time school and public-health nurses and 10 full-time school and public-health doctors in every county in the country;

5. To purchase 10 new modern school busses in each county in the United States each year;

6. To maintain one psychiatric and behavior clinic in every county in the United States;

7. To provide 10 full-time recreation and juvenile guidance workers in every county in the United States;

8. To bring all schools of the country up to a reasonable standard of efficiency, and by that I mean with an expenditure of $300 to raise the level of our poorer schools;

9. To provide free education for the 3,000,000 children under 18 who are now not attending school, keeping every child in the country in school until 18 years of age.

10. To meet the pay roll of one junior college with 10 instructors in every county in the United States;

11. To provide all the expenses of a 3-year post-graduate course for 10,000 selected students and scientists each year;

12. To pay the full maintenance and tuition at college or technical school for 1 year of the 900,000 boys who would be conscripted under the principal proposed bill;

13. To erect a three-quarter-million dollar trade and technical school in each congressional district each year.

We would still have an unexpended balance of $15,300,000 annually!

Small wonder that the distinguished Dean of the American hierarchy, the venerable Archbishop of Philadelphia, Cardinal Dougherty, when asked what he thought of these military schemes recently answered: "Compulsory military training in peacetime in the United States of America, if such a change in our American system is brought about, will be a windfall for military officials and a catastrophe to taxpayers. It will be the ruin of our young men!"

MORAL, INTELLECTUAL DANGERS

I ask you gentlemen as the fathers and friends of young boys to meditate that last sentence in the Cardinal's declaration. In what ways will our boys be affected physically and morally and intellectually by the permanent adoption of militarism as the pattern of their preparation for life? Whether or not you eventually favor such a system in whole or in part, you will wish to think this particular point over most carefully. I take it that fathers generally want their sons to grow up strong, clean, tolerant, reasonably independent, unregimented as Americans tend to be, as Christians should be. If the experience of the rest of the world proves anything—and only a fool despises the experience of others as a source of wisdom—under peacetime military conscription you'll raise your boy to be a soldier—or else! Your son—at the impressionable age of 18—will be a soldier or a convict. In any nation where this system under any form has been established, the only alternative to universal military training has been jail. Fresh from high school and without regard to personal or vocational or parental plans, in time of peace as in time of war the boy goes to camp; to the atmosphere and language and standards and morals of the barracks. He is trained to kill, to be proficient in the arts of war, to be a cog in the machinery of modern militarism—to obey without reasoning why. So much for his intellect.

I shall not dwell on the moral point—but I ask you to think it over. Do not think of it in terms of wartime morals—bad as those are—but think of it in terms of morals in peacetime barracks where the controls which might come from the danger of imminent death are no longer present. It is a dangerous thing to speak in public of the evidence all over the world of what militarism does to the morals of boys. I only raise that question. I ask you to think it over. Even the proponents of universal military training do not pretend that their camps will be a school of morals. In spite of the strenuous efforts of some of its members to represent universal military training as a glorified boys' boarding school, the President's Conscription Commission frankly stated: "We must admit at once that a serious moral problem is presented by the removal of a boy of 18 from the normal influences of home, church, school and local community and his comparative isolation in a camp with large numbers of other men under an entirely new and different environment." How serious that problem is—the moral problem—some European nations could tell us. France could—bitterly. Germany could—in appalling detail. Good men make great armies when armies are needed in time of proved crisis; peacetime conscription does not make good men. "It would never occur to me after my own 2 years in the Army," said a great American last month, "to attempt to improve the character of my son by putting him in the care of a Marine sergeant."

MAKE AMERICANISM THE GOAL

More and more as you weigh the evidence on this serious question, gentlemen, I am convinced that you will decide that religious,

educational and civic leaders have been right in their reluctance to back unrestricted universal military training—in their warning that the draft is legitimate in time of national emergency and under clear guarantee of maximum protection of our youth—but that permanent systems of conscription in peacetime carry within them the seeds of a nation's decay. Mothers and fathers have never believed that a year of life in the barracks is just the thing for the growing boy. We hope they won't begin to believe it now.

Even in the face of emergency it may well be time to rethink the whole question of military preparedness. Victory, we are told, in modern war is no longer won by big battalions, but by big factories. Big armies no longer prevent war, they provoke wars and, having provoked them, are powerless to win them. The mass army, with manpower as its yardstick of strength, has given way to technological revolutions in weapons as the means of waging war, if, which God forbid! war must still be waged.

Men, my fundamental point all comes back to this: We in America have grown great, relatively prosperous and comparatively free from the major worries of the Old World, because we have treated our youth as our greatest asset and trained them within a tradition that united all the best of the Old World and eliminated all the worst especially the worst ideas of Europe. But lately some of these evil ideas have been gaining ground within this land. One of them is communism, the other is militarism. Sometimes we are told that we must make a choice between the two. It simply isn't true. There is still a third possibility, and that possibility is Americanism, the kind of political philosophy, at once Christian and democratic, of which we used to speak so proudly and which kept us from entertaining ideas like communism and militarism. I have been quoting quite often of late from the magnificent American and peerless prelate who was Cardinal Gibbons, America's famed cardinal and a man who spoke the language you and I understand. He had wise words to say on this whole question of American freedom from conscription as opposed to European militarism. This is what he once said:

"The oftener I go to Europe the longer I remain there, and the more I study the political condition of its people I return home filled with greater consideration for our country and more profoundly gratified that I am an American citizen. When I contemplate the standing armies of over a million soldiers in each of the principal countries of Europe; and when I consider what an enormous drain these armies are on the resources of a country and what a frightful source of immorality; when I consider that they are a constant menace to their neighbors and an incentive to war, and when I consider that the subject of war engages so much of the attention of the cabinets of Europe; and when, on the other hand, I look at our own country with its 55,000,000 inhabitants and its little Army of 25,000 men scattered along our frontiers, so that we might travel from Maine to California without meeting a soldier or gendarme; when I consider that if need be, every citizen is a soldier without being confined to barracks, and is ready to defend or die for his country; when I consider that we have no entangling alliances; when I reflect upon our material prosperity; above all, when I consider the happy blending with us of authority and civil and religious liberty; with all our political corruption, I bless God for the favors He has vouchsafed us, and I pray that He may continue to hold over us the mantle of His protection." To that prayer I say: Amen! God bless this native land of ours! God keep us free! God make us worthy of our freedom! God give us men—men of faith and freedom—men like our forefathers were who made America the home of the brave—but the land of the free!

Land Utilization Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, during the depth of the depression, the United States Government organized the land utilization projects of the Department of Agriculture. These are now a part of the Soil Conservation Service. This agency set out to purchase submarginal lands from the farmers located upon them, and the Resettlement Service relocated these farmers on other and more fertile land. The land purchased was usually the poorest and it was located often in a very poor agricultural section of the country. The land was purchased almost for a song—some of it in north Louisiana costing from $2 to $4 per acre.

With WPA labor, the Government set out to put these lands into other uses which the condition of the soil would support. I know of thousands of acres which were turned from farming to forest uses. Little seedlings were planted, and during the years have been nursed along until they have become saplings and sizable trees. The trees are now ready, after years of patience, for cutting, and the Soil Conservation Service is now permitting the farmers to go upon the land and cut certain trees selectively, thereby providing by this means of yearly cutting trees large enough for industrial purposes.

Some of this poor, submarginal land was placed in pasture. It was fertilized by WPA labor, and now the Soil Conservation Service permits farmers for a fee to use if for cattle grazing. Little lakes were built and recreation facilities were established. They are all run on a paying basis, and they have taught farmers how to use their lands and how not to use them. I think they have rendered a real service to sections of country which are rural and as a rule are very poor.

Mr. Speaker, two such projects were provided for my own congressional district, and these projects, built almost without cost to the United States—they were paid for with WPA funds—are now yielding modest returns to the Government. Each year the amount of returns increase, and each year Uncle Sam reaches out his long hand and puts the money in his pocket. He makes no provision for the return to these projects of the money he takes from them. He does not seek to spend in these communities a proportionate amount of money in development or otherwise.

The Bible says, "For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath."

And this is certainly the situation as to the people of these localities wherein these land-utilization projects were placed. The land was poor; the community was poor; the people needed help. Our Government has provided the example by buying the land at ridiculously low prices during the depth of the depression upon the plea that these projects would be helpful. They are now being operated on a profitable basis, and as the scriptures say, "from him shall be taken away even that he hath."

This Congress should provide at least that the money earned as profit on such projects should be returned to rebuild them. The two projects I have in mind are being allowed to run down. They are not being kept in good condition. They are being "bled" so to speak, and the little sustenance which is in those localities is being taken away and put in the general coffers of the great United States Treasury. This is not right. It should be corrected.

Information from Soil Conservation Service as to receipts from Louisiana project No. 1 (Caney Lake) and project No. 2 (Corney Lake) and their disposition:

Caney Lake (located largely in Webster Parish with small portion in Claiborne Parish)

Total net receipts	$10,253.23
Breakdown:	
Forest and forest projects (lumber, etc.)	8,269.00
Recreational facilities	1,251.00
Grazing permits	388.00
Hay permits	100.00
Rentals from buildings occupancy	243.00

Of the net receipts of $10,253.23, Webster Parish received $2,468.72; Claiborne Parish received $94.54.

Balance to United States Treasury, $7,689.99.

Corney Lake (located entirely in Claiborne Parish, La.)

Total net receipts	$22,513
Breakdown:	
Forest and forest products	21,295
Recreational facilities	1,161
Grazing permits	16
Hay permits	40

Of the net receipts of $22,513, Claiborne Parish received $5,628.30.

Balance to United States Treasury, $16,884.70.

Mikolajczyk Describes Red Plans To Take Europe in 2 Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the last of a series of installments and the first of three special articles by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland, as they appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel.

On March 17 Mr. Mikolajczyk spoke at the Southside Armory in Milwaukee, Wis., and said, among other things, that the Russian Communist menace is a greater threat to western civilization than most of us can appreciate. Mikolajczyk saw the operations of the Russian police state first-hand. He is an

important witness to the danger of Russian world-wide aggression.

Following are the articles:

REDS PLAN TO TAKE EUROPE IN 2 WEEKS

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish peasant party)

Russia declared war on the democracies of the world last April. The formal military phases of that war have not as yet appeared. They will not have to be used, if the secret Russian forces, which are in every democratic country can win Russia's economic and political battles.

If the Red army's civilian fighting forces which have swirled through the streets of France, Italy, Greece, and other countries fail to achieve their primary objectives—strife, chaos and the "incident" that would enable the Red army to flood over Europe—they will try again. Recently those forces lost a battle, they did not lose a war. The immense machinery remains in motion.

As is its traditional plight, Poland felt the first repercussions of the new war.

In April 1947, the Communist head of the Polish Security Police, the NKVD leader Stanislaw Radkiewicz, called a hurried meeting of Communist leaders in Lodz and made formal announcement of the forthcoming conflict.

PRIMED FOR WAR

Until the day Radkiewicz spoke at Lodz it had been a criminal offense for a Pole to mention the possibility of a world war III. Thereafter, the 100,000,000 persons living behind the iron curtain—as well as Russia's 180,000,000—began to be primed mentally for the war and to be encouraged to speak of it.

"There will be a war with the West," Radkiewicz told the assembled Polish Red leaders. "This war will be won by the U. S. S. R.; of that there must be no doubt. The important thing at the start is to indoctrinate the people."

The Communist press of Poland immediately opened a campaign against American imperialism. On May 1 Wladislaw Gomulka, Vice Premier, announced the time is ripe for the merging of the Socialist and Communist Parties.

The days of the Polish Peasant Party had, of course, been long since numbered. Now 80 percent of our offices and headquarters through the country were taken from us by housing commissions. We occupied six floors of a Warsaw building. The Communists took the first three floors and ordered us to wind up our affairs and clear out in 2 weeks.

WAR SIGNS APPEAR

There were many signs in Poland that the decision to make war on the free world was gaining pace. Travelers from Russia kept us informed about the tempo within that country, and daily we watched the moulding of Poland into a Soviet state which would be forced to aid in that conflict.

Perhaps the most vivid of the evidence was supplied by a Russian colonel whom I cannot name by name. I can only assure the reader he does exist, that he did hold for me a certain affection, and that he never believed I would manage to get out of Poland to make this report.

"I've just returned from the U. S. S. R.," he told me just before I escaped. "The preparation for the war is everywhere. The people are now as ready for it as they were ready for Hitler's attack.

"Molotov is the new head of the war party. His picture now is displayed on the same level with that of Stalin. Pictures of the victorious Czarist Generals Suvorov and Kutuzov are displayed everywhere through the country.

"I don't know whether our scientists have as yet been able to produce atom bombs, but we have made great strides with rocket developments. We are training special units for service in each country of Europe. The units of instructors for France, Italy, and Germany are ready, and so is the one for Spain. We are preparing others, of course, for the South American countries—where we have made considerable gains of late.

"Personally I am not as confident about the economic collapse of the United States as the leaders are, but I agree that Great Britain is already in that collapse. Our men prepare the way for us in France and Italy, and they hope to bring about changes in the government there so the Red army will not be forced to march in. But even if they fail, there are plans for the army to move into those lands.

"The American, British and French occupation forces in Germany will offer a token resistance but they will naturally be liquidated. We have military plans to take Europe in less than a fortnight.

"Great Britain will remain neutral. It cannot endure another rocket war. The United States will declare war, but what does that matter? It is not prepared. It can have no offshore bases from which to attack the continent. We do not rule out the possibility of a negotiated peace with America."

We made plans for a conference of our MP's on October 20 to map out a plan of action which we would follow when parliament reconvened later that month.

But on October 18, I was informed secretly, from a source I knew and could trust, that the Communists would introduce a bill at the opening of parliament which would deprive the three leaders of the Polish Peasant Party—Stefan Korbonski, Wincenty Bryja, and myself—of our immunity to arrest. We were to be arrested, tried, and shot. The verdict was already sealed. The death sentence had already been handed down by the military tribunal.

Our deaths could only have produced demonstrations against the government, which would have enabled the security police to do what they had longed to do—conduct a mass murder of independent-minded Poles and thus tighten the bonds of their control of the country.

So from the moment I learned I would be arrested—a report which I took care to confirm by two other secret sources—I began making my plans to escape.

I did escape * * * to tell this story and to sound this alarm to the free peoples of the world who today—whether they realize it or not—are in grave peril from a determined enemy of mankind who is out to rule the world and crush from the human race its God-given rights.

MIKOLAJCZYK REVEALS HOW HE OUTWITTED HIS RED BODYGUARD

(Special article No. 1)

I can now tell the methods by which I escaped from Poland late last year, and will delete only those names and events which might enable the Communists to wreak revenge on persons who helped me and the places that offered me haven.

Eight of us made the break for liberty, by five separate routes. Six of us came through. The two who were caught were Wincenty Bryja, the economist who had served as treasurer of the Polish Peasant Party, and Maria Hulewicz, a brave girl who had been my secretary after a career as a professor at the University of Krakow and dangerous courier work as a member of the Polish underground during the German occupation.

BLAME THE CZECHS

These two were caught in Czechoslovakia and returned to Poland by the NKVD. Czechoslovakia, once a haven for political refugees and ostensibly now ruled by men who enjoyed refuge from the Nazis, gets the blame for refusing to give sanctuary to these brave Polish patriots.

Those who reached freedom, besides myself, are Stefan Korbonski and his wife; Kazimierz Baginski and his wife; and my secretary, Pawel Zaleski. But it is my intention to tell only of my escape, and to preface my report with this one note: It is a hard thing to be forced to flee when one's only "crime" is the espousal of the liberty and independence which had been promised to Poland by its Allies.

I left Warsaw the evening of October 20, 1947, shortly after my last meeting with the Polish Peasant Party members of the Parliament. Two days earlier I had confirmed that the Reds would strip me of my parliamentary immunity against arrest when Parliament reconvened in a few days. My death sentence had already been delivered to the military tribunal, which was ready to put me through the mockery of a trial.

My first job was to get away from the 10 security policemen who constantly followed me. They and others eavesdropped on my last meeting with the MP's and so I took advantage of their tactics. I made certain that one group of them heard me tell an MP that my mother was ill in Poznan and that I planned to go there to see her in the next day or two. I told another MP, as loudly as possible, that I wanted to run down to Krakow to see Cardinal Sapieha, and to others I mentioned other destinations.

I knew I had to confuse the security police records so thoroughly that I would have at least 5 days of grace before I would be missed and a general alarm sounded.

When the meeting finished I went quickly to my car and told my able chauffeur, Tryc, to drive me quickly to my home. I saw my "bodyguard" of 10, which included a young girl, leap into their two cars and start after us.

Tryc, instead of driving into the street as he usually did, circled around the block in such a way as to place my car—when parked—pointed in the opposite direction from its normal position. The security police came into the street in the usual manner, so that their two cars were parked on the opposite side of the street, and pointed in the opposite direction from mine.

I told Tryc to wait for me, that I would be out in a few minutes. I went inside quickly and in the fewest possible number of words told Mme. Hulewicz and Zaleski that I was about to attempt to escape. They immediately began their own plans.

I put on a hat and overcoat, then a large topcoat over the overcoat. Into my pockets I stuffed a razor, a few blades, a small towel, shaving cream, brush, comb, money and my revolver.

LIKE A DISGUISE

The hat and coat were in the nature of a disguise. The Communist press had always portrayed me as a very stout, baldheaded, coatless figure in their political cartoons.

While I made myself ready I gave Zaleski his brief instructions. He would go with me in the car, be dropped as soon as we were out of sight of the security police, walk to the railroad station and buy a ticket for Leszno. I would meet him at the station about 8 p. m.

Then we left, very quickly. It was 6 o'clock and very dark. We jumped into our car and Tryc catapulted away. The security police cars were forced to make a U-turn, which gave us a few precious seconds. Tryc drove quickly around the block, hit a main highway and pushed the accelerator to the floorboards.

After racing several blocks along the highway we stopped, Zaleski jumped out and started for the station, and I told Tryc to turn to the right and douse our lights. In a very short time I saw the two security police cars go screaming up the main highway in search for us.

HOME OF FRIEND

I did not want to tell Tryc that I was leaving, for I knew he would be questioned when it became known I was gone. So I asked him to drop me at Hoza No. 14, which had been the home of a friend.

"Don't bother coming back for me tonight," I said. "I'm having dinner with some friends and they'll drive me home. And, tomorrow, take the car to the garage and have some work done on it. In fact, take a few days off, and when the car is ready just go to the party headquarters."

At Hoza No. 14 I bade him goodnight, and good-by.

For the next hour and a half I rode in a succession of taxicabs, taking one to one section of Warsaw, dismissing it, then taking another across the city. My last destination was our party's print shop. It was only 300 yards from the station.

I walked into the station about 8 o'clock. Zaleski was there. We shook hands gravely and I felt the ticket pressed into my palm. I nodded, went through the gate and boarded the train.

At dawn on October 21 I got off the train at Ostrow and boarded the train for Lesno. But just before the train reached Krotoschyn, I stepped off at a small station which I cannot identify.

This was a familiar region, for my father had been born there and I had lived there as a boy. The chance of being recognized was greater, but that was outweighed by my knowledge of the terrain. I walked to a neighboring village and went directly to a farmer's door, pretending to be an UNRRA official. He agreed to provide me with a cart and horse, and with a boy at the reins I rode to another village.

I paid the boy and dismissed him and walked into the neighboring forest to the little cottage of a forest guard and knocked on the door. It was a risk, but I was relieved as soon as I heard his voice. He had the accent of an eastern Pole.

I asked for a glass of milk, and stepped inside and closed the door. His manner was hostile, for the security police had treated these forest employees viciously on the ground that they collaborated with the bands of Poles who continued to live in the forests and opposed the enslavement of the country.

"You were taken to Soviet Russia in 1939, weren't you?" I asked him.

"Yes," he said, still very suspicious.

I knew then that I was with a friend.

"I am Mikolajczyk," I said.

He bolted the door quickly and his whole manner changed.

"What are you doing here?" he asked.

"I'm leaving Poland," I said.

HATCH ESCAPE PLOT

Together we hatched the means of getting across the border. He would leave immediately by bicycle to contact one of the active smuggling bands that trafficked in goods along the frontier. I must remain in his barn until he returned. His daughter would take care of my food needs.

It took my friend nearly 3 days to pedal to the border, make proper arrangements, and return. And late on the day after he departed, and as I hid in the hay of his barn, I thought my end had come.

I heard the scream of motorcycle sirens coming closer and closer to the little place, and then my heart stood still as I peered out and saw five members of the security police thunder up to the nearby cottage and dismount.

With their hands on their guns they moved on the door of the cottage. I got my own gun ready and prayed.

California-Arizona Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, since when have a member of the Cabinet, namely the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. J. A. Krug, and a high Government official, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Michael W. Straus, assertedly been given authority to outwardly and openly lobby for any particular legislation? This is a question which I am officially asking both of these gentlemen to answer. In addition to this question, I am requesting that they answer the following questions. I shall also present evidence in support of these questions.

The great State of California is now suffering the worst drought in its history. At the same time, it is struggling against the efforts of the State of Arizona to take from California water of the Colorado River that legally belongs to California.

Legislation to have the California-Arizona controversy taken to the Supreme Court has been introduced. Arizona is fighting it, and Mr. Krug and Mr. Straus have been, and still are, assertedly illegally using their high offices in support of Arizona. Mr. Krug and Mr. Straus are fighting for one State against another. They are endorsing a gigantic new Arizona irrigation project. The water for that project would have to be taken from California. This project would jeopardize the economic future of California.

I offer as evidence in support of my questions to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation the following:

An expensive multicolored, profusely illustrated book of 96 large pages.

On page 87, in large green type, is the following head: "Attention, Members of Congress!"

Thereafter follows on the same page an impassioned appeal for water for Arizona that would have to be taken from California.

At the bottom of this stirring plea are the following facsimile signatures: "J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; Michael W. Straus, Commissioner, United States Reclamation Bureau."

Here we have a Cabinet officer and a high Government official openly lobbying, shamelessly propagandizing, personally circularizing the Members of Congress.

I demand to know this: Did Mr. Krug and Mr. Straus volunteer the use of their names in this manner?

Do they know their names have been used in such a way?

Did they forbid the use of their names in this propaganda?

I shall include in the extension of my remarks the text of the Krug-Straus appeal on page 87 of this book, which is titled: "Presenting the Central Arizona Project to You."

Now I turn to page 8 of this same book.

In the upper left-hand corner of page 8 is a picture of Michael W. Straus. Next to it in large peach-colored type is the following head: "Central Arizona irrigation is sound investment."

Thereafter follows, occupying the entire page, what purports to be a personal statement of Mr. Straus, in forceful language supporting the Arizona project, and unequivocably taking the side of Arizona in a bitter interstate controversy.

It must be Mr. Straus' own statement, because at the bottom is the facsimile-signature: "Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of United States Bureau of Reclamation."

In the extension of my remarks I shall also include the text of Mr. Straus' statement of propaganda on page 8, but I shall here quote a single sentence from that statement:

Colorado River water must be brought to central Arizona.

Knowing that legislation is pending on the division of Colorado River waters, did Mr. Straus make such a statement?

He must have, because it bears his photograph and his signature.

Therefore, I want to know if he is guilty of using his office in an illegal manner to influence legislation.

Now I turn to page 1 of the same book.

In the lower right hand corner are listed the names of the book's editors, and the names of the officers of the corporation that published it. I shall include them in the extension of these remarks.

But here I wish to report that not one of the editors or officers of this corporation, nor the corporation itself, is registered as a lobbyist. There is a Federal law which requires such registration, and there is a severe penalty for failing to obey that law.

It cannot be that these editors and officers do not consider themselves as lobbyists. A part of their book is addressed to Members of Congress. The entire book is designed to influence legislation.

I demand that the Department of Justime make an immediate investigation to determine why these persons are not registered as lobbyists. I want to know if they have violated a Federal law.

Here in this book we have the Secretary of the Interior and Commissioner of Reclamation openly associating and acting in concert with lobbyists, assertedly violating the law by lending their names, and in the case of Mr. Straus his picture, to influence legislation, and to put pressure illegally on the Members of Congres.

This is the statement, under the heading "Attention: Members of Congress" that bears the facsimile signature of both Mr. Krug and Mr. Straus:

Seven hundred twenty-five thousand acres of richly productive farm land in central Arizona are menaced by water shortage which threatens to force 40 percent of these acres into idleness.

In the memory of one man's life this land in Maricopa, Pinal, Graham, and Greenlee Counties has been reclaimed from the desert.

At first the venturesome pioneers of the seventies and eighties employed picks and shovels and hand labor to construct the crude beginnings of water-diversion systems. The toil and sweat, and the courage and the vision of those who came first convinced the Nation of the great future for arid lands if irrigation water could be supplied.

After careful investigation, the Federal Government made funds available and developed a gigantic program combining reclamation, water conservation, and power production.

(In italics.) In the central valleys of Arizona approximately $50,000,000 was invested, and that investment has been self-liquidating. It has created a civilization, population, cities, towns, and a community of prosperity and good citizenship.

Irrigated agriculture has become Arizona's basic industry. In 1946 Arizona's irrigated farms produced $160,000,000 in gross income. And the baby State, with its economy based squarely on agriculture, paid $75,000,000 in Federal taxes.

The future of Arizona is now menaced by drought. There is insufficient run-off from the natural watersheds to supply water for above-ground storage to meet the demands of the irrigated acres now developed. Groundwater pump withdrawals have temporarily met the gap between need and supply, but ground water is being withdrawn in the various areas at a rate from 50 to 100 percent in excess of the safe limits established by engineering studies of the United States Geological Survey.

The text continues on for page after page, but the signatures of Mr. Krug and Mr. Straus appear at the bottom of this quoted page.

And here is the propaganda, also designed to influence legislation and Congress, that appears on page 8 under the picture and over the signature of Mr. Straus:

CENTRAL ARIZONA IRRIGATION IS SOUND INVESTMENT

Irrigation in Arizona has been a sound investment for the Government. Into the Yuma project the Bureau of Reclamation put less than $10,000,000. Yet in 1944, crop returns totaled more than $7,750,000—almost 100 percent of the investment in 1 year, while the value of the farms themselves had risen from practically nothing to more than $70,000,000.

Every cent spent on Bureau of Reclamation projects in Arizona is being returned to the Government. Here is an outstanding example of a gilt-edge investment in the development of the prime resources of the State, and of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I interrupt here to ask what commission Mr. Straus gets for selling these "gilt-edge" investments, and if the income is properly noted on his income tax?

Mr. Straus' statement continues:

IRRIGATION CREATES NEW WEALTH

Out of areas of Arizona that were wasteland and desert a few score years ago, there came forth in 1946 crops and livestock of a total value of approximately $150,000,000! These were vital foods, fruits, garden truck, concentrates for livestock feeding, forage, short- and long-staple cotton.

COLORADO RIVER WATER MUST BE BROUGHT TO CENTRAL ARIZONA

We have fully completed investigations to determine a feasible means of diverting Colorado River water into central Arizona, where irrigation wells are being pumped dry.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION FAVORS DEVELOPMENT

The Bureau of Reclamation has embarked upon a program looking toward the fullest possible development of the land, water, and other resources of the West. We shall leave nothing undone in helping central Arizona to share to the greatest extent possible in the fruits of this work.

MICHAEL W. STRAUS.

I would surmise that Mr. Straus is leaving nothing undone to give to 300,000 people water that is vital to the economic future of more than 5,000,000 people in southern California. That would be the result if his lobbying and propagandizing should be successful.

Following are the names of persons associated with Mr. Krug and Mr. Straus in this lobbying activity. I have found that none of them is registered as a lobbyist: Bryan Akers, Stephen C. Shadegg, Al Olchvary, Phil J. Grumbach, C. A. Saylor, Mavis Akers, Jack Klock, Paul La Plante.

The organization is listed as Southwest Publications, Inc.

Our Citizens Want a Strong and Effective Foreign Policy To Cope With Russian Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from one of my constituents which represents the opinion of a number of people in my district who have been seriously thinking of the problem of Russian aggression. I believe that this letter demonstrates that some of the soundest thinking in America is done by our average citizens back home. In that fact lies the strength of America.

Following is the letter:

MY DEAR MR. KERSTEN: My father, my husband, members of 8 bridge clubs, and at least 40 other friends requested me to express to you, Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY and Representative BROPHY, our humble opinions of world conditions. These conclusions are the results of several months of discussions. We are all American-born and represent a small segment of the little people who form the backbone of our Nation. Some of us are parents with draft-eligible sons.

We always thought Congress represented our most foresighted thinkers, but now we are horrified that a few Congressmen wish to appease Russia after 2 years of continuous failure by America and by European nations who now are or shortly will be drawn into the Communist net. We want peace and freedom for ourselves, for our children, and for the world.

We firmly believe that Russian leadership has no respect for words nor agreements, and retracts only in face of military, industrial, scientific, and financial supremacy. Therefore, we want the Marshall plan, immediate compulsory military training, the world's most powerful air force and scientific laboratories, war-equipment stock piling, immediate discontinuation of scorched-earth policy in Germany (the present policy is Communist breeding grounds), intensive American propaganda campaign in free Europe, Asia, and western Germany (silence spells guilt), a clear and firm foreign policy, intensive campaign and conviction of Communists in America, patent-law revisions to protect our scientific and industrial inventions, investigation and curtailment of American industrial trade with Russia, immediate stimulation of German peacetime industries, normal food allotments for Germany, and increased American educational opportunties for worthy exchange students from free Europe, Asia, and western Germany.

In the past Russian leadership always has given to Communist minorities every kind of strength to bring the latest victimized nation under complete Soviet domination. Therefore, we feel that it is imperative that America lend financial, industrial, scientific, and military strength to protect the few free European nations and western Germany from Russian domination. We firmly believe world peace, the fate of Europe, and the future freedom of America depend entirely on immediately checking and controlling the Communist fire before it reaches our shores and destroys even America.

We are not filled with war panic and hysteria, but we firmly believe, "Put your shoulder to the wheel rather than your back to the wall." "Where there is no vision, the people perish," and we would rather pay now the small cost for peace and preparedness.

Our fate is in the hands of Congress. Twice in the past American unpreparedness cost needless sacrifice of American lives. Please, this time, grant the privilege of prompt preparedness to the little people of America who always pay in one way or another for congressional inaction and lack of foresight. We hope and pray that Congress will not delay for weeks and months compulsory training. This is not the time for needless debate, speeches, nor party politics.

Our eyes are on Congress. Our future votes will be cast for those men who immediately protect the house of freedom before the thief robs the entire world and destroys even America.

We wish to thank all of you for past foresighted legislation and to wish you every personal success. Special thanks to you, Mr. KERSTEN, for your untiring efforts against anti-Americans.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JENETTE WINTERHALTER,
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore Sun of March 15, 1948.

OLD-AGE PENSION RISE SOUGHT

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Nearly 12,000 Marylanders would immediately benefit if 120 Representatives succeed in their efforts to increase old-age assistance benefits to $60 a month in this session of Congress.

These Marylanders are persons who are now receiving monthly benefits under the old-age assistance program of social security.

An undetermined but large number of other citizens of the State also would be aided if the Congressmen succeed in lowering the age of availability for old-age pensions from 65 to 60 years.

MANY WOULD BE ELIGIBLE

It is roughly estimated that as of July 1, 1947, there were 75,000 Marylanders between the ages of 60 and 65. Probably not all, but a large number of these would be eligible under the proposed pension system.

It would be difficult to estimate the number of persons who are already over 65 and are not now eligible but who would become eligible under the relaxed requirements of the proposed set-up.

The Congressmen are opposed to the present old-age assistance system and are urging that a bill be passed which would enable the Nation's old folk to be fully independent.

They have charged that present payments of old-age assistance are woefully inadequate and inequitable.

THIRTEEN LEAD DRIVE

Leading the united effort to get action are 13 members of the House who are the authors of old-age pension bills. Among this group is Representative LANDIS (Republican, Indiana) who has been outspokenly critical of the present set-up.

The 120 Representatives have joined in a friendly request for action in this session and have placed their suggestions before the House Ways and Means Committee. Action on their proposals is expected as soon as Congress completes other urgent business now on the floor.

They propose that the subcommittee report to the floor of the House an open bill that will accomplish their aims to establish an adequate pension system for aged retired persons.

Under the present system of old-age assistance, eligible persons in Maryland receive an average monthly payment of $31.88. The maximum payment in the State is $40, and there is no minimum payment.

During the fiscal year 1946–47, 11,819 persons over the age of 65 in Maryland received old-age assistance totaling $4,266,000.

OMIT SOCIAL SECURITY CARD

If the Congressmen succeed in their legislation to provide pensioners with direct Federal aid of $60 per month, these Maryland beneficiaries would receive $8,640,000, more than double the present total.

This would be in addition to whatever sum the State would pay.

The payments, according to the proposed plans, would also be made regardless of whether the pensioner has a social security card.

The only requirements, according to provisions outlined by the Congressmen, are that the pensioner be a retired person over 60, that he has been a citizen and resident of the United States for 10 years and has a gross income less than the minimum required to file a Federal income tax return.

NO MINIMUM STANDARD

Some of the Representatives have proposed that the maximum gross income qualification be set at $750 for an individual.

The pensioners, the Congressmen propose, would not have to prove, as they do now, that they are without sufficient income or other available resources to provide reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health.

The Congressmen suggest that property owners and citizens who have money would be treated the same as those who do not own property or money. A man's house, his lots, and his share of stocks and bonds would not disqualify him from old-age benefits.

STATE BELOW AVERAGE

The Representatives also request that the Federal appropriation be available uniformly in all States, irrespective of whether the various States find themselves in position to match the Federal grant.

Under the present system, the Federal Government appropriates a sum up to $25 per month on a State-matching plan.

Old-age assistance payments, including the State and Federal sums, average $35 in the Nation today. This is about $3 more than the average paid monthly to Marylanders.

Questions and Answers To Demonstrate the Harmful Effect on Our American Merchant Marine That Would Result From the Transfer of 200 Additional Ships Under the Proposed European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, by means of questions and answers, I desire to bring to the attention of the House the adverse and detrimental effect that will result to our American merchant marine from the transfer of an additional 200 American ships to European nations, as proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in its bill setting up a European recovery program.

Question: Will the charter of 200 vessels from the laid-up fleet to foreign nations affect the American merchant marine?

Answer: Charter of 200 vessels to foreign nations from the laid-up fleet will result in the immediate lay-up of at least 200 vessels presently flying the United States flag. During the last 6 months of 1947 over 370 vessels flying the United States flag were laid up in our reserve fleet. During January 1948, 58 vessels flying the United States flag were sent to the laid-up fleet. During the first few weeks of February, American shipowners, informed the Maritime Commission that they are returning an additional 58 vessels for lay-up. Hardly a day passes when one or two vessels are not turned back to the United States Maritime Commission. The lay-up of American-flag vessels is a direct result of the large-scale construction of vessels abroad and the numerous transfers of American tonnage to foreign flags. There is at present an excess of large tonnage over the demand, and the American fleet being the highest-cost operator suffers all of the contraction. It is folly to suggest that vessels transferred to foreign flags from our laid-up fleet do not affect the active American fleet. Actually, if transfers are to be made, it would be wiser to call down the American flag on an active ship and turn it over to foreign flag since the cost of removing a vessel from lay-up for charter to a foreign government and of returning an American-flag vessel to lay-up is approximately $25,000. The cost of removing 300 vessels from lay-up for foreign charter and of returning 300 American vessels to lay-up would be approximately $4,500,000.

Question: Since an eventual decline in the American merchant marine is contemplated, would it not be wisest to transfer vessels to foreign flags, take the blow now, and urge American seamen to secure jobs elsewhere while job opportunities exist?

Answer: Such a position accepts without reservation the thesis that the United States will have no tramp shipping fleet in the postwar era. American maritime workers cannot accept this thesis. Within recent months, the United States Maritime Commission has established a special tramp shipping committee which is surveying the possibilities for the operation of an American tramp fleet. The transfer of 200 vessels now would force many American tramp operators to close down their businesses and would dissipate our skilled maritime labor force. Such action would predetermine the results of the tramp shipping committee for, even if the committee should find that American-flag tramp operations are feasible, the dissipation of our management and labor forces would prevent the carrying of our tramp-shipping plan into operation.

Question: Would not the charter of 200 vessels to foreign governments result in a reduction of shipping freight rates causing savings to the foreign countries and to the American taxpayers?

Answer: Present-day freight rates are approximately 25 percent lower than a year ago. In relative terms, the freight rate structure has declined even more drastically since ship-operating costs have risen rapidly. Bunker oil and bunker coal is approximately 50 percent higher in cost this year than in 1947. Stevedoring, towing, bagging, and other costs have risen rapidly in recent months. If it were not for the fact that there is such a large excess of tonnage available over the demand these large-scale increases in cost would have forced increases in freight rates. The importance of maintaining the American charter fleet on the high seas for the purpose of stabilizing freight rates cannot be over estimated. Despite the fact that the French and Italian Governments can secure all of the tramp tonnage they need over and above their own tonnage from Panamanian operators, these governments have made a practice of dividing the business between Panamanian and American flag in order to keep the American tramp operators in business. These governments fear that if they threw all of their business to the Panamanian or to other foreign flags, the American chartered fleet would be virtually wiped out overnight, the supply-demand situation would be reversed, and freight rates would rise rapidly. Hence, over the long run, it is to the interest of European nations to maintain the American chartered fleet in order to stabilize rates at a reasonable level.

Question: Will the refusal of the United States Government to transfer additional vessels to foreign countries increase the cost of the European recovery program?

Answer: No. The Congress is going to appropriate a specified amount of money for the European recovery program. Whether the goods secured under the program are to be carried in American vessels or in foreign vessels will not alter the sum appropriated by the Congress.

Hence, the cost to the American taxpayer will not be increased if provisions are made for the transportation of a certain portion of the ERP commodities in American vessels. It has been argued, however, that, insofar as dollars must be used for the purchase of American shipping services, they will not be available for the purchase of other commodities. This argument is truthful, but it does not tell the full story. There is no doubt that there will be some savings in dollars if the 16 European nations were able to transport all of the ERP goods in their own bottoms. However, the saving has been greatly overestimated. Despite the fact that the State Department's original estimates ran between five hundred and six hundred million dollars, the Herter committee, in its report entitled "Transportation as It Affects the European Recovery Program," comes to the same conclusion as the National Federation of American Shipping, namely, that the saving at most will run between two hundred and three hundred million dollars. As the national federation has pointed cut, the estimated saving is about 2 percent of the amount of funds to be made available under the ERP. These savings must be counterbalanced by a number of other factors. Our Nation spent over $225,000,000 training the maritime labor force we now have. Dissipation of this maritime labor force by the transfer of additional vessels to foreign countries will be a real loss to our Nation which must be counterbalanced against the alleged savings. Similarly, seamen will be thrown out of work and their families will suffer hardships. There will be the cost of unemployment-insurance benefits and the loss of the taxes paid by seamen and the business that their earnings generate. Hence, the question really before the Congress is one of balancing a small diversion on the part of the European nations from certain commodities purchases to shipping-service purchases against the great loss to our Nation. Moreover, we may well question why the American fleet must be driven off the seas while these European nations pay dollar freight for tonnage flying the Panamanian and Honduran flags which is owned by citizens of Greece, of Great Britain, of Sweden, and possibly of other European countries. If the 16 European nations are really interested in saving dollar freight, let them show their good intention by requiring their citizens to register their tonnage under their own flags.

Question: Since the Americans have never been able to successfully engage in the tramp shipping business, and since the bulk of the ERP business is both tramp shipping and of a temporary nature, would it not be wisest for the United States to concentrate on building up its liner services, and allowing the European nations to take over more and more of the bulk tramp shipping business?

Answer: None of the proponents of further ship transfers to foreign countries advocate the dissipation of the American liner fleet. However, what these proponents do not see is that the transfer of additional vessels must of necessity seriously affect the prosperity of our liner fleet. While American tramp operators using chartered vessels from the United States Maritime Commission are prohibited by the Commission from carrying tramp cargoes in a liner trade on the theory that the American liner operators in those trades must be protected, European tramp operators can and do operate in these trades. The charter of 200 vessels to European operators will mean that these vessels or vessels freed from other services by these chartered vessels will be thrown into the liner routes to compete against the American liner companies. Thus, the proposed charter of 200 vessels will have a permanent damaging effect upon that segment of the American merchant marine which all persons, even the proponents of the proposed charters, want to maintain.

Palestine Reversal Requires Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, several days have now elapsed since the terse and mystifying statement was made in the Councils of the United Nations that the United States had changed its mind about the Palestine question. Millions of people in this country and elsewhere in the world were shocked and bewildered by this sudden announcement. They were unwilling, and are still unwilling, to believe that the American Nation, which has assumed the role of the spiritual leader of this war-torn world, had abandoned its solemn pledge to aid in the establishment of a free Palestine. They are equally unwilling to believe that our great Nation has cold-bloodedly determined to abandon the many thousands of Jews now in their homeland to an unthinkable fate at the hands of their traditional foes.

But thus far there has been no adequate explanation of this amazing reversal of our previous policy on the Palestine question.

One of the most alarming reactions to our right-about-face on Palestine has been a widespread fear that the United States has decided to abandon all reliance on the United Nations in international affairs. The American people have expected our Government to exercise strong leadership in upholding United Nations decisions. Yet, in the case of Palestine, we have pursued exactly the opposite course. The United Nations went on record in favor of partition, and the United States had a primary obligation to accept the decision of the majority in favor of the establishment of a Jewish state. Can it be, as has been repeatedly suggested in the last few days, that we have decided instead to embark upon a course of power politics in order to protect private oil interests which are interested only in foreign commercial profits?

The Members of Congress are entitled to an immediate and clear-cut statement of our future Palestine policy from the Department of State and our representatives in the United Nations. We have a right to demand such an explanation at once.

City, State, and National Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report unanimously adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Lackawanna, N. Y., relative to tax reductions:

REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE LACKAWANNA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON THE SUBJECT OF CITY, STATE, AND NATIONAL TAXATION

The committee feels that this chamber must take its position along with other business organizations of the United States in their fight against inflationary practices and wastes.

Not one man in our organization can hold a brief for the extravagances of our present Federal expenditures. A figure is contemplated which is 800 percent greater than the costs of operating the same government in the booming twenties. It would seem that the war spending practices have developed habits among the various departments upon which peace presents no significance. Keep the big pay roll and to blazes with the costs and the people who pay.

The State of New York is little, if any, better in its treatment of our people. The present State government has gone about raising salaries and mandating expenses of local government jurisdiction apparently without the slightest concern of where the money will come from. The present Governor has doubled the State budget during his term of office. We seem to be drifting toward that huge octopus of statism which destroys initiative and individualism and lays the whole course of economic and cultural procedure in the grip of the political machine.

What can we do to combat this trend? First we must make ourselves heard. Our complaints and criticisms must be loud enough for the politicians to hear over the cries and clamorings of the special interest groups.

These special interest groups are financed and backed by a certain number of votes well known to our elected Representatives. You, Mr. Citizen, become that part of the inaudible or quiet mass of voters who merely pay the bills. Your interests are of course represented by your duly elected Congressman or Senator but as an individual your protests and requests are downed out by these special interest groups.

What can we do about this? After all, this is a democracy and the price we must pay for our privilege of living in a democracy as everyone knows is eternal vigilance. We cannot be vigilant very effectively by ourselves so we band together and in this case we form a chamber of commerce. Now we have representation in Washington and in Albany. And what good is this representation going to do us if we do not tell them how we feel about running our Government? None. So let us establish a policy for our chamber and forward it to Washington and

Albany so our representatives may know our desire. This is the proper exercise of democratic processes. We leave the other methods to the long-haired boys who wear horned rimmed spectacles.

So let's adopt a chamber policy for 1948. Your committee suggests the following:

1. The United States Congress must reduce the cost of government drastically.

2. The big Federal debt should be reduced annually so that a bit of blue sky will be seen on the horizon.

3. Promotion of Federal plans by which the ownership of Government bonds by individuals and thrift institutions is encouraged. Commercial banks' surpluses should be out working in the general economy of the Nation.

4. For the present, only those Federal and State public works should be prosecuted which are of an emergency nature.

5. Increase the efficiency of all productive labor, no make-work, no feather-bedding or other devices for collecting pay for work not done.

6. Lower Federal income taxes for all business and people.

7. The committee suggests that Federal laws be enacted which permit business to use an adequate part of their earnings for improvements and expansion.

8. We don't believe in the Government paying somebody to build up a price. Such action is for wartime only and tends toward Government control of business and farming.

9. We feel that the Marshall plan in principle should be adopted. As to how much money should be used and over how long a period we must leave to the decision of the Congress as a whole who, through committee hearings, are in a position to know the economic and social balance involved. We do feel, however, that the work should be administered by a newly created department, guided by the State Department as to policy, accountable to the President and subject generally to the approval of a joint bipartisan committee of both Houses.

10. Federal Government should immediately correct the inequity in collection of income tax caused through the community property provisions in various State laws.

11. The Federal and State Governments should not practice double taxation. Dividends from companies who have paid the tax on their earnings should not be taxed again when they are received by a stockholder.

12. We believe that the day for tax exemption of businesses and corporations owned by cooperatives, religious institutions, and educational bodies is past. Manufacturing, buying, and selling for profit is the backbone of our American way of life. It is not fair to tax the business of one man while his next-door neighbor in the same business is not taxed simply because that neighbor's business is owned by a group, each of whom benefit from their ownership of the business. This same treatment should apply to businesses owned and operated by religious and educational institutions.

Education and religion, while owning operating corporations, should pay the same tax as individuals in business.

This does not mean that we think the church or the college should be taxed. It means only that businesses owned by the church and the college should be treated the same as your business is treated in respect to taxation.

13. On the subject of the sales tax there are many phases to be considered. First, we are all of the opinion that more money was needed for educational costs. The first thought is that additional tax should be taken from income and corporate taxes. On this item we should not kill the "goose that lays the golden egg." The Southern States weaned the textile mills away from New England by lower taxes and we don't want that to happen in New York State. Also a high income tax can chase labor and without labor, industry cannot flourish. The next thought was to get these additional funds from the people who were being benefited most. Thousands of residents of New York State do not pay income taxes. How could these contribute to the additional cost for educating their children and how much will it cost them. These questions were considered before the State passed the permissive tax legislation.

Statisticians have found that the individual earning as low as $2,500 will not pay more than $5 per year. This is, of course, because of the many exempt items. On the other hand would the people of this city like $4 per thousand dollars of assessed valuation added to their tax bill? Certainly they would not and properly so. Real estate has been used as a major tax base so long that residents shy away from home buying if they can. Let's not pour it on. Your committee therefore felt that with two or three additional exemptions we should try this sales tax a few more years.

Again your committee urges your action on a tax policy for the good of your country and for the good of your city.

(This report was unanimously adopted as part of the Lackawanna Chamber of Commerce program for 1948.)

The South in Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, a most justifiable wave of indignation and protest has swept the Southern States at President Truman's civil-rights message to Congress. In this message he recommended certain measures that would, in effect, set up an ogpu or gestapo in the South. This is to try to enforce certain laws which he says he wants the Congress to enact, such as a Federal antipoll tax bill, a Federal antilynching bill, and Federal employment-practices bill. He also recommended legislation to do away with segregation of the races throughout the country.

Of course, Georgia has already done away with the poll tax, and other Southern States are rapidly doing the same. No Federal laws are necessary to abolish the poll tax, as it is dying out anyhow.

The same is true of lynching. No man who believes in law and order believes in lynching. And, as Congressman STEVE PACE, of Georgia, pointed out in a great speech he made in this body a few days ago, there was only one lynching in the entire country last year. Obviously, no Federal antilynch law is necessary.

It is agreed by the wise leaders of both races that an FEP law would disrupt industry in the South, and its enforcement would require a horde of snoopers to enforce it that would be intolerable to people of both races.

PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

I am told by those who know that President Truman personally does not believe in the enactment of such laws, or in the establishment of a gestapo to enforce them. But his political advisers have forced him to make the proposals to counteract the candidacy of Henry Wallace, and to prevent the Negro vote in the big cities from going to Wallace or to the Republican candidate. The Republican Party has always stood for these laws and will incorporate them in their platform.

SOUTH WILL NOT BE PUSHED AROUND

The people in the South have come just about to the end of the row. They do not propose to be pushed around any more by leaders of the Democratic Party from the North and East, who think that the South is going to vote Democratic in spite of the contemptuous treatment accorded us.

This time the people are in earnest. If the proper leadership is forthcoming, and if a plan can be worked out that will force the leaders of the party to give some heed to the South, we can make our influence and power felt, and stop such nonsense.

WILLINGHAM PROPOSES PLAN

My friend, Harold Willingham, representative of Cobb County in the Georgia Legislature and prominent Marietta attorney, has proposed a plan that to me makes sense, up to the point where he proposes to set up a fourth party. I am for the plan, but do not think that we should actually bolt the party. It can certainly do the South no good in this respect to elect Henry Wallace or a Republican President. It is my considered opinion that we ought to make our fight within the party. I think Willingham's plan will make it possible for us to win out within the Democratic Party.

Briefly stated, Willingham's proposal is that all Southern States agree to hold their primaries for all State offices, and for Congressmen and Senators, well in advance of the Democratic National Convention. All disputes within the party would then be ended, and all could devote themselves to the task of winning recognition for the rights of the South within the Democratic Party. We would go to the national convention with a united front.

Willingham proposes that we go with uninstructed delegations, but with agreement that we propose southern candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency.

THREE DEMANDS OF SOUTHERNERS

At the convention, we would be in position to demand of the leaders of the party, three things: Re-establishment of the two-thirds rule in the National Democratic Convention for the nomination of a President; selection of a southern man for the Vice Presidency if Truman is named as a candidate for the Presidency; and an abandonment by the party of measures that are diametrically opposed to the welfare of the South. All these would be the conditions upon which our votes would be cast for Mr. Truman. Our demands would be reenforced by a definite threat to set up a Southern Democratic Party which would go to the electoral college after the general election, to choose a President, with instructions to withhold the 115 votes which we southerners hold, and thus throw the election into the House

of Representatives, where each State has one vote. A majority of each State delegation of electors would determine to which candidate the State's vote would go. I believe this plan will work without any actual revolt from the Democratic Party.

EVEN TRUMAN PREFERABLE TO REPUBLICAN

As much as I disagree with Mr. Truman on his proposals, I am convinced that the Republicans would be just as bad on this issue. And one has to be here for a very short time only, to understand how opposed to the general welfare of the South and its people is the Republican Party. We can expect nothing from them or their leadership, and that is said with no criticism of those who believe in Republican principles and who follow the Republican Party in the South. They have a right to their belief in, and adherence to, the Republican Party and its philosophy. But, I do not believe in the principles of the Republican Party, and think their winning a national election would be a calamity to the South.

After all, Mr. Truman can only recommend. Whether or not his proposals become law depends upon what Congress does. You can rest assured that every southerner in Congress will oppose to the end, such recommendations as the President has made.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I believe the House would be interested in the results of a poll taken by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. Questionnaires were sent to 50,000 lawyers, 50,000 physicians and others. The following is the result of an analysis of 3,017 of the questionnaires returned:

HIGH LIGHTS OF OPINION ON THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

(As reflected in this analysis of Nation-wide poll of thoughtful Americans)

Nine to one against $17,000,000,000 4-year commitment.

Three to one against $6,800,000,000 in 15 months.

Four to one against advances to governments; favor advances mainly or solely to private enterprisers.

Ten to one in favor of requiring foreign governments to pledge their assets to secure loans.

Twenty to one would restrict use of loans and require governments to guarantee loans to their citizens.

Twenty-one to one against subsidizing European socialism.

Only 26 to 33 percent believe loans will retard Soviet's westward push; 72 percent would confine loans to private enterprisers.

Seventy-two percent would require repayment in American dollars.

Five out of eight would confine aid to relieving hunger and distress.

Nine out of ten would require reduction of Federal spending equivalent to appropriations for foreign aid.

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted at the county convention of Madison County, Miss., Democrats on March 20, 1948:

Be it resolved by the White Southern Democrats of Madison County, Miss., in convention assembled at the courthouse in the city of Canton, That:

Whereas it is the hope of this assembly that the Democratic Party, as we have heretofore known it; and, until recent years, as heretofore constituted, may be maintained; and

Whereas at this time the party to which we gave our unswerving allegiance in the darkest days of the Southland, is now in the ignoble clutches of, controlled and garrotted by, a band of political wood-colts and freebooters whose greed dripping and clammy hands are endeavoring to set at naught the traditions which are the very warp and woof of Southern ideals and culture, and which are sacred to all through whose veins course the purest blood of the Anglo-Saxon race; and

Whereas the party of our fathers has been cruelly betrayed by the aforesaid political illegitimates and usurpers of authority who, in barter and exchange for the votes of mongrels and bastard ideologists would, with one swift stroke, plunge the stiletto of hate into the very vitals of the Southern way of life; and

Whereas the act of the President of these United States in thus recommending to Congress the enactment of the inexcusable programme of bitterness and hate will prove a hindrance and impediment to a continuation of the good feeling and mutual understanding which has prevailed among the people of both races in our State in recent years, and as an incitation to suspicion and ill-will; and

Whereas we resent, with all the outraged feelings contained within us, the studied efforts of the occupant of the White House to smear the hallowed traditions which have made the South the envy of other sections of this Nation; and

Whereas we deem it not only expedient, but also our sacred duty, to reject as at once contemptible and inexcusable, and as wholly unworthy of one who professes to be the son of a Confederate soldier, those unwise and uncalled for recommendations of President Truman in his civil-rights program addressed to the Congress of these United States, as an attempt to besmirch the noble ideals so dear to those who wore the grey and to their descendants; and as a thrust entirely unworthy of any man occupying a position of such great dignity and high honor; and

Whereas as southerners we are pledged and dedicated to fight to the bitter end any and every movement tending to acquiesce in, or to aid, the contemplated candidacy of the man who stands as both author, sponsor, and god-father to this iniquitous political broth thus served to the Congress for its consumption; and

Whereas we desire to record our deep feeling of resentment against this unwarranted intrusion, and this wilful invasion, of our State's rights, and to blazon to all betrayers in high places, or in low, our fixed determination to maintain those standards, traditions, and ideals against the onslaughts of all the cohorts of evil who now so cruelly assail them.

It is the sense of this convention that, in any event, we now stand and shall continue to stand unrelentingly, unflinchingly, and irrevocably opposed to the nomination of Harry S. Truman for the Presidency of these United States of America; and

That it is the sense of this assembly that its delegates to our State convention be, and they are hereby, pledged to use every honorable means therein to secure the adoption and effectuate the passage of such resolutions and measures as shall tend to make impossible the nomination of the present occupant of the White House, and which shall contribute to the restoration in the quondam Democratic Party of the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson; and of all those principles of good government so long its shield, sword, and buckler, but which, in recent years, have been so sorely ravished by the mental peewees and official misfits in its once proud ranks in exchange for the political gew-gaws and the suffrage of unworthy balances of power in sections of this country; and that it is further

Resolved, That we most heartily commend our Governor, the Honorable Fielding L. Wright, and his adamantine courage displayed in the crisis that now confronts us. That we are proud of his leadership. That we shall hold high his hands carrying the banner of States' rights in this important engagement. That we commend the truculent spirit of his official family and that of the State legislature, and who have been so loyal and steadfast in their impregnable determination that the enemies, haters, and traducers of this Southland shall not prevail.

That we would not overlook our able and distinguished Representatives in the present Congress who, with such zeal, courage, and ability are bearing their burdens in the heat of the day, and whose swords have flashed from their scabbards to shield and protect the Southland and all her cherished traditions; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to Senators EASTLAND and STENNIS; to Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of the House of Representatives; to the Jackson Daily News, the Clarion Ledger, the Madison County Herald, the Flora Paper, and the Commercial Appeal; to Gov. Fielding L. Wright; to the speaker of the House of Representatives, and the president of the Senate of the State of Mississippi.

Adopted this the 20th day of March 1948.

B. H. JONES, *Chairman.*
DICK C. MCCOOL, *Secretary.*

Whither Are We Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, considering all the hatred and fear that now obsess men's minds and hearts, and the harsh words and unjust acts that set nation against nation; and mindful of the tremendous strides made by man in developing the instruments of destruction, it would seem that our civilization is headed for complete destruction. Is there no hope for us? Is there nothing that can save us? Will we continue to drift toward the third and final world war—a war so terrible that we hesitate to face the appalling details of its horrors?

DID CHRIST AND GANDHI SHOW US THE WAY?

An assassin's bullet has just taken, in far away New Delhi, the life of probably the greatest personality of our time. Gandhi, the great Hindu leader, met and conquered the imperialism of the West. He dedicated his life to bringing independence and freedom to his people. What were his weapons? Force, guns, planes, machines of war? Far from it. Rather, his weapons were those of the spirit. Nonviolence, justice, righteousness, goodness, sacrifice. Just a few days before his death he demonstrated in a remarkable way his hold upon, and power over, the teeming millions of India. Civil war was growing daily in scope and destructiveness. By the simple method of fasting, he wrung from the warring factions a promise of a truce in the fighting and disorder. And remarkable to relate, the promise was being kept until his untimely death.

Someone writing of his death and of his life, said that he was the greatest man to appear upon this earth since Christ. And no doubt he was. To say as much does not put him upon the same plane as Christ, since those of us who accept the Christian faith believe that Christ was very God and very man. God's supreme revelation of Himself to man.

Gandhi, the embodiment of the mysticism of the Orient, accepted the moral and ethical foundation upon which Christ based his teaching. And made them work in this age of materialism for the freedom of his people and for peace.

DARE WE FOLLOW?

Can spiritual forces save us? Firmly I believe that eventually they must save us if we are to be saved from total destruction. We have fought two world wars in the name of peace and democracy. Yet we have neither in the world today. Can a third world war save us? On the contrary it means total annihilation.

Significant it is that the very scientists who invented the atom bomb, the jet plane, and guided missiles, are now scared to death of their own inventions, and are calling upon men to come back to reliance upon spiritual and moral forces for salvation. Einstein, whose equation made possible the atom bomb, is calling. MacArthur, when the Japanese surrendered, uttered the same warning, that only spiritual forces can save us. David Lawrence, Walter Lippmann, Drew Pearson, and other men of letters join in the call for a return to brotherhood, justice, and righteousness and the other fruits of the spirit.

It is true that we must remain armed and ready to repel any attack made upon us by those who believe in the pagan philosophy of force, with its dependence upon military might, power, and deception. To do less would encourage those who depend upon force to attack us. To drop our guard would be to invite destruction by the evil forces of paganism. Yet our ultimate dependence must be upon the spiritual forces of life. Somehow we must be patient and prepared, while we do our utmost to convince Russia and other nations who have accepted the doctrine of force and powers of the German philosophers of the last century, that their weapons and their philosophy will eventually destroy civilization. Impossible, you say?

A few days ago I read this imaginary dialog between God and man, attributed to Harry Emerson Fosdick:

At times I think I can verily see the hand of God on man's shoulder urging him on, and saying: "You are going through to international brotherhood and peace and a more decent economic order. Move!"

And man says, "I will not." Far from fighting an idealistic battle against the universe, he holds back. He digs in his heels. He is vexed at change.

"Nevertheless," says God, "you will. You will face constantly more complicated international relationships until you have to. Every other road you take will be blocked. You will go forward on My road."

But all man's selfishness and stupidity rise up against that. "I will have my way," he says, "my prejudices and my hatreds. I will not go."

"Nevertheless," says God, "you will. You have already come a long way since I started you. You have said that you would not overpass tribalism, or feudalism, or slavery, or judicial torture, but you did! Every time I have found a seer to see My way, you have said 'No;' but you came. I have carried you along ever since time began, and you are going further than you have dreamed."

PERILOUS DAYS AHEAD

Today we are facing more complex international relationships than man has ever had to face, and more complicated domestic and human relationships. If we survive we must follow these seers that God has raised up to show us the way of life.

THE GOOD ROAD

We must take the good road as it is called by Frank Buchman, that remarkable man who started the mighty force for good known as moral rearmament. A musical play by that name, The Good Road, produced by Buchman's followers, has just played for almost a week, to capacity audiences here in Washington. The play was sponsored by leading ministers, by Congressmen and Senators, who realize that we are facing the most perilous days in the history of humankind. It was in the nature of the old morality plays, but modernized and made attractive by lovely music written especially for the play. It was a compelling and moving drama, pointing men to the necessity for adopting as their guide on the road of life, the spiritual forces of love, brotherhood, justice, and righteousness.

After its showing in the mining districts of England and Wales, the output of the miners was increased tremendously, and spiritual fires were rekindled. Probably nothing has been seen like it since the preaching of Whitfield and Wesley.

There are hundreds of people in the play, all of whom depend upon free will offerings to finance the production and all the expenses incident to the travel involved.

All these things, Gandhi's life and death, the Buchmanites, the awakening of our scientists and military men to the hopelessness of depending upon war, and the necessity for utilizing the moral and spiritual forces of the world, the fact that the people of Washington and other great cities are flocking to the churches to hear men urgent in their preaching like John Rustin, of the Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church, here—a Georgian, by the way—and Peter Marshall at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, and Dr. Cranford, of Calvary Baptist Church—all these things are straws in the wind, signifying that God's spirit is blowing upon and moving the hearts of men. This is the command to move, to go on to international brotherhood, as Dr. Fosdick said. Man must move along this good road, or he is forever lost.

Is Stalin Promoting the Marshall Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

IS STALIN PROMOTING THE MARSHALL PLAN?

The official line in Washington is that Russia is opposed to the Marshall plan. But is she? During the war, our wise men in Washington told us that Russia was a "freedom loving democracy"; that Stalin was a fine chap and noble fellow with a heart of gold. They were wrong. Are they wrong now?

I wish we had some good horse-traders who were shrewd enough to imagine that Stalin might want us to go forward with the Marshall plan, and figure out the angles on that basis.

Why should we believe anything Stalin or his stooges say? Didn't Stalin say at one time: "Words must have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? * * * Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

That Stalin, Molotov, and Vishinsky are plain stupid is a conclusion to be wary of. You've got to look at these politicians obliquely to get them in focus. They are past masters in treachery, faithless to the plighted word, and skilled in oriental cunning. Can it be supposed that when Vishinsky attacked us in New York that he was just shooting off his mouth because his ears loved the noise? There are two angles worth considering—maybe more. One is that he made these noises to bolster up his fellow tyrants back home—make the proletariat believe we were gunning for them, and they had better close ranks. Machiavelli and Sherlock Holmes would surely keep this thought in mind.

The other angle is that Vishinsky knew his speeches would create American sentiment for the Marshall plan, and made them deliberately as a come-on.

Then came the establishment of the Cominform in Belgrade, and Molotov's speech in Moscow with the horrid news that Russia had the atom bomb. That sounded phony to me. If Russia had it, why advertise it? The London Times said, "The effect of the Molotov speech will be, like most Soviet actions lately, to help the progress through Congress of the European Recovery Program." Are we to believe the Kremlin brain is so simple as not to know that?

If Russia wants to promote the Marshall plan, it's as plain as the nose on a wall-faced

pike that the way to do it is to antagonize and terrify the naive Americans.

As Garet Garrett says in American Affairs: "Why should Moscow, pretending otherwise, want the Marshall plan? Here one question may help to answer another. Why should it not want it? In the first place, American billions poured into Europe cannot be controlled by political dikes; they will flow in all directions. Russia and her satellites are bound to be benefited somewhat. These American billions will create new assets in Europe. * * * If they believe, as they do, that a debacle of the capitalist system in the United States would deliver the world to socialism, and secondly, that this prodigious aid to Europe will weaken the American economic structure and hasten that debacle, then, of course, they would be for the Marshall plan."

Lenin said he would make the capitalistic countries choke on their bonds and printed money. Load up any country with too much debt, too high taxes, and printing-press inflation and you can destroy it. Is Stalin practicing what Lenin preached?

This is no time to let our natural tendency to be boobs get completely out of hand.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

The Education Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Marjorie Rea to the editor of the Minnetonka Herald, Wayzata, Minn., which appeared on March 18, 1948:

To the EDITOR:

People concerned about the Nation-wide crisis in education today generally agree that the possibility of Federal control of schools is a dangerous solution. Another mutual field of agreement is that our Federal taxes are much too high.

But to editorialize against high Federal taxes may point up, but certainly does not solve, the educational problem.

I too deplore the need for Federal aid to education. But we have to be realistic. Federal taxes are not likely to be reduced in the immediate future (and we do have a war to pay for—remember).

At any rate, there is a crisis in education that must be faced now. Some prominent educators have already warned that if schools continue to deteriorate, the Federal Government may take over completely.

Those most seriously concerned about the problem—educational groups—do endorse Federal-aid-to-education bills providing (1) they give control of Federal funds to the State, (2) if they protect the educational welfare of minority racial groups, and (3) if the use of Federal funds is limited to such schools as the State makes eligible for State support.

Your attitude, Mr. Editor, has a defeatist sound. "We believe," you wrote last week, "State and local agencies more capable of diagnosing their own educational ailments and curing them." Any quick look at schools the country over proves the fallacy of that statement. Our own State legislature, after years of ignoring the problem, roused itself to act during the 1947 session and passed the long-needed school-reorganization plan, and the even longer needed correction in State aids.

Mr. MACKINNON, no less than you, recognizes and deplores this general apathy toward our educational responsibilities. But he has studied the problem and attempted a solution that deserves better than the ridicule you heaped on it in your earlier editorial. Undoubtedly there are valid arguments against his suggestion of a Federal salary of $2,400 a year for every teacher in the country. Nevertheless, it seems one ingenious method of assuring Federal aid without Federal control. And in many areas in this country that sum would lift the type of teacher to a far higher standard. To argue as you do, that this salary would become the top-wage ceiling, is to ignore economics. There is, since the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, a minimum wage in certain industries now—but nobody believes that minimum becomes the maximum. The law of supply and demand rules; the topnotch teachers could demand and get a top-notch salary. But in depression years no school board could reduce its teachers to below-standard salaries. Latest available figures for teacher salaries follow: National average, $1,846; Minnesota, $1,754; lowest average for white teachers, Arkansas, $924; average for Negro teachers, Mississippi, $342.

Teachers now are further handicapped because, if they want to move from one State to another, they lose their retirement rights. Mr. MACKINNON has suggested that such retirement funds be under Federal control, so that teachers, like workers under social security, would not lose these benefits if health or any other consideration forced their removal to another part of the country. What's wrong with that idea?

It is logical to believe that an annual base salary of $2,400 would alleviate the present scarcity of teachers, which has resulted in many with substandard certificates teaching. And freedom to avail themselves of higher salaries in any part of the country would be a further inducement for young people to look more favorably on the teaching profession.

Such raids of alert western school authorities on eastern school personnel, as happened during the war, would have a salutary effect on pinch-penny school boards.

I wholeheartedly agree with you on the need of safeguarding State and local controls, but we must take more than a passive interest in supporting it at these levels. In your capacity as editor, you will have an excellent opportunity to inform your readers when a sound plan for reorganization of the Hennepin County school districts is worked out and ready for action by members of the various districts.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE REA.

A Glance Behind the Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, overlong Communists in labor organizations have used loyal, industrious, and thrifty workers and their unions as a cloak to conceal their real purposes and activities.

Union members who wanted none of communism have, because of the shrewdness, the unscrupulousness, and the thoroughness of party leaders, been intimidated and their union controlled by those who apparently followed Moscow's program.

One gentleman, who may, or may not, have been a member of the Communist Party, found that the practice of testifying falsely before a congressional committee was not as safe as it had seemed to be. One chapter in his story was written early this month. The concluding chapter may not be written until there is a formal decision by the United States Supreme Court. Whatever the decision in that Court may be, the decision of the jury here in Washington is at least a warning to those who have heretofore indicated no respect for the authority of the Congress.

From Allis-Chalmers News of March 19 comes an editorial that should be of interest to all union, as well as nonunion employees. That editorial is as follows:

THE END OF AN ERA

On March 4, 1948, a Federal district court jury of eight men and four women handed down a decision in Washington, D. C., which brought to an end a long strife-filled era for Allis-Chalmers employees.

This jury found Harold Roland Christoffel, former leader of Local 248 of the UAW-CIO, guilty of lying when he said he was not a Communist. In effect, the jury found that he was a Communist, that he endorsed and supported communism, and that he associated with known Communists.

Let us see just who those jurors were. They were—housewives, a mechanic, a carpenter, a meat salesman, a railway express driver, a saleslady. Some were union members. In short, they were the everday Americans you know and meet daily on the streets.

After listening to all of the evidence, including Harold Christoffel's defense, they found him guilty as charged.

The verdict had a deeper meaning for Allis-Chalmers employees—it marked the end of a strike-torn era.

To more fully realize the significance of this verdict let us review both what happened in this era and what was behind these happenings.

In the beginning, about 1935, a young Communist fresh from boot training in Moscow and propaganda testing in China, came to Milwaukee to head the Communist Party here. He was Eugene Dennis, now national secretary of the Communist Party.

He had a twofold purpose in coming here: To establish a Communist-dominated union at Allis-Chalmers, a company vital to all of the Nation's basic manufacturing and food producing, and to wreck the Socialist Party.

He used the same tool—Harold Christoffel—to achieve both of these ends.

Now let us see how Allis-Chalmers, its employees, and local 248 all were undermined.

Soon Sigmund Eisenscher, a frequent Communist candidate for public office, showed up as head of local 248's key educational committee, and his successors were of similar stripe. From this position false propaganda was spewed forth, smearing anyone daring to oppose the Communist-dominated leadership of the union. With this backing Harold Christoffel became so firmly entrenched in union office that repeated attempts by sincere trade unionists, who objected to the purposes for which the union was being run, were unable to dislodge him.

Under this Communist-dominated leadership there were strikes, stoppages, and slowdowns.

The 1941 strike was called on a proved fraudulent strike vote. It has been testified under oath that this strike was ordered by the Communist Party.

Why did the party order this strike?

Because of considerations of international politics. The Russian Government's' aim was to slow down growing American military strength, and to prevent American aid to our allies. Due to this Communist ordered strike the Navy destroyer program was held up and, as a direct result of this strike, there is no way of accounting for the number of American lives lost during the war.

After the war, Russia sought to retard the speed with which America was swinging into economic recovery, and also to prevent American food from reaching Europe. So in 1946 there was another strike at Allis-Chalmers, again called on a trumped-up excuse.

And in all of these situations, Communist domination was enforced by violence. Employees were beset by goon squads, and when that was not enough, employees were set against fellow-employees.

Considered in the light of Communist teachings the long-range revolutionary purpose behind all these happenings becomes quite clear.

Communist Lozovsky writes, "The final end of the strike struggle in the capitalist state is the destruction of the state apparatus."

In other words, the destruction of the American Government is the ultimate Communist aim.

Communist Olgin says: "The workers are on the march against the enemy. He who says there is unity of interest between employers and employees is committing treason to the working class."

To state it simply: The Communists hope to assume power by creating a civil war—by setting American against American, brother against brother.

The aim of the Communist Party is, and always has been, to create dissension, to create hatred, to divide and rule by the Russian method.

(Those of us who have heard from relatives in Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and Russian-occupied Germany know only too well how this works.)

This, then, is the history and the hidden purpose behind the era which a jury of 12 American citizens brought to an end by declaring Harold Christoffel guilty as charged.

Today we are on the verge of a new era. What does this mean?

It means that once again we have the opportunity of cementing our relationships at Allis-Chalmers on a sound, workable basis—a basis free from "isms" or considerations other than what is best for the security and prosperity of all of us. It means that we can live together in friendliness, with respect for the rights and dignity of each other.

Let us all, then, turn our backs upon the era just closed and confidently face the future together.

Aid to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by letter from Mrs. Maud Russell, executive director of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, that this organization was refused an opportunity to testify in opposition to the provisions for aid to China, which will be considered this week by Congress in conjunction with ERP or ECA.

I am sure it has been quite a shock to all of us to learn that the committee reported out the aid to China, Greece, and Turkey, without proper consideration or hearings being granted to all interested parties. It certainly is a bad precedent to bring legislation on the floor of the House which involves the expenditure of billions of dollars, and to deny to those in opposition an opportunity to be heard. I can understand the natural desire of the proponents to hide the shameful waste and military expenditures that have taken place under the so-called aid for the poor Chinese and the poor Greeks. How anyone can vote for a further expenditure to slaughter and kill off poor Chinese and Greek peasants is beyond me. Some wonder why the Chinese and Greek guerrilla forces are increasing. The answer is easy. These guerrillas are not Communists. They are opposing rotten, fraudulent, and corrupt governments in their countries, and every time you kill a guerrilla all his brothers, cousins, nephews, and uncles take up arms to avenge the death of one of their family. I dread to think how many years it will take for us to regain the love and respect of the Greek and Chinese people. We are now hated, despised, and cursed more than the British ever were, and I shall have no part of this militaristic program, which is aimed at the subjugation of a people who are rebuilding their economy and striving to clean out putrid political governments. When the Colonists had their Revolution they bitterly resented and hated the hired and paid German Hession legions that came to fight on the side of the British Tories. Cannot we understand that a political purge in Greece and China is long overdue? We have no business sticking our long nose into their affairs, or bringing our men and arms to take sides with the Tories in those countries.

The letter to Chairman EATON and the statement follow:

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC
FAR EASTERN POLICY,
New York, N. Y., March 12, 1948.

Mr. CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee, House Office Bulding, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EATON: As suggested by you in your letter of March 5, we now enclose a statement from the committee for inclusion in the RECORD of the Committee on Foreign Affairs' China-aid proceedings.

We also wish to go on record as protesting against the exclusion of any witnesses opposed to the China-aid program, and the exclusive hearing of people who not only favored the present plan but advocate direct military intervention.

Sincerely yours,

MAUD RUSSELL,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT ON PROPOSED AID TO CHINA PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, MARCH 12, 1948

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, with a membership composed of recognized Far Eastern experts, writers, correspondents, missionaries, and citizens interested in promoting better relations with the Far East, having been denied an opportunity to testify on aid to China before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, presents the following statement on its position for your record:

1. The program of aid to China as proposed to Congress by President Truman on February 18, 1948, does not really aid China or the Chinese people. It aids only the Chiang Kai-shek dictatorial regime and constitutes direct intervention in the civil war in China. Any aid given, according to the present proposal, would only be used to further civil war and aggravate the suffering of the Chinese people, as was admitted by President Truman when he said that the $570,000,000 grant would free Chinese Government dollar balances for other most urgent, i. e., military needs.

2. The proposal is a violation of the policy of our Government as formally put forward by President Truman himself in his statements on China of December 15, 1945, and December 18, 1946. These pledged noninterference in the internal affairs of China: that United States support would not extend to United States military intervention to influence the course of any Chinese internal strife; and that the United States would prepare to assist the National Government only as China moves toward peace and unity. The proposed new violation of the high-minded policies as stated by the head of our Government will cause a further deterioration of our country's prestige in the eyes of the Chinese people. They will be confirmed in the already too prevalent view, in China, that we are hypocrites, that our mouths drip honey while our hands dabble in the blood of Chinese men, women, and children, victims of a civil war that could not continue without our interference.

3. The war in China, contrary to the statements of our generals, is not one between communism and democracy. It is a conflict in which the Chinese people seek to free themselves from feudalistic oppression. Chiang Kai-shek has ruled China with an autocratic hand for more than 20 years, with no democratic elections, no democratic constitution, and no civil liberties. This rule has plunged the country into continuous chaos, corruption and civil war. Our support to Chiang's regime changes the United States, in the eyes of the Chinese people, from a peace-seeking, democratic country, to a defender and supporter of corruption and dictatorship obstructing their liberation from feudalism.

4. According to estimates made by this committee from published information, our government has given the Chiang Kai-shek government, since VJ-day, well over $4,000,000,000 in financial and military aid. Of the direct military aid, two figures have recently been revealed by the State Department:

Sale of 1,071 airplanes and training of Chinese air personnel, $300,000,000.

Other military aid from VJ-day to July 1947, $777,638,292.55.

These alone total over $1,000,000,000. It does not include the cost of training and arming a number of Chiang's divisions, the transfer of 271 ships, large quantities of surplus war materials, etc., since VJ-day.

Despite all this aid, Chiang's military, political, and economic situation is more desperate than ever. General Chennault, who considers the President's proposal insufficient and urges more military aid admits that "substantial portions of the equipment we have already furnished to China—tanks, artillery, machine guns and motors, equipment which needs a continuous supply of ammunition and parts to remain serviceable—have already fallen into the hands of the Communists." It is the considered opinion of this committee that as long as the Chinese government remains in the hands of Chiang Kai-shek's decaying regime, American help, in no matter what quantities, will be wasted or go to line the pockets of corrupt officials.

5. The sentiment of nationalism is particularly strong in China. Outside interference, from our country or from any other country, is bitterly resented. This committee realizes that further American intervention in China can only turn her entire population against us. The actions urged by our

generals will only result in our reaping a whirlwind of wrath, the wrath of Chinese nationalism.

6. This committee is interested in seeing prosperous trade relations develop between the United States and China. Under present circumstances, the idea of American businessmen that a virtually inexhaustible postwar market exists among 450,000,000 potential Chinese customers is fading rapidly. We believe that there will be no markets in China, for goods or investment, until the civil war ends and the good will of the Chinese people is restored. American aid to Chiang has already resulted in a statement by other parties—the Communists, the Democratic League, and the Kuomintang opposition center at Hong Kong—that they will repudiate the Sino-American commercial treaty and all loans to Chiang for civil war, and claim damages for such aid to him whenever they come to power. These parties constitute the already substantially victorious coalition that will make up China's future government. A China engaged in peaceful reconstruction, whatever her leadership, will need imports of machinery, goods, and technical skills from outside, many of which the United States alone is capable of providing in quantity. But United States aid to Chiang has already raised crises which must be settled before such future trade can begin. Making Chinese fearful of our interference in their internal affairs will tend to make them seek other trading partners wherever they can get them—unless we abandon the present policy.

7. If our Government continues to pursue its present course and acts according to the advice of some of our generals, the sending of American combat troops to China will inevitably follow. Even such frivolous and criminal sacrifice of American lives will, in the opinion of this committee, be ineffective in keeping Chiang in power. History shows that no external aid has ever preserved an unpopular, corrupt, and inefficient government against a people already in arms against it. We are already taking the first steps which may lead to American blood, as well as American dollars, being poured down the Chinese drain for purposes alien to the national feelings and real needs of rank-and-file Americans, whether workers, farmers, or businessmen.

Believing that our Government's China policy is both wasteful and harmful, we not only oppose any further aid to Chiang's regime but urge that we remain neutral as our own explicit promises and morality require; and subscribe to the principle that the management of internal affairs is the responsibility of the peoples of the sovereign nations, as publicly stated by President Truman on December 15, 1945.

We urge that no loans, no arms be supplied to China until the civil war is ended; that United States military personnel training and advising Chiang's forces be withdrawn, and that we let the Chinese people settle their own affairs, and act to restore once more the traditional friendship between them and ourselves.

Bonneville Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a statement made by me before the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations for Bonneville on March 19, 1948:

STATEMENT OF HOMER R. JONES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIRST DISTRICT, STATE OF WASHINGTON, TO THE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR BONNEVILLE, MARCH 19, 1948

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to thank you for the opportunity you have extended to me. I appear again this year in support of the construction and operating estimates of the Bonneville Power Administration. Further expansion of the facilities under this Administration as provided for in the budget estimates before this committee are vital to the economic welfare of the First District of the State of Washington, particularly the City of Seattle, for the Bonneville Power Administration has become the major wholesaler of power in the Pacific Northwest and the only hope for that district to secure sufficient electric energy to meet our increasing industrial and domestic needs. I have examined the Bonneville estimates now before you and I have compared these estimates with the so-called Tacoma agreement. I believe that the program submitted is a sound and businesslike listing which will produce benefits to the area as well as sizable revenues for the Treasury.

Last December the supplemental estimate of the Bureau of Reclamation was before this committee and you wisely added three more generating units at the Grand Coulee Dam, even though the budget submissions did not make this provision. It is the generation of power which provides the investment repayment to the Federal Government, especially those parts of the reclamation investment in the Grand Coulee project which cannot be returned by the sale of water for irrigation.

The Bremerton Navy Yard is a part of the Seattle district, although located across Puget Sound. The navy yard receives part of its power from the transmission facilities of the Bonneville Administration. The width of the sound precludes a direct overhead crossing; consequently, to reach the navy yard, overhead-transmission facilities must be routed up the Olympic Peninsula. Therefore, as part of the supply to the first district, the facilities extending from Covington to Olympia, to Shelton and thence to Bremerton, must be handled as if they were a direct line from the Covington terminus to Bremerton. Accordingly in this submission I am calling attention to the Covington-Olympia-Bremerton facilities as an item of superior priority. A part of this facility was constructed immediately after Pearl Harbor in order to handle the repairs needed following the treacherous attack of the Japanese. Last years' Interior bill contained items to supplement the supply into Bremerton, and the items included in the present estimate are a continuation of your past authorizations. From the record I understand that the previous grants by this committee were made on the understanding that the approved items were really a part of a continuing program. The line section between the existing Covington station and Olympia would be at 230,000 volts; at the latter point a transformation step-down will be made which will reduce the electrical pressure to 115,000 volts for transmission up to the Olympic Peninsula, with a branch to Bremerton.

TACOMA AGREEMENT

All the power-distributing agencies in the States of Oregon and Washington, public and private, are in complete agreement as to the urgency of the work included in the 1949 Bonneville estimate. This work should be completed as soon as possible in order to meet future developed loads and to relieve overloads on existing lines and substations. The Puget Sound Power & Light Co. is facing an extremely serious operating condition, and, in my opinion, needs additional interconnections over and above what is included in the submitted budget. Due to overloads, the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton is facing a low voltage condition which can only be corrected by the installations included in the 1949 submission.

LOADS

At present there are two 230,000-volt transmission lines extending from Grand Coulee Dam into the Puget Sound area which terminate in the Covington substation, located immediately south of the city limits of Seattle. During the peak season of last December these transmission lines handled 252,000 kilowatts into the Covington substation. Out of this 252,000 kilowatts delivered, 215,000 kilowatts served to augment the capacity of all existing public and private distributors in the area, and 37,000 kilowatts were transmitted out of Covington for use south of Puget Sound. By 1950 the supplemental supply needed in the Puget Sound area will reach 435,000 kilowatts; by 1953, 599,000 kilowatts; and by 1956, 835,000 kilowatts. This supplemental supply is over and above what will be constructed by the distribution agencies in the area. By 1950 the city of Seattle will have completed 60,000 kilowatts installation at the Gorge plant; by 1952, 180,000 kilowatts at the new Ross Dam; and by 1956 another Ross Dam installation of 180,000 kilowatts. This represents the largest non-Federal construction project in the entire Northwest, but, nevertheless, with this 420,000-kilowatt addition the area will still be 833,000 kilowatts deficient in meeting the required load. Therefore, it is obvious that facilities must be provided to move the additional Grand Coulee generation into the load center of the area of use. This can only be accomplished by scheduling all the facilities as a part of a composite set-up. I am mentioning this feature in order that the items applying to the Puget Sound area will have assembly consideration.

PUGET SOUND CO. ITEMS

As part of the facilities serving the city of Seattle, the Puget Sound Co. has a substation located at a point known as Beverly Park. This local distributing point is located north of Seattle in close proximity to the Snohomish facilities included in this estimate. Unfortunately the submitted estimate does not include items necessary to make a physical connection betwen the Bonneville Snohomish substation and the Beverly Park station of the Puget Sound Co. Two 115,000-volt transmission lines are needed to connect Snohomish with Beverly Park. These two lines are known as Beverly Park lines No. 1 and No. 2. The Beverly Park line No. 1 would represent a cash item of $170,000, and the No. 2 line $54,000, divided between $33,000 cash and $21,000 contract authorization. I understand that the Bonneville Power Administration has filed with the Budget Bureau an appeal for an amendment including these two items and I wish to urge your full consideration when and if these items reach you.

In like status is another interconnection item affecting the service of the Puget Sound Co., and that is known as the Covington substation terminal facility. The amount of this item now before the Budget Bureau is $45,000, of which $6,000 is cash and the balance contract authorization. The Covington substation facility is needed to provide a connecting point with one of the lines which the Puget Sound Co. will build to agument services into south Seattle.

As a part of my presentation I am submitting two exhibits, designated respectively exhibit A and exhibit B. Exhibit A covers the facilities located in whole or part within the Seattle district, while exhibit B covers those facilities needed to move the Grand Coulee generation from the Coulee Dam site to the borders of my district. Exhibit B represents items which are located outside

of my district but which are needed to enable the facilities within the district to function adequately. Exhibits A and B are electrically tied together, and neither one would be workable without the other. I urge that, in the consideration of the Bonneville estimates, the items I have listed in exhibits A and B be considered together.

Sawmill operators in northwest Washington as well as paper mill operators and other wood-product manufacturers are all urging the completion of the facilities I have listed in exhibits A and B. These private operators have found it necessary to defer the installation of larger plant units until the supplementary supply of continuous power can be guaranteed. The lumber, plywood, and cellulose plastic byproducts of these operations play an important part in our national program of housing construction. Lack of power for such operations consequently lowers the national production of requisite basic products and slows down the housing program, the effect of which is well known to all.

These points, as well as the Federal payout requirements, are, in my opinion, sufficient justification for continuing the proven investment in transmission lines necessary to move the large volume of Coulee generation to the point of use. Without such transmission, revenues will not accrue to make the full return on the Federal investment.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

From an examination of the Bonneville submission I find that an item of $3,700,000 is included to cover the expense of operating and maintaining these transmission facilities. The construction program necessary to reach critical shortage areas involves a sizable engineering staff. The large cut of last year materially reduced the size of the operation and maintenance organization. If the construction schedules are to be met and power relief made possible, then the operating allowance of $3,700,000 should be granted. I know that the staffs of the substations have been reduced to a point below safe limits. I therefore trust that this component of the estimate will be given special attention.

I appreciate the time you have given me to present the needs of the First Washington District. In order not to trespass further on time which is of extreme importance to you, I shall not attempt to read into the record the two schedules designated exhibit A and exhibit B which in summary form indicate the specific items which I feel personal responsibility to bring to your attention, but request, Mr. Chairman, that these schedules be made a part of the printed record of my testimony.

EXHIBIT A

FIRST WASHINGTON DISTRICT, 1949 FISCAL YEAR REGULAR INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUDGET, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

These cover budget items located in the first district:

Item	Cash	Contract authorization	Total
1. Covington-Olympia-Bremerton line and facilities	$250,000	$650,000	$900,000
2. Bremerton substation capacitors	5,000	75,000	80,000
3. Customers' metering	8,000	----------	8,000
4. Small facilities, located in first district	25,000	----------	25,000
Total	288,000	725,000	1,013,000

Item 1 covers Olympia line, Covington substation terminal, and Olympia substation additions. Needed to feed lines going into Bremerton. Necessary completion date, fall of 1950.

Item 2, 10,000 kilovolt-amperes of capacitors to correct voltage. Completion date, October 1949.

Item 3, metering equipment to measure customers' power flow.

Item 4, miscellaneous scattered additions to Puget Sound area facilities for protection purposes.

EXHIBIT B

FIRST WASHINGTON DISTRICT, 1949 FISCAL YEAR REGULAR INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUDGET, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Items listed below are located outside district No. 1 but are needed to bring power into the district. These are a part of the grid connections supplying the Seattle area.

Item	Cash	Contract authorization	Total
Grand Coulee-Snohomish line:			
No. 1	$4,000,000	$600,000	$4,600,000
No. 2	150,000	200,000	[1] 350,000
No. 3	750,000	696,000	[1] 1,446,000
No. 4	200,000	629,000	829,000
Columbia-Midway line No. 2	100,000	400,000	500,000
Midway-Goldendale line No. 5	200,000	600,000	800,000
Chehalis substation, additions	43,000	----------	43,000
Snohomish substation, additions	10,000	39,000	49,000
Ross substation, Vancouver	94,000	----------	94,000
Chehalis capacitors and terminals	25,000	225,000	250,000
Longview substation, additions	50,000	1,000,000	1,050,000
Midway substation, additions	150,000	----------	150,000
Communication facilities	50,000	----------	50,000
Tools and equipment, general	233,000	----------	233,000
Total	6,055,000	4,589,000	10,644,000

[1] Items on these projects included in supplemental estimate.

These specific items will be covered in the testimony of the Bonneville witnesses. The purpose of this exhibit is to identify those grid items which are located east and south of Seattle, but nevertheless are part of the supply system feeding into Seattle network.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the text of one of a series of most interesting broadcasts made over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., by Ann Su Cardwell:

In an address before the United States Senate January 22, 1917, the then President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, declared that a Poland "united, independent, and autonomous," must be restored. For almost 21 years following World War I, Poland enjoyed a status of independence. It does not enjoy that status today. Instead, and with an American President consenting to the aggression, Poland has undergone another partitioning and occupation, this time Soviet, and had a Soviet-controlled puppet regime forced upon her.

Betrayed and abandoned though they have been, neither the Poles at home nor the multitudes of Polish refugees scattered over the world have been shaken in their faith that the time will come when Poland will again be free. That is a belief in which right-thinking people everywhere must concur. It is a belief that must be shared by thoughtful students of history. For as Demosthenes so truly said, "It is not possible to found a lasting power on injustice, perjury, and treachery."

Losing their independence, Poles did not wait idly for another nation to hand it back to them. They threw themselves and all they had into the struggle to regain their rights as long as the armed conflict lasted. When that ended, they firmly stated their stand and continued the fight by informing the world of the true situation, while awaiting the turn of events giving Poland its opportunity.

Why is it that I believe the Poles are justified in demanding the restoration of a free and independent Poland with a western orientation? Why do I firmly believe that Poland will again achieve independence and that today's serfdom is only an unhappy interlude? I base my justification of those beliefs on eight aspects of Polish life and history that constitute Polish rights to national sovereignty. I list those rights as follows: geographical, ethnic, historical, cultural, political, heroic, moral, and functional. Today I shall discuss the first two of these rights—geographical and ethnical.

First then, the geographical right.

A nation must of necessity give national defense a place of first importance. In times past, natural frontiers were of immense advantage to countries possessing them. Poland is not among such favored lands; Poles realize only too sadly that geography has not been kind to them. The Carpathian Mountains provide a frontier on the south and the Baltic Sea would serve a similar purpose on the north if East Prussia should be politically united with Poland, of which it is geographically, economically, and to a certain extent ethnically a part. On the east and west there are no natural frontiers for Poland, excepting the partial break on the east by the marshes of Pinsk. However, in this age of aviation and mechanized warfare national security depends not upon natural frontiers but upon favorable alliances and modern armies.

Aside from the question of security, geography does in a way through the Polish river systems, based on the Vistula, make a unit of Poland, even of the Poland as it was before the 18th century partitions. Considering the fact that rivers were the world's first roads, determining population movements, market places, and settlements, this is an item to be taken into account.

Place names bear witness to early Polish possession of the Polish land. The western area is peppered with Slavic names as far as Hamburg. But Poles are not laying claim to territory on that extreme western fringe of Slavdom.

Geography, then, proves one thing very clearly. Poland is not a "state on wheels," to be shifted whenever and wherever it suits the plans of the aggressive and predatory neighbors. Poland is a definite place on the earth's surface.

Leaving the geographical aspect, let us turn to the Polish right from the ethnic, or national, standpoint. On ethnic grounds the Poles can make good not only on claims to the lands within the boundaries fixed by treaties following World War I, but to certain territories beyond those boundaries.

During the years between the two World Wars, when the Germans were demanding the return of the so-called Polish Corridor, many Americans, misled by German or other unfriendly propaganda, refused to believe that this corridor and the German provinces to the south of it were the cradle of the Polish people, though this was a fact well established by historians and archaeologists. Here is a bit of proof supplied by archaeology. The report of a teacher who had

noticed a peculiar hewn beam sticking up out of the waters in Lake Biskupin, some 45 miles from Ponzan, led to the discovery of one of the most perfectly preserved prehistoric towns in all Europe. A hundred or so dwellings within a strongly fortified enclosure had been uncovered when the work was interrupted by the 1939 German invasion. Floors of the dwellings and the log-paved streets were just as they had been when the inhabitants, forced by the lake's rising waters, abandoned their homes, leaving behind all sorts of household utensils, tools, toys, and decorative article. It was my good fortune to spend an afternoon in mid-August 1939 in company of the archaeologist in charge of the excavations and hear him tell the story of this ancient community and explain the significance of the finds, which have made it possible for archaeologists to fix the date and determine the racial character of the settlement. This earlier settlement—for after the first flooding had subsided centuries later the place was again inhabited—is fixed at roughly 700 B. C. And on each occasion the settlers were Slavs. Every article found was Slavic in form and fashion, and one architectural feature of these ancient dwellings occurs in many Polish peasant cottages today.

In the area west of the Vistula River and north of Silesia, 27 prehistoric sites similar to that of Biskupin had been discovered by the autumn of 1939. Where excavations had been begun, the findings of Biskupin were confirmed, providing indisputable evidence of residence and possession of this area first by ancestors of the Poles and then by the Poles, since prehistoric days.

In the tenth century A. D. central and eastern Europe were inhabited by a large number of Slavic tribes. One of these, the Polanie, had ceased by this time to be merely a tribe and had become the nucleus of the nation Poland—land of the fields. In fact all the tribes inhabiting what later became Poland were related, fundamentally one people. The Germans never left off their pressure toward the east, but so tenacious were the Poles that the line which became the western frontier of the Polish kingdom in 1320 remained, with subsequent fluctuations, the western Polish boundary throughout the life of the Polish commonwealth and became that of restored Poland in 1919.

In the districts not purely Polish, that is to the east, northeast, and southeast, large sections have been ethnically Polish for hundreds of years. The Poles succeeded, where the native populations had failed, in repelling recurrent devastating invasions from the east, and in providing security through Polish settlements in those sparsely inhabited areas, and thus the Polish ethnic right was established on a footing at least equal with the rights of the kindred Slavic peoples native to the regions. However, the justice and propriety of including the easternmost rim of Polish territory in the Polish state are based even more on other grounds which will be discussed at a later time.

Since Poland lies at the crossroads of Europe, the blood of many European peoples flows in Polish veins. Manifestly that has had its effect upon customs, culture, and mentality. But the Polish cultural core has assimilated all these foreign elements, and the Polish life and tradition have remained throughout history fundamentally Polish, reserving a solidarity and a unity that false boundaries have never been able to destroy. The Polish Nation is in a very special way an ethnic unity and as such it has ethnic rights.

In this brief talk I have tried to make two points for Poland's right to independence—the geographical and the ethnic right.

Capital Needs for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, part of this year's program of the House Small Business Committee has been the study of capital needs for small business.

A Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, consisting of Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, chairman, Representative FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER, of Pennsylvania, and Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, are conducting the study.

Their first hearing was in Boston, Mass. The Wall Street Journal wrote a very good account of the hearing. I am extending it, so that every Member of the House may have the privilege of reading it.

IT NEEDS MORE CAPITAL TO FINANCE GROWTH—ASKS LIGHTENED TAX BURDEN—NEW ENGLANDERS HIT BY LACK OF LONG-TERM CREDIT—OLD FIRM FACES FORCED SALE—CROSS-COUNTRY HEARINGS BEGIN

(By Lester Smith)

BOSTON.—Small-business men have their own ideas about how to entice more capital for their expanding operations.

They say: Ease the tax burden on little firms; eliminate double taxation of dividends (first, a tax on the business; then on the stockholder who gets a dividend); provide more liberal depreciation allowances on plant and equipment.

These three suggestions stood out among the several recommended by more than a dozen small-business men who assembled to tell their troubles before members of a House Small Business Subcommittee. This group, concerned about an apparent scarcity of capital for the little fellows, held the first of a series of hearings in Boston this week. Another will be convened at Atlanta next week, and others—perhaps 10 in all—will be conducted in various parts of the country, as far west as Denver.

NO GOVERNMENT FUNDS SOUGHT

One thing stood out: The businessmen want no financial support from the Government; they simply want more favorable tax conditions.

The need for more funds was clearly evident from the tales told by New Englanders at the meeting here. For example:

A fish-packing enterprise has boosted its sales 100 times in its 6-year history, but hasn't been able to save needed working capital because of high taxes.

A maker of heaters is about to sell his business because he can't obtain long-term capital.

A chinaware maker wants to build his own pottery, but he can't raise the money to do so.

A manufacturer of plastic contact lenses had to turn to nonbank sources for needed capital.

Heading the subcommittee making the tour is GOP Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York, accompanied by two committee colleagues and representatives of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Department of Commerce, and Internal Revenue Bureau.

Representative RIEHLMAN has recognized the financing problems confronting small business. Short-term credit is available to nearly every healthy business at rates ranging from 5 to 6 percent, he declared at the opening of the Boston session, but long-term credit is unavailable from banks because of regulations which require that the bulk of bank assets be kept in liquid condition.

A BILL FOR $25,000 TAX CREDIT

Some of those at the Boston hearing favored a bill recently introduced by Representative W. C. PLOESER, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, which would exempt from corporate taxation the first $25,000 of earned income, provided the money be reinvested in the business. In fact, chief effect of the small-business hearings is expected to be support for some kind of corporate tax reduction.

It may be, stated Representative RIEHLMAN, that the crux of the problem lies in a faulty tax structure wherein a large percentage of small companies' earnings are drained off to meet taxes. He saw a possible repetition of a trend of the 1930's when companies changed over to partnership and single proprietorships to sidestep double taxation as corporations.

A down-east Yankee, Vice President Paul Jacobs, of North Atlantic Packing Co., of Bar Harbor, described his troubles.

North Atlantic Packing was formed in 1942 with an invested capital of $2,100 for canning Maine crabs. The business has since grown to include canned mussels and a complete canned seafood meal. The company was unable to borrow funds needed to finance incoming orders and turned to the New England Industrial Development Corp. for assistance. The latter helps small business concerns to obtain needed capital from individuals who are interested in investing in situations where they feel their particular experience will prove valuable.

The firm's invested capital has increased 30 times and sales 100 times in the 6 years of its existence. But no dividends have been paid, although earnings on the common stock have been as high as $30 a share. So the company has been unable to build up working capital because of high taxes.

A CASE OF TIGHT BANK CREDIT

Bank credit is getting so tight, stated Mr. Jacobs, that recently a Boston bank, with which the company has had satisfactory relations, refused to discount an invoice with a bill of lading on the United States Army.

The company will need a line of credit, Mr. Jacobs explained, because in the period May 1 to September 30, $300,000 worth of merchandise will be turned out; all will be sold before being produced.

Holyoke Heater Corp., manufacturer of gas heaters, could have obtained credit from one source, but it would have had to pay 25-percent interest, Government men were told by Minot Edwards, who owns the company. The problem of working capital has been serious because the concern was in receivership when acquired at the end of the war. Because of the difficulty of obtaining long-term capital, Mr. Edwards is about to sell the company, which has been in business for 50 years.

RFC officials at the Boston hearing were impressed by Mr. Edwards' desire to continue as a small businessman and invited him to place his problem before the Government agency before concluding the sale.

Sheffield China Co., of Cambridge, Mass., a distributor of chinaware, would like to construct its own pottery, but it can't raise the necessary $75,000 to $100,000, President

S. R. Taylor told the committee. The company operates at a small profit, but liquid assets are largely represented by inventory and can't be used to buy machinery.

NEITHER SUBSIDIES NOR LOBBIES

Small business does not seek charity in the form of subsidies nor does it maintain lobbies, and unless it is given an opportunity to grow by its own efforts, it won't survive, stated A. D. Bach, president of the New England Metallurgical Corp. He favored the $25,000 earnings exemption as a tax credit for money plowed back into the business, also more liberal depreciation allowances and elimination of double taxations.

Lack of venture capital nearly stifled the growth of Mullen Laboratories of Boston, which began in 1938 to produce an all-plastic contact lens. If the firm had failed, a lens which now has large acceptance might have been lost, according to Mrs. E. P. Mullen, a company official.

Late in 1946, Mrs. Mullen stated, the company turned unsuccessfully to banks for venture capital to develop a new type of lens. The money was finally provided by another source. The new lens is now in production and has been enthusiastically received, Mrs. Mullen declared.

The New England Industrial Development Corp. is a private company which seeks to help manufacturers solve problems relating to new products, markets, and finance. According to William L. Stoddard, its president, it has been successful in the past year in getting people with capital to buy stock in small companies. But they only do so, he pointed out, on condition that they participate in the business in an official capacity.

Between 50 percent and 75 percent of the cases of equity capital deficiency in small industry could be met and cured if 5- to 10-year loans were available, Mr. Stoddard said.

Further hearings by the House subcommittee are scheduled for next Monday in Atlanta, Tuesday in Jacksonville; and in April hearings will be held in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Milwaukee, Kansas City, Omaha, Minneapolis, Denver, and Dallas.

Russian Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the New York Times of Tuesday, March 23, written by Hanson W. Baldwin, regarding Russian air power:

WITH LARGE SUPPORT-TYPE AIR FORCE, RUSSIA NOW IS BUILDING BOMBER UNITS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Soviet Air Force is probably operating about 14,400 planes, about 8,200 of them combat types, according to best available estimates. There are probably at least 10,000 other planes—most of them, however, obsolete—in reserve and storage.

The exact strength and capabilities of the Russian air power are among the enigmas of the greater enigma which is Russia; but enough reliable estimates have filtered from behind the iron curtain to fix the strength within a fairly wide range.

There is no doubt that Russian air power is numerically strong and that major and increasing efforts have been made since the war to improve it quantitatively and qualitatively. There is also some—although as yet inconclusive—evidence that the wartime Russian concept of air power that envisaged the plane purely as an auxiliary for close support of the ground army is undergoing modification and that attempts are being made to build up a long-range strategic bomber force.

In any case, there is no doubt that Russia is building heavy bombers. The newest ones are almost a copy of our Boeing B–29's, several of which came into Russian hands during the war.

More than 50 B–29-type aircraft have been seen at one time in Russia, and others at different airfields seen almost simultaneously indicate that Russia had, late last year, at least 175 of these planes. It is possible, although improbable, that Russia has manufactured as many as 1,000; 200 to 400 would seem to be closer to the actual number.

DESIGN VARIED SLIGHTLY

Some slight changes appear to have been made by Russian designers in the original American version. The contour of the Russian "29" narrows down toward the tail, and it seems likely that the Russian version is somewhat lighter than our own and may have slightly greater range.

Just how the Russians expect to use these planes is not yet clear. The Soviet air force is organized in six air armies, one to support each of the six ground armies. One report, unverified, has indicated that the sixth air army, formerly in the Far East, is being reorganized to become a long-range strategic striking force, something that the Russians have not hitherto possessed.

In addition to their new long-range bombers, the Russians have developed a number of new jet aircraft. At least six or seven different types have been seen in Russia, all of them fighters or light bombers.

Many German aeronautic experts are working for Russia, and the Russians captured in Germany at least one model like our XS–1, an experimental plane that recently flew at supersonic speeds. The Russians also have flown types similar to the German jet Me–262, and another type with swept-back wings. Their jet experimentation and development may be, with the help of the German experts, almost equal to our own; their production is believed to be greater.

The bulk of the Soviet air force, however, is still composed of close-support types—fighters, fighter-bombers, light and medium bombers—many of them of obsolescent design. The Russian version of close support emphasizes the word "close"; the Russians do not have—or, at any rate, did not have—a concept of "isolation of the battlefield" such as our Air Force implemented with such success in Normandy. Russian air attack was usually limited to the battlefield and 15 to 20 miles behind it.

The Russians have a great number of day fighters, but they are particularly weak in night fighters, anti-aircraft control, fighter control, air warning systems and radar.

However, they have been making great attempts, with the German help, since the war to overtake the Anglo-American lead in electronics, and it is significant that one of the main targets of the Canadian spy ring was radar.

One other indication of what may be a major trend in the Soviet Air Force is the considerable increase in the war and postwar years of Russian transport craft. The Russians are supposed to have a large number of trained airborne troops—perhaps 100,000—and included in their 14,400 operating aircraft may be some 2,000 transports, most of them of the short-range C–47 type.

The Russians have some planes of the C–54, B–29 and other types, with range enough—theoretically, at least—to raid the northwestern area of the United States from bases in Kamchatka and return.

If they were willing to undertake one-way suicide raids—which is unlikely because of the limited number of long-range bombers available—Soviet B–29's would be able to reach many parts of the United States.

Russian aircraft production is an unknown figure, but the Soviet maximum output during the war was 40,000 to 50,000 planes. This figure is misleadingly large, since it cannot be compared in airframe weight with the United States wartime production. Practically none of the Russian wartime production represented four-engine planes; most of it represented single-engine craft.

Today a "guestimate" of the Soviet output is 6,000 to 12,000 planes a year, of which perhaps 500 are four-engined bomber-type aircraft and 1,000 to 2,000 are jets.

There are probably 400,000 to 500,000 men in the Soviet Air Force. A sizable number are long term regulars; the rest are conscripted for 3 years.

In general, the Soviet air arm is noteworthy, like the Soviet army, chiefly for its numerical strength, particularly in day fighters, but there has been considerable qualitative and technological improvement, still continuing, in the postwar years.

Don't Give Up the Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I request the following article, appearing in the New York Times today, be inserted in the RECORD.

It is wholly inexplicable to me why the House Foreign Affairs Committee should insert in the ERP bill the provision for foreign charter of our ships, when the Senate, after due deliberation, struck this provision from the bill, and when, by unanimous vote, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which knows most about this subject, a few weeks ago reported in strong language against it. The Maritime Commission has now spoken out in unmistakable terms, as indicated by the following article:

COMMISSION FIGHTS TRANSFER OF SHIPS—MARITIME GROUP WARNS PLAN TO SHIFT VESSELS TO ALIENS WOULD SCUTTLE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

The Maritime Commission has taken a strong position against the proposed transfer of American ships to foreign nations under the European recovery program, warning that carrying out of the plan would scuttle the American merchant marine.

A 9,000-word statement on the subject, in the form of a letter to Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, was made public in New York last night at the Commission's district headquarters at 45 Broadway. The statement declared that "today it is the American merchant marine, not the shipping of the 16 nations, which needs help and protection if it is to survive."

Mr. LODGE had asked for a report on the Commission's position.

OPERATION SEEN AS VITAL

"Instead of any further vessel transfers abroad, whether permanent or temporary, it is therefore vital that the American merchant marine be assured at least of continua-

tion of its present participation in trans-Atlantic aid shipments, when the European recovery plan begins to operate," the Commission replied.

"The United States Maritime Commission, duty bound to warn against a plan under which, in the effort to help 16 nations, a vital arm of our national defense and an essential industry would be sacrificed, strongly opposes the ship transfer provisions of the 16-nation plan."

The letter pointed out that 1,504 large American ships have been turned over to foreign nations since the end of the war in Europe and declared that the wartime losses of the participating nations—those to receive ships under the plan—have been replenished, with the exception of special type vessels of which there is no surplus in the American fleet.

IMMEDIATE, LONG-RANGE DAMAGE

The Commission declared that its opposition to further transfers was based on "the unanimous conviction" of the five Commissioners that immediate and long-range damage would accrue to the merchant marine.

"We find that the growth of the fleets of the 16 nations has been estimated very conservatively while the shipping requirements have been estimated very liberally," the statement continued. "We find, too, that the 16 nations do not make the best use of the ships they have, and do not need the ships they ask for. Moreover, we find that any dollar savings on transportation, while permitting larger purchases of American goods, will save the taxpayer nothing at all and will not reduce the cost of the aid program to the American people, but, through loss of taxes and charter hire of Government ships to American operators, will actually increase it."

The statement, the most forthright made on the subject by the maritime agency, charged that the ERP recipient nations want vessels turned over to them which would fit into their long-range shipping plans, and not solely for the purpose of carrying recovery program cargoes.

Transfer of 500 ships either by sale or charter was originally sought in the early stages of the ERP consideration by Congress. The proposal was then dropped, and was revived last week with an amendment that would afford the aided nations 200 vessels under charter.

The Commission's statement yesterday said the 16-nation request was for between 100 and 170 ships averaging 10,000 deadweight tons.

A Program for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, March 12, 1948, on the subject of a program for China for which we appropriated money in the China aid bill:

A PROGRAM FOR CHINA

In the efforts to oppose communism in China almost everything has been tried except doing something for the Chinese people. The people have had so little that is desirable from their Government that they no longer give it their trust. To use an ancient Chinese expression, the Government has "lost the mandate of heaven." As a result the people have no enthusiasm for aiding the Government in fighting the Reds. Under present conditions many billions of dollars in arms and other supplies could be given to the armies of Nanking by the United States without producing a united and completely independent China.

The United States could aid in resisting communism in China with some hope of success only if a means could be found to help the Nanking Government acquire again the popular support it once had. The current proposals for large gifts to the Chinese would be far more attractive—no matter whether only economic or both military and economic support is considered—if they included sizable appropriations to help the Chinese people in Government territory actually win some of the benefits in the way of improved living conditions, health, education, and local democracy that the Communists so persistently promise in their propaganda. This idea, on first consideration, may seem utopian. It is not. There is a sound and tested program, devised and tried out by Chinese within China, that could be put to use if the American Congress would finance it and if the Chinese Government would give it the wholehearted support—to the extent of discharging any official who interfered with it—that the program would require for success.

The program is that developed in mass education and rural reconstruction centers in China over a period of 25 years by James Y. C. Yen and his colleagues. It is a program in which mass education is used to reduce illiteracy as the first step in a coordinated plan. The other parts of the plan are designed to produce a greatly increased income from farming (through use of better seeds, cooperative credit organizations, etc.), to rid farming areas of debilitating diseases (through training laymen for preventive work), and to create democratic governments on the village and county level.

Wherever the program has been given a fair trial, with strong Government support, the results have been excellent. In some areas it has nearly doubled the income of peasants—and peasants make up more than three-quarters of the population of China. Before the start of the Sino-Japanese War it seemed possible that the Yen program would remake all of China within a generation or two. Unfortunately the work was halted during the war in many regions as a result of Japanese interference or the growing power of Chinese reactionaries in the Kuomintang Party.

If the mass education and rural reconstruction program could be started again on a major scale in China, the intellectuals of the country, now extremely critical of the National Government, could be given a great cause for which to work. They could be enlisted in large numbers—for this has been demonstrated in the past. China would thus recruit for valuable employment some of the most able men in her population—the liberals to be found in the universities and other centers of intellectual activity—who now do little except sit around condemning the corruption or inefficiency of some of the men who rule China.

The cost would not be great. The total cost of teaching a Chinese to read and write under the system devised by Mr. Yen is only an American dollar. The total cost of economic and social reconstruction in a Chinese county is only $5 per capita. There have been estimates that $180,000,000 would be enough to finance the program for a period of 3 years, during which 30,000,000 young people would be trained. This estimate may be too low—it certainly would be best to err on the side of generosity in financing such a program—but it seems apparent that the cost of economic and social reconstruction in China would be only a fraction of the sums currently suggested for military assistance.

One of the American political leaders interested in opposing communism in China might well introduce in Congress a bill to provide for mass education and economic and social reconstruction in that country. The legislation might provide that control of the project be given to a commission composed of Chinese and Americans with a Chinese chairman. Such a bill would add an affirmative proposal well worth support, to the negative and essentially defensive measures now under consideration. Why not do something affirmative about China while a little time remains? Why not attack communism in China by offering full bowls of rice and good health and democratic government instead of attacking it with guns alone?

The New Deal Responsibility for the Present International Confusion and Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on Wednesday, March 24, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Because we have lived in crisis and fear for nearly two decades, we lack the stability to appraise historic values.

Cowardice is not caution, it is lack of character; it is egotism degenerated to egocentricity. It is cowardice rather than principle that controls policy in this country now. It is not the caution of statesmanship in the face of great events; it is the petty fear of those who dare not meet oblivion. It is not national; it is personal.

Let us analyze Palestine and Trieste as examples of the pursuit of opportunity rather than adherence to principle.

The Palestine problem arises out of the Balfour declaration in 1917. Therefore, there has been ample time to formulate a policy which is based either upon high principle, self-interest, or a combination of both. Up to 1945, the United States ostensibly supported the general purposes of the Balfour declaration, which recognized the establishment in Palestine of a national home.

The British in 1939 offered, in a white paper, a solution to that problem which actually was as good, if not superior, to the partition plan of the United Nations. This 1939 plan was rejected by American Zionists, who led in opposition to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who, as world head of the Zionists, was willing to accept it.

The then President of the United States, who exerted an unparalleled influence over American Jewry, played a double game, supporting both the Jewish and British positions with such skill as only he could display.

Subsequently war came and went. The Arabs were generally pro-Nazi, but the British, viewing the complicated problems of their waning empire, courted them. Mr. Roosevelt then supported both the Jews and the Arabs so ingeniously that he kept for himself the support of the American Jews on election day, while he assisted the Arabs to re-create a universal state, financed by American money and credits.

Harry Truman inherited this situation and viewed it strictly in terms of an American election issue. He wanted to preserve the economic advantages of our association with the Arab universal state, whereas George Marshall wanted to maintain rigidly the diplomatic and military alliance with Great Britain which is the basis of his policy. But they did not wish to antagonize the Jewish vote in big cities.

The partition plan was put over by the United States on the assumption that it would assist Truman to be reelected. As soon as Harry Truman's calculators were assured that not only would he not carry New York State, but that Henry Wallace would probably get more votes in New York City than Truman, the President and his amazing Secretary of State decided to kill partition, which they have done—killing the last vestige of UN authority along with it.

Their only excuse for killing partition is that they cannot put it over, largely because they fear an international force lest the Russians demand representation on it equal to that of the United States. Were such a force composed of citizens of countries other than the United States and Russia, it would undoubtedly include soldiers from behind-the-iron-curtain countries. Having no desire to face that issue, they junk the Charter of the United Nations. Is this the time and the way to abandon it?

Again, Trieste was an Italian city with a mixed population, including Yugoslavs. It should have remained Italian, but to placate Stalin and Tito, we endangered the national existence of Italy, threatened the peace of the Mediterranean, and imperiled France by making Trieste a "free territory" under a governor general appointed by the United Nations.

The "free territory" is now junked and the Italians, on the eve of an election, are encouraged to believe that Trieste will be returned to them. This is, of course, an election bribe and may be wonderful policy.

Manchuria and Ethiopia killed the League of Nations. Palestine and Trieste can kill the United Nations just as effectively.

Is that the way the administration in Washington wants it? If so, why not simply withdraw from the UN and say that it was all a mistake? That would make more sense than the immature, opportunistic conduct of the past 6 months.

Vote That Represents the Overwhelming Majority Sentiment of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, Wednesday, March 24, 1948:

VETO OR NO VETO—CUT TAXES

"We have been taking calculated risks for the benefit of all the rest of the world. Let us today take a calculated risk for the benefit of the American people."

The above advice was thundered to the United States Senate Monday by Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, Colorado, in the course of the closing debate on the Federal income-tax reduction bill.

Shortly thereafter, a vote was taken, and the bill passed by the overwhelming score of 78 to 11, or 14 more votes than would be needed to override a Presidential veto.

The Truman administration forces, determined as usual to bail out and butter up foreign nations rather than lift a finger to help the American people, fought the tax-reduction bill to the last ditch. But when the last ditch was reached only a corporal's guard of die-hards was found in it.

Plenty of long-time administration supporters went over to the Republican side when the vote was taken, including Senators CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, Florida; SCOTT LUCAS, Democrat, Illinois; LISTER HILL, Democrat, Alabama; and JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana. The affair was described by some political analysts as the worst defeat yet suffered in Congress by the Truman administration.

The seriousness of the setback was emphasized in the shrieks of despair with which Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, Texas, closed the debate for the minority side and announced that he was voting against tax cuts and against what is thought to be the sentiment of the American people.

Well, what does this bill provide? Overall, it maps a total reduction of $4,800,000,000 in Federal income taxes to be paid for the year 1948.

The measure cuts taxes by 12.6 percent in the lowest brackets and by 5 percent in the highest. It jacks up the present $500 personal and dependency exemption to $600—meaning that if the bill becomes law, some 7,400,000 wage earners can stop paying any Federal income taxes at all—until and unless taxes are raised again.

Under this bill, too, husbands and wives are permitted to split incomes for tax purposes, regardless of who makes the money for the family, and thus avoid the higher brackets. This is the so-called community property principle, long incorporated in the laws of various southwestern States, and tracing, we believe, to oldtime Spanish statutes predating the Mexican War. If we're correct in that belief, then God bless the bones of those old Spaniards, wherever they may rest.

The bill also makes an important adjustment in the estate and gift tax laws—rather complicated, but we think desirable.

It is confidently predicted by backers of the bill that it will pass the House overwhelmingly; and that if high tax Harry Truman vetoes the measure his "no" will be overridden by the necessary two-thirds majorities in both Houses of Congress.

Senator TAFT, of Ohio, had predicted that Mr. Truman might try a fast play, by timing a demand for additional national defense appropriations to coincide with the tax bill furor. And yesterday's development made TAFT look like a shrewd hombre when the Joint Chiefs of Staff put in a bid for two to ten billions.

We hope Congress will refuse to let itself be intimidated or stampeded by any such administration play as that. The Nation is already spending around eleven billions a year on its defense set-up. If it isn't getting a pretty darned big and efficient bill of goods for that amount of money, then some darned big and searching investigations by Congress are in order.

The fundamental fact in this whole tax debate, it seems to us, is that the existing Federal income tax rates are too high for the continued health of our economic system.

These taxes are draining away venture capital which would otherwise go into new business enterprises or expansion of existing ones. They are leading more and more people to wonder what is the use in working so hard when you are actually laboring from one-fifth to more than one-half of the time for the Government.

That kind of taxation can cripple the strongest and wealthiest country in time; and it is beginning to get into the nerves and muscles of Uncle Sam. The time has come to start reversing this trend, and we hope Congress will take the first step by making the $4,800,000,000 tax cut bill a law, veto or no veto.

Don't Tread on Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald, March 21, 1948:

DON'T TREAD ON ME

Before the first flag of the United States was raised at Cambridge on January 2, 1776, the Revolutionary flag which was most nearly national in its make-up was the so-called rattlesnake flag which showed a coiled rattler, ready to spring. The snake had 13 rattles, symbolic of the Colonies, and the legend on the flag read "Don't tread on me."

Great Britain was on an imperialistic fling under a tyrannical King at that point in history. It was audacious for 13 infant colonies to liken themselves to the deadly rattler, but the faith and courage behind the principles which bound those colonies together into one effective instrument were far more powerful than any power which the great monarch in London could land on distant shores. The bite of the rattler proved deadly enough to bring freedom to a great continent.

Tyranny is on the march again in war-weary Europe. Under different names it marched in 1914, and again in 1939. Europe, worn with paths beaten by tyrants from ancient times, failed to unite after World War I to assure that it wouldn't happen again. It held to its nationalistic divisions only to promote the weakness which invites tyrannical adventure. Only within weeks, after the new imperialists had proved beyond question the insatiability of their appetites, have the western European states finally moved toward more practical union. Five of them have outlined a defense agreement, while sixteen are cooperating economically under the Marshall plan.

But we must not fool ourselves. These countries are much less able to defend themselves today than they were when we came to their assistance during Hitler's march up the hill and down again. They can be of immeasurable assistance, but the bulwark of anti-Communist power in the world is right here in the United States. It would be the height of folly for them to defy the stalking Russian bear in the absence of our support. There could be no courageous anti-Communist governments in France or Italy, fighting the underhand methods of Soviet agents, if the United States was to let them go it alone. There could be no defying of the nearby and threatening Soviet power by the premiers of those fine Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, if they did not know real strength was on their side. Men who love freedom will have the courage to fight everywhere so long as America, the citadel of liberty, makes clear its intentions and shows the will and means to back them up. The underground will grow in the Balkans and Poland. Czechs, undaunted by the Hitler legions, will vex the Communist tyrants until the bear tastes hornets in its honey.

Free Europe, backed by the United States, is saying in no uncertain terms, "Don't tread on me." It is saying it with actions as well as with words. And we have said it, too. Speaking for freedom at Berkeley, Calif., on Friday, Secretary Marshall paraphrased the Revolutionary slogan in the following words:

"It should now be perfectly clear that rule based on threats and force instead of on reason and justice must not be allowed to spread further unchecked."

The Kremlin should realize that now the whole freedom-loving world is arrayed against it. One more step and the serpent may spring. It won't be Italy, France, or Sweden that Russia will be stepping upon, but the undying principle of freedom itself.

The Scrap-Hoarding Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following press release:

THE SCRAP-HOARDING SCANDAL

Speaking for the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., Mr. C. Monteith Gilpin, secretary, stated: "The shocking revelation that German industrialists are hoarding more than 10,000,000 tons of scrap metal in the face of the crucial world shortage, is another glaring example of the efforts by the Germans to sabotage European recovery."

Mr. Gilpin added that certain high officials in the American military government who are obsessed with the idea that the rebuilding of German heavy industry take priority over the rehabilitation of her neighbors are partly responsible for this scandalous condition.

In this connection Mr. Gilpin demanded the removal of all officials whose record indicates that they would not hesitate to scuttle the European recovery program in favor of the rebuilding of a strong Germany. Text of the full statement follows:

"The shocking revelation that German industrialists are hoarding more than 10,000,000 tons of scrap metal in the face of a crucial world shortage is another glaring example of the efforts by the Germans to sabotage European recovery. Undoubtedly, this scandalous condition would not have arisen if Allied authorities who are responsible for the economic developments in Germany were not obsessed with the idea that the rebuilding of German heavy industry must take priority over the rehabilitation of her neighbors."

While American plans for European recovery placed great emphasis on the maximum utilization of all resources in Europe, these officials continue to pursue policies which undermine the efforts of western Europe toward that end. As early as October 1945 one of the top economic officials of the AMG, Mr. Don C. Humphrey, recommended the bypassing of allied policy regarding the delivery of Ruhr coal to her neighbors. Mr. Humphrey acted as though the rebuilding of German heavy industry was far more important than the rehabilitation of her victims. In like manner, key Government officials have moved heaven and earth to prevent the delivery of Germany's surplus capital reparations to the nations that were ravaged by the German war machine. It is, therefore, not surprising that the eight-man commission appointed by the Secretary of Commerce to survey the scrap situation in Germany should discover this great hoard of vital raw material necessary for the steel industries of the nations of western Europe as well as the United States.

There is no possible justification for permitting German industrialists to hoard such vast quantities of scrap metal. Estimates reveal that German steel plants have as much as 6 months' supply on hand, in contrast to the 2 to 3 weeks' supply in American steel mills.

But the scrap-metal crisis is just as acute in the nations of western Europe, as revealed by the report of the 16-nation conference on the Marshall plan. They asked for a yearly delivery of about 2,000,000 tons of scrap for their steel industries. This has been refused by the United States because of the serious scrap situation in this country.

The present economic crisis in western Europe is largely due to the disastrous policy of withholding Ruhr coal, German reparations as well as scrap metal—all vital materials for the rehabilitation of the war-torn economies of the liberated nations. Moreover, it has compelled our Government to call upon the taxpayer to render additional help. We are convinced that the load of the American taxpayer will increase in direct proportion to the efforts of some of our policy makers to reconstitute Germany's industrial war potential at the expense of her neighbors. This must stop now.

What are we going to do to release the scrap metal hoard in Germany and to effect its utilization among the Marshall-plan nations?

How can we expect the western nations of Europe to produce to capacity when we permit the Germans to withhold these vital raw materials?

And why do our officials continue to tolerate this situation? In western Germany there exists a steel capacity of 20,000,000 tons, 9,000,000 of which are surplus in accordance with the new level of industry plan.

Why is this surplus not delivered to Germany's victims?

Have some of our officials given assurances to German industrialists that the total 20,000,000 tons will be retained in Germany?

Does this explain German defiance of American policy for the rehabilitation of western Europe?

It is our considered judgment that the European recovery program will be undermined if the following measures are not taken at once:

1. Delivery of the millions of tons of scrap metal both to western Europe and the United States as reparations.

2. Immediate delivery of the 9,000,000 tons of German surplus steel capacity to the nations of western Europe.

3. The removal of all officials whose record indicates that they would not hestitate to scuttle the European recovery program in favor of the rebuilding of a strong Germany.

Illinois Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention an outline of various laws which have been enacted by the legislature of the great State of Illinois in behalf of veterans and their dependents, compiled by George Brown, State adjutant, and Warren Wright, State commander, department of Illinois, Disabled American Veterans, 155 North Clark Street, suite 1620, Chicago 1, Ill.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not fully aware of the valuable rights, preferences, privileges, and exemptions available to them, and I am, therefore, hopeful that this résumé will come to their attention.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONUS

Payment has been authorized to World War II veterans who served honorably from September 16, 1940, to September 3, 1945. The minimum payment is $50 and shall be made on the basis of $10 per month for domestic duty and $15 per month for foreign duty. Veteran must have been a resident at time of entering such service and must have served at least 60 days. Any person on active duty on September 2, 1945, may, for the purpose of qualifying for minimum payment, receive credit for such service thereafter, but only prior to November 1, 1945.

In case of death of eligible veterans, next-of-kin may be paid sum to which deceased would have been entitled. If death occurred while serving in the military forces between September 16, 1940, and September 3, 1945, and was service connected, the law provides for payment of $900 to next-of-kin, regardless of length of service of deceased. Remarried widows are not entitled to payments, according to present ruling, which is being contested in the courts. Divorce, prior to death of eligible veteran, will bar surviving spouse from any claim. Deadline for applications is July 1, 1949.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Burial expenses not to exceed $150 may be granted on basis of need.

Appointment may be made of suitable persons to have charge of the burial of indigent veterans of World War II, their mothers, fathers, wives, widows, or minor children.

County allowance is available for burial of indigent veterans, their mothers, fathers, wives, widows, or minor children. Not applicable to mothers and fathers who are recipients of old-age assistance at time of death. Burial may not be in potter's field. Relatives may be allowed to conduct the funeral.

A cemetery lot, the property of certain veterans' organizations, vests in the municipality on dissolution of the organization. It is the duty of the municipality to enforce contracts for the care of the lot.

Counties may acquire grounds for the burial of indigent veterans, their mothers, wives, or widows. County allowance is available for burials in such grounds.

State registration of burial places of veterans is provided. Veterans' organizations are authorized to aid in collection of data, and are entitled to copies of cemetery plots at the expense of the county. Burial permit shall contain military record of the decedent.

A cemetery association may not prohibit the erection of a monument or headstone prescribed or provided by the United States or the State for a veteran's grave.

Counties may provide headstones for veterans' graves.

Counties may purchase cemetery sites for indigent ex-service persons and their dependents, known as Soldiers' and Sailors' Burial Fund.

Provision is made for State requisition to the Federal Government for headstones and for the setting up of headstones.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Execution of affidavits, etc., and the administration of oaths is provided.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Powers of a trustee are suspended while in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS—ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS—SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration.

Honorable discharges are recorded free of charge.

Veterans' commission has been established with administrative office in Springfield and a branch in Chicago. One field office is provided with a service officer in each county except Cook, where there are 15 such offices and officers. Appropriations are made for the expenses of the commission.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS—QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Contracts may be made with Federal Government to provide for course of instruction at State teachers' colleges and State normal universities.

Normal school and University of Illinois scholarships are available to veterans.

Benefits are preserved under unused scholarships to the University of Illinois during military service.

The use of facilities of University of Illinois to subversive seditions or un-American organizations is prohibited.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Admission is provided to the Illinois Soldiers' and Sailors' Children's School. Department of public welfare shall obtain suitable employment for children placed from the school and thereafter keep a social case record until legally discharged. Scholarships are awarded certain students to the State university or normal school. Students may attend other colleges providing similar scholarships and receive the same benefits for maintenance and other expenses as those attending the State institutions.

Aid is extended to resident children of veterans who died while serving in the armed forces during World Wars I or II or as a result thereof. Amount, $150 per year per child.

Each county in the State shall be entitled to one honorary scholarship in the State university for the benefit of the descendants of soldiers and seamen who served in the armies and navies of the United States during the late Rebellion or World War II, preference being given to the children of such soldiers and seamen as are deceased or disabled; and the board of trustees may, from time to time, add to the number of honorary scholarships when, in their judgment, such additions will not embarrass the finances of the university.

United States Veterans' Administration fund is composed of moneys received on contracts by teachers' colleges and normal schools from the Federal Government.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Credit is allowed for service in the Spanish-American and World Wars in computing eligibility for firemen and police pensions upon payment of the amount such fireman and policeman would have contributed to the pension fund during that time.

CIVIL SERVICE

Honorably discharged veterans head lists of eligibles with 1 percent credit for each 6 months' service up to 18 months. For promotion, 1 percent credit is added for each 6 months up to 30 months.

Leaves of absence are granted for civil-service employees entering military service at any time on or after October 16, 1949; reinstatement must be within 3 months after termination of military service.

Leaves of absence are granted for municipal employees during active military service. Civil service and pension rights are preserved.

Preference is extended to veterans in civil service of Cook County.

Preference is extended to veterans in employment on public works of State and local units.

Veterans have preference in State and municipal service. Widows are extended preference where veteran dies in service or because of a service-connected disability.

Benefit rights are preserved under the judges' retirement system, the teachers' retirement system, the municipal retirement fund and the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Contractual continued service status of teachers is protected while in military service.

Service in the Spanish-American and World War I is credited in computing service under the teachers' pension and retirement fund.

Servicemen's Employment Tenure Act has been enacted.

The offices of coroners, county clerks, county treasurers, clerks of courts, county reporters, superintendents of schools and sheriffs are not deemed vacant by reason of absence of incumbents in active military service.

The superintendents of county veterans' relief commissions shall select secretaries and other employees from among veterans of the Spanish-American and World Wars I and II or their widows.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as pension, adjusted or additional compensation or bonus from the United States or from the State on account of military service is exempt from execution, attachment, and distress for rent, for 1 year after receipt thereof.

GUARDIANSHIP, ETC.

No fees are allowed public administrators for services performed in administering that part of the personal estate of a war veteran which consists of compensation, insurance, or other moneys due or payable from the United States.

The interest of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is limited in the estate of a minor or incompetent to that part of the estate derived from payments made directly to the estate by the Veterans' Administration. Guardians and conservators making application for leave to invest the ward's funds or to expand such funds for the support or education of any person entitled thereto are required to give notice to the chief attorney of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the State.

HOMES

Mothers, widows, wives, and daughters of veterans may be admitted to the soldiers' widows' home.

Veterans and their wives may be admitted to the soldiers' and sailors' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Inmates of soldiers' home who are insane may be committed to a State hospital as State charges.

Veterans' organizations may lease grounds from forest preserve districts as grounds for convalescing sick and disabled veterans, and as a place upon which to construct rehabilitation quarters.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Military record of decedent shall be entered on burial permit and copy filed for record in the military and naval department of the State.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

Admission to the State fair free of charge is granted.

Authority is granted to park districts to issue bonds for playgrounds, athletic fields, and grandstands as living war memorials.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

County aid is extended to veterans and families of deceased veterans through veterans' organizations.

General appropriation of $800,000 and emergency appropriation of $104,000 to the department of public welfare has been made for operation of veterans' rehabilitation centers in Chicago and for purchase of property and construction of necessary buildings for centers in other parts of the State. One hundred thousand dollars was appropriated in 1943 for rehabilitation.

A legislative committee has been created to examine and consider plans being formulated by the various States for the benefit of returning veterans of World War II.

Relief is extended to widows and children of deceased World War veterans through the State department of public welfare.

TAX EXEMPTIONS—EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Certain veterans' organizations are exempt from license tax and fees for holding boxing, sparring, and wrestling contests.

Resident fishing and hunting licenses are issued for nonresident members of the armed forces.

Operators' licenses are continued in force during active military service.

Renewal of certificates of registration of architects, barbers, beauty culturists, private detectives, horseshoers, chiropodists, optometrists, public-health and registered nurses, funeral directors and embalmers, plumbers, real-estate brokers and salesmen, structural and professional engineers, and pharmacists, without payment of lapsed renewal fees or restoration fees, may be made within 1 year after termination of military service.

Licenses of insurance agents, brokers, solicitors, and company service representatives may be renewed within 1 year after termination of military service.

Memorial buildings in honor of soldiers and sailors of the county are tax-exempt as county property.

Taxes levied for 1943, 1944, 1945, or 1946 in certain counties on property belonging to members of the armed forces shall not become delinquent, and no penalty shall be charged therefor.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Powers are granted to certain veterans' organizations to hold and dispose of property.

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of the American Legion, VFW, AMVETS, and auxiliaries is declared a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not less than $15 and not more than $200.

Nonpolitical organizations of veterans are authorized to use the memorial hall, when erected by the soldiers' home in Chicago, without charge for such use.

Quarters may be set aside in county memorial buildings for the use of veterans' organizations without charge.

County aid is extended to veterans and families of deceased veterans through veterans' organizations.

Forest-preserve districts may lease property to veterans' organizations as grounds for convalescing sick and disabled veterans,

and as a place upon which to construct rehabilitation quarters.

Function of representatives of certain organizations in the administration of relief to widows and children of deceased veterans has been outlined.

Representatives of veterans' associations are to cooperate with the soldiers' and sailors' children's school for the care, clothing, training, and education of needy children of veterans.

Certain veterans' organizations are exempt from payment of tax on gross receipts from sale of tickets of admission to boxing, sparring, and wrestling matches.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted over the years through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

Most of the 48 DAV chapters throughout the State, whose membership dues average around $4 annually, provide volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to the service rendered by the individual chapters, the DAV maintains eight full-time national service officers, under the direction of Elmer W. Roetter, at the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, 366 West Adams Street, Chicago.

These DAV specially trained experts render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Organized in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation, Public Law No. 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law No. 668, approved July 15, 1942, active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during or by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before Jan. 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization, to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must therefore supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits diretly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's more hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

I can highly commend the high service standards of the DAV, which makes me proud to be one of its members.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able statement, with respect to H. R. 29, providing for repeal by the Federal Government of the poll tax in Federal elections, by Hon. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., who is now serving as a Representative in Congress from the Sixth District of Virginia, but who has been elected attorney general of Virginia, and will soon take office.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR., OF VIRGINIA, ON H. R. 29 BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION MARCH 23, 1948

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing in opposition to the pending measure in a dual capacity, as a Member of Congress and as Attorney General-elect of the State of Virginia.

I am grateful for the privilege of registering my opposition to the enactment of H. R. 29, an act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

My approach to this subject is not circumscribed by the fact that since 1902 the Constitution of Virginia has prescribed, as one of the qualifications as a prerequisite to the exercise of the franchise in all elections, the personal payment of a poll tax. Nor does the fact that the Legislature of Virginia has already taken the legal steps to submit the issue in the form of a constitutional amendment to the people of my State have any bearing on the subject immediately before us or my views relative thereto.

My opposition stems solely from my firm conviction that the Federal Government is devoid of constitutional authority, express or implied, to invade the sovereign right of a State to prescribe the qualifications of its citizens to participate in any election on its soil and conducted through its governmental processes.

In the congressional hearings and debates on this agitated subject many and diverse irrelevant arguments and preposterous theories have been advanced. Some of these are appeals to emotion based on the crackpot theory that this is a moral issue; that it will stimulate or stifle voting, and that the elimination of a $1.50 tax dedicated to free public education will enable the poor to vote.

Some of the agitators go so far as to contend that the tax constitutes an onerous burden on many thousands who receive the blessings and protection of government, refuse to pay the tax and thereby escape the payment of any tax of any nature whatsoever. Their ostensible but crocodile concern is for those who, with equal facility, claim and receive all of the blessings of government and pack the burdens on the shoulders of their fellow man.

Considerations of political advantage and expediency motivating many of the proponents of this legislation are an unmitigated travesty on political honesty and decency. The amalgamated wolf-pack of confederacy of Communists, left-wingers and ultra-radicals who seek, with undisguised bitterness and effrontery, to ravish the honor and sovereign integrity of the Southern States, are certainly strange and unsanitary bedfellows for some of my colleagues who have voluntarily elected to cohabit with them in support of this legislation. Their harvest will be to reap the illegitimate offspring inevitably to be spawned from this unholy and illicit consortium.

There are some, however, who advocate passage of this legislation for whom I entertain the highest respect and whose motives I cannot and do not impugn. Their unblemished records of salutary public service conclusively refute any assertion to the contrary.

None will deny that the Federal Government, in its relation to the several States, is the creature and not the creator. The States through common consent and concessions formed the central government, breathed into it the breath of life, pulsated it with sovereignty and bestowed upon it all of the authority, though limited, which it possesses. Those rights which the States regarded as inalienable, and indispensable to State sovereignty, were expressly reserved by the several States inviolate from the impingments of the Federal Government.

Whether or not there should be a poll tax prerequisite in any State is a debatable question. It is a State and not a Federal question. This is not the proper forum for such a debate except on the question of submitting a constitutional amendment to the States for ratification. The matter of statutory repeal belongs exclusively to the States. The same is true, of course, in regard to the elimination of poll tax provisions from State constitutions.

Under our system there is no such thing as a Federal election. All elections are State elections and only those who qualify under State law acquire the right to vote therein. Every cog in the election machinery including expense and full responsibility for every step in the process is under complete State supervision and control.

The debates in the Constitutional Convention clearly demonstrate that the matter of elector qualifications was amply considered and discussed. Various suggestions were made and proposals advanced. Certainly there was no pretermission of the subject of qualifications. The proposal of uniformity of qualifications was considered. Objections were raised against leaving the matter subject to the will of the several States and it was proposed that the power to prescribe qualifications be vested in the Congress. Conditions, restrictions and inhibitions were considered. The composition of the conflicting views of the framers produced article I, section 2 of the Constitution:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The only limitation imposed by the Constitution on the subject of qualification is that it must conform identically to that prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. This defines the limit of the power conferred by the States upon the Federal Government relative to the qualification of electors.

The identical language found in the seventeenth amendment relating to the election of Senators is conclusive of combined congressional and State recognition that the matter of elector qualification resides solely with the States subject to being divested only by amendment to the Federal Constitution.

In an unbroken line of decisions the Supreme Court has recognized and affirmed the exclusive power of the States to prescribe the suffrage qualifications of their electors subject to the provisions of the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments forbidding discriminations only because of race, color or previous condition of servitude, or sex.

In *Breedlove* v. *Suttle* (302 U. S. 277) the Supreme Court in a unanimous opinion said:

"To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege of immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States but is conferred by the State and save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate." (Citing cases.)

It has been contended by some of the proponents of the pending measure that the Supreme Court has subsequently held (*Classia case* (313 U. S. 299)) that the right to vote and have the vote counted is derived from article I, section 2 of the Constitution. The Classic case does not support this contention. It draws a clear distinction between privilege and right. The State law determines the qualification necessary to exercise the privilege to vote. The Constitution protects the right once it has been acquired through the exercise of the privilege to qualify. This distinction was drawn in *Ex parte Yarbrough* ((1883) 110 U. S. 651), wherein the Supreme Court clearly sustained the exclusive power of the States to prescribe the qualifications of voters.

In the Classic case the Court defined the issue with this language:

"The questions for decision are whether the right of qualified voters to vote in the Louisiana primary and to have their ballots counted is a right secured by the Constitution within the meaning of sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code, and whether the acts of the appellees charged in the indictment violate those sections."

It is clear, therefore, that the Classic case dealt with the rights of qualified voters and not with qualifications prerequisite to the exercise of those rights.

The decision in the Breedlove case stands unimpaired, without qualification by subsequent decision, and is the final authority for the proposition that the matter of voter qualification has always resided with the States.

It seems entirely clear that under the construction placed on sections 2 and 4 of Article I of the Constitution, (a) by the contemporaneous statements of the framers of the Constitution, (b) by the unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the courts of last resort of the States, and (c) by actions of Congress and the States with respect to constitutional amendments regulating the State's exercise of its powers over suffrage, the States reserved unto themselves full and unlimited powers to prescribe qualifications for voters at all elections, except that such qualifications as to Senators and Representatives in Congress should not be different from those prescribed for voters for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Section 1 of H. R. 29 manifests an attempt on the part of the legislative branch to place a judicial construction on Article I, sections 2 and 4, of the Constitution. It undertakes to say, in the face of a contrary adjudication by the Supreme Court, that the matter of qualification shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding elections and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting. It is an effort to repeal a vital provision of the Constitution of the United States in a manner which violates that instrument. Furthermore, it is a tacit admission that if the requirement is a qualification, then Congress possesses no power to legislate with respect thereto.

Article I, section 4 of the Constitution relating to the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives was not designed by the framers and has not heretofore been construed or applied to embrace the subject of qualifications. Under this section the power of Congress is restricted to the making or altering regulations prescribed by State legislatures only as to the times, places, and manner of holding elections. It does not invade the field of prerequisite qualifications. The qualification of a voter is something entirely separate, distinct, and apart from the holding of an election. A qualified voter may or may not, as he chooses, participate in an election. Until he qualifies he cannot.

Alexander Hamilton was the most outstanding early champion of a strong centralized government. His construction of section 4 was as follows:

"Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon on other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature." (The Federalist, LIX LI.)

In support of this view a quotation from Story on the Constitution is highly pertinent:

"The history of the times indicates beyond reasonable doubt that if the Constitution makers had claimed for this section the broad regulation which some now contend, the Constitution would never have been ratified."

If we should concede, for the sake of argument, that the payment of a poll tax is not properly embraced by the inclusive term "qualification" its requirement is nevertheless a proper exercise of the reserved powers of the States over suffrage, as well as over the taxing powers. In conferring powers upon the Federal Government through ratification of the Constitution the States granted only those powers defined by the Constitution and such implied powers as were necessarily incident to the reasonable exercise of the powers expressly granted. All powers not granted, nor expressly prohibited to the States by the Constitution were reserved by and to the States through the tenth amendment. When the Constitution was adopted each State possessed and retained unlimited power over suffrage.

Recurring again to the Breedlove case supra:

"Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate."

The fifteenth and nineteenth amendments do not confer the right of suffrage. They do nothing more than prevent discrimination against those who meet the test of qualification required of those who are permitted to vote.

The requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to vote is a valid exercise of the taxing power of the State. In the Breedlove case the Court said:

"Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the State's power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution."

I respectfully submit that this is a judicial and not a legislative matter. An attempt by this method, whatever the motive be, to repeal any part of the Constitution of the United States is a violation of the oath to uphold and defend it. The only constitutional legislative approach is through the prescribed procedure for amendment. This has been the unyielding course of the past. Political expediency does not render the great charter of our liberty less sacred or less inviolate. God forbid that it ever will.

If the Constitution is being violated by the States, as some contend, if rights of citizens are being abridged or denied the only remedy is resort to the courts for redress. If Congress has the power, through this method, to abrogate the poll-tax requirements of the several States then, by the same token, it possesses the power to nullify requirements as to registration, age, residence, and mentality. It can open the ballot box to the moron, the idiot, and the felon. If it can enlarge the privilege of suffrage it can diminish it. If it can undermine the sovereign rights of the States in this respect it can destroy the last vestige of those rights.

Bugs in the Marshall Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an editorial from the Daily World of Opelousas, La., of date March 9, 1948, as follows:

BUGS IN THE MARSHALL PLAN?

Some interesting facts pertinent to the Marshall plan, alleged in an article this month by Henry J. Taylor, noted economist and writer, deserve reproduction and comment.

Mr. Taylor declared that England was primarily responsible for the plan and will get 32 percent of the total appropriation, although there is no threat to communism in England—one of the principal reasons set forth for adoption of the plan.

He declared that Prime Minister Ernest Bevin, of England, asked in January 1947 for a supplementary loan of $5,500,000,000 to augment the almost four-billion loan already granted, and that this request was kept secret from the American people * * * that Secretary Marshall knew that Congress would not approve such a loan unless it was included in an over-all European recovery program * * * that Bevin christened the program the Marshall plan to give it the weight of the general's name, although Marshall's remarks in a graduation address did not encompass the eventual plan (Marshall has since asked removal of his name, and it's now called European recovery program) * * * that Bevin traded with France and Italy at the Paris session at which the request for aid was made, when they balked at the huge English slice of the Marshall plan appropriation by promising his influence to see that they got $658,000,000 from the United States as stopgap aid * * * that Great Britain's huge share of the plan has been hidden by lumping together the totals, and that he had to undertake a special investigation to find out how much England would receive.

He found that the appropriation will be allocated as follows: England, $5,348,000,000; France, $3,701,000,000; Italy, $2,913,000,000; United States-British zone in Germany, $2,499,000,000; Holland, $2,436,000,000; Belgium-Luxemburg, $1,419,000,000; Austria, $713,000,000; Denmark, $582,000,000; Ireland, $497,000,000; Greece, $473,000,000; Norway, $234,000,000; Portugal, $150,000,000; Iceland, $38,000,000; Turkey, $18,000,000; total, $21,021,000,000.

This, he said, is not all, for the program, by its nature, will lead to similar plans for other nations.

It's time we all realized that what is now going on in Washington is an attempt to sell to us a program which will be expensive to each one of us, individually—we are now paying for postwar relief programs abroad at the annual rate of $376 per United States family. By the Marshall plan, this will be raised to $862 per American family by 1951, according to Taylor's figures.

Some of us will be better off—those who make the things to be bought—but the average person will pay and pay.

Look in your pantry, your clothes closet, your garage—because it's from them that this money will come. It's costing you, not the Government or the other fellow.

We are supposed to be buying this plan to protect western Europe from communism; to avoid a depression at home, and to be humanitarians. The people overseas now receive little of our aid as direct gifts—this aid is sold to them by their governments and others, which is one reason that we aren't receiving the personal credit we believe is coming to us.

Certainly, paying big sums to keep out communism in England, Ireland, Iceland, Denmark, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland is not logical, for there appears to be no tendency on their part to go Communist. France and Italy, yes; certainly Austria and Greece, but these last two seem to need more military aid at present than economic.

The investigations Congress is making into the ERP are, in the light of Taylor's statements, highly welcome.

That's a big order now being marketed to us, and we should examine it well before we plank down our cash.

Government Decentralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I have prepared on the subject of decentralization. The article appears in the February 1948 issue of the magazine, the Reserve Officer, and discusses a matter which I regard as of crucial importance to the Nation and on which I have submitted suggestions since my coming to the Senate 9 years ago.

I respectfully submit that this article is particularly appropriate in view of National Security Week, February 12 through 22. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST DECENTRALIZE

This is a time for straight talk, rather than double talk; for hard and fast steps, rather than pussyfooting. There is one, and only one, important potential menace to the United States in the world today, and that obviously is the Soviet Union. They know it and we know it. There is one relatively short channel of attack from Russia to the United States, and vice versa, and that is via the Polar Cap. There is one principal type of warfare calculated to insure speedy success, if war came (and God forbid that it does), rather than a long stalemate, and that is through a lightninglike attack on the enemy's principal centers. Yet the Russians are decentralized to a far greater degree than is the United States. The Soviet Union is sprawled over one-sixth of the earth's surface, although, of a necessity, because she is a dictatorship, she is somewht centralized. Still, it is evident that her military arm is being decentralized just as her industry has been throughout Siberia.

Let me, however, make it clear at the start that I do not believe that conflict with Russia is inevitable or that it is imminent, and I certainly don't believe that it is desirable.

Decentralization will not of itself assure completely adequate American offense and defense. Obviously, it will not be an active element in offense, but it wil be a vital element in defense. It would be folly to decentralize and at the same time lack sufficient air power, ground power, and sea power of the most modern sort with which to carry on the possible warfare of the future.

In February 1941 I asked publicly in the Senate if our naval and air arms at Pearl Harbor were in the same position as the Russian fleet was at Port Arthur in 1905; that is, if they were laying themselves open to a blitz attack. My question went unanswered. I asked the Secretary of State to report to the full Senate in executive session on the conditions of far eastern defense. My bill was pigeonholed, and my request went unfulfilled.

The months from February to December slipped by, and on the seventh day of the twelfth month of that year we suffered the horrible losses at Pearl Harbor that might have been prevented so easily. I recommended stock piling of zinc and hemp, mass building of corvette boats to safeguard against the submarine menace, but these suggestions, too, went unheeded. I am not trying to prove any particular personal prescience. Actually, many other authorities, if not in the Senate, had indicated the possibility of a catastrophe similar to Pearl Harbor and had urged defense measures. It matters not one bit who made the predictions then or who is making the predictions now, so long as the individual has or had fair qualities of competence. What does matter, and what did matter, is that these predictions which are and were soundly based are being and have been given a brush-off, with the result that our dear land is endangered.

1. I have written to Secretary of Defense Forrestal, urging him to influence his colleagues in the Cabinet to make the necessary plans for decentralization for purposes of national security. Secretary Forrestal responded by stating: "I heartily agree with you that decentralization of Federal activities is advantageous from the viewpoint of national defense." He added that he has given considerable thought to this question and has discussed it on numerous occasions with various advisers. He then went on to say: "For the past 15 months the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been studying the dispersion and protection of military facilities and other national agencies contributing to our national defense in the light of new developments in weapons and operational techniques."

Secretary Forrestal stated further that he has appointed Secretary of the Air Force Symington as chairman of a small committee to work with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with the National Security Resources Board on the broader aspects of the problem. The Secretary went on to add that he was forwarding copies of my letter to various interested officials, particularly to the National Resources Board, which he indicated had final responsibility for the broader phases of this subject.

2. In 1947 the Presidential succession bill, making the Speaker of the House next in line to the Presidency after the Vice President, was up for consideration. At that time I introduced an amendment to the effect that if the entire specified line of succession was exhausted, because an atomic bomb might erase all of the principal civilian officers mentioned in the bill, the highest-ranking military officer in the United States would assume the duties of the Presidency until such time as a civilian officer for this post could be elected by the Congress. My amendment was defeated on a voice vote.

3. Obviously, if there were an atomic attack on the United States, the people of Wisconsin and the people of any other State in the Union could not possibly assemble to hold an election lest they invite their mass extermination. Suppose, then, there were vacancies in Congress to fill because a bomb had obliterated Washington and most Members of Congress? The State Law Section of the Library of Congress has reported to me that Wisconsin is the only State in the Union which does not have at present provision in its laws for filling a vacancy in the Senate by interim appointment by the Governor pending the holding of a general election. I have accordingly written to Governor Rennebohm, respectfully asking consideration of initiating a change in our Wisconsin statutes.

4. I have introduced an amendment to the Constitution providing that the executive authority of each State shall issue writs of election to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives providing—and this is the new proposal—that the legislature of any State "may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct." At present, article I, section 2, of the Constitution provides only for an election in the event of vacancies in the House of Representatives, and grants no power to the legislatures to delegate the power of temporary appointments or even mentions such a power.

5. I have contacted business leaders throughout the Nation for the purpose of encouraging them to decentralize their industrial operations to the maximum extent possible.

I might note in this connection that I had previously written to Director Webb, of the Bureau of the Budget, along this line. His reply was, however, confined particularly to the administrative difficulties involved in the process of decentralizing.

Once there was a Wisconsin man named "Billy" Mitchell, who broke his heart and gave his life trying to awaken his countrymen to the danger they faced from the Pacific; the danger in the air; the danger to Alaska. May the warning of our present danger meet with speedier response than did his warnings of the danger of the past.

The Armed Forces and the European Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 20, 1948, I addressed a meeting of postal employees in Spartanburg, S. C. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that portion of my remarks with reference to the armed forces and the European situation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On August 14, 1945, the curtain closed on what we hoped, at the time, was the final act of a tragic drama. Having achieved a great military victory after four bitter years of a life or death global conflict we hoped that we were ready to bring our boys home to enjoy the rest of their days in well-earned peace.

We know now that there are forces at work in the world which are delaying full realization of this dream of peace. It is obvious, now, that the period following the dramatic curtain-closing episodes at Hiroshima and Nagasaki has been only an intermission—an intermission filled with discordant passages from the orchestra which has neither followed the score nor the conductor. The discords, as you well know, were mostly in the form of vetoes and empty seats in the Russian section of the United Nations symphony.

At the President's special joint session of the Congress this week, we moved into what might be called the second act. The plans and preparations we make now will determine the outcome of the, as yet, unwritten third and final act. Upon our actions now rest the verdict of whether it shall be a climactic Journey's End or the Puckish simplicity of a Midsummer Night's Dream. If we are to enjoy the latter we must act, and act now.

The President asked for immediate passage of the European relief program. That bill was passed by the Senate after midnight last Saturday night and is now receiving swift action in the House. Just before the final vote on ERP I said, on the floor of the Senate: "I am anxious to do whatever is necessary to set up a bulwark of free people in western Europe to help stop this onrushing tide of communism which is even now engulfing more and more of Europe day by day. Let us be sensible about the Russian threat. It is real. The time has come when we must step into the picture squarely. Any further delay may be fatal * * *. We must stop the overrunning of western Europe by this Red tide. Let's face the facts. While we hope to alleviate suffering among the war-torn people of Europe we are basically making an effort to preserve the peace. In deference to those who so lately gave their lives that we might enjoy the fruits of a peaceful existence we can do no less than our utmost to preserve the peace. We who owe so much to so many cannot afford to economize with aid of bread and milk alone. In a shrunken world armed to the teeth with atom smashers and master minds of scientific research we must back our aid with our own preparedness program at home. And that preparedness is not enough on paper."

The President asked for immediate passage of UMT and a limited form of selective service. Following the President's message, the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, went into immediate session with Secretary Marshall. The following day we began sessions with Secretaries Forrestal, Royall, Sullivan, and Symington to get their recommendations before taking final action in the Senate.

My position on the matter is in favor of immediate action to bring our military forces up to full strength. I have favored this action all along and will continue to do so until such time as the world situation reverses itself and there is no longer a threat of war from Russia or any other zone of influence.

Letters and telegrams to my office indicate to me that the people of this country, as we so well know, do not want war. But they also advise every possible precaution of aid and full preparedness at home against, as one group of marine veterans put it, "another all-expense tour of Europe."

We must prepare, and we must prepare without any further delay. Nothing short of full preparedness right now will put us in a position to order a full halt to the current Russian expansion.

As to the final form of UMT and selective-service legislation I cannot say at this time. We will receive the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense in the Armed Services Committee on Monday. But, gentlemen, whatever it may be—whatever it may require—I want to see this country ready to defend itself, if necessary, at home and abroad—and I want to see it now.

Comments by Henry A. Wallace on the President's Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by Henry A. Wallace which was given on March 18 in answer to President Truman's address to Congress on March 17. Mr. Wallace's address appeared in the New York Times of March 19, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday we heard a call for universal military training.

Tonight I plead the case for universal peace.

The grave issues of peace and war were thrown into sharp focus on St. Patrick's Day. Those issues will not be settled by name-calling.

Three years ago Franklin Roosevelt died. And in those 35 months the hopes of the people of the world have been undermined by those who talk of war and turn their backs upon the policies for which he worked.

Two years ago Winston Churchill, sponsored by the President, laid down the policy which has been followed ever since. One year ago the President announced the Truman doctrine to contain communism by using American arms to bolster corrupt and reactionary regimes a long way from home.

Yesterday Americans were asked to give their sons to enforce that doctrine.

Yesterday that doctrine was expanded to a point where it threatens the life of every human being in the world.

Why have we reached this crisis in world affairs?

Is there a single reason why we cannot make a peace to end the cold war?

Is there any evidence that Russia has aggressive designs against our country or that our national security is threatened from any source?

These are the questions which were left unanswered in the hysteria-breeding speeches of St. Patrick's Day, 1948.

The men who are stirring up hate and fear traffic in a word. That word is "communism." They hope that it will provoke a hostile response from great masses of the people. They think that it is capable of blotting out reason.

But you can't fool most of the people any of the time. We know that ideas can't be licked with guns. America's mothers and sons know that millions of soldiers won't cure the social and economic conditions which turn many peoples of the world to Socialist and Communist Parties. They rightfully believe that a draft and compulsory military training are not the way to preserve freedom at home or to guarantee democracy abroad.

Let us answer the questions which others have left unanswered as they cry for militarization of America and the world.

First, why have we reached this crisis in world affairs?

We have reached this state because the men who are running our Government fear the power of the common men and women the world over. They have recognized that the world is changing; that the peoples of the world are on the march. They know that the people of France, Italy, Czechoslovakia—yes, and the people of China and Greece, want to try a new approach. They are afraid of this demand for change and they are standing against it. They are using our resources, our science, our productive facilities—and soon they hope to use the bodies of our young men—to stop the demands of the people everywhere.

One year ago I said that President Truman was the greatest salesman communism ever had. I repeat that charge tonight. He has ignored the deep, underlying nature of the people's problems. His approach to fighting ideas is wrong, totally wrong. Ideas are like nails; the harder you hit them on the head, the deeper they go.

Fundamental land reform is long overdue in both China and Italy. The Communists recognize this situation and use it, but they did not create it. Our Government is tacking the phrase "Russian aggression" onto movements which are essentially the expression of an inevitable historical trend. I don't want to see billions of American dollars—and what is far more important, millions of American lives—wasted because American politicians will not accept these simple facts.

We have come to this world crisis because willful men with private interests are dictating our foreign policy. Their interest is profits, not people. They seek to protect and extend their foreign investments against the democratic actions of people abroad. They have had the assistance of other men who do not understand the problems of the people—either here at home or overseas.

Some of these men pose as humanitarians as they ask for the militarization of America. They say we must militarize to fight for freedom. But their records do not reveal that they have led fights for a secret ballot in South Carolina, or free elections in the poll-tax States, or for an end to the divisive practices of segregation and discrimination.

In accusing another nation of sole responsibility for the undermining of the United Nations, this administration tries to cover up facts which have brought us shame and cost us friends throughout the world. It was our State Department which killed the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which circumvented the United Nations to give military aid to Greece and Turkey, which ignored the United Nations Economic Commission in planning what it called European Recovery, and which is ignoring even today the decision of the United Nations on Palestine. We have a heavy share of the responsibility for the weakening of the United Nations. We shall have to assume that responsibility. It is on the record. It can't be wiped out.

If we stand self-righteously and stubbornly insist that the responsibility for the world crisis rests entirely with others, we shall make peace impossible.

It is openly proclaimed in high places that we shall, sooner or later, fight the Russian people, yet no reason for such a war is advanced.

Why should we fight Russia?

Does anyone really believe that we are helping the growth of civil liberties in Russia or eastern Europe by threatening their governments with our armed power and economic boycotts? Such actions actually curtail civil liberties there and here. We can't extend civil liberties by war and preparations for war.

There are some who want a holy war for the propagation of their faith. To them we must say we are against baptism by atomic bombs.

Shall we fight Russia because she offers us competition in world markets? Obviously not. The Soviet Union is in no position to compete with us for world markets. Quite the contrary. She offers us a great market for our own goods.

Shall we fight Russia because we are competing for the raw materials of the world? We shall dissipate more raw materials in such a war and in preparation for such a war than they are worth to either the United States or Russia. There is no competition for raw materials which cannot be settled by peaceful means.

Is there a single reason to militarize America—to deprive our young men of freedom and throw them under the domination of Army and Navy authoritarianism? There is not.

The attempt to make the fight for peace subversive will not succeed. We shall seek as earnestly for the common ground for peace as others seek the reasons for conflict.

The program to militarize America, if carried out, will impose a police state. Already men and women are paying a high price to speak forthrightly for peace. Speech is not free when it costs a man his job. Preparations for another world war will undermine American freedom just as surely as if the enemy had conquered us in the war just ended.

If we believe in democracy we have to support the free flow of ideas here at home and everywhere in the world. The ideas of Communists and Socialists for the solution of basic problems can only be countered with other ideas—positive ideas. They can't be licked with guns or standing armies.

It is shameful when high officials of the United States imply that a free, democratic election in Italy is a threat to freedom. We can't counter the propaganda of others by saying that we only believe in democracy when the election results please us. We can't win friends anywhere in the world by telling needy people that they shall vote as the administration wants them to vote or they shall be deprived of aid. It is an exhibition of a lack of faith in the democratic process.

It is not our job to attack or defend actions of any other nation as we insist that our American policies conform to American principles. We can't in good conscience point our fingers at others when our own Government has perpetuated civil war in Greece and China, forced major parties from the cabinets of France and Italy, armed Latin-American dictators, and violated every fundamental American principle while it has used the words freedom and democracy.

I say that our only national defense lies in a return to a foreign policy which is American in principle and practice.

National defense cannot be founded on arms and weapons of terror.

The production of those weapons is profitable business. We must take the profits out of defense. The young men who are asked to give up years of their lives make no profits from defense and war, nor should any American.

We must take the offensive for peace. As we fight against the draft and compulsory military training, we must also fight to eliminate the conditions which make war and defense profitable for private interests. We must bring under control—strict public control—the private foreign investments of the monopolists.

We must demand that our Government accept its share of the responsibility for the world crisis. We must demand firm allegiance to the United Nations. The price of self-righteousness is war and depression.

Speak up now. Speak up for peace. Pay the price for forthright expression. Don't let the fear-makers intimidate you into silence. Be heard—be heard now—for the voice of peace-loving, freedom-loving people is our only national defense.

Let us remember that military might has never imposed a good idea nor sustained a bad one. Recall with me the words of the prophet Isaiah:

"Woe to those who trust in chariots,
Because they are many;
And in horsemen, because they are mighty."

Resolutions Adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association at its annual meeting in Topeka on March 11, 1948. They are so important that I send to the desk excerpts which are of general interest, and ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Whereas the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico continues to be a threat to our livestock industry and requires that our Federal and State sanitary officials be constantly on the alert to prevent its spread across the border, to that end we make the following recommendations:

1. That the Mexican-American joint commissions push the quarantine line south as rapidly as possible, destroying any and all livestock which becomes affected with the disease, behind the quarantine line or in the buffer zone.

2. That work be started immediately to complete the border fence.

3. That the Bureau of Animal Industry begin, at the earliest possible moment, an intensive program of study and research as to the nature, cause, prevention, and possible cure of foot-and-mouth disease.

4. That the embargo provision of the tariff act of 1930 be maintained without modification. Its importance as a safeguard to our industry is increased by the outbreak in Mexico.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Whereas the Reciprocal Trade Act expires in June 1948, and whereas the present chaotic condition of world trade makes it impossible to gage accurately the long-range needs for tariff protection: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress, if it extends this act, to limit the time of such extensions to 1 year and to require Congressional approval of any trade agreements entered into thereafter.

CATTLE GRUBS

Whereas cattle grubs cost the livestock industry an estimated loss of at least $100,000,000 annually, and whereas methods that have thus far been developed for cattle-grub control are an inadequate solution for the country as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association recommend that Federal appropriations be made available to the United States Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine for research on more effective materials and methods for the control of cattle grubs.

4–H CLUBS AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Whereas the importance of the 4–H Club and the vocational agricultural programs are recognized as of great worth to the rural youth, and since the 4–H livestock and vocational agricultural projects are interwoven with the livestock industry of Kansas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association go on record as approving the Statewide 4–H and vocational agricultural programs, and that every member feel his personal responsibility in helping these two organizations with their individual projects.

INTERSTATE SANITARY REGULATIONS

Whereas the interstate movement of cattle has been, and is being, hampered by confusing and conflicting State regulations, particularly in regard to cattle vaccinated for Bang's disease; and

Whereas progress is being made in the methods for controlling this disease; and

Whereas the Kansas livestock sanitary commissioner has been cooperating with officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the United States Livestock Sanitary Association, and the National Assembly of Livestock Sanitary Officials for promoting uniform sanitary regulations covering movement of cattle between the various States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend this work be continued and that various State officials cooperate in making regulations effective in their States and in seeking uniformity of all rules and regulations affecting the interstate movement of livestock.

MEAT-INSPECTION APPROPRIATION

Whereas the Federal meat inspection has been conducted for many years as a public-health program; and

Whereas Congress last year canceled the appropriation for this service, making the industry pay the cost of same, thus weakening the morale of the service and the protection afforded the public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to restore this service to its original and effective basis.

CAPITAL GAINS

Whereas under I–T 3712, issued by the Internal Revenue Department on the sales of breeding cattle or sheep in any year in excess of the normal sales are taxable only under the capital-gains provision of the revenue act; and

Whereas the National Livestock Tax Committee is seeking an amendment to the revenue act which will make this regulation a part of the law itself: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge our Representatives in Congress to give this effort their full support.

FLOOD CONTROL

Whereas the limiting factor to stabilizing beef production in the long grass and Flint Hill area of Kansas is the cultivated area in the valleys largely available for the production of feed crops, and whereas the reduction of each acre of valley cropland would automatically throw out of balance an additional 12 to 15 acres of grassland, and whereas the entire agriculture economy of this area, and the dependent industries, and taxation returns would be so drastically upset if a substantial part of the valley cropland is removed from production, and whereas evidence gathered from members of this association indicates a large number of stockmen, farmers, and businessmen in the area are opposed to the construction of large dams for flood control, thereby taking a large acreage of the best cultivated land out of production, and whereas recognized engineers are of the opinion that effective flood controls can be secured at a lower cost by the construction of a larger number of smaller dams which would not remove from production vital crop lands, and whereas a recognized authority on hydraulics and engineering is of the opinion that smaller dams near the headwaters of the tributaries of larger streams would raise the water level in all adjacent territory, thereby benefiting both pasture and farm land: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association inform the Committee of Public Works of the United States Congress that it is unalterably opposed to approval of the report of United States Army engineers for flood control in Kansas, also that a resurvey of the area be made in the use of soil-conservation practices and the construction of a large number of small dams in an effective control program; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each United States Senator and Congressman from Kansas and each member of the Water Resource Committee from Kansas, J. C. Mohler and George F. Knapp.

R. F. Brock, chairman, Goodland; George Andrews, Kanopolis; Ed C. Robbins, Belvidere; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City; Merle Mundhenke, Lewis; F. H. Arnold, Ashland; Fred Beatty, Vermillion; C. Earl Kielhorn, Cambridge; E. A. Stephenson, Bucklin; Edwin Brown, Eureka; John Perrier, Dodge City; Herb J. Barr, Leoti; Willis H. Shattuck, Ashland, absent.

Government Decentralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from a statement made by me in the Senate and letters dealing with Federal decentralization may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 23, 1940]

DECENTRALIZATION OF SHIPBUILDING

It is conceded that it is imperative to get our national forces built up. That does not mean simply more ships of the same kind. No; it means, if we are to have a preparedness program, that America must use its head. We do not want more ships of the old type. We want our present ships made more immune to attack from torpedoes, submarines, and airplane bombs. It may mean the creating of a new type of ship.

Recently I took the matter up with the Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Knox, of building on the Great Lakes a great program of (decentralized) shipbuilding, whereby America would create an independent arm of the Navy—a mosquito fleet—if you please. We could build these small torpedo boats—they are only 70 to 100 feet long—we could build a hundred or more of them for the cost of a battleship. In the Battle of Britain, which is to come, we may find new lessons. But when we speak about a two-ocean navy, we talk of prospects 5 and 6 years from now.

We could build in 6 months to a year 5,000 of these small torpedo boats by taking over the shipyards on the Great Lakes, and those boats could protect every harbor on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. Why? Because they are speedy. We could improve the present design. They carry torpedoes. Some of them go at the rate of 70 to 90 miles an hour. They have antiaircraft protection. The sinking of one of these small boats would mean the loss simply of a complement of a few men. These boats are built for attack. They could proceed 500 miles out to sea. They could tear out from behind warships. They could supplement our submarines, they could supplement the air force, and they would give us the protection which America wants now.

For a year and a half now I have pressed this matter (for decentralization of war and Navy contracts) upon the Navy Department. I took it up about a year and a half ago with Admiral Land, as I recall, and I persisted in it. I hope to have talks with Mr. Knudsen and others in relation to that subject. We do not always have to look to Germany to have the most advanced step. Germany has the blitzkrieg. We have intuition here. We have invention here. We have brains here. Let America use these qualities. Let America awake and lead the world—not simply be a follower.

In this challenging period let us arouse all America to contribute to the preparedness program.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 22, 1941]

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 22, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Friday evening last, you announced the transfer of more than 10,000 Federal workers in 12 Federal agencies from Washington to other cities in this Nation. In doing that, you put into effect what many of us contended should have been done long ago; only we believe you have not gone far enough.

We hope that step is but the beginning of decentralization of Government agencies. We believe there are many more agencies which should immediately be taken out of Washington; so doing will make government more efficient.

What is more important, Government in taking this step will put into other cities and other communities Government pay rolls, which are sadly needed there in this war period. As you know, Mr. President, there are communities that have been sadly depleted by Government because of the centralization of defense activities in other areas.

There is a great demand in this country for a "pruning" of all Government activities and agencies which are not necessary for defense. The Agriculture Department, the Interior Department, and others have "mushroomed" under your administration during the past years. Here in Congress we know that when a man heads up any department in Government he seems to have but one purpose, and that is to make his department bigger and more expensive to operate. As a result, bureaucracy has run rampant, efficiency is forgotten, and the obligation to the taxpayer is overlooked.

Think of it. This year the "overhead" of the Department of Agriculture is over a billion dollars—more than the total cost of Government some years back. I call to your attention that in 1932 there was a pledge to abolish useless commissions and bureaus and to save not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

Just as common sense dictated your move in relation to these 12 agencies, so conscience and common sense should dictate further decentralization of Government and defense agencies, and "pruning" of personnel in those departments which are not especially connected with the war effort.

With compliments of the season, I remain,

Respectfully yours.

ALEXANDER WILEY.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26, 1946]

CORRESPONDENCE WITH SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. WILEY. Recently I inquired of Secretary of War Patterson whether the War Department had considered the decentralization of the War and Navy Departments from their congested sites in Washington, D. C.

Just contemplate for one moment what would happen if one of the atomic bombs should be exploded inside the Pentagon Building, in Arlington. With one stroke the very brain of American military defense would be shattered.

I am not revealing any secrets when I report that Secretary of War Patterson responded as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1946.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: With further reference to your recent letter concerning War Department plans for defense of the Nation against possible atomic-bomb attack, our representatives are collaborating with representatives of the Navy Department on the matter and have drawn up in a tentative form a broad defense plan for the United States in which defense areas are blocked out. These plans, when completed, will be presented to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and upon approval, detailed plans for each area will be formulated. It is anticipated that the plans for the Washington area will include the detailed decentralization considered necessary for the War and Navy Departments as well as for other governmental agencies.

The plans have not yet progressed to the point where definite recommendations have been made to the Bureau of the Budget.

Your considerate interest in this matter is appreciated, and I assure you that careful attention is being given to decentralization of governmental agencies in connection with these defense plans.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

American Foreign Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article on American foreign policy in China, written by William R. Johnson and published in the China Monthly of January 1948.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Condensed and revised from the China Monthly of January 1948]

THE UNITED STATES SELLS CHINA DOWN THE AMUR

(By William R. Johnson)

Something has gone wrong with American policy in China. There, as an aftermath of victory over Japan, both China and America are losing the peace as surely as we won the war. Russia is falling heir to Japan's conquest. Yet, instead of taking action to forestall such an event, so far America has actually collaborated. We did not send Generals Hurley and Marshall to China with directions to strengthen the hands of the legal government, recognized by all the United Nations, or send supplies and aid to help China regain her lost territories. They were sent with instructions to withhold aid unless the Chinese Government should take in the Communists who have been the instruments of Russian aggression in China as everywhere else. Four years of such a policy has brought China almost to collapse.

In February 1945, at Yalta for a price, President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill traded to Stalin extensive territories including Outer Mongolia, together with transportation and industrial facilities which, whenever held by Russia or Japan, have always meant a developing foreign political domination in Manchuria.

With the end of the war, the Russians and their Moscow trained puppets proceeded to organize several Soviet governments in Manchuria and Inner Mongolia. On the orders of the World Revolutionary Executive Committee, a Moscow agency, in April 1947, these Soviets and the original Chinese Soviet Government were united into the Communist Peoples' Republic with Mao Tse-tung as chairman. Simultaneously, the Russians were retraining and indoctrinating many thousands of Japanese war prisoners and training and arming immense new levies in China and Korea, bringing the Soviets strength to 2,000,000 troops or more and making the U. S. S. R. the dominant land power in the Far East.

These developments in direct violation of the Yalta agreement and the Sino-Russian Treaty of 1945, and the increasingly heavy Communist campaigns against the Chinese Government leave no room for doubt that the Soviet Union is determined on the conquest of China; unless she can accomplish her ends by the alternate method of a coalition government, infiltration and the purges that have become so successful in Europe. Such purges do not end with the elimination of National and Provincial leaders. In Kiangsi Province, China, my home for over 30 years, where two-thirds of the Province was held by the Chinese Communists for from 2 to 5 years, some 20 percent of the population were disposed of largely by rump courts and firing squads, to force submission.

Because of the failure of the Communist coup to seize the Chinese Government at Hankow in 1928 the Communist International that year at its World Congress at Moscow carefully revised its plans for world conquest and published them for the guidance of its agents throughout the world. One section of these plans entitled, "Theses of the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semicolonies" develops that theme in great detail for all such countries. Instructions for China's conquest are developed around three main objectives: First, the preparation of the masses for and the maintenance of armed rebellion in order to, second, overthrow the Chinese Government, and third, establish Soviet rule.

From its formation in 1927 in Kiangsi the Chinese Soviet has maintained its complete independence of the Chinese Government and sustained armed insurrection, except when it was too weak or was held in check because the U. S. S. R. chose to strengthen temporarily Chinese resistance to Japan. This loyalty to the 1928 program and the craftiness and subtlety which characterize their propaganda in China and abroad is well indicated by Order No. 16, issued jointly by the Chinese Communist Party's Politburo and the Far Eastern Bureau, a Kremlin agency, in March 1946, during the Marshall negotiations in China and as a heavy spring offensive was being launched in Manchuria. A quotation from this Order well illustrates their deviousness:

"Estrange relations between the United States and Chiang Kai-shek. Render the Kuomintang isolated in China and internationally use delaying tactics not to solve any problems * * * with the Kuomintang * * * to bring about political stability * * * while negotiating * * * to secure the sympathy of the American Government."

The Chinese officials so grossly attacked in the Communist propaganda are the very leaders who have united China (except for the foreign-subsidized Communists), introduced many reforms, created a one-party government—actually a broad coalition of many factions and groups. That Government held China steady through 8 years of war for independence in spite of blockade, foreign-planned and subsidized civil war, and her own and the enemy's scorched-earth policies. Recently, in spite of every device of the Communists, these leaders gave China a democratic constitution, which was unanimously adopted by a large national assembly representative of all China.

Only the fact that China's own revolution produced a group of leaders who so thoroughly took the measure of their Soviet, as well as of their Japanese enemy, that no betrayal by their own nationals or offers of American aid for their surrender to Soviet demands could induce them to make terms with so implacable an enemy, has maintained China's independence, so desperately won from Japan, to this hour.

That General Marshall went to China with no adequate knowledge of Russia's plottings against China and only discovered shortly before he left China a year later how he had been used to serve Soviet ends in delaying China's rehabilitation while Russia built up her war machine, seems to be indicated by a paragraph of his report on China:

"Now the Communists have broken off negotiations by their last offer * * * which the Government could not be expected to accept. Between this * * * group in Government and the irreconcilable Communists, who I must state did not so appear last February, lies the problem * * * of * * * the peace."

How is it to be explained that, in 15 months, between the issuance of the Cairo Declaration and the Yalta agreement, America's China policy was reversed from that of the restortation and defense of China's territorial integrity to one of surrender to Russia, in effect, of more than was soon to be recovered from Japan?

Two conclusions follow from facts discernible at the time to students of Communist propaganda of the period. First, the position to which America's China policy was secretly committed at Yalta was clearly foreshadowed in prior Red propaganda; and second, there was (and there still remains) a coterie of the Communist front stealthily working within the State Department who participate in the briefing of Presidents and ambassadors on Chinese affairs; while serving against us.

In June 1945 I filed with the State Department an article entitled, "Will Russia Supersede Japan as Aggressor in the Orient?" showing that it was Russia's purpose to succeed to Japan's conquests as she is now doing. This was shown by an analysis of parts of two propaganda books, typical of many. One was by Edgar Snow, the other by Owen Lattimore.

Mr. Lattimore, adviser to the State Department and occasional representative of Presidents to China and the Far East, has been active in the formulation and implementation of this change in American policy toward China. His "Solution in Asia" was first published in Britain in 1944. So deviously has this pro-Soviet policy been insinuated into the text that some readers fail

to perceive that he proposes a reversal of American policy. A few quotations will show his intent. He tells us that he seeks to find "the changes which are bound to come in Asia in such a manner as to make power conflicts unnecessary" (p. 163). But we shall see that they involve appeasement greater than that at Munich and that they have led and will lead to wars and not to peace.

He first discredits our historic China policy: "The open-door policy is a 'me too' policy" (p. 66). Again, he calls it a selfish policy in the interests of American trade. That this policy has served China's interests as well as America's is clear from any unbiased examination of the history.

Mr. Lattimore continues: "In Asia, key countries of the freedom block will be China, Outer Mongolia, Korea, the Philippines" (p. 169). Here he anticipates the Yalta agreement and the Sino-Russian Treaty of August 1945 in the delivery of Outer Mongolia to Russia under the camouflage of its attaining independence.

Continuing the Lattimore quotations: "We do not want China to become dependent upon us * * *. If we ever find the Chinese Government becoming dependent upon us to the point where it cannot deal with other governments without our backing or * * * with its own people unless we support it, it will mean that we have gone beyond the safe limits of a direct foreign policy and should refer all questions to the United Nations" (pp. 191–192).

The kind of treatment of China's interests which Lattimore here recommends was given when T. V. Soong was sent back to Moscow in the summer of 1945 to do what in June of that year he had refused to do, sign away in the new Sino-Russian treaty China's rights that had just been traded off at Yalta in China's absence. Learning at Moscow that the Russian demands had been increased beyond those promised at Yalta, he sought the advice of a distant American diplomatic friend who received Soong's radioed inquiry simultaneously with State Department instructions that no advice should be given. Thus, China and Soong were left at Stalin's mercy.

We did not treat Britain or Russia (or Venezuela, earlier) like that when they had Germany to deal with. A Monroe Doctrine or an open-door policy is useless if we refuse to aid the nations involved when they are victims of aggressors determined on conquest.

Again we quote from Solution in Asia: "Our China policy must be brought into proper liaison with our Soviet and our British policy" (p. 92). "The general understanding between China and Russia is bad." He does not suggest why. Some elucidation would have been in order. "America as middleman cannot successfully bring the Chinese and the Russians together" (p. 193).

Both Generals Hurley and Marshall proved Lattimore a good prophet as to America's usefulness as middleman in this case. But they tried for peace only on the basis Lattimore advocates; i. e., on the Soviets' terms—a coalition Chinese Government. They might have brought peace by insisting on the "open door" and the Atlantic Charter, if America had demobilized more slowly and been less naive in her diplomacy on the advice of the sophisticated Red front. Even yet it might be done by the only alternative chance for peace than that to which "solution in Asia" is devoted, appeasement, and finally surrender. That is, by immediate adoption of universal military training and complete mobilization for defense of and with both European and Asian economic and military aid. If that does not stop Russia, we will at least be preparing for the then inevitable war.

Mr. Lattimore's argument continues: "Most important of all, only emphasis on the United Nations as a group can provide a strong framework for the future of the northeastern provinces. * * * If China disintegrates, the break-up will be territorial and political. * * * If the tendency is to fall apart, the British in the strategic southwest and the Russians in the northeastern provinces and at Dairen and Port Arthur will feel a strong pressure to take steps to insure minimum local control * * * primary decisions lie with the Chinese themselves. * * * The responsibilities of China's allies is to show that their support for constructive tendencies is collective and in the world interest and not a race for individual advantage. Britain and America can successfully support their legitimate capital interest in China and at the same time work in cooperation with the Russians for democratic harmony in China" (pp. 195–196).

According to Lattimore, then, with the "open door" and the Nine-Power Treaty out the window, the UN, with military force to maintain peace (but not against great power aggression) around the corner, the Chinese taking Russian orders with no help from us, our capital interest secure behind the iron curtain, why should America worry? Democratic harmony, indeed.

The author is clearly preparing us for the break-up of China and for its Sovietization. He buries his proposals under such generous and pious phrases that one is liable to forget that it is the largest, most homogeneous, industrious, and enduring body of humanity that he thus proposes to deliver to foreign exploiters.

The attempt of the United States to force a coalition government upon China has been worse than folly. It is betrayal. With American munitions such as China desperately needs scattered over the Pacific, we have fiddled while China burns in a fire we helped with oil to kindle and are refusing water to extinguish. Our military mission sent to aid in China's defense have piddled with civilian reform instead of training troops; while the Russians have prepared vast forces for her destruction. Meanwhile, a second 30,000,000 Chinese refugees have been driven from north China—mostly peasant-farmer folk who have learned at terrible cost the difference between the rosy anticipatory propaganda and the stark reality of Communist tyranny. Without our military aid now, China will be wrecked for a generation and the road will be wide open for the sovietization of Asia.

Of course, Russia does not want war with us any more than did the Nazi. But she is making war continuously in China and Greece and absorbing our potential allies, one by one; while her agents and her dupes high in our Government turn American policies in her favor and organize American opinion for her immediate ends and our ultimate defeat, already freely predicted.

What greater immediate reward could we give for Russian obfuscation and delay in negotiations over Europe than to leave her unopposed to carry out her conquest of China. What greater appeasement?

The problem of dealing with Russia is a world problem involving the liberties of all peoples, more accurately at the moment, of those nations on her immediate borders. In the end it is the same problem for all. The solution is dependent on American initiative after we have faced up to the facts of her essentially predatory and immediately aggressive character. The only hope is firmness and immediate complete mobilization of everything required to stop the Soviet's advance across China and western Europe and to the Dardanelles whenever and wherever needed.

Partition of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editor of Progress magazine, and general superintendent of the International Reform Federation, of Washington, D. C., which will appear in the April 1948 issue of that magazine under the title Partition of Palestine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE SAM SURRENDERS TO THE ISHMAELITES

After giving long delayed aid and comfort to the Jews in Palestine, the promised land of their fathers, and their acceptance of the partition by the United Nations under the leadership of President Truman, and as a part of the Truman doctrine, accepted by Congress and the Nation as well as the Jews, including American Zionism, it looks as though the United Nations have made a complete assignment of their assets in favor of the Arabs.

It began to look as though at long last after ages of suppression, oppression, persecution, and assassination, the House of Israel was to have a homeland of their own restricted in area, with the surrender of their ancient capital, Jerusalem, to foreign administration.

A BETRAYAL OF TRUST

Likewise the Arabs were to have self-government in the area allocated to them. This agreement by the United Nations, the Arabs, despite their five empires covering 1,000,000 square miles of territory, as large as the United States east of the Mississippi River, refused to accept, and terror has reigned in the interim of division.

The conquest is unequal because weapons and munitions were supplied the Arabs by the United States and England and denied the Jews. The Jews are at a great disadvantage because they have nothing to offer, while the Arabs have oil, which is required by the Christian nations to preserve the peace by force among themselves. None of them are afraid of the Arabs; they are afraid of each other.

OIL WINS—HONOR LOSES

This was the situation as of March 18, 1948. Like a bolt from the blue, the Truman doctrine collapsed and the spokesman for the United States announced at the meeting of the United Nations its sudden withdrawal from its agreement to sustain the partition it proposed, which, at great humiliation and sacrifice, the Jewish leaders of the world accepted. This is a complete reversal of its covenant with the Jews, without notice and without trace. It throws them upon their own resources, while Russia, England, and America conspire to sacrifice the Jews for Arabian oil to fight each other. Certainly not to fight the Jews or Arabs.

"He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision." Do the nations imagine that God is going to break His covenant and promises of restoration to the Jews because they have broken their word? These United Nations talk like

King Pharaoh, who said, "Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice to let Israel go?"

GOD'S COVENANT WITH ABRAHAM

"Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great * * * and they went forth into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came. And Abraham was very rich in cattle, and in silver and in gold. * * * And the Lord spake unto Abraham and said, lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward, for all this land will I give unto thee and to thy seed forever."

Note, God said all: "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees to give thee this land to inherit it. * * * In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land. All the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." God gave to Abraham a clear and everlasting title.

PASSED ON TO ISAAC AND JACOB

This possession and title was passed on to Isaac (Genesis 26: 1–5). Note the promise to Isaac, "All the land—all these countries." And this title deed was passed on to Jacob (Genesis 26: 13–16). "And the land which I gave unto Abraham and unto Isaac, I give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, to the east and to the west, to the north and to the south. * * * And in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Every appearance, and every promise closed with these words.

A PERPETUAL POSSESSION

This covenant was passed on to Joseph and to Moses. When God created man he gave him a home in the Garden of Eden. When he created a nation under the guidance of Moses, he gave them a homeland in Palestine (Exodus 3: 6–8) to which God promised to return them after their dispersion. As God scattered them, he promised to gather them.

GOD'S IMMUTABLE PROMISE

"But fear not thou, O my servant Jacob, and be not dismayed, O Israel, for behold I will save thee from afar off, and thy seed from the land of their captivity: and Jacob shall return, and be in rest and at ease, and none shall make him afraid. * * * For I will take you from among the nations and gather you out of all countries and I will bring you into your own land. * * *

"Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and make them with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. I will gather them on every side, and they shall be no more two nations; neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children, forever; and My servant David shall be their prince forever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them: it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them and will set My sanctuary in the midst of them forevermore." Unto what other people or nation did the Almighty make such a promise?

"DIVINE TITLE DEED"

From the days of God's covenant with Abraham, during the time of the dispersion, the carrying away into Babylon, the return under Nehemiah and Ezra, and under the dominion of the Roman Empire to the birth of Jesus, Palestine has been recognized as the homeland of the Jews.

When God's favor was withdrawn and they were punished because of their idolatry and sins, there was always the promise through the prophets of their restoration in the land promised to Abraham and their fathers. The Hebrew title deed to Palestine, the ancient land of Canaan, is signed by the hand of Almighty God, and their restoration is as certain as the oath of Jehovah, "For when God made promise to Abraham," says St. Paul, "because he could sware by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, 'And I will establish my covenant between thee and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession'."

A DEED IN PERPETUITY

This is the title deed of the Jews to Palestine, the like of which has been given to no other people or nation, not to the Germans, the Italians, the English, or the Americans, in the history of the world. Other nations have their possessions and their homelands by discovery, by purchase, by treaty, by conquest, by the might of their arms, but Palestine belongs to the Jews by the oath of Jehovah, when He sware by Himself for an everlasting possession. It was a warranty deed signed by the Almighty, which when disputed by the nations, the signer must make good. They are a thousand times more entitled to Palestine than the Arabs to Arabia, the Turks to Turkey, the Italians to Italy, the French to France, the English to England, and the Americans to the United States, for to none of these peoples hath Jehovah spoken with an oath by Himself to give them their lands for an everlasting possession.

THE HEBREW BIRTHRIGHT

It was an inheritance from God, who said, "The land is mine. The land shall not be sold forever." The birth certificate of a Hebrew child was a title deed to his estate, which could not be sold. It was a perpetual possession.

This was the land from which the Jews were exiled by conquest, to which they are now waiting to return by purchase and promise whose right to return is being disputed by the Arabs, who have a million square miles of their own, many times larger and more fertile than Palestine with 9,000 square miles, about the size of the State of New Jersey. Palestine is their only hope, and they are going back.

JACOB SHALL RETURN UNDIVIDED

Recently Zionism held a significant mass meeting in the Presidential room of the Statler Hotel. Usually such a meeting is widely announced by the Washington press. Only by the merest accident did the editor see the half inch display item in his home newspaper. The famous Rabbi Stephen Wise, of New York, was the main speaker. One thousand representative Jews filled the auditorium. We have never before heard such forthright speeches. They seemed to have some information from the Jewish underground. Notice was given that the Jews of the world would resist to the death any attempt at Arab control.

ZIONISM MAKING GOOD

Notice was served by Rabbi Wise and Goldie Meyerson, of Jerusalem, who collected a defense fund of $8,000,000 in 4 weeks without asking for it, that Palestinian Jews would make war on none, but if attacked they would resist with naked hands to the last drop of blood. They have since been attacked, and are making good. The atmosphere was apprehensive. The meeting was not reported by the press, who may have been tipped off, for within 10 days the administration and the UN changed front.

MAN'S PLAN REJECTED

Rabbi Wise and the editor are long-time friends. He highly commended my article, "Jerusalem for the Jews," a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and given world-wide circulation. We conferred after the meeting, and I gave it as my opinion that partition was contrary to the plan and promise of God and would not succeed. Sarah and Hagar could not dwell in one tent, nor Isaac and Ishmael.

I emphasized that God had promised Abraham all the land, and "no more two nations," that God was against partition. He assented, and urged that the plan was not theirs and had been forced upon them by the United Nations.

GOD'S PLAN ACCEPTED

Now, that partition has been taken from them by force, and the United Nations have broken faith, there is hope for Zion, if Zion rejects partition and takes God at His word. No longer Jerusalem for the Jews, Palestine for the Jews, and Arabia for the Arabs, wherein they have dwelt since the days of Ishmael, who was not the son of promise, but the son of Hagar, an Egyptian bond woman, "And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran: and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt."

FATHER OF THE FAITHFUL

"And the angel of the Lord said unto Hagar, behold, thou art with child, and shall bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Ishmael. And he shall be a wild man; his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand shall be against him. And I will make him a great nation." But to Abraham he said, "My covenant will I establish with Isaac, and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him."

CONFIRMED BY PAUL

The Apostle Paul, writing to the Galatians says, "Now brethren, we as Isaac, are the children of promise. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."

If one or the other of these two races must vacate Palestine, it should be the sons of Ishmael, and not the sons of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, David, and the Prophets, who are the children of promise.

Government Decentralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25 (legislative day of Monday, March 15), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have noted in the February 4, 1948, edition of the Wheeling Intelligencer, published in Wheeling, W. Va., an editorial entitled "Decentralize or Perish."

I believe that an editorial on so important a subject deserves wide reading, and I am, accordingly, asking unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECENTRALIZE OR PERISH

Writing in the Reserve Officer, United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, said atomic war with Russia could turn this Capital (Washington) into

a death trap for American liberty. We are now living in a fool's paradise of apathy and inertia. We must decentralize or risk a destiny of national extinction.

Something has got to be done about the big cities of the United States, as Senator WILEY suggests, or we risk national extinction.

Senator WILEY is a thousand times right. Our biggest cities must be decentralized and scattered and converted into smaller cities of, we would suggest, not more than 500,000 population.

Doubtless Senator WILEY at present is as a voice crying in the wilderness. But we trust he will not remain so. We commend him for his vigilance and foresight.

H. R. 5759 Is Designed To Liberalize Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the urgent need for an increase in railroad retirement benefits, I introduced H. R. 5759, providing for a 30-percent increase to all recipients of pensions under the Railroad Retirement Act.

The following statement was made by me on March 22 to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in urging early and favorable consideration of H. R. 5759.

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNNSYLVANIA, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 5759

Mr. Chairman, in the hope of providing at least temporary relief and without increasing the pay roll tax on management and employees now working, I introduced H. R. 5000, to increase present benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by a flat 30 percent. The cost of the proposed increase is to be borne by the United States Treasury and not by the Railroad Retirement Fund. This committee was very gracious several weeks ago in permitting me to testify in behalf of H. R. 5000.

Since my testimony, I have learned that there is opposition to paying the cost of H. R. 5000 out of the funds of the United States Treasury. For that reason, I introduced H. R. 5759, providing for a 30 percent increase in benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and that the cost be borne by the Railroad Retirement Fund.

The following letter, dated March 1, is from the Railroad Retirement Board and it explains, in detail, the estimated cost of H. R. 5759. The letter is as follows:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,
Chicago, Ill., March 1, 1948.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: In your letter of February 17, 1948 you requested me to prepare a bill providing for a flat 30-percent increase in annuities and pensions to all recipients under the Railroad Retirement Act, and to furnish you certain data on costs of such an amendment.

I am enclosing a bill to provide such an increase which was prepared by our Associate General Counsel.

The cost of the increase in terms of tax rate is 4½ percent. It would be 1.3 percent for a 10-percent increase in benefits and 2.8 percent for a 20-percent increase in benefits. You will note that the estimated increase in costs are not in direct proportion to the direct increase in benefits. This is because moderate allowances were made for the probable increase in retirement rates as benefits rise.

I cannot give you very good estimates on the increase in expenditures from year to year since we cannot project the actual amount of benefits each year very far. However, as indicated in my letter of December 17, 1947, the cost would be about $24,000,000 in the current year for each 10-percent increase in benefits. This would increase to about $33,000,000 for each 10-percent increase in benefits in the year 1952–53 and would continue to increase gradually thereafter.

I am attaching a table in accordance with your request, giving the receipts and expenditures and balance in the railroad retirement account each year for the fiscal years 1942 through 1947. You did not request the last year, but I thought perhaps you would like to have it.

The balance in the account at the present time is approximately $1,300,000,000. While this balance may seem large, it must be remembered that it is not large compared to the great obligations of the account. The reserve is built up so that when the time arrives, as it will in the not too distant future, that tax collections will be less than benefit payments, the interest on the reserve will make unnecessary an increase in taxes for present benefits.

If there is any further information that I can give you, I should be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER MATSCHECK,
Director of Research.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I should like to insert at this point, a statement by the Railroad Retirement Board, showing the receipts and expenditures of the Railroad Retirement Account for the fiscal years 1942–47 inclusive. The statement is as follows:

Receipts and expenditures of the railroad-retirement account, fiscal years 1942–47

Fiscal year	Receipts	Expenditures	Balance	Cumulative balance
	Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
1941–42	143, 993, 059	126, 656, 781	17, 336, 278	94, 139, 717
1942–43	220, 577, 849	130, 863, 977	89, 713, 872	183, 853, 589
1943–44	272, 557, 049	135, 215, 326	137, 341, 723	321, 195, 313
1944–45	324, 057, 493	142, 527, 642	181, 529, 851	502, 725, 164
1945–46	312, 024, 329	153, 815, 252	158, 209, 077	660, 934, 240
1946–47	322, 420, 274	173, 101, 153	149, 319, 121	810, 253, 361

NOTE.—Receipts consist of appropriations and interest.

Before concluding my statement, I want to point out that by increasing the railroad retirement benefits by 30 percent it will cost approximately $72,000,000 a year.

If you will study the statement of receipts and expenditures you will observe that each year the cumulative balance has increased in excess of $72,000,000 every year. In fact, during the period 1946–47 the increase was approximately $150,000,000. Based on present conditions with railroad business good, employment and wages at a high level, the cumulative balance in the fund will continue to increase, making it unnecessary to levy any additional taxes on pay rolls. In other words, my amendment, if it should become a law, will not cost the railroads or their employees one penny, since the income from the present pay-roll tax is more than adequate to meet all costs of the Railroad Retirement Act, including my amendment.

I sincerely hope that this committee will give favorable consideration to H R. 5759.

What's Wrong With the State Department?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to present some matters of importance which in my opinion will show what's wrong with the State Department.

WHAT'S WRONG IN OUR STATE DEPARTMENT?

On February 2, 1948, I addressed the following letter to Hon. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, chairman of the Subcommittee to Investigate the State Department:

As I have advised you from time to time, I have personally spent a great deal of time investigating various divisions of the Department of State, and I now desire to place before our committee in open hearings certain facts I believe deserve our immediate attention.

While it is my opinion, from facts I have developed, that hearings should be held on several departments as soon as possible, I believe it is imperative that we call before our committee at once, Mr. John Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Administration, and Mr. Hamilton Robinson, Director of the Office of Controls.

I feel it is imperative to hold hearings immediately on the economy and efficiency of the Office of Controls and on Mr. Robinson's qualifications to continue in his present position.

At the hearings I propose to show (1) Mr. Robinson was not qualified and had no experience that would qualify him for his position; (2) that in view of certain facts known to his superiors he should have been removed from office many months ago.

I am making this letter public because I believe the people have a right to know the facts in the case of Mr. Hamilton Robinson.

I shall appreciate your cooperation and trust you can see your way clear to hold hearings at once.

I respectfully invite attention to that part of my letter wherein I said:

At the hearings I propose to show (1) Mr. Robinson was not qualified and had no experience that would qualify him for his position; (2) that in view of certain facts known to his superior he should have been removed from office many months ago.

On Wednesday, March 10, 1948, the subcommittee met and for 2 hours heard Mr. John Peurifoy, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Administration, and Mr. Robinson. The hearing was continued until Friday, March 12, 1948, and without warning or notice of any kind was concluded with the following statement by the chairman:

Well, I will say to you, Mr. Robinson, as chairman of the subcommittee, that the hearings are concluded as far as you are concerned.

Inasmuch as I had stated a moment before the hearing was concluded that I had not even started to introduce what I proposed to show regarding Mr. Robinson, and the fact that I was assured by

the chairman, Mr. CHENOWETH, I would have ample time to develop everything I had in mind, I feel compelled to disagree with the manner in which the hearing was concluded. Therefore, I am obliged to use this means of bringing before the House of Representatives the information regarding the qualifications of an employee of the State Department who is the man selected to pass on the suitability of approximately 20,000 State Department and Foreign Service employees from a qualification, security, and loyalty standpoint.

In his statement to the subcommittee on March 10, 1948, Mr. Peurifoy states—and I quote from the transcript:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks to the allegations made by Mr. BUSBEY in a letter addressed to you which he released to the newspapers on February 3. That letter stated that Mr. BUSBEY proposed to show, first, that Mr. Robinson was not qualified for the position which he holds as Director of the Office of Controls and, second, that his superiors should have removed him from office many months ago.

Mr. Peurifoy stated that he is the immediate superior of Mr. Robinson and that he selected Mr. Robinson for the position of Director of Office of Controls. Mr. Peurifoy also stated—and again I quote from the transcript:

Before I took over, the officer serving as Director of Office of Controls had applied for a position in the Foreign Service and has passed his examination. So I looked around for a person who could help me with my new task. Mr. Robinson was at that time Director of the Office of Economic Policy in the Department. Assistant Secretary Norman Armour, who had known Mr. Robinson and his family for many years, had recommended him. Under Secretary Will Clayton and Assistant Secretary John Hilldring, both spoke highly of his work. Mr. Robinson had an outstanding record in organizational and administrative work for 3½ years in the Army, where he had gone from first lieutenant to full colonel. That security report on Mr. Robinson, made by Department's investigators, was not only clear, it was filled with highly commendatory reports from those with whom he had worked. For instance, Mr. John Foster Dulles, for whom Mr. Robinson had worked for 6 years in the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, characterized Mr. Robinson as a man who is sober in his habits and of high moral character. He added that there was no question as to Mr. Robinson's loyalty and that Mr. Robinson was ideally qualified for a position in the Department of State. In addition to our own report, because of the nature of the job, I asked the FBI to give me a full investigation on Mr. Robinson. That investigation reported, what I already knew, that Mr. Robinson had a second cousin who had been the subject of investigation for alleged communistic activities. Otherwise the report was completely favorable to Mr. Robinson and his qualifications. The FBI report contained commendations from Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, no relation, who had been Mr. Robinson's superior in the Army; from E. R. Stettinius, Jr., when Mr. Stettinius was Lend-Lease Administrator; from Maj. Gen William F. Tompkins, retired, under whom Mr. Robinson had served; and from a number of other prominent persons who had known him well.

It was on the basis of this information that Mr. Peurifoy considered Mr. Robinson qualified for the position of Director of Office of Controls and so appointed him. According to Mr. Peurifoy Mr. Robinson's office employed around 782 people and is comprised of six divisions; Passport, Visa, Special Projects, Foreign Activity, Investigations, and Munitions. Further, Mr. Peurifoy stated that the Department has over 20,000 employees.

In selecting Mr. Robinson for the position of Director of Office of Controls, Mr. Peurifoy said that the information he had received that Mr. Robinson had served in management capacity in the Army gave me to believe that he would be in position to put in better administrative procedures in the office and that he believed and still believes that Mr. Robinson is qualified for the job.

Now let us look over the information regarding Mr. Robinson that Mr. Peurifoy submitted to the subcommittee as the information upon which he based his conclusion that Mr. Robinson was qualified for the position of Director of Controls.

Mr. Robinson was born July 18, 1908, at New Haven, Conn. He attended the Taft School, Watertown, Conn., from 1922 to 1926; Princeton University, 1926 to 1930, where he received a B. A. degree; Yale University, 1931 to 1934, where he received an LL. B. degree.

From October 1934 to September 1940 Mr. Robinson was employed as an associate attorney by Sullivan and Cromwell, 48 Wall Street, New York City, at a salary of $2,400 to $6,000 per annum. From September 4, 1940, to October 15, 1941, he was employed by the British Ministry of Supply Mission as an attorney in charge of the legal division at an annual salary of $6,000. From January 16, 1942, until April 24, 1942, Mr. Robinson was employed by the United States Treasury liquidation office as head business specialist, chief liaison officer, $8,000 per annum.

Having received a commission as second lieutenant in the ROTC program while attending Princeton University, Mr. Robinson entered the military service April 16, 1942, as a first lieutenant. He was released under honorable conditions at Washington, D. C., January 13, 1946, with the rank of colonel and a showing that the character of his service was superior.

Mr. Peurifoy stated that Assistant Secretary Armour came to Washington about September or October 1946, and recommended Mr. Robinson as a very able man for a position in the State Department, and that Mr. Robinson was later (November 1946) appointed and held the position of director of the Office of Economic Security Policy. Mr. Peurifoy further stated "when General Marshall became Secretary of State in January 1947 he asked me to assume the job of Assistant Secretary in charge of administration. One of the four offices under me dealt with the loyalty and security of the personnel of the Department of State. That was a matter which the Secretary was concerned with, and so was I, so I looked around for a person who could help me with my new task." Mr. Peurifoy placed much emphasis on the letter of recommendation by Mr. Armour, but it so happens that Mr. Armour's letter was written about a week or 10 days before the hearing, which was on March 12, 1948, or more than 1 year after Mr. Robinson had been appointed to his present position. A careful reading of the Armour recommendation will show that Mr. Armour had no personal knowledge of Mr. Robinson's abilities and wrote only of "obvious abilities."

The undated Armour letter concerning Mr. Robinson is irrelevent. While Mr. Armour believes Robinson to be "a man of loyalty, integrity, and intellectual honesty," there is no statement as to Mr. Armour's belief in Robinson's qualifications for director of the Office of Controls. There is no evidence that Mr. Armour has seen the questionable cases which Mr. Robinson has approved and no evidence whether Armour concurs in or rejects Robinson's findings. Since these cases and Mr. Robinson's competency to pass on them is one of the most important elements of the hearings, Mr. Armour's letter may be dismissed as a typical example of glittering generalities of no import on the present matter. However, the Armour letter is quoted in full:

In response to your suggestion, I am submitting herewith a statement of my impressions of Mr. Hamilton Robinson.

I have known Mr. Hamilton Robinson's parents for many years, in fact, since I was an undergraduate at Princeton, which was my own home as well as Mr. Robinson's. The family was always held in high esteem in that community and I had great respect for Professor Robinson, who was Mr. Robinson's father, and head of the history department at Princeton University.

Since we were of different ages I knew Mr. Robinson himself only casually until he married Miss Nancy Brereton in 1943. Mrs. Robinson is the daughter of Capt. W. D. Brereton, United States Navy, retired, who was naval attaché in Buenos Aires when I was Ambassador to Argentina, and we became quite intimate with her and her parents. Mrs. Armour and I have seen a good deal of Mr. and Mrs. Robinson since their marriage and number them among our close friends. They visited us in Nassau, after my retirement from the Foreign Service, in the winter of 1946, we spent several days with them at Lake George the following summer. Our relationship continues to be close and cordial.

I have thus come to know Mr. Robinson well and I consider him a man of loyalty, integrity, and intellectual honesty. Furthermore, he has a strong feeling that people who are in a position to do so should enter public service. Because of this and because of his obvious abilities, I believed, and still believe, that he is well qualified for Government work. It was for this reason that I suggested he apply for a position in the State Department and I came to Washington myself to arrange the necessary introductions for him. I was pleased to learn later that he had received an appointment and was subsequently designated to the position of Director of the Office of Economic Security Policy.

I repeat, it gives me pleasure to testify to the high regard I have for him as a loyal and conscientious official.

From the highly commendatory remarks in the security report made by the Department's investigators I quote the following:

Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson of the War Assets Administration also supervised the subject at the War Department and remembered him as a high-type officer who rendered excellent service during the war. In the opinion of General Robinson, it would

be greatly to the advantage of the State Department to secure the services of this applicant whom he described as independently wealthy and hence not in need of a job.

Mr. John Foster Dulles, a member of the American delegation to the United Nations, stated that Mr. Robinson entered the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell from the Yale Law School and in his 6 years with the firm proved to be a very valuable and capable employee; that Mr. Robinson is intelligently alert, trustworthy, and a gentleman at all times; that Mr. Robinson comes from a good well-to-do American family; that Mr. Robinson is married and his family life is perfect; that Mr. Robinson is sober in his habits and a man of high moral character; that there is no question as to Mr. Robinson's loyalty and he is ideally qualified for a position with the Department of State.

Mr. C. Tyler Wood, of the State Department, and whose name was submitted by Mr. Robinson as a reference, stated he persuaded Mr. Robinson to consider the position of Director of Office of Controls and personally introduced him to Assistant Secretary Clayton. Mr. Wood said he was formerly associated with Mr. Robinson at the War Department and described him as "tops"; that he had no hesitation in endorsing Mr. Robinson from the standpoint of ability, integrity, and loyalty to the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Battley, Army Service Forces, stated that Mr. Robinson had worked under his supervision 1½ years during the war; that on one occasion Mr. Robinson was appointed to a highly confidential assignment with the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and that Mr. Robinson is a very fine operator, high-type, dependable, public-spirited citizen, a home-loving man, and loyal to American institutions.

Mr. Ezekiel G. Stoddard, named as a reference by Mr. Robinson, stated he attended Yale law school with Mr. Robinson and was also associated with him at Lend-Lease Administration; that he has a high regard for Mr. Robinson's ability as a lawyer, his temperance in personal conduct, and other qualities.

The above is the sum and substance of the report of investigation made by the State Department on the question of Mr. Robinson's suitability for the position of Director of Office of Controls. Mr. Robinson, as well as Mr. Peurifoy, seem to be laboring under the impression that this is an attack on the personal reputation and character of Mr. Robinson, and that my letter to Chairman CHENOWETH of February 2, 1948, constitutes charges against Mr. Robinson. Nothing is further from the truth. In my letter of February 2, 1948, I stated that—

At the hearings I propose to show (1) Mr. Robinson was not qualified and had no experience that would qualify him for his position; (2) that in view of certain facts known to his superiors he should have been removed from office many months ago.

Mr. Peurifoy has stated that on the basis of the information he received from the reports of investigation, including the letter from Mr. Norman Armour, he considered Mr. Robinson qualified for the position of Director of Office of Controls and so appointed him.

Now let us take a look at the record of Mr. Robinson's office and determine if that record sustains Mr. Peurifoy's judgment or if the record supports my statement that "Mr. Robinson was not qualified."

On March 21, 1947, President Truman issued Executive Order 9835 prescribing procedures for the administration of an employees' loyalty program in the executive branch of the Government. It is provided in this Executive order that:

The head of each department and agency in the executive branch of the Government shall be personally responsible for an effective program to assure that disloyal civilian officers or employees are not retained in employment in his department or agency. He shall be responsible for prescribing and supervising the loyalty determination procedures of his department or agency, in accordance with the provisions of this order, which shall be considered as providing minimum requirements.

The Executive order provides the standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty. The standard is, "That, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States."

The Executive order further provides:

The Loyalty Review Board shall currently be furnished by the Department of Justice the name of each foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons which the Attorney General, after appropriate investigation and determination, designates as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

The Executive order also expressly provides:

The provisions of this order shall not be applicable to persons summarily removed under the provisions of section 3 of the act of December 17, 1942 (45 Stat. 1053), of the act of July 5, 1946 (60 Stat. 453), or of any other statute covering the power of summary removal.

The act of July 5, 1946, 60 Stat. 453, is Public Law 490 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is an appropriation of funds for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1947. The proviso contained in the act of July 5, 1946, is renewed in the Appropriations Act for the Department of State approved July 9, 1947 (Public Law 166, 80th Cong.) and is:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, on or before June 30, 1948, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

For the purpose of exercising this right granted by Congress the State Department issued an announcement regarding the matter of dismissing an employee for security reasons. Mr. Peurifoy testified that this order was prepared by Mr. Robinson. The pertinent parts of the order are:

The Department of State, because of its responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs, is a vital target for persons engaged in espionage or subversion of the United States Government. Due to this fact and because of the great number of highly classified communications which pass through the Department, the security of which is essential to the maintenance of peaceful and friendly international relations, it is highly important to the interests of the United States that no person should be employed in the Department who constitutes a security risk.

The Secretary of State has been granted by Congress the right, in his absolute discretion, to terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States. Accordingly, in the interest of the United States, the Department of State will immediately terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service who is deemed to constitute a security risk.

As used herein an officer or employee constitutes a security risk when he falls into one or more of the following categories: When he is—

1. A person who engages in, supports, or advocates treason, subversion, or sedition, or who is a member of, affiliated with, or in sympathetic association with the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Parties, or of any foreign or domestic party, organization, movement, group, or combination of persons who seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means or whose policy is to advocate or approve the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their right under the Constitution of the United States; or a person who consistently believes in or supports the ideologies and policies of such a party, organization, movement, group, or combination of persons.

2. A person who is engaged in espionage or who is acting directly or indirectly under the instructions of any foreign government; or who deliberately performs his duties, or otherwise acts to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interest of the United States.

3. A person who has knowingly divulged classified information without authority and with the knowledge or with reasonable grounds for the knowledge or belief that it will be transmitted to agencies of a foreign government, or who is so consistently irresponsible in the handling of classified information as to compel the conclusion of extreme lack of care or judgment.

4. A person who has habitual or close association with persons believed to be in categories 1 or 2 above to an extent which would justify the conclusion that he might through such association voluntarily or involuntarily divulge classified information without authority.

5. A person who has such basic weakness of character or lack of judgment as reasonably to justify the fear that he might be led into any course of action specified above.

D. In the determination of the question whether a person is a security risk the following factors among others will be taken into account, together with such mitigating circumstances as may exist.

1. Participation in one or more of the parties or organizations referred to above, or in organizations which are "fronts" for, or are controlled by, such party or organization, either by membership therein, taking part in its executive direction or control, contribution of funds thereto, attendance at meetings, employment thereby, registration to vote as a member of such a party, or signature of petition to elect a member of such a party to public office or to accomplish any other purpose supported by such a party; or written evidences or oral expressions by speeches or otherwise, of political, economic or social views;

2. Service in the governments or armed forces of enemy countries, or other volun-

tary activities in support of foreign governments;

3. Violations of security regulations;

4. Voluntary association with persons in categories C (1) or C (2);

5. Habitual drunkenness, sexual perversion, moral turpitude, financial irresponsibility or criminal record.

E. In weighing the evidence on any charges that a person constitutes a security risk the following considerations will obtain:

1. A former course of conduct or holding of beliefs will be presumed to continue in the absence of positive evidence indicating a change, both in course of action and conviction, by clear, overt, and unequivocal acts.

2. There will be no presumption of truth in favor of statements of the witnesses in any hearing on security risk, but their statements will be weighed with all the other evidence before the hearing board, and the conclusion will be drawn by the board.

3. If a reasonable doubt exists as to whether the person falls into one of the categories listed in paragraph 1C, the Department will be given the benefit of the doubt, and the person will be deemed a security risk.

Mr. Robinson testified before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on January 28, 1948. He stated that the Division of Security and Investigations, one of the six divisions under his supervision, is responsible for the security activities of the Department and the Foreign Service insofar as they relate to personal security and physical security. Questioned as to his investigative experience, Mr. Robinson replied:

I am not an investigator; I think I am an administrator. I have six divisions here, all of which are totally unrelated to each other and, therefore, the way I try to approach this is not from the point of view of being a specialist in any field, but of trying to make the thing work from an administrative point of view. It is true I spent some time on security because security has been one of the things in the forefront of all our minds during this last year.

If the truth were known, and the employees of the six divisions under Mr. Hamilton Robinson dared talk, one would soon realize that the morale in each division is at its lowest ebb. The only thing that will correct this condition is to replace Mr. Robinson with a competent man of experience. Better still, inasmuch as there was no reason for establishing the Office of Controls in the first place, someone in authority should seriously consider abolishing it at this time.

Mr. Robinson was then questioned about the State Department employee identified as case No. 5. The report of investigation showed the testimony of eight persons, including six professors at Harvard and University of California, a naval officer, and a fellow student, stating that the subject has strong Communist sympathies; that he frequently expounded those sympathies and is either a party member or a fellow traveler.

The subject of this investigation was discharged from a naval school during the war "because it was found that he was an ardent student and advocate of Communist doctrines." There is in the file of the case a memorandum dated July 21, 1947, to the effect that—

recommendation was made that subject be terminated from the Department; however, Mr. Peurifoy did not feel that there was sufficient evidence against subject in view of the fact that he had not been shown to commit any overt acts or to affiliate himself with Communist organizations.

In response to a question regarding this case Mr. Robinson replied:

That case is interesting, Mr. Chairman, because there is not one scrap or iota of evidence indicating any overt act, any association he has had, anything that he has done which would indicate that he is actually working against or even associating with people who are working against our people.

Mr. Robinson was merely echoing the opinion of Mr. Peurifoy.

The subject of this case admitted having subscribed to the Daily Worker as well as admitting membership in the American Veterans Committee, the Institute of Pacific Relations, and the World Citizens Movement. There is nothing in the record to indicate whether Mr. Robinson or Mr. Peurifoy made any attempt to determine if any of the abovementioned three organizations are front organizations within the meaning and contemplation of the directive prepared by Mr. Robinson and approved by Mr. Peurifoy. It is all too apparent that no consideration was given to the information in the report of investigation regarding the subject's sympathies or the statements that he "is either a party member or a fellow traveler."

According to the directive prepared by Mr. Robinson, an officer or employee constitutes a security risk when he—

engages in, supports, or advocates treason, subversion, or sedition, or who is a member of, affiliated with, or in sympathetic association with the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Parties.

Nowhere in the directive prepared by Mr. Robinson is it provided that there must be proof of an overt act of any kind.

Let us assume for the moment that there is no question of loyalty in case No. 5 and scan the report of investigation for information on the subject's qualifications and suitability for Government employment. In his application for the position the subject stated he had received a Ph. D. degree from the University of California, while the records of the university show that subject failed in his examination for his Ph. D. and no degree was awarded him. It has long been the policy of the Civil Service Commission to cancel applications wherein there is fraud. The subject was employed in the State Department in Research and Intelligence and it goes without saying that the claim to a Ph. D. degree had considerable bearing on the question of his qualifications. But fraud in securing a position in the State Department apparently has no bearing on the question of honesty insofar as Mr. Robinson is concerned.

I agree with Mr. Robinson that case No. 5 is interesting, so let us look further into the report of investigation. In a report dated October 15, 1947, there appears a statement from a State Department official who knew the subject in China as well as here. This witness said the subject's work was below par; that he is a mediocre, dull, and slow-thinking individual and that he is the only man in the Government the witness knows of whom he would speak unfavorably. Another State Department official said he considers subject weak as to ability, common sense, and public relations. Yet to Mr. Robinson this man is fully qualified for a position in the State Department. Does not this raise a question as to Mr. Robinson's qualifications for a position where he is required to pass on the qualifications of other employees?

Neither Mr. Peurifoy nor Mr. Robinson stated what they considered to be an "overt act," but in connection with Mr. Robinson's statement that he resolves all doubtfuls regarding loyalty in favor of the Government let Mr. Robinson state whether or not the State Department had information in case No. 5 indicating that the employee had contributed financial support to the Japanese-American League for Democracy, a Communist-front organization; that the employee had tried to convert another State Department employee to his radical views; that a "white Russian" employee in the State Department under the supervision of No. 5 resigned in disgust because of the evident Communist sympathies existing in the State Department, and if the State Department reviewed the report of investigation in the files of the Civil Service Commission made when case No. 5 was employed in the Bureau of Economic Warfare, is not this ample proof of how Communists and their sympathizers get inside our sensitive agencies?

For years officials of the State Department would alibi the presence of Communists and fellow travelers in the Department and hide behind the smoke screen that under existing laws they could not dismiss employees who were suspected of being disloyal. Therefore, in order to overcome this objection Congress passed, in the early summer of 1946, what is now known as the McCarran rider. This was part of the 1947 fiscal appropriation bill. Under this law, the War, Navy, or State Department could discharge any employee without regard to civil-service regulations or any previously enacted laws, when, in the opinion of the head of the agency, the continued employment of any such individual constituted a security risk. And this without proof of anything or kind. Mr. Peurifoy testified he could, under the McCarran rider, even fire an employee if he did not like the color of his necktie. An employee so discharged would have no recourse, but still the State Department continues to keep undesirable people on the pay roll.

It is quite evident from the facts adduced at the hearings before the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees that the State Department still has a number of employees who are suspect and who are being harbored in the Department due to the plain and simple reason that Messrs. Peurifoy and Robinson do not have the ability or qualifications to recognize facts as developed by an investigation or that they do not want to recognize such facts.

Undoubtedly there are numerous other cases but I will limit the discussion of Mr. Robinson's qualifications to citing one more case in the State Department.

The subject of case No. 9 was appointed to a very important position prior to full security investigation. He is also an applicant for a position as Foreign Service career officer. On April 12, 1942, he was granted a passport to travel in South America representing the Division of Cultural Relations of the State Department. The then Assistant Secretary of State raised the question as to the advisability of granting a passport but finally approved it saying:

> This is the conclusion. It is a flimsy case either way. I don't think the man is politically dangerous—merely a fool. I see no reason for not granting the passport. I can think of several for not giving him the job—but that is already done. I may add that I consider the synopsis of (No. 9's) activities—as belittling his association with various radical activities of the past, probably because of a lack of familiarity with the set-up and activities of such organizations.

The investigation revealed that case No. 9 was a member of the trade-unions delegation to Soviet Russia in 1927; that he was a sponsor of the New Theater Guild, a Communist-front organization; that he was a member of the Supervisory Committee on Progressive Education Association; that he was a member of the Chicago branch of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy; that he was a member of the League of American Writers; and that he was a member of the American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia.

Inasmuch as the subject of case No. 9 is still employed by the State Department it is quite clear that Mr. Robinson is as unfamiliar with the set-up and activities of the organizations with which the subject was affiliated as was the person who prepared the synopsis submitted to the Assistant Secretary. Without going into great detail regarding the trade-unions delegation to Russia, it is believed sufficient to say that this delegation was repudiated by William Green, president of the A. F. of L. The League of American Writers was created in 1935 at the Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, which organization was cited as subversive by the Attorney General. In the official report of this meeting it is stated in the concluding paragraph that the meeting was dismissed by all members who were present standing and singing the Internationale.

The American Society for Cultural Relations in Russia was a predecessor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, also cited by the Attorney General as subversive. The North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was one of the many Communist Spanish-aid fronts that milked the American public of thousands of dollars to aid Spanish democracy.

While membership in any one of these organizations does not mean, ipso facto, that a person is disloyal to the Government of the United States, it is sufficient to raise the question of his loyalty. But membership in alleged Communist-front organizations was not all the information in the file of case No. 9. This person had written and collaborated in writing with several individuals on books and articles showing Russia in a very favorable light. He was superintendent of schools in a small city and revolutionized the educational system there. He is reported to have introduced a Russian primer in the school after he visited Russia in 1927. The Daily Worker has mentioned him in a very favorable light on a number of occasions. He signed a petition to the Secretary of Labor in 1935 requesting right of asylum for John Strachey, well known British radical. The records in the industrial detail of the Chicago Police Department listed him as a Communist in 1930.

In response to a question whether case No. 9 was still in the employ of the State Department, Mr. Robinson replied:

> Yes, sir. It is awfully easy to damn a man on the basis of that kind of statement when it has not been examined.

What Mr. Robinson did not say was that his department recommended that the case of No. 9 be closed because—

> The available information is not sufficient to regard the subject as a security risk.

Surely the information was sufficient to raise a doubt, but Mr. Robinson told the Subcommittee on Appropriations:

> You have to have evidence that is sufficient to make you reasonably sure in your own conscience that somebody is not getting a dirty deal.

However, Mr. Robinson, in response to a question by the chairman of the subcommittee investigating the State Department as to any doubt being resolved in favor of an applicant for a position in the State Department, replied:

> No, sir; no sir. The doubt is always resolved in favor of the Government.

Evidently Mr. Robinson forgot this most positive statement, for 2 days later he testified:

> It is our purpose to protect the interests of the Government first, and so far as is consistent with that first premise, to protect the individual.

In view of Mr. Robinson's confused and conflicting statements to two committees of the House of Representatives, can it be said that he is fully qualified to hold a position where he is required to pass on questions of the security and loyalty of Government employees? It seems that according to Mr. Robinson's testimony that he has an obligation to protect the individual employee when that employee's suitability is in question. Mr. Robinson apparently does not consider that Government employment is a privilege and not a right, and that it is his bounden duty to see that there is no question as to the loyalty of any State Department employee. All that is required of Mr. Robinson is a fair and impartial evaluation of the evidence developed by an investigation of the affected employee. After all is said and done, how on earth are we going to rid any Government agency of subversives and those considered to be a security risk when we have people in important positions with ideas such as Mr. Robinson has?

Looking further into Mr. Robinson's qualifications as an administrator, he stated that if an employee of the State Department is charged with disloyalty or being a security risk he would have the right of an appeal to Mr. Richardson's loyalty board—Mr. Seth W. Richardson is chairman of the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, created pursuant to Executive Order 9538.

Mr. Robinson is uninformed on procedures of appeal or cannot distinguish between a loyalty case and a security case. An employee charged with being a security risk may be removed by the Secretary of State in accordance with provisions of the McCarran rider to the appropriations act. This provision of the law is the basis for State Department announcement No. 765 prepared by Mr. Robinson. There is no appeal from a dismissal under this law and Executive Order 9835 expressly provides that it is not applicable to persons summarily removed for security reasons. If an employee is found to be disloyal the procedure for his removal springs from Executive Order 9835 and the directives issued by the Loyalty Review Board. An appeal to the Loyalty Review Board is provided.

Another illustration of the lack of Mr. Robinson's qualifications will be found in his testimony before the Special Committee Investigating the State Department in regard to employees discharged for inefficiency. Mr. Robinson stated that such removals are governed by Civil Service Commission rules and employees so removed have the right to appeal. Removals for cause are provided for in the new Civil Service Commission rule 6—old Civil Service Commission rule 12—which is a restatement of section 652 of the United States Code. There is no provision for appeal.

All of these matters amply illustrate to me that Mr. Robinson is not qualified for the position of Director of Office of Controls of the State Department; that these facts were known, or by the exercise of ordinary care, should have become known to his superiors.

It is to be remembered that in my letter of February 2, 1948, addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee, requesting that a hearing be held and that Messrs. Peurifoy and Robinson be called before the subcommittee, I stated that at the hearing I proposed to show that Mr. Robinson was not qualified and had no experience that would qualify him for his position and that in view of certain facts known to his superiors he should have been removed from office many months ago. I raised no question as to Mr. Robinson's loyalty and my letter was not intended to convey any idea that any question existed as to Mr. Robinson's loyalty.

In his opening statement at the hearing on March 10, 1948, Mr. Peurifoy used these words:

> I am as concerned with the problem of security in government as any of you. I have been shocked, deeply, by the revelations of the Canadian white paper. I have taken note of the effectiveness of the infiltration of Czechoslovakian institutions. But I cannot

believe that the only alternative is to be swept off our feet by the gossip-mongering and character-assassination which so often accompanies personal investigations. I am also, quite frankly, disturbed by the present tendency to extend the highly questionable theory of "guilt by association" to lengths that amount to a travesty of the traditional American justice.

What could have been the reason for Mr. Peurifoy's personal disturbances over what he referred to as "the present tendency to extend the highly questionable theory of guilt by association"?

Let us look further into Mr. Peurifoy's opening statement. Speaking of the investigation conducted by Mr. Robinson, Mr. Peurifoy said:

In addition to our own report, because of the nature of the job, I asked the FBI to give me a full investigation on Mr. Robinson. That investigation reported, what I already knew, that Mr. Robinson had a second cousin who had been the subject of investigation for alleged communistic activities.

However, as Mr. Peurifoy made no attempt to give any details about this second cousin, it necessitated cross-examination of Mr. Robinson to shed some light on the alleged communistic activities of Mr. Robinson's second cousin, Mr. Robert T. Miller III.

Mr. Miller was appointed Chief Informational Liaison Officer in the State Department at an annual salary of $6,500 on June 7, 1944. He later held positions of Assistant Chief in Charge of Publications, Division of Research and Publications, and Acting Assistant Chief of the Division of Publications.

The Register of the State Department for the year 1946, an official publication of the State Department, lists the following information under the name of Robert T. Miller III:

Born Pittsburgh, Pa., April 5, 1910; Kent School graduate; Princeton, A. B., 1931; M. A., 1932; writer and analyst for Public Relations Corp., 1933–34; free-lance newspaper correspondent in Europe, 1934; published and editor of weekly magazine, 1939–41. [His Government employment is then added.]

The following information was available to the investigation staff of the State Department and could have been secured by the exercise of a little investigative ability. Let the State Department say whether they learned that—

Mr. Miller applied for a passport sometime in 1934 and left for a visit to Moscow where he arrived in September 1934. He stated he was going to Moscow as a correspondent for the Chattanooga News when as a matter of fact Mr. Miller was unknown to the Chattanooga News and they never employed foreign correspondents in any country.

While in Moscow Mr. Miller married Jenny Levy, an American girl, who was or had been employed by both the Moscow Daily News and the Academy of Sciences in Moscow. Mr. Miller was friendly to a certain well-known Soviet espionage agent who introduced Miller to a courier in the Soviet espionage service in New York in May 1941. When Mr. Miller was employed in the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs as an intelligence officer he gave to the Soviet espionage courier information and pamphlets which he obtained as a result of his official position. Mr. Miller told this Soviet espionage courier that because of his position in the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs he had access to official reports prepared by the FBI, the Office of Strategic Services, the Naval Intelligence, and the Military Intelligence and gave the Soviet espionage courier typewritten summaries of those reports. Mr. Miller, as late as April and May 1946, associated with, visited or was visited by individuals and groups of individuals who are presently being investigated for Soviet espionage activities in agencies of the United States Government.

Let Mr. Peurifoy or the State Department say whether they were aware of Mr. Miller's activities and whether the removal of Mr. Miller was recommended on the ground that his continued employment in the State Department constituted a risk to the functions of the Department. Yet, without regard to Mr. Miller's activities, recommendations for his removal, and so forth, Mr. Miller continued in his position in the State Department until December 1946 when he was permitted to resign.

But Mr. Miller is Mr. Robinson's cousin and it was evidently the thought of Mr. Peurifoy that Mr. Robinson's loyalty was going to be questioned, so Mr. Peurifoy advances his fear of the tendency to apply the questionable theory of guilt by association. What was the association of Mr. Robinson with Mr. Miller? Mr. Robinson testifying before the subcommittee on March 10, 1948, said that:

And since I have been here in Washington, since the fall of 1940, I have seen very little of him. He calls up once or twice a year for lunch. I think I have had lunch with him a couple of times before I took this job. Since I accepted this job as Director of the Office of Controls I have had absolutely nothing to do with him; and before that time I heard nothing whatsoever at all which would indicate he was either a security risk or disloyal.

Now let us consider Mr. Robinson's testimony. Mr. Robinson was first employed in the State Department in November 1946. At that time his cousin, who incidentally was best man at Mr. Robinson's wedding, was also employed in the State Department. Mr. Miller was permitted to resign, yet Mr. Robinson has the audacity to say he knew nothing about his cousin which would indicate he was either a security risk or disloyal. At the time Mr. Robinson testified I wonder if he recalled, or conveniently forgot, a conversation he had with certain Members of Congress some time before when he stated that he had had lunch with Mr. Miller occasionally since he was Director of the Office of Controls, that he had seen Mr. Miller on at least a dozen occasions since then, and that he was of the opinion that Mr. Miller is known to be pro-Communist, that he probably is a Communist, and that he may be a Soviet agent.

This is no attempt to hold Mr. Robinson responsible for the conduct and activities of a relative. However, the fact that Mr. Miller is Mr. Robinson's cousin and was best man at his wedding raises a question as to whether Mr. Robinson has been altogether truthful about his association with Mr. Miller. This question may rightfully reflect on Mr. Robinson's qualifications for the position he occupies in the State Department.

While it is within the realm of possibility that Mr. Robinson knew nothing about the activities of his cousin it is highly improbable. Here is another bit of information regarding Mr. Robinson that could indicate he was not so disinterested in the welfare of his cousin as he would have us believe. On October 7, 1946, Mr. Byron C. Sarvis, Chief of the Procurement Section, Projects Support Division, Central Intelligence Group, addressed a letter to Mr. Hamilton Robinson advising that Robert T. Miller III had been referred to the Central Intelligence Group as one well qualified for an intelligence position and requesting information as to where Mr. Miller could be located. Mr. Robinson replied by letter dated October 13, 1946, as follows:

In response to your letter of 7 October Mr. Robert T. Miller III is an executive of the State Department and lives at 3223 Northampton Street NW., Washington. According to the telephone book his phone number is Ordway 1420.

Now remember the letter of inquiry from the Central Intelligence Group was written at a time when Mr. Miller was associating with Soviet espionage agents, yet did Mr. Robinson tell the Central Intelligence Group that his cousin was suspect?

One would think that any American who had the best interests of his country at heart would have put any department of our Government on guard, especially the Central Intelligence Group, by advising them regarding what he knew of Mr. Miller's background. This action of not advising the Central Intelligence Group regarding Mr. Miller takes on special significance in view of the fact that the Central Intelligence Group is charged with the responsibility of all our secret intelligence throughout the world. Instead of putting this agency on guard against Mr. Miller, Mr. Robinson merely chose to inform them of Mr. Miller's address and telephone number in a very sarcastic manner, to wit:

According to the telephone book his number is Ordway 1420.

Maybe Mr. Peurifoy might think such an attitude qualifies a man for the position of passing on the security and loyalty of approximately 20,000 employees in the State Department. If he does, I most heartily disagree.

Yet this is the action of a man who presently holds a position in the State Department and who passes on the loyalty of 20,000 State Department employees and who now says that any doubt of a person's loyalty is always resolved in favor of the Government. Is not this cumulative evidence of Mr. Hamilton Robinson's lack of suitability and qualifications for an important position in the State Department?

Mr. Robinson's experience in the Government service prior to his military service was limited to 3 months, January 16, 1942, to April 16, 1942, as a specialist in the Treasury Liquidation Office. In the early part of November 1946 he received an appointment in the State Department and 3 months later, or on

February 13, 1947, he was selected to head the Office of Controls.

We turn now to the testimony of Mr. Robinson before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on March 18, 1947. Testifying in response to a question as to his background, Mr. Robinson stated:

> Originally I was a lawyer in New York. I practiced law in New York for 6 or 7 years. I was then counsel to the British Purchasing Commission in Washington for a year. I was then with Mr. Stettinius as an adviser on British policy for 6 months, and then I was in the Army until the fall of 1945, during which time I was in the office of General Somervell, on matters relating to management, planning, and handling of the various duties that went with special assignments and special jobs on a more or less of an expediting basis.

Mr. Robinson stretched his period of employment with the United States Treasury Liquidation Office to double its length but it could well be that he was testifying from memory and his memory failed. Testifying as to the investigation of State Department employees on the question of loyalty, Mr. Robinson said:

> The top investigation is made whenever evidence comes to the attention of the security people that there is some evidence of disloyalty, subversive activities, or things of that nature * * *. My job as Director of Office of Controls is to present to Mr. Peurifoy all the facts, good and bad, and he makes the decision. * * * On the other hand, although we are going to try to get these people out of the Department, we must have evidence of a substantial nature to justify dismissal, and we want to be careful not to lean over too far in that direction, but we have to be sure. We have to get good evidence, and I put a great deal of emphasis on the quality of the evidence that we need rather than its quantity. That evidence has to be properly corroborated and substantiated, and the credibility of witnesses we get has to be substantiated.

Less than 3 months later, or on June 11, 1947, Mr. Robinson testified before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. Questioned as to his background of experience in administration, Mr. Robinson said:

> I was originally a lawyer. I was associated with a New York law firm. Then I was Washington counsel for the British Purchasing Commission. When I went on duty in the Army I went into a thing called the Control Commission, where I was for the whole war, except for a year when I was with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Control Division was an organization designed to improve management in the whole Army Service Forces. While I knew very little about management techniques and methods before I started, I absorbed quite a bit, I think, during that period. I am afraid, in deference to my profession, I must also claim that a lawyer has perhaps more adaptability than a soap salesman, and that, therefore, a lawyer may be able to swing into a new job with perhaps more facility than members of the general business fraternity.

In a prepared statement read to the subcommittee, Mr. Robinson said, on the subject of loyalty investigations:

> In this connection the Department has adopted the policy that every departmental and Foreign Service employee shall be investigated for loyalty. * * * The personnel and physical security program together constitute what is called the internal-security program. In our judgment it is vital to our national interest and to the successful conduct of foreign affairs.

Now let us come down to a more recent date and try to determine if Mr. Robinson practices what he preaches or if he was just talking to the subcommittee for budgetary purposes.

On his appearance before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on January 28, 1948, Mr. Robinson was questioned about a certain State Department employee. The report of investigation on this case is:

> This man is an applicant for a P–7 position. Investigation was initiated June 25, 1947. The file reflected that he studied under Harold Laski at the London School of Economics, 1927–29. In 1933 he wrote an article, Applied Marxism in Soviet Russia, which was an objective review of the principles of Marxism as applied by Lenin and Stalin. He pointed out that much progress would continue to be made "toward the completion of the foundation of the classless socialist state." One of his former associates of UNRRA praised him and referred to his excellent educational background. In this connection, investigations at the University of Wisconsin revealed that he was dropped for poor scholarship at that school in 1921, readmitted in 1923, and dropped again in 1924. Prior to coming with the Government in 1942, applicant's top salary was $3,700 per annum. On his application he indicated that he would not accept less than $8,000 per annum. His only position in excess of that has been with UNRRA. A coworker at War Foods Administration, in a report dated September 3, 1947, expressed reservations concerning his loyalty. This report reads: "He stated further that the applicant had admitted his loyalty to the Government had been questioned on two occasions when he was asked about the articles on Russia and the Communist activities of his father. It was alleged by the applicant that he was mistaken for his father, who has the same name and who is known to have attended some Communist meetings." The applicant traveled to Russia in 1936. As of October 15, 1947, the investigation was still pending.

Mr. Robinson testified this man was employed by the State Department. What is to be gained by the expenditure of thousands of dollars investigating prospective Government employees if Mr. Robinson is going to employ, in vital positions in the State Department, such people as described above.

If it is necessary to wait for proof of an overt act of disloyalty on the part of a suspected employee before any adverse action can be taken it is necessary to make some changes in the laws. But laws, rules, and regulations will not cure such a condition. In these days of alarms, excitements, and rumors of war the record must be kept straight. Agencies have the Hatch Act, the McCarran rider, and other laws to rid the Government of subversives and persons of doubtful loyalty. But it takes people of courage to put laws, rules, and regulations to use.

Mr. Robinson has fully demonstrated that he lacks either the courage to take action or the ability to evaluate the information he received and understand its true meaning. In either event he has amply demonstrated that he is not qualified for the position he holds.

"The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance." No man should be placed in a position to pass on the security of employees in an agency as vital as the State Department who demonstrates as little knowledge of the rights and duties of a Government employee as has Mr. Robinson.

As a lawyer, Mr. Robinson should know that employment by the Government is a privilege and not a right. No person has a constitutional right to a Government position, but having once accepted a position in the Government the person has certain duties and obligations. One of those obligations is unquestionable loyalty to his Government. If it is determined that there is some question of his loyalty he should be dismissed from the Government service. Such dismissals are not punishments within the meaning of any penal law. The individual is not punished or prosecuted and, therefore, proof of an overt act of disloyalty is neither necessary nor required to support such a dismissal. This, Mr. Robinson, even as a Wall Street lawyer, should know.

The failure of Mr. Robinson to recognize facts that indicate an employee should be removed from the Government service, either under the McCarran rider to the Appropriations Act or any other law, is but one example of how these questionable characters creep into the Federal service. Mr. Robinson and Mr. Peurifoy sitting idly waiting for evidence of an overt act could well apply to the Marzani case. So far as the record discloses Marzaini never committed an overt act, such as Robinson and Peurifoy look for, while employed in the State Department. Yet Marzani had 4 years of continuous Government employment while a member of the Communist Party. The utter incompetence of certain State Department employees and the United States Civil Service Commission to investigate loyalty matters and place a common sense interpretation on evidence is illustrated by comparing the inside story of the Marzani case that appeared in the October 1947 issue of Plain Talk magazine by J. Anthony Panuch, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, with the records of the Civil Service Commission.

Marzani was transferred from the OSS to the State Department some time in 1946. He had been investigated for a position in the OSS and in January 1943 the Civil Service Commission ordered his removal from the service. The investigation revealed that Marzani was born in Italy and came to the United States at the age of 12, later receiving derivative citizenship through the naturalization of his father. He attended Oxford University and there married an American girl. Both Marzani and his wife were employed on WPA, where Mrs. Marzani was discharged for her Communist activities, it being alleged, among other things, that she circulated 17 Communist petitions. The New York City Police Department records showed Marzani as a well-known Communist and known under the Communist Party name of Tony Whales—or Wales—and that he was formerly a sec-

tion organizer on the East Side for the Communist Party.

Now the State Department, according to the article by Mr. Panuch, discovered, in October 1946, that the New York City Police Department had some information concerning one Tony Whales—or Wales. What did the State Department do when they discovered in October 1946 that Marzani was or had been a member of the Communist Party? Did they exercise their authority under the McCarran rider and discharge him as a security risk? Marzani was discharged under the McCarran rider because he had falsified to the State Department regarding his Communist affiliations. Even this action was not taken on the information in the files of the Civil Service Commission or the New York City Police Department. This action was taken only after a detective in the New York City Police Department had identified photographs of Marzani as being the Tony Whales—or Wales—the subject of the information in the files of the New York City Police Department.

Of course, the State Department should have removed Marzani from the service in October 1946 when they became aware of the information in the files of the New York City Police Department. But they waited for proof that Marzani had committed a crime, or as Messrs. Peurifoy and Robinson say, proof of an overt act.

If persons of responsibility in sensitive Government agencies wait until they obtain proof of an overt act or proof that an employee had committed a crime before they rid the Government service of persons whose employment constitutes a security risk, then it is time to supplant those officials with men who are aware of such danger.

The transcript of the hearing on appropriations for the State Department before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives is persuasive proof of the incompetence and lack of qualifications of not only Mr. Hamilton Robinson, but also of Mr. Peurifoy.

Much emphasis was made by Mr. Peurifoy and Mr. Robinson at the hearings before the subcommittee in deprecation of the guilt-by-association idea. In other words, the unreasonable doubt should not be had of an employee's loyalty merely because he was seen in the company of known Soviet agents. Yet section 4 of the State Department order on dismissal grounds of suspected employees written by Mr. Robinson reads as follows:

> 4. A person who has habitual or close association with persons believed to be in category 1 or 2 above to an extent which would justify the conclusion that he might, through such association, voluntarily or involuntarily divulge classified information without authority.

The two categories mentioned in the above paragraph are:

> 1. A person who engages in, supports, or advocates treason, subversion, or sedition, or who is a member of, affiliated with, or in sympathetic association with the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist parties, or of any foreign or domestic party, organization, movement, group, or combination of persons which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means or whose policy is to advocate or approve the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States; or a person who consistently believes in or supports the ideologies and policies of such a party, organization, movement, group, or combination of persons.
>
> 2. A person who is engaged in espionage or who is acting directly or indirectly under the instructions of any foreign government; or who deliberately performs his duties, or otherwise acts to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interest of the United States.

I submit that using the old clichés of not judging a man too harshly because of his associates such as were used by Mr. Robinson and Mr. Peurifoy at the recent hearings goes counter to their own views as expressed in the sections quoted above.

The critical situation of the United States because of the continued encroachments of the Soviet Union in its cold war to extirpate democracies does not permit us to make fine distinctions now as to a man's loyalty, security, integrity, and discretion. We should not be deterred from our duty by shibboleths of civil liberties, freedom of speech, or association or any of the cloaks which an incompetent, or worse, uses to protect himself. So long as the causes for this critical situation exist, the State Department as an outpost in foreign policy should be inviolable. It should be like Caesar's wife, and it is utter nonsense to be confronted with case after case of reasonable doubt as to an employee's loyalty only to find Mr. Robinson clearing him or waiting for proof of an overt act.

I submit that association of an employee with suspected agents is a matter of extreme urgency. No bank would continue to employ a teller as cashier who was known to associate with gamblers. Recognized police procedure places great emphasis on criminal associations. I maintain it is criminal malfeasance in such critical times not to take instant, summary action on a prima facie case of this kind.

With the foreign situation as delicate as it is now, it is a mystery to me how our State Department can be so careless as to harbor in it questionable persons having access to secret material. It is a mystery how important officials can in essence require almost incontrovertible direct evidence before taking action, yet our courts can convict on circumstantial evidence. Are we to learn nothing from the experience of Czechoslovakia and France before World War II, of the numerous other countries whose inertia, complacency, and stupidity permitted the infiltration of disloyals or incompetents whose acts helped undermine the fabric of those countries?

THE GERMAN SCIENTIST PROGRAM

In an article in the March 1948 issue of the American magazine, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator from Virginia, relates how the German scientists are now being used by the United States for research in the fields of jet propulsion, rocket propulsion, aerodynamics, thermodynamics, supersonics, and other fields. After the cessation of hostilities in Europe, a race was on between the United States, Great Britain, and Russia to grab the German scientists. Senator BYRD writes that none of these Germans has been given a State Department entry visa or allowed to apply for American citizenship. A special contract was worked out which made the Germans civilian employees of the Army in Europe, assigned to temporary duty in the United States. Bringing these German scientists into the United States whereby this country could profit from their knowledge was delayed for months while the War and State Departments deliberated over the contract.

Small numbers were brought over at first and kept under conditions similar to prisoners of war. Senator BYRD writes:

> Theoretically they were paid salaries, but they never saw the money. All of it went to their families or dependents, who weren't allowed to leave Germany.

On the question as to whether these German scientists would make good American citizens Senator BYRD continues:

> General Putt thinks "that those we have recommended for visas would make as good Americans, from the standpoint of loyalty, as the average flow of immigrants common to the history of our country. Intellectually, of course, they have proved their special values."
>
> But the State Department apparently is not so sure. It is represented as feeling that, if naturalized, the Germans would be subject to much less surveillance—no mail censorship or control of movement about the country, for instance—and couldn't be held to work contracts for the armed forces or their industrial contractors. About 60 of the Air Force's Germans have been recommended for entry visas, with which they could file their first naturalization papers. So far the State Department has issued no visas.

Several weeks ago a radio program featured a story of an attempt of our military authorities to bring into the United States the scientists in Germany who had for years been experimenting in the development of new weapons of warfare. It was stated that—

> About the middle of 1946 the program planning was completed. It was approved by the President; it was approved by the Army and Navy; it was approved by the Acting Secretary for the State Department; and it was approved by the Justice Department, which includes the Immigration Service. It was the understanding of everybody that the Army and Navy would screen these scientists in Germany before bringing them over. Nobody wanted any Nazis. But with everything all set the program began running into trouble. Even though it had been approved by the State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff couldn't get the project past the State Department Office of Controls, which includes the Visa Division.

In a later broadcast the same commentator said that he learned—

> That the Army and Navy are not the only ones who've been given the runaround by this same little clique in the State Department Office of Controls, which is under the direction of Hamilton Robinson. Various big industrial corporations have been trying to get State Department permission to bring German scientists into this country. These corporations want the German technicians so

that they can get the advantage of their industrial knowledge. They've found a great many scientists in Germany who would be able to improve American production methods and efficiency. It would mean, in many cases, lower prices, better products, and expanded production, plus, of course, more American jobs. The companies have approached the scientists and have persuaded them to come to this country. The only thing necessary is to obtain the approval of the State Department. And once again the matter rests with the Office of Controls and Hamilton Robinson.

All of this causes one to wonder why any person with so little experience in highly important Government matters as Mr. Robinson has is enabled to wield such influence in important matters of state.

Let us remember the testimony of Mr. Peurifoy before the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on March 10, 1948, when he said:

Now, mind you, I say what I was looking for was an administrator, not a top investigator as such. I wanted a man with sound judgment.

We look to the remarks of the commentator for further enlightenment of Mr. Robinson's duties as an administrator and if he possesses the sound judgment Mr. Peurifoy was looking for. The radio commentator said:

And there's one very strange feature about this whole affair. The Office of Controls is a little agency within the State Department which has no readily apparent reason for existing. It was set up in one of the State Department's reorganizations in 1944, but was never staffed until 1946. At that time it became a sort of an overlord to a number of divisions within the State Department. They'd been functioning very well on their own before the Office of Controls was ever thought of. One part of the Office of Controls is the Visa Division. That is the division which normally would have handled this matter of the German scientists, and which actually is handling it now, but under the direction of the Office of Controls. The Visa Division has tried to cooperate in this program, but the Office of Controls has stepped in and taken the matter out of the Division's hands. That's just a part of the story. The program is being hamstrung and the ax work is being done by an office in the State Department, the very existence of which nobody in the State Department can fully explain.

So we find an article written by a respected and honored Member of Congress published in the American magazine and radio commentators broadcasting about the inability of our Government to utilize the German scientists in matters that are vital to the very existence of our country. What are the facts surrounding this situation? If a committee of Congress calls on any agency in the executive branch of the Government for facts we are met with the statement that such facts have to do with security matters and cannot and will not be given to the legislative branch of the Government. We have tried arguments, pleas, subpenas, and we have remonstrated, but all to no avail.

So now we are compelled to say let the State Department deny or affirm that the following incidents have occurred as a result of the military's efforts to bring the German scientists to this country:

That after VE-day the military began bringing over small numbers of these German and Austrian scientists under a program which authorized their entry with a view toward immigration after arrival. The technical know-how gleaned from these scientists astounded the military authorities and as a result of this experiment it was decided, for the first time in the history of the world, to exploit brains as a part of war.

That from the very first instance it was recognized that in order to get the most out of these scientists it would be necessary to give them some definite assurance of permanency by allowing them the privilege of immigration if they proved to be worth while future citizens.

That during the fall and spring of 1945 and 1946 several meetings were held between the State, War, and Navy Departments for the purpose of facilitating the entry of the scientists for utilization by both the military and civilian establishments, and that on March 4, 1946, the Coordinating Committee of the State, War, and Navy Departments made some observations including—

That these scientists possess knowledge of such great value to the United States for both military and civilian use that every effort should be made to prevent other nations from exploiting them, it being noted that Great Britain, France, and the U. S. S. R. are already proceeding with a policy of long-range exploitation of the scientists in their zones. It was pointed out that current United States procedures permit short-term exploitation, but that the temporary conditions existent destroy incentives for them to do their best work and utilization of them on a long-range basis is desired.

That to bring the scientists and their families to the United States under the immigration laws, the interested departments will certify to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the admittance of the individual scientists would be in the national interest. The Joint Chiefs of Staff will cause an investigation to be made of each scientist to ascertain whether he is objectionable as a Nazi and then obtain final clearance from the Department of Justice.

That following this proposal the Joint Chiefs of Staff delegated the specific task of investigation to the Joint Intelligence Objectives Agency (JIOA). The JIOA was composed of members representing the Army, Navy, and State Departments.

That in April 1946 the JIOA held its first meeting. Attending as the State Department representative was one Samuel Klaus. At this meeting the importance of the program was emphasized and the desire of the United States to obtain some 600 scientists out of a total of 1,500 in the American zone. It was also brought out at this meeting the necessity of gaining the scientists on a long-term basis and furnishing an incentive by setting up procedures for eventual naturalization if the scientist qualified under the law. It was also clearly stated that the United States already had approximately 300 of these scientists working in various sections of the United States, some of whom were desired by the Government on a long-term basis.

That on August 30, 1946, the State Department submitted a memorandum to the President requesting approval of the project and to expand it to include a total of 1,000 scientists from selected individuals who would be granted permanent status in the United States under the immigration laws. The President approved the project on September 3, 1946.

That the following month, by letter dated October 1, 1946, to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General agreed to arrange for giving the scientists under this program immigration status by the preexamination process and obtaining visas in Canada. In short, this letter offered the complete facilities of the Immigration Department in an effort to hasten this important program.

That from the first meeting Samuel Klaus indicated that he did not favor the German-scientist program. At the April 1946 meeting he was requested to furnish the JIOA with the security requirements of the State Department with a view to immigration. The preliminary requirements were finally furnished in June 1946, and read as follows:

That on June 19, 1946, Samuel Klaus prepared a memorandum outlining the basic information required by the State Department in connection with applications of German scientists for visas to enter the United States saying that the memorandum had been prepared for the guidance of JIOA and the sponsoring agencies of the War and Navy Departments and was submitted only for that purpose, and that in that memorandum Mr. Klaus set forth the laws and regulations pertaining to the requirements for the issuance of a visa by a consular officer.

That JIOA worked to comply with the regulations submitted by Klaus and when cases were submitted to the State Department for approval they were turned down on the basis that they still did not answer State Department requirements. A year after the German scientist program was officially under way, not one scientist had been brought to the United States under the program, and on April 9, 1947, almost 1 year after he had sent the State Department's preliminary requirements, Klaus initiated additional requirements which he included in a memorandum that was signed by Hamilton Robinson as Director of the Office of Controls and wherein it is stated that the Department of State finds lacking certain information considered essential if a decision is to be reached which will not jeopardize the security of the United States and that further Klaus listed in the memorandum other information desired which would require examination of numerous records in Germany necessitating months of additional work and that some of the additional requirements included insistence that German SS and SD records be checked in Berlin or wherever else they were in Germany, which Mr. Klaus and Mr. Robinson should have known was an impossible request.

That from the first instance Klaus has used his authority as the State Department representative on the JIOA to delay, obstruct, and confuse the program. He has even gone so far as to state that this may be the policy of the Secretary of State and the President, but it is not the policy of Samuel Klaus. Klaus is alleged to have made this statement before members of the board at one of the first meetings in the summer of 1946. The influence which Klaus wields in the State Department is unbelievable. Wherever the War and Navy Departments touched in an attempt to unravel the confusion it found an official who could not act or say a word until he contacted Klaus.

That Assistant Secretary of State John Hilldring received a delegation of high military officials in the fall of 1946, who were determined to see the program underway. Hilldring was informed at this time that Klaus was undermining all the efforts of the Army and Navy and it is alleged that he promised to do something about it. Two weeks later when contacted Hilldring is alleged to have admitted his inability to cope with the situation.

That Klaus was eventually taken off the JIOA and no substitute was appointed. However, one Rebecca Wellington was named at the instance of Klaus, with no written orders, to act as liaison officer. At that time Rebecca Wellington was an assistant to one Solomon Silver, who occupied a somewhat

nebulous position as a deputy to Hamilton Robinson. Wellington and Silver followed the Klaus line and it is alleged that they have stated that they look upon the War and Navy views askance and take their statements with a grain of salt.

That the State Department, through Klaus, Wellington, and Silver, not only insisted on impossible requirements but also insisted that they be informed relative to the precise details of the scientific programs to be carried out with the Army and Navy, and that Klaus and his cohorts were aware of the pleas of the War and Navy Departments to the effect that time in this scientific research is of the essence, and it will take us 10 to 15 years to catch up on our own with present German developments which are ours for the taking through this scientist program. Every day delay turns more of these scientists into Russian hands. Klaus is aware that these scientists are actually being bought and kidnaped by the Russians, even from the American zones.

That it is significant in considering Klaus' power that 2 weeks after offering his full cooperation in this program and asking what he could do to help the War and Navy Departments, Frederick B. Lyon was no longer Director of the Office of Controls. Dennis Flinn, Lyon's deputy, was anxious to help, but was blocked higher up. Flinn, too, was quickly out of the Office of Controls. Hamilton Robinson replaced Lyon and Solomon Silver took over Flinn's supervisory duties.

That Klaus indicated to the JIOA that he was obsessed with the DP program, and it is known that he personally arranged for 500 to come in through Mexico and another 1,000 direct from Germany. Yet, he could not arrange for even 1 scientist to come to the United States to be placed in a program that was of the utmost interest to the United States.

That to date, March 1948, the German scientist program is still not under way. Klaus and his cohorts in the State Department have succeeded in sabotaging a most important program.

The Visa Division of the State Department is a part of the Office of Controls. Mr. Hamilton Robinson is the Director of Office of Controls. It is not necessary to enter into a minute discussion as to how the Visa and Passport Divisions operate and how they have operated for years. With the advent of Mr. Robinson into the position of Director of Office of Controls, he decided that the Visa and Passport Divisions needed a higher or intermediate echelon of direction and supervision. On February 3, 1947, he created within the Office of Controls a travel-policy committee. On April 16, 1947, he created a committee on immigration and naturalization policy. These committees are composed of employees within the State Department who had no connection with matters of visas or passports; yet, under the organization created by Mr. Robinson, they passed on questions relating to visas and passports. The policy governing matters of visas and passports is a question of law, and no policy committee can change those laws. These committees created by Mr. Robinson did not add to the efficiency of his office, but, on the contrary, created confusion, agitation, and turmoil, as illustrated in the cases of the German scientists; and I submit this is additional evidence of Mr. Robinson's inability to cope with the problems of the State Department.

The following article appeared in the column of a news commentator in the March 23, 1948, issue of the Washington Post:

Hamilton Robinson would have resigned as State's secretary officer if he hadn't been smeared by a couple of Congressmen who questioned his loyalty. He has no intention of resigning under fire. The former law associate of John Foster Dulles, the Republican foreign-policy adviser, may have some very interesting things to say if and when he does resign.

I speak only for myself when I say that I have never questioned Mr. Robinson's loyalty, neither have I smeared him. It is my honest and sincere belief that the Government is entitled to the best-qualified personnel, and that Mr. Robinson definitely lacks the necessary qualifications for the high and important position to which he was appointed in the State Department.

THE IRON CURTAIN

On September 7, 1941, Hon. Martin Dies, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of the House of Representatives, charged that at least 50 persons with records of affiliations with Communist - front organizations were employed in a certain Government agency. Since that day much has been said and much has been written about Communists and their fellow travelers being employed in Government agencies. However, little, if anything, was done to rid the Government service of such undesirables. The results of the 1946 election made it apparent that the people of the United States had become disturbed over the existing conditions, and it is all too evident that the new Congress would do something about it. Undoubtedly realizing that the new Congress would act immediately upon convening, the President, on November 25, 1946, issued an Executive order creating the President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty. This Commission was authorized—

To inquire into (a) the standards, procedures, and organizational provisions for the investigation of persons who are employed in the United States Government, or who are applicants for such employment, (b) the removal or disqualification from employment of any disloyal or subversive person, and to prepare a report incorporating any recommendations deemed appropriate in order to improve existing legislative and administrative arrangements in connection with loyalty investigations, administrative responsibility in loyalty standards, standards of loyalty, loyalty adjudication and related matters, so as to protect the Government against the employment or continuance in employment of disloyal, or subversive persons, and assure fair hearings to persons against whom such charges are brought.

Officers of the Department of Justice, Department of State, Department of the Treasury, Department of War, Department of the Navy, and the Civil Service Commission were designated to serve on the Commission as representatives of their respective agencies.

Subsequently the Commission submitted its report, which concludes with the following sentence:

In conclusion, the Commission recommends that this report, together with any Executive order which the President may issue, be submitted to Congress for consideration.

On March 21, 1947, the President issued Executive Order No. 9538, entitled "Prescribing Procedures for the Administration of an Employees Loyalty Program in the Executive Branch of the Government."

I have it on very good authority that Mr. Hamilton Robinson played rather a large part in the drafting of this Executive order. In this connection it is to be noted that when the representatives of the several agencies were designated to serve on the President's Temporary Commission, Mr. Donald S. Russell, the then Assistant Secretary of State, was named to represent the State Department. Mr. Russell resigned on January 20, 1947, and was replaced by Anthony J. Panuch. Mr. Panuch resigned on January 23, 1947, and he was replaced by John E. Peurifoy and Mr. Peurifoy is the man who appointed Mr. Robinson to his present position.

In October 1947 rumor was rife that Government agencies were about to clamp on a blanket of secrecy on the civilian affairs of such agencies. It was then learned that a super secrecy committee, headed by Mr. Hamilton Robinson, had drafted rules of secrecy to be submitted to the President for his approval. The authority for such rules was discovered to be a "sleeper" clause in Executive Order 9835, issued in March 1947. That "sleeper" will be found in part VI of the Executive order under the heading of "Miscellaneous" and is designated as paragraph 2. It reads:

The Security Advisory Board of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee shall draft rules applicable to the handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents and information which should not be publicly disclosed, and upon approval by the President such rules shall constitute the minimum standards for the handling and transmission of such documents and information, and shall be applicable to all departments and agencies of the executive branch.

Now, remember, this Executive order was issued for the express purpose of prescribing procedures for the administration of an employees' loyalty program in the executive branch of the Government and has nothing to do with censorship.

Let us take a look at this super-duper committee. The Directory of Committees, Committee Secretariat of the Executive Secretariat, dated November 1, 1947, reflects that in December 1944 by an exchange of letters between the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of War the State-Army - Navy - Air Force Coordinating Committee was established. The committee was reorganized in October. Subsequently this committee created a subcommittee called the Coordinating Subcommittee for Security Control or Security Advisory Board, with Mr. Hamilton Robinson of the State Department as Chairman.

Just as soon as Executive Order 9835 was issued Mr. Robinson and his subcommittee started working on a draft of so-called security regulations for civilian departments and continued working on such regulations for nearly

8 months. Meanwhile, the State Department put through its own regulations in anticipation of eventual issuance of Government minimum regulations. The whole preposterous situation came to light when it was discovered that the Veterans' Administration had adopted rules, pursuant to a request of the Security Advisory Board, State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, that imposed secrecy upon the operations of the agency.

So far as I have been able to ascertain the President has never approved any draft of rules submitted by Mr. Robinson's Board.

Let us look a little further and see what the ideas of Mr. Robinson and his Board are on the subject of handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents and information which shall not be publicly disclosed. According to Mr. Hamilton, the guiding principle of the censorship program is that Department officials shall be in a position to decide what the public shall be told about Government business and be in a position to enforce their decisions. Accordingly Mr. Robinson and his Board have divided "confidential documents and other documents" into four categories—top secret, secret, confidential, and restricted. The original definitions were changed, because of strong criticism, and some objectionable phrases deleted. The definitions are:

Top secret: The term "top secret" as used herein means information, the security aspect of which is paramount, and the unauthorized disclosure of which would cause exceptionally grave damage to the (prestige of the Nation or any governmental activity thereof) Nation.

Secret: The term "secret" as used herein means information the unauthorized disclosure of which would endanger national security, or would cause serious injury to the interests or prestige of the Nation, or would be of a great advantage to a foreign nation.

Confidential: The term "confidential" as used herein means information, the unauthorized disclosure of which, although not endangering the national security, would be prejudicial to the interests or prestige of the Nation, (or any governmental activity thereof) or would cause unwarranted injury to an individual, or would be of advantage to a foreign nation, (or would cause serious administrative embarrassment).

Restricted: The term "restricted" as used herein means information which requires security protection, other than that information which has been determined to be top secret, secret or confidential.

On July 1, 1947, a 25-page mimeographed pamphlet on secrecy regulations was issued. It is stated on the cover of the pamphlet that it was "issued pursuant to Executive Order 9835." That executive order expressly provides that the Security Advisory Board shall draft rules and upon approval by the President shall be applicable to all departments and agencies of the Executive Branch. However, the opening paragraph of the document provides:

These rules constitute minimum standards for the handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents and information which shall not be publicly disclosed and are applicable to all departments and agencies of the executive branch.

Not one word was said about approval by the President so it is no wonder that some Government departments treated the document as a binding order. At least the Veterans' Administration did. When the Security Advisory Board refused to clarify the secrecy rules, upon request of the Veterans' Administration, the Veterans' Administration issued an order canceling the secrecy rules they had issued. The Security Advisory Board said that it would rescind nothing because it had issued nothing, while the Veterans' Administration says it has records to support its position that it received an order from another Government department.

The action of the Veterans' Administration made it plain that the Security Advisory Board was without authority to place into effect any of their suggested regulations without approval of the President and further that the President had not as of November 7, 1947, approved any such regulations. Let us turn to the records of the Security Advisory Board for a determination as to whether they have placed into effect the unapproved rules they drafted.

On May 9, 1947, on the letterhead of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, Security Advisory Board, the following communication was addressed to counsel for a committee of the House of Representatives:

Pursuant to your telephonic request of this date, copies of the letters forwarded to you on May 5, 1947, are inclosed herewith.

This letter is stamped at both bottom and top with the word "Restricted." That could not possibly apply to the enclosures for they are both stamped "Restricted" and each communication is marked with a separate serial number.

Compare the letter of Mr. Robinson's board dated May 9, 1947, with Mr. Robinson's board's definition of "Restricted" and the answer is that all documents that cannot be classified as Top Secret, Secret, or Confidential are, ipso facto, Restricted.

If it took Mr. Robinson and his Board 8 months to concoct regulations that even the President would not sign, is it any wonder that I raise the question of his qualifications? If it took Mr. Robinson and his Board 8 months to make up such a senseless and unacceptable rigmarole is it any wonder that he knows so little about the loyalty and security risk of State Department employees? Is it any wonder that Government agencies complain that the appropriations of funds by Congress are insufficient when a top-salaried employee spends 8 months in drafting rules or regulations that are meaningless, worthless, and of no weight or effect? Is not this cumulative evidence of Mr. Robinson's utter lack of qualifications for a top position in our State Department?

ENTER ROWENA ROMMEL

In order to understand the entire picture of what is wrong with the State Department one must go back even before the Office of Controls was officially established at the beginning of 1945. This reveals one of the most mysterious and influential figures, very seldom talked about, that ever went into the State Department. The person to whom I have reference is Mrs. Rowena Barlow Rommel. The following account of the part she played in wrecking the State Department is a sincere and honest evaluation of her activities and does not seem to be altogether a secret around the State Department. Here, in the opinion of some people, is one of the cleverest, most sinister figures in the entire State Department set-up, as will appear later. By not obtaining the top salary grade in the Department and at all times operating ostensibly as one of the subordinates in a given group, Mrs. Rommel has been able to mask her extraordinary effectiveness and real power. Actually she has been one of the key figures in the State Department mystery, but until the last stages of the Robert T. Miller case (he resigned December 13, 1946) Mrs. Rommel has woven in and out of various peculiar situations in the Department without any tangible proof adduced against her for her responsibility in creating these situations.

Her biographical record from the State Department register of December 1946 shows:

1. Birth in Rhode Island.
2. Education at Brown University with an A. B. degree in 1932, an M. A. in 1933.
3. Traveling scholar for English Speaking Union in summer of 1935. (The time from June 1933 to summer of 1935 is not accounted for.)
4. Intern, National Institute of Public Affairs 1936–37.
5. Clerk, Personnel Department Home Owners Loan Corporation 1937.
6. Secretary and research assistant to member of Social Security Board 1937–1939.
7. Administrative analyst, Division of Administrative Management, Bureau of the Budget 1939–1942.
8. On August 4, 1943, appointed management and procedural analyst at $3,800 in State Department; on April 16, 1944 appointed at $4,600 an assistant to the Director of the Office of Departmental Administration (this man was John Rose now with United Nations and at that time a well-known leftist); on April 16, 1945, appointed an executive assistant at $5,600 and became an assistant executive officer of the Steering Executive and Coordinating Committee preparing for the United Nations Conference which began at San Francisco in May 1945. On September 16, 1945, she became an information specialist with the Office of Public Liaison and remained there until 1947 when she was attached to the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation under William T. Stone. Her present salary is not available but it is either about $7,200 or $8,100.

It will be observed that her field is that of personnel and management. Her highest salary was about $3,200 in 1943 in the Budget Bureau before coming to State.

It will be recalled that the Budget Bureau was the central spot in scrambling up the Government apparatus and credited with planting leftist personnel in various departments to formulate government policy and for blanketing into the State Department approximately 7,000 employees from OWI and OSS and OICC.

Schwartzwalter, William T. Stone, Paul Appleby—those are only a few of the names of men in Budget who have been suspected of acts bordering on conspiracy. Budget Bureau by virtue of its extraordinary authority in approving or

rejecting Government requests for appropriations before they went to Congress was in a position where unscrupulous officials in Budget could intimidate weak budget officers in agencies or assist their confederates whom Budget had planted in various agencies, and thereby mold the policy of the Government.

It appears that Rowena Rommel was selected by a leftist group in Budget as the first plant in the State Department. From her entrance in 1943 began most of the troubles now existing in that Department. It was known in Budget Bureau that Cordell Hull had instructed Stettinius to reorganize the Department for more effective organization. Rowena Rommel was assigned by Budget Bureau for that purpose. She had no particular skill, and I have been informed was ignorant of State Department practices and policies, was arrogant, curt, and supercilious to inferiors; fawning, flattering, and sycophantic to her superiors. This reorganization was praised by the Daily Worker before it was released.

In no set-up has she been the top person, but in every reorganization set-up she has been practically the sole active operator and she has been the only person in the State Department who has been connected with all phases of the reorganizations.

The first reorganization was in January 1944, the second in December 1944. Both were major ones involving every phase of the Department. Thereafter there has been a succession of minor changes which have not altered substantially either of the major reorganizations. They merely have corrected oversights and the major ones according to her plan.

Mrs. Rommel with the active assistance of Elwood Thompson of the Budget Bureau and with the passive aid of Walter Laves of the Budget Bureau, was the leading spirit in these reorganizations which have left the State Department in such disorganization, lack of responsibility, and divided authority that it is a fair question whether these actions were not a conspiracy to weaken the structure of the Department and permit the infiltration of divisive forces dedicated to a foreign way of life. Laves today is the American representative on UNESCO. Thompson is a high official in the Department or in the United Nations.

It is necessary to go into Mrs. Rommel's sympathies. Ample evidence should exist as to her association with suspected agents, her active part in promoting the entry into the Department of one Robert T. Miller, believed to be one of the most dangerous Soviet agents ever to infiltrate the Department of State. Furthermore, she was responsible for placing Robert T. Miller in a spot where he had access to the most sensitive and top-secret information in the Department during a crucial period of our relations with Russia. There is no doubt that investigators have produced this and more damaging information.

What is more important is that Mrs. Rommel is reputed to have been the key figure in scrambling up the Department so that it has become hopelessly overlapping, dangerously inefficient, and so divided in responsibility that quick, accurate decisions are difficult to make.

Under Mrs. Rommel's guidance, spending, demands for huge appropriations, embarking on impractical ventures became the watchword. It is no wonder that the Department's budget skyrocketed from $16,000,000 in 1939 to close to $200,000,000 asked for the next fiscal year. Commitments under international obligations accounted for some of the increase, but much of it is attributable to the unsound, visionary schemes concocted by Mrs. Rommel and her budget pals. For example, one from the Budget Bureau who assisted was William T. Stone, who worked on the Benton project while a member of the Budget Bureau and then moved into the State Department in a key position.

Reverting to Mrs. Rommel, she made her bill of goods attractive by creating a huge, expensive apparatus in the Department at tremendous expense with reclassifications in salary horizontal throughout the Department. The key word was expansion, needless hiring, qualifications secondary—just fill up the Department with high-salaried personnel and then put them to work. Sections became divisions, divisions became offices, and then came a greatly expanded executive staff for each office to keep track of personnel and budgetary requirements. Mrs. Rommel volunteered to select the personnel of executives for each office which, if it had succeeded, would have given her a machine controlling the budget for the entire Department and, above all, would have given her a chance to select personnel when vacancies occurred. One can imagine the pressure of this scheme was terrific as Mrs. Rowena Rommel, by virtue of her influence in the State Department Management and Planning Division could make or break, or at least curtail, the effectiveness of a given office—especially in connivance with her pals in the Budget Bureau.

After these reorganizations she helped actively at the United Nations founding in San Francisco. She was partly responsible for creating and staffing many of the new divisions in the Department attendant upon the creation of United Nations, and it is no accident that there have been repeated questions as to the loyalty of many of these persons.

Thereafter she went to Public Liaison, or the Department's public-relations office. As part of that scheme she was responsible for two noted leftists, Professor Schuman and Owen Lattimore, lecturing in the Department of State.

Presently she is in a key committee dealing with UNESCO. The United States pays $6,000,000 as its contribution for UNESCO. Russia is not even a member, yet Russia is said to be the most effectively represented nation in the world on UNESCO. There is no record that Mrs. Rommel has ever tried to rid UNESCO of subversives nor in the light of her record is she likely to do so.

Mrs. Rommel, ignorant of State Department traditions and generally of the historic policies of the United States, brought with her new concepts of foreign-office techniques. One might say that she was more than a Russia-firster; she thought the Russian experiment was a noble one worth emulating in the United States. Consequently, she set up a system, and the thought is inevitable that she has at all times been carrying out orders, whereby the Department was staffed with a strange mixture of ardent, fervent pro-Sovieters, starry-eyed one-worlders, and general incompetents. Public organizations whose representatives were brought to the Department to help put over one or another Department plan always had a generous shaving of front organizations or worse. She was responsible for bringing around the Department a few years ago representatives of some of these organizations to meet division chiefs and questioning them on foreign policy under the pretense of selling the policy of America. Some division chiefs were shocked at the bold pro-Soviet questions put to them. It was only natural, because of Mrs. Rommel's control of administrative machinery that she was in a position to exert a great deal of pressure and intimidation on these chiefs because she could hurt them when the budget came up annually if they did not go along.

Public protest over the appearance of Schuman and Lattimore under her auspices caused her to go under cover temporarily. Her connection with the Miller case and the mention of her name by Congressman DONDERO in March 1946 also caused her to be more covert, but to this day, to my knowledge, she has never altered her plans.

The machine she set up remains and it is so cumbersome and complicated that it baffles investigators. One has the feeling that the administrative structure of the Department, particularly the Office of Budget and Planning, is an extraordinarily large and expensive group, but one does not realize this was done deliberately to confuse investigators by dividing authority so that no one knows all the answers.

Rowena Rommel is probably as responsible as anyone for the huge cost of administrative machinery but her real contribution has been the clever, subtle, insidious setting up of unnecessary groups and offices, inexcusable enlargement of already existing offices, and introduction into the Department of ardent Russia-firsters.

All of the matters mentioned herein are either the product of Mr. Hamilton Robinson's "administrative ability" or his lack of capacity to recognize the gravity of the situation as far as security is concerned and to take corrective action.

The evidence developed in the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives brought out that there are fellow-travelers, if not actually Communists, still in the State Department. The same hearings and the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments amply illustrate that Mr. Robinson does not possess the necessary qualifications to pass on such important questions as loyalty and security. The information relating to the efforts of the

Air Force to get the German scientists into this country further illustrates that Mr. Robinson lacks the qualifications to deal with such important matters as visas. Does the State Department now contend that Mr. Robinson was qualified and at the time of his appointment had experience to qualify him for the position of Director of Office of Controls? Does the State Department now contend that they did not have knowledge of the matters developed herein and will the State Department now deny that Mr. Robinson should have been removed from office several months ago.

Mine Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the widows and orphans, relatives and friends of the 111 coal miners who died in an explosion in the Centralia, Ill., Mine No. 5, March 25, 1947, will meet today for memorial services at the Centralia High School.

It would be a fine thing if it were possible to inform that gathering that Congress had seen to it that steps had been taken in the past year to prevent future sacrifice of lives in our Nation's coal mines. Instead, speakers on the memorial program must point to the neglect of Congress to enact legislation in the interests of mine safety.

In the remarks I made on the floor today I invited the membership of the House to sign a discharge petition which I have placed on the Speaker's desk to force upon the floor legislation in the interests of mine safety.

Under leave to do so, I include with my remarks an editorial from the United Mine Workers' Journal of March 15, 1948, reviewing the Centralia disaster and pointing to the inactivity of Congress in a field in which Congress should be greatly concerned. The editorial follows:

DEATH AND AGONIES CAN CONTINUE IN COAL AS FAR AS CONGRESS IS CONCERNED

There will be no report of the passage of Federal mine-safety legislation to prevent a repetition of the hell-hole inferno explosion in Centralia No. 5 mine, where safety measures were forgotten as a necessary adjunct to coal mining, when the widows and orphans and friends of the 111 victims whose lives were snuffed out March 25, 1947, meet for memorial services at Centralia High School on March 25.

Instead of safety progress, the participants in the memorial services will be shocked by the continuing record of slaughter in American coal mines covering the full year 1947, which shows a toll of 1,165 killed, an increase of 91 over 1946, and 63,000 injured, for a total of 64,165. The nonfatal accidents increased 6,200 over 1946.

The high-sounding promises of the United States Senate subcommittee that investigated the explosion on the scene, as well as Congressmen from coal-mining areas, that the time had come for the Federal Government to act and that the Congress was determined to enact Federal legislation with teeth in it that would give to the Federal mine inspectors the power to enforce their recommendations have never materialized.

Running true to form as regards political promises, the Congress did a 100-percent job of forgetting its pledges for mine-safety legislation as soon as the disaster submerged as a leading public topic.

Congress forgot its solemn promises and assurances to the widows and orphans and the public that the men who met death at Centralia will not have died in vain.

In order to cover up their willful dodge of enacting mine-safety legislation, Congress passed meaningless Public Law 328 which only required the Secretary of the Interior to make a quarterly synopsis report on Federal mine inspections. This law was drafted and passed solely for the purpose of deceiving the public into believing that the Congress was doing something to promote mine safety.

In the period that has followed, Secretary of Interior Krug has submitted two quarterly reports. The first report admitted that "sufficient information may not be obtained from the State agencies to allow the Congress to determine the condition of the mines."

Summed up, the reports have been more of a statement of the refusal of the State mine bureaus of the various coal-producing States to assist in the enforcement of Federal mine inspectors' recommendations for improved safety than evidence that the United States can hope for State cooperation.

Simply stated, the State mine bureaus assert that they have no authority to and will not go beyond the provisions of their own State mining codes, which fall far short of the Federal safety-code provisions.

After the first report was received, there was another flurry of individual Congressmen and Senators asserting that legislation would be passed, but as usual nothing has been accomplished. Some of the Senators and Congressmen have insisted that because of the acceptance of a modified Federal safety code by the UMWA and the coal operators as part of the 1947 wage agreement, no legislation is necessary.

All of which makes the Congress more gullible than Illinois Governor Green's investigating committee, who found that "a workman should be held accountable in some manner for individual carelessness and omissions tending to cause accidents," but "it is impractical to obligate working coal miners to assume the general responsibility for safety measures."

Thus the attempt of the Congress to pass the buck back to the coal miners—who possess no power to enforce safety measures and who lose working time by closing a mine down, resulting in their inability to feed their families during long periods of idleness—is just another political trick to dodge the issue.

Investigation of the Centralia explosion by the United States Senate and the State of Illinois produced positive evidence of campaign cash and political hook-ups between coal operators and the Illinois department of mines as being the underlying reason why coal operators are permitted to violate safety laws at will.

As the Journal has pointed out over and over again, the political skulduggery and campaign contributions that brought about coal industry control of the Illinois department of mines are not confined to Illinois alone. Coal miners have long recognized that the State mine inspection bureau in most States is an integral part of the political machine in power. It is an old-established custom for coal operators to buy control, through political contributions, of State mining departments so as to control the selection of the department head and the appointment of inspectors.

An investigation by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch turned up endearing political letters which became known as the "dear Bob and Bill" letters and which revealed that Director Robert Medill of the Illinois department of mines sent a copy of a report of wholesale safety violations made by State Inspector Scanlan to William P. Young, operating vice president of the Centralia Coal Co., with the request that "dear Bill" let him know if he had any comment. Then "dear Bill" wrote "dear Bob" right back blaming the urgency of wartime coal production as the reason for not taking time out to make the safety improvements recommended by inspector Scanlan.

This letter was dated February 28, 1945, 2 years before the explosion actually took place. The mine, however, was kept going at top speed with little or no attention paid to safety improvements, which multiplied rather than decreased the near certainty of an explosion.

Coal miners have never asked the Federal or State Governments for the passage of a safety code that they expected could guarantee the complete elimination of explosions and all other hazards connected with underground coal mining. All the UMWA has ever asked for is a practical application of the known safety measures that can be applied by the diligence of mine management and the cooperation of the men to promote the maximum degree of safety.

Even a Federal law bestowing police power upon Federal mine inspectors to enforce their recommendations is not going to completely wipe out all the hazards inherent in coal mining. What the coal miners do ask is honest enforcement of the safety provisions of State and Federal laws.

As pointed out by President Lewis in his testimony dealing with the Centralia explosion before the House Committee on Education and Labor in April 1947, it is the enforcement of the provisions of safety laws that counts and not merely the enactment of a safety code into law.

Lewis called the attention of the committee to the Federal mine safety code provided in the United States-United Mine Workers of America agreement, which Secretary of Interior Krug was entrusted with enforcing. The agreement provided:

"As soon as practicable and not later than 30 days from the making of the agreement, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, after consultation with representatives of the United Mine Workers and such other persons as he deems appropriate, will issue a reasonable code of standards and rules pertaining to safety conditions and practices in the mines. The Coal Mines Administrator will put this code into effect at the mines. Inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Mines shall make periodic investigations of the mines and report to the Coal Mines Administrator any violations of the Federal Safety Code. In cases of violation the Coal Mines Administrator will take appropriate action which may include disciplining or replacing the operating manager so that with all reasonable dispatch said violation will be corrected."

Lewis argued that the language of this provision could not be qualified, yet it remained unenforced.

Of course, everybody knows why Krug did not enforce it. He was too busy gallivanting around the country—over to China, Alaska, and other places, having a good time at the expense of the Federal Government and taking his friends with him on these joy trips and meeting the forces that make for entertainment—to be seriously concerned about the welfare of the coal miners.

Had the Federal Government undertaken to enforce the agreed safety provisions of the United States-UMWA agreement, the Centralia explosion would probably never have occurred.

All of which brings up the question not only of the need for legislation, but the kind and character of the administrator who is charged with enforcing the law.

The Journal has advocated for a long time that the Bureau of Mines be removed from the Department of the Interior and set up

as an independent agency that will give its sole attention to coal mining, the development of byproducts of coal, and the conversion of coal into synthetic fuels on a cost basis that will make it competitive with oil-well production.

We think that it is the duty of the Congress to pass an over-all mine safety code, giving United States mine inspectors police power to enforce their recommendations and to set up the Bureau of Mines as an independent Government agency where the power of administration, enforcement, and direction of the United States inspection force will be vested.

As matters stand, the Interior Department is a loosely connected organization in which the problems of reclamation of lands, the leasing of public lands, maintenance of forests, national parks, oil reserves, and what have you are reckoned by each succeeding Secretary of the Interior as overshadowing in importance the question of coal mining.

We do not share that viewpoint and insist that since coal is the basic industry that powers the Nation's mills, factories, and transportation and heats the homes and by chemical processes is converted as a base for several thousand medicinal usages, the industry and the men who mine the coal should be reckoned with as more important to the Nation's well-being than has been the case in the past.

As an example of how the coal industry has been neglected by the Department of Interior and considered on the basis of a second rate status, Secretary Krug, in pursuit of more beneficial political results to be reaped from favoring the coal operators, immediately following his post-Centralia grandstand play of closing down 518 mines on which the Department had inspection reports at hand showing gross violations of safety measures, made an infamous attempt to convince the Congress and public that he was reorganizing the Department to promote a better administration by forcibly promoting the resignation of Dr. R. R. Sayers as Chief of the Bureau of Mines and having President Truman appoint James Boyd of Colorado, whom no one in the coal industry knew anything about, as Sayers' successor.

When called before the Senate Public Lands Committee, Boyd admitted that he had never been in a coal mine and that the only knowledge he possessed relative to coal mining came from textbooks.

The UMWA protested the Boyd appointment and during an investigation that followed it was discovered that the citizenship of Boyd was questionable. In his first submitted biography, Boyd claimed that he was a United States citizen by reason of the naturalization of his father. But on the date given in his biography that his father was naturalized by a Federal court, Boyd had already reached maturity and was over 21 years of age and consequently could not become a citizen by the mere process of the naturalization of his father. Boyd claimed, however, that there was a mistake in dates, but thus far the question of whether Boyd is a citizen has not been cleared up.

The first session of the Eightieth Congress refused to confirm the nomination. Boyd was given an interim appointment and thus far the second session of the Eightieth Congress, which convened on January 6, has failed to act. Boyd has remained on the job unconfirmed, and, as we understand it, is ineligible to draw pay from the Federal Government.

Certainly the Boyd episode constitutes solid ground for the demand of the UMWA to transfer the Bureau of Mines from the Department of Interior and set it up as an independent agency.

We regret that the widows, orphans, and friends of the victims of the Centralia disaster have to face such a sordid set of facts when they gather to pay their respects to their loved ones who met such an untimely death in the fatal explosion.

It is a sad commentary upon the intelligence of the Members of the Congress of the United States, who are allegedly engaged in rescuing the peoples of the world from the evil forces that have beset civilization, that they cannot pass simple, understandable, and necessary legislation that would at least minimize the industrial murder of our own people in American coal mines.

But such is the case.

General Electric's Mr. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the magazine Plain Talk carries an open letter addressed to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who served as chairman of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, that should be of interest to people wanting to know what part the Communists played in the formulation of the report.

Remember that of the committee of 15, 6 are accorded mention as having had membership in, or affiliations with, organizations which have been officially characterized as Communist fronts, including the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., among still others. One of the committeemen has 32 such connections, one has 28, one has 24, and another 7. And remembering, too, that the Communist Party has played up the report, it is natural that the public should want to know the real purpose of the committee in issuing it.

The letter is as follows:

OPEN LETTER TO GENERAL ELECTRIC'S MR. WILSON

Mr. CHARLES E. WILSON,
General Electric Co.,
Schenectady, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: You perhaps know by this time that a good deal of the Communist Party "line" was smuggled into the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, of which you were chairman.

Plain Talk would like to ask you a number of questions. In so doing, we are moved by a concern for the principles of Americanism which, we are confident, you share to the fullest extent.

It has been widely rumored that you were not given an opportunity to read the report before it was published. Is this true, Mr. Wilson? It is also reported that you entertain the most emphatic dissent from some of the statements in the report. Would it not be a distinct public service for you to speak up, if this rumor is true?

Do you know who wrote the report? If so, did you investigate his background before assenting to his appointment? Or, were you ever consulted about his appointment? By now, it is generally known that one Milton Stewart was the author, or main author, of the report. We can assure you that Mr. Stewart has expressed considerable pride in his handiwork.

Did you know, before accepting the chairmanship of this committee, of the numerous Communist-front affiliations of some of your fellow committeemen? Did you have anything to do with the composition of the committee?

The report, which has been widely publicized, together with the utmost exploitation of your prestige, states that this country is in a "state of near-hysteria" over communism, and that this condition threatens the freedom of "genuine democrats." Do you believe this, Mr. Wilson? If you do, will you be good enough to name a few of the "genuine democrats"?

Once again, the report speaks of "irresponsible opportunists who make it a practice to attack every person or group with whom they disagree as Communist." Do you believe this, Mr. Wilson? If so, why not name the irresponsible opportunists? Or, do you not know that this has been a Communist device for 30 years, calculated to shield the agents of the Kremlin?

You, in the report which exploits your name and prestige, say: "There are two groups * * *. The first are the Communists * * *. The second are the native Fascists." Do you believe that this is a correct or reasonable analysis of the menace which confronts America today? Do you not know that there are 100 agents of the Kremlin for every native Fascist in the United States today, and that your analysis is, thus, fraudulent?

Are you, as your report implies, against any loyalty check on Federal Government employees? Your report states that "our whole civil liberties history provides us with a clear warning against the possible misuse of loyalty checks to inhibit freedom of opinion and expression." Do you, Mr. Wilson, believe a word of this?

Do you know, Mr. Wilson, that the Communist Party's Daily Worker and New Masses immediately seized upon your report as useful ammunition against all those who are engaged in exposing the Communist fifth column in this country? Do you want the citations? Do you know that the papers of the Communist-dominated CIO unions feature your report in their columns? Do you want these citations?

Your report sells for $1 a copy. Do you know that the Communist Party official bookstore has a feature display of your report in its window on Thirteenth Street in New York City? Does the significance of this fact escape you?

It is reported that extraordinary pressure from the White House led you to accept the chairmanship of this committee. Did you, as reported, decline the first invitation? Did you accept the second invitation only after it was pointed out that enormous Government subsidies for atomic research might be switched from General Electric to Westinghouse?

Variety, weekly paper of the theatrical world, announces that you will be the feature on a series of broadcasts over the Mutual Broadcasting System beginning February 10, 1948, and that this series will carry the message of your report to the country. Variety further states that one Mitchell Grayson will direct the MBS series. Do you know, Mr. Wilson, that Mitchell Grayson was, according to a public record, a member of the Communist Party, unit 15, section 30, New York City? Do you still intend to appear on his program?

Butte Teamsters Union, Local No. 2, the Oldest Teamsters Union in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am happy to

bring to the attention of the House a full-page article which appeared in the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., under date of Wednesday, March 10, 1948. The article is entitled "Proudly We Present" and it refers to the factor that the oldest teamsters union in the United States is the Butte Teamsters Union, Local No. 2. This article gives full and deserved credit to the Butte local for the fine work that it has done over the years and for the outstanding contributions made for the benefit of an outstanding community like Butte.

Local No. 2 is not an organization which must depend on publicity to make its good work known. What they do in their jobs speaks for their interest in the welfare and the betterment of a community in which they live. Local No. 2 is to be complimented for the fine spirit of cooperation and friendship which exists between it and the firms employing its members. Other unions would do well to copy the outstanding record of the Butte local and certainly would have a very desirable mark to shoot for if they want to achieve the record which the Butte local has made over the years.

Mr. Speaker, many of the officers and members of this union as well as many of the employers in the firms listed as sponsoring this full-page article in the Montana Standard are friends of mine and people in whom I have the greatest confidence. I think that the spirit of cooperation shown by the local No. 2 and the employers in Butte is a demonstration of the type of solidarity which should wherever possible bind the American worker and the American employer together on a sound, equitable, and democratic basis.

Mr. Speaker, the article referred to which appeared in the Montana Standard of March 10 is as follows:

PROUDLY WE PRESENT

THE OLDEST TEAMSTERS UNION IN THE UNITED STATES—BUTTE TEAMSTERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 2

Officers and members of the Butte Teamsters Union, Local No. 2, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Warehousemen and Helpers of America (for that is their full title) are probably one of the most reticent unassuming groups in Butte. Ordinarily they shun publicity; let their deeds speak for themselves. However, their "deeds" particularly during the war years, speak loud and clear. Without question, the scrap drives, metal drives, and paper drives that the teamsters conducted during these critical times did much to aid the war effort. Furthermore, no worthwhile effort fails to receive their support.

Local No. 2 is justifiably proud of the fact that they are the oldest Teamsters Union in the United States, and for that matter in the world, being organized in 1910 as an affiliate with AFL. No Local No. 1 exists.

Current officers include Lee Vercammen, president; Kenneth Davis, vice president; Lou Bradley, recording secretary; W. J. McIntosh, financial secretary; Frank Birmingham, business agent, and Art Speraw, Art Rasor, F. J. Birmingham, trustees.

Safest and most courteous drivers on the road.

Is CIO Wholeheartedly Opposing Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, designed to create a doubt as to the genuineness of the present opposition of some CIO leaders to communism, Pegler this morning gives us the following:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The decision of the bosses of the CIO to oppose the Communist traitors in the campaign of 1948 is a political stroke unrelated to patriotism and principle. It will be remembered that Roosevelt alternately disowned and embraced the Communists, according to circumstances.

Another time the same union politicians, carrying spurious credentials as spokesmen for several millions of American citizens, might find it expedient to collaborate with and defend the Communists as they did in many cases in the past.

Their credentials are fraudulent for many reasons but primarily because there is no guaranty and small pretense of honesty in union elections.

The case of Harold Christoffel, of Milwaukee, now 36 years old, formerly president of Local 248 of the United Auto Workers at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee, will show that the present mood of the CIO and of the United Auto Workers is entirely political. It will also enlighten the public on the reliability of union elections.

Christoffel recently was found guilty on six counts of perjury in the district court at Washington, D. C., for having denied under oath to a committee of Congress that he was a Communist or ever had been one. He is one of the most treacherous operators in the entire union racket whether CIO or AFL.

During the war, he was the more dangerous because other union politicians in the CIO and the Auto Workers who knew he was a member of this traitorous Russian band fought him only as a political rival within the racket but never as an enemy of the United States.

They never denounced him to the public as a traitorous plotter against the country because that would have been Red-baiting, and they were always ready to make a deal for Communist strength in some political coup within the union or to terrorize a community by organized riots. The Communists are expert rioters and terrorists.

Christoffel and a small group of fellow-Communists at Allis-Chalmers were responsible for a strike of 78 days in 1941 which was the most destructive stroke of sabotage that any enemy struck this country in the war. The Wisconsin Employment Relations Board said in writing: "The officers of local 248, Harold Christoffel and others, caused at least 2,200 ballots to be marked as favoring the strike and caused such ballots to be counted."

The Board had authorized examination of the ballots by Clark Sellers, of Los Angeles, and John F. Tyrell, of Milwaukee, experts in handwriting and disputed documents. They acted independently and reached the same conclusion by the same evidence which was unnoticeable to the layman's eye.

Christoffel and his co-conspirators struck Allis-Chalmers in January 1941 while Hitler and Stalin were allies and the American Communists were doing all they could to hamper the war preparations of the United States.

The attitude of the Communists then was similar to Henry Wallace's attitude today.

Christoffel's local of the United Auto Workers contained only a minority of the workers. Fewer than half of the employees voted, so the strike failed to carry. But 2 days later, on January 21, Christoffel took another vote. This one was pulled off in the union headquarters, subject to no outside observation or supervision. The racketeers reported 6,759 ballots as against a total of 4,547 persons clicked off on an automatic counter by a company official across the street as the voters entered the place.

The union would have refused to submit the ballots for expert inspection but had made the careless mistake of delivering them to the employment relations board in a trivial dispute over the mere wording of the proposition. Thus they were in hand when the Messrs. Sellers and Tyrell wanted to see them, and they found glaring proof that the Communists had forged more than 2,000 "yes" votes. There were batches of a hundred fake votes tied together. They had been marked in series by the same hand and enlarged photographs brought out "ghost marks" on many of them, proving that they had been marked wholesale, one ballot atop another. Voters mark single ballots and thus do not leave vacant impressions on other ballots. The case was so strong that the union lawyers didn't try to deny the findings.

The Allis-Chalmers strike involved absolutely no labor dispute between the management and any employee. It was a Communist frame-up which held up the manufacture of many great machines which were needed for the manufacture of other machines. It held back marine engines for warships and many important special machines.

The professions of hostility to Communists and communism uttered by Philip Murray, the president of the CIO, may be evaluated by the fact that, after the fraud had been proven, Murray opposed an urgent appeal by the Navy and the Office of Production Management to Allis-Chalmers to resume work at once on vital production. The strike had been a traitorous fraud against the United States, and yet Murray, who now would appear to be piously anti-Communist, challenged the Government's own right to request that it be ignored. Meanwhile, incidentally, the taxpayers paid unemployment benefits to all who were made idle.

Walter Reuther, the president of the United Auto Workers, lately has had the benefit of much fake publicity. This might be the work of a professional propaganda plant but might easily be the result of the forgetfulness of those who prepare and edit copy.

Reuther was one of the high politicians of the UAW throughout the war when this union made the worst record of all in the matters of wildcat strikes, loafing, "feather bedding," whistle jumping, and general obstruction. Most of the wildcat strikes were so-called only so that the union could have its strikes but dodge responsibility.

Christoffel was a slacker as well as a saboteur, and his status as a union faker in the UAW of the CIO gave him the right to stay a civilian long after thousands of patriotic young Americans had been killed in battle. Finally, in 1944, when he was still only 32 years old, this privileged draft dodger was called up. For 5 years he had done scarcely a tap of work at Allis-Chalmers, having been occupied instead as a union official on leave from his job. As a union official his work

was to obstruct war production and this he did very well.

In January 1944, when at last he was called, he had also become the president of the CIO council of Milwaukee County. Phil Murray made no public move against him nor did Mr. Reuther oppose him as a Communist.

Like thousands of other grafters, rioters, slackers, or traitors of the union racket, Christoffel enjoyed almost automatic exemption from the draft because union parasites were assumed to be doing essential war work.

On January 8, 1944, when many loyal Americans already were dead in the war, Christoffel got wind that his draft board had classified him 1–A. Instantly he tried to scramble to safety by giving up his union racket and resuming his work at the bench.

The company officials, the dirty dogs, refused to ask deferment for him as an essential worker and finally he had to go, although not for long.

He was a union saboteur for almost 9 years and only now has it been established that he was a Communist all the time, not that there ever was room for doubt.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. SCOBLICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. SCOBLICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over Station WARM on March 21, 1948:

Ladies and gentlemen, during the past week, the men and women of this country have seen events happen in our Nation's affairs that, to say the least, were momentous.

We witnessed the President of the United States, in a surprise visit to a joint session of Congress, calling for speedy enactment of a draft law, universal military training, and a European recovery program.

The tenor of the President's message was speed, speed, and more speed. It palpitated with emergency.

And because of the highly important proposals that have been made, the decisions that are facing us, and the effect they will have on our lives and the affairs of our Nation, I deemed it proper to bring to the people of Lackawanna, a report from your Congressman.

At the outset, however, I want to emphasize, that as we hear the rumbling of drums, it is indeed difficult to determine immediately whether they are the drums of war, or the beating of drums in a Presidential campaign in which the outstanding Democratic candidate feels something slipping.

The President's message, in some quarters, was described as taking a strong hand against Russia. It is one thing to scare Russia, if she can be scared, and another thing to scare the people of the United States.

The President's appeal for foreign aid certainly did not have the element of emergency which he strived to give it, with a personal appearance before the Congress. The foreign-aid bill was well on its way in Congress and its need is fully appreciated by a majority of Representatives and Senators.

And as for the other two proposals, that the President dignified with his personal appearance, a call for a draft, and a call for universal military training, the question naturally follows that if we have one, then why have the other.

President Truman for some time has been promoting the idea of universal military training. It has not been received with enthusiasm. It has been well said, that universal military training is against the traditions of this country and that where it is in existence, is precisely where most wars have taken place; it would remove young men at a critical age, from their home surroundings, and safeguards; that it is boosted more by soldiers, particularly Army officers who covet promotion and higher salaries, and the chances are that hereafter battles will be fought in the air, rather than on foot, and in that case large armies will not be needed.

And in view of any future wars being fought in the air, or with push buttons, many Members of Congress were considerably surprised that the President failed to ask for an expansion of our air services.

I believe American mothers and fathers, and American youth, do not want universal military training, but they will, on the other hand, support a draft, as they have always supported their country in its crises.

However, are we in a crisis, and if we are we want to know what it amounts to, and how did we get that way.

In our intercourse between nations, when we are at war we turn the job over to the generals and the admirals, but when we are at peace, or supposed to be at peace, it is strictly a job for the diplomats. Today the diplomats are speaking in terms of a cold war with Russia. On the other hand, with the President talking of draft, and asking for it, it gives the people of this country visions of tanks, planes, and bombs.

The amazing feature in the spread of communism in Europe, which we, in our foreign policy, are dedicated to stop, is the fact that while we give and give and give, and promise to give more and more and more, communism, which gives nothing, is flourishing and extending itself in the countries where we were directing our assistance.

We have heard reports of secret commitments having been made at the conferences of the Big Four. Was the spread of Russian influence and control of countries, up to a certain point, one of those commitments? And is the present crisis that the President warns us about one that has developed because the Russians are going beyond those commitments?

The Congress of the United States and the people are entitled to know, just how did we get in this international crisis?

If the commitments were made at Yalta, Mr. Truman cannot confess ignorance to them, because his Secretary of State, General Marshall, was at that time the head of our armed forces and was sitting at the elbow of the late Mr. Roosevelt.

It is true, according to our Secretary of State, that mistakes have been made. General Marshall, himself, has said: "We made mistakes and we have to correct them."

Such being the case, and we will take the general's word for it, should we find ourselves embroiled in war, before we have had a peace from the last war, then the word "mistakes" is an understatement, it will truly be a blunder of the worst type and indeed pitiful, if the only means of correction are tanks, planes, and bombs, and the shedding of the blood of our American youth.

The American people have backed up their diplomats, with their dollars, and all of the modern tools as conceived by our diplomats have been placed at their command. If they have failed their jobs, then we have an administration that is grossly incompetent.

The next development to be watched on the international scene will be the election in Italy on April 18. There is grave danger, it is reported, that the iron curtain of Russian communism will be voted by the people of that nation, and if such is the case, our affairs will take on a more serious crisis. So serious is this situation, that last week, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, asked those men and women of this country who have ties in Italy, to write to their friends and kin, invoking a vote against communism and asking for a vote for democracy.

Here in Lackawanna County, there are thousands who have ties with the people in Italy, and tonight, in the name of the Speaker of the House, I ask them to take their pens in hand and write to their friends and relatives, about democracy as we know it, how we have succeeded with it, and how it can benefit them also.

Yes, indeed, ladies and gentlemen, the events of this past week were momentous, but the Congress will want to know much more about the threat Mr. Truman speaks of before a universal military training bill is passed, or before a draft law is enacted.

The Members of Congress are not unmindful of the drama that was used last St. Patrick's Day when Mr. Truman addressed in person the joint session of Congress. Mr. Truman appeared at a time when his political stock was hitting a new low. Mr. Wallace had just upset Boss Flynn's Democratic district in New York, by sending one of his followers to Congress. And Mr. Wallace is the third party candidate for President. Mr. Truman was concerned with the new rebellion in the South; a rebellion that is causing him no little embarrassment from a large part of his Democratic machine. Mr. Truman was concerned with the Republican vow to slash his proposed budget.

All of these situations have been weighed in the light of his surprise message, and no little weight given to them when Mr. Truman, immediately upon shocking the Nation, boarded a plane for New York City to view a parade.

The huge block of electoral votes that goes to the candidate who carries New York State is something that all Presidential candidates eye with deep concern, and Mr. Truman is truly a candidate for a full term.

It has been said that Mr. Truman is especially fond of universal military training, because if such a proposal should become law, it would preclude the possibility of cutting his budget. He is especially sensitive in having his budget operated on.

However, ladies and gentlemen, the Republican Members of the Congress are determined that the expenses of this Nation shall be slashed, Mr. Truman, notwithstanding. And in this connection, their positions, I submit, are well taken.

This can be readily understood, when you realize that Mr. Truman's $40,000,000,000 budget is more than twice all the profits made by American industry in the year 1947. It is $13,000,000,000 more than the entire Federal public debt at the close of World War I. It is more than the entire national income in the year 1933. It is more than four times the Federal Budget in 1939. It is nearly eight billion more than the 1942 budget, which included the first year of the war.

It has been pointed out that the colossal sums in the President's recommendations are intended to be spent in the year beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949 and means that 4 years after the close of World War II the Government of the United States is spending at a higher rate than at any time in its peacetime history.

It has also been pointed out that economists consider it to be hazardous when the Government extracts as much as 20 percent of the national income for taxes. Assuming a national income of $200,000,000,000 the Government will have brought us to the hazard, and that, to say the least, must be stopped.

And please believe me when I assure you, that the Republican Members of Congress will do something about it.

And now in conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the seriousness of the situations that are confronting us, in these days of history, may I ask for your advice and sentiments in these matters.

Writing a letter to your Congressman has been the source of many jibes, but please believe me, it does serve well in letting your lawmakers know how the people feel back home, because it is your vote he is casting when a vote is taken on affairs of your Nation.

Better Days for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article, I submit an article from London, England, by William T. Chase entitled "Better Days for Europe," as follows:

BETTER DAYS FOR EUROPE—MORE FOOD AND FUEL PLUS MILD WINTER HELP NATIONS

(By William T. Chase)

LONDON.—Battered Europe's food, fuel, and health conditions looked better today than at any time since the end of the war. A mild winter reduced suffering and helped conserve fuel supplies. No epidemics were reported.

Germans still existed at near starvation levels. France and Italy fought inflation as they awaited Marshall plan aid, and Britain struggled in an economic morass.

An Associated Press survey of conditions across the Continent indicated Switzerland, Eire, Belgium, and Portugal were the best off generally, with Russia and her Soviet-dominated nations reporting improved living conditions.

FARM PROSPECTS GOOD

Spring planting prospects looked promising. A late February cold spell was reported to have done little damage. Health statistics showed decrease in some common diseases. There were fewer malnutrition cases.

This is the way things shaped up with spring just around the corner:

Britain: The nation's health improved greatly during an exceptionally mild winter. A survey showed a marked drop in influenza deaths. Food remained rationed but there was more fresh and canned fruit available. Coal stock piles were higher than expected and the Fuel Ministry said the nation hoped to export two or three million more tons than she had promised under the Marshall plan.

Eire: This was still a land of plenty. Farmers predicted bumper crops and Washington reports indicated Eire probably would get 400,000 tons of wheat from America.

France: Wheat prospects looked good and coal supplies were on the upgrade. Bread was still rationed and one of Premier Robert Schuman's main tasks was to induce farmers to sell their products at a reasonable price rather than hoard them. Wages were frozen, yet prices continued to go up.

Germany: The mild winter was a blessing to fuel-short Germans. In the Anglo-American zones they received an average food ration of 1,300 calories daily, less than half the amount consumed by a working American. Nutrition authorities said there were no epidemics. Crop prospects were favorable.

Austria: The people survived the winter far better than they did last year, and crop prospects were brighter. The food ration rose 300 calories, to 1,850 daily. Coal output increased and the nation began exporting electricity to Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. General health was below prewar standards.

UNITED STATES PULLED GREECE THROUGH

Italy: Mild weather cut fuel costs, but prices continued to soar. Bread, spaghetti, and olive oil reached postwar peaks, but eggs dropped from 10 to 5 cents each. Health authorities cited malnutrition as the chief cause for an increase in tuberculosis.

Greece: The United States pulled Greece through the winter without privation by supplying nearly $400,000,000 worth of food. Prospects were reported excellent for nearly normal farm production.

Begium: Rationing of all commodities neared an end after a mild winter. Only milk, fats, bread, and sugar remained on the ration. Health was fairly good and fuel supplies adequate.

Holland: Food, fuel, and health conditions were described as fair, with the food ration maintained at 2,100 calories daily.

U. S. S. R.: The Russians were reported eating better than since the beginning of the war. Increased agricultural planting and favorable weather led to hopes for an excellent crop this year. Coal production was above prewar standards, and health and morale there said to have improved.

Czechoslovakia: The food outlook was brighter, although rationing continued. Imports of grain from Russia and meat from Poland and Hungary were expected to safeguard the food supply. The mild winter prevented an acute coal shortage.

MILD WINTER HELPS

Hungary: Neither food nor fuel was a serious problem this winter. The shops had plenty of unrationed food and there was enough fuel to heat most homes. Spring crop prospects were described as reassuring.

Rumania: Wheat, sugar, bread, and vegetable oil remained on ration but adequate supplies of food were available at State shops at six times stabilization prices. Mild weather prevented a serious fuel shortage. Official circles said there was a definite decline in disease.

Bulgaria: Increased planting was called for under the state economic plan and the ministry of agriculture said crop prospects were good.

Yugoslavia: A new government system of prices and supply went into effect March 1, designed to stem soaring prices of most consumer goods.

Poland: Authorities said the 3-year economic program extending through 1949 had been assured, thanks to Soviet aid. Russia was scheduled to deliver 200,000 tons of grain to provide bread until the next harvest.

Denmark: Food supplies continued adequate, although white bread and butter were still rationed.

Finland: Food conditions were much better than last year, but prices were soaring. Rationing continued.

A School Is Only as Good as Its Teachers and the Support It Receives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House an article from the Bozeman Chronicle of February 26, 1948. This article carried the story of a speech made by Mr. Dan Young, of Gallatin Gateway, one of Montana's outstanding citizens. I urge the membership to read this speech by Mr. Young. There is much food for thought and will give you an insight not only into some of the school problems in Montana but I believe will give you an understanding of the school problems over the Nation as a whole. Mr. Young has studied this problem at great length and as he says, "School is only as good as its teachers and the support which they receive." Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am including this article from the Bozeman Chronicle:

SCHOOL ONLY AS GOOD AS TEACHERS, DAN YOUNG, OF GATEWAY, TELLS GALLATIN HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION

"A school is only as good as its teachers," Dan Young, of Gallatin Gateway Inn, told an assembly of students at Gallatin County High School yesterday when he appeared before them as a member of the citizens' committee in support of legislative bill 124. Young was introduced by Homer Anderson, principal of the school.

"This is really a beautiful building," Young told the pupils, "but beautiful architectural designs never did nor never will make a good State-wide school system. For any State to have a good school system it must have good, qualified teachers and they must have the right tools and encouragement to work with, otherwise we will lose these good teachers we now have and we are losing too many of them."

"A school is only as good as its teachers and the support which they receive," Young continued. "Without educational designs, architectural designs mean nothing, which leads up to why I am here to ask the help of every boy and girl in this room.

"A year or so ago Governor Ford, who wants good schools, decided to investigate and determine what was wrong," Young said. "To do this he appointed a committee with Mr. Dean Chaffin as chairman. This committee did an excellent job. They didn't miss a thing. But when it came to getting their recommendations set up into new laws, they didn't get it over. The State house legislature approved and passed their bill, known as 124, but the State senate turned it down, not being satisfied it was the wish of the people.

"A citizens' committee has now been formed in each county which is to represent the people, including you, and which intends, with your help, to satisfy these gentlemen that the people of our State do want more desirable laws governing our school system so that every boy and girl in every part of the State may benefit equally in having the finest teachers available and the support they should have from our State government along with each school board's members. Their main objective is the money to provide those things that are needed for better education. Under the present system, when extra money is required for various improvements, our educators and school boards have to go to Helena and battle for it, too often without success and too often the penalty being added mills to our already heavy taxes. This shouldn't be," Young said.

"The biggest task before the citizen's committee is to convince our State government of one thing, that is, a certain amount of all revenue coming into our State fund be set aside or 'earmarked' for the schools' educational programs. We are one of the very few States not doing this," Mr. Young pointed out.

"Now, how can you help? You can be the biggest help of all simply by doing this:

When you get home today tell your parents about what I have said, ask them to attend any meetings that are in the interest of this program, ask them to look into it and to do something about it, don't just sit back and let the other fellow do it. Tell them no additional tax will be necessary and that this will be the way of stopping those additional mills. Then ask them if they realize that our schools have fallen from second to twelfth place in the United States school ratings. That alone is enough to 'wake the dead.'

"Maybe some folks will wonder just how much prestige you boys and girls would carry in such a program as this," Young said. "Maybe some of them would think you couldn't carry any weight. To those people I'd like to say that they don't know young men and women like I think I do, and as just one demonstration of what you could do let us say that we will arrange for just 100 of you boys and girls from this county, and 100 from each of the other 56 counties, making a total of 5,600 boys and girls, to march around our State capitol at Helena with banners declaring your wishes in this matter; 5,600 boys and girls represent 11,200 votes. If that wouldn't represent prestige, then I don't know what would. It would attract not only State attention but national attention. That's how strong you boys and girls are, in case anyone doesn't realize it," Young concluded.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my words totally to flood conditions in the Greater Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City area and to express my sincere concern for you thousands of friends who have been affected by the worst disaster we have witnessed in our valley for many years.

First, let me emphasize my desire to be of every possible service I can to you folks, to the unfortunate sufferers in the flood zone, and to ask you to let me know, as you always do, whenever I can assist you.

Due to various statements that have been made recently, the burden of proof is being placed on me at this time to show what action I have taken to bring about flood control for Endicott and Vestal during the past 9 years I have served you in Congress.

Flood conditions already prove how vulnerable the Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City areas are to the ravages of the Susquehanna. They are absolutely unprotected, and thus far no actual construction work has been started by the Army engineers.

In spite of these facts, however, I have not been idle and believe I have the right, after what has been said about inaction on my part, to tell you people that I have worked constantly and consistently through the years to gain recognition for Endicott and Vestal in their immense flood-control problem.

And it is an immense problem. It is bigger than any one man can tackle. It should have the immediate attention of the whole Congress, the Army Engineer Corps, the New York State Flood Control Commission, and every responsible citizen in our triple cities.

I want to praise here and now the tireless, determined, and sometimes thankless efforts for the past decades of P. Clay Knickerbocker, chairman of the Endicott Flood Control Commission, of Arthur L. Coleman, chairman of the similar Vestal group, and supervisor Leland Jones of Vestal.

Reams of painstaking correspondence, extending over a period of many years between these gentlemen and me are available in my files to anyone who questions the amount of work these public-spirited people and their respective committees have put in.

In May 1944, Congress passed the Hall flood survey bill as a part of the Flood Control Act of that year. There was widespread rejoicing in Endicott and Vestal because this action hailed the first and only legislative step that has been taken to provide flood control for greater Endicott-Vestal and Johnson City in 50 years. I have in my possession plenty of official correspondence from home to prove how much you approved of my action.

The Hall bill, now on the Federal statutes, ordered the Army engineers to proceed with a comprehensive survey of flood conditions along the Susquehanna River in the greater Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City area, and the act carried funds with which to do the job. General Wheeler informed me today the funds are still there and that he is using them for this purpose.

Some will say, Why have we waited nearly 4 years for the engineers to carry out this survey? I am not prepared to answer that question. I occupy a legislative capacity in the Government, not an executive one. I have agitated again and again and inquired why the law has not been carried out, but I do not have the power to order the executive branch to do anything.

I realize the Army engineers have a tremendous job on their hands in making these surveys and they cover the entire United States. They cannot be everywhere at once. A Congressman from Michigan whose district is likewise experiencing terrific floods at this moment, told me his survey was held up 7 years.

Immediately upon learning that our Valley of Opportunity was flooded, I held a long conference with General Wheeler, Chief of the Engineers, demanding no further delay in their making this timely report. I am happy to tell you that as the result of my action, General Wheeler dispatched one of his top engineers, Colonel Wannamaker, with instructions to go full-steam ahead with the important job at Endicott and Vestal. I am told the colonel is now there and doing as directed.

As to what recommendations the engineers will make for our area, I cannot predict. I cannot imagine under these terrible circumstances and after seeing the damage, how they can do less than advocate early construction of flood walls on both sides of the Susquehanna. I feel the same now about these walls as I did in 1944 when I told the House the following:

Every year thousands of people are flooded out of the lowlands on each side of the Susquehanna as it courses down through Johnson City, Willow Point, Broad Acres, Vestal, and through the Greater Endicott area. For this reason I submit to the House that this job has been only partly done. Nearly as many people are affected in these areas as there are in the city of Binghamton. I hope the House will give serious consideration to further and additional flood-control work being done in the very near future by the Army engineers on those few miles beyond the confluence of the Chenango and the Susquehanna Rivers. Those people living in and around Vestal and Endicott are just as much entitled to have their properties protected against floods as the good people in my own home city of Binghamton. I believe that the Army engineers owe it to the people of the municipalities farther down the river to see to it either that the river is dredged at Vestal and vicinity or that constructive and substantial flood walls are erected at these points so that floods will not in the future ravage and damage the properties of the people down there.

I made that speech in 1944 and its truth is proved today.

The Hall survey bill for the Greater-Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City area has been passed by Congress, it is the law of the land, it is up to the executive department to see it carried out.

I am willing to go as far as the folks in Endicott and Vestal want me to in asking Congress for funds to build the flood walls. I asked for $500,000 in 1944; I will ask for a million today if you want me to.

But I can ask until doomsday and the answer will be "No" unless the Army engineers approve the amount. That is in the law. There is no getting around that, and all the griping about the failure of Congress to do more will avail nothing. Every Congressman is in the same boat on that score.

The important thing, then, is for you folks in Endicott and Vestal to make it plain to the Army engineers you mean business. I will go along with whatever you want. That is what I am down here in Washington for.

Let us get the engineers to report the flood-work plans favorably, approve a specified amount, and I will go to bat and do my best to get Congress to give us the money.

Then the Army engineers can build the flood walls, the Susquehanna will be tamed, and Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City will be safe from floods forever.

Recovery of French Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the information contained in the news article of the Courier-Post newspaper of Camden, N. J., March 24, 1948, which I am herewith submitting, under the unanimous consent granted to me by the

House, is of a character that should make every Member of the House "stop, look, and listen" before agreeing to that provision of the European recovery bill which transfers to European nations 200 additional ships from our merchant marine fleet.

Anyone who studies the question will find that this country has already transferred more than 800 large oceangoing vessels to these European nations. The transfer of these vessels has already put European shipping back on its feet. The following article reporting recovery of French shipping is an indication of what is taking place in all the other maritime nations of Europe. The news article to which I refer is as follows:

OCEAN TRADE GAINS STAGED BY FRANCE

PARIS.—At the time of the liberation in 1944, France hardly had a ship to her name.

The remnants of her prewar merchant fleet were scattered around the world, held by ally and enemy alike. More than half of it lay on ocean floors.

Today, less than 4 years later, the French merchant marine already is two-thirds of its prewar size. French ships again are in service all over the world.

In the beginning of January 1939 France had a total of 670 bottoms with a gross tonnage of 2,733,638 tons. Today she has 490 ships totaling 2,007,350 tons.

Her cargo vessel tonnage is greater than before the war and her tankage tonnage almost as large. Only in passenger vessels is there a great disparity—only 54 operating to the 146 before the war.

RECOVERY SWIFT

The comeback is the more remarkable in light of the fact that more than half of the merchant fleet—404 vessels totaling 1,707,935 tons—was lost during the war.

After the liberation, France took stock and found only 204 of her ships available. Another 47 were recovered from enemy countries at the end of the war. Desperately in need of shipping to feed the reconstruction of the nation's economy, France bought, begged, and built as many more bottoms as possible.

France has completed only 18 vessels in her own war-damaged shipyards to date, but another 37 have been built abroad, 14 of them in Great Britain and 10 in the United States. Additionally, France has bought 135 second-hand ships from other nations, including 87 from the United States alone. Four have been taken from Germany as reparations.

FAMED LINE COMES BACK

The Compagnie Generale Transatlantique—the famed French line—actually started 1948 with eight more ships than the 75 it had when the war started. The French line suffered the loss of such ships as the luckless *Normandie*, the *Lafayette*, and the *Champlain*.

Nevertheless, the French line is back in the Atlantic luxury-travel business and growing all the time. The *De Grasse* currently is its only big trans-Atlantic ship. But the *Ile de France*—a streamlined *Ile de France* with a new, two-stack silhouette—will go back into service toward the end of the year when her refitting is finished. The *Liberté*, the former German liner *Europa*, taken as reparations, also is being completely refurbished at St. Nazaire and will go into service next year.

French-line ships again are plying between France and the West Indies and North Africa, although still on a limited scale. Two 20,000-ton vessels, the *Antilles* and the *Flandre*, are being built now for the West Indies trade.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

As American citizens we are profoundly shocked at the United States retreat from implementations of the UN partition decision. For 30 years American policy has been firmly established by United States congressional resolution ratification of League of Nations mandate to Great Britain and repeated Presidential statements of policy. The United States reiterated this policy by its vigorous leadership at the UN Assembly in favor of a Jewish State. In recognition of the historic rights of the Jewish people in Palestine and the extreme urgency of the rehabilitation of the survivors of Nazi extermination.

This reversal by the United States jeopardizes the very existence of the UN. International law and world peace depend upon the vigorous enforcement of UN decisions. There must be no surrender to threats of force.

We, the members of the United Jewish Fund, assembled in public meetings this Sunday evening, March 21, 1948, representative of the Jewish Community of Pittsburgh, therefore most earnestly urge that the United States return to its traditional policy and that full world support be given to those who abide by the UN decision for partition of Palestine. We further urge that prompt recognition be given to the Jewish provisional council of government in accordance with the UN time schedule and that support be given to the Jewish militia in defense of the UN decision. We further urge that the UN demand full observance of its charter by the Arab States.

Be it resolved, That the foregoing resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to Secretary of State George C. Marshall, to United States Delegate Warren R. Austin, to the United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and to the Representatives in Congress from Allegheny County, to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to the mayor of the city of Pittsburgh.

UNITED JEWISH FUND OF PITTSBURGH.

We Are Our Brothers' Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial written by the Reverend Robert W. Searle, D. D., which appeared in the January 31, 1948, issue of Protestant Church Life, an official publication of the Protestant Council of the City of New York:

"Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Offering each the bloom or blight;
And the choice goes by forever
'Twixt that darkness and that light."

Such a cause confronts us—and the choice is now!

Were I a parish minister, in deep conviction of my responsibility to my people—to each of whom the choice that confronts our Nation offers "the bloom or the blight"—I should utilize my sermon period on Sunday morning, February 22, to read the pronouncement of the Federal Council of Churches on "The Churches and the European Recovery Program."

I should do this in sincere Christian belief that this statement, carefully and prayerfully constructed by the united efforts of more than 100 of our best informed Christian leaders, is more nearly God's message to them than could be any words of my own.

I should do this on February 22 because February 22 is the day on which the Federal Council has urged that the message be particularly stressed.

Having read the message to my people, I should ask them to consider it in the light of Christian conscience and to make it their own by voting on it as a congregation.

This action I should convey to my Congressmen.

I should then explain to my people the importance of their acting as individuals and of expressing to their Congressmen their belief that the United States should respond promptly and generously to Europe's desperate need in this urgent hour.

These things I should do because it is a function of the church to be the conscience of the conscience of society.

These remarks are doubly apropos today, as this House concludes its debate on ERP. We are our brothers' keeper.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Miami Herald of Sunday, March 21, which was written by Lee Hills, managing editor. Mr. Hills has just returned from a trip abroad, and in view of the present international situation I am sure that the Members of Congress will find this editorial interesting and informative.

SOME HANDS ACROSS THE SEA DON'T HAVE PALM OUTSTRETCHED

A trip to South Africa is one way to get a new focus on a world stunned and bewildered by the threat of a new shooting war.

For Africa is one continent that doesn't have its hand out.

In two visits to Europe and the Middle East and one to the Orient since VE-day, I've found that hands across the sea often come with outstretched palm. The same is true in Latin America. It's easy to get cynical about it.

But Africa is asking no monetary grants from the United States. The Union of South Africa, bright spot on the dark continent, even offers to help shore up western Europe against the onrushing Red tide. And it is one of the last few spots on earth that practices free enterprise.

The fact that half the world cries for help does not mean we should put a padlock on

our purse. We have too much at stake. Yet it does confuse and anger many Americans, for while we no longer cling to isolationism, we are strongly "antisuckerism."

So, perhaps, we can get a fresh look at ourselves and Europe when Jan C. Smuts, world statesman and grand old man of Africa, talks about the world crisis.

I saw Smuts at Groote Schuur, the famous house near Capetown which Cecil Rhodes gave to the nation for its prime ministers.

This old Boer warrior battled the British for independence, fought with the British against the Kaiser, and fought with the world against Hitler. Today, nearly 78, he hikes youthfully up Table Mountain. Few statesmen are as active physically. None is more active mentally. He radiates vigor and energy, yet has a strange serenity. His enemies know him as a dynamic, subtle, crafty foe.

For 30 years this soldier, statesman, scientist, and philosopher has been a leading figure on the world stage. For over half a century he has dominated South Africa. He helped father the League of Nations and the United Nations.

Two weeks before I met him Field Marshal Smuts told a young interviewer that the power bloc split-up of the world does not mean war. "I do not think you will see another world war in your time."

Now, after Czechoslovakia, he is not so sure.

It depends, he said, on whether the free peoples of the world act together to save human liberty as we know it.

"We are in the greatest revolution in history," Smuts declared. "This is the most solemn hour the world has known in a thousand years. What is happening is going to shake our civilization to its very foundations. Fifty years from now the world may be an entirely different place from what it is today."

Germany, in two wars, broke up the western world until only fragments of democracy are left in most places, Smuts declared.

"Fortunately, in America and in the Dominions something more than fragments are left. But now there has arisen a country with a new kind of mission which we must resist or perish.

"They call it the new democracy. We used to call it slavery. This bondage of the human spirit now looms before us all.

"It has come to Czechoslovakia. That once-fine little democracy has been swallowed—extinguished by an unparalleled victory. The same threatens Finland.

"Are we going to submit? Are we going to bow down before the storm? Or will we stand up to it with all our strength and meet its challenge on behalf of human dignity and freedom?

"That is the question we in South Africa, you in America, and the rest of the world must face.

"We are dazed by what is happening. Today there is no time to think things out. If we are not prepared, we cannot recover ourselves. Thanks to the modern tempo of human affairs, there is no time to prepare. Tomorrow the situation may be irretrievably lost."

Smuts was emphatic in saying that dollars alone, in the form of the Marshall plan, will not save the situation.

He said there must also be a union of western European nations. And a customs union, military alliance, and military preparedness. Above all, there must be a new spirit of human solidarity to fight this new creed of persecution, domination, suppression, and enslavement of the free spirit of man.

In that partnership, said Smuts, Africa will play her part.

"Africa is divided into territories, nearly all of which belong to or are allied to the nations of western Europe. Africa and America are affiliated with the western company of nations.

"Africa, like America, can supply the resources needed to rebuild Europe, and the Union of South Africa in particular is rich in the things that Europe requires. We can help Europe live again.

"It is not a question of ganging up on Russia. In the restoration of Europe she is excluded only by her own choice. It is a fact of history that Russia has been busy building and extending her own bloc. It is now time to say 'thus far and no farther.' "

South Africans see their continent as a vital strategic area in case of war with Russia.

This is true not only because of the vast mineral and other resources, including the world's largest production of uranium, it is true militarily and politically. If the Soviets should overrun western Europe, what would happen to Great Britain, to the British Empire?

After the royal family's historic visit last year to Capetown, many think South Africa might become the center of the Empire in the event of disaster in Europe.

One of the top British generals in World War II sketched this military picture for me in Johannesburg:

"If war came and Russia got western Europe, she would also have the Mediterranean. Our only east-west lifelines would be by air across Africa and by sea around the Cape of Good Hope.

"If we couldn't hold the Middle East, and perhaps we couldn't at the start, Africa might be the only base from which we could strike back and recover."

America in the past has gone to war when a single hostile power threatened to seize western Europe. Events this week indicate we might do it again. Africa, then, becomes important to us, too.

Africa also is a land of promise. We think of gold and diamonds, but it has vast riches in coal and chrome, manganese, wool, hides, and other raw materials.

Free enterprise thrives in South Africa. Every white man is either a capitalist or expects to be one. Communism has made little headway.

The people think and act and talk more like Americans than any I've seen in other parts of the world. Johannesburg, with its skyscrapers, is a modern, American-type city. Subtropical Durban is another.

There is no sign here of weakness, of lack of faith in our way of life. South Africa has a major role in the world problem of adjusting race relationships, but it is tackling it with some signs of success. Already its political genius has worked out a smooth formula for harmony between Afrikanders (Dutch South Africans) and the British.

Africa's great natural resources will become steadily more potent in the world economy. They offer great material power in the event of war. And south Africa is inviting American capital to help develop these resources.

Those with little faith in the American system should go abroad and see how our freedom and performance have lighted up the hopes of man.

They should go to Japan and see how, in 30 months, we have turned enemies into friends and have them eagerly working to change their military dictatorship into a democracy.

They should go to Manila and witness the example of freedom we have given to the Orient by voluntarily giving up the Philippines.

They should see how Britain's move out of India has inspired new faith among dark races in the western concept of human liberty.

They should go to Venezuela and Liberia and Port Elizabeth in south Africa and see how American private enterprisers have raised the standards of living, provided individual opportunity for profit, and helped those countries help themselves.

Or they should go to Europe and see how most of its millions hope that western civilization—what Smuts calls "that splendor of the human spirit"—will prevail.

The rest of the world turns to America not just because we have the dollars. It looks to us because the United States is the greatest single power on earth.

If America is a helpless giant then the world is hell-bent down the road to war. If America acts like what it is, and acts in time, tortured humanity can look forward to peace.

LEE HILLS.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

LOWELL HEBREW COMMUNITY CENTER, INC.,
Lowell, Mass., March 22, 1948.

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ROGERS: At a meeting of the people of Lowell, held in the Lowell Hebrew Community Center on Monday evening, March 22, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"We protest the cynical repudiation by our Government of its oft repeated promises to the Jewish people; and we view with alarm the reduction of the United Nations to impotency when under American influence it is compelled to execute a hasty retreat from its original position, as soon as it encountered some difficulty. At the same time the flag of America is being dishonored. How can we protest the destruction of national independence in Czechoslovakia, when our Government proceeds in cynical fashion to destroy Jewish national independence in Palestine? Hereafter all our protestations of concern for the independence of small peoples will appear in the eyes of the world as mere hypocrisy.

"That the honor of America may remain unsullied, that the prestige of the United Nations may remain unimpaired, that solemn international obligations to the Jewish people may be justly fulfilled; be it

"*Resolved*, That we call upon our Government to proclaim immediately its undivided support of the United Nations decision of November 29, providing for the partition of Palestine and the establishment of an independent Jewish state and an Arab state, and that our Government take all necessary steps for its immediate implementation, including the recognition of the Haganah as the official Jewish militia, and the lifting of the arms embargo so as to permit the unrestricted sale and shipment of arms to those in Palestine who support the United Nations decision of November 29; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Truman, Secretary of State Marshall, United Nations Delegate Austin, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, and Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL."

JAMES CANTOR,
President.

BENJAMIN SANDLER,
Clerk.

Child Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of March 23, 1948:

IMPROVING CHILD HEALTH

Pennsylvania will no longer be content just to discover which of its public-school children need medical attention. It proposes now to help those at the lower end of the financial scale receive the medical and dental care recommended as a result of public-health examinations.

The State examined 808,677 children in 1947. It found that seven out of every ten were suffering from some ailment requiring medical attention. Unfortunately, the parents of many of these children were unable to provide treatment.

Now Pennsylvania is starting an interesting experiment. With $500,000 available for the period ending May 31, 1949, it will pay the medical, surgical, and dental bills of its poorest children. The local doctor or dentist, to be chosen by the parents, will be paid directly by the State. No aid will be approved except on recommendation of local school officials. The family need not be on relief for the child to receive aid, but the family will have to be in the lower income brackets.

It seems to us not only humane but economically practical to treat the child at State expense now rather than permit the ailing child to become for want of early attention a permanent charge upon the community.

The facts uncovered by the examination of children last year, it has been pointed out by Governor Duff, "should convince every thoughful American that the betterment of public health is one of our serious problems demanding immediate solution."

The Duff administration's experimental program is a commendable step in that direction. The next 14 months will establish the feasibility of the program. We hope that a great improvement in child health will convince the assembly that the program should become a permanent part of Pennsylvania's public health service. That would be quite a feather in the administration's cap.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles Is an Organization Where the Members Ask "What Can I Give" and Not "What Can I Get"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a so-called "cold war" is being waged now because of the selfishness, greed, and avarice of various groups and leaders throughout some parts of the world.

I want you to consider a different group, an organization giving service year in and year out, to their fellowmen without thought of reward. So today, it is indeed appropriate to mention the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which, on February 6 celebrated its fiftieth year of existence.

If every organization on earth was as unselfish as the Eagles we would have no cold wars or hot wars. Having been a member for more than 25 years I can certify, from personal experiences, that here is one organization where the member asks, "What can I give to make my fellowman's lot a little happier or easier," and not, "What can I get out of it if I belong."

Every meeting of every one of the hundreds of "aeries" or lodges in the United States is pointed toward service. True, there is a clubroom atmosphere, where members may meet and good-naturedly talk over the problems of the day and enjoy a fraternal atmosphere. But, when the meetings start everybody realizes he is in a patriotic American gathering, pledged to service to his country, his God and his fellow man.

Every aerie has a sick committee which reports on members who are ill. Eagles are not satisfied merely to visit this brother. They ask, "Is he or his family in want," and if so, those wants are supplied. The aerie sees to it that good medical service is provided, that the brother is hospitalized, if necessary, that his loved ones do not suffer. Countless thousands have had fuel, rent, food, clothing, shelter, and medical aid provided without show or ostentation, but only as part of the help thy fellow man philosophy of this great order.

But the Fraternal Order of Eagles goes further—much further—than helping only its own members. It always has taken the position that the underprivileged, the aged, and others, shall enjoy as many of the comforts and necessities of life as possible.

Long ago the Eagles sponsored, in Missouri, the first mothers' pension law in America. Thousands of women, destitute, and with small children, have benefited in many States because of this forward-looking pioneering in mothers' pensions.

The first workman's compensation law—in Wisconsin—was drafted by an Eagle and Eagle-sponsored. Over the years, millions out of work through no fault of theirs, have been able to keep homes together because of this pioneering.

Many years ago, Eagle lodge officials and members were plugging for old-age pension laws. I know in my own State of Minnesota that back in the early twenties, State Senator George Nordlin, later to hold the highest national office in the order, together with other Eagles, sponsored successfully Minnesota's first old-age-pension law. In every session of the Minnesota State Legislature, the Eagles fought to extend and strengthen this law. By educating many States in the human way of caring for those who were in their declining years, the way was paved for the national law.

First public plea for observance of Mother's Day was advanced by the Eagles.

Our order spent 14 years advocating the social-security law and when President Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act on August 14, 1935, he presented the pen to the FOE and said in part:

I have long observed with satisfaction the sponsorship by the FOE of social-justice legislation, both in the States and Nation. * * * The pen I am presenting the order is a symbol of my approval of the fraternity's vision and courage.

Eagles, who long have emphasized Americanism in their rituals, led in sponsoring I Am an American Day, the first program being at Manitowoc, Wis.

In 1930 the order began advocating an annual wage, so workers would have a steady income and industry have steady labor with 52 pay checks a year. This idea is spreading and the industries using it are among the most successful in the Nation.

During two World Wars, the Eagles, it goes without saying, did everything any good American organization could or would do to help win the war, to take part in every drive to conserve or to raise funds, and especially to make it easier for the men and women in the armed forces whose lives were so severely disrupted.

We have a memorial foundation, where the money raised is inviolate and in permanent trust. Income from this fund particularly will be used to make useful citizens of the children of those who died in the service. The youngsters will be given the chance their dads would have given them to make good.

These are but part of the activities of this mighty fraternal order. No enterprise to make America a better place in which to live is neglected. Eagles always are in the forefront of any effort to improve conditions on a local, State, National or international scale.

Truly, the Eagles deserve their mighty membership of more than a half a million. They deserve the enviable reputation they have built for justice, humanity, and fellowship. I am proud to be an Eagle and I am happy to tell the Congress about this great order's accomplishments. I thank you all for this privilege in the name of my fellow members—1,300,000 of them from 1,500 aeries located in cities and towns in every section of the Nation.

What Is Our Objective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "What Is Our Objective":

WHAT IS OUR OBJECTIVE?

Sometimes we wonder whether the head men in our Government know what they are doing or where they are heading.

This observation is prompted by a report that a large majority of the Senate Armed Services Committee was convinced that quick adoption of both universal military training and selective service is a national necessity, after a closed door session with Secretary

of State Marshall, Secretary of Defense Forrestal, and Secretary of the Army Royall.

Since both these recommendations were made last week by President Truman, it was unlikely that members of his Cabinet would oppose his views. As a matter of fact, it is probable that the Cabinet members themselves originated the program and sold it to the President. But that does not alter the fact that the proposal to adopt both the draft and universal military training at this time is open to serious question.

The Plain Dealer has long been an advocate of universal military training as a peacetime program which would give the armed forces an ample reservoir of trained men upon which to draw in time of emergency.

But this newspaper is not convinced that a universal training program would be desirable or adequate in time of war or threatened war, whether of the hot or cold variety.

If the international situation is as serious as Government officials have described it—and we have no reason to doubt that it is—then we should start drafting men into the armed forces immediately, and we should increase the authorized strength of the armed forces, particularly of the Air Force, to the degree necessary to enable them to perform the functions required of them and to act as a restraining influence on Russian militarists.

This is no time to inaugurate a program of sending boys to training camps for periods of 6, 9, or 12 months, as has been proposed, in the certain knowledge that more time would be required to organize them into combat, service, or supply units in the event of war.

An attempt to build up the armed forces and at the same time to inaugurate the universal military training program would result in a duplication of effort and materials and a dissipation of our energies and resources.

What is our objective anyhow? Is it to strengthen the armed forces so that Stalin will think twice before biting off any more chunks of Europe, or are our military leaders using this crisis to secure acceptance of the universal military training program which they are anxious to have adopted?

If it is the former, we should resume drafting men into the armed forces at once and forget about universal training until the emergency is over. But if adoption of the training program is the real objective, Government officials should give more convincing evidence than so far has been presented that such a program would deter Stalin and make us strong enough to defend ourselves in case of sudden attack.

Tribute to Hon. Charles A. Eaton, of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, following is well-deserved tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, in an editorial published in the Washington Post today, for his splendid leadership in connection with the pending European recovery program legislation:

EMPHASIS ON FREEDOM

Chairman EATON of the Foreign Affairs Committee struck a note in his address opening the debate in the House on the foreign-assistance bill that can scarcely be overemphasized. "The measures proposed in this bill," he said, "constitute a conscious recognition of the menace now confronting mankind. It is not a partisan measure. It is the voice of the American people of high and low degree; of all sections, breeds, creeds, and conditions, announcing once more to the world their invincible will to be free and their comradeship with all other peoples of like character and mind." That sentiment is not new, but it was so well expressed by Representative EATON in a brief speech that it brought his colleages of both parties to their feet in a great demonstration of respect and approval.

Mr. EATON'S clear perception and well-reasoned defense of the bill stand out with special force because of their contrast with other remarks that entered into the same debate. Congressman Cox had spoken approvingly of the bill as "a war measure." Representative MARCANTONIO, who usually speaks and votes as if Moscow were a part of his constituency, repeated this charge in the same words in order to denounce the bill. Both, of course, are utterly wide of the mark. The world has, indeed, embarked upon a momentous struggle. There is much to be said for Mr. EATON'S thesis that "mankind stands today in a shattered no man's land between two ages." But the issue now to the fore is not a show-down of military strength. It is, rather, a contest between two ways of life. As Mr. EATON put it: "Is the new world civilization to enthrone slavery in every land with Russia as its instrument of control? Or is the new world civilization to enthrone freedom in every land with America as its leader and champion?"

Because of the ruthless nature and aggressive tactics of Moscow's assault on freedom, the danger of hostilities breaking out is ever present. We must be prepared, both militarily and psychologically, to cope with that menace. But this does not alter the fact that the impetus behind the United States policy comes, not from any desire for military conquest or domination but from our determination to maintain a civilization based on human freedom. The European Recovery Program is especially designed to serve this purpose. Its emphasis is on reconstruction—the antithesis of war. The sound thesis of the sponsors of ERP is that its healing influence will give the democratic peoples of western Europe strength enough to resist the creeping paralysis of communism without war.

The difference between these two concepts is immense. One points hopelessly toward destruction and an immeasurable increase in human suffering. The other points toward the renewal of strength in the democratic world for peaceful purposes—toward buttressing the institutions of freedom so that we shall no longer need to fear encroachments from totalitarian zealots fighting with misery, terror and falsehood as their allies. It is of the utmost importance that this constructive aspect of American policy shall not be lost to sight.

National Whirligig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks I enclose the following article from the Charleston, S. C., Evening Post of March 8.

The only exception I have to the article is its failure to tell of the active part taken by my friend the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. BURR P. HARRISON, to protect the apple growers from the injustices described. It is a matter of record that Mr. HARRISON has been untiring in his efforts to eliminate the inequalities of this situation.

I think the people of his district should know that he has left no stone unturned to protect and project the interests of the Virginia apple growers in their fight against the unjust misrepresentation of the American taxpayer as described in the enclosed article.

Along with my distinguished friend John D. Neff, I know of no one who has been more diligent in aiding one of the most indispensable and essential crops of the Nation.

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG—RED TAPE SNARLS BIG APPLE DEAL

WASHINGTON.—"Operation applesauce" is the ironic description which Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON'S Virginia apple growers now apply to foreign trade in one of the Old Dominion's more profitable products. Several old-established firms stand to lose several hundred thousand dollars because of frozen dollars and price controls in Sweden, England, and other countries abroad.

Although hundreds of American exporters dealing in other commodities suffer from the same tragicomic difficulties, the Virginia producers believe that their plight provides a dramatic lesson in what happens to private concerns when the United States or any other government finds it necessary to interfere with ordinary transactions.

The incident serves to explain why Senator ROBERTSON and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, two of the Nation's largest apple growers, are so violently opposed to President Truman's demand for a return of rationing and price fixing. Here are the details of the story which they do not find at all amusing.

CEILING

Several months ago the Virginia planters were encouraged by the State and Agriculture Departments to prepare shipments of York apples for export to Sweden, where this particular brand is especially popular. The fruit had to be packed in barrels for the overseas haul, and in such a way that it put the exporters to unusual expense.

After the apples were wrapped up in accord with detailed instructions, Sweden froze her supply of dollars. Our State Department intervened, however, and $500,000 was unfrozen for financing the Virginia deal. Everything seemed in "apple pie" shape until Stockholm applied price ceilings to this commodity.

Virginia growers were about to haul their product to the nearest railroad or port when Sweden found it necessary to install the price-fixing system. They placed the maximum retail figure on the Virginia York apple at such a low ceiling that Swedish dealers could not handle them profitably. Due to the higher ceiling fixed for Winesaps, the $500,000 order was given to growers on the west coast.

Facing a total loss, the Robertson-Byrd constituents turned to their agents on Capitol Hill for assistance.

LUNCH

The Virginia representatives then moved to persuade agriculture to include apples in their school lunch program and they were successful in their quest. Secretary Anderson's dietitians agreed to set aside $2,400,000 for the fruit which keeps the doctor away.

Again it appeared that the prospective loss and waste of the packed goods could be avoided. However, agriculture notified the Virginia planters that it could buy apples only if they were packed in boxes. Inasmuch as they had already been piled in barrels, the transaction fell through because of this red tapism.

The next step was to try to have the all-packed-but-no-place-to-go apples included in the Marshall plan. But it was discovered that the prepared shipments will spoil if they are not consumed by the end of the current month, and ERP will not be operative for several months at least.

SATISFY

The persistent John B. Neff, well known apple raiser at Staunton, Va., figured out a plan which might offer him a market for his wares. But he soon discovered that red tape, bureaucracy, and official stubbornness are not an exclusive American possession.

The conscientious Mr. Neff recalled that his father had incurred a $5,000 debt to the British firm of Simmons & Co. some 20 years ago, with $3,000 remaining to be paid. He offered to ship apples worth that sum to London, and thus discharge the ancient obligation.

Since a poorer grade of apples now sell in England at 50 cents a pound, and inasmuch as the deal would not require any loss of dollars to Britain, he thought that his substitute plan would satisfy everybody concerned.

UNWILLING

British authorities at Washington, however, refused to approve his scheme.

"We would rather have dollars now," wrote Charles Campbell, who has charge of embassy public relations. "If we cannot get dollars, we will take nothing. We need dollars more than apples. Why not sell your apples here, and pay us in the dollars you obtain?"

Mr. Neff felt like replying: "Applesauce." Instead, he wrote, in effect:

"In other words, you are unwilling to relieve your own people's hardship, yet you are asking our Government for the loan of American dollars."

TRIBUTE

Two prominent Members of the House side are paying Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG an amusing but a high tribute. They are striving to obtain something like his stature in the field of foreign affairs.

Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts, has assumed almost entire charge of the Marshall plan in the lower chamber, although the venerable CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, heads foreign relations. Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, has made a race of it by successful sponsorship of an increased appropriation for the Voice of America.

Cloakroom colleagues refer to the rivalry as competition for the role of becoming known as "the poor man's Vandenberg," a deferential acknowledgment of the fact that the Senate enjoys supreme charge of foreign affairs on Capitol Hill.

On Writing Letters to Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, which I wrote at the request of the American Association of University Women for the winter 1948 issue of its journal:

CONCERNING LETTERS TO CONGRESSMEN

(By WALTER H. JUDD, Member of Congress from Minnesota)

It is commonly said that in a democracy decisions are made by a majority of the people. Of course, that is not true. Decisions are made by a majority of those who make themselves heard.

Good citizenship includes persuading high-grade persons to run for public office, supporting them during campaigns and at the polls, and getting others to do likewise. For some it means willingness themselves to become candidates.

But this is not enough. The good citizen must also make himself heard, especially on issues which develop after an election and were not debated in it.

At a time when so many powerful groups are organized to put pressure on Congress to serve their own ends, it is all the more important that your representatives be kept informed on the thinking of those who have no personal axes to grind but desire only what they believe best for the general welfare.

THINGS YOUR CONGRESSMAN LIKES

1. He likes to hear opinions from home and wants to be kept informed of conditions in the district. Base your letter on your own pertinent experiences and observations.

2. If writing about a specific bill, describe it by number or its popular name. Your Congressman has thousands of bills before him in the course of a year and cannot always take time to figure out to which one you are referring.

3. He likes intelligent, well-thought-out letters which present a definite position, even if he does not agree with it.

4. Even more important and valuable to him is a concise statement of the reasons for your position—particularly if you are writing about a field in which you have specialized knowledge. He has to vote on many matters with which he has had little or no first-hand experience. Some of the most valuable help he gets in making up his own mind comes from facts presented in letters from persons who really know what they are talking about.

5. Short letters are almost always best. Members of Congress receive many, many letters each day, and a long one may not get as prompt a reading as a brief statement.

6. Letters should be timed to arrive while the issue is alive. If your Congressman is a committee member, he will appreciate having your views while the bill is before him for study and action.

7. A Congressman likes to know when he has done something of which you approve. He is quite as human as you.

THINGS YOUR CONGRESSMAN DOES NOT LIKE

1. He does not like letters that merely demand or insist that he vote for or against a certain bill; or that tell him what you want him to vote for but not why. He has no way of knowing whether your reasons are good or bad, and he is not greatly influenced.

2. He does not like to be threatened with promises of defeat at the next election.

3. He does not like to be told how influential the writer is in his own locality.

4. He does not like to be asked to commit himself on a particular bill as the best means of achieving a desired end, until the committee in charge of the subject has had a chance to hear the evidence and dig out all the pros and cons.

5. He does not like form letters or letters which include excerpts from other letters on the same subject.

6. He does not like to hear from people from other districts, except when the letter deals with a matter which is before a committee of which he is a member. Congressional courtesy makes him refer letters from nonconstituents on other subjects to the proper persons.

7. He does not like to be deluged by letters from the same person on the same subject. Quality, not quantity, is what counts.

We Do Not Want War Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter of Adela Rogers St. Johns, from Cosmopolitan magazine:

WE DON'T WANT WAR AGAIN

(By Adela Rogers St. Johns)

Hon. DONALD JACKSON, of California,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: With the shrewdness of his master, the devil, Hitler—remember him?—calculated his chances.

Night after night he studied the reports of his agents and his political bureau, hesitated, vacillated, while the scales hung in the balance.

At last they tipped for war, and Hitler marched upon Poland.

How obvious now that he took well into consideration the unpreparedness of the United States; how plain that had we possessed a trained citizen Army, a powerful Air Force, and a Navy manned to match our envied place in the seething world of 1939, he would have decided otherwise.

But no. He could afford to plunge the world into chaos and agony. The odds were in his favor. When he had conquered Europe, and England had fallen, his plans in South America and Mexico would be ripe; then he could move upon the United States, and his dream of world conquest would come true. Remember?

A fantastic dream. Granted. How close did it come to fulfillment? Who stopped it? The RAF in the battle of Britain, the year England stood alone against this monstrous threat to humanity. Being a proud people, we do not like to admit that then the British Navy was our only line of defense, but a truly great people can with humility admit a truth and learn from it.

Who let Hitler dream that mad nightmare that engulfed the world? A United States unprepared to speak with power and with dignity for peace. At long last we destroyed him, but at what a cost you know as well as I do.

Are we letting the forces of evil in the world dream that dream again?

You and your fellow Members of Congress must answer us that question now, Mr. JACKSON.

For, looking back, one thing stands out like a cross, a bitter cross against the stormy skies of these past 8 years. If we, the United States of America, had been prepared there could have been no war. It was not our courage, our integrity, our honor, our ideals, our genius for production, or our character which Hitler discounted. It was our preparedness, as Kaiser Wilhelm had discounted it 25 years before when he ordered the rape of Belgium.

We learned nothing between those two wars. Have we learned nothing yet?

Suppose, in 1939, we had been prepared to say to Hitler, "If you fire one gun in this one world where we and our neighbors desire

to live in peace and harmony, and hope to follow the bright upward path of human evolution, we shall move against you with swift and terrible vengeance." Suppose we had said, "There are, in this advanced time of civilization, ways and means for settling all differences wisely, safely, peacefully. We shall use our might to preserve peace. We maintain our might only to preserve peace."

Do you doubt that those honest, simple words from a strong and prepared United States would have halted that frothing little paranoiac in his tracks?

In 1942 I saw a report which had been sent by a Japanese agent in this country to his military war lords. Our desire for peace, he admitted, was an honest one. But it was, he said, a poor, weak thing, a beggar forced to cringe and plead, and no flaming angel of peace. Our words, he wrote, were the empty mouthings of fools who could delude themselves into believing anything they wished to believe. Having studied our refusal to prepare for war, he told his masters it looked like a winning gamble to attack us.

So you and I sat on what we thought was a peaceful Sunday afternoon and heard the radio shriek that the Japs had bombed the American Territory of Hawaii. How dared they? For so long we had said they wouldn't dare. They dared, all right.

Then the sons of America went forth, and many were killed and maimed at Wake, at Midway, at Guadalcanal and Bougainville, in the Marshalls and the Gilberts. They were a screen behind which we prepared—behind which we trained an Army and a Navy and an Air Force and built ships and planes.

Remember?

Need they have died, those men who fell—as my brother fell at Rabaul—if that Japanese agent had written: "Beware the great and peaceful United States; she is prepared to prevent war"?

Will Congress give me an honest answer to that question?

We do not want war. We have never wanted war. But war can be—has been—forced upon us. We have proved that we will, in the end, fight for certain ideals and principles and causes. We have proved that we can win. But if you believe, as I do, that foresight could have prevented the need to fight at all, we have won at a shameful cost.

Someday there will be no more wars.

Until we have grown spiritually into that peace which passeth human understanding, there is only one way to insure peace, and that is to be stronger, swifter, surer than those who want war.

Anything else is saying, "Peace, peace," where there is no peace; it is pretending the winds and waves have obeyed us while the tempest still roars. Throughout all history there have been those who wanted war. Can we be sure there will not be again?

There has been talk that the women of this country, the mothers of this Nation, are against preparedness, against some form of universal military training.

I do not believe this to be true. If it is true in some cases, I sincerely believe it is because the mothers' love of peace has misled them. It is not the objective itself they are against, but the methods offered. They cannot see that it is better to send their sons to prepare for a war that will never come to us if they are prepared, than to have them dragged once more from their homes by a voice shrieking of treacherous attack or immediate danger.

There is much talk, too, Mr. Congressman, of the dollars and cents in terms of taxes, which it costs to prepare, to train, a citizen army and navy. How cheaply do you think we can buy peace?

Do you possess one cent, down to your very last one, which you wouldn't pay gladly so that we shall never again wait and watch and listen in the dark night for the news from our sons—my son—fighting on Christmas Day in the Bulge with Patton, our brothers—my brother—going ashore in that yard-by-yard battle with death at Iwo Jima?

We should question many of your expenditures, Mr. Congressman, but the one to prevent that waiting and watching I promise you, in the name of every American mother, we shall not question.

Why, only 3 years ago we were on our knees, saying, "Dear God, stop this war. Stop it—stop it. We don't care how tough the going is afterward; we are not afraid of hard times; just stop the killing and the dying and the shooting. Some of our sons won't come home even now. We know that. But stop this awful war before we are completely bereft. Give us peace, Almighty God, and we promise to guard it, maintain it forever—no matter what the cost. Only stop this war now."

We said that on our knees with our hands uplifted. Didn't we? Didn't you?

Who dares compare the cost of peace to the cost of war?

Believe me, you and the other gentlemen of Congress, there isn't one woman in America who would not give all she has or all she hopes to have to prevent war. And it is to prevent war, not to wage it, that we must prepare.

Years ago I read in some book a letter written by George Washington to his troops right after the end of the Revolutionary War. The exact words I don't have, but they went about like this: You will now desire surcease from all high endeavor. But I warn you that if you yield to this you will lose the fruits of that same high endeavor. You and you alone can protect the freedom and peace of that victory for which you fought so gloriously.

The women of this Nation will not shrink from further high endeavor if you of Congress will show us that it is to preserve peace.

The American Legion has trumpeted warning—the fathers and brothers of those who will come under whatever form of universal military training you can work out for us. They have said: "Prepare as we did not. Stand behind the United Nations, demand of them an international law, first, and then the means to enforce that law. But until the day when, with one great shout to heaven, we can all lay down our guns, carry that which will allow you to say to the beast of war, 'Back. Back. Growl and lash your tail, bare your teeth, unsheathe your bloody claws. But take one step forward, and I shoot you down as I would a mad dog.'"

It is the custom of the Royal Air Force when they go into combat to leave behind a letter "To be mailed in case of my death." That one which came to me in September 1943, contained these words: "I have come to be sure, Mom, 'that a man's life only means, what the eager spirit gleans.' I am doing what I know had to be done. Make it count; that's all we ask."

Surely we have not grown so ignoble that we shall stumble and falter and fear to stand tall and mighty against God's blessed sun, so that such men need not have died in vain.

Is there any sacrifice in a preparedness program compared to the sacrifices we were forced to make when war was let loose upon us?

They tell you people want to forget about the war; they don't want to hear any more about it; it's unpopular to bring it up. If that is true, which I myself do not believe for a moment, then it is the duty of every man in your position to refuse to allow us to forget.

So now, Mr. JACKSON, I come to the practical purpose of this letter.

No bill for universal military training, no program for preparedness, is upon the agenda of Congress.

Yet it is manifestly the duty of Congress to give us preparedness. In your hands rests our destiny at this very moment.

You are the men selected by our millions to frame and enact those laws under which we shall have the best democratic life and Government. You are trained and able men, and it is your duty and your privilege to inform us, lead us, act for us, that we may stand the guardians of peace for ourselves and, if possible, for what science and progress have made one world.

Get on with it.

Certainly there are differences of opinion. It is for you to resolve them. Some like the Taft bill; some like the universal military training bill; some want the age younger or older; some favor an emulation of the Swiss plan of citizen military training; some believe in raising the benefits of voluntary military service in a standing army; some believe only in conscription.

But there is always a solution. A right way. Find it, and find it at once.

The delay in solving this vital problem is a disgrace, a danger. You of Congress have no right to bog down, to stall, to quibble and duck and side-step this. In the end the people of America will despise you for your vacillating weakness. There are no statues to those who tried to please everybody.

There is on record no crisis in which the American people have not risen strongly to support the right as God gave them to see the right. If there is a weakness in Congress, it is to underestimate the strength of our ideals, the intelligence and heart and soul of this Nation. I tell you that flatly. There has been too much fear of calling upon this country to take its stand with honor and integrity, too much shilly-shallying in talk and work as though we were a lot of self-indulgent weaklings. We are not. We never were.

Show us the way, and we will be as strong and splendid in peace as we have been in war.

Do otherwise, and you will defeat yourself and betray democracy.

To evil and those who desired evil, the Prince of Peace said, "Not peace, but a sword."

Forge that sword, you of Congress. Forge it now; let us hold it in our hands as a sacred trust, so that we are prepared to say, "No more war." For this we, the living, and they, the dead, shall hold you accountable. We can be efficient in war. Let us now be efficient in peace. We can unite for war. Unite us now for peace. That's your job.

Yours sincerely,

ADELA ROGERS ST. JOHNS.

Politics, Not Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial from the Miami Daily News of March 22, 1948.

The Miami Daily News is the oldest newspaper in the State of Florida. It is owned by James M. Cox, former governor of Ohio and Democratic candidate for President in 1920 and is managed by Dan Mahoney. It has the second largest circulation of any paper in the State, and its editorial page is widely read and respected. I make this preliminary

statement so that the Members of Congress will know that the following editorial is not written by irresponsible extremists but is a sound analysis of what that newspaper and its capable editors feel on the subject of tax reduction:

POLITICS, NOT STATESMANSHIP

When Representative KNUTSON first reintroduced his tax bill in the present session of Congress, it pretty much stampeded the House, but saner heads in the Senate spoke words of caution. Let us wait and see, they said, how much money we are going to need for national defense and foreign aid in the coming budget. These apostles of prudence included the more responsible Senators in both political parties.

Now, we have waited and we have seen. We have seen that the Marshall plan, in substantially undiminished strength, is going to be voted by Congress. We have seen that large new expenditures on the armed forces will have to be made, whether or not Congress votes, as in all conscience it ought to vote, for UMT and for a resumption of selective service. We have seen, incidentally, that the February break in commodity prices has been repaired and that we are not heading into a recession economy.

Everything that has happened since KNUTSON reintroduced his bill has justified the waiting attitude. More than that, everything that has happened has justified the fiscal fears which were the basis for that attitude. Yet now that it has been demonstrated that we cannot afford to cut taxes in this of all years, Congress continues to insist on cutting taxes. Even some of the apostles of the waiting policy are now declining to follow the logic on which they were then operating. True, the Senate is not going to stand for the extravagant, across-the-board slashes which were made by the House. But the Senate is willing, with little resistance, to cut $4,800,000,000 from revenues that ought to be held in hand for the twin purposes of financing our remobilization and making a dent in the national debt, while the quasi-peaceful conditions still permit us to make a fairly decent reduction.

To ask for the facts, get the facts, and then refuse to act on them, is politics, not statesmanship.

Imagine the United States in China's Fix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of March 16, 1948:

IMAGINE UNITED STATES IN CHINA'S FIX

(By William H. Newton)

(NOTE.—For 2 years as Scripps-Howard correspondent in China, William H. Newton reported China's civil war from both Nationalist and Communist areas. He is now temporarily on duty here in Washington, covering the controversy over extending military aid to China's legal Government. In the following—call it a satire or a fantasy—Mr. Newton draws an if-it-were-on-the-other-foot parallel, to give his impression of the unreality of some of the arguments made against helping China.)

It is 1950.

The Red Army occupies Alaska, Canada, and the east coast of the United States as far south as Savannah.

The Independent People's Republic of New York has just extended diplomatic recognition to the Independent People's Republic of Pennsylvania.

A pincer movement is developing which will cut off the Great Lakes area and isolate the Ohio Valley.

Chinese newspapers are giving full coverage to the civil war in America.

"It is apparent," writes Wong Fin Wu, of the Nanking Daily Call, "that the uprising in America is an agrarian reform movement, brought about by the Government's mistreatment of the peasant class."

Ching Lee of the Chungking Times gets through the fighting lines and obtains an exclusive interview with William Z. Foster, the new people's Governor of Pennsylvania. Mr. Lee discovers great "spiritual qualities" in Mr. Foster's face. "It is evident," he writes, "that this man is motivated solely by his deep love of the ordinary worker and farmer." Foster, he adds, "is no more a Communist than Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, or Calvin C. Coolidge."

There is some demand for military aid to the United States in the Legislative Yuan, but it is quickly smothered. China's Foreign Minister, Ling Fu, says in a ringing speech that "we will not send 1 penny in military aid to America until the Government abolishes the poll tax in Georgia and gets rid of the political bosses in Jersey City, Memphis, and other cities."

"Even then," Mr. Ling continues, "the reactionary cliques within the present National Government must go. Truman must get rid of Forrestal, Marshall, Anderson, Snyder, Tom Clark, and Harriman."

Defense Minister Lu Ying Fu firmly rejects demands to increase allocations from China's surplus military stocks to America. "This is ridiculous," Mr. Lu said. "We have already sent them 3,147 used rickshas, 1,400 battle-axes, and some surplus cannon from the Russo-Japanese War, to say nothing of 213 first-class Piper Cub fighting planes."

The Shanghai Express puts its even more strongly. "Every penny of Chinese aid to America must be carefully supervised to see that it gets into the hands of the people," says a lead editorial. "We have had experience before this, with the Kelly-Nash machine, and the Pendergast machine, and the Hague outfit in Jersey."

Dr. J. Leighton Fing, the Chinese Ambassador to the United States, is touring from city to city, making speeches. "If you expect any help from us, America must turn to the middle way," says Dr. Fing. "You must turn to the teachers, the educators, the great philosophers, and men of learning."

"America has a great future," says Dr. Fing. "But the Government must reform. Civil rights must be restored. Something must be done for the Navajo Indians."

That week, the Pacific Northwest is occupied by the Communists and the transcontinental railway cut in seven places.

What Means the Christian Attitude?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as we pause in our labors at this season of the year, so meaningful to Christians throughout the world, I commend to my colleagues the following article entitled "What Means the Christian Attitude?" from the inspiring pen of the editor of the Brighton-Pittsford Post, published in Brighton, Monroe County, N. Y.:

WHAT MEANS THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE?

The Lenten season is primarily a period of deliberation. The withdrawal of large segments of society into meditation and prayer for this brief time gives opportunity for much worthy introspection.

At the city club recently, the speaker, Carlton Meyers, assistant to the president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Co., Robert Young, commented on labor and management relations and casually remarked that the old methods would have to be replaced with a Christian attitude. Not infrequently an audience hears the reference to the Christian attitude in local, national, or international affairs.

It is always a good commentary; sort of displaces worry and seemingly makes an easy disposition of confusing situations. It is somewhat commonplace to many speeches where controversial spots occur. But it also seems to dispossess the speaker of any further need of responsibility and therefore releases him to the rest of his proposals.

LET'S DEFINE "CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE"

It may be trite to ask what is the Christian attitude, what is its place in the world, and how does the appeal to Christian attitude include the Mohammedan, Buddhist, or hundreds of other forms of religion.

That there must sometimes be a quizzical feeling among some of other faiths, when listening to references to "the Christian attitude," seems quite possible. These listeners probably experience no more than a slight moral uplift to such gratuitous statements and generally take it as an acceptance of the fait accompli. Living in a country where the Christian faith is predominant, too many people take it as the only religion, so much used to it are they.

But in its full appreciation, the Christian attitude should stir people of other faiths, especially if it worked in full measure and full value, at all times and in all places. The lack of its full operative value by its followers probably damages the Christian attitude with strangers, more than anything else.

When taken abroad, the Christian attitude among those of other faiths should represent only the "rate of exchange" among Mohammedans, Buddhists, and others. Basically, whatever religion exists must have for its base nothing but good. Within that broad term everything else takes root, brotherly love, good neighborliness, honesty, veracity, the golden rule, honor to parents, and good will toward all men.

PARITY OF ALL RELIGIONS NEEDED

Just as dollars have a rate of exchange, and can be translated into francs, lire, drachmas, and other specie, so should the Christian attitude have translated worth into other native religions. The only difference from dollars is that the rate of exchange should be on a parity for all religions. By such par values, the Hebrew, Christian, and Moslem might possibly enter upon equal positions in relation to good. If all religions have equivalent fundamentals, and identical objectives in the moral uplift of man there should be some common ground of approach where the world as a whole could find responsive and mutual respect.

Only in the case of the militant atheist, who neither wants a comparable base for good, nor wishes to see it exhibited in others, can there be diametrically opposed viewpoints. The Christian attitude, otherwise, can be found in all people, of all faiths, with all good as a common ground of appreciation. This attitude is not foreign to those of other faiths, but is only the expression among those of one faith as to the name of

its moral stability and relationship with all people.

In the secular life of all nationals there seems to be much in common of the lesser values, such as avarice and greed, which has quite a compelling force, and which binds us from time to time in common agreement and objective. To win wars, where oil, minerals, and land are concerned, we exert great teamwork, we have combined boards of strategy, we lend to those who have not, without hindrance, even to repayment. We find, to settle differences of opinions on material things, that we can understand the Turk, the Greek, the Indian or any other nationals, but to making a better world where moral values are concerned, we have nothing to offer.

BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

It would not be fitting and proper in this short digest to consider that the world can turn toward such channels today or tomorrow, nor that this is even the time to expect progress in the direction submitted here. It is, however, patent, that when the time comes and we enjoy the fruits of that peace which passeth all understanding, it will be through such channels outlined, and we no longer should have any fear of other religions, nor they of ours.

In the meantime, the Christian attitude should get a good practice work-out in this land at least, and its product should be that of combining at least, Christians, Catholics, and Protestants, and as well, those of the Hebraic faith, in an understandable brotherhood of man. Perhaps with this accomplishment, we may find the necessary ways and means of successful approach to a rate of exchange of the Christian attitude into other parts of the world.

REA Expansion in the Twenty-first Congressional District of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio interview between myself and Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the National Rural Electrification Administration:

CLAUDE R. WICKARD TELLS OF REA EXPANSION IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. FISHER. One of the greatest problems which Texas farmers and stockmen have had for many years is the one of getting electricity. Texas farms and ranches cover a tremendous amount of territory, and some of this area has comparatively few residents. This is particularly true of my district, the twenty-first, with its stock farms and cattle, sheep, and goat ranches. However, we in our district are very proud of what's been done, in the face of many difficulties, to bring the benefits of electric power to our people. But we realize there's still much more to do; large numbers of Texans in this area are still waiting for power. In order to find out what the prospects are, I decided to ask some questions of a man who knows a good many of the answers. The man is seated across the table from me now—it's Claude R. Wickard, Rural Electrification Administrator. I am very glad to have this chance to talk with you, Mr. Wickard.

Mr. WICKARD. Thank you, Congressman FISHER, and I hope I have the answers to your questions.

Mr. FISHER. Well, as I told you, I'm depending on you to bring our listeners up to date on the rural electrification picture, not only from the national and State angle, but coming right home to the Twenty-first Texas Congressional District.

Mr. WICKARD. As I recall the location of your district, Congressman FISHER, it's in the southwest central part of the State. It might very well be in the section about which the song was written, Deep in the Heart of Texas!

Mr. FISHER. You're right about that, Mr. Wickard. We consider the Twenty-first Congressional District pretty much the heart of the State. My home, San Angelo, is a great wool and mohair shipping center. Every county is agricultural—raising cotton, wool, mohair, peanuts, pecans, and other farm products along with the cattle, sheep, and goats. Then down in the Uvalde country which excels in livestock, there is a large honey industry. Former Vice President Garner lives there, you know, and he is famous also for the John Garner pecan, a variety that is much sought after.

But some of that farm and ranch country is the area that's been waiting a long time for power lines to be built, Mr. Wickard. It would mean a lot to those people to have electric service.

Mr. WICKARD. Let me make it clear right at the start of this discussion, Mr. FISHER, that there are problems of rural electrification in Texas very similar to those in some other States. It isn't the only area where new engineering techniques have had to be developed, because potential consumers are far apart. It's never easy to solve these problems, but good progress is being made in Texas as well as in other parts of the country. As a matter of fact, I'd say that your State has made tremendous strides in rural electrification since REA came into being in 1935. Only about 2 percent of the farms in Texas had electric service then. This represented a little more than 11,000 farms out of a total of around half a million. Since that time the proportion has gone up to more than 55 percent, representing well over 214,000 farms.

Mr. FISHER. That's a wonderful record, Mr. Wickard. Being a Texan, naturally that doesn't surprise me. When we're given opportunities we make the most of them. And I know that my State has received a large amount of money in REA loans since that first one, way back in 1936. That loan, I remember, was made to a group located in Bell County, not far from the eastern boundary of my district.

Mr. WICKARD. You're right about the amount of REA loans granted in Texas. The REA program in your State is the largest in the entire country. Of course that is mostly because the State is so big and has so many farms and ranches. More than $100,000,000 of loans have been approved for Texas borrowers. These number 97, by the way, and 96 of them are cooperatives.

Mr. FISHER. That makes an average of well over a million dollars for each borrower in Texas, then.

Mr. WICKARD. That's right, Mr. FISHER. But to complete the rural electrification picture so far as the State of Texas is concerned, you may be interested to know that this amount of money will bring electric service to more than 200,000 rural consumers, along almost 90,000 miles of lines.

Mr. FISHER. That sounds like a mighty big operation, Mr. Wickard. But I notice you say, "will bring." There are a good many farmers and ranchers in my State who are still waiting for electricity. A lot of them are right in my district, too.

Mr. WICKARD. That's true, Congressman FISHER. When I look at a map of your State showing the locations of those 97 REA-financed-power systems, it comes home to me that there are thousands of square miles where electricity is still just a dream and a hope to the people living there.

Mr. FISHER. I'm glad to hear you use the word "hope," Mr. Wickard. That indicates they have some basis for their dreams. I know, of course, that construction is under way in all parts of my district. Down in Kinney County there's a new REA-financed co-op getting started, near Bracketville; the Rio Grande Electric Cooperative.

Mr. WICKARD. And I understand there's expansion in the other six co-ops which have headquarters in the Twenty-first District. They're building new lines to serve rural people as rapidly as loan funds and materials become available. This activity is also taking place in the five or six other co-ops which have lines extending into your district.

Mr. FISHER. That reminds me to ask you another question about money, Mr. Wickard. Do you have the complete figures on the money loaned to co-ops in my district?

Mr. WICKARD. Yes, and I'll give them in round numbers, Mr. FISHER. That will give our listeners the picture without too many figures. The total of the loans approved for the REA-financed co-ops in the Twenty-first Congressional District is a little more than $7,000,000. About four and one-half million of that already has been advanced to the co-ops to pay for completed construction. This has provided around 3,600 miles of line now in service, taking power to more than 8,000 consumers. When the balance of this construction has been completed, there will be more than 12,500 families in your district receiving co-op power.

Mr. FISHER. I knew we made a lot of progress last year and am pleased to get those specific figures. I wonder, Mr. Wickard, whether you'd care to express any opinion as to how long it will be before the hopes of those people, and of a good many other rural residents throughout the whole State of Texas—become reality?

Mr. WICKARD. It's hard to be definite about this, Congressman FISHER. There are several factors to consider. First of all, I'd like to point out that the demand for electricity is greater than it's ever been before. This undoubtedly is because people in the thinly settled areas of the country realize now that it's possible and economically feasible to bring the power to them. They've seen it happen in other localities, and now they know it's just a matter of time before they can get it too.

Mr. FISHER. The letters I receive from my constituents make me realize how true that is. However, it doesn't help them a great deal just to know there are lots of other people in the same boat.

Mr. WICKARD. I know that—but I think it should encourage many of those people to know that there has been a substantial improvement in the supplies of construction materials. Ever since the end of the war, this has been a serious problem, and it still is, but to a somewhat lesser degree. And just as fast as that situation improves, the building program of REA borrowers will move a lot faster.

Mr. FISHER. Then you feel that any increase in supplies—such things as transformers, wire, and insulators, for example—really will help to speed up construction.

Mr. WICKARD. Yes; we used to have a shortage of poles, but now the co-ops can get all the poles they need. Then it was transformers; the manufacturers say they will be about current on transformers next fall. Now it is wire that is in short supply—orders placed now will be delivered in 3 years. REA borrowers all over the country are ready to get new lines under way any day. Their loans have been approved, their lines designed—some of them have the new lines all staked out and the right-of-way cleared. Everything's ready except the materials.

Mr. FISHER. Most of us can understand what that shortage means—we still remember the wartime shortages of materials. But it seems to me it shouldn't take too long to get caught up in this respect.

Mr. WICKARD. We hope not, Congressman FISHER. As a matter of fact, rural power lines are going up faster right now than ever before in history. The co-ops in your own district added more than 4,000 consumers to their lines in 1947. Of course, even this peak rate of progress isn't enough to keep pace with the new demands from farmers for electricity.

Another point is that the initial lines built out in the country are soon outgrown as farmers rearrange their living and their farming around electricity. They keep increasing their use of power.

Mr. FISHER. I know that's true. I checked up a while ago and found out that farm consumption of electricity in Texas has increased in recent years. For instance, in December 1941, the average use was 45 kilowatt-hours a month; in December 1946, it had gone up to 66 kilowatt-hours—almost a 50 percent increase.

Mr. WICKARD. Oh, yes; when a farmer or a rancher organizes his farm to use electricity that power just has to be there for him when he needs it. I can give you an example of that from my own personal experience. On my farm in Indiana, we now have a dairy enterprise going, in addition to the farming operations we formerly carried on. Electricity milks the cows, cools the milk, then pasteurizes the milk we drink on the farm. We have water piped to every field. If we couldn't get power when we need it, we would suffer a substantial loss.

Mr. FISHER. I have had letters from people complaining because they aren't getting all the power they need from the co-op lines that serve them. What's being done to help these folks?

Mr. WICKARD. The co-ops are trying to increase their capacity just as fast as they can, Mr. FISHER—we call it "heavying up" the lines. That's what has to be done whenever the load gets too heavy for the first lines, you see. However, the REA-financed systems are designed so that this can be done efficiently, and with the least possible expense. But the materials situation here is the same as in building new lines.

Mr. FISHER. I can understand that maintaining the service, and expanding it when necessary, is just about as important as getting it started in the first place. But that isn't much consolation to the folks who've been waiting so long for electric power.

Mr. WICKARD. Perhaps those people in your district will be a little more patient, Mr. FISHER, if they know about the applications for REA loans which are on file with us right now, or being prepared in the field. The latest figures show that these applications from groups in your district alone amount to over a million and a half dollars—for loans to build more than 1,300 miles of line, to serve about 1,500 more consumers.

Mr. FISHER. I know those figures will be of interest to a great many of our listeners, Mr. Wickard. And while we're dealing in figures, I'd appreciate it if you'd explain a little about the way the REA program operates.

Mr. WICKARD. Gladly. It's a business proposition, Mr. FISHER. We make loans to local groups. The loan covers the full cost of building new power facilities to reach rural people who don't have electric power. Farmers' cooperatives make up more than 90 percent of all REA borrowers, and such a co-op is owned by those it serves. The rate they pay for electricity is based on the cost, with allowance for repayment of the Government loan. Interest and amortization are paid from revenue. The loan is repaid, at 2-percent interest, over a period of 35 years. And I'm glad to tell you that today less than 1 percent of the amount due is delinquent and twenty million has been repaid ahead of schedule—we think that's a fine record.

Mr. FISHER. How does Texas stand in respect to payment of REA loans, Mr. Wickard?

Mr. WICKARD. Your State has a good record, Congressman FISHER. Our latest summary, covering transactions up to January 1 of this year, shows that Texas borrowers have repaid almost $11,000,000 in principal and interest on their loans, over a million dollars being credited as advance payments. Forty-three borrowers in your State were ahead on their payments.

Mr. FISHER. That sounds mighty good to me. And I guess it shows pretty clearly that the only thing rural people needed was the opportunity to get electric power. Those who have it certainly are making good use of it.

Mr. WICKARD. I know that—and I might point out that we in REA are greatly concerned over the present shortage of power to carry over the lines. We recognize the fact that everything possible must be done, and promptly, to increase the power-generating capacity of this country.

We know that the people of your great State want and need adequate electric power. There's no other force available which will do more to raise the standards of rural people, both economic and cultural. You may be sure, Congressman FISHER, that we in REA will do everything possible to speed the day of complete rural electrification.

Mr. FISHER. Thank you, Mr. Wickard. I certainly agree with everything you have said about the great benefits the rural people are getting from the REA service. What you've said has been of great interest to me, and to all our listeners. I know I speak for my own constituents and for the people of Texas as a whole when I express gratitude for your kindness in answering my questions on a subject of such vital interest to so many.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. RUSSELL
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

TAXES

The House, the membership of which is supposed to more closely reflect the wishes of the people, was in a tax-cutting mood yesterday. As a result, it seems we can finally count on getting an individual income-tax cut this year.

They met an hour earlier and, in what could be called lightning-like speed for that body, voted 289 to 67 to accept the Senate's $4,800,000,000 individual tax cut. The measure was rushed to the White House immediately.

This puts the matter directly up to President Truman. He has until midnight April 5 to sign or veto it. The House vote of 289 to 67 for the cut was 51 votes more than will be needed to override a veto.

Following on the heels of the Senate's 78 to 11 vote for the cut, the more than 4 to 1 approval registered in the House yesterday convinced most Members a veto will be overridden. President Truman, it may be recalled, vetoed two tax-reduction bills last year.

More than half the Democrats and all but one Republican voted for the cut. The score was 205 Republicans and 84 Democrats were for the cut. Sixty-four Democrats, one Republican, and New York's two American Laborites voted against it.

In the hour of debate preceding the vote it seemed that everybody wanted to get into the act. The general theme was "speak no evil of tax reduction in this general-election year." The bill, when and if it becomes law, will be retroactive to last January 1. But the lowered withholding rates contained in the bill will not be felt in your pay envelope until May 1. Tax overpayments between January 1 and May 1 will be refunded to taxpayers next year.

And so, unless something sensational happens soon—something which would require additional billions of dollars in spending by the Federal Government—the tax-reduction measure should become law in about 2 weeks.

How much depends entirely on your salary or wages and, of course, how many dependents you have. To give you an idea: You know what's being withheld from your pay check now to pay your income taxes.

Well, if you're married, have two children, you should find after May 1 that, if you're earning $60 a week, your withholding tax will be a dollar and a half each week. If you're earning $70 a week, your tax will be $2.90 a week. If you're earning $90 a week, your withholding tax will be $5.90 a week, and if you're earning $100 a week, your withholding tax will be $7.50 a week.

Incidentally, the congressional approval of this tax reduction came at a time when the Nation's military chiefs reportedly are ready to propose that the new defense budget be upped anywhere from eleven billion to as high as twenty-one billion dollars. This would be one major argument for the President to veto the bill.

Incidentally, the measure gives every taxpayer some relief. In addition to increasing personal exemptions from five hundred to six hundred dollars, with an extra $600 for persons over 65 and the blind, it permits all families to split their incomes for tax purposes. As Chairman LEO ALLEN, of Illinois, of the House Rules Committee, put it: "The greatest national defense this country can have is a solvent government and a contented people." Well said, Mr. ALLEN. If it works, a lot of us will be more solvent and most certainly more contented.

Reduction of Postage on Overseas Relief Packages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one calling himself Two Packages Weekly has written a letter to the Washington Times-Herald, published in its column Voice of the People, under date of March 13, 1948, which, under leave to extend my remarks, is quoted below:

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

To the Congress:

You state that "the generosity of Americans in sending private relief abroad has boosted overseas parcel-post shipments 24 times the prewar level, the post office reported yesterday."

Yes, Americans still heed the gospel injunction to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked. Thank God. God cannot but bless America for that.

The Americans who practice this gospel charity—millions of them—do so at the cost of real sacrifice. They are predominantly the average Americans, the sub-$5,000 per annum people—the laborer, the corner grocer, the clergyman, the teacher, the office worker.

They are the kind who cannot afford to order very many CARE or SAFE packages at $10 per order. Instead, they bargain about as best they can. They collect used clothing, recondition used shoes, melt lard into cans, grind left-over bread and cake into crumbs, etc.

There comes the shipping of these cargoes of mercy—usually at the rate of one or two packages per week. The lard costs you 25 cents per pound to buy, but you pay another 14 cents to ship the precious calories; sugar sells at 8 cents per pound, but costs almost twice that outlay to send it.

Your package of 22 pounds, whose contents represent a lot of good United States money and a lot of labor and love, dents your pocketbook and budget for the sum of $3.08.

Of course, old Uncle Sam does not allow you to write off any of this private charity on your income-tax report.

And the post office is proud of these Americans (as witness the report above). It should be—and grateful, too. The starvation and rags and misery of Europe and the Christianity of Europe's brethren here are working overtime to whittle down the annual postal deficit of immemorial tradition.

But these Americans generally are acutely aware of this continued grab-it-from-them-while-you-may policy. Most of them know, for example, that last November a Senate committee unanimously recommended a substantial lowering of the parcel-post rates on packages to the starvation and tuberculosis areas of Germany.

The Christmas season has passed and so have January and February, and March is passing, and the post office—that is, the Truman administration—is still demanding its $3.08 of Shylock. They will remember this fall.

TWO PACKAGES WEEKLY.

It was primarily to help the very people to whom this correspondent refers, those who could not afford to put up $10 for a CARE package, that I introduced on last December 2 my bill, H. R. 4616, to reduce by one-half the postal charges on overseas shipments of food, clothing, medical supplies, soap, and other necessaries. To encourage the same form of charity and extend the privilege of income-tax deduction to those whose gifts were not necessarily made to an organized charitable corporation, I offered on last December 16 a bill, H. R. 4753, to permit the senders of such gift packages overseas to deduct, within authorized limits, the cost of such charitable relief.

This letter reflects the sentiments of hundreds of thousands throughout the land whose ties of kinship or national origin daily lead them to this type of generous effort which deserves our encouragement and support.

Railroad Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. RUSSELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the membership of the House the following letter which I received from Mr. William J. Kennedy, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, in answer to questions propounded by a group of retired railroad employees of Sparks, Nev.:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,
Chicago, Ill., March 18, 1948.

The Honorable CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RUSSELL: This will acknowledge your recent letter which you wrote on behalf of the retired employees of Sparks, Nev., who requested information about the railroad retirement system. I am glad of this opportunity to explain some of the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board.

I am listing, below, the questions which were asked by those retired employees and my answers to each of those questions:

1. What is the present reserve in the United States Treasury?

On January 31, 1948, the balance in the railroad retirement account was $1,308,466,000.

2. What is the average number of employees in retirement, this to include all beneficiaries?

There were 212,919 retired railroad men receiving monthly benefits from the Railroad Retirement Board totaling $15,555,000 on January 31, 1948.

3. How many widows are now on the annuity list?

At the end of January 1948, 56,546 widows were receiving monthly benefits which totaled $2,016,000. In addition, over $700,400 was paid to 23,224 children and 411 parents who were also receiving monthly survivor annuities.

4. With the increase in tax on railroad employees and the companies, what is the net income over and above all beneficiaries and expenses per month?

I think I can best answer this question by the brief financial summary which follows below. All figures are for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947:

Retirement taxes (from both employers and employees)	$380,057,000
Retirement and survivor benefit payments	173,101,000
Administrative expenses	4,756,000
Balance in the retirement account on June 30, 1947	810,253,000

Of the $380,057,000 collected in retirement taxes in the last fiscal year, 46 percent was used to pay retirement and death benefits; a little over 1 percent was used for the administration of the program; and 53 percent was added to the reserve for future benefit payments. In terms of tax collections, administrative costs were 1¼ cents for each dollar collected. It has been estimated that, over a long period, each dollar collected in retirement taxes will be used approximately as follows: Old-age annuities, 49 cents; disability annuities, 25 cents; survivor benefits, 25 cents; and administrative expenses, 1 cent.

The following summary is for the first 6 months of the present fiscal year, that is, July 1 through December 31, 1947.

Retirement taxes (from both employers and employees)	$274,336,000
Retirement and survivor benefit payments	110,201,000
Administrative expenses	2,554,000
Balance in the retirement account on Dec. 31, 1947	1,268,983,000

5. Are there "unemployment checks" issued to the retirement-fund employees?

If the question pertains to whether a man receiving retirement benefits may also receive unemployment or sickness benefits, the answer is, "yes," but since the law provides in such cases that only the amount, if any, of unemployment or sickness benefits which is greater than the retirement benefit is payable, duplicate benefits are in effect prohibited. In any event, very few retired employees can qualify for either unemployment or sicknss benefits since the employee would have had to earn at least $150 in railroad employment in the calendar year immediately preceding the beginning of the benefit year.

6. How many beneficiaries are receiving $50 per month and less?

About 13 percent of all annuitants who were being paid benefits on December 31, 1947, were drawing less than $50 a month, and 26 percent $50 but less than $60 a month. This latter percentage is high because of the large number of annuitants receiving the $50 minimum. In addition, about 45 percent of the 12,590 former carrier pensioners who were receiving benefits on December 31, 1947, were getting less than $50 a month and 12 percent were getting $50 but less than $60. I might explain that those men who retired on the private railroad pension rolls and whose pensions were taken over by the Railroad Retirement Board as of July 1, 1937, are referred to as "pensioners." Annuitants are retired railroad employees who were awarded annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Although none of the new individual survivor annuities to widows, children, and parents is as high as $50, in more than 6,000 cases, a family consisting of a widow and at least one child, or of two or more children was receiving $50 or more a month.

7. What is the average cost per month to administer the Crosser Act, and how much of it is for the retired employees?

See answer to question No. 4.

8. How much of the reserve fund is loaned out and at what interest?

All funds in the retirement account, except a relatively small cash balance, are invested in special 3-percent United States Treasury notes. The cast balance on hand at the end of any month is usually not more than $4,000,000.

9. Is there any good reason why the beneficiaries should not receive their share of the increases—the boys on the road have. That 5¾ percent is there—take out our share to meet the high cost of living. We can't figure out why it should go to the reserve fund.

The increase in the retirement tax rate is not exclusively for the purpose of the building of the reserve. I should like to explain the tax schedule to you. Under the amended Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the rate on employers and employees alike was raised to 5¾ percent in January 1947, and will be further increased to 6 percent in 1949 and to a maximum of 6¼ percent in 1952. The old rate was 3½ percent in 1946 and would have been 3¾ percent in 1949 and thereafter. However, of the increase of 2½ percent in the maximum tax rate, three-quarters of 1 percent is for the purpose of placing the retirement system on a full actuarial reserve basis, while 1¾ percent is to meet the costs of the liberalization in the retirement and survivor-benefit provisions contained in the 1946 amendments. Thus, even without the new benefits it would have been necessary to increase the old tax rate to 4½ percent to keep the system actuarially solvent.

In this connection, I might point out that while the railroad retirement reserve may seem large ($1,308,466,000 on January 31, 1948), it should be pointed out that future obligations arising out of credits toward retirement and survivor benefits which have already been accumulated by railroad workers now amount to several times this figure. Eventually, the benefits paid out in any one year will exceed the taxes collected during that year. By that time, the reserve must be large enough so that the interest on it will be sufficient to make up the difference. If we were not building up a sufficiently large reserve against the time when benefits will exceed taxes, we would eventually be faced

with three alternatives: to reduce benefits, to increase taxes, or to ask for a Government subsidy. The present tax schedule, we believe, enables us to finance the present retirement system indefinitely, without having to face any of these alternatives.

The Board, of course, has been aware of the hardships imposed by the high cost of living on retired employees and on the survivors of deceased employees. During the last session of Congress several bills were introduced for the purpose of increasing benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, but no provision was made for increasing taxes to take care of the increased costs. In its report on these bills to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Board had this to say with reference to the proposal to increase certain annuities:

"In view of the increased cost of living and the reduced purchasing power of the dollar, the Board believes that higher annuities are desirable. However, any substantial increase in benefits necessarily increases costs. If Congress can find a way to increase benefits without increasing taxes, the Board would not oppose such a change."

I feel confident that, in view of the sharp increases in the cost of living, the Board would support increases in retirement benefits, provided that these benefits were properly financed. I believe I have covered the points that the retired employees had in mind. If I can be of future assistance, I shall be glad to hear from you again.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. KENNEDY,
Chairman.

Address of Hon. R. G. Le Tourneau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very worthwhile and excellent address made by Hon. R. G. Le Tourneau of the Le Tourneau Industries and the Le Tourneau Foundation last night. I commend the reading of the speech to the Membership of the House:

ADDRESS OF R. G. LE TOURNEAU AT CEREMONY WHERE HE IS AWARDED CERTIFICATE OF MERIT BY GEN. R. A. WHEELER, CHIEF OF ARMY ENGINEERS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 24, 1948

Thank you General Wheeler. In my humble way as an ordinary citizen, I want to express my appreciation tonight for the opportunity of meeting with you distinguished gentlemen from the high councils of government and the top ranks of our armed forces.

I regard this as one of the most important and most solemn occasions of my life, because right now the cold and calculating forces of communism that reach out with steely fingers to crush the last vestige of freedom and democracy in Europe and Asia are extending their frightening shadows straight at the heart of America.

You gentlemen know, perhaps better than I, how serious is the threat of the war clouds that gather on the horizon. All of us, however, can recognize these clouds—for we have seen them twice in our generation, and both times they quickly have mushroomed into storms of war that have engulfed nations and continents.

The signs which we see today are unmistakable in their clarity. If war must come, this time it will in deed and in truth be total war—with the full forces of peace, and right, and justice, arrayed against those of slavery and oppression, of deceit and cruelty the forces of anti-God.

It is our high duty to withstand and to oppose the further spread of communism with every means and force at our command. If, in this battle for peace and right, it becomes my painful duty to turn my factories again from the making of plowshares to the sword, I stand ready to renounce all personal profit. The Christ whom I worship and serve went about opposing evil and oppression and asked neither profit nor reward. Yet, from the days of the Caesars down to the present, the forces of anti-God have tried by cunning and deceit, by oppression and war, to stamp out religion and the freedom of worship. If my factories must turn again to the production of weapons of war, I am ready, if necessary, to give not only the 90 percent I have given, but a full 100 percent of my personal profits from the operation of my plants to the protection, growth, and spread of Christianity and the right of religious freedom and worship.

Our only hope of preventing another great war, as I see it, is to profit by avoiding our mistakes of the past. After World War I we sank our fleet. As the clouds of World War II gathered, we were weak and in no position to oppose any foe. If the liberty loving, democratic people all over the world, who like myself love and really want peace, had raised up in strength and righteous indignation and given the Kaiser, Hitler, and the Japs to understand in unmistakable terms that we would fight if their aggression continued, I believe that multiplied thousands of our finest young men who died in both wars would today be with us and enjoying the benefits of free America, instead of sleeping in the vermin-infested jungles, on the sunbaked shores of the Pacific, in the cold waters of the oceans, the hot sands of Africa, or the bloody fields of Europe.

I thank God, whom I love and worship, that we had the wisdom and foresight to retain our naval strength after World War II. This "fleet in moth balls," because of its quickly available power, is today one of our most potent forces for peace. In view of that fact, why should not Congress act quickly today to put our manpower, both civilian and military, in a similar state of stand-by readiness?

This is no time for wishful thinking, for the forces of anti-God are on the march. The threat of all who love and worship Him, and to all who love freedom and liberty, is very real. Communist Russia must be stopped cold in this cold war. Secretary of State George C. Marshall knows what he is talking about. Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG knows what he is talking about. The alarm has been sounded. It is unthinkable that at this late hour we should again hide behind a cry of "politics," or "it can't happen here, not again, not so soon."

Every Sunday of my life I am going into pulpits all over this great land, and in my small way, by the grace of Almighty God, continue to cry out against the Communist shadow which creeps ever closer—just as I started doing in England and Scotland 15 months ago. Although the very thought of its grieves my heart, I feel called upon to make these statements of warning in the face of approaching Easter, the joyous season that marks the resurrection of the Prince of Peace, who gave His life that you and I might live.

I accept this citation of honor in humble spirit, for I myself played only a small part in the great and bloody war that is still fresh in our minds.

This honor given me tonight is in recognition of what the men and women in our plants achieved during World War II.

I recently read in the press where the Russians have an airplane the speed of which has been estimated by our radar experts in the Far East at approximately 800 miles per hour as compared to the greatest known speed of our planes which, I understand, is about 640 miles per hour. Would it make you feel any better if I told you that the men in my plants, who made this certificate of merit possible for me this evening, now have a rubber-tired bulldozer working which weighs 100,000 pounds and has 700 horsepower and are prepared to build one big enough upon which to mount the biggest gun and take it down the road at 60 miles per hour? If we have a world war III we won't use the toy bulldozers we used in World War II, and the Communists may just as well find that out now.

I must also observe that hardly less vital to the welfare of the country, in respect to its future security, is the record we are making today in helping build up a reserve of trained technical workers.

We have 545 young veterans enrolled continuously in our Technological Institute at Longview, Tex.

Through the foresight of you men in Congress who set up the machinery for disposal of wartime installations which no longer were needed by the armed forces, we are operating this school in what formerly was an Army hospital.

As each of those boys leaves us, he is carrying with him a skill that will increase the industrial might of our land.

These boys fought for their country in the last war. Let us try to make our Nation so strong that they will not have fought in vain.

Caesar, Alexander, Napoleon, the Kaiser, Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, and now Stalin—all made the same mistake. They left God out of their plans and failed.

We who believe in God must now face cold facts and defend that belief—even if it means war.

The Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published in the Oakland Tribune of March 5, 1948.

The editorial clearly shows some of the implications which are involved in the tidelands controversy which, in principle, affect the rights of all States whether or not they have tidelands on their borders.

As the editorial points out, the action of the Federal Government, in claiming the tidelands of California, shows a tendency on the part of bureaucratic forces to further centralize authority over public property. There is ample evidence that a State government is just as good a trustee of the interests of the people of the State and Nation in matters which can be handled locally as the Federal Government and is much more responsive to the needs of those immediately concerned.

A new method of delaying corrective legislation is pointed out by the editorial.

The newspaper article follows:

The extremes to which the Attorney General of the United States seems willing to go in efforts to block legislation to quitclaim tidelands to the States is legitimate cause for concern. His actions, approaching those of a rabid partisan closer than those of a legal authority presenting his case, cannot fail to

suggest there are some forces in bureaucratic Washington determined to invade States' rights and seize property for a central authority, even if they have to adopt desperate means.

Announcement by Attorney General Clark that he now intends to sue Texas for its tidelands "within a month or two" is tip-off to procedure as well as another warning that a dispute first held to be of concern solely to California and Washington concerns all States with tidelands and possibly all States with marginal lands on lakes and rivers. Admitted before the present hearing at Washington, the plan to be followed by the Attorney General is to file suits, one by one, against the coastal States.

When President Truman vetoed former legislation to quitclaim the tidelands, he did so because a suit had been filed. If he follows that pattern, he will veto any new legislation on the subject just so long as the Attorney General is successful in keeping a suit on file. As Chairman E. H. MOORE, of the joint congressional subcommittee, asked of Mr. Clark, "So, if you file a suit against Texas now * * * you could file a suit against Louisiana next year and again it could be said that Congress could not act while that suit is pending?"

Procedure of the kind, if recognized generally as it was recognized in the President's veto and appears to be in practice by the Attorney General, could outdo the worst of filibusters in blocking legislation. Under it all that would be necessary to stop a law approved by a majority in Congress would be the filing of a suit by the law's opponents. What a club this would be in the hands of any administration determined to have its own way, despite popular will.

There is no legal justification for such a course. The rights of Congress to enact legislation under all circumstances cannot be questioned. If maneuvers of the kind now admitted were successful, we could have one move toward the establishment of a precedent and be a step nearer to a lawsuit veto power by which needed legislation, at any time, could be blocked.

Maryland Day—March 25, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, today is Maryland Day—314 years ago the first settlers of Maryland sailed up the St. Marys River to a point of land which looked so sheltered that they decided to go ashore. Under the branches of a large mulberry tree they raised a cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass was offered. This was on March 25, 1634, and the settlers named the place St. Mary's City.

Why did these settlers come to Maryland? The Calverts were Catholic and Catholics were not happy in England because England was a Protestant country. Lord Baltimore thought it wise to found a colony where men could worship as they pleased so King James allowed George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, to draw up a charter and granted him the powers of a proprietor or governor over the territory north of the Potomac on both sides of the Chesapeake Bay as far as the fortieth degree of latitude. The name of Maryland appeared for the first time in the charter although in Latin—Terra Mariae.

Before the seals were put on the charter, the first Lord Baltimore died and Cecil Calvert became the second Lord Baltimore. He stayed in England and his brothers Leonard and George with about 300 persons set sail in the *Ark* and the *Dove* for America. Under the charter never was there a more fair or more tolerant attitude toward religion than that which granted each settler of Maryland the right to worship as his conscience dictated. The Maryland charter sowed the very first seed of American democracy.

Not only was Maryland the first Colony to assure freedom of religion but the only place in the world where men could worship as they pleased. During the first years of the Colony the settlers so lived up to their ideal that action was taken against those who interfered with freedom of religion and not against any religious belief.

Maryland's history from the days of first settlement to the present day is the story of freedom. Founders of Maryland passed the first law providing religious freedom and with the passage of this law achieved, not only the reason for Maryland, but an ideal man has fought for through the years. No one regardless of belief can deny that Maryland has lived up to this greatest achievement.

The idea that everyone should be free to worship as he pleased was an entirely new one in those days. The first Catholic Church built by Englishmen in the United States was built at St. Marys City and that place became the first and the only place in the New World for a time where such toleration was encouraged.

If we were to go to Church Point at St. Marys City today to the Leonard Calvert monument on the spot where the first settlers landed we would read engraved on the stone—"Here the first colonists of Maryland assembled to establish a government where the persecuted and oppressed of every creed and every clime might repose in peace and security, adore their common God, and enjoy the priceless blessings of civil and religious liberty."

We are proud to be natives of this great free State of Maryland. In this present day of prejudices, jealousies, and hatreds, we can well profit by the example set by the first settlers of Maryland 314 years ago.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the time ever come when the saber-rattlers, brass hats, and war profiteers cease to stir the citizens of this country into a state of hysteria over the question of universal military training and conscription in utter disregard of the facts relating to these subjects?

I am inserting, under leave to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Daily Mirror of September 14, 1945. I suggest that those who are worried over our national security read these facts before yielding to the propaganda urging conscription and universal military training as a permanent part of our national system of government.

The editorial follows:

FREE ECONOMY

At the back of all the socialistic and semi-communistic bills that are now before Congress there is one "conviction" which has been repeated in one form or another for the last 12 years, from President Roosevelt and Henry A. Wallace down the New Deal line to the most superficial of the pro-Russian copperhead scribblers.

It is that the United States of America has reached the limits of her 156-year-old economic system, that there are "no more frontiers," that, in a word, the "saturation point" of the free-enterprise-competitive system has been reached and that we must go back to school—in Moscow.

HERE'S THEIR ANSWER

The complete answer to anyone who asserts that our American economy has passed maturity and is going to seed, or that our American system of government, private enterprise, and society in general is outmoded or that we must go to some form of socialism, fascism, communism, or dictatorship to exist in the postwar world lies in these facts:

1. For 40 years the warlords of Japan were driving the Japanese people hard for production to get ready for a war which they knew they would some time wage against America.

2. For 20 years Mussolini drove the Italian people in war preparations for the conflict which he saw would come some time.

3. In Russia the whole population was slave-driven and regimented to tremendous production plans in anticipation of a war which Stalin knew lay in the future.

4. For 12 years Germany was driven under the lash and spur of Hitler and the Nazis to superhuman efforts to get ready for a war which Hitler knew he was going to wage against civilization.

5. Throughout that interim America was part of the time sending a lot of goods to Europe on credits which never were liquidated.

6. Starting almost from scratch, then, as compared with the other nations, the United States of America—with free labor, free agriculture, free industry, a free Government, a free society—in 3 years overcame Japan's 40-year lead, Russia's 20-year lead, Germany's 12-year lead, Italy's 20-year lead.

In 3 years our American system had caught up with all that the war lords had done in those years and put us on an offensive war basis.

We began to furnish tremendous aid to our allies—all of this virtually without impairing our living standards at home.

7. Under our American system of free Government, a free economy, and a free society, we attained the highest living levels, the highest wages, the best working conditions, the greatest degree of religious and political liberty and tolerance, the finest educational system, the greatest technique of mass production ever achieved by any people in the history of the world.

In view of these facts, one is constrained to ask those who tell us that our economy is rotting, that there are no more opportunities in America, that our mode of Government, our economy, and our society have become obsolete:

What have the dictators done that we have not done better? What have the dictator countries got that we haven't got better? What can the dictator-ridden countries do that we can't do better?

THEORIES, NOT FACTS

Have the socialistic slave-staters, the "New Liberals," the pro-Russian fanatics, the New Dealers, the critics, and defeatists of our traditional American system ever thought of those questions or answered those facts?

No. For the would-be destroyers of the American way of life do not deal in facts.

They have for 12 years been dealing wholly in theories—all of them reactionary in principle—and using the American people as a giant guinea pig.

What this country needs now is a fearless, outspoken American statesman who has not his eye on the voters in 1948—an American who will recall to us perpetually what it was that in 3 years caused the United States of America to break the grip of the two greatest military powers in the world.

The answer is: The mobility of a free economy.

Jackson Hole National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from the Jackson Hole (Wyo.) Courier of March 4, 1948:

MONUMENT CONTROVERSY CAUSES RIFT IN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Officers of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce, through the secretary's office, issued a statement last Friday with request for publication, as follows:

"There is much misapprehension among residents of Jackson Hole in regard to the action taken by the directors of the chamber of commerce in endorsing the Barrett bill, H. R. 1330. This bill seeks to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument in its present form, adding to Grand Teton National Park all lands situated west of the Snake River, and returning to the Forest Service all public lands situated east of the Snake River. It is thus an attempt to settle by compromise a controversy that has kept the economy of this area in a turmoil for several years.

"The directors of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce, believing that action toward settlement was necessary in the interests of all established and potential commercial development, and believing that settlement of the question to be the desire of all interested parties, endorsed what appeared to be the only logical and democratic solution, a compromise.

"This action was taken only after repeated discussion covering a period of more than 5 months following receipt of a letter from Governor Hunt, dated July 7, 1947, inviting endorsement of the Barrett bill in the interests of Jackson Hole business development.

"Widespread controversy has resulted. Motives are in question, procedure is criticized, and petitions are reported to be in circulation bearing the names of some of those who were party to the condemned resolution. If the only motive behind this agitation was in question of procedure, of the authority of the board to act thus without the approval of the entire membership, the matter would be of relatively minor significance, to be adjusted within that organization. The probability of other motives exists, among them an effort to wreck the chamber of commerce.

"There is need of such an organization in Jackson Hole, and the need grows as the flood of letters increases from potential visitors anxious to see the country so much in controversy; an indirect result of the controversy itself. There's a wide open field for worth-while development here, which cannot occur under the sponsorship of divergent and unrelated factions. The chamber of commerce is a community enterprise, and to function must be supported by the community. Financial support is not the only need. How can we in Jackson Hole gain any objective with our house divided within itself? And how can we ask the support of neighboring communities, of the State itself, if we cannot tell them or it what we, ourselves, want?

"Are we to be forever hillbillies, feudin' and fussin' and fightin'?"

ACTION REPUDIATED

One of the petitions referred to as reported to be in circulation is probably a protest in writing, signed by some thirty-five or more prominent businessmen of Jackson Hole, as members and director of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce, and said to have been used in debate rebuttal by Hon. Leslie A. Miller at Rock Springs last week, as follows:

"We, the undersigned members of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce, wish to protest the high-handed and totally unauthorized conduct of certain of our board of directors who have been appearing in various parts of the State and before congressional committees both in Washington and Wyoming, giving the impression that the Jackson Chamber of Commerce is in favor of the Barrett bill and the abolition of the present Jackson Hole Monument. This is not so. No proper poll of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce has ever been taken.

"We repudiate this action. These men, self-appointed, have no right to appear as spokesmen for the Jackson Chamber of Commerce, the Town of Jackson, or the valley as a whole."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Neither the editor nor the Jackson Hole Courier is a member of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce. Solicited to join, by Bert Lanz, one of the prominent, original organizers, some two or more years ago, the editor refused. The reason given then to Mr. Lanz was that so many similar local organizations had foundered on park extension issues in the past 30 years that to join was like asking to be "put on the spot." That sooner or later, if history repeated, a few would appear, one way or another, to represent all, anent that controversial question, and the rest would have to rise to be counted.

History appears in the throes of repeating.

The Way Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Armand Eisler, of New York, has prepared an interesting paper on Palestine and the Charter, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question, together with a letter which Dr. Eisler wrote to the New York Times on February 16, 1948:

PALESTINE AND THE CHARTER—WAY TOWARD PEACE

Splitting Palestine proved to be the detonator of violent chain reactions with unprecedented virulence although this area was previously torn by Arab riots and Jewish terror. There was a tranquillity of great expectations for peaceful settlement pending the session of the General Assembly before which Britain had placed the task of finding a solution that would be acceptable to both Arab and Jew. This British neutrality formula has been generally misunderstood and the majority of the delegates have utterly failed to cope with the problem of reconciliation. The General Assembly was warned, not only by the British delegates, but also by preeminent experts on Palestinian affairs, among them the former president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Dr. Judah L. Magnes, that a resolution in favor of partition would inevitably plunge the mandated territory into civil war. But the delegates paid no heed to these warnings which resulted only in hesitation and the abstention of 10 members led by Britain as 13 delegates voted against 33 in favor of partition; these delegates placed expediency above the primary purpose of the United Nations to make peace. They wanted "to do something, and to place the hostile groups before hard facts."

The result is the paralysis of the Holy Land by internecine civil war aggravated by hideous war crimes and crimes against humanity; explosions, banditry, raiding villages, bombing houses, killing women and children, and increasing daily death toll are the marks of the savagery of this type of war unleashed by the proclamation to divide Palestine. The most sinister peril besetting the United Nations by pressure groups (the same which before November 29 tried to calm down the fear of troubles) is this: to be entangled in a policy of enforcement, dictated by a false sense of prestige, while the true concept of the prestige of the United Nations can only be that of a peacemaker who should humbly avow a mistake and make good instead of enforcing it. To yield to the mounting cries for arms and international troops in excess of a truly neutral police force would probably perpetuate or expand the situation into a serious danger to the international peace and security, or at least produce an Arabian irredenta without stopping the Jewish terror, dissatisfied with partition. Earnest efforts should rather be concentrated toward the primary purpose of the United Nations as laid down in article 1 of its Charter, to develop friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination.

Charter obeyance can only be based on Charter abidingness by the United Nations themselves. It can be questioned as long as the International Court of Justice will not render a binding advisory opinion on the controversial issue whether or not the all-important criteria of both legality and finality are to be attributed to the resolution of November 29 on partitioning the mandated territory. The General Assembly has omitted to request the advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on the legal question whether the General Assembly was authorized to divide the mandated territory into two independent states without a trust agreement between the concerned peoples and the mandatory government. This neglect was all the more amazing as the General Assembly had passed during the same session a resolution to take recourse, if legal questions arise, to the principal judiciary organ, the International Court of Justice being an integral part of the United Nations to which, as a general rule, legal disputes should be referred. Nothing has infuriated more the Islamic world of 300,000,000 against the United Nations than the arbitrariness

by which the General Assembly disregarded its own resolutions to refer legal questions to the International Court of Justice.

As in every political dispute, at the core is also a legal question, in every war the principle of justice is involved. According to the resolutions of the general assembly, passed against the votes of the Soviet bloc, it is now the general understanding that the International Court of Justice will be authorized to render decisions and advisory opinions in order to interpret the Charter itself; the question of constitutionality is raised.

It is never too late. An appeal to the International Court of Justice would be probably the best way to command a truce between the struggling parts of the population. Arbitration or decision by the International Court of Justice would even make peace. Its decision would be binding upon the parties and could be enforced as a judgment given by a court of law acknowledged by the peoples themselves.

Examination of the related provisions of the Charter justifies the doubt cast on the constitutional procedure followed by the general assembly in the partition plan. The case in point is governed by chapter 12 of the Charter by which the international trusteeship system is established. According to article 77 (a): "The trusteeship system shall apply * * * to territories now held under mandate, * * *" and, according to article 77 (c), to "territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration."

Article 77 provides also that the placing of the international trusteeship system ought to be done by means of trusteeship agreements by which the mandated territory is transformed into the trust territory.

According to article 79 of the Charter: "The terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate by a member of the United Nations, and shall be approved as provided for in articles 83 and 85."

And article 76 provides the basic objectives of the trusteeship system in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations laid down in article 1, and among them—

"Progressive development (of the inhabitants) toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement."

The resolution of November 29 does not conform with the above-cited laws of the Charter. It is not the subject of this disquisition to inquire into the responsibilities for the procedure which has been followed. Yet it can be hardly asserted that the General Assembly has applied the international trusteeship system, as provided in the charter, to the whole territory of Palestine. It appears to be applied merely to the territory of the city of Jerusalem. But dividing the territory and establishing independent states, and particularly an independent state, against the "wishes of the peoples concerned" imports a basic departure from the Charter. This constitutional defect would remain an open wound in the social body of the trust territory. It should be healed and not considered a fait accompli.

Above all, every earnest endeavor to arbitrate and to make peace requires to abide by the rules of the charter by means of a trusteeship agreement. The trusteeship agreement provided for in the Charter is not yet in existence. The resolution of the General Assembly can only assume the preliminary character of a recommendation. According to article 83:

"All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council."

And—

"The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas."

Where the General Assembly has surpassed its powers, the Security Council is authorized by the Charter to exercise its functions with regard to Palestine as a strategic area, which it doubtless is. In fact, the Security Council has already been siezed by the question and should not delay to act. The resolution of November 29th is not final.

The Security Council being not bound by the resolution of the General Assembly shall in discharging the duties of the United Nations toward the mandated territory and potential trust territory act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and "first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement." Expansion of the regime for Jerusalem to the whole territory would be the next step (art. 33 of the Charter).

The basic requisite of a trusteeship agreement is the consent of the mandatory state, Britain, which could hardly refuse to cooperate if a solution is sought for peace, that means a solution accepted by Arab and Jew. Any other trust agreement would be of no avail. If necessary, and it will be probably necessary, the principal judiciary organ of the United Nations, the court, shall contribute its share to the settlement. The duration of the International Trusteeship system should not be predetermined at a fixed date but last until the peoples concerned will find the way of agreement upon self-government. Then the idea may prevail of a binational state where neither Jew nor Arab shall dominate each other, but a more perfect union be created toward the establishment of a truly Holy Land. The International Court of Justice should remain in this area the guardian of equality, human rights, and fundamental freedoms. An international board would determine the absorptive capacity for immigration. (Partition would diminish this capacity and transform immigration into invasion.)

This is the way toward peace. Enforcing partition upon the majority of the indigenous population is the way to destruction of peace and of the capability of the organization responsible for its maintenance, the United Nations.

There are powers on earth which would like to fish in the troubled waters.

Dr. ARMAND EISLER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 6, 1948.*

[From the New York Times]

PRESTIGE OF THE UN—REMEDIES SEEN PROVIDED BY CHARTER IN PALESTINE PROBLEM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The letters to you of Milton R. Konvitz and Bartley C. Crum as well as your editorial, A Test Case for the UN, are hammering the widely publicized argument of prestige into the public mind at the time of decision.

The question arises whether the true concept of prestige for the UN affords a policy of enforcement or a policy of making peace.

Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve in her recent letter to you raised this question and called attention to articles 33, 36, and 37 of the Charter. According to these provisions the Security Council must first of all call upon the parties concerned to seek a solution by peaceful means, negotiations or judicial settlement. For this human approach on unassailable legal grounds Miss Gildersleeve has been assailed by Mr. Crum.

Mr. Konvitz's and Mr. Crum's interpretation insists that the partition has been ordered by the UN or adopted as "decision by more than two-thirds of the nations of the world." "It is not any longer a question of justice to Jew or Arab." "Riots and disorders have been expected." To keep the record straight, only 33 delegates—not "more than two-thirds of the nations of the world"—voted in favor of, 13 against partition, and the abstention of 10 members, led by Britain, demonstrated that world opinion was divided.

There cannot be a doubt that the General Assembly is neither a legislative nor a judicial body, according to the Charter of the UN. The resolution concerning partition is a recommendation of the General Assembly and is neither final law nor decision of the UN. The recommendation is addressed to the competent organ of the UN, the Security Council (art. 83), and "to the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power" (art. 79). The approval by the Security Council and by the mandatory as well as in conformity "with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned" (art. 76) are the requisites to the enforcement of the recommendation of the General Assembly in accordance with the Charter.

According to the Charter, the Security Council shall, "without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council" (provision of the Charter, art. 83) until the peoples concerned determine themselves their form of government. This is the meaning of the Charter.

Departure from the rules of the Charter would be a constitutional defect and remain a wound in the social body of Palestine. The Charter has provided the system of international trusteeship for a mandated territory after termination of the mandate. Charter obeyance can only be enforced if the UN itself abides by the Charter.

The suggestions of Miss Gildersleeve are the remedies provided by the Charter. Yielding to the hue and cry for military forces and lifting of the embargo would be "the spark starting a stupid war," to cite General Eisenhower. The sovereignty of international law—the most sacred issue of our time—should not be attributed to the recommendation of the General Assembly, which on November 14, 1947, acknowledged (against the votes of the Soviet bloc) that the International Court of Justice is the ultimate authority to interpret the Charter. The question of constitutionality having been raised, it is never too late to resort to the court.

ARMAND EISLER.

NEW YORK, *February 16, 1948.*

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

JOSEPH MORDECAI BRENNER
RELIEF SOCIETY,
Chicago, Ill., March 22, 1948.

Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN,
Member of Congress,
Sixth Illinois Congressional District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND, CONGRESSMAN O'BRIEN: Kindly have inserted in the first available issue of

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached resolution, which is self-explanatory, under the terms of which it is my pleasant duty to respectfully ask that you do so due to the unpleasant situation that caused said resolution to be adopted.

In asking your colleagues for this unanimous consent, you will not be imposing on them, for it is rare indeed that you have asked them to do so, judging by my reading of that publication, which you have so kindly sent me daily for years when Congress is in session.

It is needless for me to say that I deeply appreciate all of your past courtesies, and I further wish to emphasize that all of our members, individually and as a group, extend to you and your most able assistant, Mr. Elmer F. Neagle, our kindest regards and best wishes for your continued well being and happiness.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT HIRSCH,
President.

RESOLUTION

The Joseph Mordecai Benner Relief Society, of Chicago, Ill., a not-for-profit organization of about 200 individuals, at its regular meeting held March 21, 1948, adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we register our vigorous protest against the abandonment by the United States Government of the Palestine partition decision adoped by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, and in which the United States concurred.

"That we urge that the United States Government revert to its position of supporting the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947, and that it exert every effort to implement that decision, in order to safeguard the establishment of an independent Jewish state and the continued existence of the United Nations.

"That we urge that the United States Government revoke its embargo on the shipment of arms to the defenders of the Jewish state in Palestine.

"That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the two United States Senators from Illinois, and to the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Member of Congress from the 6th Congressional District of Illinois, with the request to the latter to have this entire resolution included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, first available issue."

ALBERT HIRSCH, *President.*
J. D. BRENNARD, *Vice President.*
ABRAHAM FRIEDMAN, *Secretary.*

Reduction of Veterans' Administration Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein resolutions adopted by the Manchester, N. H., Veterans Council in regard to the reduction of Veterans' Administration employees:

MANCHESTER VETERANS' COUNCIL,
Manchester, N. H., March 22, 1948.

Hon. CHESTER MERROW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The following is a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Manchester Veterans' Council in regards to the reduction of Veterans' Administration employees.

"Whereas the Manchester Veterans' Council, consisting of a constituent assembly of representatives from the 15 major veterans organizations in this city have duly recognized the present trend of false economies which will result in discrimination against the general welfare and lawful benefits of veterans of the armed forces of the United States, we, the Manchester Veterans' Council, hereby declare our policy in relationship to all false economies: And we are therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Manchester Veterans' Council is unalterably opposed to any drastic reductions in the scope and means by which lawful veterans' benefits are administered; and it is further

"*Resolved*, That the Manchester Veterans' Council shall do its utmost to oppose any unjustifiable curtailment of lawful veterans' benefits which are attempted under the guise of false economy; it is further

"*Resolved*, That the Manchester Veterans' Council does hereby endorse the action of the State Department of the American Legion and all other properly constituted veterans organizations which are currently pressing for an adequate Veterans' Administration budget."

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. LETENDRE,
Chairman.

The Chinese People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate on the China aid title of S. 2202, the ERP bill, it is important to note that the emphasis is being placed on the interests of the Chinese people and that the nature of the Chinese National Government is being evaluated in the balance of the whole problem facing the people of the United States respecting China.

It is significant that the statement of purposes of the China-aid title contained in section 402 of the bill, refers throughout to the people of the Republic of China. Following is an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 12, 1948 entitled "A Program for China," analyzing this point of view. It was followed on March 24 by another editorial entitled "Good Sense on China," approving the approach to the problem as it developed in the bill proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As I said in the course of the debate on the China-aid title on March 24, 1948, however, the main problem which we face is to have a situation in China in which government reform and improvement in government are possible, regardless of whether the people critical of the Government or those justifying the Government's course, are right. By our aid to China we have a reasonable chance for retaining the opportunity for those reforms which are forecast in the work of Dr. James Y. C. Yen and his colleagues reported in the ensuing articles. The China-aid title makes available over 40,000,000 United States dollars for this work.

Support for this position is found in the resolution of March 16, 1948, of the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, on China aid first appended below which recognizes this as the key point.

(The matters referred to are as follows:)

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
Foreign Affairs Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAVITS: The executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, at its meeting on March 16, adopted a resolution supporting the aid-to-China program embodied in the President's message to Congress on February 19. The resolution follows:

"The executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is desirous that steps be taken by our Government designed to alleviate human suffering in China, to afford that country an opportunity to initiate measures of stability and public order, to retard economic deterioration, to promote projects of long-range reconstruction, and to maintain in China conditions that will enable the Christian churches to carry forward their missionary and educational activities.

"Accordingly, we endorse in principle the aid to China embodied in President Truman's message to Congress under date of February 19, 1948."

I might add that this statement was adopted by a unanimous vote.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER W. VAN KIRK,
Secretary.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 12, 1948]

A PROGRAM FOR CHINA

In the efforts to oppose communism in China almost everything has been tried except doing something for the Chinese people. The people have had so little that is desirable from their Government that they no longer give it their trust. To use an ancient Chinese expression, the Government has "lost the mandate of heaven." As a result the people have no enthusiasm for aiding the Government in fighting the Reds. Under present conditions many billions of dollars in arms and other supplies could be given to the armies of Nanking by the United States without producing a united and completely independent China.

The United States could aid in resisting communism in China with some hope of success only if a means could be found to help the Nanking government acquire again the popular support it once had. The current proposals for large gifts to the Chinese would be far more attractive—no matter whether only economic or both military and economic support is considered—if they included sizable appropriations to help the Chinese people in Government territory actually win some of the benefits in the way of improved living conditions, health, education, and local democracy that the Communists so persistently promise in their propaganda. This idea, on first consideration, may seem utopian. It is not. There is a sound and tested program, devised and tried out by Chinese within China, that could be put to use if the American Congress would finance it and if the Chinese Government would give it the wholehearted support—to the extent of discharging any official who interfered with it—that the program would require for success.

The program is that developed in mass education and rural reconstruction centers in China over a period of 25 years by James Y. C. Yen and his colleagues. It is a program

in which mass education is used to reduce illiteracy as the first step in a coordinated plan. The other parts of the plan are designed to produce a greatly increased income from farming (through use of better seeds, cooperative credit organizations, etc.), to rid farming areas of debilitating diseases (through training laymen for preventive work) and to create democratic governments on the village and county level.

Wherever the program has been given a fair trial, with strong Government support, the results have been excellent. In some areas it has nearly doubled the income of peasants—and peasants make up more than three-quarters of the population of China. Before the start of the Sino-Japanese War it seemed possible that the Yen program would remake all of China within a generation or two. Unfortunately, the work was halted during the war in many regions as a result of Japanese interference or the growing power of Chinese reactionaries in the Kuomintang Party.

If the mass education and rural reconstruction program could be started again on a major scale in China, the intellectuals of the country, now extremely critical of the Natfonal Government, could be given a great cause for which to work. They could be enlisted in large numbers, for this has been demonstrated in the past. China would thus recruit for valuable employment some of the most able men in her population—the liberals to be found in the universities and other centers of intellectual activity—who now do little except sit around condemning the corruption or inefficiency of some of the men who rule China.

The cost would not be great. The total cost of teaching a Chinese to read and write under the system devised by Mr. Yen is only an American dollar. The total cost of economic and social reconstruction in a Chinese county is only $5 per capita. There have been estimates that $180,000,000 would be enough to finance the program for a period of 3 years, during which 30,000,000 young people would be trained. This estimate may be too low—it certainly would be best to err on the side of generosity in financing such a program—but it seems apparent that the cost of economic and social reconstruction in China would be only a fraction of the sums currently suggested for military assistance.

One of the American political leaders interested in opposing communism in China might well introduce in Congress a bill to provide for mass education and economic and social reconstruction in that country. The legislation might provide that control of the project be given to a commission composed of Chinese and Americans, with a Chinese chairman. Such a bill would add an affirmative proposal, well worth support, to the negative and essentially defensive measures now under consideration. Why not do something affirmative about China while a little time remains? Why not attack communism in China by offering full bowls of rice and good health and democratic government instead of attacking it with guns alone?

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 24, 1948]

GOOD SENSE ON CHINA

The danger that the United States might become directly involved in the civil war in China has been reduced as a result of sound judgment shown by members of the Foreign Affairs Committees in the Senate and House. Despite a barrage of propaganda in favor of forthright military assistance for Chiang Kai-shek, the House committee approved only $150,000,000 in military aid. The Senate committee, to its credit, went even further and eliminated all mention of military aid from its bill. Senator VANDENBERG and his colleagues got around the problem by providing $100,000,000 as a grant to China to be used to suit its own necessities and purposes.

If the members of the two committees had not given careful consideration to China they might have succumbed to the arguments of special pleaders. They could have made mistakes, not obvious at the moment, that would have led to the most serious consequences. They could have put the United States in a situation that would have resulted eventually in almost complete American responsibility for defeating the Communist armies in China.

While the bill produced by Senator VANDENBERG's committee is superior in some respects to the House version there is one provision in the House bill that certainly should be retained and, if possible, strengthened. This is the provision for a rural reconstruction and rehabilitation program in China along the lines proposed by Dr. James Y. C. Yen and other liberal Chinese leaders. If such a program had active backing in both Nanking and Washington it would improve living conditions in rural areas of China and give the Chinese peasant a strong reason for fighting the Communists. It could produce popular support for Generalissimo Chiang that would be worth far more than all the American help he ever can obtain.

Salary Adjustments in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the subject of salary adjustments for the loyal workers in our postal service is of great interest to me. I personally appeared before both the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees to urge quick action on the bills providing for an upward adjustment in pay, both for the postal employees and for other Federal workers.

Recently, during the hearings conducted by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the question of a salary increase for postal employees, Mr. Gurden M. Higley, of Harrisburg, testified on behalf of the Central Pennsylvania Postal Employees Council. Mr. Higley, as legislative chairman of the council, is one of the most well informed and enthusiastic workers for postal employee benefits. Ever since his employment in the Harrisburg, Pa., post office he has interested himself in the problems confronting postal employees and is conversant with all legislation enacted to date for their benefit. His statement before the committee is such a fine example of his thorough analysis of the situation, I am including it in full as part of my remarks:

Chairman REES and members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I submit herewith a statement dealing with postal salaries:

We are all aware of the fact that postal salaries are inadequate and do not provide a reasonable standard of living to one of the real career services of the United States Government. Prices have reached unprecedented levels (record high in the middle of January). The saturation point has been reached as far as postal employees are concerned. Debts are mounting for many; others are being forced to make loans to meet current living expenses.

I offer three sample budgets below for your earnest consideration. These are typical and I would say the average from three different groups of postal employees.

This from a railway mail clerk (family of four—husband, wife, daughter 14, and son 6):

"House payment	$ 58.00
Insurance	10.50
Gas (heat, water, cook)	30.00
Electric	5.00
Telephone	3.50
Bread, milk	20.00
Groceries	85.00
Total	$212.00

"This includes bare necessities, take-home pay, $250 per month."

Out of the remaining total of $38 per month clothing, house repairs and maintenance, doctors' and dental bills must be paid. This seems like a small margin to maintain a decent standard of living.

This from a letter carrier (family of three—husband, wife, and daughter, 4):

"Mortgage	$ 48.75
Insurance	20.24
Telephone	2.59
Light	4.50
Gas	1.90
Taxes	9.80
Coal	10.50
Water rent	.75
Uniforms	5.00
Church	5.80
Newspapers	1.48
Food	80.00
Credit Union loan	42.00
Bus fare to work	3.36
Total monthly expenses	$236.67

"Take-home pay per month, $225.60.

"It is noted that this budget shows a deficit of $11.17 a month, caused by the refinancing of a loan made to secure a down payment on a house. This budget includes nothing for recreation, medical or dental expenses, clothing, repairs on home, or miscellaneous expenses. This means that I cannot set aside each month for each item on the budget. Thus, when taxes are due or coal must be bought, a loan must be made."

This from a post-office clerk (family of three—husband, wife, son 3):

"House payment	$ 58
Light and gas	7
Insurance	15
Coal	11
Dues	1
Church and charity	2
Bus fare, work	4
Papers and incidentals	4
All food, including milk and bread	102
Total (no clothes)	$204

Take-home pay per month, $224.60."

You will note that this budget has only $20.60 remaining to provide for repairs and maintenance of the home, clothing, doctor and dentist bills, and other miscellaneous items.

The above budgets are among the many that I hear about each week from the employees of the Harrisburg area and railway-mail clerks in the terminal. These men are concerned for themselves and their families. Before leaving the subject of prices I should like to quote Mr. Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics: "In mid-January," Clague said, "not only was the general cost of living at a record peak, but each single category, food, apparel, rent, fuel, electricity, ice, house furnishings, and miscellaneous items hit all-time levels."—Washington Post, February 21.

I should like to include a few quotations regarding the postal service which I feel are very pertinent to this general subject. The following is an excerpt from the speech of the Honorable JOHN C. KUNKEL, Eighteenth District of Pennsylvania, before the Eastern

States Postal Employees Conference held in Harrisburg, Pa., Saturday, February 14. "In particular reference to postal employees, the only universal service in the United States today is the postal service. Few people realize that. Millions of citizens do not have electricity or telephone or telegraph facilities or even transportation. The United States mail goes everywhere, and under all kinds of conditions at all times. By the same token, the postal service is the one way in which everyone comes in contact with the United States Government. I have never known a group who were so uniformly polite and considerate."

At the same conference, Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, senior Senator from Pennsylvania, said, "Your excellency of service and devotion to duty are the most effective lobbying activities in your behalf. When your representatives come before Congress, they find the good will has already been created for them by the rank and file back home in every post office and in the postal service. That does not mean that you have always gotten from the Congress the things that you want and have a right to expect or gotten them promptly enough when you did get them. The delays in acting upon employee benefits of all Government employees, including the postal employees, and sometimes the postal employees have at times verged on the tragic side."

Postal employees are particularly happy to know that the Members of Congress and the American public are appreciative of their efforts to render the best possible service.

The postal service has a tradition dating before the adoption of the American Constitution. We employees are anxious to maintain and, if possible, improve on this record of service. It will make it easier if we are free from the worry of making an insufficient salary provide the necessities of life for our families.

We postal workers feel that the provisions of the Dingell-Nodar and the Langer-Chavez bills are necessary to provide a reasonable standard of living to ourselves and our families. On behalf of the Central Pennsylvania Postal Employees Council, of which I am legislative chairman, I endorse the above bills.

The Eastern States Postal Employees Conference, of which I am co-chairman, adopted S. 1849, the Langer-Chavez bill, as the paramount issue of the meeting. The delegates to this conference represented some 25,000 postal employees.

I appreciate the courtesy and privilege of being allowed to file this statement and I respectfully request that you gentlemen take immediate action to enact a bill that will provide adequate postal salaries. Thank you.

Abuse Seems To Work Because We Are Still Shipping Essential War Materials to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 25, 1948, entitled "Sixty-five Million Bucks for What?"

SIXTY-FIVE MILLION BUCKS FOR WHAT?

In New York on Tuesday, an agreement was signed for a loan of $65,000,000 by the United States to the United Nations. The money, if Congress approves the deal, will go to pay for the palatial UN headquarters in east midtown Manhattan. We'll probably never get the money back.

BIG SOAP BOX FOR GROMYKO

Before Congress approves the loan, we think it might well consider something else that happened in New York Tuesday, at Lake Success. There, Andrei Gromyko, Soviet deputy foreign minister, spewed his umpty-umpth discharge of blatherskite abuse at the United States. Two of Gromy's riper passages:

"They (the United States) are in need of fishing out old rubbish taken from the Goebbels kitchen of propaganda, who, as is known, had always tried to intimidate everybody, including the German people, by Soviet Union, by communism.

"For more than 2 years American and British politicians have considered Czechoslovakia as their easy potential prey."

In this performance, Gromy was pursuing the long-time Kremlin policy of using the UN as a sounding board for the bouncing of anti-American propaganda around the world. Russia is obviously determined to use the UN chiefly for this purpose as long as the United States continued to oppose world communism.

So, by building the UN a $65,000,000 string of palaces in Manhattan, we'll be furnishing Gromyko with the toniest possible soap box from which to yell that we are a bunch of monarcho-imperialist Fascist beasts who copy the late Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels' propaganda methods and are ambitious to rule the world.

Really, must we be as suckerish as all that?

Loyalty Inventory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Loyalty Inventory," which appeared in the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal of Friday, March 19, 1948:

LOYALTY INVENTORY

The House Un-American Activities Committee can be thankful that FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover waited until this week to release a progress report on loyalty investigations. If Hoover's statement had been issued a week earlier, the House vote giving the committee an additional $200,000 might not have been so emphatic as 337 to 37.

The angle in Hoover's report that got the headlines was the disclosure that a surprisingly large number (1 out of 12) of Federal workers were found to have police records. More significant, however, was the revelation that disloyalty among workers in strategic departments was found to be practically nil.

In 84,923 loyalty investigations completed by the FBI, 84,780 uncovered no derogatory information whatever. Of 143 cases where the FBI did find so-called derogatory information, 137 still are being rechecked, 4 persons resigned before their records could be laid before the loyalty board, and 2 were exonerated by the FBI.

The Un-American Activities Committee may argue that its zeal in exposing and harassing Communists has frightened disloyal persons away from the Federal service. And such a claim would seem plausible. Nevertheless, the fear of large-scale Communist infiltration of Government is what causes Congressmen who disapprove of the committee's methods to suppress their aversion and vote more funds for the probe. Apparently there hasn't been any large-scale infiltration.

Regardless of who deserves the credit for preventing a Communist invasion of Government departments, the public should be gratified by Hoover's report. It encourages confidence in our system of government. Furthermore, by lessening fear of Communist influence in Federal positions, it tends to curb the clamor of periodic, wholesale purges. This is not to say that Americans should cease to be vigilant because few if any Communists have succeeded thus far in worming their way into strategic offices. The danger is real and it is continuous. The hazard should be guarded against but not exaggerated.

Amendment of Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, last week, when I introduced H. R. 5875 to increase the benefits payable under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by 25 percent, I called attention to the fact that the cost of living had increased by 25 percent since July 1946, when the amendments to the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts, generally known as the Crosser amendments, were adopted. I pointed out that it would consequently now take 25 percent more to buy the quantity of goods and services that we thought we were enabling unemployed, sick, and retired railroad employees to buy with their benefit payments as provided in July 1946. I stated that the bill I was then introducing was designed to relieve that condition insofar as benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are concerned. But I also stated that study was being given to the practicability of likewise securing for retired employees some measure of relief and that with that purpose in mind I expected to introduce a bill at an early date.

Yesterday I introduced H. R. 5993 for that purpose. The bill provides for an increase in retirement benefits amounting over all to as close to 20 percent as it is practicable to come in revising the annuity formula.

The increase provided would constitute a somewhat higher percentage of the smaller annuities than it would of the larger ones, in view of the fact that a uniform percentage of increase applied to the lesser annuities would give insufficient recognition to the effect of the rising cost of living upon people with small incomes. The bill also provides for a restoration of the policy formerly embodied in the law guaranteeing that each employee or his survivors will be, under all circumstances, entitled to benefits at least equal to the contributions made by him, plus interest. It appeared from the cost estimates available when the 1946 amendments were under consideration that railroad employees would

have to forego this guarantee in order to finance the protection they wanted for surviving widows, children, and dependent parents. Subsequent developments have shown that financial considerations do not compel the relinquishment of that guarantee and I therefore now propose that it be restored.

The bill does not seek to impose any additional tax upon the railroads or the employees. The employees particularly, in view of rising living costs and lagging wage rates, are in no position to absorb an increased tax. In order to keep the system on a safe and sound financial basis without increasing the tax it has been found necessary to hold the increase in benefits to a level that is not fully commensurate with the increase in the cost of living that has occurred since the last amendments were adopted, and a level that is considerably less than the increase that Congress has provided to retired civil-service employees. Nevertheless the prompt enactment of the bill should provide a substantial degree of relief for retired railroad employees by utilizing the additional income that results from the rise in railroad pay rolls beyond the levels that could be anticipated when the 1946 amendments were under consideration. In this way the system can be kept on a safe and sound financial basis without imposing additional tax burdens.

The bill is endorsed by all the standard railway labor organizations represented in the Railway Labor Executives Association, and I am requested to state that these representatives of the railroad employees strongly urge early enactment of the bill.

Mikolajczyk Tells What He Would Do About the Reds' Broken Pacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, following are the two final articles of former Prime Minister of Poland Stanislaw Mikolajczyk as printed in the Milwaukee Sentinel.

We have the evidence of the Russian police state in action in Poland. Our foreign policy has been largely responsible for the sad fate of Polish freedom and the fact that it is now in the iron grip of the Soviet NKVD. The tragedy of Poland was largely the result of our attempting to appease the Soviet aggressor. The love of liberty, the love of things of the spirit, the love of freedom of religion and speech and of the press will never die in the Polish heart.

Following are the articles:

HOW I ESCAPED FROM RED FASCISTS

(By Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and president of the Polish Peasant Party)

(Special article II)

I lay in the barn of my friend and held my breath. The armed security police, who would have been richly rewarded if they found me, strode to the door.

My friend's daughter answered their heavy knock.

"Where is your father?" the leader demanded. The father had, of course, ridden off the night before to attempt to find a way to smuggle me over the frontier.

"Oh, he just stepped out," the brave girl answered casually. Then, to what was at first my horror, she added, "Won't you come in?" But then I was forced to smile, for she was taunting them. It was late in the afternoon and she knew their inherent fear of being in the forest after dark. They mumbled some excuse and drove away.

SOME GOOD NEWS

My friend returned in midmorning on October 22 of last year. When I was certain there was no one in sight, I came out of the barn and my first question was, "Have they discovered I've gone?"

He rushed me inside. "There is nothing in the newspaper," he said. "And nothing on the wireless. And I have good news for you. A smuggling group that operates out of a village near Gubin has agreed to try to take you across the border."

On October 24 a delivery truck, in the service of a cooperative that functioned in that area, drove up to the cottage. The chauffeur hopped out, entered the cottage with what might have been a box of groceries, and emptied the contents—a change of clothes—on the table. I quickly changed into the new clothes and bade good-by to my friends, who decided then and there that they, too, would attempt to escape from Poland, in an opposite direction. "Maybe we'll see you on the other side some day," they said.

NOT REALLY A COMMUNIST

I left with the driver of the truck, as his assistant.

We drove in silence for a time, but finally I had to ask some questions about my destination, and about the people who would handle me.

"The name of the next man you will meet does not matter, nor does the village in which he lives. He is the most prominent Communist in the village."

I looked at him, but he was smiling faintly.

"He isn't really a Communist," he said. "He just lets it be known that he is, and that saves him a lot of bother."

GOING TO BE A PARTY

In time we drove up to the man's house. He expected me and led me to a dark upstairs bedroom, where I changed back into my regular clothes. Then, in the darkness, I heard him say:

"There is going to be a party here beginning very soon. You must keep your door locked. Don't answer any knock until I come back for you—and then I will identify myself by knocking in the 'V' manner * * * three dots and a dash."

The party formed downstairs and the house was soon filled with drunken Polish and Russian laughter and song. But at the height of the party I heard the "V" knock. I opened the door and my man said, "Come * * * quickly."

He led me down the back stairway. My hand clutched my gun. A Polish soldier stood silently in the backyard. The three of us then walked swiftly across fields for 6 or 8 miles and finally to a road, where a jeep—manned by a Red army sergeant was waiting. With the sergeant was a German civilian.

HAD TO TRUST THEM

I had to trust them. I sat in the back of the jeep, my hand on my revolver.

But after an eternity of time we made a right turn off the highway and came into a sleepy little village. And my heart leaped when in the darkness I detected a German sign or two. We raced through the village and stopped on its outskirts at a peasant's rambling house. It was five in the morning, but I was expected.

An old couple came to the door to mumble a greeting. With them was a strikingly beautiful and stylishly dressed girl. They introduced her as their daughter, though she was obviously a part of the smuggling ring, and then the old couple took me to a tiny bedroom in the rear and bade me goodnight. I slept.

The girl came into the room at 9 the next morning with coffee and bread. She sat down and lighted a cigarette I gave her.

"Don't be afraid if Russian soldiers visit us," she said. "If they see you just be nonchalant. Give them cigarettes."

Then she outlined the next leg of my escape. Berlin was too well policed by the Russians to risk going through there. The main highway from Berlin to the British zone of Germany was also too well policed.

Dressed in ragged peasant's clothes I was taken to another village on October 25, by horse and cart.

From that village, on the morning of October 27, I was driven to a railroad station by a boy—who had timed our arrival so the train was just pulling in.

THREE NERVE-WRACKING DAYS

The boy led me off the train at a short stop, some 60 miles from where we had boarded it, and we walked 5 miles to another German home, where I spent three nerve-wracking days in a small room.

But on the third night a jeep containing a civilian and two Red Army men drove up and I was ordered to hop in. We drove to a forest near the border between the Russian and British zones and the jeep stopped. The civilian and I stepped out, and he walked me through the woods until 9 o'clock that night, when we came to a clearing where five civilians, heavily armed, were awaiting us.

PATROLS VERY HEAVY

"We must be very careful," the leader whispered. "If we fall into the hands of the Russian guards it means the lives of all of us. The patrols are very heavy tonight. If you hear the least bit of noise, you must drop to the ground and try not to breathe."

Our grim little group walked the remainder of the night, crossing and recrossing barbed wire emplacements, and as the first suggestion of dawn touched the east we tramped into a small German town. They stopped on the edge of the city.

"You're in the British zone," the leader said. "We leave you here. When it is light enough, go to that house there," and he pointed at it, "a British officer lives there."

I told him I'd go then and there, but he shook his head.

"You'd arouse suspicion," he ruled. "Wait until it is quite light * * * and then join your friends."

HEARD OVER WIRELESS

I hid in the streets until about 7:30 a. m. and then went to the house. A suspicious German housekeeper answered the door and peered at me through a slim opening. I asked to see the British officer in charge.

"Wait," she said, and closed and locked the door and I had a feeling that I should have pushed into the room. It is a bad feeling to be so close to safety and yet be standing still helplessly in danger.

At last a young soldier came to the door and, after a bit, admitted me.

"I am Mikolajczyk," I said. "I——"

A grin came over his face and he shook my hand. "We heard over the wireless that you had escaped," he laughed. "And we thought the Russians had killed you and simply put out a story that you were missing."

REUNITED WITH FAMILY

Two days later the British were able to drive me to an airport. The RAF had sent a special plane for me. It flew me to the

blessed security of England—and I was reunited, at last, with my wife and son.

The war had imposed on my little family many great hardships.

But now we are together again, yet, for one of us—myself—the war has not ended. It cannot end until that previous thing for which Poland bled—peace and security and democracy—is once again rooted in our soil.

(Special article III)

There are a number of methods by which the democracies and the freedom-minded people in the captive countries can combat Russia's tremendous offensive that is aimed at conquest of the world.

STERN WAR ON

The first obligation placed on the democracies is to recognize that one of the sternest wars in history is in progress at this moment and that the aggressor, the U. S. S. R., has conquered more than 100,000,000 human beings in Europe alone and is maintaining incredibly efficient operatives in every country in the world.

It is important in these times that we make more use of the established instruments of peace. Russia has cold-bloodedly broken the agreements it signed with the United States and Great Britain at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam; it has perverted the Atlantic Charter to which it subscribed, and it has, of course, violated each agreement it has signed with Poland and other states which have become helpless puppets.

These ruptured pacts should be brought to the attention of the United Nations by the remaining parties to the pledges. The UN can be strengthened, of course, by the elimination of the veto privilege in the Security Council, a right which has enabled Russia to obstruct nearly all of that body's efforts to mend the chaos of the world * * * for the Reds know full well that out of chaos will nearly always rise the specter of communism.

There may be those who will say if the UN Charter is changed against Russia's wishes Russia will resign from UN.

GAVE ATTITUDE IN 1945

I wonder if that would represent such a tremendous calamity? Russia's outlook on UN was expressed at a meeting of the Polish Politburo in Warsaw in May 1945, when the nations were meeting at San Francisco and the world looked hopefully toward that city.

Jacob Berman, the Communist leader of Poland today, told a group of Communists at a secret meeting:

"The Soviets are doing their usual clever job at San Francisco. We will continue to blind the west by entering into agreements, as we did at Yalta and elsewhere."

One needs only to look through the minutes of UN proceedings to realize the striking manner in which the U. S. S. R. has used that organization solely as a sounding board. Russia has no intention of quitting UN. Why would it walk out completely on a means of spreading its propaganda and baseless lies across the front pages of the world's free press?

The Marshall plan constitutes a tremendous physical boon to Europe's suffering people. It will do its share to restore fertility and vigor to the devastated regions. It will be, and is being, fought tenaciously by the Reds, for it threatens to elevate in some countries the greatest of all menaces to communism—stability and a better standard of living.

SPIRIT NEEDS LIFTING

But the spirit of the devastated lands needs lifting, too. The morale needs sustenance. My own country is an example. Its 24,000,000 people, who underwent fantastic hardship while remaining in the Allied camp during the war, and who were promised freedom, are now wholly enslaved by what amounts not even to 5 percent of the population.

The Poles sought to vote that yoke off their backs, and the vote was stolen. They looked to the Big Three to carry out the solemn promises made to what President Roosevelt once called "the inspiration of the nations—Poland." But those pacts have been callously broken by Russia with only "paper protests" from the remaining parties to the pledges, and no one has dared to raise a protesting voice in UN.

The Reds have adopted the old Goebbels technique of lying. Those lies must be combated by truths from the democracies. If they are not, then eventually the people of the enslaved countries will believe what they are reading in their controlled press.

PLAN WORLD RULE

Their plan, which they have revealed in capturing eastern Europe, is to rule the world and to reduce all human life to the bloodlessness of serfdom.

Russia today is a gigantic economic menace to private enterprise everywhere.

It has killed, or is in the process of killing, all private enterprise from eastern Germany to Alaska.

The West has demobilized. Russia has not, and, in addition, has gained the armed forces of many countries.

The West believes in the freedom of labor. Russia exploits its tremendous manpower.

The West's leaders can be removed from office if they violate the essential rights of their peoples. The Communist gang cannot be removed and when Stalin dies there will be well-trained men to take his place.

The West maintains no secret forces in Russia. Russia, as I have said, maintains sub rosa forces in every country, ready to strike at every weakness.

Do my personal experiences matter? They do not, nor do the experiences of others who have been forced out or persecuted during Russia's new offense against freedom: Maniu, Petkov, Dmitrov, Nagi, Pfeiffer, and their like.

Only this matters: Red Russia is at war against the dignity and peace of the human being, and against all governments which afford its citizens those rights. Unless the free peoples are warned, and unless they adequately prepare to fight this monstrous evil, the whole world could become what chained and terrified Poland is today.

Pouring Holy Water on Troubled Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the events since the publication of the article I am inserting in the RECORD, taken from the Congress Weekly of March 12, it merely reflects the prophetic powers of the editors. It becomes part of the post mortem over the corpse of world Zionism, struck a deadly blow by our own Government.

However, one bit of information has come to me since the article was written. That information, not as yet documented but fairly substantial in nature, is that a silent and generous member of the Committee for Justice and Peace in Palestine is the notorious Benjamin Freedman, of New York. The similarity of the new organization's name to Freedman's pro-Arab pressure group, the Committee for Peace and Justice in Palestine, is obvious at a glance. It now seems likely that Freedman is again opening his copious purse to pay the bills for the new respectable pro-Arab pressure group, and quite likely in collaboration with the English industrial and oil interests who helped him with his old front.

The article referred to follows:

POURING HOLY WATER ON TROUBLED OIL

Hiding discreditable purposes behind impressive and high-sounding titles has long been regarded as a favorite tactic of disreputable groups and front organizations. The latest practitioners of that tactic, however, are a group of eminently respectable Americans who have launched a committee for justice and peace in Palestine. Their stated purposes are to bring peace with justice to the Holy Land, to further the best interests of all Jews, Christians, and Moslems in the Near and Middle East, to foster friendly relations among the peoples of all three faiths and to strengthen the United Nations. Although the organization seems to have been created too hastily to permit elaboration of detail, its program calls for a cease fire order by the security council; reconsideration of the General Assembly's decision on partition; reference of the problem to the International Court of Justice; and the development of a bipartisan policy on Palestine. Actually, the committee is concerned neither with justice nor with peace. Its real purpose, clearly and simply, is to destroy the emergent Jewish state and to surrender unconditionally to the Mufti and the Arab League. If the committee achieves these ends, it will be perpetrating grievous injustice and dealing a body blow to world peace.

The membership of the national council of the new organization is interesting. Obviously, no more fitting person could have been selected as its executive director than Kermit Roosevelt, the most respectable pro-Arab League propagandist in America. Inveterate foes of Jewish national rebirth such as Virginia Gildersleeve, Paul Hutchinson, of the Christian Century, and Prof. William Hocking were, of course, logical candidates. Nor is it surprising to find the National Association of Manufacturers represented through the person of the chairman of the NAM board, Earl Bunting. The NAM would be serving its master's cause ill if it failed to dance to the tune of the oil interests who, we suspect, are not the least influential group within NAM ranks. It need hardly be added, too, that among the charter members is that acceptable Jew, Rabbi Morris Lazaron, spiritual adviser to the Council for Judaism, who will probably fill the same post in the new body.

Most of the committee, however, is made up of Christian churchmen who have been associated in one form or another with missionary work in the Near and Middle East. The opposition of these groups to Jewish settlement in Palestine, let alone the creation of a Jewish state, is not a new phenomenon. Nor are its roots difficult to trace. Their missions, colleges, and hospitals in the Near and Middle East have given them as deep a vested interest in the maintenance of the status quo as that of the feudal rulers of the Arab lands. Their relationship to, and dependence on, the oil companies would make it highly embarrassing for them passively to acquiesce in policies which the oil moguls oppose. And they probably entertain deep fears that the democratizing influence a Jewish state is certain to exercise over the entire area will render the Moslems less susceptible to Christian missionary efforts and more likely to rely on their own rich spiritual and cultural heritage.

The concern of the members of the committee with "justice" seems to be strikingly recent in origin. We do not recall any such

restless passion for justice when the hapless refugees of the *Exodus* were being forced back to Germany a few short months ago. We did not hear the voices of these churchmen when Jewish students were expelled from Lebanon and the American University in Beirut. We are not aware that these missionaries have been berating their disciples and prospective converts for the medieval atrocity propaganda that has been unleashed against the Jews in Moslem lands. Nor did their newly found sensitivity to justice impel them to protest when their pupils so recently launched pogroms in Iraq and Syria and Aden.

Scarcely less striking about the committee's statements is what in any other group would constitute incredible naïveté but which in this instance falls far short of moral honesty and simple integrity. The committee calls for an end to violence in Palestine. If its members have the kind of influence in the Near East which they undoubtedly imagine they possess, they can very easily stop further bloodshed. These crusaders for peace need only persuade their Arab friends to abandon their war of aggression against the Yishuv and their armed defiance of an internationally sanctioned decision. When they call for a bipartisan policy on Palestine, they are no less disingenuous. What they really want is a reversal of the traditional and present bipartisan policy of support for a Jewish state, the official policy not simply of both parties but of the United States of America. And to declare that one of the committee's purposes is to strengthen the UN is brazen effrontery; for no one has had the temerity to deny that the UN will be gravely, if not fatally, injured if its decision on Palestine is subverted by Arab violence.

One thing, however, is clear. These churchmen have been more deeply corrupted by the feudalism of the Middle East than the Moslems have been enlightened and uplifted by their missionary efforts. We can only hope that lengthy and continued sojourn in America will help them recover the perspective on Christianity which has led the vast majority of their fellow Christian churchmen in this country to be among the foremost supporters of the Jewish restoration in Palestine. Meanwhile, the Committee for Justice and Peace in Palestine would have been much more honest and honorable if it had adopted its true name, "Christian Friends of the American Council for Judaism," another body whose name similarly stands in stark and flagrant contradiction to its actual aims and activities.

International Refugee Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMBASSADE DE FRANCE AUX ETATS-UNIS,
Washington, le February 25, 1948.
Mr. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I wish to express my sincere gratitude to you and your colleagues of the House of Representatives for your kind letter referring to the action taken by the French Government with regard to the vote of the IRO bill. It is gratifying that France, who suffered so much herself from the war, could manifest her deep interest in the sufferings of all people affected by its consequences by joining the IRO in an effective manner despite the difficulty of her present economic situation. I associate in your wish that two additional countries will now adhere to IRO so that it can soon become a permanent institution.

I know the instrumental part played by the special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on displaced persons and International Refugee Organization in promoting the humanitarian ideals embodied in the IRO Charter and I wish you success in your future endeavors.

I shall not fail to communicate your letter of February 17 to my Government and I am sure of their deep appreciation of its content.

Sincerely yours,

H. BONNET.

International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, consummating 4 months of negotiations among 56 nations from every part of the world, a charter for the International Trade Organization has just been agreed upon in Habana; only two of these nations, Argentina and Poland, failed to sign the charter. A summary of the charter prepared by the New York Times, appearing in its issue of Thursday, March 25, 1948, is appended below. During the time I spent in Habana as one of the United States delegates to the conference which drafted this charter, I was able to experience at first hand the magnitude and difficulty of the task. That it was successful is a major victory for international cooperation.

The European recovery program which the House is now considering, provides in its statement of policy, section 102, that "the accomplishment of these objectives calls for a plan of European recovery, open to all such nations which cooperate in such plan, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers." To the attainment of these objectives, the freeing of world trade from undue restrictions contemplated by the International Trade Organization charter is essential. This charter is very likely to prove a most important factor in helping the European recovery program to succeed and giving the nations operating under it an opportunity for economic stability.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION CHARTER SIGNED IN HABANA

CHAPTER 1. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The first chapter (article 1) states in broad terms the purpose and objectives of the Charter and of the ITO. The purpose is defined by reference to article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations. The objectives are listed as:

(a) To assure a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, to increase the production, consumption, and exchange of goods, and so to contribute to a balanced and expanding world economy.

(b) To promote industrial and general economic development, particularly of those countries which are still in the early stages of industrial development, and to encourage the international flow of capital for productive investment.

(c) To further the enjoyment by all countries, on equal terms, of access to the markets, products and productive facilities which are needed for their economic prosperity and development.

(d) To promote on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce.

(e) To enable countries, by increasing the opportunities for their trade and economic development, to abstain from measures which would disrupt world commerce, reduce productive employment or retard economic progress.

(f) To facilitate the solution of problems relating to international trade in the fields of employment, economic development, commercial policy, business practices and commodity policy.

CHAPTER 2. EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

(Arts. 2 to 7)

Chapter 2 declares that the avoidance of unemployment and underemployment is not of domestic concern alone but is also a necessary condition for the realization of the general objectives of the Charter, including the expansion of international trade, and for the well-being of all other countries.

Under Article 3, Maintenance of Domestic Employment, each member will take action to achieve and maintain full and productive employment and a large and steadily growing demand within its own territory through measures appropriate to its political, economic, and social institutions. Members will seek to avoid measures creating balance-of-payments difficulties for other countries. Where persistent maladjustment in a member's balance of payments leads to balance-of-payments difficulties for other members, which would handicap them in maintaining full employment without resort to trade restrictions, the member is to make its full contribution and appropriate action is to be taken by the other members concerned to correct the situation. Such action should expand rather than contract international trade.

Article 6, Safeguards for Members Subject to External Inflationary or Deflationary Pressure, recognizes that members may need to take action to safeguard their economies against inflationary or deflationary pressure from abroad. In the case of deflationary pressure special consideration is to be given to the effect on any member of a serious or abrupt decline in the effective demand of the other countries. Article 7, Fair Labor Standards, calls on members to do whatever is appropriate and feasible to eliminate substandard conditions of labor, and refers in this connection to cooperation with the International Labor Organization.

CHAPTER 3. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND RECONSTRUCTION

(Arts. 8 to 15)

Chapter 3, Economic Development and Reconstruction, recognizes that all countries have a common interest in the productive use of the world's human and material resources. Under Article 9, members are obligated progressively to develop and to reconstruct industrial and other economic

resources and to raise standards of productivity. There must be cooperation between members and with the Economic and Social Council and with ITO to promote economic development as well as reconstruction of war-devastated countries. Members undertake, under article 11, not to impose unreasonable impediments in the way of obtaining facilities for development or reconstruction, nor to take action injuring the enterprise, skills, capital, arts, or technology supplied by other members.

Article 12 deals with international investment for economic development and reconstruction. It recognizes that public and private international investment can be of great value in promoting development and reconstruction. But members have the right, without prejudice to existing international agreements, to insure that foreign investment is not used as a basis for interference in their internal affairs or national policies, and to determine to what extent and upon what terms they will allow future foreign investment. Members also have the right to state in just terms, requirements as to the ownership of existing and future investments. Subject to these rights, members undertake to provide reasonable opportunities for investments acceptable to them and adequate security for existing and future investments. They also agree that it is desirable to avoid discrimination between foreign investments.

Limits on restrictions set

The need for governmental assistance to economic development and reconstruction of particular industries or branches of agriculture in the form of protective measures, such as quantitative import restrictions, is recognized in article 13. But unwise use of such measures would put a burden on the economies of the members using them and unwarranted restrictions on international trade. A distinction is made between measures conflicting with negotiated obligations (i. e., obligations assumed through negotiations with other members but not conflicting with the commercial policy obligations under the charter) and measures that do conflict with charter obligations.

Protective measures of the former type are to be settled mainly by direct negotiations between the members concerned. Measures of the latter type must be referred to the ITO for approval. Automatic ITO approval will be granted if certain stated criteria are fulfilled. These criteria relate to certain types of industries and their date of establishment. The article also deals with damage to trade resulting from protective measures, emergency action to offset excessive imports, and the need for secrecy in administering the provisions.

Special circumstances may justify preferential agreements for economic development and reconstruction (art. 15). The ITO must be informed of any proposed new preferential arrangement and may authorize it by a two-thirds majority. ITO approval will, however, be given automatically if the new preferential arrangement fulfills stated conditions or criteria. Among these are (a) contiguous territories among the parties to the arrangement, or belonging to the same economic region, and (b) the preferential rates involved must insure a sound market for the branch of industry or agriculture to be protected. If the new arrangement is found to be likely to injure the trade of members outside the arrangement, procedures are laid down for negotiating satisfactory compensation.

CHAPTER 4. COMMERCIAL POLICY

(Arts. 16 to 45)

Section A. Tariffs, preferences, and internal taxation and regulation

Under article 16, members agree to give most-favored-nation treatment to other members in all matters respecting customs duties, charges on imports and exports or on transfer of payments for imports and exports, and importing and exporting rules and formalities. Existing preferential systems are allowed to remain, subject to the commitment, under article 17, which obliges members to undertake negotiations directed to a substantial reduction of tariffs and to the elimination of preferences on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis. Existing preference margins are not to be increased. Rules are laid down for conducting such negotiations.

If a member is found to have failed to negotiate in good faith, the ITO may authorize the withholding of benefits under the most-favored-nation clause. Successful conclusion of negotiations will have the effect of bringing members into the group of contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Article 18 provides that internal taxes and trade regulations are in general not to be more severe upon products imported from other members than upon domestic products. One of the exceptions (art. 19) permits, subject to certain conditions, the use of screen quotas to protect national film industries.

Section B. Quantitative restrictions and related exchange matters

Quantitative restrictions on imports and exports are in general prohibited (article 20). But a number of temporary and permanent exceptions, other than those on balance-of-payments grounds, are permitted. Among the temporary exceptions is the preventing or relieving of a critical shortage of food. Restrictions covering agricultural or fisheries products needed for the enforcement of internal government control schemes are also excepted.

Balance-of-Payments Situation

Article 21 deals with restrictions to safeguard the balance of payments. It is recognized that while it is primarily the responsibility of each member to maintain a stable balance-of-payments situation, an unstable situation may harm the position of other members and may affect international trade. A member may, to safeguard its external financial position, restrict the quantity or value of its imports, subject to the rules and within the criteria laid down in this article.

Article 22 sets out the way in which quantitative restrictions to safeguard balance of payments should be administered without discriminating between exporting countries.

Article 23, in view of the problems of postwar adjustments, authorizes members, with suitable safeguards, to deviate from the principle of nondiscrimination during a transitional period. Until March 1, 1952, ITO approval is not required. But members who discriminate in their import restrictions must promote the maximum development of multilateral trade during the transitional period. Alternative procedures, known as the "Havana option" and the Geneva "option," are available for members requiring to operate under this article.

Article 23 also permits a member applying quantitative restrictions for balance-of-payments purposes to direct its exports in such a way as to increase its earnings of hard currencies, provided it does not deviate from the nondiscrimination principle laid down in article 21.

Working arrangements between the ITO and the International Monetary Fund are defined in article 24. The ITO is obligated to accept all statistical and other facts presented by the fund. This includes matters concerning monetary reserves, balance of payments, and foreign exchange. The ITO may require nonfund members to enter into a special exchange agreement with the ITO. Such agreements would place on such members obligations similar to those under the fund.

Section C. Subsidies

Articles 25 to 28 deal with subsidies, including any form of income or price support, that operate to maintain or increase exports or to reduce or prevent an increase in imports. Members are obliged to give full details of the subsidies they are using and to discuss limitation of subsidies with members whose trade is affected.

The abandoning of export subsidies as a general policy is to take place as soon as possible, and in any event not later than 2 years after the Charter enters into force, although the ITO has powers to grant extensions. However, as regards primary commodities, special provision is made for the use of export subsidies in certain defined circumstances. Members may not use subsidies on primary products to gain more than a fair share of world trade in the products concerned.

Section D. State trading

Articles 29 to 32 lay down the principle that state-trading enterprises must be guided by commercial principles in buying and selling and must avoid discrimination. Marketing organizations are included. An exception is allowed for imports of products for governmental use. State trading is also brought within the Charter obligations for reduction of preferences.

Section E. General commercial provisions

The general purpose of the so-called technical articles—articles 33 to 39—is to provide standard rules for the administration of freedom of transit, valuation for customs, import and export formalities, marks of origin, trade regulations, and trade terminology. This section also provides rules covering antidumping and countervailing duties.

Section F. Special provisions

Article 40 deals with emergency action allowed in the event of concessions under this chapter resulting in a sudden flood of imports that threaten serious injury to domestic producers.

Articles 42, 43, and 44 deal with the territorial application of this chapter. They allow for measures otherwise inconsistent with the Charter for a group of countries to take steps toward forming a customs union. The formation of free-trade areas, involving the elimination of tariffs and other commercial restrictions between a group of countries is also provided for.

Article 45 deals with general exceptions to chapter 4. In addition to the standard exceptions to commercial treaties, there are a number of temporary exceptions connected with emergency conditions, such as postwar shortages.

CHAPTER 5. RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES

(Arts. 46 to 54)

Members are obligated to take action against restrictive business practices in international trade wherever they are contrary to the principles of the Charter. A procedure is laid down for the ITO to investigate complaints concerning the effects of such practices as price fixing, territorial exclusion, discrimination, production quotas, technological restrictions, misuse of patents, trade-marks, and copyrights. The powers of the ITO will be limited mainly to instructing the offending member to correct the abuse and to publication of the facts.

As regards services such as transportation, insurance, and the commercial services of banks, the ITO will have only restricted authority for dealing with complaints of harmful practices. If direct negotiations between members is unsuccessful, the ITO will refer such complaints to the appropriate international agency, where one exists. In other cases, the ITO may be asked to make recommendations.

CHAPTER 6. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMODITY AGREEMENTS

(Arts. 55 to 70)

Recognizing the special difficulties affecting primary commodities, chapter 6 lays down the objectives of intergovernmental commodity agreements, the procedures for

conducting study groups and for holding commodity conferences, the general principles which are to govern commodity agreements and the types of agreements which may be concluded. The ITO is to be concerned with all types of agreements, including "expansionist" agreements, intended to enlarge world production and consumption of a commodity. But the ITO is specially concerned in laying down rules to cover "control" types of agreements, which may have harmful restrictive effects on trade.

Members are obligated to enter into new control-type agreements only through charter procedures. If, however, there is unreasonable delay, interested countries may proceed by direct negotiation.

Commodity-control agreements are to be entered into only when there is a burdensome surplus or widespread unemployment, which could not be corrected by normal market forces alone. These agreements are to insure the availability of supplies adequate at all times to meet world demand at reasonable prices. Guiding principles for administering control agreements are laid down, but particular methods to be used for dealing with specific commodities are not given, this being left to be worked out by the countries especially interested, through defined procedures.

Disputes arising out of control agreements will normally be settled in the appropriate commodity council. If this fails, they will be referred to the ITO.

The main exceptions to the charter directives relate to commodities dealt with under State-trading arrangements, to agreements between one exporting and one importing country, to agreements dealing only with fair distribution of scarce commodities, and to agreements concerned with conservation of exhaustible resources or of fisheries, migratory birds, and wild animals.

CHAPTER 7. THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

(Arts. 71 to 91)

Chapter 7 sets out the structure and functions of the ITO (except for settlement of differences).

Section A (arts. 71–73) lays down the conditions of membership and provides for the admission of separate customs territories and United Nations trust territories under certain conditions. Article 69 lists the main functions of the ITO, in addition to those functions specified in other chapters. The structure of the ITO is to comprise a conference, an Executive Board, and such commissions as the ITO may establish. There is to be a Director General and staff.

Section B (arts. 74 to 77) details the composition, sessions, procedure, officers, powers and duties of the Conference. Each member will have one vote in the conference.

Section C (arts. 78 to 81) details the composition and powers of the Executive Board. The board will consist of 18 members, to be selected partly as representing members and customs unions of chief economic importance, and partly by a two-thirds majority vote. Each member of the board will have one vote.

Section D (arts. 82 and 83) gives the Conference powers to set up commissions.

Section E (arts. 84 and 85) lays down regulations covering the Director General and the staff.

Section F (arts. 86 to 91) deals with other organizational provisions. Under article 86 (relations with the United Nations) members recognize that the ITO should not attempt to take action that would involve passing judgment on essentially political matters. Any measures taken by a member directly in connection with a political matter brought before the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter will fall within the scope of the United Nations and will not be subject to ITO charter provisions.

Other articles in section F deal with relations with other organizations, the international responsibilities of the Director General and his staff, the legal status of the ITO, and contributions.

CHAPTER 8. SETTLEMENT OF DIFFERENCES

(Arts. 92 to 97)

Chapter 8 provides procedures for dealing with complaints by members.

If any member considers that any benefit accruing to it directly or indirectly, implicitly or explicitly, under any of the provisions of the Charter is being nullified or impaired, the member concerned may first resort to consultation or arbitration, keeping the ITO informed. Failing settlement, the dispute may be referred to the Executive Board (art. 94), with provision for appeal to the Conference (art. 95). The ITO may, under article 96, request from the International Court of Justice advisory opinions on legal questions arising within the scope of ITO activities.

In dealing with complaints and settlement of differences members undertake not to have recourse to any procedures other than those envisaged in the Charter. Members also undertake, without prejudice to any other international agreement, not to resort to unilateral economic measures of any kind contrary to the Charter provisions.

The rules of procedure for settlement of differences will be established by the ITO.

CHAPTER 9. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(Arts. 98 to 106)

Nothing in the Charter will preclude any member from maintaining economic relations with nonmembers (art. 98), but members recognize that arrangements with nonmembers to obtain preferential trade treatment or to conduct trade with nonmembers in a way that would injure trade with members should be avoided. The problems arising out of relations with nonmembers will be studied further by the ITO.

Article 99 lists the general exceptions to the Charter. No member will be required to give information that it considers contrary to its essential security interests. No member will be prevented from taking whatever action it considers necessary in relation to fissionable materials, traffic in arms or in time of war or other emergency in international relations, or in carrying out agreements made by or for a military establishment for the purpose of meeting essential requirements of national security. Nothing in the Charter will override the World War II peace settlements.

Articles 100 to 102 deal with amendments, review of the Charter, withdrawal, and termination.

The Charter will enter into force (art. 103) 60 days after ratification by a majority of governments signing the Final Act. If by April 1949 the Charter is not in force, the ratification of only 20 governments will be needed. If the Charter is not in force by October 1949, the governments that have ratified it will discuss on what terms they desire to bring the Charter into force.

Articles 104, 105, and 106 deal with territorial application, the annexes and authenticity of texts.

ITO Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, again the State Department with its crew of fellow travelers has been selling out the United States to foreign countries through the International Trade Organization.

The editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of March 26, 1948, recognizes the dismal failure of the State Department at Habana but seeks by the editorial to soften the blow now suffered by those who were beguiled by propaganda to join in this international racket. What an astounding disclosure, as the editorial points out:

Hence it follows inevitably that the ITO charter contains so many reservations and exceptions to the general principles enunciated as to raise the question whether it serves any purpose at all except as an expression of ideals of trading conduct impossible of realization in these disordered times.

But the arrogance of the State Department in setting up with British cooperation an interim ITO in an effort to perpetuate its useless activities and continue its international meddling contrary to any provision of law or constitutional authority is a usurpation of power that Congress should investigate.

Under leave to extend I am inserting the editorial to which I have referred:

ITO PACT

The charter for an International Trade Organization has been signed at Habana by representatives of 53 nations, after discussions extending over a period of 4 months had resulted in radical revision of the preliminary draft of the preparatory committee that met last year in Geneva. That preliminary draft was itself a watered-down edition of the original plan outlined by the United States. As a matter of fact, the summary of the Habana charter provisions prepared by the United Nations Department of Public Information indicates that the removal of obstructions to world trade expansion, the ultimate aim of the agreement, will not be attainable for a long time to come. For instance, it has been impossible to secure unqualified assent to proposals to abandon forthwith export and import quotas, trade preferences, and export subsidies, or to level barriers to the free flow of investment capital from country to country.

The reasons are plain: Many, indeed most, nations are confronted by unsolved international balance-of-payment problems; hence restrictions on imports and stimulation of exports have to be relied upon indefinitely as corrective measures. Moreover, the ever-present threat to security growing out of the present politically disturbed state of the world makes it essential for member nations to reserve the right to protect themselves against economic infiltration by alien interests that might constitute a threat to their national sovereignty. Hence it follows inevitably that the ITO charter contains so many reservations and exceptions to the general principles enunciated as to raise the question whether it serves any purpose at all except as an expression of ideals of trading conduct impossible of realization in these disordered times. Certainly in its present form the charter cannot be regarded as much more than a tentative step toward achievement of the ultimate aims of removing the shackles from world trade.

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to discount the potential importance of the work of the Habana Conference. For, as Secretary of Agriculture Anderson says, it "establishes a set of rules and an organizational framework for peaceful international consultation by member nations." Members will be encouraged to thresh out differences, and rules of procedure for the settlement of such differences will be established by the ITO.

Given a strong central administration, therefore, and a real desire on the part of member nations to work together for elimination of unreasonably obstructive trade practices, the Habana charter, despite its weaknesses, will provide much needed machinery for assisting the world's important trading nations to develop and enforce codes of fair practice calculated to promote trade expansion and encourage gradual abolition of trade barriers. The alternative to such cooperative efforts is to leave each country free, as at present, to set up special regulations to deal with its own trade problems without regard for the effect on other nations. That policy tends, as Secretary of Commerce Harriman warns, to result in trade anarchy.

British Halt United States Hunt for Ethiopian Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, in the Chicago Tribune of March 22, 1948, there appeared an article by Arthur Veysey, under the date line of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, dealing with the action of some British officers, both military and diplomatic, in forcing American oil prospectors to suspend operations in a part of Ethiopia. The article is quite an important one in view of the general petroleum situation in the world today, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH HALT UNITED STATES HUNT FOR ETHIOPIAN OIL—RULE IN OGADEN; SEIZED IN WAR

(By Arthur Veysey)

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA, March 21.—British officers, both military and diplomatic, have forced American oil prospectors for the Sinclair Co. to suspend operations in the British ruled Ogaden section of Ethiopia, the Tribune learned today.

Suspension of the oil explorations is considered a major scandal here and its disclosure is expected to:

1. Convince advocates of Marshall plan aid to Europe that the "cooperation" so often declared in Washington between America and Britain is merely verbal and that when a situation arises in which cooperation is needed, it is not only lacking, but is replaced by outright opposition.

2. Bring pressure on Britain to carry out its often made declarations that Ethiopia is a sovereign nation and not open to partition by other nations.

CONSIDER DENOUNCING PACT

Because of the situation's explosive nature, no official—American, British, or Ethiopian—will permit himself to be quoted by name. All explain that the matter is in flux and the sides are not finally drawn. One expert in Ethiopian oil-diplomatic affairs, commented, however, that "with one hand the British are seeking billions in Washington and with the other are trying to knock down America in Ethiopia."

The difficulties involve both local personalities and high policy. America, Britain, and the Somali tribes all are engaged. The dispute is reaching a crisis and tempers are rising. Ethiopian Government officials are considering denouncing the postwar treaty with Britain.

Somali tribesmen have hurled stones and threatened to use guns. These are the superficial reason for the American withdrawal. But behind the tribesmen are local British officers who, if not inciting the Somalis and protecting them, as some people charge, are at least refusing to protect the Americans.

MAKES RUSSIANS HAPPY

The happiest people in Ethiopia over the situation are members of the large staff of the Russian legation. The Russians are staying quiet because all the others concerned would like very much to put the blame on communism and thus clear themselves.

The Tribune learned that within the past few days R. J. Bender, Sinclair's representative here, accompanied by the American Minister, George Merrell, presented a letter to Emperor Haile Selassie. The letter pointed out that by a 1945 agreement signed with Sinclair the Ethiopian Government promises protection to exploration crews should they need it.

Since Britain has acknowledged that the Ogaden territory it grabbed control of during the war belongs to Ethiopia, the British Government must carry out the Ethiopian Government's commitments to the Americans, the letter continued.

TRY TO KEEP SECRECY

British officials here advised against bringing the dispute into the open, declaring that "moves are imminent" and that publicity may sharpen the conflict. One high Briton called on the Ethiopian foreign office when he learned the situation was about to be revealed by the Tribune.

All British officials here declare they would be only too glad to see the disputed Ogaden territory handed over to Ethiopia and British troops withdrawn. They say that although only the equivalent of one company is involved, British manpower and supplies are needed elsewhere. However, London instructions are to hang on to Ogaden.

The background of the British-Ethiopian-American dispute is this:

In 1942, when restoring Haile Selassie to his throne following the Italian invasion and exodus, the British demanded and got military control of all Ethiopia. Wartime security was the reason given.

MADE PLEA FOR OGADEN

Two years later, when the war on African soil had ended, Ethiopia asked the British to quit, but the British demanded keeping a strip in northern Ethiopia near the Eritrean border and Ogaden Province in southeastern Ethiopia.

The British said they needed the landlocked, semidesert Ogaden to carry on the war against Japan. "It was a pretty thin excuse," one Briton now admits. A less charitable commentator snorted: "The British wanted it as a submarine base."

The debate lasted most of the year. The British put on pressure, pointing out that Ethiopia's only good outlet was by rail to the French Somaliland seaport, Djibouti, and that Djibouti was, at that time, controlled by Britain. Likewise, the British pointed out, all the supplies badly needed in Ethiopia were regulated by the wartime combined boards, and since the American partners of the boards were mostly mute on middle eastern affairs, that meant British control. The Ethiopians let the British stay in the Ogaden.

BRITISH WERE CONSULTED

In 1945 the Ethiopian Government granted to the American-owned Sinclair Oil Co. exclusive rights to seek and produce oil in all Ethiopia for 50 years. The Americans and the Ethiopians, say the British, were consulted and agreed to give all possible assistance as long as they ran the Ogaden. The British say now, however, they did not know of the agreement officially until equipment began arriving late last year.

During most of last year geologists made aerial and ground surveys. They traveled throughout the Ogaden by ones and twos without incident. For the first well they selected an area 7 miles from the village of Warderi where the British had a military post. They began drilling for water.

Within a few days the American drilling crew began to get threats from the Somalis living nearby. In other areas, also near British posts, the oil company's surveyors began to receive similar threats. In August Somali youths stoned a jeep.

In September, the Ethiopian Government submitted a proposed treaty to the British Government returning the Ogaden to Ethiopia. For 6 months the British have been studying the draft.

In December some Somali chiefs gathered at Warderi and told American oil men in the presence of the British rulers that the Americans are the vanguard of the Ethiopians and the Somalis don't like the Ethiopians. British officers said there was nothing they could do. The Somalis raised a tribal flag and when other Somalis objected, a British officer and British police stepped in, thus convincing the flag raisers that they had British protection.

On January 5, Somali youths stoned and disabled a Sinclair plane which landed on the Warderi strip. Two hours later youths stoned an American-piloted Douglas transport owned and operated by the Ethiopian Government air line.

PROTECTION RESTRICTED

British officers refused to make arrests, saying any action would only provoke more outbursts. British officers told an American oil crew, which numbered about 30, that British police would not be responsible for any assaults if the Americans left their camp to continue drilling operations.

On January 14 the oil company ordered its crew to return to the railroad station at Diredawa with all its equipment. Notes traveled to London and Washington. The United States State Department suggested the oil company withdraw because it couldn't get sufficient laborers among the Somalis. Oil company men declare they had been swamped with applications.

London instructions are to hang on to the Ogaden. The reason given now is that British control of the Ogaden is necessary as long as Britain must administer the ex-Italian colony of Italian Somaliland.

Two reasons are cited here for Britain's hanging on to the Ogaden. One is that Britain wants the oil herself. This the British here deny. They declare no British company has sought the rights and, anyway, if the Americans find oil it will help Britain as much as the United States.

The second is African and Empire politics. This involves the Somali tribes. The tribal lands were, for centuries, part of Ethiopia, the people roaming with their goats and camels the half-grass half-sand plains north of the Equator and south of the Red Sea. Their coastal strips had been grabbed by France, Britain, and Italy, leaving the interior area to Ethiopia.

After the Italians were knocked out of Africa 4 years ago Britain considered forming a greater Somaliliand, annexing to the British coastal strip that taken from Italy and also Ethiopia's Ogaden. A Somali youth league was formed. It preached the nationalist idea. A year ago a British agent in Somaliland told an American that the Somali youth league and the British administration are "cooperating."

SAY LEAGUE IS HEADACHE

Today the British in Addis Ababa say the league is a headache and acknowledge no parentage or patronage of the league.

A few months ago the British foreign office in London decided the idea of a greater Somaliland was not feasible and should be

dropped. The youth league, however, has only shouted louder. And some local British officers admittedly deviate from the new London policy. It is explained these deviations are largely unintentional, that the local officers may be influenced by close association with the Somali agitators and that they may "fail to take the broad view" because of being generally fed up with the job. However, none has been replaced, the explanation being that the British civil service works very, very slowly.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made on March 24, 1948, by Deane W. Malott, chancelor, the University of Kansas, with regard to universal military training. The chancelor's approach to this controversial subject is so intelligent and so scholarly that I believe it ought to be brought to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(By Deane W. Malott, chancelor, University of Kansas)

With world dangers pressing ever more ominously, the problems of national defense crowd necessarily high on the agenda of our national policy. The leaders of our country press for immediate action that America may be strong. No thinking and patriotic American would wish for any other objective.

But the problems of our national defense are murky with sentiment, assumption, and blind ignorance. We are simply told that universal military training is imperative and that there are no alternatives for a mighty America. Must we then assume that universal military training, at a cost of say a billion and a quarter or so a year which the taxpayers must pay, is so intelligent and so sound that we must give immediate and totalitarian obedience to the mandates of the military? May we not ask for intelligent answers to some serious questions, without being branded subversive, unintelligent, or blind?

There are many questions which loyal and patriotic Americans are asking, in an effort to assume well directed and immediate success of the program to strengthen the United States for any emergency.

The proponents of universal military training have never given the public direct and impelling answers to such questions as the following:

1. What is the specific objective of universal military training?

In a day of rockets, robots, jet propulsion, atomic bombs, and biological warfare, just what is accomplished by 6 months of basic training for every young man in the Nation, thereby retarding by presumably a year the academic training of every potential scientist and technician so vitally needed in modern warfare?

2. What can be done in six months?

During World War II, it took 3 years to train engineers 3 years for physicians, 2 years for radar specialists, a year and a half for flyers, 16 weeks for mechanics, and 16 weeks for basic training. Six months offers no common denominator on the basis of past experience. Was it chosen on the basis of some new necessity, or of expediency?

3. Why are the recommendations of the President's Commission on Universal Military Training not being followed?

The Commission advocated universal military training only as a part of an integrated program of defense; not as an isolated effort. Yet the universal military training project has been lifted from the context of that report, as though it were the sole recommendation of that group.

4. How long will the benefits of training under universal military training be expected to last?

I have asked this question over and over again; the answers are evasive with a general opinion among the military that the effects are good for 6 years without retraining. Under the obsolescence of dynamic warfare and with due consideration to the frailty of human memory, I should want a more expertly derived opinion, but if 6 years is perchance correct, we need be in no panic. There are more than 12,000,000 young men less than 6 years along the way from previous active military experience.

5. Where are the officers and men to man a universal military training program?

At Fort Knox, where I recently visited the experimental UMT unit, 640 trainees are today served by a cadre of some 600 officers and men, carefully selected to lead and provide for this group. With 1,800,000 young men arriving each year at age 18, where are the hundreds of thousands of officers and men qualified to handle this group, and in a day of dramatic world events are not other duties of occupation and advanced training a prior responsibility for the armed forces, recently described by Secretary Marshall as a mere shell of defense?

6. Are we confusing education and military training?

In addition to the basic military training the present trainees at Fort Knox are given splendid care, intelligent guidance, hygiene, moral and citizenship training; they are permitted to complete high-school courses, supervised in operating trainee courts for minor infractions, and provided with hobby shops for gem polishing, airplane modeling, photography, art, and classical music. The military leaders are justifiably proud of the atmosphere and morale of the group. But a large part of this activity is social welfare, not preparation for imminent and darkening storm clouds on the international horizon. If the present educational system of the country is unequal to its task, perhaps some other agency should be caring for our youth, leaving the Army free for the exclusive and immediate problems of our national defense.

7. Are there no other alternatives?

The recalling to active status of selective service would seem to be a possible and immediate alternative; it is directed toward the job in hand, particularly if it results in training both for occupation and military defense. Presumably it would disturb only enough of our youth to bring the armed forces to full strength and to maintain them there for the emergency duration. A further alternative would be an immediate expansion of the high-school and college ROTC programs, thereby coordinating military training with the vocational training and professional education of the trainee, to assure his maximum and earliest fitness to contribute to the national defense in the many highly skilled specialties of modern warfare.

8. Is there evidence that universal military training provides a mighty nation?

The evidence of history in Europe seems to indicate that some nations with universal military training have been plunged into violent wars; others have stayed out. Other nations have not had required training and some of the group have warred and some have not. There is no whit of evidence from the pages of history to justify universal military training as either a propellent or an inhibitor of combat; war comes from other and more overwhelming forces.

These, then, are some of the questions which the citizens of America are entitled to ask and to have frankly answered, without emotion, rancor, or partisanship. Upon the answers to such questions must depend the only sound basis for decision on the momentous problem of universal military training. It is the task of every thinking citizen to make diligent inquiry and to think through to an answer for himself, and with an enlightened decision to make his beliefs known to his representatives in Washington. This is the true process of our democracy.

Disposition of Surplus Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1948 was enacted some $40,000,000 of section 32 funds, which ordinarily would have been available to the Department of Agriculture, were withheld. This money, under the terms of permanent legislation, is normally used in disposing of surplus agricultural commodities in foreign or domestic outlets other than normal channels of consumption. This money was withheld presumably under the assumption that the problem of surplus agricultural commodities would not be as serious in the immediate future as it had been in previous years. Insofar as cotton, wheat, corn, and possibly other staple commodities are concerned, this has been the case. However, there are some agricultural commodities that have been available in surplus quantities. Most of these commodities, such as potatoes, dried eggs, citrus and deciduous fruits, both fresh and dried, are perishable in nature and unless they can be utilized within a reasonable time will spoil. In view of the fact that there is a tremendous world need for all kinds of food, every effort ought to be made to utilize as much of these surplus commodities as we can for foreign relief.

Section 11 (e) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, with which I had something to do, was a step in the right direction. It has been possible for the Departments of State and Army to obtain from Commodity Credit Corporation some 800,000,000 pounds of food for use in feeding hungry people abroad. The approximate quantities of commodities utilized under the provisions of section 11 (e) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 are as follows:

Commodities:	*Quantity*
Citrus juice, concentrated---------gallons--	1,500,000
Honey----------pounds--	10,851,780
Prunes---------short tons--	80,000
Raisins----------do----	96,760
Potatoes, Irish, fried-----hundredweight--	4,500,000
Dried eggs---------pounds--	24,752,000

More than ample supplies of citrus fruits have been available to consumers this year. Large quantities of grapefruit, which probably never would have been harvested, have been utilized under this program. The honey which is being made available for foreign-relief feeding is of the dark-colored, strong-flavored types which consumers in this country do not like but which is entirely acceptable in certain foreign countries.

A large percentage of our dried prunes and raisins are normally exported and amounts which have been moved under this program represent only a part of our exportable surpluses. We are all familiar with the difficulties which the Department of Agriculture has encountered in handling potatoes acquired under its price-support program. I do not believe there is anyone who would argue that we should use our surplus potatoes in making industrial alcohol or as livestock feed when there are hungry people abroad to whom these potatoes can mean so much. The dried eggs which have been acquired by the Departments of State and Army are not from current production but were acquired by the Department of Agriculture under its price-support programs in earlier years.

The Aiken amendment to S. 2202 which appears as sections 112–e and –f of the act now under consideration is another step in the right direction. It makes available the $40,000,000 of section 32 funds which was withheld when it appeared that there would be no problem of surplus of commodities. It would be a serious mistake for the American consumer to feel that this activity is detrimental to his interest. This is not the case at all. The Department of Agriculture, through acreage goals and price support programs, has encouraged production of those commodities which are needed the most. The American people are better fed today than at any time in history. Surpluses which have normally moved into foreign outlets, as well as production in excess of domestic requirements, should not be allowed to spoil. It is estimated that the $40,000,000 of additional section 32 funds will be sufficient for the remainder of the 1948 fiscal year to permit the Department of Agriculture to move the surplus commodities for which there are no outlets in this country at the present time. We should enact S. 2202 as amended without delay.

In connection with the foregoing the following tables are of interest:

Estimated losses under sec. 11 (e) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947

Commodity	Approved price per unit	Quantity	Loss to CCC
Citrus juice, concentrate.	$0.3985	1,500,000 gallons	$1,900,000
Honey	.0467	10,851,780 pounds	875,738
Prunes	72.40	80,000 short tons	8,996,900
Raisins	91.80	96,760 short tons	7,106,532
Potatoes, Irish, fresh.	.04	4,500,000 hundredweight.	14,434,203
Dried eggs	.32	24,752,000 pounds	23,991,085
Total			57,304,458

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, commodity allocations, and obligations by commodities, fiscal year 1948

Program and commodity	Commodity allocation as of Mar. 29, 1948	Obligations incurred July 1, 1947, to Feb. 29, 1948
Purchases for direct distribution:		
Apples, fresh	$2,445,000.00	
Pears, fresh	393,750.00	$211,214.85
Apples, peaches, prunes, raisins, dried	9,850,000.00	3,224,012.33
Figs, dried	1,220,000.00	992,055.15
Grapefruit juice, canned	3,500,000.00	
Irish potatoes	10,000,000.00	3,915,583.76
Sweetpotatoes	1,250,000.00	756,424.05
General vegetables	875,000.00	121,515.99
Tree nuts	1,280,000.00	
Eggs	6,041,092.88	652,235.83
Prior year transportation costs	157.12	157.12
Total	36,855,000.00	9,873,199.08
Exportation: Cotton	2,600,000	1,703,484.65
Diversion:		
Cotton:		
Insulation	1,000,000	813,625.00
Paper	200,000	
Pear, fresh	135,000	
Irish potato	1,000,000	
Total	2,335,000	813,625.00
Administrative expenses	1,760,000	1,213,470.85
Program allotments and transfers	450,000	450,000.00
Grand total	44,000,000	14,053,779.58

In Self-Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an interesting newspaper article by Walter Lippmann, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune today:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

IN SELF-PROTECTION

The mounting tension has brought with it a spirit of fatalism—a feeling that events may be beyond our control, even perhaps beyond the control of Stalin and the Soviet Government. There is no warrant in the situation for such helplessness and hopelessness unless we become rattled and first lose control of ourselves. This country is so nearly invulnerable, and its potential power, moral and material, is quite sufficient, to enable us to take the view that we shall hold firmly for ourselves the right to decide not only if we shall act, but when, where, how, and for what end.

The spirit of fatalism is merely a reflection of the fact that we have for so long a time been carrying on a policy which is generalized, vague, defensive, and inconclusive, that our efforts are dispersed and not directed, that behind them there is no strategical plan and no clear diplomatic objective. When the administration has clarified its purposes and its conceptions and its objectives, as it must if it is to regain the initiative and the control of events, fatalism will give way to resolution and confidence.

But of all the causes of the fatalistic feeling that we are no longer the masters of our destiny, that modern man is obsolete, that western civilization is perishing, none perhaps is so insidious as the contemporary doctrine of total war. It is of the utmost importance that this doctrine—which is so universally accepted—be reexamined, and particularly by our military leaders and our diplomats.

For it may be true, and I venture to think it is true, that this doctrine is a military heresy, a legacy of Hitler's satanic genius, profoundly inapplicable to the conflict with Russia, and fatal to those who, like Hitler, would entertain it.

The doctrine of total war is, like most heresies, a half truth. It is true that in any large modern war the whole population and its whole resources will be engaged, and that there is no such thing as the exemption of civilians or their immunity. But it is not necessarily true that war waged with total effort must be waged for total ends—for the absolute, unlimited destruction of the enemy state and the total subjection of its population. The German war, alas, was fought to a total end because Hitler willed it that way, and was able to destroy any German successor government with which peace could have been negotiated. The European settlement has been made well-nigh impossible as a result.

But the Italian war, and even the Japanese war, were not fought for total but for limited ends. Verbally the surrenders were unconditional. In fact the Italians have, and the Japanese will get, a negotiated peace. Can there be any question that the outcome is preferable? And does this not prove that even in the modern age a total war need not necessarily be absolute, unlimited, and total?

The experience of history shows, I think, that Russia has often been defeated in limited wars for limited objectives but that those who, like Napoleon and Hitler, wage total war against the Russians are disastrously defeated. There is no reason to think that modern weapons would produce a different result. The Russian empire is a far more powerful military state than it has ever been before. It is better organized and disciplined to wage total war and to resist it.

Our military leaders, therefore, have a very special responsibility to see to it that the civilian leaders and our people generally do not, even if it comes to war, commit this country to an unlimited war, which if it could be won at all, could be won only at a cost of blood and treasure which would make the victory ruinous. For the American people are particularly susceptible to the dangerous, perhaps fatally dangerous, heresy of total war for total ends, and they are in great need of firm and lucid guidance from their trusted military leaders, like Secretary Marshall himself, like Eisenhower, Bradley, and one may hope MacArthur as well.

The American civilian population is susceptible to the heresy of unlimited war in many ways. There is the idealistic tradition, which Wilson formulated, that this country cannot with a good conscience recognize any settlement which rests on a balance of power and the existence of spheres of special influence. The tradition holds that only one world of like-minded states is tolerable, and that all the arrangements which diplomatists have made in the past to accommodate the perpetual rivalry of nations are intolerable. This tradition, noble though it is in its purpose, is not compatible with peace in a world where great powers are not like-minded, and do not mean to be.

The tradition produces crusades, and to undertake a crusade against a giant power like Russia would surely mean interminable war for an unattainable objective. The susceptibility of the American people to crusades is dangerous because, as yet, we have

never had the experience, which all older nations have had, of realizing the limits of our power.

We cannot afford not to realize them now, and therefore to make up our minds that if we become engaged in an armed conflict, we shall wage it for limited, concrete objectives, for a negotiated settlement which restores the balance of power and recognizes the existence of spheres of influence among the powers.

Then we shall not confuse the need for a total effort with the pursuit of total ends. Then we shall not allow the conflict to be blown up into a universal anti-Communist crusade. For that would commit us to the invasion and subjugation of Russia, and to the fearful bloody business of crushing civil wars all over the globe.

If through idealism, inexperience, righteous indignation and hysteria we entangle ourselves in such a commitment, history will say that we encompassed our own ruin, a thing which no external foe was capable of doing.

Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Founding of the City of Biloxi, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi:

House Concurrent Resolution 52

A concurrent resolution designating April 8, 1949, as the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Biloxi; authorizing, empowering, and requesting the Governor to issue a proclamation designating and calling attention to the date; and requesting the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a postage stamp commemorating the date

Whereas Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville, appointed governor general by Louis XIV, King of France, and ordered to establish colonies in Louisiana, did reach the Gulf coast of the present State of Mississippi in the vicinity of the site of the present city of Biloxi on February 10, 1699; and

Whereas Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville, did begin the construction of Fort Maurepas in the vicinity of the present site of the city of Biloxi on April 8, 1699; and

Whereas Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville, did name the settlement he established around Fort Maurepas Biloxi, in honor of the Biloxi Indians; and

Whereas Pierre le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville, did make Biloxi the first capital of Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That April 8, 1949, be and is hereby designated the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the first white settlement in the present State of Mississippi and in the lower Mississippi Valley; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Mississippi be and is hereby authorized, empowered, and requested to issue an official proclamation designating and calling attention to April 8, 1949, as the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the first white settlement in the present State of Mississippi; and be it further

Resolved, That the Postmaster General of the United States be and is hereby requested to issue a 3-cent postage stamp to be placed on sale at Biloxi on April 8, 1949, in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the first white settlement in the present State of Mississippi and in the lower Mississippi Valley; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Postmaster General J. O. Donaldson, Senator James O. Eastland, and Senator John C. Stennis, and to the Mississippi Representatives in Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives March 16, 1948.

_____,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate March 18, 1948.

SAM LUMPKIN,

President of the Senate.

Democracy in Europe Needs Vigorous Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an article by Blair Moody, which appeared in the Detroit News, March 24, 1948.

DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE NEEDS VIGOROUS LEFT—SOCIALISTS AND OTHER LIBERALS ARE GIVEN ONLY ONE RALLYING POINT BY COMMUNISTS

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—The most powerful and lasting bulwark to freedom in Europe will be the building of a strong, anti-Communist political left.

The impression is rife in many conservative circles in the United States, including some in Congress, that if we lend a hand to the semisocialistic Government of England, or the leftish but vigorously independent social-democratic movements on the Continent, we are somehow moving to undermine the foundations of free enterprise in our own country.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the exact opposite is true.

The greatest hope the Soviets have of taking over the Continent, short of risking war with the United States, is to destroy the political influence of those who favor economic and social reforms but who believe in democracy and freedom.

That has been the basic tactic of the Kremlin for many months. Any sophisticate on European affairs accepts it as an axiom. In fact, nearly everybody seems to know it, except exemplars of that certain Maginot line mentality in the United States who rarely find important things out until too late, or until someone else has saved their bacon.

The reason for this Communist strategy is plain. There are many abuses in Europe that have existed for centuries. The masses are refusing to accept quiescently conditions as they have been in the past. They are never likely to cast their votes for those who symbolize the vast historic gaps between rich and poor.

PEOPLE CONFUSED

Did not this boiling, turbulent protest exist, the Communists never could have built the political power they have in western Europe. To cement and extend it, they first try to conceal the fact that they are in reality not leading the masses to higher living standards but toward an inferior system and the servitude of a police state.

Second, they plot to kill off all rival leftist movements, so that workers and farmers who object to things as they were will have only the alternative of voting for the comparative right—or voting Communist.

The one great nation in Europe where the Communists have not got to first base is England. Why? In part, due to the steady nature of the British people. But largely also due to the fact that not one—but both—political parties have moved rapidly to the left, to meet the demands of the mass voters without surrender of basic liberties.

LEFTISTS ENCOURAGED

In the last few weeks, a feverish attempt is being made, with tacit American support, to strengthen the anti-Communist left, so that workers and farmers will have a channel to voice their protest against past injustices without voting away their freedoms and dynamiting the weakened structure of western Europe.

But if Italy goes Communist, it will be because the democratic parties of the left were too weak to hold, or even effectively split, the industrial and rural voters who belonged with them.

The United States should not attempt to defend capitalism in Europe because its record cannot be defended. In reality it bears little resemblance to American capitalism.

EUROPE IS DIFFERENT

To an American the phrase "free enterprise" means a tough, alert, usually competitive effort to make the best possible product and sell it to the public at the lowest possible price. It means, generally, high wages, big profits, and the pride of high-speed, productive accomplishment. Its competitive incentives have created the highest standard of living in the world, and one that is still rising.

European capitalism has never been like that. It was built around cartels and high prices and special privilege and low wages. With occasional exceptions, it has never given the workers a decent living. By American standards, and again speaking generally, its productivity has been pitiful.

OLD ORDER ENDS

It is probably true that the dead hand of bureaucracy will soon prove that socialism, even when voted by the people, is no match for the American style of incentive system. Sooner or later, Europeans may find that if they want to live as Americans do, they must chart their economic course along American productive lines.

But that's for Europe to find out, in its own time and its own way. In their domestic endeavor, let them make their own experiments and learn by their own failures—so long as their people are always truly free to vote a change. The question in Europe and the world today is not doctrinaire capitalism or doctrinaire socialism or even doctrinaire economic communism, but freedom.

Rampant, power-drunk dictatorship, masked once more behind the hypocritical label "give the little guy a break," threatens our safety and our system. This threat must be combated not by blind slogans, but intelligently.

Don't Give Up the Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I speak in favor of an amendment to the emergency relief bill, providing for the elimination of section 111 (a) (4) of the bill S. 2202. This section of the bill, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, provides for the chartering of 200 of our dry-cargo war-built vessels to foreign nations.

This particular section of the bill was reinserted by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs after it had been eliminated therefrom when passed by the Senate several days ago. As a matter of fact, the bill included a similar provision when reported by the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, but subsequently it was eliminated by unanimous action by the Senate.

As a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am deeply interested in this serious matter and have given it exhaustive study since it was first proposed by the State Department and others who recommended that a large number of our war-built vessels be turned over to foreigners. It appears quite obvious to me that the proponents of this provision have given no consideration whatsoever to the destructive results which would be suffered by our merchant marine and the public interest in general if the provision should be enacted. Let me remind you at this point that our Government has spent huge sums of money in an effort to develop and maintain an adequate merchant marine. It is unthinkable to me that we would be so shortsighted at this time as to take any action which would tend to destroy the very policies which we have repeatedly enunciated in support of our merchant marine, and our national defense.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held extensive public hearings last February with reference to a proposal to extend the Ship Sales Act of 1946, which otherwise would have expired at the end of February. The President requested that the Ship Sales Act of 1946 be further extended in order to make available by charter and sale such number of our war-built vessels as may be deemed necessary to enable this Government to fulfill certain of its commitments in connection with our foreign policy. The committee reported favorably on the extension of the said act, and in the report thereon, the sole reason given for such extension was based on the representations of the State Department for the absolute need of transporting large quantities of bulk cargo, principally coal and grain, to certain foreign countries for relief purposes.

An extension of the Ship Sales Act for a period of 1 year was passed by this Congress, and approved by the President as recently as February 27, 1948. In that act, Congress specifically prohibited by law the charter or sale of any war-built vessel to foreigners on and after March 1, 1948. The reasons for this specific prohibition were clearly stated in the committee report reading as follows, and I quote:

> In this connection, the committee is also of the opinion that the transfer of ships to foreign nations, as has been suggested in connection with the proposed European recovery program, is wholly inadvisable. The committee feels that neither the Maritime Commission nor any other agency should attempt to charter, sell, or transfer title to any person who is not a citizen of this country, nor to any foreign government. To do so would not be in the interest of the United States, nor of the shipping industry, nor of the thousands of seamen and workers who are engaged in maritime employment.

To me, it seems inconceivable that Congress would enact legislation as late as 4 weeks ago specifically prohibiting the sale or charter of any additional war-built vessels to foreigners at the very same time when it was aware of the fact that the present program had been recommended and was being considered by Congress. I feel that we should strongly stand on the policy enunciated by Congress the latter part of February, prohibiting the further charter or sale of our war-built vessels to foreigners. The prewar fleets of substantially all of the participating foreign nations have been restored by the generosity of our Government up to an amount equal to and possibly exceeding their prewar tonnages.

About a week ago, the President spoke to us on the critical international situation and requested Congress to enact selective-service legislation in order to provide necessary trained manpower for our military services. If we permit 200 of our war-built vessels to be chartered to foreigners, at least 8,000 American seamen will be beached and perhaps become unavailable for further service in our own merchant marine even though they would be needed in the event of another national emergency.

This poses a question of vital importance to the strength of our national defense, and I think we should do everything within our power to strengthen the power of our seafaring personnel as well as its allied military services. I cannot believe that we would be so short-sighted at this time as to take any action which would actually diminish the strength of our merchant marine either from the standpoint of the number of ships or the necessary trained seamen to man them. If we turn over to foreigners 200 of our inactive war-built vessels, as proposed by the said provision of this bill, it will force an equal number of our active American-flag vessels to retire from the high seas and become idle. This is the very reason why I have pointed out that 8,000 American seamen would be deprived of seafaring employment in the event this particular provision of the bill is not eliminated. It is unthinkable to me that any Member of this Congress would take any action in favor of foreigners which would deprive our own citizens of gainful employment in their chosen vocations.

The said provision of this bill contains some language which proposes that these 200 ships, upon demand, would be returned to the United States, if the President determines that such redelivery is necessary in the interests of national security. In my humble judgment, this stipulation is absolutely absurd and nothing more than an empty gesture.

There is no doubt in my mind that some of these ships, if not all of them, will fall into the hands of unfriendly nations if and when the present critical situation is further expanded. It stands to reason that if any of our ships are placed under foreign flag and manned by seamen of a nation that may become unfriendly to us, such nation will refuse to recognize any contractual obligations of the proposed charters; and those vessels will never be returned to us and never again will fly the American flag.

On the other hand, if these vessels remain under our flag, operated and manned by our own citizens, we will not incur the risk of losing them to an unfriendly nation at a later date, and will always be available to us in the event of another national emergency. We cannot predict at this time when we may be called upon to build additional vessels in order to supply our armed forces in foreign areas. It is possible that we may need every vessel now flying the American flag, as well as a large number of additional new vessels, in the interests of our national welfare in the event the present critical situation is further expanded. I know we all hope and trust that no such situation will arise, but I do feel that we must be fully prepared for any possible eventuality.

The principal argument of those advocating the charter of 200 of our war-built vessels to foreigners stems from their erroneous idea that it would result in substantial savings to us, as it is proposed that the recipient foreign nations will operate the vessels and man them by their own citizens and under their own flags. This argument is wholly inconsistent in several respects, particularly from the viewpoint of our public interest and the welfare of our own merchant marine. The proponents of this argument apparently overlook the fact that no charter hire will be paid to us by the foreign nations for the use of these vessels, irrespective of any terms of the charter agreements.

It would cost our Government about $50,000 each in order to put these vessels in good operating condition before being delivered to the foreigners. This item alone would amount to approximately $10,000,000. Our Government would also have to pay all the expenses incurred by these vessels at ports in the United States for fuel, miscellaneous supplies, port charges, loading expenses, and so forth; and it is conservatively estimated that this item would cost us about $70,000,000 during the period for which the charters are contemplated. The Maritime Commission would also suffer the loss of

charter hire in an amount estimated at approximately $50,000,000 which otherwise would be paid by our own citizens to the Commission for the chartered use of 200 Government-owned vessels.

I have good reasons to believe that the proposed chartering of these 200 ships to foreign nations would result in no economy to our Government. I believe that it would result in actual losses to us in the final analysis. The Chairman of the Maritime Commission wrote to Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE on March 4, 1948, and I urge your particular consideration of that part of the said letter, reading as follows:

> Moreover, we find that any dollar savings on transportation, while permitting larger purchases of American goods, will save the American taxpayer nothing at all and will not reduce the cost of the aid program to the American people but, through loss of taxes and charter hire, will actually increase it.

Another matter which concerns me very much is the fact that these 200 vessels cost our taxpayers about $400,000,000. I strongly urge upon you that we will be making a grave mistake if we take any action which would permit the turning over of these vessels to foreigners under existing circumstances.

I strongly urge that the provision of this bill which contemplates the chartering of these vessels to foreigners be eliminated. I think we would be derelict in our duty to our national interest if we failed to take such action.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, published records of the Rural Electrification Administration indicate that applications for funds to build rural electric facilities are coming in at a greatly accelerated rate.

During most of the calendar year 1947 applications were received at a rate of about $24,000,000 per month. The only reason the total was not greater was that the rural leaders know that only a limited amount of loan funds was available; hence there was no incentive to apply for sufficient funds to completely fill their needs when they realized that adequate money was not to be had.

The record shows, however, that for the first 11 weeks of 1948 applications for loans have been coming in to REA at a rate of eight and one-third million dollars per week. If this rate continues during the remainder of fiscal 1948 and throughout fiscal 1949—and I have every reason to believe it will be accelerated still more—then applications received by July 1, 1949, will total over $550,000,000. This, plus the $300,000,000 backlog of applications now on hand, brings the total to over $850,000,000 that will be needed by the Rural Electrification Administration during the remainder of this and the next fiscal year to fill applications for loans. Against this the REA has only about $50,000,000 of this year's funds for which loan papers have not been completed but which has been earmarked and committed. This leaves a net total of about $800,000,000 that this Government will be called upon by its rural citizens to lend—not give—during the remainder of this and the next fiscal year to brighten farm homes and lighten the drudgery of rural men and women throughout America.

If the Senate approves the full $400,000,000 for fiscal 1949 that the House has passed, and if the President's request for $175,000,000 supplemental for the remainder of this year were appropriated in full, the combined total of $575,000,000 would still fall far short of the $800,000,000 that will be needed during that period for expansion of this great rural electrification program.

I am inserting in the RECORD a list of applications for loans by States. The 12 States which have in the largest total applications at this time are: Missouri, with $30,437,000; North Dakota, $22,490,000; Texas, $17,739,500; Nebraska, $18,579,000; Georgia, $14,790,000; South Dakota, $14,260,000; Iowa, $13,781,000; Kansas, $13,523,000; South Carolina, $11,795,000; Minnesota, $11,753,000; Kentucky, $11,147,000; and Florida, $10,250,000.

The complete list follows:

ALABAMA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $5,752,000.

ARIZONA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,076,000.

ARKANSAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $4,785,000.

CALIFORNIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $130,000.

COLORADO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $5,698,000.

CONNECTICUT

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

DELAWARE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $150,000.

FLORIDA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $10,250,000.

GEORGIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $14,790,000.

IDAHO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,310,000.

ILLINOIS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $9,387,000.

INDIANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,130,000.

IOWA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $13,781,000.

KANSAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $13,523,000.

KENTUCKY

The applications now pending from that State amount to $11,147,000.

LOUISIANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2.591,000.

MAINE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $146,000.

MARYLAND

The applications now pending from that State amount to $800,000.

MASSACHUSETTS

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

MICHIGAN

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,456,000.

MINNESOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $11,753,000.

MISSISSIPPI

The applications now pending from that State amount to $6,730,000.

MISSOURI

The applications now pending from that State amount to $30,437,000.

MONTANA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $8,462,000.

NEBRASKA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $18,597,000.

NEVADA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $80,000.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $3,469,000.

NEW JERSEY

The applications now pending from that State amount to $140,000.

NEW MEXICO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,510,000.

NEW YORK

The applications now pending from that State amount to $127,000.

NORTH CAROLINA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $4,112,000.

NORTH DAKOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $22,490,000.

OHIO

The applications now pending from that State amount to $3,276,000.

OKLAHOMA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $9,407,000.

OREGON

The applications now pending from that State amount to $1,740,000.

PENNSYLVANIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,170,000.

RHODE ISLAND

The applications now pending from that State amount to zero.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $11,795,000.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $14,260,000.

TENNESSEE

The applications now pending from that State amount to $10,055,000.

TEXAS

The applications now pending from that State amount to $17,739,500.

UTAH

The applications now pending from that State amount to $590,000.

VERMONT

The applications now pending from that State amount to $450,000.

VIRGINIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $4,485,000.

WASHINGTON

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,195,000.

WEST VIRGINIA

The applications now pending from that State amount to $53,000.

WISCONSIN

The applications now pending from that State amount to $6,059,000.

WYOMING

The applications now pending from that State amount to $2,550,000.

A Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege given to me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a tabulation of the present soil-conservation-expansion programs presently before the Congress.

This tabulation was compiled by the Agriculture Bureau of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce and it briefly sets forth the pertinent facts regarding the bills presently before the Congress and the American people. I believe that this tabulation will assist everyone in clarifying his own thinking regarding this highly important matter.

Summary of proposed or suggested soil-conservation set-ups

	Jehsen bill	Cooley bill	Anderson plan	Recommendations of PMA State committeemen to PMA Administrator Gilmer	Present set-up
Stated purpose	Setting up of a national land policy and protection of Nation's agricultural lands.	Coordination of agricultural soil and water conservation programs.	Develop sound long-range agricultural policy and coordinate existing agencies to effectuate this policy.	Preservation of land and water resources to insure permanent, self-revitalizing agriculture.	Conserve and rebuild soil resources, establish a permanent agriculture, and reduce floods and siltation.
Dominant provision.	Strengthens and enlarges existing Soil Conservation Service and empowers Secretary of Agriculture to transfer activities of other agencies to SCS to avoid duplication.	Eliminates Soil Conservation Service as a separate agency, places its functions under agricultural extension service and assigns conservation research to State experiment stations.	Soil conservation work of Production and Marketing Administration and Soil Conservation Service combined into a single conservation agency and program.	Stresses incentive payments as a requirement. Provides that county and community committees have full responsibility for all program development and leadership, including furnishing of technical assistance to farmers.	Soil Conservation Service handles technical operations and research and provides conservation materials and equipment; Production and Marketing Administration makes incentive payments and provides conservation materials.
Offices specifically abolished.	None specified, but Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to eliminate such as in his judgment are unnecessarily duplicative.	All regional Soil Conservation Service offices are abolished and all others merged with the Extension Service.	None specified.	None specified.	None.
Farmer representation.	Supervisors of soil conservation districts, temporary county committee of 5 appointed farmers and the county agent where no conservation district exists, and 2 farmers on State conservation committee. (No specific reference is made to county or community ACA committees or State PMA committee.)	Supervisors of soil conservation districts, 3 elected farmers on local area committee, 4 farmers plus county agent on county committee, and a State committee of 5 farmers plus directors of agriculture, Extension Service and experiment station, and 1 representative of State conservation committee.	Establishes USDA county and State farmer committees. (It is assumed community ACA committees and conservation district supervisors are retained.)	At State level, committee of farmers appointed by Secretary of Agriculture administer program. At county and community levels, program directed by farmer-elected committees of 3 to 5 members. County agent ex-officio member of county committee without vote.	Soil Conservation Service operates through State conservation committee and conservation districts. Production and Marketing Administration operates through State PMA committee and county and community ACA committees.
Relation to soil conservation districts.	Specifically recognizes soil conservation districts and continues Federal technical and other aid to districts as at present.	Specifically recognizes soil conservation districts and provides county agent shall assist districts through educational work as in other agricultural activities and provide technical assistance to districts.	Recognizes conservation districts and provides for technical assistance as now.	Soil conservation districts not mentioned. Individual farm conservation program is same as farm plan as now developed by farmer in cooperation with soil conservation districts.	Soil Conservation Service provides technical assistance and grants in aid to conservation districts. Production and Marketing Administration has no official relationship to conservation districts.
Reference to Government payments.	Grants in aid (as provided in bill) shall not be used for cash payments, but ACA incentive payments are not specifically prohibited.	Permits cash payments for soil-conservation practices approved by a State technical committee but not in excess of 50 percent of the estimated average cost.	Anderson says, "Such supplementary assistance as is required in the public interest to encourage and speed up desirable shifts in land use and in application of essential protective measures to the land should be provided."	Stresses necessity of incentive conservation payments on ground that practices are applied to greater extent where such payments are made.	The ACA makes cash payments for approved soil-conservation practices. The SCS makes no cash payments but supplies limited amounts of seed and makes loans of special equipment needed for soil conservation work.
Reference to work to be done.	Conduct surveys, investigations, and research; provide technical assistance to conservation districts and some such assistance to farmers outside districts; make conservation survey of Nation's lands as a whole; classify by capabilities land in existing and proposed agricultural development projects; provide grants in aid to supplement contribution of farmers in applying conservation practices.	Educational, informational, demonstrational, and technical assistance to any farmer with respect to the use of his farm acreage to prevent erosion thereon, to soil-conservation districts and to State, county, and local committees as agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the State director of extension, and encouraging conservation practices by use of incentive payments under existing AAA Act.	To promote maximum participation by farmers in developing and carrying out conservation practices and in formulation and administration of farm programs. To make complete inventory of land conditions, provide farmer with written basic conservation plan, provide technical on-site assistance and continue research.	All programs for conservation—including technical assistance to farmers, preparing individual farm conservation plans, making of incentive payments, all loans, purchases, marketing programs, crop insurance and related programs—to be under administration of county and community committees.	Same as stated under Anderson plan.

Resolution on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on Palestine adopted at the annual meeting of the Associated Synagogues of Greater Boston, Mass., on March 21, 1948:

Whereas as American citizens, loyal and devoted to our country, who have always looked with pride to the past history of our country and to the ideals upon which our country was founded, to whom America means not only a physical territorial entity, but a concretization of the teachings of justice, freedom, honor, and moral integrity; and

Whereas the Government of our country through every administration since that of President Wilson, including the present administration, has supported the program of a Jewish state in Palestine, supported by the public opinion of the American people and the platforms of the two major political parties; and

Whereas the American representative at the meeting of the United Nations Security Council on March 19, 1948, announced a sudden reversal of historic American policy, in effect, vetoing the partition plan for Palestine adopted by more than two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly under America's leadership on November 29, 1947: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates and representatives of the Jewish congregations, orthodox, reform, and conservative, of greater Boston, meeting in Brookline, Mass., on March 21, 1948, at the sixth annual convention of the associated synagogues of greater Boston, do hereby record our profound shock, pain, and grief, aroused by this latest action of our Government at Lake Success. We cannot help but feel that this sudden inconsistent action constitutes a serious reversal, not only for Jewish hopes, but for American ideals, and for the hopes for world order and international peace, vitiating the moral leadership of the United States, and destroying the effectiveness of the United Nations at this perilous hour in the history of civilization; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our Government to reconsider its course of action while there is still yet time, and to express once again the moral leadership dictated both by the demands of justice and honor and the practical necessities of the hour, and forthwith to implement the plan leading to the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine, and further, to recognize immediately the provisional government of the Jewish State together with its right of self-defense and self-preservation, to which end the embargo on arms should be lifted; be it further

Resolved, That we affirm our bond of brotherhood with the embattled Jews of the Yishuv to whom we shall render all possible aid in this hour of life and death for them; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the above resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the representative of the United States at the United Nations, and to the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

How Great Britain Cares for the Mentally Ill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I called to the attention of the House recently the serious problem facing us with reference to the adequate care of the mentally ill and suggesting that a Federal bureau be set up to give attention to this important problem. As a part of these remarks I am including an interesting and informative study of this problem in Great Britain which appeared in the March issue of Hygeia. The article follows:

HOW GREAT BRITAIN CARES FOR THE MENTALLY ILL

(By Rose Patterson)

"One of the mental advantages which the United States and Britain have over their enemies is that they do not believe they can be defeated," Dr. James M. Mackintosh, then Glasgow University professor of preventive medicine, wrote in 1944 in his book on "The War and Mental Health in England." That mental advantage of the average man and woman in Britain in the dark days of the war is now considered by thousands of thinking people throughout the world, to have made all the difference between civilization and freedom on the one hand and a return to chaos and slavery on the other.

Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, and the subsequent phenomenal war production of Britain's people under relentless air bombardment afforded outward and visible signs of a mental health which the enemy had grieviously misjudged. This same mental health has its value today, and every effort is made in Britain to enable those who develop mental illness to return to normality in the shortest time.

In a cathedral city in the English midlands you might see a very astute shopper, darting in and out of the small stores, consulting and marking off a long list of requirements; he has an uncanny "nose" for a bargain. This is old George, a patient at the big county mental hospital two or three miles away, and he is shopping for most of the other patients who are unable to go out. After his journey back to the hospital in the county omnibus, during which he has chatted incessantly with his many village acquaintances, he will stop and discuss the success of his expedition with a number of men all the way up the drive through the well-kept grounds to the hospital buildings. These men will be mowing the lawns, wheeling barrows or going to or from the hospital farm on their various jobs.

Among the groups of patients you will notice here and there a man in a neat uniform; he is a nurse. Not all the nurses' charges are as bright as Old George, but they are working because they want to, and many of them, largely because of their work or occupational therapy, are recovering from their mental disorders. Among them are bricklayers and bank directors, clerks, laborers and some ex-soldiers. I saw some clever designs in water color by some of the women patients.

This particular hospital is the Burntwood County Mental Hospital near Lichfield, in Staffordshire. Its young and enthusiastic medical superintendent, Dr. J. Clegg, told me something of the treatment of mental disorders in Britain; the first country, he said, to introduce humane and rational treatment of the insane. He reminded me that the mental hospital run by the Quakers in York, The Retreat, recently celebrated its one hundred and fiftieth birthday with a special radio program. A century and half ago The Retreat determined that mental abnormality was an illness and began to use methods applied to other sickness instead of punishment and restraint. Its teaching spread and various acts of Parliament culminated in the Lunacy Act of 1890–91.

Important statutory developments followed upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1926 and a steady advance has been marked by the Mental Treatment Act of 1930, permitting patients to admit themselves to publicly owned mental hospitals on a voluntary basis and to discharge themselves if they wish. This law also allows patients to be taken into hospitals without the stigma of being certified insane if they are thought to be capable of recovery within 6 months. Britain's local authorities, under this law, have to provide clinics for the early diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders and neuroses.

These acts of Parliament are administered by a board of control older than and separate from the Ministry of Health. It is responsible to the Ministries of Health and the Lord Chancellor. There is a fairly equal representation of medical and legal experts on the Board, whose commissioners must include a certain proportion of women, and it is represented in Parliament by the Minister of Health.

Most mental patients go to the 101 county and borough mental hospitals. Local government of these institutions is carried out by elected representatives of the county or borough councils, who choose visiting committees. These committees generally elect subcommittees to deal with the various departments of the hospital (stores and canteen, gardens, farms, etc.) after hearing the advice of the paid experts in charge of them. The medical superintendent generally is the chief administrator. Members of the visiting committee go to the wards at least once a month and are always accessible to patients' relatives as their representatives on the local council.

Private mental hospitals, which take patients for profit, and registered mental hospitals, supported by voluntary contributions and endowments, are regularly visited by the commissioners of the board of control, who also visit the public mental hospitals at least once a year.

There is a government mental hospital, Broadmoor Criminal Asylum, for the treatment of persons convicted of a serious crime and subsequently found to be insane, and there is also a state institution at Rampton in Nottinghamshire for mental defectives who lapse into crime.

Britain's Army, Navy, and Air Force authorities make special arrangements for the treatment of mental cases and these do not come under civic law until discharged from the services.

According to present arrangements, a patient suffering from mental disorder may obtain treatment in the first instance as an outpatient in any of the clinics run by the voluntary hospitals or by the local authorities. If it is then thought necessary to admit him to a mental hospital, and he is willing to go, he can do so as a voluntary patient, signing an undertaking to give 72 hours' notice in writing before leaving. If unable to express his willingness, the patient may nevertheless be admitted on a temporary order at the request of his relatives and two doctors, one of whom has been specially approved by the board of control.

A patient failing to qualify for treatment as above may be certified and admitted on an order of a justice of the peace. On recovery, the certified patient is discharged by the visiting committee on the recommendation of the medical officer. If he has not recovered, he may still be discharged if the committee is satisfied that his family is able to provide for him adequate care and control. A private patient can be discharged by relatives responsible for his maintenance.

The treatment of mental disorder aims at effecting a cure by removing all abnormal symptoms but, if this is not possible, to effect social readjustment. In the last 20 years, great advances have been made in the medical treatment of mental disorders. As a result, cases hitherto considered hopeless are often discharged to their normal home life.

The promotion of normal social contacts and activities is very important. At the Runwell Hospital, in Essex, in-patients' clubs were so successful that out-patients' clubs on the same lines were started at Guy's and St. Bartholomew's, both big voluntary hospitals in London. Symptoms combated by the social clubs are shyness and loneliness, inferiority feelings, claustrophobia—a morbid fear of being shut in—sexual maladjustment, and the psychlogic effects of physical abnormalities.

Occupational therapy, which we saw at work at the beginning of this account, employs all the various handicrafts—weaving, rug-making, carpentry, and so on. Sound psychologic principles govern each case and allow the patient to express himself. From occupational therapy patients graduate to work—actually work therapy—in the utility departments of the hospital and often become very keen on their jobs.

Burntwood patients run their own social club and organize dances, play readings, and dramatic entertainments. The hospital provides regular cinema shows, concerts, dances, and sporting events (there is a fine cricket ground), as well as motor trips. A good library is available to patients able to make use of it, and a canteen is run on cafe lines, where patients may sit and have refreshments and buy extra luxuries with their money allowance.

Though patients are nursed in both open and closed wards, no patient may be locked in a room without special permission from the medical officer; such permission must be for some definite reason, such as acute excitement, and the seclusion, as it is called, must be reported to the board of control. Open wards are open to the grounds, and patients may walk in and out as they desire. Some patients have outside parole to visit neighboring towns or their friends during certain hours.

Restraint is nowadays so rarely employed in Britain that Dr. Clegg told me he has never seen a straitjacket in his 16 years' experience.

Mental nurses undergo a period of 3 years' training. Many of them are fully qualified general nurses as well. The mental hospital is a complete training school and prepares candidates for both the Royal Medico-Psychological Examinations and the State examinations.

The importance of psychiatry and psychology in placing and training men in the services in World War II is well known now. A brilliant summary of the methods evolved in the British Army has been made by the consulting psychiatrist, Brig. J. R. Rees, M. D. In civil life in England much has been learned about mental care under the strain of air bombardment by dealing with problems of evacuation, rest centers, and so on.

Of the voluntary organizations for mental health in England, the oldest is the Mental After-Care Association, which, as its name implies, is chiefly concerned with the care of patients discharged from mental hospitals, though the scope of its work has extended since its inception in 1913. The National Council for Mental Hygiene, formed in 1920, set out to educate the public in the more positive aspects of mental health, studying the causes of mental disorder with a view to prevention and endeavoring to secure a closer association of psychiatry with general medicine. A body known as the Central Association for Mental Welfare provides supervision and community care for large numbers of defectives and borderline cases not covered by the Mental Deficiency Act.

In 1926 was established the Child Guidance Council, whose work, supported by the Commonwealth Fund, has been particularly successful. The council introduced psychiatric social work into England, first sending social workers to the United States for special instruction and practical experience in that field and subsequently establishing a training program in England. In 1931 the mental health course of this body was transferred to the London School of Economics. The outbreak of war in 1939 prevented the complete amalgamation of these four voluntary mental health associations of England and Wales, but the war itself promoted cooperation and the Mental Health Emergency Committee came into being to develop regional services of great value to the country, especially in connection with evacuated children.

Patients treated in the Emergency Medical Service neurosis centers between October 1940, and July 1946, included 5,152 civilians, 2,233 ex-service and 53,908 service men and women. Only three of these centers are still running, one in Wales and two in England; the number of cases is now only 600 and is steadily lessening.

Many of the voluntary (general) hospitals run psychiatric departments, mainly for outpatients. Dr. C. P. Blacker's book, Neurosis and the Mental Health Service, published in 1946 by the Oxford University Press, shows that of the 210 psychiatric out-patient clinics listed the majority are located in Britain's voluntary hospitals. Roughly speaking, for the years 1938–42, the average number of new patients per clinic per year was 105.

Northwest Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard L. Neuberger, one of our outstanding western journalists, has written a very interesting article, entitled "Northwest Empire," which appears in the March edition of the Eagle magazine. It is an excellent description of the recent large-scale development taking place in the States of Oregon and Washington. The article is as follows:

NORTHWEST EMPIRE—A FRONTIER IN TRANSITION, OREGON AND WASHINGTON HAVE ONE FOOT IN FORESTED, PRIMEVAL SOLITUDES AND THE OTHER IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

(Many years ago a great editor in the city of New York said, "Go west, young man." Horace Greeley is supposed to be out of date today, but there is a great opportunity in the Northwest for people from the East, from the South and some overcrowded parts of the Middle West. You here show them the opportunity of still going West.—Franklin D. Roosevelt, at Grand Coulee, Wash., August 4, 1934.)

It is practically traditional for Americans to think of the Pacific Northwest as the last frontier. Boyhood images of Lewis and Clark in long canoes are not forgotten. Yet the Northwest is a frontier with one moccasined foot in a metropolitan stirrup. No longer is it a lonely realm of logging camps, vast cattle ranches, and untrod valleys. Since 1940, Oregon's population has soared 39.2 percent; that of the State of Washington, 28.6 percent. These statistics, mere numbers on paper, express themselves in terms of a frontier which is slowly giving way to factories, bulging cities, and countrysides dotted with subdivisions.

In the Northwest, the atomic age and the wilderness of Lewis and Clark strangely mingle. Indeed, the Hanford plutonium works, final stage in the atomic process, rise from the sagebrush flats where the campfire of those first westbound argonauts flickered nearly a century and a half ago.

Lewis and Clark blazed the trail for a mighty procession, yet it was only a platoon, compared with the surge to the Northwest during the past few years. Oregon has gained more population since 1940 than in its entire first half-century of Statehood. Since the last census, Washington has overtaken such industrial States as Connecticut, West Virginia, and Maryland. The Northwest is burgeoning. Portland's metropolitan area is now larger than that of Kansas City or Indianapolis. Seattle is strongly in pursuit of Minneapolis and Milwaukee.

Yet to the region the vestiges of the frontier still cling. Prospectors from Alaska clamber off boats fastened to Seattle's piers and stroll up the steep streets in parkas and mukluks. Occasionally they plunk down a poke full of gold dust in an airy new chain grocery store. Columbian black-tails with 10-point antlers forage in meadows within sight of the sprawling new aluminum plants. Mile-a-minute streamlined trains hurtle past trappers' bivouacs and rangers' cabins. Indians fishing for salmon with spears watch Diesel tugs pushing a record commerce through the world's highest liftlocks at Bonneville Dam. And the first delivery of power from Grand Coulee Dam, mightiest source of hydroelectric energy on earth, was made not to a light-metal plant or the Great Northern's electrified crossing of the Cascade Range, but to a Nespelem squaw named Ernestine Nanamkin, who bought a washing-machine just for the occasion.

"Washington is full of Swedes and Oregon is full of Methodists," wrote an old-time correspondent of the New York Times who visited the Northwest just after Henry Villard had thrust the Northern Pacific down to tidewater on Puget Sound. This was a bold generalization, but it was partly true, as the political life of the two States now attests.

Washington, with a greater proportion of Scandinavians than any other State except Minnesota, has lusty leanings toward farm cooperatives, trade unions, and public ownership of electric power. Washington's Government reflects the progressive tendencies of Norway and Sweden. Washington ranks fourth nationally in old-age assistance payments; the average check is $50.02.

Only the width of the Columbia River separates the two great States of the Northwest, but it is a moat which divides the manor from the fields. Oregon was settled by migrants who preferred the rhythm of the plow and harrow to the uncertainties of the California creeks. It has never been exposed to Alaska's brawling touch. Conservatism guides its habits, caution rules its government. In many respects, Oregon is New England transplanted the width of the continent.

Oregon carefully husbands its finances and watches its morals. Liquor may be bought only at State stores. When the staid old Oregonian published a story telling that shapely girls were posing au naturel for Portland art classes, letters expressing great horror poured in. However, in this same cloistered atmosphere, the Jantzen Knitting Mills have thrived as a national institution for three decades, producing wool bathing

suits skimpy enough for the most venturesome female.

There was a time—and not so long ago—when Jantzen, with its spindles and looms, was one of the Northwest's few manufacturing plants. Industrialization on a large scale stems mainly from the tapping of the immeasurable power resources of the Columbia River. This stream locks in its swift reaches nearly half the undeveloped hydroelectricity of the Nation. Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams represent the first Federal efforts to put this power to work. The Boeing aircraft plants and Henry Kaiser's wartime shipyards were operated with Columbia River kilowatts.

But the new Northwest alumnium industry is the most spectacular manufacturing project. Before President Roosevelt dedicated Bonneville Dam in 1937, not an ounce of aluminum was turned out west of the Mississippi. Today, practically 50 percent of the aluminum production in the United States takes place on the timbered banks of the Columbia. Aluminum reduction plants nestle in the pines near Spokane and push against the firs just outside Vancouver and Portland.

As the light-metal industry is born on the fringe of the Northwest's cities, the oldest industry in the region passes its maturity in the backwoods.

This is the lumber industry. The Northwest is still the citadel of lumber and logging, though its virgin forests are thinning. The last great stand of Douglas fir mantles southern Oregon. Indeed, the tiny town of Coos Bay has become the leading lumber seaport of the world. At a time when cities from Rangoon to Des Moines cry out for wood for housing, the docks of Coos Bay groan beneath fresh-cut stacks of fir and cedar.

The Northwest is a lusty region possibly because of the proximity of mountain, sea, and evergreen wilderness. Rare, indeed, is the resident of the Northwest who does not fish or hunt. Big game abounds in the forest, trout and salmon lurk in the rivers. The Northwest's people are vigorous and forward-looking people.

The Northwest is the land of the initiative and referendum, where for the first time people enacted laws by circulating petitions. Even now, women in the Seattle, Portland, and Spokane marketplaces must shift packages to sign referendums. The voters have balloted on everything from increasing old-age pensions to lengthening hotel bedsheets.

The Northwest is divided culturally, geographically, and climatically by the rugged cordillera of the Cascade Mountains. This range runs north and south through the region like a vast battlement. West of the Cascades, the Pacific's heaving surf beats sonorously against capes and headlands. East of the Cascades, a gaunt upland desert rolls away to the distant Rockies.

On the tidewater side of the mountains, 128 inches of rain often drench Tillamook County, Oreg., and Jefferson County, Wash. But in the inland empire the rainfall is only 13 inches. The west side harbors dense, rainy forests as clogged with moss and ferns as any in Africa. On the east side, men have reared at Grand Coulee the greatest irrigation project of history, so that the arid sagebrush flats will bloom one day like the Garden of Eden.

Life is pleasant in the Northwest. The sight of eternal snowcaps on the horizon—Rainier, Hood, Adams, Baker—has a fascination which grips newcomers. Immediately after VJ-day, thousands of war workers rolled eastward to their homes in the Dakotas, Harlem, and the deep South. Within a year their social security numbers were reappearing on Northwest payrolls. They had come back—this time, they said, to stay. And so the pouplation of the Northwest continues to rise. Two thousand migrants a month still are arriving both in Washington and in Oregon.

What is the Northwest? On this question, many men disagree. George Rogers Clark considered the Ohio country "the Northwest Territory." Canada has its Northwest Territories. Recently the Saturday Evening Post called Minnesota the Northwest. A letter from an inhabitant of Grays Harbor, of Washington, complained that Minnesota was 2,000 miles east of his bungalow. The editor of the Post wrote a jocular explanation which said "the reference to Minnesota was written by a noneasterner who adds, 'I regard Minnesota as part of the Northwest because it is northwest of my home town, Gibson City, Ill.'"

But regardless of jocularity, Oregon and Washington are the States most generally regarded as the Northwest. Some experts lump these States with Idaho and western Montana, because these areas are part of the great Columbia River Basin.

Idaho and western Montana salt the Northwest's T-bone. They are gaunt, booming Mountain States, with no large cities and plenty of outdoors. They are spectacular, and their people are equipped to cope with a grim and stern climate. It often is 60 below in the Bitterroots, and snowdrifts plug the passes so that the railroad rotaries must whirr from November until March. The open spaces are so vast that the deepest chasm in North America lies along the Idaho-Oregon boundary, yet few people know about it, beyond the thinnest legend. This is Hell's Canyon of the Snake River, 6,500 feet from rim to river at Freezeout Saddle.

Civilization in Idaho is concentrated in the fat southern part of the State, where the Mormons are the dominant sect. These thrifty people have used the rushing waters of the Snake River to reclaim from the sagebrush an empire of potatoes and sugar beets.

Yet between the inland regions of the Northwest and those along the seacoast, there is one profound difference. Both Idaho and Montana have been losing population, whereas Oregon and Washington have forged in the opposite direction. Most of the increase is concentrated in such harbor cities as Portland, Seattle, and Tacoma. On the coast, which faces off toward Alaska and the Orient, the destiny of the Northwest lies.

The Pacific Northwest, rural once, is rural no longer. Most of its people now dwell in cities. For every man eating johnny cakes in a logging camp or herding sheep on an upland meadow, there are today a dozen fighting their way into crowded trolleys or standing in the costly line at the grocery store. The migration to Oregon and Washington since 1940 has been without precedent. This migration is making the Northwest a domain of cities, factories, and huge housing developments.

In the first century after Lewis and Clark, fewer men, women, and children trekked to Oregon than in the 7 years after FDR asked Congress to make America "the arsenal of democracy."

Stirred by this impact, the frontier region of the United States is growing up. With one foot in the solitudes, the other in the atomic age, the Northwest moves on.

The Case Against Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and honor of presenting to the Congress and the American people a declamation, written by Miss Gayle Williams, a junior in the Marysville, Ohio, high school, which won a district contest on a most controversial subject. I believe the declamation by Miss Williams will be of interest to many.

THE CASE AGAINST LABOR UNIONS

(By Gayle Williams)

The other night when I picked up the paper, this headline caught my eye: "Union Dissenter Jobless." These are the particulars of the case. The company officials had been forced to discharge Mr. Frank S. Smith because he had refused to contribute from his weekly wages to a union fund in order that they might strike against the Taft-Hartley law. Mr. Smith, who is the father of five children, could not afford to give this money up. When asked about the dismissal a union official replied that it was "regrettable" and that Mr. Smith had been a fine worker for 23 years, but that there was no choice but to dismiss him.

No fair man denies the right of anyone to form an organization for the betterment of himself and his fellows. That was what labor organizations were instigated for and that has been their supposed aim and purpose in several decades of existence. They have secured living wages, shorter hours, better working conditions, protection, and a score of other essentials.

But does the union today follow the principles on which it was founded? No; it does not. The union of today has no place in our land of freedom. There is nothing less free than an organization that uses force to attain its selfish demands, regardless of the cost to anyone else. Does it seem right that in this great Nation every union man must do just as his union boss tells him, that a man of superior ability with a black or yellow skin is refused a job in preference to a lazy slothful man of the master race, that a master craftsman like a carpenter has to pay huge sums of money to get the job he wants. Certainly you will agree with me that the answer to all these questions is "No."

The labor unions of this country are controlled by a few egotistical, demanding, scheming politicians who want only their own selfish desires, no matter how many people are harmed and killed by their pigheadedness. John L. Lewis is one notorious example of this kind. He has defied every law, human or divine. You can say that he has built up the United Mine Workers so that they are among the highest paid of workers. But what else has he done? In 1936 he contributed $400,000 of the United Mine Workers' welfare fund toward the reelection of President Roosevelt, in return for which he had exacted a promise from the President that he would support Lewis as the Vice Presidential candidate in 1940. But Mr. Roosevelt crossed him up, and Lewis was so embittered that he used half a million of the union funds in 1940 to support Willkie. But does the average worker know about such things? Even if he did, what good would it do him? Lewis and the others are so firmly entrenched that little short of shooting at sunrise could dislodge them.

Last year when Philip Murray could not reach an agreement with United States Steel he called out a sympathy strike in which 700 companies were forced to shut down, although they had nothing to do with the production of steel and they had no disputes with their employers.

When a PWA low-cost housing project was being erected, Westinghouse bid $50,000 for switchboards to be installed, but their offer was turned down for one from a local union manufacturer to supply this material for twice as much merely because the Westinghouse product did not bear the union label. Does something like this make for low-cost

housing? These are only a very few examples of practices that labor organizations and their bosses resort to in order that they may have centralized control governed by the theory that might makes right.

The representatives of the unions do not even know what their members want. For example, in a General Motors dispute 2 years ago, the supposed spokesmen of the union argued long and hard on the issues of a retirement plan. Finally the company took a secret vote of the employees and found that they would rather have a straight wage increase than a retirement plan and a smaller increase. If the leaders of the unions do not even know what the worker wants, how can a company be expected to know what to do?

One of unionism's basic principles may someday be the ruin of all industry in this country. A worker is only allowed to turn out as much per day as the laziest, most inefficient worker in the business. If he does more than this standard, heavy fines are imposed upon him. We cannot hope to control inflation, pay off the national debt, feed Europe, and do the thousand and one other things that this country needs currency for, with such laws as this.

One of the basic laws of economics is that you get out of something just what you put into it. Unionism defies this law. The union theory is that the less a man produces the more jobs there will be. The worker, blinded as usual by false propaganda, does not realize that restriction of production increases cost; that increased cost lowers the purchasing power of a dollar; therefore by lowering production he lowers real wages. What is this union theory but sheer economic nonsense?

Events in the United States during the past few years have paralleled those in Italy during the early 1920's. During that period the economic life of that country was disrupted time and time again by all kinds of strikes. In some cases the labor union even took over the industries. Then along came a very remarkable gentleman named Mussolini who promised to bring peace to a troubled Italy by knocking together the heads of the offending parties. This brought a temporary peace, but what a price was paid—virtually the loss of all political and social freedoms. This is what every average American has at stake in the present labor crises. We have fought wars to preserve our freedom. Now are we going to sacrifice all that in such a way?

There are two ways we can control our unions. The first is the way of such regimes as Russia. There if you go on strike you lose your ration card and home. Since all the industries there are controlled by the Government, there are no other jobs available. It is just a case of abide by the Russian Government or die. The taxpayers of this country are giving their dollars and cents to Europe under the Marshall plan, one of the aims of which is to control the spread of the Communistic state. Certainly this is ample proof that we do not want that type of government.

Or we can change the structure of our labor organizations. In place of the ones we have now we must erect unions based on the principles of equality and freedom, offering hope, encouragement, and advancement to the working class of this country. The employee must be made to feel that the company cannot turn out as good products without him. Employee and employer must understand the difficulties of each other, so that they can try to help the other. There should not be the huge monopolistic unions of today, but, rather, small unions within each shop, to help the individual. Even this could not entirely settle our problem, but we would be one step further on the road to a lasting industrial peace.

War Scares Are Unnecessary and Ill Advised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that the Secretary of the Navy saw fit to mention the fact that a submarine had been sighted off the American coast. Why could not this information have been kept in the confines of the Navy and given such attention as it deserves by them.

Such statements at the time when we are trying to pass the European recovery bill simply alarm and excite the public unnecessarily. Many of us are anxious to do what we can on the recovery bill, feeling that it is a necessary step in the direction of peace. Such statements as I refer to indicate that the people are being prepared for a war emergency, and their fears are being excited.

Last week end I was in Charlottesville, Va., and while there read an editorial in the Richmond Times-Dispatch which very well expresses my views. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this editorial:

WHY BROADCAST THESE SYNTHETIC ALARMS?

Just what is the point of the Navy Department's statements as to mysterious submarines sighted off our coasts, if the purpose is not to create war hysteria in the United States?

One would suppose from the tone of these revelations that there is something violative of international law in the presence of a Russian submarine in the Atlantic or the Pacific Oceans. Actually that is nonsense. The Soviet Union has as much right to send submarines into those oceans as we have to send warships into the Mediterranean.

At present, we have a carrier, three or four cruisers, and a dozen destroyers in the Mediterranean. Not only so, but they are there for the purpose of influencing public opinion in Greece and Italy, to say nothing of Russia. Are we to argue that Russia, nevertheless, has no right to send submarines into the Atlantic and the Pacific?

The U. S. S. R. has direct outlets on the Pacific and on various bodies of water leading into the Atlantic. The Navy itself admits that there is no reason why the submarines of a "friendly" power should not cruise the high seas, so long as they stay outside the American 3-mile limit. Many would say that the U. S. S. R. is not "friendly," in the ordinary sense of that term, but certainly we are not at war with the Soviet Union, and we may never be at war with that country. Moreover, if the United States can send warships into the Mediterranean, to say nothing of the Atlantic and the Pacific, under international law, the Soviets can do the same.

The Navy not only performed a disservice in making known the presence of the Russian submarines, but it got its signals crossed in the process. Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan let it be known that submarines "not belonging to any nation west of the iron curtain have been sighted off our shores." He declined to say when or where the undersea boats were seen, saying that "it would be very important for the 'other fellow' to know which of his subs have been sighted and which have not been."

It was not good public policy to make even this much known, for why tell the Soviets that we had noticed their ships anywhere? Yet, in the face of Secretary Sullivan's own declaration that details could not be released, a high naval official proceeded immediately thereafter to release them. He announced to the world that three foreign submarines had been sighted in the Pacific since January 30, and gave the times and places.

Secretary Sullivan had asserted that he was "not prepared to evaluate the significance of these sightings," but then he went on to say: "However, we all recall that an early step of the Germans in 1917 and 1941 was to deploy submarines off our coasts."

Such an alarming declaration can only have been intended to create a war psychosis in the United States. There is enough such propaganda of one kind or another, without our having to contend with this sort of thing from Cabinet officers. It would be just as logical for Pravda to tell its readers that the maneuvers of our warships in the Mediterranean are reminiscent of those of the French and British naval vessels in the Bosporus on the eve of the Crimean War.

There are enough disturbing developments in the world today without the synthetic alarms just broadcast by the United States Navy.

The Russian Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I read an editorial in the Phillipsburg Review, one of the papers in my district. I am sure this article represents the thinking of a great majority of the people I represent. The people are thinking seriously of the Russian situation.

They are hopeful that Congress will solve this all-important question. They look to Congress for strong and wise leadership.

The editorial follows:

During the last century, Great Britain has never lost a war. Yet this powerful nation stands today stripped of many of the possessions it fought to maintain; its people are living on austerity rations, with many of their traditional freedoms stripped away.

China is experiencing a paralyzing civil war; India is torn with internal strife; the Jews and the Arabs are battling in Palestine; France, Italy, Germany, and other principal countries on the European Continent know the bitterness and futility of armed struggle; Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the other Russian satellites are existing behind the iron curtain in fear and horror; Greece has been virtually destroyed; Japan is governed under the military rule of the United States; vast territories in Russia were devastated by the Nazi might; thousands of Americans gave their lives in defense of their country.

These are the fruits of total war. All war is waste, destruction, death. Men die, economic systems are so torn that innocent victims cannot survive; nations lose their identities, and the moral character of the individual is distorted.

Today, with World War II only briefly behind us, ominous storm clouds again appear on the horizon of world peace.

The United States embarked on a foreign policy which had for its objective the high ideals of democracy. Our Nation wants, or wanted, no more territory, no further financial advantage anywhere in the world.

Russia, the only other world power capable of making modern war, has territorial ambitions and subjugates entirely the nation which it dominates.

These two policies were bound to clash.

We can debate the wisdom of imposing our idea of democracy upon other nations; we can debate the necessity of rebuilding stricken nations; we can debate a foreign policy which takes our men, equipment, and money completely around the globe; but regardless of our wisdom, our course has been set. We have no choice.

In advancing the high ideals of our own type of democracy, we have made commitments to other nations which do not permit of honorable withdrawal—we have undertaken to defend democracy around the world.

Christian people everywhere will pray that all nations can rebuild peacefully; that our problems can be solved without armed conflict. We hope that Winston Churchill was right when he said that wars do not occur when the people are aware that they are imminent.

Shocked by the foreign developments of the past weeks, Americans are today aware of the dangers and we hope that our leadership has the strength and wisdom to cope with them.

Text of Resolution Adopted at Meeting of Gate City Post, No. 72, Department of Georgia, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at meeting of Gate City Post, No. 72, department of Georgia, the American Legion held at Atlanta, Ga., Thursday, March 18, 1948:

Whereas under the partition plan, with the strong backing of the United States, the United Nations body after lengthy discussion and investigation did set up a separate Jewish state in what is commonly known as Palestine, and did assign certain areas of Palestine to the new Jewish state; and

Whereas it is evident that the non-Jewish peoples of Palestine and adjoining areas are deliberately flouting this action of the United Nations and are creating a reign of terror in Palestine; and

Whereas with the ending of the British mandate in Palestine to become effective May 15, 1948, it is feared that bloody civil war may break out in Palestine, as was the case in India, resulting in a massacre of the poorly armed people of the Jewish state; and

Whereas the present embargo of the United States on the shipment of arms to the Middle East (including Palestine) hampers the new Jewish state in its efforts to adequately arm itself against aggression; and

Whereas American-born Jews (ex-servicemen of the armed forces of the United States) now in Palestine are threatened with loss of citizenship and passports if they resort to force, even in self-defense; and especially

Whereas it is believed that present chaotic conditions in Palestine could result in another world conflict, Gate City Post, No. 72, of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, at a regular and legal meeting held on Thursday, March 18, 1948, adopted the following resolutions with the further proviso that they be submitted to the national body of the American Legion for prompt action, through the fifth district, and the department of Georgia:

Be it resolved—

First. That in the interest of world peace, the United Nations be urged to implement its partition of Palestine with military force, if necessary, since the failure of the partition plan would be tacit admission of the inadequacy of the United Nations.

Second. That the existing United States embargo on the shipment of military supplies to the Middle East (including Palestine) be lifted or modified to the extent necessary to enable the new Jewish state to adequately arm itself against any outside aggression and to enforce peace in its own boundaries.

Third. That the threat of loss of citizenship and passports to American citizens now in Palestine be voided, so that they may properly protect themselves if necessary without fear of such punitive measures for so doing.

MACK FRANKEL, *Commander.*
MADGE M. COOPER, *Adjutant.*

Bankers Directing Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that we have embarked on a policy of militarism and the reconstruction of monopolies and cartelists, we ought to examine the two leading advisers and policy makers who are pushing our Nation along this disastrous route. Everybody knows that the two mainsprings of this policy are Forrestal, Secretary of National Defense, and Harriman, Secretary of Commerce.

From Who's Who in America, we have the following information:

Forrestal, James, investment banker; with New Jersey Zinc Co., Tobacco Products Corp., New York City (1915–16); with Dillon, Read & Co., 1916–40, president 1937–40. Clubs: Racquet and Tennis, Links, River, (New York City); Meadowbrook (Long Island, N. Y.). Office, 28 Nassau Street, New York, N .Y.

Harriman, William Averell; son, late Edward Henry Harriman. Vice president, purchases and supplies, Union Pacific R. R., 1914–18; chairman of the board, Merchant Shipbuilding Corp., 1917–25; chairman of the board, W. A. Harriman & Co., 1920–30; partner Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co. (merger) since January 1931; chairman executive committee, Illinois Central R. R., 1931–42, now director; chairman of the board, Union Pacific R. R. Co. since July 1932; chairman of the board, Los Angeles and Salt Lake R. R. Co., Oregon Short Line R. R. Co., Oregon and Washington R. R. and Navigation Co. Office, 59 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

Now, I do not challenge their patriotism, but as a Democrat I do object to big bankers directing our foreign and domestic policies. No wonder this is being referred to as a bipartisan administration when Wall Street bankers have moved into the White House.

The Democratic Party is the party of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. The big bankers belong to the Republican Party.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a recent speech delivered by William R. Barry, superintendent of schools, Northampton, Mass., which is most interesting and enlightening on the subject matter in opposition to Federal aid to education for schools:

Despite an alarming shortage of elementary grade teachers in Massachusetts as well as a genuine need for modern school buildings in keeping with this day and age, the No. 1 school problem for the towns and cities of this Commonwealth is more adequate financial support.

In the past and at present the public schools of Massachusetts have been and are depending almost exclusively on the local real-estate tax. In the future it will not be possible for them to continue to do so. The added financial support necessary would need to come through either State aid or Federal aid or through both.

A Federal-aid bill has been filed providing for $300,000,000, of which Massachusetts would receive $4,160,000. The other New England States would receive Federal aid as follows—Connecticut, $1,705,000; Maine, $1,060,000; Rhode Island, $720,000; New Hampshire, $640,000; and Vermont, $615,000. It is at once obvious that Federal aid would not give any financial relief to the six New England States as they would contribute far more to the $300,000,000 Federal fund than the small amounts they would receive from it. In the case of Massachusetts, for example, it is estimated that this Commonwealth would be forced to contribute in excess of $33,000,000 in order to receive $4,160,000.

It should be at once apparent, therefore, that aside from the fact that public education is and has been primarily a prerogative of the State and not of the Federal Government—as assured in our Federal Constitution—a realistic perusal of the actual situation will point to no other solution than State aid. It would be futile for Massachusetts to send $8 to Washington in order to get back $1 for public education in Massachusetts.

Of course, a State such as Mississippi, would receive slightly over one-half of the $33,000,000 Massachusetts contributed and in and by itself it would be a splendid thing for Mississippi to receive $16,985,000 as it would if the bill passed. But in any case, that in one way solves the challenge faced by the public schools of Massachusetts and the other five New England States—the solution of which can be solved only by these States themselves through adequate financial support.

Our present State legislature will consider a bill providing $28,500,000 for school aid to the towns and cities of Massachusetts. While a sales tax would provide this money, a sales tax evidently lacks public sanction in Massachusetts although it is readily accepted in a goodly number of States and in Connecticut after a short trial apparently it is accepted but not so readily. Even a conservative reduction in the Federal income tax would provide Massachusetts with the necessary twenty-eight and a half million in addition to furnishing substantial tax relief to the individual citizens of Massachusetts.

The question is sometimes asked why the distribution of Federal funds to the individual States for education is any different

from the distribution of State funds for education to the towns and cities within a State. This assmption is doubtless due to a rather common fallacy, shared even by some educators and students of government to the effect that the relationship of the Federal Government to the States is identical with that of the State to the municipalities within its borders. The municipality is the creature of the State and may be destroyed by the State as was the case with Enfield, Prescott and North Dana when the Metropolitan Dam was being constructed. The Federal Government does not have this same relationship with or power over the individual States as our Federal Constitution provides that no State may be deprived of its representation in Congress except through its own volition.

A further inquiry is sometimes made as to why municipalities and States which accept Federal grants for school buildings and equipment should not accept Federal aid for teachers' salaries and for other instructional purposes. In addition to the original purpose of Federal grants for school buildings having been the relief of unemployment and the benefit to and the stability of our entire economic pattern, the all-important difference is that the buildings and equipment do not become part of the educational process until the Federal Government has relinquished its interest in the school. Federal grants for school buildings are needed and should be continued.

It is sometimes contended that because early America enjoyed an agrarian civilization, the framers of the Constitution overlooked the consideration of education. Actually they purposely omitted education because they recognized that education is the function of the States, not of the Federal Government. No greater evidence is needed to sustain the contention that the great thinkers of that day were not unaware of the need of education than to realize that during the same year that the Constitution was adopted, the great ordinance of 1787 had as one of its cornerstones the stipulation that religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

An underlying principle in American life has been that those powers which are remote from the individual belong to the Federal Government while those which are immediate or close to the individual belong to the separate States. With the exception of the right to worship God as one sees fit, for which the Pilgrim fathers left their native shores and family sustenance, nothing is closer to the individual and the family than education; and consequently the control of education has been the function of the individual State, not of the Federal Government.

To think that the Federal Government would continue to furnish Federal aid indefinitely without participating in its control is fantastic—as "the one who pays the piper calls the tune." The States should not be induced by coercion or by favor to surrender the management or control of their own schools.

At the 1947 convention of the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City, Senator TAFT, in discussing his bill for Federal aid to education, advised those States which could do so to avoid participating in Federal aid to education—stressing the point that while his bill specifically protected the States from Federal control, there was nothing to prohibit a future Congress from amending this provision.

Actually the Federal Government under both major parties has been taking unto itself more and more of the tax resources of the individual States. It has even been seriously suggested that all income taxes be assigned to the Federal Government—leaving but the gasoline taxes, sales taxes, and other similar taxes to the States. In less than 20 years the number of Federal employees has increased from slightly over half a million to two million. This has not only increased greatly the tax burden of the States but has resulted in taking from productive enterprise great numbers of able persons now unnecessary in their Federal positions estimated from one-half million to one million and thereby reducing production and contributing to inflation and a continued increasing high cost of living.

Former Secretary Byrnes reminds us that the nearest approach to immortality we have on this earth is a Federal bureau once established. Experience tells us that such a bureau hangs on tenaciously through organized pressure long after having served its purpose. Setting up a system of Federal aid in addition to failing to give assistance to a great many States including Massachusetts, could result only in another great bureau—which would spend a very substantial percentage of its funds in administration and on propaganda, possibly setting up a dual system of public education in America as was feebly attempted in the thirties and might be more successfully attempted in the future, and ultimately tending toward collectivism or fascism and moving away from our traditional American heritage of a decentralized government and State control of public education.

Regardless of the merits of Federal aid, however, and the extent to which it could lead to the destruction of freedom in education, the basic fact which confronts public education in Massachusetts is that this Commonwealth could receive from a Federal fund for education only a fraction of the amount it would need to contribute to that fund. While this would be financially beneficial to Mississippi it not only would necessitate a greater tax on the citizens of Massachusetts and thus would add to this Commonwealth's financial burden, but in no substantial way would it contribute to the solution of Massachusetts' need for greater funds for public education.

Unless Federal taxes are reduced the individual States will be hard put to it to find sources or resources for additional income which are necessary if public education is to hold its hard-earned gains and maintain its present standards, let alone improve them.

A special commission appointed by President Truman to study the question of compulsory military training, under the chairmanship of President Compton, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has reported its recommendations. The two most important are as follows:

First, that unless compulsory military service were necessary all the arguments in its favor would not justify it.

Secondly, that compulsory military training is necessary for America's safety.

The only logical and patriotic deduction to make from the two conclusions of the commission is that if compulsory military training is proved to be necessary, we should have it and that if it isn't necessary, we should not have it.

To date the commission has not attempted to prove to the public that compulsory military training is necessary. However, in recommending it the commission has set up a broad educational program under Army and Navy supervision.

This has caused a very slight degree of apprehension among some educators. However, this week's recommendation of another of President Truman's commissions—namely, that on higher education—recommending nearly $2,000,000,000 of Federal aid to publicly supported colleges with the commission's admitting it expects the program will eliminate the small colleges and universities throughout America which are are unable to keep pace with their publicly endowed competitors, greatly increases the degree of apprehension and concern. When it is realized what an important factor these small colleges and universities have been in helping to make America what it is today, and as one observes the ever-increasing tendency and attempt to centralize more and more the control of life's activities with the Federal Government, Federal aid to public education becomes a potential threat to our traditional freedom in education. The public-school classrooms of America have kept free from political propaganda and indoctrination down through the decades, under State control, of course. "The power to tax is the power to destroy" could not be better illustrated than in the attempt to have the Federal Government use the tax resources that should rightly stay within the domain of the State, and subsequently set up a dual system of education in America in which collectivism would eventually dominate by so reducing State tax resources for public education to virtually eliminate State control of education. The Federal Government will be the more powerful factor in confiscating sources of taxation, particularly the income tax unless America insists on retaining a decentralized government with State control of public education.

In the long run the American people will insist on a high standard of free public education, but without State aid the teaching profession and public education itself are destined to experience a serious set-back.

Greater State aid to public education, therefore, warrants the immediate study and ultimate support of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

Colorado River Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I have used the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to criticize Mr. William E. Warne and the Department of Interior for what I believed and still believe is only serving the purpose of propaganda against us in southern California at this time, I consider it no more than fair to allow Mr. Warne access to the same medium for presenting his case for refuting by contentions.

My contention has been that a statement such as Mr. Warne made and his arguments reiterated in his following letter merely incites opposition to California in the legislation which will be coming before Congress in the near future on the subject of the water controversy on the Colorado River.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1948.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. POULSON: When it comes to free and easy assignment of motives, I think you excel in your comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 17 on the proposal to begin the study of how to get more water for California.

You are not only putting words in my mouth but are berating me for them when you say that I attempt to distract attention from California's legitimate rights in the Colorado River. Surely it is clear that such is not the case because of the work that I

have done on such projects as the All-American Canal, the Coachella Canal, and the San Diego aqueduct and my efforts in behalf of settlement of the controversies over Colorado River water.

Let me state again what my proposal, which you deride and oppose, is, much as I have done in an address on March 19 before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress here in Washington.

The proposal is as follows:

The United States will not be well served by permitting any of its western water resources to waste.

The wealth that the waters of the western rivers will create through their use on the land and through their use by cities and towns will be needed in the decades to come. I think it is not so much a question of taking water from the Columbia River as it is of finding suitable places outside the Columbia Basin to employ the resource that is represented by the waters of the Columbia River that are in excess of the needs of that great basin.

California has so many advantages otherwise that I am convinced that the State will in the end use a part of the water of the Columbia and in doing so aid in the creation of the sources of things that are basically needed to maintain the whole population of the West and of the United States.

Interbasin development in the West has been started in the Metropolitan Water District Project in southern California, in the Colorado-Big Thompson Reclamation Project in Colorado, and in several projects in Utah and elsewhere.

The drought of recent months has brought home to all the perilous position of California and Arizona. Nevertheless, there is still water to be conserved in streams in California that presently are uncontrolled. And, also, half the water of the Colorado River flows unused to the Gulf of California, even now. But, with all of the waters of and available to California controlled in multiple-purpose reservoirs, there will still be need for additional water if continued growth is to be assured. The point has been reached at which we can dimly see the lowering of the ceiling on growth in the West by complete utilization of the waters.

I repeat, all of the water resources of and now available to California, must be salvaged. Even when that is done, however, it now seems evident that growth is likely to out-run water supply in 20 years or so.

The great Columbia of the Pacific Northwest annually discharges to the ocean more water than all of the other western streams combined, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, Colorado, Rio Grande, and the miscellaneous streams all the way from southern California to northern Washington.

In fact, this great river discharges on the average more than 160,000,000 acre-feet of water to the Pacific Ocean after all present consumptive uses are deducted. Obviously all of this water cannot be used in the Columbia River Basin. It would, in fact, irrigate 40,000,000 acres—more than twice as much as is now irrigated in the whole United States. Suitable lands in this quantity are not available in the area drained by the Columbia.

Diversion of Columbia River water southward is not too enormous a concept, nor is it too fantastic. It is simply 20 or 30 years in the future. This problem, of course, should be approached with the understanding that any waters taken south should be diverted below Bonneville Dam, the last point of use in the Columbia River Basin. We have the engineering skill to solve such a problem today. I think the time is near at hand to begin serious preliminary planning in order to determine feasibilities and requirements.

Attention as well should be given to other means of procuring suitable water for the use of cities and the irrigation of lands. The first faint stirrings of interest in these have recently become apparent, as note a bill introduced in the Congress to provide for experiments in reclamation of sea water.

The consideration of long-range plans for the solution of these water problems that we know to exist and which we must eventually face squarely should not be confused today with the short-range objectives of localities that are involved. To do so can only serve to lull the people into a false sense of a water security that does not exist. The short-range objectives, such as full use of the waters of the Colorado River and settlement of interstate controversies involving the stream, should be pursued diligently, of course.

I have received a letter or two from California on the subject. One says that the Columbia River Basin ought to use its own waters (even though that happens to be impossible because of the enormity of the supply), and that southern California should not accept growth and additional population because this tends to cause difficulties.

He concludes: "Anyway, why encourage the footloose horde to roll in and smother the old inhabitants with their roots in this region. Both groups lose in the transition."

I have too high a sense of the destiny of California, my home State for 34 years, to accept any such a philosophy.

I should think that the one agency, the Department of the Interior, that has consistently worked for use of western water and development of the West, southern California, and elsewhere, would be deserving of a more careful hearing than that given, and its position entitled to support.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary.

Communism in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter addressed by Mr. William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of Economic Affairs, dated October 2, 1946, to Admiral W. W. Smith. This letter is of particular interest at this time because it shows conclusively that we were demanding that the Chinese Government set up a coalition government before certain aid would be granted them. A coalition government meant that the Communists would have to be taken into the present government of China before aid would be given. Does this look like the administration and the State Department have been trying to stop the spread of communism?

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 2, 1946.

Admiral W. W. SMITH,
Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL SMITH: I refer to your letter of September 5, 1946, asking the views of the State Department with respect to the extension by the Maritime Commission of a credit to China of $76,000,000 for the purchase of 159 war-built vessels under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946.

The Department of State has no objection to the negotiation and conclusion of a credit for the above purpose. Such an arrangement would be in line with the general policy of this Government to assist in the rehabilitation of essential aspects of the Chinese economy. In accordance with general policy toward credit assistance to China, however, the Department requests that any transfer of war-built commercial-type vessels to China on a credit basis be subject to the following proviso:

"It is the desire of the United States Government that these commercial-type vessels be destined for a united and democratic China under a coalition government. It is, therefore, understood by the Chinese Government that if it appears to be in the best interests of the United States, the latter may discontinue the transfer of these vessels."

The Department of State will promptly inform the Maritime Commission if at any time it appears to be in the best interests of the United States to terminate or suspend such transfers, and requests that it be kept currently informed of the status of transfers of ships being purchased. The Department is also interested in developments concerning the terms of such credit arrangement as may be negotiated with China.

Sincerely yours,

WM. L. CLAYTON,
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs.

Proudly We Present

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a full-page advertisement extolling the McQueen Athletic Club. This was carried in the Butte (Mont.) Standard on March 24, 1948, and is one of a series of articles sponsored by Butte businessmen and friends of McQueen addition.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the outstanding achievements in fellowship and sports by the real Americans who belong to the McQueen Club. I know practically every one of its members, and I have the highest regard for all of them. I am proud to call them my friends and to be their Representative in the Congress of the United States. Their devotion to their community, to Butte, to Montana, and to the United States marks them as citizens of the highest caliber, and they are a real asset to our country. To all the members of the McQueen Athletic Club and to the residents of McQueen addition, I want to say I am proud of you, and I wish you every success in the future. You deserve it.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

PROUDLY WE PRESENT!—THOSE WHO FOSTER A CONTINUALLY EXPANDING YOUTH PROGRAM—MCQUEEN ATHLETIC CLUB

CURRENT OFFICERS OF THE M'QUEEN A. C.

Anthony Mihelich, president; Clarence Dunstan, vice president; R. A. Boksich, treasurer; Angelo Quilici, cashier; Louis Spear, financial secretary; Mark Petritz, recording secretary; Michael Mihelich, Sergeant-at-Arms; Selwyn Davis, trustee; Nick Fabatz, trustee; Peter Kovasich, trustee.

MARKING THE TWENTY-NINTH BIRTHDAY OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

The story of the McQueen Athletic Club, the headquarters of which is now located at 2124 Yew Street, in the heart of the McQueen addition, dates back to 1919. At that time a group of young men organized, elected officers and launched a recreational program which has made McQueen addition one of the most active suburbs of the Butte district. Of the first officers, Frank Thomas, president, Nick Spear, vice president; Rudy Klune, secretary; Dan Orlich, treasurer, and Charles Pesdark, Sergeant-at-Arms, only Pesdark is not now affiliated with the club. From 1919 to 1924 the club enjoyed rapid growth but it was after 1944 when the club acquired its present holdings that membership really soared to the 262 members on the roster today. In February 1946 the club incorporated under the laws of Montana as a nonprofit organization with its objective the promotion of athletic activities and community life of the McQueen area.

ACTIVE IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Although primarily an athletic organization, the McQueen A. C. takes an active part in all programs of the McQueen addition. Each year the club sponsors a Christmas party for the children of the district, and each Christmas more than 500 gifts are distributed during a party held beneath the large community tree which is erected annually across the street from the club rooms. The club's annual picnic is another entertainment highlight, as is the New Year's Eve party.

"M'QUEEN ADDITION IS TO BUTTE WHAT BROOKLYN IS TO NEW YORK"

Someone has said that "McQueen addition is to Butte what Brooklyn is to New York City." The statement has an element of noisy truth; men, women, and children follow McQueen teams with the same devotion that residents of Flatbush bestow upon their beloved Dodgers. And McQueen teams justly deserve such backing. City league baseball championships were won by the club in 1935, 1937, 1939, 1942, and in 1945 the suburbanites captured the Copper League flag.

The McQueen juniors won the 1929 Junior Independent league football title, the 1931 baseball title, and the same year, the junior city independent basketball championship.

The Knights of Columbus junior independent basketball title was won by a McQueen team in 1932. Bowling honors were won in the 825 division in the city tournament in 1945.

With the largest membership in its history, it looks as if the club's plans for the building of a gymnasium and bowling alleys seems but a matter of time, but regardless of time, one thing is certain, the McQueen Athletic Club can be counted upon to maintain its record in Mining city sport circles.

The Opportunities for Peace Have Not Been Exhausted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, war is not inevitable. The opportunities for peace have not been exhausted. Armed conflict is, however, more likely each day the United States delays the implementation of a positive, active program of militant opposition to the spread of communism.

The aggressive program of the Russian Government to spread its terroristic totalitarianism over the world is a direct threat to world peace and stability. It must be so recognized. It must be stopped. The choice of method is not and cannot be altogether ours, but our course is clear:

First. We must give economic assistance of the nature suggested in the Marshall plan.

Second. We must actively participate in strengthening the United Nations.

Third. We must mobilize and maintain a military strength of operational and combat efficiency sufficient to destroy any nation or groups of nations with which war is possible in the foreseeable future. To accomplish this requires calm but determined American people who understand the issues, the calculated risk, and the material cost. Such a program will, I believe, insure peace.

Peace is not a luxury today, and it cannot be overshadowed by political considerations or accomplished according to the most desirable plan. There is no new crisis or new enemy. Only the situation is different. Totalitarianism has been and is our threat and will be our threat until it is destroyed. We can no longer speak of it in diplomatic terms and hushed tones, hoping against hope that it will fade as a mirage.

The European recovery program will pass the House this week. Then we will take up the mobilization program. Its objective is to insure military strength which we will not need, pray God, rather than to have military weakness in time of great need. All of us realize the great responsibility attached to such an undertaking.

Our objective is peace. A straightforward, realistic program is, I believe, our best assurance. We still have an opportunity for peace and freedom. No people have ever had more.

Shortly before the Easter holidays, my able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, made a trip home to talk to the people he represents in this Congress.

He walked the streets of the towns and villages in his central Texas district, listening, talking, answering questions, and asking questions himself. He was greatly impressed by the fact that wherever he went the same question was asked over and over, "Can we have peace?"

On the night of March 25, Mr. Gene Cagle, able and public-spirited manager of the Texas State Network, agreed that Mr. JOHNSON could go on the air and give his answer to that great and all-important question. Other stations throughout the State joined with TSN to carry the broadcast, realizing how deeply interested every Texas citizen is in this terrible problem of keeping the peace.

I am impressed with the clarity, timeliness and character of Mr. JOHNSON'S statement. It will be helpful to all who read it. I particularly commend it to veterans. They hate war. It is a message all Texas veterans should read—indeed, every veteran in the United States should read it. In these days when we hear so much double-talk on all sides, when we see so many men in public life afraid to speak out frankly and boldly and with courage, the honesty of LYNDON JOHNSON'S brand of statesmanship revives faith in the greatness of this free land.

LYNDON JOHNSON understands freedom. He understands that it has no value unless it is used. He has used his freedom to speak what he believes, and what I believe, is truth. Yes, and he understands that freedom must be defended and fought for—and it is as certain as the day is long that we will have to fight again unless we are prepared now.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. JOHNSON'S speech, America in the World Today.

AMERICA IN THE WORLD TODAY

My fellow Texans, Sunday morning I came home to talk with the people of my district. I've talked with farmers, merchants, workingmen, businessmen. With mothers and with ministers. With young men subject to selective service, or universal military training. Knowing that I am the senior Texas member on the House Armed Services Committee and a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, people have asked me: "Are we going to war?" "If so, when and why?"

Some folks said, "Is this situation really bad, or is it war hysteria for political purposes?"

THE ANSWER IS "NO"

My purpose is to discuss those questions. I believe that when you realize the facts of the world situation, you will take the needful steps which will make the answer "No" to the question, Are we going to war?

Was this crisis dreamed up for political purposes? For the honest answer, get out your map of Europe. Compare it with the prewar map. No American plotted the fall of Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Albania. Washington did not engineer the conquest of Czechoslovakia. At this moment Finland sits at a table in the Kremlin, trying to make the best of a bad bargain. What Finland does may determine the fate of Sweden and Norway. A few days ago, only 16 votes kept a free France from becoming a Communist France. Twenty-four days from today the elections in Italy will influence the fate of every nation touching the Mediterranean. We have been told to get out of Germany. Civil war rages in China. Guerrillas have Greece on her knees. Stalin is marching as Hitler marched, repeating chapter by chapter, verse by verse. Each day the iron curtain hides a larger portion of the world. If we continue to do nothing, what will happen? One day we'll wake up in a world in which the Western Hemisphere is a lonely island, and all the rest of mankind is behind the iron curtain.

COULD BE MAJOR TRAGEDY

How can a reasonable man believe the situation of our world today was manufactured for political purposes? It is unfortunate that a dictator's big push should come in our election year. If that coincidence should influence our decisions, it will be a major tragedy—perhaps one from which our civilization will never recover.

If we accept the facts as they are, what can we do?

To help you decide, get your pencil and paper. Take down these figures as I read them. At the top of one column write, Russia. At the top of the other write, America.

Now, write down: Russia today has more than 4,000,000 men in her army. America has 540,000. Next, put down: Russia is building 8 to 12 thousand planes a year. America is building 1,800. Now write down: Russia is spending $20,000,000,000 a year to

make herself invincible. We are spending between ten and eleven.

Now some other information I think Texans need and are entitled to. After VJ-day, when all of us looked forward to a peaceful world, we asked our military men what the minimum needs were in times of peace. In times of peace. Now write down three columns on your tablet. The first column is our minimum needs. The second column: Today's actual strength. The third column is our peacetime shortage. Now the figures: The peacetime strength of our Army should be 670,000. Today it is 540,000. The Army is short 130,000.

The peacetime Air Force should be 401,000. We have 364,000. The Air Force is short 37,000.

The goal for the Navy was 552,000. We have 397,000. The Navy is short 155,000.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND MEN SHORT

Add up the third column. Three hundred and twenty-two thousand men short of minimum peacetime needs.

Talk over these figures with your family and take them to bed with you and pray over them. This is no time for hysteria, nor fright, nor politics. It is time to prepare to keep out of world war III.

Let's be honest about our last two wars. Let's admit that we were not ready for World War I, but nevertheless we were forced to fight it. Bryan said, "Don't listen to warmongers;" the Kaiser heard him and believed we wouldn't fight. The America Firsters, the peace in our timers, and the Coughlins screamed when our President recommended 50,000 planes and an army of 5,000,000. Hitler heard them. He thought we wouldn't fight. He persuaded Hirohito to destroy our Navy at Pearl Harbor.

CRYING "WARMONGER" AGAIN

Today we are again told that preparedness leads to war. The cry of "warmonger" is once again in the land. What shall we answer? Shall we make the same mistake a third time? And this time at the very probable cost of our civilization?

While we're talking of warmongering, let's get this clear. If anybody fears, hates, and despises war, it's the man who has fought a war and will fight the next one if it comes. That man wants to keep out of war more than anybody else. Who is recommending preparedness? The same men to whom yesterday we entrusted the lives of our 12,000,000 fighting men. Our Secretary of State, General Marshall; our Secretary of Defense, Forrestal; our Secretary for Air, Symington; our Chief of Staff, General Bradley, our Chief of the Air Staff, General Spaatz, and our Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Denfeld.

These men are not running for office. They know the strength of other nations. They know our strength. They want to avoid war. What do they say? They say, In the name of all the boys who died needlessly, don't make the mistakes we made in World War I. Don't make the mistakes we made in World War II.

DO THESE THINGS

They say, do these things:

One. Speedily enact the European recovery program. Today we have few strong friends in the world. We must help them to recover their strength.

Two. Build up the world's best air corps.

Three. Even in an atomic air war we must have bases and ground operations, and an Army.

How can we do these things?

Recruiting for 2 years has failed. The alternative is selective service. As it has been proposed, it would apply to all single men aged 19 to 25, excepting veterans of World War II. The terms of service would be 18 months. An estimated 3,000,000 men are eligible. From them perhaps a half million would volunteer and 220,000 would be drafted.

VETERANS KNOW NEEDS

You men between 19 and 25: I know you don't want the Army as a career; nor do your parents. Neither did they want their boys in the jungles of New Guinea, nor in the skies over Berlin. The 12,000,000 who fought know that we must be prepared. They feel that if their younger brother can buy peace with 18 months of selective service, it will be cheap indeed. To reject selective service now may mean selective service for years to come—or perhaps slavery.

The next step our military leaders urge is universal military training. Some of our finest citizens say, in our air-atomic age, we won't need a foot-soldier army, so why universal military training? I wish I could believe what they say. I wish it with all my heart. Why must our boys have the military training and the discipline proposed in the bill now before the Congress?

Let us suppose that an atomic bomb is dropped on Washington. The President and his Cabinet; our military leaders and planners; the entire Congress—all are gone. We have no plan for a provisional government. The governors of 48 States would desperately attempt to defend their borders. They must have men trained for just such an emergency. Otherwise, panic and hysteria would rule.

UMT NOT ARMY DUTY

Does UMT mean induction into the Army? It does not. The bill proposes that young men of 18 shall receive training for 6 months, spending another 6 months in specialized training such as in the National Guard or some other organized unit. They are not liable to Army duty. They are not compelled to bear arms except in a National emergency or war.

It's unpleasant for a young man to leave home. But it's better to go away for 6 months than to go for 6 years—or go forever.

I have heard the evidence and weighed the risks. I have and will support the Marshall plan; the world's greatest Air Force; selective service; and universal military training.

Now a final thought. In two wars we were unprepared and divided. Let's prepare now. Let's mobilize our men, our industry, and our brains. By using every means at our disposal, including the United Nations, let's avoid another war.

LET'S NOT FORGET

How short is our memory. How soon we forget. To make us less forgetful, somewhere there should be a tablet of enduring bronze and on it inscribed two columns of names in everlasting letters. Above one column would read the inscription: Here are the names of those who refused to prepare. Here are the names of those who voted to send our Army home. Here are the names of those who thought our European friends beggars and tramps. Here are the names of those who voted against selective service, against the Marshall plan, and said Communists wrote it, and against UMT. That would be the heading of the first column. And on the other side would be eight short words, "here are the names of those who died."

If what I have said makes sense, let me hear from you. Take time to give me your reactions. I hope you will study the facts, ponder over them, pray over them, as I have done. What happens to our country must be decided in homes across the Nation, like yours and mine. It's not always easy to decide.

THE BEAR STALKS NOW

As we Americans debate these issues, the great Russian bear, a bear who walks like a man, is stalking across Europe; and to every citizen of that unhappy continent, a bear on the back door step is much more persuasive than an eagle across an ocean. His shadow falls across the snipers in the Grecian mountains; across the ballot boxes of Italy; and stretches out to the first home of freedom, England. Where the great bear's shadow touches, all else is blotted out.

If Italy is lost, Greece will be cut off and Turkey isolated. The bell has tolled for Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia. It is tolling for Finland, Norway, Sweden. Each toll of the bell brings closer the day when it could toll for you and for me.

SPEAK OUT FRANKLY AND BOLDLY

There is a time to keep silence and a time to speak. The time for Americans to speak is here.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting a letter received from a constituent, who I am sure expresses the view of the majority of the American people.

The writer of this letter is a very intelligent woman whose ideals and background dig deep into American pioneer traditions. Her lifetime has been spent in building up her community and State. Certainly she has been far removed from any social contact or influence that would cause her to think other than in the interest of her own home and country.

ST. GEORGE, UTAH, *March 24, 1948.*

Representative WALTER K. GRANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRANGER: As I see it, democracy means that an ordinary citizen has a certain responsibility in keeping informed on Government action and in expressing his views with regard to Government policy. So deeply do I feel about the proposed universal military training and the peacetime draft, that I must get it off my chest. I hope you won't mind.

If the present crisis is so great, why do we begin wrong end to? Production is much more important than men in war—then why do we not begin with bringing industry into line? In the kind of war which we will face next, technicians and scientists are much more important than 18-year-old boys herded together and marched around. If we need more men in the Army, why not offer inducement that will enable those who do go in to do so on their own volition? To me it seems that the proposed universal military training and the peacetime draft are in direct opposition to our American tradition.

The Russian people, I believe, fear us far more than we need fear them. They see our policy as one of imperialism; they think we want to manage the elections the world over; they accuse us of being responsible for the use of poison gas in the fighting in Greece. Whether or not these accusations are true is not so important as that they think they are true. Can we not disillusion them in some way short of killing them off, and millions of our own people at the same time?

As the most powerful Nation in the world, we hold in our hands the future of the white race. Would it not be a mark of courage on our part to insist upon peaceable, sensible approaches to understanding? Would it not be a sign of strength to insist upon a conference, even if we had to go all the way in the matter of where it is to be held?

This Stalin, these Russian people, are the same ones who held the line for us until we could gather our forces, who saved what little of Europe was saved. Not so long ago we had unlimited praise for them. As we fought together then, may we not at least talk together now, rather than assume a bullying, name-calling attitude?

Why cannot somebody somewhere in high places have the vision to see that we, too, must change our attitude now before we are committed to a policy from which we cannot turn back. Now is so important.

How can we make our leaders sense that the people want peace, that it is their business, first, last, and all the time to work for peace. Sectional intefests, private interests—nothing else is important in the face of this.

The common experiences of life, in the home and among neighbors and communities, should teach us all that we can gain peace only in the ways of peace and with the tools of peace; that a blustering, swaggering, tough attitude only engenders the same reaction in the other party, when things might be changed by a different approach.

I think that before any man should help to turn us toward war he should be forced to visit all the veterans' hospitals in the country and become conscious again of what the last one did.

But I run on too long. Please forgive me. As the mother of so many sons, I cannot but be concerned with legislation which will change the whole course of their lives. I can do so little about it; nothing, really, except protest. That is why I cannot be honest with myself unless I register my protest in the best way I can, blundering as it is.

Sincerely,

JUANITA BROOKS.

The Common Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Rev. William C. Kernan, entitled "The Common Defense," which appeared in the March 1948 issue of the Metropolitan Star, an official publication of the Metropolitan Council, B'nai B'rith, New York, N. Y.:

THE COMMON DEFENSE

(By Rev. William C. Kernan)

Our attention is properly called to the divisive tactics of Fascists in America to weaken our unity by stirring up hatred between racial and religious groups.

Not enough attention is paid to the same kind of tactics which Communists employ to destroy our unity by arousing class hatred. Yet, capitalists everywhere are presented to us in Communist propaganda as corporation criminals, oppressors, and imperialists—the evident intent being to prejudice as many people as possible against those who are described as belonging to the capitalist class.

The fact is, of course, that those who work for the common good of America are to be found in every class, as they are to be found in every race and religion. It was, for example, a businessman, Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric, who was chairman of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. Again, it was a group of businessmen, under the chairmanship of Oren Root, Jr., which recently sent a telegram to Congress declaring that the great majority of American employers believe in nondiscrimination in employment, and stating further that employers realize job bias is undemocratic and un-American.

According to the Communists, capitalists are not supposed to be interested in such things as the right of a man to work regardless of his race, religion, color, or national origin. What a gross misrepresentation that is. For, in the group which petitioned Congress for passage of the Ives bill against discrimination in employment are Henry R. Luce, Nelson Rockefeller, Spyros P. Skouras, Eric Johnston, Beardsley Ruml, and Herbert Bayard Swope.

So, while we do battle for Americanism and brotherhood against the Fascists who deal in racial and religious prejudice, let us fight as valiantly for the same ends against the Communists whose propaganda is aimed at destroying our unity by arousing class against class and making them hate one another.

In all cases, the rules to follow are the same: 1. Accept—or reject—people on their individual worth. 2. Don't listen to, or spread, rumors against a race, or a religion, or a class. 3. Speak up, wherever you are, at home, in business, in school, labor, church, or social groups—against prejudice, for understanding.

Universal Military Training Mass Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, 1948, in Atlanta, Ga., the veterans of Georgia, led by my good friend Paul Ginsberg, commander of the Department of Georgia, Jewish War Veterans, held a mass meeting and demonstration, urging the adoption of universal military training, as a measure to insure peace.

The Georgia veterans UMT committee had as its chairman Mr. Paul Ginsberg, with my good friends, Dr. W. E. Burdine, commander, Department of Georgia, American Legion, and C. Flannery Pope, commander, Department of Georgia, Veterans of Foreign Wars, as vice chairmen.

This was an outstanding meeting, with well known national exponents of universal military training participating in the program, and I think that the example set by Georgia veterans should be followed in other of our States. For this reason I should like to extend my remarks to cover in detail the events as they transpired, which should prove beneficial to other veteran and civic groups who desire such an undertaking.

The veterans organizations of Georgia, in cooperation with many civic organizations of Atlanta, held a mass meeting and demonstration, urging the adoption of universal military training, as a measure to insure peace, with its theme "we are calling on Congress to insure peace through UMT."

This meeting was sponsored by the Jewish War Veterans, Department of Georgia; the American Legion, Department of Georgia; Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Georgia; Disabled American Veterans, Department of Georgia; AMVETS, Department of Georgia; Military Order of World Wars; Marine Corps League; Reserve Officers Association; Air Reserve Association; Atlanta Barbed Wire Club; Fleet Reserve Association; Reserve Officers' Naval Services; Naval Reserve Officers' Association; United Spanish War Veterans; the participating civic organizations being the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce; the Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce; Atlanta Lions Clubs; Kiwanis Club of Atlanta; and the Atlanta Lodge, No. 78, BPO Elks.

The program was presided over by Mr. Paul Ginsberg, commander, Department of Georgia, Jewish War Veterans. Rev. Courteney Oakes, chaplain of the Department of Georgia, American Legion, delivered the invocation, which was followed by the singing of the national anthem and the salute to the flag. Hon. M. E. Thompson, Governor of Georgia, was the first speaker. He favored UMT, stating: "I favor UMT if I knew there would never be another war." He was followed by the Honorable William B. Hartsfield, mayor of Atlanta, who likewise favored UMT. Hon. Blake R. Van Leer, president of the Georgia School of Technology, was the next speaker on the program, followed by the Army UMT expert, Brig.-Gen. Josef R. Sheetz, commanding general of the experimental UMT unit, at Fort Knox, Ky. General Sheetz gave a thorough outline of the training procedure that is being carried on at Fort Knox and the procedure that would be used under the UMT program.

Admiral L. R. DuBose, commandant of the Sixth Naval District of Charleston, S. C., gave a stirring address. He declared that UMT is conceived as a cold, practical means to protect our very lives. He warned that another Pearl Harbor in this atomic era might spell national disaster if our military puncl is too little or too late. He emphatically warned that, should war come again, we might have only 1 hour to prepare.

Maj. Gen. Edward P. King, Jr., retired, our hero of Bataan, and himself a prisoner of war, who was charged with the heartbreaking task of surrendering our forces on Bataan to the Japanese, arose and offered himself as a horrible example of the results of unpreparedness. General King spoke with feeling, as he told what it means to send untrained men into battle. His plea rang true.

Paul Ginsberg, commander of the department of Georgia, Jewish War Veterans, and chairman of the meeting, opened the rally by declaring that Representative LEO ALLEN, Republican, Illinois, is keeping the UMT bill off the floor of the House and called upon Representative ALLEN to let the measure be brought out for a congressional vote, and a democratic discussion in this democratic country where the will of the people could be heard and carried forth.

A combat motion picture, featuring captured Japanese newsreel films, and showing the invasion of Bataan and Corregidor, the capture of our forces, death march of Bataan, and a detailed account of the Battle of Manila, was the closing feature of the program.

Among the distinguished guests present on the rostrum were: Brig. Gen. Alpha Fowler, adjutant general of Georgia; Brig. Gen. George Finch, commanding general, Fifty-fourth Fighter Wing; Col. Donald Spicer, commanding officer, United States Marine Corps; Capt. Edward S. Addison, United States Navy; Col. Jack Gillespie, United States Army; Capt. George Griffin, commanding officer, United States Naval Reserve; Dr. George Sparks, director, University of Georgia, Atlanta division; and Earle Cocke, Jr., national defense chairman, American Legion, of Georgia.

Gov. M. E. Thompson acted as host at a buffet supper given at the Governor's Mansion, for the speakers and the distinguished guests. The YAARAB temple Shrine "Million Dollar" band furnished the music.

It is respectfully submitted, that meetings such as this, are good investments in patriotism. That veterans and civic organizations throughout the country, should follow the lead set by the Georgia veterans.

I want to particularly commend most highly, the efforts of Paul Ginsberg, who first conceived the idea of this mass meeting, and devoted a considerable amount of time and effort to make this rally a success. Mr. Ginsberg is a veteran of World War II, having served with distinction in the southwest Pacific where he received several awards. He was permanently injured as a result of enemy action and was retired as a captain. He is active in veterans affairs, also being commander of the Betty Harrison Jones, chapter 1, Disabled American Veterans, the sixth largest DAV chapter in the United States, and is also national junior vice-commander of the Disabled American Veterans organization, and a past commander of another veterans organization in Atlanta.

He is the type of patriotic citizen who deserves recognition and has always led the fight for justice for those who have sacrificed their youth and part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

Mr. Ginsberg is a leader, and believer that faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performances, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate, that they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying high tribute to the leadership, ability and integrity of one of Georgia's heroes, outstanding veterans and a leading citizen of the Atlanta community, Mr. Paul Ginsberg.

Barnyard Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Robert J. Sullivan, staff correspondent of the Wall Street Journal from Ramona, Calif., located in one of the Nation's largest turkey-producing areas. He explains in detail, the results of governmental regulations, in the turkey industry. In this, as in numerous other instances, these regulations often produce the very conditions they were intended to forestall. The article is here quoted:

BARNYARD ECONOMICS—EGG SCARCITY AT EASTER FORESHADOWS SHORTAGE OF THANKSGIVING TURKEY—GROWERS SLEW LAYING HENS WHEN "POULTRYLESS THURSDAY" DEPRESSED PRICES—SIX MILLION FEWER GOBBLERS

(By Robert J. Sullivan)

RAMONA, CALIF.—Thanksgiving, 1948, appears likely to go on the history books as the day of the great turkey shortage.

This minor national calamity can be blamed on a current crisis in egg supply. Or, if you wish to trace it back a bit, you may blame last autumn's poultryless Thursday proclamation which climaxed other unfortunate economic events.

Gobbler growers from coast to coast calculate they'll raise 6,000,000 fewer of the tasty birds than last year. The estimated crop of about 28,500,000 turkeys will be the smallest in 10 years, and 36 percent below the record 44,200,000 birds produced in 1945.

But there'll be no corresponding reduction in prices. On the contrary, turkey men forecast, consumers can count on paying at least 65 cents a pound for dressed tom turkeys, compared with last year's average of 50 cents a pound. The shortage of turkeys, plus a probably smaller supply of red meat next fall, will put premiums on the big birds.

Meantime, the public's taste for turkey meat is rising. Last year, United States consumption hit a record 650,000,000 pounds, or more than 4.5 pounds per capita. By contrast, in 1939 some 393,000,000 pounds were served on United States dinner tables, or about 3 pounds per capita.

Behind these barnyard economics is a string of events which have kept turkey men in a tizzy for 2 years.

TURKEYS ON ICE

Their troubles began in 1945 and 1946, when more turkeys were produced than the public wanted to eat. Result: Cold-storage facilities of packing houses, wholesalers, and retailers were jammed with birds. By January 1, 1947, some 128,000,000 pounds of turkeys were on ice. That was nearly double normal inventories of 70,000,000 pounds on the same date of an average prewar year. Today warehouses hold about 69,000,000 pounds of cold-storage turkeys.

Then last fall along came poultryless Thursday (better known as black Thursday here in Ramona) to knock the last props from under the turkey market. With prices of wheat, corn, and barley, three chief turkey feeds, soaring to new heights, many turkey men said "What's the use" and quit the business.

Gobblers were slaughtered by the thousands last fall when turkey raisers could get only 25 to 30 cents a pound for birds that cost 31 cents to raise. Breeding hens as well as toms went under the ax as flocks were pared to economy size.

"But we carried the purge too far," says one grower, dolefully eyeing a row of empty nests. "When we killed the hen turkeys, we killed the birds who lay the golden eggs."

This year California turkey-egg producers will fall 15 percent to 20 percent short of filling all orders for hatching eggs.

California leads the Nation in producing eggs for sale to commercial raisers. Last year the State had a breeding-hen population of 650,000, producing 32,000,000 eggs. This year in California the number of hens will total about 390,000, and they'll produce only about 15,000,000 eggs. For the entire country breeding hens now total about 2,800,000, a third less than a year ago.

AN EGG-LAYING MOOD

Southern California has no monopoly on turkey-egg production, but its semitropical climate puts turkeys in a mood to produce more eggs per hen than anywhere else.

These eggs are shipped all over the Nation for hatching by commercial raisers in the spring. The biggest markets are in States like Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and New York where cold winter weather is a drawback to turkey raising. Most growers in cold weather areas market their entire flocks before winter sets in, and depend on California, Texas and one or two other southern States to supply them with new broods each spring.

But because slaughter of turkeys last fall was extra heavy, demand for the smaller supply of eggs this spring is running far out of bounds.

As a typical example of turkey raisers' clamor for eggs, J. H. Maxwell, hatchery superintendent of the Ramona Cooperative Turkey Producers Association, cites this experience:

"Last week a hatcher in Pennsylvania telephoned to plead with me for more eggs. He said he had ordered 12,000 eggs a week from a producer in northern California and he was getting only 2,000. Could we supply the rest? We broke down and agreed to send him another couple of thousand. That is the best we could do."

This year producers estimate they could get about 45 cents apiece for eggs compared with 25 to 30 cents in 1946 and 1947. But the price is being held to about 35 cents per egg. That allows a net profit of about 8 cents per egg compared with an averaged prewar net of 4 cents.

HOLDING THE LINE IN EGG PROFITS

Growers here feel this year's profit is about in line with other industries. They point out their costs are double those in 1940, and that most breeders lost money on every egg sold last year.

Board and room for a turkey now comes to about $1 a month; before the war it was around 50 cents a month. The big factor in the increase is feed costs. They still are near last year's peak despite recent declines in grain prices.

For instance, mash which sold for $2.25 a hundred pounds before the war is $6.50 now. Wheat has risen from $1.40 to $4.80. Barley is up from $1.25 a hundredweight to $4.50. Because nearly all feed has to be imported from Middle Western Grain States, feeding costs are higher here than in other turkey-producing areas.

One way to cut costs is to produce better turkeys, growers say. So they work steadily to breed a faster-maturing, more prolific, more disease-free species of bird.

Fast maturity means a big saving to growers. For example, Curtis Huntsinger, of San Fernando, one of California's leading progeny breeders, explains:

"In 5 or 6 years, by careful selection and mating of breeding stock, I expect to have

turkeys that will mature in 5½ months, a full month sooner than today's average bird. To a raiser of 5,000 birds that extra month will mean a saving of $5,000 in feed costs."

THE TREND TO BETTER BREEDS

Albert J. Mattlaack, manager of the Ramona Turkey Growers' Association and president of the American Turkey Federation, reports more growers are following the trend to efficiency breeding than at any time since the first white men ate turkey meat 450 years ago.

That was in 1498 when Spanish conquistadores encountered wild turkeys in Central American jungles. They carried some live birds back to Europe and began breeding the first domesticated turkeys. A century later New England settlers brought descendants of those first birds to the United States and began crossing them with a slightly different species found on the Atlantic seaboard.

Today there are six chief varieties of that original strain: the Bronze, Bourbon, Red, Narrangansett, White Holland, Black and Slate.

The favorite modern-day turkey is the "broadbreasted" Bronze because of its larger size and weight; hens weigh about 15 pounds at maturity (24 to 28 weeks) and toms about 25 pounds.

It is this variety that breeders in California have set out to improve. Through careful selection of mating birds, turkey men say they are now in the process of developing a more buxom bird to lend eye appeal in the market. Under present State regulations a "broadbreasted" Bronze must measure at least 3½ inches across the breast. Critics say there is no more meat on this kind of turkey than on varieties with V-shaped breasts, but it looks better in the showcase.

One method of improving the breed is "trap-nesting." Registered pedigreed hens and toms are mated and a strict record kept of the offspring. When a pedigreed hen lays an egg she walks into a nest from which there is no escape until the producer has a chance to record the pedigreed parentage on her egg.

When these eggs are hatched, only the poults (baby turkeys) having the best qualities are kept for future breeding. Each successive brood turns out a little better than the previous one.

Increased egg production is one byproduct of these scientific breeding methods. Flocks are far more prolific than the average.

In 100 days the hen turkeys lay about 60 eggs each, compared with an average of 40 to 45 per hen in California. At least 48 of the well-bred eggs will hatch and produce turkeys, whereas only about 25 of the average hen's 40 to 45 eggs hatch.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from one of my constituents:

SATURDAY, THE 20TH.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARLESS: Don't take it to heart over the sob stories of some of the poor landlords. They have made more money on some of the old cow barns in and around Phoenix in the past 6 years than they did in 15 years prior to the war.

Shacks in Sunny Slope that rented during the winter months only have been renting 12 months out of the year since 1942. I know of a house that was built on the corner of Seventh Street and Vogel Avenue, Sunny Slope, that cost $1,650 to build and furnish; was rented for $25 per month. Quite a handsome profit on $1,600. This house was sold once for $4,500 and resold for $6,500. How much have taxes gone up in and around Phoenix on a house under $2,000—about $15 per year.

I know of a house near Glendale that rented for $33 per month before the war. When the shortage of houses came along, this house was sold for $5,000. The buyer lived in it for a while and rented it for $125 per month. The tenant after a while complained to the rent control board. It was reduced to $85 per month. That was entirely too much on a $5,000 investment.

The rent control boards have never failed to give a landlord an increase in rent if he could prove that he was entitled to it. What a harvest the landlords would reap if rent controls were taken off. Where would some of the Government retired employees get off on that bountiful $1,200 per year, which has stayed the same since 1930? They were granted a widow's pension a few days ago—that doesn't fill their stomach.

Yours respectfully,

SCOTT FURNISS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

P. S.—Please place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Easter—A Dave Kirk Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under privilege to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to include an editorial about the Easter season by David L. Kirk, editorial writer for the Spokane Chronicle.

Mr. Kirk is an unusually talented philosopher of the fourth estate. His editorial about Easter, 1948, makes thoughtful reading for every speculative citizen.

SOMEDAY ALL THE WORLD WILL HEED GENTLE VOICE

(By David L. Kirk)

The Christian world will pause again tomorrow to recall that death is a dream and that love is for aye.

In that sense Easter is an occasion for all the world to venerate, for the final incident which closes every life has been regarded too long as tragedy. Tomorrow we shall all say again that love is immortal.

More than 1,900 years have passed since the Roman soldiers gamed for the raiment of a Man who had died upon a cross between two thieves. He was dead, they said, and the world was through with an outcast. Materialism had triumphed over the things of the spirit with which this patient nonconformist had confounded the iron legions of the law.

Never again would the multitude be regaled with the inane idea that a man should love his enemies and do good to those who rose up against him. Men would be men again, nor follow the silly counsel to turn the other cheek when struck. They would strike back in the best traditions of Rome.

The Man who had babbled about going 2 miles with the person who compelled you to go one; was He not safe out of the way with all his unsound doctrines?

Poor bungling creatures, that was the best they knew!

More than 1,900 years have passed, and the Colosseum is crumbling into dust. The iron fist of Rome has failed, again and again, to batter down the slowly, steadily growing spiritual wall which mankind is building around his better self against the smiting of greed and hatred.

The man who emerged from the tomb from which the stone was rolled away has gathered about him followers by the millions in place of the humble little band of 12. Oh, there still are among them Judases who sell out for pieces of silver, Thomases who doubt, Peters who deny. But the great idea is growing with the centuries. Mankind is coming slowly to see that it does take more moral courage to turn the other cheek than to strike back, that the patient processes of kindness are mightier in the end than military legions.

We are still wrangling on the fields of international discord, but little by little the day is being won. One by one men are deserting the camps of force and going over to the conviction that love is not a thing to be talked of with apology, not a mechanism of the weak, but a gentle virtue of the strong.

Most of the civilized world has been won over to the doctrine of peace. A few men remain in positions of authority who still think that violence can found a lasting dynasty, but the numbers are massing so mightily against them that some day war will be impossible, just as the decent peoples of the world already have outlawed brawling on the streets. Possibly that day already is here.

If that consummation really has been attained, the 1,900 years of struggle and discouragement will have seemed worth while.

Tomorrow is a day for all the world to contemplate with hope, for it is a symbol of victory over the last enemy. And death is an enemy only in the finite thinking of man, for there is no good reason to believe that that part of the cycle of existence is not as good as the beginning. Our fears are founded on what we do not know.

This we know: That from the seed which falls to earth from the dying, withered stalk, new life springs into being with the springtime resurrection. All about us at Eastertime there are evidences of the reviving green of immortality.

It would be strange, indeed, if men were the only bit-player in the vast scheme of existence who did not respond to the waking call.

Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Armed Force, volume IV, No. 13, issue of March 27, 1948, publishers, Army and Navy Bulletin, Inc., 1600 Twentieth Street, NW., Washington 9, D. C.:

JUSTICE

The ever-increasing probability that, once again, thousands of the Nation's young men are going to be yanked suddenly out of the

familiar ways of civilian life and thrust into the military and naval establishments makes it all the more imperative that some of the points of friction which civilians encountered in the services during World War II be smoothed out as speedily as possible.

Well in the forefront of these irritants was military justice. Probably no one phase of military life was so incomprehensible to the average unindoctrinated civilian as the unique concept of justice held by career soldiers and sailors. Certainly nothing else stirred up such postdemobilization storms of protest and condemnation.

Beyond the general agreement that "something ought to be done about it," the basic issue still is far from a satisfactory solution. Without exception, every distinguished body of qualified experts appointed to study the problem and make recommendations has demanded that the system of military justice be removed from the chain of command. With equal tenacity, the careerists have insisted that this shall not de done. Thus far the military has prevailed.

Secretary of the Army Royall, himself an attorney of no mean attainment, successfully forestalled outside attempts to impose drastic modifications on the Army's justice by conceding that the system had certain flaws, but ascribing these to human imperfections rather than to any basic fault in the code. To his adroit handling of the issue can largely be credited the fact that the only pending legislation affecting the system, H. R. 2575, (passed by the House and awaiting action in the Senate), still confines the military justice system within the chain of command.

Now comes another body of lawyers, the special committee on military justice of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, to reopen the controversy and to insist that the existing court-martial system set forth in the Articles of War and the Manual of Courts-Martial contains basic defects which permit of grave abuses, despite a concession that, superficially, the system appears to be fair, impartial, and objective. As related in a news story elsewhere in this issue, the committee contends that neither the present system nor the reforms contemplated in the Elston bill (H. R. 2575) can achieve justice until the system is removed from the chain of command.

Citing the interlocking powers vested in command, the committee charges that: These powers have in the past and, unless checked, will in the future, too often expose the defendant to the mercies of command rather than the independent judgment of the court. Such a system is repugnant to every concept of American justice. It is surprising and a tribute to the character and sense of fair play of the officers of the armed forces, handicapped by a system designed to encourage indefensible interference, that it has so often resulted in approximate justice.

The committee, asserting that vesting in a single individual not only the power to review, but also the power to influence the court, the prosecution and the defense has never been tolerated in any civilized community, recommends that the judicial power be divorced from command and vested in officers peculiarly qualified to discharge the judicial function. They insist this would assure the right of a soldier to an impartial trial without impairing efficiency.

We happen to be in complete agreement with another finding of the committee that there is no particular merit in the provision in H. R. 2575 which would permit enlisted men to sit as members of courts-martial. Not only have we failed to encounter any overwhelming demand among enlisted personnel for this supposed "reform," but the few experiments attempted in this direction have failed to register any marked improvement in the administration of justice.

It seems highly improbable at the present writing that the Senate Armed Services Committee will override the objections of the military to the separation of justice from the command function. However, the New York group's query as to what possible justification exists for the retention of that power in command, if it be concededly wrong for command to exercise the power to influence the decisions of the court, still remains unanswered. It deserves an answer.

Regardless of the fate of pending legislation, it seems elemental that the importance of the issue, and the frictions which are bound inevitably to arise, warrants the adoption of the suggestion of the New York group that a permanent civilian advisory commission—to observe and make periodic recommendations on the operations of military justice—should be created in the Defense Secretariat.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on March 24, 1948:

THE TAX BILL

The overwhelming vote of more than 7 to 1 in the Senate seems to indicate clearly that even if President Truman should veto the new tax-reduction bill this measure will be enacted promptly over his veto. The Government will then be in a position of having made a substantial cut in its own prospective revenues for the next fiscal year, and of having freed more than 7,000,000 people of the responsibility of paying any Federal income tax whatever, even before it has added up the bills that must be paid next year and arrived at a clear understanding of how much money it will need to pay them. Admittedly taxes are high—so high as to create an evident shortage of risk capital. But surely the wise and prudent course of action would have been to count up next year's costs before chopping down next year's income.

This is particularly true because next year's costs are bound to rise above present estimates if Congress takes the steps that should be taken to safeguard the security of the American people. President Truman included in his budget an item to cover a year's cost of universal military training, in the hope and expectation that Congress would have the wisdom to enact this measure. But there is no item in the budget to cover the cost of the reenactment of selective service, and the costs of the adequate and indispensable air power program recommended both by the President's Air Policy Commission and by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board exceed anything set aside for that purpose in the budget. One of the gravest risks of making a tax cut at this time is that Congress, having emptied part of the national pocketbook, will argue—when the defense items come up—that there isn't enough money left to do the job adequately.

National security must be the first concern of Congress. There should be no reckless cost-paring in meeting that responsibility. When all of the costs are in, and all of the proper and reasonable economies have been made elsewhere in the Government's expenditures, it will be the inescapable duty of Congress to see that the national budget is in balance, with a respectable sum left for debt reduction—and to provide, through the reimposition of old taxes or the enactment of new ones any additional revenues that may be needed to achieve this purpose.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the international bankers, exporters, this administration, and the military have put on a 6 months campaign of propaganda, greater than the Nation has ever witnessed. The unfortunate part of it is that they have not told the people the whole truth. The rank and file of the American people who will have to pay the taxes to support the $20,000,000,000 Marshall plan have, in fact, not been represented so far as this propaganda campaign is concerned. The only representation they have is to be found among the Members of Congress. These Members have not had the facilities with which to combat the vast propaganda machine referred to. This barrage of propaganda has been so great that it has discouraged many Congressmen and influenced some to the point where they feel that it is futile to further oppose this legislation. We who have opposed it have not the facilities to get the facts across to the American people.

The people have not been told that the Marshall plan means—free to Europe—13,200 trainloads of coal, 11,800 trainloads of grains, 10,200 trainloads of meat, 4,900 trainloads of steel in the equivalent of steel ingots, 4,100 trainloads of fats and oils, 3,700 trainloads of sugar, 1,500 trainloads of cotton, 152,000 trucks, 26,000 freight cars, 200 more merchant ships in addition to the 800 they have already given away.

It means $500,000,000 in free American electrical equipment, everything from powerhouses to punch drills; another $500,000,000 in new American oil refineries and pipe lines; $400,000,000 worth of American steel plants; $2,200,000,000 in oil, gasoline, and grease to be shipped free; $1,200,000,000 in iron and steel. Countless thousands of other items are involved. The shipments would begin at once.

The administration, international bankers, and the military promoting this plan have not told the American people that less than 40 percent will go for food to the people of western Europe, yet, their main plea has been, it is necessary to feed the people.

This giving away of $20,000,000,000 will increase inflation, and continue to raise the high cost of living to our people. It will likely bring back strict rationing and controls of everything.

It will increase the cost of Government when we should be reducing it. It will

deny further aid to the older people and make it difficult to further appropriate money for the extension of education throughout the Nation.

It will, in fact, threaten the financial solvency of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the postal employees, many of them in the lower brackets working at a salary of $2,100 a year, find it most difficult to support their families. They, and the postal employees generally, are urging this Congress to give them a raise in their salary to meet the exceedingly high cost of living. It is most difficult to raise salaries as they should be raised when we are asked to vote $6,205,000,000 for aid to Europe and China in this session. The Federal employees, many of them in the lower brackets, should have an increase in salary. All Federal employees are asking for salary increases. The school teachers of the Nation are asking for an increase in their salaries and there should be more money appropriated generally throughout the Nation for education.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us, when approved as it will be, may prevent the passage of such legislation. Every Member of Congress almost every week receives a communication from some disabled veteran who served in World War I or World War II who pleads total disability and asks for a little help by way of compensation that will make it possible for him and his family to live in the most meager fashion. Our Government, under its rules and regulations, cannot, and in many instances, will not provide such relief.

Many of the older people throughout the Nation are living on a bare pittance as a result of the small amount of old-age assistance our Government feels able to give them and the passage of this legislation tends to block the way for increased relief to them.

These are some of the questions, in my judgment, that the Members of this House ought to think about most seriously before they vote to start out on this program to aid Europe to the extent of $20,000,000,000 over a period of 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the passage of this legislation will not only help to block relief for our own people which is needed but will cause the cost of living to continue to rise which will make it much more difficult for the millions of people in the groups I have referred to, to feed, house, and clothe themselves in the simplest form. The purpose of this legislation is to balance the books of 16 European Nations by putting in enough billions from this country to pay whatever these nations lack to place them on a standard of living as high or higher than they had prior to the war. Our Government will not balance the books and pay the losses sustained to any little businessman or to any farmer at the end of the year. Our Government will not make up the loss that any family sustains if lack of work or sickness takes more of his salary than usual and compels him to go into his savings, if he has any, to meet such expense, yet, under the Marshall plan we propose to underwrite the losses of 16 nations of western Europe in 1948 and for 3 years thereafter. We balance the books with our cash paying any difference sustained by the entire nations. In other words, if their production and wealth and their exports to other nations are not sufficient to place them on a plane of living equal to or higher than prior to the last war our Government makes up the difference. That is about as near as I can explain the first phase of the Marshall plan.

Mr. Speaker, later, of course, we are to arm them, and if necessary fight for them and protect them with American soldiers if their territory is invaded. It is a rather big order and in fairness to the American people upon which this obligation is about to be imposed, I wanted to bring out these few points.

I am opposed to placing this obligation which is not understood by the American people upon them which will prove such a tremendous burden to them and the nation in the future. While I would be willing to support a reasonable amount of aid for a few nations who may need it, I cannot in good conscience, support this 4-year program which, in my judgment, is not necessary in its fullness, and may wreck the financial solvency of this Government engulfing the Nation in poverty and chaos.

Echoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Armed Force, issue of March 27, 1948:

ECHOES

The members of the class of 1940—class 1–A, that is—are going to be hard to restrain if selective service is restored. For once, the guinea pigs are going to have a chance to talk back to the scientists.

The unique opportunity of correcting some of the mistakes of omission and commission which were perpetrated the first time around seems likely to fall to the copyright owner, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

Actually, the job performed by General Hershey, the Selective Service Administration, and the selective-service boards during World War II was far better than the Nation had any right to expect. That a task of this magnitude and complexity was brought to a generally successful conclusion by inexperienced men and women with so few major mistakes is a minor miracle. There were, however, a few minor mistakes, which we now, in all humility, call to the attention of General Hershey.

Please, General, don't say much, and don't say it often. When policies affecting the lives and livelihood of thousands of young men and their families are fixed and final, then announce 'em and leave 'em lay. Let's have no more of these monthly mix-ups where the 37-year-olds aren't likely to be called—oops, sorry, the 37-year-olds probably will be called—nope, wait a minute, the 37-year-olds with moles on their left arm are liable to be called, etc., etc., etc., ad infinitum. Silence would never have been so golden as it would if you had exercised it on a few memorable occasions.

There were countless minor irritations in the draft operation, but their triviality made them nonetheless annoying—because they were all deeply personal. One criticism of a general nature was the lack of provision, at least in the early stages of the draft, for a preinduction physical. This lack caused needless uncertainty—and, in a few cases, actual hardship. Young men with chronic and incurable ailments, and who possessed incontrovertible medical proof of their infirmities, still were subjected to the uncertainty, delay, and, occasionally, humiliation of having to wait until called up to report for their physical examinations. Certainly, something can be done this time to correct this situation.

Bedloes Island and the Statue of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Council of the City of New York:

Resolution 726

Resolution requesting the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to approve of the $1,000,000 appropriation requested by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior to be used to improve and beautify Bedloes Island and the Statue of Liberty

Whereas during the past 50 years, millions upon millions of immigrants and refugees from all nations of the world coming to the shores of our great Nation, and upon entering the harbor of New York City, have thrilled to the sight of the Godess of Liberty with her torch flung high, sending out rays of hope, fulfillment, and welcome to a land of promise and freedom; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of veterans returning to these shores from fighting wars to rid the world of oppression and tyranny, have looked upon the Statue of Liberty as the monument to the cause for which they fought and to those who gave their lives that her torch may shine for all times and liberty shall prevail; and

Whereas millions upon millions of visitors from all parts of this glorious land of ours and from all corners of the globe have come to see this symbol of freedom and pay homage at this shrine of liberty; and

Whereas, due to inadequate apropriations during the past 12 years during which Bedloes Island has been a national monument under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service of the Department of Interior, the island has been and is in, a woefully sad state of neglect and disrepair and ugliness; and

Whereas the appropriation requested by the National Park Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, is $1,000,000 to be used to give the Statue of Liberty, the setting it so rightfully deserves, and shall be used, in part to tear down existing decrepit buildings, clear up the rubble which now disgraces the island, repair the seawall, construct necessary walks and promenades and to do a job of landscaping; and

Whereas the city of New York, the mecca for visitors, refugees and immigrants has always prided itself on its civic virtue and the

beauty of all its sights, places of interest, monuments, museums and the like, is profoundly shocked by the condition of the site of perhaps the greatest monument in its environs, the immortal shrine to freedom, the Statue of Liberty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of New York hereby requests the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to give favorable consideration to the request made by the National Park Service of the Department of Interior for an appropriation of $1,000,000 to be used for the restoration and the beautification of Bedloes Island and the Statue of Liberty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable BEN F. JENSEN, chairman o the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the Representatives, from the city of New York and to the Department of the Interior.

A Peaceful Attitude Is Not Cowardice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial written by D. B. Turner, editor of the Bulloch Times, which is published in my home town of Statesboro, Ga.

Mr. Turner is well known in Georgia for his ability to take humorous events of the past and convert them into prologue. This simple story of a dog fight at a country school house may well describe coming international events. Russian war dogs are on the prowl. In his recent speech to Congress President Truman turned our own pup loose. This dog of ours has not done so badly in the past. He has been backed into a corner now and then, but he always comes out. And how.

SHALL WE SNEAK AWAY?

At our school in the long ago, two Hart brothers who had come from Texas, and were sort of recognized as "wild westerners" in habits of thought, were daily followed by a couple of curs which lay around the yard during the school hours. They chased away hogs; sometimes ran after passing vehicles, and always were willing to double-team on a passing strange dog.

Jason Taylor drove past the schoolhouse with a yoke of young oxen. His farm dog trotted behind the wagon—innocent of any evil intention. The Hart dogs espied him and bristled as they gave voice to unfriendly designs. The Taylor dog dropped his tail and ran under the passing vehicle. Was he a coward? This emboldened the Hart dogs, and they sprang at his throat. The pursued dog ran to a nearby vacant house and backed into a corner. Was that what would be expected when a man was invited to come out and fight?

Thus emboldened, the Hart dogs dashed on, with little caution, began to nip the coward's ears. Blood came. The students ran in to see the final ending. It seemed to be a one-sided combat. Suddenly, the dog in the corner changed his attitude. He came dashing out, jumped into the fray with all his vigor, tore ears into shreds, seized first one and then the other of the assailants and slung them right and left. It was short and swift. The Hart dogs knew they had gone too far—and they turned and fled from the scene.

The Taylor dog came outside, looked down the road toward the disappearing vehicle beneath which he had sought safety, and slowly trotted toward it without a word of farewell or apology to the dogs which had mistaken his peaceful attitude.

Now, there's Russia. What does she think we are—a bunch of cowards? Have they mistaken our peaceful attitude for cowardice? Because we ran under shelter—did we run because we were scared or because we had no wish for bloodshed or world disturbance? Can we continue to sneak under the wagon?

Our People Must Have Decent Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the disregard of the demoralizing housing situation in the country is a national, inexcusable act of irresponsibility. In New York City, one-half million of the population is living under disgraceful conditions. There is an estimated shortage of 187,000 family units. The number of families living doubled up is estimated to be 360,000 of whom 265,000 are doubled up against their wishes. Throughout the country nearly 2,000,000 families are still living doubled up.

The social and emotional well-being of our citizenry face irreparable damage. The Wagner-Ellender-Taft-Celler bill awaits action. If such action could be hastened, we could at least have a program with teeth in it. Four important steps are contained within the bill.

First. The institution of a program of research to reduce building costs through the employment of new methods, new techniques, and new materials. There is no doubt that prefabricated houses could bring quick relief, for example.

Second. A program to reduce the cost of home ownership through more liberal home financing. The objective of this would be to reach the veteran and nonveteran who cannot afford more than $40 or $50 a month in rentals or payments.

Third. A public-housing program to construct 500,000 homes for people who cannot afford more than $15 or $20 a month rent.

Fourth. A program to clear the slums and redevelop these areas. The number of substandard homes has been conservatively estimated at 5,000,000. Authorities contend it is closer to 12,000,000. Thus, we must be compelled to face the necessity for the long-range relief offered by the Wagner-Ellender-Taft-Celler bill.

In addition to the companion bill to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, I have recognized the need for increased federally aided public housing for families of low income, the need to increase the guaranty of real-estate loans to veterans by the Government, and the need to provide increased limits on cost in the case of federally aided low-rent housing.

We can no longer disregard the national disgrace confronting us in terms of adequate and decent housing. A day of reckoning will come. Families continue to live doubled up, young people delay marriage and the raising of families, the dignity of our citizens continues to be assailed by utter lack of privacy. It is a contributory factor to national problems such as divorce and juvenile delinquency. An apartment or home of one's own has become something one can only dream about.

The number of permanent homes built in 1947 was 854,000. There were 900,000 marriages in 1947. These figures speak for themselves. We are making no dent in housing needs at all.

The joint congressional committee in its housing report emphatically stated that in a survey of about 35 cities there is almost no rental housing on the market, especially for the low- or middle-income groups. Such homes as are being built now are well above $10,000, revealing as well how badly construction and material costs have been hit by inflation. Sixty percent of the population are renters; in 1947 only 10 percent of the new construction was built to be rented.

We need 15,000,000 homes in the next 10 years, built for people who are making between $40 and $50 a week.

We cannot divorce the problem of housing from that of the high cost of living. An anti-inflationary program, including price control of critically short material, control of credits, and controlled distribution of scarce commodities. Steel prices rise and there is immediately a direct relationship established between that increase and the increased cost in housing. An industry as basic as steel shrugs off all sense of responsibility and in a concerted move raises its prices which, in turn, affects every other commodity price. The inflationary spiral may bring about the tightening of mortgage credits, a disastrous possibility if we are to build more rental units. Profits are legitimate, but when huge profits throw out of balance the relationship between profit wages and price, a devouring monster is being created that inevitably must turn on its maker.

Address by Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the address delivered by Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Friday, March 19, 1948, Washington, D. C., to wit:

It is a pleasure for me to meet once again with the members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and to discuss with

you the rivers and harbors and flood control program of the Corps of Engineers.

When addressing your membership on occasions such as today, it has been the custom for the Chief of Engineers to frame his remarks to constitute a report of progress. Your active interest and steadfast cooperation with the Corps of Engineers in its program of civil works has justified— even demanded—that he render you an account of stewardship regarding the vitally important work placed by congressional directive under his organization. Today I shall not break with this wisely established custom. I should like, however, to deviate somewhat from the established pattern in a conscious effort to emphasize to you the gigantic proportions of the current civil works program, and the tremendously important fact that this program is of necessity so diversified in nature and purpose that it requires the best abilities and skills of the engineering profession.

The development of the Nation's rivers and harbors, and the provision of flood control on a Nation-wide basis, is essential to national progress. Under modern engineering, the plans adopted and the methods required to achieve this necessary development are as diversified as are the benefits to be derived by the Nation from them. It is not only engineering in the modern sense, but also engineering in its full sense of highly specialized fields of endeavor. For supplementing the primary purposes of navigation and flood control improvements are valuable auxiliary uses of our water resources which the Corps of Engineers, as directed by Congress, must—and do—consider in conducting its investigations and surveys. These corollary benefits include major drainage, hydroelectric power, water for irrigation, for industrial use and municipal supply, pollution abatement, recreation, and fish and wildlife preservation.

To illustrate the magnitude and the specialized requirements of our current overall program, I should like to discuss a few of the Corps of Engineers' projects which are either being maintained or are under construction today. The projects I have selected for mention are not singular in themselves, but are types of work encountered throughout our highly specialized program. As such, I offer them only as tangible evidence of the program as a whole.

In the Northeast, at Portland, Maine, New Haven, Conn., and New York City—are excellent examples of the port development work we have been conducting on a Nation-wide scale for more than a century. On the Hudson River, which, with the New York Barge Canal, links the New York Area with the Great Lakes, is an example of the channel development work we have accomplished on an important connecting waterway. Flood control is also a problem in the Northeast. There we have under way such projects as the Union Village Reservoir in Vermont, an important unit in the plan for protection against major floods in the Connecticut River Basin. The comprehensive plan for this basin, which includes 20 reservoirs and 10 local protection works, provides complete protection for the principal flood damage centers on the Connecticut River, including the industrial cities of Hartford and East Hartford, Conn.; and Springfield, West Springfield, Chicopee, Holyoke, and Northampton, Mass.

In the Middle Atlantic area, we have at Philadelphia, on the Delaware River, dredging operations to provide a dependable deep-water channel for an ocean port which lies more than 100 miles inland from the sea. In the same general area, but relating primarily to flood control, is the Buggs Island project, a $69,000,000 multiple-purpose reservoir now under construction on the Roanoke River, in Virginia and North Carolina. Although operated primarily for flood control, this project offers the important secondary benefits of electric-power generation, and the regulation of downstream flows for pollution abatement, navigation, and commercial fishing. It is typical of the multiple-purpose projects either planned, or under construction, on other major streams of the Nation.

In Florida, we have an excellent example of a different type of flood-control problem. This one is particularly correlated with major drainage. Under a comprehensive plan of improvement prepared by the Corps of Engineers, the existing Federal project for the Caloosahatchee and Lake Okeechobee Drainage Area would be extended and modified. The plan—estimated to cost $208,000,000—affords a high degree of flood protection for central and southern Florida. Also, the drainage of excess waters for control and storage in wet seasons, and for beneficial use during dry periods, would be possible. In addition, the planned improvements would reduce the intrusion of salt water into lands and water supplies of coastal areas. The proposed channels and control works would also afford the basic framework for a possible system of interlocking navigable waters throughout central and southern Florida. The comprehensive plan, as approved by the Governor of Florida, will be presented to Congress at an early date.

Florida is the terminus, on both its Atlantic side and on its Gulf of Mexico shoreline, of intracoastal waterways maintained at a 12-foot depth. Light-draft vessels today travel these protected routes as far north as Trenton, N. J., on the Atlantic, and almost to the Mexican border on the Gulf. The waterways are key units in the Nation's closely integrated network of approximately 30,000 miles of navigable inland waters.

Extending north from the Gulf, on the lower Tombigbee, Black Warrior, and Warrior Rivers, we have an example of a canalized navigation route developed to a 9-foot depth. The waterway connects the important Birmingham steel-producing area with the Gulf—a distance of more than 400 miles.

In the center of the country—and very appropriately, too—is the outstanding single project of the Corps of Engineers, the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. Here flood-control and navigation improvements have been inseparable from the beginning. Ocean navigation depths are provided upstream from the Gulf to Baton Rouge, La. An authorized 12-foot navigation channel extends to Cairo, Ill. Project features include levees which aggregate 1,700 miles on the main stem, and an equal mileage of smaller embankment on tributaries, floodways, and backwater areas. There are also channel improvements, bank stabilization, and reservoirs. Though the project is only approximately 60 percent complete, it is estimated that to date it has saved the Nation more than $4,000,000,000 in the prevention of flood damages. This great savings is in addition to the substantial benefits that have been derived by the Nation's commerce and navigation from this key unit in the world's greatest inland navigation system.

On the upper Mississippi River, the Corps of Engineers has developed a 9-foot navigable channel as far north as St. Paul. The same channel depth extends on the Ohio from Cairo to Pittsburgh, and up the Illinois to the Great Lakes. We are currently developing the Missouri River to the 9-foot project depth authorized by Congress from its mouth to Sioux City, Iowa. These improvements are outstanding examples of our canalized river work.

On the upper reaches of the Missouri River is Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir—the world's largest hydraulic earth-fill dam—a navigation, flood-control and power project. Also on the Missouri is the $177,000,000 Garrison Dam and Reservoir, and the Fort Randall project, now under construction as units in the comprehensive program for that basin with which you are familiar. When completed, they will provide flood control, conserve water for irrigation, help regulate stream flow for navigation, provide hydroelectric power, and render other public benefits.

On the Great Lakes, deep-water depths have been provided for a series of ports, and the channels which connect the Lakes have been improved. Today more tonnage passes through the Sault Ste. Marie than through any other canal in the world. The Great Lakes also afford an example of another type of important work—the provision of harbors of refuge. Present indications are that construction may be initiated during the next fiscal year on the first of a group of 21 Great Lake harbors of refuge, as authorized by Congress in 1945.

At Louisville, on the Ohio River, is an excellent example of the many local protection works developed by the Corps of Engineers. I refer to the $19,000,000 project now under construction for the protection against floods of the largest urban area in the State of Kentucky. The project consists of a system of levees and concrete floodwalls along the river front, and includes pumping facilities for disposal of interior drainage, and other necessary appurtenances.

In the Southwest, the Conchas Reservoir in New Mexico and the John Martin Dam in Colorado are completed; and in Texas, Denison Dam is virtually complete. In addition to providing flood control, navigation, and electric power, Denison Reservoir is extensively used by the public for recreation. Two large waterfowl refuges established on the reservoir contribute to our wildlife interests. Also in Texas, several reservoirs now under construction will conserve badly needed water supplies for agricultural, industrial, and municipal use.

On the Columbia River, in the Northwest, the $84,000,000 Bonneville Dam has been in operation since 1938. In addition to primary navigation benefits, the dam's installation of 518,400 kilowatts is contributing materially to current efforts to meet the region's base electric power load. In planning Bonneville Dam, great care was taken to provide facilities for the upstream passage of fish—and the downstream migration of fingerlings—for the benefit of the important fishing industry. McNary Dam, also on the Columbia River, is under construction. When completed, it will produce important navigation benefits, while providing an ultimate hydroelectric generating capacity almost twice that now at Bonneville. Mud Mountain Dam, constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the State of Washington, is 425 feet above bedrock—the highest rock-fill dam in the United States.

In California, projects such as the $44,000,000 Folsom Reservoir, and the $36,000,000 Pine Flat Reservoir, will provide important irrigation benefits in addition to their primary purpose of flood control.

This quick sketching of a few of our civil-works projects—and I have mentioned only a relative few as examples of the many—will suffice to show the national scope of the work of the Corps of Engineers, and the broad variety of purposes our projects serve. They underscore the strong link of mutual interests between the Corps of Engineers and the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

I, here, should like to emphasize that major drainage improvements are eligible for authorization as Federal projects if the benefits to be derived are in excess of the estimated cost. This phase of flood control is not new. We in the Corps of Engineers have long considered improved drainage in many areas a natural complement of flood control. Inevitably, the tremendous strain on our agricultural areas caused by the pressing needs for full production has caused depletion of our land and soil resources, and has stressed the need wherever possible of bringing marginal land into production. Thousands of acres of fertile soil can be

brought into production by economically sound drainage improvements. Consequently—and under the direction of Congress—the Corps of Engineers is giving increasing attention to this potential.

Coastal beach erosion is becoming increasingly severe; and I call your attention briefly to our work in this field. Since 1930—when Congress authorized the Chief of Engineers to undertake in cooperation with State agencies specific studies in beach-erosion control—nearly 50 cooperative studies setting forth recommended plans for corrective measures have been completed. In August 1946, Congress authorized Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property up to one-third of the construction cost. Under this new policy, 3 cooperative studies have been completed and 19 studies are under way. The studies are designed to further develop sound engineering remedies for shore erosion.

As most of you know, all river and harbor and flood-control projects are based on extensive surveys made by the Corps of Engineers. This survey work, though one of the most important phases of our civil activities, is perhaps the least spectacular. I might point out that more than 800 investigations currently authorized by Congress are being prosecuted as fast as budgetary limitations permit.

There are more than 450 river and harbor reports outstanding. These reports range from an analysis of the advisability of further improvements of small-craft harbor facilities, to major studies—such as that pertaining to a determination of the advisability of increasing project depths from 9 to 12 feet on the Ohio River, the upper Mississippi, and the Illinois waterway. There are also studies on related problems, including greater control of water hyacinths in streams of coastal States.

There are approximately 350 flood-control reports outstanding at the present time. Typical of these reports is one for the Columbia River Basin expected to be completed in October 1948. A comprehensive plan for the control and use of the waters of the Middle Rio Grande Basin has also been developed.

All projects, if approved for construction by the Congress, will become part of the integrated plans developed for the watersheds of the country. These basin plans are flexible, allowing modifications and additions directed by Congress, and warranted by changing physical and economic conditions.

In our studies of future needs—and in other phases of our work—the Corps of Engineers looks to associations such as your own for constructive suggestions regarding the most beneficial uses of our water resources. As the foremost authorities in the waterway field, you are eminently qualified to appraise the true value of proposed projects in the broad interest of the Nation as a whole.

Perhaps more than any other group of representative citizens, this association recognizes that economic justification must be established by thorough investigation before we can recommend to Congress the undertaking of any project. In this connection, we must bear in mind that we no longer are living under prewar conditions. Our production potential has increased enormously—both in agriculture and industry—and our employment figures have reached record proportions. Our population has passed 145,000,000 with the 1947 gain the greatest on record, and with a population of 166,000,000 forecast by 1975. Never before has there been such peacetime demand for electric power. Our merchant marine is almost wholly comprised of new and larger vessels of deeper draft. River craft are increasing in size and power to achieve increased shipping economies.

In short—and though many factors still render obscure the picture of future conditions—it would seem that our Nation is being geared to a vastly increased scale of production, which, in turn, demands many supporting facilities. Certainly, the combined available knowledge, experience, and wisdom of all recognized authorities will be needed if we are to come up with the best answers to our problems. We must keep our thinking sufficiently flexible to make whatever adjustments are required. Fundamentally we must have before us the compelling necessity of seeing to it that our national waterways and the works that will eliminate or check the devastation of costly floods are adequate to meet the needs of our expanded domestic economy.

We cannot escape consideration of the international situation, and the imperative need of keeping our Nation strong. As the stronghold of human freedom, we, as a Nation, fervently hope for the achievement of an enduring peace. For only in peace can we make real progress in the realization of lasting projects for the public good—projects that in recent years of national emergency have had to make slow progress. America is a young and lusty Nation; and its greatest years lie ahead. Let us together do our parts in wisely discharging the responsibilities entrusted to us.

Under our democratic procedures, each of you has a vital part in sponsoring and furthering proposed improvements of merit, and affording a means for expression of the will of the people. No authority beyond that of the people is required to accomplish the desired improvements.

It is the duty of Congress to determine the amount of funds which the Nation can afford for the improvements recommended to it. You in this association, like we in the Corps of Engineers, must have noted with gratification the willingness of the Congress to provide generous appropriations for the current fiscal year for river and harbor and flood-control work. Present indications are that the need to accelerate this large and highly specialized program is becoming widely recognized, and that larger appropriations may be provided for the 1949 fiscal year.

In carrying out the mandate of Congress in these matters, and in cooperating with you in your valued functions, I pledge you the best endeavors of the Corps of Engineers.

Shipment of Arms to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SOMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Assemblyman Irwin Steingut, Democratic minority leader of the New York State Assembly, who represents the eighteenth assembly district of the county of Kings, made by him on February 10, 1948, in the assembly, in support of his resolution, which is also set forth in this RECORD, and adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York memorializing the President, the State Department and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine and to make possible the immediate shipment of arms and munitions for the defense of the Jewish people of Palestine against the unprovoked acts of aggression and warfare of the Arabs.

STATEMENT OF ASSEMBLYMAN IRWIN STEINGUT

I offer the following resolution and prior to moving its adoption, I would like to make a statement in support of it.

The object of the resolution is to memorialize the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States, to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine, who are defending the decision of the United Nations and make possible the immediate shipment of arms and munitions for the defense of the Jewish people of Palestine against the unprovoked acts of aggression and warfare of the Arabs.

When the United Nations voted partition of Palestine and the setting up of a Jewish state, they did not mean it as an idle gesture but as a just and equitable solution of a vexing problem.

If the United Nations is to survive in its first test of strength, it must implement its decision with force, if necessary; otherwise, it will meet the sorrowful fate of the League of Nations.

Until the United Nations can send a force to implement its mandate, we in the United States must in good conscience do everything we can to permit the Jewish people to defend their most cherished and newly born homeland.

The partition and the establishment of a Jewish homeland is not a Jewish question alone. It is a humane one, in which all freedom-loving people join. If other nations or races were confronted with the same problem, I would be just as zealous in fighting for their rights as I am doing now in support of my resolution.

All the world knows of the suffering and anguish which the Jewish people have been subjected to in the last decade. Their only hope and salvation which has sustained them has been their dream of a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

By maintaining an embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine, we are encouraging bloodshed on a defenseless people, and must therefore share the responsibility for the loss of life in Palestine.

By adopting this resolution, we serve notice on Washington, that we the elected representatives of the people of the State of New York, the largest State in the Union, with one-tenth of the population of the Nation, insist that the embargo be lifted on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine, so that they may defend their homeland. I move the adoption of the resolution.

[By Mr. Steingut]

"Whereas the United Nations has decreed that Palestine shall be partitioned into separate Arab and Jewish states; and

"Whereas the Arab nations, in defiance of the decree of the United Nations, have refused to participate in negotiations preparatory or subsequent to the vote on the partition plan; and

"Whereas the Arab nations have persistently followed a course of terror and violence designed to nullify and prevent the implementation of the United Nations Palestine decision; and

"Whereas the Jews of the world, in a spirit of amity and compromise born of the suffering and persecution which they have endured through the ages, have gratefully accepted and agreed to be bound by the decision of the United Nations on Palestine although it does not carry out promises made to them in the Balfour declaration; and

"Whereas the public press carries daily accounts of unprovoked mass Arab raids and

terroristic attacks against the Jewish people in Palestine and the toll of wounded and dead Jewish people continues to mount with unabating intensity; and

"Whereas the Arab attacks on the Jews threaten to disturb the peace of the world and the Jewish people should be permitted, assisted, and encouraged to arm and defend themselves against such attacks; and

"Whereas this Nation, through its embargo on arms and munitions destined for shipment to the Middle East has prevented the Jews of Palestine from obtaining the weapons of defense sorely needed by them to resist and defend themselves against the attacks of the Arabs, while the Arabs continue to secure arms and munitions from neighboring Arab and other states; and

"Whereas the Honorable William O'Dwyer has openly announced his opposition to the arms embargo and has urged the Government of the United States to cancel the same and to permit the immediate shipment of weapons and munitions to the embattled Jews of Palestine; and

"Whereas the people of the State of New York are justifiably disturbed and alarmed over the plight of these defenseless Jews in Palestine and urgently implore the President and the State Department to cancel the arms embargo without further delay: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the President, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to cancel the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to the Jewish people of Palestine who are defending the decision of the United Nations and make possible the immediate shipment of arms and munitions for the defense of the Jewish people of Palestine against the unprovoked acts of aggression and warfare of the Arabs; and be it further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York."

Adopted in both houses.

The Election in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 29, 1948:

ABROAD—THE COMMUNISTS ARE MAKING THEIR BIGGEST FIGHT

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The Italian electoral struggle is unique in political history. Nothing quite like it has occurred since the war. The conquests of Communist minorities in eastern Europe were victories of sheer force and terror in territory inaccessible to the play of western power. The two postwar political events of comparable importance were the Labor vote in Britain and the secession from the Communist-dominated Labor Federation in France. The first changed the direction of England without outside intervention from any source; it had nothing to do with the Communist drive for empire. The second was the first open revolt in the labor ranks; it was a successful and significant but not a conclusive battle.

But the Italian election will be decisive. As the campaign approaches its climax it strikes a note of desperation—proof that both sides realize they are choosing not merely a national government but a system of life and a position in an international conflict. Every day it is pounded home to the poor Italian voter that he is voting for Christ or anti-Christ, for Truman or Stalin, for Tito or Trieste. In the churches he is told that he will lose his soul if he votes one way; in the piazzas that he will be an "American slave" if he votes the other. All he asks is a little bread and wine, a little freedom and peace, and what he gets is a stern and overwhelming mandate to decide the fate of Europe.

A LONG WAY TO GO

The methods employed by the Communists are the best proof of what it means to them. Never anywhere have they fought as they are fighting now for the Italian vote. They have here a great initial advantage. For nearly 4 years, ever since Togliatti brought his well-trained team from Moscow in the summer of 1944, they have erected on the shattered framework of Fascism—"made for us," as Togliatti boasted—the tightest, best disciplined and strongest political organization in the land—in any land outside of Russia, because to their own ranks they have linked the majority of the Socialists with bonds of steel—so that they control the labor unions and are thereby well hedged against such an open defection as the Socialist trades-unions staged in France.

Compared to this monolith, the other parties are loose and porous agglomerations of political amateurs. They try to make up in zeal and earnestness what they lack in experience, organization and money, but they have a long way to go against the most formidable handicaps. In many places Italian Democrats have organized themselves into an association called "Friends of America" to counter anti-American propaganda, but these friends of ours have no funds at all except the small sums they collect among themselves, while the Communists have plenty to distribute largesse in all directions. We spend vast amounts in Italy to save democracy, and threaten to discontinue our help if the Communists win—surely political intervention—but it is against our principles to distribute a few thousand dollars where it could be more effective in helping those who are fighting our war on the front line against a well-heeled and resourceful antagonist.

People abroad point to the church as an older organization than the Communist Party, and presumably more influential in a country as solidly Catholic as Italy. The country is blanketed with parishes, and the pastors are preaching vehemently against the terrible dangers of a Communist dictatorship. But they started very late. Catholic Action, the lay arm of the Church, went into action only a month ago. All talk to the contrary, the Church is not organized for a political campaign.

THIS IS THE SHOW-DOWN

A report from Pescara, where the Communists recently won a local election, illustrates their methods. In that election they spent millions of lire, while all the other parties together had only about 300,000 to spend. After their victory they immediately resumed their person-to-person and house-to-house canvass for the next test. From Emilia they have brought to Pescara 40 Communist women who work in the streets, stores, and homes, making promises to some, threatening others and distributing packages of flour, sugar, and coffee. They tell the people that "Russia is forced to send this help secretly because de Gasperi's government refuses to accept help from Russia." "America makes us pay for the help she sends," they say, "while if the Italians had asked Russia for help she would have sent it at a better price and in greater quantities."

Reports from all parts of the country tell the same story of intensive and unremitting work. The Communist leaders are stopping at nothing, because they know this is the show-down. If they lose this election, they lose their position in Italy, their standing in Moscow, their chance in Europe.

Other party leaders are no less aware that everything is at stake for them, too—their property, their lives, their families, their country. "But we have hardly any means," writes one of the Friends of America. "Each of us is depriving himself of wine, potatoes, wood, and whatever clothing he can spare in order to gain the sympathy of some of the border-line Communists. We are printing pamphlets and sending out newspapers. In this region we could have wonderful results if we had the money to pay 50 resolute men. People are scared, and whoever speaks up loudly and clearly will win."

A Fatal Dose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, when the tiny Republic of Finland was fighting against Russia and we were engaged in a gigantic struggle with Nazi Germany, the then American President, with the flair for the dramatic for which he was famous, refused to accept Finland's annual payment on its national debt to us with these words:

Our foreign policy is not for sale for $168,000.

The Finns, although fighting against one of our allies, still wanted to pay their bills. More important, the Finnish leaders probably saw the future a lot more clearly than did the ailing man in the White House, who, the American people were told was "the picture of ruddy health."

The Finns knew what Roosevelt had never learned, and what his successor, Harry Truman, may never know, that Russia, or any nation, is going to act in its own self-interest.

Roosevelt at Yalta and Truman at Potsdam expected men of known murderous tendencies, men with blood on their hands, from having murdered millions of their fellow countrymen, to act unselfishly and in a paternal, Christian spirit in the future. Our leaders signed agreements giving the Russians a virtual carte blanche in eastern Europe.

The Russians, as any normal, thinking man would expect, have been aggressive since VE-day, but no more aggressive than the New Deal administration, which has been in charge of this country's foreign policy, has encouraged them to be. For that reason, if the majority of Americans are blaming Russia for what has happened since the end of World War II, they are missing the mark. The New Dealers in the State Department and White House have been wrong

every step of the way—and they are today to blame, as they well know, for the so-called emergency which really is not an emergency except in the minds of thoughtless people.

If the Republicans swallow the medicine President Truman has prepared, it will be a fatal does for their party and their country. It will lose more votes to Henry Wallace than the New Deal is losing to him, for millions of Americans are sick and weary of a bipartisan foreign policy that leads them closer and closer to war while proclaiming with each new measure that peace will be assured.

We shall soon be hearing about the pressure Stalin is putting on Finland. Yet, what about the pressure Roosevelt put on the Finns only a few years ago? What about the treaty which hapless Finland was forced to sign, with the acquiescence and support of the New Deal administration, giving Stalin what amounted to a blank check throughout the Republic of Finland? Now that Stalin wants to cash that check, some Americans would blame him.

The New Deal is anxious for the people to forget. Republicans should keep busy helping the people to remember. If the voters can get to November without being shoved into a war, and can remember just a few major facts, they will solve a lot of the Nation's problems.

Remember this—Russia has not made one overt move in Europe that has not been agreed to beforehand by Roosevelt and Truman at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. James F. Byrnes, the former Secretary of State, who has admitted to misleading the American people, is so discredited by the record that he should never be quoted by any thoughtful America. Yet, he still has the nerve to talk about foreign policy and some newspapermen are stupid enough to report what he says. He now says that if Truman's policies are followed, the "emergency" will be solved and we will have peace. He is the same James Byrnes who came back from Potsdam proclaiming that peace was assured. He is the same James Byrnes who sat in the State Department while the Communists took over Manchuria and said little, if anything, about containing Russia.

It seems incredible that any responsible group of Americans would want to take action on any score in the field of foreign policy, other than hold what we can, until a new administration takes office. The present administration, which led us into war, sold us numerous bills of goods and now cries "wolf, wolf," every time the inevitable results of their policies come to pass, can lead us nowhere except to more crises and more emergencies.

All the time the Truman administration is calling for a show of forces to try to frighten the rulers of the Kremlin, it not only continues recognizing the illegal dictators of Russia, but actually continues to permit shipments of carload after carload of materials that can be used in war. What kind of fools do the New Dealers think the American people are? Or can they be right in thinking that all they have to do is cook up a new emergency just before every election to win hands down?

Infiltration Is Where You Find It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under privilege to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a column by Fred C. Koch, editor and publisher of the East Wenatchee Journal. Mr. Koch is unusually qualified to comment on the matter of Russian propaganda in America. During and following the war, Mr. Koch participated in the management of the American newspapers published by our occupational forces in Germany and covered the early part of the Nuremburg trials.

The Sunnyslope school to which he refers happens to be the school which I myself attended and it is the school system that serves a truly typically American community. This fact makes Mr. Koch's observations all the more pertinent at this time.

(By Fred C. Koch)

"So long as communism threatens the very existence of democracy," President Truman told a joint Senate-House session last week, the United States must remain strong enough to support those countries which are now threatened with Communist control and police state rule.

The countries of eastern Europe, the Baltic States and Finland lie within the reach of Moscow's physical tentacles. Some of them, like Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, were thrown to the wolves of the Kremlin so long ago many people have forgotten them. Here was the first major Soviet violation of neighboring states' rights and independence which we and the British condoned—because we were still under the influence of Rooseveltian appeasement of the Communists.

It was easy for the American policy makers of a few years ago to close their eyes to this international rape, especially in view of the fact that our policy makers had dipped the Stars and Stripes to the Communists, so many times during the war that no one raised an eyebrow when Stalin pushed the Nazis out of the Baltic States and, like a stronger vulture, seized upon and held fast in his claws these three helpless little states.

The gory talons have now sunk their claws into Czechoslovakia. They're seeking out the soft underbelly of Italy, Greece, France, China, and Korea. Communism is on the march, eastward and westward—and around on the other side of the earth where these two points could meet lies the United States of America—the only power in the world today that stands in the path of Russian domination of the earth.

The people of the United States should read of the Soviet expansion with alarm. It is not an expansion that stops on the shores of France and off the sea of Okhotsk. The American people have not felt the coiling crush of the Soviet tentacle as have the Finns, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, and the north Koreans—but the vanguard of Soviet expansion is not the tramp of the Soviet foot-soldier's boot. When you hear that crunch along the street, it's too late.

The invisible shock troops of the Soviet expansion are insidious. They are sly, deceitful methods of destroying confidence in the United States Government, and confidence in the American way of life. The methods are given expression through the printed and spoken word. They are to be found everywhere in America today—even in Wenatchee.

Even in Wenatchee. I have before me four wicked pieces of Soviet propaganda—four magazines whose every word of content is designed to destroy faith in the American way of life and in the men who stand for the American way of life. The title of the magazines is "Soviet Russia Today."

And where do you think these magazines were found?

On the reading rack at the Sunnyslope school!—that is, they were on the reading rack until faculty members became so incensed over this audacity that the superintendent finally removed them and threw them into the wastebasket.

An article in one of these Soviet demoralizers is titled: "The Devil and Jimmy Byrnes." It calls the former Secretary of State's book Speaking Frankly an incredible and terrifying document because it speaks frankly of Soviet acts and purposes. The article tries to cover Soviet expansionism by holding up before its readers the horrors of American expansion, and then takes this tack: "Is it conceivable that the United States or Britain has ever violated pledges?"

The article also attempts to prove the lily-white purposes of the Communists in China whereas, it says, the United States has intervened with troops and dollars!

Then this same issue squirts its poisonous venom upon General MacArthur in an article titled "What Is MacArthur Up To?"

The article seeks to discredit the work of MacArthur and the American forces in Japan—and behind it is the grievance that Russia has had no share in jurisdiction over Japan (upon whom she failed to declare war until Japan was crushed singlehandedly by the Americans).

After smearing MacArthur, the publication moves in defense of the Soviet concentration camps by holding up the horrors of American prisons. The vicious publication moves from personality to personality, from situation to situation, undermining, besmirching, belittling, and smearing any person who raises his voice in defense of America—if such defense happens to be diametrical to Soviet schemes and machinations.

Naturally the magazine heroizes Henry Wallace—which ought to label this man who came so dangerously close to becoming the President of the United States!

Of course, the publication is edited by so-called Americans who say "we are doing wrong to stand in the way of Soviet expansion and we should appease the Kremlin and we should thrust out any person who stands for America and for everything for which America stands.

An adult can readily see through the silly pretense of this magazine; but a youngster, of junior-high age—or an adult with a grade-school mentality—could easily be taken in by its deceit. Since the magazine aims at destroying confidence, where better can this be done than in the mind of a growing child who has not yet acquired enough in knowledge and facts to be able to evaluate and weigh controversial subject matter?

Yes, the expansionist program of the Soviets is world-wide. If we wait until guns and atom bombs are required to stop its conquest of America, it may be too late.

We must destroy the infiltration processes now. We must ask why the United States mail allows itself to become a vehicle for disseminating seditious propaganda—and why some school authorities have allowed such poison within reach of children.

Sea Power and the Balanced Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the edited version of an article, Sea Power and the Balanced Fleet, from the February 1948 Marine Corps Gazette.

This article, by a prominent military writer, is particularly significant in that it explains the basic character of the organization of our naval service, pointing out clearly how our naval organization is peculiarly fitted to this Nation's maritime and geographical position, and is, consequently, an American innovation to naval organization. The article is also of major significance in that it discusses the nature of the term "naval campaign." This is a term used in writing the National Security Act, and the article explains the meaning of the term as it was used by the members of the House Executive Expenditures Committee's subcommittee who prepared the initial draft of the bill that later became Public Law 253.

After reading this article I believe that you will again realize how wise the Members of the House of Representatives were in deliberately refusing to impose limitations on the prosecution of a naval campaign by naval air, submarine, surface, and fleet marine forces. This article will go far, if given adequate distribution, toward helping create a greater appreciation of the uniquely American character of our naval organization, based upon what is so aptly termed the concept of the "balanced fleet." This is one of the most important military articles in recent years.

SEA POWER AND THE BALANCED FLEET

(By Lt. Col. James D. Hittle)

Sea power as a concept is nothing new to military thought. The forceful application of sea power by the balanced fleet is not only something relatively new, but it is a purely American contribution to the conduct of modern war.

Capt. Alfred Thayer Mahan, United States Navy, the greatest naval thinker of modern times, devoted a large portion of his professional life to convincing this Nation of the validity of his concept of sea power as a fundamental feature of the sound military thinking upon which the over-all security doctrine of the United States must be based. Contrary to so much that is now carelessly written about sea power, Mahan considered sea power to be much more than the combat vessels of the fleet. He viewed a nation's sea power as every aspect of national life that contributed to ultimate control of the seas—social conditions, economy, geography, politics, merchant marine, and the Nation's Navy. All this, Mahan postulated, influenced the ultimate ability of a nation to control the seas.

Sea power as a concept is no innovation to warfare, but the means by which our national sea power is forcefully applied is a unique and, from the historical standpoint, an American contribution to modern war methods. Our fleet today comprises surface, subsurface, naval aviation, and naval landing forces. In its basic structure the fleet is well proportioned, possessing its own organic types of forces to permit accomplishment of any combat mission incident to achieving or exercising control of the seas. No individual element of naval power is emphasized to the exclusion of any other necessary component.

The air, surface, subsurface, and landing force components of the fleet are recognized to play a vital role in applying naval power; each is provided for in significant strength, with the result that the capabilities and limitations of each of the functional components of the fleet are considered in relation to each other as well as to the over-all requirements of naval war. The term balanced fleet denotes an organizational concept, the fundamental feature of which is the inclusion within the fleet of all functional components to permit the fleet to conduct any type of operation incident to the prosecution of a naval campaign, involving, as it may, the coordinate employment of surface, subsurface, naval air, and naval landing forces. Command, organization, and composition of forces of a balanced fleet are appropriately oriented in accordance with the predominantly naval character of the operations. Each functional component of the fleet is employed according to its capabilities for the purposes of achieving the final objective—command of the sea.

In keeping with this concept, surface or subsurface vessels do not engage the enemy merely to fight a surface action; landing forces do not assault a beachhead solely to fight a land battle; neither do air units strive for air supremacy over the disputed sea area or its shores merely for the sake of air supremacy in itself. All action on, below, and over the sea, as well as landing operations, when conducted as operations incident to a naval campaign, are reciprocally supporting and contribute to the attainment of the mutual naval objective. The balanced fleet provides all the basic tools needed for the conduct of a series of naval operations comprising the naval campaign.

The naval campaign is a series of operations predominantly naval in character. Such a campaign is usually conducted over a relatively large water area, and may involve separate air, surface, or subsurface combat; some or all of the operations that comprise a naval campaign may involve the coordinate employment of the various functional naval components—air, submarine, surface, and landing force. In the conduct of war on a hemispheric or global scale control of such land and water areas as are seized by means of naval campaigns serves a twofold purpose: It denies freedom of such waters to the enemy, ultimately severing such enemy sea routes as traverse the area; when sufficient bases have been seized and command of sufficient sea areas is achieved it ultimately facilitates the further projection of air or land forces against the enemy.

Technological advances since the days of sail have not materially altered the principle that control of sea areas is dependent upon possession of necessary base facilities. With the geographical character of the earth's surface being such that water and land areas are alternating in location, it is obvious that the control of water areas is dependent on terrestrial bases which may be either insular or littoral in character. For instance: In the Pacific, possession of key islands permits the control of the various water areas operationally remote from the Asiatic or American mainland. Pacific water areas bordering the mainland are controlled largely by bases on the Asiatic or American littoral.

Regardless of how effectively air, surface, or subsurface forces may be in defeating enemy forces within a sea area, control of such a sea area will remain largely transitory until such time as the land base governing the area is seized and exploited. The naval campaign, therefore, is the means by which naval force is applied to effect the desired control of water areas, usually by seizure of critical base areas.

World War II, waged on a global scale, presented many examples of the naval campaign. The operations incident to the seizure of the Marianas provided an illustration of such a campaign. Prior to the assault on the islands, naval air, surface, and submarine forces engaged in operations designed to achieve freedom of movement across the waters surrounding the Marianas. Such naval actions came to a climax with the large-scale air, surface, and land battles, by which Japanese naval forces lost command of these waters. Continuation of the naval campaign, initially involving surface, submarine, and carrier forces, required the further application of naval power by seizure of necessary bases in the Marianas Islands. The naval campaign culminated with the assault and capture of Saipan, Tinian, and Guam. Landing forces in each instance were under over-all naval command, emphasizing the primacy of naval interest in such operations. Development of the Marianas bases permitted consolidation of control of the surrounding waters. It also provided the bases from which subsequent forces were projected against enemy strongholds of Iwo Jima and Okinawa and permitted establishment of long-range bomber bases within range of the Japanese mainland.

The operations leading up to and including the assault and seizure of the Marianas illustrate the predominantly naval character of such a series of operations, conducted for the purpose of achieving control of a major sea area. Command and organization of forces involved in the Marianas naval campaign were in consonance with the nature of the operation. Naval forces gained freedom of the necessary sea approaches by a series of aggressive submarine, surface, and air actions. Although Army units comprised a sizable portion of the landing forces used in the Marianas, the inclusion of Army troops within the landing forces used in the Marianas, the inclusion of Army troops within the landing-force organization did not alter the character of such operations, as those Army units were subject to over-all naval command and operated in accordance with the amphibious doctrine applicable to fleet marine force units.

Thus in the Marianas naval campaign, as in the naval campaigns in the Solomons, the Gilberts, and the Marshalls, the inherently naval character of such operations was reflected in the organization of forces involved. A balanced fleet, under naval command, provided the principal means for fighting the varied but intimately related sea, land, and air battles involved in the prosecution of a naval campaign.

It is noteworthy that this Nation should be the first to evolve and apply the concept of the balanced fleet. Although such a concept is peculiarly appropriate to the geographical character of the United States, this Nation is by no means the only one whose geographical position has accentuated naval aspects of national security.

England and the United States have been prominent maritime powers of the modern western world. For a nation whose existence in the modern world has depended on freedom of the seas, England has evidenced a surprising disinclination or reluctance to rationalize sea power, the very thing upon which British survival rested. It remained for Alfred Thayer Mahan, writing in the last decade of the nineteenth century, to present a thorough rationalization of sea power.

There have been periods in British naval history when it seemed that the British were on the verge of creating a balanced fleet. Before the days of the submarine and air-

plane, a balanced fleet would have required two basic components, the surface force, comprising combat and transport vessels, and a landing force integrated into naval organization and subject to naval command.

From early times, England's Fleet has been a power on the world's seas. But in spite of her dependence upon the fleet, England's naval organization never quite reached the stage of development that would have given the Royal Navy its permanent counterpart of our present fleet marine forces.

One particularly close approach to creation of fleet marine forces was made in 1704 when Admiral Rook, of the Royal Navy, seized Gibraltar, destined for centuries to be the symbol of British power. In that historic operation Royal Marines comprised a sizable part of the landing forces.

Following Rook's seizure of Gibraltar, there was a discernible tendency within the Royal Navy to associate marines with landing operations. Such a trend was further manifested in 1740 when two regiments of marines were raised for service as landing forces with Vice Admiral Vernon in the Caribbean. Had the government in London sensed the logic of making Vernon's expedition an all-naval one, as was so clearly justified by the nature of the contemplated operations, and by the preponderance of marines in the landing forces, England would have been in possession of a balanced fleet. Never had such an organizational concept been more appropriate to naval operations.

The account of Vernon's Caribbean expedition points to significant and inescapable conclusions. The contemplated operations were predominantly naval in character. The preponderance of marines in the accompanying military forces could well have been interpreted as justifying an organizational structure in harmony with and at the same time emphasizing the naval character of the operations. Vernon's acquiescence to a council of war did not indicate that unquestioned command rested with the naval commander. To put it another way: Clearly Vernon's Caribbean enterprise had the basic characteristics of a naval campaign. Just as clearly, neither the organizational structure of the forces involved nor the method of command was appropriate to the prosecution of a naval campaign. Such incongruities could not have existed if Vernon's forces had been organized in accordance with what we know today as the concept of the balanced fleet.

The Royal Navy did not comprehend the potential value of the Marines who were already part of naval organization. Neither did the Lords of the Admiralty realize how reasonable and appropriate it would have been to utilize Marines as the naval landing force of the fleets.

Having failed to integrate naval landing forces into the structure of the fleets, British naval power was without the experience or theoretical background capable of indicating the manner in which aircraft should be incorporated into the organization of her naval establishment. At least officially, England failed to recognize that aircraft could be just as much a component of the fleets as were the surface or subsurface vessels. As in the case of landing forces in the days of sail, the Royal Navy in the twentieth century failed to realize that the instruments of naval power were more than the ships of the fleet. Consequently, prior to World War II the air weapon never became a major combat element of the Royal Navy.

As a consequence, England at the beginning of World War II possessed powerful fleets of ships, but the fleets did not possess the landing forces or the powerful combat aviation forces that were so indispensable to the realization of true naval power. On the outbreak of World War II the end result of centuries of British naval history was that England, because of her historical disinclination to incorporate major landing forces or air combat forces into naval organization in sufficient amount to complement the waterborne components of the navy, entered the war without a balanced fleet. For this failure England paid dearly. As Secretary of National Defense Forrestal has pointed out, "the consequence of this neglect was that the British went into the war with a totally inadequate naval air force." The sinking of the *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* did not end the disasters that befell England because of her failure to possess a balanced fleet.

The German invasion of Norway presented England with the opportunity to exploit her sea power in the defense of Norway, and in so doing to give the Germans an important and sound defeat. Tactically and strategically, reaction to the German threat in Norway was dependent on naval power—the ability to wage a naval campaign against the Norwegian coast. Again the lack of powerful naval air force had an immediate and unfavorable effect on the conduct of the British operations. From the practical standpoint the British initiated operations against the German forces in Norway without benefit of naval air cover. But British deficiencies in naval power did not stop with the absence of naval air forces. In keeping with historical precedent, England, on the eve of the Norwegian compaign, lacked the specially trained landing forces so necessary to extending the striking force of the fleet against land objectives.

Because England's naval power did not possess a readily available fleet marine force, 16,000 troops without adequate amphibious training were dispatched as a landing force against the Norwegian coast. Unprepared for an amphibious mission as a part of the conduct of a naval campaign, the landing force failed in its mission. In short, the Royal Navy was short on both naval air forces and naval landing forces similar to our fleet Marine Forces. England did not possess a balanced fleet, and consequently England lost Norway.

The lesson of the failure of the British naval campaign against Norway has been succinctly summarized by Secretary Forrestal: "This disaster, which profoundly affected the course of the entire war, was more than the failure of 16,000 men, but was a failure in the exercise of sea power on the part of the then largest Navy in the world, and it was entirely due to the lack of a small, specially trained amphibious force such as we have in the form of the United States Marines, to supplement ashore the action of the fleet at sea."

The naval traditions of the United States have their origins in the Royal Navy. The early naval thought of the United States Navy was closely akin to British thinking, so it was not strange that when United States Marines were first organized in 1775 they were employed largely in the manner in which the Royal Marines had been used by the Royal Navy. From their inception the United States Marines were associated with naval functions, seeing service as part of ships companies, at naval establishments ashore, and as landing parties in connection with naval attacks of shore positions. Such employment was no departure from British precedent.

During the hundred-odd years that intervened between the Revolution and the Spanish-American War, marines participated in numerous landing operations. Used principally in conjunction with sailors to form a landing party or as part of a larger landing force composed largely of army troops, marines continued to be employed according to European precedent. Until the end of the nineteenth century there was little or no indication that this Nation saw the need for integrating landing forces into the structure of the fleet. The United States Navy was no closer to the realization of the need for a balanced fleet than was England.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century two things happened that were to have a profound and lasting effect on the future naval development of this Nation. Alfred Thayer Mahan wrote The Influence of Sea Power on History (copyrighted 1890), and the United States went to war against Spain. It was a war of a nation of the old world against a nation of the new world. As such it was an intercontinental war involving both hemispheres. The Spanish-American War, coupled with Mahan's rationalization of sea power, brought home to the American people the realization of how dependent they were upon command of the sea.

The balanced fleet today may well be considered both as a logical extension and application of the thinking of Mahan, and as a practical outgrowth of the war with Spain. The writings of Mahan provided the theoretical basis for the intelligent solution of the naval problems created by this Nation's emergence from the Spanish-American War as a leading naval power.

The United States became a great sea power by virtue of the defeat of the Spanish Empire. And with this victory over Spain came a new and greater appreciation of the role of landing forces, and the necessity for integrating such landing (or expeditionary forces as they were called) within the structure of the fleet. The efficient assault and seizure of the advanced fleet base at Guantanamo by a battalion of marines stood out in bold relief against the background of confusion that characterized the efforts to get Shafter's troops ashore at Siboney. The value of landing forces within the naval organization was demonstrated at Guantanamo and it was readily recognized by those who exercised naval command in the Cuban waters. Landings on the South coast of Cuba provided abundant opportunity to compare and contrast the landing efficiency of troops accustomed to normal land warfare and those, such as the Marine battalion at Guantanamo, accustomed to the sea and the requirements of naval command. Admiral Sampson soon recognized the asset he possessed in the Marine battalion. It is reported that on July 3, 1898, when the Spanish fleet finally emerged, Sampson was actually on his way to inform General Shafter that if he wasn't able to dispose of the Spanish batteries commanding the entrance to Santiago, he (Sampson) would bring up the Marine battalion and do it.

The Spanish-American War's demonstrated need for fleet marine forces was readily recognized by those who understood the character and requirements of a naval campaign. The following quotations indicate the extent to which naval thought appreciated the need for landing forces within the structure of the fleet:

Admiral Dewey: "If there had been 5,000 marines under my command at Manila Bay, the city would have surrendered to me on May 1, 1898, and could have been properly garrisoned."

Rear Adm. John E. Pillsbury, while Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in 1908, stated that the marines "should be organized into regiments, battalions, and companies, and should be embarked, or ready to embark in a suitable vessel, and should be attached to the fleets, thus forming part of the fighting force of the fleet directly under the commander in chief."

Marines continued to see the logic of the employment of expeditionary forces as part of the fleet. In 1908 Major General Commandant George F. Elliott invited attention to the "absolute necessity for * * * transports for the sole and exclusive use of the Marine Corps." In 1912 Major General Commandant William P. Biddle again commented on the need for proper transports for expeditionary forces. General Biddle accurately visualized the nature of future fleet marine force establishments as he called for the

adoption of "the policy of having at least one large post on each coast," for use of the expeditionary forces. His remarks of December 18, 1913, are particularly significant, in that he pointed to the necessity for maintaining sufficient marine forces for use in connection with a naval campaign.

The above quotations are noteworthy in that they show clearly how our national naval thought adjusted itself to the problems involved in the conduct of a war on a global scale, as was the then recent war with Spain. Expeditionary forces of Marines were to be separate and distinct from the Marine detachments of the various ships, and as such these expeditionary forces were a definite departure from previous United States and British naval thought on the employment of Marines. Almost coincident with this Nation's emergence onto the world scene as a leading naval power, our high command recognized something that the British failed to learn in over two centuries of dependence on sea power—that employment of naval power in the exercise of a Nation's sea power necessitated a fleet organization that provided the naval commanders with the necessary combat tools to wage a naval war. The United States after the Spanish American War, her first venture into war conducted on a global scale, readily recognized that the application of naval power by a maritime Nation demanded that such naval power be predicated upon the concept of the balanced fleet.

The period covering the last years of the nineteenth century and the first years of the twentieth century, an era dominated by the Spanish American War and the United States emergence as a naval power may well be termed the era of amphibious awakening. Out of those years came the new realization of a need for landing forces within the fleet. This made possible the balanced fleets that proved to be the key to victory in the Pacific in World War II.

World War I did not give this Nation the opportunity to employ expeditionary forces in conjunction with major naval operations. Consequently, immediate postwar military thinking questioned the need for Marine expeditionary forces organized as functional components of the fleets. Those who may have doubted wisdom of maintaining Marine expeditionary forces received their answer on March 13, 1920, when Maj. Gen. John A. Lejeune testified before House Naval Affairs Committee and presented his views as to what he believed to be the proper functions of the Marine Corps in the future. Lejeune pointed out that World War I did not permit the Marine Corps to carry out its logical mission. While recognizing the peculiar nature of World War I as it affected the utilization of fleet expeditionary forces, he emphasized the thought that future wars would not necessarily be in keeping with the patterns of the First World War.

The need for Marine expeditionary forces ready for immediate service with the fleets, was clearly explained. Said General Lejeune: "There is always the danger that the next war may burst upon us as suddenly as did the last war on England and France. As these expeditionary forces of marines are intended for service with the fleets, they must be kept in a similar state of readiness. The duty of the expeditionary forces with the fleets would be the seizure, occupation, fortification, and defense of temporary naval bases. Fleets cannot operate without bases."

Lejeune's testimony went far toward clarifying thinking regarding the need for Marine expeditionary forces. Not only did he help reorient our naval thought to the logical requirements of a maritime Nation but the thoughts expressed in the testimony served as a blueprint for future employment of the Marine Corps, emphasizing its fundamental mission of providing landing forces for employment in naval war. His testimony regarding the employment of marine naval landing forces was both prophetic and sound.

In 1933 the marine landing forces received the official and still effective designation of "fleet marine forces," an accurately descriptive term. Twenty-seven years after General Lejeune appeared before the House Naval Affairs Committee, Congress passed the National Security Act of 1947, and in that law Congress set forth the functions of the Marine Corps. The concept of the employment of Marine expeditionary forces (fleet marine forces) as visualized by General Lejeune is today embodied in the National Security Act of 1947.

Based upon the demonstrated willingness to consider landing forces as an integral component of naval power, there was no historical precedent in the United States Navy that prevented the airplane from being accepted along with the ships and landing forces as a functional component of naval power. In contrast to British naval thought and organization, the airplane was progressively developed and integrated into the structure of the United States naval forces. Early development of the catapult and the growth and versatility of the carrier emphasized the manner in which the airplane was accepted as a component of naval power. The airplane was recognized as a weapon capable of materially assisting in the struggle for control of the sea, and a combat instrument, particularly as in its later specialization for naval use, admirably suited for employment in extending the striking force of the fleet against enemy air, shipping, land targets, and in conjunction with surface, subsurface, and landing forces in prosecution of a naval campaign.

Acceptance of landing forces and air units as components of naval power produced the balanced fleets that stopped the Japanese tide of victory at Guadalcanal, drove in the perimeter of Japanese Empire defenses at Bougainville, and struck aggressively across the central Pacific, finally gaining bases from which the Army Air Forces could bring the Japanese homeland under B-29 and fighter attack. Indeed, it may be said that the balanced fleet was the principal means by which the war in the Pacific was fought and won.

The balanced fleet was no accident in the development of our naval organization. Basically the balanced fleet is a distinct departure from previous, and particularly British, naval precedent. It is indeed fortunate that those who formulated this Nation's naval policy were endowed with the vision, wisdom, and mental courage that permitted the United States to adopt the concept of the balanced fleet. By so doing the makers of our naval policy gave this Nation the naval organization tailored to fit the requirements of a maritime power, and as a consequence this Nation was able to avoid the disasters that fell upon the British because of that nation's failure to adopt such a logical concept of naval organization. The ability of the United States naval power to occupy Iceland on short notice and to strike with little preparation against Guadalcanal stands in sharp contrast against the failure of British naval power to respond successfully to similar requirements in Norway and Crete. The difference between British failure and United States success is explained principally by the fact that the British did not possess a balanced fleet. The United States did.

Acceptance of the concept of the balanced fleet provided the means by which the United States could most effectively apply its sea power. Effective application of sea power is still a fundamental consideration of national security. Strengthened by the increased combat capabilities of the air weapon, the last war clearly demonstrated that naval power provides the only reliable medium for gaining and maintaining control of ocean areas. Today, when even the need for any navy at all is being questioned at the highest military level, it is better to base our national defense doctrine upon demonstrated truths than upon the unsupported contentions of enthusiasts who deprecate naval power and claim the air weapon to be an independent instrument for achieving victory.

Our national naval power has utilized the air weapon, not as an independent force in itself, but as a weapon capable of assisting in gaining and maintaining control of the seas. As it is used in naval war, the airplane is an integral part of naval power, exploited to full advantage, its effort coordinated appropriately with other elements of the balanced fleet in the struggle to achieve a naval objective. No one component of naval power wins a naval campaign. It is the coordinate effort of all elements—landing force, air, and combat vessels—that constitutes the naval combat team known as the balanced fleet. As they exist as components of the balanced fleet, landing forces are not thought of as land power, nor are naval air components identified as air power; neither are combat vessels considered synonymous with sea power. Rather, each is a mutually supporting component of naval power, and as such finds its logical justification in the coordinate role it plays in the application of the Nation's sea power.

As long as this Nation continues to realize that sea power is an indispensable factor in national security, and as long as the balanced fleet is accepted as the most efficient means of effecting the forceful application of sea power, then, for that long, the existence of fleet marine forces (which in fact means the Marine Corps) and naval aviation is logically justified. Thus, the balanced fleet is reason for maintaining fleet marine forces and naval aviation as we know them today. It goes without saying that diminution or major alteration of the function of naval aviation will have an immediate effect on the status of fleet marine forces; conversely, a reduction or major modification of the function of fleet marine forces will have a similar effect on the status of naval aviation. Both have their raison d'être in the concept of the balanced fleet. Neither are today logically justified without it.

The concept of the balanced fleet is probably more applicable to the future than the past. It was valid when only landing forces and surface vessels comprised a balanced fleet, and it has even more effectively demonstrated its applicability in the technologically advanced atmosphere of World War II. It will continue to be a factor of world strategy in peace or war. Future technological advances may well alter the present composition and technique of the balanced fleets required for the prosecution of a naval campaign. Greater emphasis will be placed upon naval combat aviation as a means of intensifying and extending the striking power of the fleet. Fleet marine forces of the future will place increasing importance upon air transport. Illustrative of the inherent versatility of the balanced fleets of the future, the increasing importance of air transportation for fleet marine forces may be equaled by the advances in the utilization of undersea craft for the transportation of such fleet marine forces.

Thus the concept of the balanced fleet, valid in the past and present, will continue to be justified in the future. Based upon such guiding principle our naval power of the future should retain the characteristics of teamwork, operational self-sufficiency, and the unexcelled strategic mobility that have come to be the intrinsic attributes of our progressive naval thought and action.

The balanced fleet has been accepted as a major feature of national security. The National Security Act of 1947 recognizes both naval aviation and fleet marine forces to be major elements of naval power, and the

"naval campaign" is accorded legal recognition in this basic security legislation. In writing the National Security Act, Congress recognized our national dependence upon sea power and, by directing the maintenance of surface, subsurface, air and landing force elements of naval power, made the concept of the balanced fleet a major feature of our national security.

Congress, in passing the National Security Act of 1947, recognized that the organization of our armed forces must be designed according to our peculiar needs as a maritime nation. As a consequence, Congress further recognized that the structure of our armed forces cannot be patterned according to continental European military thought nor based upon the purported combat self-sufficiency of any one type of weapon.

As long as such truths remain self-evident, the security of this Nation will in large measure continue to depend upon the forceful application of our sea power by the balanced fleet.

U. S. S. "Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese-American Citizens League, together with many Americans of Japanese descent, believes that if the United States Army Transport *Pvt. Sadao S. Munemori* were sent into the Pacific, where it might make regular calls at Japanese ports, it would be of inestimable value in further cementing Japanese and American friendship and understanding.

I believe there is a great deal of merit in this suggestion and therefore commend it highly to the Department of the Army.

In connection with the renaming of this Army transport in honor of Sadao S. Munemori, I present herewith an extract from the New York Times of Saturday, March 20, 1948:

SADAO MUNEMORI'S SHIP

For the first time in our history a United States Army vessel now bears the honored name of a Japanese-American soldier who gave his life for his country. In a ceremony at the Brooklyn Army Base the ship has been rechristened the United States Army transport *Pvt. Sadao Munemori*. Sadao is dead, but his name lives on.

Munemori's service is recorded in a posthumous award of the Congressional Medal. He was a Los Angeles Nisei boy who joined the famous Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team early in the war and later during the Italian campaign made a distinguished record as assistant squad leader of Company A. On April 5, 1945, near Seravezzra, the company was pinned down by fire from the enemy's mountain batteries. Munemori, advancing alone, knocked out two of the foe's machine guns with grenades and was making for a shell crater occupied by two of his men. An unexploded grenade bounced from his helmet and rolled toward his comrades. He promptly flung himself upon it and was blown to bits.

If his ship could now be manned by his old Nisei companions in arms and sent to Japan, it would be a telling token of democracy and racial understanding at work. Patriotism and heroism are passports across every frontier.

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials from the Clarion (Pa.) Republican of March 25, 1948:

(These two essays published here were written by Edith Talbot, a senior in Knox High School. Her grades on the two essays, the first prepared and the second extemporaneous, won first place in the county contest for her, and the prize of a 4-year scholarship at any one of several State institutions. The Republican is proud to present Miss Talbot's essays.)

WILL DEMOCRACY SURVIVE?

Democracy, which gives birth to the kind of civilization in which men may live as men and not as slaves, was invented in Greece many centuries ago. It traveled to Rome, was blotted out for a time by the empire, lived underground during the Dark Ages, only to crop up in England and migrate to the American colonies. The torch first lighted in Athens is now in the hands of the American people. Will that torch light the centuries to come? Will democracy survive?

Within this generation we have watched dictatorships rise and fall, we have seen discontent grow under monarchy, we have seen the Japanese Imperial Government lose its grip on its people. Yet our American democracy has survived two wars, and we are still able to feel confident of its ultimate survival. Although we have not reached a utopia or have effected a perfect democracy we do go forward with faith in the fundamental ideals for which democracy stands.

Democracy in its long evolution, with its false freedoms, excesses, and frequent failures, is still the upspringing faith in man's right under God to be free, to govern himself, and to worship his Creator. Democracy is not just a political form; it is a spiritual faith. All men are created equal, not in the shallow sense of equal health or equal intelligence quotients, but in the deep sense that each and every man has the same intrinsic value.

The greatest threat to the democratic way of life is the Russian-guided Communist Party. The word "Communist" is on the lips of every person speaking of national or international affairs. We realize that the Russians are as intent on spreading communism as we are on spreading democracy. It would be contrary to our democratic principles to deny them this right. However, we do not force our ideas on them, and for the same reason deny them the right to use subversive methods with us. Nor is it enough for us to be anticommunistic any more than it is enough for us to be antismallpox. You can still die of smallpox unless you use the serum against it. Our most effective serum in this case is to make democracy work for greater opportunity and greater security for all people.

The breeding ground for communism is that spot where people through no fault of their own do not have enough to eat or enough to wear. Communism hunts misery, feeds on misery, and profits from misery. The President of Shanghai University points out that hunger is driving many Chinese students to communism out of sheer desperation. Hunger is making many lose their sense of decency. Such a distorted sense of values is also seen in the story of a 10-year-old Nuremberg schoolgirl. Asked to write a theme on The Happiest Day of My Life, she wrote, "The happiest day of my life was November 17, 1947, when my brother died and I inherited his underwear and shoes."[1]

Freedom walks hand in hand with abundance. Thus we are fortifying democracy when we rid the world of want. At the same time this is an effective means of overcoming communism, although that is secondary in our purpose. George Marshall surely must have realized this when he said, "Our foreign policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, desperation, and chaos."[2]

The differences most frequently pointed out between the two systems are in the economic field. The basis of our economy is competition and free enterprise, factors ruled out by communism. Yet our economy is by far the most productive in the world. With 6 percent of the world's population we produce one-third of the world's goods, and use three-fourths of the automobiles, one-half of the radios, one-third of the wool supply, and one-third of the soap. The Russians call this unimportant beside their armament manufacturing. The current Soviet 5-year plan calls for overemphasis on heavy industry—the only country where heavy industry is larger than light industry—in order to put themselves on an equal footing with the "warmongering" nations. Yet Andre Vishinsky said, "There will be no war in my lifetime." But he added slyly, "However, I am 63 years old."[3]

Wherein lies our strength? How can we insure the peace? Again we come to a clash of ideals. We of the democratic nations see national strength and real peace only when our basic consideration is the highest welfare and happiness of all people. This is the justification for our foreign policy. Our democracy challenges us to tolerance and respect for the individual, and for opportunity for education and profitable occupation, not only for ourselves, but for all people.

The torch is in the hands of the American people. It is up to us to prove that the ideals of democracy can be made to work. This is not merely a national problem, nor one which is dependent upon a small group of politicians, but one in which each individual must share the responsibility. But is not "democracy based on the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people"?[4] Certainly democracy shall survive.

Bibliography

Case, Leland D. Peace Demands Action, pages 43, 44, 113, 114, 115. Rotary International, Chicago, 1947.

Editorial, Is There a Witch Hunt?, Life magazine, January 12, 1948, page 26.

Fisher, John. Why They Behave Like Russians, Harper Bros., New York, 1947.

Haslam, R. T. Competition Is an American Resource." Reader's Digest, January 1948, pages 132–134.

Hauser, Ernest O. The German Russia Hates Most, The Saturday Evening Post, November 15, 1947, page 24.

Hutchison, Paul. From Victory to Peace, Willett Clerk & Co., Chicago and New York, 1943.

Lamott, Willis. Do You Want a Christian World, pages 27–33, Friendship Press, New York, 1944.

[1] Newsweek, December 8, 1947.

[2] Gen. George Marshall, Secretary of State: Quote, Droke House, Indianapolis, volume 10, No. 20.

[3] Andre Vishinsky, Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister: Quote, Droke House, Indianapolis, volume 14, No. 15.

[4] Harry Emerson Fosdick, Today's Woman, November 1947.

Raymond, Ellsworth L. Russian Industry: Myth or Menace, The Saturday Evening Post, November 29, 1947, page 28.

Special report, Marshall, Grand Strategist, Newsweek, January 5, 1948, page 22.

The Weekly Digest, Quote, Droke House, Indianapolis, volume 14, Nos. 15, 20

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

Unity without uniformity—this was the definition of democracy found in a small-town newspaper. But is this just a grand ideal, or is it something real on which to base our future and the future of the world. To those to which democracy means something real, it is more than a political form; it is a spiritual faith to which they cling. These ideals must mean something to every one of us, and we must make them mean something to others; for today's world is desperately in need of something firm to build on.

Education stands as an ever-important factor in the development of democracy. The uneducated masses are never able to think things through for themselves and this is always an open path for communism to step in or for a dictator to grab his power. Numerous South American countries have set up constitutions similar to ours and have patterned their system of government after ours, but still have been a failure. Are we doing our part to educate the people of the world for democracy and teaching the democratic way of life? A Chinese family that had been living in Cuba for 5 years, in daily contact with Americans and within 150 miles of the world's greatest democracy could not explain what democracy was or even stood for, when asked. Yet when asked to explain what communism stood for, the response was immediate and answer in full detail. Are we failing in this phase of education? The more widespread education is up to us.

International unity cannot be possible unless we have a race and religious tolerance within our own country. A grave on a South Pacific island was found marked, "Here lies a black man, who died while fighting the yellow man, so that the white man might be free." America is waking up to the realization that this attitude must not exist in a democracy. This is not something to be settled merely by legislation; it is up to each of us as individuals to show tolerance to our fellow man. It is found in Switzerland, a real democracy, that three distinct races of people have been able to live together; each retaining their own customs and languages. Surely this is proof that it can be done.

The economic system we have developed in this democracy, based on private enterprise, initiative and hard work, has given us the reputation of the best-dressed and the best-fed people of the world. But does this mean we are to act like the rich family on the hill and refuse to see the slums below? The misery of our fellow men, sometimes through no fault of their own, is our concern, too. Communism hunts misery, feeds on misery, and profits from it. Freedom walks hand in hand with abundance. Although our foreign policy is aimed at fortifying democracy, this comes secondary to those principles taught by democracy; that we cannot sit by and let our neighbors suffer while we are wasting our surplus.

Yes, democracy is something real, a grand ideal that can be realized, and a unity still retaining individual freedom. Men have always been more willing to fight for their God or their country than to examine them and practice the principles they teach. We have defended these ideals, and now we must prove to others what we know this our democracy really is.

California DiGiorgio Farm Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 of this year, Congressman ELLIOTT, of California, in a speech to the Congress, made certain statements regarding a 6-month-old strike at the DiGiorgio Farms near Bakersfield, Calif.

I received a letter from Mr. H. L. Mitchell, president of the National Farm Labor Union of the American Federation of Labor, welcoming the plan of Congressman ELLIOTT, that the Committee on Education and Labor send a subcommittee to make a fair investigation of the working conditions and the circumstances at the DiGiorgio Farms which caused this strike.

He has also submitted a complete report made by the American Friends Service committee which has already made a complete survey of the conditions leading up to this strike. The American Friends Service Committee is a Quaker organization which received the Nobel peace prize for its services during the war.

In fairness to the striking employees, every Member of Congress should read the unbiased report of this committee, which follows:

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION STRIKE AT THE DIGIORGIO RANCH

(By Dr. Clarence Yarrow, American Friends Service Committee)

INTRODUCTION

The following report by Dr. Clarence Yarrow, formerly with the War Labor Board and now director of the Pasadena branch of Telluride Association, was prepared at the request of the American Friends Service Committee following several visits to the strike area.

Development of the economic relations committee in the Philadelphia office, and of an economic problems seminar series in our own area, have led us to investigate this strike in Kern County with some care, looking toward increasing our knowledge of the situation and toward being useful, if opportunity should offer, in working out a solution.

Clarence E. Pickett, executive secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, has joined the National Citizens Committee under the chairmanship of Dr. John Haynes Holmes.

PAUL B. JOHNSON,
Executive Secretary,
Southern California Branch.

The National Farm Labor Union, American Federation of Labor affiliate, formerly the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, has long been concerned with the welfare of the rural worker as an employee of large farming corporations that are characteristic of many areas of the South and West. The union decided to expand its concern to the rural workers on the west coast and began organizing at several points in the San Joaquin Valley with greatest success at the DiGiorgio Ranch near Bakersfield.

The DiGiorgio Fruit Ranch, comprising about 20,000 acres, employs about 1,500 men on a year-round basis. In September 1947, the union asked for a chance to negotiate, but there was no response from the management. A strike vote was taken and the strike called October 1, asking for union recognition. Union figures show 850 members in the Farm Labor Union and 128 in the Teamsters Union, AFL. The two unions have cooperated closely in organizing and striking. The strike has continued since that time with picket lines fully manned.

Because of the limitations of space, this report will deal largely with conclusions rather than a minute study of the evidence. The conclusions are based on several trips to observe the situation at first hand and talks with the DiGiorgio management, representatives of the Associated Farmers of California, the DiGiorgio local, and officials of the National Farm Labor Union and the American Federation of Labor. These investigations were undertaken as a representative of the American Friends Service Committee.

A CONFLICT OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE

This small drama being enacted at the DiGiorgio Ranch is an item of major consequence in the lives of people and the economic relations in the San Joaquin Valley. Both sides are mustering their maximum powers to fling into the struggle. The AFL is supporting the strike to a very large degree. On the other side, the Associated Farmers of California are, I believe, completely opposed to any negotiations with the union.

TAKING SIDES IN THE CONTROVERSY

One can make a good case on either side, depending on the assumptions with which one approaches the controversy. If one assumes that the farm operators generally are sensitive to the needs of their workers and are caught between the two millstones of the market and the wage bill with terrific hazards of weather to upset all predictions, one might conclude that the additional hazard of dealing with a union is too much, Such a union might call a strike at the time of harvest and ruin a whole year's investment. If one assumes, on the other hand, that the welfare of the workers and their families is of prime importance and that the management is not likely to be overly sensitive to these needs, then one is inclined to favor the union side of the picture.

The second assumption is the one to which I am inclined, and there are several factors which lead me to draw conclusions on this basis.

1. Human values

On a large ranch the person-to-person relations become considerably diluted. A worker is one among many, with little sense of personal belonging, and his sense of security in the job becomes jeopardized even when, as in this case, the management tries to be very considerate of the worker's welfare.

It is a prime Quaker and Christian principle that one should respect the individual and if one expects the best, one gets the best. Although this principle must be modified by realism in practical situations, it is nevertheless a very important key. The management is patronizing and pitying. It expects the worst and does not give the workers a sufficient sense of worth or security. The union expects the best and has achieved great results. There is a strong sense of solidarity in the group, a feeling of commitment to a higher ideal than their own welfare. The Associated Farmers would depreciate this, but their own testimony indicates that the workers have taken the strike on as a "crusade."

2. Values of union organization

If one feels that unions generally have been more of a detriment than a benefit one would be opposed to unions in this field. Management and Associated Farmers representatives seemed to think that unions might have their place in industry but not

in agriculture. Just as unions, in my opinion, have generally been a necessary and valuable concomitant of large industrial growth, so in the area of farming the depressed state of the workers is ample evidence of the need for organization. Perhaps I am not farmer enough to listen to the plea that the harvest is such a crucial matter that the operator can brook no possibility of interference at that time. There are other operations that are just as critical in the industrial field, and I have no doubt that this argument has been used again and again to combat any union that was in formation. I would say then that it is important to have a union organization to strive for improvements in working conditions and give the workers a sense of democratic participation in the vital issues of our society.

An additional factor of importance is that agricultural laborers receive no benefits from most social legislation. The union stresses the needs of unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, etc., as an important part of their program. While these are long-term objectives, it is evident that until some strong organization is able to speak for agricultural laborers, they will continue to be discriminated against.

3. Responsible leadership

It is very important to ask whether the leadership of the National Farm Labor Union is acting responsibly and in the long-term interests of the workers. There have been many irresponsible efforts in the agricultural labor field where workers have been exploited and used to further a political line. This is not the case with the NFLU. I have known H. L. Mitchell, president of the NFLU, and many union leaders for some time. I can amply affirm that Mr. Mitchell has not been alined with the Communists at any time and has, in fact, headed several struggles against Communist control in the agricultural labor field. The union has done an excellent job in the South in bettering race relations and has continued with that emphasis in this situation where racial prejudices have been an important factor.

The strike has been conducted in a most exemplary manner by the union leaders. Animosities have been kept down. Counsels of moderation have prevailed; fears of violence have not materialized. While tensions may arise in the future, I feel that the leaders will do all they can to prevent incidents. Without the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act, which does not apply to agricultural laborers, and confronted by a very powerful economic organization in the DiGiorgio Corp. and the Associated Farmers, temptations to forceful action against strike breakers have been great.

4. Tactics used in the labor controversy

Again drawing conclusions without giving the evidence because of lack of space, I should say that the tactics of the management and Associated Farmers have been ones largely of suppression of news, smearing the opposition as Communist, provocation to violence, and use of courts and police to intimidate. Many incidents could be related to support this statement. The union has not been altogether fair in the publicity it has issued, but by and large, the union tactics have been for a full and free public discussion, economic pressure without violence, moderate and equitable demands.

POSSIBILITIES OF A SOLUTION TO THE CONFLICT

The courage and good spirits of the strikers are impressively maintained. On the other hand, the DiGiorgio Corp. carries on with a large amount of imported labor. A stalemate persists, one which is full of potentialities for violence and injustices. In such a situation the influence of outside groups may have considerable effect.

ASSISTANCE BY OUTSIDE GROUPS

As stated, the Associated Farmers desire the controversy to be localized and ignored as much as possible. The union would like to have as much publicity and national notice as possible. Attempts that have been made to form impartial local committees for mediation and investigation have been unsuccessful. The special citizens' committee which produced the pamphlet, A Community Aroused, is completely on the side of the Associated Farmers. The chief backer of this committee is a man who has potato and cotton crops. The union has been trying with some success to raise the labor rate on these and other crops.

A national citizens' committee on the DiGiorgio strike is being formed with purposes of relief, investigation, and mediation. John Don Passos and Monsignor Ligutti are serving on it. There has been talk of a California committee of similar purpose. If the weight of independent liberal groups is to be effective at all in the field of labor relations, they should certainly exert as strong an influence as possible in such situations where the call for investigation and impartial mediation is imperative.

National Defense Is First Function of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun, Friday, March 19, 1948:

CAN WE AFFORD TO BE WITHOUT NATIONAL DEFENSE?

The Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, coupled with Stalin's demands for a "defense" agreement with Finland and mounting totalitarian pressures in France, Italy, and other European nations, has brought the international situation to its worst point since 1939.

But the direct approach to the crisis, spearheaded among our national leaders by President Truman's historic requests to Congress this week, appears to be meeting that crisis as well as the Nation is today able to cope with such a situation.

It is clear that those who dislike and envy us abroad respect only one quality in a country—and that quality is military strength. It is not warmongering to say that the United States must maintain a defense establishment far more effective than any we have ever had in peacetime so long as the world remains in its present explosive state. That is simply insurance for our survival.

According to those who know best, all branches of our military forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard alike—are in a dangerously weak condition. We have sunk, in the space of about 2 years, from the greatest military power on earth to a third-rate military power.

This was only partially the result of the postwar demobilization. The armed services have been denied requested appropriations for research and development which they consider absolutely vital if they are to keep pace with the Soviet Union, whose army is reported to be still at wartime strength. This has been done, of course, in the name of economy. But while military budgets have been cut, there has been the most flagrant waste in other directions.

Representative HOMER R. JONES, of Bremerton, pressed home a point before a House committee hearing in Washington last week. Seeking an increase in funds for the Navy's Bureau of Ships to $400,000,000—the minimum necessary for the 1948–49 tasks at hand in that department—JONES properly pointed to the Budget Bureau as being "severely cautious and frugal to the point of being detrimental to the good of the service and the welfare of the Nation."

This is not a political matter. The national defense is the first function of government, regardless of what party is in power. And to say we cannot afford a first-rate military establishment at a time when we are wasting untold billions, is criminally to mislead the people.

Increase of Pay for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the postal workers in southern California (in fact all Government workers in that area) are well deserving of an increase in pay at the earliest possible moment. Living costs have increased rapidly without regard to the size of salaries, the number of children in the families, or the thousand and one other expenses which accumulate in the life of every American family.

I hope that a bill will be brought out soon to grant an increase in salary to these deserving Government workers. In this connection I submit herewith the following editorial from the Long Beach Press-Telegram of March 17, 1948:

POSTAL WORKERS MERIT RAISE

Testimony before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has made a conclusive case for legislation to increase the pay of postal employees. The reason is twofold. One involves simple justice to these workers, who are egregiously underpaid. The other is that recruitment of new employees in the service, as well as maintenance of efficiency among those already enrolled, inevitably suffers when salary scales are substandard.

The entrance pay of postal personnel at present is $2,100 annually. Since 1939 the scale has been increased only 20 percent. But in the same period the cost of living has risen 69 percent, according to a February 1 report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In terms of the purchasing power of the 1939 dollar, employees in the entrance bracket are working for $23.38 per week, before deductions. Under these conditions the job of carrying the mail, although requiring civil service certification, ranks with casual and unskilled work.

Bills pending in committee provide for increases from $500 to $1,000 annually. The cost of living statistics suggest a fair compromise of about $800. While this is a relatively large raise to be made effective in one stroke, it is intended to right an injustice that began 9 years ago. From a standpoint of equity, a portion of it may be considered retroactive pay.

In Long Beach, 300 carriers and 400 postal clerks are among those who will benefit from the salary adjustment. Actually, everyone will benefit through improved mail service now and in the future.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include two editorials dealing with national-defense problems. The first of these appeared in the Indianapolis Star, issue of March 25, and the other in the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, issue of March 26, 1948:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of March 25, 1948]

WHERE IS THE CONNECTION?

The proponents of universal military training have succeeded in linking it in many minds with the possible need for an emergency draft. The influential Senate Armed Services Committee reportedly now favors a draft and universal military training. The United States Chamber of Commerce comes out in favor of strong defense measures and universal military training. Former Supreme Court Justice Roberts says the "Commies" are behind opposition to universal military training.

The Star asks again: Where is the connection between an emergency draft and universal military training? If the Congress of the United States feels we are in such danger that we need a draft, then by all means let us have it. But why this insistent linking of selective service and other defense measures with universal military training? Just how would universal military training make this Nation militarily stronger against the present Russian threat?

Under universal military training the Army would give 18-year-old boys 1 year of mild (to say the least) military training. The boys would at no time be members of the Army or subject to Army regulations. Universal military training would not make them into soldiers trained and ready to fight in complicated modern warfare. The thing would be a glorified CCC. Even so, it would take a long time, perhaps 2 years, to put it into operation. It would cost an estimated $2,000,000,000 a year. It would cost as much as our atomic research, the most expensive research program in history. It would take away funds desperately needed for truly effective defense measures.

Universal military training would not supply the technicians needed in modern war, nor could it contribute to our crying demand for an adequate intelligence service. Instead, it would take money now needed for such a service. It also would require up to 50,000 Army officers, who would be taken away from vital duties to play nursemaids to youngsters over whom they had no real authority.

Furthermore, universal military training would not be emergency legislation such as selective service. It would be a long-range departure from our democratic traditions. Like other such infringements on freedom, it would be difficult to dislodge once it was fastened on the American people.

The Star supports all legitimate and effective increases in this Nation's armed might. We favor a stepped-up reservist program, more inducements for volunteer enlistments, a revival of our once great Air Force, increased funds for research in everything adding to military efficiency, an adequate intelligence service and all other measures that will serve to protect us against Russian aggression. And when a majority in Congress decides the time has come for a draft, we shall favor that, too. But not universal military training. We cannot afford to waste manpower, time, money, and valuable trained military personnel on such a program when every penny spent for preparedness has got to count.

[From the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times of March 26, 1948]

Secretary of Defense Forrestal, while calling for a draft of 19- to 25-year olds in a $3,448,000,000 military expansion program, said peace prospects are good. At about the same time Secretary of the Navy Sullivan gave the country the jitters by declaring submarines had been sighted off our shores. If peace prospects are so good, why are the submarines patrolling the Atlantic? It seems to us that such a high official as Sullivan should have made his statement in secret, or he is taking this tack to get the additional three billion from Congress.

John Marshall Robsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anita Pollitzer, from Equal Rights for January-February 1948:

JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION: FRIEND AND LEADER

(By Anita Pollitzer, chairman of the National Woman's Party)

When Congressman John Marshall Robsion of Kentucky passed away on February the seventeenth, advocates of the Equal Rights Amendment lost the leadership of a great friend in Congress. As ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, as chief sponsor of the Equal Rights amendment, and as chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary charged with reporting the amendment to the House of Representatives, Mr. Robsion was earnest and intent on the passage of the amendment in this session. We will greatly miss his wisdom and personal legislative guidance.

From the time he consented to act as our chief sponsor, he built solidly. Early in the session, he wrote to friends of the amendment inviting them to join him in its introduction. In response to this, 102 Members of the House of Representatives are officially cooperating in securing passage of the amendment. Through the reorganization period of the first session of this Congress, he carefully planned so that the amendment would receive early consideration in this session. To this end he scheduled an early hearing. This was to have been on February 18. Congressman Robsion passed away on the evening before the day scheduled for the hearing.

Those of us who had the privilege of working closely with Mr. Robsion on the amendment deeply appreciated his ability, his sense of justice, his great understanding, and his kindliness. The cases he would cite to show the obvious justice of the amendment came from his own experience in the practice of the law and his observations of inequality. In a speech which he read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 29, after quoting support of the amendment from high places, he said with the down-to-earth realism which so characterized him:

"I know a man, not far away from my home, who had a wife and 12 children, ranging from a few months to 16 years of age. They were all at home. They owned no land, no personal property except their meager clothing and household goods and one fine Jersey cow. The mother was responsible for the family having one cow. The cow was the mainstay of the family. The father traded that fine Jersey cow for an old second-hand Ford car. No persuasion could have induced that mother to have made such an improvident trade. But under the laws of Kentucky the father had the legal right to swap the family cow for this old Ford."

There was not a particle of pretense about Mr. Robsion, and when he said: "We should, without further delay, submit to the States for ratification, this constitutional amendment and grant equal justice under the law" that was what he meant.

Throughout Mr. Robsion's political life, he took pleasure in aiding the cause of women. His first national political responsibility came in 1916 when he was delegate to the Republican National Convention, and was chosen as a member of its resolutions committee. Alice Paul was there, leading the demand of women for a suffrage plank in that platform. She has often recalled how Mr. Robsion at once pledged his support of the suffrage plank; voting in the resolutions committee and in the convention of 1916 for this first party plank to declare for woman suffrage—an experience which undoubtedly caused him to see the significance of his party's present plank favoring submission of the equal-rights amendment.

Last July, at a memorable garden party at national headquarters, arranged by Cecil Norton Broy, political chairman, in honor of the congressional sponsors of the amendment, Mr. Robsion, in a rousing speech, prophesied that in the fight for the amendment's passage we would soon "rejoice in triumph."

AN APPRECIATION

(By Betty Gram Swing, cochairman political committee, National Woman's Party)

With the passing of John M. Robsion, Congressman from Kentucky, the National Woman's Party loses one of its most courageous champions. He was a special friend of its members, an eloquent advocate of the equal rights amendment. He liked to recall his introduction to their campaign for equality. It was in 1916 when as member of the platform committee of the Republican Convention in Chicago he heard the pleas of a group, drenched with rain and shivering with cold. They had been parading during a storm and had left the line of march to make their pleas before the committee. With a twinkle in his eye he often related this episode and how he was captivated by the fervor and valor of this group. Two years later when he came to Washington as a Congressman one of the first votes he cast was for the nineteenth amendment enfranchising women.

Mr. Robsion was known to his friends as "that mountain Congressman." He resembled the Great Emancipator in more than appearance, like Lincoln, being rangy and 6 feet 4 in height. Born in a one-room log cabin, orphaned at 12, he worked his way through school, graduated from National Normal University, taught school, practiced law, and entered politics. He was elected to Congress in 1918 and was one of the few Republicans able to hold his seat from a normally Democratic State.

He held some of the most important committee assignments, among them that of the Judiciary Committee, and as chairman of its subcommittee which handled the equal-

rights amendment, was in a key position to guide the destiny of its passage through the Eightieth Congress. He had a clear vision of the importance of extending and guaranteeing under the law, democracy to half the population of this country. He felt that the year 1948 was not only crucial but dramatic. He said it was the year of destiny for women's freedom, that it was crucial because of the necessity of recording the enormous gains in support of the amendment before the coming election; dramatic—because of the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the first equal rights meeting ever held in any country in the world. Mr. Robsion was determined to culminate the campaign in victory.

But he died the day before the scheduled hearing of the equal-rights amendment before the Committee of the Judiciary of the House, on the very eve of success.

Like Lincoln, who led the great fight to end the enslavement of a race, Mr. Robsion led the fight for similar freedom and guaranties for women. All women in the United States owe profound gratitude to this man, "that mountain Congressman" who dared to fight for their freedom. We have lost one of our wisest counselors and one of our best friends.

Whisky, Not Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as we alert ourselves in an effort to preserve our free way of life, many astounding disccveries are being made. We were shocked to learn that vital war materials have been steadily flowing into Russia and her satellite Communistic-dominated neighbors. This is a shocking fact which our people do not understand.

As pointed out in the attached clipping from the column of Drew Pearson, although our stock pile of industrial alcohol is almost nil, distillers are still working overtime to manufacture intoxicating drinks. Let us hope that those in authority will act without delay to stop these almost treasonable practices.

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)
WHISKY, NOT ALCOHOL

WASHINGTON, March 24.—While the brass hats demand the drafting of men for the Army, they continue to let the big distillers pour out more and more whisky, despite the fact that the Nation's industrial alcohol reserve remains dangerously low.

Industrial alcohol was one of the most strategic materials of the late war, being used in producing synthetic rubber, chemicals, insecticides, TNT, and munitions. In fact, industrial alcohol was considered so essential that more than 200,000,000 gallons were stockpiled in the year 1943 alone.

Today, however, only about 21,000,000 gallons of industrial alcohol are stock piled—enough to last 10 short days if war should break.

While the big distillers are ignoring Truman's plea for voluntary rationing by adding to the already groaning supplies of whisky in warehouses, the Army and Navy munitions board is doing absolutely nothing about stock piling industrial alcohol for defense.

Real fact is that we face a worse industrial alcohol shortage, in event of an emergency, than before the last war—because at that time we had a big grain surplus. Now we have virtually no grain surplus, with foreign aid taking about all we can spare.

Meanwhile, the brass-hat-controlled munitions board hasn't even bothered to put industrial alcohol on its list of "strategic and critical materials."

The Communist Campaign in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by George E. Sokolsky, entitled "Techniques of Confusion" that appeared in the New York Sun on March 25, 1948:

TECHNIQUES OF CONFUSION
(By George E. Sokolsky)

In Italy, the Communist Party supports religion. Italy is peculiarly a Roman Catholic country in the sense that practically all Italians regard themselves as Catholics, even the atheists. In such a country, religion is the national philosophy of life, the central social relationship. It is a civilization. Italians who never set foot in a church are Catholics because without it, their way of life would lack meaning. That is admittedly difficult for Americans to understand; here it was possible for the Supreme Court to outlaw religion—any and all religion—to make atheism a way of life.

So, whereas the whole of Marxian philosophy is based upon a biologic conception of life which rejects God and the supernatural, in Italy, the same party, the same individuals support religion, encourage church marriages, baptisms, confirmations. By this device they encourage the Italians to believe that their Communists are simply politicians vying for power; that they do not have a philosophy of life which is utterly different from the Christian philosophy of life. It is a wonderful device.

Of course, the Communists attack the Vatican and the Catholic clergy, but not the religion that they represent. This is clever, too. For by not attacking the religion but only the clergy, they seek to separate the people from their intellectual leaders who happen to be the clergy, just as in Romania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, they killed or exiled professors of the universities, schoolteachers, middle-class leaders—separating their peoples from their leaders. In Poland, they killed most of them. Many in Hungary were exiled to Yakutsk. It is a technique of confusion designed to leave the people almost helpless. For in many countries in Europe, particularly in those where literacy is not too high, the intellectual plays an extraordinarily important role of leadership. By killing off or exiling the anti-Communist intellectuals, the Russians open the door for their stooges to act as substitutes.

And now, they have started a new campaign. The Italians are naturally proud of the fact that for over four centuries every Pope has been an Italian. Now the Communists in Italy are telling the people that the next Pope is to be an American. There are three of them, Cardinals Stritch, Mooney, and Spellman, who are being advertised as prospects for the Papal succession. Behind that is the scare that "American imperialism" will force an American Pope on the Italian people. A clever device.

In a word, not only is "American imperialism" a dollar control of a country, according to the Communists, but in Italy, it takes on a special form of also controlling the Vatican. This is an example of the way this party operates on a universal scale. In each country, it employs whatever techniques serve for the moment. It does not matter whether there is the slightest truth in what they say. Does the truth matter? Does anything matter but the end to be achieved? For that end, they will lie; they will even kill. It is what the Communists regard as the "inevitable" end, for which all things may be done.

And that is what Americans must remember. We Americans are irrevocably attached to freedom of the individual, freedom of speech, of thought, of expression in every manner. So when the Communists need to cover their corruption, they shriek about freedom. That immediately evokes every sense of fair play and decency in an American. Why should not every American, or for that matter, every human being, be free to express himself as he chooses? Are we to have thought control? Are we to have censorship of the movies? Are we to refuse to recognize that there is another side to every question?

Let us look at the other side of that picture. A vast international conspiracy, directed centrally by a universal state, designed to achieve a world unity around a separate creed, functioning in every country through disciplined agents, obedient to the will of an elite, operates in the United States as it does in Italy, France, Czechoslovakia, China, everywhere.

Are we not to protect ourselves? Is it necessary that we should be destroyed as a people because we dare not protect ourselves?

Palestine, Trieste, and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to help clarify the confusion abroad relative to the position taken by the United States at the United Nations, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by the insertion of an editorial that appeared in the Cleveland Press on March 22:

PALESTINE, TRIESTE, AND WAR

There is grave danger of world war. Our Government's highest duty is to prevent war if possible, by military preparedness and by economic and political means. This explains Washington's latest diplomatic moves in the Palestinian and Italian crises. Unfortunately, much of the congressional and public reaction ignores the world situation and passes partisan judgment.

Our Government proposes to suspend the Palestine partition recommendation in favor of a temporary United Nations trusteeship, pending Assembly reconsideration. This is cursed by certain Jews as a sell-out, praised by Arabs as a partisan victory, deplored by others here as a reversal of policy. The idea that American security and war prevention should be the determining factor in American policy—rather than pleasing Jews or Arabs—never seems to occur to them.

In the case of Trieste critics emphasize that this is a reversal by the United States, Britain, and France; that we want to welsh on the Italian treaty in order simply to outsmart the Russians. The proposed return of Trieste to Italy is generally approved, even though it is assumed that our Government is pulling a fast one which we would not permit Stalin to pull.

This too-prevalent attitude toward American diplomacy is a compound of half-truths and untruths, as dangerous as it is fantastic. It assumes that in international affairs there is always a clear, easy choice between right and wrong, black and white; that there is always a permanent solution; that a government should have a rigid policy and stick to that, regardless of changing circumstance. All of which is naive to the point of absurdity.

There is no choice between absolute right and absolute wrong in either the Palestinian or Trieste issues; the only possibilities are lesser of evils. And there is no chance now of a solution of either one of them—not in the sense of a guaranteed peaceful settlement of equal justice. Moreover, the best and wistest policy if either problem could be isolated, could be the worst policy if it produced a world war—particularly a war for which we were not prepared.

The ideal Palestine solution is a free, democratic country in which all enjoy equal rights and live in peace together. That has been made impossible by mutual hatred and strife between Arab and Jewish extremists, whose violence not only prevents any just, peaceful Palestine settlement but endangers world peace.

So a UN commission majority proposed, and a UN Assembly majority recommended, political partition with economic unification. They considered this only as a lesser evil and voted for it reluctantly. The United States also considered it a lesser evil than mutual Arab-Jewish extermination or than a world war; and so approved it reluctantly.

Since last fall two of the conditions essential to the partition plan have proved impossible. One is UN enforcement. The small nations will not supply the forces and failed to vote the international constabulary proposed by the United States; and the Security Council will not vote for outside forces under partition. Whether this is desirable or undesirable—and this newspaper has favored a neutral constabulary and opposed American or Russian troops from the beginning—it is the situation. The second foundation stone of partition was economic unity between the Arab and Jewish states. At present that required cooperation cannot be produced—not even by force.

Our Government is recognizing that the chances of proposed partition, never bright, have ceased to exist—at least for the moment. In suggesting temporary UN trusteeship our Government offers the only apparent hope of getting the UN to take responsibility for law and order on Palestine, to save the rights and lives of law-abiding Jews and Arabs and to modify a threat to world peace.

This is not a sell-out. Neither is it a sure solution, nor peace guaranty. It is just a desperate effort to reduce the war threat and risk of Soviet intervention.

The reversal of American policy on Trieste is another case in which the proposed settlement has failed, and in which our Government is trying to prevent that local failure from increasing the war threat. From the beginning our Government favored giving the heavily-Italian city of Trieste to Italy. Stalin was willing to do this, but only at the impossible price of giving still more Italian territory to Tito. So the United States joined in a compromise treaty making the Trieste area a free territory as a lesser of evils and to prevent threatened Yugoslav attack.

But Stalin and Tito have negated the treaty. The international trusteeship cannot operate because Stalin prevents appointment of a governor, and Tito already has turned one part of the free territory into a Communist police state. So Stalin was about to bid for Italian election support by proposing that the city of Trieste go to Italy.

The United States, Britain and France instead propose that all of the free territory of Trieste—that is held by Tito, as well as the city—go to Italy, where it justly belongs. This is a peace move because it denies Stalin a weapon with which to win the Italian election—a Red dictatorship in Italy almost certainly would lead to world war.

Here again, as in the Palestinian case, the United States Government is trying to preserve peace against terrible Stalinist odds. Washington makes mistakes. It may fail. But in any case American foreign policy in a prewar emergency like this should not be judged on a partisan basis—either of race or religion or political party.

Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post for this morning, I found this logical and timely editorial on the question of the abolition of poll taxes. Surely this is a fair statement and I commend it to my colleagues.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

It is not necessary to accept all the excited statements made by opponents of the anti-poll-tax bill to see that it is a bad piece of legislation. The bill owes its popularity to the fact that it seeks to bring about an over-due reform. We heartily agree with its sponsors that all taxes as prerequisities as to voting should be abolished. The preferable method is action by the States. Since a few States are stubbornly holding out against abolition of this undemocratic requirement upon voters, however, we should be delighted to see Congress propose and the States ratify an anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution. At least two resolutions for this purpose are before the House. But these are not the proposals that are being advanced by vote-hungry Members of Congress. The bill accepted by the House and now under study by the Senate Rules Committee is an attempt to amend the constitutional requirement as to the qualifications of voters by act of Congress.

The Constitution says in unmistakable terms that the voters entitled to choose Congressmen "in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This does not give the States power to prescribe the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress as such. It simply makes use of the various yardsticks laid down by the States to serve a Federal purpose. Since that requirement of the Constitution no longer meets with public approval, it can be changed, but surely a constitutional amendment is the proper way to effect the change.

The anti-poll-tax bill attempts to effect the desired reform by changing the meaning of words in the Constitution—an underhanded and undemocratic process. It says that the requirement of paying a poll tax before voting "shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting. * * *" If this bill were law, citizens in the poll-tax States could vote for Congressmen without payment of a poll tax. But the same citizens could not vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The requirement of the Consititution as to who shall vote for Congressmen would thus be clearly defeated.

We recognize that it is more difficult to pass a constitutional amendment than a simple act of Congress. But expediency has seldom been recognized in the United States as a valid substitute for principle. At a time when we are engaged in a world-wide struggle against short cuts to power it seems especially deplorable that the Congress should be advancing so devious a scheme to accomplish a desirable reform.

Opinion-Aire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Variety of March 24, 1948:

OPINION-AIRE

(With Harry Lacossitt, moderator. Producers: Hollis Seavey, Jack Paige. Sustaining. Mutual, from Washington)

George Denny can rest easy with his Town Meeting of the Air, and NBC and CBS need not rush out to defend their laurels in the forum-discussion field, if Mutual's rearing of its forum-type sustainer "Opinion-aire" of last Wednesday is any gage of the program's future performance.

In fairness to the show's originator, Opinion-aire format, which employs a courtroom technique with direct and cross-examination by lawyers for both sides, may have possibilities for dramatizing a lively issue. In practice, the courtroom atmosphere of last week's show was completely subordinated to long-winded questions, bickering, and crossfire which soon lost both direction and flavor.

The preem show pitted CIO attorney Frank Donner against NAM counsel Ray Smethurst in what conceivably could have been a spirited discussion of the pros and cons of the Taft-Hartley Act. As it turned out, the broadcast was consistently dull.

The debate is supposed to tee off with a provocative question by counsel for the protagonist of the affirmative side—in this case the argument for repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. Actually, CIO counsel, Phil Lazarus, threw the ball to Donner who proceeded to monolog for most of the 6 minutes theoretically earmarked for rapid-fire direct examination. At another point during cross-examination Lazarus shot a double-barreled 2-minute-long question at Smethurst which wound up "Isn't all this so?" and left his opponent with little time and no composure to refute the charges. All of this may give aid and comfort to the protagonists but it makes poor listening.

Show would be 100 percent improved by a firm wielding of the gavel and frequent interjections from the moderator. Choice of protagonists was also unfortunate. The same issue batted around by top politicos and not by organizations whose views on the

subject have been rehashed ad nauseam might have been easier to stick with.

Another gimmick of dubious listener value is the telephone poll conducted by Pittsburgh poll-taker E. L. Rayhawk. Reports on phone calls from listeners in a half-dozen cities, supposedly divided between agricultural and industrial areas, are supposed to add fillip and a sense of audience participation to the show.

If Mutual's only purpose is to get a showing of listeners' prejudgments on the issue—and not to air what purports to be a bona fide public opinion poll—this fact should be made crystal clear on the program itself. And if the web's intent is to give het-up listeners an outlet for their feelings, the poll could be handled in a much lighter fashion without any attempts to pose as a scientific sampling of opinion.

Skeptical listeners seeking enlightenment are neither illuminated nor convinced when only percentage votes—and not the actual number of calls made—are reported. And the fact that calls are made from the minute the show goes on the air divorces any significance the poll might have for the participants themselves or for the impartial listener. By 10:30 p. m. last week the last-named were not tuned to Mutual.

HOLL.

Panama Canal Toll Increases Would Injure American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Seattle Times of Tuesday, March 23, 1948, on a subject of extreme importance to the shipping interests of the Pacific Northwest and to the entire country in its desire to maintain a strong and adequate American merchant marine:

PRIVATE SHIPPING SHOULD NOT CARRY THE WHOLE LOAD

Intercoastal shipping interests of Seattle and other Pacific coast ports are rightly perturbed over proposals under consideration in Congress to increase Panama Canal tolls.

An act of 1937 established a ceiling toll of $1 per cargo ton for laden ships passing through the Canal. Present toll is 90 cents a ton for laden ships and the proposal is to increase this to the $1 ceiling. At the same time, consideration is being given to increasing the ceiling itself. The present high cost of operating the Canal is given as the reason for this proposal.

Seattle shipping interests have been given assurance by various Members of Congress from this State that they will oppose the Canal toll increases unless these appear absolutely necessary. Washington's Senators and Representatives should stand on that, for the intercoastal shipping interests along the west coast assert the increase would constitute a serious and perhaps fatal set-back to that trade, which already has suffered a loss of 3,500,000 tons of cargo a year.

Certain broader issues should be given careful consideration as well. Since the Panama Canal was opened in 1914, commercial shipping has liquidated three-fourths of the original cost of the Canal construction, and has paid for all the operational cost, the Canal being toll-free to Government vessels. During the period from 1914 to 1946, inclusive, the Canal's operating income under this set-up has exceeded the operating cost by some $270,000,000. It may be time to give thought to a revision of the policy under which private shipping hitherto has carried virtually the whole burden of canal operating costs and the bulk of its construction cost.

In view of the severe blows west coast shipping has sustained as a result of the war, we should seek every means of avoiding the imposition of further hardships. An adequate merchant fleet is an essential factor in the national defense and the national security. The Congress should go slow in dealing this new blow to the backbone of the American merchant marine.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT BY AUSTRALIAN MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DR. H. V. EVATT ON AMERICAN TRUSTEESHIP SUGGESTION FOR PALESTINE

The following is the text of a statement made at 11 p. m. Monday, March 22, 1948, by the Australian Minister for External Affairs and Deputy Prime Minister, the Right Honorable Dr. Herbert V. Evatt:

"Decisions of a competent international conference should be accepted after there has been full enquiry and fair debate and a just settlement has been reached Accordingly any setting aside of the United Nations Assembly decision on Palestine must be closely scrutinized. It is impossible to examine the new plan in detail because nothing definite is known about it. It is said the "trusteeship" will be the new solution. But the word itself is ambiguous. What does it mean? It certainly seems to imply that the peoples to be placed under "trusteeship" are not sufficiently advanced for self-government. Such a suggestion would seem to be untenable in relation either to the Palestinian Arabs or to the Palestinian Jews. If however what is now proposed is a temporary United Nations trusteeship merely for the purpose of carrying out the Assembly's decision it would be a very different matter. But is that intended? The final decision was reached in December last after two General Assemblies had dealt most carefully and exhaustively with the matter after all parties were heard and after a special Commission involving very heavy United Nations expenditure had visited Palestine and reported in favor of the principles of the plan ultimately adopted in the Assembly. The plan adopted is inappropriately labeled "partition" because it involves four separate points: First, economic union of the whole of Palestine under the control of an authority with a majority of United Nations membership; second, political division of Palestine into two new states, Jewish and Arab; third, United Nations trusteeship over Jerusalem and Bethlehem; and fourth, full safeguards for the holy places and especially for the Christian churches throughout the whole of Palestine. The only alternative plan suggested to the Assembly was to establish a unitary state under Arab domination with no adequate safeguards for the protection either of the Jewish people or of the Christian churches. This alternative was plainly inadmissible and was rejected by an overwhelming majority. The United Nations decision was reached by more than a two-thirds majority, the only dissentients being the Arab States and certain nations very closely associated with them. The decision was a just and impartial one and must not be lightly set aside.

"The United Nations did not intermeddle in the Palestine matter. It intervened only after the United Kingdom Government had especially requested the United Nations Assembly to handle the matter as all previous efforts at reconciliation between the Arabs and Jews had entirely failed. At the United Nations the British Government did not itself propose any solution and announced it would accept the United Nations decision. In these circumstances Canada, Australia, South America, and New Zealand, all supported the proposal finally adopted. After all that had occurred to throw the solution into the melting pot again may be very damaging to the authority of the United Nations. It has been contended that the enforcement of the assembly's decision is not possible. Had the great powers who supported the proposal at Lake Success, N. Y., adhered firmly to it there probably would have been little difficulty. In any event under the assembly's decision the new Jewish state and the new Arab state was each to be entitled to establish its own militia forces for the defense of the new territory and this decision clearly carried with it the right of Jews as well as Arabs to import arms and equipment for the purposes of defense. It is impossible to pass final judgment on the new proposal because no one has explained it as yet. I was chairman of the committee which worked assiduously to obtain a just solution. The Committee repeatedly modified its proposals at the suggestion of the mandatory power in order that the United Kingdom should be able to withdraw its forces after its long, its thankless, but on the whole, successful development of the Palestine area since it was captured from the Turks by the British and Australian forces in 1918.

"In my opinion, the United Nations decision has been gradually undermined by intrigues directed against the Jewish people. It would be little short of a tragedy if the fundamental rights of self-government were to be denied to both the Jews and Arabs as it is guaranteed to them under the Assembly decision just as religious freedom is also guaranteed to the Christian churches throughout Palestine. The only considerations that influenced the United Nations Assembly were those of justice and fair dealing to all concerned. It would be most disturbing if mere considerations of power politics or expediency were allowed to destroy the decision. However, if a special United Nations assembly is called it is hardly likely to accept any plan which involves the annihilation of the previous decision unless new facts of overwhelming cogency are proved to exist.

"I need hardly add that under the United Nations Charter the Security Council has no power whatever to overrule the recommendation of the assembly."

Sick and Annual Leave Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several letters written to the editor of the Seattle

Times as a result of an editorial appearing in its issue of March 16, 1948, entitled "153 Idle Days Every Year on Uncle's Pay Roll." These letters are, I believe, fairly representative of all points of protest registered by the loyal and conscientious employees of our Government against the Senate committee report on sick and annual leave privileges of Federal employees and are deserving of the consideration of the Congress in connection with any possible action which may be resulting from Senator BRIDGES' committee report.

FEDERAL WORKERS CHALLENGE BRIDGES COMMITTEE REPORT—READERS HAVE THEIR SAY

(From organization spokesmen of Federal and Government employees come the following protests against recent editorial comment in the Times. Again we say, the errors recited in these letters were not of the Times' making, but stemmed directly from report of a Senate committee which the Times accepted in good faith as official Government findings. These letters and those published Sunday are fairly representative of all points of protest in the many letters received. Further argument on the part of Government workers should be with Senator STYLES BRIDGES, committee chairman.)

HARD WORKING AND SINCERE

EDITOR, THE TIMES:

We, the members of the Government Employees Council of Seattle, vigorously protest the printing, in a recent issue of the Seattle Times, of an editorial which viciously attacked the sick- and annual-leave privileges of Federal employees. That editorial contained at least one statement which was not true, and was written in such a manner as to create, in the minds of your readers, a whole series of false impressions and misconceptions of the sick- and annual-leave privileges and how they are administered.

We are right now in the midst of a campaign which has for its goal the enactment of legislation to adjust our salaries to enable us to meet the terrifically increased cost of living. Your editorial is a foul hit below the belt which will damage this campaign and will darken our reputation for a long time to come. We appreciate your editorial of correction, but it was not sufficient to correct the damage done, nor did it straighten out the false impressions which have been created.

That editorial, as written, is a blanket indictment against all Government employees, inferring that we all receive at least 15 days sick and 26 days annual leave, that 73 percent of us abuse the sick-leave privilege, and that accumulated sick leave is paid off in terminal-leave payments. This is not so.

The truth is that the 360,000 postal employees receive only 10 days sick and 15 days annual leave, which is insufficient to keep them physically fit, and of high morale, for their often strenuous activities and irregular hours of employment.

"During the period studied by the committee, more than 73 percent of all employees used their sick-leave privilege." We feel that it is remarkable that almost 27 percent of us did not require an hour or more for sickness, doctor, or dental appointment, dogbite, or other calamity.

Employees upon separation from Government service, are paid in cash for all accumulated annual leave, exactly as are members of the armed forces, and very similar to the system used in the great number of private industries which are more and more developing sick and annual leave systems. Sick leave may be used only upon satisfactory evidence of illness, or for medical or dental appointment, and cannot be paid for in cash at separation from the service.

One thing which should be borne in mind during consideration of sick and annual leave of Federal employees, is the fact that every single absence of 1 hour or more and for whatever cause, must be accounted for to the minute, and is charged against either sick or annual leave. This includes all absences for the transaction of personal business of any nature, and all absences resulting from sickness or death in the family. It has frequently happened that absences of this nature have expended the entire annual leave of employees.

We challenge the charge of "widespread abuse of the sick-leave privilege," and point to the very great number of employees in the Post Office and other old-line agencies who have the major part of the sick leave, to which they have been entitled during their years of service, accumulated to their credit.

The vast majority of Government employees strive sincerely to live up to the standard recently portrayed by President Truman. "The strength of our Government is in direct proportion to the character of the Federal employees, and with knowledge of that strength, we can take just pride in our Federal workers and the job they are doing. I know them to be hard-working and sincere in their efforts to contribute to the well-being of the United States."

SAM MORLEY, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

PRIVILEGES NOT ABUSED

EDITOR, THE TIMES:

Your attention is called to the editorial in your March 16 issue of the Seattle Times wherein you quoted from Senator BRIDGES and also added some of your own comments pertaining to the number of days Federal workers are idle and annual and sick-leave privileges enjoyed by Federal workers.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that during the past war Federal workers were obliged to put in many hours of overtime daily after regular working hours, on Saturdays, and often on Sundays, with practically no remuneration therefore and often none. It is not so long ago that Federal workers had to work 12 hours a day, later 10 hours a day, and 9 hours a day. At the present time we are on a 40-hour week. This is no different than in the case in many private industries.

Your comment pertaining to the number of days Federal workers are idle at the expense of Uncle Sam is very much out of order in view of the fact that we are not paid for Saturdays or Sundays. As far as holidays are concerned, we at present enjoy only the national holidays; we do not get any State holidays whatever. Workers in private industry have the same privileges and in some cases more.

Your statement concerning accumulated sick leave is also wrong. No accumulated sick leave is paid for. If sick leave is not used during the time a Federal worker is employed, it is lost to him and in event he leaves the Federal service, it is not paid for at all, but is a total loss. The only leave accumulated that is paid for is annual leave.

In some instances, annual leave was accumulated because, during the war, Government agencies frowned upon leave being taken. In some cases, leave was not permitted, due to the enormous amount of work that had to be done.

As far as abuse of sick leave is concerned, such is not the case in the Federal service. Records indicate that despite the fact that an employee is allowed 15 days a year sick leave, only 6 days of sick leave per individual a year are used on the average. To us that does not indicate any abuse of the said privilege.

It is our contention that the said editorial did us an injustice.

LOUIS J. SMITH,
President, Local 8,
National Federation of Federal Employees.

ABUSE NOT WIDESPREAD

EDITOR, THE TIMES:

I am surprised that the Times was so carried away that you gave so much space to the editorial 153 Idle Days Every Year on Uncle's Pay Roll. I have worked for the benevolent Government as you call it since 1934—on field-survey parties, many years on Government vessels, and now for the past 2 years at an office job. The law permits us only 40 hours a week, so why do you worry about the Saturdays and Sundays that one is not paid for?

I will admit that there is probably small abuse of the sick-leave privilege and not widespread abuse as the committee claims. Any such leave in excess of 24 working hours requires a leave slip signed by a doctor. During the war, many temporary employees that intended only to work a few months, or a year or two, did abuse many privileges that have since been changed. However, the permanent and would-be permanent career employees, I have found, take their jobs seriously and honestly live up to the regulations.

The reason, I believe, for the excessive amount of accumulated annual leave is due to the fact that many bureaus imposed strict regulations on the use of leave during the war, and naturally leave that one was unable to get, accumulated; and in many cases personnel lost annual leave.

The pay scale for most Government employees is unusually low as compared to private industry, and for the past 2 years there has been no change in the Federal pay classification.

I sincerely believe that Federal employees are not "enjoying privileges far in excess of those accorded in private industry" as you state in your editorial.

C. E. PEDERSON.

Iowa Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal right to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Iowa.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws, as compiled by Ned S. Richards, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 208½ East Fourth Street, Waterloo, Iowa, as follows:

BONUS

The general assembly enacted a bonus bill for World War II veterans to be submitted to the voters in the 1948 general election. It provides for $10 for each month of domestic service; $12.50 for each month of foreign service, with a $500 maximum. The bonus would be paid for active duty between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945, to legal residents who had maintained such residence for at least 6 months prior thereto; honorably discharged or separated, still in active service in honorable status, retired, furloughed to Reserve, or placed on inactive status. A veteran must have served a period not less than 120 days prior to December 31, 1946, to be eligible.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans, their wives,

widows, or minor children. Burial may not be in a potter's field.

The adjutant general is required to make and preserve, by counties, a permanent registry of soldiers' graves.

Provision has been made for care of veterans' graves at county expense if provision for care has not otherwise been made.

A county allowance is provided for headstones and metal markers for memorial purposes

A State allowance is provided for a marker or monument to be erected at the graves of Revolutionary soldiers.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Protection is afforded persons acting under power of attorney for members of the armed forces.

Reports or records of the Federal Governments that a person is missing, missing in action, interned in a neutral country, or is dead, or is alive, may be received in court as evidence.

Wills may be proved if attesting witnesses become incompetent or are unavailable in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS, ETC.

Discrimination is prohibited against any person because he or she is wearing an Army or Navy uniform.

The Board of Parole may recommend to the Governor the pardon of a paroled prisoner who, during parole, and during World War II, entered the Army or Navy of the United States or its allies, or who, during said war, was employed upon or in public works by or for the immediate benefit of the United States, and who has been honorably discharged from such Army or Navy.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Public record custodians are required to furnish free copies of such records to veterans or their dependents for use in connection with a claim against the United States.

Discharge papers are recorded and indexed free of charge by county recorders.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Annual appropriations are made for tuition of World War veterans at the State University and the College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts.

Free tuition is extended to resident veterans in all State schools but fees may be charged covering costs.

Free tuition is extended to veterans in high schools in the school district where the veteran resides.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed while serving in the armed forces of the United States in World War I and II or died as a result of such service. Amount—$300 per year per child.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Veterans of World War II are exempt from the provisions of the State barber code for 12 months after discharge.

Leaves of absence are granted to State and municipal officers and employees entering military service with preservation of status and efficiency ratings.

Preference is extended to veterans in appointment, employment and promotion in public departments and on public works of State and local units.

Benefit rights of members of the policemen's and firemen's retirement system are preserved during military service.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Space is provided in county courthouses, rent free, to permit disabled war veterans to operate newsstands for the sale of newspapers, tobacco, and candies.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as pension from the United States or a homestead bought with such pension is exempt from execution.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted, with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran, or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives, or widows may be admitted to the soldiers' home.

Orphans of veterans may be admitted to the soldiers' orphans' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Memorial halls or buildings erected by counties, towns, or cities are available, so far as practical, for the special accommodations of veterans.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Veterans are exempt from military service in the State at their election.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to survivors of the Northern Border Brigade, Spirit Lake Relief Expedition, and Mitchell's Cavalry, and their widows.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks and building and loan associations may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

County aid is extended to veterans, their widows or families, outside the county home.

Settlement rights of persons entering the military or naval service of the United States are preserved.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Free hunting and fishing privileges are extended to persons in the military or naval forces of the United States.

Pensions received from the United States by veterans are exempt from income tax.

The first $2,000 compensation for services in the armed forces and subsistence or dependency allowances and all compensation for such services payable to any person where the member of the armed forces died while serving in World War II is exempt from income tax.

Property which passes to veterans organizations is exempt from inheritance tax.

The expiration date of motor vehicle operator's licenses is extended, without payment of fees, until 6 months after discharge from military service.

The registration fee for a motor vehicle placed in storage by the owner entering military service is refunded.

Certain veterans (not including those of World Wars I and II) are exempt from poll tax.

Collection of fees for renewal of licenses of registered professional engineers in the military service is deferred.

Property of veterans' organizations, soldiers' homes, household furniture, and equipment is exempt from taxation.

Veterans, their wives or widows, dependent children or widowed mothers are granted property-tax exemptions.

Homestead tax credit is allowed for a person in the military service and for the spouse.

UNIFORMS

Veterans are exempt from prohibition on wearing the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 30 days or a fine not to exceed $100.

Appropriations are made to the United Spanish War Veterans for the purpose of meeting headquarters expenses, etc. They also have supervision, etc., of memorial halls.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the Iowa Legislature during the last 28 years through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time there are some 48 chapters of the DAV in the State, which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains two full-time national service officers, under the direction of William L. Stout, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Des Moines, Iowa.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

FORMATION OF DAV

The DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders. It was organized in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for and by America's disabled war veterans.

In accordance with its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities, incurred during or by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Being a disabled veteran of World War I myself, I am proud to be a member of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the great need for extending its service activities after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into a contract with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. A very intensive 6-month special college course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the direct supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of these trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in solving the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No other veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide, expertly trained service staff to help solve the problems of all veterans and their dependents than the DAV—especially those who have service-incurred disabilities.

The DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents during the more than 28 years of its service activities.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical to enumerate here, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

National headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the DAV semi-monthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-the-minute information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents. It is located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., the present national commander of the DAV, is a badly wounded World War I veteran. He is an insurance agent in private life and has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State and National DAV activities which eminently qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Vivian D. Corbly, the national adjutant, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. His able assistant is Capt. Cicero F. Hogan.

The funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation, are on deposit with the largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

National service headquarters of the DAV, since 1945, have been located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

DAV national service officers, understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, are naturally more sympathetic in their approach than are nondisabled veterans or civilians. They are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

It is generally agreed among most citizens that the DAV is correct in its contention that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veterans' disabilities were actually incurred in or aggravated by his military or naval service.

Proving that a disability is service-connected, however, is not an easy task, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim, therefore, cannot necessarily be legally established.

Quite a number of different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran to factually prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually they were service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has sponsored, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all handicapped veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The 93 percent remaining are less than totally disabled and, therefore, must supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment of some sort.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job. His disabilities are not stressed. The employment record of such employed disabled veterans indicates that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been clearly demonstrated that it is just plain good business to employ physically handicapped veterans, thus bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and to taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the best interest of all citizens that the fight for justice must be waged for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in defense of our country and its institutions in time of war.

We must keep faith with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who in the future may be called upon to make similar sacrifices will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

This determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled defenders are adequately provided for should be generously supported, not only as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, but as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a real pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country. I am indeed proud to be an active member of this great organization.

Antilynching Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks, I enclose herewith a splendid editorial from the Boston (Mass.) Herald. I sincerely trust that my friends who are urging the passage of the so-called antilynching bill will read this fair, truthful, and courageous statement, observing that it comes from the historic State of Massachusetts.

WHY NOT CLEAN HOUSE?

You needn't be in favor of lynching to oppose the House antilynching bill. Indeed the aroma of politics is so heavy about the bill that it savors of political lynching.

When President Truman made a Federal antilynch law No. 3 in his civil-rights program, he placed himself conspicuously on the side of the angels. When the Republicans in Congress decided for once to go along with the President, they also ranged themselves with the heavenly hosts. But such righteousness becomes a little suspect when it is also politically profitable. If Mr. Truman can entice back a little of the liberal vote from Mr. Wallace, and if the Republicans can promote a southern insurrection against the President, all by being on the right side, then virtue and expediency are delightfully wedded for once.

But it is too glib, and Americans who, deep in their hearts, are concerned with the interracial strife and cruelty of this country will wish for legislation that is completely divorced from political opportunism. This is no time to pass a Federal antilynching act.

The present bill assumes several things that are not quite so. It assumes that lynching is still a widespread southern custom. But the Tuskegee Institute has reported that six out of seven potential lynchings are being prevented in the South by courageous peace officers, alert public officials, and popular reaction against mob murder. Before the turn of the century, lynchings ran over a hundred a year; since 1924 they have been on a marked decline, and last year and in 1945 there was only one. Nor can we piously point the finger at the South, when 25 Negroes were killed and 340 badly hurt in the Detroit riots of 1943.

The bill also assumes that lynching can be reduced or eliminated by making it a Federal crime. Yet it could very well have the opposite effect by stirring new animosity among the mob-minded of the South. No Federal law was needed to round up those taxi drivers in the Greenville lynch trial last year, nor to provide a determined and able prosecutor and a stern and impartial judge. It was the jury that freed those defendants, and no one has yet gone so far as to suggest that a Federal antilynch law should dispense with a jury. Would a federally impaneled jury be free of the South's bias?

The North, which practices its own furtive jim-crowism, could clean a little of its own house before it attempts to legislate virtue into the South. And a time of less political connivance would be more appropriate.

The Vacant Chair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an article from the pen of Mrs. Jennie Esmond Wright, who resides at the Methodist Building, Washington, D. C.

This is a most challenging statement. Since reading this, I have called Mrs. Wright and find that she has traveled throughout the world and spent some months in Palestine. The world must listen and recognize that the peace objective cannot be accomplished unless we are spiritually garrisoned.

THE VACANT CHAIR

Why has the United Nations failed?

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it." Psalm cxxvii:1.

When the chairman of the League of Nations was asked: "Why are not your sessions opened with prayer?" The reply was: "We haven't the time." So the League of Nations wrangled on to utter failure.

The United Nations likewise has had no time for prayer. Our Christian delegates, in further appeasement of the Russian atheists, who, of course, do not believe in prayer or in God, left Him out of the United Nations deliberations. Then why should we expect Him to bless and give success, where He is not asked, and is thus scorned?

A certain cartoon in the Star, representing the United Nations in conference, and a vacant chair at the head of the discussion table, created much interested comment. It showed that the Master, not being invited, was not present to guide and bless the efforts for world peace.

When in 1787 the Continental Convention continued to wrangle, unable to agree on important matters, Benjamin Franklin introduced a resolution providing that each morning the assembly be opened with prayer. He said, in part: "This assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, is scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illumine our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, Sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a Supreme Providence in our favor. To that kind of providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we not forgotten that powerful friend? or do we imagine that we no longer need his assistance? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. I firmly believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. I therefore beg leave to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven, and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service."

Some delegates opposed the motion on the ground that at that late day it might lead the public to believe that dissensions within the convention had suggested this measure which was answered "that the past omission of a duty could not justify a further omission."

Mr. Randolph proposed in order to give a favorable aspect to the measure, that a sermon be preached at the request of the convention on July 4, the anniversary of Independence, and thereafter prayers be used by the convention every morning; but the motion was lost by adjournment without a vote.

Who shall say that it was not in answer to the prayers of Franklin and like-minded patriots that Franklin was inspired to invent the Senate, and so break the stalemate by satisfying both factions—those who insisted that representation should be by State, and the others equally determined that it be by population. He thus saved the Constitution, the bulwark of our freedom.

William E. Gladstone, the great English statesman, affirmed, "The American Constitution, so far as I can see, is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

I quote again from Psalm cxxvii:1: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it."

Had the Master been asked to occupy that vacant chair at the head of their conference table, perhaps the United Nations, instead of failing in its efforts, might have been successful in securing world peace.

Mrs. JENNIE ESMOND WRIGHT.

Chickens Come Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it should be evident to all Members of this House that the Nation is faced today with a difficult question. We are having trouble finding a way to meet the new problems that have grown out of the war. The great problem that confronts us necessarily is to find a method by which we can maintain peace. We are getting little help from some of our former allies, especially one to whom we gave tremendous help after it was attacked.

Ours is a duty to maintain the American system, and it is being challenged from many angles by an entirely foreign ideology. It would be reasonable to assume that this condition results from the practices and the policies of the administration in power at that time. Ambitious men in many instances are worthy men, but ambitious political men conceivably can be dangerous men.

The problems that confront us today in our relationship with Russia are traceable without question to the President of the United States who served from 1932 until 1945. His over-zealousness to not only be a third term President, but to be a fourth-term President, prompted him to make concessions with forces both within and without our country. Those within our country were sympathetic to the forces from without, and today those of us who remain must face the situation. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is a case of the chickens coming home to roost.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article taken from the Detroit News of March 26, entitled "Communist Plot Exposed," written by James Sweinhart:

COMMUNIST PLOT EXPOSED—EXTERMINATION STEPS FOLLOW A TAKE-OVER—EX-BOLSHEVIK PICTURES A SEIZED DETROIT IN LIGHT OF USUAL SECURITY OPERATIONS

(By James Sweinhart)

In previous articles I have shown how Karl Marx was imbued with the scientific spirit of his day which worshiped a god of nature as the primal force of the universe; how he scoffed at religion and its restraints on human actions and how he put the stamp of atheism on the Communist movement from its beginning, 100 years ago.

After him came men who went farther. They taught and practiced the propaganda of the deed (assassination) and preached, among their fellows, the scrapping of all moral law whenever it stood in the way of Communist Party ends.

To their undying shame, so long as man shall continue to inhabit this planet, the Communist Bolsheviks, during and after the Russian Revolution of November 1917, and the Soviet Government, in every country which it has captured since, have used the technique of Genghis Khan, pagan Asiatic conqueror, who devastated half the then-known world in the 13th Century by opening the gates of a city by treachery, from within, and then massacring mercilessly everyone who resisted in fighting for their lives, their homes, and the freedom of their children.

TAKE-OVER TACTICS ALWAYS THE SAME

They did it in all the great cities and out on the farms during the November Revolution in Russia. They did it in Tallinn, Riga, and Kaunas, when they took over the Baltic States. They did it in Warsaw when they took over Poland. They did it in Bucharest, Sofia, Tirana, and Belgrade when they took over the Balkans. They are just now completing their security operations after taking over Czechoslovakia in February.

What are security operations like? Let Rakovsky tell us.

"Rakovsky" (not his real name) is the former minor Soviet official, who, in 1941, told me in detail of the surprise attack technique taught at International Lenin School, Moscow, for seizing Detroit and other key cities of the United States on take-over day—the day on which the Communist Party of the United States (CPUSA), the fifth column tool of the Kremlin in this country, plans to seize governmental power.

In yesterday's article he had got to the point where the Communists had captured some high city official and, with a gun at his head, made him surrender Detroit.

But that wasn't the end of his recital.

SECURITY OPERATIONS STALKED BY DEATH

"The difficulty with you Americans," he began again, "is that, never before having had a great, secret revolutionary organization at work in your country, you are utterly incapable of comprehending what the Communists are doing.

"What I've told you is only part of it—the beginning. After the Communists have got the city in hand, then the 'Security Operations' begin and God have mercy on the soul of man or woman they go looking for.

"During their preparatory operations they have made lists of men and women of spirit and courage who will probably try to organize resistance. 'Liquidation' of these potential resistance leaders immediately begins.

"More frightful terror grips the whole city. It has been districted—into, say 20 to 30 blocks to a district. Police scout cars, driven by captured policemen who know the city and manned by armed Communists, now race to districts assigned to them, each with a list of names. They hunt out these potential leaders, shoot them down, toss them from high apartment or office building windows, or otherwise exterminate them.

"Sometimes, if they can't find the person they want, they kill others in, or all of his or her family. In the last 6 weeks of 1917 more than 130,000 of the outstanding men and women of civilian Russia died like that.

"Why is it that you Americans can't grasp the fact that the coming to power of communism means extermination of everything but communism?"

TO TAKE OVER, THEY WANT A SLUMP

"Have the Communists fixed the date of 'take-over day' in the United States?" I asked. He replied:

"Only conditionally. To succeed they must have certain basic factors just right. They must have a trained, disciplined 'underground' corps large enough to carry out the operations I described in many cities. They must have plenty of weapons, ammunition, and other supplies in case the fight for control is prolonged.

"But, most important of all, they must have the mass good will and sympathy of the people. This is hardest to get—but they have a scientific way of building it.

"They move heaven and earth to bring on industrial depression, by unnecessary and uselessly prolonged strikes and every other means. This throws more and more people out of work. No work, no wages; no wages, no buying; no buying, more and more mills shut down; the more mills shut down, the greater the unemployment. The deadly cycle moves constantly toward deep depression.

"The Communists figure that in about 2½ years from the day a big crash on the stock market, or in banking or industrial circles, indicates that depression has set in for sure, the American people will have suffered sufficiently to be willing to back the Communists for a change of our form of government."

APATHY IN THE WAY OF EFFECTIVE LAWS

"How can Communist activities in the United States be stopped?" I then asked. He replied:

"The first thing you've got to do is get laws that comprehend the situation. And, unless before that you arouse the American people from their apathy, you won't even get the laws. The average American I talk to seems to think these things we've been talking about are only the Government's business—not his."

I had no answer. Rising to go, I started to say good-by.

"Wait a minute," he said.

Crossing the room, he searched, for a moment, in a small trunk. Presently he found what he sought. It was a little book.

"Here," he said, "take this. Your radio program"—first referred to in the article published 2 days ago—"is a good idea. It could help the Nation a lot. Maybe this book will help you."

It was the official Communist Party Manual on Organization from which I took the graph of the government the Communists are trying to set up, which was printed with my first article.

ROAD BLOCKING OF A RADIO PROGRAM

What became of the radio program which had been projected as a counter to Nazi-Fascist-Communist activities?

Ten weeks before the dead line to sign up for coast-to-coast radio time all my work was done and three programs had been prepared for production.

But, because they touched on international matters, the broadcasting system would not consider them until they had been approved by the FCC—the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC, for the same reason, would not release them until we had the O. K. of the United States Department of State.

For 10 weeks futile effort was made to contact the particular man in the State Department who alone could O. K. release. Week after week went by as we pulled strings to actually get the appointment that may be available shortly, but never arrived.

Finally, the dead-line for signing for radio time came. We could not sign. The whole project was abandoned.

UNEXPECTED LIGHT ON DISAPPOINTMENT

But, a few days before that, while in New York, I met Rakovsky in Fifty-ninth Street. He looked fine. He told me that, somehow or other, he had been employed by the State Department as a consultant on Russian matters.

He asked about the radio program. I told him bitterly of my experience. Suddenly he burst out laughing. For a half minute he laughed uproariously. I felt foolish but ascribed his action to that peculiar Russian sense of humor.

Then, as suddenly as he had started laughing, he stopped, and his face became very grave. With a tone of sympathy in his voice he said:

"My good friend, how could you, an honest, unsuspecting American, incapable of understanding how Communists work—how could you be expected to discern, or even suspect, that perhaps the very persons through whom you were trying to get your interview might be loyal Communist supporters?"

Again I had no answer.

The International Poker Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. A. Q. Miller, of Belleville, Kans., as printed in the Belleville Telescope. I commend this article from one who has helped formulate public opinion in Kansas for the past 40 years:

THE INTERNATIONAL POKER GAME

(By A. Q. Miller)

At last the cards are on the table and it can be seen to what extent the United States has become involved in the game known as international poker, the thing George Washington so gravely referred to when he warned against "becoming engaged in entangling alliances with foreign countries." From his broad experience, Washington knew of the pitfalls, trickery, and political intrigues that were involved if this country tried to form partnerships with other countries with conflicting ideas and mercenary objectives.

If the experience of history was worth anything, and the attitude of Russia for the past 5 years (during and since the war) was worth anything, it was as plain as the nose on one's face that Stalin and his communistic philosophy were in violent disagreement with anything resembling a democratic form of government, and that sooner or later America would have to have a show-down with Russia. This was clearly brought out in the San Francisco Conference of United Nations, when America stood strong before the world and could have put into effect—and had the power to enforce—any reasonable terms for peace. But like Chamberlain at Munich, dealing with Hitler, we followed the appeasement policy and gave Russia the veto power, which was the death knell to world peace and proved the downfall of all subsequent efforts to world tranquillity. Moreover, we gave Stalin 3 years to rehabilitate his country, gave him several billion dollars in cash and materials, including locomotives, railroad equipment and even war materials, besides the billions of dollars of war materials we saw him pilfer from eastern Europe. Basically, world conditions have not materially changed since the meeting at San Francisco and now, belatedly, the American people are told a crisis or emergency exists and that they must do certain things to preserve our democracy.

Two important events last week in international affairs brought out in the open how grave the hidden issues have been between Russia and the western powers. First was the reversal of the United States' position on the Palestine question, when we announced that this country would no longer support the partition policy after having helped force that issue upon the Arabs last fall in a United Nations meeting. That action brought on a civil war in Palestine between the Jews and Arabs. In the background Arabian oil was involved and on the other hand Jewish friendship in this country, which is another way of saying politics was involved.

In quick succession another crisis was precipitated in Italy when this country joined France and England and voted to give back Trieste to Italy, just ahead of the Italian election, ostensibly to effect the result of the election on the question of communism. It will be remembered that after the war Trieste was carved out of Italy, and given to Yugoslavia at the behest of Russia and Yugoslavia, as an appeasement measure, while Europe was being carved up. It is no secret that an intense struggle is on in Italy in which the Communists are trying to take over the country, with the help of Russia. Italy is the last stronghold in the Mediterranean area and the western powers cannot afford to lose it. The Catholic Church has taken notice of the encroachment of communism in Italy and has warned its members against supporting it. General Marshall has warned Italy if it goes communistic, American aid will be withheld from the country. So it will be observed that in the international poker game the participants are playing for big stakes just ahead of the Italian election. The $64 question is, what will Russia and Yugoslovia do when the Italians move back into Trieste, with United States, French, and British approval? And what will this country do to support our position?

With all our mistakes and blundering in international affairs we must have unity in this country in our international relations. We must back up our Government in its commitments, whether we like them or not. However, there would be more unanimity of feeling in the country if our Government officials would take the Congress and the people into its confidence before committing the country to foreign policies. After all, this country is supposed to belong to the people.

The Place of Cooperatives in American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Place of Cooperatives in American Agriculture, which I delivered during Farm and Home Week at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, March 23.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLACE OF COOPERATIVES IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The joint sponsorship of this evening session by the Ohio Council of Farm Cooperatives, the Ohio Farm Bureau, the Ohio State Grange, and the university is a splendid example of the spirit of cooperation.

In a world that is beset by turmoil and unrest, this is a spirit which the people of all nations can well afford to emulate.

I am always happy to be with groups such as this because I naturally like to visit with farm people and with those who are interested in the welfare and problems of agriculture.

My own interest in agriculture is due not only to my membership on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry but also to the fact that until I went to Washington I never lived off the farm and depended upon farming for my own living.

In addressing my remarks this evening to the subject The Place of Cooperatives in American Agriculture, I shall stress two general lines of thought.

One is the challenge which farm cooperatives face if they are to fulfill, to the greatest possible extent, their important role in American agriculture and in the American economy, and the other is a warning to farm people to be on the alert for the forces that are seeking to cripple or destroy cooperative organizations.

Cooperatives have come a long way in this country. They already occupy an important place in our agriculture.

Thousands of well-established, farmer-owned and farmer-controlled organizations are now in existence in the United States.

Many of these associations have back of them a quarter of a century or more of successful operating experience.

Agricultural cooperatives are functioning in every State in the Union, and it is estimated that at least half the farmers in the country are members of cooperative associations.

The growth of farm cooperatives has been in response to an urgent, unmet need of farm people.

When they have been unable to get adequate credit they, with the sanction of Congress, have formed farm-loan associations.

Excessive margins by old-line traders and the need for additional marketing facilities have resulted in the formation of farm-marketing associations.

When farm people have had difficulty buying supplies of good quality at fair prices, they have formed purchasing cooperatives.

This has put farmers more nearly on a par with big business enterprises whose purchase operations are on a coordinated, large-scale basis.

In the final analysis, the idea back of cooperatives is a very simple one. When farmers find that a marketing, purchasing, or service undertaking is too big for them as individuals, they band together as a group and get the job done through cooperation.

And they have to display the same initiative, the same business acumen, the same foresight that corporation executives must show in order to succeed.

Evidence of this initiative and this foresight is found in the fact that in the last two decades we have witnessed in this country substantial expansion and marked improvement in local cooperative enterprises and services.

There are cooperatives for the storing, processing, and marketing of every major farm commodity; the purchasing of farm supplies; and the procurement of many needed services such as insurance, irrigation, electric power, telephones, frozen-food lockers, and the joint use of farm machinery.

The cooperative idea is by no means limited to agriculture. The Rochdale system, which originated in England, is synonymous with consumer cooperation. Consumers in this country have employed the Rochdale principles and practices to obtain a wide variety of goods and services at less cost.

It is a well-known fact that business groups frequently employ the cooperative method. There are such familiar examples as the Associated Press, bank clearing houses, grocery stores, trade associations, and even cooperative apartment houses.

One of the latest cooperative pioneering efforts is in the department-store field. On the 11th of this month, I participated in the ceremony that marked the opening of the first cooperative department store in the United States.

This store is located in Arlington County, Va., just outside of Washington, D. C. Present plans contemplate that many more such stores will be opened in various localities of the country within the next few years.

In considering farm cooperatives, we need to keep clearly in mind the philosophy back of these associations.

That philosophy is based upon the idea that in our democracy the family-sized farm is the fundamental bedrock of rural society.

To preserve this way of life in our capitalistic system we need to keep alive the spirit of competition in practice as well as in theory.

We all know that the trend for many years in the United States has been toward monopoly in business and industry.

In 1800 ours was a country of small industries and small farms. Today this is a country of big industries and small farms.

Do we want our farms to come under the domination of the octopus-like controls of big business, owned by absentee stockholders, and operated by hired managers?

If we do not want this to happen, and I am sure we don't, the surest and soundest way to prevent the triumph of monopoly over agriculture is to maintain competition through cooperative action.

We cannot maintain this competition if we permit the old farm practice of marketing commodities at wholesale while purchasing supplies at retail to continue to apply.

That is just what has happened far too much in the past. That practice forced the creation of farmer-owned and operated business enterprises.

The big challenge to cooperatives is to so grow and expand as to enable farmers through cooperation to maintain their competitive status in our economy.

To bolster the family-sized farm is an 'mportant objective of such a program.

The cooperative movement is the buffer between monopoly and the varying stages of isms that we hear so much talk of today.

It is extremely interesting to note that the people who have talked so much about the sanctity of free enterprise and competition have not fought cooperatives until cooperatives have provided keen competition to the established business groups.

So long as co-ops operated only in local fields or on a small scale they were all right. There was a place for them. But once they invaded the terminal markets and extended their services down the line to consumers they became the targets of the vested interests.

In other words, these interests don't like this competition from cooperatives.

Instead of saying they are fighting the co-ops to try to kill off competition, however, they use a flanking attack, concentrating upon some phase of the cooperative system.

Hence, all the false propaganda about co-ops not paying taxes. They charge also that certain types of cooperatives are monopolistic or that they are contrary to our way of life.

The rank-and-file cooperatives definitely do not contribute to the creation of monopoly. If there are those that are big, they are big because it takes bigness to cope with the gigantic monopolies they are trying to counteract.

Bigness of itself is no disgrace. It is only when big business becomes monopolistic that it becomes a menace.

If big cooperatives can prevent big corporations from gaining monopolies then we are fortunate to have them.

Instead of cooperatives being monopolistic, they, on the contrary, seek to break the strangle hold of some existing monopoly, and by breaking that strangle hold they strive to restore health to the competitive system.

The cooperative is rooted in the concept of dispersal of ownership and control—the opposite of monopoly.

The cooperative is the regulator—the great leavening influence—in our economy.

It has been aptly said that the cooperative is "a practical method of introducing needed correctives to a capitalistic, competitive economy of which it is a part."

There is no question about the fact that cooperation is part and parcel of our capitalistic system. It is a function which has as its main aim the same economic motive that other businesses have.

To get a higher net return on sales, to save money on purchases or services is what co-ops seek to achieve.

The main difference between what co-ops do and what other businesses do is that the co-op's objective is mutual benefit for all of its member patrons and the corporation's objective is profit for a limited group—the stockholders.

When it comes to a question of democracy in business, our cooperatives are in a class by themselves.

It is a common practice for them to adopt a one-man, one-vote principle, and to discourage proxy voting, thus preventing the concentration of power as is usually the case when voting is by stock rather than by persons.

The directors are elected from the members and savings are distributed in accordance with the amount of business transacted.

Moreover, farm cooperatives provide a dual benefit. They help the farmer by providing increased income through lower costs or increased returns, and they help the consumer through lower prices and better quality farm products.

As for the contention that cooperatives do not pay taxes, this is, as I have said, just a smoke screen thrown up by their enemies to try to discredit the cooperatives and confuse the public.

They resort to false propaganda of a most vicious type.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that corporations have the same right as cooperatives to make refunds to their patrons, and to exclude these refunds from income, if they are willing to enter into a contractual agreement to do so on the same basis as cooperatives.

In fact there are many instances in which corporations have done this very thing.

Moreover, businessmen in many cases have formed cooperative associations which are under an obligation to account to each of their members for all amounts received from them in the course of their business dealings over and above operating and maintenance costs.

I have referred to the Associated Press as being a familiar example in this category. These business associations pay no income taxes on refunds.

As a matter of fact, practically everybody in the country has at one time or another

received a business patronage refund which has the same tax status as the cooperative refund.

I call attention to such items as dividends from mutual insurance companies, coupons attached to cigarettes, trading stamps given out by local merchants or discounts allowed by stores and industries on sales to their employees.

These are but a few of the practices familiar to the public which business concerns indulge in under the refund principle.

Yet when cooperatives operate under this principle, a great hue and cry is raised against them.

Some opponents of cooperatives even go so far as to suggest that the cooperative idea borders on the subversive or in some manner or means is not in keeping with our democratic institutions.

Nothing could be further from the truth because cooperative associations are capitalistic organizations formed and operated for the purpose of increasing the net returns of their members.

The desire for financial savings to their members is at the foundation of every cooperative association.

I have mentioned earlier in my remarks the fact that the reason for the existence of cooperatives in our capitalistic system is to fulfill an unmet need of farm people and consumers.

In recognition of this role, the Congress has for a number of years sought to foster the development of cooperatives on the ground that they are in the public interest.

The public has an interest in the welfare of agriculture because we as a nation are dependent upon the products of the farm for our livelihood and our national existence.

It has been in the public interest that we have steered away from a peasant type of agriculture in this country, just as we have not wanted to see the corporate farm dominate our agricultural economy.

Therefore, the Congress has endeavored to further the development of the family-type farm. The cooperative is a bulwark in support of the family-type farm.

The Congress in the past has not been reluctant to take steps to foster enterprises contributing to the welfare of this country.

I call attention specifically to the grants and subsidies that have been provided for such enterprises as the railroads and steamship and air companies, and tariffs for the protection of industrial ventures.

If it was expedient to do these things in the public interest, why is it not just as expedient to encourage cooperatives and thus safeguard the family type farm in the public interest? We have no logical alternative.

The farm family of America is the lifeblood of our democracy. Farms are the most abundant source of our population. Cities would wither and die if it were not for the boys and girls from the farm who go to the city to live.

Moreover people who grow up on a farm are good citizens. Character is the most valuable farm crop. We must halt the alarming march toward monopoly in the United States today.

On every hand we see evidences of the bold and ruthless forces of monopoly encircling and encroaching upon the individual and often upon the public interest.

The railroads and the utilities have become so powerful that when new developments, such as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, come up for consideration the very first question asked by many is: What will be the effect of this development upon the railroads and utilities?

They ask that instead of demanding to know what will be the effect of such a development upon the welfare of the entire economy.

The so-called Bulwinkle bill, which was passed by the Senate last summer by an overwhelming vote, and is now pending before the House, is designed to take the railroads out from the antitrust laws of the land.

There are many other examples of the trend toward concentrated power. I mention this to illustrate that the surge of monopoly is running at high tide.

We have seen in this country a deliberate holding down of productive capacity by certain industries thus placing a limit upon production while at the same time prices have been forced up to an artificially high level.

We heard much talk about controlled agricultural production in the thirties, and I want to make it clear that I am not defending that practice, but if we are honest with ourselves why is it any worse for farmers to limit their production to keep prices up than it is for industrialists to cut production to force their prices up?

The recent rise of $5 a ton in the price of steel is traceable to the fact that there has not been sufficient expansion of productive facilities in the steel industry, which incidentally is a rigidly controlled industry—a near monopoly if you please.

It is little short of a national scandal that the over-all industrial plant today is only slightly larger than it was in 1929.

Think of that. In the last 18 years the industrial plant of this Nation has been wearing out or becoming obsolete just about as fast as it has been replaced.

And during that period our population has increased by about 23,000,000 persons; the labor force has expanded by over 10,000,000 workers.

The inevitable blind alley to which monopoly and lack of progressive foresight or faith in the industrial future of America can lead is illustrated by the fact that such industries as steel and iron, railroads, oil, electric light and power, and textiles are alarmingly short of capacity today and there is every indication that they will continue to be short for many years to come.

How can we expect to have an expanding economy in this land of ours if the basic industries and utilities are constant and chronic bottlenecks to progress?

Perhaps there is an opportunity here for the people, through co-ops, to inject a little more competition into the industrial field.

Surely something must be done to free our economy from the strangle hold of the disciples of monopoly.

I have grave misgivings about the future welfare of our Nation if this trend toward unfettered economic concentration and power continues to increase.

The most urgent challenge to cooperatives is for them to serve as the medium through which the rank-and-file rural citizen can exert his influence in curbing monopolies.

In this way cooperatives can be an effective means of bringing about needed corrections in our free-enterprise system by restoring competition to its rightful and necessary role.

We need fair competition in our economy. That is the principle upon which our greatness has been achieved. We must not forget that competition is the first casualty of monopoly.

In considering the important role which cooperatives can play in our economy, we should bear in mind that they are the one bright hope not only of maintaining competition but also of the family-sized farm—two of the vital bedrocks of our Nation.

By all odds agricultural cooperation is worth whatever effort is required to keep it alive, efficient, and on the march.

Therefore, the need for farm people to be on the alert for the forces that are seeking to destroy cooperatives is urgent.

These sinister forces are mobilized on a broad front. They operate in an insidious manner by attacking not the cooperative idea itself but certain phases of the cooperative way of conducting business.

They do not dare to work against the people by coming out flatly in opposition to the whole cooperative set-up. Rather they spread misleading propaganda, half truths, and outright falsehoods.

It is a part of their technique to insinuate that co-ops are exempt from taxes and enjoy other special advantages which are denied to ordinary businesses.

The implication is that cooperatives are in some favored-class category which is not open to businesses that operate for profit. This is not the case at all.

As I have pointed out, any time a corporation wants to enter into a contractual agreement to refund overcharges to its patrons instead of holding the money back as profit, for a few stockholders, the corporation can do so.

Business partnerships operate now on the very same basis as the cooperative does insofar as taxes are concerned.

There are those who work full time against the various phases of the co-op program. Many more work part time seeking to undermine and discredit certain isolated aspects of this movement.

Whatever the form of the attack, it is persistent and relentless. Evidence of the sniping crops up in many places. Sometimes the opposition bears a clear-cut label; sometimes it masquerades as a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Whatever form it may take, the opposition hews to one line—the objective is to destroy cooperatives.

This opposition has been manifested at one time or another all along the line from the grass roots to the Capitol in Washington.

Just the other day, I was reading a recently published congressional House report which had this statement tucked away in the fine print of a footnote—so fine that some of the committee members apparently didn't see it.

I quote, "They (small businesses) are being bankrupted by competition of tax-free cooperatives. * * *"

It is not the welfare of small-business enterprises that is bothering the tax equality leaguers and their cohorts; they are concerned about eliminating competition wherever they find it.

They are just as ruthless in knocking off the competition of small businesses in the profit category as they are in fighting cooperatives, and if they can organize, finance, and use small businesses themselves for this purpose, they make every effort to do so.

It is highly significant that small businesses and the services and professions are most prosperous in those rural districts where successful co-ops are resulting in greater income and lower expenses to the farmers.

I urge farm people everywhere in this Nation to marshal their forces behind the cooperative movement. We cannot let up for one moment in this drive to keep competition alive in America.

We must take the offensive and support the cooperative movement to the limit. Either we take the road forward with cooperatives and the family-sized farm or the road to corporate farming and eventual peasantry.

A sound, strong agriculture is essential to the maintenance of our democratic way of life.

So long as we have a sound and stable agriculture, we need not fear the infiltration of the isms, the foreign ideologies, and the glorified state concepts of government that are so rampant in the world today.

In closing, I want to reemphasize that cooperatives must meet the challenge they face by playing an increasingly vital role in our economy. This will bolster private enterprise—not hurt it.

I urge you, and farm people everywhere, to be on the alert day and night against the corruptive forces that seek to destroy this movement. Eternal vigilance is the price not only of liberty but of progress.

Old-Age Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on March 26, 1948, in which he discusses the timely topic of old-age insurance.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every day brings its sharp reminders that time is pressing upon us. We must act quickly to improve international relations. We must help in building a peaceful world.

At the same time, we must not forget that time is also passing at home. We must strengthen the social-security protection of our own people.

Last month the Congress took account of the hardships which rising prices imposed on veterans who are trying to complete their education, and increased veterans' educational allowances. Congress has already made some small adjustments in the salaries of Federal employees. Consideration is now being given to a further adjustment because their pay has fallen behind the cost of living.

While the Congress has made these adjustments, and others, the benefits paid to our retired old people and to widows and children under old-age and survivors' insurance have not been increase since 1939. During these 9 years, the cost of living has increased 70 percent. Rising prices have also wiped out a large part of the value of private savings or insurance on which these people relied to round out their insurance benefits.

The situation is critical. Two million persons now depend, in whole or in part, on these social-security benefits. Many more persons who are insured and eligible to retire would do so if they could live on the social-security benefits. At the present time, the average benefit for an aged couple is only $39 a month; for a widow and 2 children, $49 a month. Surely, such benefits today do not provide the social security which Congress intended and the American people expected. The people of the United States have a right to expect the Congress to change the Social Security Act to bring the insurance benefits up to date and to make it possible for the insured people to have real social security.

Five years ago, in 1943, I introduced a bill to expand and improve our old-age and survivors' insurance program. The Congress acted in that year as it had previously, and as it did again in 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947, to prevent the scheduled increase in old-age and survivors' insurance contribution rates. However, the Congress did nothing to increase the benefits; and it did nothing to cover millions of workers who had been kept out of the insurance system. I was not able even to get hearings on my 1943 social-security bill, or on the similar bill I introduced in 1945. However, I refused to be discouraged. I was constantly receiving letters from people who told me of the hardships they were suffering in trying to keep body and soul together on their small insurance checks. Also, I was receiving letters from people who had been denied insurance protection under our law and were facing destitution. Last year, joined by Senator WAGNER and Senator MCGRATH, I introduced a new bill (S. 1679) that would correct the most important weaknesses in the old-age and survivors' insurance system.

My bill would extend old-age and survivors insurance protection to farmers and to persons in business for themselves, to agricultural workers, to persons in domestic service or employed by nonprofit organizations such as hospitals and charitable agencies. The insurance protection would also apply, on a voluntary basis, to employees of State and local governments.

My bill would increase the amount of the benefits paid to widows and orphans, and to retired workers aged 65 and over. It would make the benefits payable to the wives of retired workers when these wives reach age 60. The increases which I proposed would bring the insurance benefits back into about the same relation to wages as they had in 1939 when the present benefits were enacted.

My bill, S. 1679, would also provide benefits for workers and their families if the worker is forced to retire before age 65 because he is permanently disabled and can no longer work. Failure to provide disability benefits is one of the most serious weaknesses in our national insurance system, and one which I hope will be corrected soon.

After 5 years of constant effort and disappointment, I am encouraged by the recent action of the House Ways and Means Committee in appointing a special subcommittee on social security legislation. Since this is regarded as tax legislation, the first action must be taken by the House of Representatives. I earnestly hope it will take action promptly.

I am also encouraged by the information that the Senate Finance Committee has appointed an Advisory Council on Social Security, and that this council has been reviewing our social security program and is expected to make a report in the near future.

I hope that the millions of people who depend on our social security system will not be disappointed again. I hope the Advisory Council is giving careful attention to the social-security improvements which I have recommended. I hope its report will point the way toward the three most needed improvements in our old-age and survivors insurance system: (1) larger benefits for those already receiving benefits and for those still to receive them, taking account of the actual cost of living; (2) larger coverage, so that the insurance protection will apply to the tens of millions of people who have been kept out of the insurance system; and (3) insurance protection and benefits for disabled workers and their families.

In my opinion, the Congress has neglected some of our important responsibilities for the welfare and security of the American people. I call upon the Congress to take action on social security at this session, to strengthen our democratic defenses against poverty and insecurity in our own country.

Palestine Reversal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last week a close personal friend, David R. Uchill, of Denver, Colo., wrote a guest editorial for the Denver Post, entitled "Reversal on Palestine Declared Betrayal." I am in such complete agreement with the arguments, the conclusions, and the observations of Mr. Uchill that I ask unanimous consent to insert this great editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it may be available to Members of Congress and to others.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVERSAL ON PALESTINE DECLARED BETRAYAL—UNRESTRICTED IMMIGRATION A PLANK IN BOTH PARTY PLATFORMS

(The author of the following guest editorial is David R. Uchill, Denver furniture man, a member of B'Nai B'rith, South Denver Civic Association and regional chairman of the United Jewish Appeal. He recently made a tour of Europe and Palestine in a party of 28 Jewish businessmen from the United States.)

(By David R. Uchill)

I just returned from Germany, Italy, and France, where I had occasion to talk to homeless, familyless Jewish men and women in DP camps. To them, I was an American businessman who lived in the country where justice and fair play prevailed.

This week, American justice has been betrayed. This week, the ideals of American statesmen have been smashed. This week, the United States has lost faith with every democratic-loving nation and people in the world. This week, the hand of every tyrant in the world has been strengthened. Every American citizen has the right to question whether the promises of our statesmen and politicians will be kept.

What happened?

The stand of Woodrow Wilson has been repudiated.

The promise of Warren G. Harding has been repudiated.

The promise of Calvin Coolidge has been repudiated.

The promise of Herbert Hoover has been repudiated.

The promise of Franklin Roosevelt has been repudiated.

The promise of Harry S. Truman has been repudiated.

The promise of the Republican Party platform has been repudiated.

The promise of the Democratic Party platform has been repudiated.

What is the promise of these Americans that was broken? Let me quote from just two of these, and they all read essentially the same:

From the Republican Party platform of 1944:

"In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth."

From the Democratic Party platform of 1944:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

Our President has gone back on the stand taken by every President before him since the Balfour Declaration, his own stand, as well, and that of the League of Nations. Warren Austin's statement of reversal on the Palestine partition repudiates the stand of the 33 nations in the UN who voted for it. It breaks faith completely with the Jews who were willing to accept the smallest portion of a land that was promised to them in its entirety.

What does it mean when the United States breaks a promise? What does it mean when the United States does not uphold the ideals on which she stands?

We cannot destroy the only potential for democracy in the Middle East, while trying,

at the same time, to build up democracies in western Europe. We are giving to Russia the opportunity to say democracy is weak and corrupt.

The fact that the Arab League, through its campaign of terrorism, could cause the United States to back down simply means that crime does pay. The greatest criminal of them all—a man who delivered thousands of children to their death, who gave Hitler advice and help, a man who was exiled as an enemy of the Allies after World War I and whose record as a war criminal is as black as the blackest Nazi in World War II—the mufti, can well be jubilant now. By what reasoning can we assure ourselves that the Arab leaders, who were traitors before, will not be traitors again?

This is more than irony: The Jews of Palestine fought alongside of the British in Europe and Africa, while the Arabs gave their help to the Nazis. The mufti spent most of the war years in Berlin, helping Hitler plan the extermination of the Jews.

The Jewish state would constitute the type of democracy which America wants in the Mediterranean. The Jewish state could be trusted to fight against either "Red or Brown Fascism." Can the Arabs be thus trusted?

No American can take part in an injustice. Every American should raise his voice to protest this betrayal of the United Nations.

An American Plan for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Easter Sunday my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] was interviewed on a radio program under the auspices of the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette and the Arlington (Va.) Daily, both being newspapers in the adjoining area in Virginia across the Potomac. The interview was heard over Station WEAM in Arlington and Station WNDB in Daytona Beach, Fla. I ask unanimous consent that the interview which has aroused a great deal of general interest, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. PARMER. This is Charles Parmer from Washington. With the Easter dawn came hope today—hope that America will lead all nations toward the achievement of the world's dream—peace.

Abroad, and especially in Moscow, there is a belief that America is weak; that we are divided; and, worse, that we are undecided in both our foreign and domestic policies.

True, we do have our differences, between parties and even in parties. But today—this Easter—there is every sign that once again we shall present a united front to the world.

So, I've asked to this microphone an American leader who, in the past few months, has demonstrated to the world that regardless of internal differences, we stand as one against all potential threats to peace: United States Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida.

Even in his own party he stands for unity. That was shown when, after being led up the mountain by Henry Wallace and shown the mirage of a political promised land, he steadfastly refused to desert his President and his Party leader—despite the most tempting of offers.

That was—and is—CLAUDE PEPPER—American leader. One of the few men in the world who has ever stood face to face with Stalin in the Kremlin and talked to him man to man about peace in the world.

One of our most widely traveled Senators, he goes to a country and talks with its leaders when he wants facts. Senator PEPPER is the man qualified on this Easter to offer a plan—to suggest one last try for world peace.

Senator PEPPER, what is the way, sir?

Senator PEPPER. First, let me thank you very warmly for those gracious words, Mr. Parmer. I am always delighted to be on your program, because I like the way you try to bring the facts to the people of this country.

Mr. PARMER. Senator, our audience loves to hear you.

Senator PEPPER. I thank you. The Bible says "Blessed are the peacemakers." I am not afraid, therefore, to continue in any reasonable and honorable and patriotic way to try to prevent the scourge of war from coming to curse our country and our world again. Now it is very difficult to know what to propose. The situation has deteriorated very greatly. The Soviet Union has been guilty of aggression which offends and affronts our sense of independence and dignity and freedom for the peoples of the world. I have not, however, lost all hope—as dark as the situation now appears.

I want the President of the United States to make one last and earnest attempt to find a basis of cooperation and peace between the United States and the Soviet Union; and I want the President to propose in a personal conference with Stalin at some mutually agreeable place, an American plan for peace. I want the President before proposing that plan to confer with the leaders of all parties in the Congress and with the head of our armed services, and with public opinion in America as fully as that may be possible, and present an American plan for world peace to Generalissimo Stalin. If he will do that and if that plan, provided it is reasonable and fair, is rejected by Marshal Stalin, then I will feel that we have done what we should do, at least made a last dramatic effort to prevent the horror of another unspeakable war from coming upon the earth and upon our Nation.

Mr. PARMER. Senator PEPPER, you have really presented a new plan there. What would you suggest that that plan should emphasize?

Senator PEPPER. In the first place, we will have to require that all nations cease physical and ideological aggression upon their neighbors—simply suggesting that nations observe the obligation they undertook when they became members of the United Nations organization. We shall on our part, I think, also have to assure all nations that if they will not commit aggression, either physically or ideologically, upon their neighbors that we will help them with economic aid to repair the damage of war, and to get back on their feet again after the economy of the earth has been so shaken as it has been by World War II. In other words, I have the feeling that probably at the end of World War II we made a mistake in giving an impression to the Soviet Union and some of the nations around about her that because we did not like their political system we were not going to help them to recover from the damage of the war. Now we must not forget that the Soviet Union and Poland alone suffered 20,000,000 dead from that Nazi aggression in World War II.

Stalin told me that the Russian people were 25,000,000 homeless, so they suffered greatly in the war. If we did give them the impression, even unintentionally, that we were unwilling to help them to recover from war's devastation, then let us make it plain to them that we are anxious to help them to get back on their feet, and to recover from war's destruction as we are to help other allies in Western Europe to recover from war's damage, and to start up the road to prosperity again. Of course, our people want to be sure that their policies are to be policies of peace and not of war—that they are not going to take the help we give them and use it against us. That they are going to discontinue their physical and ideological aggression upon their neighbors, and truly pursue their aspirations in a peaceful way. The democracies expect the objectives of all nations to be sought by peaceful means. If we will get together and talk to one anotner as to what are the conditions of peace, what could keep us from having to go to war? It might be that although we are on the very brink of the precipice, we could yet draw back before we fall over it into an abyss from which possibly none of us shall be able to recover.

Mr. PARMER. Senator PEPPER, the President does not have to call for permission of the Congress to ask such a meeting?

Senator PEPPER. No; he does not. Just as President Roosevelt engaged in international conferences, the President today could do the same thing.

Now I want to make it very clear that this is not a proposed meeting for appeasement. I don't believe in appeasement. I didn't believe in appeasing Hitler. I don't believe in appeasing anybody else, but I do believe in peace. I know the horror of war with modern weapons, and I don't want to see the youth of America butchered in another war if there is any honorable way to prevent it. And I think that every one of us, public official and private citizen, owes it to those who would give their lives of necessity in a war—we do not know how many that might be—to make the utmost effort before that plunge over the precipice, to prevent that kind of a catastrophic war.

Now some say it is too late. Well, that is a philosophy of defeatism and despair. It is not too late, in my opinion, to work honorably for peace, and the thing that is necessary is to bring about an understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States. Now we are not going to remain weak. We are not going to be pushed around today and day after day in Congress. We are building up the Nation's military strength and power.

Mr. PARMER. Now while we are seeking peace, in the meanwhile, what about keeping our powder dry?

Senator PEPPER. Well, I fully believe in that, and having plenty of it—and always keeping it dry. I want us to have a great Navy. I want us to have a tremendous air force. I want us to have an adequate personnel in our armed services. For that reason, I am willing to vote for temporary revival of selective service.

Mr. PARMER. You think that is necessary?

Senator PEPPER. I do think the temporary revival of selective service is necessary, but I am not prepared yet to vote for universal military training. I do not believe that is necessary. I know that selective service was sufficient to give us an armed force that won the greatest victory in history for us, and I am willing for the armed services to have the full use of selective service, but I do not yet wish to fasten upon peacetime Americans that European system of compulsory military training which has regularly taken the boys into the armed services over there for periodic training, and has not kept the peace of Europe.

Selective service is a temporary expedient, and when the emergency has passed it can be done away with, but I am afraid when we once establish a system of compulsory military training for our high-school boy when he graduates from high school, or when he

reaches a certain age, I don't know how long it will take us to get it off.

Mr. PARMER. Would that start us on the road to imperialism?

Senator PEPPER. Well, there is a sentiment in the country that feels that there are some who are so foolish as to desire that policy, but I feel that if we will use selective service to get all the personnel of all ages that may be required to have a strong armed force to defend America that that will be adequate for all reasonable purposes, and that we will be spared establishing this compulsory military training in peacetime for every youth as soon as he graduates from the high schools of this country.

Now, Mr. Parmer, I believe that we must always recognize this: We have given billions and billions of dollars of aid to the countries of western Europe, and we are day by day giving more to those nations. I am in favor of it, but I have a feeling that the nations of eastern Europe resent that, and feel that since they gave more of their citizens and soldiers in the defeat of the Nazis that they are entitled to more consideration than they have had. On the other hand, we feel that western Europe has cooperated with us to try to keep world peace, and that the Soviet Union and eastern Europe has blocked those efforts. Now then, if we can bring them into the orbit of the nations that are working for peace, wouldn't it be better to let them have a few billion dollars in money to recover their economy, to buy goods from us, to help build the structure and the edifice of peace, than to spend that in war? Or even in preparation for war?

Mr. PARMER. Certainly. And right along that line, Senator PEPPER, would you make a move in Congress to give them that financial aid?

Senator PEPPER. I certainly would, provided they would adopt policies that are in the direction of peace instead of policies that seem suggestive of war and oppression. That is what I want President Truman to do—to sit down with Premier Stalin and say, "Maybe you have misunderstood us, maybe we have misunderstood you. We are today on the brink of world war III that will ruin us both. Cannot we settle our differences and become friends again as we once were against the Nazis, and work together for peace as we did once to destroy the threat of the evil Nazis that tried to enforce totalitarianism upon the world?"

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening. President Truman was very angry at his press and radio conference this week when he branded a columnist as a "liar," one who had fabricated "a lie out of the whole cloth," in having reported in his column that President Truman had told a New York publisher that the Jews of New York were "disloyal."

I have no intention of going into the matter of whether the President said it—as the columnist still insists—or didn't say it. What I am interested in is the general subject of Jews in relation to the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. I think I will let Jacob Pat, writing in the New Leader, explain the background of the situation. Jacob Pat is the executive secretary of the American Jewish Labor Committee. He went abroad to gather the personal stories of Jews who had been under Soviet rule.

"For many years," writes Mr. Pat, "Jewish Communists, in America and in Europe, pointed proudly to Soviet Russia, declaring it to be a paradise for Jews, where there are no pogroms, where there is no anti-Semitism, where the Jews enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, where they have opportunity for national and cultural development, where the Soviet Government even created an autonomous Jewish state in Birobidjan.

"Reactionaries and anti-Semites pegged their propaganda on the same issue: Communism was a Jewish affair, Russia was ruled by Jews who have turned it into a paradise for themselves, therefore—down with the Jews."

That points out the two things I want to discuss; first, is communism a Jewish affair? And second, is Soviet Russia a paradise for Jews?

How about that business of communism being a Jewish affair? It has just about this much truth to it: Karl Marx was a Jew; Leon Trotsky was a Jew; there were many Jews among the older Bolshevik leaders. But what happened? After Lenin died and Stalin took over, he purged Trotsky and practically every other Jew in high places. His agents followed Trotsky to Mexico and perpetrated a hideous ax-murder on him. Jews were largely the victims of the Moscow show-trials. Today, the only Jew who is on the Politburo—the ruling body of Soviet Russia—is Lazar Kaganovitch. No Jews are in a position to succeed Stalin when he passes on. In America, the two men who have been the leaders of the Communist Party for the past 10 years are Browder and Foster. Neither is a Jew.

What about the make-up of the Communist Party, throughout this country? One of its early leaders told a congressional committee that not more than 15 or 20 percent of the rank and file were Jewish.

A great many of them were probably converted on the ground that the Soviet Union was a paradise for their coreligionists. For many years the Soviet Union, through its marvelous propagandists were able to get away with this. But they can't do it anymore. As more and more Jews realize the situation, the more they may be expected to turn away from the party which has so outrageously deceived and exploited them. The truth will out—even if a lie can go around the world while truth is pulling on its boots.

During World War II, the Red army overran the eastern part of Poland. About 600,000 Poles—mostly Jews—were seized and sent to work in the forests of the north and elsewhere. About 400,000 of them died, but from 150,000 to 200,000 were still alive when the war ended. They were given the chance of leaving Russia. Not only did all of them seize the opportunity, but many Russian Jews stole or forged passports and left the country, too. Says Jacob Pat, who went over to get their story: "It was anomalous that in a country which claims to have solved the problem of religious and racial minorities, all the Polish Jews declined the hospitality of remaining in Russia. These people are aware that very little friendship awaits them in postwar Poland. These Jews are not so anxious to remain in the new Poland as they are to flee Russia." This, in itself, is a crushing indictment.

Take the case of Josef Sigelbaum. His father was Samuel Sigelbaum, a famous figure in Polish Jewry. Josef Sigelbaum, himself, joined the Partisan forces, then the Red Army and rose to the rank of captain. He was awarded the Order of the Red Star, the Medal of Moscow, and the Partisan Medal, First Class. He had the chance for a career in the Red army, but he turned it down. He escaped to the American zone of Germany where he lived in the DP camp and wrote a book about his experiences.

"I visited scores of cities and towns and villages where the mass of Russia's Jews had once lived," he wrote. "It was impossible not to realize that, although officially anti-Semitism is forbidden in Russia, nevertheless one feels it in daily life, in the factory, in the office and most of all, in prison."

Josef Sigelbaum realized that gas chambers and crematoria are only one dictator's way of getting rid of a people. He speaks of the 400,000 Polish Jews who did not return from Russia in these words:

"The remaining 400,000 perished, not in gas chambers and in crematoria but in the forests of Siberia and the wastelands of central Asia. They died building 'socialism' on the Soviet pattern, creating the 'happy life' according to Stalin." These people, on forced labor, he said, "had died by the thousands at their tasks, in their bunks at night, of typhus and malaria. They died on the roads and no one cared."

Isaac Don Levine has written a pamphlet called "The Jewish Tragedy in Soviet Russia." It records some of these cases of Polish Jews.

S. M., a rabbi, reports: "In Margelan, during the Jewish feast of Purim, I was invited to a house where the Jews, Soviet citizens, assembled for evening prayer. One of the neighbors reported them to the NKVD. The premises were raided and the host arrested and sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment."

N. M., another Polish Jew writes: "What became of the thousands of synagogues and houses of worship existing in prerevolutionary Russia? Ninety-eight percent of them were 'spontaneously' ceded by the Jews and transformed into places for public use. This was done in the usual way. The authorities imposed such heavy taxes that it was impossible for the community to pay them. The parishioners were also harassed with all kinds of vexations, not to mention the imprisonment of the rabbis."

Jacob Lestchinsky, in charge of economic research for the Jewish Scientific Institute, wrote a piece recently in the New Leader. He records that he found, in the Jewish Yearbook, issued in this country, a list of no fewer than 173 Jewish publications which appear regularly in the United States. In contrast to this, what does Soviet Russia offer to them in way of a Jewish press, and he answers:

"Only one meager sheet—a thin paper, barely one-third the size of a New York Jewish daily. And this solitary Jewish paper gives up three-quarters of its space to general news coverage, devoting only one-quarter to items of specific Jewish interest. There is not a single Jewish publication in Russian, neither a weekly nor a monthly. There is not even a single issue of an annual scientific periodical of Jewish import."

In the American Jewish Yearbook, 50 pages are needed just to list the functioning Jewish organizations in this country. Somewhere in this country, thousands of Jews meet every evening to discuss and work together. But in Moscow, that one little newspaper I mentioned never carries any indication of Jewish gatherings, except an occasional announcement of a literary evening for writers.

Mr. Lestchinsky says that a friend of his who had spent several years in Russia observed that nowhere can such ardent Zionists be found as in Russia. "The feeling of a Russian Jew," he says, "is like the attitude of a prisoner to whom freedom is a thousandfold enhanced."

What makes it complicated is that it is a crime to be a Zionist in Russia. Dr. Julius Margolin, a Zionist leader in Poland, who spent 5 years in Stalin's slave camps, says: "My most shocking encounters in the Soviet camps were meetings with people who had

been sentenced solely for having been Zionists in their youth. Before me were old men and women, broken, without hope or faith."

And yet, the Communists in this country have the unmitigated gall to pose as the friends of Zionists. They hope that Zionists will forget that during the bloody riots in Palestine, in the late 1930's, the Communist newspapers printed anti-Zionist cartoons which were so foul that they looked like the propaganda of a Josef Goebbels. They are betting on the Zionists forgetting because they are now forming a new Communist front, according to the most authoritative news letter on communism in the United States—the news letter called Counterattack. The name of the new front, which is created to exploit the Palestine issue in favor of the Soviet Union is the United Committee to Save the Jewish State and the United Nations. Remember that long and portentous name: The United Committee to Save the Jewish State and the United Nations. It will save the Jewish state just about as honestly as it will serve the United Nations.

I quote from the files of the American Jewish Congress the following: "Saddest of all is the fact that both covert and overt anti-Semitism of the Government (of Soviet-controlled Poland) and of the Army are able to continue unchecked. Tens of thousands of executioners of Jews, whose hands still drip blood, go scot-free, basking in the sun of the new Polish democracy. No one has yet been brought to trial for anti-Semitic activity."

Drew Middleton, former Moscow correspondent for the New York Times, writes: "The extent and intensity of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is surprising in a country that boasts of its lack of racial prejudice. It is met in the streets and is evident in Government departments. It flourishes in Moscow but also in Odessa and Kiev. Reports on minor court cases reveal evidence of flourishing anti-Semitism in the poorer quarters of the capital. The Jews are blamed for shortages of bread or potatoes. In Kiev, widespread discontent over the inadequacy of rations assumed an anti-Semitic aspect. * * *

"Anti-Semitism is not an announced government policy as it was in Germany. But it is difficult to believe that such widespread anti-Semitism could exist in so closely controlled a police state if the government did not give its tacit approval. * * * Jews are barred from joining the Ministry of Foreign Affairs even in the most subsidiary positions. Jews cannot now enter the principal military academies in Moscow."

Speaking of the anti-Semitism in Kiev, where some of the old Czarist pogroms took place. David J. Dallin says that a Jewish exsoldier, coming back to his home town in Kiev, wrote him: "I found myself surrounded by such animosity that I immediately decided to flee abroad."

Mr. Dallin further says that he is in receipt of many communications from Jews in Russia in which they throw the blame for the situation on Alexander Scherbakov, a very influential member of the Politburo, who was close to Stalin and who was known to have anti-Semitic tendencies. But Scherbakov died 2 years ago and the incidents do not seem to have lessened since them.

No report on the Jews in the Soviet Union could fail to mention the famed Jewish autonomous state of Birobidjan. But Cyrus L. Sulzberger, foreign correspondent of the New York Times and a member of the family controlling the Times, reports that the Soviet Government, to say the least, had lost interest in Birobidjan. This Russian homeland for the Jews has been allowed to fall pretty much into decay. No new supplies are sent out and the local factories are reported to be "in a state of uninterrupted break-down."

One of the chief duties of the secret police in Birodidjan is to prevent disillusioned pioneers from leaving, he says.

Apparently, while the Birodbidjan project was a very powerful instrument of propaganda for the Soviet Union to use abroad, it did not succeed in fooling too many Jews within the Soviet Union. Mr. Sulzberger reports that only a third of the population of the Jewish Autonomous Republic of Birobidjan is Jewish.

The Jews in Russia are evidently on to the regime there. Certainly those who have been elsewhere, or who have escaped out of Russia are on to it, so far as its being a paradise for the Jews.

Jacob Pat, whom I have mentioned before, tried to draw out some of the returning Polish Jews on the subject. "Surely, after all," he would say to them, "it couldn't have been so bad. Russia is the worker's fatherland. You may regret your decision to leave the Soviet Union."

"You are trying to be smart," he was answered. "But you forget—we were there."

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

The March of Despotism Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., before a civic mass meeting in the auditorium at Toledo, Ohio, on Saturday evening, March 27, 1948, in connection with a campaign inaugurated by Mayor Di Salle and other citizens of Toledo to encourage letter writing to Europe aimed at Communist penetration:

THE MARCH OF DESPOTISM MUST BE STOPPED

Fellow citizens, for many generations in America we took liberty pretty much for granted. We did not have to worry about the quarrels and squabbles in Europe and the Orient. We were—in those days—geographically far removed from other nations across the seas.

We went our way untroubled by any thought that aliens would infiltrate into our own Government, into our own labor and social organizations, for the purpose of destroying every principle, and the fruit of every principle, embraced in our steadily progressing American system of freedom and opportunity. Those days are gone.

Under our American system men had found a new freedom. They had found freedom to forge ahead and achieve careers in the professions, or they could go into business. By hard work and careful attention to proper methods, they might go as far and become as rich as their talents and industry would carry them. If some preferred to follow craftsmanship or agriculture, they could learn trades or engage in their chosen farm work, build homes, marry, settle down to raise families, and save up for old age, when they should want to take things easy.

Our American system had some flaws. Those who were unfortunate or who lacked the talent and capacity to get ahead did not get as many of the comforts of life as others. But we were constantly progressing toward a more comprehensive and practical system of care for our aged, poor, ill, or otherwise incapacitated citizens.

Within a little more than a century we had achieved a place of power in the world greater than that of any other nation in existence 10 times or 20 times as long.

We became the greatest melting pot for all classes, from all races and all countries, the world ever saw. Within a century and a half we had achieved the highest living levels of any people on the globe. We had the highest wages, the best working conditions, the shortest work days and weeks, and the most efficient mass-production system mankind ever knew.

We had built the finest railway and highway systems in the world. We had the greatest degree of religious and political liberty; the finest system of education for the masses; the most comforts for the average citizen, of any people anywhere.

America was at peace with the world. We wanted no trouble with any other peoples. We did not seek the lands or the possessions of any other peoples. We were receiving and absorbing into our wonderful, free way of life millions of people from other countries. Those who found their own governments oppressive, or life in their native countries too hard, came—as many of them as could—to free, rich America. Here they were welcomed. They got good jobs and good wages. They began to send millions in savings back to their relatives in their homelands, either to finance them for a trip to America, or to make life a little easier in their own home countries. Nobody objected to that. It went on for years. Nobody now can recall how many billions of American dollars were sent abroad in those years to help peoples across the seas. Our American system of free government, free economy, and free society made all those wonderful things come to pass.

Whenever and wherever disaster struck, American dollars and the American Red Cross were there to aid the injured; to comfort the dying; to feed the hungry; to shelter the homeless, and to reach out the hand of kindly charity to the helpless. Nobody, today, can say how many millions piled upon more millions have gone out over the world in American dollars to relieve famine and earthquake sufferers, hurricane, or pestilence victims. America, rich, kindly, benevolent America, made all that possible.

Then we were drawn into the First World War. We sent in thousands of men and billions of money. We fought on the side of peace and freedom. All we asked in return was that the nations of the world try to get along in peace and amity, just as America had always been ready and eager to get along with all peoples in the world in peace and amity. We didn't get peace.

Out of that First World War two dangerous powers of evil and brutality were spawned. One was called communism. It never was communism at all. It was always a brutal, desperate despotism operated by a few men. They gathered about them a minority—and a very small minority at that—of those in Russia who exchanged the brutal despotism and tyranny of life under the Czar for the worse and more brutal despotism of life under the masters of the Kremlin.

The other power of evil spawned of the First World War was fascism and nazism. Mussolini marched on Rome. Later Hitler started on a rampage of armed aggression. All through the years following the first World War the schemers of the Kremlin were engaged in world revolution. They were gaining minorities—discontented minorities of social misfits, agitators, sadists, crackpots, and paid traitors in various countries. The cloak of an idealistic communism was very cleverly draped over the real purpose of world revolution and world despotism. It fooled many good and earnest people at first. Some teachers, and preachers, and writers, apart

from the leaders of local discontents and malcontents, though they saw the key to Utopia, and the formula for eternal bliss. Nobody was going to have to work hard. The rich were going to pay all the bills.

Gradually some of those who looked a little closer began to perceive that the followers of communism were either foolish, fooled, or dangerously desperate revolutionaries bent upon overthrowing our great American system. Many of us began to warn the people of the danger growing by leaps and bounds right in our own country.

Then came the years when Communistic schemers were welcomed into high Government posts. They gained their way into labor unions. They continued their tactics of boring from within. They sabotaged every benefit they could. They nourished frictions and suspicions, and disputes between sections and classes of individuals.

Then came the Second World War. You will reall that the Communists were howling all over this country against the United States going into that war. It was an imperialistic war, they said. The reason for that opposition by the Communists in America was because the masters of the Kremlin had signed the partnership pact with Hitler which gave him the green light to begin his awful, wicked, desperate war on civilization. They picketed the White House against America giving aid to Britain and others. They were writing, speaking, marching, doing everything they could, to prevent America from going into the fray to stop Hitler. Those who bore the first brunt of Hitler's ruthless persecution should forever remember the fact that it was Stalin and Molotov, it was the masters of the Kremlin, who gave Hitler the pact which made him feel secure in starting on his mad course.

Then, when Hitler and Stalin quarreled over the spoils, Hitler turned on Russia and invaded that country. What happened? The war suddenly became a great cause with the American Communists. Actually their biggest newspaper, the Daily Worker, remade its front page and declared America must go into the war instantly, while the inside pages of the paper still carried fulminations against America taking even the slightest part in the struggle.

Japan had for 40 years been plotting war. The men of the Kremlin knew that. Japan was a threat at their back. Germany was attacking at their front. America went in, and with more than eleven billions of dollars of war supplies, and tanks and guns and food, and with millions of the flower of our young manhood and young womanhood we saved Russia. There is not the slightest question in this world that if we had not gone to the rescue of Russia that country would have been laid waste by Hitler. It is probable the men of the Kremlin would today be dead or in hiding—probably dead.

What did we seek as we were forced into this second world struggle? We sought peace—a just peace—among nations. We gave more billions in money, we produced more to help our allies than they, altogether, produced to help themselves.

The masters of the Kremlin have wantonly, cynically, sadistically, and with calculation and deliberation, violated every principle of civilized international justice. They have embarked upon the same kind of a desperate attempt at world domination and despotism the mad Hitler and his brutal minions tried.

We are today the only great nation left which can spearhead a world movement to stop this onward march of despotism. We are the only people left who have the strength, the means and the tools by which to weld together a world movement to stop these madmen from subjugating and enslaving Europe and Asia. We must stop them. We intend to stop them! We sent men out to die for liberty, and to keep the torch of hope and freedom burning in the world. We do not intend to see their sacrifices made futile and empty by men mad with lust for power who are determined to overrun the world.

We have sent more than twenty billions of dollars to help the war-stricken since the fighting ceased. We are confronted with the necessity of sending still more billions piled upon billions of dollars to peoples in other countries to feed them, to try to help them. As we are engaged in this great humanitarian task, the despots of the Kremlin and their cowardly, evil minions in all those other countries are working, and striving, and conniving, to try to keep hunger, and suffering, death, and pestilence active. What manner of men, what kind of humans, can such creatures be who to gain power are willing to starve men and women and little children; who are willing to impose still more suffering upon peoples in a world utterly weary and desperate after the worst war the planet ever saw?

Now there is a great force—it could be the deciding force—in America which can do more than any other force, short of a war of obliteration, to stop this march of the Kremlin despots across Europe and the Orient. That great force whose might no man can calculate, lies in those American citizens who themselves have come from those other countries, or whose parents or grandparents have come from those other lands.

Millions of people in other countries have been led to believe the American people are starving; that America is bankrupt; that we are in the midst of a great depression; that our people are enslaved by the government. It seems crazy to us, here in free America, that millions of other people could be led to believe such lies, but it is so. They have no way to learn the facts from their own leaders in many cases.

If all the people in the United States of foreign birth or extraction will start movements in each group to write letters to their relatives and friends in the homelands telling them how much better freedom and Americanism are than despotism, under the cloak of communism, or fascism, we can win this cold war without it becoming a blood-war.

These letter-writing campaigns should be organized by the leaders in each group or colony of foreign-born, or foreign-descent citizens. Those younger men and women who have a clear understanding of the government, and the ways of this Nation, should be organized to write the letters for those who are unable to do so for themselves.

Translators could take the letters and put them into the language of the peoples to whom the letters would go. They could do a tremendous work for liberty if the movement can be well organized.

The leaders of each of the different groups could organize a series of meetings. The individuals of the different groups could be told how they can render this grand service to America, a marvelous service to civilization and the world, and a loving service to their own relatives. This is a campaign in which young and old could participate with all their energy. Not a life would be lost. Not a drop of blood would be shed. Millions of lives can be saved. Rivers of blood can be prevented. And those who, themselves, or whose progenitors, came from foreign lands, could render the cause of freedom, and of free America, the greatest service ever rendered by any peoples to any nation and any cause on this planet.

The leaders of the various language groups could rally the younger people to the campaign. The veterans, men and women, could be brought into action.

I believe it may well be possible the advance of the iron curtain can be greatly slowed down, possibly stopped, by this campaign of world letter-writing if we go at it with the earnestness and intensity with which we go into battle. It can be particularly effective if a flood of letters is sent into Italy before the elections of April 18.

This, my fellow Americans, is a crusade. It is a holy crusade. It is an American crusade. It is fitting that we should be discussing this movement on the eve of Easter Sunday.

I am convinced it may be quickly made the most effective, the most far-reaching, the most wonderful crusade for the preservation of civilization the world has ever seen.

The foreign language newspapers should take up this work. Some already have. They can do a marvelous service in boosting this campaign.

The letters should tell how people in America live, and work and play. They should set forth the comforts and luxuries which even the poorest people enjoy in this country. They should describe the great liberties and privileges all men and women and children have in this country. They should tell of our churches, our schools, our highways, our railroads, our theaters, our parks, our pastimes, our games.

These letters should tell how men and women and little children of all races and creeds go to sleep in their homes at night in this land secure against any fear that secret police or political assassins will knock on the door and take away forever some member of the family.

These letters should tell how men and women may belong to labor unions, to lodges, to clubs without fear. They should tell of the rights labor enjoys in America as in no country under the iron heel of despots.

These letters should tell of the complete freedom in this country from any fear that neighbors or other informers will bring trouble or the secret police if a man voices criticism of the government or his idea of how government should be operated.

Why, my friends, we have in this Nation more comforts, more richness of life, more freedom of movement, more liberty of action, more security, more opportunity than any people in any nation on the globe.

Let us tell the world about it. If each citizen of foreign birth or extraction will send these letters to each of his relatives and friends in the old country who would trust what he says, and if photographs and snapshots were sent along as pictorial proof of the information in the letters, we can move the world by this campaign. We can stop communism. We can make the beacon of hope burn more brightly for every people in the world. We can send the flame of freedom into the skies for all men to see and guide their steps toward it.

I here and now urge every leader and every newspaper of every group to start organization of this campaign among their people. Get the women and the girls to help. Call meetings in the churches or social club halls. Put the fire, and the push, and the zeal behind it. I would feel honored if every leader and every editor who starts this campaign would write me what he is doing, so I could make the information public in order that other groups may know what is being done among their people in each part of the Nation.

Let's start such a flood of letters telling the truth about great, grand, free America they will help to drown out and wash away the totalitarian movements in Europe and Asia. Let's put the greatest force known on this globe—public opinion and the universal love of peace and freedom—behind this campaign. Let the religious leaders join in with every ounce of their influence.

Let's all work together to make history—a history of peace, and good will and human liberty and human progress for every people.

Let's make freedom ring around the world. God strengthen us!

Red Military Forces Vast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, March 28, 1948, by Lester Allen:

RED MILITARY FORCES VAST—SURPASS UNITED STATES IN ALL PHASES EXCEPT NAVY AND INDUSTRIAL KNOW-HOW, SURVEY OF FACTS SHOWS

(By Lester Allen)

Considered without sentiment or prejudice, the question of the strength or weakness of the armed forces of the United States must be by comparison with the only major power which now threatens the United States and that requires estimates as close as possible to actual fact about the armed strength of the Soviet Union and six satellite nations or areas as well.

The best possible index is the budget figures for military purposes in the Soviet Union for 1948 announced on January 31. Mark that date. It was before Czechoslovakia was absorbed by the Soviet Union by the Communist coup d'état. Reckoning 5.3 rubles to the dollar, the Soviet Union military budget was $20,000,000,000, or 17 percent of all the revenue of the USSR.

Czechoslovak armed forces were earmarked on January 31, before the Communists took over, for $153,000,000, with $68,000,000 for Yugoslavia, $13,000,000 for Hungary, $18,000,000 for Rumania, $22,000,000 for Bulgaria, and $2,000,000 for north Korea. These sums must be paid back by the satellite countries.

ABOUT FORTY BILLION

Even though the official rate of exchange is 5.3 rubles to the dollar, the real value of the budget, due to use of slave labor in armaments industries and military works construction is twice the amount shown, or $40,000,000,000.

If there are critics of our expenditures in aid to Turkey, Greece, and the nations in the European aid plan, let them consider that we are spending less than a third of what the Soviet Union is spending.

Let's consider now the relative strength of the two nations. The Soviet Army is divided into six armies—the western army under Marshal Clemety E. Voroshilov, administers from the Murmansk coast on the frozen northern sea to the Baltic. The second army, under Marshal Konstantin Rokossovsky, administers from East Prussia through Germany, Austria, and Poland. The third army, under Marshal Georgi K. Zhokov, administers from Balkan-occupied areas to Odessa. The fourth army, under Marshal Ivan Bagramian, a Syrian, administers in the Caucasus-Black Sea area. The fifth army, under Marshal Semyon Timoshenko, administers the Caspian-Turkestan area. The sixth army, under Marshal Radion Malinovsky, administers the far eastern area.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE RED DIVISIONS

All told, the Soviet Union, exclusive of satellite armies, has 195 divisions, with slightly more than 3,800,000 men, with 10,000,000 men in reserve. The United States has an over-all total of only 3,650,000 men in its regular and reserve forces.

On the sea only is the Soviet Union overmatched. We have almost 4,000,000 tons of ships against 475,000 tons for the Soviet Union.

The best surveys show that we have 35,000 planes of all kinds, while the Soviet Union has 28,000. But, when this figure is broken down, it is seen that the Soviet Union has 10,500 planes operational, ready, and manned to fly, while we have about 7,500, with the rest in reserve.

PLANE PRODUCTION

The Soviet Union is producing 6,000 to 12,000 planes a year, and we are not producing half as many. The Russians are operating an air force of several hundred long-range bombers of the B–29 type, six types of jet planes, and an air transport force comparable to our whole commercial transport system.

The minimum force needed in defense of the United States now, according to the survery of the President's Air Policy Commission would have the Air Forces equipped with 12,400 modern planes to establish a minimum of 70 groups with 6,869 front-line aircraft, an air national guard with 3,212 aircraft, and an air reserve of 34 groups with a reserve of 8,100 aircraft.

The Navy requires 5,793 front-line planes with 5,100 planes in support.

To accomplish this the military budget would have to be increased from its present rate of $10,098,000,000 to $11,590,000,000 in 1948 and to $13,200,000,000 next year.

THE LAST RESORT

It may be noted here that no consideration has been given to the atom bomb, biological warfare, or mass-obliteration weapons for the specific reason that it is manifest that these are still weapons of last resort or retaliation. In short, the United States would not employ biological warfare or atomic warfare unless it were reduced to dire straits, or in retaliation for such an attack upon the United States.

The mass power of the Soviet forces lies in its numbers—primarily foot soldiers used to privation, tough, stubborn, and illiterate, many still in a state of barbarity.

The Russians have an immense amount of weapons, a large part worn by use in World War II, or captured from Germany. They are deficient, however, in transport, still using obsolete trucks and automobiles and a vast amount of horse-drawn transport.

ARTILLERY GOOD

They have excellent tanks and know how to use them. They have developed the mass use of artillery even further than the United States. A comparison of infantry divisions in Russia and an American infantry division shows that the Soviet division has 10,000 men equipped with 24 76-millimeter guns and 24 122-millimeter howitzers. The Russian artillery division has 72 76-millimeter guns, 12 122-millimeter guns, 48 122-millimeter howitzers, and 24 152-millimeter howitzers.

The United States postwar infantry division has fifty-four 105-millimeter howitzers and eighteen 155-millimeter howitzers.

The Soviet Long Tom, comparable to our 155-millimeter howitzer is the 152-millimeter howitzer and it outranges our larger caliber howitzer by several hundred yards.

The Soviet 76-millimeter howitzer of the infantry and artillery divisions can be hauled into position by manpower. Our weapons cannot.

MASS ARTILLERY FIRE

The Russians have four all-artillery divisions, which are employed for mass fire of artillery, and they frequently regroup infantry divisional artillery to obtain the effect of mass artillery fire.

There is some question of how many troops the Russians have in Europe, outside the borders of the Soviet Union in occupied or satellite countries. The best estimates are about 40 divisions. It is known that they have a total of 125 divisions west of the Ural Mountains, and about 30 divisions in the Far East.

The morale of divisions in actual contact with the west is low, and there have been desertions, but this was counteracted by withdrawing the disillusioned veterans and replacing them with half-trained conscripts under reliable, war-trained leaders.

But our troops in occupation are scarcely better, for they are all too young, too little trained to their job, actually a low-grade police force rather than a tactical army.

SUPERIOR IN AIR

Whatever superiority the United States would have in the opening phases of a shooting war would be in the air, and that would mean expenditure of air groups we now have with no replacements. It is doubtful if it would be decisive in holding back the tremendous rolling, numerical mass of the Soviet ground forces.

The Russians have some cavalry divisions, mainly from conscripts from along the Don, who still bring their own horses into service when they are conscripted. The Cossacks are required to provide one horse and a remount, but, in actual practice this could not be done, because it stripped the farms and collectives along the Don of work animals. The cavalry divisions, however, are lightly armed with only 84 artillery weapons, and they have, wherever observed, shown surprising mobility, although they have to live off the country, being unable to carry fodder for their animals. Where cavalry was used by the Russians, the following foot regiments, also living, in part, off the country, suffered real privation because the cavalry had used up all the fodder, leaving none for the predominantly horse drawn transport of the infantry regiments.

AIR POWER VITAL

Thus, in any conflict that might develop between the east and the west, the greatest striking power and the best chance of hurling back the advance of the mass of Soviet armies rests with an air force able to chop up rail communications so thoroughly that communications and supply will be brought to a dead halt.

The experience of World War II, as demonstrated by the United States strategic bombing survey was that the most effective use of air power was delayed until the final phases of the war in Europe, the smashing up of German communications and transportation.

In the light of the role that air power must play the foreign policy and policy of aid to certain nations becomes clearer. The Navy's role with its carrier strength operating in the Mediterranean, the Baltic, the cold northern seas, even in the Black Sea, could wreak initial havoc on Russian lines of communication.

SLOW-MOVING ARMIES

Even now the Soviet Union cannot move masses of troops from one front to another with anything like the speed that the Germans demonstrated. Their far eastern armies must stay there, and their Caucasus armies can lend little support to their western and southwestern armies, except in a long struggle.

No consideration has been given here to the industrial strength which is a first requisite for support of such armies. The seizure of Czechoslovakia was not primarily a move to reinforce the numerical strength of Soviet forces, but more to acquire the technical skill and the industrial plants of the Czechs, who, with the Germans, are the best technicians and producers in Europe. The Skoda works is still primarily a heavy industry dedicated to war, and the Russians now have it. It is certain that in the event of an armed struggle the Skoda Works and its affiliated Czech industries would have to provide the weapons and munitions for at least three of the six Soviet armies.

Those are the facts about the relative strength of the United States and the Soviet Union, today. It should make the questions of universal training, conscription, and the military budget a little clearer. In actual superiority we can count our industrial know-how and the Navy as far superior. In the other components of military power we appear to be deficient.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening. All of a sudden the world is full of war talk. The assumption that the Soviets would not move to provoke a war until after they had the atomic bomb has had to be reexamined. There were many signs and portents that they might be getting ready for a decisive move this spring. It has galvanized Washington with a sense of urgency that has not been known since before Pearl Harbor.

Just what can be expected from the Soviet Union? Is war inevitable from their standpoint? Are they preparing for world conquest—trying and expecting to succeed where Hitler failed?

These are questions I hope to examine this week and next. First, let's go into what the leaders of communism have said about the inevitability of war. That may be the clue to the whole thing.

Their literature is filled with expressions which couple the word "imperialism" with "democracy." In fact, the expression "imperialist countries" is used as a complete substitute for the words "western democracies," or "capitalist nations." It is thoroughly ground into the consciousness of all Communists and of the people of the Soviet Union that capitalist countries must of necessity be imperialistic—and this is the rationale—the reasoning—which is applied; the reason why every capitalist country must, of necessity, become a marauding aggressor against other countries is that "capitalist contraditions," as they call them, are tightening about them. They believe and teach that world capitalism is in its death agony. It is driven by its own internal contradictions to an ever more ruthless policy of world exploitation as depression deepens and home markets fail. They say that the capitalist rulers, sensing their danger, will launch their countries on a policy of world expansion, to save their markets and to prevent a domestic revolution. It will inevitably lead to war against the Soviet Union.

This is their teaching—whether it is the actual belief of the policymakers of the Soviet Union, or not. There is a curious mixture of personal hatred toward the capitalist rulers with a very impersonal, detached opinion that the capitalist leaders cannot help themselves, that it is inevitable, from the circumstance of capitalism in decline, that the capitalist countries will have to seek the way out in war.

Now, with it in mind that the Russians say capitalism equals imperialism, let's see where it leads Stalin. I am about to quote from Stalin's principal theoretical work which he calls the Problems of Leninism. He sums up in these words, part of it being a quotation from Lenin: "The basic fact is * * * that no longer exists a world-wide capitalist system. Now that a Soviet country has come into existence * * * world-wide capitalism has ceased to exist. The world has been severed into two camps—the imperialist camp and the anti-imperialist camp * * *.

"We are living, not merely in one state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably, side by side, with the imperialist states. Ultimately, one or another must conquer. Pending this development, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states must inevitably occur."

That ought to be plain enough. It is considered by the Soviet inner circle as their marching orders. It is not arguable. It is an article of faith.

Ah, but some of you may say, that was a long time ago when Stalin wrote the Problems of Leninism. His mind may have changed in the meantime. But what do we find from the famous election speech of Stalin, delivered on February 9, 1946? In that speech Stalin was talking about the causes of the last war and was weighing the chances for world peace, in the future.

"It would be incorrect," he said, "to think that the war arose accidentally, or as a result of the fault of some statesman. Although these faults did exist, the war arose, in reality, as the inevitable result of the development of the world economic and political forces, on the basis of monopoly capitalism." There again the note is struck, of the inevitability of war, under capitalism.

Then he says this: "Perhaps military catastrophes might be avoided if it were possible for raw materials and markets to be periodically redistributed among the various countries, in accordance with their economic importance, by agreement and peaceable settlement. But that is impossible to do, under present capitalist conditions, of the development of world economy."

If peace depends on the redistribution of markets and raw materials and if that is impossible to do, under capitalism, then it follows that Stalin regards war as inevitable so long as there is capitalism. He regards the "Socialist fatherland" of Russia as unsafe as long as there is a "capitalist encirclement." From this it follows that security for the Soviet Union can come only with the complete Sovietization of the world. And the literature of communism is full of the evidence—in so many words—that that is precisely what they are going to do. They don't shilly-shally about, and say it softly or obliquely. They come straight out and say it. For example, the official history of the Communist Party states: "Study of the history of the Communist Party strengthens the certainty of the final victory of the great task of the Lenin-Stalin party: the victory of communism in the whole world."

Pravda, the official organ of the Soviet Government, says: "The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk, but an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality. It cannot be otherwise. * * * Our ultimate aim is world communism; our fighting preparations are for world revolution, for the conquest of power on a world-wide scale and the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship."

The upshot of the February 1946 speech by Stalin was that he instructed his people to prepare themselves for war; to subordinate all peacetime production, all consumption-goods industries, to the building up of the heavy goods and war-making potential of the country. Many observers think that February 9, 1946, marked the actual declaration of war by the Soviets on the Western World, the breaking away from them as former allies.

Certainly the events of the past 3 years reinforce the view that the Soviet Union regards war with the democracies to be inevitable; that the only thing for them to do is to refuse to cooperate, except at their own very high price, to grab everything they can lay hands on, to reach out farther and farther from their own borders and take over country after country, either by armed aggression or by exploding them from within by fifth-column penetration, as in the case of Czechoslovakia.

From their actions it is quite plain that they figure there is no use in trying to be friends, of cooperating for the sake of bringing peace to the world, when war is inevitable by the theory of their own highest authorities. No, they must reach out—take every advantage, make themselves ready for the inevitable day when they will be attacked. That accounts, partly, for the seizure and political subjugation of the nearby countries. They reason that they must take country A, for example, and thus deprive the democracies of the chance of using country A as a base for their planes. But country B lies right behind country A—so take country B, too. And so on, for country C, country D, country E, F, and G—right on up to Cape Finisterre on the farthest point of Spain. The same thing goes for China and Korea. Only that way can the inevitable capitalist war on the Soviet Union be defeated they reason to themselves. This is part sophistry, of course, because that is the only way they can justify their own imperialist expansion. It leads to the ultimate in sophistry of the war lords, that any move they make toward world conquest is only self-defense. Any war that they embark upon—no matter who fires the first shot—is, by definition, a defensive war. This is so close to the Hitler sophistry that one could almost weep to see the same thing happening again, only on a bigger and more deadly scale.

It is all the more terrible to think that probably this world has got to wade through blood again just because some theoreticians in the Kremlin have decided, on a theory, that capitalism and imperialism go together and that the break-down of capitalism leads to imperialist wars, which will inevitably be directed against the Soviet Union. Let's just examine that theory in the light of actuality. Take Great Britain, a state which is an empire, too. Many competent observers say that Great Britain is in the stage of final liquidation as a great nation. Her own spokesmen point to her approaching bankruptcy, if the battle of exports cannot be won. One would think, from the Soviet theory, that they would be madly getting ready for imperialist aggression, to retrieve themselves at the expense of the rest of the world. But what is the fact? We see Britain, far from expanding, contracting. We see her give up the fairest jewel of her Empire, India, without firing a shot. We see her withdrawing from Egypt. We see her withdrawing from Burma, while cutting her commitments in all parts of the world.

This is actuality—not theory. It makes it all the more tragic to think that the world probably must have another blood bath, brought on by the aggressions of the Soviet Union, just because Lenin and Stalin held a theory—wrong, as it turns out to be in actual practice.

The uselessness, the wickedness of this is beyond description. To think of what may come, just because of a theory, held as an article of faith, rather than as something which could stand the light of scientific analysis and of historic fact.

On the other hand, we have the Soviet Union holding itself quite blameless. It cannot be an imperialist power because, by definition, it is not a capitalist country. Whoever heard before of a world war brought on by a cockeyed definition? It is mad. It has an Alice-in-Wonderland quality. "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." In spite of the fact that Britain—the capitalist-imperialist nation, par excellence—is now contracting, in spite of the fact that this country, the United States, has put forward no claim to a foot of foreign soil of any organized country, these two democracies are held up by the Soviets as imperialists, warmongering states, by definition. While the Soviet Union, the one great imperialist aggressor to come out of this war, is innocent as any babe.

Right here I would like to ask what Henry Wallace and Senator TAYLOR mean when they speak, also of the imperialism of the United

States. Do they accept this very special definition of the Kremlin, too? Have they been converted to the Soviet idea that any capitalistic country must become imperialist and aggressive? Have they absorbed so much of the ideology of communism that they condemn their own country as imperialist while excusing and justifying at every turn the Soviet foreign policy?

What is the actual, undeniable record of Soviet imperialism since the war? Already occupying one-fifth of the world's total land surface, the largest contiguous land mass on the globe, the Soviet Union and various Communist parties have attained control of more than 240,000 square miles, inhabited by 110,000,000 people in Europe alone, since 1939. That is almost two and a half times as much as the area seized by Hitler when the rest of the world, tiring of his depredations and fearful that he was out to conquer the globe, decided to resist. Here is the list of what they have taken over by direct annexation: Eastern Poland, Karelia, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, Bessarabia and Bukovina, Moldavia, Petsamo, the Koenigsberg area in east Prussia, the Carpatho-Ukraine, south Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, and Tannu Tuva. This area is larger than all our New England and Middle Atlantic States, with Virginia and North Carolina thrown in.

If that isn't impressive enough, no less than 12 nations have been forced into the orbit of predominant Soviet influence, with populations of about 165,000,000 people. That means all of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, parts of Austria, all of Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, eastern Germany, Manchuria, northern Korea, and Outer Mongolia. Now they are after Finland, Italy, and France. And they have a very good chance after April 18 of grabbing off Italy.

But that couldn't be imperialism—no, no. That is justified self-protection in the peculiar language of the Soviets and the Communist parties all over the world and of their latest appendages and apologists, Henry Wallace and GLEN TAYLOR.

It all goes back to the fact that the Soviets regard war with us as inevitable. Nothing that we can do can change that—not even piecemeal appeasement. The only appeasement that will do any good—that will avoid the war that the Soviets see coming so clearly—is total appeasement, which means total surrender of the rest of the world. I wonder if Messrs. Wallace and TAYLOR are willing to follow along to that extent?

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Virginia Veteran Laws and the DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws, as compiled by Donald E. Reece, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans. Mr. Reece is now located at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Roanoke, Va. His compilation followed by a statement about the DAV is as follows:

VIRGINIA VETERAN LAWS AND THE DAV

(By Donald E. Reece)

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

An appropriation is made to Confederate memorial associations for the care of graves of Confederate soldiers.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A soldier in actual military service, or a mariner or a seaman being at sea, may dispose of his personal estate as he might have done prior to statutory regulation.

Disability of minority is waived for a veteran to contract under the GI bill of rights.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Provision is made for administration of estates of members of the armed forces "missing in action," and so forth.

An owner of a motor vehicle in the armed services may authorize a member of his immediate family to transfer title.

Presumption of formal execution of wills made by persons in military service is provided.

Protection is afforded to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided for members of the armed forces.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Clerks of courts and the registrar of the Bureau of Vital Statistics are required to furnish, without charge, to veterans, their dependents or representatives, certified copies of vital records, orders relating to guardianship, and so forth, for use in presenting claims to the United States Veterans' Administration. The fee for a certified copy of the record of discharge papers is limited to 50 cents.

Clerks of courts shall record, free of charge, the discharge certificate of any veteran of any war in which the United States has been engaged.

The fee for recording discharge papers of World War veterans in the World War Memorial Record is limited to 35 cents.

An appropriation is made for the preparation and prosecution of claims against the Veterans' Administration and other Federal agencies on behalf of disabled war veterans and their dependents, and the surviving dependents of deceased war veterans.

A Division of War Veterans' Claims has been created under the Attorney General to render assistance to veterans, their widows and orphans with annual appropriations provided.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Teachers have certain obligations under State scholarships discharged by active military service.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Educational aid is extended to children of persons killed or totally and permanently disabled as a result of service in World Wars I and II in an amount not exceeding $200 per year.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Five- and 10-point preference is granted to veterans of World Wars I and II in State employment examinations.

Removal of disability of holding office under or receiving pension from the United States Government is provided, thus permitting members of the armed forces and veterans to hold State offices.

State, county, and municipal officers and employees are restored to former positions after discharge from the armed forces.

War service credit is granted under the State retirement system.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as Confederate pension is exempt from levy, garnishment or attachment.

GUARDIANSHIP

A trustee may be appointed for an incompetent veteran where it appears that one is needed for the purpose of receiving and administering benefits of compensation and insurance payable by the United States Government, or negotiating sales or rental of lands in behalf of said veteran.

HOMES

Any housing authority which may be created may develop and operate low cost nonprofit housing projects for World War II veterans.

Confederate veterans and their wives, and munitions workers may be admitted to the Lee Camp Soldiers' Home.

A Confederate Memorial Park has been dedicated to the perpetual occupancy and use of the R. E. Lee Camp Home for Confederate veterans.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Incompetent veterans may be committed and transferred to State or Federal hospitals.

MEMORIALS

Any county, city, or town may appropriate money for erecting a memorial to veterans.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans, their widows, hospital matrons, and servants.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Induction and discharge records from draft boards of World War II veterans have been given to clerks of courts.

The Confederate Memorial Institute is keeping and preserving the three Confederate flags delivered to Virginia by the State of Michigan.

Rosters of camps of Confederate veterans have been recorded by clerks of courts.

A World War II History Commission has been created to edit and publish information and material on the State's contribution.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Life insurance companies may invest funds in loans secured by mortgages on real estate to the extent guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Local units may levy taxes for aid to Confederate veterans or their widows.

The Division of Rehabilitation, State Department of Education, provides vocational training to veterans not entitled to same from the Veterans' Administration.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Pensions received from the United States or the State on account of military or naval service of the recipient or relative are exempt from income tax.

Licenses to practice law may be granted certain veterans of World War II.

Veterans' organizations are exempt from inheritance tax.

Abatement of penalties and interest on certain taxes of members of the armed forces is provided.

Motor vehicle operators' licenses are extended during service in the armed forces, with refund on unused portion of fee paid and transfer of title.

The unused portion of the annual truck license may be applied on a new license after demobilization.

Veterans of World War II are exempt from poll tax for 3 years following discharge.

Payment of poll tax is made by the State out of the armed service poll tax fund on members of the armed forces.

Insurance agents' and solicitors' licenses are renewed following military service.

Real and personal property of veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

UNIFORMS

Rights of veterans have been established with respect to the uniform, insignia, etc. of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Provision has been made for the registration of names, badges, etc. of veterans' organizations. The unauthorized use or wearing of such insignia is a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine not exceeding $100, or in case of default, 60 days in jail.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

Quarters in the State office building are provided for all war veterans' organizations.

Property which passes to veterans' organizations is exempt from inheritance and gift taxes.

Most of the above laws have been enacted by the Virginia Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

At the present time there are some 10 chapters of the DAV throughout the State, with John J. Quinn, 501 Second Street, Portsmouth, Va., as department commander.

The DAV maintains three expertly trained full-time national service officers, under the direction of Mr. Donald E. Reece, at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Roanoke, who extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE-TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 handicapped veterans of World War II to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most-distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

The Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to express my views concerning the present situation in Palestine and my desire to obtain justice for the Jewish people and an equitable solution of the Palestine question.

About a quarter of a century has passed since the mandate for Palestine went into effect promising the Jewish people a national home in Palestine. Strife, broken promises, and long years of disappointment and toil have marked the course of the Jewish homeland since that time. During the recent tragic war millions of people of the Jewish race suffered death and unspeakable suffering at the hands of a sadistic persecutor. The survivors of the gas chambers and the concentration camps have been pleading with the conscience of the world, ever since the war ended, to fulfill the promises made to them years ago for the establishment of their national home in Palestine. These pleas have struck home, these pleas have quickened the conscience of mankind, and an answer has been given by the nations of the world through their international organization—the United Nations. On November 29, 1947, after the British had decided to surrender their mandate over the Holy Land, the general assembly of the United Nations voted to solve the impasse between Jew and Arab in Palestine by partitioning the country into Jewish and Arab states.

What had happened in Palestine following the November 29 decision had been expected. The Arabs had plainly stated before the vote was taken they would resist. Herschel Johnson made it perfectly clear in urging the partition of Palestine that the implementation of partition would not be an easy one but offered it as the only workable plan. Trusteeship had been considered and rejected by the general assembly, rejected because of our insistence that only partition could work. Now what have we? Right up to the last moment the accepted belief was that the United States was solidly behind partition. The reversal on the Palestine issue has been a shocking blow. The Zionists must receive justice. After all these years of broken promises regarding the founding of a Jewish national home in Palestine, after all the suffering and travail which this persecuted race had endured, the United States must not let them down, the United Nations must not falter, a partition must go through.

Has Everything Possible Been Done To Avert War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Detroit News of March 29, 1948:

HAS EVERYTHING POSSIBLE BEEN DONE TO AVERT WAR?—ANSWER SHROUDED IN SECRECY OF WHAT PRECEDED TRUMAN DOCTRINE YEAR AGO

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Millions of mothers and fathers are beginning to worry over whether their sons will soon have to go to war. They—the parents and relatives of the men who would be asked to make the supreme sacrifice—have a right to ask whether everything has been or is being done that could be done to prevent war.

There are two historic methods of trying to avert war. One is to build up military armament and try to frighten the other party into submission. The second method is to try to resolve the points of difference by negotiation.

In America quite a propaganda campaign has been built up against peaceful negotiation of the difficulties between Russia and the United States. The official argument is that Russia "understands only one language, and that's the language of force."

If it be true that there is absolutely no other way to deal with Russia except by force, or threat of force, then war cannot be averted and the question of when an incident or overt act may occur is anybody's guess. It might occur in a few weeks or years—but that sort of logic means that only war can settle the outstanding issues.

If it be said on the other hand that peaceful negotiation should be tried, the official answer hereabouts is that this has been tried and has failed. Unfortunately the entire record is not available. For some mysterious reason the texts of all the notes exchanged between Russia and the United States have never been made public. The record of our public officials in their negotiations has never been subjected to impartial scrutiny by congressional committees. All that is heard is that the Russians are unreasonable, intractable and do not want to negotiate.

WHAT DID REDS ASK?

What isn't disclosed particularly is what led up to the declaration of the Truman doctrine just a year ago. The Russians considered this a virtual declaration of war. What the Russians have done since has to be viewed in the light of America's decision in the Near East.

It is the period before the Truman doctrine was announced that could well be studied by historians. What did the Russians ask for? What did we refuse? Did we offer any alternative plans? When did we decide on force to back up diplomacy's failures?

Many officials insist that Russia has been aggressive from the beginning. If so, then war was inevitable from the day this fact became convincingly apparent to our officials. For if one nation has only diabolical designs against another nation, it does not matter much what is said between them in the period before war does break out.

Unfortunately the evidence does not show that the Russians and Americans ever understood each other. If force were the only language usable, then America, while taking a strong hand in the various conferences, forsook the idea by withdrawing from Europe nearly all her forces, thus giving the Russians the impression that military force was not important after all.

Even today the Russians cannot be sure whether America has given up hope of a peaceful settlement. There is nothing to show that the United States will resume peaceful negotiations or that the United States will go to war. The Russians cannot approach America with any peace plan because our officials say nothing would be accomplished by such discussions. Apparently our officials foreclose every opening for peaceful settlement now and give the impression that war is the only answer.

FAILS TO MAKE SENSE

If American diplomacy connotes military action to back up immutable demands, then a show-down cannot long be postponed. The behavior of American officials indicates that war is inevitable, with only one proviso—that the Russians are considered to be too weak to start a war for at least 5 years.

But along with such statements one hears at the same time in Washington gloomy stories about our own lack of preparedness and of the real danger that for the first time in her history America may face defeat or stalemate in a major war. It all does not add up to much sense.

The public has a right to a better coordination of national policy. If, through good luck a war can be staved off till after the November elections, it may be that a nation which is united under a President—whether it is Mr. Truman or anybody else—can then decide better on its course than can be done in the political atmosphere of today.

If America does not want to talk to Russia, then war is sure. The timing is less important than the fact that our officials behave as if they have done everything they could to prevent war and that unless the Russians agree to be frightened and retreat the fight must come sometime. It is a tragic prospect but it seems that all the ingenuity and resourcefulness which the highest officials of our Government think can be applied to a critical international situation and keep it on a peace basis have been exhausted.

Meanwhile, millions of persons are on the anxious seat wondering whether the Nation heads toward more and more scarcity of goods, more inflation, and bigger and better casualty lists than those of World War II.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening. A few months ago, when the Marshall plan was announced and while it was getting started, the United States seized and held the initiative as against the Soviet Union. They held it for many months, while it appeared that the threat of communism was receding. The Cominform announced its unalterable purpose of defeating the Marshall plan. But we thought we had pretty well begun to contain Russia and keep her from grabbing off any more countries. We weren't too worried—save about what Congress might or might not do about the Marshall plan. Things were going our way.

Then, in the short space of 2 weeks, a Czech crisis arose and the most westernized country of central Europe went under. Not a single military unit of the Soviet Union was within the borders of Czechoslovakia. We had long held the idea that only where the Red Army was present to overawe the people was there much danger of a country going Communist. But here, it was an inside job. And hardly a shot was fired. It was a triumph of organization and planning of the Communist International and of the Communist Party inside Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia simply went under with an appalling suddenness, completeness, and you might say, neatness about the job which has vastly impressed Washington. It not only represents the failure of a concept of the Czechs that they could get along with the Russians and be a bridge between east and west if they appeased the Soviets on foreign policy, but it represents a severe blow to our own concept that the line could be held by dollars.

Have you noticed what has been happening this last week? Senator BALL has introduced an amendment to the Marshall plan, calling for a defensive pact between the western nations. In Europe, they are making renewed efforts to put together just that—a

western union of nations to r sist aggression. General Wedemeyer told Congress that dollars, alone, would not do the job of containing Russia anywhere in the world. Blood may have to be spilled. And this first week in March, I record it here, I have heard it from the lips of two responsible officials that they expect war to break out within 6 months—one of them said 3 months.

Things are moving fast. The timetable of Russia has quickened. Before they get through swallowing the Czechs, they start in on the Finns. Who is next? That is what Europe is asking and that is what we are asking.

For the time being, at any rate, the initiative has passed. The Soviet Union has the ball and is running with it. Where to? How far? Will she risk a war? Will we lay down a line and say so far and no farther?

We have to remember that elections are coming up in Italy in April. The shuddering thought hits—what if the Communist bloc comes up with the largest single party in Parliament? Won't that start the same pattern of action that has regularly taken place wherever the Soviet Union has moved? And if that pattern is followed out and Italy goes the way of the others, what then? Well, we don't like to face it, but the truth is that if Italy goes Red, then the balance of power will have definitely shifted against us, in Europe, and we will be outflanked physically in the Mediterranean and politically in the rest of Europe. It will be a terrific defeat for the Western World. If this thing happens in Italy next month—and it may readily happen—then it will just about have accomplished what the Cominform said it was going to accomplish—defeat the Marshall plan. Then the Marshall plan will have to be supplemented by the things that Senator BALL has been asking for. We will be much, much closer, also, to a shooting war. It was thoughts like these which were in the minds of those two Government officials I mentioned awhile ago.

I was speaking, too, about a pattern that the Soviets use. They have applied that pattern over and over again. It may be worth while to study that pattern. There is a saying that if you know enough history, then the bad things of history need not repeat. But that presupposes action—that presupposes that something can be done in time, once the pattern is detected and understood. Tonight I shall trace this pattern for you, to show the series of steps by which Communists get into power—how they take over a government from within. The pattern can, at least, tell us what time it is in some countries.

I think we can liken it to a baseball game. The primary objective of the batter is to get on base and to advance around the bases to home.

What is first base for the Communists?

Everywhere in the world, the first base that they try to get on, is to penetrate and control labor unions. That is the largest leverage they can hope to wield, at first. Naturally, they plan while they are penetrating them, to penetrate those which are most strategic to the economy of the country and to the defense of a country. That is why they have always concentrated upon shipping and communications, and—in the age of electricity—upon electrical manufacturers. The Communists seek to penetrate all strata and to form a mass base for their activities and for their protection within a society, but by far the most important one is the trade-union movement.

Well, on the basis of our simile, communism is "on first base" practically everywhere in the world. It has received a recent set-back in the labor movement of this country but it still has control of several internationals. They are praying for a depression and 10,000,000 people out of work.

What is second base?

Second base is getting their people into the Government, in greater or less degree. It usually starts out in a very small degree. They worm into government departments, as they have in these United States. Communist Party liners get elected to Parliament, as they have to Congress in these United States. They get elected to the State legislature, as they have in the State of Washington. This recently came out through investigation. The investigation showed that a handful of Communists had come close to running the entire State of Washington, during the late 1930's.

Incidentally, unless you lived on the West coast, you probably saw or heard next to nothing about this investigation. For some reason the reports by the three press associations were not relayed to the East. Almost nothing was carried in the metropolitan press of the East coast. The first intimation I had of the real story came from the pages of the weekly newsletter Counterattack. Then Newsweek carried it, but that was all I saw. Still, here was a case of self-confessed members of the Communist Party elected to the State legislature, holding their cell meetings under the guise of the committee on dikes, drains, and ditches, right under the capitol dome.

Admitted Communists have been members of the legislative body which governs the city of New York. For several years the Communist Party had sufficient leverage to swing the city of New York and the State of New York its way in elections. That was because of the small difference of strength in the two great parties in that State.

The hard nucleus, most of the organization and much of the money in support of the Henry Wallace third party, comes from the Communists and neither Mr. Wallace nor his running mate, Senator TAYLOR, has repudiated this support.

We have quite a lot of penetration within the departments of the Government here. It was very easy for them to get in during the war years and before. It is very hard to get them out now. As I recall, the sum of $13,000,000 has been approved to try to root them out. And I don't suppose the Truman administration, which O. K.'d the sum, is just imagining a few commies under the bed, when they talk in terms of these millions to get them out.

Of course, in most countries of Europe there has been penetration of the government itself, in more or less degree by Communists. In some countries, like Czechoslovakia and the Balkans, the process had gone very far. They form coalition governments. They had 38 percent of the votes in Czechoslovakia at the last election, making them the largest single party. On the strength of that, Gottwald was made Prime Minister.

You might say, in those countries, they got not only to second base—they took a long lead off second, toward third.

And third base is the real pay-off base. That is where they have got so thoroughly entrenched in the Government that they can take over the Ministry of Interior and of War. There has yet to be a single country in Europe where that was not the first thing the Communists demanded when they got sufficient power.

Why?

Because then they could control the police, the elections, and the army.

In those countries of central Europe the Ministry of the Interior not only runs the national police force but the local police as well. The Ministry supervises the elections, counts the ballots, and announces the results. You can see why it is so important. In the case of the Czechs, they also got the Ministry of Justice, which controls the courts. They put a strong Communist sympathizer in as head of the army and they were all set. The army leader, General Swoboda, betrayed President Benes in the pinch.

You probably saw where the thing that touched off the crisis was when the non-Communists discovered that the Minister of the Interior was dismissing all key police officials who were not party members and replacing them with Communists. They also discovered that agents provocateurs were getting ready to discover those classic plots against the Government which the Communists invariably discover as the excuse for their taking over.

When the Social Democrats and others saw how far the thing had gone they made desperate attempt to forestall it, but it just precipitated the crisis. With a terrifying smoothness the machine began to operate. A hundred thousand people rallied in the main square at Prague for an address by Gottwald. The labor leaders of the red-dominated trades-unions then rallied to him—and later on they carried out a 1-hour demonstration strike. Still later they threatened a general strike if Benes did not bow to the Communist demands. That shows the absolute importance of the Communists getting to first base—getting control of the unions. Next came the demonstration of the importance of getting to second base and third base. The police appeared, armed with machine guns and rifles. They ousted the socialists from their own headquarters, began rounding them up and throwing them into prison. The Social Democrats began caving in and joining the red tide. Police next began occupying all important public buildings. Then came the red goon squads. They broke up all opposition meetings, terrorized the populace and forced—on threat of getting them thrown out of jobs—conservative and liberal workers to join in a mass demonstration, a huge parade supporting Gottwald against Benes. About the only organized protest came from a few score of students who vainly tried to cross a bridge toward the President's castle. They were broken up by police. Reports have it that some of the police wept as the students stood their ground for a moment and sang the Czech national anthem. But they went ahead, nevertheless, and obeyed orders. It was the last flare-up. Benes caved in. Gottwald and the Commies not only were on third base—they stole home, as well.

Final stages in seizure of power are the same everywhere. In Czechoslovakia it is, or will be, no different from the rest: First, the claim that the non-Communists were plotting civil war. Then the ban on all the opposition press. The arrest of all opposition leaders. The abolition of the most powerful opposition party. The hanging or jailing for life of the leaders of that party.

It is all so repetitious that it becomes almost wearisome. But the Communists don't change the act because it is still effective.

About all that Benes and the rest of the Czech people can do is to reproach themselves now for having ever believed that they could get along and find a basis of live-and-let-live with the Communists. They should have realized way back there, at second base when the government was penetrated to any large degree, that third base was inevitable and stealing home was inevitable. Once inside the government, the Communists would not cooperate with that government—they would move to take it over.

Democratic people have long been deceived by what they wanted to hear. It is easier to believe a lie if it is an agreeable one. But Benes, sitting a captive in Hradkin Castle, must hear echoing and reechoing in his mind the fair words of Gottwald: "We believe in democracy. We practice democracy. There is not a word of truth in the assertion that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia cannot operate with other parties and that, sooner or later, it must strive for dictatorship."

Well, Gottwald and his quislings are now in power. Gottwald is the dictator of Czechoslovakia—under Stalin, of course. The world has had another lesson as to Communist intentions and methods.

And the lesson, in plainest terms, is—never let them get to first base, if you can help it. Certainly, never let them get to second base—penetration of the government. Because when that goes on for a while, they inevitably get to third base. Then they steal home—your home.

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Informal Letter to Henry Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Henry Wallace which was printed in the Atlanta Journal:

INFORMAL LETTER TO HENRY WALLACE

DEAR HENRY: The whole burden of your song has been, we ought to understand Russia. Joe Stalin, you assume, is an amiable chap whom we should get along with easily enough if we would only see things from his point of view, and let him have his way. The politburo is a benevolent group of gentlemen trying to preserve concord at home and spread the blessings of communism across Europe and the world. If in so doing they find it expedient to shoot any Russian who may differ from them and to crush any little country that dares assert its independence, why should we cavil at these mere trifles of technique? Such is your song, dear Henry, as you denounce our Government for planning to help the endangered democracies and to strengthen our own defenses instead of dancing docilely to the Stalin tune.

Now, why don't you run over to see Joe—as a private citizen, of course—and find out just how much you and he have in common?

No one here would object to your going to Russia.

And you might like things there so well that you would want to stay. In that event the majority of the American people, excepting your Communist supporters, would utter a fervent amen.

Moscow would give you a thunderous ovation, Henry, and all the Kremlin would drink your health fathoms deep in vodka.

You are the American most frequently quoted by the Soviet press and radio. Your attack on the President's recent message to Congress was printed almost in its entirety in Pravda and Izvestia, and when you charged our Ambassador at Prague with being responsible for the murder of Czechoslovakia's freedom, all the commissars rose up and called you blessed.

Yes, you could count upon an open-arm welcome from the tightest-mouthed and heaviest-fisted dictatorship the world has ever known.

And what a time, Henry, you and Joe would have in your heart-to-heart talks about the issues of the hour. You would be in thorough accord on the evils of the European-recovery program, the wickedness of America's sending aid to Greece and Turkey, the injustice of our attitude toward the innocent Communists in Italy, and the foul motives behind the west-European union.

Even when you, Henry, denounced universal military training and the selective draft, Joe would puff his pipe complacently and remark, "Yes, my dear friend, you are absolutely right as far as the United States is concerned, though Russia, of course, must be prepared to defend herself against the Wall Street imperialists and the warmongers in Britain, France, and Finland."

But we feel that we should caution you, Henry, against indulging any difference of opinion with Marshal Joe, for if you did, you yourself would be put down as a warmonger and that shaggy head of yours would be none too safe.

We doubt not, however, that you would find a visit to the Soviet Union quite flattering to the self-esteem in which you are not wholly wanting and that you would return as an even better Russian, if not a poorer American, than you are today.

What if you should decide to remain in the Red Star land and move your assets thither? Then, of course, you would have to surrender to the Communist state the fortune which you have acquired under our decadent capitalist system. But such an ineffable idealist as you have posed yourself to be should have no hesitancy on that score.

By all means, Henry, go to Russia. It would be good for your country if not for yourself.

Roll of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my remarks of January 29, 1948:

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech I made in the House on June 20, 1946, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date on page 7248.

On April 27, 1946, there appeared in Labor, a weekly newspaper owned by 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations, an article entitled "The Roll of Honor," and I quote the exact heading of this article which is as follows:

"THE ROLL OF HONOR

"Below, Labor prints the names of the 218 Members of the House who defied the powerful railroad lobby and signed the discharge petition presented by Congressman Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia. The list includes 136 Democrats, 80 Republicans, 1 American Labor Party member, and 1 Progressive. Readers of Labor should not forget these lawmakers who came to the assistance of the railroad unions when they were fighting with their backs to the wall. (Republicans are printed in caps, Democrats in lower case, Prog. stands for Progressive, and A. L. for American Labor Party.)

"Florida: PRICE."

The list of those signing the petition included the 217 other names from the various States.

This same paper, issue of June 29, 1946, carried another news article entitled "Railmen's Friends Put Over Crosser Bill; Powerful Pleas Are Made in House Debate," and I will quote several statements from this article, as follows:

"Every vote counted when the critical moment came.

"The committee substitute was defeated 136 to 129, a margin of only 7 votes.

"Effective blows for the latter measure were struck by many Congressmen."

Quotations were made that were taken from the following Members of Congress who spoke in favor of the Crosser amendments. Those mentioned were BECKWORTH, of Texas; FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; MAHON, of Texas; PRICE, of Florida; WHITE, of Idaho; and BRADLEY, of Pennsylvania.

Two full paragraphs were quoted from the speech I made on the floor at that time, but I wish to insert the full speech in the RECORD.

"Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

"Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crosser amendment because of my personal knowledge of the working conditions of railroad employees.

"At the time of my birth my father was an employee of a railroad and continued with them for about 20 years. As a small boy, and during the time I attended high school, I was well aware of the inadequacy of the pay as well as other conditions, by no means favorable, under which my father worked. In addition to my father's connection with the railroad, two of my uncles who lived in our home also worked with railroads and at different times two of my brothers were so employed. At present, one of by brothers is working for a railroad and has been so employed for about 30 years.

"I also have a personal knowledge of the subject before us, for when I was about 15 years of age, during summer vacation from high school, I was employed by a railroad. I worked in the storeroom of a railroad shop as delivery boy, at the handsome wage of 12½ cents per hour, 10 hours per day, 6 days per week. The work I was called upon to perform would have caused a draft horse to balk.

"When I finished high school, I secured what I thought was a real position in a railway yard office. On this job I worked 8 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, and in leap year, for good measure, 366 days. I earned $133 per month, and straight time was paid for overtime, but I earned no overtime unless I doubled, which meant a 16-hour day. Of course, any time I took off was deducted from my pay. At that time no retirement benefits were provided for railroad employees, and no provisions were made for employees who became ill.

"When I had been employed on this job for about 2 years, the case of a fellow employee caused me to stop and think. He had been with the company for about 25 years and received the same salary I did. He became ill and was forced to take time off. This time was deducted from his pay, and as he had a family to support, he began working when he should have been home in bed. After a few months he died. I decided to look for another job and in a few months left the employment of the railroad.

"We all know that the working conditions of railroad employees have improved during the last few years, but there is still room for much improvement. The railroads now have a so-called retirement plan, but those who are really familiar with its provisions will tell you that it is no better than social security. Most railroads now give their employees a week's vacation, and some give even 2 weeks to employees who have been with the company for as long as 5 years. At the age of 65, employees are allowed to retire, provided they have 30 years' service.

"I feel sure you will agree with me that a man who has worked for 30 years under the conditions I have just described to you is entitled to retirement regardless of age. I have known many men who have reached 65 years of age and completed 30 years of service and retired, but I can vouch for the fact that only a very few lived for more than 2 or 3 years after retiring. Why compel a man to work until he is practically dead before allowing him to receive the benefits

for which he has toiled so long and for which he actually has paid his hard-earned money?

"The employees of all the railroads in America deserve a rising vote of thanks from the entire population of the United States for the wonderful contribution they made to the war effort. These men and women actually performed miracles in the vital field of transportation at a time when they could easily have changed employment and increased their compensation, in many instances, twofold. Therefore, I am convinced that Congress owes this group of loyal citizens a fair and decent retirement program. I hope the Members of the House will show their appreciation by voting for the Crosser amendment and thus bestow upon the employees of the railroads of America a 'well done, thou good and faithful servant.'"

Shipping War Goods to Russia Is Stupid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since my address on the floor of the House last Wednesday disclosing the alarming manner in which war supplies were being shipped to Russia by American manufacturers enjoying the Administration's approval of their profit-made ventures in potential blood, a great tidal wave of approving telegrams, letters, and editorials has rolled into my office offering support of my proposed amendment to the ERP legislation which would put an end to this type of double-headed, self-contradictory foreign policy.

I am gratified indeed to report that our Committee on Foreign Affairs has now voted to accept my amendment.

Indicative of the widespread support for writing and administering a consistent foreign policy is the following editorial from the Daily Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., whose editor, Fred C. Christopherson, has an enviable, national reputation for writing profound and patriotic editorials in the public interest:

SHIPPING WAR GOODS TO RUSSIA STUPID

Before the last war the United States shipped great quantities of scrap iron and other supplies to Japan.

And then we got some of this back at Pearl Harbor and elsewhere in the form of deadly and destructive missiles of war.

And now we are shipping supplies to Russia—just as much a potential enemy, if we are to accept the word of President Truman and Secretary Marshall for it, as Japan.

Our leaders, in truth, are insisting that we become firm with Russia and that we arm ourselves in preparation for the use of force in resisting that nation's expansion.

Disturbed by our shipments to Russia Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, proposed in the House this week an amendment that would permit a flat ban on exports from this country to Russia of any supplies that could be used for war purposes.

Emphasizing the necessity for such action, MUNDT drew attention to large quantities of cranes, motors, and other equipment being loaded at Jersey City for shipment to Russian ports.

MUNDT'S proposal, it seems, deserves prompt endorsement. Surely it is unwise, extremely so, to ship vital war supplies to our major potential enemy.

It is the worry about Russia that is now creating a desire for rearmament in the United States. The Russian menace is the reason behind President Truman's recommendation for an immediate draft, for quick action on selective service and for the development of a powerful military establishment. Obviously some of our efforts at home in this respect will be nullified if we continue the shipment of war materials and supplies to Russia.

Russia found it possible to stop Germany only because she was able to obtain great supplies of American war equipment. It would be tragic, to put it mildly, if she should be able some time in the future to stop America with American supplies.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Charles Wesley Flint, resident bishop of the Methodist Church, Washington area, asked himself "What kind of resolution would you propose or support?" His answer which follows merits the thoughtful consideration of all peace-loving citizens:

The bishops of the Methodist Church and the constituency of that church are unanimously committed to the cause of peace by the elimination of the causes of war and the cultivation of international justice and good will.

They urge that, as rapidly as possible, adequate peaceful means for settling international differences be devised and perfected.

They hope, pray, and labor for that measure of good will, diffused throughout the world, which will make possible and effective the universal renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, or of deliberate resort to war for gaining national advantage.

This renunciation would include universal elimination of required military training and, indeed, universal disarmament. The objective of their unremitting efforts is the day when physical force has no longer a place in international relations. Every interim proposal is tested by such ideal attainment.

In a world still unstable, with national attitudes far from uniform, and in which peace can be only by joint responsibility while the decision for war can be made by a single nation, there will naturally be differences in judgment regarding the practical steps in progress toward the ideal.

Some of the bishops and some of the Methodist constituency are opposed to all military establishments or military preparedness, including military training, and will not compromise on any intermediate provisions or program.

Others equally sincere in their efforts to promote peace and to attain a warless world are of the opinion that there have been, and may yet be, situations in our imperfect world, where defense of vital principles, even of civilization itself, the upholding of justice and freedom, and even more the protection of the weaker against unwarranted aggression, required resistance which makes war the unavoidable alternative.

Those of this latter group divide further on the subject of military training. Some, including apparently a large number of ministers, think this to retard progress toward a peaceful world, to endanger the United Nations organization, to tend to make war more probable, to be militarizing, to be disruptive of the educational process, and to endanger the moral and spiritual development of young men. While not absolute pacifists, these regard required military training as unnecessary, provocative, and baneful.

Others, equally conversant with world conditions and equally loyal to the peace objective do not share these convictions; they think that there may develop conditions which make required military training necessary, that it may make war even less probable, that it may bring added strength and confidence to the United Nations organization, that it can be so set up that the educational process will not suffer and moral and spiritual welfare be conserved.

These would say that, when, in the judgment of those who are entrusted with the knowledge and responsibility, world conditions call for required military training, they regretfully acquiesce but urgently plead (1) for the least disruption of normal community and family life and of the educational program; (2) that the provision be regarded as temporary, with frequent reviews of the situation looking toward its earliest feasible discontinuance, along with unremitting efforts toward international agreement to this end; (3) for civilian control with close public check through citizens committees and inspectors; (4) for instructors of the highest type in culture and character; (5) for program and environment helpful, and not harmful to moral and religious development, not only by regulations guarding against alcoholic beverages, sexual and other immoralities, but also by wholesome recreational facilities and effective religious ministration so that during the period of training the moral environment and religious atmosphere shall be equal to, if not superior to, that of the better communities and better educational institutions.

War, Whisky, and Gin Under Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Trade Agreement Act adopted in 1934 by the New Deal can be credited with two outstanding achievements, neither of which I supported or approved. What were these achievements? First, it made possible the war with Japan by attempting to build up the exports, which the advocates of the trade-agreement policy had promised in order to win votes and propaganda support for it. The shipments of scrap iron amounting to 10,000,000 tons, oil, steel ingots, airplane engines, and other essential war materials to Japan did increase exports, and for this subterfuge the price paid was the murder in Pearl Harbor of 3,000 American boys, and the loss of the better part of our Navy.

The other achievement was in organizing the Christian churches under the leadership of Mr. Charles Taft to support and endorse a plan which opened the flood gates to foreign whisky and other liquors. The tariff under the Trade Agreement Act was reduced under

this plan from $5 a gallon to $2.50 a gallon on whisky, but the flow into this country of whisky and gin had to be accelerated so that now the tariff is only $1.50 a gallon on whisky.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an article relating to trade agreements:

IS THIS A RUBBER-STAMP CONGRESS?

President Truman has asked Congress to extend again for another 3 years the fraudulent and injurious Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which was concocted by the socialistic New Deal in 1934 and which, unless Congress servilely interferes, will expire on June 12 of this year.

This being a Republican Congress, and the Republican Party having been since its inception the advocate of the protective-tariff system, the traditional guardian of American free enterprise and in many respects the promoter of our industrial progress, it is hardly conceivable—especially in a Presidential-election year—that Congress will again abdicate its constitutional powers and duties and continue to serve abjectly as a mere tool of Executive dictatorship.

For such has been the history and the practice under the New Deal's tariff procedures.

The original trade-agreements law was sponsored by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a Democratic devotee of the obsolete British free-trade theories which Great Britain itself had abandoned when the doctrinaire, Mr. Hull, imported them—duty free—into his own country.

The act, as drafted by the New Deal bureaucracy, and approved by the original rubber-stamp Congress, violates the Constitution in two respects.

It authorizes the executive branch of the Government to reduce—but not to increase—tariffs by 50 percent by negotiation with foreign countries, so that successive reductions may whittle an import duty away entirely.

A tariff schedule is a revenue measure; and the Constitution requires that all revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives.

By accepting the act in 1934, the lower House of Congress lawlessly abdicated one of its most important duties.

The act also provides that trade agreements negotiated by the Executive shall become effective when merely signed by the President, hence no review or veto can be exercised.

Yet these agreements are treaties by their very nature; and the Constitution commands that all treaties be submitted to the Senate and be ratified by the upper House of Congress.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was thus a nullification of representative government and an unmistakable step toward totalitarian government by Executive order.

On constitutional grounds, therefore, it is the duty of Congress to permit the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to die a natural death, just as it will be political wisdom and political honesty for the Republican Party to reestablish its sound historical position in our domestic economy.

Furthermore, every segment of our economy, and every section of the country, is vitally affected by this question.

The tariff system has already been arbitrarily riddled by the New Deal.

Small manufacturers in every field, and agriculture in every aspect, have had their protection bartered away without fair hearings, without any real or adequate consideration of their needs, and without any appeal to any tribunal of justice.

They have suffered.

The abnormal displacements and disturbances of world war have deferred the full consequences of the New Deal's planned economy—but it would be utter folly to assume that this kind of protection is any substitute for national policy.

As one of its major efforts in postwar reconstruction the Republican Party should restore the protective-tariff system and give our farmers, our small producers, and especially our highly paid labor the rights and benefits of law—and lawfulness.

Punitive Excise Tax on Furs Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the House Committee on Ways and Means will bring to the floor very shortly a bill revising the Revenue Act of 1943. My interest in the proposed revision concerns the punitive 20-percent excise tax on furs.

This tax on the fur industry is highly discriminatory and not only affects the industry in general but unless some immediate relief is granted, it will put out of business many small furriers.

Since 1943 the excise tax on furs has produced revenues from $44,000,000 in 1943 to $97,000,000 in 1947. The fur industry, and especially the small furrier, has found it impossible to compete with other firms manufacturing wearing apparel that is sold tax-free.

It is realized that the Federal Government needs tax revenue, but it is unfair to obtain such revenue by not only discriminating against an industry but threatening its very existence.

Let us consider the average American housewife who needs a warm winter coat, and who, by thrift and sacrifice, has saved $300 to buy a fur coat.

When she visits her local store and selects her fur coat she finds that, instead of $300, the coat, because of the excise tax, will cost her $360, or $60 more than she has to spend. Not having the extra $60 in her budget, she realizes she can purchase from another store a very fine fur-trimmed cloth coat without paying any excise tax. This punitive tax drives this customer from the furrier to the store selling fur-trimmed cloth coats.

This situation is a serious one, not only for the fur industry, but especially for the small furrier.

To substantiate this statement, I want to read to you a letter from Mr. S. K. Williams, president, Clearfield Furs, Inc., located at Clearfield, Pa., in my congressional district. Mr. Williams' letter is as follows:

CLEARFIELD FURS, INC.,
Clearfield, Pa., March 9, 1948.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter of March 4, our firm paid out $262,100 in wages and salaries to approximately 150 employees in 1947, who support nearly 500 people, in a community of less than 10,000. In addition, we paid out $46,300 in commissions to representatives in the nearby area.

Since the war, and particularly now, it is extremely difficult to move merchandise, due to the tax resistance.

We have kept prices as low as we could and meet our obligations, but the growing resentment against the tax and loss of volume due to general price resistance has made it impossible to maintain our regular staff, and it has been necessary to reduce our force by approximately one-third. Unless some immediate relief is forthcoming it will be necessary to reduce further our number of employees, as we cannot afford to produce in the face of the present resistance.

It seems to me that fur coats, considering that the average sale is less than $200, can hardly be considered a luxury. It is a practical, warm, long-wearing garment that gives more comfort over a longer period than a cloth coat costing as much. True, there are a few high-priced coats sold, but the bulk of business is in the popular-price field where, at the present time, it is almost impossible to do business unless one could absorb all the tax and we can't do that and stay in business.

Very truly yours,
S. K. WILLIAMS,
President.

I want to emphasize the fact stated by Mr. Williams that the sales resistance brought about by excise tax on furs has caused him to cut his staff by one-third and, unless relief is granted immediately, he will have to make further reductions.

Mr. Williams' case is not an isolated one, as we have other furriers in my congressional district, who are suffering the fate of Clearfield Furs, Inc.

I feel certain that Congress never intended to destroy any man's business by punitive taxation such as is revealed by the application of the excise tax on furs.

If we want to destroy the economy of this country, of which the keystone is small business, then the excise tax is a perfect vehicle.

To the American housewife a fur coat is not a luxury but is a necessity and every American woman looks forward to possessing such a coat as a necessary part of her wearing apparel.

I sincerely hope that the Ways and Means Committee will not disappoint the women of America by continuing this discriminatory tax that is driving the dealer in furs into bankruptcy and destroying the jobs of a vast army of skilled American workmen.

Down on the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, without prolonging the argument with my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], regarding the home products of Arkansas, including our dogs, I would like to include a short addendum indicating that Arkansas is making great industrial strides as shown by the follow-

ing editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of March 24:

DOWN ON THE FARM

The other day in Congress Representative GROSS, of Pennsylvania, arose to address a query to Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas. Is it true, he asked, that the Arkansas farmer gets up in the morning at the alarm of a Connecticut clock, buttons his Chicago suspenders to Detroit overalls, washes his face with Cincinnati soap in a Pennsylvania pan, sits down to a Grand Rapids table, eats his Chicago meat and Tennessee flour, cooked with Kansas lard on a St. Louis stove? He added that the Arkansas farmer puts a New York bridle on a Kansas mule, fed with Iowa corn. He plows a farm covered with Ohio mortgages with a Chattanooga plow. At the end of the day he says a prayer written in Jerusalem, crawls under a blanket made in New Hampshire, only to be kept awake by an Arkansas dog—the only home product on his place.

Mr. HAYS had the pleasure of informing Mr. GROSS that things have changed more than somewhat in the 50 years since Henry Grady made his classic dissertation on the plight of the agricultural South in an industrial age. The Arkansan countered by drawing a composite portrait of the farm animals in the State—among other things a combined cow with her front feet on the Great Plains, her hind hoofs in Canada, and her tail switching icicles from the the North Pole. And, if time had permitted, he could have added a great deal more.

These days an Arkansas farmer could be roused in the morning by an alarm clock manufactured in Little Rock. He could turn on current generated at a local hydroelectric dam or a steam-power plant, and soon he will be able to see it light a bulb made at Little Rock. He could put on work clothes and shoes produced in Arkansas factories. With the exception of coffee and sugar his breakfast could consist of Arkansas foods. His wife could cook the meal in utensils made from Arkansas bauxite, and serve the food in dishes manufactured in the State. The kitchen stove could be fueled with butane from several Arkansas refineries. The farmer's mechanical equipment would come from distant factories, but handles in his small tools would have been shaped from Arkansas timber. The crushed lime and ammonium nitrate with which he increases the fertility of his fields could come from State plants. The car in his garage would be made in part from raw materials from Arkansas farms; he might even own a station wagon whose body would show the craftsmanship of a big West Helena plant. In the evening he and his family could enjoy a modern home supplied with furniture made in Arkansas. Sleepy, he could stretch out on an Arkansas mattress, and relax in the knowledge that balanced farming will soon enable him to pay off his Ohio mortgages.

And as to that home-produced hound—well, some of Mr. GROSS' constituents are willing to pay a good deal of money for the privilege of prowling over Arkansas' hills and plains while listening to the sweet and plaintive melody of the chase.

Sclerosis Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of March 29, 1948:

SCLEROSIS CLINIC WILL OPEN TODAY—RESEARCH INTO NERVE DISEASE TO START WITH FIRST UNIT IN BOSTON HOSPITALS—ALBANY TO GET ONE SOON—SPONSORS CONDUCTING $450,000 CAMPAIGN TO PUSH STUDIES IN OTHER LARGE CITIES

The first of a series of research clinics for the study of multiple sclerosis, an incapacitating nerve disease that attacks all ages but mainly those between 20 and 45 years, will be open today in Boston at Beth Israel and Boston State Hospitals, through a grant from the National Multiple Sclerosis Society.

In making this announcement yesterday, Ralph I. Straus, president of the society, said a second clinic would be opened soon in Albany at the Albany Hospital and other multiple sclerosis research clinics would be set up in large cities across the country as soon as funds of the society permit. The organization is conducting a campaign for $450,000.

Public health authorities consider multiple sclerosis the most important neurological problem of the present, according to Mr. Straus. As there are indications that the number of cases is increasing, the society will launch a Nation-wide statistical survey to determine the exact extent of the disease and the sections where it is most prevalent.

At the clinic to be opened in Albany, neurologists of the Albany Medical College will cooperate with the division of research and laboratories of the State department of health in conducting research into the baffling disease, also known as disseminated sclerosis and Charcot's disease.

Acute cases may quickly become fatal but the disease is more often slowly progressive and a patient with advanced multiple sclerosis is usually severely handicapped and may be confined to a wheel chair or bed.

The disease is a nerve disorder in which the fatty sheath surrounding the nerves, called myelin, is damaged and replaced by scar (sclerotic) tissue. When this damage occurs, the nerve impulses cannot be transmitted with the full strength of a perfect nerve. As the damage progresses and the scar tissue grows denser, it eventually prevents the passage of the nerve impulses altogether. What causes the nerve damage and the means to control it have eluded medical science thus far, according to Mr. Straus. At first considered rare, multiple sclerosis has been established by modern diagnostic techniques as a common nerve disorder.

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society has headquarters at the New York Academy of Medicine Building, Fifth Avenue and One Hundred and Third Street.

Half Measures and Generalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post:

HALF MEASURES AND GENERALITIES

(By Walter Lippmann)

If it was in fact necessary that Secretary Marshall should leave Washington at this time in order to go to Bogotá, he cannot come back too quickly. For the condition of our affairs is very serious indeed, and without continuous attention it may become unmanageable. The President's message, the speeches, testimony, and press conferences of Mr. Marshall, Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Royall, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Symington have put this country in the position of preparing slowly and with half measures for a war of undefined objectives.

The peril of war will become more acute and more immediate unless the Administration accelerates its military measures and clarifies its diplomatic objectives.

Our policy, it is said, is to convince Stalin and the Politburo that aggression will mean war. But half-measures, taken slowly, are quite as likely to convince the Kremlin that our policy can be defeated by bold and ruthless measures taken quickly. There is good reason to think that this is precisely what the Czechoslovak coup, the Finnish action, the menacing pressure on Scandinavia, and on Iran signify—namely, the conviction in Moscow that they can obtain the strategical advantage before this country can mobilize and deploy its forces. It is by no means certain that the Russians have not concluded that the risk for them is less if they bring about a showdown in the near future than if they wait until western Europe is united and recovering and until we are rearmed.

For our power, though potentially great, requires time to develop. It has to be exerted at the end of long lines of supply. And, morally and politically, we are committed in a dozen scattered areas of the globe, all of them within much easier reach of Russia than of the United States. Moreover, in all these areas the Russians can intervene, using the native Communists, far more easily than we, supporting the mixed and divided factions that are anti-Communists. Our superiority in the great weapons, like the atomic bomb and in long-range aircraft, no doubt exists. But time, distance, and mass on the one hand—the ability to provoke civil war and to seize hostages on the other hand—are, if not a defense against our superior weapons, a very considerable offset.

So we must not think that the measures the President has recommended and the declarations about no more appeasement are anything more than the first beginnings of a national policy to deal with the situation. They are in fact rather like digging a hole which is to be the foundation of a house for which the architect has not yet made a plan or the contractor assembled the materials.

The military measures recommended by the Truman administration will remain half measures, even though they are backed by an industrial and financial mobilization, until definite strategic decisions are taken as to where and for what purpose American military power is to be deployed. These decisions have not been taken. They have not been taken because the diplomatic policy of the administration is still the policy of containment, which means in military terms that American forces may be required all around the periphery of the Soviet Union in Europe and Asia, when, where, and as the Soviets choose to take the initiative. It is impossible to make effective military preparations to support a policy of this kind. We shall never have enough military forces, or be able to get them to these scattered theaters at the right time, or having gotten them there to do more than win local, indecisive, engagements.

The alternative is a policy designed for a concrete, and therefore a limited but decisive objective. That objective can be only, it seems to me, a settlement, induced by power and facilitated by compromise, which results in the withdrawal of the Red Army from the Stettin-Trieste line to the frontiers of the Soviet Union. Such a settlement may be impossible to achieve without war. But whether it was achieved by diplomacy or war it would be a settlement of the main conflict between the Soviet empire and the western world.

It would not settle all the troubles of mankind. It would not end the ideological conflicts that divide the world. But nothing will settle all the troubles of mankind. Containment will not settle them. No war will settle them. An anti-Bolshevik crusade will not settle them. All that can be settled now is whether half of Europe shall remain under occupation by the Red Army and the other half in danger of occupation.

In one way or another that will have to be settled, and upon that settlement all our power and all the resources of our diplomacy should be focused and concentrated.

Federation Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

FEDERATION PROGRESS

The Paris Conference of free European nations already has made greater progress than was expected generally when it began. The present hope is, according to Paris advices under date of last Monday, that the charter and statutes of the cooperative federation will be drafted and approved within 2 weeks. Thereafter, it is added, formation of the Marshall plan organization can be so rapid that it can open headquarters this spring.

The conference will recess over Easter, we read, permitting the delegates to return to their respective countries and consult their governments. If the agreements shaped and shaping at Paris receive governmental approvals, the final details will be swiftly completed. If there are objections and suggestions of change from any quarter, revision of the drafted program may be necessary, but the Paris view is that this task would not take more than a week. Thereafter, the Foreign Ministers of the participating governments are expected to come to Paris for the signing.

This forecast may be overoptimistic. There remain some differences to be worked out. But the delegates and their home governments have displayed an encouraging disposition to, and capacity for, teamwork. Probably the trend toward cooperation has been speeded by the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia and Moscow's demands upon Finland. Europe's remaining free nations and peoples now face the definite threat that they may be picked off and subjugated singly unless they federate for their own safety and economic recovery. The recovery effort has been and is being sabotaged by the Communists in every possible way. The proposed federation for freedom, supported and strengthened by the American European recovery program now assured of enactment, is probably the only and surely the best means of defense and the sole practical hope for economic restoration.

A great deal depends, of course, upon the result of the Italian elections on April 18. If the Communist thrust for governmental control is beaten there, the chance of a successful European federation of free peoples may be translated into a certainty.

National Preparedness Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from AMVET letter for February 16, 1948:

Since the birth of this Nation, it has been United States policy after each war to demonstrate our sincere desire for peace by stripping our military establishment and presenting a weak military force to the rest of the world. Instead of this policy accomplishing its objectives, it has been a factor for disturbances arising internationally and finally resulting in war. For example, it is well known that both the Kaiser, in the First World War, and Hitler, in the Second World War were successful in telling their people that the United States was decadent and impotent and not a serious factor to consider in the achievement of the ambitions of the German nation. It is inconceivable to AMVETS that only two and a half years after the greatest and most horrible war in history we are again repeating this "weakness invites peace" policy when everyone knows history proves that weakness invites attack.

It is strange and almost incredible in the light of past experience that the United States should again allow its armed forces to be stampeded into the greatest demobilization in history. Our present Army is 100,000 troops under its minimum strength, according to military experts. Our Air Force has deteriorated to a point where we have only one-third the number of combat planes that Russia has. Our Navy is able to float only two battleships fully manned and has only recently been required to at least partly man the ships with Marines.

We hold this fact to be self-evident: That the most productive and greatest country in the world democratically controlled can be the strongest force for peace in the world only if it is sufficiently prepared to enforce the peace. No aggressive nation has ever yet attacked a peace-loving nation which is patently stronger.

Already the international situation has deteriorated to the point that our State Department has declared we are in a cold war with Russia; that our Secretary of State recently called off the four-power conference and said in effect that diplomacy had failed and that basic decisions must be changed in order for diplomacy to succeed. The hour is getting late but it is not too late yet for the United States to build up a strong enough military force to make the breaking of the peace by any nation too expensive. Universal military training has been proposed and has not yet been passed, nor is there any apparent reason to be optimistic about its passage. The Findletter Report on the state of our Air Force and the need for establishing a stronger Air Force has not been acted upon. If the world is to have peace, these conditions must be corrected by appropriate action by the Congress of the United States supported by the people of the United States, who obviously must concentrate on the need for such action.

AMVETS, therefore, proposes that April 19, 1948 be established as a National Preparedness Day. On that day programs should be conducted which will focus the attention of the people of the United States upon the need for preparedness and why this preparedness is the single greatest factor for the preservation of international peaceful relations. Weakness invites attack; strength preserves the peace, so long as that strength lies in the hands of governments controlled by people who hate war. We, the veterans of World War II, who were principally responsible for the winning of the greatest war in history, want no more wars. We fought with the hope that there would be no more wars and we strongly believe that preparedness on the part of the United States at this stage in the affairs of history is the single, strongest, most practical means of maintaining the peace.

We, therefore, are going to conduct a Paul Revere Preparedness Day on April 19th. The program will start where Paul Revere started so many years ago in history when, on the 19th of April, in 1775, he alerted the Nation to the need for preparedness. His alert was too late.

Today, the tempo of affairs has stepped up so amazingly that an airplane can cross from coast to coast in a shorter time than it took Paul Revere to go from Charleston to Concord. We believe that this theme can be dramatized to the people who may awake in time. On that day, there will be three lights lit in the Old Church Tower of Boston; one if by land, two if by sea, and three if by air. A horse will be saddled and ridden the route that Paul Revere rode. Addresses stressing the need of preparedness will be given on Lexington Common by distinguished national speakers, including our national commander and a national radio broadcast will be arranged. In every one of our 1,400 posts and 48 State departments, programs will be executed; in some cities and towns there will be parades, town meeting will be held in others, and various functions will be undertaken to put the facts before the American public why preparedness is a program for peace.

That night throughout the United States AMVETS in each city and town, village and hamlet will cause to have lighted green lights in homes, on the streets, in towers and in every possible place. The green light to signify GO for preparedness, for peace. Cooperating organizations have already indicated their desire to aid this program.

The Heart of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM PICKETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an article that appeared in the Houston Post, Houston, Tex., on Sunday, March 21, 1948, by Hon. V. A. Collins, a former member of the Texas State Senate and one of the most highly respected members of the bar in my State. This article merits the careful reading and thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress:

THE HEART OF THE CONSTITUTION
(By V. A. Collins)

The States came together to form a more perfect Union.

The States or Colonies had all power then; they did not have to surrender any of it, but they chose to surrender certain powers in order to create a more perfect Union.

But they wanted the powers they surrendered to be very specific.

Since the States created the United States they had a right to surrender or withhold such powers as they saw fit. As the President said of Puerto Rico "they should have the right to determine their relationship with the United States," which they were creating, and the Thirteen Colonies, called States in the Constitution, made a covenant with each other, creating a General Government, the United States, and delegating to it such powers as seemed best to them.

When that covenant was adopted it became a sacred contract among the States and was binding on all only by the reasonable interpretation of the contract.

The contract would never have been made had they not agreed to retain all power each possessed in severalty except such powers as they all agreed to surrender to the Union they were creating.

The powers which they agreed to surrender to the United States are set out in plain language in section VIII of the Constitution as adopted.

In that section there were 18 specific grants of power. When this was adopted it became a sacred agreement among the States. Each had a right to demand that all adhere to the agreement, but no one, or even a majority, had a right to enlarge on the powers granted.

Delegates met to "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Remember, it was the Colonies, called States in the Constitution, that came together to create a more perfect union. Those Colonies or States were self-governing units at the time. They had all the rights and powers to dispose of as they pleased. They did not have to delegate any of the powers, but they thought it was best to create an agency to act for all of them in certain matters. The United States was created by the States only as an agency for them.

They feared to surrender too much power to their agent. It was not unlike your naming an agent, and delegating to him certain authority. When he acts beyond his delegated authority, his acts cannot bind his principal.

With this in view, they knew it was important to make plain the duties and powers to be delegated to this agency they were creating.

In section VIII of the Constitution they made very clear what powers this new agency was expected to exercise.

Section VIII is headed: Powers Granted to Congress. Section IX is headed: Powers Denied to the United States.

Please read carefully those two sections.

If Texas appointed an agent to perform the things set forth in section VIII of the Constitution, and he undertook to fix the qualifications of the voters in Texas, would you not say his acts were void because he went beyond his delegated authority?

It is as simple as that.

But section IX undertook to define what Congress could not do, it gave some latitude for misinterpretation.

Because it expressly mentioned eight matters, which Congress could not do, a group of politicians interpreted it to mean that the mention of the eight matters excluded all others, and that Congress could do all things not expressly inhibited in the Constitution.

Of course, the same interpretation should have been applied to section VIII; the mention of the powers granted should have excluded every power not expressly granted, but experience has proved, if any thing in the law is left to construction, men will construe it so as to widen the scope of their power, and the first two or three sessions of Congress again verified that characteristic of men.

In everything Congress again sought to exceed its constitutional limitations on the interpretation that powers not expressly prohibited in the Constitution were not denied to Congress.

The great champion of democracy, Jefferson, was at work prodding the people to adopt a Bill of Rights, and finally his friend and disciple, Madison, introduced and passed the resolution for the Bill of Rights. It was adopted 3 years after the adoption of the Constitution.

There is little doubt of the authorship of the Bill of Rights.

Doubtless we owe it to that great democrat, Thomas Jefferson.

It is the soul of the Constitution. It specified rights that neither the Congress nor the States could take away from the people; the right of freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, the right to keep and bear arms. Article III gave us the right to select the tenants for our houses, and so on through the whole 10 articles constituting the rights which neither Congress nor the States can take away from the people, and finished with article X which is the crowing glory of our constitutional liberty.

Article X. "The powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

As if the framer of the Bill of Rights feared he had left some loophole through which power-greedy Congressmen may go beyond constitutional authority, it seems that article X of the Bill of Rights was thrown in as a perpetual bar to congressional invasion of the rights of the States and the people.

Mr. Jefferson thought it would protect us from congressional dictatorship, but he did not know twentieth century politicians.

Of course, he thought that when a man took the oath of Congressman, he would keep it.

Reread article X of the Bill of Rights: "The powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Read section VIII of the Constitution and you will see every power granted to the United States.

Section VIII is headed: Powers Granted to Congress.

Read all the powers granted to Congress.

Do you see anything that by the most liberal construction, would authorize Congress to pass a law to say who can vote in Texas, or repeal any law enacted by Texas fixing the qualifications of voters, or any constitutional amendment voted by Texas voters requiring a poll tax to qualify one to vote?

Do you see any authority to enact a Federal antilynching bill?

Do you see any authority to establish a commission to go into your store or shop and supplant white employees with Negro employees, if perchance it found the employees of the two races out of proper proportion to the population of the races in the community?

Do you see any provision in there that would authorize Congress to pass a law that would prevent the States from sending white children to one school and Negroes to another?

If not, then read section X of the Constitution, and see if the States are denied these rights.

Only three powers are denied to the States, and, if you will read them you will see the States are not denied the power to regulate by law and enforce such laws as deal with the President's Civil Rights program.

If that is true, then article X of the Bill of Rights reserves such rights to the States, or the people. Of Truman's civil-rights program, they are all reserved to the States, except what is known as the FEPC (fair employment). It is a right reserved to the people—to select their own employees and to employ whites, Negroes, or Mexicans, or Russians, if you please.

All one has to do is to read the powers granted to Congress in section VIII of the Constitution, and section X of the Constitution rights denied to the States, and, if he fails to find the right to fix the qualifications for voters, the right to pass antilynching laws, to pass the FEPC, or the right to abolish our segregation laws under the section VIII, and fails to find those expressly inhibited in section X, then they are reserved to the States, or to the people.

The coming crisis:

It seems certain that Congress will accept President Truman's challenge and pass all his civil-rights program.

He started it for political effect, and the Republicans will take the play away from him.

Nothing better could be expected of a Republican Congress, when challenged by one who called himself a Democrat.

Of course, he will approve the legislation, notwithstanding it cuts the heart out of the Constitution.

Can we depend upon the Supreme Court, our last line of defense?

I fear for the safety of the constitutional rights of my country.

It is time for plain talk.

No man of intellectual honesty can study the Constitution of the United States and honestly say that Congress has the constitutional authority to pass such laws as advocated in the President's civil-rights program.

It is not for the lack of understanding that Congress would try to pass and enforce such laws.

The writers of the Bill of Rights, knowing that there might come a time when majorities would utterly ignore the rights of minorities, put article X in as the heart of the covenant.

Oh, why will men, sworn to protect and enforce it, ruthlessly strike it down?

Congress is sworn to protect the Constitution of the United States, yet they (many of them), have their swords unsheathed to cut the heart out of it, by cutting out article X of the Bill of Rights.

Shame on any man who would pay homage with words to the greatest Democrat that ever lived, as they do at Jefferson Day dinners, and then strike at the Bill of Rights, the greatest bulwark of our democracy and our liberty.

A Bitter Pill for Americans—This Country Has Led the World in Smashing the Fabric of Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following article

by Mr. Felix Morley as written in Human Events March 24, 1948:

HERE LET US STOP

(By Felix Morley)

Americans are supposed to be an intelligent people. At least one must assume that, or else be forced to conclude that our political institutions are absurd.

These are built around the belief that there is some virtue in democracy, meaning control by majority opinion. But if majority opinion is stupid, shortsighted, or misguided, then obviously a form of government which conforms to majority opinion is likely to exhibit disastrous faults. The present crisis strongly suggests that our present bureaucracy represents the worst, and not the best, in the American heritage.

There is abundant evidence that the United States, for all its tremendous physical power, is accomplishing nothing that can be called beneficial to mankind. We are certainly throwing our weight around. We certainly talk about democracy as though we really believe in it. We also talk a great deal about our responsibilities. But our political leadership seems wholly unable to fulfill these responsibilities, or even to define intelligibly what they are.

Actually, the administration is now concentrating on preparation for another war, in which there is much to indicate that we would be the aggressor. The waging of aggressive war is the poorest possible defense of democracy. It is, rather, a confession of mental and moral bankruptcy. And it has always been the historical prelude to the downfall of the aggressor.

The lives of our youth are not the property of the State, to throw on a rubbish heap in Korea or Yugoslavia as some brass hat may ordain. And the traditions of this Republic were not entrusted to incompetent demagogues to dissipate and squander at their sweet pleasure. Whether or not intelligent, Americans are at least a decent people. Lately they have paid a terrible bill, with nothing worth while to show for it. Before they lose what is left of their heritage, before they are conscripted for the war that nobody wants, an accurate accounting of governmental performance is in order.

It is not enough to wait patiently for the next election, still more than 7 months away. By then, as things are going, it may be too late to save the Republic. Indeed, there is all too much reason to believe that the Presidential entourage is not unwilling to precipitate a war before the election, on the too clever assumption that there is now no other way in which those responsible can keep their appalling record at least partly concealed from public scrutiny.

II

Let us meet the present administration on the same low ground which Mr. Truman chose for his crisis message of March 17. Let us, for the sake of his argument, forget with him the principles which really made this Republic great. Let us confine the case to the narrow issue of national security. Let us even for the moment admit what history will deny: that American participation in the last war was inevitable.

In defense of President Truman it must be said that his predecessor set the course toward catastrophe. It was Roosevelt who filled Government offices with fellow-travelers; who capitulated to Stalin in secret agreements which he did not dare to reveal to the American people; who permitted the Russians to occupy half of Europe and strengthen their offensive position in the Far East.

All that is clear enough. But when set forth it still remains undeniable that Harry Truman accepted and confirmed the Roosevelt policy of strengthening Communist dictatorship. It was Truman who gave Manchuria and northern Korea to Russia, in return for 5 days of assistance against an already conquered foe. It was Truman who signed the Potsdam agreement, which made the Communists hegemony in central Europe certain. It was Truman who led the Republic blindfolded into the snare and delusion of the United Nations. It was Truman who, for political purposes, surrendered to Zionist pressure and thereby assured the humiliating tragedy of Palestine. It is Truman who is now playing Pendergast politics by trying to reverse the hopeless blunders which he approved at Trieste.

Finally it was Truman who personally endorsed the two cold-blooded atrocities by which America destroyed all of its moral supremacy in the last war—the atomic bombing of Nagasaki, after Japan was licked; and the Nuremberg trials, a travesty of justice accomplished in concert with a government which the President himself now indicts as a menace to American institutions.

In face of this record no honorable man can uncritically accept the statement of Mr. Truman that: "The achievement of lasting peace, based on freedom and justice, has been the great goal of this Nation." It has been the goal of the Nation, but certainly not the goal of those who for too long have been allowed to lead it progressively toward irredeemable confusion and disaster.

III

Separate consideration should be given to the fate of the United Nations, already—as a factor for the preservation of world peace—as dead as frozen mutton.

The infinitely superior League of Nations lasted nearly 20 years without American membership, and accomplished much valuable work. The United Nations, primarily New Deal in design and sponsorship, is fading out of the picture well in advance of its third birthday. Politically speaking, it has served only to stimulate strife and to assist the subtle Russian program of world domination.

The only real issue about UN, now, is that which has so often exercised the ingenuity of those who write murder mysteries—how to dispose of the remains in such a manner that responsibility for the crime may be concealed. And if all this were no more than a "whodunit" there might be something soothing in all the ingenious endeavor to divert suspicion from the White House. We could accept as a game the present feverish effort to focus responsibility on those who only 18 months ago agreed with us at Nuremberg that—

"to prepare, incite, or wage a war of aggression, or to conspire with others to do so, is a crime * * * and that for the commission of such crimes individuals are responsible."

But it will not need another Nuremberg trial—next time in Moscow or Washington—to make clear where the responsibility for the demise of the United Nations rests. It rests with those who, defying everything in the American tradition, attempted to base world peace on a concept of power politics. As Human Events has often pointed out, the United Nations was in theory nothing more than an alliance of great powers, set up to dominate the world. When the two most powerful Allies fell out, the "peace-loving" organization inevitably collapsed.

One is forced to wonder whether Americans are any longer capable of appreciating the profound wisdom of Washington's Farewell Address, and its admonition that:

"The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our foreign relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled, with perfect good faith. Here let us stop."

If anything is clear, amid the chaos produced by our contradictory and capricious foreign policy, it is that the so-called isolationists were essentially right. They knew that America can run its own affairs reasonably well. They knew that in pontifically declaiming on the world stage we would be likely to prove ourselves blundering fools.

IV

Our whole system of government, the whole idea of a Federal Republic, is based on foregoing the path of empire, on developing those private ventures in which American genius is brilliant, in shunning those grandiose schemes of power politics—mislabeled internationalism—which can only bring misery at home and abroad. It is not unnatural for a ward politician to be President of the United States. But it becomes grotesque when a man of parochial outlook, inferior training, and deficient ability, attempts to rush a reluctant people down the dangerous road of imperial rule.

"The moving finger writes, and having writ moves on." It is a bitter pill for Americans to realize that this country, during the past few years, has led the world in smashing the fabric of civilization; has accomplished virtually nothing outside its borders toward the rebuilding of something better. It is not merely German factories that we have dismantled. It is the whole structure of American ideals.

The mistakes which we have made cannot be canceled out. But it is not necessary to pile new blunders on those which now serve to plague us. There is no reason to be hysterical because we did not foresee what we helped to precipitate in Czechoslovakia. The way to keep the disease of communism from conquest is to fight it in the realm of mind and spirit, saving conscripted bodies as a last and forlorn hope.

The union of western Europe is all to the good. The world would have been happier if the Europeans had developed it long ago. But let us not delude them into thinking that American opinion wants to see this republic a party to a military alliance directed against those with whom we were so recently, and disastrously, allied.

In less than a year the so-called Marshall plan has been completely altered from its original design. It is no longer a European recovery program. Now it is a program for subsidizing and even arming western Europe as a fringe of imperial outposts. Only the most fatuous diplomacy could have produced so dubious and desperate an outcome.

Before our failure can be redeemed, its appalling magnitude must be understood. We have only ourselves to blame. And we must realize that emphasis on physical power is now more likely to hasten than to avert the final war toward which we are plunging headlong. To avoid this end we must restore the ideals on which our power rests.

So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

We Must Believe in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt from the Washington Daily News of March 29, 1948:

WE HAVE NOT SEEN PEACE, YET WE MUST BELIEVE IN IT

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

EN ROUTE TO ENGLAND.—We might almost draw an analogy on this Easter Sunday between the position of the early Christians and the position of the peoples of the world today. As the first Easter Sunday dawned so many centuries ago, those who followed Christ and believed in Him as the Saviour of mankind had been through the depths of sorrow and despair since the crucifixion.

On that Easter day, however, hope dawned again. The Lord was risen and new understanding of His teaching was opening for His followers. Many of the faithful must have been bewildered, for they had thought of an earthly kingdom and not a spiritual one. They had thought that their battle was to be won at once on earth, but the resurrection of Christ, and the things He said to the followers with whom He met, pointed to the fact that the battle would be a long one and the victory far off.

Life here on this earth might well seem to be a failure. The reward and the triumph might only exist for the spirit once freed from the trammels of this world.

The people of our day have thought that with the end of the war they would have peace and security, but they find themselves faced with continuing anxiety and more wars and rumors of wars. They look at the world of nature around them and realize that all things die and lie again, and the flow of life in spring emphasizes the Easter lesson.

We, the people, may seem to fail in our efforts to attain a world in which security and brotherly love prevail. If we do not learn in time, we may come to complete destruction, but the Resurrection seems to promise that the spirit of man shall ultimately triumph over the enemies of man—those enemies which lie within man himself and which he must conquer before he can be free.

St. John, in describing Christ's appearance to the disciples, records His salutation: "Peace be unto you," and when He appeared to them again to quiet the unbelief of Thomas the doubting one, He said: "Because thou has seen Me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and yet believed."

It is hard for us to believe in peace and to keep our spirit keyed to the assurance that we can achieve the realization of Christ's words. We have not seen peace and yet we must believe in it, for without that belief in the thing which we seek and in our ability to find it, we will be useless as the doubting disciple.

Easter is the season that emphasizes for all of us the need for faith—faith in our religion, faith in ourselves, faith in our neighbors and in our friends and in the peoples of the world. If the United States has a destiny—and we Americans have believed this ever since the days of the founding fathers—then it would look as though the resolving of our difficulties at this time lies in greater faith—to insure greater effort toward the ultimate achievement for all upon earth of Christ's salutation: "Peace be unto you."

Hon. Eamon De Valera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech made by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] at a monster reception to Hon. Eamon De Valera, for 16 years Premier of Eire, which was held in Boston, Mass., on Sunday evening, March 28, 1948:

Less than 2 weeks ago, on the occasion of the Feast of Saint Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, most of us took the opportunity to recall with justifiable pride the past glories of Ireland.

Much oratory was spent in stirring the souls of Irishmen, and those of Irish ancestry, with tales of saints and scholars long dead—by lauding the character of Irish heros and statesmen—or by dwelling upon the cultural and spiritual heritage of the Irish people.

But even though you and I know that the history of Ireland did not stop with the emigration of our own forebears, all too often we are inclined to forget that there is a modern Ireland which is right now perpetuataing the great religious and political traditions which have distinguished that nation since the days of Saint Patarick.

Tonight we are signally honored by having with us the one man whom I consider to be the living embodiment of the achievements and aspirations of modern Ireland.

From 1913, when he made the cause of the volunteers his own, until a few weeks ago, when he laid down the reins of government after 16 illustrious and eventful years as Premier of Eire, our distinguished guest has spent the whole of his time, his great talents, and his prodigious efforts to bring his beloved land to its proper place in the world commonwealth of free nations.

How well he has succeeded in that great and noble task is evidenced today by the fact that, alone in western Europe, Ireland is the one nation where the scourge of communism has no chance of either infiltration, domination, or survival.

The character of the man is revealed in his philosophy of government. And his philsophy of government—and that of the people of Eire is nowhere more clearly reflected than in the great constitution for the self-government of the Irish people which was adopted during the period of his dynamic leadership.

In 1937, when emergent, godless political philosophies were spreading the darkness of despair over large portions of Europe and Asia—at a time when materialistic theories of the economic man were finding widespread acceptance—and only 2 years before the outbreak of the most terrible war in history, the Irish people, under the guiding genius of the De Valera government, adopted a new constitution.

Listen for a moment to its preamble:

"In the name of the Most Holy Trinity, from Whom is all authority, and to Whom, as our final end, all actions both of men and states must be referred, we the people of Eire, humbly acknowledging all our obligations to the Divine Lord, Jesus Christ, Who sustained our fathers through centuries of trial, gratefully remembering their heroic and unremitting struggle to regain the rightful independence of our nation, and seeking to promote the common good, with due observance of prudence, justice, and charity, so that the dignity and freedom of the individual may be assured, true social order attained, and the unity of our country restored, and concord established with other nations, do hereby adopt, enact, and give to ourselves this constitution."

Here in a few brief phrases, we have the essence of true social and political philosophy combined with the simple but sublime theology of true Christian faith. Stripped of all legalisms and devoid of the weasel-words of diplomatic language, the phrases have the beauty of a prayer. They express the Christianity of Ireland and they dedicate her people to the principles of Christian democracy. What would happen, I wonder, if the benighted, disorganized countries now floundering in the chaos of postwar turmoil could, or would, be reestablished and governed under constitutions with preambles like that of Eire?

Following the preamble, we find enumerated all of the national and individual safeguards essential to the democratic way of life. The guaranties of the constitution, which the administration of Mr. De Valera translated into effective realities, are a litany of democratic principles:

All citizens, their personal rights, and their civil liberties are guaranteed equality before the law; the sacredness of the family and family rights is assured; freedom of education and the rights of parents therein are guaranteed; the right of private property is declared and protected; freedom of conscience and religion is secured to all creeds and denominations.

In article 45 of that constitution it is laid down as a basic postulate that the function of the state is to insure the control and distribution of national material resources—not for socialistic or communistic purposes—but for the service of the common good, and to provide every citizen with the means of livelihood. In what is almost a paraphrase of the Corporal Works of Mercy, the Irish Constitution asserts that—

"The state pledges itself to safeguard with especial care the economic interests of the weaker sections of the community, and where necessary, to contribute to the support of the infirm, the widow, the orphan, and the aged."

I have dwelt at length upon the progressive, enlightened character of Irish constitutional philosophy, because, to my mind, it reflects the genius and statecraft of our honored guest here tonight. Shortly after the adoption of this splendid charter of government, without mention of his own tremendous contribution to its structure, Mr. De Valera stated that—

"The chief significance of the new constitution * * * is that it is in complete accord with national conviction and tradition in these matters, and that it bears upon its face, from the first words of its preamble to the dedication at its close, the character of the public law of a great Christian democracy."

That his description was accurate, and that such significance is paramount, are amply attested by the fact that Ireland, under his inspired guidance, has prospered internally and maintained her national integrity externally during the most trying and difficult period of 11 years since adoption that the world has ever known.

And lest anyone entertain any doubt about the nature of the nation which Mr. De Valera helped to rebuild, and which he so ably guided through its formative years, it is worthy of note that the constitution of 1937 unequivocally asserts that "Ireland is a sovereign, independent, democratic state."

And that furthermore "all powers of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—derive under God, from the people, whose right it is to designate the rules of the state, and, in final appeal, to decide all questions of national policy, according to the requirements of the common good."

In these magnificent phrases, under the sanction of which the De Valera government gave Ireland the most democratic rule in modern Europe, we have the Irish manifesto against all forms of the totalitarian state. We have a declaration of Irish national independence—humbly joined with a declaration of dependence upon the dispensation of divine providence.

In short, we have enshrined in the national, basic charter of the Irish people the impress of the character, the genius, the philosophy, and the faith of Eamon De Valera.

In aiding and guiding the evolution of that constitution, in translating its ideals into

practical reality, Mr. De Valera has written his own best tribute and erected his own most enduring monument to his high place in world history.

With all of my fellow citizens here tonight, therefore, I am privileged to record our own added tribute to the chief architect of the firm and noble structure which is modern Ireland. To our own most distinguished guest we wish to express the fervent prayer and earnest hope that he may be spared for long years to achieve the final unity of his gallant country which fears no tyrant and pays no homage but to God.

Conditions in the Panama Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of Members of Congress to the following articles published in the Baltimore News-Post, in connection with conditions now existing in the Canal Zone. I think they deserve the serious attention of every Member in view of the prevailing world situation.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 14, 1948]

NEW DEAL POLICIES HARMFUL IN CANAL ZONE

(By David Sentner)

ANCON, C. Z., March 13.—The Panama Canal Zone, sheathing the vital life line of America, is in a state of confusion bordering on chaos.

Sixteen years of New Deal policies applied to the strategic artery between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have produced the following unhappy results:

Due to inept diplomacy, interference with the military and the spawning of a left-wing labor movement in its midst, the Canal Zone is wide open to attack from within and without.

The long period of State Department appeasement toward the Soviet Union has permitted Russian agents to use the Panama Republic as a swinging door for subversive operations in the Zone and throughout Latin America.

APPEASEMENT POLICY

A similar appeasement policy adopted for Panama has proved ineffective.

Tiny Panama, owing its national existence and economic life to the Canal, has refused to grant bases to the United States for the Canal's protection.

This refusal marks up a humiliating diplomatic defeat for America, which aims to halt the Soviet Union.

Russia is making the most of the situation in her anti-American propaganda throughout South America and makes no bones of the Communist influence on the rejection of the bases agreement by the Panama National Assembly.

PACT BY ROOSEVELT

The loss of the bases is attributed directly by Army and Navy top side to the give-away of American security in the 1936 treaty with Panama conjured by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The defense chieftains call this treaty the Little Yalta agreement.

It cancelled the traditional right of the United States to have protective bases in Panama.

It gratuitously provided for huge financial concessions to Panama, including the return of American-built roads, property, and the "forgetting" of an Export-Import Bank Government loan.

It carried an "equal treatment" clause which has given an excuse to New Deal global good-doers to attempt to raise the low income Panamanian population to the same high American standard of living—at the expense of the American taxpayer.

The 1936 treaty is also being interpreted by left-wing bureaucrats as meaning Panamanians—and anyone, including a Soviet agent, can obtain Panamanian citizenship—should be permitted to compete with American civil service workers in the Canal Zone.

COMPOSED OF ALIENS

Along this line of economic internationalism, the New Deal, a few years ago, invited a Communist-dominated union—the United Public Workers of America—to organize the Panamanian workers in the zone.

Composed entirely of a membership of aliens, UPWA local 713 in the Canal Zone poses a flagrant security threat.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 15, 1948]

REVEAL SOVIET AGENTS ACTIVE IN CANAL ZONE

(By David Sentner)

ANCON, C. Z., March 15.—Soviet agents and their Communist tools are overrunning the Panama Canal Zone and the surrounding Caribbean area like ants in a tropical sugar bowl.

They await but the word from Moscow to sabotage the Canal, aid in another Pearl Harbor attack, or assist in an air-borne invasion, possibly from some nearby Communist-dominated territory or country.

HOLD STRATEGIC POSTS

They have infiltrated strategic civilian posts in the Panama Canal Zone and are even among the crews of the American Government-owned liners operating from the States.

During the current Soviet "cold war" period they are busily engaged in gathering vital military data, spreading anti-American propaganda, and inciting friction between Americans and Panamanians.

The organization of 20,000 Panamanian workers into an alien union, with New Deal blessing, under an American pro-Communist leadership, furnishes grist to the subversive mill.

OTHER REVELATIONS

And here are some other revelations which failed to get through the bureaucratic curtain shrouding current events in the Canal Zone:

A Soviet vessel recently "accidentally" rammed the locks of the Panama Canal.

The ship was damaged more than the locks and tied up in the Canal to be repaired by American craftsmen. Members of the ship's crew were permitted to wander over the Canal area in the interim.

A purported Swiss couple from a tourist ship was found in the control tower of the Gatun locks.

FIND SECRET BUTTON

They had discovered the secret button operating the intricate mechanism but were merely fined $50 for trespassing.

Soviet agents are smuggled into Panama via dugout canoes operated on the old smugglers' trail along the Atrato River in Colombia, which runs for 40 miles to the Panama border.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 16, 1948]

CHARGE CIVILIAN RIGHTS IGNORED IN CANAL ZONE

(By David Sentner)

ANCON, C. Z., March 16.—The thousands of loyal and freedom-loving civilian Americans who run the Panama Canal are writhing under the oppression and inefficiency of the socialistic regime set up in the Canal Zone by the New Deal.

There is no private enterprise in the Canal Zone. Everything is owned and run by the Government—food stores, housing units, schools, moving-picture theaters, hotels, railroads, and what have you. A Government doctor brings your child into the world, and a Government undertaker conducts your burial.

SAY RIGHTS IGNORED

Under the civil administration, headed by Gov. Joseph C. Mehaffey and his executive secretary, "Straw Boss" Frank Wang, it is charged constitutional rights have been ignored, the civil service law has been violated, and bureaucracy has run riot.

The Governor is appointed for a 4-year term by the President.

Braving intimidation and possible dismissal, a small band of American zone employees have vainly attempted to bring their unrecognized regimented plight to the attention of the American people.

Junketing Congressmen, inundated with social attention from the authorities and a guided tour of only the right spots, have missed the true state of affairs.

JOBS ARE LIMITED

They have been prone to think in terms of the Canal Zone as merely a military installation.

Actually, the Army's job in peacetime is only to guard the Canal; the Navy to furnish pilots for the commercial vessels transversing the locks.

The families of servicemen in the zone, as well as civilian personnel, are under the civil administration of the Canal agencies, and feel equally as bitter about their socialized existence as do 6,000 American civil-service employees who make the Canal work.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 17, 1948]

TELL INJUSTICES TO CANAL ZONE EMPLOYEES

(By David Sentner)

ANCON, CANAL ZONE, March 17.—New Deal bureaucracy—with a strong Soviet accent—straddles the Panama Canal from ocean to ocean.

While an alien union of Panamanians, under a procommunistic leadership, is openly pampered by the Washington-appointed civil administration of the zone, the American civilian employees—who run the Canal and love their work—retain only the right to breathe.

A group of American legionnaires in the Canal Zone last October stuck out their necks to write for Presidential intercession against the un-American, un-Democratic and inefficient conditions prevailing.

COMMUNICATION EXCERPTS

Here are excerpts from their unanswered communication to the White House:

"The Panama Canal Civil Administration is a law unto itself.

"Fear is in the hearts of Canal Zone employees and a spirit of desperation exists.

"Health conditions: Hospitals and dispensaries are on a purely socialized medical basis. Cost is prohibitive; service is very poor; doctors are disinterested.

"Internes or medical orderlies perform obstetrics when cases are brought in during the night, even on difficult cases.

"Secretary: We all feel very strongly about the danger to security since Civil Service appointments have been opened to aliens.

"Although small, the Isthmus of Panama is one of the most vital strategic areas in the world for the United States.

REDS ARE ACTIVE

"Communist activities: Communist activities have never ceased and since the war has

ended, their influence in the Panama area is ever boldly increasing.

"Civil-service employees—veteran preference: Publicity of Civil Service publications or releases are screened from general dissemination in the Canal Zone and are treated with an air of secrecy.

"Veterans are not obtaining their rights and appeals bring no results, other than prejudice, and many times eventually lead to loss of jobs."

[From the Baltimore News-Post of March 19, 1948]

NEED FOR CANAL IN NICARAGUA OUTLINED

(By David Senter)

ANCON, Canal Zone, March 18.—A Trojan horse containing communism, bureaucracy, and blundering New Deal diplomacy is astride the Panama Canal.

The prevailing internal confusion in the Canal Zone, plus the stripping of its defenses by the loss of bases in Panama, furnishes flaming reasons why a second transocean canal should be built in Nicaragua.

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

A Nicaraguan canal could be an all-American canal.

It could be a home for American workers instead of a land of exile under a socialist regime.

A democratic civilian administration could be established, possibly under a city managership form of government.

A fresh start could be made with the assignment of a civil service representative, responsible solely to the Civil Service Commission.

Nor would there be any necessity for a one-way treaty involving employment guarantees for aliens and the drain of financial gratuities to the leasing nation.

WRITE OWN TICKET

Nicaragua has made it clear that the United States can write its own ticket—if it will but build the canal which was unanimously recommended over the Panama route so many years ago.

Nicaragua, with its homogeneous Indian strain, has no such racial problem to be met as is faced in dealing with Panama, and there would be no need for New Deal ideological concepts.

Nor would Nicaragua prove an orchidaceous terrain, dependent on nourishment from the economic soil of the Canal Zone.

Nicaragua is a flourishing, self-sustaining agricultural nation of diverse products, worthy site of a new crossroads of the world.

SUBTLE CAMPAIGN

A subtle propaganda campaign is being currently waged by bureaucracy in favor of sea-leveling the Panama Canal in preference to construction of another canal in Nicaragua which would shorten the route by a day between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Fallacious arguments are put forth that a Nicaraguan canal would cost five times as much as the $2,500,000,000 estimated for sea-leveling the Panama waterway.

It is admitted it will take 10 years to do the Panama job.

Murder Will Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following statement I made before a meeting of the Pioneer Women today:

There aren't words strong enough to express the feeling of, first, disbelief and then revulsion that followed United States abandonment of partition. The sentiment was echoed everywhere—both the Jews of Palestine and the cause of peace had been deserted. Every mature authority conceded that the United States reversal in the Security Council had wounded and crippled the United Nations in its growth toward an effective instrument for peace. Even those who prior to the partition vote on November 29 had been lukewarm to Zionism deplored the shifty, underhand turnabout.

I called it the most immoral act the United States had ever committed in international affairs. And nothing that President Truman or Secretary of State Marshall said thereafter has caused me to change that judgment.

If Mr. Truman's statement was a clarification of the United States position, then all I can say is that I have not yet learned how to read English, nor has he. If ever there was a masked, slippery use of subject and verb, that was it. If Mr. Truman had meant he supported partition, then all he would have had to say is: "The United States supports the partition of Palestine in accordance with the United Nations decision." Simply, directly, and without equivocation. He said instead that trusteeship was not a substitute for partition and did not jeopardize any eventual political settlement.

What does that actually mean? It means that not only is partition not ruled out but also that neither is any other kind of eventual political settlement ruled out either. Add all the sentences together, the direct statement and the questions and answers which took place during the press period last Thursday and what emerges is: Any political settlement is possible, including partition, if it meets with the approval of both Arabs and Jews. In short, the whole circle has been traveled and there we are holding hands with the British and singing the same song.

So now what do we have? In Palestine two factions opposing trusteeship instead of one faction opposing partition. How does that spell peace and stability? How does that rule out the use of force more than does the imposition of partition? How long a trusteeship is proposed? One year, ten years, or twenty-six years which is as long as the British trusteeship lasted, a trusteeship which was also imposed leading supposedly to eventual independence? American soldiers will not be sent to impose partition, says Mr. Truman, but Mr. Truman refuses to comment directly about the use of American soliders to impose trusteeship. Can you think of a shabbier play for public sympathy? Remember we have soldiers in Trieste and in Greece.

Mr. Truman hopes that there will be no declaration of a Jewish state by May 16. What does he hope for? That the Jews will slink off to a corner, give up Zion, desert the Jewish displaced persons languishing in DP camps, all to save Mr. Truman personal embarrassment?

Mr. Herschel Johnson in speaking before the General Assembly last fall didn't fall back on language that had to be searched for meaning. He said directly: "I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented, either to this Assembly or to the Mandatory Government during its long years of tenure, or in any other place, which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No such plan has ever been presented, and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented. If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of this problem it cannot be done without the use of the knife." Remember, too, that trusteeship had been discussed and discarded before the partition vote was taken. The necessity for using force, as Mr. Johnson's statement clearly sets forth, was likewise foreseen. The upheaval in Palestine was not unexpected. What new facts have come to life that warranted such a shameless betrayal?

But as we look back to December of last year, we know now that the United States was surely coming to this act of betrayal. The embargo arms to Palestine was an ominous portent. The United States was sitting back with its arms folded watching the chaos grow in Palestine, knowing that the Arabs could get as much arms as they wanted, and knowing, too, that the Jews of Palestine were defenseless. The arms embargo, let us not mince words, was an invitation to murder. We saw the State Department refuse passports to Jewish youths, a procedure that had not been followed when American boys sought to volunteer in the armies of England, France, and even Spain in the prelude to World War II. When members of the House and Senate wrote to Marshall and the President the replies were as indirect and evasive as all their replies have been since. On March 10, Senator MURRAY and myself wrote to Secretary of State Marshall asking for the clarification of our Palestine policy, asking why the arms embargo, why the secret intrigues between the American consuls in the Near East and the Arabs, why we do not show our determination to make the partition decision stick. To that letter was attached the signatures of 41 Senators and Congressmen—all of the Democratic Party. To date, no reply has been received. In the interim, Senator AUSTIN and President Truman have made their immoral and indefensible betrayal.

Was it meant to appease the millions of Arabs, not, mind you, Palestine Arabs, but Arabs of all Moslem countries, Turkey, Pakistan, and Egypt included? Was it meant to insure the American-Arabian Oil Co. that their profits from Saudian-Arabian oil would not be disturbed? The answer is "yes" to both of these. And I say unless officialdom of the United States turns its back on betrayal, they are manufacturing ghosts that will come back to haunt them. The free world looks to us for moral guidance, for assurance that force alone does not rule and that might does not supersede right. That is our quarrel with totalitarianism today. And that was our quarrel with totalitarianism only 2 short years ago. We have taken justifiable pride in our decencies, in our sense of honor and fair play. That's what we are trying to sell to the peoples of the world, trusting that they will be on our side. We dealt a mortal blow to the trust smaller nations can place in us. When 6,000,000 Jews were killed in Europe we were told that military expediency precludes our active intervention. When Jews are faced with aggression again in their own land, again we are told military expediency precludes our helping them. No other peoples in the world have been called upon to suffer again and again and over again the indignities of international power politics. I can't recall any other incident in history when we did not place our strength, moral and physical, on the side of the weaker. Only with the Jews of the world have we played this hypocritical cat and mouse game.

Now the smaller nations of the world say: "Force pays off." Now the terrorist groups in Palestine will say: "Force pays off." The Arabs say: "Now we garner the fruits of force." With one stroke the United States Government has broken the faith of a whole world in the worth of a pledge. The hope of our civilization that men of good will are shaping our destiny is beginning to fade.

If this betrayal made sense the bitterness would not be this deep. The sinister pattern is clear. The United States will ask Britain to stay on. Britain may reluctantly consent.

Nothing will have changed. The white paper will remain in effect. The anger will be turned against the Jews for resisting an imposed trusteeship, and possibly British police which failed to turn against Arab aggression when they fought the UN decision will turn their wrath against defenseless Jews if they resist trusteeship. We do not need history to judge the bitter irony of this. We see it plainly before us now.

I say that with this Palestine reversal the United States, the most powerful Nation in the world, has turned the clock backward for all mankind. By such betrayal, it has defied force. It has said that force speaks louder than justice, logic, reason, and good will.

We have bought no good will with this maneuver, nor have we been strategically clever. In the event of conflict, the United States cannot benefit from a downtrodden, undeveloped, untrained area, led by men of shifting loyalties. As the last war proved, the United States can only be benefited by the industrialization, the skills in medicine, a sound economy that can produce and distribute all kinds of material that only a Jewish Palestine can offer. The Jews of Palestine, in addition to the goods of their country, gave their loyalty and their lives. The Arabs gave nothing.

Has the military asked itself how much more than oil (which could not be reached in time of war anyway) would a friendly, industrialized, eager nation mean to the United States in that critical area? If acting only in the name of self-interest, the Government of the United States had every business encouraging the immediate establishment of the Jewish state. The blind folly of all this is that in the name of national security, the United States by its abandonment of partition has undermined its national security. They have placed themselves in the position where help can be expected neither from the Jews nor the Arabs.

But this is not the final word. The Jewish state is and will be. If we lose sight of that basic fact, then we join with our betrayers. Never before have the Jews been called upon to believe so fervently, to rally together, to give of its strength and its endurance and its wordly possessions to compel recognition of its national destiny. That the Jewish state already exists is a fact. Whether it will endure, whether it will take its place among the nations of the world, formally acknowledged depends on you and me, each one of us here. We must not cease our agitation. Let the protest continue, louder and louder in volume until it penetrates to the conscience of the world. We'll continue to contribute to every fund which means the building of Palestine, giving in the sacred knowledge that it is an indestructible act of faith. The arms embargo must be lifted. While many of you as residents of Washington do not have congressional representation, you can ask your friends and relatives in every State of the Union to write to their own Representatives to speak up for Zion. This is not the end, not by any means. The Jews of Palestine need desperately to know that the Jews of the United States are behind them. You will not also betray them. This is not only a fight for the Jews of Palestine, it is also the good fight for the rights, privileges, and immunities of every peoples against the tyrannies of Government whether imposed from within or without. If the Jews of the world now feel frightfully alone this, then, is the day of challenge. Two thousand years of bitter betrayal could not destroy or wither the Jews. The Jews are in Palestine, building miraculously their own national monument, creating out of their suffering a way of life in Palestine for the whole world to emulate and marvel at. Their homes, their workshops, their farms, their factories, their hospitals, their art, and their science. These will not perish. Let the Jews of America tell them so.

Speech of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, at Dinner to Hon. Eamon De Valera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a speech made by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, at a banquet tendered the Honorable Eamon De Valera in Boston, Saturday evening, March 27, 1948:

Your Excellency, Bishop Wright, Your Excellency, the Governor, your honor, the mayor, General Ashton, United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, our distinguished guest, former Premier Eamon De Valera, and friends and admirers of Premier De Valera:

The biographer of the gentleman we honor tonight tells a story about his escape from Lincoln jail in 1919.

It seems that his disappearance had caused a tremendous sensation on both sides of the Channel, and the British press was indulging in wild speculation as to his whereabouts.

According to newspaper stories, within a week he had been seen in London, in Glasgow, in Paris, in Dublin, in a fishing boat, in Skibbereen, and in the Hebrides Islands. One rumor had him secretly meeting President Wilson, and another rumor had it that he was dead.

The Daily Express had its own theory: "Ireland," it reported, "is full of stories of banshees, leprechauns, and quaint spirits—and De Valera is just a distillation of all these mystic things."

Actually, he was safe in Manchester where he was resting at the house of an Irish friend.

Tonight, while we like to think of him as the embodiment of all good Irish spirits, there is no doubt that he is here with us in Boston in person, and I want to assure him that he is with Irish friends and with friends of the Irish!

It is no small task to pay tribute adequately, in the brief time allotted to me, to the life, the character, the personality and the achievements of Eamon De Valera.

The description of him by the English newspaper as a "distillation of all mystic things" in Ireland came closer to the truth than it realized.

For throughout his career, as a teacher, a revolutionary leader for justice, president of the republic, parliamentarian, and for (16) trying years, a statesman, premier of Ireland, there has been a mystical quality about his sublime faith in the justice of his cause and the destiny of the Irish people.

The world at large came to realize this when, as president of the council and assembly of the old League of Nations, he strove vainly to salvage peace and order for the world by fearless espousal of the cause of small nations.

There he revealed himself as a man of sterling integrity, a servant of justice, a believer in right instead of might, and an international statesman of unusual stature.

There is a saying applicable to those in public life, and particularly in elective public life, "A politician thinks of the next election: A statesman, of the next generation." To be a statesman, one must not only possess ability, vision, the power to evaluate and interpret events and trends, but above all must possess courage. The past 20 years have been one of the most trying periods of the world's history, in fact there has been no more trying period and it is still in operation.

Eamon De Valera possesses and has exercised all of those traits. Eamon De Valera is truly a great statesman, not only on Eire, but of the world. By his faith, by his deeds and his leadership, Eamon De Valera stands recognized as one of the outstanding statesmen of all time.

If the weight of his voice and his wise counsel had prevailed in the League, there would have been no Italian aggression in Ethiopia and no Japanese conquest of Manchuria. And since these were the testing grounds for World War II, it is safe to say that the world might have been spared an orgy of blood and desolation if the western democracies had followed the path of De Valera instead of the path of appeasement.

Today, the old League has a successor struggling for life: And what I conceive to be an abuse of the veto power by today's aggressor has shamefully and unfortunately kept the voice of Ireland and her senior statesman out of the councils of the United Nations.

More than ever before in world history, the peoples crying for peace need the leadership, the wise counsel, the humanitarian philosophy, and the beautiful faith of statesmen like Eamon De Valera.

In speaking on one occasion about his own beloved land, he expressed the essence of the good-neighbor doctrine—and the hope of all peoples everywhere—when he said with his characteristic simplicity:

"I want you to believe that we in Ireland desire peace—peace at home and peace abroad. * * * I want you to know that our history is the history of a people who have consistently sought merely to be allowed to lead their own lives in their own way, at peace with their neighbors and the world."

It is because many peoples in small nations other than Ireland are not allowed to lead their own lives in their own way that the world needs the courageous voice and the living faith of a De Valera.

In a career devoted with magnificent zeal to the realization of the aspirations of his own people, he has given us the perfect example of how democratic principles fortified with Christian faith can work the miracles of freedom and liberty.

As I understand the man, his own final goal, the achievement of unity, is not yet accomplished.

Yet he perseveres.

In the world order, our own great country has a similar task.

It is my fervent hope that, in facing it, we may be blessed with the same courage and determination with which he has faced his.

In one of his own favorite sayings, translated from the Gaelic: "May God assist him and us in our exalted task, and may he not permit that we should fail!"

What's Wrong With the World Expressed in a Single Sentence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, reams of paper and millions of words have been used in trying to analyze or alibi the difficulties in which the world now finds itself as the inevitable harvest from the seeds of appeasement which President Roosevelt and his successor so recklessly

planted at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, and elsewhere. However an alert and able South Dakota Kiwanian has found a way to diagnose our ills within the confines of a single sentence with which he heads his weekly luncheon announcement to his fellow Kiwanians of Watertown, S. Dak.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Congress and this country—and more especially the President and the Secretary of State—should ponder thoughtfully this following significant sentence from the pregnant pen of Ted Wrage, secretary of the Watertown (S. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce and editor of the Kiwanis Club Bulletin of that city. Here is what Ted Wrage had to say on March 27 concerning the world situation:

The outstanding fact in international relations today is that the United States, potentially the greatest democratic force in the world, is undecided as to what to do while freedom-loving people in Europe and Asia are stunned by the Russian hammer and mowed down by her sickle.

Labor Must Have a Positive National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Labor Must Have a Positive National Policy," written by me, and appearing in the first number of a new magazine called the North American Labor, published March 14, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR MUST HAVE A POSITIVE NATIONAL POLICY

When I became chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee I made the announcement that my chief aim was to unite labor. At that time, the group of labor leaders who organized the CIO had just left the American Federation of Labor. Immediately my statement was interpreted as meaning that I was going to attempt to reunite the CIO and the A. F. of L. That, of course, was not my intention. I merely meant that I was going to attempt to help labor in attaining its national objectives.

Organizationally, labor may divide as much as it wishes and still remain very effective. By division there is a multiplication of leadership and there is more of a chance for the individual worker to be benefited through organization for his primary interest group than if our country just had one labor organization. Even jurisdictional divisions are better for our country than a "swat down" single willism.

Then, too, if labor were united organizationally, the clamor for a labor party would be stronger. A labor party would not be good for the United States nor for labor itself. The reason is a very simple one. In America, political parties are not professional. They are sentimental. They are not economic. They are traditional. We do not want political parties built upon economic lines in the United States because such parties cannot help but emphasize class distinction. The glory of America is that the employee can still marry the boss's daughter, and members of different political parties can meet together in their churches, in their business, in their homes, and husbands and wives can go separately to the Democratic and Republican primaries or rallies without serious clashings. That is a more glorious characteristic of our American democracy than most people appreciate.

Professional or economic division would be as disastrous to American democratic fundamentals as a party built upon church affiliation. The formation of a labor party would invite the formation of a party made up wholly of employers or management. Victory for either group would destroy unity in America.

My idea of unity is unity in battling for those causes which advance the general welfare, and battling in such a way that that welfare can be improved and not compromised by division at the time the people's representatives are selected. We only vote once every 2 years for a Congressman, once every 4 years for a President and Governor, and once every 6 years for a Senator. Therefore, if the general welfare should be advanced above that which is enjoyed today, the time for real unity must come on those 2, 4, and 6-year days. That proposition is so simple that it is apparent to all. But this apparent proposition has been ignored more often on those 2, 4, and 6-years days than it has been observed. Therefore, labor's struggles for her objectives have been hard and have not gone forward progressively, but have only moved forward by fits and starts.

If we will but read the preamble of our Constitution, especially that part providing for the general welfare, we will realize that the objective of our founding fathers was to set up a Constitution which would function in such a way as to further the public good.

The other day in one of our committee meetings, a man who had been appointed by the President to a great public office, an office which gave him the right to administer on behalf of the people one of the greatest information distributing agencies man has yet invented, was asked what he thought was the first fundamental connected with the administration of this great office. He could not answer. His legal adviser with him did not know. And when a Senator suggested that his office should be administered for the benefit of the people, he smiled as if he had never thought of that. It undoubtedly came to him as a surprise.

I wonder if it has dawned on any owner of our newspapers, or radio stations, or heads of our medical associations, or lawyer organizations, that, through licenses granted by the public, through the guaranty of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of thought, the Government sets up these various people in their occupations and guarantees them a sort of monopolistic right because it is deemed good for the public welfare that the press should be unhampered in its thought, that radio should be free, that those in the professions should be well trained and competent, all in the public interest. That being the case, should not their first consideration be the public interest?

When Government guarantees the right to organize and to associate with one's fellows it has been deemed that the freedom to organize is a freedom in the public interest. Thus the laboring man should have the same respect for the public interest that the doctor should have, the lawyer, newspaper publisher, or the radio station owner. But in all of these branches of our economic life we hear more of the rights coming from these governmental guaranties than we do of the duties or the responsibility in connection with these great guaranties and privileges. Labor, since it has been given the right to organize, owes something to the public which guarantees it that right.

In labor case, labor has had to fight for that right. No one was opposed to the doctors organizing, or the lawyers organizing, or business organizing until business used its organized strength for dishonest purposes and advantage-taking. But in organizing they were never stopped. Labor, however, had to prove that its organization was not a conspiracy.

Now what do I mean by a positive program. I mean it for all of the branches in our economic life I have mentioned above which are so necessary in bringing to the American people their guaranteed freedom and general welfare. I mean by a positive program that all of these people must accept those privileges not so much as rights or guaranties but as opportunities to serve, to make better conditions in our land, and to help the Government in providing for the general welfare. From time to time those who have led the various types of organizations, I have pointed out, have not been entirely free from selfishness and advantage-taking.

If labor is to have a positive program it has got to become united in regard to certain fundamentals, and those fundamentals must be so much a part of the life and thought of every laboring man that when those all-important days come on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November every 2, 4, and 6 years, he will respond in the selection of the type of men who, by their lives, have proved that they understand what is meant by providing for the general welfare. We can never have faith that a man will provide for the general welfare who is subservient to a class or a group, or whose organization was brought into existence for advantage-taking.

What are the elements of our economic and social life which should be fundamental in the thought of every true American who believes that the public welfare should be the first consideration of every citizen? First of all, it is education; second, it is health; third, it is conservation; fourth, it is the continued production of wealth, not its exploitation and its wastage. As the individual citizen moves forward economically as a result of the rising standards of living, not only does he benefit but all benefit. Health is a matter which in its final analysis becomes of benefit to all of us because fewer persons are carriers of illness. A trained citizenry is the only sure guaranty of a democracy. A healthy, vigorous citizenry is the only sure guaranty of a continued expanding economy. The three evils of man are illness, ignorance, and poverty. Overcoming these for all of our people should constitute a positive labor program in which all may unite.

Labor's struggle to stand on equal terms, in a bargaining position, with management is one which found itself bound by the legal theory of conspiracy. To break these shackles labor had to overcome the force of the courts expressed in the power of injunctions. It had to overcome the power of the State, which power resorted to the use of the militia, armed guards, and labor spies. All of which, at sometime or another, were given sanction as deputy or temporary enforcers. In gaining equality at the bargaining table labor had to find friends of sufficient strength to finally get a law through Congress, giving them equality at the bargaining table only to face that greatest of all powers in our democracy, the power which comes from money and the ability to hire brains.

It should never be forgotten, as long as man has to work with his hands and has only his tools to furnish him with a livelihood, that when the National Labor Relations Act became a law sixty-odd men, who called themselves constitutional lawyers and whom the press characterized as such, declared that the National Labor Relations Act was "patently" unconstitutional and advised employers to ignore it. Much of this

same struggle must now be repeated. Is labor going to fail to unite to put themselves back again into a position of equality at the bargaining table? Is labor going to fail to unite when the suggestion is made that there shall be resort to injunction again, when a suggestion is made that the military be used again, when a suggestion is made that resort again be made to the hiring of brains in the shape of radio broadcasters, columnists, and expensive lawyers to overcome the gains which were made up until January 1947? Not to unite is a backward step. A step which those who come after us will have to take again if the general welfare is to be advanced. Here is a responsibility for all who are thoughtful.

Preparedness for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the grave problems involved in our international relationships are such that we should take counsel with the people of the United States and see to it that they are kept informed of major developments.

To the extent that information can be given to the public without embarrassment to the armed services, I feel that we should state our views upon the vital issues of the day. In line with this thought I have prepared a statement as to one important aspect of the present-day situation and request unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, OF MARYLAND

After considering the detailed statements of our military leaders and other well-informed persons testifying before the Senate committees, and after completing study of the work of Commissions which made intensive surveys of our present status, I am definitely of the opinion that any program designed to strengthen our national security will have as its keystone the building of a strong, active Air Force.

And the primary consideration in building a strong Air Force—the single aim that deserves the major part of our efforts—is speed. To say that we do not have a single day to lose in building up our weak Air Force is an understatement.

Active air power stronger than that of any other nation in the world is our best, our only assurance of peace. Any future attack on the United States would undoubtedly come devastatingly, swiftly, without warning through the air. Our next Pearl Harbor may be New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Washington, St. Louis—a dozen different key industrial centers struck simultaneously.

We would be guilty of the worse type of national indifference if we did not recognize frankly the direction from which such an attack will come if we did not face facts and admit the existence of Russia as a possible next aggressor.

Only Russia has the aggressive policy, the technical ingenuity, the mechanical ability, and the human manpower today to wage a war against us. And all of these elements are embodied in increasing quantities within Russia.

We are informed that thousands of the best scientific brains of Germany are now at work for Russia, behind the carefully guarded iron curtain, possibly in the inaccessible area of Siberia. We can imagine just about what those brains are developing.

Our leaders have proof that the most efficient machines of Germany's industrial might were transplanted bodily into Russia at the close of the war.

In tomorrow's war, if unhappily it should come, we face the horrible threat of Russian bombers attacking us across the polar routes—the most direct path to the heart of our Nation.

Rockets, guided missiles, atom bombs, perhaps also the untold horrors of bacteriological warfare, may be raining on our Nation without warning or declaration of war.

We must have a strong, active Air Force—an Air Force in being—to defend ourselves against these overwhelming attacks.

Today's great tragedy is that we do not have that Air Force. We have a pitifully weak Air Force, and an obsolete Air Force, backed up by a withering aircraft industry. The time for discussion already has passed. The time for action is here.

We have the basis for action in the recommendations of the two important groups which have recently completed exhaustive studies of the vital air-power problem—the Congressional Aviation Policy Board and the President's Air Policy Commission.

The statements contained in these reports alarming as they are, are not careless remarks of irresponsible, unthinking men. They are the carefully considered recommendations of men of outstanding intelligence and capacity, men who have spent the past 5 months in a day-and-night study of the threat of warfare and the means for defense.

Already, we have suffered a tremendous loss in time. We have allowed ourselves the luxury of smugness because we were lucky enough to win the final battles of the last war. We have permitted ourselves to drift into dangerous complacency toward the extreme urgency of a strong, long-range air-power program.

If we should have learned one lesson from the last war, it is the precious value of time.

Too few of us, I am afraid, have any idea of the deplorable condition our Air Force and Navy air arm, as well as our aircraft industry, are in today. Too few of us realize what a tremendous task is ahead of us in rebuilding the air services and the aircraft industry to sufficient strength to meet that kind of challenge.

In 1944, at the peak of its tremendous productive power, the aircraft industry built the staggering total of 96,318 planes. Yet, in 1946, the total of military planes produced had dropped to 1,330. In 1947, it was less than 1,500 planes.

It must have come as a distinct shock to most of you—I know it did to me—to read in the Congressional Aviation Policy Board's report that the effective radius of action of our longest range bomber now in use is less than 2,000 miles, and the famous B–29 has an effective range of only about 1,700 miles. The effective radius of action of a bomber is approximately one-third of its range.

It is equally disheartening, as the congressional report points out, that in spite of our extensive experiments with jet planes operating in the transsonic ranges, around the speed of sound, at speeds of more than 650 miles an hour we do not have a fighter plane that can remain aloft longer than 1 hour and at top speeds, its maximum time aloft is considerably less than an hour.

If we in Congress do not act immediately we will stand accused of the responsibility for the greatest military tragedy in our history—the irreplaceable loss of our entire air force, of our entire aircraft industry.

In 1946, production of aircraft was down to one-eightieth of the 1944 peak. At the 1944 peak, more than 2,000,000 persons were employed building airplanes. In 1946, less than 170,000 remained. Thousands more have left since that date.

It is needless to go into details of what recommendations our boards of experts have made toward building an air force in being. They have been enumerated frequently, and they are available for us all to study.

The important fact we must remember is that they must not be allowed to become forgotten. If we agree with them—and it is virtually impossible not to agree with them—we must act.

The Marshall Plan for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 31 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Marshall plan for China, broadcast by me over the facilities of Station KSL of Salt Lake City, on March 30, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Some people still object to the idea of one world. But more and more we see that, in spite of the strife and conflict in making the peace and restoring the world, economically, the problem is a problem reflecting the fact that it is one world in which we live. We are experimenting in an entirely new field. The Marshall plan has behind it a theory that is similar to the concept of one world. This is the first time, however, we have attempted to use this theory, old as is this dream, in a practical way. We realize now that a restored Europe is not sufficient to restore peace. And so we hear discussions about a Marshall plan for the Americas, that that the Western Hemisphere was hurt by the war, too, and needs our cooperative help. We have before us General Marshall's recommendations in regard to China, military aid for Greece and Turkey, and, in addition, we have not only the struggles of bringing peace and recovery to Germany, but also to Japan and to Korea. Let us talk briefly about the President's message based upon General Marshall's recommendation for relief to China.

General Marshall recommends $510,000,000 for foodstuffs and sixty-odd-million for economic recovery, the building of necessary railroads and other projects, which might be termed public works. This is a lot of money as the European plan calls for a lot of money, but few take issue because much money is required for any of these plans. The alternative of continued chaos threatens to be so much more costly. The last war cost us nearly three hundred billions. An eighteen or nineteen billion dollar attempt at doing something for peace, even if it is experimental, is definitely worth while and will pay dividends the like of which no war has ever paid, if it turns out to be successful.

There are two approaches to the Chinese problem uppermost in the minds of the people. One is General Marshall's suggestion that help to China should be in the nature of relief, primarily, and completely nonmilitary in its character. General Wedemeyer and former Ambassador Bullitt and many Members of the House of Representatives are

urging military aid to China; first, to make the government of Chiang Kai-shek successful in the present civil war in China; and, second, to build up a strong Chinese barrier against the Chinese Communists and Russian influence in China. General Marshall's plan implies that military attempts bid to be failures, that the civil-war situation in China is such that military aid will not solve the problem at all but might aggravate it. I can understand that it might aggravate it. If Chiang Kai-shek should become successful in the civil war, he still has division in his own party, a division which challenges his own leadership. That might lead to another civil war in another way. Those are the types of risks to consider in any land which is full of warlords and wandering armies living upon the people of the country.

Chiang Kai-shek does not seem to have, great as his ability has been in the past, the ability to unite the Chinese people for their own mutual benefit. He united them pretty well against Japan. He united them pretty well as an ally for us, but he has not been able to unite them for his own universal rule. Seldom has political unity ever come to China from the inside. There was political unity when the Mongol dynasty had control of China but that was a conqueror's control. There was political unity with the Manchu Dynasty but that also was a conqueror's control. China did develop a political unity during the great Sung Sung and Han dynasties, but, then, China was all south of the great wall and no one thought of Mongolia, Manchuria, Tibet, and Turkistan as being parts of China proper.

Much can be said in favor of the great progress China has made since the revolution of 1911. Politically her progress has been great. Through the help of others she got rid of German, Japanese, and some British influences, and she freed herself, through the help of America, of our and English extraterritorial jurisdiction. But she has never honestly gone about setting up her new constitution. The present government of China is more or less a dictatorship, a dictatorship which, too, cannot crush the civil war and which, too, is not powerful enough to overcome the inflation with which China now is struggling. When government's money becomes worthless, the economy and the land of that government become lost indeed.

Five hundred and ten million dollars worth of commodities may be sufficient not only to stave off starvation but may be enough to bring that money stability which will restore economic production in China. That is our hope. We must never lose sight of one fact about China which is all important. The Chinese Revolution carried on by Sun Yat-sen was a revolution against a fatalistic dogma which recognized starvation as something that could not be coped with, something that was inevitable and a part of life. It was considered natural that many would starve each year because they always had starved. That hopelessness and that helplessness which result from a people's inability to cope with a situation brought China to a place where she accepted fatalism and became confirmed in it. That, however, has been broken. The concept of progress has dawned upon certain leaders in China and that alone shows that a greater and finer day is going to dawn. If we hasten that day, we will be a beneficiary, too, of the good order which will come in the overcoming of her chaos.

Now, let us talk of military relief. To send military relief, definitely means that we take sides in the Chinese Civil War. If we start it, we will have to see it through to its conclusion, just as we will have to see the Greek Civil War through. Then, after one side is crushed as a result of our efforts, we may find that, after all, we will not have achieved a reconciliation which will unite the country because the winners may not prove themselves worthy to keep control of the government.

I feel that the wisest method is to help stave off starvation, help restore the economy of the land, help the government to bring about its own reforms by peaceful means because such reforms are the only lasting ones. Good order has never come out of war. Good order has sometimes come out of a wise peace treaty, but, without the peaceful restart after a war, good order has never persisted.

See how unwise it was to turn Formosa over to the Chinese. The loss of life, the pillaging, the misery which the victorious allies were responsible for was more devastating than if the armies had gone there to conquer instead of to set up peaceful government. Nations in the midst of civil war can hardly be trusted to carry peace anywhere and it will take years for the world to forget what took place in Formosa. Mind you, those who lost their lives were not just the former enemies, the Japanese, but they were the inhabitants of Formosa who had done no wrong to anyone and who surely had never taken sides during the last war against the Chinese. Unrestrained troops are a menace anywhere. Troops, led by leaders with decent ideals, menace no one and are sustainers of peaceful processes. China, in the first task given her, that is, the control of Formosa, failed and failed terribly. The thing to remember now, however, is that the 400,000,000 Chinese who are struggling for life were not responsible for the actions of the Chinese military that went to Formosa. It is these 400,000,000 Chinese we must think of in trying to bring peace to that troubled nation.

These are some of the problems we have to cope with as members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. These are some of the problems all of your representatives in Washington will have to help solve. These are the problems which ultimately affect the lives of all of us. People have sometimes been critical of those of their representatives who have spent so much time and given so much of their thought and energy to international relations in attempting to bring peace into the world. Surely we all now see how these big questions have a way of coming right into our very homes to live with us. Only those in America who are completely without relatives and who pay no taxes can criticize those who give their energies in attempting to bring peace and stability into the world. The hardest thing that comes to any man is to realize that mistakes are being made by those having the power of decision without the necessary background knowledge.

A Word to the Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster (Pa.) Daily Intelligencer-Journal of March 16:

A WORD TO THE WISE

Those who heard James A. Farley speak last night can understand why he isn't interested in politics, as such, any longer. His sights are set much higher.

His concern is for the future of the United States in the present crisis, and he doesn't believe that politics should be allowed to sidetrack the issues.

They must be met now, with no thought of political consequences.

Mr. Farley is confident that we can weather the present storm, provided we agree to, and support our present nonpartisan foreign policy.

And we must be tough about it.

We cannot back down.

We cannot appease.

In short, we must show our teeth.

Mr. Farley admits that there is danger of war, but he would not put off facing the fact, just to gain a brief respite.

Mr. Farley professes to know nothing of what is going on in Washington except what he reads in the newspapers. Nevertheless, he summed up the challenge the world situation presents to us, adequately and forcefully.

It must be remembered that Mr. Farley, like Mr. Byrnes, who just Saturday said approximately what Mr. Farley said last night, were both in Washington (officially) when Mr. Hitler presented a world problem, comparable with the world problem Mr. Stalin presents today.

So it would behoove good Americans to listen to their wise counsel.

They are no longer in the Government.

But they know whereof they speak, because of their past experience in the Government.

Oleomargarine Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, at the time the House Committee on Agriculture took action to table pending bills to repeal Federal taxes on oleomargarine, a resolution was adopted directing the chairman to appoint a subcommittee to make a further study of oleomargarine taxes.

I am today appointing this subcommittee. Its membership is as follows: HILL, chairman; SIMPSON of Illinois; COTTON; MCMILLAN of South Carolina; WORLEY.

I am asking the subcommittee to begin an early and comprehensive study of this very controversial question and I am sure that as a result of such study, it will be able to offer constructive suggestions in the way of a sound solution of the problem, to the full committee and the Congress. While the action of the committee in tabling further consideration of the question for the session will preclude the full committee from considering legislation during the Eightieth Congress, such suggestions as the subcommittee may make will be available for early action in the Eighty-first Congress.

In the meantime, it might be well to point out that, in addition to Federal laws, almost all States place some restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. Twenty-three States, in which reside almost two-thirds of the population of this country, prohibit both the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine. These States are as follows: California, Connecticut, Delaware,

Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

No matter what action Congress takes with respect to oleomargarine taxes, these State laws will still prevent housewives from purchasing colored oleomargarine. In other words, passing any of the pending bills will be absolutely futile as far as people living in these 23 States are concerned. A number of other States impose taxes upon colored oleomargarine, and some States restrict the sale of all oleomargarine except that manufactured from domestically produced ingredients. It is of interest to note that of the 20 bills which have been introduced to repeal Federal taxes on oleomargarine 11 are by Members coming from States which prohibit the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine. If legislation is passed, their constituents will be in exactly the same position they are now.

Because any action taken by this Congress on the question of taxation can have little effect as to consumers, it seems to me to be advisable for Congress to await the report of this subcommittee, which, I am sure, will go into all phases of the matter in a fair, impartial, and unemotional way.

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Hennepin County Review, Hopkins, Minn., of March 25. The editor of this newspaper, Jim Markham, is a keen observer of national and international affairs and an outstanding Democrat. The following editorial is typical of his keen, penetrating observations into many public questions:

ANOTHER WAR?

It was most unfortunate that President Truman didn't think to consult the congressional leaders before his message to the joint session of House and Senate last week.

The consensus in the House and Senate cloakrooms seems to be: Show us that you are right, in your crisis thinking, and we'll no doubt go along with you. But it would have been much safer had the President taken the leaders into his confidence beforehand.

If Russia is the terrifying menace to peace which the President declares her to be, the Congress presumably will provide much of the defense program asked for by the President and the military. But if it should not, if the President is unable to convince Congress in an election year of the gravity of the situation, the spectacle of a disunited United States will be of little help in fostering resistance to the Russian march abroad.

The Government at Washington has failed miserably to keep the people informed of developments abroad in the cold war with Russia. There has been altogether too much of the hush-hush in the name of so-called security. We are a nation of some 140,000,000 pretty hardy people, and we can take the bad news. Let the State Department and the White House take notice of that simple fact and in the future give the people the information they have a right to expect.

There are many citizens in the land today also who believe that the President cannot justify an attitude of resignation to war with Russia. It is granted that the Soviets are a difficult people to deal with, that they never worry about such out-dated matters as national integrity or honor. It is well known that the government of Mr. Stalin does not concern itself too much with its word. Just the same, before we resign ourselves to an inevitable war, the majority of citizens feel some more realistic moves in the interests of peace had better be made. This is no time for standing on dignity. If Mr. Stalin will not come to Washington that, of course, is humiliating. As between the humiliation of our President and another try for peace, the people will say to the President, put your humiliation in your pocket and arrange to see Mr. Stalin if you have to go to Moscow to do it.

It is more than sad to relate, but we have lost the peace as decisively as we won the war. And that fact cannot all be laid beside the Kremlin door. A good share of it must be attributed to the discouraging lack of competent leadership at Washington, D. C.

Democrats for MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have read in the newspapers of a spontaneous movement, originating entirely among Democrats, for the nomination and election of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Presidency of the United States.

The spokesman of what is an exceedingly large and rapidly growing army of Democrats is Frank D. Richardson, of Charleston, S. C., and Washington, D. C. He is the president of the Democrats for MacArthur organization, which already has or soon shall have branches in each of the 48 States and all the Territories. Mr. Richardson, in his statement announcing the formation of Democrats for MacArthur has this to say, and I quote:

The times call for the strongest man. Our country is in danger and MacArthur is the man.

There is no doubt about the strength of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He looms before us like a veritable rock of Gibraltar.

I welcome and hold out the hand of friendship to the countless Democrats who, casting aside partisan politics, realize this fact, and now are working actively for General MacArthur's nomination and election.

They show discernment, patriotism, and complete comprehension of the duties of good citizens.

I am sure that they, like many another American citizen of varying political faiths, sincerely believe that our country is in danger.

They have had, from early New Deal days and now, down through the Truman administration, one crisis after another thrust upon them. A few of these crises have been real. Most of them, however, have been manufactured for political purposes and the country today is being given a daily hypodermic of fear serum.

A very heartening aspect of this first press announcement of Democrats for MacArthur, is that it contains no reference to either the little people or the common man. I congratulate these Democrats for MacArthur upon eschewing these two sinister and erroneous phases. This is a big and great country and its only little people are its children. The mothers and fathers of America want them to grow big, in stature and in spirit, as fast as they can. As for that other misnomer, the common man, I hope those within sound of my voice can see that I smile when I say it. Even with a smile, I would hesitate to use it to any one of my constituents.

I repeat that I welcome these Democrats for MacArthur. I know that their number will grow, for I am aware of the growing resentment of many, many Democrats over the hideously cruel mistreatment of President Truman by members of his own party.

I have only contempt for the scheming, backstage political assassination maneuvers that are now in progress. They are as despicable as the degradation they seek to achieve. By wild, insensate action, plus the frenzy of despair, these plotters are like a pack of marauding jackals in attempting to tear down the candidacy of Harry S. Truman. They seem to have forgotten that he is the President of the United States, as well as the head of their party.

And as for the defection of two of the Roosevelt sons, well, that seems to me to approach a new low in political immorality.

I should like the RECORD to include the very forthright and honest statement announcing the national organization of Democrats for MacArthur, which follows:

WASHINGTON, March 28.—Formation of a Democrats for MacArthur national organization was announced here today.

The president of Democrats for MacArthur is Frank D. Richardson, of Charleston, S. C., and Washington, D. C. He is a former investment banker, a high official of the United States Treasury in the Wilson administration, and served with the OSS during the war. He also is the son-in-law of the late Charles N. Haskell, who was Oklahoma's first governor and a stalwart in the Democratic Party for more than 50 years.

"The times call for the strongest man. Our country is in danger and MacArthur is the man," said Mr. Richardson.

"In times of great national emergencies, politics should be adourned and while this is not wholly possible in a Presidential campaign year, so many Democrats regard General MacArthur as the strongest candidate for the Presidency that the formation of this organization in his behalf is not only a natural but a very necessary measure.

"Countless Democrats have advised me of their desire to put partisan politics aside and work for the nomination and election of General MacArthur. Consequently, we are

in the process of establishing branches in each of the 48 States and the Territories. We expect to assist the main organization for General MacArthur with financial aid, speakers, and campaign and election workers. We have already begun our active campaign for the general."

National headquarters of Democrats for MacArthur is 1700 I Street, Washington, D. C. The organization is the result of a canvass of the Democratic opinion in New England and mid-Western States during the winter and more recently in Texas, Oklahoma, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, and Florida.

The Case Against Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda emanating from one-worlders and the military to fasten universal military training upon the youth of this land is now attacking the Rules Committee and especially its chairman, Hon. LEO ALLEN, because this nefarious and un-American bill has not been catapulted onto the floor for debate. Even the Atlantic Monthly has joined the hue and cry for releasing this bill for immediate consideration.

It is fortunate indeed for the liberty of this country that there are such men as John Henry Martin, former consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whose article, which appeared in a recent edition of Look magazine entitled "The Case Against Universal Military Training," I am inserting in the RECORD under unanimous consent.

Unless a free people refuses to be stampeded by the impact of false propaganda, the freedom which has made this the greatest Nation on the face of the earth will be lost.

The article referred to follows:

THE CASE AGAINST UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—BASIC TRAINING FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS WILL NOT STRENGTHEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By John Henry Martin, former consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff)

The American people are being asked to support universal military training because its advocates claim only such a program can achieve national security and preparedness. The assumption is made, and the conclusion fostered, that opposition to universal military training is opposition to preparedness; that those who are against UMT are pacifists and dreamers.

Because most Americans have accepted this assumption, a feeling has been generated that opposition to universal military training is unpatriotic.

Yet, today, after a year's delay by Congress, an increasing number of important officials, who are seriously concerned with the security of our Nation, have come to realize that UMT, after closer examination, may be the single most costly and dangerous error in preparedness that this country could make.

CAN UMT PROVIDE FUTURE STRENGTH?

Universal military training has gained its greatest support from the fact that opposition has thus far failed to subject the proposal to military analysis. This analysis would ask: "What can universal military training provide toward the future military strength of the United States?" To answer this question, we must examine the relationship of UMT to those factors upon which our military position is based. The first requirement of a strong and prepared United States lies in the vigor and capacity of its professional military personnel. We need a wide-awake Army, an active Air Force, and a hard-striking Navy. We starved the services between World War I and World War II. Despite their abusive treatment, the services performed magnificently in the past war. They did so by providing a rigidly trained core of professional experts around which a huge civilian force could be rapidly assembled. The seasoned Regular was the nucleus of our wartime military expansion.

Let us examine with simple arithmetic the effect which universal military training would have on the maintenance of a vitally needed core of alert military personnel. Training 850,000 men will require personnel from the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. These services have estimated that they will ultimately need an aggregate of about 230,000 persons to operate the UMT program.

Estimates of the number of Army commissioned officers needed for UMT duty have ranged from 29,000 to more than 50,000. If the United States maintains a peacetime Army of 1,000,000, it will be staffed with approximately 100,000 officers. By using the conservative War Department estimate of 29,000 officers—considered too low by many military men—our figures indicate that about 3 out of every 10 officers will spend their time shepherding youngsters through elementary military routine—if we adopt universal military training. A proportionate number of officers will be drained from the other services for training duty.

WE'D WASTE PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS

To reduce our professional military officers to a full-time devotion to the dull, dead level of recruit training is to invite disaster. We would instantly recognize the dangerous folly of asking our too-few atomic physicists to spend their entire working day teaching science to high-school students. Under such a program, we would soon lose our first position in the field. We cannot afford to impose on our professional officers a program that would give them no opportunity to grow in their proficiency in the complexities of modern warfare.

A second basic military objection lies in the fundamental error of giving every conscripted youngster elementary combat training. At the height of World War II, the United States Army had approximately seven men in essential noncombat duty for every soldier at the front. In the Navy, for every man aboard a combatant ship, there were several on auxiliary vessels, in supply depots and shore bases throughout the world. To give every able-bodied young man in the United States elementary combat training will be wasting such training on more than 70 percent of these men in terms of their function in any future war.

UMT WILL NOT TRAIN SPECIALISTS

Training in combat warfare is the most rapidly learned skill the services require. In World War II, our primary difficulty was in getting and training the thousand varieties of specialists—noncombat specialists—which modern warfare demands. There can be no specialist training in 6 months. Under the most urgent of wartime conditions, technicians in all branches of the services, learning at war-inspired speed, took a year or more to train. Pilots were produced, frantically, in 18 months. Radar technicians were trained in about the same amount of time. Other specialties required training proportionate to their complexity.

Universal military training, being advanced as a measure to prepare us for war, is in these terms a dangerous delusion. Adopting conscription will be a comforting blindfold concealing our weakness from ourselves—but not from our potential enemies.

Another requirement for national security lies in the mysterious business and science called intelligence. An America without eyes will have another Pearl Harbor. This time, not against a fleet at anchor, but against a nation asleep. Warning will come—if it comes—only through the successful efforts of an elite intelligence corps. Training 18-year-old boys has no obvious contribution to make toward an alert intelligence effort.

INTELLIGENCE FUNDS BEING PARED

We are already witness to the dangerous manner in which other huge military expenditures are making Congress cut and pare the meager funds budgeted for the United States Central Intelligence Authority. The popular estimate of $2,000,000,000 annually for universal military training will further squeeze the pennies available in the Treasury for an infant intelligence program. It will do so at our risk.

The cost of UMT can best be understood if compared with what we could buy if we decided to spend the same amount for other things—for national defense. We should know whether our readiness for war will be more advanced through adopting UMT than it would be if a sum equal to its cost were spent on other preparedness measures.

The Secretary of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington, has stated the need for appropriations to purchase 5,200 aircraft annually during the next 5 years. By striking contrast, the aircraft appropriation for the fiscal year 1948—approximately $750,000,000—provides for the purchase of less than one-third this number of aircraft.

The appropriation for military research during the fiscal year 1948 is $550,000,000—about one-fourth of the estimated annual cost for the UMT program. Research in all branches of the service has had to be curtailed because the available funds are so pitifully weak.

RESEARCH WILL SUFFER

Research work in Government military projects is failing to attract many of our leading scientists. Since the end of the war these men have returned to civilian jobs simply because they cannot afford to work for the relatively meager salaries offered in Government research.

The guided-missile program, by public and private admission, is 10 years away from practical fulfillment. If provided with adequate funds, this program probably could be hastened to earlier completion. We have ample evidence of what can be accomplished when the lack of appropriations does not impede progress. Both the atom bomb and the German V-2 rocket came from nowhere to completion during the war.

Yet development of the atom bomb, the world's most costly and complex research program, cost less per year than the services now want for teaching boys how to shoot a rifle. Adopting UMT will withdraw $2,000,000,000 every year that could be spent on maintaining the world's best air force and the military research needed to keep our technical superiority.

The President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training has advocated UMT. But this group clearly recognizes the danger that could result in the withholding of funds from other essential parts of our total defense program. "Universal training," the Commission reports, "should not be undertaken at all unless the citizens of this country understand that it has a value only as a part of a program that will demand the expenditure of a much larger proportion of our national income than we have ever

allocated for national defense in time of peace."

What is claimed for universal military training? First, that a weak-appearing United States will tempt attack; that universal military training will give us an imposing facade of strength.

CONSCRIPTION FAILS TO PREVENT WAR

For 150 years, the nations of Europe have wasted their substance on conscription without preventing a single war. In fact, the only area of the earth where universal military training has been tried is also the continent on which all the major wars of modern history have been fought.

It would be easier to employ the historical facts to show that conscription is an invitation to war. But it does seem mildly strange that a system hated by the ancestors of our country, a system that drove many of them here, a system inexorably linked in every textbook as a contributing factor leading to war, can be foisted upon this Nation and believed by its advocates as a measure for peace.

We are told that the United States needs a trained and readily available reserve of foot soldiers in the event of war. Realizing that 15,000,000 veterans of World War II constitute a reserve of trained personnel that will be available in adequate condition for at least 10 more years, the proponents of UMT have been hard put to explain the necessity for training more—and now.

Some seem to have forgotten this fact: The veteran of World War II has received a training in combat which he will not soon forget. He demonstrated a technical and combat prowess second to none in the world. But the spokesmen for compulsory military training argue that it is unfair to expect men to be called upon twice to face an enemy in war.

YOUNGSTERS WOULD NOT FIGHT WAR

Are we seriously being asked to believe that in the event of war, this Nation will call upon 6-months-trained boys rather than recall the ablest fighting team that history has ever seen? The error of this reasoning is apparent to everyone, and it is most obvious to the veterans themselves.

There are a number of other small reasons seriously put forth by the services to support the program. The press has quoted officials at the Fort Knox universal military training experimental center, who extol the educational benefits, self-discipline, social courtesies, health, reductions in crime. There is no need to examine these claims, nor do they warrant serious study.

All that is claimed in these respects may be true. But it has nothing to do with the basic fact of military preparedness. And that is what we are here examining. Additionally, for each and all of these claimed benefits, the following can be stated beyond the possibility of denial: If our country wanted to spend annually $2,000,000,000 improving these national deficiencies in health or crime, the military forces would be the least likely agencies we would choose to carry out such reforms.

We have noted that universal military conscription would deaden the capacity of our professional officers, compete with essential intelligence needs for funds; give inadequate combat training to all, when only a small percentage will require it; fail entirely to train technicians who will be needed most; and finally, and most dangerously, will give us a false sense of security and strength.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING WOULD BE AN EXPENSIVE DELUSION

Universal military training or, to call it by its older and more honest name, conscription, would be the most expensive military delusion this Nation could undertake. To adopt it would undermine our true strength, drain our public funds in wasteful activity, and leave us in ostrich-blind exposure.

No arguments have been made here about a push-button war. No appeals have been made to sentiment or to the American mother. No quotations have been advanced from experts. Rather, we have endeavored, honestly and without emotion, to examine conscription as a question of military preparedness. Universal military training will not and cannot survive such analysis. Universal military training is an unsound proposal. It must not become American law.

Yearly cost of UMT would exceed total 1948 expenditures for planes, research, and ships.

UMT (per year)	$2,000,000,000
Aircraft (fiscal year)	750,000,000
Military research (fiscal 1948)	550,000,000
Naval ship construction (fiscal 1948)	278,000,000
Intelligence	(?)
Total	1,578,000,000

Socialism Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the last several days in the discussion of ERP we have heard many loose statements about the Socialist Party and its supposed parallel to the program of the Communist Party. Since I have lived in a city in which the major administrative power was conducted by Socialists and since I do not at all believe that the Socialist and Communist Parties are one and the same, I have asked the secretary of the Socialist Party in my district, Raymond S. Hofses, present candidate for the congressional seat now held by me, to write me a short letter defining the aims of that party. While I do not agree with their philosophy, believing rather that free enterprise under such conditions of control that it cannot injure the general public is best for full development of our resources, physical and spiritual, I do agree that their definitions are fair and able. For the information of the Members of Congress I include his reply in my remarks, also the following extract from a letter from the present candidate for Vice President on the Socialist ticket, Darlington Hoopes, of Reading, who, it may presumed, fairly represents the thinking of that party:

I am writing at this time to let you know that along with many others of your constituents I have not changed my mind about the desirability of UMT, or of the renewal of Selective Service. I am violently opposed to the dictatorship of the U. S. S. R. and to its tactics in undermining and then overrunning other countries. As you no doubt are aware, Communists hate and fear Socialists more than any other group because they realize that we know their methods and tactics and will expose and fight them to the bitter end. However, we believe that this battle should be on a political basis and not on a military one. We have enough confidence in democracy to believe that, if fair-minded people are given a chance to make a choice between democracy and dictatorship, there will be no question about what that choice will be.

Communism feeds upon fear, desperation, and frustration, and the best weapon against it is to help the people help themselves and give them hope for something better in the future. For that reason I am in favor of the economic aid of the Marshall plan.

READING LABOR ADVOCATE,
Reading, Pa., March 29, 1948.

HON. FREDERICK A. MUHLENBERG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: Since there is considerable loose thinking on the part of some of our lawmakers about the aims of Communists and Socialists, it is with the hope of making the Socialist objective clear that this letter is being written. I believe clarification on this matter is needed, not only by Members of the Congress, but also by members of our own party who may be pulled off base by the manifest fact that the capitalist private-profit economy has lead the world to wars and dictatorships, and, here at home, is able to function only with the assistance of governmental measures (subsidies, surplus stock-piling, business and labor controls, etc.) which fail to mesh with either traditional conceptions of political democracy or with official professions of faith in what is called free enterprise.

We have seen what communism has come to mean in nations which have rejected socialism by parliamentary action until their capitalist economy crashed. Democracy dies, civil liberty disappears, group power subverts or silences popular expression. Fortunately, however, we also have seen the efforts of British Socialists to establish a collectivized economy by intelligent use of the freedoms won by their forefathers. We therefore have some basis for comparison.

The American people are being told that communism aims to overthrow our Government by force and violence and that American Communists give first allegiance to a foreign government. To the extent that those charges are true, Socialists differ basically with Communists.

We Socialists do, indeed, aim to end the capitalist private-profit system and set up another economy which will be owned socially and operated democratically. It is the fulness of that aim which compels us to reject violence as a course of action.

We know in advance that freedom and democracy cannot be imposed upon a people, that they must first be desired, and that to depose one tyrant by violence inspired by resentment or despair is to become the subjects of another and a greater tyranny. So we appeal to reason and seek our ends through the employment of the tools of a political democracy.

However, having said all this, it must be recognized as a fact that not all peoples possess the tools of democracy. In countries where peaceful opportunity for radical changes have been destroyed, then, there is no recourse but to violence. Emphatically, I am offering this stipulation, not to justify what is happening in countries where freedom has long been weak but to tell you that the most important job for America's lawmakers is to see to it that the opportunity to make legal changes shall be preserved and strengthened here at home.

Socialists submit that good Americanism is what the American people decide it shall be. They are neither inhibited nor directed by the dictators of a foreign land or by the opposition of those self-styled patriots in and out of American public life who appear ready to make any revision of freedom that may become necessary to preserve an economy which enables owners to profit from the labor of workers.

I have been rather painfully avoiding an urge to justify the Socialist objective and to limit this letter to a statement on the chief points which distinguish us from Com-

munists. In closing, however, I will add that while the treatment of Socialists by Communists in other countries causes us to fear them, we also—and in no less degree—fear the 100-percent Americans who stand ready to crush socialism by methods which have already been made infamous by Fascist-minded beneficiaries of class privilege. And this in spite of the fact that on January 14 of this year the State Department told Congress that Socialists believe in democracy, fundamental freedoms such as those of speech and religion and individual rights, and are among the strongest bulwarks in Europe against communism.

Thanks for your consideration, and my apologies for the length of this letter.

Best personal wishes.

RAYMOND S. HOFSES.

A Criticism of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from my constituents, severely criticizing the President and the State Department for the way in which they have handled foreign affairs. The following letter from a citizen of my district is typical of many that I have received and is a severe criticism of the President and his State Department:

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., *March 15, 1948.*

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: Pray tell when this Republic became a dictatorship? How come the President may say that Congress cannot question the hired man? Can he do just that and get away with it?

Rather looks, if that be true, that Congress needs the Marshall plan here at home.

By the way, just what is this Marshall plan in plain English?

We hear that through it $250,000,000 worth of tobacco will be purchased to assist the French, Germans and Italians, the English, the Irish and Welsh, Belgians and Hollanders, to keep communism away from their doors.

That causes us to wonder if the whole is something of a hoax concocted to keep prices high in America, that special interests may be called upon to support the New Deal campaign.

We know you are busy as can be and sincerely hope you will find a way to thwart some of the things that seems to us to be rushing us toward communism.

Our State Department needs an immediate house cleaning.

We thank you and with best wishes.

Radio Address of Hon. Abe McGregor Goff, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include the timely and able address recently delivered by our esteemed colleague, Hon. ABE MCGREGOR GOFF, over Station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah. I commend it to the membership for their careful perusal.

THE SKY IS THE LIMIT

My fellow westerners, it is a genuine pleasure to have this opportunity to greet you again, and I regret that it is not possible to see and visit with each one of you in person.

It has been 2 years and a half since formal hostilities came to an end in the greatest and most devastating war in all this old world's long history. However that fierce struggle may have left its mark in our personal lives, we can remember the hopefulness with which we looked forward at that time to the establishment of an ordered world in which all mankind could live in peace and security. We realize now how little we comprehended the variety or magnitude of the problems at home and abroad which would rise up to plague America. We sadly underestimated the economic impact of the war's wastage and destruction. Worst of all, was our blind reliance on the gratitude, fairness, and good intentions of the Soviet Union.

The major dictators of the late thirties were Hitler, Stalin, Tojo, and Mussolini. Chiefly through our efforts, all have met the ultimate fate of dictators, except Stalin. In the necessary overthrow of three dictators, we unleashed a greater scourge. At Yalta and Teheran, a tired, sick, old man was no match for cunning Stalin. Our spokesmen failed to erect a protective bulwark against the Red menace. Communist ideas and proponents can come out of Russia freely. There is no counterflow.

Now, with a supine Germany, Soviet armies could spread out over Europe in a matter of weeks at most. But, callous of human lives as is any dictator, I doubt if Stalin considers it wise or necessary to resort to formal hostilities. Communist agents and their misguided tools in these countries are doing the job quite effectively. To an Oriental, at least in thought, time is not important. Fanatical and zealous, the disciples of Lenin reach their greatest effectiveness by pulling down nations from within rather than armed attack from without. Then, too, Stalin is smart enough to appreciate the work being done by those who toe the Communist line in the United States. Why risk provoking a war, when he thinks there may be an outside chance they may be running the show here next January? If he abandons the undercover tactics, those who think of him as a bland, kindly, much-maligned old gentleman will gather fewer votes in November. If they win, he can have his way everywhere, just as he has in Czechoslovakia. No, I do not believe Russia is yet ready to direct her armed might against the chief obstacle to world-wide Communist domination. Besides, we have the atom bomb, which she has not.

Last Wednesday the President called on Congress to speed the European recovery program, enact universal military training, and authorize the return of Selective Service. I agree that if our money can successfully underwrite a western European economic and military alliance against Russia, then a substantial investment is justified. Calm appraisal of universal military training will disclose that its adoption would be a step in the wrong direction. It would furnish no immediate recruits to swell our armed services, and would be wasteful and ineffective as a long-range program. I favor immediate restoration of Selective Service operational machinery and resort to the draft in case volunteers sufficient to supply necessary manpower do not come forward.

Failure of the President to stress air power was an amazing omission. He designated Russia as our only potential enemy. If he is right, then we should shape our defense plans to meet that contingency.

Any outside attack upon us by that power can come only by air. Flight over the polar icecap is the shortest approach to our industrial centers, which would be the primary target. Coupled with this would undoubtedly be sabotage, which would include the stealthy preplacement, by agents, of mass destruction weapons. Guided missiles might be employed, but our territory is still too far away for these to be accurate, even if such missiles could reach us.

While Russia has been quietly building a formidable submarine flotilla, based on improved German design, she has no surface navy of consequence to hold off our own fleet, even if she had the transports to convey a mass army to our shores for an invasion. She cannot attack us by sea.

We know that the Soviet is building a great air fleet. She has already made good use of the B–29's seized when they landed on Russian soil during the war, and observers report that planes of like design are already in the air. In contrast, we have permitted our own air force to deteriorate. Its planes are largely those left over from hostilities. Worse than that, we have permitted our aircraft industry to run down. If an attack should come, neither our ground forces nor the Navy can save us. We must be capable of meeting and turning the full effect of an air attack. We must be able to inflict swift destruction by air retaliation. We must patiently persist in peaceful means and open discussion, in an effort to settle our difficulties, but the one thing which will constitute a sure deterrent against such an attack is the knowledge that we could more than hold our own, if it came. I feel that those who would commit us to the training of a mass ground army by a program of universal military training have failed to analyze the necessity of a more modern approach to our problem.

Air power is the one effective way to carry the war to Russia. History warns us of the futility of meeting her mass ground armies. Napoleon tried this and was utterly defeated. Hitler invaded Russia with 220 crack divisions at the height of German military power. We are hopelessly outdistanced in manpower at the start with the millions of troops that the Soviet could put in the field. The swiftest, surest, cheapest means, and that which would insure the least casualties, would be the employment of the new strategy by air, which was so successful against Japan. If war comes, the only choice is to destroy industrial capacity. Armies without a source of supply, with frightful devastation in the homeland, will become impotent. What Russia fears is the terrible sting carried by a swarm of superbombers. If we acquire air supremacy, we can prevent a war, because we will not start it, and Russia will not risk it.

My bill, introduced during the special session, is to retrieve our air supremacy. It provides for the immediate construction this year of 6,000 additional military planes and for constant scientific air research in the development of aircraft, rockets, guided missiles, atomic weapons, electronic equipment, and other modern offensive and defensive equipment to the limit of American genius. I do not mean that we should entirely neglect the building up of a reasonable land force. But the function of such a force will inevitably be secondary. If we need more manpower, we can turn to the selective draft. The universal military training bill reported out by the House Armed Services Committee is an ill-assorted compromise designed to curry the support of those who have qualms against large-scale, purely military service in peacetime. It will take away all our able-bodied young men from their civilian pursuits, and we do not need so many. While it is recommended by most of our military leaders and by the President, I share the

view privately voiced by many officers that we can place no confidence whatever in its effectiveness. As a member, for a time, of General MacArthur's staff, I believe I am safe in saying that this is his view. It is not an answer to present manpower problems, because the trainees will not even be a part of our armed services, but take up a considerable part of the precious time in a half-baked schedule under a civilian board. I am quite sure that most of the people who have signed petitions to Congress for the speedy enactment of this bill have neither read nor understand its provisions.

I am afraid too many people confuse universal military training with national defense. It seems to me that in the grave world situation we face we must concentrate our wealth and effort on decisive weapons instead of spreading them thin on means which will not give us the ultimate in military power. Millions of half-trained men here will not dissuade Russia from attacking us or from overrunning Europe. Machines and not men will win the next war if it comes. I firmly believe we court disaster if we prepare to accept battle on the surface of the earth. National survival and the survival of liberty in the whole world depend on concentrating our efforts on the one way where American ingenuity, productive capacity, and technical skill can overcome the superior manpower we would face.

Finally, I charge you, as loyal Americans, to man the watchtowers on the alert for the foe within. Infestation by political invasion is the proven pattern of the Communist advance.

I regret that we must discuss war and preparation against it when the great church festival of Easter is so near. Let us hope that another year will find us in a happier situation.

God bless you all.

General Mitchell Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the following letter, with the enclosed United Press dispatch of March 27, 1948, from Mr. Joseph Greenwood, Clinton, Ind.

Mr. Greenwood's sentiments in regard to the great World War I hero, Gen. "Billy" Mitchell would be echoed by all who served under him and knew him as a military officer.

CLINTON, IND., *March 27, 1948.*

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RAY: I just read the enclosed clipping in regard to the vindicating of Billy Mitchell which I am sure will be joyfully received by all those who served under him.

I had the pleasure of serving as an enlisted man in the air service under Billy and I can assure you if our general officers today were as democratic and used the same diplomacy as General Mitchell, a universal military training bill would not be necessary as young men would be glad to enlist.

This article should have made headlines.

Best wishes,

JOSEPH GREENWOOD.

AIR FORCE VINDICATES GEN. BILLY MITCHELL

WASHINGTON, March 27.—Brig. Gen. William L. (Billy) Mitchell was honored posthumously today for the fight he lost in disgrace 22 years ago in behalf of a powerful and vigorous air force.

Before a gathering of top officials of the armed services, old-time flyers and Members of Congress, Gen. Carl Spaatz, air force chief of staff, presented a special Gold Medal of Honor to the pioneer airman's son, 19-year-old Billy, Jr.

"Billy," Spaatz said solemnly, "your father was the inspiration for all that the Air Force is today."

Typical Reaction to President's Recent Address to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from my constituents giving me their reactions on the President's recent address to the joint assembly of the two Houses of Congress. Some have said that it reminded them of the age-old strategy of an attempt of a leader to weld together his diverted forces at home by directing their attention to a foreign enemy. The desertion within the ranks of those who normally would be the President's followers, has apparently been most disconcerting to the administration. In desperation, naturally an attempt would be made to consolidate party factions. The split over the civil-rights program of the President and other vital issues has caused much comment.

However, my people think the President failed to tell the Congress or the people anything new. Everything he said seems to have been known before he delivered his message last week. They anxiously awaited and expected to hear the real story behind the scenes. They wanted the facts and are demanding them before the administration throws us into another vortex of war.

Some have suggested that the strategy which they think he attempted to employ was a reflection on their intelligence. The American people are quick to discern what is back of the message and they do not hesitate in writing their Congressmen to express themselves freely on this subject. A typical example of the letters and comments I have received is contained in the following letter from Tulsa, Okla., dated March 14, 1948, addressed to me by a prominent leader in one of our most highly respected labor unions, and reads as follows:

I have read the President's speech to Congress. I have heard his talk the same night in New York. To me they have the familiar ring of the last two world wars. There were slogans then: "He kept us out of war," "Our boys will not be sent to fight on a foreign soil," "All assistance short of war," and Churchill's statement to the effect that we were not supposed to furnish manpower to fight that war, and then we furnished not only 75 percent of the manpower on the western front but most of the money and munitions.

The repeal of the Neutrality Act, the arming of merchantmen, the use of ships given to England, then the peacetime draft, and the final attack at Pearl Harbor, and war.

The parallel is almost deadly. I have never been convinced that with proper and factual understanding, that this Nation might not have avoided both world wars of the past.

I am not convinced now that the American people are properly informed—that means the millions like me—to agree in cool and calm and dispassionate manner to the peacetime draft and selective service of the wartimes. If it is necessary to fight another war I want my elected officials to tell us that it is, to tell us the reasons why and to uncover for us so we may honestly make up our minds any agreements or misunderstandings that may have been made concerning the last world war, and any that may have been made since.

I am not convinced that it was or is inevitable unless we set ourselves up as a police force of the world. I am not an advocate of trying to police any other part of the world, nor am I of the belief that we will be able to eternally do this.

I believe now and have believed from the beginning that the only thing such things as the Marshall plan or other organized aid to Europe and Asia will do will be to place us in a position that we will at some future time get into war to protect those plans. We cannot buy loyalty and friendship.

For these reasons I am opposed to the selective service, to the draft of manpower, to the Marshall plan or any other plan to try to run the world our way. If this is a stop communism movement let us wonder if that is not a stop democracy movement. If this is to be the battle of Armageddon let us now know it, and let us realize that it will possibly mean the utter break-down of civilization where there will be neither communism or democracy, but only a terrible effort to survive by individuals.

I know you have been against these things. Unless you have more information than I do I hope you still will maintain your position. I want full information.

Tariff Classifications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the following list prepared by the United States Tariff Commission compares old and new rates of duty on 122 tariff classifications. Every tariff item imported in excess of $1,000,000 in 1939 is listed. Together they accounted for a large part of our prewar dutiable imports. Of these classifications, 112 were affected in recent trade agreements; 83 rates were lowered, most of them very substantially; two quotas were increased, and 27 rates were bound or frozen.

The President has asked for another 3 years in which to conduct new negotiations aimed at lowering tariffs still further. Apparently there is no minimum short of absolute free trade that will satisfy him.

List of the most important dutiable tariff items included for consideration in the Geneva trade agreements—Comparison of tariff rates under Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930 with rate actually in effect in 1945 and the Geneva agreement rate

[Includes all classes subject to duties in which imports were valued at $1,000,000 or over in 1939]

Commodity	Tariff Act of—			1945 rate [1]	Geneva agreement rate
	1913	1922	1930		
Cattle weighing less than 200 pounds each:					
(a) Entries not in excess of 100,000 head per calendar year.	Free	1½ cents per pound	2½ cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	1½ cents per pound—bound.
(b) Entries in excess of 100,000 head per calendar year.	do	do	do	do	1½ cents per pound up to 200,000 head. 2½ cents per pound in excess of 200,000 head (quotas not effective until end of meat shortage).
Cattle n. s. p. f. weighing 700 pounds or more each, other than dairy cows:					
(a) Entries not in excess of 60,000 head per calendar quarter year or of 225,000 head per calendar year.	do	1½ or 2 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound	do	1½ cents per pound—bound.
(b) Entries in excess of 60,000 head per calendar quarter year or of 225,000 head per calendar year.	do	do	do	do	1½ cents per pound on quantity up to 120,000 head per quarter or 400,000 annually; 2½ cents per pound in excess of quotas (quotas not effective until end of meat shortage).
Whitefish not further advanced than beheaded or eviscerated.	do	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	¾ cent per pound	½ cent per pound.
Sardines valued over 9 cents per pound	25 percent	30 percent	30 percent	30 percent [2]	15 to 44 percent. [13]
Fish in containers weighing not over 15 pounds, salted cod, etc., containing more than 43 percent moisture.	15 percent	25 percent	¾ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound	¼ cent per pound.
Crab meat, crab sauce, and paste:					
Meat	Free	15 percent	15 percent	22½ percent	22½ percent—not in agreement.
Sauce and paste	25 percent	30 percent	do	do.[3]	
Calfskins, wet salted	Free	Free	10 percent	5 percent	5 percent—bound.
Calf and kip leather, upper	do	do	15 percent	15 percent [2]	12½ percent.
Calf and kip leather, lining	do	do	do	12½ percent	10 percent.
Leather footwear, women's, "other"	do	do	20 percent	20 percent	20 percent—bound.
Leather gloves not over 12 inches, machine-seamed, not overseamed, not lined:					
Men's	$2.50 per dozen pair	$5 per dozen pair [4]	$7 per dozen pair [5]	$5 per dozen pair [6]	$5 per dozen pair, but not less than 25 percent.
Women's and children's	$2 per dozen pair	$4 per dozen pair [4]	$6.50 per dozen pair [5]	$6.50 per dozen pair [5]	$6 per dozen pair, but not less than 40 percent.
Silver or black fox:					
Dressed	30 percent	50 percent	50 percent	35 percent (changed to 37½ percent).	37½ percent—bound.
Undressed	Free	do	do	35 percent (effective May 1, 1947).	
Bristles; sorted, bunched, or prepared	7 cents per pound	7 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound [2]	3 cents per pound, bound.
Feathers for beds	20 percent	20 percent	20 percent	20 percent [2]	10 percent.
Oats	6 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.	15 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.	16 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.	8 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.	4 cents per bushel of 32 pounds.
Barley malt	25 cents per bushel of 34 pounds.	40 cents per 100 pounds.	40 cents per 100 pounds.	40 cents per 100 pounds.	30 cents per 100 pounds.
Bran, shorts, and other wheat byproduct feeds.	Free	15 percent	10 percent	5 percent	2½ percent.
Bran and other wheat byproduct feed withdrawn from bonded mills.	do	do	do	do	Do.
Potatoes, white or Irish, certified seed:					
(a) Entries not in excess of 1,500,000 bushels of 60 pounds each per year.	do	50 cents per 100 pounds.	75 cents per 100 pounds.	37½ cents per 100 pounds.	37½ cents per 100 pounds.
(b) Entries in excess of 1,500,000 bushels of 60 pounds each per year.	do	do	do	75 cents per 100 pounds.	37½ cents per 100 pounds on quantity up to 2,500,000 bushels. 75 cents per 100 pounds in excess of 2,500,000 bushels.
Tomatoes, fresh	15 percent	½ cent per pound	3 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	Various.[7]
Pineapples, in crates	6 cents per cubic foot	22½ cents per crate of 1.96 cubic feet.	50 cents per crate of 2.45 cubic feet.	35 cents per crate of 2.45 cubic feet.	35 cents per crate of 2.45 cubic feet—not in agreement.
Pineapples, prepared or preserved:					
Candied, crystalized, or glaced	20 percent	35 percent	35 percent	35 percent	35 percent—not in agreement.
Otherwise prepared or preserved	20 percent	2 cents per pound	2 cents per pound	1 cent per pound	¾ cent per pound.
Brazil nuts, shelled	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	4½ cents per pound	2¼ cents per pound	1½ cents per pound.
Brazil nuts, not shelled	do	do	1½ cents per pound	¾ cent per pound	⅜ cent per pound.
Cashew nuts	do	do	2 cents per pound	2 cents per pound [2]	1½ cents per pound.
Cottonseed oil, refined	Free	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound [2]	3 cents per pound—bound.
Vanilla beans	30 cents per pound	30 cents per pound	30 cents per pound	15 cents per pound	15 cents per pound—bound.
Cane sugar 96° (from Cuba)	1.0048 cents per pound	1.7648 cents per pound.	2 cents per pound	0.75 cent per pound	0.50 cent per pound.[8]
Molasses not used for extraction of sugar or for human consumption.	Testing not above 40° —15 percent. Testing above 40° but not over 56°—2¼ cents per gallon.	½ cent per gallon when not above 52 percent total sugars ⅛ cent for each percent above 52 percent total sugars.	0.03 cent per pound of total sugars.	0.03 cent per pound of total sugars.[2]	0.03 cent per pound of total sugars—bound.
Maple sugar	3 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	8 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	2 cents per pound.
Brandy	$2.60 per proof gallon	$5 per proof gallon	$5 per proof gallon	$2.50 per proof gallon	$1.25 per proof gallon.
Rum in containers holding 1 gallon or less	do	do	do	do	$2.25 per proof gallon.
Whisky	do	do	do	do	$1.50 per proof gallon.
Cordials	do	do	do	do	$1.25 per proof gallon.
Vermouth in containers holding 1 gallon or less.	Not over 14 percent alcohol, 45 cents per gallon. More than 14 percent alcohol, 60 cents per gallon.	$1.25 per gallon	$1.25 per gallon	62½ cents per gallon	50 cents per gallon.
Still wines produced from grapes, containing 14 percent or less alcohol, in containers holding 1 gallon or less.	45 cents per gallon	do	do	75 cents per gallon	40 cents per gallon.
Malt liquors in containers holding 1 gallon or less.	In bottles or jugs, 45 cents per gallon; otherwise, 23 cents per gallon.	$1 per gallon	$1 per gallon	25 cents per gallon	25 cents per gallon but if domestic tax is applied to imports duty becomes 12½ cents per gallon.
Castor beans	15 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.	½ cent per pound	½ cent per pound	¼ cent per pound	¼ cent per pound—bound.
Perilla oil	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free—bound.
Tax				4½ cents per pound [9]	3 cents per pound.[9]

Footnotes at end of table.

List of the most important dutiable tariff items included for consideration in the Geneva trade agreements—Comparison of tariff rates under Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930 with rate actually in effect in 1945 and the Geneva agreement rate—Continued

[Includes all classes subject to duties in which imports were valued at $1,000,000 or over in 1939]

Commodity	Tariff Act of—			1945 rate [1]	Geneva agreement rate
	1913	1922	1930		
Tulip bulbs	$1 per thousand	$2 per thousand	$6 per thousand	$3 per thousand	$3 per thousand—bound.
Cigar leaf wrapper tobacco, unstemmed	$1.85 per pound	$2.10 per pound	$2.27½ per pound	$1.50 per pound	$1 per pound.
Cigar leaf filler tobacco:					
Unstemmed, from Cuba	28 cents per pound	28 cents per pound	28 cents per pound	14 or 28 cents per pound.[19]	14 cents per pound.
Stemmed, from Cuba	40 cents per pound	40 cents per pound	40 cents per pound	20 or 40 cents per pound.[19]	20 cents per pound.
Cigarette leaf tobacco, unstemmed	35 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	30 cents per pound	15 cents per pound on Latakia type only.
Hops, valued at 30 cents or more per pound.	16 cents per pound	24 cents per pound	24 cents per pound	24 cents per pound[3]	12 cents per pound (on hops valued at 50 cents or more per pound only).
Peat moss	50 cents per ton	50 cents per ton	50 cents per ton	50 cents per ton [3]	50 cents per ton—not in agreement.
Cotton cloth:					
Bleached	10 to 30 percent, depending on yarn number.	0.45 cent per average number to No. 40; above No. 40, 18 cents per pound+⅜ cent per average yarn number with a minimum ad valorem of 13 percent+¼ cent per average yarn number to No. 80; a maximum of 33 percent above No. 80.	13.35 to 44.50 percent, depending on yarn number.	10.25 to 36 percent, depending on yarn number and value.	7¾ to 27½ percent, depending on yarn number and value (concession limited to cloth over specified values).
Printed, dyed, or colored	do	Not over No. 40, 5⅝₀₀ cent per average number per pound. Above No. 40, 22 cents per pound+⁹⁵⁄₁₀₀ cent per average number per pound exceeding No. 40; minimum ad valorem of 15 percent+516 of 1 percent average yarn number to No. 40; and the maximum of 40 percent above No. 80.	16.35 to 47.50 percent, depending on yarn number.	12.25 to 39 percent, depending on yarn number and value.	10¾ to 32 percent, depending on yarn number and value (concession on yarn numbers not over 90 limited to specified values).
Tapestries and upholstery cloths of cotton or other vegetable fiber.	35 percent	45 percent	55 percent	55 percent [3]	40 percent.
Gloves and mittens of warp-knit fabric, valued at $1.50 or more per dozen pairs.	do	50 percent	60 percent	60 percent [3]	$1.50 per dozen pairs but not less than 30 percent or more than 60 percent.
Cotton wearing apparel, embroidered, etc.	60 percent	75 percent	90 percent	75 percent	50 percent.
Cotton laces, machine-made, 12 point and finer.	do	90 percent	do	60 percent	45 percent.
Cotton articles embroidered, etc., n. s. p. f., "other" hand-made.	do	do	do	90 percent [3]	70 percent.
Cotton imitation oriental rugs (without fringe).	20 percent	35 percent	35 percent	20 percent	10 percent.
Rugs, n. e. s., cotton	do	do	do	35 percent [3]	17½ percent (on cut pile and hand-hooked only).
Burlaps, not bleached, etc	Free	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	½ cent per pound.
Bags of jute, not bleached	10 percent	1 cent per pound+10 percent.	1 cent per pound+10 percent.	1 cent per pound+10 percent.[2]	½ cent per pound+5 percent.
Flax, hackled	Free	2 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	1½ cents per pound—bound.
Flax, not hackled, value $340 or more per ton.	do	1 cent per pound	1½ cents per pound	¾ cent per pound	¾ cent per pound—bound.
Plain woven fabrics of flax weighing less than 4 ounces per square yard.	30 percent	35 percent	35 percent	20 percent	10 percent.
Table damask of flax exceeding 130 threads per square inch.	35 percent	40 percent	45 percent	25 percent	15 percent.
Woven fabrics, n. s. p. f. of flax	30 percent	do	40 percent	20 percent	10 percent.
Handkerchiefs wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber other than cotton, embroidered, etc., by hand, valued more than 70 cents per dozen.	60 percent	75 percent	4 cents each + 40 percent.	4 cents each + 40 percent.[2]	3 cents each + 20 percent.
Articles or fabrics, embroidered, tamboured, appliqued, etc., of vegetable fiber other than cotton, not including wearing apparel.	do	do	90 percent	90 percent [3]	45 percent or 70 percent.[11]
Donskoi and similar wools, in the grease	Free	12 cents per pound	24 cents per pound [12]	13 cents per pound [11]	13 cents per pound—bound.[11]
All other wools not finer than 40's in the grease.	do	do	do[12]	do[11]	Do[11]
Wools n. s. p. f. in the grease, finer than 44's not finer than 56's.	do	31 cents per pound	34 cents per pound	34 cents per pound [3]	25½ cents per pound.
Wools, n. s. p. f. in the grease finer than 56's.	do	do	do	do. [3]	Do.
Wool noils, not carbonized	do	19 cents per pound	23 cents per pound	16 cents per pound	12 cents per pound.
Wool rags	do	7½ centsper pound	18 cents per pound	9 cents per pound	9 cents per pound—bound.
Wool fabrics, except woven green billiard cloths more than 11 and not more than 15 ounces per square yard; over 4 ounces per square yard:					
Valued, $0.80 to $1.25 per pound	30 percent	45 cents per pound+50 percent.	50 cents per pound+50 percent.	50 cents per pound+40 percent.	37½ cents per pound+25 percent.
Valued, $1.25 to $2 per pound	do	do	50 cents per pound+55 percent.	do	Do.
Valued over $2 per pound	do	do	50 cents per pound+60 percent.	50 cents per pound+35 percent.	Do.
Oriental, Axminster, etc., rugs and mats.	50 percent	55 percent	50 cents per square foot but not less than 45 percent.	25 cents per square foot but not less than 22½ percent.	15 cents per square foot but not less than 22½ percent.
All-silk woven fabrics:					
Valued, $5.50 or less per pound	45 percent	do	55 to 65 percent depending on width and weave.	55 to 65 percent depending on width and weave.	55 to 65 percent depending on width and weave—not in agreement.
Valued over $5.50 per pound	do	do	do	45 percent	25 percent.

Footnotes at end of table.

List of the most important dutiable tariff items included for consideration in the Geneva trade agreements—Comparison of tariff rates under Tariff Acts of 1913, 1922, and 1930 with rate actually in effect in 1945 and the Geneva agreement rate—Continued

[Includes all classes subject to duties in which imports were valued at $1,000,000 or over in 1939]

Commodity	Tariff Act of—			1945 rate [1]	Geneva agreement rate
	1913	1922	1930		
Filaments of rayon not exceeding 30 inches in length.	Not in commerce	20 percent	25 percent	25 percent [2]	20 percent.
Hat materials, straw, not bleached, etc.	15 percent	15 percent	15 percent	15 percent [2]	7½ percent.
Hats, not sewed, etc., of paper, bleached, etc.	25 percent	35 percent	25 cents per dozen+25 percent.	25 cents per dozen+25 percent.[2]	25 cents per dozen+15 percent.
Lumber, spruce, western white	Free	Free	$1 per M board feet	50 cents per M board feet.	25 cents per M board feet.
Lumber, spruce, other than western white.	do	do	do	do	Do.
Tax [9]				$1.50 per M board feet.	75 cents per M board feet.
Lumber, pine, northern white and Norway pine.	do	do	do	50 cents per M board feet.	25 cents per M board feet.
Cedar siding	do	do	Free	Free	Free.
Tax [9]				$1.50 per M board feet.	75 cents per M board feet.
Boards, maple, birch, and beech (not flooring).	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free.
Tax [9]				$1.50 per M board feet.	$1.50 per M board feet—bound.
Cabinet woods, other than mahogany, Spanish cedar, etc.	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free.
Tax [9]				$1.50 per M board feet.	$1.50 per M board feet—bound.
Cigarette paper in bobbins	50 percent	60 percent	60 percent	45 percent	30 percent.
Residual fuel oil	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free.
Tax [6]				¼-cent per gallon	¼-cent per gallon—bound.
Unfinished oils (petroleum)	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free.
Tax [9]				¼ cent per gallon	¼ cent per gallon—pound.
Paraffin wax	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free.
Tax [9]				1 cent per pound	½ cent per pound.
Portland cement, not including white nonstaining.	Free	Free	6 cents per 100 pounds.	4½ cents per 100 pounds.	2¼ cents per 100 pounds.
China clay	$1.25 per ton	$2.50 per ton	$2.50 per ton	$1.75 per ton	$1.25 per ton.
China tableware, decorated, except bone china.	55 percent	70 percent	70 percent+10 cents per dozen pieces.	70 percent+10 cents per dozen pieces.[2]	35 percent+10 cents per dozen pieces or 45 percent+10 cents per dozen pieces (limited to ware over specified values).
Earthenware tableware, decorated, "other."	40 percent	50 percent	10 cents per dozen pieces+50 percent.	10 cents per dozen pieces+50 percent.[2]	10 cents per dozen pieces+20 or 25 percent (limited to ware over specified values).
Diamonds, cut but not set (less than 10 stones per carat).	20 percent	20 percent	10 percent	10 percent [3]	10 percent—bound.
Diamonds, cut but not set (10 or more stones per carat).	do	do	do	do [3]	Do.
"Other" precious and semiprecious stones, cut but not set.	do	do	do	do [3]	5 percent.
"Other" imitation stones, cut but not set.	do	do	20 percent	20 percent [3]	10 percent.
Iron and steel girders, etc., not assembled or advanced.	10 percent	⅛ cent per pound	⅛ cent per pound	⅛ cent per pound [3]	⅛ cent per pound.
Tubes of iron and steel not containing alloy.	20 percent	25 percent	25 percent	25 percent [3]	25 percent—not in agreement.
Manganese ore containing 35 percent and over of manganese.	Free	1 cent per pound of metallic manganese.	1 cent per pound of metallic manganese.	½ cent per pound of metallic manganese.	¼ cent per pound of metallic manganese.
Ferromanganese, containing 30 per cent or more manganese and 1 to 4 percent carbon.	do	1⅛ cents per pound of metallic manganese.	1⅛ cents per pound of metallic manganese.	1⅛ cents per pound [3] of metallic manganese.	1 1/16 cent per pound of metallic manganese.
Ferromanganese, containing 30 percent or more manganese and not less than 4 percent carbon.	do	do	do	1 cent per pound of metallic manganese.	1 1/16 cent per pound of metallic manganese.
Tungsten ore other than for refining and export.	do	45 cents per pound of metallic tungsten.	50 cents per pound of metallic tungsten.	50 cents per pound [2] of metallic tungsten.	38 cents per pound of metallic tungsten.
Spiegeleisen, less than 30 percent manganese, more than 1 percent carbon.	do	75 cents per ton	75 cents per ton	75 cents per ton	75 cents per ton—bound.
Bauxite, crude	do	$1 per ton	$1 per ton	$1 per ton [3]	50 cents per ton.
Aluminum metal in crude form	2 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	2 cents per pound.
Copper, unrefined black, blister, etc.	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free.
Tax [9]				4 cents per pound of copper content.	2 cents per pound of copper content.
Nickel, in pigs, ingots, etc.	10 percent	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	2½ cents per pound	1¼ cents per pound.
Zinc ores	do	Free to 1½ cents per pound zinc content.	1½ cents per pound of zinc content.	¾ cent per pound of zinc content.	¾ cent per pound of zinc content—bound.
Zinc blocks, pigs, and slabs	15 percent	1¾ cents per pound	1¾ cents per pound	⅞ cent per pound	⅞ cent per pound—bound.
Machinery and parts, n. e. s., except agricultural.	20 percent	30 percent	27½ percent	27½ percent [3]	15 percent.
Cobalt oxide	10 cents per pound	20 cents per pound	20 cents per pound	10 cents per pound	10 cents per pound—bound.
Cartridge roll film	Free	1/10 cent per linear foot.	25 percent	12½ percent	6¼ percent.
Motion-picture film, 1 inch or more in width, positive.	do	1 cent per linear foot	1 cent per linear foot	½ cent per linear foot.	½ cent per linear foot—not in agreement.
Books, etc., of foreign authorship, "other".	15 percent	15 percent	15 percent	7½ percent	5 percent.

[1] Rate actually in force in 1945.
[2] No change in 1930 rate.
[3] Flexible tariff change (rate of duty changed under sec. 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930).
[4] But not less than 50 nor more than 70 percent.
[5] But not less than 50 percent.
[6] But not less than 30 percent.
[7] Until the President proclaims the end of the unlimited national emergency and that the abnormal situation in respect to tomatoes has terminated, the rate will continue at 1½ cents per pound. After that time various rates ranging from 1¼ to 2¼ cents per pound will be in effect during various parts of the year.
[8] Import compensating taxes omitted because they are levied to equalize tax on domestic sugar.
[9] Import excise tax (taxable under Internal Revenue Code).
[10] Lower rates applied when total imports of Cuban leaf filler and scrap tobacco did not exceed 22,000,000 pounds each year; higher rates applied on imports in excess of that quantity.
[11] Sheets, pillowcases, and damask tablecloths and napkins, 45 percent; other, 70 percent.
[12] When entered under bond and actually used in manufacturing carpeting and certain other items, entitled to free entry.
[13] Sardines, neither skinned nor boned: Valued not over 13 cents per pound, 44 percent; valued over 13 cents but not over 18 cents per pound, 30 percent; valued over 18 cents but not over 23 cents per pound, 20 percent; valued over 23 cents per pound, 15 percent.

Our Electoral System Is in Urgent Need of Remodeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by me on the subject of our electoral college system appearing in the April 1948 issue of the Progressive magazine.

The article is as follows:

OUR ELECTORAL SYSTEM IS IN URGENT NEED OF REMODELING

(By Representative ESTES KEFAUVER)

Some southern leaders of the Democratic Party have been crashing the national headlines with threats that Presidential electors chosen within their States would desert the national Democratic ticket in the November election.

These southern rebels against the party's national leadership have pointed out that there was nothing in the Constitution or in State legislation that would commit the southern members of the so-called electoral college to support the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates chosen at the Democratic National Convention. They emphasized that there were two choices open to bolting electors from Southern States:

1. They could cast their ballots for the Republican Party's candidates. This move, if it comprised a sufficient number of Southern States, would certainly assure a Republican victory, or

2. They could cast their votes for neither the Democratic nor Republican candidates. This move might well succeed in preventing either the Democratic candidates or the Republican candidates from obtaining a majority of all the electoral votes in the country.

If this should happen, the election of a President would then devolve upon the House of Representatives. Under the Constitution, each State would then have one vote, and the Southern States, acting as a unified bloc, might determine the outcome.

Most political commentators have refused to take this threat very seriously. They have pointed out again and again that a similar threat had been made in 1944, particularly on the part of a significant portion of the Democratic electors in Texas. The Texas threat soon blew over, however, and all the Texas electors ended up in the Roosevelt-Truman column. They have also cited the unwritten tradition in America that the electors chosen within any State are morally bound to cast their votes for the convention nominee of the party on whose ticket they ran. Any elector who disregarded this tradition would be regarded as guilty of having violated an unwritten law.

To any serious student of the American political scene, however, these recurrent threats of revolt in the electoral college have tremendous significance. It is often said that the electoral college system of electing Presidents, while useless, is harmless. If this were true, the system would be a minor defect indeed in our political structure and, at a time when America is beset by so many world-shaking problems, it might well be ignored.

But anyone who studies the subject closely will see that it is not true. The entire electoral college system is riddled through with so many serious and dangerous defects that it has been under serious criticism ever since it was first put into operation.

The greatest demonstration of popular government in our time is when 50,000,000 or more American citizens, with freedom of thought and action, go to the polls and determine who shall be the next President of the United States. No patriotic citizen will question the contention that such an election should be conducted under rules which will definitely result in the election of one of the candidates and that all votes should be counted by a method that will accurately and justly reflect the will of the American people. We do not have such a system today.

Section 1, article II of the Constitution provides that each State shall be entitled to a number of Presidential electors equivalent to the number of Senators and Representatives of that State in Congress; that the electors of each State shall meet in the State capitol on the same day and choose a President of the United States and a vice president.

What's wrong with this procedure?

Everything—for a democracy.

First of all, as is indicated by the recurrent threat of revolt among the electors, there is always the danger that some electors will not actually cast their votes for the national candidates of their party. State legislation, on the whole, has left undefined the responsibility of electors to cast their ballots for the candidates of their own political party.

A recent study shows that "only two States, California and Oregon, have enacted legislation imposing a duty upon electors to vote for the candidates of the political party which they represent. Only Oregon exacts from an elector a pledge that he vote for his party's nominees for President and vice president."

Second, the system is far too open to the possibility of a President being selected by the House of Representatives, an extremely undesirable procedure. In order to win, a candidate must obtain a majority of all the electoral votes—266. It is perfectly clear, then, that in the event of a close contest between the two major parties any third party which obtains a few electoral votes can prevent the immediate election of the major party candidate who obtains only a plurality (that is, the greatest number of votes but less than an arithmetical majority). Once the election is thrown into the House it would be possible, as has happened on three occasions in American history, for a candidate with the second highest number of votes to be elected President.

Third, each State casts its electoral votes as a unit. The total electoral vote within any State goes to the candidate who has obtained the plurality within the State. The votes cast for opposition candidates within the same State are not counted in the final outcome. Thus, if a candidate wins by a plurality of one vote the entire electoral vote of the State goes for that candidate.

There are other minor defects, but these three are of sufficient importance to warrant affirmative action to change the system.

The current controversy over the President's recent civil-rights message also highlights the underdeveloped political rote of the South. No matter what one may think about the merits or demerits of the various proposals for dealing with the problem of discrimination and minority rights (and this is not the place to discuss the substantiative issues that are involved), it is clear that the national leaders of the Democratic Party regard the South as "safe."

Since it is confidently expected that the South will vote Democratic, no matter what policies are followed by the Democratic Party, the national leaders of the party are under little compulsion to give adequate consideration to the special problems of the South.

The same is true with the Republican Party—but for a different reason. To the Republican leaders there seems to be no chance whatever of obtaining the electoral votes of Southern States (except under unusual circumstances such as those that developed in the 1928 election), so there is no reason why they either should give adequate attention to the special problems of the South.

This neglect of the South by our major political parties affects not only the formation of national policies but also the entire character of election activity in America.

Since both national parties are mainly concerned with winning the electoral votes of the doubtful States and since the South is hardly ever doubtful, a system has developed of political discrimination against southerners in the selection of Presidential candidates.

In the early days of the Republic our most outstanding Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Madison—came from the Southern States. Today some of the most capable men in the country, unsurpassed in ability and integrity, come from the South. Yet today such men, while their abilities may be recognized throughout the Nation, have no chance of being nominated as the Presidential candidate of either party. As the result of the electoral-college system, each party is forced to judge potential candidates by their ability to carry a small handful of doubtful States in the North.

Moreover, once the two national conventions have been held and the candidates are selected, the campaign is concentrated mainly in the doubtful States. National organizations are forced by the logic of circumstances to give practically all of their attention to these pivotal States. The South is pitifully neglected.

Finally, the present system deters southern voters from exercising their right to vote. The Democratic voter feels sure that the electoral votes in his State go to the Democratic candidate; there is more reason for him to stay home on election day. The Republican voters knows that no matter how many Republican votes are gained in the State, none of the electoral votes in the State will go to the candidate; he too, therefore, feels no compelling urge to go to the polls.

It is clear that there is a very close relationship between the electoral college system and the underdeveloped role of the South in the political life of America. But the connection is not, as some southerners have mistakenly contended, that the possibility of a revolt in the electoral college provides an instrument for the political liberation of the South. This approach is short-sighted and self-defeating. The electoral college system, far from being an instrument of liberation, is itself an instrument of tyranny. The answer to the problem is not to misuse an already defective system but rather to iron defects out of the system.

In developing a program for improving our system of electing Presidents, it is first necessary to go back and see just what the founding fathers had in mind at the Constitutional Convention and how the system took form during the early days of the Republic.

The question of how the Chief Executive should be elected presented almost insurmountable difficulties to the men who wrote the Constitution. "If the tranquillity of the Nation is to be disturbed," predicted Chancellor Kent, "and its liberties endangered by struggle for power, it will be upon this subject of choice for President." All sorts of plans were proposed. One that the President be chosen by Congress was adopted, and afterward rejected. Another that the national executive be elected by the governors of the States was rejected.

Gradually the idea of an election indirectly by the people gained ground until at last it was agreed that the choice should be made by electors appointed by the legislators of the States; this was a compromise between the large and the small States. The method was intended to place absolute control of the choice of the President in the small body of superior citizens selected by the several

States to exercise their independent judgment in choosing a President.

It was intended to avoid, on the one hand, the popular tumult and passion that a direct election by the people might involve, and on the other hand, it was intended to avoid legislative domination of the executive by the Congress. Each State was to have electors equal in number to its Senators and Representatives, who were to meet in that State on the same day on which the electors met in all other States. It was thought that each separate State group would be unaware of the decision of the others. In the early days of the Republic the electors were not elected at all, but were appointed by the legislatures. South Carolina followed this practice until 1868. The original provision of the Constitution provided that after the President was chosen, the person having the greatest number of electoral votes was to be Vice President.

Only a few years were needed to develop some of the worst imperfections of the original electoral plan. As early as 1797 a proposed amendment sought to require the electors to distinguish in their ballots between candidates for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, but it was not until a real crisis arose which threatened the life of the Republic that some defects were cured. John Adams became Vice President in 1789, though he did not receive half the votes.

In 1800 Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr received the same number of votes—73—and each a majority. It was well known that the electors desired Jefferson for President and Burr for Vice President. This demonstrated the folly of voting for both President and Vice President upon the same ballot. It proved the possibility of electing a President from one party and a Vice President from another, and it showed the danger of a tie vote and opened the door to deals.

The Jefferson-Burr controversy threatened a dissolution of the Government. It was said that the country escaped from a civil war only by the prevalence of that kind temper and magnanimity in the Congress which prevailed in the Convention itself. This was the first time a Presidential election had been thrown into the House of Representatives, and it nearly wrecked the young Republic.

This controversy resulted in the passage of the twelfth amendment in 1804. The main features of the amendment were that the electors were to vote separately for President and Vice President. If no person received the electoral majority for President the House of Representatives is to choose from the three highest instead of the five highest as provided originally in the Constitution.

The second and last time an election was thrown into the House dates back in time to 1824, 124 years ago. In the electoral college there were 182 votes, of which Andrew Jackson had 99, John Quincy Adams 84, William H. Crawford 41, and Henry Clay 37. Jackson had a plurality of 50,000 in the popular vote. There was no question as to the election of John C. Calhoun as Vice President.

Henry Clay was Speaker of the House at that time. Before the day for counting the votes a great scandal arose. Charges of corruption were made against Clay, which were investigated without result. The situation was one which invited intrigue, and no doubt there was much bargaining and attempted trading of votes. Excitement ran high. A coalition between the followers of Clay and those of Adams resulted in the election of John Quincy Adams on the first ballot. Clay, on account of being fourth in the electoral college, was eliminated in the House. If the old provision of voting for the five highest on the list had not been changed to the three highest, Clay instead of Adams probably would have been the choice.

In a very short time after the birth of the Republic the motivating reasons for the electoral college were either forgotten or abandoned. The electors whether chosen by the legislatures of the States, as they were originally, or by the popular suffrage, as now, became only robots or puppets, selected under a moral restraint to vote for a particular person in a particular party. So it has come to pass that this curious machinery of the electoral college has become only a mode of casting the vote for that candidate who is the favorite of a majority of the people within the particular State electing the elector.

The Constitution itself contains nothing to indicate that the total electoral vote of any State should be given to the candidate who has obtained the greatest number of votes in that State. In fact, at the time of the Constitutional Convention, it seems to have been taken for granted that the electors in most of the States would be selected on a district basis. By this system some electors could cast their votes for one candidate and other electors for another candidate.

In 1800, however, the Federalist States enacted State legislation doing away with the district system and providing for the selection of electors on a general ticket. The purpose was to enhance the opportunity of electing the Federalist candidate. The Jeffersonians protested against this device, claiming that it served to disenfranchise the anti-Federalist voters within the Federalist States. They made an unsuccessful attempt to amend the Constitution for the purpose of requiring the district system to be followed by all the States. Failing in this attempt, they then adopted the general ticket system themselves in the anti-Federalist States, thereby disenfranchising the Federalist voters in their States. As a result, the general ticket system spread and soon became universal.

Theoretically, it would be possible for the general ticket or bloc-voting system to be done away with by the States themselves. Certainly, there is nothing to prevent any State or group of States from taking such action. Yet the history of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution proves that unilateral action by the States is impractical. Before the seventeenth amendment was adopted, many States enacted legislation which in effect provided for the popular election of Senators. But it was impossible for this system to become widespread until it was provided for by constitutional amendment. The same is true with respect to any effort to break down the bloc-voting system.

A constitutional amendment is also necessary for other reasons. The easiest method to get away from the general-ticket system is to allocate the electoral votes of each State to the candidates of the various parties in direct proportion to the number of votes cast for them. Yet this necessarily means that a third-party candidate who obtained a sprinkling of votes in a number of States without winning a plurality in any would obtain a number of electoral votes on the final count.

Under the present provision requiring a candidate to obtain a majority of the electoral votes, this might prevent either of the candidates of the two major parties from obtaining a majority; the result would be to throw many more elections into the House of Representatives. This contingency should be avoided at all costs. The only way to avoid it, once a system of allocating electoral votes in proportion to popular votes is adopted, is to change the present constitutional requirement for an arithmetical majority of the electoral votes and to provide that any candidate shall be elected President who obtains a plurality of the electoral votes. This change, of course, can be effectuated only by constitutional amendment.

Also, the only clear-cut way to remove the threat of a revolt among the electors is to abolish the electors themselves as entities differing in any way from the voters who cast their ballots at the polls.

It would be rather a futile waste of time to enact measures compelling electors to abide by the decision of the voters, for in so doing the utter uselessness of the function of elector would be underscored. The wiser course of action, clearly, is to do away with the office of elector. This does not necessarily mean doing away with the system of allocating electoral votes to each State. This system can be continued without harm so long as the electoral vote is divided on a proportional basis among the opposing candidates, so long as the requirement for election is changed from a majority to a plurality, and so long as the separate office of elector is abandoned.

The House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, is currently considering a number of proposals to modify the electoral-college system by amending the Constitution to provide for some of the basic changes I have proposed in this article. Early action, I am convinced, is vital, if we are to strengthen our democracy for the great trials in the years ahead.

Greek Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO ISACSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that this body give the most searching thought to the proposals now before it which would lightly toss hundreds of millions of dollars into the mire of corrupt Greek politics, and carelessly jeopardize the lives of America's youth. This deliberative body should not be stampeded into undeliberative haste to commit the lives and resources of the American people to the perpetuation of a discredited monarchy in Greece.

The anxiety of the administration to rush this legislation through is of course understandable. The tactics of the administration are as obvious as the crisis it has conjured up is synthetic. Mr. Truman presented no new information to the Congress when he summoned the joint session on returning from his vacation. Gentlemen, there is no crisis except the crisis in Mr. Truman's political fortunes. There is only an attempt by the administration to generate an atmosphere which makes impossible any reasoned examination of its foreign policies. The administration is in haste to see this legislation enacted not because any new forces threaten our national security, but because it fears that congressional and public scrutiny may pierce through the smokescreen of hysteria so artfully laid, and see the President's foreign program for the irresponsible, war-provoking policy that it is.

That foreign policy has now been a year in the making. This bill is the implementation and amplification of the Truman doctrine enunciated for Greece and Turkey in March 1947. A year has passed since then and we have had ample evidence of the manner in which this doctrine has operated and the ends it has achieved. To what extent has the Truman doctrine accomplished its announced purposes of reconstructing

the Greek economy, feeding the Greek people, and strengthening the peace through the preservation of democratic Greek institutions?

The answer is: The Truman doctrine has been a dismal and humiliating failure. On this point there is no more cogent testimony than the President's own report to the Congress on February 16, 1948. I quote to you several excerpts from this report:

The military situation in Greece has shown no improvement during the period under review.

The economic position of the country remains critical.

It is unlikely that the strong inflationary forces operating in Greece can, with the means now available to the Greek Government, be overcome within the near future to the extent necessary for prices and wages to take a substantial downward trend.

Implementation of plans for basic economic reconstruction * * * has been impeded by the presence of military operations and a sense of general insecurity.

Slowness in industrial progress is caused largely by the widespread feeling of insecurity.

And, finally:

Events since early November have not * * * justified the high expectations then entertained for a stable pattern of industrial relations. The continued rise in the cost of living has largely wiped out the beneficial effects of the general wage settlement and resulted in the prospect of renewed pressure for further wage increases. Furthermore, recent actions of vital interest to labor have tended to undermine the mutual confidence required for effective cooperation in the field of labor relations, notably the drastic law of December 7, which was passed without prior knowledge of the mission, providing extreme penalties for strikes and lockouts during the period of civil strife.

Administration spokesmen have been frank to state that during the past year the $300,000,000 expended in Greece under the Truman program has made no headway in the fight against the guerrilla forces and has barely served to hold the line against them. Americans who have recently returned from Greece say that even this is an overstatement, and that in fact widespread resentment against what the Greeks term the American occupation has actually strengthened the guerrilla forces in some areas. The right wing Greek press has been so embarrassed by the continual routs of the Greek nationalist forces that it has set up a clamor about the superiority in number and quality of the rebels' equipment, in the face of common knowledge and repeated statements by the American mission that the very contrary is true.

What the Greek Nationalist Army lacks in spirit and popular support it has made up for in a brutality and bestiality that do violence to every decent human instinct. To proddings by the American mission that they undertake an offensive against the guerrilla forces, the Greek Army has responded by such acts as the mass execution of captives after they had been tortured and tormented on a death march through the streets of Salonika that, according to the New York Times correspondent on the scene, could just as well have taken place in the fourth century before Christ. And hardly more than a fortnight ago this "gallant" Greek Nationalist Army made a raid on a tuberculosis sanitarium on the pretext that a rebel band was in ambush somewhere in the vicinity and dragged off to jail 15 seriously ill patients, who were denied all medical attention and even the protection of a blanket against the chill of the night air.

This is the Greek Army which we are clothing, feeding, and for whom our officers are devising strategy. These are the royalists with whom we have made common cause. These are the troops who consider themselves, and are considered by all Europe, our agents and our emissaries. No matter how self-righteously we denounce their acts of barbarism, no matter how vigorously we disclaim responsibility, we are tainted by them.

The brutality of the Greek royalist army is matched by the repressions of the Greek Government, nourished by the Truman doctrine. A year has now elapsed since the enunciation of the Truman doctrine to defend so-called democratic institutions in Greece, and mass arrests, deportations, and executions of those opposed to the royalist regime are still the order of the day. On March 7 the New York Herald Tribune reported that two editors—not Communists, by the way—who had dared to criticize the mass execution of members of the Greek resistance were arrested on a military warrant, while the Greek Government simply stated that it could not intervene in the workings of military courts. And these ruthless acts are committed in the name of the Truman doctrine, and are considered a gesture to the United States. I am including in this text an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on March 8 attributing these acts to the Greek Government's interpretation of the Truman doctrine:

PURGE OF GREEK LEFTISTS CALLED GESTURE TO UNITED STATES—EX-MINISTER SAYS ATHENS SEES TRUMAN DOCTRINE REQUIRING REPRESSIONS

(By Homer Bigart)

ATHENS, March 7.—Nicholas Kolyvas, former Minister of Justice, said today that the current wave of mass arrests, deportations and executions was the result of the Greek Government's interpretation of the Truman doctrine. It believes, he said, that Washington desires ruthless suppression of the "left" as an implementation of President Truman's "containment of Communism" theme.

Mr. Kolyvas, Justice Minister in the Plastiras government at the time of the Varkiza agreement of February 12, 1945, under which the ELAS leftist resistance force was disbanded, said he saw no moral justification for the recent execution of ELAS members for alleged crimes committed during the German occupation. After so long an imprisonment—several were first jailed in the weeks immediately after the Varkiza agreement—it scarcely was humane to march them out and shoot them, he said.

URGES REVIEW OF SENTENCES

"I suppose I'll be labeled a Communist and a traitor for saying this," Mr. Kolyvas said, "but I believe these convictions should have been reviewed. Remember, some of these crimes were committed in a period of extreme political upheaval, when murder often was regarded as patriotic. At that time, both British and American broadcasts were urging the EAM (National Liberation Front) to neutralize and repress all elements collaborating with the Germans.

"Undoubtedly, there were murders motivated by personal vengeance rather than patriotism, but in a period of anarchy such cases are difficult to clarify.

"For that reason," Mr. Kolyvas said, "the amnesty granted under the Varkiza agreement should have covered all crimes committed during the occupation. In any event," he said, "the present purge is dangerously crude and has already eclipsed most of the fundamental liberties guaranteed by the Greek constitution."

CALLS REGIME REPRESSIVE

In the matter of individual freedom, the coalition government of Liberals and Populists (Royalists)—created last September by Loy W. Henderson, State Department director of near eastern and African affairs—has proved far more repressive than even the predominantly Rightist governments which preceded it, Mr. Kolyvas maintained. He said thousands of suspected leftists have been deported without trial, journalists arrested for criticizing the government and civil servants purged for disloyalty without benefit of the right of appeal.

Liberal Deputies at Athens today denounced as unconstitutional a decree adopted Friday by a Parliamentary committee giving to the military council power to drop 60 senior army officers. Most of the officers are Liberals, and the Liberal Deputies hinted they were being discharged for political reasons by the predominantly Royalist military council.

Now the American mission cannot disclaim responsibility for this—nor can Mr. Truman. Is it any wonder that the American Army and the American Government have suffered a tremendous loss of prestige in the eyes of Greece's neighbor Italy? That our claims to be regarded the defenders of western democratic civilization are looked upon with more than a little scepticism?

The capacity of the Greek economy to absorb American dollars without approaching one step nearer solvency is almost phenomenal. In a report to the Greek people on March 11 of this year Governor Griswold, head of the American mission to Greece, stated that the $300,000,000 voted by this Congress in July of last year and scheduled to have lasted until June 1 would be exhausted by the 1st of April. In addition, the Greeks have received $38,000,000 in post-UNRRA shipments and a $25,000,000 credit for surplus supplies and for larger sums—in all a total of $814,500,000 since the war's end. Yet despite all this coddling—and let me digress to say that the American mission in Greece, in order to get Governor Griswold's report published, deemed it necessary to give two Greek newspapers a subsidy to cover the printing costs—despite all this coddling, the Greek economy still totters uncertainly.

Inflation has not been licked. In March the prices of basic food commodities reached a peak. The hungry have not been fed, except in certain quarters where food has been baldly used as a political weapon. And the civil servants are threatening to strike because of the Government's reluctance to grant bonuses and extra rations. It is important to note, moreover, that very little further progress toward reconstruction and rehabilitation of the Greek economy can

be soft-pedaled, while the administration openly in its present hysterical warmongering emphasizes the predominantly military character of the $200,000,000 additional assistance which it now proposes to render Greece.

With all our supposed efforts to befriend the Greek people and to relieve their distress, we are today cordially disliked throughout the length and breadth of Greece. The hungry hate us because they have not been fed. The civil servants hate us because we are opposed to their bonuses. The freedom-loving Greeks hate us because we have helped place them under the yoke of an oppressive monarchist regime. Even those Greeks who are our minions despise us because they regard us as fools and suckers. And to achieve this universal unpopularity it has cost us more than $800,000,000 since the war's end.

It is clear then that the Truman doctrine has failed to achieve its stated purposes. It has neither aided the reconstruction of Greece nor advanced the cause of Greek democracy one step. Its one tangible result has been to keep in power the corrupt, reactionary, Nazi-loving Greek monarchy, which otherwise would have long since been repudiated and put to flight.

Why, in the face of this outstanding failure, do the administration and the bipartisan coalition in the Congress cling so tenaciously to the Truman doctrine? I have said that the Truman doctrine failed to achieve its stated purposes in Greece. But I submit that its stated purposes are not its real purposes. I submit that the Truman doctrine was never intended to feed the hungry and to protect and preserve democracy in Greece. I submit that the Truman doctrine has been eminently successful in accomplishing its real purpose—and that purpose has been to keep any popular democratic regime from coming to power in Greece, to saddle the Greek people with a corrupt reactionary monarchy which is odious to them, and thereby to promote unrest, instability, and strife which will set the stage for American armed intervention to protect extensive American investments. But not primarily investments in Greece. Greece is merely the outpost, the gateway for the oil of the Middle East which reaction in Greece is supposed to defend for American oil companies.

The Truman doctrine is nothing more or less than militarism rampant on a blood-soaked field of oil. It is unadulterated imperialism—oil imperialism. Yesterday Greece, today Palestine, tomorrow the world—bathed in a mixture of oil and blood. And it is in pursuit of this policy of aggressive imperialism—of intervention in Greece, Turkey, China, and every part of the globe that American mothers are now asked to turn over their sons in the flower of their youth to the military.

Greece proves that the 1947 Truman doctrine was never intended to protect the peace by strengthening democracy abroad. And the 1948 proposal to send hundreds of millions of dollars to Greece is not intended to protect the peace either. It is calculated to do the very opposite—to promote discord and strife, to involve us heavily financially, to make armed intervention in Greece inevitable. Whether or not we Americans recognize these implications of our foreign policy, it is clear that the Greek people do. It is significant that, according to our own press dispatches, the President's recent message to Congress provoked in Greece, and I quote a "fresh wave of war jitters," and cause a rise in the price of gold.

I should like to adress myself briefly to the Members of this body who, though they have serious misgivings about the President's proposal to aid Greece and the other proposals of his foreign program, are nevertheless prepared to go along with that program because they feel that the alternative is inaction and a starving Europe. I say to you that by voting this program you are yourself shutting the door to any peaceful and decent alternative. I say to you that your vote is another foundation stone pulled from the edifice of the United Nations. I say to you that almost anything would be better than a war-provoking policy which holds the promise of devastation, not reconstruction for Europe, and untold horrors for our own people. I say to you, gentlemen, that you may shrink from recognizing the truth but your vote for this proposal is a vote against the peace. There is a way out—the way of working through the United Nations which my bill proposes.

Farm Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MONROE M. REDDEN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration is probably the most important measure the present Congress will have the privilege of passing upon. The debate has been very interesting. The pros and cons have been thoroughly revealed.

There is one thing that stands out most prominent when one considers the opponents' viewpoint. They urge that the bill will not prevent a third world war, nor will it stop the spread of communism. These seem to be the chief reasons assigned by the opponents as to why they do not intend to support the bill.

Of course, it is always easy to advance strong arguments in opposition to spending billions of the taxpayers' money. But the other side of the picture must also be viewed if we are to properly evaluate the true aspects.

It may be conceded that this bill will not prevent war. If Russia is bent on war with America, then no legislation that this Congress could pass will change that decision. If Russia is determined to spread communism over the earth, then no measure this Congress could enact will deter Russia in these efforts. The question then arises: What shall we do to secure ourselves and other countries of the world who oppose this aggressive conduct? It is argued by some that we should withdraw from Europe and turn over that vast empire of 280,000,000 people to the ravages of communism and Russian military power, that in doing so we should come home and draw into our own shell and build a wall of steel around this country. That argument was good a half century ago. It was good in the days of George Washington, when weeks were required for the bullet of any gun to reach our soil or the ship of any fleet to approach our shores. But time has changed these conditions, and America to be secure must change her views of the Washingtonian era. We know the purpose of this bill is not simply to feed Europe. It is to help stabilize the economy of Europe and to strengthen her military forces, to the end that the Red tide may be stopped before it engulfs that continent. The best assurance we have of preventing war is a strong anticommunistic Europe. The money that we are spending today is cheap in comparison to the amount that will be required if we enter the struggle against Russia. When Europe becomes strong again, economically and militarily, we will have won the peace and not before. The dollars we send to Europe under this bill will save American soldiers in days ahead. If we withdraw from Europe we have surrendered to communism; we have turned over the entire world to the militarists of Russia and we will stand alone as proponents of freedom.

Who would remain in Europe to engage the Russian armies if we abandoned Europe to these invaders? Upon whose soil would we land if all Europe surrenders?

If this bill is passed it may not prevent war, but it will strengthen our allies who will join us in the greatest of all struggles. It will save American lives and American blood. It is the best investment ever made by this Government to secure the peace.

Slum Clearance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Joseph H. Deckman, chairman, public housing committee, Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington, entitled "There's an American Way To Clear the City's Slums and House the Needy":

THERE'S AN AMERICAN WAY TO CLEAR THE CITY'S SLUMS AND HOUSE THE NEEDY

After a 5-year period of studying the problem of slum clearance and low-rent housing and after listening to numerous discussions on the subject both over the radio and from the speaker's rostrum one becomes firmly convinced that many fundamental truths about housing are escaping the attention of

all those who are talking so much about America's No. 1 problem.

For some unknown reason those who cry for a vast Government housing program are continually blaming the builders of the country for the slums and the improper housekeeping habits of the poor and indigent slum dwellers. Likewise, the spokesmen for the building industry are always trying to excuse themselves of blame for slum conditions when these conditions are not of their making and it is not in their power to cure them.

Probably there are more phony experts, charlatans, misguided people, and self-seeking bureaucrats advising the American people on housing matters than on any other major subject of the day.

Very few of those in Government, either in the legislative branch or in actual control of housing agencies, have ever built a house, estimated the cost of one, or even planned one. From what has been written to date by newspaper reporters, columnists, and magazine writers it is quite clear that their fundamental knowledge of the housing industry and its operations is very limited.

Because the country is being flooded with so much false propaganda and misinformation it seems a good idea to set forth certain basic truths about housing, so the subject can be studied in a factual way and not on the excitement plan which is now so much in vogue.

The first point to be made in order to clear the housing atmosphere is to state the fact that the problem of slum clearance has nothing to do with the housing industry and its normal function of producing new housing units.

The problem of slum clearance is purely a local one and its solution lies in the speedy promulgation and enforcement of housing codes and sanitary laws.

A second fact to be stressed about housing is that the solution of the slum-clearance problem is in no way bound up with public housing. Instead, public housing is simply a political means of furnishing subsidized rents to a class of voters for political propaganda purposes. Slum clearance is only the popular vehicle to sell socialized housing to the taxpayer and the real aim of the public housers is to promote state socialism.

The third and final point to be established about housing is to make it clear that the production of new housing units and the providing of low-rent accommodations should not be confused with each other. Obviously, any student of the subject of housing recognizes the fact that new dwelling units are not the only source of good rental housing.

Now, to explain fully the three main facts as set forth, each will be discussed in detail.

Beginning with the first point, it is utterly ridiculous to blame the building industry for the slum conditions in our cities because the builders of new housing do not own even a fraction of the properties which are located in the slum areas. It is the function of the constructors of new housing units to build good new buildings and due to building codes and Federal loan insurance requirements the builder from necessity is forced to erect sound buildings. Therefore, present building programs are not contributing to slum conditions because of the builder. Also, what has been done in the past is no more to be blamed on the present-day members of the building industry than is society in general.

Instead, the blame for slum conditions is to be placed squarely on the shoulders of the owners of slum properties, the poor housekeeping methods of slum-tenant and the municipal authorities who allow unsanitary slum conditions to exist.

Slums are not caused by old buildings, but are definitely the result of houses not kept in repair and slovenly housekeeping.

Georgetown, in Washington, D. C., is the finest known example of a slum area reclaimed into a fine residential neighborhood without construction of a new house in block after block of that section.

The solution to the problem of slum clearance is basically found in the promulgation of adequate housing codes and sanitary laws at the local level. Proper laws would make it unlawful to rent substandard housing or maintain unsanitary housing conditions either by tenant or by owner.

Enforcement of housing codes and sanitary laws would result in slum properties either being placed in good livable condition or in being torn down or their use as housing discontinued. In this manner the slums will disappear at no cost to the taxpayer. Also the logical development of our cities can take place and they will not be redeveloped through a public housing program which from past experience builds two-story dwelling units in the heart of a city where multifamily apartments or commercial property would eventually be constructed by the dictation of sound economics.

If for some reason the people of a city feel that they wish something more than just a sound housing code then a strictly local Redevelopment Act could be passed along the lines of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. In no case is it necessary for Federal legislation to be passed for the purpose of subsidizing the clearing of the slums of the Nation's cities.

In discussing the second point it cannot be too vigorously stressed that public housing and slum clearance have nothing basically to do with each other. Public housing is purely a means of subsidizing bricks, mortar and lumber to produce fictitious low rents at great cost to the taxpayer. Slum clearance is simply the "surrey with the fringe on top," which is used in an attempt to put over government ownership of housing and to date a fine job has been done in confusing the collective minds of the American people.

A good example of how the public housers operate is the statement made by Nathan Strauss (one of the Nation's foremost public housers), during a radio program on December 30, 1947.

Mr. Strauss stated that in 1946, 50 percent of the babies born in America were born in slums. For this reason the builders of America were failing to properly house the population and consequently the only alternative is a great public-housing program.

It is not known where the statistics can be found concerning in what section babies are born and how many, but certain other factual data is available, which certainly makes Mr. Strauss appear to be very much misinformed.

According to the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Report, Series P-70 No. 1, dated October 29, 1947, it is stated that in 1947, 93 percent of all the housing in American cities was not in need of major repairs. Also it was stated that 84 percent of all urban housing occupied as dwelling units contained both private bath and private flush toilets. This is a condition not equaled by any other nation in the world. The report further shows that approximately 55 percent of all housing units in the United States were owner-occupied in 1947.

From these facts it can be safely stated that only approximately 10 percent of the urban housing in our country can be construed as being in the slum category, and not all of this housing is truly slum property.

Now if 50 percent of the children were born in slums in 1946, then the people living in 10 percent of the housing of our cities are showing a rate of prolificy which is unheard of before in the annals of mankind.

It is more reasonable to assume that Mr. Strauss is as far off base with this statement as he is with all his other statements about housing made in a recent article published in the American magazine.

When public housing is stripped of its tie to the many maudlin approaches made to slum clearance, the political jobbing in human suffering and the general official bungling with a relatively simple problem; it is readily seen that the housing of the low-income group and clearing slums through the medium of public housing is a physical and economic impossibility.

The light of cold reason thrown on Government housing exposes it as a political farce which is "operation rathole" as far as the American taxpayer is concerned.

No one either public or private can build a new house to rent economically to a man who cannot afford to pay rent. Therefore, in order to house the very needy a subsidy is necessary, either in the form of subsidized Government housing or direct rent relief to the tenant in private housing. The selection of the means of housing the needy then becomes an economic problem as to which is the more economical method. From this standpoint it is a proven fact that rent relief to the tenant in private housing is much less costly. Public housing costs more to construct and to operate and with its inherent wasteful governmental management it is ruled out as a solution from a sound business standpoint. Rent relief through time-proven public welfare is the only solution for housing the needy. To date the vast majority of that class are now being taken care of in this very manner.

The record of public housing proves that it does not clear slums and does not house more than a fraction of the class that its supporters so righteously claim it is built for.

After approximately 10 years of the public housing experiment in America we find that it is an expensive failure as a solution to slum clearance and the providing of low-rent housing.

It is a fact that eight hundred millions of dollars have been spent for clearing slums and building permanent low-rent housing while only 155,000 Government-owned housing units have been constructed with this money and the slums have been practically untouched.

In these units not more than 25 percent of the over-all Nation-wide tenants are of the lowest income group that cannot afford to pay minimum rents. Also, not over 25 percent of the rents charged for public housing can be classed as low rents in comparison with rents for comparable private accommodations.

The 75-percent of public-housing tenants who are paying the so-called economic rent are paying rent for housing which is being furnished in good private-enterprise housing for equal or lower rent. This is true despite the fact that public housing enjoys lower interest rates, a longer amortization period, and subsidies in the form of lower tax payments and direct grants. Proof of the fact that private rents are equal or less than public is found in the same census report already quoted. This report gives the median private rent of the country at large for 1947 as $29.33 per month, specifically for urban areas it is $31.64 per month. Compared to this is the median rent of public housing of $36.61 per month, as stated in the hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the General Housing Act of 1945. This median rent figure for public housing is now much higher, as many rent increases have taken place in public projects since 1945. This is particularly significant, as it proves the lack of knowledge of the housing business by the public housers, since the original rents which were set for public projects were supposed to be adequate to cover all costs for a 60-year period. It is also to be noted that almost all public housing is now in the used or second-hand housing cate-

gory, because none has been built in quantity since 1944.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which is offered by the public housers as a housing cure-all for the propagandized housing problem, according to one of its sponsors, Senator TAFT, will not cause any housing to be built for approximately a year after its enactment, and it will also cost the Federal Government, by Senator TAFT's admission, in direct subsidies for slum clearance and public housing, 7.2 billions of dollars during the first 45-year period of its operation. Furthermore, it will only produce 500,000 publicly owned houses. These would merely scratch the surface of the low-rent housing needs or, in Senator TAFT's words, "take the edge off the need."

To really find out what a public-housing program would cost, one must deal with the ultimate number of units which the public housers desire to build and from this figure arrive at the total cost.

Until recently it was commonly conceded that the aim of the public housers was to house the lower third of the population. Recently, however, at a New York meeting of the National Association of Housing Officials, it was brought to light that the real goal of the program in mind is to house the lower two-thirds of the population in Government-owned housing. This is true even though 55 percent of the housing units of the country were owner occupied in 1947.

First let us find out the cost to house the lower third. Based on the cost set forth in TEW bill, and figuring the number of housing units at one-third of the Nation's units of 37,500,000 in 1947 (or a conservative figure of 12,000,000 units), it is found by dividing 12,000,000 by 500,000 that we must multiply the cost of the TEW bill by 24: $7,200,000,000 by 24 equals $172,800,000,000.

One hundred seventy-two billion eight hundred million dollars then becomes the cost to the Federal Government for the first 45 years to house the lower third. To this cost must be added the cost to the local taxpayer for local tax exemptions or local grants to the public housing authorities. This figure at the local level can be conservatively estimated from past experience at well over $50,000,000,000 for a 45-year period.

To arrive at the total cost to the taxpayer to house the lower third of the population it can be safely stated that the cost will reach approximately $225,000,000,000 at the end of the first 45 years of such a program. If the lower two-thirds of the population is to be housed as desired by the public housing zealots, then the cost becomes $450,000,000,000. This is a figure greater than the cost of World War II, and it must be considered because once a large-scale program of public housing is launched and a national policy established as set forth in the TEW bill, then the program will be carried on until national bankruptcy ends in State socialism.

It is needless to point out to any one of average intelligence that the public housing solution to the Nation's housing problems in any form is an economic impossibility without causing financial chaos.

Furthermore, it is physically impossible to build enough new public housing units at any one time to carry out the philosophy of sheltering all the needy in new housing for the simple reason that not over 2,000,000 units can be built in any one year with the present anticipated material production capacity and labor supply. Consequently, a great quantity of second-hand public housing would mount higher under such a program as the years pass. With funds for maintenance of the used publicly owned housing becoming progressively more difficult to obtain, because of a continual wrecking of the economy by tax-exempt public housing; the result could only be for the public housing to become slums, just like any other housing that is not properly maintained. Evidence of this condition is taking place now in public units in Washington, D. C., which are not yet 10 years old. Because rents were not set high enough to take care of maintenance and repairs over the years, the buildings are beginning to approach slum condition, as visualized by photos reproduced in this issue of Home Builders' Monthly.

The third and final point to be made about housing concerns the current fuzzy thinking with regard to the cost of new housing and the need for low-rent accommodations.

The truth to be firmly established is the fact that builders cannot build de luxe housing today, with current wage and material cost, to rent for monthly figures based on 1939 prices. At this time the builders in most large cities are forced to build de luxe housing, as financing is not available for them to build "stripped housing" which would be comparable to the housing units constructed by public housing authorities.

Wages have gone up since 1939 over 85 percent, and material costs have followed wages.

To take the cost of housing in 1947 and compare it to a previous 1939 cost without comparing the relation to wages and material costs is an intellectually dishonest trick that is being continually used by the left wingers in our country.

It is axiomatic that housing costs, like all other costs, are subject to wage costs and must be considered in relation to them. In fact the relation must be considered more carefully in housing than in other commodities as over 75 percent of the cost of a house, from the raw materials in the mines and forests to finished product, is wages.

Actually housing costs have not risen as high proportionately as wages since 1939 and the criticism of the builders for the high cost of housing is unfounded. When the facts are studied it is found that housing comprises one of the best buys today for the American dollar.

On the subject of providing very low rental accommodations for the low-income groups it is stressed that these accommodations must be found in the used house supply now as has always been the case in the past.

In this country we have approximately 41,700,000 housing units. Not more than 2,000,000 of these units could be called new. Now it seems simple logic to assume that we will have most of these units with us for a very long time. This being the case, why isn't it sensible to look to these units to provide the low-rent housing needed rather than attempting to accomplish the economic and physical impossibility of housing all the slum dwellers and low-income groups in new public or private housing?

To endeavor to do this job by public housing would bankrupt the country and change our form of government to state socialism as already pointed out.

If we are to preserve our American way of life we must take an American approach to the housing problems of the country. This means building new housing for those who can afford to pay for it and making sure that the used housing on hand is kept in proper condition by local housing codes and sanitary laws.

In this way the free competitive system will supply good, sound housing to all at prices they can afford. Also the housing will be supplied far quicker than under a Government-owned and operated housing program.

Much is said about the housing shortage in America, but actually what is wrong is a temporary maldistribution of the population. Today there are more housing units per capita than there were in 1940 and with builders constructing housing at the present rate of a million units a year the supply will continue to increase on a greater per capita ratio basis. This point is clearly proven by taking the 1947 census figure of 41,700,000 housing units and multiplying it by 4, the standard number used for the number of occupants per unit. This gives a total current accommodations for 166,800,000 people and the population figure is far from this total. Of these 41,700,000, 37,500,000 were not in need of major repairs and can be considered as good, sound housing. Using the same rule-of-thumb occupancy figure of 4 persons per unit, we find that 150,000,000 can be housed in decent, sanitary housing. Here again we find there is adequate housing for all, as the population at present is approximately 145,000,000, and we have good housing for 150,000,000.

Competition in housing is almost upon us and the price of housing will soon begin to show the effects of this competition if the self-styled professional housing experts will keep their clammy hands off the one industry which is the lifeblood of a sound American economy. No greater harm, short of war, can befall America than would result by more tinkering with the housing industry from Washington.

From the facts set forth herein, it should be clear to the American people that they must investigate for themselves the facts about housing before forming any opinions on the subject. The time has come to cease accepting as gospel the half-baked solutions that are continually being served up by a bunch of pseudo-housing experts. Most of these self-appointed experts have never driven a nail and are not as well qualified, either from experience or intellectual honesty, as is the average layman for drawing proper conclusions from the wealth of facts available on the subject of housing.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 30, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OWENS: I have, as you know, consistently urged your opposition to peacetime conscription (which Mr. Truman, in his St. Patrick's Day message and speech, craftily called universal training legislation), and I now just as emphatically also urge your opposition to his latest demand, viz, for temporary reenactment of selective-service legislation.

For such drastic demands, with no war imminent or threatened, Mr. Truman should have advanced good and sufficient reasons. His only reason was, "to enable us to meet our international obligations."

Inasmuch as such obligations are of doubtful constitutionality, he really advanced no good reasons for his demands. He has adopted the philosophy of his predecessor, "do not let any doubts as to the constitutionality of my proposals deter the Congress from blindly acquiescing in my demands."

The burden was upon the President not only to make out a prima facie case for the desired legislation—but to prove his case beyond a reasonable doubt. Both of these requirements he completely failed to meet.

In stating that the big issue today is "Tyranny against Freedom"—he recommends a cure, peacetime selective service and peacetime conscription for training, which cure is as bad, if not worse, than the ailment which he does not mention by name, but which he implies exists.

I have no use for Henry A. Wallace, or any of his philosophy, but to "give the devil his due" we must agree with his statement that acquiescence in the latest demands of the President is "the beginning of an American police state"—as is at the same time "a shameful call for world remobilization."

If the danger to which Mr. Truman alludes is immediate, it is already too late to prevent Russia continuing her policy of taking over her neighbors by agreement and treaties—but, he hasn't pointed out specifically the nature of the immediate danger.

If the danger is in the future, he hasn't stated how far into the future he is looking, and it must be very, very far, because the report of the President's Advisory Commission on universal training finds that Commission unanimous in the opinion of experts in atomic bomb production—that it will be 1955 at the earliest before an attack in quantity can be made with atomic bombs, against us.

In hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, Dr. Karl T. Compton, Chairman of the President's Advisory Commission, stated (p. 4187):

"Therefore, that kind of a danger (from atomic attack) is a danger that is several years off, if it exists at all. The thing that we might get involved in, would be away in some distant part of the world that we might get maneuvered into, because of some international bluff situation, or we might get involved in trying to maintain police power—to maintain peace at some place or other—it is not as immediate as when Admiral Leahy appeared before you in 1940."

In the same hearings, Father Edmund A. Walsh, also a member of the Commission, was asked this question (p. 4210):

"Would you say that the postwar pattern as laid down by Stalin is identical with the prewar pattern as laid down by Hitler?"

Dr. WALSH: "With one exception—yes—to achieve it without shouting, without a war of journal aggression. The program for world revolution visualizes the conquest of the world by Marxian communism, through infiltration—by the capture of trade unions, by penetration, and by barring from nothing. It rarely mentions military aggression." Also see other statements in said hearings to the same effect.

The use of our youth in 1940 to 1946 has almost completely wrecked one generation of Americans; if this proposed mad plan is adopted, it will just as surely wreck another generation of our people, for the latest reports indicate that our brass hats don't merely want some three or four hundred thousands of draftees, but that they actually want 3,000,000 of our 19- to 26-year-old youngsters for at least 2 years of service, while universal-military-training peacetime conscription is being maneuvered into an established policy.

If the international situation is as weak as President Truman apparently believes that it is, how can "business as usual" be justified? How can we approve drafting some men and at the same time permitting others in vital industries (coal, meat) to quit their jobs?

If it is necessary to spend billions to defend ourselves against Russia, what justification is there for sending the Reds war materials and potential war materials, accepting in exchange mainly furs?

If our defenses are as weak as we are now told, what happened to the $10,500,000,000 estimated expenditures for national defense for the fiscal year to end June 30? Or the $15,150,000,000 paid out for national defense during the fiscal year ended last June 30?

If our present debt of $253,626,439,961.60 is so great as to endanger the economic foundations of the Nation, how do we expect to finance a new war or even an "all-out" armanent program that we hope may avoid a new war?

If we are weak today, as so many of our leaders and our writers and our speakers constantly insist, is it not possible that our weakest link is our financial position?

If we plunge into another war and win a military victory, are we confident it will not be at the expense of just about everything we started out by believing we were fighting for?

These are just a few of the questions that today disturb us—along with a great many other people, we would imagine.

Vigorous and united opposition by the members of the Republican Party in Congress is in my opinion the only sure method of placing a Republican President in the White House in November. If a Democrat is elected, good-by Republicans, Congress, and all the rest for many, many years to come.

Both selective service and peacetime conscription should be overwhelmingly rejected.

Cordially,

CHARLES V. FALKENBERG.

Broadcasts of Walter Winchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 29 I introduced House Resolution 514, urging that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the truth of the statements and accusations made by Walter Winchell during his regular weekly broadcast over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. last Sunday evening.

Permission was granted to me at that time to insert as part of my remarks the broadcast by Mr. Winchell to which I have referred.

The broadcast was as follows:

Mr. and Mrs. United States, good evening. Thanks very much for your telegrams and letters. Many of them were put on the desks of top men in government. I'd like to thank United States Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington State. He inserted last Sunday's broadcast in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 days in a row last Monday and Tuesday. Thanks also to Congressman CAMP, of Georgia, who from the floor of the House the other day urged the State Department to rebroadcast it all over the world. I am back in New York—250 miles nearer the people, and only 6 miles from the United Nations at Lake Success. The country is now united for national defense. I have good reason to tell you that your President is concerned only with the Nation's welfare, and that his political future concerns him not at all. The President is following one line—a line he believes to be his duty. I believe it to be mine when I offer the following report to the President of the United States. Mr. President: Inside the United Nations this week there was diplomatic spring weather. The rays of peace were stronger, but the clouds of war were darker. At Lake Success the Russians misunderstand our laws even more than they misunderstand our people. The Russians believe that we are decadent, that we must wait for Congress to declare war before the Nation can be protected. This mistake of American law may be one of the tragic blunders in history. Our Supreme Court has explicitly ruled that the Commander in Chief need not wait, and I quote, "for Congress to baptize it with a name." Under our law, a design of war on our country gives you, Mr. President, the power to act. Further, a foreign government under our law can create by a hostile act a state of war which you, as Commander in Chief, without the Congress, can recognize. Mr. President, I believe the Kremlin does not know this, or Russian submarines would not be off our coasts. Our history books in plainest type tell a story which Russian intelligence seems to have overlooked. Thus, our declaration of war on the Imperial German Government in 1917 did not even include the German people. Again, the United States Supreme Court has recognized that the United States fought a war with France between 1798 and 1800, though neither our Congress nor France actually declared it.

Neither our people nor their laws are decadent, Mr. President, and it is very important that that be understood. The American people want no war, and I can certify that you want no war. But to make room for peace there must be absolutely no room left for misunderstanding. An intelligence department is not a Russian monopoly. I think Marshall Stalin ought to know that we know that he intends to march his Red army into western Europe and that his D-day is early October. His incredibly misinformed intelligence agents have told him that America will then be split by a Presidential election. Moscow doesn't understand that next only to baseball, our national elections are our national sport, and that every American is on only one team if any outsider tries to break up the game. But to leave no doubt in Mr. Stalin's mind, a joint congressional committee capable of pledging both our parties for defense and for alliance, should be at your elbow and publicly. And I think, Mr. President, such joint committee should keep the public informed of all developments. That for instance, Moscow has put a Communist consul in Norwegian Spitzbergen without even asking Oslo, and that Russian troops, disguised as coal miners, are migrating there. Needless to say, the heaviest units of His Majesty's Royal Navy are now at sea north of the Shetland Islands. I think it important for the American people to know that the royal navy is more than a symbol. Should peace efforts fail, and America be forced to fight, the sun will not set before the British and the Canadians will be fighting at our side. The RAF is ready for action. Mr. President, much has been said about the precarious military condition of our troops in Europe. The map shows that our Berlin troops are cut off from the coast. But it would be a fateful mistake to believe that they are cut off from the American people.

We do not run from our flag, and we most certainly do not run out on our men. Under international law, any attack on them is an act of war. Because we will start no war, false inferences are drawn. After attack it has always been an American strategy to regain the initiative at the earliest possible moment. It would add to the chances of peace if all foreign diplomats understood this. Mr. President, the people are alerted and the Government is acting, and decisive steps are being taken to meet the crisis. But a very grave constitutional question has arisen. Some top Democratic Party leaders are considering resigning from the Democratic Party next month, and not for party reasons. They say that the great civilian Democratic Party has lost control of the military. These top leaders say that the military-minded people are making all appointments and fixing policies without even consulting you. These party leaders do not blame you. They say that you are so concentrated on national defense that you are not conscious of the terrific growth of the

military party. And they also say that the military party is killing the last chances of peace. Mr. President, do you know this—that by unanimous decision of the executive committee of the Democratic National Committee, a policy of revision of the United Nations Charter was approved? These political leaders allege that this great recommendation for peace—a world conference under section 109 of the United Nations Charter—was killed by the military. And they further charge, Mr. President, that the military party will have its key men so firmly entrenched by next November, that because of international events it will be beyond the control of any civilian party. Mr. President, if that happens, we may have defeated communism abroad at the equally ghastly price of fascism at home.

When you were Senator the American people backed the Truman investigating committee to the hilt. The people came to know you because even while we were fighting a war, you were the symbol of civilian control. They liked to see your familiar gray suit, because it is the uniform of a civilian Commander in Chief. But, Mr. President, the fact is that the basic foreign policy of our Nation is being determined by military expediency. Historically, there is no more infallible formula for national disaster. Wars can only be won by men carrying weapons for a principle. A principle they believe greater even than "thou shalt not kill." No American can face the God of our Nation with a rifle in his hand unless he can explain that it was used for peace for all men. Premier Clemenceau of France once said that war is far too important to be left to the generals. The foreign policy of our military-minded men, based on purely military considerations, has morally bankrupted the American people in the eyes of the world. I, for one, refuse to believe that the little nation whose life hung on a thread at Valley Forge, now as a mighty giant, is dependent on 700 miles of cast-iron pipe in Arabia. Mr. President, the civilized world believes that the United Nations is dying. That the dagger of the United States Government is stuck in its back and that the handle of that dagger is inscribed "Military expediency." If so, Mr. President, it is against the will of the American people. A nation can no more desert its conscience than a soldier can desert his flag. Mr. President, both are moral, and therefore military disasters. The United Nations, weak though it is, is one of the last means of preventing horrifying atomic war. We have no right to leave any means to peace unexplored. The principle of international law and order is above geography.

We are hypocrites before the world, Mr. President, if we send American men to die abroad for the same principle that we are diplomatically killing at Lake Success. Therefore, I consider it my duty to report this to you, that unknown to you, one of the men who so strongly recommended the fearful and fateful reversal by the United States at Lake Success, in my opinion, was disqualified to speak. Millions of American boys between 19 and 25 may soon leave their homes to serve our country. I believe it only justice to these boys and their families to make the following public: That very same Arabian-American Oil Co., which provided visiting Arabian diplomats with expensive motor cars, also procured complete air conditioning for the Washington apartment of your Ambassador to the Middle East; his name is Loy Henderson. I know that you did not know this, but please denounce it, President Truman. Senator Truman would never have stood for it. Mr. President, the most momentous decision in world history is now on your desk. Section 109 of the United Nations Charter provides for revision of the United Nations to make it work, if it fails. That great chance for peace without slackening our preparation for defense must be taken. Your party wants it and the people want it. There is no military expediency above the conscience of the Nation. We civilians look to you, our civilian President, to try for peace. Today is Easter Sunday, the day of resurrection of the hope of man. As few men since, it is given to you, Mr. President, to again give hope for that peace for which the Prince of Peace died. Good night, Mr. President.

Mr. Speaker, when a radio commentator credited with having a listening audience totaling 30,000,000 people charges that a responsible official of our State Department has accepted an air-conditioning unit from the Arabian-American Oil Co. for his own personal apartment, some effort should be made to determine the truth of such an accusation.

Mr. Winchell further charged that Arabian diplomats visiting the United States have been given expensive motor cars by this same Arabian-American Oil Co.

While these accusations are important and serious when one considers the position held by this official of our State Department, Walter Winchell's further statement that we, meaning our Government, know that Marshal Stalin "intends to march his Red Army into western Europe and that his D-day is early October," I am still more disturbed.

I am also disturbed by Mr. Winchell's charge that a unanimous decision of the executive committee of the Democratic National Committee urging a policy of revision of the United Nations Charter was not presented to the President because of the interference of what Mr. Winchell refers to as the military party within our Government.

Personally, I believe that Mr. Winchell will welcome the opportunity of presenting whatever information he has to a duly constituted committee of the Congress. I want to make very clear that I am not asking Mr. Winchell to disclose the sources of his information but simply that he present the information he has officially to a congressional committee.

I am tired of trying to vote intelligently on legislation affecting our national security and safety on the meager factual information given to us. It is difficult to think straight and to arrive at a proper decision when one's thinking is disturbed by wild rumors, some of which are alleged to come from people in high places in our Government.

All I seek to do is to learn the whole truth about the situations to which I have referred. I hope that the resolution I have introduced will receive the speedy approval of this House so that the inquiry may go forward at once.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure while serving in Congress to work for the expansion of rural electrification.

Having been reared in a home lighted by kerosene lamps, and where the pumping of water was done by hand, I know what a blessing electricity is to the farmer and his family, especially his wife.

Recently I supported a motion to recommit a deficiency appropriation bill with instructions to include $300,000,000 for rural electrification. This motion was lost, but I hope that the amount can be included in the Senate. I have always supported appropriations for rural electrification, as I know that thousands of homes in America are enjoying the benefits of electricity today that would not yet have been reached by private companies. I hope that we can continue this program now, as the material necessary for this work will soon be available in sufficient quantities.

Today in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Boston Traveler on Monday, March 29, 1948:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON
(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Millions of mothers and fathers are beginning to worry over whether their sons will soon have to go to war. They—the parents and relatives of the men who would be asked to make the supreme sacrifice—have a right to ask whether everything has been or is being done that could be done to prevent war.

There are two historic methods of trying to avert war. One is to build up military armament and try to frighten the other party into submission. The second method is to try to resolve the points of difference by negotiation.

In America quite a propaganda has been built up against peaceful negotiation of the differences between Russia and the United States. The original argument is that Russia "understands only one language and that's the language of force."

If it be true that there is absolutely no other way to deal with Russia, except by force or threat of force, then war cannot be averted and the question of when an incident or overt act may occur is anybody's guess. It might occur in a few weeks or years—but that sort of logic means that only war can settle the outstanding issues.

If it be said on the other hand that peaceful negotiation should be tried, the official answer hereabouts is that this has been tried and has failed. Unfortunately the entire record is not available. For some mysterious reason the texts of all the notes exchanged between Russia and the United States have never been made public. The record of our public officials in their negotiations has never been subjected to impartial scrutiny by congressional committees. All that is heard is that the Russians are unreasonable, intractable, and don't want to negotiate.

What isn't disclosed particularly is what led up to the declaration of the Truman doctrine just a year ago. The Russians considered this a virtual declaration of war. What the Russians have done since has to be viewed in the light of America's decision in the Near East.

It is the period before the Truman doctrine was announced that could well be studied by historians. What did the Russians ask for? What did we refuse? Did we offer any alternative plans? When did we decide on force to back up diplomacy's failures?

Many officials insist that Russia has been aggressive from the beginning. If so, then war was inevitable from the day this fact became convincingly apparent to our officials. For if one nation has only diabolical designs against another nation, it doesn't matter much what is said between them in the period before war does break out.

Unfortunately the evidence does not show that the Russians and Americans ever understood each other. If force was the only language usable then America, while taking a strong hand in the various conferences, forsook the idea by withdrawing from Europe nearly all her forces, thus giving the Russians the impression that military force wasn't important after all.

Even today the Russians cannot be sure whether America has given up hope for a peaceful settlement. There is nothing to show that the United States will resume peaceful conversations or that the United States will go to war. The Russians cannot approach America with any peace plan because our officials say nothing would be accomplished by such discussions. Apparently our officials foreclose every opening for peaceful settlement now and give the impression that war is the only answer.

If American diplomacy connotes military action to back up immutable demands then a show-down cannot long be postponed. The behavior of American officials indicates that war is inevitable with only one proviso * * * that the Russians are considered to be too weak to start a war for at least 5 years.

But along with such statements one hears at the same time in Washington gloomy stories about our own lack of preparedness and of the real danger that for the first time in her history America may face defeat or stalemate in a major war. It all doesn't add up to much sense.

The public has a right to a better coordination of national policy. If, through good luck, a war can be staved off until after the November elections it may be that a nation which is united behind a President—whether it's Mr. Truman or anybody else—can then decide better on its course than can be done in the political atmosphere of today.

If America doesn't want to talk to Russia, then war is sure. The timing is less important than the fact that our officials behave as if they have done everything they could to prevent war and that unless the Russians agree to be frightened and retreat the fight must come sometime. It is a tragic prospect but it seems that all the ingenuity and resourcefulness which the highest officials of our Government think can be applied to a critical international situation and keep it on a peace basis have been exhausted. Meanwhile millions of persons are on the anxious seat wondering whether the Nation heads toward more scarcity of goods, more inflation, and bigger casualty lists than those of World War II.

Letters to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take advantage of the privilege accorded me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication and enclosures from four postal employees in Waterbury, Conn.

Their actions demonstrate, without a doubt, the fine, unselfish attitude of the great majority of our underpaid Federal workers. I believe that their example is an inspiring one and should spur us on to greater efforts in combating the menace of Communism, which is now seeking to destroy free peoples of the world.

The letters follow:

WATERBURY, CONN., *March 23, 1948.*
Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed are copies of two letters, one directly to Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, asking his permission for carrier distribution throughout the whole country of the second letter.

We believe that further explanation is unnecessary for the two explain themselves.

May we also have your reaction to our proposal?

With best wishes, we are,
Sincerely yours,
THOMAS F. PHALEN.
HUSTON F. CAROLAN,
HAROLD J. QUINN.
DANIEL F. WALSH.

WATERBURY, CONN., *March 23, 1948.*
Mr. JESSE DONALDSON,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: It has occurred to a group of letter carriers of Waterbury that we may possibly be able to help our country in its efforts to avoid another world-wide conflict, which, if it should happen, would be even more destructive than the holocaust just finished.

This is what we would suggest. The enclosed letter could, after proper editing for necessary corrections, be mimeographed or printed and distributed by carriers to all families of Italian extraction throughout the country. If the contents or instructions contained in the letter were to be followed, then those persons in Italy receiving letters from their friends or relatives here may possibly be influenced in the manner suggested in the letter. Small pamphlets similar to those used at Christmas requesting early mailing could be used instead of letters if necessary.

We hope this will meet with your approval, for it is our sole, sincere wish to do all in our power to help avoid another upheaval from which the entire world would be years in recovering.

It is our intention that these suggested letters be sent air mail, so as to reach their destinations before the elections to be held in Italy on April 18, 1948. Because of the nearness of the date, we believe speedy action is essential.

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS F. PHALEN.
HUSTON F. CAROLAN.
HAROLD J. QUINN.
DANIEL F. WALSH.

To All People of Italian Parentage in the United States:

People of the United States believe it would be to your advantage and to the best interest of your friends or relatives in Italy if they were to vote against communism, or its representatives, in the national elections of Italy to be held on April 18, 1948.

Communism is a dictatorial government which deprives people of the rights and privileges they could have under a democratic government, such as we have here in the United States.

Communism destroys freedom of speech.

Communism destroys freedom of religion.

Communism threatens the security of home life.

Communism can take children from control of parents so that a central government can better educate them to their ideals.

Communism can disrupt your normal way of living.

Therefore, it is suggested that some member of your family write to as many relatives or friends as possible, in Italy, telling them of the advantages to be gained by voting against representatives of communism.

It could also be said that if Italy were to elect a communistic government, that the people of the United States and its Government would no longer be able to extend a friendly hand to Italy's people. In fact, if such a form of government is elected, Italians may be forced to share what they now have with others.

It is suggested that these letters be sent by air mail so as to avoid further delay.

Air mail to Italy is 15 cents for a half-ounce letter.

Leib Played Important Role in Securing AMVET Congressional Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present at this time a few facts regarding the passage of the American Veterans of World War II Congressional Charter which was enacted into law last year.

It is an undisputable fact that the AMVET petition for a charter was sponsored and prepared by J. H. Leib early in 1946 while he was the organization's national legislative director. The yeoman work that he performed for AMVETS in Congress and throughout the Nation is well known to many Members of this Chamber and attested by the fact his efforts have been mentioned in Congress by numerous Members from every State in the Union. His task as national legislative director of AMVETS was to clear the road for recognition in behalf of an infant veterans' organization and he did a splendid job in that capacity.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD several pertinent letters and two newspaper clippings concerning this matter, as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR Mr. LEIB: Relative to our conversation of yesterday you may rest assured that I will do everything in my power to bring about the passage of the AMVET charter during this session of Congress.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., *Speaker.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1946.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
National Legislative Director, AMVETS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Please be advised that I have arranged for a hearing for the AMVETS

at 10 a. m. Wednesday, June 12, in the Judiciary room. The hearing will be held and witnesses will be heard before subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee, of which subcommittee I am chairman.

Yours very sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY WHIP,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1947.

MR. J. H. LEIB,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. LEIB: I was interested to note the efforts being made by AMVETS to procure a permanent charter. I shall be glad to speak to the leadership about it and try to be of all possible help to you in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

L. C. ARENDS, *Majority Whip.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1947.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. LEIB: I am very glad to have your views relative to the AMVETS charter. You may be assured I shall be very glad to cooperate with you in every way possible when this matter is brought up for further consideration.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GWYNNE.

(NOTE.—Congressman GWYNNE was chairman of the judiciary subcommittee that handled and passed the AMVET charter.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1946.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
National Legislative Director, AMVETS, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Your letter of May 22, 1946, and enclosures received. You may be assured H. R. 6143 will have my most careful study when its consideration by the committee gets under way, and I am glad to have the material regarding your organization which you have sent me.

Sincerely yours,

EARL C. MICHENER.

(NOTE.—Congressman MICHENER is now chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 22, 1947.

Mr. JOSEPH H. LEIB,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. LEIB: I am certain that the signing of the national charter for the AMVETS by President Truman was of special significance to you not only from the general point of view but also from the point of individual contribution.

The effective work that you, together with your coworkers, did in seeing the bill through to passage has borne fruit.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

(NOTE.—Congressman CELLER is now ranking minority leader of the House Judiciary Committee.)

[From the AMVETS National Auxiliary Advance of August 1947]

AMVETS FIRST AGAIN

PRESIDENT TRUMAN SIGNS CHARTER

AMVETS have the honor of being the first World War II veterans' organization to be recognized officially by Congress, when on July 16 they were granted a national charter. Last year AMVETS were the first veterans' organization of this war to be recognized by the VA.

The success of the campaign for the signing of the charter came as culmination of an effort begun last year when Representative PRICE of Illinois introduced bill H. R. 6143, on April 15, 1946, and Senator PAT MCCARRAN and Senator MCFARLAND introduced bill S. 2053 on April 10, 1946. This was as a result of the untiring effort of Joseph Leib, who was then legislative director of AMVETS. Past Commander Jack Hardy is due a great deal of credit for his efforts, as well as National Vice Commander Richard D. Marks, who has worked hard on Capitol Hill this year on the charter. It was pushed by AMVETS, big and small, and no small credit is due to AMVET posts in both Houses of Congress.

The charter will allow the group to use public buildings for meeting places and permit it to participate in the administration of State funds for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans. It extends the same legal status held by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans—only other charter holders.

[From the Stars and Stripes: the National Tribune of September 26, 1946]

VETERANS' ASSOCIATION RECOGNITION GIVEN TO AMVETS—GENERAL BRADLEY NOTIFIES COMMANDER HARDY OF APPROVAL IN PRESENTING OF VET CLAIMS

AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, has become the first World War II organization to receive official recognition from the Veterans' Administration.

Jack W. Hardy, AMVETS national commander, received notification of the recognition in a letter from Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The general wrote "I am pleased to inform you that I have approved your request for recognition of AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, under the provisions of section 200, Public, No. 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, in the presentation of claims before the Veterans' Administration."

The United States Senate unanimously approved legislation to give AMVETS a congressional charter as a nonprofit corporation before Congress adjourned. The measure also was recommended favorably by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee; but final congressional approval was not secured at the last session because of the last-minute pressure of business.

Much of the initial work on both the securing of recognition by the Veterans' Administration and congressional charter approved in the Senate was done by former Legislative Director Joseph H. Leib of Washington, D. C.

A Code of Fair Dealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 26, 1948:

A CODE OF FAIR DEALING

The charter of the International Trade Organization, signed at Habana by representatives of 53 nations, is one of those solid accomplishments which add to one's respect for human intelligence, patience, and good will. Its primary purpose is to set free the world's trade, to the mutual advantage of all participating nations. Naturally, this purpose cannot be realized at once. The charter is the product of compromises, many of them reluctantly acceded to by the United States. The issue between the highly developed and the less developed countries could not be wholly resolved. Existing preference systems are allowed to continue, though they may not be increased. Quantitative restrictions on imports are banned in principle, but with exceptions to take care of what are regarded as temporary emergencies.

But the charter does move toward certain objectives which will not be impossible of final attainment in a peaceful world. It seeks a balanced and expanding world economy. It proposes to promote industrial and general economic development, particularly of those countries which are still in the early stages of industrial development; to further the enjoyment by all countries, on equal terms, of access to the markets, products, and productive facilities which are needed for their economic prosperity and development; to promote the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce; to render restrictive measures unnecessary; to help solve problems relating to international trade in the fields of employment, economic development, commercial policy, business practices, and commodity policy.

These are large and sweeping terms, the full implications of which go far. But what is behind the charter is clear. During the interval between the two world wars the trading nations drifted further and further from the comparative fluidity of trade that had prevailed during the early years of the century. The rise of communism in Russia, of fascism in Italy, and of nazism in Germany placed great areas of the world under rigid and managed systems, in international trade as in other phases. The British Commonwealth of Nations clung desperately to a strengthened preference plan. Blocked currencies were the order of the day. Almost the only signs of light were the Hull reciprocal trade treaties, patiently negotiated over a series of years.

The Geneva Trade Conference, which met last April, frankly faced the fact that under postwar conditions individual nations were strongly tempted to impose or retain restrictions in what seemed to be their own narrow interests, but that if this practice were general all would lose. The Conference, in the words of Sir Stafford Cripps, proposed to do something "never before attempted except at the tower of Babel." In addition to writing the Charter the members also negotiated 123 trade agreements among themselves. The final result at Geneva was a document representing, as Russell Porter has pointed out in his dispatches to this newspaper from Havana, "the views of the great industrial and trading nations of the world." The process that has been going on at Havana since last November has been the modification of these views to meet the needs or policies of the smaller countries. As early as December 10, 800 amendments had been submitted.

Again and again the Havana meeting seemed about to wreck itself on quantitative restrictions—a term which became so familiar that it was soon abbreviated to "QR." Acting Chairman Clair Wilcox, of the United States delegation, deserves high credit for the final compromise, showing patience and skill of the highest order. The result was that out of 56 eligible delegations only 3 failed to sign—Argentina, Poland, and Turkey. Czechoslovakia, so recently and tragically shut behind the "iron curtain," nevertheless was a signatory of the ITO Charter. And behind the whole proceeding is a new prestige for the United Nations, under whose auspices this Conference was held.

This "code of fair dealing in international trade," as President Truman has called it,

must now go to the signatory governments for ratification. It is of the highest importance that our own ratification be swift, and that if implementing legislation is desirable, such legislation be promptly passed. Certainly the powers granted the Tariff Commission and President Truman under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which would otherwise lapse next June, should be extended. For the ITO Charter, no matter how imperfect, affords a firm base on which world recovery can continue long after ERP has done what we hope and pray will be its healing work.

Congress Should Be Furnished a Copy of Departmental Estimates Filed With the Bureau of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under existing law the head of each department of our Federal Government is required to submit to the Bureau of the Budget, on or before September 15 of each year, estimates of the amount necessary to operate his department during the next fiscal year.

The Budget Bureau analyzes these estimates, then submits them through the President to the Congress of the United States. In many instances, the estimates are reduced by the Bureau of the Budget before being submitted to Congress. When the budget reaches Congress, the heads of the various agencies are restricted by being forced to defend the figures arrived at by the Bureau of the Budget. They have no opportunity to refer to the need of their original estimates. The best illustration that can be used is that which concerns appropriations for national defense. Under our National Defense Act, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Forces, and the Chief of Naval Operations are required to provide the American people with an adequate national defense. In the field of national defense they are supposed to have the last word.

For the fiscal year 1949 the Army asked for $3,978,000,000, but the Bureau of the Budget reduced the figure to $3,013,000,000, or a decrease of $965,000,000. In the case of the Army Air Forces, the original request was for $4,422,000,000, which the Bureau of the Budget reduced to $3,054,000,000 a decrease of $1,368,000,000. The Navy Department asked originally for $5,310,000,000 but the Bureau of the Budget decreased this request to $3,510,000,000, or a reduction of $1,800,000,000. In other words, the original appropriations requested by the Army, Navy, and Air Forces totaled $13,710,000,000, which were reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to $9,577,000,000, or a decrease of $4,133,000,000.

On November 15, 1946, the President of the United States issued a memorandum to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in which he said in part:

I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them (departmental heads) and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress.

With this restriction in effect, Congress, representing the American people, is denied information as to the original budgetary requests of the heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces. While it is true that the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations have access to information concerning the original estimates, most of the information is obtained in a confidential way and behind closed doors. Congress, as a whole, is not furnished information concerning the original estimates of Federal agencies. This policy should be changed, and for that reason I have introduced a bill amending the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 so as to provide that budgetary requests of each governmental department, when submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, will also be furnished to Congress at the same time. In this way, every Member of Congress will have this information available and will not have to resort to snooping tactics to obtain it.

This bill, in my opinion, is a very important one, and I hope that it will receive immediate consideration by Congress.

The War Scare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOCK HAVEN, PA., *March 29, 1948.*

DEAR SIR: I am disturbed over the state of our international affairs, as I know you are; and I realize you are anxious to know what the people back home think, whether you agree with them or not. I don't pretend to know the facts of all our problems, nor the solutions to them, but I'm afraid we are following some dangerous trends that can lead to no permanent peace.

Something is wrong when the world's leading nation talks peace and at the same time takes the lead in an armament race. Something is wrong when we can maintain peaceful economic relations with Russia, calling her a friendly nation, and at the same time try to mobilize our forces to settle our political differences with her. Something is wrong when we give lip service to the United Nations and bypass her by reversing our decisions on Trieste and Palestine overnight. Something is wrong when our administration depends solely on military advice and solutions to our diplomatic problems—of course, we shall get the military answer. No nation has ever successfully held an olive branch in one hand and the atomic bomb (or its equivalent) in the other.

I'm not pro-Russian nor communistic. But can we condemn an eastern bloc in Europe when we are backing a western bloc—both do no more than divide the world in two and set up armed camps of opposition. Europe needs aid and must be rehabilitated—might not such a gesture through the United Nations rather than the Marshall plan, backed and manipulated through one nation, where economic pressure can talk just as effectively as political or military, serve our ultimate purpose of peace better and discourage the formation of blocs? If we don't strengthen the United Nations we'll be financing another war. It is always the nation who holds the purse strings that pays the bill. We are the only major nation to come out of this last war short of bankruptcy. Another war could easily pull us to their level instead of raising them to ours. For every problem war solves it creates a hundred worse ones. Military training or preparedness has never guaranteed any nation either victory or peace—look at Napoleon, Caesar, Hitler, master champions of military preparedness. Power is no substitute for diplomacy and war does not wipe out ideologies—it only wipes out people and creates future seedbeds for all sorts of radicalism that feeds on chaos, hunger, fear, and insecurity.

Military training and the revival of the draft is not a step toward world peace—it could be no more than an expediency. Of course Marshall would not favor backing world disarmament—where would the "brass hats" of any nation be? He would call it visionary and impractical. But what could be more impractical than war? What could be more costly and give less in return, even to the victor? We must have a police force in the world as it is today. It would cost the United States less and give her greater prestige among all other nations if she would back a United Nations police force—even if she had to pay the bulk of the bill—rather than to set us up as a police state.

But my chief argument against military training lies in the story of history. What happens when two nations arm against each other—just to play safe? What happens if my neighbor and I sit on our boundary lines with a gun at our shoulder, a suspicious eye on each other? Someone makes a false move—and a gun goes off—and then the whole neighborhood is involved. To hear us talk you would think it is only one nation that arms—to play safe. That never happens in history—it necessitates the arming of another nation, and another—just to play safe. And so we take our boys out of colleges where they are learning to be doctors, and teachers, and engineers, and social workers and we put a gun in their hands and tell them to keep an eye on the other fellow—"be prepared to meet your problems." And the problem grows with the growth of suspicion and fear and insecurity and armament—and our boys will know only the military answer. And we'll say we are on God's side and making the world safe for democracy. And we'll dip into our pockets for billions to finance a war that might have been avoided by half the cost of supporting diplomacy and education—with a little vision and patience and understanding and honest effort. Of course we don't solve our problems by appeasement—but has everyone forgotten the word compromise?

Why must we assume the problems of centuries must be solved in a day, or a month, or a year—at one conference—or we'll grab a gun and annihilate the problem? When VJ-day came and I saw the people hysterical with joy I could have wept—we are so willing to suppose that the dove of peace is something that perches on our shoulder as soon as we lay a gun down. Peace is an achievement that takes years of effort, patience, tact, education, compromise, sacrifice—with plenty of errors along the line—but grabbing a gun at every cross road does not bring the solution nearer.

And how I deplore the sensationalism of the newspapers and some commentators. It provides them an audience of course—peace

is never so glamorous as war. Russian submarines 200 miles from California should not be news unless they were sighted within our 3-mile limit—but you can sway a mob with such headlines.

Obviously we have failed on the diplomatic front in this administration. Could it be that a foreign scare will take the eyes off domestic troubles at election time? No matter how grave the problem—there must be someone with a solution short of war and national armament—if we are to survive, or be worthy of survival.

Everyone knows now that the Civil War could have and should have been avoided. Slavery was already on the way out and was dying of its own economic failure and the pressure of public opinion. We are still confronted with many of the problems of that war; but we don't pick up a gun and fight it out when the North and South disagree.

No one with intelligence wants to see communism supplant democracy. Communism follows all wars—and would follow another. It is a symptom of economic and political chaos and insecurity—the result of social maladjustment. The cause of communism should be wiped out—then it can't survive. The Christian Church tried communism and it died out; the Virginia colony was first set up on a communistic basis—it didn't work and died out. We have had various communistic settlements in our own Pennsylvania in its early history—they died out when democracy proved superior. The only way to fight communism is to make democracy work and to prevent the conditions in which it would flourish. Communism is a weed that crops up in a poorly tended garden, destroying the whole garden is an expensive way to eradicate the weed. A starving man or nation is the most dangerous threat to world peace; wars give us starving men and bankrupt nations—a perfect seed-bed for communism. Isn't it about time we try to solve our problems instead of shooting at them. A man disagrees with his wife—he does not solve his problems by shooting her. My ideologies are not identical with many of my neighbors—we manage to get along in the common interest of us all without shooting out our differences.

I don't need to mention the increased dangers of inflation with another war—no one knows better than you Congressmen what that would mean. But if force must supplant reason and intelligence in meeting our problems I feel we are going the way of Egypt, Greece, Rome, France, Spain, and the British Empire. Recently I received a letter from a Dr. Fisher at Canton, China—a teacher of English in the university there. One statement in the letter brought me up short: "There will be no real crisis in China so long as there is no foreign intervention." I called a former missionary to see what he would say of such a statement. His reply, "That is the way we always felt when we were in China. China needs food, material improvements, education—but not guns." It is one thing to rehabilitate a country but quite another apparently to use that country as an armed camp to promote our own interests—we are bound to invite a clash of arms with other nations upon whose interests we may also be encroaching. Of course we want democracy for the whole world—but can we can get it at the point of a gun?

If it were a matter of just a gun, war would be relatively simple. We could follow the old pattern of men and arms. But what good will 100,000 trained military men do this little town if one atomic bomb is dropped? We have the secret of the atom bomb? Since when has science shown any favoritism in dispensing her secrets? I may refuse my neighbor my best cake recipe—and wake up to find she has concocted one better than mine. The methods used to train our boys now, and the equipment, will be obsolete in 5 years. There must be another way out—why can't we have the long view instead of a policy of inadequate expediency?

Very truly yours,

MRS. LA RUE GRESS LEHMAN.

Hamilton Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 19, 1948:

THE TREMBLING LITTLE MAN

Hamilton Fish, whose record as a nationalist and an anti-New Dealer makes him anathema to all me-too Republicans, filed as a candidate for delegate to the Republican National Convention from his congressional district in New York. One of Governor Dewey's stooges in the State Republican machine has managed to throw out Fish's nominating petition on technical grounds.

Dewey and his crowd wouldn't have gone to these lengths to bar Fish from the ballot if they hadn't been afraid that he would win. The little wedding-cake bridegroom in Albany still has to preserve the appearance of a candidate, even though he really isn't one. His role in the convention is to create a deadlock and prevent the nomination of an honest Republican. He can't win himself; he knows he can't win, and everyone else knows he can't win.

To keep up appearances, however, it is necessary that he go into the convention with the solid backing of his own State. Fish was a barrier to that legend of unanimity, so the Dewey crowd had to liquidate him.

Why Farm Prices Have Been High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am herewith including an article entitled "Why Farm Prices Have Been High," by Dr. John D. Black, professor of economics at Harvard University. This article appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

WHY FARM PRICES HAVE BEEN HIGH—THE WIDE HORIZON

(By John D. Black, professor of economics at Harvard University and authority on farm economy)

A large fraction of the people of this country have been blaming agricultural prices and even the farmers for the inflation in full gallop until a week or so ago, and very possibly only temporarily checked. And then they have gone on from there to blame the high prices of farm products on Government price supports and have demanded that all these supports be removed.

The mere fact that wholesale prices of these products have broken as they have recently should be sufficient answer to the second of these charges. These breaks prove conclusively that it was not Government price support that was holding the prices of food and fibers at over 120 percent of parity, but instead the forces of supply and demand, coupled with a lot of the speculative holding for a further rise that always comes in a period of inflation.

The Government price-support level is only 90 percent of parity (92½ percent for cotton) and, of course, these supports do not cover all products. The last monthly report on prices shows hay at the farm at 62 percent of parity and citrus fruits at the orchard down around 20 percent of parity. It is true that a modernized parity would reduce parity prices for oranges about a third, but even then the prevailing prices would be only a third of parity.

Virtually no other prices would go down to these levels or anywhere near them if the Government price-support program was abolished. This program has strengthened somewhat the prices of a small list of farm products, including principally potatoes, peanuts, poultry, and eggs, which have generally been hovering around parity, and more often a little below than above it. But if all of the price-support measures had been stopped, the parity ratio would not have fallen more than two or three points below the 123 which it averaged last month.

How much of the level of 123 was because of basic supply and demand factors and how much because of speculative elements in the market is not for me to say at this time. We shall never know, if we get a real business recession shortly. If, however, prices of farm products straighten out after a week or two at a level, let us say, of 110 percent of parity, we shall be able to say that the extra 13 was mainly because of speculative holding. If we get a real recession at this time, of course prices of farm products may go clear down to the support-price level, and even below it temporarily in some cases.

There are some other Government activities which do strengthen farm prices. Buying to supply hungry Europe comes under this head. But this is a part of the demand—and a small part of it at that. It is also true that the price of sugar would fall a cent or two per pound if import duties and restrictions on sugar imports were removed. Removing the ban on imports of beef from Argentina would also lower meat prices. But present arrangements with respect to these cannot be properly connected with inflation. They have been national policy for a long time. The sugar duties were twice their present levels during the Hoover administration.

That domestic demand is almost solely responsible for the high prices consumers pay at retail—and these are the prices that really count—is evident from the exorbitant profits being made by the processors and distributors of commodities of agricultural origin. In 1947 in the textile industry, to take the extreme case, a profit of 47 percent was made on actual investment before taxes and 28 percent after taxes. Profits of department and dry goods stores on textile goods are probably not equally high, but are far above normal. Yet consumers have gone ahead and bought all they could get of these commodities at these extravagant prices. And if you believe in the profit system as is, you have no basis for criticizing the processors and merchants for these high profits.

Suppose they had denied themselves these profits, would this have helped? The shelves of the merchants would have been swept completely bare; the processors would have been under extreme pressure to manufacture

more goods; prices in cotton and wool markets would have been pushed well above the levels of the past year, and the farmers would have made the profits instead of the processors and merchants. The consumers at the same time would have had more money to spend on other things, and would have pushed up the prices of these.

An argument can be advanced to the effect that the consumers, and even the poor farmers, need additional goods in their standards of living much more than the manufacturers and merchants need more profits; but this has nothing to do with inflation. In fact, so far as inflation is concerned, the argument runs the other way; the more income that is put in the hands of consumers, the more of it will be spent, and the more the inflation will be.

One more point needs to be made about the support-price program for farm products. The farmers could not be expected during the war to expand their production to meet war needs unless assured of prices equal at least to 90 percent of normal cost-price (or parity) relationships for 2 years after the end of the war. We underwrote the investment of manufacturers in other products needed in the war effort, and we could do nothing less in the case of the farmers if we expected to get the food produced.

It takes 2 years or more to recover on an expanded investment in most lines of farm production—4 or 5 years, for example, on an investment in dairy production, or in farm equipment. Fortunately for the Government, the demand for farm products has thus far supported prices of most farm products at the guaranteed level.

Nor is the time for such underwriting of farm prices past. The world is still short of food. We must plan our production this year, and probably next, as if there will be unfavorable weather in some major-producing areas, for only so will we be sure of having enough. If the weather then proves to be highly favorable for some crop, we must be prepared to step in and support the price.

We must assure the producers in advance that we will do this. Otherwise they cannot be expected to plant the acreages which will prove to be needed in the event of bad weather. We must continue such a policy with each major farm product until the world has built up enough reserves of it to take care of one bad year.

Finally, to assure farmers of prices at 90 percent of parity no matter what the size of the crop, and thus induce them to produce enough to be safe, is also very good protection against the inflationary effect of a short crop.

Danger From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, most people know there are reds and parlor pinks in the Administration, but few of us realize the number of people with police records, who are administering our laws—carrying on our business. If you are interested, read this editorial from the Chicago Tribune of March 30. Here it is:

HAVEN FOR CROOKS

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the instance of Attorney General Tom Clark, set out on a propaganda mission to demonstrate that the New Deal is not so top-heavy with bolsheviks as it sometimes seems. The results were unexpected.

Communists usually sail under false colors and keep their tracks well covered, so that it is hardly a surprise that the FBI has been able to report to Clark's order that the files fail to reflect overt disloyalty in 99 percent of the cases studied. It is true that no less than 84,923 suspects were cited among the first 410,211 Federal pay-rollers to come under scrutiny, but the FBI professed inability to pin anything on all but 1 percent.

But in the course of these inquiries the FBI matched up enough fingerprints to uncover the striking fact that one of every 12 persons in Truman's bureaucracy has a police record. "The great mass," states Chief J. Edgar Hoover, "are felonies; we have very few misdemeanors." Mr. Hoover took some satisfaction in the fact that very few of these lawbreakers were also Communists.

He stated that in the civil service as a whole 205,279 jobholders were found to have police records, but that the Civil Service Commission has fired only 8,761, reprimanded 1,964, and warned 2,331. Nothing has been done about the rest.

In addition, 6,221 of 71,920 persons seeking positions in the atomic energy program were found to have records, and 11,521 of 410,211 pay rollers checked under the loyalty procedures. The investigation has proceeded far enough, according to Hoover, to establish that there is a consistent ratio of 8.5 percent of Government workers who have transgressed the law.

In the light of the Truman administration's unsavory record as the protector of the Pendergast vote thieves of Kansas City and as fairy godmother to the Capone mob, four of whose leading lights were recently paroled after considerable sums of money found their way into the hands of pals of Truman and Clark, the rush of the jailbirds to Washington need occasion no great wonder.

An administration which for 15 years has been synonymous with graft, scandal, trickery, and corruption, whose former head lent himself to the $200,000 swindle of John Hartford and whose present boss runs with the Pendergast convicts, is certain to attract other birds of the same feather.

Bull's-Eye Scored by Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a reprint of a notice which appeared in the Postal Bulletin of March 2, 1948, in which the new Postmaster General—the first such high official ever to be promoted from the ranks of the postal workers—gives some very helpful and long overdue advice to his thousands of colleagues in the postal service.

I believe that we in Congress should praise Federal administrators, regardless of political affiliation, if they show themselves to be truly efficient and earnestly endeavoring to make the Government service better. In this instance, the Honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, the new Postmaster General, certainly has scored a bull's-eye for the post-office hierarchy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Postmaster General's order:

[Order No. 36725; dated February 27, 1948]

ORDER OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

To All Postal Personnel:

From the time of its establishment in the very earliest days of the Republic, the United States postal service has had as its primary function the collection, distribution, transportation, and delivery of the mails.

We in the postal service cannot lose sight of the fact that we have a grave responsibility to the people of this country to keep the mails moving quickly and on schedule at all times.

Postal revenues and mail volume have increased so rapidly in recent years that it has not been possible, due to other demands on industry, to secure all of the equipment, buildings, and related items of supply that we require. Expansion in facilities will be provided as quickly as economic conditions permit, but in the meantime we must maintain an efficient and regular mail service in every city, town, and village, and on every rural route. To accomplish this, we must have the fullest cooperation of our entire postal organization.

Notwithstanding the use of machinery, conveyors, and other timesaving devices, efficient mail service is, and always will be, dependent on the devotion to duty and the skill of our vast army of postal workers.

It takes human minds, and eyes, and hands to read addresses and to effect the sorting, distribution, and delivery of the mails. Therefore, in this fundamental personal service, our success is measured by our ability to work together for the common good. Those charged with the responsibilities of administration and supervision must be firm but kind and tolerant. Each employee must be treated as a dignified human being. Conversely, each employee must have proper respect for his superiors and be willing to perform the duties assigned to him cheerfully. Briefly stated—it is my earnest wish that all workers and supervisors will follow the precepts of the Golden Rule.

Courtesy is contagious: If all those in our organization are courteous to one another, it will be reflected in courteous service to the patrons. It is easy to acquire the habit of saying "Please" and "Thank you," and it makes the day's work so much easier that I am asking everyone who contacts the public to acquire this simple, courteous attitude. I am sure it will pay rich dividends in good will.

Personal appearance is also important. All those meeting the public should present a clean, neat appearance at all times. It is of equal importance to keep workrooms and public lobbies in good order by regular, frequent, and thorough cleaning. Let us get our houses, large and small, in order and then let us all put our shoulders to the wheel so that the mails will get in and out on time. Do first things first, which in the postal service means:

(1) Work first-class and daily papers for dispatch on the first available train or airplane and for delivery on the first available trip.

(2) Work all other classes of mail in the order received and keep it moving. Eliminate congestion and delay in post offices and railway-mail-service terminals.

(3) Make frequent checks on the handling of mail by transportation agencies and take prompt steps to eliminate all delays.

(4) Check collection and delivery schedules frequently to insure proper flow of the mail and expeditious service. Keep these collection and delivery trips on schedule.

It is requested that postmasters, general superintendents of railway mail service, inspectors in charge, and their staffs, coordinate their efforts to correct any service irregularities or difficulties and, when all concerned are in full accord, take the necessary action in the field without referring the matter to the Department. Each postmaster and general superintendent is expected to act independently if no other service is involved. Obviously where increased expenditures are to be made, prior approval must be secured from the proper bureau.

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

Our Biggest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from Rev. N. R. Stone, of Corsicana, Tex., who has had more than 50 years of service in the Methodist Church. Reverend Stone has requested me to have his letter brought to the attention of all Members of Congress.

OUR BIGGEST PROBLEM

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Washington, D. C.:

There are some great questions, besides politics, that need attention in 1948. When the question of giving is up for any cause whatsoever, the first thing to consider is, are we able, have we got it to give? That can and should be answered by a direct "Yes" or "No." Any arguments on the merits of the case is meaningless until question one is settled. We cannot honestly give that we do not have.

We lost more than $250,000,000,000 in the war gamble, money we still owe. The world is no better off, Europe is no better off. Every sane man must admit $250,000,000,000 is only a small part of our loss. Yes, if we had only stayed out of that gamble in Europe, we might be in position now to help substantially where help is needed, that help is needed no one will deny. That question needs no argument.

No one has yet come forth with a plan to liquidate that war debt in the next 50 to 100 years. There are plans, and plans to add millions, and millions more to the debt. What a burden on the necks of future generations. Is that fair treatment for the unborn millions in our own homeland? Is it honest? That that does not belong to us should not be given away even in acts of charity. The future generations must bear the burdens of their own times.

What will this Congress do about that big debt that is right now threatening our security? Our security is not so much dependent on military preparedness and the UMT as it is on the liquidation of that debt. That is the biggest question before our Nation today. A plan to pay five billion a year and interest will clear the debt in 50 years, if we have no more wars. But for our safety it should be liquidated in 25 years.

The common people are agreed on one thing that is needed at Washington, less extravagance and greater economy in running the Government. That "25 percent reduction in Government expenses" must now be more than the empty promise and the mirage they have followed till they are faint and heart sick. Here is where the money must come from to pay old debts. The country will not stand for higher taxes or the present wartime taxes much longer.

If this Nation is to survive and retain her place among the leading nations of the world as leader, she must plan a more economical regime. A debt that has been accumulating for 15 years will not be easily liquidated. We may not hope to get out of the red in our time and truthfully say the books are in balance, but we can inaugurate a plan, if faithfully followed, some future generation may have that satisfaction.

N. R. STONE.

Veterans' Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I am quoting from the Rehabilitation Service Bulletin published by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States under date of March 10, 1948. This is one of the best discussions of the different problems arising under the administration of the so-called GI bill of rights that I have seen and would like to commend its reading to the membership of the House.

Those Members who have received numerous communications on the subject of avocational training for veterans will do well to read the following bulletin to which I have already referred.

VFW VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND EDUCATION BULLETIN NO. 27

Sooner or later it was bound to arise and now it is here—the question as to the relative prudence exercised by our GI's in the selection of types of training under Public Law 346, and the question mark on the ultimate success which our GI's will obtain. This is the $64 question. This bulletin will not give you the answer, but it will give you enough basic information to bring you up to date on what is going on, and at a later date, place you in a better position to analyze the situation in your own backyard.

Without possessing the qualities of a mystic, I believe it safe to say that all of the activity now in progress on this problem, in the form of news releases, surveys, congressional hearings, conferences, etc., will eventually result in some modifications to the GI bill. I doubt very much that any changes will take place this year, but the hubbub of chatter gives strong indications of what is in store for the future, based on present findings.

It is interesting to listen to and read the comments of various nonveteran groups and persons who present their ideas relative to veterans' welfare, but when such persons are so far removed from veterandom and start to speak for the veteran they usually end up on the wrong track.

By this time we have developed certain views and have drawn certain conclusions about the GI program and how it has progressed thus far in our own community. We know that it is not, nor never will be, any better than the veterans' ability, interest, and application to the type of training he has chosen. However, the decision that our veterans must make on a future career is not an easy one. They, like everyone else, are trying to obtain the security of the future by their present planning and in the light of present conditions, with talk of depression, job markets, and even a potential war, it is no easy task to use calm, easy reasoning about the future.

To make the matter more practical, look to your own experience and to the experience of those who come in contact with you. How difficult a decision it is, to arrive with a degree of certainty, at a future occupation? If someone 20 years ago would have told you that you would be a VFW service officer today; that I would be writing this to you; that we would have seen activity in many other occupations before we finally settled on the one that best suited our abilities—would you have agreed with them? The answer, I leave with you. The only point that I am trying to make here is that our GI's are having the same trouble trying to decide just what is best for their own future.

Most veterans, I believe, are capable of planning their future wisely. By this I mean that they have the native ability to follow through on what they have started, to a successful completion. Evidence from training institutions all over the country, give proof to the fact that they have left an unmistakable mark on the American scene. They work hard, work their teachers harder, get higher marks, and waste little time on horseplay. In fact, they will eventually bring about a second industrial revolution but this time it will be in education, for the reason that they are showing the schools that some of their methods of teaching and procedure are just a little on the antiquated side.

It is also true that we have veterans who are attending school merely for the sake of receiving a subsistence allowance, until something better shows up. For these veterans I manifest no interest. If they do not want to help themselves seriously, they most certainly don't want any help from the VFW. This group of veterans are at a minimum, thank goodness.

There is another group of veterans that really need our assistance. It was true before the war, and it is true now, that there are veterans who are not capable of setting up a proper prospective and following through to completion. These veterans, sincere with themselves, but confused as to how and where to proceed, are the victims of anyone who can sell them a bill of goods. And believe me, there are lots of bills of goods being sold too, and the poor veteran doesn't know what to do with it after he buys it. Letters coming across your desk and mine, interviews with veterans day after day, give indication of what has been said. Just for example sake—here is a veteran who is attending a radio school because, as he stated, it looked so simple and appeared to be the quickest approach to a method of earning money to support his family. Without consulting anyone, he entered school. After going to school for about 2 months, he finds that he is not doing too well and becomes the victim of lucious advertising in some other field, and decides that refrigeration is the thing for him. Now just what is happening to this veteran? He is sincere, we won't question that. But here he is wasting valuable eligibility time, and building up a mind-set of discouragement, simply because he does not have the ability to plan.

Now we have a cross-section of veterans in training. For all veterans we have advocated the use of advisement and guidance, as a possible solution. Yes, I know that it is not 100-percent accurate; in fact, we both know that any test of human nature has its limitations. But we are agreed that it is a more certain guidepost than to select a course of education or training out of mere whim or fancy, rather than on the solid ground of ability and a fair indication of success.

We have no reason to question the courses taken by those veterans, who can show something tantamount to occupational as well as cultural success in life. If, however, we put the accent on the cultural alone, or on the hobby interest of the veteran, then the intent and purpose of the GI bill is being defeated. We are not saying that cultural or hobby courses are wrong, but we are saying that such courses are not the intent of the GI bill. The intention of the Congress is the rehabilitation of the veteran to the role he must play in civilian life as a productive citizen. Now, many schools have shifted their emphasis from vocational opportunities for

veterans to promises of fun and enjoyment for recreational, social, and leisure-time pursuits. It is apparent that the intent of the law is being set aside. More evidence can be thrown out to prove this point, too. For example, one advertisement for a course in ballroom dancing asks, "Are you tapped by the best dancers?" and offers "in a few magic hours" to make veterans, via the GI bill, "the darling of the stag line." Baloney, pure and simple. Another, a flight-training school, advertises: "Know the exhilaration of flying on crisp, clear days, or the thrill of flying through the night," in an advertisement urging veterans to enroll now under the GI bill. I am not saying that flight training, dancing, music lessons, or any other type of training is to be condemned. No; but where it is evident that such courses are not preparing for a job objective, then, as Will Rogers says, "I'm agin it."

The language of the GI bill (Public Law 346, as amended) is very broad. Enrollment in training courses, for example, which have no connection whatsoever with occupational objectives of veterans, is not prohibited under the law. It was the intention of the Congress that the training in which the veteran engaged, should contribute materially toward his occupational objective. As it now stands, the VA is powerless to issue any regulations to confine training to that which will lead toward an occupational objective.

The GI bill was enacted by Congress in June of 1944. The purpose of the law was to accomplish the transition from military life to civilian life, via the media of education or training to prepare the veteran for a productive livelihood in a respectable and honest occupation. Out of this law the greatest expansion in education became a reality. Never in the history of education was such an interest manifested in training. Close to 5,000,000 veterans have already taken advantage of the provisions of the law, and we have also seen the advent and development of many new schools and training institutions.

The responsibility was delegated to the States to prepare lists of educational and training institutions which were qualified and equipped to provide training for veterans. The schools, because of the wording of the law, that were approved can be either of a recreational nature, an outlet for hobby interests, or one of sound vocational training. It is the duty of the State approving agencies to investigate and supervise the places which they approve. We need not bow our heads when we say it, but all of the State approving agencies have not lived up to good basic standards of education, judging from the types of places that are placed on the approved lists. It is easy enough for a State approving agency to approve a place of training, but unless there is follow-up and supervision of the approved place of training, the elements of decay soon rear their ugly head to the disadvantage of the veteran and the discredit of the approving agency. If you believe that this is far-fetched, the files of complaints from veterans will more than justify the contention. The task placed upon the approving agencies was an enormous one, many of them approving schools long before any established procedures were available by which to measure what should be approved and what should be rejected. The job is just too big for the State approving agencies to competently control. In many States one man is responsible for over 200 schools and places of training. Funds are not available in other States. But there is no use crying over "spilt milk." The situation is here, and the veterans select what is approved and hope that they get the best of the bargain.

Earlier, I mentioned that many new schools came into existence since the passage of the GI bill. They are approved by the State approving agency and are in business to make a profit. There are close to 30,000 of these private schools in the United States. In fact it is really a big business, running into billions of dollars. Our veterans attend these schools in large numbers, and a question mark looms up on the sincerity of some of these schools. This is not meant to be a crack at the private schools, collectively, because for years certain private schools of long standing have served a worthy public service by filling a gap that was not provided in public education. We have no cause for argument with those schools that are primarily interested in serving a public function, but we most certainly have a gripe to pick with those schools that have profit as their primary consideration.

It is easy enough for people to criticize the VA in its issuance of regulations and what have you. I'm not saying either that I always agree with the regulations that are issued, but I want to make clear that in 1945 when only about 5,000 veterans were in this program, no one dreamed that it would ever grow to some 2,600,000. Obviously regulations had to be made and made fast, and because of this fact errors have been made. But I have also found that whenever we could go to the VA and say that we felt a certain procedure was incorrect and substantiate our reasonings by facts, a change was brought about in regulation. Even the representatives in the conference on private schools publicly admitted that the VA was honestly and conscientiously applying what they believed to be the law. When Congress writes out a law, they cannot spell out each and every act, like you would the ABC's, and the VA is charged by law as the agency to give the proper interpretation. Our policy has been, that when a dispute arises between the VA and the school we will listen to both sides and then, after a deliberation of the merits of the case, take a stand in the interest of the veteran and the law. Our direct responsibility is to the veterans and his interests, and everything consistent with the law should be construed to foster his welfare.

In March 1943, just a year prior to the passage of the so-called GI bill, the law known as Public Law 16 was passed for the vocational rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of World War II. The pattern followed by this law was similar to that which was used after World War I, but with decided improvement—to give a sound employment objective for each veteran so as to make him self-reliant and self-supporting. You are aware of the fact that Public Law 16 veterans, only enter training after they have been exposed to psychological testing and a determination of a definite job objective. The reason for this method of approach is quite obvious. Under Public Law 16, the Veterans' Administration has a direct responsibility to see to it that the rehabilitation of the veteran to a suitable employment objective is accomplished. In their efforts to accomplish this end, the VA is most cautious in the movements they make regarding the disabled veteran. Despite this cautiousness, however, we know that the employability of these veterans, after training, presents a major problem, and is the real test of the success of the program. But the step is in the right direction—good training. For the purpose of our discussion, it is to be noted that the same caution is not exercised when it comes to veterans in training under Public Law 346, because the law does not require it. I am contented to know that the interest of our disabled comrades is protected, as this protection extends to some 250,000 men now in training. But I can't lose sight of the fact that for every one man training under Public Law 16, you have 10 men training under Public Law 346. At the present time, there are approximately 2,600,000 veterans in training under Public Law 346. Out of this number, plus those who have either used up their eligibility or who have discontinued training, only one in about eight have used the advisement and guidance service. In other words, a free rein is given to the veteran to choose any type of training that is approved, and because of those veterans who cannot plan; because of those schools and training establishments which jumped on the band wagon for profit; because of the laxity of some State approving agencies; because of the reductions in the number of training officers, who formerly supervised the veteran in training, but who no longer do so, and because of the broad meaning to be taken from the wording of the GI bill, we have our present problem.

The question now is: At what point are you going to make changes in the GI bill? There has to be some freedom of choice of courses and we cannot make the same mistake that some other groups have done, namely, condemn the school alone, when it is a good school, but one that offers instruction in an already overcrowded field of endeavor. Some definite wording must be put into law that will bring about the solution to all the becauses mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

A Different View of Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from a recent issue of the Country Gentleman entitled "A Different View of Surpluses":

The common feeling toward an old farm bogey—surpluses of food and feed grains—needs changing. Nearly all the proposals for a new farm program so far presented to the House and Senate committees have viewed an oversupply as an evil to be prevented or got rid of as speedily as possible.

Yet recent experience, during the war and at present, has twice demonstrated that reserves of food and feed grains are an inestimable asset. When Pearl Harbor came, approximately 600,000,000 bushels of wheat, corn, and other grain were in storage, either owned by the Government or under loan. Without these reserves the expanded livestock, dairy, and poultry programs, which contributed so much to victory, would have been impossible. Right now a reserve of wheat and feed grains would be one of the greatest blessings we could have. It would avert a reduction of livestock and poultry that threatens to carry them below the country's going needs.

Such urgencies can be repeated in the future. Droughts will recur, as this year. We have embarked on a foreign program that is likely to call for emergency supplies at times. This country has nearly 12,000,000 more people than in 1940 and its growing population has shown that it wants to eat more meat, dairy and poultry products. Long-range farm programs to raise the food level in this country by expanding production along these lines have been proposed by H. E. Babcock, in Country Gentleman, and by the Department of Agriculture. They can be successful only if adequate feed reserves are on hand to stabilize operations. Without them the first drought or emergency drain on supplies would cause a liquidation of herds and flocks that would be disastrous to farmers.

Plainly an adequate reserve of food and feed grains is in the interest of agriculture, the consuming public and the nation. The

question is how to prevent it from having a depressing effect on farmers' market prices.

One logical method has been suggested. This is for Congress to establish, as a permanent Government policy, that such a reserve shall be maintained as an investment in the national security. Although it would be turned over to prevent deterioration, the same volume would be held until needed to meet shortages or other emergencies. It would be off the market until required. Any production goals which might be set up would take its existence into account. Part of the depressing effect of surpluses in the 1930's is attributed to uncertainty over Government policies. There would be no uncertainty over this policy. Such a reserve might still exert some influence on the market, but this should be outweighed by its stabilizing effect on agriculture generally.

There is the further factor of the public interest, which must be considered in any farm program. Farmers want and are entitled to price supports to protect them from disastrous price breaks. But no such insurance can be a one-sided proposition. In return for it the consuming public is entitled to the assurance of plenty of food. A safe reserve of food and feed grains is necessary if that is to be done.

With the present outlook for winter wheat and the prospect of nearly empty bins next summer, there is no chance now of building up such an extra supply. But Congress, at least, should recognize the necessity and provide for the future. The earliest possible accumulation of an adequate reserve of food and feed grains and its maintenance for emergencies should be made a definite Government policy. And such a surplus should be financed and looked upon as what it really is—an investment in the national security and not a burden to be borne by the farmers.

The Marshall Plan—What it Will Cost You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because its terms have been uncertain, few have had the opportunity to learn the cost of the Marshall plan.

Recently the Congressional Legislative Service, which receives some $250,000 per year to furnish information, made a study of the plan as now proposed and learned that from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, we extended aid to foreign nations to the amount of $24,099,211,087. If that amount had been paid in proportion by each individual, it would have cost each of us, including the children, those in prison, hospitals, and Federal institutions, $183.03. The present proposal, extending from 1948 to 1952, and calling for but $17,000,000,000, will cost each of us $129.11.

If you figure the two together, each of us will be required to pay $312.14 for foreign aid. But if you want to know what the plan will really cost you, you might, just for a pastime, sit down, figure the number of people in your block, then determine how many can pay this $312.14, or any part of it, count them out and determine just how much you and those who can pay will be required to pay to aid foreign nations.

To give you a little more information about the cost, there is printed herewith an article by STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator from New Hampshire, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee which handles appropriations. If anyone knows anything about what this plan will cost, Senator BRIDGES undoubtedly has as much reliable information as anyone. My suggestion is that you read his statement.

Most respectfully, too, I add that if you are inclined to find fault about high prices, about the scarcity of something you went to town to buy, just remember that the Marshall plan and its advocates are, to a large degree, responsible for those high prices, those scarcities.

You know, you just cannot, and I am sure you will pardon the repetition of this shopworn statement, have your cake and eat it, too. You cannot send it abroad and use it here at home.

The article by Senator BRIDGES, which was printed in the March issue of the American magazine, is as follows:

ERP—WHAT IT WILL COST YOU

(By STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator from New Hampshire)

I often wonder, as I sit in Congress, how many Americans back home are facing up to the cold, hard truth about the Marshall plan to promote European recovery. How many have figured out what it will mean to them for the next several years in terms of grocery bills, taxes, rents, and that new car they want? Are they ready to pay the price?

These questions bother me because the Senate Appropriations Committee, which I head, must decide each year how many billions of dollars our country can prudently spend on this project. The people should know the facts and be prepared to pay the price before we appropriate money to send billions of dollars' worth of American products to Europe.

Perhaps I am so conscious of public opinion because I am from a Yankee State where voters are in the habit of telling their lawmakers what they think in bluntest terms. A few months ago, before I left for Europe to investigate the need for a Marshall plan, a friend of mine, who was the railroad ticket agent from whom I was purchasing a ticket, remarked to me: "Well, I don't know what this Marshall plan is all about, but to be frank, Senator, I don't think you do, either."

I concede there was possibly something in what he said, and in Europe I tried to remedy the situation. My committee went into nearly every corner of Europe. We talked not only to government officials but to opposition leaders, farmers, industrialists, and miners. In at least one instance I was examining the horse's mouth so closely that I was accused of being a snooper. I did not mind that, for I think America is entitled to know how some of the billions we have sent abroad are being spent.

On my return I talked over my findings with some of my neighbors. I told them that western Europe, as I saw it, is war-torn and virtually poverty stricken, a pauper drain on the rest of the world, and a breeding ground for communism. I told them I had reached the conviction that for the next few years we, in America, should appropriate money to send substantial aid to Europe to help get its people on their feet.

"Our Government has taken over the role of leadership for three-quarters of the world," I said. "If we are to live up to our responsibilities, you and I have got to do this thing, and we might as well face it."

One of my friends, Seth Durham, a storekeeper who gave me my first $5 contribution when I ran for Governor in the thirties, explained his feelings to me. "For years," he said, "it seems like we've done nothing but sacrifice to make a better world. I've sent my boy to war. I've gone without help here at the store and scrimped on food and gas, and have had to put up with high prices and taxes. Now I'm all tuckered and confused no end. We seem to be getting nowhere faster all the time. I suppose we've got to do this, STYLES, but put on all the safeguards you can."

I assured him I would do my best.

I think that most Americans feel much the same way about the European recovery plan. Sending these billions will hit us all hard. It is unquestionably a gamble, a definite risk. But, as I told my neighbors, we shall be taking a greater gamble, and running a more frightful risk, if we don't.

The State Department's original plans submitted to Congress were so loosely drawn that, to my mind, the risk was aggravated. However, these risks can be greatly reduced if we insist that the European governments get their houses in order, and likewise insist that our Government follow up the aid in a businesslike manner to make sure the aid is used effectively.

The aid program is one way, short of physical combat, of discouraging the imperialist ideas of Moscow. We should look at it as a sort of insurance policy for a peaceful world in which our families can be prosperous and intact.

While this insurance policy will be cheaper than war, it will still be a real burden to every American. And unless this disagreeable fact is faced, an enormous disillusionment lies ahead. Too many of the administration's spokesmen have tried to gloss over this burden.

My neighbors in New Hampshire—and all the people of the United States—have got to realize that the tremendous shipment of goods contemplated by the European recovery program is going to hit them right in their homes, stomachs, and pocketbooks. It is going to mean that my friend, Seth Durham, for example, is going to have to pay still higher prices in many cases. Also, he's going to have to put up with more shortages, and he's going to have to pay high taxes for several more years. I'm still not sure how well Seth is going to like this aspect of the European recovery plan.

Perhaps the burden would not be so heavy if it came some other time. But as it is, the aid program is coming when the United States is in the midst of a tremendous inflationary boom and is desperately trying to balance supply and demand.

I have discovered from talking to Seth and others that most voters don't realize that the United States has already poured over $15,000,000,000 in supplies, food, loans, and gifts into Europe since the war ended. In a period of 2 years we sent 2,000,000,000 feet of lumber. And 10 percent of all our steel products have been going outside the country. Lumber and steel are two of the fundamental items in our economy. They make homes and cars and tractors. Therefore, is it any wonder that we're suffering from shortages and high prices?

Under the European recovery program we are expected to send several billion dollars' worth of help to Europe in the next 15 months, and then, in each of the next three succeeding years, appropriate additional billions. In the over-all program we shall be expected to send to Europe millions of tons of grain, cotton, and finished steel, and hundreds of thousands of trucks.

Obviously, such shipment will leave gaping holes in our economy here at home, and they are only a few.

It is well established, for example, that Government buying of food for shipment is a major cause of the high prices you are paying at stores—and probably will have to continue to pay. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson acknowledged to my committee that every time he goes into the market to buy wheat

his action kicks the price up. His buying, he agreed, does have a "material influence" in keeping wheat prices high. And that keeps your bread prices high. Mr. Anderson says he tries to buy when the market is slacking off, so as to excite it as little as possible. But no matter when he buys, it is bound to send prices through the roof, because the United States Government is the only outfit buying in millions of bushels. Furthermore, we were told by farm groups that word invariably gets out that the Government is going to buy several days before it does, thus touching off a buying spree.

You should think of this vast Government buying for export the next time you find yourself muttering about high food prices. Under the European recovery program there will be much more of the same.

If we ship grain in vast quantities, it means we are going to have to conserve grain at home. That means that my neighbor, Walter Stoneham, is going to have less grain for feeding and fattening his livestock and poultry. And that, in turn, means fewer eggs, less milk and butter, and stringier beef and a scrawnier chicken for your table.

If we ship steel in large quantities, it means you are going to have to wait longer for that new car, that new refrigerator, that new family plane, that new home. It means that Walter is going to have to wait longer for that new harvester he needs.

The European recovery plan, if carried out on the scale contemplated, will mean that for several more March 15's you and Seth and Walter are going to have to send a sizable part of your income to the Government. I don't know about you, but I know that Seth and Walter had been hoping for a real tax break soon. Some tax reductions certainly should be made, but the aid program will prevent the large-scale tax reductions we had hoped for.

Finally, if the program is carried out, many high Government officials believe we face the possibility of a return of rationing and controls. Don't misunderstand. I'm not in favor of them, but they may be staring us in the face. When I mentioned to some of the storekeepers in Concord the possibility of a return to rationing as one of the prices of ERP they exploded with indignation.

This whole European recovery plan will affect my New Hampshire neighbors, and you, in many very personal ways, and unless the Government is extremely careful it can affect you in a disastrous way.

We can no longer be careless in lavishing our resources. Our Nation possesses about 9 percent of the world's total resources, and we are closer to the danger point of depletion than many people realize. America's resources are far from inexhaustible. and, in fact, two of our greatest sources of strength, our steel and oil, are getting ominously close to exhaustion. It is very essential that we continuously survey our resources so that there is no danger of breaking down our economy by overdoing.

No matter how badly the rest of the world needs help we must recognize there is only so much we can safely do. Consider food: We have 7 percent of the world's population and raise about 12 percent of the world's food supply. Thus it should be obvious we can't afford to feed and supply any large part of the world indefinitely.

As I saw it, one of the great weaknesses of the administration's plan for rushing grain abroad under the stopgap aid bill was that no adequate safeguard was made against depleting our home supply. What if we had a disastrous crop failure next summer? Grain experts at our hearings testified that in the Southwest, at least, wheat is off to a bad start and is in a "precarious" situation. We were accused of haggling, but I thought Congress was only being prudent when it wrote into the bill a clause requiring the President to allow for at least a 150,000,000 bushel carry-over of wheat until the next crop is in.

If the United States is to achieve any worth-while results from the far-flung program to assist foreign countries now projected, I am convinced that our administration should show far more "banker caution" than thus far exhibited. We should look more searchingly, not only at our own resources, but also at those of the nations asking help.

I am convinced already that many of the countries asking for help have a great deal of hidden or unutilized wealth that was not taken into account in assessing their needs. And I'm further convinced that if these assets are intelligently utilized we can scale down somewhat our own contributions once the program gets rolling.

Little has been said about these hidden assets. When I mentioned them recently, in my talks with neighbors in East Concord, they showed an intense interest in what I had to say, so I'll pass on my observations to you.

Consider first the hoarded gold on the Continent. The statistical reports of the Bank for International Settlements estimates that Frenchmen may be hoarding $3,000,000,000 worth of gold in their crocks and socks. When I was in Paris I saw United States $20 gold pieces I hadn't seen in this country for decades. One of our Embassy officials there told me of the French farmer who came and asked him in a low voice how much gold it would take to buy a certain type of American tractor.

I don't blame the Frenchmen for hoarding their gold. Their Government's currency is inflated and the recent devaluation of the franc to around 216 to the dollar will probably not stop gold hoarding.

Similarly, French farmers are known to be hoarding their crops. Under the German occupation this was considered patriotic. Now the paper money they would receive from selling their crops through the regular channels is so unstable in value that they barter or hoard. It is known that, whereas French farmers before the war ate meat only once a week on the average, many now eat it nearly every day.

If we can prevail on the western European countries with printing-press money to stabilize their currencies, a lot of things—including hidden gold and hidden food—will start to flow again.

Another great source of wealth that could be tapped is the hidden capital held by Europeans in this hemisphere.

I am continually coming across evidence that many rich Europeans have invested their money here as a snugger harbor than unstable Europe. For example, I noticed that Wilhelmina, queen of one of the 16 nations asking for aid, recently disposed of a large Washington apartment house she had owned all during the war.

It is hard to get an accurate estimate of foreign holdings in the United States—that is, the undisclosed holdings—but there are some clues. The United States Treasury has estimated that French citizens may hold as much as $227,000,000 worth of undeclared assets in the United States, largely free of taxation from either the United States or French Governments. It is also believed that the liquidation value of French investments in Latin America would total another $90,000,000.

My contention is that the French and other European governments should make a more strenuous effort to draw upon these assets, either by stiff taxation or by requiring the owners to turn over all their foreign holdings for government securities. If my New Hampshire constituents are going to endure stiff taxes to support foreign aid, then I think that wealthy Europeans should be made to pay stiff taxes, too.

Even more unutilized wealth could be tapped in the countries themselves if they would adopt equitable and thorough-going methods of tax assessing and collecting. Several western European countries still have loose, weird, inefficient tax systems hitting only a few classes that we would never tolerate in America.

Finally, I believe we should prevail upon the countries receiving aid to utilize more effectively the natural resources they have. For example, under interim aid we are sending about 10,000,000 tons of coal to Europe despite the fact that we have an acute shortage at home and despite the fact that Britain, Germany, and France all have excellent mines. The reason we must send the coal apparently is that their miners produce far less coal per day than the United States miners. The average American miner, for example, digs more than five times as much coal in a day as a British, French, or German miner.

Partly, this low productivity is due to inadequate nutrition. But the main cause is the use of old-fashioned mining techniques and machinery, plus lack (in Britain) of individual incentive under government ownership.

Perhaps an even greater opportunity for more effectively utilizing our natural resources lies in fish. Of the 16 nations that requested United States aid at Paris, all but 2 (Luxemburg and Switzerland) are coastal countries with oceans full of fish nearby.

The waters of these countries are not being fished thoroughly and efficiently in most cases because their boats are in bad repair or because they cling to obsolete fishing methods. With modern American methods and a little more effort, many of these nations could vastly increase their food supply. Fish is a good substitute for meat, is high in protein, and would be pure gain.

Likewise, the use of modern farm machinery, fertilizer, and more productive seed could greatly increase the output of European farms. Many farmers there still use one cow for plowing, and the use of cows and oxen for plowing is the rule. Furthermore, France has 20 percent less land under cultivation than it had before the war.

To my mind, it would be smarter to send seed, fertilizer, and farm machinery than to send millions of tons of food. Our purpose should be to restore production in Europe, not distribute scarcity.

If we make sure these countries receiving aid fully utilize all their resources I am confident that they can achieve recovery faster than they anticipated. Their increased progress, in turn, will enable us to cut back our contributions, so that Americans—including my friends and neighbors in New Hampshire—can start enjoying lower prices and taxes and few aggravating shortages.

To get any cut-back, however—or to get western Europe back on its feet at all—we've got to make absolutely sure that the aid project is handled in an efficient, businesslike manner. Otherwise it will surely become an "operation rat hole."

If we are not careful, all our billions can be frittered away by sloppy administration on our part or by inflation, wild currency, black markets, crazy tax systems, and graft in Europe. In such case, we would be in danger of being pulled down to Europe's level.

I have promised my people in New Hampshire that in my capacity as head of the Senate Appropriations Committee I will fight, at every consideration of funds for foreign aid, to see that these three conditions be met:

1. The countries receiving aid have got to demonstrate that they are putting their houses in order. That means curbing black markes, tightening up their tax systems, cutting down swollen public pay rolls, stabilizing their currencies, which is most important.

Under the present fantastic currency setup in the United States zone in Germany,

the farmer receives the same price in the legal market for a ton of wheat that he receives for a pound of butter in the black market.

2. The countries receiving aid must show evidence that they are really trying to help themselves, as originally envisioned in the Marshall plan, and are not expecting to rely on permanent United States aid.

3. Finally, there must be provision for real American follow-up. I will fight to see that the whole foreign-aid program be handled on a real business basis by businessmen who have had to meet pay rolls.

To be frank, I am very wary of entrusting large-scale foreign aid either to striped-pants diplomats in the State Department, to amateur do-gooders left over from the UNRRA mess, or to Army brass hats. I've seen too many frightening examples of their past administration of aid.

In Greece I saw $75,000,000 worth of American machinery and equipment supplied UNRRA piled up for acres rusting after sitting there a year or more, even though Greeks nearby desperately needed the material. In Germany I found our Government officials dynamiting hundreds of our surplus planes, even though other United States Government officials were buying second-hand British planes in Cairo to distribute to friendly nations. And in my committee hearings I have often found State Department officials appallingly inconsistent.

One day, for example, State Department representatives came before my committee asking for funds to resist communism in Greece and Turkey. I'm happy to say I supported the request. But that very same day the same State Department sent representatives to my committee at the same hearing asking for permission to continue lend-lease aid to Communist Russia.

As a result of such disillusionments I believe that America's top business and technical brains should be entrusted to handle the foreign-aid program from top to bottom. They should be the ones to determine the most useful places where the aid can be applied, do the purchasing, follow up abroad to see that the stuff is received and put to use efficiently, get something concrete and useful in repayment for the aid, and see that credit is given to us, where credit is due. Otherwise, Communists will spread the rumor that we are profiteering.

I personally would advocate some sort of labeling on all food and equipment we send abroad under the aid program. Perhaps the label might read:

"Product of the United States. This product is furnished to your government under the European recovery program without cost to your government. Anything you pay goes to the treasury of your government for various vital purposes."

As for getting something concrete in return, I think we should receive clear-cut assurances that the countries receiving the aid will provide us with specific amounts of strategic materials at their disposal for United States stock piling. The British and Dutch Empires, for example, control a large proportion of the world's tin, a highly critical strategic material which we need.

Likewise, one or more of the 16 countries receiving aid could supply us with such strategic steel-hardeners as beryllium, tantalum, tungsten, and antimony, which are crucial in the manufacture of jet planes, self-propelled missiles, atom bombs, and other weapons of modern war. I could go on to list dozens of other strategic materials which we need and which they could supply.

If we go about our European recovery program in a businesslike manner, both our own people and the peoples of Europe will have more confidence in its success.

Most of the world looks to us for leadership, and we should respond in an intelligent, consistent, and sound manner. We must be tactful, and yet realistic. We must give only within our limits to give, and then see that what we do give is effectively used.

That, to my mind, is the best way to assure economic security at home and a peaceful, prosperous world.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Incorporation of the City of Schenectady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Schenectady (N. Y.) Gazette of March 26, 1948, relative to the incorporation of Schenectady as a city 150 years ago:

CITY OF SCHENECTADY INCORPORATED JUST 150 YEARS AGO TODAY—BILL SIGNED BY GOVERNOR JAY CLIMAXED NEWCOMERS' STRUGGLE WITH DUTCH

(By William B. Efner, city historian, in collaboration with Janet Wright)

At the ancient Stadt house, the temporary capitol of the State in Albany 150 years ago today five men sat at a shabby table, a relic of the colonial period. John Jay, the Governor of the State, sat at the head, being the president of the powerful State council of revision, which, at the time, was in session. Engrossed bills, enacted into law by the legislature, lay strewn about the table top awaiting approval or veto.

ADOPT BILL

The Governor finished reading through a bill of evident interest and remarked: "Gentlemen, it does not appear improper to me that this bill should become a law of this State."

His opinion was shared in by the other members. The words framed in the form of a resolution, were read by the clerk. A vote was taken. The resolution was adopted. The bill became a law of the State as the clerk was inscribing in his minutes:

"An act to incorporate that part of the Town of Schenectady therein mentioned;" and under the words the record; "In Council of Revision 26th March, 1798—Resolved that it does not appear improper to the council that this bill should become a law of this State."

The bill, with a notation by the Governor on the jacket, was moved along the table to the Governor. With strong up-and-down strokes, his quill left in its tracks the well-known signature of this great statesman, John Jay, without flourish or curlicue but followed by a long broadening stroke, a symbolism of strength. With the adoption of the resolution, Schenectady became the fourth city of the State.

HISTORIC OCCASION

It was a historic occasion. Today its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary is observed. A heritage has been laid claim to and possessed.

The surprise move in the legislature in 1797 by the faction known in the township as the "newcomers" and the defeat of their bill for the retirement of the township trustees of the common lands and the election of their successors by the freeholders of the place, strengthened rather than shattered the egoism of these opponents of the Dutch descendants. In fact defeat only whetted their appetite for power, with the result they carried their fight into town politics, substituting daring for caution, and successfully. Now in the open, the newcomers met in town meeting, and nominated John Prince as their candidate for the assembly, and elected him in the town elections, defeating the Dutch descendants' candidate, John Sanders.

USED NEWSPAPERS

Likewise the newcomers carried their arguments to the public through the columns of the local newspapers, the Mohawk Mercury. They demanded the end of Dutch control in the administration of the common lands. They called upon the trustees to retire and sought the election of their successors by the freeholders of the town.

Directly following the defeat of the newcomers' bill in the legislature in 1797, the trustees went into session with the leaders of the Dutch descendants. Following the routine inspection of accounts, the minutes of the trustees show, discussion veered from accounts to a plan for the future management of the common lands. At the same time, incensed because they had no voice in the management of these lands, a newcomers' committee approached the trustees, asking for a hearing, referring to "alterations as shall be mutually agreed upon," evidently in reference to earlier talks. The trustees, however, busy with their conferences with the descendants' committee, rejected the proposal for a conference.

At the moment a joint committee of trustees and descendants had before them a report in which the election of trustee by the freeholders was discussed. To qualify as an elector under their plan, however, a freeholder had to be a descendant of a settler residing here not later than 1760, the year in which newcomers first began treading on Dutch toes. Further, the joint committee had under consideration a descendants' proposal that the remaining 40,000 acres of unconveyed land be leased or conveyed to descendants only. In support of these descendants' recommendations, the trustees circularized the 400 Dutch descendants' families of the township, calling them into session at a future town meeting, of which nothing further is known.

PICK COMMITTEE

A few months later, on July 3, 1797, the first move that can in any way be connected with the plan authorized by the legislature on March 26, 1798, is noted in the trustees' records. A committee was appointed to confer with the Albany attorney, Abraham Van Vechten. From the wording of the minutes, it is assumed that the conference had to do with prospective legislation. On September 19, 2 months later, another conference with Van Vechten is reported. This time Peter W. Yates, able Albany attorney and tutor in the law of Joseph C. Yates, of Schenectady, the third member of the trio, counsel for the board, was consulted. Another 3 months slipped by, then Van Vechten was again advised with.

These maneuvers reportedly were participated in by the trustees and a committee of the inhabitants. Just what part the newcomers' faction played in what appears to have been a plan to be laid before the legislature is not clear, yet it is evident the dawn of an era of compromise had arrived. Had the unreported conferences and meetings of the last 6 months been devoted to the working out of a compromise agreement? Reference to a settlement with the inhabitants can be taken to mean a compromise; likewise it could mean the conclusion of negotiations with the Dutch contingent for pecuniary compensation.

WERE GOOD MEN

It is well to remember in forming conclusions that the 11 trustees named on March

15, 1796, and in control at the time of these conferences were men of sterling character, good business acumen, and civic interest. The manner in which they buckled down to the task of clearing up old misunderstanding and ugly complaints permits of little doubt but that it was their predetermination to put an end to dissention and community conflict, and secure legislative authority for a more satisfactory administration of the common lands. Such being the case, compromise was essential.

When 1793 rolled around the dawn of the new year found little evidence of scarring wounds. It was as though a truce had been declared, from what appears in the documentary record of the period. A new spirit pervades the pages of history of the time. Newcomers appear to move jauntily along the streets to their places of business. Dutch descendants, their customary stiffness in check, it seems took unusual pains to greet their Yankee neighbors affably.

One morning Abraham Oothout, the doughty fighter in the days of the Revolution, drove away from the village and headed for the old road across the pine plains for Albany. He carried a petition signed by the 11 trustees. The first name on the petition was that of Abraham Wemple, a fellow hero and Oothout's predecessor as colonel of the old Schenectady regiment. Both were members of the trusteeship, as both had been members of the Revolutionary committee of safety and correspondence.

Arriving at the Stadt house in Albany, Oothout dismounted, made fast his horse at the hitching post in front of the hall of legislation and immediately proceeded to the assembly room, where he handed in the precious document, the petition of the trustees of the common lands of the township. That was on January 4, 1798.

ASKED FOR LAW

The petition asked that a bill be drawn and enacted into law making legal the retirement of the 11 trustees and the election of their successors by the freeholders of the township. It was a moment that long had been prayed for; and at the same time it was a capitulation by the Dutch in the interest of community harmony and prosperity. If homage were due anyone for their part in the building of this prosperous city, homage is due the 11 trustees who voluntarily surrendered a great trust that a community might equally share in the benefits derived from the lands set aside for them by the patent of 1684.

The story of the legislation of 1798 must of necessity be broken and spotty. From State records, the minutes of the trustees of the common lands, available newspaper files of the period, and scattered documents, a story of the legislative maneuverings has been assembled. It is far from complete, but in general accurate. The story is based on original research in large part, as was the story of the legislation of 1797.

Not long after the handing in of the petition, Oothout returned to the capital for consultation this time with Van Vechten, the attorney and member of the Senate. When Oothout recrossed the pine plains, he carried home with him a copy of a bill that had been drafted by a Senate committee. The next day, January 9, 1798, the trustees sat down to an old pine table in the tavern meeting room here to carefully scrutinize the bill, drafted to comply with the trustees' petition, the first signature on which was that of Colonel Wemple.

SECOND PETITION

On January 17, a second petition was handed in, signed by Lawrence Vrooman and others of the town. Lawrence was the son of old Isaac Vrooman, mayor of the borough of Schenectady in 1765 and noted surveyor whose services had been under retainer in colonial days, both by Gen. George Washington and Sir William Johnson in the golden era of land speculation and patents. The son, like the father, was a noted surveyor. He surveyed the township and made the map of the common lands at the order of the 11 trustees. Closely affiliated with the trustees and a Dutch descendant as well, it is not improbable that the second petition like the first was drafted at the solicitation of the trustees. There is considerable uncertainty on this conclusion, however. The petition, "* * * to erect them (the inhabitants) into a body politic, a corporation, with immunities and privileges familiar (sic) to those heretofore granted to cities * * *," carries the mind back to 1765 and the borough charter, which brought Isaac Vrooman into office as borough mayor.

Two petitions were now in. One, the Wemple petition, for a law legalizing the election of trustees by the freeholders; the other, Vrooman's seeking incorporation as a city.

TRUSTEES ASSEMBLE

On January 27 the trustees assembled at their meeting room. A committee reported on a conference with Aaron Burr at Albany, relative to a bill, which bill is not clear. The fact that the trustees on January 29 sent another committee to Albany to confer with Mr. Burr to see whether the "bill is drawn to the intention of the board of trustees," as reported in the minute book, leaves the feeling that the stir was created by a bill originating with the trustees and about to be reported by an assembly committee.

On February 3, two things happened. The assembly did report a bill, "to incorporate the inhabitants," etc., and on the same day the trustees, irritated over some upset in their plans, authorized a committee to proceed to Albany and there give formal notice that "unless the principles of our bill now before the legislature according to resolution of this board, or the amendments now made by this board, be inserted in the bill now pending in the legislature * * *" that the trustees would "never surrender or convey our rights and trust * * *." They authorized another committee, in the event of failure of the bill in question to safeguard "the principles" referred, to "immediately petition the legislature and recall our former petition."

An act to incorporate the inhabitants was reported out of committee on February 3. It went to the Committee of the Whole House.

The undaunted Oothout and his associates on another committee returned from the capitol with news that a bill was to be laid before the legislature, which bill they disapproved, the legislators having added several amendments. Another committee was rushed by the trustees to Albany with orders to examine the bill in question, to remonstrate if unsatisfactory; to approve if agreed to.

ASSUME CHANGES MADE

That was the last mention of legislation in the board minutes. The assumption is that the desired changes were made, this done, the townsmen gave the go-ahead signal and, with a few God bless you's the bill completed its way through the assembly, for the bill to incorporate was passed and sent to the Senate on March 2 and on March 20, the Senate passed the bill but with amendments.

Again the red traffic light blazed. Everything stopped. When the bill was sent back to the assembly consideration of the amendments was postponed for some reason, but on the next day, someone put an O. K. on the amendments and they were confirmed.

When the bill later came before the committee of the Whole in the Senate, the Wemple petition was brought from its resting place in a legislative pigeonhole. It had made no progress since its arrival. Here we see the skilled hand of the veteran Abraham Van Vechten. Until the bill to incorporate was in final form and approved by the trustees (Van Vechten was their counsel and probably the author of the Wemple petition) the petition for a law to legalize the election of trustees and make possible the dissolution of the trust was held back. The act to incorporate meeting with approval, the Wempel petition was dusted off, read and referred to a committee of three senators headed by Van Vechten, then taken into consideration with the bill to incorporate. That was on March 5. The Wemple petition having been embodied in the bill to incorporate and most to appease factions other amendments were made, the bill was adopted. The Senate gave its final approval on March 22, when the measure was returned to the assembly and immediately transmitted it to the council of revision which body reported back on March 27 that "it does not appear improper to the council" that the measure should become a law of the State, the decision being reached on March 26, 1798, a century and a half ago today.

Recommendation to Congregation of Riverside Church, New York City, on ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great churches of the United States is in my district at Riverside Drive and One Hundred and Twenty-second Street in New York City. Under the distinguished ministry of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick it became world famous. This distinguished tradition is being carried forward and illuminated by Dr. Robert J. McCracken and his associates, Dr. C. Ivor Hellstrom and Dr. Norris Z. Tibbetts. The interest of the Riverside Church in the advancement of men toward peace and well-being is shown by the following recommendation of the board of deacons on the European recovery program, distributed to the worshiping congregation on Sunday, March 7, 1948:

A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE SOCIAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE RIVERSIDE CHURCH, APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF DEACONS

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The program for European reconstruction is before the American people and Congress, awaiting a verdict.

Like all political proposals, it is undoubtedly the product of various motivations. It is being looked at by our fellow citizens from the viewpoint of varying political philosophies and interests. No one can take a position regarding it without finding oneself in unpredictable and perhaps undesired alinements.

We recognize that the proposed program is liable to misuse, in which case it might contribute still further to the already vast disruption of European life rather than to its reconstruction.

Yet the very gravity of the issue confronting us is such that inaction for fear of failure may well bring about that failure. Nor would we be blameless if we let pass this period of time provided for public thought and education regarding the meaning of the plan without undertaking to relate it to our obligations both as citizens and as Christians.

The plight of much of Europe and Asia presses upon our consciences as Christians.

It gives urgency to any proposals for alleviation of human suffering and it lends a bias of favor toward whatever plan may have in it a reasonable possibility of remedial results. Ordinary Christian compassion moves us to this position in view of the state of comparative comfort, security, and well-being of the American people.

As citizens, too, we know that although we are now in a position of protected privilege and power, this cannot be long maintained at the level utterly disparate to the scale of living of the other peoples of the world, and that, therefore, even common interest dictates support of any plan which bids fair to lift the subsistence level of our fellow men anywhere in the world.

The European recovery program is the one organic proposal uniting the nations of the West in an attempt to restore normal living for the people of the European nations concerned.

We particularly hope for the success of this plan, because it combines help toward rehabilitation with the stimulus to self-help in the renewal of economic and industrial life of the communities involved.

We believe that it should be administered so that it may not be viewed as a measure to organize one group of nations for resistance to another, thus adding to the already divided state of Europe.

Further, it should be so used as not to impair the political independence of the participating nations or their freedom to choose their own way of life.

We hope it may yet be possible to win the cooperation of the eastern as well as the western States in the furthering of European recovery.

In accordance with the request of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, we recommend that the members of our church give their support to the program.

CHARLES W. IGLEHART, *Chairman.*
MARCH 3, 1948.

Why Should We Have War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fairmont Sentinel of March 22, 1948, a daily newspaper published at Fairmont, Minn., in my congressional district:

AFTER ALL, WHAT ELSE MATTERS?

The most tragic indictment of civilization in the world's history lies in the prospect of the two greatest, most self-sufficient nations on earth getting set to tear each other to pieces.

The tragedy of it, the pitiful, inexcusable tragedy lies in the lack of human leadership which would recognize that for the cost of a single atom bomb and the destruction it can wreak, countless thousands of unhappy humans could be made happy, self-sustaining and useful.

For the price of many atom bombs, war planes, ships, munitions required to wage a war, the entire world could have its economic face lifted. Where hunger, privation, pestilence, want, insecurity, and fear rules today, there could be peace, contentment, hope for the future.

Uncertainty and tears would give way to happiness and laughter. There would be a new freedom—a world-wide freedom.

Why can't these two great nations join hands in such a venture, become big brothers to a sick and apprehensive world, sharing the joyous and benevolent task of promoting peace on earth, good will toward men?

Neither politics, race, creed, nor religion need have a predominant part in such a project. Humans everywhere would applaud it, and surely it would have God's richest blessing. And when all is said and done, what else matters?

Moral Leadership Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members to an article by Mr. Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, on the United States reversal on partition.

He tells the tragic story of what the United Sates reversal on Palestine means in terms of the long-run security of the United States:

MORAL LEADERSHIP MISSING
(By Sumner Welles)

The official explanations of the reversal of our policy on Palestine at least make two points wholly clear. There is no shadow of justification for this reversal; and the position which the United States now occupies is profoundly humiliating.

Secretary Marshall states that our action is due to vital elements of our national security. He implies that the enforcement of partition would bring about the dispatch of Soviet troops to Palestine, and that the resulting situation would touch off the powder keg.

If this Government had had the foresight, when the assembly adopted its partition resolution, to insist upon the creation by the Security Council of a United Nations constabulary for Palestine composed of contingents from the lesser powers there would have been no possibility that Russia or any other major power could seek to police Palestine. The Arabs would never have resorted to extreme measures. Today Arab aggression is increasing. Encouraged by the way in which the mighty United States has weakly given in to their threats, the Arabs have flouted the United Nations. They reject any suggestion of a trusteeship. They will try to seize the whole of Palestine as soon as the British withdraw.

The Jews are defending the areas granted them under partition. They have announced the establishment of a provisional government to assume control of those areas the day after the British leave. They are abiding by the terms of the Assembly's decision. But they will resist any proposal that does not give them their promised freedom.

Because of our previous vacillation, partition may now mean local hostilities. But a trusteeship would touch off the very powder keg of which we are told to beware. In that event Russian intervention would be certain.

Are military dispositions the only vital elements of our national security?

To many of us the good faith of the United States, the preservation of its moral leadership among the nations of the world, the confidence that other peoples possess in its dependability, and the survival of the United Nations are elements that are also vital. It is these elements that the reversal of American policy on Palestine has flagrantly disregarded.

The legalistic arguments that the American delegate was instructed to deliver to the security council represent a flat denial of the responsibility of the United Nations for the preservation of world peace. That denial undermines the very foundations upon which the United Nations was built. The action of the United States in regard to Palestine can be as far reaching in its results as the refusal by the League of Nations to protect China when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. We are destroying the faith of the peoples of the world in the efficacy and authority of the United Nations.

Are the American people willing to agree that the United Nations has already ceased to be a "vital element of our national security?"

What confidence can the weaker nations have in our good faith when this Government welshes on its commitments?

The United States was chiefly responsible for the adoption by the Assembly of the partition resolution 4 months ago. Since that time the President, the Secretary of State, and the American delegate to the United Nations have given repeated assurances that the American Government stood four-square behind that decision. The Jews of Palestine have relied on those assurances. Their course has been governed by that faith. Yet those assurances have now been deliberately violated.

The lesser members of the United Nations are already in open revolt.

The effect upon the confidence of the smaller nations in American leadership can best be illustrated by the published statement of a representative of one of the Latin-American Republics: "First, they convinced us that partition was the only answer. Now they are trying to convince us that partition is insane. It is true that I represent a small nation which cannot stand alone. I am willing to accept United States leadership. But this is treachery. By this latest reversal the United States has forfeited whatever moral justification it once had for leading the small nations."

At this crucial moment when we seek to rally the countries of western Europe to our leadership in the face of Russian expansion, are we prepared to agree that our moral prestige and the confidence of other peoples in the good faith of this country are no longer vital elements of our national security?

This reversal by the United States will increase, and not diminish, the danger of a major war in the Near East. It deals what may well be a death blow to the United Nations, and to our hope for collective security. It shakes confidence in the United States throughout the world.

For what is alleged to be momentary expediency we have thrown away national assets that were essential to our safety. And these, unfortunately, are not assets which can be soon regained.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Anne O'Hare McCormick from the New York Times of March 31, 1948:

ERP IS THE GREATEST WEAPON IN THE POLITICAL WAR

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The passage by Congress of the appropriation for the European recovery program is now imminent. It will be approved by an impressive bipartisan majority, in the full amount asked for by the administration, and a good month ahead of the time expected by the anxious overseas statesmen who have been wondering all winter if they could hold the line until reinforcements arrived.

It has taken nearly 10 months to translate into reality the historic suggestion made by Secretary Marshall at Harvard last June. Those 10 months have been the most bewildering and depressing this country has ever known, not excluding the war years, when we knew where we were going and had no doubt that the end would bring victory and peace. They have been months of intensive and painful education, slow in respect to the pace of crisis but fast in respect to the process of changing and hardening the mind of a population as diverse and resistant as ours. The acceptance of the Marshall plan signifies the sober assumption by the American people of the burdens of world power.

This is a great event. If we had done last fall what we are doing now, our action would have been doubly effective, but our delays, mistakes, and fumblings do not alter the fact that no nation before us has ever sponsored or supported a project like the ERP. It is not a peactime project, for the world is not at peace, but neither is it a war measure in the usual sense. That we are prepared to make sacrifices, endure shortages and take incalculable risks to meet political aggression not yet aimed directly at us proves how far we have traveled.

BEST GUARANTY OF SURVIVAL

It is not an altruistic policy. The ERP is nothing but a means of building up the only allies we can count on in the struggle to stop aggression and prevent war. It is an investment in order and stabilization. Western Europe understands this very well. The peoples participating in the enterprise are not effusively grateful for our help, even when they acknowledge that their survival as free nations depends on it. They ascribe it to self-interest, and respect this motive as much as they envy our ability to act in our own interests.

Europe has to wait for us, has to follow our lead, and to follow, sometimes against their own judgment, is a harder role for governments to play than American statesmen can quite realize. On our side, it is rather a shock to perceive that our capacity to give and produce is attributed to our natural resources and industrial primacy and almost never to the political and economic system by which we live.

Anticipation of the ERP has kept democratic governments going for the past 6 months. Advance grants of interim aid have been literal lifesavers in France, Italy, and Austria. But the full effects of the bill will appear only now, when its passage is assured. Until the end the proposal was hedged around with the uncertainties felt by Europeans when they listen to the far echoes of congressional debate. They were never absolutely sure it would go through. The Cominform did its best to feed this doubt. Its story was that a depression would kill the plan, that Europe would be a dumping ground for unusable American surpluses, that the program was a bluff and would never be carried out.

The plan turned into reality is something else again. Approved by Congress and put immediately into operation, it constitutes the most telling weapon yet launched in the political war. It is the best guaranty of the survival of Western Europe. Russia has nothing to offer that can match this immense subscription to recovery. Against a great venture in international partnership, a free union of free nations in defense of freedom, the Soviet Union pits only its ironbound system of suppression, subjugation and silence. It cannot compete, and this is why the Communists have fought the recovery program with unexampled ferocity. In Paris and Rome the writer has seen them froth at the mouth when they spoke of it.

TROUBLE AHEAD

It is through Communist eyes, indeed, that one sees what a tremendous weapon it can be. Used as it can be used, moreover; used immediately to pump blood into the production system and confidence into the mind and spirit of the free people of Europe, it can shift the emphasis back again to peace and construction. This must be the cardinal aim of American policy, for if nations live in the dread of war they will never join in laying the foundations of peace. The ERP is a peace policy, the spectacular evidence that the first objective of the United States is to restore order, tranquility, prosperity and hope—the lost conditions which alone make life worth living, and peace worth preserving, for the ordinary human being.

Observers on the European watchtowers look for a great Soviet foray into Western Europe before the spring is over. They see signs that the coup de force threatened by the Italian Communist leaders if they lose the election, as they seem to expect, will be synchronized with action in Austria and Southern France, possibly in eastern Germany, and increasing pressure on Norway and Sweden. It would not be surprising if the Cominform strategists hasten to make all the trouble they can before the United States mobilizes its strength. This is another reason for getting the recovery program under way with a bang. The first-line defense against Soviet expansion is a Europe with a will to live and a promise of support.

Aid Is for the People of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of March 26, 1948, entitled, "Aid for Rural China," shows that the Committee on Foreign Affairs understand the problem and is endeavoring to deal with it. The letter of Hon. Stanley Isaacs, a Republican member of the city council of New York, which is also appended from the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1948, voices the reports, doubts, and concerns, about how the Chinese people are faring about which the committee heard during its hearings; it states another side which is entitled to a hearing. It is important to remember that under any circumstances so long as a typical Communist regime does not cover China there is an opportunity for reforms and ideas and democracy to work out in China, but once we let her go the "police state" way, there is no longer hope or opportunity; the door is shut tight.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 26, 1948]

AID FOR RURAL CHINA

Indications have come from China that American assistance for rural reconstruction and rehabilitation would be welcomed by some Chinese officials but that they would prefer to have direct control of any sums granted. Dr. Han Li-wu, vice minister of education in Nanking, has emphasized the interest of his organization in mass education and other devices for improving the lot of China's peasants. He has predicted that his ministry would have no difficulty in obtaining more funds for such work after the China-aid program now under consideration in the American Congress is approved.

One point to be made in this connection is that the efforts of the Nanking Government to do something for China's farmers—and thus give them better reasons for opposing the Communists—have been effective in only a few small areas. Several Nanking officials have excellent intentions along this line, as Dr. Han has, but it is doubtful that any project for rural reconstruction that was wholly controlled by Nanking would be worthy of American support. The trouble is not with men like Dr. Han but with the corrupt and inefficient governments in the provinces and counties that fail to put into effect decisions made at China's capital.

A project to improve the lot of China's farmers which was controlled by an independent commission made up of Chinese and Americans, as suggested by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, would accomplish more than one dominated by the Nanking government. If the problems of China are to be attacked like those of Europe, by trying to improve the basic economy of the country, it will be essential to have American funds used for the purpose intended. This could be done by relying one carefully selected Chinese for local direction of what must be a Chinese program and upon a commission made up of first-rate American and Chinese, preferably with a Chinese chairman, to do the over-all planning and to supervise expenditures.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1948]

COMMUNISM IN CHINA

UNITED STATES AID FOR PEOPLE URGED

To the New York Herald Tribune:

I read with interest and approval your leading editorial on March 12, urging our participation in a constructive program for the betterment of the Chinese people as the best method of combating communism in that country. You are so right. It seems shocking to me that this has not long since been recognized by our Government.

General Stilwell told us that the Chinese Army officials were more interested in strengthening themselves, in continuing their corrupt control of the Chinese Armies, in draining Chinese resources to their advantage, than they were in driving the Japanese out of China. United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration officials reported with substantial unanimity that their efforts to feed the starving Chinese people were blocked and thwarted by the corrupt men with whom they had to deal. Bargeloads of medicines and food supplies were allowed to rot in Chinese harbors so that those in control could collect huge sums as demurrage while the vitally needed cargoes remained unloaded. Trucks furnished by the United States to transport supplies and munitions to the interior of China were stolen or diverted.

Official representatives from this country, whose integrity cannot be questioned—Douglas Falconer, for example, first director of the Greater New York Fund; Dr. Ernest Osborn, of Columbia University; Helen Harris, executive director of United Neighborhood Houses—all of whom spent many months in China—have testified to the lack of interest on the part of Chinese officials in the care and education of children; in hospitalizing the sick; and in feeding the starving. We have reports of how the Chinese Army leaders drafted troops—raiding villages, seizing able-bodied men, carrying them like so much cattle into camps, starving them while they were being trained, diverting food supplies and medical supplies into the black market so that they could fill their own pockets, and losing half or more of the recruits through disease and starvation before they were brought into action. We have read of the protests of the students, the professors, the liberals, and seen how these protests were silenced—wholesale arrests, followed by assassination and murder. We have read of the revolt in Formosa against the vicious cruelty of the Chinese Governor General; the calling in of the military and the massacres of thousands of civilians.

We have the detailed and first-hand testimony of reporters and writers who have been labeled as radical just because they gave evidence which our Government did not want to hear. No one can read the various volumes and articles by Edgar Snow and by Richard Lauterbach; Unfinished Revolution in China by Epstein, or Thunder Over China by Jacoby and White, without being convinced of the truth of what they are saying. Yet our Government persists in its course, pouring not millions but billions into China, giving the present government planes, guns, unlimited ammunition, surplus vessels, as well as hundreds of millions of dollars—only to see the Communists steadily increase in strength.

Secretary Marshall was sent to China to try to make peace and reestablish a unified nation. He might have succeeded were it not for the fact that our Army and the underlings in the State Department undermined his efforts. His mission failed through no fault of his; not because his plan to save China was unsound, but because he was not given a chance by his own country.

We do not realize that it is just this which is strengthening Russia in China. The Communists are gaining and will continue to gain as long as they espouse the cause of the oppressed Chinese people. They will continue to gather increasing support wherever they displace the corrupt landlord who has been robbing his tenant farmers, first through oppressive rents, then (as tax collector) through exorbitant taxes, a substantial part of which he keeps in his own pocket.

Your editorial outlines the only sound way of handling the problem of how to prevent Communist control of China. It is obvious that our present policy has failed.

We should return to the policies that made us the greatest as well as the most powerful Nation in the world—the policy of helping the people, the masses of the people achieve their liberties; of helping them to raise their standard of living; of feeding the starving; of establishing hospitals and sending medical supplies to heal the sick. It used to be our mission to promote genuine democracy throughout the world; not to support tyranny. The Marshall plan in Europe represents the kind of program which we can and should follow everywhere. This is the sound way to stem the tide of communism. Big business and its chambers of commerce may refuse to support such a program and Communist leadership may oppose it bitterly, but this really helps to prove that the European recovery program represents a sound approach in the east as well as in the west. I hope that the course recommended by your editorial will some day be adopted. It is the only path to follow if we want truly to build a democratic Chinese nation. Only a China supported by its own people because it serves their interest can survive as a strong and free nation. That is the China we ought to help.

STANLEY M. ISAACS.

NEW YORK, *March 15, 1948.*

Address of Hon. John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, Before Convention of National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the thirty-eighth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in the city of Washington on March 20, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Delegates to the convention and ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, on behalf of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for myself personally, I wish to thank Station WMAL of Washington and the American Broadcasting Co. for making available to us their facilities on this occasion.

I am convinced that the people of this Nation are more interested than ever before in progressively sound programs and policies with respect to the conservation and development of the great natural resources with which our country is endowed. They have come to know that many of our basic natural resources are not unlimited and therefore must be conserved and made to provide the maximum in benefits that they can afford to our economy and to our people. Many practices and usages indulged in in the past with respect to the harvesting of our forests, with respect to the cultivation of our soil, and to the exploitation of our basic minerals caused or permitted waste or deterioration and such usages and practices must be stopped. Otherwise, a continuation of such neglect and indifference with the lack of adequate conservation and protection could ultimately lead to an impoverishment that would seriously impair our national economy, lower our standard of living, and considerably weaken us as a great and powerful Nation.

We have all come to realize that our great water resources, of which we have an abundance, have not been adequately developed and that the water resources we possess have in them tremendous inherent wealth yet unexplored and only partially developed.

We are learning of the great potentialities of our streams and of what their proper improvement will mean in terms of increased opportunities, in terms of jobs, in terms of production—both with respect to agriculture and industry. We can now visualize how much such improvements will add to the capital wealth of our Nation and increase its military and economic strength and power. We have awakened to their possibilities and we are becoming more and more resolute in our purpose to develop this great resource, not only to our own advantage but to that which will provide a stronger economy, greater power and capacity of production, and thus enhance our own well-being and leave not an impoverished land but a richer heritage to future Americans.

Year after year we have witnessed and experienced one tragedy after another as a result of devastating floods sweeping down one of our great valleys and then down another with losses of many human lives and property damage running into millions. We have witnessed severe drouths sweeping over areas of our land to the injury of agriculture, destroying crops and leaving in their wake devastation of property and human want and suffering.

It may not be within the scope of man's ingenuity to devise ways, means, and methods sufficient to wholly prevent the recurrence of all these misfortunes, but from the experience we have gained up to the present we do know that we can make tremendously greater use of our waters and that many of these misfortunes and losses can be prevented and others greatly minimized. The storing of water—for human, industrial, and agricultural uses in the arid regions and the harnessing of our waters for protective purposes to prevent recurring floods is of major importance to the saving of human lives, to the prevention of property loss and damage, and to the further growth and progress in agricultural production in the richest areas and valleys of our land, and to the proper improvement in those areas by means of increased industrial productive capacity.

Uncontrolled floods annually sweep billions of tons of our richest soil into the bottom of our streams and into the ocean, the intrinsic value of which can hardly be measured by figures behind the dollar mark. Notwithstanding the progress that has been made in the course of time since the National Rivers and Harbors Congress came into being nearly half a century ago, the magnitude of the task, before our major objectives will be fully attained, still looms large on the horizon of tomorrow. It remains a challenge that engages our consuming interest with a demand that we exercise practical judgment and wisdom in initiating the necessary programs and pursuing sound policies that will carry us through to the consummation of these great achievements.

It is indeed gratifying that the Congress and the Federal Government have become cognizant of their major responsibility with relation to the attainment of these goals. During the past quarter century great strides have been made and we would have been much further advanced except for the necessity of suspending construction on many authorized projects during the war years. But during that time the Congress wasn't idle or neglectful of its duty. A tremendous backlog of river development projects was processed and authorized, most of which still await appropriations for construction.

Last year under a green light from the President of the United States the Congress appropriated more than one-half billion dollars to get construction resumed. This year, judging by the action already taken by the House of Representatives and as indicated by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, which now has the civil-functions appropriation bill under consideration, we can well expect appropriations for this program for the fiscal year of more than $600,000,000.

At the beginning of 1947 we had 434 flood-control and 269 river and harbor projects authorized and awaiting construction at a total estimated cost of $5,000,000,000. We now have 537 flood-control projects and 289

river and harbor projects authorized, at an estimated cost of $7,000,000,000. Of these, we now have under construction 243 flood-control projects and 66 river and harbor projects. When this year's appropriation is made available, others of these authorized projects will be started.

In this connection, I want to emphasize another great benefit that will flow from many of these improvements which are dams and reservoirs, multiple-purpose in character. The hydroelectric power which they will generate when completed is sorely needed in our Nation today. We have at present throughout the Nation a total power-production capacity of 65,000,000 watts annually, which produced in 1947 a total of 306,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Of the 65,000,000 kilowatts capacity, approximately 15,000,000 are in hydroelectric plants. But this tremendous capacity is wholly inadequate to meet the demands of our industries and economy of the present. Within the next decade this capacity will need to be doubled if we are to supply to American users the quantity that their needs will require. The construction of many of these projects will contribute greatly toward meeting the present and the accumulating deficiencies in this indispensable economic commodity.

Time will not permit a fuller discussion of the details and ramifications of this great progressive program, but you who are in attendance at this convention—and I trust my listeners of the radio audience—have a clear concept not only of the magnitude of this program and task but are fully cognizant of its importance to our national strength and future security.

The instability of world affairs, the disturbed relation between nations, the falling of many free governments, the tottering of others, and the march of tyrannical totalitarian aggression that is sweeping over large sections of the world give warning of great danger ahead. It is significant that every speaker who has appeared on the program at this convention—Senators, Congressmen, high-ranking military men, and prominent citizens—have all alike emphasized that we must keep America strong. The very basis of both our economic and military strength is reposed in these great natural resources and in the vision and intellect of our people.

The delegates to this convention recognize this truth and throughout our deliberations we have not thought in terms of one section of the Nation as against another nor in terms of local communities but we have held to the course of highest national interest. Whatever projects we approve and whatever we do, we intend that they shall serve to increase national strength, to enhance our economy in time of peace and to give us a greater fortress of defense and more striking power in time of war.

Some 39 projects have been considered by our projects committee, which will report today. Those projects have been screened. Only those that can be justified will be approved. Others will have to wait for more facts and information that will establish their economic justification and some, of course will be rejected.

When our resolutions committee reports, I feel sure it will emphasize the necessity of accelerating the construction program. As Americans, and as Members of this Congress, we are consecrating our deliberations and actions to the further development of our Nation's economic strength and power and contributing what we can to the future peace and security of the world.

I trust and I believe we shall all leave this convention with renewed inspiration and with the high resolve to carry on until the worthy objectives of our program shall have been achieved. In so doing, we perpetuate American strength and build it stronger and contribute to progress and future peace and world security.

How Priceless the Fertile Soil of This Good Earth Can Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, except for the national defense, I know of no function of our Government more important than the work of conserving our soil.

Into my office just a few days ago came a report which is eloquent and inspiring testimony to the common sense of soil conservation. It was written by men who know what they are talking about—the board of supervisors of the Bastrop and Fayette Counties Soil Conservation District No. 310. Mr. J. M. Carmichael, of Smithville, is the chairman of this able board, and the other officers include: Mr. Edward Doms, of Muldoon, vice chairman; Mr. Paul Carlson, of Elgin, secretary-treasurer; Mr. Roy Bucek, of Schulenburg, member; and Mr. Frank Rauch, of Round Top, member.

Bastrop County is one of the counties I represent in this House, and it has been my privilege to work with those fine people since they first began their earnest efforts to conserve the rich topsoil of those central Texas farms.

VISION OF MEN AND WOMEN CLOSE TO SOIL

One section of the board's report impressed me deeply. It presents a truly forthright statement of the attitude these farmers and ranchers take in carrying out the work plan of the district. More than that, it is a wonderful statement of the wisdom and vision of those men and women who are still close to the soil.

These good people know—if some city-bred penny pinchers up here do not—how priceless and valuable the fertile soil of this good earth can be. Congress may spend millions on many things, but no money is better spent than the dollars loaned to soil-conservation districts.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this section of the Annual Report of the District Supervisors of the Bastrop-Fayette Soil Conservation District No. 310 for 1947, in the Appendix of the RECORD for the day:

ATTITUDE OF FARMERS AND RANCHERS IN CARRYING OUT THE DISTRICT WORK-PLAN

The interest, desire and willingness shown today by the cooperating farmers and ranchers in the organized groups in carrying out the district work plan is increasing continually.

All are anxious and more or less determined to complete in the shortest possible time the soil conservation program as planned for their particular farm or ranch. Of course, this cannot always be done, for various reasons. Some are not financially able to do so; others in better financial circumstances are handicapped, too, because of lack of necessary equipment to do the job and the scarcity of labor.

This is particularly true of cropland. Weather conditions are the big controlling factors in limiting the amount of work done on this land. The good results obtained in the way of increased production and thereby reducing production costs from the practices thus far applied during our short period of existence have convinced them that the time and money spent for this purpose is the best investment they ever made.

They have learned, too, that it is a good business policy, more economical and more practical to grow more on less acres.

The high price and scarcity of labor existing during the war and continuing in the postwar period no doubt had its influence along this line. By adopting the soil conservation practices and applying them as quickly as possible they find that the operating costs are held to the minimum and the net profit at the end of the year increased to the maximum and in the same operation the fertility of his soil is saved and restored, which adds value to his capital assets.

He realizes this capital expenditure of time and money pays dividends from the beginning and continues into the future. All realize that good fertile productive acres are always in good demand and bring a premium when offered for sale; on the other hand poor, infertile, depleted, barren and eroded ones become a liability not only to the owner but to the community, State and Nation.

If this condition is not corrected now, soon we will have ghost villages, towns, and cities scattered throughout States and Nation * * * the result of man's folly of doing too little and too late.

In the beginning there was quite a bit of opposition among the skeptics and doubtings Thomases to overcome, who resented what they called outside interference with their own personal business. They feared that this was another scheme to gain control of their business and eventually wind up in some sort of domination or regimentation. However, this fear has been overcome by the use of the educational facilities at our command and by publishing the good production results obtained from cooperators.

At this time, there is no longer any disagreement among the people as to the necessity for the conservation of our soil and the proper approach to the solution of this grave problem is of national, yes, of universal concern.

The whole world is looking to us for succor.

To get the job done in this country, this duty was assigned to the National Soil Conservation Service, a separate and distinct branch of the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America, cooperating with all State agencies created for the same purpose.

Under this method of procedure, success is assured because soil-conservation districts such as the Bastrop-Fayette Soil Conservation District are typically American, in that they provide a means for mutual action to reach common objectives as determined by the majority.

They are independent political recognized subdivisions of the State. They plan their own program of operation from information obtained from the people in all walks of life in which they operate, free from outside influence. In short, they tend to their own business.

They have the legal power and authority to procure governmental aid and assistance which an individual alone could not do. This is purely a democratic approach to the solution of the biggest and gravest problem facing every individual American today—with the exception of winning or buying the peace.

Sons of Italy Pay Air Mail Expenses for Messages to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have received permission to extend my remarks and wish to include an announcement and appeal made by Judge Eugene V. Alessandroni, grand venerable of the Pennsylvania Sons of Italy, to the membership in Pennsylvania. In it the membership is informed that the expenses of sending individual messages of encouragement to relatives and friends in Italy will be borne by the organization.

Judge Alessandroni is a great citizen and a great American, and he represents a most patriotic group of Americans. For initiating this high-minded effort he deserves the highest commendation and the hopes of all of us for its success.

The announcement follows:

Judge Eugene V. Alessandroni announced on Easter Sunday that the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, with headquarters at 1409 Tasker Street, Philadelphia, will bear the total expenses of individual messages addressed to relatives and friends in Italy during the following 2 weeks.

The messages prepared and printed by the Sons of Italy, signed by local residents will be forwarded air mail in order to insure delivery before April 18, date of the general election in Italy.

"We must encourage the Italian people," said Judge Alessandroni, grand venerable of the Pennsylvania Sons of Italy, "to defend and preserve Christian and cultural traditions of Italy, and to defeat the monstrous doctrines of Russian communism that would enslave Italy and Europe. We will gladly pay all expenses to send this appeal to our brothers in Italy."

The message reads as follows:

"AN APPEAL TO OUR ITALIAN BROTHERS

"Five million Americans of Italian origin, people of your own flesh and blood, send you this message, moved by their desire that Italy, Europe, and the world be saved from the monstrous threat of Russian communism, the triumph of which would be assured by a victory of Italian communism at the election on April 18.

"Your Communists do not believe in the sacred principles of God, country, and family; they foreswear the most beautiful, century-old traditions of the Italian people; they are the fifth column of Stalin's Russia, and attempt to entice the Italian workingmen and farmers with boastful promises which they know will not be fulfilled.

"We Americans of Italian origin know that America has no designs on Italy; we know that everything that the United States has done, is doing at present, and will do in the future for Italy and the Italian people is inspired by genuine desire to bring peace, justice, and liberty to all the nations of the world.

"Russia proposes to enslave the Italian people as it has already enslaved other nations of Europe; a Communist victory in Italy would put your country under the most cruel dictatorship; your liberties would be destroyed; and you would be subject to the only admissible law—the edicts of the Moscow dictator.

"Is this the fate reserved to the land of Dante, Manzoni, Carducci, Marconi, Toscanini, Mazzini, and Garibaldi?

"No; a thousand times no.

"We, your blood brothers, although we are Americans, are proud of our great heritage, and we desire that the glorious traditions of the Italian people be preserved for the future generations.

"This is the reason for this unselfish appeal, the appeal of brothers to brothers which is sent at this moment of great decision in your life.

"Brothers of Italy, keep unbroken the ties with your brothers of America. Keep Italy close to America for the triumph of peace, progress, and justice in the world. Save Italy from the awful danger of communism, that antisocial, anti-Christian, and anti-Italian communism.

"Do not vote your perdition. On April 18 you must proudly reaffirm your belief in liberty and democracy by voting against communism.

"ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA,
GRAND LODGE OF PENNSYLVANIA."

Moral Leadership Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Sumner Welles which was printed in the Washington Post of March 30. The title of this article is "Moral Leadership Missing."

In my humble opinion, whatever good may come from the use of American dollars and America's leadership in economic matters, we will fail in our responsibility to the world if we do not provide moral leadership.

The handling of the Palestine situation by our own State Department and by the United Nations is one of the most tragic blunders of all time. I recall that a great many years ago I responded to an appeal for funds to be used for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. These funds were raised throughout the United States and contributions were made by Jews and non-Jews alike. The fund was raised as the result of definite commitments made by the British Government. If the United Nations is not now strong enough to enforce its decision, steps should be taken at once to provide the necessary strength. Until that can be done, we should certainly take advantage of every legal means to put in the hands of Jews in Palestine the equipment needed for their own defense. I would prefer to see this situation handled by the United Nations but inasmuch as the Truman policy of unilateral action insofar as providing military equipment is concerned has already been approved in the case of Greece, Turkey, China, and other nations, it should be extended at this time to Palestine.

When the pledged word of the Government of the United States is not kept, we face moral bankruptcy.

The article referred to follows:

MORAL LEADERSHIP MISSING
(By Sumner Welles)

The official explanations of the reversal of our policy on Palestine at least make two points wholly clear. There is no shadow of justification for this reversal; and the position which the United States now occupies is profoundly humiliating.

Secretary Marshall states that our action is due to vital elements of our national security. He implies that the enforcement of partition would bring about the dispatch of Soviet troops to Palestine, and that the resulting situation would touch off the powder keg.

If this Government had had the foresight, when the Assembly adopted its partition resolution, to insist upon the creation by the Security Council of a United Nations constabulary for Palestine composed of contingents from the lesser powers, there would have been no possibility that Russia or any other major power could seek to police Palestine. The Arabs would never have resorted to extreme measures. Today Arab aggression is increasing. Encouraged by the way in which the mighty United States has weakly given in to their threats, the Arabs have flouted the United Nations. They reject any suggestion of a trusteeship. They will try to seize the whole of Palestine as soon as the British withdraw.

The Jews are defending the areas granted them under partition. They have announced the establishment of a provisional government to assume control of those areas the day after the British leave. They are abiding by the terms of the Assembly's decision. But they will resist any proposal that does not give them their promised freedom.

Because of our previous vacillation, partition may now mean local hostilities. But a trusteeship would touch off the very powder keg of which we are told to beware. In that event Russian intervention would be certain.

Are military dispositions the only vital elements of our national security?

To many of us the good faith of the United States, the preservation of its moral leadership among the nations of the world, the confidence that other peoples possess in its dependability, and the survival of the United Nations are elements that are also vital. It is these elements that the reversal of American policy on Palestine has flagrantly disregarded.

The legalistic arguments that the American delegate was instructed to deliver to the Security Council represent a flat denial of the responsibility of the United Nations for the preservation of world peace. That denial undermines the very foundations upon which the United Nations was built. The action of the United States in regard to Palestine can be as far reaching in its results as the refusal by the League of Nations to protect China when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. We are destroying the faith of the peoples of the world in the efficacy and authority of the United Nations.

Are the American people willing to agree that the United Nations has already ceased to be a vital element of our national security?

What confidence can the weaker nations have in our good faith when this Government welshes on its commitments?

The United States was chiefly responsible for the adoption by the Assembly of the partition resolution 4 months ago. Since that time the President, the Secretary of State, and the American delegate to the United Nations have given repeated assurances that the American Government stood four-square behind that decision. The Jews of Palestine

have relied on those assurances. Their course has been governed by that faith. Yet those assurances have now been deliberately violated.

The lesser members of the United Nations are already in open revolt.

The effect upon the confidence of the smaller nations in American leadership can best be illustrated by the published statement of a representative of one of the Latin-American Republics: "First they convinced us that partition was the only answer. Now they are trying to convince us that partition is insane. It is true that I represent a small nation which cannot stand alone. I am willing to accept United States leadership. But this is treachery. By this latest reversal the United States has forfeited whatever moral justification it once had for leading the small nations."

At this crucial moment when we seek to rally the countries of western Europe to our leadership in the face of Russian expansion, are we prepared to agree that our moral prestige and the confidence of other peoples in the good faith of this country are no longer vital elements of our national security?

This reversal by the United States will increase, and not diminish, the danger of a major war in the Near East. It deals what may well be a death blow to the United Nations, and to our hope for collective security. It shakes confidence in the United States throughout the world.

For what is alleged to be momentary expediency we have thrown away national assets that were essential to our safety. And these, unfortunately, are not assets which can be soon regained.

California Tidelands Belong to California—Federal Government Should Not Invade States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, since her admission into the Union as a sovereign State, California has constituted a vast empire rich in natural resources which have profited the whole Nation. The giant timbers of California's mountain slopes, her mineral wealth, her fertile valleys all have contributed to the development of the Nation in peace and to its defense in time of war.

Today California has become the focal point in a controversy over the issue of State's rights in which the Federal Government has laid claim upon the tidelands which extend along the coast of California for 1,200 miles.

This issue does not affect California alone, but threatens the sovereign rights of every State in the Union bordered by tideland areas.

Under the Constitution of the United States certain rights were delegated to the Federal Government and certain rights were retained by the States. This balance between State and Federal Government has been upheld by Supreme Court decisions time and again throughout the history of our Nation.

In the present controversy the Federal Government is attempting to set aside all precedence and claim jurisdiction over and title to the tideland territory, control of which has been a matter of State sovereignty upheld by the Supreme Court for over a hundred years.

Much has been made of the oil deposits under the tideland area in California and the need for Federal control for the preservation of natural resources. The facts show that oil deposits are actually found under 15 miles of California's coast line, and half of the estimated oil supply in those pools has already been extracted.

The State of California is the guardian of all the rich natural resources so important to our national economy and security, and shares equal concern with the Federal Government for the development and protection of these resources.

The 1,200-mile coast-line tideland area of California is one of the State's greatest natural resources. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the State and its citizens on harbors, fisheries, pleasure resorts, and other uses essential to the orderly development of the State. The cities and counties of California all have additional plans for the future use of the tidelands. If the present claim of the Federal Government to title to these lands is upheld, then these plans are retarded and the people of California are subordinated to the Federal Government in these matters.

I believe that equity calls for the confirmation of the title to these lands to the State that has been recognized since the beginning of the Republic, and I urge the Members of Congress to support legislation which will confirm and establish the title of the States in and beneath the navigable waters within their boundaries.

The Pope's Easter Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the whole world is watching the Italian elections. We know that a crucial and most fundamental issue is involved in those elections. We know that there is involved therein the fate of Italy, its repercussions on Europe and on the world. If the Communists gain control of Italy they have put themselves in a position to deliver a lethal blow to Europe.

The issue in Italy? Christianity versus Atheism.

Lenin wrote, "Our program rests in its entirety on a scientific philosophy and notably on a materialistic philosophy—our propaganda therefore necessarily embraces atheism."

Karl Marx wrote, "Communism begins where atheism begins."

The voice from the Vatican last Easter morning, speaking for all Christian churches on this fundamental issue, was as follows:

Romans, beloved sons and daughters, the solemnity of the Resurrection of our Lord has often in the past offered an occasion for your gathering in peaceful array on the majestic expanse of this grandiose colonnade whose arms open wide to receive all those who approach the church and Peter.

The Easter blessing, urbi et orbi, which you have come to receive, demands of each of you a frank, joyful, and public profession of the faith received from your fathers, of unyielding fidelity to holy mother church, of indissoluble unity of thought and action with the keeper of the keys entrusted to him by the Divine Founder and Lord of the Church.

In this year of anxieties and dangers, in this moment heralding perhaps definitive and irreparable world events, there falls upon this multitude of believing Romans a shadow of singular gravity, a sacred sense of anticipation, a powerful spirit which, like an inner fire, singes the minds and hearts of all.

Anyone who is not blind sees, anyone not spiritually deafened hears: Rome the herald, mother and guardian of civilization and the eternal values of life; this Rome which its greatest historian already called, as if by divine instinct, "caput orbis terrarum" (capital of the world, Livy, Auc. I, 16) and whose destiny is a mystery which is unfolded through the centuries; this Rome now finds itself before, or better say, in the midst of, changing times which demand of the head and members of Christianity a maximum of vigilance and of tireless readiness for unconditioned action.

Watch and pray (Matthew 26: 41). Thus did the Lord admonish His disciples on the vigil of His passion.

Watch and pray. This is the cry which in the name of the risen Saviour we direct to you, to your and to our fellow citizens, to all the faithful of the world.

The great hour of the Christian conscience has struck.

May this conscience of Christianity be awakened to a full and virile appreciation of its mission of help and salvation for a human race wavering in its spiritual framework; then it will be salvation, will be the realization of the formal promise of Our Saviour: Have faith, I have conquered the world. (John 16: 33.)

Or, indeed—may God forbid—should this conscience only half arouse itself, should it not give itself courageously to Christ, then His verdict, His terrible verdict, is no less formal: He who is not with me is against me.

You, beloved sons and daughters, know full well what this alternative signifies and involves for Rome, Italy and the world.

In your conscience, aroused to such a full appreciation of its responsibility, there is no room for blind credulity toward those who at first proclaimed their respect for religion but then, unfortunately, show their true colors as deniers of all that you hold most sacred.

In your conscience there is no room for the pusillanimity, complacence, and indecision of all those who in this crucial hour believe they can serve two masters.

Your conscience realizes that the actuation of social justice and peace among nations can never be effected and assured if men close their eyes to the light of Christ and open their ears instead to the false words of agitators who on the denial of Christ and God lay the cornerstone and foundation of their program.

Romans! the Church of Rome, which for you even more particularly is your mother, has been in our day publicly subjected to most unjust attacks. As Christ was destined "in signum cui contradicetur" (for a sign that

shall be contradicted, Luke 2: 34), as He was calumniated, covered with insults and mud, so the adversaries of the church, blinded by passion, spare her no affront.

Vainly, in this very city, the center of Christianity, has she multiplied her succor; vainly, in circumstances of imminent danger, has she saved, welcomed, and given hospitality to the persecuted of every category, even among her proudest enemies; vainly, in times of tyrannical oppression, has she affirmed and sustained the dignity and rights of the human person and the just freedom of peoples; vainly, when the menace of starvation weighed on this eternal city, has she provided for its sustenance; vainly, as faithful interpreter of the commandments of Christ, has she raised her voice against the evils of spreading immorality which leads the people to decadence and ruin.

She is accused of being "reactionary" and of supporting doctrines which she has condemned; she is reproached with impoverishing and reducing to wretchedness people whom she has so generously succored and continues to succor, very especially with the providential help which the charity of the Catholic world so willingly furnished in response to her repeated and earnest appeals; she is accused of betraying the doctrine of Christ, her Divine Spouse, the doctrine which she tirelessly proclaims, defends, and actuates; to her are imputed, in a widely exaggerated and generalized form, the misdeeds of one or other of her degenerate members which she herself was the first to deplore, reprove, and punish.

But, though obliged as she is to deny and refute so many unjust accusations for the honor of the name of Christ, for the integrity of His doctrine, for the safeguarding of so many simple, incautious souls whose faith might be shaken by those calumnies, she loves also her detractors who also are her children and she invites them all, as we now invite you all, O people of Rome, O people of Italy, O people of the world, to union, to harmony, to love, to the thoughts and to the plans of peace.

May the grace of Almighty God, the protection of the most holy Virgin Mary, Mother of Divine Love, and "salus populi romani" (health of the people of Rome) descend upon you, while we, from the depths of our heart, impart on all here and everywhere our paternal apostolic benediction.

Shades of 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 28, signed by National Guard man of Brooklyn, N. Y.

I recall that in the military maneuvers of 1939 National Guard units were required to use broom handles in lieu of rifles and 6-inch stove pipe in lieu of cannon.

If our National Guard units throughout the United States are not well equipped, the responsibility certainly must be assumed by Secretary of Defense Forrestal and the high command of our armed forces. Considering the hundreds of millions of dollars that were spent for tanks during the war and the number of tanks on hand on VJ-day, there is certainly no excuse for any Regular Army, National Guard, or civilian component to be without necesary tanks for training purposes. I hope that the Armed Forces Committee of the House will inquire into the situation.

NATIONAL GUARD DILEMMA

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Secretary of Defense Forrestal told the press that the National Guard is neither well enough trained nor well enough organized to take its place in defense of the country. Every one, including myself, accepts those facts.

What irritates me, as a veteran and member of the National Guard, is that none of the reporters or Senators present asked why. For those who are interested I can throw some light on the subject.

Our unit is the only armored battalion in Brooklyn. We are supposed to have medium tanks. Would it surprise you to learn that we haven't even received weapons? No uniforms to speak of. No tanks. No vehicles. In short, no nothin'.

Yet, we are supposed to show young men and students that we are, in every sense of the term, a National Guard. With what? Surplus tanks are rotting all over the country. Millions of rifles, etc., are stored away. I realize that we haven't the men to take care of the actual equipment we should have, but we haven't the men because we haven't anything tangible to work with.

Give us only two tanks, give us some weapons, give us something to work with and we'll give you a National Guard.

NATIONAL GUARD MAN.
BROOKLYN, *March 24, 1948.*

Six-Year Program for Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the 6-year program for the Missouri River Basin, as a whole and separately for Nebraska, as prepared by the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee.

I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD so it will be available for study by all Senators. I wish Senators to have the plan before them when the Army engineers' and reclamation programs come before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary—6-year program for Missouri River Basin

Agency	Estimated cost		Funds available to end of fiscal year 1948 [1]	Funds required by fiscal years						Total estimated cost, 6-year program, 1949-54	Total unscheduled cost and funds required after fiscal year 1954
	Total for construction	Annual for continuing programs		1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954		
Corps of Engineers [2]	$1,789,876,000		$403,970,245	$142,522,905	$167,581,650	$165,005,300	$130,725,500	$92,439,700	$49,925,700	$748,200,755	$637,605,000
Department of the Interior [3]	2,769,316,755	$5,279,863	173,989,627	108,344,907	174,024,964	221,187,440	228,792,920	239,608,454	238,103,315	1,210,062,000	1,421,634,239
Department of Agriculture [4]			55,125,000	69,066,000	51,097,000	58,030,000	72,672,000	89,591,000	93,420,000	433,876,000	
Federal Power Commission				152,000	163,500	164,000	158,000	152,000	149,500	939,000	
Department of Commerce	1,504,000	652,562	246,000	855,000	964,000	1,015,000	1,063,000	794,000	730,000	5,421,000	
Subtotal, Federal agencies	4,560,696,755	5,932,425	633,330,872	320,940,812	393,831,114	445,401,740	433,411,420	422,585,154	382,328,515	2,398,498,755	2,059,239,239
Missouri	30,000	2,239,852	2,209,413	2,930,452	3,093,852	3,220,452	2,592,452	2,592,452	2,592,452	17,022,112	
Kansas	526,700	698,200	579,655	572,900	867,900	764,100	765,650	779,650	785,150	4,535,350	
Iowa		815,200	817,700	817,700	815,200	815,200	815,200	815,200	815,200	4,893,700	
Nebraska	21,299,550	651,000	5,639,935	6,888,550	5,033,500	3,229,500	6,955,500	2,245,050	762,750	25,114,850	
Colorado		606,632	604,232	606,632	606,632	606,632	606,632	606,632	606,632	3,639,792	
South Dakota	668,200	374,360	97,670	938,310	289,060	379,810	406,360	438,160	468,660	2,920,360	
North Dakota	5,932,500	734,800	955,887	1,412,270	1,459,100	2,353,600	1,748,800	1,514,800	1,852,800	10,341,370	
Wyoming		317,861		486,095	544,095	209,595	214,595	224,095	228,595	1,907,070	
Montana	8,208,252	2,585,400	1,743,736	3,205,420	3,526,555	3,605,440	3,972,265	4,034,650	4,241,825	22,586,155	
Subtotal, States	36,665,202	9,023,305	12,648,228	17,858,329	16,235,894	15,184,329	18,077,454	13,250,689	12,354,064	92,960,759	
Grand total	4,597,361,957	14,955,730	645,979,100	338,799,141	410,067,008	460,586,069	451,488,874	435,835,843	394,682,579	2,491,459,514	2,059,239,239

[1] Includes summation of funds available to end of fiscal year 1948 for construction projects and only fiscal year 1948 funds for service functions.
[2] Totals for years 1949 to 1954 do not include funds for work unscheduled at this time.
[3] Includes costs, undistributed to States, of $1,450,000; transmission lines, $257,365,000; and studies, $3,152,500.
[4] Includes that part of the USDA program, dealing directly with agricultural land and water conservation, use, and development and estimated cost requirements for rural electrification. Direct payments to farmers for conservation practices are not included.

Nebraska—6-year program for Missouri River Basin

Feature or project	Estimated cost: Total for construction	Estimated cost: Annual continuing programs	Funds available to end of fiscal year 1948 [1]	Funds required by fiscal years—1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	Total estimated cost, 6-year program, 1949–54	Total unscheduled cost and funds required after fiscal year 1954
Corps of Engineers:											
Aten	$500,000		$500,000								
Indianola	98,000		85,000	$13,000						$13,000	
Bartley	96,000			96,000						96,000	
Omaha	8,800,000		2,799,700	2,900,000	$3,100,300					6,000,300	
Missouri River, Sioux City-Kenslers Bend	2,800,000		1,675,000	700,000	425,000					1,125,000	
Harlan County Reservoir	41,200,000		11,403,000	9,000,000	12,500,000	$8,297,000				29,797,000	
Gavins Point Reservoir	21,600,000		50,000	3,000,000	5,000,000	7,500,000	$6,050,000			21,550,000	
Missouri River levees	11,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	$500,000		9,000,000	
Missouri River, Sioux City-Kansas City	119,500,000		93,294,000	9,500,000	6,200,000	4,300,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	$706,000	26,206,000	
Niobrara Basin	9,500,000			[2]							$9,500,000
Platte River Basin	19,700,000			[2]							19,700,000
Kansas River Basin	500,000			[2]							500,000
Minor tributaries of Missouri River	3,100,000			[2]							3,100,000
Surveys and reports	889,000		271,300	116,700	135,000	[3] 16,000				267,700	250,000
Missouri River above Sioux City [4]											
Subtotal, Corps of Engineers	239,283,000		112,078,000	[5] 27,325,700	[5] 30,360,300	[5] 22,113,000	[5] 10,550,000	[5] 3,000,000	[6] 706,000	94,055,000	33,050,000
Department of the Interior:											
Albion	11,799,330		930	2,250	309,950	2,016,200	3,600,000	3,025,000	1,345,000	10,298,400	1,500,000
Bostwick (also Kansas)	6,661		4,661	2,000						2,000	
Cedar Rapids	13,209,780		1,023			3,000	5,757		300,000	308,757	12,900,000
Columbus	81,796,195		9,045	208,750	2,010,200	5,010,700	6,035,000	6,022,500	4,000,000	23,287,150	58,500,000
Frenchman-Cambridge	54,478,711		6,797,507	8,909,700	12,244,065	8,858,850	6,736,850	5,480,750	5,150,989	47,381,204	300,000
Grand Island	97,593,640		39,082	514,550	4,049,583	7,061,000	10,020,000	11,000,000	15,000,000	47,645,133	49,909,425
Middle Loup	25,245,960		31,427	302,250	1,012,463	3,017,700	3,930,000	2,575,000	500,000	11,337,413	13,877,120
North Loup	23,707,780		1,007		6,773				500,000	506,773	23,200,000
North Republican (also Colorado)	2,024,890		46,285	17,400	303,200	701,000	503,946	400,000	53,059	1,978,605	
Pumping (also Kansas)	2,500							2,500		2,500	
Tricounty	62,099,780		1,080		6,000	2,700				8,700	62,090,000
Mirage Flats (WCU)	3,024,946		2,849,632	146,279	11,050	15,700	2,285			175,314	
North Platte	490,813		177,438	183,250	12,050	40,700	50,000	20,000	7,375	313,375	
Benkelman	8,880		1,266				7,614			7,614	
Braziel	6,000		6,000								
Beaver City	10,440		587		1,853	8,000				9,853	
Red Willow	20,440		605		4,835	15,000				19,835	
Culbertson	31,470		12,145	2,250	12,375	4,700				19,325	
Lower Platte	2,405,684		765,398	718,250	787,481	61,100	20,000			1,586,831	53,455
Republican River Subbasin	13,000		5,000	4,000	4,000					8,000	
Missouri River (Sioux City-Kenslers Bend)	4,000			4,000						4,000	
Harlan County (also Kansas)	32,700		9,420	15,300	7,680		300			23,280	
Niobrara River Basin	338,950		131,950	200,000	7,000					207,000	
Minor tributaries of Missouri River	4,000				2,000	2,000				4,000	
Platte River Basin	7,000		4,000			1,500	1,500			3,000	
Nemaha and Little Nemaha Rivers	9,000		6,000	3,000						3,000	
Mud Creek	5,000		2,500	2,500						2,500	
Salt Creek	5,000			3,000	2,000					5,000	
Basin-wide surveys	476,000		14,300	23,800	68,100	83,100	106,600	94,600	85,500	461,700	
Federal refugees and hatcheries	587,337			50,000	17,137	65,000	242,300	142,300	70,600	587,337	
Wildlife and fisheries research		33,300		30,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	200,000	
Mining studies	43,500			12,500	5,000	5,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	43,500	
Land classification [5]	55,629		7,979	8,000	11,800	14,000	7,700	2,350	2,050	45,900	1,750
Cadastral	9,050			1,525	1,525	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	9,050	
Water investigations		409,000	209,000	264,000	474,000	444,000	444,000	414,000	414,000	2,454,000	
Geological mapping and minerals investigations		11,200	5,000	10,000	12,000	15,000	15,000	15,000		67,000	
Topographic mapping		705,000	450,000	1,130,000	800,000	500,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	4,230,000	
Subtotal, Department of the Interior	379,554,066	1,158,500	11,590,267	12,768,554	22,218,120	27,980,950	32,370,852	29,837,000	28,071,573	153,247,049	222,331,750
Department of Agriculture:											
Watershed management:											
Flood control											
Surveys			81,000	187,000	399,000	38,000				624,000	
Programs of remedial measures						240,000	1,800,000	4,200,000	5,761,000	12,001,000	
Conservation of farm lands:											
Program of conservation application			1,019,000	1,019,000	1,199,000	1,660,000	1,931,000	3,188,000	4,163,000	13,160,000	
Educational program in watershed management [7]											
Research on conservation and land use:											
Soil surveys and publication [8]							32,000	67,000	58,000	157,000	
Research on conservation treatment of land			42,000	42,000	104,000	109,000	109,000	109,000	104,000	577,000	
Use and conservation of forest lands:											
Natural forests			40,000	42,000	60,000	63,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	375,000	
Private forests [9]			9,000	9,000	17,000	25,000	35,000	65,000	80,000	231,000	
Forest and range watershed research			14,000	14,000	44,000	50,000	55,000	60,000	66,000	289,000	
Irrigation and drainage:											
Technical service for irrigation farm			321,000	227,000	236,000	257,000	343,000	489,000	789,000	2,341,000	
Farm credit for irrigation facilities			60,000	60,000	554,000	722,000	840,000	1,176,000	1,344,000	4,696,000	
Irrigation education program [7]											
Technical service for drainage						76,000	83,000	95,000	95,000	96,000	445,000
Investigation, research and plan for irrigation development:											
Soil surveys and publication [8]						28,000	28,000	69,000	22,000	28,000	175,000
Research related to irrigation and drainage			5,000	5,000	136,000	171,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	852,000	
Rural electrification			9,215,000	12,013,000	5,553,000	6,158,000	6,900,000	6,488,000	4,343,000	41,455,000	
Subtotal, Department of Agriculture			10,806,000	13,618,000	8,406,000	9,604,000	12,459,000	16,209,000	17,082,000	77,378,000	

[1] Includes summation of funds available to end of fiscal year 1948 for construction projects and only fiscal year 1948 funds for service functions.
[2] Projects to be adopted and scheduling of expenditures to be determined from investigation and studies now in progress or contemplated.
[3] Scheduling of expenditures dependent on authorization of investigations.
[4] See under South Dakota.
[5] Totals by years are exclusive of work not yet scheduled.
[6] Includes resources administration, fire protection, planning, mineral examination, resources development, and maintenance.
[7] Estimates for accelerated program are included in each State report. Half of this item in each State estimate can be considered Federal cost.
[8] Estimates are for accelerated program in addition to current activity.
[9] Tree planting, fire protection, and technical service based on half Federal and half State funds.

Nebraska—6-year program for Missouri River Basin—Continued

Feature or project	Estimated cost		Funds available to end of fiscal year 1948	Funds required by fiscal years—						Total estimated cost, 6-year program, 1949–54	Total unscheduled cost and funds required after fiscal year 1954
	Total for construction	Annual continuing programs		1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954		
Federal Power Commission:											
River basin work				$10,000	$8,500	$10,000	$15,000	$15,000	$18,500	$77,000	
Power market surveys				7,500	7,500	8,000	7,000	6,000	5,500	41,500	
Subtotal, Federal Power Commission				17,500	16,000	18,000	22,000	21,000	24,000	118,500	
Department of Commerce:											
Coast and Geodetic Survey	$482,000			32,000	145,000	175,000	130,000			482,000	
Weather Bureau:											
Flood forecasting service		$20,300	$25,000	5,000	13,000	19,000	25,000	30,000	30,000	122,000	
Weather supply forecasting service		2,100		3,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	13,000	
Hydroclimatic network		18,300	10,000	12,000	16,000	20,000	20,000	21,000	21,000	110,000	
Machine processing and analysis program		20,000	5,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	120,000	
Supporting services		33,400	6,000	30,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	200,000	
Subtotal, Department of Commerce	482,000	94,100	46,000	102,000	230,000	270,000	231,000	107,000	107,000	1,047,000	
State of Nebraska:											
Agricultural Program [10]		565,800	35,000	399,750	489,250	553,250	623,250	653,250	676,250	3,395,000	
Studies and Investigations [11]	58,050		23,335	16,800	13,750	13,750	13,750			58,050	
Highways	160,000			160,000						160,000	
Game, fish, forestation, and parks	97,000		97,000								
Geological investigation		25,700	14,400	29,500	30,500	27,000	22,500	22,500	22,500	154,500	
Administration of land and water resources development		56,300	53,000	53,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	60,000	60,000	338,000	
Stream pollution work and sanitation		3,200	5,000	1,500	2,700	3,500	4,000	4,000	4,000	19,700	
Subtotal, State of Nebraska	315,050	651,000	227,735	660,550	591,200	652,500	718,500	739,750	762,750	4,125,250	
State governmental subdivisions [12]	19,753,500		4,922,200	5,847,000	4,092,300	2,327,000	6,057,000	1,435,300		19,758,600	
Local unit of government [13]	1,231,000		490,000	381,000	350,000	250,000	180,000	70,000		1,231,000	
Total, State of Nebraska	21,299,550	651,000	5,639,935	6,888,550	5,033,500	3,229,500	6,955,500	2,245,050	762,750	25,114,850	
Grand total	640,618,616	1,903,600	140,160,202	60,720,304	66,263,920	63,215,450	62,588,352	51,419,050	46,753,323	350,960,399	$255,381,750

[10] Accelerated program.
[11] Archeology and paleontology, 50% Federal aid.
[12] Nebraska Public Power System. Consumers Public Power District and Tri-County.
[13] Local flood protection.

Salaries of Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, prior to the passage of Public Law 134 on July 6, 1945, postmasters at offices having gross receipts of more than $600,000 but less than $1,500,000 per annum receive a salary of $6,000 a year. Public Law 134 increased the salaries of postmasters receiving $6,000 per annum to $6,400 per annum, but divided the gross-receipts requirement to provide that the following salary scale would prevail subsequent to July 1, 1945: $600,000 to $1,000,000, $6,000 per annum; $1,000,000 to $1,500,000, $6,400 per annum.

The salary grades provided herein are those as stated by Public Law 134 and amended by Public Law 386, effective January 1, 1946, which latter law increased all existing salaries by $400 per annum.

In order to protect the incumbent postmasters, whose receipts were between $600,000 and $1,000,000 at the time of Public Law 134, section 8 (b) was included in the law to provide the base annual compensation of an incumbent postmaster shall not be reduced and the readjustment to conform to the provisions of this act except for decrease in gross postal receipts to an amount for which a lower-salary grade is provided. The Comptroller General ruled that this protection applied to incumbents as of July 6, 1945, only. Accordingly any postmaster whose receipts were in excess of $1,000,000 but less than $1,500,000 for the calendar year 1944—which is the year used in adjusting postmasters' salaries July 1, 1945, the effective date of Public Law 134—and his receipts dropped to less than $1,000,000 for any subsequent year, his salary was immediately reduced to $6,000 per annum which removed the benefits he obtained under Public Law 134 and 386. While postmasters in post offices with receipts of more than $600,000 or less than $1,000,000 and whose office did not increase above the $1,000,000 mark retained the $6,400 salary providing of course that the postmaster was the incumbent on July 6, 1945.

This has created a paradoxical situation in that a postmaster with longer years of service with a larger office may be drawing less pay than a postmaster with a fewer number of years and a smaller office.

For example, the gross receipts for the Savannah, Ga., post office were $1,035,856 for the calendar year 1944, and the postmaster's salary was set at $6,400 per annum—under Public Law 386—for the fiscal year 1946. For the calendar year 1946 the receipts of the Savannah post office dropped to $821,000 and the salary of the postmaster was automatically reduced July 1, 1947, to $6,000 per annum. During the same period of time the postmaster at Macon, Ga., has received $6,400 per annum because the receipts of his office exceeded $600,000 but never went beyond $1,000,000 per annum, the receipts for this office for the calendar year 1946 amounted to $602,472. Thus we have the situation where a postmaster at one office receives $400 per annum more money than a postmaster at an office one-third larger, notwithstanding that both postmasters were incumbents at the time of Public Law 134 and should be covered by section 8 (b) of the act.

I have introduced a bill to correct this inconsistency.

Message From President Truman to National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message from the President of the United States to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on the occasion of its thirty-eighth annual convention, held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on March 19 and 20.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 15, 1948.

To the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

It is a source of genuine regret to me that I will not be able to attend the thirty-eighth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I am very happy to send this message to the delegates.

I would like to refer briefly to the State of the Union Message to the current session of the Congress. At that time I stated that our third major goal as a nation is to conserve and use our natural resources so that they can contribute more effectviely to the welfare of all our people.

Last summer I also sent a message to the Congress urging that we undertake a program which would provide for the substantial completion within 10 years of the flood-control projects necessary for the protection of the vast Mississippi River Basin. I pointed out in that message that the corollary to this control of floods is the harnessing of waters for the productive uses which return to the Government a large share of the initial investment.

The Congress has recognized the compelling need for an accelerated program for the greater use and control of our water resources. In these momentous days, with domestic productive facilities under a continuing strain to meet the ever-increasing demands of the postwar era, this development is a vital necessity. The international situation is such that a strong and progressive America must be in the vanguard of the unceasing struggle for an enduring peace.

In addition to the appropriations made by the Congress for water use and control programs during the current fiscal year, I have recommended the allotment of much larger sums during the coming fiscal year. I feel that this development and protective work is essential to equip the Nation with the greater facilities and strength needed to achieve its growing national and international obligations.

On this occasion I wish to take the opportunity to commend the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for its efforts over the years to foster and to guide the development of our water and land resources. I know that this progressive association will continue to work for preservation and development of these important national assets.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, March 30, the second of the series of programs opposing the misnamed civil-rights program brought forward by President Truman and his Commission on Civil Rights was broadcast over the Mutual network. The two speakers were Mr. Donald R. Richberg and Mr. Raymond Moley. Of course, neither of these gentlemen lives in the South or has a southern background.

Mr. Richberg is a Protestant by ancestry and individual faith, but throughout his life he has lived and worked with Catholics, Jews, and free-thinkers, as well as with Protestants.

A lawyer with a national reputation, Mr. Richberg represented for many years all the railway labor organizations, was principal author of the Railway Labor Act, and coauthor of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the National Industrial Recovery Act. He later served as general counsel and Chairman of the NRA. As a largely gratuitous service he aided in the organization and recognition of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Mr. Richberg's strong economic and political convictions support a free economy, a democratic government, and individual liberty. He is deeply hostile to communism and to any programs or legislation which aid the spread of communism.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Richberg's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. Richberg's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS ON CIVIL RIGHTS BY DONALD R. RICHBERG

Anyone who expects me to make a speech tonight against civil rights or against their enforcement is going to be disappointed. The civil rights of American citizens should be enforced, regardless of race, color, religion, or ancestry.

But here are two difficult questions: What are these civil rights? How can they be enforced?

Let's not make the mistake of thinking that whenever we have a right to do something, we must have a civil right to do it.

If I have a civil right, it must be a legal right; that is, a right which is written down in a law and which I can call upon the Government to enforce.

Our fundamental civil right is individual liberty—but that does not give me freedom to injure you, nor give you freedom to compel me to serve you. My civil liberty, guaranteed by the Constitution, is largely a right to be let alone—a right to speak freely, to practice my religion, to choose my own friends and associates, and to earn my living in any lawful business.

Let's also understand that every moral right cannot be made a civil right. You have a moral right to kind treatment by friends and relatives whom you have helped. But no government could make that a civil right.

Even a moral right that might be made a civil right is not a civil right until a government declares it in a law and provides for its enforcement.

We have two kinds of government in the United States, a National Government and 48 State governments. Each one has separate and limited powers granted by the people when the people wrote our national and State constitutions. So we can't talk sensibly about civil rights unless we know which government has the power to create and enforce the particular civil right we want to enjoy. Is it the National Government, or one of our State governments?

Now, please don't be impatient and say that it doesn't make any difference to you whether Congress grants you a legal right and the National Government enforces it, or whether your State government does the job. If you will just listen to me for a few minutes I think I can prove to you that your freedom as an American citizen, and your future peace and prosperity, depend on keeping the powers of our National and State Governments separate and restricted as they have been separated and restricted by the Constitution of the United States.

For example, under our Constitution the people did not give the National Government any general police power, which is a broad authority to make laws to protect and promote the public safety, health, and general welfare. They gave that police power only to the State governments.

The police power is a very dangerous power. It can be used either to keep a people free and to help them prosper, or to make them the tax-ridden slaves of a tyrannical ruling class. The safety of the people lies in keeping local control of any government which has the police power—in having that government near to them, and operated by State, city, and county officials whom their neighbors know personally, whom they can watch and whom they can remove from office when they misbehave.

Our forefathers knew very well that a remote, national government, if it had the police power, might be made into a national police state—a national tyranny. So they definitely limited the powers of Congress in the Constitution, and then they wrote that all powers not granted to the National Government were reserved to the States or to the people. They not only limited the powers of Congress, but they also flatly prohibited Congress from making a great many laws, such as laws to restrict free speech, a free press, or the free exercise of religion.

Recently the President's Committee on Civil Rights made a report urging Congress to make a lot of new laws to enforce some old rights and to create some new ones. Congress has been given the power in the Constitution to make some of the laws which the committee recommended. Time will not permit me to discuss the wisdom of all these recommended laws. Tonight I will try only to explain why I believe that one law which the committee approved, not only would be a very bad law, but also is a law which the Congress has no power, and has been expressly forbidden, to enact.

I oppose the enactment of a national fair-employment-practice act like the one now being considered by the Senate in the Ives bill, S. 984.

This proposed law would make it unlawful for a private employer to refuse to hire, or to discharge, any person, or to discriminate against him in promotion or other conditions of employment, because of his race, religion, color, or ancestry.

We might have a long argument as to whether men ought to be, and can be, prevented by law from acting in accordance with ancient, deep-rooted preferences or dislikes, based on race or religion.

We might have a long argument over the wisdom of having the National Government send out from Washington thousands of petty officials to investigate and regulate millions of daily decisions of employers throughout the United States, in hiring, discharging, promoting and otherwise dealing with millions upon millions of employees. Or you might agree with me, quickly, that this is a crazy, unworkable scheme.

But, I have time tonight only to explain briefly: First, why Congress, if it had the power, should not make a law giving anyone a civil right—that is, a legal right—to be given private employment by a man who does not want to employ him. Second, that Congress has been given no power, but has been expressly forbidden, to make such a law.

Now let me point out again that a moral right cannot always be made a civil right; and that one man cannot be given a civil right to destroy the civil rights of another man.

A right to life is certainly a fundamental civil right; and the ability to get food and drink is essential to life. You might argue, and I might agree, that you ought to have a civil right to have the Government feed you, if necessary. But, I hope you will not argue that you should have a civil right to

compel any private citizen to whom you applied, to provide you indefinitely with food and drink. For the same reason no one should contend that a moral right to earn a living provides the basis for creating in anyone a civil right to compel a private citizen to employ him in a private business. I hope, by the way, it will be admitted that making it unlawful for you to refuse to hire a man is simply a way of compelling you to hire him.

Everyone will agree that you have a moral right to get married, that is, assuming that you are physically fit for marriage. But I don't believe you would ask the Government to give you a civil right to be married, which would be enforced by punishing anyone who refused to marry you. Nor would you ask the Government to make a law providing that no man or woman should refuse to marry anyone because of the race, religion, color, or ancestry of the person proposing marriage.

Everyone will agree that such a law would violate our constitutional guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of association, and a free exercise of religion, and would destroy the sacred institution of marriage.

But this proposed antidiscrimination law would be equally destructive to economic liberty and the maintenance of private business. Although less offensive than enforced marriage, compulsory association in business would have a similar effect in denying civil rights of individual liberty, freedom of association, and a free exercise of religion, and in destroying our economic system of free enterprise and private property. The manager of a private business has a civil right, a civil liberty, written in our National Constitution, to use his own judgment in choosing his associates and employees, with whom he will make contracts. Under such contracts employees are given the right to use private property, and the employer accepts legal obligations to pay them wages and to protect their health and safety. Under these contracts he is bound to serve them, just as they serve him, and by law he is made responsible for their acts as his agents.

To compel an employer to make contracts of mutual service with persons with whom he is, for any reason, unwilling to make contracts, is to force him to accept an involuntary servitude, which the Constitution declares shall not exist in the United States.

If the Government had the power to force all private employers when dealing with employees to apply only the standards of judgment and to act only upon the motives which were approved by Congress, then private management would soon be so crippled and shackled that it would be better to let the Government run all industries and accept the responsibility for the results.

This ultimate destruction of private business is, of course, the objective of Communists, who enthusiastically support this antidiscrimination act. They run true to form in clamoring for fraudulent civil rights through which eventually all real civil liberties are to be destroyed.

Don't let anyone tell you that the legal objections to a national antidiscrimination law are just lawyer arguments to defeat a beneficent law and to maintain an out-of-date theory of States' rights. This law would destroy long-established civil rights of tremendous, proven value. Rights which are vital to the happiness and prosperity of all of us would be destroyed in order to create a new right of very doubtful value to anyone.

This law would violate the civil rights of both employers and employees—the rights of free speech, a free press, and a free exercise of religion, which are guaranteed by the first amendment.

This law would violate the civil rights of liberty of contract and freedom of association, which are guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

This law would not only permit, but actually compel, involuntary servitude which is prohibited by the thirteenth amendment.

This law would be an attempt by the National Government to exercise the police power which is reserved to our State governments by the tenth amendment.

Thus, by ignoring and deliberately violating the Constitution, Congress, in this law, would undertake to establish a national police state. No wonder this antidiscrimination law is a main plank in the Communist platform. But, why, oh why, do liberal-minded men and women, who hate and fear Communism, permit themselves to be deluded by noble emotions into giving to Communists this incalculable aid in their efforts to destroy our constitutional safeguards of private business, individual liberty, and self-government.

A cry comes echoing down the years: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the second address on the program was delivered by Hon. Raymond Moley. Mr. Moley was formerly Assistant Secretary of State. He is an outstanding journalist, educator, and author. At present he is the associate editor of Newsweek, and is a professor of public law at Columbia University.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. Moley's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY RAYMOND MOLEY

In considering the President's civil rights program, I am speaking as a northerner. Every root that I have is embedded in the Unionist North. I shall, however, try to point out the position of the South in this controversy. It should not be necessary for those directly concerned to fight this battle alone. We are, first of all, Americans. And if Americans can find no way to peace at home, they are poor ministers of peace in an unhappy world abroad.

I am not approaching this subject from a political angle. But this I want to say. I saw at first hand, as did Don Richberg, who was in Washington with me in 1933 and who has just spoken, the laying of the basis of Democratic policy. This policy continued for 15 years and finally put Mr. Truman in the White House. When that foundation was laid in Roosevelt's first term, there were no more loyal workers than those Southern Senators and Congressmen who are now driven into revolt. Their reward for their loyalty to Roosevelt is to have another President hand to Congress for enactment a program largely created by people who were never Democrats at all. That is not only ingratitude, it is an affront to the intelligent and loyal citizens of a dozen States. They are constructively trying to solve a problem that the President wants to meet by coercion and legislative fiat.

This problem of civil rights should not be made a political issue. Its bearing on deeply felt emotions, its Nation-wide significance, and the moral values involved should lift it above a squabble for political advantage. But the President, by raising it now and in this manner, has made it a political issue. He has raised the suspicion that he has yielded to those who advise him that at all costs he must win the political support of northern cities and that the South has no option except to vote for him. Thus, a blinding political fog is thrown over a grave issue of broad national welfare.

It is northern interference in southern problems that gives strength down there to those demagogs and clowns who are occasionally elected on waves of prejudice and hate. The enlightened people of the South tell us again and again that they can win if we in the North will only mind our own business.

But the crisis in the South created by the President's civil-rights message calls for more than mutual recrimination and retaliation. But there is a constructive way out, if cool heads on both sides can prevail. Never since President Rutherford B. Hayes, 70 years ago, began to extinguish the burning ashes of civil war and reconstruction has there been more need for statesmanship in dealing with this issue.

The acute phase of the trouble started with the appointment in late 1946 of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. The crisis appeared with the publication of the committee's report in late 1947. The President's message last month rubber-stamped the committee's recommendations.

No one can quarrel with the humane objectives involved. No decent person, North or South, condones lynching or favors injustice, brutality, or bigotry. Almost everyone wants more qualified people to vote And few will deny the desirability of fair employment, better housing, and sound medical care for all.

But the committee and the President seem to have forgotten that the South's problem is not a pure question of logic and law. It involves a sense of bitter history and of personal and sectional pride. A good illustration of the bias of the committee is its apparent approval of the civil-rights legislation passed between 1866 and 1875. This program, as every reader of history knows, was the creation of a radical Republican Congress inflamed by the passions of the Civil War. It was designed to humiliate and degrade a defeated enemy. It was a measure of Carthaginian peace. No broad-minded northerners should want to recall that program or the sordid atmosphere of those dreadful years.

Today one cannot visit the South and not be profoundly impressed by the economic and intellectual renaissance going on there. Great universities are growing up. Products of the mind and imagination are pouring forth. Projects of social welfare are in the making. The very population is not only expanding but growing in character and distinction. Agriculture is beginning to throw off the chains of a single crop. Diversity in farming is increasing. And industry is expanding with incredible rapidity.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights was ex parte. The report was ex parte. It was by and for one side of the case. The committee was largely composed of northerners—northerners who will be regarded in the South as unfamiliar with southern problems.

The report shoots the works. Almost every controversial racial question which has rocked Congress in 20 years is included. In tone it is an unmitigated indictment of the South. In arrangement it is an affront, because the very first of its recommendations is for the imposition of a Federal police system penetrating into every corner of the South.

Don Richberg has properly told you of the danger of police power, especially of Federal police power. This report would set up a full division of enforcement in the Department of Justice. Then it would set up eight or nine regional offices, manned by what the committee deceitfully calls skilled personnel, but which really means detectives and police agents. These would be the local arms of the Washington Gestapo. The report even goes so far as to recommend the setting up of police schools to train these operatives. Among other things, these training programs should—and I use the committee's own word—"indoctrinate" these

agents. "Indoctrinate" is a war word—a police state word. It does not belong in the language of American States.

The report speaks again and again of our sister States in insufferably condescending terms. I quote: "It is a sound policy to use the idealism and prestige of our whole people to check the wayward tendencies—of a part of them." (End of quote.) The majority of the committee recommends the withholding of Federal grants-in-aid to force sovereign and tax-paying States to obey. This is exactly the sort of thing we are threatening to do to States behind the iron curtain. This must mean millions for Germany and not 1 cent for Georgia.

The President's report only grudgingly admits gains, although gains in the South have been significant. Lynching has, in fact, almost disappeared. The figures are 64 in 1921; three in 1939; and one in 1947. The poll tax and the white primary have been disappearing rapidly.

The constructive approach to this problem is to invoke the principle of regionalism. This principle of regionalism has been growing very rapidly in the South as well as in other parts of the country in the past few years. It is, in a sense, an idea that the makers of our Constitution seem to have overlooked.

Perhaps they did not sufficiently foresee the vast expansion and diversity that would characterize the Nation whose foundation they were building. They clearly saw what we all now see, that this country is too big for centralized government. The makers of the Constitution did not see that States would sometime be too small to solve the problems of great regions. There was needed an additional institution midway between the central Government and the States. I am bold enough to believe that if such a regional institution had been in existence, the dreadful laceration and carnage of the Civil War might have been avoided. But to labor that point is to cast tears on dried blood.

The point is that regionalism has been growing. A good example is in the active promotion of regional meetings of governors to consider and solve problems common to groups of States—problems too big for a single State and unsuitable for Federal action.

If the President felt that national unity was being impaired by discrimination and injustice, it would have been the act of a statesman to call together the leaders of southern States and to present these problems to them for solution. Instead of appointing a committee which, after all, discovered nothing new and said only what had been twice told, the President might have called the governors, Senators, Congressmen and unofficial leaders of those States and presented the problem to them. Under his leadership they might well and, I believe, they would have taken measures to accelerate the obvious progress already made.

In this, we are dealing with deeply rooted conditions which cannot be eradicated in a day. They require careful, measured, intelligent treatment by people thoroughly familiar with the facts. There are grounds for great hope that such efforts would succeed, because they move with the tides of economic and political evolution.

It is not too late for the President to take this course. If, as he said in his message on communism, he wants unity, here is a way he can attain it. But unity cannot be secured so long as some Americans threaten other Americans with outside pressure and punitive laws.

I speak for those millions of Americans who are not extremists on either side of this issue. We want what the Constitution calls domestic tranquillity. And we want a President to help us get that domestic tranquillity.

Contributions of the Legal Profession to Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the opportunity and the need for development and strengthening of the United Nations through judicious handling and settlement of current international difficulties were stressed in a splendid address made by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, and now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., before an overflow meeting of the Loyola College Alumni Association on March 30.

The contribution made by members of the legal profession to the development and maintenance of the American system of constitutional government likewise was extolled by Mr. Farley. Because of the recognized ability and the broad and understanding outlook of Mr. Farley on both national and world affairs, I believe that his address deserves widespread attention and consideration, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is admirable and fitting that the Loyola alumni should dedicate each annual dinner to a group of college graduates. Tonight it is your fine and representative group of lawyers who are reminded of their special value to their alma mater and to the communities in which they practice. I understand nearly 200 of your group are lawyers and there are 75 young men in your halls preparing for the bar.

In 1852, when Loyola was founded in the two private dwellings in the war memorial plaza area, most of the men who entered American colleges did so with the intention of entering the clergy, the academic life, or the professions. Few thought then, as many do now, that a liberal-arts education could be of advantage to men who were to pass their active lives in business. The number of colleges a hundred years ago, and their enrollment, both of which now seem small, illustrate the old theory that colleges existed to educate only the community leaders who followed the professions. Today the hundreds of thousands of students in thousands of undergraduate schools are proof, indeed, of the broadening educational concept of this country.

This is at once our strength and our pride. Yet we must beware of pride in intellect, for by that sin rather than by ambition fell the angels, and man cannot win by it. Ambition should be made of nobler stuff. To my mind there is no nobler ambition than the aspirations in public service so common to the profession of law. Politics, to my mind, is the greatest of the temporal professions. In no other can a man of scrupulous honesty and broad vision do so much for his generation and for posterity. The whole world is his stage and history is his theater. True, there are many villains to every statesman, yet the good in politics outweighs the evil. In this I speak—and may I say it modestly—from a rather full experience in public life, and I speak as one who has solemnly and unequivocally flung away all political ambition. In a word, I have done it with a word, and that word is "no." One word is enough to deny ambition if denial springs from the heart.

From my background of 35 years in public life I have had ample opportunity to note the contribution made by the legal profession. I sometimes wonder whether the immense contribution to community life and the Government by your brotherhood is fully understood. I had long been aware of the contribution to the community, but it was not until I came into the Government that I realized how largely public administration is in the custody of the legal profession. We have a strong and welcome reminder of this fact tonight in the presence here of some of the Loyola men who have carried their legal training into public service and have risen to deservedly eminent positions. Interest in public affairs may almost be said to be a principal and not a secondary interest of lawyers, and this has been true from the earliest colonial days when a man, like John Marshall, could appear before the bar after only some 3 weeks of formal training and rise to the position of Chief Justice of the United States—a post in which he channeled the stream of justice. If we pause to think about it, this interest of lawyers is natural because ours is a government of laws, and in recent years, I can add, it has become a government of complicated laws. We laymen are told this is necessary, and, while I am not prepared to deliver an opinion here and now, I reserve the right to dissent. Nonetheless, the setting being what it is, lawyers are playing a great part; in fact, they are the key group in the operation of a complex government.

You may recall that in the early days of the selective service a list was published of the priority status of the occupations. At the end of the list, numbering two or three hundred, was the word "lawyers." Whoever compiled that list was a man of little experience, because the war effort had not progressed very far before the lawyer had once again, both in the armed services and in his community, proved his patriotism and his professional usefulness. All through our vast war establishment lawyers were in key positions. When the call was for the trained mind and for experience in handling varied situations, the lawyer very often turned out to be the fellow who could do the job.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the legal profession's chief role is the guardianship of justice. Justice is not solely in the hands of the judiciary, but is also in the care of opposing attorneys before the bar. The quality of justice depends upon the quality of the attorney as well as the quality of the judge. If the lawyer and the judge are honest men, then will there be justice and equity. For this reason the legal profession has need of a code of ethics comparable to that of the priesthood. Dishonesty and the absence of ethics in the legal profession can certainly destroy free government, guaranteed by our Constitution. As a layman, I am warmed in spirit by the fact that such institutions as Loyola are defending our form of government by inculcating a high standard of legal ethics as well as lasting spiritual ethics in its young men.

There is another aspect of the lawyer's life about which something should be said. Sir Norman Birkett, the famous English judge, remarked, when here recently, that lawyers were disliked in his country because they took unpopular causes. Sir Norman insisted, and any wise person would agree, that they should not be criticized on that basis. Lawyers are spokesmen for their clients. They say what the clients would say if they had the training, or perhaps the intelligence. The saner portion of the community will not blame a lawyer who represents an unpopular

client with all his strength. Under our system of justice everyone is entitled to representation before the courts. It is to the credit of the American bar that again and again when some great principle has needed testing, or some injustice has threatened, there have been found lawyers who were willing to incur public displeasure in order that they might discharge the higher duty imposed upon them by their profession. I hope it will always be so.

Lawyers and laymen alike should rally to correct injustice and to safeguard freedom, because the sacred torch of liberty has now fallen into our hands. If we fail to bear it on high there are not hands to which we can pass it in this world. Through the centuries mankind has traveled a long and tortuous road, slowly but surely ever moving to higher ground. Although aggressors have pressed down the cruel crown of hates on the brow of mankind and erected a cross of dictatorship in mankind's path, the ground we have reached today must not finally be the Calvary of civilization. Rather let it be the "hill of difficulty" over which the United States, the "Great-Heart" of nations, shall lead the world to peace and brotherhood, as Christian was led in Pilgrim's Progress to the "celestial country."

Like "Great-Heart" we are armed with a far-reaching sword, a stout helmet and a close-guarding shield, but the world stands in greater need of our example and counsel. That example can best be given if we stand united at home. Those among us who align class against class, race against race, and creed against creed are not promoting the freedom of mankind, as they would have us believe, but are rather brewing bitter vinegar and sharpening a deadly spear for the golgotha of mankind. This is no time for violent, unreasoning partisanship, but an era which stands in desperate need of unity. At no time in history, perhaps, has the world had a greater need for courage and leadership. At no time are our leaders being watched with keener interest and being weighed more exactly by their actions.

It is indeed a mad world and a sad one. It is now nearly 3 years since Germany surrendered and since the Japanese were stunned into capitulation by the horrible dawn of the atomic age. No peace has been concluded with either shattered country. Troops of four nations are tramping Germany. Hundreds of thousands of persons are penned in camps; camps without the brutality of the Nazi concentration camps but with a full quota of bewilderment. Hundreds of thousands of Germans have been reduced to the status of slaves. The destruction of war appears to be rooted in the soil. Much of this I have seen with my own eyes.

Troops are in many other corners of this uneasy world. The heralded peacetime harnessing of atomic energy has yet to materialize. The unity of the Allied nations, cemented in war by the common Axis enemy to such solidarity as to give some promise of a lasting peace has been crisscrossed by abysmal crevices. The bloody specter of war hangs over our lives, a war far more devastating than the awful conflict just ended. Lustful war, it seems, increases in horror and destruction by what it feeds on.

The haunting specter is hanging over us because one nation has launched a program of imperialistic expansion, no less horrible, if more successful than that of the conquered Nazis. Totalitarianism is no less infamous in a red shirt than in a brown shirt. If anything, Red fascism is the worse, because it has held its own people in fearful slavery for almost 30 years. I have nothing but pity for the 180,000,000 Russian people and a deep loathing for the comparative handful of Soviets who rule them through the villanies of a police state.

The dismaying fact about this era is that one nation can decide whether the future shall hold peace or war. Russia can decide whether the common man is to pass through decades of horror, or is to have a chance to work and flourish in peace. There is a bitter irony in this awful power which the Russian dictatorship now holds, because their own docile people are told meanwhile that the concern of their elite is for their welfare, and their national security. The unhappy bands of faithless Communists in other lands are fed doctrines of envy and malice on the theory that their group disloyalty and treachery will weaken their respective countries.

When we survey the utter remoteness of the Kremlin mind from all the hopeful, fruitful, and humane tides of history, we should remember on this academic occasion that education beyond the three R's stage is not a significant factor in Russia, and that religion is there officially regarded as benumbing superstitution. They have no Loyola colleges, no liberal institutions of the kind that have enriched life in the western nations. Nor have they altars at which man may pray for benevolence and the humane spirit. Not one of the men in power there has had an opportunity to learn the principles by which the rest of the world thinks. Under the czars there were few Russian educational institutions. What there were went down as such in the Communist revolution of 1917, and these have been replaced by military and scientific trade schools and establishments for narrow political indoctrination. There is an effort to destroy any common ground of culture or social development. You must have noticed the semi-official abuse recently heaped on some of the Russian composers, literary men, and physical scientists because in their arts and science they have not expressed themselves as the Communist politicians say they should have. Sometimes, regrettably, the common courtesy observed elsewhere by all of mankind is officially stifled. For example, personal correspondence from participants in the Nuremberg trials to their Russian colleagues goes unanswered. The lives and spirits of the Russian rulers have not been affected by religion or by education, but in too large part by fighting, treachery, and political assassination. They have been indoctrinated in violence and their political and diplomatic attitudes reflect it.

A few moments ago, I warned of pride in intellect. I did so because I feel strongly that the cause of communism has been advanced in countries by those of swollen intellectual pride, who turned from the path of faith into the road of secularism. Without the hope of heaven man can be no more than a savage. And so be it with nations. The Soviets who fall to their knees only under the knout cannot finally conquer those who fall voluntarily to their knees to pray. By flattery and deception pride-blown intellectuals or those who fancied themselves to be intellectuals, were led to the mountaintop where the Soviet satan offered them the whole world. Many succumbed and promoted the unholy gospel of Moscow.

Some embraced the politico-religious heresy, others clasped the Red hand of fascism to travel in fellowship, and not a few believed that communism and democracy could work together. The other day the free world was shocked by the tragic death of a leader who regarded his country as a great experiment, a happy union of collectivist economy and democratic individualism. His unhappy fate should be a lesson to intellectuals everywhere and particularly in our country.

Freedom screamed when Czechoslovakia fell to Red lust for power as she had shrieked for Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Albania. Now, unhappily, freedom is preparing to shed tears over other nations in the Red path. While we mourn the fall of each of these peoples, we cannot forget that their end was destined years ago by those who espoused, out of pride of intellect, the doctrine that the Red bear would lie down with the lamb of democracy.

However, I have no intention of devoting my time to recriminations and regrets. What has been done still can be for the best if we learn from our mistakes. We must not fail. The past will be prologue to a bright future if we but see the right and steer toward it with the firmness of loyalty and devotion. We cannot fail if we resolutely steer the ship of humanity between the shoals of compromise and expediency by the light of the torch of freedom to the harbor of happiness.

If I have expressed concern about international relations, I trust I have not suggested that I am without real hope. There is, indeed, much in the present situation to be thankful for. I refer to the United Nations. Too much has been made of disappointments and not enough has been made of the solid fact that there is a great international meeting place, that there is a forum for helpful study and debate, and that means are being evolved to implement the decisions taken.

The United Nations, I repeat, is the best hope of mankind. Nationalism is old. Nor will it disappear for a long time to come. The citizens of each country hesitate to turn over to anybody else, or to any other group, decisions affecting their country. We ourselves have been as reluctant as any in this respect. Our absention from the old League of Nations was a significant evidence of this. But at every point and for every purpose where they can properly be employed I favor the processes of the United Nations. We must make them work. Our country should continue to participate valiantly in that great effort.

In nearby Washington a great debate on aid to Europe has ended. I was glad to accept the invitation of Henry L. Stimson to join the citizens' committee to sponsor this wise policy. Few are so foolhardy as to say that we should do nothing to effect the economic transfusion necessary to make western Europe healthy again. True, the amounts involved are great. The strain on our own economy is such that only we could stand it. But we are advised—and I accept the judgment—that we must make a substantial contribution in order to avoid the much greater sacrifice of increasing military establishments, and I am confident that the Congress after this long debate will set up a program on a basis broad enough and strong enough to achieve its purpose.

In conclusion, I should like to recall the moving words uttered by a great President in one of the Nation's most critical hours. With a slight elision, the warmly human lines of Abraham Lincoln could serve as a national, even an international, prayer today. I quote: "With malice toward none, with charity to all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves and with all nations."

The Czechoslovak Trade Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD three communications relative to contemplated action by our State Department with regard to trade agreements with Czechoslovakia. They are: First, a telegram to

me from Willard Bittle, factory manager of the United States rubber footwear plant at Naugatuck, Conn.; second, my letter to President Truman on this same subject; and, third, a reply from John R. Steelman, the Assistant to the President:

NAUGATUCK, CONN.,
March 23, 1948.

JAMES PATTERSON,
House of Representatives:

We are quoting herein telegram to President Truman which is self-explanatory. We would appreciate your furthering this cause and intercede for postponement of proclaiming this agreement in effect.

"Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
"President, United States of America,
"White House, Washington, D. C.:

"We are very much interested in Geneva trade agreements, especially on rubber footwear and note Czechoslovakian agreement signed on March 20. We protested to our congressional Members some time ago in permitting approximately 8,000,000 pairs of rubber footwear to enter this country on a tariff reduced 50 percent. European political developments since Geneva trade agreements make final consummation of Czechoslovakian tariff reduction not in best interests of United States. We earnestly request that you withhold proclaiming Czechoslovakian agreement in effect so long as world freedom is threatened through their action reported 'national shift.' Four million Czechs' Sunday donation of 'free' labor on March 23 indicative of trends under which Czechoslovakian goods will compete with United States. Our rubber industry is vital to the security of our Nation and discrimination against our industry of rubber workers in this means will seriously affect both."

W. E. BITTLE,
Factory Manager, Naugatuck Footwear Plant, United States Rubber Co.

MARCH 24, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am very much disturbed by action which might possibly be taken by the Department of State with regard to approval of the Czechoslovakian portion of the Geneva Trade Agreement.

It is my understanding that when this agreement was previously arrived at, its effectiveness would be based upon both the Government of the United States and the then freely chosen Government of Czechoslovakia becoming signatories to the act.

I wish now to express to you my protest against affirmative action by this country in becoming a signatory to this plan. The recent Communist coup in Czechoslovakia should preclude our maintaining commitments previously advanced. It is a well-accepted fact that the Government of Czechoslovakia is now dominated by the Soviet Union, and is not of the peoples' choosing. Any trade agreement in the name of reciprocity would serve only to aid that nation and its satellites, who now seek world domination. The consummation of this agreement would also retard seriously the production of rubber footwear in this country, by placing domestic goods on an unfavorable cost basis.

There is located in my home town of Naugatuck, Conn., the largest rubber-footwear plant in the United States. This plant, at full capacity, employs between five and six thousand citizens. Any agreement, at this time, which would place their products on an unfair basis in a competitive market, would seriously affect the employment of great numbers of people.

For the reasons stated above, I protest very vigorously any affirmative action that might be taken by the Department of State in this regard.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 30, 1948.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: The President has asked me to look into the matter about which you wrote him on March 24 with reference to the Geneva Trade Agreement.

The Department of State has informed me that these agreements were completed last October and that Czechoslovakia has already signed. On March 20, however, the Department of State issued a statement to the effect that the Department "is examining the implications and obligations of the agreement in the light of the recent developments in Czechoslovakia."

Thank you for your expression of interest in this matter.

Sincerely,
JOHN R. STEELMAN,
The Assistant to the President.

Mr. Steelman's letter merely reiterates the State Department statement of March 20, to the effect that it "is examining the implications and obligations of the agreement in the light of the recent developments in Czechoslovakia."

It is my contention that our State Department might well consider any past agreements reached with the then free government of Czechoslovakia.

It is, at least, an inconsistent position, if not an untenable one, in which we find ourselves at this juncture of world affairs. We, who are appropriating tremendous sums of money to combat communism are, at the same time, considering trade agreements favorable to regimes under the domination of the same Communists.

A State Department as adept at reversals of policy as ours seems to be, might well consider reversal, in this instance, which would be of benefit to our citizens.

Where Are We Drifting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a letter addressed to me from one of the leading lawyers of Florida in which he discusses the present world condition:

TREADWELL & TREADWELL,
Arcadia, Fla., March 23, 1948.

Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DWIGHT: It seems to me obvious that we are drifting swiftly toward war, and I think we should make every effort to prevent such a catastrophe. If we are forced into another disastrous war, when we get through with it, whether we win or lose, the whole world, including the United States, would be impoverished. No nation would be able to help another with chaos everywhere and the almost certainty that our Government as it has existed since we threw off the English yoke would be superseded by some kind of communistic government. I say this because another war would destroy the greater portion of our natural resources and practically all our wealth and would create a debt beyond any possibility of payment, which would mean the impoverishment of the people, if the Government stood.

Hungry, poverty-stricken people don't reason very much; they furnish a fertile field for extremists and opportunists, so I hope everything possible will be done to keep us out of what seems to me to be an inevitable war.

I don't think war is inevitable entirely because of the administration's foreign policy. It might be possible to postpone it for 5 or 10 years by some other foreign policy, but I think it is inevitable for the reason that it does not make much difference whether we tell Russia in blunt terms we are not going to permit her to extend her sphere of influence or try to compromise with her and postpone the evil day. That is, I think war with its results are inevitable just so long as we attempt to meddle in European affairs, and I think history, and especially the First World War and what has happened since then, has clearly shown that the course we are now pursuing is fundamentally unsound and cannot lead to anything but war after war until everything is destroyed.

In the First World War we rushed to the aid of England and France, particularly England, in connection with a quarrel that England and France had with Germany over its policy of expansion in attempting to overrun Belgium and other countries. Germany at that time was a strong, stabilized Government headed by the Kaiser. We were successful in defeating Germany and what happened? In no time at all England became afraid of France and began to wink at, if not encourage, Germany in building up its army. This was done not because England wanted another war, but she wanted to do as she had been doing for years, she wanted to hold the balance of power. All of this resulted in Hitler coming into power, so we swapped the devil off for his witch. In fact, I think almost anyone would agree Germany under the government headed by the Kaiser was a much better country and a much better neighbor than it was under Hitler.

If we had stayed out of the First World War I don't think there is any doubt at all but what England and Germany would have come to some reasonable settlement. France might have been trimmed down in the transaction and some of the other countries likewise might have had territory taken away from them, or been restricted, or placed under obligations that might have been hurtful, but I am inclined to believe if Germany had won and made terms with England that France would have been a better country today and I am not so sure the rest of Europe would not have been just as well off. But at any rate we rushed to the assistance of England and France in 1918, and as a result the German Government, as it had existed, was defeated. Hitler came into power and we had a worse situation than we had before and again England, France, and other European countries became involved in war with Germany headed by Hitler. At the beginning of that war the American people were overwhelmingly against the United States participating therein, or doing anything that would in anywise lead toward involving our country. The papers were almost unanimously to that effect and the people themselves raised their hands in holy horror at the idea of our getting involved

in another war overseas. But our country got into the war and again the result was the defeat of Germany but to defeat Germany we had to rescue Russia from almost certain defeat and furnish her billions of dollars, fighting equipment, etc., and put her in position where it is now possible for her to dominate Europe. Now, instead of Germany as headed by the Kaiser, or Germany as headed by Hitler, Europe is menaced by Russia headed by Stalin and others. I submit that Russia today is much more dangerous to the civilization of the world than Kaiser Wilhelm or Hitler ever were, for the simple reason the German people as a whole are educated, high type people, while the rank and file of the Russians are ignorant and wholly devoid of the cultural background of the German people.

So in the face of fighting two wars to settle the quarrels of the European people which have practically bankrupt this country and in which we did not accomplish anything so far as permanency of peace is concerned, now again we are being called upon by the people in Europe, who think it is our duty to do so, to come to their rescue. It looks as if we would learn sometime from past history and especially recent history. This country's history up until 1918 had been one of constant advancement, with a few setbacks in the way of financial readjustments, etc. We had been attending strictly to our own business and we were successful, but since we departed from one of the fundamental principles on which this country was founded and entered upon a course that requires us to meddle and attempt to force our opinions upon other countries we have been in constant trouble, and just so long as that policy is followed, just that long we will not only be in trouble but we will be in wars if we are able to fight.

I understand it is the opinion of many that if we don't take part in European affairs that the crowd over there will gang up on us and some day come over here and take us over, but I would rather risk my chance on that which is a bare possibility than face the absolute certainty of destroying our Government by the course we are now following, which course will undoubtedly lead to war which will result as above stated in the end of our Government and the destruction of what was once the most powerful Nation on earth.

If we had not interfered in the First World War we would never have had Hitler and the Second World War would not have been fought and if we had not interfered in the Second World War we would not now be confronted with the almost certainty of a third world war of which the United States will probably have to bear the brunt. In other words, if we had stayed home and minded our own business hundreds of thousands that were killed, injured, and maimed in the two world wars would have been with us today and we would have been the largest, strongest, most prosperous, and respected nation on earth.

As a result of our meddling with other people's affairs we lost hundreds of thousands of our best boys either by death or being incapacitated and we have wound up with a debt even if the strictest economy is practiced, it is going to be hard for the people to ever pay and so far as benefits are concerned we have accomplished exactly nothing. On the other hand two wars have just about destroyed Europe financially and otherwise, wrecked us financially and have made it almost certain we will be involved in another war for the reasons above mentioned.

If the third world war is fought, which it undoubtedly will be unless we about-face and go back to the principles that made this country, then there will be nothing left worth fighting over in the so-called civilized part of the world.

In business and in all everyday affairs if we find a policy, however thoroughly we have committed ourselves thereto, won't work and it has led and is leading us into trouble, those that survive reverse their position, and I think that is exactly what the United States Government should do. I realize such a step as suggested might be embarrassing and would mean the untangling of a lot of red tape but in my humble judgment it is the only thing that is going to save this country.

With kind regards, I am

Yours very truly,

E. D. TREADWELL.

George Washington Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the affirmations and principles of a group of young men who have recently organized the George Washington Young Republican Club:

MARCH 16, 1948.

We, the George Washington Young Republican Club, have formed an organization dedicated to vigorously reaffirming the traditions and ideals of our truly progressive American way of life as exemplified by a Government devoted to the preservation of individual freedom and liberty.

We believe that this form of government has reached its highest development to date under the leadership of the Republican Party.

We pledge the devotion of our total energies to revitalizing the spirit of freedom of action and enterprise which has raised our country to its position of preeminence among the nations of the world.

We heartily endorse the tenet that only through national unity can we achieve a truly representative government.

We thus condemn and disclaim the cynical practice of recent Democrat administrations in using class hatred as a political commodity.

We shall strive for the eradication of the morass of bureauracracy and overcentralization of government which has appeared during the Democrat reign, and which, if allowed to continue, must lead us further toward the abyss of absolute State control of the individual.

We pledge ourselves neither to the totalitarianism of the right, nor to the misguided and unbalanced forces of the left, both of which we believe inimical to the basic freedoms and happiness of all humanity. It is our steadfast purpose to accept the challenge of world leadership which has been thrust upon us, and through the closest cooperation with other members of the Young Republican National Federation, to formulate a consistent, realistic, and determined, national policy based upon our newly realized responsibilities and the best interests of our Republic.

We shall utilize to the fullest the interests, abilities, and talents of our members as we constantly strive to maintain the vitality of our party in order that it may remain, as it is today, a positive and constructive advocate of the true liberalism which is our American heritage.

We dedicate our club to the discussion and application of the doctrine of the Republican Party to enable our members to become more effective citizens; to act as a sifting ground for ideas, and a training ground for leaders. We pledge ourselves as citizens of the United States, and of the world, to wage a tireless war against the forces of totalitarianism, deceit, and hypocrisy which are at work in the world today, by constantly proclaiming and asserting the principles of our conviction.

We accordingly choose the only course to national security and progress and pledge ourselves without reservation to the support of the Republican Party and to its national victory in 1948.

BILL WENDT,
Chairman.
DICK TRIBBE,
Vice Chairman.
DEAN SCHLUP,
Secretary-Treasurer.
JACK MCKEE,
Membership Chairman.
DICK PATCH,
Steering Committee Chairman.
LEW HOFFACKER,
Vice Chairman.
GLENN LEWIS,
Liaison Officer.

Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which is important to the citizens of Alabama and the citizens all over the country. I ask that Members of the House give most respectful consideration to the needed revisions in our Social Security Act.

RESOLUTION BY ALABAMA STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Whereas the Federal grant-in-aid program provided by the Social Security Act does not recognize the fiscal ability of each State to finance the public-assistance program; and

Whereas the Federal Government has assumed responsibility only for certain specified groups; and

Whereas there can be no comprehensive social-security program until there is a public-assistance plan whereby all persons in need regardless of where they live receive equitable treatment; and

Whereas the present social-insurance program excludes certain groups of persons and provides no protection against loss of wages because of disability; and

Whereas Federal legislation is now pending which, if enacted, would rectify many of these inequities; and

Whereas the State board of public welfare, in September 1947, memorialized the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation, so urgently needed: Therefore be it

Resolved by the State board of public welfare, That the Commissioner is directed to call again the attention of the Alabama congressional delegation to this pending legislation and to work in such other ways with the members of the delegation and other appropriate groups concerned with the development of a comprehensive system which guarantees a minimum economic security to all

our people, to the end that necessary changes are made in the Social Security Act; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Alabama congressional delegation and be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

Palestine Partition and the United Nations Still the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the American people should not be confused by the changes of position by the administration or by propaganda speeches in the United Nations. The issue is and remains, Shall the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, through a two-thirds vote, stating that partition of Palestine with economic union is a just solution, be honored, or shall the United Nations retreat in the face of the violence and threats of the five small Arab states around Palestine and of the pro-Nazi Grand Mufti, chairman of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine? The two editorials which follow clearly state the issue:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 26, 1948]

PARTITION IS THE ISSUE

Mr. Truman's grave emphasis upon the open warfare that is just over the horizon in Palestine will not be taken lightly. At this season and on this day when so many hearts are doubly conscious of the tremendous events which have made Palestine the Holy Land for millions, the prospect of death and destruction sweeping through that land is particularly appalling. Certainly, if reason could prevail, if a truce might be agreed upon to avert worse calamities than those which have already ravaged Palestine, there would be cause for rejoicing.

But there have been many efforts to solve the Palestine dilemma by pure reason—as well as by more passionate and less high-minded methods—over many years. The Jews and Arabs are fighting now in the Holy Land. They have been brought to blows by forces which were powerful enough to make them prefer the risks, the sacrifices and the hardships of war to the conditions which might prevail were they to lay down their arms. Those conditions are not changed by Mr. Truman's plea for a truce.

Partition is still the paramount issue. Mr. Truman argues that the American trusteeship plan is not a substitute for partition, but simply an emergency device to forestall the chaos which would ensue from the abandonment by Great Britain of her mandate. But chaos is not threatened simply by Britain's formal renunciation of her responsibility. It would spring from the intense pressures which have been generated within Palestine by the conflicting interests of Jews and Arabs. Trusteeship would not of itself reconcile those interests. It would not end the powerful Jewish drive toward statehood. It would not abate the fierce Arab hostility to these goals. It would be a return to the uneasy stalemate which has been so often broken by violence.

The first reactions to Mr. Truman's proposal for a truce indicate the lack of any objective basis for an agreed suspension of hostilities. Arab spokesmen assert they will end their campaign only if the Jews renounce all hopes of partition. Jews have made it clear that partition is the irreducible minimum of their demands, and they have already set up their state. Upon such a deadlock, Mr. Truman's plea can have little effect, and the trusteeship plan seems shadowy and unsubstantial against the harsh realities now warring in the Holy Land. Doubtless the President was sincere in yesterday's statement, but sincerity is only one element in policy, not a substitute for it.

[From the Washington Post of April 1, 1948]

GROMYKO'S GLASS HOUSE

Soviet Russia is losing no opportunity to exploit the tragic state of affairs in Palestine for propaganda purposes. It was a foregone conclusion that Andrei Gromyko would use the occasion of the United States' proposal of a truce in the fighting between Arab and Jewish factions to denounce the vacillating policy that this Government has followed. There is ample ground for criticism. Few Americans are proud of their Government's record in dealing with this baffling issue. But when stones are thrown, surely they ought to come from someone who does not himself live in a glass house.

The Soviet delegate to the Security Council says that his government still considers the partition of Palestine "a just solution." But Russia has given absolutely nothing but lip service to that solution. In the Security Council Mr. Gromyko has offered no suggestion for either peaceful implementation of the General Assembly's formula for political partition of the Holy Land or the mobilization of force to back up that plan. The United States proposed that the Security Council accept the task assigned to it by the General Assembly in respect of Palestine and appoint a committee of five to work out the problem. Mr. Gromyko rejected the proposal. The American delegation then tried to secure a working arrangement through the big five, and again the Soviet representative gave no cooperation. In short, the Moscow attitude has been wholly negative.

Mr. Gromyko has played the role of the obstructionist who waves his hat and shouts wildly for a cause in public and then quietly blocks every effort that is made to do anything about it. Obviously Moscow's chief interest in the partition plan lies in the possibilities it offers for embarrassing the United States. It should not be difficult, however, for Americans as well as the other peoples interested in a rational solution of this troublesome problem to see the hypocrisy that fills the wide gap between Mr. Gromyko's talk and his actions on this issue.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I inform the House that the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce has endorsed statehood for Alaska. The endorsement is contained in a resolution recently adopted. The people of Alaska remember with pleasure the visit there last summer of Mr. John Ben Shepperd, national president of the Jaycees. Mr. Shepperd traveled extensively throughout the Territory. Like so many others, he became firmly committed to the proposition of statehood after having been in Alaska. We who believe statehood should be granted without delay appreciate the position taken by this great national organization whose endorsement is contained in the following words:

Whereas there are pending in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Congress of the United States, bills to enable the people of Alaska to form a constitution and be admitted as a State in the American Union; and

Whereas the question presented to the American people by these bills is Alaska's right to statehood now; and

Whereas Alaska and Hawaii are the only remaining Territories of the United States, the other 29 Territories which have been organized in the history of the Union all having been admitted to statehood; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has through a series of acts and committee reports indicated to the people of the Territory that Alaska would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and

Whereas in the the 80 years since the purchase of Alaska, it has become a modern American community, with a sound economy and healthy and literate people, who have shown themselves to be fully capable of self-government; and

Whereas the people of Alaska have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States unqualifiedly endorsed immediate statehood for Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, That this organization endorse and it hereby goes on record as favoring immediate action by the Congress of the United States to enable Alaska to be admitted as a State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Alaska, and the Governor of Alaska.

Boy Scout Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I wish to include two letters received from a scoutmaster in Idaho. I had the pleasure of being host to a group of Idaho Boy Scouts and their leaders, who stopped in Washington en route to the world jamboree in Paris last summer.

I asked these Scouts to become messengers of good will to their foreign friends. These letters indicate the vast amount of good accomplished. I con-

gratulate these Scouters for their splendid works.

TETON PEAKS COUNCIL, No. 107,
BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA,
Idaho Falls, Idaho, March 22, 1948.

Congressman JOHN SANBORN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SANBORN: The jamboree Scouts and I will never forget the hospitality you showed us while in Washington last summer. The results of this jamboree have been far reaching, and with the scores of letters I have received from all parts of the world we get a first-hand picture of what is transpiring elsewhere.

In no case have any of these Scouts or Scouters had a patronizing or begging attitude, but in every case they have shown great respect for us Americans. Thousands of friendships have sprung up between us and these people of foreign countries.

The letter which I received last week from a boy of about 18 years of age in western Hungary tells a great deal. I am sure he had no idea that I would pass this information on to others, but since it has certain information which I feel is vital to our consideration of America, I am sending you herewith a copy of the same. I have purposely deleted his name, city, and country since his situation is precarious in his country due to the fact that he is trying to carry on the kind of a Christian life and traditions of Boy Scouting which we in America realize are so important, including freedom and security. You will note this lad has adopted me as he uses the salutation. This, of course, could be the suggestion of our American friend.

I shall appreciate hearing from you as to your reaction concerning this friendly letter that was sent to me.

Sincerely and cordially yours,
VERNON L. STRONG,
Scout Executive.

DEAR UNCLE VERNON: I have received your very dear letter, but deserve to be scolded for not having written sooner. But as you see I have been looking for, and have finally found a gentleman who is so kind as to write a more understandable letter for me. He is from Youngstown, Ohio, and had settled down here before the war. In fact, he is the American correspondent of the Hungarian-American Oil Co., affiliated with the Standard Oil Co. He teaches English here, having just started a new class, and I am one of his 70 pupils. I hope I shall be able to write better in a few months.

There are many other causes which causes retarded me in writing sooner, for as you know, the after effects of this long war are still prevailing and very much felt here. There are many things of which I can't write, which you well know why.

It makes me really happy to know that Americans care a little about us. I wish to let you know that I have organized a Boy Scout troop of 64 boys of the age of 14-16. They are all sending you their best regards and respects, since I have told them much about you. They are all eager to see you. Please send us your photograph with your family and also of your troops. As soon as I get mine ready I shall send it to you.

You have asked me to write about our Scout work. Sorry to say, but I don't know how long our movements, activities will last and exist. As I hear, our movements have been disbanded in the more eastern neighboring countries. Perhaps you know the reason. They call us reactioners and Nazis, which we have deliberately refuted. We are taught materialistic ideas and they want to cut religion out of scouting entirely. The leaders are all materialists. This is too new to us. If their intentions don't change soon, meaning their attitude, we shall be absorbed or dispersed. Perhaps by the time I write my next letter there will be no Boy Scouts here.

My being a Boy Scout is of disadvantage even in school. I had almost been thrown out of school twice on account of it. There are persons who take close observation of our activities and are directing us toward materialism against our will. I hung up one day in the schoolroom the little flag which you gave me, but had to suffer the consequences. I am before my final exams and am afraid that they will flunk me, although I study hard and always know my lessons well. This is the state our leaders are in as well who have always trained and taught us and the new generation love of peace and patriotism in the spirit of B. P.

In closing my letter I must let you know that not only us Scouts but majority of the population here have respect of for these people who are in favor of peace, good will for mankind, and liberty. I wish you and your dear family the best of health, and wishing the same to my American brother Scouts, please tell them not to forget about us Scouts who are forever striving for a more honorable life of peace and love of mankind.

In sending you our Boy Scout salute I am,
Faithfully yours,

SCOUTMASTER.

Wallace-Communist Coalition Rejected by Labor and Progressives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, those who think Mr. Wallace and his Communist fellow travelers are speaking for the progressive forces in America are being badly fooled. An editorial in the Sacramento Bee of March 5, 1948, points out that his third party has been rejected by the AFL, the CIO, the four railroad brotherhoods, by the Socialists, and even by the New Dealers. The editorial stresses the fact that the Nation, a liberal weekly published in New York, has refused to join him on the ground that his party gains its only important organizational strength from the Communists. The truth of this statement is borne out by every move Wallace makes. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to insert the Bee's very fine editorial at this point in the RECORD:

PHONY PROGRESSIVISM

The New York Nation, liberal weekly, has rejected all overtures to secure its adhesion to the third party. In the current issue, in announcing its opposition to the Wallaceites, the Nation declares as an American publication it wants no part in any movement which "derives its only important organizational strength from the Communists." And it adds:

"The Wallace third party has been rejected by the CIO, the AFL, the 4 railroad brotherhoods, by the Socialists, by the organized farm groups, and by the overwhelming majority of the New Dealers who served under President Roosevelt.

"Entirely apart from the dangers of making a progressive party so dependent on Communist strength, the fact that it is so is to build on quicksand. Let the 'party line' change, for reasons beyond the control of Mr. Wallace, and the foundation of his movement will collapse overnight."

The Nation's analysis of the situation is to be commended to those whose eyes are not yet open to the phony nature of the third party's progressivism. Every day brings new evidence Wallace has been taken captive by the Stalinists.

His statement on Czechoslovakia, in which there is not a word of criticism for the Communists or a word of sympathy for the Czech people, but only harsh words for his own Government is a case in point. It is Uncle Sam who destroyed the Czech Republic, according to Wallace.

And to think this man might even now be President of the United States. That would have been just perfect for the Kremlin.

Plenty of $125 Apartments in District Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the situation with respect to living quarters in the District of Columbia, I include as part of my remarks the following article from the Washington Daily News of March 30, 1948:

PLENTY OF $125 APARTMENTS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SOON

A Washingtonian who ought to know today predicted there will be plenty of apartments available in Washington by next September—at $100 to $125 per month.

He is Col. Waldron E. Leonard, director of the Veterans Information Center at Fourteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW.

"Last week," Col. Leonard said, "we put 328 veterans in apartments. That was the biggest week we ever had.

"At least 1,500 apartments are registered with us for veterans, scheduled to be completed by June.

"We have stopped bothering about furnished rooms—supply is back to prewar normal.

"We still try to get apartment sharing and kitchen-privilege placements for veterans, at $40 to $65 a month. But the supply of these accommodations is running out."

"We find no new or unfurnished apartments below $70 a month—the range is $70 to $125 for one and two bedrooms."

Oleomargarine Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement by Mr. Harley J. Credicott of Freeport, Ill., delivered before the House Committee on Agriculture on oleomargarine legislation.

It was my great privilege to be associated with Mr. Credicott through State association work of the dairy industry for many years in Illinois, at a time when I was serving as president of the Illinois Milk Dealers' Association and Mr. Credicott was serving as president of the Illinois Butter Manufacturers' Association. Mr. Credicott is an outstanding butter manufacturer of the United States. He has performed great research work and given the industry the benefit of his work in the butter industry. He is a man of unusual outstanding character and integrity, and everyone in the industry knows that Mr. Credicott is a recognized leader in the production of high-quality dairy products.

STATEMENT OF HARLEY J. CREDICOTT, OF FREEPORT, ILL., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON OLEOMARGARINE LEGISLATION, MARCH 10, 1948

My name is Harley J. Credicott and I am president of the Freeport Dairy Products Co., Freeport, Ill., manufacturing butter, ice cream, and related dairy products. I am speaking on behalf of the American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill., a national trade association of butter manufacturers, which represents approximately 550 creameries in 42 States. Member creameries furnish a daily market to over 1,000,000 dairy farmers. I am a former president of that organization and am now a member of the board of directors and the executive committee.

The policy of the American Butter Institute, adopted at the past annual meeting, November 1947, follows:

"*Resolved*, That we retain present State and Federal laws on oleomargarine to prevent fraudulent misrepresentation of this product to the consuming public."

This means that oleomargarine should not be permitted to flagrantly imitate butter by usurping butter's natural trade-mark—the natural yellow color. Attached herewith is a list of recent resolutions and policies adopted by various area and State dairy groups.

All butter is naturally yellow—a color endowed by nature and transmitted by the butterfat portion of the milk. The nature of feed and the breed of the cow influence the intensity of the yellow color. However, since most of the butter is made during the period of the year when cows are on pasture, approximately 75 percent of all butter is manufactured and sold without added color. The sole purpose of adding color is to standardize the winter butter to the natural color of summer butter. However, I emphasize, all butter is yellow, the color trade-mark endowed by nature. And, gentlemen, you have heard previous testimony that oleomargarine cannot be produced naturally yellow from domestic oils.

An allegation was made in this hearing that butter manufacturers have intentionally restricted production to boost the price to consumers. This is definitely untrue. Did the committee realize that butter production was drastically reduced almost 40 percent during the recent war emergency by discriminatory pricing formulas and premeditated policies of forced diversion imposed by Government agencies. The creamery industry was the only dairy-products industry which was forced by Government control to go through the war with less than normal volume. During this same period, other major branches of the dairy industry operated with substantially higher volumes. However, production of creamery butter in 1947 showed a 15-percent gain over the previous year. And you can be assured that the industry is striving to regain or even exceed the prewar per capita supply. The consumer desires butter which is the symbol of good living in the American way of life.

The butter industry is probably the most competitive of all food industries. The butter industry operates on the smallest spread (margin over procurement, manufacturing, and distributing costs) in the food industry. Recent figures released by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, indicate that the producer of butterfat for butter-making purposes receive 76 percent of the consumer's butter dollar in 1947. The producer of oil for the manufacture of oleomargarine received only 30 percent of the consumer's oleomargarine dollar. Thus, the butter manufacturer receives only a small margin over actual ingredient costs and the cream producer's price fluctuates directly and continually with current butter quotations.

The oleomargarine interests stress the statement that their product is the "poor man's spread." Professor Thomsen, of the University of Wisconsin, has kept a record of the wholesale prices in Chicago for butter and oleomargarine, and also the approximate cost of the raw materials used in oleomargarine. If oleomargarine is the poor man's spread, its price should vary with the cost of ingredients and not with the price of butter. Figures, however, show that the price of oleomargarine tends to follow the price of butter. Since 1929 the price of oleomargarine has been from 32 percent to 70 percent of the price of butter, and the wholesale price of oleomargarine has been from 40 to 350 percent over the cost of the ingredients. During this same period, the selling price of butter, even when selling at 16.3 cents per pound wholesale, has never been over 20 percent above the ingredient cost, and is usually lower.

The dairy industry has fought for maintenance of color restrictions because of the long and bitter experience of the fraud in oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter. After the passage of the present Oleomargarine Act in 1902, it took the Government years to clean up fraud at the wholesale level. The records of the Internal Revenue Department from 1902 to 1910 will disclose the conviction of many concerns who purchased uncolored oleomargarine in bulk, secretly colored it for sale as butter. In that period I was an employee of the Dairy Division, United States Department of Agriculture, and was directed to assist the internal-revenue agents in uncovering fraud.

One concern in Denver, Colo., was coloring two carloads per week. Their practice was to bring a quantity of oleomargarine to their place of business late at night, color it in imitation of butter, and distribute to the retail stores early in the morning. An inspection of their place of business during normal business hours showed no trace of the illegal business in which they were engaged.

It took a large concentration of internal-revenue agents working under cover for several weeks to learn how their traffic was conducted. This plant was under observation day and night by agents using high-powered telescopes. A raid in force on the plant after midnight caught them in the act of coloring and packaging oleomargarine in imitation of butter and secured the evidence needed for conviction. The retail stores had purchased this product believing it was butter.

These violations were large at the wholesale level. However, they were relatively small in total volume as compared to the fraud that has been and is common practice today of serving oleomargarine in place of butter on the tables of countless eating places throughout the country.

The Federal Government cannot deal with this type of fraud and the only protection the consumer has are laws passed by some States, the most common of which is a requirement that a sign must be posted where oleomargarine is served. However, enforcement of such laws has been lax, and if a sign is posted it is usually so illegible and inconspicuous that few diners will notice it.

No one can say how much fraud is practiced by individuals who may buy oleomargarine, color it to sell as farm butter either to stores or directly to the consumer. The customary price differential between oleomargarine and butter provides those with criminal intent a powerful incentive to defraud.

Illustrating this point, I submit details of cases Nos. 511 and 512, State of Arkansas, as reported by Clarence R. Jones, Arkansas State Board of Health. These cases deal with two women who mixed oleomargarine, cream, milk, salt, and artificial color in an old dasher churn in the kitchen of their home. Analysis by the State Board of Health showed:

Sample No. 118: 50 percent moisture, 44 percent fat, 6 percent curd; January 6, 1948. Sample No. 119: 53 percent moisture, 41 percent fat, 6 percent curd; January 10, 1948. Sample No. 120: 50.5 percent moisture, 43.5 percent fat, 6 percent curd; January 24, 1948.

This product was packed in one-half pound prints and sold to a store at 50 cents per pound. It was then resold to unsuspecting consumers by the store for 75 cents per pound as country butter. These offenders were apprehended January 24, 1948, found guilty and fined $100 each with a 60-day suspended sentence.

Further evidence of fraud at the retail level was reported within the past 10 days by a member company branch in Lawton, Okla. A butter carton containing three one-quarter pound prints of oleomargarine and one quarter pound of butter was returned to the branch after being offered for sale as butter. Substantiating affidavits can be furnished the committee.

In a broadcast over WGN, February 3, 1948, the subject, "Shall butter and oleo be treated alike by Government," was debated. Mr. George M. Strayer, secretary, American Soybean Association, Hudson, Iowa, who testified earlier in this hearing, presented the affirmative statement and was asked the following question from the audience: "If treated alike, how could the consumer be able to tell the difference in restaurants and public eating places?"

Mr. Strayer replied, "If you as a consumer, cannot tell them apart, since they are equally nutritious, since the nutrition experts cannot tell the difference nutritionally, what difference does it make whether you can tell them apart?"

I believe Mr. Strayer's statement about nutrition is not a proven fact but the part which interests me is his question, "What difference does it make whether you can tell them apart?" In this question, Mr. Strayer has shown the bland indifference to the rights of the consumer which is characteristic of the oleomargarine industry.

I submit that Mr. Strayer was trying to gloss over a plain case of fraud which will be practiced on millions of American citizens if the color restrictions are removed. It makes a lot of difference if you are served a product you have a right to expect is butter, because it is yellow like butter, when the product is actually an imitation costing about one-half as much.

From the beginning, the oleomargarine industry has not been satisfied to make an imitation of butter to be sold on its own merits. They have set as their ultimate goal a complete imitation of butter, even to the color natural to butter.

When a consumer walks into a grocery store and buys a pound of butter, she has a right to know that she is getting butter, not a yellow imitation.

Who is going to protect Mrs. Consumer?

If the 10-cent tax on yellow-colored oleomargarine is removed, yellow oleomargarine

will legally be sold everywhere. Suppose a fly-by-night distributor takes legal oleomargarine, rewraps it, and puts it in a butter carton, then sells it to unsuspecting grocers and restaurants. His profits will be tremendous, and a new illegal racket is fostered.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration has jurisdiction over the labeling of the product in interstate shipments. When removed from the original package for fraudulent purposes, how can the States, cities, and villages adequately protect the consumer from this misrepresentation? It would be as difficult for cities or States to prevent the sale of yellow oleomargarine as butter as it would be for cities or States to prevent the passing of counterfeit money if the Treasury Department stopped enforcing this law.

The committee is certainly aware of the extreme efforts made by the oleomargarine industry to imitate butter in every detail. Oleomargarine is sold in packages that resemble butter packages. These packages are of the same weight, same shape and measurements. The product wrapped with the same kind of parchment, cartoned in the same kind of paraffin containers, and printed in the same style of lettering. It is no accident that many of the oleomargarine cartons are predominantly yellow in color. Some oleomargarine manufacturers package their product in quarter pounds. Much of the oleomargarine advertising in magazines, newspapers, and on billboards alludes to churns, dairy-fresh, milk solids, and other terms that seek to confuse the consumer that oleomargarine is a dairy product. Oleomargarine pictured on these original advertisements is colored yellow to imitate butter. All literature published and advertising sponsored by the national trade association of the oleomargarine manufacturers are principally yellow. This advertising is intended to induce the housewife to endorse their demands that Congress repeal the color restriction. For many years they have been building their propaganda into the minds of the public by misleading statements in their advertising.

Why are these terms and applications of yellow color used? The answer is simple—to imitate butter. Thus oleomargarine manufacturers are striving to build a market for their product by stealing the good will and trade-mark color of butter.

The use of the word "churn" is abused in oleomargarine advertising. A recent unabridged dictionary supplies this definition of a churn: "A vessel in which milk or cream is beaten or agitated, as by the use of a dasher, to separate the oily globules from other parts and gather them as butter." The oleomargarine manufacturer is fond of using the word "churn" in the hope that the consumer will accept the association of ideas.

A definition and standard of identity for oleomargarine was issued by an order of the Federal Security Administrator on June 5, 1941, under authority of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. This definition permitted the addition of artificial flavoring diacetyl to oleomargarine. This ingredient in natural form imparts the pleasing, characteristic flavor to butter. Dr. Henry A. Lepper, a chemist in the Food and Drug Administration, testified in substance in the hearings called by the Administrator that the permitted use of diacetyl in the manufacture of oleomargarine was not in the interest of honesty and fair dealing, because diacetyl produces or enhances the butter flavor and would lead uninformed consumers to believe that there were substantial quantities of butter present in oleomargarine. However, these views were ignored by the Administrator and artificial flavoring diacetyl is now an optional ingredient of oleomargarine. Benzoate of soda may also be added as preservative under these definitions—no dairy product contains any preservative. In correspondence with a prominent State official at the time of this Food and Drug hearing, the Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt made the following statement: "Traditionally, oleomargarine has been recognized as a product made in imitation or semblance of butter. It is so designated in the Oleomargarine Act of 1886 and in the subsequent amendments thereto."

Most oleomargarine is now fortified with the addition of vitamins which occur naturally in butter, but not in oleomargarine. The committee can recognize the fact that every possible avenue of imitation has been pursued and even aided by Government agencies.

The field of imitation in the dairy industry is not limited to butter alone. Vegetable fats can be substituted for butterfat in fluid milk and cream, ice cream, cheese, evaporated milk, and dry milk. If oleomargarine is permitted to imitate butter in its entirety, these other imitation products will logically follow.

When imitation of a food product is brought to a point where the consumer cannot distinguish between the imitation and the real product by use of her senses of taste, smell, and sight, it becomes necessary for laws to be enacted that will protect the consumer. Courts have ruled that when an imitation so closely resembles the real product that the purchaser cannot recognize a difference, she is entitled to protection from fraud by law.

Oleomargarine apologists frequently advance the proposition that the Federal food and drug law constitutes adequate protection for the consumer. This simply is not true. The reason it is not true lies in the tremendous incentive to fraudulent practice which exists because of the difference in price between oleomargarine and butter, and also in the ease with which oleomargarine is made to imitate butter.

Where such fraudulent possibilities exist heroic measures are necessary to protect consumers.

The oleomargarine situation is much like the filled milk problem.

In dealing with that problem, Congress absolutely prohibits the interstate shipment of the product. The Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the constitutionality of that law. Congress had appraised the possibility and actuality of confusion, deception, and substitution in the traffic of filled milk and determined that nothing short of prohibition would suffice to protect consumers.

It is when imitation is close as in the case of filled milk and oleomargarine that something more than labeling is needed to protect consumers.

Gentlemen of the committee, there may be an imitation—but there is no substitute for butter. Only butter can be butter.

RESOLUTIONS ON OLEOMARGARINE (ADOPTED BY STATE DAIRY AND BUTTER ASSOCIATIONS)

Unalterably opposed to any change in the present statutes regulating the sale of oleomargarine.

NEBRASKA BUTTER INSTITUTE,
P. A. DOWN, *Secretary.*

The Federal tax as now imposed is necessary in order to protect the consumer from fraud in purchasing misbranded table fats and also to reserve for butter the exclusive color nature intended for it to have. The South Dakota Dairy Council (representing all dairy groups, including producers) highly deplores the activity of individuals and groups attempting to repeal oleomargarine tax legislation.

SOUTH DAKOTA DAIRY COUNCIL,
D. L. R. HANSEN, *Secretary.*

A determined effort is now being made to permit legal exploitation of butter's natural trade-mark, its yellow color, by an inferior substitute. Urge Representatives in Congress to seek support for the dairy industry in this fight.

MINNESOTA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION.

This association urges defeat of bills pending to reduce existing tax on oleomargarine.

UTAH DAIRY PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION.

Nature's gold yellow color, identifying trade-mark of butter, must be protected in fairness to consumers and dairy farmers.

TENNESSEE DAIRY PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,
DAVID P. ADAMS, *Executive Secretary.*

Support the position taken by the American Butter Institute to retain present tax on vegetable-oil butter substitutes and ruling against coloring these substitutes. The American dairy farmer is America's greatest agricultural asset.

OREGON MILK DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION,
R. L. SINNER, *President.*

Manufacturers of oleomargarine are once again proposing the repeal of Federal laws imposing a 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine so that product may be sold in imitation of butter. This association, composed of all branches of the dairy industry in Michigan, knows that there is as great a need for the protection of the consuming public now as there existed 45 years ago and urges the support of Michigan Members of Congress in denying the repeal of such laws.

MICHIGAN ALLIED DAIRY ASSOCIATION,
LEONARD N. FRANCKE, *Secretary.*

Our association pledges cooperation with the program of the American Butter Institute relative to oleo taxation and urges continuation of present laws.

PACIFIC STATES BUTTER, EGG, CHEESE AND POULTRY ASSOCIATION,
PAUL J. MESSER, *Executive Secretary.*

Disturbance of the butter industry would seriously jeopardize the other phases of the dairy industry such as the market milk, ice cream, etc., to the detriment of the nutritional welfare of the Nation and particularly such segments of the consuming public as children and pregnant mothers.

The removal of taxes and other existing controls of butter substitutes threatens to seriously affect the welfare of a large segment of the agricultural population which represents all the best standards of agricultural community life, and also threatens to jeopardize the welfare of the consumer.

The Kansas Inter Breed Dairy Cattle Council, representing six dairy cattle breed associations in Kansas, go on record as urging the Congress of the United States to keep the present taxes and controls on butter substitutes in order that the best interests of the entire population may be best served over a long period of time.

KANSAS INTER BREED DAIRY COUNCIL.

On record emphatically oppose any changes whatsoever in legislation concerning the licenses and taxing of vegetable oil substitutes for creamery butter.

NORTH DAKOTA DAIRY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
JOHN BURNHAM,
Executive Secretary.

The manufacture and sale of butter is important to the economic welfare of the dairy industry. This association vigorously opposes the removal of the 10-cent Federal tax on the sale of colored oleomargarine.

OREGON DAIRY MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
G. H. WILSTER, *Secretary.*

The repeal of oleomargarine laws will remove the protection to the public from fraud and deception in the sale of butter substitutes. This association supports the fight against the repeal of such laws.

UPPER PENINSULA DAIRY MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
BEN KNAUSS, *President.*

These associations unalterably opposed to repeal of present oleomargarine laws. The general welfare of the entire public is basically involved not only from the standpoint of potential fraud, but primarily from the standpoint of maintaining and assuring the Nation an adequate supply of milk for all purposes at all times in the future.

OHIO BUTTER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
OHIO DAIRY PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,
O. E. ANDERSON,
Executive Secretary.

Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] jokingly twitted my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] about our Arkansas resources. He, of course, did not realize at the time just what wrath he was bringing down upon his head. As an example, I just received a letter from a good Republican friend of mine, Jay Russell, mayor of the city of Eureka Springs in Carroll County, Ark., my home county. Eureka Springs is among the best cities in Arkansas, known throughout the world as a health resort, and noted for its clear, cool, health-giving water which flows from a hundred springs. However, judging from Jay's letter, the gentleman from Pennsylvania almost made it another Hot Springs. The letter says in part:

What I want to know is: Where were you when the enclosed speech took place? Bela Pendergrass and I decided you were sitting there seeing if you could hear that houndawg hollering back in Arkansas. I am glad to see that Congressman HAYS leaped to the defense of Arkansas. For me you can tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he is all wet.

The Arkansas farmer gets up from instinct, he doesn't need any Yankee alarm clocks to wake him up. He puts on a pair of overalls made at Fort Smith or one of a dozen different places in Arkansas; this Arkansas water is so clear and refreshing that he doesn't need any soap; you don't need soap to cut good, rich dirt. If he does need soap, he gets some that was homemade with a little lye from the ash hopper. He dips his water up with a long-handle gourd, that was raised in his own back yard. He sits himself down to a table made either in Fort Smith or Camden. He has a big pan of hot biscuits, made from good soft Arkansas flour milled at Arkadelphia; eats a big slice of country ham, taken from a genuine Arkansas razorback, dips his biscuit in good red grease gravy, cooked on a stove made in Fort Smith, burning natural gas produced at Ozark or Clarksville, helps himself to a big bowl of Arkansas Maid Rice produced at Stuttgart; tops it off with another biscuit or two loaded down with jam made from Arkansas-grown strawberries, sweetens it a little more with some good old molasses made right in his back yard, or with some honey from his own beehive. He goes out to the barn and hitches up his mules with harness made in Fort Smith, mules that were raised right here in Arkansas. He wipes his brow with a good, clean handkerchief, made from Arkansas cotton, adjusts his diamond stickpin sporting a diamond from Pike County; lights up his corn-cob pipe from St. Joe, filled with the good white burley tobacco from Oak Grove, and looks the world in the face, for he wears no man's yoke. His only trouble is that he still votes for Jeff Davis.

May I say to my colleagues from the other 47 States of this Union, let this be a lesson to you and lay off Arkansas unless you are itching for a good fight and are ready to follow through; because, as you can see from the mayor's letter, we lay aside politics down there when the fair name of our State is involved.

Washington on Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the New York Herald Tribune of March 27, 1948:

WASHINGTON ON PREPAREDNESS

BOSTON, MASS., *March 22, 1948.*

To the New York Herald Tribune:

A rereading of this dignified and purposeful utterance of the first Commander in Chief with regard to a matter of great concern to our country in 1793 might dispel some of the hesitancy now hampering suitable action on the same topic in 1948.

MARION E. ROBINSON.

Journal of the Senate of the United States of America, being the first session of the Third Congress, begun and held at the city of Philadelphia, December 2, 1793, and in the eighteenth year of the sovereignty of the said United States.

"Fellow Citizens of the Senate and of the House of Representatives:

"I cannot recommend to your notice measures for the fulfillment of our duties to the rest of the world without again pressing upon you the necessity of placing ourselves in a condition of complete defense and of exacting from them the fulfillment of their duties toward us. The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that, contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war. The documents which will be presented to you will show the amount and kinds of arms and military stores now in our magazines and arsenals; and yet an addition even to these supplies cannot with prudence be neglected, as it would leave nothing to the uncertainty of procuring of warlike apparatus in the moment of public danger.

"G. WASHINGTON.

"PHILADELPHIA, *December 3, 1793.*"

Conservation of Agricultural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 6054, to which I invite the attention of the Members of the House. The purpose of this bill is to establish a new land policy, designed to halt the destruction of the Nation's agricultural land and water resources, and geared to the needs of America's steadily-increasing population for food, clothing, and other agricultural products. I offer this bill for consideration as part of the foundation of a long-range agricultural program.

This bill has far-reaching implications for the future of both farmers and urban consumers. It proposes as a national policy that the conservation, improvement, and orderly development of the food, fiber, and forest-producing resources of the Nation be carried on at a rate which will assure the country of enough of these productive resources, at all times, to meet the needs of the American people.

At the present time the United States is losing through improper use enormous quantities of productive land each year. At the same time our requirements for agricultural production are mounting at a rate directly proportionate to our increase in population, estimated at approximately 2,000,000 annually, and to our demands for an improved diet.

Translated into simple arithmetic, the figures show this discouraging outlook. Under our present conservation program we are losing about 500,000 acres of cropland each year through erosion, silting, improper land use, and other preventable causes.

At present standards of production, about 3 acres of cropland per person are necessary to maintain what we regard as an American standard of living. More specifically, this means a diet containing nutritionally adequate quantities of meat, milk, fruits, and other dairy products, as well as cereals and vegetables. This means that with our population increasing about 2,000,000 each year, an additional 6,000,000 acres of land is required annually to care for our expanding population.

In comparison to our needs, therefore, we are operating our agricultural plant at a rate which is eating into our reserves of available land about 6,500,000 acres a

year—the 500,000 acres we are losing by improper conservation and the 6,000,000 acres we need to feed our new population. The bill is in harmony with much of the testimony that has been given before the Committee on Agriculture in its hearings on a long-range agricultural policy and in its recent hearings on the subject of soil conservation.

Those hearings have demonstrated beyond question that there is almost universal agreement among agricultural leaders and among farmers themselves that conservation of our soil and water resources is the No. 1 objective in a long-range agricultural program. In our 11 field hearings farmers have differed with each other on a great many points, but they have been almost unanimous in their belief that our most urgent single need is for a program of conservation that will stop the devastating loss of our agricultural resources and provide a coordinated conservation program geared to the needs of American consumers.

In its present form the bill accomplishes four major objectives:

First. It establishes, for the first time, a basic land policy for the United States. That policy is the sound conservation and orderly use and development of our resources. Heretofore our land policy has been one of year-to year expediency and has been based more on the exploitation and maximum production of our land and water resources than on their conservation and sound development.

Second. It provides an integrated conservation program and places responsibility for that program on one agency specifically established for that purpose. At the present time there is no coordinated conservation program embracing both private and public lands and responsibility is divided among many different agencies in several different departments of the Government.

Third. It takes into consideration both the present and future relationship between conservation and the needs of American consumers for food and other farm and forest products.

Fourth. It places the responsibility for carrying out conservation and development programs jointly on the Federal Government, the States and their local governments, and the owners and operators of agricultural resources. Farmers themselves, through their soil-conservation districts and local committees, are given a large share of responsibility for and control over conservation programs.

With the almost certain prospect of additional emergency tenants on our agricultural production in the years immediately ahead, it is imperative that we adopt a land policy without further delay. Throughout our history, we as a nation have treated our land—which supplies our living—with complete disregard for its permanence. The soil which produces our food, our clothing, and other essentials, has been farmed carelessly and often exploited for what it would produce with little thought of adequate maintenance or future needs of the Nation. The result is that we have ruined many millions of acres of once good land, and the United States is approaching a point where it will be unable to feed and clothe the people properly. We have not reached that stage yet, but we will—and soon—unless we establish a national land policy to end carelessness and exploitation and to protect the land and water resources we have left.

We must bring to bear all the forces at our command to get the job done before it is too late. Land once destroyed is useless for generations, or gone forever. We must utilize research, education, technical operations, financial and material aids, and cooperative planning and work to get the job done.

Just as we have recently united our armed forces to present a unified command of our defense against attack from without—so must our land forces be united and coordinated against the destruction of our agricultural resources.

The economy of nature is not divided into parts labeled soil conservation, forestation, watershed protection, agricultural production, Federal programs, and local programs. It is one big proposition. The task of conservation cannot be accomplished piecemeal by many separate agencies devoting themselves independently to their own little sphere of activity. The unification of these forces provided in this bill is more than mere coordination for the sake of economy and efficiency. It is, in my opinion, the only way the job can be done.

The purpose of the bill, as stated in its title, is "to establish conservation and orderly development of the Nation's agricultural land and water resources as a basic policy of the United States (and) to provide for a national agricultural land- and water-conservation program."

The bill establishes a new executive agency, called the Agricultural Resources Administration, in the Department of Agriculture. It also sets up a top advisory group on conservation, the National Agricultural Land and Water Resources Advisory Board, with the Secretary of Agriculture as Chairman.

The Agricultural Resources Administration set up in the bill would have as constituent agencies an Agricultural Land Service, a Forest Service, a Fish and Wildlife Service.

The bill merges into the Agricultural Resources Administration the present Soil Conservation Service, all related functions and activities of the Production and Marketing Administration, and the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, and any other bureaus or offices of the Department of Agriculture having to do with conservation and the physical aspects and characteristics of soils.

The Secretary is specifically directed to utilize to the fullest extent the educational and research facilities of the Extension Service and the State Experiment Stations, which remain unchanged.

The bill also transfers to the proposed new Agricultural Resources Administration those functions of the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior concerned with the use, administration, and conservation of agricultural lands and waters. Functions of these Bureaus dealing with other than agricultural resources would not be affected.

Outright transfer of the Fish and Wildlife Service from the Department of the Interior to Agricultural Resources Administration in the Department of Agriculture is provided in the bill. The fish and wildlife resources of the Nation are so closely related to and dependent upon the agricultural land and water resources that they should be made a part of the agency having the responsibility of carrying out a national land policy. This agency was formerly a part of the Department of Agriculture and was known as the Bureau of Biological Survey.

Under the bill the Secretary of Agriculture is required to see that all activities and programs carried out by the Department are consistent with the land policy established by the bill. Where statutory limitations may prevent this, the Secretary is to report such situations to Congress and suggest corrective legislation.

To bring about complete uniformity and prevent uncoordinated or duplicating functions, the President is directed to survey the other executive agencies and to designate for transfer to the Agricultural Resources Administration any activities which would, if continued, substantially duplicate the authority or activity of the Administration.

Specifically exempted from this consolidation are the Office of Indian Affairs and the National Park Service of the Department of Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Among the technical provisions of the bill, one outstanding authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make a complete conservation inventory of the Nation's agricultural lands as a guide for land use capability maps and for farming and conservation programs.

Other technical provisions include authority to conduct surveys, investigations, and research independently and in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies; to conduct demonstrations of methods and measures used in conservation; to acquire lands, improve them, and lease them for purposes consistent with the terms of the bill; to provide technical assistance to Federal and State agencies, soil conservation districts, and other local farm groups, and to individual farmers; to assist in conservation programs on public lands; and to survey and classify for agricultural use lands in existing, proposed, or potential reclamation or multiple-purpose projects, and determine the feasibility of such lands for agricultural use.

Economic assistance to farmers may include cash payments, conservation materials, planting stock and seed, use of equipment, and similar measures. Such assistance may be given to individuals or groups. In providing such assistance the Secretary is to take into consideration the need, the availability of funds and materials, and the ability of

the recipient to use such assistance effectively.

Conservation payments are continued under the bill, with emphasis placed on payments for those conservation practices—called class A payments—which have long-term-conservation benefits, such as terracing, drainage, and irrigation, water diversion systems, and other improvements of a permanent or semipermanent nature, when such practices are part of a complete farm conservation program.

Secondary emphasis is placed in the bill on class B payments for practices of a temporary nature such as liming, fertilizing, crop rotation, and similar recurring measures.

The bill specifically continues the county committees—usually known as AAA committees—and gives them an active part in the conservation program, It also authorizes the establishment in each agricultural county of a county agricultural program board.

These new county boards would be composed of one representative of each locally elected committee in a county participating in the administration of Federal or State agricultural programs, such as rural electrification cooperatives, soil conservation districts, the local committees formerly known as "AAA county committees," and also county committees cooperating with the Agricultural Extension Services and farm loan groups. Under the bill, State or Federal employees would not be eligible for membership of the new county boards.

These boards are authorized to prepare long-range programs of agricultural objectives and also annual work plans, both based upon studies of needs and assets; to make periodic checks, progress reports, and recommendations on the work; and to consult and work with both State and Federal agriculture agencies and with other agricultural and nonagricultural leaders and organizations to assure widest understanding and coordination of effort.

The bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress, before the first request for an annual appropriation, a preliminary timetable of land conservation and development, showing—

current rates and extent of land damage in the United States, the dates practicable for the completion of the conservation survey authorized * * * and a specification of the land treatments in his opinion deemed necessary, including estimated costs thereof.

The bill likewise provides that 5 percent of the annual appropriations for the work, exclusive of funds appropriated for class A and class B payments, are to be devoted to authorized research in land conservation and development. It also authorizes Congress to appropriate not more than $3,000,000 annually to supplement present cooperative extension work in soil and water conservation education.

I do not presume to tell the House that I believe this bill to be perfect in every detail. I am convinced that the principles it expresses are sound and I am certain that in the forum of the Committee on Agriculture and of this House, with the advice and counsel of those most deeply interested in the agriculture of this Nation, we can perfect this legislation into a new land policy for the United States that will be of lasting benefit not only to ourselves but to generations yet unborn.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, Tuesday, March 30, 1948:

EQUALIZING EDUCATION

There are many good reasons why S. 472, the bill which would provide $300,000,000 of Federal aid annually for the public-school system of the States, should be approved by the Senate this week. The best reason for such approval is that the measure aims at equalizing among the States educational opportunities for pupils in elementary and secondary schools. That differences exist in a serious way has long been known. They are caused by variations in State wealth, State income and tax-paying ability. They are the result, too, of the relative number of children to be taught. The poorest States have pupils in plenty. In arguing for the bill, Alabama's Senator LISTER HILL last week put this aspect tersely and accurately when he said: "The children are where the money ain't."

Past efforts to win Federal grants for schools have failed, the last defeat having been registered in 1943. Prinicipally, the failures have been the result of the form in which the bills were drawn. It has been feared that Federal grants would be a long step toward placing control of State education in Washington. But the wording of S. 472, says Senator TAFT, of Ohio, avoids this possibility.

The bill has had strong sponsoring from both Republican and Democratic Senators. Senator AIKEN of Vermont has predicted its passage, as has Senator TAFT. We hope that they are right.

The Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by O. J. Dekom, from Plain Talk for March 1948:

BEHIND THE RIDDLE OF THE WASHINGTON POST
(By O. J. Dekom)

The phenomenon of an organ of conservatism being turned into a Trojan horse for totalitarianism is still sufficiently novel to baffle the innocent American public. To the European who has witnessed and experienced the strange alliances which led to the rise of Fascist, Nazi, and Communist forces there is nothing astonishing about hard-fisted capitalists donning the garments of totalitarian liberals. The case of the multimillionaire who promotes a Communist propaganda film or a Fascist coup or a Nazi newspaper is familiar to all of us. But the sources of this social chemistry remain obscure even to most students of current history, and are a sheer mystery to the American reader.

That a leading GOP newspaper, perhaps the No. 2 daily of the Republican Party in the country, should serve as a vehicle for the subversion of everything that it professes to represent, might come as a shock to the general public. Yet, it is far from being the first or only case in point. The amalgam between a contributor to the Communist New Masses and one of the editors of the staid Saturday Evening Post, as illustrated in the affair of Edgar Snow exposed in last September's Plain Talk (Red Star Over Independence Square), is a noteworthy precedent. There are other and perhaps even more important journalistic citadels permeated by totalitarian elements or apologists who, from within, misshape their avowed policies and purvey their propaganda under the label of freedom.

The editorial record of Eugene Meyer's Washington Post, a paper which wields great influence because it is owned by one of the pillars of free enterprise, because it is published in the Capital, and because it is a lively journalistic product—according to the standards of the day—has long been in need of examination. A scrutiny shows that it has followed in recent years, on most major issues, the basic patterr of the Communist Party line—not in the outspoken manner of the Moscow Pravda or the New York Daily Worker, but in that very special dialect which Marshall Field's PM and Michael Straight's New Republic have so adroitly introduced into our contemporary language.

Behind pro forma attacks on communism, occasional sorties against Gromyko and Vishinsky, support of the Marshall plan, aid for Greece and similar lip-service manifestations, the Washington Post has pursued these lines:

1. Oblique defense of domestic and foreign Communists, Communist organizations, and Communist activities.

2. Attacks on persons exposing Communist infiltration, on respectable anti-Communist Members of Congress, and on the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

3. Attacks on the President's loyalty program.

4. Attacks on such legitimate governments as those of Greece and China—of moment to our national defense.

5. Subversion of confidence in the United States Government through its editorial columns.

6. A double standard on civil rights.

In its 70 years of existence, the Washington Post has undergone alternate periods of prestige and decline, of prosperity and financial hardship. During the great depression, the paper was bought by Eugene Meyer, ex-Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, who had made his fortune in Wall Street. Meyer brought a surprising amount of vitality and journalistic acumen to his new enterprise and was able, within a few years, to rescue the paper from its lethargy. He made the Post one of the most successful newspapers in the East.

The deterioration of the Post began after it had turned to the left during the early days of the war. In 1946, when Eugene Meyer gave up active control to become President of the International Bank, this deterioration was speeded up. The Post fell into the

hands of a left-wing clique, who managed to put over a watered-down version of the party line, disguised and embellished by the pedantic literary style of intellectual fellow-travelers.

When the position of editor in chief was assumed in 1946 by Herbert B. Elliston, the change became marked. British-born Elliston had had limited American newspaper experience before he joined the Post staff in 1940 as an associate editor. He came to the United States in 1921, and 2 years later went off to China. He likes to boast—as he does in Who's Who—that he was economic adviser to the Chinese Government. Actually, Elliston was assistant to W. H. Donald, adventurous Australian newspaperman, who was an adviser, not to the Chinese Government, but to Chang Hsueh-liang, the degenerate war lord of Manchuria. In 1927 Chang was defeated by the Nationalist armies of Chiang Kai-shek. Donald was thereupon employed by the Chinese Government. Elliston returned to the United States, and has shown little love for the Chinese Republic since that time. He became an American citizen at the beginning of the last war.

The Post's present city editor is Ben W. Gilbert, who was at one time active in the Young Communist League under the name of Ben Goldberg. He is said to be cordially disliked by members of the staff, with the exception of the leftist clique. Gilbert is responsible for some of the party-line material appearing in the news columns and for assigning reporters to write stories favorable to the Communist cause.

Upon his appointment to the International Bank, Meyer made his son-in-law, Philip L. Graham, the Post's publisher. Graham has been a consistent apologist for the paper's editorial policy. The liberal faction of the Post also includes cartoonist Herbert Block (Herblock). A recent loss to this coterie resulted from the appointment as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission of Wayne Coy, a protege of the late Harry Hopkins, who served as director of the Post's radio enterprises.

Mrs. Agnes Meyer, wife of the publisher, is an itinerant do-gooder of the Eleanor Roosevelt school. She takes extensive trips to study social problems, which form the basis of her benevolent articles about the masses. Her attitude was refreshingly expressed when she told the Associated Press that the only reason the American people fear communism is because they have bad consciences about conditions in the United States of America.

To understand the policy of the Washington Post, one must explore the philosophy of Alan Barth, who is unmistakably the ideological guide of its editorial page. Barth, who has written for such journals of left-wing innocence as the Nation and New Republic, is labeled a New Dealer. Although his editorials are not signed, it is easy to spot his work by a comparison with his periodic column in the Guild Reporter, official organ of the American Newspaper Guild. To cover up his adherence to the party line, he has developed a specialized technique which combines old-time melodrama with modern psychoanalysis. He often writes of the "hysteria" and "panic" which have gripped this country and its Government, and the "phobias" and "neuroses" which rule our political life.

"The Eightieth Congress," he wrote, "was a fear-ridden Congress. It suffered from a neurosis that might be called commiphobia. * * * At a moment in history when the United States is at the pinnacle of its military strength, when it is supposedly in exclusive possession of the most formidable single weapon ever devised by man, it is also experiencing the most profound sense of insecurity. Insecurity has led the Congress to countenance a witch hunt threatening the essential guarantees of individual liberty. * * * Only blind neurotic fear could prompt accepting in this degree the ugly paraphernalia of the police state we are striving hysterically to escape."

In another piece he stated: "It seems to me that panic is not too strong a term to apply to the current climate on Capital Hill. * * * All the hoop-de-do about Communists and labor. * * * Congress seems to be gripped by a sense of impending doom."

Barth's apparent skepticism on the merits of our democracy is more expressly indicated in his statement that the "function of leadership in a democratic society * * * entails molding of public opinion in such a way that it will be receptive to the course which the leader wishes to pursue."

Take "democratic" in the sense now used by Stalin and "the leader" in its Der Fuehrer concept, and you have a perfect totalitarian gem.

When the case of the international comintern agent, Gerhardt Eisler, came to public attention, Barth was ready with an indirect defense which might have done justice to the Daily Worker: "At best he is by his own admission a German Communist who got into this country by perjury. * * * If a man is a "Commie," he's liable to be a spy, and evidence or no, the FBI has to link him to our atomic secrets. * * * This kind of hysteria (that word again) operates of course only as an expression of insecurity. And it is a wonderful paradox indeed that the United States, now punatively the sole possessor of the atomic bomb, has never in its whole history felt so desperately insecure."

He was equally quick to come to the defense of the Hollywood left-wingers and to denounce those who cooperated with the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In the Guild Reporter he stated:

"A considerable body of Hollywood actors, actresses, directors, and writers in no way identified with the Communist Party, joined hands in * * * the Committee for the first amendment. * * * They stood up like Americans.

Lashing out furiously at Humphrey Bogart, who had given away the fact that the Committee for the First Amendment was actually a Red front, Barth accused the actor of having made "a pathetic flip-flop. * * * Poor schizophrenic Mr. Bogart."

The most complete surrender to Stalinist policy is shown in Barth's position on the admittance and presence of foreign Communists in this country. He made a special attack on the State Department for its silly ban against holding of the Congress of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), Soviet-controlled labor front, in the United States. "Does anyone really fear that the handful of Communist delegates to the WFTU could undermine the American society?" he mocked.

Similarly, in the dispute over two Communist correspondents to the UN who were detained at Ellis Island, Barth wrote: "The ineptitude of the American action is almost as shocking as the intent. * * * As a matter of elementary common sense it ought not to exclude such newspapermen from covering the United States at large. * * * We have come of late to behave as though we had something to hide."

It may be enlightening to consider, point by point, the main lines of Post editorial policy.

1. DEFENSE OF COMMUNISTS

The label "Commiphobia" coined by Barth, has been used to discredit anti-Communists. In an editorial under that title, the Post attacked Representative GORDON MCDONOUGH'S bill to define communism as treasonable:

"Hysteria [sic] now and then becomes so extravagant as to result in a revelation of its own absurdity. * * * We have allowed men to be stigmatized as disloyal when they could not be convicted of treason and we have charged men with being security risks when we lacked evidence to call them traitors. * * * What constitutes 'the practice of communism' we do not profess to know. * * * The offense, in any case, is a matter of political affiliation or belief."

When a number of prominent universities barred Communist speakers, the Post proclaimed, "Nowhere is the panic atmosphere of our time more pitifully disclosed than in the timorousness—the allergy to ideas—of some of our great institutions of learning. * * * What are the universities afraid of?"

The paper objected to the exclusion of the WFTU stating that "the admission into the country of a few revolutionary spirits for a brief period certainly would do us no harm."

On the Hollywood hearings, the Post came to the defense of the movie industry's leftists:

"We have no sympathy * * * for a committee that would use its authority to compel this disclosure of a matter that is essentially private and personal. Whatever the legal merits of the question (whether or not they are Communists), it seems to us that the committee's line of inquiry was improper and offensive. * * * We think it aimed at an interference with the freedom of the screen which was violative of the whole sense of the first amendment."

When the War Department was forced to bow to congressional pressure and terminate the services of two fellow travelers in the military government in Germany, the Post came to the rescue editorially.

Apparently on orders from city editor Gilbert, a defense of Hanns Eisler was published on October 5, 1947. Eisler's Comintern March was described as stirring. His work does not necessarily reveal him as an agent of the Kremlin or as a Communist sympathizer, the Post concluded.

On January 5, 1948, the Communist-dominated United Public Workers of America (UPWA, CIO) called a strike against 42 Government cafeterias. The only Washington newspaper to come to the defense of UPWA editorially was the Post. The strike was the result of the union's failure to obtain legal certification as bargaining agents because its pro-Communist officers had not signed the non-Communist affidavits required under the Taft-Hartley law. From its pink ivory tower, the Post proclaimed:

"The mischief hidden in the Communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley Act is made manifest by the current strike in the GSI-operated Government cafeterias. * * *. The mischievousness of the Communist affidavit clause lies in the pretext it affords employers capriciously to deny the authority of a union when that union has failed, for whatever reason, to affirm that it has no Communist officers." The Post carefully avoided the suggestion that UPWA might bring itself under the protection of the law by the simple expedient of its officers' stating under oath that they were not Communists.

The Post has shown the same solicitude for Communist propagandists in other countries. It printed an erudite defense of Rev. Hewlett Johnson, the Red Dean of Canterbury, supporting by implication his claim that he is the Christian spokesman within the Anglican Church for the great mass of English opinion, but neglected to state that he wields negligible political influence at home.

2. ATTACKS ON ANTI-COMMUNISTS

The Post's denunciation of Representative MCDONOUGH has been cited. Another anti-Communist Congressmen who has come under its fire is Rep. GEORGE DONDERO, who

first exposed the deep penetration of Communists into the American military government. It has attacked the un-American Activities Committee in general for having brought the investigative function of Congress into disrepute, and in particular for its hearings on communism in Hollywood.

When the anti-Communist leader broke away from the Red-controlled Conféderation Générale du Travail (CGT) in France, the Post was quick to point out that "the division of the French labor movement into two antagonistic groups is a step fraught with considerable danger. 'Solidarity' has been the traditional watchword of labor movements." Evidently the Post believes in the kind of solidarity which is on display in May Day parades and which spells subjugation to the Kremlin. Was it a coincidence that this was exactly the line of attack made by the Communists in the CGT?

Last fall there was quite a tempest in Congress over the policy of dismantling German plants for shipment to the Soviet zone. But the Post was prepared for the emergency:

"The protest against dismantlement seems to emanate from persons who see Germany again in terms of the years between—that is to say, the efficient collaborator with American business." Here was a clear-cut echo of the Moscow propaganda claim that American business was linked with Nazi business in a joint conspiracy.

3. THE LOYALTY PROGRAM

The Washington Post has led a crusade against the loyalty program. Typical of its attitude on this score was a cartoon by Herblock showing 1,600,000 Government employees being forced to walk barefoot over a pile of glowing coals and spiked boards, while two savage witch doctors explained, "If you're innocent you won't holler." Editorially the Post said that the reaction to the problems involved in the loyalty program "has created a situation highly favorable to hysteria (again), to personal malice, and even to blackmail. * * * It has also created a situation highly dangerous to civil liberties."

The establishment of an impartial loyalty review board did not satisfy the Post, which continued to proclaim its high regard for civil liberties.

Issuance of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations called forth a special attack. The Post branded it an "arbitrary denunciation from the Government. * * * No one pretends that the members of the proscribed organizations have committed a crime. * * * (The list) has stigmatized a great number of citizens * * * whose right to freedom of thought and speech and freedom of assembly cannot be denied. * * * (Government) has no right to inquire into the beliefs or associations of private individuals. * * * Why, then, trample upon the spirit of liberty by working up a blacklist?"

The Post was responsible for most of the difficulties experienced by the State Department in its feeble efforts to get rid of its own pro-Soviet employees. It was laregly the newspaper's constant hammering that forced the Department to beat a retreat in the case of seven security risks, in spite of FBI evidence to the contrary. Herblock ridiculed the State Department in a cartoon showing a typical Washington cocktail party where a browbeaten fellow, wearing a gag, was told, "You're with the State Department, I presume." Does the Post favor the indiscriminate cocktail chatter that has been the source of innumerable leaks of vital defense secrets For this cartoon, the Post received a public letter of gratitude from the Communist-infested UPWA.

4. ATTACKS ON FRIENDLY NATIONS

Though the Post has been obliged to support the principal phases of our European policy, it has never missed an opportunity to cast suspicion on the advisability of our actions by making party-line charges against friendly governments.

The Greek Communist rebels, the Post asserted on January 3, 1948, "have thriven" upon the "ineptitude of the Athens administration. * * * The corruption and maladministration in Athens make the government itself a recruiting agent for the Communists. It is even said (note use of hearsay evidence) that the soldiers are not allowed to read the official newspaper of the Liberal leader. * * * We must see to it * * * that the regime stops alienating the population."

On January 11, the Post returned to the attack with an editorial On Labels:

"Take as an example of false labeling in world affairs the situation in Greece and China. Under a labeling system all the Greeks and the Chinese who are opposed to the governments * * * are Communists. This is a fantastic concept—as fantastic as the labeling as Communists of those persons at home who are simply good American nonconformists. Both Greek and Chinese Governments, which shelter corruption beyond imagining, are themselves creating Communists."

The most complete reflection of the Cominform line is shown in the Post's editorial policy on China. Here is a combination of vicious attacks on the Chinese Government and of outright untruth that seems indistinguishable from the propaganda of the Daily Worker. An editorial entitled "Chiang and China" is typical of this approach:

"In calling upon China to fight for her life against the Chinese Communists, Chiang Kai-shek is really appealing to the United States, trying to inflame the commiphobia (sic) in our midst with the hope of winning all-out American aid for Chiang. It is to be hoped he will not succeed. * * *

"It is often said if we don't move in, the Russians will. * * * The Russians have more sense than to get involved again in China. They have profited by their experience in 1927. * * * A role on the side lines is more to Russia's advantage. * * *

"The statements by Chiang contain a lot of bunk. * * * He would have us believe that * * * all the Communists are directly guided by Moscow. This is a line that we cannot swallow."

Every attempt to promote aid for China brings an immediate reprisal from the "Republican" Post. For example:

"Both Governor Dewey and Senator VANDENBERG said China, but they meant Chiang Kai-shek * * * who (is) intent on the control of all China. * * * If the aid is voted, it would not be China or the Chinese who would be helped. And they know it. Nothing is more clearly destined to alienate the Chinese people * * * than the arming and equipping of Chiang's armies."

On December 18, 1947, the Post made an attack on the China-aid amendment offered to the interim-aid bill and on its sponsor, Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, who was almost entirely responsible for the amendment's passage.

In its fight against the Chinese Republic, the Post has grasped at straws to justify its position and has surpassed many an avowed Soviet propagandist. It has cited as a leading authority Gen. Feng Yu-hsiang, the most notorious turncoat in China, who is presently speaking in this country under the auspices of the Red-front Committee for a Far Eastern Democratic Policy. In an editorial entitled "China's Generals," the Post wrote:

"The Capital at the moment is entertaining a distinguished visitor from China. * * * Renowned in China as a blunt man, he is calling a spade a spade in Washington. * * * It is wrong to think that the present war is a war between Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists."

General Feng, misnamed the "Christian General," is a quisling among quislings. He has betrayed so many people that the Chinese call him "Mutiny Feng."

On one occasion the Post proposed Chang Hsueh-liang, a notorious dope addict, as the right type of leader for China.

5. CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Material already quoted illustrates how the Post has attempted to destroy confidence in Congress and the Government. The harping on hysteria to describe the mood of the Congress parallels the Communist-sponsored propaganda campaigns. Similarly, the attacks on individual Members of the Congress fall into this category.

6. UNDERMINING SECURITY FORCES

In line with Communist doctrine, the Post frequently uncovers cases of police brutality and incompetence. Recently its most celebrated case against the police department blew up.

Willie Clegg, a Negro employee of the Post, was arrested on the charge of molesting a white woman. On the following day, the paper carried lurid tales of the brutal beating Clegg had received during police interrogation. As a result of these stories, three policemen were placed on trial before a special police board. It was obvious from the very beginning that the Post had no case, that most of its assertions had been born in the fertile brains of its policymakers. One witness, who was a prisoner in the same room with Cliegg, stated during the trial that the Post had offered to give him substantial financial help if he would testify that Clegg had been beaten. He said that the police had never even raised their voices to Clegg. The Post's reporters were obliged to admit that they had seen no marks of beating although they had been very close to Clegg.

The defense attorney for the three accused officers made the charge that the "Post and members of its staff had entered into a conspiracy against the Police Department * * * by presenting Clegg as the direct instrument to bring these false charges. * * * It was the policy of divide and conquer, and the purpose was to make ineffective all the laws and regulations of the Police Department." The trial board was unanimous in its verdict clearing the police of any charge of brutality.

During January, the fire chief of Washington was on trial for alleged incompetency. In the course of the proceedings, the Post hinted darkly that a whitewash was in the making. This editorial led the defense attorney to make the charge that:

"It is a disgraceful thing that a daily paper * * * The Washington Post, will proclaim on page 1 for civil rights and in an editorial advocates denial of those rights to my client and to seek to intimidate this board, saying in effect, 'If you don't convict Murphy we'll chop your head off.' "

In view of the Post's "liberal" editorial policy, one would assume that it maintains a model policy toward its employees. But of all newspapers in the Capital the Post has the worst labor relations. Both the International Typographical Union and the Newspaper Guild have been forced to fight with Post management for the rights of employees and for fair contract terms. City Editor Ben Gilbert has been repeatedly charged by the guild with arbitrary and unjustified discharges of staff members who have incurred his displeasure for real or imagined reasons, as well as with flagrant violations of the terms of the union-management contract.

The grievance situation at the Post grew so serious after Gilbert became city editor that the guild was forced to appoint a city-wide grievance committee in a last-ditch attempt to straighten out the difficulties with Eugene Meyer. The typographical union reported that the Post was the only news-

paper that had failed to reach an agreement in current contract negotiations.

There are sound members of the Post staff who believe that a drastic housecleaning is long overdue and may be in the offing. It is no secret that the editorial policy of the paper has aroused concern and resentment in responsible circles in Washington. Representative DONDERO expressed this sentiment when he referred to the Post as "the Washington edition of the Daily Worker."

Another winged phrase about the Post that has caught on in Washington was tossed off by Chief Murphy's defense attorney when he called it "the Washington Pravda."

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, these questions and answers relating to H. R. 4790 may be useful to the membership, therefore, I am inserting them under leave to extend:

1. Question. What are the objectives of H. R. 4790?

Answer. H. R. 4790 is designed to provide stimulus to labor, management, and venture capital; to adjust for the increase in the cost of living and to equalize geographically the tax burden of the income, estate, and gift taxes.

2. Question. How are these objectives accomplished?

Answer. To accomplish these objectives H. R. 4790 provides an increase in the personal exemptions from $500 per capita to $600 per capita; a special exemption of $600 for those 65 years of age and over; changes the present law $500 special deduction for the blind to a $600 exemption; increases the standard deduction from a maximum of $500 to a maximum of $1,000; allows all married couples to split their incomes for tax purposes; for all taxpayers combines with the present law 5-percent straight-across-the-board reduction a 12.6 percent reduction on the tentative tax up to $400, plus 7.4 percent on the next $99,600, plus 5 percent on the excess over $100,000; and equalizes the estate- and gift-tax provisions of present law as between community- and non-community-property States.

3. Question. In the last 14 years how many major revenue acts have been enacted?

Answer. There have been 15 major revenue acts since 1934.

4. Question. How many of these 15 revenue acts reduced individual income taxes?

Answer. Only one. The Revenue Act of 1945.

5. Question. What was the level of personal income in the calendar year 1947? In December 1947? At what rate is it running currently?

Answer. Personal income for 1947 averaged $197,000,000,000. In December 1947 the annual rate was $210,400,000,000. In January 1948 the annual rate was $210,800,000,000.

6. Question. What levels of personal income were estimated for calendar year 1948 by the Treasury Department and the Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in figuring the revenue loss under H. R. 4790 and Federal receipts for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949?

Answer. The Secretary of the Treasury when testifying on H. R. 4790 before the Ways and Means Committee, January 16, 1948, stated that the Treasury was using an estimated level of personal income for calendar 1948 of $200,000,000,000 which they assumed to be a continuation of current levels. The staff in preparing their revenue estimates used a level of $203,000,000,000 which seemed more in line with current levels but somewhat below the January figure of $210,800,000,000.

7 Question. What was the original budget estimate of receipts of the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1946 and what were the actual receipts?

Answer. The budget estimate of receipts for the fiscal year 1946 was $41,300,000,000 and the actual receipts were $43,000,000,000.

8. Question. What was the original budget estimate of receipts of the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1947 and what were the actual receipts?

Answer. The budget estimate of receipts for the fiscal year 1947 was $31,500,000,000 and the actual receipts were $43,300,000,000.

9. Question. What was the estimate of receipts made by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for the fiscal year 1947?

Answer. The staff estimated in January of 1947 that Federal receipts in fiscal 1947 would be $41,500,000,000, as compared with actual receipts of $43,300,000,000.

10. Question. What is the latest estimate of receipts made by the Treasury for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 compared with the most recent estimates of the staff?

Answer. For the fiscal year 1948 the Treasury estimate is $45,200,000,000, the staff estimate $46,300,000,000. The staff is $1,100,000,000 over the Treasury. For fiscal 1949 the Treasury estimates receipts of $44,500,000,000 and the staff $47,300,000,000. The staff for 1949 is $2,800,000,000 over the Treasury.

11. Question. What is the estimated revenue loss of H. R. 4790 on a liability basis in calendar year 1948?

Answer. H. R. 4790 is estimated by the staff to reduce taxes in calendar year 1948 by $4,800,000,000.

12. Question. What is the effect of this $4,800,000,000 reduction upon the budget surplus for the fiscal year 1948?

Answer. The staff estimates the effect upon the surplus in fiscal 1948 will be to reduce it by $558,000,000 or from $5,600,000,000 to $5,000,000,000.

13. Question. What is the effect of H. R. 4790 upon the budget surplus in the fiscal year 1949 assuming a $3,000,000,000 expenditure in fiscal 1948 to a trust fund available for expenditure under the European recovery program in fiscal 1949 and an additional $311,000,000 of foreign aid not in the President's budget?

Answer. Using the staff's estimates of receipts there will be a surplus of $5,200,000,000 in fiscal 1949 after enactment of H. R. 4790.

14. Question. How much reduction in the present-law tax does a single person receive under H. R. 4790 if his net income (income after deductions but before exemptions) is $800, $3,000, or $5,000?

Answer. A single person with a net income of $800 receives a $24 tax reduction or a reduction of 42 percent in his present tax. With a net income of $3,000 he receives a $75 reduction or 15 percent. With a $5,000 net income he receives a reduction of $111 or 12 percent.

15. Question. How much reduction in the present-law tax does a married couple with two children receive under H. R. 4790 if the husband is the only provider and his net income (income after deductions but before exemptions) is $2,500 or $5,000?

Answer. A married couple with two children and with a net income of $2,500 receives a tax reduction of $78 or 83 percent of what they now pay. With a net income of $5,000 they receive a reduction of $157 or 27 percent of what they now pay.

16. Question. How much total exemption does a single person who is over 65 years of age and blind receive under H. R. 4790?

Answer. He receives a total exemption of $1,800. $600 personal exemption, $600 exemption for being 65 years of age or over and $600 for being blind. He receives the above in addition to the 10-percent standard deduction.

17. Question. What are the various changes made by H. R. 4790 in the individual income tax and the revenue loss from each?

Answer. The various changes made by H. R. 4790 and the revenue loss in a full year of operation of each are as follows:

1. Increases the present $500 per capita exemption to $600. Revenue loss $2,000,100,000.

2. Provides an additional $600 exemption for those 65 years of age and over. Revenue loss $163,800,000.

3. Provides a special $600 exemption for the blind in lieu of the present $500 deduction. Revenue loss $100,000.

4. Allows married couples to split their income for tax purposes. Revenue loss $550,300,000.

5. Increases the standard deduction from approximately 10 percent of adjusted gross income or $500, whichever is the lesser to approximately 10 percent of adjusted gross income or $1,000, whichever is the lesser. Revenue loss $59,400,000.

6. Provides percentage reductions of 12.6 percent on the present law tax on the first $400 of tentative tax, plus 7.4 percent on the next $99,600 of tax and 5 percent on the excess over $100,000 of tax. Revenue loss $1,799,700,000.

7. Provides for equalization of the estate and gift taxes between community-property and non-community-property States. Revenue loss $199,100,000.

Total decrease in liabilities $4,772,600,000.

18. Question. How many taxpayers are relieved of paying Federal taxes under provisions in H. R. 4790?

Answer. Seven million four hundred thousand taxpayers are relieved of paying Federal tax liability.

19. Question. What percentage of the present tax do taxpayers with net incomes under $5,000 pay and what percentage of the total reduction under H. R. 4790 do this class of taxpayers receive?

Answer. Under present law taxpayers with net incomes under $5,000 pay 55 percent of the total individual tax and they receive under H. R. 4790 71 percent of the total reduction.

20. Question. How much does the tax reduction provided by H. R. 4790 represent of the total tax liability under present law?

Answer. The reduction in individual income taxes and the estate and gift taxes represent 21.4 percent of the total liability.

21. Question. What changes does H. R. 4790 make in the requirements for filing a declaration of estimated tax?

Answer. Under H. R. 4790 an individual is required to file a declaration of estimated tax if he reasonably expects his income for the year to exceed $4,500 plus $600 for each exemption claimed and his income is from wages subject to withholding, or more than $100 from sources not subject to withholding and his total income is $600 or more.

22. Question. Will there be any difference in the method of tax computation for the low-income taxpayer under H. R. 4790, as compared with present law?

Answer. No. The tax table on Form 1040A will still be available for those with adjusted gross incomes of $5,000 or less. The table will make allowance for all the changes provided by H. R. 4790. The same is true for taxpayers who now file Form W–2 (the withholding receipt).

23. Question. Does H. R. 4790 change the rates for computing the Federal estate and gift taxes or change return forms for the estate and gift taxes?

Answer. No. The rates for both the estate and gift taxes remain the same. The method of computation and treatment of the income

will of necessity change the form of return.

24. Question. What is the effective date of H. R. 4790?

Answer. January 1, 1948.

25. Questions. When will the new withholding rates become effective?

Answer. May 1, 1948.

Reduction of Veterans' Administration Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly concerned in the reduction of Veterans' Administration personnel to see that no essential service is lost to the veterans. In this connection I have stressed the necessity of keeping the production-line people, for these are the employees who render the direct service to the veteran. While investigating the personnel reduction by the Veterans' Administration I have obtained some very interesting facts which I believe all Members of the Congress should know.

Generally speaking a supervisory employee is considered to be a grade CAF–5 or above or one of the professional grades. Some of the professionals do perform production work. Approximately 47 percent of the jobs being abolished are grade CAF–4 or below; 53 percent are CAF–5 or above or one of the professional grades; 74 percent of Veterans' Administration employees are CAF–4 or below. These figures mean that 3,361 CAF–5's or above, 713 professional grades, and 4 subprofessional grades make a total of 4,078, or 53 percent. The 47 percent figure includes 3,311 CAF–4's or below, plus 229 CPC grades.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that approximately 50 percent of the jobs being abolished are concerned with direct service to veterans, the remaining 50 percent are engaged in executive, administrative, and planning activities. For example, the claims program sustained a 11.5 percent cut; contact work, 9.58 percent; and insurance, 5.71 percent. In terms of positions it means that in contact work 252 grade CAF–4 or below will be lost by reason of the reduction and 469 in grades CAF–5 or above. A total of 444 CAF–4 or below be abolished in the claims program while 408 CAF–5 or above will be reduced. In the insurance program 367 CAF–4 or below will be dismissed together with 81 CAF–5 ar above.

The following information prepared by the Veterans' Administration at my request gives some indication of the effect of this reduction:

PERTINENT FACTS ON THE REDUCTIONS

Question. Are we firing all of the privates and none of the colonels and generals?

Answer. No; we are not. In January 1948 the average salary for all VA jobs, field and Washington, was $2,803. It is estimated that the average salary of the jobs reported as being abolished is $3,140.

Question. Are we firing the workers and leaving the bosses?

Answer. No. According to a study recently made, 74 percent of all jobs in VA are CAF–4 and comparable level and below. This means that 74 percent of VA employees earn less than $2,469, which is the base of CAF–4. On the other hand, only 47 percent of the jobs to be abolished are CAF–4 and below.

The detailed report of jobs abolished was gone over to obtain an estimate of proportion of jobs being abolished which are concerned with direct operations or direct service to veterans. It is estimated that 50 percent of the jobs being abolished are concerned with direct service to veterans; the other 50 percent are engaged in executive, administrative, planning, high-level supervisory, or auxiliary service work.

Question. Where are the heaviest cuts taking place?

Answer. Forty-nine percent of the indicated positions to be abolished are in vocational rehabilitation and education.

Eleven and five-tenths percent are in claims.

Nine and five-tenths percent are in contact.

On the other hand, there are no indicated reductions in Board of Veterans' Appeals and Readjustment Allowance.

Veterans' Administration employees, by program

Program	VA employees on duty Dec. 31	Reduction in VA employees	Percentage of reduction
Executive administration (1,100)	1,694	218	12.8
Administrative services (1,200)	13,594	674	4.95
Finance (1,300)	10,465	86	.82
Personnel (1,400)	2,293	623	27.2
Supply, real estate, and utilities (1,600)	3,165	399	12.7
Contact (2,000)	4,608	769	16.7
Claims Service (3,100)	10,478	921	8.75
Board of Appeals (3,200)	316	0	0
Solicitor and Chief Attorney (3,300)	1,501	20	1.33
Insurance (4,000)	16,239	823	5.05
Vocational rehabilitation and education (5,000)	21,503	3,940	18.3
Loan guaranty (6,000)	2,411	26	1.08
Readjustment allowances (7,000)	277	0	0
Special services (8,120)	598	39	6.5
Construction and supply (8,130)	1,261	155	12.3
Total	90,403	8,693	9.6

Number of rating boards abolished

Branch No.	City	Total number of rating board members, Feb. 29, 1948	Number of members to be on duty, June 30, 1948	Total number of rating boards operating Feb. 29, 1948	Number rating boards to be abolished by June 30, 1948	Location of boards to be abolished by June 30, 1948
1	Boston	115	102	39	6	Boston (2), Hartford, Providence, Togus, Maine, and White River Junction.
2	New York City	189	175	59	5	Albany, Buffalo, and New York City (3).
3	Philadelphia	163	146	62	11	Newark, Pittsburgh (7), and Wilkes-Barre (3).
4	Richmond	105	91	35	7	Baltimore, Huntington, Roanoke (2), Washington, and Winston-Salem (2).
5	Atlanta	126	113	45	5	Atlanta, Miami, Montgomery, Ala., Nashville, and Pass-A-Grille Beach, Fla.
6	Columbus	122	125	38	0	None.
7	Chicago	146	127	46	8	Chicago (4), Indianapolis (2), Milwaukee (2).
8	St. Paul	81	70	26	4	Des Moines (2), Fargo, N. Dak., and Minneapolis.
9	St. Louis	102	97	33	2	Muskogee, Okla., and Oklahoma City.
10	Dallas	119	126	41	0	None.
11	Seattle	54	48	16	2	Portland and Seattle.
12	San Francisco	116	104	37	4	Los Angeles (2) and San Francisco (2).
13	Denver	30	27	9	1	Denver.
	Total	1,468	1,351	486	55	

Statement of Ben W. Creim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the testimony of Mr. Ben W. Creim, of the Bureau of Reclamation, before the California Utilities Commission in San Francisco, March 12, 1948:

STATEMENT OF BEN W. CREIM

The Bureau of Reclamation has been charged with seeking to withhold power from California in this time of emergency. These charges are without foundation. For more than a month the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has failed to utilize 10,000 kilowatts of peaking capacity available to it, under contract, at Shasta power plant. All the company has had to do is ask for it, as provided in article 5 of the contract amendment No. 1:

"During periods of emergency throughout the life of the existing contract, the United States may, in its sole discretion and upon request of the company's system dispatcher, furnish and deliver to the company 10,000 kilowatts of power capacity in addition to that provided for in article 4 hereof and in the existing contract."

Inasmuch as the company has not requested this 10,000 kilowatts of peaking capacity since the first week in February, charges of withholding power are obviously untrue. Further, during the month of February, the Bureau delivered 47,000,000 kilo-

watt hours in excess of a contract commitment of 22,000,000 kilowatt hours.

Inasmuch as we are not withholding power, what is the real controversy?

Section 9 (c) of the Federal Reclamation Project Act of 1939, provides, in part, as follows:

"That in said sales (or leases) (of electric power) preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies; and also to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and any amendments thereof."

This granting of preference in power sales to public agencies and cooperatives has also been written into the Federal statutes by the Congress in the following legislative acts: The Reclamation Act of 1906, the Raker Act of 1913, the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938, the Flood Control Act of 1944, and the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945.

We think it is not an overstatement to say that this preference is something in which the Congress believes. We would go so far as to say it is eleven times a law of the land, and we know for sure that, as employees of the Bureau of Reclamation, it is the law governing and limiting our administrative actions. To effectively and realistically accomplish the intent of Federal law is the major problem before us.

But for more than a year now we have been trying to do business with a company which wants us to take a very dim view of this law—so dim that our vision of it would keep changing as convenience suited. At one time we are asked to pretend quite simply that it doesn't exist. Then again we're expected to recognize that it does exist, but doesn't apply to anything except project pumping. Then suddenly, our vista is widened to a new concept: the law exists but has reference only to camps, administrative offices, and other facilities of the Bureau of Reclamation. At the present time we are in the dark as to whether an admittedly existent law applies to national parks, and at the same time are again being asked to pretend that no such law exists.

On September 23, 1943, the United States, through the Bureau of Reclamation, made a wartime contract with the P. G. & E. Co. for purchase by the company of energy generated at Shasta power plant. Article 20 of that contract, which is still in force and remains so until December 31 of the present year, is entitled "Preference to Public Agencies" and it reads as follows:

"During the term of this contract, and in order to meet the existing war emergency, the parties agree (without establishing a permanent policy in respect to the disposition of power of the United States) that they will endeavor to carry out the provisions of the reclamation law providing that preferences be given public agencies and cooperatives in the lease or sale of Government power, by mutual agreement supplementary to this contract, if, as, and when the occasion may require."

Note particularly the phrases "the parties * * * will endeavor to carry out the provisions of the reclamation law * * * by mutual agreements * * * as and when the occasion may require." Since the Bureau had at that time no transmission lines to serve preferential customers, this clause, taken by itself, could mean only one of two things: (1) That the parties would work out mutual agreements whereby the company's transmission facilities would be made available for service to such preferential customers, with due compensation from the Government, or (2) that the parties would make mutual agreements for withdrawal of power committed to the company by the contract, in the event the Bureau obtained its own transmission facilities in order to serve preferential customers. In the context of the contract, however, the second possible meaning is eliminated, for article 18 is entitled "withdrawals" and covers that particular subject very thoroughly. The only possible remaining meaning to this clause, therefore, is that the company would endeavor to make arrangements with the Bureau for what is sometimes called "conveyance" or "exchange" of Government power to a preferential customer as occasion arose. Otherwise the contractual provision, which exists today, would be meaningless.

Occasion first arose even while the contract was being negotiated, and the material arrangements were incorporated in the contract itself. The Contra Costa County Water District was purchasing power from the P. G. & E. under a 5-year contract for operation of the pumping plants of the Contra Costa Canal, a unit of the Central Valley project serving the district. In article 15 of the 1943 contract it was agreed that the P. G. & E. Co. would take Government power at Shasta substation in exchange for power delivered at the Contra Costa pumps, at the rate of 1¾ kilowatt-hours at Shasta sub for 1 kilowatt-hour at the pumps. This operation went into effect on July 1, 1945, when the contract which the public agency—in this case a county water district—held with the utility company expired. This was the first occasion on which exchange was invoked by mutual arrangement.

The second occasion arose in the autumn of 1945, immediately after the Bureau executed a contract with the city of Roseville for Central Valley project power. On this occasion the public agency was a municipality, and the company flatly refused to exchange.

The third occasion arose in the summer of last year, when the Bureau asked the company to exchange Government power for housing which the Bureau was providing for workers at the site of the Tracy pumping plant. On this occasion the company agreed, by letter of June 18. This was a case of a Federal Government establishment.

The fourth occasion arose 2 months later. However, by letter of August 22, the company refused to exchange for Hunter's Point and other naval shore stations in the area.

The fifth occasion involved Lassen National Park, another Federal establishment, and one never supplied with commercial power by the facilities of any utility. By letter of November 6, 1947, the company informed us that it was investigating the matter. We have had no further response to this particular request.

The sixth occasion arose at the same time, when the Government inquired regarding the company's willingness to provide exchange service for the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, a public agency of that State. The company replied that it was unwilling.

Just a week ago we received a letter from the company regarding the seventh, to date the final occasion. This had to do with our request that the company exchange for the Government camp at Friant Dam site—another Federal Government establishment. On this occasion the company agreed.

Let's look at the score: Seven exchange requests, two of them involving agencies of the State of California buying power from the company; four of them Federal Government establishments; and one a public agency of the State of Nevada. The company complied in one instance involving a State agency, declined in the other two. The company complied for one group of Federal establishments, to date has refused for the others. We think it is entirely understandable that the Bureau finds this policy on the part of the company confusing, illogical, and discriminatory.

Before I bring this discussion up to the immediate present, I would like to outline in a little detail for you what was involved in the instance I cited above as the fourth item of exchange service to naval establishments. In its present refusal to exchange for the Government, the P. G. & E. Co. has discriminated against not only its largest single supplier of power, but also its largest single customer—the Government of the United States. The 11 major Army, 9 Navy, and 5 Air Force establishments of the Government in this service area in 1947 alone totaled over 60,000 kilowatts of noncoincidental maximum demand. One point of determination in the Congress, when funds were appropriated for project transmission to the Delta load center, was that it would be absurd for the Government to sell power to the private company, then turn around and buy it back, at a substantial profit to the company, for Government use. Yet this procedure is followed each year for the major military establishments in this area, to the tune of almost 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours and at a cost of about $1,750,000. Now, in refusing to exchange for these establishments of the Government, here is what the company policy prevents the Government from accomplishing—a saving of $700,000 per year in cost of purchased energy (that is, contracting the Bureau's rate schedule R2-F1 with the company rate schedules) and added revenue to the Central Valley project of about $300,000 per year. This calculation assesses the reimbursement made to the company for exchanging this energy against the revenues to the project. The cost of such exchange was computed at 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, a figure which the company itself has suggested in those instances where it agreed to exchange. A net gain of $1,000,000 per year to the Federal Government if the company would live up to the intent of its contract commitments and exchange Shasta energy. Gentlemen, that sum, over the 50-year payout period, would pay for all the presently proposed transmission lines of the Central Valley project.

Now, these are the kind of thoughts which have moved the Bureau to insist, in contracting for the new Shasta generation and in discussions regarding renegotiation of our basic contract with the company, that there be substituted for article 20 of the existing contract—an article to which the company has denied any substantial meaning—a newly worded article asking quite clear what is meant by "preference to public agencies." In my opening remarks I listed the Raker Act of 1913 as one of the congressional enactments containing a provision similar to that which governs the Bureau of Reclamation in its dealings with the company. Under the Raker Act, the company has been exchanging for the benefit of the city and county of San Francisco since 1945, on precisely the basis called for in the contract with the Bureau—that is, an exchange of energy, with delivery at numerous points. This operation, although an isolated one, clearly represents the effectuation of a general policy of the Federal Government, as repeatedly prescribed by the Congress. But in the Central Valley, the company chooses to regard the Federal Government as in some special category in which, in turn, each different agency of the Government is a separate entity, to be dealt with separately. The company will exchange for the Bureau of Reclamation's facilities, whether they be housing units, administrative offices or pumps, but will not do so for the Army, the Navy, or any other Federal or public agency. Under the contract with San Francisco, however, the company delivers in exchange for Hetch Hetchy power to the numerous agencies of the city and county

and at several hundred points. In fact the second "whereas" of the contract begins:

"Whereas city now uses large quantities of electric energy for its diverse municipal purposes which are hereinafter generally enumerated."

Why should there not be a contract with the Federal Government beginning:

"Whereas Government now uses large quantities of electric energy for its diverse large-scale undertakings which are hereinafter generally enumerated."

Might not such a contract thereby satisfy the intent of the Federal reclamation law even as the contract with the city and county of San Francisco satisfies the Raker Act?

The P. G. & E. Co. knows very well what we are talking about and what the Congress intended its duties and responsibilities to be under a contract with the United States. But for more than a year the company has failed to assist in the development of a substitute for article 20 of the old contract. That substitute would take the place of articles 15 and 20 in the expiring contract. It could be entitled "Exchange of Energy" and it would effectuate a performance similar to the San Francisco contract. In summary, I repeat that the subject of exchange remains the only point of the contract for the new Shasta energy upon which we have substantial disagreement with the company.

So I have presented here in some detail the story of exchange, which is our only recourse in satisfaction of our guiding legislation when we continue to lack transmission facilities. The company opposes our transmission lines; the company refuses to exchange for other public agencies. The only possible deduction is that the company does not believe with the Congress in the principle of preference to public agencies in the sale of Government power. California is in the middle of a desperate situation, for which the company, as Mr. Boke outlined, left this area unprepared and unapprised.

Now, at this critical juncture, Mr. James Black has written us as follows:

"You even threaten to withhold power from the public in the present drought emergency in your attempt to force upon the company a contract which would accomplish this purpose."

We respectfully ask this Commission and call upon every citizen of California to answer for himself: Who is withholding what, and on what ground? There is only one possible answer, and it is this: The P. G. & E. Co. is withholding its transmission facilities in defiance of the best interests of the State of California, is withholding its signature from a proffered contract for this power, is withholding Shasta power from the people of California, and solely upon the grounds of company policy. We ask any fair-minded citizen, which he considers paramount in the public interest: the policy of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. or the policy of the people, as represented in the Congress of the United States?

In spite of the attitude of the company, the new Shasta power will be available to the people of California. Secretary of the Interior Krug sent a wire to Governor Warren on March 5 of this year, in which, as you will recall, he concluded:

"I am therefore offering to you, for use during this emergency, all new power at Shasta Dam power plant. This energy can be marketed by any agency you may designate. Only basic requirement I care to impose is that this energy should be made available to agriculture and industry without any middleman's profit."

I understand this offer has caused some bewilderment here, in view of the fact that the P. G. & E. Co. is still the only possessor of transmission facilities. I am now authorized to amplify Secretary Krug's offer by way of several specific suggestions. I should first like to emphasize, however, that the State of California and the people of this area have as much at stake in this issue as the Federal Government. Thus far, I have confined my remarks to the Government's position in relation to these negotiations, but I cannot refrain from pointing out that the welfare of the State should not permit the P. G. & E. Co. to impose its monopolistic will on this situation.

Our primary recommendation to the Public Utilities Commission is that it order the P. G. & E. Co. to exchange power with the government through the Bureau of Reclamation for service to all Federal establishments having a connected load in excess of 500 horsepower, to the city of Roseville, and to such other public agencies as may wish to make contractual arrangements with the Bureau for Government power. Such a solution to the present impasse would not only make the new energy immediately available in the most normal manner but would preclude a repetition of this impasse when the present contract between the Bureau and the company expires on December 31 of this year.

If such action be not taken, for whatever reason, our second recommendation is that the Commission request the company to provide this exchange service on a voluntary basis in view of the company's basic responsibilities to the people of the State.

Failing either of these, our third suggestion is that contained in the final paragraphs of Secretary Krug's telegram to Governor Warren—namely, that the Governor name an agency which may administer the disposition of the new energy, with the stipulation that such agency not exact any middleman's profit. This would be a temporary, emergency measure enabling utilization of the energy immediately but in no way solving difficulties which can be expected to arise upon expiration of the Bureau's contract with the company at the end of the year.

We do not believe that any of these suggestions represents an easy or a totally satisfactory solution—since clearly nothing short of independent project facilities will ever be satisfactory. The deadlock precipitated by the stand of the power company is not an easy situation. But the Government cannot permit a betrayal of the public trust. The State of California most desperately needs the power. The State should take action. If that means special legislation, if it means enlarging the powers of your Commission, if it means setting up a new agency, then that is what should be done.

Gentlemen, Shasta power must get to the people of the State of California. We have made three concrete proposals to attain that end. We await your decision and we urge that you make it available at the earliest possible date.

Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the New York Post by former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Harold L. Ickes, has just come to my attention. It gives some very interesting information about the Greek King and his crooked coterie of upper wealthy and officeholders. It shows that the Greek-German King has seven brothers-in-law who served under Hitler, that he is extremely wealthy, and receives $480,000 a year.

It strikes me that it would be to the interest of the Members who are so strongly urging additional millions to Greece to read this article, and I am sure that they will come to the conclusion that the American taxpayers have been robbed.

Mr. Ickes suggests that the Secretary of State make known a report on the Greek situation which was recently submitted to him, but I am constrained to feel that the Wall Street Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries will not permit him to do so. The article follows:

MAN TO MAN

(By Harold L. Ickes)

There is an old adage, "Beware the Greeks bearing gifts." But how about Greeks accepting, in fact demanding, gifts? President Truman seems to fear that the American Congress will not vote money fast enough to satisfy the apparently insatiable hunger of Greek officials for American dollars.

A year ago the President demanded $300,000,000 to save Greece from communism. At that time some Greeks were fighting a king whom they did not want. Now twice as many are fighting him. With the $300,000,000 gone, the President is asking for an additional $275,000,000. When the same docile Congress has voted this sum, how long will it be before Mr. Truman will again grab another laden tray to serve the hungry Greeks with more and better food?

Do the American people know that the Greek King is paid $40,000 a month for salary and expenses, free of income taxes? Yet, "he toils not, neither does he spin." This is nearly half a million dollars a year. Even Mr. Truman, who is spending more public money for personal expenses than any President in our history, does not get nearly that much. Moreover, the Greek King has a very large income aside from this $40,000 a month. It is said to be about twice that of the King of England. Two palaces are maintained for him, one in Athens and one about 15 miles outside of the city. The King is German. The Queen is even more German. She had seven brothers in Hitler's army.

Where do these $40,000 a month come from? I suggest that, if they do not come directly from the American taxpayers, they do indirectly. At the very least, if this great income is out of Greek taxes, we are making it good by paying an equivalent amount towards the rehabilitation of the Greek economy and in fighting the guerrillas. In other words, if the Greek people are paying $40,000 a month to the King, we are paying this much into the Greek treasury, and much more besides.

The King of Greece ought to be sufficiently interested in his soft job to contribute money for Greek defense and Greek rehabilitation. Nor does the German royalty that reigns in Greece compromise the only "Greeks" into whose pockets American money is flowing in a steady stream. There is a swarm of parasitic Greek officeholders who are leeches upon the public treasury and, therefore, upon the American treasury since we are supplying the difference between the little that the Greek taxpayers pay and the much greater amount that the Greek Government spends. In 1939, according to some figures that I believe the State Department could supply if it would, there were 50,000 political job holders in Greece. Today there are 90,000, in addition to 60,000 more in quasi-public service. Many of these work only 3 or 4 hours a day and many others perform no more arduous task than to draw their pay. It has been estimated that fully one-half of the Greek population is on the government pay roll.

It has been notorious for a long time that the wealthy Greeks pay little, if any, taxes. It is believed that at least $1,000,000,000 of Greek wealth reposes in the banks and safety-deposit boxes of such countries as the United States, Switzerland, and the Argentine. Naturally, these money-fat Greeks are loyal to their German King and Queen. They want no change in a rotten political and economic system that taxes the poor, encourages the parasite, and makes evasion easy for the rich. Moreover, the Greeks have other means of tapping American wealth. Greece has a far-flung pension system. Of course, this does not benefit the poor, either. In Greece, pensions may be inherited. They pass from a father to his children, and it is possible for a person to be on two or three pension rolls at the same time. He may even get a good salary, besides, or hold a sinecure Government job, or be rich in his own right in addition to his pensions.

Diogenes lived a long time ago and if he were in Greece today he would need a high-powered searchlight to find his honest man among the officials. And yet this is the country in which the deformed Truman doctrine has attained its most perfect flower. This is the country to which the President proposes that we throw 275,000,000 more good dollars after the 300,000,000 bad ones of last year. I wonder if Secretary of State Marshall would consider making a full disclosure to the country of the economic situation that exists today in Greece, particularly as it relates to taxation and Government stipends. The facts are within the knowledge of his own Department, although, as with the Wedemeyer report on China, they have not been made public. The facts that have been cited and others that would undoubtedly interest the American people are in a written memorandum that recently was sent to the State Department by an American official in Greece. It is to be hoped that, if Secretary Marshall does not make a clean breast of the whole sorry Greek mess, someone in the Congress will have enough gumption to demand the facts.

Congress Boards the Tax-Cut Band Wagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Boards the Tax-Cut Band Wagon," which appeared in the March 24 edition of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky. I hope that all my colleagues will read this thought-provoking editorial on an issue of vital importance to the entire Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS BOARDS THE TAX-CUT BAND WAGON

Inflation is taking wings again, after a brief, spasmodic drop in the commodity markets. The total and the per capita income are at their highest. Corporation profits, $17,000,000,000 after taxes in 1947, are larger than they have ever been. The world is in crisis, a condition which calls for resolute, swift, and costly action on part of our Government, if it is to meet its obligations to security. The public debt is massive, and in light of uncertainties of today and tomorrow, must in all reason be reduced while the means to do so lie so readily at hand.

And this is the hour in which Congress perversely drives in a kind of breathlessness to cut income taxes.

The topheavy vote by which the deed was done in both Senate and House, should show all too plainly a shameless haste to get aboard the tax-cut band wagon as it rolls merrily down the highway of the months toward November and election day.

But through it all, a consciousness of guilt is clearly betrayed. The individual citizen must feel it, torn between the self-interest of personal savings and the awareness that the country is in an emergency, none the less real though not yet officially declared. Members of Congress show signs that they feel it.

For example, Senator TAFT points to circumstances which might make it hard to override the President's expected veto. Suppose, he suggests, Mr. Truman at this juncture sends a message asking additional appropriations of several billion dollars to strengthen national defense. This is more than a hypothesis. "I don't know," he says, "what effect that will have."

What is he saying? Obviously he implies that such a request very likely would be regarded by many members as sound, in view of the daily increasing tensions. It might upset calculations by which the cut was justified. However, its soundness would not be the result of the President's stating the case. If it would be sound then, it is sound now. Why wait for it to be made—and waiting, indulge in a gesture of ingratiation? The odds are that the gesture is a fleeting one and, in a large sense, insincere.

You catch sight of Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut, struggling with himself and with his awareness of this fact, even as he votes for the tax cut. He finds himself impelled to say: "I would be less than fair to my constituents if I did not add that any tax cut may be of short duration." But you fancy that if the duration lasts beyond November, all will be well.

The Senate bill, which the House indicates it will accept instead of its own, was drawn craftily to overcome the qualms of the like of Senator MCMAHON. Here again is a revelation of motive, the motive of defeating a veto. For the House reduction of $6,500,000,000 a figure of four and five-tenths billions was substituted. At the same time it embraced several plausible reforms, like its community-property feature, which induced Senator MCMAHON to accept it on a point of policy.

It appears likely that supporters of the move will take their cue, when it comes to defending their action, from Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, who guided the measure to passage. Incentive capital is drying up, he said. A healthy economy, undrained by high taxes, is necessary if the country is to stay healthy. We wonder if the Senator is not confusing health with obesity, which can be anything but health. In view of the record of profits, production, and income, we wonder who will see this argument in behalf of a healthy economy has anything other than a rationalization of an arrant political competition

The Senate vote betrays this nature of the competition. Not a single Republican Member voted against the bill. This was a party measure, and the party discipline was tight. Thirty Democrats out of 41 voting bowed to the inevitable and joined the opposition. You may guess that many of them decided to go after whatever credit might ensue, both for themselves and for their party. The 11 who stood fast against this dubious course should be commended for their recognition of realities. They are Senators CONNALLY, GREEN, HATCH, HAYDEN, KILGORE, MCFARLAND, MCGRATH, MYERS, O'MAHONEY, TAYLOR, and THOMAS of Oklahoma. Kentucky's BARKLEY did not vote, but was paired against the bill. Here is a nucleus about which to rally support for the veto which the President, if he is to be consistent, must write. The chances that they will prevail are slim, but the times and the truth require that the effort be made.

Statement by Richard L. Boke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, there is an acute shortage of power in California which seriously affects our farmers and our industry. Mr. Richard L. Boke, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in testimony before the California Utilities Commission in San Francisco, March 12, 1948, made the following statements, which I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF RICHARD L. BOKE

We are determined that Shasta power soon to be available be delivered to the farms, the factories, and the shops of California. Mr. Creim and I, who were in Washington for Appropriation Committee hearings, have flown to this meeting with three positive proposals to attain that end. We hope the Commission will find means of taking immediate action on these proposals.

It should be stated at the outset that these proposals in no way represent a relaxation of the Government's position regarding ultimate disposition of this electric power, and we must, perforce, regard this hearing as a public forum for setting forth the reasons why the P. G. & E. Co. cannot and must not be permitted to impose its will even with respect to the immediate situation. To do so involves telling, as fully as time permits, a story which has been suppressed for more than a year while privation encompassed this region, and which even now—after it can no longer be suppressed—is being misconstrued and misrepresented to the California public. This is the story of the power shortage itself, which has a considerable past, and the more recent history of contractual impasse reached by the Bureau with the company. I shall confine my remarks to an account of the development of the shortage. Mr. Ben Creim, the Bureau's regional power manager, who has conducted our attempted negotiations with the company, will tell the contract story and will suggest possible resolutions of the present impasse.

It is easy to fall into a view of regarding the long-standing contract negotiations between the Government and the P. G. & E. as reflecting merely a bureaucratic stubborness, in which the consumers are the ultimate sufferers, and the recent impact of the power shortage quite naturally operates to inflame this view. I assure this Commission that I have no desire to embark on a campaign of name-calling—either of the P. G. & E. or of any other entity or person—simply for its own sake. But I do say, with all respect to this Commission, and in fairness to the people of California, that the Commission should not and cannot reach a decision on the matter which a combination of exigencies has placed before it, without attention to a rather detailed factual narrative of the developments which, over a long period, have brought about these

exigencies. The situation we have today did not come about simply because Nature has been temporarily remiss, nor did it come about overnight, nor during the past few weeks or months. It had its inception many years ago.

The P. G. & E.'s contribution to the present shortage is due to an attitude of mind reflecting a curious conception of public responsibility, of which we have the first recorded manifestations as far back as 1922, when the Water and Power Act came before the California Legislature. The Central Valley Project Act of a few years later brought into the open the company's violent opposition to the development of public power, for the State's Central Valley Project Act provided, in section 8, for a preference in the sale of power to public agencies. The history of the P. G. & E.'s campaign against that measure and its predecessor, the Water and Power Act of 1922, is recounted in detail in many public documents. I will not review it here, except to refer, as typical, to the famous letter from the president of the company to an eastern investment company executive, in which Mr. Hockenbeamer detailed the activities of the company in what he called "* * * our two big campaigns against the so-called 'Water and Power Act.'" The Central Valley Project Act nevertheless was passed by the California Legislature. Then followed a referendum, in which the company conducted yet a fourth campaign, claiming, among other things, that a market did not and would not exist for the water and power of the project. Enough of the California people had sufficient foresight to pay no heed to such prognostications and voted in favor of the act.

When the State could not finance the project and it was authorized as a Federal reclamation undertaking 2 years later, it was substantially the same project, and its governing legislation still grants preference in the sale of power to public agencies. The company, once it was clear that the power generating facilities of the project were to come into being, turned its attack to those physical features which were necessary to enable satisfaction of the preferential sales clause—that is, transmission lines and a steam plant. It also waged a successful lobbying campaign against State legislation to enable municipalities and irrigation districts to issue revenue bonds. The company's objectives have been (1) to prevent the formation of public agencies to take public power, and (2) to prevent public power from becoming available to such agencies as do contrive to get started. I will not review here all the recurring misstatements of this continuous campaign. But I cannot refrain from citing a few of those most ludicrous, in the light of events of today but nevertheless sometimes effective—for example, the argument that the Bureau was attempting to make a power project out of a water project. I doubt that there is a single farmer in the Central Valley today who hasn't learned this year that he is a major user of power, and that for him power is water. Or, for another example, the argument that the Central Valley project transmission lines and the steam plant would be "wasteful duplication" of company facilities. If the company had not successfully opposed funds for the west side transmission lines in 1946, those lines would now be in service and not only would there not be any impasse over getting the new Shasta energy to the people of this State, but almost twice as much power could be transmitted then. And if the company had not opposed funds for the Delta steam plant from 1941 onward, that capacity might now be available for the relief of our farmers and our industries.

The damage has been done for the present, and we must look about us and see what we have to work with now. We have a Shasta Dam which is operationally complete except for the drumgates, to be installed this summer. We have two generating units in operation at Shasta, rated at a total of 150,000 kilowatts but which have been operating steadily at 170,000 and peaking at 180,000 kilowatts. Work has begun on the Tracy pumping plant, for which alone the project would require its own transmission grid and steam standby, even if there were no other reason for these facilities. Keswick Dam will be in operation next year and all its generating capacity will be ready for the 1949 peak power season. No construction funds are available as yet for the Delta steam plant. About 13 percent of the total funds required for transmission have been provided. About one-third of the money required for switchyards has been provided and 13 percent of the money required for substations. All of this money is presently obligated.

All of the remaining three Shasta units will be in operation by the 1949 irrigation season of peak power demand. These are units No. 5, No. 2, and No. 1, but I shall refer to them here in the order of their installation—as the third, fourth, and fifth units. The third unit has now completed its period of testing and is in operation, replacing, in turn, the two initial units which have been in steady operation since they went into service in 1944.

However, water releases at Shasta will not be sufficiently large to permit utilization of the third unit until about April 15, when irrigation releases are scheduled to begin. I wish to emphasize this point, because certain self-appointed spokesmen have given the public to understand that this new unit could go into full production at any time. On the contrary, the schedule of irrigation releases rules the Shasta generation, and those releases will not permit utilization of the new unit until about a month from now. At that time, due to inadequate transmission to Shasta substation, the delivered kilowatt capacity of the Shasta plant will be increased by only about 43,000—from a maximum of 177,000 kilowatts delivered at Shasta substation for peaking purposes to a steady 220,000. Gearing this kilowatt availability to scheduled water releases from Shasta Reservoir, we have outlined a schedule of expected generation at Shasta power plant during the calendar year 1948. With your permission, I should like to offer a copy of this schedule for inclusion in the RECORD.

At this point, I should like to emphasize that during February the Bureau delivered to the company more than three times the amount of energy called for in our contract with the company and that the generation anticipated during April is five times the contract figure. Incidentally, in February, upon advice from the project watermaster, he was concerned about meeting irrigation requirements this summer, the Bureau had intended to cut down its generation to 43,500,000 kilowatt hours from the 94,500,000 generated in January. However, the company had used up its contract commitment of 22,000,000 in the first 8 days of February on a basis of unrestricted call upon the project capacity. The full force of the power supply emergency then broke on the State, and generation at Shasta was kept to a steady 2,000,000 kilowatt hours per day, resulting in a total monthly generation of almost 67,000,000 kilowatt hours, 20,000,000 higher than expected.

One further point. It will be noted from the schedule which I have submitted that generation for October, November, and December is down to the P. G. & E. commitment. This is so scheduled because of the fact that Shasta storage will be drawn far down at the end of the irrigation season and a program of building up that storage will be necessary. I regret to say that no possible run-off, short of flood stage, will cause any change in this generating schedule for those final 3 months of the year. To get below 2,000,000 acre-feet of storage begins to tread on dangerous ground for operation of the project in the following season, but in the fall we expect the storage to be at 1,500,000 acre-feet.

So much for the present development of the Central Valley project and the immediately future availability of project power, for the inadequacies of which the P. G. & E. company certainly cannot escape a large measure of responsibility. After it was apparent that this area was headed for serious trouble in its power supply, Mr. Black of the P. G. & E. went before the congressional Appropriations Committees with his unfortunate denials of impending shortage and his cries of wasteful duplication. Here is a quotation from the House Appropriations Committee hearings of February 18, 1946:

"Mr. JOHNSON. The Bureau has represented that there is a prospect of a shortage of power in that area in the future. Do you say to the committee there is no prospect of any shortage of power in the Central Valley?

"Mr. BLACK. There is no prospect whatsoever, sir.

"Mr. JOHNSON. Is there any shortage now?

"Mr. BLACK. There is none now; there has been none, and there will be none in the future."

At the same time that Mr. Black was making categorical predictions that he could not possibly vindicate, the Federal Government made the first of a long series of attempts to warn this area of its danger. On December 16, 1946, the Bureau of Reclamation stated:

"Unknown to all but a few persons, development of the past months have brought the northern and central California areas to a critical shortage of electric energy."

This announcement and its statistical supporting data went entirely unheeded. One month later, on January 26, 1947, Mr. Creim, the Bureau of Reclamation regional power manager, in a verbal account to the press, repeated this warning, whereupon officials of the P. G. & E. were quoted in the Sacramento Union as replying that:

"The company has 13 steam plants and 53 hydroelectric plants capable of handling any demands * * * and 160 reservoirs in the Sierra Nevada have enough water to take care of even the driest year."

By February 3 I had become thoroughly alarmed by the increasing signs of system failure, and I made a further and fuller statement to the press. I should like to quote a few sentences from that statement:

"California is all dressed up and has some place to go, but it hasn't the power to get there. * * * Northern California, the bay area, and the Central Valley are inevitably going to suffer a limitation, and the limitation will be only more acute in proportion as the public power phase of the development should fail of realization. This area's productive capacity in every field of agricultural and industrial enterprise is going to experience a restriction. It is the job of all concerned to hold the restriction to a minimum."

That those words were not alarmist then, I submit must be evident to this Commission. But what resulted from this warning? Nothing less than a letter from the executive vice president of the P. G. & E. to the State water power authority, charging that—

"Mr. Boke's statement is erroneous in its assumption and misleading in its conclusions."

I'm afraid I must further point out that at that time, while measures might still have been taken, no other agency concerned in the matter seemed sufficiently enlightened to endorse the technical accuracy of the position of the Bureau of Reclamation. It was laughed down, and, officially, a shortage did not exist—simply because the lights had not yet gone off.

On February 10, I replied to the P. G. & E.'s latest statement by saying:

"There is a basic lack of power reserves in California to meet demands by the rapidly growing population and industrial development."

By August of last year, the clocks had already run slow once, and we knew that they would again. The bay area's chemical plants were curtailed, and the possibility of shortage had become official. On August 20 I again warned that this situation was not temporary, that it was going to get worse before it got better, and at that time I said:

"What this area needs, and needs fast, is a real development program by both public and private power agencies to the full measure of their abilities."

On the same day, another P. G. & E. vice president, Mr. Sutherland, was quoted by the San Francisco News as follows: "The curtailment will not be of long duration nor is any further power restriction in prospect."

This, then, was the situation leading up to the present condition of area-wide suffering and privation: the Bureau of Reclamation was warning of the dangers ahead and was calling for maximum realization of its own program and that of the P. G. & E. The P. G. & E., on the other hand, continued to proclaim a false security and continued to oppose the Bureau's construction program in the Congress and in its calculated daily participation in the community life of the California people. The company implied that there was no basic lack of reserves, and that its difficulties have been due to bad water conditions and such inadvertencies as forest fires, rats falling across cables, storms, and such.

Gentlemen, it is of the utmost concern to me that the company even now continues to obscure the true picture of the power shortage. Even while many thousands of men are losing worktime, while farmers' pumps are being forcibly shut off, and while this whole major part of California is having to curtail rather than expand its productive activity, the P. G. & E. has the effrontery to put the primary blame on drought conditions. I think everyone who knows anything at all about the power business in California knows that 1948 would have been a year of frustrating power shortage even if it had been the wettest year on record. The effect of the drought has been to increase the severity of a situation which would have been critical in any case. I want to make four statements of simple arithmetic, which nobody can deny:

1. Available capacity in the area was entirely absorbed by the peak system demands of July and August 1947.

2. Load growth on January 1, 1948 (over January 1, 1947), was 152,000 kilowatts—just about twice what load growth was on January 1, 1947, over the same date in 1946.

3. Since total annual load growth in 1947 was 225,000 kilowatts, this meant that a total growth of at least 300,000 kilowatts could conservatively be expected in 1948.

4. Taking into account completion of all construction programed before July by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the private company, a shortage ranging upwards from 100,000 kilowatts was inevitable in 1948.

Now we have this devastating shortage into which the people of California have been led blindfolded, while the Bureau of Reclamation has for more than a year been trying to tell them what was coming and that they must prepare for it. On the 20th of last month Mr. Black, of the P. G. & E., addressed to me a letter which within the past week he has made available to the public. It will probably not be news, then, that Mr. Black wrote to me, as follows:

"It is unthinkable that the Bureau—an agency of the Government—would withhold power from the public at this critical time."

Mr. Black is correct. The Bureau has been attempting for more than a year to get his signature on a contract for this power; but further, his company apparently finds it equally unthinkable that it should do anything else but seek to utilize the suffering of California, for which it cannot escape some measure of responsibility, for the purpose of continuing to withhold from this area the benefits of Central Valley project power to which California is entitled by its own hard-won fight and by numerous legislative acts of the Congress of the United States. Mr. Creim will tell that story. Thank you.

The Palestine Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, there is wide public concern over the Palestine issue, and I feel that the widest possible attention should be given to all shades of opinion on this important matter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made March 25 by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, former president of the World Zionist Organization and of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, who is now preparing to return to Palestine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The gravity of the present moment compels me to break my silence on the issues involved in the Palestine problem in the light of the recent declaration of United States policy.

There are three established principles in the Palestine question. The first is that to prolong tutelage and delay a final solution based on independence is to increase confusion and bloodshed. The second is that to make Arab consent a condition of a settlement is to rule out all chance of a settlement. The third is that to abandon a judgment under pressure of Arab violence is to give an incentive to further violence. The recent United States declaration fails to take account of these three elementary facts, and runs counter to everything that long experience has taught. Trusteeship for Palestine was rightly rejected unanimously by several organs of the United Nations; and surely the very conditions which made the last months of the mandate so tragic are likely to apply to any new trusteeship.

I, therefore, feel convinced that the Jewish people must take its stand firmly on the settlement recommended by the General Assembly. The United Nations and its leading members will find no satisfactory solution for Palestine, except by moving forward resolutely to the implementation of that settlement.

The plan worked out by the Assembly was the result of a long and careful process of deliberation in which the conflicting claims of the various parties were judged in the light of international equity. In order to achieve a compromise between Jewish and Arab national claims, the Jews were asked to be content with one-eighth of the original area of the Palestine mandate. Their consent was sought for the recognition of a second Arab state in seven-eighths of the area originally designated—as I can personally testify—for the creation of the Jewish homeland. They were called upon also to cooperate in a settlement for Jerusalem which set that city's international associations above its predominantly Jewish character. We accepted these limitations only because they were decreed by the supreme authority of international judgment, and because in the limited area allotted to us, we were to be free to bring in our people and were awarded the indispensable boon of sovereignty—a boon which the Arabs so lavishly enjoy in such vast territories.

In quarters which but 3 months ago admitted its unpractical nature, there is today much talk of conciliation. But conciliation cannot be a mask for mere appeasement. There has been a solemn act of judgment by the authorized tribunal. The aim of conciliation should be to summon all parties to the obedience of judgment—not to adapt judgment to the will of a defiant party.

During the last quarter of a century I have repeatedly made attempts to seek an agreement with important Arab interests both in Palestine and outside. No settlement ever emerged, because the Arab leaders denied to the Jews the fundamental right to those elementary freedoms and opportunities of development which they everywhere claimed for themselves; they insisted that Palestine too must be an Arab state, despite the hallowed traditions and historic ties which bind the Jewish people to that country. It is abundantly clear that that is still their claim today. It is a claim that has been emphatically rejected by every impartial tribunal which has examined it, including the General Assembly. Arab governments are now openly seeking to extort by war what they failed to attain by argument. To pursue Arab consent by further concessions at our expense as a necessary basis for a settlement is thus pure appeasement of aggression—it is not conciliation. Indeed the worst feature of any change in policy now is the undeniable fact that it arises purely as an act of submission to Arab violence.

Some people suggest that the partition decision shou'd be shelved because it has not secured the agreement of all parties. Yet it was because the mandatory power itself constantly emphasized that the prospect of agreement was nonexistent that it submitted the question to the United Nations, whose various organs also found that no solution exists for which the agreement of both sides may be envisaged. The United States, the Soviet Union, and other powers concurred emphatically in this view, which has been further reinforced by Arab aggression in recent weeks. Whatever solution may be proposed will require enforcement. It seems therefore that a sustained effort should be made on behalf of a solution twice recommended by distinguished commissions (the Royal Commission and UNSCOP) and now reinforced by the Assembly's own authority. I have spent many strenuous years laboring at this problem and I know that there is today no other practical solution—and none more likely to achieve stability in the long run—certainly not the Arab unitary state which the conscience of the world has rejected, or the so-called federal formula which is in fact nothing but an Arab state in another guise, or an impossible effort to impose trusteeship and arrest the progress of the Palestine Jews toward their rightful independence.

But for the admission into Palestine of foreign Arab forces, no problem of security would have arisen which the local militias envisaged by the Assembly's decision could not control. I shall never understand how the mandatory government could allow foreign Arab forces to cross freely by bridge and road into Palestine and prepare in leisure and impunity to make war against the Jews and against the settlement adopted by the United Nations. I have always paid high

tribute to the great act of statesmanship of Great Britain in inaugurating the international recognition of our right to nationhood. But in exposing everything and everybody in the country to destruction by foreign invaders, the mandatory government has acted against its own best traditions, and left a tragic legacy to the country's future. I say these words with the deepest sense of disappointment and pain. For me they mark the frustration of very high hopes.

The Jews of Palestine will have the support of Jews the world over in these steps which they will deem necessary to assure their survival and national freedom when the mandate ends. I would urge the Jewish people to redouble all its efforts to secure the defense and freedom of the Jewish state. It seems certain that our people in Palestine must face a grave ordeal, and that their sufferings will be greatly increased and prolonged as a result of the reversal in American policy, which has given such powerful encouragement to Arab aggression.

Within a fortnight I shall be leaving this country for Palestine. I now, more than ever, count it a privilege to be with my people in their hour of crisis. I still cherish the hope that the United Nations will vindicate the Charter and provide for the carrying out of the resolution so solemnly adopted last November. If we are left alone to face Arab aggression, we shall not shirk the struggle; for if we were to go down, the ideals of international order would perish with us and force would prevail against justice as the arbiter of human destiny.

Appropriations for Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the deficiency bill which I voted for today restores at least half of the funds previously cut from the Veterans' Administration. I regret that it does not restore all of the funds which I believe we should do. But let the record clearly show that the cut in veterans funds which resulted in firing several thousand employees of the Veterans' Administration and discontinuing many vital services, that this cut was one levied by the executive branch of the Government and not by the Congress. It was a cut levied by the Budget Bureau and acquiesced in by the Veterans' Administration.

I know this because I have protested against the cut to all parties concerned. I recently read an interesting report in one of the Maine papers of a statement by the principal VA representative in Maine to the effect that the cuts in Maine could be prevented by Congress if it would act. If this statement were correctly reported, it meant that the VA, through its Maine representative, was pointing VA's finger at Congress and accusing it of a cut actually levied by the Budget Bureau and supported by the VA. The import of the VA representative's statement was that Congress was the guilty party for the cut that fired several thousand VA employees and cut vital services to the veterans.

It is amazing that in this time when the executive department is asking for billions in aid to the people of Europe, who our veterans freed with their blood, sweat and tears—and billions for our Armed Services, which our veterans manned and sparked to victory in World War II—that the executive department would start pinching pennies and economizing on our veterans.

The executive department is either short on memory or gratitude. It compounds this guilt when efforts are made to place the blame on Congress for the miserly acts of the executive department.

By passing this bill, the Congress can fully show that it is not short on memory or gratitude to the veterans. The Congress can show the veterans that it overrode the penny pinching of the Budget Bureau and the VA and that the Congress gave the veterans that which the Budget Bureau and VA sought to take away from the veterans.

An Address by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, annually for the past 164 years the members of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in the city of New York have on each 17th day of March gathered round the banquet table and celebrated the feast of the patron of their society. Each year the same three toasts are offered, "The President of the United States," "The Day We Celebrate," and "The United States."

This year to the toast, "The Day We Celebrate," His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, responded. The burning words and patriotic fervor of this great churchman and outstanding American electrified the 2,600 Friendly Sons and their guests and brought them to their feet with thunderous applause, as he condemned atheistic communism and declared in favor of universal military training.

Eight years previously and at the time when Hitler was setting the present-day Stalin pattern of crushing small nations, Cardinal Spellman, with far-seeing vision, had solemnly warned an American Legion convention in Boston:

> It is better to have protection and not need it, than to need protection and not have it.

Subsequent world events confirmed his bold and forthright statement.

Will the people of the United States, and will the Congress, heed the words of this great patriot, Cardinal Spellman, who hates war, but who fears not to don the armor when his country is in danger? I have no doubt as to the action of the American people and the American Congress.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I am including in my remarks the inspirational address of Cardinal Spellman which follows:

MANKIND'S MOMENT OF DECISION: SELF-STRANGULATION OR SURVIVAL

As the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick are met here tonight to break bread together and do honor to their patron on his feast day, it is my privilege to offer homage to the President of our beloved United States and at the same time pay tribute to the founding saint of another democratic nation from whom many of our forebears came. But there is more than social interest in our gathering this evening, more than the intention of praising Eire as a land of liberty-loving men and the expression of our hopes that she may ever have and hold her rightful place among the free peoples of the earth. That interest is the determination to win the war—the war that never actually ended with VJ-day, the war that daily threatens to overcome America, relentlessly destroy her freedoms and make her captive to atheistic communism.

When first I was asked to speak before you tonight, I was happy and proud of the honor. But, as the days wore on, and my speech began to be outdated before it was completed, my heart became weighted and sad, and fear outran my pride. For once again my eyes bore witness to headlines screaming of Communist outrages that were but carbon copies of cruelties inflicted upon helpless, decent, democratic nations by Nazi oppressors, as Soviet Russia builds herself an empire surpassing even Hitler's conquests and ambitions.

Then did I fully realize how futile it is for me to make speeches—for had I not ever since Pearl Harbor pleaded protection for small, weak nations, as publicly and privately I prayed for peace, begging victory with justice and mercy for those little peoples who had no one to whom to turn except America. Good men have sacrified, brave men have died, that we and other nations might have this peace. Yet, triumphant over all our foes, we find ourselves without the peace we willed, without the wit to bind up our own wounds, without the courage here at home to share the very gifts we carried overseas. And so these little peoples, overwhelmed by destitution and death, fell victim to Soviet Russia—the Pied Piper who promised a panacea for all their anguished ills in communism—the drug of godless men of lusts—communism, whose true name is soul's enslavement.

The past and present mingled in my thoughts, for having viewed on battlefields abroad war's fodder piled in the cemeteries like old coats left discarded by a road; and having mused the lessons there revealed, where sleep the trampled glories of man's past—the broken swords, the tarnished pomp of power, abortive dreams of dynasties, and all the madness that is spawned from human hearts—then thought I, what has this World War brought if it fails to justify the martyred deaths of thousands of our boys or the deathlike life of even a single son? Are these boys, our spoils of war and pawns of peace, to be forgotten while masters of malice sow new hatreds among masses of men to breed the next and last world war? What will the morrow bring if it seals not a sacred peace among nations of free, tolerant, and God-living men, but instead signs the death warrant of liberty in the bloodied pattern of a Soviet peace?

But whether my words be futile or not, I felt that I would not be a true American if I sunk into the conspiracy of silence and appeasement enveloping those who fear the triumph of communism over Americanism, but apparently fear more the danger of

speaking or acting publicly against this insidious enemy of our liberties.

America is not immortal. America is no safer from mastery by communism than was any European country. There we witnessed the killing and enslavement of whole peoples by Communists who, with the shedding of blood, became as if drunken with it. And so, deep-rooted belief in my fellow Americans and solicitude for the salvation of our common country, as well as the threat and fear of this common and imminent danger, urge me once more to come before you this night, a son of the soil of America, begot from the loins of Irish ancestors, sons of toil that helped make our country great. Fortified by the feeling that you believe in my love of these twin lands of liberty, I feel hopeful that you will hear and heed my reflections with friendly ears and open minds.

Once again the world hangs crucified on its cross of sin—crucified by nails of greed, anarchy, tyranny, cruelty, and atheism. And in this hour of dreadful, desperate need we have permitted Soviet Russia to continue her policy of persecution and slaughter, dooming our neighbor-nations and ourselves to reap a rotted harvest of appeasement. Once again while Rome burns, literally and symbolically, the world continues to fiddle. The strings on the fiddle are committees, conferences, conversations, appeasements—to the tune of no action today. Once again statesmen, politicians, clergy, and laity, industrialists, laborers—all of us—are grinding our teeth, clenching our fists, and shouting at one another "Fascist," "warmonger," "isolationist," the same contradictory, controversial words so lightly lipped less than a decade ago, when then as now, we failed to face the vital, vibrant issue of fair play and peace, or foul play and war.

And it is foul play for Soviet Russia to desecrate and devour the little God-loving, free peoples of the earth. Yet that is what she was doing even before the tears of war had dried upon the sad, scarred faces of many lands—lands used so little time ago as gored and bloody battlegrounds and fetid funeral fields for their own native sons—and ours. Fear must clutch your hearts as tightly as it grips my own, as we watch the towering glacier spread ceaselessly, mercilessly, across Europe and Asia, as powerful, aggressive, ruthless forces press to a finish the issues of slavery against democracy, evil against good, might against right, Stalinism against God.

And 1 month from tomorrow as Italy must make her choice of government, I cannot believe that the Italian people, whom I learned to know and to love as I spent with them 13 of the most precious years of my life, will yield their faith and America's friendship to Soviet Russia's Communist pressure and propaganda. I cannot believe that the Italian people will choose Stalinism against God, Soviet Russia against America—America who has done so much and stands ready and willing to do so much more for Italy if she remains a free, friendly, unfettered nation. And as Soviet Russia spews forth her Communist hordes over the face of the earth, adding whole empires to her orbit of power, I pray God that the Italian people with their great faith in Him and their common sense, will not yield their love and loyalty to any puppets of Stalin and thus betray their country and enslave themselves. For unless they become traitors to every sacred Italian tradition and sense of right, justice and freedom, their choice must be God against Stalinism.

It is not alone in defense of my faith that I condemn atheistic communism, but as an American in defense of my country, for while communism is an enemy of Catholicism, it is also a challenge to all men who believe in God and in America. I bear no ill-will for any individual or peoples upon the face of the earth, but if any man or nation proves to be an enemy of God or America, I consider him a foe, whether he be a Russian, an Englishman, a German or an American. And surely Soviet Russia, our ally in war, has not remained our ally for peace, for if she truly wanted peace, she would not vengefully oppose the principles of justice for which we are still fighting, nor through brute greed demand gains which prolong the wretchedness and agonies of men, nor through insane malice incite another war that will commit future generations to serfdom in a world itself enchained.

It is in such dread and darkness that I pray you reflect with me on the light that comes from Ireland, that small island, heaven flung into the sea, that might become as a beacon light to a world still untaught by the tragedies of two world wars in one generation. For the Easter fire which Patrick struck upon the hill of Slane still shines—symbol of faith which alone guides man to salvation. And in her hours of trial and persecution, midst the grasp of paganism and idolatry, Ireland survived because she lived by this light of life divine.

History recounts the vicious attempts made by Ireland's enemies to kill her. Her land was overrun and confiscated, her priests imprisoned and executed, her people impoverished, degraded, and enslaved as a race of day laborers and hovel dwellers. Yet no tyrant could extinguish the light of faith in the souls of the Irish and the fire enkindled on the hill of Slane was never quenched. May faith like unto the faith that saved Ireland bring resurrection to the martyred little nations of today—as "the whole world hangs in the balance."

These seven singularly strong and simple words of Secretary of State Marshall—"the whole world hangs in the balance"—foretell the doom of man if man heed not God and God's laws, and they challenge us to save democracy and civilization. For Secretary Marshall knows, just as I know, just as we all know, that if each man gives full measure of deed and devoted service to humanity, taking God as his inspiration and God's laws as his guide, democracy cannot fail. Which side of the scale shall man choose as his own: God, democracy, and peace, or godlessness, dictatorship, and war?

Six days God labored for man, dividing the light and the darkness, studding the skies with sun and stars, stocking the forests with birds and beasts, sowing the plains with fertile seed, storing ore and oil in the earth. Then did God create man to His own image and likeness, and blessed him. But in disobedience and defiance man failed God. Yet, did a forgiving, merciful God bestow upon man His greatest blessing, investing His only Son in humanity, making the world livable and life lovable for man's own and his children's sake. God gifted man with brawn and brain, with the good rich earth and the fruits thereof, opening before him widening avenues for service to all humankind. Possessed of these gifts, it is man's sacred duty faithfully to remain the repository and stronghold of God's trust, fulfilling his debt to God, rendering unselfish service to Him and all humanity. For no man should be slave nor master to another, but each should be servant to God and helpmate to his neighbor, spirited by reverence and love of God, working together to do His will on earth as it is done in Heaven.

All this must every man believe and live—taking God as his model—for the law of God's life is the law of love. And if man fails God, civilization will fall and godless communism will reign in its stead.

What justification have I, you ask, to interpret thus the words of Secretary Marshall?

This question you are free to ask, and with deep conviction I answer that because I know this great soldier and sincere statesman, I feel within my heart this implication of his strong and simple words: "The whole world hangs in the balance."

Yet do you rightfully question me: Can one man alone, one hundred, one thousand, or hundredfold one thousand, slacken the savage speed which Communists have set for the doom of democracy and Christian civilization?

And I answer, "Yes," if that man be a lover of God and follower of His ways—though he be but numbered one—for one man on God's side is never alone but finds in Him strength beyond mere human strength to point, pattern, and tread the path to peace.

But when man rejects God he rejects peace, for peace must be based on truth and God is truth. Why then are we surprised when Soviet Russia disdains and distorts truth? Should not ever man live by his creed and is not atheism the official creed of Communists? It is foolhardy for man to believe he can piece together the shattered fragments of civilization and rebuild God's world without God's help, and if men continue to try to recapture tranquillity and restore order without Him, who is peace, they are but planning new treaties to be broken, plotting new ways to spend in future wars other millions of young lives—for the fuel of war is youth.

Yet today we are deceiving ourselves that we are at peace, though in truth we know that naught for which we fought has come to fruit. And the fault is ours—a fault not alone of the statesmen entrusted with the richest heritage of any people throughout the world—but the fault of every American who tills the farm, who toils in the factory, who tends the shop, who teaches in school, who preaches in the pulpit, who graces the home, the fault of each one of us who does not fulfill his sacred trust to God and to America. And as a priest of the church which was already ancient before the present great nations of the earth were dreamed of or conceived, I believe with all my soul that it is the duty and the mission of each man to live and to teach loyalty to God, to be his brother's keeper, and help bring peace to him and to all mankind, and thus save America and civilization.

At the feet of my own mother now in heaven, I, as probably each of you, first learned to know and love my God and my country. In the long years since those peaceful times I have traveled earth's end to end, and I avow that the hopes that rest within the heart of one God-loving man are not unlike the other. For in their common plans and pleas and prayers is one hope above all others—that God may bless us all with peace, and spare our sons still living in the blood-red shadow of two wars from the curse of yet another.

The sands of time are running out as mankind faces its moment of decision—self-strangulation or survival—as humanity stands at a universal altar, where, whether man chooses or no, he must offer sacrifice—yea and himself be sacrificed.

Will we revere and follow God and live in peace with God and with our neighbor, or will we betray Him, banish ourselves from the glory of His sight, and face again the drums of war whose next call means world's end?

Will we honor and serve God, or will we profane and resist Him, locking our hearts against Him, closing all ways that would lead us to Him and to peace?

Peace. Powerfully does the word strike the inmost chords of the human heart which longs for love, yet finds none until it has found true peace in God, and even the cruelty of man to man cannot rob him of this peace, if it be deeply rooted in his heart, for then it is a peace that comes from heaven and leads to heaven.

Lives there an American who would not pledge his faith in God's love divine to save his country's soul, and for the world, gain peace? God needs the faith and love of each of us for even God cannot make a peaceful world without peace-loving, God-loving men to help him. In God alone dwell the power

and the promise of peace. In man alone abide the wit and will to seek or reject it, as today the whole world hangs in the balance. And this very day, as I listened to President Truman make his plea before Congress, I recalled speaking before the annual convention of the American Legion assembled in Boston 8 years ago. Then Hitler's hordes were about to spill across Europe conquering country after country. Then it was I stated, "It is better to have protection and not need it, than need protection and not have it."

My daily prayer, my lifelong work, is to help bring peace to men and men to God. I hate war. And it is because I do hate war that I must put my trust in men who know better than I the dangers that beset America; and, if these men chosen by the vote and confidence of the American people believe preparedness will prevent war, then I, who love America better than I love my life, cast my vote, as a private American citizen, on the recommendation of the President of the United States, for universal military training.

And, this night, as we stand at the crossroads of civilization—a civilization threatened with crucifixion by communism—I beg Thee Almighty God that Thou, Who from out confusion and disorder fashioned beauty and design, will once again come to the world's salvation and give unto man the grace and will to choose Thy side, O God, and peace.

Address of Hon. Robert Tripp Ross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening, it was my distinct privilege and pleasure to be present at the national banquet of the order of AHEPA. At the close of the banquet, my colleague, the Honorable ROBERT TRIPP ROSS, delivered an excellent address. I am pleased to include a copy of his speech for careful consideration and study by the Members of the House:

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud and highly honored to have been asked to join you and talk to you this evening. I have been told to be brief and I shall be. However, the brevity of my message will in no manner detract from the significance of the subject matter to Greek-American relationships.

As most of you know, I have sponsored in the Congress a bill to increase the Greek immigration quota 5,000 a year over the next 3 years. To me a liberalization of our immigration policy in specific instances, certainly in this instance, should be made a definite part of our foreign program.

The United States has locked arms with Greece and together they are facing up to the many and complex postwar problems besetting that gallant little nation, which can truthfully be called the cradle of liberty and the source of western culture. We have extended the hand of friendship which has always been strong for Greece, by providing assistance in her valiant efforts to rehabilitate her economy and prevent the imposition upon Greece by foreign powers of an ideology contrary to her free way of life.

This week the Congress will, I am certain, approve legislation providing further aid to Greece, that our mutual interest may be broadened and strengthened.

It was in this spirit that I proposed we liberalize our immigration policy toward Greece at this time. I am sure that it was in this spirit that my colleagues from California, Mr. DONALD JACKSON and Mr. WILLIS BRADLEY, joined in this effort by introducing similar bills.

To permit an additional 15,000 Greek nationals to immigrate to the United States over the next 3 years, to stretch out not only our hand of friendship, but to bring out the welcome mat as well, would be a great morale tonic to the people in Greece who are striving so hard to save that vital area from the clutches of communism.

All of you know of the heartaches and hardships close relatives are enduring because of their inability to obtain visas which would unite them with their families in this country. I have many personal friends, fine outstanding Greek-American citizens, who have been trying for years to bring over their loved ones. Although the increase proposed is relatively small, it would be a start from which we could hope to permanently liberalize our Greek quota.

I would caution you who have a vital interest not to be overoptimistic about the passage of this bill tomorrow or next week. You know the slowness sometimes of the legislative processes. But I would ask you to use your influence individually to have the Congress act upon this matter. I would ask the AHEPA organization to champion this cause as it has done in so many worthy causes for the betterment of Greek-American relations. It would round out our mutual interest and mutual assistance program. The dreams and aspirations of thousands would be fulfilled and an invaluable contribution would be made to the strengthening of our American way of life and to the progress of America.

Nondisability Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the National Guard Association of Massachusetts:

Resolution relating to the terms of a nondisability retirement bill for the civilian components which are contained in title III of H. R. 2744 and S. 1598

Whereas all the interested agencies of the War and Navy Departments together with the various civilian organizations, have agreed on the provisions of a nondisability retirement bill for the civilian components which provisions are contained in title III of H. R. 2744 and S. 1598; and

Whereas H. R. 2744 and other bills of similar purport are pending in the Congress and H. R. 2744 has been acted upon favorably by the House Armed Services Committee and is now on the calendar: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Guard Association of Massachusetts in conference assembled this 10th day of January 1948, That the officers of this association be directed to make every effort to obtain the enactment of H. R. 2744 in this session of the Eightieth Congress.

JOHN J. CAREW,
Colonel, Massachusetts National Guard, Retired; President, National Guard Association of Massachusetts.

Vacillation on Palestine Policy Leads to Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles from the newspaper PM on Palestine. One was written by I. F. Stone, chief of the Washington bureau of PM, and a great American reporter. The other was written by Victor H. Bernstein, another brilliant reporter who has been covering the United Nations for PM in recent months and achieved fame for his coverage of the Nuremberg war-guilt trials.

The matter referred to follows:

[From New York PM of March 26, 1948]

PARTITION ALREADY EXISTS

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON.—The impression created in this country is that the American Government is trying to make up its mind whether or not to partition Palestine.

The actual situation in Palestine, as disclosed in first-hand reports by recently returned travelers and in confidential reports to Lake Success, is quite otherwise.

These reports show that partition by and large is already an accomplished fact. What is bothering the American State Department and the British Foreign Office is not whether to enforce partition, but how to undo it. Their search is for the way in which they can destroy the Jewish state with the least possible public outcry.

In the Arab areas the Arabs have achieved virtual independence. The British have withdrawn most of their troops from the Arab portions of Palestine. Those remaining have been instructed to obey the control orders of Arab gendarmes and pickets, to stop at road blocks, to show their papers, and to acquiesce in searches.

The British no longer make any effort to control the frontiers which divide the Arab part of Palestine from Egypt, Transjordan, Syria, and Lebanon. Thus the Arabs have been free to bring in men and supplies from the surrounding countries.

The Arab part of Palestine is split into two parts under three area commanders. Samaria is controlled by Fawzi el Kaukji, one of the leaders of the 1936–39 uprising who was in Berlin with the Mufti during the war, but came back bitter against the Mufti. The anti-Mufti forces, whose stronghold was in the Arab cities of Samaria, have rallied behind el Kaukji.

In the rest of the Arab country, there are two area commanders, both lieutenants of the Mufti—Abdel Kader el Husseini in Jerusalem and Hassan Salameh in Jaffa. Salameh was a German parachutist during the war and was dropped by plane in Palestine late in 1945.

In the Jewish area, virtually all governmental services, including police stations and police, have been taken over by the Jews, who now have effective control not only in the thickly settled areas of the coastal plain and the Emek, but in the Negev as well.

The major threat to the Jewish state, which was a going concern weeks before its provisional proclamation last week, lies not so much in the Arabs as in the British troops.

Most of the British troops have been withdrawn from the Arab areas and most of them are concentrated in the Jewish areas.

Were the UN Assembly to reverse its decision on partition and were the British to assume the trusteeship proffered them by the United States of America, these troops would be available for action, i. e., for war, against the Jewish state.

The actual situation is thus pretty much as planned by the British months ago. The Arabs are free to bring in volunteers, the British forces have been concentrated in the Jewish areas, the Jewish state is blockaded from the sea by the British Navy and "blockaded" in another sense also by the American arms embargo.

Partition is in effect, but under circumstances which have given the Arabs freedom to prepare for war while Jewish resistance is being hamstrung by Anglo-American policy.

Should the British withdraw their troops as promised and end their naval blockade of the Jewish seacoast, the UN would be unable to impose a trusteeship on Jewish Palestine without organizing an international force or obtaining American troops to make war on the Jewish community there.

Partition exists, though under circumstances arranged by Anglo-American policy to favor the Arabs against the Jews. It can no longer be ended by statements from the White House or reversals at Lake Success.

The only hope today of the enemies of Jewish Palestine is to stall along, to continue the British naval blockade and the American arms embargo, and to stir up the Arabs for a mass attack after May 15 on the Jewish area.

Anglo-American policy today is not aimed to conciliate the Arabs. Its aim is to use the Arabs to crush the Jews as quickly as possible, if possible. Its real, though not its declared aim, is to liquidate the Yishuv, to reverse partition in blood.

The fumblings and mumblings at the White House are not as idiotic as they appear to be. They are desperate efforts to play for time while hoping for Arab victory.

[From the New York PM of March 26, 1948]

LOOK AT THE RECORD AND WEEP

He is for partition. He is against partition. He is for trusteeship because it won't need enforcement. He is for trusteeship with British enforcement. He is for trusteeship with American enforcement but without American troops, or maybe with. He is for UN, but he is against what UN decides. He is for truce; but he is against partition which would bring a Jewish truce, and he will not say that he is for an Arab state which would bring an Arab truce.

HINDSIGHT AND FORESIGHT

Asked why the United States of America supported partition originally, he says that a schoolboy's hindsight is better than a President's foresight. If this means anything, it means he thinks the United States of America should never have supported partition. But apparently he has no more faith in the schoolboy's hindsight than in his own foresight, for in the next breath he insists the United States of America is still for partition.

He is the master logician. Consider: He wants Jews and Arabs to agree. For 25 years, while the British have been in Palestine, the Jews and Arabs have failed to agree. Ergo, says he, the British must stay on in Palestine.

WHAT THE CHARTER PROVIDES

He is an eminent international jurist. He says: "We have explored every possibility consistent with the basic principles of the UN Charter for giving effect to partition. Unfortunately, it has become clear that the partition plan cannot be carried out at this time by peaceful means."

Has he read the UN Charter? Article 41 of chapter VII says:

"The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions. * * * These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communications and the severance of diplomatic relations."

Has the United States of America tried any of these peaceful means? Yes, but not against the Arabs. Only against the Jews. For what else is the United States embargo on arms to the Jews but an "interruption * * * of communications"?

He is the world's greatest physicist, specializing in vacuums. He says: "Trusteeship is not proposed as a substitute for the partition plan, but as an effort to fill the vacuum soon to be created by the termination of the (British) mandate on May 15."

Fill the vacuum with what? A pencil-fiddling trusteeship commission which will stop violence by shaking its collective head and saying: "Naughty! Naughty!" Or an army? If an army, which army? The UN army which couldn't be formed to enforce partition? The United States Army which couldn't be sent to implement partition on "both Charter grounds and as a matter of national policy"? The British Army? But supposing, for once, the British mean what they say, and withdraw their army?

IS UNITED STATES POLICY PRONATURE?

Well, you can always fill Palestine with nature. The nature which abhors a vacuum. Is this United States policy on Palestine pronature? or nudism? or rosicrucianism? or the transmogrification of the incarnate?

He is the great peacemaker, the shedder of sweetness and light: "I have instructed Ambassador Austin to urge upon the Security Council in the strongest terms that representatives of the Arabs and Jews be called at once to the Council table to arrange such a truce."

TALKING TRUCE OVER AND OVER

Truce, it's wonderful. For the last 3 weeks United States delegates have been talking truce to the Arabs and Jews: in United States delegation headquarters at 2 Park Avenue, at French delegation headquarters, at 4 East Seventy-ninth Street, at Chinese delegation headquarters at 350 Fifth Avenue. Also, on previous occasions, in the General Assembly, in the committee room of the ad hoc Committee on Palestine, and in the delegates' lounge at Lake Success. Also, still earlier, a UN commission talked truce to Arabs and Jews in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Jaffa, Hebron, Nablus, and almost every other corner of the Holy Land as well as in Beirut, Lebanon.

Truce, it's wonderful. The Jews have said: "By all means truce, if you give us the partition UN has promised us." The Arabs have said: "By all means truce, if you throw partition out of the window." They said that before the President's statement yesterday, and they have said it again since—in New York, in Beirut, in Cairo, in Jerusalem, in Tel Aviv, in Nablus, in Hebron, in Damascus, and at Lake Success.

Must they say it again in the Security Council? Is the President really disinclined to believe anything unless it is uttered in the sacred chamber of that august body? What a place to look for truth.

Mumble-jumble, the voodoo incantations of a man who wants desperately to succeed, and is desperately afraid he can't even succeed himself. That's how he talks. What is he really thinking?

Whatever it is that the President is thinking, I know what western European diplomats at Lake Success are thinking. They are thinking: Here is the great country, which promises us help against 500 divisions of the Soviet Union, reduced to driveling impotency by a couple of thousand Arabs brandishing small arms.

VICTOR H. BERNSTEIN.

Peace or War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include herein a radio address I made over Station WMEX, Boston:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, March 17 was the day on which the mounting tensions of this postwar period exploded in stark fear and, like a chain reaction, a wave akin to hysteria swept the country.

Secretary of State Marshall had prepared the way by stating that the international situation was grave and cautioning us to keep our heads and face the facts without passion.

President Truman summoned a special joint session of Congress at which he branded Soviet Russia as an aggressor and recommended such measures as the draft and universal military training, both of which spelled crisis.

Where is this course leading us?

Will it firm the wavering peace, or will it spill over into war?

This is the question that worries us with dread apprehension as we face the uncertain future. On the one hand we know that craven appeasement of communism will not work. On the other hand we realize the frightful possibilities of atom warfare and germ warfare which, once set in motion, might endanger all life on our planet.

As free men and women, we must try to find the middle road between these extremes. To do so, we must carefully weigh all of the facts. Through the media of a free press and a free radio, we know some of the details.

Others, unfortunately are hidden in the secret deliberations of our State Department and in the conferences of the military high command.

As a safeguard for our national security, it is well that a potential enemy does not have access to certain scientific information which he could turn against us.

Aside from this, however, the people of a nation such as ours have the right to know what our foreign policy is. The American people can be counted on to make the right decision if they share the special sources of information which are available to their Government.

At the present time we are not being told all that is going on. I maintain that this is not helping ourselves or the world to find a solution to this crisis.

But the crisis is at hand, and we must examine those facts that we have.

Toward the close of World War II the hearts of all people were lifted with joy and hope as delegates from all over the world gathered at San Francisco to establish the organization known as the United Nations.

Here was the way to solve the problem of war in a family spirit, each nation, in spite of differences with others, recognizing the common bond of interdependence.

As the UN was organized the Big Five nations—China, France, Britain, Soviet Russia, and the United States—reserved to themselves the right of veto. At the time it was believed that the veto would be used sparingly and with due regard for the rights of others. However, Soviet Russia has seen fit to use it twenty-odd times to reject any measure which affected her interests in the slightest degree.

As a result, the unrestricted use of the veto has paralyzed any effective action on the part of the UN. For this we are partly to blame. Our delegates have not pressed vigorously for a limitation of this power.

Today the UN is on the sidelines, unable to cope with aggression and failing in its duty to preserve the peace. The hour is late and the crisis will not wait for the shadow-boxing and hair-splitting procedures of the diplomats at the UN, but peace-loving people demand that the delegates at the UN work morning, noon, and night to streamline the UN and make of it a working organization that will save the world from the disaster of another war.

Perhaps it is too late to look for any constructive action from that direction. On April 18 the people of Italy will decide at the polls whether their nation shall go Communist or preserve its Christian democracy. There is even a possibility that the Communists, if they sense defeat, may seize control of the Government by fraud or treachery before that time.

Why are the elections in Italy so important? Largely because of its geographical position controlling the Mediterranean. If Italy goes, all our efforts to strengthen Greece and Turkey will be wasted, for these nations will be outflanked. Our communications with the great oil reserves of the Middle East, will be cut off. France, being a next-door neighbor of Italy, will feel the Communist pressure.

One at a time, by outside force and local intimidation, Russia has taken over the nations of central Europe, gaining in strength by each conquest. The tragic suicide of Jan Masaryk, Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, who believed in freedom as much as we do, but who thought that one could get along with the Russians in the desperate hope that by so doing the peace could be preserved, shocked the world into reality. After his country fell to Communist intrigue, Masaryk was asked to continue in his position.

But he knew that the real motive was to use him as a democratic front to allay the gathering suspicions of the free world. He could not escape, and he would not allow his honored name to be used in order to lull the remaining democracies into the belief that some shred of freedom remained in his beloved country.

What he could not say in warning to the world, he tried to convey by taking his own life. Such is the bitter experience of freemen who are caught in the web of Communist treachery. Jan Masaryk, who believed in God and in the dignity of man, could not endure living as a slave to communism. By his unfortunate death, he tried to rouse the world to its peril.

I think that he has succeeded.

After Czechoslovakia comes Finland. Italy is next. Then Scandinavia.

When will liberty-loving nations stand together and say: "Thus far and no more"?

Fear is the weapon by which Red fascism forces the unwilling into line. Fear that the United States is merely sounding off during an election year and is encouraging other nations to fight communism without being there to help them. Fear that Russian expansionism cannot be stopped. The fear, spread by propaganda, that if they dare vote against the Reds their names will be put upon the black list and that they will disappear as so many millions have disappeared, never to return to home and family.

People who are destitute and afraid need help and encouragement.

Through the billions we are appropriating for European recovery, 16 free nations will receive the material assistance which will rescue them from poverty and despair.

It will get them going again as self-supporting members of the family of nations. It will help to build their morale and their unity to resist Communist pressures. By their own hands, with the tools we give them, they will be encouraged to build a far better life than that which the Red tyranny would force upon them.

The only condition we attach to the material aid we are giving, is that the participating nations do everything in their own power to help themselves.

Their response is most enccuraging.

In nine historic days at Brussels, the representatives of England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg got together in a pact unprecedented in the history of Europe. The union they set up provides for automatic mutual assistance if any member is attacked, for close coordination of the five nations' economic systems and for standardization of such social services as old-age pensions and unemployment compensation.

France and Italy are working on a customs union. The 16 Marshall-plan nations are conferring on cooperative self-help measures. Western Germany will have a position on the team.

The significance of these moves is that it will dissolve the artificial barriers among these nations and, similar to the free flow of trade and commerce among our 48 States, will stimulate economic development.

There is every reason to believe that Russia fears the success of the Marshall plan. She has declared that she will do everything in her power to sabotage it.

The misery and the stagnation of present-day Europe provide a fertile breeding ground for communism. If Europe is permitted to recover, to become prosperous and happy, the Reds will have lost their most favorable opportunity. Perhaps there are some men in the Kremlin who are urging Stalin to seize control before the transfusion of the Marshall plan revives prostrate Europe.

If the Soviets should take this course, dollars alone would not stop them. The United States, Great Britain, and France have not the military forces in Europe to bar their way. The Russians know this. Therefore, we should back up the Marshall-plan countries with specific military guaranties in the event that any one of them is attacked and calls upon us for help. This is the realism that the Reds understand.

There are a few people in Washington who believe that we should start a preventive war on the theory that it would be easier to solve the problem now than 10 years from now, when Russia would be stronger.

Such a proposal is indefensible. It is a repudiation of all our moral beliefs. Even with matters coming to a head in Italy, our Government cannot send troops to interfere in the elections of that country. To do so would label us as aggressors.

We can warn that we shall withhold Marshall-plan aid from those countries which do go Communist, as we have told the people of Italy.

We can evidence our sympathy for the democratic elements by urging that Trieste be returned to Italy, and by recommending that Italy shall participate in the trusteeship of her lost colonies pending final disposition. The American people on their own initiative have sent tremendous quantities of food and clothing to help that impoverished country.

Relatives and friends in the United States have dispatched millions of letters, asking the people of that key Mediterranean nation to reject the Red propaganda.

These various approaches will help, but they may not be enough.

The President's warning to Russia that she must stop her dangerous policy of aggression was good, but I believe that the American people want a more definite idea as to just how we are going to back up that warning.

Such proposals as the draft or universal military training are gestures at best. Russia, with the millions of men under arms, will hardly be impressed by the fact that we are thinking of calling half a million men into service in the months to come.

But if we determine to build an air force which will be second to none, Moscow will stop, look, and listen.

Even better, because time is running out, all available heavy bombers should be sent to bases in our zone of Germany and to bases in north Africa, Greece, Turkey, and Arabia.

Then notify Russia that any further aggression directed against other nations or any meddling with their internal affairs will meet with swift reprisals.

Finally, invite Marshal Stalin to meet President Truman at the conference table in a resolute effort to solve such problems as peace treaties for Germany and Austria, the question of establishing security for all nations, and other points at issue.

The United Nations, which is the last, best hope of mankind, is not yet strong enough to insure the peace.

Meanwhile, the line has been drawn.

Realism on our part and by Russia is the one immediate factor that can prevent the Italian and Scandinavian crises from breaking out in armed clashes that would involve the world.

If we can get by these situations without a war, there will be some hope that the United Nations will grow up to save all of us from self-annihilation.

Lincoln Day Address of Dr. Paul Austin Wolfe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following oration delivered by Dr. Paul Austin Wolfe, of the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club, held February 12, 1948, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City:

Chairman Wadmond, Mr. Hoover, Speaker Martin, Senator Ferguson, distinguished guests, members of the National Republican Club, and friends, it is a privilege and a pleasure to speak to you again on Abraham Lincoln. Whatever way you look at him, he is "profitable company." He is particularly profitable in these days.

Travelers in the desert, their bodies beaten by the winds, their hands baked by the sun, their faces cut by the sharp blasts of sand, find shelter and strength in the shadow of a mighty rock. So it is when Americans turn to Abraham Lincoln. He towers above the flat levels of our day as the Ship Rock towers above the flat wastes of New Mexico. Living in a struggling world, carried to and fro by the drifting sands of war, buffeted by the shifting winds of political ideologies, burdened with the intrigues of international politics, we take advantage of his birthday to recover our bearings and renew our spirits.

Since you met 1 year ago the Lincoln papers in the Library of Congress have been made available. It will be some time before they have been thoroughly examined. But already there has been sufficient scrutiny to declare that the new information will not alter our judgment of the Great Emancipator. The elevation of his character, the dignity of his personality, the discernment of his judgments—these things are all confirmed. Closer acquaintance with Lincoln only heightens his greatness.

The papers, however, lay a fresh responsibility on us. We are under obligation to know him better. The Lincoln student today

must give himself more and more to a thorough study of the man. Tonight I invite you to look at him in the period between March 4, 1861, and July 4, 1861. On March 4 he was inaugurated president. On July 4 he delivered his message to the special session of Congress. In those 4 months the untried and unknown man who became the sixteenth President of the United States demonstrated his genius. The message to the special session of Congress is not the most popular of his State papers. Yet it reveals Lincoln as the master of his craft; he had a firm grasp on history; he was willing to make decisions; he was tactful in his handling of men and issues; he had an unconquerable faith in the common man; he was a mature statesman.

Often we have been told that Lincoln matured in office; we say that he showed an ability to adjust, to meet new conditions; his spirit deepened under the burdens of the Presidency. I am sure all this is true, but it should not blind us to an equally significant truth. Abraham Lincoln not only grew, he was; he had that within him which was cast, not molded. From the beginning greatness was in him. William G. Green, Jr., who had known Lincoln on a flat boat in 1830 remarked: Lincoln "was as great when a surveyor or flat boat man, in his circle, as he is now (1860) in a higher one." John Stuart, his first law partner, commented on Lincoln that he "is always studying into the nature of things." That was Lincoln, Lincoln in 1830 and Lincoln in 1860. "Studying into the nature of things." From that study and its discipline came his character, his insight, his elevation. When he became President of the United States, greatness was already part of him.

March 4, 1861, was an uncertain time. No one had known whether the inauguration would be permitted to take place. General Scott felt responsible for taking every precaution. Sharpshooters were placed on every public building. Cannon faced the crowd that listened to the inaugural address. Feeling ran high. Seven States had already seceded and formed the Confederacy. No one knew whether other States could be held in the Union. Would Virginia secede? Would the border States secede? Would the entire Union fall to pieces? It was a time of rumor and alarm. Each day seemed to bring a new crisis.

The day of the inauguration the crisis centered on Seward and the Cabinet. Could Lincoln form his own Cabinet, "a Cabinet of all the talents"? Or was one element in his party to dominate him and control his administration? The next day came the information on Fort Sumter. That fort in Charleston harbor was beseiged by Confederate artillery seized from the Federal Government. Ten cannon were trained on the fort for every cannon inside it. Provisions would last for little more than 2 weeks. Should the Federal Government hoist the white flag and surrender? Or should the Government attempt to retain the fort and reinforce it? Within 6 weeks Fort Sumter fell; the first blood had been spilt and the Civil War was on.

On April 15 came the call for the Militia. The people must defend the Union; they must defend Washington as soon as possible. For almost 2 weeks the Capital City was in a state of siege. Troops could not get through from the north. Baltimore prevented the passage of trains and the State of Maryland objected to Union soldiers landing on her shores. (This is the first year Maryland has officially recognized the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.) Telegraph lines were cut. Information was hard to get. In Washington, Government officials anxiously scanned the Virginia hills across the Potomac. Would Confederate cavalry come out of those hills across the long bridge and occupy Washington before the Union troops arrived?

On April 25 the Union troops did get through. With that crisis past came new crises and the need for emergency measures. Congress was not in session. The Executive had to act. Baltimore had to be made safe for Union troops. The Government could not live with a pistol held permanently at its back. There was the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. Shortly thereafter came the first serious repercussions from abroad. Seward drafted a note to England. If it had gone as written, it would have seriously impaired our relations with that country; it might have involved us in war.

And running through all these crises there was the constant responsibility for expanding the Army and the Navy. On the day of the inauguration there were 653 Federal soldiers to defend Washington. General Winfield Scott, the commanding officer, was old and physically so incapacitated that he got around Washington with difficulty even in a carriage. Lee was offered the command, but Lee refused it and withdrew to head the opposition in Virginia. One-third of the officers of the Army went over to the Confederacy. New officers had to be found and appointed. The Nation had to gird itself for war.

At the conclusion of this period Lincoln had to face a new and untried Congress and present his measures for the defense of the Nation.

What stands out in these months is not the perfection of Abraham Lincoln, but his imperturbable strength. Errors there might have been and probably would be; but in Abraham Lincoln the country had something to which the Government and the Union could cling. On July 4, 1861, the crisis was not over and the Union was not yet saved. Long years of war and hardship were yet to be endured. But the groundwork for a successful war had been laid; the foundations on which the defense of the Union could be erected had been put in place. Because the foundations were sure the future was full of hope.

What were some of the characteristics which Abraham Lincoln demonstrated during this period?

First of all there was his willingness to make decisions, if necessary, to make them alone. Lincoln demonstrated that he knew how to be a vigorous leader of a democracy; he was willing to assume responsibility; he was willing to act with or without the approval of his colleagues.

The first illustration of it is Fort Sumter. The surrender of Fort Sumter was demanded. What should be done? Should the Union submit? Would such submission keep the peace, avoid bloodshed, appease the Confederacy? Lincoln put the question to his Cabinet at its meeting on March 15. Wisely he asked the members to give their opinions in writing. Five members, including Seward, urged appeasement; evacuate the fort. Two members, Chase and Blair, said hold on to it. Lincoln was inclined to agree with the minority. But he did not act hastily. He sent Gustavus Fox to visit Fort Sumter and bring back information as to its actual condition. He sent a friend from Illinois, Mr. Hurlburt, to Charleston, S. C., to discover if there was any Union sentiment which would respond to appeasement. It was characteristic of a man interested in the nature of things to get all the information he could.

On March 28 at the close of the first state dinner, he called a special meeting of his Cabinet. He presented to them a memorandum received that evening from General Scott. General Scott asserted that it would be impossible to reinforce Fort Sumter and he suggested that it might soothe feelings if the Federal troops withdrew gracefully. At noon the next day there was a Cabinet meeting to reconsider the entire situation. This time the vote stood three for evacuation and three for reinforcement. When the meeting was over Lincoln wrote out his own memorandum to the Secretary of War to prepare an expedition to sail April 6 for the reprovisioning of the fort. Before this expedition arrived the Confederates had fired upon the fort and it had fallen. Lincoln did not use force until force was forced upon him.

History has confirmed the judgment of Abraham Lincoln. In the South there was no sentiment to rally to the Union. Indeed there was the belief that the North was cowardly and afraid; it would not fight. The issues of the Civil War could not be settled by appeasement. The Union could not be saved by a surrender of fundamental authority. Lincoln was willing to go ahead of the crowd and act alone.

A similar decision was made in regard to Baltimore. A United States citizen had been arrested for enlisting soldiers in the Confederate Army. He was imprisoned at Fort McHenry without due process of law. Chief Justice Taney, living in Baltimore, issued a writ of habeas corpus. The commanding general refused to recognize the writ. Justice Taney gave his opinion and directed that it be laid before the President that he might uphold his constitutional duty and enforce the law; the President had no authority to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

If Lincoln received that opinion, he did not heed it. The military continued to act in the city of Baltimore. But in his message to the special session of Congress Lincoln reviewed his acts and gave his reasons for so acting. His arguments were that the Constitution provided that in an emergency the writ could be suspended. We were now in such an emergency. The Constitution did not provide who should suspend it. Common sense indicated that it was the President and not the Congress that must act in an emergency. He had so acted. If Congress wished to pass further legislation, the matter was before it.

All this was typical of Lincoln. If he had violated the letter of the law, he had not violated its spirit. The acts of the Executive were subject to perusal by the representatives of the people. A question had arisen: Must the President be restrained from violating one law, when such restraint might mean his inability to enforce all law? Lincoln's answer was the practical one: There are emergencies when the preservation of freedom requires immediate action. Lincoln believed our Constitution gave the Executive sufficient power to act. He had acted.

There was a second characteristic revealed in these months. Lincoln demonstrated his ability to handle men. No better illustration of it can be given than in his dealings with William H. Seward.

Seward had been the Governor of the State of New York. For 8 years he had been United States Senator. He was the foremost leader in the Republican Party. At Chicago he had been the most prominent candidate for the nomination for the Presidency. Between the election in November and the inauguration in March, Seward had emerged as the leading figure in Washington, perhaps the leading figure in the Nation. Some men believed that he, single handed, had held the National Government together. When Seward spoke in the Senate on January 12, 1861, the galleries were crowded as in the great days of Webster and Calhoun. Seward actually believed that the fate of the Nation hung on him.

Abraham Lincoln needed William H. Seward in his Cabinet. He needed him for his party leadership, for his quick mind, for his influence and position in the country. In December 1860 he offered him the post of Secretary of State. Seward accepted and assumed that he would be the leading figure in the new administration; the new President would be putty in his hands, yielding to his mature and experienced judgment.

Abraham Lincoln, however, was not the kind of man to be putty in anybody's hands. He proceeded to arrange his own Cabinet and to include in it the men he believed could best meet the needs of the time; he included Chase and Blair and Wells, all of them former Democrats. Mr. Seward and his New York Republican associates were astonished. Two days before the inauguration Seward called on Lincoln. He indicated that if Chase were included in the Cabinet, he, Seward, would have to remain out of it. Lincoln begged him to consider further. The day before the inauguration a New York delegation called on Lincoln. Evidently the delegation had talked with Seward. Its advice was "Do not include Chase." Lincoln listened and then spoke. He spoke slowly, almost apologetically. He was sorry there was so much conflict of opinion. He did not want to revise the Cabinet list which he had selected, but if it had to be done, he was willing to suggest the following changes. The delegation leaned forward. Lincoln proceeded to read the names of Chase, Secretary of the Treasury; William L. Dayton, of New Jersey, Secretary of State (of course New Jersey was not New York, but it was near New York and New York men ought not to mind); Seward, Ambassador to England. Within a few moments the New York delegation departed. You can guess where they went. Within a few hours there came an ultimatum from Seward. He asked leave to withdraw his consent to accept the office of Secretary of State in Lincoln's Cabinet. It was the day before the inauguration.

I do not imagine Lincoln slept much that night. Among many other things William H. Seward was on his mind. Should he yield to Seward? Should he exclude Chase from his Cabinet and thereby make Seward its head, and the virtual head of his administration? Or should he remain firm, not yield, and thereby deprive the Nation of the services of one of its ablest men?

On the morning of his inauguration Lincoln sent his own ultimatum to Seward. It wasn't phrased that way. It was conciliatory, but there was a date line in it. Lincoln asked Seward to countermand the withdrawal. He told him that the country needed him and that he wanted him. He asked him to answer by 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. After the inauguration Mr. Seward and Mr. Lincoln had a walk together. Before 9 o'clock the following day Seward's acceptance was received. Lincoln had won the first round. He was to be the head of his own Government.

Do not imagine, however, that Seward had learned his lesson. Throughout the discussions on Fort Sumter, throughout the first 12 weeks of the administration, Mr. Seward was confident that he and he alone knew what would save the Nation. In the past he had spoken of the irrepressible conflict. Now he was all for compromise and appeasement; slavery need not be an element of strife; let us call a convention and revise the Constitution. The enemies of Seward still think that he seriously embarrassed Lincoln in regard to the reprovisioning of Fort Sumter. On April 1 he presented Lincoln with an amazing document, offering to take the responsibilities of the Government off his hands. He said that for 30 days the United States had had no policy; it was time to get one; Seward offered his services and proposed that one of the first things the Nation should do was to prepare to fight a foreign war; in a foreign war all the States would forget their differences and join against a common enemy.

Looking back it seems almost unbelievable. It must have seemed so to Seward, too, when he looked back to those early days of April 1861. Yet Lincoln replied courteously and firmly. He called attention to what the policy was, that it had been discussed by the Cabinet, that it would continue to be discussed by the Cabinet before changes were made. Still later there was Seward's note to England. It was a sharp, harsh, insulting note, seeming almost to have the deliberate purpose of provoking a war. Lincoln took his pen in hand and went over it patiently; he went over it word by word; he changed this word and softened that. And when the final corrections were made then he approved the note and it was sent.

At long last Seward began to catch on. In this tall, ungainly figure of a man who was President of the United States there was something that was different; there was some inner light, some strength of heart and soul, some turning of the mind to truth, that was irresistible. Slowly Seward learned: Old Abe wasn't a fool. And then for 4 years he served both Lincoln and his country faithfully.

I do not know how to characterize Lincoln. You do it. He was a humble man, a meek man, a teachable man. And yet, with it all, he was firm and controlling. He molded men and events. They didn't mold him. He was a big man. The Nation needs a big man for President.

Again throughout these months Abraham Lincoln revealed his sense of history; he believed freedom was the inevitable goal of history.

Lincoln was confronted with a fact—secession. The Southern States justified their secession on the ground that the right to secede had not only been reserved to the sovereign States in the Constitution, but the right was implicit in any doctrine of freedom: when men do not like a government they are free to withdraw and form another government more to their liking.

Was there a historical answer to the fact of secession? Both in his inaugural address and in his message to the special session of Congress Lincoln touched on history. Unlike the French philosophers and modern revolutionists, Lincoln's political reasoning was not based on guesswork or philosophical speculation about human freedom and human welfare; it was based on history. What had made man free? What had promoted human welfare? He was acquainted with the Continental Assembly of 1774, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Federal Constitution. The answer of history to the current facts was clear. "There were never States outside of the Union." The Colonies were first referred to as States in the Declaration of Independence. That was a united declaration; men from the Colonies pledged themselves to joint action. The Union is older than the States. The Union procures our independence and our liberty.

We cannot overemphasize this historical sense of Abraham Lincoln. His chief convictions were derived not from theories about how men should act, or how men might act; they were derived from a study of how men had acted. He was thus able to combine the ideal and the practical. He could be a statesman, not merely a politician. His belief in freedom was rooted in the Declaration of Independence. His belief in progress rested on the Constitution. The condition of progress is freedom. The condition of freedom is the Union. The condition of the Union is the Constitution. The freedom and welfare of the common man are preserved not by far-flung schemes of social betterment, but by the orderly processes of free democratic government.

This historical sense is extremely pertinent for us. We, too, are in the time of confusion. If you read our magazines, our newspapers, our columnists, you will be informed that there is a great fear, a lack of confidence throughout the Nation; this fear is due to the threat to civil liberties; orderly constitutional processes are inadequate; we are a democracy in name only; therefore men are afraid.

Would it not be wise for us to look into history for the answers to our confusions? It is true that civil rights are far from perfect in this Nation. But it is also true that there has never been a time when there was less danger of their abridgement. In 1900 there were 130 lynchings in America. In 1947 there was one lynching. The record is not clean, but the record shows progress. The record shows that there is no need to destroy the constitutional balance between the powers of the States and the Federal Government.

The record shows more; it shows that the fear through the Nation today is not fear for civil liberties. Lloyd Morris in his Postscript to Yesterday, said that in 1896 we, as a nation, were unafraid, we had confidence, we believed in ourselves and in our future. Fifty years later that confidence has vanished. Yet during those 50 years our civil liberties had increased. Why then are we now afraid?

Perhaps history, too, can give us the answer. To Lincoln, and to Americans up to the twentieth century, history revealed the orderly and slow growth of human freedom. Progress meant not a break with the past, but a fulfillment of the past; freedom broadening down from precedent to precedent; and reaching out to nation after nation. As the Declaration of Independence phrased it giving "liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world."

I do not know when this concept of history died. I do know that it is no longer taught in our schools and it has ceased to be the driving power in national policy. Sometime during the last 40 years our ideas of freedom, the rights of man, the Declaration of Independence, the dignity of the individual—all of these concepts have been diluted with the ideas of class warfare, the rights of pressure groups, a collective society, state socialism. And out of the dilution has come not hope, but despair; not faith in the orderly progress of men, but fear lest the deluge be upon us. In our generation history has become the revelation of catastrophe. Catastrophe is inevitable. There is nothing we can do about it. Liberty must die. Freedom must go. Government planning, state socialism, some forms of totalitarianism—these are the next steps in historical development.

Is it not clear why modern man is afraid? He is filled with alarm for the safety of his social and political institutions. In Europe those institutions have all but been destroyed. Everywhere social gains and social welfare have been given precedence over the rights of freemen. In the name of social gains the currency and credit have been seized by the State; in the name of social gains trade has been directed and regulated by the State; in the name of social gains prices have been controlled by the State. One control has led to another control until at last the State has had to ration housing, clothing, food. And what is the consequence? More and more controls by Government have led to less and less goods for the common man. Instead of the promised abundance, there is the ration card. Instead of freedom from want there are long lines of helpless people waiting patiently, trusting some omnipotent state will fill their empty market baskets. Instead of freedom from fear there is humanity on the verge of despair.

Two weeks ago, before a committee of the United States Senate Bernard Baruch said, "We have been attempting to repair the devastation of the costliest war in history almost entirely through Government loans and Government institutions. The results have been of pigmy proportions. Let us call into action the giant energies of aspiring and perspiring peoples everywhere."

The energies of the people! But if those energies are to be evoked, the people must be free. Yet everywhere people are ringed around by barriers, barriers to trade, barriers to production, barriers to thought, barriers to freedom. Let one attempt to destroy these

barriers and he is told that these barriers are the compulsions of history.

The strength of communism does not lie in its party organization, its cells, the number of its adherents. Its strength lies in the atmosphere with which the teaching of history has already been surrounded in our schools and colleges. "Etwass muss geschehen!" "Etwass muss geschehen!" "Something must happen!" This was the cry of the National Socialists in Germany. It is the cry of every group looking for the dissolution of a political order. The deluge is at hand! Act! Act quickly! Scuttle your past!

It was the strength and glory of Abraham Lincoln that he did not renounce his country's history. He was rooted in it. He, too, believed that there was a compulsion to the institutions of democracy. That compulsion tended not to less freedom, but to more; not to revolution and catastrophe, but to an ever enlarging human liberty. The Declaration of Independence affirmed the goal of freedom. It affirmed it not only for this land, but for the people of all lands; not only for this time, but for all future time. It was liberty and liberty alone that "gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of men." For that principle of freedom Lincoln was willing to try to save his country. So great was his devotion to it that he affirmed he would rather be assassinated than surrender it.

But someone says, you do not understand: This is the century of the common man. The common man today is not interested in liberty. He sees the defects of the institutions of liberty; he is "estranged from the systems of democracy and freedom"; he looks with wistful eyes at some form of centralized government and collective planning. The common man today wants security, he wants housing, he wants medical care, he wants education, he wants these things regardless of whether or no they bankrupt his government and destroy his freedom. You cannot rely upon the common man to support freedom.

I can only reply that it is those who thus speak who do not understand the common man. Where communism has entered the world today it has been through treachery and subterfuge, never by a freely given majority vote of the common man. Where socialism has come in it has always come in through a back door, protesting that it really was not socialism, promising abundance at the same time that it supplied ration cards. Nowhere have the common people of the world consciously and deliberately deprived themselves of liberty.

Abraham Lincoln had faith that they never would. Lincoln's faith in the common man shines like a beacon in the dark and uncertain days of the first 4 months of his administration. For a time, that faith had to be content to be merely a faith. Events, then as now, seemed to belie it. In March 1861, the people did not know what they wanted; they seemed listless, unconcerned, indifferent. "The desire for peace; the hope of compromise, disbelief * * * and, strangest of all, a certain national lethargy seemed utterly impossible to account for. * * * All seemed to mark a decadence of patriotic feeling." Public men were willing to "abandon constitutional landmarks and sacrifice elementary rights." There were abundant grounds for despair. (Vol. III, p. 441, Nicolay and Hay.)

Lincoln, however, did not lose hope. He believed and he affirmed that liberty was the concern of the common man. "This was essentially a people's contest—a struggle to maintain that form of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men, to lift artificial weights from all shoulders, to clear the paths of laudable pursuits for all, to afford an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race of life." Whatever the defects of free government, he did not doubt its successors. "The free institutions we have enjoyed have developed the powers and improved the condition of our whole people beyond any example in the world." Lincoln affirmed that the common man understood this. He had faith that, when "confronted with the question whether discontented individuals too few in number to control administration * * * could arbitrarily without any pretense * * * put an end to free government," the common man would act.

That faith of Lincoln was more than confirmed. In the hour of national trial, the people stood firm. While many officers resigned from the Army and withdrew to the opposition, "not one common soldier or common sailor deserted his flag." Not only that, but, when the call went out for men to defend liberty, almost over night the people responded. For the first time in history an army of 400,000 men was created, not one of whom was there but of his own free will out of devotion to freedom. Lincoln saw it all and read its meaning clearly. "This, he said, "is the patriotic instinct of the plain people. They understand without an argument that the destroying of the Government founded by Washington means no good to them."

No wonder Lincoln could lead a democracy. He perceived that its strength actually lies in the common man. It is not a material strength, a strength of numbers; it is a moral strength, the conscience and hopes of humanity. As the compass needle responds to the magnetic pole so the hearts of men respond to truth and right and freedom. Trusting the plain people, Lincoln was close to them, he talked their language; he was bold to tell them the truth. He believed that the people can understand.

Do you believe it? Why, then, do you not arm yourselves with Lincoln's faith? Why do you not set yourselves without reservation, without thought of personal ambition or political preferment to speak to the hearts of the American people, to tell them the truth? Tell them we don't live in a safe world or a secure world. Tell them security is for the dead. Tell them liberty is fighting for its life. Tell them this Nation must be strong or the battle will be lost. Tell them the first requirement of strength is faith in freedom, belief again that it is the goal of history, belief again that only with freedom and under freedom can there be sure and steady progress. Tell them that the second requirement of strength for our Nation is economy, then more economy, and then still more economy. "Overhanging everything," said Mr. Baruch, "is the national debt. It pressures for inflation. It imperils our national security. In the event of a future emergency our national debt might paralyze us. A nation that has destroyed its national credit has no recourse other than regimentation."

But do not limit yourselves to the freedom and the economy needed on the home front. Bring to the people the truth from abroad. Tell them that if liberty is to survive, it needs every friend and ally it can find anywhere in the world. Tell them these allies must be strong; they must have food; they must have machines; they must have dollars. But, tell them more than that. Tell them they must have our faith. Do not mislead the common man into believing that dollars alone can save the world. They can't. No amount of money can revive the sick nations of Europe and Asia unless somewhere we can revive their hearts and their spirits. Ultimately it is the common man of England, of France, of Germany, who must rise to the defense of his own freedom. He must be willing to fight against communism for the preservation of his own dignity.

Finally, tell them that common men who love liberty belong together. They must stand together, united peoples, united nations, in a free and peaceful world. Liberty and union are one and inseparable, now and forever.

"Having thus chosen our course, without guile and with pure purpose, let us renew our trust in God and go forward without fear and with manly hearts."

Displaced Persons in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine of Sunday, March 28, carried an exceptionally fine article entitled "DP's in America: 'We Have Become Alive,'" written by Gertrude Samuels. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DP'S IN AMERICA: "WE HAVE BECOME ALIVE"

(By Gertrude Samuels)

It is just a year since I returned from a visit to the displaced persons camps of Germany, on a boat bound for the United States with refugees and war orphans. Behind them lay all the misery and uncertainty of two eras—the Hitler war era of concentration and slave labor camps and common graves; and the postwar era of makeshift DP and children's centers. Before them lay America.

And they looked to America as though to a miracle—with the emotion born of miracles—unable to believe it could come true. There was hardly one among them from the teenage children who had lost every precious thing in life, to the quiet, sturdy men and women of many nations—Poles Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians, Yugoslavs—who did not believe that life could be good again. Yet, as they neared the new horizon, the questions in their minds were: How would they fit into American life? What would their contribution be? Above all, would Americans accept them—into their homes, their communities, and their hearts?

Now I have seen and heard the answers to these questions.

I have gone into the neighborhoods where DP's of a year ago have made homes and found jobs. I have gone into the schools where they are learning the new language; have spoken to their employers, neighbors, social workers who helped them, and their teachers. And I have met again some of the children with whom I sailed from Germany, who, like the adult DP's, have been dispersed to 32 States of the country.

And the picture they make is itself miraculous. Because I had seen something of their earnestness before they landed in America, I had expected some assimilation. What I had not guessed was the extent to which this could be accomplished in a few brief months. And equally surprising was the natural ease and simple friendliness with which Americans have warmed to the former DP's. As one new immigrant put it, with the poetical flourish his English has taken: "When we came many of the people helped us. And yet these people knew us not. For the first time we have become alive."

What this means—to "become alive"—is illustrated by two kinds of resettlement

which have taken place: one of a Polish family group of the Greek Orthodox faith in Chicago; the other of a Jewish war orphan in Buffalo, N. Y.

The Moralski family (that is not their real name; they asked that it be withheld) settled in Chicago's "little Poland" district. On the second floor of a small two-story house live Victor Moralski, slight and grave, looking 10 years older than his 31 years; his wife, Ludmilla, and their son, George, now 2, who was born in Heidelberg. To understand the gratitude and stoicism with which they have adapted to their new life, one must see it in the context of their old experiences.

Victor was a graduate engineer of the Techniczna School of Brzesc, Poland. He is a linguist who speaks and understands six languages, and also the "language" of the underground. When Poland was overrun in 1939 the Arbeitsamt (German Labor Office) drafted him and other engineers into road planning at Radomsk; when the Germans began to ship technical workers into Germany he went into first-aid work in a Polish hospital to avoid that draft and remain with the Armia Podziemna, the Polish underground. A member of one of the thousands of "cells" which took orders from Warsaw, he helped to sabotage munitions factories and trains, and distribute underground papers.

In 1943 the Gestapo jailed him, his parents and a brother, and killed another brother on the doorstep of their house as he was entering. After 3 days of questioning, Victor was sent in a transport of thousands to Grosz-Rosen concentration camp, where he became a number, working from 4 a. m. to 11 p. m. at a Mercedes-Benz factory, living on bread and soup, listening at night to the dying who sank under the heavy work, lack of food, and the beatings.

Finally, as the Russians neared Poland, all who could stand were sent to Dachau. Victor was kept behind to care for the sick. "Then, on the 5th of April 1945, I remember, I have in my eyes this wonderful picture, the American tanks forced the German soldiers out of the forest and cleaned them up."

Victor was sent then, as medical aide, to Osterburken, later to the Mossbach DP camp, working with UNRRA, where he first met Ludmilla. After their marriage, they transferred to the Aglasterhausen children's center near Heidelberg to help heal the broken bodies and minds of children.

Ludmilla's history—and that of her family—differs from Victor's only in degree. A graduate doctor of medicine of Belgrade University, Ludmilla was forced into a slave-labor camp near Berlin, doing a mechanic's work. Discovering her medical and linguistic abilities—she speaks seven languages—the Nazis changed her status to doctor in partial charge of a factory hospital.

Her father, Nikolaj Staragow, an electrical engineer who had fled from Russia to Yugoslavia in 1920, had refused to fight the Yugoslav partisans and was deported with his family to the same work camp. After the Third and Seventh American Armies liberated the Staragows, they were sent to Mossbach DP camp, where Ludmilla was a doctor with UNRRA.

Eleven months ago the Moralskis arrived from the DP camps with all their worldly possessions on their backs and in one suitcase, and with $14 from the American Christian Refugee Committee, which had paid their way over. They had asked in New York to settle in Chicago, because, though they had no American relatives or friends, they had a DP friend, a Jewish doctor who had worked with them at Aglasterhausen.

Within 3 weeks after arriving in Chicago, with the help of Church World Service and the United Charities of Chicago, the Moralskis had a home and Victor a job. Victor was told that the owner of a carpentry shop needed a helper. Would he be willing to learn a new trade until he mastered English—learn to make restaurant fixtures, drop ceilings, do upholstery? There were rooms above the shop which, though uninhabitated for years, could be made into living quarters for his family. Victor was willing.

He moved his wife and child into the shabby-looking building. For the first week, lacking furniture and bedclothes and refusing help, they slept on the floor. "But is all right," Victor adds calmly in recalling this. "We have slept on the earth and forests. This was like heaven." He joined the carpenters' union, bought furniture on the installment plan, painted and wall-papered the rooms, put a boiler in the crude bathroom, and made electrical installations.

A few months later, the Church World Service brought Ludmilla's parents and younger sister and brother—the Staragows—out of the DP camps and reunited the family in the eight rooms which Victor refashioned.

Today their lives are an amazing contrast to their former existences. Their home exudes the new spirit. The modernistic furniture, the flowered linoleum on the floors, the wonderful mixture of wall decorations ranging from holy pictures and concentration camp scenes to a picture of Roy Rogers and his horse Trigger, the work boots drying out above the stove, the spotless cleanliness of it all—reflect a family that has settled down.

And the hot tea and pirozhniks (sugar cakes) for the visitor ("When we bake to home it costs not so much"), the Sunday visits with their friends from the Aglasterhausen, their family songfests and the long evening hours of study (the Polish-English dictionary is a living room fixture)—reflect natures that are clearly outgoing, eager for friendship, intense "about being Americans."

As their grocer next door artlessly summed up their home life: "You know, this is typical for Slavs. They are good people. We have seen how friendship and good-will moves them. And they pay cash for everything."

Another symbol of integration is their work. In addition to being physically healthy (all DP's must undergo mental, physical, literacy and counter-intelligence tests before emigrating), the Moralskis and Staragows take working for granted.

Victor has his carpentry work in the shop below, where his employer says he works even too hard. The Moralskis have 5 years in which to pay back the $490 transportation costs to the welfare agency. "But," says Victor with his calm assurance, "it will all be paid by next year." He often earns $100 a week, has paid off $420 on the furniture, and sends 40-pound packages of food, clothing, and shoes to his parents in Poland, last survivors of his family.

With her mother doing the housework, Ludmilla has taken a job as laboratory assistant at St. Luke's Hospital, earning $150 a month; she does blood counts, studies hemoglobin contents, and makes reports in English for the records. Dr. Edwin F. Hirsch, director of the laboratory, had the highest praise for her ability. He had needed another assistant, and when he went over her history he knew that anyone with that experience and linguistic ability had to be good.

The other Staragow, an erect and gauntly handsome man in his fifties, has also carved a niche, as a leather factory worker, earning $50 a week. And his son, 24-year-old Oleg, a medical student, earns $30 weekly as a garage handyman. Mother Staragow, reflecting on their industry, offered, "The past is past, like an impossible story." It is the future for which they live.

With the exception of young George (whose only spoken words are "Oh, boy" and "Okay") the whole family studies or goes to school. The Moralskis and Father Staragow attend evening classes at the neighborhood Y. There, in the small, crowded room, decorated with charts of Congress and Government, where a score of foreign-born men and women pored over a Federal textbook on citizenship and English worksheets, their instructor said: "The Moralskis are doers. They moved into the advanced English group after a few weeks. You see, they're educated in their own language."

Sitting at dinner with the family that evening—a simple meal of beef stew and sauerkraut, red wine and fresh fruit, which was like a rich banquet in that atmosphere of concern and love for one another—I asked Victor what his plans were.

"Just for this year, we must live again," he said quietly. "We need these clothes, this food and chairs, these necessary things. And we must pay back first all that we owe to those who have helped us. We make one plan at one time, then we can make hundreds.

"We all feel so changed," he went on, "so alive now. I did not want my family to go back to Poland after the war, because many people who came into the camp illegally told the same thing—that this Polish Government is not free. I do not care for that. America," and his voice shook with earnestness in the quiet of the room, "has been good to us. And we will do eveything to make her glad of this."

The other kind of resettlement which I saw—of a Jewish war orphan—stirred personal memories. When I returned from the camps last year, I wrote this of Lili Silbiger, one of the 86 war orphans who sailed with us:

"The pretty, raven-haired 17-year-old Polish Jewess, born in Auschwitz, was 11 when the Nazis ordered the Jewish people of her community to the Sosnowitz ghetto. She worked as a garbage collector in a camp 11 kilometers from the ghetto, making the trip home daily. In 1943, while Lili was at work, all the ghetto inhabitants, including Lili's parents, her two sisters, Helga, 18, Ruth, 15, and a brother, Seth, 7, were sent to the left, back to Auschwitz to be killed. She was kept at her work camp for 2 years; afterward all there were moved from one camp to another—landeshut, Grosz-Rosen, Flossenburg.

" 'People who have not lived in that atmosphere—' she began. Then she shook her head. 'We are told to forget, but we cannot. Believe me, we want to, we are young, and we would forget. * * * If I could be calm again. This is our biggest wish. To have some peace.' "

Today, Lili has found peace. And security, and a constructive life.

In contrast to the somber, lonely child who stared at the new horizon of America so tense with emotion that she could not weep, Lili today is a healthy, rosy-cheeked girl with sparkling eyes and "a family." She lives in a pleasant, middle-class home with a gentle, gray-haired woman who has seven grown children of her own. The natural and loving ease with which Lili called her "Mother" told its own story.

She has her own small neat room with snapshots of her dead sisters on her wall; the Nazis destroyed the only picture of her parents. Her cousin, Alfred, sole survivor of his family, as Lili was of hers, lives with her "mother's" son in the apartment below, so their bond is unbroken.

And Lili is going to school. Lili's school record is perhaps the greatest single memorial to one child's quest for peace. This was a child who hadn't known school since she was 11, who, in the ghettoes, concentration and slave labor camps, was denied books and newspapers and even conversation. In her 1 year at the Bennett High School in Buffalo She has finished 2½ years' work. She asked for—and received permission to carry all the regular subjects.

She passed her first-year finals last June, averaging 85, with a 75 in English. She went to summer school and made up half a

year; at the end of 5 more months she took second-year examinations, passing with 92's and 93's. Now a junior, she carries six academic subjects, including English 3-A, world history and business arithmetic. She is expected to graduate with the rest of her class next January.

Her performance, which has the teachers completely fascinated, was explained this way by her principal: "We tried to understand her problem a bit, and told the teachers what she had been up against. Then we just assigned her to classes to see what would happen. She had a tremendous hunger to learn. And this is what happened."

To Lili it seemed natural enough.

"At first," she said, "I thought it could never be. But I remembered that every person is human and has the right to take out from life as much as possible now. I have missed so much, so at first my English and Polish dictionary were together always at school. Some could do their work in half an hour; for me it would take very many hours.

"Now, I am not any more confused about many things," she went on, her wise eyes reflective. "Life used to be without meaning once. It used to be, What will happen to me tomorrow, tomorrow? Now I know I have a future. Each day is a happy day, because I can feel normal and be as a human being."

In her snow-white Gibson-girl blouse, sitting with her American friends in the school cafeteria which rang and reverberated with the noise of a thousand teen-agers, Lili was clearly one of them—accepted and responsive. And thinking back to another scene of just a year ago—to our last lunch on German soil in the DP cafeteria at Bremerhaven, and that tense and frightened atmosphere, among people who were not sure they would ever go anywhere—I could hardly hear Lili's laughing question: "Do you think we are very noisy here at lunch?"

What has happened to the Moralskis and Staragows and the Lili Silbigers on American soil is true for many of the 30,000 DP's who have come in the past 20 months. For these told of here were not handpicked. They were chosen at random from a dozen families suggested by the great welfare agencies working to resettle DP's in America—the Church World Service, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the United Service for New Americans (Jewish). And from a dozen of the war orphans with whom I have kept in touch.

That Americans are well aware of the intelligence, love of humanity, and skills which these displaced persons bring with them is shown by the way communities have warmed to them, and by the swelling grass-roots movement to welcome more of them which has occurred in the Middle West and North Central States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Iowa, and North and South Dakota.

These movements stem from two considerations. One is humanitarian, for thousands of citizens in these areas—second and third generation pioneers—have relatives in the DP camps whom they seek to help; they are stymied by our restrictive immigration system, which still sets aside two-thirds of its annual quotas for Great Britain and Germany.

The other consideration is practical. These States, the breadbasket of the country, have lost heavily in population since 1940 (North Dakota, for instance, by 148,417; Wisconsin, Nebraska, and Minnesota by 100,000 each, or some dozen States in the area by a total of 1,000,000). The slogan has been gaining that "if the DP's need America, America needs DP's."

These facts led last October to a unique experiment in North Dakota, where Governor Fred G. Aandahl created a committee of 13 from church, labor, agricultural, and veterans' groups to survey his State, looking to the possibilities of DP resettlement. A month later Gov. Luther W. Youngdahl of Minnesota created a 10-man commission on the Resettlement of Displaced Persons, and, through the churches, circulated 100,000 questionnaires which bluntly asked: Have you relatives in DP camps in Europe whom you would like to help bring to Minnesota to live? If not, would you like to help a DP family to come to Minnesota? * * * What kind of assistance could you offer (living quarters, employment, etc.)? Other States followed suit—Nebraska with a 31-man committee, South Dakota and Wisconsin with State-wide church surveys.

And what began as an experiment by the governors swelled to a people's drive for action. Church, labor, and civic groups report thousands of requests to bring in DP farm families, skilled workers, nurses, domestics, and war orphans. As a spokesman for the surveys puts it: "These good people are closer to the shores of Europe than many imagine."

The surveys come at a time when the whole DP problem—for there are still 850,000 men, women, and children in the camps, 73 percent of them in family units—is being studied in Washington. A recent Senate bill, which has been critized as inadequate, anti-Catholic and anti-Semitic, proposes that 100,000 DP's be admitted in the next 2 years. Most Government, religious, and civic groups believe that something like the Stratton bill, which has slumbered in Congress for 15 months, represents a more honorable solution of the problem. It puts America's "fair share" at 400,000 over a 4-year period, with admission on a human rather then selective basis.

Whether the mood of the American people will influence Congress remains to be seen. The Moralskis, the Staragows, and the Lilis have already made their mark, and the last question goes: Do they point the way for others? Only Congress can answer that one.

Economic Concentration Problem Should Be Given Continuous Study—Proposal by Fred I. Raymond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the increasing tendency toward monopoly in business during the last few years has resulted in studies by leading economists, businessmen, and Members of Congress. In attempting to find a solution for this problem it is important to consider the various proposals that have been made. Fred I. Raymond, a businessman in Chicago, who has had a long experience in private enterprise, views with alarm the increasing tendency toward economic concentration. He has written a book in which he sets forth the ways and means he thinks the problem can be handled. Mr. Raymond's analysis has many interesting features though there is much controversy about the remedies he has suggested in his book, the Limitist.

The study definitely deserves consideration of those interested in this problem. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a discussion and review of the Limitist by John M. Blair, economist of the Federal Trade Commission, which is as follows:

In this short work Mr. Raymond presents the case for "limitism," which might roughly be defined as a philosophy of restraining economic concentration by placing an arbitrary maximum ceiling on the permissible size of firms or the proportion of an industry's business which any individual firm or group of firms is permitted to hold.

Limitism is by no means a novel doctrine in this country. Among its earliest adherents was the elder Senator La Follette, who in 1911 proposed an amendment to the Sherman Act which would prohibit any firm from holding more than 40 percent control of an industry. But in very recent years limitism has become a matter of major importance, both on the domestic and international scenes. The courts have been concerned, notably in the recent aluminum case, with what percentage of control of an industry constitutes, per se, a violation of the Sherman Act, and various economists have struggled with the problem of defining limits of control on economic grounds. On the international scene, the decartelization law for the British and American zones of Germany provides that if any German firm reaches a size of 10,000 workers, a prima facie case exists for examining the concern on the grounds that it possibly represents an excessive concentration of economic power.

The heart of Mr. Raymond's particular variant of limitism is a restriction upon the size of any large firm (public utilities excepted) to one point of delivery or shipping point. "* * * no person shall control one or more business organizations which deliver to purchasers at more than one point of delivery any of the commodities or services sold by any of such organizations unless and except in case the total of all employees engaged in and for such organizations is less than 1,000."

Behind the doctrine of limitism, and also behind all measures designed to check economic concentration, is a profound belief in the economic, social, and political desirability of a widespread distribution of property. The absence of any such diffusion should be apparent to all. The reasons for its absence, according to Mr. Raymond, are as follows: (1) Through the creation of modern legal instrumentalities such as corporate trusteeship, the estate corporation, etc., the possibility of a dissipation of fortunes by incompetent heirs has largely been eliminated; (2) panics, bank failures, and monetary inflation no longer result in a redistribution of wealth, since these upheavals now have an equal if not greater effect upon small as upon large savers; (3) the redistribution of wealth which takes place as a result of the transfer of business from large, established firms to new and smaller concerns is of limited importance, owing to the multitudinous difficulties confronting the average small firm today; (4) the development of new means of transportation and communication has made it possible for large firms to operate on a Nation-wide basis without being seriously affected by the law of diminishing returns; (5) the rise in capital requirements of mass production has made it increasingly difficult for enterprises to become established; (6) in the field of marketing the producer who makes only one product is at a marked disadvantage as compared to the large, diversified concern which produces a variety of goods that can be advertised and distributed jointly; (7) because of the difficulties facing small business, many small firms which develop new and improved products dispose of them on a royalty basis to establish large concerns; (8) the advent of the chain store not only has had the obvious effect of eliminating numerous small retailers and wholesalers, but, in addition, has proved harmful to small producers

since the chains tend to centralize their purchases, thereby reducing the number of outlets available to small manufacturers; (9) any small concern which develops a new and improved product will, in all likelihood, be taken over by a giant corporation. "If the independent refuses to join when he has the invitation, he must face the probability that the large corporation will then introduce a similar product. This in turn will force each of the large corporation's competitors to do so, and thus the independent's competition will be so great as to endanger his continued success if he remains independent."

This lack of alternatives open to the independent is part of what Mrs. Raymond terms "forced growth." Giant corporations are constantly enlarging their operations both forward toward the market and backward toward raw materials. The fear that some supplier of raw materials or parts, particularly critical items, might sell out to a rival impels the large corporation to absorb or duplicate the facilities upon which he is dependent.

Mr. Raymond makes the interesting point that this desire to obtain self-sufficiency has tended to increase unit costs. The large manufacturer "could not take the risk of being dependent on a machine that was owned by his competitor. Nor could he take the risk of being dependent on the machine owned by an independent. There was too much danger that the independent might sell out to one of his competitors. This condition has led to a marked duplication of costly machines which are operated at only a fraction of their capacity. The capital charges for these machines have manifestly increased costs as compared with costs as they might have been with fewer machines operated at greater capacity."

In Mr. Raymond's view the increasing centralization of property resulting from these forces must be reversed. Concentration has reached such heights that drastic action is necessitated. Limitism by legislation is his answer.

Some 33 years ago John Bates Clark and John Maurice Clark advanced a somewhat similar limitist proposal. They felt, however, that it was impossible to formulate any single piece of legislation containing one specific limitation which would be applicable to all of the Nation's widely varying industries. Instead, they held that the function of limiting size would have to be carried out by some administrative commission and, incidentally, advanced an interesting suggestion for the implementation of this proposal.

Here again is work for a commission. No fixed rule of size can be framed, for the present at least, which would work well. We cannot pass the country's industries through a legal sieve with a mesh of just the right size to stop all monopolies and let all others pass. The law might take some notice of size. Any corporation controlling over half its field, for instance, may be required, as a condition of getting and keeping its license, to show affirmatively that there is enough competition remaining to safegard the interests of the public. All smaller corporations should then be assumed to be free from monopoly unless some special complaint were brought against them. Such a rule would simplify the work of granting licenses, while it could still be adapted to the needs of particular cases, however varied.

In refutation, Mr. Raymond infers that "administrative" limitism would not do the job; that the administrative commission would never be able to reach all of the industries in which concentration is excessive; that it would be severely hampered by a shortage of funds, political interference, and all of the forces which can be generated by our modern pressure groups.

But limitism, whether legislative or administrative in character, is only one approach to the problem of concentration. It is in Mr. Raymond's comparison of limitism with other possible approaches that his book is weak and unconvincing. His cursory dismissal of such alternatives as expanded antitrust activities, regulations and taxation, together with his failure to examine the potential disadvantages of his own proposal, greatly weakens his case, even with those who fully share his belief that some type of action is necessary.

But, in general, Mr. Raymond is off to a good start. In this concise, readable, and well-organized little book, he has forcibly reintroduced limitism as a theory of social action. Whether or not the theory ever obtains any widespread acceptance will largely depend upon whether this beginning is followed by an objective and critical analysis of limitism as compared with other possible alternatives. It is certainly to be hoped that Mr. Raymond will carry on his work by providing us with this needed analysis.

JOHN M. BLAIR.

Disorder at the Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting under leave to extend an article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the April 1, 1948, issue of the Washington Post:

DISORDER AT THE TOP

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is not, I think, an alarmist exaggeration to say that the condition of the Truman Administration is a grave problem for the Nation, not merely for the Democratic Party. The problem is not whether Mr. Truman can be nominated and elected. It is how in the perilous months immediately ahead the affairs of the country are to be conducted by a President who has not only lost the support of his party but is not in control of his own administration.

The heart of the danger lies in the fact that Mr. Truman is not performing, and gives no evidence of his ability to perform the functions of the Commander in Chief. Yet in a crisis of peace and war our constitutional system vests in the President the responsibilities and the power over the great decisions of diplomacy and military strategy. The Secretary of State, if he does not have extraordinary powers, cannot do this. For the Department of State, as such, has no authority over the armed forces or over the financial and economic agencies of the Government. The Cabinet cannot do this. For as a body it has no authority of its own. Ours is a presidential system of government, and only the President has the authority to make the decisions which coordinate power and policy, means and ends, in a crisis of war and peace.

The appointment of General Marshall was welcomed by the country as the best possible way to compensate for the fact that Mr. Truman does not have the qualifications that are essential in a commander in chief. There was not only a fine modesty but wisdom in the President's appointment of General Marshall, and it was a fair assumption that Mr. Marshall would not be merely the head of the State Department but in fact, by virtue of his prestige and of Mr. Truman's unlimited confidence in him, a vicarious commander in chief. The traditional objection to a military man in a high civilian office was in his case dissolved by the belief that the peculiar and critical circumstances called for a man who could conduct foreign policy with unquestioned knowledge of military needs and military risks.

In fact it has not worked out that way. To have been in effect a vicarious commander in chief was a delicate and difficult assignment, especially for a scrupulous man of high character, used to direct dealing through recognized channels, and devoid of personal ambition for power.

It could have been done only if he had remained continually in Washington in constant personal contact with the President and the other heads of departments and the leaders of Congress. But for reasons which seemed good, perhaps compelling, Mr. Marshall has devoted such a large part of his time and energy to performing the work of a traveling ambassador that he has not had, and does not have, the whole of our foreign relations under his control.

And so, at the very center of the Truman administration, at the critical point where the fateful decisions of the highest diplomatic and military consequence are made, there is a vacuum of authority and responsibility. There is, that is to say, no one who guides, directs, coordinates, and disciplines the actions of the Government. The condition at the top is from the point of view of unity of command in some ways comparable with that which prevailed in Honolulu and in Washington before Pearl Harbor.

The action of the House of Representatives on Spain and the European recovery program is perhaps a diplomatic disaster that can be repaired. But it is an ominous portent of the disorder inside the Truman administration. For the action of the House, which will do immeasurable harm to our cause in Italy, France, and all over Europe, was, as Mr. Reston correctly reports, instigated by military men in ruthless disregard of the considered views of the Department of State.

This could not have happened if in a matter of such high policy Mr. Marshall had been in firm control, and if Mr. Forrestal had had clear guidance, and had then exercised the discipline which a civilian official is supposed to exercise over the Military Establishment. But Mr. Marshall is in Bogota.

This episode is merely one symptom of a condition within the administration which the country must be enabled to understand if measures are to be taken to correct it. This country and the world are in great peril. For we are doing the very thing which all experience warns us we should not do: instead of talking softly and carrying a big stick we are talking loudly while we hesitate and procrastinate about getting a big stick. For though military preparedness is undoubtedly our best insurance against war, military gestures and warlike talk without actual military preparedness, is the height of recklessness.

It is well known in Washington that Secretary Marshall is aware of this very danger, and is deeply disturbed by it. But he will be unable to cure it if he does not come back to Washington and take command of the situation—if he does not on the one hand persuade the Truman administration and Congress to stop playing around with half-measures of military mobilization and, on the other, if he does not lay it down on the line to the military men and to his colleagues and to his diplomatic subordinates here and abroad that they must seek to reduce the tension, and to postpone, not to precipitate, the show-down.

A Story of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am including, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from the history of Missouri by Hon. Edgar C. Nelson, secretary of state, as printed in the Official Manual of the State of Missouri, just off the press:

A STORY OF MISSOURI

PREHISTORIC HISTORY

Long ago great inland seas lay over all of Missouri. In them swam huge sharks and armored fish. There were rainbow-colored beds of sea-lilies which covered acres of sea bottom and later became limestone.

Ages later when the marshes, coal forests, and the last of the oceans were gone from Missouri, out of the north came the first of the glaciers. It was a growing mass of ice that came crunching and grinding, year after year, southward over the State. Rolling prairie lands with wide, shallow stream valleys were formed. Over the prairies, the glaciers deposited a rich drift soil composed largely of finely ground limestone, shale, and sandstone together with boulders and fragments of granite, schist, gneiss, and quartzite. Vegetable and animal remains have given this soil a rich black color.

Years passed, and the mound-building Indians came to live along the rivers. In dugout canoes these early people had come up from the South, lived for many years, left their bones and artifacts in burial mounds, and disappeared. The later Indians followed them into the fertile prairie region, a great expanse of generally level land extending across the State north of the Missouri River; into the Ozark Highlands, between the White River and the Missouri River; into the Great Plains, a broad V-shaped wedge, penetrating the central western part; and a splinter of the rich, flat Mississippi River plain that reaches into the southeastern corner. In those days bison, with a rumbling of hooves, came in clouds of dust to drink or wallow in the mudholes of the wet prairie, and the enormous flocks of passenger pigeons, curlews, white cranes, green parakeets, and ducks and geese in autumn darkened the sky as they went south.

MISSOURI IN 1673

This, then, was Missouri in 1673, when the Governor of Canada, authorized by the King of France, sent explorers to claim the Missouri country for France. With them came French missionaries to convert Indians to the Catholic faith. One of the priests was Father Jacques Marquette, who had come willingly into the hardships of the new land and had given himself to the cause of Christianity in the Missouri country. With him was Louis Jolliet, fur trader and explorer. Other priests came, and in 1679 Frenchmen in canoes traveled along the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, with that forceful leader, Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle, who in 1682 took possession of the Mississippi Valley in the name of France, calling it Louisiana in honor of Louis XIV of France. He erected a fort at what is now Peoria, Ill., and built Fort St. Louis atop Starved Rock; he planned others, but fate was against him. Mysterious attacks destroyed his forts and murdered his men. La Salle, himself, was murdered in Texas in March 1687.

ST. LOUIS ESTABLISHED

Between 1735 and 1750 Creole families from Kaskaskia, in present Illinois, moved to the west bank of the Mississippi River, and the settlement of Ste. Genevieve developed along the banks of the river. Trade with Canada and New Orleans increased rapidly. In 1762 the New Orleans firm of Maxwell, Laclede & Co. received a monopoly of the fur trade on the Mississippi in the area between the Missouri and the St. Peters Rivers. In 1763 Pierre Laclede Liguest, directing the company's activities, selected the site for St. Louis. In 1764 Laclede sent to the site a 13-year-old boy, Auguste Chouteau, as his chief lieutenant in the construction work of his new headquarters.

Within a few months the village received official notice that by secret treaty on November 3, 1762, France had ceded its colony west of the Mississippi and the city of New Orleans to Spain. By the Treaty of Paris, made in 1763 at the end of the French and Indian War, France lost Canada and her possessions east of the Mississippi to England. Missouri's strategic position at the crossroads of this international boundary gave the region a new prominence which resulted in rapid development.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE

Napoleon, dreaming of reviving the French colonial empire, forced Spain in 1800 to return New Orleans and the Louisville Territory to France. The port of New Orleans was closed in 1802. The frontiersmen urged that the matter be decided once and for all, either by purchase or force. Ministers were sent to negotiate with Napoleon for the purchase of New Orleans. To their surprise, they were offered the entire Louisiana Territory for a purchase price of $15,000,000. The purchase was consummated by the United States Government under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson.

At first the new government was well received. Later, dissatisfaction arose due to the new taxes, the swarm of officials, and the location of the seat of government in Indiana. In the fall of 1804 the various districts sent representatives to a convention in St. Louis where they drafted a memorial to Congress requesting specified changes in the government.

Congress responded by the act of 1805 whereby the District of Louisiana, including the area now in Missouri, became the Territory of Louisiana. Officials, appointed by the President of the United States, consisted of a governor, a secretary, and a legislature—the last composed of a governor and three judges who were empowered to establish inferior courts, prescribe their jurisdiction, and make all necessary laws. The first governor appointed was James Wilkinson, but his administration was so bitterly opposed that on March 3, 1807, he was replaced by Meriwether Lewis who was well known and popular in the Territory. In 1812 the Territory of Louisiana became the Territory of Missouri with Benjamin Howard as the first Governor. In 1813 William Clark was commissioned Governor of the Missouri Territory. Frederick Bates, who served as secretary of the Territory from 1807 to 1820, was acting Governor at various times during the terms of Lewis, Howard, and Cook.

Such were the events of more or less national interest.

PETITIONS FOR STATEHOOD

In the fall of 1817 a number of petitions addressed to Congress and urging Missouri's admission as a State began to circulate. On January 8, 1818, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presented in Congress the first petitions from Missouri asking for statehood. On February 2, John Scott, the Missouri Territorial Delegate, presented a similar petition, and in March others appeared. On November 13, 1818, the Territorial legislature adopted a memorial to the second session of that Congress asking the admission of Missouri into full-fledged statehood. The following month the Speaker presented this memorial to the House of Representatives.

The appearance of the Missouri statehood bill in the House of Representatives on February 13, 1819, signaled the start of one of the greatest political battles of American history. As the bill was taken up, an amendment limiting slavery in Missouri was attached. The House passed the bill with the amendment, but the Senate refused: the measure remained in a deadlocked Congress until the end of the session.

When Congress reconvened in December 1819, Scott reintroduced the memorial of the Missouri Legislature. Finally, after combining the bills of Missouri and Maine for admission to the Union, an enabling act for Missouri was passed on March 6, 1820, the first great Missouri compromise which prohibited slavery north of the 36°30′ line except in the proposed State of Missouri.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1820

On June 12, 1820, the first constitutional convention met in St. Louis. In 32 days a document was drawn up which briefly defined the respective powers of the governor, the general assembly, and the judiciary. The governor was to be elected for a single, 4-year term. He was authorized, with the consent of the Senate, to appoint a secretary of state, an auditor, and an attorney general, each to serve for 4 years, and a chancelor, and judges for the supreme and circuit courts, all of whom were to hold office on good behavior. The bicameral general assembly was to have a house of representatives limited to 100 members and a senate with a minimum of 14 and a maximum of 100 members. The representatives were to serve for terms of 2 years; the senators for terms of 4 years. The judicial power of the State was to be vested in a supreme court having jurisdiction over the court of chancery (abolished in 1822) and the circuit courts. Every free white male citizen who was 21 years of age or over and who had lived in the State for 1 year and in the county for 3 months was to be allowed to vote. Federal and State officials and priests and ministers of any religious group could not be elected to the general assembly. Slavery was recognized, but the emancipation of slaves by their owners was permitted. Laws provided for their humane treatment and gave them the right of counsel, trial by jury, and parity of punishment with white persons.

FIRST ELECTION IN MISSOURI

The constitution was put into effect immediately. On July 19, 1820, David Barton, president of the convention, issued writs for the election of State officials and of a United States representative. Alexander McNair, backed by the honest farmers, was elected governor in a campaign which evidenced the growing resentment of the rural districts toward the St. Louis clique of lawyers who had been in control of the territorial government. The legislature elected David Barton and Thomas Hart Benton as United States Senators.

SECOND MISSOURI COMPROMISE

To Missouri's surprise, when the constitution was returned to Congress for final approval, the old debate over the admission of the State was revived. After much controversy, the Missouri compromise resolution was adopted, by the terms of which Missouri was to be admitted to the Union and the constitution accepted, on the condition that the State Legislature would, "by a solemn public act," declare that the offending clause pertaining to Negroes would never be carried out. The Missouri Legislature, well aware of the absurdity of the situation, made the required declaration, and on August 10, 1821, President James Monroe proclaimed Missouri's admission into the Union.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN ST. CHARLES

When the General Assembly adjourned on January 21, 1826, it closed its last session at the temporary State capitol in St. Charles. The following spring all the State property, which scarcely filled an ordinary two-horse wagon, was loaded into a Missouri River keelboat and taken to the new capitol site at Jefferson City.

St. Charles, which saw its beginnings during the Spanish period, had about 100 houses, 2 brick kilns, a tanyard, and several stores in 1820. It was chiefly an agricultural village as compared with its commercially minded neighbor, St. Louis, which had served as the French, Spanish, and territorial capitals and which was no longer the center of the settlement. Demands for a new capital had been heard. After a long and bitter fight in the General Assembly, St. Charles finally had been named the temporary capital. On June 4, 1821, the first session of the General Assembly at St. Charles convened in answer to a special call of Governor McNair. The statesmen met on the upper floor of a St. Charles building which still stands today.

ACQUISITION OF PLATTE PURCHASE AREA

One result of overland trade and expanded steamboat traffic was the rapid settlement of western Missouri. Land hunger also prompted the rush to this area. In 1836 the Indians relinquished their title to the Platte country, a strip of land now embracing the six northwestern Missouri counties—Buchanan, Platte, Atchison, Andrew, Holt, and Nodaway—acquired by Indian treaties. It was annexed formally to Missouri in 1837 by the proclamation of President Martin Van Buren. Since the Platte area became slave territory, its acquisition was in violation of the Missouri Compromise of 1820. Settlers swarmed into the area. Within a decade the culture of tobacco and hemp, thriving on slave labor and cheap water transportation, was firmly established.

SECOND CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN 1845

Many of the modern problems of State government were presented to the people of Missouri in their second constitutional convention. The convention, which assembled in Jefferson City on November 17, 1845, set many precedents and might well be called the pathfinder in the field of modern constitution making in Missouri.

A growing movement for constitutional revision had received legislative approval in 1843 when the General Assembly provided for a constitutional convention subject to the approval of the voters. The convention was in session 2 months and adopted the proposed constitution by a vote of 49 to 13, but Missouri voters rejected it by a majority of more than 9,000.

The proposed constitution in attempting to meet the needs of the day changed the terms of office of the entire judiciary from a life term to a term of years and placed the circuit judges on an elective instead of an appointive tenure. Another important change concerned the basis of representation in the House of Representatives. The suggested ratio method of selecting Representatives was not satisfactory to the rural districts and was one of the causes for the rejection of the constitution by the people.

The document contained provisions restricting legislative power in incurring State debts; creating banks, lotteries, and other corporations; granting divorces; regulating duels; and passing private and local bills. It also required that no legislative session should last longer than 60 days.

While the document was rejected by Missourians, it did attempt to meet the needs of the day. Some of these reflected the new democracy of the West; others reflected distrust of it.

1849 TO 1858

Missouri's famous series of radical proslavery instructions to Congressmen and Senators, which ultimately brought about Thomas Hart Benton's downfall, passed the State senate on January 26, 1849. They are sometimes referred to as the "Jackson-Napton resolutions." These resolutions stated that only the people in a Territory could prohibit slavery there and that Congress did not have this power. If Congress assumed such power they declared Missouri would stand by the slave-holding States. Finally, they instructed Missouri's Senators to vote accordingly. To Benton the resolutions came as a direct attack on him and his policy. The conflict over Benton split the Democratic Party in Missouri into two forces and consequently increased the power of the undivided Whigs. In 1850 Henry S. Geyer was chosen by the Missouri Legislature to replace the veteran statesman in the United States Senate.

MISSOURI SENATORS EXPELLED

When the second session of the Thirty-seventh Congress convened in Washington in December 1861, no Missourians answered the Senate roll call. Trusten Polk and Waldo P. Johnson, the two Senators from Missouri, which was still nominally a loyal State, absented themselves from Congress rather than be untrue to their pro-Southern convictions. For 46 days Missouri remained unrepresented in the United States Senate during one of the most momentous periods of the Nation's history.

Their absence, together with numerous reports accusing them of disloyal activities, prompted Members of the Senate to take action against them. Resolutions introduced for their expulsion were referred to the Committee on Judiciary. After an investigation the two men were pronounced guilty of voluntarily absenting themselves from the Senate, making secession speeches, entering the Confederate lines, and being engaged openly in rebellion against the Government. Polk was accused also of helping finance secession newspapers in southwest Missouri. The Senate unanimously voted for expulsion of the two Missourians on January 10, 1862. Lieut. Gov. Williard P. Hall appointed Robert Wilson and John B. Henderson as their successors. They took their seats a week later.

MISSOURI AND THE CIVIL WAR

In October pro-Southern members of the legislature met in Neosho and passed an act of secession on the basis of which Missouri was soon after admitted into the Confederacy. In the meantime the pro-Union State convention had reconvened in July 1861. With the support of the Federal Government and troops it had ousted Jackson and the refugee representatives and had set up a provisional government with Hamilton R. Gamble as governor. Thus, was Missouri saved for the Union, escaping military rule and the problems of reconstruction from outside the State after the war.

In all, 1,162 battles or skirmishes were fought in the State or 11 percent of those fought in the Nation—more than occurred in any other State except Virginia and Tennessee. Missouri provided a total of 40,000 troops to the Confederacy and 110,000 to the Union. The Western Sanitary Commission in St. Louis provided hospital and medical service for much of the Mississippi Valley. Public and private groups in the Middle West donated more than $4,000,000 in money and supplies. Several homes for soldiers and a home for soldiers' children were established in St. Louis.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF 1865

The rule of the radicals in Missouri advanced the final step toward control on January 6, 1865, when Missouri's third constitutional convention assembled in St. Louis. The election of 1864 had brought a radical victory with a radical legislature and the radical chief executive, Thomas C. Fletcher. The 1865 constitutional convention brought forth a radical constitution.

Charles D. Drake, a St. Louis lawyer, a hard committee worker and an effective leader on the convention floor, was so conspicuous in drafting the constitution that the assembly sometimes is called the "Drake Convention."

The halfway measures of provisional government in regard to loyalty oaths and emancipation had failed to satisfy the radical elements. The radicals moved to call a State convention to revise the constitution. Five days after convening, the convention voted 60 to 4 in favor of the immediate emancipation of slaves, about 11 months before the thirteenth amendment brought Nation-wide emancipation.

The suffrage restrictions passed by the convention were thorough. The "ironclad" oath of loyalty required of all voters, jurors, officeholders, officers and directors of corporations, trustees, attorneys, teachers, and preachers and the "registry act" which divided the State into small districts and required voters to register with a superintendent were both passed. The convention's "ousting ordinance" declared vacant all judicial offices in the State as well as many State and county offices. The radical governor was given power to fill them.

Special attention was given to education, banks, and corporations. Largely, the new constitution was progressive although there was wholesale denial of fundamental American rights. The convention remained in session until April 10, 1865.

1866 TO 1874

Meanwhile under the leadership of B. Gratz Brown and Carl Schurz, a liberal opposition to the radical faction was developing. In 1869 Schurz defeated the radical Republican candidate for the United States Senate, and the following year Brown was elected governor of Missouri. The liberal Republicans then formed a joint State ticket with the revived Democrat Party and won a complete victory over the radical Republicans in the election of 1872. Once the power of the radicals had been broken, the liberal Republican Party disintegrated, and the Democrats began a long period of domination in Missouri.

CONSTITUTION OF 1875

The 68 delegates who met May 5, 1875, to make a new constitution for Missouri were able, conservative men. Six were Republicans, 1 a liberal, and 61 Democrats. They were men of substantial economic ability. Two-thirds were lawyers, and two-thirds had a college or university education. The convention was in session for 3 months. It unanimously adopted the new constitution. Its work was ratified by a majority of 76,688 out of 91,205 votes.

The constitution of 1875 limited the powers of the legislature as never before. The order of appropriations was specified with the pay of legislators put last. State aid was prohibited. A new State debt of more than $250,000 was made impossible without a two-thirds majority approving it at the polls. State taxes were limited to 20 cents and were to be reduced to 15 cents when the valuation reached $900,000,000. Lawmakers placed 32 subject prohibitions on special legislation. They made it unprofitable for legislators to live in Jefferson City more than 70 days during regular sessions. The public finances of city and county, town and school districts received attention. Limited and maximum rates and debts placed prohibitions on officials and voters.

The convention recognized the expansion of government and gave greater power to the Governor and restored his 4-year term. Public schools were secured in at least one-fourth of the State revenue. Cities were given wider powers in framing charters. Centers of population were given more just representation in the legislature. The city of St. Louis was permitted to separate itself from the county.

The main criticism of this constitution has been directed against its ordinary legislative

characteristics, its detailed grant of powers and restrictions, its session acts rather than fundamental, organic provisions.

In 1913 the law was passed providing for an official Missouri State flag. In 1915 the first Monday in October was designated as Missouri Day. In 1916 the Missouri National Guard served on the Mexican border.

In the Presidential campaign of 1912, Gov. Herbert S. Hadley was suggested as a compromise candidate for the Republican Party which had split into two factions. At the same time another Missourian was figuring importantly in the Democratic convention. Champ Clark, then serving his ninth term in Congress and his eighth year as Speaker of the House of Representatives, ran for the Presidential nomination but was defeated at the last moment by Woodrow Wilson.

MISSOURI AND WORLD WAR I

Missouri in World War I oversubscribed its quotas in all five war loans and enrolled 140,257 soldiers, one-third of them volunteers. The National Guards of Missouri and Kansas consolidated to form the Thirty-fifth Division which landed on European soil in 1918. Provost Marshal Enoch H. Crowder, of Grundy County, drew up and directed the activities of the Selective Service Act. Gen. John J. Pershing, of Linn County, commanded the American Army in France. On April 24, 1917, the Missouri Council of Defence, for 21 months the supreme military authority in the State, was organized under the direction of Dean F. B. Mumford, of the University of Missouri. When the National Guard was called to service, 10,000 citizens were sworn in as a home guard. By June 1, 1919, Missouri's casualties totaled 11,172.

MISSOURI AND WORLD WAR II

Missouri's most outstanding contributions to World War II were the leadership given by Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, of Moberly, who directly commanded the largest number of American combat troops in United States history and the service of approximately 450,000 men in the armed forces of the Nation.

The Missouri State Council of Defense was created in 1941. All citizens responded to the call of community service.

It was on the battleship *Missouri* on September 2, 1945, that history was made with the formal signing of the Japanese surrender in Tokyo Bay. From the initial action when it escorted carriers of Task Force 58 in the first mass air strikes against Japan itself, the U. S. S. *Missouri* followed the tide of battle to the final Japanese surrender.

1945 CONSTITUTION

At the general election in 1942 the people authorized the calling of a constitutional convention. Later, 83 delegates were chosen to prepare a revision and to submit it to the people for their approval. The convention met on September 21, 1943. Three hundred seventy-seven proposals were introduced, all suggesting changes in the existing constitution. Each proposal received careful consideration. For several months the committees held public hearings. The convention submitted to the voters a new constitution which was adopted on February 27, 1945, by a vote of 312,032 for, to a vote of 185,658 against. It went into effect on March 30, 1945.

The 1945 constitution contains many of the sections of the constitution of 1875.

Among the new provisions were continuation of the Legislative Research Committee; senatorial redistricting; adequate improvement and maintenance of State parks; assignment of existing boards, bureaus, and commissions to a division of the executive department to which their work is germane; establishment of a merit system for employees of the State hospitals and penal institutions; centralization of all tax-collecting agencies in the department of revenue; establishment of a fiscal year beginning on July 1, and extending through June 30, of the next calendar year; retention of the nonpartisan court plan; replacement of justices of peace with a system of magistrate courts; authorization of four classes of counties; and establishment of a bipartisan board of education and a commissioner of education to be appointed by the board.

It was the duty of the sixty-third general assembly to revise the statutes to conform to the 1945 constitution. During its 234 legislative-day session approximately 1,500 bills were introduced of which almost 550 were revision bills. Of these, 450 were approved, revising 2,341 sections of the Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1939, and adding 1,401 new sections.

FIRST PRESIDENT FROM MISSOURI

In 1934 Harry S. Truman, now President of the United States, was elected to the United States Senate by a majority of 262,000. He ran again for the Senate in 1940—primarily on his own record—and the people voted to send him back to Washington. He helped to draft railroad legislation, was author of a bill for the Federal licensing of operators of motor vehicles used in interstate traffic, and aided in writing the Civil Aeronautics Act. His most spectacular work was as chairman of the Truman Investigating Committee during World War II. This committee saved the Government—and the people—over $200,000,000. In 1944 he was elected Vice President, and with the death of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, he acceded to the Presidency.

MISSOURI AND THE FUTURE

If Missouri may judge its future by its past, progress is as certain as the cream-white petals of the dogwood trees on its hillsides every April. Missouri may not lead the parade of American democracy, but neither will it bring up the rear. Many of its people are at work on accumulated social reforms; they are surveying others with equal determination to make things better. They and their fathers have done much, but much remains to be done by them and their children. Missouri is looking toward the future. A history such as it has is to be guarded, developed, expanded, and shared with the world.

The United States Needs Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials setting forth reasons why the United States needs displaced persons.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 28, 1947]

WE NEED THE DP'S

It is high time people in the United States began to think of admitting dispaced persons from Europe, not so much as a favor to these homeless unfortunates, but as a great favor to this country. The blunt fact is that there are parts of the United States which are sorely in need of the DP's as new population to replace crippling losses.

As everyone knows, the North Central States comprise the national breadbasket. They are the granary of this country—to a large extent they are the granary of the world. In the 7 years since 1940, these States have lost population, according to official current census compilations, as follows: North Dakota, 148,417; South Dakota, 131,272; Wisconsin, 99,528; Minnesota, 97,022; Nebraska, 92,586; Iowa, 83,546.

To come closer to home, Missouri and Kansas also have lost population, the former 119,912 and the latter, 20,659. Add the Missouri and Kansas losses to those of the six States in the table and we have a total of more than 800,000. And if we add in the 229,416 out-State migration from the Mountain States, such as Colorado and Wyoming, the figure goes above 1,000,000.

Americans who have served with the occupation in Germany are impressed at the advanced years of the men and women who labor in the fields, often in the role of beast of burden as well as plowman and mower. Do these Americans know what the average age of a farmer is in North Dakota? Well, it is 60 years. In the other States of the great wheat-growing area the average age mounts close to this obviously dangerous figure. In Colorado, for example, it is 57.

How has this come about? Have all the farmers suddenly grown much older? The answer is as simple as it tragic for the affected regions. The young men and women have walked out. They went away as boys and girls to the war, either to the armed services or wartime work, and they have not come back. What is more, most of them are not coming back. Technological changes in agricultural methods are a factor but they do not in themselves account for the migration.

This is something which could be foreseen—which, in fact, was foreseen. Four years ago, Joseph Kinsey Howard, in Montana: High, Wide, and Handsome, declared that World War I had left his State "bankrupt in land, money, and men" and that the effects of World War II "may be worse." By 1942 war-plant migration had brought many Montana towns and some cities to "the verge of collapse."

The openings which are thus left on farms, milk routes and dairies, in blacksmith shops, farm-machinery agencies, and small-town businesses are waiting today to be filled by many thousands of Europe's displaced persons. Men and women and children of Europe will be immediately at home on this land. They will be at home just as years ago many of their people came to the States of the Missouri and upper Mississippi valleys and were at home on the virgin plains.

Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Yugoslavs, Hungarians—these are the chief groups from which displaced persons for the United States would be selected. All of them are used to hardship. Most of them know the rigors of winter and how to take care of themselves if given half a chance. Those from the Baltic countries, in particular, are ideally suited to take over as farm hands and other agricultural workers in the area whose population is smaller with each passing day.

Governor Youngdahl's commission of agricultural, labor, religious, and welfare representatives in Minnesota, Governor Aandahl's similar commission in North Dakota are signs that the area is beginning to wake up. Facts and figures are needed. Let these commissions go to Congress with enough evidence of what population losses are doing and the number of DP's who can be accommodated, and the next handling of the Stratton bill will be a different story.

The DP's need America, but no more than America needs the DP's. The National Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons could not have a sounder appeal for action.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1948]

FOR ACTION ON THE DP'S

Excellent reports on the displaced persons from Members of Congress and others who visited the European camps last year have discredited opposition to the resettlement of a reasonable number here. That opposition had its chief basis in the murky and mistaken suspicions of American isolationists. A move by State governments to facilitate the resettlement of needed farm workers, particularly in the Middle West, indicates that opposition on economic grounds was likewise baseless.

There is everything to be said for permitting a fair share of the displaced persons to come to our shores. The United States responsibility for leadership toward a just and permanent peace requires that we offer a solution of the war's gravest human problem. Resettlement is now the only acceptable solution for the hard core of refugees remaining in the DP camps. This country must open its doors if it hopes that other nations will open theirs. The refugees are, for the most part, people this country wants and needs. They hate tyranny; they have miraculously maintained self-respecting ambition through years of camp life. There are large groups of Poles and Balts who cannot return to their homelands for fear of persecution. They are like the 48 sailing Estonians whose plight, following their landing in Miami in late 1946, stirred the sympathies of the country. Such people still come to our shores in their small ships. Twenty-three reached Savannah last summer, only to be interned on Ellis Island. This group has just received permission to enter Canada. Is it not time that the United States opened its doors, took such people in?

It is far more costly to support a barren existence for the displaced in camps than to permit them to be self-supporting. If we are to offer that solution—it will be to our eternal shame if we do not—the offer must be made soon. Some of the best of the displaced are filtering off to countries which bid for special skills; the morale of the others cannot be maintained forever in internment camps. We urge that Congress speed the action required to admit a fair share of those whose loyalty to democratic principles is something to be nourished and sustained in this modern world.

[From the New York Times of December 28, 1947]

CONGRESS AND THE DP'S

"If we are going to do anything, we should do it promptly. * * * The next step to be taken is legislation by Congress." The crucial word in this statement, by Ugo Carusi, former Immigration Commissioner, who has just completed a survey of the DP camps of Europe, is the word "if." For it is not at all clear what congressional intentions are toward the DP's. The story which Mr. Carusi brought back—his survey was requested by the President—has long been known to Congressmen of both Houses. Speedy plans must be made, he said, by immigrant-receiving countries to absorb the million-odd homeless men, women, and children, for morale is low and getting lower. A logical move, he felt, was passage of the Stratton bill, which would admit 100,000 a year for 4 years.

The DP's themselves can well challenge the fitness of Congress' course. Their protagonists from labor, government, religious, civic, and industrial groups pleaded their case eloquently before House hearings last June and July. And the hearings—693 pages of them—have been printed for all to read. It is a document that puts squarely before Congress the needless sufferings in peace of people who were abused in war. It is a reminder, also, of the delaying tactics which hampered consideration of the Stratton bill by the whole House in the last session. If America is truly a sanctuary for the persecuted, there can be no "if" about the next step. That step is action—on the Stratton bill and our responsibilities to the forgotten people in the DP camps.

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Republic of January 2, 1948]

SOUTH DAKOTA SHOULD WELCOME DISPLACED PERSONS

Benefits to both the homeless European war victims and to the State of South Dakota may accrue from the survey ordered by Gov. George Mickelson to determine this State's capacity to absorb a number of displaced persons.

Admission of the DP's to this country still depends upon congressional action, and that action should be taken without further delay when Congress reconvenes.

Implications Involved in Tax Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, my vote to sustain the President's veto of the tax bill was not a party vote, and it was cast with due respect to my colleagues who may differ with my views.

It is my feeling that the only basis on which it would appear sound to make any tax cuts at present, would be if the amount of the cut could actually be saved by a reduction governmental expenses. As a Member of an economy-minded Congress, I have supported and will continue to support continued reductions in unnecessary Government expenses.

The record reveals that the Federal budget for 1948 originally called for expenditures of thirty-seven and five-tenths billions. The latest estimates on expenditures for 1948 with 3 months remaining in the budget year, reveal that the expenditures are $200,000,000 higher than originally estimated. This increase occurred even though Congress cut expenditures severely, because new expenditures were forced by new conditions. as for example the payment of terminal leave bonds.

Up to the present time, the 1949 budget of thirty-nine and seven-tenths billions has been reduced by approximately 2 percent with the larger items of national defense, international commitments, veterans' programs, yet to be considered, and where little cuts can be expected.

Prudence requires that we look ahead, not only to see how much the Government will have to spend to meet its responsibilities but also to see how well it has planned its revenues to meet these needs.

If we are engaged in a cold war, can we afford to take a chance in world security by partially dismantling the machinery that enables us to meet our heavily financial responsibilities both at home and abroad.

These are the disturbing facts as we seek peace and financial security.

During the past few years by sound fiscal management the public debt has been reduced from $279,000,000,000 to $253,000,000,000. Yet this debt is staggering requiring in the 1949 budget interest charges of $5,300,000,000.

Seventy-five million Americans have purchased Federal bonds, including our banks, insurance companies, and other financial agencies have used the peoples' deposits to insure sound financial statements. We must maintain the financial integrity of our banks and insurance companies.

It is expected that receipts for 1949 will reach $44,500,000,000 to apply on a $39,700,000,000 budget. The surplus estimated is $4,800,000,000. Under the Marshall plan or the Economic Assistance Act the Congress proposes to shift $3,000,000,000 of the cost from 1949 to the surplus for 1948. Thus, the surplus for 1949 will be enlarged to $7,800,000,000.

Out of this surplus it is proposed to absorb a $4,800,000,000 tax cut and have $3,000,000,000 to apply on the debt. But this is not quite accurate since the tax-reduction bill will cause an increase in tax refunds, conservatively estimated at $300,000,000, leaving a surplus of $2,700,000,000.

Since the budget was submitted, what has transpired? Russia continues to move westward. These moves by Stalin make Hitler look like an amateur.

The cost of bringing the strength of our armed forces up to the level set by Congress and for halting deteriorating trends in our military strength will require expenditures of probably $2,000,000,000 or more. Thus, our surplus for 1949 will be less than $1,000,000,000. This I feel is an appallingly slim margin of safety in a world of uncertainties.

There are some who contend it is easy to raise taxes once there is an emergency. Let us not forget that in pre-World War II days, selective service passed the House by 1 vote. It is not easy to prepare for an emergency and I contend we even now face one when at any hour we may be told by our military leaders we cannot hold certain areas in occupied Germany.

Let us not fool ourselves when we pass a tax-reduction bill on the basis of what Federal spending is predicted to be 15 months hence.

Why should we desire to pass on to our children and grandchildren that portion of the public debt from the shoulders of us who made it?

Why face, as I fully expect in the light of world conditions, deficit financing? It is not sound, especially at a time when our national income, employment, and production are the highest in history.

The prospects ahead are not pleasant. There is not one among us who does not wish they were otherwise. I for one sincerely believe we should face up to our responsibilities, that we should think clearly and plan carefully. Reducing taxes at a time when we are confronted with so many unknowns, and when, if ever, a budgetary surplus and debt reduction are so plainly in the public interest, does not make for financial or world security.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is a minority of us in the House who feel conscientiously impelled to vote against any tax reduction at this time, however much we would like to do so. I realize the heavy burden of taxation that rests upon all classes of citizens under present laws. But I also realize the overwhelming need, in this time of great crisis, to operate the Federal Government with a balanced budget.

It is not sound business nor sound arithmetic to reduce the revenues of the Government at this time.

The whole story is graphically told in the headlines of every morning paper today.

The Senate yesterday voted a $300,000,000 annual charge on the Federal Treasury for aid to education.

The Senate Civil Service Committee on yesterday voted for a cost-of-living pay increase to Federal employees which would cost the Federal Treasury approximately $1,000,000,000 per annum.

The House will today pass the conference report on the European recovery program, involving an expenditure of $6,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

The President sent us yesterday a request for $3,375,000,000 additional for national defense.

These items, when added together, show a prospective increased expenditure for this year of approximately $11,000,000,000.

Against this, and in the face of a great national emergency, it is proposed in the pending measure to reduce taxes by approximately $5,000,000,000. There is no way, under the rules of common sense, arithmetic, or ordinary business intelligence, by which the Government can increase its expenditures in these huge sums, and in the same breath reduce taxes, without leaving the financial structure of your Government in a precarious situation.

I realize the need for the worthwhile expenditures proposed, and I realize the very understandable desire of the American people to be relieved of some of the burden of taxation under which we are struggling.

But in my arithmetic, two and two still make four.

Tax Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the House should have sustained the President's veto of the tax bill, H. R. 4790. This bill is both untimely and inequitable.

It will weaken the financial structure of the Government at a time when a strong revenue system is essential. It will reduce revenue by about $5,000,000,000 in a full year of operation precisely at the time when our foreign commitments are requiring heavier expenditures for military preparedness and foreign aid. It will weaken the revenue system in a period when a substantial Government surplus is needed to help fight inflation.

Proponents have argued that we can have, with room to spare, tax reduction provided by H. R. 4790. The President, however, has clearly demonstrated that we can ill afford tax reduction at this time.

H. R. 4790 holds promise for deficit financing in the next fiscal year. Proponents of H. R. 4790 are fully aware of this possibility and, to avoid it, they have resorted to an ingenious bookkeeping device in an attempt to conceal the deficit which would most certainly occur without it. I refer, of course, to the $3,000,000,000 bookkeeping entry provided by the Foreign Assistance Act to make believe that 1949 expenditures actually occurred in 1948.

Proponents of H. R. 4790 also have claimed that a tax reduction is required now to increase production. They have maintained this position for almost 2 years. The fact is, as the President states, that our economy has now reached record levels of national income, employment, and peacetime levels of production. It is now clear that had tax reduction of the magnitudes involved in H. R. 1, during the first session of this Congress, and H. R. 4790, during this session, been passed, the rise in prices would have been substantially greater, and the bust that follows an inflationary boom might already have occurred.

Tax reduction, under present conditions, is an explosively inflationary measure. It increases income in the hands of individuals and businesses and thus increases their demand for the scarce goods and services which are now available. The Secretary of Commerce, in his appearances before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, demonstrated conclusively that investment by businesses is at the highest level in history. To increase spendable income of taxpayers with net incomes over $5,000 by $1,700,000,000, as does H. R. 4790, would increase the demand for investment goods—for steel, and lumber, and machinery. Our economy is functioning virtually at capacity, so increases in demand will only increase prices, and cannot increase production at this time.

Inflation is borne mainly by the lower-income groups. These people have been squeezed by the constantly rising level of consumer prices. Any tax relief that we can afford should go to these hard pressed people. Instead, H. R. 4790 decreases the estate and gift taxes by 30 percent and decreases the income taxes paid by taxpayers with net incomes above $5,000 by an average of about 20 percent.

We cannot shirk our responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world and for the maintenance of a sound economy at home. H. R. 4790 would weaken our ability to pay for international relief and rehabilitation and for the minimum military preparedness which is so necessary in this period of international turmoil and crisis.

H. R. 4790 will, moreover, increase inflationary pressures and will hasten the bust which will follow.

A Political Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's veto of H. R. 4790, known as the Knutson tax bill, was an example of outstanding statesmanship.

In this critical period of international emergency and with a $260,000,000,000 world war debt on our shoulders, the so-called Knutson tax reduction bill is nothing more than an indirect method of purchasing votes in this Presidential election year. The leadership in the Congress has done nothing to reduce the high cost of living and this tax bill will rekindle the fires of inflation in the same manner that the killing of price control did in June 1946. Millions of American consumers who want relief from the high cost of living have received another body blow by reason of this election-year tax reduction.

Most people do not realize that 40 percent of this $5,000,000,000 reduction will be a windfall in the laps of but 5 percent of American taxpayers in the higher brackets. In the case of gift and real estate taxes, nearly all the two hundred and fifty million annual reduction will go to only about 12,000 of the most wealthy families.

I wish to submit the following editorial from this afternoon's edition of the Washington Daily News, entitled "Tax Veto Should Be Sustained":

TAX VETO SHOULD BE SUSTAINED

Congress seems hell-bent on an election-year tax cut. But if we were a member of that honorable body we would vote to sustain President Truman's anticipated veto of the Knutson-Millikin bill. A vote to override, in our opinion, would be an act of irresponsibility at a time of world crisis.

Congress has decided the situation is serious enough to justify spending $6,200,000,000 in the next year to help western Europe, Greece, Turkey, and China stand up against Communist aggression. Does it not follow, then, that it is too serious to diminish revenues our Government needs?

If peace and national security require—and we think they do—that Uncle Sam lay his hand on the shoulders of several thousand young men for selective service and military training, then obviously this is no time to try to buy votes by taking more than 7,000,000 civilians completely off the income-tax rolls.

The public debt is $252,000,000,000, the annual interest charge $5,000,000,000, the defense budget alone rising to $14,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 or more. In the present state of things, when nobody can tell how

many unanticipated expenditures will be necessary, there is no assurance that the Knutson-Millikin $4,800,000,000 can be spared without running the Government again into red ink.

The Republican plan is to vote on the veto as quickly as possible, with the minimum of debate. We think the issues are so paramount that the debate should be carried on long enough for public opinion to crystalize and for the people to make their wishes known.

Our belief is that most Americans at this time are more interested in saving their hides and saving the peace than in saving taxes.

We Salute the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Journal of March 31, 1948:

WE SALUTE THE DOCTORS

In recognition of the boundless benefits which mankind receives from members of the medical profession, it is exceedingly fitting that they be paid special tribute by a grateful public whose suffering from diseases and other physical and mental ailments would be many times more painful and distressing were it not for the skillful and sympathetic services rendered by the doctors.

There is never a moment of time that fails to record activities toward cure and alleviation by those who devote their lives to the practice of the noble profession of medicine.

Profound gratitude by recipients of these helpful ministrations should be ever present in the hearts of those who benefit from medical practice engaged in for the welfare of the sick and the suffering.

In appreciation of what the medical fraternity does for the relief of persons in pain and distress due to human ills and infirmities 1 day in the year is designated Doctor's Day. It is observed on March 30 in Louisiana and throughout our Nation. The observance represents a deserved silent salute to the doctors, a deeply merited tribute for work well and faithfully done, a genuine gesture of thanksgiving that in every city, town, village, hamlet, and cross-road settlement unfortunates who become ill and indisposed are assured of services by the doctor, by a messenger of hope and encouragement, an agent of consultation, diagnosis, and treatment through which every prescription known to medical science is available in efforts to bring cure, relief, and alleviation.

Origination of this annual demonstration of esteem and appreciation of the medical profession—Doctor's Day—was in the State of Georgia, whose founders of the inspiring idea chose the date for the observance in honor of a famous Georgia physician whose birthday was on that day. That was many years ago. In Louisiana and other States the same day is designated for this special tribute. Doctor's Day, on which physicians, surgeons, practitioners, specialists, and other members of the noble medical fraternity are especially honored, is sponsored by the auxiliary of the Southern Medical Association, which comprises 16 States. It is a gracious, gratifying testimonial of commendation of the medicos and of unbounded thankfulness for their services to mankind.

No form of science means more to the human race than that represented by medicine. No forces strive more to bring security to humanity's welfare. No agencies wage more effective battles than those whose foes are germs and conditions which threaten human life. When the man of medicine enters upon his career he dedicates his talent, effort, and interest to the medical science. He obligates himself to devote his professional knowledge, skill, and other resources to those whom he is called to serve as patients. In carrying on the work, much of it extremely strenuous and wearying, he must deprive himself and his family of many of the privileges that would be theirs were he engaged in a less exacting profession. However, the faithful and dutiful doctor sacrifices personal comfort and desire and gives his time and attention toward assisting those in need of medical science's ministrations.

The doctor can set no hours for his work and can never safely predict any regular periods for rest and relaxation. He is constantly at the beck and call of those requiring his services. In respecting the principles on which his calling in life is based, he responds to appeals for his services regardless of unfavorable weather conditions, personal deprivations, or other circumstances that might with some other workers justify postponement of engagements or declination of calls to duty. Such is the life of the typical American doctor. By living that life this professional man earns the highest commendation that can be given.

It is intensely proper that once a year there be particular recognition given the doctors. The Journal joins with countless others in saluting the doctors, in paying them tribute, and in wishing them a full measure of satisfaction and success in their great profession.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, as a businessman for many years, and now as a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, I have been deeply interested in the operation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and its effect upon the future of this great Nation of ours.

It is my firm conviction that few Americans understand anything about reciprocal trade agreements. They think they have worked well because we have operated at a high rate of production with substantial profits the past few years. Reciprocal trade agreements had nothing to do with that. The compelling factor in what has happened to us the last few years has been that demand was greatly in excess of supply, and we have had full operation and production.

The reciprocal trade agreements have never operated under what I call normal conditions. To be sure, they came into effect before World War II, but it takes several years for such agreements to even get into operation. Then we ran into prewar demands. Next we ran into the war itself. Now we have excess of demand over possible production.

We hope that some day we will again have normal conditions, and it will be then that the American people find out that reciprocal trade agreements—which interfere with the maintenance of wage standards and price standards which have become part of American life—do great injury to American industry and thus to all the workers in American industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two letters from Mr. John Breckinridge, under date of March 25, 1948, and March 29, 1948, which, taken in conjunction with letters introduced in the Appendix of the RECORD by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] on March 3, 1948, will bring facts to the attention of my colleagues and the public which I feel they should have.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPE BALLARD & LOOS,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1948.

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES,
Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAWKES: I refer to my letter to you of February 28 which appears at page 2049 of the March 3, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and particularly to the following statement made therein:

"The State Department policy boils down to this: discourage exports (except a few favored products such as automobiles), discourage American production of anything except what it favors and considers efficient; encourage imports at expense of American producers; encourage foreign production and export to United States; shift producers to favored mass production industries; encourage a specialized and centralized American industrial economy that is easy to control."

Can that statement be substantiated? Yes, it can, and with a very concrete and recent illustration.

During 1947 Mexico placed an absolute embargo on the importation of all fountain pens and mechanical pencils containing any part of gold or silver, even if a pen has only a gold point. The Mexican duty on fountain pens and mechancial pencils not containing any parts of gold or silver were raised to astronomical heights which are equivalent to embargoes.

The agents of the Parker Pen Co. in Mexico just recently wrote the Parker Pen Co. as follows:

"In line with the subject protectionism you will be interested to know that in a recent talk with fairly well-informed members of the economic board regarding the extremely high duties now assessed against the importation of fountain pens and pencils, one of the explanations given for these was that it was hoped that, because of them, some important American factory would find it beneficial to their interest to build a plant in Mexico in which to manufacture fountain pens and pencils. It was explained that this type of a factory, termed 'light industry,' was more in keeping with the sort of industrialization Mexico wishes to promote—no comment on our part, but we shouldn't cherish the job of marketing the product."

The Parker Pen Co. has already been forced to transfer plants, capital, production and employment to Great Britain and other countries. Now it will be necessary for the Parker Pen Co. to transfer a plant, production, and employment to Mexico. During 1946 the Parker Pen Co. did a little better than an $800,000 business in Mexico. During the last 6 months of 1947, they did only

$5,000 worth of business. To get the Mexican business it will be absolutely necessary to transfer a plant and employment to Mexico. A neat little plan on the part of Mexico; incidentally, approved and assisted by the United States State Department.

You will recall that the State Department has publicly announced that it had conferred with Mexico and agreed in each case to her increased duties and embargoes on imports from the United States. You will also recall that the Mexican Ambassador recently emphasized the fact that Mexico had discussed each embargo and each increase in duty with the State Department and obtained their prior approval.

To fit this into my above quoted statement, Mexico has, with the advice, assistance, and approval of the State Department, taken steps to eliminate production and employment in the United States, discourage exports from the United States, force production and employment in Mexico and export to the United States, force employees previously engaged in production for export to Mexico into one of the more favored (by the State Department) and more centralized mass production industries such as the automobile industry. If more proof is desired I will attempt to dig up more illustrations for you, or a congressional committee might take on this job.

The Parker Pen Co. has in the past been a very strong supporter of the State Department and reciprocal trade-agreements program. The State Department even deceives its own friends and supporters and sells them down the river.

The publicly announced purposes of the Mexican embargoes and increased duties are to more adequately protect domestic industries and to conserve dollar exchange. In this case and in other cases Mexico has no such industry to protect and a careful investigation would reveal that there is no real dollar shortage in Mexico. If the true facts were known, it would be quite apparent that the real purpose for Mexico's action is to force the transfer of American industries into Mexico and to blackmail the United States into giving them a hand-out of dollars under a Mexican recovery program. Also I believe that a real investigation of the Canadian situation and her recent embargoes, quotas, and increased duties would reveal a similar purpose of inducing the United States into spending a large portion of the hoped for Marshall-plan dollars in Canada. I will just cite one illustration. Canada imposed a very small quota on imports of citrus fruit with the announced purpose of conserving American dollars. However, since the imposition of that quota, Canada has and is buying, with the approval and assistance of the State Department, Italian lemons and British Empire oranges outside the quota and paying for them with American dollars.

This Mexican fiesta of deception is just another of the State Department's planned crises and claimed international emergencies. When are Congress and the American people going to wake up and remove the foreign wool which the State Department has pulled over their eyes? When is one of the political parties going to have enough courage to come out honestly and tell the people what is going on?

After Congress gets through passing the ERP, it had better be prepared for a barrage of propaganda for a Mexican recovery program and for a Latin-American recovery program—they are all getting on the band wagon even if it takes blackmail to do it.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

P. S. I want to emphasize that above language and views are my own and not those of the Parker Pen Company.

J. B.

POPE BALLARD & LOCS,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1948.

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES,
Senate Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAWKES: In my letter of February 28 to you and other members of the Senate Finance Committee, which appears at page 2049 of the March 3, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I pointed out that the State Department policy under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act had always been one of unilateral tariff cutting and one which favored large, centralized mass-production industries and the shifting of American laborers and capital from production in our small businesses to production in the centralized mass-production industries.

It is interesting to note that a majority of the American small-business men agree with my statement of State Department policy. In a press release issued today, the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., stated as follows:

"In support of numerous protests over handling of tariff matters by the executive department of Government, received by the federation from members during the past year, federation members voted favorably on a proposal that control over the tariff be returned to Congress; that the executive be deprived of the wide discretion it now exercises. Interesting to note is fact that tariff complaints have been heaviest from the New England area. However, the expression of opinion from federation members on Nation-wide basis indicates that appreciation of the problems involved is not regional; rather, that it is national."

This expression of opinion from the American small-business men and from other independent business and professional men is the result of ballots submitted to the National Federation of Small Business in answer to the question: "Return control of the tariff completely to Congress?" The percentage of the votes favoring return of the tariff control to Congress is interesting to note. Out of 120,000 ballots submitted to the federation on this question, 76 percent favored return of tariff control completely to Congress, while only 17 percent opposed it. Seven percent had no vote on this question.

This opposition to the executive control of our tariff policy by the overwhelming majority of our small-business men is of particular significance, and I hope it will be carefully considered by your committee in its current review of our national tariff policy.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE.

Hon. Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well deserved, well written, and complimentary article relating to my colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], written by Barnet Nover and published in the Denver Post of March 28, 1948. Since I fully subscribe to the nice things which it emphasizes, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD where Members of Congress and others may enjoy it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLIKIN WINS SPOTLIGHT BY BRILLIANT TAX VICTORY—COLORADAN ALREADY ONE OF TOP SENATORS

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON.—Heavy-set EUGENE DONALD MILLIKIN, who has a voice that comes up like thunder and next to the Capitol and the Jefferson Memorial, one of the most impressive domes in Washington, has been representing Colorado in the Senate of the United States for 6¼ years.

That is not a long time as Senate service goes. No fewer than 43 Senators outrank MILLIKIN in seniority. Yet in those 6¼ years, the equivalent of just over a single term, MILLIKIN has become one of the half-dozen real "movers and shakers" in Congress.

By way of proof there is the Millikin-Knutson tax-reduction measure which MILLIKIN brilliantly piloted through the Senate.

The final vote on that measure, which the administration had fought, was 78 to 11, with 3 out of 4 Democrats voting with a solid Republican phalanx for the bill. It was by all odds the worst defeat suffered by the Truman administration since it came into being.

Undoubtedly one reason the bill passed the Senate was the same one given by the Republicans for their recurrent defeat at the hands of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, namely, "You don't shoot Santa Claus." Tax reduction is popular. But that does not begin to tell the whole story of Senator MILLIKIN'S impressive victory.

VETO BIG PROBLEM

His efforts from the beginning had been to put through not merely a tax-reduction bill that would dovetail with budgetary realities but one that would be veto proof so far as possible.

He had to contend with the desire of the House of Representatives, previously expressed by the overwhelming passage of the Knutson bill, for a deeper slash in taxes than the state of the Nation warranted.

He had to take into account the yearning in various quarters within his own party for the elimination of special taxes that had been added during the war years, but which, under existing circumstances, it was neither safe nor expedient to eliminate.

Nor was he unaware that no tax bill that did not have the overwhelming approval of Democrats as well as Republicans—and of Senators who do not face reelection this year as well as those who do—could be enacted into law.

MILLIKIN'S job as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee involved a combination of flexibility and firmness. He had to be at one and the same time diplomat, driver, and wailing wall. How well he accomplished his task the results show. Even the hard-boiled denizens of the Press Gallery were loud in their praise of MILLIKIN'S generalship.

The passage of the tax-reduction bill made MILLIKIN a nationally known figure, yet, long before this development, he had become one of the most influential Members of the Senate. As chairman of the Republican conference and member of the six-man Republican policy (steering) committee, he holds two key places in the inner circle of his party. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, he directs the affairs of one of the most powerful committees in the upper House.

This combination of great power and, outside his home area, of equally great popular obscurity led some to the suspicion that he was a new sort of gray eminence, a Mazarin

from the Rocky Mountain empire. Such suspicions dissolved into thin air on closer acquaintance with the junior Senator from Colorado.

Actually, nobody could be less devious than EUGENE MILLIKIN. The fact that outside the Senate he has not been widely known resulted from the circumstance that, while never fleeing from publicity, he has never avidly gone after it. He is no headline hunter, yet newspapermen find him accessible, informative, and candid. His influence stems from two simple and old-fashioned traits—character and ability.

Endowed with a deep and rumbling voice, he is given to no tricks of oratory. He is not much interested in making the rafters ring. In fact, his speeches are few and far between, and during the first year and a half of his tenure in the Senate he deliberately kept silent. He did so—a characteristic trait—in order to get thoroughly acquainted with the ways of the Senate before participating in its debates, yet there are few better phrase makers in Washington.

"STOP SCRATCHING"

Once, in a colloquy with Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, the New Deal Democrat from Florida, who had been berating the Republicans for the role they had played in the fight on the League of Nations in 1919, MILLIKIN urged his colleague to "stop scratching an unholy itch."

In a reply to the then Senator Truman, who had accused him of being an isolationist, MILLIKIN, after denying the charge, said that he did not want to trade epithets with the Senator from Missouri because it "would be like wrestling with a cipher."

These statements were made without venom. MILLIKIN'S tongue never drips acid, he never indulges in personal invective, engages in no feuds. The only power one can exercise in the Senate derives from personal relations, and today's foe is tomorrow's ally.

Still remembered in the Senate is MILLIKIN'S brief, maiden speech in June 1943, when he strongly opposed the measure to bar the payment of salaries to three officials mentioned by name in the appropriations bill because Congress deemed them Reds.

This action, said MILLIKIN, "smells of ancient tombs in which liberty has been buried." Congress approved the measure. Later the Supreme Court held it unconstitutional.

On the basis of his economic views, MILLIKIN is every inch a conservative, but he is no die-hard and with reason prides himself on his record in defense of civil liberties.

His was one of the loudest voices raised in opposition to the bill, introduced at the behest of the administration and overwhelmingly passed by the House, to draft striking railroad workers. In this instance the Republican MILLIKIN and the Democrat PEPPER literally fought side by side and shoulder to shoulder. MILLIKIN said of the bill:

"I respectfully affirm that the proposed legislation is an ill-considered, hasty product of hysteria, is an affront to our veterans, is violative of human dignity, human decency, and fair play, is lacking in candor, is arbitrary, capricious, and brutal, is unconstitutional in its present form, and should not be enacted into law."

GRADUATE OF UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

MILLIKIN'S career in the Senate tops a successful career as a lawyer in Denver. Born in Hamilton, Ohio, the son of a doctor, he went to Colorado for his health, graduating from the law school of the University of Colorado in 1913.

Two years later came his first political effort. He helped manage the campaign of George A. Carlson for Governor of Colorado, and when the latter was elected became his executive secretary. When the United States entered the war he enlisted as a private, emerging 2 years later as a lieutenant colonel of engineers and the possessor of a citation by Pershing for distinguished and meritorious service.

Returning to Denver, MILLIKIN became associated with Karl C. Schuyler, later United States Senator from Colorado. Schuyler was killed in an automobile accident in Massachusetts in 1933. Two years later MILLIKIN married the latter's widow, the attractive and charming Delia Alsena Schuyler. They live simply in an apartment house on Washington's Connecticut Avenue, avoiding social life as much as possible.

No one was more surprised than MILLIKIN when friends told him, after the death of Senator Alva B. Adams, that he was to be named for the unexpired term. MILLIKIN bet one friend a suit of clothes that the rumor was false. He would not believe it even when he got word from Gov. Ralph Carr directly and spent some hours arguing with Carr, a classmate at the University of Colorado, that there were others far better suited for the post than EUGENE MILLIKIN.

ARRIVED AT GRIM TIME

Appointed on December 20, 1941, MILLIKIN arrived in Washington at a grim time. By the very nature of things the center of action was not the Capitol but the White House and the Pentagon. But even then reputations were being made in Congress, as witness the career of Harry S. Truman.

MILLIKIN first attracted the attention of his colleagues, if not of the general public, by his careful questioning of witnesses before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as a sort of guest interrogator, and in the discussions on the Senate floor itself on the Dumbarton Oaks plan and the Connally resolution.

The tenor of some of MILLIKIN'S questions led some to believe that the new Senator from Colorado had isolationist leanings. The impression was unfounded, but it is noteworthy that while MILLIKIN ultimately came to the conclusion that the United Nations was a very worth-while experiment and voted for the Charter he had his reservations about how the experiment would work out.

Noteworthy in this respect was the point he made in the debate of November 5, 1943. Citing the views of Woodrow Wilson, he declared that the basis of lasting peace must be that the "world be made safe for democracy."

"We Republicans," said MILLIKIN, "had much sport with that phrase, but Wilson was only telling us that the existence of any powerful dictatorship holds the potentiality of war. To have a successful organization in permanent world peace, we have to make the world safe for democracy."

This was 3½ years before the proclamation of the Truman doctrine.

In a colloquy on the floor of the Senate, MILLIKIN once remarked: "I do not war with history. I cooperate with the inevitable."

This is a fairly accurate summation of his views on international affairs. MILLIKIN is no doctrinaire internationalist, but he is no bigoted nationalist, either. He voted against Bretton Woods and the British loan, votes that he finds it fairly easy to explain now. He voted for interim aid and the Marshall plan and played a great part, together with Senator VANDENBERG, in working out a compromise arrangement that permitted settlement of the fight over renewal of the trade agreements program, a compromise described by an eastern newspaper as a "happy combination of the highminded and the practical." MILLIKIN'S role both in the hearings and in the debate on the United States-Mexican waterways treaty was highly praised, as also the role he played in the steps leading to the enactment of the McMahon bill for the control of atomic energy.

The latter was par excellence a case of "cooperating with the inevitable." Once when I asked him how he, a staunch conservative, could have given his approval to so far-reaching a measure of Government control, he replied that almost every aspect of the bill did violence to his basic views. But the more he studied the matter, he added, the more he examined the revolutionary nature of atomic energy, the more he found himself coming to the reluctant conclusion that there was no alternative to the types of control the bill imposed.

It is this devotion to facts and his surpassing skill in marshalling them into a logical pattern that has given MILLIKIN the prestige he has come to enjoy among his colleagues. That and his unfeigned friendliness and courtesy, his salty wit. There is no better story teller in the Senate than MILLIKIN.

LEADS COLORADO GOP

Although a political unknown when appointed, MILLIKIN now enjoys the unchallenged postition of No. 1 Republican in Colorado. Elected in 1942 by 48,000 for the unexpired term of Alva Adams, he topped the ticket 2 years later, receiving a majority of 63,000 votes, almost twice that received by Thomas E. Dewey. There is no doubt that were MILLIKIN to run this year his majority would be even more impressive. Yet he has built up no personal organization in Colorado and is not and has no desire to be the Republican "boss" of the State.

His success in Colorado is a triumph of personality, intellect, and power of persuasion. A regular Republican, he does not hesitate to get off the reservation or even to stand alone—as he did when he cast the sole vote against the Inter-American Defense Treaty. But he has never deviated from his unfailing defense and promotion of the interests of the State he represents and the region of which it forms a part.

It is no secret that MILLIKIN favors the candidacy of ROBERT A. TAFT for the Republican nomination, although he has not formally announced his stand. Yet he works in closest harmony with the partisans of other candidates and has the respect of all factions. And his friendships extend across the line to embrace a great many Democrats as well.

To the men in the press gallery MILLIKIN has become a familiar and welcome figure. Looking with his bald head, large face and large, rounded figure, like the carpenter in Alice in Wonderland, he is a faithful attendant at Senate debates. But he is less often to be found at his desk than athwart the doorway leading to the Republican cloakroom where, without violating rules against smoking, he can take a puff or two while keeping an ear cocked to what is being said on the floor.

EUGENE MILLIKIN has come far in 6 years. But nobody who knows anything about the Senate and his role in it can doubt that he will go much further. Of all the noncandidates who are going to crowd the hotels in Philadelphia next June and wave their banners on the floor, MILLIKIN is the man to watch.

International Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on Wednesday, March 31, 1948, entitled "Let Us Have the Record."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US HAVE THE RECORD

How can the President and General Marshall expect the country to follow blindly their zigzag decisions on foreign policy without knowing the true facts behind each decision? Mr. Truman told Congress that Russia has violated agreements that "could have furnished a basis for a just peace." What agreements? How were they violated?

Thirty-two Senators, headed by Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, are asking the President these questions in a resolution introduced in the Senate. They want the American people to get a full and frank disclosure of the facts behind the changes in American policy abroad. They want the people to know the real reasons why a big new arms program is being considered and what further dangers might be in store for us from communism.

In America a foreign policy cannot succeed unless it has the full support of the people. Americans will not long support a policy they only vaguely understand, particularly if it is a dangerous one. To gain this support Mr. Truman should let us in on the secret meetings between Russia and the United States and tell us everything that happened since Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, and Moscow.

The Star does not believe that the President or the Secretary of State has misjudged the seriousness of the world situation. Nor are the American people hiding their heads in the sand. But we have a right to know just why American diplomacy has failed so we can participate in every attempt to strengthen the cause of American security and world peace.

From what we do know, Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam were monstrous mistakes which made the seizure of eastern Europe by the Soviets inevitable. Mr. Truman is now frantically trying to extricate us from these and other mistakes. But his attempts to do so would get far more sympathy and public support if he laid all the facts on the table and told the country the whole truth.

President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Heart of the Constitution," by V. A. Collins, of Livingston, Tex. Mr. Collins is a former State senator in Texas, and a very distinguished lawer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HEART OF THE CONSTITUTION

(By V. A. Collins)

The States came together to form a more perfect Union.

The States or Colonies had all power then; they did not have to surrender any of it, but they chose to surrender certain powers in order to create a more perfect Union.

But they wanted the powers they surrendered to be very specific.

Since the States created the United States they had a right to surrender or withhold such powers as they saw fit. As the President said of Puerto Rico, "they should have the right to determine their relationship with the United States," which they were creating, and the Thirteen Colonies, called States in the Constitution, made a covenant with each other, creating a general government, the United States, and delegating to it such powers as seemed best to them.

When that covenant was adopted it became a sacred contract among the States and was binding on all only by the reasonable interpretation of the contract.

The contract would never have been made had they not agreed to retain all power each possessed in severalty except such powers as they all agreed to surrender to the Union they were creating.

The powers which they agreed to surrender to the United States are set out in plain language in section 8 of the Constitution as adopted.

In that section there were 18 specific grants of power. When this was adopted, it became a sacred agreement among the States. Each had a right to demand that all adhere to the agreement, but no one, or even a majority, had a right to enlarge on the powers granted.

Delegates met to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Remember, it was the Colonies, called States in the Constitution, that came together to create a more perfect Union. Those Colonies or States were self-governing units at the time. They had all the rights and powers to dispose of as they pleased. They did not have to delegate any of the powers, but they thought it was best to create an agency to act for all of them in certain matters. The United States was created by the States only as an agency for them.

They feared to surrender too much power to their agent. It was not unlike your naming an agent, and delegating to him certain authority. When he acts beyond his delegated authority, his acts cannot bind his principal.

With this in view, they knew it was important to make plain the duties and powers to be delegated to this agency they were creating.

In section 8 of the Constitution they made very clear what powers this new agency was expected to exercise.

Section 8 is headed "Powers granted to Congress." Section 9 is headed "Powers denied to the United States."

Please read carefully those two sections.

If Texas appointed an agent to perform the things set forth in section 8 of the Constitution, and he undertook to fix the qualifications of the voters in Texas, would you not say his acts were void because he went beyond his delegated authority?

It is as simple as that.

But section 9 undertook to define what Congress could not do; it gave some latitude for misinterpretation.

Because it expressly mentioned eight matters, which Congress could not do, a group of politicians interpreted it to mean that the mention of the eight matters excluded all others, and that Congress could do all things not expressly inhibited in the Constitution.

Of course, the same interpretation should have been applied to section 8; the mention of the powers granted should have excluded every power not expressly granted, but experience has proved, if anything in the law is left to construction, men will construe it so as to widen the scope of their power, and the first two or three sessions of Congress again verified that characteristic of men.

In everything Congress again sought to exceed its constitutional limitations on the interpretation that powers not expressly prohibited in the Constitution were not denied to Congress.

The great champion of democracy, Jefferson, was at work prodding the people to adopt a Bill of Rights, and finally his friend and disciple, Madison, introduced and passed the resolution for the Bill of Rights. It was adopted 3 years after the adoption of the Constitution.

There is little doubt of the authorship of the Bill of Rights.

Doubtless we owe it to that great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson.

It is the soul of the Constitution. It specified rights that neither the Congress nor the States could take away from the people; the right of freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, the right to keep and bear arms. Article III gave us the right to select the tenants for our houses, and so on, through the whole 10 articles constituting the rights which neither Congress nor the States can take away from the people, and finished with article X, which is the crowning glory of our constitutional liberty.

Article X. "The powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

As if the framer of the Bill of Rights feared he had left some loophole through which power-greedy Congressmen may go beyond constitutional authority, it seems that article X of the Bill of Rights was thrown in as a perpetual bar to congressional invasion of the rights of the States and the people.

Mr. Jefferson thought it would protect us from congressional dictatorship but he did not know twentieth-century politicians.

Of course, he thought that when a man took the oath of Congressman, he would keep it.

Reread article X of the Bill of Rights: "The powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Read section 8 of the Constitution and you will see every power granted to the United States.

Section 8 is headed: "Powers granted to Congress."

Read all the powers granted to Congress.

Do you see anything that by the most liberal construction, would authorize Congress to pass a law to say who can vote in Texas, or repeal any law enacted by Texas fixing the qualifications of voters, or any constitutional amendment voted by Texas voters requiring a poll tax to qualify one to vote?

Do you see any authority to enact a Federal anti-lynching bill?

Do you see any authority to establish a commission to go into your store or shop and supplant white employees with Negro employees, if perchance it found the employees of the two races out of proper proportion to the population of the races in the community?

Do you see any provision in there that would authorize Congress to pass a law that would prevent the States from sending white children to one school and Negroes to another?

If not, then read section 10 of the Constitution, and see if the States are denied these rights.

Only three powers are denied to the States, and, if you will read them you will see the States are not denied the power to regulate by law and enforce such laws as deal with the President's civil rights program.

If that is true, then article X of the Bill of Rights reserve such rights to the States, or the people. Of Truman's civil rights program, they are all reserved to the States, except what is known as the FEPC (fair employment). It is a right reserved to the people—to select their own employees and to employ whites, Negroes, or Mexicans, or Russians, if you please.

All one has to do is to read the powers granted to Congress in section 8 of the Constitution, and section 10 of the Constitution, rights denied to the States, and, if he fails to find the right to fix the qualifications for voters, the rights to pass antilynching laws, to pass the FEPC or the right to abolish our segregation laws under the section 8, and fails to find those expressly inhibited in section 10, then they are reserved to the States, or to the people.

The coming crisis:

It seems certain that Congress will accept President Truman's challenge and pass all his civil-rights program.

He started it for political effect, and the Republicans will take the play away from him.

Nothing better could be expected of a Republican Congress, when challenged by one calling himself a Democrat.

Of course he will approve the legislation, notwithstanding it cuts the heart out of the Constitution.

Can we depend upon the Supreme Court, our last line of defense?

I fear for the safety of the constitutional rights of my country.

It is time for plain talk.

No man of intellectual honesty can study the Constitution of the United States and honestly say that Congress has the constitutional authority to pass such laws as advocated in the President's civil-rights program.

It is not for the lack of understanding that Congress would try to pass and enforce such laws.

The writers of the Bill of Rights, knowing that there might come a time when majorities would utterly ignore the rights of minorities, put article X in as the heart of the covenant.

Oh, why will men, sworn to protect and enforce it, ruthlessly strike it down?

Congress is sworn to protect the Constitution of the United States, yet they (many of them), have their swords unsheathed to cut the heart out of it, by cutting out article X of the Bill of Rights.

Shame on any man who would pay homage with words to the greatest Democrat that ever lived, as they do at Jefferson Day dinners, and then strike at the Bill of Rights, the greatest bulwark of our democracy and our liberty.

Advantages of American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the article entitled, "Mr. Vishinsky—When You Return to Russia, Will You Tell Your People Those Truths About the U. S. A.?" by E. F. Hutton, Westbury, Long Island, is one of the clearest statements on the advantages of the American way of life as contrasted with communistic controlled governments, that it has ever been my privilege to read. Under the unanimous consent granted to me by the House I am including it as a part of my remarks in the hope that it will be widely read. It is as follows:

MR. VISHINSKY—WHEN YOU RETURN TO RUSSIA, WILL YOU TELL YOUR PEOPLE THESE TRUTHS ABOUT THE U. S. A.?

You could do it in Pravda, which means truth. You could use Radio Moscow to tell them. You could tell it to your people who are not members of your Communist Party but who are owned, body and soul, by your party.

You could tell your people that we Americans are not seeking war and are not warmongers. We hate war. We want peace. We want the whole world to have the opportunities and freedom upon which lasting peace can be brought to all nations. You know that.

You could explain that we are not a capitalistic monopoly. Tell your people that our railroads, telephones, radios, air lines, shipping lines, factories, stores, mines, and forests are not owned by Government but that they are owned by the people as private citizens. You could tell them that millions—and many more millions—of the people's dollars are invested in our railroad, automobile, and our steel industries—and all other industries—all of which came out of the savings of the people.

You could tell your people that we are not a capitalistic Nation—but that your Russia today is the only complete capitalistic nation on earth. It owns everything, including the people and the profits the people could make on their own labor.

In America, the people own everything—including the Government. In U. S. S. R. the government owns everything—including the people.

Tell the Russian people that in America, through industrial know-how, we have turned luxuries into mass production within the reach of everybody. Explain that telephones, bathtubs, gas stoves, radios, refrigerators, electric lights, vacuum cleaners, and automobiles are not luxuries in America. Tell them we have over 80 percent of all the automobiles in the world—and they are owned—not by the rich—they are owned by the people. They are the capitalists. Every bit of property our people own is owned because they have saved money out of the greatest earnings ever earned by any people. All because of the free, competitive system, made possible by liberty.

Tell your people about our courts of justice. Explain our jury system by which 12 of our equals decide on the guilt or innocence of any one charged and brought to the bar. We do not have judges who decide on guilt or innocence. We, the people, decide. The judge pronounces sentence. We elect the judges.

Also tell your people that we sent to your country $11,500,000,000 of lend-lease war material to win your war over Nazi Germany, your former ally, who turned on you. Marshal Stalin said that the war would have been lost without the productivity of America. You might tell your people that all the material and food sent to you was produced by America in addition to what we needed to win our own war and help England win hers.

Tell your people how much greater American production is than that of Russia. Why? The secret is that United States of America production is free and every producer is free. Explain how every family in America is self-regulated and runs itself better than you of the inner circle run all of the Russians from the Kremlin.

Explain, Mr. Vishinsky, that in the United States of America every man, woman, and child has the right to progress—is automatically given liberty and freedom—can pick out any educational opportunity they want, the job they want, and decide, personally, what they want to be.

Tell them about our Constitution and how—if some people want something which is not constitutional there must be submitted a proposed amendment so that all may vote—and only by three-fourths vote of the legislatures of the State can such amendment become law. No person, in or out of Government, can issue an order in defiance of the Constitution. Tell them that America believes in the rights of man and that we make the State a servant of the people. That is just the opposite of the Russian communistic system where man is nothing and the state is everything, the sole possessor of liberty and freedom.

Tell your people the United States of America is a Republic. That the same legal rules which enable us to continue as a Republic also enable our businesses to continue with constant change and modification. Would you tell them that America has achieved the highest living standard—the greatest tolerance, the truest charity—all because of giving liberty and freedom to all people, and that we in America regard the police state as a horror, as a crime against the body and soul of man.

Tell your people that we resent the charges that we are a warmongering people. It is not only unkind and uncalled for, but a malicious statement.

Mr. Vishinsky, if you were a citizen of the United States of America and returned from visiting Russia, you could state publicly what you discovered. You could say it in print, by radio—even in moving pictures. You would have that right as an American citizen. You are one of the big men of the U. S. S. R. Can you go home and tell the truth?

As an American citizen of the United States of America, I have freedom to make this statement in public print as often as I please. Recently I was invited to make a radio broadcast. I will be glad to send it to you. It is something about our country and the freedom of every individual in it. Would you like to read it? I can send it through the United States mail. Any citizen can have it.

That is freedom, Mr. Vishinsky. That is the byproduct—just one of the byproducts—of the most priceless secret that you could carry back to Russia. The secret is the system by which the United States of America has made progress. A system of liberty and freedom for the individual. If you would see your own country move fast into a great, productive nation of happy people, set your people free. Take capitalism out of the hands of your government and put it in the hands of your people, where it belongs. Capitalism then ceases to be what you have called it, and becomes the secret by which common wealth is created for all the people.

Not a single word of this message has a double meaning. We owe a debt of gratitude to those who established our way of life and only by preserving and spreading the dignity of man—the rights of freedom—can we pay that debt.

You can answer this message, Mr. Vishinsky, in this same newspaper. You have unlimited funds at your command. Why, you are the agent of the greatest capitalistic power on earth. I am just an American citizen, one of the millions you have referred to as capitalists.

We in America believe in the spiritual as well as the material side of life. They must go hand-in-hand. No country—no government—can abolish nature—the hand-maiden of God. Nor can they control the flood—and ebb tides—the changes of seasons—nor did any country or government place in the earth—minerals—oils—fish in the waters—fowl in the air. No scientist can make the seed which creates the harvest to feed the people. Only God can do that. Nature insists that man be free in order that he may reach his highest possible position and be of service to his fellowman—not to any state.

When you return to your country, Mr. Vishinsky, why don't you tell your people about our way of life in America? When peace shall once more be acclaimed, the work of the world will have begun.

Universal Military Training Is Needed for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, surely with the rapid change in world affairs, we must be conscious of our great danger. In spite of the fact that within the span of a few years our military forces have twice won great victories, we have not yet won the peace.

The people for whom I speak are keenly alert about world conditions. I believe the folks back home are ahead of the administration and the Congress in their consciousness that added military strength must be provided without further delay.

This morning I received the enclosed telegram from William P. Lanford, commander of the T. H. Mason Post, No. 6385, Veterans of Foreign Wars, to which I have replied as per the attached copy.

We have just completed the bill providing for funds to be used in the European recovery program. It is all the more essential now that Congress pass measures for the strengthening of our armed forces. I urge our leadership to present bills providing for the revival of selective service to take care of our immediate needs, to be followed by the establishment of universal military training. If we are to preserve our free way of living, these measures are essential until the communistically dominated countries come to their senses.

WOODRUFF, S. C., *April 1, 1948.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Democrat, South Carolina,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

By unanimous vote, we urgently request immediate restoration of selective service to meet the present needs of our Armed Forces and passage of universal military training for our future needs. We as urgently request measures be taken to destroy communism in any form existing in these United States, its possessions or territories. We have each borne arms on foreign shores and many of us bear scars attesting this fact. We stand ready to do this again to preserve our American way of life. May we unite with you in saying, "They shall not have died in vain."

WILLIAM P. LANFORD,
Commander, T. H. Mason Post, No. 6385, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Woodruff, S. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 2, 1948.*

WILLIAM P. LANFORD,
Commander T. H. Mason Post, No. 6385, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Woodruff, S. C.:

Retel: Greatly appreciate strong and courageous attitude of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 6385, Woodruff. Fully concur in views expressed. Have, and shall continue to urge immediate compliance with your program for national security.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress.

Palestine Christians Oppose Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Palestine partition still calls for attention by the United Nations and the United States. Eleven Christian groups in Palestine are opposed to partition. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news item which bears a Jerusalem date line:

PALESTINE CHRISTIANS OPPOSE PARTITION—APPEAL TO ALL WORLD RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL GROUPS TO MAINTAIN THE RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION OF PALESTINE AS ENVISAGED IN THE CHARTER OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—ELEVEN CHRISTIAN GROUPS IN ZION HIT PARTITION

JERUSALEM, March 3.—Leaders of 11 Christian communities in Palestine urged today that the partition plan be shelved in the interest of peace.

The statement was issued at a news conference in the Old City at the Coptic chambers adjoining the Holy Sepulcher.

It was signed by the Orthodox (Greek) patriarchate, the Latin patriarchate, the Armenian patriarchate, the Custodia de Terra Santa, the Vicar of the Melkite patriarchate, the Arab Evangelical Episcopal community, the Coptic patriarchate, the Vicar of the Armenian Catholic patriarchate, the Metropolitan of the Syrian Orthodox community, the Vicar of the Syrian Catholic patriarchate and the Arab Lutheran community in Palestine.

The statement was addressed to all world religious and political bodies.

It expressed "deep sorrow and strong indignation at the lamentable situation in which the Holy Land, the cradle of peace, has been placed as a direct result of the erroneous policy which has been imposed on the country and which has culminated in the partition plan."

"It is our firm conviction," the statement said, "that peace will not be restored, nor would any endeavors made for the promotion of the peace of Jerusalem be crowned with success, unless those bodies who undertake the determination of the future of Palestine remove the causes which have made a battle of the Holy Land, reestablish the principles of justice, and maintain the right of self-determination as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations.

"The Christian Union (the church communities signing the statement) wishes to declare in unequivocal terms that they denounce the partition plan, being of strong conviction that this plan involves a violation of the sacredness of the Holy Land, which by its nature and history is indivisible, and represents an encroachment on the natural rights of the Arabs, the people of the country."

(Ballots not bullets for the Holy Land.)

Radio Address of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine:

[From the New York Times of April 1, 1948]

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, declared yesterday that the latest United States proposals for a truce in the Holy Land and further consideration by the United Nations of the future government there are wholly unsatisfactory and futile.

What is needed, he said, is adherence to the partition plan sanctioned by the General Assembly of the United Nations last November, and the organization and equipment of a Jewish militia to support the provisional government schedule to be set up in Palestine not later than May 16. To this end he urged the removal of all embargoes in the shipment of arms to the Jewish people of Palestine.

The statement was delivered over a network of the Columbia Broadcasting System, which announced that Ambassador Warren R. Austin, representing the United States in the United Nations discussions, has been invited to reply on April 7.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

"Last November the United Nations Assembly, under the leadership of our Government, overwhelmingly approved the recommendations of its special committee to solve the Palestine problem by the setting up of two independent states in Palestine, one Arab and one Jewish, within an economic union, and the internationalizing of the Jerusalem area.

"This action came in reply to a request which was made in April of last year by Great Britain, the mandatory for Palestine, asking for a Special Assembly of the United Nations to make recommendations for the future government of Palestine.

"The recommendations made by the United Nations in November 1947, were accepted by Great Britain, which later announced its intention to relinquish the mandate on May 15 next, and to complete the withdrawal of its troops from Palestine by August 1.

"In the meantime the United Nations appointed a commission to implement the plan. This commission has already done an enormous amount of work in connection with the execution of the plan. A committee of experts is already at work in Jerusalem. Were it not for the refusal of the mandatory government to permit it to come any earlier than May 1, the commission would now be in Palestine completing the arrangements for taking over all governmental and administrative functions.

"April 1 was the last day set for the announcement by the commission of the provisional councils of government for the new states. The Jewish community of Palestine has already informed the commission of its suggestions for the composition of the provisional council of government for the Jewish state.

"It was on the eve of the consummation of this plan that the United States Government, on March 19, requested that the Palestine Commission should suspend its work and that a special Assembly of the United Nations be called to establish a temporary trusteeship for Palestine pending an eventual political settlement. The explanation given for this sudden reversal is that the plan cannot now be implemented by peaceful means and that a further opportunity should be given the interested parties to reach an agreement regarding the future government of Palestine.

"It was, of course, never anticipated that the partition plan or, for that matter, any plan for the settlement of the Palestine problem, could be carried out entirely by peaceful means, and that no force whatsoever would be required to back up a settlement. In fact, it was the United States delegation

itself, last November, which first spoke of the need for an international constabulary made up of volunteers to enforce a United Nations decision.

"Throughout the long discussions which preceded the vote at the Assembly, the representatives of the Arab states and of the Arabs of Palestine made it unmisakably clear that they intended to resist by force any decision of which they did not approve. It was in the full knowledge of this resolve of the Arabs to resort to violence that the Assembly of the United Nations, inclusive of our own Government, nevertheless took the step which it did."

MILITIAS PROVIDED FOR

"State militias were provided for in the plan to preserve law and order, and the Security Council, it was understood, would step in if a breach of peace developed, exercising all the power assigned to it under the Charter.

"Equally misleading is the other reason given for suspending work on the partition plan and the calling of a special Assembly, namely, to afford another opportunity to Jews and Arabs to reach an agreement regarding the future government of Palestine. In this connection it would be well to recall what the representative of the United States, Ambassador Herschel Johnson, said last November when this subject was being discussed in the Assembly:

" 'Much has been said during the course of these debates on the desirability and necessity of presenting to the General Assembly a plan which would command the agreement of both the principal protagonists in this situation. I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented either to the Assembly or to the mandatory government during its long years of tenure or in any other place which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No such plan has ever been presented and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented.'

"At the General Assembly last November, the British representative, Sir Alexander Cadogan, stated: 'After years of strenuous but unavailing effort, His Majesty's Government have reached the conclusion that they are not able to bring about a settlement in Palestine based upon the consent of both Arabs and Jews, and that the mandate is no longer workable.'

"As far back as 10 years ago the Royal Commission on Palestine, which made a thorough study of the situation and recommended partition as the only practical solution, declared:

" 'Neither Arab nor Jew has any sense of service to a single state. * * * The conflict will go on. The gulf between Arabs and Jews will widen. * * * The hope of harmony between the races has proved untenable. We would suggest that there is little moral value in maintaining the political unity of Palestine at the cost of perpetual hatred.'

"When in the face of this overwhelming testimony, the United States Government now requests the abandonment of a plan which has been approved by the United Nations and which is in process of implementation, in favor of renewed consultations in order to reach an agreed solution between Jews and Arabs, it is not making a serious contribution to the subject. It is, in fact, engaged in an act of inept political improvisation which is dictated by no responsible statesmanship and by concern neither for basic national interests nor for the larger interests of the world community."

SUMNER WELLES IS QUOTED

"No one can help but agree with the sentiments expressed on Monday last by Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, who stated:

" 'There is no shadow of justification for this reversal; and the position which the United States now occupies is profoundly humiliating. * * * The United States was chiefly responsible for the adoption by the Assembly of the partition resolution 4 months ago.

" 'Since that time the President, the Secretary of State, and the American delegate to the United Nations have given repeated assurances that the American Government stood foursquare behind that decision. * * * This reversal by the United States will increase and not diminish the danger of a major war in the Near East. It deals what may well be a death blow to the United Nations, and to our hope for collective security. It shakes confidence in the United States throughout the world.'

"The United States Government has requested a special Assembly of the United Nations to reconsider the Palestine problem. To what end? What can another Assembly do that the last Assembly failed to do? What new facts are available now that were not previously known? This problem and this little country of Palestine have been investigated by more commissions in recent years than any other problem or any other spot on the face of the globe.

"What new solutions can be pulled out of the bag? There are none, and the Palestine problem cannot be solved by postponements and procrastinations. That way lies continued strife and growing chaos.

"The United States has proposed a temporary trusteeship for Palestine, although in its formal resolutions introduced yesterday in the Security Council it made no reference to trusteeship. It avows that this is no substitution for partition. The President still maintains that he is for partition, and so does the Secretary of State.

"The United States feels that emergency action is needed inasmuch as there will be no public authority in Palestine after May 15, and that large-scale fighting among the people of that country will be the inevitable result of the vacuum thus created.

"But if the plan of the United Nations is carried out faithfully in letter and spirit, there will be a public authority in Palestine on May 15. There will be a commission of the United Nations to take over. There will be an organized Jewish militia in the Jewish state to maintain law and order, provided the mandatory regime fulfills its obligations loyally and permits this militia to be organized and adequately equipped in time."

GOVERNMENT SET-UP READY

"The Jewish Provisional Government on May 15 will be prepared to take over all the responsibilities of administration of the proposed Jewish State under the guidance of the United Nations Commission. There is no need for a temporary trusteeship to fill any vacuum.

"An international trusteeship will require as much force, if not more, to maintain itself as would the partition plan. Where is this force to come from? Is the United States prepared to send troops into Palestine to impose a trusteeship upon that country when it is unwilling to send troops to back up the United Nations' decision on partition? If so, why? Why is it willing to send in troops to back up what is clearly a temporary arrangement which leaves the basic solution still unsettled, and why is it unwilling to make such a contribution in troops toward a final and permanent settlement? Palestine has lived under a trusteeship (the British mandate) for 25 years. If, through this long period, a trusteeship has not been productive of any agreed solution for Palestine, why are we now to expect a solution to result from another and temporary, trusteeship?

"It is clear that no trusteeship is contemplated without British participation. Great Britain would not permit any other power to come to Palestine before May 1. It has denied that right to the United Nations Commission. How then will a trustee power, other than Great Britain, be able to take over in time and fill the so-called vacuum? For all practical purposes it is to be either a new British trusteeship supported by the United States or a direct Anglo-American trusteeship with or without France.

"In any such event the trusteeship will be drafted on British terms, British policy in the Middle East is firmly wedded to the sponsorship of the Arab League. Consultation with 'States directly concerned' called for under the trusteeship rules of the Charter would be interpreted by Great Britain as consultation with the Arab States.

"An unfriendly mandatory power and hostile Arab states would thus, in the main, determine the terms of the agreement upon which the new trusteeship is to be based. Is it not clear that this new trusteeship would be directed against those fundamental Jewish rights in Palestine which the United Nations, under American leadership, has but recently approved. The task of suppressing a disillusioned and resentful Jewish population which has been prepared for independence and statehood would inevitably involve the individual or collective trustee in heavy military liabilities.

"The American Government is proposing a trusteeship without any assurance that a trustee is available, that the special General Assembly to be convoked will approve of such an arrangement, that any section of the population will cooperate, or that adequate means of enforcement can be secured. The partition plan admittedly involves difficulties, but these can hardly compare with the accumulation of hazards and difficulties involved in its abandonment.

"The Jewish Agency for Palestine feels that the cause of justice and the cause of Palestine will best be served by carrying out the decision taken by the United Nations last November. That decision represented a major compromise. Partition was never the Jewish solution. It represents a grievous abridgment of Jewish rights. Nevertheless, the Jewish people reluctantly but loyally accepted that decision because it appeared reasonable to the United Nations."

ACTING ON UN DECISION

"Relying upon the collective judgment and authority of the United Nations, the Jewish people of Palestine has been moving forward in the spirit of that decision. It has notified the Security Council that it must oppose any proposal designed to prevent or postpone the establishment of the Jewish State, and that it rejects any plan to set up a new trusteeship regime.

"It informed the Security Council that upon the termination of the mandatory administration, and not later than May 16 next, a provisional Jewish government will commence to function in Palestine. This decision of the organized Jewish community of Palestine was taken after the most searching and serious deliberation. It may involve a measure of conflict after May 15. It still hopes that there may be no need for prolonged conflict in Palestine.

"The Jews of Palestine hope that the Arabs of Palestine will come to accept the United Nations decision and thereby put an end to the scourge of strife and bloodshed which can only do incalculable hurt to both peoples. But in the face of the mounting threats and the incursion of armed bands across the frontiers from neighboring Arab States bent on war, the Jewish people of Palestine are compelled to make all necessary preparations for self-defense.

"They ask that they be permitted to organize and equip their own militia. This is an elementary moral obligation of the United Nations in view of the decision which it took. It is likewise an elementary moral obliga-

tion on the part of those nations who have approved the plan, to remove all embargoes on the shipment of arms to the Jewish people of Palestine who have accepted the decision, and to deny such arms to those who are violently resisting it.

"The Jews of Palestine wish first and foremost to defend themselves, but their hands must not be tied. They plead with the United Nations to remove all obstacles in the way of their self-defense. They are carrying out the purposes of the United Nations. They should not be penalized for doing so.

"They appeal to the United States, the greatest democracy on earth, whose people have, through the years, manifested deep understanding and sympathy for the historic right of the Jewish people to rebuild their national life in their ancient homeland, to desist from a course of action which is calculated to do them grievous wrong, prolong strife in the Holy Land and discredit the United Nations as an instrumentality for solving grave international problems and making its decision stick. They appeal to the people and the Government of the United States to help them in their desperate struggle toward freedom and independence."

Chinese Mass Education Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, in the China-aid bill, 10 percent of the money was earmarked to support the Chinese mass-education movement.

The following is an excerpt on the Chinese mass-education movement from the Report, Visit to Szechuan, December 11 to 23, 1947, by Hugh Hubbard, UNESCO's consultant for China.

This objective report gives a comprehensive and up-to-date picture of the splendid work that is being done under the leadership of Dr. James Yen.

Mr. Hubbard was sent by UNESCO last December to make a survey of the work of the Chinese mass-education movement with the object of adopting its basic principles and techniques to UNESCO's fundamental education program for other parts of the world as well as utilizing the movement as a center for its pilot project in China.

[Excerpt on the Chinese mass-education movement, from "Report, Visit to Szechuan, December 11 to 23, 1947," by Hugh Hubbard, UNESCO consultant for China]

THE EXPERIMENTAL AREA OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MASS-EDUCATION MOVEMENT

A. THE NATIONAL COLLEGE OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION AT HSIEH-MA-CHANG

The mass-education movement, started by Dr. James Yen in 1922, has had a varied experience, first in cities, then at Hinghsien, a rural district (1927–36), then in Hunan, Kwangsi, and Szechuan. It has often cooperated with the government, both national and provincial, but has maintained throughout its independent organization and support.

Personnel, rightly motivated and adequately trained, is felt to be the basic requirement of rural reconstruction and has led Dr. Yen to the founding of this college. At present, something over 200 students are in attendance and the first class is due to graduate next year.

The college is divided into departments of rural education, sociology, agriculture, and hydraulic engineering.

An important feature of the training received is the required field work for students during their third year. A so-called research and practice field has been embarked within easy reach of the college and here the students put into practice among the farmers the theories they have learned in the classroom.

Two days were spent at Hsieh-ma-chang, the site of the college, and in the research and practice field. Here in a typical rural environment, with guided field work, under experienced leaders, are conditions favorable to the producing of effective workers in fundamental education. And effective workers are the first requirement for successful work.

College and field work are weak on the side of public health. There is no department in this important science and only one doctor and three nurses working in the dispensary attached to the college. This weakness is fully recognized by those in charge, but is chiefly due to the lack of funds and also the difficulty of securing medical workers for rural areas.

One other handicap might be mentioned in connection with the college and that is the necessary absence for most of the time of its president, Dr. James Yen. This is necessitated by the budget of the mass-education movement, which has to be raised by Dr. Yen and largely abroad. This seems to be a necessary accompaniment of the policy of keeping the movement independent, privately supported and controlled.

B. THE EXPERIMENTAL AREA (THIRD PREFECTURE)

This area covers 10 hsien, or counties, plus the special district of Peip'ei. It was designated as an experimental field for the Mass Education Movement by the provincial government and the nominee of the Movement, Mr. Sun Lien-ch'üan, was appointed by the Government as magistrate in March of this year. The area in general seems fairly typical, not only of Szechuan, but of territories in neighboring provinces to the south and east. Its estimated population is 5,000,000.

Mr. Sun is far from the typical official. He has devoted a lifetime to rural reconstruction, before which he made a special study of rural economics for 2 years in Japan (about 1915). Prior to accepting this post, he had been wartime provincial commissioner for the training of magistrates. Most of the hsien officials now under him were trained by him. He impresses one as being an unusual man and a very fortunate choice.

Dr. Yen gives four basic principles for rural reconstruction:

1. The initial project should not be alien to the rural community, but something deeply rooted in the community to be improved.

2. Emphasis on decentralized production and centralized management through cooperative production, marketing, purchasing, and financing.

3. Assistance to the village is mainly an initial lift, providing impetus for reconstruction by themselves by training and demonstration.

4. A correlated program must be followed, including such basic elements as literacy, health, agriculture, and citizenship education.

Experimental work is fairly recent and has thus far been largely confined to three districts, Peip'ei Bishan and the Research and Practice district around Hsier-ma-ch'ang.

I. Peip'ei

The director of Peip'ei is, like Magistrate Sun, a very unusual type of official. His name is Lu Tsu-ying. He and his better-known brother Lu Tso-fu are public-spirited men who have great ability and have dedicated their lives and their fortunes to the service of this their native district. Mr. Lu Tsu-ying took over this bandit-infested area 21 years ago, not even worthy of being a hsien, and has made it the most progressive single rural area the writer has seen in China.

Town of Peip'ei: The writer drove into town over well-paved roads, which will soon include all the streets. Electricity from a nearby hydroelectric project lights the whole place. A clean, modern hotel furnishes pleasant quarters to the visitor and good food is served at a nearby restaurant. Not far away is a large town hall, built in modern style, lighted with neon lights. Other public institutions include a library, with a children's division; a natural-history museum; a hospital; a public-health center; a public park and athletic field for 2,100; educational system from nursery to college; and adult classes for illiterates. Last, but not least, a sewer system.

Fundamental Education

(a) Primary schools: The writer visited one primary school with a good plant and over 500 pupils. The teachers seemed intelligent and progressive and the equipment reasonably good. Mr. Lu Tsu-ying stated that, in his district, there were:

Central schools of primary grade	584
Citizens, or ordinary primary schools	3,593
Primary schools of all grades	4,177

He also gave the following figures for children of school age:

	Ages 5 to 12	Ages 12 to 15	Total (5 to 15)	Percent
In school	9,840	1,607	11,447	75
Not in school (uneducated)	2,304	1,487	3,791	25
Total	12,144	3,094	15,238	100

From the above, it would appear that primary-school education is now reaching 75 percent of the children of school age, which is a very high average for China. Peip'ei is an unusually progressive district, and this may well be the case.

(b) Adult education: Peip'ei may be cited as an example of the way in which adult education is organized and carried on in the part of the experimental area so far worked; namely, Peip'ei, Bishan, and part of Pa-hsien.

(1) Primary school centered: The district is divided up into primary school districts, each one being, so far as possible, a natural economic or agricultural unit, and not more than a mile or so in radius. A feature of most of Szechuan is that farmers live on their land in scattered homes and not in villages, as in most of China. A watershed or half a valley might be taken as a school district, with the school near the center. This school will have one teacher for its regular classes. The Mass Education Movement, in connection with the area magistrate, Mr. Sun, who is concurrently director of the experimental area, will appoint a second teacher to have charge of adult education and will be called mass-education director.

(2) The mass-education director will take charge of any evening class there may be in the school itself. He will also organize the school area into relay classes according to the distribution of students, availability of classrooms, etc.

(3) Relay classes are intended to cover all illiterates, whether of school age or adult. There may be a dozen in a school district.

They are taught by local teachers, selected by the students with the help of the mass-education director.

(4) These local teachers are called tao-shenk, or leader students. They represent an adaptation of the monitorial system as known in England. They may be local persons with a degree of education, or even advanced students and graduates of literacy classes. One of these leader students who impressed us particularly by his intelligence and teaching ability had had but 1 year in regular primary school and was a shoe repairer by trade. These leader students are given 2 weeks' training by the Mass Education Movement and are brought together every 2 weeks after that for discussion of problems and further coaching. Thus, education is relayed down from the Mass Education Movement, through the directors, to the actual teachers of the illiterates.

(5) In addition to the mass education director, an agricultural director is available for a larger district. He is also under the Mass Education Movement, and his duties are to work with the members of the classes in agricultural improvement and in the promotion of cooperatives. He participates in the meetings each fortnight with the leader students and introduced various projects in agricultural lines. Some of these projects are connected with the contents of the textbooks, some are contained on separate leaflets.

(6) An important feature of the whole mass education scheme is the integration of literacy, livelihood, and cooperatives. Wherever there are classes, there must be cooperatives organized around local needs and guidance in livelihood.

(7) Attack on the tenant-farmer problem: Mr. Sun Lien-chiian considers one of the most serious evils of rural society in Szechuan is the prevalence of tenant farmers. According to the Szechuan Provincial Yearbook for 1946, tenant farmers number 46.7 percent, owner farmers 28.2 percent, and part owners 25.1 percent. There is constant friction between the tenants and their landlords. Mr. Sun proposes to remedy this evil by asking every owner in a district with a cooperative society to first offer the land for sale to the cooperatives, before putting it on sale to the general public or individuals. He estimated that there is a complete turn-over of land in about 15 years and that a cooperative might be able to buy up the land within its field in that period, thus eliminating absentee ownership and tenancy and enabling the members of the cooperative to own and cultivate the land cooperatively. This experiment deserves close attention. It may easily arouse the opposition of the large landowners, although it is not proposed to dispossess them forcibly. On the other hand, if successful, it may solve serious problems now innate in the system of speculating in land and absentee landlordship.

Summary of observations at Peiplei: In looking for weaknesses in the work of fundamental education in this district, one might mention:

(a) The very recent start (summer of 1947) and rather brief period of experimentation.

(b) The almost total lack of emphasis on public health.

(c) From the UNESCO point of view, one regrets the total lack of emphasis on international understanding, so far as this observer could see.

(d) Only one organization outside of the Mass Education Movement and the government seem to be cooperating and that is the agricultural experiment station of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, situated near Peip'ei. The question might be carefully studied whether other institutions and organizations might not be drawn into this work of reconstruction.

On the positive side, there is much to be commended:

(a) A well-conceived and carefully executed system, whereby fundamental education is relayed in several steps down to the farmer himself, his wife and children, in a form suited to his needs and acceptable to his taste.

(b) The unusually talented personnel which the Mass Education Movement has succeeded in concentrating on this area, especially—

(1) Mr. Sun and Mr. Lu, third prefecture magistrate and Peip'ei district director, respectively;

(2) The various directors and agents of the Mass Education Movement, many of them with 20 or more years of rural experience, working in the field;

(3) The leaders of the Mass Education Movement itself, of whom it may suffice to name but two, although many others are worthy of note:

Dr. James Yen, more than any other leader in China the pioneer and inspirer in Mass Education.

Mr. Liang Chung-hua, now acting president of the Rural Reconstruction College, well known for his accomplishments in Shantung and Honan and for his classroom teaching.

(c) The well integrated program which combines literacy with livelihood and cooperation.

(d) The smooth cooperation of government and private personnel.

(e) The rapid development of classes and expansion of the field. Three districts are now included and all other eight in the experimental area are asking for similar help.

(f) Success in securing the interest and cooperation of large numbers of the populace, a most important and significant factor in such an undertaking.

II. Bishan

(a) The general program of mass education in Bishan is similar to that of Peip'ei in most respects. For this report it may suffice to summarize the results to date:

	Statistics 1947	Plan for 1948
Started in 4 "Hsiang"	(1)	[2] 362
Literacy relay stations	326	3,000
Leader students	544	7,000
Graduates	7,161	70,000

[1] Out of 35.
[2] Schools.

Four classes were visited which numbered 30 or more students, largely girls and women, many of the latter with babies in their arms or at the breast.

(b) Weaving cooperative societies constitute the more particular interest at Bishan. During the war, weaving was an important industry in this district. It was done on home looms, a supplementary to agriculture, during the spare time of farmers and their families and more by women than others. Szechuan produces cotton, but not enough for her consumption and much is imported from Honan. After the war, a depression occurred in this industry and an estimated 40,000 looms lay idle.

Following the policy of forming cooperatives around local needs, the mass-education workers under the leadership of the Magistrate Mr. Sun Lien-ch'uan made a study of the situation and arranged with the farmer's bank for loans to cooperatives. Starting with two cooperatives in March 1947, they have gradually increased the number to 12 in December.

The writer met with the officers of these 12 cooperatives and with the cooperatives specialist in charge of training and promoting. He also visited homes in which were some dozen looms at work making cloth. He also spent some time in the cooperative union which includes these 12 societies and standardizes their produce and markets it. The weaving cooperatives are apparently well organized and doing rapidly increasing business with substantial profits. Mr. Sun foresees a great future for this movement, as officers and members can be trained properly and organized and funds become available.

Starting with 46 farmers, organized into two societies in March, and a loan of CN$56,000,000 from the farmer's bank, 787 standardized bolts of cloth with the cooperative trade-mark were sold in Chunking in 2 months. The wages paid for this work were $9,440,000 to the individual members and a further profit of $12,000,000 was made for the societies. This profit is actually not in cash, but in thread and cloth. Twenty percent of this profit was voted for education and 10 percent for health clinics. The other 70 percent was voted to capital investment. Here, as at Peip'ei, the cooperatives are inseparably linked with fundamental education. In order that the poorer farmers may profit, loans are limited to only two looms per farmer.

The following figures summarized the activities of the Bishan Co-op Union: 12 societies, including 616 members, of whom 419 were granted loans; 794 looms are owned by the members and loans made on 556 of this number; members shares in the societies total CN$102,800,000; CN$858,363,000 has been borrowed from the farmer's bank, after investigation of the status of these societies; 27,291 feet of standardized cloth have been woven.

Mr. Sun and the director of cooperatives say the next step is a dyeing and finishing plant, which will not cost too much and will be owned and operated by the co-op union. Next, they hope to own their own spinning mill, to provide them with the thread. After that, they might investigate the possibilities of organizing allied societies in Honan, for the improvement of seed, ginning, baling, and transporting the cotton to Szechuan. On the marketing side, they would study the possibilities of transporting and marketing their cloth in Yunnan and Kweichow, which are the great consumers of the cloth produced. Thus they envisage a complete circuit in the cotton industry, from the grower to the consumer.

Water power: Here, as at Peip'ei and Hsieh-ma-ch'ang, the writer was impressed with the latent possibilities of harnessing water power to the needs of industry. Some streams are dry at certain periods of the year, but such a situation may be taken care of, as it is at the Hsieh-ma-ch'ang dam, by building up reservoirs for use at such times. Other streams are dependable the year round. Rural lighting already exists around Peip'ei and Hsieh-ma-ch'ang. Much more can be done with capital and expert guidance. There are resources in water power that do not exist on the great North China.

This concludes our observations in the experimental area of the Mass Education Movement. Although the work was initiated quite recently, real fundamental education is in progress, closely related to the needs of the people, guided by intelligent and experienced workers and under the government of unusually cooperative and understanding officials. A foundation has been laid and a beginning made which would seem to offer possibilities of fairly rapid development and expansion, especially with the resources in trained personnel in the rural reconstruction college, and the exploitation of local leadership characteristic of this movement.

The Communists Use Freedom To Destroy Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following article from the Arkansas Democrat:

The Communists, who prate so much about democracy, profane the word when they use it. Their only interest in democracy is to use its freedom to destroy freedom.

Wherever they have come to power, they have been a minority of the nation, lying, cheating, threatening, and then forcing their way to the top. Once there, they have swiftly blotted out liberty—intimidating, imprisoning, shooting and hanging all opposition with merciless efficiency.

They were a handful of the population in Russia when they took over. In Bulgaria their numbers are put at about 7 percent of all the people, in Rumania at 3 percent, and in Poland at 2 percent. Everywhere they are a minority. The Russian trade-union paper, Trud, recently said that there are only 20,000,000 Communists in all the world.

Yet some Americans argue that we are in no danger from Communists here, because they're so few. We'd better all get rid of that notion and clear the reds out of important places. They are, at the least, eyes and ears for Russia. But let's be careful that we don't pin the Communist label on real American liberals—who long have spearheaded our political progress.

Come Home, Mr. Benton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that ERP—European recovery program—has passed the House and the Senate, an act committing our taxpayers to over $6,000,000,000 as the first installment of a $17,000,000,000 gift to 16 nations, a third of which $17,000,000,000 is going to the Socialist Government of Great Britain, there emerges day by day the hypocrisy of the Truman administration.

Just how long the people will be flimflammed into suffering and permitting a political party candidate to ride into power by breeding a war I do not know.

Is it worthy to arm an enemy and then send a million boys to their death to reelect a President?

This has occurred twice; why yield to this propaganda again?

I favor making our form of government work as intended under the Constitution, rid our Government and country of the Communists and other subversive elements before attempting to arm, feed, finance, and rule the other nations of the earth.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Frank Tripp which appeared in the Elmira Star-Gazette on March 29, 1948:

COME HOME, MR. BENTON
(By Frank Tripp)

Mr. Truman said that sending potential war materials to Russia was shipping to a friendly nation; that some of it had been ordered 2 years ago. Which made it all right, he thought.

A week before that classic alibi from our head man, a Republican Congressman said we had promised these things to Russia and we should keep our word.

My father once promised me a rifle—which he repossessed and locked up, after I had shot a neighbor's cat.

A few days preceding these amazing Washington pronouncements, 13 locomotives were shipped from an Army holding point 6 miles from my house—destined to Finland.

A reporter dug up the story and observed in connection with it that Finland is dangerously close to Russia both geographically and dictatorially. After the story came out it was revealed that 46 Russian-type locomotives have been thus sold and some shipped. Shipment of the remainder has been held up "pending investigation."

Shortly we began to hear about millions worth of war excess going to Stalin and his dominated sphere, including bomber plane engines, bought with Americans' war bond savings. Never promised, not under 2-year-old orders; but with the knowledge and consent of agencies now getting set for war with those who received them.

William Benton, of the State Department—one of 25,000—by Mr. Truman's appointment heads a 29-member United States commission now attending a United Nations Freedom of Information Conference in Geneva, Switzerland.

This is to suggest that the commission might well have held some dress rehearsals in Washington and gone to Geneva with clean noses.

This column and plenty of other writers and journals of the supposedly free and informed American press have been pounding away for months for freedom of information at home. A kind that would let you know what is going on.

Mr. Benton's parting word as he left for Geneva was: "The goal of the American delegation must be to lay a cornerstone for an ultimate broad world acceptance of the fact that freedom of information is the keystone of democracy and thus of peace."

I want to ask every uneasy American who reads this just one question:

What kind of freedom of information have you had when men to whom you entrusted your ship of state seek your billions and conscription of your sons to defend you against a "friendly" nation to which they have permitted to be shipped materials, and even weapons, which may be used to destroy you?

Just how far do such acts fall short of being treason by negligence?

Had these things been known to the people long ago they would not have happened. The damnable secrecy which shrouds and sanctifies the deeds of the clique of Washington spendthrifts forms an iron curtain as dangerous as any that Russia ever dropped.

Again the importance of our press comes home to us. But that it is free is not enough.

It is free to speak, yet cannot speak what it does not know. It can dig and pry and will, in time, unearth the truth. Sometimes the truth comes late. God grant that the recent sickening truths have dawned in time.

We send commissions to Geneva. We blast Europe with radio pleas that the people shake off the fetters of secret government. Meantime we are victims of the very secrecy which we condemn. What must be Joe Stalin's biggest laugh, to us is tragic.

Many of our national ills would never be if they could not fester in the dark. A few men take it upon themselves to be judges of all things.

They only go back to the people for money and for votes. Relatively few are schooled in their tasks. Most of them are political choices. Many move from post to post according to party loyalty or their financial needs. They dominate vital functions of which they know nothing. They puff all up with prominence and title.

The inspiration and guidance which could make them really great are back among the people from whom they hide their acts. Instead they guide each other, the blind leading the blind, into deep waters—and drag us with them.

True democracy requires that the governed know the course they pursue in times of peace. Only in war is there excuse for the kind of secrecy which has brought us to our present world plight.

The pressure of public opinion is great. It can only be safe pressure when the people are informed. Those who fear or distrust informed public opinion or withhold the truth from the people are not fit to hold public trust.

Come back home, Mr. Benton—till we clean up our own doorstep.

Vets Demand State Department Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, a copy of the letter which was directed to Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, on March 30, 1946, by the combined Americanization committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and Catholic War Veterans, of Great Neck, N. Y., was sent to me. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter in the RECORD:

[Combined Americanization committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and Catholic War Veterans—Walter H. Nowill Post, No. 372, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Charles A. Fowler Post, No. 160., Inc., American Legion; the Great Neck Memorial Post, No. 818, Catholic War Veterans]

GREAT NECK, N. Y., *March 30, 1948.*

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY MARSHALL: The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 25, 1948, contains an article by Congressman FRED E. BUSBEY, of Illinois, entitled "What's Wrong With the State Department?" which article makes serious charges against your department of the Government. The Congressman contends that the Office of Controls is responsible for the major errors in organization and administration and for the alleged presence of subversive personnel in the State Department and he advances the following facts to support his belief that Director Hamilton Robinson has conclusively

demonstrated his incompetence to hold office under your command.

1. Mr. Robinson gave conflicting testimony regarding his association with his cousin, Mr. Robert T. Miller III, who was permitted to resign from the State Department after evidence was presented indicating that he was a Communist and probaly a Soviet agent. Miller was originally placed in a position in the organization where he had access to secret files of Mrs. Rowena Barlow Rommel, said to be one of the cleverest, most sinister figures still employed by your Department. Despite evidence indicating that this woman was the primary cause of the alleged over-expansion and disorganized condition of the Department and that she was responsible for loading several branches of the United Nations Organization with leftists, Mr. Robinson is said to show no interest in dismissing her.

2. Mr. Robinson failed to dismiss two suspected employees even though their extensive records of subversive activities showed them to be definite security risks. He is said to be unable to distinguish between loyalty cases and security cases.

3. Employees under Mr. Robinson's control have obstructed for more than 2 years the efforts of Army and Navy authorities to obtain efficient utilization of the services of German and Austrian scientists on vital security projects and these same obstructionists have demanded precise details of the type of projects upon which the scientists are to be employed.

Many criticisms of the State Department have appeared in the press during the past few years but nothing so apparently well documented as Congressman BUSBEY'S article has come to the attention of this committee. If his charges are true it would appear that an extensive house cleaning is definitely in order.

The efforts of the local veteran groups to limit subversive activities and to promote Americanism in our community will be of little value in the broad picture if the foreign policy making department of our Nation remains blind to the presence of the sinister agents of Soviet Russia in positions of influence.

We strongly urge that investigation of Congressman BUSBEY'S charges be given high priority in your immediate program. We shall appreciate a copy of the report of investigation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. GREENE, *Secretary.*

Shipbuilding Is an Important Element in Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, shipbuilding demonstrated during the last war, as it also did in World War I, that it is one of the most fundamental elements in the maintenance of our national security. The necessity of maintaining this important industry in a high state of efficiency is clearly and forcibly set forth in an editorial appearing in the Courier-Post newspapers, Camden, N. J., in their April 1, 1948 issue. The editorial is of much worthwhile character that I am including it as a part of my remarks, under the unanimous consent granted to me by the House. It reads as follows:

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY AS ITS LEADERS VIEW IT

"Shipbuilding employment throughout the country is wholly inadequate to meet present national security needs."

No, that is not John Green or some other shipworkers' union official talking.

It's a representative of management, big business, if you please—at any rate a business that is always of mammoth proportions when America is plunged into an emergency, though our habit is to let it shrink away to skin and bones the instant the emergency is over.

The statement cited above is one to which Green and every other labor leader concerned would, however, subscribe wholeheartedly. They have said the same thing time and again in the hope that President Truman and Congress would listen and heed.

This time the speaker was H. Gerrish Smith, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America. He was addressing other heads of the industry at the council's annual election meeting a few days ago.

According to Smith, total personnel now employed in the Nation's shipyards is about 100,000. Three-quarters of this number are engaged in repair and reconversion work. In other words, only 25,000 are engaged in new construction, and even this small force will largely be laid off in the next few months because of the dearth of orders.

The most deplorable side of this situation is that, according to Smith, the 25,000 are the ones whom the industry most needs and wants to keep on the job. They include the most highly skilled, the technical staffs who would be first and worst needed in case of emergency. To train replacements would be a long and costly process.

But they cannot be kept as long as the shipyards are empty of new construction. True, said Smith, orders for 23 large-type tankers have recently been placed, assuring some work in certain yards for a certain time. But these tankers are of similar or repetitive design and do not utilize the broad, technical, diversified skills possessed by the most highly trained workers whom the builders are so anxious to keep at their trades.

Only one passenger ship is under construction in the entire country, and it will be completed in a few weeks. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is conducting hearings now on the state of our depleted merchant marine and shipbuilding industry. But even if and when it gets around to acting on the President's advisory committee's recommendations for new construction (which President Truman himself threw overboard) the industry will have long since stagnated. Its revival and the reintegration of its skilled craftsmen into a new working force will be excessively difficult.

At some other periods of shipbuilding decline, the Navy has come to the rescue with building programs. This is not the case today. According to the shipbuilders' president, only one contract for a naval vessel has been placed since the war, and that was for one experimental submarine.

"The present naval program," he says, "offers little hope of activity in shipyards in the next 12 months." On March 1 there were 13 naval vessels, of 135,000 displacement tons, under construction in the Nation's private and Navy yards. Many of them are near completion.

This country needs many new, modern passenger and passenger-cargo ships for its merchant marine. There is no need to go over the figures again. They were presented to the House committee at a hearing 2 weeks ago by Camden union spokesmen, Congressman WOLVERTON, Mayor Brunner, and others, together with the stark and dismal facts on unemployment in the yards.

This country must have a merchant marine commensurate with its rank. It must have a shipbuilding industry capable of quick expansion for emergency purposes.

It can have these necessities if Congress will pick up the ball that President Truman has fumbled and adopt at least the minimum building program his advisory committee recommended.

Hall Voting Record Shows Him One of Most Loyal of GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the boys who are always trying to put a fellow in the middle by little under-cover, off-color jabs and wisecracks, as well as for the RECORD, I insert the following newspaper article appearing in the Binghamton Sun, dated March 29, 1948:

HALL VOTING RECORD SHOWS HIM ONE OF MOST LOYAL OF GOP

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Representative EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of Binghamton, is one of the most loyal of Republicans, his record in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses reveals. HALL in this session has voted only once against GOP policies, but when the Democrats were in control he voted 19 times against the majority.

In the last and current Congresses, HALL has voted 228 times in person; was paired on votes with other Congressmen 69 times, and missed roll calls 15 times. His attendance record and his party loyalty are quite high in comparison with the records of many other Republican Members from the State, the Sun survey shows.

Depleting America's Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we have a grave decision to make—a decision whether we are going to continue the America we know, or substitute an America we know little about—the America of the internationalists and the one-worlders.

The question is: Shall we blindly follow these, and give America away? The question is: Shall we blindly follow and accept the delusions of our President? Yes, shall we follow the advice and suggestions of General Marshall, the Secretary of State, who, to this day, does not know where he was on the night of December 7, 1941? I doubt that he now knows where he is, or where he is going.

General Marshall, together with Morgenthau and FDR, created the mess in which we find ourselves. He, as Chief

of Staff, together with Morgenthau and FDR, halted General Patton for weeks so that Russia could invade Germany, and take Berlin. We are now paying for that mistake. General Patton blamed General Eisenhower for this blunder. General Eisenhower, however, was simply carrying out the policies laid down by General Marshall, Morgenthau, and FDR.

The question is, Shall we blindly follow the multimillionaires in the executive departments that would give away America—who would deplete it of the raw materials that belong to unborn generations? We have already depleted our natural resources from over 11 percent to less than 9 percent of the world's supply.

I submit that we have no moral, legal, or constitutional right to do so. This Nation, born amidst the sufferings of Valley Forge, is not ours to betray or destroy. It belongs to unborn millions as much as it belongs to us. It is the property of future, as well as of living, Americans.

The step that we are now asked to take is a betrayal. It leads to inevitable depletion and destruction. Lincoln was right when he said that this Nation would never be destroyed unless we ourselves were its destroyers. We are now asked to accept, without question, the false propaganda of international profiteers and multimillionaires that infest the various departments of our Government. Take the profits out of the Marshall plan, and there would be no Marshall plan.

These profiteers are interested in advancing their financial gains, by selling products to foreign nations that rightfully belong to Americans. They are interested in having these nations pay for these goods with our American dollars—gifts—the Marshall plan. This at the American taxpayers' expense. They would deplete this Nation of all its raw materials to further enrich themselves.

The trouble with this Government, since the days of President Harding, has been that the President has had too many multi-millionaires in his Cabinet. We have gone from the Mellons to the Sumner Welles to the silver-topped Stettiniuses, the Lovetts, the Claytons, the Grews, the Harrimans, the Rockefellers and scores of other international bankers and international businessmen—all products of, or alined with, Wall Street.

Unfortunately the President, in his message, still insists on carrying out the policies of the former President—the policies of Morgenthau, Wallace, and company. He too believes that we can buy international friendship. He too would give to beggar nations that which belongs to the American people.

He forgets that American resources have already been largely depleted. He, and his amateur statesmen in the executive departments, apparently believe that we, a little over 6 percent of the world's population—occupying less than 7 percent of the world's area—can permanently feed and house the other two billion.

In the same breath, the President asks a reduction in the cost of living. He believes this can be done by regimentation—dictatorship. He is mistaken. Congress cannot, by passing any law, increase the food supply. It cannot replace depletion. We cannot stop it by meddling in other nations' civil affairs. Neither can we stop it by creating a dictatorship at home.

The President ought to realize that we cannot give away the food and products that America needs—creating scarcity—and at the same time, reduce the cost of living. He should know that you cannot give away your cake and eat it too—that you cannot give away your meat to foreigners, and have it for your family at the same time. He ought to know that you cannot give away America's shirt, and still have and wear it.

The President ought to know that we have had enough of bureaucracy and regimentation. We have had enough of Luckmann, the $24,000,000 cartels international soap bubble. Our Government, in its melodramatic role, has in recent years propagandized the American people—gave them false alarms. Soap-bubbler Luckmann gave them meatless Tuesdays and eggless and poultryless Thursdays. Laughable, if it were not so tragic.

This soap bubbler told the farmers that they should sell all their grain to be shipped abroad. He can be excused for not knowing that the farmer needs some grain for seed and feed. Then, he insisted that the farmers cut down their poultry flocks, and reduce their hog and cattle production. This when there is already a shortage of meat. It never occurred to him that if his advice were followed, then there would be millions hungry in America—there would be meatless and mealless weeks, not days.

The President should know that high taxes, foreign gifts and loans, and the Government's attempt to bribe good neighbors are solely responsible for the high cost of living. The Federal Government now takes 57 cents, on an average, out of every dollar earned. That means a direct increase in the cost of living of 57 percent. Then, after the 57 cents has been taken out of your earnings—your wages—and you wish to buy groceries or a suit of clothes, the person selling it, will have to add his 57 percent to break even. There alone is an increase to the consumer in the cost of living of 114 percent due to Federal taxes.

There are already 73 hidden taxes on a single hot-dog sandwich, 126 on shoes, 154 on a bar of soap, 148 on a pair of overalls, 125 on a cotton dress, 172 on a bottle of milk of magnesia, 378 on other medicines, 205 on gasoline, 195 on farm dresses, and last, but not least, 52 on a loaf of bread. We have had enough of taxes.

Then, since the war, we have made loans and gifts to foreign nations amounting to $27,000,000,000. These nations buy in competition with the consumer, and with your money, drive the price up.

In addition your Government also enters into competition with the consumer. Using your money, it pays $3 for a bushel of wheat and gives it to foreign governments, who sell it for $4 to $5 a bushel to those who have the money to buy, while the poor people remain hungry.

The Marshall plan will produce only hatred and war. It is as stupid as it is dangerous. It will create an additional indebtedness of $20,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000. If adopted, it will have created an international WPA that will be hard to abolish.

Under the existing rate of taxes, it will take 86 years to pay our present indebtedness. This $20,000,000,000 will have to be borrowed, and payment postponed for 86 years. With simple interest at 2½ percent, it will, at that time, amount to $86,000,000,000. With compound interest, it will be $160,000,000,000. The time has come that we talk plainly, and call a halt to the further looting of America under the Marshall or any other plan.

The time has arrived for clear thinking. The Nation cannot continue to go deeper into debt. Every man, woman, and child now owes the Government $4,756 for debts and future obligations. It is true that you have not given a note and mortgage on your home, but there is a blanket mortgage—a tax lien—on you, your children, and your home. Over one-half of all you eat, drink, or use goes for the payment of this tax.

How are we going to reduce taxes and balance the budget, when the Executive keeps plunging the Nation deeper into debt by making foreign gifts? How can we balance the budget if we are going to arm half the world against the other half? How long will we be a first-class nation if we continue to deplete our raw materials?

We are willing to feed the deserving people of Europe for another winter, because we know we are not blameless for their condition. However, we object to starving our own in order to feed the indolent in Europe, who are unwilling to help themselves.

The policy of our Government of "foreigners preferred, Americans forgotten" must stop. There are many critical materials that we will never again produce in sufficient quantities for our own use. There is still a severe shortage of trucks, tractors, combines, automobiles, and other products. Yet we find hundreds and thousands have gone to foreign nations. Many of these were shipped to aggressor nations. While we are threatened with an oil famine, we shipped millions of barrels abroad, including Russia, its satellites and other aggressors.

Our visibility is low—the international weather is disagreeable. Our Uncle Sam's vision is very poor. Our Presidents and leaders were outgeneraled at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. In place of looking for more entanglements, the time has come for Congress to repudiate Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, and all the other commitments that are not in keeping with decency and honesty among the nations.

In his armament race, in his power politics, the President is following the unfortunate footsteps of the former President. He is entering an undeclared war. All this could have been avoided if, at Potsdam, he had repudiated Yalta and taken a firm stand by telling Stalin to get back into his own country where he belongs and stay there.

China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, you cannot stop an idea with bullets. The way to combat communism is to support democracy. The rural-aid program in the China-aid bill aims to do just that. There was much in the China-aid bill of which I disapproved, but I heartily support the movement for appropriations to further the mass education and social reconstruction program for China started by Dr. James Yen.

Following are two editorials from the New York Herald Tribune on the subject, dated March 21 and March 26, 1948, respectively:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1948]

GOOD NEWS ON CHINA

The House Foreign Affairs Committee deserves praise for the excellent judgment it has shown in drawing plans for aid to the Chinese. While there is no real change in policy involved in the proposal for $150,000,000 in direct military aid, the proposal for $420,000,000 in economic aid includes a provision that has great possibilities. This provision would enable the Secretary of State to use from 5 to 10 percent of the $420,000,000 for a rural reconstruction and rehabilitation program, provided that he can make an agreement with the Chinese Government to have this program directed by an independent commission, composed of three Chinese and two Americans.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee recognized that the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek must win popular support in rural areas before it can have any hope of defeating the Reds. The members of the committee were able to see the heart of the Chinese problem despite all that has happened to obscure it. They acted accordingly. Their essential idea is thoroughly sound. The detailed suggestion they made can be improved if there is enough opportunity for further study of what they suggest. One improvement would be to increase the amount offered to aid China's peasants. Another—perhaps an essential one—would be to provide that the sum given could be used for no other purpose than rural reconstruction and rehabilitation. This would make it difficult for reactionaries in Nanking to try to divert the entire $420,000,000 to projects that have nothing to do with the welfare of the Chinese people.

The essential point, however, is that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has drawn a plan for China that includes a proposal in line with the European recovery program instead of being contradictory to that program. The committee, in essence, suggests that efforts to kill Communists are not enough in China. Its members want to meet the Chinese problem as this newspaper has urged for years, by offering the Chinese a superior alternative to communism, one which will mobilize public opinion for a real fight against the danger. In addition—and this is most cheering—the committee members have a specific plan to carry out what they propose.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 26, 1948]

AID FOR RURAL CHINA

Indications have come from China that American assistance for rural reconstruction and rehabilitation would be welcomed by some Chinese officials, but that they would prefer to have direct control of any sums granted. Dr. Han Li-wu, vice minister of education in Nanking, has emphasized the interest of his organization in mass education and other devices for improving the lot of China's peasants. He has predicted that his ministry would have no difficulty in obtaining more funds for such work after the China aid program now under consideration in the American Congress is approved.

One point to be made in this connection is that the efforts of the Nanking government to do something for China's farmers—and thus give them better reasons for opposing the Communists—have been effective in only a few small areas. Several Nanking officials have excellent intentions along this line, as Dr. Han has, but it is doubtful that any project for rural reconstruction that was wholly controlled by Nanking would be worthy of American support. The trouble is not with men like Dr. Han, but with the corrupt and inefficient governments in the provinces and counties that fail to put into effect decisions made at China's capital.

A project to improve the lot of China's farmers which was controlled by an independent commission made up of Chinese and Americans, as suggested by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, would accomplish more than one dominated by the Nanking government. If the problems of China are to be attacked like those of Europe, by trying to improve the basic economy of the country, it will be essential to have American funds used for the purpose intended. This could be done by relying on carefully selected Chinese for local direction of what must be a Chinese program and upon a commission made up of first-rate American and Chinese, preferably with a Chinese chairman, to do the over-all planning and to supervise the expenditures.

THE SOCIAL FRONT—MASS EDUCATION AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR CHINA

MARCH 9, 1948.

The following points illustrate and emphasize the urgency of action on this program today:

1. The phenomenal growth of communism in China: Twenty years ago the Communists in China were a negligible group. Chiang Kai-shek fought them for 4 years with all the modern weapons. He failed and the Communists have been gaining steadily in military strength and in popular support since that time. The Nationalist Government has lost the confidence of the people and created thereby a tremendous political vacuum. The Communists lost no time in filling this vacuum. They have succeeded to an alarming extent in posing as the champion of the oppressed and illiterate masses of China.

2. Why aid for the military front alone is futile: If bullets alone were enough, the superior Nationalist army would have defeated the Communists long ago. The fact that the Nationalists have been losing to the Communists in spite of their military superiority should give us pause. One important reason for the success of the Communists is that they do not fight on one front alone. They have the military front. But they also have the social and economic front—political education, agrarian reform, and even public health.

3. Social front vital: Without the social and economic front the military front can never succeed. It is not enough to be anti-Communist. Any government and any army without the support of the people is doomed to fail. A social front must be established to serve the needs of the people, to raise their standards of living, etc. This social front will help to strengthen the military front. It will also win back the confidence of the people in the government. Most important of all, it will lay the foundation for a strong and democratic China.

4. Urgent need for American dollars: The requirements of this program have not been understood. It has sometimes been thought that American dollars are needed merely to pay the pay roll in China for the administration of this program. This is not the case. Essential materials from the markets of the United States will be urgently needed:

A. Educational aspects: Paper and ink for textbooks, reading material, newspapers, magazines, etc.

Films for visual education to train leaders along scientific and technical lines.

Radios for audio-education technique.

B. Livelihood: Agriculture—seeds, fertilizers, farm machinery and tools, machinery for irrigation; animal stock for breeding; poultry, insecticides.

Rural industries—tools for handicrafts, paper-making, looms, dyeing and finishing equipment, tanning equipment, and so forth.

C. Health: Medicine, equipment for clinics, small units for hospitals, pharmaceuticals.

D. Technical personnel: American technicians and specialists for visual education, cooperative organization, plant breeding, animal husbandry, veterinary science, textiles, dyeing and finishing, public health and medicine.

5. Ten percent of financial aid to be earmarked for the social economic front: This will show the people of China that the United States is concerned with their welfare. It will start the basic reconstruction necessary for a democratic China. If only military aid is given, it will be resented. For military aid alone will look to the Chinese as a form of American imperialism.

6. Machinery to administer the fund and the program: A joint commission of American and Chinese representatives appointed by the respective governments. This commission should be independent, nonpolitical, and nonpartisan. This commission should have power delegated by their respective governments for control of all funds. The members should be chosen for their interest or practical experience in mass education and social reconstruction.

A Rehearing Should Be Granted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shereveport Times of March 21, 1948:

A REHEARING SHOULD BE GRANTED

The brief filed by Delta Air Lines appealing the recent Civil Aeronautics Board decision denying Delta a New Orleans-Washington-New York route which would have given the huge Mid-South area radiating from Shreveport one-carrier service to those eastern cities offers strong, logical, and sound reasons why the Federal agency should order a rehearing of the case.

At the same time the brief, through its factual presentation and between the lines, reveals in a manner that should shock the American public the pitiful situation of a Civil Aeronautics Board completely disorganized as to objective viewpoint and perspective.

Delta's application was for a new route between New Orleans, Washington, and New

York. Through its present Fort Worth, Dallas, Shreveport, and Atlanta service, Delta thus would be able to give one-carrier service to and from the present political and financial capitals of the world—Washington and New York—to a mid-South area that now is the largest geographical and population area in the Nation not having such service.

Instead of granting Delta's application, the CAB gave Pennsylvania Central Airlines a New Orleans-Birmingham-Washington route connecting into the Great Lakes area and denied the Delta application. The map printed on this page today graphically illustrates how ridiculous this decision was from the standpoint of granting service to areas most needing it. The darkened area is that which would have benefited if Delta had been granted its application. The light enclosed area is that which benefits from the PCA grant made by the CAB. The legend printed with the map shows how many cities would benefit from Delta's proposed service, how few gain anything from the new PCA service.

The CAB thus has, by its decision, deliberately spurned the needs and desires and transportation welfare of a thriving, prosperous, progressive section of the Nation, and in doing so has placed a tremendous stumbling block in the path of that area's future progress. And, in our opinion, in doing so it has violated the rules of common logic, common business sense, and simple foresight. It has, in fact, followed directly the courses of illogic, bad business, and narrow shortsightedness. For example, as Delta states in its brief of appeal:

"The Board's decision is wrong because it rewards PCA's mismanagement and penalizes Delta's good record. Delta is a soundly organized, well-run, low-cost system. PCA is a disorganized, high-cost operator. PCA is under investigation, in proceedings initiated by the Board itself, with reference to the soundness of its route structure and its financial stability. The Board has violated a first principle of administrative action. It has rewarded poor management and penalized good management. The Board is wrong in fixing the permanent route pattern on the basis of an unproved assumption of the seriousness of the present conditions."

If the board of directors of a business corporation followed such a course, the stockholders soon would have a new board—or the corporation would be forced out of business.

The CAB decision not only is unsound, in our opinion, but it was reached through thoroughly unfair and discriminatory steps in that the Board permitted cities along PCA's lines to intervene and be heard in the hearings but refused to let cities along Delta's route be heard—such as Shreveport, Tyler, Dallas, Monroe, Jackson, Meridian, and so on.

In doing this, and in rewarding PCA's bad management while penalizing Delta's good management, the Board certainly has justified the criticism that has been made of it in some quarters, namely, that it is and has been engaged in fostering the interests of air lines with big eastern financial backing at the expense of lines with Southern or other backing, and at the expense also of the American traveling public; that this is especially true of Eastern Air Lines.

The CAB also completely ignored the fact that the Dallas-Fort Worth area, while now having one-carrier service to the East via American Airlines, needs additional service and that Dallas was one of the cities officially backing Delta's original application and now officially is backing Delta's appeal. And CAB apparently was unimpressed by the vital fact that the points between Fort Worth and Birmingham would produce more than one-third of all the estimated traffic over the proposed extension to New York.

In other words, CAB seems to have ignored just about everything of real bearing on the case, including the report of its own examiner who, a year ago, recommended unequivocally that Delta be given the route requested and who stated that award of the route to Delta would best serve the public interest.

It is a dangerous thing, indeed, for a laymen-board of any kind to flout the recommendations of experts and professionals who have made thorough investigation into the problem at hand—but CAB did this, apparently with no more than a casual glance at the examiner's report. At least, the text of the CAB decision completely ignores that report and its recommendations and does so without any explanation.

The preliminary statement in Delta's 47-page brief of appeal, though carrying a slight touch of legal phraseology, so clearly summarizes the strength of Delta's position and the weakness of CAB's decision, that we quote a portion of it here:

"The management of Delta, on behalf of the company, its stockholders, and employees, protests against the treatment accorded it by the decision of this case. We believe it difficult to overstate the seriousness of the injury which has been done by the board's decision. Delta has been denied an essential step in its natural growth, from which it may now be finally foreclosed since the board is now about at the end of the cycle of cases involving route enlargements and almost all of the major routes have been allocated. The injury done to Delta at this stage, by closing the door on this major development and keeping Delta as a second-class air line, cannot be brushed aside on the ground that the loss can be recouped by its securing future routes. There are virtually no other major routes available to it.

"In summary: This result was reached by the board as the consequence of a disorderly and improper administrative mishandling of the case which resulted in a denial of a due hearing to Delta;

"(1) By denying Delta the hearing which the act requires by delaying the decision 20 months and then deciding the case on the assumption of the seriousness and the controlling importance of the temporary present depression in the industry about which, necessarily, there was no evidence on the record, whereas if the depression is as serious as the board believed, it should have followed the advice of the President's air-policy commission and delayed action on the case;

"(2) By denying Delta the hearing to which it was entitled by the act, as the result of granting rights to PCA (conflicting with those sought by Delta) in a contemporaneously pending regional case (the Southeastern States case) in violations of the principles of the decision in *Ashbacker Radio Corp.* v. *Federal Communications Commission* (66 Sup. Ct. 148), and in complete disregard of the repeated protests of Delta made on the ground that the two cases involved the same trunk-line issue and that the case of Delta in this docket should not be prejudiced and prejudged by conflictive action in the other docket;

"(3) By discriminating against Delta in favor of PCA by excluding from participation in this case as formal parties the representatives of the cities on Delta's route 24 in Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, although over one-third of the traffic involved in Delta's proposed operation is traffic from such points, which Delta alone could serve and although the representatives of cities on PCA's route 55, which were similarly interested, were permitted this right;

"(4) By accepting as evidence unproved and untested statements of fact made in argument by counsel of Eastern Air Lines as to its alleged present low-load factors and earnings; and

"(5) By so misunderstanding the service proposed in Delta's application, as to grant the certification of a service other than, and inferior to, the service actually proposed by Delta."

In its decision, the CAB contended that North-South service in and out of the Great Lakes area was essential and that PCA should be granted its application as a result. Delta suggests that this Great Lakes area service be retained as granted, but that CAB should eliminate one single route mile in the PCA grant which would leave the through New Orleans-New York route, and its accompanying Fort Worth-Dallas-Shreveport-New York new route, to Delta—through a grant by CAB to that effect. This would provide one-carrier service for the huge Mid-south area extending east and west of Shreveport.

If CAB does this, it will rectify one of the gravest and most inexcusable errors ever made by a Federal agency. We earnestly recommend such action to the members of the Board.

The Samuel Gearhart Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to report to Congress and the American people the most recent information I have received on the Samuel Gearhart case from the War Department relative to the shocking incident I reported to you on the floor of this House on March 10.

At that time you will recall I stated that this incident had been given practically no attention whatsoever and that if it had not been for the inquiries that were made by a newspaper correspondent and myself, the War Department informed me the files would have been marked "closed" and no further questions asked of the Russian authorities as to the disposition of this case. Continuous prodding resulted in a request by the War Department to General Keyes in Austria for an investigation and report on the case.

I have just received from the War Department the following information on the Gearhart case which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point. I shall continue to inquire of the proper authorities in our Government, whom I feel should be interested with me in a clarification of this entire shocking incident, in an effort to determine what action the Soviet authorities are finally willing to take for the cause of justice.

In reply to your cable No. WCL 40954, requesting information as a basis for a reply to the Allentown Call, the following information is furnished:

The Russian civilian, Stephan N. Inrin who allegedly inflicted injuries on Pfc. Samuel Gearhart on the night of December 18–19, 1947, resulting in Gearhart's death was turned over to Russian authorities in Vienna on the night of the incident. Interallied agreements for military police control in Austria require that nationals of the four occupying powers who are arrested be turned over to their own authorities for investigation, trial, and punishment. Immediately after the incident was reported to the United

States Provost Marshal in Vienna a complete and thorough investigation was made by the United States Twelfth Criminal Investigation Division. Result of United States Army investigation was that Gearhart died in line of duty as a result of injuries received when he was assaulted by Stephan Inrin. Every step has been taken by United States authorities to make American witnesses in the case available to Soviet authorities in Vienna for testimony, and to cooperate with Soviet authorities in bringing Inrin to trial. However, no United States witnesses have been questioned by the Soviet authorities to date.

Repeated inquiries have been made by the American Provost Marshal to the Russian Provost Marshal concerning disposition of the case. The only answer received has been that the case has been referred to higher Russian authority and that no further information is available. Meanwhile, the United States High Commissioner for Austria has dispatched a letter to the Soviet High Commissioner pointing out the fact that no American witnesses have been approached for testimony in this case. The United States High Commissioner further requested the Soviet High Commissioner for information as to the status of the case and assurance that Inrin will be promptly brought to trial and adequately punished. The Soviet High Commissioner has been unable to offer any information other than the statement that the case has been referred for action to higher Soviet authority (presumably Moscow).

Every effort will continue to be made by this headquarters to determine final action taken by Soviet authorities in this case.

KEYES.

MARCH 30, 1948.

The Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 12 adopted by the Legislature of the State of California.

The resolution represents the considered judgment of the Legislature of California. Its members are the elected representatives of the same people who elect some of us to Congress. Those representatives serve with the same high purposes with which we in Congress serve.

The affairs of our people in matters of local concern can best be handled by their representatives in State and local government in many instances. The handling of tide and submerged coastal lands is traditionally such an instance.

The resolution points out the grave concern of the State of California with regard to its tidelands. It points out by implication the equal concern which each State has in its natural resources and the right of the State to control them as opposed to further centralization of control in some Federal bureau.

The enactment by Congress of the legislation mentioned in the resolution is highly desirable.

The resolution is as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 12

Joint resolution relative to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of California

Whereas on the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the original States, as successors to the English crown, became the owners of the tide and submerged lands within their respective borders, and such ownership was retained by them on the adoption of the Constitution and never has been relinquished to the Federal Government since; and

Whereas the State of California was admitted to the Union on a basis of equality with the original States, possessing and enjoying all the attributes of sovereignty residing in the original States, including the ownership of the tide and submerged lands within its borders; and

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the United States vs. California has held that "The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of inland waters, extending seaward three nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein"; and

Whereas this decision casts a cloud upon the title of the State of California and all of its subdivisions or persons acting pursuant to its permission, to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of the State of California extending seaward 3 miles; and

Whereas the Supreme Court has declared that the power to determine the question of ownership resides in the Congress; and

Whereas the State of California, its subdivisions and persons acting pursuant to its permission have spent enormous sums of money improving and developing the tide and submerged lands along the coast of California, which improvements and developments are in jeopardy unless the Congress enacts legislation to remove the cloud on the title to said lands created by the Supreme Court decision; and

Whereas the State of California has developed and made available for public use, a system of beaches and parks at great cost and expense to the people of California, and these State-owned and operated beaches and parks have been developed to the point where they are now used and enjoyed by approximately 22,000,000 people per year; and

Whereas the State of California, its cities, counties, and other political subdivisions have made improvements to tide and submerged lands for many purposes including but not limited to harbor developments, piers, docks, wharves, jetties, recreational facilities, and industrial sites; and

Whereas the State of California has had for many years a full and complete set of laws designed for the conservation, regulation, and management of its natural resources in such fields as mining, forestry, beaches and parks, oil and gas, public lands, soil conservation, fish and game, and harbors and navigation, and the State has provided for adequately staffed and financed administrative agencies to carry out these laws; and

Whereas the State of California, its subdivisions and persons acting pursuant to its permission have made the investments, improvements, and developments herein set forth in good faith upon the assumption that the State of California was the owner of, and had dominion and jurisdiction over the tide and submerged lands lying off the coast of California; and

Whereas for many years prior to the Supreme Court decision, many agencies of the Federal Government have recognized the ownership, dominion, and jurisdiction of the State of California over these tide and submerged lands; and

Whereas the cloud created by the decision of the Supreme Court not only affects the investment, development, and improvement already made on and to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, but it will prevent further investments in and development to and improvement of these tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, to the detriment of the people of the State of California and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact legislation now pending before the Congress, to remove the cloud created by the Supreme Court decision by quitclaiming to the State of California and the other respective States of the United States and to their subdivisions and to persons acting under and pursuant to their permission, ownership of, title to, and dominion over the lands beneath the tide waters and navigable waters of the United States a distance seaward 3 miles; so that the State of California together with the several States may continue without interruption the title to and dominion and jurisdiction over said lands, thereby perpetuating what has been considered for more than 160 years in good faith to be a proper sphere of State jurisdiction, dominion, and ownership; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and to the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to send copies of this resolution to the mayors of all California cities and the chairmen of all boards of supervisors of California counties and urge that they, in their local areas, continue unabated their valiant battle for the reaffirmation, by the Congress and the President, of California's unquestioned title to its tide and submerged lands.

Cotton Trade Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item:

COTTON TRADE LEADERSHIP

A statistical review of American cotton trading for the 13 business days from March 10 through March 24 discloses the significant fact that for 9 of these days New Orleans transactions were greater in volume than those of New York. Taken all by itself, this would be an impressive announcement, for it reveals what appears to be a definite trend. But it should be considered also in its relation to other high lights of the New Orleans scene.

New York's leadership in the volume of cotton-futures trading has stemmed from

the fact that it is the world's foremost financial center, to which the concentrated volume of commodity purchase and sale naturally would gravitate. New Orleans, on the other hand, is in the heart of the cotton-producing belt, it is a leading port for cotton shipment, and most of our exchange activity is carried on by men whose families have been engaged in cotton planting for generations.

The most significant aspect of this situation, however, transcends home-town boosterism. Because the largest volume of futures trading was carried on in New York, most of the mills have followed the practice of making their purchases on the basis of New York exchange quotations. If the present shift of trading volume to New Orleans is maintained, that situation will change with it. In that event, with the mills transferring the larger share of their purchasing activity to New Orleans, and basing their prices on New Orleans quotations, a still greater volume of ordinary trading will be channeled through the New Orleans exchange, bringing to this city a great deal of business that now goes elsewhere.

New Orleans would thus become the center of the world's cotton trade. In the light of recent trends, this is entirely possible, and even probable, for the first time in something more than 70 years.

So much for the implications arising from this disclosure on its own account. But it is only fair and reasonable to emphasize that this is not an isolated instance of the city's postwar commercial and industrial expansion. The phenomenal growth of our port business has attracted world-wide attention, thanks to the publicity given to it by Greater New Orleans, Inc. The creation of a free-port zone and the establishment of a permanent Army port of embarkation were two of the high lights of our 1947 progress.

The opening of the International Trade Mart, whose facilities are already overtaxed by advance reservations, is scheduled for the early summer of this year. Our continued industrial growth was underscored the other day by the announcement that the annual pay-roll total for New Orleans now exceeds $358,000,000, which is a 337-percent increase over 1938, with 27 percent of the total coming from manufacturing industries.

Thus the disclosure that New Orleans is seriously challenging New York's volume leadership in cotton-futures trading must be taken as part of a general picture of continuing growth and development which gives added ground for optimism in viewing the city's future.

Is World War III at Hand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, in the March 26 issue of the United States News, there was a very sobering news story entitled "Is World War III at Hand?"

In asking unanimous consent to have this news item inserted in the RECORD, I do so with the feeling that the prospects ahead are not pleasant to contemplate. There is not one among us who does not wish they were otherwise. If there ever was a period in the history of our beloved country that we, as Members of Congress, should seek divine guidance in our actions, it is now.

In the light of world conditions and in the interest of the youth of America, we must face our responsibilities.

These news items reported from the nerve centers of Europe, as well as Washington, is inserted for thoughtful study:

IS WORLD WAR III AT HAND?

(Reported from Stockholm, Berlin, Paris, Rome, London, and Washington)

War fear is great and growing in many nations of Europe.

War is expected in a matter of months by some, within 4 or 5 years by others. War trend is running strong.

War sentiment is getting stronger in Washington.

War could come from events in Norway or in Italy. It all depends on how far the Russians are ready to push.

Feeling in the United States is that war may be imminent.

To find out what informed Europeans are thinking about war, U. S. News and World Report asked its world staff inside Europe to get off-the-record opinions from the best sources. The replies:

STOCKHOLM

Chances are 50–50 that Russia will try to push ahead this year. Norway would be first in line. Sweden would be cut off by the Russians as she was isolated by Nazis in 1940.

Feeling is that Russia acted 4 months ahead of schedule in Czechoslovakia and Finland to offset growing anti-Communist strength in both countries. There is a similar trend in Norway. Norwegians feel they may be next, but they expect Russia to strike with force from without. Norwegians are secure within; Communists are weak.

Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, all are hurrying to strengthen their defenses. Premiers of all three countries, meeting in Stockholm, have pledged resistance to attack. But Sweden, if cut off by a Russian drive into Norway, may stay neutral.

Real war would go mainly through Germany to Atlantic ports. It is believed Russians could take all western Europe to the Spanish frontier within 4 weeks if war should come this spring or summer.

Bombing retaliation against the Russians would last 5 months to 1 year while armies are organizing.

Result would be destruction of what remains of western Europe.

Struggle for military supremacy would require 5 to 7 years. Outcome would leave victors greatly impoverished, facing a ruined world.

BERLIN

There is less war feeling among informed sources in Germany than elsewhere in Europe.

Russia, it is believed here, still is wrapped up with limited objectives that Soviet leaders hope to be able to reach without war.

Currently, Russia is trying to squeeze American, British, and French authorities out of Berlin, an island in the Soviet zone. German Communists, backed by Russian officials, are publicly urging the Allied Control Council to get out, leaving Berlin to their "German Government." Communists in non-Russian zones of the city are warning Germans to obey Communists or expect trouble when Russia takes Berlin by force.

If war does come, Germans expect to be hurt more than other Europeans. As matters now stand, it is thought that Russian troops could occupy western Germany quickly, perhaps within a fortnight. Under Russian occupation, western Germans see nothing for themselves but a bloody purge of anti-Communists, hunger, misery, and American bombs through a long war.

PARIS

Top Frenchmen agree war is inevitable sooner or later, possibly within 6 months.

War now could result from Soviet's pushing too far too fast in efforts to prevent the United States from arming 250,000,000 Europeans against Russian expansion.

Before Russia pulled Czechoslovakia into line, French leaders counted on two years' grace before war. Now it's believed that the grace period is lost, and western Europe is in a state of alert.

War psychology is more noticeable on the streets of Paris than in 1938 and early 1939. Fears of war feed on reports that United States public opinion is prepared for war over issues that are fully understood and clearly defined.

France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg are looking to the United States for arms for 20 divisions as soon as possible. Leaders in all four countries wish without hope that American strategy is for defense on the Rhine.

French officials admit privately their arsenals are empty, their warplanes few, their troops not entirely reliable. They look to Britain for military leadership and air support.

French privately favor United States military action as soon as possible. They think long-range atomic bombing should be employed before atom advantage is lost. Atomic attack, they think, would force Russians back of the Polish frontier for a quick armistice.

Swift occupation of western Europe by the Russian Army is expected should the Soviet Union start a war. Aim of the Soviets would be to shut the United States off from continental Atlantic bases north of Spain.

Britain's position, thus, is expected to be less tenable than in 1940. But French officials fear that Britain is not yet frightened enough for real union with western Europe. It is expected developments in Italy may alter British views.

ROME

Much less war scare is evident in Italy than in United States public opinion, Communists, campaigning for elections April 18, are following the usual line of peace ahead, denying war danger. Some officials believe Russia is pursuing objectives in the Far East, and will not encourage the use of force by Communists in western Europe till war comes.

General optimism prevails for the short range. Long-range thinking is that war is inevitable within 4 or 5 years.

Majority believes Russia doesn't want war, because the United States is too strong. But it is agreed that the next move is up to Russia. If Russia goes ahead in Italy toward a revolt by Italian Communists, an ultimatum from the United States is expected to halt Moscow.

Greatest danger, most agree, is that a United States ultimatum might arrive too late, after Russia has stirred Italian Communists to action. Civil war, once started in Italy, would be hard to stop. Moscow, even if it desired, might not be able to call a halt in Italy if revolt begins.

There is confidence everywhere that war, once begun, will end in victory for the United States.

LONDON

Britain's leaders are acutely conscious of the danger that Russia may be carried away by her effort to get what she can without war. That, as the British see it, is the No. 1 danger of war now.

Feverish haste is evident on the diplomatic side. British officials are vitally interested in getting the United States to put a military guarantee of western Europe on paper as soon as they can.

There is not so much haste evident in Britain's own military preparations. Britain

thinks of stopping Russia in terms, first, of United States strength and United States willingness to use that strength. As realists, British leaders no longer are counting first on Britain's own military power.

No speed-up of civilian defense is evident yet, at least in terms of 1939.

The British Navy has announced that British warships, including the newest destroyers, still top secret, are going to the West Indies this summer for joint exercises with the United States Navy. A September cruise is scheduled for the South Atlantic. Both plans could be canceled if war appears imminent.

In the air, Britian's fighter squadrons are well equipped with Meteor and Vampire jet planes. But the Royal Air Force probably has no more than 100 bombers ready for action. For bombers, Britain looks to the United States.

On land, Britain has enough basic equipment to meet emergencies. It won't be necessary for the United States to rush over a million rifles, as in 1940. But Britain expects war, when it comes, to be long. With Britain under rocket attack, new weapons would have to be made in America.

WASHINGTON

Top officials in Washington do not expect war this spring, barring a sharp turn of Russian policy toward armed conflict. Informed sources, in fact, are thinking in terms of blocking a war for this year and for several years to come through preparing United States public opinion and United States defenses.

Up to now, it is believed in Washington, Russia has been out for everything she can get short of war. Question is whether the Russians expect to meet a United States ultimatum. United States aim is to convince the Russians that they can move no farther westward, whether by armed force or by Communist revolts, without risking war. It is recognized, however, that Russia may start trouble that Russia cannot stop.

Basis of United States policy, thus, is to prepare American defenses in order to make war more remote. Congress and public opinion are being informed of the danger that Russia's acts may force the United States in defense, to show a willingness and an ability to engage in a shooting war.

Freedom Is Everybody's Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address, Freedom Is Everybody's Job, of Attorney Peter W. Hoguet, delivered at the rally of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom, 406 East Sixty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., February 22, 1948:

FREEDOM IS EVERYBODY'S JOB

(Address by Attorney Peter W. Hoguet, delivered at the rally of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom, St. John Nepomucene Auditorium, 406 East Sixty-seventh Street, New York City, Sunday, February 22, 1948)

The American Friends of Slovak Freedom is an organization dedicated to the cause of international understanding, and it is fitting that we should hold this rally today, on George Washington's birthday, in this auditorium of St. John Nepomucene.

It has often been said of our first President, George Washington, that he was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen. We Americans have a great history and tradition to follow and live up to.

Slovakia has certainly its share of the aftermath of the war.

Today the Slovak Nation must struggle for survival against the establishment of the Russian political system, within boundaries. The Communists precipitated the present crisis in Czechoslovakia by their plan to establish a police state. Through the Communist Minister of Interior, Vaclav Nosek, they ordered the transfer and purge of all non-Communist police district supervisors. Immediately in protest two Czech National Socialists and three Slovak Democrats as well as the three Czech peoples ministers resigned their Cabinet posts. These men and all the people of Czechoslovakia, who believe in the democratic principles need help.

People who have had a Catholic and democratic inheritance and have no self-rule will never submit willingly. The Slovaks, although a small nation numerically, have an ancient and honorable history. After the war, Slovakia voted against Communist rule in its first parliamentary election. Czechoslovakia has avoided being completely drawn into the Soviet orbit. The Slovak Democrats and two other parties are now fighting to deliver a set-back to the Communist program to dominate eastern Europe. Today's papers all carry headlines of resistance to Communist pressure.

But Czechoslovakia is going through what has happened to neighboring countries under Soviet domination and unfortunately, slowly but inexorably, it is paying the price for its resistance to communism. And especially little Slovakia is feeling for the second time since 1945 a ruthless invasion of communism.

Many of us here know what this means and know the reprisals and dictatorial steps that have already been taken against the church, friends, and some instances our own families. This knowledge of what has happened under Russian domination makes this group, and all the American Friends of Slovak Freedom keenly aware of their present-day responsibility here in America.

Slovakia is the heart and crossroads of Europe and American Friends of Slovak Freedom by disseminating information about the Slovaks, perform a great service and further the cause of international understanding.

The Slovaks have a long Christian and Catholic tradition and history. The Slovaks built the first Christian church in all eastern Europe in 833 at Nitra. SS. Cyril and his brother Methodius were responsible for the largest conversion in the history of Christianity. The missionary work of these two brothers not only provided an alphabet for the Slavs but held out hope of unifying the whole family of nations in middle Europe and the Balkan Peninsula.

We shall accomplish little by merely pointing out the forces that are weakening the Christian tradition. It is true—a new Christendom or a new Pagandom is ahead—but instead of lethargy, we need action, organization, and individual responsibility.

That is why it is so important to meet here today and give your support to the American Friends of Slovak Freedom.

Complacency can descend upon practically all of us and easily cause us to slip into a very dangerous position. We may content ourselves by being very busy condemning communsim without alluding to the fact that we have done practically nothing towards shaping a positive program for the great number of individuals in our country who are living off the benefits of Christian civilization but who are becoming less and less conscious of the great Christian fundamentals that have made our Nation possible.

Freedom is everybody's job.

There is also a need for developing and reflecting the opinions of Catholics, of citizens to possess a background of solid principles. We here, I know, all hope that American Catholics will broaden the scope of opinion and strengthen the basic policy developed by an informed citizenry, a citizenry aware of Christian principles.

Knowing that much of the future of the world depends upon America, it is extremely important that we support our patriotic community organizations and that each individual play an active part and intelligent part in each of our communities because democracy will survive only on the ability of the average citizen to make intelligent decisions. The citizen cannot make an intelligent decision unless he is informed and is willing to play an active part.

Let us all accept the challenge of today and not let the authority for our decisions rest on force but on Christian principles.

Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT,
Sandusky, Ohio, March 31, 1948.

Re Oleomargarine.

Congressman WALTER HUBER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBER: I read in the papers that you are sponsoring a movement to bring the oleomargarine bill before the House of Representatives for a vote, taking it out of the Committee of Agriculture, which evidently were trying to kill the bill.

I wish to congratulate you on your efforts and I wish, in writing this letter, that the contents of this letter may be passed on to other Members of Congress. I have already written to Senators TAFT and BRICKER and Representative FREDERICK C. SMITH, of Marion, on the subject.

In my previous letters to them I have stated that there is not a single pound of butter produced in Erie County, of which I am the health commissioner for the county, and city of Sandusky, Ohio. I have made quite a study of this matter, and have gathered quite a lot of information, and I have found very few farmers in Ohio are making butter for their own use, that they are engaged in selling their milk to the grocery store and buy margarine for their table use. I know of one instance in which the parents of the manager of one of our Kroger stores have 22 head of cattle, a very modern barn, model equipment with milk produced under very good sanitary conditions. They are selling their supply to the Page Dairy Co., of Toledo, Ohio, and use margarine on their table for table use.

There is no surplus of milk in Ohio. In fact, there is a shortage of milk and all the milk that our farmers can produce can be sold for liquid milk and for manufacturing processes in the making of cheese, cottage cheese, and ice cream. It is significant to note that the day the announcement was made from Washington that the Agricultural Committee had tabled this bill, the

price of butter in one day's time rose 8 cents a pound. I can see why the farmers or anyone else prefers to use margarine over butter because the average differential between the price of a good quality margarine, as compared to a pound of good quality butter is 50 cents and over a period of time the average individual can't afford to pay this differential.

There should not be too much discussion about the relative nutritional value of the two products, as studies have been made and tests have been conducted wherein groups of children fed oleomargarine did somewhat better than a similar group of children using butter alone. Further, I see no reason why the dairy farmers should be making such a fight on this bill, because other farm products go into the manufacture of margarine and from most of the 48 States of the Union.

Relative to certain charges that the dairy interests have made about the possibility of fraud on the part of the manufacturers of margarine selling their product as butter, this is just mere bunk. One product is marked margarine, the other product is marked butter, and sold in the carton from the grocery store. The only chance for fraud might be in hotels and restaurants, but most States have laws that require a sign on the wall that states that margarine is used in this place of business. The dairy interests could, if they were dishonest in the manufacture of butter, use part margarine in the butter that they make, and it would be hard to detect that they did so. Furthermore, when cows are not on pasture, the butter manufactured is very pale in color and the dairy interests use coloring matter in their butter, for which there is no penalty or restrictions.

I have gone so far as to ask the Gallup Poll to make a survey of the farmers of the country to verify the facts that I have given above.

In summarizing, I feel that this whole problem is one of penalizing the consuming public in paying a tax on a product that is so widely used, and it is an imposition on American housewives to require them to have to color margarine, which is in such general use.

I wish you every success in bringing about the correction in this matter of tax and the coloring of margarine.

Very truly yours,

F. E. MAHLA, M. D.,
Health Commissioner.

Soviet Expansion, Unchecked, Means War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by me entitled "Soviet Expansion, Unchecked, Means War." This appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union and in the Manchester Evening Leader, Thursday, April 1, 1948. Both papers are published in Manchester, N. H. The article follows:

SOVIET EXPANSION, UNCHECKED, MEANS WAR

The world is shocked by the rapid expansion of the Soviet Union and by the aggressive tactics being practiced by the Stalin dictatorship. In this report I am presenting the complete story of the Russian territorial acquisitions since 1939. They far exceed the seizures of territory made by Adolf Hitler before his attack on Poland. The march of aggression by the Kremlin is bold, ruthless, and sinister. If continued, it will end in a third world war. By taking a resolute stand the democracies can prevent such an eventuality. Soviet expansion must be halted if the world is to live in security, happiness, and peace.

SOVIET TERRITORY AT OUTBREAK OF WAR

In September 1939 at the beginning of World War II, Soviet Russia covered a territory of approximately 8,095,728 square miles. The population numbered 170,467,186. By 1946 the area of Russia had expanded to 8,390,490 square miles and the population had increased to 196,963,182. The territorial gains of the Soviet Union during this period approximated 300,000 square miles of territory—an area greater than the State of Texas.

RUSSIAN ACQUISITIONS BEFORE THE NAZI ATTACK

All of these territories were not acquired as a result of the war. In September 1939 Russia claimed and occupied a large section of eastern Poland comprising about half of the Polish territory. In October and November of the same year the Soviet Union demanded territory from Finland to which the Finns would not accede. Russia invaded Finland and in March 1940 this country was forced to give about 16,000 square miles of her territory with a population of 500,000 people to the Soviets. In the summer of 1940 Russia, by tactics of force, occupied and annexed Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. These three Baltic states have an area of about 65,000 square miles. By the employment of similar tactics Russia obtained 20,000 square miles from Rumania. She seized Bessarabia and northern Bukovina.

TERRITORY LOST AND REGAINED

Shortly after the Nazis attacked Russia on the 22d of June 1941, all of the territories which I have mentioned above were lost. From the middle of 1941 to the early part of 1944, nearly all of European Russia fell into the hands of the invading Germans. From the first part of 1944 and more especially after DE-day, the situation changed markedly in favor of the Soviet Union. In September 1944 Russian forces entered Finland and according to the terms of the armistice, Finnish troops had to be withdrawn behind a line which was drawn by the Finnish-Russian Treaty of March 12, 1940. In September 1944, Moscow regained what she had taken in 1940 and lost in 1941. In addition to this Finland ceded to Russia the Petsamo area of approximately 4,000 square miles and leased to the Soviet Union the Porkkala headland for a period of 50 years. This extensive stretch of sea and land is to be used for a military base. About this time the forces of the Soviet Union reoccupied eastern Poland, Bessarabia, northern Bukovina, and Moldavia. Bessarabia, northern Bukovina, and Moldavia with an area of about 30,000 square miles were a part of Rumania.

CONFERENCES

At the Crimea Conference in February 1945 the late President Roosevelt and the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, signed with Marshall Stalin the Yalta Agreement recognizing the title of the Soviet Union to the above territories. In addition they gave Russia the Japanese half of Sakhalin Island, an area of 15,000 square miles, also the Kurile Islands with an area of 4,000 square miles. As every one knows parts of this agreement were kept secret until March 1947.

In July 1945 at the Tripartite Conference in Potsdam, the United States and British Governments agreed, and I quote from a State Department bulletin of August 5, 1945, "in principle to the proposal of the Soviet Government concerning the ultimate transfer to the Soviet Union of the city of Koenigsberg and the area (about 3,500 square miles) adjacent to it * * * subject to expert examination of the actual frontier."

TERRITORIAL GAINS IN EUROPE AND THE FAR EAST

The present Soviet territorial additions in Europe have resulted in part from treaties of peace signed with Italy and the four Axis countries—Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, and Rumania—on February 10, 1947, and from the Yalta agreement of February 1945. These documents confirm Russia's right to the territory seized in Europe. In the Far East her territorial acquisitions were confirmed by the Yalta agreement. No confirmation seems to have been necessary for the acquisition of Tannu-Tuva, a 64,000-square-mile area north of Outer Mongolia. We became aware of this by a Soviet statement published on October 17, 1945.

TABLE OF ACQUISITIONS

The following tabulation by W. H. Chamberlin in the American Mercury of May 1946 gives the name of the territory, the area in square miles, and the population of the territories which Russia has seized since World War II:

	Area in square miles	Population
Eastern Poland	68,290	10,150,000
Finnish Karelia	16,173	470,000
Lithuania	24,058	3,029,000
Latvia	20,056	1,950,000
Estonia	18,353	1,120,000
Bessarabia and Bukovina	19,360	3,748,000
Moldavia	13,124	2,200,000
Petsamo	4,087	4,000
Koenigsberg area of East Prussia	3,500	400,000
Carpatho-Ukraine	4,922	800,000
South Sakhalin	14,075	415,000
Kurile Islands	3,949	4,500
Tannu Tuva	64,000	65,000
Total	273,947	24,355,500

STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

By outright annexation of the areas in the above table the Soviet Union has become enriched. Russia has gained control over some very strategic points. The Petsamo mines contain one of the largest nickel deposits in the world. Bessarabia, northern Bukovina, and Moldavia are the finest lands for the production of grain in all Europe. Through the control of Finnish Karelia with its great supply of forest products and timber, Russia has become a major exporter of timber and wood pulp. The Baltic countries, and more especially the Koenigsberg area, are of distinct strategic significance. The Kurile Islands stretch almost to the northern tip of Japan proper. In this lies their importance to the Soviets.

CLAIMS AND CONQUESTS

Prior to 1917 a large part of the territories belonged to the Russian Empire. The argument of Moscow is that since they are a part of Mother Russia they have only been returned. However, some of these territories, the Koenigsberg section, eastern Galicia, Carpatho-Ukraine, northern Bukovina, and Kurile Islands never have been under Russian suzerainty. These are new conquests. Over and above all these acquisitions Russia now occupies more than a third of Germany and the richest part of Austria. She has seized and held Manchuria long enough to take from that country practically all of its industrial equipment.

ANNEXATION INDIRECTLY

Russia, in addition to annexing these areas, has secured control of larger areas by annexation indirectly. As stated by W. H. Chamberlin in the American Mercury, May 1946, it is "the domain of indirect annexation—enforced by a variety of methods, from military occupations to installation of Communists in key posts, overwhelming economic

and political pressures, exclusive trade agreements, etc.—that Stalin's greatest gains have been achieved."

By such methods the Soviet Union has erected a veritable Chinese wall which extends from the northern tip of Finland to the Adriatic and the northern shores of the Black Sea. Behind the iron curtain are Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, eastern Germany, eastern Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and Rumania. These countries are approximately 650,000 square miles in area. The population is more than 100,000,000. In the Far East the pattern of Soviet expansion is the same. Northern Korea, Manchuria, and outer Mongolia are practically closed to the outside world.

Through outright annexation, annexation indirectly, and temporary military occupation, the ruthless and sinister dictatorship of Russia has brought under its domination a million square miles of territory with a population of approximately 200,000,000 people. If Finland falls under the domination of the Kremlin, 134,500 square miles with a population of 3,900,000 will be added to the Soviet Union. Should Italy fall after the 18th of April there will be a further addition of 119,800 square miles and a population of 45,600,000 to the Kremlin. The appetite of the Russian bear cannot be satiated.

RUSSIAN EXPANSION GREATER THAN HITLER'S GRASP OF TERRITORY

The colossal expansion of the Soviet Union far exceeds the seizures made by Adolf Hitler prior to the outbreak of World War II. The following table gives the expansion of Germany up to the beginning of World War II in 1939:

Area	Population	Square miles
Saarland	810,000	740
Austria	6,500,000	32,000
Sudetenland	3,500,000	10,500
Czechoslovakia	9,500,000	34,000
Memel	150,000	830
Total	20,460,000	78,070

What the Nazis did by the way of taking territory before the invasion of Poland is almost infinitesimal to what the Soviet Union has done and is doing. An unparalleled record of aggression, territorial acquisitions, and expansion is being written by Mr. Stalin. How much longer will we and the other free countries of the earth allow the Soviet Union to seize territory and people without telling Moscow that aggression must cease? Only by offering unrelenting resistance will the march of communism be stopped.

OUR POSITION SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR

I have repeatedly stated that the following principle should be one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy:

We should inform the world that we intend to stop aggression directed at certain strategic positions such as the approaches to the Atlantic, western Europe, the Dardanelles, the islands of the Pacific, Iceland, Gibraltar, the Near East, the Persian Gulf area, etc. Our interests circle the globe and when there is encroachment on strategic areas, the integrity of which is necessary to our security, we must be ready to offer immediate, continued, and unrelenting resistance.

Our position should be made perfectly clear. The sooner we take a stand, and in no uncertain terms inform Moscow that we will resist aggression in the future just as we have so admirably done on two occasions during the last four decades, the sooner the Soviet bluff will be called and the sooner we will be on the road to a peaceful world. The only hope of preventing a third world war is to take such a stand and make ourselves so powerful militarily that our position will be respected.

Who Is Enslaved Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, again our Nation is confronted with a singular situation. One man in this great Nation of freedom seems possessed of power to shut down many industries again, and thereby threaten the Nation's economy.

Industrial strength is sapped in a period of inflation and international crisis. It is my considered judgment that antitrust laws should be extended to cover labor-union monopolies.

Mr. David Lawrence, an accomplished writer, contributes the following editorial on this important subject and, under unanimous consent, I include it herewith:

WHO IS ENSLAVED NOW?

(By David Lawrence)

For nearly a year now labor-union bosses have been carrying on a propaganda of distortion, telling the rank and file of the workers that the Taft-Hartley Act is a "slave labor" law.

Millions of dollars of dues are being extorted from the workers' pay envelopes to carry on a political campaign to defeat Members of Congress who voted for the law.

This money will be wasted.

For the supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act have the strongest and most militant ally they could possibly have to keep the law on the statute books—John L. Lewis.

Just when public opinion was turning its attention from labor controversies to other things, Mr. Lewis has bobbed up to keep alive the flames of indignation which have twice before swept the Nation when the country's coal mines were shut down.

Many Democrats and particularly President Truman have harbored the illusion that only meat control and some of the irritations growing out of rationing caused the Republican landslide in November 1946. But it was the rank and file of labor who rebelled and cast their secret ballots against labor bosses. They had been intimidated and threatened with "closed shop" punishments if they dared to express dissent in union metings.

Again American laboring men and their families are being victimized by another coal strike.

IMPAIRING THE NATION'S ECONOMY

Steel mills are shutting down and the Nation's industrial operations soon will be seriously impaired. It happened that way just before Pearl Harbor. It is happening again when the Nation faces a critical emergency in international relations.

What is becoming apparent is that the Taft-Hartley law is a wishy-washy affair with not enough teeth in it to serve the public interest. It is full of ambiguities which permit avoidances, if not evasions.

Mr. Lewis has gone counter to the spirit and letter of the new law and can tie up the whole industrial system while the long-drawn-out procedures must be complied with. Meanwhile, Mr. Lewis' economic power is undiminished and the nation evidently must witness a surrender to his wishes or face catastrophe.

Congress seems to have suddenly become indifferent. Not a single speech of criticism came from either Republican or Democratic leaders in Congress last week despite the fact that the Administration has been plainly sabotaging the Taft-Hartley law by its own dilatory maneuvers.

ONE MAN'S POWER

The prediction last summer was that the Taft-Hartley Act would "enslave" labor.

Collective bargaining nevertheless goes on just the same, and so do strikes and work stoppages. It is the employers and millions of innocent workers who, in trying to produce goods to overcome shortages and bring an end to inflation, are really "enslaved" today.

One man, who is dictator of a large union with control over all the miners of the country, can shut down steel mills and factories and cause public utilities to curtail use of power and light.

Has any industrialist ever wielded equal power?

Just the other day the steel companies increased their prices a few cents in a minor adjustment and the howl that arose could be heard from the Bowery to the Golden Gate.

Union leaders expressed their protests and Senators and Representatives of both parties cried out against the alleged plot to ruin the national economy by more inflation.

Yet last week as this very scarce product—steel—was made even scarcer by curtailed operations due to the coal strike, thus permitting a return to "gray markets" just as there were signs of an approach to a balance between production and demand in certain lines, not a word of protest came from either William Green of the A. F. of L. or Philip Murray of the CIO.

The Taft-Hartley law spells out what a work stoppage is and says that 60 days' notice must be given before it can be legal. But Mr. Lewis proceeds to bring one about just the same. Formal strike calls are as outmoded with Mr. Lewis as declarations of war are nowadays.

True, Mr. Lewis was supposed to give notice of a coming work stoppage and he was supposed to notify the Federal Mediation Service, too. But the most that could happen to him would be an injunction by the National Labor Relations Board after several months of procrastination, such as is to be noted in the procedure over the International Typographical Union's disregard of the law. An injunction proceeding can be stalled in the courts for many more months while legality or unconstitutionality is argued.

Meanwhile, the country eats into its stockpile of coal. The price of coal goes up. So do the prices of many manufactured products which become scarce because steel is scarce.

Coal is used for locomotives on a large part of the Nation's railroad systems. Already a curtailment in freight movements has been ordered.

If the public interest has not been defied, then what is meant by the phrase public interest?

LENGTHY LEGAL PROCEDURES

Why does Congress appropriate so many dollars to carry on antitrust persecutions over legal technicalities while it allows union leaders to conduct flagrant monopolies in restraint of trade?

The President, to be sure, has been advised that the filing of an unfair-labor-practice charge under the Taft-Hartley law would be too complicated and too lengthy a procedure while the miners are on strike and that the most expeditious way to get action by injunction is to use the provisions which stipulate that, after a study by a fact-finding board, an injunction for 80 days is obtainable.

But Mr. Lewis can tie up the court proceedings on that, too, by delaying tactics.

Thus, Mr. Lewis doesn't consider the present work stoppage to be a strike because he hasn't called it. He tried the same maneuver last year when the Government obtained

look at developments that point to the possibility that North Dakota may be on the threshold of a new era of economic expansion. For instance:

The expanding group of citizens whose thinking is on a State-wide scope about the basic things which must be done to bring about a more advanced development of North Dakota's resources of products, brains and wealth.

The creation early in 1947 of the Fargo Industrial Development Corp. which has acquired, in cooperation with the city of Fargo, the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Milwaukee Railroads, over 200 acres of industrial sites.

The willingness of local citizens to invest money in their communities as evidenced by the new hotels in Minot and Grand Forks.

The encouraging progress of the North Dakota Research Foundation in developing scientific information on the resources of the State.

The willingness of North Dakota people to back up their ideas with money as evidenced by the YMCA drive in Minot within the last 6 months which produced in excess of $400,000 in donations.

The population estimate of 900,000 people in 1970 developed by the Federal Power Commission in connection with its study pertaining to the River Development Programs of the Corps of Army Engineers and the irrigation programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The tremendous lignite coal deposits in North Dakota, 600,000,000,000 tons, which are practically untouched and the activity now underway to utilize more of these resources by the United States Bureau of Mines. (Recent appropriation by Congress, $750,000.)

The added stability brought about by diversification of agricultural income and the aggressive soil conservation practices already in operation.

The substantial increase in the over-all net worth in the State and in the total volume of sales.

The growing realization that the State's economic growth would be facilitated by having more services of experienced investment banking firms.

Last, but not least, the current financing by Smith, Inc., of Fargo, of $100,000 in preferred stock and $200,000 in debenture bonds.

At least four points appear pertinent about the Smith, Inc., financing. They are:

First, the history of its growth under America's capitalistic system of free enterprise, something impossible to conceive of under the communistic system.

Second, the financial "know-how" Smith, Inc., has learned and which, as related herein, may prove helpful to other small business firms in working out the mechanics of their capital financing.

Third, the emphasis on employing outside specialized talent in building up small companies.

Fourth, the interest, counsel, and cooperation of several North Dakota bankers and local insurance company officials in guineapigging Smith's Inc.'s financing thereby reflecting support for growing local companies from sources strategic in the State's present and future economy.

Smith, Inc., as a business, was born in Fargo in January 1934, during the depth of a major depression. The company's original name was Smith Commercial Body Works, Inc., and its original capital was $1,700. It marked the beginning of a relationship between a young man with ideas and the courage to back them up and an older man who enjoyed encouraging ambition and who was willing to back up the encouragement with some capital.

The company's present net worth of $300,000 has been built up entirely from the original investment of $1,700 out of earnings with the exception of $47,000 paid into the concern in new capital in 1947.

It seems a long way from the company's modest beginning 14 years ago to an organization which today employs 100 persons, operates 4 businesses as 4 divisions under one corporate name in an area 500 miles long and 250 miles wide with total sales in 1947 of over $3,000,000.

From a relatively modest operation of building truck bodies in 1934, the business has been guided by its management through four progressive transitions to where it is now one of North Dakota's largest distributors of construction, mining and municipal equipment, truck equipment, aluminum truck bodies, school busses, semitrailers, fire and safety equipment, and farm implements.

From a one-man operation, the company has grown to a complex modern business structure of executives, division heads, superintendents, and department managers, functioning as a smooth coordinated organization in the normal handling of sales quotas, budgets, territory studies, advertising, sales forecasts, cost accounting, cost of living programs, salesmen commission plans, inventory turn-over, accounts receivable aging, working capital ratios, local bank lines, Chicago bank connections, investment house transactions, labor-union contracts, workmen's compensation rates, National and State labor laws, Fair Labor Standard Act regulations, unemployment compensation rates, local, State and National tax reports along with all of the additional ramifications of doing a volume business.

The more recent know-how acquired has been in the field of investment and long-term capital. It's first step was a $55,000 issue of 4-percent, 10-year debentures sold through established commercial channels in January 1946. Approximately 4 months were consumed in negotiating and completing the transaction. Its present program involving a total of $300,000 has been in the hopper more than a year. The problems and technicalities would fill a book. At one time, in order to secure an unqualified supporting legal opinion for the issues, the company found it necessary to reincorporate under the laws of another State.

One underlying operation principle of the company's management is to employ specialized talent on major activities. When it is not practical to have the talent within the company, its policy is to engage it outside of the company.

When a decision was reached toward the end of 1945 to investigate the possibilities of using investment capital financing, the company soon discovered that there was no specialized service of this nature available within North Dakota. Thereupon two officials of the company went to St. Paul and discussed its thoughts with the investment firm of Kalman & Co. A modest program appeared feasible to the investment house, and the wheels were put into motion that resulted in the $55,000 debenture issue.

Financing step No. 2 found Smith, Inc., and Kalman & Co. back together again. When the size of the offering had been tentatively agreed upon, the next step was to test the company against the standards required in the larger money markets. Smith, Inc., agreed to submit to an analysis of its management, operating standards, capital structure, earning ability, products, and territory. The analysis was made by the firm of Duff, Anderson & Clark of Chicago. A thorough examination by this firm resulted in a favorable report.

In the mechanics of financing, it is the observation of Smith, Inc., officials that too much stress cannot be put on the importance of a good presentation of a complete financing package supported by all of the necessary legal formalities. Here again specialized talent plays a part. After knowing it could meet the test of the larger as well as the smaller money markets, a carefully planned financing program was assembled as to how the company was to employ the money, and the safeguards the company was willing to offer for the protection of the investors.

Smith, Inc., had $300,000 of its own capital, and to support outside investment funds of $300,000, it was willing to do the following:

1. First sell $100,000 in 6 percent cumulative preferred stock, which automatically would have a book value of 400 percent.

2. Maintain a working capital position equivalent to at least 200 percent of the preferred stock outstanding.

3. In calculating the working capital, it would not include, as current assets, accounts receivable over 60 days old or inventory in excess of 75 percent of the company's working capital.

4. Ten percent of the contingent liability on conditional sales contracts sold on a recourse basis would be set up as a current liability.

5. The company would not dilute the book value of the preferred by selling additional preferred stock.

6. A sinking fund would be established commencing in 1950, calling $6,000 of the stock annually.

After the $100,000 in preferred stock had been sold, the company would issue $200,000 in 5-percent 10-year debenture bonds, which would be supported by a net worth ratio of 2 to 1.

1. During the time the bond issue would be outstanding, the company would: (a) Maintain a minimum working capital of $350,000; (b) Not pay dividends on its common stock, unless its working capital was kept in excess of $500,000.

2. In calculating working capital, it would exclude the same type of assets previously described under the terms of the preferred stock.

3. The company would not create contingent liabilities in excess of 50 percent of its working capital.

4. It would keep assets unencumbered.

5. It would establish two sinking funds, one providing for $20,000 per year and the second based on a percentage of the company's earnings as prescribed in a certain formula.

After the financial package had been carefully assembled, the following was decided upon:

1. Smith, Inc., would place $50,000 of the preferred itself and the balance of $50,000 would be offered to the public by the W. R. Olson Co., of Fergus Falls, Minn.

2. Kalman & Co. would handle the sale of the debentures to an institutional investor.

Clearance of the securities commissions of North Dakota and Minnesota and the 5-day waiting period by the Securities and Exchange Commission were completed last week. Public offering by the W. R. Olson Co. was to commence this week. Smith, Inc., has already received commitments for $50,000 in preferred, and Kalman & Co. has received a commitment for the $200,000 in debentures, subject to the prior sale of $100,000 in preferred.

Individuals and firms who participated in the preliminaries up to the actual transaction, and those who have participated in one or more actual phases of the financing have included several North Dakota bankers. From Fargo, Clarke Bassett, president, and Adrian McLellan, vice president of the Merchants National; Fred Irish, chairman of the board, Harold Crosby, president, and George May, vice president of the First National; William Stern, president, Ralph Butterwick, vice president, and Owen Boyle, cashier of the Dakota National. In Grand Forks, Fred Orth, president of the First National.

Insurance-company officials included Otto Haakenstad, president, Western States Life Insurance Co. and Bradley C. Marks, president, Pioneer Mutual Life Insurance Co., both of Fargo; George Cook, vice president, Bankers Life Insurance Co., Lincoln, Nebr.

intimidate, they frighten, they terrorize, and then move in.

Their methods are political and social, not military. I repeat, this is not a war crisis. It is a peace crisis. You can't shoot and kill an idea with a gun. Military genius, no matter how excellent, is not the answer that we dare to rely upon for victory in this cold war that gnaws at the peace.

In the face of this obvious fact, the policies of our country today are dominated by dozens of military men who by instinct and training think only in terms of war.

If we are to continue leaving the affairs of our country in the hands of military men we shall virtually confess that we cannot solve the problems of world peace by peaceful means. The answer to the threat of this hour in our Nation's history lies in a wholly different approach.

Both the Truman and Wallace programs offer us nothing but chaos and despair. Both programs represent a bankruptcy of statesmanship and lead to ultimate war. They are both absolutely unnecessary. I assert that we can turn back this enveloping threat if we will only start using the skills and the creative genius in which the American people excel every other nation on earth. I assert with complete confidence that with courageous, informed leadership and competent Government, our Nation need not fear war and we can preserve the institution of human freedom.

WAGING PEACE

Now, having cleared the dust from our eyes and the confusion out of our brains, let's go to work as free Americans, to make sure we will continue to be free. It is a tough job. It is a long job. But it can be done. It can be done if we start waging peace by all the means at our command.

First of all, it is time to call a halt to the petty politics, the wobbling uncertainty and paralysis that plagued our foreign policy since the end of the war. The time has come to wage peace with all the vigor, the imagination, the skill and energy which the most highly developed political system in the world can produce. The Administration should start enlisting first-rate men who understand the true nature of the problems we face. Never before in our history did we have a President who constantly complained publicly that he could not get good men to serve their country. I have not had that difficulty in a State government. There is no excuse for it in the National Government.

And let me add that even though the Democratic Party is so bankrupt, there are plenty of able men in the Republican Party.

I propose that we start effectively countering the evil propaganda of communism with the truth. Here we are, the greatest Nation of salesmen in the world, with the greatest product in the world to sell—the free American way of life—and we are actually being licked day after day by the propagandists of a Nation that has nothing to sell but slogans. We have given $20,000,000,000 of foreign aid since the end of the war and the Communists have actually been taking credit for it. The "Voice of America" was actually used by our State Department to beam broadcasts to Europe telling how Henry Wallace was a great man at the very time he was traveling around Europe mouthing Soviet propaganda against his own country. Let's wake up. Let us see that good Americans are put in charge of telling our magnificent story of freedom and that we get the ablest public relations brains in the country, which means in the world, to tell that story. Next, let's start using the money we have been spending around the world like hard-headed Americans instead of soft-headed playboys. We must use it not only for necessary relief. But what we really want is to use it to create new resources and new economic health in sick nations and not merely to prolong their convalescence.

There is a still greater goal. We should start right now, using our full power and resources to bring about real unity among the fredom-loving nations. Divided into 16 weak nations, Europe is a continuing invitation for any aggressor to topple them over one after the other. If we just restore those nations to the condition they were in before the last war the world will be no better off than it was in 1939. But a federation of western Europe's 270,000,000 people into one strong economic and political union would be the greatest triumph of statesmanship in history.

WANTS PROCESS SPEEDED

Two months ago I called for such a program in Boston. Since then the fall of Czechoslovakia has driven the nations of Europe with accelerated speed toward unity. This bulwark of peace has come closer to realization than ever before. We should speed it up with all the strength and skill at our command and with success we will have the greatest force for peace the world has ever seen. We will bring to an end this constantly repeating need for America having to rescue western Europe. Europe will be strong enough herself to remain free and at peace.

Of course, we must also be strong enough ourselves to keep peace. I have long advocated that we maintain adequate strength by universal military training and limited selective service or whatever means are necessary in order to protect America. Most of all, we must be strong by means our Government has not suggested, by creating an Air Force which is the most powerful single Air Force in the world. If we are strong enough we will be leading from now on from strength not from weakness. We will be leading for peace, not war. If we are strong enough to be respected and have other free nations in the world we can live at peace with Soviet Russia and every other nation on earth. I assert with all the force at my command that if we are strong enough your boys and my boys need not be sent into another war.

In the Far East we know that we have almost lost Korea. Now certainly we must make sure that China does not also fall. So far the administration has only proposed—and belatedly—that we spend some money. There is still no program of effective aid. If the national administration cannot present a far eastern program that will work, it is high time it made way for an administration that can.

We should create immediately a competent, world-wide intelligence service. During the last war, for the first time in our history, we had many brave men planted in dangerous places all over the world. We really knew at the end of the war what was going on in the world. But the President by a stroke of his pen on January 22, 1946, created a new, untried, and inexperienced group. Our established services were later abolished. He cut off the fine services J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI had established. He closed down on Army Intelligence and Navy Intelligence. This incredible administration of ours has put out our eyes and cut off our ears. Real intelligence services, under competent direction, that will alert free government to its dangers and its opportunities should be reestablished and reestablished immediately.

WOULD MOBILIZE EXILES

At the same time, we should start using our American resources and our political brains to see that the Communists do not steal elections by bribery and intimidation in free nations which are necessary to the security of America. When all this is done we shall not even yet be well started. We shall not yet have gone to work. We should immediately mobilize for these tasks an organization to go to work for the cause of freedom wherever it is in danger. It should include the good people who have fled to France, Great Britain, America, and other nations in the face of the Soviet steam roller. They really know the kind of corrupt infiltration and terror the Communist Party is carrying on. There are tens of thousands of these men and women who, if we would only give them the opportunity and the resources, could help us effectively and powerfully to tell the story of freedom in every area now threatened.

For one example, the labor unions are the first point of Communist attack. The leaders of the American Federation of Labor have long recognized the danger and have bitterly fought against putting American labor under the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions. There are now in this country and abroad thousands of labor leaders who know that a Communist government means the end of freedom for labor. If given the opportunity and the resources they could work with immense effectiveness on behalf of free government in every danger spot. It is time we started trusting the freedom-loving people more than we have ever done. It is time we gave them a real part in stopping communism without war.

In recent years we have failed in our mission. Instead of guiding the course of events, America appears before the world as being driven from one position to another. The Soviet Communist party has meanwhile seized and twisted into its own debased slogans the great ideas of human welfare expressed in our Declaration of Independence, our Bill of Rights, our Emancipation Proclamation, and in the Constitution of the United States. With a false halo in one hand and a blackjack in the other, their leaders have lured and terrorized misguided and frightened people. Today all these people and all those in the remaining free nations wait breathlessly for American leadership. They pray that we will give moral leadership and evidence of faith in high ideals backed up by deeds and American common sense.

So most important of all is the need of our Government to launch a moral offensive which will rally the peoples of the world to the cause for which we stand. Ours is the cause of justice, of religion, of the dignity of the individual, of common decency.

For generations the peoples of the world knew and admired our institutions of freedom. The great American dream of freedom and equality caught the imagination of the world.

I have outlined the course that I earnestly believe we must follow. I have unlimited faith that by this course we can achieve peace with freedom and with security. America will again be safe in the world—it will again assure its own peace and its own freedom when we start showing by our faith and by our works that we are willing once again to lead mankind up the path to individual freedom and human liberty.

Social Security for the Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the legisla-

tive committee of the Board of Supervisors of Wood County, Wis.:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Wood, ss:

I, J. A. Schindler, county clerk, in and for Wood County, Wis., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the legislative committee of the Wood County Board of Supervisors at their meeting held on March 11, 1948.

Introduced by the legislative committee.

"Whereas social security laws as now written do not reach a vast number of the citizens of Wisconsin and United States, such as farmers, small-business men, farm laborers, and many other groups;

"Therefore, it is the opinion of the legislative committee of the Wood County Board of Supervisors that social security should be extended so that the benefits may reach people in all walks of life, and perhaps ultimately will work so as to eliminate the present pensions, both private and public.

"W. W. CLARK,
"W. H. DIX,
"HENRY ALPINE,
"Legislative Committee, Wood County, Wis."

Dated at the Court House in the office of the County Clerk, this 11th day of March, 1948.

[SEAL] J. A. SCHINDLER,
County Clerk.

The Country Weekly: It Lights a Window—Keep It Blazing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States is fortunate in having scattered throughout the country vast numbers of small weekly newspapers. They are weekly making a great contribution to the country. They are keeping the people informed and they are telling the story of American life.

It is regrettable indeed that a similar condition has not prevailed throughout the countries of Europe. Had this been true the principle that we so frequently refer to as democratic—or better still, our republican form of government, which is a government of, by, and for the people—might have successfully prevailed there.

My distinguished friend, Mr. Ralph W. Keller, manager of the Minnesota Editorial Association, speaking at the eighty-second annual convention of this organization in St. Paul, had the following to say:

THE COUNTRY WEEKLY: IT LIGHTS A WINDOW—KEEP IT BLAZING

You may put your tongue in your cheek, cross your fingers, pat yourself on the back, or just smile indulgently, while we go on record that not only must small towns stay alive, and country newspapers prosper, but they must spread—spread to every corner of these United States, all over the North and South American Continents to the remotest hinterlands of the entire world.

If the people of Germany, Russia, Japan, yes, even of England, and the people of every other despairing, paralyzed, cold-cramped, hunger-haunted nation on earth—if these common run-of-the-mill rural and small-town workmen, business and professional people had the free radio and the free magazines and the free newspapers—media free to tell the truth as the editor sees it, free to comment on industry and politics and social life, free to help readers to unprejudiced understanding of themselves, their neighbors, and the rest of the world—if the seemingly bottomless pits of misery and ignorance into which we are pouring billions of American relief, were lighted by the torches of a free press, then could we work with confidence for world prosperity and hope with assurance for world peace.

Compared with the great searchlights of New York, Chicago, the Twin Cities, your country newspaper may seem only a candle, but it lights a window in our American structure of literacy and know-how and free enterprise, and it is guiding someone along the pathway of personal endeavor, community progress, and world-wide brotherhood—Keep it blazing.

Army Day Program of the City of Meadville, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as a part of their Army Day program the city of Meadville and the nearby boroughs and rural areas—in my district—have adopted the little town of Fismes, France, the place where Crawford County's Company B suffered its first casualties in World War I nearly 30 years ago.

The Last Man's Club, an organization which is made up of Company B men of the Twenty-eighth Division of World War I who fought at Fismes—with the permission of the mayor of Fismes—has changed its name to the Societes de Fismes.

A carload of clothing and food will be shipped to Fismes in the very near future. Churches, organizations, clubs, merchants, Boy Scouts, junior police, school children, and the people in general throughout this area are aiding in this project. The school children are collecting toys and other articles for Fismes' 350 children. The postmaster at Meadville has announced that rural mail carriers will accept packages of clothing and other gifts for Fismes from any rural-area families.

French Ambassador Henri Bonnet states that it is a wonderful gesture, and he has promised that this "hands across the seas" collection will get top-transportation priority out of New York City for France. Ambassador Bonnet is sending his consul to Meadville for the Army Day celebration to accept the generosity of the good people of this area in the name of France.

And knowing the great Americans of this northwestern Pennsylvania community, I am certain that as long as Fismes is in need of aid, it will be forthcoming.

I laud the city of Meadville and the nearby communities for exemplifying the true spirit of Americanism by extending the hand of friendship through the medium of the great Army Day celebration, not only in northwestern Pennsylvania, but across the sea.

Truly, this adoption of Fismes by the people of Meadville and the nearby boroughs and rural areas is a fitting tribute to their gallant boys who made the supreme sacrifice at that little French town.

It is my earnest hope that many of the other communities throughout these United States will follow this example and adopt a town in France or Italy.

Potato Subsidy Program Bungled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report which was submitted by me to the Honorable AUGUST ANDRESEN, chairman of the Committee on Food Shortages, on the disposal of potatoes in the Chicago market under the price-support program.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 1, 1948.*

Hon. AUGUST ANDRESEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Food Shortages,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Disposal of potatoes under price support program.

MY DEAR MR. ANDRESEN: Under the price-support program as originally introduced in 1941 by Congressman STEAGALL, authority was given the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of expanding the production of certain scarce commodities in the United States for war purposes. Under this law, the Secretary of Agriculture is permitted to select any commodity he believes necessary to come under the support-price program and guarantee farmers 90 percent parity, and in addition, to do anything in his judgment necessary to keep them from falling below the established parity price, which, during the past year was $2.80 per 100 pounds.

During the last season, due to this so-called incentive program to farmers, plus the increased production due to free fertilizer given the farmers under a subsidy program and exceedingly favorable growing conditions, between 80,000,000 and 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes above the normal consumption were raised. The State of Maine had a tremendous surplus of potatoes during the last year. Notwithstanding the great shortage of all types of freight cars, 1,000 carloads of Maine potatoes were moved into the Midwest market, principally Chicago, Cleveland, Indianapolis, and Toledo.

From what information I have been able to obtain, we already had a surplus of potatoes in the Chicago market during the past 6 months and there was no necessity whatever for shipping additional potatoes here, particularly from such a far distance as the State of Maine. Not taking into consideration the tremendous administrative cost involved in the entire price-support program, and more particularly as it applies to this particular situation, the cost of getting these potatoes to Chicago, in my opinion, was considerably in excess of $4 per bag.

After these potatoes arrived in Chicago, they were warehoused at the following storage plants: G. H. Hammond & Co., 4551 South

Racine Avenue; Ashland Cold Storage & Warehouse, Fortieth Street and Packer Avenue, United States Stockyards; and the Central Cold Storage Co., 1500 South Sangamon. A total of 8,178 bags containing 100 pounds each have been disposed of locally for animal feed at 1 cent per 100 pounds. Of this total amount one farmer in the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, received 5,879 bags. These potatoes have been sold through the local office of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Five thousand four hundred and eighty-nine bags were sold without any penalty clause whatever, and as a consequence the recipients of these potatoes at 1 cent per 100 pounds were free to permit a portion of them getting back into the commercial market without any penalties being imposed upon them. Later, during the sale of these potatoes, ostensibly for animal feed, the following penalty clause was made a part of the purchase contract:

"Liquidating damages: If the purchaser disposes of or uses such potatoes other than as livestock feed, said purchaser agrees to pay to the corporation, as liquidated damages, $3.59 per 100 pounds for each such quantity for other than livestock feed.

"Section 35 of the Criminal Code of the United States (18 U. S. C. A. 80) reads in part, as follows: '* * * whoever shall knowingly and willfully falsify or conceal or cover up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or make or cause to be made any false or fraudulent statements or representations * * * in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States or of any corporation in which the United States of America is a stockholder, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both'."

I particularly call your attention to the fact that the penalty clause $10,000 fine or imprisonment or both is meaningless as long as the purchaser of these potatoes pays $3.59 per 100 pounds to the Commodity Credit Corporation as liquidated damages. I further call your attention to the fact that this price is considerably below the prevailing price for potatoes during the period these potatoes were sold in the Chicago market. It is a known fact that No. 1 Maine potatoes of the same quality that were shipped into Chicago under the price control program have found their way into what might be termed the bootleg market under the current price quoted for these potatoes. I will be very pleased to give your committee the names of the individuals who can substantiate this fact.

In one instance these potatoes having been shipped from Maine to Chicago and put into storage and storage paid at the rate of 25 cents per bag for the first month and 15 cents per month thereafter, were reloaded in cars and shipped to New York for export at another increase in cost to the taxpayers. A total of 18 cars were so loaded and reshipped to New York.

Another factor in this situation which should be taken into consideration is that after purchasing these potatoes for one cent a bag, the purchaser is in a position to sell the bags alone for a net profit of from nine to fourteen cents each. In other words, the purchasers not only got the potatoes for nothing, but were in a position to sell the bags alone for a net profit on his transaction of from 900 to 1,400 percent in addition to having the benefit and value of the potatoes.

I respectfully call your attention to the fact under the present subsidy program on potatoes a tremendous, unwarranted profit is being made in the raising of potatoes. To illustrate, even before the farmer plants his potatoes, he knows he is going to be guaranteed by the Government $2.80 per 100 pounds. It is reasonable to assume that under the present conditions, with free fertilizer given the farmer at the taxpayers' expense, he will average around 500 bushels per acre, and there are 60 pounds to a bushel, which means the farmer would have an income under this subsidy program of $840 per acre. To me this seems utterly ridiculous, and we will never get the price of food down in this country by following such a program that is entirely unjustified so many years after World War II has ceased.

The burlap bags in which these potatoes were shipped are extremely scarce, being made of jute, a product imported from India. Under the present unstable conditions existing in India, we have been able to import only a very small percentage of our needs of this commodity. As a consequence, new potato bags are selling at approximately 30 cents each, and any kind of a used burlap bag will bring 10 cents, and one in good condition will bring 15 cents.

The local office of the Commodity Credit Corporation was not able to show me any basis for establishing the sales price of 1 cent per 100 pounds other than that they under the impression potatoes were sold to the Federal penitentiary at Terre Haute, Ind., for animal feed at this price. They used this as a precedent to establish the price of 1 cent per 100 pounds for surplus potatoes.

During the latter part of last November, I made inquiry of the warden of the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., as to whether he had been able to obtain any of the surplus potatoes for the prisoners. Much to my amazement, he informed me that he had to go out and purchase retail on the open market all of the potatoes used for inmates of the institutions. I think this is a ridiculous situation, and a totally unwarranted waste of the taxpayers' money. My personal opinion is that your committee should make a thorough investigation of this situation, and I believe the facts developed in the support price program of potatoes would give ample evidence to the Congress that this program should be discontinued at once and that no funds should be appropriated for the coming fiscal year to support such an economically unsound program which, in my opinion, has been poorly administered, to put it mildly.

In conclusion, I think the facts justify and I respectfully urge your committee to make a thorough investigation of the price support program of potatoes.

I shall be more than happy to give your committee the benefit of all facts my investigation has developed, some of which I prefer not to put into this preliminary report.

Very truly yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

Appropriations for the Air Force and the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1948

MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE BEFORE THE COUNTRY

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the most important issue before the United States is the achievement and maintenance of air supremacy at all costs. Overwhelming, irresistible, paralyzing, devastating air power is the surest guaranty for a peaceful world.

PLANE PRODUCTION—UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

In 1946 and in 1947 the average annual production of military aircraft was about 1,500 planes. In contrast to this the Soviet Union is producing between 6,000 and 12,000 planes a year. If we are to have the most powerful Air Force in the world, it is imperative that we immediately appropriate the money necessary to construct such a force.

THE 70-GROUP AIR-FORCE PROGRAM AND NAVAL AVIATION

The Army Air Force has recommended the so-called 70-group program as the irreducible minimum air protection for the United States. As summarized by General Spaatz the 70 groups include 6,869 aircraft; also, 3,212 for the National Guard and 2,360 for the Air Reserve. This totals 12,441 planes. A reserve of 8,100 planes is necessary. This makes a grand total of 20,541 planes.

In addition we should develop a 14,500-plane Navy. Naval aviation is vitally essential in realizing air supremacy. The naval program and the Air Force program must be achieved at the earliest possible moment if we are to have the basis on which we are to lay the foundations on which we can build air supremacy.

If we want air power, we must enact appropriation bills. It is obvious that the time is long overdue for providing the funds to create an all-powerful Air Force. All the money required to keep us the strongest military nation on the planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress. Having done this Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early realization of the proposed goal.

H. R. 4729

On December 15, 1947, I introduced H. R. 4729, making appropriations to provide supplemental funds for the Department of the Army to be expended for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Department of the Army, to be expended for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force, upon the direction of the Secretary thereof, to be immediately available, in addition to the amounts appropriated under the Military Appropriation Act, 1948, and to be available for any of the purposes of that act which relate to or are in support of the functions and operations of the Department of the Air Force, the sum of $500,000,000.

This sum could be used economically during the remainder of the current fiscal year for the purpose of implementing the proposed 70-group program. We must have the money available so that the services can place the contracts and the aircraft manufacturers can begin to produce the planes. Even if contracts were let immediately years would be required before deliveries could be made.

H. R. 5617

On February 27, 1948, I introduced H. R. 5617, making appropriations for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum

of $6,000,000,000, to be expended, in order to carry out the functions and operations of the Department of the Air Force, (a) by the Department of the Air Force, and (b) by the Department of the Army for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force.

The $6,000,000,000 for the Air Force during the fiscal year 1949 is $2,946,000,000 in excess of the budgetary request for $3,054,000,000. It should be emphasized and reemphasized, iterated and reiterated that the suggested supplemental appropriation of $500,000,000 for the current fiscal year and an annual appropriation of $6,000,000,000 beginning with the next fiscal year will provide for this country only the barest minimum peacetime Air Force. Even with the allotment of the funds I have advocated it will be 1952 before the United States will have achieved the 70-group program.

H. R. 5873

On March 16, 1948, I introduced H. R. 5873, making appropriations for the Department of the Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum of $4,800,000,000, to be expended by the Department of the Navy in carrying out its functions and operations.

The Budget sets the Navy figure, including Navy aviation, at $4,071,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949. My bill increases this by $729,000,000. This would provide sufficient funds to enable the Navy to procure 2,400 planes in the fiscal year 1950 as against 1,050 as provided by the President's budget. Over the next 5 years we should increase the naval appropriations until in 1954 we have the 14,500-plane Navy so necessary for the security of the country.

SUGGESTED BUDGETARY INCREASES

The above appropriation bills which I have introduced increase the budgetary provisions by $4,175,000,000 for the Army Air Force and the Navy between now and June 30, 1949. To make this perfectly clear H. R. 4729 calls for a supplemental appropriation for the Air Force of $500,000,000 to be used before June 30, 1948. H. R. 5617 raises the Air Force appropriations for the next fiscal year from the budgetary estimates of $3,054,000,000 to $6,000,000,000. This is an increase of $2,946,000,000 for the next fiscal year. H. R. 5873 raises the appropriation for the Navy, including naval aviation, for the next fiscal year from $4,071,000,000 to $4,800,000,000. This is an increase of $729,000,000. By simple addition $500,000,000 plus $2,946,000,000 plus $729,000,000 equals $4,175,000,000 which is the total increase I am requesting in budgetary estimates for the Air Force and the Navy, including naval aviation.

If we mean what we say when we advocate the achievement of air supremacy, then we must become realistic. We must insist that the budgetary estimates for the Air Force and for the Navy be increased by $4,175,000,000. All we have to do is enact the appropriation bills, inform the Air Force and the Navy that we must have air supremacy and direct them to achieve it at the earliest possible moment. By doing this we will be buying insurance for the success of ERP, for the survival of the United States and for the peace of the world.

The American people are demanding United States air supremacy. They are willing to pay for it. They are insisting that we exercise the leadership and the statesmanship needed to construct the strongest air force in the world.

What To Do When a Veteran Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STRATTON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a splendid outline, What to do When a Veteran Dies, as compiled by the office of Col. Herman H. Weimer, veterans' employment representative for the State of Illinois, a past national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, has just come to my attention.

Believing that the pointed information in this outline of benefits for veterans might well prove helpful to many veterans and their dependents, I insert it in my extension of remarks, as follows:

WHAT TO DO WHEN A VETERAN DIES

When a veteran dies these things should be done to provide—

1. For burial with military honors.
2. For protection of his dependents.

Request undertaker or veteran organization to obtain flag for casket from Supply Section, Post Office, or from nearest office of the Veterans' Administration. (In Chicago this office is at 366 West Adams Street, telephone Dearborn 7500. Ask for Contact Division.)

Arrange for church or other services, and set time and place of service and interment.

If veteran dies in a Veterans' Administration or Goverment contact hospital, they will return remains to point designated by the next of kin, or advise next of kin to call for them. In this case there is an extra maximum allowance of up to $35 (based on mileage) to cover cost of hearse from the hospital to the funeral establishment and from there to the cemetery; this is in addition to the $150 burial allowance.

Notify any of the following of which veteran was a member: Post of the American Legion, AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, or Veterans of Foreign Wars.

If the veteran was a member of more than one organization, it has been customary to request the one in which he was most active, or the one he designated to provide colors, firing squad and bugler; also pallbearers if necessary. Call the commander, adjutant or service officer of the selected organization.

If you cannot locate any of them, get their telephone numbers from the county or department headquarters of the organization.

Allow them as much time as possible to complete their arrangements.

The veteran may also have been a member of some other veteran group, such as his Division Veterans Association; if so, advise the president or secretary.

Inform any church, civic, commercial, fraternal, labor or other organizations of which he was a member. Some of them may offer to conduct a form of service; if you accept such offer, indicate time and place.

In case interment is desired in a national cemetery (Arlington, etc.), designate which national cemetery. Telegram should be sent to "Custodian, National Cemetery, at _____." This telegram should give name, rank, organization, and serial number of veteran, should designate railroad transporting remains, and expected time of arrival.

Widows of veterans can be buried with them in national cemeteries.

When a veteran dies without record of any next of kin, and body is unclaimed, leaving no one to bury him, and if he dies outside of a Veterans' Administration or Government-contract hospital, it is the duty of the Veterans' Administration to see that he is interred, as no veteran should be buried in a pauper's grave. This fact seems not to be generally known, but any veteran organization can assist in compliance with this law.

There are instances where the veteran's family has no knowledge of his military experience, and all personal records, including his discharge, have been lost or destroyed. In such cases, undertaker should be requested to make fingerprints, which should be sent immediately to the Adjutant General of the Army or the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C., requesting wire reply with necessary information.

PROTECTION

Besides making his will, which is of first importance, every veteran, if he has not yet done so, should prepare a statement to guide his dependents in the event of his death. This statement should read as follows:

1. My name is _____. Address _____. My Army—Navy—USMC—USCG—Serial No. was _____.

I attach copy of my will. Another copy is in the hands of attorney _____ at _____. Please consult him.

2. I designate _____ as undertaker if still in business; if not, I ask my dependents to make selection.

Ask him to get a flag for casket from the post office or the Veterans' Administration. _____ can assist him in this. He will have doctor's certificate recorded at courthouse. It is best to have extra copies made. Undertaker can arrange. Copies may be needed for insurance companies, etc.

3. Please arrange for church—requiem mass—other services.

4. Notify commander, adjutant, or service officer of: _____ Post—Chapter No. _____ of all details as soon as possible. Also notify: _____.

5. It is customary to have an obituary notice in the press; I desire mention made of my membership in _____.

6. While the law allows 2 years' time in which to do so, it is best to apply for burial benefits immediately on Adjudication Form No. 530 (Veterans' Administration), copy of which can be furnished by funeral director or veterans organization.

If demise is at Veterans' Administration hospital, they will ship to any point you designate.

The present burial benefit is $150. There is an extra allowance for hearse from Veterans' Administration hospital to funeral parlor, and for hearse from there to cemetery. This is on a mileage basis, and the maximum extra allowance is $35.

7. I prefer interment at _____ or national cemetery at _____. If the latter, a wire will have to be sent to superintendent, national cemetery, advising him name, rank, organization, and time of arrival.

8. I have applied for compensation for a service-connected disability, or I received compensation for a service-connected disability. My claim number is C _____. My record is on file at the regional office of the Veterans' Administration at _____.

9. My dependents are entitled to draw unpaid compensation.

10. My dependents should apply to the nearest office of the Social Security Board for survivors' insurances. Veteran organizations will assist.

Or if veteran is Government employee, my dependents cannot draw social-security survivors' insurance, but they are eligible to draw my retirement money. They are also entitled to money for my unused and accumulated annual leave. Take this up with my department chief.

Or if veteran is State employee:

11. I carry policy No. ------ Government life insurance, amount $------.

I carry policy No. ------ life insurance, amount $------, with the ---------- Life Insurance Co.

Veteran organization will assist in applying for this.

12. I have applied for $------, or I have received State bonus.

13. I have applied for $------, or I have received terminal-leave pay.

14. I desire my dependents to apply for widows pension (or widows and children's pension) on form 534 of the Veterans' Administration. This should be prepared with the help of a service officer of a veteran organization or should be checked by him before being submitted to the Veterans' Administration .

15. My checking and savings accounts are at banks as follows:

They are in my name or they are joint accounts in the name of my wife and myself.

(Copy of death certificate may not be necessary; but, postal savings accounts are not joint accounts, and photostatic or certified copy of death certificate is essential.)

16. I desire ---------- and ---------- dependents who are employable to see Mr. ----------, veteran employment representative at ---------- office of the State employment service, who will assist.

17. If cemetery rules permit, a Government headstone can be obtained with name, rank, regiment, division, and date of death. I advise that if this is desired, you apply through the Graves Registration Office, State of Illinois, Springfield, Ill. They will then requisition from the Government, but the State will pay delivery costs, and costs of preparation for installation.

18. (Signature) ----------

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make the following statement:

It was generally known among many of my colleagues here in the House and also to many of my constituents that in principle I opposed the original Marshall plan.

I continued my opposition to the ERP consistently up to the last day of debate on the floor. I want to inform you at this writing that this bill is definitely not the original Marshall plan—that the bill should be known as a coalition bill agreed to by Mr. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, and the State Department.

I do not like the legislation. I think the bill is poorly written—I have no assurance that the President will appoint an Administrator who will even carry out the provisions of the bill.

Before the vote was taken, I forced myself to make this decision—that I would vote for the bill for this reason and this reason alone—that the money will be well spent if it will encourage and obligate the countries of western Europe who have united to fight communism and will hold their ground. Further, if the money allocated to Italy will stave off communism in that country—which will be proven unquestionably on April 18 on which day the election is held—the decision will be worth while.

I want it thoroughly understood that I consider my vote purely a gamble but if this money will save us from world war III and assure us that American soldiers will not be called upon to spill their blood in Europe, we can indeed be very thankful for our decision.

I will support immediately legislation to appropriate billions of dollars for national defense so that in the event the European recovery program fails we will be in position to defend America adequately.

There is no question that ERP is the last stand for peace. Let us all hope and pray that this European recovery program does bring peace to the world.

ERP May Lead Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAYTON E. PHILLIPS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for the European recovery program with the hope that it will in some way help to save the world from communism and chaos.

I do not believe that it is the duty of America to continue a never-ending flow of money and material to Europe or any other part of the world. As I have stated many times in the past, it is my belief that we should not ship essential and needed farm machinery from this country to the detriment of our farmers in this country. I do not believe that we should continue to drain our resources and critical material. Above all we should make sure that critical and strategic war material is not shipped to Russia, nor should material we ship be permitted to get into the hands of warminded satellites of Russia. Japan received much material before World War II, which was used against our boys. We should never again permit a situation to occur which may result in the very material our country ships abroad being used against our own people.

In view of the critical world situation today we are faced with a difficult problem. The recent developments in Europe are convincing proof that America can no longer stand idly by, but must take note of the swift and changing events in Europe. We should have the finest Air Force in all the world, with air bases in Canada, Alaska, Iceland, and China, as some of the principal points from which we may be in a position to defend ourselves in case of actual attack. I cannot help but believe that dry powder, atomic energy, and air power are essential in this day and time.

The dark shadow of communism, hunger, and fear hangs over western Europe as a constant reminder of the malignant growth of the Red menace. The march of communism may extend the iron curtain throughout Europe and Asia and finally into China. It is believed by many that the European recovery program will give encouragement and help to these people before it is too late.

No price is too great to secure the peace of the world. From reports coming to this country from Europe there is every indication that Russia is a greater menace to the peace of the world than Hitler ever was. It would seem that the Communists have in mind world revolution. The cost of a third world war would probably run into hundreds of billions of dollars. While the European recovery program is a large outlay of money, it would be a small item compared with the cost of another war in life, property, and money. The life of one American soldier is worth more than any price we could pay in dollars. With modern methods of warfare, civilization throughout the world could be destroyed in another major world conflict. A tough policy with Russia may be the means of preserving world peace.

When I vote for the European recovery program, I join with millions of others who believe and have faith that if we help our friends there is an element of chance that during our lifetime we may have at least a slight hope of peace on earth in our time.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, today the House voted to override the President's veto of the tax-reduction bill. I was one of the 88 who voted to sustain the President.

I would like to have voted with the majority; I would like to have my taxes reduced, just as I am sure all our people would like to have taxes reduced. The thing that concerns me most is, Can we afford it?

There are features in the tax bill which I think are badly needed. It provides an additional $100 personal exemption which will be of considerable help, especially to people of low incomes.

Moreover, it is manifestly unfair for citizens who live in so-called community-property States to have a tax advantage over all the rest of the Nation.

But this bill would reduce our revenue by $5,000,000,000, and again I ask myself whether our Nation can afford this reduction in revenue.

Events of the last few days have accentuated my conviction that this is the wrong time to reduce taxes. We have just passed the Marshall plan. Its success, and our own future security, will require a quick rebuilding of our national defense establishment. We will be called upon to appropriate additional funds for our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force.

The increase in cost of living is working serious hardships upon our Federal employees, and committees of both the House and Senate are now considering civil-service pay increases which will necessitate large additional appropriations.

Federal aid to education is proposed and expansion in public health and public housing programs are contemplated.

We have a tremendous public debt and surely none of us believes it wise to increase that debt in peacetime when our employment and national income are exceptionally high. It is my belief that a tax reduction at this time, in the face of greatly increased appropriations, may result in in unbalanced budget in the 1949 fiscal year. I think this is unwise and unsound financing.

Moshe Shertok Answers the Arguments of the Partition Reversal Supporters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent privilege heretofore granted, I ask that a statement made by Moshe Shertok, of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The statement was made April 2, 1948, before the United Nations Security Council at Lake Success. It follows:

STATEMENT BY MOSHE SHERTOK, HEAD OF THE POLITICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE, BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL, APRIL 2, 1948

I feel bound to comment upon the setting in which the United States draft resolution seeks to present the problem of restoring peace in Palestine. That setting distorts the picture in two vital respects.

It conveys the impression, first, that the armed conflict now raging in Palestine is a purely local affair, affecting only the population of Palestine, Jewish and Arab; and, second, that the fighting has broken out as a result of both sides having fallen upon one another, so that both are now equally guilty, or at least as if it is impossible or immaterial to determine which is the attacker and which the attacked. Because of these misleading implications the resolution itself becomes a wrong starting point for the quest for peace.

Rarely in the modern history of international relations can an act of aggression by Arabs have occurred in a manner more blatant, more scornful of concealment, or more exultantly arrogant. The campaign of aggressive violence was launched amidst clamorous proclamations by the heads of Arab governments of their intention to use force against the Jews of Palestine and against any agencies of the United Nations which might proceed to carry out their lawful duties in implementing the General Assembly's resolution. These statements were swiftly translated into action.

CHARGES ARABS PREPARE MOVE

As the Security Council deliberates week after week, Arab armed forces are moving into battle positions on what is still the territory of the British mandate, perfecting their organization and periodically breaking out into attacks upon the Jewish population in preparation and training for the major assault whereby they hope to intimidate the United Nations into final submission and impose a settlement of the Palestine question by force.

It is, therefore, astonishing to find the United States representative setting the problem of violence in Palestine in terms of a conflict between the "Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine."

The mandatory power, which has abdicated its responsibility as the guardian of the frontiers of Palestine and relegated itself to the role of a mere recorder of their violations, does not seem to have registered the direct responsibility of Arab governments for all these invasions save as regards an incursion from Syria on January 21, against which His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom lodged a protest of sorts with the Government of the Syrian Republic and the Kingdom of Trans-Jordan. The protest was ignored, no further action was taken by the United Kingdom, and incursions from Syria continued and became more open.

This campaign of aggression raises two questions which are relevant to the first of the United States resolution. First, there is a fundamental point of principle. Is it legitimate for member States to use force against a settlement adopted by the General Assembly? The Representatives of Arab states in their statements before the Security Council have evaded the issue by arguing that member States are under no obligation to comply with a resolution of the General Assembly. Not to comply is one thing. Openly and actively to defy is quite another. So much for the aggressor states. But a more serious question arises in relation to the Security Council itself.

Is it proper for the Security Council having received conclusive evidence of aggression actually committed, to take no steps at all to suppress, nay, not even to condemn—nor even to record—that aggression? Is it a just interpretation of the Security Council's function in this question that it should obey the demand of the aggressor at pistol point, and advocate a revision of a General Assembly resolution for no other reason than that the resolution is assailed by armed force?

WARNS ON EFFECT OF REVISION

Mr. President, if the Security Council sees aggression going on before its very eyes and proceeds to fulfill its main objective by recommending a revision of the General Assembly's resolution, the consequences for world peace must be grave. These consequences entail a very heavy responsibility for the leading world power which sponsors the present resolution.

To recapitulate, the United States draft resolution tears the problem out of its context and treats the conflict in complete isolation from the question as to who upholds and who defies the United Nations authority; it ignores the gravest feature of the Palestine crisis which is aggression from outside; it flies in the face of facts by diagnosing the crisis as the result of a mere local communal clash; by implication, it exonerates the aggressor states of all guilt; without even attempting to deal with the invasion of Palestine by foreign forces it misses the target by urging a local truce as a remedy.

In brief, the resolution perpetrates a triple optical illusion. First, it arbitrarily separates the conflict from its international setting; second, it artificially reduces its scope; third, it wantonly creates a position or false equality between the Jews and the Arabs.

Mr. President, it is against this background that it is my duty to set before the Security Council the attitude of the Jewish Agency and of the Jewish population of Palestine toward the proposals of a truce. That attitude was expressed in a letter which I had the honor to address on March 17 to the Secretary General in response to a question put to us by the United States delegation in the course of the consultations held by the permanent members of the Security Council. The letter reads as follows:

"I have the honor, on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, to submit the following reply to the question addressed to the Jewish Agency as to whether it would be prepared to enter into the necessary agreements to bring about an effective truce in Palestine.

"1. It must be emphasized that insofar as the term truce implies a conflict between two belligerents it does not accurately fit the facts of the present situation, in which, on the one hand, an attempt is being made by the Arab states and the Arabs of Palestine to alter by force a settlement approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations, while the Jewish community has been defending itself and the decision of the United Nations which it has loyally accepted.

"Subsequent to the adoption of the resolution of the General Assembly of November 29 on the future government of Palestine, the Jewish population in Palestine has been subjected to attacks by Arab forces, including armed bands from outside the country which, as the United Nations Palestine Commission has reported to the Security Council, are attempting to alter the resolution of the General Assembly by force.

"3. The Jewish people has in no case resorted to aggression against the Arab people, nor does it seek conflict with them. At the same time, the Jews of Palestine have been obliged to take measures to protect themselves from attack and to uphold their rights under the United Nations resolution.

"4. The moment that Arab aggression ceases Jewish armed reaction will also terminate. There must, of course, be a clear understanding that the cessation of Arab aggression will also include the stoppage of preparations for future aggression, the evacuation of foreign forces, and the prevention of further incursion of armed bands into Palestine.

"5. It is assumed that any arrangement for a truce will be carried out within the framework of the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly and in strict conformity with the timetable provided in that resolution."

WOULD AVOID VIOLENCE

It will be seen from this letter that the aim of avoiding violence in Palestine is one which the Jewish Agency and the Jewish people of Palestine wholeheartedly uphold.

The underlying idea of a truce is most welcome to us. We must only be concerned to pursue the aim in a manner that will insure a real truce and lead to a lasting peace and not produce a mere breathing spell as a prelude for renewed violence under worse conditions. In particular the purposes of order

cannot be separated from the purposes of the law. Order cannot be purchased by setting law aside.

I now draw particular attention to paragraph 4 of our letter in which the Jewish agency stipulates "the evacuation of foreign forces and the prevention of further incursions of armed bands in Palestine" as indispensable condition of any truce. There is no reality in "a truce between the Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine" when the Arab community is merely a subsidiary agent of aggression, when the Jewish community has no other interest but to defend itself and move forward to the fulfillment of an authorized international program, and when the source of aggression lies outside the control of both parties and flourishes unhindered in the very center of the country.

We believe that we are justified in claiming their expulsion and that the fulfillment of this claim is both practical and necessary. No people anywhere in the world will voluntarily sign a truce with invading forces converging upon it and poised to strike. This would be not a truce. It would be a capitulation.

The authority supervising the truce should not have much difficulty in locating any of these large units, though some individuals may be found to have merged with the general population.

In paragraph 5 of our letter of March 17, we stipulate that the proposed truce shall not hamper or delay the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution of Nov. 29. It is obvious that to delay the implementation of that resolution would be no neutral act in the spirit of a truce, but a concession under pressure of violence to the main objectives of the attacking party. It is necessary to make this point clear since a situation may arise in which one of the parties makes the truce conditional on the suspension of the Assembly's resolution, while the other party makes it conditional on the maintenance of that resolution.

It should go without saying that there can be no equation between the upholding of an international instrument and its violation. The Security Council, as an organ of the United Nations, can hardly take any other view.

The main principle to be followed is to avoid any impression, under the terms of a truce, that violence is politically rewarded, that it is left free by the conditions of the truce to renew itself with even greater vigor when occasion arises, and that it is encouraged by the very circumstances of the truce to repeat itself in the future.

FOR AUTHORITY WITH POWER

I would only refer to one overriding question which should be cleared up before this resolution is voted. The maintenance of a truce requires an authority to supervise its observance by both parties, if and when they have agreed to its terms. This authority must also have power to take action against any violation of the truce by one of the signatories.

Its particular function must be to watch over the frontiers and prevent their violation. It seems to us that it would not be realistic to pursue this matter far without any assurance that such a supervisory authority is available. The United States can hardly be unaware that the issue of enforcement cannot be shirked in the Palestine problem, not even in the maintenance of a truce.

It is proposed that the General Assembly be convoked once again in special session "to consider further the question of the future government of Palestine." There is a curious, if not ironic, coincidence attached to this proposal. It is debated here today 1 year less 1 day since the same request was originally presented by the United Kingdom. It is phrased in language almost identical. A word has been added. The word is "further." This may, or may not, represent progress.

Up to this moment no suggestions have been made to the Security Council as to how the Assembly's resolution may be implemented. If there were any consultations on this subject, and if any conclusions were reached on their result, they have not been reported.

The Jewish Agency, for its part, did submit to the conference of the four permanent members of the Council its concrete proposals regarding the steps that might be taken by the Security Council with a view to ensuring the implementation of the Assembly's resolution.

The Jewish Agency is not aware whether this nine-point program was ever discussed.

In motivating his counsels of inaction to the Security Council, the distinguished representative of the United States stated that it has been found impossible to implement the Assembly's resolution by peaceful means. One may search the text of the resolution in vain for any provision, express or implied, that unless it can be carried out peacefully it must remain inoperative.

The sordid record of how every proposed step of the Palestine Commission was impeded and obstructed is too well known to need repetition.

To sum it up, the will to implement the plan peacefully was not forthcoming. In the absence of that will, the way to implementation has not been found.

Trusteeship means denial or at least postponement of independence. We believe that we are ripe for independence. So are the Arabs. We challenge anyone to prove that we are not. We have passed the threshold of statehood. We refuse to be thrown back.

But the United States Government, through its Chief Executive, has declared that partition still remained the ultimate goal of its Palestine policy and that the proposed temporary trusteeship was designed merely to pave the way for its peaceful achievement. One looks in vain for consistent reasoning to explain this deviation from the original program. If the reason for abandoning partition as an immediate objective is armed opposition, why should that opposition not apply to a trusteeship the only purpose of which is to serve as an intermediary stage leading toward partition in the future?

It is surprising that not a single one of the crucial and intricate questions raised by trusteeship has been elucidated by the United States delegation. The second draft resolution still invites the Security Council to set out on a course with no clear destination, and no milestones on the way.

Appropriations for Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to see the additional $3,000,000 appropriation for the Veterans' Administration in this bill. It shows to me that the many hours of hearings and efforts by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs were not in vain.

Our chairman, Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS, has worked hard and often under difficult conditions both in the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee to bring the true conditions to light. She has truly been the representative of the veterans and has served them well. On behalf of them, I extend our thanks and sincere appreciation.

One warning, however, as to the use of these additional funds. We all appreciate the attempts at economy of the Veterans' Administration officials, but we want it accomplished in the right places. In other words, the unnecessary "brass," not the real producers such as contact and training officers, should be eliminated in any future reduction of force.

We of the Veterans' Affairs Committee shall be watching closely this action and use of the additional funds granted today.

Missouri Vote-Fraud Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Up to Attorney General Clark" from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 1, 1948. The editorial deals with the recent acquittal in the United States district court at Kansas City of certain persons charged with vote frauds in the primary in the year 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UP TO ATTORNEY GENERAL CLARK

When Attorney General Tom Clark reads the report from Kansas City on the acquittal of Boss McKissick and seven others on vote fraud charges, here are two things for him to keep in the forefront of his mind:

1. Due to the blasting of the safe in the Jackson County courthouse, and the theft of ballot boxes, much vital evidence was missing at the trial. Maurice M. Milligan and his aid, Richard K. Phelps were put to no such disadvantage in 1936 as the same Mr. Phelps had to face this year, as special prosecutor. In 1936 it was possible to make photographic enlargements of ballots and poll records and show clearly in court the nature and extent of fraud after fraud. This year it was not possible to do this with a lot of the evidence since it was stolen between the time the county grand jury first studied it and found it proof of fraud and the time for it to be used in the belated Federal investigation and trial.

2. In the 1936 trials, the jurors were kept free from all likelihood of outside influence from the time the trials began until they were concluded. Under Judge Otis, jurors were not permitted to go home where they might have received telephone calls, threats, or inducements. The results of the 1936 trials were 259 convictions and no acquittals. This year, Judge Duncan permitted the jurors to go home each night. He also permitted them to go home after the case was concluded, but before they had come to a verdict.

The first fact makes it Attorney General Clark's responsibility to redouble the efforts of his department, which includes the FBI, to find out who blew the safe, to indict the culprits, and to bring them to trial. Enough time has passed for the FBI to have found out a dozen times. Is J. Edgar Hoover ready to say that the FBI gives up on this inside job of safe blowing? The FBI has cracked many a harder nut, and Mr. Hoover and Mr. Clark both know it.

The second fact makes it urgent that there be an investigation into possible pressures on the jurors outside the court. Notwithstanding the ballot thefts, Mr. Phelps thinks there was sufficient evidence to make the acquittals "a travesty on justice." That should be enough for Mr. Clark, who appointed Mr. Phelps, to order a thorough investigation with no restrictions on the FBI.

Attorney General Clark was painfully slow to do anything about the 1946 primary frauds. He acted only when forced into it. He can atone now by putting the great influence on his office full behind a double-barreled investigation. The acquittals do not end the vote-fraud case. They only emphasize that there is much more to find out, much more to bring to light.

Address by the Ambassador From Norway at Madison, Wis., and Statement by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a very stimulating and forthright address by the Honorable Wilhelm Morgenstierne, Ambassador from Norway to our country, which His Excellency delivered at the Norway Week dinner in Madison, Wis., on March 31, 1948.

I also ask that immediately following the text of the Ambassador's speech there be printed a statement which I issued on his inspiring message.

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE AMBASSADOR OF NORWAY, WILHELM MORGENSTIERNE, AT THE NORWAY WEEK DINNER, MADISON, WIS., MARCH 31, 1948

Thank you very much, everybody, for letting me come to Madison on this occasion. It is, indeed, a fine thing on the part of the students of this university to devote 1 week each year to the culture, customs, and problems of another country. And personally, of course, I think that it is particularly fine that this year you have selected Norway. I can assure you that we have plenty of all those things—culture, customs, and problems.

Standing before this distinguished audience tonight, there are many things coming to my mind. One of them I will dispose of quickly, though reluctantly: My purely personal pleasure at being back here in the State of Wisconsin, which I have been privileged to visit on numerous occasions ever since I first came to my country's legation in Washington in 1910. I know something of your cities and your farm lands, forest-covered hills, and lovely lakes—with or without fish. And then I have good friends here, which counts more than anything. With warm feelings I recall my friends, Albert Schmedeman, of Madison, who was American Minister to Norway; Congressman Nels P. Haugen, Dr. Adolph Gundersen, of La Crosse; Waldemar Ager, of Eau Claire; Olaf Rove, of Milwaukee.

And what about those outstanding Wisconsin men of Norwegian heritage, the late Aad Vinje, the very much alive Alexander Wiley, William Evjue, of this city; Herman Ekern; Hjalmar Rued Holand—and, by the way, where is Ole Bull.

But to go on: I appreciate more than I can say to be a guest at this university. This great institution—not only of learning, but of progress and life, is one of those factors—I am gradually coming to them, which make up that extraordinary relationship, rich in human and cultural contacts, in common outlook and ideals, between the people of Norway and the people of Wisconsin. To this university men of Norwegian birth or heritage—Rasmus B. Anderson, Julius Olson, Magnus Swenson, Paul Knaplund, Conrad Elvehjem, Einar Haugen—only to mention a few—have contributed in various ways their best efforts and talents. Already long before the last war, students came here from Norway, and were privileged to study at various departments of the University of Wisconsin, and at the Forest Products Laboratory and today, as we well know, a considerable number of Norwegian students are offered opportunities here which Norway in consequence of the war years, cannot just now give them.

And now, my friends, I come to the origin and source of our close relationship through the years—that chapter in history which Norway shares with America. I am thinking, of course, of that tremendous event in modern Norwegian saga which is the emigration of hundreds of thousands of Norwegian men and women to America during the last 120 years. Already in 1838—10 years before Wisconsin obtained statehood—the first Norwegian immigrant, Ole Nattestad, settled in Rock County. And in the following years thousands upon thousands of his countrymen followed in his wake, until in 1890 the Norwegian-born population of Wisconsin amounted to 65,696 persons.

We cannot forget in Norway that the first Norwegian church in America was the church at Muskego, which has been restored and moved, and is now a Norwegian-American shrine at Luther Seminary at St. Paul, Minn. The first Norwegian newpaper in the United States was Nordlyset (The Northern Light), which first appeared in the Muskego settlement in 1847. It is interesting to note that this paper had as its chief editorial policy the abolition of slavery.

These are significant facts—but the great, moving drama seems to me to be that continuous trek of men, women, and children, with their scant belongings, coming from the valleys of Norway to seek new homes on the rich, generous soil of America—soil which their homeland, for all its love, could not offer them. Here they came—with what is sometimes called nothing—but which is truly the fundamental riches: A stout heart, strong arms, indomitable will, eagerness to build a home, a community, a state, under freedom, for themselves and their own. They broke the prairie, and plowed the land and saw it grow and prosper around them. They were not only in harmony with America as they found it, but they made their own contribution too, they left their imprint on, that spirit of the Middle West which is a potent factor in American cultural and political life today.

In a remarkably short time they became Americans—without any necessity of suppressing their Norwegian heritage—because there was no discord between their, and your, fundamental instincts and way of life. When the Civil War came, it was a man of Norwegian birth, Col. Hans Heg, who led the famous 15th Wisconsin to battle against slavery, and for the preservation of the Union.

And so, in peace and in war, Norwegian-born citizens of Wisconsin have mixed sweat and blood with their native born brothers. In the last war, again, they fought with the rest of you, and side by side with their kinsmen in Norway, the great battles for human freedom and for government of and by the people.

With this record, and in this spirit, Mr. Governor, I come here today as the representative of my people, my King and my government, to offer our sincere, warm thanks, our tribute and our good wishes to the State of Wisconsin on its hundredth anniversary. Our people have shared so much with you, from the very beginning—we are, so to say, boyhood friends.

And I think that perhaps today, in the present state of the world, the Norwegian people feel closer to you than ever. In the spirit of that outstanding citizen of your State, Robert M. La Follette, we both stand for liberty, social justice, and human rights. We both stand unflinchingly against tyranny, dictatorship, and subversive disruption of popular majorities. We both trust to the end the good sense and the genius of the people.

We thank the State of Wisconsin, through you Mr. Governor, for the material and spiritual advantages, which through the years, the State of Wisconsin has offered to my countrymen, and for an environment entirely congenial to their aspirations and ideas of civic government. Opportunities have been given them to create here, in perfect harmony with their fellow Americans, those free, democratic institutions which aim at the material and spiritual well-being of every man, woman and child who call Wisconsin their home. I believe that many of you here will recall the unforgettable visit to Madison of the Crown Prince and Crown Princess of Norway in 1939. You gave them a wonderful reception here, and the Crown Prince interpreted warmly the feelings of the Norwegian people with regard to your State and your people. I know that Their Royal Highnesses would have been happy to be with you on this occasion.

May your State prosper, may the people of Wisconsin enjoy peace and happiness in the years to come. May history, perhaps, some time say, that a star in the beautiful flag of America, the star of Wisconsin, shines a little brighter, because hardy men and women from Norway joined you in 1883 and after.

You and we, and all humanity are longing desperately for peace, for real peace. Not a cold peace, like at present, but a warm brotherly peace. All our common ideas and plans for the well-being and happiness of the common man are bound up with that longing. But, unfortunately, it is not enough to keep repeating: "Peace, it is wonderful." In our present world, peacemaking is a complicated and serious business. Peace can always be had, by individuals and nations, by giving in on every point until one is stripped of everything—except peace, the peace of the grave.

No one could love peace more passionately than the Norwegians do. History is our witness. Even in April 1940 we could have had peace, of a kind, by submitting to Hitler's outrageous demands. But we had to ask ourselves: What price peace? When the

Norwegian people stood up to fight the German aggressors, it was because we found the price too high, it was because we loved something more even than peace. We loved freedom, democracy and justice above everything.

And what of today? I have been asked this again and again. Well, what of today? Let me first emphasize the fact that Norway lives in understanding and friendship with all nations, and we expect, and wish with all our heart, to continue to do so.

But if that situation by any possible chance should ever change, which God forbid, I can assure you that the Norwegian people will remain true to itself and to its past. We shall of course stand up against any future aggressor, from wherever he might come. We shall fight with everything we have, against any attempt by foreign or domestic enemies to destroy our freedom, independence, and democratic institutions. Once more we shall prefer to die on our feet rather than live on our knees. It is my profound conviction that the overwhelming majority of the Norwegian people would rather perish than submit to terror and slavery imposed by antidemocratic forces.

We Norwegians know exactly what freedom mean—because for five long years we were robbed of it. We realize, as our war poet said, "That freedom and life is one." We know the horror, the deadly oppressive silence when brutal force usurps the seat of the Goddess of Liberty. We know that freedom, very simply, means freedom of the spoken and written word, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom from want and from fear. We know that freedom implies a regime of law and equal justice for all. No one can convince us, by tortured dialectics, that freedom means something else. We know also that so-called government for the people—be it either by a benevolent, autocratic monarch, or by a totalitarian dictator—is a fraud. What we want is a government of and by the people, then the rest will take care of itself. The very foundation of democracy is the right and opportunity for the people, all the people, through universal suffrage and free and unfettered and secret elections, to choose their own government. And then for the people to feel secure in the knowledge that those thus elected are not their masters, but their servants and their friends.

That is what our people fought for, and died for. That is what they propose to live for.

That is freedom. That is democracy. That is Norway and America.

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

The statement made by Ambassador Morgenstierne of Norway at the Norway Week Dinner in Madison was an inspiring message to all Americans of Norwegian descent and to all freedom-loving people in our own land and throughout the world. The Ambassador's forthright, courageous statement that Norway "shall of course stand up against any future aggressor from whereever he might come" could not help but have been interpreted by Soviet Russia as the voice of the bold, unafraid people of Norway speaking.

We all recognize that it is no easy task for tiny Norway to stand up for her rights in this hour of crisis, when geographically she is almost in the mouth of the Russian Bear. We know that the path of expediency might lie elsewhere than the trail blazed by Ambassador Morgenstierne.

But the free spirit of the Norwegian people, as of their Ambassador, is unquenchable. The profound convictions of freedom for Norway will not permit any compromise.

The Ambassador serves to cement anew the unbreakable bonds of friendship between America and her Scandinavian brothers. Now that the European recovery program has been passed, we are looking forward to a further stiffening in the stand of the other nations of the Scandinavian bloc and of all western Europe.

Norway, which felt most severely the lash of the oppressor, has taken the lead in asserting her freedom against the reckless ambitions of any other oppressor. We pray that Norway's example of firm independence and uncompromising principle will be followed by all of western Europe and, in particular, by the people of Italy in the election of April 18.

Brave words followed by meaningful actions—that is the keynote of Ambassador Morgenstierne's address. And that should be the keynote for America and all of Europe.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1948

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent letter by Mrs. Lotty Von Beuningen, an official of the Dutch Red Cross. This letter has been of interest to many Members of the House not only because of her concise description of the material needs of Europe for reconstruction and recovery, but also for the need for spiritual inspiration and leadership to help them rebuild the war-devastated areas.

The letter follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 23, 1948.*

DEAR MR. LANE: We have been traveling about so much that it is only now that I can answer your letter of January 29.

I am writing about Holland because it is my own country, and having lived there right through the war, the German occupation and the years after, I know what is going on there. I know also that what is going on there is going on all over Europe, and that this means great danger for the European democracies and for the United States.

Much of Europe's reconstruction depends on the Marshall plan and on the material help of America. But even the Marshall plan will fail if, together with material aid, America does not export to Europe a dynamic self-sustaining new spirit, the ideology of a God-inspired democracy that will be an answer to war in the future. Old Europe is so worn out by war, enemy occupation, and the groove of traditions that it needs above everything an ideology which will give a high enough incentive for living, that will unite husband and wife, parents and children, management and labor, nation and nation, and make every one of us listen to God again and obey Him. William Penn said: "Men must be governed by God, or they will be ruled by tyrants." If freedom is to last, we need a pattern of inspired democracy that makes it more dynamic and effective than any form of organized materialism.

In Holland immediately after the liberation people began very energetically to work on the reconstruction of our country. Many bridges over our big rivers that were blown up by the Germans have been rebuilt, broken roads reconstructed, dikes mended, all the flooded land made dry again; plans to rebuild the bombed areas and the stricken towns are ready. Three or four families live cheerfully in one-family houses because they know our Government is going to make every possible effort to rebuild the stricken areas.

But now a sort of apathy and hopelessness has got in because of lack of material. We cannot rebuild houses without bricks or wood or steel or cement or other building materials. We have remade our dikes, and the land is ready to cultivate again, but there is no fertilizer, no good seed to plant. Our workmen and our farmers are ready to work, but it is difficult to do a maximum day's work on indigestible bread made of a mixture of potatoes and second-rate substitutes for wheat, hardly any butter or margarine or fat, very little meat and sugar, etc. Wages are very high, but we have so little food and textiles that people are unable to buy food, clothes, or household linen for their families. After their work they come back to crowded houses that are badly heated because there is no coal.

All this is breeding discontent, lack of energy, and hopelessness, which hold back the speedy reconstruction of our Nation and is a fertile ground for ideologies creeping in which are dangerous to democracy.

I believe that America, land of pioneers and warm-hearted people whose truly great men all listened to God and depended on Him, can give Europe a spiritual lead that will make their direly needed material help so effective that it will unite the European democracies into a stronghold for its democratic free way of life.

Yours sincerely,

LOTTY VON BEUNINGEN.

New Dealers' Desertion of Truman Lacks Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Dealers' Desertion of Truman Lacks Logic," by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Post of last Friday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DEALERS' DESERTION OF TRUMAN LACKS LOGIC—SPORADIC DEMANDS THAT PARTY "DITCH" PRESIDENT SEEN AS "STUPID"

(By Frank R. Kent)

It is an ironical fact that outside of the South, where there is a special reason, the current clamor within the Democratic Party against Mr. Truman comes not from the elements that logically might be expected to oppose his nomination but from those which by every rule of reason should support him.

Certainly, he deeply distressed conservative and anti-New Deal Democrats when he vetoed the Taft-Hartley bill; when he came out strongly for the so-called "civil rights," including that Fair Employment Practices Act which has so enraged the South; when he delivered his "State of the Union" message in which he went far to the left on social and spending legislation; when he failed to give encouragement to the effort to reduce the size and cost of the Federal bureaucracy.

However, it is difficult to see in any of this—or in anything else Mr. Truman has done—an excuse for the vicious and vociferous attempt to defeat him now being made by the worshipful followers of the late Mr.

Roosevelt. On the contrary, the course Mr. Truman has followed should have especially endeared him to these. For, without exception, every policy he has is a Roosevelt policy. Not one is original with him. Undoubtedly most of them, such as the civil rights proposals and his support of the CIO bosses, are unsound economically, demagogic politically, and doubtful constitutionally. None the less, they are Roosevelt policies and as such were enthusiastically advocated by the very New Deal politicians, columnists, and commentators who today are trying to cut his throat, hypocritically alleging that he has "abandoned the Roosevelt policies."

This is so transparently false that one wonders at the effrontery of those who charge it. Actually, the only two things alleged by these screeching anti-Trumanites which can be even measurably sustained are (1) that he has failed to keep in his administration certain notorious New Dealers, notably James M. Landis; (2) that he reversed himself on the Palestine issue.

So far as the first is concerned, it is true Mr. Truman made no effort to retain a number of these self-advertised statesmen, but in most cases there are adequate reasons for not doing so. In the case of Mr. Landis, it was a kindness to him that Mr. Truman "took the rap" without publicly proclaiming the reasons.

As to the second, Mr. Truman's original advocacy of Palestine partition was politically inspired by a desire to hold the big New York Jewish vote upon which the machine politicians count so heavily. That was not an admirable action. But later, when he realized his mistake and was convinced by the State Department and the Secretary of Defense that the national security was imperiled, he reversed himself. And that was an admirable action, nonpolitical and courageous.

Whatever Mr. Truman's deficiencies, it seems plain he is getting very shabby treatment from a group with a very poor case against him. Particularly mean is the yapping of the Roosevelt brothers, Franklin, Jr., and Elliott. As for Mrs. Roosevelt, when she left for England she was neutral. Recently some of her self-appointed spokesmen declared she will stand by her sons, that she is a very great woman whom millions love and follow. Perhaps so, but there are other millions who regard her as a very dull, self-righteous, and tiresome person, and who will certainly go in the opposite direction.

It seems exceedingly unlikely that this drum-beating, anti-Truman drive will alter the conviction of General Eisenhower that a Presidential nomination is something he distinctly does not want, especially one from a party not his own and engineered by individuals whom he does not highly esteem. Clearly, the sort of draft now suggested is one in which he would have to connive. Few believe that after his unequivocal statement he could be inducted to do anything remotely savoring of stultification. It is incredible that he would permit himself to be used by persons whose motives are so completely transparent and so wholly selfish. In brief, it is unlikely General Eisenhower can be played for a sap.

Of course, it is possible Mr. Truman may be frightened by the kind of publicity the people behind this drive are able to command. But those who know him best do not think so. One reason is that he is not the sort of man to be scared out of a fight just because the odds are against him. Another is that certainly he will lose more self-respect and go down in history as a shoddy character if he quits under this kind of fire than if he stands up and takes his licking no matter how bad it may be. Hoover, Landon, and William H. Taft all gained in public esteem through defeat.

Still another reason is that there may be a change of political scenery before next November. In 1946 Mr. Truman's prestige was so low that a demand was made that he resign. In 6 months he was running ahead in the popularity polls. This is not to say Mr. Truman can duplicate that performance. Things look worse for him now than they did then. But it is possible. In any event, under existing circumstances, his stupidity in allowing this gang to ditch him would be exactly equal to the stupidity of the Democratic Party in doing the ditching. Their fortunes are inseparably linked. In tearing down Mr. Truman all these snorting liberals can do is to make a bad situation worse.

German Paintings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "German Paintings," from the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN PAINTINGS

Completely apart from any concern for their security, we are wholly in accord with the proposals to retain the German-owned art treasures in this country for another year. There could be no better evidence of the popular appreciation of this magnificent heritage than the crowds that have been visiting the National Gallery of Art since these paintings were put on display. Some 404,031 persons attended the National Gallery during the first 19 days of the exhibition; and on Sunday a turnout of 62,983 made impossible anything but a fleeting glimpse.

If there is such great interest in Washington, it is a reasonable assumption that there would be a similar reception for the paintings elsewhere in the country where there is normally less access to such cultural advantages. For this reason we agree heartily with the purposes of the Fulbright bill to provide for tours of the paintings under the supervision of the National Gallery—a move, incidentally, which Senator FULBRIGHT had been preparing in consultation with the War Department and the National Gallery, even before the current wave of comment. Senator FULBRIGHT'S sensible proposal is enhanced by a provision that reasonable admission fees be charged and that the proceeds be turned over to the International Children's Emergency Fund for the benefit of German children.

It is doubtful whether the paintings would see any such utility if they were returned to Germany in these days of unrest. Indeed, the fact that they were found cached in a salt mine does not speak well of the Nazi regard for them. A decision to keep the paintings temporarily in the United States need raise no question of their ownership. That ownership is specifically recognized in the Fulbright bill, and it could be implemented further by adopting the suggestion made by several persons to bring over German curators to explain and protect the paintings. In providing for the eventual return of the paintings to Germany, the United States will be completely reversing the policy of the Nazis, who pilfered Europe of its art from one end to the other as a "right" of conquest. The truth is that art treasures such as these are not exclusively the property of one country; rather, they are a trust for the people of the world. The safeguarding of these paintings for the time being in the United States would merely be assurance that this trust will be respected.

The Tense Situation in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the script of a very excellent analysis of the tense situation in Berlin which was delivered at 8 o'clock this morning by George E. Reedy over radio station WOL in Washington.

In his commentary on the Berlin situation, Mr. Reedy paid particular tribute to General Clay and the officers and men of our Army in Berlin for their calm, firm, disciplined conduct in a situation which might well have provided the spark to set off a war we hope will never occur.

As Mr. Reedy pointed out in his commentary, the Russian intransigence and arrogance in connection with its attempt to seal off Berlin from western Germany provided a situation in which—and these are the commentator's words—"any hothead with a gun could start world war III. One shot would have touched off a major collision," Mr. Reedy said, "and full-scale military conflict."

Recently we had a situation in Vienna which could also have led to war had American troops and their commanders not shown truly courageous restraint in the face of most extreme provocation, when an American boy was shot in the back in a cowardly display of a drunken Russian soldier's arrogance and bestiality.

When we recall how many bloody wars have been started in history by incidents of a similar nature, I think we all owe our heartfelt gratitude to the men and officers of our Army in the hot spots of the world for the remarkable restraint they have exercised while at the same time pursuing a firm and honorable policy.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Berlin situation has suddenly been eased, and Americans can heave a deep sigh of relief. The tension is still there, and the difficulties are many, but one thing has been demonstrated. Our interests are being protected by top-notch men.

It is difficult to imagine a tougher situation than that faced by our forces in Germany last week. The Russians suddenly closed off Berlin from the rest of the world. We were unable to supply our soldiers or civilians—by railroad.

The Soviets, in their usual arrogant manner, demanded conditions to which we could not submit. They wanted to board our trains, and investigate the documents of every passenger. Furthermore, they refused to talk over the situation, to reach a compromise.

Our military leaders reacted calmly but quickly. They refused to accede to any of the Russian demands. Instead, they met force with force, blockade with blockade; meantime, supplying Berlin by transport aircraft.

It would be an understatement to call the atmosphere tense. It was obviously a situation where any hot-head with a gun could start world war III. One shot would have touched off a major collision and full-scale military conflict.

Every move had to be exactly the right move. To act wildly would have provoked a shooting war. To have given in at any point would have been a demonstration of weakness which the Russians would have exploited to the fullest extent.

It is a tribute to our armed forces that they made neither mistake. As a result, American prestige has been increased tremendously. We have gained a moral victory that will tell heavily in the final accounting.

Of course, we are not out-of-the-woods, in any sense. The problem of American-Soviet relations is just as acute as it has been for the past several months. But we have established a pattern which should serve as a guide for future conduct.

We may—and probably will—find the Communists just as recalcitrant in all future dealings. But in this case we have forced them to ask for a conference. Even if the meeting ends in a stalemate, that single fact is of importance.

The real danger of the Berlin situation last week was not that the Communists were being belligerent. They are always belligerent. There is nothing new about that. The real danger was that they even refused to talk over the situation.

In other words, they were laying down their demands on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. The implication was that we could either take it or go to war. Apparently they expected us to humble ourselves and take it.

The Russian request for a conference to talk over the question is a plain case of backing down. No amount of bluster on their part can conceal that fact from the world. The policy of cool firmness has paid rich dividends.

There are other trouble spots throughout the world. If we can follow the Berlin policy everywhere, we may find that we are bringing the world much closer to peace than it has been in a long time. There is every reason to believe we will do just that.

But, in passing, it is an excellent time to pay tribute to General Clay and the Army officers who stood so firm in Berlin. They have proven that American policy is both firm and responsible. They have provided the kind of leadership so badly needed by a troubled world.

Let's Be Kind to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert in the RECORD a cheerful refrain which appeared in the New York Times magazine section of April 4, 1948:

SONG FOR SOLONS—OR, LET'S BE KIND TO CONGRESS

April is a month of gladness,
April's fresh and April's gay;
And in hovel and in mansion
Boundless is the soul's expansion;
Dourness fades away.
Warmer now the casual greeting,
Now a smile attends the nod;
Kindness, like a cuddly kitten,
Steals upon the hardest-bitten
And they throw no clod.
Countrymen, be true to April!
All should be our friends in spring.
For a day, then, try withholding
Carping, nagging, chiding, scolding—
Come, and with me sing:

Let us be gentle with Congress,
Let's send ev'ry one of 'em flowers!
Let nobody grouse at the Senate or House;
Let's substitute sweetness for glowers!
(It's only for 24 hours.)
Let's have orations and banquets,
And telegrams gushing with praise,
And radio shows, and we'll get Billy Rose
To put on some gala displays.
For who can be bitter in April?
The jaundice of winter's behind!
Let's shower good will over Capitol Hill;
Yes; even to Congress be kind!

How amazed, yet how delighted
Members of the House will be,
From complaint and indignation,
From reproof and accusation,
Briefly to be free!
Can't you see the tears of pleasure
Streaming from the Senate's ranks?
Hear the speeches of rejoicing,
Speaker after speaker voicing
Gratitude and thanks?
Let them share the fellow-feeling
April in our hearts implants!
True, it is unprecedented,
True, it may be soon repented,
But—let's take the chance!

Let us be tender to Congress,
Considerate, cordial, and bland;
Let's hammer their backs with affectionate whacks,
Let's give the poor fellows a hand.
(For only 1 day, understand?)
Let's have the parades and processions
With Hollywood gals in each float,
And bands, with aigrettes, and the Army's cadets
(With mule), and the Navy's (with goat).
No editor's stricture,
No colyumnist's blast
Must mar the dear picture
Till midnight is past!
We're kind to the schnauzer and spaniel,
To sinner in hoosegow confined—
So, heedless of party: Two cheers, make 'em hearty!
To Congress let's also be kind!
Yes, even to them let's be kind!

—*Arthur Kramer.*

Peace Appeal to Stalin Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hardly ever agree with Mr. Drew Pearson, who writes the Washington Merry-Go-Round, but it seems that once in a while he can be inspired. In his column of recent date he wrote under the headline "Peace Appeal to Stalin Proposed." I really think this was inspired, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE APPEAL TO STALIN PROPOSED
(By Drew Pearson)

These are days when it isn't easy to write a column. It's partly the cherry blossoms, the magnolia trees in front of the White House, and the violets in my own back yard. They make closed-door committee meetings, Army-Navy feuds over airplane carriers—the things editors pay me to write about—dull and drab in contrast.

The world looks so fresh and clean and ready to begin life over again—at least nature's part of it. So you don't want to write about backstage skulduggery or Communists' threats or preparations for war. And you can't help but think that if man's part in this world only kept up with nature's part, we wouldn't have to worry about war and preparations for war.

All these things make me sad and depressed. I shouldn't be. For my grandson has just come to see me. He's red-headed, named for me, and cute enough to make you forget all the headaches of the world—except when you remember that he and a lot of other kids are being brought into a world of atomic bombs, germ warfare, rockets, and guided missiles.

While these kids grow up we sit mute and helpless—we who are supposed to know something about government—merely watch the world drift toward another war.

Hope is the symbol of Easter—the hope inspired by Christ risen from the dead. Hope was never more desperately needed than now. And as I look round the country there is one thing that gives me hope—the American people. That's our greatest wealth—our fine, wonderful, generous people. You have to go out as I did on the Friendship Train to know and appreciate them.

And the greatest hope of other countries is exactly the same thing—the people. I also found that France and Italy were full of the same kind of warm-hearted, friendly, eager people. Their one great hope was peace and friendship.

The funny thing is that despite all the propaganda and iron curtain between us, I'm sure the Russian people are exactly the same way—if you can ever get by their rulers. At least they were when I was in Siberia. They get sentimental over cherry blossoms. They get worried about the future. And they don't want their babies to grow up to be cannon fodder any more than we do.

So if you could just get the Russian and American people together—let them know each other, mingle with each other, trust each other, then we wouldn't have to worry about war. For people don't start wars. It's the kings and dictators and fanatics who push people into wars.

That, of course, is exactly why the 14 bosses in the Politburo have an iron curtain. That's why they're so careful to keep foreigners out, why the Red Army in Germany and Austria is kept isolated.

Some time ago I talked with Secretary of State Marshall about making one last appeal direct to Stalin to get the American and Russian people together. Stalin is always talking about Russia's desire for peace and America's threat to the world; so let's call him on it; let's put it to him, squarely on the line, that the way to peace is through the mingling of people. And make the appeal public—for all the world to know.

For a time I thought General Marshall was going through with this idea.

He didn't, but it's still not too late.

It's not too late also to print several million copies of such an appeal in different languages and drop them in Yugoslavia, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and all over Europe to show that we really want peace—that we made a proposal of Russian-American friendship. We should keep on dropping copies of this speech behind the iron curtain, telling the Russian people we are their friends. Millions of copies. It would counteract a lot of lies. More important, it might prevent war.

Sometimes from our lowest depths the best things come. This week most of us went to church. We listened to Easter sermons. But outside of church many of us forget about the greatest Spokesman who ever lived. So let's put some of His words and thoughts into that plea for friendship with the Russian people—if General Marshall will only make it.

If that appeal is made it might remind the world—and Russia—that in Christ's day the world was pretty much the way it is now. Men needed guidance. They were swayed by greed, selfishness, doubt—as many of us are now.

But a great principle was laid down in that day—a great goal for all mankind—the Sermon on the Mount. And while the United States has been following it only imperfectly, we still believe it can be applied to our relations with other nations and other men. So, casting no stones, and not without sin, we invite our potential enemy to join us in a new journey down the road of friendship.

This appeal might fall on stony ground. It might fall on the sands and quickly be washed away. But if only one part fell on fertile soil anywhere in Europe, the appeal would be worth making.

An Englishman Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Friedrich A. Hayek, Austrian-born British economist and professor in the University of London since 1931, according to a news item in the Chicago Tribune this week, warned in an interview given at the University of Chicago that American aid to Europe under the Marshall plan should be financed by higher taxes on the American people, less government spending at home, and a further increase in production for shipments abroad.

Thus an Englishman speaks, telling American taxpayers what to do to support Europe's socialistic economy while they nationalize all industry and use our hard American dollars to wipe out every vestige of private enterprise—the keystone of America's greatness.

In my statement in the House on March 29 on the Marshall plan, I stated that our foreign policy was being dictated by our debtor nations, and here they are telling us in plain language what to do.

America Endangered by Bureaucratic Military Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following timely editorial by John L. Knight which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, Sunday, April 4:

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY ENDANGERED BY MILITARY BUREAUCRACY POWER

Ever since the United States did a volte face on Palestine partition, Walter Winchell has been certain the "military party" is running America.

Actually, military men have risen to the most important positions of civil authority throughout the Presidency of Harry S. Truman.

President Roosevelt liked the military side, particularly anything connected with the United States Navy. But Roosevelt never permitted a doubt as to who was the real commander in chief.

Truman, on the other hand, is literally overwhelmed by the importance of military brass and braid. He has a special weakness for the three- and four-star variety.

Historically, our form of government yields to military ascendancy in time of war and returns to civilian control once the peace has been declared.

The transition is certain to be slow, however, since the civilian elements that have been "out" need time to rebuild their strength and the military "ins" continue to flex their muscles and dislike to relinquish power.

In peacetime, the military men become shrewd and sharp politicians. In order to get their budget requirements from Congress, they have learned to give approval of the type of pork-barrel legislation that dredges obscure creeks, builds useless dams, and preserves ancient inland forts as active fighting units in the districts of influential Congressmen.

While such old-fashioned political tactics are no longer necessary in the year of the big scare, one doesn't need to scratch an admiral or a general very hard to uncover the color of his political underwear. They are all first-rate lobbyists for the branch of service to which they belong.

Following World War I, the transition from military to civilian control was more rapid. In the first place, the Military Establishment was not large compared with World War II standards. Secondly, the postwar problems were somewhat dissimilar.

There was no threat of an all-enveloping communism spreading over Europe nor were any dictators running amok with plans of world conquest.

A mild "Pershing for President" campaign was launched but it had none of the enthusiasm or spontaneity of the Eisenhower boom or even the wide appeal of the carefully planned MacArthur movement.

This time the "military power," as Winchell calls it, is far more firmly entrenched than Congress itself.

If you do not believe we are seeing today's world situation through military eyes, a recapitulation of the military men who sit in the highest civilian positions is worth studying. Hanson Baldwin put it together in Harper's magazine.

There is Admiral William D. Leahy, the President's chief of staff—a post which Baldwin describes as "of great power and intimate influence."

George C. Marshall, general of the Army, is Secretary of State. The Assistant Secretary of State for occupied areas was Maj. Gen. John H. Hildring and later Charles E. Saltzman, a former brigadier general.

Japan is governed almost unilaterally by General MacArthur. Korea is under a military man. Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay remains in Germany and Lt. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes represents us in Austria.

Mr. Baldwin points out that these men ostensibly carry out a policy framed by the civilian State Department, but actually, as administrators of policy in military government, they are also architects of it.

In the foreign service there are Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith and Admiral Alan Kirk as our Ambassadors to Moscow and Belgium.

Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer has been entrusted with a special mission to China and his still unpublished report rests in the State Department's files.

In South Africa a retired general heads the legation and there are 13 military missions wielding not only military but political power in South America.

Like Mr. Baldwin, I agree there is nothing insidious in all of this, per se. Much of it is the natural consequence of a victorious war, but what must be examined is the tendency to think that the solution of any international problem lies in terms of physical power.

As Mr. Baldwin says, "the attempt to achieve absolute security by the sword is a pattern to be watched."

I wonder if it is generally understood how far the military influence has worked its way into nearly every phase of American life.

In education, there is a certain degree of subsidization by the armed services. It exists in scientific research and ROTC courses through direct payments by the Government.

In industry, there are numerous integrating links with the military such as the Navy Industrial Association and the Army Ordnance Association. Military orientation schools offer courses for industrial executives. Off-the-record meetings keep manufacturers apprised of possible mobilization plans.

The repudiation of our anti-Peron policy in Argentina was based primarily on military considerations—as was the decision to risk the wrath of the Zionists by forgetting about partition in Palestine.

Consider the scope of the propaganda drive for universal military training. Veterans' organizations, civic societies, chambers of commerce are constantly being warned by big-name speakers who profess to have the low-down that without UMT we are a lost nation.

Selected parents and any newspaper reporters who could sell the junket to the managing editor were flown to Fort Knox, Ky., to see for themselves what wonders the Army was working for America's youth.

Maj. Gen. Hugh Knerr told a Miami audience last week that the universal training program should start in the kindergarten "with sticks and toys."

Shades of Hitler!

The influence of the military is responsible for the passage of legislation in various States legalizing wire tapping.

In at least one case, the Supreme Court of the United States condoned a search by officials without a warrant, a direct repudiation of the fourth amendment to the Constitution.

The Free Press was one of the first newspapers in America to oppose the imposition of peacetime censorship regulations on Federal agencies in Washington. It was only through the intervention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors that President Truman and Secretary of Defense

Forrestal finally decided to back away from this outrageous proposal.

Yet censorship is being deftly practiced in official circles. It is more insidious than use of the blue pencil. The bureaucrats simply bottle up news at the source on the dubious plea that national security must not be endangered.

This indefensible practice is used to cover up mistakes of judgment and withhold the real truth from the American people.

Within the last week Secretary of Navy Sullivan talked ominously about unfriendly submarines being sighted off American shores. The inference was clear that he meant Russian submarines.

His purpose was to speed up passage of the Marshall plan by sowing more seeds of alarm. It was a thoroughly shoddy device but typical of the influence that military propaganda can exert upon the civilian mind.

As a firm believer in military preparedness, I make only the point that we must not permit our constitutional guaranties of liberty and freedom to be engulfed by a wave of military hysteria.

The General Knerrs would start universal military training in the nursery and carry it along through high school and college. They would, in fact, embrace the very methods by which Hitler regimented Germany and carried his countrymen to eventual destruction.

I know of no quicker way to lose the essence of democracy about which we boast than by placing halos on the heads of men who would like to see kindergarten tots in uniform.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

United Nations Will Be Calling Your Boys to Another World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Organization established to maintain world peace will soon be asking for American youth to be drafted into an international police force subject to the orders of a foreign military staff, and as Secretary—General—Marshall on February 27 asked for $275,000,000 to be used for strictly military purposes in Greece, you may be interested in knowing something about this United Nations organization and a part of its record to date. You will get some of it if you will read the Chicago Tribune editorial of February 26 entitled, "Prettying Up the Corpse." Here it is:

PRETTYING UP THE CORPSE

Mr. Truman said in his second annual report on the United Nations that "the problems of international relations arising this past year in the meetings of the United Nations were met neither by evasion nor by meaningless compromises." Mr. Truman thereby violated a rule known to every man in public life: Never tell people what they know to be untrue.

The President was compelled to prove his specifications by representing UN's manifold failures as successes. He cited:

1. Greece, where UN is "acting to maintain the independence and integrity" of the country. This is plainly false. The United States has taken on the job unilaterally of keeping Greece out of Russia's clutches. It has already cost us three hundred million and a second installment soon will fall due. A UN commission has hovered futilely on the margins of the problem.

2. Korea, where UN is acting "to bring independence." The fact is that the Russians holding the northern half of the country showed their contempt for UN, after it dispatched a commission to attempt to unify the country, by hurriedly establishing a puppet "people's republic," backed by a Soviet-trained native army of between 200,000 and 800,000 men.

3. Palestine, which UN is "placing * * * on the way to settlement on the basis of two independent states, one Arab and one Jewish." Palestine is a hot potato which Truman and the UN have got hold of and don't know how to drop. Truman has jeopardized the vital oil supplies of the Arab Middle East by throwing support to the partition as a vote catcher. If he now gets some American troops killed there, his political demise will be sudden and complete.

Mr. Truman did not even refer to UN's disgraceful intervention in support of Dutch imperialism in Indonesia, where the native independence movement was sold out with the active support of American agents. Dr. Frank Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, who turns up on one New Deal commission after another, was the American representative on the sell-out commission. He has had the unmitigated gall to describe the Dutch as champions of freedom and tolerance, who, in World War II, died for the liberation of Indonesia.

Nor did Mr. Truman mention that his own Marshall plan for $17,000,000,000 to Britain and western Europe, plus his support of the British scheme fostered by Foreign Secretary Bevin to organize a western European military alliance against Russia, constitute a final repudiation of UN as an organization capable of doing anything good.

Instead, he talks piously about "the fulfillment of the Charter in its entirety." The only surviving function that UN possesses is to hitch unwilling Americans to a lot of inimical foreign ideologies which express the fulfillment of the New Deal objective of eventual state regimentation. New Deal propagandists no longer ask us to admire Communist states but are busy telling us that we should understand and admire socialist states.

Thus, Mr. Roosevelt's former attorney general, Francis Biddle, the Nuremberg hanging judge, turned up as lecturer for the Walgreen Foundation at the University of Chicago, originally established for the study of American institutions. Mr. Biddle seized the chance to plug European socialism, presumably on the theory that if it isn't yet an American institution, the New Dealers hope to make it so.

"The alternative to communism in Europe," he said, "is not capitalism but some sort of socialism. We may like this situation or not, but Europeans will not go back to their old order." So we are to spend seventeen billion more to prop up socialist regimes, which left to their devices, would long since have fallen of their own weight, and we are not to dislike it. Why not? Because the New Dealers don't?

In the UN the United States has 1 vote in 54. Already the doctrine is advanced that the Senate, having supinely ratified the UN Charter as a treaty, has thereby made it the supreme law of the land. It is argued by Truman's Commission on Civil Rights that Congress may legislate such laws for civil liberty as are deemed necessary to carry out treaty obligations, even where, in the absence of a treaty, it has no other power to pass such statutes. The Commission hints that Congress will be obliged to accept whatever "international bill of rights" UN produces. Under this construction, the other 53 nations can rewrite the American bill of rights to suit themselves.

The moribund institution at Lake Success thus has become an active danger to our republican system and constitutional freedoms. It has the support of Truman and the New Dealers only because, by employing it to break down that system and those freedoms, they can freeze the country in their own malign grasp and steer it into the Socialist regimentation which so commands their admiration in Europe.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress To Enact Legislation To Relieve Hardships Now Suffered by Veterans of World War II and Their Families Because of the Lack of Dwelling Accommodations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution that I have received from the secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to relieve the hardships now suffered by veterans of World War II and their families because of the lack of dwelling accommodations.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the General Court of Massachusetts, an acute public emergency exists in the serious shortage of dwelling accommodations for veterans of World War II and their families and other people in the commonwealth; that adequate, safe, and sanitary dwelling accommodations are unavailable for veterans of World War II and their families; that the resulting conditions of insecurity, overcrowding, use of unsound and unsanitary buildings and dislocation of family life are disruptive of morale, injurious to health and safety, and detrimental to morals, and constitute a dangerous threat to the well-being of the entire Commonwealth; that these conditions cannot be adequately and immediately remedied by the normal processes of construction of permanent housing, but rather constitute a critical emergency which requires emergency measures and the mobilization of all agencies to coordinate a program of public housing in order that public housing may be provided as expeditiously as possible; that this emergency requires the temporary suspension of various normal restrictions, prohibitions, limitations, and procedures in order that immediate relief from this condition may be provided; that the shortage of adequate, safe, and sanitary dwellings for veterans and others of low income cannot be relieved through the operation of private enterprise and that the construction of housing for veterans and persons of low income by public agencies would not be competitive with private enterprise; that the construction of dwellings for veterans and other persons of low income is a public purpose necessary for the immediate relief of an emergency and is considered to be a governmental function of concern for the welfare of its citizens for which public funds to secure such relief may be expended; and that the lack of adequate housing in the acute housing shortage which now exists and the necessity in the public interest for providing funds for the construction of low-rental

housing constitutes an emergency, the continued existence of which is considered to be injurious to life, health, and well-being; therefore be it further resolved that

Whereas the greater resources which can be mobilized by the Government of the United States are needed in this acute emergency, it is deemed necessary that the Congress of the United States should immediately enact legislation tending to alleviate this condition, by (1) enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill with amendments; (2) providing legislation for the creation of a Veterans' Reconstruction Finance Corporation, permitting lending institutions to transfer mortgages on GI home loans without recourse; (3) by the enactment of legislation providing for direct Government loans to veterans, with no down payment and amortization over 40 years at 2 percent interest, for home building; (4) by the enactment of legislation to give veterans and veterans' mutual housing associations number one preference in the purchase of permanent war housing; (5) by the enactment of legislation giving veterans preference for housing in Federal housing projects; and (6) request the War Surplus Administration to stop the sale to nonveterans of materials essential to veterans' housing; therefore it is hereby further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted, March 23, 1948.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Assistant Clerk, Acting Clerk.

In the house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, March 29, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The Betrayal of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the text of an address delivered over the radio network of the Columbia Broadcasting System by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, on March 31, together with a news story in regard to the address which appeared in the New York Times of April 1:

SILVER EXHORTS US TO BACK PARTITION—HOLDS TRUCE, TRUSTEE MOVES FOR PALESTINE FUTILE—PRESSES DEFENSE RIGHTS

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, declared yesterday that the latest United States proposals for a truce in the Holy Land and further consideration by the United Nations of the future government there are wholly unsatisfactory and futile.

What is needed, he said, is adherence to the partition plan sanctioned by the General Assembly of the United Nations last November, and the organization and equipment of a Jewish militia to support the provisional government scheduled to be set up in Palestine not later than May 16. To this end he urged the removal of all embargoes in the shipment of arms to the Jewish people of Palestine.

The statement was delivered over a network of the Columbia Broadcasting System, which announced that Ambassador Warren R. Austin, representing the United States in the United Nations discussions, has been invited to reply on April 7.

TEXT OF STATEMENT

"Last November the United Nations Assembly, under the leadership of our Government, overwhelmingly approved the recommendation of its special committee to solve the Palestine problem by the setting up of two independent states in Palestine, one Arab and one Jewish, within an economic union, and the internationalizing of the Jerusalem area.

"This action came in reply to a request which was made in April of last year by Great Britain, the mandatory for Palestine, asking for a special assembly of the United Nations to make recommendations for the future government of Palestine.

"The recommendations made by the United Nations in November 1947 were accepted by Great Britain which later announced its intention to relinquish the mandate on May 15 next and to complete the withdrawal of its troops from Palestine by August 1.

"In the meantime the United Nations appointed a commission to implement the plan. This commission has already done an enormous amount of work in connection with the execution of the plan. A committee of experts is already at work in Jerusalem. Were it not for the refusal of the mandatory government to permit it to come any earlier than May 1, the commission would now be in Palestine completing the arrangements for taking over all governmental and administrative functions.

"April 1 was the last day set for the announcement by the commission of the provisional councils of government for the new states. The Jewish community of Palestine has already informed the commission of its suggestions for the composition of the provisional council of government for the Jewish state.

"It was on the eve of the consummation of this plan that the United States Government, on March 19, requested that the Palestine Commission should suspend its work and that a special Assembly of the United Nations be called to establish a temporary trusteeship for Palestine pending an eventual political settlement. The explanation given for this sudden reversal is that the plan cannot now be implemented by peaceful means and that a further opportunity should be given the interested parties to reach an agreement regarding the future government of Palestine.

"It was, of course, never anticipated that the partition plan or, for that matter, any plan for the settlement of the Palestine problem, could be carried out entirely by peaceful means, and that no force whatsoever would be required to back up a settlement. In fact, it was the United States delegation itself, last November, which first spoke of the need for an international constabulary made up of volunteers to enforce a United Nations decision.

"Throughout the long discussions which preceded the vote at the Assembly, the representatives of the Arab states and of the Arabs of Palestine made it unmistakably clear that they intended to resist by force any decision of which they did not approve. It was in the full knowledge of this resolve of the Arabs to resort to violence that the Assembly of the United Nations, inclusive of our own Government, nevertheless took the step which it did.

MILITIAS PROVIDED FOR

"State militias were provided for in the plan to preserve law and order, and the Security Council, it was understood, would step in if a breach of peace developed, exercising all the power assigned to it under the Charter.

"Equally misleading is the other reason given for suspending work on the partition plan and the calling of a special Assembly, namely, to afford another opportunity to Jews and Arabs to reach an agreement regarding the future government of Palestine. In this connection it would be well to recall what the representative of the United States, Ambassador Herschel Johnson, said last November when this subject was being discussed in the Assembly:

" 'Much has been said during the course of these debates on the desirability and necessity of presenting to the General Assembly a plan which would command the agreement of both the principal protagonists in this situation. I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented, either to the Assembly or to the mandatory government during its long years of tenure or in any other place, which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and the Jews. No such plan has ever been presented, and I do not believe that any such plan will ever be presented.'

"At the General Assembly last November the British representative, Sir Alexander Cadogan, stated: 'After years of strenuous but unavailing effort, His Majesty's Government have reached the conclusion that they are not able to bring about a settlement in Palestine based upon the consent of both Arabs and Jews, and that the mandate is no longer workable.'

"As far back as 10 years ago the Royal Commission on Palestine, which made a thorough study of the situation and recommended partition as the only practical solution, declared:

" 'Neither Arab nor Jew has any sense of service to a single state. * * * The conflict will go on. The gulf between Arabs and Jews will widen. * * * The hope of harmony between the races has proved untenable. We would suggest that there is little moral value in maintaining the political unity of Palestine at the cost of perpetual hatred.'

"When in the face of this overwhelming testimony, the United States Government now requests the abandonment of a plan which has been approved by the United Nations and which is in process of implementation, in favor of renewed consultations in order to reach an agreed solution between Jews and Arabs, it is not making a serious contribution to the subject. It is, in fact, engaged in an act of inept political improvisation which is dictated by no responsible statesmanship and by concern neither for basic national interests nor for the larger interest of the world community.

SUMNER WELLES IS QUOTED

"No one can help but agree with the sentiments expressed on Monday last by Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, who stated:

" 'There is no shadow of justification for this reversal; and the position which the United States now occupies is profoundly humiliating. * * * The United States was chiefly responsible for the adoption by the Assembly of the partition resolution 4 months ago.

" 'Since that time the President, the Secretary of State, and the American delegate to the United Nations have given repeated assurances that the American Government stood foursquare behind that decision. * * * This reversal by the United States will increase and not diminish the danger of a major war in the Near East. It deals what may well be a death blow to the

United Nations, and to our hope for collective security. It shakes confidence in the United States throughout the world.'

"The United States Government has requested a Special Assembly of the United Nations to reconsider the Palestine problem. To what end? What can another Assembly do that the last Assembly failed to do? What new facts are available now that were not previously known? This problem and this little country of Palestine have been investigated by more commissions in recent years than any other problem or any other spot on the face of the globe.

"What new solutions can be pulled out of the bag? There are none, and the Palestine problem cannot be solved by postponements and procrastinations. That way lies continued strife and growing chaos.

"The United States has proposed a temporary trusteeship for Palestine, although in its formal resolutions introduced yesterday in the Security Council it made no reference to trusteeship. It avows that this is no substitution for partition. The President still maintains that he is for partition, and so does the Secretary of State.

"The United States feels that emergency action is needed inasmuch as there will be no public authority in Palestine after May 15, and that large-scale fighting among the people of that country will be the inevitable result of the vacuum thus created.

"But if the plan of the United Nations is carried out faithfully in letter and spirit, there will be a public authority in Palestine on May 15. There will be a commission of the United Nations to take over. There will be an organized Jewish militia in the Jewish state to maintain law and order, provided the mandatory regime fulfills its obligations loyally and permits this militia to be organized and adequately equipped in time."

GOVERNMENT SET-UP READY

"The Jewish Provisional Government on May 15 will be prepared to take over all the responsibilities of administration of the proposed Jewish state under the guidance of the United Nations Commission. There is no need for a temporary trusteeship to fill any vacuum.

"An international trusteeship will require as much force, if not more, to maintain itself as would the partition plan. Where is this force to come from? Is the United States prepared to send troops into Palestine to impose a trusteeship upon that country when it is unwilling to send troops to back up the United Nations decision on partition? If so, why? Why is it willing to send in troops to back up what is clearly a temporary arrangement which leaves the basic solution still unsettled and why is it unwilling to make such a contribution in troops toward a final and permanent settlement? Palestine has lived under a trusteeship (the British mandate) for 25 years. If, through this long period, a trusteeship has not been productive of any agreed solution for Palestine, why are we now to expect a solution to result from another and temporary trusteeship?

"It is clear that no trusteeship is contemplated without British participation. Great Britain would not permit any other power to come to Palestine before May 1. It has denied that right to the United Nations Commission. How then will a trustee power, other than Great Britain, be able to take over in time and fill the so-called vacuum? For all practical purposes it is to be either a new British trusteeship supported by the United States or a direct Anglo-American trusteeship with or without France.

"In any such event the trusteeship will be drafted on British terms. British policy in the Middle East is firmly wedded to the sponsorship of the Arab League. Consultation with states directly concerned called for under the trusteeship rules of the Charter would be interpreted by Great Britain as consultation with the Arab states.

"An unfriendly mandatory power and hostile Arab states would thus, in the main, determine the terms of the agreement upon which the new trusteeship is to be based. Is it not clear that this new trusteeship would be directed against those fundamental Jewish rights in Palestine which the United Nations, under American leadership, has but recently approved. The task of suppressing a disillusioned and resentful Jewish population which has been prepared for independence and statehocd would inevitably involve the individual or collective trustee in heavy military liabilities.

"The American Government is proposing a trusteeship without any assurance that a trustee is available, that the special General Assembly to be convoked will approve of such an arrangement, that any section of the population will cooperate, or that adequate means of enforcement can be secured. The partition plan admittedly involves difficulties, and these can hardly compare with the accumulation of hazards and difficulties involved in its abandonment.

"The Jewish Agency for Palestine feels that the cause of justice and the cause of Palestine will best be served by carrying out the decision taken by the United Nations last November. That decision represented a major compromise. Partition was never the Jewish solution. It represents a grevious abridgment of Jewish rights. Nevertheless, the Jewish people reluctantly but loyally accepted that decision because it appeared reasonable to the United Nations."

ACTING IN UN DECISION

"Relying upon the collective judgment and authority of the United Nations, the Jewish people of Palestine has been moving forward in the spirit of that decision. It has notified the Security Council that it must oppose any proposal designed to prevent or postpone the establishment of the Jewish state, and that it rejects any plan to set up a new trusteeship regime.

"It informed the Security Council that upon the termination of the mandatory administration, and not later than May 16 next, a provisional Jewish government will commence to function in Palestine. This decision of the organized Jewish Community of Palestine was taken after the most searching and serious deliberation. It may involve a measure of conflict after May 15. It still hopes that there may be no need for prolonged conflict in Palestine.

"The Jews of Palestine hope that the Arabs of Palestine will come to accept the United Nations decision and thereby put an end to the scourge of strife and bloodshed which can only do incalculable hurt to both peoples. But in the face of the mounting threats and the incursion of armed bands across the frontiers from neighboring Arab states bent on war, the Jewish people of Palestine is compelled to make all necessary preparations for self-defense.

"It asks that it be permitted to organize and equip its own militia. This is an elementary moral obligation of the United Nations in view of the decision which it took. It is likewise an elementary moral obligation on the part of those nations who have approved the plan, to remove all embargoes on the shipment of arms to the Jewish people of Palestine who have accepted the decision, and to deny such arms to those who are violently resisting it.

"The Jews of Palestine wish first and foremost to defend themselves, but their hands must not be tied. They plead with the United Nations to remove all obstacles in the way of their self-defense. They are carrying out the purposes of the United Nations. They should not be penalized for doing so.

"They appeal to the United States, the greatest democracy on earth, whose people have, through the years, manifested deep understanding and sympathy for the historic right of the Jewish people to rebuild its national life in its ancient homeland, to desist from a course of action which is calculated to do them grievous wrong, prolong strife in the Holy Land, and discredit the United Nations as an instrumentality for solving grave international problems and making its decision stick. They appeal to the people and the Government of the United States to help them in their desperate struggle toward freedom and independence."

There Is Still a Chance for Small Business in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly hearing that the day of small business is done. It is being pressed from one side by monopolistic large capital structures and from the other side by cooperative enterprise. Many thousands of men, especially young men, have looked at the picture and felt the future to be hopeless against these tremendous odds. And still once in a while we find a case where small business when manned by the right type of men meets these challenges and moves forward to great heights.

It is a matter of particular personal satisfaction for me to present to the Congress the story of a small business enterprise starting in the city of Fargo, N. Dak., in January 1934, with a capital of $1,700 and moving forward in this short space of time until it shows a net worth today of $300,000. This amount has been built entirely from the original investment of $1,700, there being only one exception, when $47,000 was paid into the concern in new capital in 1947.

It is my privilege to know intimately the founder of this business, Mr. Donald A. Smith, and the other members, particularly Mr. Richard H. Barry, who makes a great contribution to the firm with his excellent financial judgment.

I submit this story to the Members of Congress. It is taken from the magazine entitled "Commercial West" published in Minneapolis, Minn.:

FORWARD WITH NORTH DAKOTA—FARGO FIRM PIONEERS NEW PATTERN FOR SMALL COMPANY FINANCING

A pioneer, says N. Webster, is one who goes before, exploring and preparing the way for others. And just as pioneers opened up this great country of ours and other pioneers kept on pioneering, exploring and expanding, still other pioneers today continue to go on preparing the way for others.

For an outstanding example of modern pioneering one has only to look at what North Dakotans, always recognized far and wide for their hardy pioneer spirit, have done and are doing to bring about a new era in economic development of the State and, more specifically, to promote the growth of its locally owned individual establishments.

Now, a brand new chapter on how to finance small companies under the capitalistic system that made the United States of America so great, has just been added to the story—it boasts Nation-wide as well as Statewide interest and import since it pioneers a new way and pattern—but first of all let's

look at developments that point to the possibility that North Dakota may be on the threshold of a new era of economic expansion. For instance:

The expanding group of citizens whose thinking is on a State-wide scope about the basic things which must be done to bring about a more advanced development of North Dakota's resources of products, brains and wealth.

The creation early in 1947 of the Fargo Industrial Development Corp. which has acquired, in cooperation with the city of Fargo, the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Milwaukee Railroads, over 200 acres of industrial sites.

The willingness of local citizens to invest money in their communities as evidenced by the new hotels in Minot and Grand Forks.

The encouraging progress of the North Dakota Research Foundation in developing scientific information on the resources of the State.

The willingness of North Dakota people to back up their ideas with money as evidenced by the YMCA drive in Minot within the last 6 months which produced in excess of $400,000 in donations.

The population estimate of 900,000 people in 1970 developed by the Federal Power Commission in connection with its study pertaining to the River Development Programs of the Corps of Army Engineers and the irrigation programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The tremendous lignite coal deposits in North Dakota, 600,000,000,000 tons, which are practically untouched and the activity now underway to utilize more of these resources by the United States Bureau of Mines. (Recent appropriation by Congress, $750,000.)

The added stability brought about by diversification of agricultural income and the aggressive soil conservation practices already in operation.

The substantial increase in the over-all net worth in the State and in the total volume of sales.

The growing realization that the State's economic growth would be facilitated by having more services of experienced investment banking firms.

Last, but not least, the current financing by Smith, Inc., of Fargo, of $100,000 in preferred stock and $200,000 in debenture bonds.

At least four points appear pertinent about the Smith, Inc., financing. They are:

First, the history of its growth under America's capitalistic system of free enterprise, something impossible to conceive of under the communistic system.

Second, the financial "know-how" Smith, Inc., has learned and which, as related herein, may prove helpful to other small business firms in working out the mechanics of their capital financing.

Third, the emphasis on employing outside specialized talent in building up small companies.

Fourth, the interest, counsel, and cooperation of several North Dakota bankers and local insurance company officials in guineapigging Smith's Inc.'s financing thereby reflecting support for growing local companies from sources strategic in the State's present and future economy.

Smith, Inc., as a business, was born in Fargo in January 1934, during the depth of a major depression. The company's original name was Smith Commercial Body Works, Inc., and its original capital was $1,700. It marked the beginning of a relationship between a young man with ideas and the courage to back them up and an older man who enjoyed encouraging ambition and who was willing to back up the encouragement with some capital.

The company's present net worth of $300,000 has been built up entirely from the original investment of $1,700 out of earnings with the exception of $47,000 paid into the concern in new capital in 1947.

It seems a long way from the company's modest beginning 14 years ago to an organization which today employs 100 persons, operates 4 businesses as 4 divisions under one corporate name in an area 500 miles long and 250 miles wide with total sales in 1947 of over $3,000,000.

From a relatively modest operation of building truck bodies in 1934, the business has been guided by its management through four progressive transitions to where it is now one of North Dakota's largest distributors of construction, mining and municipal equipment, truck equipment, aluminum truck bodies, school busses, semitrailers, fire and safety equipment, and farm implements.

From a one-man operation, the company has grown to a complex modern business structure of executives, division heads, superintendents, and department managers, functioning as a smooth coordinated organization in the normal handling of sales quotas, budgets, territory studies, advertising, sales forecasts, cost accounting, cost of living programs, salesmen commission plans, inventory turn-over, accounts receivable aging, working capital ratios, local bank lines, Chicago bank connections, investment house transactions, labor-union contracts, workmen's compensation rates, National and State labor laws, Fair Labor Standard Act regulations, unemployment compensation rates, local, State and National tax reports along with all of the additional ramifications of doing a volume business.

The more recent know-how acquired has been in the field of investment and long-term capital. It's first step was a $55,000 issue of 4-percent, 10-year debentures sold through established commercial channels in January 1946. Approximately 4 months were consumed in negotiating and completing the transaction. Its present program involving a total of $300,000 has been in the hopper more than a year. The problems and technicalities would fill a book. At one time, in order to secure an unqualified supporting legal opinion for the issues, the company found it necessary to reincorporate under the laws of another State.

One underlying operation principle of the company's management is to employ specialized talent on major activities. When it is not practical to have the talent within the company, its policy is to engage it outside of the company.

When a decision was reached toward the end of 1945 to investigate the possibilities of using investment capital financing, the company soon discovered that there was no specialized service of this nature available within North Dakota. Thereupon two officials of the company went to St. Paul and discussed its thoughts with the investment firm of Kalman & Co. A modest program appeared feasible to the investment house, and the wheels were put into motion that resulted in the $55,000 debenture issue.

Financing step No. 2 found Smith, Inc., and Kalman & Co. back together again. When the size of the offering had been tentatively agreed upon, the next step was to test the company against the standards required in the larger money markets. Smith, Inc., agreed to submit to an analysis of its management, operating standards, capital structure, earning ability, products, and territory. The analysis was made by the firm of Duff, Anderson & Clark of Chicago. A thorough examination by this firm resulted in a favorable report.

In the mechanics of financing, it is the observation of Smith, Inc., officials that too much stress cannot be put on the importance of a good presentation of a complete financing package supported by all of the necessary legal formalities. Here again specialized talent plays a part. After knowing it could meet the test of the larger as well as the smaller money markets, a carefully planned financing program was assembled as to how the company was to employ the money, and the safeguards the company was willing to offer for the protection of the investors.

Smith, Inc., had $300,000 of its own capital, and to support outside investment funds of $300,000, it was willing to do the following:

1. First sell $100,000 in 6 percent cumulative preferred stock, which automatically would have a book value of 400 percent.

2. Maintain a working capital position equivalent to at least 200 percent of the preferred stock outstanding.

3. In calculating the working capital, it would not include, as current assets, accounts receivable over 60 days old or inventory in excess of 75 percent of the company's working capital.

4. Ten percent of the contingent liability on conditional sales contracts sold on a recourse basis would be set up as a current liability.

5. The company would not dilute the book value of the preferred by selling additional preferred stock.

6. A sinking fund would be established commencing in 1950, calling $6,000 of the stock annually.

After the $100,000 in preferred stock had been sold, the company would issue $200,000 in 5-percent 10-year debenture bonds, which would be supported by a net worth ratio of 2 to 1.

1. During the time the bond issue would be outstanding, the company would: (a) Maintain a minimum working capital of $350,000; (b) Not pay dividends on its common stock, unless its working capital was kept in excess of $500,000.

2. In calculating working capital, it would exclude the same type of assets previously described under the terms of the preferred stock.

3. The company would not create contingent liabilities in excess of 50 percent of its working capital.

4. It would keep assets unencumbered.

5. It would establish two sinking funds, one providing for $20,000 per year and the second based on a percentage of the company's earnings as prescribed in a certain formula.

After the financial package had been carefully assembled, the following was decided upon:

1. Smith, Inc., would place $50,000 of the preferred itself and the balance of $50,000 would be offered to the public by the W. R. Olson Co., of Fergus Falls, Minn.

2. Kalman & Co. would handle the sale of the debentures to an institutional investor.

Clearance of the securities commissions of North Dakota and Minnesota and the 5-day waiting period by the Securities and Exchange Commission were completed last week. Public offering by the W. R. Olson Co. was to commence this week. Smith, Inc., has already received commitments for $50,000 in preferred, and Kalman & Co. has received a commitment for the $200,000 in debentures, subject to the prior sale of $100,000 in preferred.

Individuals and firms who participated in the preliminaries up to the actual transaction, and those who have participated in one or more actual phases of the financing have included several North Dakota bankers. From Fargo, Clarke Bassett, president, and Adrian McLellan, vice president of the Merchants National; Fred Irish, chairman of the board, Harold Crosby, president, and George May, vice president of the First National; William Stern, president, Ralph Butterwick, vice president, and Owen Boyle, cashier of the Dakota National. In Grand Forks, Fred Orth, president of the First National.

Insurance-company officials included Otto Haakenstad, president, Western States Life Insurance Co. and Bradley C. Marks, president, Pioneer Mutual Life Insurance Co., both of Fargo; George Cook, vice president, Bankers Life Insurance Co., Lincoln, Nebr.

Kalman & Co. was represented by Bert Turner, vice president, and Robert Z. Bronn, secretary; Duff, Anderson & Clark by James H. Clark and Charles S. Leonard; W. R. Olson Co. by Walter R. Olson; the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, trustee for the bond issue, by Ronald Kimball and Boyd W. Simmons, vice presidents; and Broeker & Hendrickson, certified public accountants, St. Paul, by Milton Broeker.

The following legal firms participated in various phases of the transaction; Wattam, Vogel & Vogel, Fargo; Doherty, Rumble, Butler, Sullivan & Mitchell, St. Paul; Jesse J. Holland, Chicago.

Directors of Smith, Inc., include; the Hon. Charles T. Yirchott, chairman of the board; Donald A. Smith, president; Richard H. Barry, executive vice president and treasurer; C. Robert Yirchott, vice president; Philip B. Vogel, secretary. Other stockholders active in the company are: Leon H. Miles, comptroller; Charles J. Beck, sales manager, construction equipment division; Bernard J. Diederich, sales supervisor, truck and bus division; Ivan O. Edlund, sales manager, aluminum truck body division; Merle E. Sparrow, manager, parts and accessories department.

Reduction in Prices by Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a press release handed out last week by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey announcing a reduction of prices of several hundred petroleum products.

This price reduction by such a company is one of the most encouraging signs of the times so far as the battle against inflation is concerned. I should say that the Standard Oil Co. has given the country and the business leadership of the country a highly salutary example of sound industrial statesmanship.

In a recent book, Col. Johnson, of Johnson & Johnson, said that "a man who writes the price tag controls the throttle of business." By reducing prices at a time when the upward trend seems to have been resumed, the New Jersey company is writing the price tag of business in a manner calculated to stimulate, because stabilized prices now will keep the dollar from shrinking.

Inflation reduces the purchasing power of the dollar and thereby contributes to the reduction of the market for business, as well as to a lowering standard of living for the rank and file.

I have not had an opportunity to study any of the details of the new price schedule, but judging by the release given out by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey in its advertisments, I should say that it has given industry an example which should be followed.

Gratifying as the action may be, however, I still think that the effective stabilization of the economy, particularly in the light of the increasing demand for the goods produced in America, can be accomplished only by congressional action.

There being no objection, the release issued by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESSO STANDARD CUTS PRICES ON 350 PRODUCTS

Price reductions on more than 350 products of Esso Standard Oil Co. will be made immediately, M. J. Rathbone, president, announced today. Products affected by the price reductions are farm-tractor fuel, bottled gas, roofing asphalt and a wide variety of lubricating oils and greases used principally in industry and farming.

In addition, the company is offering a summer "fill-up discount of seven-tenths of a cent per gallon on kerosene and home-heating oils, good until September 1, 1948. This discount is offered to encourage customers to fill up their tanks during the next 5 months when transportation and distribution difficulties are at a minimum. Moving the maximum quantities of these fuels as close as possible to the point of ultimate consumption during the "off season" is an important step in making available to the consumer next winter adequate quantities of these home-heating oils "as needed and when needed", the company pointed out. In addition to helping achieve this goal, the summer "fill-up" discount will mean real dollar savings for distributors and consumers.

Esso Standard Oil Co., which markets in 18 States along the Atlantic and Gulf seaboards, estimates that these price reductions will benefit directly more than 1,000,000 families and businesses. Indirectly these lower prices should benefit many more millions of people because they are a step in the direction of lowering the manufacturing costs of hundreds of factories producing almost every kind of goods, and in reducing the cost of producing food on farms.

Motor gasoline prices are not being reduced, Mr. Rathbone explained, because these prices have stayed behind the general upward price trend and are low today when compared with the prices of almost all other commodities.

Under the new price schedules farm-tractor fuel will come down one-half cent a gallon. Bottled gas (propane) in cylinders will be reduced one-half cent per pound and all grades of roofing asphalt will be cut 5 percent. More than 325 industrial lubricants, greases, and cutting oils will be reduced in price by varying amounts up to 25 percent on some grades.

The Importance of American School Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the April 1948 issue of the N. E. A. Journal published by the National Education Association contains a very brief and interesting statement by the daughter of one of our distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

This brief statement written by the Senator's daughter describes the Senator's conception of the importance of American teachers and their serving as an inspiration to our youth. Because I know it will be of interest to many brother Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Miss Elisabeth Wiley's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHE LIT A CANDLE

(By Elisabeth Wiley, daughter of Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin)

Recently I found a paper containing several stanzas called "My Teacher." My father's name was signed at the bottom.

As I read it I wondered about the teacher who had inspired him to write, "Every bit of learning was a step to nobler truth."

We read articles on what a teacher ought to be. But here was a teacher who had inspired her pupil, who had transmitted to him a love of learning and the start of a discipline necessary to attain wisdom.

"She told us to dream dreams and build ourselves a great plan of life, full of joy and vision." Did my father dream that some day he would sit in the United States Senate?

She told him, "In helping others, you help yourself." She taught him "to think, to breathe, to feel; to get rid of fear and ignorance and go out and do."

My father as a young man painted houses, worked in lumber camps, earned his way through college, and finally received his law degree. Certainly he put into practice the lesson learned from her that "no task was drudgery but an opportunity for growth."

What was this teacher like who helped mold my father's ideals? The verses told me: "Glad and joyous was she. She had enthusiasm—the Greek fire of the soul."

When I told my father about coming across these verses, his face lighted up. "Now there was a fine teacher," he said. "She took such a personal interest in her students. Why, she would come and sit with us when we had some difficulty and help us with our work."

He had written the poem during his first year of college, upon hearing of her death. Remembering all she had done for him, he had gratefully tried to put his feelings on paper.

Henry van Dyke says that a truly great teacher "lights many candles which in later years will shine back to cheer him."

This teacher, with her enthusiasm, understanding, and love of teaching, gave a boy confidence in himself, faith in his ability to succeed honestly in life. This teacher truly lit a candle.

A Trusteeship for Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Palestine is one that should have the earnest attention of the Congress. The United States cannot, and will not, at this time support the abortive recommendation to partition that land. Pressure groups in this country which were responsible for that action have rendered a disservice to our people and to the world. I make that statement frankly, yet with no malice or

rancor in my own heart. I have no partisan interest, except the concern for maintenance of peace in the Holy Land.

Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention a letter written by Judge J. C. Hutcheson, Jr., United States circuit judge, to the editor of the Houston Chronicle, on March 26, 1948. He served as chairman of the joint Anglo-American Committee of 12 which was charged to examine and report on Palestine and the condition of Jews in war-torn Europe. Judge Hutcheson qualifies as an expert and he points out with singular clarity the situation that exists in Palestine and gives the reasons his committee found against the plan of partition. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include all of Judge Hutcheson's fine letter:

JUDGE J. C. HUTCHESON EXPLAINS AND UPHOLDS TRUSTEE PLAN ON PALESTINE

To the EDITOR OF THE CHRONICLE:

I was in New York on March 19, when Mr. Austin at Lake Success made his statement on the Palestine question. Published in full in the New York Times, Saturday, March 20, it at once became the talk of the town.

Read with an open mind by few and understood by fewer, it was misunderstood, misinterpreted, and misrepresented by most. The partisan and the ignorant, misleading and misled, filled the air with protestations, objurgations, and laments.

Americans of good will, with no ax to grind, no partisan purpose to serve, lacking the knowledge necessary to understanding, the understanding requisite to judgment, seemed everywhere confused and dismayed.

On my return to Houston, your editorial of Monday the 22d, The About Face on Palestine, crystallized the half resolution I had formed in New York to publicly raise my voice in full support of the truth in fact and the justice in law of the position which our Government has at long last taken.

I take advantage, therefore, of your expressed willingness to receive and publish a letter from me to affirm, from the background of long acquaintance with, and study of, the Palestine problem, and with all the force I have, that Mr. Austin's statement of where we now are and where we must go from here is accurate, authentic, and just, and is completely documented in fact and supported in law.

I particularly wish to affirm that his statement, about which so much partisan and political hue and cry is being raised, in effect that the UN committee's recommendation for partition cannot legally, and therefore will not, be imposed by force and that a trusteeship for Palestine should be established under the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, points out and supports the only course which the United States and the United Nations can, in these circumstances, legally, justly, and honorably take.

STATEMENT IN ORDER

The space limitations imposed by letter require a statement in form more dogmatic, less fully reasoned and documented than I would otherwise have chosen. Because this is so, and because few people ever knew, and fewer still remember, that, in respect of Palestine, I speak not as the scribes and the Pharisees do but as one having some reason to know whereof I speak, a brief personal statement from me is in order.

In December 1945 President Truman appointed me American Chairman of the Anglo-American Committee of 12, created by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, to examine and report on Palestine and the condition of Jews in war-torn Europe. Thereafter, and until I delivered the Committee's report to the President in April of 1946, I was engaged almost exclusively upon the inquiry.

In the course of it, the Committee held sessions for taking testimony in Washington, London, Berlin, Vienna, Cairo, and Jerusalem. It traveled in Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Italy, and Greece. It spent several weeks in the Middle East, the greater part in Palestine, with visits to and inquiries in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Trans-Jordan. It completed its labors in Lausanne, Switzerland, by signing, on April 20, 1946, a report which, comprehensive and thorough, was unanimous. Shortly thereafter the report was delivered to and released by the two nations.

Of the Committee's many recommendations, those of peculiar interest here are its Recommendations Nos. 3 and 4, and its statement that it was unable to recommend partition as a solution.

Pointing out the intense bitterness and hatred caused by the rival claims of political Arab and political Zionist to set up a racial or religious state and rule in Palestine, the Committee declared:

"PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT: NO ARAB, NO JEWISH STATE

"Recommendation No. 3: In order to dispose, once and for all, of the exclusive claims of Jews and Arabs to Palestine, we regard it as essential that a clear statement of the following principles should be made:

"I. That Jew shall not dominate Arab and Arab shall not dominate Jew in Palestine.

"II. That Palestine shall be neither a Jew state nor an Arab state.

"III. That the form of government ultimately to be established shall, under international guarantees, fully protect and preserve the interests in the Holy Land of Christendom and the Moslem and Jewish faiths."

Pointing out the powerful forces, both Arab and Jew, operating from outside Palestine, it declared:

"MANDATE AND UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP

"Recommendation No. 4: We have reached the conclusion that the hostility between Jews and Arabs and, in particular, the determination of each to achieve domination, if necessary by violence, make it almost certain that, now and for some time to come, any attempt to establish either an independent Palestinian state or independent Palestinian states would result in civil strife such as might threaten the peace of the world.

"We therefore recommend that, until this hostility disappears, the government of Palestine be continued as at present under mandate pending the execution of a trusteeship agreement under the United Nations.

"CHAPTER X. GENERAL

"1. In view of the dissolution of the League of Nations and of the statement of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons on November 13, 1945, we assume that the British Government will in the near future prepare a draft trusteeship agreement for eventual submission to the United Nations, and that this agreement will include the terms under which Palestine will be administered * * *."

In regard to the question of a solution of Palestine's problems by partition, the committee reviewed the previous efforts to find such a solution and concluded in the same chapter:

"3. * * * We have considered the matter anew and we have heard the views of various witnesses of great experience. Partition has an appeal at first sight as giving a prospect of early independence and self-government to Jews and Arabs, but in our view no partition would have any chance unless it was basically acceptable to Jews and Arabs, and there is no sign of that today. We are accordingly unable to recommend partition as the solution."

The committee from first-hand experience knew that intolerance and intrigue would everywhere arise to stifle any proposed solution which was not partisan and unfair. It knew, too, that tremendous political pressures would be brought to bear by both Arab and Zionist to prevent the adoption of a report which, rejecting the chauvinistic and nationalistic claims of each, protected the substantial rights of both.

Nevertheless, it had great confidence in the painstaking accuracy of its report and the legality and justice of its recommendations. It believed that the approval of the report by the two governments with a sincere purpose to carry it out would bring ultimate peace to Palestine, and it was with the highest hopes that, delivering the report to the President, I called our work done.

When, therefore, I saw the report attacked by political Zionists and political Arabs, political Americans and political British, and undermined and rejected, I was sore, troubled, and dismayed, and the subsequent developments, until Austin's recent statement, have given me greater and greater concern.

I have been disturbed and alarmed by the pressures exerted by strongly placed minorities in pivotal states, political Zionists and their sympathizers, to form our public policy on Palestine not broadly, justly, and legally, but along partisan lines.

I have been particularly distressed when it seemed that such pressures would put the United States and, through the United States, the United Nations, in the illegal and unjust position of attempting to impose by force upon an unwilling majority the Assembly's partition recommendation.

NOT MERE RECOMMENDATION

Put forward by the Assembly under article 10 of the Charter as a recommendation, in response to the United Kingdom's request of April 2, 1947, that "the Assembly make recommendations under article 10 of the Charter concerning the future government of Palestine," this recommendation for partition, in the eyes of the Zionists whom it favored, and of their uninformed and political supporters, ceased to be a mere recommendation.

It became a law which the United Nations must enforce, and this in the face of the fact that the Assembly has no law-making powers and its recommendations are wholly without legal and binding force.

Determined that on these hands of mine there should be no blood of either Jew or Arab, I accepted the chairmanship of the committee with a sincere interest in and sympathy for the plight of both, resolved to discharge my duty without favoritism toward or prejudice against either, and I point with complete confidence to the report as proof that all members of the committee were like-minded. It is in that same spirit of interest in, and sympathy for, the plight of both, that I write this letter.

I know few Arabs. From the ardent opposition to our report as a whole of politically minded Arabs, I suppose I have no well-wishers among them. I know many Jews. I have many well-, few ill-wishers among them. This is not, I believe, because they regard me, or the report, as either pro- or anti-Jew, for as near as may be I have throughout my life endeavored to avoid being, or being regarded as, either pro- or anti-Jew.

Regarding and treating American Jews as my fellow Americans and Jews in general as my fellow men. I have, I think, generally been regarded and treated by them as such.

In Jewish history, both Biblical and post-Biblical, Palestine is called The Promised Land. In modern history, Palestine, land of promise, may be truly described as the oft-promised land. But these promises, except as

they are embodied in the mandate for Palestine, are all water over the dam. The rights and obligations of Jew and Arab there, and the obligations of the nations of the world to support and defend those rights, derive entirely from the mandate and the history which has been, and is being made under it.

We must, therefore, as intelligent persons, who can recognize and, recognizing, cannot deny the footprints of history, reject as entirely meaningless and without force the claims to Palestine as a political entity put forward by Jew, Arab, or Christian on sentimental grounds. We must concentrate our attention upon the Palestine of the mandate as history has formed and fashioned, and is still forming and fashioning.

Stating the rights of the contestants, and the rights and duties of the United Nations, in the terms of the mandate and of the United Nations Charter, any solution of enforced, as distinguished from agreed, partition must be rejected as inconsistent with, and a denial of both mandate and Charter.

Because the report of the Anglo-American Committee was completely and without reservation in accord with the mandate, that it report, the solution it presented was an eminently fair and just one. It is because political Arabia and political Zion, political America, and political Britain rejected our solution that matters are at their present dangerous and desperate pass.

In the full light of mandate and charter and of the history made by and under them, I have no hesitation in saying that if the United Nations or the United States undertakes to impose partition by force, it will be violating the pledged faith of those who proposed and instituted the mandate and of those who adopted the charter, the pledged faith of the civilized nations of the world.

Under the Charter, the United Nations was instituted as an instrument of peace and justice. As such an instrument, its proceedings may not be employed in the interest of any partisan group to bring about by force an unjust, an illegal, result, the result here of splitting a small country into smaller fragments against the will of the great majority of its inhabitants.

INSTRUMENT OF WAR

It may not be used for the purpose of subjecting a large portion of that majority to the political domination of a racial or religious minority. If it is so used, the United Nations has ceased to be an instrument of justice and of peace. It has become an instrument of injustice and of war.

What then can the United Nations do? The answer is quite simple. The Anglo-American committee stated it in recommendation No. 4—mandate and United Nations trusteeship. Mr. Austin has given it chapter and verse in the March 19 statement. The Charter of the United Nations furnishes full and explicit directions for utilizing trusteeships for non-self-governing countries, such as Palestine, to bring order out of chaos, amity out of hatred, peace instead of war.

It was our recommendation that a United Nations trusteeship be created. I believed then, and I believe now, that under the guidance of such a trusteeship, the frictions, the tempers, the passions, the hates, which had been aroused while Great Britain was mandatory, could be allayed, and a unitary, binational Palestine could in time be established under proper constitutional provisions.

These provisions, drawn to carry out the terms of the mandate and in the interest of Palestine as a whole, and not of either Jew or Arabs as a group, would first of all reject the chauvinistic, the nationalistic, statehood claims of Arab to dominate Jew and of Jew to dominate Arab.

Protecting and fostering the unalienable rights under the mandate of both Arab and Jew, they would create neither a Jewish nor an Arab, but a Palestinian state.

They would, therefore, in accordance with mandate article 6, "while insuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced," provide "for facilitating Jewish immigration under suitable conditions."

They would provide, too, for the general welfare of the people, not as Jews or Arabs in a Jewish or Arab state, but as Palestinians having a common interest in a common country.

If, on the other hand, experience gained under and through the United Nations trusteeship should bring all concerned to feel that partition by agreement was the best solution, that could be brought about.

The important, the controlling fact about Palestine, which our report paramounted but all the United Nations' activities have overlooked until Austin's March 19th statement again called it to their attention, is that Palestine is, under chapter XI of the United Nations charter, a "non-self-governing territory."

It is such a territory, not because the peoples individually are not advanced enough, but because the conditions there, the warring claims, the tensions between political Zionists and political Arabs, make it impossible for Palestine under present conditions to be a self-governing territory.

In standing up for Mr. Austin and the United States here, let me say that I am not objecting at all to your belaboring the administration for what you regard as a very awkward, if not wrong, change of policy. I concur fully in Henry Watterson's dictum, that "Things have come to a hell of a pass when a man can't larrup his own jackass."

My purpose in writing is to point out that human beings and nations must adapt and change their courses where they can, as knowledge comes and clear hindsight succeeds dim foresight. A nation or individual which persists in a wrong course merely to be consistent is as stupid as it is unjust.

The only question, then, material here is not the number of mistakes we have made but whether the course the United States delegate has just outlined is legal and wise. I know from long and hard study that it is, and I congratulate the United States and the United Nations that they have had the wisdom to see before it is too late and the courage to declare that a change of course is necessary.

I think that it cannot be too strongly emphasized that out of all the clamor and shouting we hear one thing emerges clear and plain: that of paramount importance to the just determination and settlement of the Palestine question is the recognition that it is not a question on which America's foreign policy should be formed under partisan political pressure.

There are nearly 6,000,000 Jews in this country, of whom, if propaganda is a reliable indication, the great majority are political Zionists. Official and general public opinion is being subjected to barrages and pressures from political Zionist minorities having heavy concentrations in pivotal states and openly and vigorously thrusting from and trading on these strong positions.

As typical, I cite the new Palestine, February 29, 1948, with its blast against Austin and the makers of the United States policy, and its claims of the power of Zionist pressures in American politics. I cite, too, the comments in the general press that the President, because of Austin's statement, lost the Jewish vote.

This would not be quite so bad in a country like ours, where all are free to combine to attain political ends, if opposed to these strong American Zionist minorities there were equally strong American Arab minorities to present their side. What has always kept, and will continue to keep, this country on an even keel is the balancing of partisan with partisan opinion, while the men in the middle, with no ax to grind, carry the day.

The dangerous thing in our situation is that with few or no voices raised here in partisanship for the Arabs, sound middle of the road opinion, hearing only one voice raised, is in grave danger of believing that this question, which is greatly two sided, has only one side.

If, then, I accomplish nothing else by this letter than to convince those who read it that there are two sides, two strong and powerful sides, to this question of Palestine and its future, I will be content, for I will have convinced them that the only just solution is one that recognizes these two sides and selects a solution on principles of justice and not of political expediency.

I credit the Zionist first group and their adherents with absolute sincerity when they put political Zionism before every other consideration. I deny, though, that they speak either for Americans as a whole or for the Jews of America when they seek by political pressures to dictate and control our foreign policy on Palestine. I certainly will not, when they denounce the foreign policy of our Government as unjust and when they present the Palestine question as having only one side, and that the Zionist, permit them unchallenged to stand as representative of American opinion. For here they feel too gravely concerned as partisans, and their support of, and interest in political Zionism above every other consideration stand out too clear and plain.

Proponents of partition by force glibly speak of dividing the land between the Jews and the Arabs—let the Jews have one part, they say, the Arabs the other. If this could be done, even though a better part might be assigned to one or the other, I would do my best to get the disputants to agree to the division.

But that is not what is proposed. In the proposed Jewish state some 400,000 Arabs are forcibly cut off from their 700,000 or 800,000 fellow Arabs. In addition, in a state which is to be set up as a Jewish state, with all that that means to the Arabs, they are, without their consent, to be subjected to the political domination of some 500,000 Jews, in a land where the Arabs were born, and their ancestors have lived and died for centuries.

It is true that the proposed Arab state does consist largely of Arabs with comparatively few Jews, but the tragedy of the whole proceeding is that the whole of Palestine, no bigger than Vermont, is by this knife thrust cut violently in two. The result will be a continuing source of irritation through the rivalry of politically partisan Jew and Arab, each trying to conduct a self-governing country under the most impossible conditions and in such inflaming proximity to the covetousness and intrigue of the other that they will be found without the means, the ability, the self-control to do so.

If, abandoning the illegal and fruitless efforts to bring about an enforced partition, the United Nations will proceed along the lines of Mr. Austin's recommendation, it will proceed legally and, therefore, justly, and with authority. So proceeding, it will be able, I am sure, to work out the destiny of Palestine in accordance with the spirit, if not the precise letter, of the mandate and thus reach a just and legal solution and one which will contribute to the peace and safety of the world.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. HUTCHESON, Jr.,
United States Circuit Judge.

HOUSTON, *March 25.*

He Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1948, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas delivered the Yulee lecture at the University of Florida. In my opinion, it is one of the finest talks on democracy that I have ever read, and I urge every Member of Congress to study it carefully.

Mr. Justice Douglas is, in himself, the personification of the kind of democracy which has made this country great. We of the Northwest are proud that he came from our part of the country; and, while we claim him as our own, we are happy to share this great humanitarian and liberal with the rest of the Nation. He is, in the broadest sense, a real American, whose interests are not confined to any one locality but to every corner of this land of ours. Resolute, courageous, and with integrity beyond question, he typifies the ideal which many of us consider greatness in man.

Mr. Speaker, we in Montana are fortunate, indeed, that Mr. Justice Douglas has consented to address our State bar association in late August. We are looking forward to his visit with anticipation, and we know that when he leaves us we will be better Americans because of what he will have said. Justice Douglas needs no eulogy from me; his words and his actions mark him for what he is—a great American.

The address follows:

We, the democrats of the world, need to reassess our political achievements and redefine our political responsibilities.

A few years ago conservatives and liberals alike were given a lesson in the aims and tactics of fascism. It was almost too late when we read and at last understood Mein Kampf. Today we face a political program of communism which has infinitely more finesse than the Nazis were able to perfect. The well-disciplined Communists operate from their central quarters in Moscow, planning domination of the world. It is time that liberals and conservatives alike understand what that program is. "The Problems of Leninism" and "Foundations of Leninism" by Stalin must be read before it is too late. For if the Communists win their political campaigns, we, the Democrats, are marked for extinction. Extinction is as complete and final whether a Nazi or a Communist be the executioner.

We, the democrats, are a diverse group. Millions are laborers. Still other millions are farmers, specialists, and technicians. Millions are capitalists like the shop owners of Main Street, the factory owners of Middletown, the stock and bondholders of Wall Street. Others are socialists like those who today hold the reins of government in England and other countries of western Europe.

We, the democrats, are of different colors, different races, different religions. Our tastes in art, literature, and philosophy are as varied as the hues in the sunsets over the Berkshires or Wallowas. There are differences in our religious creeds, our political faiths, and our economic theories, differences as great as those that mark the Great Plains from the crags of the Tetons. This diversity is our strength. Since our tradition lies in freedom for the individual, we have striven with Mr. Justice Holmes to put our faith in "the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." Our democratic ideal insists that the soap box, public platform, press, and radio be open to all. The Communist organ—the Daily Worker—is sold in the same stall as papers representing schools of thought violently opposed to communism.

Our literature is not standardized boilerplate issued by a central government bureau. Our art, music, and literature are not limited by those specifications which glorify a person or party in power, which sustain belief in a particular creed or faith. One can write or paint to depict the seamy or disgraceful side of our perfomance, and even receive public acclaim and awards for doing it.

In these and in other ways we guarantee through the first amendment of the Constitution what Holmes called the "free trade in ideas." We can shape opinion for this or that panacea or reform. Or we can revel in the luxury of complacency. We can nationalize an industry whose power is too great for private interests to have. We can establish a Government plant to compete with it. We can rely on anti-trust remedies to control it. Or we can embrace laissez-faire.

We have the same freedom as to other social and economic problems, those of sharecroppers, banks, minimum wages, prices, coal mines, housing. We can experiment and proceed by trial and error. We can have revolution, if we so will it, by the peaceful route. And having had it, we can undo it four years later. We are committed to no one single panacea for all the ills of mankind, whether they be economic or spiritual. For democratic peoples the choice is not merely one of two absolutes—or, as the Chinese say, between Motz and Yang.

Political absolutes distinguish both fascism and communism. Neither has room for accommodation, since they are committed to one economic and political theory. Lenin went so far as to conclude that a classless science was impossible. The Communist state, moreover, summons all media of communication for the propagation and defense of its political creed. Art which is free and unrestrained can become a serious subversive influence to the totalitarian theory. The same is true of literature and music. Thus in Russia art, literature, and music have become part of a political agent's bureau of psychological warfare. They cease to be free expressions of the aspirations of man. Artists become mere illustrators of the so-called glories of a political regime. And so man's great creative genius is perverted in cheap and tawdry ways.

We, the democrats, have few absolutes. Even free speech is not so free as to override the law of libel. He who shouts "Fire!" in a crowded theater goes to jail. Religion which sanctifies human sacrifice or other kinds of immorality has no constitutional sanction. We, the democrats, know that God works in mysterious ways, that the paths to salvation—to happiness and achievement—are not one but many, that no one economic theory is adequate to satisfy all the needs of man in the complex society of a changing world. No political or other standard is set for art, literature and music.

We think that the right to experiment with new techniques is as important in the fields of politics, sociology, and economics as it is in art and the sciences.

This rejection of absolutes, this freedom for experimentation mark the first basic and irreconcilable difference between the political philosophies of the totalitarian right and the totalitarian left on the one hand and the political philosophy of the democrats on the other.

James Madison marked the second great and irreconcilable difference when he stated in his Notes on the Confederacy that "the great desideratum in government is such a modification of the sovereignty as will render it sufficiently neutral between the different interests and factions to control one part of the society from invading the rights of another, and, at the same time, sufficiently controlled itself from setting up an interest adverse to that of the whole society."

Madison's statement is enduring because of the insight into the workings of every society which it embodies. The struggle inside every state has been to keep any one group or interest from getting too much power. The competition between groups has been keen and varied. Social groups—families—have produced ruling classes and kings. Churches have produced potentates. A guild has sought to fasten its hold on an economy. One or more corporations have endeavored to merge economic and political power into a regime. Agrarian interests, mercantile interests, industrial, banking, and labor interests have vied for power and position. It is not this struggle for position between groups which is the danger. That, indeed, is a sign of health. Every society is an aggregation of pressure groups. Their activities are not things to deplore. The danger lies in one group gaining the ascendency, moving into a dominant position, and exploiting the other groups. When one group acquires that power, there is eventually a revolution. If processes of orderly change are not provided by the system of government, revolution follows the path of violence. But if government provides the machinery for change, the revolution is bloodless.

Our own history shows both examples. We threw off the heavy yoke of a king by force and arms. Our peaceful revolutions have been more numerous. By the end of the last century an industrial oligarchy had fastened its hold on the country. The Money Trust, the Oil Trust, the Beef Trust were not figments of the imagination of rabble rousers. The trusts controlled the fate of workers, damned the public, and used monopoly power to crush competition. They merged political power with economic power by electing and at times buying executives, legislatures, and even courts. They used their great power to exploit both labor and the public. The workers at the lathes and in the mines and mills were part of the raw materials that went into the production of coal, steel, and lumber. And when they had served their masters' ends they were tossed aside as human wreckage—broken, bruised, and impoverished.

Then came the severe reaction. The golden voice of Bryan pleaded with the conscience of the Nation. Altgeld, La Follette, and a host of others joined the fray. But it took the reforms of the two Roosevelts and of Wilson to restore the balance of power and to bring the competing forces closer to equilibrium. Labor unions emerged strong and reliant. Some of them, under evil influences, exploited the workers in much the same way as had their industrial masters. But that influence passed. Unions acquired character, integrity, and brains. They grew in size and power equal to the might of the giants against whom their demands must be made.

That is but one example of the forces at work in the life of a society. The list could be extended almost indefinitely, for the process of keeping society in balance is an endless one. Strife and friction, adjustment and readjustment are the essence of life itself.

As Tannenbaum has put it, the social conflict is a "conflict between multiple forces * * * a battle to which no finis can be written—for conflict is part of the process of institutional life itself, and the end of the conflict would really signify the end of life itself."

Strife and friction are inherent in the relationship of a single biological organism and its environment. They are inherent in the relationship of man to man. They are present in every group—from the family to the state. When they relate only to details, they are not serious. When they strike deep, and accommodation is not possible, revolt may destroy the institution itself. Revolt is frequently the only remedy when one group attains a position from which it may dominate or exploit the others. The dominant group may be a king, the proletariat that Marx proclaimed, or a political party. It makes no difference. No one group with its special interests to serve can serve the needs of all. Every man needs elbow room. Men cannot be unanimous and should not strive for that goal. The Creator gave man the same amazing diversity that he gave the mountain meadows in June. Those who try to hold man to one set of aspirations, to one goal of achievement, to one pattern of conduct or belief must resort to secret police and armies. But force is not enough, as the dictators of all times have eventually discovered. For man by nature cannot long be held in serfdom.

Those are the things that Madison knew. He did not want government so constituted that one group or interest would have the upper hand and the power to invade the rights of the other. Madison also knew that government, the state itself, can become so powerful that its interests become adverse to that of the whole society. He knew what happened whenever a private institution or class became the government. Those consequences would be duplicated if bankers or merchants, the proletariat, or farmers became the government. It is tyranny when any one interest has the power of life and death over every other interest.

Madison's theory is the democratic theory of government. We in this country have a steadfast faith in it. And the sweep of 160 years of our experience reveals an exciting picture. It shows in dramatic fashion that the process of restoring balance between the groups which make up a society is an endless one. It shows that imbalance has been eliminated and balance restored through processes of law with the single exception of the Civil War. All of us chafe and fret when our own pet program or grievance gets no attention. We become discouraged because our democratic processes lack perfection. But one cannot view the chronicles of our experience since 1787 and call democracy a never-never land where there is no advance over suffering and exploitation.

Communism rejects Madison's theory. Communism takes its text from the Communist Manifesto published by Marx and Engels in 1848. They saw the bourgeoise, i. e., the capitalists, having the "upper hand." Capitalists undoubtedly were in that position. Marx and Engels saw the workers viciously exploited, as they unquestionably were. Marx and Engels believed that revolution was the only path by which the workers could cast off their chains. That was certainly true in Russia, and it was probably true in numbers of other European countries 100 years ago. And then Marx and Engels took the next big step and, from history, the most fateful one of all. They proclaimed that "the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation." And then they called the workers of the world with the ringing words: "Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite." These were words that to many have sounded great with idealism. For the proletariat was taken to mean the people; and the Manifesto was construed as a charter of liberty for the common man in the Jeffersonian tradition. But such idealism that has been read into the Manifesto has in practice become a mockery.

Marx and Engels speak of raising the proletariat to the position of the ruling class as the establishment of democracy. But it soon became apparent that the proletariat and the people were not synonymous. Lenin made clear that the dictatorship of the proletariat has meaning only when one class knows that it alone takes political power into its own hands, and does not deceive itself or others by talk about popular, elected government, sanctified by the whole people. In practice the Communists have gone one better. They have not placed the powers of the State even in the hands of the proletariat. They have placed it in the hands of one select political clique.

It is the very antithesis of democracy when any one group has permanently acquired all the powers of government. The age-old problem of society is to be free of the domination of any one class and to provide the greatest opportunity for each individual to work out his own destiny. That has been the struggle of man throughout recorded history; and man has had the greatest success in that effort under the democratic form of government. The Communists by promoting the contrary theory join the Nazis in giving to one clique the power of exploitation. They introduce a wild and primitive touch of pseudo-theology to the whole business. It is as if a revengeful god chased a devil off a throne and then, with the sceptre in his hand, became the new devil.

To turn the powers of the State over to one group is to defy the history and teaching of the governments that have produced the greatest abundance and the most enlightenment for the people. Moreover to assume today that the basic struggle is between workers and employers, between labor and capital is to make a most egregious error. There is conflict between those two groups. But that alone is not significant, for life itself is conflict. The significant fact is that the conflict between workers and employers is evolving into manageable forms in this country as well as in the democracies of western Europe. Recognition by law and custom of collective bargaining is the foundation of stabilized industrial relations. In addition there are emerging plans for guaranteed annual wages and other measures which recognize labor's equitable claim to a fair wage. There are and will continue to be strikes. But the occasions for them decrease as management in factory after factory recognizes labor as a working partner, as labor is given at least as great a claim against earnings as are investors. Every man has the right to work. But we need not throw away the values of western civilization and become a police state to guarantee that right.

It is true that the one most important economic problem of society lies in the industrial field. But it is not in Marx's struggle between management and labor. Management and labor together constitute the industrial power of the Nation. The foremost problem—the one most pregnant with conflict—is the relation of that industrial power to the whole economy. It is between the industrial plant and society that there is the greatest potential conflict. Our standard of living depends on the productivity of men and machines. The national income is a measure of that productivity. An economy of abundance is essential if we are to meet our obligations, both domestic and foreign. An expanding economy, increased productivity, and widespread and full distribution of goods are essential if we are to raise the real income of our people to levels hitherto undreamed. These are problems of management and labor. They have a joint responsibility to society for their solution. Depression or prosperity will turn on the skillfulness of their handling.

Communism was not conceived as an answer to this problem. Communism is essentially a political idea, not a scientific blueprint for a machine age. Indeed, communism was launched in an economy of poverty where the problems of industrialization were yet to be faced. It has never faced, much less mastered, the complex problems of an industrial world. If it were concerned with the central industrial problem of the age, it would be moving in quite a different direction. It would then be aimed at directing and planning production and distribution—at benefitting the people of the world rather than just controlling them. It would not be obsessed with pouring mankind into one mold.

Thus the second irreconcilable difference between totalitarianism and democracy is that the former deposits all the power of the State in the hands of one clique and selects class warfare as the central problem of the age.

There is a third basic and irreconcilable difference that has even greater immediate significance than the other two. It is a fundamental and irreconcilable difference in political techniques.

There is a civic genius which distinguishes the politics of the democracies. It is what in this country William James called "the habit of trained and disciplined good temper toward the opposite party when it fairly wins its inning." That was, he thought, the "only bulwark" of our people—a habit "more precious, perhaps, than any that the human race has gained." Political parties vie for popular support. The one which wins stands or falls on its record. The others accommodate themselves to the regime of the victor. They live under the laws and policies of the party in power, though they strive to renew their strength so as to unseat the incumbents at the next election. Sometimes they do; sometimes they do not. But the important thing is that a party takes over the government only for the period during which it commands popular support. The opposition, while acquiescing in that arrangement, knows that once it takes over it will be on a purely tentative basis and can hold power only so long as it retains popular support. There is no police or army which suppresses the party which is out of power.

Communism has no such tolerance. It leaves no room for accommodation and compromise. It has one goal—to transform one small clique of men into the state. It has never compromised with that objective. The only compromise it has made is in the methods employed to reach that goal. And on analysis those compromises are merely evidence of the political finesse with which the Communists undermine democratic institutions.

Stalin makes the technique as plain as day in Foundations of Leninism and The Problems of Leninism. There are two stages in the process. The first is the bourgeois revolution. The second is the proletariat revolution. The first is the process of taking over existing democratic institutions. It is what has just transpired in Czechoslovakia. The bourgeois revolution puts control of democratic government into the hands of the Communists, not to carry out democratic programs but to destroy the forms and processes of democratic government.

The Communists, therefore, pose as democrats for the purpose of the bourgeois revolution. They adopt democratic dialectics. They use democratic slogans. They appear

as champions of liberal causes in the democracies. They are against the exploiters and for the underprivileged. They are champions of every minority. They plead the cause of justice for those who have been discriminated against because of race, creed, or color.

Actually, however (as many liberals have sadly discovered), the Communists plead the cause of justice and liberalism only so long as it aids them in their fight to win control. They want power. Their great chance of gaining it through political means, and thus completing the bourgeois revolution, is to have a weak, ineffective, and faltering democratic government. Thus their political strategy is to exploit weakness, to create doubts and suspicions, to develop differences between groups. Their influence in the democratic state is essentially divisive.

If people understood that strategy, the political power of the Communists would be infinitesimal. It is because they appear to be champions of the oppressed that they gain prestige and support. Too often oppressed people, idealistic people, members of minority groups, are seduced because they find the Communists again and again on the reform side of current arguments. Or if not seduced, they are at least confused; and being confused they allow their forces to be divided. And too often the conservatives, instead of fighting Communists, fight liberal causes because Communists support them. Thus the Communists drive their small wedge deeper into the nation which has been marked for a bourgeois revolution.

China is a spectacular case history of the way in which a democratic people by their default invite the disaster of communism and the methods by which Communists win for themselves the allegiance of the masses.

Twenty years ago the Chinese Communists were a small military band located at Kiangse in Central China. The Nationalist Government waged war on them with vastly superior forces. The Communists started a long retreat—a retreat of 1,600 miles to north China. There they became established at Yenan; and since that time have grown stronger and stronger in popular support. Why is that so? The Chinese are freedom-loving, individualistic people whose instincts oppose a police state. Why have such numbers of them gone over to the Communists?

The Nationalist Government in China has lost ming-shing—the heart of the people. It is tainted by corrupt and reactionary elements. Its secret police patrol the universities and schools to discover dangerous influences—those who protest the serfdom in which the people are held, those who press for liberal reforms. It has, indeed, liquidated the liberal movement in China. The Communists in China have cleverly capitalized on this program of inaction and oppression which the Nationalist Government has adopted. They have taken over large segments of the mass education and social reconstruction program which Dr. James Yen and his group of Chinese patriots launched in China some 25 years ago. They have adopted a program of aid to the millions of impoverished Chinese. Among other things they have undertaken to eradicate illiteracy, to inaugurate programs of public health. By reason of a political program of that nature the Communists in China daily win adherents to their cause.

Thus the Communists in their quest for power vary their tactics to suit the requirements of each particular situation. They may launch their own reforms or seek to wreck the reform governments of the democracies, whichever course seems the more expedient.

Whenever the Communists are in power they reject the accepted parliamentary techniques of the democracies. When they win an election it is for keeps. Unlike Democrats or Republicans in this country or Laborites or Conservatives in England, the Communists take over not on probation but for good. They are not there only for so long as they have popular support. They are in power for one purpose and one purpose only—to destroy the democratic government that elected them and to make their own party the state.

To do the latter they need more than the democratic traditions. Up to the time they perfect their bourgeois revolution they may have used democratic tactics alone or democratic tactics plus the threat of force. Up to then they have used free speech, free elections, political campaigns, and all the other trappings of democrtic political traditions. Once in power they add two of the ancient tools of tyranny—murder and terror—to their political techniques.

There is no place in their scheme of things for the free trade in ideas that Holmes proclaimed. One who is against the destruction of the democratic government and the substitution of a one-party, one-class state is naturally a subversive. He may disappear mysteriously like the lieutenants or precinct leaders of parties in Poland. Or he may be tried for high crimes and treason. The important fact is that everyone around whom effective opposition might rally must be liquidated.

The Communists did not originate this political technique. Many of them were hunted men in their early lives. For the Czar used precisely the same technique against them. By western standards it is a lawless and vicious political practice. It makes fear the overriding influence in public affairs.

We in this country cannot know what it means to live in an environment of terror and fear. Jan Masaryk knew. Every mother in a police state who needs ration coupons for milk and meat for her children knows. Everyone in a police state who is dependent on a government bureau or agency for favors knows. And the greater the power of government the greater is that dependency. Once fear begins to operate in a thousand and one different ways the hold of the Communists on the democratic state becomes more and more complete. The talk of free elections becomes a mockery. People cease to express their opinions for fear of reprisals. The ranks of the Communists are swollen by new adherents. They win overwhelming support in the elections. The bourgeois revolution is complete. By outward appearance it has conformed to all democratic traditions. The people have spoken. And by the very best of democratic traditions the people can have any form of government they choose.

Thus the stage is set for the second phase—the proletariat revolution. It can proceed quietly and peacefully. It can follow all constitutional forms deemed wise or expedient. Like the bourgeois revolution it can be achieved without dropping a bomb or moving an army.

It is, of course, the right of the Russian people to have such form of government as they may choose. We, the democrats, will be the first to defend that right. When confined within their borders, their totalitarian regime is their concern, not ours. For all peoples should be free at all times to work out their own destiny. But it is that very principle, so basic to our democracy, which makes it alarming when other nations are unwilling victims of the Communist virus. Stalin announced in the October revolution that the Russian revolution constituted "the beginning and premise of the world revolution." Our very real concern is the manner in which the Communists are making that prophecy come true—the manner in which they undermine flourishing democracies, the manner in which they win victories by default.

Many who have studied this political phenomenon of communism conclude that war between Russia and the western democracies is inevitable. As Holmes once said, "It is not enough for the knight of romance that you agree that his lady is a very nice girl—if you do not admit that she is the best that God ever made or will make you must fight." The Communists are not romantic knights. But their leaders and organizers are crusaders with a fervor that is all-consuming. They get their religion from dialectical materialism. Some say that dialectical materialism is dialectical nonsense. But it is nontheless a faith to which men have committeed their lives. It is the theology of communism.

These facts make the prospects for peace appear gloomy. But the choice is not between war and appeasement for neither will solve the problem which confronts us. For it is a basic fact which must not be overlooked that communism to date is a political program backed by force. An army can be defeated and routed by guns and ammunition. But a political program is not destroyed by military might unless the victor, like the Communists, is willing to install a police state.

If we visualize the United States the victor in a war with Russia and roll the film ahead 10 years, what would we see? We would see a world in ruins—poverty and great illness on every hand—suffering and dislocations of life unequalled in history. That is the environment in which ideas as virulent as fascism and communism flourish.

These facts eloquently proclaim that the answer to the political program of the Communists is a dynamic and vital political program on the democratic front.

The remedy on the domestic front is a relatively easy one if we have the will and faith to adopt it.

At home we must put an end to the shameful practice of branding everyone a Communist who espouses a liberal reform or promotes a program for the underprivileged. We must put an end to attacks on those who read leftist literature. We should no more ban the Communist literature than we should bar medical students from studying cancer.

If unreliable people hold important posts from which Communist activities might be promoted, they should be removed. We need not ape the Communists to combat them. Political victory over them can easily be had within the lawful procedure of our democracy. All it needs is our earnest and wholehearted efforts.

The Communists through the use of their principle of democratic centralism have confined the differences in their ranks to the arguments within each of their cells. Once the decision of the few men in their top cell is made, it becomes the party line. It thereupon commands full allegiance from all members. This is one secret of their effective use of a minority position.

They are, moreover, active political agents at all times. They will spend their evenings ringing doorbells, writing literature, spreading their faith of dialectical materialism while the rest of us are at the movies or relaxing in social activities. By sheer persistence and waiting they will get command of meetings espousing human causes and move their agents into important posts in democratic organizations. Progressive labor leaders have shown how these political tactics can be combated. There are not over 100,000 Communists in this country. They would be fairly impotent, though 100 times that number, if we, the democrats, took our politics seriously and threw our full energies into political organization and activity.

The political antidote to communism is effective democratic government. For effective democratic government can remove even the pretense for saying that there are insoluble differences between the classes or

groups within a nation. This can be achieved not by giving the underprivileged alms or opiates but by practical measures which recognize the human rights of all citizens and raise the standard of living at all levels of society. The words of Lincoln spoken in 1838 before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield are advice we should not forget: "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

The problem on the foreign front is equally important but much more difficult. The United States has emerged from its chrysalis of isolationism into a position of tremendous political responsibility in world affairs. Its task is to take the leadership in keeping alive the great human values in western civilization.

De Tocqueville, writing over a hundred years ago, stated: "The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and give free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm: the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Since that time the Czars have perished and another political clique controls Russia. But the distinction between the two nations that De Tocqueville marked persists to this date. The rivalry between them has greatly increased since communism has become an active imperialistic force in the world.

The basic rivalry between the two nations today is political. We must be equipped and prepared to meet the political program of the Communists at whatever point in the world they may select for action. Better still, we must ourselves regain the initiative by promoting in our own areas of influence tried-and-true political antidotes to communism.

Our greatest error would be to fashion our foreign policy merely in terms of anticommunism. We will fail miserably if we do no more than that. For then we will end by railing and ranting at the specter of communism but do nothing to eliminate the conditions on which communism thrives. If we follow that course, war will soon appear as the only alternative. And this time war could well be an Armageddon.

Our foreign policy—in its execution as well as in its formulation—must be designed to espouse and promote liberal, humanitarian programs for the masses of people of the world. It must strengthen the democratic forces in other nations and not entrench reactionary interests that thirst for power.

Most of the areas of the world are bleak and desolate when judged by the living conditions of the people. At times the people live under a serfdom of poverty and disease. At other times it is an industrial or political serfdom. The Communists are artists in exploiting these conditions. They can promise pie in the sky—in fact the whole world—to those who will enlist in their political army. Revolution may indeed seem a welcome relief to those who have been exploited. It may to desperate men have the appeal of a swift and cleansing purgative that sweeps before it all the rot and filth of the old tyranny that has oppressed them.

Those impulses cannot be controlled by talk and promise of vague and remote democratic ideals. The Voice of America, if it is to be powerful among the masses of people, must do more than talk of the glories of democracy. If we want the hundreds of millions of the peoples of the world in the democratic ranks, we must show them the way with practical programs of social reconstruction.

We cannot force such programs on other nations. But we must stand ready to suggest such programs and to help work them out. We must stand ready to support with sanctions the liberals of any country who have programs of social reconstruction for their people. There are in many countries men who may not be in the government but who have the inner strength and vitality to formulate programs for their own people. James Yen has such a program for China—a program of mass education and rural reconstruction. It is indigenous to China and thus true to the character of the Chinese. With our backing and support it can do more than save China from communism. It can set in motion a force that will sweep Asia and aline it with the democratic forces of the world. What can be done in China can be done in other outposts.

It is increasingly evident that however necessary military aid may be, the real victory over communism will be won in the rice fields rather than on the battlefields. The fight against communism depends for its ultimate success on the people of the various nations, not on their governments. Thus we must support those who represent democratic values in the various countries and who have practical programs for political action. When we prop up governments that are self-seeking, corrupt, or Fascist, we lose ground in the world-wide struggle against communism. When we stand behind the liberal and progressive forces in other countries, we become in the eyes of the peoples of the world, identified with their interests. Then the democratic cause gains strength and character. Then the flood tide of communism will begin to recede.

This course takes great steadfastness. It also requires the backing of a strong, alert, and mobile military machine. For weakings never yet won a campaign—political or otherwise—against dictators. This course will bring down on our heads the rantings of the Communist bureaus of the world. We will be charged with being imperialists and intervenors. The more effective our political achievements along the democratic front the louder will be the clamor. But the values of western civilization are at stake. We cannot afford to be dilettantes. If we are, we will pay perhaps even a greater price than we paid for giving too little and too late to those who stood between us and the Nazis.

Inexorable forces are sweeping the world. We are part of those forces, since we were among the first to kindle the spark of freedom. Tompkins has said that "the secular and humanistic seeds of the Renaissance could not germinate on Russian soil." But those seeds were transported here; and they flourished. They can, if we will it, be carried to the most desolate places of the world and make freedom flourish where only tyranny and suffering have been known. This was done in Palestine. It can be done elsewhere.

De Tocqueville wrote a hundred years or so ago, "The nations of our time cannot prevent the conditions of men from becoming equal; but it depends upon themselves whether the principle of equality is to lead them to servitude or freedom, to knowledge or barbarism, to prosperity or wretchedness." Experience with the instruments of democratic government since that date shows the bright promise, the great potential it holds. It shows that government can be just and yet civilized, fair to all classes, exploiters of none.

The survival and extension of the democratic traditions are the great challenge of the century. They present to this generation a unique opportunity for honor and service in politics and government.

Coordinated Cancer Research Program of the University of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, every adult citizen of America recognizes cancer as one of the most devastating diseases known to man. Recently the Senator from Illinois had a most illuminating and educational conversation with Maurice Goldblatt, president of the University of Chicago Cancer Research Foundation. Following that conversation I have received a letter from Mr. Goldblatt which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Following that I also ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD a copy of a brochure of the coordinated cancer research program of the University of Chicago, which tells in a very few words what is being done under the research program. Among other things, the brochure tells the country that cancer at this moment is killing 197,000 Americans each year, 20 each hour and 1 every 3 minutes. It is an interesting piece of literature, and I believe extremely educational.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that it will cost $213 to print the matter I have submitted.

There being no objection, the letter and a copy of the brochure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 29, 1948.*

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: I would like to express my appreciation to you for the time you have given me and tell you how pleased I was to learn of your sincere interest in the various health programs.

If you will bear with me, I would like to take a few minutes of your time to go into greater detail about Government appropriations for cancer research.

As you know, my interest in cancer began with the death of my brother Nathan, a victim of this dreaded disease. Shortly after his death, I made a thorough survey to determine what was being done in cancer research, and, to my amazement, found that very little was being done because of the lack of necessary funds and because very little encouragement was given to universities to do research in cancer.

As a result of this survey, the Goldblatt Bros. Foundation made its donation to the University of Chicago, who, in my opinion, had the most notable staff of scientists and doctors qualified to do this work. It was then that the University of Chicago Cancer Research Foundation was formed, and then that the needed funds were raised for the necessary facilities for this research work. With support from the American Cancer Society and the Public Health Institute, their research work is assured. Had other universities been encouraged, they, too, would have had their own fund-raising programs. I feel that more encouragement should have been given to universities to do more cancer

research, with the assurance of financial support from the Government and private organizations. Now they have this encouragement from the Government.

Through various private fund-raising campaigns, through the American Cancer Society, and through the interest of the Government, the public, in the past few years, has become acquainted with the disaster of this dreaded disease. In my opinion, it is because of the interest of the Government and its appropriations for cancer research that the public has become so educated. It is very important that these appropriations continue, and continue until a cure is found.

The appointment of Dr. Scheele as the new Surgeon General will enrich this research and is a wonderful step toward the solution of our country's medical problems.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE GOLDBLATT.

THE COORDINATED CANCER RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION,
Chicago, Ill.

This brochure tells the story of cancer research at the University of Chicago. The board of trustees, officers, and staff of the university and of the University of Chicago Cancer Research Foundation are united in support of this vital program.

Cancer kills 175,000 Americans each year, 20 each hour, 1 every 3 minutes. It is claiming more victims each year because the life-expectancy of man has been increased by medical science. Thus more persons are living into the age range in which the disease takes greatest toll. Although cancer is most common between the ages of 40 and 60, no age group is exempt. Not even newborn infants escape.

It is indeed a grim paradox to have conquered so many of the diseases of early life, bringing more people to the enjoyments of maturity, only to increase the risk of death from one of the most painful of maladies.

Much has been learned about the nature of cancer, and advances have been made in methods of treatment, but too little is known about its cause. Until we understand its fundamental biological character, cancer will remain the great challenge to medical science.

The University of Chicago has resolved to do all that it can to meet this challenge. It is consolidating its cancer research efforts in order to produce maximum results.

From the achievements of modern science we may safely assume that ultimately this dread disease will be conquered.

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL.

THE DISEASE

Cancer is a problem of growth. Certain cells in the body which have previously functioned normally begin to multiply rapidly in an abnormal way. They first invade and then destroy the surrounding tissue; and, finally, they overwhelm the human body by widespread invasion of one or more of the vital organs.

The study of cancer is, therefore, a study of the fundamental attributes of living matter. It involves the entire problem of the reasons for, and the methods of, both normal and abnormal growth. It requires the cooperation of nearly every branch of physical and biological science, from mathematics to surgery.

The ultimate solution to the cancer problem may be found in one of the fundamental sciences which might seem at first glance to be rather remote from this area of research. For this reason the attack on cancer should be pressed in many different fields.

THE PRESENT RESOURCES

For many years a substantial part of the biomedical facilities of the University of Chicago has been devoted to the investigation and treatment of cancer.

The cancer problem does not, as many laymen suppose, come exclusively within the sphere of the medical departments of a university. Every scientific department concerned with living cells or their physics or chemistry can contribute its special knowledge.

The university is strongly staffed in the physical and biological sciences. The clinical departments of medicine, surgery, pediatrics, roentgenology, obstetrics and gynecology, the nonclinical departments of zoology, botany, chemistry, bacteriology, and parasitology, pathology, anatomy, physiology, pharmacology, and biochemistry, and the institutes of radiobiology and biophysics, and of nuclear studies, all participate in the study of cancer. The Committee on Cancer, composed of 22 representatives in these departments of the University of Chicago, coordinates the cancer research program.

COORDINATION OF RESOURCES

The committee on cancer

The nonclinical departments: Zoology, botany, anatomy, physiology, pharmacology, biochemistry, bacteriology and parasitology, pathology.

The institutes: Institute of radiobiology and biophysics, institute of nuclear studies.

Physical sciences: Physics, chemistry.

Clinical departments: Obstetrics and gynecology, pediatrics, surgery, division of roentgenology and radiology, medicine.

Dr. Charles B. Huggins, chairman, professor of surgery.

Dr. Leon O. Jacobsen, executive secretary, assistant professor of medicine, associate dean, division of the biological sciences.

Albert L. Lehninger, secretary, assistant professor of biochemistry.

Dr. Arthur C. Bachmeyer, director of university clinics, associate dean, division of the biological sciences.

Dr. E. S. Guzmán Barrón, associate professor of biochemistry.

Dr. Austin M. Brues, associate professor of medicine.

Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall, professor and chairman of the department of medicine.

Dr. M. Edward Davis, professor of obstetrics and gynecology.

Dr. Lester R. Dragstedt, professor of surgery.

Earl A. Evans, Jr., professor and chairman of the department of biochemistry.

James Franck,[1] professor of physical chemistry.

Dr. Eugene M. K. Geiling, Frank P. Hixon distinguished service professor and chairman of the department of pharmacology.

Dr. Anna Hamann, assistant professor of roentgenology.

R. Wendell Harrison, professor of bacteriology and dean of the division of the biological sciences.

Dr. Paul C. Hodges, professor of roentgenology.

John O. Hutchens, associate professor and chairman of the department of physiology and director of the toxicity laboratory.

Morris S. Kharasch, Carl William Eisendrath professor of chemistry.

Carl R. Moore, professor and chairman of the department of zoology.

Dr. Paul E. Steiner, associate professor of pathology.

Harold C. Urey,[1] distinguished service professor of chemistry.

Raymond E. Zirkle, professor of botany and director of the institute of radiobiology and biophysics.

Cancer research at the University of Chicago has a twofold aim:

1. To improve present diagnostic and remedial methods by continued research in the fields of surgery, radiation, medicines.

[1] Nobel prize winner.

2. To search further for the cause by intensive research in all fields of knowledge concerned with living cells. Among the subjects under investigation are plant tumors, cell respiration, carcinogens, gastric juices, heredity, enzymes, sex hormones.

I. TREATMENT

The three recognized methods of treatment of cancer in use today are surgery, radiation, and medicine.

Surgery: Surgery is still the most effective treatment for most forms of cancer, and in many instances it is the sole hope of cure. Operative techniques have been developed for the successful removal of new growths in practically all organs and tissues of the body. Rarely is a tumor now considered inoperable because of location alone.

The success of surgical treatment is largely dependent upon early diagnosis of the disease, before the cancerous growth has spread throughout the body. The refinement of X-ray procedures and the development of instruments to inspect the interior of the body have greatly facilitated such diagnoses.

Radiation: The use of X-ray and radium to kill cancerous cells has been a second major method of treatment. Cancer of the lips, mouth, larynx, and uterus are often treated by radiation alone. In combination with surgery, radiation has provided an effective control of many malignant tumors.

Medicine: At the present time only a few medicines are helpful in cancer control. Estrogens (female sex hormones) have been used successfully in the treatment of cancer of the prostate. At the University Clinics their use, in combination with surgery, has resulted in complete relief for long periods of time or marked, though not permanent, improvement in nearly all cases of prostatic cancer.

Radioactive phosphorus and nitrogen mustard (a war gas) have already proved of real, though temporary, value in treating leukemia (a cancer-like condition of the blood-forming organs). Recent reports of the use of radioactive iodine in the treatment of cancer of the thyroid gland are very encouraging.

Research in surgery

The technique of surgery in cancer control has been greatly advanced during the past 10 years. At the University of Chicago, significant contributions have been made by Drs. Phemister, Brunschwig, Huggins, Dragstedt, Adams, and Allen. The surgical removal of the lower esophagus without impeding normal food passage is an example of a type of surgical treatment of cancer now in general use. By means of extensive bone grafting as an alternative to amputation, the possibility of excising bone tumors and retaining use of the affected limb has been shown. New operations have been devised at the University for the removal of a cancerous pancreas, an organ until recently thought inoperable because of the danger of acute pancreatitis.

The treatment of abdominal cancers has required the development of new operations to fit individual conditions. Recently, the surgical treatment of one hundred cases previously regarded as "inoperable" resulted in some measure of relief for 50 percent of the patients, 12 of whom remain free from evidence of active cancer, 4 years after the operations.

The work done in this department on the cause and treatment of surgical shock has contributed much to making modern radical operations feasible. Some of the early work was done at the University of Chicago on the intravenous administration of amino acids to provide nourishment for patients who are unable to take food by mouth.

Further improvement of surgical technique is desired, in order to increase both the percentage of complete cures and the number of cases that are successfully operable.

Research in radiation

The controlled release of atomic energy is, perhaps, the most spectacular event in the history of nuclear physics. It may prove to be equally significant in the control of cancer. The effect on cancerous growth of the powerful rays associated with atomic fission is not yet known. The Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics has been established at the University of Chicago under the direction of Dr. Raymond E. Zirkle to study the manifold problems which have resulted from these new radiations. Available to the Institute will be a new 140-inch cyclotron, capable of producing deep-penetrating high-energy particles from atomic nuclei. The Institute will cooperate with the Cancer Research Hospital to determine the clinical value of these rays in the treatment of cancer patients. A beam of protons produced by this cyclotron should be superior to currently available types of radiation. This beam has a definite range in matter and is exact in shape and size, and therefore can be concentrated upon the cancerous growth. Thus, damage to surrounding tissue, a limiting factor in the effectiveness of present X-ray and radium therapy, should be reduced to a minimum.

Although the use of radium and X-rays is universal in cancer hospitals, there is no exact knowledge of the physiological effects of radiation or of the mechanism by which these effects take place. Nor is the exact combination of radium and X-rays that is most effective in cancer control yet known. These studies are among the long-range projects of the Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics in cooperation with the Department of Roentgenology under Dr. Paul C. Hodges.

Research in medicine

Research in the use of chemical compounds in the treatment of cancer will take two directions: First, the search for compounds that will attack and kill cancer cells; second, the search for compounds that will combat cancer-stimulating agents within the body. Estrogens (female sex hormone) used in cases of prostatic cancer are examples of the latter type of compound. The brilliant researches of Dr. Charles B. Huggins, of the University of Chicago, on the relationship of sex hormones to the growth of benign and cancerous tumors of the prostate gland, constitute a milepost in the treatment of cancer. Dr. Huggins was able to establish and make practical application of the fact that both the elimination of the male sex hormones and the administration of female sex hormones suppress the growth of prostatic cancers even after they have spread to other parts of the body. It is probable that other compounds equally effective in the treatment of other types of cancer will be found.

The hope for the discovery of a compound that will attack and kill cancerous tissue depends upon the process of selective localization. Certain chemical compounds, when introduced into the human body, immediately localize in one organ. If a compound which was attracted only by a cancerous tissue could be found, highly effective treatment of a spreading cancer could be accomplished. Into such a compound it should be possible to introduce radioactive atoms, thereby concentrating radioactivity exclusively on the cancer cells, killing them without damaging normal tissue.

The Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics will cooperate with the clinical and basic science departments in attacking this problem by the use of radioactive isotopes—forms of an element which have precisely the same chemical properties as the more common atoms but which differ in weight and radioactivity. The existence of these isotopes—now available in larger quantities as byproducts of atomic fission—makes it possible to "label" a particular sample of a substance by including an isotope within it. This substance may then be followed through the body and the isotope identified at any point.

II. RESEARCH IN THE CAUSES OF CANCER

All normal cells which are part of a larger organism will continue to divide and multiply only so long as there is reason for growth. Thus scar tissue will form until a broken surface on the body has been closed. Then the growth will stop. A piece of skin grafted on the arm will grow until the graft has become a part of the surrounding skin—and then will grow no more.

But in cancer cells, the unknown brake which stops the growth of tissue is absent. Unless they are removed by surgery or killed by radiation or a chemical agent, these cells will continue to grow as long as the patient lives.

The cause of this difference between normal and cancerous cells must be discovered. This is a fundamental biological problem that is now being approached from several directions.

Cell respiration

The problem of cell respiration, the process by which cells consume oxygen, is being studied by the research scientists in the departments of chemistry and biochemistry. An intimate relationship exists between the capacity of a cell to burn fuel and its capacity for multiplication. But the full details of the mechanism of cell respiration are not yet known.

One of the problems, successfully solved, has been the development of techniques for the measurement of rates of reactions. The present experiments have been directed toward an understanding of normal cell growth. Any observed contrasts between respiration in a normal cell and in a cancerous cell may furnish the clues we are seeking.

Plant tumors

Over 150 chemical compounds have been found which, when injected into certain plants or applied to their surfaces, will cause abnormal cell growth. These studies may yield information vital to our understanding of human cancer. The chemical processes involved in plant and animal cancers are similar in many respects.

As an example, it has been discovered that excessive application of tryptophane—a constituent of all normal cells, both plant and animal—causes abnormal growths in plants. It is interesting to speculate whether a natural increase in the tryptophane concentration in human cells has any relation to cancer. This is a problem for further medical research.

Carcinogens

Carcinogens are agents—both virus and chemical—capable of producing cancerous growth in animals. Members of the department of bacteriology and parasitology are examining the nature of such viruses extracted from animal cancers. They have observed that these viruses have much in common with other infectious agents.

In addition to viruses, scientists have identified a large number of complex chemical substances which will cause cancer. Possibly, under abnormal conditions, the body may change one of its harmless ingredients into one of these powerful carcinogens. The similarity in structure between some compounds found in the body and certain cancer-causing agents can be seen in the above diagram. Further extensive research must be done to determine the exact role of carcinogens in the cause of human cancer.

Gastric juices

Cancer of the stomach is the most common cancer of the internal organs. For a number of years, members of the department of surgery have been engaged in the study of the chemistry of gastric cancers and of the distinctive alterations in the physiology of cancerous stomachs. Gastric juices from patients suffering from cancer of the stomach have much in common with the gastric juices from patients with pernicious anemia. Normal stomachs secrete a highly acid gastric juice. The secretions of cancerous stomachs frequently contain no free acid. It is also true that almost by definition pernicious anemia patients secrete no free acid. It is possible that there is a definite relationship between pernicious anemia, nonacid gastric juices, and cancer. This possibility is being explored.

Sex hormones

Much of the fundamental work on the chemistry and the physiological activity of sex hormones has been done at the University of Chicago in its departments of biochemistry and zoology under Drs. Fred C. Koch and Carl R. Moore.

The treatment of certain forms of cancer by the use of sex hormones or the removal of the testes, has recently stimulated interest in the whole relationship between hormones and cancer. It is known that the incidence of cancer of the ovaries is much greater after the cessation of menstruation. Since the menopause is closely associated with alterations in internal glandular secretion, this would seem to be further indication of the close relationship between the secretion of hormones and cancerous growth. Members of the department of obstetrics and gynecology are studying the hormone content of ovarian tumors in an attempt to learn more about this relationship.

It is extremely significant that the use of estrogent (a female sex hormone) will, in certain instances, cause the reduction of the growth of the primary cancer of the prostate and even the disappearance of cancer which has already spread to the bones. The reasons for this effect and its application to other forms of cancer will continue to be investigated.

A byproduct of this research with hormones has been the discovery of a chemical test for prostatic cancer. Further research may result in the discovery of an accurate test for all types of cancer—a discovery which would be invaluable in the diagnosis and early treatment of the disease.

Enzymes

Enzymes, constituents of all living cells, are responsible for the occurrence and control of virtually all chemical reactions which take place in protoplasm. Among these reactions are those concerned with the abnormal multiplication of cancer cells. As evidence of this, it has been established that the enzyme content of normal cells is not identical with that of cancerous cells. Members of the department of biochemistry are searching for those enzymes which determine whether a cell will behave like a normal cooperative member of a multicellular community, or will develop at the expense of its fellows. If, by the use of chemicals, we can interfere with the growth of cancer cells, the cancer problem might be brought under control.

Heredity

Extensive research has indicated that cancer is not fundamentally a hereditary affliction. However, experimental inbreeding of mice has produced several strains in which the incidence of cancer of certain organs can be predicted almost with certainty. This would indicate that a tendency to be susceptible to cancerous growth may well be inherited.

A long-term study of the genetics of human cancer has been planned. It will involve a comparison of the incidence of cancer among members of identical and nonidentical twin sets and the occurrence of cancer among members of families through successive generations.

THE BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH

The three essentials of an effective research program are: Skilled personnel, sufficient research funds, and adequate physical facilities.

Only when all three are provided can the best results be achieved.

Personnel: The university has the necessary personnel. It has exceptionally strong facilities in the physical and biological sciences. Its men are mature research scientists who have already added much to our store of knowledge about cancer. Furthermore, the University of Chicago Medical Center has a distinguished medical staff, each member of which devotes full time to research, instruction, and treatment of patients in the university hospitals and clinics.

Research funds: Although the university always has need of additional fluid research funds, it appears probable that grants from charitable foundations, governmental agencies, and organizations such as the American Cancer Society can adequately meet present needs.

Facilities: The major unfulfilled requirement at the present time is additional buildings and equipment. Therefore, the university has launched a program to build new facilities for basic research in medical, biological, and physical sciences costing approximately $15,000,000.

The coordinated cancer-research program of the University of Chicago insures that all these new facilities will be fully exploited for cancer research. Those listed below are the most directly related to the problem of cancer and are therefore of immediate concern to the Cancer Research Foundation.

Cancer research hospital	$1,600,000
Isotope laboratory	2,000,000
140-inch cyclotron	1,550,000
Total cost	5,150,000

The Cancer Research Hospital (Nathan Goldblatt Memorial Hospital) will be built on the campus of the university adjacent to the surgery wards of the medical center and will be devoted exclusively to the study and treatment of cancer.

The building will have seven floors and a basement. On the first floor will be offices and conference rooms for the committee on cancer. The second floor will contain an out-patient clinic. The third and fourth floors will each have a capacity of 26 hospital beds for the care of cancer patients. The number of beds in the hospital has been limited in order that the medical and scientific staff may concentrate on the research aspects of cancer.

The fifth floor will house the radiology clinic, which will be equipped with the most advanced apparatus for X-ray and radium therapy. The sixth floor will contain a major operating room. The remainder of this floor and the entire seventh floor will house modern research laboratories.

The Isotope Laboratory Building will provide facilities for processing and storing radioactive isotopes and for their use in experimental work and in the treatment of patients.

There will be complete facilities in this laboratory for treating patients with radiophosphorus, radioiodine, and many hitherto untried radioactive isotopes. There will also be facilities for observing the behavior of radioactive isotopes in animals.

The health hazard inherent in working with these substances means that the lower three stories will have to be specially constructed to protect workers and equipment from radioactive isotopes and other dangerous radioactivity. An extremely efficient ventilation system will be required.

The 140-inch cyclotron will be one of the largest in the United States. With a 2,500-ton magnet, it will produce a 375-million-electron-volt beam of protons. Its major use will be in the study of the forces that hold the nuclei of atoms together. But this great instrument will also be available for fundamental experiments in biology and for clinical work with emphasis on cancer research and treatment. It is expected that the cyclotron will produe a beam of high-energy particles superior to presently available types of irradiation for deep therapy. For example, it is theoretically possible that, with this beam, a tumor located deep in the lung could be treated with little damage to the skin and other normal tissue. This might solve the problem of skin burns from deep therapy, which has always been a limiting factor in standard X-ray treatment.

PROGRESS TO DATE

The generous gift of the Goldblatt Brothers Foundation has enabled the University to build the Cancer Research Hospital, which will be named the Nathan Goldblatt Memorial Hospital. The financing of this hospital is in process of completion, and construction will begin in the spring of 1948.

From an anonymous source the university has received a pledge of $980,000 toward the construction of the 140-inch cyclotron, leaving a balance of $570,000 to be raised.

THE GOAL OF THE FOUNDATION

The goal of the foundation is to provide the balance of the funds needed to complete the Cancer Research Center of the University of Chicago.

For the isotope laboratory	$2,000,000
Balance for the cyclotron	570,000
The total goal	2,570,000

As its immediate objective, the foundation will raise the $570,000 needed to complete the 140-inch cyclotron. Because of the great potentialities of this instrument in cancer research, and because the major part of the cost has been provided, the foundation appeals to the people of Chicago and the Nation with confidence that they will provide this powerful instrument for the use of the university's scientists.

MEMORIAL OPPORTUNITIES

Many attractive opportunities for memorial gifts are available to persons desiring to make a contribution to this vitally important cancer research program at the University of Chicago. These opportunities cover a wide range, both as to type and to cost. The University of Chicago Cancer Research Foundation will be pleased to furnish complete details upon request.

This brochure has been prepared by the University of Chicago Cancer Research Foundation, a not-for-profit corporation whose purpose is to secure funds exclusively for the support of research at the University of Chicago in the cause, diagnosis, and cure of cancer.

The University of Chicago Cancer Research Foundation invites your support of this vitally important research program in order that maximum results may be achieved.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO CANCER RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Board of trustees: Graham Aldis, Leigh Block, Edward E. Brown, Britton Budd, Col. Henry Crown, Robert M. Cunningham, George H. Dovenmuehle, Thomas B. Freeman, Charles F. Glore, Maurice Goldblatt, Mrs. Nathan Goldblatt, John R. Hurley, John S. Knight, Walter A. Krafft, Oscar G. Mayer, John L. McCaffrey, Max McGraw, Frank McNair, Nicholas J. Pritzker, Lawrence F. Stern, Herman Waldeck, Edward F. Wilson, Mrs. Walter B. Wolf.

Officers: Maurice Goldblatt, president; Graham Aldis, vice president; Frank McNair, treasurer; J. Parker Hall, assistant treasurer; Neil H. Jacoby, secretary; John W. Huck, assistant secretary. Dr. Charles L. Dunham, medical consultant; W. Brewer Grant, executive secretary.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, several days ago an editorial from the Washington Post in regard to my bill to abolish the poll tax as a restriction on the right to vote in Federal elections was introduced in the RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a letter of mine published in the Washington Post of April 2, in reply to that editorial:

I am a little surprised at your sweeping editorial pronouncements of March 29 in regard to the alleged unconstitutionality of my bill to abolish the poll tax as a restriction on the right to vote in Federal elections. I believe that where the Washington Post expresses a minority view in such a matter you owe it in fairness to your readers to indicate that it is a minority view.

I am glad that you recognize that the abolition of the poll tax as a restriction on the right to vote is "an overdue reform." It is unfortunate, therefore, that you editorially champion the position of those who, as I said in my testimony on the bill before the Senate Rules Committee last week, have never faced a free election in their political lives and hate this measure the way the devil hates holy water. It is doubly unfortunate that you should champion their position by advancing constitutional arguments which have been answered a dozen times and then fail even to suggest that the persuasiveness of those arguments has been questioned.

The truth of the matter is that all possible constitutional objections to this bill which could be devised by the gentlemen from the poll-tax States, including those advanced by your editorial writer, have been thoroughly discussed four times on the floor of the House and the House has four times passed the bill with overwhelming majorities. These arguments have three times been considered in detail by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the committee three times reported that the legislation is constitutional and should be enacted.

As long ago as 1942, in its first report on this legislation, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary demolished the contentions which are now advanced against the bill. Permit me to quote from that masterful report, submitted by the late Senator George W. Norris, on the specific point as to the qualifications of voters which you raise:

"Those who believe the proposed law is unconstitutional rely upon section 2, article I, of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

" 'The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.'

"The qualification of a voter is generally believed to have something to do with the capacity of a voter. We think, it will be admitted by all that no State, or State Legislature would have the constitutional authority to disqualify a voter otherwise qualified to vote, by setting up a pretended 'qualification' that in fact has nothing whatever to do with the real qualification of the voter. No one can claim that the provision of the Federal Constitution above quoted would give a legislature the right to say that no one should be

entitled to vote unless, for instance, he had red hair, or had attained the age of 100 years, or any other artificial pretended qualification which, in fact had nothing to do with the capacity or real qualification of the voter.

"We believe there is no doubt but that the prerequisite of the payment of a poll tax in order to entitle a citizen to vote has nothing whatever to do with the qualifications of the voter, and that this method of disfranchising citizens is merely an artificial attempt to use the language of the Constitution, giving the State power to set up qualifications, by using other artificial means and methods which in fact have no relation whatever to qualifications."

The Norris report then considers the other constitutional objections which have been raised against this bill. I commend the 8½ pages of this report to the attention of your editorial writer as one of the most able statements ever made on the constitutionality of this legislation.

My bill to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections is clearly constitutional and should be promptly considered and enacted by the Senate to restore the right to vote in Federal elections to millions of American citizens—Negro and white alike—who are now denied that right in seven poll-tax States.

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Representative from Ohio.

WASHINGTON.

March Score Sheet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

MARCH SCORE SHEET

Diplomatically speaking, while March may not have come in exactly like a lamb, it certainly has gone out like a lamb. International tensions are at their highest point since the end of World War II. The total score is not tallied yet for the March moves and countermoves, but here are the major moves and countermoves by the western democracies, acting for the first time with concerted diplomacy:

Congress worked out the appropriation for the European recovery program (Marshall plan).

Sixteen nations met in Paris to set up administration of the ERP and to plan expanded customs unions and free-trade zones. Western Germany delegates acted as observers.

Five western European democracies—Britain, France, Belgium The Netherlands, and Luxemburg—joined a 50-year, unbreakable treaty of mutual defense and economic cooperation, leaving the door open to other democracies.

The United States Army, it was decided, would remain in control in the United States zones in Germany. General Clay brought on a showdown with Russia on cooperation in unifying the German economy and administration.

The United Nations held to its intention of country-wide elections in Korea on May 9, despite Russia's refusal to let UN commissioners even enter the Russian half of Korea. The UN also began hearing charges of aggression against Russia in connection with the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia.

Thousands of Italian-Americans sent letters and telegrams to relative and friends in Italy urging them to vote against Communist candidates in the April 18 election. The United States, Britain, and France boldly proposed to the UN that Trieste be turned over to Italy. Secretary of State Marshall told Italy bluntly that she need expect no ERP aid if she goes communistic.

In a startling about-face to prevent the civil war in Palestine getting entirely out of hand, the United States proposed postponement and reconsideration of the General Assembly's decision to partition Palestine. President Truman appealed to Arabs and Jews to agree to a truce and to negotiations for a settlement satisfactory to both sides.

Underscoring the necessity for inter-American agreement, in the midst of extraordinarily grave and pressing problems, Secretary Marshall flew to Bogota to participate in the conference of American republics.

Vigorous diplomatic action against the menace of communism may show some results soon.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the overwhelming action of the House on Friday in accepting the conference report on the European recovery program, I would like to make a few remarks concerning this report.

First of all, I want to commend the House conferees in coming to a rapid agreement with the Members of the Senate on this vital measure. I want to commend especially their statesmanship in connection with the Spanish issue. On both occasions when the House was considering the proposal to recognize Spain as one of the participating countries, I opposed the consideration. I firmly believe that in this cooperative effort the 16 nations should themselves be allowed to decide upon the membership of their group. It seems to me that for us to attempt to defeat communism by supporting fascism would in the end only mean the defeat of democracy.

The success of this venture depends on the continuing harmony of the participants. Indeed, we can all fervently hope that out of this cooperative venture may come a more closely unified Europe with a resulting reduction in the many trade barriers which have plagued that Continent for centuries. Such a salutory result would be impossible if the United States Congress were to attempt to dictate the membership in the European recovery program.

In addition, I oppose on principle those who would extend the hand of friendship to one totalitarian regime in fighting another. In this case there is little strategic gain to be made in forming a partnership with the Spanish Government, as now constituted. Indeed, we would suffer a serious moral loss. If the United States is to hold a position of moral leadership, we must oppose all totalitarian governments, whether they be Fascist or Communist.

It is for these reasons, then, that I have opposed any move to include the present Spanish Government in the European recovery program.

In eliminating those provisions of the House bill referring to that government, the conferees and the Members of the House are to be congratulated.

Poem by Horace C. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly interested in a poem written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle entitled, "Let's Make Our Pleas Upon Our Knees." I think this is particularly appropriate for this time and I wish to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks his poem:

LET'S MAKE OUR PLEAS UPON OUR KNEES

We're grateful to God for our mem'rable past,
With its mem'rable deeds of unselfish devotion,
Done by valiant men, whose influence will last,
With the years, and that thrill us with joyful emotion;
For the good deeds they wrought and the battles they fought
Have inspired us to strive to be all that we ought,
That George Washington's God may continue to be
The one Ruler Supreme in the Land of the Free.

We're grateful to God for the virtues that shone
In the life of the First President of our Nation,
Who stood high 'mongst his comrades, apart and alone,
An example most worthy of our emulation—
His still voice, from the dead, bids us be not afraid,
But to prayerfully face the tasks that lie ahead,
That George Washington's God may continue to be
The one Ruler Supreme in the Land of the Free.

We're grateful to God for the true faith that must
Have inhered in the hearts of the Nation's immortals,
Whose great motto we still cherish, "In God We Trust",
Which they proved till they passed thru eternity's portals;
And we'll fervently pray—until our dying day—
As we hopefully walk in the straight narrow way,
That George Washington's God may continue to be
The one Ruler Supreme in the Land of the Free.

Horace C. Carlisle.

Constitution of the AMVETS Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following national constitution and bylaws of the AMVETS Auxiliary:

NATIONAL CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS OF AMVETS AUXILIARY (AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II)

(As revised and adopted at the second annual national convention, AMVETS Auxiliary, October 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1947, Columbus, Ohio)

PREAMBLE

We, the mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters of AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), fully realizing our responsibility to the community, State, and Nation, associate ourselves for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to safeguard the principles of freedom, liberty, and justice for all; to promote the cause of perpetual peace and good will among nations; to maintain inviolate the freedom of our country; to preserve the fundamentals of democracy and Americanism; to perpetuate the friendship and associations of the Great War of Liberation, and to dedicate ourselves to the cause of mutual assistance—this by the grace of God.

ARTICLE I—NAME

The name of this organization shall be AMVETS Auxiliary (American Veterans of World War II).

ARTICLE II—OBJECTIVES

The aims and purposes of this organization are as follows:

1. To serve our country in peace as in war; to build and maintain the welfare of the United States of America toward lasting prosperity and peace for all of its inhabitants.

2. To encourage, in keeping with the policies of our Government, the establishment of a concrete plan to secure permanent international peace, and to assist in the maintenance of international peace.

3. To inspire in our membership a sense of responsibility and to develop leadership, for the preservation of our American democratic way of life.

4. To help unify divergent groups in the over-all interest of American democracy.

5. To train our youth to become purposeful citizens in a republic with full knowledge of the responsibilities as well as the privilege of citizenship.

6. To cooperate with all duly recognized existing veterans' organizations in the furtherance of the aims of World War II veterans.

7. To keep the public forever reminded that the veterans of World War II fought, served, and died to preserve peace, liberty, and democracy for their Nation.

8. To aid in the fulfillment of the aims and purposes of the AMVETS, our parent organization.

9. To promote the welfare and fellowship of our own members and their families.

10. To expedite and assist in the rehabilitation of the veteran by sponsoring and giving support to educational opportunities; to recreational advantages, to hospitalization and personal problems, and to support the veteran in all legislation for veterans' benefits.

11. To recognize in all auxiliary activities—national, State, and local—that the organization known as AMVETS and chartered by congressional action on July 23, 1947, is the parent organization, and that all organizational divisions of the auxiliary exist solely to promote the interests of the parent body of AMVETS; therefore cannot act independently except as it favors the objectives of the parent body.

ARTICLE III—ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. The AMVETS Auxiliary shall be organized with a national headquarters, and State and Territorial departments. Under the departments there shall be local auxiliaries—intermediate administrative local units—may be created by the national executive committee where such action is deemed advisable.

Regional territories of the auxiliary shall correspond to the regional boundaries set by the AMVETS. The United States is divided into the following six districts:

District I: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey.

District II: Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia.

District III: South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas.

District IV: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

District V: Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana.

District VI: Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California.

SEC. 2. The national headquarters shall be composed of officers hereinafter described; one department representative from each department and such other members as the national convention shall specify. It shall be the duty of the national officers to advance the cause of the AMVETS Auxiliary, carry out its aims and purposes, provide the machinery of organization, and carry out the national policies and plans of the entire organization as established by the national convention.

Departments

SECTION 1. Each State or Territorial area of the United States shall constitute a department, which shall be organized in a manner similar to the national organization. It shall be composed of officers and representatives selected by local auxiliary delegates to a department convention, which convention shall be held not less than 3 weeks before the annual national convention. The department shall have an executive committee and shall conduct its own convention, at which time it shall elect its officers, its delegates, and alternate to the national convention, and elect its national committee women and alternate.

(a) A minimum of three local auxiliaries shall be required to organize a department.

(b) A national regional vice president, or if for any reason she cannot be present, a deputy appointed by the national president and approved by the national executive committee shall call a meeting of all local auxiliaries within the State or Territory within 60 days from the receipt of a petition for a State organization signed by not less than three local auxiliaries petitioning for the organization of a department. At such organization meeting the national regional vice president or her deputy shall open the meeting and preside until the election of officers; she shall then install the elected officers and thereupon surrender the chair to the newly elected president and her staff of officers.

(c) Departments shall have the authority to create intermediate administrative groups such as district and county organizations, for the promotion and administering of local auxialiaries, where the department deems such action advisable.

(d) No member shall hold two elective department offices at the same time, but she may hold one elective office and one appointive chairmanship at the same time.

The term of office of chairman of departments and standing committees shall run concurrently with the term of office of the department president.

All department offices shall be held only if and while the person remains in good standing in the auxiliary of which she is a member.

The department installing officer shall be a member who has held the rank as department president, or one who has held any elective office in the national auxiliary. She shall be chosen by the retiring department president.

(e) It shall be the duty of the department to aid in organization and maintenance of local auxiliaries, and to carry out the policies and plans delegated to it by national headquarters, and to adhere to the provisions of the national constitution.

(f) Each department auxiliary shall be subordinate to the corresponding department of AMVETS.

Local auxiliaries

SECTION 1. Local auxiliaries shall be chartered by national headquarters and administered by the department headquarters, but shall be governed locally by their own officers, chosen according to the constitution and bylaws. The policies, activities, and actions of the local auxiliaries shall never be at variance with those prescribed by the national headquarters.

(a) Local auxiliaries may be formed on the application of not less than 10 persons eligible for membership. Application for a charter shall be approved by the department, and if there is no organized department, application shall be made direct to national headquarters. If the department approves, the application shall be forwarded to national headquarters and a charter will be issued within 90 days after approval by national headquarters.

The application for a charter shall be made in writing on a blank form provided for that purpose by national headquarters, and shall contain the name, number, and location of the proposed auxiliary, which shall be the same as the name, number, and location of the AMVETS post to which it is to be attached.

The charter application for a new auxiliary shall be approved by the AMVETS post commander and shall be presented to the department president, where a department exists, for her approval and then forwarded to the national headquarters for approval of the national president.

All auxiliary charters shall be signed by the national president, countersigned by the national secretary, and bear the national seal.

At the organizational meeting called for the purpose of making application for an auxiliary charter, temporary officers shall be elected who will carry on the work until the charter has been received. After the charter has been received these temporary officers shall continue to serve until the date of the annual auxiliary election, as provided for in the department constitution and bylaws, at which time permanent officers shall be elected. Temporary officers shall be eligible for election as permanent officers.

After its receipt, the charter shall remain open for a period of no longer than 6 months, at the end of which time the names to appear thereon shall be furnished to the national secretary.

(b) No auxiliary shall be formed where no AMVETS post exists.

(c) As of October 2, 1947, if auxiliaries exist where there are no AMVETS posts, they shall be established as branches of an auxiliary to an AMVETS post, and entitled to representation through that accredited auxiliary, so that there will be no more auxiliaries in the department than the number of AMVETS posts having auxiliaries.

All auxiliaries holding charters and not attached to an AMVETS post as an accredited auxiliary as of October 2, 1947, shall surrender their charters, so that each auxiliary shall be entitled to official representation at the national convention.

ARTICLE IV—MEMBERSHIP AND DUES

SECTION 1. Membership in a local AMVETS Auxiliary is limited to the mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters, not less than 18 years of age, of regular members of AMVETS, and mothers, widows, sisters, and daughters, not less than 18 years of age of deceased veterans of World War II who would have been eligible for AMVET membership.

The term "mother" shall be interpreted so as to include any female member of the family or any female guardian of such person or deceased veteran who has or is exercising the case and responsibility for the rearing of such person or deceased veteran.

SEC. 2. There shall be three forms of membership.

(a) An active, regular membership.

(b) Honorary membership granted in instances where circumstances and/or qualifications merit such distinction.

(c) A life membership.

The national, the department, and any local auxiliary may grant one honorary membership each year.

The national auxiliary shall bestow an honorary membership at the discretion of the national executive committee. In the instance of a national honorary membership, national per capita dues shall be forfeited.

In the instance of a Department granting an honorary membership, the national per capita dues shall be paid by the respective department, and department per capita dues shall be waived.

Honorary membership in a local auxiliary shall require the payment of both national and State per capita dues by the auxiliary granting the membership, and local dues are waived.

Each division shall grant its honorary memberships independently of any other division.

(d) A life membership may be granted for the sum of $50. This amount shall be prorated according to the allocation of annual dues as provided by the constitution of national, department, and local. There shall be no extra per capita tax on a life membership. The application for a life membership shall go through the regular channels. The national auxiliary headquarters shall issue all life membership cards.

SEC. 3. No person shall be a member of more than one auxiliary at any one time. No person expelled by one auxiliary shall be eligible for membership in any other auxiliary without the consent of the expelling auxiliary or the consent of the department executive committee, after hearing an appeal.

(a) Any member in good standing may transfer to any other auxiliary on presentation of a completely executed transfer card to be furnished by the respective department, her annual paid-up dues card for that year, and acceptance by the auxiliary to which she makes application.

Report of the transfer shall be made to State and National headquarters by the treasurer of the accepted auxiliary, showing the name and number of the auxiliary from which the member transfers.

(b) A member seeking a demit shall be in good standing in the local auxiliary from which she asks a demit. She shall have in her possession an annual paid-up dues card for that year showing her dues paid in full to the next December 31.

For the purpose of maintaining continuous membership, the demit shall be recognized for a period of 5 years at the end of which time it shall be void.

The demit holder shall pay annual dues for not to exceed 1 year immediately preceding the year in which she reinstates, and the dues for the current year.

SEC. 4. Dues.

(a) Dues shall be payable annually or for life.

(b) The annual membership fee for each member shall not be less than $2.50.

(c) Each local auxiliary shall remit annually to the national headquarters the sum of 75 cents for each member as national dues; each State department shall determine the amount to be paid annually per member to State headquarters for State dues; and each local auxiliary shall determine the amount to be assessed each member for local dues.

Auxiliary fees for district or other departmental governing group shall be determined by the department executive committee.

Membership shall be based on the last membership report of the preceding year.

(d) Annual dues received after October 1 of any year shall cover the next year's dues.

(e) Dues shall be remitted to State and National headquarters once each month by the local auxiliary, preferably immediately after the regular monthly business meeting of the auxiliary.

(f) An auxiliary shall be considered in good standing when both National and State dues have been paid with proper report of membership and correct remittance of dues.

ARTICLE V—NATIONAL CONVENTION

SECTION 1. A national convention shall be held annually at the same time and in the same city as the national convention of AMVETS.

SEC. 2. The members of the national convention shall consist of department and auxiliary delegates. The department shall choose its delegate and alternate at its convention held at least 3 weeks prior to the national convention. Each AMVETS auxiliary shall have a delegate and alternate elected to attend the national convention. The delegate to the convention shall have a vote.

SEC. 3. Each delegate shall be entitled to one vote. The vote of an absent delegate may be cast by an alternate. Alternates shall have all the rights and privileges of the delegates except that of voting.

SEC. 4. The department representative and her alternate to the national executive committee shall be elected at the department convention, and by such election shall also become one of the delegates to the national convention, without vote for the department. However, as a member of the national executive committee the department committeewoman will have a vote at the national convention.

SEC. 5. Sixty percent of the voting delegates shall constitute a quorum to conduct business.

ARTICLE VI—NATIONAL OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The national convention shall elect a president, senior vice president, junior vice president, six regional vice presidents (areas to correspond to the six districts outlined by AMVETS), recording secretary, treasurer, sergeant at arms, historian, chaplain, and paliamentarian. A corresponding secretary, public relations officer, and liaison officer shall be appointive.

SEC. 2. No president shall be eligible for reelection. No vice president shall be eligible for reelection to the same office. The junior vice president may be elected to the senior vice presidency and the senior vice president to the office of president. All other officers may be reelected.

SEC. 3. All auxiliary members in good standing shall be eligible for a national office.

SEC. 4. Officers shall be nominated from the floor at the annual convention. They shall be elected by a majority vote at the following convention session. Election shall be by ballot. Each delegate or alternate representing a delegate shall cast her own vote.

SEC. 5. On the first ballot the name of the candidate receiving the lowest number of votes shall be dropped, and so on in sucessive ballot until an election is made.

Whenever there is but one candidate for an office the presiding officer shall instruct the secretary to cast the elective ballot of the body for the candidate.

SEC. 6. The officers shall be installed by the retiring national commander of AMVETS, or someone delegated by him, at the last session of the convention. The new officers shall enter on the duties of their respective offices immediately after the adjournment of the meeting at which they were installed, and hold office until their successors are duly elected and installed.

SEC. 7. In the event the office of president is vacated, the senior vice president shall serve as the president for the unexpired term. In the event that both president and senior vice president cannot serve, the junior vice president shall be next in line to serve. All other vacancies occurring in the elective offices of the national auxiliary shall be filled by the national executive committee in the following manner:

The national president shall notify all members of the national executive committee that the vacancy exists, and after 30 days shall send to them the names of persons presented to fill the office. Members of the executive committee shall cast a ballot vote of their choice, mailing same to the national secretary. At a time specified by the national president, the ballots shall be opened by tellers appointed by her, in the presence of such national officers of either the AMVETS or the national auxiliary, as the national president shall name. The member receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected to the vacant office.

ARTICLE VII—DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The national president shall be the executive head of the AMVETS Auxiliary and shall be responsible for the successful functioning of all the other national auxiliary officers and other members of the national executive committee. It shall be her specific duty to:

(a) Officially represent the national auxiliary at all functions where such representation is advisable.

(b) Preside at all meetings of the national executive committee and at the annual national convention.

(c) Appoint officers, committee chairmen, and committees with the approval of a majority of the national executive committee.

However, no appointment of whatever nature shall be announced by the national president until after action has been taken by members of the national executive committee and she shall have been authorized to make the appointment. After such action by the national executive committee the national president shall invite the person approved to accept the appointment.

(d) Enforce the provisions of the national auxiliary constitution and bylaws and the decisions of the national executive committee.

(e) Approve and countersign all vouchers drawn by the recording secretary, approve and countersign all checks drawn by the treasurer, when such approval is justified.

SEC. 2. Senior vice president: The senior vice president shall assist the national president, in the performance of her duties and preside at any meeting or function in the absence of the national president. She shall also serve as chairman of the membership committee.

SEC. 3. Junior vice president: The junior vice president shall assist the president and senior vice president in the performance of their duties and preside in their absence. She shall also serve as chairman of organization and legislation.

SEC. 4. Regional vice presidents: The duties of these respective vice presidents shall be to foster organization of auxiliaries in their respective areas; to serve as directors of the respective areas; and to submit a quarterly report to the national president advising her of the work being accomplished and of the needs of the respective area.

SEC. 5. Recording secretary: The recording secretary shall:

(a) Keep and record the minutes of all executive committee meetings. The services of a public stenographer are advisable for all national conventions.

(b) Keep a file of the national financial record of all members.

(c) Draw and keep a record of all vouchers.

(d) Keep records and duplicates of all official national headquarters correspondence.

(e) Send out notices of all national executive committee meetings.

(f) Perform any other duties as prescribed by the national president or the national bylaws.

(g) The recording secretary shall prepare before each national convention a list showing the accredited auxiliaries attached to an active AMVET post, and in good standing with the national auxiliary; she shall also certify the list of auxiliaries entitled to a voting delegate at the national convention. The list shall be submitted to the preconvention national executive committee meeting and if approved shall be given to the convention credentials committee as their guide.

(h) Within 30 days, subsequent to the closing of the national convention she shall send to each member of the national executive committee, to each delegate, and to each auxiliary president, the minutes of the proceedings of the national convention, and within 30 days after a meeting of the national executive committee, to each department president, and to each auxiliary president the minutes of the proceedings of the said national executive committee meeting.

SEC. 6. Corresponding secretary: The corresponding secretary shall help the national president with any or all correspondents where the president desires aid, and assigns the responsibility to her.

SEC. 7. Treasurer: The treasurer shall:

(a) Receive and account for all money of the national AMVETS auxiliary.

(b) Report on the financial condition of the auxiliary monthly to the national president.

(c) On receiving properly signed vouchers, prepare and sign all checks, disbursing funds of the auxiliary and send same to the national president to be countersigned.

However, when funds allowed by the budget for any certain item, such as postage, etc., have been exhausted, the treasurer shall issue no checks for further expenditures on that item, but shall wait for action of the national executive committee.

(d) Present a complete financial report at the annual national convention; at each meeting of national executive committee, or on request within a reasonable time.

(e) She shall send to the members of the national executive committee and to each department treasurer an itemized statement of receipts and disbursements at the end of each fiscal year, and her financial balance as shown on her books at that time, as of December 31, of each year.

Section 8. Sergeant at arms: The sergeant at arms shall preserve order at all national meetings and at the national convention and shall prevent unauthorized persons from attending such meetings. She shall see that the room is in proper order for all executive committee meetings and at the national convention. In addition she shall perform such other duties as assigned to her by the national president.

SEC. 9. Historian: The historian shall be responsible for maintaining an accurate written history of the auxiliary and she shall present a written summary of same annually at the national convention.

SEC. 10. Parliamentarian: The duties of the parliamentarian shall be:

(a) To serve as chairman of the legal advisory committee.

(b) To advise the president and other officers on all matters of legal significance.

(c) To interpret the constitution and bylaws in regard to legal matters.

(d) To assist the national executive committee in prescribing proper disciplinary action for members and departments disregarding said provisions of the constitution and bylaws.

SEC. 11. Chaplain: The chaplain shall offer prayer at the beginning and end of all meetings and at the annual convention. She shall represent the auxiliary in all religious affairs.

SEC. 12. Public relations officer: The public relations officer shall serve as chairman of the publicity committee and as such shall keep the public informed through the press and other available channels of all national auxiliary affairs. She shall cooperate with the national AMVET projects and with other patriotic and veterans' organizations when opportunity presents.

SEC. 13. Liaison officer: Her duties shall include cooperation with the national AMVET headquarters in all matters of mutual interest between the AMVETS and the AMVETS Auxiliary.

ARTICLE VIII—NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SECTION 1. The administrative power between national conventions shall be vested in the national executive committee, which shall be composed of the national president, all other national elective officers, the junior past national president, and one national executive committeewoman from each State, to be elected by the respective State departments. An alternate shall be elected by each department to serve in the absence of the committeewoman.

SEC. 2. The term of office of each national executive committeewoman and alternate shall be one (1) year, which shall commence immediately on adjournment of the department convention at which she was elected.

SEC. 3. Members of the national executive committee shall be delegates to the national convention, each with one vote. The president shall vote only in the event there is a tie.

SEC. 4. (a) Expenses of all elected national executive committee members, with the exception of the department national committeewoman, whose expenses shall be paid by the respective departments, shall be paid from the national treasury, due consideration being given the general welfare of the national auxiliary in the first instance.

(b) No money shall be advanced to any national executive committee member to attend meetings or the national convention, but action shall be taken by the members of the national executive committee present at any meeting of the committee, to determine how much, if any, funds shall be distributed among the committee members present to defray their expenses. The amount distributed shall never exceed the actual expenses incurred by any member.

(c) Stated meetings of the national executive committee shall be held immediately preceding the national convention, and within 24 hours after the adjournment of the national convention. Special meetings of the committee shall be held on reasonable notice at the call of the national president.

(d) A majority of the members of the national executive committee shall constitute a quorum to conduct business.

SEC. 5. AMVETS, national headquarters, shall be authorized to call a national executive committee meeting of the auxiliary for the purpose of handling emergency matters requiring the joint action of both AMVETS and the AMVETS auxiliary.

ARTICLE IX—FINANCES

SECTION 1. (a) All finances of the National AMVETS Auxiliary shall be under the control of the national treasurer and the finance committee.

(b) The treasurer shall make an annual report at the national convention.

(c) The treasurer shall receive and properly account for all moneys.

(d) The treasurer shall disburse funds only on presentation of a proper expenditure voucher, designated clearly to whom payment is made, itemized as to what the expenditure is for, and she must make sure that the expenditure is within the approved budget allowance.

(e) The treasurer's books shall be audited by a certified public accountant previous to the national convention and the report of the auditors shall be read to the national convention body. The certified public accountant shall be employed by the national executive committee and the expense of the audit shall be paid from the National Treasury.

SEC. 2. (a) Revenue shall be derived from annual dues and other sources approved by the national executive committee. Regulation of annual dues shall be determined by a majority vote of the delegates at the annual national convention.

(b) The treasurer's books, together with those of the national secretary, shall be at all times open to inspection by the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. (a) An annual budget shall be submitted for approval at the first meeting of the national executive committee following the national convention. It shall be prepared by the retiring treasurer and the finance committee, who shall have received estimated budgets from the several national departments and other retiring national officers and shall have consolidated same.

The tentative budget having been submitted, after due consideration, shall receive final action at said postconvention meeting. When adopted, it shall be the expenditure guide for the year. In the event that the budget is not approved, a special finance committee consisting of five (5) members of the national executive committee shall be appointed by the new national president to prepare the budget.

(b) After adoption of the budget the national treasurer shall issue no checks above the specified amounts set forth in the budget, except with the unanimous consent of the executive committee. If a request is made for additional funds on any item, the amount needed and the reasons for making the request shall be given to the body of the national executive committee.

SEC. 4. (a) The national treasurer and national secretary shall be bonded with an indemnity company as surety in a sum double the amount of funds for which, so far as can be anticipated, they will be held accountable.

(b) The bonds of the national treasurer and the national secretary shall be held by the national president.

(c) The national auxiliary shall provide a medium for bonding, for the convenience of departments and local auxiliaries.

(d) All books and records of the national AMVETS auxiliary shall be made available to the AMVETS, national headquarters, on request for either examination or audit.

ARTICLE X—DISCIPLINE

SECTION 1. Disciplinary rules relating to local auxiliaries shall be prescribed by the department.

(a) Members may be suspended or expelled by an auxiliary on a proper showing of cause. Written charges shall be based on disloyalty, neglect of duty, dishonesty, conduct unbecoming to a member of the AMVETS auxiliary, or disregard of the provisions of the constitution and bylaws.

(b) Officers found guilty of any of the foregoing misdemeanors by a two-thirds vote of the respective executive committee shall be automatically deprived of their office, due notice of such impending action having been given the offender.

(c) Any member of an auxiliary has the right of appeal to her department executive committee, and if not satisfied she has the right of appeal to the department convention body.

SEC. 2. The national executive committee, after notices and hearing before a subcommittee, may cancel, suspend, or revoke the charter of the State department for good and sufficient cause to it appearing. Procedure for such action shall be prescribed by the national parliamentarian.

SEC. 3. In the event of such action, the national executive committee is empowered to take over the operation of the department, but is bound by the constitution and bylaws thereof.

At the next department convention thereof, new department officers shall be elected to carry on the work of the department.

ARTICLE XI—AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. This constitution may be amended at any national convention by a majority vote of the total authorized delegates present. Proposed amendments shall be submitted through the national secretary to the several departments and members of the national executive committee by mail at least 30 days prior to the opening of the next national convention. This constitution, may, however, be amended at any convention, without notice, by an unanimous vote of all registered delegates.

SEC. 2. No proposed amendment shall be submitted through the national secretary unless it shall be submitted by a department convention, department executive committee, or the national executive committee.

SEC. 3. This constitution shall automatically be amended by any action taken by a national convention of AMVETS, governing changes in the AMVETS constitution affecting the constitution of the AMVETS auxiliary.

SEC. 4. All amendments adopted at any national convention of the AMVETS auxiliary, according to the provisions of this article, shall take effect only on the approval of the AMVETS national executive committee.

SEC. 5. Except for provisions as herein stated, all amendments to the constitution of the national AMVETS auxiliary become effective and operative at the close of the convention at which they were adopted.

Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I wish to insert an article from the letters to the editor section of the Washington Post, dated Tuesday, April 6, 1948:

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

The Washington Post is so often right that it is perhaps ungracious to disagree with it. However, I cannot avoid feeling that your March 29 editorial "Anti-poll-tax Bill" deals somewhat cavalierly with what is really a difficult question of constitutional law.

You base your opposition to the antipoll tax bill solely on constitutional grounds, which is always dangerous. It is your contention that, under the original Constitution, the States have sole power to determine the qualifications of those who may vote for Members of Congress. This is unquestionably true. There still remains, however, the question of whether the imposition of a tax as a condition of a right to vote is a "qualification" or merely a restriction upon the right to vote. Surely, you would not argue that every burden which the State may choose to impose upon the franchise constitutes a "qualification." Certainly, it is at least arguable that a "qualification" must in some way relate to the capacity of fitness of the individual who seeks to vote.

In the past, it is true, the Supreme Court has taken a different view; but there is a substantial difference between the function which the court exercises when it refuses to declare a State law unconstitutional and the function which it exercises when it affirmatively strikes down a law of Congress. May there not be, in the definition of "qualifications," a twilight zone in which the State may be free to impose a restriction in the absence of congressional action, but in which Congress may be free to define more precisely the term used in the Constitution? Certainly, the issue is not foreclosed.

Furthermore, the power of the States in this as in all other matter is limited by the subsequent adoption of the fourteenth amendment which forbids the States to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws and which empowers Congress to take affirmative action for enforcement. If the Congress determines that in its actual operation and practical effect the poll tax deprives a large number of persons of equal protection of the laws, is its judgment not entitled to that respect which courts customarily extend to their copartners in a government of checks and ballots?

These are difficult questions on which students and lawyers may well differ. To you the answers seem easier than they are—and my objection is they seem too easy.

EDWARD F. PRICHARD, Jr.

LEXINGTON, KY.

United States Supreme Court Should Decide California-Arizona Colorado River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there are now pending before the Congress a number of resolutions which, if adopted, would authorize a suit in the United States Supreme Court to determine the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River.

I have received resolutions adopted by the councils of many of the cities of southern California endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 145, House Joint Resolution 226, and other of the joint resolutions introduced to bring this controversy before the Supreme Court for settlement, as well as a joint resolution adopted by the California State Assembly.

To the people of southern California, as well as to the people of the other States involved, water is vital and necessary for the reclamation of the land for agriculture, for the raising of cattle and other livestock, as well as for the sustenance of human life itself. Where more than one State derives water from the same source, the residents of each State must of necessity demand their just share of the available water supply.

The Colorado River is an important source of water supply to the people of Nevada, Arizona, and California. The vast agricultural lands of Imperial Valley in southern California, a land reclaimed from the desert, depends upon the waters of the Colorado to keep crops growing. Lack of water would return this land to the desert. Water from the Colorado supplements other sources that supply the vast needs of the constantly increasing population of the metropolitan Los Angeles area, and any decrease in the Colorado River water allotted to southern California would create serious problems of water supply.

California, of course, acknowledges the rights of Arizona and Nevada to their just share of the water available from the Colorado River. But the people of California object to any measures which would arbitrarily deprive them of what they believe to be their just and legal share. For that reason I firmly believe that the only fair and equitable settlement of the controversy between California, Arizona, and Nevada over rights to the water of the Colorado River must be determined after an impartial presentation of all the facts before the United States Supreme Court.

I, therefore, urge the Members of Congress to pass legislation now which will permit the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada to bring this matter before the Supreme Court for settlement.

Port Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, free enterprise should be encouraged wherever practicable in the United States. The United States merchant marine and privately owned port facilities should be used in preference to Government-owned ships and port facilities, except where the needs of the armed services or the Nation require otherwise.

In this connection, I invite your attention to a resolution published here-

with, from the California Association of Port Authorities, advocating the use of free enterprise along the lines indicated above:

Whereas it appears that a considerable volume of waterborne cargo not directly connected with the activities of the armed services, the movement of which is directed by various agencies of Federal Government, is being handled through marine terminal installations operated by the armed services, and carried on ships operated by the Army and Navy, and on commercial vessels used at either (a) commercial or special published rates per ton; (b) time charter or other charter for an entire vessel or a portion of a vessel; and

Whereas the merchant marine fleet and the publicly and privately owned port facilities available for handling commercial cargo are geared to handle the peacetime commerce of the Nation, and are dependent on such commerce for their very existence; and

Whereas it is paramount in the over-all program of national security that the extensive investment in the Nation's merchant marine and marine terminal facilities be preserved and maintained and available for use by the armed services in time of war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California Association of Port Authorities hereby petitions and urges the various agencies of Federal Government, controlling the movement of waterborne cargo not directly associated with the activities of the armed services, to route such shipments wherever practicable through commercial port facilities and on vessels of the merchant marine; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to all Senators and Congressmen representing the State of California, and to all agencies of Federal Government directing or controlling the movement of cargo.

Promotion of Happy Race Relationships in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today extending in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial clipped from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of March 21, 1948, entitled "Here Is How to Promote Mutually Profitable and Happy Race Relationships in the South."

HERE IS HOW TO PROMOTE MUTUALLY PROFITABLE AND HAPPY RACE RELATIONSHIPS IN THE SOUTH

(The following editorial appeared in the Journal on July 18, 1944. It set forth what this newspaper believed to be a sound program for promoting happy and mutually profitable race relations in the South. The passage of time and intervening developments seem to make it even more pertinent today, and we print it as an affirmation of our stand on this controversial matter.—THE EDITORS.)

In this column a few days ago, July 12, we concluded an editorial on the so-called Fair Employment Practices Committee with the following words:

"The peculiar pity of the FEPC's abuse of power is that it hurts most the very people it is supposed to help. The sanest and best minds in the South, with the cooperation of the best and sanest elements among our Negro citizens, are moving patiently toward a solution of their common problems. But when a clique of heady doctrinaires, 'most ignorant of what they are most assured,' strike out for an impossible revolution and propose to burn down the house in order to exploit their social theories and fry their political fat, the South and the Journal say 'No.'"

Having spoken thus regarding the extremists, the Journal would like to state with equal clearness and candor its views on the constructive side of the race question. We, or Georgia and the South owe it to ourselves, to our material interests, and our security of conscience to meet hostile criticism, not merely with protests, but with positive ideas and affirmative acts. We owe it to ourselves to think earnestly and speak frankly on such questions as the Negro's opportunity to earn a decent living, acquire a useful schooling, enjoy good health, and share justly in the rights and safeguards of democratic government. These are matters for the common sense and common conscience of the southern people. So long as any part of our population cannot rise to a wholesome standard of living, get a serviceable education, find sanitary and comfortable housing, and share in the safeguards and essentials of democratic government, so long will the South fail to achieve its full measure of material and spiritual well-being. Let's discuss briefly, one by one, these four practical points in a question that concerns us all.

1. A decent living: Negroes make up nearly a third of the South's population, a third of its wage earners and spenders. Suppose their capacity to produce and consume were increased by only 10 or 20 percent; what an enrichment that would be to our region's business. A few years prior to the present war the average per capita income for the South was $314, compared with $604 for the rest of the United States. While there are various causes for such a disparity, one of them undoubtedly is the extremely low subsistence level of that third of our population represented by Negroes. Raise the earning power and the buying power of the 10,000,000 persons in that group, and we shall see the South's per capita income steadily mount. This applies equally, of course, to millions of whites who dwell on the bitter border line of poverty. But to ignore the Negro in plans for economic improvement and better living standards would be as foolish as to exclude him from measures for fire prevention or for the control of contagious disease. To leave him in penury and ignorance would be a deadly drag on southern progress and a stupid mistake from the standpoint of the white man's self-interest.

2. A useful schooling: Obviously, if he is to contribute his due part to the common weal he must have the knowledge, the training, and the skill to do so. He must know how to farm successfully and conserve the soil, how to work efficiently in whatever he undertakes, how to think truly, and how to live wholesomely. In short, he must have education. To southerners who know their traditions there is nothing new or strange in this idea. Reading the life of Robert E. Lee or studying the gospel of Stonewall Jackson, we can have no doubt as to what those heroic spirits would counsel us today. Soon after the First Battle of Manassas and before the full news of the Confederate victory had spread, a crowd gathered around the post office at Lexington, Va., eagerly awaiting the mail. The first letter, a historian tells us, was given to the Reverend Dr. White. Seeing at a glance that the handwriting was General Jackson's, he exclaimed, "Now we shall know all the facts." What he read, however, as the crowd intently listened, was this:

"MY DEAR PASTOR: In my tent last night after a fatiguing day's service, I remembered that I had failed to send you my contribution for our colored Sunday school. Enclosed you will find my check for that object, which please acknowledge at your earliest convenience, and oblige

"Yours faithfully,

"THOMAS J. JACKSON."

Such were the thoughts of "Stonewall" in the wake of the battle that gave him his immortal name. In this same spirit of Christian wisdom and statesmanship the South of our time will provide adequately for the education of its Negroes. That they will continue to have separate schools goes without saying. No one who seeks the best interest of both races wants it otherwise.

3. Health and housing: The rightness and the expediency of seeing to it that the Negro population has a healthful environment is so obvious as to need no arguing. Slums, whether urban or rural, are dangerous to the common weal, regardless of who occupies them. Such public services as water, sewers, hospitals, and playground and recreation facilities should be equitably apportioned on a basis of human needs. There has been much progress in this respect, though much remains to be done.

4. Civic rights and safeguards: Negroes are entitled to impartial justice under the laws of our Republic and our Commonwealth. They are entitled to security of person, as well as property, against any abuse of police power. In the opinion of thinking southerners, they are entitled to participate in their Government by voting, in conformity with the laws of the United States and of the State in which they reside. The Journal shares the view of those fair-minded and practical-minded southern leaders who are convinced that we should work out a plan under which qualified Negro citizens can vote in our primaries. This is the counsel, not for heady reformers, but of sober justice and common sense.

We have tried to outline four constructive ideas for promoting happy and mutually profitable race relationships and for serving the best interests of the South. Each and all of these proposals rest on the major premise that social segregation shall continue. Segregation is not discrimination, if accompanied, as it should be, by a just apportionment of community benefits. Segregation is a guarantee of the integrity of both races, a safeguard against tension and conflict, a fact deep-rooted in the Southern order. Realistic friends of our colored people will recognize this fact and thus we can go forward with good sense and Christian kindness.

Retraining the German Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission, I wish to call to the attention of the Members an editorial by Sumner Welles which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, April 6, 1948:

ELBE FRONTIER—RETRAINING THE GERMAN MIND

(By Sumner Welles)

General Clay tells us that we have established on the Elbe River a frontier for western thinking and western philosophy.

The mounting crisis in Europe has necessarily caused the abandonment of the plan for the establishment of a civilian administration in our occupation zone in Germany.

But the consequent continuation of United States military government raises the question of what progress we may now expect in the inculcation in the German mentality of our kind of thinking and our form of political philosophy.

American military government has so far failed in its propaganda. By its failure to carry out any effective and democratic reconstruction of schools and universities, the German youth, whose minds were poisoned by the Nazi doctrines, have had only a scant opportunity to learn for themselves why freedom is preferable to the police state. It has failed to provide adequate facilities for adult education. It has failed to make available to the inhabitants of western Germany full and objective news of what is going on in the rest of the world.

Most Germans in the western zones will tell you privately that democracy is responsible for their present misery. They have not been made to realize that it is American democracy that is saving them from starvation.

The military government is getting ready to remedy its former fiasco in propaganda by preparing for an all-out campaign to tell the Germans what the European recovery program will do for them.

Leaders of the Christian Democrats and of the Social Democratic Party are to accompany the delegates of the military government to the forthcoming Paris Economic Conference. ERP operations during the first year are expected to bring imports valued at $2,000,000,000 into the bizonal area and to result in three-quarters of a billion dollars' worth of exports. If the practical benefits that western Germany will derive from the recovery program can be brought home to the individual German, the continuing inroads of communism will be at least temporarily checked.

Helpful as economic improvement and the effects of an efficient publicity campaign can prove to be, they will only solve a part of the problem.

The existing division between west and east may continue indefinitely. It is imperative that some means be found to remedy the failure of the military government in the fields of education and of political reconstruction. The short-range objective is to counteract Soviet influence. The long-range objective should be to prepare the way for the conversion of the German spirit so that the Germans west of the Elbe may become safe members of the European community.

Under present circumstances a large part of the arrangements for the civil administration of Germany must properly be under military control. But this American military authorities are not fitted by training, knowledge, or inclination for the formulation of an educational or political program.

Is not this the moment when Washington should call upon private individuals and organizations to help in framing a long-range program for German political reconstruction and German education, and to take part in supervising its execution?

The Germans in the western zone feel isolated. Freedom of information is as yet unknown. Except in relief work there is no close relationship between the German religious groups and those of the west. A few American labor leaders have been permitted to do some effective work, but far more remains to be done if the German trade-unions are to reject Communist domination.

And while if German democracy is to be more than a fiction it must be the outgrowth of German initiative and represent an authentic German aspiration, surely much good could come from frequent visits to Germany by outstanding leaders of the major political parties of the United States as well as of western Europe and by a continuing contact between them and German democrats.

Were the Administration to establish as an advisory council on German policy a committee composed of representatives of the American press associations, of the American publishers and editors, of such religious bodies as the Federal Council of Churches and the National Catholic Welfare Conference, of American labor, and of spokesmen for the two great political parties, an enlightened and constructive long-range policy could soon be formulated.

If the determination and control of our educational and political program in Germany continues to be left in the hands of the military, the results will be as sterile as they have been until now. There would then then be scant hope for that rebirth of Germany which is essential to the future peace of the world.

The T-Men Do a Good Job and There Is No Reason To Discriminate Against Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are privileged to sit on the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations subcommittee of this House have had an opportunity to learn at first hand of the great work being done by the investigative and law enforcement personnel of the Treasury.

Because absence of publicity makes their work more effective, they have not received much of the credit which is their due, and the public is not entirely aware of the importance or effectiveness of their operations.

Legislation is now pending to provide adequate pensions for such personnel. Congress a short time ago granted pensions to other enforcement agencies of the Government, but not to those personnel in the Treasury Department. This discrimination should be eliminated, so that the services will be made more attractive to young men, and because of the increasing importance, scope, and peril of the work these men do. This view is very well expressed in the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News of March 31:

THE T-MEN DO A GOOD JOB AND THERE IS NO REASON TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST THEM

Precisely because their jobs call for self-effacement, the public seldom hears much about investigators of the United States Treasury Department. Much of the success of such agencies as the Secret Service, Narcotics Bureau, Customs Bureau, Intelligence Unit and the Alcohol Tax Unit, lies in the fact that their activities are kept more or less under cover. The absence of publicity makes for much more effective law enforcement by the T-men.

The tendency for avoiding the spotlight is no reason for discriminating between these men and the employees of more highly publicized units such as the FBI. Unfortunately such discrimination now exists. Congress last year liberalized retirement provisions for FBI agents, but neglected to pass these gains on to their counterparts in the Treasury.

Two similar bills introduced by Senator CHAVEZ and Representative LOVE would correct this inequity. Treasury investigators have an impressive record of crime detection to their credit, including the conviction of such criminals as Al Capone and Louis (Lepke) Buchalter, the No. 1 man in Murder, Inc. Adequate pensions as provided in the proposed legislation offer one way of continuing to attract young and vigorous men necessary to keep up the good work of the Treasury Department.

National Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the country is and always will be interested in its agricultural program which has to do with producing the food and fiber to feed and clothe the people of this and other nations. The House Committee on Agriculture has held long and exhaustive hearings on a long range agricultural program and we hope soon to write and present to the Congress a bill providing for such a program.

On March 19, Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. N. E. Dodd, delivered a very interesting and informative address before the annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on the subject Our National Agricultural Program which I think the friends of agriculture would like to read and study. Under leave granted today, I am inserting in the RECORD, Mr. Dodd's address which is as follows:

OUR NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

I am especially glad of the opportunity to discuss before your progressive group some of the basic phases of our national agricultural program. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture which I represent have certain fundamental objectives in common.

You are concerned primarily with the perpetuation and the wise and profitable use of the Nation's major water resources. The condition and use of the land on which the water first falls and from which it flows into our rivers and harbors is of direct and vital concern to you. The Department of Agriculture is charged with the task, among other things, of promoting the productiveness and well-being of the land. The use and management of the water that falls on our land and crops, and its orderly disposal through these water courses on its way to the ocean are of utmost importance to successful agriculture. Thus good farming is the handmaiden of flood control and waterway stabilization.

The land actually is the source of most of our wealth—food, fiber and vegetable-oil crops, timber, meat and dairy products, wool, leather, and so on. It is the wealth of the Nation which moves, in substantial part, down the country's waterways and through its harbors, or depends on water power for processing or manufacture. Sustained, abundant production of this wealth is essential to our whole economy, for the water front of Portland or New Orleans extends to Wyoming or Ohio.

It must be fairly obvious, then, why these three things are fundamental to Department

of Agriculture policy and its action program of service to agriculture and the public at large: (1) Abundant production geared to better living and a fuller economy, instead of a policy of scarcity and a pinch-penny economy; (2) conservation of our productive land and water resources, as opposed to their costly exploitation and waste; and (3) effective contribution to flood control, beginning with the highest forests, fields, and pasture land in a watershed.

We have no alternative to a basic, long-range policy of abundance, granted that the unprecedented demands on American farm production in recent years drops off somewhat as world conditions adjust themselves. Not only would it be difficult to slow down the new and easier stride of agricultural production to which we have become accustomed, but the present high level of consumption alone shows that such a policy need not be necessary. With high-level employment in this country, and even with conservative amounts of agricultural products for export and industrial use, we most certainly will have a market for the abundance which our farmers can produce.

We are proving every day at the dinner tables of America that the so-called farm problem of the depression was not one of overproduction but one of underconsumption. In 1947, we ate 17 percent more food than we did during the 1935–39 prewar period. Who among us would dare set himself up to say that we don't need our abundant production? And who would propose that we throw overboard our present position of world leadership, in favor of a policy of controlled scarcity? It surely would be followed by similar policies in other nations, with a whole train of increasing tariffs, import quotas, blocked currencies, and other economic barriers of unhappy remembrance.

Fortunately, we have had the experience—and now have the perfected and time-tested machinery—to enable us to realize this goal of plenty. Thus we have the direct purchase and distribution program which we have been using successfully for years, particularly for localized surpluses of nonstorable commodities. We have the school-lunch program which so far is reaching only one-third of our school children, and we have had experience with a food-stamp plan. In light of the latter experience, the Department has recommended, on an experimental basis, a program which would attempt to put a floor under the food consumption of our low-income families. We should have such a program ready for expansion whenever serious recession threatens.

Intelligent, economical production must, of course, underlie any marketing and distribution devices for them to be effective. Programs to encourage production adjustments and prevent ruinous price drops accordingly are our second line of defense, in good times and bad. We are fortunate in having had such full experience with price support and acreage allotments. They have enabled our farmers to weather such situations, for example, as the recent British stopping of flue-cured tobacco purchases in this country and the earlier potato pile-up resulting from an unexpected favorable turn in the weather. Practically everybody seems to agree that the parity concept should be maintained as a measuring stick for farm prices.

We also need to continue our emphasis on fundamental research, experimentation and scientific advancement in every branch of crops, soils, animal husbandry and so on. Never in the long history of the Department of Agriculture's achievements in these fields have there been more really revolutionary scientific advancements than there have been in the last few years. Development of improved breeds and varieties of animals, poultry, and crops goes on at a never slackening pace. Remember forest fire protection; soil investigations, and soil conservation research, technical aid and payments; veterans and tenants farm ownership loans, extensive farm credit, crop insurance and other indispensable services. Sometimes we may be prone to overlook some of these component parts of the program, though we will hardly lose sight of such spectacular developments as DDT and the aerosol bomb, or the making of penicillin widely available—in all of which Agriculture's research had an important part.

And of utmost importance, of course, is the fact that through extension educational facilities of the Department, practical information about all its research developments and its different services is made available promptly to farmers and the public in general. That, after all, is the end result which measures the effectiveness of our agricultural program.

Of all the parts of this program, none, perhaps, is of more direct interest to you than our soil (and water) conservation undertakings. For that matter, none is more important to the farmers and to everybody else, because productive land, adequately watered, is the indispensable base of all agriculture. It is recognized—the farmers recognize—that we have had to push our land harder than was good for it, in order to meet the continued demand for output of most crops at high wartime levels. We have had no choice. But, knowing as we do the need for balancing the books of our soil resources as quickly as possible, we must intensify our conservation efforts.

Actually, a policy of abundance—the matter we have been looking at here today—works to save our soil rather than to exhaust it. That is to say, if everybody got enough of the kind of food he wants—including more meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables—we would have more land in pastures under protective grass and legume crops and less of it in soil-depleting row crops. We can't afford to let our rivers run thick with soil and our harbors fill with silt from off our farm lands. We can't afford to mine our soil.

A national agricultural program without soil and water conservation at its very base is unthinkable, and we have at last recognized this all-important element of agriculture and have perfected our conservation techniques and means of applying them. Farmers and ranchers, who are the best judge of all on such matters, have expressed themselves unmistakably on this point. The Department of Agriculture divides its assistance in soil conservation as between incentive materials and payments for various soil-conserving and improving practices and research and direct technical assistance to farmers. The payments are made under the agricultural conservation program administered by the Production and Marketing Administration, as determined by local county and State committees of farmers and ranchers. The technical assistance is provided by the Soil Conservation Service, through farmer-organized and farmer-directed soil-conservation districts formed under enabling laws now in the statutes of all the States and Territories.

There isn't time for me to tell you about even a few of the remarkable accomplishments in soil and water conservation that have been realized in a few short years. Many millions of acres of our cultivated land, range and pasture lands, and farm woodland have benefited. The individual gain to landowners and operators directly affected hardly have exceeded the public benefit in such respects, for example, as the flood-control contribution of soil conservation on watershed agricultural lands. We must not forget, however, that, with all our progress, the conservation job actually has only been well started. We still are letting productive soil get away from us faster than we have had facilities for conserving it. We can never feel that we have an adequate conservation program until we have balanced the books on our soil, water, and timber resources.

One important means of arriving at that balance is through effective flood control, complete flood control insofar as it extends from the highest forested watershed to the very mouths of the rivers which drain the continent. There is a popular song title that "One Raindrop Doesn't Make a Shower." Neither does one shower make a flood; but enough showers added together over inadequately protected watersheds can and all too often do, end up as floods. The cost of floods is too intimately known to Members of your Congress for me to dwell on that point.

I do want to mention, though, that the Soil Conservation Service found through sample surveys that last summer's floods in the upper Mississippi River watershed took about 660,000,000 tons of soil from upland farms in 6 Cornbelt States—enough to fill a train of freight cars that would encircle the earth at the equator 5 times. I ask you: Was that good for the rivers and harbors into which that tremendous tonnage of once productive soil moved? Much of it, of course, settled as sediment in navigation channels and will be costly to remove. Assuming that wasted soil to be worth the nominal price of a dollar a ton, there you have $660,000,000 erosion bill in only 30 days in just these half-dozen States. That is not including an estimated $200,000,000 crop damage, or the untotaled damage to bottomlands, roads, land, water transportation, and other facilities.

This is the kind of damage, and expense, that the orderly operation of our national agricultural program will help to prevent to a greater and greater extent as time goes on. The 1936 Flood Control Act charged the War Department with responsibility for works of improvement in aid of flood control on navigable rivers and their tributaries, and placed responsibility on the Department of Agriculture for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention in aid of flood control on the watersheds of these rivers. There has been consistent agreement, I am pleased to say, as to the proper division of these responsibilities; because both types of measures are clearly essential to the over-all job.

The 1944 Flood Control Act gave further impetus to the flood control activities of the Department of Agriculture, by authorizing special treatment of 11 watersheds. They embrace some 30 million acres of land in these States: New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Texas, Iowa, Oklahoma, and California. The installation of works of improvement is estimated to cost the Federal Government approximately $90,000,000 and local interests some $30,000,000, in completion periods ranging from 10 to 24 years.

Work is underway in all 11 watersheds through the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service in cooperation with soil-conservation districts and other local agencies and, of course, the Army engineers. The Department of Agriculture, during its nearly 12 years of activity in flood control, has developed a sound and efficient procedure for making watershed investigations and carrying out the recommended works of improvement for waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in the interest of flood control.

This work is designed to increase the infiltration capacity of watershed lands so greater amounts of water can be stored temporarily in the soil; to stabilize gullies; to develop field waterways and small-stream channels so the run-off from watersheds will be retarded and controlled on its way to the larger waterways; and to prevent erosion and thereby reduce the silt load of streams and the rate of sedimentation of reservoirs. The treatments include wise use of land and measures to bring this about, protection of natural vegetation, revegetation of severely

eroded areas, control of fires and grazing, use of proper cutting and logging practices, conservation cropping methods, the use of structures and other engineering devices, and the application of other measures to our forests, pastures, and croplands.

More than 600 watersheds, moreover, have been authorized by the flood-control acts for investigation. The Department has completed preliminary examination of 159 watersheds, or portions of watersheds, and has completed surveys of 18. Survey work now is underway on 32 watersheds on which some work was done before the war, and preliminary examinations and surveys have been started or are planned on 56 others.

Congress has determined that it is a public responsibility to aid in establishing direct flood-control measures consisting of watershed improvement as well as large flood-detention reservoirs. There are necessary flood-control jobs on privately owned lands in almost every watershed that the farmers cannot afford to do and should not be expected to do, because the benefits go primarily to the public and not to the individual. On the other hand, where the conservation job is primarily of benefit to the individual, he should be expected to carry a major share of the cost of this work, aided by the public with technical and certain other help.

In addition to general land treatment measures there are the direct flood-control measures needed to bridge the gap between conservation farming, or proper land management, and the downstream major flood control works, such as reservoirs and levees. There flood-control measures provide for the orderly movement of water and its silt load through the waterways and stream systems of the watershed down to the main-stem rivers. These measures include inter-farm waterways, channel straightening, stream-bank stabilization, structures for the control of major gullies, and special measures in some places, such as silt or small water detention basins.

I want to make myself clear, in connection with the Department of Agriculture's flood-control activities, that we recognize the definite limits to what we can accomplish, no matter how effectively and efficiently the work is done. The program of watershed improvement which I have just discussed is an essential part of the total flood control job. It will greatly reduce the number of small floods and the flood damages caused by those which occur on many minor tributaries and will keep much sediment from the larger streams. But this work alone will not protect the lower drainages when major floods come. In order to provide adequate flood control for all parts of a drainage basin, reservoirs and other necessary works along the main channels also are necessary. The two types of flood-control protection supplement each other, and together do a complete and effective job.

The task ahead of us is a big one, and it is not the job of any single agency or branch of government. Neither is it a problem that can be met simply or without cost or effort. Soil Conservation Service surveys show that the conservation needs of the remaining untreated land include such items as more than 124,000,000 acres of contouring, 90,000,000 acres of terracing, around 142,000,000 acres of strip cropping, 208,000,000 acres of stubble-mulch farming, and proper stocking of some 358,000,000 acres of range and pasture land.

There always have been floods and high water; but best historical evidence is that, in most drainage basins of the United States, erosion and the sediment loads of our streams have increased greatly since white men settled the country. We shall always have to grow crops, produce meat and wood, and use our timber and mineral resources for an increasing and progressing population. That is why our projected national agricultural policy of abundance is inevitable.

The problem is how to produce all these necessities safely. The flood control and soil and water conservation I have outlined do not add up to a theory of disuse of the land or curtailment of its bounty flowing into the channels of industry and trade. On the contrary, they comprise a practical science of wise use.

It is all a question of vital importance to agricultural and rivers and harbors interests, among many others. I hardly need remind you that it is estimated that something like $3,250,000,000 has been spent on waterway improvements in the United States, not counting cost of terminal facilities. It is also estimated that more than $10,000,000 a year is spent in relieving harbors and inland waterways of erosion-derived sediment. I won't even attempt to get into the costly business of reservoir siltation, too often on sites that cannot be duplicated or substituted feasibly.

You may think that I have been speaking primarily here today of what we can do through Government action to further sustained abundance, arrive at effective soil conservation and flood control, and so on. But I assure you that no one is more conscious than I of the fact that Government is but one important factor in the equation. Organizations like the National Rivers and Harbors Congress are another. Government can move no faster than public opinion moves. You, on the other hand, can step out in the lead.

The challenge is plain for all of us: Our agriculture, our Nation, and the whole world in which we live and trade have changed. For better or for worse, we are living in a new era. The world of 1948 is not the world we knew before the war. We cannot go back to prewar conditions, even if we wanted to. I feel confident that we have the will and the capacity to meet that challenge.

Great Job for a Great Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members to an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on April 4, 1948, endorsing the suggestion that President Truman draft General Eisenhower to go to Moscow at once to talk to Marshal Stalin.

Some weeks ago, I proposed this idea to the Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. My arguments were much the same as those of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial.

I urged that the committee request the President to take such action.

My thinking went something like this. Ours is a Foreign Affairs Committee. It is the duty of our committee, it seems to me, to explore every possible method for obtaining peace.

The easy out is to add an authorization for arms to our bills, but then we are no longer the Foreign Affairs Committee but the Military Affairs Committee.

Before we start pitting body against body, we ought to pit mind against mind. We must get behind the iron curtain. We must speak into Marshal Stalin's ear, loudly enough for him to hear. We must put our cards on the table.

We must make it perfectly clear that if we go on the way we are going, war is inevitable.

I cannot believe that the Russians or anyone else seriously want war—to drift into it would be a crime against humanity.

The one man to handle this assignment is General Eisenhower. He has the confidence of the American people—of both parties. I should imagine he still has the confidence of the Russians. General Eisenhower proved himself to be an able negotiator in the war. I have every confidence that he would prove so again.

GREAT JOB FOR A GREAT MAN

Many Americans believe that President Truman should draft Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to go to Moscow at once to do all that can honorably be done to halt the drift toward war. Representative CASE of South Dakota and others are making this suggestion. The idea of such a mission was indorsed yesterday by Senators HILL and WILEY. We join wholeheartedly in the proposal.

We believe that General Eisenhower should be drafted to perform this mission for peace in the world, because he is fitted for it as is no one else.

General Eisenhower was supreme commander of the allies in western Europe. He had many dealings with the Russians. He knows some of their upper command, and he and some of their military leaders have been friends. For General Eisenhower to meet again with the Russians would recall the time when the United States and Russia were allies against a common enemy.

General Eisenhower is known to the Russians as the military leader who launched the second front in World War II. He is identified as the commander who relieved them of bearing the full fury of the Nazi war. He represents something the Russians came to appreciate from experience—American military skill and might.

General Eisenhower is a rarely able negotiator. As supreme commander, he proved himself diplomat no less than military leader. He handled grave problems of statecraft. He dealt openly and understandingly with British, French, Polish, Belgian, Dutch, and other sensitive groups. He could now sit down with the Russians and talk frankly, fairly, and honestly. He could make it plain that the United States and Russia can only suffer by war, that both countries have much to gain by preserving peace in the world.

General Eisenhower is more than a distinguished soldier and a proved diplomat. He is now the leading private citizen of this country. Political workers in both parties have been eager to persuade him to be their Presidential nominee. After removing himself from consideration for the Republican ticket, he has had to take a similar stand with respect to the Democratic nomination. He is so highly esteemed in both parties that it has even been proposed that he run on both tickets and be elected by acclamation.

General Eisenhower, therefore, could perform this great mission for peace on a wholly disinterested basis. He could keep the task above and apart from Presidential politics. No one else could do this in the way that he could do.

General Eisenhower could go to work in Moscow in a minimum of time. A meeting between General Eisenhower and Marshal Stalin could be held almost as soon as General Eisenhower arrived.

No one can predict that such a conference would be entirely or even partially successful. There is no way of knowing in advance. But it would be worth the effort many times

over whatever the odds against it. Even if it is a 1,000-to-1 shot, it is worth trying.

Even though it failed it would impress the world that the United States is ready to sit down at the table and to try to arrange a settlement of the cold war. It would do more for our moral leadership than anything else we could do at this time. It would prove that we are willing to take the initiative in a full exploration of conditions which, if not arrested, threaten to bring about a third world war.

President Truman should draft General Eisenhower. A great task awaits a great man.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a splendid editorial, with which I fully agree, from the St. Joseph, Mo., News Press, opposing Federal aid to education. It is as follows:

THE ILLUSION OF FEDERAL AID

Those persons and groups of persons who are agitating for Federal aid to education would do well to direct their efforts where they belong, toward our own State legislature. The State senate has just cut a $5,000,000 appropriation for teachers' salaries from an omnibus bill now under consideration. The house has approved the amount as an emergency measure earlier in the week.

We have said before and we say again that the problem of financing education is not a function of Federal Government. When our own State senate will not act favorably in an educational crisis what would we benefit by pouring funds into a Federal coffer for distribution to other States? It is our duty as citizens of this State to provide our children with adequate education. That duty should not be hampered by an expensive Federal bureaucracy which is in reality nothing more than an investment in communism.

What is the cry of those who seek Federal aid? We quote from a pamphlet distributed by the National Education Association of the United States: "Many local school systems and a number of whole States are fiscally unable, even after levying confiscatory taxes, to finance schools of average cost. This results from a highly uneven and inverse distribution of children and wealth." So the proponents of Federal aid are advocating a solution which this Nation has just voted $6,205,000,000 to combat abroad. Distribution of the wealth for educational purposes is just as communistic as distribution of the wealth for personal comfort.

Those States with high per capita expenditures for education will suffer a reduction in order to provide for low-expenditure States. And the high expenditure States, the ones with initiative, will develop further means to raise their standards once more and the discrepancy will continue in spite of Federal aid.

The argument that inadequate school support cannot be removed if the States are left to depend on their own resources is a fallacy. The truth is that no State has yet developed to the fullest extent its potentialities for providing adequate education, either in income or initiative. The fact that some States have outstripped others is mainly to be attributed to their ability to remain alert and adaptable to new needs.

Our State senate exhibited neither of these attributes in rejecting the $5,000,000 emergency allotment. Why then should we resort to a Federal bureaucracy to accomplish something we can do ourselves?

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the text of the second of a series of most interesting broadcasts made over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., by Ann Su Cardwell:

The first talk in this series on Poland's right to independence was devoted to a discussion of that right as viewed from the geographical and the ethnic standpoints. Today attention will be directed to Poland's history and to its culture.

Taking up the historical right, it is evident that we must look at Poland's achievements in history from two angles, namely, the place Poland occupied in the community of nations throughout the 1,000 years, and what the Poles did during those 1,000 years to justify their claims to independence.

Poland's place in history can in part be judged from the territorial extent of the Polish Commonwealth. Until the years immediately preceding the 18th century partitions, Poland was one of the largest countries in Europe. When Kazimierz the Great ascended the throne in 1333, Poland was already firmly established, strong, and western in orientation. During Kazimierz's reign the lands that became Poland's southeastern provinces, through dynastic inheritance were brought within Polish frontiers. In 1386 Jadwiga, queen of Poland, married Jagiello of Lithuania, and through this union, Lithuania with its vast eastern regions became part of the Commonwealth of Poland, a bond cemented in 1569 by the famous treaty of Lublin, making the Polish state the largest in 16th century Europe, extending far enough east to include within its borders the cities of Kiev and Smolensk.

No Poles would claim any such eastern frontier for modern Poland. The extreme eastern areas were always frontier regions. The Riga Treaty, signed without reservations by the Bolsheviks in 1921 after the Polish-Bolshevik war, fixing the line that was approved by all nations until Stalin and Hitler began redrawing world boundaries, gives Poland not even half its 17th century territory, which in 1650 included the two above mentioned cities—Kiev and Smolensk. The Riga treaty gave the Poles only 53.1 percent of what remained Polish after the 1772 or first partition. The Polish-Soviet boundary thus drawn was identical with the Polish eastern frontier after the 1793 or second partition. That means that all the Polish lands tsarist Russia had forcibly annexed by the first two partitions were left within the borders of Soviet Russia.

So much for the eastern Polish frontiers. In the north, after 1561 present day Latvia and much of contemporary Estonia joined Poland as protection from Russian aggression. Of Lithuania we have already spoken. The whole of this northern area was included in the Polish Commonwealth not through conquest but through requested relationship. East Prussia, a German colony established by the Teutonic Knights in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries through force, trickery, and extermination of the native population, became the fief of Poland in 1466 and remained so for almost 200 years. One of its provinces was Polish until Frederick of Prussia took it in the first partition in 1772, though he did not succeed in getting Danzig until the 1793 partition.

History substantiates Polish territorial claims. Furthermore it establishes a precedent for and sets forth the wisdom of close association between the Baltic states and Poland. As long as Poland was free and independent and these states were in federation with her, there was less danger of either German or Russian aggression. As for East Prussia, the southern part, is ethnically Polish and should on those grounds be restored to Poland; and the rest of it with the exception of the northeastern section which the Poles agree should go to a free Lithuania should also be joined with Poland, where it belongs both geographically and economically unless we wish to leave Germany a stronghold for another world war.

Turning now to what Poles did during the 1,000 years of national existence to justify recognition of their demands for restoration of a free and independent Poland, we find a lengthy chronicle. Under the Pia kings, the Polish state was consolidated, became Christian and western, and repeated Tartar invasions were repulsed, Poland becoming the recognized eastern bulwark of Christianity. Under the Jagiellon kings, the Teutonic Knights were defeated in the Battle of Grunwald in 1410, thus for centuries checking the German menace; and the security and peace of Central and Eastern Europe were further assured by the Polish-Lithuanian union already referred to.

Batory, one of the elected kings, drove back the Muscovites pressing west under Ivan the Terrible; and Sobieski, successful in keeping the Turk and Tartar out of Poland, answered the call of emperor and Pope and routed the Turks besieging Vienna. After the partitions Polish history is still sprinkled with notable events and actions—in 1791 May Third Constitution, renowned as one of the most liberal and progressive of its times; the 1794 Kosciusko-led insurrection and its attendant accession of new liberty for the peasants; the later insurrections of 1830–31 and 1863; the 1905 revolt of the Polish school children; and the famous Pulsudski Legions of World War I—to cite only a few of the outstanding actions.

Leaving the historical rights we turn to the cultural side of Polish life, which is so full and rich that whole books have been written about each of its many fields, art, literature, music, education, science, and invention, and political institutions. History has recorded instances of peoples who set standards in cultural achievements that have never since been equaled. But the glory of those nations is the glory of centuries gone. Poland does not belong in that category. Its culture, rooted deep in western civilization, has been as sturdy and flourishing as Polish patriotism. The achievements of Poles in the cultural field both at home and abroad have won wide recognition.

The sixteenth century is commonly referred to as Poland's golden age. But before that time Poland was leading in the educational life of central Europe, with the University of Krakow founded in 1364 and attended by students from all over the Continent, and Copernicus attracting the attention of scholars everywhere. Poles were traveling both in Europe and the East, carrying on correspondence with men of many lands, entertaining visitors from near and far. Poles studied abroad and returned to Poland to establish schools that often were an improvement on western models.

Education has always held a place of prime importance with Poles, and while progress in that field was hampered under the oppressing powers after the partitions, the restored Poland in 1919 made great advance in promoting general education, preparing the child to find its place as a free man or woman in a free world, unlike the schools functioning in Poland today, which are being prepared to train individuals in the destructive atheistic philosophy of communism.

Naming even a representative list of Poles who have contributed to world progress and civilization is out of the question here. But one cannot think of Polish culture without recalling Mme. Sklodowska-Curie, twice Nobel prize winner, the first shared with her husband in physics, the second alone in chemistry; Poland's great poet, Mickiewicz, familiar in translation to people of many lands; the novelists Sienkiewicz and Reymont, both recipients of the Nobel award; the painter Matejko, with his monumental historical canvases, and so many other painters, among them Chelmonski, Brandt, the Kossaks, the Stykas. At least two Polish musicians are known and loved the world over, and Americans and the peoples of western Europe are familiar with the names of scores of the compatriots of these artists.

The Poles of the past 7 years have a record of cultural achievements well worth recording, although most of that achievement is due to Poles abroad, since all life in Poland is again under the direction of a foreign power's underlings, and none of the freedom necessary for the flowering of talent, except as it be harnessed to the regime's propaganda, exists. But Poland's talent will not always be under the yoke of an oppressor or forced to live in exile. My husband once asked Paderewski on what he based his hope for the restoration of a free and independent Poland. "A thousand years of culture and of fighting," came the prompt reply. And surely a nation of Poland's historical and cultural background and its unceasing struggle for independence, can demand with the expectation of receiving the right to live" as equals with equals, free with free, in a family of nations.

Clark Hill Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Waynesboro (Ga.) True Citizen, which deals with the highly controversial question of who should build the Clark Hill Dam. I subscribe fully to the argument advanced by this prominent young editor, Mr. Roy F. Chalker.

THE POWER COMPANY SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM CLARK HILL FIGHT

(By Roy F. Chalker)

The fight between those who are sponsoring the construction of Clark Hill Dam by the Federal Government and others who represent the interests of the power company, has degenerated into a name-calling charge and countercharge stage.

The public is familiar with the history of the project. Originally, the power company had a franchise from the two States involved to construct the dam. A world-wide depression and short-sightedness on the part of the power company caused the project to be abandoned. Later, Augusta interests and others asked the Federal Government to construct the dam. The power company offered its cooperation.

Still later, the power company again asked to be allowed to construct the project, and that the Federal Government withdraw. The fight was taken to the people and to the congressional committees concerned.

The good faith of the power company was taken for granted by a majority of the public, and many, who believe in private enterprise as against Government in business, have expressed themselves in favor of development of the project by the company.

However, due to some of the tactics now being employed by both sides, such as petitions being circulated by both parties to individuals who are not familiar with the facts in the case, and efforts on the part of the power company's Washington attorney to delay or kill appropriations for the project in committee, the fight itself is endangering the project. It is also placing the power company's fine position of public favor in jeopardy.

Therefore, it would seem wise for the power company to withdraw from the fight. If it values the welfare of the people of this section it should do nothing to endanger the project to complete the construction of the dam.

The interests of the power company are secondary to the welfare of the general public.

After the dam is completed in every detail, there will be time enough to petition for rights to the distribution of the power, or so much thereof as may be wise.

Sweden—Citadel of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times reports on March 28 that:

Commentator M. Semenov said in an article in the Red Fleet that the Swedish Commander in Chief, Lt. Gen. Helge Jung is attempting to plan the "use of Swedish armed forces as an appendage of the American military machine and to subject the foreign policy of Sweden to the expansionist ambitions of the United States in northern Europe."

Such statements are not new to us. We Americans are no strangers to them. They are part of the unchanging pattern of the Communist assault on civilization. They used this form of attack—divide and conquer—in the French elections and in the overthrow of representative government in Czechoslovakia. They are using it, today, in Italy. It would indeed be surprising if they did not resort to this same strategy in the case of Sweden.

Americans and Swedes have lived too long together in the New World for our two peoples to misunderstand one another. Our histories, our cultures, our common interests have merged. There were Swedes on that ill-fated expedition to this country—over a century before Columbus came—who left the evidence of their being here written on rock in southern Minnesota. Our history tells, too, of the courageous settlers in New Jersey, then called New Sweden, only 18 years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. Jenny Lind, the Swedish Nightingale, visited these shores and became a legend in American music. Carl Sandburg is the dean of American poets. Inventor John Ericson changed the entire course of naval warfare. Strong men who knew how to plow and to pray helped to settle the Midwest and to span this continent. Swedish scholars founded or contributed to the founding of colleges in a score of States.

Massachusetts, New Jersey, Texas, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, California—yes, and my own Nebraska—owe a debt too vast to ever repay to Americans of Swedish origin. The last official census, 1940, reports 445,070 Americans in this country who were born in Sweden. Of this number, 9,435 Americans in Nebraska were of Swedish birth. These figures do not take into account the hundreds of thousands of Americans whose father or mother were born in the Swedish homeland. It would be safe to say that the Americans of Swedish ancestry today would be equal to approximately one-third of the total present population of Sweden.

Here in these very Halls of Congress are men whose names testify to the truth of what I say—SUNDSTROM, JOHNSON, ANDERSON, NORBLAD, and TOLLEFSON, among others.

Because America knows the true Christian character of the Swedish people, we are able to scorn the Communist strategy and to believe that Swedish Prime Minister Erlander said in Stockholm on March 18, 1948.

The Prime Minister, whose thoughts have so well reflected those of his countrymen in the past, said in part that day:

Scandinavia is not an isolated island. Our economic welfare is dependent on the developments in Europe.

Cooperation between the Scandinavian peoples is increasingly important to us, but it is not directed against anybody. No one need feel threatened. It should be clear to everyone that stability and strength within Scandinavia is a contribution to peace.

Today there are other questions rivaling with economic problems for our interest. Particularly the events in Czechoslovakia have made a strong and deep impression on our people. Our feelings have been shocked by the fact that a seemingly well established and clearly democratic system has been trampled under foot. Practically all the people as well as the Swedish Social Democratic Party are reacting against this.

The Communists in Sweden have dropped their masks. The situation has clarified. No one need any longer doubt where communism stands. The fight against Communists will now be a part of the defense of Sweden's freedom and independence.

Every aggression from without will call forth a fight for our freedom, with every resource at hand. When, during the war, we strove to keep our country out of the war and its devastation, this was not an expression of indifference toward the values at stake. But we believe that the greatest contribution which was within our power to make in behalf of freedom and democracy was to gather our energies in their protection within the small part of the world where our efforts could be of value.

We are still prepared to take part in the defense of freedom and peace, but nevertheless we do not wish, in advance, to relinquish the hope that there will develop a general understanding between all peoples of the world.

Prime Minister Erlander has spoken profound truths.

America should profit by them.

Like Sweden, the United States has a goal of cooperation between nations that is not directed against any one nation.

Like Sweden, the United States has seen the loathsome face of communism, stripped of its mask.

Like Sweden, the United States feels that it can make its greatest contribution to world progress in peace.

Like Sweden, we are resolute in our determination to wholeheartedly take our battle stations in the fight for our liberties, should that time come.

And—still like Sweden—we have not relinquished the hope that a general understanding between all peoples of the world can be developed.

But, whatever our future, I devoutly pray that the people of the United States shall have at their side in their forward march of progress the keen minds, the capable hands, and the courageous spirit of the twentieth century Vikings of the north—the people of Sweden.

The Republican Housing and Rent Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 is far from adequate. The Congress was given the opportunity to consider several rent-control bills which would have provided effective rent control. These bills were not reported from the House Banking and Currency Committee.

In a final effort to obtain a good law, I offered my bill (H. R. 5823) on the floor as a substitute for the Wolcott bill, but the majority in the House rejected it.

The Wolcott bill which was passed by Congress is full of shortcomings. I mention for the RECORD only the more important defects.

In the first place, this bill provides for the termination of all rent controls on March 31, 1949—1 year from now. It is perfectly clear that the need for rent control will be as great a year from now as at the present. Much of the effectiveness of rent control is lost in handling rent legislation in this piecemeal manner from year to year. Tenants faced with uncertainty for the future become easy prey to all sorts of schemes to evade the rent ceilings.

Fortunately, the conferees representing the House in the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, agreed to modify the unconstitutional provision sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan giving local advisory boards full authority to decontrol rent-control areas and to grant general rent increases.

Under the bill as it was finally passed, the recommendations of the local boards must be supported by adequate and substantial evidence. If the Housing Expediter rejects the recommendations of a local board, the evidence is reviewed by the Emergency Court of Appeals.

The law, however, does not give either the Housing Expediter or the Emergency Court of Appeals adequate time in which to consider the cases that will be presented to them. The weakness of this procedure is the danger that the evidence concerning the recommendations will not be fully developed and that while the evidence adduced in the record may support the local board's recommendations, such recommendations might not be supported if all the evidence available was made part of the record. It therefore becomes important for tenants, tenant organizations, civic-minded organizations, veteran groups, and labor unions to be alert and to take care that all pertinent evidence is presented to the local boards.

Tenants and all groups concerned with maintaining rent controls must insist that these boards be properly representative of both landlords and tenants.

If people will take the pains and do the work necessary to get all the proper evidence in the record, I think the worst feature of the original Wolcott bill will have been avoided.

The bill as it was passed by this body is deficient in several other aspects of major importance.

EVICTION CONTROLS

It does not contain adequate eviction controls. Without real control over evictions a rent-control law just cannot be very effective.

We all agree that the law should permit the eviction of tenants for nonpayment of rent, commission of nuisance, illegal and immoral conduct, for occupany by the landlord and his family or a new purchaser, or for necessary alterations. Where, however, the eviction is not based on the tenant's fault, such as nonpayment of rent, but is based on a circumstance beyond his control, such as eviction or occupancy by the landlord or by the purchaser or for remodeling, and so forth, the tenant should be protected by an adequate stay or waiting period during which he can seek other shelter for his family.

One of the worst features of the 1948 bill is its failure to provide for notification to the area rent offices in eviction cases.

To be adequate the law should have provided that when a landlord seeks to evict a a tenant the landlord is to give written notice to the local rent-control office as well as to the tenant. If the tenant failed to vacate in response to this notice the landlord could proceed to court just as he could prior to rent control and the passage of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948.

The only difference is that under my suggestion the landlord sends a copy of his notice to the rent-control office. The rent-control attorney would then be in a position to screen these notices for illegal attempts to evict. Protection would have thus been afforded to tenants who are for the most part uninformed as to their rights. It also, in many cases, would have saved the landlord time and money where he is proceeding illegally and might eventually have his case thrown out of court. This safeguard would have tended to insure uniform and equitable administration of the eviction provisions of the law. The Eightieth Congress, under Republican leadership, refused to give this protection to millions of renters.

I urged that the new rent-control law provide for a stay or waiting period of 90 days after judgment, where the tenant is evicted for occupancy by the landlord or a member of his family, by a purchaser, or for the purpose of demolishing or altering the premises. Tenants who are to be evicted through no fault of their own should be given a breathing space in which to find another roof. The rent-control bill which passed requires that in above cases landlords must give 60 days' notice.

ENFORCEMENT

The only enforcement provided for the Rent Administrator by the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 is the limited authority to seek injunctive relief to restrain a landlord from violation.

No law can be fully effective unless adequate provision is made to enforce it. If the Congress really desired rent control and intended to enact a law that will be fully respected and obeyed, it should have made provision for the criminal prosecution of willful, flagrant, and habitual violators.

The Rent Administrator should likewise have been adequately equipped with the authority to bring treble damage actions for rent overcharges in those cases in which the tenant fails to bring such an action or otherwise settle his case after a reasonable period. The Housing Expediter testified that the inadequate enforcement sanctions of the 1947 law were ineffective to prevent wide-scale violation of the law.

DECONTROL

The 1948 rent-control bill continues the inequitable and harsh decontrol of the millions of units occupied by families living permanently in residential and apartment hotels, motor courts, trailer camps, and in units created by new constructions, conversion of old units, and accommodations held off the rental market between February 1945 and February 1947.

Millions of tenants, among whom are persons living on life-insurance benefits, annuities, veterans' disability allowances and other sources of fixed income, will continue to be denied the protection of rent control as a result of the 1948 bill.

15 PERCENT RENT INCREASES

The 1948 rent-control bill continues the so-called voluntary lease device.

The bill will permit leases running through December 31, 1949, with 15 percent rent increases to be made through December 31, 1948. I advocated rolling back the increases imposed by the leases made prior to December 31, 1947. I think the continuance of this rent hike device is wicked.

We are forced by Republican majority action to vote for the Wolcott rent bill to obtain a slice of bread for millions of renters, when we should be voting for a real rent-control bill which would give them the loaf of bread they so badly need.

Women in Armed Forces—Regular Versus Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] has charged me with the responsibility of killing S. 1641.

If a bill as important as this is to be considered only on the Consent Calendar, then I unhesitatingly accept that responsibility.

In the first place, I would call the attention of the House to page 48 of the Consent Calendar, for Tuesday, April 6, 1948—today's calendar—wherein it describes S. 1641 as "An act to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve and for other purposes."

The Members of the House will note that the words "Regular Army," and "Regular Navy" are predominant in the description of the bill. This is grossly misleading as this bill in the form it was reported out by the Committee on Armed Services, in no respect establishes the Women's Corps in either the Regular Army or the Regular Navy. Make no mistake about it, it is a temporary 1-year Reserve bill.

The Senate voted to give women Regular status as well as Reserve status in passing S. 1641.

The House Armed Services Committee refused to give Regular status.

The House bill definitely dodges the issue. The issue is simple—either the armed services have a permanent need of women officers and enlisted women or they do not. If they do, then the women must be given a permanent status. The only possible permanent status is that of Regular status—not Reserve status, which at most is temporary. There is no such thing as a service career for a Reservist.

This issue was squarely met by the Senate, which granted the request of the armed services to give women Regular, as well as Reserve, status in the armed services—and rejected the attempts to deny women Regular status.

This legislation does not give women any security in their military service because it discriminates against women, and it will result only in not getting women of desirable caliber for the armed services.

I am convinced that this is extremely unwise legislation. I am further convinced that it is better to have no legislation at all than to have legislation of this type. I am, therefore, unalterably opposed to it and I objected.

I would point out in answer to the charge of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] that I have killed the bill, that there is nothing to prevent the Committee from seeking a rule on the bill so that the House can fully discuss the bill—and so that amendments to the bill may be offered. Therefore the responsibility is clearly that of the House Armed Services Committee—for it is up to the Committee to request a rule—and that means specifically the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

When there is such a radical difference between the Senate version and the House version, it is extremely surprising that an attempt would be made to get this legislation railroaded through on the Consent Calendar.

I include in my remarks copies of two letters which I wrote to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee on the bill. They clearly state my position.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1948.

Hon. W. G. ANDREWS.
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been told that Subcommittee No. 12, the Policy Subcommittee, has cleared S. 1641, the Women's armed services integration bill, for hearing and action by Subcommittee No. 3, the Organization Subcommittee, only at your urgent personal intervention. May I commend you for your forthright action?

However, I have also been told that the Policy Subcommittee took this action on the strict condition and understanding that the bill be amended to prevent women from being given Regular status in the armed services, and to grant them only Reserve status in the armed services, keeping them on active duty indefinitely. I have also been told that this compromise agreement results from "off-the-record executive session" statements of duly authorized officer representatives of the Navy Department.

Such a compromise would definitely dodge the issue. The issue is simple—either the armed services have a permanent need of women officers and enlisted women or they don't. If they do, then the women must be given a permanent status. The only possible permanent status is that of Regular status—not Reserve status, which at most is temporary. There is no such thing as a service career for a Reservist.

This issue was squarely met by the Senate, which granted the request of the armed services to give women Regular as well as Reserve status in the armed services and rejected the attempts to deny women Regular status.

I hope the House Armed Services Committee will match the forthright manner of the Senate and give a direct "Yes" or "No" answer and not a dodging "maybe," as has been reported to have been agreed upon by the policy subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1948.

Hon. W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since I will be unable to be present at the meeting of the committee on March 23, 1948, when the WAC-WAVE legislation will be voted on, I wish to inform you that in the event that proxy votes are permitted to be cast, I desire that proxy votes be cast for me as follows:

1. For integrating women into the armed services in permanent Regular status and Reserve status;

2. Against integrating women into the armed services only in a Reserve status and on extended active duty indefinitely, and barring them from permanent Regular status; and

3. For restricting the assigned duties and number of women Reservists on active duty to the bare minimum necessary for the administrative housekeeping of a skeleton Women's Reserve organization to be expanded in wartime—and exclusively for this purpose and not for any other duty.

As I wrote you earlier, I am unalterably opposed to the proposal of giving women only Reserve status and keeping them on active duty indefinitely. If they are not to be given Regular status, then their Reserve service should be restricted as in (3) above.

I am asking and authorizing Hon. LEROY JOHNSON to cast my proxy vote as indicated above.

Sincerely,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I also include copy of an editorial taken from the Christian Science Monitor, March 29, 1948:

WHY BAR WOMEN?

Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Representative from Maine, who has been praised frequently by her male colleagues for her wisdom and courage, deserves the plaudits of a wide public for her solitary vote in the House Armed Services Committee to make women permanent members of the military services.

On advice from former Chief of Staff Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Forrestal, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to admit Wacs, Waves, and other women into the armed services on a permanent basis. But the House committee has voted to put them in a reserve, to be called only when needed.

Peacetime military service for American women can be looked upon as a right that would help prove this generation worthy of the men and women who participated in the first women's-rights convention at Seneca Falls, N. Y., just 100 years ago. In the United States such service for women does not involve shouldering arms as in Russia or its satellites, but it can, even in America, be classed as a necessity. For, as was amply proved in the recent war, it prevents the weakening of national defense by assignment of able-bodied men to jobs that women usually perform more efficiently.

WHY BAR WOMEN?

I also include in the RECORD an analysis of this issue.

ANALYSIS OF REGULAR VERSUS RESERVE ISSUE

First. It is an established fact, testified by the Secretary of the Defense Es-

tablishment and chiefs of the armed forces, that the utilization of women in a permanent military establishment, now and in the future, is vital to the most efficient performance of its mission.

Since it is assumed that any future emergency would require total mobilization of women as well as men, it is essential that the National Defense Establishment maintains in each of the services a professional nucleus of women officers and noncommissioned officers ready for immediate expansion in time of emergency. Adequate preparedness requires trained skeleton staffs.

Second. The inclusion of women in the Reserve rather than in the Regular Military Establishment does not guarantee the continued utilization of women by the armed forces. Any or all women might be removed from active duty should appropriations be cut.

Such insecurity in an organization that offers no guarantee of a permanent career would result in only second-rate women volunteering for service. Therefore, it would be impossible to obtain and maintain the necessary skilled nucleus of officers and noncommissioned officers.

Third. A bill to provide for women in the Organized Reserve Corps with no Regular Army counterpart will necessitate setting up a training structure in the Reserve for which there is no precedent in the male Reserve.

Fourth. It has been stated that the bill providing for women in the Reserve will result in benefits for Reserve women on active duty equal to those of male personnel in the Regular Army. This is based on a second assumption that H. R. 2744 will pass the Senate. This statement is not true, even if H. R. 2744 should pass the Senate.

(a) Title II of H. R. 2744 provides for the voluntary retirement, based upon years of service, of officers, warrant officers, and Regular Army enlisted men. This title applies to Reserve officers but is specifically limited to enlisted personnel of the Regular Army, so that enlisted women in a Reserve status would not receive any of its benefits.

(b) The basic purpose of title III of H. R. 2744 is by providing retirement benefits to furnish an incentive that will hold men in the Reserve components for an extended period of time. To be eligible for the retirement benefits of title III, a person must be 60 years of age and must have satisfactorily performed Federal service for a minimum aggregate of 20 years in one or more of the armed services or their Reserve components, including certain stipulated requirements as to minimum periods of active Federal service. One example indicates that an enlisted woman in a Reserve status would not receive the same benefits under this law as she would receive if she were in the Regular Army. A 20-year-old Regular Army enlisted man can be assured that if he serves for 30 years in the Regular Army he will be eligible for full retirement at the completion of his thirtieth year or at age 50. An enlisted woman of the same age enlisting in a Reserve status, if she were permitted to serve 30 years on extended active duty, would have to wait until she reached her sixtieth birthday before she would be eligible to receive any retired pay. She would have to revert to inactive-duty status in the ERC, after completing her 30 years service, or she might remain on active duty, but she would still have to wait 10 years before becoming eligible for any of the benefits accorded in this title.

Fifth. It has been emphasized by the Secretary for National Defense, as well as by the Chiefs of Staff of the three services, that women are essential in certain military jobs. Following the pattern of business and industry, the Military Establishment desires to utilize women in those jobs for which their aptitudes better qualify them than men. Based on the fact that women will always be needed in certain types of jobs in the Military Establishment, a Reserve bill will result in discrimination against women by giving them temporary status rather than the permanent status which proper utilization and mobilization planning require.

Shipment of War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the press of the Nation is almost solidly behind the efforts of this Congress to stop shipment of war materials, and equipment needed in the manufacture of such materials, from the United States to the Soviet Union. In this connection, I present herewith an editorial from the Long Beach Press-Telegram of March 26, 1948:

STOP AID TO RED ARMY

National safety demands an immediate embargo on exports from the United States to Russia, pending further investigation of shipments already completed and others still in process.

Disclosures within the last 2 days hint that this country is repeating, on a vastly larger scale, the tragic mistake it made in supplying Japan with war materials to be used for the destruction of American armed forces and civilians.

The 1947 report of the Long Beach Harbor Department shows that machinery, petroleum products and unclassified items valued at $4,293,755 were shipped to the Soviet Union through the port here. More than half of the total was heavy machinery. It was these facts and others like them that influenced Long Beach Young Republicans to petition Congress for an embargo on all exports to Russia and its satellite nations. Similar petitions and further evidence showing the extent to which the United States has contributed to Russian postwar military strength are developing rapidly.

Chairman Raymond V. Darby of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors yesterday said, in a vigorous protest, that he and Long Beach city officials recently saw in Long Beach Harbor planes and gasoline being loaded for shipment to Russia.

The error in this case is even more flagrant than in the prewar shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan. Whereas Japan was supplied with scrap metal, the United States has permitted Russia within months to buy an undetermined number of new plane engines, in operating condition and suitable for bombers or troop carriers, according to testimony before a House subcommittee. Since VJ-day, witnesses said, the War Assets Administration has disposed of 21,278 combat-type planes for scrap prices. How many of these eventually found their way to Russian-dominated territory—and who profited by the deals—is not known. Congressional investigators should dig up and publish that information.

While the sales were arranged through brokers, the Federal administration cannot escape responsibility for permitting the exports. All shipments of surplus material must be licensed by the Commerce Department, and, in addition, surplus armament must be licensed by the State Department.

Yet in the face of the deepening crisis in international relations, there is no evidence that any Federal agency has ordered a cancellation of licenses or even a thorough survey of the quantity and kinds of exports now awaiting shipment from American harbors.

"Boxes and cases marked for Russia are being loaded every day. They are being loaded this afternoon," testified Clarence Carruthers, president of a New York aeronautical supplies firm, who appeared before the subcommitte on Wednesday.

Meanwhile, Washington dispatches predict that a $10,000,000,000 military preparedness program will be submitted soon to Congress by the administration. To authorize such an outlay against Russian aggression, and at the same time to supply Russia with the weapons for aggression, is a fantastic inconsistency. Since the Truman administration has been slow to act, Congress on its own initiative should order an embargo now.

The Reserve and the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I insert herewith a resolution adopted by the Greater Atlanta Chapter of the Reserve Officers Association at its regular meeting held in Atlanta, Ga., on March 10, 1948:

It has come to the attention of the Greater Atlanta Chapter of the Reserve Officers' Association that the Army and Navy Journal, in the issue of 28 February 1948, editorially advocated the separation of the Reserve and National Guard officers' nondisability retirement provisions in pending legislation (H. R. 2744) from those for the Regular Army and Air Force.

It is difficult to believe that this editorial is speaking for the Army and Air Force officers, for as such it would be a breach of good faith with the Reserve Officers' Association. Spokesmen for the officers of the Army and Air Force pledged their support of this legislation.

This editorial we consider to be unfair and misleading in that it attempts to leave the impression that this pending legislation regarding retirement of Reserve officers is a controversial matter. It is no more controversial, and probably not as much so, as other provisions of the bill. It has the backing of all the Departments of the armed forces.

This provision for partial retirement benefits of Reserves was advocated by General

Eisenhower and other high officials because it furnishes an incentive to officers to hold their commissions and keep themselves available and fit for service when needed.

Such advice and suggestion as was made in this editorial sabotages the confidence that should exist between officers of the Regular Army and Reserves, and is most unworthy on the part of the Army and Navy Journal, which has been the spokesmen of the services since 1863, and an outstanding advocate of national security: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Greater Atlanta Chapter of the Reserve Officers' Association—

1. That the aforesaid editorial be condemned as being an attempt to put a wedge of doubt between Reserve officers and the high executive officers of the Regular Army;

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the editor of the Army and Navy Journal;

3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the editor of the official organ of the Reserves, the Reserve Officer, with the request that the same be published; and

4. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congressman from the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia and to the two Senators from Georgia.

Authorized by the Greater Atlanta Chapter of the Reserve Officers' Association in regular meeting on March 10, 1948 at Atlanta, Ga.

PERCY H. PERKINS, Jr.,
Colonel, Armored Reserve,
President, Greater Atlanta Chapter,
Reserve Officers' Association.

The Oleo Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there are certain members of this House who—never having been on a farm in their lives—believe most naively that the 1948 farmer is a man who goes from one golden harvest to another, inspecting his sources of income from the front seat of a plushy limousine.

His wife—in the minds of these same deluded members—sits beside him, clad, of course, in sables and silk. She toys with her priceless jewels as the farmer collects another bag of money.

Well, the letters coming to my office would quickly destroy these peculiar illusions. Farmers are not reaping vast profits, and especially not from butter.

It is a mistake to bring up this oleo tax controversy and have it confused with the general problem of high prices. If the oleomargarine tax is repealed, there will come a time when the farm families who are dependent on the cream checks for their income will suffer.

The voice of the farmers of America who tend the cows that produce the butter is the voice of the people who get up early in the morning. It is the voice of the people who cannot take any week ends off because dairy cattle must be tended to Saturdays and Sundays and every other day. It is the voice of people who must carry on in spite of weather, prices, and political and economic attacks such as they are facing today. It is the voice of the people who make up rural America, the heart of our great Republic. An attack upon the dairy industry is an attack upon them.

The farmers' wives write most of the letters I receive. Their husbands are much too busy with the business of keeping the farms going to devote time to anything else.

Mrs. Tom McClellan, of Elwood, Nebr., well stated the case for the farmer when she wrote:

The other day I heard a radio announcer state that housewives now had a chance to oppose the tax now imposed on colored margarine. He didn't say anything about dairy farmers' wives who might write in favor of it, but I assume that is our lawful privilege also. Most housewives do not know that the true reason for imposing the tax is to prevent unscrupulous dealers from passing off margarine as butter. They seem to think we just stubbornly want them to have to mess around with another bowl, doing their own coloring for just plain orneriness.

The town or city housewife feels that the butter producer is getting rich from butter prices. What most people with no first-hand experience do not know is the huge amount of expensive feed it takes to produce the butter, and the tied-down job that is the dairymaid's.

If we take all the profit from the butter producer, then you are likely to finish the midwestern family-type farmer and eliminate butter entirely from the grocery, doing both at once.

Segregation in District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

[From the Washington edition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Courier of April 3, 1948]

ERP VERSUS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SEGREGATION

Pressured by Nation-wide war-talk hysteria and the ominous implications in the recent Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, the United States Senate 2 weeks ago stamped its approval on the United States financed European recovery program.

Thus $5,300,000,000 of United States taxpayers' money has been earmarked as first installment for ERP, which in effect is a program designed to stem the spread of communism in Europe by supplying the economic needs of European war-shattered countries.

About the same time the Senate took this historic action, here in the District our Superintendent of Schools, Hobart M. Corning, was pleading for an immediate expenditure of $50,000,000 to maintain our undemocratic, outmoded Jim Crow school system.

A $50,000,000 emergency school program, financed by a Federal loan, is the only possible solution to the ever-growing problem of overcrowding in the District's Negro schools, Corning declared.

Taken together it is difficult to reconcile these two financial projects. On the one hand this country is virtually frightened into dumping billions into Europe to combat communism; on the other here is the spokesman for a reactionary element striving mightily to perpetuate a system in which communism should certain hit our most vulnerable point for infiltration.

It is heartening to know, however, that national leaders are now acknowledging an awareness of inconsistency of this country's preachments and programs abroad, and treatment of minority group problems at home.

During Senate debate on ERP, Senator BALL, Republican, Minnesota, warned against the hypocrisy of trying to cover United States shortcomings at home by lavish expenditures of money abroad.

"We are not fooling anyone but ourselves," he told the Senate. "Europeans now know what goes on in America. We cannot buy democracy. We should first get our own house in order."

Even more pointed and direct was Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, New York City. Addressing the House on the measure he said in part: "We can prove to the people of the world that American democracy is a vital, dynamic way of life by making it work.

"By making sure that slum kids get the same chance to have a decent education as bankers' children; that no one is discriminated against because of his race, color, or creed."

Further along in his speech Representative KLEIN said: "It comes with ill grace for us to complain of European children being indoctrinated with political propaganda while we waste millions in this country maintaining an extravagant double system of segregated schools in many States.

"This includes the Nation's Capital, where the Superintendent of Schools has said it will take a $50,000,000 expenditure just to keep up the un-American system of separate schools for blacks and whites."

Viewed against the backdrop of fast-moving international events, world tensions, national uncertainties and unrest and universal strivings for peace and brotherhood, Corning's representation is pronounced un-Americanism, subtle but vicious.

His and the position of those he represents constitute a deliberate lie, or refusal to recognize the demands of the times.

They know full well, as does every District citizen, that Washington has more than enough schools. It is simply that those for whites are half empty; those for Negroes are criminally antiquated and pitifully overcrowded.

It is within the power of the school officials to recommend immediate ending of the dual system. Citizens were reminded of this recently by the district court when it denied validity of suit brought by the Browne Junior High School PTA attacking the overcrowded condition.

Thus it is revealed that our progress, and the progress of this Nation, is held in check by short-sighted, petty city officials without vision who stubbornly resist and ignore the changing demands of the times. Until they are replaced with enlightened, courageous leaders with vision our hopes are dim.

Just so long, too, will our Nation continue to be embarrassed before the world in its efforts to sell American democracy abroad.

Let's Fight for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. F. D. Simpson, from the Atlantic (Iowa) News-Telegraph:

LET'S FIGHT FOR PEACE

We wonder if getting ready for war does not father war. Every move made by the United States in the direction of war has resulted in a counter move by the Russians, so that each act of preparation brings war that much closer, until it seems that the threatening nations, after reaching a certain point in their preparations, automatically fall into bloody conflict.

Surely there is some way to avoid war. How can this Nation ask the same young men who just returned from one war, to turn around and carry through another? Not until every resource is exhausted should this country be forced into war. Congress must find a way out. It is up to Congress, because the rest of the administration has taken on such a military tinge and has such a fatalistic attitude, that every move it makes brings the world closer to war.

We do not mean that the United States should become so pacific that it permits international gangsters to run roughshod over the world, but we do mean that in strengthening our Nation we need not be so threatening that possible enemies construe every move as a thrust at them. The United States can build herself without threatening Russia. She can make herself less and less vulnerable without convincing the Russians that she is preparing to attack them. She can see to it that free peoples remain free without furnishing the Reds with grounds for starting to war.

It should be understood, too, that no war will eliminate the Communist movement. A war might eliminate Russian direction of Communist thought, but communism would continue. The only way it will ever be overthrown will be through a demonstration of democracy's superiority over communism—not by might of arms, but as a way of life.

Finally, if this Nation, when it thinks of war, will think of it in terms of death to its own sons, there will be less talk of war and more effort expended in seeking grounds for peace. There is yet time to retain peace. Negotiations with Russia should be undertaken immediately. Maybe a bargain can be struck with the Reds. Perhaps some changes in present governments in Europe could be instituted for the purpose of making democracy more palatable and for keeping the people from turning to communism. All things in Europe must not be lovely, else the people would not be wildly searching for something new. In any case, before this country is plunged into a war that no one wants and that no country is prepared for or can afford, every effort must be made to straighten out the mess into which Europe has fallen. Only when everything else has failed, should the nations try war.

The Marshall Plan and a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a letter received from a constituent who has voiced in no uncertain terms his sentiment regarding the Marshall plan. I have deliberately withheld his name but it can be furnished upon request for any Member who might be interested.

LAWRENCE SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I do not talk to labor men—I don't talk to big-name manufacturers—I do get around a lot and eat out 21 times a week.

I talk to taxpayers at lunch counters, etc. None of them favor the Marshall plan. Nobody has any confidence in this squandering. Nobody thinks the United Nations will settle anything. It is too soon to pin any hope to the actions of this Assembly.

I just wrote a letter for you but it is too long. I will sum it all up by saying simply that the Russians were at war with the United States before the last war was half over. All this time Roosevelt was handing over valuable concessions to the enemy—Russia. We are still doing much the same thing. Russia will take all she can without firing a shot and then use startling force with her 4,000,000 men now under arms to swallow up all Europe and mid-Asia and even move into Manchuria before you men in Washington can rub your eyes.

People everywhere ask: Why do we not have a unified front in Washington and a plan of action. Why are they debating now?

Why don't we have a strong man who will speak out now to Russia and say, "Stop." Drop an atom bomb within 24 hours if they don't get back within their own borders. We need not go to war now but we must act now. Take this matter out of politics. Do not wait till after election. The Russians have a plan. They are using it. Their timetable shows they will take all they can before election.

It appears to me that we should shelve the United Nations till we have united many nations under a plan of our own. We must use Russian style of tactics to win. We must take over military and police control but let the various governments alone and intact. We must then purge all Communists by secret police methods and all countries desiring our aid must agree to this. Also, it is clear that no subversive elements be allowed to vote, to say nothing of not allowing them a place on the ballot. We must get tough—and quickly—if we are to win without firing a shot. Otherwise if the Russians take over an inch more we will be embroiled in a shooting war and with manpower five to one against us we do not know if we will surely win. So, stop talking and start immediate action. Brush the brass hats out of the way. Our confused, disorganized national defense is amazing. How are we going to muddle through? While top planners are debating a spark may be set off and we are not ready. Send this letter to President Truman if you think best and let us get on with a unified plan of action.

Yours truly.

Potato Growers in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the authority given me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a speech, I am very glad to have printed a speech made by the Honorable S. R. Smith, Director of the Fruit and Vegetable Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, of the United States Department of Agriculture at the fourth annual meeting of the Kern County Potato Growers Association at Bakersfield, Calif., on March 16, 1948.

Mr. Smith tells the potato growers in California some wholesome truths which I hope they will take to heart, because if the potato growers in that great State persist in the way they are going in devoting increased acreage to potatoes it will merely destroy any effectiveness that the support price program as operated under the Steagall amendment by the Agriculture Department may have.

The policy of the New Jersey potato growers is quite a contrast to the attitude of these farmers in California. In about 1925 there were 95,000 acres under potato cultivation in New Jersey, but this acreage has been reduced considerably in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture so that in 1947 about 54,000 acres were under production.

The New Jersey potato grower has really done an extraordinary job in cooperation with the Government because he recognizes that by such cooperation his best interests are served. It is my earnest hope that potato growers in all parts of the country will cooperate in the Government program and not jeopardize the interests of the industry by flooding the market with potatoes.

Mr. Smith's excellent speech follows:

THE 1948 POTATO PROGRAM

Gentlemen, I'm very happy to be with you today. I enjoyed being here last year and I have looked forward to meeting with you again this year. But it's not solely because I enjoyed my visit a year ago that I have anticipated being with you again. Actually, I've looked forward to talking to you today because I have some things on my chest that I want to get off.

Your efficient secretary and my good friend, Sid Carnine, has taken the liberty of assigning to me the topic "The 1948 Potato Program." So I in turn am going to take the liberty of discussing this topic in my own way. I'm not going to go into this year's program. The support price schedule for the early potatoes which are of primary interest to you has already been announced, together with the more important features of the program. Details of the provisions of the 1948 early potato program will be in the hands of your State production and marketing administration people soon, and they will pass the information along to you.

What I'm going to do, instead of discussing program details, is to indulge myself in some plain talking. What I'm going to do is trade places with you gentlemen. Whenever you have encountered something in a potato program with which you found yourselves in disagreement, you have been blunt, direct, and at times rough in your criticism. Well, today, I'm going to speak with equal frankness. I don't expect that what I'm going to say will make you happy, but I'm sure you will recognize that each of us ought to understand clearly the other's position.

I'll quote you a couple of figures, to start out. Your potato goal in southern California this year is 52,000 acres. Your planting intentions indicate an acreage for harvest of 75,000 acres. On an acreage basis, that's about 57 percent compliance. On a grower basis, it's about 70 percent compliance. And looking at it broadly and detachedly, it's a very poor compliance record.

This certainly looks like outright disregard, by one segment of an industry, of provisions of a national program designed for

its own protection. You may feel that this is your business. And, to an extent, you are right. You very well may come out in good shape on this year's operation. You may have a locally profitable short run. But you might better take the long view of your operations and see how you will come out in the long haul. And you would do well to keep constantly in mind that what you do in Kern County, Calif., has its bearing on the over-all potato picture. It may also have a great deal to do with what machinery the potato industry will have to work with in a post-Steagall period.

I trust that I am not alone here in realizing that, failing continuing or similar legislation by the Congress, there will be no Steagall amendment mandatory price support for potatoes, including Kern County potatoes, next year.

In connection with this, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson on February 26 of this year again addressed a letter to the House and Senate Agricultural Committees on the subject of price support. Covering the question generally, the Secretary emphasized the problems of potatoes.

In his letter, Secretary Anderson pointed out that farmers were deserving of the farseeing legislation which afforded them basic price protection for a postwar period of readjustment to peacetime production schedules. But, he emphasized, farmers do not wish, any more than does the rest of the country, to continue operating under a frozen pattern of inflexible price supports which can under certain conditions result in a waste of production effort, waste of money, and waste of soil.

Secretary Anderson recapitulated in his letter some of the more troublesome problems encountered in recent years under potato price-support operations. Outstanding of these was the burdensome 100,000,000-bushel surplus of the 1946 crop. Despite vigorous and aggressive action by the Department to handle this surplus, more than 25,000,000 bushels were lost entirely. And net cost of the price-support program for the 1946 crop approximated $89,000,000.

Direct steps were taken by the Department to minimize price-support costs and waste for the 1947 crop. Supports were limited to those farmers who remained within potato-acreage goals and better quality potatoes were channeled into the commercial market, with necessary diversion concentrated on lower grades. These efforts were partly successful. The Department has not been compelled to remove from commercial markets as much of the 1947 crop as it did of the 1946 crop, and only about a half million bushels were lost. But the best current estimate is that when the marketing year ends, the 1947 price-support operations will have cost about $45,000,000.

The fact that the current program may cost that much—$45,000,000—even in a year when production was only a few million bushels above the goal, and when all practicable steps were taken to minimize costs and waste, spotlights the potato problem. It is something to which you gentlemen gathered here today should give a good deal of thought. And while you are thinking, you might give consideration also to the fact that the Congress has not as yet indicated its willingness to continue Steagall price support after December 31.

This December 31 cut-off date affects you here in California—that its, it affects you in your late crop counties this year. Moreover, what you people do here in California this year on early potatoes does affect what may happen to the entire potato industry for many years to come. It would be well for you to gear your thinking to a period of several years, and not to a single year's operations.

You know, when you get to looking it over, you are relatively new in the potato business. From 1925 to 1930 you averaged only about 2,000 acres of potatoes. You've come a long way since then—a mightly long way. Kern County now accounts for about 80 percent of the total southern California potato acreage. But, despite the size of your operations, now, you're still pretty much late-comers in the potato business.

It wasn't until 1939 that California turned out a 10,000,000 bushel crop. That year California's acreage was 33,000 and you produced 10,890,000 bushels. The California farm price for those potatoes was about 51 cents a bushel. There was no Department of Agriculture price support for that crop, and 1,041,000 bushels went unharvested because of market conditions. The Government did not buy them.

Acreage jumped to 39,000 in 1941, but dropped back to 35,000 in 1942. Then it leaped to 49,000 in 1943, with production of nearly 16,500,000 bushels. In 1944 acreage increased to 64,000 and production to 22,750,000 bushels. Potatoes were looking like a crop, tailor-made for southern California. Yield per acre was increasing—to over 350 bushels.

In 1945 acreage was stepped up to 73,000; total production went to 23,360,000 bushels. In 1946 acreage soared to 81,000. Production, with a yield per acre of 410 bushels, was 33,210,000 bushels. And the Government, as you gentlemen well remember, bought plenty of your potatoes.

Then last year, in 1947, you pulled back a little. Your acreage came down to 62,000 and your production dropped down to 26,040,000 bushels. I think you were a little wary of the acreage goal provision of the potato price-support program.

Now this year, 1948, your recommended goal for southern California is 52,000 acres. You have indicated that your actual acreage will be closer to 75,000 acres.

That, of course, is up to you. It's your gamble. You probably think you're going to hit the jackpot. Maybe you're right—and maybe you're wrong. I'm sure I don't know how your gamble will turn out. But, if the gamble you are taking on the disposal of your crop, in view of the western late crop situation, proves wrong I don't see where you'll have much of a reasonable basis to ask the Department of Agriculture to bail you out. If you guess wrong, it will be your problem.

I hope you will bear this statement in mind. If you choose to disregard the goal provisions of the national potato program—and your planting intentions have indicated that you may have overplanted your goal by many thousands of acres this year—then I hope you have made plans for handling the production that acreage will bring forth.

Conditions in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, ever since the announcement of the Morgenthau plan I have been concerned, as have others of my colleagues and many of our fellow citizens, over the conditions in Germany.

Judge Joseph J. Moriarty of the eighth judicial district of Minnesota has recently made an extended visit to Germany. The following is a newspaper account of the speech made by him on March 23 at New Ulm, Minn., and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I also include a resolution which was unanimously adopted by an audience of over a thousand persons at New Ulm, Minn., and a resolution of the village of Winsted, Minn., concerning the same subject, all of which will be of great interest to those who are concerned in the peace of the world.

The newspaper account and resolutions follow:

[From the New Ulm (Minn.) Review of March 25, 1948]

MORIARTY MESSAGE HAILED BY HUNDREDS AT ARMORY—NEW ULM FIRST TO ADOPT SPEAKERS' RECOVERY PLAN—STARTS BALL ROLLING

A solemn, thoughtful audience packed the armory Tuesday evening to hear Judge Joseph J. Moriarty, Shakopee, tell of conditions in Germany and present his suggestions for a solution of the problems. That same group roared its approval at the close of his address and rose to its feet as unanimous approval was given to three resolutions proposed by Attorney Tom Streissguth. This unanimous decision will mark New Ulm as the first city to express verbally to the President, Secretary of State, Minnesota Representatives and Congressmen, their desire for immediate action in Germany, according to the plan of Judge Moriarty.

John Heymann, C. & C. president, presented Dr. H. E. Schwermann, recently returned visitor to Germany, and Attorney Streissguth, who in turn presented Judge Moriarty.

Dr. Schwermann outlined his experiences in Germany, where he also met Judge Moriarty, and described the want and suffering of the German people. He pointed out that skill of the Germans and the need of being permitted to manufacture and produce. Declaring that the black market flourishes in DP camps, he stressed that there was a difference between displaced persons and refugees. He also declared that exchange of needed products between the border countries and Germany would alleviate the commercial standstill to which the country has been reduced.

MORIARTY'S MISSION

Attorney Streissguth explained that Judge Moriarty has a mission and that is to do something about conditions in Germany. The 64-year-old district judge lost a son Maxinne, a Navy pilot, in World War; another son, Pat, came back, only to return to Germany to organize the first boys' club in the country. In this way the judge learned firsthand about conditions in Germany; he wanted an official mission to go there and bring the information he gleaned to other Americans. He was given that mission by the President of the United States; whenever needed he was given military escort and he was the first man to enter Germany who was given the right of free speech. Every word of his report, submitted to President Truman is true. What he asks and wants is a country-wide program which will approve his plan for giving the people of Germany the same chance to work out their salvation in the world, as we in America.

Judge Moriarty told of the work with German youth and then launched into an account of conditions as he saw them in the war-torn cities of Germany. He told of the dead bodies still buried in the debris and still being sought; of the thousands yet unrecovered in the tunnels of Berlin, which were flooded by Hitler's orders in order to shut off the Russians.

GERMAN PEOPLE NOT TO BLAME

"The German people had nothing to do with the war," declared the speaker. A political organization in control did the same thing that is now happening in Poland, Finland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia under Russia's plans. Said he, "The entire situation there is working out according to Henry

Morgenthau's plans, after leaving the Treasury Department for the State. Why didn't we stop Morgenthau? Why wasn't something done to stop what happened to the German people? Why wasn't something done about Poland, Finland, and the other countries? I'll tell you why. We didn't know about it until after it happened."

Quoting a press correspondent with whom he talked while in Germany Moriarty said, "Morgenthau's hands are dripping with blood; but if we are called upon to fight Russia, more blood will be on his hands. If we are to survive, we must change hate and desire for extermination of people to rebuilding and rehabilitation of people."

What is the matter in Germany? Morgenthau's plan to deindustrialize the country is exactly what Russia wants. Every plant is a military potential. Why don't the German people go to work? "What with?" There is a policy of extermination that goes on all of the time. People are always hungry; they want to work if they have tools or equipment, but all of that is military potential and has been swept into Russia.

Over eight or ten thousand persons are dying from starvation each month. Judge Moriarty pointed out that New Ulm and the towns in the various communities in Minnesota have done an outstanding job in sending packages to the needy and urged that more be sent. It is distributed by the Army and right there is where he asked a question that has been asked repeatedly in America. What happens to the food? There was a crop failure in German last year. The swivel chair experts figured that 60 percent of the normal crop was raised but they made a mistake of 40 percent in their estimate.

There are no trains, they were taken to Russia, except one leading out of important towns. "Who took them off?" "The United States of America," answered Moriarty. The food is taken by the black market and sold at prices that the average person cannot pay. Bacon is $30 a pound on the black market; an egg (after it has been kept in the United States 2 years) costs 15 cents and a suit of clothes costs $700. The racketeers of the world run the black market and this originates right in the DP camps. The racketeers of Europe—the convicts, Communists, the worst of criminals are waiting and biding their time to come to America. We don't want them in Minnesota or the United States. If the German mark is stabilized, the racketeers will own Germany. America cannot afford to see the extermination of the German race, if we do we will lose our liberty.

Russia is at one end of the balance beam; America at the other, the pivot point is where the fate of sixty or eighty thousand people rests. Which way will it go? Stalin knows it—Morgenthau knows it—but we can do something about it.

MORIARTY'S PLAN

Judge Moriarty suggested that the President have a long-range policy against Russia and demand, now, that Russia give back into the German zone the territory which they occupy. He urged that a democratic form of government be set up and that German currency be stabilized. Germany is one of the economic units and this would be a stronghold against communism. He asked that the people of America back up resolutions which would bring this about. If it means county organization this is what we must do.

After visiting the places of suffering and misery, where utter desolation stalks, Judge Moriarty stated that Germany is not Godless. Churches are being rebuilt, when a preference is given to rehabilitate buildings. "They are teaching Christ from the ruins that the Godlessness of Hitler brought upon a blessed land."

A warning came from the stern-faced man, who chose to see Germany the hard way at his own expense, that he might bring back to his own country the message heard at the armory. But there was a warning for America, too. "Be careful that God remains in our midst," he charged. "Maybe, like Germany, too many pink Communists in the State Department, should be moved out; along with them should go the eager beavers below. Let's establish a government by God-fearing people." How can you get along in a democracy without God? We recognize God. The Constitution and the courts were founded upon a recognition of God. America needs help to maintain that consciousness.

In presenting the resolutions which were adopted unanimously in favor of the Moriarty plan. Attorney Streissguth said that he would ask the C and C to appoint a committee to select a collection center in the county where food and clothing for the relief of the German people could be brought and sent out.

Judge Moriarty was feted at a dinner at Turner Hall that evening in honor of his sixty-fourth birthday. Even a birthday cake centered the table where business and professional men gathered to pay tribute to one of Minnesota's outstanding citizens. Attorney Streissguth was host for the event.

[From the New Ulm (Minn.) Daily Journal of March 24, 1948]

MASS MEETING DEMANDS UNITED STATES AID GERMANY TO HALT COMMUNIST MARCH—MORIARTY'S TALK BRINGS ACTION HERE—MUST AID GERMANY OR LOSE OWN LIBERTY, SHAKOPEE JUDGE SAYS

Residents of New Ulm and surrounding towns present at a public mass meeting at the New Ulm armory Tuesday night had taken the lead today in recommending that the United States give increased aid to Germany as a means of stemming the western push of the Communists in Europe.

The action came in approval of three resolutions by approximately 1,000 people after they had heard two recent European visitors—Dr. Henry E. Schwermann of New Ulm and District Judge Joseph J. Moriarty of Shakopee—describe conditions in Germany.

Thomas O. Streissguth, New Ulm attorney, long-time professional associate of Judge Moriarty, and a former justice of the Minnesota Supreme Court, drew up the resolutions approved enthusiastically by the crowd.

The meeting opened at 8 o'clock following a short concert by the New Ulm Municipal Band under the direction of Ray Meidl. John Heymann, president of the New Ulm Civic and Commerce Association, presided at the meeting.

Dr. Schwermann reviewed his trip to Germany, a talk which, in its essentials, was much the same as he has given in several previous appearances.

President Heymann, following Schwermann's talk, called upon Attorney Streissguth to introduce the Shakopee judge.

Moriarty, in a typical, fighting address, made such an impression and aroused such interest that when a voluntary offering was taken at the end of the meeting, $205 was given.

The offering was collected by Frank Niemann, Henry N. Somsen, Jr., Carl Witt, and Nic Retzlaff. Nic made a rush trip to his hardware store to get four children's gaily painted sand pile play pails which resulted in passing the pail instead of passing the plate.

Judge Moriarty arrived in New Ulm early, and his friends here were pleased to learn he was sharing his sixty-fourth birthday celebration with them. An informal dinner was held in honor of the event, and a birthday cake was served.

Mr. Streissguth, in introducing Moriarty, reviewed the fact that Judge Moriarty had lost a son, a Navy pilot, in the last war; and that another son, Sgt. Patrick Moriarty, has become world-famous for his German boys' clubs, in which more than 100,000 boys are now enrolled in Germany.

Space limitations today prohibit a complete report on Judge Moriarty's speech. The following excerpts will give, it is hoped, an intelligent outline of his principle points:

The war was caused by a political organization which got into control of Germany, which tied the people hand and foot. As well ask, why didn't the people of Czechoslovakia, Romania, Poland, and now Finland, stop their leaders from going over to totalitarianism. "Gone from the top," the judge said.

As well ask, he declared, why didn't we, the American people, do something about Roosevelt's commitments at Teheran and Yalta and Truman's pledges at Potsdam.

Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau domineered the United States State Department into a policy of extermination in Germany. Why didn't we stop Morgenthau?

A Chicago news correspondent told Moriarty, "Morgenthau's hands are dripping with the blood of the German people today." And, Moriarty asserted, Morgenthau's hands will be dripping with the blood of American boys if this country has to resort to arms to halt Joe Stalin.

Eighty percent of the black market in Germany is operated from the displaced persons' camps—"criminals waiting to be brought into the bosom of America." Governor Youngdahl would be pleased to have 60 of these families in Scott County. I don't know how many he would be pleased to have in Brown County, but I do know the 60 we'd get wouldn't be in our county 24 hours. We'd run 'em out."

Racketeers of the world have centered themselves in Germany to get in on the black market. "Where the carcass is, there gather the vultures." Many are from the United States; one cleaned up $800,000 since September 1, another $400,000.

The Russians have picked Germany clean of industrial potential. We let them have the bread-basket area of Germany, too. Although it is said the United States has changed its policy of extermination, it has not been stopped. Eight thousand to 10,000 die every month of hunger and starvation.

"America cannot afford to let Germany go down. If we permit that, we will lose our own liberty just as sure as we sit here tonight."

Germany is the pivot point of Europe. Stalin knows that. Is it too late? Can we about-face? Yes. I told President Truman if we had a courageous long-range policy Russia wouldn't move.

The United States should demand Russia return its sector, and a democratic condition formed as a condition of the Marshall plan.

Don't think for one minute Germany is a godless nation. They are teaching Christ from the ruins.

We've got too many pink Communists in the State Department. It's time to reestablish the Government in the hands of God-fearing people.

At a mass meeting attended by over a thousand citizens of Brown, Nicollet, and adjoining counties, held at the armory in the city of New Ulm, Minn., on the 23d day of March 1948, under the auspices of the Civic and Commerce Association of New Ulm, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas uniform official and unofficial reports on present conditions in Europe in general, and Germany in particular, including the reports we have heard tonight from the Honorable Joseph J. Moriarty, judge of the eighth judicial district of the State of Minnesota, and Dr. Henry E. Schwermann of New Ulm, Minn., have made us realize the desperation of the democratic peoples of Europe, and particularly those of Germany, and have clearly shown the pressing need of

a complete reorganization of the governmental structure of Germany as a means of stopping the westward surge of communism: Be it

"*Resolved*—

"1. That the United States spare no effort or funds and waste no precious time in providing adequate food, clothing, and medical supplies for the starving people of Germany, thereby affording them an opportunity to live normal and healthy lives;

"2. That the United States take vigorous steps to immediately wipe out and permanently suppress the gigantic "black market" now in complete control of the food supplies in Germany and one of the major obstacles to its economic recovery; and

"3. That pending the adoption of a peace treaty with Germany, the United States demand that the American, English, French, and Russian zones into which Germany is now divided for administrative and military purposes, be consolidated and organized into one central democratic government, with complete civil and administrative powers short of sovereignty itself; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to General Huebner of the United States occupation forces in Germany, for immediate consideration and action."

WINSTED, MINN., *March 29, 1948.*

At a meeting consisting of nearly 700 people assembled in the village of Winsted, McLeod County, Minn., on the 29th day of March 1948, the following resolution is unanimously adopted:

"Whereas it appears to the satisfaction of the people here and everywhere that the German people of the American zone of Germany are suffering hunger, starvation, and exposure which has amazingly increased the death rate and whereas, it is possible and within the power of the Government of the United States to immediately remedy this deplorable situation.

"Whereas an organized Germany, fully supported by the United States in food, clothing, medicine, and other necessities of life, is vital to the safety and security of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the unanimous consensus of this meeting that something be done at once to relieve the situation and that this resolution be forthwith forwarded to Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, the duly elected and acting Member of Congress from this district, to Hon. JOSEPH BALL and Hon. EDWARD THYE, the duly elected and acting Senators from the State of Minnesota, and we hereby urge them and each of them, as our Representatives in Congress, to forthwith and at once bring this important matter to the attention of the Congress to the end that something be done at once without further delay; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chairman of the meeting forthwith forward this resolution to the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Honorable JOSEPH BALL, and Honorable EDWARD THYE."

The Federal Grant For Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD G. ROHRBOUGH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., April 4, 1948:

TO HUSBAND A VITAL RESOURCE

In its 58-to-22 vote in favor of the Taft aid-to-education bill, the Senate has taken enlightened action in behalf of the Nation's greatest single asset—the potential talent of its young folk.

The measure has been resisted on two main grounds: First, on the ground that it will cost too much; and second, on the ground that it will open the door to Federal control of education. On both counts, however, Senator TAFT and its other advocates have argued persuasively to the contrary.

Their answer to the economy-minded is that the bill constitutes a sound investment in the development of the minds of America's young—a vital natural resource that is in danger of erosion wherever primary and secondary education is deficient. As for the control power, the answer is that the bill specifically vests it in the States, even to the extent of determining whether any of the Federal funds are to be used, directly or indirectly, to support the operations of private or sectarian schools.

What the Senate has voted to do is simply to deal with a situation in which many of our cities and towns are running inadequate schools because they cannot afford anything better. They are located in the less prosperous States—States that are unable, by themselves, to finance the minimum job that needs to be done. They may allot as large a percentage of their income to this field as do the richer ones, but still they lag behind and their children do not have nearly the same educational opportunity as children elsewhere. Thus, for example, Mississippi's schooling outlay is less than $45 per year per child, as against more than $198 in New Jersey.

Wholly apart from the fact that such interstate educational disparities mock the democratic concept of equal opportunities for all, they indicate a condition that must certainly be taking its toll of potential talent. The toll may not be measurable in terms of dollars and cents, but certainly it adds up to the waste of a great human resource, a waste that needs to be checked every bit as much as the erosion of our soil. Accordingly, to cope with the problem, the Senate would have the Federal Government grant to the States a minimum of $5 annually per school child and a maximum of about $25—an aid program that would cost approximately $300,000,000 in its first year.

This would not equalize interstate educational opportunities, but it would improve them substantially where they are deficient. Everything considered, its supporters have made an excellent case for the view that the House will be practicing good husbandry if it follows the Senate's lead in adopting the program.

Henry A. Wallace and the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge, I believe, that the greatest threat to world peace, to our way of life and to western civilization, is the threat of Communist domination and the well-known desire of Russia to make a police state of the world. It is equally realized that Russia has unfortunately succeeded in this effort in many countries in which only from 5 to not over 20 percent of the population are Communist. She bores from within, secures control of the police, destroys respect for the Parliament, which, as you know, is similar to our Congress, replaces the patriotic democratic members with Communist stooges and takes over.

Unfortunately there are prominent citizens of our country who do not call themselves Communists but are greatly contributing toward the success of this infamous effort. Of them, I consider Henry A. Wallace to be the outstanding one. In fact, I think he convinced practically all who heard his testimony before our Foreign Affairs Committee in February that such is the case. Before quoting therefrom, it should be stated that the annual proposed costs of the Marshall plan, or ERP, is approximately $5,300,000,000 which Mr. Wallace pretends to believe, by using very dubious argument indeed, would be $18,000,000,000 instead. I quote from his testimony:

Mr. JARMAN. You spoke of a blueprint for peace. I believe you would be the last to feel that you have a monopoly on your desire for peace. I believe you would agree that others also want peace, even though they approach it from a different route.

Mr. WALLACE. That is right, sir.

Mr. JARMAN. You spoke of the march of people everywhere to a new light free of reaction. You refer to the old deal in Europe. You refer to economic gauleiters.

Now, is this peace that you have in mind the type of peace which now exists in countries such as Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and particularly Bulgaria?

Mr. WALLACE. Peace is a very difficult thing to attain, as we all know. I certainly am against a peace that is obtained by any type of totalitarianism. However, we have to approach the problem from the existing situation and the keystone to peace at the present time fundamentally is an understanding between the United States and Russia.

Mr. JARMAN. That being true, do you really think it is fair—bearing in mind that we always have had national defense in this country, and I hope we always will—we always have had a certain expense for our Army and Navy even in peace—to include the entire military expense in your statement of the expense of the ERP for this year?

Mr. WALLACE. You can add up all the various items and then subtract the amount we spent for the military prior to World War II, and still have more than $18,000,000,000.

Mr. JARMAN. You did do that in your figures?

Mr. WALLACE. I did not go into the full details but you will find if you subtract the amount spent in 1939 you still have over $18,000,000,000.

Mr. JARMAN. I do not know what the budget was in 1939. You do not charge all of that increase—we have had a war in the meantime the peace of which has not been signed and consequently have occupation armies in Europe and Asia, which was not true in 1939—you do not charge all of that increase to ERP, do you?

Mr. WALLACE. No; not the interest on the debt and that sort of thing, no.

Mr. JARMAN. I mean the national defense; the $11,000,000,000 for national defense?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes; I included it all.

Mr. JARMAN. You included that?

Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

Mr. JARMAN. I just do not see how you arrive at that conclusion.

Mr. WALLACE. It just depends on the point of view, sir.

Mr. JARMAN. From my viewpoint I hope you are sounder in some of your other presentations than I think you are in that one.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, why are we spending all this money for the military? I will say this for the military—you are evidently a very good friend of the military.

Mr. JARMAN. I am primarily a friend of this country.

The witness also said in reply to Mrs. BOLTON:

Mr. WALLACE. No; I do not think it possible to say specifically what the approach would be. The method of it seems to me to be quite clear; * * * second; that there must be a meeting by the new President and the head of the Russian Government, Premier Stalin.

I also quote the practically identical reference in the initial advertisement of my opponent in the congressional race now in progress:

I am convinced that personal talks between the President and Premier Stalin should be renewed.

A recent Drew Pearson column said:

It looks as if Henry Wallace's third party is now acting on direct orders from Moscow.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing into the RECORD an article which appeared in the April 4 edition of the Washington Sunday Star, entitled, "To Husband a Vital Resource."

I agree entirely with this editorial and hope that the Congress will heed its advice.

TO HUSBAND A VITAL RESOURCE

In its 58-to-22 vote in favor of the Taft aid-to-education bill, the Senate has taken enlightened action in behalf of the Nation's greatest single asset—the potential talent of its young folk.

The measure has been resisted on two main grounds: First, on the ground that it will cost too much; and second, on the ground that it will open the door to Federal control of education. On both counts, however, Senator TAFT and its other advocates have argued persuasively to the contrary.

Their answer to the economy-minded is that the bill constitutes a sound investment in the development of the minds of America's young—a vital natural resource that is in danger of erosion wherever primary and secondary education is deficient. As for the control power, the answer is that the bill specifically vests it in the States, even to the extent of determining whether any of the Federal funds are to be used, directly or indirectly, to support the operations of private or sectarian schools.

What the Senate has voted to do is simply to deal with a situation in which many of our cities and towns are running inadequate schools because they cannot afford anything better. They are located in the less-prosperous States—States that are unable, by themselves, to finance the minimum job that needs to be done. They may allot as large a percentage of their income to this field as do the richer ones, but still they lag behind and their children do not have nearly the same educational opportunity as children elsewhere. Thus, for example, Mississippi's schooling outlay is less than $45 per year per child, as against more than $198 in New Jersey.

Wholly apart from the fact that such interstate educational disparities mock the democratic concept of equal opportunities for all, they indicate a condition that must certainly be taking its toll of potential talent. The toll may not be measurable in terms of dollars and cents, but certainly it adds up to the waste of a great human resource, a waste that needs to be checked every bit as much as the erosion of our soil. Accordingly, to cope with the problem, the Senate would have the Federal Government grant to the States a minimum of $5 annually per school child and a maximum of about $25—an aid program that would cost approximately $300,000,000 in its first year.

This would not equalize interstate educational opportunities, but it would improve them substantially where they are deficient. Everything considered, its supporters have made an excellent case for the view that the House will be practicing good husbandry if it follows the Senate's lead in adopting the program.

Local Government in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been saying that local government is dying at the roots. The reason is that both State and county governments have failed to provide adequate salaries for people who would like to give their time to public service. It is costing the government closest to the people much of its previous strength and influence. This is a tendency away from the kind of government we want because it tends to centralize both administration and power in Washington. In addition, it encourages mediocrity in all branches of what local government is left.

A fair example of this is the recent retirement of State Senator Oliver Carter in my district from the California State Legislature. State Senator Carter is one of the ablest and most promising young men in California government. But he has had to get out because financially he simply could not stand the pressure. It is unfortunate that State government in California is losing the services of an especially able man. It is also significant of a trend throughout the United States which has real implications affecting the fundamental philosophy of American government. An editorial in the Redding Record of March 8, 1948, in regard to Senator Carter pretty clearly defines the situation and I offer it at this point in the RECORD:

WHY WE LOSE SENATOR CARTER

Shasta and Trinity Counties have had the good fortune to have an outstanding man as their State senator since 1941. It has been California's good fortune, too, and State Senator Oliver J. Carter is recognized throughout the State as one of the ablest and fairest men in the legislature. He has a talent for legislative work. By any standard, he is one of the top two or three men in the lawmaking branch of the State government.

Some capitol newspapermen, who are shrewd judges of men, rate him No. 1, and so do such big and liberal men as Senator Chris Jespersen of Atascadero. He has the confidence and respect of such men as Senator George Hatfield, whom he has opposed on many major issues, and in turn has great respect for Hatfield. (Carter thinks Hatfield has more legislative savvy than any other man in Sacramento.)

Carter is a Democrat and Governor Warren is a Republican, but the Governor, too, admires the senator from the second district. It was Carter, rather than a man from the Governor's own party, who succeeded in getting a highway construction measure passed, after it appeared to have been killed by lobbying presure. Carter's skill at parliamentary procedure and his ability to organize other men resulted in the program of aid for county road systems, and allocation of highway money to rural counties.

In our opinion Carter is a brilliant man, morally and intellectually honest, and warm of heart—a liberal in the best sense of the word. He will be hard to replace.

Yet, though he thoroughly enjoys lawmaking, he has had to give up the position at a time when his reelection could almost be taken for granted. The problem is financial. We pay our senators only $1,200 a year. That means any man who has real ability has to make a big personal sacrifice if he takes the job. The legislature now holds a session every year, and usually special sessions besides. In between sessions there are committee meetings and investigations, taking the senators and assemblymen away from their homes and businesses. That just doesn't let a man make an adequate income.

There is our dilemma. We expect ability and honesty from our elected representatives. But we don't pay them enough so they can make a full-time career of government, and we keep them so busy that they can't keep a private business going. There are ways a legislator can get by, of course. He can keep his connection with a law firm, and even appear before State agencies as attorney for persons asking favors. But that involves using his public position for private gain; it is morally questionable, and something Carter has refused to do. Another thing, of course, is to take outright bribes or donations of campaign funds from sources that will ask favors in return. That, too, is something Carter won't do, and that voters don't want their representatives doing.

It's too late, of course, to do anything to keep Carter in the senate. His friends have feared he would retire, and have urged him to remain, but he can't take the financial sacrifice any longer. But we can, if we want good government, back a movement to pay our legislators enough so that the positions will be attractive to able men, and enough so that an honest man can afford to stay in government.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial from the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, March 31, 1948:

MR. LOVE PROTESTS

A timely warning was given by Representative FRANCIS J. LOVE, Republican, First, West Virginia, in an address he made this week to the United States House of Representatives. He was discussing the so-called Marshall plan, or ERP, and its effects on the food budget and food costs of the United States people.

"Under the pending bill," said Mr. LOVE, "some $3,186,000,000 (over $3,000,000,000) is to be spent for food again. It is my contention that this amount estimated for food is entirely too high. The cost of living for office workers, school teachers, wage earners, and all our people in the United States should be considered before we continue to ship excessive exports of food to Europe for the next 15 months. * * * Most certainly the excessive food program should be drastically curtailed. The continuation of such a large food program also is bound to keep grocery prices high."

When our Congressman takes this stand we believe he is ably reflecting the views of the vast majority of his constituents here, and elsewhere, too. It is not a question of our willingness to aid Europe. It is also a question of our ability to aid Europe. If we cannot do so without imposing unnecessarily grave hardships on our own people, then the plan had better be sharply reduced, if not abandoned altogether. People in Europe who know they must work to eat will work much harder under the impulse of sheer necessity.

A New Administration Is Our Hope for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the Hennepin County Review, of Hopkins, Minn., on April 1 pointed out editorially that if the people of this Nation retain their balance until a new President is inaugurated—he said a new President—"then there is the hope a new administration may be able to resume the diplomatic chess game against Pal Joey with a better chance of scoring one for the side of peace." In my opinion, this is clear, long-headed thinking and an accurate appraisal of the situation. It is clear that our only hope to make a long-range improvement in our foreign situation is to make a long-range improvement in the person who runs our foreign affairs—the President. I include the editorial in its entirety:

THE WAR MAKERS

The war hysteria is increasing every day, with probably a majority of the country of the opinion now that a war with Russia is inevitable.

If the headline writers, some of the help in the State Department, a few members of the Cabinet, a handful of the top industrialists, and a portion of the high brass have their way, we'll be hard at it again before long making the world safe for democracy once more.

On the other hand, there are some sober minds who have not yet been taken off balance, who can see no possibility of our going to war again at least within the next few years. Russia is frightening, the events in Europe and Asia are sufficient to scare the wits out of all thinking persons. The Soviet leaders are hoodlums in their national morals and gangsters on the international stage. Russia has been impossible to get along with in the framing of the peace. She has taken the position that she had better grab what she wants and needs while the grabbing is easy, and to hell with what anyone thinks, including her old ally, the United States of America.

So far as Uncle Sammy is concerned, his hands are a little dirty, too. He has talked big since VJ-day. He has changed his mind a dozen times. He has sounded off there and back-tracked here. Most of his contribution to any settlement of the confusion resulting from a world still at war 3 years after the end of the shooting has been, sad to say, largely wind. He has been saddled with the most incompetent leadership to grace the scene at Washington since the time of Ulysses S. Grant. To make a sad matter sadder, that leadership has been led around by its nose by a combination of Wall Streeters and militarists. The press of the Nation has added to his (Sammy's) burden by whipping up a phobia on the subject of communism. When the leaders get in the way of their own stupidities and duplicities periodically, they come forth with the communism, communism, communism, and more comumnism chant.

Whereupon the newspapers, breaking out the big type, pick up the noisy refrain for them until between them they have half the people believing that we have been lily white; that only the Communists have contributed to the world's sorry mess.

Russia has been a devil to get along with and the United States of America has been cast in the role of a simpleton doing business with a sharp and calculating devil.

So, we find ourselves in a fine international stew.

For 10 months, until a new President is inaugurated, we will continue to stew. If we the people retain some degree of sanity in these 10 months the stew is not likely to boil over, barring some untoward incident by some hot-headed little fellow leaning on either side of the international fence. Joe Stalin isn't quite simple enough yet to set off a war deliberately against the one power in the world still able to give him a real fight.

If we can remain at peace that long, then there is the hope a new administration may be able to resume the diplomatic chess game against Pal Joey with a better chance of scoring one for the side of peace. In the meanwhile, the best any sane citizen of the United States of America can do is, take it easy. Let the gentlemen mentioned in the second paragraph of this piece continue rocking the boat if they must. Let the rest of us keep calm and remain optimistic.

There is no use in all of us going all out for another war and the end of everything.

Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Southwest American, published at Fort Smith, Ark., in its February 23, 1948, issue. The editorial is by Mr. Clarence F. Byrns:

The other day I got a close-up look at the operations of the Federal agency created to help farm people who can't get help anywhere else to buy and operate their own farm homes.

The State advisory committee of the Farmers Home Administration met in Little Rock. I am a member. We got a bird's-eye view of the whole operation in this State and had a wholesome discussion of the philosophy on which it operates. I doubt if people generally understand very clearly what it is and what it does.

The Farmers Home Administration is a new name for an old agency, the Farm Security Administration. Congress abolished the FSA and created the FHA, eliminating from the agency its collective farming activity, which got a bad name for FSA with many people. FHA carries on the program of help for the individual farmer who cannot get adequate credit anywhere else to buy a farm of his own, or to carry on his farm operations.

On the advisory board are representatives of every government agency in the State which has anything to do with farm operations. There are men from the College of Agriculture, the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, all State and Federal agencies. But the majority of the members are farmers, several of them members of county committees which deal directly with the farmers who use FHA credit.

Probably the most significant thing we did was to express our view that the Farmers Home Administration should continue to devote its efforts to the little fellow and stay out of financing larger-size enterprises. The question was whether we should recommend that the limit of FHA loans to buy farms should be kept at the present $12,000 ceiling, regardless of the average value of an economic farm unit in a given county, or whether the limit should be raised to permit financing of larger operations. We were unanimous in the view that FHA was created for the little fellow and should be within that sphere.

There are plenty of little fellows who need and use its help—and many of them are now well on the way to financial independence and marked success. The bigger operations and the specialized farming enterprises, such as citrus fruits in the irrigated areas, we felt are outside its province.

In Arkansas there have been 4,500 loans made since 1937 by FSA and FHA to help people with farm backgrounds buy their own homes. The loans are payable over a 40-year period, with interest which was 3 percent and is now 3½ percent. So far, 1,100 of these loans have been paid back in full—obviously long before they were fully due. Loans now outstanding total about $10,000,000. In 1946, payments were almost two and a half times the amount due that year. People were paying up in advance while they had the money. For 1947, payments have been almost twice the amount due. About 5,500 applications are pending now for such loans. Trouble is there isn't enough money to go around. Congress cut down the amount available—part of the economy drive, although these funds are for loans, not grants, and the loans are repaid. Applications are coming in now at the rate of about 200 a month, of which 150 are veterans.

The basis of these loans is interesting. No loan is made for more than the appraised value of the land, and the appraisal is based on its earning power, on prewar prices, not the present inflated level. It has to be a good long-time risk to get approval, which is one reason for the good repayment records.

FHA does not compete with ordinary sources of financing, because it cannot step

in unless the borrower is unable to get credit elsewhere. And then it steps in on an ultra-conservative basis.

It seems to me this agency is doing a good job with little public recognition.

The Intracoastal Canal of Louisiana and Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. M. COMBS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, the intracoastal canal of Louisiana and Texas, which now extends from New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex., and will shortly be extended to Brownsville, is one of the great waterways of our Nation, both as to the importance of the region it serves and the large volume of traffic upon it. It is also of vast importance to many regions and cities far removed from Texas and Louisiana because of its connection with our great inland waterways system. In order that this increasingly important waterway may be better known, I desire to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Mr. John W. Fulbright, of Beaumont, Tex., president of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, at the American Merchant Marine Conference in New York on October 15, 16, and 17, 1947:

THE INTRACOASTAL CANAL OF LOUISIANA AND TEXAS

(By John W. Fulbright, president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas)

Your program committee has indicated that I should confine my remarks to inland waterways, which is altogether fitting and proper before this panel, and inasmuch as the subject of the intracoastal canal of Louisiana and Texas is of prime interest to me, I shall attempt to discuss that important waterway.

The growth and development of the intracoastal canal has been very ably presented to this group heretofore by the late Roy Miller, of Corpus Christi, Tex., one of the most enthusiastic and able proponents of inland waterways the Nation has known, and the remarkable value of the canal as a wartime artery of commerce has been discussed by Munger T. Ball, of the Sabine Transportation Co., of Port Arthur, Tex., both of whom cited the tremendous tonnage moving on the bosom of the canal which has far exceeded the fondest hopes of its proponents and sponsors and the estimates of the Corps of Engineers in their original and subsequent surveys.

May I here make this observation that a nation is wealthy first in natural resources, second in industry, thrift, and ingenuity of its citizens, and third in its facilities for the transportation of its resources from the source of production to areas of consumption. Therefore, any contribution toward improved and economical transportation facilities is a direct contribution to the wealth of the Nation and the prosperity of its people. Following this line of thought we have abundant reason to consider the intracoastal canal a generous contribution to the wealth of the Nation.

Since the canal, now operating between New Orleans, La., and Corpus Christi, Tex., and further authorized to Brownsville, Tex., is firmly established and the tonnage is increasing by leaps and bounds, I would like to offer you the fundamental basis for this phenomenal success by calling attention to industries which have physical connection with this waterway, which enjoy the benefits of the economical water transportation which it offers and which industries provide the major portion of the tonnage originating on the canal banks and are responsible for a great percentage of the in-bound tonnage. This is indeed a broad field and my limited time precludes a full discussion of the subject, in view of which my remarks will only highlight the proposition and will, therefore, of necessity omit many minor items.

Statistical figures, although perhaps valuable in a report for reading, frequently have an adverse effect when used by a speaker; therefore, I shall not burden you with this phase. However, I would like to remind you that the Texas section of the intracoastal canal during the year 1945, the latest figures I have from the Corps of Engineers, carried a total of nearly 16,000,000 tons of commerce, and I would like for you to bear this one figure in mind.

A study of statistics reveals that a huge percentage of this tonnage carried was and is petroleum and petroleum products, which is, perhaps, the most vital item in the Nation's economic structure, followed closely by products of the soil, which is the No. 2 item of tonnage. The area bordering the intracoastal canal and its tributary channels is bountifully rich in these and other natural resources and since the canal connects with the great mid-continent network of waterways, it follows that practically the entire Nation is privileged to enjoy the economy of water transportation and water-compelled rail rates that result from this facility.

As previously stated, the present western terminus of the intracoastal canal is Corpus Christi, Tex., 562 canal-miles west of New Orleans, La. Corpus Christi, a thriving city of 112,000 people, is also a deep-water port and is filled with live, wide-awake, enterprising citizens who overlook no opportunities to improve their city in a commercial way. Corpus Christi has six oil refineries with a combined daily capacity of approximately 125,000 barrels of crude oil. A good portion of the crude run is received by canal barges and a like percentage of their refined products are in turn so transported. Among the other leading industries are a zinc refinery, alkali plant, food-processing plants, cotton gins and compresses, oil mills, seafood canneries, fertilizer and chemical plants. Soil products for the area are grain sorghums, cotton, corn, flax, and great quantities of vegetables, all of which contribute to the tonnage of the intracoastal canal.

Freeport, east of Corpus Christi, with intracoastal canal connection, produces a major portion of the Nation's sulfur, and at this point a great chemical plant, erected at a cost of many millions of dollars, for the extraction of magnesium and other chemicals from sea water, is in operation.

Proceeding eastward from Freeport, we reach the city of Galveston, one of the largest customs districts of the Nation, a great cotton market and cotton-concentration center. Galveston's industries consist of grain elevators, flour mills, shipyards and drydocks, breweries, acres of cotton warehouses with compresses and allied industries, while the fish and oyster business provides employment for an army of workers.

Near Galveston is the port of Texas City, and in spite of the recent holocaust which practically destroyed its active water front, the port is rapidly resuming its former status as a shipping center and is a hive of activity with its oil refineries and the world's largest tin smelting and processing plant. And a giant chemical plant which was entirely destroyed is in process of rebuilding.

In this metropolitan area is the port of Houston—Texas' largest city—where is found huge oil refineries, chemical plants, lumber mills, cotton compresses, and cotton-oil mills, meat-packing plants with acres of stockyards, shipyards for original construction and repair, drydocks, iron and steel fabrication shops, rice mills, grain elevators, paper mills, furniture factories, synthetic rubber plants, cement mills and many other industries too numerous to mention. The Houston-Texas City area has twelve petroleum refineries with a total daily capacity of approximately 600,000 barrels, much of which crude is received by barges through the Intracoastal Canal, and a great portion of the products resulting therefrom are reshipped via the same facility.

Leaving the Houston-Texas City-Galveston area, the intracoastal canal connects next, to the eastward, with the great industrial and oil refining area of Jefferson County, Tex., and the industrial cities of Beaumont and Port Arthur, known as the District of the Sabine. More crude petroleum is refined in this county than in any other county in the world, the total crude consumption by the six major refineries in the district running well over 650,000 barrels per day. While a large proportion of this crude is received by trunk pipe lines converging here from the many fields of the mid-continent producing areas, much of the crude is received by way of barges which traverse the intracoastal canal, and again many barges and the intracoastal canal are used for moving refinery products to distribution points as far removed as New Orleans, Memphis, Cairo, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh on the Ohio; St. Louis, St. Paul, and Minneapolis on the Mississippi; and Kansas City and Omaha on the Missouri.

In addition to the oil refineries of this section, this is the heart of a great rice producing area, Jefferson County alone irrigating some 65,000 acres of this important food commodity which is harvested with combines, dried in huge rice driers and milled, polished, and prepared for human consumption in the several mills at Beaumont. In the area are lumber mills, iron and steel foundries, brass foundries, shipyards and dry docks, both for construction and repair, mammoth boiler shops for servicing the many industrial plants, a large butadiene plant for the extraction of this important rubber ingredient from petroleum derivatives, and two huge synthetic rubber plants to utilize the product. All of these industries and many minor plants and shops provide tonnage for the intracoastal canal.

At Orange, Tex., we find more shipyards for both construction and repair, paper mills for the production of kraft paper from southern pine and a $50,000,000 nylon salt plant.

At Lake Charles, La., 30 miles to the eastward, are located more oil refineries and crude terminals and the huge plant of the Matheison Alkali Co. Lake Charles is the agricultural center of a rice and cotton growing section boasting the largest rice mill in the world, and abundant plants for processing cotton products such as oil, cake, and meal, and the accompanying compresses for high-density cotton bales.

May I here point out that Dow chemical plant at Freeport, the Monsanto chemical plant at Texas City, the DuPont Nylon salt plant at Orange, and the Matheison alkali plant at Lake Charles, to name some of the larger plants, each costing many millions of dollars, are pioneer industries which are now utilizing a portion of the natural mineral and chemical resources so abundant in this area. Because of the availability of these resources many industrial leaders who have their

fingers on the pulse freely predict that this section is soon to become the chemical manufacturing center of the Nation.

Here I would like also to say a word about the production of rice, the principal cereal in the diet of one-half the world's population. Our Nation annually produces about 18,000,000 bushels of rice, while in only seven counties of Texas, along the banks of the intracoastal canal, approximately 13,000,000 of these bushels are grown and valued at nearly $40,000,000.

The Louisiana cities of Crowley, Lafayette, and New Iberia compare favorably with Lake Charles in the industries above-mentioned and contribute generously to tonnage for the intracoastal canal. Morgan City, La., is the capital of the shrimp industry of the Nation. Great fleets of shrimp boats hail from this port, where their catch is processed and canned for the use of the Nation, while Houma, farther to the eastward, is a great fish and oyster center.

For more than a hundred miles in this section of Louisiana the intracoastal canal traverses the great sugarcane fields which produce in giant sugar mills huge quantities of ribbon cane sirup, the finest granulated sugar, for the Nation's table, and blackstrap molasses, which has many and varied uses—all of which supplements intracoastal-canal tonnage.

The next port of call to the east is the interesting and fascinating city of New Orleans, La., which is reached through the Harvey Locks and a short trip up the Mississippi to the harbor, where ships of the world discharge and receive cargo imported and for export, much of which has moved or will move via barges through the intracoastal canal or on the bosom of the Mississippi and its water connections. The time element precludes my enumerating the many and varied industries of this, the great Crescent City, the most of which contribute to the economic justification of the intracoastal canal.

Throughout the course of the intracoastal canal the entire area is studded with oil derricks, storage tanks, refineries, and allied industries, together with sulfur mines, salt beds, and magnesium plants which represent the mineral wealth of the coast, which is bountifully supplemented with products of the soil such as sugarcane, rice, cotton, corn, grain sorghums, fruits, and vegetables; and upon completion of the intracoastal canal between Corpus Christi and Brownsville, Tex., the mammoth citrus and vegetable industries of the lower Rio Grande, known as the magic valley, will be placed in position to enjoy the economies of water-freight rates and water-compelled rail rates. This area, approximately 150 miles southwest of Corpus Christi, is an alluvial valley of half a million fertile acres on the Texas side of the Rio Grande. Semitropical vegetation, such as oranges, lemons, and the nationally famous valley grapefruit, flourish as the bay tree, producing annually more than a million tons of fresh fruit and a quarter of a million tons of canned fruits and juices; 375,000 bales of cotton, 100,000 tons of cottonseed, and 200,000 tons of vegetables. This section is also rapidly developing into a petroleum producing and refining area, and when the final section of the canal is completed and opened to traffic many hundreds of thousands of tons will be added to the present volume.

Many of the Nation's roads are constructed by the use of gravel, crushed rock, etc., but throughout the entire area traversed by the intracoastal canal are found great accumulations of oyster and clam shells, the shell from which is extensively used in the construction of roads. The shell is dredged from the reefs in clamshell buckets and dumped into barges for transportation to points convenient to road-construction areas, and this commodity constitutes a good percentage of the intracoastal canal tonnage. Incidentally, roads constructed of this material are equally as good, but not as permanent, as roadways based on gravel or crushed stone.

My remarks have been confined principally to commodities which originate and are shipped from points on the intracoastal canal, and I would like to point out that a great deal of the total tonnage carried on the intracoastal canal originates beyond its shores and provides the citizens of Texas and Louisiana with reduced rates on consumer goods manufactured in the North and East and moved to distribution points along the canal, such as iron and steel pipe and fittings, steel sheets, machinery and boilers from the Pittsburgh and Birmingham mills, and elsewhere, automobiles, trucks, tractors, and other manufactured articles too numerous to mention.

The sponsors for this great waterway have been beset with many difficulties in bringing it to its present state, and I am happy to say that each individual who has been connected with its development has been amazed and gratified beyond measure at the unprecedented growth and value with which it has been attended. This includes its proponents and sponsors, the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, who labored hard and long to obtain the original and subsequent authorizations.

Here we should pay just and lasting tribute to the late C. S. E. Holland, who conceived the idea and revealed his thoughts to a group which he called together at Victoria, Tex., on August 8, 1905, and who was active as president of the association to the time of his death, or for a period of nearly 40 years.

We should also pause to pay richly deserved tribute to that great dynamic and rugged advocate of water transportation, the late Roy Miller, active vice president and president of the association, who in his remarkable wisdom could foresee the success of the undertaking, while many of his critics and skeptics considered the project the brain child of a dreamer or endorsed the proposition with tongue in cheek.

We would also be derelict if we failed to recognize and memorialize the late Judge J. J. Mansfield, Congressman from the Ninth District of Texas, for many years chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Congress, and to whom should go credit for the development of many of the rivers and harbors and waterways of the Nation, including, of course, the intracoastal canal.

Much credit is also due the Corps of Engineers, who have been extremely cooperative and instrumental in the development of the canal to its present status and who have been amply justified in making favorable reports on the economics of the system, which ultimately resulted in congressional authorization and construction.

This waterway was conceived and sponsored and promoted by the association which it is my pleasure and privilege to represent, and with the dredging of the unfinished but authorized section between Corpus Christi and Brownsville, we will have accomplished the initial step in our over-all program. However, the tremendous tonnage that has developed has conclusively shown the merit, value and virtue of such a waterway and our future program covers the further improvement of the present system by widening, deepening and the elimination of limited radius curves, the canalization of the several larger rivers and bayous which connect with our present canal and which will afford valuable feeders to the present system and carry the benefits of water transportation to these hinterland areas, adequate improvement of the Gulf-Intracoastal Waterway between New Orleans and west Florida, a barge canal across Florida connecting with the present inland and protected system between Jacksonville and Trenton, N. J., and a subsequent protected channel paralleling the coast line to the Maine border, thereby supporting our slogan for "an inland canal from Maine to Mexico." With this alone we shall not be content or satisfied, since we have in our program the full support and cooperation of our organization with our friends south of the border in extending our system along the east coast of Mexico to Tampico and Vera Cruz, and, indeed, the construction of a navigable canal across Mexico to the Pacific, by the utilization of two rivers which have a practical common source, one flowing to the Pacific, the other to the Gulf of Mexico. On its face this appears as a very ambitious program, but far more difficult things have been accomplished.

It has been a pleasure for me to speak to you on this most pleasing subject, and I thank you for your attention and interest.

Voices of Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on April 5, 1948:

VOICES OF SANITY

Of the 61 Republican Congressmen who voted against the folly and extortion of the Marshall plan, 34, more than half, came from six Middle Western States. These men who place their own country first were Messrs. VAIL, OWENS, TWYMAN, CHURCH, REED, ALLEN, JOHNSON, CHIPERFIELD, JENISON, VURSELL, CLIPPINGER, and BISHOP, of Illinois; GILLIE, HARNESS, JOHNSON, LANDIS, and WILSON, of Indiana; MARTIN and GWYNNE, of Iowa; SHAFER, HOFFMAN, CRAWFORD, WOODRUFF, BENNETT, YOUNGBLOOD, and DONDERO, of Michigan; SMITH and HULL, of Wisconsin, and CLEVENGER, MCCOWEN, SMITH, GRIFFITHS, MCGREGOR, and LEWIS, of Ohio. Representatives BUSBEY and MASON, of Illinois were also paired against the bill.

These men spoke with sanity against the panic that has gripped most of the rest of Washington and the Atlantic seaboard. They undoubtedly expressed the will of the large majority of the people in the pro-American section of the country. Because of their courage, they will have no explaining to do when time establishes the Marshall plan for the fraud and failure that it is and is bound to be.

Other Republicans joined with the Democrats in the House, as in the Senate, to inflict Mr. Marshall's and Mr. Truman's fantastic scheme on the taxpayers of this country. It was only by bipartisan support that this, as well as all of the other monstrosities of the Roosevelt and Truman foreign policy, got the sanction of Congress. Because of this bipartisan support, ill-considered as it was, the New Deal administration has received everything that it has ever asked of Congress to implement its foreign policy.

Mr. Truman got UNRRA, which the late LaGuardia and his Communist employees proceeded to make an instrument for extending Stalin's influence in Europe. He got the ratification of the Charter of the futile United Nations. Previously Mr. Roosevelt had got the World Bank and the monetary plan. Mr. Truman got the gift to Britain, which the Socialists of that country wasted in less than half the period it was to last. Aid to Greece and Turkey, interim aid to France and Italy, and now the supreme folly

of the Marshall plan were all given Mr. Truman when he asked for them.

Some of these ventures have already proved failures. UNRRA was such a one, and the Monetary Fund developed into a confidence game of international finance that would have done credit to Dr. Hjalmar Schacht. The demonstrated futility of the United Nations is only equaled by its dishonesty. The gift loan left Britain begging for still greater largess. The Marshall plan, the most grandiose of all these projects, will provide the most grandiose failure of all.

One thing Mr. Truman and Mr. Marshall and all their bleeding heart and anti-American followers can never plead. That is that any of their plans were frustrated or in the least degree hampered by narrow partisanship. Every tool they asked was given them. The series of fiascos that have constituted American foreign policy from Tehran through Yalta and Potsdam to the present isolation of the American garrison in Berlin is the responsibility, and the sole responsibility, of the Democratic Party, which must answer to the people for its failures.

Never in the history of our country have its affairs been in the hands of such fools and knaves.

On the Tail of a Comet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of Congress will be interested in reading a very important address delivered by Chancelor Deane Malott of the University of Kansas a few days ago. The address is entitled, "On the Tail of a Comet." It was delivered at Abilene, Kans., before a large group of representative citizens of our State.

Chancelor Malott is one of the outstanding educators in this country. His views with respect to problems that confront the people of America, at home and abroad, are constructive as well as informative. The address follows:

I come to you today to talk about your responsibilities as citizens of the Republic, because grave problems press for solution in a day when the world is literally shooting off like a comet. They are problems not alone for Federal officials in Washington, but for you and me who sent them there, and who are members of the electorate which in a democracy has the determining voice.

In the words of an eminent educator, our fitness to survive is at stake; and our survival depends upon a vigorous demonstration in the coming years that our American democracy can work in a war-torn world. We face a practical situation for which we must assume responsibility. We must formulate and execute imaginative and bold policies at home and abroad; a courageous assumption of our international responsibilities as a great power, and a continual appraisal and development of our internal economy; and above all a realization of the uniqueness and responsibility of our American democracy, and a determination to keep always ahead the historic goals of our way of life.

This is no easy task, and our leadership rests the more heavily upon us, because we are presumably better able than many citizens, through education, training, and responsibility to bear the burden. That it is a task of leadership over others becomes evident by realizing that without leadership exercised upon others, our votes are no more valuable than those of the laboring man under the spell of political rabble-rousing, or the dilettante socialite with never a serious moment of cerebral activity.

As never before business needs men who appreciate the responsibilities of business to itself and to that unique society of free men which has developed on this continent. Such men must understand not only the practical working of industry, but also the economic and social background in which business operates.

I propose to discuss just a few random areas where on this speeding comet of instability and revolution the vocal leadership of businessmen is desperately needed in the world of tomorrow. They are selected merely as typical—a sample of problems of our day and time:

TAXATION

Let us first look just at the broad field of taxation. Our basic tax laws have not been overhauled for many a year; we have merely tinkered with them. We have an enormous debt, a very high and wasteful level of governmental expenditures and a very human desire on the part of our citizens for lower tax payments. The President of the United States urged a cut across the board in personal income taxes, the burden to be added onto the corporate tax load. But there is little disposition in the executive offices of the Government to attack the problem at its source and to cut Federal expenditures. Furthermore, high corporate taxes mitigate against the national welfare in two ways:

1. It tends to hide the burden; yet in reality it does not. Inanimate objects and legal concepts cannot pay taxes; taxes are paid by people, whether through corporate organization or the individual.

2. High corporate taxes lead straight to the socialization of business. When we drain off earning power to the point where venture capital is unavailable; where retooling, maintenance, development, and expansion incentives are removed; then, in times of crisis, business fails to meet its responsibilities and the hue and cry goes up for taking over the business by Government. We have already seen that movement in Great Britain, and history cites many an example. It is a peril of the future which is before us today.

As the London Economist observes: "The human donkey requires either a carrot in front or a stick behind to goad it into activity." The rewards of success have been removed by taxation, while security measures have worked for equality, until there is hardly a flavor of carrot or a shadow of the stick, and yet we wonder why the donkey doesn't break into a trot.

I believe that the present tax policy, with its alluring tax-exempt bonds, its confiscatory rates at high levels of income, its corporate tax structure, and other inequalities is incompatible with the maintenance of a dynamic economy and its revision must be placed high on the agenda of national economic policy. We must see to it that a thorough and sound tax structure is built, and that revisions of our tax laws are not merely unskilled cuts without commensurate reductions in Federal expenditures.

WITCH HUNTING

For nearly two decades some of our high Federal officials, far from being true to the concept of government as a servant of the people, have been engaging in witch hunting, to the detriment of the national economy. The latest burst is directed toward speculation, as though speculators in the commodity markets were engaged in some specious activity, antisocial in character and deriving sustenance off the sweat of other toilers.

We cannot live as a free nation without speculation. Speculation enters into all of our activities. The American farmer is a speculator; he sows his wheat in the fall and takes the risk of winter-kill, or insect infestation, or hail, or lack of moisture. A builder enters construction activities with the hope of sale at a profit. A contractor makes a bid for the job and hopes that his costs will be under the contract price. The taxpayers of Kansas provide millions for a State university in the hope that they will be returned to the State in the intelligence and character of oncoming generations.

In defending risk bearing and risk takers, I am in no way justifying manipulation or manipulators, already long outlawed by law and exchange regulations. But a statistical study which I personally made a few years ago tracing price movements in a variety of commodities, going to market through a variety of channels and methods—private negotiations, sealed-bid auction, open auction, and commodity exchange—showed that the commodities in which a future market was maintained behaved no differently in their swings and deviations than commodities without such mechanisms.

Our great marketing mechanisms are part and parcel of the industrial strength of America, and the risk takers in commodities are close kin to the venture capitalists that have built America. We should prevent their abuse while protecting their vigor and imagination and enterprise. The leadership of America, of which you are a part, must understand these things.

DEFENSE OF AMERICA

Another problem now facing the country, our national defense, is murky with sentiment, assumption, and blind ignorance. We are told we must engage in universal military training in order to be ready for any eventuality. Somehow, some way, we are made to feel that 6 months in a military camp, so nicely placed in the calendar that it destroys or postpones a year of university training, makes America strong. Yet let us look at the facts:

1. These are days of highly technical warfare—of robots, rockets, high-speed projectiles, and atomic bombs. It takes a year and a half to train a pilot, 2 years for a radar mechanic, three full years for an engineer, three for a pharmacist, four or five for a doctor, 16 weeks for a cook, 16 weeks for a mechanic, 16 weeks for an infantryman. Six months is no common denominator at all for a highly technical army.

2. What therefore is to be done in this 6 months' training, by whom is it to be given, and how long will its effects last? The armed forces have no large staff of trained teachers, 6 months is longer than apparently required for basic training, and no one can now be clear as to the technical pattern of a future war.

3. If a general educational program is contemplated, the armed forces would scarcely be the agency for its operation, nor is one required because the present private and public educational system of the Nation is carrying the load. Nor is the Army the agency to which the youth of the land would normally be entrusted for moral and intellectual training.

4. In a day of highly technical warfare why destroy a year of technical or professional training in the well-equipped laboratories of our educational institutions, for 6 months of some basic, general, and volatile indoctrination.

5. Why not expand the ROTC to cover every major high school and college? It would be entirely practicable to prepare engineering students for the Engineer Corps and the Seabees, physics majors for radar work, medical students for the Medical Corps, business

students for the Quartermaster Corps, and thereby integrate the vocational and professional interests of the young man, with his maximum military contribution, without loss of time, with probably less expense, and without the difficulties and dangers of a militaristic hold over the youth of the land.

While military training is being debated, with a paucity of facts and frankness, we are allowing our merchant marine to deteriorate, we have no policy for the future use of the hundreds of cargo ships now rapidly deteriorating in disuse, and only 47 passenger and passenger-cargo ships are flying the American flag in active service. Our operating costs are high, the maritime unions are strangling our shipping, the impact of competition with air routes has created uncertainty, and we would be seriously handicapped in the event of future war.

The President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine has published a detailed report recommending a Government-sponsored shipbuilding program, submitted in the belief that national security and support of this country's position among the leading nations of the world are themselves sufficient justification for active Government fostering of merchant shipping. This report is worthy of our attention.

The President's Air Policy Commission has also reported on the requirements for American survival in the air age. This report also should be read by all citizens in a position of leadership. We should have the strongest air force in the world. The money cost of universal military training—several billions a year—added to existing Air Force appropriations would immediately give us world advantage to implement our foreign policy.

The President's Commission urges an appropriation of billions a year for the next 5 years to build an Air Force on the following assumptions:

1. It is impossible to know certainly when other nations will have atomic weapons, but it is proper to assume, for our present planning purposes that other nations are not now producing such weapons in quantity.

2. It is known that other nations are working diligently on atomic energy.

3. It seems safe to assume that possible hostile powers will not be producing atomic weapons in substantial quantity before the end of 1952.

4. It would be an unreasonable risk to rely on other nations not having atomic weapons in quantity by the end of 1952. (The best discussion extant on the theory of atomic power, according to some scientists, has been published in the Russian language in a Russian periodical.)

5. It would be an unreasonable risk to assume that this country will surely have warning of the manufacture of atomic weapons by others.

6. Biological weapons are being studied everywhere and are being developed to terrific potency.

Under these conditions and in the present stage of world developments we must not delay in being strong, tragic though the cost may be.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

Another problem deeply affecting us as citizens and business and professional people, is the growing tendency of the Congress to appropriate from the vast Federal deficits, grants-in-aid to the States. In the peak year 1939, grants-in-aid exceeded four billion and amounted to nearly 50 percent of all Federal expenditures in that year. We need a guiding policy lest it becomes fixed habit to extend largess from the Federal Government to meet State responsibilities under the naive assumption that the costs are somehow more tolerable because less direct. Under the category of these aids come relief, agricultural aid, social security, highways, public works, housing, and National Guard. Public-health grants are on the increase, and interest is being shown in a vast series of appropriations for education, with funds possibly being made available for State universities, private college, municipal and religious institutions, without any analysis of the fundamental purpose of these institutions and whether or not their standards should be so lowered as to absorb a great influx of those hitherto educated in purely vocational schools.

A national policy for Federal aid is badly needed, a policy which would scrutinize Federal aid on a basis such as to show:

1. That there is an interest, a need, and an obligation affecting the Nation as a whole.

2. That the State governments and their subordinate local governments are unable to meet the problem without Federal aid.

3. That the basis on which the States enter into partnership relations with the Federal Treasury shall be such that it does not jeopardize the autonomy of the States or unduly promote partisan political advantages of the party currently in office in the national administration.

An enlightened public must take part in these decisions and we are a part of that public.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY AND RECONSTRUCTION

This is the most important subject facing America today. Communism is an increasing threat to world stability. Russia is playing for time, delaying decisions, frustrating reconstruction, purposely keeping the world uncertain while she consolidates an empire, slowly but inexorably subjecting millions to the crushing hopelessness of seeing the iron curtain lowered between them and democratic, free people.

It is not yet known whether we can live in the same world with Communistic Russia. Certainly we cannot unless she is contained in an area on the other side of the world. But totalitarian government maintains itself by growth and expansion; it lives on promises of future benefits, seldom on the realities of current advantage. It must be aggressive, ruthless, and imperialistic. Russia will be prevented from world aggression by one thing alone—a strong America, so mighty, so influential, so determined and unified in purpose that Communist leaders will not dare to continue their thrusts. Russia is seeking chinks in the armor of the western world. Today they are not hard to find. Europe is disorganized, scourged by inflation, beaten by unemployment, prostrated by the destruction and cannibalization of her industries, with political uncertainties, with millions of her population wandering and homeless. There is not at present enough strength in all that land to combat Stalin should he march through western Europe.

Today America is strong—stronger than Russia. We have industrial know-how, military strength in air power and atomic energy, vast and organized raw material resources. But we lack a determined foreign policy and the courage and will to execute it, fearlessly and aggressively.

We must face the fact that war with Russia may be inevitable. It may be inevitable because there is one attribute of our life which will always be dearer to us than peace, and that is freedom. If we can maintain freedom by economic pressure and a definite and strong foreign policy, certainly we should do so. That is the point which Senator VANDENBERG is this week making before the Congress.

The Committee for Economic Development, composed of a group of American business leaders, has recently announced an American program for backing the Marshall plan. It is worthy of your thoughtful consideration. Under its proposals, the program should be as follows:

1. It should be made a minimum condition of aid that the European countries carry out the commitments they made at the Paris Conference and that these undertakings should be implemented in the specific agreements made with separate countries.

2. Western Germany should be made an integral part of the recovery of western Europe.

3. Continuous emphasis should be laid in the aid program on the economic development of western Europe as a whole, as well as on the development of the separate countries.

4. The aid program must take into account the needs of other areas as well as the needs of Europe and the United States in the allocation of scarce supplies.

5. Once a program of cooperation has been approved, the funds and materials made available must be used in a realistic and businesslike manner.

6. The program must bring about maximum utilization of the resources and initiative of the European peoples in order to expand production.

7. Insofar as possible loans should be truly loans, currency transactions should be currency transactions, and gifts should be gifts.

8. The division of aid between loans and gifts should take into account not only the European ability to provide goods and services in payment but also American willingness to receive goods and services in return.

9. In general the aid program should not be used as a method of financing the acquisition by the American Government of property rights in Europe or its colonies.

10. Funds should be provided in amounts and over a sufficient period to make the program a success.

Time is of the essence. A new Russian empire is growing fast in eastern Europe. The Molotov plan is leaping ahead of the Marshall plan and is designed to create satellite nations in her orbit and to exploit their wealth. Russia has already taken an estimated $12,000,000,000 out of its orbit countries. The United States method is to give aid; Russia's to exploit gains.

Again I repeat, time is of the essence. If eastern Europe is to escape Russian domination by means short of war, it must be done before economic, political, and social subjugation is complete. If we cannot bring this about, then a continual and explosively dangerous armed truce, an inevitable lowering of living standards, wars, and chaotic world conditions may lie ahead. We are engaged in a gigantic test of strength between the Molotov plan and the Marshall plan. The former is in operation, the latter still not implemented into action. That puts the Molotov plan several jumps ahead.

Our forceful opinion today is needed in this great crisis in history. We are accountable, individually and alone, for our participation in world affairs. A decision must be made expressing the multiple-minded will of the American people.

Events are now in progress which will yield an acid test. I ask of each voter, not that you agree with me, but that you take the trouble to inform yourself, to have an opinion, to try to influence others, that we may demonstrate the strength and purposefulness and fearlessness of a democracy, that we traverse "the narrow knife-edge which divides softness from belligerency, and that we demonstrate such an agreement as to the ends for which we all labor as to be an inexorable force in the years to come."

My faith as to the end result of these years of crisis rests on the belief in the enormous strength of the American traditions and our free sources of power, if implemented by an aroused and thinking leadership from among the Nation's citizens, of which we are all a part.

Americanism Preferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Allston Calhoun over Station WAYS, Charlotte, N. C., on April 3, 1948:

Hello folks, this is Allston Calhoun speaking to you on Americanism Preferred. When the lower House of the Congress passes the European recovery program and the Marshall plan by a vote of 329 to 74, it gave final authorization, with the exception of President Truman's signature, to the largest overseas relief and rehabilitation program ever undertaken by any one nation. The bill calls for a total of $6,200,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to be literally given away to all the European nations who promise our Government that during the next year they will be good little boys, so to speak, and who promise that they will at least keep the Communists in their back yards and out of sight during that time. President Truman, himself, in his St. Patrick's Day speech calling for an immediate enactment of the bill, termed it an economic barrier to the spread of communism.

Besides this, the program earmarks additional billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money to be used as an economic barrier to the spread of communism in Europe in the years to come. And you can bet your last bottom dollar, your shirt, and your shoes as well, that those foreign nations will be calling for those billions of dollars for relief, or rehabilitation, or by whatever name you may wish to call it, when next year rolls around. One Congressman, Representative LAWRENCE SMITH, of Wisconsin, tried to kill this commitment, of the future years to come, with an amendment which declared this country under no moral or legal obligation to continue aid to Europe after the first year. This was voted down, but by a very close vote.

Speaking of the entire measure, Representative VURSELL, Republican, of Illinois, termed it a fantastic world-wide WPA. And another Republican, Representative O'HARA, of Minnesota, said that financing the huge European gift program would mean dragging the people of this country through the dirt. Of the 74 Congressman voting against passage of the bill were North Carolina Congressmen BARDEN and DOUGHTON, our dean in the Congress for many years—the sage BOB DOUGHTON.

But perhaps the most bitter opponent of the bill was young Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, who is serving his first term in the House. Congressman DORN has been against this European gift program from the beginning, and he has taken a great deal of criticism as a result. One daily newspaper devoted nearly two columns of its editorial page of last Sunday to a very bitter criticism of the young man. But DORN has stood his ground and he was in there fighting against the measure when the final vote was taken. At this time he said: "I find that one trouble with this Congress is that so few of us have the courage to stand alone. I believe that World War I could have been averted. I believe that World War II could have been prevented. This Marshall plan will not prevent world war III. I say that for this reason: Even the proponents of the bill admit that it is a military measure. Do you think for a moment that Theodore Roosevelt, Gen. George Patton, or Andrew Jackson would support such a defensive, such a passive bill? They would have gone straight to Moscow and asked Joe Stalin to meet them in Paris, or somewhere, and told him in no uncertain terms that they would prevent him from moving another foot in Europe or anywhere else.

"This bill is like sending your wife out to confer with the neighborhood bully and tell him to please go away. Mr. Chairman, sometime, some day, somewhere you are going to have to face the masters of the Kremlin on the field of battle or else you have got to meet them right now and tell them in no uncertain terms that, if they move another foot, the bombs will be dropping over Russia. If you place the natural resources of this country under the Marshall plan or the Bevin plan, or whatever else you want to call it, it is only stalling for time. Who benefits by this time gained? Does the United States benefit? I rather think it is Soviet Russia with their undeveloped resources. They are gaining militarily every day. If you pass this plan, whereby our resources will be given away to Europe, in 5 years or 10 years Russia will be the strongest nation in the world. Today our Nation is the strongest. So I say, let us have a show-down now and not throw away this $17,000,000,000 which I personally believe, from my observation of Europe, Russia is in favor of even though she pretends to be against the Marshall plan."

Congressman DORN, who is a veteran serving all through the last war, and who actually fought all the way from the coast of France to Berlin, continued, "I talked with General Ira C. Eaker last year. His opinion then was that Russia could overrun all of Europe in 3 weeks. This Marshall plan will not stop them. It will only put more products in Europe for them to seize. The only thing that will stop them is for America to have the greatest Air Force in the world."

When asked if President Truman would be the man whom DORN would now send to negotiate with Stalin, the young Congressman replied, "I certainly would not. That is one of the reasons why I am voting against this bill, the incompetent leadership that we now have and which has been responsible for this bill. They have reversed themselves, and that includes the Secretary of State. They have reversed themselves on nearly every foreign policy they have promulgated."

Congressman DORN then spoke on the futility of sending our foot-soldiers, so to speak, to fight the Communists. This was in criticism of a speech by former Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, who had said that the Marshall plan was the only alternative to sending our soldiers overseas again. Said DORN in this connection, "If you ever do send your sons to Europe, you will never build as large an Army to invade Russia as Germany had on June 22, 1941. She invaded Russia with the largest and the best equipped army that the world has ever known, or will probably ever see again. What did she get? She reached the gates of Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad and extended her lines to the breaking point. She would have had to advance 2,000 miles to get beyond the Urals alone. So when you talk about sending an army to Europe bigger than that, with all of the incidental transportation, it is too ridiculous even to think about. But we must have an Air Force that can cover the world and smother Russia at any time. That is the only thing she will respect and the only thing that can stop her expansion."

Now, folks, that strikes me as plain American horse sense. Even a grammar school kid knows that you can't stop a bully by offering him candy bars. He'll take the tribute with greedy hands and then be coming at you stronger for more. The only thing to do in the interest of permanent peace is to wind up and swing a punch at him, that will either knock him out or put him in his place for keeps. And the strange thing about it is that in my school days I made some mighty good friends by that very method.

But here is a point that everyone seems to be forgetting, with the exception of Mr. Dorn, our own Bob Doughton, and others—that this first year of the Marshall plan will not be the first year of European recovery and relief wherein billions of American dollars have been poured into Europe either as pump-priming money or you-be-a-good-boy money. It will actually be the fourth year of the so-called European recovery and rehabilitation since the end of World War II. In the nearly 3 years since the end of hostilities in Europe the American taxpayers have actually given the European nations nearly $22,000,000,000 in the way of food, equipment, and supplies, or in outright gifts and loans of money. Has this vast European relief we have already given them stopped Russia from dropping one nation after another behind the iron curtain, or has it stopped the Communist agents of Russia from infiltrating into the very vitals of practically all those nations, and with the exception of Spain, alone?

Why, if all those billions of dollars in pump-priming money and remittance money that we have already sent to Europe had had any effect in stopping the march of communism in Europe we wouldn't be worrying, right now, as to whether or not Italy was going communistic by the vote of her own people in the general elections the 18th of this month. Italy has been one of the largest recipients of our American gratuities since the end of the war in spite of the fact that she was our enemy in that war. Only recently our Government struck off at one time an obligation of a cool billion dollars that the people of Italy owed the taxpayers of America. And yet, only this week the Communist controlled labor unions of Italy, numbering 5,000,000 workers, who are literally under the control of the Communists in Italy, whether they like it or not, are threatening general strikes, under the orders of their Communist leaders. The labor unions of France, numbering about 5,000,000 workers, are also under the control of the Communists in that country.

No, indeed; I cannot see that this first year of the Marshall plan, which is in reality the fourth year of the so-called European rehabilitation and recovery program at the huge expense of American taxpayers, can have any more effect in stopping the march of communism in Europe than it has had in any other year since the end of hostilities. During all this time the Communists have continued to bore from within in practically all these countries that have been getting our billions of dollars. And most assuredly they have gotten a goodly share of this American bounty. And the interesting thing to me about it is that it was only when the moneys and goods of our former commitments had begun to run out that we began to hear threats of some of these nations in western Europe going Communist.

I'm not too much of an admirer of all of the activities of Governor Jim Folsom, of Alabama, but I did admire his opinion of the Marshall plan which was expressed in the question, "Did you every try to wean a baby?" President Truman is preventing America from weaning this 3-year-old baby of the New Deal, European recovery and rehabilitation program, with his Marshall plan to provide more years of pump-priming money for the recovery of European industry thus giving further strength to the Communist controlled labor unions, and as remittance money so those nations will continue to promise to keep the Communists in the backyard.

Of course, the Communists like the Marshall plan, even though they claim they don't.

Not only does the Marshall plan provide them with a goodly share of this American bounty, but it gives them time—time in which to strengthen the fighting power of the one country to which they give their allegiance, and time in which to further infiltrate and strengthen their position not only in the nations of Europe and Asia but right in our United States.

In President Truman's speech of about 2 weeks ago calling for the enactment of his plan to stop the march of communism 3,000 miles away, I did not hear him say one word about stemming the tide of communism right here at home. And yet one of the Presidential candidates is not only openly claimed by the officials of the Communist Party, but he shows by his every action and his every word that he is the willing vassal of his lords in the Kremlin in Moscow. Henry Wallace, indeed, makes Benedict Arnold turn over in his grave and weep with envy.

The sole and only way to preserve peace in this world is to keep the mailed fist of the most powerful Air Force in the world hanging over the mother country of Communist world banditry while at the same time cleaning them out of our own household.

But the thing which is by far the most distasteful feature of the Marshall plan, to me, is the "you be a good boy," or "remittance money angle" of the plan whereby Uncle Sam is saying to all these little nations of Europe, "You be a good boy now, and I will pay you off." This is in direct violation of one of the most vital tenets of Americanism, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

So long folks; write me in care of this station what you think about the matter.

Des Moines, Iowa, Veterans of Foreign Wars Support H. R. 5213

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Nation-wide interest is rapidly developing in H. R. 5213, a bill designed to establish as a matter of policy, a system of uniform service pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II.

The immediate objective of this bill is to extend to the veterans of World War I and World War II the traditional service pension, which provided benefits in their declining years to veterans of the Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Mexican War, Civil War, Indian Wars, Spanish-American War, and lesser campaigns and expeditions.

Recently Des Moines Post, No. 738, Department of Iowa, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, adopted the following resolution, petitioning the Iowa Members of Congress to vote for H. R. 5213 and to promote its passage.

The resolution is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
DES MOINES POST, NO. 738,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Des Moines, Iowa, March 23, 1948.

To All Officers and Members of Des Moines Post, No. 738, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

Whereas it has been, since the days of the Revolution, the traditional policy of this Nation that no man who fought to defend the United States against its enemies on world battlefields should ever have to live out the declining years of his life in want and privation; and

Whereas the Veterans of the Revolutionary War, War of 1812, Mexican War, Civil War, Indian Wars, Spanish-American War, and other lesser campaigns and expeditions were all enabled to face the twilight of their lives with the knowledge that the Nation they had served so faithfully had provided for their security by the granting of service pensions based on age and disabilities; and

Whereas the granting of such pensions has occurred within approximately 25 years after the termination of each of these wars, and it is now almost 30 years since the termination of World War I, and no provision has yet been made for the security of the veterans of this great conflict in their declining years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Des Moines Post, No. 738, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in meeting assembled, do hereby endorse and recommend the passage of the bill known as H. R. 5213, introduced in the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, which provides for service pensions, similar to those granted for previous wars, to the veterans of World Wars I and II, and any future wars.

We further petition the Iowa Members of the Congress to vote for this measure and to use their influence and every means possible to promote this legislation and to insure its passage.

FOREST C. MILLER,
Commander, Post No. 738.
GEORGE A. HARTNETT,
Legislative Officer, Post No. 738.
GUSTAV VILLONH,
World War I Member, Post No. 738.
DEAN W. HOOKER,
World War II Member, Post No. 738.

Radio Address to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WLBF on April 3, 1948:

Dear friends of the Triple Cities and my congressional district, once again, the springtime visitors to Washington are flocking into my office from home. This is always an extreme pleasure to me, as I do enjoy chatting with old friends, if only for a moment.

In spite of this week's terrific schedule of official business, I took time out to greet a large number of graduating classes and Girl Scout Troops making their sojourn to our Capital. An occasion such as this is significant because the Washington trip means the climax of these young folks secondary education.

Here, they see American Government in action. They view the Capitol with its spotless shining dome against the early spring sun, or at night blazing under a hundred powerful search lights.

They visit the White House, home of our Presidents, and admire the grand simplicity of its Colonial pillars and portals.

Approaching the Supreme Court Building, they stop in awe to admire the massive columns and solid foundations, fitting and strong support for the embellishment upon its face, which bears the words "Equal justice under law."

They climb the monument to George Washington and observe the city's best view. They visit the Lincoln Memorial and the National Airport and finally ride down to Mount Vernon, where they see how the Father of his Country lived as a farmer and landholder.

Yes; the young folks who called at my office this year from Windsor, Deposit, Vestal, Harpursville, and Port Dickinson, assured me they were fully as impressed as those who formerly came and whose pictures, taken on the Capitol lawn and hanging on my office walls, date as far back as 1939 and 1940 when I first came to Congress.

I pointed with pride to some of those early pictures. The young people recognized some of the former graduates and told me they were now hard-working citizens in their respective communities, raising families and contributing to the welfare of their fellowmen.

It is interesting to mention that I hear from those graduates, now grown-ups, and have sent them information and data from Government departments, yes, and several infant care books, too.

I am also hearing from the 1940 grads as veterans, GI's out of the country, and voters as well.

So you see, they do grow up and your Congressman runs across them in later life after they leave school and pursue life's several paths.

I have always encouraged the visits of these graduating classes, because to meet them is invigorating, is refreshing, and helpful to me to learn what the new America is looking for. The younger folks keep me abreast of the times.

On Monday evening, April 19, in your home library, Johnson City, there will be held one of the most important public gatherings that the Triple Cities has ever witnessed.

My friends and supporters at home have tendered me a most gratifying invitation to be their guest of honor at the annual ball dinner staged by the Broome County Townsend Committee and its women's auxiliary.

It is not necessary for me to tell you how gratified I am over this honor. I have assured Mr. Merlin Casterlin, New York State Townsend leader and chairman of this affair, that I will be most happy to attend.

On that evening, you can count on my clearing the air in no uncertain terms, of some of the foul clouds which always gather when one has his back turned and is on the firing line in Washington.

Along with other Easter visitors, I was very glad to welcome four prize-winning carrier boys on the Binghamton Sun under the escort of Mr. Arket Lewis, Binghamton Sun circulation manager. These boys were receiving recognition for their fine work in distributing the Sun in the Triple Cities.

The two town committees from Conklin and Kirkwood organized for action on flood control of the Susquehanna River in their locality can count on my going the limit in cooperating with them in their fight for recognition.

I was sorry not to be able to get home for their progressive meeting this week but I had to vote on the Marshall plan.

However, as I told Supervisor Whiting, Jules Livingston, and Fred Lawrence, I feel Conklin and Kirkwood both should have whatever flood protection the folks there think should be given to them.

I look forward to greeting them when they come to Washington and extending them every courtesy and assistance.

My position still stands on Endicott and Vestal. Regardless who says anything different, flood walls ought to be built on the Susquehanna in the Endicott Vestal-Johnson City area.

Councilman Fischette's contention that Binghamton can still stand some more as-

sistance is well taken. I agree with you, Tony, that the third ward ought to come in for its share.

Anyhow, I will be coming home for the big event at your home library, Monday evening, April 19, and will be available to meet with any or all the various flood control committees that have been organized to fight our section's No. 1 public enemy, flood.

We Must Not Forget Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in our zeal, commendable as it may be, to perform our proper role in world affairs, we must not, of course, forget our domestic obligations. In the forefront of these, it seems to me, it is the duty we owe to those senior citizens whose hard work and devoted effort have contributed so much to the creation of our present condition of prosperity, which makes it possible for us to do our full share in discharging our international responsibilities.

Many of these older people are now facing the evening of their lives with apprehension and insecurity. It is a tragedy for one, who has labored hard for years, to be now wracked with worry and distress lest tomorrow bring either deprivation or public charity.

Of course, many have laid away a nest egg, on which they may draw for a comfortable livelihood in later years. Others have children or close relatives who are delighted to repay in part, even though they can never discharge completely, the debt they owe to those they love. Such voluntary effort in the finest tradition of our forefathers is praiseworthy in the extreme and should never be discouraged.

There are countless instances, however, where through no fault of their own and through no lack of devotion on the part of loved ones, it is simply impossible for our older people to maintain even a decent standard of living without some form of governmental assistance. The immortal Lincoln drew the proper distinction when he said that the people should be encouraged to do for themselves, but that the ultimate objective of government should be to step in when they become unable to do for themselves.

It is for this reason that I have favored the broadening of the social-security law so as to include many groups of those who toil, who do not now benefit under the act, such as domestic and agricultural workers, employees of charitable agencies, and the self-employed. Also there should be a substantial increase in the benefits in order that they may more nearly reflect realism in the light of existing high costs of food, clothing, shelter, and other actual necessities of life.

When their younger brothers or sons retire 15 or more years hence, the amount they are scheduled to receive will exceed severalfold the benefits enjoyed by those wage earners presently forced into retirement. In other words, there is this interim period during which these elder citizens feel the pinch caused by the fact that their benefits are measured in terms of their payments into the fund, resulting in many instances in the receipt of a mere pittance, insufficient for even a bare subsistence level.

When the social security law was enacted, it was thought impossible to make a more generous provision for those retiring soon after the passage of the legislation because of the danger of the impairment of the fund. Recent studies, however, have led me to the conclusion that the benefits for our older people who have to quit work now can be substantially increased without jeopardy to the financial soundness or solvency of this fund, provided the base is broadened to include the noncovered 40 percent of all those gainfully employed.

There is no legerdemain involved. In the first place, the fund has built up a reserve beyond its forseeable requirements. Secondly, as every insurance actuary is aware, when large numbers of additional employees are brought under coverage, risk is diffused and liability more widely distributed, thus reducing the actual cost and permitting more generous benefits.

This step should be taken, in my judgment, and taken quickly. Cases of real hardship are almost daily brought to my attention, which could be to a large extent alleviated by this simple and altogether just and humane expedient.

There is another important way in which we can and should help our older people to improve their economic status. Unrealistic and ridiculous is the existing law providing that, if a person drawing old-age and survivors insurance benefits earns $15 or over in any one month through part-time employment on the outside, he loses all benefits under the social security law for that month. This provision not only lowers the morale and discourages those who laudably seek to help themselves, but it also inevitably encourages chiseling and evasion. Without condoning such a tendency, we, as legislators, cannot escape our responsibilities. Whenever a law is inherently unjust and oppressive, it furnishes an open invitation to such action.

More than a year ago I introduced H. R. 2952 to amend section 203 (b) (1) of the Social Security Act, to permit one enjoying old-age and survivors insurance benefits to earn up to $40 a month without being compelled to forfeit such benefits. In this way, with almost no cost to the Federal Government, the plight of many of our older citizens could be substantially improved and their spirits lifted. In fact, in the light of existing living costs, thought should be given to raising this figure, to perhaps $50.

On December 30, 1947, the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency reported to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, recommending that my bill be enacted into law with a modification, which I am very happy to accept, providing that one who has attained the age of 70 be permitted to draw old-age and survivors insurance benefits, regardless of the amount which he may earn in some gainful employment.

Again I urge, with all the emphasis at my command, that early action be taken on this long-delayed legislation. I can think of nothing on the domestic horizon of more urgent concern. Particularly is this true in the case of those wage earners who have already been forced to retire from their jobs or are facing that prospect in the immediate future.

History Repeats Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Frank W. Severne, editor of the Watkins Express, Watkins Glen, N. Y., together with a letter written by me to Mr. Severne. They follow:

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

Somewhere in the twilight of history, centuries before the Christian era, vast movements of population began surging wave upon wave against the ramparts of western civilization. The walled towns and cities of Greece and Rome were sacked, burned, and leveled to the ground, and the country for miles and miles around was laid in waste. Babylonians, Persians, Syrians, Huns, Arabs, Tartars, Mamelukes, and Turks came and went—earthquakes of the human race—leaving ruin and desolation behind them. Civilization crumbled and disappeared for centuries, shrouded in the gloom and mystery of the Middle Ages.

History repeats itself. Again the forces of violence and destruction are on the march. Again western civilization is the object of their assault. Brewed in Old World cauldron of envy, jealousy, and lust of power, a scheme of world-wide domination, called communism, is spreading over the earth. Like the barbarians of old, it tears down but does not rebuild. It substitutes force for law, the will of the individual for the will of the majority, and the rule of the dictator for the rule of the common people.

The basis of democratic government in any form is a conception of the freedom of the individual and a desire for social unity and security. Food, clothing, heat, and shelter are the indispensable requisites of human health and human happiness. Where these are not, the seeds of communism fall on fertile soil.

Poverty and misery go hand in hand, and in Europe millions now cry for bread. Their survival and our own are linked together by the immutable laws of brotherhood and humanity. American institutions and American civilization are in the balance. Out of its abundance the New World greets the old to fill the mouth of famine and bid the sickness cease. Less than this we must not do, and more when necessary.

Communism is moving westward. Already it is knocking at our doors. Country after country in Europe no longer exists in name—death heads of democracy, political automatons, caricatures of departed glory.

Why close our eyes to the all too obvious truth? If we do not want our country to become another Czechoslovakia, communism must be exterminated root and branch. To do this we must have strong laws and strong men to see that they are enforced. "Gentlemen may cry peace, peace, but there is no peace." Between communism and Americanism there can be no compromise and no middle ground. With such an issue, and in such a cause, our American democracy will dedicate itself anew to world peace and world progress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1948.

Mr. FRANK W. SEVERNE,
Watkins Glen, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SEVERNE: The March 17 copy of the Watkins Express has lain on my desk for some weeks awaiting an opportunity for me to write you expressing my very genuine and complete commendation for the excellent editorial entitled "History Repeats Itself," appearing on the front page of that issue.

It is very seldom that fundamental truths can be expressed with brevity and simplicity but, at the same time, completely. This editorial is one of those instances.

I think so highly of it that I shall place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that other citizens of our country may realize that the people of rural America are aware of world happenings and the part which America must play in formulating a sound, permanent policy for international confidence and accord based upon the fundamental principles of personal liberty.

Sincerely yours,

W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert transcript of my latest radio broadcast over stations in my district and a letter in reply to my broadcast by the Honorable Robert S. Baird, judge of probate, Cheboygan County, Mich.:

Last week the President addressed a joint session of the Congress. He asked the Congress for three things: Prompt action in passing the European recovery program, the enactment of universal military training legislation, and authorization for the reestablishment of the draft, to bring the military services up to minimum required strength. He cited as his reasons for these measures the rapid spread of communism throughout the world as a threat to all freedom-loving peoples and to our own national security.

In this critical period of history, all of us must discipline ourselves in order that we not become victims of war hysteria and at the same time recognize the seriousness of our international problem. We must ask ourselves from what are we seeking protection? Is it Russia herself, or is it the ideology of communism—or both? There is a distinct difference between the International Communist Party and the Soviet States, even though Russia is entirely controlled by the Communist Party. The Communist philosophy today is based on the teachings of Marx, Lenin, and the practical application as applied by Stalin. Being international in scope, it has paid trained agents in every country. Their basic belief is that any nation that has a system of government that is not a proletarian dictatorship is their enemy. They have been given the objective of overthrowing all governments that have a different philosophy of life than theirs. Their prime hatred is toward capitalistic countries. That makes it impossible to appease or compromise with this movement.

The Communists follow a set pattern of operation. Their trained men assume key positions in most countries. They recruit individuals of that nationality—many of them being sent to Russia for special training. They endeavor to assume positions of influence—such as in educational systems, labor unions, various security divisions, and in government. When they consider the time is ripe, they strike to overthrow that government by internal revolution and set it up as a Communist state—Czechoslovakia and Finland being recent examples. Russia, as a nation, is subordinate to the Communist Party, and can, and will be called to further the aims and desires of the Communist International when considered necessary. I believe that Russia will resort to a shooting war only if the present method of internal revolution fails and if America is so weak that Russia thinks she has a chance of winning.

The main difference between the way of life as practised by the Communists and our way of life, I believe, narrows down to one basic principle. We are a Christian people and believe in a Divine Power; that the Creator gave man an individual dignity. We believe that the individual has certain inalienable rights and that such are not subject to rule of other people. Communism is a materialistic philosophy. You cannot believe in a Divine Creator and accept the principles of communism. They believe that an individual exists to promote the group. Individuals are subjugated much the same as our domestic animals. If one strays from the principles, he is disposed of. We have more at stake than just the issue of democracy versus communism—it is Christianity versus atheism.

How does the legislation proposed by the President aid to combat these forces? We all are concerned with the deplorable condition of our military strength which necessarily will have to be built up. I have advocated universal military training for some time—if it had been established last year, there would be less necessity now for considering the draft. The increase in our military units will afford us protection against possible Russian military aggression. However, military force alone does not give us the protection needed to combat the forces of the Communist International, which is relentlessly working to establish itself in every country today. It is hoped that the European recovery program will halt the march of communism. We all must admit that ERP is a gamble. If it fails, America can say in clear conscience that we have tried to save a sick world by means of the only solution at hand. Let us hope and pray it will accomplish its aims and freedom of the individual will survive. It is the worst type of defeatism for us at this time to close our eyes on this threat to world security. If we fail to take decisive action now, we may in a short time be all alone in the sea of Communist nations, where their combined activities could be concentrated on us.

Regardless of political affiliation, regardless of religious beliefs, regardless of economic status in life, none of us wants to lose his individuality to become a cog in a diabolical revolutionary machine.

PROBATE COURT,
Cheboygan, Mich., March 20, 1948.

The Honorable CHARLES E. POTTER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

In re proposed civil-rights bill.

DEAR CHARLES: You may have a difficult time through which to reconcile this letter, but it will be despite the fact it is mailed in Michigan, "a genuine voice from the Deep South." I am a native Alabamian. Both my grandfathers fought in the Confederacy. My Grandfather Baird suffered two wounds, which were never completely healed until his second son grew up and became a physician and surgeon and took over the care of his father. I know the South from inheritance, and having lived there until I was nearly 30 years of age, I know its faults and its virtues, and I know particularly it obstinacies.

The present predicament grows, not out of the Civil War, but out of the reconstruction atrocities and abominations forced and foisted upon a helpless and conquered South by a victorious North, under the diabolical leadership of fanatics in the Republican Party after the death of Lincoln.

The Civil War was fought not to free the Negroes from slavery, but to preserve the Union, and shortly thereafter the victorious Federal Government under the fanatical leadership which gained the ascendancy on the death of Lincoln, proceeded to destroy the States, and set up military districts and thereafter, farcially "readmit" the States which had purported to secede, but which at Appomattox had been decided could not be done. For this crime the Republican Party has never officially repented, and has never been forgiven in the South, and until the Republican Party officially repents for the crime of reconstruction and its fanaticism, the South will continue to be a one-party section.

During reconstruction, the freed Negroes were allowed to vote by the force of Federal bayonets, and became the pawns of the carpetbaggers, the scum and filth of the North, which had been spewed out of their own communities and foisted upon a beaten and helpless South. The recently emancipated Negroes were elected to high and low offices, even to the United States Senate and to Congress, and the whites of the South were held in subservience by Federal bayonets under the leadership and sponsorship of the Republican Party.

The Republican Party and the northerners had no love for the Negroes, as is evidenced by the fact that no Negro was ever elected to Congress or to the United States Senate until about 1928, when a Negro—mulatto—born in Alabama, but then living in the First Illinois was elected from a district top-heavy with a Negro population. Some time thereafter and after the Roosevelt landslide, another Negro born in Alabama, Mitchell by name, I believe, but on the Roosevelt Democratic ticket defeated the Republican Negro. Thereafter I believe a Negro was elected from a New York district. Based upon my memory, and I believe it to be true, only three Negroes from any State north of Mason and Dixon's line have ever sat in the Houses of the Congress. Several more than that have sat in the Houses of the Congress from States of the South, because they were put there by Federal bayonets. There are men living in the South who remember those Federal bayonets, and they have passed the story on down to their descendants.

I think you know, as well as I do, that except in heavily preponderant Negro city districts in the North, no Negro in the North would stand the ghost of a chance of being elected to either House of the Congress.

I make no argument as to the right or the wrong of the civil-rights bill. I only say

that at present, it will never work, but will undo the good work of level-headed Negroes and fair-minded whites of the South. It will immediately cause a revival of the Ku Klux Klan, and I believe it will not increase the percentage of Negroes now voting in the South by as much as 10 percent. But I do believe that it will ultimately cause the death, by means, which even a one-man grand jury would never discover, of many Negroes.

The Honorable Chase Osborn is correct, and CLARE HOFFMAN, following his lead, is also right.

If the Republican Party would seize the opportunity of repenting of its reconstruction sins and defeat the adoption of these measures at this time, and thereafter, in the South, become a lily white party, and appoint to Federal office only whites of the highest caliber, there would come the opportunity in a few years of a strong Republican Party developing in the South.

In my home State there are 67 counties, 14 of which are apt to go Republican. The strange thing about these counties is that they have practically no Negro population. Res ipsa loquitur.

Apparently the Republicans are going to elect a President this year, and I feel sure he should not be burdened with a Federal statute, which cannot be enforced and which if tried would only bring bitterness and dissensions. We need unity now against the foreign enemy. In the South Negroes enjoy "heart rights" but not all of the civil rights; in the North the Negroes enjoy (theoretically at least) all civil rights, but have no "heart rights." By this I mean that men and women of good heart, by the compulsion of their own nature, will see to it that Negroes receive a fair and square deal, but will not agree to let them vote (in many counties the Negro population equals or exceeds the white). Whereas in the North, if the law is invoked, the Northerners will agree to let the Negroes have their civil rights, but thereafter there is a bitterness of the heart against the Negroes such as they do not experience in the South (I am speaking now of the good class of whites both in the North and the South). As Christian principles grow and as education advances, Negroes will be accorded all the rights and privileges to which every other citizen is entitled.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. BAIRD.

Trade With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, "Should we trade with Russia?" I am assuming that the question relates to the present time, and if my assumption is correct the question would read: "Should we trade with Russia now?" The fact is that we are trading with her in the usual way, even today. On last Monday the executive vice president of one of our large shipping lines advised a House committee that during the period January 1947 up to and including February 1948, 39 vessels were loaded from the port of New York over its line with cargoes consigned to the Soviet Union. These vessels carried a total of 163,430 tons. In the concluding paragraph of his letter was this statement, and I quote:

We have noted no significant change in the character of cargo moving to the U. S. S. R. Today's manifests, to the best of our recollection, are similar in every respect to manifests of a year ago or 10 years ago.

So there seems to be little doubt that we are trading with Russia, under most unusual circumstances.

Now what kind of trading have we been doing? The shipping company that I have referred to also advised this House committee that the ship manifests included such commodities as metal-working machinery, lathes, cutters, planers, grinders, and heavy industrial presses. Electrical machinery, including hydroelectric-power equipment, transformers, motors, and internal-combustion engines; agricultural machinery. Excavating machinery, including road graders, scrapers, cranes, and power shovels; oil-refining equipment, including oil-well tools, drill collars, oil-well-drilling equipment, steel pipe for oil lines, and steel storage tanks; also steam locomotives, Diesel electric locomotives, and railway dump cars. The list continues: Steel piling, steel railway-car wheels, and wire rope; auto trucks, auto parts, and accessories, sisal rope, woolen rags, graphite electrodes, various types of abrasive grains and products; scientific and measuring instruments, radio receivers, and equipment, foodstuffs, and petroleum products.

Do you think it is in the national interest for us to continue trading with Russia under the circumstances that exist today? I do not. Under normal conditions we certainly should do business with that vast country. It has raw materials that we can use and we have fabricated goods that are needed there. But the relationships between the two countries are not normal. Today Russia is our potential enemy, in fact, it is the only one in the world. This is extremely unfortunate, but I believe that we must be consistent in our approach toward the Soviet Union. We cannot blow hot and cold.

Just this week Congress passed the European recovery bill, which is designed to stop Russian aggression in western Europe, and Asia. It was the first step in a program which is to cover a 4-year period and calls for the spending of $17,000,000,000. We have already spent billions of dollars in Greece, Turkey, and China for the same identical purpose. What consistency is there on our part to trade with Russia and provide it with materials for war equipment and at the same time spend billions to oppose its aggressive conduct all over the world at the expense of the American taxpayer? We are not justified in trading with this potential enemy under these conditions. One Pearl Harbor in the history of our Nation is more than sufficient.

The public and Congress are aroused, and on March 1 the State Department and the Department of Commerce were directed by Executive order to place an embargo on our goods shipped out of this country to Europe. When the value of goods is in excess of $100 an export license is required.

If we honestly mean to stop Communist aggression in Europe, in China, Turkey, and Greece then we must not trade with Russia. So we want to stop communism? Certainly. But we shall never stop its aggressiveness by providing it with the sinews of war. To continue to follow our present policy under existing conditions is no less than treason. There should be no trading with Russia unless and until she is ready to abandon aggressive action toward peaceful nations.

The Russian drive to communize the world is not a fiction but a fact. Last fall I had an opportunity to see its tragic effects in Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. We have always considered these countries as friends, but one by one they are being taken over by the Soviet. The people who are our friends in those unfortunate nations go about with a look of fear in their eyes; at any minute of the day or night they may be seized and never returned to their families. Local Communists are engaged in a campaign of liquidating their opposition, which have no means of resisting. They want to know when the Americans will return to free them from the grip of communism. I have seen these people; I have talked with them, and I know how terrible is their fear of Russian communism.

Should we trade with Russia? Not at this time if we are sincere in our efforts to stop communism.

Army Day Addresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in connection with the Army Day activities held in Baltimore, a luncheon was sponsored by the Association of Commerce and the city of Baltimore. Lt. Gen. Leonard T. Gerow, commanding general of the Second Army, and Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., were the principal speakers. Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD, first, the speech of Mayor D'Alesandro and then the speech of General Gerow.

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR., MAYOR OF BALTIMORE, MD.

General Gerow and representatives of our armed forces, today Baltimore joins hands with the rest of the Nation in paying a deserved tribute to the United States Army. As mayor of the city of Baltimore I am very happy to have the Army as our official guests on this day and to say that we citizens of Baltimore are glad of the opportunity to show by this luncheon and the various activities to follow our admiration and respect for the finest army in the entire world.

We welcome the opportunity to work with you in any way possible, because unless the civilian and the soldier work together for the common defense, the United States cannot hope to achieve adequate security in a rapidly changing world. Two devastating

World Wars are undeniable evidence of this truth.

All true Americans hate war. Our veterans hate war because they witnessed its horrors on the battlefield. It destroys nations, brings suffering to the people, and fills them with bitterness and hate.

Because we hate and fear cancer, we do not turn our backs on this dread disease but we apply science and wealth in the search for a cure. Cancer kills and maims, yet we do not stand idly by and say because man is created in the image of God it is not right that we should have cancer.

By the same token, war is a form of insanity, bred in the minds of insane men. It, too, is a killer and crippler of men. Yet we cannot escape war in idle contemplation of the fact that war is wrong, that such insanity is repugnant to the brotherhood of man. War is a disease and if we are to avert it, we must take preventive steps. We must face reality, and admit it when the dangers of war exist. We must apply wealth and science, intelligence and reason, courage and moral leadership in our effort to stamp it out.

We must have a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force. We must be so strong that any nation seeking to destroy us will be deterred by our armed might. America has never been an aggressor nation. We want to be strong to prevent aggression.

The city of Baltimore is delighted to honor the Army. We are glad General Gerow and his Second Army are stationed here. We delight to pay them honor and to cooperate with them in every possible way.

The purposes of Army Day, as might be supposed, are many fold. In formally according recognition to our armed forces, we are not only honoring great men and essential institutions of the past, but are looking ahead to the future security and peace of the Nation.

Since this Republic was founded the Army has engaged in seven great wars, and in each our country has emerged victorious. Our Army has been great in peace as well as war. When disaster strikes the Nation or our neighbors, the Army moves quickly to lessen human suffering. This is done because our Army, charged under the Constitution to provide for the common defense, is equipped to deal with these disasters. This protection is guaranteed under our contract of citizenship.

With the new devastating weapons hanging over the head of all mankind, this Nation must maintain every element of moral, spiritual, and physical strength. In no other way can we fulfill our responsibilities to the liberty loving peoples of the present faltering world.

We must do this or prepare to give up our heritage of freedom.

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. LEONARD T. GEROW, COMMANDER OF THE SECOND ARMY

Today throughout America millions of people are taking time out of their busy lives to celebrate Army Day. They pause to honor a democratic Army—an Army composed of you and your fellow citizens—its virtues are your virtues, its faults, your faults, its achievements, the achievements of the homes, towns, and cities of the Nation.

It is most fitting that we pay tribute, on this day, to those men and women of the Army, who gave their lives to preserve our precious heritage of freedom. May the supreme sacrifice they made, honored and praised in war, be not forgotten in these critical times.

The Army is not only a protector of the Nation in war, but is also a faithful servant of the people in peace. It has always been prompt to drop the weapons of war and to employ the tools of peace for the welfare of the Nation. United States history contains many glorious pages recording the part played by soldiers in opening up the West for settlement, in mapping unexplored areas, in improving waterways for domestic commerce, in furthering science and industry in the fields of medicine, electronics, and chemistry, and in providing assistance to those suffering from major disasters.

The Army is performing similar tasks today and in addition is completing, throughout the world, in occupied territories, the job started in 1941. When the shooting stopped, it was assigned nonmilitary, but equally important responsibilities, maintenance of law and order, protection of the persecuted and control of the unruly, execution of the policies of our Government, teaching others, insofar as they may, the principles of individual liberty. These added missions are being carried out in occupied countries, not yet recovered from the ravages of war and still suffering from hardships and near starvation. The soldiers of today do not have the compelling motive of imminent battle to spur their efforts, as did the veterans of military campaigns, but they are going about their duties proudly and successfully and merit your wholehearted support.

The United States Army unlike the military forces of dictator governed nations, exists solely to foster and preserve the liberties of our true democracy and not to curtail them. The Army is and should be the instrument of policy in the United States, and not the maker of policy. This precept is not only a matter of law but is also one of tradition and creed, with the military services. Since the days of George Washington, there has been laid upon military leaders by law, by custom, and by regulation the responsibility for rendering professional advice to the policymakers, the executive branch of the Government, the Congress, and the people.

When the present National Defense Act was under consideration, the War Department submitted to the President and to the Congress, recommendations with respect to the strength and organization of the postwar military forces, required for national security. Those recommendations were based on the then existing national policies which in turn were based upon assumptions that have since failed to materialize. Briefly, it was anticipated that world conditions would quickly stabilize and the signing of peace treaties would promptly follow, thus permitting considerable reduction in requirements for occupation troops. Unfortunately those assumptions have since proved unsound.

Today, while we are engaged in bringing home our 300,000 war dead, peace treaties have not yet been consummated, and our Nation is engaged in a bitter economic, political, and psychological struggle, in every part of the world, where dictators have control. We are confronted with difficulties and impending dangers, which leave us with a sense of apprehension. Other leaders, and other peoples in other times, have had the relatively simple problems of building a new Nation, or preserving the Union. Our generation faces the more grave and complex task of establishing a world of law and order, of stability and permanent peace.

The chief problem is to arrange adequate machinery to guarantee to all men everywhere, the basic liberties, which we have enjoyed for so long, as to take them as much for granted as we do sunshine and rain. It sounds like a simple matter to accomplish. In actual fact, it may be so difficult, that the world will be destroyed in the effort to effect it. America cannot shirk this responsibility, for the simple reason that we stand to lose our own liberties, unless the same liberties are guaranteed to the whole world.

The current disturbing situation has developed in spite of the earnest and unselfish efforts of our statesmen to establish the foundation of a just and lasting peace. We hope and pray that the United Nations, through conference and agreement, will succeed in building a peaceful world, a world based on law and not on force. But, until that objective is attained, America must be prepared to support free and democratic nations throughout the world, and to maintain—through force if necessary—our own freedom and liberties.

On March 17, the President, in his message to Congress, outlined the critical nature of the situation in Europe and recommended three measures to strengthen our Nation. Two of the three—universal training and selective service—are designed to build up the armed forces. These two, together with the third, the European recovery program, represent in the words of the President, I quote: "The most urgent steps toward securing the peace and preventing war."

In his message, the President emphasized the vital importance of prompt action in implementing those three measures—he urged speed in providing financial assistance to free and democratic nations, and speed in the enactment of universal training and selective-service legislation. There is no conflict between selective service for the Regular forces and universal military training for the Reserve components. Selective service will provide the men urgently needed now to bring the Regular forces up to required strength. Universal military training will furnish eventually the basically trained young men needed to fill civilian components to authorized strength, and provide the Reserve pool of militarily trained citizens essential to success in any future war. Universal military training will require several years to implement, while it is being established on a sound foundation. Selective service will meet the immediate need for military manpower.

Increase in our military strength is being urged as preparedness against war—not for war. A strong America is both a deterrent to aggressor nations, and an encouragement to our peaceful friends. It will serve these purposes, only if we demonstrate to the world, a willingness to back up our foreign policy with whatever force is necessary to make it effective. Our words at the council table will have only the weight of our armed forces. Military strength is the only language a dictator understands.

You, as civilians, look to the military for advice as to the organization and strength of the armed forces best suited to meet the requirements of the present situation. If war should come again, it will be fought in the air, on the ground, and on and under the sea—therefore, for balanced strength, we must have units specially skilled in operating in each of these three elements. Decisive battles will be fought by task forces composed of all three services—operating as one team under a single commander. Development of one service—Air, Army, or Navy—at the expense of the others would be fatal to the success of those teams. The weakness of such an unbalanced armed force would be quickly recognized by military leaders of aggressor nations, and such weakness exploited to their own advantage. Since this is Army Day, and since my entire service has been in the ground forces, I shall confine my remarks primarily to the Army member of this unified team.

In our plans to strengthen the military forces as a preventive against aggression, we cannot risk the entire safety of the country on the assumption that thereby peace is assured and war is an impossibility. We must be realistic—face the situation as it is today—and build a military structure, which, if war should occur, can defend our Nation against a surprise attack and take the first important initial steps in an offense that would keep the battleground away from our shores.

In order to understand clearly the part the Army will play, we must consider the various tasks military forces may be called upon to perform in the earlier phases of a possible war. We can assume that we will

be attacked first—it is inconceivable that this Nation will start a war by offensive action. The attack will come without warning and Air and Navy forces will be responsible for meeting the first thrusts and for initiating retaliatory measures.

Therefore we need a strong Air Force, capable of air defense of our homeland and its outposts and of seeking out and destroying the enemy. This Air Force must be able to strike sustained blows far beyond the bases we now hold.

We need a Navy capable of protecting the sea lanes of the world, of waging antisubmarine warfare, of moving by sea transportation, manpower and supplies to distant points and, together with air and ground forces, of conducting amphibious operations.

But neither the Air nor the Navy can do their jobs effectively without the assistance of the Army. Land bases from which they will operate initially must be held secure by ground forces—enemy bases which would interfere with their operations must be seized and defended by the Army. As the war progresses, additional bases will be required from which the full strength of our air and naval power can be brought to bear on the enemy's country. These bases must be pushed closer and closer to the enemy, in order to make the Air and Navy effort continuous. By bases I mean not merely airfields and small harbors, but large land areas containing extensive facilities, communications, supplies, equipment, and armaments. The Army troops needed to seize, occupy, and defend such bases will add up to large numbers—not only combat divisions—but antiaircraft and service troops of all categories. And finally, upon the Army, will fall the task of carrying the battle into the homeland of the enemy. This is the traditional role of the Army.

There are other purposes for which we need a larger Army than we have today. Our antiaircraft defense must be strengthened—we cannot rely on air defense alone. Men on the ground will be required to counter hostile air drops—to prevent sabotage, and to protect our vital installations. Landing parties from enemy submarines must be discovered and destroyed. These are all tasks for combat soldiers. Supporting these fighting men will be service and technical troops in the ratio of approximately eight service to one combat. No substitute has yet been found for trained soldiers. There is no easy or cheap way to avoid the human toil, effort, and suffering inherent in land battles.

All of us at this luncheon can remember those dark days in 1941–42 and the oft-repeated cry of "Too little, too late." We are prone to forget now that we were forced to send hastily trained and partially equipped young men to reenforce inadequate garrisons in the Philippines—in Panama—in the Caribbean and other strategically located outposts. Urgent requests poured into the War Department for defense forces which were nonexistent. The Alaskan chain of islands was occupied by our enemies, and defenseless continental United States was spared a similar fate—solely because our enemies lacked the means to bridge, with ships and aircraft, the Arctic wastes and broad oceans. In this day of improved weapons and scientific methods of waging war, these material obstacles can no longer be counted upon as barriers to invasion. To be effective they must be defended by trained men—men in aircraft, men in ships, and men in tanks. In 1948, as in 1941 and 1942, trained manpower is not available and if war should come in the near future, that tragic phrase "Too little, too late" would be repeated.

Much has appeared in the press recently to the effect that future wars will be push-button affairs, fought by a few scientists, and that soldiers and ground armies are obsolete. The push button is not something new in warfare, it has been used since the invention of gunpowder. The trigger on a rifle was the first modern push button used to project killing power to a distance. In the past two wars, many types of push button were used—in tanks, in ships, and in aircraft—to fire simultaneously groups of large-caliber guns and to drop bombs, singly or in clusters, on selected targets. One man pushed the button, but assisting him were crews, varying from one to hundreds of men. Those who advocate substituting groups of technicians for armies disregard the fact that, in World War II, it required some 6,000,000 trained ground soldiers, together with some 7,000,000 trained sailors and airmen, to advance push-button-operated weapons into positions where they would be effective, and to maintain them there in spite of enemy efforts to destroy the weapons and their defenders.

It is a historical fact, that the British Isles continued to be devastated by push-button-operated rockets and guided missiles, located on the Continent, until the sites were overrun by ground armies. Neither the atom bomb, nor any other known weapon has made obsolete this method of operation, and there is no justification for the belief that a few technicians will suffice to take over, in the foreseeable future, the role, played by some 13,000,000 soldiers, sailors, and airmen—in a war completed less than 3 years ago.

What is the status of our Army today? The Regular Army has been so drastically reduced that it is hardly more than a skeleton of its wartime strength and its combat value is almost nil. Its total strength is approximately 542,000 officers and men. Two hundred and fifty-eight thousand of this total are scattered thinly throughout the world on occupation duty, and are so depleted everywhere as to be little more than a police force. The remaining 284,000 are on duty in the United States. Of this number, about 230,000 are performing service duties necessary to maintain occupation forces or are engaged in administrative and training duties at headquarters, schools, recruiting centers, and with the civilian components. After meeting the requirements just mentioned there remains, immediately available in the United States for combat duty, approximately 54,000 men—just about enough for two and one-third divisions with supporting troops. This force constitutes the only organized and trained reserve available to reenforce overseas garrisons, to defend our thousands of miles of coast line and our vast interior, and to undertake offensive retaliatory operations in coordination with Air and Navy forces.

Compare this strength of about 2⅓ divisions with the strength of 88 divisions we had in combat on VE-day, and it is evident that the Army contingent of the armed forces team is today inadequate to support current negotiations for peace and is hopelessly inadequate to meet the requirements of a war emergency should aggressor nations attempt to impose their way of life on America and the rest of the world.

In an effort to compensate for the lack of strength in the Regular Army, hundreds of thousands of patriotic citizens are devoting much of their time and energy to the organization and training of National Guard and Organized Reserve units. In spite of their efforts, the civilian components are understrength, short equipment and trained to a limited degree only. Their leaders are striving earnestly and unselfishly to overcome the obstacles that are hindering the full and prompt accomplishment of their missions. They cannot do it alone, but must have your active and positive help—as well as your thanks and good wishes.

There is, in addition to the Regular Army and the civilian components, an unorganized reserve composed of veterans of the last war. The availability of this group for combat service is decreasing rapidly because of age, sickness, death, and family obligations. It is estimated that the current usable pool of World War II veterans is diminishing at the rate of between one and one and one-half million men per year.

Voluntary recruiting has failed to provide the trained manpower now lacking. Selective service and universal military training will correct this weakness. We hope that these measures, if and when enacted into law, will contribute to the prevention of war. But if our peace efforts fail and if war should occur again, the preliminary steps taken now to train our young men for a national emergency will save precious time and—what is more important—thousands of lives.

Americans have demonstrated, time and time again, their willingness to make any sacrifice when aggressors act to destroy our way of life. But because of our profound desire for peace, we are slow to accept the existence of threats to our security, and hesitant about taking adequate measures to meet them.

World peace is in jeopardy. Our people cannot hear too often—nor is it possible to exaggerate—the scope of the responsibilities which devolve upon our Army and upon all citizens individually and collectively—in upholding our country's position in the Congress of Nations. We all enjoy the blessings afforded by a peaceful America—we should likewise share the sacred responsibilities of building a strong America.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert transcript of my radio broadcast of the week of March 15, 1948, over the stations in my district, and a letter in reply to this broadcast by the Honorable Robert S. Baird, judge of probate, Cheboygan County, Mich.:

We have been hearing much lately about civil rights—in fact it has been a very "touchy" subject since the President sent his message to Congress requesting legislation on this issue. The southern leaders are pretty hot about it and are seriously talking of walking out on the President at the Democratic National Convention, if he continues to force a show-down in Congress on this problem.

Like every question, there are two sides to this one. I am sure we all agree that the Negro should have equal opportunity for employment, education, and vote—those rights are guaranteed to all American citizens under our Bill of Rights. We despise lynchings, just as we hate gang murders. Most of us believe it unfair to require a tax for the privilege of voting.

The President has requested Federal legislation to correct these inequalities. It seems a little ironical to me that the question of civil rights always comes up just before a congressional or Presidential election. Both parties are guilty of using civil rights as a bait to get the Negro vote of our large northern cities.

Let's look at this issue objectively—assuming that we all believe no person should be discriminated against because of race or creed.

The southern leaders claim they recognize the problem and are doing everything possible

to correct it. They cite that the number of lynchings has dropped off considerably in the past few years while, in fact, the number of gang murders in the North have increased.

It is not the poll tax that keeps the Negro from voting in Southern States but rather the fear of retaliation from the whites. If the poll tax were abolished, there are many who believe it would not affect Negro voting in those States.

The question of States' rights also enters into it. How far should the Federal Government try to go in forcing its will on one particular section of the country?

What results could we expect from the enactment of civil-rights legislation? Would it be the same as was prohibition—impossible to enforce? Do you think we can settle this great social and economic question overnight by just passing a law or two? I, for one, have my doubts. I think we should ponder seriously the words of wisdom of our honored Chase S. Osborn—the grand old former Governor of Michigan and pioneer of Sault Ste. Marie. Governor Osborn wrote to the editor of the Detroit Free Press in response to an editorial chiding Representative HOFFMAN, and he quoted the honored Negro leader Booker T. Washington as saying "Brains, property, and character for the Negro will settle the question of civil rights. The best course to pursue in regards to the civil-rights bill in the South is to let it alone. Let it alone and it will settle itself." He went on to say: "Good schools, teachers, and plenty of money to pay them, will be more potent in settling the race question than many civil rights and investigating committees."

These were not the words of a white southern politician but rather the words of Booker T. Washington, the pride of all Negroes.

We in our district do not have a racial problem, but I am inclined to believe our esteemed Governor Osborn and Booker T. Washington are right in their contention. There is a strong possibility that civil-rights legislation on a Federal level might cause more lynchings, more race riots, and more hard feelings than now experienced—and all these would seriously hinder the great strides the Negro has made in the past 60 years.

You have done quite a bit of reading on this question of civil rights which has so stirred up the South—I have, too—I would be most happy to receive your comments on the subject. Let me know whether you think a Congressman from the North should vote for the passage of civil-rights measures, or do you believe that this legislation might cause more strife between the two races—white and colored—than now exists, and that any change such as this must of necessity be slow and that education is the solution rather than civil-rights legislation.

PROBATE COURT,
Cheboygan, Mich., March 20, 1948.

The Honorable CHARLES E. POTTER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

In re proposed civil-rights bill.

DEAR CHARLES: You may have a difficult time through which to reconcile this letter, but it will be despite the fact it is mailed in Michigan, "a genuine voice from the Deep South." I am a native Alabamian. Both my grandfathers fought in the Confederacy. My Grandfather Baird suffered two wounds, which were never completely healed until his second son grew up and became a physician and surgeon and took over the care of his father. I know the South from inheritance, and having lived there until I was nearly 30 years of age, I know its faults and its virtues, and I know particularly its obstinancies.

The present predicament grows, not out of the Civil War, but out of the reconstruction atrocities and abominations forced and foisted upon a helpless and conquered South by a victorious North, under the diabolical leadership of fanatics in the Republican Party after the death of Lincoln.

The Civil War was fought not to free the Negroes from slavery, but to preserve the Union, and shortly thereafter the victorious Federal Government under the fanatical leadership which gained the ascendancy on the death of Lincoln, proceeded to destroy the States, and set up military districts and thereafter, farcically "readmit" the States which had purported to secede, but which at Appomattox had been decided could not be done. For this crime the Republican Party has never officially repented, and has never been forgiven in the South, and until the Republican Party officially repents for the crime of reconstruction and its fanaticism, the South will continue to be a one-party section.

During reconstruction, the freed Negroes were allowed to vote by the force of Federal bayonets, and became the pawns of the carpetbaggers, the scum and filth of the North, which had been spewed out of their own communities and foisted upon a beaten and helpless South. The recently emancipated Negroes were elected to high and low offices, even to the United States Senate and to Congress, and the whites of the South were held in subservience by Federal bayonets under the leadership and sponsorship of the Republican Party.

The Republican Party and the northerners had no love for the Negroes, as is evidenced by the fact that no Negro was ever elected to Congress or to the United States Senate until about 1928, when a Negro—mulatto—born in Alabama, but then living in the First Illinois was elected from a district top-heavy with a Negro population. Sometime thereafter and after the Roosevelt landslide, another Negro born in Alabama, Mitchell by name, I believe, but on the Roosevelt Democratic ticket defeated the Republican Negro. Thereafter I believe a Negro was elected from a New York district. Based upon my memory, and I believe it to be true, only three Negroes from any State north of Mason and Dixon's line have ever sat in the Houses of the Congress. Several more than that have sat in the Houses of the Congress from States of the South, because they were put there by Federal bayonets. There are men living in the South who remember those Federal bayonets, and they have passed the story on down to their descendants.

I think you know, as well as I do, that except in heavily preponderant Negro city districts in the North, no Negro in the North would stand the ghost of a chance of being elected to either House of the Congress.

I make no argument as to the right or the wrong of the civil-rights bill. I only say that at present, it will never work, but will undo the good work of level-headed Negroes and fair-minded whites of the South. It will immediately cause a revival of the Ku Klux Klan, and I believe it will not increase the percentage of Negroes now voting in the South by as much as 10 percent. But I do believe that it will ultimately cause the death, by means, which even a one-man grand jury would never discover, of many Negroes.

The Honorable Chase Osborn is correct, and CLARE HOFFMAN, following his lead, is also right.

If the Republican Party would seize the opportunity of repenting of its reconstruction sins and defeat the adoption of these measures at this time, and thereafter, in the South, become a lily-white party, and appoint to Federal office only whites of the highest caliber, there would come the opportunity in a few years of a strong Republican Party developing in the South.

In my home State there are 67 counties, 14 of which are apt to go Republican. The strange thing about these counties is that they have practically no Negro population. Res ipsa loquitur.

Apparently the Republicans are going to elect a President this year, and I feel sure he should not be burdened with a Federal statute which cannot be enforced and which if tried would only bring bitterness and dissensions. We need unity now against the foreign enemy. In the South Negroes enjoy "heart rights" but not all of the civil rights; in the North the Negroes enjoy (theoretically, at least) all civil rights, but have no "heart rights." By this I mean that men nd women of good heart, by the compulsion of their own nature, will see to it that Negroes receive a fair and square deal, but will not agree to let them vote. (In many counties the Negro population equals or exceeds the white.) Whereas in the North, if the law is invoked, the northerners will agree to let the Negroes have their civil rights, but thereafter there is a bitterness of the heart against the Negroes such as they do not experience in the South (I am speaking now of the good class of whites both in the North and the South). As Christian principles grow and as education advances, Negroes will be accorded all the rights and privileges to which every other citizen is entitled.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. BAIRD.

Palestine Partition Advocates Ignore National Security Phase of Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Constantine Brown, noted writer, in the Sunday Star of April 4, points out very clearly that ardent advocates of Palestine partition are ignoring important political considerations in insisting upon partition at this time. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

PARTITION ADHERENTS BLIND TO OBSTACLES FACING PLAN—SECURITY REASONS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHANGE IN PALESTINE POLICY RATHER THAN OIL INTERESTS OR ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Constantine Brown)

The Zionists and other ardent advocates of Palestine partition appear to be blind to the political reasons which prompted the administration to withdraw its support for the immediate creation of a Jewish state.

Some frustrated spokesmen for partition-at-any-price lay the blame publicly on oil interests which, they say, have prevailed over humanitarian interests in those administration quarters which decided at the eleventh hour to reverse themselves. Others blame certain officials of the State and Defense Departments whom they accuse of anti-Semitism. The truth—and the most prominent American Zionist leaders ought to be aware of it—is that the tense situation created by the U. S. S. R. in the world has become so threatening that any attempt to enforce the decision of partition at this time would jeopardize the security of the United States, of which the American Zionists and their non-Jewish friends are citizens.

Throughout the war the Palestine Jews did not bargain with their lives when it came to support of the Allies against the Nazis. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist leader, was the first to urge his people to give their utmost in the defense of the British Empire, and these young men performed wonders at the Battle of El Alamein. They helped save the day for the British and their Allies.

PRESSURE BEGAN IN 1944

It was in the spring of 1944 that the movement to coerce Britain to live up to the Balfour declaration took formal shape in the United States. Representative BLOOM of New York, then chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, prepared a resolution asking Congress to go on record with a demand that the British fulfill their obligations and a plea for the creation of a Jewish state.

General Marshall, then Army Chief of Staff, went to see Mr. BLOOM on President Roosevelt's instructions and pointed out that any practical enforcement of such a resolution would call for at least four and possibly six American divisions in Palestine. Under then-existing conditions, the American Army could not spare such a force without endangering our chance of victory against the Axis.

Considering the extensive commitments of our forces, we were operating then on a shoestring. We had only 64 divisions to meet all commitments. Mr. BLOOM was impressed with the explanations given in an off-the-record conversation by the Chief of Staff and withdrew his resolution.

Later in the summer Senator WAGNER of New York called on President Roosevelt and pointed out to him that he had a tough fight on his hands and a good deal of opposition from the Jewish voters in that State because the administration had not lived up to its pledge for a Jewish state. President Roosevelt wrote him the now well-known "Dear BOB" letter, allowing him to assure his electors that this matter would be taken care of without delay—and to the satisfaction of the Jews—when Congress reconvened after the election.

The same difficulty presented itself again in November of that year, when Senator WAGNER insisted that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate report out a resolution demanding that Britain give assurances for the creation of a Jewish state. Britain, the American Government knew, was going to pass the buck to the United States and we did not have the necessary force to assume any obligations in that area without endangering our military position in other areas.

BLINDNESS OF HOPE

For some time we all lived under the delusion that the United Nations would guarantee the world from another large-scale conflagration. The skeptics were denounced as birds of ill-omen and jingoists who did not want peace. Even the fact that the Russians were preventing the formation of a United Nations force to implement the decisions of that body was overlooked.

Most of the people connected with the UN had become adepts at the Dr. Coué trick of repeating "Every day in every way I'm getting better and better." They believed strongly in the power of mind over body. Our Government led the parade when it refused to understand that with the United Nations as weak as it was, and with the western world lacking a military force, it would be America's responsibility to enforce the Palestine partition plan.

Until a few weeks ago the political leaders of this country refused to believe that Russia's intentions were aggressive and that the Kremlin had set a pattern for the conquest of Europe and China which would place the United States in the position of having to decide between fighting for its existence against heavy odds or accepting the Russian dictates.

After VJ-day we went into an orgy of disarmament. The 64 divisions which formed our ground forces were reduced to something like 8 divisions, strewn over the entire world: In Germany, in Austria, in the Trieste free territory, in Japan and Korea. There is not enough organized force left in this country to support our outposts in case of an emergency. We do not even have enough troops to garrison properly our strategic Territory of Alaska. The Air Force was reduced to a sad minimum, with only 1,800 first-class planes, and two-thirds of the Navy was placed in moth balls.

From all over the world, from China, from France and from Scandinavia we hear appeals for eventual military help. We have pledged ourselves to defend the sovereignty of Turkey, Greece, and Italy, because they are considered strategically vital areas in the event Russia decides on an early show-down with this country.

Perhaps our political leaders can be accused of shortsightedness. But that is water over the dam. They pledged themselves to partition of Palestine and the creation of a Judaic state, when they should have known Russia's intentions and should have recognized that we could not spare even a corporal's guard to fulfill our promises.

RUSSIA HAD MOTIVES

From the time the Soviet Government agreed to associate itself in the partition proposal our military men pointed out to the White House and the State Department that Russia's willingness was prompted not by humanitarian considerations but by the desire to send troops of her own to Palestine and thus control the Suez Canal.

The persecution of Jews in the U. S. S. R. and the drastic restrictions placed on all persons of Jewish faith and race—not only in Russia but in the satellite states as well—leave no doubt about the motives for Russia's decision. Moscow knew as well as Washington the American military potential and prepared for itself a comfortable niche in Palestine to be taken over not by methods employed in Central Europe, but with the approval of the United Nations. Only those blinded by passion refused to see the situation in this light.

The oil of Saudi Arabia—which the Zionists and their friends have described as a gigantic speculation intended to fill the pockets of the Standard Oil stockholders—is, in fact, important not to those persons but to the security of the United States itself.

No responsible person in this country contends that there is not a strong possibility of conflict between the United States and Russia. The best American military minds consider Saudi Arabia as a strategic point. Aviation, it is universally admitted, will play an enormous role in the next war.

SUPPLIES ARE ESSENTIAL

Russia is not Germany. It is a vast country, extending from the Oder River and the Adriatic to the Pacific. To carry on operations against that power we must possess airbases at several points in the world. The air strips of Saudi Arabia will be of enormous importance if war comes. Furthermore, logistics in the next war will be even more important than in the last.

Airplanes can be operated only if we have almost inexhaustible oil and gasoline supplies. These the Arabian oil fields can provide. Without them we would have to send oil and gasoline by tanker across seas infested by enemy submarines.

The possession of air strips in Saudi Arabia and the exploitation of oil lands in the same area assures us an advantage of paramount importance to our national defense and to the security of this country. The denial of that territory to the United States would mean a very grave danger to our national existence.

If the U. S. S. R. had decided to abide by the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter, instead of attempting to make that organization into a sounding board for her expansionist aims, there is no question that the Palestine question would be regarded today in a different light.

But when the American people and their Government have to decide between defense of the country itself and the creation of a Jewish state, it is inconceivable that even the American Zionists would hesitate on which way to turn. The overwhelming majority of the American people have a deep sympathy with the plight of the homeless Jew, but under the present circumstances they have a deeper concern in the defense of the United States itself and of the way of life which they have inherited through many years of struggle.

CAUSE OF REVERSAL

It is not the desire of a few to enrich themselves, or the desire of certain officials to prove themselves right, which has compelled the administration to revise its policies toward Palestine. It is the dire necessity—which was so grossly overlooked by vote-catching politicians—to meet the Soviet aggressiveness which has caused the reversal of our policies.

There should be no doubt in the mind of any American, regardless of race or creed, that when he has to choose between the security and possibly the survival of his own country and the creation of a Jewish state, the interests of America must have top priority.

So long as it appeared that a long period of peace and harmony would follow World War II, the Zionists had a good case. But now, when this illusion of peace and harmony has been shattered by Russian actions, any pressure to compel this country to sacrifice its vital interests to that laudable idea of a Jewish state can turn only to the disadvantage of the Jews throughout the world.

Their fate is closely tied to the survival of freedom and democracy. If these are submerged by the Russian hordes, and our military potential is weakened because of Zionist insistence that America fulfill her pledges regardless of consequences, they will suffer as much as the freedom-loving countries.

The Stillwater Convention, 1848

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, historians consider the convention which was held at Stillwater in what is now Washington County, Minn., on August 26, 1848, as the most important official event leading to the creation of the Territory and eventually the State of Minnesota. As a result of this convention Minnesota was created as a Territory in 1849.

Public Law 459, of March 25, 1948, authorizes and directs the Postmaster General to prepare a special series of 3-cent postage stamps of such design as re shall prescribe to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Territory of Minnesota. Because of the historical significance of the Stillwater convention as the forerunner of Territorial status for Minnesota I have written to the Postmaster General urging him to select one stamp, in the series he is directed to prescribe, that will give proper recognition to the historic Stillwater Convention.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Mr. Speaker, you may not be familiar with the historical significance of the memorable Stillwater convention. The events that led to this meeting concerned

the establishment of the States of Iowa and Wisconsin. On August 6, 1846, Congress passed the organic act for Wisconsin and in December of the same year Iowa was admitted as a State. Since what is now Minnesota had previously been a part of these Territories, their creation as States with their present boundaries left the Minnesota region without organic existence except in what is now Washington County where they were still under Wisconsin Territorial laws, but due to be severed therefrom as soon as Wisconsin adopted her State constitution.

Therefore on May 29, 1848, when Wisconsin became a State, organized government west of the St. Croix and north of Iowa ceased to exist. No government had been provided for this region.

Filled with a common sense of danger and neglect, the scanty populations of the remnants of Wisconsin and Iowa were drawn closer to each other than ever before. The little settlement of Mendota, which had formerly looked to the Territorial government of Iowa for its laws and administration, found a new attachment to the neighboring towns of St. Paul and Stillwater. The people from both sides of the river promptly met to confer with each other and seem to have agreed to coordinate their activities in an effort to bring back the benefits of organized government.

CONVENTION CALL

Several meetings, attended by residents of both regions were held in St. Paul and Stillwater during July and August. As a result of these meetings 18 leading citizens on August 4, 1848, signed a call for a convention. The call read as follows:

We, the undersigned, citizens of Minnesota Territory, impressed with the necessity of taking measures to secure an early Territorial organization, and that those measures shall be taken by the people with unity of action, respectfully recommend that the people of the several settlements in the proposed Territory appoint delegates to meet in convention at Stillwater, on the 26th day of August next, to adopt the necessary steps for that purpose.

Residents who signed the call were as follows: Louis Robert, H. H. Sibley, Joseph R. Brown, W. Holcombe, Jona McKusick, M. S. Wilkinson, Anson Northrup, C. Carli, John R. Brewster, H. K. McKinstry, James D. McComb, Jacob Fisher, John Collier, H. L. Moss, Socrates Nelson, Franklin Steele, P. A. R. Brace, Horace Jacobs.

Sibley was to become Minnesota's first Governor and Holcombe our first Lieutenant Governor.

THE CONVENTION

The convention met as prearranged on August 26, 1848, and was well attended. Sixty-one delegates signed the memorials. Among them were nearly all the outstanding men of the whole Minnesota region, Joseph W. Brown, A. L. Larpenteur, C. F. Leach, H. L. Moss, Morton S. Wilkinson, W. Holcombe, H. H. Sibley, H. Jackson, Socrates Nelson, Louis Robert, Joshua L. Taylor, Samuel Burkleo, James S. Norris, and many more. These men were the true pioneers of the Minnesota country. They lived mainly in St. Paul, Stillwater, Marine, and the adjacent towns, but others had received word of the meeting far in their northern settlements and had descended the river many miles to take part in the deliberations. Only the distant Pembina region on the Red River seems to have been unrepresented.

The convention took two important steps. First, they unanimously elected Sibley as a delegate and instructed him to proceed to Washington City to negotiate with the United States Government for the organization of Minnesota as a new Territory. Secondly, they passed a resolution addressed to President Polk which summarized their views. It read:

Your memorialists, citizens of the territory north of the northwestern boundary of Wisconsin and of the northern boundary of Iowa, ask leave respectfully to represent:

That the region of country which they inhabit, formerly a portion of the Territories of Iowa and Wisconsin, subject to the laws and government of those Territories. * * *

That this region of country is settled by a population of nearly 5,000 persons, who are engaged in various industrial pursuits. * * *

That by the admission of Wisconsin into the Union, with the boundaries as prescribed by Congress, and the omission by that body to pass a law for the organization of a new territory, embracing the portion of country inhabited by your memorialists, they and all their fellow citizens are left without officers to administer and execute the laws. That, having once enjoyed the rights and privileges of citizens of a Territory of the United States, they are now, without fault of their own, virtually disfranchised.

They have no securities for their lives or property but those which exist in mutual good understanding. Meanwhile all proceedings in criminal cases, and all process for the collection of debts, are suspended; credit exists only so far as a perfect confidence in mutual good faith extends, and all the operations of business are embarrassed.

They also pointed out that so lawless a state "is fraught with evils and dangers," and they closed with an appeal to the President to "call the attention of Congress to their situation at the opening of the next annual session and recommend the early organization of the Territory of Minnesota."

DELEGATE SIBLEY AT WASHINGTON

With his credentials from the Stillwater convention and an official certificate of election as Delegate from the Territory of Wisconsin, which election was held subsequent to the convention, Henry H. Sibley presented himself at the opening of Congress in December 1848. On December 22 he appeared before the House Committee on Elections and delivered a speech in which he said probably all that could have been said in behalf of the recognition of this last unorganized portion of the old Northwest Territory. His main argument was that Congress could not morally and legally withdraw the rights and privileges granted by the ordinance of 1787, which extended to all the inhabitants of the Territory.

We are a part and parcel of the people to whom were secured these blessings, and a decision which would deprive us of the right to be represented on the floor of Congress would virtually annul these guaranties.

As a precedent he cited the case of Paul Fearing, who had been a Delegate from Northwest Territory when the State of Ohio was created and retained his seat as representative of the people of the rest of the Territory after Ohio had been admitted to the Union. On January 2, 1849, the committee brought in a report recommending that Delegate Sibley be seated, and by some skillful parliamentary tactics on January 15 the report was adopted and the question of Sibley's right to his seat decided in the affirmative.

Thus, as a direct result of the Stillwater convention and the subsequent election, Delegate Sibley was seated in the United States House of Representatives and Minnesota was eventually created as a Territory and finally admitted as a State.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Postmaster General will, by selecting an appropriate commemorative stamp, give due recognition to the historic importance of the Stillwater convention in the establishment of the Territory of Minnesota.

Emergency Resolution—Omaha, Ponca, Santee Sioux, and Winnebago Indian Tribes of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1948, the tribal representatives of the Omaha, Ponca, Santee Sioux, and Winnebago Indian Tribes of Nebraska reduced to writing and subscribed a statement of their grievances and their prayer for relief. The language of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Omaha, Ponca, Santee Sioux, and Winnebago Indian Tribes of Nebraska have faith in and rely upon their legal, equitable, and moral relationships with the Government of the United States specified and reflected in the long line of solemn treaties, acts of Congress, Executive orders, decisions of the courts, administrative regulations, administrative interpretations and procedures amounting to prescribed and accepted mutual understandings of binding relationships that were designed and pledged for the benefit and protection of the Indian people by the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the Omaha, Ponca, Santee Sioux, and Winnebago Indians of Nebraska accepted by tribal elections the act of Congress approved June 18, 1934 (Public, No. 383, 73d Cong.), commonly known as the Indian Reorganization Act, and these tribes are now and have been since the acceptance of the act in 1934 operating as far as possible under its provisions as organized and incorporated Indian tribes; and

Whereas the undersigned officers and representatives of the Omaha, Ponca, Santee Sioux, and Winnebago Indian Tribes are charged with the legal and moral responsibility of doing everything in their power to safeguard and promote the welfare, prosperity, and happiness of their tribes; and

Whereas many agreements and understandings mutually executed for the welfare and advancement of the Indian people have

not been carried out nor completed by the Government of the United States, including civilization, law and order, education, health, training in industry, the art of social relations, and the ways of the white man in the complex requirements of living, the large majority of our people are not now prepared nor trained to assume these responsibilities nor to withstand the disastrous consequences of unpreparedness; and

Whereas our tribes have not been able to provide funds for the operation of our tribal affairs but have relied upon the Government of the United States to furnish funds, personnel, and other necessary facilities under treaties and laws of Congress; and

Whereas during the past few years increasing agitation in various sections of the country has caused the limitation and abandonment of many contractual and essential services by the Government of the United States to the American Indians, and these sudden—unsupported by facts and ill-advised—stoppages and neglects already have resulted in damages to the Indian people that can never be repaired; and

Whereas the welfare of the people is the most important factor of our national citizenship and therefore constitutes the foundation of all considerations and services and should not be neglected on the peril of disaster as has been done with the Indians of Nebraska by abolishing the position of welfare worker, public-health nurse, home economics teacher, and education field agent, all without consulting the Indians or local people for the facts and circumstances; and

Whereas we believe that mutual good faith and confidence between the Indian people and the Government of the United States should never be violated and that the sacred trust of the welfare, health, education, and economic security of the Indians shall not be neglected nor abandoned but looked after and promoted as promised over and over again until such time in the future when the promised goals shall have been reached; and

Whereas within the past year several Federal employees of the Winnebago Indian Agency occupying key positions and performing needed and beneficial services have been transferred or their positions abolished without conferring with the Indian people and without regard to the needs or the neglects of the Indian people and the obligations of the Government of the United States to supply them; and

Whereas our people are now feeling the bad effects on their welfare, general health, education of their children, and support of their families, and the great majority of the Indians of Nebraska are not prepared to be deprived of the aid and help of the Government of the United States nor to take care of themselves in the competition of living, many of them having tried to live and work in nearby cities of Omaha and Sioux City, but have been compelled to return to their reservations because they could not take care of their families, in many cases causing family separations and desertions, resulting in all kinds of difficulties—social, economic, legal, and otherwise; and

Whereas section 16 of the act of Congress approved June 18, 1934 (Public, No. 383, 73d Cong.), provides: "The Secretary of the Interior shall advise such tribe or its tribal council of all appropriation estimates or Federal projects for the benefit of the tribe prior to the submission of such estimates to the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress"; and the Omaha, Ponca, Santee Sioux, and Winnebago Indian Tribes of Nebraska have been denied the privilege and right to exercise this important legal function in behalf of their welfare, thus handicapping each tribe and its officers in the reasonable discharge of their duties because of lack of funds for tribal projects, personnel, and facilities, as well as insufficient funds and personnel for our local agency; and

Whereas we feel that unnecessary and unjustifiable expenditures of funds for the employment of supervisors in district offices absorb and deplete appropriations which should be used locally, and that the elimination of funds and personnel from the local and cooperative work with the Indians destroys the very purposes of the appropriations and prevents the accomplishments of the objects of treaty agreements, legal and administrative understandings; and

Whereas it is impossible to carry on a progressive, constructive, protective, and beneficial program or administration without adequate funds, personnel, and equipment for the tribal organizations and for the local Government agency: Therefore

Resolved, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, our Congressmen and Senators from Nebraska and the Committees on Indian Affairs of the Congress be informed of these conditions and be reminded that the said present adverse and deprivation conditions are the immediate and direct results of suddenly stopping services, reduction of funds and essential local personnel, without previous and acceptable arrangements with the tribes and the local county and State governments to assume the duties and services belonging to the Government of the United States; and

Resolved, That it is our candid and inescapable belief that conditions will continue to grow worse and cause increasing hardships and acute suffering unless changes and reductions already made are immediately retracted and replaced and the necessary funds are supplied; and

Resolved, That the following local Federal agency services and personnel recently abandoned and abolished be re-established: education field agent, field health nurse, social welfare worker, home economics teacher, extension agent, three clerk-stenographers—these are minimum requirements, really the need for reasonable progress toward a day when the Indians are ready to carry on justifies twice the above number in addition to the present under-minimum staff to carry out the commitments of the Government of the United States to the Indians of Nebraska; and

Resolved, That the Omaha, Ponca, Santee Sioux, and Winnebago Indian Tribes of Nebraska desire to cooperate fully with the Government of the United States in hastening the day when the obligations and purposes of the treaties and laws shall have been discharged and fulfilled to the honor and credit of the Indians and the Government of the United States, and therefore feel that adequate Federal funds and equipment both for tribal and local agency use should be supplied at once for needed protection, training, and progress of the Indians of Nebraska to final discharge and completion of mutual agreements and understandings.

Respectfully and urgently submitted.

Omaha Tribal Council, Macy, Nebr.: Amos Lamson, Chairman; Charles A. Walker, Vice Chairman; Charles J. Springer, Secretary; Louis A. Saunsoci, Treasurer; John C. Freemont, Lawrence Hallowell, Lambert Walker, Members. Santee Sioux Tribal Council, Niobrara, Nebr.: David Frazier, Chairman; Ellis Campbell, Vice Chairman; Isaac Redowl, Jr., Secretary; Joseph H. James, Treasurer; Fred Frazier, Harrison Goodteacher, Dan Graham, Gordon E. Kitto, Clarence Mackey, Gabe Rouillard, Charles Thomas, Harry Walker, Members. Ponca Board of Governors, Niobrara, Nebr: Joseph LeRoy, President; Lea A. Peniska, Vice President; Henry Peniska, Secretary; Mabel P. Peniska, Treasurer; Otto Birdhead, Rose Birdhead, Robert Cole, Thomas O. Knudsen, Alice Wright, Members. Winnebago Tribal Council, Winnebago, Nebr.; Frank Beaver, Chairman; William St. Cyr, Vice Chairman; John Little Wolf, Secretary; Charles V. LaMere, Treasurer; Louis Armell, Isaac Greyhair, Edward Hatchett, Anson McKee, Ashley Raye, Harry Snowball, Susie White, Moses Whitebear, Members.

Land Tenure as a Cause of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter to Secretary of State Marshall from Paul A. Eke, economist at the University of Idaho, on feudal land ownership.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *March 24, 1948.*

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am acutely aware of the confusion in the minds of our people concerning the matter of checking the spread of communism. I wonder if this is not the result of a lack of facts concerning the causes and roots of communism. As a land and institutional economist (Ph. D., University of Wisconsin, 1923) in economics and political science, I wonder if a few facts and observations as I see them might be helpful to you in meeting the critical situation in the world today.

1. First, I wish to state that communism and other forms of totalitarianism is not much of a problem in countries where land reform has removed feudalistic organization of their agriculture; in short, where most farmers own the land which they farm. For example, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Ireland, the British Isles (and even France), and the United States are such countries. France is the only country where this reform came about by violent means (1789). If land reform had occurred in Russia in the nineteenth century, communism would probably never have come in that country in 1917.

2. Land reform has given political security to farmers which has enabled them to act as a counter force to the worst features of industrialization and have made capitalism reasonably tolerable.

3. In those countries with independent land-owning farmers and many farmers' cooperatives, organized labor unions have attained a status of respectability, responsibility, and power which further acts as a curb upon concentrated industrial management, which concentration tends toward plutocracy. Sweden is the best example of this type of development. The United States of America is lagging in this development.

4. Communism in power and threats of communism are prevalent now in many countries with recent, concentrated private rural land ownership as in the Balkan states, Turkey, Spain, Italy, China, and India. In Argentina it is fascism.

5. Thomas Jefferson held that private land ownership by the many was the foundation of democracy because each man had security and could speak his mind freely and vote

without compulsion. In modern America and in other industrial nations many if not most citizens are deprived of this type of security. I suggest the following remedy. That the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution which reads in part: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process of law" have the word "productive employment" or "job" inserted after "property." Civil-service laws and the Wagner Act have already gone a great distance in this direction. This type of program it seems would tend to insure America and other liberal democracies against trends toward communism and fascism. May I quote Walter Reuther at this point: "You can't slug it (communism) to death with a club or a slogan—you have to show it up in the market place of ideas, expose it by honest dealing." In fine it seems we must put forth in the market of ideas the proposition that in a democracy everyone must own something (a livelihood) which cannot be taken from him without due process of law. This will promote individualism and freedom as against communism and regimentation. Land reform sponsored by the United States in China is no doubt better than arms to the feudal lords. The same may be said of Italy.

6. Land-ownership reform in Europe seems to have had roots in religious reform, namely, the Protestant Reformation. It is noteworthy that predominantly Protestant countries have had land reform while other countries such as Russia, Spain, Italy, Poland, and others with totalitarian religious authority have lagged and now have totalitarian tendencies in government and industry. South American countries are other examples of lack of land reform, maybe for the same reasons.

I am sure that the above is only one side or part of one side of the shield of situations, but it seems to be so important that to ignore it is to underestimate the powerful political arguments which the communists have ready at hand in countries still feudalistic in land ownership and in control of natural resources generally.

Very truly yours,

PAUL A. EKE,
Economist at University of Idaho.

Charter of International Trade Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD statements recently issued by Secretary of State Marshall and Ambassador Austin in connection with the signing at Habana, Cuba, of the charter of the International Trade Organization.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY MARSHALL ON CONCLUSION OF HABANA ITO CONFERENCE

It is gratifying that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment has succeeded in producing a charter for an International Trade Organization.

Completion of the charter follows 2 years and more of intensive effort, including four meetings held under the auspices of the United Nations, to formulate a generally acceptable code of fair practice in matters affecting international commerce. Representatives of more than 50 nations have now produced a document which, when approved by the governments concerned will bring into being an organization dedicated to these purposes.

In the development of the charter, widely divergent interests and points of view had to be reconciled. The present economic difficulties and special situations of many of the countries represented at Habana added to the difficulty of this task. The fact that agreement was finally made possible in these circumstances demonstrates that the most difficult common problems are susceptible of cooperative solution where there exists a common determination to succeed.

The course and outcome of the Habana Conference also demonstrate the great immediate importance attached to both the ends and the means set forth in detail in the charter. Participating governments sent some of their leading men to the meetings and were intensely concerned, to the end of the negotiations, with the exact final terms of agreement. Chaotic economic conditions at present brought home the vital need for a statement of long-range objectives and for agreement upon the fair trade policies to be used in seeking these objectives. The charter for the ITO is an answer to both needs.

The charter represents agreement on basic economic policies never before treated in a single general international agreement. It recognizes the degree to which national action over a wide area affects the economic well-being of other nations. Employment, economic development, international trade policy, intergovernmental commodity agreements, and cartel activity are dealt with, in each case with a view to assuring that national and international action in these fields will be directed toward a general raising of living standards throughout the world. The charter not only spells out in considerable detail principles to govern world trade but establishes procedures for making them effective. It provides for the establishment of the International Trade Organization to be the agency responsible for the administration of the provisions of the charter. The Organization will furnish a forum for discussion and consultation regarding solution of international problems of trade and employment.

The acceptance of the charter will affirm the common economic goals of world recovery, point the way toward those goals and thus contribute to progressive expansion of world production and consumption through a grown and mutually profitable trade among all members on a fair basis.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR WARREN R. AUSTIN, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE AT THE SEAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS, ON THE SIGNING OF THE CHARTER OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION IN HABANA

I welcome the signing of the charter of the International Trade Organization as I would welcome the signing of a treaty of peace. The ITO is, in fact, in the nature of a treaty of economic peace, ending more than two decades in which protection and reprisal were far more common than cooperation. The full significance of the step cannot be appreciated without recalling the tariff rivalry of the 1920's, the restrictive nationalism of the depression years, the distortions caused by Nazi and Fascist trade aggression, and the tight controls imposed on almost all economies during the last great war. It was a trend relieved only by this country's sustained effort toward tariff reduction under the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Thus the ITO is a turning point. It is the international organ, in the United Nations pattern, through which the world will work cooperatively to cut away the accumulated snarls which have entangled peacetime international trade.

The importance of this event in forwarding the interests of political peace are self-evident. As the ITO functions effectively, nations will be able to exploit more fully their natural economic advantages of geography, resources, and skills, and to develop industrially. Workers and consumers will reap the benefits in increased employment and higher standards of living. The ITO influence on the flow of international trade can be expected to aid also in achieving international monetary stability. In short, commercial frictions are diminished and energies can increasingly be devoted to peaceful pursuits.

Hand in hand with the ITO goes the reciprocal trade agreements program, now up for renewal in Congress. The ITO Charter pledges member states to negotiate for the reduction of tariffs and the elimination of trade preferences in much the same way that the United States, almost alone, has pursued reductions over the last 14 years. Consequently, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is the essential vehicle for carrying out ITO objectives and achieving our own aims under the ITO Charter.

Moreover, extension of the act by Congress would be evidence of the good will of the United States toward world trade expansion. It would offer to the trade of other countries the prospect of entering the American market, but only in return for concessions providing wider markets for American goods. It would stimulate the expansion of commerce, increase production, and stabilize employment.

The President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on last evening, April 6, the last of three programs presented in opposition to the misnamed civil-rights program submitted by the President of the United States was delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System network. The two speakers were Gov. William M. Tuck, of Virginia, and Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, of Florida.

Governor Tuck is an outstanding Governor who has rendered more than 25 years of service to his State. He served in the Virginia General Assembly for a number of years, and also served as lieutenant governor. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Tuck's remarks may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM M. TUCK, OF VIRGINIA

Virginia stands firmly with her southern neighbors, and with liberty-loving people everywhere, in opposition to what has been cleverly cloaked with the name of the civil-rights program of the President. Actually, the so-called civil-rights program provides the spade and the shovel with which to bury virtually every remaining right of the States

of this Union and all the individual rights of the citizens.

There is an unenviable record on the part of reformers in recent years to wipe out the liberties, traditions, and customs which have carried the Nation to greatness and provided its citizens with the greatest individual freedom and independence of any country in the world. The President's so-called civil-rights program would crown this trend with the death blow to many of these liberties and customs.

The proposals embodied in the civil-rights report include, among others, abolition of the poll tax in Federal elections, enactment of a Federal antilynch law, abolition of segregation among the races, and enactment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. There are other equally objectionable planks in this rights-destruction platform but I shall confine my discussion in general terms to these four.

The Federal Constitution, in section 2, of article I, and in the seventeenth amendment, provides that the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be composed of Members elected by the people of the several States, and that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In other words, the determination of the qualification of voters is and always has been a right of the States, and there is no excuse, legal or otherwise, for the present effort to allocate to the Federal Congress authority which the framers of the Constitution clearly left in the hands of the States.

Aside from its unconstitutional aspects, the proposed Federal enactment is wholly unnecessary and entirely inappropriate. The poll tax as a prerequisite to voting remains in effect in only seven States. In Virginia, a suggested amendment to the State constitution eliminating this requirement has been approved by two regular sessions of the General Assembly. The amendment now will go before the people in a referendum in November next year. If the people of Virginia desire to repeal this requirement, they will have this opportunity of doing so. The Federal proposal would deprive the voters in Virginia of their right to decide this question for themselves. The same would be true in the six other poll-tax States.

No phase of the President's rights-destruction program is a more flagrant invasion of the prerogatives of the States than the proposed antilynch law. This proposal represents nothing more than an attempt to seize upon a volatile issue for political agitation and political gain in northern and eastern States where racial minorities with little political puissance have thrown the scare into candidates whose ambition for public office exceeds their courage and convictions.

The suggested antilynch law is patently unconstitutional, as are all the civil-rights proposals. In addition, it would set the pattern for the Federal Government to take over the prosecution and administration of all criminal law. If the Federal Government assumes the authority to act in cases of lynchings, there is no reason why it should not take jurisdiction in all criminal cases from petit larceny to murder, robbery, and rape.

The agitation of the lynching issue is inexcusable. As the Honorable CLYDE R. HOEY, United States Senator from North Carolina, so appropriately pointed ou recently, there was but one death by lynching in the United States last year. In Virginia there has not been a lynching since the enactment of a strong antilynch law in 1928 during the administration of Governor BYRD, now United States Senator from Virginia. Other States have similar statutes, and lynchings have ceased to be a concern. The Federal Government, instead of expending its energies on such unnecessary and useless enactments, might do well to concern itself with the problems of the national defense and international relations which, under the Constitution, it is charged with promoting.

Those unacquainted and unfamiliar with relations among the races in the South have sought to label segregation of the races as discrimination. There is a vast difference between segregation and discrimination. The South contends that segregation promotes racial integrity, not discrimination. I have stated often and want to repeat now that the individual States are fully competent to solve these matters. Outside interference and dictation will serve only to jeopardize the good relationships that now exist and to make more difficult the solution of the few existing problems between the races.

The Southern people of the white race do not desire to impose upon their Negro friends. They want to advance the welfare of all the people of the South, and long strides have been made in this direction, particularly in recent years.

I am somewhat at a loss to understand the sudden and impassioned interest in the Negro people of the South on the part of some of our politically sensitive Northern brethren, except that this is a Presidential campaign year.

I recall an occasion in July 1946 when I journeyed from Richmond to Philadelphia to participate as Governor of Virginia in ceremonies marking the erection of a monument to a great Negro composer, James A. Bland, who wrote approximately 700 songs and ballads, including "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia." The general assembly has adopted that as the official State song of the Commonwealth. Bland was not born in Virginia; in fact, I do not believe he ever visited here. But an organization composed entirely of white Virginians contributed the funds with which to erect the monument over his previously unmarked grave in that lonely little cemetery on the outskirts of Philadelphia. I do not recall having seen any of those who now advocate this iniquitous program in attendance at those exercises, whether they call themselves Democrats or Republicans. Southerners are ready and eager to recognize and honor leaders of all races for their notable achievements, and no element of discrimination enters into their thoughts. It is noteworthy that the Virginia General Assembly in 1946 voted $15,000 for establishment of a birthplace memorial to the Negro educator, Booker T. Washington. At the same time it appropriated similar amounts to memorialize two other great Virginians, Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry.

We like to boast of the fine careers of our Negro people. All of us rejoice in their progress. Only a year ago I had the pleasure of designating Joseph Jenkins Roberts day and sharing in exercises honoring the memory of this native Virginia Negro who was the first President of Liberia.

All of these facts refute the oft-repeated but unfounded charge that the Southern States lack understanding, tolerance, and cooperation between the races. Our interracial harmony is not a matter of mere words and gestures. We have enjoyed mutual respect and good will among the races in Virginia for more than 300 years, and we desire to continue this prized relationship.

Those vote-chasing pseudo-liberals who arouse feelings of discontent, distrust, and antagonism are the greatest enemies of the Negro. They care nothing for the Negro, North or South, except to use him as a vehicle for their own political preferment.

The most iniquitous of all the so-called civil-rights proposals is that for establishment of a permanent Federal Employment Practice Commission. Under this plan, the agents of a Federal bureau could dictate to every employer in the United States as to whom he could hire, could force him to retain inefficient and unsatisfactory employees, and could have him fined and jailed if he had the courage to challenge the edicts of these minions of bureaucracy. All of this could and undoubtedly would be done under the guise of prohibiting "all forms of discrimination in private employment, based on race, color, creed, or national origin." The last vestige of private rights in the operation of business and industry would be strangulated by this most ruthless and overpowering of all alphabetical monsters.

The ramifications of the recommendations of the President's Committee on Civil Rights are all but incalculable. The President's committee outlined very specific and very clear suggestions for forcing the States to abdicate their functions and to kowtow on every item to Federal inquisitors.

I call attention particularly to the recommendations endorsed by the President which states than the grants-in-aid to the States could be made contingent upon "the elimination of various forms of discrimination or other violations of civil rights." The President's committee not only suggested such a course but declared it desirable.

I cannot conceive of a greater affront to the taxpayers of this Nation. The funds extracted from their pocketbooks would be used to bludgeon them and their State officials and thus compel compliance with orders wiping out their rights as taxpayers and as free citizens.

I am amazed to read of the many evidences in Congress of the lack of awareness of these threats to constitutional government. The rights of the people mean nothing to these advocates of governmental largess who have become intoxicated by this orgy of spending. Advocates claimed that the bill recently approved by the United States Senate establishing a policy of grants-in-aid to the States in education carried no objectionable strings or restrictions. They did not tell you that the strings are all ready to be attached. Complete control over all grants would be provided in the civil-rights committee recommendations. The funds simply would be withheld from the States unless they complied with the so-called antidiscrimination orders.

If this Federal plan of aid to education becomes law, and if the civil-rights sanctions also are invoked, Virginia will not accept one farthing of these funds while I am Governor of the Commonwealth. It is preferable for our people to be poor and honest than morally bankrupt even though they have all the money in the rapidly dissipating treasury. I believe the vast majority of the people of our State are controlled by these same convictions.

Our people, who have struggled for their liberties, will not now remain phlegmatic while the bonds of Federal control are being forged around them.

Virginia for four long years was the battleground in the War Between the States. At its conclusion, our resources were exhausted, our manpower depleted, and our homes were overrun and devastated. The maimed and the crippled from that war took up their labors and rebuilt their homeland, without any State or Federal aid, nor was there any aid received from any foreign power. Moreover, during this tragic era, we were compelled to support carpetbaggers who swarmed about us like locusts to leech from us the fruits of honest toil. Despite these horrible conditions, the fields which in March and April ran red with the blood of our noblest citizens, were teeming with rich harvests in October. From the rigors of this self-recovery program emerged a strong citizenship, which continues today sturdy and self-reliant.

It is deplorable that those beyond the borders of our States, who know nothing of our problems, see fit to inject uncalled for and unconstitutional issues into our present domestic affairs. They would destroy the

benefits derived from merely a century of effort on the part of the people of the South of both races.

You are familiar with the Palestine debacle. The effort of the United Nations to enforce by fiat an entirely new and radical relationship among different races within the confines of Palestine should be a glaring illustration of the inability to bring about by law or decree a condition unacceptable to the people concerned.

We have seen the inroads of communism in the countries of Europe. In each instance, it has come from within. In every case a centralized government provided a ready vehicle for communistic usurpation. The values recognized by the framers of the Constitution in the proper division of powers between the Federal and State governments are thus accentuated and brought into bold relief.

In the face of these proclamations of danger, it is difficult to conceive of the Congress of the United States plunging blindly into this abyss of constitutional destruction, masquerading as a program for civil rights.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Gov. Millard F. Caldwell, of Florida, served in the National House of Representatives for 8 years. He is immediate past chairman of the National Governors Conference, and he is now in his fourth year as Governor of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Caldwell's statement may likewise be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS BY GOV. MILLARD F. CALDWELL, OF FLORIDA

Let us speak very clearly and very frankly about this matter of the so-called civil rights. Let those who advocate the adoption of the laws creating a Federal police system to enforce drastic punitive measures aimed at the South honestly admit that they advocate a change in our form of government. Let them admit that, by the establishment of a Washington Gestapo to police the internal affairs of the several States, we depart from the ideals and concepts of those who founded this Nation. Then let them acknowledge that if the Congress has the power to enact laws to enforce the civil-rights program, it may further interfere with the private lives of the citizens and move into the schools, the churches, and even the homes of America, to dictate what we should learn or believe and how we should live. It should be frankly said that the purpose of the legislation is political and not humanitarian, sociological, or religious in nature.

The political meddlers have changed the meaning of the very term "civil rights," and have fastened narrow and provincial imputations upon it. They have corrupted the otherwise respected term into a political slogan. They are interested in votes—not rights.

The average American citizen is a tolerant person. Basically, there is not a great deal of difference in our ideals, notwithstanding the happenstance of birth or residence. Given the facts, our conclusions on what is right and what is wrong will not differ too greatly.

Unfortunately, the facts are not readily available to the people of the North. Their newspapers and magazines have never presented the unbiased truth on these questions. Indeed, it would be difficult for one not intimately acquainted with the problems in the South to do so.

It is understandable that our viewpoints must vary in accordance with our respective backgrounds and experience. Those who live in daily contact with a given problem have a clearer understanding and a more practical approach than do those who know of it from an academic standpoint only.

Here in the South we understand and appreciate the difficulties. We remember the unhappy days of reconstruction following the war between the States, and we are certain that no thinking person in the North or South would want those conditions repeated. We hope that it may be made clear to every citizen that the civil rights program means little more or less than a repetition of what happened after the Civil War when a vengeful Congress passed similar legislation for the purpose of humiliating the defeated South. We do not believe our thoughtful neighbors in the North can approve any such unwarranted interference. We believe that, aside and apart from the furors raised by the politicians, the people of America have a quiet and abiding hope for harmony between all peoples and all sections, and that when the matter is fully understood they will stand with us.

Racial prejudices are as old as humanity. Too few of us are without such prejudices in one form or another, but we know that as our degree of education improves, understanding comes to us, and a more sympathetic racial relationship will follow. As we dispel fear, logic takes its place. None of us should attempt to justify prejudice and intolerance, but none of us can honestly deny that both prejudice and intolerance exist throughout the country. The South complains of the intolerance of the North in its effort to control our thinking and our actions. The North complains of the intolerance of the South. The better course would be for each of the sections to look to its own troubles and improve upon its own manner of life. We should emphasize and reemphasize the fact that there is no virtue in intolerance, whether directed against a religion, a race, a nation or a part of a nation, or whether it stems from the pulpit, the political hustings, or from ignorance.

Intolerance should be especially condemned when it is nourished by those who would seek a selfish end. It must be frankly admitted that the present controversy is with us because certain political forces desire to capture the vote of minorities and, in an effort to do so, have prated about the supposed intolerance and discrimination in the South. Such an approach is both insincere and reprehensible, and delays the day when we may come to accept all peoples on the basis of worth and merit.

Because accurate information has not been available, the arousing of sentiment for the civil-rights legislation has been comparatively easy. Conditions in the South have been deliberately misrepresented. The people in other parts of the country have not been told of our efforts and progress in the field of humanities. They have not been told that living conditions of the Negro in the South are better than they are in Harlem and the other segregated communities of the North. They have not been advised of the strides made toward better educational facilities for the Negro of the South; that our Negro teachers in Florida, for instance, are paid upon the same basis as are our white teachers, and that the rate of pay is far above the national average. The people have never been told that in all of the nonsegregated medical schools of the East, North, and West there are only 86 Negro medical students, whereas in the South, at Meharry of Nashville and Howard in Washington, something more than 1,000 Negro students are being educated in medicine. Nor do they know that in the South several thousand Negroes occupy high places in education, as presidents and professors of institutions of higher learnings, whereas in the North only a scant handful are so recognized. Neither have the people heard that many of the southern States have long ago abolished the poll tax, that lynching is practically a thing of the past, that public health and public education have made tremendous headway, and that no decent southerner condones lynching, bigotry, or brutality.

It would be far wiser for all of us to avoid sectional recrimination and devote our efforts to the improvement of educational facilities in both the North and the South, remembering that knowledge will displace the abuses. Let us learn more about facts and conditions and not permit ourselves to be made unwitting pawns in a political game. And let us not forget that bigotry is a destructive force and should be avoided, whether it be between man and man, or section and section. None of us should assume an attitude of superiority over another and none of us has the right of domination over a neighbor. No section of this Nation has the right to interfere with the private lives and internal affairs of any other section.

Florida would never presume to dictate to Georgia. Both are parts of the indivisible Union, and both share equal responsibility for the tranquillity of that Union. The United States would never presume to dictate to Canada or to Mexico on internal matters. We resented the efforts of the Nazis to reform our thinking in America before the war. We are displeased by the Soviet insistence that we change our philosophy of government and make it conform to communistic ideologies.

And so it must be understandable that we in the South resent the efforts of the rest of the country to reform us and make us over in another pattern. The reaction here is a human one. We read of the gang wars, crimes, and riots of the North, but we would certainly never attempt to tell you how to correct those conditions. We know that you are better advised and know more about the problems than we do—and we give you credit for earnestly endeavoring to correct the evils. Be just as fair with us—acknowledge that here in the South we are living with these problems and that we are assiduously trying to better our standards in an effort to oust all inequities. We are handicapped by outside interference, but we are succeeding.

If the rest of the country really believes in fair practices, law enforcement, and generally improved conditions, and if there is a sincere desire to accomplish the objectives, then work with us and not against us. The course you have taken will not only delay the happy day but will destroy much that has been done. Let us not confuse worthy aims and lofty ideals with a grimy political effort to hoodwink the minorities.

Those of us who have concerned ourselves with the problem of bettering conditions in the South note an immediate resistance to our efforts every time the northern reformers introduce meddlesome legislation. The deep resentment against outside control and against those who would cast us in a mold of their own choosing, beclouds the goal and makes it difficult to advance.

It should be made clear that if the rest of the country persists in its effort to control the internal affairs of the Southern States, the inevitable result will be strife, hardship, and confusion. That effort will lend aid and comfort to the forces of intolerance by driving many otherwise good and thoughtful citizens to their ranks. Instead of improving racial relationships, that effort does much to sharpen animosities. Instead of permitting the South to continue its successful battle against lynching, now practically won, Gestapo methods provided by the antilynching bill, which in all honesty should be called the lynching bill, will revive the evil. Instead of allowing the South to quietly and in an orderly manner acknowledge the right to the ballot of every citizen, outside interference will invite discord and disorder. Instead of encouraging a spirit of mutual helpfulness, the civil-rights program will array section against section and class against class.

If ever there was a time when the people of this country should work in harmony, this

is it. Civilization is threatened on every hand. America is the one bulwark against universal chaos, and Americans should work together in a spirit of good will for our safety and the welfare of mankind. This is no time to split the country and the peoples of this country into selfish, hating factions.

The South is making great progress. We covet your good will and your assistance. We hope that you will not make our task harder by foisting upon us your moralisms and your dogma.

Thank you.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Daily Idahonian at Moscow, Idaho, from B. B. Brigham, of Genesee, Idaho. This letter was printed on March 18, 1948.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR, DAILY IDAHONIAN,
Moscow, Idaho.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I notice after reading your editorials for the past year that you have consistently attacked the proposals of Henry Wallace and GLEN TAYLOR. More recently you have attempted to prove that the Communist grab of Czechoslovakia is embarrassing to the third party. It is hard for me to follow your reasoning when you attempt to associate Henry Wallace with what happened in Czechoslovakia. If Mr. Wallace had been directing the foreign policy of the United States for the past few years you might be able to draw some conclusions from the results, but as it is, it hardly seems logical to brand his ideas as foolish when they are as yet untried. I have never heard any statement from Mr. Wallace or Senator TAYLOR that the United States should model her Government after that of Czechoslovakia.

But there is one very logical conclusion that you can draw from what has happened in Czechoslovakia and in other countries bordering Russia, and that is that the foreign policy of the United States is failing miserably to preserve peace or stop communism. Unless there is an about-face, a new approach to the problem, we are heading straight for war and total destruction of civilization. It is popular in some quarters to place the entire blame upon Russia, and certainly it is impossible to make apologies for the strong-arm methods of the Soviet Union, but our hatred for Russia should not blind us to our own mistakes.

Our first misunderstanding with Russia occurred in San Francisco when our delegation held out doggedly for the admission of Argentina, an open ally of Hitler, to the United Nations. This gave rise to the Russian demand for the veto; at least it encouraged it, for it gave Russia a clue to our real intention to back anyone who professed to be anti-Soviet. Later we gave aid and comfort to the Franco dictatorhip in Spain and recently we have been sending food, guns, and soldiers to Greece to back a vile dictatorship which has never had more than a handful of supporters among the Greeks. In addition to this we have given half-hearted support to the Chiang Kai-shek dictatorship in China and now we are backing Hitler's henchman in the Middle East and undercutting the United Nations program for the partition of Palestine to which we ourselves subscribed.

Throughout all of the lip service we have been giving to the United Nations we have consistently bypassed it and undermined it whenever it has interfered with our plans to play power politics. We have professed to have only peaceful intentions while at the same time President Truman has done all in his power to establish compulsory military training and has gathered about him a war cabinet of militarists and power politicians. Is it conceivable that other nations believe we want peace under such circumstances? And is it hard to understand why a third party should be formed to get us back on the right road to peace?

If we are to have peace, the first thing we will have to decide is that we must live in the same world with Communists. We must of course, retain our arms for the time being, as Henry Wallace has said on many occasions, but we must let the world know that we will lay aside our weapons if Russia will do the same. It is not enough to say that Russia would never disarm. After all, we have never made a concerted effort to get her to. We must select our best and most honest salesmen for peace and disarmament and charge them with the responsibility of selling peace, disarmament, and prosperity to the leaders of Russia. By all means, let us select someone who can go to an international conference with a clean conscience and who does not believe in power and politics or jockeying for military advantages, a man who is not a pacifist or an appeaser, but one who thinks along peaceful lines. We would never find such a man among the ranks of the military. If we fail in this let us use our influence to reorganize the United Nations eliminate the veto, and form a international police force so strong that aggression by any nation would be impossible. This would require a world constitution setting forth the rights of all nations to do everything they have done in the past except to make war or to prepare for war. If all this fails, then we had better build a $100,000,000,000 air force, decentralize industry, build war plants miles underground, move our 150,000,000 people to underground caves and shelters, and resign ourselves to a mole-like existence from here on out.

The concessions we make to bring about world-wide disarmament are inconsequential if we compare them to the losses we will suffer in the event of war, or even in preparation for war.

Very truly yours,

B. B. BRIGHAM.

GENESEE, IDAHO.

Can You Unscramble an Egg?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill, a former Democratic Member of the House from Indiana.

To unscramble an egg is generally accepted as being impossible, but here is an opportunity in case you are interested to try your hand at unscrambling a complex political egg.

The statement follows:

WHAT THEY SAID

(By Samuel B. Pettengill)

I do not, and I will not, accept the political support of Henry Wallace and his Communists. (Harry S. Truman, 1948.)

The only thing I regret, the only thing, is that my nomination meant the defeat of Wallace. (Harry S. Truman, 1944.)

I think Henry is perfect. I like him. He's the kind of fellow I want around. He's honest. He thinks right. (Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1940, when he dropped Garner for Wallace.)

I welcome the support of anyone who will help keep the President in office. (Harry S. Truman, 1944.)

American Communists * * * will in 1944 support Franklin D. Roosevelt for President of the United States. (Earl Browder, 1944.)

Harry Truman can find courage in the knowledge that he is fighting in the brave and goodly company of Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt. (Henry Wallace, 1946.)

If Truman is nominated, our Democratic Party is sunk, and if he is elected the country is sunk. (Former Governor and Ambassador, George H. Earle, 1947.)

The Soviet Union is entitled to take such steps as it may judge best to create a regional system in eastern Europe. (Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State, 1945.)

I think they (the Communists) are a greater menace than Hitler was. (W. Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to Russia, 1948.)

The war is but a step in the revolution. (Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, 1944.)

Is there a single reason why we cannot make a peace to end the cold war? (Henry Wallace, 1948.)

It is not only senseless but criminal to wage a war for the destruction of Hitlerism camouflaged as a fight for democracy. (Molotov, 1939.)

All nonsense about Sovietizing the Baltic States is only in the interest of our common enemies. (Molotov, October 1939.)

The friendship of Germany and the Soviet Union, cemented by blood, has every reason to be lasting and firm. (Stalin, 1939.)

For more than 2 years American and British politicians have considered Czechoslovakia as their easy potential prey. (Andrei Gromyko, 1948.)

General Marshall has just testified that notwithstanding these vast postwar military expenditures our military defense is a hollow shell. (Senator HARRY F. BYRD, 1948.)

War is neither imminent nor inevitable. (Rear Adm. E. M. Zacharias, 1948.)

One hundred and seventy-two million dollars spent by American taxpayers to help kill 20,000 Greek guerrillas works out to $8,600 per guerrilla. An additional $275,000,000 means $22,500 per guerrilla which seems a pretty high price. (Harold L. Ickes, 1948.)

President Roosevelt is within the law sending munitions to Stalin. The lend-lease law gives him that discretion. * * * But in his discretion he could have refused. * * * Who is our new friend? He is an Asiatic mongol who turned Norway, Denmark, France, Belgium, Holland, Greece, and England over to Hitler's bombers. He let Hitler crush Poland and for his reward, crept over that stricken land like a ghoul plundering the dead. He is the rapist of Finland. * * * "He who lies down with dogs will get up with fleas," as Poor Richard says. (Pettengill, in this space, October 1941.)

Don't write Wallace off. * * * He is in the doghouse now, but in another year or two he may head the peace parade to Moscow. (Pettengill, October 1946.)

Centenary of Hungarian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following declaration by the American Hungarian Federation on the centenary of Hungarian independence, March 15, 1948:

On the one hundredth anniversary of Hungarian independence we, members of the American Hungarian Federation, who also speak for the silenced and subjugated people of Hungary, solemnly restate our unshakable belief in the basic human rights guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States, and proclaimed by the Hungarian people under the inspired leadership of Louis Kossuth on March 15, 1848.

Hungarian independence, bloodlessly won on March 15, 1848, was crushed by the overwhelming military might of the Austrian and Russian Empire in 1849.

After a hundred years Hungarian freedom and independence once more succumbed to Nazi and Communist tyranny. All the ideals which the freedom-loving countries of the Western World—among them Hungary and especially the United States—realized after so much struggle and sacrifice, are now threatened with complete obliteration by the ruthlessly expanding Soviet power.

That new international order, which was agreed upon at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, delivered eastern Europe to Soviet imperialism and to Communist world revolution. Eastern Europe, with its more than a hundred million inhabitants, was delivered to that Asiatic barbarism, which in ruthlessness and cruelty surpasses even the hordes of Genghis Khan. By discarding the principles of the Atlantic Charter the door was opened wide to Soviet expansion and a hundred million people are being forced to serve the Soviet preparations against the United States.

It was proven that unlimited compromise only increases the danger of war and increases the Soviet appetite. There cannot be lasting peace until Soviet Russia either retreats or is forced to retreat beyond her own frontiers.

Therefore, we support the Marshall plan which is to save western Europe, but at the same time we raise our voice in warning against any attempt to establish a new balance of power by the division of Europe into two opposing parts.

The European continent is an indivisible unit militarily, politically, economically, and culturally. The security and prosperity of the peoples of Europe depend on this unity. The unity of western and eastern Europe, therefore, must be reestablished. The security of Europe and also the security of the United States demands this.

The warning words of Lincoln that the world cannot be half free and half slave, were never as true as today. Our freedom and our traditions would be endangered if we permitted the peoples of eastern Europe permanently to remain in Soviet slavery.

The Hungarian people demonstrated at the elections of 1945 and 1947 that they adhere to their independence, constitutional freedoms and rights the same way as their ancestors did 100 years ago. Then the gallant struggle of the Hungarians aroused the admiration of the American people, and Louis Kossuth on his landing in the United States was hailed as the champion of world freedom.

We hope to believe that this generation of Americans will show itself worthy of its ancestors, that it will repudiate the useless policy of appeasement and will return to the service of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Abandonment of these principles produced the present plight of mankind. The return to the American traditions, so highly regarded the world over, will bring security to the peoples of the world, assure the generally desired moral leadership of the United States and with it peace to the world.

Sharing the Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely and forthright statement from the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of April 5 by the editor, Francis Pierce Fisher.

The editorial follows:

SHARING THE WEALTH

Every radical attack on the American economic system is based on the old gag that, under capitalism, "the rich get richer and the poor get children." And every advocate of communism or any other totalitarian system argues that it offers the only road to a division of wealth and a higher standard of living for the masses of people.

One of the best answers to that all-important question was recently given by the Rev. Edward A. Keller, C. S. C., who is director of the Bureau of Economic Research of the University of Notre Dame.

Father Keller's study is called, "The National Income and Its Distribution," and is written in language any layman can understand. Here are some facts he has correlated:

First of all, the rich are not getting richer. In 1917 Americans with a personal annual income of $25,000 or more got 7 percent of the Nation's entire income after taxes. By 1928 they were getting 11 percent. But in the latest year for which complete figures are available, 1944, they got only 1 percent. Their dollar income was almost $9,000,000,000 in 1928, while it was less than $2,000,000,000 in 1944.

If that is true, where is the money going to? Father Keller answers that also. Americans making under $5,000 a year, the group to which most families belong, have immensely improved their position. They received 87 percent of our total personal income in 1917, 77 percent in 1929—and 90 percent in 1944. The dollar figures are still more impressive. The under $5,000 Americans received a total income of $47,000,000,000 in 1917, and $140,000,000,000 in 1944—a gain of nearly a hundred billions in one generation.

Another catch phrase is that the owners of industry—the stockholders—get an inordinate share of earnings, while workers don't get enough. Here too the figures tell a remarkable story. In the 17 years from 1929 to 1946, national income rose 93 percent. But corporate dividends went down 14 percent. As Father Keller puts it, "Taking our economy as a whole * * * the main item of cost of production of all goods and services is labor cost—90 percent—while cost for the use of tools is a relatively minor cost—6 percent."

Capitalism gives more people more benefits than any other system. Capitalism is the only system which makes possible maximum economic progress with the largest possible degree of personal liberty for all. Americans can well be proud of their capitalistic system. Most of the "isms" seek to live off of it while working to destroy it—then what would they have to divide? Nothing but their own poverty until new capital could be saved.

Tide and Submerged Lands Off the California Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a senate joint resolution passed by the Legislature of California.

The resolution is now the law and reads as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 12

Relative to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of California

Whereas on the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the original States, as successors to the English Crown, became the owners of the tide and submerged lands within their respective borders, and such ownership was retained by them on the adoption of the Constitution and never has been relinquished to the Federal Government since; and

Whereas the State of California was admitted to the Union on a basis of equality with the original States, possessing and enjoying all the attributes of sovereignty residing in the original States, including the ownership of the tide and submerged lands within its borders; and

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the *United States* v. *California* has held that "The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of inland waters, extending seaward 3 nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein"; and

Whereas this decision casts a cloud upon the title of the State of California and all of its subdivisions or persons acting pursuant to its permission, to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of the State of California extending seaward 3 miles; and

Whereas the Supreme Court has declared that the power to determine the question of ownership resides in the Congress; and

Whereas the State of California, its subdivisions, and persons acting pursuant to its permission have spent enormous sums of money improving and developing the tide and submerged lands along the coast of California, which improvements and developments are in jeopardy unless the Congress enacts legislation to remove the cloud on the title to said lands created by the Supreme Court decision; and

Whereas the State of California has developed and made available for public use a

system of beaches and parks at great cost and expense to the people of California, and these State-owned and operated beaches and parks have been developed to the point where they are now used and enjoyed by approximately 22,000,000 people per year; and

Whereas the State of California, its cities, counties, and other political subdivisions have made improvements to tide and submerged lands for many purposes including but not limited to harbor developments, piers, docks, wharves, jetties, recreational facilities, and industrial sites; and

Whereas the State of California has had for many years a full and complete set of laws designed for the conservation, regulation, and management of its natural resources in such fields as mining, forestry, beaches and parks, oil and gas, public lands, soil conservation, fish and game, and harbors and navigation, and the State has provided for adequately staffed and financed administrative agencies to carry out these laws; and

Whereas the State of California, its subdivisions and persons acting pursuant to its permission have made the investments, improvements, and developments herein set forth in good faith upon the assumption that the State of California was the owner of, and had dominion and jurisdiction over the tide and submerged lands lying off the coast of California; and

Whereas for many years prior to the Supreme Court decision, many agencies of the Federal Government have recognized the ownership, dominion, and jurisdiction of the State of California over these tide and submerged lands; and

Whereas the cloud created by the decision of the Supreme Court not only affects the investment, development, and improvement already made on and to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, but it will prevent further investments in and development to and improvement of these tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, to the detriment of the people of the State of California and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact legislation now pending before the Congress, to remove the cloud created by the Supreme Court decision by quitclaiming to the State of California and the other respective States of the United States and to their subdivisions and to persons acting under and pursuant to their permission, ownership of, title to, and dominion over the lands beneath the tidewaters and navigable waters of the United States a distance seaward 3 miles; so that the State of California, together with the several States, may continue without interruption the title to and dominion and jurisdiction over said lands, thereby perpetuating what has been considered for more than 160 years in good faith to be a proper sphere of State jurisdiction, dominion, and ownership; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and to the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to send copies of this resolution to the mayors of all California cities and the chairmen of all boards of supervisors of California counties and urge that they, in their local areas, continue unabated their valiant battle for the reaffirmation, by the Congress and the President, of California's unquestioned title to its tide and submerged lands.

Repeal of Oleo Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the March 26, 1948, Farmer's Friend, by Mr. Robert C. Schultz, who has been one of the leading agricultural men in Wisconsin for many years. The editorial is as follows:

CLAIMS BUTTER PRICE HIKES ARE AN OLEO TAX REPEAL SCHEME

(By Robert C. Schultz)

It looks as though the dairy industry's temporary victory over the oleomargarine tax repeal issue handed down by a heckled agricultural committee last week may be short-lived, if certain manipulators have their way.

On Tuesday the agricultural committee voted the oleo tax repeal bills back on the shelf and it was reported that they wouldn't get it off the shelf to come before Congress during this session.

On Wednesday, within 24 hours of that decision, butter prices started soaring to new record heights and there wasn't any change in fluid milk prices to warrant such price increases. Butter went galloping up to as much as a dollar a pound in Louisville, Ky., and reached near that peak in some of the larger midwestern cities.

WHAT'S BEHIND IT?

Now, as I see it, there wasn't any basic reason for that price hike except that certain interests wanted butter prices to go skyrocketing. Why? Well, that would make the housewives mad at butter. That would build up a public resentment and get sympathy for oleo tax repeal, and it would open a new path to get that tax repeal issue on the floor of Congress in spite of the fact that it had temporarily been shelved by the Agricultural Committee.

There is more than one way of making an issue stick even though the decision is against it. And one way is to build up a public clamor so that Congress will be voting on an oleo tax repeal before we can set up a new defense.

Just stop and realize that some of the top factors in the butter industry are also top factors in the oleo industry and you'll see quick enough that the squeeze play is on with butter prices being forced up to get public symathy for the oleo claim that it should be relieved of that tax.

DELIBERATE MANIPULATION

It looks like a deliberate manipulation, with certain packing interests who are in both the butter and oleo business, deciding that oleo is the best profit item and should be pushed. Haven't they been pouring huge sums into advertising campaigns and merchandising schemes to get oleo sales higher and higher? Hasn't the cry against butter and in favor of oleo been price?

Now just stop and think that butter prices were following a normal price trend based upon supply and demand, with the flush season just ahead they were showing a tendency to come down rather than go up. Then suddenly, something happens in Washington that keeps oleo in its former position as to taxes, and without rhyme or reason butter prices go skidding skyward.

Why? It is my opinion that they were forced up. Interests who know they can make bigger profits selling oleo want that tax repeal measure to go through. It didn't get past the Agricultural Committee last week. But that doesn't mean that they can't build up a general indignation against butter by forcing prices up and creating a public clamor that Congress do something about it.

MORE PROFIT IN OLEO

Only last week a University of Wisconsin professor, L. C. Thomsen, pointed out that there was almost three times as big a profit in oleo for the processors as there was in butter. So the packing house interests who are playing both these markets would naturally push the big profit item, oleo.

It's just another form of the power bloc method of squeezing the farmer and blaming him for the rise in butter prices while the manipulators push prices up to make enemies for butter and build up a huge cry to bring the oleo tax issue before Congress again this session.

Oleo interests last week, when the tax bills were put back in the pigeonhole, threatened to get them before Congress by the petition route. They weren't accepting the defeat, no matter how temporary, and they let that fact be known.

Now, it doesn't matter whether they force those repeal bills off the shelf again or get up new ones, or maneuver in some other way to bring the issue up again. That is what seems to be going on right now. Butter is the goat, and the dairy farmer who produces the butterfat is going to be blamed for the high cost of butter.

PART OF TAX FIGHT

The dairy farmer hasn't anything to do with this new hike in butter prices. As I said, in my opinion, it is a plan, a program, a deliberate manipulation to push butter prices up to where the public will feel justified in demanding that Congress take action and loose oleo to run rampant on a sales spree, free of all taxation and permitted to enter the butter market in similar color.

Oh, I know there will be a lot of reasons put forth for the price hike in butter. But the answer will come to us when we wake up and find that oleo won that tax fight in Congress anyway. It's merely another sample of the power bloc technique with hands on the throat of two competing commodities and squeezing hard on the one that shows the lesser profit to them regardless of what may happen to the dairy farm.

Concerning Universal Military Training and Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include two extraneous items, I want to present two different views of the much discussed current questions of universal military training and a renewal of the Selective Service Act. The first of these is a letter from Dr. Samuel Burkhard, head of the department of education of the State college at Tempe, Ariz. The other is an expression from the American Legion post at Phoenix, which will be explained and presented following the letter.

Dr. Burkhard is a very sane, level-headed, practical thinker, who has very nearly expressed my own views at the

moment in regard to universal military training and the restoration of the selective service program. Because I recognize the saneness and soundness of his thinking, I am passing on to my colleagues Dr. Burkhard's statement that it may have wider circulation. The letter is as follows:

ARIZONA STATE COLLEGE,
Tempe, Ariz., April 2, 1948.

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURDOCK: It has come to my attention that a measure designed to establish universal military training in the United States will be up for consideration in the near future in Congress.

In my opinion the adoption of such a measure would be unwise. First, as a means of meeting any urgent military necessity it would be pretty largely a waste of money and effort. Second, as a long-time policy it would serve our country no better than it did the defeated nations now on our hands.

I am not opposed to a draft measure set up for the meeting of whatever emergency now exists. This, I hold, is quite different from the matter of adopting a program of universal peacetime military training.

I have been a lifetime student of questions of war and peace. I have also been a student of German education and am aware of the insidiousness with which militarism as a philosophy gets injected into the work of education. It appears to me that the establishment of universal military training in this country would pave the way for the injection of militarism into public education in the United States. This might not happen in the next year or two, but as a long-time policy I see no reason why we should not eventually suffer from the same weakening policy that paved the way for the downfall of Germany.

I have read a great deal on the question written by both military and other men and find that there are military officers who are as strenuously opposed to universal peacetime military training as I am. It seems to me that the adoption of this program would mean that we have lost faith in everything that has gone before in our history to make America a strong nation. May we continue to be strong and not copy the methods whereby the defeated nations were eventually brought to their present plight.

In this brief letter I have neither the time nor the space to say all I would like to say, but briefly one would have no difficulty in showing that Germany became weak by virtue of a type of education which was dominated by the philosophy of militarism.

It is my desire to do all I can to keep America from being among the "has been" nations and that is why I am writing you at this time asking you to consider well this measure before casting your vote. It is my opinion that America will be far safer without the universal military training program than with it.

I do not minimize the necessity for an Army nor do I minimize the necessity of being prepared to maintain our place among the nations by the use of force and for that reason I am not opposed to the draft measure. But the measure for universal peacetime military training is, in my judgment, foreign to American democratic traditions and is, therefore, an unwise policy to adopt. It is, to my mind, a denial of all that has gone heretofore to make America the land of initiative and power in the affairs of nations. Long live America.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL BURKHARD,
Head, Department of Education.

The second item which I wish to include herewith is taken from the Arpil 1 issue of the Arizona Times, and is said to be the expression of the commander of the Luke-Greenway Post, No. 1, the American Legion, James E. Warner. If correctly quoted in this regard, Commander Warner expresses my sentiments as well as the sentiments of many of his comrades. This item in the Times was called to my attention by Eugene Salyer of Phoenix, who declares it expresses the views of many with whom he has discussed the subject. The newspaper item is as follows:

WARNER SAYS, "DON'T DRAFT VETERANS"

Announcement from Washington that in the formulation of plans for the proposed draft of manpower to bring military forces up to required strength, it is proposed to draft World War II veterans, brought forth a quick rejoiner from James E. (Jim) Warner, commander of Luke-Greenway Post, No. 1, the American Legion.

Warner voices vigorous objection to the plan to draft veterans until all other eligibles have been called. He states that the American Legion stands solidly behind the military forces of the country and is heartily in accord with the program for bringing them up to the sufficient strength to indicate to the world that while we are by nature a peace-loving people we don't subscribe to a doctrine of peace at any price.

The time may come when it will be necessary to draft veterans, says Warner, but that time isn't now. Thousands of veterans are yet endeavoring to establish themselves on a firm economic basis and have not been able to overcome the handicap imposed on them through their withdrawal from civilian life for service with the military.

INFLATED VALUES

Most veterans are staggering under the load of inflated values piled on them upon their release from service, in this community hundreds of them have purchased homes which they are struggling to pay for, according to Warner.

In Phoenix and every other city and town in the United States there are hundreds of "indispensable men," exempted from military services during the war because their jobs were considered essential to the war effort. They are not essential now—there is a veteran qualified and ready to fill every one of those so-called essential positions.

Commander Warner suggests that the first draft call be met by the induction into service of the "essential men."

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 3, 1948:

ELECTION YEAR TAX CUT

The tone of the President's message vetoing the tax-reduction bill—a veto which was promptly overridden by decisive margins in both House and Senate—makes it rather evident that Mr. Truman had no hope of stemming the pressures behind the demand for lowered taxes in this election year. He was writing for the record, and the position which he has taken is one which probably will be vindicated by later developments.

Mr. Truman made two principal points against tax reduction at this time. One dealt with its inflationary aspects—an old argument based on the inevitable effect of putting $5,000,000,000 more into the hands of consumers at a time when consumer goods continue in relatively scarce supply. A tax cut in this amount can be expected to result in higher prices, and the blow will fall heaviest on the little fellow.

The other, and more fundamental objection, is that tax reduction will weaken rather than strengthen the United States at a time when international conditions make strength imperative. There are two aspects of this. First, there is the loss of revenue resulting from tax reduction. Second, there is the fact that our troubles with Russia are going to require expenditures which were not taken into account when budget estimates were made. We do not know the exact amount of these new outlays, but there is every reason to believe that they will be substantial and that they will be necessary.

In the President's judgment, the combined effect of lowered revenues and increased expenditures will be to revive deficit financing by the Government. That, at a time when the Federal debt stands at $253,000,000,000, is a most serious matter.

If we are not able and willing to reduce this debt in a time of such unparalleled prosperity as the country is now enjoying, then it will never be reduced. Those who voted for tax reduction know this perfectly well, and the chances are that, before long, the certainty of another deficit will compel the legislators to boost taxes again.

This is what the President had in mind when he said: "If I endorsed tax reduction now, knowing that to do so would in all likelihood mean increased taxes next year, I would not be dealing fairly with the American people." That is a fair statement, and, for a man seeking reelection, a politically courageous statement. Mr. Truman is to be commended for calling the shots as he sees them.

Taproot of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of April 5, by the editor, Francis Pierce Fisher.

It is impossible to abolish private ownership of property of some without ultimately destroying it for all; a true statement which brings us to a strange paradox. Here we are, the private enterprise system of America supplying tens of billions of dollars in merchandise to support socialism in Europe particularly in England where they are now in the process of nationalizing all industry and wiping out every vestige of private ownership. No wonder our people are confused by the strange operation of this administration.

The editorial follows:

THE ROOT OF FREEDOM

There is only one basic difference between the American system of government and the governments of those countries suffering from varying degrees of dictatorship. That difference is the right, protected by law of private

ownership of property. Private property is the taproot of freedom.

It is impossible to abolish private ownership of property for some without ultimately destroying it for all. And once it has been destroyed, a central government becomes boss for the simple reason that it is the sole employer and sole property owner.

Oppression follows automatically when a people, stripped of property, must rely blindly on a government run with a free rein by men who need no longer recognize antitrust laws, labor unions, or anything else—men who can abandon the constitutional trappings of a free country because they are bigger than the law by right of might.

Total control is always the dream of ruthless men. The ultimate in total control is total government. The one thing standing in the path of total government in the United States is the private ownership of property vested in millions of American citizens. It must ever remain so.

A Tribute to Oklahoma Youth 4–H Clubs and Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there are no activities in America more important than the work being done by our FFA and 4–H Clubs, and there is no State in America in which the activities of these organizations are in the forefront more than in my own State of Oklahoma. We are all proud of the fine work of our farm boys and girls, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert an editorial from the Quinton Times, Quinton, Okla., under date of March 4, 1948, entitled "A Tribute to Oklahoma Youth." The editorial follows:

A TRIBUTE TO OKLAHOMA YOUTH

With over $100,000 raised to back the Tulsa Livestock Exposition, which already ranks in premium money and entries among the top five stock shows in the country, many may wonder at the motive which prompted the building of the biggest, best, the longest stock show ever to be held in Oklahoma when it opens March 12 for a 10-day run.

The obvious answer is that Oklahoma agricultural and business leaders, determined to improve the breeds and quality of animals in this area, generously donated the money necessary to produce a superlative show. But the real credit for the inspiration of this record-breaking event must be given to the farm youth of Oklahoma. For the public-spirited citizens who put up the money to assure an annual, big-time stock show for Oklahoma have set for themselves the challenge of building a show big enough to do justice to the already national record made by State FFA and 4–H Club youth.

And what a challenge that is: Oklahoma farm youth have won five international grand championships. They have produced more champions in national competition than any other State. Forty-one percent of the animals for final judging at Chicago's Royal National were Oklahoma steers.

Yet the State's leaders are intent on building a major stock show to match that record, and 5,000 entries representing nearly 1,000 top breeders and exhibitors in a nine-State area have more than gratified the sponsor's hopes. The exposition's premium list is big time, too, with over $50,000 in livestock premiums and rodeo prize money. Fifteen rodeo performances will be directed by the internationally famous Verne Elliott, featuring the Lone Ranger. Added special features include the thrilling calf scrambles a cutting horse contest, a quarter-horse show of major importance, and the famous Bill Hames carnival.

Tulsa extends a warm welcome to the visitors, exhibitors and performers who come to the exposition, and anyone who fails to attend sometime between March 12 to 21, will miss not only the biggest show in Oklahoma, but the biggest in the triangle between Denver, Kansas City, and Fort Worth.

The Plan for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, the Monday morning St. Paul Pioneer Press contained a splendid editorial entitled "The Plan for Security," which I include with my remarks:

THE PLAN FOR SECURITY

The plan for the draft and universal military training submitted late last week by Defense Secretary Forrestal no doubt will, as the chairman of the House committee says, be subject to considerable change in detail. But Congress will be temporizing seriously with national security if it does not adopt a comprehensive program of this kind at this session.

The chief difference of opinion on the basic idea appears to arise from the belief or hope that the draft would be adequate and that universal military training can be avoided. Of the two, the draft is by far the more drastic step and the greater interference with the careers of the young men affected by the program. It is therefore surprising that the stronger dose should be preferred by objectors who have complained in the past that UMT would be going too far.

This apparent self-contradiction arises as the result of wishful thinking. There are doubtless some who prefer the draft just because it is the stronger measure, but for the most this preference is an expression once more of the hope that there really is no serious security problem to be faced. The purpose of universal military training is the long-term training of young men to build up and constantly refresh the reservoir of military manpower. The advocates of the draft alone, for the most part, hope that by inducting a relatively small number of young men into the armed forces this international crisis will be ridden out and then America can once again slip back into disregard of things military and disagreeable.

If the danger of war is averted over the short term, that will not mean that it has been averted for all time. It is naive to think that the Soviet Government does not know exactly what it is doing and to believe that it will abruptly change its course in the opposite direction. The Soviet Government has gone about its program of expansion and infiltration by deliberate decision based on careful calculation of the risks. Any other assumption would be a dangerous underestimation of a very formidable adversary.

The draft is needed now because, in anticipation of world cooperation which has failed, America demobilized its armed forces, and volunteering has not been sufficient to bring them up to authorized strength. Moreover the world situation calls for an increase of authorized strength.

The probability is very great that the Russian plan calls for no overt acts which would be likely to precipitate an early war. But it is equally probable that the Russian plan will be carried on as circumstances permit until it either succeeds, fails, or leads to war. For that long pull the slower, easier, and by far more economical pace of universal military training is best. For if we do not adopt universal military training, we are faced with the permanent draft of young men into actual military service, with the degree of sacrifice very unevenly distributed among those called and those not called.

Communism Challenges America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, international communism today threatens everything America stands for or aspires to be. The doctrine of world revolution is a doctrine of ruin and rule. The police state begins where the orderly processes of representative government bog down. World communism has but one policy—to break down every working and workable system of government in the world which can be manipulated from Moscow.

It was the Roosevelt New Deal which extended the helping hand of United States recognition to the Communist outlaw—Russia—in 1933. That act of the New Deal invited the godless maverick among the nations to become a member of the family of civilized people—gave Russia an opportunity to pick up her just share of the burden of human progress.

Instead, Russia continued to be the outlaw, the nation whose foreign policy knew no rule save the ruthless rule of aggression and plunder.

Russia's treaties are mere scraps of paper. Russia's promises are made only to be violated when opportunity affords an advantage from repudiation. Russia made treaties with Hitler to partition Poland, made an agreement with Roosevelt to partition Korea, and an agreement with Truman, at Potsdam, to partition Germany.

Since the defeat of Germany three short years ago, Russia has devoured and blotted out the national existence of no less than 11 nations in Europe and Asia. Today her plans for aggression and plunder know no bounds. A power-drunk outlaw, Russia tramples the lives and fortunes of entire nations, as our lawless horse thieves of an earlier generation once terrorized the frontier outposts of law and order—at gun's point.

Mr. Speaker, I call as my witness today, a fellow-American, Mr. George H. Earle, former governor of Pennsylvania, some time a member of the Democratic National Committee, and former United States Minister to Austria and Bulgaria, under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During his diplomatic service in Bulgaria, Minister Earle had opportunity to observe the pillage of the Kremlin juggernaut throughout the Balkans.

He warned Washington repeatedly, before Pearl Harbor, concerning the true aims and objectives of Soviet diplomacy. His advice was never welcomed by the White House. When war came, he was given a commission in the United States Navy and exiled, under White House directive, to American Samoa for the duration.

History will make known one day the exact text of the communications to the White House by which Mr. Earle warned the Roosevelt administration concerning the consequence of the New Deal's secret alliance with the Kremlin. Mr. Earle tried to let the American people know what his Government was doing in these secret adventures. But his every communication was suppressed in the State Department or the White House, and Earle himself was held virtually incommunicado in American Samoa—a "prisoner of war," as he once described himself.

Only 2 months ago I received a communication from Mr. Earle, from his home at West Grove, Pa. He is no longer subject to naval censorship. He is free to tell the American people what the Roosevelt-Hopkins secret diplomacy did to them. He is devoting his entire energy to that high mission. He seeks to tear the veil of secrecy from the Roosevelt alliance with international revolutionary communism. He is convinced that President Truman is a party to that unsavory secret diplomacy. His letter ends on the note: "If Truman is nominated and elected our country is sunk."

At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD Mr. Earle's letter of January 13, 1948, as follows:

This session of Congress will decide, not the welfare of us Americans, but our very existence.

You have before you a recommendation of General Marshall, basing European recovery upon economic measures, namely, the expenditure of billions of American dollars. If carried out, this great sacrifice by the American people, raising our own cost of living to unbelievable heights, will be just as successful as the British of old, trying to buy off the Danish ravagers.

If Russia occupied Canada and we had no Army, Air Force, or Navy, would any of us be interested in building up our own business? That today is the position of every European country outside the iron curtain.

Why is our country threatened as never before?

Simply because first Roosevelt, Hopkins, and Marshall, and then Truman and Marshall, failed completely, in spite of repeated warnings, to analyze correctly the Russian menace. Yet you gentlemen, selected by our people because of your patriotism, foresight, and integrity, consider seriously again following the disastrous policy of President Truman and General Marshall.

In the autumn of 1945, Russia, by breaking again and again her agreements for Europe and Asia, was exposed in her true colors. Then we had the mightiest military power in world's history, on land, sea, and in the air, and a monopoly of the atomic bomb. That was the time for the show-down with Russia. And now, today, due to the policy of Truman and Marshall, we are about to face this show-down with one-tenth of our military power and with God and the Kremlin alone knowing if we still monopolize the atomic bomb.

From the bottom of my heart, I say if Truman is nominated and defeated our Democratic Party is sunk. If Truman is nominated and elected our country is sunk.

Miller-Engle Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, M. C. Hermann, quartermaster adjutant, Department of California Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, recently appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands urging favorable action on the so-called Miller-Engle bill providing for the immediate construction of a dam on the American River near the town of Folsom, Calif.

Because I feel that Sam Hermann's statement is so pertinent I include it as part of these remarks, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the congressional committee, my name is M. C. Hermann, and I am the quartermaster adjutant of the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and my business address is Suite 107-108 Veterans' Memorial Building, San Francisco, Calif. I appear before you today to specifically urge immediate passage of the Miller-Engle bill known as H. R. 4157.

We are particularly interested in the immediate erection of Folsom Dam in accordance with the President's policy in the matter of operation and control. We feel deeply that if the full beneficial effect is to be obtained, that the operating control of all dams erected by Federal moneys in the Central Valley should be vested in the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the 160-acre limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act, and if the waters backed up by these proposed dams are administered by the Army and not by the Reclamation Bureau, we believe effective enforcement of the 160-acre provisions of the law will be impossible.

At our Cleveland encampment, held in September of 1947, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the delegates present, who represent approximately one and one-half millions of members of our national organization:

"Whereas special interests which seek to avoid enforcement of the 160-acre water limitation of the reclamation law in Central Valley of California are making deliberate use of the Army engineers as a tool to accomplish their purpose: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States ask Congress to enact legislation that will place all water resource development in the Central Valley unequivocally under reclamation law and charge the United States Bureau of Reclamation with sole and entire responsibility for enforcing the law; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars shall call upon the President and upon the Secretaries of Defense and Interior to take all steps necessary to prevent the Army engineers from serving as the instrument for depriving large numbers of the Army's own veterans of the opportunity to obtain a farm in the Central Valley."

"Whereas under existing veterans' preference laws the amount of publicly owned land now available to qualified veterans desiring to farm is wholly insufficient to meet the need; and

"Whereas Congress has shown in the Columbia Basin Act now, by authorizing Government purchase of excess private landholdings under the reclamation law, the amount of good farm land so available to veterans can be greatly increased; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States ask Congress to apply the reclamation law to every publicly financed irrigation development and to authorized Government purchase of excess landholdings under the 160-acre water limitation, in order that the existing veterans' preference may be changed from an empty gesture into a measure of prompt and substantial help to large numbers of veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That we protest any administrative relaxation of the 160-acre water limitation under pressure, whether it be a weakening of the law by acquiescing in mere technical compliance, or by interpreting it to permit publicly financed water for 320 acres to man and wife, which is an obvious distortion of the original intention of Congress, and an injustice to those veterans and others for whom acreage limitation was intended to create opportunities to the farm."

The recent drought situation in California has driven home and emphasized the immediate need for the completion of the Central Valley project. Were the waters which have run through the various draws from the great watersheds of California conserved, the drought situation could not have existed as there would have been ample water in reserve to supply the entire Central Valley farming area. In addition to the necessity for the conservation of waters for the development of land and for the protection of farmers now on the land in this great area, the tremendous migration of settlers from other parts of the country into California make it imperative that the full development of the hydroelectric resources be made at the earliest possible moment. California has no coal, and it is dependent entirely upon electrical power to run its many industries. If sufficient power is unavailable, industries will not be encouraged to set up in California and many thousands of people ultimately will find themselves without employment. The recent drought situation in California has caused the institution of a power-rationing program in California. This situation is far more serious than most people believe and the condition in the Central Valley in the matter of unemployment, because of conditions that could have been remedied had these dams already been built, is pitiful, to say the least. This unemployment situation in the valleys is directly felt in the urban communities of California, and thus the situation affects the entire population of the State.

We appeal to you now in Congress to take the necessary steps to cause at once the erection and the proper control of these projects, to the end that in the future California's economy and the economy of millions of people will be safeguarded.

Gentlemen, to further aid conditions in the matter of the 160-acre limitations of the Reclamation Act, I would request permission to submit to you here for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the prepared statement made by Max Singer, past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, on the occasion of the Klamath Falls drawing held on March 15, 1948. Your courtesy in accepting this statement for the RECORD will be deeply appreciated. In conclusion, we urge:

1. Full enforcement of the 160-acre limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act.

2. Prevent any regulations or interpretations of the law which permit excess landowners to escape from the law by paying up construction charges, and which condone laxity and permit favoritism by Government officials during the period until excess land owners have done so.

3. That the responsibility of the enforcement of the excess acreage limitations be placed upon the Reclamation Bureau as proposed by the Miller-Engle bill, with assurance of vigorous enforcement of set regulations.

4. Authorization by Congress for the Governmental purchase of excess lands, as was done in the Columbia River Basin. We believe this would make enforcement generally easier. As veterans we have a large and special stake in Government ownership of excess lands as a ready means to bring them within the laws establishing preference for veterans.

5. We request this Public Lands Committee of the Congress to conduct an investigation and review of the enforcement and nonenforcement of the 160-acre limitation, with full opportunity for public hearings.

6. We ask that you authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to construct power plants at the Folsom Dam immediately upon completion of the dam itself, and to complete all upstream developments upon the American River which will contribute to our power and irrigation resources.

7. We ask that you tie all water development within the watersheds of the Central Valley into the Central Valley project, including the Kings, the Kern, and the American River developments. Only by this unification of our entire development will it be possible for the veterans and for the people of California to receive the fullest benefit which it is possible to obtain from the reclamation of our water resources. On behalf of the thousands of veterans that I represent, I wish to thank this committee for affording me the opportunity of making this appearance and for the courtesies extended to me.

Legionnaires Extolled in Verse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a poem printed in the Stockton Legionnaire of Stockton, Calif., written by one of the members of Karl Ross Post No. 16. The poem follows:

LEGIONNAIRE

For God and country
To do and dare,
That's why I'm a Legionnaire;
To make my community
A better place
And meet my neighbors face to face,
Help distressed comrades
Their cross to bear,
That's why I'm a Legionnaire;
To face with courage the coming day,
To teach my children how to pray,
To make my flag a symbol rare,
That's why I'm a Legionnaire;
And at last when taps are sounded,
I climb that golden stair
To face my Lord and Maker,
Thank God, I'm a Legionnaire.

—*Robert Mentzer.*

Selective Service Handled by Civilians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in view of the suggestions now being made for the revival of the selective-service program, the following editorial is very timely. I would recommend to all interested in this subject careful consideration of the following suggestion made by Mr. H. E. Taylor, editor of the Traer Star-Clipper, published in Traer, Iowa:

Indications are that Congress will authorize peacetime conscription of American youth again for the armed forces, because of the alarm felt over the present state of our relations with Russia. It is the view of the Army generals that voluntary enlistments cannot keep the services at even their present authorized strength, and that a draft, unpleasant as it will certainly be, is the only solution. The President, and the brass hats of the armed services, are also asking for compulsory military training. They say that the only alternative to a huge standing Army, which has always been repugnant to our country for reasons of principle as well as the huge cost, is a trained civilian reserve.

Until recently it appeared unlikely that the administration-sponsored bill for universal military training would be considered at all by Congress in an election year. The prospect that it would win the approval of Senators and Representatives having to run for reelection this year seemed impossible. But war hysteria in the National Capital in recent weeks has immensely accelerated congressional interest in national defense, and most anything seems possible now.

Volunteer enlistments have been disappointing for the reason that the services are having to compete for manpower with private industry, which is still short of help in many places in the country, and is continually raising wages to attract and hold skilled workers. If there was a scarcity of jobs in the country now instead of more jobs than takers, the armed services would have no trouble at all in getting all the volunteers necessary, because service pay is certainly attractive when you consider all of the extras.

Some Members of Congress will vote for a peacetime draft on the theory that it will immediately accelerate volunteer enlistments, and they think that actual conscription will not be necessary. The public should not put too much faith in that prediction. We are inclined to think that when the draft is set up again, it will be used.

The Star-Clipper does not pretend to be an authority on whether a peacetime draft is necessary. But if reestablished, we sincerely hope Congress will take heed of some of the abuses of the system during World War II and not allow them to happen again.

Having closely observed selective service as it was operated during both world wars, we think the administration of it during World War I was much better than during the late war, from several standpoints. It was fairer and more considerate of the boys involved, it was open and aboveboard, and was handled with far less confusion, bungling, and fewer changes of policy and regulations.

During much of World War II the draft was often so incompetently handled that the boys subject to military service were unable to properly apply themselves to their studies in school or to the jobs they filled while waiting for the induction call. They were continually on edge because of uncertainty over their status. Their parents and families, their employers, and their personally owned businesses were continually upset, not knowing what to expect from the dizzy administrators in Washington, who so frequently shifted policies and rules, and reversed themselves time and time again. A farmer never knew whether to plant another crop or sell out. Hard-pressed employers were usually wondering whether to try to replace the men and boys registered for the draft or to depend on promises of deferment.

This criticism is not aimed in any way at the Tama County selective service board. The late E. O. Harris and Fred Guy and Forrest L. Flynn had this thankless job for more than 5 years, and I often wondered how they ever lived through the experience. They were the victims of a poorly administered system, the same as the selectees. The trouble was at the top.

In our opinion, selective service during World War I was better handled because the administrators from top to bottom were civilians. During the late war, the administrators from General Hershey on down to and including those in the State capitals were military men. The only civilians were in the local boards, and they had to follow orders from the top. In carrying out orders they had to do many things against their better judgment.

The Army ran the draft during World War II about as efficiently as it handled the Army, and you have all heard plenty about that. Much of the confusion caused by the brass hats seems inexcusable now.

The argument for selective service is that it is the most democratic way of recruiting an army in time of war. Its avowed objective is to treat everybody fairly. Democratic ideals and objectives will more nearly approach reality if the system is handled by civilians. The military could better be used in training the selectees or in combat, leaving selective-service processes to civilians who have more intelligent consideration for the needs of the American public as well as the armed services. That is the opinion of this country editor who as a news reporter covered selective-service activities for the Star-Clipper during part of the First World War and during all of the last one. We had better success trying to interpret what was going on when civilians were at the steering wheel. Little, if anything, was withheld from the public, and that is something you can't say about the draft administration during the late war.

Wallace's Louisiana Backers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there are none so blind as those who will not see, and there are none so deaf as those who will not hear.

I believe the time has come when every related incident, no matter how insignificant, no matter how apparently unimportant at first blush, should be called to the attention of the American public whenever communism or anything associated with communism appears on the horizon.

I have in mind the announced candidacy of an individual by the name of Henry Wallace, who in his wanderings has walked every political path that suited his purpose at the moment. He now walks the trail arm in arm with those who would tear down and destroy the kind of government we would like to believe is the kind of government the founders of this country intended for us to enjoy. We cannot continue to blind ourselves, nor can we continue to turn deaf ears to the situation as it does exist. It is time that everybody stand and be counted; it is time that we all be on the alert; it is time that we know the color, whether it be deep red or light pink, of those who espouse the candidacy of individuals who would be President of the United States.

In this connection, I think the editor of the New Orleans States has done a splendid job in the editorial which I submit to the House. I could not say it better than this New Orleans editor has said it, and I suggest that you read the following editorial which appeared in the New Orleans States the other day. It is written in unmistakable, effective, and direct language:

WALLACE'S LOUISIANA BACKERS

"Even though the New Orleans press may not wish to support the Wallace movement, it does have the duty to make it possible for a rational public opinion concerning the Wallace movement to develop." (Mitchell Franklin, State chairman, Wallace for President Committee for Louisiana, in a statement.)

We are in full agreement with this quite logical statement. It is the duty of the press to help form "a rational public opinion" of the Wallace movement here. This we will attempt to do today.

First comes to hand a letter from Mr. Irving Goff, State chairman of the Communist Party of Louisiana, which includes an attack against the southern governors who are fighting President Truman's anti-States' rights program.

In part, Mr. Goff's mimeographed communication, says: "They (the southern governors) are revolting against * * * tens of thousands of southerners who have sat in unsegregated audiences to cheer and support Henry A. Wallace * * *" and adds:

"Most specifically, they are in revolt against the main political organizational instrument through which these democratic trends among the southern people may express themselves and gain political power—the third party organization in the several Southern States."

So the Communist Party in Louisiana appears to be foursquare behind Wallace for President.

When Wallace announced for President some months ago, the administrator of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Edmonia W. Grant, who has since resigned her position, giving as reason a lack of funds, said that the SCHW would probably support Wallace. The fact that last June the SCHW sponsored a speech by Wallace in Washington lends authority to the former administrator's estimation of what the SCHW would do. And recently the SCHW issued a brochure featuring an article by Henry Wallace published when he was editor of the New Republic which touched upon political organization in the South. Inasmuch, however, as the SCHW was given a pat on the back by Wallace in this article, it may have been just a little log-rolling, and can be dismissed as such. There is evidence of closer ties.

There are five officers of the Wallace for President Committee of Louisiana. Of these, we find that the vice chairman of the Wallace group is State chairman of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and two are members of the SCHW.

Four of these five officers are on the nine-member steering committee. Of the nine members, four are members of the board of directors of the SCHW and one is the wife of an SCHW director.

There is also a national Wallace for President Committee comprised of some of the officers and steering committee members of the Louisiana group. In these are four who were members of the New Orleans Council for Soviet-American Friendship, which has been listed by the Attorney General's office as a subversive group. Of these four, one is a former chairman of the council and one is wife of another former chairman.

This may aid the formation of a rational public opinion of the Wallace movement, backed here by interlocking, jigsaw groups, two of which have been called Communist fronts by congressional committees and one of which is the Communist Party itself.

Republicans Protest on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Republicans in common with all other good Americans have been outraged by the pusillanimous reversal of our Palestine policy by the administration, damaging alike to United States prestige and that of the United Nations, and assailing our sense of justice.

The following resolution of one of the outstanding regular organization clubs in my district which is under the direction of Executive Member Harold S. Lazar eloquently expresses this position:

The Republican Club, thirteenth assembly district, north, New York County, in meeting assembled unanimously adopted the following resolution with instructions that the same be forwarded to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, Member of Congress from this district.

Whereas the Government of the United States has reversed its policy heretofore favoring the partition of Palestine, which had as its chief object the establishment in Palestine of the historical and religious home of the Jewish people; and

Whereas this action is excused by Secretary of State Marshall as occasioned by vital elements of our national security; and

Whereas this shocking reversal, one day urging partition and the next day opposing partition, is costing our Government the moral leadership of the world, is jeopardizing the United Nations, and introduces by itself danger of armed conflict: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Republican Club of the thirteenth assembly district, north, of New York County, N. Y., expresses its strong disapproval of the action taken and urges the immediate return to the policy favoring the partition of Palestine and the taking by the United Nations of such steps as may be necessary to insure the maintenance of peace in the area afflicted; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, Representative in Congress from the Twenty-first Congressional District, of which the thirteenth assembly district is a part.

JOHN A. BOLLES,
President.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 2, 1948.*

Our Scrap Iron and Pig Iron Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, our country is desperately short of steel and of the necessary scrap iron to produce steel. Not only this, but the continuous stream of steel and steel products going to Russia and her satellite countries is placing the industries of this country and their pay rolls in jeopardy.

It has been necessary for one of the important industries in my home city of Dunkirk, N. Y., to shop around throughout the United States in an effort to get sufficient pig iron to keep a large radiator plant in operation. Finally in desperation it was necessary for Mr. Malcolm C. Reed, the purchasing agent for this plant, to buy pig iron from Holland. Were it not for the 300 tons of pig iron obtained from Holland this fine industrial plant would be idle and the men who work in the plant would be unemployed. I may add, however, that it was necessary for the purchasing agent to pay $68 a ton for pig iron when a good price for it would have been $42.50 a ton. Commenting on the 300-ton Holland shipment, Mr. Reed said that there is no doubt that a certain percentage of it is metal originally shipped overseas by America during the war.

It does seem a travesty on justice that we should be arming those countries which are supposed to be our potential enemies with steel, iron, and other products of which we are short. It would seem that our experience in arming Japan, Germany, and Italy prior to World War II ought to be a warning against this inane policy established by the New Deal.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article relating to this subject which appeared in the Evening Observer of Dunkirk, N. Y., under date of Friday, April 2, 1948:

DUNKIRK RADIATOR USING IRON SHIPPED HERE FROM HOLLAND

A temporary shortage in pig iron in the immediate area and higher prices on other American markets has forced the Dunkirk Radiator Corp. to procure pig iron from international sources.

Malcolm C. Reed, purchasing agent for the Middle Road plant, today announced that 300 tons of pig iron have been received from Holland through an importing firm in New York City.

Normally the radiator company uses about 750 tons of pig iron monthly for the manufacture of boilers and radiators. This ton-

nage was supplied by three Buffalo sources and an additional one in Erie. Recently, however, one plant in Buffalo and the Erie concern closed down in order to carry out repairs to their blast furnaces.

The two other sources gradually cut down their supplies until Dunkirk Radiator was getting only 200 tons monthly, a tonnage far below its needs.

Concerns in Colorado, Texas, and Chicago were approached but they reported short stocks or that pig iron was obtainable at $100 per ton. This figure was more than double the $42.50 per ton Dunkirk Radiator paid for pig iron through the Buffalo and Erie firms.

Mr. Reed then began looking to the international market to fill the plant's requirements. He found a supply available in Holland at $68 per ton and immediately placed an order for 300 tons to tide the plant over until the Buffalo and Erie concerns were back in operation. The 300 tons sent here were part of 5,000 tons shipped to America recently.

The tonnage received is not as good as American pig, Mr. Reed said, because America has a closer controlled analysis over pig iron and consequently turns out a better grade product. However, the Holland shipment will carry the plant over the emergency.

Primary reason for the pig-iron shortage is the lack of steel scrap at low prices. The high price of finished steel caused pig-iron producers to swing over to basic iron used in steel production, thereby making better profit.

Commenting on the 300-ton Holland shipment Mr. Reed said that there is no doubt that a certain percentage of it is metal originally shipped overseas by America during the war. The Holland concern has quite likely purchased abandoned, damaged, or useless war equipment and converted it into pig iron. The result is that part of America's war supplies has returned home.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the text of the third of a series of most interesting broadcasts made over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., by Ann Su Cardwell:

Our attention today will be centered on Poland's right to be united, independent, autonomous as based on its political and fighting records.

For 200 years Germany and Russia have persistently sought by every conceivable propaganda device to undermine Poland's political reputation, their objective being threefold; to prevent growth of friendship for Poland that might lead to intervention in Poland's behalf, to prepare the world for acceptance of the partitioning of Poland as logical and unavoidable, and to justify German and Russian acts of violence and large-scale territorial annexations after the partitioning had occurred. That threefold objective applies to the Stalin and Hitler regimes as well as to earlier Russian and German Governments.

The Germans believe they are the master race. The Bolsheviks think they have the only form of government destined to survive. The Poles know they are mortals and make no claim of political perfection. Accepting the fact, therefore, that Poland, like America, has made and will make mistakes, the matter of Polish political competence depends upon the number and relation of pluses and minuses in Poland's political record.

Out of the very considerable evidence for Polish political wisdom in past centuries, I shall stop to note only the tolerant decrees and statutes with regard to the Jews, beginning in 1264 with the Statutes of Kalisz, at a time when all western European countries were expelling Jews; the codification of Polish laws in 1347, making for stability, peace, and social progress; the Polish habeas corpus act of 1430; the maintenance of garrisons for the protection of the eastern provinces; the two acts already commented upon the Polish-Lithuanian union, completed in 1569 and the 1791 May Third Constitution, embodying political reforms so dangerous to Russian and Prussian plans that the work of partitioning was hastily finished before the new constitution could be put into effect.

During the partitions period no Polish political activity could exist, except of an underground nature, so we pass to the year of 1918, but not without remarking that with all due credit to factors working outside Poland, restoration was owing primarily to people on Polish soil. The break-down of the Austrian, German, and Russian empires in 1918 created the possibility of a free Poland but the Poles themselves created the fact.

The western allies were through with war in 1918. The Poles had yet to fight the Bolsheviks, and alone, despite their pleas for help. It was not until the spring of 1921 that the Poles could turn to reconstruction of their ravaged and poverty-stricken country. The situation was appalling, at least for any but a people reveling in regained freedom. One-seventh of France had been invaded and occupied, six-sevenths of Poland has been a battlefield—and I know how it looked for I saw it in 1922.

The difficulties were by no means confined to those of war destruction and its accompanying poverty. The three parts of Poland, Austrian, German, and Russian, were now united, a Polish government formed, the first in 123 years. Legal codes and systems had to be harmonized, frontiers provided with defense, foreign relations established, a constitution written and a parliament elected, schools put into operation even before texts could be written and teachers trained.

Financial difficulties were frightening. It required great wisdom and high courage to solve the problem of currency, credit, banking, and exchange at a time when the Polish mark was falling every hour, until in April 1924 one American dollar purchased 9,300,000 marks. But the Polish currency was stabilized, and Poland was still on a gold basis when in 1930 France, Britain, and America felt compelled to abandon it. Rural reform was one of the first items on the new government's program, a real rural reform, that, to mention one of its aspects, by 1939 had through parcellation provided adequate homesteads for some 700,000 landless or dwarf-farm owners. It was no policy of peasant impoverishment through allotment of such small plots that collectivism must follow, as is manifestly the goal of the present Polish regime.

Communication systems were repaired and extended, the port of Gdynia and its shipping developed in rapid tempo. Industries like the great Lodz textile mills, the Silesian foundries, the oil wells of the southeast were soon going, and doing better than in prewar days. Small enterprises all over Poland were springing up, while the central industrial district, in process of development when the 1939 war broke was to have been of immense significance for all Poland.

By their achievements between 1919–39 the Poles demonstrated their political ability. And note this well—later events have shown conclusively that Polish political sagacity with regard both to Germany and the Soviet Union was far superior to that of western statesmen. Had Polish counsel been followed there would have been no 1939 or 1939 German aggression and no Russia in Europe today. This is a matter of record, not of opinion.

Turning from Poland in peaceful times, see what the Poles will do when their independence and territorial integrity are threatened. The record of recent years will suffice. For 8 years, beginning with Japanese aggression in Manchuria in September 1931, the international history of Europe and America had been an unbroken record of retreat of right before might. Gangster methods were successful in Asia, Africa, and in Europe—until they were tried on Poland. The world watched and listened, said it was "High time somebody told the Nazis where they got off," but left the Poles to meet the blitzkrieg armies unaided and alone. I was there in the midst of it—heard the bombs, saw the planes, the fires, the ruins, and the courageous resistance of the Poles.

Every Pole knew what must be the outcome of the fighting under such circumstances. Yet, since the Nuremberg trial of German military leaders we know that had the British and French, weak as they were, attacked in the west the Germans would have lost. We know, too, that General Sosnkowski's army was getting the best of the Germans in southeast Poland when Moscow fulfilled its part of the German-Soviet secret pact and stabbed Poland in the back. The Poles fought as long as they had anything with which to fight. Compare their record with that of the west, which had 8 months for preparation to meet the Germans, and the advantage of Polish experience with the blitzkrieg, but where France asked for an armistice—as Poland never did—after a little over a month of fighting.

After the Polish collapse Poles slipped across the green frontier in a steady stream to join the Polish Army forming in France. Those remaining in Poland joined the underground, with its many forms of activity. Never since the morning of September 1, 1939, have the Poles ceased to fight. They fought and won laurels in France, in Norway, in Britain, where, undaunted, they moved after France fell, and where they were indispensable in the Battle of Britain; in Africa and in Italy. And they were ready to go into the Balkans had Churchill's plan for invasion of the Continent carried. Polish aviators had an important part in the bombing of Germany, and Polish units formed part of the 1944 invasion from the west. The less spectacular but no less effective work of the Polish Navy and marine must not be passed over, and we remember that it was a Polish destroyer, the *Piorun*, that first engaged the German battleship *Bismarck*.

Poles outside the homeland have no monopoly of Polish heroism and devotion. The consecration, endurance, ingenuity, and bravery of the Poles in the underground services is beyond all praise; and the way the underground army fought in the 1944 Warsaw uprising under seemingly insuperable difficulties is little short of incredible.

There are some 800,000 Poles who today are listed as refugees, not counting the multitudes of the Soviet Union. A large number of these men and women have been soldiers risking their lives for freedom. Thousands of others who have not carried arms have fought no less well in other ways. These devoted patriots cannot return to their native land as long as that land is ruled by a foreign power that has blotted out all

freedom and whose purpose is to destroy Polish institutions and Polish culture. These Poles can only wait and work for another turn of the wheel of fate that will set their country free. In concluding this comment on the Polish right through heroism, I quote from the New York Times, October 19, 1941: "These unconquered Poles have made themselves the symbol of the indomitable national will. If ever a nation by sacrifice and courage earned the right to resurrection, it is Poland." The next and concluding talk of this series will be devoted to Poland's functional and moral rights to independence.

Grand Mufti of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose here to either praise or condemn Mohammed Amin El-Husseini, the Grand Mufti of Palestine. Few of us know anything about the Grand Mufti, his history, his philosophy, or his program. We do know that he is a leader of, and a spokesman for, millions of Arabs. It behooves all of us to learn all facts possible on all sides of this serious and explosive Palestine question. On March 30, the Grand Mufti issued what may become an historic statement, entitled "An Arab Charter for Palestine." The Grand Mufti may not deserve all of the praise that has been given him. I am sure that he does not deserve all of the censure that has been heaped upon his head. I wish neither to question nor to vouch for his sincerity. His pronouncement, however, is worthy of note. I commend it to the reading of all who want to be fair and informed in the premises.

AN ARAB CHARTER FOR PALESTINE

(By Mohammed Amin El-Husseini, Grand Mufti of Palestine and chairman of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine)

At this momentous phase in our vital struggle for independence and liberty, I wish to declare and reaffirm the sacred principles to which we adhere, and which guide us in our righteous struggle. We are certain that public opinion throughout the civilized and democratic world will look with sympathy upon our aims and cause when the true facts are revealed and the confusion, created by the perfidious campaign of Zionist propaganda to discredit our noble national movement, is exposed.

By the Covenant of the League of Nations our "existence as an independent nation has been recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance." Yet for the last 30 years we have been deprived of our independence and sovereignty. Our aim during this whole period, and until today, is to obtain our independence and the freedom and liberty of our country, the establishment of a sovereign state with a constitution based on democratic principles which would include adequate safeguards for minorities, the safety of the holy places as well as all civil rights and freedoms. Such a state will treat all citizens and peaceful residents of all creeds with justice as befits a truly democratic country.

In demanding and seeking the attainment of this end the Arabs of Palestine are simply demanding the recognition of their legitimate, natural, and inalienable right to self-determination and self-government, which is the lifeblood of liberty, the first step to progress, and a basic principle of the United Nations Charter. The Arabs of Palestine hereby solemnly affirm that they do not recognize the right of any foreign power or powers to deprive them of their natural right to independence or that their country should be subject to interference from or encroachment by foreigners.

The Arabs of Palestine—Christians and Moslems—are united in their common resolve for independence and freedom. Arabs are God-fearing people who cherish with the greatest reverence the religious beliefs, rites, and traditions of all religions. The sanctity of all holy places is to them a matter of the greatest importance. For centuries they have been the guardians and custodians of these holy shrines. The Arabs of Palestine wish again to impress upon the world that they regard as a sacred trust of civilization the preservation of the Christian, Islamic, and Jewish holy shrines in Palestine, and consider it as their responsibility before God, to the three great faiths and to the civilized world, to protect these holy places against all transgression, violation, aggression, or sacrilege.

The Arabs of Palestine cherish freedom of religion and worship. They are prepared to guarantee complete freedom for all religious communities and denominations in the full exercise of their religious duties and rights. They guarantee full protection and freedom for all religious, educational, and cultural institutions. For religious purposes they will guarantee full and free access to all pious pilgrims and worshipers to these sacred shrines.

The Arabs of Palestine wish to declare that they are not opposed to Jews as Jews. Before the Zionist invasion, Arabic-speaking Jews lived in Palestine as fellow citizens with Christian and Moslem Arabs on the most cordial terms. The Christian and Moslem Arabs have reverence for all prophets common to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. This fact is an added proof that the strife in Palestine is not based upon religious sentiments or grounds, but is a result of the invasion of Palestine during the past 27 years by hordes of immigrants from foreign lands, instigated and directed by the international Zionist cabal. Arabs consider it their sacred duty to defend their country against this invasion, and are determined to see to it that these invading hordes will never succeed in establishing their sovereignty on one inch of Palestine soil.

Foreseeing the outbursts and uprisings which would result from the recommendation of the General Assembly to partition our country, and in the face of the most outrageous provocations committed by Jews against Arabs, the Arab Higher Committee on two occasions issued proclamations to the Arabs of Palestine urging them to exercise every possible care in the defense and protection of all foreign consulates—their buildings and staffs—against all acts of aggression, and that all diplomatic representatives should be treated with the greatest respect and consideration in accordance with their diplomatic immunities. They were also urged not to molest neutral, peace-abiding foreign residents, but to afford them protection, to refrain, as they were wont to do, from all acts of violence against hosiptals and other medical and health institutions and from showing any sign of hostility to their doctors, nurses, or other members of their staffs, and never to interfere with the free movement of Red Cross and Red Star ambulances or those of any other medical institution or benevolent association. They were reminded of their inherited traditions not to harm or attack defenseless women or children, to afford all protection to women and children, the aged and the sick, and that they shall not attack the homes and dwellings of peaceful citizens, but to restrict their operations to repelling the unprovoked aggression of the Zionist invaders. It is also urged on all Arabs fighting for the liberation of their homeland to refrain from killing Jewish captives or wounded men or women and to give them all human care and aid in accordance with the accepted international conventions.

The Zionist invaders have committed in Palestine the most atrocious and savage crimes against defenseless and peace-abiding Arab inhabitants. They have bombed and destroyed Arab dwellings and hotels; murdered innocent and defenseless old men, women, and children; committed acts of sacrilege against churches and mosques; attacked Christian priests and Moslem sheikhs; destroyed hospitals and other institutions of benevolence and mercy. They have used dum-dum bullets; as sniping posts and machine-gun nests they have used their Hebrew University, Hadassah Hospital, and the great synagogue in the old city from which they attacked innocent and defenseless Arabs and Arab dwellings. They have committed countless other barbaric and uncivilized acts.

In spite of these outrageous provocations, we Arabs of Palestine declare that, in accordance with our traditions, we shall exercise every effort to keep our noble struggle on a higher plane. Therefore, I exhort the noble Arab people to maintain their self-control and restraint and not to descend to the abysmal depths of degradation into which the Zionists have sunk, but to uphold the glorious Arab ideals and their heritage of chivalry.

The Arabs are liberty-loving and God-fearing people who cherish their religion, their family life and traditions, the possession of private property, the right of private enterprise, respect for the dignity of the human individual. By nature, they are a democratic people. Their traditions, supported by their history, bear witness to these qualities. The Arabs of Palestine, like all other peace-loving peoples of the world, are interested only in the exercise of their inalienable right to live as free and independent people, and to have friendly relations with all democratic and peace-loving nations. More than any other people, they are anxious to put an end to this tragedy in Palestine and to establish peace and order in the Holy Land. Peace, however, cannot reign in that country as long as justice is denied to its rightful inhabitants.

MOHAMMED AMIN EL-HUSSEINI,
Grand Mufti of Palestine,
Chairman, the Arab Higher Committee.

Seedbed of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1946, in a primary campaign speech over radio station WTCN, Minneapolis, Minn., I discussed the critical problem of the European countries and their future needs. My speech was delivered about 15 months before Secretary of State Marshall announced his plan for European recovery which was the genesis of the bill we are considering today. In the course of my 1946 speech I stated:

We must accordingly now act as the seedbed of victorious democracy and from this

will spring the economic life of the peacetime governments of the future world. We should do this in the same spirit of mutual helpfulness that we acted as the arsenal of democracy in wartime. But our contribution will have a more lasting effect. It will be in the direct interest of world-wide peace. To do so will cost money, but to not do so will earn us the undying hatred of the rest of the world and lead to future wars. These wars would eventually cost us much more in money, lives, and personal suffering than our presently contemplated assistance.

I make no claim to being a prophet, for a blind man—if he would but think out the situation—would come to no other conclusion than that the United States would have to give assistance if the European nations were to get back on their feet in our time. Needless to say I will support this bill. I endorse its high general objective. At the same time I share the doubts of many that this Administration will administer it efficiently. They are famous for inefficient administration. Why should we expect an efficient administration of a foreign WPA when we could not get an efficient administration of WPA right here in our own country. In the present case the added distance will add difficulties—and the foreign governments will add difficulties—but it is a step we must take or suffer more dire consequences. Even today the newspapers report a Russian propaganda barrage against the Scandinavian countries—I pray to the Lord that with our help they will be successful in their resistance to that scourge.

Likewise, in discussing this issue in the past with those who are economy minded—as I am—I have pointed out that this program is less costly than would be a program of full military preparation in our own country. On this point I was pleased to note the substantiating statement of the distinguished chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on the War Department, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, given in his forceful speech on Monday and which begins on page 3618 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Read it if you have not done so already. There the gentleman from Michigan, who is the best informed man in the United States on the cost of our Military Establishment, points out that we get 10 times as much defense for our money in the Turkish area than if we were to assume that duty ourselves and that the Turkish Army of 1,000,000 men is the equivalent of a four to five million man Army in the United States. That argument is unanswerable in this discussion. He gives similar figures for England, France, Greece, and Belgium and the same argument applies to the Scandinavian countries. Read that statement, I say, if you would vote intelligently on this matter.

But what brings us to this $20,000,000,000 program of aid so soon after we won the war? Why is it necessary to include military aid? Any person who would look could envisage the need for some aid of a relief and reconstruction nature but not military aid of the proportions here requested. Well, gentlemen, you know and I know that this is brought about by a resurgent Russia that is threatening to engulf Europe and Asia in the red tide of communism. She is able to do this, and we are required to act to the proportions here involved, because those in charge of our foreign policy allowed Russia to become strong while we became weak. At Potsdam President Truman confirmed the secret Russian aggressions that were permitted at Yalta and Teheran. Then with full knowledge of all the secret deals that had indicated the aggressive nature of Russia's designs and made Russia strong, and at a time when the American people were in ignorance of the tremendous aggressions that our Chief Executive had sanctioned, President Truman permitted—without raising his voice—the liquidation of the finest army the world has ever known. I venture to suggest that this decision was his and not the unanimous opinion of his advisers and history will someday so report. He permitted the liquidation of our armed strength and thus practically invited the red tide to sweep into Europe. Come November the slogan will not be "He kept us out of war" or "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream"—it may well be "He lost the peace." Certainly, for those behind the iron curtain in Poland and elsewhere the peace is already lost. President Truman permitted, without opposing, the liquidation of our armed forces at a time when he knew what strength the Russians were given, and the American people did not know those facts. He kept those facts from the American people. Is it any wonder that with such leadership we are a target in international affairs? When the Republic of Panama has no respect for us after living off our bounty for 42 years how can we expect Russia, who attacks our basic ideology, to be less aggressive?

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the due bill for our inept foreign policy. Much of the money is in the nature of a salvage operation—trying to save the peace. We must pay this bill in atonement for permitting secret diplomacy. We must pay the cost and hope for a change in the Chief Executive who has charge of our foreign policy. We cannot expect any long-range improvement in our foreign policy unless we make a long-range improvement in the man who has misguided our foreign policy. That is our only hope that our Nation will again rise to the position where it is respected by foreign powers.

Enlistments in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, now that the President has asked for the reenactment of the Selective Service Act and the adoption of universal military training the Congress and the people should have a clear picture of our present military situation and our future needs. With this thought in mind I wrote the heads of the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, asking them their authorized strength, their present strength, the number applying for enlistment during the past year, the number accepted, the number rejected, and the bases for rejections. At the end of these remarks I offer for the RECORD the letters I have received in reply.

It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, there is an unusually large number of applicants rejected, particularly in regard to the Navy and Marine Corps. The Navy reports that it does not have the record of applicants before November 1, 1947; just why I cannot understand. In the 4 months ending February 29, 1948, it reports that 79,910 persons applied to enlist, of which 37,676 were accepted and 42,034, or 52.7 percent, were rejected. We find about the same condition in the Marine Corps. During the year ending February 29, 1948, 39,185 applied for enlistment, of which 18,169 were accepted and 21,016, or 53.6 percent, were rejected.

The record of the Army and Air Forces, whose recruitment is handled by one agency, is somewhat better. In the 9-month period to December 31, 1947, 232,777 persons applied for enlistment of which number 156,442 were accepted and 76,335 or about 33 percent were rejected.

It is my understanding that standards are now higher for all branches of the armed services than they were at the beginning of the last war. While I can appreciate the desire of these services to get the cream of the youth of this country I cannot help but feel there should be a place in each of them where a boy who desires to volunteer his services to his country could serve even though he could not meet the high standards now set up. A future war would require that all persons, military and civilian, would be required to take part. Why should not the military be required to take its share of the average men and women, especially when past experience shows that they have taken much more than their share of the doctors and nurses and the medical supplies and equipment of the country in time of war. It would be interesting to know how many men in uniform are now performing the services of civilians—services that could as well be performed by men who do not meet the high standards set for enlistment. The armed services were never very happy with the voluntary enlistment program set up by Congress. Does this record of enlistment reflect that attitude?

All the services have been notorious for their waste of manpower and money. If this country is confronted by another grave emergency it seems imperative that somehow better business methods of running them should be put into effect. I am sure the country was astounded when the Secretary of the Navy declared our defense services were a hollow shell. The people have a right to ask what the military has been doing with approximately a billion dollars a month since VJ-day. This is almost 10 times what we spent before the last war.

Mr. Speaker, before this House authorizes the appropriation of more billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for the use of the armed services I urge the Committee on Appropriations to go to the bottom of their present policy on expenditures and insist the people get value received for their money. The day has passed when we can permit the reckless waste of our manpower and resources.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1948.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: In reply to your letters of March 17 and 19, 1948, requesting information relative to enlistment statistics, the following is furnished:

(a) 1. The present authorized strength of the United States Navy is 500,000.

2. The size of the Navy as of March 1 was 351,181.

(b) I regret that records in this Bureau are incomplete, and I am unable to supply the number who applied for enlistment during the past year. However, there was a total of 79,710 applications for enlistment for the period November 1947 to February 1948, inclusive.

(c) There were 65,518 enlistments by the recruiting service through February of this fiscal year.

(d) The major reasons for rejection of applicants for enlistment at recruiting stations during the period November 1947–February 1948 are itemized as follows:

Failed recruiting test (mental)	11,967
Withdrew	3,162
Lack of education or mental deficiency	2,425
Underage	2,176
Defective vision	1,939
Police record	1,344
Other causes	1,312
Married or dependents	864
Defective (or lack of) teeth	711
Medical discharge	700
Parents' consent	569
Pes planus (flat feet)	533

I trust the foregoing satisfactorily answers your inquiries.

By direction Chief of Naval Personnel.

Sincerely yours,

G. R. DONAHO,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director, Recruiting Division.

HEADQUARTERS,
UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, March 19, 1948.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MILLER: Your letter of March 17, 1948, addressed to the Commandant, United States Marine Corps, and requesting certain information concerning enlistments in the Marine Corps, has been referred to me for reply.

The enclosed tabulation will, I believe, give you the complete information you desire. Although the authorized enlisted strength of the Corps has been established at 100,000, money has been appropriated for a strength of only 75,000 (end figure, fiscal 1948). The actual enlisted strength fluctuates from day to day, the figure shown in the tabulation being the estimated strength as of today.

With very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. E. RILEY,
Brigadier General, United States Marine Corps,
Director of Recruiting, Marine Corps.

[Enclosure (1).]

For period Mar. 1, 1947, to Feb. 29, 1948

Present strength of Marine Corps, Regular:	
Officers	6,742
Enlisted (estimated)	73,114
Number of applicants for enlistment	39,185
Number accepted for enlistment by recruiting service	18,169
Number rejected for enlistment	21,016
Reasons for rejection: (51 reasons given).	

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1948.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Reference is made to your letter of March 17, 1948, requesting detailed information in connection with the strength of the Army and data relative to applicants for enlistment.

There is some legal question as to the authorized strength of the Army and the Air Force, since no law specifically authorizes Army strength. Until the recent action of the President in asking for strengthened armed forces, the Army had been working toward a requirement as follows:

Officers	78,842
Enlisted men	589,796
Total	668,638
Actual strength as of Feb. 1, 1948:	
Officers	75,909
Enlisted men	476,241
Total	552,150

Latest strength estimated as of March 1, 1948, is 542,000 of which 74,000 are officers.

Applications, acceptances, and rejections—April 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947: (These numbers do not include applicants or enlistments at posts, camps, and stations.)

	Army and Air Force Number	Percent
Number of applicants for enlistment	232,777	100.00
Number accepted for enlistment	156,442	67.21
Number rejected for enlistment	76,335	32.79
Rejection by cause:		
Neuropsycho	5,551	
Physical	25,894	
Failure R test	31,266	
Total	62,711	
Failed to report	2,027	
Elopements	4,280	
Declinations	6,791	
Total	13,098	
Administrative ineligibles	526	

Average monthly rejection rate, 33 percent.

For your information, the following amplifications of the above causes for rejection are offered:

Physical: Failure to meet minimum physical requirements.

Failure R test: Failure to meet minimum mental tests.

Failed to report: Failed to report at central examining station for physical and mental examination.

Elopements: Reported to central examining station but disappeared prior to taking oath of enlistment.

Declination: Reported to central examining station but while being processed declined to go any further.

It is regretted that the above information has been delayed in reaching you. I sincerely hope that these figures are adequate for your needs.

Sincerely,

EDWARD F. WITSELL,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
DIRECTORATE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
Washington, March 29, 1948.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MILLER: This will refer to your letters of March 17 and 19, 1948 requesting information regarding the authorized strength of the United States Air Force, together with statistical information relating to applicants for enlistment therein.

The desired data regarding applications and rejections is not available for the months of January, February, and March of 1947. The information given in this regard pertains only to men who applied for enlistment at the recruiting stations during the period April 1, 1947 through December 31, 1947, and does not include men enlisted at posts, camps, and air installations.

Authorized strength for fiscal year 1948:	
Officers	63,689
Enlisted men	337,673
Total	[1] 401,362
Assigned strength as of Feb. 1, 1948:	
Officers	47,565
Enlisted men	305,578
Total	353,143
Estimated strength as of Mar. 1, 1948:	
Officers	47,858
Enlisted men	316,592
Total	364,450

[1] NOTE.—By agreement with the Department of the Army, the Air Force portion of the approved budgetary funds for the fiscal year 1948 limited the strength to 375,000 of which 50,000 are officers.

Applications, rejections, and declinations, Apr. 1 through Dec. 31, 1947:

	Army and Air Force Number	Percent
Applications	232,777	100.00
Acceptances	156,442	67.21
Rejections	76,335	32.79
Rejection by cause:		
Neuropsycho	5,551	
Physical	25,894	
Failure R test	31,266	
Total	62,711	
Failed to report	2,027	
Elopements	4,280	
Declinations	6,791	
Total	13,098	

Administrative ineligible, 526.

Average monthly rejection rate, 33 percent.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH F. STEARLEY,
Brigadier General, USAF, Director, Legislative and Liaison Division, Directorate of Public Relations.

Whence Our Strength?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of April 7, entitled "Whence Our Strength?" In the present confused state of world affairs, we

are likely to lose sight of what constitutes real preparedness and real strength in the defense of our country and the principles for which it stands. I, therefore, wish to bring this article to the attention of every Member of Congress, and all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHENCE OUR STRENGTH?

A prizefight champion needs a stout right arm. But the stoutest arm will not make him a champion without strong legs, endurance, and an inner vitality and resilience. Disaster awaits the fighter who trains too rapidly, who saps his real strength to build too much muscle. And when the champ begins to fade it is not his right arm but his legs that go first.

So it is with nations.

The question we as a people have to decide is not whether the United States should be strong. In this parlous world we must be. The question for decision is how we may best be strong.

President Truman and his military advisers think the way to military strength is through a huge standing Army and an armament industry geared now for war. They think the way to be strong is to go now on a war footing, to draft both men and resources now for some coming battle.

That is ever the answer of military men. They plan their wars in terms of battles; they count the troops, guns, planes, and ships on their chessboard at the opening and depend on these, and their skill at tactics, to win them wars. Since battles are fought with men and guns, getting a lot of them seems the obvious way of preparing for war. But troops and guns, and even skill at tactics, do not guarantee victory. They are a necessary adjunct to military victory; they win battles. But they can also lose wars if in acquiring them a nation pays too high a price.

Were this not so, the face of the world we know would be quite different. Hannibal chased Roman generals over half of Italy for 7 years. Napoleon outfought all his opponents, even Wellington, and turned all Europe into a vast war machine. Students of Civil War tactics study Lee and Stonewall Jackson, not the Union generals.

Yet, Carthage was salted into the earth, the Napoleonic empire crumbled, and the Confederacy went with the wind. Staying power born of economic strength won the wars if not the battles.

Twice in our generation a weak America plodded through lost battles to overwhelm invincible armies that had been a decade or more in the making. Both times we supplied the strength not only for ourselves but also for the rest of the world. We were the wellspring of vitality for all our allies.

Now the military men want us to prepare for the next war by walking the road that is already littered with the wrecks of mighty military machines. They want us to pattern our planning after the failures.

We question that road. The real strength of the United States, it seems to us, is its tremendous vitality, its reserve power in the face of great emergencies.

Therefore, what adds to that vitality and reserve builds strength; what destroys it makes for weakness.

Whence comes that strength? Not in the quantity of our labor supply, for in numbers we are inferior to some weaker nations. Nor, indeed, in the quantity alone of our physical resources, for there are other areas equally rich, and some more so. What makes us unique is that our labor is the most productive in the world and that we have developed the most efficient industrial plant for utilizing the physical resources we do have.

The priceless ingredient in our society is the discovery that the freeman is a greater asset to his community than the slave. From that has come a productivity unequaled in history and it is that productivity, the efficient use of resources, that has made us strong.

Now what the administration proposes is this: That we drain off more than a million and a half of our labor force and compel them to take arms; that we turn a large percentage of our industrial capacity into making goods that add nothing to our future productive power; and that we bind our energies with continued oppressive taxation and with regulations and controls by an omnipotent government. This is to make us strong.

Possibly we could stand this for awhile, as a healthy man can for a long time fight a sapping disease. A champ starting from perfect physical pitch can abuse his body for a long time and still be better than the next man.

But in the end if we abuse our heritage it will make us weaker, as it did Germany and Japan, as it will Russia, too, if she stays on a permanent war basis. A nation, like the strongest man, needs a rest to recuperate its strength.

We need to be prepared. We need a well-knit, skilled armed force to offer initial protection from sudden aggression and to form the nucleus of a mightier force if war should come. But we should beware lest too great a faith in arms exhaust the inner strength that is now, and always has been, our real source of power.

A Socialist State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that no vote of mine has contributed to the continuation of the socialistic Government of Great Britain. The very course the Congress has followed and is now following so far as our foreign relations are concerned, can lead only to the destruction of our free enterprise system and the substitution for it of a socialistic state.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial in the Wall Street Journal under date of April 8, 1948:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

PROGRESSION

Britain has taken another step in its progression toward the abolition of private capital and the free enterprise system. Its government now proposes a capital tax that is confiscation with a vengeance.

We have never been deluded by the rosy theory that this British socialism could be some middle road between a free society and complete statism. Once a community embarks on the way of state socialism there is no stopping place short of complete oblivion for individual economic freedom. The obliteration of private capital in England may come more slowly than in, say, Russia, but it seems to be coming just as relentlessly.

The taxing power is the present instrument of destruction. The new British budget proposes a tax on investment income which can be greater than the income itself. For instance, a £50,000 investment income would pay the regular tax of £45,000 and in addition a new special tax of £24,000. In short, the government not only taxes all the investor's income but £19,000 besides.

In such an air private capital cannot long exist. What can will flee. What cannot, will be swallowed by the State. There will be no new capital except what the State acquires by taxing. And as private capital dwindles the State must inexorably levy more and greater taxes.

What can the end of such a progression be but a society in which there is nothing except what belongs to the State?

The Brooks Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a statement issued by the Provisional Committee for Justice in the Brooks Case:

PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE FOR
JUSTICE IN THE BROOKS CASE,
March 5, 1948.

DEAR FRIEND: On Friday, February 27, 1948, at 3:15 p. m., in the city of Gretna, La., Roy C. Brooks, a decent law-abiding citizen of this State and a long-time member and leader of local 309, FTA-CIO, was deliberately murdered in cold blood by Policeman Alvin Bladsacker, of the Gretna police.

FTA has investigated this case thoroughly and has found, without the shadow of a doubt, that this is the most brutal murder case in the long and bloody history of Negro murder by the Gretna police.

The facts in brief are this: Roy C. Brooks, a Negro, got on a bus in Gretna behind a Negro woman who had boarded the bus mistakenly, inserted her nickel in the slot register and then, finding that she was on the wrong bus, asked for the return of her nickel. The bus driver refused, saying that the nickel had gone through the register and that he could not return it to her. Brooks, being right behind the woman, and noting the incident, handed her his nickel instead of inserting it in the register so that no one would be the loser. This is common practice in such cases. But the bus driver challenged Mr. Brooks and insisted that he insert a nickel in the register. This, Mr. Brooks rightfully refused to do.

Policeman Alvin Bladsacker, on traffic duty at the ferry entrance a few feet away, walked over to the bus when he heard the bus driver's loud talk and ordered Mr. Brooks immediately from the bus. Mr. Brooks attempted to explain what had happened to the policeman and the policeman struck him savagely in the head with his blackjack. He then proceeded to walk Mr. Brooks, bleeding profusely, to the Gretna jail, a block away. When half way to the jail, policeman Bladsacker, without any provocation whatsoever from Mr. Brooks (it was broad daylight and hundreds of people were walking the street in the vicinity) pulled out his pistol and very deliberately murdered Mr. Brooks. The coroner's report stated that there were two bullets in Brooks' body—one in the abdomen and one in the back—both fired at close point-blank range. It was also stated that Mr. Brooks was unarmed. When his body was examined he was still holding a bag of peanuts in one hand and his hat in the other. The policeman had claimed that he shot in self defense when Mr. Brooks pulled a weapon on him.

Policeman Bladsacker is back at his post at the ferry.

The Louisiana Seafood Workers Council of FTA-CIO has met with heads of the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and Brotherhood of Railway Sleeping Car Porters, as well as with representatives of many other unions and organizations. A committee has been set up, with Albert O'Brien, FTA, as chairman, and G. C. Montgomery, of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, as chairman, to fight this glaring example of lynch law. Other organizations referred to above are represented on the committee.

May we ask your assistance in helping to bring a murderer to justice? Will you use your good offices to obtain maximum support to this end? Wires have been sent to Attorney General Tom Clark and President Truman asking them to investigate and take action. No replies have been received.

Sincerely yours,

PROVISIONAL COMMITTEE FOR JUSTICE IN THE BROOKS CASE,
LEWIS BROWN,
President West Bank NAACP.
LARRY LARSEN,
Regional Director FTA-CIO.
G. C. MONTGOMERY,
Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.
A. A. O'BRIEN,
International Representative, FTA-CIO.

Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 7, 1948.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Committee on Foreign Affairs has received a great many calls from Members of the House inquiring about the details of the administration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948. The enclosed circular was drawn up with the intention of supplying the answers to these questions.

I may use this means to send the Members of the House information regarding further developments under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 as administrative problems become clarified.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. EATON, *Chairman.*

INFORMATION ON THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

LOCATION OF ADMINISTRATION

The Economic Cooperation Administration is being housed in the Maiatico Building, Connecticut Avenue and H Street NW., Washington, D. C. At the present time the only Government telephone line to the building is a connection to the guard's desk, Executive 3111, extension 197. It is not known yet whether this will be the permanent telephone number of the Economic Cooperation Administration. Members of the House will be notified as soon as the permanent telephone arrangements have been made.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

The nomination of the Administrator has already gone to the Senate. It is safe to predict early confirmation. This means that there will be no interim administration in pursuance of section 104 (c) of the act. The Members can feel assured that there will be no impasse in administration such as was feared by some during the debates on the bill.

Until his own organization has been fully developed, the Administrator will necessarily have to operate by delegation of authority to the regular agencies of the Government or through the temporary assignment of some personnel of those agencies to the ECA, or both. The availability of personnel and the nature of the administrative problems will largely determine what method he will use in the initial stages. In any event, this will have no critical bearing on the nature of the administration.

PERSONNEL

One of the initial basic decisions which the Administrator must make is whether to concentrate as many of the functions as possible in his own shop or to use established agencies as far as possible, as permitted by section 111 (b) (2) of the act. This is something for the Administrator himself to decide on the basis of which will contribute most to the efficiency of the program. In any case, it may be expected that the program will require the employment of about 1,000 individuals to serve in the United States and approximately 400 to serve overseas.

A key to the success of the program will, of course, be the quality of personnel. Many thousands of letters from applicants have already been received. Persons of various talents will be required, including clerks, secretaries, statisticians, engineers, and above all persons with practical business experience, particularly in matters of supply. There will be openings for 100 qualified individuals for service in the United States, to be hired without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act, i. e., 75 may be paid up to the limit of salaries established under the Classification Act without approval of the Civil Service Commission, and 25 may be paid up to $15,000 per year. Employees serving overseas will be given the special advantages of status in the Foreign Service. This means that top salaries for a limited number will run as high as approximately $13,000 per year with additional allowances for overseas living expenses.

No interim employment is planned. For the brief initial period personnel of the established departments and agencies of the Government will be used. The hiring of a permanent staff will be deferred until the main organizational problems of the program have shaken down. In the meantime the Department of State is accepting applications for employment. These will all be forwarded to the Economic Cooperation Administration. Individuals interested in applying for a position and desiring to mail their applications in as early as possible should send them to Mr. Arch K. Jean, Chief, Division of Personnel, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. Those who are interested in applying for jobs and desire personal interviews should be referred to Mr. Lewis B. Fulwiler, Division of Personnel, Department of State, Room 315, Walker-Johnson Building, 1734 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., telephone Republic 5600, extension 5468.

Members who may wish to suggest specially qualified persons for places in the recovery program might just as well wait until the new Administrator has appointed an assistant for Administration and Personnel. In any event, the Administrator will probably not be able to give personal attention to such applications for a matter of a few weeks. As soon as an assistant for Administration and Personnel has been selected, the members will be notified of his name and how he may be reached.

BASIC AGREEMENTS

In the initial stage the program will consist of keeping the relief supply lines filled. The recovery aspects, which are intended to realize the full objectives of the program, will be developed later. Before the Administrator can develop these, he must (a) get his organization set up, (b) get his appropriations, and (c) complete the basic agreements with the participating nations. The basic agreements will be different from country to country. They must be negotiated with the greatest care to insure compliance with the objectives laid down by Congress. It was obviously impossible to commence these negotiations until Congress had laid down the final policy in the conference report. Pending the completion of these agreements, operations will be carried forward under interim letters of intent, as authorized by the act. The draft of these letters was approved by the President on April 5, 1948.

PROCUREMENT UNDER ECA

It is evident that relief items will be programed on a quarterly basis. The recovery aspects will be planned on a long-term basis. Actual procurement of recovery items will be deferred until the above indicated steps have all been completed. Members of the public who are interested in participating in this phase of the program can be reassured on that point.

In the act Congress specified the maximum practicable use of normal trade channels in the execution of the program. It should be understood that the Administrator is not going to assume responsibility for determining the initial needs of recovery supplies or for their procurement. The initial steps will be up to the participating countries themselves and will be taken by the agencies which those countries establish after the basic agreements have been worked out. The Administrator will serve as a screening, reviewing, and approving authority, not as a procuring agent. This is an item of information that might well be passed on to those business organizations who are interested in participating in the program. It is anticipated that American business will operate through its normal outlets abroad and not through any new bureaucracy established under the program.

REDUCTION OF POSTAL RATES

The possible reduction of some postal rates for shipment of relief packages abroad will be deferred for the time being. This reduction cannot be accomplished until the Administrator has established his organization. After that it will be necessary for the Administrator and his subordinates (a) to work out the details with the participating countries, and (b) to reach an agreement with the Post Office Department regarding rates and regulations on the domestic postage aspects. The rate reductions which will be realized will be announced by the Post Office Department as soon as the arrangements are completed. Meanwhile it should be emphasized that the rate reductions will be authorized only on relief packages being sent to countries participating in the program on a grant basis and to the western zones of Germany and Trieste. The countries will be specifically enumerated when the Post Office Department announces the rate reduction.

A New Era in Coal Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 27, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under permission of the House, I place in the

RECORD this very important paper which is related to my bill, H. R. 2161, on synthetic liquid fuels recently passed by the House:

A NEW ERA IN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(By Prof. S. W. Hockett, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, December 26, 1947, at Chicago, Ill.)

Civilization, if measured by man's ability to supply his wants, may be mathematically expressed in terms of man's rate of consumption of power—the life-blood of industry.

In spite of the glamorous promises of atomic energy in which we all pin our ultimate hopes, our Nation's immediate future planning for economic stability must inevitably be based upon a highly developed program of better utilization of coal. The recent war was ample warning of the calamitous risks involved in dependence upon petroleum.

Modern trends in fuel utilization, including rocket and turbine propulsion, Diesel motor power, oil heat, pulverized coal fuels, liquefied gaseous fuels and synthetic gasoline or motor-fuels, show a rapid acceleration toward completely disguised forms of coal energy.

The early mastery of the chemical and technological problems in the way of speedy development of the modified coal industry is doubtless one of the most crucial tasks facing scientists today.

It was the acknowledgment of this situation and the growing realization that liquid fuel from coal must become an important factor in our national security that led Congress in 1944 to pass the synthetic fuels bill authorizing the large-scale research program in synthetic liquid fuels which is now under way. Some $30,000,000 have already been allotted to the program.

According to the annual Mineral Yearbook, the consumption of crude oil increased in this country from 3 gallons per capita in 1900 to 425 gallons in 1940, with a far higher figure than that ever since.

During the first 7 months of this year (1947) over 400,000 new oil-burning furnaces were installed in homes for domestic heating in this country, and the figure has since increased at such a rapid rate that a stop limit had to be placed on the number of oil customers.

TREND TO LIQUID FUELS

According to oil company reports in the decade up to 1943 (until war even further over-emphasized the natural trends) oil consumption for heating purposes had increased over 300 percent. During that decade 30 percent of all fuel-oil consumption was for domestic heat, the highest of any market for petroleum products at that period.

Even back in 1940 over 40 percent of the products from crude pertroleum were burned to produce heat other than motor-fuel heat.

Likewise, the motor-distillate fuel demand of the Diesel type thus far this season is considerably more than 20 percent over the demand of last year, according to oil company statistics.

Furthermore, the increasing demand for fuels for gas turbines now coming into prominence in aviation and other high-speed locomotion (which fuels are chiefly kerosene or gasoline) is giving rise to another demand.

In spite of the low efficiencies obtained thus far from coal, the cost of coal energy, as given in the Minerals Yearbook is nevertheless only one-third the cost of Diesel fuel energy, being (in 1945) 13 cents per million British thermal units, as against 39 cents per million British thermal units for the latter. (This was figuring coal at $4 per ton of 13,000 British thermal units per pound rating.)

Most of the coals of the area covered by the report herewith sold for less than half of that figure.

And yet, with proper utilization, this cost ratio may easily be cut still further into half.

FUEL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Bituminous Coal Institute of Washington, D. C., states that roughly 340,000 square miles of continental United States of America (or 11 percent of our total area) contains coal, representing approximately half of the world's proven supply of that fuel. Our coal-bearing lands, they state, exceed in area the total combined areas of England, Ireland, and France, or of Germany, Austria, and part of Italy. (Cf. Chemical Engineering, April 1947, p. 130, charts of fuel reserves, Bureau of Mines data.)

Dr. W. E. Wrather, of the United States Geological Survey, has stated that 98.8 percent of all our national fuel reserves lie in our coals, while shale oil rates second as a resource at 0.8 percent, natural gas third at a trifle over 0.2 percent, and petroleum at less than 0.2 percent of our national resources.

The total proved reserves of petroleum are about one-twelfth of what we consumed last year (1946).

What is the significance of this fact? As insurance against the shortage of all types of fuels, gaseous, liquid, or solid, we must look ahead to coal.

Dr. Wrather placed the estimated reserves of Iowa alone, the lowliest member of the central group, at over 30,000,000,000 equivalent tons, or enough at the present rate of Iowa's production to last her over 10,000 years.

(The terms "billion" and "trillion" are used here as in United States of America and France, but not as in Britain.)

Further scrutiny of the geologist's figures shows that by far the greater proportion of these reserves lies within our Midwest areas, where the coals are of the high-volatile class of bituminous coal, mainly, and of subbituminous and lignitic varieties.

PROPERTIES OF HIGH-VOLATILE COALS

Considering the properties of these high-volatile bituminous coals, we note that in the everyday consumption a high percentage of their actual British thermal unit value is wasted. When fed on fires, these coals distill quickly without oxidation, their rapid vaporization holding down the temperature below the kindling point of the gaseous products; so the rich, high-caloried volatiles, most of which are invisible, dash out and up the flues before they can be ignited.

SUMMARY OF MODERN METHODS OF COAL UTILIZATION

The major procedures being employed today for better utilization of coals are:

1. High-temperature carbonization.
2. Low-temperature carbonization.
3. Hydrogenation process of liquefaction.
4. Fischer-Tropsch synthesis of gases into liquid fuels.
5. Underground gasification of coal (in experimental stage).
6. Atomized coal burning.

(1) The first process aims at production of metallurgical coke, chiefly, and to some extent manufacture of fuel gases.

(2) The second process is scarcely known in this country today, but will be discussed in this paper later because of its importance.

(3) The Bergius process of hydrogenation of a coal-paste mixture with some of the tar-oil residues from previous batches, uses high pressure and a temperature around 800° F. to produce the first stage, there being two stages in the final production of liquid fuels. It produced the main source of synthetic liquid motor fuel for Germany during the late war, and has been improved upon materially at the synthetic-fuels branch of the Bureau of Mines plant at Louisiana, Mo., until the yields are now about twice what they were in Germany.

(4) The Fischer-Tropsch synthesis uses fuel gases, either such as water gas, or natural gas, or coal gas, or gas from underground gasification of organic materials, causing them to combine under great pressures at relatively low temperature to form liquid fuels. Catalysts must be used, as in every process, to obtain satisfactory yields.

(5) Underground gasification aims to eliminate costs of mining, transportation, labor troubles, costs of equipment, etc., and to utilize fuel seams too thin to mine.

(6) As to atomized-coal burning, already locomotives to be, powered by powdered-coal-burning turbines, have made the headlines and are destined to set a new era in locomotive power, many scientists believe. These modern gigantic power plants on wheels can handle virtually any grade or type of coal, and process it directly on the locomotive. They operate without water, and with very little oil, with a thermal efficiency of 25.6 percent of the thermal energy of the coal, according to Dr. John I. Yellott, research director in charge of the innovation, a project of the locomotive development committee, Bituminous Coal Research, Inc.

POWDERED COAL FOR HEATING AND STEAM PRODUCTION

If anyone were in any doubt as to the great effectiveness of pulverized coal burners as being used today in rapidly increasing numbers for major power sources and heating plants, let him only visit such a plant as that which heats the State Capitol Building of Iowa with Iowa high-volatile (low-grade) coal; only be careful when you peer through the opening in the wall of the furnace at the white-hot ball of fire, lest you singe all the hair off your head and eyebrows. The heat is terrific.

OTHER INVESTIGATIONS WITH HIGH-VOLATILE COALS

These high-volatile coals were also studied to ascertain:

(a) Their amenability to liquefaction, and

(b) The feasibility of better utilization by other techniques, such as low-temperature carbonization.

Samples were requested from every coal mine in Iowa known to have been productive during the war, and were subjected to various methods of processing including carbonization, liquefaction, alkylation, pulverization burning and various methods not classified under any standard procedures.

Of all types of solid fuels of whatever character, from anthracite to peat, only one of the entire lot could be said to be made suitable for all six of the modern methods of better coal utilization itemized above. And that one type is the high-volatile coal, typified by the coals of Iowa and the Mississippi Valley areas. This lowest in rank of coals proved to be the most versatile of the lot when it came to being worked over into all the various modern disguised forms of gaseous, liquid, or atomized fuels. Here was a bit of irony—the lowest in rank became the noblest in service.

SUMMARY OF CHARACTER OF HIGH VOLATILE COALS OF THIS AREA

A compositing of all Iowa samples tested on a dry basis showed: 41.7 percent volatile, 42.9 percent fixed carbon, 15.4 percent ash, and sulfur about 5 percent.

RESULTS OF TESTS ON LOW-TEMPERATURE CARBONIZATION

Of all the various procedures applied to these coals as mentioned above, low-temperature dry-distillation seemed to give the best data on the coal's constituent ingredients and their affinity to the mother matrix or coal structure.

A much shorter period of time and a much lower temperature are found to be required

for these high-volatile coals than the high-rank coals.

This leads to a concomitant greater ease of control of the character of the evolved products, thus giving these high-volatile coals specific points of superiority over higher rank coals. There is less competition between pyrolysis of the distilled products and simple rapid distillation.

At the end of only one-half to 1 hour at temperatures rising up to 500° or 550° C. virtually all volatiles were found to be expelled.

This low temperature and short time of heating are indeed a far cry from the 12- to 18-hour periods at temperatures beyond 1,000° C. employed in industrial coke or gas ovens today.

Nothing could be gained by any such prolonged periods of heating or such high temperatures when applied to these high-volatile coals.

This would indicate that if retorts could be so constructed as to eliminate internal obstruction of volatile material and at the same time deliver a temperature of 500° to 550° C. to the entire mass within, several batches of coal could be carbonized in the time and with the heat now being required for one single batch.

Logically, the maximum practical carbonization temperature may be regarded as at the upper limit of the plastic range, which in the case of these Iowa coals was invariably below 550° C. and generally nearer 450° C.

This is further demonstrated by the very low temperature of the gaseous products evolved from these H–V coals. A few inches away from the red-hot retort, the iron conduit pipes are so cool the helpers hold their hands on them with scarcely no sense of appreciable warmth. Even grass or weeds yield hotter evolved products than this; and high-grade coals requiring high temperatures of 600° or over for distillation, yield gaseous products of a high wasteful temperature.

In the carbonization of eastern coals, the temperature curve scarcely shows any leveling off or break at all at the plastic temperature (if there be one), indicating greater endothermic energy is required to release the volatiles; some of this higher temperature also may break apart high energy bonds, releasing chemical energy to be wasted with the gases in the form of higher temperatures and more expensive condensing techniques. Many of the valuable by-products needed in industries are likewise cracked and decomposed at these higher temperatures.

FUEL GAS FROM LOW-TEMPERATURE CARBONIZATION

The fuel gases from these low-temperature distillations are notably free from sulfur, carbon monoxide, and tarry or pitchy products, and furnished considerably more heat per cubic foot than the municipal gas which was supplied at that time to the laboratory, ranging from 700 to 1,000 British thermal units per cubic foot as against less than 500 for the latter at that time.

Apparently the carbonizing temperature and time were not favorable to the production of water gas or the decomposition of the sulfur compounds present in the coal.

The most notable characteristic of the volatile materials was the high yield of tars, oils, ammonia, and the high British-thermal-unit character of the gas.

The condensed products yielded a very much higher percentage of benzene and other basic chemical constituents solely needed in our industries today.

The tar liquors ran around 360 pounds per ton as against 10 to 80 pounds from industrial oven operations. It is a well-known fact that tar yields of any given coal are very nearly inversely proportional to carbonization temperatures, which accounts for this much higher yield of valuable by-product tars and crudes.

Maximum tar yields must of course therefore be at a temperature close to the initial decomposition point, or initial plastic temperature; this, in the case of low-volatile coals is generally above 600° C., rather than around 450° C., as with these coals.

LOW-TEMPERATURE COKE

The coke from these low-temperature carbonizations of high-volatile coal is exceedingly light, porous, clean, easily handled either by hand or mechanically, does not deteriorate out in the weather, lights almost with an ordinary match, and burns freely with a clean, smokeless, free-burning hot glow, with less tendency to leave unburned carbon in the residues than higher temperature coke. It is very active chemically, compared with other free forms of carbon, being readily and feasibly activated to a high degree.

As a source of heat for fireplaces, rural homes, forges, water-heaters, or for making blue-gas or pulverized fuel, it is ideal. Regardless of its sulfur or ash content, it invariably produces the same type of white-hot ball of fire obtained from the powdered coal itself, leaving only a dustlike fluory residue at the base of the stack.

This coke also releases a larger portion of its imprisoned gases than high-temperature coke, showing a relatively lower percentage of such gases residually in its pores, in spite of the lower temperature and time of carbonization. This is in keeping with its better activating properties.

The higher the temperature of carbonization, the more dense, less porous, less reactive, and less feasibly activated is the coke product.

England has the largest low-temperature coke plant in the world, and Germany had to increase her low-temperature production of coke fivefold in an endeavor to meet the increased demands for this fuel. Such plants are very common throughout Europe where the demand for this fuel always exceeds the supply. As our own woodlots and forests wane in productivity, we shall inevitably find this low-temperature coke a godsend.

Advantages of low-temperature coke may be summed up in:

(a) Decrease in smoke wastes.

(b) Increase in efficiency of fuel utilization.

(c) Production of more raw materials for synthetics and modern industries using coal-tar products.

(d) Production of a high British-thermal-unit fuel gas at low cost.

(e) Facility of handling, and cleanliness and less risk of spontaneous combustion or deterioration in storage.

(f) Low-cost domestic fuel for fireplace or stoves, etc. (forges, water heaters).

Low-temperature carbonization directly at the mines and distribution of the gaseous fuels over long distances through pipe lines is practiced extensively in Germany, largely because of the high demand for both the gas and the coke. The fivefold increase in the industry shows the practicability of this method of processing coal for better utilization. Already large industrial concerns in this country are considering the possibilities of making their own fuel gas at the mines and piping or bottling it for use in their plants.

AMENABILITY TO LIQUEFACTION OF HIGH VOLATILE COALS

With regard to amenability to liquefaction the following basic premises have been established:

(1) Rank of fuel proves insignificant where liquefaction is concerned. Lignite, peat, wood, cornstalks, or even weeds may serve as raw materials for the manufacture of liquid synthetic fuel.

(2) High-volatile coals exhibit far greater susceptibility to chemical reactions and amenability to liquefaction than low-volatile coals.

(3) When they react they do so with less exothermic manifestations or waste of energy.

(4) Their hydrogen content is in higher ratio to the carbon, ranking them in this respect nearer to the petroleum fuels than low-volatile coals.

(5) They produce a high British-thermal-unit fuel-gas, suitable for either Fischer-Tropsch synthesis or for direct industrial and domestic utilization.

CARBON TO HYDROGEN RATIOS OF IOWA COALS

Inasmuch as about 15 percent of Iowa coals is waste (ash) we thus have from 100 parts of coal on a dry basis: 15 parts waste, 5 parts hydrogen (to 7 percent in some cases), 80 parts carbon (fixed and volatile).

This 80–to–5, or 16–to–1, ratio of C to H would correspond to the formula in a definite compound of about C_6H_5 if it were happily possible to have the coal structure in such a set-up.

Good gasoline shows a C/H ratio of about 85 to 15 percent, with no waste. It would correspond approximately to the ratio in the compound nonane, C_9H_{20}.

In tabulated form these ratios stand approximately thus:

Coal: 80 to 5, or 16 to 1, or 48 to 3.

Motor fuels: 28 to 5, or 17 to 3, or 5.6 to 1.

The 16-to-1 ratio, instead of a mere 5½ to 1, as in quality liquid fuels, leaves a carbon excess of about two-thirds of the total carbon content of the coal, which means that there is only about enough hydrogen present in coal to liquefy one-third of the carbon present, leaving a balance of two-thirds of 80 percent (or about 52 percent of original coal's weight) as residue of char or coke, if we were to attempt to liquefy coal by means of only its own hydrogen.

In the Bergius process of hydrogenation, over 50 percent of the expense of the fuel product obtained originates in the cost of the hydrogen itself, and that it must be exceedingly pure.

The question arises, should not greater attention be given to research into a successful synthesis of the one-third of the coal's carbon which its own hydrogen is capable of liquifying?

Inasmuch as carbon surplus can always be utilized to good advantage, and coal is so abundant and cheap, is the attempt to hydrogenate the 52-percent carbon surplus justified?

If the liquification could be conducted on a basis of utilizing only that one-third which provides the 85 to 15 ratio sought in an ultimate product, we would have the following theoretical possibility of coal yield: Per 100 parts of dry coal (of Iowa grade): 52 parts carbon surplus, 15 parts waste, 33 parts synthetic liquid fuel (of 28 carbon to 5 hydrogen).

These considerations led to attempts to synthesize Iowa coal by its own fuel gases, leaving an excess of carbon or char. An attempt was made to utilize the great adsorptive power of atomized coal particles at the temperature of incipient decomposition or plasticity, and their reactivity at that same temperature.

One of the most hopeful procedures so far is to inject a mixture of the atomized coal together with some of the low-temperature fuel gas from the same type of coal into a high-pressure-oscillating converter with powerful catalytic agents. Under these conditions, the gaseous molecules bombard the plastic surfaces, forming concentrated masses of adsorbed gaseous matter of highly energized mass at the areas of incipient decomposition. This should make amenable a number of happenings, including:

(1) Partial solution of gaseous molecules in the coal structure.

(2) Depolymerization of the coal structure.

(3) Oxygen removal from the coal by the reducing influences.

(4) Metathetical changes (double decomposition) or reaction between gas (small and large solid molecules) to produce medium-weight liquid molecules of distillable range; in other words, decomposition of the coal structure to lend molecular masses to the high-velocity gaseous molecules, thereby producing liquid molecules instead.

This process should be continuous, the unreacted gas being purified and returned to the circuit, while the residual fly-ash may be separated by hot cyclone separators. (Note: Of 100 parts of coal, 20 parts would be needed for the atomized charge for every 80 parts required to furnish the gaseous supply. This would leave, in the case of a coal of 15-percent ash, 3 percent fly-ash per 100 parts of coal, and in the retorts 52 parts of coke as marketable or utilizable residue. Thirty-three parts of liquid fuel should result in a 100-percent yield.) This process should be capable of almost automatic control, with little manpower and low-cost equipment. It would dispense with the costly added hydrogen. The only question is finding the right catalyst to give it a high yield.

We are navigating the shoals to this new continent of synthetic oil in search of a deep channel which, if not already present, must be made. Its ultimate exploitation will be no less significant to mankind than the discovery of a whole new continent on earth.

In summary, these then are the high lights of great happenings in the coal industry: Powdered coal will have a phenomenal place in our future power picture; low-temperature gas production is coming to stay, with its bottled or piped or directly used high-value fuel gas for home or industry and its valuable coke and tarry products; gaseous derivatives from coal will find a bigger application in turbines and other power appliances; synthetic liquid fuel for both auto and Diesel motors, and many new fuels on the way will make phenomenal expansion in industrial uses and production.

It may not be long before the average citizen may scarcely know what a lump of coal looks like in its raw state.

Workers' Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following article by Richard L. Strout in the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "A Workers' Education Service":

A WORKERS' EDUCATION SERVICE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—With all the hubbub over the Taft-Hartley labor bill, it is interesting to note that another labor measure of potentially far-reaching importance is also pending in Congress. It is a very modest, quiet, nonprovocative bill in most respects, and yet it is not impossible that, if passed, its final consequences might be more far-reaching than the one which has generated all the headlines.

For 20 years or longer, Britain has had what is known as the Workers' Educational Association, or WEA. Observers come away with the same remark: The funny thing about these workers is that they want education; they really do.

The striking proof of this is in the House of Commons today. On the Labor benches there are scores of plain workingmen whose formal education stopped at 14 years, or earlier. But the WEA took them on from there. They were hungry for knowledge, and the WEA fed them. Some of the restraint, discipline, and stability that is in the British Labor Movement as contrasted to the American, must be attributed to this British process of adult education in cooperation with schools and universities.

In the United States, the Department of Agriculture, through the famous Agricultural Extension Service, has been dealing with the practical educational needs of farmers for many years. At present, services are offered 6,000,000 farm families, and the relatively modest annual cost is about $24,000,000 annually. No comparable Federal service is offered the Nation's 42,000,000 wage and salary earners.

State colleges and universities are doing what they can to provide labor extension programs. They find a certain type of ambitious, intelligent, and imaginative worker hungry for facts about their lives, union, and industry, and are trying to feed them. In view of the demand, however, the present facilities are pathetically small; hardly in keeping with the resources of the Nation or, more specifically, with the growing industrial need evidenced by problems in union-management relationships.

What are the men interested in? The basic fact to begin with, as investigators turn up the facts, is that a majority of industrial workers have had little elementary schooling. Maybe that is the fault of formal education. Maybe it is the fault of the workers. Maybe it just happened that way.

Anyway, experience has shown that in nearly every big city there is an element of ambitious, interested workers, often stewards or officers of labor groups, seeking to get as adults some of the training they missed in school, particularly with reference to their own trade, industry, and union. Many employers say they prefer to deal with well-informed union leaders who can discuss the questions at issue with a full knowledge of facts.

What courses do workers want? As reported by schools and teachers, they include such matters as economic problems of American industry; economics of individual industries; labor legislation and law; social security; collective bargaining; history of the labor movement; consumers' problems; health and safety; current events; government. Then there are requests for practical courses in public speaking, parliamentary law, grievance procedures, shop steward practice, and foreman training.

Some 75 colleges are now conducting adult workers' courses. They can't begin to meet the demand. A larger field staff is needed "immediately," reports the University of Wisconsin. "Penn State lacks resources to meet more than a fraction of the growing demand," the State college reports. Chicago University declared: "Because of lack of staff, we reached less than 5 percent of the union members who want to attend classes." Senators ELBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah, and WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, have just introduced bill S. 1390, proposing to set up labor educational extension aid, of $30,000,000 annually, comparable to the Farm Extension Service, to be given those States willing to match at least 25 percent of the Federal sum.

After 10 years of discussion the rival AFL, CIO, rail brotherhoods, and other unions have unanimously agreed on this one subject at least, to offer a common program. Indeed, if workers' adult education ever reaches the usefulness in America that it has in Britain, it may do much to further responsible union leadership.

Old-Age Pensions Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the recent radio broadcast during which my colleague, Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, and I discussed Mr. MACK'S bill, H. R. 5751, to amend the old-age and survivors' insurance law.

Representative TOLLEFSON. In recent months there has been considerable interest regarding activities of the House Ways and Means Committee, which is considering changes in the social-security law. Many people have written me expressing their opinions about this law and urging certain revisions. We of the Washington State delegation are very happy and proud that one of our members, Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK, of Hoquiam, has been a leader in this move to make the social-security law more equitable. Congressman MACK has introduced a very fine social-security bill which is now before the House Ways and Means Committee. I am very happy this evening to have Representative MACK as my guest on this program. Mr. MACK, many people have written me about losing their social-security coverage when they become self-employed. What happens is this: an individual will work, for, say, 5 years, as an employee, and will pay into the social-security fund during all this time. He then decides to open a small grocery store or some other business under his own management. When he does this he not only loses all social-security coverage in the future, but he loses every cent he has paid into the social-security fund. Just how does your bill propose to help these people?

Representative MACK. Under the present old-age and survivors' insurance law, Thor, a young person must work 40 quarters, or 10 years, in covered employment before he is eligible to receive a monthly pension at age 65. If he quits his covered employment before having paid withholding taxes for 40 quarters he forfeits all rights to a pension. He also loses all the withholding taxes he has paid into the old-age and survivors' insurance fund. He never gets back one cent of the money he paid for this old-age protection. The Government keeps all of it. This, obviously, is unfair and unjust. Our Government never would permit a private insurance company to commit such an injustice on its policyholders. Our Government certainly should not do so itself.

I know a young man, Thor, who was employed as a store clerk for 9 years and 9 months (39 quarters) and throughout that time he paid old age and survivors' insurance taxes. He paid in a total of $585, believing that this money would entitle him at age 65, to a pension.

At the end of the thirty-ninth quarter he went into business himself. Self-employed persons are not covered by old-age and survivors' insurance. This young man, by going into business for himself, loses all right to a pension at age 65 and also loses the $585 he and his employer paid for that protection.

My bill, if enacted into law, will correct this injustice. My bill brings self-employed persons, as well as those who work for others, under old-age and survivors' insurance protection. Under my bill, all self-employed persons—the owners of grocery stores, butcher shops, service stations, barber shops, drug stores, and all other businesses will be

protected. Under my bill, when a worker quits his job to go into business for himself, he merely continues to pay withholding taxes and builds up additional credits for an increased pension. He is not, as under the present law, deprived of both his rights to a pension and of the money he paid for that pension.

Representative TOLLEFSON. Out in the Pacific Northwest, Russell, we have another problem which is rather peculiar to our area. I refer to the growing trend for public bodies, such as city governments and public utility districts, in buying out private utility companies. What happens in this case is that employees will work for private power companies, or a private transportation company for a good many years, and will, during all that time, pay into the social-security fund. A public agency will come along and buy out the private company and operate the business itself for the people. When this happens, all the employees involved not only lose future benefits from the Social Security Act, but all the money they paid into the fund. Is there any way, RUSSELL, in which your bill will continue social-security coverage for these people who become employed by public agencies?

Representative MACK. Yes, Thor, my bill provides for the extension of old-age and survivors' insurance coverage to all employees of States, counties, cities, and all their subdivisions such as to the employees of port districts, public power districts, public bus lines, and publicly owned water companies.

Under the present law if a store clerk or factory worker quits his job and goes to work for a State, county, or city or any of their subdivisions he forfeits all rights to an old-age pension and also loses what he has paid in for that pension. He suffers the same injustice that is done the store clerk who quits his job to go into business for himself.

If my bill is passed, the worker who for a time was in covered private employment and now has transferred to public employment, will have all of the credits he earned while in private employment restored to him. He will just go on paying withholding taxes and thereby piling up credits that will add to the amount of the pension he will receive at age 65.

Representative TOLLEFSON. While we are discussing this matter of public employees, I would like to ask another question. As you know, Russell, many public agencies, such as our school districts, already have their own retirement systems. Does your bill extend social-security coverage to these employees, and what effect would this have on their private retirement systems.

Representative MACK. I realize, Thor, that there are certain groups of public employees such as teachers, policemen, and firemen, who now have pension systems of their own. They are fairly well satisfied with these pension systems and may not want the additional coverage afforded by Federal old-age and survivors' insurance.

My bill provides that where a group has a pension system of its own, each State is to decide what of these groups shall or shall not be covered; which, in effect, means the question of whether they are to be covered is made voluntary.

Representative TOLLEFSON. The present Social Security Act specifically excluded employees of charitable and non-profit institutions. This included employees of hospitals, community chests, social agencies such as the YMCA and so forth. Will your bill, if passed, in any way affect these employees?

Representative MACK. Yes; my bill provides for old-age and survivors' insurance coverage for all employees of nonprofit organizations such as you mention. My mail indicates that most nonprofit organization workers want this coverage and I can see no reason why they should not have it.

I was very much interested in a letter I received last week from a Catholic Sisters' Hospital in Spokane. The sister said the hospital was experiencing difficulty in obtaining middle-aged nurses, because the hospital being a nonprofit organization was not covered by old-age insurance and the nurses wanted to go where they could get this coverage. The Spokane Catholic sister was very pleased that my bill extends coverage to the employees of nonprofit organizations.

Representative TOLLEFSON. As you are well aware, Russell, the present law has received much criticism because the benefits people receive no longer compensate for the tremendous increase in the cost of living. Several days ago I received a letter about this very matter from Mr. J. H. Wade, of route 7, Tacoma. "We elder citizens," writes Mr. Wade, "feel that we are truly forgotten. Despite the rise in prices, there has been no change in pension rates for 11 years." Just what does your bill propose to do in the way of increasing actual social-security payments?

Representative MACK. One of the greatest weaknesses of the present old-age and survivors' insurance law, Thor, in my opinion, is that the present monthly pensions provided by it are insufficient to provide even a meager living standard.

I believe these pensions can and should be substantially raised. My bill provides for an increase of about 40 percent in the monthly pension payments.

My bill will give an increase of $15 to $21 in the monthly pension of single persons and $22.50 to $31.50 a month to married couples both of whom are 65 years of age or older.

Under the present law a single person whose average wage is $200 a month and who has worked 35 years in covered employment is entitled to a pension of $45.50 a month for the rest of his life. Under my bill, this single person would receive $65 a month instead of $45.50.

Under the present law a married couple, both 65, whose average wage was $200 a month and who worked for 35 years, is entitled to a pension of $68.75 a month. Under my bill this same married couple would receive $97.50 instead of $63.75, which is an increase of $28.75 a month.

Representative TOLLEFSON. Naturally, when one advocates an increase in payments, the question always arises regarding the financial soundness of such a program. Will your increased payments make it necessary for people to pay a larger portion of their salary into the fund?

Representative MACK. The old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund on February 29 of this year contained the astounding balance of $9,641,000,000. This is the amount of money the fund has collected in withholding taxes over and above what it has paid out in benefits.

The present schedule of benefits was adopted in 1939. The amount of money collected since then in old-age withholding taxes is far greater than any expert estimated at the time the present schedule of benefits was adopted and the amount of benefits paid out is far less. The reserve fund contains about twice as great a balance as actuaries in 1939 estimated when the present schedule of benefits was adopted.

On that basis, I think we can substantially increase the monthly benefit payments to those over 65 without endangering the long-range soundness of old-age and survivors' insurance financing.

It is interesting to note, Thor, that the old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund is even now increasing at the rate of $115,000,000 a month. If my bill, with its 40-percent increase in monthly pension benefits, had been in effect last year, the fund still would have collected about $900,000,000 more last year than was paid out on the basis of the higher benefits my bill proposes.

Representative TOLLEFSON. Many people have also written me protesting the $14.99 a month ceiling placed on their private earnings. In other words, if they earn more than that figure, they lose their monthly social-security benefits. A typical letter on this phase of the program was written me by Mr. Joseph F. Hunold, of 617 North Prospect Street, Tacoma. In pointing out that he must forfeit his pension if he earns over $14.99 a month, Mr. Hunold says, "There are 18 of us former employees of the News-Tribune who individually are not receiving more than $34 from the Government. We are not allowed to take even 1 day's work at our former job, because we would then earn $15.25, which would mean that we would lose our social-security pension." Mr. Hunold concludes his letter by pointing out that this ceiling prevents people in his position from supplementing their meager social-security pension. Does your bill, Russell, have any provisions to raise this monthly ceiling of $14.99?

Representative MACK. The present $14.99 monthly limit on what a pensioner may earn without losing his or her pension is, in my opinion, Thor, one of the most unsound and unwise provisions of the present law.

Personally, I am inclined to believe there should be no limit on what a pensioner may earn. The pensioner has paid withholding taxes for a pension. He should get that pension, just as he would get monthly payments from an insurance company if he carried a policy entitling him to monthly benefits at age 65.

However, social-security experts fear that if some limit is not placed on what a pensioner may earn the cost on the fund would become too heavy. Therefore, in my bill, to meet this objection and thereby increase chances of the whole bill being passed by Congress, I have raised the amount a person may earn a month to $50.

Representative TOLLEFSON. I understand that there is another provision of your bill which is of special interest to veterans and their families. Would you mind briefly explaining that portion?

Representative MACK. In my opinion, Thor, one of the greatest injustices done the World War II veterans was depriving him of old-age and survivors' insurance credits for the years he served in the armed forces. The man who stayed at home and benefited from war-swollen wages got his old-age and survivors' insurance credits, but the man who went into the armed services did not.

Here is how this injustice works. Two young men worked side by side in the same factory for 5 years. Then one of them was called into the armed services and served for 5 years while the other stayed on his civilian job.

When the veteran returned after 5 years, the man who stayed at home would have 10 years of old age credits and the soldier only 5 years. If at that time the two went into business for themselves, or into farming or both took a State, county, or city job—none of which occupations are covered—the soldier would never earn the 10 years of coverage credit which he must have to be eligible for a pension.

The boy who stayed home would get a pension at age 65 because of his 10 years of credits. The boy who went into the Army would not get a pension at age 65, because, due to his absence in the armed forces, he had lost 5 years of credits.

Obviously, that isn't fair to the man who went to war. Then, suppose both men spent their entire lifetime working in covered employment. At the age of 65 the boy who stayed at home would have 5 years more social security credits than the boy who was

absent in the armed forces for 5 years. Since pensions are in part based on the number of years of credits one earns, the man who served for 5 years in the armed forces would receive a $3 or $4.50 a month smaller pension than the worker who stayed home.

My bill proposes that World War II veterans shall be allowed old age and survivor's insurance credits for the period they were in the armed forces and which they would have received had they remained at home. It is only fair that they should.

The recently adopted pension bill for Federal employees gives Federal employees who were in the armed forces pension credits for the years they spent in the armed forces. Congress has recognized that Federal employees are entitled to pension credits for the period they served in the armed forces. I believe we now should extend those social security credits to those who come under social security old age and survivors' insurance.

Representative TOLLEFSON. Well, Russell, I see that our time has run out, so we will have to discontinue this discussion until some future date. I want you to know at this time, however, that I am 100 percent behind your legislation and that we of Washington State are very proud of the leadership you have shown in fighting to provide more and better security for our people. Thank you again, Congressman RUSSELL V. MACK, of Hoquiam, for being my guest on this program. Goodnight.

"Vinegar Joe" Stilwell on Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a news story from the Washington Post in regard to the recently published diary of the late Gen. Joseph W. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell. I believe that his comment on the regime of Chinese Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, based upon Stilwell's first-hand experience in China, is worth attention.

Under Chiang Kai-shek—

Stilwell wrote—

they (the Chinese) may expect greed, corruption, favoritism, more taxes, a ruined currency, terrible waste of life, callous disregard for all the rights of men.

The late Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, wartime American commander in China, is offering posthumous testimony against the regime of Chinese Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Publication of a collection of Stilwell private papers, diaries, and letters to his wife, indicate that in 1944, at least, this country's chief representative in China thought the Chinese Communists offered the people a better deal than the Nationalist Government.

"Under Chiang Kai-shek," he wrote, "they (the Chinese) * * * may expect greed, corruption, favoritism, more taxes, a ruined currency, terrible waste of life, callous disregard for all rights of men."

PICTURED AS BEWILDERED

On the other hand, he said, Chiang "is bewildered by the spread of Communist influence. He can't see that the mass of Chinese people welcome the Reds as being the only visible hope of relief from crushing taxation, the abuses of the Armt and Tai Lai's gestapo."

The memoranda, edited by Theodore White, a student of Chinese affairs and a close friend of Stilwell, is being printed in a condensed version of 40,000 words in April's Ladies Home Journal.

The article tells in bitter words the struggles, disappointments, and defeats Stilwell experienced in China—ending with his recall in 1944. They reveal that from the day he was called from the shelter of his California home to take over a prominent war role he kept an open eye at all times for double-dealing and shabby treatment not only from America's Allies, but also from officials at home.

On February 2, 1942—less than 2 months after Pearl Harbor, Stilwell records a visit at the White House to discuss his war assignment. After 20 minutes with President Roosevelt, he entered in his diary:

"JUST A LOT OF WIND

"F. D. R. very pleasant, and very unimpressive. As if I were a constituent to see him. Rambled on about his idea of the war. 'A 28,000-front is my conception, etc., etc. The real strategy is to fight them all.' Just a lot of wind.

"After I had enough, I broke in and asked him if he had a message for Chiang Kai-shek. He very obviously had not and talked for 5 minutes hunting around for something world-shaking to say.

"Finally, he had it—'tell him we are in this for keeps, and we intend to keep at it until China gets back all her lost territory.'

"Then he went on to say he thought it best for Madame Chiang not to come here, as invited by some organization or other. It would be too much like a lecture tour of women's clubs. He's right on that. He was cordial and pleasant—and frothy."

DIM VIEW OF HIGH OFFICERS

Also early in his diary he recorded that General Marshall had a dim idea of the value of some of America's high Army officers. He quotes Marshall on January 21, 1942: "It's hard as hell to find anybody in our high command who's worth a damn. There are plenty of good young ones, but you have to reach too far down."

But mainly Stilwell's diatribes were directed at Chiang to whom, after a few months in China, he generally referred as "The Peanut." Once he called him "The Rattlesnake," and at another time used a term that The Ladies Home Journal considered unprintable.

Stilwell's comparison between the Chiang regime and the Communists was at a time when he was trying to get Chiang to correlate the war efforts of the two armies. Instead of fighting the Japs with all their vigor, at that time, the two forces were building up to the present full-blown civil war.

To an Associated Press writer, White, Stilwell's editor, said that if the general were alive today he probably would counsel the American Government to adopt a hands-off policy toward China now.

WITHDRAWN UNDER THREAT

The diaries confirm that Stilwell was withdrawn by President Roosevelt under Chiang's threat to pull out of the war—but they also indicate that Chiang was tipped off that Mr. Roosevelt would order the recall if asked.

Stilwell's strongest statement against Roosevelt followed a conference with F. D. R., Churchill, and other Allied leaders in Washington in May 1943. War Department heads held that ground troops to defend air bases in China should be trained and sent over before stronger air forces were sent out. Churchill disagreed, and Roosevelt joined with Churchill.

"The inevitable conclusion was that Churchill has Roosevelt in his pocket," Stilwell wrote. "That they are looking for an easy way, a short cut for England."

He added that with the "Limeys" not interested in the Asiatic war and "with the President hypnotized, they (the British) are sitting pretty."

He complained that Roosevelt would not "let me speak my piece." He found Marshall and War Secretary Henry L. Stimson "understanding," and the "War Department O. K."

"Even the air was a bit fed up on Chennault," he remarked, referring to the Army Air Forces chief in China. He then concluded with this choice bit of sarcasm, directed toward Roosevelt:

"But what's the use when the world's greatest strategist is against you?"

Inside the Diplomatic Pouch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me today to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter, I desire to quote the following from the Upton Close newspaper column, Close-Ups, released February 7, 1948:

INSIDE THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH

Your own private cause may be just a racket or a vendetta, but if you can make it look like the Secretary of State or the United States Government is behind it, you are sitting pretty.

How many times have our Communists or other left-wingers been able to use diplomatic channels as their mouthpieces, making foreign governments believe that Uncle Sam himself was speaking?

Here's one instance. Pardon the "personal"—a man can speak with most evidence and authority when he is the guinea pig.

The particular group in this instance was the so-called Friends of Democracy, headed by "Reverend" Leon Birkhead. Associated with Birkhead in the deal was a Sunday evening radio commentator, Walter Winchell.

The international incident was an effort by this group, commonly called the Smear Bund, to use State Department influence to clamp a censorship on Mexican border radio stations. These stations, beamed to the United States, are the most powerful in the world, and operate under a strict international code drawn up in Havana some years ago.

As soon as I announced in December that I would begin broadcasting from these stations, along with some American stations, "Reverend" Birkhead lodged a protest with the State Department, and he and the Sunday evening key-hole commentator then began pressuring both the Mexican Government and our State Department to prevent me and five other American anti-Communists from using the Mexican radio outlets.

The New Deal commentator broadcast on the night of January 11, 1948, a statement obviously intended to intimidate the President of Mexico. He implied that the Mexican Government would be sorry next time it came "hat in hand" to Washington for money if it did not cut us off the Mexican stations.

On the following Sunday evening, Winchell announced that the President of Mexico had agreed to investigate the anti-Communist speakers.

Last week we speakers objectionable to the Smear Bund received official word from the Mexican Ministry of Communications, which supervises Mexican broadcasting, that it had listened to recordings of our broadcasts and had found them not only acceptable, but in fact commendable, and a help to the Mexican Government in combating communism.

A few hours after we received this official statement, however, we received word that the State Department had lodged an official protest with the Mexican Government through our Ambassador to Mexico, Walter Thurston, formerly of the United States Embassy at Moscow.

It looked as if the State Department was forcing Mexico to silence free speech over the radio.

Efforts of Senators, Representatives and private investigators at first received only denials from the State Department that it had lodged any protest with the Mexican Government.

Probing in Mexico City and Washington brought out, however, that the State Department had turned over its offices to the Smear Bund for the transmission of private protests—protests from "Reverend" Birkhead and associates—to the Mexican Government.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER'S office was told in the State Department that the American Embassy at Mexico City had taken the responsibility of doing the protesting, thus prostituting itself into a subagency for the libel-charged political poison-pen Smear Bund in the United States. * * * And this over the head of its own State Department which, however, should be questioned as to why it forwarded such smear stuff in a United States diplomatic pouch.

I tried to telephone Ambassador Thurston to insist that he make clear to the Mexican Government that the protests were unofficial, that they came from Birkhead's group and that their transmission had been an abuse of the diplomatic channels. However, on learning that the call was from me, Ambassador Thurston refused to talk. Is a United States ambassador liable for abuse of his offices in depriving United States citizens of their constitutional and contractual rights?

The Government of Mexico at first naturally took the protests as official. As this article is being written, however, the Mexican Government has decided to use its own judgment as to the broadcasts under its jurisdiction.

I repeat the question with renewed interest: How many times have left-wing groups been able to make such use of government offices to further their own political program? Why should rightist Americans support a State Department that is a leftist agency?

The following letter to Marshall remains unanswered:

JANUARY 16, 1948.

Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that a certain organization, calling itself the Friends of Democracy, has announced in its publication, Friends of Democracy's Battle (issues of December 15, 1947, and January 1, 1948), that memoranda have been sent to you, asking that you bring pressure to bear on the Mexican Government to interfere with the broadcasting of Upton Close commentaries over stations in Mexico.

I do not anticipate that the Secretary of State has time for, or interest in the complaint; nor do I anticipate the State Department would consider the bringing of pressure upon a neighboring government to suppress free speech within its province.

Nor do I consider it necessary to apprise yourself or the State Department of the character of this pressure group. However, lest it has escaped your notice, may I say that the Friends of Democracy is an organization (so-called) existing in the office of a man named Leon M. Birkhead. Mr. Birkhead supports his flourishing office in New York by running a deplorable racket. That racket is the frightening of Jews by misrepresenting to them that various persons are the enemies and persecutors of Jews. Thereby Mr. Birkhead procures contributions to fight these enemies—largely imaginary.

The perpetrator of this racket has recently been called to answer a charge of criminal libel in New York for falsely calling a New York magistrate anti-Semitic. Birkhead's record, before he developed his present racket, was most unsavory—as described by John T. Flynn in his pamphlet, The Smear Terror, which has sold something more than 200,000 copies since publication. Mr. Birkhead has not seen fit to challenge this biographical material in any court. I enclose a copy for your interest and that of your assistants.

Since this racketeering pressure group has seen fit to announce to the public that it is providing you, General Marshall, with memoranda, I am considering it the proper thing, and I am sure you will not disapprove for me to make public this letter to you. I am sending it to the Communications Committee of the Senate, and to several other Senators and Representatives. I am also sending it to the managers of the radio stations to whom the racketeer Birkhead presumes to dictate.

My own public utterances, although consistently in opposition to New Deal policies—a privilege guaranteed to American citizens under the Constitution—have at all times been patriotic, decent, and thoroughly American. In spite of every political pressure used to combat my utterances, I have never once in 30 years of journalism and radio speaking been hailed before a court on the charge of libel or scandal or scurrility. That is a great deal more than some of my political opponents can say.

With highest respects, I remain,
Sincerely,

UPTON CLOSE.

P. S.—Following closely on Birkhead's publication, and having a decided connection therewith, was the January 11 broadcast of Walter Winchell, who is one of the supporters of Birkhead's Friends of Democracy. Winchell insulted our neighbor, Mexico, by saying that when the Mexican Government next comes with hat in hand for an American subsidy it should be asked to bring in the other hand copies of the scripts it permits to go out over its radio stations. As for me, my scripts are not only available but are published, and always have been, whether given on American networks or anywhere else.

I enclose copies of recent broadcasts for you. They uphold true Americanism as millions of Americans see it. The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech for this viewpoint. It would be very foolish, indeed, for Americans to spend billions combating Russia's expanding influence if we were to give up the right of every American citizen to say what he thinks, and the right to take issue with some policies of his administration.

U. C.

FEBRUARY 5, 1948.

Secretary of State GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
United States State Department,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully ask how can State Department which protests Russian dictatorial methods suppression of free speech in Hungary and Poland and which asks public money to broadcast its viewpoint to world, take part in a smear and intimidation campaign of Communist-sympathizing group called Friends of Democracy by protesting to Mexican Government through United States Embassy against the broadcasts of Upton Close and Gerald Winrod over Mexican stations, as informed by Ministry Communications Mexico City last night? This official communication received after unofficial instigation had already caused Ministry to report "Ministry checked Close and Winrod broadcasts very carefully and far from being opposed Ministry Communications finds itself very glad for what they are doing in helping the Mexican Government in its fight against communism." Respectfully ask you to investigate this scandalous, undemocratic, unconstitutional, unfair, and Russian-type interference in free speech and attempt at neighborly dictation by some State Department official at once and to correct the misapprehension at Mexico Ministry Communications that you are protesting free speech of patriotic American broadcasters. Please note the same broadcasts are now on American stations freely under FCC which governs propriety in broadcasting. State Department needs confidence of American voters and Congressmen right now, not such doubts as this raised to its willingness to use methods no better than Russia's and cooperate with political libelists and poison pen groups and be steered by the rantings of Walter Winchell who wants the air all for himself internationally as well as nationally. Am asking several Senators and Representatives and others who have requested to be kept informed on this and in anticipation of this since Winchell predicted it to join me in respectfully asking your excellency for the explanation this morning.

UPTON CLOSE.

As this goes to press, the State Department (through its assistant chief of press relations), has sent me the following wire:

Washington, D. C., February 9, 1948.

UPTON CLOSE,
Hollywood, Calif.:

State Department and Embassy in Mexico City have not protested your broadcasts over Mexican stations and have no present intention of doing so.

M. J. MCDERMOTT,
Assistant Chief of Press Relations.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I insert herewith the following letter received from Mr. Sidney Parks, executive secretary, Gate City Lodge, No. 144, B'nai B'rith, Atlanta, Ga., enclosing resolution adopted by his lodge on April 5, 1948:

GATE CITY LODGE, NO. 144, B'NAI B'RITH,
Atlanta, Ga., April 6, 1948.

The Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: As Executive Secretary of Gate City Lodge No. 144, B'nai B'rith, I would like to call to your attention the following resolution which was adopted at a regular meeting of our lodge last evening:

"Be it resolved by Gate City Lodge of B'nai B'rith, a National Jewish Service Organization, in regular meeting in Atlanta, Ga., this 5th day of April, 1948, That it is the sense of this meeting that America's traditional attitude of justice and fair play has been violated by the reversal of our Government's support of the United Nations Assembly's position on the partition of Palestine; that

this reversal is without justification, and will undermine the authority and influence of the United Nations at a time when it is needed most; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Georgia Senators and Representatives in Congress, with the appeal that the present policy of the United States administration on the Palestine issue in repudiation of the United Nations be protested on the floor of Congress."

It is the earnest desire of our membership that you do everything within your means to implement the decisions of the United Nations, especially those which serve the cause of democracy and freedom. We feel that only by giving our undivided support to the United Nations may we be assured of a final opportunity to preserve the peace so dearly fought for by freedom-loving peoples all over the world.

Respectfully,

SIDNEY PARKS,
Executive Secretary.

A Labor Extension Service Constructive Step Toward Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to submit the following information concerning H. R. 4078:

A LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE CONSTRUCTIVE STEP TOWARD INDUSTRIAL PEACE

The elimination of industrial conflict is the outstanding domestic problem presented to the American public today. Perhaps the least spectacular, and yet the most constructive, proposal in this field concerns the extension of workers' education. The Congress is asked to consider a measure introduced in the Senate by Mr. THOMAS and Mr. MORSE and in the House by Mr. MADDEN and Mr. TOLLEFSON which will provide Federal aid for workers' education programs. Such education aims to provide wage and salary earners with the information they need for effective participation in their jobs, in their organizations, and in community life. It is directed toward the American worker, organized or unorganized, as the basis upon which our highly industrialized economy is constructed. The sponsors firmly believe that the measure offers the only constructive approach toward the permanent establishment of enlightened and stable labor-management relations.

Organized labor has already recognized the need for a vital and informed working population. They have established many union education and research departments and in cooperation with universities and colleges have established labor-education programs through special summer schools, institutes, and extension classes. However, these programs are able to satisfy only a small portion of the requests from workers who reccgnize their need for instruction in nonvocational problems and have been directed principally toward the education of labor executives. Equipping the worker for his part in industrial society is no less important than training managers and leaders since the vast bulk of human contact takes place at the rank-and-file level far removed from the labor or industrial executive. Even more important, is the fact that labor executives, in general, can only be as responsible as the majority of their membership.

The proposed bill would provide for extension services by institutions of higher learning with the use of Federal grants-in-aid. Operating responsibility remains at the local level. Workers' groups must first request educational services and the cooperating institutions must be designated by State-labor extension boards. Courses are designed by the institutions themselves. The Secretary of Labor allocates funds for approved programs on the condition that at least one-fourth of the cost be met from State and local sources. The National Labor Extension Service will provide over-all policy and procedure with the advice of a National Labor Extension Council, but the program will be flexible and developed around local abilities and circumstances.

The bill is built upon three principles which the sponsors are convinced are eminently sound. First, educational services are extended upon the request of the workers after they themselves have analyzed their needs. Second, the assistance is provided through established channels, using colleges and universities that already have extension courses in workers' education, or could offer such resources, and have instructors and techniques for this type of approach. Third, the decisions as to Federal-State cooperation are left to the States.

In this proposal the Congress has the opportunity to take a constructive step toward a more stable economy through a means thoroughly in keeping with the traditional American belief that in expanding educational opportunity we establish the basis for peaceful solution to internal strife and class conflict.

CONGRESSMAN AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM

Senator A. H. VANDENBERG: "I am greatly interested in the objectives to which S. 1390 and H. R. 4078 are addressed. I think it is a thoroughly useful and constructive undertaking. I hope that Congress may be able to give the proposal sympathetic consideration."

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN: "The farmers and farm families of America have long derived education benefits from the program of the Agricultural Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture functioning in cooperation with the higher educational institutions. A national program to provide extension education on a similar basis to the men and women who work in the factories and industrial plants is long overdue.

"Therefore, I am heartily in accord with the objectives of the proposed publicly supported Labor Extension Service which would operate cooperatively between the Department of Labor, universities, and colleges in the States and local groups of industrial workers."

Senator IRVING IVES: "The objectives of S. 1390 (H. R. 4078) are laudatory for they complement and supplement in the American tradition other existing programs. It seeks to establish an additional avenue through which one group of citizens may more fully develop their understanding of the prevailing patterns of their world."

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS: "I am glad to sponsor this bill in which labor says 'give us light,' and I ask this Congress to give that light by establishing a Labor Extension Service for wage and salary earners."

Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON: "I feel that peaceful relationships presuppose a well-informed participation by everyone involved. I believe this bill is a constructive approach to successful collective bargaining."

Senator LISTER HILL: "This bill would extend the Extension Service into the field of labor and labor-management relations. And I think we must agree that the Extension Service in the field of agriculture has been a success on the whole."

Representative RAY J. MADDEN: "Good employment relations cannot be maintained where management and employes do not acquaint themselves with the others' problems."

Senator WAYNE MORSE: "One of the reasons why I am so convinced of the soundness of the objectives of this bill is that by personal experience and observation I know the need of this type of extension service to the workers of this country if they are to live up to what I think are their obligations and responsibilities in this new era of labor relations."

Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach: "S. 1390 (H. R. 4078) the proposed Labor Extension Service Act is designed to initiate a program which will furnish rank and file industrial workers an opportunity to acquire, in some degree, education in fields of vital importance both to them and to the welfare of the Nation. For workers' education provides wage earners with the information they need for effective participation in their jobs, their organizations, and in community life. It employs a method based on the conviction that a person learns best when his own experience is used in the process and where participation by the student group is encouraged."

BILL RECEIVES NATION-WIDE PRESS COMMENT

Richard L. Strout in the Christian Science Monitor:

"WORKERS' THIRST FOR EDUCATION

"It encourages optimism about the vitality of American democracy when we see fiercely ambitious breadwinners and the future leaders of the labor movement poring over books, often after a hard day of physical labor.

"Now, there is a new proposal in Congress to put the Federal Government behind the workers' educational movement, on a State-aid basis, in a system that has already shown its worth in certain other countries. * * * Organized labor is unitedly supporting it."

Editorial from the Washington Post, Monday, March 1, 1948:

"LABOR EDUCATION

"An education extension program for industrial workers on something like the lines of the Agricultural Extension Service which makes educational assistance available to the farm population is so sensible an idea that it is a wonder it wasn't put into effect by Congress long ago. * * *

"The program would equip labor to carry out its share of the collective-bargaining process more effectively in its own interest and in the public interest. In doing this it would serve greatly to promote stable and peaceful relations between unions and management."

Alice Frein Johnson in the Seattle Times, March 8, 1948:

"TOLLEFSON's bill would set up a Labor Department Extension Service operating through universities, colleges, and research agencies, in cooperation with local trade unions."

Editorial from the Union Register, February 20, 1948:

"The Labor Extension Act would aid in diffusing practical and useful information to some 42,000,000 wage and salary earners of the United States."

Louis Stark in the New York Times, February 22, 1948:

"Can labor disputes be settled by briefs rather than brickbats?

"Many labor and industrial leaders and public officials believe they can. Some of them advanced their views this week before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee."

COLUMNISTS URGE SUPPORT OF MEASURE

Malvina Lindsay, June 28, 1947: "Better informed workers would increase labor productivity. They would, also—since ignorance breeds belligerence—do more in the long run to bring about industrial peace than all the labor laws Congress could devise."

Eleanor Roosevelt, March 4, 1948: "I heard a good piece of news the other day; namely, that the Labor Extension Service bill actually had been presented before a Senate subcommittee."

PROMINENT EDUCATORS ENDORSE PLAN

Raymond B. Allen, president, University of Washington: "Labor education is a national as well as a local responsibility. This is true because the communities in which labor education is most needed are the very ones in which the funds are unlikely to be forthcoming from local agencies. * * * It is high time that an effort is made to place this form of education on a higher level with the viewpoint of the public interest. We are in agreement that the bill is well conceived and should be passed."

Arthur H. Compton, president, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.: "I want to urge your support of S. 1390 and H. R. 4078 with regard to the establishment of a Labor Extension Service.

"I am interested also by the fact that the bill provides for making use of the educational facilities available in the various communities through universities and other educational organizations, and calls for cooperation in locations conveniently available to those who wish to attend. The bill will provide economically for the type of education that will best enable labor groups to perform their proper functions as American citizens."

President Ruthven, University of Michigan: "Labor is being discriminated against in respect to educational opportunities, and universities which should be developing programs for adult study are unable to proceed for lack of funds. Experiments of the university over the past 3 years has demonstrated conclusively a need and desire for workers' education, the ability and willingness of colleges and universities to cooperate in providing it, and the necessity for Federal support. Extension service for workers is as practical and important as for agriculture, and is long overdue in the United States."

Edwin M. Witte, chairman, economics department, University of Wisconsin: "The university's responsibilities for workers' education are very clear. This can be soundly developed only through cooperation between the universities and organized labor, with guidance afforded by such an agency as the United States Department of Labor."

Horace B. Brown, Jr., dean, University of Mississippi: "I am most certainly interested in the program which you are sponsoring and in the passage of the act (S. 1390) (H. R. 4078)."

J. O. Keller, assistant to the president in charge of extension, Pennsylvania State College: "May I offer my unqualified endorsement on the need for expanding labor education and my belief that only through appropriation of public funds can this be realized to the fullest extent possible."

ALERT MANAGEMENT SEES BENEFIT OF LABOR EXTENSION PROGRAM

E. C. Kreutzberg in Steel magazine, March 22, 1948.

"TRAINING LABOR LEADERS

"Far less attention than it deserves has been given by employers to a bill now in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It would create in the Labor Department a new Division of Labor Education which would have something like $10,000,000 yearly to encourage labor education in the various States. * * *

"The Ball subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has completed hearings and is expected to file a favorable report on the basis that it would pay the taxpayers of the country to spend $10,000,000 a year for unbiased labor education if only one major strike were avoided as a result."

Executive's Labor Letter, July 8, 1947, (supplement) published by the National Foremen's Institute:

"THE LABOR TREND

"No informed person is satisfied with the way collective-bargaining relationships are now handled in this country. How can these relationships be improved? To that question professional labor-relations men tend to reply: 'education, more education, and still more education'. * * *

"Two United States Senators—MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, and THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah—last month introduced in Congress a bill which promises to fill this vital need. * * *

"Management should rally to the support of Federal grants-in-aid for labor education under the control of the Nation's universities and colleges."

Cyrus E. Eaton, financier and industrialist: "The leaders of organized labor, a group of men and women who daily bear increased responsibility for the national well-being, would be better able to exercise that responsibility if they had greater access to formal educational facilities. The national program of labor education that would be provided by the proposed bill would, in my opinion, go far to meet the need."

Alfred B. Connable, investment counsel, regent of the University of Michigan (in testifying in favor of the measure, as regent of the University of Michigan, Mr. Connable made the following statement): "Today we live in an industrial age which brings to the doors of our colleges thousands of industrial workers asking for services which we feel under obligation to supply, just as we have supplied other services to citizens in the past. This, if you like, is our obligation to our own tradition and our country."

Paul Fitzpatrick, administrative vice president, American Arbitration Association: "I believe the enthusiastic cooperation of Government and the educational machinery that is available can instill in most wage earners a zeal for making democracy work that will immeasurably reduce the misunderstandings that create dispute. And labor disputes based on misunderstanding exact an economic toll that dwarfs the cost to the educational job that would help prevent them."

PROGRAM HAS UNITED LABOR SUPPORT

American Federation of Labor: "Such a service would give workers the material and tools with which to meet their educational needs." (Unanimously adopted, sixty-fifth convention, A. F. of L., Chicago, Ill., October 1946.)

Congress of Industrial Organizations: "All affiliated international unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support this program, by resolution, publicity, financial assistance, and communications to their respective Members of Congress, and cooperate with the committee for the extension of labor education toward this end." (Unanimously adopted, eighth constitutional convention CIO, Atlantic City, N. J., November 1946.)

Railroad labor: "Our association endorses the principle and objectives of this proposed legislation." (A. E. Lyons, executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, January 14, 1947.)

IAM: "If our members are to be fully served, they must have access to the facilities of the universities and of other educational and research institutions. These supplementary services will be made available to labor by the passage of S. 1390 and H. R. 4078." (Harvey Brown, International Association of Machinists.)

SOME BASIC QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE BILL

Question. Is this bill a further extension of Federal controls in the field of education?

Answer. The bill is so drafted that the planning of programs and the choice of instructors remains at the local level. The Department of Labor will not be able to tell the colleges what they shall teach. The administration of Federal funds must always be done by some central body, in this case the Department of Labor, whose responsibility is to review standards and allot funds. Adequate provision is made for State participation in the review of applications for extension programs and in designating the cooperating institutions.

Question. Why hasn't this plan been presented as a part of an over-all adult education program?

Answer. There is a great need today for worker education in the specific field of labor relations. The particular needs of other groups have long been recognized in agricultural and vocational programs. In the recent past, misunderstanding and ignorance of labor law and labor economics as well as of the procedures of collective bargaining have contributed to the troubles of labor groups and of the individual worker. The bill contemplates a program of education directed toward the solution of these specific problems, and such an objective would surely be lost in an over-all adult education program.

Question. Why hasn't the program been set up to include the lower echelons of management as well as the worker?

Answer. Present facilities have already been established to equip management with a reservoir of trained people from the colleges and universities capable of handling their labor relations problems. The Department of Commerce has long made information available to businessmen on all phases of employee relations programs. The present bill contemplates specifically a worker education program. There is often such a wide gap between the educational backgrounds of the average worker and the representative of management that separate classes are a necessity. In addition, for full, free discussion of labor-management problems by the workers, educators are agreed that separate classes are desirable.

Question. Isn't it more logical to place the Extension Service in the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency?

Answer. If a service such as this bill provides is to be successful, it must have the confidence of American labor. The Department of labor is specifically charged with the responsibility of promoting the welfare of workers, and has long held their confidence. Because of its specialized functions, it is much better equipped to carry out a program specifically directed toward worker education. In addition its established contacts with labor groups and labor educators make it the logical agency for this function.

Question. Why should organized labor have 50 percent of the representatives on the National and State Labor Extension Councils?

Answer. This is a bill written for the express purpose of improving labor-management relations. By far the greatest amount of this activity is conducted by organized labor groups. It is only natural therefore that the greatest representation should be from these groups. It is their cooperation which is most vital to the success of the program, and they are best able to state worker needs in this specific field of education.

Question. How do unorganized workers get represented under this program?

Answer. The program is made available to all wage and salary earners. The State and national boards include representatives from groups who have many contacts with unorganized workers, i. e., adult education groups, worker education groups, and the representatives from cooperating institutions.

Formulation of United States Policy on World Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, in the following editorial, submits some practical suggestions on our diplomatic shortcomings and some constructive recommendations on averting future wars.

His statements should be given consideration by the Members of Congress:

BEST BRAINS OF NATION MUST SHARE IN FORMULATING UNITED STATES POLICY ON WORLD RELATIONS

In his column in last Friday's Post-Tribune, Edgar Mowrer said that to win the cold war against Russia and to avoid the shooting war "the United States needs not only military strength but political savvy and what I might call moral sex appeal." He thinks this country must have political coherence and moral principle.

This is the truth and our lack of them is the reason we have had to fight two world wars and are now faced with the problem of avoiding a third. Why do we get into such spots? It is chiefly, we think, because we have not sufficient understanding of, nor coherence in, our international relations. We make incredible mistakes because we have failed to understand the age we live in or to develop the machinery that will function in it.

Walter Lippmann brought up a phase of the same general situation in Saturday's Post-Tribune when he said we are faced for the first time with the creation of international leadership rather than merely going along with a leadership that is already functioning. We merely joined in the two world wars after the leadership and issues had developed. Now we must decide what the policies are and must provide the leadership to carry them out. Can we handle this job?

Indeed the problem is more difficult than Lippmann suggests because he assumes that we have time enough to decide whether there shall be a third world war. The fact is there may not be time enough to prevent war. If this is true it is because we have spent the last 3 years without understanding the dangers threatening us. Had we organized a department of Government with the single purpose of studying our world relationships, developing a national policy, coordinating and implementing our action, then we probably could have kept the world at peace.

But we were content to leave the leadership of the Nation in the hands of the President and the State Department just as we did in the horse-and-buggy days. The State Department has been remodeled and refurbished, to be sure, but in the main our foreign relations remain in the hands of a small group of men whose only experience has been in the diplomatic world.

That experience is not enough to save this country from war and possible extinction. Nor is the added experience of the President, no matter his name, equal to the job. Nor in times of crisis does the added experience of the armed forces make up the deficit. Our foreign relations in today's world call for all of the best experience, knowledge, imagination and hard work of which this Nation is possessed.

One difficulty to the setting up of such a group has been overcome to a degree in the cooperation shown in recent months by the executive and legislative branches at Washington. The President and Secretary Marshall have seen the necessity of asking for the help of Congress in formulating policy and this appears to be a hopeful start toward a new method of handling our affairs.

However, a national policy committee would require the services of citizens eminent in business, labor, agriculture, engineering, industry, science, history, economics, geography and various other interests. It would become a permanent department of government and its members would give all or whatever part of their time would be required in the study and formulation of issues.

Had we organized a group of this sort before the First World War it is quite likely there would have been no First nor Second World Wars. Had America understood what the Kaiser was up to, we could easily have stopped him by having a competent armed force and letting it be known it would be used against an aggressor.

Japan would never have invaded Manchuria had we possessed a real armament and told the Japs to lay off. Nor would Hitler have invaded the Rhineland, nor Austria, nor taken Czechoslovakia nor attacked Poland if we had been armed and told him we would not stand idle if he moved.

There is no doubt now that Hitler went against the advice of the German generals when he took the Rhineland, and was prepared to stop had anybody protested. But the Rhineland gave him a preview of the attude of the world powers and from then on all he had to do to get what he wanted was to threaten.

Felix Morley says we could and should have avoided being involved in the last war and he blames Roosevelt and Truman for setting the present course toward catastrophe. But he seems to believe they wanted to get the country in trouble, a belief for which there is no basis.

We got into all these messes because we didn't know any better. We have made incredible mistakes because we had no way to find out what should be done and no method of coordinating what little we did know. Both Roosevelt and Truman have done the best they could, but that is not nearly good enough to save us from catastrophe.

We don't get into international trouble because we have Presidents of bad intention, but purely and simply because they don't know enough to create policy and machinery to do their duty. And the worst part of our situation today is that we have made very little improvement since the end of World War II.

Truman makes the final decision although it is understood he takes whatever plan Secretary Marshall works out in the State Department. Undoubtedly Marshall has help from other departments, but still this isn't good enough. Marshall is a very able man, but he is a soldier and has some of the weaknesses of any soldier in heading a civilian department of Government.

Let's not get this wrong, because if we continue to make mistakes of the first order there soon may not be any more mistakes we have a chance at. We are not handling our foreign relations as they must be handled if we stop world war III. And remember, Lippmann says we now must formulate, not accept, policy. Upon us has fallen the job of saving western civilization. Our only chance to succeed is in using the knowledge and brains of the American people. Diplomats and soldiers alone cannot do the job.

Here We Go Again, Looking for People To Take Our Money and Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an Associated Press news item from yesterday's paper.

Here we go again, looking for people to take our money and goods. This performance smacks of the lend-lease days when the administration had agents all over the world soliciting customers to accept our goods as a gift.

The ink is not dry on the European recovery plan bill before the State Department is at work south of the border. One official is reported as telling the Latin-American governments that $1,000,000,000 is now available and that this is only a part of the aid they can obtain.

Our military leaders are now figuring on a minimum boost of $4,000,000,000 in the coming fiscal year and $10,000,000,000 more each year after that. This would raise defense costs to $15,000,000,000 in the first fiscal year beginning July 1, and from $20,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 annually thereafter. With the cost of civilian government officially projected at $25,000,000,000 a year, with foreign aid adding another $4,000,000,000 a year, the country is headed for annual budgets of at least $45,000,000,000, with a strong likelihood that they will exceed $50,000,000,000 if all spending proposals go through.

If such budgets become standardized the national debt will be doubled, with $10,000,000,000 a year in taxes necessary to service the crippling burden. When that condition is even approximated the predictable outcome is national collapse.

When will all this end? Surely we cannot continue in this drunken profligate fashion.

The item follows:

LATINS TO GET BILLION IN ANTICOMMUNISM AID, UNITED STATES OFFICIALS SAY

BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, April 7.—United States officials said today Latin America can count on at least $1,000,000,000 in aid from official agencies to help fight communism. Three-quarters of this, they said, would come from United States agencies.

The officials said that under present plans Latin America could obtain about $750,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank. Another $250,000,000 is reported available in the coffers of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The officials said this was only part of the aid the American Republics may obtain as a result of discussions at the Pan-American Conference now in session here. The rest is expected from private sources.

Secretary of State Marshall told the conference 6 days ago the European recovery program must take precedence over Latin American requests for United States financial aid. He said it would be up to Latin American

countries to encourage investment of foreign capital by giving it equal treatment with domestic capital.

The Export-Import Bank is reported to have about $250,000,000 already committed for Latin American loans. General Marshall told delegates the United States Government is ready to ask Congress to appropriate another $500,000,000 for loans to Latin America.

Peacetime Universal Military Training—Article by Senator Thomas of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I prepared at the request of the editor of the New York Times on the subject of peacetime universal military training. After certain changes made by the editor, this article was published in the magazine section of the New York Times, April 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You ask me five questions on universal military training. I am happy to answer them categorically:

1. Is UMT necessary? Why?

No. Our Army should become an Army of specialistis in given fields. The ordinary counter to that will be that those specialists should be selected from a mass of trained men. That, of course, is true, but forced training in a field in which he is not interested may deaden the zeal of the selectee quite as much as contribute to his ultimate worth in the Army.

From the time American boys enter school they are taught to choose careers. They do not always choose wisely. They need guidance. But there are, for example, many very successful doctors who were successful medical students but could find no interest in their premedical work that was not related to their field. Individual initiative has never been discouraged in our American educational scheme. Would not UMT work in the opposite direction?

2. Would UMT make us a military-minded nation?

No. Definitely no. The American people are not military-minded. They do not want to become military-minded. Even after having millions of men in the armed services during the recent period of the war, we are now having difficulty finding young men who want to go into Annapolis or West Point. This was the reaction after the First World War. To an extent, it occurred after the Spanish-American War. Neither war, mobilization, nor the country's greatest propagandist drive for UMT has brought our people to the support of militarism as a state policy.

3. What are the alternatives to UMT?

I now speak from the experience of having been closely connected with the military in two world wars, having been a sponsor of the Selective Service Act, a defender of our military actions during the First and Second World Wars, and one who, after the Second World War, attempted to keep an even keel during the premature demobilization which was pressured by public opinion.

Above all, I do not want to have an emotional army. Emotion has its place in warfare, but I want an army based upon intelligence and high morals, which we have always been able to produce when necessity arises. When I say that, however, please do not assume that I am one who believes in the minute-man theory and our ability to raise men overnight and turn mobs of persons into a coordinated armed force. I had much to do with the introduction of the ROTC in our schools. I grant military training and military science its proper place in our American educational scheme. I have always supported these studies just as I have supported the teaching of United States history and United States constitutional government. But I am unsympathetic toward UMT for the same reason that I am unsympathetic with forced courses in our constitutional government taught on a level which makes for misinformation about how our Government functions because of lack of preliminary preparation, just as UMT may bring us the emotional soldier instead of an intelligent one.

The alternative which you ask for is a simple one. We know from actual history—and here let us give the devil his due; Mr. Hitler was not, in any sense, responsible for what he was able to accomplish—that when Hitler turned to complete mobilization he was able to raise an army within a year of 4,500,000 men and was deficient only in noncoms. He was able to do that because the Germans, as a result of the army-limitation provisions of the treaty after the First World War, were forced to change their whole educational outlook in regard to training soldiers. The Kaiser's army was built on the theory of pure militarism and availability of sufficient "gun fodder." When the peace after the First World War was written, the Allies insisted upon limiting the German Army to 100,000 men. A German officer countered and said, "That will be all right because we will train 100,000 majors, colonels, and senior officers." Then the Allies insisted upon a 13-year-enlistment period in the treaty army to make the army a career for the enlistees and the training of great numbers of officers impossible. The Germans then changed their educational approach to training soldiers. Instead of using the mass idea, which has to be used when you have UMT, they made entrance into their 100,000-man army a matter of competition and selection. While the members of this army remained privates during their period of service, each was individually trained up to his maximum potentiality—that is, if a boy had the ability to be trained as a brigadier general, he got that training. In this way Hitler was able to expand his army into an army of 4,500,000 from an army of 100,000 and be deficient only in noncoms.

We can do this better than Hitler did because there are no restrictions on our training programs and we will have trained leaders for any emergency. Such a method will give us an opportunity to give specialized training to our Air Corps, to our Navy, and will supply officers of all grades for expanded ground forces. If once in America we could get the idea of training men individually, as did the Germans, there would be no need for universal military training. It is an easy idea to absorb and one always used in the higher levels of training periods. Why not concentrate on this type of training throughout the whole of our peacetime Army?

The answer which the advocates of universal military training will give to this is that we need a mass of men to give practical training to our divisional and corps staffs and commanders. But that will come when the emergency arises because every battle, every maneuver, and every campaign must be built around the physical aspects of that campaign.

4. Would universal military training make for war?

No. I have no fear that universal military training will promote war in America. It has made for war in militaristic countries, but most of those countries are now, from a military standpoint, virtually exhausted.

There are those in our country who feel that, if we could just establish universal military training, Russia and the whole world would be good. A resort to universal military training for this reason is pretty close to mobilization in anticipation of imminent war. Those who know the history of the beginnings of the First World War know that one country mobilized because another country mobilized on its border, and mobilization was an actual cause of war. However, I do not take the stand that a resort to universal military training would be interpreted by any nation as an American threat as the world is constituted today. I do not think that France, Italy, Great Britain, Canada, and on down the whole list of nations would think that America was resorting to universal military training because she expects to go to war against them or expects them to go to war against her. There is only one country in the world that could possibly interpret universal military training on our part as an act in preparation for war and this is Russia. But Russia would not, in my opinion, so interpret it. Having known nothing in the last several generations but universal military training, Russia knows the weaknesses of the system quite as much as its strength. It must be remembered that Russia uses universal military training for other purposes than raising her Army. Russia has the problem of national unification, the problem of overcoming diversity of language, and local nationalistic tendencies. Then there is her great problem of unemployment, and Russia uses her army as a solution for all of these.

5. Is UMT consistent with democratic thought?

I believe that it is not inconsistent. Selective service in time of emergency is as democratic as any other way of raising an army. I am not opposed to UMT for any other reason than it is just the poorest way to build an army in America and to make that army strong and keep the men in it, from the Commander in Chief to the last private, full of pride, patriotism, and that morale that make soldiers.

Compulsory universal military training would never be compulsory. It would never be universal. It would not build up our citizenry. This statement is not based upon theory. It is based upon the facts learned as a result of our selective service. Five out of every 10 men called to the draft were rejected. In some States 7 out of every 10 were rejected. In other States 7 out of every 10 were accepted. That means that UMT would not be universal, that it would not be honestly representative of our whole country. The great need now is the development of that backward manhood represented in those parts of our country where only 3 out of 10 were found acceptable. If UMT were based upon the theory of making our country strong those men who were found deficient would be built up and made efficient. Sometimes men were rejected because of lack of education, sometimes because of poor health. Half of these, I am sure, were corrective cases, and many of these were accepted by the Army, without correction, as the manpower barrel began to empty. This is the problem which now confronts us and this is the task which the Army has always neglected. When Jefferson said that a nation's greatest asset was a well-trained citizenry, he was not referring to UMT.

When the Selective Service Act first started to function, I chided one of the personnel

officers of the Army on the score of their just taking the cream of our youth. I pointed out that, if we got into war, standards would be dropped, as they were dropped. I suggested that we take the weak fellows and build them up, then standards would never be reduced, the Army would be representative of all of our people, and an approach to universality could be reached. The excuse offered was lack of time. To an extent that is valid in wartime, but it is surely not valid during a period of peacetime UMT.

It is the Army itself of which I am thinking. I want a strong Army. I believe that all branches of our armed forces will be put back a whole generation if we resort to UMT because of the great number of officers and the mass of men who will be needed on the basic-training level year after year. There is nothing that dulls any leader more than being deprived of an opportunity to grow in his leadership. There are about 900,000, or maybe a million, boys turning 18 each year. It would take fifty or sixty thousand junior-grade officers to train them. Those officers will be doomed to that job. Think what that would do to our specialized services.

I realize that the President's Commission and all of the armed forces' high personnel declare themselves in favor of UMT. But are they? The thoughtful among them want a strong, efficient, and well-trained Army, Navy, and Air Force, and they know these do not come from boys whose natural make-up is not in harmony with the type of training necessary for UMT.

We all know the sense of safety the French got from the Maginot line. In the middle twenties a German officer conducted me over some of the destroyed forts along the western front. The forts were all destroyed in accordance with the treaty provisions. In our conversation I suggested that it was a shame to destroy anything, that probably the forts could be used for something else. He answered me as a typical, life-trained, Army officer would—that it was all right to destroy them, because fighting from that kind of fort had become obsolete. We talked about the Maginot line. He said that, too, was obsolete, "We will jump it or go around it." The Siegfried line also proved insufficient defense for Germany.

Let us put our faith in the type of military which is kept so much on the alert that it can adapt itself to the latest and most effective war instruments. The task of UMT will be a drag upon the technical services.

The glory of our great Army and Navy men is that they are Americans first before they are military geniuses. Look at Marshall's leadership now; Eisenhower's great statements about the peace; Nimitz' common sense; and MacArthur's democratic peace-structure building. These men I honor, and it is America that makes them great. I would hate to see any of our American military leaders turn into Hindenburgs. I would not even like to see them Bismarcks.

The Legal Aspects of Civil Rights—Address by Senator Chavez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on the 9th of April I made a few remarks before the Harvard Law School Forum on the legal aspects of civil rights. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was very happy when your forum invited me to discuss the legal aspects of civil rights.

It is a pleasure to be in such an atmosphere of learning and of liberal and progressive political thought. The subject is fitting and timely. Harvard, the oldest university in the United States, has a tradition of liberalism in its preception of students from minority groups for which you may well be proud.

Before examining the strictly legal aspects of the problem of civil rights, I will briefly describe some of the minority problems of our country and define civil rights and outline the theme which I am to develop this evening.

Different religions, different customs, different pigmentation and different places of origin have given rise to discrimination by groups of earlier origin than the minority groups who came later. As a result numerous problems have arisen since the earliest days of the foundation of this country. At no time in the history of our country has the solution of these problems in a democratic American way been more necessary.

For the present, a nominal definition of civil rights is perhaps best. This would embrace such broad rights as freedom of speech, religion, assembly and suffrage and freedom from the denial of the rights of citizenship because of race, color, or religion.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights in the report To Secure These Rights, considered four basic rights, the protection of which is essential to the well-being of the individual and to the progress of society, namely:

1. The right to safety and security of the person.
2. The right to citizenship and its privileges.
3. The right to freedom of conscience and expression.
4. The right to equality of opportunity.

This evening I will consider:

1. The civil rights background of the United States, its development through legislative and judicial evolution;
2. The legal aspects of civil rights as they exist today; and
3. The legislative action which is necessary for adequate protection of these rights.

Concerning point one, the civil rights background of the United States. These are days in which the established standards and institutions, all over the world, are faced by an increasingly serious challenge from new and disturbing forces. That which was new, radical, challenging, and dynamic a century and a half ago is now traditional.

The whirligig of time, in one of its masterpieces of irony, places the Nation, whose representatives once were turned away from the court of Catherine of Russia as dangerous and fanatical revolutionaries, in the position of seeming to everywhere support the status quo against a new tide of revolution which sweeps today from the vast dominions once ruled by the great Czarina.

In the face of such a threat, there is an urgent duty, falling upon all Americans regardless of race, creed, economic status, or political affiliation, to strive for a common appreciation and understanding of the body of legal and political principles in which are to be found the ultimate source of our national strength. As we strive to raise our armed forces and our economic sources of strength to levels adequate to sustain the safety of our Nation, we must never lose sight of the fact that, without an unshakable conviction as to the superiority of our way of life and our political institutions over those which now push from the East, we have no real defense at all.

In the light of this fact, it has become an increasingly important responsibility of every loyal American to devote earnest and intelligent consideration to the whole matter of our constitutional civil rights so that he may have a clear understanding of that body of rights, privileges, and liberties which the accumulated wisdom of centuries has found to be the best basis for the organization of men into a free and democratic society.

The United States Constitution as originally adopted contained no bill of rights. The Convention in drafting the Constitution became a battle between the conservatives who advocated the close limitation of the influence of government on the common man and the extreme liberals who felt that the ultimate degree of civil rights should be written into the new charter of government.

The founding fathers were remarkable lawyers and practical men of affairs and extremely well-read students of political philosophy. When Thomas Jefferson was asked to name the sources of the ideals set forth in the Constitution he named Aristotle, Cicero, Locke and Sidney. The doctrines of natural equality and freedom, so vital a part of the philosophy of the American Revolution, came directly from the Stoics of ancient Rome and reflect principles embodied in Roman law.

We must keep in mind that through the bitter debates of the Convention and the public clamor in the ratification debates which followed, at no time was thought given to the protection of individual rights from abuses by individuals or by the States; the demand was for protection of individual rights from abuse by the Federal Government.

At any rate, the liberals lost the battle but won the war, for the first Congress speedily passed and submitted to the States a series of amendments which the States, by December of 1791, had ratified and which embody the document known as the Bill of Rights.

The new amendments set forth in specific and definite language what the Federal Government could not do to the people. It was an expression of fear and distrust of central government. It was protection for minorities against abuse by majorities using the arm of the Federal Government only. For protection of individual rights one had to look to State and community governments.

The postwar problems of the Civil War forced a new concept of Federal responsibility. It was apparent that many of the States could not or did not fulfill the obligations to protect individual liberty for certain classes of persons.

The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, described as the civil rights amendments to the Constitution, were adopted. Five statutes followed which provided serious penalties against State officers and private persons for violating the rights contained in these amendments.

Unfortunately, subsequent Supreme Court decisions began whittling away the Federal power assumed by Congres in enacting these laws. In the Slaughterhouse cases of 1873 the Court narrowed the protection of the amendment to rights arising from Federal citizenship and held that most personal rights were inherent in that kind of citizenship know as State citizenship and were not "privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States,"

The Civil Rights cases in 1883 held the act which forbade discrimination in railroads, inns, and places of public amusement to be unconstitutional and that the fourteenth amendment did not empower the Federal Government to enact protective legislation against private persons and that corrective legislation had to be addressed to States or their officials.

As a result of these narrow interpretations Congress by 1910 had repealed most of the legislation which the Court had not held unconstitutional. This brings us up to date and to the second point of my discussion.

Today the only important surviving corrective statutes are sections 51 and 52 of title 18 of the United States Code; section 51 dealing with conspiracies to harm citizens in the exercise of federally secured rights, and section 52 with depriving persons of civil rights under color of law. These two sections plus the anti-peonage section constitute the only authority by which the Department of Justice may act in defense of civil rights. By authority of these statutes former Attorney General Frank Murphy in 1939 established a Civil Rights Section in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

The division, however, has been tremendously handicapped. It must work within the narrow limits of court interpretations of the statutes previously mentioned. One of the principal objections to both sections is that they contain criminal sanctions only.

A further and more serious difficulty is the problem of determining the specific civil rights that these sections protect, since the Constitution nowhere lists personal rights which may be protected by the Government nor does any Federal statute.

The present head of the Criminal Division is an outstanding attorney and citizen of North Carolina, the Honorable Lamar Caudle. His division has the responsibility for prosecuting violations under the civil rights statutes and, in his own words, "the pressing problem of enforcement of these statutes consumes more of my time and attention—and my personal interest—than any other phase of my duties in the Criminal Division."

The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights contains an excellent analysis of the specific constitutional bases for Federal action in the civil-rights field.

The first is the power to protect the right to vote. The specific sources of this Federal power are:

Article I, section 4, of the Constitution, which permits Federal protection against interference with that right from any source;

The fourteenth amendment, which prevents State interference with equality of opportunity to vote in any election;

The fifteenth amendment, which supports action against interference because of race or color with the right to vote in any election; and

The nineteenth amendment, which supports action against interference based on sex with the right to vote in any election.

The second power is to protect the right to freedom from slavery and involuntary servitude. This power comes from the thirteenth amendment.

The third power is to protect the right of fair legal process, to free speech and assembly, and to equal protection of the laws. This power is derived from the "due process," "equal protection" and "privileges and immunities" clauses of the fourteenth amendment. Under Court interpretations it protects only against interference by agencies of the State or local governments.

The third power is to protect the right of fair legal process, to free speech and assembly and to equal protection of the laws. This power is derived from "due process," "equal protection," and "privileges and immunities" clauses of the fourteenth amendment. Under court interpretations it protects only against interference by agencies of the State or local governments.

The fourth power is the war power. Under section 8 of article I, Congress has practically unlimited power to regulate the armed forces and to legislate concerning national defense and security.

The fifth power authorizes regulation of activities which relate to interstate commerce. Congress has exercised very broad powers under article I, section 8 of the Constitution in its efforts to regulate, conduct and institute reforms in many fields.

The sixth, or taxing and spending powers. These also are derived from article I, section 8.

The seventh is the postal power. Stemming from the same article, the Federal Congress can act to protect against the use of mails for undesirable purposes.

The eighth is the power over the District of Columbia and other territories found under article I, section 8 and article IV, section 3.

So now I come to my third and concluding point. The President's Committee has recommended an extensive program designed to strengthen the machinery for the protection of civil rights. The President included the principal recommendations in his message to Congress on February 2, 1948 on a civil rights program. They are as follows:

That the machinery of government respecting civil rights in Congress and in the administrative branch must be strengthened: There is neither a congressional committee on civil rights, nor a permanent commission, and as now constituted the Civil Rights Section has a very inadequate staff.

Existing civil rights statutes should be strengthened in two respects. In present form section 51 protects persons only if they are citizens and only against conspiracies by two or more persons. It should include all inhabitants of the United States and it should be afforded against actions by persons acting individually as well as in combination.

Section 52 has proved inadequate because of the generality of its language. A specific enumeration of the rights protected under this section is needed.

On Federal protection against lynching: The Constitution specifically states that every person accused of crime shall have a fair, orderly trial in an impartial court. If Congress has taken action on white slavery, why not on lynching?

Protecting the right to vote: The President recommends statutory protection of the right to vote from discriminatory action by public officers based on race, color, or other unreasonable classification. He also recommends that Federal anti-poll-tax legislation should be enacted.

A Fair Employment Practices Commission: We hold out to the world the principle, "All men are created equal." Certainly our Government should then assure equal opportunity to all of our citizens.

Interstate transportation: The President recommends action in line with the Supreme Court, which recently declared unconstitutional State laws requiring segregation on public carriers in interstate travel.

The Congress has taken no final action on any of the President's recommendations. The recommendations present extremely controversial problems. Proposals for legislation on some of these matters have been introduced.

In regard to FEPC: Senator IVES and others introduced S. 984, a bill designed to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. It is expressly declared that the right to employment without discrimination is recognized to be a civil right of all the people of the United States. This right is to be protected by the Federal Government to the fullest extent permitted by the Constitution. This measure is now on the Senate Calendar.

Antilynching: A bill patterned on numerous similar bills is S. 1352, introduced by Senator WAGNER and Senator MORSE.

In the declaration of policy, it is stated that a duty is imposed on all States to exercise their police powers in a manner which will protect all persons equally without discrimination because of race, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion; that the inaction of a State constitutes a deprivation of life, liberty, or property when it has the effect of a discriminatory withholding of protection.

Lynching is expressly referred to as a form of deprivation; the punishment set forth for what is made a felony by this bill is a fine not to exceed $10,000 or imprisonment for a period of not to exceed 20 years, or both fine and imprisonment; the act provides punishment for failure by State or Government officials or employees to prevent lynchings or to make diligent efforts to apprehend, arrest, and prosecute participants in a lynching. These acts are likewise made felonies.

Senate 1465, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and S. 42, introduced by Senator HAWKES, of New Jersey, are similar to S. 1532, which I have just discussed, in respect to definitions and punitive provisions. There is material difference in the bill of Senator HAWKES in regard to the compensation provisions. These three bills are now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

ANTI-POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

Senate bill No. 94, was introduced by Senator PEPPER, of Florida. It is before the Committee on Rules and Administration, and makes unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

House bill No. 29, introduced by Representative BENDER, of Ohio, has passed the House and now is in the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate; it is similar to Senator PEPPER's bill.

It is impossible in the time allotted to more than touch on some of the salient points of my subject. Perhaps there can be some clarification in the discussion which follows.

We are engaged in a vast global conflict—a conflict not of planes, guns, ships, and tanks, but a conflict between the ideas and moral values of our democratic civilization and the philosophy of totalitarianism. The right to safety and security of the person, the right to citizenship and its privileges, the right to freedom of conscience and expression, the right to equality of opportunity, in short, what the President's committee report terms "the essential dignity and integrity" of the individual—these are the touchstones of our democratic ideal. In the consciousness of democratic peoples everywhere, these are the weapons with which we confront the philosophy of totalitarianism. They will win superiority for us in that conflict of ideas only to the extent to which we utilize them. The treatment of our minorities is no longer a side issue; it is the test of our sincerity of purpose. We cannot rally the peoples of the world against the police state if we permit any manifestations of police brutality in our own country; we cannot rail against an iron curtail if we deny freedom of expression to groups within our midst—however unpopular those views may be—we cannot appeal to the conscience of that two-thirds of the world that is colored if we continue to deny civil rights to men of color here at home; we cannot appear as the apostles of the four freedoms until we demonstrate that we mean those freedoms to be for everybody. In short, we can no longer isolate ourselves from our own moral ideal; we can no longer justify and tolerate amongst ourselves the self-same practices we denounce so strongly in others. "The United States is not so strong, the final triumph of the democratic ideal is not so inevitable that we can ignore what the world thinks of us or our record."

Education and the Fate of Democracy—Address by John W. Studebaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy," by John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, delivered at the fifteenth annual John Adams lecture at the University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., on March 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION AND THE FATE OF DEMOCRACY [1]

THE THESIS

The thesis that I propose briefly to defend this evening is really quite simple and, I trust, manageable. It is this: The fate, or if you prefer, the future of democracy as we understand that term is presently clouded and uncertain. If democracy is to survive and to prevail in the world of the future, education must succeed in developing a better understanding of democratic principles and a greater zeal for their attainment in practice than we have as yet achieved.

A little more than 6 years have elapsed since we entered the war in which the forces of nazism and fascism were defeated. But the fate or future of democracy remains clouded in uncertainty. Totalitarianism, in an only somewhat different form, continues on the march in Europe and in Asia. The danger to democracy daily becomes more apparent. Within the period of little more than a year three European nations have fallen completely behind the iron curtain. Another's fall appears in early prospect. April will almost certainly bring a Communist crisis in Italy whose outcome is now unpredictable.

THE THREAT FROM AGGRESSIVE COMMUNISM

Let those disposed to do so continue to scoff at warnings of danger. Let them fail to sense the dark realities of the hour which justify the alarm and urgency of Senator VANDENBERG when he said recently in the Senate: "Aggressive communism threatens all freedom and security in the Old World and the new when it puts free people anywhere in chains." The Senator is no alarmist. Neither is he a chauvinist, a crackpot, or the mouthpiece of economic imperialists. He knows, as does everyone else who has taken the trouble to read the sober and well-documented reports of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that the totalitarian despots now throttling almost half of Europe and of Asia have set as their goal world-wide dominion through revolutions systematically induced and managed by their fifth columns in more than 60 countries of the world. He knows that a relentless undeclared war is already being waged against the United States and the other democracies.

What then, you ask, may one do to oppose totalitarianism? History having flung its present challenge, how shall it be met? Certainly it will not be met by persisting in any spirit of blind optimism to believe in the inevitability of democracy's triumph. There is an old aphorism to the effect that "None is so blind as he who will not see." Democracy could conceivably be destroyed by a purblind and complacent belief that it can never really be in mortal danger from any rival ideology or form of human political association. I do not discount the lift to the spirit in times of difficulty and discouragement that may be had from such lines as those of the poet Lowell:

"Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own."

I, too, prefer to believe that, in the timeless struggle between good and evil, good will ultimately prevail; that God is in his universe and that God means good. But the events of the last few decades seem to me to indicate that however deep in human nature the roots of democracy may run, as a form of human political association it can still be too readily uprooted by ruthless and determined foes to warrant any easy optimism. France, with about the same long experience of freedom and self-government as our own, was weakened from within until she fell easy victim of the Nazis. The Czechs, whose history is one long striving for freedom and independence, have just been captured by the now-familiar tactic of Communist infiltration.

COULD IT HAPPEN HERE?

Admittedly the imposition of a totalitarian regime in the United States might prove more difficult. But the possibility of such a control of our country cannot lightheartedly be dismissed. Confronted by the consolidation of totalitarian tyranny in both Europe and in Asia, mayhap weakened and distraught by economic collapse and accompanying widespread domestic insecurity and resentment, our faith in democracy as "the best form of political association that the mind of man has been able to devise thus far," [2] might not be proof against the zealots of class hate and proletarian dictatorship even here; it might not be strong enough to avoid surrender to an equally reactionary Fascist scheme through which freedom would be extinguished.

Just as one must beware the counsels of the rosy optimists, so one must be on guard against the prophets of inevitable disaster, since the effect of our acceptance of either would be to freeze us in complacency or fear. There exists a doctrine, you know, of historical and economic determinism which would have us believe that we are today merely witnessing the denouement of great historical forces, catacylsmic in character, which are not amenable to the control of human reason or volition; hence, we might just as well throw in the sponge and concede victory to the totalitarians. But one should note that despite their deterministic philosophy even the zealots of the Kremlin do not really act as if they needed only to sit quietly and ride the wave of the future. No, they seem to act as if they believed that their individual zeal, their singleness of purpose, and their untiring efforts were essential to the so-called inevitability they proclaim.

Shall we, the believers in democracy, be any less assured that our zeal and our activity as individuals are essential to the eventual triumph of democracy? Surely our faith in the dignity and worth of the individual, in his perfectibility, in government by consent of the governed, in civil liberties, in freedom for the mind and conscience, should elicit even more enthusiastic and effective dedication to the cause of democracy as we conceive it than the totalitarians can possibly muster for their brand of so-called democracy.

Up to this point in my discussion I have sought to indicate why it is I see the fate or future of democracy at the present moment as clouded and uncertain and why it seems to me necessary to warn alike against blind optimism or a spirit of defeatism. Let me now turn to a consideration of the role of education in relation to the fate of democracy.

EDUCATION ESSENTIAL TO DEMOCRACY

That education, from the beginning of our history, has been intimately associated with the fate of our democracy, no one, I think, will deny. In his first annual message to the Congress, President Washington wrote: "Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community, as in ours, it is proportionately essential * * *." And in his Farewell Address appeared these sentences so often quoted: "Promote, then, as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

President Jefferson was the author of a similar sentiment which reads: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization it expects what never was and what never will be."

Similar quotations concerning the essential relationship of education and democracy could be multiplied indefinitely.

ELEMENTS IN THE AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC FAITH

As we strive for a more effective political democracy and as we seek to make the social ideals of the democratic faith operative in lives of more and more people, we shall need to clarify popular understanding of the elements of that faith. The Citizens Federal Committee on Education, an advisory body to the United States Office of Education, has recently given utterance to a statement of the consensus of that group concerning these elements or principles. The composition of this committee reflects the varied complexity of American life: its membership includes representatives of wage earners; farmers, manufacturers, and merchants; Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; Negroes, housewives, parents, lawyers, veterans, doctors, and engineers; residents of various regions of this country. Despite the diversity of its membership, the committee was virtually unanimous in asserting that the principles of the democratic faith meant to them:

"(1) That membership in a common humanity, whose distinguishing characteristics are the capacity for reason and conscience, endows each and every human being with dignity and worth, far transcending differences which derive from race, sex, creed, or national origin.

"(2) That the destiny of the human race is bound up with the progress of intelligence and with the extension of the moral horizon of increasing numbers of individuals.

"(3) That the members of society have a moral claim to and capacity for participation in the control over their common destiny and that the legitimate powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

"(4) That in addition to the rights which individuals have to participate in government (political liberties) they also have

[1] By John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, Fifteenth Annual John Adams Lecture, the University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., March 18, 1948.

[2] Merriam, Charles E., What Is Democracy? University of Chicago Press, 1941.

rights which the Government cannot legitimately abrogate (civil liberties) and rights under government (liberty under law).

"(5) That the rights of any individual in society are strictly limited by the like rights of other members of society and can be secure for the individual only when enjoyed by all.

"(6) That rights and duties are in reciprocal relationship: The rights of individuals being convertible into duties to safeguard the rights of others, and that in addition to the specific duties which membership in society imposes, there is the general duty of sensitive and intelligent concern with the general welfare.

"(7) That the purpose of governmental, economic, cultural, and social institutions and arrangements is the increased abundance of life, materially and culturally, of the individuals comprising society.

"(8) That the interests of the members of society are best served by wide diffusion of power, authority, and responsibility."

EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY MUST BE EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY

Now the point I wish to emphasize is this: That whatever the minor variations in the phrasing of a statement of the elements of the democratic faith, the inculcation of the faith itself must be a controlling purpose in the conduct of this country's educational enterprise. In the present critical world situation, we must make that purpose central and dominating in the curriculum of our schools and colleges. We must place first among all educational objectives the development of a better understanding of and a more zealous dedication to the defense and implementation of this democratic faith.

There are those who will object to the inculcation of a democratic faith because of their misgivings concerning the term "faith" itself. To them "faith" connotes a blind and slavish attachment to dogmas foisted on the immature and uncritical by the mature and sophisticated. They seem to fear that the inculcation of any faith, even faith in democracy, will result in equipping the individual with a set of intellectual blinders which will permit him to glance neither to the right nor the left; which will stifle or hinder intellectual independence and self-reliance.

SHOULD EDUCATION INDOCTRINATE?

But such objections to the inculcation of a faith, and especially to the inculcation of a democratic faith, fail to take into account the role of faith in every individual's life. They fail to recognize that every individual, willy-nilly, acquires some faith or other. And they seem to ignore the character of the democratic faith itself with its insistence on freedom for the mind. Young Americans must and do manage somehow to come by some common body of ideals as to truth, goodness, justice, honesty, duty, and all the other ingredients that constitute the spiritual and cultural heritage of western civilization. How better than by acquiring them from trustworthy sources?

To have integrity the individual cannot merely be a weathervane turning briskly with every doctrinal wind that blows. He must possess key loyalties and key convictions which can serve as a basis of judgment and a standard of action. In this age of powerful conflicting propagandas, it is doubly important that the school help youth to the possession of a firm core of democratic convictions and ideals as standards by which to weigh rival claims. Failure to do so will make the youth the prey of the most insistent propagandist, however implausible or subversive, who can win youths' attention.

HOW SHALL WE DEVELOP ZEAL FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY?

This is not the occasion for a detailed exposition of the materials, methods, and procedures by which the schools and colleges may build a more zealous devotion to the American democratic faith. Obviously, a democratic faith must have its roots in the soil of habit; it must be given positive expression in the life of the school; in the context of shared study and play, cooperative planning and execution of projects, student participation in school government, and the whole range of student activities. Obviously also, a democratic faith must be clarified both by study and discussion and by the application of faith in the judgment of events, institutions, and public policies.

SHALL WE TALK ABOUT COMMUNISM IN THE CLASSROOM?

At the appropriate stage of student maturity the tenets and practices of the democratic faith must certainly be compared and contrasted with those of its rivals. This is all the more essential because the Communists have sedulously sought to debase the verbal coinage of democracy. They have sought to give the term "democracy" itself a connotation quite alien to its meaning in the lexicon of the West.

It is important, too, when students reach the proper stage of maturity, that they be given a clear and full understanding of the strategy of chaos and the tactics of intrigue of communism; of the Communists' use of dissimulation and deceit and lies; of the means by which Communists seek to capture and use organizations as fronts for their purposes; of their lip-service to liberal causes, their noisy clamor concerning long-recognized democratic shortcomings, their promise of a Communist millenium. It is not enough, I say, that young people be helped to clarity of conviction as to what they are for; they must by the same token know what it is they are against and why.

I realize, of course, that the comparative study of democracy and its competitors in the classrooms of our high schools and colleges is not without its difficulties. I know that it will require relationships between the school and the community that are both cordial and understanding, lest the teacher's effort at enlightenment be misinterpreted and nullified by obscurantist criticism and outright opposition. When that happens it will usually be because the teacher, in giving evidence of human sympathy for the Russian people, has not made clear the distinction to be drawn between the Communist Party as an international conspiracy and the great rank and file of the Russian people who are the victims and slaves of a relatively small clique of tyrannical rulers.

Personally I have little fear that any appreciable number of American teachers will ever properly be accused of being apologists for communism itself. Most of them I am convinced are clear in their own minds between communism (spelled with a small "c") as an economic theory of communal ownership, and Communism (spelled with a capital "C") as an international conspiracy for the violent overthrow of the economic, political, and social order in democracies everywhere and the substitution of the dictatorship of a single party throughout the world.

Whether or not the Communist Party in this country should be outlawed I do not presume to say. But of this I am convinced, that no avowed or proven Communist is fit to be entrusted with the job of inculcating the American way of life in any school; and I make that statement on the rather obvious ground that education for American democracy cannot be entrusted to the enemies of American democracy.

Teaching is not a task for timorous or feeble souls; nor for the complacent and the uncertain. It requires Americans whose faith in democracy does not waver or falter, because they know whereof they speak and are convinced that the values they defend are eternally right and true.

Flood Control in Ohio—Editorial From Cincinnati Enquirer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cough Up, Uncle Sam" published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of Saturday, April 10, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 10, 1948]

COUGH UP, UNCLE SAM!

Cincinnati, it seems to us, is being done a real injustice by the failure of the Federal Government to repay our $650,000 flood-control loan. Seven other cities are in the same boat.

The loan came about in late 1946. President Truman, in seeking to balance the budget, had cut back flood-control spending. Cincinnati wanted protection from Millcreek Barrier Dam, nearing completion. It wanted work to continue. It footed the $650,000 bill.

To do so it loaned the Federal Government that sum from bond money. Cincinnati now pays interest on those bonds. It gets no interest from the Federal Government. It suffers also from having more than half a million dollars of its funds tied up when they could be used elsewhere.

The money was advanced because the Federal Government was short of flood-control money. In the following spring, however, the Congress voted nearly $300,000,000 for flood spending, much of this for brand-new projects. It is now about to vote approximately $440,000,000 for next year. That is hardly a shortage of funds.

Yet, in spite of a plea by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee has just declined to include Cincinnati's $650,000 in the present appropriations bill. Senator CHAN GURNEY, chairman, told the Enquirer's Washington correspondent the committee felt that there was just not enough money to go around.

"There is not complete satisfaction within the committee, however," GURNEY added, "that the Government should not repay these debts. The matter will certainly be brought to the attention of the full Senate Appropriations Committee next week."

The full committee, headed by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, should include those debt payments. There is no reason why the Federal Government should finance new projects with Cincinnati's money. That is what, in effect, it is doing.

Adequate Road Systems Essential to Nation's Economic Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my approval of the prin-

ciples of continuing Federal road aid to the States as outlined in H. R. 5888. The road systems of our country may well be compared with the complex network of arteries and veins of the human body. It is necessary that to function adequately both must have clear channels to circulate the vitalizing forces upon which life depends. The human circulatory system cannot be cut off at any one point without some sort of paralysis setting in. Similarly, inadequate road facilities have a withering effect upon the health and economy of the areas they serve. We need a complete main highway system but we also need good secondary and feeder roads if we are going to prevent a wasting away of important resources at their point of origin.

While I approve the proposals set forth in H. R. 5888 I hope that consideration will also be given to the amendments which I offered in a similar bill which would make the Road Act permanent. This bill would increase the appropriation to $550,000,000. The increase would be added to the $150,000,000 which is authorized for projects on principal, secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural-free-delivery mail and public school bus routes either outside municipalities or inside municipalities of less than 5,000 population.

An amendment in this measure would change the present law by giving the country road officials the primary say as to how the funds are to be expended on rural roads in their counties. Their program would have to be approved, however, by the State highway department and the Federal Highway Administrator.

In my State of Tennessee, for example, we have about 57,500 miles of roads—7,500 miles under the direct supervision of the State highway department and 50,000 miles under the supervision of the 96 local highway organizations. Under the Federal Aid to Highway Act the Public Roads Administration would not recognize a local road department but would cooperate only with the State highway department. That in itself gave the State highway department the final say in the location and construction of all the rural roads that were to receive Federal Aid. Under this system and at the present rate of construction it will take many years to complete the secondary road system in my State.

Another amendment which I offered in my bill sets up a definite formula for the distribution of rural and secondary road funds among the counties of the various States. The formula is based upon area road mileage and population. In this way each county would be assured of receiving its fair and equitable share of the secondary road fund. The formula for the distribution by the counties is the same as the one used for distribution among the States. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 has met with great success. The States and counties have cooperated fully but only a beginning in road building improvement has been made. Increased traffic conditions and the necessity of a secondary and rural road program and the improvement of streets in municipalities makes it imperative that the program be continued and made permanent.

The Compromise Process of Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Oliver Martin, professor of philosophy at the University of Ohio, in which he presents a discussion of the compromise process of legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEYOND COMPROMISE

(By Oliver Martin)

Can the democratic way be identified completely with compromise as a method of making social adjustments? In his writings Prof. T. V. Smith of the University of Chicago has glorified the politician and has identified the latter's art with the method of compromise. In a recent article in the Saturday Review of Literature (April 12, 1947) Alan Valentine, president of the University of Rochester, presents a similar thesis. Mr. Valentine tells us that "the expert politician and the expert publicity man think in the same terms * * * They are concerned * * * with the arts of charging words and phrases with high emotional potentials, of turning a respectable word into an insult, of clothing an ordinary word in the raiment of popularity." If Machiavelli were alive today, he would recognize these "more refined procedures." By these means the politician not only gains his ends but also solves social problems with a minimum of force. When citizens disagree, there are but two solutions. "One is for the majority to force its full will upon a reluctant and perhaps powerful minority * * * The other way is to compromise, and democracy is essentially a government by compromise. Politicians make compromise possible." The politician is a pragmatist and realist and gets things done. The statesman, by contrast, is an idealist who is inefficacious because, and precisely to the degree that, he stands firm and unswerving upon his ethical principles.

A respectable tradition, from the time of the Federalist Papers to the present, is behind this view of democracy. It has the virtue of simplicity that all common-sense views share. The average man can understand it. But the simple may also be a partial truth—in this case resting upon the ambiguity of the term "compromise." I propose to defend the idea of statesmanship, to show the necessity of transcending compromise, and to prove the impossibility of identifying completely the democratic way with the method of compromise. I say completely, for no sane person denies the virtue of compromise or its admitted necessity at times. However, compromise is logically neither the only alternative to force nor is it in fact, or even theoretically, alone capable of preventing the use of force.

There are three possible methods of adjustment in social relations: (1) what for the want of a better term may be called the method of rational persuasion, (2) compromise, and (3) force expressed in the forms of coercion and/or violence.

Let us consider the method of persuasion. The two disputants in immediate conflict come together by themselves or with a third party to consider their difficulties. It is assumed that, with good will and the use of reason, truth in the matter of value conflicts may be discovered. One or other of the disputants, as the case may be, is persuaded that his opinion is wrong or that the opinion of the other is better. Or it may be that both may be persuaded that their respective opinions are not so desirable as some third point of view. In a case of this kind something quite different from compromise takes place. Neither side has made any concessions; neither has lost anything. If disputant X is persuaded that disputant Y has a better point of view, a fuller truth in a value-judging situation, in relinquishing his own opinion and accepting that of Y, X has gained something. Discounting for the moment as irrelevant the fact that any human being may make a mistake in value judgments, X feels that he has only lost a false judgment but gained a true, or truer, one.

The method of persuasion is, of course, undoubtedly an ideal one, and its all too infrequent use is witness to that fact. But it is used sometimes, and its very ideality demands that it ought to be used more often. The method of persuasion has its presuppositions. It assumes that through the use of reason objective truth in the matter of values and principles, together with particular exemplifications of these, can in general be determined, and that the disputants have good will and honestly seek the truth before all else. Obviously, in any particular case the method of persuasion is inefficacious if its presuppositions are not satisfied in fact.

Another possible method of bringing about adjustments in social relations is that of force. In this case the will of one or both of the disputants is asserted through either coercion or violence. This method presupposes (1) bad will on the part of at least one, if not both, of the disputants; (2) that in the particular case at hand, at least, truth cannot be determined, or, if it can be determined, it is not desired; and (3) that in the given case compromise is not worth while, the object or end willed being worth the risk of the use of force.

Now we are in a position to determine more precisely the meaning and limitations of the method of compromise. Compromise has broad and narrow meanings, and it is necessary to distill the essence from it. Assuming that there are choices or decisions that humans make which are merely matters of taste, perhaps the term "compromise" can legitimately be used to designate a possible adjustment in such matters. However, in this case the term has a meaning that is irrelevant to ethics and so need not be considered a part of our problem.

The term "compromise" is also used sometimes to designate what are really two variations of the method of persuasion. (1) Even when there is good will on the part of two parties and the method of persuasion would ordinarily be used, in a given case a decision may have to be made before there is time enough to resolve the matter in the ideal manner. One may have to accept the other's point of view, or both accept a third. The two parties may be said to have compromised, but only in the sense that, though the method of persuasion was willed, circumstances beyond their control prevented its usual consequences from being realized. (2) Sometimes it happens that, even with good will and after a great deal of thought and discussion on the part of the disputants, there remains a considerable honest difference of opinion. Consequently, it is necessary to

reach some compromise position, as we commonly say.

Now there are several reasons why these two meanings of compromise do not express its essence. In the first place, in both cases what is expressed is the essence of the method of persuasion, for good will, and the appeal to reason are presupposed on the part of the disputants. The fact that there are circumstances beyond the control of the will of the disputants, to wit, the time element, lack of data on which to come to a definite decision, or that perhaps the evidence pro and con on the matter at issue is evenly balanced—all these factors, to repeat, being, by hypothesis, beyond the control of the wills of the disputants does not imply that, because the usual full consequences of the method of persuasion do not eventuate, therefore they (the results) were arrived at by some other distinct and different method than that of persuasion. If, for example, for some reason or other a decision has to be rendered on the question at issue between two disputants before there is time enough to work out the matter in detail through rational discussion, then for one of the disputants to accept the point of view of the other, or both to adopt some third position, is certainly not to compromise, if it means something else than the method of persuasion, even though, in acting so, the disputants remain unconvinced of the other's point of view. As a matter of fact, given the circumstances, there would be a lack of good will and rationality, which are presuppositions of persuasion, if either one of the disputants would insist on the usual procedure that takes place when time is not at a premium.

Referring to the second case—when some third position is accepted by both disputants because, with good will and after sufficient rational discussion, there still remains an honest and sincere difference of opinion—we do not find the essence of compromise here. Each disputant really wills the third position rather than his own, and, in doing so, each recognizes that the best or the right has prevailed. Neither one can be said to have lost anything or really to have made any concession. As in the former case there is only the appearance of compromise; its form is present, and that is responsible for the appearance, but there is lacking its content.

The essence of compromise as a distinct method of adjustment in human relations may now be stated. Its presuppositions are the same as, or similar to, the method of force, but the end it aims at is the same as, or similar to, that of the method of persuasion. There is a lack of good will and the normative use of reason, but the evil effects of such presuppositions are to be softened and mitigated by the appeal to reason used in a nonnormative way. While in the method of force bad will is chiefly actual and active, in compromise it may be active, but also it may be potential or dormant. Whether or not there is merely a lack of good will, or actual bad will—or to put it in another way, whether bad will is active or dormant—is partly determined by the disputants' conceptions of the function of reason and the status of truth. Bad will may be derivative from a notion of what reason is. If truth in the matter of values is thought of, consciously or unconsciously, as essentially subjective, if it is believed on the part of one or both disputants that there is nothing over and above the present conflict of wills to which an appeal can be made with any chance of success, if it is believed, again consciously or unconsciously, that reason cannot serve as a critic of wills, but that its chief function is to find good reasons for defending what is already willed, then the method of persuasion becomes not only an impractical instrument but a theoretically impossible one. In this case bad will is essentially the result of a false metaphysic.

On the other hand, reason as nonnormative or merely instrumental may result from bad will. Again there will be nothing over and above the particular wills of the disputants to which an appeal may be made, and reason will take its perverted form of rationalization. Here, bad will is the cause rather than the effect of a false metaphysic. However, regardless of the cause and effect relationship between will and reason, the presuppositions of compromise are a lack of good will and the nonnormative use of reason. The meaning of nonnormative reason will be made clearer presently.

In the method of persuasion, when incompatible ends, principles, or objects are willed by two disputants, the function of reason is that of being a critic of the values willed. Each disputant transcends himself, becomes a critic of his own will, on the supposition that, since there is objective truth in such matters, there is the possibility that one or the other or both of them are wrong. However, the method of compromise is necessary because oftentimes disputants lack good will and will not allow reason to lead them to truth. Hence, in compromise reason is appealed to, not to reach a new or fuller truth but to alleviate the effects of bad will. While the factors present are the same as those when the method of force is used, the aim is somehow to prevent that very method and the evils therewith from being a necessity. The disputants are asked to listen to reason, to be reasonable. But this simply means: "Can't you see that if one or both of you don't give in and make some concession, coercion, violence, or increased bad will will eventuate?" And the disputants become rational, as we say, when they willingly sit down and arbitrate the matter, each giving up something, conceding part of the whole willed in order that the rest may be saved. However, it is to be noted that the disputants listen to reason only because they are irrational to begin with, to put it paradoxically. In the method of persuasion the disputants reason in order that both may gain a truth through resolving their conflict in some higher synthesis. In the method of compromise the function of reason is chiefly that of discovering what and how much each disputant will give up and lose in order to prevent the logic of the presuppositions of the method of force from being asserted.

The recognition of the exact distinction between the method of persuasion and the method of compromise is important because all too often they are confused and compromise is identified with persuasion. However, as we have attempted to show, even though certain examples of the method of persuasion may have the form of compromise, they lack the content, that is, the essential factors that define the method of compromise. In literature the terms "persuasion" and "compromise" are often used interchangeably as having the same meaning. And while prose as well as poetry has its license, when clarity is the issue it makes only for confusion nct to recognize that the two terms stand for distinct methods. Now, just as the method of persuasion sometimes has the form of compromise, but lacks its substance, so the method of compromise may produce a similar illusion. When disputants agree to mediate their differences through a third party, is not each disputant persuaded to accept something other than his original position? True, but persuasion means something quite different here from what it means when reference is made to the method of persuasion. The difference lies in the function of reason in the two cases. As this has already been discussed, it will suffice here to point out that in the method of persuasion disputants yield because of insight into a new or fuller truth discovered through reason; in compromise they yield because each feels that it is more reasonable to lose a little than run the risk of losing all. The form is that of persuasion, but the substance is that of compromise.

The method of compromise is, then, itself a compromise between two methods, that of persuasion, on the one hand, and that of force, on the other. If this is true, it is not unimportant, for all too often this truth is not recognized, and compromise is given virtues it does not possess. Its value as a means of eliminating the possibility of violence is overrated. The method of compromise for some becomes an absolute that is an intrinsically good means, as opposed to its supposedly only other alternative, force, which is an intrinsically bad means. Hence, socially we seem to have the two alternatives: either democracy (compromise) or dictatorship (force).

It is not to be disputed that if the method of persuasion proves unworkable most of the time in a social system, and if compromise also does not always prove practical, then most certainly the only other alternative is force. What is false is the notion that, in order to eliminate force, the method of compromise is enough, the only alternative method, and that democracy as a way of life can be identified completely with it. Rather, if any social system is based completely on, or identified completely with, the method of compromise, so far from being a means of eliminating force, on its very principles compromise leads to and promotes coercion and violence.

If the democratic method be identified completely with the method of compromise, the following implications may be drawn. Human nature being what it is, persuasion, with its normative use of reason, cannot be depended on as workable. Conflicts between groups of individuals cannot be resolved with a total gain for all parties concerned. Rather, each loses something and gains only in the negative sense of not losing all. Also, it follows directly from the meaning of compromise that no disputant can surrender the whole end, principle, or object willed, for such surrender can take place only through persuasion or force.

Now, if democracy is identified with compromise, there is ruled out on a priori grounds the possibility of a "democratic" use of the other two methods. It is not that men seldom use reason normatively in social situations, a truth to which everyone agrees; rather, it is that they cannot. In making the method of compromise absolute, a doctrine of human nature and a function of reason are implied that restricts the realm of possibilities. But a more subtle "deduction of the categories" than that of Kant's, with perhaps even less plausibility, would be necessary to demonstrate the legitimacy of such on a priori limitation of possibilities. For what guaranty is there that situations will not arise between disputants such that neither can compromise, the case in which the least concession on the part of either disputant would mean, not compromise, but complete capitulation and surrender? That such situations can occur no one will dispute. There are cases in which sufficient quantitative changes produce a qualitative change. This is a truth that may be accepted independently of whether or not one may embrace wholly the logic of the dialectic with which such a principle is usually associated.

Consider the case in which no concession can be made without complete surrender, when to sacrifice a part is to sacrifice the whole. Compromise is impossible. The only alternatives are the methods of persuasion and force. What are the disputants to do? If force is resorted to, that is undemocratic. One party simply makes the other surrender

his whole position. On the other hand, the normative use of reason, which is persuasion, possibly could achieve the same result. But if this method is ruled out on a priori grounds, and compromise made the only possible alternative to force, the conclusion is rather obvious.

The only possible resolution of the situation is by force. Hence, the identification of democracy entirely with the method of compromise results in a reductio ad absurdum, for, in willing such democracy, one is willing a plain contradiction. However, actuality has ways of breaking through contradictions, and that way is force. The method of compromise is limited to those cases in which a part can be conceded without destroying the whole. But there are times when history demands the latter to be given up by disputants. In that case force is the alternative to persuasion. Hence, to make compromise an absolute method is simply to make coercion and violence inevitable.

The politician glorified by Professor Smith and Mr. Valentine cannot go beyond compromise, though he can go beyond conscience. As a democrat the politician cannot rely on force, and, not being a statesman, he cannot brew a judicious mixture of force and persuasion. The statesman, who is something more than a politician, will recognize that if sometimes the method of compromise is necessary as an alternative to force because persuasion is impractical, it is also true that there are times when persuasion becomes the only alternative to force if compromise proves impossible.

If democracy cannot be equated with the method of compromise, neither can it be identified completely with either of the other two methods. Obviously, not with force; and not with persuasion, for then democracy would be defined so as to be unworkable. As an ideal to be attained, democracy would be that state of affairs in which no other method than persuasion would be necessary. As a method of realizing that ideal, democracy must be a method which can make use of persuasion, compromise, and force, with proper weights and measures of each. But this demands a dialetic which only the statesmanship of philosopher-kings can understand and manage, something more than the mere diplomacy of the politician whose formalism in theory, because of inadequacy, unfortunately aften becomes a mask for an opportunism in practice.

Germany—A Problem for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our country has muffed the ball in Germany. Soon it will be 3 years since the men of Hitler surrendered unconditionally to the Allied forces. Yet there has been very little progress in the direction of reestablishing the political or economic policies of that country. We have stumbled and fumbled with our foreign policy there; in fact, President Truman has had no constructive policy. The time has now come for Congress to step in and demand that a prostrate Germany be put to work.

Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of the American Association for a Democratic Germany, I include as part of my remarks the following pamphlet entitled "Do You Know?"

DO YOU KNOW?

Do you agree that it is the problem of the American people—

That 2½ years after the end of hostilities, people guilty only of the crime of German descent are still being driven out of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia? That 12,000,000 of them, deprived of all their possessions, have already been dumped into a truncated Germany?

That a territory three-fourths the size of prewar Germany must now support a population as large as that of Germany before the war? That the density of population in Germany today is 505 persons per square mile, as compared to 44.2 per square mile in the United States?

That the area east of the Oder and Neisse Rivers, transferred to Poland and Russia, supplied a fourth of Germany's prewar agricultural production? That agricultural production in the three western zones of Germany, which before the war were only 50 percent self-sufficient in food, is now reduced by shortages of machinery and fertilizer to three-fifths of its prewar level?

That more than half of the food in western Germany is now derived from imports from the United States? That the food available for distribution in western Germany is, nevertheless, about 10 percent less than the amount required to meet the official ration of 1,550 calories? That the dietary level in some of the industrial cities of the British zone has fallen at times to the Belsen level of 700 calories? That nutrition experts of the League of Nations estimated the minimum requirements of an average adult, not engaged in heavy work, at 2,400 calories per day?

That German industrial production, the only possible source of foreign exchange to pay for necessary imports of food and raw materials, is today at about one-third of its prewar level, although the output of other European countries has almost returned to normal? That in a Europe where shortage of railroad equipment is one of the principal bottlenecks, the Allies have kept the great railroad equipment works of the Ruhr idle? That the Germans are still forbidden to have ships that could fish the waters of the North Sea to augment their diet?

That the level of industry agreement under the Potsdam plan allowed Germany to manufacture 5,700,000 tons of steel a year? That the revised level of industry agreement, recently adopted by the British and American Governments, recognizes a production of 10,700,000 tons a year in the bizonal area as necessary? And that in October, the best month to date, production was at the rate of only 3,700,000 tons a year? That if Europe is to become self-supporting under the Marshall plan, Germany's capacity must be put to work? That although it would take approximately 20 years at prewar rates of construction to replace the German dwellings destroyed in the war, this task has not even been begun in the 2½ years of Allied occupation? That building material factories have been removed and are still being removed, as reparations?

That despite an acute shortage of transport and skilled labor in Germany, both are being diverted to the dismantling and removal of factories? That most of the plants being removed are not from war industries, but from essential peacetime industries? That despite Russia's failure to fulfill the obligations of the Potsdam agreement in respect to the treatment of Germany as a unit, she is still receiving both war factories and other plants as reparations from the western zones?

That while Communist literature, printed in tremendous quantities in the Soviet zone, floods western Germany, so little paper is made available for democratic literature that books are now limited to editions of 5,000 in the western zones? That reeducation in western Germany today is the task of a handful of military government officials, operating almost without books or other facilities?

That currency and postal restrictions keep the average German from access to books printed in the democracies as effectively as Hitler's censorship did? That the Soviet Union prints special editions of books for shipment into Germany?

That in the Soviet zone the Social Democratic Party—formerly the strongest in that area—is today illegal? That in Berlin, which is under four-power control, a Soviet veto has prevented the elected city government from functioning for a year?

That in western Germany, although elective governments have been established in the various states, these are subject to the decisions of military government even in minor matters? That although General Clay himself has said that military government is the antithesis of democracy, plans to replace it by a civilian administration for Germany still exist only on paper—more than a year after they were first announced?

YOU ARE GERMANY'S KEEPER

Today Germany is a key battleground in the struggle between democratic and totalitarian ideas. Its industry is the key to European recovery. And American policy is the key to Germany's fate. We and our allies are today the rulers of Germany. Hence Germany is your responsibility and the responsibility of every American. If you believe that we must build an economically healthy and politically democratic Germany in order to save Europe and the world, then support the American Association for a Democratic Germany in working for:

A unified, democratic Germany;

Substitution of civilian control for military government;

Full utilization of German productive capacity for European reconstruction in accordance with the principles of the Marshall plan;

Removal of all obstacles to the flow of ideas between Germany and the western world.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR A DEMOCRATIC GERMANY.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Repeal of Transportation Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to repeal the existing tax on the transportation of property. This is a particularly vicious form of taxation because it discriminates against those regions of the country that are compelled to transport their goods substantial distances. This tax thus has a regressive effect on many sections of our country, because it imposes a relatively greater burden purely because they are less favorably situated from a geographical standpoint.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a table which conclusively demonstrates the wide disparity in the per capita effect of this tax on the citizens of various States. While these figures do not reflect the exact burden on individuals in a particular State because

some of the taxes paid one State are passed on to purchasers who may reside in another State, still the figures are very informative and show the clear inequity of levying a tax on this basis. Is it not handicap enough for a person to live at considerable distance from the great manufacturing areas and be forced to pay greater transportation costs than those living in closer proximity? Why should the United States Government compound the difficulties of adverse geographical locations and the inequity of unequal freight costs by saddling an additional 3 to 4 percent transportation tax on such States?

The table follows:

TABLE I.—*Internal revenue receipts, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947*

Districts	Transportation of property—3 percent of amount paid except coal, which is 4 cents per ton	1940 population	Per capita tax
Alabama	$1,638,907.62	2,832,961	$0.579
Alaska	148,926.07	72,524	2.053
Arizona	266,252.12	499,261	.533
Arkansas	330,150.23	1,949,387	.169
California	20,534,565.33	6,907,387	2.972
District of Columbia	4,988,108.15		
Colorado	2,074,507.80	1,123,296	1.846
Connecticut	4,679,825.59	1,709,242	2.738
Delaware	284,876.45	266,505	1.068
Florida	1,160,721.07	1,897,414	.611
Georgia	1,790,118.49	3,123,723	.573
Hawaii	275,042.40	423,330	.649
Idaho	364,010.55	524,873	.693
Illinois	38,543,049.18	7,897,241	4.880
Indiana	2,620,426.26	3,427,796	.764
Iowa	1,584,054.14	2,538,268	.624
Kansas	3,506,380.06	1,801,028	1.946
Kentucky	3,480,241.51	2,845,627	1.223
Louisiana	1,332,449.86	2,363,880	.563
Maine	999,755.17	847,226	1.180
Maryland	10,221,755.64	1,821,244	5.613
Massachusetts	5,457,931.42	4,316,721	1.264
Michigan	8,433,652.13	5,256,106	1.604
Minnesota	11,238,473.39	2,792,300	4.024
Mississippi	345,751.68	2,183,796	.158
Missouri	15,204,457.01	3,784,664	4.017
Montana	361,435.03	559,456	.646
Nebraska	5,329,602.78	1,315,834	4.050
Nevada	96,254.95	110,247	.873
New Hampshire	225,151.97	491,524	.458
New Jersey	4,106,762.79	4,160,165	.987
New Mexico	161,115.41	531,818	.302
New York	44,404,130.72	13,479,142	3.294
North Carolina	3,635,625.86	3,571,623	1.017
North Dakota	130,374.98	641,935	.203
Ohio	12,459,147.78	6,907,612	1.803
Oklahoma	1,309,633.28	2,336,434	.560
Oregon	2,193,670.55	1,089,684	2.105
Pennsylvania	30,077,068.49	9,900,180	3.380
Rhode Island	254,866.30	713,346	.357
South Carolina	337,867.90	1,899,804	.307
South Dakota	314,536.48	642,961	.489
Tennessee	2,018,342.56	2,915,841	.692
Texas	11,060,904.62	6,414,824	1.724
Utah	542,097.69	550,310	.985
Vermont	519,947.50	359,231	1.447
Virginia	10,175,191.68	2,677,773	3.799
Washington	1,742,666.40	1,736,191	1.003
West Virginia	430,897.02	1,901,974	.226
Wisconsin	2,185,158.43	3,137,587	.696
Wyoming	124,574.19	250,742	.496

Veterans' Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of releases in regard to veterans' education, issued by the American Council of Education.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(This is the first of a second series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. Ralph J. Strom, of the American Council on Education, was director of the project and conducted the survey. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson of the University of Minnesota served as chairman of the committee.)

MINNEAPOLIS, March 9.—Among the many problems brought to bear on college and university administrators by the tremendous influx of veterans returning to the college campuses, providing for the special needs of the disabled veterans is of major importance.

For the first time in more than a century of American higher education, the student bodies are composed of a sizable number of disabled veterans on the campus ranging in types of disability from minor ailments to those of almost total physical disability. Among the disabled veterans now in college training are the arm and leg amputees, those with spinal and back injuries, those with diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis, the deafened and the blinded, and those with psychoneurotic disabilities.

In an effort to find out how effectively these disabled veterans have been adjusting to their college training a special committee of the American Council on Education, with funds made available by the Disabled American Veterans, has recently completed several Nation-wide surveys of the problems of college veterans in order to focus attention on the particular needs of the disabled students.

Dean Williamson stated that with the findings of these studies the American Council on Education will enlist the aid of the Disabled American Veterans and other such organizations in helping the colleges to improve their services to disabled veteran students. These college services to be improved include counseling, vocational guidance, placement in jobs after graduation, and many others.

The findings of the recent council survey revealed that the Federal aid received under the provisions of the rehabilitation bill was more instrumental in assisting the disabled veterans to remain in school than was true of the nondisabled men. Forty-two percent of the disabled married veterans and 21 percent of the disabled single veterans replied that they would not have been able to enroll in college without the Federal aid whereas similar returns for the married and single nondisabled veterans were 33 percent and 15 percent, respectively.

Of the disabled veterans interviewed, 1 in every 6 found that his disability barred him from a vocation he would have liked to enter. The disabled student has also been at a disadvantage because the disability has prevented him from accepting part-time employment. Four out of every ten disabled veterans replied that their disability had interfered with their ability to participate in outside work to supplement their income. This is one of the major reasons why the factor of Federal aid has been of increased significance to the disabled veteran.

The results further indicated that a substantially greater number of the disabled found it necessary to change their occupational goals from what they were prior to the war, the figure being 44 percent for the disabled and less than 35 percent for the nondisabled.

Those veterans with disabilities were asked as to the special type of treatment which the college and university they attended did or was able to give them. Of the disabled veterans which were interviewed many replied that the school had given them special help in registration, others had received the benefit of special regulations and privileges, still others had received special counseling assistance while others were given special seats in the classroom, special parking privileges, etc.

Among the shortcomings of the college programs cited by veterans was the need for more individual consideration. Others stated that some changes in regulations could have been made for them in their academic progress. Still others cited the possibility of additional aid in registration facilities and in orientation programs. Elevators and escalators could have been installed and some thought that additional aid could have been given in obtaining housing.

Mr. Strom reported that he is now collecting detailed reports from about 800 colleges and universities regarding their special assistance to disabled veterans. These reports will be used by the committee to stimulate and help all 1,700 American colleges to improve their aid to disabled veterans.

(This is the second of a second series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. Ralph J. Strom, of the American Council on Education, was director of the project and conducted the survey. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson, of the University of Minnesota, served as chairman of the committee.)

MINNEAPOLIS, March 10.—"Do you think you would have gone to college if there had been no GI or rehabilitation bills passed by Congress?" This question was asked of a large number of veterans attending all types of colleges and universities in this country in a recent survey conducted by the American Council on Education with funds made available by the Disabled American Veterans.

The popular belief that the veterans legislation passed by the Congress has resulted in a large number of veterans going to college who otherwise would not have been able to go was, in general, modified and in some respects disproved by this survey.

Seventy-three percent of this representative sample of veterans indicated that they would have gone to college after their discharge from military service even if there had been no financial support provided by the Congress. Twenty-two percent said that they would not have gone, while the remaining 5 percent answered "Don't know."

When the returns were classified by types of institutions, the responses received were much the same from the veterans in State universities, private men's schools, municipal colleges, and liberal arts colleges. However, the responses of the veterans attending junior colleges and and teachers colleges were substantially different from those attending the other types of institutions. Twenty-nine percent of those in the junior colleges and 30 percent of those in the teachers colleges replied that they would not have been able to go to college without Government aid.

Further analysis revealed that the Government aid had been of greater help to the married veterans than to the single veterans, with the greatest assistance being given to the disabled veterans. Sixty-one percent of the married nondisabled veterans stated that they would have enrolled in some college despite the aid, while only 53 percent of the married disabled veterans replied in that manner. Eighty-one percent of the single

nondisabled veterans replied that they would have gone to school if there had been no aid, while 74 percent of the disabled single veterans gave the same answer.

To illustrate further the extent to which the present GI and rehabilitation bills are aiding those veterans who would have enrolled or reenrolled in college even without all of the present assistance from the Federal Government, the returns revealed that 88 percent of the single veterans who had some college experience before their military service replied that they would have returned to college without the Federal aid, 10 percent said "No," while 2 percent replied "Don't know." However, for those who had no previous college training, the figures were 71 percent answering "Yes," 23 percent "No," and 6 percent "Don't know."

Similar analysis of the responses of the married veterans indicated that practically one of every two married veterans now in college who had had no college training prior to the war would not have been able to attend college without the aid offered by the Federal Government. Forty-five percent of this group said that they would have been able to do so while 6 percent replied, "Don't know." Of those veterans now married who had been able to attend college prior to their military service, 72 percent stated that they would have been able to go to college without Federal aid while 23 percent said, "No." Five percent had no opinion.

Only one out of every two single veterans 24 years of age or over at the time of the interview and who had had no previous college experience said that he would have enrolled in college without the Federal aid. Forty-four percent said, "No," 6 percent replied, "Don't know." In contrast to these figures, of the single veterans 21 years of age and younger with no previous college training, 81 percent replied that they would have gone without additional aid.

Of the single veterans over 24 years of age with some college training previous to their military service, 80 percent replied, "Yes," while of those 21 years of age and younger with some previous college experience, 94 percent replied, "Yes."

(This is the third of a second series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses recived from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. Ralph J. Strom, of the American Council on Education, was director of the project and conducted the survey. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson of the University of Minnesota acted as chairman of the committee.)

MINNEAPOLIS, March 11.—One of the important changes which has taken place in our colleges and universities after the return of the servicemen has been the considerable increase in the number of married students. Statistics released by the American Council on Education last fall indicated that almost one-third of the veterans attending colleges and universities were married and that 40 percent of this group had one or more children.

The results of a Nation-wide survey of veteran opinions recently completed by a committee of the American Council on Education with funds provided by the Disabled American Veterans reveal that the aid received from the Federal Government has been of considerably more assistance to the married veteran than to the single veteran. Thirty-five percent of the married veterans interviewed replied that they would not have been able to go to college without such assistance. Sixteen percent of the single veterans replied in this manner.

The study also showed that the married students, because of their family responsibilities were less apt to participate in organized activities on the college campus. Although the veterans in general indicated little participation in such campus activities, the married veteran in particular found that he had insufficient time for such activities. Seven out of every 10 married veterans replied that they participate only a "little part" in such activities, whereas half of the single veterans were in this category.

The desire to achieve an education on the part of the married veterans is strikingly illustrated when the extent of the employment of the wives was studied. Of those veterans with no children 73 percent of their wives were working either full time or regular part time. This source of additional income was not available to those veterans with children because of the necessity for the mother to remain at home and look after the children, most of whom were very young.

Only 17 percent of wives with children are able to work full-time or regular part-time. The remainder were not employed or could work but intermittently.

The recent legislation passed by the Congress, which not only raised the subsistence allowance of all college veterans but authorized additional funds for children for the first time, will be of considerable help to those veterans with children.

Analysis of the responses indicated that 23 percent of these married veterans without children replied that difficulties in their living conditions such as housing, finances, etc., had interfered with the maintenance of happy family relationships, whereas 35 percent of the veterans with children said that their living conditions had interfered in this way.

The problem of study conditions is of particular significance to the married veteran with children. When asked whether study conditions in the home had effected their school grades, 30 percent of them felt these study conditions had lowered their grades, while but 16 percent of the childless married veterans replied in this manner.

Various provisions have been made or are being made by the colleges and universities for the welfare of the wives and children of veterans. Fourteen percent of the married veterans interviewed replied that nursery school facilities have been provided, while 12 percent of the veterans stated that organizations to which the wives of the veterans could belong had been organized. Eleven percent replied that recreational facilities had been provided, while 7 percent replied that medical care had been offered. However, 6 in every 10 married veterans stated that the schools had not provided any facilities for the wives and children of veterans.

(This is the fourth of a second series of articles describing the results of a survey of college veterans based on the responses received from interviews with a scientifically selected sample of veterans attending all types of colleges located throughout the country. Ralph J. Strom, of the American Council on Education, was director of the project, and conducted the survey. The study was planned by a national committee appointed by the American Council on Education and was made possible by a grant of funds from the Disabled American Veterans. Dean E. G. Williamson, of the University of Minnesota, acted as chairman of the committee.)

MINNEAPOLIS, March 12.—The influx of servicemen on the campuses of the Nation among other things has considerably raised the age level of college students, according to the results of a recent survey conducted by the American Council on Education with funds provided by the Disabled American Veterans. Many veterans returned to the campus after a period of military service of from 1 to 5 years, while others were forced to delay their enrollment in college after graduation from high school for a similar period.

This delay in their educational plans has necessarily resulted in a more mature and more experienced group of students and has wrought several important changes in the student life on the campus, the survey indicates.

Many generalizations have been made as to the role veterans as a group play on the college campus and the extent to which they maintain a separate identity.

The findings of this survey disclose that on many campuses veterans have organized in the hope that through such united action they might be able to present their problems more effectively.

Further questioning of these veterans revealed, however, that such organizations are not considered very effective. Only 13 percent of the veterans interviewed thought that the benefits resulting from organizations of this nature had been substantial. Forty-four percent replied that these organizations had been of no help to them. Significant was the finding that the remaining 43 percent did not know or had no opinion as to the effectiveness of such student veterans' organizations.

Of those who said that such groups are of help, such assistance was found to be primarily in the area of housing. Others felt that these organizations give the veteran some representation on the campus, are instrumental in providing additional social activities for veterans, and are helpful in publicizing the particular problems of veteran students.

The survey also revealed that a considerable majority of college veterans are not members of any established veterans' organization, almost 7 out of every 10 veterans interviewed indicating that he was not a member of such an organization. The remaining 30 percent are members of the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Veterans Committee, etc., with many having membership in more than one of these groups.

To find out whether this group of veterans participated to any extent in determining administrative policies, they were asked if they could cite any instances in which the officials of their institutions had ever consulted the students in this respect. Sixty-eight percent replied that they could report no such instances. Eight percent stated that their counselor or adviser had requested their opinion concerning various problems of administration. Six percent of the group said that their own opinions had been obtained through their student councils or from surveys of student opinion conducted by various student organizations. Three percent of those interviewed replied that the students at their colleges had been consulted on curricular matters. At several institutions the survey showed the student body had been consulted regarding administration policies of finances, housing, and athletic functions.

Oil Profits Versus Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD another militant editorial

from the New York Post, from the issue of April 2, 1948, entitled "Oil Profits Versus Security," which expresses succinctly what many of us think of American policy in the Middle East.

Text of the editorial follows:

OIL PROFITS VERSUS SECURITY

(By T. O. Thackrey)

Of all the lies circulated by the war-at-any-price clique the most vicious and the most unprincipled is the lie that our national safety—our very life—depends upon Arabian oil.

This is the lie used as the excuse for our unprincipled policy on Palestine * * * "We must not offend the Arabs because our national security depends upon Arabian oil."

This is the lie used to cloak the fact that we betrayed Palestine not because we are of necessity dependent on Arabian oil, but because powerful private interests were and are reaping colossal dollar profits which might, conceivably, have been endangered.

For this, we have encouraged Arabian warfare on Palestine.

For this, we are attacking, in the United Nations, the partition decision we helped to bring about.

For this, we refuse to sell arms to the defenseless citizens of Palestine while the British blockade importation of arms bought elsewhere.

For this, we have allied ourselves with the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, concealed his war record in our State Department files, and dared to question the patriotism of any citizen who cried out against the shameful policy of buying oil—and private oil profits—with Palestinian blood.

But the truth is catching up with that monstrous dishonesty.

The truth is that the President, the State Department, and the Defense Department, instead of assuring us of security, have seriously weakened our security.

In the guise of making us strong, the bald fact is that our national security has been harmed by this insistence on preferring oil from Arabia to oil from the North American Continent.

More evidence is being spread on the record by a series of stories which began in yesterday's New York Post and Home News by Oliver Pilat of our Washington bureau.

If we need oil—there is no reason for going to Arabia except profit; there was and is every reason for getting and developing the vast supply readily accessible across the border, easily defended in time of war and abundantly handy in time of peace.

Mexico has a minimum of 10,000,000 barrels of petroleum reserves on the coast, and an undeveloped 10,000,000,000 barrels in reserves inland—at least 20,000,000,000 barrels—equal to 20 percent of the total known world supply, but we ignore it: worse, we have deliberately blocked its development.

The estimates are accurate, and by a strange coincidence cannot possibly be questioned by our administrative departments, since they are made by exactly the same authority who explored the Arabian oil reserves: Dr. Everett De Golyer, who has recently completed his exploration for the Mexican Government.

Why have we neglected this supply, if we need oil so desperately for security and our domestic economy?

Because this Government is bringing pressure on the Mexican Government to sell out title to these national resources to private oil companies; a scandal 100 times greater than the Teapot Dome scandal which wrecked the Harding administration.

The Mexican Government has offered contracts calling for 10 to 20 percent of the value of all oil produced, plus operating expenses, but our State Department working with private oil companies in asking for an outright title.

More: oil companies willing to accept the Mexican Government's terms have been unable to obtain shipments of steel and other necessary equipment for the development of Mexican oil on the excuse that these materials were too scarce to be spared.

But the administration ruled that it was perfectly all right to send enormous quantities of these supplies, instead, half-way round the world to Arabia on the ground that we must have the oil.

What security are we concerned with, gentlemen?

The security of the United States and all of its citizens—or merely the security of the profits of the American-Arabian oil company?

Give Us a Strong Air Force—The Strongest In the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for a long time it has been my earnest conviction that the security of this Nation—and the security of this hard-earned peace—can best be protected by an air force second to none.

On the floor of this House on March 15 I reminded the Members that this Nation has sacrificed her leadership in air power and that the most important factor in correcting this bad—possibly fatal—situation is time.

Time is one thing we cannot appropriate. We can either save it or waste it.

In my remarks on that occasion 1 month ago I urged that this Congress act, and act quickly, to supply the appropriations for a 70 group air force.

On March 25 I spoke again over a State-wide network in Texas. Again I repeated the warning and reemphasized the urgency of strengthening our air arm to restore the United States world supremacy in the air.

SUPPORTS 70 GROUPS IN COMMITTEE

After my return from Texas, I supported a resolution asking for a 70 group air force in the House Armed Services Committee.

On every opportunity, I have sought to secure the peace by supporting an air force second to none—that, I believe, is the most vital need of our defense today.

Since making my views known in Texas through the State-wide broadcast, I received hundreds of letters supporting preparedness as the best means of keeping the peace. Among these letters have been many from veterans who fought in World War II and who are most interested in preventing world war III.

Reading these letters from Texas veterans I have found one theme repeated over and over, and over, "Give us a strong air force—the strongest in the world."

I wrote three of these veterans the other day to express my views on a 70-group air force.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter, summarizing my strong belief in the necessity of a larger air force, in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., April 9, 1948.

Mr. PAUL W. TREPTOW, Jr.,
Houston, Tex.
Mr. HUGH B. GILMOUR,
Midland, Tex.
Mr. R. J. FRICK,
Dallas, Tex.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: Since the three of you feel as I do about the urgency of building our Air Force into the world's greatest, in the interest of saving time, I am writing this letter to you jointly and will express my views in some detail.

There is a time to talk and a time to act. The time for action to provide this Nation with a 70-group air force is here.

The first order of business for Congress is a first-class Air Corps because:

1. Air power is the deciding power in the world today.

2. Our Air Force is second strength, equipped largely with second-rate craft, and in this air age, if you are second, you are last.

3. The air force we have on the last day of peace will be the air force we have on the first day of war—and our present air force is not adequate for either peace or war.

4. A first-rate air force cannot be designed and produced overnight, and it is imperative that we get started now.

5. Our present plane supply is not adequate for training of both reserve and new personnel and we need the planes to take our reserves out of obsolete World War II craft and train them in modern jets.

6. Air victories are not won by pilots alone; ground personnel, radar men, weather observers, and hundreds more are essential to the team, and the larger air force is needed to train men for these important jobs.

7. Ground troops must often be air-borne in modern warfare, and a larger air force is needed to provide adequate air transport facilities.

8. We are told that one country is building aircraft at a minimum rate of 1,000 per month. We are far behind. In the world today, the roar of airplane engines is more impressive than the guarded words of diplomacy.

9. Our strategic industrial and agricultural targets will be the Pearl Harbors of the next war and only an adequate air force can defend us.

10. In peace or in war, an adequate air force is our best hope of security—and only an air force of at least 70 groups can be considered adequate.

Hundreds of veterans have written me this week urging Congress to act on preparedness. I support the European recovery plan, the world's greatest air force, revival of selective service, and universal military training in that order.

I pledge my full effort to securing that goal.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Since Passage of ERP a Plan for Federal Union of Democracies Should Be Considered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

the high points of a speech by Mr. Edmund Orgill, a leading citizen and businessman of Memphis, Tenn. Most of us recognize that to sustain a lasting peace, steps other than the ERP are going to be necessary. The Members of Congress, particularly those on foreign relations committees, should now commence giving consideration to plans for bringing the democracies of the world into a definite working agreement for the preservation of peace. A good beginning in this connection would be close consideration of a plan of Clarence Streit for a Federal Union of the Free. Interest and support of this idea is growing rapidly. Many prominent citizens, such as Mr. Orgill, are giving heavily of their time in its espousal. I invite your attention to Mr. Orgill's excellent address:

As you all know, I am a businessman, president of Orgill Bros. & Co., wholesale hardware distributors. I am greatly concerned about the preservation of our individual freedom and personal liberty and the American way of life. And I find a great many others are worried about the same thing.

In almost every newspaper and magazine you pick up there are news items and articles which make you feel that it is going to be a tough fight to preserve our heritage and hand it down to our children.

Do you ask, "Why worry?"

Well, we have seen Soviet Russian communism gobble up central Europe. We have seen its extension into Korea, Manchuria, China. It has made inroads into Finland and Italy. Worse still, fellow travelers are at work in the western European democracies and even in Canada and Australia. And what's worst of all here at home, I doubt if we can stop their propaganda and infiltration by armed force, and I do not believe that we, in the United States, can retain our personal freedoms in a Communist world. The best we could hope for probably would be a military dictatorship—without liberty.

Are there any here who ask "What's the matter with communism?" Who look upon it as just another economic system?

I think not; we all detest it, because it denies completely the dignity of man and the sanctity of the human soul. It allows no individual freedom or personal liberty. Man is the servant of the state; his life is ordered by the state; if he doesn't do what he is told, he is shot and killed. Or he commits suicide.

Now, the reason I am here is because I think I have discovered how we can do something about arresting communism and strengthening true democracy. How we can not only preserve our own personal liberties but even in the course of years extend them to all other people, all over the world.

The answer is contained in the book, Union Now, written by Clarence Streit.

Of equal interest are three articles which appeared in the January issue of the magazine Freedom and Union, which is edited by Streit. One of them is by Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts; another tells how a common currency might be worked out and what its effect would be.

Everything I'm going to say today, everything in the pamphlets, is based on Streit's book, Union Now. It is a remarkable book, and I believe will go down in history as one of the great books on political science.

I hope many of you will read Union Now, because in my talk today I can give you only a few of the main points of this great proposal. It is going to be up to you, to read, and study, and ponder.

You may be interested to know that I first read Union Now at the insistence of my friend, Lucius Burch, who loaned me his copy in July 1946. I read the book and was completely convinced, but was not particularly worried, because I thought Russia could be dealt with and thought we ought to give the UNO a chance. However, I was deeply impressed and wanted to know the author. I wanted him to come to Memphis and talk. These desires were realized last November when he did come to Memphis and made three talks on "The Federal Union of the Free."

As a result, a branch of Federal Union, Inc., has been established in Memphis with 120 members, mostly businessmen, and several of us are actively trying to tell others about it—writing letters, making speeches, doing whatever we can.

This Clarence Streit is a great man—but, with it, completely humble. He is giving his life, fighting for our freedom and his own.

Born in Missouri, graduate of the University of Montana, soldier and officer in World War I, assigned to Versailles during the writing of the treaty, then a Rhodes scholar, then foreign correspondent all over Europe for the Philadelphia Public Ledger and New York Times. He was stationed at Geneva to observe and report on the deliberations of the League of Nations.

The vision of a federal union of the free came to him in 1933, and he delivered a series of lectures at an eastern university, embodying the idea.

He had no money and it took him from 1933 to 1939 to get his book published.

It enjoyed much popularity and caused much discussion in 1939 and 1940.

He starts out with the premise that the thing which we want most to preserve, our greatest heritage, is our individual freedom, the dignity of man. He doesn't even put peace first. He says peace and prosperity will follow. If Hitler had won the last World War, his power would have been so great, over all the world, that he, undoubtedly, could have enforced peace, but certainly, there would have been no individual freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press. We would not have been secure in our own homes. Our lives would have been ordered by the government, we would be living for the glory of the government, and for the glory of the dictators. Yet, there would have been peace.

The question is, "How can these freedoms, which are guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights, be best preserved for us and extended to all mankind"? Streit proposes, a federal union of the free. He proposes that the United States unite with other civil-liberty democracies in a federal union modeled on our Constitution. The democracies, which he suggests our uniting with, are those which have proved most capable of assuring the individual the basic liberties covered by our Bill of Rights. They include the United States, Canada, Britain, Ireland, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, New Zealand, Australia, the Union of South Africa. He admits some of these might not want to join now, and that some others might be included. Undoubtedly some of the Central and South American countries. Perhaps the Philippines might be invited at the start. This would have the advantage of bringing into the union some Asiatic people, and show that no racial barriers were intended. The idea is that the republic, thus formed, would be a nucleus for a world government. The republic would be expected to grow, just as the United States grew from 13 to 48 States. This great union would stay in the United Nations organization in order to work with all countries throughout the world. Eventually when all other nations had joined up, it would supplant the United Nations.

In this new union, you and I would still be citizens of Memphis, and Shelby County, and Tennessee, and the United States of America, but in addition, we would also be citizens of the larger union of the free. We would still elect our local and national officials, but in addition, we would elect representatives to the legislative branch of the union of the free, and have a vote for the union's top executive, or executive council.

A constitutional convention would have to be called, with each of the countries sending delegates. Their job would be to work out a constitution which would assign certain powers to the new union of the free and leave all other powers with the existing governments.

Some of the powers, which probably would be given to the federal union of the free are

1. The sole right to conduct foreign relations.
2. Maintain armed forces.
3. Issue currency.
4. Regulate commerce and communications between member nations.
5. Grant union citizenship.

The union should, of course, have the power to tax and uphold its bill of rights.

If you have never thought about this much, your first reaction might well be, "It's a pipe dream." The countries are too far apart, the people are too diverse in their thinking, they speak different languages.

The people who made up our Thirteen Colonies were just about as diverse in their nationalities, and in their religious beliefs, as the peopole who make up our 14 democracies. They had an awful time, agreeing on a Constitution, and uniting under one Government. Many of the wisest men of that day did not believe it was possible.

Let me read you what Josiah Tucker, dean of Gloucester, had to say:

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchial, it is one of the wildest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived, even by the writers of romance.

"The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of government, habitudes, and manners indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interests. They can never be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever; a disunited people until the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths, or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains."

Patrick Henry, the great patriot, bitterly opposed our union of the free.

The separate Colonies had to turn over to the Federal Government certain powers, and they were not very keen about doing it. But after they did, the country grew and flourished, and you all know very well that this would not have happened if the Colonies had stayed joined only by the Articles of Confederation. If each one had continued to maintain an army and issue currency, if each one had kept in effect the tariffs and trade barriers which they had already set up.

The United States of America is not the only federal union which has worked. Canada is a federal union, as is the Union of South Africa, and also Switzerland. Did you know that there has never been a federal union which failed to work? Did you know that in Switzerland four languages are spoken and the constitution and laws are published in four languages—German, French, Italian, and Romansch?

Now, on the contrary, there has never been a league or confederation which did work. Some of us think of the League of Nations as one of the first leagues, but they have been having leagues almost as far back as you can read in history.

I would like to emphasize the difference between a league and a federal union, which will show you why one works and one doesn't.

A league or an alliance is simply an agreement between two or more sovereign states. If one of the states violates the agreement, there's no way to punish the violator except by war—and war is what you are trying to eliminate. Furthermore, when you try to punish a state by war, you wind up by punishing a lot of innocent people. Now, in a federal union, all of the citizens of the separate states are also citizens of the union, just as we, of Tennessee, are citizens of the United States. The laws of the union are enforced on the individual citizens, and not on the separate states. If there is a violation of any federal law, the violator is hailed into court. Nobody suffers except the guilty individual. It is practically impossible to enforce international law on sovereign states—it is comparatively easy to enforce law on individual citizens.

After Mr. Streit's visit I wrote a good many letters inviting people to join the Memphis branch of Federal Union, Inc., and to read his book Union Now. I received one letter in which the writer said he did not see how any good could come from getting mixed up with a bunch of foreigners who were mostly un-Christian, and who did not believe in democracy and individual freedom. My reply to this gentleman was to suggest that he read the book and note that the people in the countries listed, by and large, have the same beliefs with regard to individual rights as we do. I also suggested that the percentage of Christians in these countries was probably just as great as in the United States.

I do not think there ever would have been a democracy or any talk of the equality of man if our Lord had not sent His Son, Jesus Christ, to come and dwell among us. The value of the individual, human dignity, personal freedom are all based on Christianity and cannot and do not exist except where Christianity is the predominant religion. In my mind the success of any federal union of the free, or any other union, is entirely and completely dependent upon the Christian religion for its foundation.

This Federal Union would be so strong as to make Russia seem a weakling beside it. The power of these few civil-liberty democracies, if united in a Federal Union, would be much greater than all the rest of the world put together.

It would have more productive power, more armed power (including practically all atomic power); it would control from 60 to 96 percent of the essential raw materials. And, more than all this, it would have predominant moral power.

All right, you say; when do we start? I say right now. The Marshall plan is just crying for a Federal Union of the Free to make it really effective.

Listen to this basic passage in the Marshall plan:

"Our policy is directed, not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world, so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. Such assistance must not be on a piecemeal basis. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure, rather than a mere palliative."

A Federal Union of the Free would assure victory in our attack against "hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." It would achieve its first objective, "the revival of a working economy in the world, in which free institutions can exist."

How could it do this?

Well, what is needed?

Think of the world-wide trade possibilities—one currency in this great new Union of the Free—no passports, no visas, no tariffs, no trade barriers—why, American private capital and managerial efficiency would pour into the shattered and obsolete factories in the European democracies.

These freedom-loving states come first, in order to head off communism, while there is yet time—in order to preserve their liberty and freedom—and ours. After that, rebuilding and development of the balance of the world would follow naturally, and in orderly fashion.

A true government would evolve. A world government with freedom for all.

The way I feel about all this, is that we are bound to have some kind of world government sooner or later. Therefore, we ought to be figuring out the kind which will most surely preserve our individual freedom, and what we call the American way of life.

I think—this is it.

What should America do about it now?

No. 1. As a stop-gap or emergency measure, extend aid to Western Europe, as provided in the Marshall plan.

No. 2. As a permanent long-range solution, call a constitutional convention of the democracies possessing our ideals of personal liberty, to work out plans for the Federal Union of the Free.

I hope this will be done while there is time to arrest Communism and prevent another war, rather than wait until communism and another war force us to do it.

Let me read you the words of George Washington. He was chairman of our constitutional convention, when our forefathers were working out our Federal Union of the United States.

They say this is the only speech he made.

"It is too probable, that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we, ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God.

"This is our final opportunity. One more mistake may be the last."

Palestine—Oil Is the Focal Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a remarkable examination of American policy in the Middle East, with particular relation to Palestine and the partition problem, taken from the February-March issue of Palestine, a periodical published by the American Zionist Emergency Council, of 342 Madison Avenue.

I regard this article as authoritative. I do not claim it is impartial. It states the position of Zionist groups in America, and it states it well.

It is my hope that insertion of this article in the RECORD will cause many of you who received this issue of Palestine to examine all the contents. Taken as a whole, this issue is a brilliant exposition of the fallacies which have entered into American policy. Not national security but private property is dictating current policy in the Middle East.

The article follows:

IS PARTITION AGAINST AMERICAN NATIONAL INTEREST?—AN EXAMINATION OF CURRENT ANTIPARTITION PROPAGANDA

Ever since the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the partition plan for Palestine, opponents of the plan have conducted a vigorous campaign aimed at its annulment. As soon as any one of their arguments is refuted by factual developments, a variant is put forward or a new rumor spread. Indeed, the arguments never seem to die even when by all rules of logic they would seem to have been eliminated. For example, while the UN plan was being discussed last autumn, the most frequently heard arguments against it were that American support of partition would lead the Arab countries to aline themselves with Soviet Russia, and would cause King ibn-Saud to cancel the American oil concession in Saudi Arabia.

The facts of the case are, of course, that though the United States did officially support the plan for Palestine partition, no alinement between the Arab States and the Soviet Union has taken place. The Arab rulers are realistic enough to understand that Soviet influence in their lands would lead inevitably to the downfall of their thoroughly autocratic regimes—it is no accident that the Communist Party is outlawed in every one of the Arab States. Nor has King ibn-Saud canceled the oil concession in his territory. Both before and after the UN decision he made repeated public statements to the effect that he has no intention of canceling the concession—will, in fact, provide all necessary protection to keep it functioning normally. Almost the entire budget of Saudi Arabia, it will be recalled, is furnished by the income from oil royalties—a situation paralleled in Iraq.

RED THREAT MYTH

Nevertheless, the threats of a Soviet-Arab alinement and of the loss of Saudi Arabian oil continue to be hurled at the American public, in the hope that those who hear or read them will be ignorant of the facts which refute them. There is a striking parallel in the case of the allegation publicly released by the British Foreign Office in the columns of the New York Times, to the effect that numerous Communist agents were sprinkled among the 12,000 uncertificated Jewish immigrants who sailed from Rumania for Palestine in December. This tale met an uncomfortable fate when the British commander of the Cyprus camps where the immigrants are interned, denied having any knowledge of Communist affiliations among any of the 12,000 immigrants or of Communist literature found, as alleged, among their possessions. Sir Godfrey Collins' statement should have put a swift end to the tale—but it continues to reappear in one version or another. And meantime under wretched conditions masses of Jews flee precipitately from the lands of eastern Europe driven both by the desire for an independent national existence of their own and by the fact that they belong to precisely that lower middle class which is being wiped out by the Communist regimes. In other words the Jews fleeing from eastern Europe are precisely those who are unwilling to live under the Communist-dominated regimes while within Palestine Jewry itself the Communist group is infinitesimal in size and the economy of the community is based partly on cooperative socialism of the western European type and partly on small individual enterprise.

The threat of Communist infiltration into the Middle East through Jewish immigration is only one of the barrage of antipartition arguments now being so widely spread. Over and over again we are told that the unrest caused by the partition plan may have an adverse effect on the flow of middle eastern oil; may lose America the friendship of Arabs and Moslems everywhere; may provide the Soviet Union with a foothold in the Middle East; and may make the establishment of a Jewish state so difficult that it had better be scrapped altogether.

OIL IS FOCAL POINT

Oil is, of course, the focal point. Already, the argument goes, violent Arab reaction to

American support of partition has led to sabotage of the arrangements necessary for the transmission of Middle East oil to Europe. Upon this oil, the argument continues, the success of the Marshall plan for European recovery is dependent. Thus, the salvation of the non-Communist world may be blocked—it is clearly implied—by Zionist aspirations.

What are the facts about Middle East oil and the European recovery program? First of all, production of oil in Saudi Arabia, Bahrein, Iraq, and Egypt goes on unimpeded; new oil fields have just been opened by American concessionaires in Egypt. Plainly, the Arab countries are as eager as ever to obtain maximum oil royalties—royalties which would be curtailed by reduction of the amount of oil produced or piped. The refusal of the Syrian Government to ratify its agreement with regard to the Trans-Arabian pipe line (which, incidentally, is not scheduled to get into full operation until 1950), is often specifically attributed to Syrian opposition to the partition of Palestine. The fact, however, is that the attitude of the Syrian Government is due to a quarrel between Syria and Lebanon as to their respective shares in the pipe-line royalties. Far from wishing to lose a much-needed source of dollar income, the Syrian Prime Minister, Jamil Mardam Bey, is reliably known to have assured American oil officials of eventual consent to the pipe-line agreement, asking the oil men, in return, for help in obtaining American backing for Syria's currency which has just been cut off by the Syrian Government from dependence on the French franc. The pipe line represents 60,000 jobs for Syrians and popular demonstrations against the Government have occurred in an effort to speed ratification of the pipe-line agreement. Interesting evidence as to the Arab States' attitude on the pipe line comes from the Beirut correspondent of Al-Hoda, the New York Arabic daily. In a dispatch sent by air early in March, he reports that Egypt, Syria, and the Lebanon are all vying with each for the pipe-line terminus. Syria has sent a special envoy to King ibn-Saud to ask him to use his influence with the oil companies to the end that the terminus be the Syrian port of Latakieh. Lebanon has already agreed to the use of Sidon as a terminus.

No less an expert on the matter than B. E. Hull, president of the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co., stated on February 13, 1948 (see the New York Herald Tribune), "As 875 miles of the 1,075-mile pipe-line route lie within Saudi Arabia itself, delays nearer the Mediterranean are not expected to delay completion of the line by 1950 as scheduled. Back of the decision to speed up construction in Saudi Arabia, were the public assistances given by King ibn-Saud that American oil activities within his kingdom would be protected regardless of what happened elsewhere. Stable conditions prevailing within Saudi Arabia are reflected in current field reports of steady progress of construction on the off-loading terminal at Ras el Misha'ab on the upper Persian Gulf coast."

OIL WILL FLOW

It may thus quite safely be assumed that unless a new world war interrupts normal communications, the oil of the Middle East will continue to flow to Europe. In the event of war, it should be remembered, formal ownership of oil fields, pipe lines, and refineries is of little account. Accessibility is the thing that matters above all. The Rumanian oil fields in Ploesti were owned mainly by American and British companies, but in World War II, it was Hitler who used their oil, for Ploesti was accessible to Germany and not to the western powers. Similarly, for many crucial months the oil of Iran, Iraq, and other Middle East countries was inaccessible to allied tankers, and American and Caribbean reserves were drawn upon disproportionately. In the light of the length of our line of communication with the Middle East and the fact that Russia is the only great power whose home territory is adjacent to the Middle East, it would seem only prudent not to count on Middle East oil reserves in the event of a major war. For authoritative confirmation of this general statement, see the March 1, 1948 Foreign Policy Report, American Security and Foreign Oil, by Dr. Bernard Brodie, resident professor of the National War College during the war, now associate professor of international relations at Yale University.

Since Arab interest in selling oil to the United States is so obvious and so well known, it is only logical to ask why the oil companies should be so concerned with defeating the partition proposal. That they are working toward that end they have themselves publicly testified. A February 24, 1948, UP dispatch from Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, reads: "In return for ibn-Saud's continued friendship, the officials said, Aramco has redoubled its lobbying efforts in Washington to convince the Government that support of partition might force abandonment of this project potentially the greatest American investment in any foreign country. William A. Eddy, former Middle East expert in the State Department, has been retained by the company to present its case, and the public relations budget has been increased, they said."

The reason for this lobbying activity is not too difficult to understand. The only standard which the owners of the Saudi Arabian concession apply to any Middle East issue or development is its possible effect on the company's business interests and profits. This is the natural approach of the businessman, and, under normal conditions, one could hardly quarrel with it, particularly in the light of the fact that Saudi Arabian oil has already provided many millions in net profit to the Arabian American Oil Co. and is likely to supply many more millions.

ARAMCO WINS

Applying the yardstick of business and profits to the Palestine problem, ARAMCO soon arrived at the conclusion that, as far as it was concerned, Jewish need and hope for national rebirth in their historic homeland was no help and might prove disturbing. Even though concessions to zionism cannot cause ibn-Saud to withdraw the concession, they may put him in a bad mood and compel ARAMCO to placate him by increasing his share in the profits or by other measures. This was enough to make ARAMCO take a hostile attitude toward zionism.

All this is human, and therefore, understandable. But the oil men have gone much further. Over a number of years they have skillfully impressed our policy makers in Washington with the idea that America's national interests are necessarily and always identical with ARAMCO's business interests. This supposed identity of interests between the American people and the Arabian-American Oil Co. was manifestly absent when ARAMCO overcharged the American Navy for petroleum supplies to the tune of many millions of dollars, and when ARAMCO manipulated its affairs so as to deprive the United States Treasury of large sums in corporation taxes—as has been demonstrated before a Senate committee just recently. Men from ARAMCO and its partner corporations were placed in key Government positions where they could promote the companies' interpretation of American national interests in the Middle East. The records of the Special Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program show at least two cases of men who, while in service with the Department of State and with the Petroleum Administration, were at the same time on the pay roll of ARAMCO or of one of the large oil companies controlling ARAMCO. Other men, till recently associated with the Near Eastern policies of the United States Government, are now working for them.

It goes without saying that the national interests of the United States are not necessarily identical with the interests of a private business concern. The whims and preferences of ibn-Saud may be all-powerful with ARAMCO, but to the American Government they should constitute only one of many factors affecting the situation. American foreign policy must be based on an over-all picture of American interests, on established American traditions, on international commitments, on the interests of world peace, and on the United Nations. When the line of demarcation is drawn between American national interests and ARAMCO's interests it becomes apparent that while the United States is interested in the production and export of Middle East oil, it should not be asked to underwrite every private desire of the concession holder.

ANTI-BRITISH FEELING HIGH

American-Soviet agreement on Palestine partition was generally regarded as a fortunate development. The two Great Powers, at loggerheads on every other international issue, found a common approach to one important problem. This augured well for the United Nations, for the prospects of world peace, and for the adequate solution of the Palestine issue. The present rumor, which is so persistently cultivated in certain American and British circles, presenting this American-Soviet concurrence as a devilish device of the Kremlin to make America unpopular among the 80,000,000 Arabs or even the 350,000,000 Moslems in the world, should certainly not be taken seriously. How, indeed, could the Soviet exploit in its own interests the alleged Arab dissatisfaction with the American stand on Palestine, if the Soviet has adopted the same attitude as America?

On another level, it is suggested that in supporting partition, Russia looked forward to chaos in Palestine which would provide an excuse to send Russian troops into that country. Oddly enough, this argument is used by those who oppose any move that would bring to an end the chaotic conditions now prevalent in Palestine. If the American Government is concerned with this contingency, it has only to use its influence, through diplomatic and United Nations channels, to the end that the UN decision be speedily carried out.

On still another level, it is whispered that Arab friendship is essential to us in the event of another war. The fact is that even Great Britain—despite its determined opposition to partition and despite its very outspoken pro-Arab line of policy—cannot boast of having acquired genuine Arab friendship. This is clearly illustrated by events in Iraq, in connection with the recently concluded Anglo-Iraq treaty. Palestine did not figure at all in the bloody riots in Baghdad which forced the Iraqi Government to resign and the Prime Minister to flee the country. It was purely anti-British and anti-foreign sentiment which caused these outbreaks. This despite the fact that Britain piloted Iraq toward early independence; sponsored Iraq for membership in the League of Nations and later in the United Nations; promoted the Arab League; trained Iraq's Army and supplied its armaments.

Another case in point is that of British-Egyptian relations. Anti-British feeling in Egypt is notorious. The Sudan question is only temporarily shelved. It is well understood that on the Sudan issue and on other issues, Egypt will be up in arms against Britain as soon as the Palestine question is disposed of, and irrespective of the manner in which it is solved.

ARABS TAKE GIFTS

From Britain and the United States, both, the Arabs will take as much as they can

get—in money, arms, military training, economic development and political support—and if a world crisis comes, they will, as previously, give little or nothing in return. It was so in the First and Second World Wars, and it will be so if and when a new world conflagration occurs.

That the Arab states are so potent a military factor as to be able to make the existence of a Jewish state impossible is still another notion invalidated by recent history and by simple contemporary facts. The military experts of our Government are certainly aware of the limited military resources of the Arab countries. They cannot help knowing also that a very considerable proportion of those resources are not available for use in Palestine since they are permanently tied down in the task of suppressing ever-present internal dissensions. If the Arabian rioters were deprived of the indirect help which they derive from the attitude of benevolent neutrality assumed by the British, their weakness would become evident. They have, despite that help and despite their thousands of well-armed Syrian and Iraqi troops, not succeeded in overcoming even a single isolated Jewish village.

The arguments of the antipartition campaign are, when analyzed, incapable of confirmation. Whether the campaign is motivated by mistaken partiotic zeal in the case of Americans, by a desire to uphold British imperial rule in the case of Englishmen, by sentimental attachment to the Arabs, by financial self-interest, or simply by a deep-rooted dislike of Jews, cannot easily be established. Different motives may prevail in different cases. What is essential is the realization that the current antipartition campaign does not spring from a detached impartial approach, but represents an attempt to justify a preconceived aversion to the UN decision by using any and all arguments that may come to hand.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about the serious threat to the entire livestock industry of the United States which the foot-and-mouth disease situation in Mexico has caused. Certainly it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish not to do everything possible now to prevent this disease from spreading into this country.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association at their seventy-first annual convention in El Paso, Tex., on March 17–18, 1948:

It is regretfully true that the enormity and the gravity of the problem that we face because of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico is not realized by the American people. The false impression that this problem is peculiar to the livestock industry and even localized on the border area is all too prevalent. This problem is of national significance and bears upon all sections of the country as well as upon all phases of our economy because it is a direct threat to the American—which now means the world's—food supply. We hope that the genuine universality of this danger will become known to all of the American people because we believe that from such knowledge will come strength to solve the problem.

Because of our single purpose which is to protect our country from the disaster that foot-and-mouth disease brings, we, the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, in annual convention assembled in El Paso, Tex., do hereby adopt the following resolution:

"1

"We state it to be a fact that not only are the American people entitled to, but it is necessary that they should at all times be given, full, complete, and entirely accurate information concerning foot-and-mouth disease, its characteristics, and the full significance of what an outbreak of the disease in our own country would be. The American people should likewise be given the same type of information concerning all developments in the program being conducted in Mexico in conjunction with the Mexican Government. This problem is of grave national and international concern, is public in its nature, and no part of the true facts should be concealed or withheld. Any agencies of our Government possessing information concerning the problem or the program should immediately pass all of that information on to the public with complete frankness and accuracy.

"2

"We wish to express our gratitude and appreciation to the entire Congress of the United States for its intelligent comprehension of the seriousness of the foot-and-mouth problem, and we commend the Congress for the thoroughness and speed with which it enacted all legislation requested for the purpose of combatting the foot-and-mouth disease problem. Especially do we appreciate and commend the fine and effective work done by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, known as the Gillie committee, for its study of the problem and its report to the Congress. We further express our keen appreciation of the wholehearted and intelligent action of the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate in handling legislation in connection with making available the funds necessary to fight the disease and protect our country. In this matter the entire Congress truly and intelligently represented and acted for the welfare of the entire country and the good of the people.

"3

"This association has heretofore on several occasions urged that the Department of Agriculture enter upon a program of scientific research into foot-and-mouth disease. We are aware of the fact that the Department of Agriculture now desires to institute a research program for the close study of foot and mouth disease in all its aspects, and we fully endorse such purpose, but, at the same time, we respectfully suggest that such belated study and research can be of very little, if any, value in the present emergency fight to eradicate the disease from Mexico, though it would undoubtedly be of value in years to come. We are aware that the Department of Agriculture has requested legislation of the Congress to enable it, at its discretion, to establish such research laboratory in the continental United States. We have not forgotten the lessons taught us for many years by the Department of Agriculture, its experts, and by other scientists, and we greatly fear that if such research into foot-and-mouth disease be conducted in the continental United States the fact that such research and experimentation would have to be done with the active, live virus would constitute a serious danger to our industry from a possible outbreak of the disease induced by such virus escaping from the control of the researchers. We, therefore, reiterate our previously expressed position that we are opposed to such research being conducted within the continental limits of the United States, and hope that the importation of the live virus in any form or through any medium will be prohibited. But we do express our hope that such research work outside the United States be authorized and provision be made therefor.

"4

"We are regretfully aware of the fact that the patrol of the international boundary line for the protection of this country against the infiltration of foot-and-mouth disease is now and has at all times been inadequate and ineffective. We urge that this patrol of our border be so strengthened and improved that it will be impossible for contraband livestock or other commodities to cross the boundary line or be brought into this country.

"5

"The canning program being rapidly developed in the northern States of Mexico is proving to be a valuable and effective method for the disposal of large numbers of surplus cattle in that area. The full protection of this presently uninfected area and the recognition of the necessity for providing a market for the livestock of these Mexican States situated north of the quarantine line is essential to a well-considered plan of eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. We commend the Department of Agriculture of the United States and all of its agencies employed in the program for the efficient and aggressive handling of this phase of the eradication work. And we further state that this particular project is so vital to the entire program that we insist that contracts for the purchase of canned meats from the named area be extended beyond the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

"6

"The position of this association on the foot-and-mouth disease problem is the same now that it has been at all times. That disease must be eradicated. Its presence upon the North American Continent cannot be tolerated. The respective economies of the United States and of the Republic of Mexico cannot bear the burden of having this disease fastened on any place on the continent, nor will the safety of the food supply of the world permit such strain to exist.

"We deeply regret that efforts to secure eradication of the disease in Mexico have not been successful. We realize that large sums of money have been expended by our country in the effort at eradication without success but we know that eradication must be accomplished. Not until such eradication has been effected will we be able to breathe with relief and face our responsibility of producing food for the world with any degree of confidence.

"It is our recommendation that a sincere fight to eradicate the disease be kept up constantly. We recommend that those officials upon whom rests the responsibility for the conduct of this fight concentrate their efforts to eradicate the disease by following a carefully planned program that will have ultimate success.

"First and foremost we recommend that the northern quarantine line in Mexico be developed into a genuine quarantine line. We fear that the present effort to maintain this northern quarantine line is not adequate. We cannot urge too strongly that such quarantine line, which is the outer defense for our country, be rigidly and hermetically maintained.

"We recommend that the responsible officials actually secure the adoption of the suggestions made by the Congress of the United States, which suggestions are also the suggestions of the official Advisory Committee, and that a qualified person be selected and appointed to manage and control the entire program and that such person be clothed with full authority to conduct the campaign.

"We recommend that, between the northern quarantine line and the zone of infection a buffer zone be established and that all necessary steps, including slaughter and burial of any livestock that might become infected or directly exposed to infection in that zone and the judicious use of the best available vaccine, be adopted to keep such buffer zone free of infection. In the event of an outbreak above the quarantine line we recommend the immediate slaughter and burial on the spot of all infected and exposed livestock in that area and a complete quarantine of such zone of outbreak.

"We recommend that constant effort be made to eradicate the disease within the zone of infection beginning at the northern edge of such zone and progressing southward. In such effort every available method must be used. Where practicable slaughter and burial of infected and exposed livestock should be conducted. And, whenever the circumstances justify such method, use of vaccine and localized quarantine and isolation of stock and premises, having in mind that, at all times, the slaughter and burial method is the only proven method of successful eradication and the education of the affected people should not be neglected, and whenever an area shall have been determined to have been cleaned of infection then restock such area, moving the southern quarantine line of the buffer zone so as to incorporate such cleaned area within such buffer zone. By such constant and serious pressure on the infection it is hoped and believed that the infection can gradually but surely be eradicated from all parts of our neighboring Republic and the danger to our own country and to the world's food supply can be eliminated.

"It is our very sincere and earnest hope that the two nations involved, the United States and the Republic of Mexico, and all officials, representatives and the agents of these two countries will never lose sight of the ultimate objective—the freeing of the North American Continent from the curse of the infection of foot-and-mouth disease. It is likewise our hope that the conduct of this campaign will be such that it will cement mutual friendship and respect between the governments and the peoples. And it is our hope and trust that the effort to prevent the further spread of the disease toward the international boundary line between the two countries will be successful, but we fear that, unless greatly strengthened, such will not be the result. And any spread of the disease north of the present quarantine line will constitute an increased danger that will necessitate this country strengthening its defenses at the boundary line.

"In the event of such a spread north of the present quarantine line—which we hope will not happen—then it is our recommendation that, in order to provide the then greatest available degree of security for our country and for the food supply of our people and of the world, it will be necessary to close the international boundary line to all traffic and commerce until such time as the same may be resumed with security and safety."

Bull Shoals—To Comrades in Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Bull Shoals—To Comrades in Council," by W. E. Freeland, which appeared in the Taney County Republican, printed at Forsyth, Mo., of Thursday, March 25, 1948.

W. E. Freeland is known both personally and through his eminent writings by many Members of this House. His plea with his people to be fair in dealing with our Government is worthy of note, particularly in these times when too many people have been imbued with the erroneous idea that the Government should support the people. He vividly portrays some of the picturesque, honest, sincere, and understanding Americans, who settled in the Ozarks and builded well.

The editorial follows:

BULL SHOALS—TO COMRADES IN COUNCIL

(W. E. Freeland)

The building of Bull Shoals Dam suggests a spirit council meeting that we may draw from each of us his best and measure by that testing weight our own decision.

We turn reluctant feet to a tryst that competent auhority has decided we must hold. We did not seek that tryst. But this is our country and its proper decision commands our acceptation without any bitterness or any cherishing of grief.

Tonight, as the machine with unfeeling mechanical regularity responds to give the lettered words wherewith I try to give my thought to you, comrades living and comrades dead stand about me to give the counsel of their lives.

Let me heed the voices no longer tuned to winged words but voices still that thunder out of the spirit silence.

From a quarter of a century ago I hear Uncle Bill Boyd speaking counsel that we need in this time of the keeping of our tryst.

It was the first time I ever offered my name for public office. My opponent had made a speech at Walnut Shade in which he had told the voters if they desired a farmer to represent them to vote for him; if they wished a newspaper man, to vote for me. Uncle Bill's comment rang like an angel's harp from the choir of heaven as he said "I thought that when we elect a representative that we elect a man to represent all of the people."

During the 16 years it was my privilege to try to represent you, my comrades, in the Missouri general assembly this comment of Uncle Bill Boyd was engraved upon my soul. I dared not consciously fail when such a comrade rested his faith in me; it was a command to utmost of my worth.

In that gone day another comrade lived who stands by me tonight. Once in a school election as he went to vote, Jim Weatherman noticed one of the candidates for a place on the school board was an election judge. Jim looked at the man sternly and said, "You, a candidate and an election judge." Then laying his ballot for the man to see he quietly marked his name off of the ballot. The courage of Jim Weatherman for simple fitness commands my worth.

Who can recall that editorial of 25 years ago when I told of Uncle John McGill riding from the Mincy community through a cold and drizzling rain to discharge a civic duty for which there was no pay—for the doing of which no law except the command of his own conscience? Still, I hear him, on another occasion coming to me and saying he had been deceived and had made an error and asking how he might undo the mistake. He is with me tonight.

The spirit of Uncle Lee Fine steps from the silence of gone days. His quiet firm spirit voice is speaking as it did to me in the past. Well do I remember an instance he told me of when he was foreman on a jury and petty selfishness, little beyond words, was standing across the path of justice. With unassuming frankness he told me of the instance and what had happened in that jury room. Knowing the earnest integrity of Uncle Lee Fine it was simple to understand how his character had shamed one man out of petty littleness and into truth.

The Lee Fine homestead will lie beneath the lake water on the Bull Shoals Dam but no covering darkness can deny me the counsel of his life. The spirit handclasp of Lee Fine abides with me and demands my worth.

How eagerly in the lost time did I look for the visit of Uncle Jink Blankenship. No darkness was so rough with sorrow and disappointment but he could smooth away the roughness and win from it a smile. Grief and blood ties close as life itself could not tear him away from justice. In the darkest hour of sorrow when his son, Edgar, had been acquitted for killing Ol Hart, Uncle Jink talked to me from the deeps of a suffering heart. He told me the sorrow had robbed him of years of life; that though he believed his son had been aggravated into hot blood and had just claim to have that considered that he did not think he should have escaped all penalty. That was the sense of justice of Uncle Jink Blankenship.

How faithfully he attends me still and how his cheerful voice rings true out of the spirit silence to demand my worth.

I could summon other comrades, living and dead, until the pages of this paper would overflow. But let these do. Every reader will remember one or more of them. In this tryst let us be mindful of their high character; let us merit their living spirit presence in this hour.

These comrades command us to put away disappointment; deny any bitterness entrance into our hearts. They call upon us to come to our tryst with accepting reason in our mind.

We are not entitled to any profit in our settlement, we are not supposed to suffer any loss.

The Little Rock office is proceeding with promptness to help to lessen so far as may be the harshness that cannot be avoided in such a project as the Bull Shoals Dam. The settlement will present difficulties. The Government must buy what we did not wish to sell. The conscience of the Nation commands that we be given just compensation.

The limitations of all human endeavor will set certain restrictions. A friend of mine, one of the most successful newspapermen in the State said to me not long ago in St. Louis:

"Of course, you will be paid for the loss of business due to your having to move."

I said, "No."

Then with great emphasis he said:

"Why that's not fair, you will be damaged, and you know and everyone knows you will be damaged in loss of business by having to move."

This earnest friend of mine had not studied the limitations of humanity. I know I shall lose and lose heavily by the necessity of change. I shall suffer anxiety, a great many trials will come up, I will have to neglect business, have already had to do it; the very necessity to take counsel with the conscience of my country as expressed by the courts has cost me much.

But I am commanded to remember that speculative damages are not a part of just compensation. The courts can set no rule by which they can be determined. The spirit comrades counsel us to remember it is our duty to understand what rule abides as we approach our tryst.

Fundamentally the rule of just compensation is what a willing buyer will pay an owner willing to sell. The determination of that is not always simple in detail. The human limitation applies, yet as to land, it is the fundamental guide; and here again, technically speaking the land is all the Government

buys. But this again is confusing. Practically, and in common speech, it is not so understood. The Government pays for improvements because the improvements enhance the value of the land.

Again as to the value of improvements we are entitled to be restored, as nearly as practical, as we are. Again the human factor enters but, generally, perhaps, a more accurate determination of the value of improvements is possible than that of land in Taney County. In a country of uniform soil and topography it is usually possible to arrive at what a willing buyer would pay to an owner willing to sell. It is not so simple in the hill country with irregular contours and wide range in productive value. We must approach this with reason expecting that we will be met with fairness. Let us set our minds in order as the first step. Let us try to consider what we would have taken if we had been willing to sell. If we can so command ourselves it will be a most persuasive plea with the Government to be careful to deal justly, considering that the spirit of the law is what heals hurts such as ours and that the overemphasis of the letter of the law may be brutal and so may leave lasting bitterness in the heart. Just as the humanitarian principles of the last clear chance commands every law, to which it may apply, regardless of the silence of the cold words of the print, so in this the right to be restored as you are commands every word in the law of just compensation so far as it is possible to apply this rule.

For the sake of illustration I have frequently stated the absurdity that if there be a rotten board in your improvement you are entitled to have that restored. That is to show that we must accept actual depreciation; we would not be entitled to a new board but we would be entitled to a rotten board restored. Let no one treat this absurdity seriously, it is merely to illustrate the principle.

The Government has the right to assume that we will have advised ourselves sufficiently to understand when it states fundamental principles. Failure to so understand may bring tragic confusion. One simple statement, several times made by Government representatives, has resulted in such grave confusion it should be mentioned.

Several times Government officials have stated that public buildings have no sale value. What they mean is that such are not bought and sold and so there is no rule for determining what a willing seller would take and a willing buyer would give. The rule of replacement "as is" would control in such a building.

To my amazement I have discovered this simple and correct statement of the officials has been so misunderstood that a rumor is out over the country that Taney County will get no pay for the courthouse because the Government officials have said it has no value. This rumor has already brought so much disquietude that it seems best to challenge it and to say we will get for the courthouse what competent appraisers judge it would cost to build such a structure now less actual depreciation. Note the word "actual" for here again confusion exists because a rumor exists that a fixed and arbitrary depreciation will be set so as to deny us any worth-while compensation for the courthouse. That is not true. If a structure has been properly repaired and maintained it might have little actual depreciation so far as just compensation is concerned. Again and again the courts have held that restoration as nearly as practical as you are, will govern.

The rumor is out that Taney County will have to vote a bond issue for a courthouse. That depends entirely upon what Taney County wishes to do. We have no right to ask the Government for a new courthouse with electric elevators and furnace heat; we do not have that now. If we wish that in the new courthouse then it will be for us to decide. If we are satisfied to have the same courthouse we have now then there will be no need of a bond issue.

The Government officials have the right to assume that we will correctly understand the statement of principles such as they made regarding public buildings. It is our duty to understand.

Improvements put on the land with the intention they shall be a part of the land enhance its value.

A well and pump and water lines, or a hydraulic ram and water lines are a part of the land and will be included in its value. A portable wood saw would not be part of the land.

For land far removed from the highway and with poor access we are not to expect as much for the same land on a good highway and with convenient access. On the other hand a well and water system on a farm off a highway might be of more value than the same equipment on land easy to access because it cost more to install it and the owner is entitled to be restored as nearly as practical as he is.

If the counsel of Bill Boyd, Jim Weatherman, John McGill, Lee Fine, and Jink Blankenship can rule our conduct in dealing with the Government its worth must persuade fairness. It is my hope that everyone will be able to approach the tryst with such good reason that no taking, other than possible technical title doubts will be necessary.

Problems will arise that will require considerate patience on the part of the Government as well as reasonableness on our side.

The Little Rock office has given convincing evidence of its earnest desire to be not only fair but to be helpful. In the course of our settlements we chance to have a jarring note I am certain proper appeal will correct that. I had one annoying experience in my settlement with the company when the Taneycomo Dam was built. As Mr. Zwart and I went over the land there was a long stretch with good timber between the 705 and 715 foot contour levels. (The dam was buying to 715 feet). Mr. Zwart agreed to drop the take line to 705 feet along this part on my giving a release to any flood damage between the 705-foot and the 715-foot levels.

When the crew came in to clear they started to cut to 715 on my place. They ignored my request to stop. I went to see Mr. Zwart and he told me not to let them cut the timber. He said to see Mr. Kennedy at the dam who had the construction in charge. (Mr. Zwart was in Branson.)

When I got to the dam Mr. Kennedy, the engineer in charge, was away. The young man in the office was burdened with responsibility. With arrogance befitting Joe Stalin he told me to go back and read my deed and a few other equally discourteous remarks. It was useless to talk to the young man. I went home unhappy but smiling at the burdened vanity of the youth. The next day I returned saw Mr. Kennedy and things were corrected. I found Mr. Kennedy fair and courteous and considerate.

Let this be a light if any problem does arise.

Treasures of spirit comradeship enrich my life with sustaining happiness and strength that abides beyond the mortal hour. In the time of honor or of need it clings as a shadow that nothing can take away but the possible cloud of my own unworthiness.

Spirit comrades of the past and those of the present are with me as I try to write. Whatever of merit has attended my endeavor has been the reflection of your counsel at your best. Not the petty selfish strivings, not the little bickerings of the hours; no, that is not you. The you I try to read in spirit is the you of such men as I have named.

Let me be worthy of such comrades as I approach the hour of settlement. Let me seek no advantage of the public's decreed necessity. Let reason master anxiety and my troubled emotions; let me walk the path, right thinking; let me remember that incidental wrongs must be suffered with no bitterness; let me be true to the worth of comrades dead and comrades living who have honored me with their faith. Then I may rightly expect fairness and considerate courtesy from all those whom the Government may choose to deal with me.

In our relations with the Government we have had all courtesy; far more, we have had understanding sympathy. That, I am certain, will continue. No such bitterness shall cloud our way as has come to some. When all is over we shall live with happy associations such as I remember of my settlement of years ago with the company that built the Taneycomo Dam.

It would be the greatest grief to me to have this community cherish such bitter memories as come to me from the Wappapello country. Responsible people who have read of the Bull Shoals Dam have written me words that sear my heart with sorrow such feelings can endure against my Government. Nor has it been that alone. Others even from the far West tell similar instances. Inept dealing has engendered harsh memories that bleed and burn. Why such came to be is not for me to say. It must not come to us. The considerate grace of the Little Rock office confirms assurance such shall not be. Let us resolve for our part to merit that grace.

The Little Rock office has sought—is seeking—so far as lies within the sphere of its activity—to pluck away the stones and thorns that beset our path in the keeping of this unhappy tryst or ours. If, perchance, we do meet some one of the personnel who like the youth I met before is burdened by his authority to the hindrance of right thinking, let us remember that proper appeal can reach those who accept responsibility as duty, not as a servant of vanity. For one who accepts authority as the handmaiden of vanity let us have a smile, assured that such will be properly rebuked by patience on our part.

There is ample evidence the Little Rock office will not tolerate any such mistaken use of authority if it comes to its attention.

We have the future; in it we must play our part, helpfully, as we may, constructively critical if that seems right. Taney County will have a hard way to travel to recover. We must suffer; let us rise to create opportunities that will mitigate our loss. How, that is not for me to answer; only may it be given me to play my little part as the years may spare me strength. One constructive thing most earnestly I hope to see, considered, at least, if not begun. That is the terracing of our country. If the old Inca Indians with only hand tools of stone could terrace the harsh sides of the Andes is it not shameful that we let our soil go unhindered to the sea?

Now I have done. Let worthy resolve repel repining and uplifted head banish sorrow. Let me seek just compensation for no selfish end but that I may rebuild the implements of community service that must be lost. After all, they were but mine for use for good; at best nature would give me lease of them but little longer. Now it is my hope—nay, more, my prayer—that it may be granted me to restore these to leave to younger hands than mine to use. So far as it has been in me these implements have been devoted to comradeship service; it has been my part to you, the payment of my debt to your sustaining faith and abiding confidence. Sometimes when my soul was weary and faintness of heart slowed my pace to leaden steps—then you have stepped beside me to command my effort. You do not, cannot, know what you have meant to me through all these years. You do not know how you have stood beside me, unknowing, perhaps, in spirit in the night even when you slept while I tried at the machine

here to put into words the worth your spirit owns. In the silence of the sleep time you have been my strength. Now as we go to keep this tryst let us strive to banish anxiety—will you, as always you have done, abide with me in all sustainment and may it be granted me to abide with you in equal worth. You who are of younger days march forward with face upturned to meet the challenge of the years; you of strength of middle life bear well the burdens of the hour and let us of the backward glance to the idealized past turn forward with strong resolve to give the counsel of the age-taught to aid in the ordered progress of humanity to its highest destiny.

"No, at noonday in the bustle of man's worktime
Greet the unseen with a cheer!
Bid him forward, breast and back as either should be,
Strive and thrive! 'cry speed—fight on, fare ever
There as here!'"

So like the fabled Phoenix may we rise from the ashes to a brighter and a better community.

Dilemma in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission given by the House today, I place in the RECORD a statement of the situation in Germany, which the administration has been ignoring as completely as it ignored the facts of Palestine for so long—and with equal or greater perils. It follows:

THE TWO GERMAN GOVERNMENTS

(By Walter Lippmann, in the Washington Post of April 12, 1948)

Last Wednesday the British military governor, Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, addressed the Parliament of the German state of North Rhine-Westphalia, which includes the Ruhr. The address had been approved by Mr. Bevin and must be taken also as a declaration of what has now become our own German policy.

There is to be a German Central Government in Frankfurt, set up with Anglo-American support, which is to compete with another German central government, to be set up in Berlin or Leipzig, with Russian support. Both German Governments will then claim that they represent the unity of Germany, and a contest will be waged by the two German Governments to win the support of the masses of the German people.

According to this policy the Frankfurt government will, on the one hand, work for reunion with the eastern Germans, and on the other hand, it will administer western Germany as an integral and essential part of the European recovery program and of the western union.

MUST GERMANY FIGHT OR DEAL?

It would be easier to feel confidence in the success of the Anglo-American policy if it were not that for at least 2 years, and openly since the Molotov statement of July 1946, it has been the aim of the Soviet Union to make itself the champion of German unity under a German central government.

Presumably the Russians would not have initiated this contest for German unity if they had not felt reasonably confident that it was a contest which they could win.

So we must hope that the British Government, which made the present policy, and the American Government which has come around to it, know what they are doing, and have not committed themselves irretrievably without a very clear idea of how this struggle for Germany is to be conducted. They have had ample and repeated warning from Europeans and from Americans who know Europe and Germany and the history of German-Russian relations.

Conceivably General Robertson is right when he says that "these are strange times * * * they have no parallel in history." But he would do well to bear in mind the saying that those who do not learn from the experience of history are doomed to repeat it.

When, for example, he told the Germans "to make the best of the largest part of your country which is on the right side of the 'iron curtain' * * * the rest will come in time," he was telling the Germans that "the rest"—that is not only the Soviet zone of what is now Germany but also the lost provinces in the east—will be restored to them.

By whom? By Great Britain and the United States? Or by the Soviet Union?

The answer to these questions is the crux of the German problem. No German can possibly talk about German unity, and not mean by that the restoration of most, if not all, the territory behind the front of the Red Army.

Now what is the situation, then, of the Frankfurt government which we are dedicating to the restoration of German unity?

Is it not that to get back eastern Germany it must either fight Russia or make a deal with Russia?

If the Frankfurt Germans ally themselves with the western powers in order to get back eastern Germany, they can get it back only as a result of war in which Russia and Poland were defeated. Germany would be a principal battlefield of such a war. On the other hand, Mr. Molotov is also offering them German unity. Mr. Molotov, however, can, if he decides to do it, give them back the eastern lands. For he has them and Mr. Bevin does not have them.

So despite General Robertson's idea that these times have no parallel in history, the parallel of the repeated German-Russian agreements from Frederick the Great to Hitler will inevitably occur to the Germans and to the Russians.

WHO CAN DELIVER WHAT?

It will be advisable, therefore, to begin thinking now how we propose to win this struggle between our German government at Frankfurt and the coming Soviet's German government in Berlin or Leipzig. We have now promised the Germans unity. The Russians have promised them unity. We have promised them the one thing which, without a world war, it is not in our power to give them. The Russians have promised them the very thing which only Russia can in fact give them. Russia can by a treaty of peace with its Berlin government cede back the lost territory. And then what would the Frankfurt government do?

Perhaps some one will explain, though no one has as yet, how Mr. Bevin expects to win this contest.

One thing, however, we can surely expect. The Frankfurt government, dedicated to German unity but unable to bring about German unity, will have to find some way of winning and holding the Germans against the obvious temptations which will be spread out before them by the Communists, the nationalists, and the Soviet Government.

Unable to achieve German unity, they will have to produce prosperity. But that prosperity will have to be subsidized by the United States. For it is unattainable if Germany is not reunited and if a reunited Germany cannot restore its prewar trade with eastern Europe.

This policy, which we have accepted on the theory that it will get Germany off the backs of our taxpayers, is in fact much more likely to compel our taxpayers to wage the struggle for Germany with more and more dollars.

For having promised the Germans unity, which we cannot give them, what substitutes shall we offer the Germans, except more dollars, for the political promise that we cannot carry out?

Tennessee Steam Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waterbury (Conn.) American of April 9, 1948:

TENNESSEE STEAM POWER

Senators and Representatives from all industrial States would do well to take a little time from their concentrated attention on foreign affairs at Washington to make a true evaluation of the new move of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It now wants Government funds to construct a steam-power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. To set its project under way it asks $4,000,000, but indicates that the plant will cost $54,000,000 and this is only the beginning of far greater expenditures.

Connecticut should particularly awake to what is going on. Ever since the Tennessee Valley power development was put into operation at government expense the State of Tennessee has been advertising the advantages of cheap power there is an inducement to get industries to move in from other parts of the Nation. It is cheap power all right. It has been made cheap at the expense of the rest of the country.

The Edison Electric Institute, privately owned, business managed, reports paying 3.10 mills per kilowatt hour in taxes in 1947. The TVA charged an average rate of 3.17 mills per kilowatt hour to their industrial customers, according to its report of the same year. Private industry cannot compete with Government-financed and tax-eased industry. Unless the Government set-up pays interest rates on the investment and fair taxes, it isn't any good, even as a so-called measuring rod for fair charges for power.

Our own Naugatuck Valley is engaged in the manufacture of brass, a metal that competes with steel and aluminum. Our manufacturers ask no special favors. They look only for fair competition. Among the big companies in the Tennessee Valley, profiting by this Government power subsidy, are the Reynolds Metal Co., and the Aluminum Co. of America. Can anyone think of any reason why these and others down there should be operating under this Government financial umbrella?

Why, in all fairness, should the industries of Connecticut be obliged to pay into Government coffers taxes that are used to provide cheap electric power for companies that will use this subsidy to make a sale rate with which Connecticut must strain to compete, or cannot compete? Why should Connecticut find its efforts to keep old industries and its invitation to new ones to locate here frustrated by the fact that Government

kindness makes Tennessee a more profitable location?

The same principle applies when the question is raised in any of our industrial States as against this favored Tennessee. The Government has done too much already. It excused its first move there as primarily a damming against floods and secondarily a power-creating project. Steam power plant building cannot thus be camouflaged. Further expansion should be killed by Congress.

Central Intelligence Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of April 11, 1948:

BROWN SEEKS TO KNOW IF INTELLIGENCE AGENCY GAVE REVOLT WARNING

Representative BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, yesterday demanded to know whether United States intelligence operatives warned Secretary of State Marshall of a revolution brewing in Colombia.

Mr. BROWN said the Central Intelligence Agency should have known the attendance of General Marshall and other American officials at the Bogota Conference "might endanger their lives and bring great embarrassment to the United States Government."

"The whole affair has been a sad spectacle of no benefit to this Nation in the cold war now being waged with communistic forces," he said in a statement.

Mr. BROWN called in Chairman HOFFMAN of the House Expenditures Committee for a prompt investigation of the Intelligence Agency. It was set up last year by Congress.

He said the agency was created for the exact purpose of keeping top American officials advised as to the activities in foreign countries which might in any way affect or endanger the welfare of this Nation.

"Surely our State Department officials would have insisted on the South American conference being held elsewhere if they had been informed a bloody revolution was impending in Bogota and Colombia, and that they and other Americans would be forced to barricade themselves to preserve their lives and to be deprived of food and communication with the outside world," Mr. BROWN said.

"It is about time the Congress and the American people learn the facts or reasons behind our ineptness in the conduct of our foreign relations."

The Loyalty Probe Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle published an editorial on March 1, 1948, that we should all stop and read.

Charges of disloyalty are indiscriminately hurled at loyal public employees. These charges often emanate from sources that make good news.

Because they are generally leveled at some inarticulate group, the opportunity to repudiate such charges, or to obtain publicity showing they are without basis is negligible.

The conservative, though eminently fair, San Francisco Chronicle has chosen, on the basis of the record, to take up the fight for Government workers.

Here is its editorial:

THE LOYALTY PROBE RECORD

Of 84,923 Federal employees investigated for loyalty up until last December 10, it is now disclosed that J. Edgar Hoover has reported to a congressional committee that the FBI found reason to suspect exactly 143.

Of the 143, only 6 investigations had been completed at that time. Of the six, two had been cleared and four had resigned.

Thus it turns out, on the findings of expert investigators that an actuarial group of Federal employees contains more than 99.8 percent whose records do not justify further investigation of their loyalty.

These figures contain sweeping rebuttal of the nonsense that communism is surging through our society—to such utterances, for instance, as that of Edward Flynn, who professed to see a great Communist menace in the fact that Henry Wallace's man had carried one chronically leftist district in New York after a campaign in which leftism was by no means the only issue.

For if there was a Communist surge in the land, we submit, it would inevitably have been exposed in the expert investigation of nearly 85,000 Federal employees. If there were a substantial number of Communists in the country, a certain percentage would have succeeded in getting Federal jobs, for obvious conspiratorial purposes, and the percentage would have been far greater than the one-sixth of 1 percent who have failed to get FBI clearance. So much for the Communist surge in America, which we have contended all along existed only in hysterical mentalities entirely out of touch with America.

As to hysteria, Mr. Hoover made a point of telling the committee that the FBI's findings proved that the agency was following conservative evidential practice instead of witch-hunting, and the figures do bear this out indisputably; no group of investigators can be accused of witch-hunting when it bags one suspect out of every 600 cases considered. We are sure, however, that Mr. Hoover does not mean that his investigators leaned over too far backward. We take it that he means they went right down the middle, and we are sure this was so.

Mr. Hoover's report should do a great deal of good. It should bring the Communist matter into proper perspective generally and make it harder for hysterical or disingenuous elements in Congress to stir up another national Red scare, leaving all of us with more energy to turn toward real and unsolved problems. It should reassure everyone about the run of ordinary Americans, of whom 85,000 Federal employees are a fair cross section. It should go far toward restoring morale among Federal employees themselves, who cannot be blamed if the furore which attended the investigation's inception caused them to fear for the fairness with which it would be carried out.

We said at the outset that alertness to possible alien loyalties in Government service, particularly in certain vital arms, was the part of minimum prudence and decried only the demoralizing and obscuring hullabaloo. The FBI seems to have refused to be stampeded by all the shouting and to have conducted the investigation to date in a sane and scrupulous manner. Mr. Hoover and his staff have thereby done the Nation an outstanding service.

Montana Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am placing in the RECORD a compilation of the various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions extended to veterans under the laws of the State of Montana.

For the benefit of veterans I am happy to put this information at their disposal. This material was made available to me by the Honorable Millard W. Rice, of the national headquarters of the Disabled American Veterans, to whom it had previously been forwarded by the Montana Department of the Disabled American Veterans. May I extend my congratulations to the Disabled American Veterans of the Department of Montana for the fine job they have done in compiling this information and making it available to the veterans of Montana.

The compilation follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for burial of veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field. It is the duty of the county veterans' burial supervisor.

The county may apply to the United States for a suitable headstone. A county allowance is provided for the purpose of having the stone set up.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Depositions of servicemen may be taken.

Privileges and immunities granted to owners of livestock serving in the armed forces during World War II are preserved in conformity with the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting are provided.

Persons receiving Government compensation for disability received while serving with the armed forces of the United States during the World War are exempt from jury duty.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Honorable discharges are recorded by the county clerk free of charge.

A veterans' welfare commission has been established with State-wide service to veterans.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Free fees and tuition are provided at units of the State university.

Honorably discharged persons are entitled to free tuition and fees in any unit of the University of Montana, including the law and medical departments.

Training is provided to practice cosmetology and hairdressing by the State and Federal vocational rehabilitation units.

A veteran's welfare fund has been established, one of the purposes of which is to provide for the education and training of World War veterans.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed in action or died from other causes while serving in the armed forces of the United States during World War I between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921. Amount: $250 maximum per year per child.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Preference is given in appointment as veterans' burial supervisor.

Preference is given to veterans in public departments and on public works of State and local units, as well as on Federal-aid public works projects.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act, teachers' retirement system (including Red Cross), and highway patrolmen's retirement system.

Officers and employees of the State and local units must be reinstated without loss of seniority or insurance benefits. Application must be made within 40 days after being relieved from military duty.

State and civil employees must be reinstated without loss of seniority or insurance benefits upon completion of military service.

Veterans are exempt from age limits for appointment to municipal police force. War service is counted in the period of service qualifying for police retirement.

Jobs and employment for World War veterans are secured through the veterans' welfare fund.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Guardianship Act has been enacted providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives, or widows may be admitted to the soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Veterans have priority in admission to the State tuberculosis sanitarium.

Request has been made for funds for additional facilities at the Federal hospital at Fort Harrison.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDINGS, ETC.

Provision has been made for construction and furnishing of a building as an adjunct to the State capitol building to be known as the Montana Veterans' and Pioneers Memorial Building.

RECORD, RELICS, ETC.

An appropriation of $1,000 has been for the presentation of the national colors and regimental flags to the 163d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks and building and loan associations may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

A welfare fund and commission have been created.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Veterans' organizations are exempt from certain exhibition license fees.

Collection of tax upon the income of persons in the military service is deferred.

Benefits received through war risk insurance or other aid received by disabled members of the military or naval forces of the United States, or their dependents, are exempt from income tax.

Certain World War veterans are exempt from poll tax.

Exemption is granted from payment of professional and occupational license fees while in the military service and for six months after discharge.

Nurses are exempt from annual fee during military service.

Collection of any property tax may be deferred on court order.

Certain property of veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

Property in the possession of legal guardians of incompetent veterans of the World War, or minor dependents of such veterans, is exempt from taxation where such property is funds or derived from funds received from the United States as pensions, compensation, insurance, adjusted compensation, or gratuity, as property of the United States while held by the guardian, but not after title passes to the veteran or minor in his or her own right on removal of legal disability.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Quarters will be available in the Montana Veterans' and Pioneers' Memorial Building for the use of veterans' organizations.

Semiannual payments are made to the United Spanish War Veterans from the Spanish-American War fund for the current use of the organization.

The Montana Veterans' and Pioneers' Memorial Building will house the books, records, documents, and other property of veterans' organizations.

Veterans' organizations are exempt from certain exhibition license fees.

Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waterbury (Conn.) American of April 2, 1948.

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Federal aid to education is supported by the National Education Association on the grounds that State and local appropriations in many parts of the country have not been increased rapidly enough to keep pace with the rising index of costs and wages. This argument is set forth in more detail in a review of the NEA's survey which appears elsewhere on this page today.

In our opinion the inflation-damage argument in favor of Federal expenditures for public-school education isn't entirely bullet proof, but we subscribe to the conclusion that Congress should enact such Federal-aid legislation this term.

Of all the projects deserving Federal support, education seems to us to rank logically near the top. The experience of many small Connecticut communities in discovering that they can no longer provide their children with the kind of schools and schooling they ought to have illustrates the general Nation-wide difficulty in a very minor way. If Connecticut towns, rated among the most prosperous in the country, are having trouble, what must be the situation in many sections of the rural South?

Critics of Federal-aid to education, almost habitually, argue that a relatively rich State like Connecticut would pay out more per capita than it would get back in any Nation-wide subsidy of public schools. But the entire American taxation philosophy is that those best able to pay shall do so, even if those less able to pay receive a larger proportional share of the benefits.

Under this system Connecticut already pays a proportionately larger share of the salary of Representative JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi than his own State does. We do more to help subsidize the Georgia peanut industry than Georgia does. The southern cotton industry draws more of its Federal subsidy from the North than from the South.

It would be smarter, as a long-range policy, for Connecticut to help subsidize some better schools for these sections so that they can eventually raise their living standards beyond the need for subsidy and elect Congressmen who don't act like RANKIN. What have we got to lose?

Some will argue that as soon as Federal aid for schools becomes available there will be a tendency for States and towns to reduce the contributions they have already been making. We had something of this experience in Connecticut when the 1947 session of the general assembly raised the State's rate of donation to town school funds.

If Connecticut's law had been better drawn, this wouldn't have happened. A Federal aid program must be designed to obviate this kind of chiseling, naturally. It should not be difficult.

Above and beyond all such considerations, public school education is not a matter which can be left forever in a haphazard town-by-town or State-by-State pattern. With the passage of every year in which we permit the continuance of substandard schools anywhere in the United States of America we inflict an injustice on a younger generation which has no recourse against the inadequacies in intelligence or the lack of foresight of its parents.

If we believe that the United States is going to have a future at all and if we believe that this future is worth the sacrifices in our time of war or reforms or high taxes or conscientious parenthood, how can we permit this national future to be less good than it could be because of a national inadequacy of schooling?

Germany—Hunger in Bizonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including interesting facts about occupied Germany. This is information that Members of Congress should have in view of the financial burden on American taxpayers by that area. If those who advocate the Morgenthau plan have their way, the people in Germany will be supported by us from now on. The facts submitted by the American Association for a Democratic Germany are brought down to March 1948:

[From Facts About Occupied Germany of March 1948]

HUNGER IN BIZONIA

THE RECURRENT CRISIS

The third annual food crisis of occupied Germany has been heralded by a wave of strikes in which almost all the workers of the British and American zones have participated. (In the Soviet zone there have, of course,

been no strikes.) The workers have not demanded higher wages, better working conditions, or any of the other things for which American workers are accustomed to strike. They have had only one demand—food. Hunger demonstrations on this scale are without precedent in any modern industrial country. So far, it is true, the strikers have been orderly, disciplined, and nonviolent. But how long they will remain so is another question. Certainly there are those who will seek to direct their discontent into less peaceful channels.

The immediate cause of the recent strikes was the reduction, at the beginning of January, of the basic rations for normal consumers to about 1,100 calories in the Ruhr and 1,200 in other parts of Bizonia. Meat and fat rations were cut sharply. The effect of this on the German population was intensified by the fact that it came after almost 3 years of occupation, and at a time when the announcement of the Marshall plan had led them to look for an improvement in their conditions. Coal production for the month fell—its fluctuations have always closely paralleled those of the food supply—and the faint beginning of economic recovery began to seem illusory.

The statement has been made that the present crisis is due to the failure of the German farmers to deliver their assigned quotas of food to market. There is some, but not much, validity to this contention. A black market in German farm produce does exist and has to some extent expanded in the past year. However, the best estimates place its extent at an average of about 250 calories a day per capita. If this food were delivered through legal channels, the present official ration of 1,550 calories would be approximately met, but the German diet would still be at only half the American level.

In the best prewar years western Germany produced slightly less than three-fifths of the food it consumed. Today, because of the expulsions from the east, its population is a fifth greater than it was at that time. Meanwhile its harvest has fallen sharply. In 1947 it was only slightly over half the prewar average. This decrease was partly due to the drought from which all of western Europe suffered last year. In part, too, it was the result of manpower shortages, deterioration of farm machinery, and fertilizer and seed shortages. These factors had already begun to make themselves felt in decreased production during the war years. After the collapse their effect was intensified by the withdrawal of the foreign labor which had served to replace German peasants who had been drafted for the Wehrmacht. (Millions of the latter, meanwhile, remained in other countries as prisoners of war.) And finally it must be remembered that Germany's prewar agricultural production had been kept at artificial heights by subsidies to submarginal producers as a part of the drive for military self-sufficiency.

THE LOST LANDS

The situation would be a little, but not much, better if the Potsdam Agreement had been carried out and Germany treated as an economic unit. The present Russian zone (including Berlin) was approximately self-sufficient before the war. But the only important surplus area was the part of Germany, east of the Oder and Neisse, which has now been annexed to Poland and Russia. This territory accounted for about one-fourth of Germany's agricultural production. None of it is today available to truncated Germany, which must nevertheless feed the expelled inhabitants of the alienated territories.

Prewar Germany had a farm population of 13,100,000 and a nonfarm population of 56,200,000. The average per capita daily consumption of the farm population was estimated at 3,400 calories. This left 2,110 calories per capita available for the nonfarm population. The remainder of the actual consumption of 2,850 calories was supplied out of imports. In what is today the United States zone, indigenous production supplied only 1,330 calories daily to its 11,500,000 nonfarmers. The 18,500,000 in what is now the British zone received 1,500 calories each from its production, while only 1,160 calories were available to the 5,400,000 nonfarmers of the French zone from indigenous sources. All of western Germany produced an average of 1,390 calories a day for its nonfarm population. The Russian zone had available 2,860 calories per capita for its nonfarmers—leaving a surplus adequate, on prewar standards, to feed something less than 50,000 people. But in the region east of the Oder-Neisse line, after the needs of the farm population had been met, 4,200 calories per capita were available for the remaining 7,100,000 inhabitants.

These territories produced a surplus of 1,350 calories per capita of their non-farm population. If there had been a transfer of 7,000,000 people from what is today the bizone to the area east of the Oder and Neisse, the eastern area would have been able, once it regained its prewar production, to feed the additional population. (This would have involved a diet of 2,100 calories for the nonfarm population—25 percent below the prewar standard but 50 percent above the actual German ration today.) But in fact these millions were driven from the east into western Germany, which before the war had needed to import 1,460 calories per capita for its nonfarm population.

Some of these imports of grain, potatoes, sugar, and meat came from eastern Germany. But even more came from abroad. In the 1920's Germany's imports of food and feed amounted to about 30 percent of her total consumption. After years of concentrated effort to achieve autarchy, the Nazi regime was able to reduce this deficiency by about a third. But even at the high point of domestic production, about 20 percent of Germany's food had to be imported.

THE BARE CUPBOARD

A low point in agricultural production was reached in 1947, when the effects of the severe drought reinforced those of the cumulative deficiency in seed (which had formerly come from eastern Germany), fertilizer, farm machinery, and manpower. The following table indicates the extent of the decline.

Bizone crops (in metric tons)	1935-39 average	1946	1947 (estimated—final figures not yet published)
Bread grains	5,032,000	3,097,000	3,000,000
Coarse grains	4,190,000	2,315,000	1,900,000
Total grains	9,222,000	5,412,000	4,900,000
Potatoes	16,320,000	11,188,000	8,500,000

In the fiscal year 1946-47, the indigenous food supply of Bizonia amounted to about 975 calories per capita per day. It was necessary to import about one-third of the basic ration for normal consumers, plus the entire amount of the supplementary rations allotted to various sections of the population. Thus, even the extremely low basic ration of 1,550 calories a day has required the importation of approximately half the food distributed to the nonfarm population.

In practice, this ration has seldom been met. Actual rations for the bizone from 1945 to 1948 have ranged between 1,014 and 1,555 calories. Besides this 50-percent quantitative decline from the prewar ration, there has been a qualitative deterioration. There is an especially serious deficiency in proteins. Where before the war meat consumption averaged 114 grams per person per day, it is today 22 grams for the entire nonfarm population and only 14 grams for the normal consumer. (Average daily per capita meat consumption in the United States in 1947 was 200 grams.) Fat consumption formerly averaged 75 grams per day. Today the ration for the normal consumer is 7 grams, and the over-all figure for the nonfarm population is only 12 grams. Actual deliveries have been even lower than these official rations. Hence, there has been a slow but definite deterioration in the health of the population. The tuberculosis death rate is 35 per 10,000—more than eight times that of the United States. Weights are below the minimum considered necessary for normal health and work.

If either the German delivery quota or the import schedule is not fully kept up, the immediate result is a serious food crisis, since the whole plan is based on minimum requirements and reserve stocks are dangerously low. The German delivery quotas for 1946-47 were almost fully met, but imports from the United States fell short. In the summer of 1947, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson promised that the United States would ship an average of at least 300,000 tons of grain a month in the ensuing year. The promised imports have so far been delivered ahead of schedule. Between July and December 1947, 2,183,000 tons of grain were sent to the bizone, but German deliveries have been less than was expected.

FOOD AND THE FARMER

In part, drought upset all plans. These had been based on a predicted 14,000,000 tons of potatoes, as against slightly over 11,000,000 for the previous year. But the latest available estimates show an actual harvest of only 8,500,000 tons. Some of the shortage, however, is also due to the increasing reluctance of the farmers to continue delivering food without receiving anything of real value in exchange. The importance of this factor has been increased by the absence of any effective system of control and enforcement, and this, in turn, results from the "federal" structure hitherto encouraged by American occupation policy, and is reinforced by the growing particularism of the food-producing States. It has led to an expanding black market and cut the supply available to deficiency areas such as the Ruhr.

Yet, in view of the size of the delivery quotas, on the one hand, and the lack of a stable currency and industrial goods, on the other, the delivery system has worked better than might have been expected. With the collapse of the Nazi regime, the tight control system which enforced wartime delivery regulations broke down. But the regulations remained in force and became even stricter.

All agricultural production is requisitioned and specific retentions are authorized for the use of the farmer and his family, for seed, and for the feeding of livestock. At present, farmers are allowed to retain for their own consumption the following amounts per person: Two hundred kilograms of potatoes a year; 12 kilograms of bread grain, and 2.6 kilograms of meat and slaughter fat for each 4-week ration period, and one-half liter of milk a day. These retentions are based on a self-suppliers' ration of 2,380 calories a day.

Before the war, about 45 percent of the potato crop, 12 percent of milk production, and until 1937, 20 percent of the bread-grain harvest, were fed to animals each year. Today, no bread grain and less than 10 percent of all potatoes may be used for feeding. Retention of milk for this purpose is limited to a fixed amount for each "authorized" calf. The use of barley and oats for feeding required special permission, and the entire oilseed and sugar-beet crops are requisitioned.

Despite dangerously low meat, milk, and fat supplies the authorities have taken steps to reduce the number of cattle to a level 10

percent below that of December 1945, and have limited hog production to the number needed to meet self-suppliers' allowances.

There are no special incentives for the delivery of the main crops, grain and potatoes. They must be sold at fixed prices, which in the case of grain are 5 percent and in the case of potatoes 30 percent above prewar levels. The money received is, of course, practically without value, in view of the absence of manufactured goods. Nevertheless, the percentage of major crops collected appears to be considerably higher than under the Nazis. This is particularly surprising in view of the fact that total harvests have been much smaller, so that even the same ratio of collection to production would leave the farmers much less. Military government figures on collections are shown in the following table:

Market deliveries in percent of total production—bizone

	Bread grains	Coarse grains	Potatoes
1935–38 average	51	19	16
1939–44 average	62	25	23
1945–46 crop year	60	21	33
1946–47 crop year	66	24	40

Collection of food from the farms is not, however, all there is to the problem. The agricultural states, especially Bavaria, have refused to deliver their quotas to such areas as the Ruhr. Both nominal and actual rations in industrial centers have frequently been lower than in other parts of the bizone. In January of this year, only about 1,100 calories were available on ration in north Rhine-Westphalia, as against 1,200 to 1,300 in the United States zone.

The role of barter is increasing. Legally, a worker receives about 180 marks a month and a farmer receives 200 marks for a ton of wheat. But the farmer can obtain 200 to 300 marks for a pound of butter, while the worker can exchange nails or wire or clothing or whatever his factory produces for food. Hence less goods pass through the official channels, the farmers lack any incentive to produce for the legal market, and there is rising resentment in the industrial areas and inequitable distribution. According to one informed German estimate, about one-third of the population of the American zone—those, such as farmers, who control some part of the food supply—live about as well as formerly; another third manage to get along by exchanging services, possessions, or illegally retained new goods for food; while the remainder of the population are reduced to starvation rations.

THE LIMITS OF IMPROVEMENT

In view of the sharp drop in domestic production since 1939, it is clear that some possibility does exist for increasing the supply of food available to Germany from indigenous sources. To some extent, there is also room for more effective utilization of existing food supplies. Collections from the farmer can be increased, and a more equal distribution of food supplies to the various parts of the bizonal area achieved, by the creation of effective central agencies. Some steps are now being taken in this direction; more are possible.

Even more important than any improvement in the mechanism of collection and distribution, however, is the restoration of a real incentive for the production and delivery of foodstuffs. This requires the provision of goods for the farmers—both consumer goods and tools, seed, and fertilizer. Not only will this result in greater deliveries on the part of the farmers, it will also enable them to produce more.

The soil of Germany is, for the most part, of rather poor quality, and German agriculture has long been dependent largely on artificial fertilizer. This, like agricultural machinery and seed of good quality, is now in extremely short supply. The following table indicates the extent of the present fertilizer deficit.

Bizonal fertilizer consumption (in tons of basic plant foods)

	Prewar average	1945–46	1946–47	1947–48 (estimate)
Nitrogen	320,000	54,000	166,000	274,000
Phosphates	356,000	42,000	127,000	222,000
Potash	574,000	196,000	296,000	450,000

Germany's domestic resources of potash, if production is brought back to the prewar level, are more than adequate for her needs. (Most of them, however, are in the Soviet zone.) Likewise, nitrogenous fertilizers can be produced in sufficient quantity if German coal production is restored and a sufficient part of it allotted to this purpose. German phosphate production has been dependent on two sources—imported phosphate rock, mainly from North Africa, and basic slag from the steel industry. The latter resource, inadequate at best to meet the needs of German agriculture, is today negligible because of the stagnation of the steel industry.

But even an adequate supply of fertilizer, seed, and machinery can do little more than restore the prewar level of production in German agriculture. There is little possibility of increasing the area under cultivation, since German forests are already reduced to a point where serious danger of erosion exists, and practically none of the land at present used for pasture is fit for anything else. Hence it is unlikely that the bizonal area will ever be able to produce much more than its prewar output of 1,250 calories per head of its present nonfarm population.

Nor does this take into consideration the question of whether it is economically desirable for Germany to devote any large proportion of her soil to direct consumption crops. The present area and population of the bizone are approximately equal to those of England, and it has long been recognized by British agricultural experts that the proper function of that country's farmers is the production of high-value protective foods such as milk and meat. (It may be added that, from a security standpoint, this type of agriculture would have certain advantages. Any country completely dependent on imports of grain is at a grave disadvantage in an extended war.)

Hence it is clear that, while Germany's present food production can be increased and its distribution improved, domestic sources alone can never solve the problem of feeding Bizonia. Under the best of circumstances, it will be impossible to attain the ration of 2,400 calories, which League of Nations experts regarded as the minimum necessary for normal consumers, without importing as much again as the bizone produces. And this, in turn, involves permitting Germany to earn the money needed to pay for her imports. For it is obvious that she cannot subsist indefinitely as a recipient of international charity.

But the only way in which Germany can pay for imported food, or anything else, is by a revival of industrial exports. Hence Bizonia's food problem is basically one less of restoring agricultural production than of restoring industrial production. Until this is accomplished, there can be no approach to a solution. And it seems likely to require more than the level of industry envisaged in the Marshal plan to enable Bizonia—or Trizonia—to pay its own way.

Historic Biloxi Lighthouse Celebrates One Hundredth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I submit an article from the Clarion Ledger, Jackson, Miss., of Sunday, March 28, 1948, entitled "Historic Biloxi Lighthouse Celebrates One Hundredth Anniversary." The article follows:

HISTORIC BILOXI LIGHTHOUSE CELEBRATES ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY

(By Anthony V. Ragusin)

Historic Biloxi on the beautiful Mississippi Gulf coast has many subjects which are representative of the town, such as the shrimp trawler, the oyster lugger, the majestic moss-draped oak, the magnificent magnolia, the silver mullet, the musical mocking bird, and the grotesque pelican, or the ante bellum home of Jefferson Davis—but one object that is outstanding in typifying Biloxi, is the stately lighthouse on West Beach Boulevard. This lighthouse is celebrating its one hundredth anniversary this year.

Congress approved the establishment of this light on March 3, 1847, but it remained until a year later for the fabricated materials to arrive aboard a sloop from Baltimore. Murray and Hazelhurst of that city had the contract to erect the tower, said to be the first one of cast iron to be built in the South. The lighthouse was erected on a brick foundation. Its brass lamps and reflectors were furnished by a Boston firm.

During the War Between the States, the illuminating apparatus of the light was buried by Confederate sympathizers. The town of Biloxi was captured by Federal forces based on Ship Island—12 miles south, in the Gulf of Mexico—at the site of the lighthouse. It was at this spot that a Biloxi lad pointed out the improbability of the rebels being starved into submission, as predicted by a Union naval officer, because of the abundance of mullet in local waters. This silver-like fish is still caught in cast nets near the old lighthouse.

Although the lighthouse is now automatically operated by electricity and is under the jurisdiction and maintenance of the United States Coast Guard, it owes many of its years of fine service to its keepers, and it is with pride and distinction that the Biloxi light lays claim to having had two women attendants, mother and daughter, who served the Government and seafaring people for 62 years.

The unusual era of lady keepers began shortly after the war between American brothers came to an end. Perry Younghans left his native Albany, N. Y., to seek new fields of endeavor in the deep South. He married a New Orleans girl and entered into the business of brickmaking in the upper or head waters of the back bay of Biloxi, but the venture proved unsuccessful. With the aid of influential friends at New Orleans, he secured the job of Biloxi lightkeeper in 1688. One year later, he died.

Maria Younghans succeeded her husband as keeper of the light that guided steamboats and sailing vessels into Biloxi at the time when the Louisville & Nashville Railroad was still in the plan stage. She kept the position for 53 years. As she became more aged she was assisted by her daughter, Miranda, who became keeper upon retirement of the

mother. The daughter was attendant for 9 years. These two women had climbed the tower many thousands of times to light and extinguish the rays of this mariner's guide.

There are many traditional stories concerning the lighthouse. One is that it was painted black after the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln, to show the deep resentment and feeling of the people of Mississippi about this fiendish act. At one time a Gulf storm weakened the lighthouse's foundation, and it tilted, becoming an American "Leaning Tower." Most of the rocks which strengthened the foundation were from a grotto which stood on the grounds of the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Biloxi's oldest official Catholic parish. The second great fire of Biloxi destroyed this church and grotto, and the rocks were then removed to the beach.

The Biloxi lighthouse occupies one of the most historic spots in all of the South. Nearby is the site of Fort Louis, third and last Biloxi capital of the French Province of Louisiana, which later became the Louisiana Purchase Territory. It was from this vicinity that the capital was moved to the infant settlement of New Orleans in 1722.

This is one of the few lighthouses to be located within the city limits of a community. It stands between the Gulf waters and the beach highway, a part of the Old Spanish Trail (U. S. Highway No. 90), connecting Florida and California via the far South. The four-lane highway begins here at Porter Avenue. Road checks by Federal authorities show that this is the most traveled highway in Mississippi.

The Case for Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the March 30 issue of Look magazine, there appeared an article entitled "The Case Against Universal Military Training" and I attempted to correct many of the false conclusions drawn by the author by writing a letter to the editor on April 1, 1948. It appears that there is such a long time lag between making up the magazine and its publication date that my remarks in favor of universal training could not be published in the magazine until June.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my letter to the editor of Look magazine regarding universal training together with the editor's reply to me:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1948.

Mr. D. D. MICH,
Executive Editor of Look,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MICH: I have just finished reading the article by Mr. John Henry Martin which is called in your magazine, The Case Against Universal Military Training. I am a veteran 37 years of age and within the past 20 years had training which is comparable in my opinion, to what is proposed in the Universal Training bill. I received 3 years training as an enlisted man in the National Guard, 4 years in college as a student in reserve training at Texas A. & M. College, and then approximately 7 years training as a Reserve officer before entering the Army in 1940 as a first lieutenant in the infantry reserve.

My most important war experience was that of training an infantry battalion for combat and leading that battalion in combat for 6 months during which time I was wounded a number of times and had to leave the battalion because of severe wounds. Therefore, with this background and having two sons 11 and 12, who will certainly be affected by the Universal Military Training bill, provided it should pass, I believe you will agree that I do have some background for expressing an opinion concerning the article by Mr. John Henry Martin concerning the case against Universal Military Training.

He states that the military analysts would ask: "What can universal military training provide toward the future military strength of the United States?" He reaches the conclusion that universal training would be the single most costly and dangerous error in preparedness that the United States could make because:

1. It would deaden the capacity of our professional officers.
2. It would compete with essential intelligence needs for funds.
3. It would give inadequate combat training to all, when only a small percentage would require it.
4. It would fail entirely to train technicians who will be needed most.
5. It will give us a false sense of security and strength.

Mr. Martin has not only drawn false conclusions but has also introduced into his case several claims that the proponents of universal training have never made.

Universal training is required to furnish a trained reservoir of manpower in the event there is a need for total mobilization. It will provide trained men for the civilian components—the National Guard and the Organized Reserve. It is a long-range plan for long-range defense.

It is a long-range positive program designed to produce a permanent strong military defense for peace and eventually it is hoped that it will provide sufficient trained manpower reserves so that selective service—except in the event of total mobilization—will not be necessary.

Let us take up Mr. Martin's points one by one. First of all he states that we would waste the services of our professional officers on routine recruit training in universal training. I disagree that our professional officers would be wasted. I contend that the greatest shortage of manpower in World War II was men who were leaders of men. Too many officers in World War II did not realize that. What Mr. Martin terms recruit training was that training which molded the lives of young men for years to come. I do not believe that molding the lives of the young men of this country for years to come is dull, dead recruit training. In my opinion, any officer who views this training as routine recruit training does not have the basic concept of the duties of an officer in the United States Army.

I have handled hundreds of cases concerning young men who were court-martialed during the past war and in far too many instances you could trace the cause of this young man's being court-martialed back to the poor leadership by some officer, and by that officer having assumed the attitude that the work he was doing was dull recruit training. I will say to you that the strength of the country will always be determined more by the strength of men behind the guns, planes, and tanks than by the strength of the weapons of war. It is contemplated that the main source of Reserve instructors will come from the college ROTC program. In addition, it is anticipated that a sizable proportion of the universal training program's own cadre will come from qualified trainees. It is my opinion that this will be the finest training that these men receive.

Mr. Martin's second point is that universal training would compete with essential intelligence needs for funds. The answer to this contention comes from the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training: "* * * the cost of operating a system of universal training might result in the withholding of funds from other essential parts of our total defense program. Universal training should not be undertaken at all unless the citizens of this country understand that it has value only as part of a program that will demand the expenditure of a much larger proportion of our national income that we have ever allocated for national defense in time of peace."

The committee pointed out that it was not in a position to state how much must be spent for support of the Regular Establishment, for procurement or industrial mobilization, for scientific research of development, or for intelligence.

The Compton report stated:

"The question we face as a nation is how much we are willing to pay for the avoidance of the incalculable horrors and cost of another war. To do less is to gamble with our lives and liberties. We feel strongly that the United States must have universal training but we are equally firm in our conviction that other elements of national security should not be sacrificed or starved to pay the bill."

Naturally there is a great difference of opinion as to whether the Army, Air Force, Navy, research development, or intelligence should get the lion's share of money available for defense. Some persons say that a sufficiently large air force can give us the time and protection to again train an army after war is declared. My answer is that the effectiveness of air power is multiplied by its nearness to enemy bases. It takes an army to win bases and hold them. In the last war a powerful American airbase in China was destroyed by a relatively small ground thrust when the air base became an annoyance. Air can strike the enemy but it can neither seize nor hold its landing fields. The following recently made statement is quite true: "Air power, like the atom bomb, can breed a Maginot line of thought among the American people."

Nor do I ascribe to the theory that push-button warfare and new air weapons have ended the need for mass land armies. Push-button warfare is a dangerous illusion with no basis in fact. New weapons have always raised the hope that machines would eventually take the place of men in war. However, quite the opposite has been true with the number of men increased in each war. The technical requirements of new weapons demand many more men and they also spread war more rapidly around the entire world. This means greater concentrations of troops in many more distant points, and the maintenance of long lines of communications.

Science is producing new weapons and these new weapons promise to make war more deadly dangerous and horrible. But science cannot replace the man. Instead of displacing the soldier, scientific warfare has made him more indispensable than ever. Men who have been instructed in weapons currently employed in warfare will be introduced to the changes as they occur during their period of eligibility.

Mr. Martin's next point is that universal training would give inadequate combat training to all when only a small percentage would require it. I would ask Mr. Martin, "What is combat training?" From his article I am sure that he would mention only the use of combat weapons. The use of combat weapons is a minor part in the training of a combat soldier. I am sure that you know

that the Boy Scout movement was originated by a British Army officer in an attempt to supply better men for the British Army. Any training which makes a man mentally alert, physically strong, and strong in character is good military training, although this program is not trying to train a combat soldier. It takes many more hours than a trainee receives under universal training to train a man for combat.

The Army estimates that it takes approximately 3,000 hours of training to ready a division and its men for combat. This is hard, constant, and intensive training. Specialized operations such as air-borne and amphibious take almost twice as long. Mr. Martin states that training in combat warfare is the most rapidly learned skill the services require. This statement is such that I am sure no man who saw combat would agree with. One of the saddest things that I saw in combat was American boys killed because they had had insufficient training or were being led by men who had had insufficient training.

Pilots were not produced frantically in 18 months, as Mr. Martin says, but were developed in less than a year under a well-integrated program. Technicians who took a year or more to train spent no longer than it takes to train a combat soldier.

Under the universal training program, the trainee is given approximately 1,000 hours of basic training. His advanced training under one or another of the options open to him would provide another 600 hours. This would bring the civilian components much closer to combat readiness than any other system we could improvise. Therefore, even though universal training would not produce divisions sufficiently trained for immediate commitment to combat, it would put them in an advanced state of readiness where the training could quickly be completed. If an emergency required instant deployment of these civilian components at home, this prior training would equal the difference between a usable unit and an ineffective one.

Six months' training will not graduate men completely trained for combat. But it will give them the basic essentials of military training and qualify them for technical or specialized and unit training in the event they are called for service. The training would not only include instruction in all ground weapons and arms but it would teach men how to exist and take care of themselves in the field, how to fit themselves into a military organization, and how to develop the teamwork and leadership needed in combat units. Therefore, even if universal training does not give us completely trained soldiers, it will provide usable forces.

The armed forces have never said that the purpose of universal training is to train specialists. It is only an introduction to technical training. Every potential soldier should receive a certain amount of basic training. This training would aid the technical services by channeling superior students and those found to have special qualifications into universities and technical schools.

Which leads to Mr. Martin's fourth point—that universal training would fail entirely to train technicians who will be needed most. As shown above, it is not necessarily technicians that will be needed the most. And universal training will play a leading role in choosing technicians by observing those with special qualifications during the training period.

Along this same line he indicates that as a result of universal training scientific research will suffer.

There is no foundation for the argument that such training would interfere. The more intelligent a soldier is, the more effective he is. Nor is it denied that research has produced means of warfare that have had decisive results on the battlefield. It would be folly not to put great stress on scientific research and development. Universal training offers the greatest assurance that research would be expanded and its results applied effectively. Scientific development is like air power. It must be protected by ground forces. For example—look what happened to the German scientists as a result of the last war. They were rounded up and are now being used by other nations.

To reiterate, universal training would safeguard and encourage research by channeling superior students into universities and technical schools and training men to apply the results of research.

Universal training must be revised—yearly, if necessary—to keep abreast of scientific advancements. If the developments of science should clearly demonstrate its obsolescence, the program could and should be abandoned at that time. Universal training could not stay on the statute books 1 year without the support and backing of the American people. The present development of scientific warfare makes it an even more urgent necessity than it has ever been before.

The armed forces are working hand in hand with the most advanced atomic scientists. No group is better informed as to its future potentialities of atomic warfare than the military-civilian-scientist teams engaged in research and development. These groups say that we must prepare for a far more rapid and far more total mobilization than we have ever known before. They say that universal training is an absolute must in a realistic approach to the potentialities of future warfare.

Germ warfare and the atom bomb may both be outlawed, as was poison gas. Although gas was a major weapon in World War I, it was never used in the last war but solely because Germany knew of our overpowering ability to retaliate.

Mr. Martin's last conclusion is that universal training will give the United States a false sense of security and strength. That, of course, is only one man's opinion of what security and strength is.

Universal training proponents have always stated that the training in itself is not a security measure. But it is a link in the over-all national security program. The other essentials, as listed by the Compton report, are a coordinated intelligence service, scientific research and development, industrial mobilization and stockpiling, and the Regular Armed Forces.

The armed forces has repeatedly said that universal training alone is not the cure-all for national defense. It is but one part of the over-all security program outlined by the Advisory Commission. The American people must not be led to believe that because they have universal training alone they are therefore safe in the event of a war. For nothing could be farther from the truth.

Universal training will give a strong power an initial and ultimate advantage in battle. It cannot insure final victory since the outcome of most major wars is decided in the end by the relative strength of the combatants and the time and manner in which it is brought to bear.

There is always the hope that by maintaining a relatively strong potential defense that we can prevent another war by confronting the aggressor with power enough to make his aggression dangerous and risky. If the Congress approves existing defense plans, both the National Guard and many Reserve divisions would be completely manned and equipped. But this is possible only if universal training provides a continuous flow of trained manpower reserves. Men, like machines, become obsolescent in their combat usefulness.

Mr. Martin has also fallen back on the old cry of conscription. Universal training is not universal military service. It is not conscription as practiced by European countries. The entire Army of the United States, including the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves, normally will be made up wholly of volunteers in time of peace. The Compton report pointed out that the word conscription can be used to describe anything which people are called on to do by their own Government, whether it be taxes, military service, or education.

Mr. Martin also adds that conscription fails to prevent wars. Switzerland has had universal service for more than a century and has had no war. Sweden has had it since 1812 and has had no war in that time. The United States has not had it and has fought six wars in that time.

Nor did such training make militaristic states of Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Holland, France, or Switzerland.

There are 54 foreign nations which have military organizations. Forty-six of these countries require compulsory military service in the regular armed forces or required it immediately prior to the last war. Japan and Germany, which had compulsory systems, are not included. Switzerland and the Union of South Africa also maintain a militia in which service is compulsory.

Only seven countries, including the United States, rely on volunteers to fill their peacetimes armies, and five of the other six are members or dependencies of the British Commonwealth. All of the other countries of the world of any military consequence require compulsory service in their standing armies.

Our universal training is not primarily designed for service in the Regular Establishment. It is designed, as pointed out by the Compton report, for the following benefits:

1. Shorten the time for mobilization of an effective fighting force.
2. Basic training for young men and training saves lives.
3. Provide an effective Reserve.
4. Improve the efficiency and quality of the Regular Establishment and produce qualified Reserve officers in numbers.
5. Provide a large trained group for civilian defense as well as a mechanism for military assignments in case of war.
6. Channel qualified young men into scientific and vocational-training programs.
7. Give greater military strength at less cost than a large standing military force.

I am sure that my training in the National Guard in the Reserve officer training program was of untold benefit to me during the past war. I do not agree 100 percent with the proposed universal training program. I believe that this work can be done much cheaper and in a more democratic way by doing the majority of this training through National Guard and Reserve Training Corps in high schools, in colleges, and in that way allow our young men to choose between National Guard, ROTC, and our Regular Army Establishment.

My hope and prayer is that my sons, ages 11 and 12, and other young men of America will not have to face an enemy in combat like so many of us had to do. I am convinced universal training will provide us with the strength to make possible agggressors reconsider their plans to wage a war. In the event of another conflict our sons will be much better trained and prepared to carry out their responsibilities as defenders of their country.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, Sixth Texas District.

LOOK,
New York, N. Y., April 7, 1948.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
103 Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you very much for your letter of April 1 which is an answer to John Henry Martin's The Case Against Universal Military Training.

Mr. Martin's piece appeared in our March 30 issue, but due to the time lag between

making up the magazine and publication date, we could not get your letter in before June. As you can see, while the subject would still be hot, the direct connection between your letter and John Henry Martin's article would be stretched too far. Also, time is very apt to overtake us on this subject—a bill might be passed or shelved in Congress before we could come out.

Thanks for thinking of us and for writing us as you did. We appreciate it a great deal and we hope you will keep Look in mind.

Sincerely,

DANIEL D. MICH.

Reciprocal Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Monday, April 12, 1948, entitled "Not Academic, Mr. Martin":

NOT ACADEMIC, MR. MARTIN

When House Speaker MARTIN said last week that the question of extending the reciprocal trade law in June is academic, he showed an appalling ignorance of this Nation's proper foreign aims.

Only last month, 53 nations, who represent almost 90 percent of the world's trade, met at Habana and approved a charter for the International Trade Organization. This document is nothing less than a milestone in modern history. For in the interests of world peace and mutual prosperity, the nations have agreed to scale down tariff walls, to end discriminatory practices, bilateral deals, barter, and other, all-too-familiar weapons of trade warfare. They have done so only because the United States, the chief offender in the past, can back up its oratory about trade sanity with proof that it, through reciprocal pacts, had eased and will continue to ease shackles on world commerce.

To abandon the reciprocal program altogether, then, or to leave the nations in doubt by letting the program die with a vague promise that we might revive it sometime, could well signal the world's return to the economic warfare of the twenties and thirties.

Certainly the Marshall-plan countries don't regard the question of extending the Reciprocal Trade Act as academic. After all, what is the real meaning of European recovery program for the western peoples? Above and beyond the negative end of stopping communism is the hope that the ravages of war can be repaired and decent standards of living restored.

Yet if prosperity and the strength it brings are to exist on the Continent, there must be markets for Europe's goods. That is simply another way of saying that Europe cannot survive unless she can earn dollars or their equivalent so as to buy what she needs from America and the world to support her productive machine. The Economic Commission for Europe had this in mind when it concluded recently that there's no hope of reestablishing a balance in the world's economy unless America increases its imports from Europe.

Further, what Speaker MARTIN does not realize is that from a purely selfish standpoint the United States has a huge stake in this trade complex. Unless we, too, can sustain a high level of exports our own productivity, employment, and standard of living will fall. But the economic isolationists among us don't see that America cannot export unless she is willing to import.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which will soon be up for renewal, shows that willingness to all the world. It must be extended by Congress, in spite of the narrow vision of men like Speaker MARTIN. For reciprocal trade, far from an "academic" question, is the very cornerstone of the world order we are trying to establish.

Address of Hon. Samuel R. Young, Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General, at Natchez, Miss., on the Occasion of the First-Day Sale of the Mississippi Territorial Commemorative Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an address delivered by the Honorable Samuel R. Young, executive assistant to the Postmaster General, at Natchez, Miss., on the occasion of the first-day sale of the Mississippi territorial commemorative postage stamp.

The address follows:

It is always good to come back home to Mississippi, especially to this historical city of Natchez where I once lived as a boy. It is a real joy to be here for an event such as this which has so much national significance for my State and for that great department of the Government which I have the honor to represent here today.

We are gathered here in this beautiful city for the purpose of properly marking the occasion of the first-day sale of the new 3-cent Mississippi commemorative postage stamp.

The Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, had hoped to be here in person for this splendid program, but the pressure of his duties as a Cabinet officer made it necessary for him to remain in Washington. Just before I left, Mr. Donaldson asked me to convey to you his greetings and to express his best wishes for the success of this memorable ceremony.

There is always great national interest and significance in the first offering of a new postage stamp. This is particularly true of this Mississippi Territory stamp which has received more advance notices on a national scale than any stamp issued in recent years by the Post Office Department.

This great interest resulted, as you probably know, from the fact that Postmaster General Donaldson and General Lawler, following the desires of the State of Mississippi and the recommendations of your distinguished Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, directed that this stamp be issued with Mississippi spelled with one less than the usual number of "s's." It was the desire of all that the exact reproduction of the old Mississippi Territory seal be strictly adhered to; and in view of this, neither the Post Office Department nor the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which prints all United States stamps, felt that the seal should be altered in any manner.

The United States Department of State, it should be pointed out, had the Mississippi Territory seal made in 1798 and sent it to the Territory with the word "Mississippi" spelled M-i-s-s-i-s-i-p-p-i.

This seal with this spelling was used as the official seal of the Territory of Mississippi from 1798 until 1817, when Mississippi became a State, at which time the new State seal appeared with the present spelling.

This beautiful new 3-cent stamp is being placed on sale exclusively here in romantic Natchez today. Appropriately enough, its central motif is an outline map showing the old Mississippi Territory and its growth from 1798 to 1812, the left portion of which appears in a dark tone, denoting the State of Mississippi as we know it today. It is upon this map that there is superimposed the seal of the old Mississippi Territory.

In the upper right portion of the stamp is a portrait of Gov. Winthrop Sargent, the first Governor of Mississippi Territory, with his name appearing immediately below in white gothic lettering. Across the top of the stamp in dark gothic is the wording "1798 Mississippi Territory 1948." The left border of the stamp is formed by a dark vertical panel in which is inscribed "U. S. postage" in white gothic.

The dates 1798, 1804, and 1812, denoting the area of the Mississippi Territory at those respective times, appear on the stamp in white gothic, as does also the denomination designation "3¢" in the lower right corner on a dark background. The stamp itself is printed in maroon ink.

During the course of a year the Post Office Department receives literally thousands of requests for new postage stamps, but only those events, occasions, and persons of outstanding historical import are selected for inclusion on the official list of stamps to be issued.

The decision of Postmaster General Donaldson and General Lawler to issue a Mississippi Territory stamp commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Old Territory was, therefore, not a difficult or controversial one to reach, because in authorizing this Mississippi stamp Mr. Donaldson was carrying out the historic policy of the Post Office Department in the matter of acclaiming outstanding events and dates of national importance.

Of course, as the executive assistant to the Postmaster General and as a native son who has never once over the years lost his love for the glorious State he calls his home, I was proud when Mr. Donaldson told me that he was going to authorize this stamp. Later, when the Postmaster General asked me to represent him at these ceremonies, I was even more proud.

The opportunity to come back home and participate in this outstanding event in the illustrious history of our great State is indeed a proud moment in my life.

Postage stamps of themselves are but tiny pieces of adhesive paper, but they are one of the most powerful of all enlightening instrumentalities. It is the postage stamp which finds its way into the offices, into the homes, and into the hands of tens of millions of Americans in every walk of life. The issuance of a postage stamp, therefore, is recognized as one of the Nation's highest methods of acclaim. It is for this reason that everyone in Mississippi today should take a justifiable pride in the fact that a Mississippi postage stamp is being issued. In the next few weeks and months this same Mississippi stamp will find its way into every home and office in the United States, and the message contained on it will be carried beyond our shores to distant points across the seas.

The Post Office Department requisitioned an initial printing of 110,000,000 of these stamps, and from every indication this first-day sale may reach an all-time high of covers canceled on a State commemorative postage stamp before the sun goes down.

I think it is entirely fitting that I should remind you at this point that the late Maj.

Otho L. Rogers, United States Marine Corps, a native of Goss, Miss., was the first postal employee to give his life for his country in the late war. He was killed on Guadalcanal in August 1942. Major Rogers served with honor and distinction as philatelic agent in the Post Office Department in Washington under the Third Assistant Postmaster General.

Now, may I take this opportunity, on behalf of Postmaster General Donaldson and myself, to commend your good postmaster, Mr. Baldwin, and his efficient staff, with all others who have joined in making this first-day sale one of the finest and best conducted that I have ever attended. I am grateful for this opportunity of meeting so many of my old friends, and I trust that our paths may soon cross again.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with genuine regret that I followed the trend of the debate in the Senate on the St. Lawrence seaway legislation and their action in recommitting the bill to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee resulted in a tremendous loss to the people of Minnesota as well as the other inland States. The benefits which would accrue to these States with the passage of this legislation merit the serious consideration of the House Committee on Public Works, which has before it the measures introduced on this side of the Capitol. The following editorial written by Mr. L. R. Reid, editor of the Renville Star Farmer at Renville, Minn., proves conclusively that the legislation should be adopted:

It is said on good authority that a very famous ruler in ancient times fiddled while Rome burned. Could be that some of the so-called leaders of this day and age of the atomic bomb and such are fiddling while the world is rapidly getting into a not-so-good situation. Maybe it will not burn or civilization be destroyed as some have predicted, but it seems to me that much could be done to make it better. Right here in this country any little boy knows we should have a strong air force, with all other branches of our defenses the best in the world. The same little boy knows this cannot be accomplished by the old, outmoded volunteer system. He knows we ought to have a universal training system for our youth. It should be so set up that at a certain age every young man would receive college or other technical training to fit him to serve as a nucleus of a defense force in case the country is attacked. Why don't they do this? Partly because a lot of people with less mature intelligence than the said little fellow do not want it because they say it would be preparing for war, something we do not want. It has never occurred to these same people to consider the possibility that strength could prevent war better than weakness. In world affairs let us speak with the authority of one who is willing and able to back up its just demands. I believe we need a system of universal training for the youth. To avoid war or to shorten the conflict in case we should unfortunately become involved in one, America must be strong.

The Gandhi system is swell for dreamers but it just doesn't make sense in a workaday world. Yes, we should have a mighty air force, modernized and fully manned and with facilities to keep it that way, the world's best Navy, fully manned and a Reserve Army of technical men and soldiers who will not have to train 2 years in case of trouble. It is shown that such a course will help avoid war. Many men of knowledge of war are for it, including General Eisenhower. Yet there are people who are doing their best to block the enactment of the proper legislation to make it possible for this Nation to defend itself properly and to continue to be a great moral force for right in this world. I don't get it. I have told you how they are fiddling with our defenses. There are many other things being treated likewise. What would be wrong with having a St. Lawrence seaway canal to connect our inland States with the sea for purposes of economical transportation of commerce and to provide a great store of much needed electrical energy which would be generated by the released power of the waters of the St. Lawrence? Did someone say we had too much electricity or do not need this economical method of transportation which would help the Northwest farmers especially, saving them money on transporting their products and saving everybody on the purchase price of coal and other vital necessities? Don't say it will cost too much. Less than a billion dollars is the cost. We give that much money away with no return every once in a while. That is no argument. Even the little boy knows that. This is getting too long, so I will have to reserve the rest for some future issue. There are, however, many issues in line with the above I wish to speak of and will.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Secretary of Defense James Forrestal before the House Armed Services Committee, April 12, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin my statement by reading a portion of the letter which I wrote to you when I forwarded the administration's proposal for legislation covering universal training and selective service. In that letter I said:

"On March 17, 1948, President Truman addressed a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, and recommended the enactment of legislation providing for universal training and the temporary reinstatement of selective service.

"Attached is a draft of a bill designed to implement the President's message. Title I of this bill deals with selective service, and title II deals with universal training.

"It is recognized that the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives has already favorably reported a very comprehensive universal training bill, H. R. 4278. It may be, therefore, that under the relevant circumstances the House Armed Services Committee would prefer to consider only the first title of the attached bill, since it has already taken favorable action on a measure substantially the same as the second title of the bill. This is, of course, a matter for decision by the legislative branch of the Government.

"It is our strong feeling, however, that legislation providing for universal training and temporary selective service are two segments of the same picture, since temporary selective service is a measure which our national security requires during the interim period before the benefits of universal training are brought fully into play. Whether universal training and selective service are dealt with in two bills or in one is relatively immaterial—but it is very material that the close relationship between the two be recognized in appropriate legislation."

That is the end of the material which I want to quote from my letter—but even though the subject of UMT is not now before this committee, I want to emphasize this consideration: That an important item to bear in mind, in connection with UMT, is the fact that the nonenactment of UMT at this time may make it necessary to maintain our regular forces, for an indefinite period, at a strength which can be reached only through selective service. Contrariwise, the sooner UMT is placed in operation, the sooner will come the time when we may safely reduce our regular forces to a level which may no longer require selective service.

This committee is already familiar with the specific program which the administration has recommended, in the light of existing world conditions. This program was presented to Congress by the President on March 17. It is no secret, that prior to the President's message of March 17, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had unanimously recommended that one part of this program should be the immediate reinstatement of selective service—a matter to which your committee has already devoted considerable attention.

Briefly stated, the program to which I refer can be summarized as follows:

We need a strong Air Force, capable of striking sustained blows far beyond the peripheral bases which we now hold; an Air Force capable of the air defense of our homeland and our protective bases and capable of seeking out and destroying an enemy that might impose war. Such an Air Force requires more aircraft and more manpower than we have today in readiness to meet the war of tomorrow. In order to speed up the work of providing such an Air Force, we have requested the House Appropriations Committee to make very substantial amounts of money immediately available for aircraft procurement—and in this proposal we have had the prompt and whole-hearted cooperation of Chairman TABER and his committee.

We need a ground force to protect our air bases from hostile attack, which it takes much more than airplanes to resist. We need a ground force to seize and hold distant bases—should the attack fall upon us—in order to take the war to the enemy. Such bases, as well as our great cities here at home and our key production centers, require antiaircraft protection, which is provided by the Army. And a strengthened Air Force will require enlargement of those Army elements which service and support its operations.

We need a Navy capable of defending the necessary sea lanes of the world from submarine attack, of developing antisubmarine warfare, of insuring the sea transportation of our manpower and our logistical supplies and equipment to distant points, and of assisting both attack and defense through air-sea power and amphibious operations.

In other words, our action in the event of any future enemy assault upon us will employ all members of the combat team—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—a combat team made up of properly proportioned elements from each service, all in readiness to accomplish assigned objectives.

This is the concept of a balanced force to which I have referred on a number of occasions. Obviously, the word "balance" does not mean that there shall be man-for-man, an equal-sized Army, Navy, and Air Force. "Balance" means that all three services shall be maintained at such size as will best enable them to assist one another, in the accomplishment of their assigned objectives—and this balance rests, in turn, on the strategic plans which the National Security Act directs the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prepare.

Because of this statutory function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and because of the fact that military strategy is both logically and legally a matter for our top military leaders—I shall continue to rely heavily on any recommendations the Joint Chiefs of Staff may make, with regard to the proper composition of a balanced force.

To meet the needs which I have just been describing, we require more manpower than we have today. The comfortable assurance of a pushbutton war is an illusion. The enormous complication of the machinery of total warfare of today rests upon manpower—not in the mass, but diffused through thousands of specialties.

Our program for a balanced strength in manpower falls into two parts:

(a) The short-term, which looks to the immediate strengthening of our Regular Forces;

(b) The long-term, which looks to the provision of adequate reserves.

There is no inconsistency or overlapping between the two parts of the program. To the contrary, the two parts supplement each other to make an integrated whole.

The short-term program meets the immediate need of building up our Regular Forces to a somewhat increased strength, about one-sixth of what we had in service in World War II. When these immediate needs have been met, and the long-term program is adequately functioning, we should be able in a more peaceful world to curtail or eliminate the short-term program. But not in our lifetime or in that of the next generation do I foresee the time when a strong military potential will not be needed to back up our diplomacy.

The long-term program is designed to provide adequate reserves which will have had a necessary amount of basic training. Reserve forces in readiness are a necessary component of our military strength. In this component (which includes the National Guard and the Reserve Corps) we are now seriously deficient. The Reserve component in time of war will take its place alongside the Regular Forces in our defensive and offensive effort.

The short-term program can be accomplished only through a selective-service law; the long-term program can be accomplished without inordinate cost, only through universal military training.

For the short-term part of the program, we need at once to increase the present actual strength of the Regular Establishment by 349,500 officers and men, as follows:

(a) The Army, by 240,000, from 542,000 to 782,000;

(b) The Navy, by 63,000, from 397,000 to 460,000;

(c) The Marine Corps, by 11,000, from 81,000 to 92,000;

(d) The Air Force, by 35,500, from 364,500 to 400,000.

This part of the program involves a supplemental budget request of $3,000,000,000 in cash and contract authorizations, over and above the authorizations which have already been requested.

This supplemental budget request, incidentally, represents the first instance since I took office as Secretary of Defense that there has been an opportunity to provide for the sort of balanced force I have been describing. Congress, in enacting the National Security Act of 1947, provided that the Secretary of Defense shall "supervise and coordinate the preparation of the budget estimates of the departments and agencies comprising the National Military Establishment; formulate and determine the budget estimates for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget." The report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board called for the exercise of this function to insure maximum return for the military-tax dollar. The $3,000,000,000-program submitted by me in my capacity as Secretary of Defense represents the first attempt to give to the Congress, in one package, the coordinated requirements of the National Military Establishment, in the interest of national security and with due consideration for the national economy.

Some of the details of this supplemental budget request have already been submitted to Congress, and the remainder will soon be submitted in the usual manner. The principal items of this supplemental budget request are: $775,000,000 for aircraft procurement, research, and development for the Air Force and naval aviation; about $760,000,000 for military personnel costs; and the balance for other necessary items of procurement, support, maintenance, and operations of the three services.

I have aleady referred to our proposal that funds for aircraft procurement be made available immediately. In a letter which I wrote to Chairman TABER on this subject on April 5, I said:

"As I mentioned in the course of our discussion on Saturday, it is my strong recommendation that funds for aircraft procurement be made available immediately to both the Air Force and the Navy, in order that the process of negotiating contracts can be begun at once. Our experience during the war has led me to the conclusion that the actual negotiation of contracts is the surest way to "get the ball rolling"—and is also the surest way to point up the concrete things that need to be done in order to make any procurement program a success.

"For example, any conclusions we might now make concerning the shortages which we might run into in an aircraft procurement program of any given size would be somewhat theoretical—but once an actual procurement program is under way, we will rapidly become aware of the exact nature of the difficulties we have to face and can then take the necessary steps to overcome these difficulties. Moreover, the lead time in aircraft procurement is an extremely important factor—and the earlier we start, the sooner we will be able to obtain delivery of the planes which our national security requires.

"I also mentioned to you on Saturday that I regard the aircraft procurement picture as the most pressing part of our procurement program, from the standpoint of the need for an early start. My specific recommendation, you will recall, was that your committee provide, both as to the $1,480,000,000 for aircraft procurement and research included in the 1949 budget and as to the $775,000,000 for the aircraft program in the supplemental request, that these moneys shall be available not only during fiscal 1949, but also that these moneys shall be available immediately for the negotiation of contracts.

"The total amount of aircraft procurement and research money which I mentioned on Saturday—that is, the total of the amounts included in the regular budget and in the supplemental request—will, in my opinion, form a base from which we can move to even greater aircraft procurement should circumstances warrant. It is a base of fairly substantial size—$2,255,000,000 in all. There are other components of our requirements which are badly needed, but the aircraft program touches so many and so varied parts of our production capabilities that I think it wise to give it the highest priority. Sixty days saved at this juncture may give us an advantage of many months in the acceleration of the whole aircraft program."

I shall refer to the subject of selective service rather briefly, since you will hear later on from other witnesses who will speak in detail on this subject.

If selective service were to be made applicable to the male age group from 19 to 25 years of age, inclusive, as we have proposed, I am advised that there would be in this group a total of 3,600,000 male nonveterans. After making allowance for those unfit for military service and for those entitled to exemption and deferment, there would remain about 1,355,000. From this age group will come the bulk of the estimated 500,000 voluntary enlistments during the fiscal year 1949, as well as all of the 220,000 men who it is estimated must be provided by selective service.

With your permission, I shall not go into the specific provisions of the UMT-selective service bill which I transmitted to you, nor shall I go into the specific provisions of the selective service bill which your committee is currently considering. In one particular field, that of doctors and dentists, I have asked the Surgeons General of the three services to prepare a coordinated recommendation, and this recommendation will be submitted to your committee in the immediate future.

The long-term part of our program deals with the inauguration of universal military training, established under a civilian commission and subject to periodc revew by the Congress. The budget for the fiscal year 1949, already submitted to you, makes provision for an appropriation of $500,000,000, and an expenditure of $400,000,000, for the initial steps which universal military training will require.

Even though this committee has already favorably reported a UMT bill, and even though this matter is not presently under consideration by you, I should like to advert briefly to the UMT program.

Many people have erroneously described the UMT program as a proposal which would involve expenditures of $4,000,000,000 a year. Similarly, it has been said that we cannot afford an annual expenditure of $4,000,000,000 for UMT, when at the same time we are planning to spend many billions additional for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

What are the facts? As I view the matter, the facts are these:

1. If UMT should be fully implemented, it may involve total recurring costs—by 1952—of approximately $1,700,000,000 a year.

2. In addition, the civilian components—the National Guard, the Air National Guard, the Naval Reserve, and so on—may involve—also by 1952, and whether or not UMT is enacted—annual costs approximating $1,600,000,000, including, it should be noted, more than $600,000,000 for aircraft procurement.

3. Obviously, the cost of the civilian components is not a cost of UMT, but some people succumb to the understandable temptation to add together figures that bear no logical relation to one another. They, therefore, add the figures in (1) and (2) above—then throw in an additional amount for investment in capital equipment—and arrive at a total in the neighborhood of $4,000,000,000.

To this I would add only one further comment: The same school of thought, as I have already noted, has added a corollary to the four-billion figure—the corollary being that by the peak year of 1952 we will also be spending tremendously increased amounts for ground-force equipment, for aircraft procurement, for ships, and for a host of other items. The fallacy here—or so it seems to me—is that we will not be spending these increased amounts on the Regular Establish-

ment, if in the meantime we have provided ourselves with trained and usable Reserve forces.

In other words, here, again, there is a temptation to add the unaddable—and I would say that if we lay our plans well now we will begin immediately to strengthen our Reserve forces, and will thereby make it possible to avoid the prohibitive costs of the Regular Establishment which many envision for the future.

Before taking that little excursion into the realm of figures and philosophy, I had outlined briefly the program which I am here to discuss. You will hear tomorrow and the day after from General Bradley, Admiral Denfeld, and General Spaatz, each of whom will discuss this program as it relates to his service.

Perhaps before going into this program in any greater detail it would be well to trace the developments which have led the President to recommend to the Congress that this program be undertaken.

By and large these developments are as new as this morning's newspaper—and as old as Genghis Khan. They are the now familiar pattern of aggression and conquest. They are developments which are as well known to you as they are to me, so I shall be brief in my description of them.

First, however, let me say that I abhor war, as do all Americans. Because of that abhorrance, what I have proposed here today is a specific program which is solely designed to achieve one great objective—to avert war, whether it be open or covert, in these times and in the times which lie ahead for us and the free peoples of the world.

Our Nation is deeply committed to the cause of peace. It is equally committed to the cause of freedom. It has always used its influence to maintain peace, but it has also by its actions made it clear that it would not permit the destruction of freedom. Twice in one lifetime we have had to enter the field of battle to prevent a conqueror from realizing his ambition of total world power.

The situation in the world today finds deadly analogies in the past. At the root of each analogy lies despotic power, uncurbed by firm opposition until too late to prevent the tragedy of war.

In 1914, it was a despot's contempt for a "scrap of paper" and the German rushed through Belgium that served as prelude to 4 years of war in Europe.

Twenty-five years later another tyrant was on the move. First, Hitler preyed upon the weak: the Austrian Anschluss in the winter of 1938; the rape of the Sudetenland in the following August; then the swallowing up of all of Czechoslovakia. Finding himself unchecked, except by the efforts of appeasement at Munich, Hitler grew convinced that the western democracies were without courage and without the will to remain free. On August 22, 1939, he told his commanders in chief: "We have nothing to lose; we can only gain. * * * Our enemies have men who are below average. * * * No personalities, no men of action. * * * Our enemies are little worms. * * * I saw them in Munich." Nine days later the Nazis marched in open war against Poland.

There is a deadly parallel between those events and the successive toppling of national governments in Europe during the last 3 years—first Poland, then Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia—although the same parallel does not necessarily exist between the human patterns behind these parallel events. Within less than a week Italy will have to make its choice—a choice in which the people of that country, with whom so many of our own citizens have ties of blood, will be harassed and threatened, cajoled and coerced, in an attempt to make them accept a system for which they have no stomach.

This record shows that despotism, whatever its form, has a remorseless compulsion to aggression. The shape of such aggression and the causes which lead to it may vary. The Kaiser embarked on overt war because he was confident thereby to achieve victory. Mussolini first marched on Rome to "free" Italy in the role of a leader of the masses. Hitler entered the Sudetenland ostensibly to lift the yoke of oppression from "free Germans." Today, another power, wearing the false mask of freedom plus economic plenty for the people seeks to spin its web over all western Europe.

The whole aim and effort of the United States is to attain the objective of peace, to prevent differences between nations developing into armed conflict, until the United Nations has gained the maturity and both the moral and physical force with which to deal with any international act of aggression. In the meantime, it must be made clear and manifest to the world that any nation which tries to copy the pattern of action which through Hitler brought so much disaster on mankind, must, like Hitler and Germany, face the determination and will of the United States.

The program which we advance today is not in contradiction of the United Nations, of which we are a member. To the contrary, the strength which we advocate for the United States is a minimum necessity if we are to discharge our responsibility in the family of peoples who desire peace. We wish to make it inescapably clear that the policy of the United States is backed by alert and resolute and ready power.

Because of its traditions and the nature of its government, it is always difficult for a democracy to make clear to a dictator that at some point in his aggression he must face the firm resistance of free nations. Four times the democratic nations waited too long to preserve the peace. Had the Kaiser known that Britain would take the invasion of Belgium as a cause of war between herself and Germany; had the arrogance of Mussolini in invading Ethiopia been met with other than ineffective sanctions; had the Japanese entry into Manchuria been countered in 1931 with strong determination by the United States and Great Britain; had Hitler's first tentative steps in the Saar and in the Ruhr been firmly opposed—can there be doubt of the effect upon the rising tempo of their boldness?

But in no case was the aggressor met with unequivocal, clear determination. The success of each aggressive step, uncurbed, encouraged the aggressor to wider and bolder methods until finally the unprepared democracies faced the overt onrush of tyrannical power at a time not of their choosing and most disadvantageous to them.

Today another great and despotic power threatens to extinguish freedom in Europe. You are only too well aware of its subtle agencies for political action in free countries, of its methods of subversion and infiltration—backed by armed strength in instant and obvious readiness—which subjugated Hungary and Czechoslovakia and which are now causing grave concern among the Scandinavian peoples.

But, despite this, the odds are not yet on Russia or war. The odds are still on the United States and peace. And if the United States acts at once and with firm and resolute purpose, the odds will continue to rest on the United States and peace through the years ahead.

On the one side of the ledger, you have the great land mass of the Soviet and her puppet states. The U. S. S. R. alone covers approximately one-sixth of the earth's land surface. Since 1939 the Soviets have acquired along their western border a solid belt of territory and satellite states, extending from Finland to the Black Sea and comprising approximately 500,000 square miles.

On the same side of the ledger is Russia's large population and her military forces under arms today—the largest numerically in the world.

But on the other side of the ledger are assets and potentialities, which if promptly developed into readiness, will turn the scale from a possibility of future war to a rational expectation of future peace. Let me speak of these assets in detail.

1. The heart of Europe is not dying or dead. There are 250,000,000 people in her free countries, and in those people persists a deep belief in free government and free institutions as a strong and vigorous spiritual force. Today these millions live under a gnawing fear. Our financial aid, however rapidly supplied through ERP, will not be enough alone to encourage them to work toward rehabilitation and resist subversion. For an effective recovery of their independence, they need one thing more. They must have assurance of America's resolute will to utilize her enormous energy and resources, her incomparable skills, and her unconquerable manpower in order to preserve the peace.

The disease of despair is contagious, but there is a greater contagion in hope. There are millions of men in these countries—just as there are also in those countries now subjugated to communism—who believe as we believe, feel as we feel, would aline themselves with us in preference to another—provided that they were free to make a real choice. They look in our direction. They are potential allies, not by virtue of any pressure imposed upon them but by reason of identity of thought and spirit. As a strictly military matter, we cannot afford to sit by while these countries fall, one by one, into the Soviet orbit, until we are left virtually alone and isolated in a Communist world.

2. Two wars have established beyond a doubt that, wholly apart from the capability in battle of our fighting men, the industrial and scientific accomplishments of the United States are preeminent. At the peak year of wartime appropriations (1944), the gross national product of the United States exceeded $210,000,000,000; in the year 1949, it is anticipated to exceed 243 billion. Our resources, such as coal, steel, wheat, cotton, and so on; our ability to produce and fabricate in mass quantities, because of the capacity of our managements and the high skills of America's laboring men and women; the inventive genius of our scientists; our vast transportation system—all of these, taken together, make up a potential that overshadows the capabilities of the Communist regime.

The Soviets suffered in World War II a terrible destruction of facilities of every kind. To supply these deficiencies, they have pillaged the industrial resources of the lands where their armies have penetrated; very recently, they have acquired the Skoda works and the modern industrial ability of Czechoslovakia. And beyond the horizon lies the coal of the Ruhr and the iron of Sweden.

3. The United States possesses the knowledge and the capacity to make the atom bomb, and as yet the Soviets do not. The mere possession of this undoubted asset would not necessarily turn the scale of war, if war should come. But its possession has undoubted power to dissuade from aggression any nation that believes we have sufficient military strength to put that weapon to effective use.

In connection with this particular asset, it is a fact known to all that we have tried, through proposed international agreement, to deny ourselves the use of this weapon—but it is also a fact known to all that our efforts to reach international agreement in the atomic field have been unsuccessful because of the Russian refusal to cooperate.

I do not recite the comparison of these assets to lull America into confidence, but

to wake America to the urgent necessity of realizing upon the potentialities which are hers before it may be too late to be effective. Our greatest danger today is that we shall dissipate our enormous potential through inaction and negligence. The shape of future war to come would be swift beyond all experience. In other wars, there was time to make ready. Today, the make-ready time exists only before the aggressor acts.

Consider what we will put in jeopardy through a continuing failure to place ourselves in ready strength. We made a tremendous effort and great sacrifices to win the war in which the fighting stopped two and a half years ago. We must not run the risk of losing that great investment in liberty by failure to prepare now to resist another effort at universal conquest—because that is what the fall of freedom in Europe will mean.

It is my belief that if we make it plain and clear that the United States will not tolerate the destruction of the western civilization of Europe we shall have peace. Not a peace, I believe, through long and exhausting war that will waste our manpower and our resources—but peace because, for once in world history, an aggressor will be forewarned of our determination backed by our strength.

It is equally clear to me that if we do not so act, we shall risk a war under circumstances which may be disastrous for us and for our friends throughout the world.

But this is no counsel of despair. There are not circumstances here which call for fear or hysteria. There is no slightest intent to shake the mailed fist or militarize our people or provoke a conflict. I merely say to you gentlemen that if the United States is now as alert and astute and intelligent in action as she is well-intentioned, the odds for enduring peace will continue to rest with us.

An inducing cause of World War II was the misapprehension of Hitler as to the real intentions and the will to fight of the free, democratic nations. He was confident, from what he had been told, that the United States was weak and would remain weak. Despotic power feeds readily upon what it wishes to hear. Similarly, it seems clear that the Soviet Union today misapprehends what I believe to be the determination of the United States.

We wish today to make that determination clear. The government of a free people has the responsibility to make known its intentions. Tonight the people of America—in fact, of the whole world—will know in full from their newspapers and radios the details of our discussion here today. Their right to such knowledge is the bedrock of liberty. But no one in this world, outside a small group in the Kremlin, can say what is the real intention of the Soviet rulers. We in America are sure only of the facts which cannot be overlooked: the threat of communism in western Europe and the inherent capabilities of Communist force to increase that threat.

The program I have suggested to you is only one factor in our comprehensive program of national security. Other factors—in addition to the matters to which I have directly adverted today—include a central intelligence agency; intensive research and development in scientific and technological weapons and procedures under the Research and Development Board, of which Dr. Vannevar Bush is chairman; and industrial mobilization under the Munitions Board, of which Mr. Thomas Hargrave is chairman. The three last-mentioned elements are now established and functioning. Let me repeat that all of the factors are essential and none can succeed fully without the others.

I shall not discuss these other factors in detail, nor shall I add any greater length to what may already be an overlong statement. In closing, however, let me stress to you that the time for action is now, for by acting promptly, and firmly, and decisively, we can maintain peace in the world.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared statement. I should like to file, for the record, copies of the statements which Secretaries Royall, Sullivan, and Symington delivered before the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 25. The four of us will be glad to attempt to answer any questions you may wish to address to us.

Rail Workers' Retirement Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the railroad brotherhoods have for many years led the way in progressive labor legislation. Because the railroad workers have had some of the most beneficial and forward-looking labor legislation they have become the most stable element of labor in the country. Many of us have wished that other labor organizations were as reasonable in their attitudes, and as sensible in their demands, as on the whole the railroad brotherhoods have been.

It is to be expected, therefore, that it is in this realm of labor that we find the next and most progressive move for the laboring man. That is a step toward some assurance of security in old age when the laborer can no longer work at his trade. The most unstabilizing factor in labor anywhere is the insecurity of unemployment, sickness, and old age. Modest steps have been taken in the field of railway labor toward assuring an end of these evils. When they are coped with on an adequate and economic basis for not only railroad labor but all labor, we pull the props from under Communist propagandists who try to play upon the insecurity of labor on the railroads and generally in the face of unemployment, illness, and old age.

In meeting this problem with railway labor, we have adopted legislation providing for unemployment and sickness insurance, and provided also for a modest retirement system for railroad workers. That legislation has provided elements of security as they go about their jobs and face the future. It is a step in the right direction.

However, these programs are pitifully inadequate. I refer particularly to the provision made for old-age retirement. Under the present law and under present economic conditions, a railroad man cannot retire. The average annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act is only about $70 a month. For many thousands it is $50 or less. The annuity formula on which these payments was based was established in 1937. We are all aware of the tremendous increase in living costs which has taken place since then. It is perfectly apparent that a railroad employee approaching retirement age faces a serious dilemma. Even if he owns his own home and has substantial savings, he would be reluctant to retire from his employment and face the hazards of retirement on such a small pension and constantly decreasing savings and perhaps the ill health which so often comes with advanced years. For all practical purposes this retirement annuity can hardly be considered as helping at all. In the face of dire necessity it would be some help—but nothing more.

Our distinguished colleague, Mr. CROSSER, who has championed so much of the railway labor legislation, has recently introduced a bill (H. R. 5993) which will tend to give some relief. The bill in effect provides that the annuity payments for retired railroad workers shall be increased from 20 to 25 percent, the higher percentage increases going to the lower-income groups. It is admitted of course that this will not cover increased costs of living any more than it would provide a complete retirement income even if prices had not increased. However, it will help.

And this is the important thing—it can be done without increasing the amount of money now required to be paid either by the railroads or the employees. The retiremen fund is in such a condition that no increased tax is necessary and the annuity payment can be increased in this amount. The amount has been arrived at by very careful actuarial and research work. It will grant the sorely needed relief to retired railroaders. It will avoid any increase in retirement taxes on either employer or employee. And it will keep the retirement fund in such a sound financial condition that the hundreds of thousands of railroaders still in service need have no fear that the retirement fund will be dissipated by the time they are ready to retire.

This legislation has my most vigorous support and I hope will be taken up for early enactment because it is not only the proper and humanitarian thing to do, but it is practical considering the economic problems.

The Flint Glass Workers State Position With Regard to Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered at a meeting of the West Virginia Glass Workers' Protective League on Tariff and Trade Agreements at Morgantown, W. Va., March 20, 1948, by Hon. Harry H. Cook, international president of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America:

Mr. Chairman, friends and fellow workers of the American handmade glassware industry, the time has come when we must pause to take stock of our position in the field of

foreign competition. This position is quite different from what it was before the war. Several developments that may be far-reaching have taken place while we were concerned with the war and its aftermath. It is time that we look at these developments and appraise them. We will find in them some very disquieting factors and we should determine what we can do about them. So much has happened during the past few years that some of the trends have gone unnoticed; and these trends are of great importance to us. One reason why they have not attracted the attention that they should have received is that in the field of international trade, we have operated on a highly sheltered side of the world. On this leeward side we have enjoyed prosperity and as a result have not been as alert as we otherwise would have been.

Because of conditions brought about by the war, the United States in 1947 exported twice as much as she imported. This condition may be expected to continue in lesser degree for some time to come. The destruction overseas crippled many of the manufacturing industries in important industrial nations while in this country we have been operating at levels that have surpassed all previous peacetime operations.

However, reconstruction has been under way in the war-torn countries and some of them are approaching prewar production and in some segments have exceeded this level. This is all to the good and no one who is interested in the restoration of peace and normal conditions regrets this progress. In fact, we all wish that it might have gone further.

The United States has supplied not only money and food, but machinery and equipment to help in the reconstruction and rehabilitation; and it is certain that we will do more yet. The purpose of the Marshall plan is to help some 16 European nations and possibly some others back on their feet by supplying food and clothing as well as additional raw materials and equipment. One purpose is to prevent the further spread of communism; the other, to restore normal prewar conditions.

We have no quarrel with these aims; but it would be short-sighted if we should fail to see that in carrying out our purposes we will, unless greater care is exercised, create troubles for ourselves in the future. Unless we watch the trends carefully and prepare to protect ourselves as the need may arise, we will find a growing foreign competition for our own markets within the United States itself.

Few people will deny the wisdom of helping the war-devastated countries. On the other hand, this help does not and should not call for the creation of future advantages in behalf of those countries without providing means of defending ourselves against some of the effect that the very success of our help will bring about. Unless we lay the groundwork more carefully we may become the victims of our helpfulness. This is not a necessary result but it does require that we do not go forward blindly, under the delusion that present conditions that are favorable to the United States will continue indefinitely. We can render the necessary help without surrendering the necessary measures of defense to protect ourselves when conditions change, as they will if our help is successful.

Judged by some of our actions of the past few years, there is distinct danger that we will not exercise the necessary care. The United States, through the State Department, acting on the leeward side of the storm, has already taken steps that make it clear that we are forgetting the past or misreading its lessons, and as a result are not looking far enough into the future. Either that or our foresight is badly clouded.

One example lies in the negotiation of a large number of trade agreements at one time in Geneva during 1947. Before that time we had already made individual agreements with some 25 countries. At Geneva we signed some 18 agreements at one sweep, some of them with countries with which we had already had agreements. We cut our duties on nearly one-half of all the articles on which we collect duties and these cuts ran from 25 to 50 percent of the existing rates. We also made smaller cuts and froze other rates so that we cannot increase them. We agreed to leave yet other items on the free list on the assumption that they would never need protection.

This was done at a time when, taking a short-range view, there was little to fear. We were exporting twice as much as we were importing. So why not make liberal cuts in our tariff? The other countries need to sell to us and we should buy from them in order to help them. We were using our foreign trade as a tool to undo the damage of the war. Nobody in this country would be injured. The step seemed a harmless one, provided we did not look into the future. The war-torn countries were not yet in a position to take full advantage of the cuts. So why worry about the future? Of course, we could have taken off our tariff completely and felt almost equally safe for the time being. The cuts were being made without adequate study. It was humanly impossible in the time allowed and the personnel assigned, to make proper studies of the competitive conditions surrounding the thousands of items both here and abroad on which cuts were made. The State Department simply wanted to reduce the tariff and that is what they did. They have steadfastly refused to say how and on what basis they arrived at the cuts they made. Yet they claim that they gave careful study. Anyone who is familiar with the kind of information that is necessary to determine the ability of foreign producers to undersell us knows that adequate studies could not have been made in the amount of time that was available. No one was sent abroad to study the industries where they are located. Only general information, such as may be found in printed form, could have been used. Beyond that the word of the foreign delegates had to be relied upon.

These trade agreements run for a period of 3 years. After that they will continue until 6 months' notice of withdrawal is given. Before that time we will almost surely find that we acted unwisely in a number of instances and without proper regard for our own interests. When the time arrives that imports begin coming in at prices far below our own, our hands will be pretty well tied. If then we seek to protect ourselves, we will be accused of going back on our agreements and of breaking faith.

The danger would not be so great but for two facts. One is that there is no evidence that wages in the foreign countries are being raised any nearer to our own levels than they were before the war. The other is that much new and modern equipment is being installed in foreign industry with our help. The foreign countries will be in a stronger competitive position than they were before the war; and they will find a lower tariff to overcome when they send their goods to this country.

To meet the low prices of these foreign goods, our own producers, the American employers, faced with low-priced foreign competition, must lower their prices. They will expect their employees to accept lower wages. The influx of foreign goods will reduce the sales of our own industries; and this will spell unemployment.

We in the United States do not fear competition at reasonable prices; for we can meet it and retain our market. We cannot, however, meet prices based on foreign wages that are far below our own without ruinous effects on our wages and employment.

The purpose of the tariff is to enable us to meet just such conditions. But what have we done through the State Department? We have made agreements reducing our tariffs or binding them at a time when because of abnormal conditions we did not feel the effects of foreign competition.

The trade agreements do carry a so-called escape clause; at least those that were most recently negotiated carry such a clause. In order to invoke this clause, however, application must be made to the Tariff Commission. This body will make an investigation and if it finds the conditions to be as alleged, will make a recommendation to the President. The whole or part of a reduction previously made may then be set aside.

To get relief in this manner proof must be submitted to show:

1. That there has been an increase in the quantity of imports.
2. That this increase has been the result of unforeseen conditions.
3. That it has resulted from a concession (duty reduction or binding) made on the particular article.
4. That the increased imports are entering under such conditions as actually to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers.

Not only will it be difficult to furnish much proof but the process of investigation and study will take many months to carry out. In the case of glass tableware it is never easy to determine the quantity of imports as distinguished from the value because of the great variety of sizes and qualities imported. Weight is not an acceptable basis of comparison for this reason; nor is number of dozens of pieces. Yet how else could the quantity be measured?

How prove that increased imports were unforeseen? Unforeseen by whom? If they were foreseen as we foresee them, presumably no relief could be obtained. Furthermore, how would it be possible to prove that the increase in imports resulted from the duty reduction rather than something else?

It is clear that the escape clause will not be satisfactory in operation, especially if it will be administered by those who believe that our tariffs should be progressively lowered.

The Trade Agreements Act expires June 12 of this year. The President has sent to Congress a request for its extension for a further 3-year period. This would permit the negotiation of further duty reductions. But even if the law is not extended the existing agreements will remain in effect until the required 6 months' notice is given. The likelihood of such notice being served may be judged by the failure of the State Department to abrogate the agreement with Mexico after that country withdrew all its concessions granted to us and in addition increased some of its rates above their pretrade agreement level. We are keeping this one-sided arrangement in effect so far as our concessions to Mexico are concerned.

Another step that has been taken by the State that indicates a lack of the foresight called for is its initiation and promotion of the International Trade Organization. The Charter for this organization is now being negotiated with 58 other nations in Habana. This is the fourth conference during the past 2½ years and every effort is being made, including many concessions by the United States, to finish the work and obtain signatures by the various nations.

Should we become a member of this organization we will be pledged to enter into negotiations and carry out further substantial reductions in our tariff. The United States, though at first seeking a number of votes for the larger countries in keeping with their greater volume of trade, agreed to one vote per country. Adherence to the organization will mean that our Congress will have no power over our tariff as long as we remain a member.

The Charter, if adopted at Habana, will, however, require ratification by Congress.

Obviously, acceptance of membership in the Organization is an overshadowing question and is much more important than the trade agreements question alone.

The outlook at the present time is that the Trade Agreements Act will be extended but that its method of administration may be modified. An attempt will be made to limit the extension to a 1-year period. Among the amendments that may be sought is congressional approval of future trade agreements as a condition on their going into effect. Other amendments will also be offered. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House has recently appointed a subcommittee to study the President's request and to make a report on it.

America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, with offices in Washington, and with which the Flint Glass Workers' Union is affiliated, is in close touch with the developments and will exert its utmost efforts to bring about legislation that will aim at untying the hands of our protective powers so that our tariff can once more be made to perform its true function. This conference needs our active support; and out best interests lie in giving our support and continuing to do so until flexibility of the tariff is restored. Only in this way can we hope to meet the changing competitive conditions of the world.

It will also be to our interest to watch carefully the developments of the International Trade Organization. It is expected that the Habana Conference will complete its work in the near future and that the Charter will be signed. It is very doubtful, however, that the Charter will be brought forward for ratification by the present Congress unless the session is prolonged through the summer. In an election year this is not considered highly probable.

The International Trade Organization cannot be defended on the same grounds as the Marshall plan although this is usually attempted. The Organization is designed for the permanent control of the conditions under which world trade is carried out. The purpose is to remove existing trade barriers and thus to move on to free trade. In the end we would be left virtually without any protection against the influx of goods made abroad by low-paid workers.

The charter also carried an escape clause; but the value of this clause would be even less than it is in the trade agreements. The question of relief under the clause would be decided through consultations with countries that were affected by the tariff rate involved. We would be placing ourselves into the hands of our competitors.

After viewing the direction taken by the State Department in the last few years we cannot avoid the conclusion that they are not interested in protecting our job opportunities but rather in opening our doors to imports so that certain industries may export more to other markets. To this end the interests of other industries are sacrificed.

There is no other way of making our voices heard than through communication with our elected Representatives and by backing up those who speak for us in Washington as our direct Representatives.

The Real Crisis in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 8, 1948:

THE REAL CRISIS IN ITALY—IT MAY COME AFTER THE ELECTION IN FORM OF MILITARY CHALLENGE TO GOVERNMENT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Italy goes to the polls a week from Sunday, and the thoughts of the world go with her.

The Italian elections, generally regarded as a crisis of contemporary history, may, indeed, record a high-water mark of communism, but election day itself—April 18—may not provide the real crisis.

For the danger in Italy does not now appear to be an electoral one. Communist political chances have diminished somewhat in recent weeks, and there seems to be only a faint outside possibility that the Communists and their left-wing Socialist allies will poll more than 45 percent of the vote; they may well poll very much less. But the allies of Moscow are almost certain to poll a sizable minority, so sizable that they may not accept an inferiority of ballots but may attempt by extralegal means a conquest of power.

Though riots and disorders may well occur on election day and, increasingly, in the intervening period, the major crisis may not come until after election—possibly between April 18 and May 8—when under the Italian constitution the chamber of deputies and senate convene to start the process of forming the new government.

This period of a "lame duck" government and the following period on into May and June may be a "time of troubles," for the Communists may try by force and the threat of force—internal and external—to compel their inclusion in the new government or (but less likely) to seize absolute power.

FORCE MAY BE DETERMINANT

The strength of the military, or semimilitary, forces available to both sides will, therefore, be a major determinant of history. Has the Italian Government, in other words, the strength to repulse an overt challenge to its authority?

The Italian military forces are limited by the peace treaty to 185,000 men in the army, 65,000 in the carabinieri or military police, 25,000 in the air force and 27,500 (until March 15) in the navy, a figure which is to be reduced to 22,500 by June 15. Some 2,500 additional men above these figures are allowed the navy as long as minesweeping due to the war continues. The navy is not permitted any aircraft carriers, submarines, motor torpedo boats or modern battleships; the army is limited to 200 tanks, medium and heavy, and the air force is permitted 200 fighter and reconnaissance-type planes and 150 transport, air-sea rescue, training and liaison-type aircraft.

The morale, organization, and training of these forces differs considerably. The navy is believed to be thoroughly loyal with little or no Communist infiltration; the monarchist influence is still strong. The air force also is believed to be anti-Communist and can, it is thought, be depended upon by government in an internal emergency.

The Army, however, is less certain. It never has been recruited to full strength of 185,000; it probably numbers about 130,000. There has been some—though not notable—Communist infiltration; the morale of some units is indifferent and the organization leaves something to be desired. In any case, the bulk of the Italian Army's strength—some five or seven existing divisions—is concentrated in the northeast, near the Yugoslav frontier.

The carabinieri, or national military police, is the force which must be the principal rampart between the Italian Government and internal aggression. This body of men is fortunately well trained, well equipped, proud of its traditions and discipline and firmly loyal. There has been little or no Communist infiltration; the carabinieri commander, an able nonpolitical leader, has seen to that. A significant comment on the loyalty of the carabinieri is the fact that 30,000 men of the Italian army have been transferred, for the election period, to carabinieri control.

In addition to these forces, the Italian Government is also able to call upon municipal and local police. The local police forces all over Italy probably number 70,000 to 90,000 (in addition to the 65,000 of the carabinieri) but they are, of course, dispersed; they are not well equipped and in some instances—particularly in the industrial north—the loyalty of some units might be open to question.

COMMUNISTS WELL ARMED

The Communist military or paramilitary strength in Italy is organized in an underground army, fanatical and well trained and apparently well equipped (except for heavy arms). Its exact size is unknown, but probably it numbers at least 40,000 men, and some estimates range to more than 100,000. Great quantities of hidden arms, some of them smuggled in from Yugoslavia, have been found daily in Italy for the past year in Government-conducted searches; the quantities indicate sufficient weapons—at least of the small-arms categories—to arm thousands.

The well-organized, well-trained, and well-equipped Communist military units probably are not very large, however; the chief Communist strength consists of the party's control of the Italian labor unions.

Despite this formidable underground strength it now seems probable that the Italian Government has sufficient reliable military strength to handle any armed revolt in the country that is not nurtured or actively assisted—once fighting starts—from outside the Italian borders. The government forces operate at a disadvantage, in that they are dispersed and the Communist forces can concentrate, perhaps in sufficient force to seize control of some of the northern cities. But unless a situation like that in Greece is precipitated by Yugoslavia, or unless the numerically strong Yugoslav Army of 350,000 to 400,000 men openly moves in Italy or sends armed tourists in great numbers across the frontier, the Italian Government probably can—though not certainly—repulse any internal challenge to its authority. But if to internal challenge is added external aggression, Italy can survive only with United States help.

Intercollegiate Conference on Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, at the Twelfth Annual Intercollegiate Conference on Government, Philadelphia, Pa., April 9, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, delegates to this twelfth annual intercollegiate conference on government and their friends, I feel honored to have been invited to represent the great Democratic Party at this important conference, and I hope that my message will be of some help to you in your deliberations.

I congratulate you for the keen interest you are taking in your Government. When the young people take an active part in their Government, in its functions, and its accomplishments, then the country's future is assured.

I wonder how many of you realize that you are real politicians. By your very presence at this conference, by taking an active part in its deliberations, by the discussions you will have with your friends and neighbors after this conference, you are engaging in politics. And that is the best thing you can do.

Now when I say you are politicians I do not mean that you are office seekers or party bosses. Neither do I use the terms politics and politicians as they are so often misused.

Many people think of politics as not quite respectable, and they think of politicians as back-alley characters. That's all wrong.

Let me define the words and apply to them the meaning in which I use them.

Politics is the machinery by which we, the people, run our Government.

Politicians are the people who participate in the running of our Government. Every man or women who votes is a politician. By the political activity of voting we fulfill our duty as citizens. Persons too young to vote but who take an interest in the affairs of Government and arouse the interest of their fellow men in Government affairs are politicians.

We need more of this type of politicians in this country. Too many persons are satisfied to enjoy the freedom and the privileges that go with American citizenship and too conveniently forget that with these privileges go certain responsibilities, of which one is to register and vote. Sad, but true, is the fact that there were 55 million less politicians in this country than there should have been at the time of the 1946 election. While there were 91,000,000 persons eligible to vote, only 35,000,000 bothered to go to the polls. Almost two-thirds of the eligible voters stayed at home. They "let George do it."

The fact that there are corrupt politicians, and I admit there are, should not deter decent, upright men and women from taking an active part in politics. Bear in mind that there are corrupt financiers, corrupt merchants, corrupt industrialists, and corrupt preachers, too. It is unfair to draw a sweeping indictment against any sector of society because it contains, here and there, a corrupt man or woman. Nothing could be more foolish than to entertain the notion that elimination of politicians would mean the elimination of corruption from Government. Elimination of politicians would only mean the extermination of democracy in Government. As Thomas Jefferson so well said: "Political interest can never be separated, in the long run, from moral right."

Under our democratic form of government, a corruptionist, be he a politician, or a member of any other sector of our society, is sooner or later found out and dealt with through legal and political action. Corruptionists are untouchables only under a dictatorship, such as existed in Germany and Italy before the last war, or as perhaps exists behind the Iron Curtain today. Yet the greatest attack on politicians in this country comes from elements who seem to uphold the viewpoint and practices which every decent American condemns.

So, I say to you, continue your active interest in your Government. By your actions you will make it stronger and help to attain for ourselves and for the world the long sought after just and lasting peace.

Our country is great because of its two great political parties. Yet someone recently said that because the Republicans and the Democrats consider our international problem in a more or less nonpartisan manner, we have reached a point where there is no difference between the two major parties.

Of course, that is not true. There is today, as there has been for the last century and a half, a great difference.

The difference is written in the records of Democratic and Republican Presidents, and in the records of Democratic and Republican Congresses.

The record shows that the Republicans believe in government for the benefit of the classes; the Democrats believe in government for the benefit of the masses. Republicans put property rights first. Democrats put human rights first.

The Republican Party, from Hamilton to today, believes that if the wealthy interests are protected by special privileges from government, the benefits will diffuse to the whole people, "trickling down to them."

The Democratic Party, from Jefferson to Truman, believes in equal opportunity for all, special privilege to none. It believes that America is great not because of what is called the "upper classes," but because of the character, the ability, the fundamental worth and the common sense of the average American citizen.

History proves the fallacy of the Republican philosophy. The workingman benefited little from big business protected by Republicanism—until he banded with others and organized the union-labor movement.

Little effort was made to protect women and children from exploitation in industry—until legislation forced the protection.

Little was done to provide security to the average American—until the great reform era of the 1930's, with its legislation for social security, unemployment insurance, old-age and survivors' benefits, minimum wage-maximum hours legislation, and other provisions for fair-labor standards. Similar benefits have come to all groups of citizens—farmers, small business, small-bank depositors, small investors.

And they have come under Democratic Party leadership.

It is the philosophy of the Democratic Party that prompted Lincoln to say that "the principles of Jefferson are the definitions and the axioms of a free society."

The Democratic Party believes in the unlimited opportunity in America; in our great free-enterprise system, in the accumulation of wealth, all Republican arguments to the contrary notwithstanding. But the Democratic Party is bitterly opposed to special privilege to anyone who, because of wealth or power, thinks that he should be treated differently by his Government than his fellow man. As President Truman said recently: "Government run for the benefit of the few will inevitably destroy all. Government run for the good of all will benefit all."

Let me, in passing, cite a concrete example of legislation for the benefit of the few.

The Republican tax-reduction bill which recently became law over the President's veto, is a case in point.

The bill provides tax relief of $4,700,000,000. Of that amount $1,748,000,000 in tax reduction will go to 2,284,000 taxpayers; that is, 36.9 percent of the benefits will go to 4 percent of the taxpayers, all with incomes of over $5,000 a year. The remainder of the tax relief, $2,900,000,000; will be distributed among 49,700,000 other taxpayers—the remaining 96 percent.

This example illustrates what I mean when I say that the Republicans' philosophy is that, if the wealthy interests are protected by special privileges, the benefits will diffuse to all the people, trickling down to them. One of the arguments they used in support of this bill was that, if greater tax reduction was given to those with high incomes, these would provide jobs for those in the low-income groups.

It was Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, who said:

"Men, by their constitutions, are naturally divided into two parties:

"1. Those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all power from them into the hands of the higher classes;

"2. Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe * * * depository of the public interest.

"In every country these two parties exist and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write, they will declare themselves."

We Democrats are the party of liberalism in America. We are the party of the people. We believe in the dignity of man.

The platforms of the Democratic Party since 1856 are replete with planks enunciating the accomplishments, the aims, and the purposes of the Democratic Party, and a perusal of these planks will show that always it has been the aim of the Democratic Party to establish a government of, for, and by the people, the very type of government which was the ideal of that great patriot and statesman, Abraham Lincoln.

The Democratic Party is the party of action. It is the party of action today as it was in 1933.

Most of you are old enough to remember, and those who are too young can find it in the pages of history, that when Franklin D. Roosevelt was first inaugurated President of these United States, our country was at the depth of the greatest depression the world has ever known. It was then that President Roosevelt said: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." He followed up this statement with bold action. He closed all the banks to prevent them from going bankrupt and to save as much as possible of the life savings of the people of this country. A Democratic Congress followed this up with the enactment of legislation creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation that now insures your bank savings.

When he took office, President Roosevelt found that the Republicans, who had been in control of our Government for 12 years, had done nothing to stop the depression and to restore our economy, which had been shattered by the stock-market crash of 1929, except to say that prosperity was just around the corner, and that states and private charities should take care of the people in need by setting up soup kitchens and permitting veterans to sell apples on the street corners.

The Democratic Party, under the leadership of that greatest of all statesmen, proceeded to enact legislation to protect the homes and farms of our citizens from being placed on the auction block. It passed social-security legislation for the benefit of the needy, the aged, the blind, and dependent children; legislation to provide unemployment compensation for those who lose their jobs. It provided conservation, irrigation, and reclamation programs to restore the fertility of the soil and to reclaim lands that today make up some of our best farms. In other words, the Democratic Party has been working in the interests of all the people, realizing fully that when a people is happy and prosperous its country is great and its government is sound.

The Democratic Party today, under the leadership of President Truman, is carrying out the principles of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt.

President Truman has, on repeated occasions, presented to the Congress a Democratic program in the interest of all the people.

On November 17, 1947, for instance, in an effort to stem the tide of inflation, President Truman presented to the Congress a 10-point program, recommending the following legislative action:

First. To restore consumer credit controls and to restrain the creation of inflationary bank credit.

Second. To authorize the regulation of speculative trading on the commodity exchanges.

Third. To extend and strengthen export controls.

Fourth. To extend authority to allocate transportation facilities and equipment.

Fifth. To authorize measures which will induce the marketing of livestock and poultry at weights and grades that represent the most efficient utilization of grain.

Sixth. To enable the Department of Agriculture to expand its program of encouraging conservation practices in this country, and to authorize measures designed to increase the production of foods in foreign countries.

Seventh. To authorize allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

Eighth. To extend and strengthen rent control.

Ninth. To authorize consumer rationing on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living.

Tenth. To authorize price ceilings on products in short supply which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production, and to authorize such wage ceilings as are essential to maintain the necessary price ceilings.

He said, and I quote: "If we neglect our economic ills at home, if we fail to halt the march of inflation, we may bring on a depression from which our economic system, as we know it, might not recover."

What was the Republican reply to this appeal? Let me give you a few samples of typical comments of Republican Members of the House and Senate on the President's message.

For instance, Congressman SCHWABE, of Oklahoma, said, and I quote: "In simple English, this means the President asked Congress to give him dictatorial power over the most essential items of food, clothing, and housing. Stripped of all its phraseology, it was a bid for power that the President voluntarily released months ago. It was a recommendation that OPA be revived and resurrected from the dead and given new life."

Senator TAFT, of Ohio, the recognized spokesman of the Republican Party, said, and I quote: "Bad as the price situation is, this is no more an emergency like war. The high-priced condition is no accident. It has obviously resulted from the policies of the administration which has controlled this Government for the past 15 years and throughout the war. Prices are higher because demand is greater than supply. Although the supply is tremendously increased over prewar, the money available for spending has increased still more. The war was financed on inflation with a deficit of $50,000,000,000 a year for 3 or 4 years."

I wonder if Senator TAFT means by that, that we should not have gone to war in order to save money. I wonder, if in Senator TAFT's opinion, it would have been better to save the money and permit our people to become slaves of the dictatorial nations.

Another of Senator TAFT's comments on President Truman's speech of November 17 was, "The way to control the cost of living, is to slash Government expenses, cut taxes, curtail price credit, control expenses, and modify the cost of the long-range Marshall plan for economic recovery of Europe."

President Truman is still waiting for action on his recommendations of last November. The Republican-controlled Congress made a pretense of enacting anti-inflation legislation just before the Congress adjourned last year. But the bill that was passed was so lacking in effectiveness that Senator WILSON of Iowa, a Republican, and a former governor of his State said of it, and I quote: "I'm not in favor of kidding the public. This bill won't accomplish anything and anybody who studies it will find that out."

We Democrats realize that the European recovery program is, as Secretary of State Marshall said, "a calculated risk." But we are willing to take that risk. We believe that there is a good chance that the program will succeed.

We believe that it is better to spend the approximately $17,000,000,000 required for this program, over a period of 4 years, than it is to sit back, do nothing but await the result of Communist activities throughout the world, and then take the consequences.

Compare the cost of this program with our expenditures for World War II, and you will find that it is only about 5 percent as great. It is only 3 percent of our national income during the life of the program. Is it not better to spend $17,000,000,000 for peace, than to spend three to four hundred billion dollars, plus 1,000,000 casualties, to fight a war? I leave that question for you to answer.

While we are using every effort possible to establish an honorable peace we must not let down our guard. We must provide for a national defense that can be effective in case of attack. President Truman has made recommendations to accomplish this.

The Democratic Party favors enactment of a Federal national health insurance program which would provide every American with good medical care, but the Republicans propose instead a medical dole to the States wishing to dish it out.

The issue poses a choice. It is between the Republican way of expending sums of the taxpayers' money to provide medical care to those who must beg "I am needy," or extending the self-respecting principle of social security, which is a pay-as-you-go method of assuring medical care to all, at no greater cost than is now spent for inadequate medical care by the average American family.

That there is an acute shortage of housing in this country is admitted by nearly everyone. The Democratic Party has been consistent in its efforts to meet this need by way of legislation providing for the construction of both private and Government financed housing. We believe that private interests either cannot or do not want to build low-rent housing, the type of dwelling units so urgently needed by servicemen and others with low incomes. The Republicans, yielding to the pressure of the real-estate lobby, have consistently, up to now, blocked every bill containing provisions for the construction of publicly financed low-cost dwelling units.

Because of the critical housing shortage situation, the selling price and rental price of housing is under continued pressure. This makes rent control a necessity if we are to keep a roof over the heads of the millions of people who find it extremely difficult to meet the present high cost of living. Yet, yielding to the pressure of the real-estate lobby, the Republicans, in answer to the Democrats' demands for a real rent-control bill, pushed through the Congress a few days ago a bill so weak and ineffective that President Truman in signing it said that it was just better than no bill at all.

The Democratic Party believes that excise or sales taxes are unfair and inequitable and should not be used except in time of war or great emergency. We favor the repeal of excise taxes on such items as electric light bulbs, ladies' handbags, transportation of persons and property, telephone calls, telegrams, costume jewelry, cosmetics, and other nonluxury items.

The Democratic Party believes that to offset this loss of revenue there could be reimposed an excess-profits tax on corporations that, while making excessive profits, maintain the highest selling prices that their products will bear.

That corporations are making exorbitant profits and that the Democrats are justified in taking this position can readily be seen by studying the profits of corporations.

Statistics show that corporate profits for 1947, after taxes, were $17,000,000,000. In 1946, corporate profits were $12,500,000,000; in 1939, they were $5,000,000,000. And do not forget that these profits were made under a Democratic administration. In 1932, the last year under a Republican President, corporate profits, after taxes, were zero. In fact, corporate losses, after taxes, in 1932, were $3,400,000,000.

And yet these same corporations complain that they are not being treated fairly under a Democratic administration.

Here are a few of many interesting figures I could quote. The 1947 profits of the American Rolling Mill was 45.5 percent above its 1946 profits, after taxes. Worthington Pump & Machine Co. increased its profits, after taxes, in 1947 over 1946, by 107 percent. Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. increased its 1947 profits over 1946, after taxes, by 233 percent; and General Cable Corp. increased its profits by 247 percent, after taxes.

Because these large corporations prefer to make exorbitant profits rather than reduce the price of their products, the cost of living continues to rise. Yet, the Republican-controlled Congress refuses to follow the recommendations of the Democratic Party and enact real anti-inflation legislation.

The present Congress, which came into being in January of 1947, is under Republican control. This means that the Republican philosophy, of legislation for the classes, prevails.

While the Republicans' plea is for a return to normal—which means the prewar level of business and employment—the Democratic Party, always progressive, strives for the continued development and expansion of our economic system and for development of the moral and spiritual elements of tolerance, unselfishness, and brotherhood, upon which true freedom and opportunity must rest.

Repeal Wartime Taxes on Barbers, Beauty Operators, and Movies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the war is over. General reductions of the income tax have been voted by the Congress. And yet we find that wartime taxes are still being collected on toilet preparations and motion-picture admissions. I think that this is unjust, discriminatory, and something should be done about it.

BARBERS AND BEAUTY OPERATORS

In 1941, when Congress was searching desperately for sources of revenue for war purposes, a tax of 10 percent on the retail selling price of toilet preparations was imposed. When the need for increased Federal revenues arose in 1943 this rate was increased to 20 percent. Although it was called a war rate and described as temporary, it remains at 20 percent.

There are a few people who still refer to toilet preparations as luxuries. By

the majority of citizens, however, fortunately toilet articles are no longer considered luxuries. Their cost has a place in the family budget. The time has come when excise taxes should be levied only on those items which do not affect the health and cleanliness of our taxpayers. As prices rise and there is no longer an urgent need to keep in effect the taxes and high rates that prevailed during the war years, the Congress should take action to remove them promptly.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 6111, to remove the war-tax rate on toilet preparations.

When there are no taxes on such nonessential items as yachts and polo ponies, it is inconceivable to me that the Federal Government would maintain a tax at a war-time rate on items that contribute to the health and cleanliness of our Nation.

I have introduced another bill, H. R. 6187, which would eliminate the troubles besetting the operators of beauty and barber shops.

This tax adds to the cost of operating a beauty or barber ship. The greater portion of the shop revenue is derived from rendering services, and cosmetics are part of the beauty operator and barber's tools. A tax on cosmetics used in shops is a tax on the tools of labor. The average gross income of shops is less than $3,000, and it is apparent that a 20-percent tax on cosmetics which constitute the bulk of the material used in the shop places an undue financial burden on the average shop.

This tax is difficult to administer since beauty shops are both retailers and consumers of taxable cosmetics. A realistic enforcement of the tax would cost the Government an amount of money which is out of proportion to the revenue received from the tax on cosmetics used in shops.

This tax places a burden on a shop selling cosmetics by requiring it to file monthly with each and every wholesale supply dealer a certificate of purchase for resale when buying cosmetics for resale. It places an undue burden on small shops, particularly, in that they must keep many records to assure themselves of compliance with the law.

Both of the bills I have introduced, H. R. 6111 and H. R. 6187 are needed to remove the hardships on the customers and the beauty and barber shop operators.

MOVIE ADMISSIONS

The tax on general admissions was established in 1917 at a rate of 1 cent for each 10 cents. The war-tax rate, which increased the tax to 1 cent for each 5 cents, was imposed in 1943. This increase was also termed temporary. In the committee reports and in congressional debate it was repeatedly pointed out that this high rate would be lowered after the war was declared over.

The time has come when this tax on family entertainment should be lowered.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 6112, to accomplish this.

By comparison with other excise taxes the rate of tax is extremely high. It bears equally hard on the well-to-do and the poor alike, whose only amusement or entertainment is often put beyond the reach of their pocketbook when they take the wife and kids to a movie or a circus. The local theaters, which play an important part in all community activities, have shown a steady decline in attendance. It is conceded by most people who have studied the situation that many people of modest means stay away from the movie because they simply cannot bear the extra costs of the tax.

Thus you have not only the taxpayer who seeks amusement being hurt, but the tax is in a position to destroy the industry furnishing the amusement.

Forts Sumter and Moultrie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert copy of a resolution recently adopted by the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Association of Erie County, N. Y., protesting against the destruction of Forts Sumter and Moultrie in Charleston Harbor, S. C. It seems to me only fitting and proper that these monuments be preserved in memory of the brave soldiers who gave their all in battle.

The resolution follows:

Whereas it has been reported that the Department of the Army is contemplating the dismantling of Forts Sumter and Moultrie in Charleston Harbor, S. C., and sale of the property to private interests; and

Whereas these forts played an important part in the Civil War, being the spot where the die was cast for one of the bitterest conflicts of all time, upon the outcome of which depended the preservation of the Union of United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Association of Erie County, N. Y., protests the destruction of these historic forts and the sale of the properties on which they stand, and urges their preservation as national monuments to the memory of the brave men of the North and South who struggled there in defense of the right "as God gave them to see the right."

Moved, seconded, and passed with a quorum present.

MRS. WILLARD B. STEPHAN,
Secretary.

Unequal Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Mr. Dewey Anderson, executive director, Public Affairs Institute, which appeared in the Washington Post of April 10, 1948.

The letter is not only interesting but very illuminating and I commend its reading to every Member of the House.

Congress has passed the 1948 tax-reduction law over the President's veto. The very substantial margin by which Congress overrode the veto would indicate that many Congressmen believed that this tax-relief measure would provide the type of equitable tax treatment that we in America have endeavored to build into our tax structure. That is—taxing according to ability to pay. Or put it another way—granting relief where the need is most urgent.

Let us examine the tax-reduction law and see if it meets this test. The President in his veto message stated:

"The tax reduction provided by this bill is inequitable. * * *"

In the case of the income tax, nearly 40 percent of the reduction would go to individuals with net incomes in excess of $5,000, who constitute less than 5 percent of all taxpayers.

In the case of the estate and gift taxes, nearly all of the $250,000,000 annual reduction would go to only about 12,000 of the most wealthy families.

There can be no question that the central issue in consideration of tax reduction at this time should have been to provide relief to the middle- and low-income groups who have suffered most from inflation. Moreover it was on this group that a substantial part of the wartime tax burden was shifted. This shift, combined with runaway prices, has seriously undermined the purchasing power and consumption of the millions of wage earners who earn $5,000 or less a year. The following table indicates the extent to which the tax load has been shifted onto these groups since 1939.

TABLE I.—*Percent of total income-tax bill by income classes, 1939 and 1947*

Income class [1]	1939	1947 [2]
Under $2,000	2.4	13.5
$2,000 to $3,000	2.3	18.5
$3,000 to $5,000	5.1	23.4
Total	9.8	55.4
$5,000 to $10,000	9.0	7.8
$10,000 to $25,000	17.0	12.4
$25,000 and over	64.2	24.4
Total	90.2	44.6
Grand total	100.0	100.0

[1] After deductions but before exemptions.
[2] Estimated.

As the table indicates, the shift in the wartime tax burden resulted in the $2,000–$3,000 class having their share of the total tax burden increased almost nine times, while those in the $25,000-and-over class had their share of the tax burden reduced by more than 60 percent.

How does the tax relief passed by the Congress, and which the Senate Committee on Finance stated in its report "is heavily concentrated among taxpayers in the low income brackets," affect this drastic shift in the tax burden? The tax reduction among the 52,000,000 taxpayers under $5,000 amounts to $3,200,000,000, or a little over $60 per taxpayer; the reduction for the 2,400,000 taxpayers over $5,000 amounts to $1,300,000,000, or a little less than $600 per taxpayer. In other words, when you examine the effect of the tax bill on a "per taxpayer" basis you find that the relief is not heavily concentrated

among the lower brackets as the committee report states.

Moreover, as the President pointed out in his veto message, nearly all of an additional $250,000,000 relief in gift and estate taxes goes to 12,000 of the most wealthy families. The following table indicates the effect of the tax-reduction bill on the distribution of the tax burden.

TABLE II.—*Percent of total income-tax bill, 1939, and under new tax law*

Income class [1]	1939	1948 [2]
Under $2,000	2.4	11.8
$2,000 to $3,000	2.3	17.2
$3,000 to $5,000	5.1	22.3
Total	9.8	51.3
$5,000 to $10,000	9.0	8.1
$10,000 to $25,000	17.0	13.0
$25,000 and over	64.2	27.6
Total	90.2	48.7
Grand total	100.0	100.0

[1] After deductions but before exemption.
[2] Estimated.

As a comparison with table I will show, the effect of the new law is to reduce the under $5,000 income taxpayers' share but slightly, with the result that it does not even begin to ease the drastic wartime weight of the tax burden of the low-income groups.

Up to now we have been analyzing the new law in terms of how the reduction affects the tax-liability burden of the various income groups, and as we have seen the low-income groups are still saddled with the war-imposed taxes.

Now let us examine the effect of the bill in ways which concern the average workingman—the central issue—adjustment for the high cost of living. In other words, how is the relief distributed in terms of added take-home pay? (The increase in spendable income.)

The following tables showing the increase in spendable income at various levels indicate clearly that the gravy goes to the upper brackets and the low-income groups get the crumbs.

A single worker with no dependents gets an increase in spendable income of 3 percent if he earned $2,500, while a corporation executive, also single, earning $1,000,000 gets an increase in spendable income of 44 percent, or almost 15 times as much. A married worker with two dependents earning $2,500 gets an increase in spendable income also of 3 percent, while the married bank president with the same number of dependents, earning $250,000, has his spendable income increased 58 percent, or almost 20 times greater.

TABLE III.—*Percentage increase in spendable income*

Net income before exemption	Single person, no dependents	Married, 2 dependents [1]
	Percent	*Percent*
$700	3.2	----------
$800	3.2	----------
$1,000	3.2	----------
$1,500	3.1	----------
$2,500	3.1	3.2
$3,000	3.0	3.2
$5,000	2.7	3.6
$25,000	4.9	18.5
$50,000	7.8	29.1
$100,000	13.1	43.0
$250,000	20.5	58.4
$500,000	24.9	51.3
$1,000,000	43.9	43.1

[1] Entire income earned by 1 spouse.
Source: Computed from S. Rept. No. 1013.

TABLE IV.—*Dollar increase in spendable income*

Net income before exemption	Single person no dependents	Married, 2 dependents [1]
$700	$21.40	----------
$800	23.80	----------
$1,000	28.60	----------
$1,500	40.60	----------
$2,500	64.60	$78.40
$3,000	75.06	90.40
$5,000	110.78	157.40
$25,000	761.77	3,045.66
$50,000	1,935.56	7,533.08
$100,000	4,778.51	16,658.44
$250,000	11,940.72	34,751.48
$500,000	22,896.75	47,923.46
$1,000,000	70,146.75	69,535.96

[1] Entire income earned by 1 spouse.
Source: S. Rept. 1013.

This tax-relief law must be appraised in the light of other substantial hand-outs already given our wealthy citizens. Congress removed the excess-profits tax and refused to reimpose that tax despite the record of the greatest corporation profits in our history. Congress removed price control, which was the most equitable way of allowing all the people to get their fair share of goods. Runaway inflation resulted, harming most of all our lower-income families. Now Congress has extended the income-splitting device which provides a substantial and disproportionate amount of tax relief to the relatively few American families who earn more than $5,000 a year.

On top of all these special favors to the wealthy few comes the basic provisions of the tax-relief law. As our analysis of the law's effects shows, the economic position of the upper-bracket groups has been further enhanced at the expense of the millions of wage earners who bore the real brunt of wartime hardships.

When we consider that it has been the upper-income brackets, represented largely by corporate management and dividend recipients, who have profited by the inflation and whose living standards have been least affected by the rise in living costs, it is clear that the disproportionate relief given them under this law does not meet the test of granting tax relief where the need is most urgent.

DEWEY ANDERSON,
Executive Director, Public Affairs Institute.

Woods Waste—One of America's Greatest Economic Losses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress appropriated $1,250,000 in the agricultural bill for the operation of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. A few days ago, the House cut that appropriation by $250,000, reducing it to $1,000,000 for the coming year. In my opinion this was short-sighted, penny-wise, and pound-foolish and not good business.

The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison is dedicated to the task of seeking through scientific research new techniques for utilizing the tremendous quantities of wood which annually go to waste in our forests and forest-product industries.

The chief of the Forest Service, in his annual report for 1947 says that "of all the wood cut or destroyed in logging in the United States only 43 percent winds up in useful products." Fifty-seven percent of all timber logged is left either in the woods to rot or is lost in milling and manufacturing processes.

The Chief Forester of the United States Government, in his 1947 report, estimates that 109,000,000 tons of wood is wasted annually in logging and forest product millings and manufacturing operations. That amount of wood waste would load 2,500,000 freight cars. Anything we, as a Government, can do to increase the utilization of this wood waste means more products for Americans to enjoy and also more jobs for American workers to do.

The scientific researchers at the Forest Products Laboratory are at work finding ways and means of economically utilizing this waste. I shall append to this speech a letter from the president of a western Washington industry which, largely through the assistance of the Forest Products Laboratory, is now using 44,000 tons of wood waste annually in making wallboard.

If one company can do this, so can others, and will, in time.

Every ton of this waste that is converted into useful goods gives the people new products to enjoy and helps to build higher living standards for them. Every ton of waste that is used means additional jobs for American workers.

If, through scientific development, all or any large part, of the 57 percent of logged trees which now goes to waste could be utilized, it would mean several hundred thousand additional jobs for American labor.

I do not know that the additional $250,000 asked for the Madison laboratory will develop use for all of the wood that is now going to waste, but I believe that $250,000 will be as good a calculated risk as any our Government undertakes.

Recently, the House authorized $60,000,000 for efforts to obtain more petroleum from coal. With 109,000,000 tons of wood—approximately 2,500,000 railroad carloads—going to waste annually, we refuse to authorize $1,250,000, only 2 percent of what we propose for the coal industry, to carry on studies of the utilization of coal waste.

And if the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison makes discoveries or perfects processes that will lead to greater utilization of the Nation's annual 109,000,000 tons of wood waste, who will be the greatest beneficiary? Why the United States Government will be, for our Federal Government is the greatest owner of timber in North America.

Our Federal Government, according to the 1947 report of the Chief Forester, now owns 179,314,756 acres of forest land. Do you know how much 179,314,756 acres are? Well, it is an area three times the size of the six New England States combined.

Our Government, on a purely dollar-and-cents-revenue basis has a great stake in seeing this waste wood utilized, even if we do not consider the far greater values of more jobs and more wealth to consume and enjoy which utilization of that waste wood would provide.

The Chief Forester says the Federal Forest Service last year had receipts from timber sales of Government-owned timber amounting to $15,400,000. That is a revenue that we may expect to get every year for all time to come, for our Federal forests now are operated on a sustained-yield basis. Sustained yield means the cutting each year only of as much timber as the natural growth will replace each year. If we stick to this sustained-yield policy, we will have perpetual, never-diminishing forests.

Consider that only 43 percent of those trees for which buyers last year paid our Government $15,400,000 wound up in useful products. Then consider how many additional millions our Government would receive every year if use is found for the 57 percent of those trees that now become wood waste. If you do that, I am sure you will say that the additional $250,000 asked for the operation of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison is a good calculated risk for our Government.

I attach hereto a letter from C. H. Kreienbaum, president of the Simpson Logging Co., of Shelton, Wash., in which he points out how with the aid of the Madison Laboratory his company is now utilizing 44,000 tons of wood waste annually—wood waste that formerly went up in smoke in sawmill burners.

The Simpson Logging Co., while not a big corporation compared to eastern corporations, thinks enough of wood waste research to spend $100,000 of its own money annually seeking uses for waste wood. The Simpson Co., and many others like it, need the aid of the Forest Products Laboratory to develop processes for using the 109,000,000 tons of wood now going to waste annually in logging and milling operations. Since the Government itself is the continent's largest owner of timber, it is not unreasonable that the Government, since it will reap most of the benefits, should maintain an adequately financed laboratory to help in wood-waste research.

I hope the Senate will restore the $250,000 cut the House made in the appropriation for the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

The letter from Mr. Kreienbaum, president of the Simpson Logging Co., follows:

SIMPSON LOGGING CO.,
Shelton, Wash., March 31, 1948.

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are very much interested in the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison. In 1941 our company realized the need for doing something about the large amount of waste resulting from logging operations as well as in sawmill operations. Two or three members of our company, including the writer, made a trip East, visiting a number of laboratories, including the Madison Laboratory. We had consultation with many of the personnel at Madison and of course with many engineering people. As a result of these conferences and on the advice of the men at Madison we shipped several carloads of wood East, a large part of which went to Madison.

We used the reports resulting from the work of these laboratories on our wood as the foundation to starting work in a small way in Shelton to solve our problem here locally. The people of Madison Laboratory were very helpful in their advice and with their work in helping us start our laboratory. All of this effort resulted in the construction of a wood-fiber plant at Shelton by our company, which today utilizes approximately 44,000 tons of waste wood per year.

You can well understand our interest in the Madison Laboratory. We certainly would urge you to make every effort to restore the appropriations which have been cut from the laboratory budget. Certainly the Pacific Northwest has too large a stake in the work of this laboratory not to make such an effort. If there is a region in the United States that has need for the work done at Madison, it is the Pacific Northwest.

You might be interested to know that our little laboratory has now grown into a structure large enough to house a fair-sized pilot plant which will produce, from mechanical pulp, various products from coarse paper to an insulation board. It maintains a personnel of from 15 to 20 persons. We have over $150,000 in the laboratory itself, and the operating budget for this year is well over $100,000. If the Simpson Logging Co. can find a venture of this kind at such cost, a profitable one, certainly the people of the United States can afford to spend $1,250,000 on their laboratory at Madison.

Here in the small town of Shelton two comparatively small industries are maintaining laboratories, the operation of which costs almost half as much as the budget requested by Madison Laboratory. Yet the people of the United States expect the personnel in the Madison Laboratory to work on projects to solve problems covering almost every species of wood in the United States, whereas we here in Shelton are working only on three or four.

I sincerely trust that you can make some impression upon those in Congress who do not fully understand what it means to an institution like Madison to refuse it the funds necessary to carry on the good work which they are doing.

Sincerely yours,
SIMPSON LOGGING CO.,
C. H. KREIENBAUM,
President.

National Petroleum Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the American Automobile Association's executive committee at a meeting in Miami, Fla., on March 18, 1948, recommending that the President establish a fact-finding committee to develop a national petroleum policy:

FACT-FINDING COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP A NATIONAL PETROLEUM POLICY IS RECOMMENDED BY AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

It is of the most vital importance that the United States should have an adequate supply of petroleum to meet the requirements of military security, the needs of industry and agriculture, the heating of homes, and the demands of our expanding highway transportation.

There has been a tremendous increase in the demand for petroleum products since VJ-day. Neither Government nor industry anticipated the extent of the demand, with the result that there is today serious concern as to the petroleum supply outlook, not only from a short-range, but from a long-range standpoint as well.

The public is greatly confused as to the actual situation. This is largely because there has been so much conflict in statements emanating from industry, Government, and other sources. One day the petroleum shortage is declared to be one of transportation facilities, while the next day it is characterized as a shortage of steel for new refinery equipment and the exploration of new oil sources.

Segments of the petroleum industry are in sharp disagreement among themselves on the issue of importing foreign oil to augment the domestic supply, either from the standpoint of meeting an alleged temporary lag between demand and supply or the extent to which the United States should depend in the years to come on a larger share of world oil. This difference within the industry is again reflected on the question of sending steel abroad for oil development purposes.

At the present time the United States accounts for two-thirds of the world's consumption of petroleum products, while the country's proven reserves amount only to less than one-third of the proven reserves of the world. Government is proposing large-scale development of a synthetic fuel industry based on coal and shale oil as a hedge against future military and domestic needs.

Industry, on the other hand, is opposing such large-scale programs, arguing that Government should confine itself to experimentation and pilot plants. Even on such a vital matter as the question of unproven reserves of petroleum within the United States there is a wide disparity of conjecture, the views ranging from high optimism to dire pessimism.

Since the end of the war with Japan, some 17 committees of Congress have engaged in investigation of various phases of the petroleum situation. Committees of the industry have undertaken inquiries; representatives of government have testified many times before committees of Congress; scores of recommendations have been advanced but most of them are in the nature of temporary expedients, such as the recommendation that the Department of Justice relax provisions of the antitrust laws to permit more flexible distribution of supplies existing or in sight. More drastic, from the standpoint of the industry and the general pattern of our national economy, is legislation already introduced in Congress which would virtually declare petroleum to be a public utility.

There has been widespread concern over the increases in the cost of petroleum products at a time when all this confusion exists and with the specter of a shortage casting its shadow over the land. The installation of more efficient engines in some automobiles has been postponed because of fuel considerations.

In view of this situation the executive committee of the American Automobile Association strongly recommends that the President of the United States appoint a committee, similar to the Baruch committee on rubber, to undertake an independent fact-finding inquiry into all aspects of the petroleum problem and to make recommendations to the President, Congress, and to

the petroleum industry for a long-range national oil policy that will safeguard the vital interests of the United States.

Further, the executive committee of the American Automobile Association endorses the principle of conservation of oil products by all users as a temporary means of getting the most out of short supplies and pledges the support of the motorists for conservation programs to the extent that the need is clearly demonstrated.

Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, our doves of peace must have strong wings. Our able Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, should have the full support and backing of this Congress in his efforts to build up American air power. We should immediately authorize and implement the recommendations of our Armed Services Committee for a 70-group air force as a minimum requirement.

We probably got into the last two world wars largely because our potential enemies thought (1) they could bluff us, or (2) if bluffing did not work, they could whip us. We must make sure that no potential enemy ever again makes this mistake. While pursuing all amicable means to promote world peace, we must, as a form of national life insurance, become and remain the strongest military power on the face of the earth. We cannot become and remain such a power without unquestioned air supremacy. This proposition seems almost academic. We live in a mad world where the language of force is too often the only recognized tongue. We cannot lead the world in paths of peace without being able to back up our commitments with force. This means unquestioned air supremacy. However strong other components of our military service may become, without air supremacy we are a second-rate power. Without delay let us give every priority to a program of building for this Nation an air force adequate in all respects for all contingencies.

Emerson Foote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a very important development in the advertising world came to my attention through widespread news reporting. This was the action of a man who had the integrity and courage to resign a $12,000,000 advertising account for reasons of principle, a business sacrifice unparalleled in advertising history. This action has stirred the hearts of men and given hope in these troubled days. It inspired Dr. George Paull T. Sargent, rector of St. Bartholomew's Church, to write:

MY DEAR FRIEND: May I say, more power to you, sir, in standing by your guns. Whatever they are, do not worry; the Lord will bless you. We, at St. Bartholomew's, pray not only for leaders of nations, but also for individual integrity, wisdom, and guidance.

For reaffirming our basic belief in liberty through principle, I would like to pay tribute to this man—Emerson Foote—and I thought the Members of Congress would like to know of this action and would like to read the article which appeared in the April 2, 1948, issue of Tide magazine:

AMERICAN TOBACCO-FCB DIVORCE—THE AGENCY DROPS THE FABULOUS $12,000,000 ACCOUNT AND BREAKS A RELATIONSHIP STARTED 25 YEARS AGO BY GEORGE WASHINGTON HILL

The advertising tradition which the late George Washington Hill stamped so indelibly on the American Tobacco Co. got a rude shock 2 weeks ago when his eldest son stalked out of his job as advertising director for the No. 1 United States cigaret manufacturer. Last week that tradition was shattered anew by an announcement from another source, Foote, Cone & Belding, Inc., which picked up the burden of Lucky Strike advertising where Albert Lasker and Lord & Thomas left it, resigned the account. It was far and away the biggest and most important piece of business any agency had ever tossed away. In 1947 American Tobacco accounted for every fifth dollar of the $52,000,000 FCB billings.

Although he made it clear that the two actions were completely independent, the motives cited by FCB President Emerson Foote for his action seemed to be cut from the same cloth as young Hill's. He had given up the account, said Foote, not "in anger or rancor," but simply because since the death of the elder Hill in 1946 he had found himself forced to create and direct the type of advertising he did not believe in. Hill, Jr., said he quit "because, for the past year as vice president in charge of advertising my operations have been hampered by executive decisions with which I am in fundamental disagreement and in the making of which I have had progressively diminishing voice or influence."

The final decision to resign the account, said Foote, was his and his alone. He had, of course, consulted the other principal stockholders, Fairfax Cone (head of the Chicago operation) and Don Belding (head of the west coast operation). But they had left the decision to him. It was, clearly, a tough one, not only from the financial standpoint but also because of the many people and jobs involved. The account's billings represented close to half the total business placed by the New York office, which Foote runs, and some 200 people out of the agency's 1,000-odd worked, part of the time at least, on American Tobacco's Lucky Strike, Pall Mall, and Kensitas accounts.

After deciding to drop the account and getting his partners' agreement, Foote still offered to resign and let the agency keep the account without him. Thus, he could resolve his own personal conflicts without affecting the firm's bankroll. But Cone and Belding turned down that offer fast. That was Sunday, March 21. The next day Foote informed American Tobacco president Vincent Riggio that he was through. It is understood that Riggio asked him to reconsider but that he refused.

HILL'S WILL

Although Foote repeatedly emphasized that the break-up evolved from nothing more dramatic than a "respectful disagreement" over how Lucky Strike advertising was being handled and that young Hill's resignation had nothing to do with it, the history of American Tobacco since Hill's death in September 1946, provided a few clues. First off even insiders were stunned when the American board of directors elected Riggio and not Hill, Jr., to the presidency. From the time that young Hill first became advertising director for Lucky Strike in 1936, it was evident that his father was grooming him for the throne. Riggio's quick election (the board took only 7 minutes for the ballot) showed that the directors had no qualms about ignoring the old man's ideas.

The blast that Hill, Jr., touched off when he resigned carried ample evidence that this initial departure from his father's master plan was no isolated incident. Hill, Jr., blued the air with charges that the company's top management had departed from "principles and procedures long established * * * and essential to effective advertising." As a result, he charged, Lucky Strike had lost most of its lead in sales, which he, his father, and the agency had fought for.

It was certainly true that Lucky Strike advertising had looked and sounded differently since Hill's death. Under the old regime, practically every year brought a new slogan which was drummed incessantly into the country's eardrums. "Nature in the raw is seldom mild," "reach for a Lucky instead of a sweet," "Smoke the smoke tobacco experts smoke," the ululations of the tobacco auctioneer, all enabled Hill and his agency to keep the public eternally conscious of Lucky Strike advertising—and steadily buying the cigarettes. Since Hill's death the advertising has contained no new ammunition or ideas. The auctioneer, the L. S. M. F. T. gadget, the faintly erotic "So round, so firm, so fully packed," etc., are still the mainstays of American's radio, newspaper, and magazine appeals.

Only once has the company's new management tried anything new and unusual. That was short-lived. Last fall, radio listeners began to find themselves assailed by "Keep your eye of the red bull's-eye"—a typical Hill idea though perhaps not with his masterful touch. After a few weeks, this war cry was suddenly stilled. Whatever the reasons (and Foote stated that the cancellation of the slogan was not his idea), the unwillingness to try anything new was certainly one point of conflict.

About the only other general observation that can be made about Lucky Strike's post-Hill advertising is that it has taken a gentler turn. Instead of hammering away at consumers until they bought the brand in self-defense or because they couldn't help themselves, American has apparently been trying to charm them into submission. This alone would indicate that the practices of the elder Hill were buried with him.

There were certain other points, omitted from Foote's explanation, that perhaps had as much to do with his "respectful disagreement" as anything. For one thing, during Hill's lifetime, the agency dealt with him alone, and formidable as he was, at least he never ducked decisions. But since his death, the advertising command at American has been exercised by a committee which apparently could seldom make up its mind. This would seem to jibe with Foote's statement that "no particular crisis" precipitated the resignation.

Foote also denied that Hill, Jr.'s resignation had anything to do with his exit. While this is undoubtedly true, some connection between the two events plainly exists. According to Hill's own statement, his departure removed from American Tobacco's ruling circle, the last defender of his father's ad-

vertising principles. If Foote also subscribed to these same beliefs (and it is hard to believe that he didn't), then he had lost his last ally among the policy-makers at American. Thus his chances of winning Riggio and the rest of the board back into the fold became even slimmer.

PRECEDENTS

Throwing a $12,000,000 account out the window certainly made history. But FCB had plenty of precedent to fall back on. Albert Lasker, under whose aegis Foote (as well as his two partners) had grown up, had run Lord & Thomas for 40 years on the same principle that Foote cited to justify his action. When American Tobacco first approached Lasker in 1923 with the brand slipping badly, he told Hill flatly that he would accept the account only on his own terms. American was then spending about $600,000 a year for Lucky Strike. Lasker told Hill that he would have him signing checks for $5,000,000. But he demanded that the client accept his judgment without question. On that bare-knuckled basis, Hill and Lasker teamed up to build Lucky Strike into a consistent front-runner in the cigarette business—on budgets almost always relatively lower than what their nearest rivals were spending.

Lasker stuck to this principle right to the day he made his final break with advertising. In 1938, he resigned the $1,000,000 Quaker Oats account when he returned from a round-the-world trip and found the client tearing up his agency's work because it failed to jibe with the Townsend brothers' "27 points." A few years later, he came to the end of another rope, when he dropped the RCA account. The story then was that president David Sarnoff had turned thumbs down on a campaign after everyone else at RCA had approved it. The second (and probably the real) reason was that RCA was proving more trouble than it was worth. Lasker resigned other accounts, too, but only once before (so far as it is known) had any agency dropped any American Tobacco business: Young & Rubicam, weary of the demands Hill, Sr., put upon it, resigned the Pall Mall account in 1941.

Personalities, always a factor in client-agency relations, apparently had little to do with Foote's action. The FCB president had nothing but kind words for Riggio. Hill's successor, said Foote, "has never failed to treat me with the utmost consideration." After contending with Hill's roughshod tactics for so many years, this alone might hint that, if anything, Foote and Riggio should have got along swimmingly. Riggio, Foote added, had always displayed as consuming an interest in Lucky Strike advertising as his predecessor. The fact that Foote finally threw in the towel shows how wide must have been the gap between the advertising concepts the agency wanted and the views of the client.

THE GOLD RUSH

Among the other bits of incidental intelligence connected both with Hill, Jr.'s departure and FCB's were Lucky Strike's recent sales standstill. Last year it sold 102,000,000,000 cigarets, down about a billion from the year before. Meanwhile, Camels had climbed from 89,000,000,000 in 1946 to 100,500,000,000 last year. Since then the figures are inconclusive, but the trade's impression is that Camels are continuing to gain, and faster than many people think.

One ironical twist on the story was a speech Fairfax Cone made last month before the Women's Advertising Club of Chicago. In it he was critical of most cigaret advertising, but lauded at length the job his agency had done for Lucky Strike over the years. Cone was talking primarily, however, about the basic strategy of the Lucky Strike advertising; he said last week that he still thought, and always would think, that that strategy was excellent; that that belief was not at all inconsistent with the agency's dissatisfaction with the present advertising; and that he knew perfectly well Foote's feeling about the advertising when he made the speech.

So far President Riggio had stayed in character. The only word from his Fifth Avenue stronghold was a bare confirmation of the FCB resignation. No one at American knew (or cared to hazard a guess) as to who would take over Hill, Jr.'s desk or what agency would handle the account. Everett Mead, who succeeded Lucky Strike advertising manager Sylvester (Pat) Weaver when the latter moved to Young & Rubicam last year, had followed Hill out the door. Naturally, the rumor mill worked overtime. One of the most persistent themes was that N. W. Ayer would take over Lucky Strike. Another possibility was J. Walter Thompson, which has made no secret of the fact that it wants a cigaret account. After that, it was anybody's crystal ball and everybody was gazing into it.

FOOTNOTES ON HEADLINES—THE FCB CASE

The advertising agency business should attain a new stature in the minds of all businessmen by what happened last week. Agencies have resigned accounts many times before but never before has an agency resigned an account of the size and importance of this one. The resignation becomes the more remarkable when you consider: (1) The length of time Foote, Cone & Belding and its predecessor firm, Lord & Thomas, had handled the American Tobacco business; (2) the intimate kind of closeness which had existed between the various principals—first between George Washington Hill and Albert Lasker, later between Hill and Emerson Foote and, still later, between Vincent Riggio and Foote; (3) the apparently complete security which Foote, Cone & Belding enjoyed—right up to the end—on this account.

To be sure, the agency might have lost the account in time. Its client's sales were standing still and the competition was gaining. The resignation of George Washington Hill, Jr., removed the agency's last hope of getting its own ideas across. Possibly the new agency, coming in fresh and without the background ties inhibiting the old one, may be able to produce advertising that is both good and effective.

Despite all these possible reservations, there are some important lessons in this case for all of advertising. The agency gave the best reason in dropping the account any agency ever could have—it did not believe in the advertising which its client insisted that it run. There was no question about clashes of personnel or unpleasant working conditions or unfortunate client-agency relations; those things just did not exist. It was a case of an agency sticking to the only principles it believed in and the only ones it felt would permit it to succeed as a good agency should succeed; the alternative was to continue spending its client's money on things it didn't believe in and to become a sort of characterless space broker in the process. The choice was that clear and sharp.

The short-range operators would have taken one course, the long-range ones another. Other agency men should consider the implications of that every time they get into comparable situations, as happens so often in this business. They should not handle advertising which they do not believe in. That would be true no matter how they questioned it—no matter whether they thought it innocuous and ineffectual (as in this case), or misleading and untruthful (as in so many other cases). When enough agency men consistently show enough courage and integrity on these questions, the same kind and degree of courage and integrity required in the Foote, Cone & Belding decision, the agency business will find its proper and permanent level in United States business.—R. C.

Increase of Pay for Teachers and Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial in the Sheridan Press, Sheridan, Wyo., under date of April 7, 1948:

RAISE PAST DUE

During the past few years with inflation pushing living costs to a dangerous level, most classes of public employees have been in an unfortunate economic position.

Teachers have suffered very seriously as a result of this pinch between a relatively fixed level of income and steadily rising costs of food and other necessities. Postal workers, too, have taken a beating as a result of that condition.

Based on the cost-of-living formula devised by the Guaranty Trust Co. a comparison between wages and retail prices shows what a difficult time postal workers have had in recent months.

The post-office clerk's average wage increased in the past 6 years from $41.63 to $54.15. But because of the shrinkage of the dollar from 100 cents in 1939 to 58 cents in 1947, the weekly wage increase has diminished from $41.15 to $31.62 in actual purchasing power, according to the Guaranty index.

Small wonder that the postal workers seek an increase of $1,000 per year.

Shrinkage of purchasing power has shot all through the Nation's economic life. The average weekly earnings of the factory worker rose from $24.54 to $46.32 in 5 years, but this benefit was halved in the rise in the cost of living. Between June 1945 and September 1947 money wages rose to $50.42; but the cost of living rose also. The postal worker, however, didn't enjoy the same proportionate improvement in money wages that came to workers in industry and private business.

An increase in pay for such workers is certainly past due this year, and should be adopted as quickly as possible.

California Power Shortage and Suggested Solutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a crippling power shortage in California. I am appearing before the Appropriations Committee with three specific suggestions as to how it can be relieved. Because of the general interest in California and elsewhere in these suggestions, I offer my statement before that committee at this point in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, I am again appearing in support of funds for the earliest possible completion of the Central Valley project. I have been before you often for that purpose. It may be plowing old ground to reiterate that this is a self-liquidating project and the sooner completed the sooner it

repays into the Federal Treasury the moneys advanced. Recent developments in California make the urgency even greater. California is facing a serious power shortage. I would like to present that matter in some detail and make some specific suggestions toward bringing it to an end.

HISTORICAL STATEMENT ON CALIFORNIA POWER

Power requirements in northern California have been steadily and continuously increasing since 1913. From 1913 to the end of 1947 the annual peak load of each year exceeded that of the previous year in all but two, 1932 and 1938. The increase in maximum demand during this long period has been from 230,000 kilowatts to more than 2,000,000 kilowatts.

From 1913 to 1931 new generating equipment was progressively and consistently installed, to the end that reasonable reserve capacity was always available. From 1931 to 1938 no new capacity was installed and reserve capacity gradually diminished. From 1938 to date the load growth has exceeded the new capacity so that since 1939 the area has not had reasonable reserve capacity and has had to rely on imports of power. Importation of power has gradually diminished so that now the generating capacity in the area is insufficient to meet peak loads. The situation would have prevailed even though 1948 had been a normal water year. The estimated deficiency on a normal water year basis is 100,000 to 150,000 kilowatts without reserve of any kind. An electrical system having a peak load of around 2,000,000 kilowatts should have a spare capacity of at least 250,000 kilowatts. The area deficiency today on a normal year basis is in the order of 400,000 kilowatts of firm generating capacity.

STATEMENT OF PRESENT POWER SHORTAGE

The present power shortage in California consists of a straight 20 percent across the board curtailment for all users. Another cut of an additional 10 percent is probable. This curtailment will continue throughout the summer and fall. If there are early rains some relief may be expected during the winter months. Under the present outlook, there is every reason to believe that the power situation in northern California will be serious for years to come. The presently announced construction program of both the public and private agencies will be insufficient to meet the power requirements for many years to come.

In addition to the deficiency in generating capacity, California is confronted with a deficiency in energy because the production of energy is dependent upon water supply and availability of fuel oil, both of which are critical in our State at this time. In other words, even though we had the generating capacity in hydroelectric plants, if we don't get the water we don't get the power.

The impact of this situation now and anticipated upon the present economy and future growth of California is disastrous. Industries desiring to move to California cannot do so. As of right now the large aluminum production plant at Riverbank, Calif., is idle only because there is no electric power available in the State to operate it. During the past 6 weeks the regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento has had to turn down requests for power from a chemical institution because of the lack of power facilities. That company is considering establishing a plant in my district in Redding, Calif. Stopping of development of this type is bad enough, but worse than that, the 20 percent power cut now in effect, with perhaps an additional 10 percent curtailment yet to come, is cutting power for industrial production throughout all of California, throwing men out of work and causing inefficient operation of industries. In one plant in my district power was arbitrarily cut off without adequate notice and a plant severely damaged.

It is perfectly apparent, therefore, that the power shortage in California is not due to drought conditions, although those conditions made it worse. The power shortage would still be there if we had normal water conditions to the extent of 150,000 kilowatts of generating capacity, and that is without a reserve of any kind, which should run as much as 250,000 kilowatts of reserve generating capacity. Our total shortage, then, is 400,000 kilowatts.

Moreover, the power demands in California are on the increase and, therefore, the shortage is going to get worse rather than better, regardless of water conditions. Unless we are willing to put an end to industrial and other growth in California, we must immediately provide a program for the construction of additional generating capacity or otherwise arrange to bring more power into California.

I have three suggestions to make to the committee along that line:

First. We must unshackle the power development in California by the Bureau of Reclamation. That power development has been held up through inadequate funds and funds tied down with some 31 different limitations. As an illustration, this fall it was necessary for the Bureau to shut down the work on the powerhouse at Keswick Dam because the money specifically earmarked for that purpose ran out, but work still continued on the dam itself. Except for the specific limitation put on the use of funds, a portion of the money to be used on the dam could have been transferred for use on the powerhouse and the whole project proceeded with expedition. If the power development at both Shasta and Keswick had been able to go ahead, today the Bureau would be able to offer the 40,000 kilowatts necessary for the chemical-plant installation at Redding, which I previously mentioned. These limitations may seem to make sense to the committee on the ground that they prevent possible misuse of funds, but they slow up a project where time is of the essence. With funds specifically marked for one purpose in the building of an integrated program when the completion of one part depends upon starting the other, and vice versa, complications and slow-downs are bound to occur. This does not contribute either to efficient planning or efficient construction. My first recommendation, therefore, in bringing an early end to the California power shortage, is unshackling the funds used in the construction of the power features of the Central Valley project so that they can be used most efficiently for an early completion of the power aspects of that project.

Second. I recommend the immediate construction of transmission lines to bring the power now being wasted in the Bonneville system to California. These lines would cost between $10,000,000 and $15,000,000. The power now being wasted there amounts to nearly 2,000,000,000 kilowatt hours. That is more power than will be produced at the Shasta and Keswick Dams when the power units are completed and in full operation. In other words, with transmission lines costing less than $15,000,000 we can add to the California system the equivalent of another Shasta and other Keswick Dam. I stress the fact that this is waste power, not power which is being used by the people in the Bonneville system. The historical studies of the Bonneville system prove that this energy waste exists now and will always continue. The major part of this waste occurs at night and during the summer daylight hours as well. Picking up this waste energy and putting it over transmission lines to California will enable us to not only back off our steam plants, which now produce almost 50 percent of our power, but in addition will enable us to back off the hydroelectric plants during the night and save the water for the peak demands.

It must be remembered that the Columbia River has only a few small storage sites, and as a consequence the Bonneville system cannot store potential power in the form of water behind its dams. The Central Valley System has immense storage. The Shasta Dam can store the complete flow of the Sacramento River for one whole year. Therefore, the power potential of the Columbia River must be used as it flows by the power plant. We should use it to a maximum and not waste it. By integrating the two systems with a connecting transmission line, we can use the Columbia River power to a maximum and save the Central Valley power stored behind its dams to meet our peaks and periods of short water.

The building of these transmission lines, I might add, gives additional security to both the California Central Valley system and the Bonneville system. In 1936, which was the driest period of record in the Northwest, the Central Valley system would have been in position to supply some power for the Northwest area.

The peak loads in the Bonneville system come at the same time as the lowest power output. During the maximum run-off there is the minimum demand. This means that waste power is inherent in the system because potential power cannot be stored behind dams as in the Central Valley. By integrating the systems, Bonneville waste will go to Central Valley and Central Valley's storage capacity may from time to time aid Bonneville. They will tend to firm each others' output.

In addition, by saving the production on the steam plants in the Central Valley system we will save something like $6,000,000 in fuel oil per annum. Oil is getting scarce; we should save it. These lines will pay for themselves in 2 years' operations.

This is the only conceivable program which can help to materially alleviate the California power shortage within the next 2 years. It is estimated that if we started immediately these transmission lines could be built within 2 years. That means that within 2 years we add the equivalent of another Shasta and Keswick Dam in northern California. I cannot too emphatically urge the serious and favorable consideration of your committee. In view of the comparative low cost and the tremendous benefits involved, and the urgency for power in California, I hope this committee will give the Bureau the funds for these transmission lines and tell them to start now.

My third recommendation has to do with the long-range development. It is the early commencement of such projects as the Folsom Dam, for which the Appropriations Committee of the House has already granted $1,000,000 to start construction. The bill I have introduced authorizing the power and irrigation features of that project is now under consideration before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. That project will bring an additional approximate 110,000 kilowatts, but the American River fully developed will produce a half million kilowatts. Integrated with the Central Valley project this capacity increases to 145,000 kilowatts of firm, dependable capacity. In addition, if the transmission lines, the immediate construction of which I have advocated, and costing less than $15,000,000 integrating the Bonneville System and the Central Valley System is built, the total amount of firm power available in the Central Valley project will be increased by even more. The Bureau of Reclamation in the near future, I believe, will submit to the Congress its comprehensive plan for the development of the Central Valley of California and other specific projects which will bring more power to California on a self-liquidating basis. I emphasize the fact that

these are self-liquidating projects for which the people of California are happy and willing to pay.

To summarize, power requirements have steadily increased. Generating capacity has not been built rapidly enough to keep up with growth and provide an adequate reserve. We are now short some 400,000 kilowatts in generating capacity. The drought has made the condition worse, but did not cause it. Power shortage in California will continue for some years. To end it we should: First, unshackle the Bureau power development in California by providing adequate funds without hampering limitations; second, immediately construct a transmission line to bring the 2,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of wasted power in the Bonneville system to California; and, third, speed with all possible haste the Folsom Dam project and those recommended for early construction to follow it.

Senator Bridges and the Miners' Retirement Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES AT THE MEETING OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE 1947 UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND, MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1948

As a basis for my remarks and the resolution I shall introduce, I want to state certain facts.

The point in issue here is not whether there should be a 1947 United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund. Neither is the point in issue the principle of such a fund or whether it is a sound undertaking. The principle and the fund itself were established by a contract entered into by the coal operators and the coal miners. By that contract, the coal operators and the coal miners have committed themselves to the principle of the fund and they have committed themselves to the proper administration of the fund for the purposes authorized in the contract. The future of such a fund is a matter for determination by the operators and the miners.

The contract entered into by the miners and operators stipulates that a portion of the 1947 United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund shall be set aside for pension purposes. The point at issue here is whether and under what conditions such a portion shall be set aside and a pension fund activated.

The 1946 welfare and retirement fund was created on May 29, 1946. I am informed that in the 23 months during which that fund has existed no part of it has ever been set aside or spent for a pension for any member of the union.

The 1947 fund was established by agreement dated July 9, 1947, effective as of July 1, 1947. The records of the trustees indicate that in the 9 months intervening no part of it has been set aside or used for any purpose.

I am advised, and I have no information to the contrary, that the stoppage of work on March 15, 1948, was caused by the failure of the trustees to activate either of these funds. I further understand that the members of the union have indicated that unless and until a proper sum is set aside for pension purposes from the fund in the hands of the trustees they do not propose to return to their work.

This is a time in which the security and economic stability of our country require not only continuous production but increased production. The dangers involved in an indefinite stoppage of coal mining are plain for all to see. Idleness in a basic industry adversely affects every man, woman, and child in America. I feel keenly my responsibility to the people to help get the miners back into the pits. In this time of national distress it is unthinkable that differences of opinion over the interpretation of an existing contract should be allowed to place the security of our country and the welfare of the people in jeopardy.

No man could possibly go thoroughly into all of the points at issue in the brief time I have had. Therefore, I have concentrated upon the basic issue with a view to placing before you suggestions which I consider a fair basis upon which the miners can return to work and we can enter upon the exhaustive study which must be made before our decisions can be final.

In my resolution I make no attempt to finally settle the questions involving legal or actuarial matters. In the weeks ahead I shall avail myself of expert advice in both these fields. In connection with this whole issue, recent months are a diary of inactivity. Today I am concerned lest the basic question again go unsolved and the country suffer the consequences of extended idleness in the mines.

The decisions we as trustees make are not unchangeable. The opportunity to change them at any time is guaranteed. In my opinion, it is better for the country that we accept any possible risk of action rather than see the national security and welfare threatened by our refusal to act. I, therefore, offer my resolution as a basis for our tentative agreement from which we can go forward sincerely to our exhaustive study of all the issues and all the evidence.

My resolution proposes that from the fund in the hands of the trustees there shall be set aside $5,000,000 for retirement benefits. This is $15,000,000 less than the amount suggested by the trustees representing the miners. The trustee representing the operators takes the position that no portion of the fund should be set aside for retirement benefits at this time.

I am satisfied that if the position of the trustee for the operators were adopted, the miners involved in this dispute would not return to work. I believe that the public welfare requires an immediate resumption of mining operations. The amount suggested in my resolution can be changed if the complete study we are to make indicates that a higher allotment should be set aside for pension purposes.

My resolution proposes that the amount to be paid each month to each qualified and eligible miner shall be $100. This is the monthly benefit suggested by the trustee for the miners. Again I must refer to the fact that my resolution, if adopted, would be a tentative agreement and the amount of this monthly pension is subject to any revision which our further study may indicate is proper.

My resolution proposes that the eligible age for retirement shall be 62 years. The position of the trustee for the miners is that the retirement age should be 60 years. The position of the trustee for the operators is that the retirement age should be not less than 65 years. On the basis of information presently available to me, it is my opinion that fixing the retirement age at 62 helps to eliminate the objections raised by the operators' trustee pertaining to the future solvency of the fund.

My resolution proposes that only those members of the United Mine Workers of America who attain the age of 62 years and complete 20 years in the coal industry on or after May 29, 1946, shall be eligible for retirement benefits.

The question relating to those who should be eligible for a pension covers the most acute area of dispute. The trustee for the operators has taken the position that were all members of the United Mine Workers to be declared eligible for a monthly pension the solvency of any allotment from the fund for retirement purposes would be severely challenged. On the other hand, the trustee for the miners has been insistent upon a completely literal interpretation of the contract. Such an interpretation would include all members of the United Mine Workers of America.

If May 29, 1946, is adopted as the controlling date, the number of persons eligible for pensions will be further drastically reduced with the result that a further possible threat to the solvency of the fund will be eliminated.

I should like to add that it was on May 28, 1946, that the first welfare and retirement fund was established under a contract entered into by the United Mine Workers of America and Secretary of the Interior, Julius A. Krug, acting for the Government of the United States.

The trustee for the operators has taken the position that a retirement fund should not be activated until there has been a judicial determination as to just who can be declared eligible for pension payments under the 1947 contract. No one knows when such a judicial determination can be expected.

Available information strongly indicates that if this position of the trustee for the operators were adopted the stoppage in mining operations would continue. It is not in the best interest of the country that this stoppage should continue. I repeat that it is my conclusion that differences of opinion over the interpretation of a contract in actual existence as a mutual agreement between the operators and the miners should not be allowed to place the security of our country and the welfare of the people in jeopardy.

I, therefore, express the hope that the trustee for the miners and the trustee for the operators will recede from the differing positions that have prevented the activation of a retirement fund and resulted in the work stoppage from which the country as a whole suffers.

Having in mind the fundamental fact that the contract before us for interpretation is the handiwork of the operators and miners themselves, I believe there is sound reason based upon the public welfare for each of you to agree to my resolution as a tentative basis upon which the miners can return to their work and we can move in good faith toward a final determination of the issues based upon a sincere and fair judgment of all the evidence we can gather.

RESOLUTION TO BE INTRODUCED AT THE MEETING OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND OF 1947, MONDAY MORNING, APRIL 12, 1948, BY UNITED STATES SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES, ONE OF THE TRUSTEES

Whereas, under the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, title III, section 302 (c) (5) (C), and under the terms of the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1947, the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund of 1947 shall designate a portion (which may be changed from time to time) of the payments herein provided as a separate fund to be administered by the said trustees herein described and to be used for providing for

pensions or annuities for the members of the United Mine Workers of America or their families or dependents and such other persons as may be properly included as beneficiaries thereunder: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That there be and is hereby designated a separate fund to be used for providing pensions or annuities for the members of the United Mine Workers of America, or their families or dependents and such other persons as may be properly included as beneficiaries thereunder; that there be and there is hereby transferred, set aside and deposited in said fund, pursuant to said act and said contract, the sum of $5,000,000 out of payments heretofore made to the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund of 1947; that said $5,000,000 so hereby transferred, set aside and deposited in said fund shall be incremented from payments already made or hereafter to be made to the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund of 1947, from time to time as upon review by the trustees experience obtained may require; that said fund shall not be subject to or be charged with, or have any obligations created against it, or be subject to any expenditures or withdrawals of any kind or character by the trustees other than withdrawals for the payment of pensions or annuities and such withdrawals as may be authorized by said trustees for the purposes of investment or reinvestment necessary or advisable for the conservation and protection of said fund, or for the purposes of the payment of reasonable administrative expenses, including tax, actuarial and legal studies if, as and when required, and which may hereafter by the trustees be duly authorized: Be it further

Resolved, That a pension of $100 per month shall be paid, subject to amendment or modification at any time as experience in the operation of the fund may dictate or require, to each eligible and qualified member of the United Mine Workers of America who on May 29, 1946, attained or thereafter attained the age of 62 years and who has served 20 years in the coal industry in the United States and who has retired from service in the bituminous-coal industry in the United States on a date subsequent to May 28, 1946; that the effective date for the payment of pensions shall be as of the date that the member of the United Mine Workers of America has retired from the bituminous-coal industry in the United States after attaining the age of 62 years and has served 20 years in the industry; but no member of the United Mine Workers of America shall be eligible or qualified for a pension in accordance with the foregoing who retired from the bituminous-coal industry in the United States prior to May 29, 1946; be it further

Resolved, That at the earliest practicable date following the adoption of this resolution there shall be formulated detailed rules and regulations, subject to approval by the trustees, to effectuate the payment of said pensions upon the terms and conditions hereinabove specified and in conformity with reasonable and proper administration of said funds; be it further

Resolved, That the trustees reserve the right to modify, include, or amend the above terms and conditions at any time both as to the amount of pension payments and the qualifications for eligibility, together with the right to modify or amend the rules and regulations hereinabove provided for, as upon review by the trustees, experience obtained in the operation of the fund may require; be it further

Resolved, That title to all moneys, paid into or transferred to the fund herein set forth, shall be vested in and remain exclusively in the trustees; that said money shall in no manner be liable for or subject to debts, contracts, liabilities, or torts of the beneficiaries of such fund; and that no benefits or moneys payable from such fund shall be subject in any manner to anticipation, alienation, sale, transfer, assignment, pledge, encumbrance, or charge, and any attempt so to anticipate, alienate, sell, transfer, assign, pledge, encumber, or charge the same shall be void.

National Safety and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a resolution which was adopted by the West Palm Beach Chapter of RONS-NROA on the 5th day of April 1948 at West Palm Beach, Fla., as follows:

A RESOLUTION OF THE WEST PALM BEACH CHAPTER OF RONS-NROA

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the members of this organization that our national safety and welfare demand that communistic aggression be immediately checked; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the members of this organization that the present international situation is a serious threat to our national safety and welfare; and

Whereas it is the considered opinion of the members of this organization that immediate action must be taken to strengthen our national defense, protect our national safety and welfare, and to stop communistic aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the West Palm Beach, Fla., Chapter of RONS-NROA, being Reserve Officers' association representing all branches of the Naval Establishment, does hereby endorse for adoption the universal military training plan presently before Congress, the Marshall plan, and the temporary reinstatement of selective service to bring our armed forces up to authorized strength; and be it further

Resolved, That said West Palm Beach, Fla., chapter of RONS-NROA recommends that Congress take immediate steps to enact legislation providing for universal military training, the Marshall plan, and the reinstatement of temporary selective service.

Resolution of Atlanta Chapter of Reserve Officers of the Naval Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 of the Atlanta Chapter of Reserve Officers of the Naval Services held an emergency meeting at the Atlanta Naval Air Station. More than 700 Reserve officers attended. A resolution was unanimously adopted by the meeting. This resolution has been forwarded to me by Hon. Robert E. Martin, who is Secretary of the Atlanta Chapter Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, and Naval Reserve Officers Association.

For the information of Members, I insert herewith the letter written to me by Mr. Martin:

APRIL 1, 1948.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: At emergency meeting at Atlanta Naval Air Station, Wednesday evening more than 700 Reserve officers resolved unanimously that this body reiterate its unqualified support of universal military training and the Marshall plan, and that it strongly advocate that the Government of this Nation—

1. Adopt Selective Service legislation for the purpose of more speedily raising to adequate strength the Army, Navy, and Air Forces;

2. Reactivate a sufficient portion of the Reserve Fleet with particular reference to large aircraft carriers;

3. Pledge immediate, active military support to any nontotalitarian government in resisting Soviet aggression;

4. Grant authority to the Secretary of National Defense to order mobilization of all or any part of the United States Naval Reserve whenever such mobilization shall be deemed expedient.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. MARTIN,
Secretary, Atlanta Chapter Reserve Officers of the Naval Services and Naval Reserve Officers Association.

It will be seen from this letter and from the resolution adopted at the emergency meeting above mentioned, that this organization and its membership are squarely behind the efforts of Congress and our Government to stop communism, and to bring our military strength to the point where it will be adequate for our protection.

I take this occasion to say that I concur wholeheartedly in the sentiment expressed in the resolution quoted above with reference to resisting Soviet aggression. I have for many years regarded communism as a grave menace to liberty and freedom, and have vigorously opposed it even as far back as the time when opponents of communism were smeared with the terms "Red baiter," "warmonger," "Fascist," "un-Christian," and similar terms. I was for 3 years State Americanism chairman of the American Legion, and the study which I gave to communism then convinced me that it is the avowed aim and purpose of the Communists to destroy our Government and all similar governments throughout the world, and to replace them with dictatorships.

It is a matter of pride to me that this great organization in the district which I represent has called this emergency meeting, and that its members have placed themselves on record in adopting this patriotic resolution. I take pleasure in commending it to your thoughtful consideration.

Soil Conservation in Black Hawk County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last year I had the privilege of seeing some of the soil-conservation work being done in Iowa. Attached hereto is the 1947 report of the commissioners of the Black Hawk Soil Conservation District. The report not only shows what was done but also indicates the size of the problem before us.

In these days of war and destruction, the matter of food production is of primary importance. We cannot long continue to furnish that food unless we can conserve our soil.

The report is as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE BLACK HAWK SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT FOR 1947

The Black Hawk County Soil Conservation District completed its second year of the organization and the first full year of operation with technical assistance furnished by the United States Soil Conservation Service. As a result, more specific needs and accomplishments can be set down in this report as compared with previous ones.

NEEDS FOR CONSERVATION

The needs for conservation measures in Black Hawk County are significant and if productivity of the soils of the county are to be maintained, an intensive action and educational program among farmers must be carried on.

Estimates of some observation measures needed include:

1. Approved crop rotations, 297,850 acres.
2. Contour planting, 157,250 acres.
3. Contour strip cropping, 7,.400 acres.
4. Tile drainage, 6,475,000 lineal feet.
5. Surface drainage, 1,980,000 lineal feet.
6. Improved drainage, $24,050 acres.
7. Establishment of grassed waterways, 4,810,000 lineal feet.
8. Terracing, 250 miles.
9. Woodland and wildlife planting, 2,035 acres.

These estimates are based on 340,000 acres of farm land, an average size farm of 180 acres, and a corresponding number of 1,850 farms.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS, 1947

In working toward these ultimate needs, the following goals of 30 complete farmer-district plans were set for 1947. Consequently, 16 planning meetings with 141 prospective cooperators in attendance were held. Actually 37 farm plans were completed, with corresponding application of conservation measures. Farmers actively cooperating with the district established the following practices and were given aid by the Soil Conservation Service technicians.

Contour planting, 872 acres.
Strip cropping, 78 acres.
Drainage, 127 acres.
Grassed waterways, 39,750 lineal feet.
Terracing, 1.1 miles.
Field reorganization, 955 acres.
Tile drainage, 15,100 lineal feet.
Surface drainage, 4,550 lineal feet.
Crop rotation (approved), 1,356 acres.

In addition, it is estimated that farmers on their own initiative, and including assistance from the Extension Service, AAA, and SCS, established 3,000 acres of contour planting, 200 acres of strip cropping, and 2,000 acres of tile drainage. One hundred and eight farms, totaling 18,000 acres, have been soil mapped by the SCS.

CONSERVATION EDUCATION

In the field of conservation education, 12 interest meetings were held throughout the county to acquaint farmers with the program. Four hundred and four farmers attended these meetings. Sixty-three news articles appeared in local newspapers. Eleven radio broadcasts were devoted to district conservation activities. Two conservation films were shown to six groups, totaling 402. These were mostly rural schools. A lecture also was given to 75 students at one school. Educational booths were established at the 4–H Fair and the Dairy Cattle Congress, where a Commissioner each day was in charge at the week-long Congress. An estimated 11,000 people saw the exhibit, and over 400 personal contacts were made.

DEMONSTRATIONS

During the year, five demonstrations were held under the direction of the District commissioners. They included a contour cultivation demonstration, Dale Hull, of the Extension Service, assisted; a surface drainage demonstration; a grassed waterway, shaping and seeding demonstration; a tree-planting healing demonstration; a ditch-blasting demonstration; in addition, the technician in the district assisted the county extension director in a clean-plowing demonstration.

RESEARCH

Grass plots were established on the Charles Dunbar farm located in one of the sand areas of the county. Various grasses, fertilizer treatments, etc., will be studied. These plots are under the supervision of Maurice Heath, of the SCS nursery. Because 10 percent of the county is comprised of sand, these experimental plots will be watched with interest. Bromegrass, Reed canary grass, and hairy vetch were distributed to several farmers for trials.

CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS

Cooperation with civic organizations was encouraged and meetings were held with sportsmen's clubs, bee keepers' association, and schools, both rural and urban. One sportsmen's group carried on a tree-planting program and members donated their time and money and actually planted the seedlings.

GROUP ENTERPRISES

In the field of group enterprises, six requests were received. These were cooperative drainage projects. One was completed and the others are in the process of development.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Due to the heavy rainfall, a total of over 18 inches was recorded from May 23 to June 30, with an intensity reaching 2.5 inches per hour. A flood-damage survey was made on July 9 and 10. As a result of the survey, damage to soil and crops in Black Hawk County reached the astounding total of $8,680,990. These figures were based on present prices. This report was later presented in detail to a flood-control hearing conducted by the United States Army engineers in Waterloo.

DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS

Ernest E. Sage, Mount Vernon Township farmer, was reelected a district commissioner for a 6-year term. Chairman Earl Douglass accompanied the air tour of the State. His report of soil and crop drainage throughout the State was impressive.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPEEDING UP PROGRAM

At this time, recommendations for speeding up the district program can be made. To accomplish such speed-up, a broader and more intensive educational program is essential. Added use of farmer group leaders would benefit with the possibility of developing more farmer conservationists. Additional technical assistance would immeasurably benefit as it would enable application and establishment of such conservation measures to advance more rapidly.

COMMISSIONERS' ACTIVITIES

The commissioners have attended all interest meetings, and one has attended most of the planning meetings. The policy of adhering to the group approach has been uppermost in the minds of the commissioners. The division of the county into three zones, one for each member, has worked successfully. A special meeting is planned for the near future, to make assignment of certain responsibilities for each commissioner. These will include publicity, demonstrations, exhibits, and other activities.

GOALS FOR 1948

Before concluding this report, it is felt that some plans for 1948 must be included. A goal of 48 acre by acre farmer-district plans has been set. It is felt that with sufficient technical personnel available to the district, the goal might closely approach the 200 mark. Further increase in the use of lime, legumes, and grasses is expected and a larger percentage of farmers becoming interested and starting practices is anticipated.

CONCLUSION

In the past year, farmer interest in the county has increased and at present there are 177 applications comprising 14 groups and including 32,285 acres. That a good beginning has been made has generally been agreed; that the surface has just been touched, is apparent. All agencies and interested people must cooperate if we are to reach our goal of complete conservation of the land.

EARL R. DOUGLASS,
J. E. ENTZ,
ERNEST E. SAGE,
District Commissioners.

The Primaries in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from the New York Herald Tribune of April 12, 1948:

PRESTIGE, NOT DELEGATES, SEEN CANDIDATES' GOAL IN PRIMARIES—MARK SULLIVAN POINTS OUT THAT CONVENTION VOTES INVOLVED BOTH IN WISCONSIN AND NEBRASKA ARE INFINITESIMAL PART OF REPUBLICAN TOTAL

(By Mark Sullivan)

The total number of delegates in the Republican National Convention will be some 1,090. The number from Wisconsin is 27; the number really significant is, say, a dozen or so—a dozen whom Dewey and MacArthur were expected to get but did not, and whom Stassen got.

This is some 1 percent of the total in the national convention. Yet, the result of the primary in Wisconsin, because of sensational circumstances attending it, is interpreted as having major and conclusive effects on the convention as a whole. The interpretation

which says that Governor Dewey is given a fatal or semifatal set-back is not true at all. When a great party has the Governor of the largest State, and when he has a record that makes him a natural and strong possibility for the party's Presidential nomination, the party does not throw him overboard merely because of a primary result in one medium-size State. The Republican National Convention at Philadelphia next June will be made of stiffer stuff.

This brings up the primary in Nebraska this week. Here is a State with eight delegates to the convention, a tiny fraction of the whole, less than 1 percent. The entire vote expected to be cast in the Republican primary is estimated at some 100,000, an infinitesimal fraction, about one two-hundred and fiftieth of the total Republican vote in the Nation; it is less than the vote in many a single Congressional district.

PRESTIGE SEEN CHIEF GOAL

Yet, to campaign up and down Nebraska, Governor Dewey last week left his office in Albany and traveled more than halfway across the continent. Senator Taft left his onerous post as Senate leader to do the same. Ex-Governor Stassen, without a day's rest after intensive campaigning in Wisconsin, hurried to begin equally intensive campaigning in Nebraska.

Why? The answer throws light on the whole nature of this race for the Republican nomination. It was not the delegates they were after; it was the prestige. Prestige with whom? To some extent with the public, but mainly with the great body of delegates who are being named throughout the country, in most cases without primary races. The prestige sought is with the convention as a whole. It is the mass of individual delegates who will count in the coming Republican convention.

The coming convention will have several marked characteristics all pointing toward openmindedness. Only a small fraction of the delegates will have been chosen in hotly contested primary races like the ones in Wisconsin and Nebraska. Nebraska is literally the only State in which all three of the active major candidates—Taft, Dewey, and Stassen—contend against each other.

Not only will most of the delegates be free from binding commitments by primaries, most of them will be free from strong emotional commitments. There will be a large number of delegates for Dewey, but they will be without personal acrimony against TAFT, and the same as to the large number of delegates for TAFT. The considerable number of delegates for Stassen will be similarly free from acrimony toward other candidates. The delegates who come for favorite sons will be there with the intention of throwing their strength toward one or another of the major contenders as the convention develops.

POPULARITY TO BE WATCHED

A convention thus free from strong group commitments and especially free from group acrimonies will determine upon whatever nomination appeals to them, taking into account all the conditions at the time. They will take account of the issues and principles involved and also the vote-getting popularity of the candidates. This accounts for the hectic campaigning of the three most active candidates in Nebraska, which is essentially a popularity contest in a small microcosm representative of Republican sentiment in a Midwest and dominantly agricultural section.

Nebraska will be watched to see whether—among Taft, Dewey, and Stassen—one or another does markedly well. Depending on this there will be many interpretations, some no doubt too sweeping, as was the case after the Wisconsin primaries.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 7, 1948:

ALL THAT SHOULD BE EXPECTED

What's the matter with the Taft-Hartley Act? Why hasn't it prevented the packinghouse strike, the coal walk-out, the Wall Street, and perhaps this or that other local shut-down?

These are questions some people are asking—questions which, despite an element of validity, spring largely from incomplete understanding of the problem.

The answer, in broadest terms, is this: Neither the framers of the new labor code, nor others well informed on the subject intended nor expected that this or any other law would stop strikes. Only a police state can do that. Nazi Germany did. Russia does. Obviously, the price of complete freedom from strikes is loss of freedom all around—a price Americans should never pay.

The great wave of postwar strikes exposed three great needs in labor-management relations which could be supplied through legislation:

First, the need to strengthen and to define more clearly the rules and the boundary lines within which employers and employees should be expected to work together, and to negotiate agreements on a basis of hear equality.

Second, the need to bring the public interest to bear in the direction of peaceful resolution of differences, by means of readily available mediation, and voluntary arbitration.

Third, the need to establish unmistakably the right of the Government to protect the public safety and welfare should some dispute go to the lengths of imperiling them, and to chart orderly procedures by which that right can be enforced.

To achieve these objectives without invading the individual liberty of either worker or employer is a delicate task. The Taft-Hartley Act attempts it. The most that should be expected is that, on the average, a greater number of disputes will be settled without strikes, and that such strikes as cannot be avoided will be reined in short of holding the innocent public for ransom.

Just how well the law is meeting needs 1 and 2 it is still too early to say. One fact is significant, however. A surprising number of informed people, including some labor leaders who opposed the law, now admit privately that it is working better than they expected. Certainly this part of it deserves a longer trial than it has yet had.

Whether it meets need 3 is now having a searching test in the coal crisis. John L. Lewis wants pensions for his miners. But it now seems evident that before he will sit down and bargain for them he proposes to probe to the limit for weak spots in the law's national emergency provisions.

What Mr. Lewis failed to see a year ago, and thus far fails to sense again, is that with his arrogant tactics, and with a necessity such as coal, probing a law can very quickly pass over into the realm of defiance of the sovereign right of a Nation to defend itself.

Thus, if the Taft-Hartley Act should prove inadequate here, Congress seems very much in the mood to fill in any deficiency. The danger is that it might go so far in trying to get at Mr. Lewis' labor monopoly as to unnecessarily curb the freedom of the great bulk of union labor, which has no part in the hold-the-public-for-ransom methods of the mine leader.

A Mystifying Retreat From a World Activity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal, Sunday, April 4, 1948:

A MYSTIFYING RETREAT FROM A WORLD ACTIVITY

A great many people are mystified by action in Congress to delay, if not to defeat, our taking part in the World Health Organization. An expression of this feeling is given in a letter from Dr. John J. Phair, Louisville-Jefferson County health director, which appears in the Point of View:

WHO is one of the most important of the specialized agencies to be set up under the United Nations. In the preliminary conference nearly 2 years ago looking to its formation, the United States and Canada had leading parts. Surgeon General Parran presided. Canada's Dr. Brock Chisholm became executive of the interim commission of 18 nations to carry on the beginnings of a world-wide health program until organization was completed. Under it, work went on to strengthen international agreements to control spread of epidemics.

Now, suddenly, without public discussion or explanation, the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives tables a bill that would make the United States an official member. This means that the organization will be created without us.

Dr. Phair wants to know why this step of retreat was taken. The 23 nations which already have signed the Constitution of WHO, many of them on assurance that the United States would do likewise, doubtless also want to know why. Our abstaining is likely to be our loss, as well as the world's.

We shall be kept from the pool of scientific knowledge and experience. We shall leave to others the inquiry and the assembly of means to guard against the encroachments of ills like malaria, cholera, yellow fever, smallpox, and the plague, which recognize no geographical boundaries. No iron curtain or nationalistic spirit may bar them. The facts are something to call to your Congressman's attention.

Progress in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there are many rumors circulating with regard to election

irregularities in Kansas City and even in my own fair State of Maryland, it is pleasant to be able to make a report of improved conditions in this important phase of our national life.

Let us concede that even now there is a contest pending in the other body, based on alleged improprieties in the last Maryland election, and that recently a candidate in the Democratic primaries, about to be held in Baltimore, openly charged that many persons listed as eligible voters affiliated with his party on precinct records, could not be found in the district. Nevertheless there are signs of progress.

The following article from the March 27 issue of the New Yorker clearly shows that conditions in Maryland have improved over the years:

NOTES AND COMMENT

This being an election year, we have been glancing through a book in our library entitled "Testimony Taken Before a Committee of the House of Delegates of Maryland on Contested Elections." It has to do with a contested election, involving the office of State comptroller of Maryland, that took place in November 1859. Our eye lit on a passage in which Mr. S. Teakle Wallis, a witness for the losing candidate, William H. Purnell, is questioning Mr. William D. Durham, a judge of election of the eleventh ward in Baltimore:

"Mr. WALLIS. Did you ever see an election at which deadly weapons were not produced?

"Answer. I don't know as I ever did.

"Question. In city or county?

"Answer. In city or county. I have seen my father kicked away from the polls, and then shot at, the bullet passing through his hat.

"Question. Never saw an election at which there were not people shot at?

"Answer. I do not remember ever going to the polls but what I saw somebody injured more or less by deadly weapons.

"Question. Did you ever see an election at which there was not somebody shot at?

"Answer. I don't think I did. I don't think I ever saw an election at which there was not somebody injured—I would not say, positively, shot at, because one weapon is a deadly weapon if it kills you in any way you take it. I think if one gets stuck with a knife, it is a deadly weapon if it kills him."

Everyone hears so much about the good old days that we are happy to pass on our reflection, arrived at after reading the above, that voting conditions, at least, are on the mend. We have never seen our dear ones, regular voters to the last sibling, shot at, or even stuck with a knife. May the coming months find our optimism well founded, our hat inviolate, our hair unsinged.

Selective Service and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PARKE M. BANTA

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by a former naval officer, Mr. Frank J. Cizek, of Rolla, Mo.:

ROLLA, MO., *March 27, 1948.*

Hon. PARKE M. BANTA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is just a short letter expressing my opinion as one of your constituents on some pertinent legislation. I do not represent any organization nor has any pressure been brought to bear upon me by anyone. This letter is just an expression of my views.

As a veteran of World War II and one who has had first-hand experience in the armed services of the United States, I wish to state that I am against any form of selective service or universal military training. I believe these are undemocratic in nature. I believe sincerely that they are an admittance of the failure of democracy to cope with the threat of totalitarianism by any other than totalitarian methods. Naturally, there are multitudes of reasons against the case for universal military service too long to enumerate here. It has been shown that, as exemplified by Germany, Italy, Japan, and now Russia, that a strong military is absolutely necessary to the existence of an autocracy.

If we must have a strong military, as the indispensable Democratic Party (remember in 1940 and 1944 the argument for reelection was, Don't change horses in the middle of the stream) say we must, why don't they reform the archic military system in our Navy and Army and induce by voluntary enlistment the necessary number for their authorized quota? Doesn't it seem strange with all their propaganda, the armed services can't get their quota filled? The pay is terrific, housing is plentiful, old-age security is a sure thing, etc. Why are the lists of our city police departments much longer than the armed service's waiting lists? The military propagandists say it's the American's natural dislike for regimentation, etc. Humbug.

Here are several of the reasons why they must have a draft instead of a voluntary program:

1. Officers are trained in tradition and technical subjects with only lip service done to leadership psychology. What teaching in leadership they do get is by teachers who are well schooled in the Prussianistic system, the same system that produced most of our most competent dictators. I believe a man should have a degree in psychology or sociology before he is admitted to a military academy. If this sounds unreasonable, consider the doctor, lawyer, or dentist who take 6 to 7 years of college to complete their education. Surely an officer who deals with the lives of men should have no less a preparation.

2. The merit system is not adhered to in too many cases. Violations in the merit system seem to vary directly with an increase in rank.

3. Some of the men on "top" of the armed services are old timers who are trying to keep alive the ideas that Napoleon conceived about running his military organization.

4. Many prominent lawyers have pointed out that justice (not leniency) from many military courts is a sham.

We should have a complete revision of our military system to suit the type of independent thinkers we Americans are. It is impossible to do this with present military minds.

I speak as a former naval officer honorably separated and with ability to substantiate through my own experiences these arguments.

Sincerely,

FRANK J. CIZEK.

Taxation of Farmers' Cooperative Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary and a statement by Albert J. Fitzgerald, president, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (CIO), to Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, November 21, 1947.

SUMMARY

The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, condemns efforts, led by giant food processing and chain store corporations, to enact punitive tax measures against the farmers' cooperative associations. The UE recognizes the common interest of farmers and industrial workers in the maintenance and establishment of cooperative enterprises, and pledges full support to all farmer and consumer cooperatives which are fighting attempts to weaken cooperatives. In this critical period of soaring prices and diminishing economic stability, it is essential that the Government use every means at its disposal to strengthen the cooperative movement as a bulwark against monopoly prices and monopoly attempts to strangle free competitive enterprise.

Removal of tax exemption privileges now enjoyed by farm cooperatives is sought on grounds that such exemptions deprive the Federal Government of much-needed revenue, and give cooperatives an unfair competitive advantage over ordinary corporations. These arguments don't hold water. Removal of the exemptions would produce an estimated $60,000,000 in revenue, at the outside. If more revenue is needed, why are members of the Ways and Means Committee talking of cutting income taxes by $4,000,000,000, largely for high incomes? If revenue is needed, restoration of the excess profits tax as proposed by Senator O'MAHONEY and closing of estate and gift tax loop-holes should be considered. On the basis of experience in 1944–45, when corporate profits before taxes were only about three-fourths of the present annual rate, an excess profits tax could easily yield $10,000,000,000 a year and do much to discourage present price boosting. Tightened estate and gift taxes according to CIO estimates could easily increase revenues by $1,000,000,000 a year.

There is no evidence that farm co-ops seriously compete in any manner with ordinary corporations. Farm marketing co-ops handle only the business of farm producers, among whom there is little corporate enterprise. Farm purchasing co-ops lose their tax-exempt status if more than 15 percent of their business is done for persons who are neither farm producers nor members of the co-ops. Six leading corporations in food processing and distribution and farm machinery manufacture alone do more business than the 10,150 farmers' cooperatives.

Cooperatives give farmers some of the protection of collective bargaining achieved by industrial workers through their trade unions. The drive for punitive taxation on co-ops is an attempt to remove that protection, as the Taft-Hartley Act seeks to destroy the protection afforded by unions. Without such protection, farmers would be forced more than ever to accept low prices for what

they sell, and high prices for what they buy. The attack on co-op taxation appears also to be a weapon to compel farm support of the NAM demand for elimination of corporate profits taxes.

Removal of present tax exemptions on farm co-ops would hurt farmers and benefit only large corporate interests like A. & P., Safeway, the meat, dairy, and fertilizer trusts, etc. It would open the way for a similar attack on consumer co-ops and small business generally. It would hurt prospects for more food and cheaper food for city consumers. It would be completely contrary to the needs of the Nation in this critical hour.

STATEMENT ON TAXATION OF FARMERS' COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS, PRESENTED BY ALBERT J. FITZGERALD, PRESIDENT, UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO, TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, NOVEMBER 21, 1947

The members of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, are deeply concerned about proposals which have been made to this committee to weaken the farmers' cooperative marketing and purchasing associations. At the twelfth annual UE convention, meeting in Boston last September, 1,000 delegates representing the 600,000 men and women of this union unanimously adopted a resolution condemning punitive tax measures against cooperatives.

The UE recognizes that farmers and industrial workers have organized and maintained cooperatives serving the people of almost every State in which our members live, and have joined together time and time again to protect their mutual interests in the field of cooperative enterprise. Our union recognizes that the drive to weaken farm cooperatives, through elimination of certain Federal tax exemptions, is led by the giant food processing and chain store corporations, the farm machinery and equipment trust, the fertilizer trust, and the big oil corporations of the Nation, which have established lobbies in Washington and in State governments to pass punitive tax laws against cooperatives. If farm co-ops are undermined, consumer co-ops will be next in line for an all-out assault. Our union therefore pledges its full support to all farm and consumer cooperatives which are fighting this threat to their existence.

It is especially important now, when soaring prices threaten our living standards and our economic stability, that the protection against monopoly now given to farmers, consumers, and the economy generally by cooperatives should not be weakened, but should be strengthened by every means at the disposal of our Government. The encouragement, assistance, and protection of free cooperative enterprise is one of the highest responsibilities of our Government under our antitrust laws and policy.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSALS TO REMOVE CO-OP TAX EXEMPTIONS?

Farmers' cooperatives are nonprofit organizations through which farmers market their produce and buy their supplies and equipment jointly. A majority of them have qualified for exemption from the tax on corporations under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code. The exemption covers income paid as dividends on stock issued to finance the cooperatives, income retained as reserves, and income returned to members and other patrons as refunds or savings after all expenses are paid. The last-named exemption—patronage refunds—may be enjoyed by any cooperative, corporation, or business enterprise which gives such refunds, regardless of whether it qualifies for complete exemption of income under section 101.

The NAM, the chain stores, and their spokesmen charge that co-op tax exemptions (1) deprive the Federal Government of much-needed revenue; and (2) give cooperatives an unfair advantage over ordinary corporations. A glance at these arguments will show that they do not hold water; their real purpose is to remove a road block to all-out profiteering.

At its 1946 convention, the National Association of Manufacturers demanded in effect that the farmers' cooperatives should either get behind the NAM campaign to eliminate corporate profits taxes, or else suffer punitive taxation on co-op income, which is real bread-and-butter income for co-op members. This same convention outlined the NAM attack on unions, which resulted in the Taft-Hartley Act.

After their success against unions, the NAM and other big corporate interests looked around to see what they could do to other organizations devoted to the welfare of the American people. The first result was an attack on consumer cooperatives, reportedly led by Safeway and the grocery chains, through the hearings of the House Small Business Committee on the Greenbelt cooperative last August. Now it is the turn of the farmers' cooperatives to be attacked.

All these things go together. They are part of what the CIO has called a coordinated program to destroy the living standards of our people. The arguments used against the co-ops are clear proof that the corporations will use every means to remove any threat to high monopoly profits.

DOES THE GOVERNMENT NEED REVENUE?

If the Government needs revenue the farm cooperatives are not the place to look for it. The United States Treasury Department has estimated that a tax on co-op dividends and reserves would in 1943 have yielded only $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 in revenue. Not much more would be collected by taxing refunds to patrons. According to available statistics, only about 35 percent of farm co-ops pay refunds. If we assume for argument that these co-ops paid refunds equal to 5 percent of their estimated sales in 1944–45, and that these refunds were taxed at the "standard" corporate tax rate of 38 percent, the total revenue would have been around $40,000,000. As noted before, any corporation can qualify for this tax exemption by giving refunds to its customers in the same manner as cooperatives. Nothing is stopping them.

The total possible revenue from changing the co-ops' tax status thus would be around $60,000,000, which is a mere drop in the bucket compared to a total Federal revenue of over $40,000,000,000. This total possible extra tax revenue from 10,150 farmers' cooperatives is less than the taxes paid by four food processors alone in 1946—Armour, Swift, Borden, and National Dairy Products corporations—which together paid $72,000,000. It is not much more than the taxes paid by eight leading grocery chains in 1946—A. & P., Safeway, Kroger, American Stores, National Tea, Colonial Stores, Food Fair Stores, and Bohack—which together paid $48,400,000.

Clearly the Federal Government does not need revenue at the expense of the farmers' cooperatives. In the first place, the Federal Government expects to have a substantial surplus of revenue over expenditures this year—sufficient, in the reported opinion of the Republican majority of this committee, to justify a $4,000,000,000 cut in personal income taxes, largely for high incomes. The Committee for Economic Development believes the surplus will be sufficient to cut income taxes $6,000,000,000.

In the second place, if revenue were needed, it should not be taken out of the already diminished purchasing power of the American people, through added tax burdens on farm and consumer co-ops. We should expect to see this committee show interest in Senator O'MAHONEY'S proposal for a new excess profits-tax formula to check the present dangerous rise in prices rather than in these proposals to tax co-ops. In 1944–45, for example, when corporation profits (before taxes) were only about three-fourths of the present annual rate, the excess-profits tax yielded $10,000,000,000 a year. We should like to see the committee consider proposals to close the loopholes in estate and gift taxation which the CIO estimates could easily yield $1,000,000,000 above the present yield. Foreign subsidiaries of United States corporations might also be a fruitful tax source. For example, according to testimony before the Senate War Investigating Committee on November 1, 1947, Arabian oil concessions owned by Standard Oil and the Texas Corp., have accumulated $116,000,000 in profits on which no taxes have been paid. These profits were earned by charging the United States Government $1.05 a barrel for oil which cost 25 cents a barrel to produce.

With runaway prices and profits draining the people's purchasing power, we must reduce taxes on low incomes. We need more exemptions for low incomes, not less. Co-ops help protect the incomes of working farmers and of many consumers against monopoly prices and business practices. To add new tax burdens on them would only increase the drain on their purchasing power.

DO FARM CO-OPS HAVE AN UNFAIR COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE OVER ORDINARY CORPORATIONS?

If the Government is looking for threats to competition, the field of cooperative enterprise should be the last place to look, especially in agriculture. In the first place, farm co-ops don't seriously compete with corporations. In the second place, their function is to protect farmers from the real threats to competition and free enterprise which lie in corporate monopoly business practices.

The House Small Business Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress declared after careful investigation: "The theory that the cooperative movement is seriously endangering other forms of business operation can be utterly disregarded."

Agriculture is the one field of enterprise in the United States which corporations have not yet entered on a large scale. Only 7 percent of agricultural business in 1937 was done by corporations, compared with 100 percent in communications, 92 percent in manufacturing, 58 percent in wholesale and retail trade, 30 percent in service industries, etc. When corporations suggest that farm co-ops now "compete" with them, they are implying that they want to get into the agricultural field in a big way, as they have already done in one State—California. But if we mean what we say about preservation of independent enterprise and especially the independent family farm enterprise, we cannot aid corporate enterprises' attempt to invade agriculture by weakening the co-ops.

Farm co-ops now do only an insignificant amount of manufacturing and processing, according to studies of the Department of Agriculture and the Treasury Department. In fertilizer production, for example, they do only about 10 percent of the business. In oil refining, they produced in 1944 only $20,000,000 worth; the value of national petroleum output was over $2,000,000,000. Three-quarters of farm co-ops processing plants are for dairy products; these were established long ago and have been losing ground to the trusts ever since. Co-ops also do a small amount of cotton ginning and fruit and vegetable canning. In such important canning products as peas, tomatoes, and corn, they account for only 1 to 3 percent of total production. Only in canned berries, cherries, pears, and citrus fruit juices do they handle as much as 10 percent of the pack.

In order to enjoy tax exemption, farm purchasing co-ops cannot do more than 15

percent of their business for persons who are neither producers nor members. Hence they cannot seriously compete with Safeway or other distributors in public markets. Marketing co-ops must do all their business for farmers; they cannot offer their services to a small-business man who might, for example, want to build up a farm-machinery business to compete with International Harvester.

Looking at total volume of business, it is obvious that farm co-ops don't seriously compete with corporations. Here are some figures:

Volume of business done by 10,150 farmers' co-ops, 1944–45

Marketing co-ops (7,400)	$4,835,000,000
Purchasing co-ops (2,750)	810,000,000
Total	5,645,000,000

Corporate sales, 1945, by selected industries and companies

All manufacturing	$137,818,000,000
Food	23,193,000,000
Tobacco	2,278,000,000
Textile-mill products	7,657,000,000
Petroleum and coal	8,771,000,000
Trade	64,155,000,000
Wholesale	34,017,000,000
Retail	30,138,000,000
Selected companies:	
A. & P	1,435,000,000
Swift & Co	1,308,000,000
Armour & Co	1,213,000,000
Safeway	665,000,000
National Dairy Products Corp	633,000,000
International Harvester	622,000,000
American Tobacco	558,000,000
Borden & Co	460,000,000
Kroger Co	457,000,000
General Foods	307,000,000
Allis-Chalmers	289,000,000
Deere & Co	138,000,000

Sources: U. S. Treasury Department; U. S. Department of Commerce; National Industrial Conference Board.

The first six corporations in the above list alone did more business than the 10,150 farm cooperatives. Is this what the NAM calls a threat to corporate enterprise? In addition, the co-ops' business was a major source of bread and butter for their members, whereas the corporations' business was carried on largely for the financial benefit of a relatively few wealthy stockholders.

From the foregoing facts it should be clear that the NAM regards any competition as a threat. A threat to what—to genuine free enterprise for all or to monopoly profits? The question answers itself. We need far more co-op business—not less—to combat monopoly's stranglehold on the economy.

For there is a real threat to competition and free enterprise which this committee could be doing something about. The Department of Justice has warned the Nation repeatedly that concentration of monopoly power in the hands of a relatively few corporations is at the most serious stage in our history. When Forbes magazine gave a dinner in New York this month to 50 top business leaders it pointed out the people and the interests which dominate our economy. If free enterprise is becoming extinct, it is because control of so much industry is in so few hands. There were, I believe, no farm co-op leaders among Forbes' 50 "business leaders."

DO CORPORATIONS NEED PROTECTION AGAINST CO-OPS?

To suggest that corporations need protection against cooperatives is like suggesting that hunters need protection from rabbits. The whole purpose of cooperatives is to protect individual, unorganized farmers against exploitation by well-organized, tremendously wealthy monopoly corporations. These corporations have traditionally sought to pay the farmer the lowest possible price for his produce, and to charge him the highest possible price for his supplies and equipment. Through their cooperatives, the farmers have achieved some of the protection of collective bargaining—the kind of protection industrial workers obtain through their unions. Selling and buying as a group rather than as isolated individuals, farmers have done much to protect their incomes and living standards against the sharp practices of the corporations with which they must deal. To cripple the co-ops is to take away that protection, just as the Taft-Hartley Act seeks to destroy the hard-won protection which trade unions give to industrial workers.

The stated policy of our Government, affirmed in the Sherman Antitrust Act and in other basic legislation, is to foster and protect small business and free competitive enterprise. As the House Small Business Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress declared: "The cooperative movement operates as a means of combating monopolistic concentrations and as such is a very healthy addition to the American economy."

Proposals to weaken co-ops do not square with the announced drive by Attorney General Clark to eliminate "price conspiracies" by the corporations in food and other essential goods. The co-ops are among the best allies the Government has in a genuine campaign to develop competition, raise production, bring down prices, and improve American living standards. Only a few years ago their contribution to war food production was gratefully recognized by the Nation.

WHAT IS THE REAL PURPOSE OF THE ATTACK ON CO-OPS?

The arguments that the Government needs more revenue and that co-ops have an unfair advantage over ordinary corporations are a smoke screen to hide the real purposes of the attack on the farm co-ops. It is first of all a maneuver aimed at further reductions of corporation income taxes. Through attacking the tax exemption granted to cooperatives, which are nonprofit, the NAM and other corporate interests hope to force through a reduction in taxes on corporation profits, which are now at the highest levels in history.

Secondly, the NAM and especially corporations like Safeway which want to expand their business in rural areas, hope to see cooperatives forced to the wall, to leave the way clear for unbridled profiteering in buying from farm people and selling to them. Farm cooperatives are the most important kind of cooperatives and the strongest. With them out of the way, the corporations could easily move in on the city consumer cooperatives just as they are moving in on small storekeepers everywhere. Thus the attack on farm cooperatives is the spearhead of a drive against all small business and consumers.

WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE ARE BEHIND THE ATTACK?

Groups attacking co-ops generally follow the NAM program we have discussed. But the NAM leaves much of the dirty work to others. As Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, told the American Institute of Cooperation on August 28, 1947, big business is using small business as a tool in the attacks on cooperatives.

The spearhead of the attack is the National Tax Equality Association. This organization is headed by Ben C. McCabe, Minneapolis millionaire and president of the International Elevator Co., a large grain handler. Other leaders in the attack include William Randolph Hearst and Roy Howard, head of Scripps-Howard papers, whom the Treasury reported in 1937 as setting up personal companies and other devices to evade payment of about $80,000 in income taxes. Another leader is the A. & P. chain, which was fined $175,000 on September 27, 1946, for criminal conspiracy to restrain trade in food products and to monopolize a substantial part of such products in interstate commerce.

Among the charges on which A. & P. was convicted was this: "* * * secretly organizing and dominating the operations of supposedly independent cooperative associations of growers and shippers."

This same A. & P. was also found by the court to have cheated housewives out of $21,714,000 through short weights, overcharges, and price boosting. The Food and Drug Administration recently cited A. & P. for selling pancake sirup containing more water than maple sirup.

The Kroger Co., another enemy of the co-ops, was found guilty on June 14, 1946, and fined $48,000 for criminal contempt of court in violating an injunction against overceiling prices. Kroger's overcharges (above OPA ceilings) were at a rate of $5,000,000 a year for its Chicago stores. The fine was later revoked on appeal to the circuit court. The Food and Drug Administration recently cited Kroger for shipping adulterated bread, cakes, and cinnamon rolls.

The Safeway chain, which reportedly seeks to invade the Greenbelt cooperative community through the help of the House Small Business Committee, recently paid fines of $660 in three States for shipping rodent-infested bread. Swift & Co. was cited by the Food and Drug Administration for shipping adulterated butter, while General Mills was found shipping flour which was contaminated by weevils, beetles, and insect fragments. Pillsbury Flour was found to contain insect fragments, rodent hairs, and pellets. Companies like these are too busy making money to protect the consumer from filth in their products, but they have plenty of time and money to spend on attacking cooperatives.

Another anti-co-op leader is the California Packing Corp., which appeared before this committee on November 13, 1947, to declare that farmers' cooperatives should "be on the same plane and bear their proper and equal share of the tax burden" along with the great corporations which dominate the agricultural processing industries. The California Packing Corp. was revealed by the La Follette Civil Liberties Investigating Committee to be one of the founders of the "Associated Farmers of California", a corporation-backed vigilante organization, using farmers as a front, which fought organized labor and the Wagner Act during the 1930's with ruthless violence.

CONCLUSION

The issue of co-op taxation underlines the choice which is before Congress to every action it takes in these critical times: will Congress act to preserve the economic well-being and the liberties of the vast majority of working farmers and wage and salary workers of the Nation, or will it act to increase still further monopoly profits and the control of economic and political life by the few? Leaving aside all technicalities, it is clear that removal of present tax exemptions on co-op income would benefit only large corporate interests. It would open the way for new attacks on consumer co-ops and small business generally. It would hurt the prospects for more food and cheaper food for city consumers. It would be completely contrary to the needs of the working farmers and of the Nation.

Communists Dominate CIO Packing-House Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American of Tuesday, April 6, 1948, which is the first of a series of four:

DEMANDS PROBE OF RED LINK IN PACKING STRIKE—ASK CONGRESS PROBE RED TRICKERY IN MEAT STRIKE

(By Charles Finston)

Demands for a full-dress congressional investigation of Communist influences in the strike of 106,000 CIO packing-house union members across the Nation were being drafted today by Representative BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois.

BUSBEY's demands for congressional action in the strike climaxed a quiet preliminary inquiry of his own in the Chicago area, where 20,000 workers in the fourth week of the strike are seeking other jobs to keep from starving.

A total of 130 meat plants have been shut in the country.

The Chicago Congressman said his findings thus far showed clearly that the strike pattern is "oddly similar" to the Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee in 1941.

This strike was proven to have been Communist-inspired to stop production of vital war materials for the Allies, and took place during the Hitler-Stalin pact.

BUSBEY stressed his inquiry was confined to un-American aspects of the strike and had no relation to labor's legitimate right to strike nor to the pay-raise controversy.

The Chicago Congressman's initial findings stressed that the patriotic motives of rank-and-file packinghouse members are not being questioned. But the leadership in the strike and the pattern of the strike have come under suspicion.

BUSBEY asserted he is "fully aware that Communists will attempt to brand me as antilabor." He stressed he is doing everything possible to "assist the large percentage of loyal union members to eliminate Communist domination and control of their unions."

FBI PROBING

The lawmaker indicated that Department of Justice agents are also probing the strike.

BUSBEY emphasized that 24 hours before President Truman delivered his St. Patrick's Day "draft revival" message to Congress, 100,000 meat-plant workers left their jobs under the illusion that they were striking solely for higher pay.

"By ordering the strike the union leaders hoped to cripple the processing of meat designed to aid countries in front of the iron curtain," BUSBEY said.

BALKS AID PLAN

The United States aid plan calls for shipment of 300,000,000 pounds of meat, dressed-carcass weight, from American meat plants during a 4-year period.

BUSBEY said in the "cold war" between the United States and Russia, the battle front is on the wheatfields and the stockyards.

SABOTAGE AIM

"The object of such strikes is to sabotage production of America's war potential and prevent the United States from becoming fully prepared," BUSBEY observed.

BUSBEY said the master blueprint for such strikes was mapped as far back as 1936 by America's current No. 1 Communist, Eugene Dennis, secretary general of the party, who has been sentenced to prison for contempt of a congressional inquiry into his un-American activities.

TELLS RED PLAN

Dennis authored the Allis-Chalmers strike as the spearhead for a workers' revolution in America, BUSBEY said. The Congressman recalled.

"Dennis proclaimed that the Allis-Chalmers strike would be an active factor in a vast program to sabotage American national defense."

The No. 1 Communist's chief lieutenant in the Allis-Chalmers tie-up was Harold Christoffel, recently sentenced to a prison term by a Federal jury for lying about his Communist affiliations before a congressional committee.

Congressional records disclosed that Dennis, Christoffel and other Communists preached that "strikes are a good schoolroom for teaching workers revolutionary tactics."

In what way is the Allis-Chalmers strike a pattern for the packing-house workers' strike?

Here are the facts, as outlined by BUSBEY:

The Allis-Chalmers strike was ordered under the guise of seeking higher wages, just like the meat walk-out.

TACTICS SAME

The Allis-Chalmers strike occurred during a world emergency, while America was building up its national defense.

The meat strike was called as Congress struggled to put the Nation an a war-preparedness basis.

The Allis-Chalmers strike started in defiance of President Roosevelt's plea for labor peace.

The meat strike was ordered after President Truman requested the leaders to hold up the walk-out until a fact-finding board investigated workers' demands.

BLOCKS SUPPLY

The Allis-Chalmers tie-up blocked manufacture of vital war material. The packing-house strike was designed to block distribution of a great portion of the Nation's meat supply.

As in the Allis-Chalmers strike, the huge majority of packinghouse union members are opposed to communism, and when they learn how they are being used they will throw off the yoke of un-American leadership, BUSBEY said.

Just as in the Allis-Chalmers strike, negotiators for the packing-house workers promised rank-and-file members a willingness to arbitrate controversial issues, but prevented peaceful settlement by obstructive methods.

LEADERS RED

Finally, as in the Allis-Chalmers strike, the packing-house worker's union has been found by a congressional committee to be "dominated by a Communist leadership."

Who are Communists who have seized control of the union and inspired the national meat strike? What is their record? What are their aims? Congressman BUSBEY names seven "unholy men" tomorrow.

Red River Valley Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary Snyder before the annual luncheon of the Red River Valley Improvement Association at the Washington-Youree Hotel, Shreveport, La., April 7, 1948:

Political, social, and economic unrest in the world today makes it imperative that this country be strongly united in every field of national effort. The dangerous inroads already made by subversive forces which would undermine the democratic order can be defeated only by common endeavor and complete unity of purpose.

The United States has never, and will not now, shun its proper leadership in the struggle of democratic society against the creeping paralysis of brutal unrestrained dictatorship. We have, as freemen, the weapons to confront the danger with our tremendous physical resources and the natural aptitude and special abilities which spark our ever-increasing economic development and well-being. With such powerful weapons, and with a common will, we can meet and repel the advance of Communist aggression.

Time and again, we have proved beyond doubt the benefit which the individual derives when he gives his time, his thought, and his constructive action not only to his own gain, but to the problems of his community and his nation as a whole. This fact has been more than evidenced in every section and segment of our national life.

Your own organization is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when combined efforts are directed toward the objective of over-all economic health. The aims and purposes of your group are not confined to a single county or parish, nor even to the four States which you represent. The benefits and profits of your undertakings accrue to the entire country. Your achievements are impressive.

The completion of Denison Dam, one of the largest earthen dams in the world, is an outstanding example of the improvements you have fostered. It has contributed considerable and permanent benefits in flood control and in providing means to generate substantial amouts of hydroelectric power.

The completion of the Wallace Lake Reservoir, designed to protect lives and property from disastrous and recurring floods, is likewise an achievement in which you have played an important part.

The congressional authorization of both the interim flood-control plan and the Overton-Red River waterway, represent further tangible steps in your broad program for the economic development of this Valley.

The President included in his 1949 budget a request for funds which would enable the completion of the Bayou Bodcau Reservoir and the Aloha-Rigolette and Shreveport levee projects, all of which you have supported. But more important, the President recommended over $4,000,000 for 1949 work on the Texarkana Reservoir on the Sulphur River. As you know, two-thirds of this money would actually go toward initial construction work on the dam. The President's program also provides for an expansion of planning activity in 1949 on four of the other reservoirs contemplated in the interim flood-control plan.

It is extremely regrettable that vital budgetary considerations have made it inadvisable to authorize larger appropriations at this time to speed further the progress of flood control and other public works projects throughout the Nation. As you well know, it is important now for us to minimize Government competition for scarce labor and materials as long as inflationary pressures are still with us. Consequently, governmental outlay in the public works programs has been confined almost entirely to projects already under way. However, in view of their strategic value, it is certain that the

next few years will allow further major advancements in these important operations.

A removal of the recurring flood threats in the Red River area, and future extension of navigation to make it an increasingly important part of the national waterway system, will greatly augment business possibilities in this part of the country.

Such a system would facilitate transportation for the petroleum industry—which occupies such an important position in this area—for fertilizers, chemicals, iron, and steel, and other of your products so significant to the national economy. The completion of this waterway will add new impetus to the greatly expanding business activity of the entire area.

At this particular time, I believe that the Red River Valley Association could appropriately assist in giving a sound and strong base to this expansion by promoting and encouraging small business undertakings as one of the major objectives in its long-range program.

Here, and throughout the entire country, the return of peacetime business and industry has opened up an abundance of new opportunities in such fields as construction, manufacturing, distribution of durable goods, and various service industries. By the end of last year, the number of business units in the United States reached a total of nearly 4,000,000—or 470,000 more than the 1941 prewar high.

Nearly all of these new ventures were in modest proportions—small factories, grocery stores, building projects, repair shops, and other such undertakings which met community demands. In fact, more than 95 percent of the new firms established since VJ-day have had less than eight employees.

Prosperous small business is the core of American free enterprise. The small-business man plays a vital part in all community affairs and, in many instances, serves those needs that could not adequately be met by most large firms. This is particularly true where a close business relationship exists between the proprietor and the customer, or where the customer's requirements are not susceptible to a certain degree of standardization. Prosperous small business is absolutely necessary to a strong and well-balanced national economy.

Small firms proved their value during the war, not only through their own production, but by serving as suppliers for larger companies and helping to make possible the spectacular output of the large war plants. And similarly today, the small business group is a very important factor in our present levels of production.

I feel equally certain that as our present plans for strengthening our national defenses develop that small business will be in the van if obligations should be placed upon it to convert to defense production.

Furthermore, the thousands of smaller businesses have afforded continued opportunity for the development of private initiative. And it is from such small beginnings that our large corporations have mainly developed. Likewise, many of our leading industrialists received their start in these practical schools.

I need not recount the stories of such outstanding men as Henry Ford, starting his business career with a bicycle repair shop; or Thomas Edison, with his railroad newspaper business; or Harvey Firestone, who once sold buggies and patent medicines, and whose Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. had only 17 employees when organized in 1900. Milton Hershey, of Pennsylvania, extended a one-man venture into the world's largest chocolate company.

And we can well pay tribute here to a great industrialist from this area—Harvey Couch, of Arkansas, who developed a one-line telephone service into a four-State enterprise, and sold it for substantially more than a million dollars; who organized a great railroad system; and who promoted Nationwide interest in permanent flood control projects for the Mississippi Valley following the great flood of 1927. Harvey Couch had this advice to young businessmen: "Don't wait for some gigantic industry. Start a little one and watch it grow."

These are random examples among thousands where initiative and vision, promoted small scale ventures into organizations of considerable magnitude. There are countless others who, starting in a small way, developed a product or service into a big business enterprise.

Few of us know that business units with less than 50 employees make up 98 percent of all national business. There are today 3,800,000 small businesses in this country and the larger proportion of these consist of very small units—a single proprietor, or a proprietor with one to four paid employees. In 1947, for example, over 80 percent of the small business units had less than four employees.

These units represent a substantial proportion of our retail stores, repair shops, filling stations, amusement enterprises, and other businesses supplying an important element of personal service.

The Department of Commerce has estimated that small business accounts for 45 percent of the workers employed in the United States and 34 percent of the total dollar volume of business.

In any business, the first requisites for success are sound management, skilled employees, and most of all, adequate capital.

The small-business firm is usually handicapped in assembling all of these qualities in a single management and, therefore, finds it a difficult undertaking in many instances to compete with big business. In those instances, however, when we find the combination of these requirements in a small business, we can definitely look forward to expansion and development.

Too often, the small firm lacks sufficient equity capital, since it must rely largely on local funds—particularly in the case of new firms difficulty may be encountered in getting short-term backing. Further a serious financial problem faced by many small businesses is the lack of alternative methods of financing. This danger may be acute for those who, relying on the expectation of continued good business, have tied up part of their short-term funds in capital expansion.

For many years the Government has recognized the importance of helping small business, and has directed special efforts to this end. During the war the Government did a good job in channeling war contracts wherever possible toward the smaller firms and in aiding their conversion to war work. Currently Government aid to small business is largely handled by the Department of Commerce, through its Office of Small Business, and by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Veterans have been given special aid in starting their own enterprises under the GI bill of rights. A substantial part of the postwar increase in new businesses has been due to the veterans' aid program sponsored by the Veterans' Administration.

An important function of the Office of Small Business is to provide competent assistance in meeting operating problems by offering counsel and advice on inventory control, pricing, marketing, the establishment of new businesses, and other technical and practical matters.

A second major function is to represent the interests of small business before other Government agencies. Thus it is concerned in the disposal of war surplus, in the procurement of Government contracts for small manufacturers, in matters relating to trade practices, and similar useful services.

Small-business concerns may obtain assistance in their financing and credit problems through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under conditions specified by the Congress. In fact, during the entire period of its existence, about 90 percent of RFC loans have been extended to such concerns, many of which were made in cooperation with banks.

The Government is also deeply concerned with the taxation problems of small-business men. Federal-tax provisions which are detrimental in their effect are the subject of active and through study by the Treasury Department. The present system of graduated income taxes, of course, is advantageous to small business.

The Treasury is continually engaged in examining the areas of impact between all of our tax laws and the daily lives and fortunes of our people. Although the tax burden cannot be reduced at one point at the cost of an inequitable increase at another, it is the position of the Treasury that steps should definitely be taken to minimize existing, unnecessary frictions.

In February, the Treasury submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee a statement containing recommendations for 49 technical changes in the Federal tax laws, each of which, if made, would in our estimation eradicate existing inequity or other defect. These listings are not contemplated and further recommendations will be forthcoming.

The submitted proposals relate to a variety of both substantive and administrative matters. One, for instance, would change the present net operating loss deduction carryback from 2 years to 1 and the carry-over from 2 years to 5, thus materially assisting new business, as well as old.

In view of the recognized greater instability of earnings of small businesses, this would be of great benefit to them. The provision for a 5-year carry-over of losses, would be especially valuable to a new firm, since losses in the early years of operation could be used as an offset to later profits.

We have also recommended an exploration of the tax-rate structure for corporations with incomes under $50,000, to see whether a more desirable arrangement of rates can be made as a substitute for the present so-called "notch rate" on corporate income in the bracket between $25,000 and $50,000.

Another recommendation would clarify the law on the treatment of employee stock options. A fourth would abolish the 3 percent rule in the taxing of annuities in favor of a system allowing a tax-free recovery of cost prorated over the expected period of the annuity. A fifth would create a civil penalty for an employer's failure to account for withholding taxes collected from employees.

These proposals can be adopted without a substantial loss of revenue, and would serve to eliminate many technical frictions in administering the tax laws.

There are many other tax problems, however, which fall in an entirely different category, either because their complexity requires more extended study, or because their present adjustment would necessarily entail an untimely reduction of Government revenues.

Outstanding among these problems is the need to return excise taxes to their proper place in a peacetime tax system. Some of our excise taxes, such as that on the transportation of freight, enter into the production costs of many commodities, and disturb normal competitive relationships. This, added to the restraining nature of excise taxes generally, calls for their reexamination in all phases.

During the past year the Treasury has completed and published 16 thorough studies of such problems, and it is now bringing 15 more near to completion. The extent and scope of these studies are in themselves strongly indicative of the injustices prevailing in our present tax structure.

As Secretary of the Treasury, I was opposed to the recent action which has been taken in lowering our present revenue level before

we have determined what our total outlay of expenditures is to be for the fiscal year 1949 and before consideration was given to the revision of the inequities in our tax structure.

In my opinion, it was most inadvisable to have reached conclusions on tax reduction before meeting the prerequisite obligations of foreign aid within a balanced budget, adequate provision for debt reduction, and equitable tax revision.

Our over-all fiscal policies must be courageously predicated on the permanent national interest and not on immediate advantages or individual profit.

We all know the gravity of the struggle in which we are now engaged—a struggle which has put in issue the very essence of our modern civilization.

Every policy we adopt, every course we follow, must be considered in the light of its effect upon our strength at home and our position before the world.

Keynote Address by Miss Ruth Ellen Halter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Miss Ruth Ellen Halter, a 22-year-old senior at William Jewell College, delivered the keynote address at the Republican convention in the Third Congressional District of Missouri held at Maryville, Mo., on April 8, 1948.

Miss Halter is an unusually gifted speaker. She has addressed important and representative groups in many cities, and was the first woman to appear before the annual Business Speaks dinner of the New York Board of Trade at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. When she took part in a program at a regular meeting of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, the Kansas City Star commented that—

Miss Halter's talk won her a standing ovation which was unprecedented, according to veteran chamber luncheon goers.

Next month Miss Halter will receive her bachelor of arts degree from William Jewell College where she has majored in both English and philosophy. During her college studies she has made an enviable academic record in addition to participating extensively in extracurricular activities, including primarily forensics. She is a member of Panaegis, senior honor society limited to seven senior women, and has been elected to honor societies in English, history, forensics, social sciences, philosophy, and creative writing.

William Jewell College, which has contributed much to the education and training of Miss Halter, is located at Liberty, Mo., in the district I have the honor to represent. Next year the college will celebrate its centennial, having been founded in 1849. It is one of the great liberal arts colleges in America, and all Missourians take pride in its high academic and ethical standards. Its alumni include some of the most outstanding men and women in the country. I might add that three Members of this House—Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, Hon. PARKE M. BANTA, and Hon. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., all of Missouri—are alumni of William Jewell College.

Miss Halter is endowed with the rich traditions of a great college.

She is an independent and constructive thinker, and her keynote address at the convention in my congressional district was phrased with such clarity and delivered with such telling effect that I include it in these remarks with the recommendation that my colleagues give it a thoughtful reading.

Miss Halter's address is as follows:

Next November on that first Tuesday after the first Monday millions of Americans will express their belief in the future of our democracy. The results of that day may well be recognized as a landmark in our way of life. As one too young to look other than at the record for the significant trends of our time, let me try to tell you why and for what my first vote will be cast.

With the leadership of the world in our hands, no election in history will command more intense, world-wide attention. This country of greatest achievement, greatest prosperity, and greatest freedom now finds itself responsible for maintaining the way of life which made its growth possible.

This achievement, prosperity, and freedom are based on what other Americans did between 1776 and 1932. How do you view the years 1950 or 1990? Our century has its greatest segment ahead—and you and I will live in it.

It is trite to say that our way of life is on trial. We all realize this and are frightened by it. But what frightens us? It is not the atomic bomb, or Russia, or inflation—or it should not be. It is something more terrifying, more formidable, harder to overcome, harder to defeat. It is something more personal, more commonplace, more habitual than these—and more powerful and permanent.

Since 1932 there has been a growing sentiment that the man who earns $50 a week should be penalized because he does not make $25 a week—penalized in favor of the less competent. For all the $50-a-week men, the standard of achievement is set by the least competent and enforced by law. With all this fatuous ineptitude about us, to take orders from our inferiors is glorified by bureaucrats in Washington as one of the essences of democracy. To express hatred of incompetence is to be accused of being intolerant. These apostles of ineptitude create one vacuum after another and call each vacuum a crisis.

The greatest crime of our age is the constant search for effortless security—a progressive security to be established by getting more and more for less and less. This means that the fangs of futility have been sunk deep into millions of Americans, poisoning their souls with the virus of inefficiency. This makes impotent the very instruments of progress. When people become inoculated with this virus of getting more and more for less and less, they must of necessity create pressure groups to protect their inefficiency. I need not remind you that the Democratic Party has become a coalition of pressure groups and that its cement has turned out to be weak mucilage.

Today the administration seeks every stamp of approval save its own. It enshrines mediocrity and prejudice as the twin gods of the mob and swings to and fro every time Gallup releases a poll of public opinion as if it were an octupus on a trapeze—all tentacles and no brains.

From the records of the bureaucrats in Washington, it is obvious that their initial act is to hire publicity agents to pump the balloons of prestige regardless of whether their clients have any ballast of ability or accomplishment or not. The bureaucrat is a man with a reputation for brilliance who sputters in a grander way than most people about the common man and then prattles self-righteously about a planned economy which will repress individual aspiration and self-reliance.

With all our gadgets, with all our higher and higher standards of living, we do not trust ourselves. We are uncertain. We sense our mediocrity without realizing it. Why?

We see collectivism swallowing Europe. We feel its processes at work in America. Every person who does not have an abounding belief in his own individual destiny is fertile ground to nourish this foreign monster. The priceless heritage of America is that each citizen possesses instinctive confidence in the integrity of his own individuality. But we have been losing this for a generation. The spirit of our time is not to multiply for ourselves, but to subtract from somebody else—the subconscious thinking of the second-rater—a process of mental intoxication exemplified by the present Government of England—a process which will be the main issue of our campaign of 1948.

This fact was most significantly dramatized in the New York speech of the candidate of the Democratic Party. At that time he finally disassociated himself from the group whose self-chosen leader is apparently to become the American counterpart of the famous "Lord Haw-Haw" (H. A. W.).

The leadership of the Democratic Party says that we must curb the spread of communism in Europe. And we must. But that same Democratic leadership stands helpless before the spread of communism in America. It was also this same leadership which sold us down the river at Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam. The only solution to this problem is to change the leadership.

For a generation the American people have been losing sight of the fact that nothing is given to man on earth. The only way man can get anything is to produce it. The only way you can get something for nothing is to take it away from someone who did not get it for nothing.

Production is the key to the wants of man. Only by production may the needs of man be satisfied. They cannot be satisfied by the state. When security is lodged in the state, not only is a self-reliance gone but the state becomes the master. Man has no dignity when he must seek his security outside himself. The most titanic struggle over the dignity of man is now being staged. This is the fundamental issue before the world. Shall man seek his security within himself or form the state? The location of this primary goal determines a man's or a nation's destiny.

The strength that makes a nation strong is the inner strength of its men and women. All these insidious forms of statism in America feed upon those who seek their security outside themselves. Where seek you yours? Where seek your neighbors? Where seek your employees? The history of mankind is summed up in the answers to these questions.

Because its men sought their security outside themselves the literature, learning, and culture of Athens were taken from the Acropolis and dissolved as pearls in the basin of the Mediterranean. Because its men sought their security outside themselves the jurisprudence and government of Rome were taken from the seven hills of the Eternal City and dissolved as crystals in the cup of Europe.

The men and women of America must seek their security within themselves before America can take the liberty and freedom

from Bunker Hill and dissolve them as the salt of the earth in the chalice of universal peace.

The despair in the world and in America today comes from the spiritual collapse of its leadership. There is no strength where there is no spiritual strength. Russia fears only the strong; she laughs at the weak. Russia knows and we know here today that the source of strength cannot be found in the leadership of the Democratic Party. Every person as well as every nation can attain this inner strength through the one principle capable of survival—respect that comes from self-respect. Democratic leadership has too long taught too many Americans to be parasites—those weaklings who seek their security outside themselves. No American really wants to be a weakling or a parasite.

The economic, political, and military crisis of the world is not the cause but the result of a spiritual and moral vacuum. In 1948 the Republican Party proposes to fill this vacuum by upholding those basic principles which first made reality of the American ideal. The main issue is not universal military training, or inflation, or even war. All these are characteristic problems arising from the one unsolved dilemma which will be decided next November. The main issue is whether we will turn for leadership to the party which embodies the fundamental way of American life or whether we will continue to permit leadership which flouts these fundamentals.

In 1946 the slogan of the Republican Party was "Had enough?" It won. In 1948 as we consider the emptiness of our leadership the slogan might well be "Fill the vacuum."

Whether or not our democracy is able to meet the challenge of the future depends upon our own belief in ourselves. Our democracy becomes a delusion unless we enforce its foundation—freedom for the individual who will preserve his own self-respect. The party whose history, policy, and opportunity makes self-reliance its basic concept requires no less than our tireless allegiance.

Your Doctor and Voluntary Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, over a period of several years now, the American public has shown an increasing interest in health insurance and a realization of its economic importance to the welfare of the family. The medical profession, health and accident underwriters, the hospitals, the fraternal orders—all report tremendous enrollment gains in their prepayment health-care plans; voluntary plans which are sponsored and financed by our own great system of private enterprise.

When we know that 61,000,000 citizens have some form of prepaid health protection, I think we can say that the American public has indeed become health-insurance conscious and in a positive manner. That such forward strides have been made in a comparatively few years is all the more remarkable when we consider that it took life insurance almost 100 years to become popular in the United States.

While I would be the first to recognize the fact that there remains much to be done in the field of medical economics, I sincerely believe the American people, in their own way and without Government intervention, can solve conclusively the problem of providing adequate medical and hospital care for everyone who needs it.

The proper distribution of medical care, especially in the middle-income brackets and in the rural areas, the cutting down of medical costs, and the expansion of health facilities—all represent an important challenge to the American people in general and to the medical profession in particular. Unfortunately, some well-meaning individuals and groups have advocated cures which do not consider other elements of the situation.

Now it is not my intention here today to comment on the merits or demerits of the scores of health bills with which we all are somewhat familiar. Instead, I wish to direct my remarks to what I personally believe is a sound contribution to health planning in this country, and what I consider are some of the outstanding achievements of the doctors of my own State of California.

I have long believed that it is tremendously important to preserve the professional standards and practices in the field of medicine, standards and practices which have been built up over a great many years. Necessarily, any comprehensive program for improving medical care must have the active cooperation of the medical profession; it should not be arbitrarily imposed upon them by legislative action. I believe that the great majority of our American doctors have awakened to their responsibility and are as anxious as you and I are to help solve this problem. Regrettably, a few short-sighted ones have at times prompted a different impression.

I am of the opinion that the medical profession throughout the country is taking active steps in the right direction toward establishing a positive program of its own, a program that frankly acknowledges the difficulties to be met and as frankly sets forth, step by step, ways and means of meeting these problems that are in harmony with sound medical ethics.

In California we have applauded the successful development of a plan sponsored by the doctors themselves for spreading the costs of illness or accident. I am referring to the California Physicians' Service which was established in the fall of 1938.

California Physicans' Service, which was the first State-wide medically sponsored plan, was launched in a field where there was no reliable actuarial information. It had a difficult period in its earlier years and all of its problems have not yet been solved completely. It is now, however, on a sound basis and can be expected to continue its growth at an accelerated rate. The program has doubled its membership since early 1946 and now protects more than 520,000 Californians from the economic ravages of illness, accident, or injury.

We have in this plan a nucleus of a sound, fundamental method of allowing the low-income worker to insure himself against the expenses of ill health through an organization which the doctors themselves operate, which is organized not for profit, and which enables the common man to enjoy the best possible medical care at a fixed rate which he can prepay on a monthly basis.

There are many similar plans in almost all the other States, plans which are operated by the doctors through their local or State medical associations. We all know that none of these plans is perfect, that all of them have some drawbacks. They are not ideal, but they are positive indication that the medical profession is in tune with the times and is anxious to extend their services to the ordinary working man on a basis which he can afford.

California Physicians' Service is such a plan and one which many people in California believe to be the best of the various plans already offered because it gives to its members probably the broadest coverage of any of the professional plans so far developed.

The plan, of course, is sponsored by the California Medical Association and returns any surplus to beneficiary members in the form of a broadened service or reduced costs per month. The trustees are community leaders who serve without remuneration. Services to employed member and family alike are guaranteed by 8,650 California physicians, surgeons, and specialists, any one of whom the beneficiary may choose in time of illness or accident. Naturally, this means that in almost all cases the member is assured of the services of his own family doctor. Necessary care will be provided by any licensed physician or legally operated hospital in the world in the same amounts that would be paid to member physicians and hospitals in California for like service. Budgeted costs are low, ranging from a little over $3 monthly for the single employee to about $8 for a family of three or more.

Institution of this prepaid health care plan in over 6,000 organizations has resulted in increased efficiency on the job, better health for the entire family, greater happiness in the home—and particularly, improved employee-management relations.

Very briefly, that is what the California Physicans' Service encompasses from the purely business standpoint. But the plan has another facet which I want to bring to your attention at this time.

In a sense, we might say that the doctors are the underwriters of a pooled fund; if there is not enough money to pay them what their services would normally command, they take what is available and accept that as full payment for their services. We must not lose sight of the fact that the doctors who are members of the service are paying the cost of an experimentation. There has been no statistics, no actuarial data, for the physicians to rely upon. When they offered their medical-hospital service, they did not know how many beneficiary members would require service each month. Would it be 10 or 10 times 10? Insurance

companies were able to offer very little advice for this plan dealt with service-type insurance, not indemnification. Nevertheless, the doctors of California launched this pioneer health movement which has been a blueprint for plans in many other States.

In the light of the subsequent and tremendous accomplishment of these doctors, I think we should pay tribute to their unselfishness and their willingness to provide professional service and think about financial return later. To me, their actions have been motivated by a true regard for public service.

When we know that the membership gain in California Physicians' Service during 1946 was 149 percent over that of 1945; when we know that the plan pays over 30,000 claims each month; when we know that the annual disbursements total $11,500,000—then we may be confident that the doctors are leading the way in developing a program which is indeed a valuable service to the citizens of California and indirectly to the citizens of any and all States.

In observing what the California Physicians' Service has already accomplished and what has also been accomplished by similar plans in other States, we can readily see that the doctors have gone a long way in experimenting in the provision of high-grade medical care through prepayment plans. We can see a definite program for providing medical care for the great low-income group of our citizens and providing it on a budget basis which falls well within the means of this group. Further, we see a plan under which the type of medical care provided is the best that the medical profession has to offer to its patients, rich or poor.

While the successful development of California Physicians' Service alone has been a monumental task, the doctors in my State have also concerned themselves with a State-wide public-education program designed to popularize the principle of enrollment in voluntary health-insurance plans. Under the aegis of the California Medical Association, the California committee for voluntary health insurance was established a little over 2 years ago. Since that time the committee has conducted "voluntary health-insurance week" observances in 53 counties in my State.

The Health Week campaign objective has been to familiarize the public with the economic advantages of voluntary health insurance. To this end the California Medical Association has given, without restriction, of its funds, energy, and efforts to promote all sound varieties of health insurance. During the week the California Physicians' Service advertises in all the newspapers, and other prepayment plans, the insurance companies, the druggists, the dairies, and so forth, have been generous in supplementing the doctors' advertising with tie-in copy of their own.

Of such national significance has been the success of these Health Week drives in creating public interest in prepaid health care that I should like to take a moment to cite but one phase of the California committee's accomplishment, made possible by the enthusiastic cooperation of local members of the county medical societies.

During the committee's State-wide activities over 18,000 people were personally contacted by interview, phone, and mail, and enlisted in the Health Week campaign. This list includes top executives in hundreds of firms, particularly major industries in the metropolitan areas; more than 3,000 keymen in the farming industry; 600 city councilmen; 120 mayors, who issued proclamations; 200 insurance company officials and representatives; 90 chamber of commerce officers; 250 attorneys; 400 newspaper editors; 75 owners and managers of radio stations; 400 presidents of service clubs; 500 druggists; 280 officers of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other servicemen's groups; and approximately 500 officers and leaders of various State-wide civic organizations, fraternal groups, and women's clubs.

In addition, of course, tens of thousands of people have been reached through community meetings, newspaper articles and editorials, radio, pamphlets, and other campaign facilities. In my opinion, there are few citizens left in California who have not read or heard the doctors' message in one form or another during this period.

Indicative of the newspaper support given these drives, let me quote you from an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin during observance of Voluntary Health Insurance Week there. The Call-Bulletin said, and I quote:

> The interest of the California Medical Association in the success of such a program is understandable enough. Doctors are in business, to apply a commercial phrase to the medical profession, for your health, but also for their livelihood. Professionally, they are interested in preventing or in curing sickness and in healing injury. But as human beings, they also like to have a little of that wherewithal to feed, house, and clothe their families and themselves. It is to their advantage, as well as to yours, that you are able to pay your medical bills without financial hardship. It is to the immense advantage of all of us, from a public-health standpoint, that we all be able to afford adequate medical care. A good way to bring about this desirable condition is through some voluntary prepaid medical care plan.

Another important phase of the California Medical Association's campaign in behalf of voluntary health insurance is its radio program, "California Caravan." This 30-minute program, carried on a State-wide network, is a distinguished presentation of historically significant stories and has won many laurels in the field of radio education. The commercials on alternating Sundays call attention to all types of prepaid health and accident plans in addition to California Physicians' Service. This splendid and cooperative gesture is positive demonstration that the medical profession and the insurance industry is making an all-out, honest, and sincere effort to meet the problem of health insurance—that the need is recognized and that private enterprise is taking forward steps in the right direction.

I believe that the California committee, the medical profession, and their many friends in the State legislature and from all walks of life should be congratulated on the fine job they are doing in my State. Health insurance enrollments are increasing daily, and I am privileged to report that right now more than 5,000,000 Californians are covered by some form of voluntary insurance—a million more than would have been covered by compulsory health insurance proposals presented to our State legislature. With voluntary health insurance systems continuing to grow apace, the problem seems to be resolving itself and there is now not the slightest excuse for political intervention.

This fact was quite clearly established when the Alameda County Medical Association, which numbers some 800 doctors, recently advertised in the local newspapers asking anyone who could not obtain medical care because of inability to pay for it to contact its offices, and guaranteed to see that such care was supplied. The association received a total of three calls in response to its first advertising campaign, and none as a result of the most recent one. In my opinion, this is good evidence that the popularized "unmet medical need," supposedly so common, does not exist.

Right here I would like to comment briefly on the success of the bureaus of medical economics which are becoming an active integral part of the public relations programs of county medical societies in my State. Basically, the bureau is designed to link the individual physician and his patient in a closer understanding of economic factors in medicine. Where this understanding does not exist and a rupture in the physician-patient relationship has occurred, the bureau seeks to restore harmony. It does not do so by appeasement. It ascertains all facts, permits no justifiable claim to go by default, and recommends adjustment when indicated.

The bureau, a nonprofit, member-owned agency, seeks to prevent all future misunderstandings on the premise that the sum of all individual physician-patient relationships equals that intangible—medicine's public relations. Popularity of these bureaus of medical economics with the profession and their ready acceptance by the public points again to the fact that rapid strides are being made in this important phase of medicine.

As stated earlier, I do not intend to concern you at this time with the shortcomings of the various proposals for a national system of compulsory health insurance. I have no doubt that after hearings have been held, there will be ample opportunity for discussion of the pros and cons in both Houses.

What I am about to say is mentioned solely for the purpose of showing conclusively that our doctors will not let financial problems be placed ahead of sound, adequate medical care.

Let me tell you briefly of the breakdown of San Francisco's 10-year experiment with a compulsory health-insurance system, the only one of its kind in the United States. The Health Service

System, as it is called, is supposed to supply medical and hospital care for the city's 17,000 employees. Throughout its operation, the System has been in the hands of a nonprofessional board of directors whose policies have been put into effect without consultation with the medical profession, and in disregard of actuarial evidence.

Dissatisfaction with the operation of the system, building up through the years, finally erupted in midyear of 1947 when its board of directors urged insured members to use "home remedies," and I quote verbatim, as a means of reducing costs, and issued directives to doctors which would have had the effect of lowering medical standards.

In a letter to the physicians, the Health Service System made three major demands of the medical staff:

1. Limit and restrict the use of laboratory tests, X-ray examinations and normal diagnostic procedures and substitute "routine examinations" for careful, scientific diagnosis.

Let me call your attention to the fact that the diagnostic procedures the Health Service System management wished eliminated or restricted are essential safeguards for the detection of cancer, tuberculosis, pneumonia and other serious diseases.

2. Discourage patients with minor ailments from seeking medical treatment and advise them to use home remedies.

The San Francisco County Medical Society retorted that if that unenlightened advice was followed, and I am quoting now, "we wonder whether the Health Service System board would accept the responsibility for the minor ailments which had fatal consequences due to faulty self-diagnosis."

3. The Health Service System dictum said:

> Hereafter no patient, except in an emergency case, will be entitled to hospital benefits under HSS coverage until authorization has been given by the medical director.

As you can well imagine, that directive—setting back the clock of medical progress more than 100 years—was too much for the San Francisco County Medical Society. They replied, I think, as you would naturally expect and as the ethics of the profession dictate. They announced that they would not condone nor countenance any attempt to deny adequate medical care to the sick and injured. Nine hundred and fifty three of the system's 985 doctors resigned.

These doctors did not urge the selection of any particular voluntary plan. But they reiterated their belief that the city employees should be given the same freedom of choice as that enjoyed under the State-employee system and the Los Angeles city-employee system, neither of which are compulsory.

The San Francisco County Medical Society has advised the Health Service directors that future discussions must proceed from a point where the directors first agree to seek elimination of the compulsory features of the system.

Meanwhile, and I want to make this point emphatically clear, the doctors who resigned from the system, are continuing to treat the city employees, but as private patients.

I believe that the medical profession, perhaps more than any other group has a sincere appreciation of the great value of budgeting the expense of illness by voluntary, prepayment methods. But they will not cheapen the type of medical service or disregard medical progress merely to cut administrative costs. If my life were at stake I would want the best of medical care. And I think you would, too.

A case similar to that in San Francisco arose last February when the Association of Santa Fe Coast Lines' Physicians had to form a labor union and negotiate with lay administrators of the Santa Fe Hospital Association in order to maintain high medical standards. The doctors claim that interference on the part of the hospital board of trustees—a majority of them being laymen—is jeopardizing the quality of medical care afforded employees and members of their families. In this the doctors are standing firm on the grounds that medical care cannot be directed and controlled by persons outside the profession.

Before closing, I just want to direct your attention to some significant developments on the national level with regard to physician-sponsored health care plans.

A little over 2 years ago—in March of 1946, to be exact—there was formed a central organization to coordinate and correlate the workings of individual prepaid medical-care plans the country over. This organization was called the Associated Medical Care Plans. It is with pardonable pride that I mention the fact that the California Physicians' Service served as the functional structure for developing this Nation-wide organization which now numbers 50 nonprofit medical-surgical plans. During the first 9 months of 1947 these plans affiliated with companion hospital plans enjoyed an increase in subscriber enrollment of 46.8 percent.

Recently the name Blue Shield and an appropriate symbol were adopted for official use by the member plans.

Because the majority of Blue Shield's member plans are operated jointly with Blue Cross plans throughout the county, cooperative agreements have been worked out to establish effective relations between the two organizations. It is highly encouraging to know that, for the first time in the organized history of prepaid medical-surgical plans and Blue Cross hospital plans, a jointly sponsored national conference was held in Los Angeles in March of this year. And I want to say here that the 300 convention delegates were most enthusiastic about the success of their program, which is crystallizing the basic idea that the nonprofit medically sponsored plans operating jointly with Blue Cross plans can become infinitely more effective as cooperating units in a strong national organization that would be possible should they remain unrelated.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at great length to cite the many accomplishments of the California Physicians' Service and the American medical profession in their conscientious and enlightened program to bring you and me and our families the best of medical care at a price we can afford to pay.

But in closing, let me say this: human personality, freedom of choice, freedom from undue domination by a government, a church, an employer, or a union, are goods to be protected and not thoughtlessly cast aside.

The time, money, and effort required to established our health plans represent vast and valuable assets of specialized knowledge and skill, applied through organizations seasoned by experience.

It seems to me that it is logical and certainly reasonable that the voluntary health-insurance plans, backed as they are by our doctors and our insurance companies and the hospitals, and by their friends, should be given every assistance and encouragement in attaining their objective. They have abundantly demonstrated by numbers and rapidity of growth and flexibility of method a real desire to serve the American people.

Roosevelt and History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, Senator HOMER FERGUSON reviewed Charles A. Beard's book on "President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941: A Study in Appearances and Realities" in the Sunday Star. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the review as it appeared.

DR. BEARD'S SEARCHING BOOK IS ANALYSIS OF FACTORS WHICH LED US INTO LATE WAR

(Reviewed by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, who, as a member of the Joint Congressional Pearl Harbor Investigation Committee, took an active part in the examination of all the witnesses)

In these days when the rush of history is swifter than the mind can grasp, the world must be grateful to those rare scholars who painstakingly sift the past for us to use as a guide to the uncertain future. This is the invaluable service rendered by Dr. Charles A. Beard in his latest book, President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941, a sequel to his American Foreign Policy in the Making, published in 1946. Together, the two books span the years from 1932 to that fateful day in December 1941, when waves of Japanese planes crippled the mighty American Fleet at Pearl Harbor.

Allowing his material to suggest an ingenious method of showing how the United States was finally involved in the late war, Dr. Beard contrasts appearances with realities in the two major divisions which unfold his story. From my experience in the Pearl Harbor inquiry, I can see that Dr. Beard has greatly enriched historical knowledge by quoting the factual material produced by the Pearl Harbor joint congressional hearings, and with illuminating source material drawn from many other quarters. In this review I shall try to give the substance of his book and its significance in past and current foreign policy.

DEMOCRATIC PLEDGES

The appearances open with the pledges given by the Democratic Party and by President Roosevelt in their covenants with the American people, whose votes were sought in the 1940 campaign. Given in the midst of war then raging in Europe, these pledges carried a solemnity not usually present in times of peace. The Democratic platform was clear-cut: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, Naval, or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. * * * The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace."

This pledge and many other like expressions of the late President and members of his party, according to Dr. Beard, proved increasingly embarrassing as a way was sought to aid the Allies without compromising the peace and security of the United States. It was apparently the gravity of Roosevelt's deep moral commitment to the American people which led to the double talk which Dr. Beard calls "appearance."

THE "NEUTRALITY PATROL"

Lend-lease was presented as a "peace measure," although it violated neutrality statutes and at international law it was an act of war for a neutral government to supply sinews of war to one belligerent for use against another. Convoying lend-lease materials abroad which even administration spokesmen declared meant a shooting war, became "neutrality patrol" when Roosevelt ordered American naval vessels to escort ships laden with war materials. Greenland and Iceland were occupied by American forces not as steps toward war but to guard the approaches between the Americas and those strategic outposts, "the safety" of which this country regards as essential to its national security.

When the shooting actually began secretly in the Atlantic, as in the case of the American destroyers *Greer, Kearney,* and *Reuben James,* all three of which engaged in hostile acts against German submarines in the course of patrol or convoy duty, the incidents were described by the administration as German acts of piracy and "attacks" upon America. Even the bill to arm merchant ships was presented not as a war measure but "to defend the Americas."

COMPLICATED DIPLOMACY

Repeatedly the plain facts and the charges of political opponents and others exposed this colossal display of linguistic duplicity. They made it difficult for President Roosevelt to ask Congress for a declaration of war on the ground that America was "attacked" within the meaning of the escape clause in the Democratic platform. But the issues were sufficiently muddled in the semantics of the great debate on foreign policy to permit the Roosevelt administration to increase American participation in the war while American opinion was conditioned for war in the name of peace. The certainty of this shift of opinion was never clear until Japanese bombs broke the Sabbath peace at Pearl Harbor.

As Dr. Beard describes it, the complicated diplomacy in our relations with Japan is an engrossing story. A fruitless search for a diplomatic settlement of far eastern problems led Roosevelt to apply sanctions against Japan in the summer of 1941. While the situation grew steadily worse, President Roosevelt met with Prime Minister Churchill at the Atlantic Conference where they secretly planned parallel action against Japan.

STRANGE COUNTERPOINT

There then began that strange counterpoint which so confused what was guardedly told to the American people (appearances) and what was actually said and done (realities) in our relations with Japan. As late as December 3, 1941 (4 days before the Pearl Harbor attack) President Roosevelt was reported in a press conference to the effect "that the United States is at peace with Japan and perfectly friendly, too."

But by this time Secretary Hull had given his final summary note to Japan (November 26) which the Army Board report stated "was the document that touched the button that started the war, as Ambassador Grew so aptly expressed it." But this time, too, Secretary Hull had told Secretary Stimson that the Japanese situation "is now in the hands of you and Knox—the Army and the Navy." But the country did not know this and the commanders at Pearl Harbor, General Short and Admiral Kimmel, remained much in the dark about how late the hour was and what was expected of them. And when the smoke of bombs cleared away, both commanders found themselves charged with dereliction of duty by the Roberts' report.

Slowly and painfully for the administration there then began the series of publications, reports, studies, and investigations which revealed a different explanation of events than had been given to the people by President Roosevelt and the State Department. Each enlarged the area of information until the congressional joint committee report, although narrowly circumscribed by Executive order restricting its ability to get official records, probed as exhaustively as may ever be needed to reveal the truth.

Dr. Beard's examination of these majority and minority reports and separate views of Representative KEEFE, together with his painstaking sifting of the voluminous evidence gathered by the committee and turned up in other quarters, is an exhaustive labor in critical historiography.

MISLEADING LANGUAGE

What does Dr. Beard say about the crucial questions? Who decided the issue of American entry into the war, and when? Events and conditions played a part. But the fateful decisions, according to Dr. Beard, came from the secret commitments and actions of Mr. Roosevelt and his associates who progressively maneuvered, not only for the "first shot," but also to shift American public opinion in favor of war, by pronouncements couched in the misleading language of peace and American security.

The time of decision was long before Pearl Harbor—and long enough in the critical days before December 7 for responsible Washington leaders to put their Pacific commanders on the clear war alert which Dr. Beard believes they failed to do.

"ERRORS OF JUDGMENT"

What of the charges against Kimmel and Short? Demolishing the Roberts report by an analysis of all subsequent data, Dr. Beard finds no agreement of judgment but apparently supports the preponderant opinion among the investigators that the two commanders were chargeable with "errors of judgment" and not "dereliction of duty." Significant omission from Beard's book on this point is the list of measures taken, omitted or neglected, from which can be formed a conclusion that these commanders were responsible not for the attack on Pearl Harbor, but for the failure to have its existing defensive strength in readiness for action appropriate to what knowledge they had, and thereby contributing to the disaster.

Pearl Harbor is something more than a tragic event in the Nation's history. It is the culmination of a theory about the part America should play in the world and of radical departures from the philosophy of government contained in our constitutional system. It is this which gives Pearl Harbor and its preceding diplomacy significance for the present and future.

DR. BEARD DISAGREES

The theory, as Dr. Beard interprets publicists who justify Mr. Roosevelt's conduct, is that Mr. Roosevelt early discovered the necessity of entering the war against Hitler or suffer the rise of a totalitarian power which after engulfing Europe would sweep down upon the United States. The stark issue was a free world of democracy or a totalitarian despotism. But the American people were not then aware of this deep issue and hence President Roosevelt had to dissemble in order to be elected and to lead his people in the positive world obligations of a free democracy against totalitarianism. His duplicity in conduct and disregard of constitutional government in leading the country to war was thus explained on the ground that the great end justified the means.

Tested by consequences is this valid? Dr. Beard thinks not. The four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter were discarded for all practical purposes and many nations enslaved. A worse totalitarian despotism, Russia, has taken Hitler's place, aided by commitments Roosevelt made and misrepresented publicly and privately. Instead of the promised peace and security, the United States must be converted into an armed camp while domestic prosperity and reforms are indefinitely blocked. The national debt, grinding taxes, and military expenditures are enormous. Despite its entrenched bureaucracy the Democratic Party was defeated in 1946 and is now split in belligerent factions.

WAS ROOSEVELT JUSTIFIED?

Mr. Roosevelt's successor, bound by his commitments and following in his footsteps, has set out on an "unlimited program" of "supporting by money and other forms of power for an indefinite time an indefinite number of other governments around the globe" while domestic affairs become appendages to management of the world. Tested by these consequences, Dr. Beard asks, "Is this the end which justifies the means Roosevelt chose and used?"

In thus sharply criticizing current doctrines of foreign policy, Dr. Beard holds that American world obligations are limited by our effective power; that Presidential proclamations of noble sentiments for world guidance are futile in result and hazardous to the United States; that the attempt to assume "the moral leadership of the world" is a dubious assertion of our own virtues likely only to "awaken suspicion and resentment" in other nations; and that "using political engines and public funds in wholesale efforts to promote universal prosperity through free or freer international commerce * * * while in practice sowing seeds of discord at home and abroad, approaches an impasse in thought and action."

What policies he would use in place of them in the current posture of affairs, he does not say. Many readers will disagree with Dr. Beard's conclusions, but his searching book is indeed a challenge for everyone to take a fresh look at the compass and perhaps set a better course.

Nebraska Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, many veterans are not fully aware of their legal preferences, rights to various benefits, privileges and exemptions, as extended to

them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Nebraska.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws, as compiled by Earl B. Wright, national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, who has his offices with the Veterans' Administration regional office, Lincoln, Nebr.

This résumé of Nebraska laws, affecting veterans and their dependents and organizations, is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Relatives may be allowed to conduct the funeral.

A veterans' burial ground has been established in Wyuka State Cemetery. Certain veterans' organizations exercise power with reference to control of such burial ground.

The dead bodies of veterans may not be turned over to the State anatomical board for dissection.

The county is required to furnish, on petition, metal markers for soldiers' graves, to mark same for memorial purposes.

The county must apply to the United States for a suitable headstone and have same set in place.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator may be appointed for persons serving in the armed forces.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Estates of missing persons, including prisoners of war, may be administered.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

Wills may be proved if attesting witnesses become incompetent or are unavailable in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting are provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Certified copies of vital statistics are furnished members of the armed forces, free of charge, when needed in connection with claims growing out of military service.

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Public officers are required to furnish free copies of public records to veterans, their agents, or attorneys for use in connection with claims to be presented to the United States Veterans' Administration.

Discharge papers are recorded and indexed free of charge.

Death certificates of members of the armed forces are recorded by the Department of Health. Certified copies may be secured for 50 cents.

A Department of Veterans' Affairs has been created, including a veterans' aid fund to assist veterans of World Wars I and II in prosecuting their claims against the United States, extend aid to the needy, assist in vocational training, rehabilitation, etc.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Institutions of higher learning are requested to eliminate the nonresident fee from charges made to veterans.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Payment was made of tuition of children of servicemen stationed in the State of Nebraska during World War II.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leaves of absence were granted to teachers in certain cities for military service.

No vacancies were created in public offices by reason of absence of officers and employees in active military service.

Preference is given to veterans under the State civil-service system.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act and the school retirement system.

Status of legal newspapers forced to suspend publication during military service of their owners was preserved.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Pension money received by a disabled veteran, and property purchased and improved therewith, is exempt from execution or attachment.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives or widows, and mothers, may be admitted to the soldiers' and sailors' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Aid is extended to veterans of World Wars I and II, their wives or widows, and children, through the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Building and loan associations are authorized to make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

County aid is extended to veterans, their wives or widows, and minor children through the Soldiers' Relief Commission.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Automobile or other conveyance furnished under Public Law 663 to World War II amputees and still in possession of the original recipients is exempt from personal-property tax.

Free hunting and fishing licenses were issued to resident members of the armed forces during World War II.

Permits for operators of motor vehicles are renewed after service in the armed forces.

Exemption is granted from poll tax and per capita tax for the State assistance fund.

Certain veterans are exempt from poll tax.

Professional and occupational licenses are extended without payment of required fees while in active military service.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Provision has been made for the State publication of the proceedings of the Grand Army of the Republic, the United Spanish War Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Organizations of veterans may be incorporated.

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, or any veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor.

Relief is extended to World War veterans, their wives, widows, and children, through veteran organizations.

Much of the above-mentioned legislation has been enacted by the Nebraska Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

The DAV maintains three expertly trained full-time national service officers at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Lincoln, Nebr., where all types of assistance is extended to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before Jan. 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE-TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to

set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities, which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV, and its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims headed by William E. Tate, the department of legislation headed by Mr. Francis Sullivan, and the department of public relations and employment headed by my friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil-service appointments, and last, but really first in importance, suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 1,525,753; total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by the service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy task, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nationwide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Speak Up for Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid article entitled "Speak Up for Your Country," written by Harrison Smith and published in the April issue of the Good Housekeeping magazine. I commend the article to every Senator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEAK UP FOR YOUR COUNTRY

(By Harrison Smith)

As a man must believe in himself to have the strength to carve out his own destiny, so must a nation. Our strength and our wealth, the abundance that flows from our mines and factories and farms, have now obliged us to assume the leadership of half the world in a time of dire peril. But unless the people of our Nation believe in it and its destiny, we cannot expect the rest of the world to have the faith we lack. Lacking unbounded faith in the goodness and rightness of our motives, we will be in danger as great as any we have faced in our entire history.

That danger is now plain for all to see. It does not stem wholly from the threat of a third world war, in which the belligerents can use atomic weapons and other awesome products of the scientists' laboratories. No, the immediate danger is not of a shooting war but of a slow weakening of our will to resist the ideological warfare that is going on now and sometimes is called the cold war.

In our battle to resist dictatorship and an economic life that is alien to us we must fight now for our own conception of how man should live and by what laws be governed. We must fight first in Europe, then wherever else peoples are threatened with the loss of their liberties and in danger of succumbing to native totalitarian rulers, whose true masters would be Russian Communist dictators. The radio waves of all the world echo the harsh eloquence of the battle. It has become for us a duty and a necessity to stop the progress of this creed of subservience wherever it seems to be overwhelming weaker nations. It feeds on hunger and general misery, and consequently we must fight this cold war with money and machines and weapons, as well as with ideas.

But all the wealth we can spare from our rich economy will not suffice if the people throughout the world we are striving to help do not trust us as a firm and determined and righteous leader in a world struggle.

Every American is now a part of this war. He may, according to our laws, believe what he chooses. He can be ideologically an atheist, a Communist, an anarchist. He is entitled to express his opinions. But he must not conspire with those who would attempt to destroy the Government of the United States by force, as French Communists have conspired to destroy the Government of France, with the aim of setting up a dictatorship controlled by Russia. He must not, in other words, be a traitor to our country. For the time being, our own liberties under our Constitution are safe; but they must be protected by a kind of patriotism new to us and yet as old as time. We have allowed our faith to be overwhelmed by criticism and attacks on the essential meaning of America—the Nation that once appeared to be a prodigy, a new light in a world in which the common man was universally enslaved.

It is an instinct of man to hope and pray for a better life, if not for himself, then for his children. There are millions on the other side of the world who have been taught that communism applied by the police state is the better way, and who are willing to sacrifice for its rights that are as essential to us as our very existence.

It is not in those millions of people who have never known the meaning of freedom that our hope for a new world society lies. The echoes of the torrent of strong American words that once burned their way to the heart and mind of an awakening Europe, promising man equality and liberty, cannot now penetrate the borders of Russia or into the states it dominates. We should read and heed again the eloquent sentiments that for nearly two centuries have promised freedom and hope to suffering mankind: the sentiments uttered by our patriots in time of stress and embraced in our Constitution.

Patriotism in our time is not dead, though its true accents are now rarely heard. The man who tries to use simple declarative sentences in announcing his belief in America's destiny, its ideals, and its Government may be called a patrioteer, accused of somehow profiting by any expression of his love for his country.

Some of our intellectuals and our liberals have few words to waste on so vital a subject; they are so endlessly and virtuously attacking our faults that they cannot see that the sun still blazes in the sky. They are not to be despised, for their service to the country is of incalculable value. But they have instilled a state of mind in many people that silences too many tongues, though in other ways Americans are not given to self-depreciation.

It should not be necessary in an analysis of our virtues to halt and count the number of people lynched in this country year before last, or to list our sins against ourselves, our intolerance against our fellow citizens who differ from the majority in race, color, or religion. This constant reminder, displayed without any attention to the splendid background of our exuberant and industrious Nation, has brought misfortune to us twice.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that the press of other countries has for long had the habit of exhibiting our worst aspects. It can be argued that the First and Second World Wars might not have started if the Germans and then the Japanese had thought we could so quickly turn civilians into soldiers, arm them with such weapons as the world had never before seen, and produce the goods and materials to supply all the nations leagued with us in the deadly contest.

Patriotism must be revived, must be stated again, in simple terms. We do not need Fourth of July orations to convince ourselves that we are great and that in us, the strongest and wealthiest nation on earth, there is neither arrogance nor any deep hatred of any other country. It is known that we have the qualities of mercy and compassion, that we are generous beyond the average of mankind. It should not lessen the value of these virtues before the bar of world opinion that our generosity has become the principal weapon in this war of words in which we are engaged with so formidable and hostile an antagonist.

Let us recognize and calmly analyze our faults, so that in time we may correct them. But let us also, and with humility, list the proofs of our strength, our patience, and our endurance, for the world must know, before it is too late, what our qualities are. And we must put into the balance that we are now united in our determination that there shall some day be a fellowship of the nations of the world, so men everywhere may stand upright, as free men should, and go about their appointed tasks without fear, confident of their future. That is our aim; our appointed destiny is to lead the world toward this millennium. If we fail, the race of man may fall with us, and the twilight of barbarianism may once more darken the earth.

Homo Americanus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, all Senators receive a great many questions concerning our foreign policy and our domestic policy. A few days ago there appeared an editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Homo Americanus," which is a comment upon the recent book, The American People, written by a scientist and anthropologist, Mr. Goeffrey Gorer. I believe it worth while to have the editorial published in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOMO AMERICANUS

Mr. Geoffrey Gorer, a British anthropologist who was here on some mission or other for his Government during the war, took advantage of his opportunity to make a professional study of homo Americanus in his native habitat. The result has been embodied in a book called The American People, which has been the occasion of some excitement in quarters where such studies are taken seriously.

Mr. Gorer finds that most of the distinctive characteristics of the American male animal arise from the circumstance that he is bound in infancy to the apron strings of the American female and spends the rest of his life in a furious but never quite successful effort to break loose from them. Out of this struggle comes his excessive but never quite plausible emphasis on his virility, or he-manliness, evinced in boyhood by the dread of being mistaken for a sissy and in maturity by the hard-boiled character of his business ethics, or in more aggravated cases by chronic alcoholism.

These antics, however, in no wise deceive the ascendant gyneocracy, which continues to rule with a firm hand and to exploit to its own benefit the superstitious reverence of homo Americanus for everything female. Thus, in the United States a man's social status and the esteem in which he is held by his fellow citizens is measured by the cost and quality of his wife's fur coat. This also explains, so Mr. Gorer thinks, the curious ambivalence of Americans in the matter of foreign relations. On his two-fisted, square-shooting, hard-hitting, he-man side, the American insists on business arrangements highly favorable to himself, but on his mama's-boy, panty-waist side he is hurt beyond measure to discover that he is not always loved by the foreigner, or that his most cherished ideals are not accepted at face value abroad.

What is at the bottom of this curious ambivalence? Mr. Gorer thinks it proceeds from the universally low esteem in which paterfamilias is held in the American scheme of family life. In folk arts of America, such as the movies and the comic strip, the father is a universally comic figure to be made sport of on all occasions, but especially on the feast day which has been dedicated to him by a kind of amused afterthought. This contempt of the father, Mr. Gorer believes, proceeds from the American revolt against the whole idea of authority, of which pater familias is the psychological symbol. The father, Mr. Gorer finds, is despised as the representative of conservatism; in a nation of immigrants it was father who clung most tenaciously to the old European ideas. The father, in short, is the perennial figure of King George III, and to make game of the old geezer is just another way of perpetuating the spirit of 1776. In Europe, where the father image is still potent, there is danger of dictatorship; but in America the danger is rather one of anarchy.

Well, that's how we appeared to Mr. Gorer after his 8 years' observation of us. It explains to his satisfaction not only why we drink so much milk, encourage our women to wear sweaters and buy pin-up girl pictures at the drug store, but also why we distrust our politicians, dislike military service, and do our best to ignore the painful realities of history.

Power Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I reported on the critical power

shortage in California and the serious situation that labor, agriculture, and industry find themselves in today. You will recall that the Secretary of the Interior advised our Governor that all the new power from the Shasta power plant was available to the State of California and that the Government would not let this power go to waste. Again you remember that the Governor asked the State public utilities commission to hold a hearing and to advise him as to means to handle this power for the benefit of the people. Again it should not be forgotten that this entire situation was created by the unwillingness of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to exchange power with the Bureau of Reclamation for use of all Government agencies as well as preference customers under Federal law.

The public utilities commission held its hearing. All sides were heard on March 12 last. Another informal closed hearing on March 29. Today, almost 4 weeks later, no action by the commission. I should like to ask why this indecision, in this hour of dire need? Is it another case of the futility of State regulation of utilities? Is it a case of lack of authority on the part of the commission? Is it a conflict of viewpoint of the commissioners? Or is it another instance of where a giant utility organization holds the future of the State in the palm of its hand? How much longer must California continue to be subjected to the complete oligarchy of this large corporation?

From my looking glass, it appears that the great squeeze play against the Government is on. The Secretary of the Interior has repeatedly said, "No power will go to waste in California." As recently as April 3, Mr. Richard Boke, Reclamation's regional director in California, addressed a letter to R. E. Mittelstaedt, chairman of the California Utilities Commission, saying:

> Several weeks have elapsed since the hearing was held in San Francisco on the subject of availability of new Shasta power. You will recall it was estimated that water releases from Shasta Reservoir would increase by April 15 to the point where generation from the new unit would be possible. This date still appears firm. At the hearing, the Bureau of Reclamation recommended three possible courses of action to be taken by the commission. Other than the informal meeting held last Monday in the commission's office, I have no information as to the commission's attitude on the subject.
>
> You will remember our assurance that no power would be wasted at Shasta. Time is moving rapidly and I am wondering whether a decision by the commission will be forthcoming soon. Any information that you can give me as to when a determination by the commission will be handed down will be appreciated.

Shortly, in a few days perhaps, irrigation demands will require additional water releases from Shasta Reservoir. These releases will make more power generation possible from the new third unit at the power plant. Because of the successful lobbying of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and others, the people of California now find themselves without publicly owned tranmission lines. In this crisis the public utility commission has failed to act.

If power is not to be wasted—and the Interior Department has promised that it will not be—one of two things must now happen. The P. G. & E. must agree to carry Government power, living up to Federal policy, or the Interior must give in to the P. G. & E., setting aside Federal policy that has been established by the Congress of the United States, thus giving Jim Black the kilowatts that the people of California have paid for with their hard-earned tax money. If this is the outcome, the deal should be entitled "How Jim Black Got Between the People and the People's Dam."

In a few days the story will be told. Perhaps the California experience will make us realize here in Congress that the only way we can really accomplish the full intent of preference to public agencies will be to pass legislation that no privately owned utility can buy Government power unless the power companies agree to transmit Government power at cost for the use of the Government, public agencies, and the REA cooperatives.

The Immortal Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Immortal Chaplains," by Harry H. Schlacht, reprinted from the New York Journal-American of Tuesday, March 30, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMMORTAL CHAPLAINS

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"Greater love hath no man—"

Here is a story of the glory of American brotherhood at its best.

When has there been, when will there ever be again—such an epic to stir the hearts of men.

It is the saga of the transport *Dorchester*.

It is the greatest story of heroic sacrifice.

It is a story based on simple faith.

The night was cold and black. The *Dorchester* was hit by a German torpedo. The sudden explosion terrified the crew. The ship was doomed.

There were four chaplains on board. A rabbi, Lt. Alex Goode; a priest, Lt. John P. Washington; two parsons, Lt. George I. Fox and Lt. Clark V. Poling.

They distributed the lifebelts to keep the men afloat.

They spoke words of cheer to keep up the men's courage.

They saw the supply of lifebelts run out.

They gave away their own.

They were last seen kneeling together on the sinking ship.

In English: "Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name."

In Hebrew: "Schma Yisroel, Adonoy Elohenu, Adonoy Echod."

In Latin: "Miserere mei Deus, secundum magnam, misericordiam tuam."

Four religions, three languages, one faith.

Four God-loving souls, who preached the glory of God and the brotherhood of man, who humbly testified to their convictions by their undying deaths.

Today the Four Chaplains Memorial Committee initiates a $500,000 drive to establish a memorial pool at the Bronx Veterans' Hospital. It is designed to give a new lease of life to 4,500 disabled war heroes.

The committee is headed by Mr. Irving Geist, wearer of the Presidential citation for service to disabled veterans.

The memorial pool will be a living memorial to American brotherhood.

Brotherhood is the crying need of the day.

Botherhood is the crying need of the age.

Out of the eons of time we can hear the voices of Moses and Christ, out of the Holy Writ we can hear the voices of the mighty prophets of old.

They talk to us in parable and paradox.

They talk to us in beatitude.

They tell us that we are beloved by God since we are the creatures of God and made in His image.

From Amos, the prophet of justice; from Hosea, the prophet of mercy; from Isaiah, singing of the heavenly majesty as the destiny of those who live with the love of brotherhood in their hearts.

Let us all rally 'round the memorial pool.

Let us all do what we can, let us all give all we can to assure its success.

Let all cities emulate this noble example.

May we pray for the day when all creed lines, race line, and all lines shall vanish.

May we all be guided by the blessed spirits of the four immortal chaplains and march forward as one great brotherhood with undivided ranks toward the dawn.

Thomas Jefferson Anniversary Address by Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at the celebration of the two hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, at the Jefferson National Memorial, in Washington, D. C., yesterday, April 13, 1948. Let me add that this address is one of the best I have ever read in connection with such a celebration service, and I commend its reading to every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is particularly fitting that the Washington chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution should sponsor this memorial service commemorating the two hundred fifth anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. As a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, I speak in all humility of the ideological symbolism of Jefferson in American politics. His abiding faith in the wisdom and sound political judgment of an enlightened electorate is chiseled in the walls of stone of this national

Jefferson shrine at which we honor him today.

His political ideology is the fountain source of American political liberalism. It springs from the deep wells of human experience and sparkles with the ever-refreshing truth that the dignity of the individual sustains the life of our self-government by a free people. This emphasis of Jefferson upon the superior rights of the individual in contrast to the subordinate rights of government encases the very essence of American democracy. It is a part of the spiritual values of a democracy which Jefferson immortalized when he penned these words of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

In a very real sense constitutional government in these United States, including all the provisions of the Constitution and the many laws which were subsequently passed, is but an attempt on the part of free Americans to effectuate the spiritual values of democracy as penned by the inspired hand of Jefferson in writing the Declaration of Independence.

We Americans in this day of national and world crises would do well to ponder anew the spiritual values of democracy from which sprung Jefferson's political faith in the rights of the common people. How very apropos to the many problems which confront us, as well as free people elsewhere in the world are these words of Jefferson:

"The mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God.

"What country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time that the people preserve the spirit of resistance?

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositories."

We need to remember that Jefferson's liberalism was a constitutional liberalism. He believed that the inalienable rights of the individual are superior to the vested interests of the privileged few who may, from time to time, gain control of government. He advocated and sought to accomplish his humanitarian reforms through constitutional procedures.

It is true that he recognized the basic right of a free people to revolt against a tyrannical government; but distorters of his political liberalism have maligned his advocacy of government through law by taking out of the context of his total political philosophy his various references to the basic right of a free people to revolt, if protection of their inalienable rights through government by law is denied them.

Throughout his political controversies with Alexander Hamilton, Jefferson placed his reliance upon an enlightened public opinion manifesting itself through the constitutional provisions of a government by law. Thus he wrote, "Cherish the spirit of our people and keep alive their attention. Do not be too severe upon their errors, but reclaim them by enlightening them. If once they become inattentive to public affairs, you and I, and Congress and assemblies, judges and governors, shall all become wolves. * * * Experience declares that man is the only animal which devours his own kind; for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe, and to the general prey of the rich on the poor."

Jefferson's opposition to the political philosophy and program of Hamilton outlines the areas of political disagreement between liberals and reactionaries which have prevailed in American politics down to this very hour. The legislative issues have changed from administration to administration during the intervening decades but the fundamental problems of promoting the general welfare and of giving primary importance to human values and individual rights in the administration of our Government are as challenging to statesmanship today as they were when Jefferson challenged Hamilton's theory of government by the privileged few.

Jefferson's successful campaign of 1800 in which he defeated the Federalist administration and probably checked Hamilton's party from establishing a political caste system in America marked a great victory for self-government by a free electorate. It was a great victory for the Jeffersonian theory that the common people of America are capable of governing themselves through a free ballot box. It was a mandate of the people which has been renewed time and time again in free elections proclaiming that our Constitution and our laws must be interpreted, accepted, and administered by the three branches of our Government as dynamic and flexible statements of basic human values and political rights rather than as static rules which when narrowly applied can be used by the privileged few to defeat the general good. Jefferson's great victory in the campaign of 1800 carved deeply into American political tradition the great democratic truths that if our form of government is to survive it must forever remain the servant and not the master of our people.

However, it is well for us to remember, as we reflect today on the many great contributions of Jefferson to our system of free government, that Jefferson was a great political realist as well as idealist. He believed that his theories of representative government were worth fighting for and in that fight he neither gave nor asked for quarter.

The campaign of 1800 probably has never been equaled in American history for bitterness and vehement partisanship. In fact we can take pride that in our day acrimony and political name calling are much less prevalent in our national campaigns than in the time of Jefferson and Hamilton. However, as is to be expected the greatness of Jefferson rose above the human frailties of the partisans of his time and he taught the political lesson that it is political principles and not personal differences by which political opponents should judge each other and be judged by the people.

Thus, following the bitter campaign of 1800 Jefferson stated in his inaugural address March 4, 1801, in making a plea for national unity, "Every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists."

His charity toward political opposition was characterized by much of the same spirit of tolerance as marked the fairness and forgiving qualities of Lincoln. The political liberalism of Jefferson and Lincoln have so many common basic principles, including their emphasis upon the inalienable rights of the individual, that students of these two greatest of American political humanitarians are in general agreement that Jefferson's political views were not without influence upon the thinking of Lincoln. Jefferson's faith in a dynamic democracy and his many challenges to the people to enlighten themselves and govern themselves in the interest of all the people were as Lincolnian as were many of Lincoln's statements of democratic truths Jeffersonian.

Thus, when Jefferson wrote, "I am ready to say to every human being, 'Thou art my brother,'" he expressed a universal truth which comprises one of the great spiritual tenets of democracy. It is a truth which, on many occasions during the Civil War era, Lincoln similarly expressed when the struggle for human rights was once again tested under our form of government. This truth of the equality of men, expressed so effectively by Jefferson and Lincoln, is once again the subject of controversy in American politics as we move steadily forward toward the goal of providing full protection of constitutional guaranties to all Americans irrespective of race, color, or creed.

Individual rights are once again the subject of conflict in international relations as we take a stand in opposition to a totalitarian philosophy of government which would destroy the right of the people to exercise freedom of choice in determining their political rights.

Although we today are confronted with new, and in many respects more complex, challenges to free government than those which confronted Jefferson and Lincoln there can be no gainsaying the fact that the choice of governmental principles which face us involve the same universal truths of democratic government for which Jefferson and Lincoln stood. They applied successfully those truths in solving the problems of their time. Those same immutable principles of human values and individual rights are applicable to the problems of our time. They believed in the power of democracy to adjust to new conditions without destroying the superior rights of the individual or yielding to the lust for power of the state. Therefore, in closing, I would suggest that we ponder well the words of Jefferson when he said:

"Can one generation bind another, and all others, in succession forever? I think not. The Creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead. Nothing then is unchangeable but the inherent and inalienable rights of man."

Greek Children as Immigrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, an article entitled "Greek Children as Immigrants," by Soterios Nicholson, of Washington, D. C., and printed in the public-letter column of the Washington Post under date of April 10, 1948, has come to my attention. I send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK CHILDREN AS IMMIGRANTS

Congress has begun to hear appeals from the American people, and particularly from Americans of Greek descent, for the taking of special steps to meet with one of the gravest problems that has ever confronted a civilized nation—the problem of the potential loss of its national existence and birthright because of the brutal theft of its children.

The facts have been obvious before the eyes of the world for many months now. Under the direction of General Markos and his Communist terrorists, the Red Balkan bloc of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia have aided and abetted the abduction of some 15,000 Greek youngsters from the Greek homeland, and have made intensive plans for the steal-

ing of 25,000 more. The consequences of these deeds of horror have been apparent, too, by terror that has struck the heart of every Greek parent, who has hastily sent his children, insofar as possible, away from Communist-raided areas into the already overcrowded cities of the ravaged Greek peninsula.

This forced mass migration of children has served to aggravate the worst problems of overcrowding, disease, malnutrition, which has so much complicated the actions of the Greek people in trying to meet the Red menace. Meanwhile, the youths already abducted behind the Communist iron curtain are heading for a life of training in Red doctrine, which will make them agents for world communism, enemies of their own fathers and mothers, to the church into which they were born, to the principles of liberty and freedom which have been always cherished by Greece.

Halfway measures will not avail before this terrible threat. Obviously, the United Nations must smash this Soviet sabotage within its ranks and take action against what has been characterized as genocide—that is, steps calculated to destroy an entire people through, for example, robbing a people of its children.

But on the doorstep of Congress itself lies the main solution of the problem, which can be taken by a number of means. Amendment of the displaced persons bill, S. 2242, now pending on the Senate calendar, is one means of action. Under this bill a total of only 100,000 displaced persons and orphans would be allowed to emigrate to America within the next 2 years, with special privileges given to farmers and citizens from the Baltic countries, leaving very little hope for Greek migration over and above the presently highly oversubscribed quota.

Such amendment as is proposed would permit the immigration, if only on a temporary basis, of as many Greek children as may be necessary under present circumstances, until the present Communist menace has been dealt with. These children could come into the homes of Americans of Greek parentage and, in addition, into other American homes, thousands of which would be eager to adopt these youngsters. Another way may be found to bring these children in the United States and place them in a special boarding school until the danger of communism in Greece is removed.

The well-planned diabolical scheme of the Communists can only be nullified by the removal of the Greek children to the United States. There is no other course open, because no matter where the children can be removed in Greece, unfortunately, Communists exist, in sporadic parts, everywhere—even in the islands.

SOTERIOS NICHOLSON.

Brasshatism in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Drew Pearson, published in the April 6 edition of the Denver Post. The article is in the form of an open letter to Maj. Gen. Floyd Parks, who is in charge of Army press relations. Strangely, enough, the Washington Post, which carries the Drew Pearson column daily, did not carry this particular article, I know not why.

Furthermore, I know nothing of the basis for or the documentary proof of the very serious charges made in this article, but they are too shocking to be overlooked, and I call them to the attention of the Senate War Investigating Committee. A satisfactory explanation should be forthcoming from General Parks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY ADVISED TO CLEAN OUT BRASSHATISM

(By Drew Pearson)

APRIL 6, 1948.

Maj. Gen. FLOYD PARKS,
Army Press Relations,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL: You have written me various letters complaining of my criticism of brasshatism. You and I also had a talk with the Deputy Chief of Staff, Gen. Joe Collins, about certain Army officers who, after writing contract terminations highly unfair to the Government and favorable to private companies, then proceeded to take lush jobs with the companies which they favored.

Today is Army Day, when the United States Army comes up for special review by the American people. This is also a period when the Army is asking for a special draft, for universal military training, and for extra funds for defense. Personally I favor voting much of these funds. But I also believe the Army owes it to the Nation and especially to the men whom it seeks to draft, to clean up unfairness, favoritism, and brasshatism first.

There was a lot of talk about this at the end of the recent war. But not too much was done. That may be one reason why your enlistments are low.

For instance I called to your attention, publicly and privately, as early as December 19, 1947, the amazing fact that the Army had permitted the Radio Corp. of America to make available to the Germans and Japs in 1938 our most priceless radar secrets, and that the Army had done absolutely nothing to reprove either the Radio Corp. or the Army officers who were negligent.

I asked you first orally, then in a letter dated February 2 to give me the facts on this case. Having heard nothing from you, I have obtained copies of some of the secret records myself. They tell a shocking story. Here it is.

Back in 1932 the Signal Corps got orders to produce a device for locating the approach of enemy airplanes while they were still out of sight. Lt. Col. William Blair, commander of Signal Corps laboratories at Monmouth, N. J., put a young civilian named William D. Hershberger on this job, under Dr. Samuel Anderson, in the sound and light section.

Hershberger, working on the idea of having radio waves bounce back from an object, finally used heavy filament tubes to produce a microray machine which he tested out on a Signal Corps launch, the *Russell*, and which was able to detect passing boats, towers, and aircraft.

Thus, after 4 years' intensive work, was born the miraculous invention called radar—a secret which no foreign country then knew about and which the Army believed might revolutionize modern warfare.

Shortly after perfecting this treasured secret Hershberger left the Signal Corps (April 1936), studied for a time at the University of Pennsylvania, then in the spring of 1937 joined the Radio Corp. of America.

A few months later, January 11, 1938, the radio corporation filed at the United States Patent Office for patent No. 2,401,717, the basic patent on radar. It listed as joint inventors William D. Hershberger and I. Wolff, an RCA laboratory man who had done some previous work with Hershberger.

Amazed, the Signal Corps immediately asked the United States Patent Office not to make the application public.

This was one of the most priceless inventions in the history of modern warfare, yet the radio corporation not only filed publicly for a patent, but also proceeded to apply for patents in Japan, Germany, and other foreign countries. This was in 1938, at a time when Hitler had already taken Austria and Czechoslovakia and when every intelligent observer knew war was inevitable.

Meanwhile RCA asked the Army whether the radar inventions were still secret and was informed that they were.

In its answer, March 3, 1938, the Signal Corps laboratories declared: "While employed at SCL Mr. Hershberger prepared a memorandum on November 22, 1933, disclosing the principles of a method for locating a metal object by means of reflected radio waves * * * it indicated that Mr. Hershberger was cognizant of such operation as early as 1933.

"Mr. Hershberger's notebook, page 31, dated June 27, 1936, shows a circuit for producing pulses which was applied * * * (a detailed description follows). In any event, this invention should be classified as secret."

This letter was signed by Capt. David E. Washburn, director of the Signal Corps laboratories, and I would be glad to show you a copy.

However, RCA deliberately flouted the Signal Corps' secrecy order by filing for patents in Germany, Japan, and the rest of the world. Meanwhile nothing was done either to prosecute or collect damages from RCA. On the contrary, David Sarnoff, head of the radio corporation, was actually commissioned as a brigadier general. Can you imagine what would happen to an enlisted man who revealed a secret to the enemy or even fell asleep on guard duty?

After the war certain people in the Justice Department and the Signal Corps dusted off the case and started to prepare a suit against RCA.

But suddenly it was called off. It was called off about the time Gen. Harry Ingles resigned as head of the Signal Corps, March 31, 1947, in order to take an important job with RCA. General Ingles became president of the RCA Institute, Inc.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial entitled "Politics in Coal," from the Providence Evening Bulletin of April 13.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS IN COAL

The natural first reaction to the end of the coal strike is a sense of relief that this menace to national health and safety is past. It may reappear at midyear when the exist-

ing contract expires. But the present crisis has ended, as it began, by the arbitrary nod of John L. Lewis.

The way the strike ended, however, cannot be gratifying to any thoughtful citizen. For it represents national politics at its worst—one might even say at its scandalous worst. By what right or reason does the Republican legislative branch of the Government, in the persons of Speaker MARTIN and Senator BRIDGES, project itself into a labor dispute in actual process of handling by the Democratic executive authority of the Government?

Was any permission sought by the Republican interveners or granted by the responsible Democratic authority for this curious maneuver? Was any pledge of future political support, direct or implied, given by Mr. Lewis in return for easing him out of a situation that was rapidly becoming untenable for him by reason both of outraged public opinion and Federal court action.

Was there any reason why Speaker MARTIN and Senator BRIDGES could not have moved through proper channels for adjustment of the dispute? Could they not have offered their solution, which apparently was known in advance by Mr. Lewis and was acceptable to him, to Mr. Ching, director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service?

If the plan of settlement were acceptable to Mr. Ching, his office would have been the logical instrumentality for its implementation. Thus would have been avoided, at least in considerable measure, the shameless spectacle of Mr. Lewis and his UMW brazenly bypassing the executive authority which had brought him to bay.

He may still learn to his sorrow that his effort to snub the Democratic executive branch by dealing directly with the Republican legislative branch was not the best path of settlement for him to take. Clearly the administration is justified in its resolution to hold him to the strictest judicial account for ignoring the back-to-work directive of the restraining order.

What the outcome of the trial of Mr. Lewis for contempt may be no one, of course, now knows nor needs to anticipate. But there should be not the slightest doubt of the necessity for such procedure, initiated by the Attorney General at the instance of Mr. Truman. In prosecuting the case against Mr. Lewis and the UMW, regardless of the strike settlement, the administration deserves credit. By the same token, its action constitutes meritorious rebuke of legislative interference of palpable political character in an executive affair.

The Nation has suffered grievously from the economic sin of Mr. Lewis in this instance. It should not have to endure the political sin of Republican legislators making common cause with him. For however beneficial the ultimate result, the fact stands out that the purely Republican move had at least the ancillary motive of a plain political purpose to embarrass a Democratic administration engaged in upholding the authority and dignity of government. Even the beneficent result hardly justifies such shabby means of attaining it.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the most important single question facing us today is the inclusion of universal military training in our national security program. Every American should have an opportunity to study both sides of this issue. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Is UMT Needed? The Pros and Cons," which appeared in the New York Times of April 4. It is an excellent presentation of the arguments on both sides of this important issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS UMT NEEDED? THE PROS AND THE CONS

PRO: "IT WOULD SUPPLY AN ESSENTIAL TRAINING; IT WOULD SHOW THE WORLD OUR READINESS IN DEFENSE"

(By Howard C. Petersen)

All of us firmly desire enduring peace and the security of our homes from threat of foreign aggression. We differ not on these ends but on the means to attain them.

With the end of the war we hoped for an increasingly effective United Nations and, as the basis of our foreign policy, buttressed those hopes with strong endeavors to make that organization work. But even with our devotion to that cause, we can perceive that the United Nations is wholly impotent to prevent aggression or war. Our security depends on our own strength and that of friendly nations.

There is no such thing as absolute security. The degree of security we achieve is determined by our appraisal of external threats and by the resources which we are willing to devote to our self-preservation.

Certainly, from the record, Russia's intentions are aggressive. In endless negotiations with Russia since the war we have reached agreements only when, as in the Balkan and Italian treaties, we made heavy concessions. Our overly generous offer on the atomic bomb, our efforts to obtain major peace treaties, all our dealings, are met with an inflexible, unreasoning position. Stalin has unequivocally spoken of the irreconcilable conflict between communism and democracy. Daily the Russian press and radio pour forth vehement vituperation, hate and lies against us.

Russia has subjugated seven sovereign states with a population of 85,000,000. It matters not that many of the Russian moves have been by indirect aggression—infiltration, intimidation, subversion, sabotage and, finally, a minority coup. The end result is the same: self-government is replaced by harsh obedience to the Kremlin. And the pace quickens. Czechoslovakia. Finland? Who will next feel those heavy pressures, pressures backed up by the capability of Russian armies speedily overrunning Europe?

In a world unfortunately ruled by military power, as recent history demonstrates, in dealing with aggressor nations the lack of an ultimate sanction, at least in being, behind diplomatic actions leads only to appeasement with its disastrous consequences. Our recovery program for Europe can be made futile through our lack of means to protect the independence of Marshall plan countries. The time may soon come when nations not now under Russian domination will have to make the choice, and unless we are militarily strong their choice will not be a free one. For them, that will mean the loss of their freedom; for us, the risk that we stand alone in a Soviet-dominated world.

Our armed forces today have 1,300,000 men, 300,000 under the strength planned 2 years ago on very optimistic assumptions. Our Army of 550,000 men is chiefly engaged in occupation, and is so deployed overseas in bits and pieces that it is ineffective as a fighting force. In these troublous times we have in this country a strategic reserve of only two and a third Army divisions.

These regular forces are wholly inadequate for our security. They should be augmented immediately, and to accomplish that the President has wisely urged the temporary re-enactment of the selective-service law.

The problem is larger than increasing our standing forces. No one wishes to have selective service a permanent feature of our military policy. But without it and inordinate costs, we cannot keep regular forces in being sufficient for our security.

Universal military training has been exhaustively examined by a Presidential commission of distinguished private citizens headed by Dr. Karl Compton. It unanimously concluded that military training, together with other measures, was essential to our security, and recommended the program before Congress today. The commission proposed that, under civilian control, every physically fit man at 18 receive military training for 6 months, followed by certain optional training in the national guard, the Reserves, or otherwise. Unlike selective service, it is a training, not a service, program.

Certainly, one clear lesson from the last war is that time and space factors will be greatly reduced in any future war, and the marshaling of our military strength must be done with much greater rapidity than in the last two wars, when we were protected during our mobilization by the oceans and our allies.

Our war-mobilization plans require an Army and Air Force of 1,750,000 men immediately ready for action. This is to be expanded as rapidly as possible to the first mobilization objective of 5,000,000 men. An essential part of the initial 1,750,000 is a National Guard of 690,000 men. Today there are 200,000 men in the National Guard, and all our experience proves that without universal training we will fall far short of a full-strength National Guard. Equally important as numbers is the provision through universal military training of trained men for the National Guard and other Reserves which will make them much more effective earlier in our mobilization than has ever been true in the past. In addition, the objective of 5,000,000 men can only be reached with speed if, through universal military training, we have built up a reservoir of trained military manpower.

With universal military training, in an emergency, we would have a selection and induction administration and military-training establishments in operation. We would not have to strip our Regular forces of men to train our citizen forces and thereby greatly decrease their fighting strength. Moreover, if an emergency came, we would have 800,000 men in training. All this would save many months and many lives.

There is the comfortable delusion that the atomic bomb has made large military forces unnecessary. The Compton commission, after 6 months of study and hearing 200 witnesses, including leading scientists and military men, unanimously rejected that idea.

Clearly in the following respects the atomic bomb either has not changed or has increased the need for large forces:

(a) If an atomic bomb balance of power is achieved between warring nations, the bomb may not be used at all. Certainly the fear of retaliation deterred the Germans and the Japanese from using poisonous gas in the last war.

(b) Moreover, it is inconceivable that we would use atomic bombs against friendly cities which had been overrun by enemy forces. Old-fashioned means—the foot soldier—would have to be used.

(c) Even if atomic bombing broke the will of an enemy to resist, it would still require large ground forces to seize and occupy enemy lands.

(d) And then there is the need for trained manpower for civilian defense against atomic bomb attack.

Another delusion is that we can obtain security merely by buying more airplanes. The need for an increased Air Force today is imperative, but the Air Force is dependent on a well-balanced Army and Navy. Air bases must be seized and maintained by the Army and sea supply lines must be secured by the Navy.

The fate of civilization as we know it may well depend on whether we adopt this program. Universal military training will immeasurably strengthen our military posture and, equally important, will signal to the whole world the united American determination fully to discharge the responsibility of world leadership. That leadership, backed by determination and military strength, is the world's best chance for peace.

CON: "IT WOULD NOT GIVE US THE RIGHT KIND OF AN ARMY; IT WOULD GIVE US A FALSE SENSE OF SECURITY"

(By Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah)

I am opposed to peacetime universal military training for the sole reason that it is the poorest possible way to build an army in America, to keep that army strong and keep the men in it—from the Commander in Chief down to the last private—full of pride, patriotism and the morale that makes soldiers.

We have been told that UMT is the only fair and effective means of raising and maintaining an army consistent with modern needs. I hold this is not true.

A modern army should be an army of specialists in given fields. It is not enough to say that those specialists should be selected from a mass of trained men. That, of course, is true, but forced training in a field in which a selectee is not interested may deaden his zeal quite as much as contribute to his ultimate worth in the Army.

From the time American boys enter school they are taught to choose careers. They do not always choose wisely. They need guidance. But there are, for example, many very successful doctors who were successful medical students but could find no interest in any pre-medical work that was not related to their field. Individual initiative has never been discouraged in our American educational scheme. Would not UMT work in the opposite direction?

The best kind of army we can strive for is the army based upon intelligence and high morale which we have always been able to produce when necessity has arisen. When I say that, however, I am not subscribing to the minute-man theory, the belief that we could raise men overnight and turn mobs of persons into a coordinated armed force. I had much to do with the introduction of the ROTC in our schools. I grant military training and military science its proper place in our American educational scheme. I have always supported these studies just as I have supported the teaching of United States history and United States constitutional government. But I am unsympathetic toward UMT for the same reason that I am unsympathetic with forced courses in our constitutional government taught on a level which makes for misinformation about how our Government functions because of lack of preliminary preparation.

The alternative is a simple one. We know from actual history that when Hitler turned to complete mobilization, he was able to raise an army of 4,500,000 men within a year, deficient only in noncoms. And here let us give the devil his due; Hitler was not, in any sense, responsible for what he was able to accomplish. He was able to do what he did because the Germans, as a result of the army limitation provisions of the treaty after the First World War, were forced to change their whole educational outlook in regard to training soldiers.

The Kaiser's army was built on the theory of pure militarism and availability of sufficient gun fodder. When the peace after the First World War was written, the Allies insisted upon limiting the German Army to 100,000 men. A German officer countered and said, "That will be all right, because we will train 100,000 majors, colonels, and senior officers." Then the Allies insisted upon a 13-year enlistment period in the treaty army to make the army a career for the enlistees and the training of great numbers of officers impossible.

The Germans then changed their educational approach to training soldiers. Instead of using the mass idea, which has to be used when you have UMT, they made entrance into their 100,000-man army a matter of competition and selection. While the members of this army remained privates during their period of service, each was individually trained up to his maximum potentiality. In this way Hitler was able to expand his army of 100,000 into an army of 4,500,000.

We can do this better than Hitler did because there are no restrictions on our training programs and we will have trained leaders for any emergency. Such a method will give us an opportunity to give specialized training to our Air Force and Navy, and will supply officers of all grades for expanded Ground Forces.

Why not concentrate on this type of training throughout the whole of our peacetime Army? The answer which the advocates of UMT will give to this is that we need a mass of men to give practical training to our divisional and corps staffs and commanders. But that will come when the emergency arises because every battle, every maneuver and every campaign must be built around the physical aspects of that campaign.

There are those in our country who feel that if we could just establish UMT, Russia and the whole world would be good. A resort to UMT for this reason is pretty close to mobilization in anticipation of imminent war. Those who know the history of the beginnings of the First World War know that one country mobilized because another country mobilized on its border, and mobilization was an actual cause of war. However, I do not think that France, Italy, Great Britain, Canada, and on down through the whole list of nations would think that America was resorting to UMT because she expects to go to war against them or expects them to go to war against her.

There is only one country in the world that could possibly interpret UMT on our part as an act in preparation for war and this is Russia. But Russia would not, in my opinion, so interpret it. Having known nothing in the last several generations but UMT, Russia knows the weaknesses of the system quite as well as its strength. It must be remembered that Russia uses UMT for other purposes than raising her army. Russia has the problem of national unification, the problem of overcoming diversity of language and local nationalistic tendencies.

I think that a great many people supporting the idea of UMT are misled by its name. Actually, compulsory universal military training would never be compulsory. It would never be universal. It would not build up our citizenry.

Five out of every ten men called to the draft were rejected. In some States 7 out of every 10 were rejected. In other States 7 out of every 10 were accepted. That means that UMT would not be universal, that it would not be honestly representative of our whole country. The great need now is the development of that backward manhood represented in those parts of our country where only 3 out of 10 were found acceptable. If UMT were based upon the theory of making our country strong, those men who were found deficient would be built up and made efficient. Sometimes men were rejected because of lack of education, sometimes because of poor health. Half of these, I am sure, were corrective cases, and many of these were accepted by the Army, without correction, as the manpower barrel began to empty.

I want a strong army. I believe that all branches of our armed forces will be put back a whole generation if we resort to UMT because of the great number of officers and the mass of men who will be needed on the basic training level year after year. There are about 900,000, or maybe a million, boys turning 18 each year. It would take fifty or sixty thousand junior-grade officers to train them. Those officers will be doomed to that job. Think what that would do to our specialized services.

I realize that the President's commission and all of the armed forces' high personnel declare themselves in favor of UMT. But are they? The thoughtful among them want a strong, efficient and well-trained Army, Navy, and Air Force and they know these do not come from boys whose natural makeup is not in harmony with the type of training necessary for UMT.

A Demand for $3,000,000,000 Worth of Our Gold for Foreign Countries

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reliable information reaches us to the effect that the Congress may soon be called upon by the administration to follow up the Marshall plan with a huge gold shipment from the United States to Europe for the purpose of stabilizing foreign currencies. The amount has been estimated to run as high as $3,000,000,000. I think the Congress would be unalterably opposed to such a measure.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that this European request for gold from the United States was first made in an off-the-cuff statement by Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin, who hoped for a shipment to Europe of some of our gold reserve at Fort Knox. The request took official form, however, in the general report of the Paris meeting. In fact, the Paris planners gave gold an urgent priority, inasmuch as they pointed out that no lasting economic recovery could possibly take place in Europe without a quick and basic stabilization of all the European currencies involved in the so-called Marshall countries.

On the question of American gold shipments to Europe, the Paris meeting of the 16 participating countries was very explicit, indeed. I quote from their general report, volume I, pages 28–29, as follows:

It is essential to the success of the whole European recovery program that stabilization should be achieved as quickly as possible. The year 1948 is crucial.

The quick success of stabilization will to a very large extent depend on adequate foreign assistance being available during the period in which stabilization is being achieved.

It would assist the difficult and painful operation of bringing inflation under control and then stopping it, if supplementary external resources specifically designed to raise the country's gold and dollar reserves to an adequate amount were made available.

The amount of such resources that is required is the total of the amounts which the various countries concerned need to make up their gold and dollar reserves to a minimum level which will restore confidence. No precise calculation can be made of the amount required without examining the position of each of the countries concerned at the time when stabilization is undertaken. But from such estimates as can be made the amount likely to be required would be of the order of $3,000,000,000.

I think that the Congress agrees with me that the House Appropriations Committee which is now about to consider the $6,800,000,000 appropriation for the Marshall program, should look into this matter of gold shipments immediately, inasmuch as it now seems that the House Foreign Affairs Committee may not have had all these facts available when it conducted its hearing on the ERP.

According to a scarcely noticed AP release of December 3, 1947, a top-level intergovernmental committee of the American Government decided against asking Congress right then for a $3,000,000,000 stabilization fund for European currencies to supplement the Marshall plan. This decision was taken after weeks of intensive discussion in said anonymous committee, and reflected the fear of the administration that the Marshall plan might have run into difficulties with American public opinion if it had been coupled, as it was in the Paris report, with a demand for gold shipment in the huge amount of $3,000,000,000. In this manner, the ticklish question of American gold shipments to Europe was postponed until Congress had passed the Marshall plan itself. As soon as the European recovery program had become a law, however, the administration would feel itself to be in a much stronger position to demand, as a necessary supplement to the success of the Marshall plan, a huge billion dollar gold shipment, as demanded by the Paris meeting already in August 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I observe that during all the debate on the floor, the bipartisan steam roller for the Marshall plan was exceedingly careful not to bring before the Congress the need for any gold shipment in connection with the Marshall plan.

However, as late as February 26, 1948, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, pointed out the necessity for currency rate changes by some of the 16 nations in the European recovery program. At the same time, the administration rejected any suggestion for a special international monetary conference aimed at settling the problems of European devaluation.

At the same time, Mr. Snyder insisted that the present needs for European currency reform did not necessitate any changes in the rules of the 48-nation International Monetary Fund. Thus, once again, this international body created at Bretton Woods was sidetracked, with the inevitable result that the only available source of gold reserve with which to stabilize European currencies, now is the United States Treasury and its gold at Fort Knox.

Furthermore, inasmuch as the American National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems thus rejected the idea of channeling any possible United States gold assistance through the International Fund, it is safe to predict that in the very near future, the pending European Currency Conference, once again, will demand that the requests for American gold shipments made at Paris in August 1947 now be speeded up.

The political decision which the administration made in December 1947 with regard to the postponing of gold shipment, will be revised some time during the next few weeks, when Congress can expect to be faced with an urgent call for an initial gold shipment, as outlined above.

Finally, that the administration is now about ready to act in the gold shipment request, was brought out on last February 28, when the United Nations' Department of Economic Affairs in its special report Foreign Exchange Position of the Devastated Countries announced that the United States was now considering means of further assistance.

Let us today warn the administration that it will not get this Congress to acquiesce in shipping billions of American gold, on top of the $5,300,000,000 of European aid, which just passed this House.

North Arkansas Has New Tourist Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial taken from the Springdale News, Springdale, Ark., the issue of April 8:

NORTH ARKANSAS HAS NEW TOURIST CENTER

Sunday we saw for the first time the new dam constructed on the Norfork river in Baxter county, near the towns of Norfork and Mountain Home, and the enormous lake it has created.

Constructed as a flood control and power project, it is necessary to view the dam to appreciate its magnitude.

The lake created by the dam and the one that will be created by the Bull Shoals dam to be built on the White River, will open up the greatest tourist and fisherman's paradise in the Middle West. The only thing they need to develop the region to its fullest will be more good roads. United States Highway 62 which passes through Springdale and crosses the north part of the State, is now paved all the way to a point some 10 miles east of Mountain Home.

If you plan a week-end trip or want to make a nice Sunday drive, however it is a little too far for a 1-day trip, you will enjoy this part of the State especially this summer when the forests of the area are at their best.

The bad part of our trip was the many fires that were burning in the Ozark forest Sunday. It seemed that they were ablaze from Eureka Springs to Gateway on both sides of the highway.

Like most other people who have never lived in or near a large forest, we never paid much attention to the program that has for its purpose "preventing forest fires." After seeing the extensive destruction that was taking place Sunday, and is probably continuing this week, we see why it is so important that this program be continued and expanded at every opportunity.

Vermont Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Vermont's laws affecting veterans, their dependents, and their organizations, compiled by William T. McDonald, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans, who recently assumed such duties with his office being located in the Veterans' Administration center, White River Junction, Vt.

Most of these potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore I am hopeful that this résumé of Vermont's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

BONUS

Bonus is payable to honorably discharged veterans of World War II who lived in Vermont at least 1 year prior to entering the service. Amount—$10 for each month in service, not to exceed 1 year. It is also payable to World War II widows. Remarriage is no bar.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A State allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans and their widows. Dead bodies of veterans cannot be turned over to physicians for dissection for the advancement of anatomical science.

A State allowance is provided for headstones for the graves of indigent veterans and their widows.

Records of place of burial of veterans are to be forwarded to the adjutant and inspector general.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator may be appointed for the property of persons serving in the armed forces.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Evidence of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces may be admitted.

Final adoption decree required to be signed by a member of the armed forces may be signed and acknowledged before certain military officers.

Medical certificates for marriage licenses may be signed by members of the medical corps of the Army, Navy, or Public Health Service.

Disability of minority is removed for veterans qualified under the G. I. bill of rights.

Wills may be proved when subscribing witnesses are unavailable in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided for members of the armed forces.

CLAIMS—ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS—SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Town and city clerks shall furnish veterans, their dependents, or beneficiaries free copies of records required in the prosecution of claims for benefits.

Town and city clerks record discharges and make a permanent record thereof. The clerk's fee of 50 cents is paid by the town or city.

A State veterans' board has been created to assist veterans, their heirs or beneficiaries in obtaining benefits.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who served in the armed forces during World Wars I or II and who were killed in action or died from other cause as a result of service. Amount, $150 maximum per child, with free tuition at State institutions of secondary or college grade.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGE, ETC.

Membership in the Teachers' Retirement Association is continued while in the military service.

Leave of absence is granted for an elective or appointive officer inducted into the armed forces.

Preference is extended to veterans in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the State government.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

State employees are reinstated to positions of like seniority, status, and pay upon application within 90 days following service in the armed forces. This is not applicable to elective or appointive positions which have lapsed.

The State veterans' service officer must be a veteran.

GUARDIANSHIP

A uniform veterans' guardianship act has been enacted providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOLIDAYS

Legal holidays: January 1, February 12, February 22, May 30, July 4, August 16, first Monday in September, October 12, November 11, December 25, and Thanksgiving as decreed by the President.

HOMES

A soldiers' home has been incorporated for the care of soldiers and sailors and deserving members of their families.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

The residence period required for divorce or annulment of marriage is not affected by absence from the State because of military service.

Signing of premarital examination certificates by a member of the Medical Corps of the Army or Navy is authorized.

MEMORIALS

A memorial certificate is issued to the next of kin of every Vermonter who died while serving in the armed forces during World War II.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Towns may keep and publish records of the soldiers and sailors furnished by such towns during any wars or military enterprises in which the United States has been engaged, certified copies to be deposited in the office of the town clerk and in the State library.

The State war history commission collects and preserves records pertaining to the military and civilian participation in World War II.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks may make loans to qualified veterans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Relief is extended to indigent veterans and their dependents in their own homes.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Members of the armed forces may fish or hunt without a license when on leave or furlough.

Collection of income tax on persons in the military service is deferred.

Payments received since February 24, 1941, for services or allowances in the armed forces are exempt from gross income taxation until 6 months after the end of World War II.

Veterans who served in the armed forces of the United States in the Civil War, Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, their wives or widows, and disabled veterans of World Wars I and II are exempt from poll tax.

Property of veterans organizations is exempt from taxation.

Real and personal property to the extent of $1,000 owned by veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars, or their widows, is exempt from taxation.

Real and personal property to the extent of $2,000, owned by disabled veterans of World Wars I and II drawing 50 percent or more compensation, or the widow of such a veteran, or of a veteran of such wars who died while serving in the armed forces, is exempt from taxation.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of a veterans' organization shall be punishable by imprisonment for not more than 30 days or a fine of $50, or both.

Towns may make appropriations for rental of rooms to veterans' organizations.

Most of the above laws have been enacted by the Vermont Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of veteran organizations.

The DAV maintains an office in the Veterans' Administration Center in White River Junction, in charge of Mr. William T. McDonald, who renders all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their claims for various governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944 to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947 and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide without cost to the applicants expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has each year been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other agencies of the Government.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities, which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The National Service Headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful buliding at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV Service Headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted, and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians, and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil service appointments, and last, but really first in importance, suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled—1,525,753; total monetary benefits—$132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical resume, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy task, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and finanical dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Federal Aid for Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial taken from the April 9 issue of the Baxter Bulletin, published at Mountain Home, Ark.:

FEDERAL AID FOR OUR SCHOOLS

Last week the Senate passed one of the most vital pieces of legislation in this session; the bill authorizing appropriations by the Federal Government to aid the States in maintaining their school systems on a competent basis. The bill, which passed by a majority of 58 to 22, provides that no State shall spend less than $50 per pupil per year on any of its pupils, and provides $300,000,000 for aid during the first year. Aid will be given primarily on the basis of need, with rich States receiving very little and poor States receiving a great deal. Arkansas is due to receive more than $12,390,000, which will bring its average amount spent per pupil up to $58. This State, with the help of Federal funds, will still be third from the bottom in educational expenditures and pitifully far below such States as Missouri, which spends $112 per student.

Among the staunch defenders of the bill was Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who delivered a lengthy address in which he pointed to the fact that Detroit's dog catchers receive far more than Arkansas' teachers. Senator FULBRIGHT defended the bill in the face of such opponents as Senator KEM, Republican, of Missouri. The most heated opposition came from Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, who dragged in the extraneous stock argument on States rights, charged a "Federal bureaucracy," and said that there was no "guaranty" that funds might not be denied in the future to States not having separate schools for whites and Negroes. Senator TAFT, author of the bill, showed that only three men will be required in Washington to administer the beneficial funds which will furnish much-needed aid to the impoverished school system of Arkansas as well as many other States.

Labor Extension Service Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee opened hearings on the labor-extension service legislation. As a sponsor of one of the bills under consideration, I wish to hereby submit the statement made by me at the opening of the hearings in behalf of this legislation:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman and the members of the Education and Labor Committee for holding hearings on Labor Extension Service at this time. I believe this legislation, if enacted into law, will extend to millions of wage earners throughout America, an educational opportunity which has been long postponed. The average worker in our country has not had the opportunity to learn and understand the intricacies of our great industrial system founded on private enterprise. If an Educational Extension Service is provided for the worker to learn the fundamentals which constitute good labor management relations, our American way of life will be better prepared for the attacks which will be made upon it in the future. The well-informed and intelligent worker will be less susceptible to the harangues of demagogic radicals who find the poorly informed worker a fertile field for his propaganda. An educational service extension program as called for in this bill, should have the support of all management and employers who are anxious and willing to cooperate with the employee on a fair and equitable basis to continue or provide good working conditions and a living wage.

My colleague, Congressman TOLLEFSON, of the State of Washington, and I have introduced identical bills for Labor Extension Service legislation.

The theory of Educational Extension Service is not a new one. Back in 1862 the Congress passed an Agricultural Extension Service bill for the benefit of the agriculture industry in our country. This legislation was sponsored by Congressman Justin Morrell and was a bill donating land to each of the several States for "endowment, support, and

maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts." The Government has followed through on its Agricultural Extension Service, but it has completely neglected any educational aid toward the millions engaged in industrial production in our country.

I have heard employers say that if the great majority of our employees understood problems of management, there would be far less antipathy and bitterness existing in labor-management disputes. The statement would work in reverse also. If employers had a better understanding of the problems and difficulties their employees are confronted with, not only from their cost-of-living economy, but also from working conditions, there would be less antipathy and bitterness existing in labor-management disputes. Good employment relations cannot maintain where management and employees do not acquaint themselves with the others' problems; this can only come about through mutual contacts and understanding such as a Labor Extension Service as is provided in this legislation.

I believe that such a service, when established, will (1) enable the workers of the Nation to understand better the laws under which they work, whether it affects their hours or conditions of work, (2) acquaint them with those methods for conciliation or other phases of labor-management relations which have encouraged industrial peace and social welfare, (3) train them in skills needed in the development of the trade-union movement which is concerned not only with problems of hours and wages, but also poses a feeling of deep responsibility for community, social, and national welfare.

Today the average worker in our democracy, especially if he has had to begin work at the age of 14 or 16, finds few educational opportunities suited to his needs. He has rights and responsibilities as a worker often little understood. Short courses, informal or visual education in labor economics, labor law and legislation, in the techniques of collective bargaining or in parliamentary law are usually impossible to find at hours and in places convenient for the wage earner after working hours.

Universities and Federal and State governments on the other hand have given millions of dollars year after year to help businessmen, engineers, farmers, and professional groups increase their special skills so as to perform greater service and secure for themselves greater rewards.

World War II intensified our appreciation that mass production depended upon peaceful industrial relations. That story, gentlemen, is one which history will reveal to the glory of the working men and women of the United States. With the help of the Labor Relations Act, great progress was made as workers and management learned to meet and bargain peaceably together. Reconversion and the need for large-scale production since the end of the war have made us more and more conscious of the need to establish good management-labor relations in this country.

As a result, a number of our universities have started labor-management schools at the undergraduate and graduate level. In some cases, workers, backed by their unions, attend these resident schools. This is a fine movement promising to give us more understanding leadership for jobs in personnel management in industry and unions.

This bill which I am sponsoring is, however, different. I believe this proposed labor-extension service, addressed to all workers interested to gain understanding, will contribute far more to preserving the democratic way of life in our Nation and to the advancement of our productive energies than courses for industrial management only. This bill recognizes the need for further extension programs planned by our great universities at the request and with the participation of the workers themselves in their own localities, just as the farmers now, through their voluntary organizations, cooperate with the agricultural-extension program. Some of our colleges and universities have now begun to give such labor-extension service; Wisconsin University, in connection with its Workers' School; the University of Michigan through its extension division; the State colleges of Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, both land-grant colleges, through their extension divisions; and, in connection with three labor-management programs, namely, at Cornell, Rutgers, and the University of Illinois. These are also land-grant colleges.

In my own State of Indiana, both Purdue and the University of Indiana have cooperated with labor in several short institutes, but no permanent plan has been worked out as yet, largely due to lack of funds. So far, labor has had to carry the main cost of such undertakings.

My bill will provide aid and service to some forty-odd-million wage and salary earners. It is similar in purpose to legislation now in operation which provides agricultural extension service to some 6,000,000 farm families. This bill has the endorsement and approval of all labor organizations. It would benefit unorganized as well as organized workers, and also management.

This bill provides that a division be created in the Labor Department to be known as the Labor Extension Division and to be administered by the Secretary of Labor. This Division shall be headed by a director to be known as the Director of the Labor Extension Division, who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretary of Labor shall formulate general policies for the administration of this act after consultation with the director. The services are provided by the interested universities.

There will also be established a National Labor Extension Council to advise the Secretary of Labor and the director in formulating general policies governing the administration of the provisions of the act.

The Council shall consist, in accordance with the amended bill now in your hands, of 12 members, 6 chosen from a panel submitted by bona fide labor organizations, national in scope, and 6 chosen from a panel submitted by participating institutions. This Council shall meet from time to time at the request of the Secretary of Labor or whenever at least a third of the members request a meeting.

This bill authorizes an amount to be appropriated adequate for this program and based upon an estimate made for the Appropriations Committee.

At the hearing before the Senate committee, some of the members inferred that the Labor Department in Washington might have too much control over this educational program. In my amended bill, I have supplemented the following, in order to eliminate Federal control over the institutions cooperating in the program.

No department, agency, officer or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any cooperating institution to which any funds which have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act. No term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, shall seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction of any cooperating institution.

I feel confident that when the Members of the Senate and House learn of the high purposes, the educational value, and the mutual understanding which this legislation will eventually promote toward industrial good will, they will agree that the relatively small cost of administering this service will make it an outstanding Government investment.

This Government Labor Extension Service will work in cooperation with universities and colleges throughout the country and in that way eliminate the expense of building construction, rental of classroom space, and other expenses incident to the opening of government schools and classrooms. Instruction would be given at places such as colleges, schools, and union halls, which would be convenient for wage and salary earners.

The expense involved in operating this proposed Labor Extension Service would be infinitesimal as compared to the billions lost annually in strikes, work stoppages and inexcusable misunderstandings by labor and management.

The Inflation Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 13, on the subject of controls versus inflation:

STILL THE INFLATION MENACE

Officeholders grouped about the President of the United States still profess to be alarmed over a price-inflation menace and yet refuse to face the real upward pressures on prices. They continue to insist that if they are given certain legal powers they can prevent the inevitable consequences of Government policies which are either stupidly or craftily designed to create the very evil they abhor.

For a recent illustration of this disorder in top-level political thinking, turn to the quarterly report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Note what it does and what it does not say. It asserts a necessity that "allocation and related control measures be promptly enacted and selectively applied." In other words, the country is up against another terrific emergency.

Last fall President Truman went rushing to Congress to demand a reinstitution of price controls and rationing. Emergency action was required to prepare us against an April famine. All the experts, from the Council of Economic Advisers to the Agriculture Department, were quite postive that otherwise meatless days would become meatless months.

The only trouble with this prediction was that it was wrong. The bottom has not exactly fallen out of the meat market, but there is certainly no famine and no skyrocketing of prices. Supplies are adequate, even in spite of a packer's strike. Prices are steady; on many products they have declined. An Agriculture Department spokesman warns that if we slip back to our prewar consumption rate of 126 pounds per person we will have a meat surplus, and have to start worrying about price supports.

The point of this is not just to confound the prophets with an unkind reminder. We bring it up because we are again hearing the same arguments for controls based on the same kind of free-wheeling prophecies.

The CEA's chairman, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, says it is now more imperative to have these control powers than it was last November.

In other words, if Mr. Truman thought he had an emergency then he has a super-emergency now.

Why? Because foreign aid and rearmament will both "entail withdrawal of goods from American consumers without a corresponding curtailment of purchasing power in their hands." The council skips over the question whether Government policy might be so reshaped as to effect curtailments of purchasing power to offset the additions thereto which will result from foreign aid and rearmament, and so moderate the price-inflationary effect of the reduced supply of civilian goods for domestic consumption.

If our Government must spend yet unnumbered billions on foreign aid and rearmament, it can counteract the inflationary consequences of these expenditures only in one way, by reducing its expenditures for other purposes and by correcting its fiscal practices which make for credit expansion. But, so far from making retrenchment its guiding rule, the administration encourages and even urges Congress to pack the budget with appropriations which heap fuel on the inflation fire. And not only the administration following but influential Members of the Republican opposition promote Federal housing and educational programs which would commit the Government to mounting expenditures over an indefinite future. The Brookings Institution says the outlook for maintained fiscal stability is not bright, mainly because:

"There are insistent pressures for larger expenditures for a wide variety of purposes and against curtailment in other cases. Such reductions as are made tend to be more than offset by expenditures elsewhere."

Federal and local Government expenditures are not the only source of inflationary pressure. The Treasury holds too insistently to its easy money practices for the sake of keeping the Federal interest account down. Wartime amendments of Federal banking law which are harmful in time of peace should be eliminated, among them the lowered gold cover requirements for Federal Reserve notes and reserve deposits of member banks.

The current round of wage increase demands is fathered by the postwar rise in living costs, which it cannot permanently relieve and will only aggravate. We think it would be quite feasible, even in an election year, for the Administration to offer resistance to the wage drive, provided it first made clear its determination to attack price inflation at its sources. Its sources, as we have been arguing, are avoidable and postponable public expenditures and the continuation into the peace of wartime fiscal devices which were questionable even during the emergency of war.

Unless the prime causes of inflation are dealt with, no program for suppressing its symptoms will avail. Controls worked none too well while the fighting war was on; their usefulness turned into obstruction of industry and trade thereafter. We think their reestablishment now is impossible.

ROBERT L. WILLIAMS, STATESMAN

With the death Saturday of Robert L. Williams, Oklahoma records the loss of one of its most able State builders and notes the conclusion of a career of one of its sons remarkable in a score of ways.

Just how great a debt the State owes to this dour, highly intelligent, and dogmatic character will probably never be completely measured.

When Oklahoma came into being in 1907, after its long and checkered career as a Federal ward, operated and managed as a Territory, ruled by the Federal courts of the land, and offering a hundred anomalies of gravity and importance, a vast array of problems faced the people.

One of the major and essential first tasks which had to be soonest solved was the establishment and proper operations of a State judiciary.

Robert L. Williams was the first chief justice of the State. It was his task to make a workable code of laws for the adequate and proper administration of justice in Oklahoma. It was a task made the more difficult by the vast mountain of decisions of the old Federal courts which still stood and had all the effect of law. With amazing fidelity and tremendous energy he set at the job and he performed miracles. Oklahoma's fine law structure today was built on the sturdy foundation this short, abrupt and somewhat cantankerous genius built.

When he was elevated to the post of Governor of Oklahoma, another grave and unusual task was placed in his hands. The State was then building itself an official home—the State Capitol Building. Williams with the same indefatigible courage and zeal, assumed this responsibility along with the maze of other duties the Governor's office demanded. It is a legend in Oklahoma he personally inspected each brick and stone that went into the mammoth building—"Bob Williams saw to it," the legend has it, "that Oklahoma received a full dollar in material and workmanship for each dollar spent in building the State capitol."

From the Governor's chair, he moved into the rarified atmosphere of the United States court as a Federal district judge. Here again, his acute and discerning legal mind made history and brought new renown and fame to him—and by the same token to his State.

On retirement from the Federal district judgeship to accept an even higher and more responsible post on the Federal circuit court of appeals, Williams performed, despite advancing years and failing strength, with the same Samsonlike power which had marked his entire life and whole career.

But time and the wear of the years were relentless and brought fighting Bob Williams down. And he fought against death with all of the stern, unrelenting courage which had always marked his life.

Yes, Oklahoma has lost one of its real founders and one of its greater men in the death of Robert L. Williams.

Robert L. Williams, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Ardmoreite, Ardmore, Okla., of April 11, 1948:

Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Third Congressional District of Arkansas, and I doubt if there is a group of counties in the United States who are more alert and active in all phases of agriculture than these 10 counties. Today, however, I refer especially to that feature of agriculture which has to do with soil-building practices.

I have received the following statement from Washington County, one of the largest in my district, with reference to Senator AIKEN'S bill, S. 2318. I ask leave to insert that statement as a part of my remarks:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, FIELD SERVICE BRANCH,
Fayetteville, Ark., April 5, 1948.

Hon. J. W. "JIM" TRIMBLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: For your information, consideration, and action, we are enclosing our recommendations and endorsement of Senate bill 2318 (Agriculture Act of 1948).

Yours very truly,

W. Shannon Pharr, Lincoln E. Maupin, Roe D. Stokenbury, Opie K. Valentine, Tom B. Bell, Claud D. Blew, Frank Skelton, William Hulsizer, E. W. Price, Rollans M. Wilson, Lee L. Williams, S. M. Claypool, R. F. Morrison, Noah W. Phillips, Powell C. Williams, J. B. McCuistion, Earl White, G. S. Smith, Dink McKinnon.

After reviewing bill S. 2318, Agricultural Act of 1948, and the recommended changes of the community committeemen of Washington County, Ark., we, the AAA county committeemen, as the farmer's representatives, approve bill S. 2318, which provides for a coordinated agricultural program; however, we recommend that (a) and (b) of section 101, under title 1, be changed to read as follows:

(a) the educational information and demonstrational features of such functions shall be exercised in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico through the Extension Service, in coordination with the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement, since this agency is to be charged with administrative responsibilities of the Agricultural Act of 1948;

(b) the research and investigation features of such functions shall be exercised through the Agricultural experiment stations in the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in coordination with the Divisions of Soil Conservation and Improvement, hereinafter provided for in this act.

Knowing the farmer committee system as we do from a farmer's and committeemen's standpoint, we recommend this system of administration. It is a flexible system, operated on a local and State basis. Therefore, we recommend the Agricultural Act of 1948, which establishes the Bureau of Agricultural Conservation and Improvement, or any other long-range, coordinated, agricultural program, be set up under the farmer committee system.

After consideration of the bill S. 2318, the community committeemen's and our recommended changes, we, the county committee of Washington County, Ark., hereby solicit your consideration of our recommendations and your support of bill S. 2318.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit

the following statement on Federal aid to education.

There has been considerable controversy of late concerning the desirability of certain measures now being considered by the House and Senate. These measures authorize the appropriation of Federal funds to help the States and Territories finance a minimum program of education in the public schools of the Nation.

This idea is hardly a new one. Education has long been recognized as a Federal as well as a State concern. The Congress has enacted some 150 Federal aid-to-education bills since 1802. However, in the years since 1940 a crisis has occurred in our educational system which has brought into sharp focus the need for further aid from the National Government for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities and assuring minimum educational standards throughout the Nation.

Some of the facts concerning present educational facilities for our young people are fantastic. The Federal census of 1940 showed that 5,000,000 children of school age were not attending any school. Millions of others attend only part of the day or a few months during the year. In some areas the expenditure per class room is as low as $100 per year, while $4,000 is the recognized level for proper instruction.

Despite the efforts of many States and communities to raise the level of salaries, most of our teachers are grossly underpaid. Over 50 percent received less than $2,000 for the school year 1946–47 and 16 percent received less than $1,200. It is little wonder that qualified teachers have been leaving the profession by the hundreds of thousands. As a result, many of our schools are left in the hands of persons without the proper background and education for the tremendously important task of instructing the youth of the Nation. In other cases the schools have closed down entirely.

This deplorable condition has resulted simply because many of our States are unable to provide adequate funds for educational facilities. It is common knowledge that the States vary widely in their ability to support an adequate school system. For instance, the amount of income behind each child of school age ranged from $1,974 in Mississippi to $9,005 in California.

Ignorance is a national not a local menace. Poorly educated persons in one area are a constant threat to the standards of every area.

The national economy is an integrated unit. Progress is not a regional nor a local matter; the flow of goods, services, and people is interstate. Each State is both a market and a producer for every other State. Thus the technical abilities and the educational level of any section is the concern of all. Least of all can the people of the Pacific Northwest afford to take a regional stand on this vital issue. We live in a rapidly growing area. Since 1940 the population of the State of Washington alone has increased from 1,736,191 to 2,233,000. A great many of these people come from sections of the country which have standards of education way below those that prevail for our area. In this way our own living and cultural standards are directly affected. In my opinion, this consideration alone is sufficient to secure the support of the people of Washington for a Federal aid-to-education measure.

There are those who charge that our State will undoubtedly have to pay into the Federal Treasury funds which will go to other areas. I believe that I have already explained why we cannot afford to take such a narrow sectional attitude. But despite those considerations, we of the Northwest in particular can hardly criticize a Federal program which will benefit one part of the Nation more than another. Our section has certainly benefited more than any other part of the Nation from huge expenditures of Federal funds for the construction of reclamation, flood-control, and power-development projects. Our State, ranking thirtieth in population for the Nation, and contributing only 1¼ percent of the total annual Federal revenue, received more than any other single State for such construction. These projects are wealth-creating projects of which we are justly proud. They were accomplished with support from all parts of the Nation and are a sound investment for the Nation as a whole.

In some respects, this problem is not unlike the problem of soil conservation. The Federal Government is actively engaged with the States in a program aimed at preventing the erosion of the natural wealth in the good American earth. Not less necessary is a program designed to check the erosion of potential talent, or the loss of constructive citizenship that takes place wherever primary and secondary education is deficient. It is seriously deficient in many of our cities and towns because funds are not available to improve it. Certain of the less prosperous States are incapable, by themselves, of financing the kind of minimum job that needs to be done.

The issue of Federal aid for standard educational facilities is far too important a matter to be decided on narrow sectional grounds. I feel sure that the people of Washington will recognize that here is a matter which concerns the welfare of the entire Nation. I hope that they will lend their support to a program dedicated to equalizing educational opportunity for youth in all parts of the Nation.

New American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an article taken from this morning's New York Herald Tribune by Mark Sullivan.

We all wait anxiously for the Italian election returns. A constituent of mine inspired by the speech given by our Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, in Toledo, recently sent out a great number of letters to American citizens of Italian descent, urging them to write relatives and friends in Italy to vote against the Communists on April 18, and pointed out the many advantages enjoyed by those living in a free country. This constituent performed a most commendable service, and I hope many others throughout this country did something similar.

If we carry through on this new American doctrine, to support all of the other free nations in helping them resist the expansion of Russian aggression to the extent of giving military aid, these nations must definitely keep up their own protective forces. It is too easy to sit back and "let George do it." When the threat of Russian communism takes the form of military aggression—and God forbid that it does come—we will be faced with a most intricate defense problem. Every means of resistance must be tried first and we must have the fullest cooperation of the participating nations.

Mr. Sullivan's article follows:

NEW AMERICAN POLICY IS CALLED BROADER THAN MONROE DOCTRINE—MARK SULLIVAN DEFINES ITS CENTRAL POINT: STOPPING THE EXPANSION OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM; SEES IT EMERGING FROM MARSHALL'S CALIFORNIA SPEECHES

(By Mark Sullivan)

During 2 weeks beginning about the middle of March, our country passed through the most momentous change in its foreign policy in its history. It is comparable to the Monroe Doctrine, adopted in 1823, but immensely larger. The Monroe Doctrine applied only to the Western Hemisphere, while the new policy applies to the whole world.

Many of our people rightly wish to know just what this new policy is. While it was in process of revealing itself, a public man so able and conscientious as Senator BALDWIN, of Connecticut, said: "The people are entitled to know the full and unvarnished facts about the situation." * * * What is needed really is not the separate facts as they emerge in different parts of the world, but the sum of them in their relation to each other and to the whole.

RESISTANCE TO COMMUNISM

Central in the new policy is that the aggressive expansion of Russian Communism in the world shall have a stopping place and be checked. We accept this as cardinal doctrine and we undertake responsibility for world leadership in resistance.

We have decided that if further areas come under Russian control, the security of the non-Russian countries and world peace would be in immediate and extreme jeopardy. We have decided that we will not stand by while country after country is taken over separately as Czechoslovakia was, or as Italy has been threatened with being. We have decided that we will not merely help individual countries save themselves; we will stand back of them as a group and we will aid and encourage them in grouping together for resistance. The documentary statement of this part of our new policy is, among other sources, in the two speeches of Marshall in California, March 19 and 20. The essential words are "the United States cannot * * * see the other free nations be destroyed one by one."

The dynamic part of our new doctrine is that we will give concrete help to countries immediately threatened, and to those potentially threatened, and to those who aline themselves in resistance to the Russian Communist drive. We have decided that with the complete agreement of these other countries, indeed by their request, we must, because of

our relative strength, supply moral, material, and strategic leadership. We have decided that we must mobilize our own resources to stop the process of engulfment even if it means meeting force with force.

On the same day on which President Truman made to Congress the formal declaration of the new policy, March 17, a military pact was being signed in Belgium by five European nations—Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg. About this military pact the President said: "This development deserves our full support. I am confident that the United States will by appropriate means extend to the free nations the support which the situation requires. I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help to do so." The omission of mention of military force in this declaration by President Truman was a deliberately careful avoidance of provocative or exciting language. It is part of our new policy that if the threat of Russian communism to these European nations takes the form of military aggression, we will give military help.

The reason for the new policy no longer needs saying. For over 2 years following the end of the war, we had a cherished policy, held to by our Government and people completely and with almost evangelistic heartiness. It was that there should be one world, dedicated to peace, with Russia cooperating and having appropriate power in it. But the Russian Communist heads made it plain that Russia did not believe in cooperation and would not practice it; that they did not believe in one world except that it be a Communist world. Realization of that forced the new policy on us. Never was a policy arrived at more reluctantly.

DECISIONS OF TRIESTE

Once our heads recognized that the new policy must be, they were resolute in laying it out and prompt in acting upon it. An early step in it was action to restore Trieste to Italy, to the end that the Italian people be encouraged to reject communism in the election on April 18. Our new policy is determined that Italy shall not be taken over by communism and that we will take any step, however drastic, necessary to enable the Italian Government and people to resist.

Formulation of the new policy, and making it concrete in a world-wide, over-all strategic concept, was the work of many minds. The most directly responsible of them were members of a new and comparatively little noticed body but one extremely important in international policy. This is the National Security Council, set up at the time of the reorganization of the armed forces last July. It is composed of the President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Secretaries of the three armed service departments, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Various actions of Congress have approved separate parts of the new policy, and the policy as a whole is now firm American doctrine.

Palestine Partition Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lowell Mellett:

ON THE OTHER HAND
(By Lowell Mellett)

When the United Nations convenes in a special assembly on Friday, strangers in the visitors' gallery should be able to pick out the representatives of the United States of America by the color of their faces. Their faces will be, or should be, red.

The American representatives will occupy a humiliating position, humiliating to themselves and to the great country for which they undertake to speak. They will have come to argue that the world organization should crawl before the threats of a group of small Arab countries and reverse itself on a decision made a little more than 4 months ago. This decision, the partition plan for Palestine, was reached in large part because of the public and private urging of these same American representatives.

On orders from Washington the American delegation back in November worked day and night in the Assembly chamber and in hotel rooms to line up a majority of the nations for the partition plan—the only plan that seemed to contain the elements of justice and practicality. They were completely successful. Even the Soviet Union agreed.

Now, on a change of orders from Washington, the embarrassed Americans must undertake to undo one of the truly constructive jobs thus far accomplished within the UN. This of itself would contain no cause for humiliation if anything had happened to reveal that the original action was unwise, unfair, or in any way improper. But nothing of that kind has happened.

The Arab countries, to be sure, have declared they will not accept the authority of the UN, of which some of them are members; that they propose to keep on killing off the Jews and nobody can stop them. But no great power—certainly not one that professes itself prepared to "contain" Russian aggression wherever it may show itself—could be expected to capitulate to such threats and ask the rest of the world to join in the capitulation.

To replace the partition plan, the American Government will suggest a trusteeship under the UN. This is acceptable to neither the Arabs nor the Jews. For one thing, there is no reason to believe that it can be made to work or can even be set up before the date of May 15, when Great Britain is due to relinquish her Palestine mandate. For another, it is flagrant afront to both the Jews and the Arabs.

"It certainly seems to imply," said Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, Australian Foreign Minister, "that the peoples to be placed under trusteeship are not sufficiently advanced for self-government. Such a suggestion would seem to be untenable in relation either to the Palestinian Arabs or to the Palestinian Jews."

If it seems that way to the Australian statesman, it is easy to understand how it seems to the Jews and the Arabs. The Jews have reason for pride in the capacities they have shown in developing their corner of Palestine. The Arabs could take pride in their ability to throw a great power, such as the United States, off its stride. Both can feel they are capable of governing themselves. In any case, both are dead set against the trusteeship idea, and that means double trouble if the plan is forced on them.

The United States is engaged in a series of brave adventures—all part, presumably, of a concerted whole—to win the world to our concept of democracy. What doth it profit us that we gain the whole world and lose our own soul? has long been asked. An even more devastating question, however, is raised by this proposed abandonment of our self-respect. It is: What will it profit us if we lose our own soul and yet fail to gain the whole world? That is one risk we should not even calculate.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an essay written by one of my constitutents, Marlyn Hitchcock, of Newark, Ohio, who is one of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

It was my privilege to personally congratulate Miss Hitchcock on being one of the winners and upon her achievement, and I respectfully urge the membership of the House of Representatives to read her essay. I also compliment the American Legion of Ohio for sponsoring such a worth-while program and for bringing these winners as their guests to the greatest capital of the world.

The essay follows:

The United Nations was formed 2 years ago. Its purpose was to maintain international peace and security, to protect and expand human freedom, and to promote human welfare.

The United Nations General Assemby has been called the town meeting of the world. In it, the United Nations member nations, great and small, have equal votes.

Under the United Nations Charter, the Assembly can only discuss world problems and recommend action to the Security Council. The power to act is held by the Council alone. Any one of the Big Five: Russia, Great Britain, France, China, or the United States—using the veto power, can undo any work that has been accomplished.

So far, the UN, in many peoples' estimation, has been nearly a complete failure. However, we must remember our own Government was formed in almost the same way.

Some of the problems discussed by the UN are: the control of the atom bomb, reduction of world armaments, controls over armaments, setting up an international police force, and reduction of the number of troops in former enemy countries. It works on small problems, as well as big problems. So far no agreements have been reached because they cannot agree on any matter. Russia, using her veto power, has blocked many large issues.

So, as Americans realized during the Revolution that a national government binding all States was necessary for the future security of their country, we of the world must realize the structure of the United Nations Charter must be changed, and a world police force maintained to enforce laws.

First, it seems to me, the absolute veto power of the five big powers must be curtailed. A three-fourths majority vote should pass all decisions.

Second, we must have world laws and a world police force to see that they are obeyed. World laws could act in the same manner as our own Federal and State governments. The world government should deal entirely with matters pertaining to world peace and security. Such questions as the disposal of the atom bomb must be settled if our civilization is to exist.

All countries must be allowed to join the UN, if they will cooperate, and each must be assured of peace and security, with free elections in its own country.

A world-wide broadcasting station could help much by broadcasting to all the world each meeting, and by explaining why each amendment is being formed. It could well be used by the United Nations to promote a feeling of friendliness toward each other of the peoples throughout the world.

A student-exchange program would help the people of the world to know each other better. By this, I mean students from the United States would go abroad, and foreign students would come to the United States.

Through toil and strife our own great country has emerged triumphant. I think that, in spite of friction and much argument, the member nations of the UN are determined and will find a real peace.

The New Dealers Had a Way of Their Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some may remember the way the New Dealers tried to silence their political opponents. They began with the smear through their stooges in radio and press, and they ended up with persecutions by Federal paid aides. Some remember how the Washington Post, through its stooge, Dillard Stokes, using his aliases, induced New Deal opponents and individuals who were anti-Semitic to send him letters and communications from various parts of the country.

The letters and articles forwarded to Stokes were not necessarily seditious, but they were decidedly anti-New Deal, and a few of the writers were violently anti-Semitic.

While neither viewpoint was a crime, the Washington Post, the New Deal administration, acting through one Redden who, it is said, is now serving a Congressional Committee in a legal capacity, and one William Power Maloney, later convicted of either being drunk and disorderly or of an assault-and-battery charge, and roundly condemned by the United States Supreme Court in a printed opinion, caused some 30 defendants to be indicted here in Washington. A few of those defendants had previously been convicted of some criminal offense. The others were guilty of nothing more than opposition to the New Deal and to certain racial groups.

As some of us remember, a desperate effort was made to drag some Congressmen through the mud, and in that procedure the Washington Post, Stokes, and Maloney were quite successful. Their efforts to convict anyone of a crime failed miserably because there was no basis for the charge made.

The viciousness, the unfairness, the injustice of the whole procedure, was, after a couple of years, fruitless effort to convict, so apparent, that even the Washington Post, which had instigated the whole thing, felt called upon to apologize publicly for the proceedings. The cases were dismissed, but not until a number of innocent citizens had been financially ruined, some 10 or more lawyers appointed by the Court, compelled to serve two or more years without compensation defending the accused.

The Canadians seem to have met a similar situation with less delay. A comparison of the two procedures is outlined in an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 10, entitled "Canadian and American Justice," which reads as follows:

CANADIAN AND AMERICAN JUSTICE

The trial of three persons charged with conspiracy to libel the Alberta government ended before it properly began, thanks to the vigorous action of Justice J. Boyd McBride.

The three defendants live in Ontario, 2,000 miles and more from Edmonton, Alberta, where the trial was held. Dr. Charlotte Whitton made a study of the child-welfare and adoption practices in Alberta. Harold Dingman used the report as the basis for an article entitled "Babies for Export." Jack Kent Cooke is the publisher of New Liberty magazine in which Dingman's article appeared.

The crime of libel on government is as old in English law as the printing press. Mayor Thompson tried to make it the law of the United States in his $10,000,000 libel suit on behalf of the city of Chicago against the Tribune. His scheme was defeated by Judge Harry Fisher, sustained by the Illinois Supreme Court in 1923.

It is very easy for Americans to look down their noses at the Canadian brethren for adhering to an ancient, tyrannous device for protecting corruption in high places. Americans, however, had best not make too much of the contrast between our institutions and those across the border, for in some other aspects of the present case, Canadian practices compare favorably with ours.

A score of men and women were dragged from their homes during the war to stand trial for seditious conspiracy in Washington. These people lived in widely scattered parts of the country. They had little in common except that most of them were crackpots, many of them were anti-Semites, almost all of them wished this country to stay out of war, all but three or four of them were so poor that they could not afford to hire lawyers, and all of them held Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal in very low esteem.

The Attorney General of the United States had this strangely assorted group indicted. Then, months later, after his original indictments had been punched full of holes, he had the defendants reindicted. They were eventually tried on a third indictment, but the old charges were allowed to stand as an additional threat. The trial dragged on for nearly 8 months. Some of the victims when in Washington were farther from their homes than Edmonton is from Toronto.

The judge died, quite possibly of shame at the part he had been playing in this travesty of justice. That meant a mistrial and a chance to dismiss the proceedings, but the Government even then persisted and only dropped the case when the courts refused to waste any more time on the farce.

There is nothing in this record for Canadians to regard with envy. In Washington, as in Edmonton, the crime alleged was the secondary one of conspiracy. On this theory in both cases, the defendants were forced to trial in unfriendly surroundings. This was particularly true in the sedition trial which was conducted in a capital city filled with pay rollers dependent upon the administration.

The Canadian judge, shocked by the attempt of the prosecution to switch indictments at the last moment, dismissed his case without further scandal. The American judge allowed the trial to go on. If there is little to choose between the behavior of the respective prosecutors, there can be no doubt that the conduct of the Canadian judge was vastly more commendable.

Both cases emphasize the abuse of the indictment for conspiracy. It is high time that the subject were reexamined by lawyers and legislators with a view to correcting manifest injustices.

Mrs. Robert A. Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malvina Stephenson, from the Washington Sunday Star of April 11, 1948:

MRS. ROBERT A. TAFT

(By Malvina Stephenson)

Brown-eyed Martha Taft, who's in the thick of the Presidential campaign, says she finds "less and less prejudice" against a candidate's wife being politically active and outspoken.

Political strategy, prompted largely by the controversial public activities of Mrs. Roosevelt, has tended to keep the wives of Presidential aspirants quietly on the domestic side, but Mrs. Robert A. Taft's popularity should lead to a reversal of this procedure.

Mrs. Taft, of course, does not present herself as an independent figure with special causes. Her accent is entirely on her husband, projecting his position and his personality in a sympathetic light.

If asked to comment on the White House policies of Mrs. Roosevelt or Mrs. Truman, the wife of the Ohio Senator will respond something like this: "I think that the first lady, and all other ladies, should do what is natural for them, what they're interested in. If they are married, naturally, they should aid their husbands."

If Mrs. Taft should move into 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the Nation probably would once more hear something from its first lady. However, she would make her role secondary and leave all leadership to her husband.

As a candidate's wife, Mrs. Taft is doing whatever she can to "help most." This has called for accompanying her husband on many of his trips, making frequent speeches, and just winning friends in general. Recently, for example, she was the first woman ever invited to appear on the radio program, Meet the Press.

The broadcast brought a flood of favorable mail from listeners all over the Nation. "A few were converted," Mrs. Taft observes modestly, "and that's always very pleasing."

According to all reports, Mrs. Taft has converted a good many persons to her husband's candidacy. If she had to sell her husband in a few words, she says she would emphasize his "courage, frankness, honesty, and, of course, his ability."

Then she adds brightly, "there's no use to be frank, if you don't know what you're doing."

Mrs. Taft thinks her husband's least understood quality is his ability to get along with people. This, she says, has been demonstrated by "his part" in the Senate leadership that has led to legislative agreements harmonizing so many different viewpoints.

Although Senator TAFT appreciates his wife's anecdotes, he does not go in for story-

telling in his speeches. "You just can't make him do something because other people do it," Mrs. Taft smilingly says.

However, the Senator does have a dry sense of humor, according to his wife, and he is quick with witty come-backs.

Senator and Mrs. Taft generally see eye-to-eye on major questions, largely she thinks, because of their common background. He often consults his wife and she does not hesitate to raise her questions. For instance, there was the time the Senator gave Mrs. Taft a preview of his speech criticizing the Nuernberg trials.

"When he had finished I said, 'Bob, that's going to be very unpopular,'" she reported later. "And he responded, 'I know it, but I believe it so strongly, I'd be ashamed of myself if I didn't say it.'"

Mrs. Taft often stresses her husband's courage. She reminds her audiences that the Senator could have had an easy berth as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, but instead he chose to tackle the Labor Committee because he thought the country desperately needed some new labor legislation. At this point, Mrs. Taft is ready to answer critics of the Taft-Hartley law.

Relaxing from heavy political thinking, Senator and Mrs. Taft share a common interest in such recreation as fishing and good music. A family songfest is not unusual, and occasionally Senator TAFT will sit at the piano and play a selection from his limited musical repertoire.

"All he really remembers is a noisy piece called 'The Storm,'" Mrs. Taft explains, "and it's simply terrible."

Politics comes naturally for Martha Bowers Taft. She has heard it all her life. Her father, a lawyer, first in Minnesota, then Chicago, served as solicitor general in Washington, and she was courted by BOB TAFT while his father was in the White House.

Marriage to young Taft in 1914 took her to Cincinnati, where as a lawyer's wife she continued to show an active interest in public affairs. She was the founder of the Cincinnati League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Taft can't remember when she first started making speeches, but her oratorical ability began to receive considerable attention in her husband's race for the United States Senate. In 1940 she moved into the glare of the national spotlight during the Senator's campaign for the Republican nomination.

Mrs. Taft stands 5 feet 6, has light-brown hair brushed with gray and is pleasantly plump. A male correspondent in Washington pointed out that her grasp of politics and capacity for witty analysis is concealed by her resemblance to all cheerful and quiet housewives.

Mrs. Taft, of course, will be standing by her husband at the Philadelphia convention, and she expects at least two of their four sons to be there, too.

But she characteristically minimizes the role she will play. She says, "I'll just stay at our headquarters and do whatever I'm asked."

Oregon Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Oregon.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws, as compiled by David King, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 513 Couch Building, 429 Southwest 4th Avenue, Portland, Oreg., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for burial of indigent veterans, their wives or widows and minor children, after 1 year's residence in the State and 3 months' residence in the county from which such benefits are requested.

The Lincoln Memorial Cemetery in Portland has been enlarged and is to be maintained as a national cemetery for veterans when accepted as such by the Federal Government.

The State has purchased a burial plot for veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator may be appointed by the court having proper probate jurisdiction for persons absent, interred, etc., in the armed forces.

Acknowledgement is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Certificates of vital records for certain purposes are furnished to war veterans free of charge.

The Adjutant General is required to furnish certified abstracts or copies of records and documents in his office, without charge, to veterans for use in establishing claims against the United States.

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge by county clerks or recorders of conveyances.

County service officers may be appointed by county courts to assist veterans and their dependents.

An office of Director of Veterans' Affairs has been set up to assist veterans and their dependents. Duties of the old War Veterans' Service Committee are taken over by the Director under this act.

The Adjutant General is required to assist veterans with claims against the United States for pensions, bounties, etc.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Credit is given toward internship for service as a commissioned officer in the medical corps of any branch of the armed forces in taking an examination for license to practice medicine and surgery.

Educational aid amounting to $35 a month for each month of service after 6 months' active duty between September 15, 1940, and December 31, 1946, is extended to veterans of World War II. Funds may be used in public or private schools or colleges.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leaves of absence are granted to State and local officers and employees in the military service.

Preference is granted to veterans under State or municipal civil service examinations.

Preference is extended to war veterans in State and local units, and on public works, where qualified.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Probationary teachers who entered the armed service accumulated teaching credit while absent but are not placed on the permanently employed list.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

No right, payment of proceeds of any loan under the Veterans' State Aid Act shall be subject to attachment or execution nor assignable.

Pensions received from the United States, or any State or any organization are exempt from attachment, execution, etc.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

"War veteran" includes those engaged in active service in any war, including the period between September 15, 1940, and December 8, 1941.

GUARDIANSHIP

Notice is given to a department or bureau of the United States charged with the payment of compensation, insurance, pension, or other benefit of certain proceedings under the law on guardian or ward.

HOMES

The transfer of the State Soldier's Home to the Federal Government is authorized and provides for the care of soldiers ineligible to enter the Federal home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Veterans may be admitted to the State tuberculosis hospital.

Provision has been made for commitment and transfer of insane veterans to Veterans' Administration hospitals, and chief officers thereof have been given certain powers relating to retention, transfer, etc., of such veterans. Commitments to in-State hospitals by out-of-State courts are recognized.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Cooperation with the United States in the settlement of veterans and their widows on State and other lands suitable for agricultural purposes is provided.

A war veterans' fund has been established to purchase farms and homes for veterans. Applications for loans not exceeding $3,000 for the acquisition of farms and homes may be made to the Director of Veterans' Affairs.

Veterans are to be considered preferred purchasers of water and water rights and lands developed under irrigation projects.

MARRIAGE

Examination and certification of applicants for marriage licenses by medical officers of the armed services is permitted.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Cities and towns may levy taxes or issue bonds to purchase sites and erect and maintain community houses for the benefit of soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Certain cities may erect memorial buildings in public parks for the use of war veterans or to acquire property for such buildings, either within or without the corporate limits of the city.

Counties may appropriate certain money for the erection of a museum for pioneer relics and/or a meeting place for war veterans.

Counties may erect memorial buildings for use as clubrooms and meeting places for servicemen and veterans.

The county courts of the several counties are authorized to pay out not exceeding $25,000 for memorial monuments, arches or buildings, to be used as clubs or meeting places to the memory of soldiers, sailors, or marines who served in any war.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

The valor fund committee is authorized to place the names and citations of war veterans in the State capitol building.

"War veteran" includes men now in military service and those discharged between September 15, 1940 and December 8, 1941.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, trust companies, and savings and loan associations may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Care and financial aid are extended to World War I veterans.

Certain receipts from the Boxing Commission to be used for charitable purposes are distributed among recognized veterans' organizations.

County aid is extended to indigent veterans, their widows and minor children, through veterans' organizations.

Placement of veterans, as nearly as possible, on the same economic equality as those who remained at home has been declared to be the policy of the State.

A committee on postwar readjustment and development has been created with specified powers.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Disabled veterans are entitled to hunting and fishing licenses at nominal fee.

Hunting and fishing licenses are issued to nonresident members of the armed forces at the same fee required for residents.

Certain commercial fishing licenses may be renewed following discharge from the armed forces.

Gifts to veterans' organizations are allowed as deductions in computing net gifts.

A deduction of $3,000, in addition to other personal exemptions, is extended on income or intangibles tax while in the armed forces.

Payment of annual State bar fees is exempted during military service.

Professional land surveyors are registered after discharge from service in the armed forces.

Professional and trade licenses are renewed within 60 days following military service without payment of the then current license fee.

Property owned by disabled veterans and their unmarried widows to the extent of $1,000 of the taxable value is exempt from taxation but is not allowed where the veteran receives a pension or disability compensation aggregating more than $1,500.

An additional $500 exemption on homesteads is provided to unmarried widows of veterans of the Civil or Spanish-American Wars.

UNIFORMS, ETC.

Veterans are exempt from the prohibition as to the use and wearing of the insignia, uniforms, etc., of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

Inmates of any veterans' or soldiers' home are exempt from the prohibition as to wearing of the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Provision has been made for State publication of the proceedings of the annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Spanish War Veterans.

Unauthorized wearing or use of registered insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor, punishable by fine not to exceed $100 or imprisonment for a period not to exceed 60 days.

Counties and cities are authorized to provide for meeting places for veterans' organizations in memorial buildings.

Meeting places are available to veterans' organizations in armories, courthouses, or other public buildings.

Much of the above-mentioned legislation has been enacted by the Oregon Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time the DAV has some 27 chapters throughout the State, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to this State-wide service, the DAV has three full-time national service officers, under the direction of Lile Dailey, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Portland, Oreg.

These DAV experts render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before Jan. 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV, and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The National Service Headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department of legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nationwide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turnover record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous

occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or who have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War II myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Why Yellow Margarine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 26, the margarine bill will come up for discussion and disposition. There is a great deal of misunderstanding as to what this bill means. This bill does not, and cannot, affect State barriers and State taxes against margarine. That is the business of State legislatures. This bill, if passed, will remove one-fourth of a cent a pound Federal tax on margarine. Surely that isn't worth quarreling about.

However, the bill goes much further, and removes the 10-cent Federal tax on colored margarine. This 10-cent Federal tax was put on margarine to prevent fraud and deception. It was put on to prevent margarine from stealing the color—the trade-mark—of butter, which is yellow. Just why Congress should make it easy for some people to pawn off margarine for butter on an unsuspecting public is more than I can understand.

I realize that some people wish to deceive themselves. They are willing to eat margarine if it looks like butter. These people do not know, however, that they are helping some restaurants and hotels to deceive the public by serving margarine in place of butter.

Just why margarine should want to parade in a yellow dress, rather than in its own beautiful white garment, I cannot understand. I am told it is afraid it might be mistaken for lard. Well, worse things than that could happen to margarine. As one, who, during his pioneer life, used lard as butter, I can see no great harm even if margarine be mistaken for lard.

Be that as it may, if margarine does not like its white color, then I am sure the dairy people have no objection to margarine being colored green, pink, red or any other color, just so it does not help practice deception upon the people, by stealing the natural color of butter—yellow—the trade-mark of butter.

Few people know how far this deception has been practiced, and the public fooled. Recently there appeared in the Washington Star a communication which clearly sets forth the facts. Here is the article:

MARGARINE AND COLORING

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The yearly tempest in a teapot about the margarine tax is again with us. Why they don't let this political football die, is beyond me. The tax is one-quarter of a cent a pound. Now what difference does this tax make to any one? Its purpose is merely to help to pay for inspection by the Department of Agriculture. The 10-cent tax on colored margarine should be repealed; yes, and the manufacture of this coloring should be forbidden by law.

In 1944, during the shortages and rationing, I was employed in a large chain store on Miami Beach. We had large quantities of colored margarine from time to time. This margarine usually was wrapped in plain paper and was sold to the unsuspecting public as roll butter at blackmarket prices, both with and without ration points. This practice was prevalent throughout the area.

ANDREW W. LARMAN.

The Grand Canyon Is in Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, leave has been granted me today to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement which I have just received from Mr. J. T. Poling, secretary-manager of Greater Arizona, Inc., Phoenix, Ariz. Preceding that inclusion, I would like to make a brief explanation.

It is universally conceded that the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River in northern Arizona is the sublimest natural feature and phenomenon on earth. It is listed as one of the seven natural marvels of this planet. In its class it has no peer. Certainly it has no superior.

What amazes me is that I find occasionally an educated person who does not know the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River is in the State of Arizona. Such ignorance is inexcusable, and it is hardly plausible for such a one to have the idea that it is in the State of Colorado. It is true that some of the neighboring States would like to claim this great natural feature and would move it out of Arizona if they could. We don't mind any of our neighboring States advertising the Grand Canyon for us, if they give Arizona proper credit. When a great exposition was held in Los Angeles more than a quarter of a century ago, in one of the exposition buildings were displayed some huge pictures under the general title of "scenes in and around Los Angeles." The Grand Canyon of the Colorado River in Arizona was one of these pictures. Personally, I think the Santa Fe Railroad shows good business judgment in its advertising of the Grand Canyon and even going so far as to label their great transcontinental railroad "The Grand Canyon Route."

I would have the Park Service advertise the Grand Canyon National Park very extensively, for there is nothing on earth to compare with it, and there is no reason why more millions of Americans should not be awed by this stupendous spectacle. It is advertised in many ways, but in some of those ways its location is not made certain. Twice on Easter Sunday I have been present at the awe-inspiring, deeply moving sunrise Easter service on the brink of the Grand Canyon. Such services are broadcast not only by national networks but by short-wave transmission throughout the world. Some of the greatest spiritual leaders of our time officiate at these Easter services, and for years millions in all parts of the globe have participated in these Easter sunrise services. If time permitted I would like to give credit to local participants.

I have carefully read the statement from Secretary Poling which follows, and I have been indignant because of two things. First, that there are otherwise well-informed persons who do not know about the location of this great natural phenomenon, the Grand Canyon, and second, and more to the point, that an agency of our Government is so pinched with false economy as to lack sufficient means of advertising to appeal to our traveling public. This latter deficiency can and ought to be quickly remedied. Secretary Poling's statement follows:

NO GRAND CANYON PUBLICITY

Next to our climate, the greatest attractions Arizona has to offer the tourist are our 16 national monuments and parks. Leading this list in popularity and attendance for years is the Grand Canyon National Park.

In spite of the advertising and publicity accorded this greatest of world wonders, there are thousands of citizens of these United States doubtful as to the actual location of the Grand Canyon. Daily, and at the most inopportune moments, the park is relegated by voice and written word to other States.

It was stated today that Greater Arizona, Inc., has written on numerous occasions to speakers, writers, and magazine editors calling their attention to this discrimination. On Tuesday, March 31, over a national radio hook-up the moderator, George B. Denny, Jr., of Town Hall, in introducing Dr. Daniel Poling as an affirmative speaker in the universal military training discussion stated that Dr. Poling had recently returned from the Grand Canyon in Colorado where he had conducted the Easter sunrise services.

"More serious than that—of misrepresenting the location of our Grand Canyon—is the appalling discovery that hundreds of letters from tourist agencies, automobile clubs, chambers of commerce, and other requests for literature on the Grand Canyon are ignored and unanswered by the National Park Service," said J. T. Poling, manager of Greater Arizona, Inc.

"Why? Simply because the Park Service has no literature and even lacks postage to mail the literature if it were available. The frank mailing privileges as well as printed

material on the Nation's greatest wonder has been so drastically curtailed that it seriously affects the tourist industry to our State. If the eastern tourist has been misled as to the actual location of our Grand Canyon and cannot get any information from the Park Service about the canyon, he will forget Arizona and the Grand Canyon and spend his vacation in Maine or Michigan, Canada or Mexico," said Poling.

Greater Arizona is taking up this serious condition facing Arizona's tourist industry with our Washington delegation and the Department of Interior.

Tourists visiting Grand Canyon National Park in March numbered 26,110 compared with 27,111 in March 1947.

Attendance for the travel year, which began October 1, totals 137,421, well ahead of the 126,203 in the like period of the previous year.

Forgotten Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the millions who served in the armed forces not only deserve the highest commendation for service to their country but the various States have sought to recognize this service by giving a token in the way of bonus. The State of Ohio and many others have voted legislation recognizing these services by granting bonuses to World War II veterans.

While most of the States have so remembered veterans of the recent war, the Congress of the United States has failed to remember those veterans for whom it is the legislative body and the only one who might remember them.

Mr Speaker, I mean residents of the District of Columbia who served as World War II veterans and on their behalf I want to include the radio comment of George E Reedy, Station WOL here in Washington:

Occasionally, the peculiar set-up of the District's government, operates to create an injustice. This seems to be the situation in the case of veterans whose homes, before and after the late war, were in the Nation's Capitol.

Their difficulty is simply that there is no one to look after them—except the Federal Government. And in their case, it is a Federal Government in which they have no representation. In other words, they cannot vote.

Veterans returning to their homes in other areas, found grateful State governments, ready to receive them with open arms. They were voted benefits and bonuses over and above those granted by Congress to all ex-GI's.

But nothing similar happened in the District of Columbia, nor could anything similar happen. For here, there is not even a city council to ask whether something could be done—for the men who left their homes to defend their country against an enemy.

Representative WALTER E. BREHM, of Ohio, has finally stepped into the breach. He has introduced a bill, which would give a bonus to the District's veterans. The amount of the bonus, would depend upon a man's length of service and where it was spent.

Under the bill, a veteran would be entitled to $10 for every month in the United States that he spent in the armed services. For every month spent overseas, he would be entitled to $15. A ceiling of $400, would be the total he would be allowed.

It would be overoptimistic to say that the chances for passage of this bill is good. As I said before, it is a measure to do something for men who have no votes.

But it should be said that the measure is entitled to careful consideration. Many States have already enacted similar legislation. It is harsh to say that the same thing cannot be done for men who live in Washington, D. C.

There is more involved than the simple question of being grateful to war veterans. That gratitude should be translated into something solid and concrete. At the moment a bonus would be far more than just a wind-fall of money.

Everyone today is faced with a host of difficult problems. Prices keep rising—even though they have already out-stripped the income of a large section of the population. It all means that it is increasingly hard to get along.

To the veteran these problems have an especially rough impact. He is struggling to make up for the long years that were taken out of his civilian career. It is not easy, as any of the men and women who wore the uniform can tell you.

They are trying to compete with people who were able to keep their businesses and their jobs while the war was on. Breaking into that kind of competition at this late date is tough—unless they get some kind of a boost.

The $400 proposed by Representative BREHM may not seem like too much money to a Congress accustomed to dealing in billions. It is probably far from a staggering sum even when multiplied by the number of eligible veterans.

But it might make the difference between success or failure to many a man striving hard to forget the war years and become a civilian again. At least this measure should not be buried without some very careful consideration.

Truman's Rare Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my own remarks, I am including an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of March 31, 1948, entitled "Truman's Rare Courage."

This editorial might also be entitled "An Editor's Rare Courage," for no one could say that the Post-Gazette is a Democratic paper. I think the editor rises to great heights in his effort to be fair to the man sitting in the White House, who has the most difficult job in the world. It makes me feel proud that I live near Pittsburgh, where such an appraisal can be made without political bias. It is probably not just the type of editorial a Democratic newspaper would have printed, but it is written from an objective viewpoint and is well worth the perusal of every citizen. The editor is to be complimented for his fairness.

TRUMAN'S RARE COURAGE

President Truman is said to be telling intimates he doesn't much care whether or not he returns to the White House in 1949. On the other hand, the President told his last news conference that he's in the race to stay and expects to win it. Whatever his personal desires, Mr. Truman's public actions would certainly indicate a lack of concern for his own future.

The ordinary garden variety of politician, which Mr. Truman is often accused of being, would avoid the moves the President has made in an election year and earlier. As a vote getter, the President is giving one of the most inept performances in the country's history. But is that a proper basis upon which to judge him? We believe not. Suppose we examine the record briefly.

Mr. Truman has twice vetoed an income-tax-reduction bill and is expected within a matter of days to do it again, although it is elementary that an office seeker should support tax-reduction measures in an election year.

At great risk to his own future and that of his party, Mr. Truman has reversed his stand on Palestine. That is expected to cost him valuable support in key political cities like New York.

Prior to stirring up that particular hornet's nest, the President boldly announced a civil-rights program which shook the South to its last magnolia blossom. Nor does he show any sign of backing down. Apparently, the President would rather stand for what he believes is right than to be returned to the White House.

Going back further, the President vetoed the Taft-Hartley labor law, which had the backing of a majority of the American people. This action alienated followers in nearly every camp but that of organized labor and the extreme left.

And on St. Patrick's Day, Mr. Truman took care of the leftists. He told a New York City audience: "I do not want and will not accept the political support of Henry Wallace and his Communists. If joining them or permitting them to join me is the price of victory, I recommend defeat. These are days of high prices for everything. But any price for Wallace and his Communists is too much for me to pay."

On still another front the President has gone counter to purely political maneuvering. His appeal to Congress for preparation against aggression calls for prompt passage of the European recovery program, enactment of universal military training and a resumption of selective service. The draft and UMT are hardly calculated to endear the Chief Executive to much of the electorate. Nor do tax-ridden Americans relish additional expenditures for preparedness and foreign aid.

These things do not have the sound of a man who puts personal political considerations above what he feels is best for the country. On the contrary, they have brought down around his ears the most unbridled abuse.

Call Harry Truman inept, to which his record on domestic economic affairs bears painful witness. Make jokes about his piano playing, his uninspiring radio personality, his sulky cap, some of his advisers, and the back porch he put on the White House. But don't in the face of the President's record, damn his simple honesty or his manifest political courage.

It is not inconceivable that Mr. Truman, realizing that his chances of election are pretty well shot, has determined that if his days in the White House are to be few, they might as well be noted as a time in which the occupant spoke his mind at all costs.

There is no quality more admired by the American people than courage. They have more respect for the man who goes down fighting for what he believes is right than

for the opportunist who hangs on through expediency.

If in the next few months Mr. Truman continues to show the sort of courage implicit in his recent public statements, he may win back support of important segments of his party plus that of many independent voters. Indeed, if there is any hope for the Democratic Party at this late hour of its deterioration, it depends largely upon the courage shown by its badgered leader in the White House.

Current Problems Pending Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I made over Station WWJ, in Detroit, Mich., on Monday, April 12, 1948:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Detroit area, it was on March 15 that I last discussed over the excellent facilities of Station WWJ the then current problems pending before the Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

It was just 2 days later—March 17, St. Patrick's Day—that the President in an eleventh-hour scheduled appearance addressed a joint session of the House and Senate and reported on the critical conditions in Europe. He recommended to the Congress the speedy enactment into law of a far-reaching program which included a draft law, universal military training, and the European recovery program.

It was a solemn occasion and the gravity of the situation was apparent to all who were present as well as to the radio listeners. The sincerity and earnestness with which the President delivered his message left no doubt that a great emergency was again confronting our country.

THE EUROPEAN SITUATION

He laid particular stress on the speedy enactment into law of the European recovery program, better known as the Marshall plan as a foundation of our policy of assistance to the free nations of Europe and urged its prompt enactment, as the most telling contribution our Nation could make toward the cause of peace.

His words were heard around the world and kindled new sparks of hope in the hearts of millions who have been clinging by mere threads to the cherished ideals and principles of their forefathers. These millions live in 16 countries within the shadow of the iron curtain—daily living in fear that that curtain will engulf their homelands. These are not fancied fears. They have but to look at what was once the legitimate boundaries of the happy, prosperous and freedom-loving people of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. Just a few days ago Finland bowed to Russia and signed a 10-year mutual-aid pact. It is true that Russia pledged herself not to interfere with the internal affairs of Finland. But that is but a scrap of paper to the man in Kremlin who has broken 47 treaties in the space of a few years.

It is no secret that Soviet Russia has designs on Norway, Greece, Turkey, China, and Italy, as well as the domination of Berlin and—for that matter—all of Germany.

On April 18 a national election of the utmost importance will be held in Italy where every effort is being made by the Communists to intimidate and coerce the voters and rig the election. If the Italian people vote the iron curtain for that nation our international situation will become acute. The incidents now occurring are being observed by the entire world and the result of the election will have a far-reaching effect upon the future of the still free countries of western Europe.

As to the Berlin and German situation, it is indeed regrettable that the countries who fought side by side and conquered Germany, cannot now cooperate in governing within specified zones the people they conquered.

The ultimate goal of Soviet Russia is the complete and final domination by the Communists of the entire world, and was laid down by Lenin long ago. That to some appears to be a big order, but Soviet Russia has a world-wide organization. It is estimated that in 57 countries there are 19,000,000 Communists ready and willing to bare their breasts for the final conflict. The fact that they are greatly outnumbered does not alarm them because the boast that approximately 150,000 Bolshevists conquered 150,000,000 Russians. Their strength does not lie in their numbers but in well-laid plans and the precision methods with which they execute them. Their leaders are trained, cunning, and crafty individuals who worm their way by one means or another into key positions in units of government, labor organizations, or for that matter any group—be it large or small—and then, before the unwary realize it there has been put into operation the master plan for that particular offensive which was blueprinted in the Kremlin.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

The Congress responded splendidly to the President's dynamic appeal and by an overwhelming vote passed the Marshall plan. The speed with which this legislation was enacted into law was brought about by the fact that Members of Congress were deluged with letters and telegrams by an awakened America. It was quite evident from the contents of the messages that poured into my office that the people of America were determined to battle for peace with the same vigor and all-out effort with which we had successfully waged victorious wars in the past. It was with that determination that the law was enacted and as one of the results, Stalin will shortly learn he has lost three of his greatest allies, namely: hunger, poverty, and despair.

It follows that as soon as the benefits of the Marshall plan are in full force, this present cold war will stop, because the false propaganda of Russia will fall upon deaf ears. In reality it is a program to wage war for peace—by peaceful and humane methods. That is why Russia and her stooges in America have been fighting the Marshall plan.

Briefly the Marshall plan provides for the conditioned participation of the United States in a program of foreign assistance that covers (1) European recovery, (2) a continuation of assistance to the international children's emergency fund, (3) military-type aid to Greece, Turkey, and China, and (4) economic aid to China. It is intended, if its provisions are met, to continue until June 30, 1952, with annual review, both for authorizations and appropriations by the Congress. The law recognizes that military security and domestic tranquillity are necessary prerequisites to economic recovery and the maintenance of peace and free institutions, to the degree that it makes provisions for military-type aid to those areas which are most beset by the dangers of externally sponsored communism.

The President has acted with dispatch in order to place the European recovery program into action. He named Paul Hoffman, an outstanding industrialist, as its administrator and directed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to turn over at once the $1,105,000,000 recovery fund advance which Congress authorized. These funds were transferred until Congress votes regular appropriations in order that the sum of $105,000,000 of new aid may be made immediately available to Greece, Turkey, China, and Trieste in addition to $1,000,000,000 for the 16 western European nations taking part in the joint, long-range recovery effort.

TENURE OF OFFICE AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

I am now serving my eighth consecutive term as Member of Congress, having been first elected on March 4, 1933, from the newly created Sixteenth Congressional District. The late Hon. Henry T. Rainey of Illinois was the then Speaker of the House and it was he who suggested that I accept committee assignments that would be most beneficial to my constituents. I chose membership on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, because there were some fifty-odd national groups in my district. I also requested assignment to the Committee on Labor because my constituents were engaged almost entirely in industrial work, and am presently the ranking Democratic member of that committee.

I was also assigned by Speaker Rainey to the Pension Committee and was unanimously elected by the House as its chairman in 1936, which office I retained until I resigned to accept the chairmanship of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 disbanded the Immigration and Naturalization Committee and placed its legislative functions with the Judiciary Committee. That act also provided that a Member could serve on but one major committee, and in view of my long service on the House Labor Committee, and its legislative jurisdiction over problems so close to my entire congressional district, I chose to continue service on the Labor Committee and am now the ranking Democratic member of that committee as well as the ranking House Democratic member on the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations set up under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill and which is composed of seven Members of the Senate and seven Members of the House.

IMMIGRATION

Despite the fact that I am not presently a member of the committee handling immigration legislation, nevertheless I continue my deep interests in immigration problems which antedate even my service in the Congress.

Within a few days after the opening day of the Eightieth Congress I introduced H. R. 732, a bill to provide for immigration into the United States of 200,000 displaced persons who are the unhappy victims of Nazi and Communist persecution. I urged its favorable consideration in a hearing before the committee and am happy to inform my listeners that on April 6 a very important step forward was achieved in regard to this vital and disturbing problem. The Republican controlled subcommittee reported its own bill to the whole committee. That bill was similar to mine. I trust that the whole committee will act favorably upon the recommendations of its subcommittee and report the bill to the House. If enacted into law it will open the doors to qualified newcomers and make possible the happy reunion of many citizens in the Detroit area with their kith and kin.

I am also gratified to be able to inform my radio listeners that the House on April 6 unanimously passed my bill, H. R. 5137, which will bring relief to many thousands of American families. This bill is now before the Senate and if passed and enacted into law will permit entry into this country, as nonquota immigrants, the alien husbands

of American women. Before the war thousands of our young women visited their relatives in the old country, and during the war thousands of our American women were overseas serving with the armed forces, the Red Cross, the USO, and other organizations. Many of them married while over there and because their husbands were aliens they were not permitted to return with their American wives to this country. Our women's organizations have been deeply interested because many families have been disrupted and much hardship and distress was caused by this unfortunate situation. The present law is a direct discrimination against American womanhood because if an American man marries an alien woman he can secure her entry into our country without delay as a nonquota immigrant. However, that law does not apply to an American girl who marries an alien, and in some instances the American girl has had to wait for as many as 7 to 11 years before she could secure a visa for her husband. My bill will remedy this situation and I of course appreciate the fact that the House approved the measure by unanimous vote. It is now pending in the Senate and I sincerely trust that they will approve this meritorious measure and that it will be enacted into law at an early date.

CONCLUSION

I regret that time does not permit me to discuss other important legislation that is pending before the Congress, especially matters affecting labor and the recent majority report of the Joint Labor-Management Relations Committee, which was filed on March 15, and to which report I made strenuous objection and was joined by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, Senator PEPPER, of Florida, and Congressman KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, in a minority report which was filed on April 1 and is numbered Senate Report 986, part 2. I will however be broadcasting again on April 26 over the facilities of this station and at that time will discuss further with my friends in the Detroit area pending congressional problems.

I thank you and good evening.

A Minister Writes About Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose a very interesting letter from Rev. Ben H. Moore, minister, of May, Tex.:

MARCH 8, 1948.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. FISHER, there is another matter I have been wanting to write you about which I think is of serious concern to every loyal American citizen.

In the light of what has happened in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, more recently in Czechoslovakia and is about to happen in Finland; in the light of the avowed purposes of world-wide revolution on the part of communism, and the proven methods of infiltration, subterfuge, and seizure by force of a country after taking advantage of every opportunity to worm their way into positions of influence in labor, political, social, industrial, civic, and educational organizations, I think it is high time that we were aroused to the danger we face right here in America and quit "kidding" ourselves that "It can't happen here."

This enclosed clipping proves that it is happening here. Right under our nose.

I am a Presbyterian minister, serving two small-town churches and living in the country, where I operate a small ranch. I come in contact with a great many average American citizens.

We are all of the opinion that proof that an American citizen has become a Communist should be interpreted as meaning he or she has renounced the American way of life and has become a traitor to his country. Communism has proved itself to be anti-Christian in its philosophy of life and undemocratic in its methods. To become a Communist one must necessarily adopt other methods of political reform than the regularly prescribed due processes of law of a democratic and free people.

It is the avowed purpose of communism to overthrow our Government and sell us out to Russian domination.

It is our opinion that Americans who embrace communism should be indicted as guilty of sedition—traitors to our American ideals, institutions, and public interests—and should be dealt with accordingly.

I feel sure I express the sentiments of all true American citizens when I say Congress should pass laws defining a Communist as one who is plotting to overthrow our Government and providing severe penalties for such treason.

We Americans have been trained all our lives to believe in fair play and tolerance of other peoples' political and religious convictions to the point where we are easy victims of communism's treacherous methods of attack.

Shall we wait until it is too late to wake up to the fact that "you can't cooperate with the devil"?

Communism says the Christian religion is stifling to national progress. I can understand that it is true that Christian principles do not permit one to stoop to the same deceitful, unfair practices of the Communists, and therefore would be a handicap to Russian expansion as being effected today.

That which is anti-Christian is of the Devil and must be treated as our deadly enemy in this democracy of ours. We must fight it with all of our forces on every front—political, religious, and educational.

For the sake of our beloved country, our homes, our religious freedom, our American way of life, do all you can in Congress to cut out this cancer that threatens our life—communism.

Yours sincerely,

BEN H. MOORE.

MAY, TEX.

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial by the editor of the Pittsburgh Catholic, under date of April 8, 1948.

This is an appraisal by the editor of the failure of the Congress to legislate on some very important problems, as well as a criticism of some of the legislation that has been enacted. It is a sweeping castigation of the failure to continue price controls in the face of rising prices—something which seems to have been forgotten by the public press in general. This is really a stinging rebuke to the Congress for the mistakes it has made.

TO THE POINT
(By the Editor)

DEMOCRACY

Representative democracy has been demonstrating both its might and its weakness in recent days in this country, its chief stronghold in a world that is yielding in many places to the pessimism of dictatorship. By passing the European recovery program (Marshall plan) legislation, our Congressmen clearly reacted to the pressure of public opinion, aroused by the critical international situation. By passing, and over the President's veto, a bill to reduce income taxes, our Congressmen clearly reacted to considerations of their own political fortunes, in disregard of the common good. By passing an inadequate rent-control measure and a weaselly social security modification bill, our Congressmen clearly reacted to the influence of selfish interests, although there is evident on every side the evils that selfish interests have inflicted on the Nation's economic structure.

At the same time, our Congressmen continued to sit on their hands with respect to measures urgently called for to right social and economic injustices—the raising of the minimum wage level, the establishment of fair employment standards against racial and religious discrimination, and protecting of the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Selfish interests and political considerations keep this legislation buried, and public opinion is not coherent and forceful enough to dig it out.

At the same time, too, our Congressmen refuse to honestly face, and correct, the harm they did by passing the Taft-Hartley labor control bill, although every day brings new proof that it is having precisely the effect against which its opponents warned. The workers are hampered in securing their rights, the foes of organized labor are encouraged to resist labor's rightful demands, clumsy and expensive legal machinery is being substituted for collective bargaining, human rights are being obscured.

Our Congressmen refuse also to honestly face, and correct, the sweeping harm they did by killing price controls before the Nation had recovered from war conditions. A strange and obstinate silence has set in as far as this subject is concerned. No individual, Congressman or private citizen, can make a move today without paying tribute to the profiteers who were let loose on the country by the ending of price controls; the food for every meal, the rent for every month's housing, every single purchase of the necessaries of life, all carry the label of exorbitance, for which Congress gave its blanket approval; and yet Congressmen do not seem to realize that this is the basic factor in most of the troubles of the country—wage disputes, tax reduction, rent control, and so on.

There is something sardonic in the solemn investigations congressional committees are conducting into the gray market in steel and the hoarding of building materials and essential machinery; didn't Congress give the go-ahead signal to all of this when it accepted the promise of the National Association of Manufacturers that free enterprise would put our economic system on a sound, equitable footing if only price controls were removed?

There is no reason why the public should feel helpless at the sight of the mistakes Congress has made. This is an election year, and Congress ought to be particularly sensitive to public feeling; if public demand can bring Congress to put through the Marshall plan bill, it can also bring Congress to correct our domestic affairs. And the billions sched-

uled to be spent under the Marshall plan to defeat communism in Europe won't have that effect unless we have a sound, just domestic economy here in the United States, to prove to the world that representative democracy is the best form of government.

Radio Service for Rural Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I hope America's rural population will awaken to the danger of being denied adequate radio service by a bill, S. 2231, now pending before a committee of another body.

Briefly stated, this bill would force a break-up of the so-called clear-channel radio stations. I know from first-hand experience that much of rural America receives good and dependable radio service only through the high-powered, clear-channel stations. True, smaller stations reach into the bulk of the farm homes during the daytime, but at night millions of farmers cannot get satisfactory reception from any radio station other than the few clear-channel stations. As a result of this situation, much of rural America—and this is true of a large part of my own congressional district—is compelled to depend upon the clear-channel stations for satisfactory and dependable radio service.

The irony of it is that the rural and small town audience has always been discriminated against in terms of radio service. Naturally enough, radio broadcasting stations are established in cities which can support them. As a result, city listeners have the pleasure of not only good radio reception but also of having a choice of programs. The farmers on the other hand, most living at some distance from a city large enough to support a radio station, are in no such fortunate position. The radio signal reaching them is, because of the distance, almost invariably of poorer quality. In many, many cases they are lucky to get very much of a choice of programs at night and for hundreds of thousands of radio listeners, I repeat, the only dependable nighttime service is through the clear channel stations.

Why then should Congress seriously consider S. 2231? The answer is, in fairness, it should not. The plain purpose of the bill is to prevent the use of high power by standard broadcasting stations and to break down the system of clear channel broadcasting. The inevitable result of such an action would be to rob the millions of rural listeners of satisfactory and dependable radio reception.

Instead of giving serious consideration of a bill to tear down radio service to rural America, we should be giving thought to bringing about an improvement of such service.

There is still another reason why, in my opinion, S. 2231 runs contrary to sound policy for Congress. By S. 2231 it is proposed that Congress act upon a highly technical and complicated question—a question which has been under consideration by the Federal Communications Commission for more than 3 years. What is the purpose of the Federal Communications Commission unless it is to deal with such problems? For Congress to step in now and pass Senate bill No. 2231 would, it seems to me, be a most impractical procedure in addition to the injustice it would mete out to the farmers of the country to whom radio is very important. Not only do metropolitan listeners have an advantage over the rural listeners in ordinary radio reception but FM broadcasting and television is now, and engineers estimate for many years to come will be, confined to metropolitan residents.

It is not my prerogative to interfere with the actions of another body, but it is within my proper province to warn the farmers of the Nation and their Representatives in Congress of this ill-advised and dangerous threat to radio service to millions of American farmers.

A Challenge of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hancock Clarion of April 10, 1948:

A CHALLENGE OF PRAYER

We have been impressed lately by the futility of this Nation in its endeavor to meet the situation of peace or war. We—all of us we feel sure—are much concerned with the outlook that is presented to us by the relations that now exist between this Nation of ours and that of Russia. Both nations seem to have arrived at a situation that threatens to be broken only by some incident that will mean nothing but war; while on the other hand if coolness and consideration are observed by our people and those of Russia, and attempt made at understanding, peace can be the result.

Why cannot the latter be the solution rather than the blind forboding atmosphere of distruct and hatred that can only result in destruction? With such a question before us the answer seems to be to us, as in like manner it surely is to the people of Russia, that the other party to the dispute is wholly in the wrong and will not consider conciliation or attempt at understanding.

With such stubborness and determination to carry through our own views both peoples will surely go down the road that leads to inevitable war that no one desires. No dispute can ever be settled where such divergent views exist as between our Nation and that of Russia without some compromise or consideration being given to the other's point of view. We do not mean such compromise to encompass a surrender of any vital or fundamental principle—that must never be considered—but there are grounds on which discussion of issues could be had that might, and we believe would, result in better understanding between our nations. These are the things on which our people and the people of Russia could and should concentrade their thoughts and aims, and by so doing something for good might be accomplished.

This Nation of ours is the outstanding Christian nation of the world and to those principles we are committed and must uphold if we shall hope to survive. We think Jesus Christ laid down the principles upon which all mankind can find a common interest and a universal purpose of good will. There is nothing selfish, or dominating, or coercive in any of the principles of Jesus Christ. They are wholly based on love and fellowship with all mankind. They are based on fairness, and honesty, and justice; and on these are builded as the foundation of all the hopes of man, the principles of freedom and liberty. No other religion can claim such a foundation, therefore we believe that on Christianity rests the hope of the world and the salvation of man from destruction.

With this in mind and with the assurance of our hope based upon our faith in God, we, the people of this great Christian nation, are faced with the challenge that must not go unanswered. Our people cannot afford to allow the principles as laid down by Jesus Christ to fail in the world because of our selfish or self-seeking attitude that appears to dominate our every act of today. We must give to the world these principles of Christ or we shall utterly fail to carry on the high resolve that has characterized this Nation from its inception to the present day. We have gone as far we shall be permitted to go in helping direct the affairs of the world if we do not at once reverse our position and stand upon the principles of true Christianity.

One of the outstanding lessons taught by the Saviour of Man was to love your enemies. That admonition is difficult for many to observe. It calls for something within the soul that gives us understanding and consideration of those who despitefully abuse us, and by the strength that love of God implants we are able to empty our hearts of hatred, and malice, and mistrust, and forgive those who despitefully use us.

It is upon this principle of forgiveness that rests our attitude today if we shall hope to avoid the misunderstanding and enmity of those who oppose us. It is by an understanding heart that we may be able to turn aside the abuse and injury that face us today. It is the love in our hearts through Jesus Christ that we are able to approach those who despitefully use us and meet their error and abuse with forgiveness and love. Why cannot we do that?

Back to the question of this being a Christian Nation, we approach that consideration by saying that if our people would gather at their places of worship and observe truly the principles of Jesus Christ, and with forgiveness in our hearts and faith in God, the course of the world today in its apparent dilemma could, and we believe would, turn the trend of affairs in the opposite direction that would lead to peace rather than war. But it must be a spontaneous and united appeal to God on the part of a great majority of our Christian people, offering up their prayers to the Father for one purpose; that being that God will so direct the affairs of the world and the decisions of the leaders of nations toward understanding and peace.

We are wondering what would be the result if on a certain day a great outpouring of our Christian people—millions of them—would meet at their places of worship or in their homes and with but one thought in their minds send up a united prayer to God to bring about an understanding between nations and direct them in the ways of peace? We have the assurance in God's Word that He will hear our prayers and give us the things we desire, and surely the people of our Nation desire peace. And in that

united prayer should we not pray for those who seem to be our enemies: those of a foreign nation upon whom rest the duties of government and leadership?

What do you think would be the reaction of Premier Joseph Stalin of Russia if he could realize that at a certain hour 50,000,000 Americans would be praying for him and asking our God to direct his life and his rule to the betterment of the world and his own people? And what do you think would be the response from God if such a united outpouring of prayer should come to Him? We believe that if such should be, the course of the world would be changed and all nations could dwell together upon the earth in harmony and good will. We believe the attitude of the people of Russia and their leaders would be changed toward us and we are sure that our own people would have a different conception of the people of Russia.

Why should not the President of the United States call for such a day of prayer and by proclamation set a day and hour at which time our people would assemble to offer up such a united prayer unto God? When we enter a war the President is quick to call upon the people to pray for success and victory, so why not a call to prayer to preserve the peace of the world? Our people have faith in God and we believe if such a day is set aside to be observed by all our people a marked changed in world conditions would result.

In our lowly and humble capacity as editor of a small country newspaper we approach our President with this appeal and beg of him that he proclaim such a day of prayer for the understanding and peace between the nations of the world.

Political Double Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial appearing in Monday, April 12, 1948, of the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Political Double Talk":

POLITICAL DOUBLE TALK

The Republican National Committee, whose spokesman has a remarkable talent for putting his foot in his mouth, has brought forth a chapter-and-verse indictment of the Truman administration for double talk.

There is something to it. The most loyal Truman supporter would be hard put to deny and disprove some of the specifications in the Republican complaint. It is true, for example, that the President did a poor job of dealing with the effort by Henry Wallace, when the latter was Secretary of Commerce, to put the skids under the policies then being advocated by Secretary of State Byrnes. It is true that the President's handling of the Pauley affair left much to be desired. The Truman record on Palestine is vulnerable, and a case can be made out against the President's so-called appeasement of Stalin at Potsdam, although, in that connection, it is not recalled that the Republican National Committee raised objection to the effort to insure peace with Russia.

If all these things be granted, however, the fact remains that the President, when the chips were down, has been courageous and steadfast in putting the national welfare ahead of partisan considerations. On the big issues—the issues which bore on the security of this country—the President has tried to do the right thing, rather than do what might be expected to advance his own political fortunes or embarrass his political opposition. In some matters, Palestine, for example, he has been late in getting around to the right position, but in the end he has consistently subordinated partisan considerations. The record in this respect is clear.

That is more than can be said of the Republican National Committee. A year from now the Republicans may be in control of our foreign policy. And when one thinks of that contingency it is depressing to pick up the National Committee's report and read such balderdash as this: "It is to be hoped that Mr. Truman's latest (international) crisis will be no worse than those which have gone before. Let us hope that this crisis has no more sinister purpose than to offset the damage of the revolt of the Solid South and the defection of Henry Wallace; that it has not been engineered and decked out in the thought that, as former Gov. Ellis Arnall, of Georgia, thought, 'the rumblings of war might pull the President through, as they did Mr. Roosevelt in 1940.'"

This is more than demagogic; it is positively stupid. One would think that the Republican National Committee did not know that respected Republicans like Senator VANDENBERG and Chairman EATON, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, not only see eye-to-eye with the President on the fact that there is a crisis, but also stand with him in his efforts to cope with it.

It is hard to say, in the light of this remarkable statement, where the Republican National Committee stands. But it is clear that for the committee to take a position like this, at the gutter level of partisan politics in such a critical time as the present, is not to stand for the best interests of the United States. The country has come to expect this sort of thing from Henry Wallace and his noisy claque. But it has a right to expect something better from the managing body of the Republican Party.

Education in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of Congress will be interested in reading a very important and informative address on Federal aid to education delivered by the Honorable JOHN SANBORN, our distinguished colleague from Idaho, over radio station KSL, Salt Lake City, on the 13th of April 1948.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include this address as follows:

Good evening, friends. I feel I can call you friends because I am your neighbor to the north. There is much interaction between Utah and Idaho, and I feel we share each other's problems.

Today, when nearly all talk is directed toward war or the preparation to prevent war, I would like to comment on a way to prepare for the future and to insure peace.

You people of the intermountain area are unchallenged leaders in the field of education.

Professors Hughes and Lancelot, of Iowa State College, in a recent book, state that Utah outclasses all other States in over-all performance in education. This is very surprising to persons not familiar with your history. But when your history is considered it appears to follow your desires.

The importance of education was engraved upon the hearts of the early pioneers by such outstanding men as Karl G. Maiser, a man nearly a century ahead of his time in the educational field.

The attention of the United States has been focused on the need for financial aid to education. The Senate has recently passed a bill authorizing the expenditure of $300,000,000 annually in Federal aid to schools.

Should this bill become law? Many say yes. Others no.

It is to this question I would like to direct my remarks.

Public education is a vast enterprise and demands the interest of many groups as well as the Federal and State Governments.

During the 1944–45 school year, the latest year for which data is available, the public elementary and secondary schools of this country served over 23,000,000 students.

A professionally trained staff of over 800,000 men and women were employed to implement educational processes, with a total expenditure of $2,600,000,000. This $2,600,000,000 represented slightly over 1½ percent of the national income for the fiscal year 1945.

On a comparative basis, England spent approximately 3 percent, and the Soviet Union 8 percent.

This will give you some idea of the responsibility and challenge with which we are confronted, and is the basis of my discussion, for the next few minutes, of Federal aid to education.

In many countries, public education is financed and administered by centralized government authorities. In the United States, however, it is wisely regarded, and rightfully so, as principally a function of the state and local government.

Nonetheless, the Federal Government in the past has contributed somewhat to the support of public education, and has carried on extensive educational activities of its own. These activities, such as the Nation-wide educational services of the Department of Agriculture and the educational program of the armed forces, have become quite diversified.

But even so, there is a growing concern over the status of elementary and secondary education. It is, as a matter of fact, and I think justifiable, highly probable that the Federal Government will assume a greater responsibility in seeing that educational equality is achieved.

Let us review for a few minutes the entire subject—arguments for and arguments against Federal aid.

Since 1919, proposals for annual appropriations have been constantly introduced in Congress in increasing numbers. Therefore, the arguments have been pretty well organized.

The opponents, for example, point out that such assistance might well endanger our educational processes and our republican form of government. In addition, it is mentioned that grants would tend toward the standardization and regimentation of education—that equalization of funds does not necessarily create equalization of opportunity—that general education is not properly a function of the Federal Government—that there is insufficient need for proposed grants, that aid might encourage waste and misuse of funds, and that the Federal Government could more desirably contribute to educational processes through channels it now utilizes.

Now let us look at the other side of the question. Here are some of the arguments used by those who propose Federal aid to education.

These proponents point to the fact that the Federal Government is partly responsible for the general education of its national citizenry; that throughout history the Government has participated in financing education; that Federal aid is necessary to reduce inequalities of educational opportunities; that grants would stimulate economic and social benefits; and that unless general aid is adopted, Federal control will result through the administration of specific education programs.

Despite the objections to Federal aid to education, there have been many bills introduced in Congress during the last session.

Twenty-one bills were submitted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Hearings were held on these proposals in April and May of last year.

The Senate has passed a bill to provide $300,000,000 annually to assist in the educational development of this Nation. This bill is now before the House. The greatest concern of legislators has been to protect the States' rights from Federal intervention, and to insure financial aid without becoming subject to Federal control.

I believe you will all agree that this latter problem is a serious one and deserves much consideration.

Never in the history of the world do we need education as we do today. As I have previously stated many times, I believe the greatest safeguard against the dangers of foreign idealogies is education of our people.

The great need for public education as an instrument of national and international policy today cannot be exaggerated. For, first of all, the integrity—perhaps the very existence, of our democratic Government depends on the enlightened participation of its citizens.

In turn, the friendly and freedom-loving nations of the world are looking to us for some promise of escape from the grim oppression which has overtaken some of their less fortunate neighbors.

Never during a time of peace has our democratic society been faced with more grave decisions. It has now become obvious that communism is a menacing threat to our survival. The years which lie in the immediate future will determine how we maintain our place in the world as a leading independent national state. If we do so with any credit, the very first requisite will be to demonstrate conclusively to the world that we are determined to resist every possible threat to our freedom and security. The tradition of our country and the unique character of our Government bespeaks a special role for public education in the growth of our national life.

When we consider what a vital role education plays in our democracy, and the special significance it takes on in the changing world today, and then consider the appalling state to which public education has declined, we are alarmed.

Throughout the Nation, moneys allotted for education facilities and for teaching talent, although large, do not cover the need. Rising costs of living have made the plight even more desperate. Help is needed from some source and even though our Federal Government is overburdened with expenses, it seems to be the best source available.

It must be admitted that the States of Utah and Idaho, along with many of the other States, have reached, or are approaching, the limit of their ability to provide funds for education. Because of our particular situation in Utah and Idaho, and the constant need for increased education for our youth, I am going to urge passage of legislation to provide for Federal financial assistance without Federal control.

Thank you and good night.

Congressional Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared recently in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS

The Congress of the United States, like some quarrelsome families, is inclined to be fiercely loyal in the face of outside criticism. The Members may exchange ponderous insults behind closed doors. But, politics aside, they will seldom admit any flaws in the way they run their household.

An interesting exception to this family loyalty is offered by Representative ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee. Writing in a national monthly, he takes his colleagues to task—and rightly, we think—for the waste of time and money and sometimes the downright harm that results from needless committees, investigations, and congressional junkets.

The La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, was supposed to abolish special committees. But the House wouldn't hear of that. So now the Eightieth Congress has 11 of them. These groups, with the standing committees and subcommittees do a lot of duplicate investigating, as anyone who follows congressional activities already knows.

Mr. KEFAUVER gives some figures. There have been 12 committees investigating the petroleum situation. Three committees and a subcommittee looked into housing. All told, the Senate and House each authorized 31 special investigations in the first session of the present Congress.

As for junkets, there were almost 200 Members touring abroad last fall. Four groups went over the same ground investigating Europe's need of American aid. As for Hawaii and Panama, those lovely spots have been investigated repeatedly by generations of Congressmen.

All this can run into wasted millions in the 2-year life of a Congress. And, says Mr. KEFAUVER, some of these activities injure congressional prestige and invade civil rights. Naming names, he cites the rather sad spectacle of the Howard Hughes hearings, the exposure of legitimate trades in the grain-market probe, and some examples of bad manners and star-chamber tactics of the Un-American Activities Committee.

Representative KEFAUVER suggests some remedies. He would abolish all special and select committees and let the regular groups do the job. This, he says, would not only save money but also remove the temptation for temporary committee heads to indulge in vaudeville tricks to attract attention and headlines.

He would give both Rules Committees the responsibility of passing on all investigations, in and out of Washington, and occasionally saying no. And he would let witnesses at investigations cross-examine their accusers.

These reforms are certainly in order, though domestic politics and world events probably won't permit them now. But we fear the voting public pays too little attention to the inner workings of Congress to insist that they be carried out.

"If economy is to begin at home," the author suggests, "it ought to start in the home of Congress." Further reforms in procedure, we imagine, will also have to begin in the same place—and with honest self-critics like Mr. KEFAUVER to give them a push.

Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PARKE M. BANTA
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by Mrs. Anthony Hayes, of Richwoods, Mo., dated April 9, 1948:

RICHWOODS, MO., *April 9, 1948.*

Hon. PARKE BANTA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is to inform you of my unqualified opposition to peacetime military conscription or a renewed selective draft law. These are merely the entering wedges of a scheme totally to mobilize and regiment America's human and economic resources for an unlimited state of emergency and a third world war, and would end by saddling this country with a military despotism.

In his Farewell Address, George Washington warned succeeding generations to "avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty." And James Madison, the father of the Constitution, stated: "A standing military force with an overgrown executive will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defense against foreign danger have been always the instruments of tyranny at home."

Respectfully yours,

CLARA HAYES
(Mrs. Anthony Hayes).

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 5 I heard my opponent charge at the courthouse in Tuscaloosa, Ala., that I voted against the school-lunch program and say with great emphasis that he would have voted for it, which surprised me because Alabama could not have received one penny from the bill against which I voted.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1946, page 1540, reveals the adoption of the following amendment to this bill, which was proposed by the gentleman from New York, Representative POWELL, of the Harlem district of New York City:

On page 9, line 6, after the period, insert the following: "No funds made available pursuant to this title shall be paid or disbursed to any State or school if, in carrying out its functions under this title, it makes any discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin of children."

Of course, I voted against the amendment as did every Alabamian except one who was not present, and as did every single Member from the deep South. I

voted for the bill when it returned to the floor after the elimination of this objectionable amendment in conference. I shall continue to so properly represent my people.

I am unalterably opposed to every phase of President Truman's civil-rights program, which I do not believe to be for the best interests of either race in the South, where we know and respect each other. We have gotten along famously together throughout the years and will continue to do so if outsiders and local troublemakers will but let us alone.

In this connection, I quote an article from a recent Birmingham paper:

PUBLISHER WILLIAMS PREDICTS CIVIL RIGHTS SOON TO BE LAW

TALLADEGA, ALA., April 10.—President Truman's civil-rights bill will soon become law, Aubrey Williams, publisher of the Southern Farmer, Montgomery, predicted Saturday.

Addressing the Alabama Student Conference on Civil Rights meeting in a 3-day session here, he praised President Truman for "being the first and only President ever to come out openly for the civil-rights bill."

"The battle for a decent America is being and will be fought in the South, and we are fighting it here more cleanly than they are anywhere else in the Nation," the speaker declared.

Mr. Williams begged Negroes to be patient and not to raise a hand in violence to give anyone an opportunity to "slap them down" or criticize them. He urged them to learn to be good citizens in order that they may properly exercise their right to vote. He declared "that is the only way they will ever come into their own."

"The FEPC and the antilynching bill will also become law soon, I believe," he said.

The speaker described himself as a great admirer of Henry Wallace. "In fact, I love Henry Wallace very much," he declared, "but that has nothing to do with the subject at hand today."

Mr. Williams spoke out also against universal military training. "We have got to fight universal military training," he said. "It will give the military leaders a chance to poison our youth." Williams was introduced by W. M. Ferguson, Birmingham.

The civil-rights conference opened at Talladega College here Friday. Speaking during the opening sessions were Dr. A. D. Beittel, president of the Negro institution, and Dr. Edward Weaver, professor of social sciences at the Montgomery State Teachers College.

About 40 students from the various Negro and white colleges in Alabama are attending the meeting, which will continue through Sunday.

Peace Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter written by the Honorable Hiram Bingham, a former Governor of and Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Senator Bingham served in the First World War as the commanding officer of our air base at Issodoun, France, and, incidentally, as my commanding officer. He is widely known for his knowledge of world affairs and his continued interest in adequate defense for the United States.

Senator Bingham's letter appeared in the New York Times of April 11, 1948, and is as follows:

PEACE PREPAREDNESS—STRONG AIR FORCE ADVOCATED AS WAR PREVENTIVE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We hate war and long for peace, but we do not always remember that the human race has inherited from its animal ancestors an instinct that calls for killing rather than for peaceful living. One of the laws of nature seems to be that life prevails by taking life. Nature is always at war. In a state of nature, most animals live by killing, live by taking the lives of plants or other animals. They hunt for, capture, and kill other animals so that they may live. It is a drastic inheritance. No wonder the history of the human race is largely a history of wars and warfare.

Yet we really want peace. "Peace on earth, good will toward men" has been the ideal of the Western World for nearly 20 centuries. Just as we have been able to tame and domesticate some animals so that they do not always long to kill each other, we have been able to restrain a large part of the human race so that there have been peaceful eras, periods when men were not engaged in fighting and killing one another. Was it done by words, promises, and appeasement or by strength?

The longest period of peace in the Western World was the Pax Romana, when for several centuries the Roman Legions, the infantry of the Roman Empire, discouraged trouble makers and kept the peace. Man's inherited love of killing and fighting was kept in check by fear of the consequences.

RETURN OF ANARCHY

When the Roman legions deteriorated and the Empire crumbled, then anarchy returned. During the Dark Ages no one lived in peace and comfort until the development of cavalry and the formation of armies of mounted knights. This led to the rise of nations whose kings could enforce the king's peace.

In the last century there was a relatively peaceful period when for a large part of the world the Pax Britannica meant peaceful living. And the Pax Britannica was due to the British Navy, well built, well equipped, ready for action and to be seen in all the Seven Seas. Britain's army was not large. It was not prepared and it took a terrible beating when it had to fight against great odds. But thanks to British seamen and the readiness of her navy, the Pax Britannica lasted a good many years.

Now the time has come for a period of peace to be assured by air forces. It may well be the Pax Americana. Our young men have the courage and daring to make great pilots. Our engineers have the initiative and the know-how to build great military aircraft. Our boys have a mechanical bent which enables them to keep those planes in condition and have them ready for any emergency. If we are willing to provide the large carriers that are needed, if we will hold the air fields that are now available to us in strategic parts of the world where our friends are willing to help us keep the peace, if we are wise enough to keep our Air Forces adequately supplied with the latest long-distance fighters and bombers and if we have the wisdom to keep out planes flying in all parts of the world, we can establish a Pax Americana which will be the salvation of the modern world.

GOOD NEIGHBOR RECORD

No peaceful nation need fear us. Our record shows that we do not covet the lands of our neighbors. We conquered Cuba and then gave the island its independence. We conquered the Philippines and then gave their people their independence. Our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, have erected no iron curtain against us. They know we are far stronger than they but they know we love peace. The votes in the Assembly of the United Nations show that most nations trust us—the ones who do not are the ones whose actions show their desire to seize and control as large a part of the earth as they can.

Our own record justifies the hope that most of the world will trust us to keep the peace and will help us to do so. If we are strong they will not live in fear. If we are weak they can well tremble at what may befall them. Just as the presence of British cruisers in far-flung harbors was for many years a symbol of peace and security so the sight of American airplanes may give the same sign. We now have the opportunity to lessen the fear of war and promote the blessings of peace by having an air force able to rule the skies and bring to the nations of the earth the assurance of a Pax Americana.

HIRAM BINGHAM.

WASHINGTON, *April 6, 1948.*

Has TVA Kept Faith?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Has TVA Kept Faith?" which was published in the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of April 11, 1948:

HAS TVA KEPT FAITH?

The Tennessee Valley Authority, soon 15 years old, is undergoing thorough examination at present from a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate.

Down here in the Valley that event interests us, is close to our hearts and minds. Not that we are unaccustomed to examination, not that we are not accustomed to living in a glass house, but the committee has intimated that this examination may be the last for some time to come. The committee, thank goodness, has indicated that the right and wrong of TVA is to be wrung out with this investigation and after this the TVA and the 5,000,000 people of the Valley who are in partnership will be let alone to go forward developing this section into one of the finest in the United States of America.

And that brings us to ask this question, "Has TVA kept faith?" Has TVA kept faith with the Congress of the United States, has the law under which the Authority was created been violated or has it been kept? Has the Authority kept faith with the people of the United States, all of them, for we write not alone of the 5,000,000 citizens of the valley.

Now why do we say so, can we prove it?

Here are some of the facts concerning TVA administration:

1. The TVA region today produces 10 times as much power as it produced in 1933.

2. The TVA system of multiple-purpose dams has provided more than 11,000,000 acre-feet of storage capacity for the control of floods.

3. This system of dams has produced a navigation channel 630 miles in length. In 1947 an estimated total of more than 341,000,000 ton-miles of freight moved on the Tennessee. The Tennessee today is carrying 10 times as many ton-miles as in 1933.

4. The control and improvement of the river, combined with the initiative and hard

work of the people of the valley, has brought a new birth of economic activity to the whole region. More than 100 privately operated boat docks have been established on lake shores to serve pleasure boats valued at nearly three millions. States, counties, and cities are developing 27 lakeside parks, while some 20 quasi-public groups have secured sites for vacation camps.

5. TVA has developed high analysis fertilizers which are needed to restore and strengthen the fertility of the soil. These materials have been tested by the State department stations, their usefulness established under the guidance of the State agricultural services and the county agents; 40,000 farmers throughout the valley region and in 22 States outside the valley were using these materials in 1947 in practical tests and demonstrations.

6. Forests and woodlands of the valley have sustained an industry of one hundred millions annually. TVA cooperates with State forestry and agricultural agencies and with private forest and land owners in setting up demonstrations for modern forest management.

7. TVA cooperating with 7 State and 2 Federal agencies and with 73 private firms, through 1947, had worked on 25 different minerals found in the valley.

8. Locally owned and operated systems, municipal and rural electric cooperatives, distribute TVA electricity to 810,000 ultimate consumers, where only 300,000 were served in 1933. In 1933 1 farm in 28 in the valley was electrified, today the ratio is 1 farm in every 2.

9. Malaria control has been so effective that the disease has now become a rarity in the valley.

10. Throughout the 15 years TVA has been a champion of free enterprise, has encouraged the growth of the valley from within and with local initiative, courage, and capital. TVA has continuously discouraged the growth of the valley at the expense of tearing down some other section of the United States of America.

So, we present the case. TVA has kept faith with the Congress, following the intent of the act in revitalizing a section of the United States. TVA has kept faith with all the people of the United States of America in developing this section of the Nation into a self-sustaining area, a people who are now contributing to the welfare of all the citizens of the United States. The experiment has been a complete success.

Home Rule for Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the authority to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials, I am very pleased to have the excellent editorials from the Washington Post of April 12, and the Evening Star of the same day printed in the RECORD.

I am sure my colleagues will pardon the satisfaction that is shared by me and the excellent subcommittee that worked for so many days on this great problem of reorganizing the government of the District of Columbia in knowing that the people through the press look with favor on our efforts.

I sincerely hope that prompt consideration will be given to this measure which I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization of the District of Columbia, have introduced, because if it becomes law the people of the District of Columbia will handle their affairs in the American way as do other cities in the United States, and although Congress, as it must under the Constitution, will retain ultimate control it will be relieved of many details which are onerous and should not be required of Members of Congress.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post of April 12, 1948]

NEW HOME-RULE BILL

The latest transformation through which the Auchincloss bill has gone has brought a number of improvements. It is evident that the House subcommittee which has the bill in charge gave thoughtful attention to the advice offered in the recent hearings and modified this proposed charter for the District with the object of eliminating objections. That is excellent strategy. As the bill goes before the full District committee and the House itself, it will certainly be less vulnerable to attack than it was before. At the same time its enactment would, in our opinion, give Washington a sound and workable system of home rule.

The first change effected is a net gain of real significance. It provides that the people of the District shall be represented in the House by a delegate, as are the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. The delegate could speak on the House floor and would be a most salutary influence in pleading the cause of the District among Members of Congress and in committee sessions. Unfortunately, he would be a spokesman only. He would have no vote in the House. Voting representation for the District in Congress cannot be granted without a constitutional amendment. Pending a more complete grant of representation, however, we are confident that the proposed delegate would be an enormously useful official.

Many citizens will be disappointed in the new fiscal formula devised by the subcommittee to measure the annual Federal payment to the District. We have alway. felt that the original plan of measuring this payment by the value of untaxed Federal real estate here, with some exceptions, was fair and reasonable. But Congress is fearful of adopting such a yardstick because of the strength it might lend to the claims of other cities for payments in lieu of taxes. In deference to that fear the Auchincloss subcommittee has provided that the Federal payment shall equal 14 percent of the District's non-Federal revenue for the previous year, up to $15,000,000, with the cost of various specified Federal services to the District deducted and the cost of District services to Federal agencies added. This would give the District assurance of receiving from the Treasury at least as much as it is now obtaining. It is thus a positive argument for the home-rule bill, even though the formula is less favorable than that of the previous measure.

Certainly the provision for a referendum next November to give the people of the District a chance to accept or reject the proposed charter is a net gain. Even a home-rule system ought not to be imposed on the community without its express approval. The other major change requires positive action by Congress and the President to give effect to legislative measures, as distinguished from local ordinances, adopted by the proposed District council. The previous bill would have authorized the council to pass legislative measures which would have become effective in the absence of a veto by Congress or the President. Arguments in favor of the constitutionality of this procedure are very impressive, and we think the subcommittee has been unnecessarily timorous in receding from its first position. At the same time this change will make the bill less vulnerable to attack.

With the bill in this form, we wish the subcommittee had spelled out in more detail the municipal powers that may be exercised without specific approval of Congress. Many existing laws hamper the District Commissioners in administering the affairs of the city and they would continue to hamper the council after it inherited the Commissioners' functions. But the bill has the great virtue of giving the council clear power to pass and put into effect the District budget, without congressional interference, except for such advice as might be given through the proposed joint Senate-House committee. And the more cumbersome legislative device could doubtless be used to clarify and relieve of encumbrance the ordinance-making powers that the council would inherit. On the whole, we think the bill will command overwhelming approval of the people, and we hope that Congress will enact it, with improvements, as it progresses through the legislative process.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1948]

THIS BILL SHOULD BE PASSED

Washingtonians should be given the opportunity to vote for or against any home-rule plan that Congress is willing to approve.

Congress should give them that opportunity by enacting the rewritten Auchincloss bill prepared for introduction in the House today.

By providing for a referendum, thus making home rule as approved by Congress contingent on the wishes of the people who live here, the Auchincloss subcommittee has accomplished these things:

It has removed objections to home rule based on the apprehension that in its final form a home-rule bill would contain injurious provisions, leaving citizens who favored the principle with no means to express disapproval of the specifications.

It has narrowed the issue of home rule to the question of whether the people here prefer a new form of partially representative local government—with all the precise details of organization laid before them in advance—or whether they prefer the existing commission form of nonrepresentative local government.

It has placed the opponents of the home-rule legislation in a difficult position. They can still work for defeat of home rule. But in opposing congressional enactment of this bill in its present form they would be resisting the idea that the people here should have the right to decide for themselves on the form of local government they prefer. That, of course, is an untenable position and cannot be logically defended.

For the new, underlying principle of the Auchincloss bill is simply this: Here is a plan for local Government that will make it responsive to the will of the voting citizens who are to be governed by it, while retaining, as any such plan must, the supreme control of the Federal City by Congress. Are you for it or are you against it?

It seems to the Star that Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and his subcommittee deserve the highest commendation for their whole approach to this question of home rule. They have been patient, diligent in their efforts to find and put down on paper a workable formula. They have sought advice on every hand, they have heard everybody who wanted to be heard, in trying to perfect a method of local suffrage that will give the people here the degree of self government permissible under the Constitution without injuriously affecting the control which Congress must retain.

The changes written into the bill reflect the views of a great many people who testified for and against it. The whole purpose of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and his subcommittee has been to write a bill that conforms to intelligent thought and suggestion. If the people here, on close study and further consideration, do not want this home rule plan, that is one thing. But if they do not want it, its defeat should come at their hands through the ballot—not through whispering campaigns or the inaction resulting from bottling up the bill in a committee.

Congress should pass this bill at this session and let the people here vote on it next November 15.

Air Markers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to implement the resolution adopted by the National Association of State Aviation Officials at their convention in Fort Worth, Tex., last October.

Many States, like my own, had elaborate systems of air markers for the guidance of flyers. In January 1942 all such markers within 150 miles of the coast line were obliterated by order of the War and Navy Departments.

In Connecticut we lost 300 such markers. This bill provides reimbursement to public agencies for the damage of their publicly owned air navigational aids and air markers.

I am including with my remarks the resolution as adopted and a list of States with the number of markers damaged and an estimate for those States where figures were not available:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AVIATION OFFICIALS IN CONVENTION ASSEMBLED AT FORT WORTH, TEX., OCTOBER 26–28, 1947

Whereas in January 1942 shortly after the outbreak of hostilities in World War II, the War and Navy Departments ordered the obliteration of all air markers within 150 miles of the coastline of the United States; and

Whereas these orders were carried out under the direction of the regional administrators of the Civil Aeronautics Administration so that approximately 3,000 publicly owned air markers were obliterated on the Atlantic seaboard, the Gulf Coast, and the Pacific Coast; and

Whereas there was submitted to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics a test claim under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act (Public Law 377, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) by the State of Florida which was refused on the grounds that it did not meet the requirements of the existing law; and

Whereas there was subsequently introduced into the Senate of the United States during the Eightieth Congress, Senate bill 462, authorizing the reimbursement to public agencies for the damage of their publicly owned air navigational aids and air markers caused by Federal agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of State Aviation Officials in convention assembled at Fort Worth, Tex., urges and requests the active support of the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the objectives of this bill when it is considered by the Eightieth Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That each Senator and Representative of the States represented in the membership of the National Association of State Aviation Officials is respectfully urged and requested actively to support the objectives of this bill which will restore to many States the air marking systems which were obliterated in the common defense during the war; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be formally sent to the Civil Aeronautics Administrator and the Senators and Congressmen mentioned.

Result of inquiries to coastal States on air-marker damage

1. Washington: Large number of air markers	-----
2. Oregon: Obliterated through military order	200
3. California: Airmarkers were casualties of war—no estimate	-----
4. Texas: Seems to have suffered no damage—no State system	0
5. Louisiana: No reply	-----
6. Mississippi: Informal reply—no damage	0
7. Alabama: Informal reply—no damage	0
8. Florida: Complete obliteration	1,081
9. Georgia: State affected to extent of 150 to 200	200
10. South Carolina: Informal estimate	200
11. North Carolina: Not advised how order affected North Carolina	-----
12. Virginia: Ordered to obliterate all air markers	300
13. Delaware: No reply	-----
14. Pennsylvania: No available records of number obliterated	-----
15. New Jersey: Suffered similar losses—no estimate	-----
16. New York: Considerable number—no estimate	-----
17. Connecticut: Entire system blacked out	300
18. Rhode Island: No damage—no State system	0
19. Massachusetts: Markers obliterated in mass	336
20. New Hampshire: No reply	-----
21. Maine: No reply	-----
Total estimate	2,617
10 others at average of 100 each	1,000
Grand total	3,617

Source: Florida State Improvement Commission, Tallahassee, Fla.

National Federation of Small Business Opposes Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times that private monopolies and Government bureaucracy cannot long exist in a country and have that country remain free. Gigantic monopolies in business naturally lead to monopolies in labor unions and to great Government bureaus to control both.

I recommend to all the reading of the attached letter written to President Truman by C. W. Harder, president of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc.:

On behalf of the Nation-wide small, independent business and professional men membership of the National Federation of Small Business, we call on you and your administration for positive action directed toward breaking the current labor-management impasse in the coal industry.

The inability or unwillingness of labor and management to effect some workable compromise of current differences is plainly an act detrimental to the general public welfare. Cessation of coal production at the present time affords aid and comfort, encourages enemies of this country and all free peoples. Cessation of coal production limits our own ability to prepare to ward off possible attack on our land. Cessation of coal production limits our ability to be of adequate assistance to free peoples in their battles against the enemies of freedom. Cessation of coal production strikes at the very roots of freedom and democracy in our own country because it further strangles our beleaguered system of free, competitive enterprise by striking both directly and indirectly at small, independent business.

Let us illustrate: Steel is an area of our economy where shortages have been and are marked. Because of the inability of this industry to meet current domestic demand, many small business concerns have been unable to get deliveries of goods from steel producers and have consequently suffered slow strangulation. Whether the steel producers are making use of this situation to further monopolistic tendencies is not here made an issue; it is sufficient to state that recent investigations by the Senate Small Business Committee tend to indicate that such is the situation. Let us illustrate further: because of this inability of the steel industry to meet current demand, the supplies of steel available for use by the oil industry have not been adequate. Consequently, this industry has not been able to meet total demand. And many small independents in the oil industry have not been able to get supplies of oil sufficient to support their successful operation. Whether these oil firms are making use of this situation to further monopolistic tendencies is here not made an issue; it is sufficient to point out that recent investigations by the Senate Small Business Committee tend to support the view that such is the situation.

Mr. President, the present coal strike is putting a deadly two-way squeeze on small independent enterprise—it is preventing the smaller man from securing a supply of goods adequate to support successful operation, and, in firing inflationary tendencies, it is increasing the small independents' cost of doing business.

We call on you for quick remedial action in the current situation. We say this action is obviously in the national interest, and in the interests of safeguarding our international policy. We believe that the current problem can be met approximately by use of the powers vested in Government by present labor laws and by the broad powers conferred on you as Chief Executive. But we believe that this problem must be met ultimately by use of presently existing, or strengthened, Federal antitrust law, to break up once and for all the vicious concentrations in labor and in management that make such Nation-wide tie-ups of vital industries possible.

We of the federation have striven constantly for Government use of Federal antitrust laws against monopolistic business concentrations; we are equally insistent that antitrust laws be used to break up monopolistic concentrations in the field of labor. We know that monopolistic concentrations in business militate against continuance of our system of free competitive enterprise as exemplified by small independent business; we are equally conscious of the fact that monopolistic concentrations in labor work toward the same evil end. We hold it apparent that the combination of monopolistic busi-

ness and monopolistic labor can, and surely will, destroy our free democratic way of life and substitute for it some form of totalitarianism.

We are aware of the fact that current labor legislation does not permit use of antitrust law against the labor element of our economy; we ask that you recommend to Congress that this quirk of law be corrected. We urge that leaders in Congress act to correct the situation. Our record clearly indicates that we are neither antilabor or labor baiters. Our suggestions spring only from a sincere conviction that the long-range interests of labor, as exemplified by the individual workingman, are poorly served by permitting the building of tremendous, concentrated power in the field of labor representation, just as are the long-range interests of free private enterprise ill-served by the building of oversize concentrations in business itself.

Mr. President, clearly this Nation now stands at a crossroads, one way leads to the preservation and strengthening of our free, democratic way of life, the other leads to totalitarianism and economic slavery. On what you do in the present crisis rests, to a great extent, the direction in which our national machine will travel. All of the enemies of our democracy are not without the country, and all of them within our borders are not Communists or dupes of Communists—many of them are good, solid American citizens who, unfortunately, do not realize just what they are doing.

We call on you, in your position of leadership, to read to them the lessons of democracy clearly, to indicate to them by positive use of antitrust law that overconcentration in either labor or industry is evil, that it corrupts our way of life and that its extension can result in but loss both by industry and labor of the right to freedom they enjoy today. We call on you to apply these principles in the current coal industry impasse.

C. W. HARDER.

The Gallup Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by George Gallup on the Gallup poll, entitled "GOP and Democratic Voters Give Tariff Cuts Wide Support":

GOP AND DEMOCRATIC VOTERS GIVE TARIFF CUTS WIDE SUPPORT

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 25, 1947.—The ancient and traditional difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties on the tariff issue has melted away so far as the rank and file of voters are concerned.

Every schoolboy learns from his history books that, traditionally, the Democrats stood for low tariffs, the GOP for high tariffs. But the 23-nation agreement recently signed by the United States at Geneva, lowering tariffs next year on many products, gets just as widespread support from Republican voters as from Democrats. In short, one cannot today tell a Democrat from a Republican so far as attitude toward tariffs is concerned.

That's the conclusion from a coast-to-coast survey of public opinion conducted by the institute. The study shows that about a third of the voters have heard or read about the 23-nation Geneva agreement, in which the participating countries agreed to revise their tariff rates downward. For the United States it was the biggest tariff revision in our history.

To record the reaction of the whole voting population on the issue, the institute gave each voter a brief description of the Geneva agreement, so that the views of both those who had previously heard about it and those who had not, could be ascertained.

The question was:

"Twenty-two foreign nations have agreed, starting next year, to allow certain United States products to come into their countries at lower tariff rates and we, in return, have agreed to let certain of their products come into this country at lower tariff rates. Do you favor or oppose this?"

The vote:

	Percent
Favor	63
Oppose	12
No opinion	25

The correlation of views among Republicans and Democrats is shown in the following vote by parties:

	Percent
Democrats:	
Favor	64
Oppose	10
No opinion	26
Republicans:	
Favor	63
Oppose	14
No opinion	23

Old sectional differences on the tariff seem to have partly melted away, too. The survey finds majorities ranging from 53 to 68 percent in the various geographical sections favoring the Geneva agreement.

By occupation groups, the smallest support comes from farmers, only 52 percent of whom approve the agreement, while 15 percent disapprove and 33 percent express no opinion.

As pointed out above, approximately one-third (34 percent) of the people polled had already heard or read about the Geneva agreement. A higher percentage of them expressed approval than was the case with the country as a whole. A total of 73 percent said they favored the agreement, as compared to 63 percent for the Nation.

GRANTED CONCESSIONS

The Geneva agreement starts going into effect January 1. The United States reduced the tariff on raw wool and wool products and whisky from the United Kingdom and on many other items. In exchange, a number of nations granted the United States trade concessions on some grains, cereal products, fresh and dried fruits, canned fruits, dairy products, tobacco, automobiles and parts, and machinery. We also agreed to reduce or peg import duties on such items as rubber, cocoa, chinaware, linen goods, cattle, fish, cheese, potatoes, and wood pulp.

Some Members of Congress believe that when the full force of the Geneva tariff slashes are felt by American industry and agriculture, there will be an outcry from businessmen and farmers. Representative HAROLD KNUTSON of Minnesota, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has already voiced the belief that a reaction against the tariff cuts may set in.

Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech which I delivered as guest speaker at the Democratic State convention, April 9, 1948, city hall, Augusta, Maine:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, we are on the march again, forward and not backward.

Because we have a clear goal and a firm purpose we do not allow ourselves to be sidetracked by the confusion of Republican propaganda.

We have our candidate and we have our platform, while the opposition is wasting its substance in trying to find both.

There is much talk about a dark horse in Grand Old Party circles. This is because most of the horses in the race are evenly matched, with no outstanding leader among them. Whereas this may be fine in a horse race, a great and powerful Nation like ours needs something more. We must know who the standard bearer is well in advance. We must know whether he has ability and courage. We must have a clear idea of his opinions on the major issues affecting the welfare of our Nation and of the entire world.

Within three-quarters of a year another Presidential term will begin, and we shall move into the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Our people want a Congress whose leadership will equal that of our President, teaming up with him for that balanced pull which will take us out of the problems which bog our progress.

In a city thousands of miles from here, named Moscow, they are watching every move on the American political scene. They dread the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan which seek to save Europe against communism and thereby insure peace. They and their agents in the United States want to defeat our Democratic administration.

Why?

So that they can trumpet to the world that the American people have repudiated their foreign policy and are retreating into the shell of isolationism.

So that they can convince the people of Europe that a new administration in the White House will stop all aid after July 1949 causing Europe, in despair, to bend the knee before communism.

Because they feel certain that a new and untried President, turning back the clock to the unworkable policies of the 1920's, will provoke the boom-and-bust which will prostrate the United States and make it easy game for communism.

They forget that we as Americans, seeing through this strategy, will oppose it at every turn.

But at the moment, as Moscow observes the Republican Presidential candidates trying to outwit one another, it must derive considerable satisfaction from their confusion.

Within every State they are cutting each other to pieces. Candidate is vying with candidate, using domestic and international problems as pawns in their personal contests.

Take all the statements of the GOP candidates. Put them together. What is the result? A hodge-podge of conflicting claims tailored to fit each group in turn but offering no unified, coherent program for the people.

No doubt these candidates mean well, but their lack of a positive policy in the public interest does not inspire confidence. Come November they will have a mystery candidate fortified by a hope and a prayer and nothing else.

For many years, while they were on the outside looking in, the Republicans had a field day. Like men in their second childhood, they complained against everything that the Democrats did but failed to offer any constructive program to support their criticism. They became the "sound-off but do-nothing party."

Finally, this negative attitude caught up with them.

In 1946, restless to throw off the restraints imposed by war, the people voted a Republican majority into Congress.

I am glad that this happened in 1946 instead of 1948, for it gave the people a chance to see what the Republicans would do and judge them by their performance rather than their promises.

In the party platform of 1944, the Republicans glibly went on record as favoring the expansion of social security, a program which they had bitterly opposed when Franklin D. Roosevelt, speaking with the voice of the people, demanded such long-overdue legislation to bring order out of chaos.

Back in control of Congress, however, after the 1946 elections, they started to undermine the progressive legislation enacted by the Democrats during the 1930's. Having learned nothing from their failures which had brought the Nation to the brink of revolution, they began to undo the reforms which had saved us.

One of their principal targets was social security. Instead of expanding it, as they had solemnly promised, in order to get back into power they set out to sabotage it. The Republican majority of the Congress voted to take away unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors insurance benefits from three-quarters of a million citizens.

They did this in the face of a Supreme Court decision which held that these persons were entitled to such benefits. They had to pass a special law in order to get around the Supreme Court and to defy the clearly expressed will of the people.

It is apparent by now that "die-hard" Republicans will not learn the economic facts of life. They stubbornly insist that the complex industrial economy of 1948, with its necessary checks and balances, should be run by the dog-eat-dog methods of the 1920's.

They ignore the fact that the man in the street is away ahead of their philosophy which still worships the "pilfering past."

The ground-swell of American public opinion wants its representatives to face up to the challenging issues of our time and work for solutions of them, not retreats from them.

In 1946 the Republicans campaigned on the issue of prices. Throw controls overboard and all will be well they argued, even though supply was far behind demand. They knew this fact, yet they bamboozled the public with the fond hope that absolute freedom of enterprise would haul prices down during a period of extreme shortage. I say that they were less interested in free enterprise and lower prices than they were in the golden opportunity to reap the harvest of higher prices while the going was good. That was their real reason for killing controls before the emergency was over.

Every American with the courage to face the facts knows how the public was betrayed by Republican propaganda. Once in power, they ditched all other controls and left the Nation wide open to an inflationary spree in which prices for all went sky-high and profits for the few reached extortionate levels.

They are milking the prosperity achieved under Democratic leadership since their capture of Congress. This is but a sample of their irresponsible greed. And now they have set their sights on the Presidency, hoping to elect a stooge who will give us drift instead of leadership and who will let the supergovernment of big business dictate to the Government which is supposed to represent the public.

They want to complete the circle back to 1920, closing their eyes to the fact that a nation cannot run around in circles but must go forward squarely meeting and overcoming the problems presented by the scientific developments of our time.

So many new things have come into our lives within the past 30 years requiring realistic adjustments to them that the standpat GOP mentality cannot cope with them.

It is this hardening of the political arteries that endangers the growth of our way of life.

Coupled with Republican near-sightedness, which reaches for every immediate, personal gain, it would put our Nation on the roller-coaster of "boom and bust" which will spell death for representative government.

Democracy is the middle way between the extremes of communism and fascism.

Democracy must evolve, and we of the Democratic Party are coming to grips with the problems of today boldly, fearlessly, knowing that our job is to reconcile liberty with order.

The only way to combat communism is for freemen to grow up and acquire a sense of responsibility to others as well as to themselves. In the process of strengthening ourselves and our system against communism, we must look lively to prevent a native brand of facism from developing within our borders.

In their desperate refusal to face forward it is conceivable that the Old Guard leadership of the GOP may adopt a diluted form of fascism, but fasicsm nonetheless.

Our veterans have returned from war eager to marry and establish homes. On every side they are stopped in their legitimate aims by a Republican-dominated Congress which buries every attempt to provide housing for our veterans at reasonable cost, and buries it at the command of the real-estate lobby.

As Democrats, who put the public welfare before that of any group or class, we know that in normal times a landlord has rights and the tenant has rights.

These are not normal times.

We are in the middle of a housing crisis which must be met by realistic methods. For the sake of our Nation's most precious assets, the health of the people and the environment of our children, Government must assume the leadership in building low-cost housing until industry wakes up and develops streamlined techniques to meet the need.

The basic rights of human beings must not be forfeited to the excess-profits motive.

In the meantime, a "better than nothing" rent control has been extended until March 31, 1949. Only a determined fight by the President and the Democratic minority succeeded in saving some protection for American tenants.

Plainly none of us wants to see rent control as a permanent policy of Government. But until such time as Democratic-sponsored legislation is enacted to increase the supply of rental housing in the low- and medium-price range, tenants must be protected from the profiteering element among landlords.

And just as plainly we need a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President to translate this need into performance.

Last, among all the nations, we have come to realize the necessity for a national health program to conserve our human resources. It is a tragic mockery that in the United States, above all countries, so many millions of our people should be living in constant fear of sickness; worried, not for themselves and the pain and disability they might endure, but haunted by the impossible cost of paying for medical care.

Meeting this challenge head-on, the Democrats are working for a National Health Insurance Act based on the well-tried principles of insurance, to effect a better distribution of the financial burden of caring for those who are ill.

It is preventive in that it encourages people to apply for medical care in time without holding back through fear of the heavy debt they might incur.

It does not change the practice of medicine in any respect, but simply changes the method by which we pay for it.

Using the same four or five billions we now spend for medical care individually, it pools this in an insurance fund, and permits doctors to keep us well, instead of treating us only after we are seriously and expensively ill.

Funds collected by the Federal Government would be expended through locally controlled plans. In place of charity medical care, we would have complete care as a right for which we paid.

Doctors would remain in private practice. Both doctors and patients are guaranteed complete freedom of choice.

There was a time when such limited plans as the Blue Cross and the Blue Shield were considered as heresy. The relentless pressure of events, however, has convinced us that we must accept adjustments for group survival. What was once feared and hated has become a blessing. So, too, a National Health Insurance Act approaching this real and urgent problem with democratic skill and courage will assure us this freedom from fear for all.

A nation with full production and wide low-cost distribution, with adequate housing, real medical coverage, and with decent wages for the teachers upon whom the future of our society depends, these have been and will continue to be our practical goals.

At this convention of Maine Democrats, I am aware that you represent the alert and forward-looking citizens of a great agricultural area.

Here is the town-meeting form of government, which is democracy in its purest sense. From your grass-root Americanism you know that the skyscrapers of New York are nothing without a healthy agriculture as the base of our existence.

You also know that more was done for soil conservation, for support of farm prices at reasonable levels, for protection of farm properties from foreclosure under 16 years of Democratic progress than under 50 years of Republican neglect.

The benefits which the Democratic farm program has achieved, may be pointed up by this one State example.

In 1932 North Dakota sold less than $61,000,000 worth of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

In 1947 it sold nearly $737,000,000 worth of the same products.

And the GOP complains:

Perhaps they want to mortgage the farmers of America all over again * * * as they did in the early 1920's under the slogan of "back to normalcy". They meant back all right, but back to the poorhouse.

They think that the farmers have forgotten the bitter experiences which they suffered under Republican administrations. They would have them give up their present prosperity and gamble their future on the selfish leadership which bled the land and left dust bowls in place of growing crops.

It is my opinion that the American farmer will not be taken in by such a shell game. Once burned by republicanism he will not fall for its "line" again.

"Down-easters," being nearer to Europe than any other part of the United States, know that the security of our Nation rests on cooperation with other peace-loving countries to stop aggression in its tracks.

The record proves that the Democratic Party fathered the League of Nations and the United Nations, both steps toward that eventual world organization to outlaw war.

In the meantime, we must be prepared.

Under the wide-awake leadership of a Democratic administration, we are strengthening our defense set-up.

But as the people of Maine are aware of our world responsibilities, they also understand that there is a job to be done at home.

The vast water power of your rivers must be harnessed, not only to reclaim lands but

to prevent floods, to extend your inland waterways, and to provide hydroelectric power.

Maine can and will become a great industrial State when her abundant natural resources are properly developed in the public interest.

At this convention, we point to the bankruptcy of Republican policy as a warning to the people.

As Democrats, we shall not dwell on the unhappy past of the GOP. We have a positive and affirmative program. While safeguarding our civil and political liberties, we shall strive for economic liberty.

Genuine freedom of opportunity, protected from monopoly in any form is our objective.

Every man and woman who is able and willing to work is entitled to a living, annual income, so that our people from their savings may invest in a greater future for themselves in these United States.

This will provide incentive, stir enterprise, and make good business for all.

As many of your forefathers left their homesteads to carry the seeds of democracy to the unsettled West, helping to build the strength of our Union, so we of today must pioneer.

With firm faith in the progressive principles of the Democratic Party we face forward.

At this convention, the strength of Maine democracy is being mobilized to bring out the vote for victory.

From the bottom to the top we shall work night and day for the election of the whole Democratic slate led by our fearless President, Harry S. Truman.

Adequate Defense Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter from Mr. Edmund Key, Jr., chairman of the Harrison County, Tex., Army Advisory Committee, a resolution adopted by that committee, and a list of the members composing the committee:

MARSHALL, TEX., *April 6, 1948.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: The Army advisory committee of Harrison County had a meeting on March 17, at which the resolutions attached were passed unanimously. This committee is composed of the heads of all the civic organizations in Marshall, together with some of the officers of the National Guard and county and city officials, and last but not least, Myron Blalock. Similar resolutions have been passed by the various civic organizations, at the instance of the Army advisory committee, and we had planned to ask all of the women's clubs in the county to join us in this endeavor to do our part in getting the Nation in a position to take care of itself.

From what I read in the paper, Congress is already showing signs that it is ready to take the necessary steps and so it may be that these resolutions may no longer be necessary, but I trust that they will not be unwelcome. You will note that the resolutions direct that our Representatives be asked for forthright committals favoring universal military training as well as the reactivation of the selective-service program. I would very much appreciate your giving me an answer in order that I may present it to the committee.

Very truly yours,

E. KEY, Jr.,
Chairman.

Whereas it appears sane and reasonable for the citizens of the United States to face the unhappy fact that the relations between our country and the Soviet Union are rapidly nearing a crisis where our country must either take the first decisively fatal step toward eventually surrendering our land and people to the Russian Government, or else settle the matter by war; and

Whereas it seems wise that such a crisis should be approached with our armed forces adequately manned, trained, and equipped to take the field with the best possible chance for a swift victory at the least cost in American lives; and

Whereas our highest and best informed military experts and authorities have recommended two steps for bringing up our armed forces to the necessary strength in men and equipment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we of Marshall, Tex., endorse first, the immediate reenactment of the selective-service program, and second, the quick enactment of a universal military training law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be presented to our Representative, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, and our Senators, the Honorable TOM CONNALLY and the Honorable LEE O'DANIEL, with a letter respectfully informing them that it is our studied wish for them to represent us by using every effort within their power in pushing such legislation through Congress, and that we respectfully ask them for a forthright answer to our request; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to keep this issue out of politics that all candidates for Senator from Texas, or Representative from this district, be asked to pledge themselves to wholeheartedly support the legislative program here endorsed. And that the officers of this organization be instructed to report back such reply as each Senator, Representative, or candidate may make.

Unanimously passed by Harrison County Army Advisory Committee on March 17, 1948.

EDMUND KEY, Jr.,
Chairman.

HARRISON COUNTY ARMY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Edmund Key, Jr., chairman; president, First National Bank.

Mercer Rains, colonel, Texas National Guard; mortician.

Myron G. Blalock, colonel, finance, AUS, TNG, retired, vice chairman; attorney.

Max Lale, lieutenant colonel, ORC, secretary; reporter for Marshall Messenger.

George P. Rains, brevet lieutenant general, TNG.

Will E. Lake, colonel, Infantry, AUS, TNG, retired; druggist.

R. M. Nichols, county judge, Harrison County.

W. H. Hartley, mayor, city of Marshall.

Ray C. Allen, colonel, TNG, commander, American Legion.

Frank Green, Jr., service officer, Veterans of Foreign Wars; attorney.

Morris Moore, major, ORC, president, Officers' Reserve Corps; Marshall Hardware.

O. H. Clark, president, chamber of commerce; vice president, First National Bank.

Donald Minter, president, junior chamber of commerce.

Millard Cope, president, Rotary Club; editor, Marshall News Messenger.

Bill Sullivan, president, Kiwanis Club; mortician.

R. C. Ladymon, president, Lions Club; merchant.

J. B. Beckett, president, Optimist Club.

Fred Lenz, past commander, Texas State Guard; jeweler.

Alexander T. Nelsen, lieutenant colonel, AUS, ORC; commanding officer, One hundred and Forty-sixth Armored Infantry; Farmers-Stockmen's Supply.

Leslie McMahon, lieutenant colonel, AUS, TNG; commanding officer, Six Hundred and Forty-seventh Armored Artillery Battalion; Emp. T. & P. Railway.

Dr. Frank Mondrik, ORC, commanding officer, medical detachment; vice president, Harrison County Medical Association.

Rev. Henry F. Selcer, Episcopal clergyman; major and chaplain, Texas State Guard.

C. M. Beckett, chairman, draft board.

R. Dennerd, superintendent of public schools.

I am also inserting herewith a copy of my reply, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 14, 1948.*

Mr. EDMUND KEY, Jr.,
Chairman, Harrison County Army Advisory Committee, Marshall, Tex.:

Have just received your letter and resolution concerning universal military training and selective service. Am wholeheartedly in favor of this program, and I congratuate the Army advisory committee of Harrison County and other participating groups and citizens for their courageous and patriotic attitude. I also favor the 70-group Air Force. It is better to be fully prepared and not need it than to need preparedness and not have it. Our war cost ran as high as $500,000,000 a day during the last war. We can well afford to risk the cost that will be entailed by the adoption of your program.

Regards.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress.

Tennessee Editor Praises National Geographic Article on TVA—Editorial Is Answer to McKellar Anti-TVA Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the Paris, Tenn., Post-Intelligencer of April 9, 1948, and was written by its capable and foresighted editor, W. Percy Williams.

The editorial comments on the feature article of this month's National Geographic which is devoted to the benefits of TVA. It especially stresses the national asset which the people of the Nation have in the recreational benefits of this great project. Mr. Williams, in discussing these incidental benefits, knows whereof he speaks, because Paris, Tenn., is near Kentucky Lake and its citizens are keenly aware of the recreational values coming from TVA.

The editorial is as follows:

FAVORABLE ARTICLE ON TVA

Several weeks ago we made some comments in this column about the absurd criticism of TVA as an electric power distributing agency, and expressed the opinion that the brightest star in the New Deal galaxy would eventually be destroyed by the Power Trust

unless the people of the United States are made to understand what its objects were to begin with, and what its benefits now are to one of the most important regions of the country.

An article that will go a long way toward bringing about such an understanding appears in the April issue of the National Geographic magazine. It was written by Frederick Simpich, and it is illustrated with 18 color photographs taken by J. Baylor Roberts.

This article is right along the line with our thinking for many years—that electric power generated by the dams on the Tennessee River, and its tributaries, is distinctly secondary. The primary objects for developing the river with a series of locks and dams was to provide a 9-foot channel for transportation through an important region of the country, to provide flood control along the river, to reclaim the soil in one of the richest valleys in the world, to provide fertilizer in time of peace and munitions in time of war, and to give one-fourth of the people of the Nation recreational facilities and advantages they can get in no other way.

This article makes it clear as crystal that the dams are worth more than they cost if they accomplish nothing more than providing recreational facilities. The leading dealer in sporting goods in Chicago reports sales in the Tennessee Valley greater than in Florida, the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, the Great Lakes, or any other section of the Nation.

Also it points out that in no 12-month period since the system of dams was finished has it failed to pay handsome interest on the money invested in controlling flood waters of the Tennessee River. And as to transportation advantages all it had to mention was that Decatur, Ala., a former inland city, is now the site of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Co. plant where ocean-going vessels are built, including the landing craft that enabled us to reclaim the Philippine Islands in the late war.

Everybody knows in a vague sort of way that air power played an important role in winning the war, but comparatively few people know TVA furnished the power for manufacturing considerably more than half of all the aluminum used in building airplanes, and still fewer people know that nowhere else in the United States than at Oak Ridge, Tenn., could the atomic bomb have been perfected.

Fertilizer is something the average person thinks of only hazily, yet without it the valley of the Tennessee would surely have suffered the same fate as the valley of the Nile. TVA is by far the largest source of fertilizer in the world, or rather the source of the most important ingredient in fertilizer, and this advantage of TVA has been publicized less than any other.

We have gone through a period of "easy money" since 1940, and for that reason the fact that the average income of the people of the Tennessee Valley area had increased more rapidly than that of any other section of the Nation has gone unnoticed. It is the only section where the average has more than doubled, regardless of the high wages of industry in Chicago, Detroit, and Pittsburgh.

Economists criticized the last annual statement of TVA on the grounds that too little of the billion-dollar investment had been allocated to power development. The truth is that none of it should have been charged to development of electricity aside from the actual cost of dynamos, high-tension lines, and substations; because electricity is nothing more, nor less, than a byproduct that was made available by the construction of dams for an entirely different purpose.

And since the people of the United States own this valuable byproduct it is certainly absurd for them to refuse to use it because they believe in private enterprise and oppose the Government competing with private industry. We believe in private enterprise as strongly as the next one but not to the extent of giving an industry something we already own and developed with our own money.

Articles such as the one in this month's National Geographic will publicize TVA in the right way and we are sincerely pleased that it came out this month right at the time Senator K. D. MCKELLAR is trying so hard to cripple this public agency. We wish a copy of it could be placed in the hands of every thinking person in the Nation.

Will Unlimited Military Spending Be Another Sucker Play for the Communists' Benefit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am concluding the following article entitled "A Voice From the Country," by Louis Bromfield, which appeared in the Omaha World Herald, April 11, 1948:

UNITED STATES CAN LOSE IN COLD WAR AS SURELY AS IN A HOT ONE—INCREASING EXPENDITURES MAY BRING DISASTROUS INFLATION

Those who are crying for steadily increasing expenditures on armament of all kinds, for Universal Military Training and for the return of Selective Service are in fact crying for something else, which can in the long run be as disastrous as war itself. It can become the opening wedge for socialism and finally for one form or another of totalitarian government. They are begging for unlimited inflation and the corresponding decline in the value of the dollar.

In this connection it might be well to observe that there is no case in the history of the world in which artificial government regulations have been able to check rising inflation for longer than a few weeks. The only real and ultimate check, save the natural leveling off of wages and prices is the brutal one in which a government repudiates its obligations both as to currency and government bonds and the interest on them, revalues its currency and starts all over again.

This is a process which throws production and employment out of gear and ruins the whole of the middle class which is the backbone of any democracy, without which no democracy can exist. This was the course taken by Germany which first brought Communist disorders, was succeeded by naziism and finally by utter ruin.

The same repudiation process on a less violent scale was practiced by France in the 1920's. It eventually brought about a Socialist government blackmailed by the Communists, which contributed more than any other factor to the collapse of France a few years later. Most people today find no choice between communism and nazism.

REDS HOPE FOR UNITED STATES ECONOMIC COLLAPSE

Such a progression seems a long way off in this country but it is not impossible if we continue in a rapidly progressing state of war, either cold or hot.

It should not be overlooked that the men of ill will in Moscow, who have just put Russian currency through the wringer because of the condition of inflation referred to above, are aware of this progression.

They understand that unlimited drains upon American economy, for military expenditure or foreign aid or both, can bring about the same process here.

They also know that economic collapse is a far greater weapon in the ultimate victory of communism than any military success.

In their shrewd minds they already are scenting victory over us by the inflation which is the accompaniment of persistent and continuous preparation for war on a grand scale.

In modern warfare the victors are ruined as well as the vanquished.

Italy and Great Britain alike are ruined nations. We, in this country, have survived because we had so vast a store of real wealth and natural resources, but these we are dissipating as rapidly as possible by preparation for war, by lend-lease, and by foreign relief.

Soviet Russia has an even vaster store of natural wealth, as yet largely untouched and undissipated. She cannot lose either socially or economically in any struggle because her citizens have neither liberties nor living standards to lose. Her strange economy is controlled in the totalitarian manner at the sacrifice of all but a tiny minority.

I am only trying to point out that the few men in Washington, who keep threatening disaster as a means of creating larger and larger armaments and larger and larger military forces are working as earnestly as the Communist element and perhaps far more effectively for the ultimate destruction of this Nation.

With them are the men who find it difficult or impossible to discover a modus vivendi with Soviet Russia.

TAXES MUST COME DOWN

Reduction of taxes is in order. An increase of taxes is impossible since in the higher brackets, we have long ago reached the point of diminishing returns and in the lower brackets an increase can only lead to strikes and demands for higher wages and consequently greater inflation and the shrinking of the dollar.

This progression is exactly what happened in Great Britain, which was ruined far more by interior economic pressures resulting from war itself than by the loss of battles or the bombing of her cities. The time came when confiscation of capital and the liquidation of private property abroad became necessary.

Today Great Britain has neither any real wealth and raw materials nor the currency with which to purchase these things. Two wars and the taxes accompanying them have bled white her whole economy.

Few people any longer dispute the direct relation of war preparations and unlimited foreign relief to inflation. Those few have already been proven wrong by the whole record of history since the time of the Greek republics.

The dollar will never regain the value in purchasing power it had in 1930 or even in 1940 short of repudiation and revolution which means disaster for most of us.

The increase of an $18.75 Government bond over a period of 10 years had already been very nearly devoured by rising costs of every commodity—long before the 10 years are up. All of us who own them stand at the end of 10 years when we cash them in to receive much less than actual value of the original $18.75.

Under increasing Government expenditures and taxes and dissipation of our real wealth we can arrive at a point where an $18 bond will not buy a newspaper.

Perhaps the fact is that we are on the horns of an insoluble dilemma.

The Soviet men of ill-will have undoubtedly considered this. When they talk persistently of the approaching collapse of American economy, it may not be simply for propaganda purposes or mere wishful thinking.

To save us, we certainly need greater leadership than has yet been revealed in Washington.

It is a gloomy picture. In considering it, we must never overlook the possibility that we may ruin ourselves in a cold war as surely as in a hot one.

Whatever measures are taken with regard to military expenditure or foreign relief deserve the most minute examination.

The surest way to deliver the world over to Russia and Russianism is the economic ruin of this last real bulwark.

Oil Pollution Must Be Removed—Our Coasts, Waterways, Watercraft, and Sea Food Must Be Protected—Menace by Fire a Serious Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 4468 is a bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, to increase the penalties specified in such act, and for other purposes. It was introduced by me to relieve from conditions arising by reason of the increased use of oil for transportation of ships. The conditions discussed in this memorandum obtain all along the harbors and coasts of the United States. Property owners are entitled to protection. I have considered oil pollution particularly in Hampton Roads but the conditions resemble those on other coasts and in other ports and harbors. I have personally examined these conditions and I know our immediate problem is largely one of enforcement, and involves detection of offenders, including ships and personnel, subjecting them to the punishments prescribed by law, but doing so without undue hardship to navigation. Serious fire menace also threatens.

The Oil Pollution Act became law in 1924. It is to be found in sections 431 to 436, of title 33, Protection of Navigable Waters. Section 434 provides:

Any person who violates the preceding section or any regulation prescribed in pursuance thereof, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,500, nor less than $500, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year nor less than 30 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment, for each offense. And any vessel (other than a vessel owned and operated by the United States) from which oil is discharged in violation of the preceding section, or any regulation prescribed in pursuance thereof, shall be liable for the pecuniary penalty specified in this section, and clearance of a vessel from a port of the United States may be withheld until the penalty is paid, and said penalty shall constitute a lien on such vessel which may be recovered in proceedings by libel in rem in the district court of the United States for any district within which the vessel may be. (June 7, 1924, ch. 316, sec. 4, 43 Stat 605.)

Section 435 provides:

A board of local inspector of vessels may, subject to the provisions of section 239 of title 46, Shipping, and of sections 431 to 436, inclusive, of title 46, Shipping, suspend or revoke a license issued by any such board to the master or other licensed officer of any vessel found violating the provisions of section 433 of this chapter. (June 7, 1924, ch. 316, sec. 5, 43 Stat. 605.)

In section 432, F. C. A., title 33, it is provided:

(a) The term "oil" means oil of any kind or in any form, including fuel oil, oil sludge, and oil refuse;

(b) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, any owner, master, officer, or employee of a vessel, and any officer, agent, or employee of the United States;

(c) The term "coastal navigable waters of the United States" means all portions of the sea within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and all inland waters navigable in fact in which the tide ebbs and flows;

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of War.

When the Oil Pollution Act of 1924 was enacted, the laws then existing which included the law for the protection of New York Harbor and adjacent waters (10 F. C. A., title 33, secs. 441, et seq.) were wholly inadequate to protect against oil pollution. The New York Harbor Act was enacted in 1888, and the conditions then existing were different from those in 1924 and now. After World War I, we were confronted with conditions similar to those with which we are afflicted now, but they have grown much worse. One of our greatest difficulties is enforcement because of the absence of evidence needed to secure apprehension and conviction. The Army engineers, the Coast Guard, the prosecuting United States attorneys, and other agencies are doing their best, but they are working with limited appropriations, insufficient staffs, and many more oil-burning vessels than ever before. Apprehension, early trials, and convictions are necessary.

I have been studying all aspects of the existing situation, receiving suggestions, and considering what may be done. Arrests are made but the cases await trial. The evidence is lost and delays result in disregard for the law by offenders and continued hardships by property owners. The law and other laws are brought into disrepute, and justice fails.

Accordingly, as one step in the solution of our existing situation, I have proposed to amend the Oil Pollution Act in the following particulars: In the bill H. R. 4468, the fine proposed to be levied is increased from a maximum of $2,500 to $10,000, and from a minimum of $500 to $1,000. Provisions for imprisonment are changed from a maximum of "not exceeding 1 year" to "not exceeding 5 years," and from a minimum of "nor less than 30 days" to "nor less than 6 months."

There is added a new subsection to be known as subsection (b) to section 4. It reads as follows:

(b) If any individual (except an officer or employee of the United States engaged in the administration or enforcement of this act) furnishes to a district attorney or to any officer or employee of the United States referred to in section 3 which leads to the imposition and recovery of a fine or pecuniary penalty under subsection (a) of this section, he shall be paid, at the time of such recovery, one-half of such fine or pecuniary penalty. For the purposes of this section an amount recovered under a bail bond shall be deemed a recovery of a fine imposed under subsection (a).

I believe that this reward for convictions will secure enforcements, apprehensions, and conviction.

It is thought by me and by many others who have studied our problems that if provision is made whereby informers may receive rewards from the fines imposed, there will be closer scrutiny of offenders, their practices and their disregard of our laws. They know the great difficulty in proving cases against them, and if persons engaged in local operations know that upon conviction of the wrongdoers they will receive payment for their efforts, they will watch the situation more closely and give more time and effort to the correction of evils which are iniquitous in the extreme.

I do not expect the amendment to be a complete remedy for our worries, but it will contribute a great deal to their correction.

In my study of this situation I have found many suggestions of considerable merit, and some of them are being tried, but the amendment I am seeking will not interfere with other remedies.

It is suggested that oil dumped on these waters may be reclaimed profitably as a fuel oil, but that will require reclamation points at which oil could be pumped into tanks and then subjected to such process as would reclaim the good oil and dispose of the remainder, without any of it being dumped in the water. It is said that vessels having oil to be disposed of, could be required by law to go to specified reclamation points to dispose of oil, under penalty of such severe fines that they would not dare disregard them. I hope that is true. It is said that even if a vessel can afford to pay a fine of $500, rather than to take the oil out to sea to dump it, they could reasonably be required to pay a reasonable service fee for such service, and that if the oil cannot be reclaimed profitably, it can be burned and without contamination to the waters of the harbor. This suggestion is receiving every attention and some relief has been worked out, but it may not suffice.

Discussing existing conditions, one property owner said in 1947:

The oil is black and sticks like glue to the body especially to the feet. One cannot walk on the beach without getting into it. When swimming, it turns one nearly black. It is more in evidence this year than at any time since I bought my first home in Buckroe in 1926.

If anything can be done to stop the merchant ships from dumping oil in and around Hampton Roads, it should be done. It is outrageous to think we who live in this beautiful section should be subjected to such indignities.

Another property owner says that ships that empty their oil in Chesapeake Bay or even 100 miles out should be forced to pump their bilge oil into drums when

they are at the docks taking on fuel; that this oil can be sold and used in connection with mosquito extermination.

He says the Coast Guard and Navy should be used to enforce the laws against ships emptying their bilges in the bay or ocean because no matter how far out this oil is dumped, it finds its way back to the shore. He says that this oil menace hurts business and keeps people from bathing, which is the chief attraction. The Buckroe Civil League has been fighting this for years, but does not seem to be able to contact the right people to have the laws enforced.

Another resident says that having at various times made a number of sea voyages as licensed Diesel engineer officer, he thinks he can suggest a way to stop a lot of the oil from being dumped.

He says:

The only sure way would be to have a free collecting barge operated by the State. The oil collected can be processed and used on roads, and if that is not done, then the only way to control the dumping overboard is to put an equally stiff fine on the chief engineer of that ship as well as on the captain, as the captain actually has nothing to do with the engine room department, but that there is usually rivalry and friction between deck officers and engineer officers, and it is often possible that the chief engineer would not care if oil went overboard when pumping ballast out of the empty fuel oil tanks in order to make trouble for the captain if he is disliked.

A fine should also be put on the engineer that was on watch at the time it was pumped overboard.

Being experienced in that line, I know that there are a number of ways that an engineer can pump ballast water out without pumping the oil and sludge. The first way is for the engineer to sound the tanks while pumping and stop before the tank is empty so that the oil and sludge floating on top of the water doesn't go out. After doing all the tanks with ballast water that way then they could pump all the smaller tanks dry into one large tank, allowing the oil to float to the top. It then could be pumped almost clear of water by sounding of the tank. The oil thus left can be run through a centrifuge and save the shipping company that much fuel.

Incidentally, the question of pumping of ballast water without dumping oil overboard should be put into the examination for all engineering officers when sitting for their licenses. (It is not in the examination now.)

To trace offenders the Coast Guard or the quarantine officers could fasten a white square flap of canvas over the overboard discharge pipes of all new arriving ships. Any oil pumped then would stain the canvas. That would be sure to make them more cautious.

A gentleman engaged in fisheries says:

The commercial fishermen and oystermen and all sea-food industry have been hurt tremendously.

On several occasions fishermen have taken fish that tasted like oil and had to throw them back. On one occasion I had fish; after they were cooked we could not eat them because of the oil taste.

The cost of taking this oil from ships while they are in harbor is about $700. If a captain could dump oil twice without being caught he can save money if he only pays a fine of $1,000. We believe if there was a jail sentence of say 6 months or 1 year and $2,000 fine, we will see less oil dumped in the waters we have to depend on for our living.

A property owner writes:

I am writing in regard to damages the dumping of oil in Hampton Roads does to my cottages and to the detriment of the returns I get from renting out these houses; in the summertime, when the tenants go in bathing and get covered with the tarlike oil, and then track it all over the cottages. It not only hurts my places, but it ruins bathing suits, clothes, shoes and towels, rugs, etc., and everything else used on the beach for pleasure.

A large local property holder writes:

I think the entire problem is one of enforcement. While there have been occasional cases where ship officers and owners have been fined for discharging oil into the waters, there are many, many cases which have received absolutely no attention.

An official writes:

As to the suggestion that ships be not allowed to pump bilges until at sea, it is not considered feasible since the emptying of holds and bilges is often a prerequisite to taking on new cargo.

Another official says:

I think that the navigation interests or other offending agencies of whatever kind causing pollution should be made to know that the law will be rigidly enforced and that a fine of sufficient proportions to compel obedience will be imposed.

A prominent member of the General Assembly of Virginia writes:

We have a great sea-food industry, the fate of which depends upon how quickly and successfully the pollution problem is overcome.

Another writer engaged in the fisheries writes:

we fishermen feel mighty bad when we see our rivers and the shores covered with oil and the fish being driven away and some places up the James River when fish go to spawn we find the little dead on the shore before they can escape and get out to sea.

This writer says that fishermen have quit in this area and gone out for other jobs.

Another gentleman writes:

This problem is of concern to every lover of fish and sea water.

The problem is that of oil pollution by dumping bilge residue from oil-burning ships. The residue destroys marine life, fish, oysters, etc., sullying boats, and causing great annoyance to the bathers on beaches, and probably considerable economic loss to the owners of resorts along the shores affected.

He says reduction in dumping in the inland waters will result in increasing it on the high seas where it is likely to cause equal damage when it reaches our ocean shores.

Another prominent resident writes:

With the increased number of ships in Hampton Roads it is quite natural that more oil will be detected in the water at Hampton Roads, and while there is at the present a fine of $1,000, it appears that when only a fine is concerned many masters or mates will take a chance, and I doubt seriously whether it will be eliminated entirely if the amount of the fine is increased. It would, therefore, appear to me that if it would carry in addition a jail sentence of 3 to 6 months, pollution would be eliminated entirely.

Many masters who have their ships anchored in the stream and are notified that they will be placed in the dock in the early morning will take a chance on emptying their bilges and assume that either the tide will cause the oil to drift away from the ship or that the ship may be taken into the dock, thereby making it almost impossible to know the ship that pollutes the water.

Another resident in the community writes that she has one and one-half acres of shore line which before the pollution was filled with grass and oysters, but that the grass is now dead and the oysters are dying in large numbers. She says:

I am sure that it is the oil that is killing them.

Another informed citizen says that closer cooperation is needed in apprehending and prosecuting violators of the regulations against pumping bilge oil. He says there has been difficulty in obtaining eyewitnesses to testify in Federal court. He says it is necessary to catch the ship in the act or obtain reliable witnesses to secure convictions. Prosecution is frequently delayed when the bilge oil is dumped just before the vessel leaves port. Then it becomes necessary to await the ship's return to Hampton Roads for Federal court hearing.

I am satisfied that the United States district engineer's office is working closely with the United States customs officials, the Coast Guard, the office of the United States attorney, and the Martime Commission in the enforcement of regulations. All of these officials have urged all witnesses to come forward whenever they see a ship pumping oil and give evidence as to time, place, and, if possible, samples of the oil, and pictures. If private individuals and organizations cooperate, pollution can be reduced.

All Coast Guard vessels in the area have been directed to be on the lookout for violators of the oil-pollution laws and masters of incoming vessels are informed of the provisions of those laws on arrival.

If everyone will do his part and stop waiting for others to take the initiative we will win. Whoever will not do what he can, ought not to complain.

There are several cases pending in the United States district court in Norfolk, Va., where indictments have been procured but they have not been tried. There may be sufficient reasons for delays in trials, but where cases of any kind are not disposed of, the law is brought into disrepute, the detection of crimes becomes more difficult, and all laws are brought into contempt. So far as it is possible to secure action on these cases, I believe the United States district attorney will do what he can to dispose of them, and I have advised him that whenever he so desires I will appeal to the Attorney General of the United States for additional assistants if his office is insufficiently staffed.

LIBEL OF SHIPS TO ENFORCE THE LAW

Under the Oil Pollution Act, libels are authorized to protect our coastal waters and I hope our enforcing agencies will see to it that they are used. I call attention to the *Pan. Am. case* (C. C. A., third circuit; 148 Fed. (2d ed.) 925), wherein the judgment of the lower court was reversed, with direction to enter a judgment in favor of the United States, and against the vessel for a pecuniary penalty.

The protection of our beaches and boats is not only an obligation due by

the United States to the property owners, but the fishery resources of the United States are entitled to protection. Our uplands and watercraft need protection from the menace of fire which is always present.

This situation is one that has been developing for a long time, but we are determined a remedy must be found and we shall exhaust every possible effort to find it. Personally, I shall welcome all information, suggestions, and aid possible from all sources. All of our ports, harbors, coasts, and waterways in the United States are menaced. Our fisheries are in jeopardy. All can help.

I hope that all areas affected may bring their grievances to the attention of their members in the United States Senate and House of Representatives to the end that we may all work together.

The gravity of the situation is graphically outlined to me by one well-informed gentlemen who writes:

Twice this summer I have gone over to Hampton Creek where I keep a small boat, and the whole length of the hull for several inches above the water line has been covered with a heavy coating of sticky black oil. This is uniformly the case with every boat moored in the creek. Also the bulkheads and shores as far as the eye could see were a black mass of oil filth.

I would like to point out that to have this oil cleaned off the hull costs anywhere from $15 to $50 depending on the size of boat. With the large number of boats in this section, 1,000 might be contaminated during the summer so that the financial loss may be of the order of $25,000—a large sum.

I saw the conditions described above. I know them to be true.

Information recently received is that there have been arrests of 49 cases dumping oil since last summer, but only 5 have been tried in court. They must be tried and I am glad to report that the United States District Attorney advises me that it is hoped to dispose of all pending cases at the next term of the United States District Court which meets in May, but that doubt is entertained as to the sufficiency of the evidence in some of the cases. The amendment which I am seeking will aid in furnishing the evidence necessary for conviction.

It has been brought to my attention that some offending vessels transfer masters or engineers who are criminally liable so that they will not be returned to the jurisdiction of the court where they are indicted. I have asked that in every such instance the vessel be proceeded against by libel, and that the vessel or the offending officers be caught wherever they can be found and proceeded against to the limit of the law. Some companies are working an apparent run-around and I shall do all in my power to uphold the authorities and drive the offenders and their ships forever from our borders.

Another situation confronting us in Hampton Roads is that some vessels passing through Chesapeake Bay en route to the other places north, such as Baltimore and other ports dump oil beyond our shores but the tides bring the oil to our shores so that we are not afflicted only by vessels coming to our ports, but by those visiting other ports.

In the Times-Herald, a newspaper of Newport News, Va., issued on Friday, April 9, 1948, appears an editorial which is very pertinent to this issue, and I desire to include it in my remarks:

NEEDED ACTION ON OIL POLLUTION

Official agencies have made commendable progress in solving the problem of oil pollution of the lower Chesapeake Bay and Hampton Roads. They are going to make it easier to conform to the law against oil pollution than to violate it, but until that program gets fully into effect some retardant action is needed. We still are denied the full use of our waterways for recreation, and the sea-food business is damaged by deposits of bilge oil, and the cases of 35 violators of the anti-oil-pollution laws are pending still in Federal district court in Norfolk.

In view of the situation, the Parent-Teacher Association of the Ocean View School voted yesterday to send a formal petition to the United States district attorney to prosecute the 35 cases immediately. The association pointed to the fact that some 500 children of the Ocean View community soon would be out of school and wanting to use the beaches which, it is implied, are contaminated by oil.

That was a most appropriate plea and the example could well be followed by various organizations of our vicinity, bringing pressure to bear on the authorities to punish the flagrant violators of the law as a deterrent to other shipmasters who might be tempted to pump their bilges into local waters, so depriving our people of their due use and enjoyment of the water that almost surrounds us.

The protest against oil pollution must be vocal and insistent, a constant spur to those who can remedy the situation. Untold damage is being done to the area by bilge-oil pollution and not only swimmers but boat owners are being put to large trouble and expense to clean up the oil that gets on boats and clothing, mooring lines and pier piling. Many a proud owner will paint his boat at considerable time and expense only to have his work and his expenditure nullified by deposits of oil on the hull and mooring lines overnight. For more than 2 years the community has been suffering from these willful violations of the law on the part of a few law-breaking shipmasters who need to be tried, convicted, and assessed stiff fines for their lawless disregard of the rights and the comfort and safety of people of our area.

A flood of protest from other interested organizations would help along the cause of pollution abatement. It should be forthcoming.

Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Evening Star for April 13, 1948, so fully expresses my own sentiments and respect for the Civil Air Patrol, an auxiliary of the Army Air Forces, that I am happy to have it included in the RECORD under my extension of remarks. Its reading is heartily commended to my colleagues.

May I also point with pride to the fact that the Connecticut wing of the Civil Air Patrol is commanded by a very fine lady, a very capable and experienced flier, Lt. Col. Nancy H. Tier.

The editorial follows:

CITATION FOR THE CAP

The Civil Air Patrol well earned the recognition which belatedly is being given to its courageous members. The air medals to be awarded to 824 of the CAP flyers who responded to their country's call for aid during the grim battle with Hitler's U-boats in the Atlantic are little enough reward for their services.

Disappointed but undismayed by their failure to be accepted as Army or Navy pilots—because of age or other disqualifications—these patriotic civilian flyers volunteered for auxiliary patrol work of a valuable and oft-times dangerous nature. At the time of organization the Nazi submarine menace was becoming more acute. Roving packs of U-boats were threatening seriously to cut the Allied supply lines to beleaguered Europe. The Murmansk run was marked by blazing and sinking ships, as our inadequately protected convoys struggled to carry on against what seemed at times to be overwhelming odds.

By joining in reconnaissance duties along portions of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, the CAP flyers, many of them in their own unarmed planes, helped to fill the patrol void until, later in the war, enough Army and Navy planes came off the production lines to handle the job without civilian aid. Much of the patrol work was monotonous, with only the vagaries of weather to make things interesting. Occasionally, however, the routine was broken by the excitement of a real alert and by a successful sub chase.

During 24,000,000 miles of patrolling, the CAP was credited with spotting 173 U-boats, with attacking 57 of them with depth charges slung beneath their light planes and with definitely sinking two submarines. Indicative of the hazards involved are the records which show that 26 CAP flyers and about 100 planes were lost in the 18 months of operations. In addition to the antisubmarine missions, the civilian pilots performed varied other wartime services inland that contributed to victory in World War II. The whole record is one of which the CAP members have good reason to be proud. It is only right that they should be decorated for their self-sacrificing achievements.

Communists Dominate CIO Packinghouse Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American of April 7, 1948. This is the second of a series of four:

BUSBEY TELLS RED RECORD OF STRIKE LEADERS—REVEALS SEVEN REDS RUN MEAT STRIKE

(By Charles Finston)

If you should find it hard to buy your favorite cuts of meat, blame seven unholy men who are avowed Communists or have Communist-front sympathies, according to Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois.

Representative BUSBEY, who has completed a preliminary investigation of Communist influences in the meat strike, found that these seven men are the brains behind the walk-out of 100,000 CIO packinghouse workers.

The strike is now in its fourth week. Many strikers are hunting for new jobs to keep their families from starving.

BUSBEY found that two of the seven men are not even affiliated with the packinghouse union, but their influence is counted on to "keep in line" the overwhelming majority of rank-and-file members who actually are opposed to communism.

These two were listed as Ernest De Maio, vice president of the CIO Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, and Warren Batterson, Communist Party director of the Iowa-Nebraska-Kansas district.

The other five, top officials in the union, are Ralph Helstein, Herbert March, Meyer Stern, Frank Ellis, and Philip Weightman.

BUSBEY observed that growing irritation among union members, who get no strike benefits and have to travel miles from home to get into a soup line, forced officers to import another "whip" last week. He is Fred W. Dowling, packinghouse union officer in Canada.

BUSBEY plans to ask immigration authorities how Dowling wangled an indefinite permit to stay in the United States, while legitimate United States labor organizers are ordered out of Canada after a 30-day stay.

SEVEN LISTED

All seven men, BUSBEY said, are listed in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Diminutive, dark-haired De Maio, a fiery spellbinder, helped kick off the strike in 130 meat plants by inadvertently disclosing at a secret meeting that industry faces more serious tie-ups, BUSBEY learned.

BUSBEY traced De Maio's affiliation with communism back to 1935–36, when the blueprint for revolution in America was authored by the Nation's current No. 1 Communist, Eugene Dennis.

THREAT SEEN

BUSBEY quoted a congressional committee as follows:

"It is our considered judgment that if Communists ever menace America, they will do so when working through such organizations as the National Maritime Union, the American Communications Association, and the Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America."

AVOWED RED

Next of the "unholy" seven listed by BUSBEY is Herbert March, Chicago district director of the packinghouse union and strike leader in this area. House files say of him:

"Herbert March is a Communist; not one of the secret variety, but one who has openly paraded his allegiance to the doctrines of Lenin and the destruction of American free institutions."

OPPOSED DRAFT

BUSBEY charged that March joined other Communists in August 1940 in signing a petition to President Roosevelt professing "opposition to conscription as subversive of American democracy."

BUSBEY listed Warren Batterson next, charging that he spreads the "unholy" gospel of communism in the Omaha area, where he is helping to keep 8,000 union members out on strike.

OUSTED BY LEGION

The Congressman found that Batterson has been a confirmed Communist since 1934 and that he was kicked out of the American Legion for being a Communist.

BUSBEY then named Meyer Stern, New York district director of the union. He was found to be a former organizing secretary of the Communist Party and affiliated with a number of organizations classed as Communist or subversive.

LECTURER

Ralph Helstein, president of the national packinghouse union, with headquarters in Chicago, was listed in the House Un-American Committee files as a guest lecturer for the Abraham Lincoln School, which Attorney General Clark called an adjunct of the Communist Party in his list of subversive organizations.

BUSBEY discovered that Helstein signed an open letter issued by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, an organization twice cited as a Communist front.

AIDED BROWDER

Frank Ellis, vice president of the union, petitioned President Roosevelt for the release of Earl Browder from the penitentiary and was a sponsor of the National Free Browder Congress, BUSBEY found.

Philip Weightman, national vice president of the union, was quoted by the Daily Worker, May 8, 1947, as declaring: "I firmly believe in the right of Communists to hold membership and office in our union."

The Twilight Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Fourth District, Fairfield County, Conn., before the annual convention of the Eastern District Association of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation in Baltimore, Md., on April 6, 1948:

THE TWILIGHT ZONE

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor for me to speak to the convention banquet of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. On the vital importance of health, physical education, and recreation there can be no disagreement. It is, let us say, one of the few noncontroversial matters in a highly controversial world. You are the workers in the vineyard, the people who do much to maintain the Nation's health. You realize how important physical education and adequate recreation are to the maintenance of a sound economy and as a basis for healthy ideas. Indeed, a Nation without health is a Nation which is fertile soil for the deadly virus of red fascism. Communism is a poison which prospers on disease, neuroses, and psychopathic maladjustments. Communism cannot prosper in a healthy community. It can make no headway with people who are in tune with their environment. Life agrees with healthy people, and where people are in harmony with the world around them, Stalin's termites are unable to make inroads.

Now we do not live in a compartmentalized world. We live in an interdependent world. What happens in Hungary or Italy or Poland has repercussions in America. We live in one world strategically and economically although, alas, it is not yet one world politically. Similarly what happens in America depends to a great degree on the health of our people. It is almost too obvious to require statement that a people can go no further than their health will allow them, that we will prosper and succeed in proportion as our people are healthy. Health means physical, mental, and spiritual health.

I should like to dwell for a few moments on the great challenge of our time, conscious of the fact that our ability to meet this challenge and overcome it depends in large measure upon the Nation's health.

Now this challenge is complex. It is composed of many segments. It is not a challenge which we can overcome with one simple positive answer. It is a challenge which runs the whole gamut of human activity. It makes an assault not only on people's bodies and on people's minds but on their spirits. It is a multifarious challenge.

The European recovery program was originally advanced by the administration as a cure-all for the foreign dilemma. Universal military training was originally proposed by the administration as a panacea for the weaknesses in our national defense structure. I need hardly point out that these are gross oversimplifications. Perhaps the administration thought that the American people wanted a quick, easy answer to the great challenge of our time. I believe that the American people, as in the past, can take the bad news and when they have understood the problem rise up in united strength to meet and overcome it. I believe that in its understanding of the challenge the Congress has been ahead of the State Department and the American people ahead of their Congress.

Of course, there is no open sesame out of our difficulties. There is no mumbo-jumbo which will suddenly dissipate the fog of tyranny which is closing down upon us and catapult us into a Lotos-land of peace and freedom. As a people we have been blessed by God. But we have no right to assume that we can emerge from this trembling hour of challenge without going through the sacrifice, the responsibility, the travail of the soul, the Gethsemane which is always the pathway to a truly worthy objective. No struggle, no victory—no victory, no crown.

The challenge of peace is, of course, far more difficult to understand than the challenge of war. We have traditionally understood well the challenge of war. We have an understanding of economics and of many of the problems of peace.

What we have failed to understand is that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace, that wars are but extensions of peacetime conflicts—the final confession of men's inability to reach an agreement. We fail to understand that the difference between the so-called cold war being waged by Russia and the hot war waged by the Germans is quantitative and not qualitative. We fail to understand that we are at this very moment locked in mortal combat with these reactionary tyrants and that the question is simply how shall the forces of freedom achieve victory. Can we achieve it short of a shooting war? Can we by the active power of our faith in freedom contain these despotic forces and roll back the iron curtain, or shall we substitute hope for action, wishful thinking for strength, vacillation for determination, and by our own weakness invite the holocaust which we are trying to avoid?

We must, before it is too late, understand what are the motive powers which determine the destiny of man. Our skyscrapers, our automobiles, our radios, our iceboxes, our airplanes, and all the innumerable devices which make life in America pleasant are the product of American ingenuity; they are symbols of American genius; yet in a very real sense they are but a byproduct of the freedom, of the faith of the American people. We must have an abiding sense of this great moral force. We must place our reliance on the faith which achieved the miracle of American production rather than on the gadgets which we have produced.

Then we shall see stretching out before us the true challenge to our generation. We shall realize that in spite of its manifold aspects it is one challenge. It is a composite challenge which finds expression in many forms and on several fronts. Our effort must be to meet the challenge as it is presented to us.

Now we have begun to meet the threat of disease, unrest, starvation, and poverty by the enactment of the European recovery program. But there are many things which must be done in order for the European recovery program to succeed. These several aspects of our foreign policy should be advanced on a concurrent front in order that we may develop, integrate, and prosecute a strategy which takes into account the comprehensive nature of the threat.

1. It may be said that although the United Nations Organization has so far failed of its objectives, it can nevertheless provide the framework for the useful purpose of spreading international responsibilities and integrating the efforts of those nations which are seeking to defend their freedom and their independence against the brutal onslaughts of Communist tyranny.

Accordingly, it is my considered view that a meeting of the United Nations should be called under section 109 of the Charter in order that this Organization should be strengthened; with Russia if possible, without Russia if necessary.

2. Instruct our representatives to the International Monetary Conference be called for the purpose of effecting a planned devaluation of the currencies of the 16 nations participating in the European recovery program, and in order that this may be accomplished with a minimum of economic dislocation and a maximum of benefit for western Europe and for the American taxpayer. A devaluation of these currencies would make European commodities cheaper to buy. It should be expedited in order (a) that these countries may increase their exports and thereby reduce their dollar deficits; (b) by reducing their dollar deficits, reduce the load on the American taxpayer; and (c) increase American imports and thereby reduce the cost of living in America.

3. The President should decide on a policy with respect to export controls, and with particular reference to Soviet Russia and her satellites. Here we must recognize that a revival of trade between eastern and western Europe is important to European recovery. It is to be hoped that when we have helped the ERP countries to create a capital goods surplus, the agricultural surpluses of eastern Europe will flow into western Europe, in spite of the Iron Curtain. On the other hand, it should be our policy and the policy of the nations receiving our aid not to help Russia to defeat ERP. Any other policy is unthinkable. This entire aspect of our foreign policy should not be allowed to drift from day to day on an improvised basis. It should be carefully considered, clarified, and synchronized with the European recovery program in order that it can help to implement its major intentions.

Whether or not western Europe can recover without a revival of trade with eastern Europe, we know that European recovery is impossible unless Germany is enabled to contribute. To isolate Germany from western Europe is to compromise European recovery and add enormously to the burden of the American taxpayer.

Under section 115 (a) of the act, "the Administrator will request the Secretary of State to obtain the agreement of those countries concerned that such capital equipment as is scheduled for removal as reparations from the three western zones of Germany be retained in Germany if such retention will most effectively serve the purposes of the European recovery program."

It is my hope that the Administrator will, as soon as possible after his appointment, look into this vital matter. The question of dismantling has been a source of considerable worry to many of us. It is enormously complex. Suffice it to say that western Germany is now being administered under directives which bear no relation to European recovery, but which are based on the vain and futile premise that western Germany should be treated as a viable economic unit. The criteria adopted with respect to reparations and dismantling should be revised and adapted to the European recovery program. To the objection that this will strike fear into the hearts of those nations which have suffered from German aggression, I would reply that this fear will be mitigated to the extent that we give evidence of our intention to sustain these nations in their efforts to preserve their freedom and independence. It is caused largely by their apprehension regarding support from the United States.

5. Instruct our representatives to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to which we make a predominant contribution, to call a meeting of the members of the bank in order that the activities of this organization should be coordinated with the purposes of the European recovery program.

6. Provide for a military establishment adequate to meet the urgent threat to our national security. Our power should be commensurate with our commitments. We must assume a military posture which will discourage external aggression. Since internal aggression is greatly facilitated by fear of external aggression, American armed might can also do much to combat internal force.

7. It is my conviction that the United States and the nations participating in the recovery program, including China, should enter into regional multilateral military agreements pursuant to article 51 of the United Nations Charter with a view to creating political and economic conditions which will assist the recovery of these nations, for the purpose of protecting their freedom and independence from external and internal aggression, and in order that the military dispositions undertaken by them shall be predicated on European rather than on national considerations, thereby effecting important economies in the military establishments of these nations while achieving greater over-all strategical strength.

8. The State Department's information and cultural program must be stepped up to the realm of psychological warfare. Newsprint must be provided to those who are resisting the Red Fascists and on-the-spot radio broadcasts inaugurated. We must also make full use of word-of-mouth propagation of information in this battle for men's minds.

There should be a drastic reorientation in the entire program. While Russia is telling lies about us we must tell the truth about Russia. Here it is interesting to note that the percentage of Communists in countries behind the iron curtain is far less than the percentage of Communists in countries outside the iron curtain. For instance, former Premier Mikolajczyk has informed me that in Poland but 3 percent of the population are Communists. In Czechoslovakia at the last election there were 38 percent. I dare say that now that the Republic of Czechoslovakia has succumbed to the Red infection, the number of Czech Communists is closer to 3 percent than to 38 percent. The vaunted Communist paradise is in fact a red hell. But when people are exposed to the distressing conditions caused by a great war it is perhaps natural that they should think that a change will be an improvement; it is human nature to believe the reckless and deceitful promises, the malicious distortions and lies slyly made by the panderers of the Politburo. We must present the constructive alternative.

We have a pronounced natural ability for propagandizing our own people, although up to now we have shown astonishing ineptitude in propagandizing others. We must learn to sell America to foreigners as effectively as Palmolive is sold to Americans. Here, too, however, I believe that we can learn to operate effectively. We can learn to understand the problem that is posed by the fact that the Communist Party in Italy had 60,000 members in 1945 and today has 2,500,000 members and that during that period the American people through their Government spent $1,800,000,000 in aid to the Italian people while the Kremlin spent a few million dollars solely in the dissemination of lies. We can understand that this is a triumph for Soviet propaganda, for Soviet public relations, and that, therefore, we must find ways and means to submerge Soviet propaganda with American propaganda. I believe that we are, somewhat diffidently, working toward that end.

9. It is clear to me that our Nation's policy should be to encourage the nations participating in the European recovery program to engage in an European economic federation which will serve as the basis for a United States of Europe, thus fulfilling the hope once expressed by George Washington. If they do not voluntarily federate for freedom they will have a Soviet federation imposed upon them.

A chief object of this great effort is to spread freedom by extending the free trade area. A world contracted by science must be united by freedom if peace is to prevail. If the objective of ERP were to restore Europe to its 1938 condition, if its purpose were to put Humpty Dumpty together again, then we would be wasting our time and our treasure.

10. In addition to the foregoing, it is vital and urgent that we learn to operate in the twilight zone in which communism makes its greatest gains. More specifically we must learn how to neutralize and defeat internal aggression. We must meet the "fifth column" or "trojan horse" technique of conquest.

As I have indicated, the Communist threat manifests itself in many forms and in several stages. The first stage is the attempt to capture legally constituted governments by constitutional means. This is the stage in which propaganda is of the greatest importance. The second stage is the attempt to capture legally constituted governments by internal force. This method is resorted to when the first method fails. The third stage is war. Now this second stage in itself is highly intricate. We find it difficult to operate in this hot manifestation of the cold war because we are essentially a legally minded people. Though we hate war, being a vital people, we accept it when it appears to us inevitable. But the resort to extralegal means by way of a sort of peacetime OSS seems to present us with a philosophical dilemma. I believe that that is the main reason why we have been so ineffective in that no-man's-land of action. We must rationalize this problem in order to take effective action, and we must do so now in order that the action will not come too late.

The subversive tactics of communism, both at home and abroad, have been carefully thought out. They are designed to take advantage of every loophole in a free system. Since our form of government rests on the consent of the governed and depends on the cooperative good will of the citizens, it is not difficult for these purveyors of terror to gain access to our most cherished institutions. And so we find that the enemies of freedom use and abuse freedom in an effort to destroy it. They use and misuse our laws, our forms, and our conventions for the purpose of encompassing their disappearance.

They resort to distortions, perversions, and lies in order to spread doubt, defeatism, and despair. They dedicate their fanatical cynicism to the destruction of our faith.

Are we powerless before these insidious onslaughts? Does freedom give us no freedom to defend freedom? Is this the real meaning of the American idea? Can it be that we can defend freedom only when war as we recognize it is hard upon us?

Ladies and gentlemen, I assert that we are in a state of conflict now and that we have not only the right but the solemn duty to fight the battle of freedom on the front of internal aggression as valiantly and as resourcefully as did our fighting men on the front of external aggression. Equity looks to the substance. "The letter killeth and the spirit giveth life." We opposed the armed might of Adolf Hitler. We resisted his attempts to conquer Europe by force of arms. We must prevent the spread of the Communist terror. Our actions must be related to the terrible reality of the threat which is charging down upon us.

Upon my return last November from a visit to several countries behind and outside of the iron curtain, I reported to the administration that it was my view that $10,000,000 competently expended in Italy would be sufficient to neutralize the Communists' attempt to seize power in Italy by internal force. I pointed out that although I was very much in favor of the European recovery program, we would get far larger proportionate returns from this expenditure than from the expenditure of the billions proposed under that program. It would, I told the administration, serve to diminish riots and strikes which because of their enormous drain on the economy of Italy add tremendously to the American taxpayers' burden. I stated that with this fractional expenditure of money and the effort required in connection therewith we could fill a dangerous gap in our strategy, and this would enable us to cope successfully with this aspect of the cold war. I stated further that not only the freedom and independence of Italy but American national security and the peace of the world depended on our ability to operate in this field. The fact is that we are now, and for sometime have been involved in a subversive war. And the further fact is that we are not ourselves engaging in effective counter subversive activities. The members of the Politburo are handicapped by no such restraints as those which we have imposed upon ourselves. They are waging this conflict by every means short of what we recognize as war. We must do likewise. We must shake off the myths and superstitions with which we have shackled ourselves and which deprive us of the freedom of action which we need to protect freedom and to extend it into the dismal dungeons of Communist oppression. This involves no sacrifice of freedom on our part. On the contrary, it enhances our freedom. Such a step in no way diminishes the moral quality of our leadership. It enables us to deal effectively with the challenge. The new weapon of 1948 is not the atom bomb of which we are making no use, but internal force which the Russians are using with terrible effect.

There is a slogan which has some currency in America that you cannot destroy an idea with force. Insofar as Stalin's communism is an idea, an ideology, this slogan may have some merit. Generally speaking, however, communism even as an ideology is but the cynical arm of Russian power. The 1948 model of communism is essentially not an idea but a predatory force. Marx and Engels, Lenin and Trotsky would hardly recognize their brand of dialectical materialism in the Hitlerian brute force which the Kremlin clique is using to gain their selfish imperialistic ends. It was not because of the contagion of an idea that communism has taken over in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. It is because of external and internal force. It is not the attraction of the communist ideology which threatens Finnish independence at this time. It is not an idea which is terrorizing the citizens of Greece. In Italy the members of the Communist Party have joined largely through intimidation and opportunism. Their communism is not a matter of deep conviction.

Nevertheless, we are most definitely engaged in a battle for men's minds. It is a question of knowledge. It is largely a matter of education. You who are engaged in that vital field understand the problem. The people must be told the truth not only abroad but at home. We must deal with the subversive assaults upon the doubts and fears of our adolescents in our schools and colleges. We must turn on the light. We must spread the truth for "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." We must thwart the gospel of nihilism by a fervent renewal of our faith.

We must meet the totality of the challenge which totalitarianism has thrust upon us.

Federal Charters for Catholic War Veterans and Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me regrettable that the other body saw fit last week to recommit to its Judiciary Committee bills to grant Federal charters to the Catholic War Veterans and the Jewish War Veterans.

These two flourishing organizations, with posts in each of the 48 States, are performing in these critical times a service of inestimable value, not only to their own veteran members but as well to the entire country. They are deserving, it seems to me, of the additional recognition which they now seek.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I feel a responsibility in taking a position on this issue which is not present, to an equal degree, regarding measures which lie within the purview of other committees. For that reason, I have endeavored to study carefully the proposed charters of these groups, their aims and objectives, and the pros and cons of the bills before us. I am convinced that the scales weigh heavily in favor of the legislation proposed.

These veterans' groups have already been recognized by the Veterans' Administration as authorized to represent exservicemen in their dealings with the Administration. They seek by the pending measures to secure additional strength, dignity, and standing which inheres in a Federal charter.

The objection is made that such legislation is divisive; that since all veterans are not eligible for membership this encouragement should not be accorded organizations which are limited to those professing a single religious faith; that such legislation is inimical to the achievement of unity as Americans among all citizens. Appreciating the sincerity of those who advance this argument, I consider it without force.

We have in this country hundreds of social, fraternal, and religious bodies whose members are no less good Americans by virtue of their affiliation with a particular order or society. Mr. Hitler made the fatal mistake of thinking that we could not unite and stand four-square against a common enemy.

Of course, we must deal with each application as it arises. No rule of thumb can be laid down to govern each case. Otherwise, there would be no need for congressional action. Any clerk could grant or deny a charter.

The purposes, for instance, of the Catholic War Veterans are stated to be—

> To commemorate the campaign or wartime service and to foster the association of veterans of the Catholic faith who served in the armed forces of the United States of America; to give visual demonstration of their faith and patriotic loyalty; to maintain the spirit of patriotism and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States of America and to engender good will and understanding among all its citizens; to perpetuate that spirit of comradeship with fellow veterans of all races, creeds, and colors, to extend aid and assistance to fellow veterans of all races, creeds, and colors, and to their respective wives, widows, and children; and to perpetuate in prayer and with honor the memory of their departed comrades.

It would be difficult to conceive of language which could better state what should be the objectives of a body of men and women banded together to promote the welfare of those who have served their country in time of war.

The achievements of these two illustrious organizations furnish convincing proof that they have, in their manifold activities, demonstrated again and again their determination to match these lofty statements with performance. No single instance has been brought to my attention where effort has been made to divide, rather than unite, the American people. Indeed, every activity has been in furtherance not alone of the interests of their own members, but primarily the maintenance and strengthening of the doctrines and principles of true Americanism.

Many, indeed, probably most, of the members of these organizations also hold membership in the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, or other veterans' bodies. Without detracting in any way from the invaluable service performed by these great national organizations, in both of which I am proud to hold membership, I am sure they would be the first to agree that the Catholic War Veterans and Jewish War Veterans have taken a position in the front ranks of those who fight the good fight every day of their lives, for those ideals and principles on which this Nation was founded, and the preservation of which alone will keep her strong, and against those subversive elements which seek to undermine our institutions and divide our people.

It is no answer to say that these Federal charters should be denied because of the precedent which they might create

for the incorporation of religious societies. We have already granted Federal charters to large numbers of religious organizations, among them the Presbyterian Congregation in Georgetown, the Protestant Episcopal Foundation of Washington, D. C., the Union Church of the Canal Zone, the Society of Deaconesses and Missionaries, the First Congregational Church of Washington, the International Sunday School Association. All of these, and many others, have been chartered by special act of Congress. Far from violating any precedent, we would be acting in accordance with established practice by a favorable vote on this pending legislation.

It is contended by the opponents that such measures might be violative of the first amendment to the Constitution providing that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

This objection seems to me equally without merit. There is no effort by this legislation to establish any religion. Obviously such an objective should receive our most vigorous opposition. It must be noted the Constitution does not say we shall pass no law regarding religion, but "respecting an establishment of religion."

Many of us who have an abiding faith in the broad religious principles upon which this Nation was founded, daily emphasized to us by those words on our coins, "In God We Trust", and, in our legislative duties, by the daily prayers so eloquently offered by our chaplains of all religious faiths, are very much disturbed over the possible effects of the recent Supreme Court decision banning all forms of religious instruction in the public schools. While it would be outside the scope of these remarks to express disagreement with the determination made by the Court on the precise state of facts before it, there is a well-grounded fear on the part of many substantial, God-fearing citizens that the extension of the doctrines enunciated in this decision might undermine one of the essential pillars of government and threaten its foundations.

There is utterly nothing in this proposed legislation which has to do with the establishment of any religion. In this great country, thank God, one may embrace any faith which he desires, or, indeed, none at all. These bills in no way act as a compulsion upon me to alter any religious beliefs which I may entertain. They simply say that one of the qualifications for membership shall be adherence to a certain faith. Other veterans organizations have qualifications for membership, not religious it is true, but, nevertheless, requirements which result in an exclusion of certain veterans. Thus, in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, those who may have served in this country, with equal patriotism and distinction are excluded. In the AMVETS, veterans of all wars except World War II are excluded. Such exclusions are perfectly proper.

The charters with which we are here concerned do not say that in order to become a member of a federally chartered veterans group one must become a Roman Catholic or profess the Hebrew faith. If they did, the point of constitutionality would be well taken. They simply say that if one wishes to become affiliated with one of these particular organizations he must embrace the faith of the other members. I can see no validity in the claim that such a provision would infringe the constitutional prohibition.

These organizations have laid out aggressive and constructive programs which have for their prime objective the perpetuation and strengthening of American, not Roman Catholic or Jewish, institutions. It is the most natural thing in the world that those who on battlefield or Army post knelt in a common Mass, or were ministered to according to the rites of a common Jewish faith, should wish to perpetuate their spiritual bond. The membership of both these bodies is composed of patriots of the first order, men and women who deserve and enjoy the respect and admiration of those of all religious faiths who have the common meeting ground of love of country. They feel that a Federal charter will strengthen their organizations and make them more effective in furthering the objectives shared by all who proudly call themselves Americans.

It is my hope, therefore, that in the House early consideration may be given to a favorable report of this legislation and that in the other body reconsideration will result in according the desired recognition to these two patriotic groups, which combine with their love of country profession of belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

How Can the United Nations Become More Effective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in presenting to the House the prize-winning essay by Miss Theresa Vlacancich, of 47 North Green Street, Columbus, Ohio, one of the three eleventh grade pupils from the State of Ohio who won a trip to Washington in the essay contest sponsored by the American Legion, Department of Ohio. Her thoughts and suggestions are worthy of consideration by all of us:

HOW CAN THE UNITED NATIONS BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE?

According to its charter the three principal purposes of the United Nations are: to maintain international peace and security, to protect human freedom, and to promote human welfare. Needless to say, so far the United Nations has not attained these aims.

The Charter of the United Nations is weak and must be amended immediately. The first and main concern of the Security Council is the deciding of actions to safeguard peace. Since the United Nations began operating there have been violent outbreaks and fighting in the European countries. All throughout Europe there are people homeless, jobless, and hungry. In Russia, scientists are concentrating on the development of new bombs, planes, and so forth. The United Nations has done almost nothing but discuss these major problems. The first and main concern of the Security Council is the deciding of actions to safeguard peace.

The "big five," China, France, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States, has the power of absolute veto. This means that a negative vote from any of the above-mentioned countries is enough to throw a stumbling block into the United Nations. It is easy to see that this power of absolute veto must be in some way changed or the member countries in the United Nations will never accomplish anything.

Soviet Russia has been the cause of most of the dissatisfaction. As the headquarters of the Communist Party, the Soviet Union is doubly dangerous because she will not accept a world organization that will not conform to the standards she sets. The Soviet Union is in the minority and a split with her would make her less imposing and dangerous as there already exists in the world the threat of a third world war.

The atomic bomb must be held under control. It must not be given to the United Nations until the world organization is capable of caring for it. It would be for the good of everyone if the atom bomb was destroyed. If the nations of the world are allowed to manufacture this bomb, the destruction of the world is inevitable.

A militarily strong United Nations coupled with a strengthened international court of justice to "enforce a world law against war" is an immediate necessity, for we cannot long endure in a world bristling with atomic and biological weapons, carried by long-range jet bombers and traveling at near the speed of sound. It is necessary that the United Nations have the armed authority to prohibit war and its preparations. A force of world police should be kept on duty at all times to see that the stipulations of the United Nations are obeyed. The world police would be responsible only to the United Nations.

Of course, a capable United Nations cannot function without funds. To raise these funds the United Nations would have to tax all international trade.

It is useless to argue about secession. Everyone will agree that the United Nations cannot allow its member nations to withdraw when they please. The United Nations was organized to maintain international peace and further human relations and so must be a tightly knit, compact, united world organization.

Until the above changes are made, peace will be only an empty word, without meaning. The peace as it stands is only a truce.

How Can the United Nations Become More Effective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an essay by Robert Johnson, of Berea, Ohio, on How Can the United Nations Become More Effective?, one of the winning essays in the recent American Legion contest. The subject is very timely and it is most interesting to read this young

man's answer to the question of making the United Nations more effective.

HOW CAN THE UNITED NATIONS BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE?

(By Bob Johnson)

The United Nations is an organization of sovereign states which have agreed to join their efforts in order to maintain international peace and security, to cooperate on the solution of economic, social, and cultural problems of international importance, to promote human rights for all without destruction as to race, sex, language or religion.

All members of the United Nations are represented in the General Assembly on an equal basis. This body meets once a year and elects nonpermanent members of the Security Council and the members of the other United Nations organs. It decides important questions by a two-thirds vote, recommends settlement of disputes, discusses important questions and promotes international cooperation.

The operating unit of the United Nations is the Security Council which has five permanent members consisting of the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, and China, and six nonpermanent members that are elected by the Assembly. The Security Council investigates every international dispute; can propose peaceful settlement, take nonmilitary measures or adopt military sanctions. It is the only organ that can take direct action without referring back to all member states provided that a majority of seven, including the affirmative vote of the five permanent members is obtained.

Other major organs of the United Nations are: The International Court of Justice; The Economic and Social Council; The Secretaiat; and the Trusteeship Council.

I believe that the Veto Rule, which gives any of the Big Five members of the Security Council, the right to veto any decision on a subject if it does not agree to it, is the weakest link in the United Nations and causes the most heated arguments. The smaller nations insist on a majority vote as the solution to this problem and the United States and Great Britain have offered other suggestions, but the veto stands because of the unyielding attitude of Russia.

The United Nations, through the Council, has really assumed the functions of policing the world. The natural questions in the United Nations are:

(a) What if one of the great powers should have a bad government?

(b) What if one of the major countries should have a revolution?

(c) What if a member of the Big Five attacks or takes over another country?

As presently constructed, the Security Council is powerless to act. At the present time the United Nations has not taken the first steps toward the organization of a joint military and air force which would be made available for international enforcement.

Another weakness is the disarmament act which requires all nations to reduce their armed forces to peacetime strength. It is a common belief that some nations are not disarming but manufacturing more powerful weapons.

The Atomic Commission made specific proposals for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction and for effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions. Inspection committees appointed by the Council are not recognized by some of the United Nations members and not permitted entry into their countries. As long as this attitude persists, there can be only suspicion and distrust.

To become more effective the United Nations must:

1. Revise the veto policy so that an aggressor nation cannot, by its own negative vote, stop all action against it.
2. Create a powerful military and air force, stationed at points where conflict is most likely to develop.
3. Enforce inspection of military production and of armed forces.
4. Eliminate distrust, dishonesty, fear, and greed from international relations.

The Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, as further proof that that the power to tax is the power to destroy, I include a letter which was directed to Mr. J. C. Capt, Director of the Bureau of the Census, by Mr. L. F. Kreger, of the L. F. Kreger Manufacturing Co. of Chicago, on March 26, 1948:

MARCH 26, 1948.

Mr. J. C. CAPT,
Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPT: Since this business is just about liquidated because of handicaps set up by our politicians, including the tax collector, and there is only one girl left in the office, two others having found more interesting position with the Veterans' Administration and board of education, the census forms you speak of have doubtless been lost.

If you will send a duplicate, I will try to give you whatever information you want, but since the census statistics if properly used are intended to project the future, in this instance I am sorry to report that there doesn't appear to be any future, for we can't buy steel through legitimate sources at legitimate prices, we can't get labor that will cooperate, and this has been greatly aggravated by Truman's war talk. We can't buy machinery because of taxes, so like many others in business, and possibly as planned by communistic politicians controlling Government agencies, this business is being liquidated.

Yours very truly,
L. F. KREGER MANUFACTURING CO.,
LARRY KREGER, *President*.

Kentucky Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. HOWES MEADE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, many veterans are not fully informed as to their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions as extended to them by the laws of the great State of Kentucky. I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, a résumé of such laws as compiled by J. Harry Stamper, department commander of the Disabled American Veterans, 268 West Main Street, Lexington, Ky., with the able assistance of his conscientious department adjutant, Edward T. Bowling, 122 South Third Street, Louisville 3, Ky.

This valuable outline is quoted, in full, as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A State allowance is provided for burial of Confederate pensioners.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Administration of estates of persons "missing in action," etc., is provided.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Disability of minority has been removed for all veterans (or their spouses) to contract under the GI bill of rights.

Men and women in uniform may not be discriminated against in any public place under penalty of a fine of from $10 to $50, or imprisonment for 60 days, or both.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

State prisoners may be paroled for service in the armed forces.

Persons in the armed forces are exempt from filing notification and declaration when a candidate for office in a primary election.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Notaries are allowed no fee or compensation for affixing jurat to an application, affidavit, certificate or other paper in connection with a claim for Federal benefits for veterans or their dependents.

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The State registrar is required to furnish, without fee or compensation, copies of birth, sickness or death records required in support of claims for compensation, insurance, back pay or other allowances to veterans.

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge.

It is the duty of the Kentucky disabled ex-servicemen's board to assist veterans and their dependents with claims for Federal benefits.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Free scholarships are provided in higher educational institutions of the State for veterans of the world wars.

Age requirement is suspended for admission to the bar of applicants subject to selective service.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed while serving in the armed forces between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or died as a result of such service. Amount, $150 maximum per child per year. Free tuition is available in State institutions of secondary or college grade.

A grade and high school has been established on the Fort Knox Military Reservation.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

World War II veterans must be reinstated in public positions of employment (including police and firemen) held before entering service, with pension and retirement benefits preserved.

Benefit rights under the Unemployment Compensation Act have been preserved.

Teachers and superintendents may be reinstated upon application within 60 days after discharge from service in the armed forces.

Preference is extended to veterans under civil service in all counties containing a city of the second class.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian for an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

A Confederate home is maintained at Pewee Valley.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

HOUSING

Cities are authorized to establish and operate veterans' housing projects and create commissions to provide housing for World War II veterans.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans or their widows.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Building and loan associations and domestic insurance companies may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

American Legion posts are exempt from license fee to hold boxing, sparring, or wrestling matches.

Income received from the Federal Government by veterans or their dependents, for wartime service, is exempt from income tax.

Time is extended for filing and paying State income tax, without interest or penalty, during military service and for 12 months thereafter.

Members of the armed forces, serving during time of war, are exempt from State income tax.

Valid operator's licenses have been extended during service in the armed forces and 6 months thereafter.

Totally disabled veterans are exempt from poll tax.

Registered pharmacists are exempt from payment of renewal fees while serving in the armed forces.

Time for paying ad valorem taxes on property, without interest or penalties, has been extended during military service and for 12 months thereafter.

All proceeds from Federal Government insurance is tax-free.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of certain veteran organizations is declared a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or a fine not to exceed $20, or both.

Each armory may provide a meeting place for veteran organizations.

American Legion posts are exempt from license fees for holding boxing, sparring, or wrestling matches, but not from the gross-receipts tax.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the Kentucky Legislature during the past 27 years through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

Most of the 30 DAV chapters in the State have volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to these chapter-service officers, the DAV maintains four full-time national service officers, under the direction of Mr. Lee R. Lyons, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Louisville, Ky.

These DAV experts render all types of aid and assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation and prosecution of their claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

FORMATION OF THE DAV

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for and by disabled veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled war veterans.

According to its congressional charter, active membership in the DAV can be secured only by those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of disease or disability incurred by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States or of some country allied with it during time of war.

Increasing numbers of those who have returned from service in World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Having incurred a disability while serving with our armed forces during World War II, I am personally proud to be a member of this select outfit.

During its more than 28 years of constructive activities, the DAV has many times pressed for liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents, and for more liberal application of such laws by the Veterans Administration, too numerous and too technical here to set forth.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Its national headquarters, located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semi-monthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General and Comptroller General, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV, and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701—Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the Department of Claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Mr. Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy thing to do, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation, its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War II myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Open Season on Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 15 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the 30th of March there was published in the Washington Daily News an article by Peter Edson entitled "Open Season on Truman." The article is such an interesting and well-written one that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN SEASON ON TRUMAN

(By Peter Edson)

This beating that President Truman gets is really something. But when you add up the crimes of which he is accused, they amount to simply this:

He has been opposed to a tax cut all along because he believes (1) the national debt should be reduced while national income is high, and (2) national defense is going to cost a lot more money which should come out of taxes, not from borrowing.

The President thinks there ought to be a Federal law against lynching people. He thinks the poll tax should be abolished as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. Only 7 of the 48 States still have poll taxes.

The President thinks there should be a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission to prevent unfair discrimination. Not all discrimination—just unfair discrimination. The President thinks Jim Crowism should be eliminated on interstate transportation. He doesn't say on local busses and streetcars—just those which cross State lines.

For these four and six more general civil-rights proposals like admitting Hawaii and Alaska to statehood, giving District of Columbia citizens the right to vote and admitting orientals to citizenship in this great melting-pot country that is trying to save the rest of the world for democracy, the President is threatened by revolt from within his own party.

Truman's proposals for universal military training and a temporary draft law to build up the armed forces and Reserves are criticized with about the same degree of consistency. The President is panned by his opponents because he didn't ask for more air power. In any defense program the first requirement is manpower. There isn't any use ordering more planes or tanks or guns unless there is trained manpower to run them.

The President is taking a shellacking on foreign policy—particularly on Palestine. There are plenty of reasons why the original Palestine policy shouldn't have been adopted. Partition has never worked. It took guts to admit this policy wasn't working and that a mistake had been made. But is there any reason why a foreign policy shouldn't be abandoned if it isn't working?

The policy on Trieste has just been changed, without undue criticism. There aren't 7,000,000 Yugoslav-Triestians or Arabs in this country—with a vote.

While the Marshall plan was criticized because it asked for too much aid, Truman's China policy was criticized because it didn't ask for enough.

There has admittedly been some confusion on just what American policy toward China has been or is. When General Marshall went to China as Ambassador, it was to work for a coalition of Nationalists and Communists. When he came back as Secretary of State it was with the feeling that coalition wouldn't work.

This position has now been clarified by statements from the President and Secretary Marshall. The United States does not favor the inclusion of Communists in the Chinese Government. Whether they are included is for the Chinese Government to decide.

All these shifts—if that's what they are—are criticized as vacillating Truman foreign policy. But what is a man to do if he has made a mistake? Keep on making it? Or admit he has been wrong and then try something different?

Thomas Sugrue, of Naugatuck, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Waterbury (Conn.) American of April 14, 1948:

TOM SUGRUE IN WHEEL CHAIR, FINDS GOD

(By Hal Boyle)

NEW YORK.—Crippled Thomas Sugrue, Naugatuck, Conn., native who has taken more than a quart of cobra venom in the last 9 years to still his pain, sat in a wheel chair today and talked to God.

"The most important thing in any man's life is his relationship with God," said the luminous-eyed little Irishman, "and this is inextricably bound up with the relation of every other man to God.

"Every man in a real sense is bound to his brother, and a man who arrived at Heaven does so leaning on the arm of someone he has helped."

The phone rang. To answer it Sugrue put the receiver to his left ear with his right hand and held it with a hunched shoulder propped up with a wooden Chinese backscratcher.

Afterward he grinned and held up the backscratcher toy, which he uses as a kind of extended arm to rake things to him out of reach.

"It's a sort of insurance policy," he said, "if I didn't have it always handy my nose would itch."

The backscratcher is only a symbol of the way Tom Sugrue, ex-newspaperman and magazine writer, has had to adjust himself to life. He was stricken in 1937 at the age of 30 with a combination of arthritis, spinal meningitis, and infantile paralysis. He has never walked since.

He went to Florida, took fever treatments in which he spent days in a cabinet containing 80 light bulbs that heated his blood to 107 degrees. For two whole years he couldn't lie on his right side. In minute doses he has taken enough pain-killing cobra venom—it quiets the nerve ends—to kill three men, if given in mass injections.

"But sick or well, I had my living to make," he said. And he had a wife and daughter to support.

He wrote a novel, Such Is the Kingdom. He no longer could use a typewriter, and the doctor would let him write longhand only 1 hour a day.

"So I memorized it, doing the editing in my head," he said, "and managed to write 1,000 words each day during the 1 hour."

Then he learned to dictate. He wrote a biography, There Is a River, and in 1946 he produced the best-seller, Starling of the White House. Last year, working with Bandleader Eddie Condon, he dictated another best-seller, We Called it Music, in 3 months.

Now, he has completed his own autobiography, Stranger in the Earth, a spiritually stirring story of one man's conquest of fear and pain and his search for God.

Sugrue believes that the purpose of man's journey through creation is to discover the mind of God, piece by piece, and to know it eventually in its entirety, thus achieving a union or companionship with God.

He said that the evil man sets himself against the will of God, the mystic actively seeks God, but most men just sit down and statically wait for him to find them.

The free religious climate of America, he hopes, will produce mystics in sufficient numbers to make this country into a spearhead for the world's salvation from international war and a new dark age.

"But I feel deeply that America must achieve a spiritual unity," he said. "It has been a pain within me ever since I can remember that, religiously, we are as broken and scattered as sawdust on a barroom floor."

A disaster to their health breaks the minds and spirits of most men. Sugrue appeared so serene and well-armored in his courage, I asked him if he had found God himself.

"No, I have not found God," he said, "I have only gathered together some clues to what I trust may be the right direction. The discovery that has meant most to my life is that I am not constrained to sit with my eyes shut and arms folded, waiting for God to come to me—but that I am free to open my eyes, unfold my arms, and go out and search for Him.

"I am completely happy. The mere discovery that I am free to move and search for God is all I need to keep me joyful for the rest of my days."

He smiled from the wheel chair.

State Action With Federal Cooperation Can Aid Private Builders To Break the Housing Log Jam and Establish a Sound Housing Economy—New York State's Program Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address by Herman T. Stichman, New York State commissioner of housing to the national economic conference of the American Legion at Chicago on April 5, entitled "State Action With Federal Cooperation Can Aid Private Builders To Break the Housing Log Jam and Establish a Sound Housing Economy—New York State's Program Points the Way":

Today, in the third year since the cessation of hostilities, we are met here still to discuss how to house our veterans and other citi-

zens. In certain of the States we still have talk only—requests that someone else do the full job, perhaps the Federal Government; in other States we have had varying degrees of action:

I believe that New York State is in the leadership in action, and that if the other 47 States had similar programs there would be little need for our meeting here today. We would now be on the way out of our difficulties. In giving you an analysis of what we have done and are doing in New York, I am hopeful that you will find a basis for a program of action in your States.

There is no adequate large-scale program of private building, by and large, anywhere in this country for those who need it the most, and the demand for more housing is continually increasing. Not only have we had the necessity of trying to provide homes for returning veterans who wish to live in homes of their own with their wives and children, but we have the normal increase in the population of the country, the normal number of new families created through marriages, the normal number of houses rendered uninhabitable through obsolescence each year, and all these are creating increasing demands upon a housing economy that is insufficiently geared to meet the changing demands. That housing economy has never been on stable footings. Its history has been one of booms and busts. No other business or industry functions on such an unscientific basis.

Private builders are saying today that they should be left alone; that the reason that they have not kept up with the housing demands is that there has been too much governmental interference. Other persons are asking that the Government step in and take over. There has been governmental intereference, and plenty of it, but that is not the full reason. Nor is Government ownership the answer.

What we need is less interference and more cooperation from Government, but cooperation of the right sort and at the proper governmental level. There is no doubt that the artificial restrictions placed on production of new housing by the Federal Government after VJ-day through its unrealistic price policy as to the production of new materials, and its unscientific program with respect to new housing, played a large part in the continution of our emergency-housing conditions. The Federal pricing controls for too long a time were such as to strangle the production of building materials and to discourage private builders from constructing new housing. Those factors account for the failure to build hundreds of thousands of homes which otherwise would have been built last year and the year before and even the year before that. But they do not in themselves fully explain why we have no adequate private home-building program even today.

The history of private home building proves it needs a helping, but not an obstructing, hand. Just consider the facts since World War I. We had the same shortage of housing in our metropolitan centers in the early 1920's that we had in 1946 and still have today. In New York City the private home-building industry was practically at a standstill. Only 247,000 new permanent nonfarm housing units were started in the entire country in 1920. Some tax-exemption aid was given in New York City; a large-scale investigation was launched there, and tardily, very tardily, private builders got back into the swing. The reason? It was the same as we have today—building costs were too high and builders were blaming labor, and labor was blaming the builders, and everybody was blaming the bankers. Isn't that the same sort of thing that you are still hearing?

In 1921 we had 449,000 nonfarm housing starts in the country, 716,000 in 1922, and so on up to 937,000 new permanent housing starts in 1925. From then on the number of new housing starts declined to 509,000 in 1929, 254,000 in 1931, and 93,000 in 1933. Our population was increasing all the time, but as you will remember only too well, we were going through some bad times after 1929 and in some places, even before. The country-wide depression that followed the stock market collapse caused hundreds of thousands of families to move in with their relatives or friends, lessening the demand—the market—for new homes. Therefore comparatively few were built. The number of new housing starts in 1934 was only 126,000, in 1935 there were 221,000, in 1937 we had 336,000; but it was not until 1939 that we got over half a million, 515,000 being the number, which increased to 602,600 the following year, and 706,100 in 1941.

During the years from 1942 to 1945, home building again took a serious drop; as a matter of fact it practically ceased in most sections of the country because of war restrictions. We had an appreciable amount of home building only in war-industry centers, the total being 356,000 new housing starts in 1942, 191,000 in 1943, 141,800 in 1944, and 209,300 in 1945. In 1946 there were 670,500, and 854,600 in 1947. The volume is still inadequate.

The doubling up that had begun in 1930 because of economic necessity continued during the war years for other reasons. Soldiers left their wives with parents or in-laws. War workers lived anywhere they could find shelter. During the war years there was a concurrent and serious exhaustion of existing stocks of materials originally intended for the building of homes as these were diverted to war industry uses, to the building of military camps, to supply civilian war housing, and to military needs in general.

Of course, someone may inquire as to whether one wouldn't expect to find on the economic chart a line showing that the number of new housing starts goes up or down, depending on our economic conditions. That has been our past history, but the trouble is that the number of people in our country doesn't go up or down at the same time. That line is continually increasing. People have to eat in good times or bad, whether prices go up or down. People want to marry and have children in good times or bad. The population increases in this country no matter whether the ecenomic chart is colored in red or black. Houses deteriorate and become unusable because of use and the natural forces at the same rate in bad times as in good. In bad times we don't ask or want our citizens who are short of money to go without food or to stop having children—we take care of them in one way or another. What have we been telling our veterans who need housing? Let someone else do the job?

And, of course, the home-building industry, if it stagnates in bad times, is one that cannot produce housing overnight when money becomes more plentiful. We've witnessed that. It takes time to produce the materials and to train the manpower to build the homes that are needed in any particular year. So the ideal would be to devise a plan whereby the provision of new homes could be kept somewhat on a level that will parallel the demand as it increases over the years with the normal increase in population and the obsolescence of old housing.

In other words, what I am saying, and it is nothing new, is that the building industry must be stabilized.

But the building industry cannot stabilize itself. The "cooperation" of Government—and I quote "cooperation" to indicate that I mean something other than bureaucratic control—is essential.

All we have to do is to go back over the history of the past 30 or 32 months to see that with clarity.

At the end of the war hundreds of thousands of families sought to leave their in-laws, their boarding houses, their war-industry lodgings for homes of their own—other thousands of veterans wished to marry and set up family life. But no homes existed for them—no sufficient quantity of home-building had taken place over the past years, as we have seen, to take care of their needs. And, of course, the home-building industry was not equipped to do the job overnight, just as no other industry can do such a tremendous job overnight. Planning to meet a future need is essential in every line of endeavor. When the private home-building industry tried to get underway it was hampered also by the restrictions to which I have referred.

Certain people claim that the unsatisfactory conditions resulting from the lack of sufficient home-building over the 15-year period which I have mentioned, and from unscientific Federal controls, should be attributable entirely to the private home-building industry, and that, therefore, Government, at the Federal, State, or municipal level, should take over the building of practically all housing for middle-income as well as low-income families. If Government did that, and really nationalized or socialized the housing economy, the people would pay the bill through their taxes and families of low income would be forced to pay for housing for families of higher income. That nationalization or socialization would perforce permeate other branches of our economy. We need some governmental aid, but we also need a rule of reason.

Government building of all the housing that is needed will not bring about a reduction in building costs; quite the contrary. One individual in the national forum has advocated that the Government do just that—build all the housing that is needed regardless of the income groups it is to serve, either under firm contracts or on a cost-plus basis, and then sell it off to private operators at whatever it will bring, with the Government—that is, the taxpaying public—paying for the loss.

It is obvious that this man has made no investigation into the field at all, because if he had, he would find out that this would cost the taxpayers billions of dollars and would result in sending the present high costs of homebuilding even higher. Cost plus, as our Government learned in the war, is the most expensive way to build. Under that method no one has any incentive to give the maximum of production. It removes the economic urge on builders to operate at the highest efficiency so as to achieve the economy necessary to earn a profit. The plan suggested, while it would cost the people billions in unnecessary expense and force the citizens with small incomes to help pay for housing for those with greater incomes, would create inefficiencies in building practices all along the line that would render it practically impossible for private operators to build for at least a generation. The public would not be able to afford the high price level to which these Government-created inefficient cost-plus practices would raise homebuilding costs.

So that is not the answer. While Government may aid, its aid should be different in the different income groups, as has been true in New York State.

This same individual has stated his opposition to any public aid to provide housing for low-income families. He says that the real remedy is to provide more units so that those of lower income may find units being vacated by those of higher incomes, as they get second-hand cars, and gives it as his opinion that it would be tinkering with the economic system and asking for trouble to proceed on any other basis. This is all right to a degree but the trouble is that as automobiles deteriorate until they become jalopies, there always seems to be someone who wants and can afford them, but jalopies can be unsafe to the driver and the traveling public. It is no different with housing. By

the time housing trickles down over a period of many years so that it is within the means of our lowest income earning groups, a substantial percentage of it has become so deteriorated and obsolescent that it is in the jalopy stage, and this type of housing carries its concomitants of overcrowding, inadequate quarters for children and home life, run-down neighborhoods, encroachment of industry, that is, slum conditions breeding and spreading disease, juvenile delinquency and area deterioration. So we need some public housing for low-income groups—it is a matter of degree. Private enterprise, as I shall endeavor to show later, cannot afford to eradicate slums without public aid.

So far as "tinkering with the economic system" as he phrases it, is concerned, he seems ready to do it for the higher economic groups by letting the Government build housing for them, with all the taxpayers footing the loss, which will include a substantial number who won't be able to afford to live in the housing for which they are helping to pay.

Our history of aid to housing in New York goes back many years. Other States can now profit from our pioneering and experience of almost 30 years. After World War I most of the States did not attempt to aid in providing housing, and contented themselves with temporary limitations on rents to forestall rent gouging. In 1920 New York State passed a law which permitted cities to grant tax exemption on dwelling structures to be completed after April 1920, or, taking into consideration the law as amended, begun before April 1925. A 10-year tax exemption was granted in New York City on new dwellings for sale or rent. The relationship between these tax exemption provisions and the amount of new housing that was built has been debated, but I refer to the plan for historical reasons. It indicates that we tried to help. In 1922 insurance companies were empowered to purchase land and erect dwellings in New York City until, as the law was amended, 1926.

In 1926 a State housing law was adopted in New York which authorized the creation of limited dividend housing companies to be supervised by the State Board of Housing. This law, the first passed by any State, offered exemptions from all State taxes and fees, and authorized municipalities to grant exemption from taxation of the value of the new buildings and improvements constituting the projects in return for a limitation on rents and restrictions of dividends to 6 percent. We now have 11 such developments built under that law in New York City, and the rents range, on the average, from about $9.55 to about $14 per room per month.

A constitutional amendment in 1938, implemented by legislation in 1939, empowered the State to make loans as well as to pay annual cash subsidies to our municipalities or to their housing authorities for public housing projects for families of low income. The State is empowered to make 50-year loans up to 100 percent of the development cost of low-rent housing projects for low-income families at an interest rate equal to the State's cost of borrowing the money. The State is also empowered to pay an annual cash subsidy which is equal to the largest annual interest charge paid by the municipal authority that borrows the money to develop the project, plus 1 percent. The municipality must match the cash subsidy of the State, but the tax exemption given by the municipality on the value of the new buildings may be used as an offset and usually is sufficient to meet this matching requirement. The amount of funds we may lend and the amount of subsidy we may pay have been increased under the sponsorship of Governor Dewey.

We now have a public housing program in our State under which we are empowered to lend $435,000,000 for the building of low-rent projects for families of low income, comprising about 160,000 persons, and to pay up to $13,000,000 annually as subsidy to help reduce the rents. At the present time we have 9 projects completed and 32 others partially completed, under construction, or under contract.

State-aided low rent public housing projects are available for low-income families whose total earnings are not more than five times the rent for a small family and six times the rent for a family with three or more dependents. The average income of non-veteran tenants is about $2,000. Preference is given to families in dwellings that are scheduled to be demolished for our projects; families living in substandard housing elsewhere and other low-income families are next eligible. In 1946, at the request of Governor Dewey, legislation was adopted to permit occupancy in our public housing projects for veterans of World War II whose income did not exceed seven times the rent for a family with two dependents or eight times the rent for a family with three or more dependents. This provision, which enables veterans with incomes up to about $3,600 to live in these projects during the post-war period of housing stringency, is presently in effect until December 31, 1949, but I anticipate that that period will be extended.

Some realtors argue that any public housing program, including ours, is a so-called type of European socialism that has been set up in this country to compete unfairly with private builders in order to drive them completely out of the market. But they are wrong. I agree that government should not be doing what private enterprise can do. However, the years have made it clear that private enterprise cannot clear the slums and blighted areas in our municipalities. Nowhere in this country has private enterprise, unaided, ever cleared a slum and replaced the substandard buildings with livable housing for the former low-income occupants of the sites at rents which they could afford to pay. The reason for that is that private enterprise cannot do so at a profit. It will go, naturally enough, to the areas and serve the people where it can make a profit. In that field of slum clearance and public housing for our lowest income earning groups, government, at the proper level, can function without competing with private enterprise.

The private realtors, who refuse to accept the plain facts that show that public housing, properly developed, does not compete with them, have gone so far as to say that wherever there has been public aid to housing in Europe it has been the cause and forerunner of communism and socialism. That is untrue. The fact is that the countries in Europe which have the soundest programs for public aid to housing are the strongest today so far as democracy is concerned, and that those countries which have been backward in giving aid to provide decent housing for the needy have been those which have fallen prey to the onslaughts of communism.

Let us take Sweden, which has been a bulwark in the struggle against the Communists. Since 1922 that country has had a program of tenant cooperative housing with direct state subsidy to provide homes for the most needy. Denmark also has had a cooperative housing program since 1911, with borrowing permitted from a government loan fund. There are other types of public aid. I need not remind you of the gallant fight that that country made to keep its democratic institutions. Holland, and I am sure that not even the most unreasonable opponent of public housing will claim that that country is socialistic, has a government-aided housing program that is more complete than that of any other country in northern Europe. Its broad and comprehensive plan for public aid had its inception in 1901.

And, as a final answer to this brand of real-estate thinking, let me point out that the country where the living conditions of the low-income citizens were the worst, where they and their children were relegated to spend their lives in hovels and shacks, was the one that fell first to the forces of communism, namely, Russia. Certain real-estate groups must awaken to the realization that their unyielding opposition to any program of governmental aid to housing families of low income for whom they are unable to provide decent housing at rents which they can afford to pay is a direct invitation to the Communists to come in and exploit to their advantage the effects of the resulting discontent.

We have had an illustration of that since the end of hostilities. Certain people are saying that we cannot take care of our veterans and others with decent shelter under our present economic system, and that therefore the people should turn to a different system. Those spreaders of false and evil propaganda have been using the present housing crisis as a means of stirring up unrest. Of course, they don't mention the fact that in Communist Russia very few except the commissars and their favorites have decent housing.

When the Nation-wide crisis in housing occured at the end of 1945, with veterans all over looking for the housing that did not exist, we in New York State went right to work to do the job that private enterprise then could not do. At Governor Dewey's request, $69,800,000 of State funds were made available by the legislature to provide emergency housing and educational facilities for veterans. We used entire installations at former forts, barracks, former schools, a seminary, a hospital, and boarded-up apartment houses. Our job is almost complete; we converted those structures to provide good livable quarters to take care of more than 11,000 families in 73 emergency housing projects in 40 of our municipalities.

We also found, early in 1946, that all our colleges, which had had a maximum prewar enrollment on campus of about 102,000 students, would not be able, because of lack of housing and educational facilities, to take care of about 100,000 veterans of World War II who would be desirous of a college education. So Governor Dewey called together the presidents of all our 87 colleges, and a plan was adopted whereby, with Federal cooperation, we aided in the provision of the needed emergency educational and housing facilities. These included homes, classrooms, laboratories, cafeterias, offices, and various student facilities.

The Governor also caused three emergency colleges to be set up at State expense, at the former Sampson Naval Training Station, at the former Rhoads General Hospital, and at the old fort at Plattsburg. There we took care of as many as 8,500 students at one time. With this program no qualified veteran in our State has been deprived of the opportunity for a higher education, and we almost doubled our prewar full-time enrollment. Indeed, we observed no State lines. In the fall of 1947, the full-time registration in our 87 colleges and universities reached 201,028. Ninety-one thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine of these were veterans, and 109,049 were nonveterans. Total student enrollment at our colleges was 309,643, including those taking full time, part time, and extension courses.

You have some idea now of the immensity of the program of the State of New York under Governor Dewey. I have tried to outline how that program seeks to aid private enterprise and to supplement it by performing in the fields where it cannot function. In our State we consider the housing market as divided among three groups, first, the lowest income earning group; second, families of middle income which comprise about two-thirds of our population; and, third, families in the top income brackets. Our aid is the greatest at the lowest level, but our cooperation with builders is uniform at

all three. With respect to the first group, as I have endeavored to demonstrate to you, private enterprise has not been able to do any kind of an adequate job. There, Government at the proper level can aid just as New York has aided.

For persons in the lower middle income groups, New York State believes not in building the housing, but in aiding private builders to do the job. We do that through our limited dividend housing companies, to which I have referred in outlining our housing history. During the past year the Governor has developed a plan to help veterans get housing which they can afford to own through those limited dividend corporations. That plan is important for various reasons, as becomes apparent after we examine certain fundamentals. Everyone knows that we must have the cooperation of government, realtors, builders, labor, and all our citizens to break the housing log jam. How can we bring that cooperation into being? I think that an enlightened public knowledge of all the factors that determine the number of homes that will be built, and their sale or rental price, can be most helpful in that respect. Knowledge of those factors will bring understanding of the forces that are now holding back an adequate supply of private homebuilding. Those factors are:

First, the extent of the demand for new housing, both purchase and rental, that is, the housing market. The public, as is becoming more and more clear, and particularly veterans, are exercising increasingly critical judgment in their selection of homes which they will buy. A number of homes that were constructed last year and the year before are still standing vacant. Some of them weren't well built, some were poorly located in undeveloped fields far from schools or transportation, and many were overpriced. Builders now realize that they must price their housing not only to reflect the real value of what they are giving, but also so that they will be within the financial capacity of our middle income groups. So the market is one for good, medium-priced homes.

The second factor is the availability and cost of land. There is plenty of land in most of our cities which can be bought at a price that will permit the building of moderate-priced homes. In the few places where reasonably priced land is not available within city limits, developers may be forced to go outside. That necessity to build beyond the city limits must be kept at a minimum by the cities, even if it costs them something in the first instance, or they will find that their real estate tax returns will be decreasing and municipal expenses increasing dangerously in future years. This is important to the public.

The third factor is the availability of building materials and equipment and the reasonableness of their cost. For some time, as I said before, unrealistic Federal controls held back the production of building materials, but now they are being produced in such volume that soon there should be no real shortage of any essential element that goes to make up a home. Our methods of distribution from manufacturer to large-scale builder are still antiquated. In many cases large-scale users who buy from the manufacturer are paying a price that reflects a substantial profit to a middleman who never saw the article, and never rendered any service in getting it from the manufacturer to the user. Manufacturers say that they must allow these jobbers and distributors a profit even though they render no service as it protects their system of distribution. Where that payment is substantial, and it generally is, I think that the method of distribution should be reexamined to see whether some correction cannot be made. The public has a stake in this if it increases the cost of shelter, and it does.

The fourth, and a very important factor, is the availability of mortgage funds and the reasonableness of the mortgage terms. Our savings banks, insurance companies, and building and loan associations and other private lenders have a surplus of building-loan funds. Despite that, we have witnessed a tendency to try to force mortgage rates up. Some lenders tell us that they must keep the rates up because they feel they are trustees of their depositors' money. They may be trustees, but they are trustees for a greater purpose than merely to get the highest possible return. Their depositors wish their funds used in a method which will not merely bring them the highest profit, but which will also insure a perpetuation of our present way of life, our present economy. If we have a forced nationalization or socialization of housing by the Federal Government, we may witness a nationalization of other things, which can only lead to state socialism or fascism. So the trustees of the depositors' funds should consider whether it isn't part of their trust to lend funds in a way that will encourage the development of moderate cost housing for the people who need homes.

The fifth factor is the adequacy of the supply of skilled labor and the degree of its productivity. As to this, the claims are conflicting. At the end of the war, when it looked as though we might have a boom in building for 2 or 3 years, labor leaders said that this would not be sound because even if sufficient workers could be trained in the various skills at a speed sufficient to put through such a program, they would be out of work at the end of the boom, and that then we would have an economic bust. Labor suggested a 10-year building program, and said that it would guarantee the training of sufficient apprentices to insure an adequate supply of skilled labor at an efficient rate of production to guarantee economic building. Builders have complained about the ability of some of the workingmen to produce a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. They have said that some were too old to do the heavy manual labor required in building, and that some just didn't have the skill. Of course, when we recall the fact that we had such little homebuilding for a period of 15 years, we can understand why some members of the labor group might not be doing as efficient a job as they would be if they hadn't had a 15-year lay-off so far as a substantial number of men in the building trades are concerned. Workers are improving, I am told, but some employers are still complaining about the rate of production. The apprentice-training program must be stepped up.

The sixth and final factor is the amount of the builder's or promoter's profit. Even in these days, we hear stories of builders holding housing at an excessive figure. Builders should not seek all the cream or the public may feel they should take the bottle away from them altogether.

Governor Dewey has set up a plan in the State of New York whereby, as I say, we can get homes for our veterans, and at the same time have working field laboratories whereby the public can find out just what is holding back private homebuilders by studying under a critical microscope the six factors to which I have referred. We call it our Veterans' Mutual Home-Ownership Program under the State's limited-dividend housing law. It is supported by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Catholic War Veterans, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the Jewish War Veterans and the American Veterans Committee. Under that plan, veterans may use their New York State bonus funds and their enlisted men's Federal terminal-leave pay to aid in the providing of permanent, private cooperative homes in garden-type housing projects to be built under our limited-dividend housing law. New York State is paying a bonus to its veterans, which ranges from $50 to $250 per man. The State will issue up to $400,000,000 in bonds to finance the bonus. The Federal terminal-leave pay averages about $225.

Veterans in a particular city can form a group to build a project in which each would eventually become, in practical effect, the owner of an apartment. That ownership would be evidenced by their interest in the stock of the developing corporation plus a renewable lease. Under the limited-dividend housing law of the State of New York, the housing companies may be exempted from municipal taxes with respect to the value of the new housing for up to 50 years, and they are exempt from all State taxes. Veterans can use their State bonus and Federal terminal-leave pay as the down payment.

The projects, theoretically, could be financed either with Federal Housing Administration insurance or with the Federal Veterans' Administration guaranty. However, as a practical matter, we are not relying on financing through the Veterans' Administration because lenders find the law governing loans from that agency unsatisfactory so far as multiple-family housing projects are concerned. So we turned to the FHA, where, unfortunately, the down payment by the veteran must be greater, but the agency itself has been very cooperative. If even this extra payment could be financed through the VA guaranty, it would bring down the costs. The VA has not gone along on this, I regret to say.

We have too many Federal agencies duplicating each others' efforts in this field. The Public Housing Authority, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Veterans' Administration are all operating in housing, but their functioning seems uncoordinated. No State would tolerate such duplication; that's why I think control should be in the States. All the Federal housing agencies should be combined in one department of Cabinet rank in order to save the taxpayers' funds.

Our first project under this veterans' mutual-housing plan is now under way. We have approved the formation of a company organized by representatives of veterans' organizations under our limited-dividend law, which has an option on a site in Queens County in New York City, on which it plans to build housing for 800 families. The Bowery Savings Bank, a great New York institution, is willing, provided there is agreement on various other terms which are now being mutually considered, to lend the company over $7,000,000 at 3½ percent interest. That is a very fair rate indeed in our region, and is evidence that the trustees of that institution realize that they are trustees of their depositors' funds to perpetuate the American way of life. To provide funds for the veterans who haven't the savings to put on top of their State bonus and terminal-leave pay for the down payment, the Manufacturers Trust Co. another great New York financial institution, has agreed to make short-term loans, also at a very fair rate, that is, at a discount rate of 3⅓ percent per annum.

Home ownership will be available to veterans in this project at a cost of about $15 per room per month for those able themselves to provide the moderate down payment. These carrying charges should be less outside New York City, where we expect total development costs to be less. The tax exemptions I have mentioned will result in savings of expense to them of about $5,000 over a 25-year period. So the veterans will be saving quite a substantial percentage of the costs of home ownership over the years. Government will thus be aiding in providing home ownership for middle income families at less than what it would cost for it to do the job itself, and in doing

so it will be aiding and not competing with private enterprise.

You can see, I think, how our veterans' mutual program constitutes a great housing laboratory to help bring about the building of the housing we need at less cost. Through it we have been able to obtain less than the going mortgage interest rates since we have a sound and worth-while project. With respect to other of the factors to which I have referred, land costs, availability and price of materials, productivity of labor and percentage of profit to the builders, you may be certain that the veterans will be maintaining a careful watch, and if any of these are excessive you can depend on our veterans to develop a public opinion which will be the most effective control. Recently, at the request of Governor Dewey, I had a meeting with 14 representatives of about 200,000 workers in the building industry. Let me list them:

Thomas A. Murray, president of the New York State Federation of Labor; Howard McSpedon, president, Building and Construction Trades Council of New York City; representatives of the Engineers International Union; the Carpenters Union; the Plumbers Local No. 2; the Painters District Council; the Sheet Metal Workers Local No. 28; the Plasterers Local No. 60; the International Laborers Union; the Electrical Workers Local No. 3; the Steamfitters Local No. 638; and the Ironworkers Local No. 40.

Those leaders of labor were enthusiastic about the possibilities of our veterans' mutual home-building program. They assured me that on our veterans' projects, labor would be working at its maximum rate of productivity, that any practices claimed by some people to be restrictive in nature would be carefully reexamined and eliminated if that were at all possible with due regard to health and safety, that an adequate apprentice-training system would be functioning since there now was sufficient opportunity for employment, and that there would be no jurisdictional strikes. It was made clear to me that labor was out to show that charges that it was responsible for the log jam in building were not true, and to prove that it was being blamed for a number of things with respect to which it was not at fault.

If as a result of these pilot mutual projects for veterans in our State it becomes evident that labor is on the prewar standard of productivity, you may be certain that we will see a degree of private home building that will give us the homes we need. For that standard of productivity will carry over into other purely private building.

And, of course, as I said, the veterans will be watching the amount of profit that the builders are taking out. In the 800 dwelling-unit projects which I have mentioned, the profit is being kept at a reasonable figure by the builder, the Roth-Schenker Corporation.

So our veterans' mutual projects throughout the State will be housing field laboratories through which we hope to do the following things:

1. Develop ideal basic designs for good housing at a price within the means of our lower- and middle-income groups. In order to do this, we plan to bring together the best talent and advice among architects, engineers, and large-scale builders so as to have a continuous research program designed to bring about better housing at less cost. The New York State Association of Engineering Colleges, the American Institute of Architects, the New York Association of Architects, and the American Federation of Labor have all agreed to cooperate in this phase.

2. Devise methods for the proper distribution of materials without unnecessary mark-ups.

3. Train effiecient and able young workmen in the various building lines. This may require recasting of our present seasonal building habits, as young men prefer fields in which there is year-round employment.

4. Have a continuous investigation of costs of materials, labor, and the services of building contractors, that is, their profits, with frequent publication of all the facts.

5. Make a motion picture of the progress of the building of our project so that the public can see all the factors that are involved in the construction of housing. The leaders of labor to whom I have referred have endorsed this idea.

6. Bring about the adoption of simplified codes of building practices. Our so-called antiquated building codes in many cases are responsible for our high costs. While their provisions may be antiquated, in many cases they are kept in force by modern pressure lobbies. By this means we hope to stabilize our home-building industry in New York State so that we will have all the housing we need when we need it at a price we can afford to pay.

I have mentioned low-income families and middle-income families. Our program will also help in providing housing even in the higher income groups. For our public housing projects are planned so as to clear slum areas which private enterprise could not clear. In some cases we are building our public-housing projects on vacant land and clearing a slum in a different part of the city. Where that slum area should not be again used for housing because the area has been invaded for industrial uses, we sell the land off to industry under restrictions to prevent its ever returning to slum uses. Our public-housing and limited-dividend projects have large open areas. Private builders want to build alongside of us to take advantage of those open spaces. Concentration of a sufficient amount of new housing in a particular area leads to the creation of good, integrated neighborhoods. Private builders are glad to provide commercial facilities for such neighborhoods. Municipalities find it economical to cooperate in the extension of the necessary utilities to such a single neighborhood if this will prevent spot building in a number of places in the city which would lead to overloading public facilities in each of those areas. So I hope that I have given you some idea of the job we are doing in New York State in cooperating, and not competing, with private enterprise.

Now for a Federal program.

Legislation has recently been proposed to Congress which neglects the low-income field. That seems to be a policy of not aiding where aid is needed the most. Federal legislation should also not be such as to perpetuate present inefficiencies and high building costs. The suggestions which have been made by some persons for so-called accelerated amortization provisions under the income-tax laws must also be critically examined in this regard, as well as with respect to their effect on the national income-tax structure.

The Federal Government can help, but I believe that its aid should be in such a form as will bring down building costs, encourage all the States to try to take care of their particuluar needs so far as possible and help to stabilize our home-production capacities. That is what we have done. The States should be encouraged to set up housing programs of their own to fit the particular needs of their people in their region and climate. They can do a better job for themselves than some master mind in Washington with one plan for 48 States. This will help to keep government at the local level, where it properly belongs, will prevent the danger of bureaucracy, and will lessen the opposition to a Federal housing program.

I think that the Federal Government should confine its role to financial grants to the States—and working only through the States so far as any public housing is concerned—on some kind of a matching basis which will encourage them to go out and do something themselves. The Federal program of aid would then be elastic enough to permit the States to adopt any plan that would fit their particular regional and economic needs. That is, the Federal Government could—

1. Make payments to the States to match the subsidy that the States pay to keep down the rents of their public housing projects for low-income families. This matching need not be on a dollar for dollar basis.

2. Make payments to match funds set aside by the States for slum clearance. The Federal grants might be on a variable basis, depending on the seriousness of the slum conditions. This would aid States with area deterioration problems far beyond their economic capacity to meet.

3. Provide loan funds upon reasonable terms to private builders who will provide housing for middle-income families. This may be tied in with partial municipal tax exemption to aid in reducing rents in projects for lower middle-income families, as is done in New York's limited-dividend housing law.

4. Provide funds for national research with respect to (a) new building materials and systems of distribution; (b) improved building methods; (c) more efficient building codes; (d) municipal and area planning; and (e) determination of future housing needs and the preparation of plans to fill them.

If the views I have attempted to outline are followed, I think we will be well on the way to meetitng our housing emergency and preventing any recurrence of it. It is, indeed, heartening to witness the interest of this great veterans' organization in bettering the living of all our fellow citizens throughout the Nation.

Increase of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army, before the House Armed Services Committee, April 14, 1948:

The Secretary of Defense has recommended to you a balanced program for the strengths in manpower of our armed forces. This balanced proposal was a resolution of the needs of the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy. This proposal is an example of unification in action. It represents an admirable execution of the purposes of unification which the Congress ordained under the National Security Act.

Of the measures proposed in the so-called "$3,000,000,000 program," this committee has already taken favorable action on universal military training. My purpose here is to recommend approval of the remainder of that program.

The original proposal—introduced by the Secretary of Defense—to expand the Army's strength was dictated by the urgent need to create a realistic combat capability within the Army.

With one out of every two soldiers engaged in overseas duties, and with a substantial part of our effort devoted to support of the Air Force, the Army has lost much of its essential combat effectiveness. It has become primarily an administrative rather than a military force.

As a result, the armed services have agreed that we must immediately and without any further delay reconstitute an effective combat strength within the Army. We have agreed that air power and sea power together are partly crippled and denied the offensive capabilities that should be theirs so long as they are handicapped by a weakness in Army combat strength.

I have not come before you today to discuss the relative capabilities or missions of the several armed services. My experience as part of the unified command in two large-scale triphibious invasions has taught me that each service benefits directly from the advantages of the others. And similarly, that each service suffers directly from the limitations of the others. None is effective without the others.

The Army is not engaged in competition with the Air Force or the Navy.

Our requirements are dictated simply by the minimum emergency tasks that will be assigned us should a conflict develop. I am concerned by the knowledge that these emergency tasks greatly outstrip the Army's ability to perform them.

Before I discuss the details of the Army's part in this program, I should like to mention several pertinent factors.

I am not unmindful of considerable sentiment that has developed to the effect that these balanced measures should be subordinated to a unilateral expansion of our air power. The press and other sources have indicated a move to establish a so-called 70-group Air Force while possibly rejecting UMT and cutting down on the Army's requirements. UMT remains an essential measure for the filling of the Reserves with trained men. It is a distinct measure within itself and cannot be supplanted by a 70-group air program. Likewise, the Army's requirements exist in any case, and cannot be met by a substitution of air strength.

Large and powerful air forces alone do not constitute air power. Only by employment of air forces in concert with land and sea forces can there be such a thing as air power.

At this point I want to make my position clear. The development of air power is essential to the national security. But equally important is the development of sea and land power.

The apparent failure of many people to realize the need for an Army stems from a belief that if we place the bulk of our reliance on air power there will be no use for land power.

THE ROLE OF THE ARMY

Success in modern war can come only through a carefully planned employment of balanced land, sea, and air forces operating as a team. But the following remarks will dwell on the Army's relationship to air power since that to my mind is less clearly understood than the Army's interdependence with the Navy.

The effectiveness of aircraft like any other weapon is definitely limited in range and numbers. They are extremely expensive and complicated. My colleagues in the Air arms will agree that in order that the limitations of air power may be reduced to the minimum and thus allow maximum effectiveness of air power there must be appreciable land forces.

Only last week Gen. Carl Spaatz, in my opinion the foremost air strategist in the world, stated publicly that anyone who believed we could fight a future war with bombers based on the North American Continent is suffering a delusion.

General Spaatz also asserted that for a strategic bombing effort of the future to succeed would require bases nearer the target than many people realize.

Air bases will unquestionably by necessary. These bases are defensive, to prevent attack on our homeland, and offensive, to permit the air effort to be carried to the enemy.

ARMY MUST TAKE BASES IN AIR WAR

This being so, the land forces—the Army—will be responsible for seizing and holding bases from which the air effort may be most effectively launched. In seizing these bases the Navy will, of course, play a large part.

We can be certain that the enemy will do everything within his power to prevent our occupation of bases. That will mean fighting—land fighting.

The Army will also play a large part in preventing the enemy from holding bases from which he can attack our bases and the United States itself.

By bases I mean not only island outposts and other strategic points but large land areas within which can be contained the great complex of facilities, communications, supplies, equipment, and armaments which go to make up strategic and tactical land, sea, and air forces of decisive size and composition. That means we must be prepared to fight on land, sea, and in the air for bases.

In addition, we anticipate many vital objectives, such as scattered guerrilla forces, against which the air weapon will not be effective. Only trained land forces can reduce such opposition. Furthermore, there will unquestionably be situations wherein the full effect of air power will be felt only in conjunction with land forces which can dominate enemy land forces.

INITIAL COMBAT FUNCTIONS OF THE ARMY

This brings me to an outline of the Army part of the plan proposed by Secretary Forrestal. At the outbreak of an emergency or before it takes place the Army must be prepared: to occupy those areas from which air attacks could be launched against our industrial cities; it must be prepared to give protection against bombing, sabotage, and fifth-column attacks, to the most vital installations, including the atomic-energy plants; and, it must be able to seize the overseas areas of vital importance to our communications and to our Air Force. The units for this job must be in being, up to strength, fully equipped, and trained.

I previously told you of the attitude of General Spaatz on the need for bases in sustaining an air offensive. By the same token, advanced bases are essential to an enemy if he is to bomb our cities. During the last war we learned that no matter how effective our radar nets, fighter protection, and antiaircraft defenses may be, enemy planes can always get through. Neither England nor Germany, with their tremendous air forces and with networks of bases but few miles apart, were able to insulate their cities from air attack. Despite the fact that for several months prior to D-day, the entire Allied air fleet aimed an offensive against V–2 launching sites, those attacks were not stopped until the launching sites were seized.

These incontestable facts lead us to one conclusion. The only certain and safe guaranty against enemy air attack is to seize and hold the bases from which his aircraft would fly.

If we, as a result of weakness in land or naval strength, permit any enemy power to seize such bases as Alaska, Greenland, Iceland, Spitzbergen, or the Azores, then we shall have laid our industrial and population centers open to air attack. All the air forces and antiaircraft artilleries of the world could not prevent it. Only troops actually occupying such bases could give us protection. Those troops are the Army.

WHAT SIZE ARMY IS REQUIRED?

The Army has estimated that in order to undertake its minimum security missions with a reasonable degree of safety, it must have 18 divisions equipped and trained for instant deployment.

These 18 divisions would constitute nothing more than an elementary defensive force. It would lack the strength for sustained or extended operations. It would be essentially a stopgap, one-shot army, a plug in the dike until we rallied sufficient and effective reserves.

An 18-division army with its supporting troops would require 1,080,000 men immediately an emergency became apparent.

To reduce the strain of so tremendous a force on both our peacetime economy and manpower supply, we elected to ask the Congress for a Regular Army force in-being of 12 divisions in the hope that we could muster another 6 D-day stand-by divisions—with their supporting troops—from the National Guard and Reserves.

With 12 divisions of the Regular Army and 6 divisions in the Reserves, our manpower requirements for actual forces in-being were reduced to 822,000 men.

This solution obviously contained an element of peril. For in relying upon the National Guard and Reserves for another six D-day divisions, we had to assume that an emergency would not develop before those units were filled and the men properly trained for deployment in combat.

Let me compare the proposed strength of 822,000 with the present Army of 542,000.

By type	542,000 present strength	822,000 strength
Overseas:		
Combat	100,000	113,000
Service [1]	158,000	159,000
Total	258,000	272,000
Zone of interior:		
Mobile striking force	54,000	223,000
Operating [2]	192,000	274,000
Nonoperating	38,000	53,000
Total	284,000	550,000
Total Army	542,000	822,000

[1] Includes military government and graves registration.

[2] Including support of Air Force, training, overhead, etc.

DEPLOYMENT OF ARMY TODAY

The next chart indicates Army deployment as it is today and as it would be with the proposed strength of 822,000.

Let me emphasize the extent of the Army's burden in the occupation of Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea. This important task is performed almost exclusively by the Army. These occupation forces are in fact the frontiers of our Nation's safety. The proposed measures will assure them—and the free peoples of the world—that the United States means what it says. Yet in the event of trouble these occupation forces would not be available for use elsewhere.

The next chart indicates how our forces are distributed within the United States. It is this element of our forces which is most frequently misunderstood.

I am going to point to these basic Army functions in the United States and leave it to common sense to determine if any function or group of personnel can be eliminated. There is also listed the requirement toward which the requested increase would permit the Army to build.

Distribution of Army strength in the United States

	Mar. 1, 1948	Required Mar. 1, 1949
1. Mobile striking force and defense of United States.	54,000	223,000
2. Trainers and students	84,000	119,000
3. Administration of posts and camps	36,000	58,000
4. Ports and transportation	12,000	18,000
5. Personnel center activities	9,600	13,000
6. Research and development	9,000	11,000
7. Medical service	20,000	28,000
8. Civilian components	8,000	9,000
9. Communications net	8,000	10,000
10. Foreign missions	6,000	8,000
11. Processing (in and out) [1]	25,000	35,000
12. Patients (general hospital) [1]	9,000	13,000
13. En route overseas [1]	4,000	5,000
Total	284,000	[2] 550,000
UMT trainers		95,000
Grand total		645,000

[1] Nonoperating.
[2] Part of the 822,000 request.

Please note the size of what could be termed the mobile striking force today. We have about 54,000 troops in combat units which could be used for an emergency.

The chief aim of the requested increase in the strength of the Army is the establishment of a mobile striking force. The numerous functions of the Army today are such that a very limited number of units are available for defense of the United States for expansion of the Army in case of mobilization or for emergency operations outside the country. The mobile striking force we consider a safe minimum is listed on the next chart.

MOBILE STRIKING FORCE TO BE LOCATED IN THE UNITED STATES

Headquarters units: 3 infantry divisions; 1 armored division; 1 airborne division; 2 regiments armed cavalry (L); 5 regimental combat teams; 12 field artillery battalions; 58 AAA battalions; 6 engineer battalions; 2 chemical mortar battalions; service support units; total, 223,000.

Together with the equivalent of six trained and equipped divisions from the National Guard and Organized Reserves that is a respectable force. But a combined force of those proportions cannot be attained without selective service for the Regular Army and UMT for the civilian components.

The committee bill, I understand, provides for strengths of the armed forces as follows: (a) The Air Force, 502,000; (b) the Navy, including the marines, 660,000; (c) the Army, 782,000.

I have indicated the manner in which the required Army strength of 822,000 was determined.

This Army requirement of 822,000 which I have described is necessary at this time whether we have 55 groups, 70 groups, or any other number of groups. Because we support the Air Force—that is, feed them, clothe them, transport them, furnish their ammunition and guns, take care of their sick, and do countless other administrative tasks, an increase in size of the Air Force does affect us. If the Air Force strength is to be increased by 100,000 we will have to increase the Army by 15,000 more to take care of that increased load.

But it must be kept clearly in mind that this increase of 15,000 does not increase Army capabilities for its own combat functions one iota. Furthermore, this must be realized—the logistic support we are able to give the Air Force with this number of Army troops is adequate only for peacetime. When the Air Force starts operating the amount of Army logistic support required will increase fourfold, just as it will for a fighting army.

The figure of 15,000 would have to be greater except that under a recent agreement with the Air Force the Army will turn over to the Air Force certain types of service support in tactical units, up to and including the wing. Thus under your bill the Army strength requirement is 837,000.

The manpower needed to fill the aforementioned requirements for the active Army cannot be met by voluntary recruiting alone. Selective service is the only other recourse. This simple chart will show how only through selective service on a limited scale can the Army be brought to the minimum strength required.

General Dahlquist and others will furnish details of the Army's recommendations on the various measures for selective service which have been proposed.

So much for the Regular Army requirements. How about the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps? The Army's plans cannot be considered sound unless the Guard and the Reserves are to be made effective. We have set a requirement for the preparation of at least six divisions to be ready for immediate action in case of an emergency. But the remainder of the National Guard and the ORC are just as vital to the long-range plans. In 1916 we sent the Guard to the border and they were in practically continuous service from then on. Yet it was 1918 before any units could be used in combat.

We started mobilizing the Guard in 1940 but it was 1942 before any were committed to action. The condition the National Guard and the Organized Reserves are in today precludes their doing the job now which must be done.

First of all, the citizen reserves are under strength. At the present time the National Guard has only 235,000 officers and men, largely composed of untrained boys. Because of the location of some units, some officers, although veterans, have had no experience in the type unit to which they now belong. Lack of armory facilities, however, greatly impedes any increase to even approximately full strength.

You cannot produce combat usable units by drill one night a week and an annual 2-week camp. Units never get beyond the elementary stage of training. Moreover, even though it were possible to fill the Guard with veterans who had served in the proper type unit there must be a limit to what we should expect the veterans of the last war to do. What will be the situation 3 years from now? Unless a training program is authorized this year the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps will still be untrained in 1951. That will mean that the total force in being would be not the 18-division minimum but 12 divisions—7 of which are committed overseas—leaving a net of only 5 with supporting troops in the United States. This would preclude the seizing and holding of any base from which we might carry the air offensive to the enemy.

LARGER AIR FORCE CANNOT REPLACE UMT

There is apparently a widespread belief that additional security may be obtained either by UMT or by a greater Air Force. There is no relationship between the 70-group program and UMT. The alternative to UMT is not 70 groups, 170 groups, or 1,000 groups. The alternative to UMT if we are to have the barest type of security is a standing army big enough to carry the Army portion of a war burden for 1 year, until mobilization can be effected. This would require at least 25 divisions initially, or about 1,500,000 men, and would cost many billions annually.

Another observation I wish to make is that UMT is not an Army program alone. It will produce men for the wartime Navy and the Air Force as well. A 70-group Air Force is not big enough to fight a war. It will require considerable expansion and its units will require replacements, both of which UMT will make possible.

Thirdly, the youth of America have a stake in this. Most of them are not going into the regular services, but if war should come most of them will have to go to war. Giving up a training program means they go to war the next time unprepared, mentally, physically, and with no training. Picture your own son or somebody else's, 18 or 19 years old, enlisted in a National Guard unit and moved off in a week or two to Alaska, or Greenland, or some other spot. Picture him going into combat. The alternative is not 70 groups or UMT. The 70 groups are not going to give that boy the lead time he needs in training.

If means are not to be provided to make the Organized Reserve Corps and the National Guard ready, the Army will have to revise its plans for the national security. Without adequate reserves as now contemplated, the Army must recast its concepts and recommend to the Congress a far larger standing Army than is under consideration here today.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SELECTIVE SERVICE

There has been considerable discussion on the relationship of selective service and universal military training. Although this committee has already acted on the latter measure, it is pertinent to state that the need for limited selective service in no way removes the need for universal military training.

UMT and selective service are interdependent, not independent. Selective service is an immediate and limited means to fill the Regular forces so that they may perform minimum current functions. It is a short-range measure.

UMT is designed primarily to provide a strong, well-trained citizen reserve, ready and able to join ranks with the Regular forces when and if needed. No better way to develop the reserves has been presented. UMT is a long-range measure.

Both selective service and UMT are necessary.

THE ISSUE: WHERE SHOULD THE NEXT WAR BE FOUGHT?

Due to the tremendous destructiveness of modern weapons and the ruthlessness of their application it is worth while considering where on the globe we should plan to fight the next war if we become involved in it. Our last two wars have been fought overseas. Our people have not been attacked at home. Our slow industrial and manpower mobilization has been protected during both wars. In those wars our people were not called upon to endure the sacrifices and sufferings that a war at home entails. For this and other reasons we should plan definitely to fight overseas if fight we must. I believe the Nation, if made to understand the choices involved, will support this idea regardless of cost. However, until guided missiles and rockets have progressed far beyond their present stage, the ability of the United States to fight the initial phase of the next war beyond its borders depends almost entirely on its ability to push forward and hold the air bases which will provide the support and protection for the strategic air offensive which must start immediately. Any failure to seize and hold a forward line for an immediate air offensive will result in the certainty of hostile occupation of that line and the danger of a war at home. The Army will play a large part in keeping war away from home.

EQUIPMENT AND WEAPONS SERIOUSLY SHORT

In conclusion may I point out that any measure calling for an increase in Army strength must provide for making available the necessary equipment, for an air-borne soldier without a parachute or a tanker with-

out a tank is no more effective than a pilot without a plane. The Army has been living off stocks remaining from World War II since the recent war ended. Because of insufficient funds no new equipment has been procured except some pilot models. Similarly we have had few funds for maintenance of much of our present equipment.

The Army has military types of equipment remaining from World War, II stocks for the initial equipment of 20 divisions. However, these stocks are not balanced. They are lacking in many items of equipment such as recoilless weapons, satisfactory antitank guns, transportation and electronics equipment. As an example, we possess radar equipment which was not designed to track jet planes. The shortage of funds has also forced the Army to defer vital maintenance. Consequently the bulk of this equipment must be rehabilitated before it is usable. A certain amount of construction will also be necessary. I have mentioned these matters because they are part and parcel of any measures to improve the national security structure.

A Parkway Along the C. & O. Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun, Baltimore, Md., April 13, 1948:

A PARKWAY ALONG THE C. & O. CANAL

The old and colorfully historic Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, bordering the Potomac from Georgetown, D. C., to Cumberland, Md., became Federal property in 1938, and now the Government is trying to decide what is to be done with its 185-mile right-of-way. The aged waterway, with its white-stone locks, granite aqueducts, and stop-over inns, winds through some of the best of Maryland's mountain country, but it is largely inaccessible and in an advanced stage of deterioration. Two stretches, 23 and 7 miles long, at the Washington end of the canal have been restored in recent years for boating, fishing, and sightseeing.

Representative BEALL, of Maryland, has introduced a bill in Congress authorizing the Government to survey the possibilities of building a parkway along the canal from Great Falls, Md., to Cumberland. The House Public Lands Committee has approved the bill. If the survey is made and proves the parkway feasible, the National Park Service would like to build a road that would parallel restored sections of the canal to Harpers Ferry and then utilize the canal bed as a right-of-way through the mountains to Cumberland. The canal route rises only 605 feet from Georgetown to Cumberland and would provide a less hazardous alternative to Route 40's sharp curves and steep grades.

The C. & O. canal dates back to Baltimore's prerailroad fight to capture the trade from the West. The canal was started in 1828, after the old Potomac Co., fostered by George Washington, had lost $500,000 in an attempt to remove the obstacles to navigation in the Potomac River. The builders of the canal visualized a continuous canal about 360 miles long, connecting the tidewaters of the Potomac with the navigable waters of the Ohio at Pittsburgh. But the project was hard hit by high costs, labor shortages, a cholera epidemic and a pitched battle between two factions of indentured Irish workmen that wrecked considerable canal and private property.

The lower end of the canal, from Georgetown to Seneca (the section now restored), was opened in 1831. A controversy between the canal company and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad over the right-of-way along the Potomac River narrows between Point of Rocks and Harper's Ferry delayed the opening of the canal above Seneca until 1833. There then followed a 17-year period of financial struggle, including the cost of boring a 3,000-foot tunnel through a mountain at Paw Paw, before the canal reached Cumberland. The State of Maryland responded loyally to each company plea for money and eventually put up more than half of the total construction cost of $11,000,000.

Business on the canal boomed for 2 decades after 1850. In 1871, the peak year, the 540 boats operating in the canal carried a million tons of cargo, the great bulk of which was coal. After 1871 the Allegheny coal operations began to snip over the B. & O., the canal's greatest competitor, and the number of canal boats steadily declined. But the canal continued to operate until 1924, despite a disastrous flood in 1889 and subsequent bankruptcy. Today the ancient towpath is accessible only to hikers. A highway would do much to bring the secluded waterway within view of more Marylanders and their visitors, if only it did not spoil the advantages of seclusion.

When Will We Get Enough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when will we get enough of the New Deal—some call it the bipartisan—foreign policy and of the propaganda which induced us to adopt and follow it and which has given us nothing but grief? "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?" Our foreign policy has been—is—thorns and thistles.

Everyone who cares to inform himself now knows that, while another President was talking peace, he was carrying on a shooting war. Why be fooled twice by the same bait?

We followed the New Deal—the bipartisan—foreign policy into one war because we were told—first, that it was our duty to establish the "four freedoms" throughout the world and, second, that unless we defeated Hitler our national existence would be imperiled. Now it is Stalin we must fear and appease. Might have been better had we let Joe and Hitler fight it out and then, if necessary, taken on the groggy winner.

What were the fruits of that war? Instead of greater freedom throughout the world, Stalin has control over more territory than did Hitler. We built up Stalin, communism, and the military might of Russia. Our young men and our young women went to war. Several hundred thousand died, over 3,000,000 were casualties. We harvested a crop of high prices and scarcities. We had an adequate dose of regimentation through OPA and other Federal agencies.

But that is water over the dam or under the bridge, and we can do nothing about it, other than learn a lesson and profit from that sad experience.

Are we to reap another similar harvest because of the New Deal foreign policy? The advocates of that policy have been sowing the seed for more than 10 years. That seed has been well watered and fertilized by internationalists, one-worlders, do-gooders—a few ambitious politicians strutting the world's stage.

AND WHAT HAVE WE NOW?

Almost a three hundred thousand million dollar debt, the Marshall plan, which means increasingly high prices, scarcities, and, we have been told a return of price fixing and rationing with, incidentally, heavier taxes upon everyone, either through direct taxation or through the increase in the cost of living.

Nor is that all. The sowing of the seed of internationalism is about to give us new fruit—something heretofore unknown to a peacetime America—compulsory universal military training, which will take several million young men out of schools and production, put them into a goose-stepping army—the policy of Hitler and of Stalin.

Another crop which we are asked to harvest from the seed sown by the New Deal (bipartisan) foreign policy is a reenactment of the conscription law. That will yank all of the physically fit young men off the farms and, if justice be done, out of the factories, mills, and mines, put them into the armed services. It will again give the old people, the physically unfit and the partially crippled, the task of working almost day and night to support our armed forces and the people in other lands.

Have we had enough? Is it too late to heed St. Matthew? He wrote:

> Beware of false prophets. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

The New Deal—bipartisan—foreign policy has given us rotten fruit—war, suffering, a lack of the things we need, heavier tax burdens for the next 200 years, and, at the moment, threat of another war, of rationing, regimentation, and, at the end, a dictator—and less of freedom everywhere.

We might well give consideration to that plank of the Democratic platform adopted just prior to the war, and which reads as follows:

> We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, Navy, or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

The administration elected on that platform made no effort—the present administration is making no effort—to carry out that promise.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." What we need here in America now is a new administration—one without a Communist in it; a policy—foreign and domestic—which has as its first objective the prosperity, the happiness, the security of our people, and the preservation of our Government.

The Theory of Soviet Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the spring issue of the magazine entitled "World Affairs" there is an article by Rudolph Schlesinger entitled "The Theory of Soviet Law." That article reveals the baseness of the Communist system. I would like to call your attention to one significant paragraph in it:

Even in civil law contract has lost much of its predominance, because of the fact that economic disputes of real importance can arise only between state enterprises whose differences are settled by a special semijudicial organ of state arbitration. While state arbitration operates subject to law, it approaches the litigant parties with a due appreciation of the interests and policies of the state which owns both of them.

The above is quite an admission—the state owns all the individuals.

It is to the credit of the American people that they have an independent spirit; that they are concerned about their liberties, and that they are not docile. The totalitarian trends in this country, such as expanded "Federal aid" schemes and growing bureaucratic control would have made more progress in the destruction of our freedom had it not been for the people's native independence and the actions of the truly far-sighted leaders in resisting New Dealism.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CITY OF GREENWOOD, S. C.,
April 12, 1948.

Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DORN: In studying newspaper reports of the various changes in the excise taxes, I want to make one suggestion. As you well know, municipalities throughout the United States are up against it in need of revenue. Cost of operations have increased so much and almost all sources of revenue have been shut off from municipalities, and, to a large extent, they have to depend upon ad valorem tax.

Any increase in ad valorem tax will certainly militate against the property owner; therefore, I want to make one suggestion. The Federal Government has an excise tax on all amusements, which amounts to practically 25 percent and includes all prices from 10 cents up. It seems to me that it would be a relief to the taxpayers if, instead of an increase in ad valorem tax to the municipality, the Federal Government would reduce that excise tax or admission tax to 1 percent on each 10 cents, fractional part thereof, or even better still to reduce it to what it was some years ago, 10 percent on each 50-cent admission, or more, and thus relieve the smaller brackets. In that way the municipality could assess a 1-percent tax on each 10 cents, fractional part thereof, in price of admission and relieve the theaters of any license other than that.

This tax would be placed upon the ones who are attending theaters or other amusements, and, in that way, we would help the amusement business by a reduction in the Federal excise tax as much as possible and aid the municipality by giving them the opportunity to levy an indirect or excise tax without increasing the ad valorem tax.

Will appreciate anything you may be able to do for the benefit of municipalities.

Sincerely yours,

E. H. BOWERS,
City Clerk and Treasurer.

New Threats to Bay State Woolen Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Hon. Arthur W. Coolidge, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, delivered April 12, 1948, at the annual dinner of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce at Lawrence, Mass.:

A little over three centuries ago bear-greased Indians camped on the shores of the Merrimac River. Plagues, hunger, tribal feuds, superstition, and the rigors of the New England climate kept them in savagery. They scarcely progressed from the era of the cave man to the time the Pilgrims landed.

Your founding fathers faced the same geographical limitations. But they had the brains to harness the river and to construct mills and factories. Now you turn out the woolen goods which not only clothe America with the new look, but also provide the income of more than 16,000 Lawrence workers.

Today the woolen-worsted industry is next to the largest employer of labor in Massachusetts, making jobs for more than 52,000 men and women. It indirectly supports butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers all over the neighboring counties. You have a right to be proud of your contribution to the prosperity of this Commonwealth.

POUNDING PAVEMENTS HUNTING FOR JOBS

But today your source of livelihood is threatened by the South. Its public utility, railroad, chambers of commerce, and Government agents are up here trying to persuade New England woolen and worsted mills to move South. Some manufacturers already have migrated to below Mason and Dixon's line.

If the kidnapers are successful, Lawrence will be more disastrously hit than by the 1936 flood. Your mills will become hollow shells. Your retailers will lose customers. Your local taxes for relief will skyrocket. Your workers will be pounding the pavements hunting for jobs.

Such a crisis could occur if Bay State labor, management, government, and the community are blind to the peril. Such a calamity need not happen if all elements concerned join together to solve the problem. A little teamwork sweat today can prevent State-wide tears tomorrow.

I propose tonight to fire an opening gun in the new industrial war between the States. I shall discuss the wool-industry problem without pussyfooting. The southerners claim that they have many attractive features. In a few moments I will debunk some of their exaggerated claims. But first let us hear what they offer.

ROBBING NORTHERN PETER TO PAY SOUTHERN PAUL

They boast that Dixie has a year-round mild climate with abundant water and power. They argue that because their labor is unorganized, workers will toil at low wages. This condition, they emphasize, means freedom from labor troubles.

Some deep South press agents dangle even more tempting bait. Mississippi cities and towns float bond issues for the purchase of sites and the erection of buildings for industry. Kentucky has a 5-year tax exemption on new industries. Louisiana has a 10-year ad valorem property tax exemption for new manufacturing plants and additions to existing factories.

Alabama even sent north "Big Jim" Folsom, her "kissing Governor," to demonstrate what the cotton kingdom has to offer northern girls in leap year. But although pictures of the playboy's smooching antics appeared in the papers, I do not find many of our young men worried by competition from the land of moonlight, magnolia blossoms, and mud waddlers.

All through the Swanee River region newspapers, public utilities, community projects, and government units are trying to attract outside industry. These razorback-hog States are operating on the principle of robbing northern Peter to pay southern Paul.

WE ARE BUYING BULLETS FIRED TO KILL OUR INDUSTRIAL STATE

Massachusetts never whines when competitors meet us fairly. But we do get our dander up when a section undermines the universal practice of sound taxation and uses the misery of its down-trodden Jeet Lesters as a lever for wrecking the livelihood of Massachusetts labor.

These bourbon States shirk their civic responsibilities in education, health, highways, charity, and other public services. But they expect our people to shell out through Federal taxes the money which they refuse to levy on their own hillbillies.

Massachusetts gets back only $2.50 for every $6 it gives to Washington. But Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, and some other "tobacco road" States return to Uncle Sam only $2 for every $7 they wheedle from Washington.

Louisiana mails to Uncle Sam only $329,000,000 annually. But Massachusetts pours into the Federal Treasury the huge sum of $1,500,000,000. Louisiana takes the money which Bay State taxpayers send to Washington and uses this Federal aid to offset the local 10-year tax exemptions which its communities give to industries that migrate from Massachusetts.

Thus we of Massachusetts are paying for the bullets that are fired to kill our industrial State. Louisiana is using Federal tax money earned by Massachusetts millworkers to put these same Massachusetts millworkers out of jobs.

RAW DEAL PLAYED ON OUR WORKERS BY HUEY LONG GANG

Bay State mill workers have a right to gripe about the raw deal the Huey Long gang is playing on them. But if these same workers looked around they would discover that many of their own crowd here also are doing things which eventually may destroy their jobs.

If we study the local picture a bit more carefully, we shall better understand why this

is so. Massachusetts is an industrial commonwealth. This condition creates our wealth. But it also creates certain hazards. An agricultural State thrives so long as its soil is fertile. A mining State prospers so long as its ore holds out.

But an industrial State survives as such only so long as its industries can be kept on a competitive basis with similar industries in rival industrial States. Unless we appreciate this fact, we will never be able to solve our problem.

STRANDED WORKERS CHIEF VICTIMS OF MILL TRAGEDY

When Bay State manufacturers no longer can make a profit here, they will either migrate or close down. Investors will place their capital elsewhere. Management will move into new territory.

But workers cannot pull up stakes so easily. Even if they follow the industry into Dixie they will have to compete for jobs with southern "crackers" who will work for less money. If they remain here, they will have to search for new employment, usually in unfamiliar lines.

These stranded workers are the chief victims of every mill tragedy. Yet many of these same workers are blindly digging their own economic grave. They listen to "screwballs" and ward heelers who kid them into believing that labor gains by taking cracks at the boss. They support certain leaders in unions, city halls and State legislatures who advocate soaking business.

But what happens to these same workers when they have restricted, taxed, and soaked business so ruthlessly that managements flee to other States to escape ruin? The demagogs and peanut politicians, who bamboozled the workers, go off on a new track. But the helpless workers, their worried wives and their hungry children are left to suffer the full brunt of empty pay envelopes.

SIREN SONGS BY BILBO BELT BANJO STRUMMERS

No businessman wants to liquidate his northern holdings and have on his conscience the knowledge that his former employees are in distress. But when he is faced with rising costs which threaten to ruin him and his shareholders, he is in the mood to listen to the siren songs by the Bilbo belt banjo strummers.

A few sour-bellied businessmen are in the habit of blaming labor every time the firm goes in the red. But if the truth were known, it is often their own managerial backwardness that is the prime cause of their lack of success.

Textile experts with whom I discuss this problem say frankly that many concerns have neglected to modernize their plants and have failed to keep abreast of technical, style, and consumer demands. A number of southern mills are competing successfully against New England plants because the newcomers have installed more up-to-date machinery and developed new processes.

However, some Bay State manufacturers maintain that although they want to modernize their plants, they dare not risk investing in new equipment because of the fear that government and labor are out to put them behind the eight ball.

WHAT GOOD IS LABOR CONTRACT IF MILLS CLOSE DOWN?

Responsible labor leaders do not brush aside this reply as merely bunk from the boss. Every fair-minded American wants labor to progress to better wages, better hours, and better working conditions. We don't want any return to the bad old days of the last century when textile skinflints forced women to toil 13 hours a day in the mills.

But thoughtful workers realize the danger of asking for more than a solvent business can afford. The betrayed workers themselves will turn in fury on their leaders if Pied Pipers insist on feather-bed practices, restrictions, and hampering regulations that either drive industry across State frontiers or drive it into the bankruptcy courts. What good is a labor contract if the mill closes down and the workers lose their jobs?

Government also has a responsibility to Bay State industry. Massachusetts is in the vanguard with laws promoting labor, health, education, welfare, and social gains.

But if the public pressures our city halls and our legislature to boost taxes beyond reason and to hamstring industry with expensive strait-jacket regulations, the public itself will be punished for its folly. When a mill is murdered, local retail business also dies.

I have not pulled my punches in describing the situation which faces this Commonwealth.

Although we have troubles, we should not be frightened by them. If we do our part to promote Bay State industry, we need not bite our fingernails in despair every time a chamber of commerce in honeysuckle heaven whistles the wolf call to Miss Massachusetts.

"DOCILE LABOR" OF MINT JULEP STATES

For the moment, certain mint julep States do have what their propagandists describe as "docile labor." But every time a New England mill heads South, a group of textile organizers pack their suitcases in New York City and also head South to sign up new members.

For example, the Textile Workers Union of America already has organized woolen and worsted plants in Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, and Kentucky—and is organizing in Rossville and Macon, Ga.; in Sweetwater, Springfield, and Knoxville, Tenn.; in Raleigh and Roxboro, N. C.; and in Glasgow, Va. Several of the plants affected are the very mills which moved away from New England to escape such unionization.

ORGANIZED LABOR GAINS IN SOUTH

In the past, local southern workers resented the type of high-pressure New Yorkers who suddenly burst in on them. But, lately, smart Emil Rieve and his CIO union chiefs have been conducting a very clever campaign of education, pointing out the advantages of belonging to strong collective-bargaining units.

Since January 1941, Rieve's unions have gained wage increases in the southern woolen and worsted industry that have totaled 58.5 cents per hour—and they are after more pay boosts.

Northern labor is mature, experienced in collective bargaining and wise to the fact that long strikes usually cause more loss than gain to workers. But deep South labor is a raw mass, inexperienced and undisciplined. It is a potential source of labor violence, race riots, and other disturbances.

Those manufacturers who today are attracted by a seemingly docile labor market may find that in leaving Massachusetts they are jumping out of the frying pan into the fire.

When a mill moves south its managerial group often goes with it. The wives of this group would be less happy in bringing up their children in an environment of suffocating summer heat, lower educational standards, and higher rate of disease.

The Bay State spends $161 per pupil annually. South Carolina spends $58.22; Georgia, $55.70; and Alabama, $54.17. Massachusetts has invested $619 in educational facilities for each pupil. The poll-tax States have from one-fifth to one-fourth of this amount: North Carolina, $177; South Carolina, $158; Georgia, $156; Tennessee, $143; and Alabama, $127.

DIXIE CLAGHORNS KEEP MUM ON DRAW-BACKS

Malaria, endemic typhus, hookworm, and typhoid dysentery are major public-health problems in the South. Tuberculosis is on the decline throughout the country but in Dixie the rate runs as much as 10 points above that for Massachusetts, due in part to the lack of pasteurized milk.

Workers in southern textile industries constitute a low-income group and, therefore, suffer the effects of inadequate diet, housing, and sanitation. Mill fever is practically unknown in Massachusetts plants but it is one of the most common industrial diseases in Mississippi. Illness cannot be segregated by social strata. The germs from the mill can spread to the boss and to his family.

Naturally, Dixie Claghorns keep mum about these draw-backs when they use their southern charm on northerners.

Last summer the Governors of Colorado, Wyoming, and several other sheep-raising States launched a campaign to induce the Boston wool trade to move out west. I didn't want Bay State folks to lose their business, so I warned our neighbors in the sagebrush country that we would fight to keep what we have. I even hinted that we might raise sheep on our abandoned farms. Then the "Little Bo Peeps" out there might lose their sheep.

That "Bo Peep" jibe fetched them. Newspapers from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific coast opened up on me with their verbal six-shooters. They said I had a tongue like a cactus and called me everything from a coyote to "cold codfish Coolidge."

They sent newspaper writers and trade commissions to Massachusetts to investigate how they might capture our wool trade and set up competing scouring plants. They barged in on me at the State House like a vigilante posse. But I introduced them to the local wool people and we all became good friends. They returned home admitting that Boston's advantages in holding the wool trade were greater than they could overcome.

I think that this new attack on us by the southern colonels will lose its drive when our manufacturers weigh all the pros and cons in the case. Business will realize that this Commonwealth has many great advantages in the industrial war between the States.

BAY STATE'S MANY INDUSTRIAL ADVANTAGES

Our mill workers are intelligent New Englanders, not so-called ignorant "poor white trash." They have the know-how in textiles which comes from local tradition and experience. More public and private research personnel and facilities are concentrated in this area than anywhere in America.

The port of Boston is close to our raw material, imported wool. The Hub is the leading wool market in the world and a reservoir of capital. Our mills are near the biggest consuming area in the United States, including the New York garment industry.

We don't intend to let the South or the West or any other section run off with our woolen-worsted industry. We propose to fight back. The recent common sense editorial by publisher Irving E. Rogers in the Lawrence Evening Tribune and the fact-studded articles which preceded it have awakened Lawrence to its danger.

I am sure that your chamber of commerce and your city's businessmen will urge your legislators to support measures to protect your community's chief source of income and employment. The New England Council already is engaged in a program to supplement your plans to save your industry.

BRADFORD PLANS TO SAFEGUARD MASSACHUSETTS INDUSTRY

Governor Bradford is giving the wool problem a top priority. He has ordered the Massachusetts Development and Industrial Commission to conduct a thorough survey to ascertain the complete story of why mills move out and to propose immediate remedial measures. The Bradford administration also is opposed to weakening the so-called 6 o'clock law and other legislation which now create jobs for women and make it possible for your

industries to compete more successfully with those of other States.

All of these steps will help protect the bread and butter of our textile cities. But in the final show-down, victory or defeat will rest with the men at the loom and the men in the office. If either group seeks only its own selfish advantage, both will be doomed. If both team together, each will share the resulting prosperity.

PAY OF MASSACHUSETTS MILL WORKER ATTRACTIVE

In the past, employment in the Lawrence mills often was regarded as rather inferior. Now the average pay of the mill worker in Lawrence is close to the top average of the State, and conditions of employment match those of any other industry. The chamber should foster this public recognition of the fact that workers in the mills are a stable, substantial, important element in the civic structure.

Formerly mill owners and managers were pictured as slave drivers whose only thoughts centered on increased money returns. There, too, is a change of attitude. The chamber should emphasize the "new look" of management—that it is human, warm-blooded, and interested in the welfare of the worker and the community.

It is literally a partnership in enterprise, in education, in mutual sharing of benefits.

VISION, SPUNK, GUMPTION

The men who founded the woolen industry in Massachusetts were men of vision and spunk, and gumption. The men who will continue its advancement will be cut from the same cloth.

They will not get the jitters whenever they hear the rebel yell from the South.

They will maintain good labor-management relations. They will promote aggressive salesmanship. They will educate the local public to the value of their industry to the community.

They will make the most of this section's advantages. They will overcome regional handicaps by being everlastingly on their toes to think new ideas and to use new machines, new techniques, and new processes to improve their product.

In other words, they will make free enterprise enterprising.

H. R. 6226

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, when H. R. 6226, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, was considered in the House today I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. This amendment increased the appropriations provided for by this legislation by $882,000,000 to provide for a 70-group air force.

I am reliably informed, Mr. Speaker, that 95 percent of the total number of planes in the possession of our Air Forces today were constructed during the year 1945 or in prior years. This, of course, is a weakness that cannot be tolerated.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is not crying "War is imminent" in proposing this amendment. We all know that war is not imminent nor is it inevitable, and preparedness does not indicate that we anticipate war. But it is far better, in my opinion, to let the world know that we intend to be capable of retaliation—a deadly devastating retaliation—immediately, rather than live in the hope that time will be on our side and that our industry will produce the planes after the battle has started.

I supported the gentleman's amendment because to me it is only good sense to have an air force ready to provide adequate protection against any aggressor. To encourage weakness is to invite disaster; but to be prepared is the best means of telling the world that we stand ready always.

This is not war talk. It is simply insurance. For 3 years we have been told that we need 70 air groups to properly defend the United States. It is time we initiated that program. I wish to emphasize the fact that we are not in an emergency. Nor are we facing impending peril. The President recognizes this fact. Army and Navy department heads who have appeared before the Armed Services Committee this week recognize this fact. Had it been otherwise the President would have declared an emergency and he would have ordered National Guard and Reserves to active duty. Nor does the present proposal to reinstate Selective Service call for any large draft of men. All that is being asked today in Congress is reasonable precautions in these troubled times.

Seventy air groups will provide us with adequate air protection. It will simply be notice to the world that we are ready but it will also serve notice to the world that we are not preparing for war, else we would be advocating 200 air groups. We are simply assuring peace by being ready for any eventuality. By initiating a 70-group program we will be prepared to expand to an even greater degree if the situation demands it.

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Allentown Evening Chronicle, April 13, 1948:

IN THE WAKE OF THE NEWS

In the light of President Truman's requests for billions for European relief, more billions for national defense, and the general tendency not to become excited over astronomical figures in Government finance, it is not likely that Lehigh Valley folks have paid much attention to the President's call for $4,000,000 to expand the facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

These additional moneys, it is explained, are to be used to create a new steam plant at Johnsonville, Tenn. Actually, competent authorities assert, the new plant will cost $54,000,000, may be the largest in the world, and will in all probability produce sufficient power to supply all the needs of a city the size of New York. This power will be made available to industries of many kinds which, it is hoped, will be attracted to the area by low rates.

What, then, does all this add up to? Simply that the Federal Government through its Chief Executive proposes to take your tax dollars to set up a specific area of the country in competition with our own particular area, for instance. Already a number of large industries have planned to locate where power is furnished by the TVA. Among them are: General Electric, Dupont, Monsanto Chemical, Borg-Warner and many others. How many of these might have located in the Lehigh Valley section of the country is, of course, a matter of conjecture. But it is safe to assume that they were attracted to TVA territory by what are described as the lowest power rates in the eastern United States.

For years, TVA propagandists have been spreading untruths to the effect that such vast projects are necessary because private utilities have not been able to supply needed power. In the case of our own section, this is an obvious misrepresentation. The Pennsylvania Power and Light Co., which furnished power in 28 highly industrialized counties of eastern Pennsylvania, was never in the slightest power difficulty during the hectic days of the war. And now with power consumption even greater, it is in a position to meet all present and foreseeable demands.

It follows, then, that if Mr. Truman's request is given congressional approval we of eastern Pennsylvania are more than likely to suffer in the matter of new employment, new industry and general economic health, because, stripped of all its double talk, what the President proposes to do is to take public tax moneys to further a vast experiment in Government socialism.

It might be well to remember that the whole TVA idea was originally sold as a project for navigation and flood control, not power production. To date it has already cost the taxpayers of the United States $900,000,000, and set up the Government in competition with private industry in many ways.

If we lose our industrial leadership due to competition in the traditional American meaning of the term, then it is because we and our industries and utilities have not been on the job. But if we are to lose because we must compete with our own Government and our own dollars, that is another matter. Legislators from this section have a serious responsibility in seeing that the latter does not happen when they consider the Government corporation appropriation bill.

How Can the United Nations Become More Effective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay, entitled "How Can the United Nations Become More Effective?" by John C. Mack, Jr., Bradford, Ohio, high-school sophomore, which won him, among others, an all-expense tour to Washington, D. C., sponsored by the American Legion, Department of Ohio:

HOW CAN THE UNITED NATIONS BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE?

The United Nations is an international organization by which the nations of the world

hope to achieve peace and security. The 57 member nations are represented in the General Assembly, each nation having one vote. The Security Council is made up of 11 nations. Six, being nonpermanent members, are elected every 2 years. The remaining five, Russia, France, China, Great Britain, and the United States, are permanent members and negative vote by any of these nations will prevent action on any matter that is being discussed.

To make the United Nations effective, we must clearly understand why the organization is not effective. The greatest defects are: (a) there is no executive head to enforce international laws, treaties, etc.; (b) it has no army or navy with which to put down a rebellion or to stop a war; (c) any action against aggression could be stopped by a veto from any one of the Big Five.

In 1788 much the same problem faced the United States. Each State had its own sovereign government, currency, militia, and some even had tariffs. This, along with the fact that there was no executive head, made the Government of the United States very ineffective. Our forefathers solved the problem by throwing away the old Articles of Confederation and started anew by writing the Constitution.

If the United Nations Organization is to be made effective, it will have to do likewise, or make these drastic changes: First, set up a strong executive department, which provides for a chief executive. This executive should be elected by the General Assembly at regular intervals and be a man who would be thought of as a representative of the world rather than of a certain powerful nation. Second, provide for an army and navy, which will be under the command of the chief executive for the purpose of enforcing international law. Third, provide that the representatives to the General Assembly be elected by the people they represent rather than being appointed by the Chief Executive, who may be biased for political reasons. This will also help eliminate half-hearted representatives from the General Assembly. Fourth, set up a common currency. This will prevent quarrels over the rate of exchange. Fifth, outlaw tariffs that prevent impoverished countries from trading with prosperous countries. By doing this it will give the small countries an outlet for their products, thus giving them more money with which to buy much needed food. Sixth, the veto power of the Big Five will have to be limited, but not altogether abolished, for the idea of the veto was to prevent small nations from making resolutions that would benefit themselves and harm the large nations. Russia has used it for the purpose of benefiting herself and harming all other nations, both large and small. To prevent one nation from stopping action on an issue favored by all other nations, a vote of two-thirds majority, including four of the Big Five, would make the resolution effective.

To make these changes every nation will have to give up some of its rights, but something will have to be done or else there may be no nations.

Our Security Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. SARBACHER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent speech recently made by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON, of the Fifth District of Connecticut:

Last week I discussed with you one phase of our security problem. When I spoke about the need for a larger and more vigorous air force, it was not meant to imply that this alone would make us secure against aggression. In reality, there is no security against aggression other than agreement by all nations on policies that lead to peace rather than war. Without a perfected organization to assure a lasting peace we must, therefore, prepare our nation against the onslaught of any aggressor Nation.

With this in mind, I feel that it might be well to discuss one other phase of our security problem. It is utter futility to maintain a strong military force without maintaining our supply line which will guarantee the effectiveness of that force. A strong army, without necessary supplies, is a useless army. This was demonstrated in the European theatre during World War II, when whole regiments of German soldiers were captured because they had not sufficient matériel to continue fighting. This problem is perhaps greater for us than it has been in the past for any other nation in the world.

Our policy, and it has been a good one was to fight the war in the other fellow's back yard, if possible. Of necessity, we must then maintain longer supply lines which are subject to constant attack by our enemies. Full production by American industry would not be enough to win World War III. We would require partial mobilization now to insure total mobilization in the event we are attacked. Our planning must be for the future. Now is the time for the people of our military staff to lay the plans for such mobilization. Diversion of goods from civilian to military use will be much greater than it has been in the past.

All civilians should banish thought of profit from a people fighting for their existence. It might, perhaps, be necessary for our government to draft whole industries for military use in much the same way that we draft young men for the same purpose. Certainly the lives of our citizens are not less valuable than the property of our citizens. New methods of awarding contracts should be proscribed. Profit by individuals or corporations should be held to the barest minimum. If the young men of America are willing to give their lives for the safety of their country's welfare, it certainly is within reason to demand that both capital and labor relinquish exorbitant profit for the same purpose.

Much has been made of the tremendous capacity for production of American industry. The reasons for this are numerous. A totally unprepared nation, at the time of Pearl Harbor, demonstrated its industrial ingenuity and capacity by supplying not only our forces, but those of many of our allies before the end of the war. However short the period of time necessary to accomplish this was during the last war, this same period may not be available to us if there is a world war III.

It is incumbent upon the leaders of this country to make ready, now, plans for mobilization so that full capacity could be attained when we are first attacked. Would this affect our economy? Most certainly. The inconveniences of the past years would once again be with us. We might get cigarettes only on Tuesdays and butter by the quarter pound. Is this too great a price to pay for the security of our country?

In any future conflict each and every one of us will be in the front lines. Destruction of our homes and cities would be as probable as machine-gun fire upon front-line soldiers. The person residing in the Litchfield Hills would be no safer than the radio man on board a destroyer at sea. If war comes, we can be certain that it will be total and destructive.

I have just outlined the steps necessary to prepare this country in the event we are attacked. I believe it necessary that our citizens know how terrible and how frightening war can be and will be should it occur. Not only is it the duty of those serving in our Government to make certain that we are prepared in the event of war—it is an even more sacred duty to do all possible to prevent war from occurring.

The United Nations was the hope of a peace-seeking world. Its administration has been a dismal failure because of the reluctance of Russia to pursue the paths of peace through negotiation. A flat and final "no" to every suggestion of other nations has seriously retarded accomplishment of peace and has made necessary alternative proposals to accomplish this end.

I believe it significant that there has been introduced in both Houses of Congress resolutions seeking to strengthen the United Nations Organization. These resolutions will have the support of many Members from both major parties in Congress. This, too, is significant. It demonstrates, without shadow of a doubt, that it is the earnest desire of both parties to remove plans for future security from partisan politics. It is hoped by the adoption of these resolutions that the United States Government will take the initiative in forming a more potent United Nations Organization for the maintenance of peace in the world. Abolition of the veto power is one of the steps in this plan. The establishment of a world police force is another. The attainment of international agreements for disarmament is a third. It is upon these premises that we must pin our hope for future security. With our great country leading the way, it is certain that peace-loving nations everywhere in the world would agree to these concepts.

What does Russia think of this, you ask. Would they participate under such conditions? I believe that the time has come to find out whether or not Russia will participate in an organization that is capable of maintaining the peace of the world. If Russia will agree to the adoption of these three steps, the cause of peace will be advanced more greatly than it has been at any time in the past 3 years. If Russia is not willing to cooperate, the other nations of the world, not now dominated by her, must form such an organization for their own protection. The strength of such a combination would serve notice upon Russia, or any other potential aggressor, that the people of all nations are tired of war and seek only to live in peaceful cooperation with their neighbors.

It is my belief, therefore, that the steps we take now in expanding and strengthening our Air Force; by preparing a plan for industrial mobilization; and by taking the initiative in striving for a stronger and greater United Nations Organization, are all steps for peace. None of us wishes war, but we must not be unprepared.

And now, folks, until next week, when it will again be my privilege to talk with you, this is JIM PATTERSON, your Representative in Congress, saying good-by from Washington.

Civil Service Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to restore optional retirement at age

55, on a reduced annuity, for persons involuntarily separated from the Government service. It merely reinstates a provision that remained in the law for many years and which Government employees had come to count upon.

The bill has two principal objectives. The first is to correct an inequity and to restore a right of long standing; the second is to make the retirement system more effective by encouraging employees to leave their money in the fund.

As for the first objective, the original reason for incorporating the provision in the law was that when employees, particularly women, reach the age of 55, and have been engaged in Government work, it is difficult for them to find other employment if they lost their jobs, partly because of the discrimination against age and partly because specialized Government work often has no counterpart in private employment, and the dismissed employee therefore finds that the work on which he has been engaged for many years has not equipped him for such employment. This position apparently never was challenged during the many years in which the provision remained in the law; and in fact the enactment of the Forand Act, which has been revived in the new retirement law, was based on exactly those principles, the only difference being that the Forand Act called for 25 years' Government service. There is no element of cost involved, since the annuity payable at 55 would be reduced sufficiently to make it equivalent in value to a full annuity at 62. The only difference in the wording of the proposed amendment and the provision formerly written into the law is that under the amendment the reduction would be on a percentage basis rather than on the basis of actuarial factors, and this is only to facilitate computation.

The reason for confining the reduced annuity provision to persons involuntarily separated is, of course, that employees who quit the service voluntarily at 55, or any other age under retirement age, do so, as a rule, because they have other jobs to go to. The person who is involuntarily separated is thrown out on his own resources and may not be able to find a job at all. To contend that there is no difference between voluntary and involuntary separation is, in effect, to say that there is no difference between having a job and not having one. It is true that the point was made in discussion of the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act that there have been some instances, possibly, where what was actually a voluntary retirement has been made to appear involuntary, to the advantage of the employee, but such isolated circumstances surely ought not to be utilized to the injury of the great majority of employees who want and need this legislation.

There seems to have been no good reason for taking it out of the bill in any event, since there was no element of cost involved. But the fact is that it was taken out, that a great many employees, particularly those in liquidating agencies, are affected, and that news of its elimination from the law came as a shock and surprise to them. It was also a surprise to many personnel officers, who had no idea that it would be removed.

The injustice to which reference has been made is this: For 2 years prior to enactment of this new retirement law, reduction in force had been in effect in the Government service, and many employees were dismissed. Those dismissals were made on the basis of the relative value of employees to the service; the most valuable were retained longest, and many of these, who will ultimately be dismissed, are still in the service. It is obvious that under the new law the less valuable employees, who were ousted before April 1, 1948, can retire, if they choose, at 55 with a reduced annuity; the more valuable employees, still in the service, cannot do so.

Thus the bill suggested is designed to correct a situation where the most valuable employees are penalized simply because they were valuable enough to keep in service, and the less valuable employees benefit because they were not good enough to keep. So much for the first objective.

The second objective, as has been stated, is to encourage employees to leave their money in the retirement fund, in order to make the fund serve as effectively as possible the purpose for which it was set up; that is, to provide for the old age of Government employees.

There has been a tremendous rush on the part of some employees to get their money out of the retirement fund as soon as they cease working for Uncle Sam. This, of course, in most cases, represents extremely poor judgment on their part; they are giving up the chance of substantial future benefits for nothing more nor less than what they have already earned. It may be the view of some that giving their money back to them relieves the Government of an obligation, but it does not actually do so. Persons who are improvident tend to become public charges, and it is much more in the public interest that they draw an income from a fund to which they have contributed than that they become paupers.

The failure of employees to understand the benefits of the retirement system has been due in part to the fact that until just now no effective effort has been made to enlighten them. Government employees, past and present, are ready buyers of insurance of all kinds, but they do not understand or appreciate the excellent insurance system the retirement fund makes available for them. Within the last few weeks the Civil Service Commission has begun issuing certificates which show what the fund is worth to them; it is the equivalent of an insurance policy.

When these certificates are widely distributed, employees will come to look upon them as they would upon an insurance policy, and will be less eager to get their money out of the fund. Of course, some persons borrow to the limit on their insurance policies, but generally a man who takes out an insurance policy does so because he wants an endowment, or protection for his family.

Prior to 1942 the provision for optional retirement at 55 on a reduced annuity was restricted to employees who had had 15 years in the Government service. In 1942 the privilege was extended to employees who had served no more than 5 years, for the reason that such employees, most of whom presumably had been in private employment and would go back to it, had no social-security protection for their years in Government employment, and would find their social-security annuities reduced accordingly. The 5-year annuities from Government employment would, of course, be small, but they would supplement the social-security annuity to such an extent that the employee would at least experience no loss from having gone into Government employment for a time. It was a practical method of solving a problem that affected many employees, and it was surely to their interest that their contributions should remain in the retirement fund. They cannot withdraw the deductions made from their pay for the social-security system, and there is no reason why they should, barring extreme emergency, from the Civil Service Retirement System. They get as good interest or better on the money they have in the civil-service fund as they could get elsewhere, and they have something available for their own use in their old age, or to include in their estates if they do not live to draw annuities.

As a matter of justice and in the interest of the Government and its employees alike, the 55-year proviso should be restored to the law.

Another very good reason why it should be restored appears in the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act itself. Under that law a widow receives an annuity at the age of 50, or, if she has dependent children, immediately upon her husband's death, whatever her age, and continuing until she dies or remarries. Her circumstances are not taken into account. She may have a job that brings her in a substantial income.

But under this same law a woman who has worked for the Government 15, 20 years or even more, cannot derive any sort of annuity until she has reached the age of 62, which seems a manifest injustice. She may be a widow, and she may have dependent children, when she loses her job. But she is deprived of a right accorded other employees for many years prior to April 1, 1948.

Many Good Small Towns—Hope of Our Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, a couple of months ago, Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, addressed a meeting of the Parent-Teachers Association of Dover, N. H. It was a stormy night and attendance was not over 200. Since then, however, quotations from this talk have appeared in

many publications in scattered parts of the country. It has been quoted from in a recent issue of Pathfinder magazine.

Too many people in this country today confuse bigger with better and biggest with best. Too many people are pushing to get to the big cities thinking that only there can they find real opportunity to make a place for themselves and achieve success.

In this atmosphere General Fleming's talk to the parent-teachers group in the small town of Dover, N. H., comes like a breath of fresh air. He has said many things that need saying at this time on the role of the small town and the tremendous contribution that our smaller cities are making to the Nation. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, insert an abridged copy of the talk in the RECORD, as follows:

There are several reasons why this is a very happy occasion for me. First of all, I like coming back to New Hampshire. For the past 8 or 9 years your State has been both my legal residence and my home. During this period my neighbors at Sandwich have afforded me and my family a welcome opportunity to become part of their community. I feel at home in Sandwich in spite of the fact that my job keeps me in Washington a great deal of the time.

After nearly 40 years of Army life, which gave me little chance to "put down roots" anywhere, I was proud and happy when Sandwich included my name and my son's name on its town Honor Roll listing the men in service from that community. I had a sense of belonging which words cannot describe.

Life in our smaller cities gives one a feeling of continuity that I have never quite found in our great metropolitan centers. It is a very wholesome and gratifying feeling, and it makes for good citizenship. Of necessity people in these smaller communities learn to do a lot for themselves. They are resourceful, and they also have learned how to get along with the people around them. In our small cities and towns our people "sit down close together," as the saying goes. The Nation has always drawn good stock from its small communities and the countryside. Their human inventory is first-rate.

Mr. Lavine asked me here to discuss community planning and the kind of contribution that the Federal Works Agency can make to this vital phase of urban activity.

City planning and urban redevelopment are much in the news these days. True, most of the attention seems to be focused on the problems that our big cities are facing—traffic congestion, overcrowding, and all the complex difficulties that the words "blighted areas" suggest. Actually, however, the problems of the small city and the metropolis differ only in degree.

But before I get into this question, I would like to suggest another phrase for city planning. Why not call it community foresight? The kind of foresight that is not very different from that every good farmer indulges in when he lays out his season's work, plants his fields, or sets out an orchard or vineyard. New England is full of such farmers—a good thing, too.

I could cite many other examples, and one is particularly fresh in my mind: Around Christmas time I managed to get home for a few days. It had been snowing in and around Sandwich and I was particularly interested to notice the way Mr. Mudget, our road agent, went about his task of keeping the roads clear. First, he went over the main highway, then took the secondary roads, and, finally, cleared the driveways and entrances.

Since the snow had quit falling, some people might have been content to call it a day, but not our Mr. Mudget. After he had made his rounds, he used the kind of foresight we all admire. He set his snow plow about 6 or 8 inches above the road and went back over the same route, pushing the piled-up snow further out of the way, to be ready for the next snowfall. That was not only planning—it was advance planning, with a vengeance—and I am sure that the good citizens of Sandwich found nothing to criticize in Mr. Mudget's example of community foresight.

As a matter of fact, many of New Hampshire's citizens and communities have been quite receptive to the idea of community planning, and, unless all signs fail, this civic awareness is very much on the increase today.

Right here in Dover you have under way an advance-planning program of public works with an estimated total cost of more than $1,334,000. The projects include school buildings on Locust Street and on Fifth Street, as well as a courthouse and a public hospital.

I know a good deal about this planning program because the Federal Works Agency has had a hand in it—just as we have made similar advances to other communities in New Hampshire and throughout the Nation. This advance-planning program, which Congress authorized under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, stimulated the design of much-needed public works in every State in the Union. All told, advances were made totaling about $61,000,000. As a result, plans for over 7,300 useful public projects are emerging. When completed, they will represent a total cost of some two and one-third billion dollars of non-Federal funds.

For the entire State of New Hampshire, approved planning advances amount to nearly $312,000. This will provide funds to plan 47 projects with an estimated total cost of $9,316,000. Plans for 17 of these projects are now completed.

Unfortunately, the authority to make these loans lapsed with title V on June 30, 1947. Bills now are pending in Congress which would restore this opportunity.

The Federal Works Agency's actual operations are in the localities, very little in Washington. As the civilian construction arm of the Federal Government, we are concerned with highways, public buildings, and community facilities of every sort. We feel a responsibility, too, to help in assuring the integrated growth of local communities—for sound growth that will make them better places for people to live and work in.

That, of course, should be the fundamental purpose of all city planning. We are learning, sometimes at a very high cost, that human welfare has a direct connection with economic and industrial progress and stability—they tie in very closely with one another. That has not been an easy lesson and we have not yet learned it fully.

We are just beginning to realize the fearful human erosion that is taking place in our big cities. Census figures tell us among many things that the metropolitan centers are not reproducing themselves, by any means. All the big cities, authorities claim, fail to produce enough children "on the site" to maintain themselves. Their increased population comes from outside. This steady movement from the smaller communities and rural areas drains away to our big cities much of the Nation's human resources. The Dovers of the country help to sustain our metropolitan centers and contribute to their expansion. Some say their overexpansion.

What other comment or data could better express the urgent need for city planning—the need for viewing the city as a whole, for trying to recreate neighborliness and livability often left behind in some smaller community—than big-city dependence upon small-city human stock.

Earlier I said that the essential difference between planning for a huge city and a smaller place was a matter of degree. This fact finds interesting confirmation in the current thinking of big-city planners. More and more they are thinking in terms of bringing back small, human-size communities which they are calling neighborhood units, as older, worn-out parts of metropolitan centers are rebuilt. There are many reasons for this approach, but the really important thing to me is that big-city people are apparently tired of the uniform endless mass of the metropolitan city and are trying to break it up into a number of what are essentially small towns linked together in a big-town setting or framework.

One of the newest proposals, for instance, concerns a great midwestern city proposed to be redeveloped through the years on the basis of 514 neighborhoods of 4,000 to 12,000 people. Each of these would be served by appropriate community facilities—schools, hospitals, shopping centers, places of worship, and so on. Individual character and local ways—neighborhood personality—would be preserved and developed where possible and where desirable. Citizen groups are working on the plans with officials.

In such an approach to city planning there is a clear recognition of community values and human factors which I find very wholesome and practical. We cannot tear down in wholesale fashion and immediately rebuild our population centers—it will take time and patient thought to do these things. Even in the smaller cities we must prepare to carry out a continuing process of building and rebuilding.

Now, to me, there is an obvious moral in all this. Our smaller cities should take the lead in supplying community foresight. Your problems can be seen more clearly and are more manageable. They require less complicated and expensive planning techniques than large cities must use. Let our smaller communities, like Dover, move into the forefront and set an example for all to see.

You have a great deal to build upon here, including a very fortunate diversification of industry. You can call upon the technical resources of an established local service agency—New Hampshire's very able State Planning and Development Commission.

Among many accomplishments of this planning body I would like to pick out the rather unique job—relocation and reconstruction of the little town of Hill. The State Planning and Development Commission did not do this job alone, of course. Rather, they acted in close cooperation with the village officials and citizens of Hill. The Federal Government helped, too.

From 1768 until a decade ago the village had stood in the valley of the Pemigewasset River. As you will remember, floods on the Merrimac River in 1936 led to a Federal flood-control program and in 1938 a dam was authorized at Franklin Falls, 6 miles south of Hill. This meant that the impounded waters would engulf the little town.

Faced with that prospect, Hill's town officials and citizens made a historic choice. Acting on advice from the State Planning and Development Commission, they determined to build a new village around an over-all plan drawn up by the commission. That plan provided for a children's playground, a grade school, and a shopping center. It eliminated dangerous highway crossings and separated local traffic from through traffic. With an eye to the longer future, the plan called for a proper segregation of public and private land use, and provided a publicly owned green belt of permanent attractive open space and green space along both sides of the highway.

Today this beautiful little village, safely located at one side of a main highway, is truly a monument to the determination and foresight of its citizens. Civic pride and community spirit, I have been told, have never been higher in Hill.

Such undertakings are not so rare today, and many of them are on a considerable

scale. I might mention, for example, Chatham Village, Pittsburgh; Sunnyside, New York; and Baldwin Hills Village, in Los Angeles, all within the limits of big cities. Private enterprise provides these illustrations of well-planned neighborhoods. Of course, the famous English towns of Letchworth and Welwyn have given us much to admire and have helped us work out our own American uses of the principles they followed.

Sound community planning does not have to start from scratch. Our cities and towns have pioneered in many directions and today offer splendid opportunities for planned rebuilding, for modern versions of pioneering effort.

One notable demonstration of what small towns can do for themselves is found in the Tennessee cities of Bristol, Johnson City, and Kingsport—plus Bristol, Va., on the Tennessee State line adjoining its namesake. Set up under the initiative of the Federal Housing Administration just before World War II an experimental project situated there had these main objectives:

1. To develop a workable and practical method of cooperative city planning, especially applicable in small cities were local, State, regional, and Federal agencies would provide a pool of various types of cooperative effort to assist municipalities in their planning.

2. To select, test, and report on technical, procedural, and public relations methods appropriate in such community-planning programs.

The three cities are located about 25 miles apart on the points of an equilateral triangle. Including the population in the immediate environs and within the corporation boundaries, in 1940 each local unit represented between 25,000 and 30,000 urban inhabitants. Taking the area as a whole, it had about the same amount of rural population closely adjacent. The area has grown considerably since.

Rather than describe each step in the program and the close cooperation which developed, let me list the major avenues of approach.

Maps were prepared which gave an adequate picture of community conditions in each city. These included maps of land-use, population, vacant land awaiting use, and of the city-wide patterns of areas where utility services were already supplied or would be needed to serve expansion in the future.

The economy—the business, industrial, and agricultural activity—of the tri-cities area was surveyed. Governments of each of the cities were reviewed and summarized, especially as to finances.

A survey was made of welfare and health services, covering all local, State, and Federal participation, contributions, and in addition, to provide a complete picture, private services provided locally or from outside resources.

Depending somewhat on the individual community and its problems, that is the kind of factual basis a well-conceived practical city-planning program requires.

Here is one direct application of the material developed that was made in Bristol, Va. The city fathers asked the city-planning commission to study a bad traffic problem it had on its hands. The planning group studied the problem of a congested thoroughfare adjacent to the town's railroad station and principal hotel.

The upshot was that the plans prepared for the proposed solution met with immediate approval of municipal business and civic leaders. The railroad consented to the changes proposed, technical and financial assistance has been given to the community in carrying out the project.

This venture in community foresight was launched in 1941. It is going strong and the local people have taken over. Interestingly enough, the initiative which happened in this case to come from the Federal Government, has been just about forgotten and properly so. That phase ended several years ago when the project was put under the joint sponsorship of the Tennesssee State Planning Commission and the TVA. Today these outside agencies play a minor role, the cities themselves have taken over the major share of financing and planning their community futures.

Needless to say, I did not come here with a master plan for Dover, in my pocket, or in my head. But I did bring with me some very strong convictions about the role that our smaller communities can and should play in building the city of tomorrow.

People who know little or nothing about city planning are beginning to appreciate that today's benefits, the way of life modern conditions make possible, are best if they remember to build upon what our small cities offer in good living. We all like the old neighborhood idea, with its friendly, easy contacts. There is not too great a disparity of interests and income among the residents People realize that in a small city you can have single homes for those who can afford and want them. You can have row houses which still give room for a garden, and you can also have apartments for those people who do not want the care of keeping up a larger place. And it is possible to work out balanced and harmonious relations of these in our cities and towns if we plan properly.

Community foresight can also provide the background of facilities and services that people in the professions seek. Too often in the past our smaller cities have watched young doctors, lawyers, teachers, and others--some of our brightest and best people—leave for wider fields of opportunity. In many, many cases this undesirable trend can be checked or stopped by providing in these selfsame small communities the very facilities and the fine skills that all communities need. Life is good in the towns and it can be better.

These young migrants often carry with them to big places a nostalgic yearning to be back in the old town, to feel again that sense of belonging. Yet often, when they do return, they are let down and disappointed to find that their home town has not kept fully abreast of the changes elsewhere that attract and hold people. If the big cities are copying the small ones today, likewise the small ones, in this day, can and often do take over big city sights and sounds, conveniences, and comforts. Industry is seeking small-town locations in many cases. Industry means jobs and income for those employed by it. This trend should help—if the industry is the right kind and the community does its part.

Not long ago I had occasion to address the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. Among other things, I discussed city planning. I recalled to that audience the famous and oft-repeated injunction of Daniel H. Burnham. His words were spoken 50 years ago, but they are profoundly true today:

"Make no little plans," Burnham said to all who help to build a city's future, "little plans have no magic to stir men's blood and probably will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work. * * * Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. * * *"

Burnham's plans and Burnham's vision had a very human goal—to make his big city a fine city in which to work and live.

What better goal could the civic pride or civic wisdom of any city—large or small—put before us?

In this spirit and for this goal, I offer citizens of Dover the hearty cooperation of the Federal Works Agency.

Opinionaire for Graduate Seminar in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[The American University, Washington, D. C.]

OPINIONAIRE FOR GRADUATE SEMINAR IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—METHODIST MINISTERS FROM 44 STATES OF THE UNION

1. Who, in your opinion, is the most reliable of the radio news commentators?

	Percent
Lowell Thomas	27
Kaltenborn	20
Baukhage	5.9
Agronski	4.8
Pearson	4.8
Beatty	3.6
Shirer	2.4
Davis	2.4
Harkness	2.4
Dryer	2.4
Heater	1.2
Collingwood	1.2
Brown	1.2
Smith	1.2
Foster	1.2
Omit	17.7

2. Whom do you regard as the most reliable newspaper columnist on world affairs?

	Percent
Pearson	28.2
Lippmann	27.0
Lawrence	2.4
Winchell	2.4
Drummond	1.2
McCormack	1.2
Bromfield	1.2
McKenzie	1.2
Alsops	1.2
Omit	32.9

3. Which news magazine do you read most regularly?

	Percent
Time	60.0
Newsweek	12.9
World Report	2.4
Kiplinger News Report	1.2
Life and Pathfinder	2.4
Christian Century	6.4
United States News	3.6
New York Times	2.4
Digest	1.2
Nation	1.2
Between the Lines	1.2
Omit	3.6

4. Do you believe church periodicals provide more dependable news coverage than the lay journals? Yes, 53 percent; no, 47 percent.

5. Do you think that universal military training is necessary in the light of the present international situation? Yes, 9.4 percent; no, 90.6 percent.

6. Do you feel that the United States Government is now dealing with Russia in an intelligent manner? Yes, 17.6 percent; no, 80 percent; omit, 2.4 percent.

7. Do you consider Russia to be a peace-loving nation, willing to fight only if she has to defend herself, or an aggressive nation that would start a war just to get territory she wants? Peace-loving, 30.6 percent; aggressive, 58.7 percent; omit, 10.7 percent.

8. Do you feel that people of military background have too much control of govern-

mental policy at the present time? Yes, 91.7 percent; no, 8.3 percent.

9. Do you think that too many of our foreign representatives are military trained? Yes, 77.6 percent; no, 16 percent; omit 6.4 percent.

10. What do you think of President Truman's handling of world affairs? The best possible, none; average, 29.4 percent; inferior, 62.3 percent; worst possible, 8.3 percent.

11. Do you think the United States lost prestige by reversing her policy with respect to the partitioning of Palestine? Yes, 82.3 percent; no, 17.7 percent.

12. Do you think we should direct all our efforts for peace through the United Nations Organization? Yes, 67 percent; no, 33 percent.

13. Do you think that our weak policy in China is the cause of the Communist Army's success? Yes, 50.6 percent; no, 45.8 percent; omit, 3.6 percent.

14. Do you think that American policy in Korea is strong enough to insure a "fair" election in the forthcoming elections? Yes, 9.4 percent; no, 76.4 percent; omit, 14.2 percent.

15. Do you think the Marshall plan is a strong enough weapon to combat the spread of communism in Europe? Yes, 15.3 percent; no, 83.5 percent; omit, 1.2 percent.

16. Do you think that the United States should promise military aid to back the Marshall plan? Yes, 30.5 percent; no, 68.3 percent; omit, 1.2 percent.

17. Do you think that American military aid to Greece is successfully combating the spread of communism in that country? Yes, 10.7 percent; no, 82.9 percent; omit, 6.4 percent.

18. Do you think that Russia understands only the language of force? Yes, 32.9 percent; no, 61.2 percent; omit, 5.9 percent.

19. Do you think that our aid to Turkey is adequate enough for her to resist Russia's demands on the Dardanelles? Yes, 11.7 percent; no, 69.4 percent; omit, 18.9 percent.

20. Do you think Spain should be included as a participant in the Marshall plan? Yes, 21.2 percent; no, 76.4 percent; omit, 2.4 percent.

21. Do you feel the present administration is playing politics by emphasizing the tenseness of the international situation? Yes, 91.2 percent; no, 6.4 percent; omit, 2.4 percent.

22. Do you think that we get enough facts through the regular news channels to know what is going on internationally? Yes, 1.2 percent; no, 97.6 percent; omit, 1.2 percent.

23. Do you think the atom bomb and bacteriological warfare should be outlawed? Yes, 89.4 percent; no, 9.4 percent; omit, 1.2 percent.

24. Do you feel that the missionary experience of the Methodist Church can provide useful information for disseminating the basic ideas of democracy to other peoples? Yes, 95.2 percent; no, 3.6 percent; omit, 1.2 percent.

25. Should the ministry use its influence to help mold foreign policy? Yes, 96.4 percent; no, 2.4 percent; omit, 1.2 percent.

26. Do you think a third world war is inevitable? Yes, 4.8 percent; no, 94 percent; omit, 1.2 percent.

27. Do you think the United States has weakened the United Nations Orgaization by its policies? Yes, 78.7 percent; no, 18.9 percent; omit, 2.4 percent.

28. Do you feel that western civilization can be saved only by a great new spiritual movement? Yes, 89.4 percent; no, 8.2 percent; omit, 2.4 percent.

29. Do you feel that the present world crisis has arisen from the behavior of the ordinary people of the world, or from the type of leadership they have had? Behavior of ordinary people, 6.4 percent; type of leadership, 91.2 percent; omit, 2.4 percent.

30. If the 1948 Presidential candidates were the following, which would be your choice? Truman, 5.9 percent; Dewey, 8.2 percent; Eisenhower, 1.2 percent; Stassen, 50 percent; Taft, 6.4 percent; MacArthur, 5.9 percent; Wallace, 20 percent; Vandenberg, 2.4 percent.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GREGORY McMAHON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the housing problem, particularly as it affects the veterans of the United States of America, has now become the most pressing problem of the times, in our national affairs; surpassing in immensity the international relief program as being advocated by our present national administration; and

Whereas the efforts, to date, of our National Government have been scandalously and disgracefully amiss and delinquent in coping with this grave problem; and

Whereas there has been brought to the attention of this body as there has been brought to the attention of the Nation as a people, countless instances of inadequate temporary housing for our veterans, disease, social degradation, and familial discontent, resulting from the squalor and discomfort which have been hopelessly foisted upon them; all of which have been particularly emphasized during our present seasonal cold and storm; and

Whereas at present time our National Government sees fit to establish spacious, healthy homes for the foreign personnel of the United Nations, for individuals who never in their lives experienced such comparative luxury; and never earned the undying gratitude of a humble Nation in the manner in which our veterans are entitled to receive it from our grateful citizenry; and

Whereas there seems to be no foreseeable relief by the way of reduction of housing costs; and

Whereas it moreover appears that the inflationary trend we find ourselves embroiled in finds support, to some degree, from those in Federal authority, thus lessening almost to the point of desperation, the hope of downward prices, in all commodities, and particularly homes; and

Whereas, many veterans who have purchased homes out of sheer necessity now find themselves financially shackled and in constant fear of losing their dearest possession, their home; and

Whereas, this body feels constrained, by all that is fair and just, to bring this heinous condition to the attention of those in a position to rectify same; in full knowledge that this year will above all other years be long remembered at the polls: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Queens County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States go on record favoring a broad plan of national relief from our housing problem, involving in its purpose some reasonable form of outright governmental financial subsidy to the veterans in his quest for adequate housing; the working details of said plan being left entirely to the more astute minds in our Congress; but in no event shall said plan obligate the veteran, even in the ultimate, with the burden of bearing complete cost of a home, by reason of long term repayments, or otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the following persons and bodies for their special attention and action: (a) Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; (b) Veterans Affairs Committee (chairman) of the House of Representatives, United States Congress; (c) Veterans Affairs Committee (chairman) of the United States Senate; (d) National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; (e) New York State Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars; (f) Senator IVES; (g) Senator WAGNER; (h) each Queens County representative in the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States; (i) each Veterans of Foreign Wars Post Commander in Queens County, New York.

QUEENS COUNTY COUNCIL,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK.

Endorsed and approved under seal:
A. W. TEEPLE, *County Commander*.
Official:
JOSEPH D. MORELLO, *County Adjutant*.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the fourth and final of a series of broadcasts made over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., by Ann Su Cardwell.

Texts of the previous three broadcasts are to be found in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages A1896, A2149, and A2187.

Of the eight arguments on which we base the justification to Poland's claims to independence, the two remaining today are the functional and moral. Poland must be considered as a part of the world with reference to the other parts. What is the function of Poland with respect to the world? Will it be an advantage or a disadvantage to other nations if Poland is united, autonomous, and independent? What is the record of the past?

In the first place, Poles unified, westernized, and Christianized the Slavic tribes in the valleys of the Oder, Warta, Vistula, Bug, and San Rivers, making of them a single strong, progressive nation. This unification was the first great Polish service. The second notable service was the defeat of the Teutonic Knights by Poles and Lithuanians at Grunwald in 1416, thus keeping the Germans of the fifteenth century within bounds and preventing the Teutonic Knights from carrying out their plans for a great German empire. In 1939, a diminished Poland could not check the modern imitator of the Knights, Adolph Hitler, when he led a Germany that an intimidated, fearful, and apathetic West had already allowed to overflow far beyond German borders.

A third function that Poland performed was the holding back of innumerable inva-

sions out of the East that threatened to inundate all Europe. The Continent was time and again saved by the Poles from these repeated menaces, but little did the Europeans of that day, among whom were the ancestors of most present-day Americans, realize the enormous cost in blood and sweat and tears and property to Poland.

The missions enumerated above were military in nature. But Poland had another function to perform in its frontier regions—the civilizing, cultural, and Christianizing function. It not only checked destructive elements; it spread the constructive. What the Pole received from the West he shared with his new communities.

In 1920 Poland had again to accept the role of bulwark in the East, when the Bolsheviks began what they proclaimed a general European revolution by invading Poland. The appeal of the Poles to their Allies in the World War then just ended went unheeded except for insignificant aid from the French. Poland was left to face this enemy of all Europe alone. And alone the Poles drove back the Red Armies and won a signal victory.

As soon as the world had settled down to what it hoped was peace, Germany began wriggling out of its obligations and, indulged by American and British capital, began preparing for another war. Moscow, convinced that conflict between the U. S. S. R. and capitalist states was inevitable, was similarly preparing. Poles, as familiar with their neighbors' history as with their own, read the writing on the wall and warned the west. But that west could only talk of "Poland rattling the sword" and went on with its plans for more luxurious living. Too late the west must now see that the Poles knew what they were talking about—now that Poland is under the heel of the Bolsheviks, and the road to all Europe has thus been opened for the Bolsheviks to enter. The west should see now that when the Polish barrier is broken down, either Germany or Russia will be fighting, directly or indirectly, for domination first of Europe and then of the world. Just that is the world function of Poland.

The last point in the discussion of this series deals with the moral right of Poland to independence. But after consideration of the seven preceding rights it should be clear that Poland's moral right to restoration as a free and independent state needs little elaboration. Each of the seven arguments cries that it is only just that the treasure of which the Poles have been robbed—a free native land—be restored to them. Our condemnation of immorality of the predatory powers—and if that condemnation is forgotten, go back to September and October 1939 American and British papers—that condemnation implies the moral obligation to rectify the wrong.

And that brings the third group participating in this judgment upon the stage. Poland is the victim, Germany and the Soviet Union the murderers and robbers, the western nations judge and jury, although the morality of the west since the days of Tehran and Yalta has been something less than praiseworthy. For along with that west the Soviet Union has served as judge instead of sitting on the bench with the accused. For six long years the Poles fought and endured martyrdom—and as their reward had almost half their country given to Moscow and the rest made Moscow's satellite.

"For what have we suffered and sacrificed so much," echoes and reechoes the cry of the Poles. They await the answer of the west. The Poles have met and passed their test with flying colors. The west is now itself on trial, and a higher tribunal than that at Nuremberg will render the verdict. That tribunal will be history. Will the responsible leaders of the west be able to say, as Rostand made his hero, Cyrano de Bergerac, say at his death:

"There is one crown I bear away with me. And tonight, when I enter before God, my salute shall sweep the stars away from the blue threshold. One thing without stain, unspotted from the world, * * * mine own; and that is my white plume."

There is yet another angle to the moral issue involved in the restoration of a free and independent Poland. The millions of people in that area are by the nature of things an important factor in the life of Europe. Under Soviet domination, with an atheistic way of life and culture and an utterly alien system of government forced upon them, the people of Poland are bound to become demoralized. Poles, heretofore, a deeply religious people, could become a menace to the Continent of Europe. If the West abandons them, pushes them out of the civilization to which they belong, and in which they have struggled with all their energies to remain, what Polish reaction is to be expected? But if we regain our morality and support them in their efforts to regain their independence, they can and should become a definite constructive moral force, as they have been in the past.

Surely the moral right of the Poles to live as free people and themselves direct their country's course is unassailable. Whether that right is translated into actuality depends upon recognition by the West of the moral obligation resting on the people of Britain and America, who, unlike the peoples under Soviet control are still able to make their voices heard in their government.

In conclusion let me recapitulate. Polish territorial rights are supported by historical record and archeology. The Poles are a numerous and highly civilized people, whose history is astonishingly full of praiseworthy events, of meritorious services to Christianity and western civilization, and of noble personalities. Polish cultural contributions to the world are of the highest order. Poles made good use of their freedom and independence between the years 1919-39 in winning of which they themselves had the leading part. In World War II Poles fought with the utmost bravery, first alone and then beside the Allies, strong in the faith that all roads to justice were roads to a free Poland.

The future of Poland has not been settled, all the assertions of the Kremlin and the Warsaw puppets to the contrary. Immoral and illegal agreements will not stand the test of time when a nation with an age-long tradition of freedom is the stake. Furthermore, for the sake of their own security, quite apart from the question of moral regeneration, Britain and America cannot leave Poland in Soviet possession for plainly speaking that is the present situation. In relation to the western world, Poland's destiny will continue to be that of the guardian of the gate of the East and West, that the East may not pass and devour the West. That is Poland's function in the family of nations.

To fulfill that function Poland must be strong, not weak; independent, not slave; Christian, and not Bolshevik.

Communists Dominate CIO Packinghouse Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American of Thursday, April 8, 1948, which is the third of a series of four:

UNIONS RULED BY REDS PERIL NATION: BUSBEY

(By Charles Finston)

Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois, today said files of the House Committee on Un-American Activites reveal avowed Communists still are entrenched as leaders in a number of CIO-affiliated unions, although most of them have thrown out the Communists.

The Red-controlled unions, BUSBEY said, cover fields in which the Nation's most vital interests are involved, such as shipping, communications, and food.

In the event of war with Communist Russia, BUSBEY warned, these unions alone—through the power wielded by subversive leaders—could paralyze the Nation.

CITES MEAT UNION

One of the key unions cited by BUSBEY is the Communist-dominated United Packinghouse Workers of America, which has forced 100,000 meat plant workers on strike for the fourth week without even providing strike benefits for them.

BUSBEY recalled congressional warnings thus:

"Communists view strikes of trade-unions as dress rehearsals for violent revolution. They have no real interest in the welfare of their members."

He emphasized that the overwhelming majority of the key unions' members are loyal Americans and have no sympathy for communism.

LAUDS PURGES

BUSBEY lauded unions who have thrown out Communist officers, declaring:

"I am confident that it is only a matter of a short time before unions will be directed by men whose patriotism will be unchallenged. I am certain that rank-and-file members are opposed to Communist Russian aggression."

The lawmaker charged Communist union leaders are helping to block national preparedness. He cited congressional reports which said:

"Large numbers of the rank-and-file members of organized labor have been sold on the idea that a Communist can be a good labor leader regardless of his communism."

"SINISTER" ERROR

"This is a fallacy of the most sinister import.

"It is a fallacy invented by Communists for the sole purpose of worming their way into positions of leadership where they may be able to do the maximum harm to American institutions."

How do these subversive leaders infiltrate and rule a labor organization as powerful as the meat plant workers?

BUSBEY cited the story of Patrick Ratigan, former Chicago representative of the packinghouse union and ex-head of the Omaha local, who disclosed how Communists grabbed power in the Nebraska union.

QUIT CIO UNION

Ratigan, who quit the CIO last fall when officers refused to sign non-Communist affidavits under the Taft-Hartley labor law, related:

"A few schooled Communists are sent in from outside to join forces with local converts.

"Their first step is to make union meetings last as long as possible, thus making attendance very unpopular.

"They drag out meetings with long speeches against capitalism, inject parliamentary tricks for diversion, and stall getting down to real business.

"A well organized and vocal minority are then in a position to dominate union affairs.

They see to it that bylaws and rules permit this."

PLAN OF ACTION

Ratigan said Communist factions always come to meetings with a plan of action. He continued:

"The Communists deploy themselves among the members. One kicks things off with an oration to push the party line. When he finishes, another is ready to take over.

"Communist speeches are well applauded by the claque. With their carefully timed attack, they are able to push their programs through against unorganized opposition."

Twenty-five Years Without Missing a Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, it was called to the attention of the House, yesterday, by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], that this is National Sunday School Week. As soon as he brought this to our attention, I thought of friends of ours, who recently visited with us, here in Washington, D. C., Mr. and Mrs. Edmund D. Clark, of Munnsville, N. Y.

Mrs. Clark has a record of Sunday school attendance that I doubt has been surpassed, or even equaled, but, in any event, it is so outstanding that in my judgment, it certainly deserves a place of honor in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and especially during this week.

Mrs. Clark's original home was in Elk City, Okla., but my wife and I became acquainted with her and her wonderful record when she lived in our home town, Lawton, Okla., and we all attended the same church and Sunday school. Her record has attracted wide attention and was published March 14, 1948, in the Daily Oklahoman, one of the state-wide publications in my home State. The article follows:

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS WITHOUT MISSING A SUNDAY

(By Beth Primm)

Elk City saw a 2-year-old girl start a habit 25 years ago which led her to attend Sunday school in 37 towns, a dozen States and in Canada—without missing a Sunday in all this quarter century.

Next Sunday will be Mrs. Edmund D. Clark's anniversary. And she will begin her twenty-sixth year without missing Sunday school this Sunday by going to Sunday school in Munnsville, N. Y., where she lives with her husband.

Mrs. Clark, the former Lois Lee McClain, Elk City, says she attended Sunday school wherever she was during those 25 years, just because she wanted to.

Not even did she miss on the occasion an auto mishap left the family car buried in a deep ditch. Nor did she miss the time she was en route to Houston, and the train, behind schedule, barely made it in time for her to make it to a Sunday school of a Christian church.

So small is the town and the church where she lives that it did not include a Sunday school for adults. So Mrs. Clark organized one and has been the teacher ever since.

She went through 12 years in school without an absence or tardy mark and was graduated from Oklahoma A. & M. college with those honors.

Parental persuasion had nothing to do with the records, either. "As a matter of fact," her mother says, "there were times when it would have been a lot more convenient if they had missed."

Britain's Collectivism Versus ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a timely and pertinent article, Britain's Collectivism Versus ERP, by the eminent author and economist, Henry Hazlitt, which appeared in this week's issue of Newsweek:

BRITAIN'S COLLECTIVISM VERSUS ERP

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Two days after the Marshall plan was safely enacted the Economic Commission for Europe released "the most complete and thorough study" on European recovery. This report, according to a Geneva dispatch to the New York Times, "contains the facts and analyses that Congress wanted before acting on ERP but could not get because they did not exist. It contains powerful ammunition for those who believe that many of the troubles of western Europe are due to the pursuit by governments of domestic policies encouraging a continuation of the dollar shortage * * * rather than industrial weakness or even losses and changes due to war."

The report shows that total commodities available for home use in Europe as a whole, excluding Germany, had reached 96 percent of the prewar level on a per capita basis by 1947. Six European countries had more goods per capita than in 1938. All this did not prevent the cartoonists who were supporting the Marshall plan here from invariably picturing present-day Europe as a starving old woman in rags, waiting to be rescued from death while pompous Congressmen had the callousness to debate the problem.

"With the exception of Britain every (European) country's foreign balance of payments has been moving steadily away from equilibrium largely as a result, the survey finds, of continuous inflationary pressure combined with artificially overvalued exchange rates." Even the exception of Great Britain here hardly seems to harmonize with the recent statement of the London Economist that the British economy "is now using up its last reserves."

Yet what are the British doing—or being allowed to do—to help themselves? In Sir Stafford Cripps' budget message we have part of the answer. It is a new graduated tax upon the portion of a man's income derived from investments. For example, a man with an income of £50,000, all derived from investments (whether in real estate, stocks, or even Government securities), would pay a special tax of £24,000 in addition to his ordinary income tax of £45,000—making a total tax of £69,000 or £19,000 more than his total income.

Such a tax will destroy capital values and further disorganize British production. It will not only prevent saving and investment but force dissaving and disinvestment. In the long run this must reduce productivity and real wages. It seems highly unlikely that the amount of American capital which we can contribute under the Marshall plan will be enough to offset the amount of home private capital that the British Government is destroying.

Meanwhile, even if Britain's production should recover in spite of everything its government is doing to prevent it, this would not necessarily solve the immediate crisis, which consists in the gap in its international balance of payments. The British bureaucracy can see this problem, as it can see every other economic problem, only in collectivist terms. It has completely forgotten that individual consumers and producers, acting in accordance with free market forces, automatically solved in the past the kind of problems its own policies are now creating. It thinks bureaucrats must set "targets" for the output, import, and export of everything.

The British trade deficit is certain to be chronic as long as the government maintains exchange control with an overvalued pound. The mere attempt to offset the distortions which such exchange control brings about must lead to increasing regimentation of the rest of British economic life. Under exchange control a free economy is impossible. The only solution is to let the pound be freely bought and sold at the prices established in a free market. But this is the one solution which the Socialist doctrinaires now in control of the British economy are determined never to permit. Meanwhile our Government has virtually committed itself to support this Schachtian device for 4 years, and to drain American capitalism for funds for British zealots to use in destroying capitalism and production in Britain.

Westinghouse Science Talent Search an Extremely Constructive Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been the privilege of Mrs. Johnson and myself to attend several of the banquets at which the scholarships of the science talent search, provided by the Westinghouse Corp. have been awarded to the winners thereof. The concluding ceremony is the awarding of these scholarships to the 40 most worthy contestants.

I can say without reservation that we have gotten more inspiration from the attendance at these annual banquets than from any other event which we have been privileged to attend in Washington. This project under the able leadership of Watson Davis, the director of science service, conducts a Nationwide contest for the purpose of discovering promising boys and girls in the field of science. It is a talent hunt that goes into almost every secondary school in the United States . Although the project has been going on for less than a decade it is already obvious from the record of those who have been awarded these scholarships that it is producing marvelous results.

In this transitory and explosive world in which we live it is an inspiration to

see and talk to these young people whose only aim in life is to discover the truth in science and to learn to understand the laws of nature so that this truth and this understanding may be passed on to the people of our country. Those of us in responsible positions in the Government where policy is made have an obsession that we must find some way to bring lasting peace. The approach of the scientists to problems should be the approach of the statesmen of the world to peace, namely, to discover what the truth is, to understand the forces at play, and to utilize them for the welfare and benefit of mankind. Young people, like these winners, who typify many others, give us renewed hope that the world of the future will be a world of truth, of understanding, of tolerance, and of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege and also a distinct compliment to have Mr. Davis permit me to place the speech of Mr. W. W. Waymack, who addressed these young scientists, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

I hope that every person to whom a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing this speech may come will read this speech, and get renewed inspiration from it, as I did. The people of the Westinghouse Corp. are to be complimented in the highest terms for carrying on this very constructive work. Untold people, some not yet born, will profit by the efforts of the talent-search project.

The interesting and constructive address of Mr. Waymack follows:

MUCH SHALL BE REQUIRED

What I have to say this evening is intended primarily for just 40 persons in this large room. The rest of you are welcome to listen if you choose. But for good and obvious reasons I am addressing directly the 40 youngest members of my audience.

To you of the fortunate 40, however, I am speaking only because you are representative of all young people of your age and interests in the country. You are here only as the lucky survivors of a particular screening process. But because you are here, and because you are for the moment in the rather uncomfortable position of exemplars of the parable of the talents, I can thrust upon you also the added job of letting your 80 ears be the targets of my homily.

My particular personal qualifications for addressing an audience of more than usually qualified young scientists may of course be questioned—by me, among others. Certainly I am not qualified on strictly technical grounds. In my high school and college days I took few science courses, and even those didn't take very well on me. Such talents as I had did not appear to be science talents.

Observe that I said, "Did not appear to be." For I have been fondly telling myself for some years that a great weakness in high school education in my period was that no effort was made to make youngsters like me understand why certain courses, such as elementary science and particularly mathematics were other than irrationally imposed and bothersome drudgery. The importance of compulsory courses that did not happen to look easy and therefore to be tempting was never made apparent to me—their importance as tools for understanding, as keys to open doors. While it did not matter, in an individual case, I think it did matter in the sense that millions of boys and girls must have gone through high school without recognizing opportunities, mostly drifting into careers; and that the Nation suffered from the loss of fully developed capacities.

I know it is much better now. It is well that it is. This I shall touch upon shortly.

Meantime, I, a potential genius in science, am very much the layman. And here I am addressing you.

Perhaps there is a law of direct relations at work in the assignment of speaking engagements to members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Selection of a speaker to appear before such an audience as this is apparently directly in proportion to the density of his ignorance of formal science.

However, the very fact that my job as a commissioner is primarily administrative (a term which seems to mean that we are charged with discovering what the main problems are, in the broad, and coming up with workable answers as policies and programs) may give some force to my principal message to you. For we "Old Crocks" of the Commission must look to you—you of the forty, as well as the thousands of your own age and interests whose unwritten proxies you hold tonight—to take over the task of running this atomic age just as soon as you are decently qualified to do so. We who have charge of what has been well termed "operation migraine" have no ambition for perpetuity in office; our stewardship will be gladly relinquished when the time and conditions dictate. The permanent task of running the atomic age is appropriately one for youth. We present members of the Commission must acknowledge ourselves to be venerable—we average 51 years. But we are deliberately building an organization of young men to enable us to deal with new problems of great complexity and of immeasurable importance to all our people. The average of our dozen most responsible staff chiefs, including the general manager of America's whole vast atomic energy enterprise, is 39. The director of our newest research laboratory is less than 50—and not one of the dozen department heads serving under him has yet, to the best of my knowledge, developed a bald spot.

In this procession of essential youth, places are reserved for you and for other science-minded young men and women like you. As we older men drop out, you must furnish recruits from your ranks to fill the gaps that are left somewhere.

The war-hastened birth of usable atomic energy is generally recognized as a revolution; and young people are traditionally the riders of revolution's wild horses, whether it be Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry in the winning of our political independence, or Schubert and Mozart finding new voices in music, or Keats and Shelley breaking frozen literary fetters. Youth is the season for scientific adventure also; Newton was barely old enough to vote when he invented the calculus and worked out his theory of gravitation; Marie Sklodowska captured the heart of Pierre Curie even while the two young people worked together on what proved to be a first step in the scientific revolution that is reshaping the world today.

There is not, I think, anything magical or mystical about this capacity of youth for experimenting with and mastering new ideas and new forms of expression. It is simply that young minds are still flexible and adaptable. It is not, as is sometimes flatteringly claimed, that young people have fewer preoccupations and prejudices. Young people have plenty of both, sometimes quite dogmatically asserted. But, fortunately, this mental junk has not had time to become hardened into the cerebral furrows and crusted over with protective shells of vested interest. Young minds, the more active and alert ones at any rate, can clear themselves of initial motions if these fail to stand the test; youth is still able to reject that which is evil and cleave to that which is good.

I do not need to stress to you, for example, that our primary need, for the long pull, is not the guarding of the secret, as I sometimes find necessary in addressing audiences of your elders. You know without needing to be told now that while much information about our atomic energy development must necessarily be kept restricted (official gobbledegook for various grades of secrecy), the basic facts of atomic physics have all been in the books, foreign as well as American, for some years. Anybody who can read a page of modern physics or mathematics can learn of the fundamental contributions of Niels Bohr, and Fermi, and Szilard, and Meitner, and Einstein, and all the rest. (It has inevitably been remarked that the roster of the scientists who made atomic energy available looks like the line-up of the Notre Dame team.) You know there are no secrets as to the basic sciences; some of you have already read these works.

Yet in another respect, and a very important one, all these openly published works are in a restricted category. For only the educated eye can read these pages and only the trained mind can understand their contents. The number of persons who have seen an atom bomb, or helped to put one together, is not large. Even so, it may possibly be larger than the number of Americans who have a really good reading knowledge of the scientific language in which the underlying facts of all atomic energy use is stated. We have altogether too few such trained minds. We must find more of them, and soon, among the young men and women who are now in high school and college. Refilling the ranks of atomic scientists is, of course, not the only responsibility of today's science-minded and science-talented young people. The world has need of workers in the whole alphabet of the sciences, from astronomy to zoology, in fields not yet touched by atomic energy as well as in those already being revolutionized by it, and in all the varied applications of sciences—medicine, engineering, agriculture, forestry, and all the rest. The harvest is indeed great, and the laborers far too few. It is to be hoped that public aid and private aid, too, for the training of scientists and the support of their research will soon vastly extend the field which the Science Talent Search has so brilliantly pioneered.

While I would not undertake to monopolize all the scientific talent concentrated here tonight for purposes of atomic research, I am quite confident that some of you will eventually be engaged in one phase or another of this work. In fact, I am informed that at least a few of your predecessors, who came here in past Science Talent Searches, are in the work now, either directly as employees of the Atomic Energy Commission, or indirectly as members of research teams employed by one or another of our contracting firms, or perhaps as users of some of our radioactive isotopes in a university or industrial laboratory. And there is no doubt that the number will increase, as your group adds new forties from year to year and as our services to American research widen.

The Atomic Energy Commission, appreciating the importance of building up a corps of thoroughly trained young scientists in fields affected by the utilization of atomic energy (and that means, or seems likely soon to mean, just about all fields), has undertaken to do some searching on its own account for science talent at the college-graduate level. Altogether, we expect to offer graduate fellowships to 355 young men and women, most of them in their second or third years of graduate work, but some already with their doctors' degrees. A total of $2,500,000 has been set aside for the first year of this program. The fellowships will be awarded to candidates selected by the National Research Council, who will do their work at any accredited and properly equipped

institution. The fields in which research thus supported may be carried on range throughout the width of science—biology, medicine, physics, chemistry, mathematics, geology—any science which may be benefited by, or in its turn benefits, greater knowledge of atomic energy and its applications.

So you see, you of the fortunate 40, that after you've climbed the hill that's immediately before you there will be yet more hills to climb. If you still think you're good enough, say, 5 or 6 years hence, you'll be welcomed to the new competition.

You may readily infer from what I have just said that the Atomic Energy Commission regards research as of first importance in the further development of this new revolution. This is so obvious that I should not mention it at all, except to reemphasize the fact that the beneficiaries of educational aid offered by the Commission are not expected necessarily to go to work directly on the Government research program afterward any more than the officers of the Westinghouse Corp. expect all you young people to go to work for Westinghouse. We are in the position of an orchard owner who sets up a colony of honeybees. He knows perfectly well that his bees will pollenize his neighbor's trees as well as his own, but the benefit he will get from even a part of their efforts will be so great that he can afford to let them fly where they please.

Anyway, the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission are so far-flung that any investment we make in new discovery, even without tight strings attached, is bound to benefit our work in some way. We can appear to be casting our bread upon the waters to some extent and be confident of profiting because our shore line is very long.

Let me give you a quick sketch of the responsibilities and activities of the Atomic Energy Commission:

The Congress and the Executive of the United States, by the law that became effective on August 1, 1946, made the development and use of atomic energy in this country a government monopoly. It set up the Atomic Energy Commission, and provided for a general manager and his staff working under the Commission.

On the Commission was put responsibility in the whole range of atomic energy, from the procurement of raw materials wherever they might be reached on earth to and including the production of atomic weapons, to and including the development of power for peaceful uses, to and including the then unforeseeables. The Commission, for the people of the United States, owns and controls all fissionable materials. It owns and directs operations of our atomic-energy industry, which produces fissionable materials. It controls information as well as materials, much of the information necessarily being kept secret. It is under orders to conduct atomic energy research on a great scale and with real drive, and to see that research is pressed by others with its aid. Its real job, almost incredibly complex, is to get ahead, all along the line.

The Commission was appointed October 28, 1946. It held its first meeting November 13, 1946. On the last day of 1946 it formally took over management and development of an already huge "going concern," a large-scale and unique industry, necessarily supported by innumerable other industries, plus, the beginnings of a great and complex research enterprise.

We have four main installations and rather numerous smaller ones. Three of them, largest and most conspicuous, are primarily production plants and one is a proving ground. At Oak Ridge, Tenn., which was and is the largest of those strange anomalies, "company towns" owned by the Government, the principal production activity has been the separation of uranium 235 from its more abundant isotope uranium 238. At the Hanford, Wash., plant some uranium 238 is converted into plutonium. The Los Alamos, N. Mex., plant is the one place where atomic bombs are made; naturally I can't talk about that. And far out in the Pacific, at Eniwetok atoll, is the new proving ground for routine tests.

Production of fissionable materials is by no means the only activity at Oak Ridge. It is also a great research center, one of three national atomic research laboratories, involving participation of both industry and universities. The two other national laboratories are the Brookhaven laboratory on Long Island, operated by a group of Northeastern universities, and the Argonne laboratory near Chicago, in which 29 universities participate.

In one part of the national laboratory at Oak Ridge intensive work is being done on methods and means for safeguarding the health of persons who work with radioactive materials—and they are dangerous, as X-rays are dangerous, or radium. A fine record of safety in this work, I may add, has been made.

Another of the Oak Ridge laboratory establishments is the recently opened biological laboratory, where a staff of brilliant researchers are pioneering in work on the effects of fissionable materials and their radiations on living animals and plants. Still another is the center for distribution of radioactive and stable isotopes for research in university and other research laboratories both in this country and abroad. We sell radioactive isotopes of a large number of chemical elements to institutions needing them in their research problems. Requests for radio isotopes are reviewed and approved by a special allocations committee, and in the case of foreign distribution a progress report on the results of the investigations is required every 6 months.

At Berkeley, Calif., is another very important laboratory, the radiation lab, which has done magnificent things in the past and which will do more of them in the future. At Iowa State College, in my own State, work of which the same could be correctly said, goes on with our support. These are not all; but I am not trying to be comprehensive.

Thus you will see that research in atomic energy, all phases, is being conducted on a wide range of bases, from work requiring large teams of men and the most massive facilities, available only in one or a few places, to one-man problems in small colleges or remote agricultural experiment stations. Some of the problems are so involved with national security that their very nature cannot be discussed; others are so open that you can go and kibitz over the researcher's shoulder—if he will let you.

Our methods of operation also are highly varied. Some of the jobs we do ourselves. Most, however—and these include production of fissionable materials—are farmed out under contract with major industrial firms. Most of our relations with the universities and other institutions is also on a contract basis. A very notable example of this category is our contract with a large corporation which does much research of its own along engineering lines to investigate the possibilities of using atomic energy for power-production purposes. There are other variations.

We thus have all degrees of enterprise. Where our own people do the work on our own property, that might be called socialistic—as socialistic as Government ownership and operation of the Post Office or the Mint or the National Bureau of Standards. That, I repeat, is a very small part. Where we enter into contract relationships it is a mixed situation, like the Navy contracting with Westinghouse for electric-propulsion machinery or the Department of Agriculture setting up cooperative research programs with State agricultural experiment stations. Where we sell research substances to individual laboratories in which the workers originate and carry out their own research projects, that is straight-out private enterprise. It's a fair cross section of the various American ways of getting things done. It sounds mixed and complex, but in action it seems sound—and largely inescapable.

With so many scientists in so many different kinds of institutions working on so many different bases of operation, it is no wonder that we already have a tremendous diversity in specific research problems. I could have collected enough samples to keep talking until morning; but you young folks want to hear some announcements from Dr. Shapley, and we old folks want to get to bed sometime ago; so I'll just choose a few fairly representative ones from different fields of science, and let them suffice.

I have already mentioned research on atomic power. I can't be very specific about possibilities here, except to say that immediate application is not in prospect, and that when it does come it seems likely to be in rather large-scale installations. Stationary power plants, especially where conventional steam and water power are not cheaply available, and perhaps propulsion for warships, are the likeliest initial efforts. Some rather difficult but, we believe, not insuperable problems have to be solved first, and those we are "at."

We have certainly progressed if we are able to work toward the use of this newly available form of energy for constructive purposes within a couple of years after its first use for destructive purposes. Remember, the first use of expansive thermal force confined within a cylinder was to push cannon balls, and it was about 400 years before people got around to using the same force in the modified form of steam to push a piston to do useful work, and about 200 more before an engine directly utilizing explosions was developed. So you really shouldn't be impatient about our slowness in delivering atomic power.

Moreover, I have a feeling of unrealism sometimes when, perceiving a need to correct misconceptions about atomic power plants being just around the corner, we say solemnly that it looks like a 10-year job before even the first experimental plant of that kind can be in operation, and perhaps 20 or 30 before much use is being made of such plants. Is 10 years such a long time; or is 30, really? I think we oldsters need to be on guard about such time scales. I further think that nothing could be sillier than to act as if a couple of decades were so long a period that the possibilities didn't matter. Our American aim must be to advance as fast as we can. If 30 years can be compressed to 28 or 26, or say, 20, compressing it should be the goal. I have an idea that you 40 young folk, who 20 years hence will be just at your age of greatest capacity, still young really, do not look on 20 years for so great a development as eternity.

I already have (in my mind's eye) a legend written on every wall where we commissioners meet, a legend, borrowed from my authentically scientific colleague, Bob Bacher: "What is it we want to achieve?" That is so that each little decision shall be tested by the larger purpose which it must serve. I think that now, inspired to articulate it by this meeting, I shall add another legend, to be looked at whenever it is necessary to estimate time required for an important accomplishment. The new one will read: "Remember the lads of 17." That one will suggest, "What do they expect of us?" and "How will this look to them?"

Most active use of atomic energy at present is the indirect one involved in the employment of what are becoming known, even in everyday discussions, as tracers. Exposing chemical elements to bombardment with

atom-particle streams of various kinds renders them, in turn, radioactive. Thereafter they can be detected, even in smallest quantities, by instruments such as Geiger counters or electroscopes, or in some cases simply with photographic film. Compounds of these radioactive elements can thus be traced wherever they go, which is why they are called tracers.

Tracer techniques are proving especially useful in medical and biological research. They can tell us how quickly drugs, poisons, or foods are absorbed in the body after swallowing, how rapidly they move through the blood stream, in what parts of the body they tend to accumulate, and how soon they begin to be eliminated through kidneys, sweat glands, or the moisture of the breath. I don't know whether this has been tried yet by any physiologist, but I feel sure that if you were to drink a cocktail (as I hope you won't) with radioactive carbon atoms in its alcohol, a Geiger counter might tell you by its excited tickings that the stuff was "going to your head" even before you began to feel dizzy yourself.

Tracer elements have been a godsend to plant physiologists, and to that outdoor application of their science which we call agriculture. So seemingly simple a thing as the rise of sap in plants has for ages been a riddle; we did not know how fast it went, with any real accuracy, and we did not know at all what paths it followed. Now we are beginning to find out. An even denser mystery surrounded the making of sugars, starches, and other foods in the green leaf, on which we all depend for our very lives. Now we prepare radioactive carbon, burn it to make carbon dioxide, feed this to a plant leaf on which light is shining, and the tracers start to tell their story. There had long been dispute as to whether starch came first and was changed into sugar, or sugar came first and was changed into starch. Tracers have shown both theories to be wrong; the initial stage in food making is neither starch nor sugar but a third something that has not yet been completely identified.

Of particular practical value has been the use of tracers in the chemical mixtures that are commercial fertilizers. Plant nutrition, especially under outdoor conditions, has always had more guesswork in it than we liked to admit. Tracers are beginning to tell us when we are wasting one chemical by putting in too much of it, or leaving the plant technologically unemployed by not giving it enough of another to let it work at full efficiency. Tracers also enable scientists to follow the flow of food substances, especially sugars, from one part of the plant to another after they have been formed, to learn how rapidly and in what places they are stored, and how much and how rapidly they get used up by the plant itself for its own life needs.

One recently reported piece of research invoked the aid of three sciences—chemistry, botany, and zoology—for its completion. The problem was to find out what became of certain organic phosphorus compounds taken in by an animal in its vegetable diet. A radioactive phosphate was prepared in the chemistry laboratory. This was supplied to growing corn as part of its fertilizer requirement. Geiger counters showed that a good deal of it went to the grain and was stored there. The grain was fed to test animals, and again traced in their bodies.

Tracers can, of course, be used in other than the biological sciences. For example, metallurgists are studying the composition of alloys with this method, and oil chemists are getting a better idea of how molecules of gasoline and other petroleum products are put together, and how they come apart in combustion.

I have only got started on the list of fascinating research results already obtained through the use of tracers; I could not possibly complete it in the time we have tonight. If I did, it would be inadequate tomorrow.

Important though tracers are, they are not the only way in which the new radioactive elements can be used. It has been known for some years that bombardment with X-rays and exposure to radium can change the germ cells of animals and plants, producing hereditary changes in the offspring. The same kind of thing can now be done much more cheaply with radiations from our atomic ovens. What this may mean to genetical science and practical plant and animal breeding is for the future. It may be considerable. There are also possibilities in the radiation treatment of diseases. They may be of tremendous importance. But all we can say now is "maybe."

Well, these are a few random samples of the research uses that are now being made of atomic energy and its products, the fissionable isotopes of the elements. They look impressive as they pass in review, but really they represent only a small fraction of the possibilities. There simply aren't enough workers now.

Here is where you come in. I have several times addressed you as the fortunate forty. Fortunate you are. Not because you are here, but because you have the intelligence and the aptitude that have enabled you to pursue your education thus far with credit, and can reasonably be expected to make good use of your further opportunities.

Good fortune is yours. Responsibility is also yours, proportionate to your proven abilities. "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."

What will we require of you? Full answer cannot be given yet, because you have still to prove yourselves further. But the demands will be made, and because you are already in the front rank, you will be expected to render first accounting.

One thing I certainly shall not undertake to tell you now is what research problems you will be required to meet when you have further prepared yourselves. I am not personally qualified to do this, even as of the present moment. And if I were, and knew exactly what problems I wanted tackled next, I would not wait for you, but would try to find workers already prepared—perhaps among the first two or three STS forties. But by the time you are ready, your problems will also be ready; if you have the stuff for real research you will find them yourselves, or perhaps even better still, you will know which research team you will want to join.

But knowing your field and choosing your task and doing it with all your might will still not be enough. Of you yet more will be required. Even now, demand is constantly becoming more insistent that the scientist shall be more than merely a machine for acquiring and arranging knowledge. He must be citizen as well as scientist, and assume a larger share of responsibility both for the direction of his own activities and the disposal of their products.

Time was, a generation or so ago, when public indifference or even hostility to science gave the scientist some justification for dwelling in an ivory tower, just as the anarchy of the Dark Ages justified scholars then for sticking tight to the cloister. But the world now realizes its need of science and what science can do. And as the thirteenth-century friars, turning their backs on the cloister, carried its hoarded spiritual and cultural treasures to the common people everywhere, so you, as inheritors of the riches of past science and the potential creators of still greater future wealth, must prepare yourselves not only to direct its creation but also to aid in its dissemination for the promotion of the general welfare.

Essay by Patricia Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, every year the Department of Ohio, the American Legion, conducts an essay contest in which pupils in the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades of the schools of Ohio compete. I am very proud to say that among the winners this year was Miss Patricia Murray, 228 Twain Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, which is in my congressional district. I wish to insert at this point her very fine essay which is entitled "How Can the United Nations Become More Effective?"

HOW CAN THE UNITED NATIONS BECOME MORE EFFECTIVE?

(By Patricia Murray)

For thousands of years the people of the world have sought an end to war. They have wanted security for everyone. But they've allowed themselves to be defeated time and again by this single obstacle: Who will take the responsibility? Who will do the job?

Today we again face the task of ending a war. Again it should be reasonably simple. The UN has been formed for the purpose of guaranteeing peace. It's the world's best hope for peace and security.

But the UN alone can't end the war. It requires the help of all of us. Every human advance has come about because the people not only wanted it but were willing to work for such betterment and to take on some responsibility. The great strides man has made toward controlling disease, crime, and other ills have been made possible through the helpful cooperation of the people as a whole. The situation today with respect to peace, rights, and human welfare is comparably worse than it was 2 years ago when the UN began operation. What has gone wrong? Why has the UN done so badly?

If the UN is to overcome its present nearly total frustration, the absolute veto now exercised by the five chief powers must be modified. It would be neither necessary nor just, however, to eliminate altogether the privileges of the big powers. With their higher development, large populations, and preponderous resources they must take the primary responsibility and, therefore, should receive special rights. The big powers could still be protected by being assigned permanent seats on the Security Council and on the principal commissions. What is needed is merely to take away the rights of absolute veto. This could be done by either one of two simple changes.

Decisions of the Security Council should be declared to require the votes of 7 of the 11 members, including the votes of a majority of the 5 big powers. Then no single power could veto, but the the big powers could be protected against a formal majority made up of small nations. Or, still simpler, the veto might be retained on decisions to undertake actual sanctions against some nation or group of nations; that is to use military force or institute an obligatory economic boycott. The justification of the veto in such cases is that if a big power didn't agree with the sanctions, it would refuse to go along in any case, unless and until the UN was strong enough to compel the big power to get in line. But the veto would be eliminated on all other questions; proposals for investigations, inquiries, arbitration recom-

mendations, the peaceful settlement of disputes, to which no nation believing in international cooperation could rightly object.

With either of these two simple changes, all of the first 24 vetoes would have been ruled out.

If such an enormous improvement could be made by so simple and reasonable a change, why, then, isn't the Charter amended along these lines? The answer is plain and revealing. By far the greatest threat to world peace is the existence, within every nation of the world-wide Communist fifth column. It is the Communist parties and armies and secret police that have been reducing the nations of eastern Europe to totalitarian puppets and are today preparing for civil war in France and Italy.

The United Nations cannot function so long as it allows itself to be thus blackmailed by a small minority. The United Nations can be made to work only if the United States together with the other non-Communist nations, is prepared to bring the real problems into the open, to use every possibility of action under the present charter, in spite of opposition and to limit the veto even at risk of withdrawal of the Soviet Union and its satellite nations.

It must be made known to the men and women throughout the Communist empire that their rightful place in the United Nations is reserved for them, that they will always be welcomed. If there has to be a detour from the path, the destination remains fixed, a world not divided by one, a United Nations transformed into a sure guardian of peace, a free parliament of mankind.

A Justified Retirement Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on my way back to Washington from a recent trip, I was waited on in the Pullman car by a porter who must have been in his seventies. He was a genial old fellow and, in the course of exchanging pleasantries with him, I mentioned that he must be about ready to retire. He grinned patiently and wanted to know if I knew how much a railroader gets when he retires.

When he told me that the average was $70 a month, and that thousands of old railroaders get as little as $50, or even less, I could hardly believe it.

I could not get the old fellow out of my mind. He is one of hundreds—maybe thousands—of tired old men who go on working far past retirement age for the simple reason that they cannot keep themselves and their dependents on the amount of money they have coming under the Railroad Retirement Act.

This is not just an old man's problem, either. For every one of those old men staying in service past retirement age, there is some young railroader being retarded in his progress up the ladder.

While I was still pondering this problem, my fellow Ohioan, the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER, introduced a bill, H. R. 5993, to increase by 20 to 25 percent the annuities being paid to these "old rails." It did not seem to me that 20 to 25 percent was enough of an increase. I knew some bills had been introduced that would grant higher increases. I wondered how the railroad boys themselves felt about it. So I asked some of them.

I found that with the caution and common sense characteristic of railroad labor, those boys had corraled some expert actuaries and statisticians to answer one question for them. The question was: How far can we go on increasing annuities without either increasing taxes or wrecking the railroad retirement fund?

When the experts came up with their answer, the railroad labor organizations—or at least 20 of them that I know of—threw their full support behind H. R. 5993, because it proposed the maximum increase considered to be safe without an increase in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this money in the railroad retirement fund is not your money or my money. It came from the coffers of the railroads and the pockets of the railroad men. It is my considered conviction that we actually have no moral right to withhold from the aged people who are suffering actual hardship without it the money that is available in the railroad retirement fund to alleviate their suffering. It seems to me that we have no choice but to enact H. R. 5993 promptly and without delay.

American Revolutionary Hero and Founder of American Cavalry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MITCHELL JENKINS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the struggle of the Thirteen Colonies of America in 1776 for their independence from the mother country, brought to our shores many lovers of liberty and freedom. They all came to our country to battle for these ideals and to aid us to gain our independence. Their military services are deeply enshrined in our hearts and their names are forever linked with the land they helped to free, but foremost among them was that gallant Pole, Count Casimir Pulaski.

On the 11th day of October in 1779, at the age of 31 years, Pulaski lost his life attempting to relieve the siege of the British before Savannah, Ga. Thus ended the life of one who was the incarnation of the best traditions of Polish chivalry. He shared its virtues and its weaknesses. Proud and unyielding, patriotic and unselfish, he proved a worthy member of the gallant band of men who came to help America in our Revolution, and there was none of those who deserve a higher distinction in the minds and hearts of the American people. His was the spirit of the Poles who saved Europe with Sobieski, who fought on so many battlefields against oppression; and, in these days of upheaval, the patriotic life of Pulaski, with his willingness to sacrifice that life for his ideals, is markedly significant and deserves commemoration.

It is only proper and just that America and a grateful people, enjoying the blessings of liberty for which Pulaski fought so valiantly, should, on this the two-hundredth anniversary of his birth, commemorate the life of this great man and pay tribute to his valor and chivalry.

Taft-Hartley Surprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

TAFT-HARTLEY SURPRISES

The Taft-Hartley Labor Act goes on giving birth to incidents which surprise some people. In the last couple of days the new statute has been unusually prolific.

AFFIDAVITS HELD CONSTITUTIONAL

For one thing, a special three-judge Federal court ruled Tuesday in Washington that the Taft-Hartley anti-Communist laws are constitutional. Chief among these is the provision that before a union can have National Labor Relations Board help in disputes with employers its officers must sign affidavits that they are not Reds.

This requirement for some reason has made many labor leaders furious, including CIO President Phil Murray. Though he hates the Communists like poison and is certainly no Red himself, Murray up to this writing has refused to sign the affidavit.

Along with the court ruling on this subject came another ruling on pensions. This one was handed down by the NLRB, and it was to the effect that employers must bargain collectively with unions on the subject of pensions—provided the officers of any union so negotiating have filed non-Communist affidavits.

This puts Murray on an interesting spot, inasmuch as he is now mixed up in pension negotiations for some of his steelworkers. Phil is probably hurt, surprised, and mad over this development; but what'll you bet he doesn't quietly file a non-Red affidavit if the Supreme Court upholds the special court?

ANOTHER PURGE GOES FLOPPO

In Illinois on Tuesday, as in Nebraska, a primary election was held.

Fifteen Republican Congressmen ran for renomination, seven unopposed. Of the other eight, all but one voted last spring for the Taft-Hartley bill. Labor leaders of both the CIO and the A. F. of L. strove fiercely to defeat these seven men, in line with their announced resolve to "purge" every Senator and Representative who backed the T-H measure.

The purge flopped. All seven of the labor chiefs' candidates for oblivion came through victorious. It was a melancholy surprise for labor leaders who hope to line up a solid labor voting bloc in the 1948 campaign and make the Taft-Hartley Act a fighting issue.

We think the boys had better resign themselves to the propositions that this law is on the books to stay for quite a while, and that a big majority of voters like it, including large numbers of workers.

Navajo Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

APRIL 2, 1948.

Hon. J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have had an opportunity to review your report on the long-range program for Navajo rehabilitation. Inasmuch as a majority of the Navajo people are located in Arizona, as a Representative of that State, I deem it advisable for me to make a few observations concerning your report.

On July 15, 1947, after having made a personal visit to the Navajo Reservation, I directed a letter to Mr. William Zimmerman, Jr., Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, calling attention to the deplorable condition and neglect of the Navajo people. Since that time, I have made further studies of the Navajo problems and have been active in Congress and elsewhere in promoting the interest and improving the welfare of these unfortunate people. In line with my continuing interest in the Navajo people, I have made a study of the Drefkoff plan and the report based on it. I reviewed your report with a great deal of interest, and at this time I want to compliment you and your Department on the fact that you have now brought before Congress and the American people some suggestions for the betterment of the Navajos. Improvement in the life of these people has been sorely needed for a long time, and I sincerely hope that this is the beginning of a real effort to solve their problems that have been so long neglected.

However, in fairness to the Navajos, to your Department, to Congress, and to the American taxpayers, who would bear the burden of financing the plan you suggest, I feel that I should acquaint you with my reactions concerning certain features of this report. Substantially, my feelings now are the same as they were in July 1947. I hope that those in your Department who are interested in forming a permanent program for the Navajos will review my letter to Mr. Zimmerman written on July 15, 1947.

My first impression is that while the total estimate of $90,000,000 set forth in your report to bring about a rehabilitation of the Navajos is not excessive, if directed to the essential factors of improving the conditions of the Navajo people, the provisions of the plan as outlined in your report allow excessive expenditures for projects of marginal or doubtful value, and fail to provide sufficient amounts for educational and medical items, which are primary in bringing about a solution of the entire Navajo problem.

It appears to me that the features of your 10-year plan do not reach at the very essence of solving the problems of the Navajo people. As I have repeatedly stated on numerous occasions, the foremost problem of the Navajo people is that of educating and properly training them so that they may assume a gainful livelihood and useful position in life. In order to make it possible for these people to assimilate into our regular economic and social structure, it is mandatory that the Government supply educational facilities and an occupational training program similar to that provided for other American people. At the present time, 80 percent of the Navajo people cannot speak or read the English language. Presently, the Government is educating less than one-fifth of the 24,000 school-age children on the Navajo Reservation. In view of this, it is shocking and astonishing to me that your 10-year plan contemplates a capacity for 13,290 students while at this very moment there are more than 24,000 children of school age. In 10 years there will be more than 30,000 children of school age. It is evident that your plan would, in 10 years, provide education for less than 50 percent of the children of the Navajo people. It would be wasteful to spend money on physical projects in an attempt to develop the resources of the Navajo Reservation if the Navajo people were not educated and trained in occupations in order to use those resources once they had been developed.

In reviewing a press release which you issued on March 15, 1948, I note in the last paragraph of page 2 that you state: "It is recognized that educational facilities for all 24,000 Navajo children of school age cannot be provided immediately, or even in 2 or 3 years. Even if it were possible, it would not be desirable because it is not known at this time what the school needs will be a few years hence when the long-range program has gotten under way." It is incredible to me that your Department would consider it undesirable to put every Navajo student in school at the earliest possible moment. While our entire American way of life is based on progressive education and maximum training, it is paradoxical that we have within our boundaries today one of the most illiterate groups in the entire world. This is not a situation which results from the lack of will of the Navajo Indians or from a lack of a desire for education and training. It is a situation which stems from a long period of neglect and indifference of our Government to a long-standing moral and legal obligation which we owe the aboriginal residents of this country. The Navajo Indians should not be deprived of educational opportunities which we recognize as basic and fundamental rights of every individual in this country.

Another vital feature in Navajo rehabilitation is the imperative necessity for health, sanitation, and medical facilities. At the present time, almost 50 percent of the Navajos suffer from some sort of disease. The infant-mortality rate is shockingly high. I have received numerous and repeated complaints from Navajo Indians relative to the complete lack of first-aid or medical facilities on the reservation. In a recent press release, the Bureau of Indian Affairs cited one case where a Public Health nurse served almost 1,700 Indians scattered over a 25-mile radius. This nurse works on a 40-hour-week schedule, and further medical aid is restricted to 1 doctor who serves 7,200 Indians. From personal observation, I know the hospital facilities on the reservation at this time are not being used to the fullest extent. Money is being spent on doubtful enterprises instead of employing medical personnel and public health experts.

Obviously, an effective health program is impossible under these conditions, and unless maximum provisions for medical treatment and hospital facilities are made, the rate of disease will continue to rise and the Navajos will continue to die for lack of medical care and attention. It would seem logical that by coordinating the need for public health and medical improvements and the need for education and training, it would be feasible to train Navajo men and women for health, sanitation, and eventually for medical work and they, in turn, could expand the training among the Navajos. It does not seem necessary to allow disease to run rampant and to allow Indians to die for need of medical care when they could be trained for first aid, which even in its most limited conception is now lacking. It is extremely disappointing to review a list of the Government employees on the Navajo Reservation and to find so few Indians employed in responsible positions. Obviously, the Indian people should be trained to assume the responsibilities of nursing, first aid, and other medical work with a minimum of employment from other sources.

Of course, I cannot go into a detailed discussion of every feature and concept of your plan, since this would require the production of a statement comparable in volume to your own extensive report. However, I do believe it is evident that education, training, and health are the vital factors in rehabilitating the Navajo Indians. These are the immediate needs and, in my opinion, are the factors which should have the focus of attention at this time. While there is a great deal of merit to some of the other major points in your program, I believe that, on the whole, the program tends to perpetuate the theory of isolating Indians and treating them as a separate group to be permanently kept apart from other Americans.

If these people are to thrive and intermingle with other Americans, it is quite evident that there must be a gradual development so that they may assume their place in the educational, social, and economic life of our country. We must encourage individual initiative and enterprise so that ultimately there will be no Indians as a group but they will all be American citizens. This is the basic concept of our American way of life. It is my feeling that the American way is to make it possible for each individual to make his own way in life and to take his place among the members of our society. I am certain that American public opinion would not sanction the concentration of any group within our country into isolated and communistic settlements. Your program provides for the liberal expenditure of large sums of money on projects of a communal nature. The features of the program would essentially communize many of the contemplated activities of the Navajo people. At the end of your 10-year plan a great many of the Navajo people would be employed in communistic enterprises. I am certain that such a plan would not be tolerated in any other unit of our democratic society. If private enterprise and individual initiative is worth while for all other Americans, it is certainly desirable for the Navajos or any other Indian.

According to your report, it will be necessary for some of the Navajo people to take jobs off of the reservation. Even though the resources of the reservation are developed to the fullest extent, there will not be enough production to provide an adequate standard of living for more than half the people on the reservation at this time. Experience has shown that the training of the Navajo requires boarding schools. I observe from your report that this has been emphasized. Many of the day schools which have been constructed throughout the reservation could not be used as boarding schools. It would be a further waste of funds to try to convert some of the isolated day schools and make them useful.

The mistakes of the past should not be added upon at this time when it is necessary to make some radical changes. Basic facts should be recognized even though it might necessitate the abandonment of some undertakings which have in the past proved worthless and nonproductive. The resources of the Indian lands and properties should be developed to a maximum. However, money should not be wasted on projects which never can compete with other American enterprises. The Indian should be placed in a position to compete with all other Americans so that he may be placed on his own at the earliest possible date. The Indian wants to be free of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. At

this time a policy should be established which will ultimately bring to a close the existence of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There is no reason why this Bureau should not be permanently abolished within the next 25 years. There is a wave of sentiment throughout the United States to have the Bureau of Indian Affairs gradually eliminated. The various States could in the near future assume the educational training of these people if the Federal Government would contract with the States involved for a period of time until the standards of these people have reached that of the other Americans.

It is selfish and near-sighted for any Federal employee to try to perpetuate the Bureau of Indian Affairs in existence beyond a reasonable length of time. According to your report, it would be necessary to keep the Bureau of Indian Affairs in existence from now on even for 100 years to administer the suggested program. Any permanent program for the benefit of the Indians should take into consideration that ultimately the Indians should be running their own business, as any other American would want to do. Paternalism must be stopped and initiative must be instilled in the Indian people. To this end I hope that you will draft a program for the benefit of the Indians instead of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I fully realize the complex nature of the problems which face your Department in connection with the Navajo Indians. However, you may be certain that the Members of Congress will study this vital matter carefully. You may be equally certain that I will continue to follow the efforts of our Government in behalf of the Indian with keen interest and that my own offorts toward the solution of this long-standing problem will be relentless. I will be happy to have your reactions to my statements, and I will greatly appreciate your keeping me informed on the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Yours very sincerely,

RICHARD F. HARLESS,
Member of Congress, Arizona.

Reducing 10 Pounds in 18 Days With Oleo in the Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in reading the articles in the Washington Post by Ada Jane Kain about a reducing diet, or how to lose 10 pounds in 18 days by eating as she prescribes.

In one of these articles I noted the following:

Restricting dairy fats to lower calories lessens the vitamin A. This can be obtained in a concentrate without calories at a cost of a bit over 1 cent a day. Supplement menus with one vitamin A and D concentrate supplying 5,000 units of vitamin A and 400 units of vitamin D.

In the suggested diet one-half pat of oleo was recommended. The point that interested me was the fact that 5,000 units of vitamin A were added to the diet. I also noted that 400 units of vitamin D were recommended. This vitamin D was discovered at the agricultural college at the University of Wisconsin.

Any person selected to conduct a diet program can be expected to be one with the proper background in nutrition. Her articles indicate such a background. She recognizes the importance of vitamins. She is cognizant of the fact that a reduction in dairy fats reduces the vitamin A content of the diet. It is to be regretted that more people do not recognize this fact.

First Water for Big Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harry H. Harrison, from the Sunday Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of April 11, 1948:

FIRST WATER FOR BIG BASIN—IRRIGATION PROJECT OPENS THIS SPRING IN PASCO DISTRICT

(By Harry H. Herrison)

A 30-year long dream will start coming true in a small way this spring in the vicinity of Pasco, Wash.

For a long time, chambers of commerce in Spokane, Pasco, Ephrata and other Washington cities have boosted ardently for an irrigation project to bring life to arid soil in the central part of their State. It had boosters in civic leaders and Congressmen too.

A few years ago their agitation bore fruit when off the planning boards of the United States Bureau of Reclamation came the Columbia Basin irrigation project. Encompassing 1,029,000 acres, it is the largest ever devised in this country.

The project, larger than the State of Rhode Island, sprawls over much of four counties in Washington. In the summer of 1945 it came officially into being when landowners signed contracts with Uncle Sam. What is to be the heart of the project—Grand Coulee Dam—already is ready.

In the past 3 years much has been done towards completion of the project. But years and millions of dollars more are needed. But in those 3 years, the Bureau of Reclamation had readied a tiny part of the big system. So, sometime within the next few weeks, water will reach 5,400 acres, located about 12 miles northwest of Pasco.

The start is small but significant. Not because millions of dollars already have been spent on the entire project, but because, as irrigationists claims, it will start shortly bringing more food into production for a hungry world. Also, it brings value worth millions (crops estimated in excess of $200,000,000) to worthless acres.

This year the 84 farms that make up what is called the Pasco unit will produce little in the way of food. It all depends just when water reaches the parched soil. Everything is ready to pump water from the nearby Columbia River except for several large electrical motors, some steel and electrical wiring. If they come not too late in the spring, fall potatoes can be planted, as well as cover grass crops for cattle.

All in all, these irrigated areas probably will not affect the economy of the region as much as what is going on across the river at Richland, Wash. There General Electric Co., under supervision of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, is spending $350,000,000 on expansion of the town and the plutonium-making plants nearby.

But the Columbia Basin project, as well as the huge atomic energy development, has given that inland section of Washington a new prosperity. It is being reflected in the larger cities that supply the area. By airline, the entire project lies less than 100 miles west and south of Spokane, 145 miles east and south of Seattle and but 200 miles north and east of Portland.

The impact later is expected to be terrific. Probably not more than 300 new people will move onto the 84 newly irrigated farms. But when water finally reaches all the 1,029,000 acres some years hence the United States Bureau of Reclamation estimates that 85,000 new persons will come in to occupy 17,000 farms, while another 170,000 will provide social services in towns now already booming or in new villages to be created.

The soil is suitable to a wide range of crops, Government tests show: alfalfa, clovers, small grains, corn, flax, sugar beets, potatoes, mangels, field peas, onions, and many fruits and vegetables. Dairying, however, is suggested as a good principal source of income.

For example, when the whole project is completed it could create a new Milk Bowl that eventually could support 198,000 milk cows. If the average production of a cow is computed at 26 pounds a year, that means a potential 44,000,000 pounds of new butterfat alone.

When will more acres be irrigated? That all depends on the economy-minded Congress. Many boosters of the project feel that since this is an election year chances are good that President Truman's request for $48,000,000 for the project for the new fiscal year, starting July 1, will not be whittled down.

These same boosters know, though, that western reclamation projects in the past few months have been the favorite targets of dollar-scrimping Congressmen.

MONEY MOST IMPORTANT KEY TO FINISHING PROJECT

Approximately $250,000,000 has been spent on the project to date.* That includes, of course, Grand Coulee Dam, which will provide the electrical energy for pumping the billions of gallons of water. The huge dam, about 50 miles north of the start of the project, cost $180,000,000 and first went into service supplying the Northwest with power at the end of 1941.

That means, then, that only about $70,000,000 so far has been spent on the irrigation proper in the 13 years the enterprise got beyond the planning-board stage. And of the $70,000,000, approximately $35,200,000 was spent in the current year. That includes a carry-over from previous years of more than $4,000,000, plus a $13,584,000 supplemental appropriation made by Congress last December. Western Senators haven't forgotten the fight they had to put up on the Senate floor to get the supplemental money which was needed. Otherwise all work would have stopped.

When completed, what will the work cost? At existing prices for material and labor (unskilled labor on the project receives $1.30 hourly), Project Manager Frank A. Banks estimates the over-all cost at $610,885,000. Of this sum irrigation structures would claim $377,000,000. The rest would include Coulee Dam and other installations at the time.

Naturally no one expects Congress to appropriate the $360,885,000 needed to complete the project in any one year. But the Bureau of Reclamation does have a schedule it hopes to keep. Campaign now is for 216,000 acres (including the Pasco unit) to be under irrigation by 1952. And that means money—a lot of money.

To attain that schedule it will require the present Congress to grant President Truman's request for the next fiscal year. After

that Congress must step the allotment up to $65,000,000 in 1950, $55,000,000 in 1951, and $50,000,000 in 1952, or a whopping total of $218,000,000 in the next 4 years.

In any event, Uncle Sam is scheduled to get back every penny invested. Under the repayment plan set-up each landowner pays back his proportionate share of the costs. That ranges from $11.75 an acre for poor soil to $130.94 for the best, with the average at $85. And all in all the landowner or his descendants have 53 years to do it in. Part of the huge investment will be returned from Grand Coulee power sales.

Most of the land in the whole project is owned privately. It is divided up this way: State of Washington 6.1 percent, railroads 3.4 percent, United States Government, 9.5 percent, and all others, 78.8 percent.

The Northern Pacific Railroad (which owns 40,000 acres in the whole project) happens to be the big landholder in the Pasco units, now approaching irrigation. The company has 34 farms out of the 84 units, and 2,467 out of the 5,400 acres.

P. D. Edgell, western land agent for the Northern Pacific, at Seattle, says the railroad's farms will be sold just as soon as the area is platted by the Bureau of Reclamation and water is about available. He says the railroad will give preference to ex-servicemen.

But the railroad, like all other business people interested in the project, will insist that the settler has financial backing, as well as some knowledge of farming with irrigation. The Bureau of Reclamation will give veterans preference by lot.

SETTLERS TO BE SELECTED CAREFULLY TO INSURE PERMANENCE

Cash or backing is needed. Most persons believe at least $3,000 in cash or equipment will be the minimum requirement. There also has been a move afoot at Pasco to have a group of business people in the towns in the area put up $100,000 in a nonprofit credit pool, which could be lent to new settlers.

"What we don't want," says one official, "are irresponsible persons who will farm a few years and then give up."

Leon L. Bailie, president of the South Columbia Basin irrigation district (the whole project is divided into three), which includes Pasco units, takes an even graver view:

"We have got to figure ways and means of making the carefully selected settlers stick. That is true for the whole area, but is particularly important on this ground, which will be in the path of visiting Congressmen sent to see how the project is working out."

Bailie says experience has shown in other irrigation projects in the West that the settler needs $2,000 cash and $1,000 credit.

A more rugged individual is Sam Driggs, successful farmer in the Moses Lake section of the big project. He says:

"We need settlers who will live in a basement a few years and spend money for better accommodations only as they earn it. It's fine to talk of special credit corporations and solicit public funds for helping the settlers get started. But the more the settlers are required to do for themselves the better chance there is they will stick if the going gets tough."

The land will be sold at Bureau of Reclamation appraised prices, which, without water, averages about $10 an acre. No farm will exceed the 160-acre maximum of the Bureau.

Some landowners already are on the scene in the Pasco unit, awaiting the water. For example, R. H. and E. E. Ferguson, father and son, have 55 acres apiece.

W. W. Johnston, Bureau project development supervisor, says the Fergusons already have a sprinkling system over their acreage. Once water is available, they hope to sprinkle for a wheat crop this fall.

"Eventually," he says, "the Fergusons plan to put their acreage into grass for sheep."

Another father-son combination is Alfred L. Hales and son. However, each has purchased a unit and they adjoin, making 280 acres. They are installing sprinkler systems, hoping to get a wheat crop this year. After that, the land will grow grass to support more than 3,000 head of sheep.

Much of the land to be sprinkled is unsuitable for gravity irrigation, being too steep. Also, it is located where sections of canals are subject to filling by wind-blown sand. Some of the sprinkling is along experimental lines. The Bureau has a 14-acre tract in the Pasco unit for just that purpose. Sprinkling will be tried for garden crops, grass-legume pasture, and alfalfa for hay.

Thus far, Uncle Sam has spent approximately $1,700,000 on the Pasco unit, of which about $400,000 will be repaid by the irrigation district. The balance comes from power generated at Grand Coulee, about 110 miles due north. The Pasco unit is at the southern tip of the whole project. George D. Wolf, 48, of Savage, Mont., has been named watermaster for the unit by the Bureau.

Project Manager Banks warns that: "Conclusions should not be drawn that the cost of constructing the Pasco unit can be used as a basis for logical comparison in building irrigation structures to serve the entire project. The Pasco unit, for example, is being used as a sort of proving ground for tests in the Bureau's program seeking lower-cost canal linings. Such research, the Bureau believes, will pay considerable dividends in building the main irrigation system for this project and in the construction of other projects."

Pasco's pumping plant, started on August 6, 1946, has two centrifugal pumps, pushing Columbia River water at the rate of nearly 500 gallons a second through large discharge pipes to headworks of the distribution system. This system will distribute it on the benchland through 23 miles of laterals and wasteways which are 170 feet higher than the river surface.

RESERVOIR EQUALIZING BASIN COVERS 27 MILES

At Coulee Dam 12 centrifugal pumps eventually will be in operation, the largest of their kind in the world. Water from Lake Roosevelt, in back of Coulee Dam, will be pumped some 2 miles away to the start of a 27-mile equalizing reservoir, from where it will course through miles and miles of canals and laterals to help quench the thirst of 1,029,000 dry acres (average rainfall throughout the area is but 7½ inches annually). This reservoir will hold about 1,150,000 acre-feet of water (an acre-foot of water is enough water to cover an acre 1 foot deep).

These 12 pumps will be so powerful, for example, that they will be able to lift a million pounds of water 280 feet per second. That is equivalent to pushing 500 tons of water to the top of a 27-story building every second.

The thousands of vast, flat acres that extend northward from the Pasco unit are studded and scarred with many parts of the project. Some are under construction, some completed. Some day the various parts will all be hooked together.

For example, the back end of the 27-mile equalizing reservoir constitutes a 10,000-foot concrete wall, varying from 5 to 13 feet in height, not including a 4-foot foundation in a trench cut into the lava bedrock. It cost $2,750,000 and, grouted to bedrock, is intended to curb possible seepage under the earth-fill dam which will rise over it. However, now it runs up and down hill, standing out in the bare landscape much like the great wall of China.

All this spending, which has reached at least $250,000,000, quite naturally has had a boom effect in much of the area. Ephrata, Wash., for example, now has a population of more than 3,300. It was only 951 in 1940.

The Bureau of Reclamation has about 1,500 employees, all classes. Contractors on the huge project averaged 885 last year, with a midsummer peak last year of about 2,100 workers. How many are employed this year depends on how much money Congress allocates the project.

Meanwhile water will bring life to 5,400 acres near Pasco this spring for sure.

False Issue—Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following articles entitled "False Issue—Communism" which appeared in the New York Post on April 14, 1948:

FALSE ISSUE: COMMUNISM—PALESTINE'S FOES TRY TO DRAG RED HERRING OVER THE TRAIL OF JUSTICE AND LOGIC

(By Observer)

The Arab League offers cynically to join the western bloc on the condition that Jewish Palestine be sacrificed. Not long ago the league threatened to go over to Russia if the Palestine problem was not solved to its liking. The league bargains with the conscience of the world and offers as the price, the impotent military strength of Arabia, nil and nihil that it is.

In other words, if Jewish Palestine is delivered to their mercy, then will they give in return? No, then they will agree to accept American dollars through ERP. In time of war, anyway, they will side with the winning party, as they did during World War II, when they crossed the fence less than 30 days before the fall of Berlin.

The U. S. S. R. is accused of trying to use the situation in Palestine for its own ends. The truth is that Russia, being reluctant to make war with atom-armed America, by her attitude in the Palestinian question, tried to free America of the fear that she is plotting against American interests in the Middle East. Had Russia opposed partition, she might have won the friendship of the Arab states with their oil, and voices charging that she did so as a political maneuver would have been justified.

By going along with the United States on the program of partition, Russia showed that she did not intend to use the Palestinian problem to antagonize the United States.

Having voted for partition, Russia is accused of plotting in the Middle East against America; having voted against partition, Russia would certainly have left herself open to the same accusation. How should she have voted in order not to provoke suspicion?

Immediately before Mr. Austin, the American delegate to the Security Council, announced the reversal of the American stand on Palestine, the Lebanese delegate, Mr. Chamoun, in a speech, declared that the plan adopted by the United Nations would lead to penetration of communism into the Middle East.

For a time a subversive propaganda campaign on the Goebbels motif of Communists and Jews was going on behind the scenes. The ideology of dictatorship has an appeal for an Arab, not for a Jew.

The work of spreading the lie that thousands of Communists are infiltrating from

the Balkan countries is carried on, not only by the Arabs, but by the British propaganda as well. Actually, all these immigrants were selected by Zionist organizations in the lands of their departure.

Thus, this propaganda is as clumsy as the report put out by British official circles charging the Zionist organization with kidnaping Jewish children from their parents, to counteract world indignation at the sending of the refugees of the ship *Exodus* in 1947, who had already stepped on the soil of Palestine, to vacant camps in Germany.

The Palestinian problem should rather be used to build peace. Just as from one crystal, new crystals grow, so the proper solution of the Palestinian problem, based on an agreement between the major powers, would lead to the proper solution of other problems in dispute and world peace would follow.

But, also with the war chances growing daily, Jewish Palestine, as stronghold of democracy and as the only productive country in the Middle East, should not be destroyed. Strategically, Palestine played a major role in the Middle East in World War II; the victory at El Alamein would not have been won had it not been for the Palestine "hinterland" with its production, its system of private enterprise in the spirit of free competition, and the enthusiasm of the Jewish people for real democracy.

On March 27, three Senators, CHAVEZ of New Mexico, Democrat; MAGNUSON of Washing, Democrat; and CAPPER of Kansas, Republican, wrote to Secretary Marshall: "Irrespective of our views in the matter, the fact remains that the Jewish nation exists in Palestine. This nation has some 200,000 able-bodied men and women who are mobilized to defend their country. Unless we endeavor to establish friendly relations and have an alliance with them, we will force them to seek protection from Communist Russia against the forces poised to attack them."

They stressed also that Jews, as allies, are a better choice than the Arabs.

It would be disastrous for mankind if America's ill-conceived policy in the Middle East should sacrifice justice to power politics, especially power politics based on the false premise that the Arab states are an effective military ally.

As far as the oil of the Middle East is concerned, it is already trivial to repeat that this oil and installation for its exportation will be of no service to the United States, in case of war, but may be of service to her potential enemy.

Pay Raise for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on April 13, 1948. The reasons given in this editorial justifying a pay raise for Federal employees are, to my mind, unanswerable:

JUSTIFIED PAY RAISE

When complaint is heard about the inefficiency of Federal employees, the workers in the postal system are rarely included. As a class, these workers are recognized as being among the best and most efficient in the Government service. In comparison with the responsibilities their duties involve, they likewise are among the most poorly paid.

Up until 1945 postal employees had received no increase in basic pay since 1925. Two raises since then have not brought it to a lavish scale. The beginning postal clerk or letter carrier receives, in this day of high prices, $2,100 a year. The top limit that can be reached after years of service is $3,100, plus a slight addition in longevity pay. The increase won in 1945 virtually was nullified by elimination of overtime work. A similar $400 increase the next year was offset by the rising cost of living.

Three bills to boost the pay of postal workers to a level more nearly in keeping with present conditions are pending in Congress. One of them, favorably reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would add $800 a year to the basic scale of postal employees and would increase the pay of other Government workers by $650 a year.

Undoubtedly a raise in any amount would be welcomed by all Federal employees, but the handlers of mail are especially deserving. Because they started lower in the pay scale, their compensation still lags behind that of comparable Government workers, despite the modest gains in 1945 and 1946. Whether or not the $800 a year specified in the pending bill is the proper figure, a raise to the postal employee to prevent him from falling farther behind in the cost-of-living race is justified.

In spite of the high costs of Government and the need for economy in its operations, Congress can afford to grant a raise to this group of employees purely on the basis that "a laborer is worthy of his hire."

Operation Oleo Versus Operation Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the radio Sunday night, April 11, Mr. Walter Winchell stated that armed forces were needed in Alaska. My first thought was why not send the battalion that is fighting the farmers, the dairy farmers I mean, in regard to providing butter for the armed forces, and see that they go to Alaska and take care of that situation.

In the north, of course, animal fats would be preferable to vegetable oils. The people in Alaska need a fat that can be absorbed at body temperatures. Does not the Eskimo diet indicate that an animal fat is the main part of the Eskimo diet?

A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has been holding hearings in regard to changing the law so oleo could be more fully used in place of butter in the armed forces and in hospitals. Large number of the armed forces testified. One of the armed services scientists appeared to be a rather good witness. Some of the others not so good. One of the witnesses, who was supporting the legislation, was asked by Congressman COLE of New York as to how long he had spent in studying up on the subject and he said about a week or 10 days. It would take longer than 10 days to read up on the phoney experiments carried on in regard to oleo.

The housewife has been led to believe by the oleo propaganda that the price of oleo will drop 10 cents per pound if the oleo bill is passed. Anyone familiar with the problem knows this is not true. The propaganda is based on false, misleading information—part truth, little truth, and no truth have been resorted to. The largest possible reduction in the cost of living could not be over 8 cents a year per person even if nothing but oleomargarine was used as a spread. If the consumers knew this fact, my correspondence indicates that there would be little or no demand for this legislation, except for the 26 corporations who have a monopoly on the American market for the commodity.

I have received many protests from men in the service because they feel that they have not been provided sufficient dairy products.

Chelsea Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution that I have received from the board of aldermen, Chelsea, Mass., protesting the action of the United Nations Council in reversing its Palestine-partition policy:

CITY OF CHELSEA, MASS.,
LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,
BOARD OF ALDERMEN,
City Hall, April 6, 1948.

The board of aldermen protest the action of the Council of the UN in reversing its Palestine-partition policy. It is certain that this action will not be an aid for the preservation of world peace.

The board of aldermen endorses the call for prayer and protest by the Zionist Organization of America, the Synagogue Council of America, and the Rabbinical Assembly of America, and the proposed closing of establishments of the members of the retail-merchants division of the chamber of commerce for 1 hour from 5 to 6 p. m.

The board of aldermen also urge those friends of Chelsea who believe in a homeland for all peoples, not to trade or attempt to trade in any store during the said hour.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the local Zionist association, the United Nations, the President of the United States, Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE, Jr., and Congressman LANE.

JOSEPH B. GREENFIELD,
ANDREW P. MURPHY,
JOSEPH MARGOLIS,
GEORGE GALLANT,
HARRY COLTUN,
ROBERT H. BROWN,
DAVID NEWMAN,
JOSEPH H. THORNTON,

In board of aldermen April 8, 1948, adopted.

Approved, April 10, 1948.
THOMAS A. KEATING, *Mayor.*

A true copy.
Attest:
JOSEPH A. TYRRELL,
City Clerk.

Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Post on April 14, 1948:

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

A new new state has been born in the world, dedicated to freedom, equality under the law, democracy, and self-government.

It is a solemn occasion, filled with the courage of idealism and dedication to a just cause. Nowhere in the world should the response be as instant, as spontaneous, and as friendly as from the United States of America, born of a similar desperate need, dedicated to the same noble purposes.

Recognition of the new Jewish state of Palestine should be immediate—not alone from the United States but from the United Nations, through the Palestine Commission solemnly instructed by the General Assembly last November 20 to bring forth such a state.

"We are resolved this day," reads the proclamation of the general council of the World Zionist Organization, "that the termination of the mandatory government of the Palestine shall in fact mark the end of all foreign domination in this country. With the termination of this mandatory rule a government of the Jewish state shall come into being.

"In this hour we turn to the Arab citizens of the Jewish state and our Arab neighbors. We offer peace and friendship. We desire to build our state in common with the Arabs as equal citizens. Our freedom is their freedom. Their future and ours rest on common endeavor. Sure in the justice of our cause we are ready to give our all to its achievement."

The recital of the history of the mandate being terminated May 15 without having been brought to fulfillment cannot fail to move the emotions of all who love justice and liberty profoundly.

The despicable capture and detention in British concentration camps of the hundreds of thousands of Jews, men, women, and children, who in their hour of most desperate need have been forcibly prevented from entering the homeland set up under the Balfour Declaration and mandated under the League; and the forcible removal of others who had already entered, is a black record.

The alliance of Great Britain's policy with the Nazi-loving war criminal Husseini, and the shameful allegiance of the United States to this betrayal of the world's sacred trust, should be as beyond endurance of all of us, who as citizens share responsibility for it, as it is intolerable for the Jews who are its victims.

The time for us to erase this shameful support of dishonor is running out.

The United States of America continues to champion the cause of the Mufti—the cause of murder and terror and religious war and intolerance in Jerusalem as well as in all Palestine—against the Jews who have sought only the fulfillment of our solemn obligations.

The administration still apparently believes that the citizens of this country can be aroused to blatant anti-Semitism on the wholly false and already debunked issue that our national security demanded such dishonor.

The United Nations Palestine Commission, still lacking the moral courage to carry out its duties in the face of opposition by the United States and by the Arab League, has yet a short time to recapture its integrity, and with it restore the great moral force for peace with justice that was the United Nations until the great United States deliberately attempted to inflict the mortal blow of a reversal of Palestinian policy.

Not all the oil in Arabia—nor all the dollar profits of a century—can make our present course palatable to a people whose contempt for bribery and disgust with chicanery will finally sweep such base misrepresentatives from office and from any position of trust.

The General Assembly Friday must refuse to dishonor its own integrity. It must refuse to yield to the combined pressure of the United States, Great Britain, and the Arab League to reverse the Palestine decision.

Instead, it must reaffirm the instructions to the Palestine Commission for establishment of a world trusteeship in Jerusalem and a Jewish state and an Arab state in Palestine.

Recognition of the new Jewish state as the first step in that program should be unanimous. Placing of a United Nations guard in Jerusalem to keep peace and order and to stop the warfare embarked upon by guerrilla Arabs must be instituted at once.

The United States both within and without the United Nations must extend all aid to this newest democratic ally of a rule of justice and law.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Daniel A. Poling which appeared in the New York Post on April 14, 1948.

AMERICANS ALL

(By Dr. Daniel A. Poling)

The growing tragedy in Palestine promises nothing of good to the world. Here is a brutal little war—and a shooting war—that should never have been, that need not have been. And those who engage in it are not responsible for it. The daily killings, the ruthless disregard for life, the hunger, starvation, and bitter hate that strike at women and children, too, are the direct responsibility of the great nations.

The evil thing began with a broken vow, when the Balfour agreement was scuttled. It has continued with deceit and subterfuge up to this time. Partition, for which the UN is chiefly responsible, is now just another debacle. Steadily the tide of blood widens and deepens. What will happen if the UN, particularly the United States and Great Britain, do not act more promptly and decisively than they give indication of acting is too terrible to contemplate.

Kenneth L. Dixon, forthright correspondent, has described the joy of Jews and Arabs together when last November they thought the settlement had been made and that a great peace would come. Other forces than those within Palestine are responsible for the beginning of organized killings. Among all the sinister captains of this mounting death, the Grand Mufti is first and foremost. But even he would have failed as miserably in Palestine as he failed when he served with Hitler, had the UN resolutely implemented partition and had the United States not failed the UN.

Arabs and Jews who were friends and who but for power politics still would be friends, are the hapless victims not of their weakness, but of our misused strength. Correspondent Dixon believes, and I believe, and the Jews and Arabs in Palestine believe that while there would be minor disturbances in a period of readjustment, partition itself could be made effective. Outside interference and reversed decisions destroyed that hope. Now we must act to avoid one of the greatest pogroms of history.

America's Honored War Dead—Among the First To Leave, and Among the Last To Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the press of our country almost daily recalls to us in vivid fashion the unlimited sacrifices made in behalf of our country and its people by so many of the finest of our youth who were killed during the late war. Daily accounts of the continuing return of their bodies for reburial on American soil keeps us mindful of the infinite debt we owe them.

Rev. August F. Bender, pastor emeritus of the Second Reformed Church and Protestant chaplain of the Jersey City Police Department, has rendered solemn tribute in verse to the honored war dead, which because of its timeliness as well as innate worth, I am pleased to insert.

AMERICA'S HONORED WAR DEAD—AMONG THE FIRST TO LEAVE, AND AMONG THE LAST TO RETURN

Rest in your "Family-Plot," ye Brave!
May thankful hearts e'er visit your grave!
Your dirge be the moaning wave
'Neath which countless "Freemen" sleep in peace!

O, there was mourning, when ye fell!
'Mongst "Comrades" and "Loved Ones" a solemn knell!
An agony, a sad, tearful farewell,
Which, true to your memory, will never cease!

Rest with your silent solemn fame!
"America" keeps record of your name!
And never can a touch of shame
Darken your buried brow!

Life's parting beams were in your eye!
Life's closing accents on your tongue!
When 'round you, pealing to the sky,
The shout of "Victory" rung!

Then, 'ere your gallant spirit fled
A smile so bright illumed your face
O, never of the light it shed,
Shall memory lose a trace!

Your's was a death, whose rapture high,
Transcended all that life could yield!
Your warmest prayer was so to die!
So, "Old Glory" gallantly to shield!

And they may feel, who loved you most,
Just pride, holy and most pure!
Death Has No Power O'er Those Who Boast
Their Treasure With God Secure!

Essay by Tom McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact that Mr. Tom McCormick, of 20 Ross Avenue, St. Bernard, of the Second Congressional District of Ohio, was one of the prize winners in the 1948 essay contest conducted by the Department of Ohio, the American Legion, for the pupils of the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades of the Ohio schools. He wrote a very fine essay on How Can the United Nations Become More Effective, which I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point:

HOW CAN THE UNITED NATIONS BE MADE MORE EFFECTIVE?

(By Tom McCormick)

The United Nations is a very young organization. Born at San Francisco in April 1945, it should be like a new spring leaf in its energy and latent power. Sadly, enough, it can better be likened, in its shambling inefficiency, to a bit of dead, autumn foliage.

No organization ever started its career with higher aspirations. The United Nations Charter glibly outlines its lofty three-fold purpose to maintain international peace and security, to protect and expand human freedom, to promote human welfare. These are fine goals, everyone agrees, but one is forced to judge an organization not so much by its theories and ideals as by its accomplishments. By the latter criterion, the UN is a dismal failure. Civil strife rages throughout the world. Wars, revolutions, massacres, political upheavals, shatter countries of the Far East, Greece, Poland, Latin America, and others. Everywhere scientists and bacteriologists work and dream of horrible weapons for use in a possible world war III. And what has the UN done—what is it doing—about it? Nothing, absolutely nothing.

The trouble seems to be more that the UN is not able to function to save the world than that it does not wish to. Its kindly offices are blocked by mechanical faults, by its construction. Its powers are partitioned into two separate divisions—the Security Council (concerning itself with problems of peace and security), and the General Assembly (charged with problems of human rights and welfare). Let us look more closely at the former, for it is there that the deadlock, leading to the present frustration, lies. The Security Council consists of five permanent members—the United States, Great Britain, France, China, and Soviet Russia—and six alternating members, selected by rotation from among the smaller nations by the Assembly. If any one of the Big Five votes "No" to any proposed plan or measure, that plan or measure is promptly killed, vetoed. There have been during the short history of the UN, 24 such vetoes, 22 by action of Russia alone.

There are two possible ways of remedying this glaring fault—both simple and practical, and both involving amending the Charter to improve the justice and equality of the Security Council. One suggested change might make a two-thirds majority vote (including three of the Big Five) sufficient to institute a measure. This would preserve the rights and responsibilities of the victor nations, while preventing "dog in the manger" tactics. The other suggested change might preserve the absolute veto of the permanent powers, but limit its application to matters of war or economic boycott.

Timorous souls shudder and say, "But either of those changes would cause the Soviets to withdraw from the United Nations." What then? Russia's consistent vetoing policy has been the rope strangling all honest efforts toward peace and prosperity. Let them go. Universal democracy would be lined up against them, and their true natures revealed to their own duped peoples. The world would profit more from releasing a stiff-necked communistic heckler than by trying to placate it. Moreover, with Russia's mounting debts, internal disorganization, and industrial dependency upon the western democracies, that Government would be forced to cooperate or to dissolve in bankruptcy.

So let the United Nations fearlessly and courageously amend its Charter to speed immediate constructive legislation in behalf of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. The United Nations is the world's only hope. It must be made to work.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by H. B. Martin, State conservationist, United States Soil Conservation Service, at a meeting of the Red River Valley Improvement Association, Shreveport, La., April 6 and 7, 1948:

In recent years a step of great significance has been taken in the effort of our Nation to solve the problem of the orderly disposal of surplus rainfall. The Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers are engaged in a common assault upon the problem. The attack is under way. We no longer are theorizing in this program; we no longer are forced to prove principles; we are now carrying out joint campaigns in the interest of flood control. One of these campaigns, of course, has for its operation plan the use of downstream fortifications, such as levees and revetments, supported by reservoirs, to reduce the destructiveness of floodwaters on streams. The other of these campaigns makes use of means of slowing down the water as it moves off the land, but it also take into account the absorptive qualities of the soil and the benefits that may be derived, not alone from reducing erosion and flood damage but in the more profitable use of water for agricultural production.

A man who begins a study of the upstream phase of the flood-control problem is apt to wonder that we have waited so long to recognize the opportunity for soil protection, better use of water, and for lessening flood damage all at the same time. We have, indeed, been derelict. In our Nation's history a few voices have been raised from time to time against wasteful land practices. Even in the Revolution days some of the leaders cried out against the farming methods which permitted gullies to eat their way across cropland. But there was little interest even up into our own generation simply because there was so much land for agricultural production that people could not be bothered with a problem that seemed so far ahead.

Finally, however, the dust storms of the 1930's and the increasing intensity of floods in those years excited the concern of some of the Members of Congress. The Soil Erosion Service was the result. However, it was not long until it was learned that the problem of protecting our agricultural land was a far bigger one than anyone had imagined and that millions of acres already had been destroyed by improper farming methods.

So the Soil Erosion Service became the Soil Conservation Service with expanded responsibilities.

A statement of the purpose of the Soil Conservation Service was contained in a recent document issued by the Department of Agriculture.

"The Soil Conservation Service," this statement said, "is responsible for the development and the prosecution of a national program to bring about physical adjustments in land use that will further human welfare, conserve natural resources, establish a permanent and balanced agriculture and reduce the hazards of floods and siltation."

The statement goes on to say that primarily the service furnishes technical assistance to farmers and ranchers in soil-conservation districts, and a little later it adds this: "The soil- and water-conserving practices and land-use measures are determined by acre-by-acre surveys to learn the land's capabilities and its needs according to topography, soil types, degree of erosion, vegetation, rainfall, and other factors affecting conservation, irrigation, and drainage activities."

These statements define the aim and fix the goal of the Soil Conservation Service.

This country has destroyed its soil resources at a faster rate than any country in the world. Many people now realize this shameful waste must be stopped if we are to remain a strong, free country.

A few years ago the Farmer-Stockman magazine published photographs of a gullied field and a deserted house and offered a prize for the best 100-word story describing the pictures. More than 600 replies were received. An Indian won the prize. His letter is good enough to repeat here. He wrote:

"Both pictures show white man crazy. Make big tepee. Plow hill. Water wash; wind blow soil. Grass gone, door gone, window gone; whole place gone to hell. Buck gone, squaw too. Papoose gone. No chuckaway, no pig, no corn, no cow, no hay, no pony.

"Indian no plow land. Keep grass. Buffalo eat. Indian eat buffalo. Hide make tepee, make moccasin. Indian no make terrace, no build dam, no give damn. All time eat. No hunt job, no hitchhike, no ask relief. No shoot pig. Great Spirit make grass. Indian no waste anything. Indian no work. White man heap loco."

It is sadly true that the white man has been heap loco. When white man came to this continent there were probably something over 550,000,000 to 600,000,000 acres of good tillable land. Our surveys show that we have remaining only about 460,000,000 acres of first-class cropland and that all but about 100,000,000 acres of this land is subject to erosion.

We know that, in spite of our efforts to halt erosion and to correct our abuse of land, we still are losing topsoil at a rapid rate. At the same time we are gaining in population. Within a number of years, as these trends continue, we will reach a point at which we have just enough cropland and rangeland and woodland to maintain our population. When that time comes we will no longer be approaching a crisis. We shall have arrived.

Our first job then is to act quickly to halt this rapid rate of erosion which is taking 500,000 acres of good soil from use each year. We are late of course in getting started, but not too late. We know now through the work we already have done that we can accomplish such a task, tremendous though it may be.

But how long will this job take? We have the answer, we believe. One-fourth of the

land which we say is still suitable for cultivation is in what we term critical condition. Another one-fourth is in serious condition. Based on experience that we have had, we believe that the lands in critical condition must be treated in from 5 to 15 years if they are not to be permanently damaged. The lands in serious condition should be treated within from 15 to 20 years. Other lands, which are deteriorating more slowly, can wait longer periods for treatment.

We hear discussion from time to time of a new land policy. I think we can rest assured that, regardless of other demands upon our attention, one of the most important tasks for our lawmakers is the development of a policy which will permanently provide for the conservation of our land as the foundation of our agriculture and, as such, a bulwark of our national security.

Let me quote from a report by Dr. H. H. Bennett, of the Soil Conservation Service, to the cotton subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture:

"The net objective of any land-conservation policy, of course, should be the permanent protection and sound development, as needed, of the Nation's remaining areas of productive land—along with the companion resource of water—in order to assure our ability to produce indefinitely at least a nutritionally adequate diet for all of our people and, additionally, to produce from year to year as large a volume of food and other agricultural products, such as timber, fiber, oil, tobacco, and wood, as may be in demand by consumers, industry, or for export. Protection and efficient management of our forests should also be an important objective."

I feel that I can discuss the over-all conservation problem at this time because the principles of sound land use are inseparable from some of the problems which are connected with the control of water flow in streams.

We know that the soil is, next to the oceans, the earth's greatest reservoir for water. We have learned, too, that neglect of soil can make it useless as a blotter for rainfall, as well as render it useless for the production of crops. We have learned that soil can be managed so that it will perform a continuing service to mankind and that this right use will enable soil to absorb moisture and to hold it for plant growth.

In watershed treatment in aid of flood control, would go a little further than we normally would for soil conservation. Emphasis is placed on retarding run-off beyond the requirements of soil conservation.

In soil conservation the farmer first applies the measures needed to tie his land down permanently and to halt erosion, then uses the land in such a way that it can yield its best on a continuing basis and become increasingly productive as seasons pass.

The measures which help to halt erosion include contour cultivation, the use of soil-improving and soil-protecting vegetation, crop rotations, terrace systems, diversion terraces, reforestation and woodland management, the sodding and seeding of pasture land, and protection from overgrazing and burning. There are other measures which can be added to retard run-off, but which are not commonly used in soil conservation. These measures include gully-control structures, small detention reservoirs, diversions, sediment traps, revegetation of critical flood and sediment source areas, retention dikes on pasture land, and Federal purchase and treatment of land which cannot be treated in private ownership.

The last-named measures constitute the connecting link between soil conservation and the downstream program of flood control.

Since the farmer does not need the special measures in an on-the-farm program, the greater share of the benefits from a soil-conservation flood-control program of course accrues to the public. It is only proper, therefore, that the public bear a proportionate share of the cost. The farmer bears about three-fourths of the cost of applying needed soil-conservation measures on his land, most of this being represented in labor, equipment, purchase of seed, fertilizer, and so on. In a soil-conservation flood-control program the public bears a larger share of the cost burden, and because of the damages that delay would involve, the work is carried out in a much shorter time.

A raindrop, of course, is a minor natural phenomenon. It falls with a certain velocity, and when it strikes it explodes with a tiny, shattering effect. Under a long succession of these minute blows, unprotected soil churns into a muddy soup with soil particles in suspension. More drops fall and run-off begins.

Dr. H. H. Bennett, the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, some years ago used this illustration. When a pitcher of water, he said, is spilled on the surface of a tilted wooden table, the water rushes off immediately and forms a puddle on the floor. But if the hard wooden table is covered with a blotter and then a heavy Turkish towel, most of the water is absorbed; the excess is impeded and spread in its downward flow by the nap of the towel.

This principle applies to the land. When the land is bare, the raindrops falling on it rush off to the nearest stream or river, just as the water rushes off the tilted table onto the floor. When the land is covered with rich absorptive topsoil, made porous by the hidden conduits of burrowing earthworms, insects, and the roots of plants, as well as the natural granularity of such soil, you have a blotter for rain. And vegetation, like the nap of the towel, forms countlesss tiny impediments to the downhill flow of any excess rain water which the soil is unable to absorb. Vegetation and vegetative litter, functioning as a screen, serve to keep open the multitude of passageways into the soil by preventing their clogging with eroded material carried in suspension. This applies to forested areas and grassland areas alike.

The flood-control program of the Department of Agriculture was authorized by Congress in 1936 by Public Law 738. The purpose of this law was to coordinate the flood-control activities of the Agriculture and War Departments. Its passage was recognition of the effects of water conservation, run-off retardation and erosion-prevention measures as a part of any program to control floodwaters.

This law specifically provided that Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department.

It stipulated that Federal investigations of watersheds and measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture.

Subsequently the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture for making examinations and surveys of watersheds was extended to include the watersheds of all streams and waterways which the War Department had been authorized to investigate.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the Department of Agriculture to carry out "works of improvement for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention" in 11 watersheds in the United States. These watersheds included the Washita River in Oklahoma and Texas and the Trinity and Middle Colorado Rivers of Texas.

To the Soil Conservation Service went the responsibility for investigations in watersheds which are principally agricultural land. The Forest Service was assigned responsibility for investigations on land primarily in forests, and the two services were to coordinate activities on watersheds having substantial areas of both forest and agricultural land.

The steps in conducting a watershed program are these briefly:

1. The people must ask for a preliminary examination, making their wishes known to their representatives in Congress. A preliminary examination must be authorized by Congress. It is to show whether works of improvement for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in the interest of flood control appear sufficiently feasible to warrant further investigation.

2. A flood-control survey then may be undertaken if the findings in the preliminary investigation warrant it.

3. A flood-control survey to determine the feasibility of a program to be conducted by the Department of Agriculture on a specific watershed.

4. The report of this survey goes to Congress for consideration.

5. Congress, then can adopt the report and authorize the recommended flood-control program.

6. Congress next must appropriate funds for operations, allocating the funds.

Operations are carried out on watersheds in accordance with work plans that have been developed. These plans are prepared in cooperation with soil-conservation districts, but they follow the pattern of the survey report.

Assistance by the Soil Conservation Service in the form of materials, supplies, equipment, and help by technically trained personnel is made available in line with the recommendations of the survey report and with the needs as shown by the work plans.

Practices and works in aid of flood-control are worked out simultaneously with plans for regular district operations.

I think it may be interesting to review briefly what happened in the course of getting a soil-conservation program in the interest of flood control under way in the Washita River watershed in Oklahoma. The Washita empties into the Red River so it seems an appropriate example.

The people residing in the Washita watershed had become increasingly alarmed over the growing intensity of floods on the Washita. There had been floods in the early days of settlement, but they were not as severe as the later ones. A flood in 1934 resulted in the death of a number of citizens and in much damage to agriculture and to property. The citizens of the watershed appealed through their representatives in Congress for help.

Section 6 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, voted by the Seventy-fourth Congress, said this: "The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause to be made preliminary examination and surveys for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the watershed of the Washita River, Okla. and Texas."

In 1938 a preliminary examination of the watershed was undertaken by representatives of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics working with the Soil Conservation Service. Field work was completed in September 1939, and preparation of the report was finished 11 months later.

This report showed the need of flood control on the Washita. It went into the history of the watershed and its people, soil types, climate and rainfall, the effect of changing economic conditions. For example, it was found that rainfall in the watershed ranged from 38 inches annually at the mouth to about 22 inches at the upper end of the stream. It was found that in the Red River floods of 1908, 1927, and 1930 the Washita contributed 29, 38, and 42 percent, respectively, in volume. The Washita's annual contribution in water to the Red River was shown to be about 1,120,000 acre-feet.

It was also found that erosion in the watershed was greatly increased when World War I made cotton a crop much in demand, that the soil lost between 1918 and 1938 ranged from 114 acre-feet per square mile in Texas to 259 acre-feet per square mile in western Oklahoma. It was estimated that the losses of farmers due to declining yields amounted to $4,006,900 annually since 1918.

The cost of a remedial program was estimated by the report at $10,577,225, of which 21.9 would be borne by flood-control funds of the Department of Agriculture.

A detailed survey was authorized on the Washita. The Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics again cooperated.

This survey showed that the cost of applying flood-control measures would be a good investment that every dollar invested would return $3.85. Benefits to farmers and ranchers were estimated at $5,000,000 annually. Reduction in flood damages was estimated at $357,000 and reduction in lake and reservoir sedimentation would represent a dollar value of about $48,000 a year.

The survey showed, too, that application of flood-control measures in the Upper Washita should mean the production of 34 percent more grain sorghum, 29 percent more corn, 21 percent more cotton, and 18 percent more forage from grassland.

In the Cross Timbers portion of the watershed the survey report indicated that the application of these measures should produce 24 percent more cotton, 22 percent more grain sorghum, 40 percent more corn, and make forage on pastures 39 percent higher.

The report recommended the future purchase and rehabilitation of 328,000 acres of critically eroded land which ought to have intensive care, reseeding, and prudent management.

There were many phases to this investigation, but the above references suggest the thoroughness and the scope of the studies.

The Department of Agriculture in 1942 proposed a comprehensive soil-conservation program in the interest of flood control on the Washita, and Congress authorized the program, with 10 others, in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

This program is now being carried on. The entire watershed is in soil-conservation districts. These districts are organized by the landowners after a majority of them have expressed a desire for it through the ballot box. The landowners elect a board of five of their number usually to manage the affairs of the district.

Since many of you are familiar with the purpose and the organization of these soil-conservation districts, I shall say only that they are at once as democratic and as effective a means of carrying out a program of this kind as mankind has been able to devise. Every effort has been made to safeguard the democratic structure of the district set-up. At the same time, such an organization places the responsibility for an agricultural program where it definitely belongs, on the shoulders of the landowners and operators. They are doing a good job. They are approaching their task with energy and understanding. They are finding an eager spirit of cooperation among the owners and operators of agricultural land wherever they exist.

They do as much of their job of soil conservation as they can—and they can do a lot of it through farmer cooperation. They ask the Soil Conservation Service and other Federal, State and local sources to help with that part of the job that they themselves are unable to do.

I believe that this last thought suggests the reason for the lasting effectiveness and value of these districts. They can use the assistance of not just a single agency, but of all agencies, organizations, and individuals who can give help. Without such a means of concentrating effort, there could be little worth-while participation by many organizations and individuals who are in a position to do much.

In a watershed program, these districts function just as they do in any other area. Much of the program involves revegetation, the use of plant cover to protect the surface of the soil and keep it from washing away with every rain. The district supervisors are doing a most effective job in obtaining seed and in encouraging the production of seed, in getting fertilizer, in providing equipment and, above all, in obtaining a high degree of landowner and operator as well as public cooperation.

Estimates of probable benefits from soil- and water-conservation practices in the interest of flood control were based on an expected participation of a little more than half the farmers and ranchers of a district. Actual experience is showing that in such watersheds as the Washita this participation is already as high as 90 percent in many districts. The credit for that kind of cooperation can go to no one but the district boards themselves.

I have said that the soil-conservation districts are in a position to use the aid of any agency, organization, or individual who can help in their program. The interest of these outside groups in helping with the program is spreading rapidly. Bankers and insurance men have been among the first to realize the benefits from assisting these districts in their soil-conservation activities. They could readily see the relation of well-managed land to their business future. Utilities, railroads, equipment companies, and other concerns dealing in services or goods that farm people use have joined in eagerly.

Special-purpose associations, civic organizations, including chambers of commerce, luncheon, and garden clubs, are increasing their activities in this program daily.

Newspapers, magazines, and radio stations are contributing effective help, some of them supplying incentives in the form of contests in which the district boards have a major part.

Educators, churchmen, and professional men and women are adding their help in the program.

It is a program which is closely geared to the welfare of individual, community and of the Nation. It is a program in which everyone ought to be interested and which everyone can help to accomplish.

For Justice and Peace in the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land, at a recent meeting, formulated a program of action applicable to the critical situation that now exists in Palestine. As part of my remarks, I include the statement at this point:

FOR JUSTICE AND PEACE IN THE HOLY LAND

We call on all Americans to support the plans of their Government for a truce in Palestine, reconsideration of the Palestine question by the General Assembly, reconciliation of the warring peoples to secure a stable and just government for Palestine.

We call on the United States Government to present its proposal for a temporary trusteeship for Palestine as a step toward a democratic state that will retain the unity of the Holy Land.

These plans will promote peace because they hold out the only hope of stopping the spread of war; because they offer the promise of safeguarding the holy places sacred to Jew, Moslem, and Christian.

These plans will strengthen the United Nations because they face the fact that partition has been shown to be unworkable, and an attempt to enforce an unworkable plan would injure the United Nations. Because, while the partition recommendation of the General Assembly had no legal binding force but was, and could be, only a recommendation, these plans will have a sound legal basis in the Charter, under the trusteeship provisions.

These plans will promote the welfare of the peoples of all faiths in the Near East because they work toward reconciliation instead of war; because they will save from danger not only the Jews of Palestine and their great achievements, but also the 800,000 Jews in other near eastern states; because they will enable the Near East to continue its economic and social development, now jeopardized by conflicts over Palestine.

These plans will promote the interests of the United States of America because they will further friendly relations between Americans and the peoples of the Near East; because they will help preserve access to the economic and strategic resources of this important area.

We further appeal for immediate action by the United States Congress to admit to the United States substantial numbers of displaced persons of all faiths as proof of our national sincerity in regard to this problem, thereby making more likely the peaceful solution of the Palestine problem.

Finally, we appeal to Americans of all faiths to express themselves on these subjects, not out of sectarian or foreign national interests, but solely and entirely out of their concern for what is best for the United States, for the United Nations, and for world recovery and world peace.

COMMITTEE FOR JUSTICE AND PEACE IN THE HOLY LAND.

APRIL 9, 1948.

Democracy in Jewish Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article which has come to my attention, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram newspaper on March 19, 1948. This article was written by Mr. Roger Stuart, a staff writer for the Scripps-Howard papers, during his recent trip to Europe and Palestine. The title of the article is "Pioneer Communities Put Emphasis on Teamwork, Preserve Democracy," and I believe it is especially fitting that the Members of the House have this opportunity to read a first-hand account of the high standards of democracy which these Hebrew pioneers of Palestine are preserving in the Middle East.

EYES TOWARD PALESTINE—PIONEER COMMUNITIES PUT EMPHASIS ON TEAMWORK, PRESERVE DEMOCRACY

(By Roger Stuart)

(For years they dream of reaching Palestine, and when the DP's finally reach the promised land their aim is to make it thrive.

Roger Stuart, World-Telegram staff writer, describes today in the fifth of his series one of their constructive organizations, the communal—not Communist—farm settlement.)

HAIFA, March 19.—Palestine is a paradox, where the ancient and the modern rub shoulders in a land which is not at war, much less at peace. And the road from Tel Aviv to Haifa, 40 miles long, winds through as conglomerate a countryside as you'll find anywhere in this historic Mediterranean area.

Here the latest type silk mills and canning plants adjoin small, one-family farms and cooperatives. In another moment you are riding through wild desert land, which looks as though it never will be worth a cent—but will be cultivated one day, nevertheless.

Then you come to a neat little village of Jewish inhabitants, with its white-walled houses of concrete and its flowered-bordered lawns. The town lies wholly at the left of the macadam highway. Directly opposite is an Arab village, much more primitive, with bare-footed women and children crouching in the doorways of mud-built huts and donkeys standing idly in the sun.

And scarcely half a mile beyond, lying in the purple shadows of the Samarian hills, is a kibutz, which means a communal Jewish settlement—where nobody has a dime to his name and doesn't want one.

Kibutzim (the plural form) today support more than a tenth of the Jewish population of the Holy Land. Another 10 percent also are farmers, but do not live in communal settlements.

PRACTICAL IDEALISTS

The kibutzim are a blend of idealism and practicality. Their members, nearly all of whom conceived the idea of dwelling together in self-sufficient economic groups when they were stateless Jews in Europe, seem to have two driving ambitions.

The first is to rear their children in the finest surroundings possible, and the second is to wrest from the stubborn Palestinian soil a living which shall be alike for all.

By no means are they Communists—in the sense that the world knows communism. They are fiercely democratic. They elect their own leaders by popular vote, but at the same time maintain the elector-consciousness of a New England town. Meetings of the full membership often are necessary to guide the Kibutz Council in its governmental functions.

Halfway between Tel Aviv and Haifa, I visited a typical 500-acre establishment operated by a kibutz organized 15 years ago. Its 350 members, mostly emigrants from Poland, Russia, Hungary, and Rumania, never have had financial assistance from the Palestinian Government.

They started on their own, borrowed money from the Jewish National Fund and private banks to pay for their land and equipment, and have paid back three-fourths of it.

Today this kibutz is a million-dollar concern. It raises oranges and vegetables, breeds cattle, sheep, turkeys and poultry, and, in addition, runs its own citrus-juice canning factory.

Last year, it showed a net profit of $5,000, after providing a living for all its members, their 300 children, an additional 60 orphan children, whom it voluntarily took under its wing, and 90 persons too old to work.

MILKING MACHINES

The kibutz now possesses modern farm machinery and is one of the first groups of its kind in the Holy Land to fit out its dairy with milking machines.

And on a knoll behind a well-trimmed orange grove, I found an excellent swimming pool, too. Water for irrigation is difficult to obtain, however, so the Jewish pioneers had to take steps to see that none was wasted. They handled this simply by diverting some of the irrigation water to the swimming pool, then, collecting it again, running it back through pipes to the fields.

"For 15 years," explained Mr. Miriam Ben Arhoin, "we struggled here to build a thriving community. We think we've done a good job. Our homes aren't as big and as well-furnished as we hope to make them. But we have self-respect, and we know the enjoyment that comes from doing something worth while for ourselves and our country."

One thing stands out among the kibutzim which indicates a Spartan side to these Jewish pioneers. Their children do not live with them. That is, no child sleeps in the home of his parents.

DENIES BLOW AT FAMILY

Soon after birth, every infant is placed in a special board school, set apart from the adults' homes, where it is cared for and educated until it is 18. It sees its parents only after school hours and on the Sabbath.

I asked Itzak Kabahn, one of the kibutz's rugged cofounders, if this kind of training wouldn't tend to destroy the family as an institution. His reply was an emphatic, "No."

He added: "Actually, there is a close bond between the children and their parents, and I imagine that we Palestinians manage to spend as much time with our youngsters as you busy Americans do with yours."

Moreover, though the parents still find it necessary to deny themselves anything remotely resembling luxuries, the children are given the best of everything, short of being pampered. Their sleeping quarters are attractively decorated, their dining rooms are in the best taste, their shower baths have the best plumbing available.

"We want them to know what it is to grow up in good surroundings," explained Mr. Kabahn. "Some day we'll have attractive homes, too. But the children must come first, for it is the children in whose hands lies the future."

None of the kibutz members earn wages. All eat in a central mess hall and draw their clothes from a department established for that purpose. If ever a member decides he wants to resign and fend for himself, he may do so. The kibutz will grant him a small going-away sum, which amounts practically to nothing.

Children who show exceptional talent are sent to college and professional institutions after completing their course in the kibutz school. And when they reach 18 they decide for themselves whether to become members of the kibutz or go away.

Our Air Force Should Be Second to None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as I will be absent from Washington on official business for the Foreign Affairs Committee, I want to take this means to indicate that I am wholeheartedly in favor of a 70-group air program. This, with additional emphasis on scientific research, is, I think, the greatest need in our armed-services program of today. We have lagged behind in the upkeep of our Air Forces since the end of the war. This we can no longer afford to do, because the security of our country is, as I see it, secured to the maintenance of an Air Force capable of being kept at full strength and able to go to any part of the world where our security demands. It is my hope that the Congress will approve a 70-group air force now, and I am, indeed, happy that the House is giving this immediate consideration. Our Air Force should be second to none.

Nobody Has Told the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement published in the Jackson Herald, Ripley, W. Va., by the editor, Mr. Sattis Simmons.

I commend it to you because it gives us, from a reliable source, some understanding of what the folks back home are thinking. If you think for one moment they are not carefully weighing such questions as the Marshall plan, conscription, and communism in this Government, you are badly mistaken.

The statement follows:

DO YOU KNOW?

To most folks it appears plain that the war scare in Washington has more politics in it than anything else, designed no doubt to dupe the people into thinking about the possibility of war while the European aid bill, the military-training bill which the military wants is rammed through Congress, and a few other things, including possibly some controls. There is a surprising number of folks who, however, seem to feel that the war scare is real and if the dupes in the legislative and executive branch of our Government would just wake up they would find that instead of accomplishing their own ends they are making Henry Wallace and his third party thousands of votes each day because a surprising number of people feel that Wallace is the only person who is fighting for peace. We believe the one idea was to build up the idea that we were on the verge of war with Russia in order to "kill off Wallace," and if that is true it is having the opposite effect, and that fact will trickle down to Washington some of these days before long.

If there is reality in all this war scare it is time we were finding out what, and when it all started. There is a possibility that we may know before long, and it looks like that it is time to inquire into some things the American people have never known anything about, and if their sons are to give their blood there are some things they would like to know about now.

A resolution introduced by 32 Republican Senators on March 19 should result in revealing the nature of the mysterious commitments made at Teheran, Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam which, it is now evident, are the basis of the present international crisis.

Yet President Truman is the only one who can divulge the secrets of those historic conferences. In his special message to Congress on March 17, he issued a call to arms because of a war threat without stating what that threat is.

Going no further than to say that one nation has persistently ignored and violated agreements which could have furnished a basis for a just peace, he made commitments binding on the lives of all Americans. On this indictment he has asked Congress to take steps. On these secrets he wants Congress to set the stage for a possible third world war.

In behalf of the people who are involved in this crisis, the Senators have asked Mr. Truman to tell Americans just how far they have been committed as a Nation. Joining in sponsorship of the resolution, one of the 32 Senators recalled the American watchword: United we stand, divided we fall.

"If we are united in our foreign policy," he said, "we will stand." But how could we know whether we are united when our foreign policy is in the hands of one man?

The resolution asks the President to state the specific violations which he believes have brought us to the the brink of war. It asks that Congress and the people be told just what agreements were made at these mysterious conferences which the Administration has designated as the foreign policy for 145,000,000 Americans.

Further questions will be asked—all of them vitally important:

Was the domination of Poland by Russia agreed to in the conference, or is it a violation?

Is Yugoslavia's alliance with Russia a double-cross, or is that part of our secretly fixed foreign policy?

What of Czechoslovakia—agreed to, or a violation?

Who's the violator in Greece?

How far, by agreement, was Russia to go in Italy?

What of Finland—agreement or violation?

These are the issues, we are told, which threaten America with war. These are the issues, we are told, which is prompting us to pour the wealth of this country into the nations of Europe which are both morally and politically bankrupt. These are the issues, we are told, which the military of this country says makes it necessary that we get ready to send boys to bleed and die again. The people want to know, "For what?" What kind of commitments were made by Roosevelt at Teheran, Yalta, and other points and by Truman at Potsdam? Nobody has ever told the American people. It is time somebody found out.

Palestine Situation Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on April 14. It correctly appraises the acute situation now existing in the Holy Land.

NEARING AN EXPLOSION

Although it comes as no surprise, the World Zionist Council's proclamation of an independent Jewish state serves to emphasize that the problem of Palestine is moving swiftly toward the exploding point. The British are scheduled to give up their mandate on May 15. On the next day, according to the proclamation, the Jews will consider themselves masters of a country of their own, and they will defend it against all comers, irrespective of anything the United Nations General Assembly may have to say about the matter.

The Assembly—which is to meet later this week to consider how best to bring peace to the Holy Land—thus faces its most critical and pressing challenge to date. Neither the Arabs nor the Jews have shown any real disposition to agree to the truce proposed by the United States and unanimously endorsed by the Security Council. Nor have either of them responded favorably to the American plan for a temporary UN trusteeship—a trusteeship that would serve to maintain law and order until a mutually satisfactory solution could be worked out. The Zionists are particularly emphatic on this point; they insist on partition, on a separate state of their own, and their proclamation warns that they are prepared to fight to the death for it.

This position—which incidentally is opposed by a percentage of Jews both in the Holy Land and elsewhere—raises a unique question of great legal importance. As constituted today, Palestine is an international mandate in which no people is sovereign. What if the UN now votes to set up its own temporary trusteeship there to replace the withdrawing British authority? What if the Arabs reluctantly agree to this, while the Zionists resist it and hold fast to their unilaterally proclaimed state? Will the latter then be committing an act of aggression against territory legally under the control of the United Nations? If so, how will the Security Council deal with it? And where will the Zionist leadership be able to look for help?

These questions, wholly apart from offering food for thought to those Jews who demand their own state by May 16, help to illustrate the complexity of the problem to be taken up by the General Assembly on Friday. Yet, with the British due to surrender their mandate within a month, a solution of some sort must be found quickly if warfare of the gravest kind is to be averted. Unfortunately, however, the outlook for an effective truce is dim in the extreme. The Arabs, both within and outside Palestine, are as unyielding as ever, and Zionists, with their new "declaration of independence," seem increasingly militant. Meanwhile, as the gulf between the two deepens and widens, the date for Britain's withdrawal comes nearer and nearer, and the United Nations has yet to organize a force to fill the prospective vacuum of authority.

This obviously is a situation ripe for an explosion that can rock the Middle East and the peace of the world. The tragedy is that, although everybody recognizes the danger, nobody seems to know what to do about it. The only hope is that the Arabs and Jews will arrive at some eleventh-hour understanding that will enable the United Nations to hammer out a sane and peaceful solution. Short of that, the worst must be expected.

Postal Employees Are Entitled to a Permanent Pay Increase of $800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the postal employees of the Nation are entitled to a permanent pay increase of $800. No other group of Government employees have given more loyal service and have been so long neglected.

Long before we had under consideration the billions of aid for Europe the question of an increase in pay for postal employees was before us.

I fully realize that there are many pressing problems demanding the attention of Congress all of which will cost many millions of dollars, but in my opinion there is none more deserving nor none that has earned our attention and speedy action more than an adequate and permanent pay increase for our loyal and hard-working postal employees.

You have all received the same kind of appealing letters from postal employees in your districts, telling you of the difficulty many of them are having to meet the present cost of living to raise and educate their children, to pay their rent or interest on their mortgages. These appeals are from home gentlemen from your own constitutents not from foreign shores.

It is unfortunate the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee did not respond to the appeals to report out a bill for an $800 permanent increase. I cannot understand how they can calculate on a temporary raise in pay for 1 year. Do they know that prices will be lower next year than they are now? And if they do, how have they found that out?

I trust that when the bill for a $585 increase comes to the House that we shall have an opportunity to amend it to $800 on a permanent basis, or at least make the $585 a permanent increase, if it has to be that amount.

Missoula, Mont., Shows the Way: Sets Up Labor-Management Board To Settle Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the business and labor elements of my home town of Missoula, Mont., have established a 15-man board to conciliate and mediate labor-management disputes in that city. The setting-up of this board is a credit to both labor and management and indicates a foresight which might well be copied by other cities in the Nation. I am certain that it will do its part to alleviate industrial unrest and to continue the fine relations now in existence between labor and management in Missoula.

I know practically every member of this 15-man board and have the greatest confidence in their individual judgment. Many of them are close personal friends of mine and I know that, as they say, the board will, at all times, apply the principles of common sense to the problems brought to them for their consideration. To all the members of the board I extend my best wishes for their success and I want to compliment them for the initiative they have shown.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting an article on the labor-management board which appeared in the Sunday Missoulian, of Missoula, Mont., under date of April 11, 1948:

LABOR-MANAGEMENT SET UP MISSOULA BOARD FOR MEDIATION

Establishment of a 15-man Missoula labor-management board to conciliate and mediate

such disputes as may be brought before it was announced Saturday night.

Seven members, representing labor, are from the membership of the executive committees of the Missoula County Trades and Labor council. Another seven, representing management, were designated by President S. F. Newmack of the chamber of commerce, after what was termed much consultation with the members of his board of directors and other businessmen of the city.

The board is headed by Dr. James A. McCain, president of Montana State University, who was selected by unanimous vote of the other 14 to serve as a nonpartisan, nonvoting chairman. Spokesmen for the committee said Dr. McCain was selected by secret vote, with all representatives of labor and management voting for him on the only ballot cast.

The board, in announcing its formation, said in a statement:

"It shall be the function of this organization to inquire into, discuss, and offer its services toward the solution of such problems as:

"1. May threaten the industrial and commercial life of the community of Missoula.

"2. May, through their wide public interest, be entitled to the intelligent cooperation and the full understanding of both labor and management.

"To these ends this board offers its facilities to the public, to management, and to labor for the conciliation and mediation of such disputes as may be brought before it. The board at all times will apply the principles of common sense to all problems."

The labor members of the board are James S. Umber, president of the trades and labor council; Mrs. Reva Walterskirchen, council vice president; Sherman Brock, council secretary-treasurer; Ed Cozad, Frank L. Matthews, Ray Nash, and James Parmelee.

Management members are Oakley E. Coffee, L. A. Colby, H. R. Dix, of Bonner, John E. Hightower, Otis J. Mudd, W. L. Murphy, and William Steinbrenner, Sr.

Mr. Brock and Mr. Coffee are subchairmen of the board, and with Dr. McCain constitute its executive committee. It was explained that, in the absence of Dr. McCain, the subchairmen are to alternate in presiding at meetings.

Announcement of the board culminated several weeks of discussion initiated by officials of the trades and labor council. They said boards such as this are in operation in many cities, and that they asked the chamber of commerce to join with them in establishing one in Missoula.

In perfecting its mechanism it was said that the board had the advice of an out-of-the-city consultant who had had more than 10 years of experience in the kind of work with which the Missoula group is expected to deal.

Revamping the UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Revamping the UN" which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union, Wednesday, April 14, 1948:

REVAMPING THE UN

The present organization of the United Nations has proved unworkable and calls for revision. There is no good of trying to disguise this fact longer or of delaying steps for its correction. The UN has been slugged into senselessness by Russia's abuse of the veto power, and unless some modifications are made in the UN Charter, the organization will die like the old League of Nations.

In making these modifications, Russia's obstruction must not be allowed to block action. Russia wants to keep the UN impotent as a potential hindrance to her plans of Communist expansion. If Russia will not cooperate in reasonable changes to make the UN potent, there is no other course but to revamp the organization without her.

Russia has split the world into two rival camps. This division lies at the base of the world's troubles today. That fact must be accepted, and the sooner the rest of the world adjusts itself to it the better it will be.

There has been a lot of hedging and hesitation in the vain hope that the Russians will change their tactics and become more cooperative. It is time that this attitude was abandoned. The Russians will change to nothing that is not in harmony with their purpose of Communist world domination.

With or without Russian cooperation, therefore, it has become imperative that the UN should be built into a real bulwark of mutual defense of peace among the nations. This fact lies behind the movement in Congress to undertake a revamping of the UN Charter. The latest expression of this movement is in the form of a resolution presented by 17 Senators of both political parties directing President Truman to initiate UN amendments and specifying what those amendments shall be.

Briefly this resolution calls for a reconstruction of the Security Council; elimination of the veto in matters of aggression, armament for aggression, and admission to membership; creation of a world force made up of recruits from smaller powers; and international control of atomic weapons as proposed by the United States, with world-wide limitation of all other heavy armaments.

Objection has been made to this resolution because it is initiated by Congress. But it seems immaterial whether Congress or the administration makes the initial move. Moreover, because the administration is inclined to do nothing, is no reason why the matter should go by default.

There is ground for legitimate criticism of the proposal to establish international control of atomic weapons and world-wide limitation of other heavy armaments if Russia does not cooperate. That would be certain to give Russia a distinct advantage. But undoubtedly the time has come to put an end to Russian obstruction in the UN, and if that nation will not cooperate, to revamp the organization into a mutual defense agency for the peace-loving nations of the world.

Do You Wish To Have the Facts About the Phony Oleomargarine Experiment Conducted at the Chicago Orphanages?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much propaganda has been distributed in regard to the experiment conducted in Chicago orphanages which claimed to show that oleomargarine was equal to butter. This experiment was given wide publicity. Reading a report on this experiment showed many conclusions and statements that were not justified. Any person who has ever followed experiments would come to this conclusion.

I do not ask you to take my humble opinion about this phony experiment, but if you are interested in having the facts and not fiction in connection with it, I hope that you will read the following testimony about this experiment which was given before the House committee when the hearings on the oleomargarine bill were held in March:

STATEMENT OF HUGO H. SOMMER, PROFESSOR OF DAIRY INDUSTRY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE COMMITTEE OF AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, HEARINGS ON OLEOMARGARINE TAXES, MARCH 8–12, 1948

My name is Hugo H. Sommer. I am professor of dairy industry at the University of Wisconsin. I am appearing in opposition to proposals to repeal taxes on oleomargarine. I am here with the specific approval of the administrative officer of our college of agriculture and experiment station.

I shall not weary you, and embarrass myself, by a detailed recital of attainments. I hold a Ph. D. degree in agricultural chemistry from the University of Wisconsin. I have been on the staff of the Department of Dairy Industry since 1920, and have been a close student of the food industry in general and the dairy industry in particular since that time. I am the author of two textbooks on ice cream and on market milk. I shall undertake to analyze some of the premises on which pleas for repeal are based.

The plea is made that fortified oleomargarine is nutritionally equivalent to butter. A further amplification of this plea is to say that we need this cheaper substitute for butter in the interest of adequate nutrition of low-income families. Frequently the rhetorical question is used: "Do you propose to tax a good food out of the mouths of needy families?" The last question is designed to embarrass anyone who opposes repeal of taxes. But, let us examine all this more closely.

Nutritional equivalency is difficult to prove or disprove. Dr. Deuel and other nutrition experts unquestionably agree with this statement. Dr. Deuel brought this out very forcefully when he cited experiments with rats carried through 20 generations, yet he seriously departs from this principle when he accepts and cites the study by Leichenger, Eisenberg, and Carlson.

It is not my purpose to contest nutritional equivalency nor do I concede it, but in view of the fact that several references have been made to the study by Leichenger, Eisenberg, and Carlson, let us scrutinize it more closely. The study is based on records ranging from 6 months to 24 months. Loose reference has been made to this study as a 2-year study, but there is nothing to indicate how many or how few records actually ran to 2 years. In any case the duration is only a small fraction of a generation time, or for that matter, only a small fraction of the human growth period. The article is surprisingly uninformative as to the complete diet. It merely states: "The diet in each institution was carefully supervised by trained dietitians and so regulated that 25 to 30 percent of the total calories were supplied by fat. The margarine constituted approximately 65 to 70 percent of the total fat calories."

That's all there is concerning the diet, except that there is also reference to meals outside of such supervision when the children were away on visits; yet, the nature of the diet is the very crux of the study. Even Dr. Deuel had to say when questioned on this point, "Presumably the diets were comparable." Since this constitutes the very

essence of the article, it would have to disclose such vital details to be considered a truly scientific study.

The article conveys no adequate information as to the state of nutrition of the children in terms of height and weight at the outset of the experiment. Again, this vital point is left to presumption.

The article is given a learned aspect by the use of a mathematical formula to test statistical significance. Yet, with so many uncontrolled or at least undisclosed variables, the application of this formula is ridiculous.

It is my opinion that this article was inspired by a desire to provide a springboard for propaganda and is not primarily concerned with the search for truth. If the latter had been the motive, the article would have been prepared in a more truly scientific manner. I am not alone in questioning this study.

With your indulgence I should like to offer the article and two letters of criticism in evidence. The first letter is by Dr. Ancel Keys, director of the laboratory of physiological hygiene, University of Minnesota. In a rather lengthy analysis of the article he arrives at the following:

"The Chicago group's results are not very important scientifically. They are what would have been predicted by any well-informed nutritionist or pediatrician. If there are really any nutritional differences between butter and margarine, they must be small, and more elaborate and costly studies would be required to demonstrate them."

The second letter is by E. B. Hart, professor of biochemistry, University of Wisconsin. He is more brief and his criticism is largely in the form of questions.

"(1) There is no record of the constituents of the diet in the published article. What were they in detail?

"(2) How much whole milk was consumed per individual daily? If the margarine group got whole milk they had butterfat. A quart of milk would have 35 grams of butterfat. A pat of butter or margarine 1 inch square and one-half inch thick weighs approximately 10 grams. Young children would not have grown well without milk.

"(3) Was no meat, eggs, or cheese given the margarine group? If they had meat, eggs, and/or cheese, the animal fats and milk fats were in the diet of the margarine group.

"(4) If there were no consumption records or detailed fat analyses, how did the authors arrive at the statement that 'margarine constituted appproximately 65 to 70 percent of the total fat calories?'

"(5) Without such details there can be no affirmative value in this experiment. It would actually prove nothing.

"(6) How much cheating went on when the children were away from the institution? Is there any record? Judged by the published data an uncontrolled and complex experiment of this type can establish nothing. There are too many unknowns and too many variables involved."

On the question of nutritional equivalency of fortified oleomargarine and butter, the truly scientific conclusion is somewhat more conservative. After extensive study and deliberation by the large group of nutritionists comprising the food and nutrition board of the National Research Council they concluded in their Bulletin 118 of the Reprint and Circular Series as follows:

"The present available scientific evidence indicates that when fortified margarine is used in place of butter as a source of fat in a mixed diet no nutritional differences can be observed. Although important differences can be demonstrated between different fats in special experimental diets, these differences are unimportant when a customary mixed diet is used."

When we look back at that statement 10 or 20 years from now, we cannot be certain how it will look. In this connection it is interesting to look back and note that similar claims of nutritional equivalency have been made before hearings in years past. At their time they were, no doubt, made in good faith, even though they were overoptimistic. As we look back now, we now know, in the light of present knowledge, that they were definitely false.

It should be added, however, with respect to nutritive equivalency of the two products, that, if it does not now exist, it will undoubtedly exist sometime in the future. This can be predicted with considerable confidence from the entire history of oleomargarine. It is patterned after butter in every respect. The standard promulgated under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act obviously has that avowed purpose. The minimum vitamin A content of fortified oleomargarine was set at 9,000 United States pharmacopeia units per pound because of testimony at the time that that was the average for butter. Since then, extensive studies have shown that 15,000 United States pharmacopoeia units per pound is the approximate average of butter, and so now most fortified oleomargarine is advertised at this level. There is in this history the open or implied invitation to fortify oleomargarine in the future to overcome whatever shortcoming may be discovered. So let us for the moment, for the sake of argument and orderly exploration on the subject, accept the conclusion that nutritive equivalency has been attained.

It is argued that because fortified oleomargarine is nutritionally equivalent to butter taxes should be repealed in the interest of adequate nutrition of low-income families. Let us examine this more closely. If the proponents of repeal were really sincere in this plea, they would center their attack on the one-fourth tax on uncolored oleomargarine with the further provision that this product must be fortified with vitamin A to be tax-exempt.

The annual saving per family would, of course, be small, but to go beyond this and repeal the 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine would defeat this purpose, through the greatly stimulated demand for oleomargarine and the resulting higher prices.

I am not saying that the oleomargarine manufacturers would take advantage of the increased demand to gouge the public, but solely on the basis of the law of supply and demand, a price increase would follow. That is the declared hope of soybean growers who have appeared here in behalf of repeal. If oleomargarine sales were to double as has been estimated here (and the increase might well exceed this estimate), then no wizardry in economics is required to foresee an increase in prices.

Even repeal of the one-fourth-cent per pound tax would set a dangerous precedent. Such action would establish the troublesome philosophy that an imitation food product achieves full legal legitimacy if it is nutritionally equivalent to the product it imitates. Under this philosophy, to be perfectly consistent, we would then have to accord similar recognition to filled cheese, filled ice cream, and filled milk. All of these products can be made to resemble the real articles just as closely as oleomargarine resembles butter. With proper fortification, pleas as to nutritional equivalency would be just as sound as for oleomargarine. The plea for the filled milk products, on the basis of adequate nutrition of low-income facilities, could be made even more forceful. But, where would our dairy industry be? Where would the skim milk come from that even the oleomargarine industry needs?

The truth is that control and restriction of imitation food products through taxation, is not taxing food out of the mouths of needy families. On the contrary, such policing is necessary to prevent frauds from being perpetrated on the consumer. Such a policy is necessary to maintain proper balance between livestock and field crops, thereby maintaining soil fertility and a sounder food economy for the Nation.

While we are on the subject of imitation dairy products, let me point out that the filled cheese, filled milk, filled ice cream, and filled cream are not hypothetical and they are definitely not a joke. Let's take a look at what has happened in the past and what is happening right now. It is a sordid story and I want to be at some pains not to smear any industry. But this subject is of such vital importance to the consumer, to the dairy industry, and even to the oleomargarine industry that we must not hide our heads in the sand.

First, there came the oleomargarine as an imitation of butter. The early oleomargarine was a sad product compared with the present-day product, but even so prohibition or regulation was considered necessary. When the Congress in 1886 undertook legislation, it was confronted with two choices: (1) Prohibit it by act of Congress, or (2) control it through taxation. Neither one of these choices was a particularly happy one. In Canada, oleomargarine was prohibited, and is prohibited even to this day. On the other hand, our Nation is so constituted that national prohibitory laws on foods apply only to interstate commerce. To prohibit oleomargarine by act of Congress would still allow it to flourish within States, unless they individually prohibit it, so long as it does not cross State lines.

Congress in 1886, therefore, chose to control it through taxation. This has the advantage of allowing control of both interstate and intrastate commerce. However, it has the disadvantage of giving the product legal recognition. The United States Supreme Court later ruled that Congress, by undertaking to tax oleomargarine in 1886, had recognized it as a legitimate article of commerce. As you well know, the oleomargarine taxes have been revised from time to time as new problems of regulation seemed to warrant change.

A little later came filled cheese. Much of our cheese was sold in export, and the filled cheese just about wrecked our export market. This was true to such an extent that even the Lord Mayor of London addressed a letter to Congress requesting that something be done.

In 1896 Congress passed the Filled Cheese Act. It again chose taxation as the means of regulating it. By imposing a tax of 1 cent per pound, plus labeling and license requirements, this product was stamped out. The social stigma that was attached to it by adverse publicity no doubt was also a powerful deterrent. Again this tax act has given the product legal recognition, and the surprising thing is that it has not recurred under present high prices. There is no assurance that it will not recur.

Later came filled milk—skim milk plus coconut fat made in exact imitation of evaporated milk. Wisconsin passed a law prohibiting it. A little later, in 1923, Congress acted on this subject. This time they chose not to give it legal recognition through taxation, but to prohibit it outright. This, however, does not apply to intrastate commerce. And so today in the populous States of Illinois and Indiana we have a flourishing business in filled milk. With this filled milk, made and sold within the State borders, the Federal prohibitory law is meaningless. I am informed that now a filled-milk plant is being built straddling the State line between Missouri and Oklahoma. Neither State has a filled-milk law, and one plant is to serve both States without coming under the Federal statutes.

It didn't stop there. During the recent war when the richness of cream was limited by Federal order, whipping cream became extinct for the time being. Then it was discovered in some States, either because of

loosely drawn statutes or indifferent enforcement, a filled product could be offered. By blending vegetable fats or oils with regular cream so that the mixture had the legal minimum milk-fat content for cream, a filled whipping cream was created which was in harmony with the wording (if not the spirit) of Federal orders, and yet contained a total fat content of 30 to 34 percent, with nearly half being vegetable fat.

A similar situation has raised its ugly head in the ice cream industry. With milk fat at $1.20 per pound in the form of sweet cream, in some instances unscrupulous individuals have not been able to resist temptation, especially where loose State statutes or indifferent enforcement exists. Some States have a legal minimum fat content as low as 8 percent for ice cream. Where the addition of other fats has not been specifically prohibited, unscrupulous individuals are presenting legitimate manufacturers with an impossible competitive problem, by turning out richer ice cream but obtaining the fat in excess of 8 percent through the addition of vegetable fats or oils. I have no way of knowing how widespread this practice is, but I am satisfied that it exists.

I am testifying along these lines with considerable reluctance, and I plead with all sincerity that this be not used to smear the dairy industry or any branch of it. The truth is that no one industry can successfully police itself. The shady practices are not practiced by the well established and larger enterprises in the industry. Their reputation and the size of their investment compels them to be prudent. Look for the shady practices among new entrepreneurs who have no reputation or little investment to lose, and to whom the idea of a quick killing, with no thought of building for permanence, may therefore hold appeal. This applies alike to all industries, and no industry should be smeared because legal control is inadequate. It is my considered judgment that removal of adequate tax control from oleomargarine would be followed by such flagrant frauds by new entrepreneurs that the industry would plead for return of regulation.

Now let us turn our attention to color. It is argued that, since butter is artificially colored during part of the year, the same artificial coloring should not be denied to oleomargarine. In this connection, outspoken statements are made that butter is at times white. The statement is also made that the oleomargarine manufacturer is put to the added expense of bleaching to escape the 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargarine. Now, let us look at the facts.

The color of milk fat is dependent upon the pigment content of the cow's diet. With this knowledge at our disposal it is possible to so plan a cow's diet that the butterfat becomes colorless. This has been done as an experiment, at considerable expense, to prove that the cow is absolutely dependent upon the pigment content in her feed. These facts hardly justify the unqualified statement that butter is at times white. What are the facts under conditions as they actually exist?

In tests run at the University of Wisconsin on 4 commercial milk supplies it was found that the natural color of butter is at its lowest ebb during March and April—toward the end of the winter feeding season. But even at this low ebb, it never went below 2.0 Lovibond tintometer units when measured by the procedure prescribed in connection with the color standard for yellow oleomargarine. In this standard, oleomargarine becomes subject to the 10 cent tax when it exceeds 1.6 Lovibond units of yellow and red combined. Butter at its lowest showed 2.0 Lovibond units consisting of 0.4 red and 1.6 yellow. In ordinary terms, this represents a definite yellow color. During May, June, July, and August, when most of the butter is made, butter from these same four commercial sources ranged from 4.2 to 5.6 Lovibond units, a deeper shade of yellow. It is to compensate for this seasonal variation in color that artificial coloring of butter has long been recognized, even before there were any United States. Yellow has long been recognized as the typical color of butter. Frequent allusions to this fact are found in literature and even in ancient writings. To color a substitute or imitation product yellow is to create the illusion or psychological reaction that it is butter. You can say this in different ways. You can say that consumers are conditioned to certain colors and that color is therefore necessary to consumer acceptance. You can even stretch scientific credulity or veracity and say that color is therefore a factor in nutritive value. You can coin other roundabout ways of saying this, but in ordinary language you are just plainly imitating butter when you color oleomargarine yellow.

The plea that bleaching of oils for oleomargarine is necessary is so misleading as to border on outright misrepresentation. Considerable loss of color naturally accompanies the steps of the refining process. The bleaching is generally practised, and is not confined to oil used for oleomargarine. In a volume entitled "Soybean Chemistry and Technology" by Markley and Goss, on page 231, we find as follows:

"After the soybean oil is refined, washed, and dried, whether by the batch or continuous method, it is then bleached to remove most of the coloring matter."

They then proceed to give the methods employed. Nowhere in this volume is there any indication that the need for bleaching is confined to or peculiar to the needs of oleomargarine.

For those of you who are interested in possible competition of imported oils, let me point out that coconut oil is to be feared not only on the basis of cost but also on the basis of its composition. You heard Dr. Deuel say that of the vegetable oils coconut oil most closely resembles butter oil. This is a well known fact and is commonly pointed out in texts on the subject of fats and oils. Butterfat contains a generous proportion of short-chained fatty acids, and butter owes its melting behavior, gradual transition in hardness over a fairly wide temparature change, and the way butter cleans up in the mouth without the lingering of a fatty film, to these fatty acids. None of the other animal fats or vegetable oils approach butterfat in this respect, but coconut oil comes closest. This directs special interest to coconut oil not only as the cheapest, but possibly also as the best source of fat for oleomargarine.

It is readily conceivable that the present alliance of interests might terminate suddenly if and when the chestnuts have been pulled out of the fire.

In closing I express my appreciation to the committee on Agriculture for the privilege of offering this testimony.

New York Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, many veterans and their dependents are not fully informed as to their various legal rights to benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions which they enjoy, and which are guaranteed to them by the laws of the great State of New York.

Gilbert R. Sharp, department legislative chairman of the Disabled American Veterans, 68 Ramsey Place, Albany, N. Y., has very kindly compiled a résumé of these laws, which I am pleased to present for the information of all veterans and their dependents who are residents of my State, as follows:

BONUS

The State legislature submitted a proposed constitutional amendment, which was ratified by the people of New York in November 1947, providing for a bonus of from $50 to $250 (according to type and length of service) to World War II veterans who were residents for at least 6 months prior to entering service and are residents at time of applying for the bonus. The amendment provides for payment to men or women still in service or separated under honorable conditions who served on active duty at some time from December 7, 1941, to September 2, 1945, inclusive.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowances are provided for burial of indigent veterans, their wives or widows, and minor children. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Relatives or friends may conduct the funeral. Privilege is granted for removal of bodies from potter's field or neglected or abandoned cemeteries to properly kept cemeteries.

Counties may acquire soldiers' burial grounds and provide for maintenance of same.

Soldiers' monument corporations may acquire cemetery lots.

Towns may purchase soldiers' burial plots in cemeteries and provide for the care of same.

Perpetual care of soldiers' burial plots is provided in Dutchess and Niagara Counties.

Reports are rendered to the Adjutant General of the burial places of soldiers, sailors, or marines, giving the name and location of the cemetery and the location of the grave in such cemetery.

County allowances are provided for headstones for the graves of indigent veterans, their wives or widows, or for the grave of a veteran left unmarked for 5 years.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A Civil Relief Act has been enacted.

In voluntary adoption proceedings the judge or surrogate may waive the personal appearance of a foster parent in the armed forces and married to the natural parent of the child and the natural parent has appeared for the required examination.

Persons entering the armed forces are excused for failure to appear for arraignment or for trial or judgment, and bond is not forfeited as a result thereof.

Proof or acknowledgment of legal instruments and the administration of oaths is provided.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Powers of fiduciaries are suspended during war service.

Power of trustees are suspended during military service.

Validity is acknowledged of nuncupative and holographic wills made by persons in actual military or naval service.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration is granted to patients in veterans' hospitals and to the wives, widows, mothers, and dependent daughters of honorably discharged veterans who are inmates of State institutions for the care of such persons.

Absentee voting and registration is provided for members of the armed forces.

Absentee voting at general annual village elections by electors in the armed forces during World War II was provided.

Absentee voting by inmates of soldiers' homes and veteran hospitals is provided.

The commissioner of correction may permit prisoners to report to an induction center for the purpose of being examined for possible induction into the armed forces.

CLAIMS—ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS—SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records for wards of the Veterans Administration are provided under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The fee for a copy of an honorable discharge, payable to county clerks of the counties in New York City, is limited to $1.

Honorable discharge of World War veterans are recorded by county clerks free of charge.

A Division of Veterans Affairs has been created to extend aid and assistance to all veterans and their dependents.

Officers or soldiers are allowed to deposit discharge papers, descriptive lists, etc., in the Bureau of War Records for safekeeping.

Counties are authorized to employ county service officers to assist veterans and their dependents living in the county in obtaining any Federal, State, or local awards to which they are entitled.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS—QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

A person applying to take the bar examination who has been in the armed forces for not less than 6 months after September 16, 1940, and who has been honorably discharged, may receive credit toward the fulfillment of the requirement of 2 years of college work for study and experience of educational value while in service, subject to some limitations in regard to the credits; 1 year, at least, of the 2 years of required college work must have been successfully completed while attending an approved college or university, either as a civilian or as a member of the armed forces.

A person who entered the armed forces before completing his law studies and whose duties prevented him from taking the succeeding examinations shall not be required to take the examinations for admission to the bar.

A veteran of any age may attend any of the public schools of the State upon conditions prescribed by the board of education, and the attendance of such veteran shall be counted for State-aid purposes.

Credit is granted for Federal rehabilitation courses in architecture on application of disabled World War veterans for license to practice.

Federal vocational training may be credited as experience on examination of disabled World War veterans for positions under Civil Service.

For 7 years after the end of World War II nonresident veterans of such war, who are eligible under the GI bill of rights, may be admitted as candidates for a baccalaureate degree or otherwise by the Board of Higher Education in a city having a population of 1,000,000, or more inhabitants.

Rights and privileges are preserved under State scholarships at Cornell University.

Unused benefits of State scholarships are preserved.

Scholarships (4 years each with value of $350 for tuition plus $100 toward maintenance) are provided for World War I and II veterans in State colleges and universities.

State institutes of Applied Arts and Sciences, Aeronautics, and Retail Business Management have been established.

The Board of Regents may endorse a Federal rehabilitation certificate as a license to practice any of the professions over which it has supervision.

The oath of office required for all attorneys in open court may be taken by a serviceman before a justice of the court if the appellate division of the Supreme Court is not in session.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Unused benefits of certain State scholarships are preserved.

Scholarships are provided for resident children of soldiers, sailors, or marines who died while serving in the armed forces of the United States or as a result thereof, or, under certain circumstances, to the children of honorably discharged veterans. Amount—$350 for tuition and $100 for maintenance, per person.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

War service credit is allowed in computing service for retirement of State police.

War service credit is allowed to New York veterans in relation to allowance upon retirement of employees in State correctional institutions.

Age limit has been extended for appointment of armorer or superintendent of an armory, on application of certain veterans.

Time has been extended for a public officer elected while in military service to file the required oath of office.

Leaves of absence have been extended for public officers in military service.

Leaves of absence have been granted for volunteer firemen during military service.

Members of the State employees retirement system absent on military duty may borrow from the retirement fund and repay the amount withdrawn without loss of privileges.

Veterans have been extended preference, rights, and privileges under civil service in State and local units up to December 31, 1940, with special preference to disabled veterans.

Preference is given to World War veterans in appointment of employees of the bureau for the relief of sick and disabled New York veterans, division of military and naval affairs.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Certain rights and benefits are preserved for public officers and employees absent on military or naval duty or on duty with the American Red Cross or merchant marine.

Rights exercised under licenses issued by a board of education in certain cities are preserved.

Protection is granted against removal from office of veterans holding positions in State, city, county, town, or under the civil-service law.

Public officers must be reinstated after termination of military service.

Retention of membership in a pension or retirement system is retained when term of office of an elected official, officers, or employees, State or local, expired during military service.

Retirement is provided to veterans employed in the Division of Public Buildings.

War service is counted as leave of absence in computing service to qualify as an exempt volunteer fireman.

War service is credited in computing service under the Police Pension Act applicable in certain villages.

Second-injury clause has been added to the Workman's Compensation Act to assist disabled veterans secure employment.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Pensions or other rewards granted by the United States or by a State for military or naval services, and certain personal property used in such service, are exempt from execution, and from seizure in any legal proceeding.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

Military duty extended includes not only those on duty with the Army or Navy but on duty with the American Red Cross or merchant marine.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications providing for the appointment of a guardian of any incompetent veteran, or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HEALTH PROTECTION

It is a felony for any person, knowing himself or herself to be infected with venereal disease, to have sexual intercourse with a person in the military or naval service of the United States.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives or widows, mothers, and dependent daughters may be admitted to the State Woman's Relief Corps Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Provision is made for commitment of an incompetent veteran to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

Provision has been made for the compilation and publication of the laws of the State relating to veterans and for revision thereof.

MARRIAGE

Marriage license may be issued upon court order without the consent of a parent who is in the armed forces and absent from the United States.

Premarital examination certificate may be issued by United States Army or Navy medical officers.

MEDALS

Conspicuous Service Cross awards are provided for World War service.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is extended for time spent in the active service of the United States.

Retirement and pension is provided for certain war veterans from the military and naval service of the State.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Leave of absence may be extended to veterans in the public service of the State and local units on Memorial and Armistice Days.

Cities, towns, and villages may appropriate money for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days, to be expended through veterans' organizations.

PENSIONS

Pensions have been granted to blind veterans and their widows.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

A Hall of Military Records is provided in the capitol, and the deposit of records, relics, etc., for safekeeping.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

Admission is provided to horse and harness races at half price.

Towns adjoining military camps are authorized to establish and maintain recreation centers.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, trust companies, private bankers, savings banks, industrial banks, safe-deposit companies, savings and loan associations, credit unions, investment companies, and specifically the savings and loan banks of the State of New York may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Corporations are authorized to contribute to the Navy Relief Society and the Army Emergency Relief.

County aid may be extended to a veteran or veteran's family.

County appropriations are authorized to associations or organizations for the aid of disabled veterans.

An appropriation of $10,000 has been made for relief for sick and disabled veterans of World War II.

Relief is extended to veterans and their families, through veterans' organizations, in their own homes.

Use of certain war-chest funds is authorized for relief of veterans.

A wife of a member of the armed forces is eligible for aid for her dependent children.

TAX EXEMPTIONS—EXEMPTIONS FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Exemption is granted from State tax on admissions to horse races.

Fishing and hunting licenses may be issued to servicemen.

Expiration date of licenses of all operators and chauffeurs in active military service since August 16, 1940, has been extended.

The period has been extended in which an applicant for an operator's license may take an examination if inducted into the armed forces before passing the required examination.

Refund is provided of registration fees upon the surrender of number plates by the owner when entering the armed forces.

Veterans of World War II or their widows are exempt from fee for county peddler's license.

Refund shall be made of fees paid for licenses as private detectives and investigators.

Certain professional and practice licenses may be renewed without examination, reexamination, fine, or penalty, within 3 months after termination of military service.

Temporary licensing is provided, without examination of designees, of insurance agents serving in the armed forces.

Property of veterans' organizations is exempt from property tax.

Real property purchased with the proceeds of a pension, bonus, or insurance granted by the United States, or the State of New York, for military or naval services, owned by the person who rendered the services, his wife, or widow, or dependent father or mother, may be exempted from taxation, except school and road taxes. Maximum exemption, $5,000.

Tax-free auto plates and registrations are awarded to amputees who have been granted automobiles by the Federal Government.

TRANSPORTATION PRIVILEGES

Exemption is provided from prohibition against hitchhiking.

Transportation may be given by common carriers to certain disabled veteran inmates of soldiers' and sailors' homes.

UNIFORMS, ETC.

Unauthorized wearing of United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard uniforms is a misdemeanor; however, such articles as shoes, socks, shirts, ties or scarfs, trousers, overalls, raincoats, field jackets, and headgear from which buttons or insignia have been removed may be worn.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Provision has been made for the State printing of the reports of certain veterans' organizations.

Powers are granted to certain associations under the benevolent orders law.

Endorsement of the Adjutant General is required on a certificate of incorporation which indicates that the proposed corporation is to solicit funds for, or otherwise benefit members of the military, naval, or marine services.

It is a misdemeanor for anyone, veteran or otherwise, to sell for personal gain or profit poppies, forget-me-nots, flags, or other articles sold for patriotic purposes, fraudulently claiming that such sale is for the benefit of an organization authorized to administer relief to veterans.

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor.

Armory privileges have been extended to veterans' organizations. Cities may appropriate money to assist certain veterans' organizations in defraying expenses for rental or maintenance of rooms.

General expense appropriations are made to the United Spanish War Veterans.

Municipal corporations may lease public buildings to veterans' organizations free of charge or at nominal rent.

Quarters in the Capitol are provided for the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Parade rights are granted to veterans' organizations under the general city law.

Expenditure of city appropriations is provided for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days through certain veterans' organizations. Similar provisions are provided to towns.

Veterans' organizations have the privilege of assisting the Adjutant General in collection of records, relics, etc., for the Bureau of War Records.

Veterans' relief is administered through veterans' organizations.

Most of the above legislation has been enacted by the New York Legislature since World War I through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

The DAV, organized in 1920 and chartered by Congress in 1932, is composed strictly of those who have given a part of their bodies or their health in defense of our country in time of war.

Most of the 70 chapters of the DAV in the State, whose membership dues average about $5 annually, maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains full-time national service officers at the five regional offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the State; 13 under the direction of Bernard R. Jordan, 252 Seventh Avenue, New York City; 4 under the direction of Abraham Janko, Brooklyn; 3 under the direction of Frank Calderala, 500 South Salina Street, Syracuse; 3 under the direction of Ronald W. Dyett, 1602 city hall, Buffalo; and 4 under the direction of William M. Buron, Watervliet Arsenal, Albany.

These DAV experts render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly as to the proper preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be equitably and lawfully entitled.

The primary purpose of the DAV is to see to it that all war-disabled veterans and their dependents receive their just entitlement to all rights and benefits available to them under the many complicated laws—both Federal and State.

The DAV has also developed a Nation-wide man-job-matching method program in an attempt to provide gainful employment for all such disabled veterans.

I am indeed proud to be a life member of this association of America's war-disabled defenders.

License Racket?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a splendid article entitled "License Racket?" written by Gustaf A. Nordin, Washington representative of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, which appeared in the April 11 edition of that newspaper. It relates with clarity certain facts about the export-license permits racket which should prove most interesting and provocative to the Members of Congress.

LICENSE RACKET?

(By Gustav A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The next hot investigation on the Senate side of Capitol Hill will deal with the sale of United States export license permits in New York City.

The investigation already has started in the Senate small business committee, headed by Senator EDWARD MARTIN (Republican, Pennsylvania), but the findings have been so productive that the special investigating committee directed by Senator HOMER FERGUSON will take over.

The Martin committee will reconvene April 26 to discuss what he calls a racket in export licenses. Involved are brokers in these licenses, which control the shipment of more than $5,000,000,000 in American goods to foreign lands.

MARTIN'S committee is wondering how many of the licenses are forgeries and how many were obtained through "inside pull."

An investigator for the committee stumbled upon the racket when he became curious about the large exports of certain companies—some of which were not too old in the exporting trade.

This led to the calling of Harry Levey, president of Haro Products, Inc., New York, who said he had purchased licenses from John Quinn, president of the Daja International Co., organized in 1947.

Levey said Quinn had told him "he had valuable connections in politics with the Mayor Hague people in Jersey City." Quinn denied having said so. Levey also quoted Quinn as having similar connections with a New Jersey Senator. He could not name which one. Quinn later told the committee that "I am afraid Mr. Levey made a little slip of the tongue." There was no further explanation.

Levey became suspicious of Quinn's ability to produce export licenses for vast quantities of lard, flour, and tallow. He said he paid Quinn more than $28,000 for the licenses used and Quinn admitted that was true.

Quinn said he received them from a Mr. McGuire, whom he thought was a former Government employee with connections in the Department of Commerce.

During the hearings, Senator MARTIN asked, "They are getting licenses for cash and you know that is customary in New York?"

Quinn replied, "It is a routine business." He later said he "got tired of shelling out * * * to the people running around New York selling licenses." Quinn readily admitted that he had 50 license applications "out now where various people are obtaining them through connections." As far as he is concerned, the licenses are valid.

The committee wonders because a District of Columbia police expert on perforating machines says the licenses before the committee were validated by a "hand-made unit" and not the single machine used at the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce.

Quinn said the standard fee for obtaining the export licenses is 2 cents a pound for lard, 15 cents a bag for flour, $4 a ton for tallow, and so forth.

He told of going to a "Beckley Electric Products Co., Brooklyn" to see the company head because he had offered to sell an export license for $25,000, covering 100,000 bags of flour for Brazil. He was accompanied by his uncle, Tom Quinn.

Asked what business the company was in, Quinn replied, "They were in every business. They were interpreters. They would get you citizenship papers. They would get you licenses. They would get you married,

get you divorced, get you anything else you want, as long as you had the cash."

He went on, "We sat down and talked with this fellow. They had just moved in. They had a bare office, nothing in it, just a desk. He told us what a tremendous business he was doing. * * * He was a fellow about 30 years old. He had a couple of people there with him with a definite foreign accent. They were in the business with him, I presume. You had to knock on the door and somebody would say, "Who's there?" If they knew you, if you had been sent around from 50 Court Street, you got in. If you hadn't—nobody was there."

Quinn also volunteered, "There is a new dodge in the export business now. Too many people have been cheated, I guess. Now the sellers of export licenses tell a buyer, 'When I give you the papers on the left hand, you give me the money in the right hand and we'll be friends.'"

The Department of Justice and the Senate committees are curious to learn more.

Alaska Salmon-Trap Sites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch concerning Alaska salmon-trap sites:

THE ALASKA SALMON GRAB

The salmon packing and canning industry, which already monopolizes the Alaska salmon run, is moving in to wipe out the last vestiges of competition.

This would impoverish the southeastern Alaska Indians, who depend on salmon fishing for their livelihood. It would put the American consumer of salmon at the mercy of a handful of corporations that even now charge 60 cents for a can that costs them 20 cents. Worse still, it would promote the destruction of the salmon run, a process already far advanced.

A bill to accomplish all these undesirable objectives has been drawn up in the Department of the Interior and introduced in Congress by Senator White of Maine.

The present condition of the Alaska salmon industry is bad enough. Here is the principal source of the world's salmon, supplying the Territory's largest industry. The fish are caught in traps, huge wire affairs sunk into the entrances to rivers and inlets, which literally mine the waters. Delegate Bartlett calls them "an antisocial machine."

Of the 434 traps licensed by the Interior Department, all but 38 are in the hands of the large nonresident canning companies. These companies have been following the policy of depleting the waters and using the resultant scarcity to support high prices. So successfully have they done so that the salmon run in many rich streams has been destroyed, and last year's run was the smallest in years, but earned the canners their highest profit in history.

The southeastern Alaska Indians live by fishing. They own many trap sites, which the Interior Department assured them 2 years ago they could fish, and deny to trespassers, the same as any other owners of property anywhere. Trusting in these assurances, the Indians bought gear to set out traps.

Now the Interior Department's bill proposes to take these trap sites away from the Indians and lease them to the monopolists for 15 years. If the Indians want to acquire the trap sites, they can do so by buying, in a tie-in sale, canneries priced at half a million dollars each—obviously far beyond their means. Otherwise, from their own traps on their own lands, each worth $3,500 to $7,000 a season in its yield of salmon, they will get a royalty of $573 or less.

Is it any wonder that the Association of American Indian Affairs says this "would give hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property to a favored few corporations for a nominal return" and that "Alaskan natives see starvation staring them in the face"?

Harold Stassen and the Republican National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of Thursday, April 18, 1948:

GOP NEW-LOOK WORRY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

There's been a good deal said in this critical presidential election year—and with every evidence to back it up—that the people are weary and wary of the stock political figure and are looking for something different.

That would seem to explain, at least partly, the Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower boom which flourishes in both major parties without regard to political ties or labels. There's plenty of the plague on both your houses, too, in the Henry A. Wallace third-party movement.

And now Republican Party leaders have discovered suddenly that they have a new look probably of their own by two rather convincing demonstrations in 1 week. Reference is to the way Harold Stassen has captivated rank-and-file voters in successive primaries in two Midwestern States—Wisconsin and Nebraska.

By the acid test which is the test by voters, in representative States, the 41-year-old Minnesotan has pushed himself into a position more closely approximating that of a people's candidate in his party than since the late Wendell L. Willkie swept into the nomination 8 years ago.

By bowling over candidates much more acceptable to the GOP Old Guard—and by the voter test—Harold Stassen has made one thing quite certain, and it is a healthy thing for the party and for the people of the Nation. He has made it very difficult, if not impossible, for a GOP Old Guard boss-dictated convention. Such a prospect has been feared because of the demonstrated weakness of the Democratic Party. Victory for Republicans seemed so sure that it had been taken for granted in many quarters that most anybody on the GOP ticket could win.

Harold Stassen represents the more progressive elements in his party, both on domestic and international issues. He has big drawing power among younger Republicans and veterans. Because of his proved popularity with the voters, he can now speak with authority at the convention. The probability of his own nomination is now greatly enhanced. But, even if he doesn't win the nomination, he is in a strategic position to throw his weight against the nomination of a candidate not in keeping with the times and to influence the adoption of a forward-looking and progressive platform.

The GOP Old Guard suffered its most severe rebuff to date in the poor showing of its favorite, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, which happened despite the energetic efforts of the Republican State organization controlled by Senator BUTLER.

Senator TAFT proved what the polls have been saying and what his GOP backers have feared—that he just is not a vote-getter. The Nebraska primary also demonstrated conclusively what the Wisconsin primary had indicated very strongly as to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. He has vacated the role of champion Republican vote-getter to Harold Stassen. It must be remembered, too, in assessing the week's results, that it was a double-bill victory for Tom Dewey in Wisconsin and Nebraska 4 years ago that clinched the 1944 nomination for him. Governor Dewey now seems out of the contest.

Harold Stassen has vindicated the gambler's chance strategy that he adopted to cope with Old Guard hostility to his candidacy.

Abandonment of Peacemaking Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a week ago one of our distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], delivered an address in my State before the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We had no enthusiasm for World War II. We felt that the precipitating causes could have been avoided; that we had not made effective use of our great preventive influence.

But we did offer our service men and women an objective to inspire their sacrifices and to console those who were left behind.

This, truly, was to be a war to end all war. Following victory, that which was necessary would be done to bring durable peace to the world.

We had made the same resolve after World War I, but this time we really meant it.

For that objective and to defeat our enemies we suffered a million casualties, including 300,000 dead. We endured countless damaging dislocations of normal life. We came into a residue of mental, physical, and moral strains which will dog us with their harmful consequences for generations to come. We poured out our treasure and committed ourselves to debt amounting to several times the value of all real and tangible personal property accumulated in this country since the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers.

In the campaign of 1944 the people were told—and a majority of them believed it—that the New Deal administration was so skillful and infallible in its conduct of foreign affairs and was so certain to bring us durable peace that we dared not make a change.

It was a pledge that involved the heartstrings of our people, their deepest and most tender emotions, their most cherished hopes.

The New Deal administration received the Nation's confidence and as we face another national election, must give its accounting. If the New Deal leaders have not made good on those promises, and especially if they in fact have imperiled the peace, or have planted the seeds of further war, then they should be kicked into timeless political oblivion for having betrayed the faith of the people and their dearest hopes and aspirations.

Under the Constitution, the initiative and conduct of foreign affairs are in the executive branch of the Government.

The guiding principles to world peace on which the President and those subject to his orders were to act and conform themselves in practice were well known. They have been stated in part as follows:

"No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed; and that no right anywhere exists to hand people about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property."

"No nation should seek to extend its policy over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful."

Those were the words spoken by President Woodrow Wilson.

What President Wilson said did not reflect an academic philosophy which he had invented or pulled from a magician's hat. It was a fine phrasing of ideals which have instinctive authority among civilized people. The obvious and unescapable impacts of history show that violation of those and associated principles brings nothing better than uneasy peace followed ultimately by war.

If instances are necessary, let me remind you that we fought our own Revolution against England because we had been denied those rights so inseparable from human freedom and dignity.

A little later on the French fought their Revolution because of the oppressions of their monarchs and all Europe became involved.

Poland has been repeatedly partitioned, but if anything is clear in history, it is that Poland will survive and reemerge from all such disasters because it has freedom in its heart and is willing to fight and die for it.

The peoples from the nations to the south of us bought their independence in blood by liberating themselves from their foreign oppressors.

And we, then a weak nation, but with bravery and spirit, fired by our own love for freedom, interposed the protecting shield of the Monroe Doctrine between those struggling republics and the conspiratorial foreign dynasties which again wanted to bring them under vassalage.

Since the indispensable peace-preserving principles were well known, it was only necessary that we rededicate ourselves to them and that they should receive the devotion of sincere practice along with fervid proclamation.

Let me document some of the more current expressions of purpose which fixed the duty of those in charge of our foreign and military affairs, and I ask that they be fixed firmly in our memories.

In August of 1941, President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill met on the Atlantic. We had already committed ourselves to lend-lease. Our Navy was cooperating with the British Navy to reduce the menace of submarines which were interfering with our flow of goods to the beleaguered foes of nazism.

A standard had to be raised that would inspire and justify the risks. And so at that meeting it was declared, among other things:

"First, their countries (the United Kingdom and the United States) seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Russia specifically approved and charged herself with the obligations of the Atlantic Charter by signing what is known as Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942.

On September 6 and 7, 1943, a Republican Advisory Council of distinguished members of our party, meeting at Mackinac Island, Mich., thrilled the Nation with its declaration of Republican support to the opposition party for an international postwar program which would aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world, which would bring about responsible participation by the United States in postwar cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

On November 5, 1943, the United States Senate, which, under the Constitution, must advise and consent to treaties, passed a resolution under shared Republican initiative, support, and cooperation which in substance reiterated the aims of the Mackinac Republican Charter.

On October 7, 1944, preliminary proposals for the establishment of a general international organization to maintain peace were made at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D. C. Republican leaders in our foreign affairs participated in the conferences and in drawing the proposals which became the working basis for the Charter of the United Nations.

Again with Republican cooperation the Charter of the United Nations organization was completed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945 and was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 28, 1945.

This Charter declared among other things:

"We, the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of the nations large and small; * * * have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

The American people had their hearts and hopes in all of these assurances and promises which I have detailed. Republicans, responsive to the will of the people, had supported their formulation and their translation into working plans.

I like to think that our servicemen who died for us found something in those declarations and pledges that made their last moments more bearable.

I like to think there was something in those declarations and pledges that gave some assuagement to the grief of those who sorrowed at home.

Now let us see what the leaders of the New Deal in the executive department were actually doing behind closed doors at the Big Three conferences. Let us see how they related their actions to the peace-making pledges of the Atlantic Charter, the Senate resolution, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the Charter of the United Nations organization, all of which have been described in chronological order.

The Big Three meeting at Teheran ended on December 1, 1943. Therefore, the New Deal representatives at that time had before them the running orders of the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941, and the Senate resolution of November 5, 1943.

The Big Three meeting at Yalta concluded on February 11, 1945. The New Deal leaders at that conference had before them the running orders of the Atlantic Charter, the Senate resolution, and the guides of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

The Big Three meeting at Potsdam was concluded on August 2, 1945. The New Deal leaders at that conference had before them the running orders of the Atlantic Charter, the Senate resolution, and the ratified United Nations Charter.

Remember, please, that all of these declarations and plans which I have described to you based themselves in substance on opposition to anything that derogated from human freedom and dignity, on opposition to territorial changes except with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. They affirmed the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. Humanity's finest and brightest hopes rode with those assurances and pledges.

At Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam the partition of our ally Poland, which Russia had accomplished while she was an ally of our enemy Germany, was confirmed.

Wholesale evacuations and resettlements of vast numbers of persons in many parts of Europe and without their consent were decreed.

It was agreed—

That Europe was to be carved up into spheres of influence.

That Russia was to have predominance over what we now know as the satellite countries.

That Russia was to occupy eastern Germany.

That she was to have the Kuriles and Sakhalin.

That she was to be in northern Korea and that she was to have dominating special privileges in Manchuria and other parts of China.

That the Chinese Government, our ally, hungry for the friendship of friends in her hour of great distress, was to be persuaded or in practical effect duressed into accepting the arrangement.

At other meetings there were secret deals gutting the open promises of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine.

When those deals were made it was known to everyone outside of the Russian orbit that murder, terror, slavery, concentration camps, and banishment are considered as legitimate means and are advocated and practiced for the desired ends of communism.

It was well known that the free exercise of religion is not safe under communism because religion deals with the spiritual rights and duties of the individual and exalts his individual, spiritual personality, and thus it competes with the totalitarian ideology of communism which exalts the state even above God.

It was well known that the totalitarianism of Russia cannot exist anywhere where individual human dignity prevails; cannot exist in the presence of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, the right of people to assemble and petition the Government for the redress of grievances.

It was well known that under American definition democracy and communism could not be considered as synonymous under any stretch of the imagination.

How was it possible to believe for even a moment that these nations and peoples thus handed over to new oppressions by new masters would find happiness in their chains? How was it possible to believe that they would not rebel and that new wars would not result whenever opportunity offered?

How could anyone believe that what was done at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam would conform to the promises to stop aggression, to promote peace, to assure the sovereign rights of independent peoples?

How could anyone reconcile what was done at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam with the promised recognition and acceptance of the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed?

How reconcile what was done with a recognition of the fact that no right anywhere exists to hand people about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property?

Look at what has happened in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Manchuria and Korea. Are those people being allowed to determine their own policies, their own way of development unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful?

Is this preserving the rights and liberties of small nations; does this promote universal dominion of right?

Does this accord with the pledge that the principal powers shall not seek territorial or other aggrandizement?

Does this accord with the pledge that there shall not be any territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; with the pledge that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them?

Is this the promised reaffirmation of faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small?

We offered bipartisan support at Mackinac, we gave bipartisan support to the Senate resolution, we gave bipartisan support to the United Nations Charter, but we did not, do not, and never shall give bipartisan or any kind of support to the treacheries to human freedom which stemmed from Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

We have given and shall continue to give bipartisan support to all feasible and sane programs to clean up and mitigate the effects of what was done at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

And following January 20 next we shall hope that our Republican President and the Republican Congress will receive the same kind of support from the opposition.

What is the Republican policy? I can speak only my individual views.

We continue our adherence and we have never deviated from adherence to the peacemaking principles and pledges which have been enumerated and which have been so grossly betrayed.

Our devotion to these principles in theory and in practice is illustrated by the strong support we have given to Senator VANDENBERG now Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who took the lead in formulating the declaration of principles of the Mackinac Charter, the substance of which as has been pointed out, was the basis of the Senate's own historic resolution.

In the debates of various measures affecting our foreign affairs before the Senate, he has voiced these principles with surpassing eloquence. His perception, shared by Congress, that decent principles must be maintained in the conduct of our foreign affairs, his insistence, shared by Congress, that the pledges for world peace must be upheld, and his application to the task brought a halt to further appeasement of Russia and brought the leaders in the executive department who were responsible for such appeasement to a reluctant change of mind.

Why reluctant? This administration gave communism the official recognition which had been denied by the preceding Republican administration.

This administration had welcomed Communists and fellow travelers into the innermost confidences of our Government—yes, even into our military establishments.

The opposition had been playing a very comfortable and cozy footsie tootsie with those characters until under Republican pressure, the exodus was gotten under way.

Think of it, American ambassadors were sent to persuade China into sharing her government with Communists. But Republican pressure compelled inclusion of China among the nations which are to receive our help in withstanding communism.

And today, it may be suspected that the anger of some of the leaders of the opposition at Henry Wallace does not derive principally from the criticism that he is friendly to Russia but that he is drawing to his support in key election spots commies and fellow-travelers who have helped the New Deal win four national elections hand-running and upon whom high hopes had been reposed for a repeat performance.

Those disastrous conferences at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam set in motion situations which have impelled our costly participation in the foreign aid recovery programs.

They set in motion events which have turned the assurance of peace which had been earned by hard-won and decisive victory into grave disquietude.

The natural, proximate, and foreseeable result, was the affliction of this ravaged world with new conquests, oppressions, and threats of war.

They stultified the moral incentives for our participation in World War II and gravely embarrassed the workings of the United Nations organization.

They set in motion a chain of circumstances that require that we again turn from our dearly earned peacetime pursuits to rebuild our military strength so that it may be adequate to our perils and to the maintenance of a foreign policy that will reflect the peacemaking principles which we must now resalvage.

Lately opposition leaders and prominent military figures have had the shameless, buck-passing gall to blame our present predicaments upon the American people. You may hear more of this from the apologists and the conscience stricken who want to get out from under. It has the symptoms of a line. Please watch for it.

They say that the situation in which we find ourselves is due to the insistence of the people promptly after VJ-day that without delay our military forces demobilized to peacetime strength.

The theory is that had we preserved intact our wartime military strength, these tragic developments would not have occurred.

But our military strength was intact when the Big Three conferences were held at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, where Poland was partitioned, when separate occupancy of eastern Germany was granted to Russia, when Russia was given special spheres of influence in the Balkans, when Russia was set into China and Korea.

The people did insist after VJ-day that our armies be brought promptly to peacetime strength. They insisted upon this because they had been led to believe that we had won a peace as well as a war.

The secret agreements, the details of the deals, had not been revealed, and the memoirs had not been written.

The people refused to allow their sons to continue to stay in our military establishments on the theory that if they were let out, they would be swelling the predicted ranks of 8,000,000 unemployed.

The people refused to regard our military establishments as detention camps to humor the defeatist reconversion planners who figured that the Nation would go to pot as soon as the war was over.

It is a clumsy, transparent, and panicky diversion to charge the American people with precipitously wanting for themselves and their sons to savor the peace which had been promised upon the achievement of unconditional surrender.

Certainly those who make this charge should be careful to separate themselves from those who shared the grizzly and then suppressed knowledge that perhaps a war had been fought merely to exchange oppressors.

What is the Republican position as to military preparedness? Again this is my personal view of it.

We are not taunting the opposition with "you got us into this mess, now get us out of it."

No, the measure of our peril is the accepted measure of our duty. We will do whatever is necessary, in the broadest sense, to protect the best interests of this country.

We will not give blank checks; we will not succumb to nervous Nellyism; we shall not cheesepare and we shall not allow any objective, no matter how well conceived, to give sanctuary to waste.

We shall not accept without question scissors and pastepot plans which we know have been feverishly prepared overnight and presented pursuant to partisan objectives or hysteria. We shall not accept piecemeal plans which cannot be sensibly referred to sound over-all plans.

We want to know, and have the right to know, the over-all plans and the subsidiary supporting plans.

If, for example, we need 40 air groups, there will be 40 air groups. If we need more than 40 air groups, the necessary will be done.

But we want to know the why of it. The answers for intelligent action involve a multitude of pertinent facts going to tactical and strategical function, manpower, resources, and industrial technology.

We want to know the help on which we can mount from potential allies. We want to know what we have and whether the best use is being made of it.

We want it made clear why it is claimed that we have no Army, no Navy, no Air Force while those who are running our military affairs are receiving from the taxpayers eleven thousand million dollars a year for military preparedness. Costs are higher but it may help our sense of proportion when I remind you that our combined foreign affairs and military appropriations at the present time approximate those made during the height of active warfare in World War I.

We want to know what potential enemies are doing and what they have to do it with.

We want to know how long it will take to bring blueprints into usable munitions.

We want to know the relation under the plans of each arm of the service to the others. We want to be assured that each such service is coordinated with the others in sound over-all plans and functions.

If one or all of the separate services have to be expanded to meet a sound over-all plan, they will be expanded. We also want to know whether any of them can be contracted if there is to be a new and more modern focusing of our striking forces.

We are not interested in aggrandizing any particular service because our sentiments and affections attach more strongly to that service than to the others. There is only one objective, and that is what should be done and the doing of that which should be done to prepare this country to meet and defeat any threatened peril.

We want no double talk. We want no artificial crises.

We shall perform our duty with cool heads, with foresight, with resolute hearts, with undeviating progress toward the required objectives.

We recognize that we can talk and bluster our way into war. And we are not going to do that. We recognize that we can blunder

our way into war by overemphasis and excited consideration of the unimportant. We are not going to do that.

We don't want war, and when we say that we mean it. We will take every honorable step to avoid war and in the meantime we shall provide sensible preparation for contingencies. That is Republican policy. That is the Republican way.

After 16 years of New Deal affliction our sense of outrage may have become benumbed. But we still have our sense of humor. Any renewal of the infallible commander in chief and infallible master of foreign affairs theme, which we may expect at any moment, will be laughed and derided into its nonsensical and ludicrous proportions.

How Can We Preserve Peace and Freedom Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio speech made on the Town Meeting of the Air in New Orleans, on April 13:

HOW CAN WE PRESERVE PEACE AND FREEDOM TODAY?

One way we could get peace is by yielding to the Soviet Union and its fifth columns throughout the world—but we would not have freedom.

We could probably preserve our freedom, at least for a time, by force of arms alone—but we would not have peace.

We can get both peace and freedom, we can prevent the present fierce political warfare from degenerating into an atomic war with incalculable destruction, even extermination, only through a world organization so revised and strengthened that it can deal effectively with all threats to the peace from whatever source—in the name and in the organized strength of free men everywhere.

In this present emergency concern for our own security has compelled us to assume the burden of assisting nations which are trying to stay free. But we cannot long carry that burden alone. We have neither the resources nor the wisdom.

Free peoples everywhere placed their faith in the United Nations as the agency to prevent war. It is clear from the experience of the last 2 years that in its present form it cannot do the job. In fact, it is so constructed that one of the Big Five, by its veto, can use the United Nations machinery to prevent the making of peace, to defeat the very thing it supposedly was set up to promote, yes, to guarantee.

We agreed to the big power veto to make sure the organization could not make war unjustifiably, on any member nation.

We were too naive to realize and too trustful to suspect that the Soviet rulers were coldly planning to use the veto not to block war, but to block peace. They have not used the veto once to prevent war. They have used it repeatedly to defeat measures or decisions that were in the direction of peace.

At Teheran, Yalta, and elsewhere our leaders, in order to get Russia to come along into the United Nations, yielded to her on matters of principle and on solemn pledges, including those in the Atlantic Charter, apparently assuming that if Russia joined, it would be for the same reason we and others joined, namely, to help solve world problems. But it soon became clear that the Soviet Government came in not to get solutions to problems, but to block solutions; not to make the UN work, but to be in the best possible position to make sure that it does not work.

The Kremlin already has a world-wide organization—the Communist Party. It has a dozen countries under complete control, plus trained, disciplined units in every other country. Believe me, that world organization is functioning efficiently, and at full speed. It intends to win, and in order to do so it must keep any other world organization crippled and ineffective.

That is an intolerable situation for those who really want peace and freedom. The remedy is not to abandon the UN, or to bypass it, but to revise it so it can function as intended. We must get its structure modified so that it can and will work—with Russia if possible, but without her if necessary.

At least three-fourths of the peoples of the world would join us in such an effort. But they cannot move without our active initiative and leadership.

Last year a group of Representatives and Senators of both political parties introduced a resolution urging the President to call immediately, under article 109 of the Charter, a general conference of the United Nations for the purpose of improving its machinery.

On March 16 of this year seven Republicans and seven Democrats in the House of Representatives introduced a more specific resolution to the same effect. Sixteen Members of the Senate, of both parties, introduced essentially the same resolution into that body only yesterday. It calls for revision of the Charter to eliminate the veto in matters of aggression and armament for aggression; to reorganize the Security Council to give representation more nearly approximating the actual strength of the various nations; to provide for inspection and control of atomic energy and other important weapons; and to set up an international police force recruited from volunteers from the smaller member states and supported if necessary by the armed forces of the major states which would be limited to agreed quotas.

If Russia's real objective is security, as some still maintain, then she should readily agree to such changes, because such a United Nations would guarantee her security, as well as ours, and that of every other country that wants to live in peace and let its neighbors do likewise.

Should Russia refuse to agree, then at least the world will know that her real objective is not security but conquest, and the other nations can go ahead to organize under article 51 of the Charter which authorizes members to unite for collective self-defense.

This time we must get an organization based on justice, under world law and with a policeman. The gun must be in the UN policeman's hand against any aggressor, rather than in an aggressor's hand against the UN and humanity.

We must get an instrument that the peaceful nations of the world can use to make peace and not one which a nonpeaceful nation (if one of the Big Five) can use to protect aggression and block peace.

We must move as effectively to strengthen our moral and our legal position as we are moving to strengthen our economic and military positions.

Stalin and his politbureau apparently think that we think we cannot get along without them. I am convinced that if we demonstrate to the Russians quickly that we and the other free peoples of the world can if necessary get along without them, we will soon find it possible to get along with them.

Whenever enough of the peaceful governments and peoples of the world get together on a basis that makes clear to the men in the Kremlin, first that they do not need to go to war to get security, or satisfaction of any legitimate grievances Russia may have; and second, that they cannot succeed even if they do go to war—at that point I believe there is a good chance they will come along, because agreement then becomes more advantageous than attempted conquest.

I recognize fully that, due to our drift and indecision, it may already be too late to prevent a blow-up in the next few weeks or months. But our best chance to preserve peace and freedom today consists of adequate strengthening of our own defenses, carrying out swiftly and efficiently the economic and military assistance programs to which we have already set our hands in Europe and Asia, and exercising positive, vigorous, imaginative leadership to develop and improve the United Nations until, please God, it can be made capable of enacting, interpreting and enforcing world law governing relations between the Nations and peoples of the earth.

The Question-Answer Bag on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me Wednesday, April 14, 1948, before the National Committee for Labor on Palestine:

THE QUESTION-ANSWER BAG ON PALESTINE

I can't think of any one act of the United States in its entire history that was more shameful, more dishonest, more harmful to its own prestige and welfare, than was its shocking turncoat betrayal of the Jews of Palestine.

The calculated brutality of it shocks the conscience. Up until that black Friday, assurances were given that the United States supported the partition plan. Even today, officialdom with bland, undisturbed face says it supports partition. Yes, says President Truman, the United States supports partition but—. Yes, says Under Secretary of State Lovett in a letter to me, the United States supports partition but—. A more tragic, disillusioning, and dishonorable "but," I have never met before in my 26 years of experience in the House of Representatives.

There were no buts last fall when the United States at the General Assembly debates ripped apart every opposing sentiment and took the honest road, the road that every fact disclosed, every logical examination revealed, was the only workable solution offered in all the months of debate. There were no buts in Hershel Johnson's statement when he said without political double talk: "I think there is no delegation here which does not know that no plan has ever been presented, either to this Assembly or to the mandatory government during its long years of tenure, or in any other place which would meet with the acceptance of both the Arabs and Jews. No such plan has ever been presented, and I do not believe that any such plan ever will be presented. If we are to effect through the United Nations a solution of this problem it cannot be done without the use of the knife."

There is a span as large as honor between the clean, direct statement of Herschel Johnson and the carefully tortured and ambiguous statements of Ambassador Austin. What meanings do words like "trusteeship" and "truce" have when the whole subject is

now treated by the United States as a local fray between Arabs and Jews in Palestine. Not once in this new presentation by the United States has a hint been given that possibly this is a war of aggression, external, definant aggression by the surrounding neighbors of Palestine.

Let's face some of these questions together.

Did the United Nations or any one of its component nations try to make partition work?

No.

Did the mandatory power in any single instance cooperate with the United Nations to put its schedule into operation?

No.

Did the mandatory power permit the authorized Palestine Commission to enter in time to prepare for British evacuation? Or did it permit the opening of a port on February 1, as resolved by the General Assembly? Did it permit the Jews to receive arms or did it throw its blockade around the port while at the same time sending arms to the Arab countries because, as it says, of contractual obligations? Did the mandatory power charged with the responsibility of maintaining law and order make any attempt to prevent acts of aggression against the Jews by Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, and Egypt? Did it not refuse to permit the organization of a Jewish militia which the General Assembly recommended? Did British police give convoy to Jews seeking to bring aid and food to stricken areas?

What about the United States? What act of implementation did it perform so that now it can say that at the present time partition is out of the question?

Did the United States, directly or indirectly, call to the attention of the British authorities the criminal neglect of their self-appointed duties? No.

Did the United States make protest of any kind to the United Nations these acts of aggression by Arab states? No.

Did it by any gesture or intimation or concrete act give anything but encouragement to the growing Arab belief that the United States was on the Arab side? No.

Did the United States give any encouragement whatsoever following November 29 that she was ready, willing, and able to help the Jewish defenders—defenders of their own home and of the UN decision?

Did our State Department issue passports to American youth seeking to go to Palestine to aid in the battle of survival? No; she reversed the position. As I recall, no passports were withheld from American youth who sought to join the armies of France or England or Canada in the prelude to World War II.

What did the United States do instead? She placed an arms embargo against Palestine. The irony of all ironies. Let me, in that connection, quote from the reply sent to a letter signed by 41 Members of the Senate and House. In that reply, Mr. Lovett writes: "The evidence indicates that arms in that area are being used by both sides for the furtherance of terrorism, murder, and intimidation. Until the peoples of Palestine can demonstrate their ability for self-control and self-government, there is every reason to believe that an increase in the supply of arms to either side would but further promote violence."

I wonder what evidence he is talking about? The evidence of the Egyptian Government assigning budgetary allocations for operation in Palestine? The evidence of the announcement of the Lebanese Prime Minister of his government's intention to supply Palestine with arms, money, and men? The evidence of the Syrian Prime Minister supervising the training of troops for war in Palestine? The evidence of the British and French unrestrainedly sending arms to the Arab states? Or the evidence of the Jews forced to defend themselves against 7,500 troops from neighboring Arab states, amply supplied with arms from friendly nations? In defense of its own shabby position the State Department tries to equalize the blame in an equally shabby way. Who has defied the UN decision? What is the equality in strength between the Jews of Palestine and the seven Arab states? Who has accepted compromise upon compromise if not the Jews of Palestine? First Transjordan was partitioned away and the compromise accepted; again ccmpromise was accepted in the partition of 10,000 square miles remaining; then compromise was accepted in consenting to the internationalization of Jerusalem. What more is to be asked of the Jews who saw millions of their brothers die because not one country was morally fit to help save them, least of all Great Britain who shut the doors of Palestine against the escaping Jews. The Arabs of Palestine, for the first time, by the partition plan are given statehood, a quality of sovereignty they never possessed before. Yet our Department of State sees fit to name the Jews and Arabs equally guilty. For shame!

Let me ask you this: Who is making the policy of the United States? Is it our people or is it "President" Forrestal or "Vice President" Truman?

Question follows question in an attempt to arrive at the answer to United States betrayal. Going around and around, we come back to the same conclusion. Had the United Nations' time schedule been followed, had the Commission been permitted to enter Palestine, had the port been opened as resolved, had the Jewish militia been formed and supplied as recommended, had the mandatory power Great Britain been true to its trust and maintained law and order and prevented aggression from outside with its 100,000 troops, had the United States thrown all its weight on upholding the decision for which it had been responsible in the first place, there would not even have existed the shadow of an excuse to throw the whole question back to the General Assembly. What followed November 29 was a concerted attack against the decision with only the Jews of Palestine seeking to defend it. What authority can the United Nations exercise when its weightiest members so recklessly and heedlessly flout its deliberations? The hopes for peace in the world were built into the structure of the United Nations, but surely as we meet here in protest those hopes are being smashed by the arrogance and disregard of human values by two countries who have abdicated their morality. I mean the Governments of Great Britain and that of the United States.

Are the Jews to be the human price paid for oil?

Is our national security to be built on shifting loyalties? Can even the Arab countries respect a powerful United States that betrays its friends because of violence and bluster? Can the oil serve a useful purpose in time of war? Or will it only drain off manpower and material vitally needed elsewhere? It is too far away to serve such purpose. Have the oil concessions either in Saudi Arabia or Iraq been canceled? Were they canceled after November 29 when the United States advocated present partition? Or has the greatest lobbying group in all of history, the oil interests, convinced their friend and protector that their profits may not be so large if King Ibn Saud sought to raise the price of these concessions? The exorbitant profits the oil interests made with Middle East oil yielded no revenue to the United States Treasury. The oil could yield no return to the military. The oil only benefits the private owners. How much more shameful than the desertion of the Jews of Palestine by our country which spends so much of its time and money proclaiming its moral superiority to the world!

Significantly enough, Herschel Johnson, who with such steadfastness and understanding of the problem, steered the debates successfully in the General Assembly, has been, as we in Washington call it, kicked upstairs. He has been made Ambassador to Mexico. Perhaps his courage and forthrightness did not sit well with the Arabphile Loy Henderson.

As for Ambassador Austin: If he had one ounce of the integrity and intrepedity of Johnson he would voluntarily resign his post. It is not the function of an ambassador merely to read the teletype messages sent to him by the Henderson group and read them off to the Security Council. Let it be recalled that he too supported partition vigorously last fall. What happened to him in the interim? Why this timidity, this ambiguity of phrase, this confused and hypocritical language that has become his lot to recite at the behest of our Department of State? From ambassador of rank he has become Henderson's errand boy.

I say we will not swallow complacently these turnabouts, this betrayal. We as free American citizens have the constitutional right to voice our protest, to keep on protesting until its sound is heard around the world and until the conscience of mankind is ripped open. This is not the end by any means. The Jewish State will be. And on May 16 when the Jewish agency and the Vaad Leumi gives over its control to the provisional government, we shall support it with all the strength at our command. We shall not surrender to dishonor.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on April 15 last my colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] delivered a timely and able address in the city of Washington before the national convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civil rights is a term that appeals to all Americans. The program of the President, however, is not a civil-rights program, but a program which will create a police state in America, destroy our economic system, and usurp the basic rights that make men free. The civil rights of an American are his most cherished poossessions, but they were not given to him by the Federal Government. They have come down from our English heritage. When the Colonies declared themselves to be independent States, these rights were protected by the new State constitutions. When the States decided to form a Federal unit they created a control Government of limited powers by delegation in a written Constitution. They conferred no jurisdiction over the civil rights of individuals to the Central Government, but retained that power in themselves. After the Constitution was adopted the States added a Bill of Rights in order to prevent the Federal Government from invading the civil rights of individuals.

After the Civil War and the adoption of the fourteenth amendment the Congress adopted a theory that the fourteenth amendment conferred upon the Federal Government the jurisdiction over the civil rights of individuals, and they passed the Civil Rights Act of

1875. This act was declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1883, the Court holding that the Congress derived no power from the fourteenth amendment to concern itself with the civil rights of individuals; that those rights were still within the jurisdiction of the individual States, where they had always been.

Southern opposition to this so-called civil-rights program is not an attempt to hold the Negro down. All decent southerners believe in economic equality and better educational opportunities and health facilities for all, regardless of race. The South has made tremendous strides in this direction, in spite of the obstacles which have been placed against us by the Federal Government. By the protective tariff and freight rate discriminations the South has been systematically impoverished. This, more than anything else, has held the Negro down, and it was placed on the statute books by Senators and Congressmen from Northern States.

Now, in particular and briefly, what is this program? First, the anti-poll-tax bill. This measure is patently unconstitutional as the Constitution specifically provides that the qualifications of electors shall be defined by the States. The poll tax is not designed to keep the Negro from voting because it does not apply in some States to people over 50 years of age and in others to those over 60, and in addition thousands of Negroes regularly pay their poll tax. This tax is primarily to raise money for the public-school system. Southern opposition to the anti-poll-tax bill is to prevent the power being lodged in Congress to define the qualifications of voters and thus to federalize elections. The founding fathers wisely felt that the control of all elections should be kept at home. They realized liberty would be destroyed if the suffrage were controlled by the Federal Government.

The next bill is the FEPC. This bill would apply more to northern industry than to the South if enacted. As proof that the bill is not sectional, it has been defeated by the legislatures of 18 Northern and Western States and adopted in only 3, and when submitted to the people of California in a referendum it was defeated in every county of the State by a vote that totalled 2 to 1 against the bill.

This FEPC bill makes it unlawful for a private employer to refuse to hire or to discharge a person or to discriminate against him in any way because of race, religion, color, or ancestry. It would send out thousands of petty officials to investigate and regulate millions of daily decisions throughout the United States. These agents would examine your books and records, go into your business, and any person whether aggrieved or not is authorized to prefer charges against any employer. A trial is then held and a decision reached in the city of Washington which could result in a fine and imprisonment. It must be admitted that making it unlawful for you to refuse to hire a man is simply a way of compelling you to hire him. By permitting the Government to take over the power of employment and promotion in private business, this bill would destroy our private enterprise system. It would deprive Americans of the constitutional guaranties of individual liberty and freedom of association, and by compelling an employer to make contracts for mutual services with persons with whom he is unwilling to make contracts it would force him to accept involuntary servitude which the Constitution declares shall not exist in this country. Every American has a civil right to hire whom he pleases and associate with whom he pleases, and one man cannot be given a civil right which by so doing destroys the civil right of another man. If a person has a moral right to work this does not give him the right to compel a private citizen to employ him. This is the most far-reaching liberty-destroying measure ever considered by the Congress. It is no exaggeration to say that a large majority of the backers of FEPC are pro-Soviet in their sympathies. Many of them are members of Communist front organizations, as were several members of the President's Civil Rights Committee. The drive for this whole so-called civil-rights program comes principally from the left and those who would use the Negro and not from the Negro himself.

The antilynch bill is unconstitutional because it invades the police powers of the States. It is fundamental to our American system that the control of the police power should remain at home. The men who created this Government, as the debates in the Constitutional Convention will show, deemed local control of the police power the most important of all safeguards of human liberty. Without it, they rightfully saw tyranny and dictatorship in America. The crime of lynching has been solved. We average only about one each year. In America today the murders in race riots are many times those killed in lynching. Yet the antilynching bill does not apply to those killed in riots in Northern cities. There were 35 people killed and 700 injured in a single race riot in Detroit in 1943, which is far more than have lost their lives by lynching in many years in the South, to say nothing of property damage estimated at over $5,000,000. If a murder because of race is made a crime by the Federal Government, it should be the same crime in both the North and the South. Could there be more hypocrisy anywhere than in the antilynching bill?

It is further proposed in this so-called civil-rights program that the segregation laws be repealed by the Federal Government in all matters affecting interstate commerce. If the various States and localities refuse to repeal the segregation laws in public schools, public housing, and other public services and facilities generally, then it is proposed to deny all such States all Federal grants-in-aid. In addition, it is proposed to set up a Federal commission on civil rights with an army of lawyers to direct the FBI in an intensive campaign to strike down any existing law or ordinance which might provide for segregation in schools, hospitals, swimming pools, restaurants, and hotels. In fact, the crux of the whole program is the destruction of all segregation in America. There is no way to force such a program on Southern people. We have pride of race and will not permit the Federal Government to tamper with our social structure.

My friends, the social structure of the South is best for all concerned. We have less inter-racial crime and less racial friction than any section of the country. On the subject of race and segregation there is practically no difference between the views of Southern and Northern people. You of the North believe in and practice segregation for yourselves and families. You, like Southern people, live segregated lives. You are guilty of racial discrimination in the newspaper business. There are thousands of Negro reporters in this country, yet a proportionate 10 percent of your reporters do not come from this race. Ten percent of your executives are not Negroes. You are not to be condemned. It is your civil right to associate with, employ, and work with whom you please. Liberty is dead when you are deprived of this right.

The abolition of our dual school system is part of the civil rights program. The South has made tremendous strides in Negro education, and the dual school system is best for the Negro race. It gives him a better opportunity to develop than he would have in competition with white students. The Negro has a better opportunity to become a professor, administrator, or scientist in his own school system. There are a scant handful of Negro college professors and administrators in all the Northern and Western States, while in the South the Negro colleges are staffed with professors from their own race. There are only 86 Negro medical students today in all the nonsegregated medical schools of the North and West because the black must compete for admittance with the white, while two Southern Negro medical colleges have an enrollment of over 1,000. It is easy to see that the Negro has greater opportunity under the southern system.

We of the South believe in the equality of the administration of the law for all citizens of every race. We do insist upon the right which we regard as sacred to choose our own associates. Before other sections condemn our views, you must realize that it is an entirely different problem in a community where the population is 5 percent Negro and 95 percent white, than where the population is 50–50. Editors from New York know that in the past few weeks there have been news items in the New York papers which describe conditions in the public schools in New York where the races are mixed in schools in approximately even numbers, city police are stationed in the corridors of the public school buildings to maintain order and discipline in the public schools. Is this an educational pattern that the advocates of the civil rights report desire to foster upon other areas where harmony and good will now prevail?

Our views are not caused by bigotry and intolerance. We have had experience; we know which is best. The whole question was analyzed by General Eisenhower a few days ago when he told a congressional committee which was discussing segregation in the Army, "You can never make people love each other by passing a law."

My friends, as I said in the beginning, this program, if enacted, will destroy the inalienable rights of all Americans and will destroy our private enterprise system. Where is the justice in depriving the majority of their inalienable traditional rights to enable members of minority groups to enjoy newly created rights which are in reality nothing but special privileges? The interest and welfare of the United States and all her people of every section are best served by retaining the American economic system and her system of government with all its guarantees of liberty and freedom. That, simply is the issue here. The South will use every resource to maintain our system and liberties inviolate. In so doing we will best serve our country as a whole.

The More Abundant Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, on April 14, 1948, Mr. L. F. Whittemore, who is the president of the Federal Reserve bank for the district which includes Boston, delivered an address before the thirty-first annual connvention of the American Brush Manufacturers Association at Atlantic City. The subject of the address was the More Abundant Life. It seems to me that the address contains so much good New England and American common sense that it is worthy of being printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent for that privilege.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these days of threat and trial and decision it is not out of place to consider

critically the underlying theories and conditions which produce such abundance of life as we enjoy. The expression "more abundant life" means all things to all men. To the politician it has often meant a legislative method of redistributing wealth for political advantage.

To Jesus, who first coined the phrase, if we can believe St. John 10:10, it meant spiritual abundance. He said, "I am come that they might have life, and may have it more abundantly."

To millions of Americans it means steady jobs, high pay measured by purchasing power, and educational and cultural advantages.

We need not quarrel over the exact interpretation of the phrase, but it seems necessary to discover the source of its production. The spiritual values producing abundance have not lost their importance but the production of the material values have often been underestimated and carelessly evaluated.

Seeking and finding the sources of the more abundant life is doubly important in this period which sees the world divided between two hostile camps—the one representing our own way of life, or something close to it, and the other representing its direct opposite. We had hoped for, and we can continue to hope for, a friendly rivalry between the two systems, each in its own way attempting to demonstrate that it produces the more abundant life spiritually and materially. If the peace is preserved then it is important to know what produces the more abundant life because in the long run our own civilization will depend upon providing more of it than the Communist system does. If, on the other hand, we should have war or a long period of armed truce, knowing what produces the more abundant life is even more important. It is an axiom derived from the last two World Wars that the nation or group of allies which has been able to achieve the higher standard of living in peacetime is able to produce more war goods per head of population in time of war. The reason is obvious. The higher the standard of living in peacetime the greater is the margin of production above that minimum necessary to sustain the civilian population during a war. A higher proportion of output can be devoted to war in a country having a high standard of living than in a country with a low standard of living.

Political leadership has not always been concerned about the more abundant life for either of the reasons I have just given. There have been those in high places who felt that the capitalistic free-enterprise system had broken down in this country. It was suggested that the more abundant life could be produced by appropriate Government-spending programs. Those who held this view made Government spending synonymous with the more abundant life; the more spending increased, the more abundant was our life supposed to be. It should not be as hard to meet such arguments in the future as in the past.

It has become fashionable today for everybody to promise the more abundant life. The advertisements tell us in effect that if we use somebody's pills, or if the women use somebody's cosmetics, or if we buy somebody's automobile, then we shall enjoy the more abundant life.

In the union meetings and in the labor press we find still another path to the more abundant life. It is the path of ever-increasing wages. So the more abundant life has evolved from a pious political platitude to something to be hawked by the hucksters and made a part of the often lopsided logic of the labor leader. Obviously, everybody who promises the more abundant life cannot be right. Let us examine some of the claims to see if we can find an element of truth in any or all of them.

First let us take the claim that Government can produce the more abundant life. The thought that strikes me first about this claim is that historically it simply is not so. This country achieved its greatest growth during a period when the role of Government, at least so far as spending was concerned, was insignificant. Here are some facts to ponder in this connection. Between 1870 and 1890 in this country the national income more than doubled, not simply in terms of dollars but in real terms, in terms of goods and services produced. It more than doubled again in real terms between 1890 and 1910. It increased by almost another third between 1910 and 1930. How big a part did Government play in these phenomenal increases in our national income? From a dollars-and-cents point of view the part of the Government was insignificant. We spent on the Federal Government in 1870 something like 6 percent of our national income. By 1910 this small proportion had dropped to only 2 percent. (We spent over 12 percent in 1939, and 21 percent last year.) High costs of government may be a deterrent to the individual accomplishment leading to the realization of the more abundant life.

The part played by the Government in producing probably the largest sustained increase in a nation's output that history has ever recorded was not a part that required any great expenditure of money. The Government kept the peace and insured justice so far as it was able and in general helped to preserve a climate that was good for business. Perhaps it did not do all the things that governments are supposed to do and it did some things that governments are not supposed to do, but on the whole it behaved well enough to give us a long running head start in getting our standard of living above the standard anywhere else in the world.

The extent of our head start is shown rather dramatically by the contrast between our standard of living and the standard of living in the Soviet Union, where the government plays and has always played a bigger part than it does in any other nation in the world. Just before the war it is estimated that the American civilian enjoyed goods and services for his own personal consumption to an amount four times greater than the amount enjoyed by his Russian counterpart. This prewar contrast has probably been widened as the result of the war's destruction. The Soviet Union, with its planned economy, its government control, and all the rest of the paraphernalia of the Communist version of the police state, has a long way to go before it catches up with where we were many years ago.

I could give you a good many more reasons why the more abundant life cannot be produced by government; one other will do. Government planning and government control does not just happen. It requires people and still more people to run the government. These people produce regulations and controls, but they do not produce goods and services that enter into the market place. The more people we put into government office, the fewer people we have producing the things we buy in the market and the larger the proportion of our income that we spend in taxes rather than for the products of industry. We have enormously expanded our Government services and probably for the most part wisely.

We cannot continue to expand them and still get the most for our money. The most important thing that we must all remember about Government services is that the price of those services does not have to meet any tests of the market. We can never decide whether we shall have another dollar's worth of steak or another dollar's worth of farm subsidies. No one knows and no one can find out how much any given kind of Government service costs him personally. That is one of the main reasons why Government services have expanded. Almost all such services bring material and tangible benefits to some group or another in the country. The groups to be benefited set up a great clamor in favor of the expansion of Government service which will benefit them. The rest of us who pay most of the bills are not aware and cannot be made aware of how much this expansion of Government service will cost each of us personally. Even on a per capita basis the amount spent for any given addition to Government service is small. Therefore, time after time Government expenditures have been increased, more money has been taken away from the taxpayer, and no one knows whether the sum total of human happiness was increased more by the Government expenditure than it would have been had the taxpayer been left to spend more of his money as he saw fit.

Probably most numerous of the secular prophets who claim that the true cause of the more abundant life has been revealed to them are the labor leaders. With some notable exceptions it has become usual for union officers to claim that the way to a more abundant life, not only for labor but for everyone, is to be found in higher wages.

There is reason for some hope that the mirage of higher money wages is beginning to be seen for what it is. Labor leadership has worked very hard since the end of the war to raise wages. For all of their strikes and their very large wage increases, workers in manufacturing industries are now receiving, on the average, real wages per hour hardly any higher than the wages they had at the end of the war. Some unions are even claiming that their hourly earnings now buy less than they bought at the end of the war.

For organized labor the way to get more pork chops is not always by getting higher wages. When all wages are raised without a corresponding increase in productivity, it is impossible for everybody to get an increase in real wages. Incident to one group getting an increase, other groups take a reduction because of higher prices. Wage increases may increase the number of dollars a worker receives, but when all workers get more dollars and no one produces any more goods, then the costs of industrial goods go up and the wages will buy no more than they bought before. If, as is likely also, the farmers don't produce any more than before, then the higher wages simply increase the purchasing power bidding for food, and food and farm prices go higher.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor unanimously adopted the following resolution on January 31, 1940:

"We have learned the lesson that when opportunities for profit diminish, opportunities for jobs likewise disappear."

The programs of labor leadership have often failed to take this resolution into consideration.

The sure way to higher wages and to a higher standard of living for everyone is increased production. The answer to the question, "What produces the more abundant life?" can be found only if we know the answer to the question, "What brings about increased production?"

It has become fashionable in the last year or so to argue that more and harder work is the key to increased production. To some extent at the present time this is correct when considered in relation to lack of enthusiasm for accomplishment and premeditated slow-down. Historically, however, and in the future, harder work is not the whole answer. Let's not forget that the increased production of the past did not result from more and harder work by the individual worker but often resulted in less and lighter work. We have increased production by inventing machines that took the strain out of heavy labor. We have increased production by better lighting, by better lay-out of work, by improving markets so that we could obtain the benefits of mass production.

In the long run, then, the answer to the question, "What brings about increased production?"—is not more sweat. It is not more brawn. It is more brains.

People have seldom in history worked harder for less than they did through all the centuries from the fall of Rome until a mere 200 years ago. Life for the great majority of people for centuries was hard, uncertain and, on the average, very short. During part of this period the world suffered from too little government. It was virtually impossible to carry on any trade or commerce over an extended area, because such governments of the day as were well-intentioned were too weak to give the trader protection.

During the latter centuries before modern times, there was probably too much government. We forget that one of the causes of our own American Revolution was the attempt on the part of the mother country to enforce laws controlling the trade and commerce of the colonies. These laws were part and parcel of the whole system of laws and regulations governing imports, exports, manufactures, and most aspects of economic life. Until these laws and regulations were swept aside there was little increase in production and in the standard of living. Either too little or too much government can hold down our standard of living.

All the restrictions which held down production and progress before the industrial revolution, however, were not imposed by governments. Probably the most important impediments to production were the laws and regulations imposed upon men's minds. It seems incredible to us today that at one time the authority of church and state was employed to enforce upon men's minds beliefs that today we consider ridiculous. Among these was the belief that a heavy body would fall at a faster rate than a light one, that the world was flat, that the sun circled 'round the earth, that a pump worked because nature abhored a vacuum rather than because air had weight, that the process of combustion occurred because a burning material gave off something rather than because it took on oxygen from the air. In the field of business, lending and borrowing were restricted because money was held to be barren and the taking of interest sinful. Exports were thought to be good for a nation and imports bad.

These and similar authoritative views had to be displaced before scientific and commercial progress could be made, and it was necessary to make progress along these lines before any great increase in production could occur. People must have an experimental attitude, a research attitude, the spirit of free inquiry rather than deference to authority before they can make progress. When men are encouraged to try something new they make discoveries. Many of their discoveries may be useless either at the time or indefinitely, but some discoveries always pay off. Freedom to inquire, freedom from authority and regulations, freedom to enter businesses of one's own choosing, freedom to expand into new markets, freedom to make and keep large profits resulting from one's own efforts—these and similar freedoms resulted in scientific discoveries, in inventions of new machines and new techniques, in the development of new markets, in the development of new industries and in the enormous increases in productivity. Altogether, these freedoms produced the more abundant life.

Our own history and the history of the western world has demonstrated that in freedom there is strength. We have evolved a system in this country, based upon freedom, which has produced the highest standard of living in the world. It is a system which, I am confident, will produce the means of defending our free way of life against all attacks of totalitarianism, whether those attacks be upon our minds or upon our country. The more abundant life has been produced and can be preserved by nurturing our freedom. It can be kept and improved by our willingness to pay the price of freedom.

The price of freedom is more than willingness to place one's services and one's property at the disposal of the country in time of war. It is willingness to serve the cause of freedom at all times. For businessmen the price must always include willingness to compete, willingness to continue the rivalry in production and in selling, willingness to stake money on a new idea. Businessmen strike a blow against freedom when they run the Government to get special privileges or special protection against competition, when they suppress new inventions, or gang up on a competitor, or agree not to compete with each other.

Businessmen and all other groups in the country can ensure the more abundant life by cherishing and promoting the freedom which has made that kind of life possible. By competing with each other in quality and price and in developing new ideas, they will enable the Nation and the private-enterprise system to out-perform any system of totalitarianism. One hundred and forty-five million free people should be able to think up more ways of producing a more abundant life than one dictator, even if he has a politbureau to help him.

Dairymen Protest at Margarine Publicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the dairy industry, which provides an important balance to the agricultural economy of the State of Idaho, points out that the position of butter producers has not always had fair treatment in the arguments of recent weeks which sought repeal of the taxes on margarine. Consequently I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter recently sent to the editor of Life magazine by E. S. Trask, of Idaho Falls, Idaho, general manager of the Upper Snake River Valley Dairymen's Association, Inc., which effectively refutes some of the misleading arguments presented in an effort to achieve removal of present oleo taxes.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR, LIFE MAGAZINE,
Time and Life Building, Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: Your editorial in Life of March 8 this year entitled "Margarine versus Butter" and also the caption "A good fight to get in on" is, to say the least, very, very misleading when you state that at least $6,000,000 a year on grocery bills would be saved by the American housewife. You were certainly wrong in adding that on to the 88,000,000 woman-hours in the kitchen. It can be admitted that the latter might be true if anyone had time to check up on it, but the $6,000,000 statement is not true.

Evidently you did not secure the facts, or at least a thorough check-up was not made into the situation before writing this editorial.

May we remind you that the ¼-cent tax on oleo also applies to renovated butter and was put on to police both products alike. The 10 cents for factory coloring was legislated into the law to prevent deception and fraud. Any product must be good if others try to imitate it—that is what the margarine people want to do.

The housewife can color her own margarine at the present price of oleo and if it were factory colored there would be no way of protecting innocent people, particularly those who eat out, against deception. The $6,000,000 certainly would not be saved and the only saving would be in the home coloring, so you were certainly wrong in making that statement.

In regard to the 52,000,000 bushels of grain which could be exported, I would much rather have you talk to those who raise grain, for evidently before we know it there will be too much grain in the world instead of not enough.

Further, if the ingredients which go into oleo were put through as rigid sanitary tests as dairy products, the cost would undoubtedly be greater. We who are in the dairy industry have no quarrel with oleo being sold for what it is, either in its natural color or any other color excepting the color of butter.

The recent vote of the House Committee on Agriculture of 16 to 10 certainly proves that the old cow still has friends.

I am sorry to have bothered you in regard to this, for I have always had a high regard for statements made in Life, but if other stories are not sifted down more carefully than this one, we will certainly commence to wonder.

Information brought out at the hearing certainly proves many points that the dairy industry has been making for years.

Yours very truly,

E. S. TRASK,
General Manager of Upper Snake River Valley Dairymen's Association, Inc.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Sunday, April 18, 1948, entitled "The Trade Pacts Hang in the Balance."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRADE PACTS HANG IN THE BALANCE

Among the States which are vitally interested in the maintenance and expansion of world trade is Virginia. This is emphasized in an article published in the April Commonwealth magazine by Dallas L. Jones, of the Richmond office, United States Department of Commerce. Virginia, it is obvious, should support renewal by Congress of the reciprocal trade pacts and all other measures which have similar objectives.

Mr. Jones draws attention once more to the reasons why the Old Dominion is vitally interested in foreign commerce. He points out that about 30 percent of Virginia tobacco has to be exported in normal times. There are several other Virginia products, such as apples, which likewise depend to a greater degree on export markets than the average.

There is also the dependence of the port of Hampton Roads on large exports and im-

ports. Norfolk, Newport News, and Portsmouth combined are exporting more tonnage at this time than any other port in the United States, if not in the world, says Mr. Jones. Hampton Roads is the greatest coal transshipment center in America, and the world's foremost tobacco port. The importance of foreign commerce to the United States as a whole also enters into Virginia's desire to expand this form of trade.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires in June, and its extension is of the utmost importance, not only to this State and Nation, but to mankind. Already the blight of totalitarianism has fallen upon vast areas, with seriously harmful effects upon foreign trade in those regions. It behooves the United States to do all in its power to promote a free flow of goods in those areas of the globe where such a flow is still possible.

Republican control of Congress is ominous for the future of the reciprocal-trade pacts, in view of the announced intention of certain GOP leaders to terminate the power vested in the President, under those pacts, to make further trade agreements. Not only so, but the Republican record on the issue could hardly be worse.

The power to enter into these agreements was conferred by Congress for the first time in 1934, on the recommendation of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull. It has been renewed four times. Except in 1943, at the height of the war, the Republicans have been overwhelmingly against the pacts.

The vote in the Senate, by parties, on each of these occasions was as follows:

1934—Democrats for, 51; against, 5. Republicans for, 5; against, 28.

1937—Democrats for, 56; against, 9. Republicans for, 0; against, 14.

1940—Democrats for, 41; against 15. Republicans for, 0; against, 20.

1943—Democrats for, 41; against, 8. Republicans for, 18; against, 14.

1945—Democrats for, 38; against, 5. Republicans for, 15; against, 16.

In the same years, the votes in the House of Representatives have shown:

1934—Democrats for, 269; against, 11. Republicans for, 2; against, 99.

1937—Democrats for, 278; against, 11. Republicans for, 3; against, 81.

1940—Democrats for, 212; against, 20. Republicans for, 5; against, 146.

1943—Democrats for, 193; against, 3. Republicans for, 163; against, 26.

1945—Democrats for, 205; against, 12. Republicans for, 33; against, 140.

That is a depressing showing, insofar as the Republicans are concerned. Has the party learned anything on this issue since it expressed such opposition to the pacts only 8 years ago? Much depends on the answer to that question. Virginia and many other States of the Union are vitally interested in the renewal of these agreements and the signing of new ones. The Soviet Union's influence of late has been strongly in the direction of a more restricted flow of international commerce. The entire world will be the loser if the United States succumbs to the tariff barons and joins the forces of nationalism and autarchy.

The Italian Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to express to many thousands of my constituents of the Twelfth New York Congressional District our sincere admiration and gratitude for the great part they have played in the past month in the letter-writing campaign to their relatives and friends in Italy in behalf of justice and democracy as opposed to Red totalitarianism and the police state.

Without exception the letters of these fine citizens of Brooklyn advocated votes in the Italian election in favor of the American way of life and policies of the Government of the United States and expressed nothing but contempt for Soviet fascism and slavery.

We pray to Almighty God that the final results of the elections in Italy will put a stop to the Communist campaign of conspiracy and chicanery, chaos, and terror, designed to fool and intimidate the peoples of the world.

Under the permission granted me by the House, I include in these remarks the following editorial entitled "United States Diplomacy Has Displayed Real Efficiency in Italian Vote," which appeared in the Boooklyn Eagle of Sunday, April 18, 1948:

UNITED STATES DIPLOMACY HAS DISPLAYED REAL EFFICIENCY IN ITALIAN VOTE

Today, in an election of historic importance, the Italian people will make a decision fateful to themselves and to a great part of the free world. This election is without precedent. It will tilt the scales toward democracy or totalitarianism in Europe. Its effects will be felt deeply by the United States and the American people.

A month or more ago the outcome of this election was cause for deep anxiety. Communism was riding the crest of the wave in Italy and its power in France was great. There was reason to fear that Moscow's sphere of influence would be extended far to the west and that domination of the continent would be completed.

The transformed prospect is attributable to a number of factors—the skill and determination of Premier de Gasperi, the new unity of Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg, the crusade of the Vatican in summoning the religious forces of the nation against Moscow, and inspired diplomacy.

The United States has been the one dominant force in arresting the Communist tide even though others have contributed materially. Its power has been exerted in many ways and the result has been that the bright hopes of the Communists have been turned to despair and, in fact, to the anticipation of defeat.

Russia has given substantial support to Palmiro Togliatti and his agents but all they have had to offer was propaganda, skillful and unscrupulous but at best only words. The United States has spoken in terms to impress hungry and impoverished people—millions of tons of coal, hundreds of thousands of tons of food, the promise of further economic aid under the Marshall plan.

The master stroke of diplomacy, however, was the proposal by the United States, Great Britain, and France on March 20 that Trieste be returned to Italy, followed shortly by an effort to have Italy admitted to the United Nations, then to give Italy a nonvoting voice in the General Assembly.

Signor Togliatti and his fellow Soviet agents in Italy literally had the ground cut from beneath their feet when Russia, whose spurious friendship for the Italian people they had been exploiting so vehemently, rejected both proposals. Under such circumstances the prententions of friendship were difficult to maintain.

Regardless of what the outcome of today's vote may be, the United States has met the challenge with a skill in psychological warfare which has been both surprising and heartening. It seems unlikely that the effort to save Italy will fail. But if we fail it will not be from lack of initiative and resourcefulness.

Our Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, our forests are among our greatest assets. Sad to relate, we have been a people of exploitation in this respect. However, we are coming to realize that one of the cornerstones of our economic prosperity is the development of a fine effective forest program.

In connection with this I would like to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks an editorial from the Southwest American, published at Fort Smith, Ark., in the issue of Wednesday, April 7, 1948, by Mr. Clarence F. Byrns, the editor of the paper, who is one of the leaders, not only of our State but of the Nation, in our soil-conservation program, and not only in soil conservation and river development but in forestry as well.

The editorial follows:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

Forests are not spectacular except when they are on fire. So most of us pay little attention to the forestry budget bill as it goes through Congress. To me, it is intensely interesting, because it deals with the greatest renewable natural resource we possess and the source of most of our industrial activity in this State.

The Federal Forest Service budget is now going through Congress. What it contains is important to Arkansas for two reasons. First, it provides the money to operate the Ozark and Ouachita National Forests which occupy much of the area of northwest and southwest Arkansas. Second, it provides the money to match with State and private funds to protect more than half the area of this State from fire.

In most respects the present bill is satisfactory. It has passed the House and probably will be up for action in the Senate about the middle of April.

It provides enough money to keep the timber sale program going at full speed. Regular and emergency appropriations for paying cost of timber sales from national forests totaled $3,790,000 in the present year, which ends June 30. The new bill, for the following year, provides $3,715,000.

It is important to Arkansas people to keep this program going full tilt. We and others need the timber which is being cut from the forest. The counties in which the national forests are located get one-fourth of the revenue from the sale of timber on national forests. The timber cut so far this year is running ahead of 1946–47 fiscal year, and promises to be the highest total on record when the year ends June 30.

The gross receipts in money probably will pay to the counties in the national forest about 9 cents per acre. The average taxes paid to the counties on similar lands in private ownership is around 5 cents per acre.

The funds from timber sales on national forests go to schools and county roads.

The bill carries the same amount as this year and last for aid to State forestry departments in fire control on privately owned lands. That is $9,000,000 a year. It has been adequate up to now to match dollar for dollar the funds provided by States and by owners of private timber lands. It may not be adequate in the coming fiscal year, because so many States are increasing their forest fire control funds.

Arkansas stepped up its forest appropriations sharply by action of the 1947 legislature. The previous appropriations for the forestry division of the Resources and Development Commission has been about $100,000 a year. The 1947 legislature raised that to $525,000 a year. The Federal Government pays half the cost of fire control, but it pays it the year after it has been spent. That means the State got no increase in Federal funds for the year ending next June 30, but will get a substantial increase in 1948–49, if Federal funds are adequate. In the following year, the State can get Federal funds equal to half the total expenditure in 1948–49. Other States are doing a similar thing. So there is logical reason for efforts now pending to raise the fire control appropriation.

One other item in the forest budget interests me. This year, $95,960 is being spent on study of watershed management of forests. That item is reduced to $70,960 in the present bill. This program, like most research projects, is a long-time job. Much excellent work has been done on an experimental forest in North Carolina in the study of watershed management to stabilize and increase water flow. It should not be restricted by a penny-pinching approach. Water is the indispensable asset in the development of any community or area. The effect of forest practices on water supply is too little understood, even by the best informed.

The forest remains our most valuable natural resource, aside from the soil itself. What happens to it is some of your business and mine.

The President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith a splendid editorial appearing in the current issue of one of the Nation's oldest and most conservative national magazines, Collier's.

It is interesting to note that so many of the better newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals, even outside our Southland, concur in our views regarding the President's so-called civil-rights program.

The editorial follows:

WE NEED SOMETHING STRONGER THAN LAW

When President Truman called recently for a lot of civil-rights laws—antilynch, antipoll tax, anti Jim Crow, etc.—either he stirred up a true hornets' nest down South or (as seems more likely at this writing) he only handed southern democrats a promising chance to make a husky bid for restoration of the two-thirds rule at the next Democratic convention.

What's the truth about this civil-rights question, anyway? It fans up the fiercest passions, and it traces back to the first hope-he's-still-burning-in-hell scoundrel who kidnaped the first Negro from Africa for slavery in the American colonies.

It seems to us that most Americans who do any thinking and arguing on the subject are at one and the same time right and wrong.

Northern intellectuals, who make southerners see red with their continual nagging at the South and their demands for Federal civil-rights laws, are surely right in principle. Lynching is a foul crime. Poll taxes are unjust when they keep any one group of people from voting. Jim Crow cars or trolley and bus sections are discriminatory. It is unfair to freeze Negroes out of good jobs for which they could qualify. And so on.

On the other hand, we think southerners are only telling the truth when they insist that Federal laws will never succeed in wiping out these injustices. It is axiomatic that no law, however well meant, can work unless it is supported by the majority of the people it affects. Northern intellectuals should know this fact of life from the Nation's experience with Federal prohibition.

Well, both sides having a measure of right and a measure of wrong in their arsenals of argumentation, is there any discoverable factor that swings the scales one way or the other? We think there is.

That factor is the unquestionable truth that the Negro's status in the South is getting better every day. He is some 90 percent better off economically than in the early years following the Civil War. Lynching is sliding toward the vanishing point. As for social equality, most Negroes apparently don't want it anyway, since they have their own social organizations to satisfy their fraternal, religious, snobbish, and so forth, instincts.

Federal laws didn't work these improvements. They have come about solely because they have been stimulated by the most substantial and respected people among the southern whites. They would have come a good deal more slowly, we think, if Federal laws had forced Mr. Whiskers to keep his nose eternally stuck into southern affairs.

If all this is as true as we're convinced it is, then it follows that the best way to solve what remains of the Negro problem is to go on just about as we've been going since around 1870. That would mean: Let the northern intelligentsia howl its collective head off about the South, let the southern and northern politicians make what political capital they can out of the question, but don't saddle the Federal Government with a bunch of laws which it cannot enforce. In other words, let the South work out its Negro problems mostly on its own—which it is doing anyway, and we think will continue to do.

Will the Price of Oleo Go Up?—Will This Be Blamed on the Dairymen of America, or on Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much publicity was given the fact that butter advanced in price 5 to 8 cents per pound after the Agricultural Committee voted to discontinue hearings on the oleo bill for this session, and to appoint a subcommittee to study and submit a bill for future consideration.

The following news item appeared on the front page of the April 15 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

SHORTENING PRICE RAISED 2 CENTS POUND

CINCINNATI, OHIO, April 15.—Procter & Gamble and Lever Bros. today increased the price of their shortening 2 cents a pound, effective immediately. The Procter & Gamble announcement said the increase reflects increased costs of vegetable oils.

The first question is, Will the metropolitan press assert that this rise in price, which compares in percentage to the rise in the butter prices, be blamed on the dairymen of the Nation?

The second question is, Will the oleo people raise the price of oleo now to meet the increase in oil prices, or will they wait until after the oleo bill is on the floor of the House for consideration on April 26?

The third point is, that since there are only 26 oleomargarine manufacturers that make oleomargarine, and since they have a monopoly on the domestic market, it will be easy for these 26 manufacturers to hold the price down—at least until after the oleomargarine legislation is considered on the floor of the House on April 26. We shall see what we shall see!

The fourth point is that vegetable oils directly and oleo indirectly have been subsidized for many years. This subsidy is between 1 and 10 cents per pound. Cotton has more subsidies than the British have traditions.

Military Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, April 18, 1948, by John Griffin:

ATOM BOMB IN UNITED STATES HANDS REMAINS BIGGEST THREAT TO COMMUNISTS' AIMS—DAY OF FATEFUL ITALIAN ELECTIONS FINDS AMERICAN B–29'S THAT COULD CARRY BOMBS SOARING OVER EUROPE

(By John Griffin)

The Italian election today may be the most important election in modern times. There is hardly ever an election that the politicians don't describe as the most critical ever, but in this case all the appraisals of the importance seem to be justified.

For if the Communists win, or even if they come close, the field of western Europe may be wide open to them, Marshall plan or no Marshall plan. The French will have a tough time holding out if Italy falls into the Russian bag, and so will other countries.

It can't be said that the United States has looked with detachment upon the Italian situation. We have played our cards well, as diplomacy goes. We have struck a responsive chord in Italian hearts by offering Trieste, and the Reds were outsmarted on that.

SENT FOOD AND ADVICE

We have sent food and other materials in abundance to Italy, and said that there is more where that came from. Hundreds of

thousands of Americans of Italian blood have thrown the weight of their influence on the side of the democracies.

And, finally, we have sent a whole fleet of B29's to Europe as a pretty blunt gesture. These great planes were due to fly over Italy, and were to be shown to the Germans. But their principal mission was undoubtedly to show the Reds that we are not destitute of power.

A couple of weeks ago a British general, commenting on President Truman's proposals for a draft and compulsory military training, suggested that a fleet of B29's would do more to convince the Russians of our power than the draft and compulsory training combined.

Apparently somebody in Washington agreed with him, for the great planes are now over in Germany. They are the planes which could carry for long distances the greatest weapon in history, the atom bomb.

Recently a friend of this writer, talking with General Clay in Germany, asked, "What about the atom bomb?"

The reply was, "Well, without it, I might ask for 400,000 or 500,000 more men."

MEANING WAS CLEAR

There can be only one interpretation of that remark. That is that General Clay feels the bomb, as a deterrent to Russian aggression, is worth half a million men. But some of the leaders in Washington apparently feel that the greater threat would be 6 months' or a year's training for a few hundred thousand American boys.

General Clay's opinion is shared by many in Congress, judging from the way in which Congressional committees are reacting to the various proposals for strengthening our position.

It seems that everybody in the world, including all the important scientists, are convinced that the atom bomb is a force that can hardly be estimated. Everybody, that is, except Army leaders, who declare that a great land army, produced by the draft and UMT, is the biggest threat.

This is a strange development, for it is an abrupt change from the former position and a reverting to old military standards. There apparently is a belief that Russia would be more impressed with our power if we had a large army of soldiers than with our posession of the greatest destructive force in all history.

Perhaps the Army leaders are correct. They are not without case, for their chief argument, although it has not been adequately and forcefully presented, is that there must be a good balance between all our services.

They made such a campaign of propaganda for compulsory training for so long a time that the public was led to believe that that was the sole guaranty of our safety, and lost sight of the best features of the Army's case.

SPLIT AMONG SERVICES

But much of the force of the argument was lost when it developed that there was no unanimity of opinion among the services as to what the most effective course should be.

For a time it appeared that there was a united front, but when the congressional committees started looking into the problems, it was revealed that there is very little agreement among the three principal services as to the present needs.

Even the Key West conference, called by Secretary Forrestal for the purpose of reaching agreement, failed to be productive. And the other day there was a veiled hint that Secretary of the Air Force Symington was likely to find himself on the spot for speaking his mind on what should be done.

It is a pity that, in times like these, the unification of the services is turning out to be just a phrase with no actuality behind it. It will be even more of a pity if this split is carried over and into the coming political campaign, for then there will be even more confusion.

The Russians have been more and more annoying in Germany in the last few weeks, and that activity may also be connected with the situation in Italy. They have gone out of their way repeatedly to cause bother to the United States and Britain. And it may be that they will get even tougher if they fail in Italy.

But most of the highly placed men in Washington feel that a smashing defeat for the Reds in Italy will set back their whole European program indefinitely, or at least long enough for the Marshall plan to produce its expected results.

MIGHT ATTEMPT FORCE

There is a fear that a bad licking in Italy may cause the Reds to try force in other areas, which would be bad indeed. They could easily do as they pleased in western Europe as far as military action is concerned, and could probably take over in a few weeks.

One thing that is unlikely to stop them is the split among the armed services here. Another that would probably have little effect on them would be a universal military training system here.

One thing that would give them pause is the atom bomb. We have it and they haven't, according to Secretary Forrestal. Apparently many Senators and Representatives in Congress feel that the smart thing to do is build our strength around our greatest military asset.

Everybody knows what a split among the armed services meant in December 1941 and nobody wants another one. We can't afford it, and the world can't afford it. If there is to be unity in the country there must be unity among our armed services.

Water Conservation on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1947, the Committee on Public Lands favorably reported to the House, House Resolution 244, which I had introduced, requesting the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to investigate and report to the President and the Congress on the economic and engineering feasibility of diverting surplus water from other river basins to semiarid California.

At the present time millions upon millions of acre-feet of water, unused and not needed in the Columbia River, is flowing into the Pacific Ocean. At the same time California now faces serious water and power shortages. Because of the greatest shift of population in the history of the Nation this situation will become increasingly more serious. Studies and plans must be made now for the conservation and utilization of all water running into the Pacific Ocean from the Columbia River to the Mexican border.

The importance of this whole matter both to the national economy and national defense is well presented in an article recently appearing in the Oregonian, published at Portland, Oreg., as follows:

FAST-DRYING CALIFORNIA LOOKS TOWARD COLUMBIA RIVER TO HELP RESURRECT VAST ARID REGIONS IN AND NEAR STATE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

California is drying up. Despite the recent rains, the development of the West's greatest State is retarded by a basic lack of water.

Can Columbia River water save California? Can it also resurrect the vast region of the Rocky Mountains, where the land might bloom like the Garden of Eden if only it could be irrigated?

William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, believes that the most extensive water-diversion project in the history of mankind might change completely the economic outlook of the States of the far West.

In Warne's opinion, the Columbia River can save California.

SEVERAL STATES TO BENEFIT

"By working out exchanges of water," says he, "the diversion of the new supply from the Columbia River, if found feasible, would make large quantities of water available not only in California and Nevada, but also to the States all along the Colorado River.

"Depending upon the more refined results of investigations yet unmade," adds Warne, "this could mean that more lands could be irrigated in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, California, Washington, Oregon, Arizona, and possibly Idaho. There is no basis now for even guessing the value of the new resources this would open up, but it would be tremendous, virtually comparable to the discovery of a new and undeveloped country of great riches into which our growing population could expand."

A few statistics will illustrate the potentialities of such an undertaking. Full use of the water in the Columbia River would reclaim 40,000,000 acres of arid land. This is twice the total of all the acreage now irrigated in the entire United States. And the artificially watered lands of today are the foundation of all the agricultural prosperity between the Continental Divide and the Pacific slope—the sprawling domain Daniel Webster once said was not worth "a silver dollar."

EXPERTS' OPINIONS DIFFER

How would the Columbia be diverted? On this question experts are by no means agreed. William E. Warne suggests that "great canals, tunnels, and conduits would be more likely than a pipe line." A similar project on a smaller scale has been constructed in Colorado, where the Alva B. Adams tunnel exchanges water under the backbone of the Rocky Mountains between the Colorado River Basin and that of the Big Thompson River. The late Alva B. Adams was a United States Senator from Denver who sponsored the undertaking.

National interest has been attracted to the proposed diversion of the Columbia by the recent California dought. The country suddenly realized the development of the second State in area and the third in population was limited by a shortage of water. In fact, city officials of Los Angeles offered a reward of $1,000,000 to any scientist who could successfully distill water from the sea in commercial quantities.

But the diversion of the Columbia is not a new idea. It has been locked in a drawer for a long time. The present crisis has opened the lock.

SEARCH COVERS YEARS

Some years ago, before California's ranges were seared an ugly brown, engineers of the United States Bureau of Reclamation at Salt Lake City were trying to find additional sources of water for potentially fertile land in the western part of Nevada. The land was caked and hard. It grew only sagebrush. Yet with water it could sprout peaches, asparagus, and alfalfa.

The engineers ran surveys on the streams of the Sierra Nevada range, off to the westward. They found that these streams already were pledged for irrigation and power. Furthermore, their flow was not great. They were not the great glassy bellies of water familiar to residents of the Northwest.

Ever farther afield the Government engineers roamed in search of water for parched Nevada. Suddenly they were in the basin of the Columbia. They had crossed the mountain rims which bar the Columbia's surges and tributaries from the Great Salt Lake region. This language appears in an Interior Department report:

PROJECT HELD POSSIBLE

"The engineer in charge of the search for water for Nevada assiduously studied topographical maps, and came to the conclusion that if the data on them were correct, it would be possible, from an engineering standpoint, to divert water from the Columbia River southward across the mountains into California and Nevada."

The report significantly adds:

"And, after numerous other analyses and estimates, the engineer felt, also, that there was strong evidence indicating that this might be done at an economically feasible cost."

Thus was born the idea of turning off to the arid south the waters of the verdant Northwest. Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, of California, a ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Public Lands, has now given congressional attention to the scheme. He has introduced a resolution directing the Bureau of Reclamation to begin immediately a thorough survey of the entire proposal.

DIVERSION BELOW DAM

Where would the diversion take place? At which point would the Columbia be tapped? On this issue Secretary Warne is reasonably specific. "The problem," he explains, "should be approached with the understanding that any waters taken south would be diverted below Bonneville Dam, the last point of use in the Columbia River Basin."

It is believed generally that this stipulation is made to avoid political complications. Were water to be diverted above Bonneville Dam, Oregon and Washington might interpose provincial objections to the plan. California advocates of the idea want the Northwest to be assured that no water diverted southward is at the expense of power or irrigation within the Columbia's own watershed.

Much of California and the intermountain region has only 10 inches of rainfall annually. The Columbia's lowlands, on the other hand, often are saturated by as much as 100 inches. Into the ocean the Columbia pours more water than all other western rivers combined. It exceeds the aggregate flow of the Sacramento, San Joaquin, Colorado, Rio Grande, and even the great Fraser of British Columbia.

Can a diversion so vast be successful?

CENTRAL VALLEY EXAMPLE

Michael W. Straus, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, is hopeful. "Perhaps the most illustrative example of the practicability of moving water long distances," he points out, "lies in the Central Valley project in California. When that project goes into operation, we shall in effect be moving water nearly 500 miles, through a series of exchanges of water—from the Mount Shasta area in the north to below Bakersfield in the south."

Pumps would be a vital factor in the diversion southward of the Columbia River. Many heights of land would have to be crossed by the water. Straus believes the pumps would be of the sort now under construction in the Central Valley, where Tracy pumping plant will be the second largest in the world. This plant will lift water from the Sacramento River into the Delta-Mendota canal.

"Many long tunnels would be involved in the Columbia River diversion project," says Commissioner Straus. "They probably would be like the Alva B. Adams tunnel in Colorado." This tunnel makes it possible for water in the Colorado River, which rises west of the Continental Divide, to irrigate land on the other side of the great mountain backbone of America. The tunnel, which is 13.6 miles in length, cost approximately $7,000,000. Obviously, the diversion of the Columbia would require numerous such tunnels.

EXACT ROUTE UNDECIDED

Would the tunnels, canals, and conduits follow along the seacoast or be built farther inland? Neither Secretary Warne nor Commissioner Straus is explicit on the route the vast project would follow. It would extend the full length of Oregon and through much of California, although once it dumped a section of the Columbia's flow into the Sacramento River watershed its mission would be fulfilled.

"Our engineers," explains Mr. Warne, "are not yet ready to indicate on a map the possible route for the main diversion." He believes the project would be 600 miles in length, possibly longer. This is not too far beyond undertakings already completed in California. The metropolitan water district of Los Angeles transports water through two mountain ranges from the Colorado River; the distance is 200 miles. The water is pumped from behind Parker Dam, a Federal irrigation structure.

MUCH POWER NEEDED

Both Warne and Straus point out that one of the principal aims in surveying the diversion route would be to find valleys and swales the canal could follow. This might keep the diversion back from the rocky coast line, with its mountains and headlands. Probably such a project as McNary Dam would have to be built simultaneously with the diversion, for the product of many of its generators would be required to pump the water over hills and ridges.

The total cost of Grand Coulee and its irrigation works will be $488,000,000. The Columbia River diversion might be more expensive. However, the Interior Department believes the reward would be great. Los Angeles envisions itself as ultimately the largest city in America. California has passed Illinois in the census and soon will overhaul Pennsylvania. It may eventually pass New York. Yet supremacy, both municipally and on a State basis, is dependent upon tapping new sources of water. The Columbia River is the principal supply of fresh water in the West, and it probably will remain so until men learn to distill the sea.

The Market for Another Byproduct of Butter Making Being Given Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following official table from the United States Tariff Commission indicates that the United States is to become the receiving station for the surplus dried skim milk of the world:

Dried skimmed milk: United States imports for consumption, 1933–37

Year	Quantity	Value
	Pounds	
1933	118,622	$5,278
1934	55	5
1935	285,781	16,124
1936	19,964,574	778,944
1937	1,390,812	53,844
1938	3,484	332
1939	864,936	23,755
1940	7,750	475
1941	36,400	2,627
1942	2,319	319
1943	65	7
1944	132	21
1945	85,098	6,979
1946 [1]	315	32
1947 [1]	----------	----------
1948: [2]		
January	179,900	19,094
February	367,700	41,919

[1] Preliminary.

[2] January and February 1948 imports all from Canada.

Source: Official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Please note the imports in 1936 when millions of dollars were being paid the American producer for not producing. Also, note the large imports in January and February of 1948 since the duty was reduced to a point where the Democrats do not appear to even be following their old slogan, "Tariff for revenue only." Canada may put an embargo on shipments of certain farm products, but she appears willing to send us dried skim milk.

This present administration gives the American market away for the products produced north of the Mason and Dixon's line. It then turns around and subsidizes cotton exports when cotton is bringing above-parity prices. This administration collects duties on imports of livestock and livestock products, sets aside 30 percent of these receipts as section 32 funds and then uses these funds for subsidizing the export of cotton and tobacco. Two million eight hundred thousand dollars of these funds are being used to subsidize cotton exports, although cotton is above parity, and $4,400,000 is being used to subsidize the exports of tobacco, though tobacco is above parity.

The present administration is antilivestock farming and is so allergic to the dairy industry that there are less cows for milk in the United States than there were when the New Deal took over. Less milk is being produced; 25 percent less cheese is being produced than in 1947; evaporated-milk production is the lowest for January 1948 that it has been for the same month in any year since 1941. Butter production is above 1946 production so far this year, but since the market for casein, lactose, and dried skim milk is being given away, this butter production is difficult to maintain, to say nothing about increasing it.

The present program is to give away tobacco, cotton, and other soil-depleting crops and to give away the market for livestock products and then talk and talk about soil conservation.

Canada may have an embargo on shipments of grains and meats to the United States, but you note they are willing and able to ship dried skim milk, which pulls the economic rug out from under the dairy industry.

Wisconsin Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Wisconsin. I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws, as compiled by Carl J. Johnson, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 1957 South Seventy-fourth Street, West Allis 14, Wis., as follows:

BONUS

A proposed bonus for World War II veterans will be submitted to the voters at the November 2, 1948, election. The State assembly passed a senate-approved resolution ordering a referendum asking voters whether they want the legislature to enact a bonus to be financed by a 3 percent retail sales tax.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Any honorably discharged veteran of any war who, at time of death, was a resident of the State, shall be eligible for burial at the Grand Army Home for Veterans at King.

County allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans, their wives and widows. Burial may not be in a potter's field.

If a veteran dies leaving an estate of less than $1,000, exclusive of benefits due him or his heirs from the United States, his estate shall not be liable for more than $100 for burial expenses in addition to the amount allowed by the United States for his burial.

The county provides for the care of the graves of soldiers, their wives and widows, when care is not otherwise provided for.

The adjutant general is required to compile a record of veterans' burial places.

Counties may provide appropriate metal markers for the graves of soldiers buried within certain townships or municipalities. The county shall apply to the United States for a proper headstone, and have the headstone set in place.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces under the Uniform Acknowledgments Act.

Administration of estates of absentees in the military service is provided.

County courts may appoint attorneys to represent persons in the military service.

A Civil Relief Act has been enacted.

Disposition is provided of undistributed money and property held by an administrator or other court officer when the legatee or heir or other person entitled thereto is a member of the armed forces.

Insurance benefits are protected under the State life fund.

Protection is afforded persons acting under power of attorney.

Disability of minority of veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights is removed.

Powers of fiduciaries and guardians are suspended during war service.

Testamentary capacity of minors in the military or naval forces of the United States is provided.

Certain obligations of persons in the armed forces are waived, extended, or suspended.

Appearance of the petitioner or the child to be adopted, should either one or both of them be engaged in military service or employed in connection with the military efforts of the United States, is waived.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Paroled convicts honorably discharged from military service are recommended to be restored to civil rights.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFIT; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Certified copies of public records are furnished free of charge by clerks of courts and registers of deeds. The county pays the fee to the proper official.

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge.

Provision has been made for creation of position of service officer by counties, such officer to advise veterans with any complaint or problem. The officer shall be a veteran.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Diplomas are granted to high-school seniors and credits to seniors of any county rural normal school or teachers' college upon entering military service during the school year.

Free tuition is granted for veterans attending schools of vocational and adult education. Local boards may receive funds from the United States Veterans' Administration.

Free tuition is granted to those taking university extension courses while in the military service.

A soldier's educational bonus has been provided.

Special powers are conferred on county boards to appropriate money to be paid to local boards of vocational and adult education.

State cooperation with the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is provided.

University extension courses have been established for World War I veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Age restrictions are not applicable to veterans.

An honorably discharged veteran of any war who has suffered a physical disability as a result of his military or naval service shall not be barred from employment in any public position or employment in State, county, or municipal civil service or otherwise, if such disability will not handicap him in performance of his duties.

All county relief commissioners shall be veterans.

All county service officers shall be veterans.

Credit is granted for war service under the teacher's retirement system.

Leaves of absence are granted for public officers and employees with reinstatement and preservation of pension rights.

Leaves of absence are granted for sheriffs in certain counties.

Military service credit is given pharmacists in computation of required continuity of drug-store employment.

Persons registered as assistant pharmacists shall receive credit for time spent in the armed forces upon application to take the examination for registered pharmacist.

Preference of 5 and 10 points is given to veterans upon examination for employment by police and fire departments.

Preference is given to veterans in cities and villages, in the State civil service, and in Milwaukee County or city.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Preservation of status and seniority rights is provided for classified civil service employees of the State and of certain counties.

Teachers' retirement credits are preserved.

Reinstatement of judges upon termination of military service is provided.

Officers and employees of the State and local units and of any private or other employer, within 6 months after termination of military service, must be reinstated.

Retention of status in State employees' retirement system by members in the military service is provided.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as pension, compensation, Government insurance, or adjusted compensation from the United States on account of military or naval service or administered by the Veterans' Administration is exempt.

Papers of any soldier, sailor, or marine derived from military or naval service or adjusted compensation, compensation, pension, citation, medal, or badge are exempt from innkeeper's lien.

GUARDIAN AND WARD

Appointment of guardians of minors in the military service is provided.

GUARDIANSHIP

The guardianship rights of parents, brothers, and sisters have been established.

HOMES

Additional land has been acquired by the Grand Army Home for Veterans with the use of Federal funds.

Veterans, their wives, widows, or mothers may be admitted to the Grand Army Home for Veterans.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Veterans declared insane may be committed to county, State, or Federal hospitals.

Certain hospital benefits are granted to veterans.

Hospitalization, medical treatment, and care for returning veterans of World War II is provided.

Where a war veteran is declared insane, the judge shall notify the State veterans' recognition board, and in event of commitment, the nearest United States Veterans' Administration facility.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

An interim legislative committee has been appointed to study all problems of veterans' legislation.

MARRIAGE LICENSES, MEDICAL EXAMINATION, ETC.

Antenuptial examinations (including Wassermann tests) required of marriage applicants may be made and certified by physicians serving in the armed forces.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, PAPERS, ETC.

Acceptance as security is prohibited.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Towns, villages, cities, and counties may erect suitable monuments or memorial buildings to the memory of former residents who served in any war.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Leaves of absence are granted on Memorial Day to veterans in public service.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

County boards are authorized to create the position of county historian to preserve and record experiences of military men and women and the records of their service.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Building and loan associations may make loans to veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights.

County aid is extended to veterans' dependent children while the veteran is hospitalized.

County aid is extended to veterans, their wives or widows, children and parents.

An emergency gift tax has been imposed to provide revenue for rehabilitation of World War II.

An emergency tax has been imposed upon all transfers of property (inheritances) to provide revenue for rehabilitation of veterans of World War II.

Statutory regulations have been liberalized as to investments by domestic life insurance companies making such companies eligible to invest in loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

An occupational tax on tobacco products has been imposed to provide revenue for rehabilitation of World War II veterans.

A postwar rehabilitation trust fund has been created, made up of the annual proceeds of the surtax on incomes. Said fund is used exclusively for health, educational, and economic rehabilitation of World War II veterans.

Settlement rights are retained while serving in the armed forces.

Temporary aid is granted to veterans and their families in their own homes.

Towns may provide aid for destitute soldiers and their families.

TAX EXEMPTIONS—EXEMPTIONS FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Certain veterans' organizations are exempt from license fees for holding boxing matches for which no admission fee is charged.

Resident hunting and fishing licenses are provided for members of the armed forces stationed in the State.

Military compensation is exempt from State income tax.

Veterans' pensions and bonus are exempt from State income tax.

Time has been extended for filing State income-tax returns.

Refund may be made of class B liquor and fermented malt-beverage fees upon the surrender of license with reissuance of license after termination of military service.

Private passenger motor vehicles used by the nonresident members of the armed forces and conscientious objectors placed in the State by the Federal Government are not required to have a State license if properly licensed elsewhere.

Temporary motor-vehicle registration permits may be issued to persons in active military service, free of charge. This is applicable to motor vehicles owned or designated by such persons.

Disabled veterans are exempt from fee for State peddler's license.

Exemption is granted from payment of license fee for conducting an auction or closing out sale prior to induction into the armed forces.

Military service is excluded from time requirements of embalmer's license law and certain regulations governing a registered apprentice are suspended.

Physicians, surgeons, and osteopaths are exempt from annual registration and payment of fee while serving in the armed forces.

Certain requirements or fees are suspended under licenses, certificates, or permits of persons in active military service.

Memorial halls and real estate owned and occupied by veterans' associations and certain other memorial buildings are exempt from taxation.

TRANSPORTATION PRIVILEGES

Railroads may give free transportation or reduced rates to inmates of soldiers' homes.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Counties may appropriate money to defray the expense of State or national conventions.

An annual appropriation of $1,000 is provided for State publication of the annual proceedings, etc., of certain veterans' organizations.

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than 30 days or by fine not exceeding $20, or both.

Annual appropriations are made to certain veterans' organizations for necessary expenses of annual encampments.

Memorial Hall in the capitol is to be used as headquarters of the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Spanish War Veterans.

Rooms may be furnished by counties.

Organizations are authorized to become auxiliaries of State historical society to preserve records of the Civil War.

Certain veterans' organizations are represented on the soldiers' rehabilitation board.

Certain veterans' organizations are exempt from license fees for holding boxing matches for which no admission fee is charged.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the Wisconsin Legislature during the last 28 years, through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

The DAV at the present time has some 38 chapters in the State, whose membership dues average about $5 annually, and which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains four full time national service officers, under the direction of Bernard G. Blackwell, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, 342 North Water Street, Milwaukee 2, Wis.

These DAV experts extend all types of service to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

The DAV is primarily a one-purpose organization—to see to it that all war disabled veterans and their dependents receive their just entitlement to rights and benefits provided under many complicated laws, Federal and State.

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide gainful employment for all handicapped veterans who are employable, under the supervision of Millard W. Rice, national director of public relations.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932, the DAV is composed solely of men and women who were wounded or disabled as a result of their service to the United States in time of war.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a disabled veteran of World War I, and a life member of the DAV, it is a pleasure for me to commend its service program.

President Manuel A. Roxas, of the Philippines, Dies—His Compatriot, Mr. Vicente Villamin, Writes an Encomium of Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the first President of the Republic of the Philippines passed away a few days ago in Manila. We mourn his death. He was a friend of America. He stood for democracy and fought communism. He was a great man and an effective leader of men. I wish to make as a part of my remarks an encomium of him by one of his compatriots, Mr. Vicente Villamin.

Mr. Villamin's statement follows:

MANUEL A. ROXAS

(By Vicente Villamin, Washington, D. C.)

Marcus Aurelius wrote: "Death is of such kind as is birth—a mystery of nature." A man of power and fame is now wrapped in that mystery. Manuel Roxas has just left his earthly mansion for that place of eternal silence which Shakespeare described as "the undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns."

Every human being is bound for that destination. God in His infinite wisdom has provided different schedules for each one and kept them in profound secrecy. Unless the irreverent hand of man intervenes, no one knows his time of departure. In this divine plan is involved the joy of living.

As Manuel Roxas departs on his journey, we whose time has not yet come can only call out to him, "Hail and farewell, dear friend, Godspeed, till we meet again." And surely we shall meet again, for we are only tarrying here for some tasks and for some time.

As he leaves on a beautiful day, we can only hope that our day of departure will be as blessed and benign.

"To die is to rest," Rizal breathed in a deathless poem he indited as man intervened in God's plan and he was told that he was to depart on the morrow. Busy from morning till night, every livelong day of his public life, Roxas earns the rest to which God has bidden him.

He worked for the people he loved. To them he gave his best. And now he begins his long, lasting vacation. He will be happy there. Sophocles said truly that a man is not happy "till his life has run its course and reached its goal."

Manuel Roxas had a great mind, which he used constantly in the service of the people who installed him as their first Presidential Magistrate. With Cicero, he could say in life, "I am not sorry to have lived, since my life has been such that I feel I was not born in vain."

He lived in an age of turmoil, which he faced and tried to dominate. It is the age when man asserts himself and demands his due. It is the age of democracy. Xenophon foresaw it when he wailed across the centuries that "it is easier to rule the other animals than to rule men."

Roxas was a leader, not a ruler. The cornerstone of his national policy is the reduction of poverty, the more horizontal distribution of wealth, and the elevation of the standard of living of the people.

The lodestar of his international policy is friendship with America, the America that created the Filipino nation. Sallust, in Catiline, declared that "the firmest friendship is based on an identity of likes and dislikes." With America, Roxas believed in freedom, opportunity, peace, and democracy, and disbelieved in tyranny, intolerance, communism, and totalitarianism.

Manuel Roxas leaves behind him a grieving people. If sympathy and tears could revive the dead, he would be among the living again. Sophocles said: "If men by tears could heal their several ills, and by their weeping bring the dead to life, then gold would be of far less price than tears."

Manuel Roxas has gone ahead of us. To him we repeat the following lines by Tennyson:

> "Now is done thy long day's work;
> Fold thy palms across thy breast,
> Fold thine arms, turn to thy rest."

Plato observed that "life is but a sojourn" on this green earth. We are all on the way to life everylasting. On the day of the resurrection we shall all meet again. While we are still here we shall be comforted by repeating the twenty-third Psalm:

"The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want; He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters; He restoreth my soul; he leadeth me in the path of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou annointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

And to Manuel Roxas we say once more, "Hail and farewell, till we meet again."

Facts About Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving a large volume of mail the substance of which is to the effect that liberty is easier to retain than to regain. It is pointed out and strongly stressed in letters that the Communists are the sworn enemy of America; that the American people expect you to see that these enemies are swept out of every department of the Government.

I have been fighting communism for more than 25 years. Communists were conducting schools during the twenties. Children were then taught to march around the American flag and spit on it and repeat in unison "I hate the American flag."

Year by the year the Communists have entrenched themselves in key positions of the United States Government. This subversive element is penetrating the clubs and organized groups, religious, civic, labor, and others wherever its poisonous influence can weaken the confidence of the American citizens in their own form of government. It is important that each sovereign citizen be on his guard lest he become the victim of communistic propaganda.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting Facts About Communism, as follows:

FACTS ABOUT COMMUNISM

Today we are hearing a great deal about the activities of communism in America. So let us see exactly:

1. Who is a Communist?
2. What are his obligations and duties?
3. To whom is he responsible?
4. How do Communists treat minority groups?
5. Do Communists use force and violence to gain their ends?
6. What do Communists consider is their relationship to the United States?
7. Is war between Russia and the United States inevitable?

For our answers we will go to the official documents of the Communist Party. We will also listen to a few words by Joseph Stalin, the recognized head of the party. Then we will have a statement or two by Lenin, from whom Stalin inherited the leadership of the Communist movement. Lenin is considered practically a "god" by the Communists everywhere.

1. Who is a Communist?

Our answer is found in paragraph 3 of the Constitution and Rules of the Communist International. This reads:

"Membership of the Communist Party and the Communist International is open to all those who accept the program and rules of the given Communist Party and of the Communist International, who join one of the basic units of the party, actively work in it, abide by all the decisions of the party and of the Communist International; and regularly pay party dues."

2. What are his obligations and duties?

For the answer to that one, let us look at a few provisions of the 21 Conditions of the Second Congress of the Communist International. No. 4 of these reads: "Persistent and systematic propaganda and agitation must be carried on in the army, where Communist groups should be formed in every military organization. Wherever owing to repressive legislation agitation becomes impossible, it is necessary to carry on such agitation illegally. But refusal to carry on or participate in such work should be considered equal to treason to the revolutionary cause."

Here is another obligation and duty of Communists: It is condition No. 9 of the 21 conditions:

"Every party desirous of belonging to the Communist International should be bound to carry on systematic and persistent Communist work in the labor unions, cooperatives, and other organizations of working masses. It is necessary to form Communist nuclei within these organizations, which by persistent and lasting work should win over labor unions to communism."

3. To whom is he responsible?

Condition No. 14 says:

"The Communist Party should carry on a precise and definite propaganda to induce workers to refuse to transport any kind of military equipment intended for fighting against the Soviet Republics, and should also by legal and illegal means carry on a program amongst the troops sent against the workers' republics."

4. How do Communists treat minority groups?

We hear a great deal about the Communists being the friend of minority groups. They are constantly trying to stir up those who think they have a grievance. To find out how they treat minority groups, we shall listen to the words of Joseph Stalin. In this way no one can say that we are not getting the truth. On page 51 of his book, Problems of Leninism, Stalin says (speaking of a country that they want to take over): "Before entering upon decisive political action the party must, by means of prolonged revolutionary work, insure for itself the support of the majority of the working masses, or at least the benevolent neutrality of the majority of the class. * * * And what is to be done with the minority, if it does not wish, if it does not agree to submit voluntarily to the will of the majority? When the party enjoys the confidence of the majority, can it and should it force the minority to submit to the will of the majority? Yes; it can and it must."

5. Do Communists use force and violence to gain their ends?

On pages 39–40 of the same book, Mr. Stalin says: "The dictatorship of the proletariat must necessarily include the concept of violence. There is no dictatorship without violence if the dictatorship is to be understood in the strict sense of the word. Lenin defines the dictatorship of the proletariat as 'power based directly on violence'." Stalin took that word of Lenin from Collected Works, page 315, Russian edition.

6. What do Communists consider is their relationship to the United States?

On January 2, 1946, Joseph Starobin, writing in the Communist Daily Worker (the official mouthpiece of the Communist Party in America), called the United States the enemy.

7. Is war between Russia and the United States inevitable?

On page 19 of his book, Problems of Leninism, Joseph Stalin gives us our answer to this question as he quotes from the works of Lenin. Collected Works, volume XXII, pages 315–317, Russian edition. This is Lenin's statement with which Stalin agrees: "International imperialism (remember, they call us an international imperialist) with all the might of its capital and its highly organized military technique, which represents a real fortress of international capital, could under no circumstances, under no possible conditions, live side by side with the Soviet Republics. * * * A conflict is inevitable."

Soybeans and Their Protective Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the March 18, 1948, issue of the Economic and Marketing Information, published by Purdue University, is an article by Professor Paarlberg, of the Department of Agricultural Economics. An excerpt of the article is as follows:

COMPETITION WITH OTHER OILS

Although the United States is practically self-sufficient in oil meals, the country generally imports large quantities of fats and oils. Soybean oil is versatile but is primarily a food fat. Its chief competitors are cottonseed oil, lard, coconut oil, and butter. In volume it is about equal to cottonseed oil but is not so important as lard or butter. In price it is in the same general group with lard and cottonseed oil. It is more expensive than untaxed coconut oil, but much cheaper than butter.

Soybeans compete with these oils in various ways. In shortening, soybean oil competes with lard and cottonseed oil. In margarine, soybean oil competes with butter, cottonseed oil, and coconut oil. In cooking fats, soybean oil competes with cottonseed oil.

Competition between these products is restricted. For example, United States soybeans are protected from foreign soybeans by a tariff of 2 cents per pound on soybeans; United States soybean oil is protected from foreign soybean oil by a tariff of 3.5 cents per pound on soybean oil; United States soybeans are protected from foreign coconut oil by various tariffs, quotas, and excise taxes on coconut oil; United States butter is protected from United States soybeans by a tax of 10 cents per pound on colored margarine.

Our distinguished economist, Professor Paarlberg, omits some of the additional facts. He does not mention the subsidy that is being paid on soybeans directly and on the oil indirectly. He does not tell of the thousands of tons of protein meal given away although classed as exports. He does not say that the oils in oleomargarine have been subsidized somewhere from 1 to 10 cents per pound during the past 5 years.

You will note that the so-called reciprocity agreements have not wholly caught up with the soybean growers yet. Note the 2 cents per pound duty on soybean imports. But the Geneva Conference is reducing this to 1 cent per pound

according to the United States Tariff Commission. The duty on oil of 3½ cents per pound is also being reduced to 3 cents per pound and 22½ percent ad valorem. This may be a high prohibitive duty under normal conditions. The reciprocity group a few days ago reduced the import duty on skim milk to three-sixteenths of a cent per pound.

The article should show, to be entirely factual, that the subsidy on soybeans directly and the oil directly is much greater than the tax on the uncolored oleomargarine.

Another point that the economist missed was this, Whose dairy cows will be eating the soybean meal? Milk cow numbers have been reduced from 42 out of every 100 before the war to 25 out of every 100 now, and if these milk cow numbers are further reduced, just exactly what dairy cows will be eating this meal? These soybean people cannot help ruin the dairy industry and still expect to sell their meal for dairy purposes.

If the economist wished to give the whole story, he should have also called attention to the fact that there is also another tax protection on soybean oil. Did he not know about that one? It is the internal tax of 3 cents per pound on imported vegetable oils used for food purposes.

The soybean people like taxes on the other fellow. They sponsored the Corbett bill which provides a 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine too—that is, if it is not made from imported oils.

While the administration may support the present oleomargarine bill, do you believe they are in a position to support the Corbett bill? With all the talk about extending the reciprocity agreements, do you think the President would care to sign the Corbett bill? The League of Women Voters and other groups have been deceived for years by the New-Deal propaganda about foreign trade. The facts are that this administration has erected the most severe trade barriers ever erected in the history of our country. The most vicious trade barrier ever erected of course was the embargo on tobacco seed.

Though our economist friend gives us the facts in his article in regard to the 2 cents per pound import duty or tax on imported soy beans, which has been reduced to 1 cent, and the 3.5 cents per pound on soybean oil, which is to be reduced to 3 cents and 22½ percent advalorem, he forgot one other protective tax. Possibly he had not heard about that one. It is the 22 cents duty or tax or protection that oleomargarine enjoys. This tax is an embargo on oleo imports. The domestic oil then has a monopoly on the domestic market. Butter has a 7 cents per pound import duty or tax for the first 50,000,000 pounds imported; skim milk has the three-sixteenths of 1 cent per pound, and the other dairy products like casein and lactose have been subjected to drastic duty reduction, and in fact all the reduction the President had the power to reduce them. Place embargoes on imports of soil depleting crops, lower the duties on livestock and livestock products, and invite these imports, pay export subsidies on wheat, cotton, and other soil depleting crops, and then appropriate more and more money for soil conservation.

If the vegetable oils were not subsidized oleo would be selling for more per pound. While old bossy is compelled to stand on her own four feet and produce the greatest food product ever known to man, her products are compelled to compete with federally subsidized oils, and with embargoes and high duties accorded the substitutes for her product.

If the dairymen of America had the legislative protection now afforded the oil crops, they would not be so fearful of the future, and of their own economic security.

Production Management Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Third Congressional District of Arkansas is located in the heart of the Ozark Mountains of northwest Arkansas. We are a district of small farms and small businesses.

Soil conservation is one of our most vital problems and a problem which has the intense interest not only of our farmers but our businessmen as well. Yesterday I received the following resolutions which were adopted at a meeting of the 10 counties of my district held at Harrison, Ark., on April 14, 1948. I include them as part of my remarks:

At a district meeting of the 10 counties composing the Third Congressional District, held at Harrison, Ark., April 14, 1948, representative county and community committeemen unanimously adopted the following resolutions in regard to the needs and continuation of the present PMA farm program commonly known as the triple A administered conservation program:

1. That conservation assistance for 1948 program and all future conservation and use programs be appropriated in the amount of not less than $300,000,000. That any amount less than $300,000,000 will have a tendency to deteriorate the program.

2. That annual appropriations should be not less than $300,000,000, with sufficient funds for administration, so that a stable program of conservation assistance can be formulated to have an effective conservation program. If the program and funds are stabilized with sufficient administrative expenses of not less than $37,000,000, a more effective job of conservation can be done, because farmer-elected committeemen can be better trained to administer the program in counties and communities. Present funds do not permit efficient training of committeemen and informing farmers in the need for and possibilities of program assistance. A stabilized appropriation at sufficient level will increase participation in and effectiveness of the program.

3. That the $500 limitation of payments should be eliminated. Conservation needs are based on cropland and not on individual farmers. The $500 limitation does not increase the amount of conservation on small farms but it does limit the conservation that can be accomplished on large acreages. The acreage on large farms needs conservation as well as that on small farms, and the large operator is in little better position to pay the entire cost (per acre) than the small operator. The limitation of assistance should be placed on the needs of the land not on the total amount of assistance to an individual farmer.

4. That the increase in small payments be taken up in materials or services.

5. That at least $65,000,000 be appropriated annually for a school-lunch program.

6. That Ralph Hudspeth be sent as a representative of this group to appear before the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committee.

7. That county meetings be held to acquaint farmers and other interested parties with the above-mentioned problems.

8. That services now available through action programs are vitally needed by farmers in their work of producing farm products and maintaining soil fertility and should be mintained. There is very little, if any, duplication of services to farmers, but if any consolidation of programs and agencies should become necessary, farmer-elected State, county, and community committeemen should administer the programs.

Recommendations by farmers and committees should remain the basis for setting up such programs. Information work necessary to the administration of the programs should be handled by committees and the Extension Service should provide educational material for farmers on subject matter and experiment-station results of practices.

False Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of April 17, 1948, entitled "False Saving" portrays most accurately the action of the majority party of the House and the majority members of the House Committee on Appropriations on next fiscal year's appropriations for the Labor Department.

Although the majority party of the House has outdone itself since the opening of the Eightieth Congress spending billions upon billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money without the actual saving of a real thin dime, it has seen fit to vent its spleen upon the Labor Department again this year in allegedly saving the comparatively inconsequential amount of approximately $4,000,000 in the operations of that vital agency of Government so highly important both to labor and management. This alleged saving means the crippling of such functions, among many others, as those performed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Women's Bureau, and abolishment of the Bureau of Veterans' Employment Rights.

Mr. Stokes' timely article follows:

FALSE SAVING

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, April 17.—The frantic pursuit of economy in Congress often achieves some strange results.

A current glittering example of false economy is the very considerable reduction

the House made in the appropriation for the Labor Department, cutting a fourth off the $16,600,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau for the next fiscal year beginning July 1. It voted $12,498,200, which compares with $15,358,000 for the current year.

Not only will this cripple the department's work and curtail or stop services long regarded as essential by business as well as labor, but it comes at a time when the military services are asking an extra $3,000,000,000 to make a grand total of more than $14,000,000,000 for Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

By contrast, the sixteen-odd million for an important function in our domestic economy seems very insignificant. The Labor Department, along with the Commerce Department, has its role in maintaining balance and stability in our economy. Among other things, it acts as a clearing house for all sorts of information to guide business and labor—in formulating policies, in planning ahead and in improving conditions under which workers live and do their jobs.

One important division of the Department, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, would be so seriously affected by the House cut in appropriations that the conservative and economy-minded Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, Ohio, raised his voice in protest.

He appeared personally before the Senate Appropriations Committee, now considering the Labor Department bill, to appeal for restoration of the nearly $3,000,000 that the House sliced from the Budget Bureau's recommendation. The House reduced the requested amount more than half—from $5,389,000 to $2,500,000. The appropriation for the current year is $4,073,000.

Senator TAFT is particularly aware of the need for a well-staffed Bureau of Labor Statistics. He is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee set up by Congress in 1946 to watch for changes in economic conditions in the country and make recommendations to Congress for legislation to correct maladjustments. He stressed the valuable service the Bureau has performed for his committee.

Furthermore about three-fourths of the reports and statistics compiled by the Bureau are for the benefit of business and industry. Many of these would be affected, as would services to labor and to States and cities.

For example, the monthly reports on employment, pay rolls, and earnings would probably have to be restricted to factories, instead of including all industrial employment. There would be curtailment, too, in reports on new house construction and dollar volume of construction which are received now on request by 4,700 organizations and individuals engaged in construction.

The Consumers' Price Index, a reliable measure of inflationary tendencies, probably would have to be put on a quarterly instead of a monthly basis. Compilation of strike statistics, now issued monthly, probably would have to be discontinued. The file of collective bargaining contracts, consulted frequently in collective bargaining, would become inactive.

Studies on productivity, already cut in half by appropriation reductions by Congress last season, might have to be eliminated. There would have to be a reduction also, in reports on industrial accidents, which now disable 2,000,000 workers a year. Most of the local and sectional studies of wages, employment, and working conditions would have to be abandoned.

Likewise the House abolished outright the Bureau of Veterans Employment Rights. This was set up by Congress to assist veterans under the Selective Service Act, which Congress now has been asked to revive. The House also cut $67,000 from the recommended appropriation for the women's Bureau program of research into industrial problems of women workers that will shut down field operations now carried on in six major cities, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

Again the Senate has an opportunity to rectify another example of false economy by the House.

Oleo Causes the Evaporated Milk Industry To See the Handwriting on the Wall—If Oleo Gets Its Head Under the Dairymen's Tent, Then Watch the Filled-Milk Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the oleomargarine controversy has evidently caused the manufacturers of evaporated milk to stop and consider what can happen to them. The 5-year period previous to the war the annual production was around 2,000,000,000 pounds per year of this good product. During the war around 3,000,000,000 pounds were produced—the high year being 1945, with 3,777,551,000 pounds—and although 1946 showed only a 2,800,000,000-pound production, the 1948 production was again over 3,162,000,000 pounds. This evaporated milk is a great food product. Millions upon millions of babies have been raised on evaporated milk. It is also used in cooking, and for table use.

A substitute for evaporated milk was developed and in the early 1920's the Congress passed legislation to prevent it from entering interstate commerce. The substitute was made by removing the butterfat and replacing it with vegetable oil, either coconut oil or oil from cottonseed. It did not contain any appreciable amount of vitamin A, and, of course, vitamin D had not yet been discovered at the University of Wisconsin.

Here is the picture. If oleomargarine legislation is passed that allows oleo to replace butter as a spread, and the propaganda can be spread and believed that oleo equals or excels butter, then, where do we go from there? "Milnot" or one of the substitutes for evaporated milk is made by removing the butterfat and adding cottonseed oil to an amount of 6 percent. Of course, all the milk solids are still in the product. According to the statements on the wrapper of the can, vitamin A and D are added as well. Oleomargarine is composed of approximately 80 percent vegetable oil, largely cottonseed oil, the other 20 percent is largely water included in the skim milk, salt, benzoate of soda, and other ingredients. Filled milk or "milnot" contains 6 percent cottonseed oil and 94 percent dairy products, known as skim milk or defatted milk, as the vitamins added surely do not amount to much on a percentage basis.

Now if the oleo people, who have a monopoly on the American market by a protective import duty or tax of 22 cents per pound, can make the Congress believe that their products, with approximately 80 percent cottonseed oil and 20 percent skim milk, equals butter, is it not apparent to everyone that the cotton lobby should not be very hard pressed to prove that a combination of 6 percent cottonseed oil and 94 percent dairy products—skim milk—was equal or better than evaporated natural milk? A few dollars spent on phony experiments and magazine advertisements should accomplish this end. If oleo with 80 percent oil and 20 percent water, skim milk, and salt is equally as good a food as a 100 percent dairy product, even a dairyman could not say that a product with 94 percent dairy product and only 6 percent cottonseed oil was not of equal food value.

I have been expecting to see the evaporated milk people follow the path of the fertilizer and sugar groups, and select some attorney from the Department of Agriculture or the Congress—since the oleo group have an attorney that was formerly with the United States Department of Agriculture and a lobbyist from the Commerce Department. You remember that our former colleague, Cliff Woodrum, was hired by the fertilizer people at a reputed $25,000 a year to keep the Government from taking over the fertilizer industry of the country. Whichever side of this issue one happens to be on, one must admit that Mr. Woodrum has done an effective job to date.

Then last year we saw Bob Shields, formerly chief counsel for the Department of Agriculture, hired by the sugar people at a reputed $40,000-a-year salary. I always figured Bob did not get their job done exactly as the sugar people thought he would. You remember, do you not, that the refinery people wanted the sugar bill that would allow them to be the only beneficiaries of the $70,000,000 blank check that the Secretary of Agriculture has under the Sugar Act? You remember, no doubt, that the farmer, the farm labor, the labor in the refineries was given equal consideration by an amendment right here on the floor. Anyway, since the National City Bank's monthly report shows that 24 sugar companies increased their net profits from $37,000,000 in 1946 to $79,000,000 in 1947, maybe the $40,000 for Bob was not exactly wasted.

Here is one more angle. Did you know that a few days ago the duty on dried skim milk was reduced to 1½ cents per pound even though it has 35.6 percent digestable animal protein? This is only ⅜ of a cent per quart duty. This is even below "tariff for revenue only" of the old days.

The oleo people can make oleo out of domestic oils, although there is testimony that coconut oil is more similar to butterfat than cottonseed oil, and import the skim milk needed and tell the dairymen of America to sell their herds. The filled-milk manufacturers can import the 94 percent of the filled milk that is composed of skim milk practically free, and use domestic vegetable oils and also tell the dairymen of America to sell their herds.

We will not even have to develop a skim milk cow in the United States, because the skim milk can be imported so cheaply. Think of it, three-sixteenths of a cent per quart.

The manufacturers of ice cream are, likewise, beginning to become alarmed, but this is a story for another day.

One situation is apparent, and that is that the American people are very likely to have the least per capita dairy products available for domestic consumption than ever before in the history of our country. Cheese production is 25 percent below 1947, milk production is down, milk cow numbers are decreasing, so we have fewer milk cows in the United States today than we had 14 years ago, when the New Deal took over.

Although certain groups are out to ruin the dairy industry of America and prevent the greatest protective food from being adequately produced, they will be in the front row cheering for the world-health program.

But why appropriate money to a world-health program when we allow the industry that provides the greatest protective food in the world to be ruined by the cotton lobby and the oleo monopoly?

Connecticut Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, many veterans are not fully acquainted with the various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions that have been extended to them by the laws of the great State of Connecticut.

It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to present for their information an outline of such laws as compiled by my friend and former Congressman, the Honorable William M. Citron, now department commander of the Disabled American Veterans, 164 Court Street, Middletown, Conn., as follows:

BONUS

A bonus law was enacted in March 1947, providing for payment of $10 for each month of active service in World War II with a maximum payment of $300. Eligibility requirements: Active duty in the armed forces (including Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or any women's auxiliary branch) or as an officer of the United States Public Health Service detailed with any of the above for a period of 90 days or more, between December 7, 1941, and December 8, 1945; domiciled in State for at least 1 year next preceding date of entering such service; honorably discharged or separated from such service under conditions other than dishonorable; still in active service; retired or released to inactive duty as reservist, provided that retired officers and enlisted men subject to recall to active duty and not having been discharged, are not entitled to the bonus. In case of death of eligible veteran, next of kin (spouse, if unmarried at time of making application, child or children, or grandchildren) shall be eligible for amount for which veteran would have been eligible, but only in order named above. Lump-sum payment of $300 is payable to eligible survivors, if serviceman died in active service. Applications should be made before July 1, 1949, to the office of the treasurer, veterans' bonus division, State Armory, Hartford, Conn.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A firing squad for the National Guard, Naval Militia, State Guard, or the Organized Militia may attend the funeral of a veteran.

A State allowance is provided for burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field.

Cities and towns may make appropriations for care of soldiers' graves.

Reports are rendered to the State librarian of the burial places of veterans, who may cause to be located and permanently identified the graves of all soldiers buried in the State.

Cemeteries may not prohibit the erection of a headstone provided by the State or otherwise for soldiers' graves.

Deceased resident members of the armed forces are eligible for a $100 burial allowance.

A State allowance is provided for headstones for soldiers' graves and these may be erected in a cemetery or public place for veterans buried abroad or missing. A memorial stone to several such veterans may be erected in lieu of individual markers.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Estates of deceased veterans may be administered by the veterans' home commission.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans contracting for loans under the GI bill of rights.

Protection is afforded to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting by residents of the State in active service with the armed forces is provided.

A member of the armed forces may make application to be made an elector.

Voting rights are preserved while absent in military service.

Forfeited rights of electors may be restored.

An affidavit from a relative or friend is required if the person is in the armed forces.

Special sessions of town boards may be conducted to examine and admit to elector's oath any member of the armed forces desiring to be made an elector.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Copies of probate records required by the Veterans' Administration to be used in determining eligibility of any person to participate in benefits made available by the Veterans' Administration shall be furnished free of charge.

Discharges are recorded and certified copies furnished free of charge.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Admission to the bar without examination is provided upon being discharged from military service if applicant was graduated from an approved law school after June 1941.

A certificate to practice naturopathy without examination may be issued upon being discharged from military service if applicant was in active practice three successive years prior to entering military service.

An embalmer's license, permit, or certificate which expired while the holder was in military service may be renewed within 1 year after termination of the war.

The State board of education is authorized to provide instruction and training in subjects at secondary level free of charge for veterans of World War II.

Veterans are exempt from the 21-year-old age limit on free transportation to State trade schools.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during World Wars I or II and who were killed in action or died as a result of such service. Amount, $200 maximum per year per child.

Educational benefits are extended to orphans of veterans of World War II.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Contributions are made to the retirement fund by the State for certain employees returning to State service after termination of military service.

A veterans' reemployment and advisory commission has been established.

Credit is granted for the period of service in the armed forces upon becoming a member of the State retirement system.

Leaves of absence are granted to State employees while in military or naval service with credit for such service.

Town boards of education may make payment of the annual annuity fund assessment of members of the retirement association who enter military service.

A $100 bonus was paid to certain State employees who entered the armed forces.

Preference is given in examinations (5 and 10 points in addition to earned rating) under the municipal merit system.

Preference is given in State civil service examinations (5 and 10 points in addition to earned rating). War service credit is given for retirement purposes.

Benefit rights are preserved under the teacher retirement system and under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Public employees may be reinstated upon application made within 90 days after discharge from military service with credit for such service.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as pension from the United States, while in the hands of the pensioner, is exempt from execution or attachment.

GUARDIANSHIP

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be made a party in interest in any proceedings brought for the appointment of a guardian of a veteran or other beneficiary on whose account benefits are payable by the Veterans' Administration; he shall also be made a party in interest in the administration of the estate of any such ward.

HOUSING

The State may guarantee notes or bonds of local housing authorities for moderate rental housing projects.

Local municipalities may enter into agreements with private builders to fix property assessments up to 10 years.

A $50,000 revolving fund has been set up for the purpose of producing lumber for veterans' housing.

HOMES

Admission, etc, is provided to the State Veterans' Home at Rocky Hill, Conn.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

Maternity care is provided for wives of men serving in the armed forces and pediatric care for infants under the age of 1 year.

Veterans are entitled to hospital care at the expense of the State.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

War service medals are available to persons who served during the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, or in the China Relief Expedition.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is given for war service with preference to service medals and retirement.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

No boxing exhibition or wrestling bout may be held on Armistice Day.

Towns may appropriate money for the observance of Memorial Day.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

The compilation, publication, and distribution of World War I service roster of Connecticut has been authorized.

Military service record must be included in reports filed with the registrars of vital statistics.

Provision has been made for the preservation of Spanish War records, histories, relics, etc.

Provision has been made for maintaining records of World Wars I and II in the State library.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

Towns may make appropriation for the assistance, support, or maintenance of military organizations.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Aid is provided to a widowed mother, wife, husband, child, or children of any veteran being cared for at the veterans' home, at any hospital, or elsewhere in the State.

Banks, building and loan associations, etc., are authorized to make or invest in loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Benefits are extended to veterans of all wars from certain funds expended through the American Legion for food, wearing apparel, medical or surgical aid, care of relief, or funeral expenses.

Mothers' aid is provided to alien widows of war veterans, provided they apply for citizenship.

Publication of the name of a person receiving aid from a charity or welfare department is prohibited if the recipient is a dependent of a resident serving in the armed forces.

Settlement rights are retained when absence from town of settlement is caused by service in the armed forces.

Temporary financial assistance is extended to veterans eligible for admission to a veterans' home, but who cannot be cared for at the home owing to a temporary lack of adequate facilities.

Temporary financial assistance is extended to veterans, or to the widows, dependent child, parent, brother, or sister of one who died in the service.

Weekly allowances are available to widows of veterans of the Civil War or the Spanish-American War under certain circumstances.

TAX EXEMPTIONS: EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Benefit performances for veterans' associations are exempt from amusement tax.

Members of the armed forces are permitted to hunt and fish without a license.

War risk insurance is exempt from inheritance tax.

Refund is made on liquor permits surrendered by persons entering the armed forces.

Exemption is granted from payment of operator's license and examination fees until 1 year following discharge from military service.

Refund is made of registration fee upon the surrender of number plates of any noncommercial motor vehicle by owner when entering the military service.

Exemption is granted from payment of old-age assistance tax becoming due and payable during term of military service.

Disabled veterans are exempt from the old-age assistance tax.

Veterans may sell goods, wares, or merchandise without a license.

Veterans are exempt from the personal tax.

Persons in the armed forces are exempt from renewal of certain licenses and from payment of renewal fees until after discharge from the military service.

Honorably discharged veterans of World War II are exempt from payment of any unincorporated business tax for 3 years following establishment of such business, if established within 2 years after discharge.

Certificates of professional engineers or professional land surveyors are renewed following military service or after cessation of hostilities.

Licenses, permits, and certificates of embalmers and funeral directors are renewed within 1 year after termination of the war.

Licenses to practice hairdressing and cosmetology are renewed upon the payment of $2.

American Red Cross real estate and tangible property is exempt from taxation.

Veterans having disability ratings are granted a maximum property tax exemption of $3,000

Property of the American Legion and of the Grand Army of the Republic, charitable funds of the GAR and of other veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

Veterans' organizations' tangible property actually used and occupied is exempt from taxation.

Veterans, their wives, widows, and parents are exempt from property tax.

Tax exemption is granted to property to the amount of $1,000 owned or held in trust for any resident of the State serving in the armed forces.

Exemption is granted from penalty for failure to file an unincorporated business tax report for specified period after honorable discharge from the armed forces.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Rights to hold property have been established.

Unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of the GAR and the American Legion is subject to $500 fine.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

Copies of the Connecticut World War service roster are distributed to the State departments and national headquarters of veterans' organizations.

Disbursements may be made from the soldiers, sailors, and marines fund through the American Legion for relief to, or in bearing the funeral expenses of, veterans of World Wars I and II.

Most of these laws have been enacted through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time the DAV has some 23 chapters throughout the State of Connecticut, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans with their problems in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains five full-time national service officers, under the direction of Rosario J. Aloisio, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Hartford, Conn.

These DAV experts extend all types of service to veterans and their dependents, free of charge, more particularly in the development and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled under existing Federal and State laws.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

Active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it. Annual membership is available for $5.

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans, under the supervision of my friend, Millard W. Rice, as national director of public relations.

As a disabled veteran of World War II, I am proud to be a member of this select outfit. It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

The McCollum Case and 300 Years of American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the recent confused and tragic decision of our Supreme Court in the McCollum case has prompted a response from scholars of the subject of religion and education all over the country. The following is a news item taken from the Marquette Tribune published weekly by the students of the Marquette University School of Journalism quoting from the remarks of the Reverend Charles M. O'Hara, S. J., professor of education at Marquette, on this subject:

AMERICAN SCHOOL TRADITIONALLY RELIGIOUS, SAYS FATHER O'HARA

(By Tim Reilly)

"The American school is traditionally a religious school. For the first 300 years of our history it was taken for granted that almost every school would be religious. Today, it is taken for granted that our tax-supported schools will be godless, where God is not in the picture at all," Father Charles M. O'Hara, S. J., professor of education at Marquette, explained in a discussion of the traditions and recent trends of American education, at a meeting of the Marquette Commission of the National Student Association, Wednesday evening, April 7.

As early as 1642, Massachusetts passed a law to establish schools "so that no child's religious education would be neglected, and to defend against the old delauder, Satan." Eight of the first nine colleges established in America were definitely religious and were founded to educate ministers, Father O'Hara explained.

"The first amendment of the Constitution states, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' What the framers of the Constitution were fighting against was the establishment of a state religion, where the head of the Government would be the head of the church. In such an arrangement, the church always loses out," Father declared.

"Since Congress can make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, Congress cannot prohibit us from learning our religion," Father said in telling of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which organized the Territory of Wisconsin and the surrounding States. The ordinance stated "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

"Our fathers stated that religion was the very reason for establishing schools; yet today the same schools are expected to be nonreligious," Father said.

The beginning of the trend to drop religion in higher education from the schools began about 1837, according to Father O'Hara, when a controversy arose over what religion was to be the official religion of the University of Michigan. The problem was submitted to a committee who decided that inasmuch as no course could be taught without religion, it would be all right to drop dogmatic religion. The committee stated that they were sure that if the godless used that decision to advance atheism, the people would withdraw their support from the university. That was the first time that dogmatic religion was dropped from a State university in the Midwest. Father explained that the problem came down to the schools saying to the religions, "Since you can't agree, park the argument outside the schools."

In 100 years the American opinion on religion in education has so changed that tens of thousands of American students read today in a popular textbook: "Following that date the religious motive began to be supplanted by the democracy motive as the driving force for the establishment of schools." Father explained that the implication is that religion and democracy in education are mutually exclusive. "How many of those students see through this fallacy? From men of such education, our Supreme Court judges are chosen. A godless school can never satisfactorily prepare students for life because the main purpose of life is preparation for eternity. If we did not have godless schools, many important educational problems would be cleared up," Father O'Hara stated.

On the question of Federal or State aid to non-tax-supported schools, Father explained that parish school parents are paying for all school services, yet their children are denied the benefits that their own taxes provide. Not only are the parish-school parents providing for the general education, but they are educating many students for which the general population does not have to pay. The general taxpayers are not paying for education of all the children, as the parish-school parents pay not only for others, but also to educate their own children at an added expense to themselves and a saving to the general taxpayers.

Father O'Hara explained that while the recent Supreme Court decision on allowing religion to be taught in the public school was representative of the present day popular opinion, it was not consistent with the traditions of American education, not consistent with the letter of the Constitution.

Martin Promises a Purge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

MARTIN PROMISES A PURGE

During a speech in Philadelphia the other night, Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN (Republican, of Massachusetts) called attention to a state of affairs which the Truman administration, with the election approaching, would dearly love to have us all forget.

The President for some months now has been doing his best to shoo the Roosevelts' and Wallace's old Communist and fellow-traveler pals away from his door. He has repudiated the Communists in speeches and news conferences, and has at least not tried to damper down the current scare over a possible early war with Russia.

That's all very well, said Mr. MARTIN, in effect, even if it does come a bit late in the day; but there are still large numbers of Federal Government jobholders who are either Communists, fellow travelers, or subversives of other types.

MARTIN described these rascals as a part of "a highly dangerous fifth column"—meaning Stalin's fifth column—and said that "it is a black page in American history that so many members of un-American groups were welcomed into high governmental posts" by the New Dealers.

"We have got to be sure," he added, "these fifth columnists are not only thrown off the public pay rolls but that they are brought out into the light of day where we can watch them and foil their nefarious operations."

If the Republicans win the November 2 election, the Speaker promised, they will throw some heavy effort into doing just that. Subversives of all descriptions now infesting Government offices will be tracked down, smoked out, and given the grand bounce.

It will be a tough job, even for a new Republican administration all steamed up with courage and energy. The chameleon has nothing on the average Red or fellow traveler when it comes to changing his surface color, and the leech is a piker compared with the average public pay-roller in the matter of clinging to something good.

But a new Republican administration can achieve such a cleanup, whereas an administration loaded with New Dealers will not—even if it could. And it can't because of long-standing political friendships, alliances, secret understandings, and the like. The fifth column made itself part of the warp and woof of the Roosevelt administration, and Roosevelt's heirs can't get rid of it.

Only a change in leadership from the White House down can accomplish that result—a result essential to the continued safety of the American Nation and people.

Mistakes of Businessmen in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mistakes Businessmen Make in Politics," which appeared in the April issue of Nation's Business, and which was written by James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISTAKES BUSINESSMEN MAKE IN POLITICS

(By James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp.)

I used to be in politics. Now, I am in business. I have had an excellent perch and ample opportunity to study the faults and virtues of those on either side. Businessmen and politicians, who should pull together as a team, shun double harness out of distrust and ignorance, and it must be acknowledged, on the firm conviction of both parties, that profits and elections do not keep steady company.

From my experience as a politician, which spanned more than 30 years in town, county, State, and national arenas, I find that businessmen err in considering politics and corruption synonymous. It may be granted that some practitioners of the art of government have given cause for such suspicion, just as some men of commerce have had none too nice a regard for laws. Happily and justly, these pirates have chiefly prospered in prison.

I have found the average businessman believes that, when the politician isn't stuffing ballot boxes, he is stuffing his pockets—pockets that apparently cannot be quite filled, like the maw of Gargantua. Too often the businessman regards his political brethren as a licensed band of thieves, much as he looks upon his Government as a curious institution licensed to pick his pockets every March 15. When he is not shunned as dishonest, the politician is avoided as unclean—a variety of untouchable given to flag waving and hot air.

As a matter of fact, the average politician is not unlike the average businessman or, for all that, unlike the average citizen. He is no more and no less honest; no more and no less moral, and no more and no less human. Flatter him and he purrs; slight him and he sulks; hit him and the chances are, like any other American, he will throw a return punch unless he is flat on his back in unwilling star gazing. Like Judy O'Grady's husband and the colonel himself, the politician and the businessman are pretty much alike under the skin.

Both have something to sell. The businessman sell his goods and the politician sells his word. True, the politician doesn't need much of a capital investment to begin manufacturing promises, but he must meet delivery dates. All that politicians have to offer is a pledge. If the man in politics earns a reputation for telling the truth, he wins confidence and honor and public trust. If he sets out to fool the people, he invariably succeeds in making a fool of himself. Honesty is good politics.

It has been said of me, and not unkindly, that I would not steal anything but an election. In my years in politics I have not been buttonholed by that particular temptation. I feel confident, however, that I would send any person who came with such a suggestion not only behind me but out the back door and over the fence. Most of the men I have known in public life would do the same. It has been my good fortune to know many great men in business and in politics, who have equally high senses of duty, honor, and service. Although the pay in business is higher, the power in politics is mightier.

I never saw an election stolen and only once, in a long and active political career, did I know of money being passed for a vote. It made a great impression on me at the time. I can still see the scene in my mind's eye in Wheeler's Hotel—the polling place in my native Grassy Point—in the McKinley-Bryan campaign, which for me, a boy of 12, was featured by the close race between Benjamin B. Odell, Jr., Republican, and Bird S. Coler, Democrat, for the governorship of New York.

With a number of playmates, I was standing outside the rail of the polling place when in came Jack Parker, a village character of bantam-rooster proportions and temperament. Jack's arrival had been eagerly awaited because it was rumored the Republicans were offering from $5 to $10 for Democratic votes. It was further rumored that Alex Rose, the town's Republican leader, had paid off Parker. The old man was deaf and his sight was failing so that he required the assistance of the election inspectors, Pat Heneghan, Democrat, and Billy Garrison, Republican.

"Jack, how do you want to vote?" Heneghan asked. Parker evaded the question with "Patsy, you know I'm a Democrat."

Heneghan said he was aware of that fact, but had to know how Jack wanted to vote. Parker drew himself up to the last of his 5 feet, 3 inches, took a deep breath and declaimed, "The straight Democratic ticket." Knowing, like everyone else, that Parker had accepted money to vote Republican, Heneghan put his question again and got the same answer. As the old man cast his vote, Rose's face was a study in embarrassed rage. Everyone present—Republicans and Democrats alike—burst into laughter. The smoldering Rose followed Parker out of the polling place to berate him for not keeping his word—and to get back his $5. When Rose demanded return of the money, old Jack drew himself up again and solemnly declared, "Anyone paying me to vote anything but the straight Democratic ticket isn't entitled to get his money back."

I am afraid old Jack wouldn't have qualified under the definition of honesty propounded by Simon Cameron, Republican boss of Pennsylvania and first Secretary of War in Lincoln's Cabinet, who said, "An honest politician is one who, when he is bought, will stay bought." The belief that a politician must be bought persists to this day, so much so that many businessmen cannot think of approaching a man in public life without pondering what gifts they should bear. In all fairness, it must be said that the businessman is not always motivated by mercenary instincts. Offers are frequently based on genuine friendship.

Men of business are invariably astounded at the disparity between public salaries and responsibilities. In my own case, one of the Nation's most prominent industrialists offered to carry me on an inside account, a proposal which would have made me wealthy. He was puzzled and hurt when I rejected the offer, insisting that he wanted nothing in return and that the transaction was entirely legal. He could not see, because he was seeking nothing in return, that I could not in good conscience accept financial independence that came even indirectly from my role as a public servant. I am sure that to his dying day he regarded me as a nice fellow but a bit stupid financially, and had something there, I must confess.

Actually public officials should be regarded as servants and counselors in government. If the business man is perplexed over some phase of his relations with government, he should consult an expert and that expert is the man who has made a career of politics. It has never failed to amuse me to find men of business pathetically grateful when a man in politics gives them a few minutes of his time. They are not aware that it is the job of the politician to meet people. The businessman should remember that he, too, has a vote and is welcome for that reason alone, if for no other.

THE BALLOT AS PROTEST

Frequently I have heard industrialists exclaim with Huck Finn's father, "I'll never vote again * * * and the country may rot for all of me." Such exclamations usually follow defeat of their candidate in elections or disapproval of the course of the party or men in office. The avowed course is ridiculous, of course, because by it the declarer surrenders his only means of protesting. The ballot is the only means of participation in government for many citizens.

Often men are ludicrous in their attempts to influence votes and elections. It will be recalled by many that an outstanding industrialist urged his workers to vote the Republican ticket in 1932 and neglected to register himself. We seized on this humorous situation to make much Democratic capital. Attempts of businessmen to influence voting—usually through paid advertisements or even duller pamphlets—are largely ineffective and often laughable. More often than not, politics is a dream world in which they find themselves, to their horror, wandering around as naked as a jay bird. You can lose your shirt in business but you can also lose your pants in politics, especially if you don't know the fundamentals of the game.

Businessmen can best influence votes, as do politicians, by gaining confidence. This can be done by demonstrating that labor and management are a partnership mutually advantageous where there are pride in performance and fairness in division of profits. The best interests of both labor and management are not so divergent that they cannot be advanced by one party.

MISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT

In my years in politics I found many businessmen carried their mistrust of politicians to their Government. Many still look on their Government as their sworn enemy. Others regard it much as a timid husband looks on a domineering mother-in-law. This is the more curious because the man of industry should accord the American Government a measure of respect in that it constitutes the biggest business in the world. Of course, it would appear that it is the only business which can apparently operate in the red better than in the black. But we in business are told that is something to be desired but not emulated.

It cannot be denied that those in business have some ground for their suspicions. Ever since business began growing out of its nineteenth century clothes, it has been subjected to governmental restraints, most of them offered like sulfur and molasses for your own good. A good many have been not only necessary but admirable, while others have been offered because there are more worker votes than boss votes. In this connection it might be noted that there is a widespread belief that big business dominates the Government and public officials. If that were true, then politics might be defined as the art by which the common man controls big business, which fancies it is controlling him. To put it more succinctly, one might say that politics is the belling of the fat cats of big business by the little fellows.

At any rate the businessman is inclined to shy away from his Government as he shies away from the politician. When he deals with his Government he prefers to do so through a lawyer or some other intermediary.

I have been amazed and amused over the lack of knowledge of respected businessmen of the most trivial and commonplace services of their Government. In my time in office my desk was snowflaked with letters of gratitude for answering inquiries, which answers were readily available to any citizen who might send a penny post card to the appropriate Government bureau. I have known businessmen to stammer and blush in approaching me to ask how they should go about getting an appointment to Annapolis or West Point for their sons. Such men have wrung my hand effusively when I told them what every school boy knows, that their Senator or Representative might make the appointment if asked or at least permit the boy in question to take a competitive examination for an appointment.

These are small things, but they serve to illustrate the point that men in the marts of trade do not know the many services offered by their Government. Not all the lack may be charged to suspicion or fear; some may be charged to neglect and more to occupation with making a living in a highly competitive world. A good deal of the businessman's concern with his Government comes from the fact that its charges are constantly multiplying on the debit side of his ledger. In these moments he is prone to cast himself in the role of a sleighing Muscovite forced to toss his financial offspring to pursuing wolves.

CONGRESS NEEDS OPINIONS

Now and then he finds himself standing in the need of aid from his Government. At other times he finds himself deeply concerned with government when a bill he considers injurious to his interests is introduced or passed. On such occasions his interest is roused to the extent of writing a letter or even making a trip to Washington. Few businessmen are aware that lawmakers are frequently as interested in hearing his story as he is to tell it, because knowledge of all sides of a question enables them to cast a more intelligent vote.

The average businessman looks on political conventions, caucuses, and the like as cabalistic rites in which politicians of all parties take blood-brother oaths to put business to the stake in order to sweat out more tax dollars. He is likely to leave any participation in such functions to officials of his association, which he also neglects. Many of these organizations perform useful and meritorious services for him and the public at large. A few are perpetually weaning themselves on sour pickles. Efforts of the latter succeed little more than bringing business into disrepute.

I feel businessmen are open to censure for their lack of participation in politics and government. Beyond a contribution to one party or the other, or perhaps both, out of a commercial instinct for hedging, the average businessman takes no part in politics. He might listen to a campaign address if there is no comedy program on the air. He intends to read important speeches, but too frequently puts them off unless he has a long wait in the barber shop. He might lift his voice in argument in the locker room of the country club, but will not follow debate in Congress.

If I exaggerate, I do so only to emphasize the importance of thorough information on public questions. The businessman should take his duties of citizenship, particularly in casting his ballot, most seriously. It is one way of preserving the free-enterprise system, perhaps the most important way.

MANY SHUN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Except in periods of crisis, usually in time of war, businessmen hesitate to enter Government service, even in Cabinet rank. Yet, as was the case during the war, they perform magnificently. No small part of our victory in the field may be attributed to their service. By the same token, it may be that part of our failure to win the peace may be due to their reluctance to take a larger role in our postwar Government establishment.

To be fair, I must recognize that the fault may not be entirely theirs. It may be that few are called and fewer are chosen for Federal service. Nothing is more embarrassing than to volunteer and to be judged wanting or unworthy. Sadly enough, I speak from experience. After Pearl Harbor I offered to return to the Government. In all modesty, I felt I had talents which my country might employ to advantage, only to find that my offer went ignored. It is a matter of profound regret to me that I was not permitted to join in the war effort.

I did not repeat my offer, having no wish to place myself in the position of the persistent and perennial candidate for public office, who rushed to the home of a New York district leader on learning of the death of an officeholder. "I'd like to take Flanagan's place," he pleaded. The district leader eyed him coldly for a moment and then observed sententiously, "It's all right with me, if you can square it with the undertaker."

But to return to Federal service by businessmen, it is my firm conviction that at no time in history as at present does the country and the world so need the best brains and ability. If the world is to be set on its feet economically and politically, it will be through the combined efforts of experts in industry, labor, agriculture, and politics. I am sure such a team can master problems at home and abroad, and I earnestly urge those in business who are called to step forward like soldiers and answer a summons with "Here and ready for duty."

H. R. 6262

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House bill 6262, the title of which is "A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense, and promote peace."

At the outset, may I state very frankly that I am not the author of this bill. Bills containing the identical language were introduced in several sessions of Congress back in the 1920's and the early 1930's, all of them sponsored by the American Legion. The bill I have introduced is a copy of the so-called Sheppard bill last introduced in the Seventy-fifth Congress.

I am convinced that this is one of the sanest legislative proposals ever submitted to the Congress of the United States. As a result of our experiences just prior to and throughout World War II, most people will now agree that it is unfortunate that a bill of this kind was not written into law in the period of time between World War I and World War II. If such a law had been on our statute books when either the national emergency was declared in 1939 or on the date of the attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, our national debt would be a great deal smaller today than it is and millions of our citizens would be better off financially.

We all hope that this country will never again become involved in another war. We had the same high hopes when World War I ended. I recall addressing audiences throughout the State of Connecticut in 1935 and 1936, urging the passage of legislation of this kind. I remember saying at that time that if we ever again became involved in a war, we would profit from our experiences of World War I and not require the male youth of this Nation to serve in the armed forces at a dollar a day while their neighbors stayed at home and profited by their country's disaster. The proposal at that time had a great deal of support but it also unfortunately had some very strong opposition.

A modern war is not fought by the armed services alone. War today if it is successfully prosecuted must be a national effort. Practically every citizen becomes involved to a greater or lesser degree. Unless we are going to take the position that another war means the end of democracy or possibly the end of civilization itself, we should take steps to guarantee that if such a misfortune strikes us again, no one will be permitted to profit from such a disaster in any way, shape, or form.

The bill I have introduced should undoubtedly be amended in many respects. Our experiences in World War II will undoubtedly indicate certain changes that should be made in the language of this bill. While it is true that the life of the Eightieth Congress is rapidly drawing to an end, there is still time for a committee of the House to give some very real study to legislation of the kind I have proposed.

Again the Tariff!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of April 17, 1948:

AGAIN THE TARIFF!

Congress is going to have to make a fast and tough decision on the tariff issue.

The Trade Agreements Act expires soon. Shall it be allowed to die; or renewed, and if so, for how long?

As a general matter, the Republican position on tariffs is sufficiently clear. Consistently since the Civil War, the GOP has stood for protective tariffs—tariffs high enough to equalize the costs of manufacture under high American wages with costs abroad where slave, subsidized or low-standard labor is used. There are, of course, many shades of definition of this general principle in the Republican Party.

The Democratic position, with many deviations, is in favor of free trade under various names. The New Deal has consistently whittled down the tariff rates of the act of 1930. World war and other difficulties have so disrupted production and transportation that there has been no test of these new rates—no chance to see their eventual effect on American production, employment and wages.

No question in American politics is more broad and more tangled than the tariff issue. To attempt to outline a tariff program satisfactory to the various schools of thought in the Republican Party, between now and the date of the expiration, June 12, would be to try to do a superhuman task.

The job of revamping the tariff structure is bound to be a matter of many months.

It is a serious embarrassment to the Republicans in Congress to have this issue tossed in their laps just before the conventions.

But it is equally embarrassing to President Truman to have to ask Congress to take action in this matter. He certainly didn't plan it that way. On the contrary, the Truman expectation was that long before this he would have a permanent trade-agreement program worked out in the form of an International Trade Organization.

Most of last year was devoted to the Geneva conference, trying to get a satisfactory charter for the ITO. And ever since early last winter, delegates have been meeting in Habana to attempt to put something in shape.

The Habana agreement has been substantially completed. But the fact is that (despite a chorus of eulogies from dutiful propaganda sources) the Habana agreement is a hodge-podge of compromises, bargains, obscurities and exceptions which the President doesn't dare submit to Congress.

One reason for the Bogota session was reported to be that of working out some harmonious agreement between this country and Latin America on the tariff issue. The revolt there, which disrupted the conference, has made virtually impossible the completion of this part of the President's strategy.

The fact is, of course, that while the other nations of the world are perfectly willing for Uncle Sam to tear down his own tariff protections for their benefit, they are bitterly opposed to making any real concessions on their own part. The Truman official family is about the only free-trade administration on the face of the earth.

It is because of his failure to obtain a satisfactory international agreement on the tariff issue which could take the place of our own trade-agreements plan that the President has asked for an extension of the Act. He hoped before this to have it superseded. What he wants now is a few more years to work out the alternative plan.

It is of course apparent to nearly everyone that the tariff mess cannot be straightened out until there is a Republican President in the White House and a Republican Secretary in the State Department, both willing to work harmoniously with a Republican Congress in the handling of this huge, sensitive and urgent problem.

From the point of view of virtually all of these different groups, with their varying approaches to the question of what Congress should do about the tariff this spring, there is unanimity on the proposition that the one real way to overhaul the tariffs starts out like this:

Elect a Republican President this fall.

The dilemma could not come up at a time more annoying to the President. The Republicans are in the majority in both Houses. Moreover, many of his own Democratic followers in Congress are in open revolt against him. It would be difficult to imagine a more tense and hostile atmosphere.

But the other side of the matter, from the Truman point of view, is that the extension or nonextension of the act is largely a moot question. To use a word applied by Speaker JOE MARTIN, it is academic.

This is true, for reasons not at all well understood by many of those deeply intertested in the tariff issue. Whether the act itself stands or falls has nothing to do with the agreements already written under the act. These continue indefinitely—until the President and the State Department terminate them. Not even the withdrawal of the foreign partner terminates them, as has been proven in the case of the Mexican agreement, where Mexico canceled all her concessions, but the United States Government has insisted that our concessions must continue.

Failure to renew the act would leave all of the scores of agreements just where they are. Tariff rates, instead of returning automatically to the Smoot-Hawley levels, would continue at the microscopic rates now imposed.

Moreover, in the new agreements at Geneva the State Department used up most of its bargaining power of a second 50-percent slash in the rates. On a great many key items, the rates are already down as far as they could go without a brand new law—down to half of the 1945 tariffs, and a fourth of the 1930 rates.

Whether the State Department and President could further modify the agreements now in effect, if the law was allowed to die, is an open question. Many tricky new provisions have been written into the agreements which tariff experts admit they cannot understand.

A good many observers feel that this is an especially unhappy time for the tariff issue to be thrown into the voting arena. The history of tariff battles indicates that it is almost hopeless to try to convince large portions of the public of the importance of the protective principle—until the time when nonprotective tariff rates have shut down American plants and thrown American labor out of work.

This country hasn't seen a tariff panic since about 1920. That's 28 years ago. Only those

who are 50 years old or more, and had some special vantage point to watch that episode, have any practical knowledge of how tariff panics work and how they can be prevented or cured. To virtually everybody else, the tariff is merely a boresome and hard-to-understand dead issue.

With many new billions of Federal spending injected into American economy, by the Marshall plan and the defense activities, it is hardly likely that there can be a tariff panic between now and election day next November. The mere fact that world shipping will be largely monopolized in hauling out some $6,000,000,000 of ERP goods from this country will be enough to prevent any flooding of American markets by foreign producers in that time.

How the Republican leaders in Congress will react to these problems and conditions remains to be seen.

Many suggestions have been made. There are a few who believe that the Republicans ought to accept the trade-agreement principle and incorporate it in their own program when they take over control of the National Government (they hope) next January.

Others would like to see a drastic revision of the whole tariff set-up immediately. How this could be done in the time available, how the different opinions could be reconciled, and how the Republicans would win enough Democratic votes to override the inevitable Presidential veto, are questions not at all satisfactorily answered.

The suggestion also has been made that the Republicans extend the act, at least for 1 year, and include in it some of the most needed protections of American industry. Those especially favored are some form of review of new agreements at the hands of Congress before they are made effective, and provision for court appeal in case American producers find themselves seriously injured.

Presumably, the President would veto an extension of the act which contained such provisions. They ran strongly counter to the New Deal strategy of putting all the tariff power in the hands of the executive branch of the Government. Very likely Congress would be unable to pass such a law over the veto. However, some Republicans feel that this would transfer the onus of defeating the extension of the act from Congress to the President himself.

A quite different reasoning is followed by others interested in the question. They argue that the United States of America is in a specially hazardous position, both in relation to world peace and with regard to our domestic economy. If there are adverse developments in either of these fields, they maintain, then it would offer the President a most welcome alibi if he were able to charge that the Republicans brought these disasters down upon the country by meddling with the trade-agreements program.

This line of thinking, of course, would lead to the conclusion that the best thing for the Republicans to do would be to extend the act unchanged until after the next President takes office—a 1-year extension.

Why the Haste?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to a press release issued from the office of the Housing Expediter by the Acting Administrator, Mr. Tighe E. Woods, ordering the decontrol of Bremerton, Wash., effective the eighth of this month.

The hasty action by Mr. Woods came as a deep surprise to me. I had understood that the new rent law required the reorganizing of the area rent advisory boards. Mr. Woods certainly did not give the Governor of Washington the opportunity to establish a representative board as required by the law before taking action on rents in Bremerton.

In addition, I am informed that the Administrator did not take proper precautions to see that the letter reached the proper person on time. First, I must state that this whole procedure seems highly irregular. I thought the action required the boards to make a recommendation to the Administrator which he would review in 30 days. Now Mr. Woods seems to have decided that he will make a recommendation to the boards to which they must reply in 30 days.

In any event the Bremerton Sun for April 7, 1948, a copy of which I hold in my hand, states that Mr. Wood's letter was sent to a former chairman of the advisory board who was in the hospital and who therefore did not see the communication until March 31. This left the advisory rent board of Bremerton only 5 days in which to substantiate its request for continuance of rent controls.

The Bremerton board tried to call the Administrator on the telephone, but he was unavailable, yet he issued a statement the next day saying: "Having received no word from the board within the stated period, Mr. Woods said he was taking the decontrol action."

The actions taken in Washington, D. C., affect our daily lives. Thousands of tenants in Bremerton whose rent has been raised in the last few days cannot understand the reason Mr. Woods took the hasty action he did. I hope he will soon explain.

Attached is an editorial from the Bremerton Sun of April 7, 1948, and two front-page articles; an article from the same paper of April 8, 1948; and a press release from the office of the Housing Expediter, dated for release April 7, 1948:

[From the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun of April 7, 1948]

CONTROLS LIFTED ON LOCAL RENTS—A CHALLENGE TO LANDLORDS

The surprise action of the United States Housing Expediter in Washington, D. C., of lifting all Kitsap County rent controls effective tomorrow causes deep concern to tenants and to every citizen devoted to the community welfare.

But more than that, the decontrol action presents a challenge to landlords. A challenge for fairness, considered judgment, good citizenship.

Let us face this fact: The tenants of the Bremerton area are less able to withstand rental increases than those of perhaps any other metropolis in the Pacific Northwest. The Bremerton and Kitsap County economy has been on the decline, and is continuing so. Some tradesmen have received higher wages, but there are fewer jobs and fewer days of work for them. The shipyard workers received a pay increase a few months ago, but it wasn't in sufficient amount to bring their wages into line with living costs. The majority of their pay checks still remain too low to maintain a proper family standard of living.

A wave of unwarranted rental increases in Kitsap County can cause serious dislocation of our economy. It can set back the local development and population growth by more than a decade. It can inflict deep wounds on local business activity. It can create family crises that would be of severe consequence.

The landlords have been patient; their costs, like everyone else's, have been rising for years. The returns on their investments have been cut to almost nothing in some instances. Rental adjustments in numerous cases can be justified on this basis.

But we plead for conscientious deliberation by the landlords before altering rental structures. Put your tenants at ease by hearing their individual cases; sit down with them and discuss the problem at hand; seek mutual agreement; try your utmost to avert hardships; bear in mind that vacant properties, if you drive tenants out of town or into public-housing areas, are a liability to you.

By the exemplification of good citizenship, rent decontrol will not be the ogre that it appears today.

SURVEY SHOWS CLASSROOMS TO BE OVERTAXED—INCREASE IN FIRST-GRADE ENROLLMENT TO SPAN 6 YEARS

A sharp increase in the number of youngsters entering city schools for the first time is expected to tax classroom facilities heavily in the next 6 years.

Next fall alone, 790 pupils are expected to enroll in the first grade. That's 138 more than first grades now have. And the classrooms are crowded already.

Over the 6-year span, at least 5,500 children are expected to join the first-year migration.

Such are the findings of a broad residential canvass conducted by parent-teacher volunteers and announced today by Schools Superintendent Stanley Wynstra.

An additional four and a half rooms would be needed to normally accommodate the newcomers who will enroll during the next year, Wynstra said.

"The number of pupils will remain fairly constant," the superintendent declared, "until 1952 and 1953 when the tabulation jumps 200 or 300 each year—with the birth rate still rising."

The parent-teacher group is to be highly commended "for their forward looking action in carrying on this survey at this time and the count shows the survey was made none too soon as preparations must be made at once for the coming year," Wynstra commented.

Concurrently with this pre-school population tabulation, three staff members of the Bremerton schools have carried on an evaluation of the present buildings within the system. The building survey was under the direction of Fred Graham, director of instruction; DeFore Cramblitt, supervisor of maintenance and transportation, and Berger Jacobsen, principal of George Dewey Junior High School.

From the results of both surveys a plan can be presented to the community in the near future which will outline the action that must be taken to prepare for the increase in school population, Wynstra believes.

[From the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun of April 7, 1948]

UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE TAKES SURPRISE ACTION TODAY—HOUSING AUTHORITY HAS NO PLANS FOR INCREASING FEES

Rent controls will be removed in Bremerton and Kitsap County effective tomorrow,

Tighe B. Woods, Housing Expediter in Washington, D. C., announced in a surprise action today.

Woods said the action was ordered after study of a survey made here in February by investigators from the San Francisco regional rent-control office.

H. H. (Bob) Magill, chairman of the local rent-control board until last night when he was succeeded by Harold Paschal, school teacher, said today that every possible effort was made by the board to "hold the line" on rentals.

"We fought it for all we were worth, but the pressure on Washington officials was too great," Magill, veterans' leaders, said today.

Paschal assumed chairmanship of the board last night and called an emergency meeting of the board. The change in chairmen was made because of Magill's ill health.

"We 'phoned Washington last night and made an effort to halt the action by the housing expediter," Paschal said today.

Woods was not available, but Paschal talked with John J. O'Brien, information director in the housing office.

"We explained to him that the local board does not favor decontrol and asked a delay to allow us to submit recommendations."

The Washington office asked for a recommendation from the local board March 5, but the letter did not reach the board until March 31, according to Paschal. The message was mailed to Magill, who was hospitalized, and thus did not receive attention, it was explained today.

"We did not realize the urgency of the request and were preparing a recommendation when we were informed last night of the action of the expediter," Paschal said.

In addition to the telephoned request for an extension of time, a telegram was sent to Washington by the board last night.

"We appeal to you for an extension of time that we may substantiate the two previous acts of this board for retention of rent controls here," the telegram said in part.

A spokesman for the housing expediter's office this afternoon said he had received the telegram from the Bremerton board. He said the order has been entered and published in the Federal Register and cannot be rescinded.

He said the new rent-control law prohibits him from recontrolling any area he has decontrolled.

Paschal said the delayed letter from Woods stated the survey here indicated "no unwarranted or drastic rent increases would result, if controls were removed."

R. C. Atwood, area rent director at Seattle, told the Sun today the action was a surprise to him and the Washington action was apparently made upon the recommendation of the San Francisco office.

After learning of the decontrol action, Mayor L. Hum Kean issued a statement calling upon landlords in Bremerton to give careful study to ability of their tenants to pay before making rental increases. He said that the economic stability of the entire city might easily be impaired if unwarranted increases are made in rents.

"This seems like a splendid opportunity for the landlords to demonstrate their good faith with tenants and their good citizenship," the mayor said.

Attorneys advised the Sun, on questioning today, that under State law landlords are required to give tenants written notice of any rent increase at least 20 days prior to the rent-paying period in which the increase will be effective.

Meantime, E. C. Searle, executive director of the Bremerton housing authority, said that the housing authority "to his knowledge" had no plans to increase rentals in any of its projects.

He pointed out that certain controls still apply to rentals to military personnel and also to tenants of the original Westpark project, which is now being tenanted only by families in low-income classifications.

Rental adjustments on a general scale seem unnecessary in any of the other areas, Searle said.

Lee S. Forbes, manager of Bremerton Gardens, privately owned apartment housing in the Manette area, said he did not know whether rentals would be adjusted there. One of the owners of Bremerton Gardens is expected here soon, and Forbes will confer with him at that time regarding rentals.

The housing authority disclosed that at present there are 395 available homes for rental in various projects; the vacancies in the projects are believed to have influenced the Housing Expediter's office in Washington in its decision for decontrol.

Of the 395 available homes, 51 are in Westpark proper (for low-income families only); 35 in Eastpark, which will be taken over in its entirety by the Navy May 1; 8 are war apartments; 8 in Westpark extension; 30 in Qualheim project, and 262 in Sheridan Park. Some of those in Sheridan are within the area which will be offered for public sale to veterans in the near future, Searle said. Regardless of future tenancy, he explained, disposal of some of these homes must go forward under Federal law.

Searle explained that eligibility for project tenancy still is restricted to heads of families who are completing war contracts in the area, shipyard workers, Navy personnel, and veterans. The housing authority also has the right to provide occupancy in some "hardship cases" where a family is unable to obtain privately owned rental property within his income range.

Ceilings were placed on rents during the summer of 1942. Rents that were in effect April 1, 1941, were set as the maximum on rental property.

WITH UNITED STATES CONTROLS DEAD, MAYOR WILL NAME ADVISORY RENT BOARD

[From the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun of April 8, 1948]

With Federal rent controls being officially terminated here today, Mayor L. Hum Kean prepared to set up a local rental advisory board, to serve on behalf of tenants who may have future complaints of unwarranted increases in rentals.

Whether the board would be given any enforcement power under city ordinance—other than the power of exerting public opinion against unscrupulous landlords was still to be settled.

Mayor Kean said the purpose of the board would be to hear complaints, to seek satisfactory settlements in cases of justified complaints, or, in cases which cannot be compromised, to seek alternate rental properties satisfactory to the tenant.

The mayor was making appointment to the board today, subject to the council's confirmation. Until the membership is complete, he withheld names but said he was seeking representative members of veterans' groups, the housing authority, the naval shipyard, and the Kitsap County Board of Realtors to accept appointments.

"Bremerton is again asked to be a guinea pig in this matter, as we were so many times during the war years," the mayor said. "All the Northwest will be watching how we handle this problem—and how the landlords and tenants react. I think the time is at hand for some good, clear, cooperative thinking by everyone interested in the welfare of the community. We can solve the problem that way."

Meantime, the board of realtors' executive board, in a meeting called yesterday, pleaded with landlords to avert any "unjust or unwarranted rent increases in this community."

Harry Mitchell, board president, said the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas rent control has been lifted in the Bremerton area; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance that there be no unjust or unwarranted rent increases in this community: Now, therefore, it is hereby

"*Resolved*, That the Kitsap County Board of Realtors appeals to all owners of rental property to make no increases in rentals that are not fully justified and that might cause people to leave this community, and thus hurt local business and be generally injurious to the individual and to the community."

Unable to stay the effectiveness of the rent decontrol order in appeals to the Housing Expediter's office in Washington, D. C., yesterday, the rent control board that functioned here under the Federal regulations appealed by wire to President Truman last night.

The message, signed by Harold Paschal, chairman, stated the local organization was not allowed an opportunity to present its recommendations on control because of administrative confusion.

A request from Tighe E. Woods, National Housing Expediter, for the board's recommendation was mailed to H. H. (Bob) Magill while the former chairman was hospitalized and did not reach the board until almost deadline, the telegram stated.

Woods knew of Magill's resignation from the board February 6, but forwarded the request to him anyway, Paschal wrote.

"Mr. President, we feel that in the interest of justice we should have an opportunity to present our side for control. We appeal to you to stay this order until we have had an opportunity to prove that decontrol would have a very adverse effect upon this community," the message concluded.

Inasmuch as the decontrol order already has been placed on the official United States Register, it seemed unlikely that the President would take any action.

It was made clear today that the decontrol ruling—which came as a surprise in all quarters—came as the result of a survey made here in February by inspectors from the San Francisco rent control office. Their recommendations to Washington were fortified by an action taken by Mayor Kean's committee on housing facts and goals which on January 29, defeated by a 4–6 vote a motion that it go on record as opposed to decontrol of rents in the Bremerton area. At the same time, the committee voted favorably on a motion that a local board be empowered to control and adjust rents in this area.

Apartment house owners and managers here today indicated they are studying the rent situation closely before taking any action toward adjusting rents.

Several owners contacted said they have not had time to discuss the matter thoroughly because of the suddenness of the decontrol announcement.

Some owners stated that some upward adjustment would be needed in the case of some apartments, but that a general increase did not seem to be warranted.

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER,
April 7, 1948.

Rent controls are being removed from the Bremerton, Wash., district, Housing Expediter Tighe E. Woods announced today. He based his action on a survey which indicated that the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met.

The action, which affects all of Kitsap County, will take effect on April 8 through an amendment to the rent regulations.

Mr. Woods had sent a copy of a decontrol survey made by the San Francisco regional office to the Kitsap County Rent Advisory Board, asking it to review the information,

supplement it with any additional pertinent facts, and make a recommendation within 30 days.

Having received no word from the board within the stated period, Mr. Woods said he was taking the decontrol action.

Information about the housing situation brought out in the survey of the Bremerton district indicated: a number of units available and vacant in public housing, some vacancies from time to time in furnished apartments at not unreasonable rents, employment stabilized at the Navy yard and not likely to increase, a Navy report of ability to adequately meet its housing needs with no backlog of applications for rental housing, an apparent gradual decline in the trend of Bremerton's population, and no apparent great veterans' housing problem.

Why Revise the Hatch Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in 1946, as a member of the Special Senate Committee on Campaign Expenditures of that year, I had occasion to review rather thoroughly the presently existing Federal laws restricting political activities in campaigns for Federal office. At the first session of the Eightieth Congress all the members of the 1946 special committee joined in reporting that the existing Federal legislation on this important subject was utterly inadequate to accomplish the purposes for which it was enacted.

The report of the special committee went to some lengths to point out that such a recommendation had been consistently made by each and every Campaign Expenditures Committee subsequent to enactment of the original Hatch Act of 1939, so there is nothing novel in the suggestions of the 1946 committee.

On April 28, 1947, a bill (S. 1173) was introduced, sponsored by all of the members of the 1946 committee, designed to repeal the undesirable provisions of both the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act and to codify all Federal legislation dealing with political activities in a single law. Recognizing the fact that this is an election year and that very shortly the work of the 1948 Special Senatorial Committee on Campaign Expenditures will commence, it seems to me that we need this legislation now if it is to be effective in time to operate efficiently in the forthcoming elections, the first primaries of which have already been held.

This bill is presently pending before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and because I have received considerable correspondence of late indicating a great amount of public interest in this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that an article which I wrote for the Republican magazine in September of 1947 be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY REVISE THE HATCH ACT?

(By Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee)

People often say, sometimes with extraordinary rancor, that Congress is too slow with its legislation. Some of the more extreme of these critics argue that many of our laws come so late as to fail entirely in prevention and do very little in the way of correction.

In a certain sense, as applied to some fields of Federal legislation, much of this criticism has been deserved. Congressional delay is not always defensible by resorting to contention that this is a republic, and that in a republic it takes a long time to sense the will of the people and even longer to effectuate popular majority demand in the face of organized minority opposition. One field I have in mind specifically, in which Federal legislation is sorely needed and long overdue, is that dealing with political activities and campaign expenditures.

It takes money to win a political election in this country. Cold, hard cash and lots of it. Now, this is not necessarily an indictment of our political system. It is merely a simple observation based upon what we all know it costs to present the issues to the people. Radio networks don't give free time to political candidates. Advertisements in newspapers cost money. Watchers at the polls on primary and election days must be reimbursed at least for their time away from their jobs. These, and literally dozens of other items, add up to sizable sums which a candidate, or those working in his behalf, must be prepared to expend in order to let the people in his State or district know something about him and for what he stands. There is nothing inherently offensive or crooked in the expenditure of large sums of money for these purposes. This does not mean the buying of votes, in any sense of the word. The fact that in some places some candidates and some machines engage in reprehensible and unscrupulous campaign practices should not so color our thinking on the subject of political expenditures as to impel a conclusion that every time a party or a candidate reports a sizable expenditure, an election has been bought.

CAMPAIGNS COST MONEY

This becomes apparent when we consider the cost of preparing and mailing a single letter to every registered voter in a State. If, for example, a candidate from one of our larger States wishes to write a letter to 2,000,000 people, the cost of getting this letter into their hands, computed on a conservative basis of 2½ cents a letter, would be $50,000. It is obvious that the aggregate cost of radio programs, speakers' bureaus, printed literature, newspaper advertisements, and all the various and sundry means fairly used in the attempt to induce a favorable vote in a sizable State is bound to involve hundreds of thousands of dollars. Much more, in fact, than the ceiling limitations presently prescribed by our State and Federal statutes.

This has brought about, in characteristic American fashion, open flaunting of these statutory restrictions by well-known means of artifice, subterfuge, and shut-eye, with the consequences that Federal statutes limiting campaign contributions and expenditures have fallen into popular disrepute. Their retention on the statute books in their present form weakens the force and efficacy of our entire legislative system. Specifically I refer to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 as amended and to the Hatch Act of 1939 as amended.

Every 2 years, in the spring of the year in which congressional elections are held, the United States Senate creates one special committee whose functions cannot be properly assumed by any of the standing committees under the Reorganization Act of 1946. This is the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, which, perforce, must be composed of Senators who themselves are not candidates for reelection in that year.

In 1946 it was my privilege to sit as ranking minority member of this Campaign Expenditures Committee. In the course of our work, while it was not a Presidential year, the inadequacies of our Federal statutes dealing with so-called corrupt practices and political activities in general were forcibly brought to my attention.

In the language of the 1946 special committee, "* * * presently existing Federal statutes dealing with elections, campaign expenditures, and contributions, and limitations thereon, are utterly inadequate to accomplish the purposes for which they were enacted."

SPECIFIC LEGISLATION IS DESIRED

The committee specifically recommended that both these acts be repealed by new and comprehensive legislation to include in one law certain desirable features of both, together with much new material calculated to bring legislation in this field into step with the times. The committee was careful to make specific recommendations respecting the nature of this new material, and, after considerable study, Senators ELLENDER, THOMAS of Oklahoma, MAYBANK, HICKENLOOPER, and myself introduced a bill (S. 1173) in April of this year, designed to accomplish these purposes. This bill is currently under study by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, successor to the former Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The conclusion reached by the 1946 committee to the effect that far-reaching legislative changes in our election laws were necessary was not without precedent. Each special committee detailed to investigate senatorial campaign expenditures subsequent to the adoption of the first Hatch Act in 1939 has taken pains to bring to the attention of the Senate, and to the country, the inadequacies in our election laws, and all have recommended that legislative changes be made at once in order to accomplish the purposes underlying the original legislation. The 1942 committee considered the limitations placed on the expenditures largely ineffective; the 1944 committee recommended complete revision and recodification of both the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act, with emphasis on giving prompt publicity to the sources of campaign funds; and the 1946 committee concluded that existing Federal statutes dealing with elections were utterly inadequate to accomplish the purposes for which they were enacted. If the consistent opinion of consecutive Senate committees composed of different Senators from different States has been uniformly in favor of thoroughgoing changes in these laws, that, of itself, is strong indication it is time to see them through. This brings us to the question of what these changes should be, in light of what appear as glaring inadequacies in the present law.

In every election, expenditures or contributions in the broad sense will be made by candidates themselves, by individuals on behalf of candidates with or without their knowledge, and by corporations and other organizations or associations interested in the candidacy of particular individuals. With this in mind it is clear that attempts to regulate corrupt practices and campaign expenditures must include provision for all three of these groups. Since the Federal Corrupt Practices Act has dealt with restrictions on sums which candidates may spend

and on the activities of political committees, S. 1173 also repeals and revises the provisions included within this act in some detail. In fact the terms, purpose, and scope of the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act are so closely connected as to make it impractical and undesirable to retain the provisions of these acts in separate legislation.

PRIMARIES ARE OFTENTIMES CONCLUSIVE

In many of the States, primary elections are for all intents and purposes conclusive in determining the ultimate victor at the later general election. This is notoriously true in the Southern States. In years past, because of doubt cast on the power of Congress to extend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to primaries and conventions, principally created by the *Newberry* case (256 U. S. 232) the term "election" contained in the Corrupt Practices Act has not extended to primaries. The power of Congress has now been shown by the Supreme Court to extend to primaries and conventions (*United States v. Classic*, 313 U. S. 299) and S. 1173 redefines the term "election" to include a primary election or a convention of a political party as well as the general election. Unless the law is so extended it is plain that campaign expenditures and contributions cannot be adequately regulated because in these several States where one political party dominates, the real contest is the contest for the party nomination.

"POLITICAL COMMITTEE" IS VAGUE TERM

Since the principal medium by which funds are collected and dispersed on behalf of candidates in our political system is that of the political committee, the Corrupt Practices Act requires reports of such activity by political committees, but in its terms "political committee" is so defined as to exclude State or local committees. This definition, which exempts unaffiliated committees operating in but one State, has been changed in S. 1173 to include any and all committees accepting contributions or making expenditures for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the election of candidates. Apparently the theory on which the exemption of State and local committees was based involved belief that Federal power to deal with corrupt practices in this manner must be based on the commerce clause. A moment's thought will show the error in this approach since it is the office concerning which the election is influenced that gives the power and not the character of the political committee's operations. A political committee in influencing the election of a Federal official concerns itself with the Federal office whether its activities are confined to one State or to two or more States.

As of today the Corrupt Practices Act prescribes ceiling limitations on candidates for the Senate or the House according to a formula which dates from a period prior to 1925. This formula disregards the extensive rise in the national price level and consequent decline in dollar value, which, with population growth in this country coupled with larger population shifts, has greatly increased the legitimate cost of campaigning in many districts. S. 1173 proposes increases in the ceiling limitation on candidates, designed to more nearly approximate present-day financial realities. It is important to remember in connection with limitations on candidates that these limitations represent only a small part of the role money plays at election time, for the reason that the larger sums are expended by political committees and individuals in many cases without the candidates' actual knowledge, and for the party as distinct from the candidate, or for a coalition ticket on which the candidate is running.

ARE POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS LIMITED?

The Hatch Act—which contains extensive provisions with regard to participation in political management or political campaigns on the part of Federal officials, and State officials connected with State administration of projects backed in whole or in part by Federal funds, features with which I am not concerned in this discussion and which have been largely retained in S. 1173—prohibits political contributions by any person in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 during any calendar year, and it further provides no political committee shall receive contributions or make expenditures aggregating more than $3,000,000 during any calendar year. Both of these provisions have been eliminated in the new legislation pending before the rules committee.

HATCH ACT HAS LOOPHOLES

Why have we done this? Let's see what has happened in the last few years, when elections in this country have been supposedly governed by these provisions of the Hatch Act. In the first place, it is interesting to note that the section limiting individual contributions to $5,000 is carefully worded so as not to apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization. The result of this loophole has been to permit individual contributions to one or more State or local committees at the discretion of the contributor, who is thus able to accomplish his purpose one step removed, so to speak, by getting funds into the hands of these local committees who are then free to dispose of the money as they wish. Reports compiled by Campaign Expenditures Committees over the past 6 years show that this has been done repeatedly and that the $5,000 limitation has ceased to have any significance whatsoever, in fact, had no significance in the first election that took place immediately after it was enacted. Certain individuals in 1940, 1942, 1944, and 1946 contributed many thousands of dollars to candidates or parties, for political purposes, by the simple device of making a contribution of $5,000 or less to many different State or local committees.

"POLITICAL COMMITTEES" MEANS WHAT?

Almost the same glaring weakness shown in the loophole existing with respect to individual contributions also developed regarding the supposed $3,000,000 limitation on contributions or expenditures by a political committee. The framers of the Hatch Act provided carefully that terms used in the section prescribing this $3,000,000 limitation should have the meaning assigned to them in the Corrupt Practices Act. When the meaning of "political committee," as defined in the Corrupt Practices Act is examined, as I mentioned previously, we find that "political committees" includes only committees operating in two or more States, or in one or more States, if a branch or subsidiary of a national committee. Obviously, a considerable group of duly organized State or local committees were specifically excepted from the ceiling limitation. The result of this was observed almost immediately in the presidential election in 1940 and in 1944, in dispersion of the fund-raising effort among an excessively large number of local committees, a factor which by its very nature deterred Federal control, discouraged presentation of the true picture of campaigns funds to the American people, and generally operated contrariwise to the purposes of the Hatch Act itself.

MILLIONS ARE SPENT IN POLITICS

Just how much money has been spent by the two parties in the last few elections? Bearing in mind the intended limitations of the Hatch Act, we find that in 1940 information presented to the campaign expenditures committee of that year showed a Democratic total expenditure of approximately $6,000,000, and a Republican total expenditure of approximately $21,000,000. In 1944, another Presidential year, committees supporting the Democratic national ticket reported expenditures in excess of $8,000,000 and committees supporting the Republican national ticket reported expenditures in excess of $12,000,000.

In the reports from these committees, the Democratic and Republican National Committees themselves reported receipts and expenditures within the $3,000,000 prescribed by the Hatch Act, but reports from 16 independent committees, groups or individuals, 69 intrastate independent committees, and all the Democratic State committees made up the balance of more than $5,000,000. The same situation prevailed concerning the Republican national ticket with 27 committees, groups or individuals, together with 39 independent intrastate committees, and the Republican State committees providing more than $11,000,000. The total contributions and expenditures in both the primaries and general elections throughout the country in 1944 exceeded $25,000,000.

CAMPAIGN FUNDS AREN'T LIMITED

If the Hatch Act were intended to limit campaign contributions and expenditures in a Presidential year to $3,000,000, it is clear that it has failed in its purpose in both 1940 and 1944, and most certainly it will fail again in 1948. If it were not intended to limit parties to an aggregate expenditure of $3,000,000, it has produced a particularly evil situation wherein a dispersal of fund-raising efforts has undermined the publicity features of the corrupt practices legislation. How unrealistic the figure of $3,000,000 as a ceiling limitation actually is, as applied to Nation-wide political activity involving the presentation of complicated issues to more than 50,000,000 people, becomes apparent when considered alongside the sums which any one of our large corporations expends each year to advertise its products. General Motors, or Procter & Gamble, for example, annually expend more than three or four times this much to tell about a cake of soap or an automobile. Isn't it ridiculous to say that the national committees of our two great parties must be limited to a certain figure, less than 2 cents a person, in presenting important national issues to the electorate in the greatest republic in the world?

It is simple knowledge that Congress cannot legislate morality, and that as long as thoroughly unrealistic limitations are placed on campaign contributions and expenditures in national elections, ways will be devised to circumvent them. This is unhealthy business for Congress to sanction. It is undesirable, and it should not be permitted to continue any longer. For 6 years congressional committees have advised against its continuance and this year legislation is at last started on the long road to passage. How does this legislation propose to remedy the situation?

S. 1173 has been drafted in light of something which I feel is fundamental to the whole question of political expenditures, which is to get to the people, the voters, information concerning how much money has been spent in their State and their county, by and on behalf of their candidates, before they vote for them. The $5,000 limitation on individual contributions has been abolished, as has the $3,000,000 ceiling limitation on national political committees.

Instead of these provisions, it is planned that all persons, individuals, or corporations, contributing more than $100, shall file a report explaining to whom they contributed this sum and when it was contributed. When these individual contributions are made to

political committees, they do not have to be reported by the individuals, but are reported by the receiving committees. All candidates, for the Senate or for the House, must file reports with the Committee on Rules and Administration in the Senate, and with the Committee on House Administration in the House, within a prescribed period prior to the date on which an election is to be held, and within 30 days thereafter. Reports filed by political committees and individual contributors are to be filed between the first and tenth days of March, June, and September in each year, and also between the tenth and fifteenth days and on the fifth day preceding the date on which an election is to be held. These reports are to be submitted under oath and very serious penalties will follow from willful misrepresentation. In every State where an election is being held, whether a primary or a general election, the information contained in these reports will be available to inquiring reporters from every State and community paper or magazine and, believe me, they will make use of them. It is further provided in S. 1173 that, in any Presidential year, the reports required of any political committee, which is a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, shall be published on the dates indicated above in two newspapers of general circulation in each State in which contributions were received or expenditures made.

PREVENT PURCHASING VOTES

In this way, I feel the purpose behind the Hatch Act, insofar as the fund-raising aspects of its provisions are concerned, may be accomplished without the harmful ineffectiveness that has characterized its administration to date. After all, the idea is to prevent, insofar as is legislatively possible, the purchase of Federal elections in this country. American memory is oftentimes discouragingly short and the mere availability of printed reports on the shelves of dusty archives and Capitol committee rooms has not been of practical help to the people in determining where their vote should lie in the new election. Through the changes proposed in S. 1173, the American people will have before them, sufficiently in advance of the day they cast their ballot for a particular candidate or a particular ticket, information concerning how much money has been spent by that candidate, or has been spent by individuals or corporations on that candidate's behalf, with or without his knowledge, and who those organizations are. With this information before them, I believe the voters can decide for themselves what candidates are attempting to buy an office or what candidates are likely to be so indebted to specific interests who would buy their office for them that impartial and honest representation of their constituents actually is open to question.

REVISE THE HATCH ACT NOW

It seems to me that this is a far better way of dealing with a problem involving matters necessarily incapable of being caged by rigid limitations. Issues vary, candidates and elements supporting them are one thing one year, and another the next. It is impossible, with any degree of accuracy, to specify rigidly working ceiling limitations as though all future years and all times were to be the same. The effect of the Hatch Act, as presently written, has not been simply negative, but it has proven a drawback to public attempts to maintain clean, fair elections. It has prevented the accurate reporting of contributions and expenditures and has openly encouraged the evasion of Federal statutes by many individuals and organizations all over the country. Revision of the Hatch Act along the lines I have indicated is clearly in the public interest. It should be accomplished before the 1948 campaign gets into full swing next spring.

Universal Military Training and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Fremont, Nebr., on April 7, 1948, on the subject of universal military training and national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We face in Congress today one of the most difficult of all of the problems which face the Nation, that of national defense. The President has requested a budget for the ensuing 12 months of approximately $11,000,000,000, and now there is a demand for an additional three or four billion dollars.

Certainly I am in favor of a military force which will be wholly adequate to defend the United States. But is such a huge sum necessary? Are we organizing our armed forces to get full value from every dollar? What kind of weapons and what kind of forces do we need in order that we may get most value out of every dollar spent?

We are met at the outset by the suggestion that we civilians can know nothing of the problem, that every decision must be made by military authorities who are experts on these problems. Of course, this argument cannot be true. The ultimate decision on over-all questions of defense and even of military policy must be made by a civilian government. If we admit the final authority of the military to decide these problems, it means that they will soon have in their hands the entire economic and political future of the United States. No student of government can be found who advocates the leaving of final decisions in time of peace, or even perhaps in time of war, to a military commander. We would lose our personal liberties and our worth-while national existence. Of course we must ask and heed their advice, but the ultimate decision is a decision to be made by the people themselves through their elected representatives. Otherwise there will be no liberty or equality under law.

In the first place, the perfectionist in military defense would insist on such a complete military force that there would be no possibility whatever of any attack from abroad. But such a force might cost from 50 to 100 billion dollars a year, as it did during the war, and would make impossible any reasonable standard of living, or any freedom of this Nation to develop the destinies of its people in a free life and an improved material well-being.

The conclusion is that we must get a defense which will make this country substantially safe without destroying the possibility of the improvement of civilian life. We must be selective therefore among the various means of defense which are proposed. We must not duplicate services in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. We must abandon those activities which seem to be of only secondary importance and perhaps no longer in accord with the new situations which have arisen in military strategy.

I believe further we should remember that success in war has apparently depended more on the existence of a great civilian productive power, developed primarily to improve the conditions of the civilian population. It was our great industrial capacity and our industrial know-how which made it possible for us, without an Army trained in advance, to conquer the greatest and most powerful technically trained and equipped armies in the history of the world.

We must realize that the main purpose of any foreign policy should be the freedom of the United States, and the second guiding policy should be the maintenance of peace. The first line of national defense, in fact, consists of keeping the peace, so that there may be no need to test the adequacy of our defense forces. You and I are peaceful in our daily lives, but we are not peaceful if we support a foreign policy and a strategic policy which takes a provocative stand on every controversial issue which may arise anywhere in the world.

I feel very strongly that any American Government should be inspired deeply and sincerely by a determination to keep the peace. Under Republican administrations in the past I believe that there did exist an intense desire to regard peace as the purpose of foreign policy. I believe that nearly every one of our Presidents felt that the involvement of the country in war was a proof of the failure of his foreign policy. During the past 15 years that has not been the attitude of the administration. There is no evidence that from Munich to Pearl Harbor there was any particular effort or concern about keeping the United States at peace. Probably we could not have remained at peace, but the story of our relations with Britain and Poland, the story of our relations with Japan and the events leading up to Pearl Harbor, lend strong support to the idea that war was not completely distasteful to those who guided our national destiny.

Regardless of our will to peace, of course, we must recognize that in this modern world we may be attacked. We must recognize that a modern attack with weapons which have been developed may be more sudden, swift, and effective than anything the world has ever seen. We must under all circumstances be prepared to meet such an attack. While the Russian attitude remains what it is, we had better retain the atomic bomb.

Of course, the most important feature of defense must be the efficiency of the organization which conducts it. Last year we passed the Unification Act. The Democrats had talked about it since Pearl Harbor, but the Republican Congress actually adopted it. The present budget, however, is still prepared on the basis of three separate forces and until recently there has been no attempt to eliminate the overlapping of roles and missions and the duplication of services. Recently Secretary Forrestal has shown a desire to accomplish this result, but it still looks as if each branch of the services is insisting upon its full share of all increased expenses.

The testimony before the Senate committee last week, however, shows a recognition of the fact that all action in modern war must be based upon an air force, that the land force and the sea force are largely important as supporting services to arrange for the occupation of foreign bases and the protection of those bases when established. We have not yet the over-all strategic plan for the defense of the United States required by the Unification Act. But we have at least a suggestion that that plan is being prepared.

There are certain matters on which all seem to agree. We certainly ought to have the finest research force to develop the most modern weapons. We certainly ought to have a completely efficient and coldly practical intelligence service so that we know exactly the possible attack that we must plan to meet.

It seems obvious to me today that the next war will be fought predominantly in the air. The only complete protection that we can give to this country against modern weapons is to have an air force able to dominate the air over this continent. The only way we can win a war is to dominate the air over the territory of our enemies as we dominated the air over Germany and Japan at the end of the last war. That means we must have the best possible research for airplanes, it means that new planes must not only be designed on paper but must be produced in fact. It means that factories must be kept in existence where such new planes can be continuously manufactured in such volume that there will be a complete opportunity to determine their merit by experience, and to give us an air force composed of the most modern planes.

Surely the Air Force must be our first line of defense and our first concern when it comes to spending money. Certainly we must provide the number of men required for the ground forces and the Navy, adequate to support operations in the air. But we don't want to add men merely to balance the growth of the Air Force by a similar growth in the Army and Navy in order to satisfy those who control those forces.

In order to get the number of men that we require, it may be necessary to adopt selective service at least temporarily. I had hoped that we might obtain them by voluntary means, and I still think that is possible, but in any event we probably must establish the draft and give the President power to make up deficiencies if those deficiencies occur.

I cannot understand, however, the value of universal military training as a means of defense. And whatever one may think of it as a permanent provision, it certainly seems to have no value as a solution of the present emergency. Of course, UMT has never been proposed as a method of getting men into the Regular Army and has carried with it no drafting for service. It would take several years before these boys are of an age to be drafted.

UMT would undertake to train approximately 1,000,000 boys every year to provide about 10,000,000 men of military age with such one-year training. It would be a tremendously expensive operation. We would have to employ 100,000 officers to carry out the training. It would cost $4,000,000,000 a year. I am basically opposed to it because it seems to me literally the very regimentation which we are trying to avoid.

There can be no greater limitation of freedom than to take men from their education, their homes and their occupations and force them into a camp to be trained according to the dictates of some War Department bureau in Washington. "Indoctrination" is the term which has been common in Army circles during the war. It means the educating of boys by a Federal bureau according to the ideologies which dominate that bureau. We have just passed a Federal-aid-to-education bill, but it prohibits completely any direct Federal interference or any direct Federal education. I certainly am opposed to the Federal Government interfering in education because I think that it presents a real danger to the whole philosophy of American government.

Of course, I can conceive of conditions under which UMT would be absolutely necessary, but I cannot conceive of it today. It is hard to see what use a 10,000,000 reserve would be for the ground forces or the Navy or the air. Surely we are not contemplating an attack in any such force on foreign lands. In case of war with Russia they could always put three men into the field on European soil for every one which we could put there—UMT or no UMT. I think the days of mass armies are over as far as we are concerned, but even if we do contemplate sending abroad an army of 10,000,000 men, it would take several years to acquire the necessary equipment and the necessary transportation, during which time they could be taught the methods of the war which they were about to fight rather than the war of 1945, the methods of which would probably be entirely out of date.

If we want an effective reserve it ought to be a much smaller number of men, much more highly trained and technically trained. It ought to be organized on the basis of the National Guard and the ROTC and kept constantly in touch with the developments of the Regular Army. Men should be paid for the time which they have to give. If the armed forces once abandoned the dream of a perpetual draft of involuntary manpower and turned to the problem of maintaining proper reserve components with high morale, they would get a much better reserve and they can get it on a voluntary basis.

In this whole field there is no reason why our approach should not be governed by the same principles of liberty as must guide other Government programs. UMT is a return to the New Deal belief that results can only be accomplished by Government compulsion, and power given to Government bureaus. The New Dealers have scoffed at the idea that the people can work out their own salvation, or work out their own problems without Government direction. Their every move has supported the idea of more power for the state and less power for the individual.

Those methods have failed in the field of economic control. They have failed even to provide the education and social security which is the greatest promise of the New Deal. I believe very strongly that economic and intellectual progress in this country can only result from the restoration of the liberty of the people. And even more strongly I believe that in providing a defense against possible foreign attacks on the liberty of our people we cannot adopt methods by which we ourselves destroy our own liberty.

Eamon de Valera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the farewell address on the occasion of the departure of Eamon de Valera delivered by Mr. John S. Burke, president of B. Altman & Co., before the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, in the city of New York, April 5, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I trust that my fellow members will not find it ungracious if I suggest to our distinguished guest that there is a certain propriety in my tendering their tribute to the first citizen of Eire. For this society, sir, founded in 1784, had as its first president an Irish merchant, Daniel McCormick. He served in that office for 34 years; a period exceeding even your own long tenure and indicating, as yours does, the stability and good sense of the Irish. He was probably the most prosperous merchant of his time, for, when he died in 1834, at the age of 91, his estate was valued at $10,000,000. I hasten to advise you, however, in respect to that point, to say nothing about other differences in his favor, that any resemblance between him and the present speaker ceases.

As I look around at this audience of men, all animated by Irish blood in their veins, I can call to mind no group to which I could speak tonight with less constraint than to this one. For I feel that I know each man here; not, of course, by name or face, but in spirit. All of us have come here for a common purpose: to express our affection for the land of our sires and to testify to that purpose in the presence of one of the great heroes in the glorious heritage of Irish heroism.

There is a picture that comes to me from childhood, a picture of a small, thatched cottage on the bank of an inlet on the southwest coast of Ireland. In the distance, at anchor in the sea, is a sailing vessel, waiting; on the bank are the old folks, a father and mother and the little children, weeping. From a small boat near the shore, headed seaward, an older brother and sister wave a last farewell to home, with love shining through their tears. Each man here can picture that scene, can understand why our hearts still hold a love for that land which our forebears left with a sorrow seasoned by hope.

Another thought fortifies me, too, as I face you. This is, indeed, a troubled time and a troubled world; it is troubling especially for men of faith and good will. The light which they follow, the light where the flames of freedom and of truth unite in a single guiding beacon, remains lighted; yet, in so many minds, in so many places, that light is obscured by the mists of misleading ideas, fostered by false prophets, who preach their noxious doctrines to distressed and unhappy peoples; and they, with their reason drugged and their will sapped, forgetting that the truth was, is, and will always be the same, else it was never the truth, lose sight of the light and, wandering in a darkened land, know not where they go.

But here I feel that I am among men who still see that light and follow it, who practice the second of the two great commandments because it is like to the first; who love and respect their neighbor, whoever he be, because he is made in the image and likeness of God; and so know that each man has an individual dignity and right to freedom which no state, no tyrant, no oligarchy may justly take from him. This is the sum and substance of freedom; this is the very stuff of which the robe of liberty is made; if it be not so made, then it is a sham and soon must rot into a tattered rag.

And tonight, my friends, we find ourselves in the presence of a man who is the leader of a people who have followed that light, like a spiritual polar star, since St. Patrick first brought it to green and lovely Erin over fifteen hundred years ago; the leader of a nation which has fought for freedom with a more continuous fortitude than any race in all history; for what other nation has sustained that struggle without interruption, as the Irish have, for over 700 years?

And it may well be that western civilization will again need the Irish as it did in the sixth and seventh centuries. There is a tradition from that time, that the great St. Benedict, standing on the summit of Monte Cassino, was given a vision of the whole world. Looking down from that height he could see all Europe devastated under the feet of barbarians from the east. Italy, Spain, all of Caesar's Gaul, the Rhineland, suffered and groaned beneath an alien tyrant. But coming out from an island in the western sea were the Irish monks, moving to Scotland, to Britain, to Gaul, and beyond, bringing back to those homes that had lost it, the light of faith and truth and culture which St. Patrick had lit on the hills of Ireland 200 years before. St. Benedict, in his vision, looking out to the west, as the Irish have done so often and so

hopefully, could have reflected with the poet of a later day:

"For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

"And not through eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly!
But westward, look, the land is bright!"

Eamon de Valera needs no praise for himself; needs no accolade that we can bestow on him. He does not fear the world nor what the world might do to him. No man could fear who stood as he did amidst his valiant comrades in that fateful 1916, saw them bravely fight and nobly die; heard, as he must have heard, those bullets crash against a Dublin wall as they sped the brave souls of the poet heroes MacDonaugh and Plunkett and Pearse home to their Divine Master, but for whose merciful providence to Ireland this other hero would have been joined in that flight to eternity.

But we should honor this man, and I think he will accept that honor; more, he will welcome it if we say to him, as we do, that he is a symbol of the goodness, the character, the nobility that is Eire; if we tell him that this symbol, personal though it be, clarifies and illustrates his cause; that he bears witness in his own person to the courage, the fortitude, the spirituality of the Irish people; that through the annealing power of his patience and sagacity all the virtues of that people have been fused so that each has gained a new potency and life.

Thus we salute you, Eamon de Valera; thus we give you the hail of the Friendly Sons; and as you speed home in the morning in your winged ship, looking eagerly ahead to see the rosy-fingered dawn rise out of the east over that land that the angels love, know you, sir, that your heart and ours hold the same high hope that, though Eire now is free, praise God, in His own good time, all Ireland will be one and free from sea to sea.

Relief of German Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HON. HAROLD YOUNGBLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNGBLOOD: May I again commend your efforts to secure relief for the most distressed people of Europe, if not of all the world—the German people who have been driven out of their homes, stripped of all their possessions and made Men Without the Rights of Man, without country, and without hope of finding a refuge under present conditions.

From statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and Appendix, it appears that some twelve million and upward of the citizens of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries, because they are of German ancestry, have been expelled from their native land, made homeless and thrown into the already overcrowded less fertile section of Germany, with no tools and no way of procuring tools, either for farming or otherwise maintaining themselves. From what I have discussed with you, I know you are aware of the appalling injustice without my restating the details at this time. However, I would like to refer, for your further consideration, the description and comments appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A2156, inserted by Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota. A complete recital of the distress and injustices that prevail as to these unfortunate people would fill a large book.

I know your heart is with these people, and I wonder whether we can get other Members of Congress to realize that we are, in a great measure, responsible and should do something to correct our errors. Wittingly or unwittingly, perhaps through a desire to aid, our representatives at the Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran Conferences, I think without power to make binding commitments, made agreements that permitted the expelling of these millions from their homes where, even in an unfriendly atmosphere, they were citizens, had their property, homes, and employment, and the sending of these people—stripped of everything—into an equally unfriendly alien land. O. K. Armstrong, writing in Reader's Digest for February 1948, states (I think the article has been reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD): "We American people and our Government have assumed a major responsibility for the future of this defeated land. To date, our occupation policies have failed to even start Germany back toward democracy and economic self-sufficiency." Into such a land, under the responsibility assumed, we and our Government have thrown some additional 13,000,000 destitute and helpless people of the other lands.

We have made a commitment of several billion dollars to revive other countries of Europe, which it now seems do not need our help, for the President's Economic Commission now reports that the other lands have attained an industrial and economic level of 1938. I do not think we owe such a moral responsibility to these other lands as we owe to the people of German ancestry who were displaced and expelled from their homes by our permission if not active participation. And I do not think it will be necessary to provide $17,000,000,000, nor $6,000,000,000 to right the wrong we permitted. I do not think we should duck our responsibility to these people, and you know how firmly I am committed to economizing in our governmental programs.

I have this idea in mind. We at least helped to make these people homeless and unproductive. We have it in our power to make them both productive and to provide homes for them. Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE, Senator from West Virginia, had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A2091, editorials from St. Louis Post-Dispatch and New York Herald Tribune and New York Times and from Mitchell Republic, of South Dakota, disclosing that there is a place here in America for many of these unfortunate people. We need only concede to them the right to enter. I think we owe it to them to provide some funds in much greater degree than we owe the ERP commitments, but I know that there are hundreds of thousands of Americans who will aid them to the extent of providing funds for transportation, so that our Government may not be required to provide even a portion of what we have been providing for their maintenance in idleness and unproductive, virtual internment.

It may be that you can amend H. R. 6094 so as to provide for the unlimited entry of such persons as have been expelled out of their homes in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other lands. It may be necessary to provide for careful identification so that only such persons as we and our Government have the responsibility for by reason of allowing their expulsion will be admitted. The mechanics could be worked out without too much complication.

I do not believe, Harold, that you or any other Congressman can do a greater service for world peace and for the preservation of the American ideals and avowed purposes in entering the war than to find a solution for the plight of these unfortunate, in many instances completely innocent victims, people of German descent. There can be neither a just and fair peace in Europe nor honor in our own efforts if we do not have the courage to face this problem and solve it in keeping with our proclaimed ideals.

You know I have given some time I could well use to my own advantage and that I will give more time to this matter because I feel it calls for the exercise of that Christian faith we must have to make the best of life it is possible to make. I hope you can find time from your many tasks to give this matter consideration.

Very sincerely yours,
EDWARD B. BENSCOE,
Executive Secretary,
Relief Association for Germans of Prewar Poland.

Copper-Lead-Zinc Mining and the Russell Bill, H. R. 2455

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. RUSSELL
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the Russell bill proposes to make incentive payments for domestic exploration for new ores of copper, lead, and zinc and for the production of marginal ores of those metals. Such payments will be made only to the marginal sector of the industry. This is entirely different from such subsidy systems as tariffs and price-support programs, which are aimed at raising the entire price level of certain commodities. The effects are also entirely different. Since not more than 2,000 productive units are concerned—compared with some 6,000,000 in agriculture—administration of specific payments is quite feasible.

The effects on the mining industry itself will be the conservation of ore reserves, efficient extraction of ores, and broad-scale exploration for new ores.

We have come to the point where conservation of ore reserves is even more important as a matter of national concern than it is as a local problem of the mining industry. Since World War I, unbalance between costs and metal prices has forced selective robbing of the better-grade ores in many of our mining districts. The pace of domestic mining has been much more rapid than that of foreign extraction. As a consequence, we have a dangerously high proportion of low-grade, noncompetitive ores in our reserves. The Russell bill will tend to restore the best possible proportion between high-grade and low-grade ores by providing for the salvage of all low-grade deposits and the mass mining at average grade of mixed high-grade and low-grade ores.

Mass mining is inherently the most efficient method of ore extraction. If

high-grade ores are removed selectively, residual low-grade ores are left in place. The cost of returning to these ores may occasionally be no more than relaying of haulage track and repair of a few timbers. Even in such rare cases, however, the costs of a first- and second-mining operation are more than would have been the single cost of one mass-mining operation. During World War II, for example, operators in the tri-State district were able to double the tons of ore output per man by mechanization and mass mining under the premium-price plan. Similarly, costs per ton of ore at many western mines dropped by as much as 30 percent during the same period, despite rising wages. More often, ore so left may be permanently lost due to the prohibitive capital costs necessary for unwatering, repair of extensive caving, and reequipment.

Exploration for new ores has lagged in this country since the late twenties. The great source of new ores is the peripheral exploration around and below producing ore bodies. An occasional strike in a new area may add large reserves for the moment, but it is the year-to-year pushing out from known territory which counts in the long run. The Russell bill provides that incentive payments shall be made to stimulate such work. Its particular direction to marginal miners will insure the activity of those most interested in exploration, since they are continually driven to explore by the inadequacy of their reserves.

The effects on our general economy and foreign relations will be similarly beneficial. We have entered the postwar period with a larger population and a manufacturing industry which can use at least 50 percent more metals than it did prewar. This is much more than our mines can produce under any circumstances. We must import metal and ores.

At the same time, we are committed to reestablishing the productive capacity of the other great metal-using area of the western world, northwestern Europe. During the thirties, we neither imported nor exported metal, and northwestern Europe was able to supply itself by importation of ores and metal from the rest of the world. Ore-smelting and metalworking are two of the great props to the economy of the ERP nations.

If we now enter world markets to meet the needs of our manufacturing industry plus the huge demands latent in our stock-piling policy, metal shortages will send metal prices to unheard-of heights. We will get the ores and metals, since our economic power will enable us to buy them, but our friends in northwestern Europe will not. They will be reduced from the status of good friends to that of poor relations. Already the British Ministry of Supply has reduced drastically its purchases of zinc and copper. Holland and Belgian smelters are unable to get ore for their needs. We are importing ores and metals from countries which have supplied northwestern Europe for decades.

High prices for basic metals spiral upward through the manufacturing process and are a major force in inflation. Our manufacturers' hope for large world markets, and our foreign policy calls for them. High metal prices will go far toward pricing our manufacturers out of these markets.

These effects can be alleviated by the Russell bill.

The low-cost producers who oppose the bill argue that high open-market prices best stimulate maximum production. This may be true of manufacturing industry, but in an extractive industry with a diminishing proportion of high-grade reserves, the effect is different. During the last half of 1947, no premiums were being paid to metal miners and we had the highest peacetime prices in history for copper, lead, and zinc. Paradoxically, our mine production was at a far lower rate than during the war years when prices were much lower, but incentive payments were in force.

	Copper	Lead	Zinc
1942 to 1944:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Average price per pound	12.0	6.5	8.2
Average premium per pound	1.1	1.1	1.9
Total	13.1	7.6	10.1
Annual domestic mine production	*Tons* 1,061,000	*Tons* 448,000	*Tons* 743,000
Last half 1947:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Average price per pound	21.5	[1] 15.0	[1] 10.5
Annual domestic mine production	*Tons* 838,000	*Tons* 366,000	*Tons* 582,000

[1] In January 1948 the price of zinc advanced to 12 cents and in April lead rose to 17.5 cents

The efficiency of the incentive payments in bringing out maximum production lies in the feature of direct payment to ore producers. These payments are not subject to the heavy proportional marketing charges which reduce greatly the effectiveness of any metal price increase. This feature saved our taxpayers billions of dollars during the war. It can be used now to get maximum production at prices which will allow our foreign friends to restore their productive capacity and our own manufacturers to meet volume demand with reasonably priced finished goods.

At the same time, it will restore to operation the maximum possible domestic productive capacity for metals so necessary to our national security in these times.

Pay Raises for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to voice my protest to the action recently taken by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in reporting postal and Federal pay raise bills that bear no relation to the facts developed by the committees of the Congress.

Legislation of the Congress is presumed to be based on facts developed through hearings, and is the reason why Congress has been given wide powers of investigation. The courts have consistently upheld these powers in order that the National Legislature should not be impeded in its collection of facts upon which to base legislation. The hearings on Federal and postal pay raise bills developed information justifying a $1,000 per year increase in salaries for these public employees, and legislation authorizing this increase should be approved by the Congress.

The bills reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which would grant a temporary raise to postal workers of $585 per annum from May 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949, and a temporary raise to other Federal employees of $468 per annum from May 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949, are not consistent with the facts and figures adduced during the hearings. Our postal and other Federal employees are either entitled to an adequate raise or they are not, and it is admitted from the information developed, that they are entitled to this raise. The question then is how much should it be. Committees of both Houses of Congress have studied statistics and heard witnesses ranging from the employees to statistical experts and they have developed information which justifies an increase in salaries to these public employees of $1,000 per annum. What then were these figures of $585 per annum for postal workers and $468 per annum for other Federal employees based on? Apparently they are not based on the findings and studies of the congressional committees. If this is an effort on the part of the committee to compromise, it is woefully insufficient even as a compromise and equally lacking in merit.

Postal and other Federal employees are deserving of just and adequate consideration, and it is my hope that the bills will be amended when they reach the floor of the House in order that we may give them the increase in salary more nearly justified by the facts and circumstances.

Color Changes in Soy and Cottonseed Oils on Hydrogenation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report by Armour Research Foundation of Illinois Institute of Technology:

COLOR CHANGES IN SOY AND COTTONSEED OILS ON HYDROGENATION

The object of this study was to determine the extent of bleaching of cottonseed and of soy oils on hydrogenation to margarine and also to compare the color of the resulting product with that given by com-

mercial butters. Several authorities have stated that the natural yellow color of most oils is bleached considerably during hydrogenation but no values are given which would enable one to conclude whether or not the color is similar to that of butter. For example, George S. Jamieson [1] states that during hydrogenation the color of the oil is noticeably bleached, and Alton E. Bailey [2] remarks that bleached cottonseed oil, peanut oil, soybean oil, and so forth, are often bleached by as much as 50 percent during hydrogenation. The experience of members of Armour Research Foundation corroborates these statements but their work has also given no information which can be used directly to solve this problem. For this reason, Dr. Douglass, of Cudahy Packing Co., has authorized us to make a study of the color changes which occur in unbleached cottonseed and soy oils during hydrogenation to a margarinelike product.

The soy oil used in the following experiments was a degummed but unrefined and unbleached oil obtained from Werner Smith & Co. The cottonseed oil was an unbleached product obtained from Durkee Famous Foods. It was found that the apparatus which we had planned to use for the hydrogenation was in nearly constant use, therefore, we rigged up a makeshift outfit which served the purpose well. This consisted of a three-neck, one liter flask equipped with a sealed stirrer in the central neck; a hydrogen inlet tube, a safety outlet tube, and a lead to a simple open-end mercury manometer at one of the other necks. The third neck of the flask was fitted with a thermometer and an outlet tube, the inner end of which was below the surface of the liquid oil. The latter outlet tube was included in order to allow withdrawal of samples periodically during hydrogenation. This was accomplished by allowing the pressure to drop to atmospheric, opening the outlet tube, and then slowly increasing the pressure in order to force out part of the liquid. This feature was necessary because we had no means of determining the rate of hydrogen absorption and, therefore, could not determine whether or not our product had reached the desired iodine value. Heating was accomplished by means of a Glas-Col mantle.

The hydrogenation charge was the same for both oils and consisted of 500 grams of oil, 0.4 gram of Rufert catalyst, 0.5 gram of Nuchar, and 0.5 gram of Hyflo Supercel. A hydrogenation was started by heating the oil up to about 275° F. During this time the system was left open and hydrogen was introduced as the temperature slowly increased in order to sweep out residual air. When the temperature reached 325° F. the system was closed, the hydrogen pressure built up to 5 pounds, and maintained throughout the hydrogenation except when samples were withdrawn. In both hydrogenations, the gauge pressure was kept at exactly 5 pounds although the pressure, as indicated by the mercury manometer, fluctuated between 10 and 11 inches of mercury (5–5½ pounds). Temperature was maintained throughout the hydrogenation between 320° and 330° F. In the hydrogenation of soy oil, the first sample was removed after 3 hours of hydrogenation under pressure and other samples removed thereafter at half-hour intervals. The first sample was taken during the cottonseed oil hydrogenation after 2 hours at the desired pressure and temperature.

The catalyst, carbon, and filter acid were removed from the samples taken from the hydrogenated oil by centrifuging to remove most of the solid and then heating for several minutes at about the temperature of hydrogenation in order to agglomerate the remaining particles and to allow simple filtering. The resulting clear filtrates were examined in a color comparator which was designed to use the Gardner color scale. The resulting values as well as the iodine numbers of the hydrogenated samples are given in the accompanying table:

Hydrogenation of soy and cottonseed oils

	Time	Iodine value	Gardner color of liquefied product [1]
	Hours		
Soy oil	0	134.7	11
	3	85.2	7
	3½	81.4	[2] 6
	4	79.3	[2] 6
	4½	76.9	[2] 6
	5	75.1	[2] 6
Cottonseed oil	0	104.7	10
	2	97.1	7
	3½	83.5	5
	5	75.2	5
Butter (fat fraction)			10

[1] In this system, each color is about ¾ the intensity of the next higher number. Color reduction from 11 to 6, or from 10 to 5, corresponds roughly to removal of all but 13 percent of the original color.

[2] Green.

The Gardner color of the original soy oil was 11, but 3 hours of hydrogenation gave a color value of 7 for the product. Qualitatively, the color at this stage was still slightly yellow, although a green color seemed to predominate. Hydrogenation for another half hour reduced the iodine value to 85 and the color to 6. The comparator we were using had no greenish tints, therefore this color evaluation is not strictly correct; however, the intensity of the color at this stage was close to the yellow color given in the comparator corresponding to No. 6 in the Gardner scale. Very little detectable yellow color remained in this sample, although it had not yet been hydrogenated to an iodine value corresponding to that of margarine. Subsequent samples taken at half-hour intervals showed little or no change in coloration. The pale greenish color predominated, and it was difficult to detect any traces of yellow. All of the samples taken after the fourth hour solidified at room temperature. The color of the resulting solid was pale gray green in each case and bore no resemblance to the characteristic yellow of commercial butters.

The first sample was removed from the hydrogenation of cottonseed oil after 2 hours of operation under pressure. During this time the iodine value of the oil was reduced from approximately 105 to about 97, and the Gardner color value was reduced from slightly over 10 to about 7. For this sample, the bleaching was obvious, although the extent of hydrogenation was not yet that of margarine. Another sample removed after 5 hours of operation was found to have an iodine value of about 75 and a Gardner color of 5. The solidified fat was nearly white, had no trace of yellow color that could be discerned. The colors of the original oils and the hydrogenated samples were compared with the fat fraction from commercial butter. The fat was obtained from the butter by liquefying and centrifuging, then separating the fat from the water layer. The Gardner color rating of the butter fat thus obtained was about 10; very close to that of the original soy and cottonseed oil. Since both these oils were bleached considerably even when only partly hydrogenated to the margarine stage, it can be concluded that this process does not give a product having a yellow color which could be mistaken for that of butter. It is probable that the effects in these experiments would be enhanced in commercial production of margarine by this method because we have avoided the customary preliminary alkali refining and bleaching which are carried out with the oil in order to improve the hydrogenation and to simplify removal of catalyst from the product. Furthermore, no further treatment was carried out on the hydrogenated product at this laboratory, although it is customary in commercial production to carry out further purification procedures such as steam deodorization before the product is marketed. All these additional commercial steps would tend to bleach the oil to a slightly greater extent than hydrogenation alone. It is concluded that commercial margarines produced in this manner would have a color very much lighter than that of most butters and very likely would have little or no yellow pigmentation whatever.

Respectfully submitted.

ARMOUR RESEARCH FOUNDATION,
R. H. CROUSE, *Organic Chemist.*
L. KOENIG, *Chairman.*

[1] George S. Jamieson, Vegetable Fats and Oils, p. 215, Reinhold, New York, 1943.

[2] Alton E. Bailey, Industrial Oil and Fat Products, p. 610, Interscience, New York, 1945.

Let's Have Our Farm Bill—Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and in the interest of the farmers in America, I beg leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the recent issue of Country Gentleman entitled "Let's Have Our Farm Bills—Now":

LET'S HAVE OUR FARM BILLS—NOW

A new farm program and the first national land policy in our history should be enacted at this session of Congress. They can be obtained if farmers want them enough to urge Congress to take action. Country Gentleman believes the interests of both agriculture and the Nation would be served by putting them into effect now.

Our whole economy will benefit if agriculture has a solid underpinning during the unsettled stages of the after-war period. While nothing like the 1920–21 experience is to be expected, some trends are becoming clear enough to indicate further safeguards for farming are needed. Increases in wages, costs of manufactured goods, and railroad freight rates will remain rather firmly fixed, while farm products, selling in the open market, will be subject to fluctuation. The Government's emphasis on grain production while livestock is declining increases the hazards in this situation.

These disadvantages require a program of stabilizing offsets. One of them is a system of flexible price supports, based on a revised and up-to-date parity formula, which will keep farm products on a reasonable exchange basis with wages and costs of goods. A broader principle, reflecting prevailing economic conditions, is needed for use in marketing agreements for perishable products. So is a positive process for dealing with so-called surpluses. Machinery should be set up to channel any temporary price-depressing supplies promptly into home or foreign consumption. At the same time an emergency reserve of food and feed grains should be recognized as an investment in the national security, to be financed by the Government and not by farmers. The lesson of World War II, when our food situation was saved by such accumulated supplies, should not be forgotten.

Both House and Senate committees have held extensive hearings and have a good working knowledge of what is needed. Past

history demonstrates that before, and not after, a Presidential campaign is the best time to get satisfactory legislation. But the paramount reason for action now is that an adequate farm program will provide needed stability to our economy during the uncertain period ahead.

Just as a new farm program is needed for the immediate future, so a national land policy is necessary in the longer-time interests of agriculture and the Nation. The two go hand in hand. An act establishing such a policy has been prepared by Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of the House Committee on Agriculture.

It recognizes the preservation and sound development of our agricultural land and water resources as essential to the national security and the continued well-being of the American people. This object is established as a national policy and made the joint responsibility of the Federal Government, the States and local governments, and the owners and users of land.

We have the paradox of a sometimes troublesome abundance now and the threat of too little in the future. Soil losses, due to erosion and the drain on fertility, are rapidly increasing. Meanwhile the lack of proper soil and water conservation is contributing to flood damage, the silting of streams, lakes, and reservoirs, and the disappearance of wildlife. Our saw timber is being used up one and one-half times faster than it is being replaced, while millions of acres need to be reforested.

The husbanding of these vital resources has been tackled in piecemeal fashion by numerous Government and State agencies. Partly because of this divided effort, partly through public indifference, it is still a losing struggle. The proposed national land policy recognizes the problems of our soil and water resources as all parts of the same proposition. It would bring the various Federal agencies, now dealing separately with them, all under one roof and coordinate their work into an effective program. Soil and water conservation would be made possible sooner and on a basis fair to both farmers and the public. This will be seriously needed when the emphasis on grain production ends, both to restore our soils and to bring a better balance to agriculture. Thus the national land policy fits in with the new farm program and makes for a permanent and productive agriculture.

It equally serves the public interest. Our food-producing resources have been an indispensable support of America's high standard of living, its armies in wartime and of its foreign policy. Their maintenance is a national necessity.

Michigan Organized Labor Supports Partition Plan for Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, April 16, I received the following telegram signed by numerous labor leaders of both the CIO and the A. F. of L. labor organizations:

Organized labor repudiates the reversal of Palestine partition plan pledged by our Government, which was instrumental in committing the UN to its original decision. Reversal represents a betrayal of the solemn promises made in the name of American people and destroys the effectiveness of the United Nations as a force for world peace. Congress must demand a complete hearing of such reversal of policy for the benefit of all the American people.

We urge Michigan Congressmen to take immediate action in Congress to recommit our Government for partition decision and to instruct our American delegation to the UN to lift arms embargo enabling Jewish people in Palestine to defend themselves, and to give full support to the provisional Jewish government being set up in accordance with the UN decision.

Trade Union Council for Labor, Palestine: Edward J. Cote, CIO Committee, Chairman; Michigan State CIO Council, August Scholle, President, Barney Hopkins, Secretary-Treasurer; Wayne County CIO Council, Tracy Doll, President, Samuel Sage, Secretary-Treasurer; UAW Local 2, Murray Body, Lloyd Jones, President; Local 7, Chrysler, Joseph Hattley, President; Local 15, Fleetwood, John Anderson, President; Local 22, Cadillac, Dave Miller, President; Local 29, Bohn Aluminum, Stanley Neubauer, President; Local 51, Plymouth, Frank Danowski, President; Local 80, Robert Orr, President; Local 84, Charles Horn, President; Local 142, Kaiser-Frazer, Jack Butler, President; Local 154, Hudson, Claude Bland, President; Local 155, Rusell Leach, President; Local 157, Blaine Marrin, President; Local 174, Harry Southwell, President; Local 189, Ted Doman, President; Local 190, Packard, Ralph Urban, President; Local 205, Ned Coleman, President; Local 208, Bohn Aluminum, Hodges Mason, President; Local 212, Briggs, Ken Morris, President; Local 227, DeSoto, Richard T. Leonard, President; Local 235, Chevrolet Gear and Axle, Rudy Pale, President; Local 236, Peter Petrucci, President; Local 351, Walter Hutz, President; Local 400, Ford, Highland Park, Albert Musilli, President; Local 490, Chrysler, Highland Park, James Dunn, President; Local 600, Ford, River Rouge, Thomas Thompson, President; Local 742, James Chichocki, President; Local 835, Gus Schrenkel, President; United Steel Workers, Locals 311, 1279, 1297, 1352, 1357, 1358, 1511, 1542, 1907, 2075, 2079, 2291, 2302, 2340, 2341, 2395, 2477, 2508, 2659, 2666, 3232, 3434, Glen E. Sigman, District PAC Director; Local 1299, Great Lakes Steel, Charles Younglove, President; Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Joint Board, Morris Spitzer, Manager; Local 33, Drivers, Clarence Boyk, President; Local 124, Cleaners, Clyde Nestle, President; Local 229, Journeymen Tailors, Tobias Eskow, President; Local 283, Allied Tailors, David Robbins, President; Local 391, Laundry Workers, John Johnson, President; Bakery and Confectionery Workers, Local 30, Joseph Vogel, President; Marine Ship Building, Local 46, Ed Ley, President; National Maritime Union, Chester Young, Vice President; Utility Workers Union, Martin Odell, President; United Fur and Leather Workers Union, Harold Shapiro, International Representative; United Packing House Workers, Local 69, Frank Clay, President; United Electrical Workers, Local 937, Charles Kelly, President; United Office and Professional Workers, Local 26, Christine Walker, President; Retail Wholesale and Department Store Employees, Joint Board, David Chaney, President; Local 289, Robert Stewart, President; Local 333, Vallie Eickholdt, President; Local 339, Albert Prosky, President; Local 362, Marie Stak, President; Local 364, Margaret Roehm, President; Local 365, Thomas Fleming, President; Local 518, George Green, President; J. C. Penny Local, Lucille Caulkins, President; Gardner White Local, Harry Boswell, President; United Chemical Workers Union, Chester Adamczyk, Regional Director; Local 108, John Sanderson, President; Local 155, Anthony Kaiser, President; Local 176, George W. Blair, President; Local 196, James Linsey, Vice President; Local 202, William Webb, President; Local 219, Howard Taylor, President; Local 256, William Richman, President; Local 296, Harry Hart, President; Local 321, Lee Handyside, President; Local 358, John Morawiec, President; United Public Workers Union, Mort Furay, Regional Director; Detroit Joint Board, Yale Stuart, President; Local 79, Robert Pruitt, President; Local 177, William Mulvey, President; Local 267-A, Mrs. Trula King, President; Local 279, Eugene Green, President; Local 478, Lyle Allen, President; Trade Union Council for Labor, Palestine, Frank X. Martel, President; Detroit Wayne County Federation of Labor, Honorary Chairman, Irving R. Bronson, AFL Committee Chairman; Detroit Building Trades Council, Finlay Allan, Secretary; Painters Local 42, Les Kaufman, Secretary; Painters Local 37, James McErnery, President; Sign Writers Local 591, R. B. Williams, President; Carpenters Local 1513, Joseph Katz, President; Carpenters Local 2265, Harry Pulver, Business Representative; Sheet Metal Workers Local 281, Marion Macioce, Secretary; Firemen and Oilers Local 32, Sol Sniderman, Business Representative; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, William E. Davis, Manager; Laundry Workers Local 129, John Paris, Secretary-Treasurer; Laundry and Linen Drivers Teamsters Local 285, Isaac Litwak, President; Bakers Union 78, Mandell Elson, Secretary; Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union 705, Louis Koenig, Secretary-Treasurer; Detroit Mailers Union 40, Max Burns, President; Letter Carriers Branch 1, James Nonan, President; Office Employees International Union 42, Albert Harrop, President; Street Railwaymen's Association, Division 26, Paul W. Hill, Secretary; Allied Printing Trades, Clifford Sparkman, President.

The National Irrigation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Our National Irrigation Program, by the Honorable William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, delivered before the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on March 19, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL IRRIGATION PROGRAM

Mr. President and members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the national irrigation program concerns every American, whether he lives in the West,

where the artificial application of water is basic to agriculture, or in the East, where products of irrigated lands help to satisfy the needs of a growing population. America's economic stability now and in the future is dependent to a great extent on the successful development and operation of a continuing reclamation program.

Arid and semiarid lands comprise more than one-third the total area of the United States. Here in the humid East, where much of our population is concentrated, it is difficult for many to understand that geographical fact.

The West is not "cow country" and "wide open spaces" because prospective farmers have not as yet got around to homesteading there. The West is sparsely settled, open country because the rainfall there, generally less than 20 inches per annum, is insufficient to support cultivated agriculture. Without irrigation no such large cities as Los Angeles, San Francisco, Phoenix, Boise, Salt Lake City, Denver, and Spokane could have come into being in the West. Irrigation, therefore, is responsible for the present state of western development, and in the future growth in population of that third of our country will be closely related to increased use of the rivers and streams for irrigation and power generation.

About 21,000,000 acres of land are now irrigated. We can foresee a doubling of this acreage with known resources and projects that may soon be feasible. Great civilizations have grown and been sustained in arid climates in other parts of the world through prudent use of the water and land resources. America is, beyond question, better prepared technically than any Nation in the past to develop its streams. Therefore a great future awaits our western country. This destiny is being approached intelligently and boldly under the banner of the national reclamation policy.

The Department of the Interior, which next year will celebrate a century of conservation service to the Nation, has been assigned definite responsibilities in the irrigation field. These are centered principally in the Bureau of Reclamation and to an extent in the Office of Indian Affairs.

The beginning of a national reclamation program was made possible by the passage of the act of June 17, 1902. Many years of discussion and decades of experiments in lawmaking paved the way for this important piece of legislation.

President Theodore Roosevelt who brought the much-debated issue to a head in his 1901 message to the Congress, said:

"It is as right for the National Government to make the streams and rivers of the arid region useful by engineering works for the storage of water as to make useful the rivers and harbors of the humid regions by engineering works of another character."

The general provisions of the original Reclamation Act are still in force today. That act provided for the examination, survey, and construction of irrigation works to reclaim lands.

The act provided for the entry of the reclaimed lands in accordance with provisions of the homestead law. It applied to 16 Western States; Texas came into the reclamation fold 4 years later by another congressional act.

Even before 1902, the Congress had wisely furnished the Geological Survey with funds to investigate and report on the favorable dam and reservoir sites on streams throughout the West. The Reclamation Service, which began as a division of hydrography of the Geological Survey in the Interior Department, was fortunate to have these early investigations on file. Because of this careful preliminary work, Reclamation was able to begin its first project—the Nevada Newlands project on August 28, 1903. In the first 5 years of the agency's lifetime, 25 projects were approved for construction.

The first major dam to be completed, and that was in 1911, was named Roosevelt Dam in honor of Reclamation's first Presidential champion. This structure immediately became world-famous because of its height of 280 feet and storage capacity of some 1,400,000 acre-feet.

Our national irrigation program has come a long way in less than half of this twentieth century. In 46 years, in cooperation with local, State, and other Federal agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation has planned and designed and constructed 89 storage dams that have provided storage of about 70,000,000 acre-feet of water in our Western States. This construction record further reveals 25 power plants with 2,250,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, numerous diversion dams, and thousands of miles of canals and ditches as well as many bridges, highways, and railways around reservoirs. Expended in construction, nearly all of which is to be repaid or has already been repaid by the irrigators and power users, is a total of over a billion dollars.

Let us stop for a moment and consider just what this reclamation record means in terms of national prosperity. In 1 year alone, 1947, the reclamation tabulation shows 90,000 irrigated farm homes; 432,000 people living on the farms; more than 1,000,000 people living in towns and cities on projects or near projects served by and serving these farms; 14,500,000 tons of food and fiber crops which grossed more than a half billion dollars.

Added to this is the figure of more than 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy generated in 1947 on reclamation projects—energy which pumped water, ran factories, milked cows, processed food, and through its sale helped to pay for project construction works. Reclamation thus benefits the Nation in better living, stronger communities, more prosperous farms, greater food supplies, and larger crop receipts.

In its 46 years, the reclamation program has grown from the single-purpose project to the more complicated multiple-purpose and river basin developments. There are several important reasons for this transition of project types. First, the water supplies of Western streams are definitely limited, and the works needed to control and conserve the last half of the supply have required larger and larger dams and other complicated works. Second, the rights to the water supplies in the streams of the States have expanded steadily to include practically all of the flow, except in a few streams such as the Columbia River. This has complicated the job of obtaining a water right to assure success of the projects. Third, State and even international competition for water from such rivers as the Columbia, Colorado, Rio Grande, and Missouri, has existed, and the resulting compacts and international treaties increasingly have complicated the problems placed in the hands of our engineers and lawyers before construction of most reclamation projects can be initiated. Fourth, the cost of projects has steadily risen, and in some cases repayment has had to be extended beyond 40 years to allow time for the water users to reimburse the United States for the costs.

The increasing costs of reclamation works have been met to a substantial degree by the development and sale of hydroelectric power. The interconnection of power transmission lines, and the interstate and international aspects of rights to the water in the West have translated the conception of reclamation projects from the individual project status to the multiple-purpose and basin-wide approach which first received national attention on a large scale in the Missouri River Basin.

You are so well informed on the planning and authorization of the Missouri River Basin project of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation that I will not discuss it in detail. The important point is that this project, the largest and perhaps most important single basin in the West, is now under construction. River basin development has been furthered by the cooperation of interagency and State committees. I am happy to report to you today that cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, the Department of Commerce, and many local and State agencies, including colleges and experiment stations, is real and workable. A great part of the success of this work stems from the committees that have been established to effectuate coordination and cooperation on the Missouri River Basin project.

The Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee, which includes representatives of the Department of Army, Agriculture, Commerce, and Interior, and the Federal Power Commission, was formed in 1943 to bring about coordination of water resource development plans throughout the United States. This committee, of which I happen to be chairman this year, meets monthly in Washington, and here the broad phases relating to the respective programs of each department are presented for review and discussion.

Also, because of a desire to coordinate activities on the ground, the affected States and Federal agencies in the Missouri River Basin formed the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee, which is the principle arm of the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee in that area. The Missouri Basin Committee also meets monthly for purposes of formulating, coordinating, and effectuating the development program in the Missouri River Basin as authorized by the Congress under the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946.

Similar cooperation and coordination have been realized in the Columbia River Basin by the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, which includes representatives of the six States of Wyoming, Utah, Montana, Idaho, Nevada, and Oregon, as well as representatives of the Departments of Interior, War, Agriculture, Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission.

These committees perform a very useful function in keeping the programs in line with the needs of those who are directly affected, and by keeping each agency informed so that everybody can push work together in the same direction.

Careful study on the part of engineers shows that the transition from the individual project basis to the coordinated basin-wide basis should expand in scope to include exchange of water between basins. This is not such a revolutionary idea, for interbasin development in the West has been started in the metropolitan water district project in southern California, in the Colorado-Big Thompson Reclamation project in Colorado, and in several projects in Utah and elsewhere.

The drought of recent months has brought home to all of us the perilous position of California and Arizona. Drought conditions have been so severe, for example, that in the city of Santa Barbara, using water to wash your car carried a $300 fine.

Nevertheless, there is still water to be conserved in streams in California that presently are uncontrolled. And, also, half the water of the Colorado River flows unused to the Gulf of California, even now.

The drought of this winter is ominous, but there is still room to grow and to develop, because there are more streams that can be regulated and the waters of which may be used on farms and in cities. But, with all of the water of the Central Valley of California controlled in multiple-purpose reservoirs, there will still be need for additional

water if we are to assure continued growth. We have reached the point at which we can dimly see the lowering of the ceiling on growth in the West by complete utilization of the waters.

Our national population, which this year exceeded 145,000,000 persons, will, according to census predictions, rise to more than 166,000,000 by 1975. How we are going to feed all of these folks is a question that is even now furrowing the brows of American statesmen and economists.

We cannot eliminate drought, but we can guard against its devastating effects by building water projects.

I know what drought means for I was brought up on an irrigated farm in Imperial Valley in the days before Hoover Dam removed the threat of flood and drought in that wonderful southern California valley.

All of the water resources of California must be salvaged. Even when that is done, however, it now seems evident that growth is likely to outrun water supply in 20 years or so.

That is why bold and far-reaching plans have been considered more and more seriously in the past year.

The great Columbia of the Pacific Northwest annually discharges to the ocean more water than all of the other western streams combined, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, Colorado, Rio Grande, and the miscellaneous streams all the way from southern California to northern Washington.

In fact, this great river discharges on the average more than 160,000,000 acre-feet of water to the Pacific Ocean after all present consumptive uses are deducted. Obviously all of this water cannot be used in the Columbia River Basin. It would, in fact, irrigate 40,000,000 acres—more than twice as much as is now irrigated in the whole United States. Suitable lands in this quantity are not available in the area drained by the Columbia.

Diversion of Columbia River water southward is not too enormous a concept, nor is it too fantastic. It is simply 20 or 30 years in the future. This problem, of course, should be approached with the understanding that any waters taken south should be diverted below Bonneville Dam, the last point of use in the Columbia River Basin. We have the engineering skill to solve such a problem today. I think the time is near at hand to begin serious preliminary planning in order to determine feasibilities and requirements.

Attention as well should be given to other means of procuring suitable water for the use of cities and the irrigation of lands. The first faint stirrings of interest in these have recently become apparent, as note a bill introduced in the Congress to provide for experiments in reclamation of sea water.

The consideration of long-range plans for the solution of these water problems that we know to exist and which we must eventually face squarely should not be confused today, as some individuals and interests are inclined to do, with the short-range objectives of localities that are involved. To do so can only serve to lull the people into a false sense of a water security that does not exist. The short-range objectives, such as full use of the waters of the Colorado River and settlement of interstate controversies involving the stream, should be pursued diligently, of course.

Turning to other areas, the water supply of the Colorado River is already claimed by the several basin States. The Department of the Interior, in House Document No. 419, Eightieth Congress, has reported that future development is severely limited there by the available water supply. The Lahontan Basin, mainly in California and Nevada, has such a limited supply that it almost has reached its economic possibilities at the present time. The Upper Arkansas and Rio Grande Basins definitely have approached the state of maximum development, and such conditions have cast shadows on the future use of other western watersheds.

I anticipate that our future water-resources program will involve large, unprecedented interbasin and interstate water diversions to the arid areas, and perhaps other programs for obtaining additional water supplies. These will, of course, be in addition to the continuation in an orderly manner of individual projects and basin-wide developments such as are now under way in the Missouri River Basin. So long as there are unused and wasting waters near at hand, our course is clear. It should be conserved and put to work.

Before work can be started on any project, there must be years of planning and negotiating. There are, of course, instances where planning, construction, and negotiations have been completed in rapid order. One such comes to mind. It is the 71-mile San Diego Aqueduct which connects with the Colorado River Aqueduct heading on the Colorado River at Parker Dam. The need for additional municipal water for the city of San Diego was forecast during the war. Seven good water years in a row alone kept a growing city from trouble during the war emergency. Construction of the project was undertaken under an agreement signed by the city and county of San Diego, the Federal Works Agency, the Navy Department, and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation's job was to investigate and plan the project, and the Navy's job was to build it. As a result of direct, positive action all along the line, the project was completed and delivered water to the city's supply system in December 1947, just in time to meet the drought this year. Without the aqueduct San Diego would have faced disaster.

The rule, however, is that years of planning must go before.

More and more emphasis has been placed on the Federal irrigation program. For the fiscal year 1948 the irrigation program has total funds of about $200,000,000 available for initiation or continuation of construction on 43 projects and units. Estimates for the next fiscal year are $257,000,000.

Our reclamation program should be placed on a long-range base, both in planning and appropriations, to maintain a sound national program commensurate with the needs.

These western projects, as I have pointed out, have proved a good investment, not only in benefits to the people but in their repayment ability. One figure tells the story. The value of crops raised last year on reclamation lands exceeded the money spent for purely irrigation works during the entire 46 years of Reclamation's history.

If we are to meet rising population rates, maintain good standards of living, and make up for the loss of land from soil depletion and erosion, we must make more good acres useful through irrigation.

To summarize, I have sketched briefly the rise of the reclamation program, transition from the single-purpose project through the multiple-purpose into the river-basin development. I have offered interbasin transfer of waters as a possibility for alleviating drought conditions and have given facts to support the statement that our reclamation program is a sound investment.

We in the Department of the Interior are proud of the 46-year achievement of Reclamation, but we fully realize that the success of its program has resulted from the splendid cooperation of the States, the Corps of Engineers, and others in the planning and construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs throughout the West.

We look forward in the Department of the Interior to the continued friendly relations and support of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, which for many years has concerned itself with the orderly and progressive development of the rivers and waterways of the Nation.

Address by Hon. Chapman Revercomb, of West Virginia, Before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association at Indianapolis, Ind., on February 21, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real honor for me to come to Indiana to meet with the Republican editors of this State. I know you are good editors because you are Republicans and I will say to you that the country needs you very much in this fateful time.

I am aware of the immense influence that you have in directing the thinking and in molding the public opinions of the American people. That thinking is the mark by which this Government by people shapes its course. The trust that is yours is a very great one, and I have firm faith that it will be discharged with that integrity and courage so essential to making the truth known, so that we may indeed chart a wise and sane course.

The force of the printed word was so pointedly brought home to me by a judge of a high court, who, after reading the contents of a brief, told the story of a young country boy who, having finished a thrilling, hair-raising book, laid it down with a sigh and remarked: "Well, I would never have believed it if I hadn't seen it in print."

Indiana is an appropriate place for this gathering tonight. Indiana is typical in many ways of our great country with its combinations of booming industry and fertile farm land. Indiana has been more than typical in that it has been a leading State in the move toward sound principles of government under the Republican Party. It is helping to lead the country forward to sounder ground after a temporary dalliance with the sirens of the New Deal.

I see here my old friend, Ray Willis, with whom I served in the Senate. I greet him with warm affection. I know his work and I know his devotion to his country. He helped to start us back upon the path of genuine freedom. He is a great patriot; and I respect and admire him so much. He is now in his old and beloved profession of the newspaper world. He is a tower of strength in this land.

Such men as your able and distinguished Senators HOMER CAPEHART and WILLIAM JENNER and your Governor, Ralph Gates, are demonstrating daily what it means to the citizens of your State and to this Nation to place in office men who believe in the principles of a free and independent people.

CHARLIE HALLECK and the other members of the Indiana Republican delegation in the House have set an example for the rest of us. They are always on the job and they stick to the principles of the voters who elected them.

What Indiana has done to restore sane and efficient government, the rest of the Nation is on its way to doing.

We made the first step in 1946 by returning the legislative branch of the Government to the people. This year we are going

the rest of the way and place the administration in the hands of those who will have due regard for the people of our own country, for the maintenance of our liberties under sound laws, and who will administer the laws of Congress so as to carry out their true purpose and intent. This means and requires the election of a Republican President.

There are many in the great Democratic Party who believe as we do, but they have been seized by the New Dealers who have the power to select their candidates and to dominate their councils and to mold their policies; so, therefore, the restoration of sound government to this country becomes the task of the Republican Party, and our party stands ready to meet that call.

A very great debt of gratitude is owed to editors like you, who were among the first to point out the dangers of the New Deal philosophies. Even when yours were voices crying in the wilderness you kept on explaining to your readers the inevitable consequences of dangerous acts of government and the eventual domination of the people by New Deal thinking. You told them that deficit financing and dilution of the currency meant that the value of the dollar would be cut in its purchasing power and that inflation would come. You told them that pitting one class against another meant a divided Nation, with groups arraying themselves against each other, making issues that had never existed before and raising hate among men of the same Nation. You told them that freedom of the individual was dependent upon man being free to live his own life, with due respect and recognition of that right in others; that freedom meant the right of a man to make his own way, to own his home, to rear his family, and to give his children a chance to earn the rewards of their own efforts without ceilings over their heads or government bars across their paths.

That is freedom. But it can never be gained under a government that would dominate the efforts and the enterprise of men and place them in limited molds under the edicts of policy makers in Washington.

It must be gratifying to you to see that your words have borne fruit. But the results of your work have come none too soon.

We have started on our way in this country with a Republican Congress. We will be really upon our way with the election of a Republican President this year. The people of our land can never receive the full benefits of sound government until the administrators of law are in harmony with the purpose and the intent of the statutes that are passed. The benefits of sound and helpful laws can never reach the people unless those who administer them carry their true purpose into effect. Therefore let the people of this country know that if they really desire to go on to success toward the restoration of sound government that it is necessary to return the Presidency to a Republican who is in sympathy with the laws of the Congress. The New Deal can never fill that position.

Tonight I want to discuss with you in the brief time that I have here some of the objectives toward which government should move, and that means the objectives toward which our party should move. I would rather talk about what I believe we should do rather than talk too much of the wrongs in government of the past several years. The people are begining to know right much about them. And while it may be necessary to cite some instances to demonstrate just what must be avoided, yet let our thoughts tonight turn primarily toward an aggressive and positive course.

The first goal is the restoration of true freedom to our people and the recognition again of the dignity and strength and position of the individual citizen. In less than 2 years we have come a long way, and that progress is attributable to the demand of the people that restraints be lifted from them and the action of the Republican Congress in harmonious answer to that demand. Such a position naturally places us in direct conflict with the New Deal idea of a policed state.

For contrast, let us review some situations that we do not want to return. During the days of war, when all the forces of the Nation were directed toward the winning of the combat, the people of this country willingly gave up those liberties they had enjoyed as American citizens in their personal lives and submitted themselves to the strict direction of their Government. This was right, because every force and every power that we had was directed at one end—toward the crushing of a foreign enemy.

But when war ended people began to look to a restoration of freedom in their lives. The New Deal in office had felt the power of controls. It played to those little groups of men who want to dominate the lives and the conditions of their countrymen. It was not ready to return, and is not yet ready to return, the citizens of this country to free lives. There, indeed, is the issue.

If I were asked to name the two elements which have contributed most to the greatness of this country, I would say: First, that we had here a land bountifully blessed by the Almighty with natural resources; with the deposits of the earth; the fertility of the fields; the power of the streams; and the wealth of the forests. And, secondly, we had given to us by the wise and thoughtful founders of this Nation a Government that has permitted the people to use that natural wealth for the benefit of all. Both of those gifts to us are necessarily a complement to each other and are of basic value for our progress.

Many other lands have been endowed with even greater natural wealth—Russia, China, India—but in those lands freedom under government was unknown. A man or a group of men ruled and the wealth of the land was used not for the well-being of the people but for the enrichment of the rulers. In those countries we see in clear picture the controlled citizens—the dominating government—the policed state—with the proved result that generations of the people failed to progress; failed to have the benefits of the country's wealth, and lived in backwardness, in meanness, and often in want, and hate stirred their hearts.

That same result will eventually come to any people under such domination, regardless of the name that you give the form of government.

So the Republican Party must keep the people free from unjust Government controls. That freedom must come from us and come now. The threat of controls continues. This very year the President declared his position in asking for the power of control over the wages of men, over prices, and in the rationing of our commodities when he spoke before the Congress on the state of the Nation in January.

The state of the Nation is not too bright now—and the view will be dim and murky if that thinking in Government long continues. Real service to the well-being of America awaits our taking over.

The high cost of living has been a matter of great concern in every household. That is naturally so and prices are too high.

Very recently we have seen some of those prices level off. I hope that it is a healthy settling down of prices on those basic commodities so much needed for daily living and in the rebuilding of our country to meet the needs of many people.

Prices will be high as long as there is scarcity here. As long as we ship out of this country excessive supplies of those things needed here we will have that scarcity and consequent high prices.

At this time and for several years past the President of the United States has had in his power complete control, through the issuance of licenses, of the kind and quantity of materials that are sent out of America. Yet there has been disregard for the needs of our own people and a failure to look to the maintenance of the strength of this country. Congress cannot administer laws—that is for the administrative officers. The only thing that Congress could do would be to declare a complete embargo against shipments out of this country, and we do not want that.

The great mills and farms and mines of America can supply the needs of this country and have a reasonable surplus to sell in foreign trade. I want this country to have its foreign trade; but the shipments abroad must be definitely tied into and based upon consideration for those basic needs here. Under the control of the present administration greater shipments abroad of some commodities were made in 1947 than in 1946. In time of need of materials in this country there is no sound basis to grant excessive supplies to other nations to free them from controls and create scarcities and situations here that would require controls to be placed upon our own people. That course is the way of the New Deal. Why would they free others and enslave our own people under Government dictation? Is this the kind of liberalism of which the President spoke last Thursday night? The time has come for policies and practices that will assure freedom and progress here in America. This we can do and still take a substantial part in world trade.

The policy must be abandoned of having our own officials place upon the back of the heavily burdened American people an unreasonable proportion of the cost of any international undertaking.

Soon the workers and the mills of this country are going to be in competition with those in other lands. Due regard must be had for this situation. Yet recently we have seen the present administration lower the tariffs more and more to the disadvantage of the American producer.

Under the reciprocal trade agreements which were recently concluded through the State Department we have seen the protection taken from the glass worker and the pottery worker and the plants of this country. The protection of aluminum production here has been reduced to the maximum extent of 50 percent by recent agreements concluded by this administration. Such a course cannot go on if we expect to maintain our own people at work at good pay and to keep up the production of this land. Yes, we want foreign trade, but we will have nothing to trade if our places of manufacture are dried up through failure to protect them in the great markets of the world.

I am advised that fruits, and particularly apples, have been a subject of lowered tariff duties that will greatly injure that industry and may destroy it. As an example, under an agreement with our neighbor Canada, to the north, Canada may ship her apples into America against a tariff of 12½ cents, but American apples go to Canada against a tariff of 39 cents a bushel. There seems to be no fairness in this.

Take the St. Lawrence canal and power project recently debated in Congress. In it we saw another example of an unfair division of cost against the taxpayers of our country. All this falls upon the backs of our own people—today burdened with a national debt of more than $2,000 for each family. Let dealing with others be fair and let our own Government give due consideration to the interests of the American citizens.

The Republican Party will strive for the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of wars and involvements of this country in international conflict. It will take every step short of surrendering its own sovereignty and its own strength in the freedom of its people to attain this end.

The Republican Party, while advocating peace and lending the efforts of this country toward the settlement of men's disputes, will recognize the course of history and the natural frailties of men, who, forgetting protestations of peace, may make war. Therefore, this Nation must remain strong in armed forces upon the water, upon the land, and in the air.

An effective and efficient Reserve Officers' Corps must be kept alive and alert with refresher courses from year to year. The great National Guard system of this country should be fostered and enlarged throughout the several States and given full support by the National Government.

We of our party have never recognized classes or distinctions among the citizens of this country. This is the Government of all the people and we will keep it so. We will refrain from arraying person against person and group against group.

There is enough here for all, and the policies of Government should be directed toward peaceful living within the country rather than conflict and strife for temporary political gain.

There is one segment of our population, however, to which an exception may well be made, and I refer to those young men who were taken from their homes, from their ambitions, from the paths of peace upon which they had set with hearts and minds bent on success, and were placed in the armed services of this country. It seems to me that the people and the Government owe these veterans the highest consideration and the soundest aid that can be given. But I want to say that any gift that may be awarded them by way of an attempt to compensate for the time they lost out of their lives will be but a bauble and useless tinsel if we do not maintain here a country that permits them to make their own way, to gain the fruits of their ambitions and their labor, and to gain rewards according to their own achievement, and to be free from regimental orders that would mold their lives under governmental commands.

The Republican Party will move toward the reduction of governmental expenditures to be effected through consolidation of governmental facilities and bureaus that have grown up like weeds in a neglected field. It will be true reorganization with a lessening of costs and a lessening of the number on the pay rolls of Government. Then we can move toward reduction of the levies upon our people and proceed to pay off the great debt under which we labor.

The majority party, the party of the Republicans, has within the last year twice passed bills for the reduction of taxes upon the individuals of this country and twice those bills have been destroyed and prevented from becoming law by the veto of the Chief Executive. Regardless of what criticisms have been hurled at the provisions of those bills, we know that they would have lessened the taxes of all people.

Today there is pending before the Senate, having already been passed by the House of Representatives, a tax bill that will be a great help to the people and particularly to those with lesser incomes, those with families, and those who have reached an age where there is less promise of expanding or growing income.

This new bill increases the personal exemption from $500 to $600; it grants 30-percent reduction in the taxes on lesser incomes after these exemptions are taken. Under this measure husband and wife would have the right to use divided incomes as a basis for taxes, thus assuring further saving to the family. A special exemption of $1,200 is granted to all persons of 65 years of age or more; and a special exemption of $1,200 is granted to blind people.

This is the plan of the Republican Party so that our people may have more of their own money for their own use to meet their obligations in life and, better still, to save if that can be done. In saving is found the greatest security of everyone, wherever they may be.

There is a severe clash today in the political thinking of men throughout the world. Names such as communism, fascism, and totalitarianism have been used. Basically they are all the same in that those in government have complete domination over the lives and fortunes of their people.

In America the Government was intended to be the people's government; and the Republican Party will keep it that way.

That some of this foreign thinking has taken root here cannot be soundly doubted. If any should have doubt on that point let him read the statement of J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, before the American Legion convention and read the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives.

Those of that faith constitute an unending threat to the life of America. They would not stay here long under a Republican administration. The soil for their growth here has been too fertile. They must go—and they must go now. They shall not find a resting place longer in this country.

The Government has poured approximately $22,000,000,000 of the money of the American people into Europe since the close of the war. Some of that was done under the form of loans—much of it as outright gifts. History gives little assurance of the repayment of any of it. Some was for the purpose of relieving suffering. Much was to sustain existing governments and rebuild the economy of those countries. There can be no doubt that much of that money was flagrantly wasted and that some of it never reached the purpose for which it was sent there.

Neither this Nation nor any other can long survive such a course. While we measure the amount in dollars the real burden is the taking of the commodities produced here from our vanishing stores of natural wealth.

Any dealing with other nations should be upon a sound business basis. This Government has no right to give away the wealth of our people.

Where we can without injury to our own citizens loan credit or money that may well be done. But such loans should be upon a basis of at least equal benefit to America. There should be a return and a repayment of it in some form assured to us. No other way can be sound.

Following this course of dishing out money under a great WPA for the world will not be of lasting value to the recipients and will not strengthen them to oppose communism. Such a plan must end.

Where there is hunger or suffering anywhere in the world the heart of America will respond with liberality within its means.

But the present aid-to-the-world plan is not for the purpose of relieving hunger or famine. It is primarily to build the economy of other nations. America cannot carry the world upon the backs of its people. If aid is to be given it must be upon a sound, business basis and with a mutuality of returned benefits to this country.

Twenty-two billions have been spent and still the demand comes for more. There is no end in sight. Such spending must cease if our own country is to remain solvent and strong.

Another illustration shows the way of the policed state which we must avoid:

Just a little over a year ago the Chief Executive, with New Deal thinking, said to the working man of America, and sought to have the idea placed in the statutes of this country, that regardless of age, regardless of where he might be, regardless of his reasons as a free man, that if he quit his job he was to be placed in the Army and subjected to the severity of court martial. Have the working people of America forgotten that? That was not freedom. Can we fail to see in that course the philosophy of the New Deal—a plan of governmental force over the individual in the way he should make his living and order his life?

And yet the advocate of that measure, which was defeated by a solid Republican stand against it, later vetoed and opposed a law that sought to find a way whereby the disputes of men over labor issues might be promptly settled, and that would permit those who desired to work to continue their work and maintain their incomes.

Some thoughtlessly called this new law a "slave labor bill." Wherein, in truth, would slavery have been—under the bill of the President to force men to work under military command and threat of court martial; or the law that the Congress passed over the President's veto which gave men the right to seek work without getting permission from anyone, that recognized the right of men to have their unions, to bargain for better wages and better conditions of work, that respected the integrity of contract, and preserved for the individual the right to stop his work or to continue his work as he pleases?

I have faith that when the facts are made known that men will find in these amendments a true recognition of the liberty of the American citizen to make his own way, free from the command of any man in power, in or out of government.

You of the press can do so much in conveying the facts to the people. That is all that can be done. Then we must have faith in the understanding of our people that they will look to the truth and that they will not be misguided by epithets or the unreasoned charges of any man. I have that faith in the thinking of the American people; that they will see good where it exists and that they will not be moved by demagogic appeal of men who would try to assert power over them.

If it be found that this, or any other law that may be enacted, should work injustice or inequities, then let it be repealed or amended as to those parts under which wrongs may result. But let there be a fair trial of the law.

The amendments to the National Labor Relations Act were passed in 1947 and have not yet been in effect long enough to permit mature judgment upon the results of them. However, there are facts which I have taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I give to you. Those facts indicate that these amendments, which have been given the name of the Taft-Hartley law, have, in effect, brought about benefits to the workers and have helped in the maintenance of industrial peace in this country. A deep impression comes out of a contrast between 1947, the date of passage, and 1946, before passage of the law.

The average worker in 1947 earned $72 more than he did in 1946 because of the opportunity to have more days of work. In 1946 the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that 4,600,000 workers in this country lost an average of 25 days because of strikes and work stoppages; whereas, in 1947, only 2,200,000 workers lost through strikes, and their loss was an average of but 16 days; the difference meant steadier employment and better incomes.

There were 1,385 fewer work stoppages in 1947 than in 1946. This certainly indicates that this new law has not harmed the worker. It shows an increase in income for him and more settled conditions of employment.

It makes little difference how much a man may earn by the day or the hour if he is de-

prived of the opportunity to do his work and at the end of the year he finds that his income has been small.

Most men and women of this country desire to work and to make their own way and to improve their incomes. Every step should be taken to safeguard that desire and to afford opportunities to those who seek to work and improve their conditions.

You, who direct the great and influential press, can do so much in leading this country to soundness in thinking and in government. Yours is an important task, an immense responsibility in service to your country. In this day of clashing ideas you can hold high a beacon light that will help guide us straight through all confusion to a settled and sound course.

To you that call rings out in the name of America. It is the call to the Republican Party of today—a living, vigorous party, devoted to the security of our people now and for the future—devoted to a peaceful and progressive Nation—devoted to fair dealing between men and Nations. I have firm faith that you will respond with great and helpful leadership to that call, as our party moves forward in high and needed service in government for the security and welfare of our free people.

A Questionable Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have called the attention of Congress and the people of the United States to the conduct of the Nuremberg trials in Germany under the guidance of well-known leftwingers and ideologists like Josiah Dubois, and so forth. These trials have made every effort to besmirch American businessmen, and, by implication, what America stands for. They have served to demonstrate to the German people that the United States is still under the influence of the Morgenthau get-tough-with-Germany plan, while the Soviet Union is adopting a more placatory attitude to win over the German people.

At the outset the tribunal refused to adopt a clear-cut definition of what constitutes aggression, for fear of offending the sensibilities of the Soviet Government now engaged in trampling down and crushing the democracies of Europe.

Prosecutions have been directed particularly against those who might be of assistance in the task of stabilizing conditions in Germany in cooperation with the United States.

More sinister than these diversionary tactics, however, is the most recent decision of the United States war crimes tribunal to the effect that—

> The obedience of a soldier is not the obedience of the automaton. A soldier is a reasoning agent. It is a fallacy of widespread consumption that a soldier is required to do everything his superior officers order him to do. The subordinate is bound only to obey the lawful orders of his superior.

Follow the implications of this statement through to a logical conclusion. In effect, it encourages mass disobedience of superior officers within our armed forces. Implied therein is the threat that if the forces of international communism are victorious, ruthless vengeance will be meted out to those who dare to defend their own country and its interests. It is an invitation to apply the Communist slogan, "Turn the imperialist war into civil war."

The person or persons who are responsible for this formulation should be severely disciplined. Let me cite by way of illustration the impression this statement made upon a veteran as quoted in the Washington Post of April 14, 1948:

BLIND OBEDIENCE

In Nuremberg Germany, recently SS (Elite Guard) officers were charged with killing persons referred to by the Nazis as Asiatic inferiors. The defense pleaded innocent on the ground that they had acted under orders from Hitler. The United States war crimes tribunal waived this aside and said: "The obedience of a soldier is not the obedience of an automaton. A soldier is a reasoning agent. It is a fallacy of widespread consumption that a soldier is required to do everything his superior officers order him to do. The subordinate is bound only to obey the lawful orders of his superior."

Who is to say whether or not the given order is lawful? Is the subordinate to require to go back to his bunk, look up the law on the subject, and if he believes the order is not lawful, so report back to his superior and decline to obey? Of course, the fact that he probably would be shot for not obeying the order cuts no figure with the honorable court.

Imagine if during a crisis, instead of instantly obeying to the best of his ability, the buck private or gob leisurely wended his way to his cot and there read Blackstone on the particular subject, or perhaps discussed the State code with his buddy. The whole thing is utterly silly. I suggest that these alleged judges read Tennyson's charge of the Light Brigade.

WILLIAM H. SHIELDS.

WASHINGTON.

Florida Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, most veterans are not fully aware of their various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Florida.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by Jack Robins, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, post-office box 829, Daytona Beach, Fla., which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Any municipal corporation which owns a cemetery in which veterans are buried is authorized to enter into an agreement with the United States for the care of the cemetery or any graves therein and to receive funds or other assistance for the care, upkeep, and maintenance thereof.

Municipal corporations owning cemeteries in which veterans are buried may accept funds for the maintenance of the graves therein and convey, sell, or transfer lots to the United States.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Residence of military personnel is required for the purpose of suits in chancery or actions at law.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration are furnished under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The Adjutant General is required to furnish certificates and certified abstracts from the records and documents in his office, for use in claims, without charge to the claimant.

Discharge papers of world war veterans are to be recorded by the clerk of the circuit court free of charge.

The county assessor of taxes is required to "aid, assist, and ascertain person, * * * and organizations" entitled to tax exemptions.

Boards of county commissioners of Leon and Palm Beach Counties are authorized to make an annual tax levy for service officers for the respective counties.

The Veterans' Service Commission is charged with the duty of aiding veterans in determining claims for compensation, vocational training, hospitalization, and other benefits.

The Adjutant General is required to assist ex-service men and women with claims for compensation, hospitalization, vocational training, and other benefits or privileges to which they are entitled under the laws of the United States.

The Adjutant General is required to assist veterans with claims against the United States for pension, bounty or back pay.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Institutions of higher learning are urged to grant diplomas or degrees to students in the senior classes and to give credits to students in other classes, at the time of leaving to enter military service.

Certain entrance and graduation requirements may be waived by professional colleges.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of persons disabled in the armed forces during World Wars I and II.

Free tuition is available at a State educational or training institution of a secondary or college grade for children of deceased or disabled World War I veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Continuation of membership is provided in the teacher-retirement system, contributions, etc., during military service.

Credit is granted for service in the armed forces during World War II under retirement system for State officers and employees.

Extension of certificates of teachers is provided during military service and for 6 months after such service has been completed.

Leaves of absence are given circuit judges in certain counties; employees of the county

school system; and public officers and employees during military service with preservation of seniority rights, efficiency ratings, promotional status and retirement privileges. Reinstatement is provided upon termination of military service.

Preference is given to veterans in civil service, merit system, and other competitive examinations for public employment.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Reinstatement is provided in labor unions after termination of military service.

Business, occupational, and professional licenses are renewed without examination following service in the armed forces.

GUARDIANSHIP

The Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

Provision is made for the appointment of a conservator or guardian for persons entitled to benefits under the War Risk Insurance Act and the World War Veterans' Act of 1924.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal Hospital under the Union Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

County commissioners in counties having a population of not less than 22,303 and not more than 22,305 may convey real estate foreclosed for nonpayment of taxes to veterans of World War II.

Veterans of World War II are entitled to 40 acres of public land as homestead upon application to the trustees of the internal improvement fund.

Trustees of the internal improvement fund are authorized to contract with the Federal Government for the purpose of locating returned soldiers.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is given for war service, with reference to retirement.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans or their widows.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

A bureau of records is provided in the office of the adjutant general and the deposit of military records, relics, etc., for safekeeping.

The record of any veteran who dies or is buried within the State must be filed with the military department of Florida.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Returning soldiers are invited to locate in the State.

Building and loan associations, etc., may make loans to veterans.

TAX EXEMPTIONS, EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

No tax is required upon cigarettes sold to post exchanges or ships service stores for resale to members of the armed forces.

Certain disabled veterans are exempt from license tax on boats, vessels, schooners, etc., used for salt-water fishing.

Veterans of both World Wars I and II and Spanish-American War are exempt from business or occupational license fees to the amount of $50.

License tax exemption is extended to disabled veterans employed in connection with the operation of race tracks, or frontons for the exhibition of jai-alai or pelota.

All licenses held by members of the armed forces and granted by the administrative board of the State are continued during active military service and for 6 months after discharge, without payment of required fees.

Certificates of tax sales on homes of Confederate veterans and their widows are canceled.

Property of the American Legion and other veterans' organizations is exempt from tax.

Exemption of property to the value of $500 is extended to disabled veterans.

Homes, clubhouses, hospitals, and other property owned by veterans' organizations in Volusia County are exempt from State, county, and municipal taxes.

Servicemen are exempted from filing application for homestead tax exemption; reductions are permitted where tax is erroneously assessed.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATION

Articles of incorporation cannot be issued by the secretary of state to any veterans' organization whose name contains the words "Legion," "Foreign," "Spanish," or "Disabled," without first obtaining approval of the national headquarters of any congressionally recognized veterans' organization whose name contains such words. Articles of associations which do not have approval of the national association must be amended.

Penalties are imposed for the unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, and so forth of the American Legion, Grand Army of the Republic, and of certain other organizations.

Tax exemption of property of veterans' organizations is provided; ch. 23075 is applicable to Volusia County only.

Many of these laws have been enacted through the sponsorship and cooperative effort of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time the DAV has some 26 chapters throughout the State of Florida, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans with their problems in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains full-time national service officers at the two Veterans' Administration regional offices; four under the direction of Albert Cuervo at Pass-a-Grille Beach, and three under the direction of Samuel A. Hoopes at Miami.

These DAV experts extend all types of service to veterans and their dependents, free of charge, more particularly in the development and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled under existing Federal and State laws.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active duty during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before Jan. 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interests and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities, which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati, the Fifty-third Union Trust Co., has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my good friend Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and most, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matching with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for

those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a disabled veteran of World War I, I am proud to be a member of the DAV. It is a pleasure for me to commend its service program and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

The Federal Judiciary—the International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address which I was privileged to deliver before the Bar Association of St. Louis at its annual dinner at the Chase Hotel in St. Louis on April 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE MEN AND A FREE JUDICIARY

Mr. President, fellow Americans, it is a joy and honor for me to meet with you here today. I have a high respect and a warm personal regard for your distinguished Senators, Senator FORREST C. DONNELL and Senator JAMES P. KEM. Senator DONNELL is a member of the Judiciary Committee, of which I am chairman, and he makes an outstanding and conscientious contribution to the work of the committee. Both my friends have what it takes. They have character, ability, and common sense. I have had occasion also to work from time to time with various members of your House delegation, and I have always been impressed with the caliber of the statesmen which Missouri sends to Washington. And while I sometimes disagree with his policies, I do have a friendly regard also for that Missourian whom I first knew when he was a Member of the Senate, the distinguished first citizen of the land, President Harry S. Truman.

INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY RELATES TO FOREIGN SITUATION

Your president, Mr. Coburn, suggested that my speech should deal with the subject of appointments to the Federal judiciary and that I refer to the international situation.

I believe that it is possible to discuss both of these subjects because it is perfectly obvious that the international situation involves the age-old battle between free men and slaves, and between the concept of a government by law and the concept of a government by men. Freedom and government by law are possible only when there is a strong, freedom-loving, independent judiciary. Without it, free men and free institutions and free government cannot survive.

THE MISSION BEFORE US AS INDIVIDUALS

You and I as individuals are called unto a high purpose, unto a noble mission, in this critical hour in the history of the human race. All about us, the old institutions, the great landmarks, are being challenged by the fierce force that is known as world communism. It is up to us here in this land to revitalize our own concepts of liberty, to invigorate our own practice of law, so that it becomes an unfolding, growing, evolving thing—contributing to the finer and higher standards of life.

It is our function, yours and mine, to combat dry rot in the law, thus the better to serve our country. What greater challenge could there exist for the individual lawyer than this, that he be adequate to his role as a leader (for I am speaking to leaders) today in this hour of crisis.

Well, how are we going to do this?

First. We must conceive of ourselves as servants. I personally am a public servant, but each of us is a servant of America, of this constitutional Republic of checks and balances.

Second. We must realize the very nature of the Republic—that it is a dynamic, representative system composed of three separate and coequal branches of Government—an independent legislative, executive branch, and judiciary. It is up to us to fulfill the dream of the founding fathers and maintain inviolate each of these three branches of Government. I will have more to say about this later, particularly as to the violation of some of the independence of the judiciary.

But what does this mean in our personal lives? How can you and I combat the dry rot that would infect us personally? How can we maintain our own checks and balances so that we are adequate to the great tasks before us?

I should like to give to you the lessons which I feel I have learned in the course of my own experience as a lawyer, as a district attorney, and as a public servant in the Senate, during these last 9 years. I have found these lessons not only in my personal life but in the lives of my colleagues and some of the greatest men of American history, notably Abraham Lincoln.

THREE SAFETY VALVES FOR OUR PERSONAL LIVES

Lincoln, as I see it, was able to maintain his balance because he utilized three releases, three safety valves, to release pressure in hours of crisis.

What were those three safety valves? They are releases which you and I can utilize in our everyday lives. They are, as I see them, humor, prayer, and a selfless devotion to country. By humor, we mean the ability to laugh at the situations we face; yes, at ourselves. To find in the serious work of the day opportunity for a bit of good cheer, to see the bright side of things, to see the sun coming through the clouds. I have seen men crack up because they lacked the ability to laugh at themselves and with others. I am not suggesting that humor should dictate our actions, but I am suggesting that humor should fill our personal lives as much as possible, whether we be lawyers, judges, or everyday citizens. That was the point I tried to make in my little book on congressional humor, Laughing With Congress, with which some of you might be familiar.

By prayer, I mean reaching out for the source of infinite power which is all-present, all-knowing, all-wise, all-seeing, which is ever available to each of us. Lincoln knew how to utilize prayer. Lincoln would not hesitate to pray in Cabinet meetings. Who, then, are you and I to spurn prayer—in our relatively humbler lives?

GETTING MORE EFFICIENCY THROUGH GOD

We have been told by eminent psychologists that if we were to devote a fraction of our work day, perhaps 15 minutes, to thoughts of the Divine, that is about us and within us, to reach out for this invisible power which is always available for us, we could increase our working efficiency by many percent. Not only that, but we could bring into our lives that peace, that harmony, that understanding for which we were meant. We could banish the negative fears, the doubts, the anxieties, which seem to fill so much of these times.

DEVOTION TO COUNTRY

Lastly, I believe perhaps the greatest value is to lose ourselves in selfless love of country, for, as we are told, it is by losing ourselves that we gain for ourselves. It is by recognizing our supreme obligation to our land and to our future that we are best able to serve our personal ends.

We know that we are but the heirs of a great system of freedom which men have evolved through the centuries, not only in our own land, but in all other lands. We are but the temporary possessors of this great legacy. It is the supreme challenge to us to pass on all that we inherited—vital dynamic, unimpaired.

The dry rot of indolence, inefficiency, fear can infect nations, can infect legal systems, and can infect our personal lives; and it is up to each of us—vitally, dynamically, to antidote it with the positive forces which I have suggested.

This, then, I believe, is the personal message that each of us should take to our hearts and apply in our everyday lives.

INTELLIGENT JUDICIAL SELECTION VITAL TO INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY

You members of the Bar Association of St. Louis and Missouri have made a great contribution to the creation and maintenance of a free and independent judiciary. As we know, judges have been chosen by the political election method in some 35 States. This is the system which had its beginnings in the Jacksonian era of the 1830's.

A century and a half earlier in 1688 after James II was driven out of power, the English people insisted on a new level of independence for the judiciary. We know that prior to the Revolution of 1688, the commission of an English judge read that his tenure of office was "at the pleasure of the King." We know that judges who refused to follow the King's will lost their offices. The Federal Act of 1701 established that a judge's commission should thereafter read, "during good behavior."

The English judiciary, as we know, became a bulwark for English liberties during the past two centuries.

We know also that the men who wrote our Constitution knew about the revolution of 1688. They had examples in our own country. They had seen colonial judges controlled by the King. In the Declaration of Independence our founding fathers complained that "he has made judges dependent upon his will alone for the tenure of their office and the amount and payment of their salary."

The founding fathers believed, as stated in the Federalist papers, that "independence of judges is equally requisite to guard the Constitution and the rights of individuals." With this background, the founding fathers established the plan of selecting Federal judges by executive appointment with confirmation by the Senate and with life tenure and as a part of an independent branch of our Government.

Ten of the Original Thirteen States followed this example of life tenure and, in fact, in one or two cases preceded it. In a few cases also judges were chosen by the legislature. In the quarter century following 1830, some 15 States adopted the system

of short terms for the judiciary filled by popular election. Every State admitted after 1846 followed that system. Today only 3 States, all of them being among the original 13, retain life tenure, and only 2 of them have an appointive system in the stricter sense.

JUDICIAL POPULAR ELECTION RESULTED FROM SOCIAL CHANGES

These changes occurred during the years between 1830 and 1850. The West was growing. There was a desire to break up the political monopoly of the so-called aristocratic groups in the older States. There was a wave of democratic fervor which swept the entire world. It brought universal suffrage to America.

It resulted in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 in Europe. Lawyers became unpopular because they represented the creditor classes. The immigrants who came to this land still recalled the whiplash of harsh persecution which resulted from the eighteenth century struggles for freedom. They remembered the barrel-head justice of English and Scotch judges. They disagreed with many of the rules of common law.

All of these factors changed our approach to the law and to the judiciary. Our new State legislatures began to supersede some of the rules of common law by statutes, and we began electing our judges rather than appointing them.

JUSTICE—THE RESPONSIBILITY OF SOVEREIGNTY

Justice is the inescapable responsibility of sovereignty. Maintaining law and order is the inescapable responsibility of sovereignty.

In our land sovereignty resides in the whole body of the people. We settle our private disputes in courts presided over by judges who wield the judicial power of a sovereign people. The Kings of England did not always select judges on the basis of judicial ability. In our country, with a more complex social order, the need for high judicial standards is greater than ever before.

In the large cities of our land political committees usually select the nominees for State judicial offices. Thirty-five States elect their judges, and some 12 States have had an appointive method more or less corresponding to the Federal system.

As we know, the American Bar Association began its studies as early as 1924, and, as we know also, by 1937 the American Bar Association house of delegates had adopted and recommended a plan.

MISSOURI PLAN HAS RESULTED IN IMPROVED EFFICIENCY

Your plan, which is known throughout the Nation as the Missouri plan, follows this general organization pattern. Your bar association and the bar association of the State worked on this project for some 4 years, and 7 or 8 years ago your State amended its constitution to establish a system of judicial selection and tenure with a system falling somewhat between elective and appointive methods.

You had as your objective the removal of judges from political pot-boiler patronage problems and pressure and you made an attempt to avoid selection wholly through popular ballot and executive appointment. You had more than a century of experience with judges selected on political election methods. Your system attempts to eliminate "blind voting" and hand-picked, boss-dominated, back-room nominees.

I am told that your system has stabilized the quality of personnel at a higher and more uniform level of fitness and capacity for judicial work.

It is my understanding that plans similar to yours are under active consideration in a dozen or more States at the present time.

In my own State of Wisconsin, just a few weeks ago, members of the Milwaukee Bar Association were being polled on a proposal that the Governor appoint all judges in the State from a list of candidates recommended by a nominating commission of lawyers and laymen, with all of the Governor's appointees subsequently seeking public approval of their records as judges in an election.

INTEGRITY OF FEDERAL JUDICIARY MUST NOT BE SHORT-CIRCUITED

The Federal Constitution provides for the appointment of Federal judges by the President "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

For the most part this has resulted in an able Federal bench through the century and a half of our national existence.

Occasionally, when the plan has not been sufficiently insulated from the pressure of political forces, there have, however, been short circuits in the integrity and independence of the Federal judiciary.

The last time I had occasion to make a survey of the Federal judiciary, I found that since 1932—of 231 Federal judges appointed—214 were Democrats and 17 were Republicans. It seems painfully apparent that political allegiance was the one factor which dominated appointments.

That, in itself, may not be so important as long as all of the appointees measure up to sound judicial standards, and as long as they do not permit any political philosophy outside of the American concepts to dominate their judicial thinking.

As required by article III of the Constitution, our Federal judges, of course, hold office during good behavior. The idea behind this, of course, is to make the Federal judiciary independent of all influence. We know, however, as a practical matter, that the outlook of the court can still be altered by altering the number of judges of a particular court or by making resignations very attractive so that vacancies result which can be filled by men of different views.

BAR CONSULTATION ON JUDICIAL NOMINEES A DESIRABLE AID

In the Eightieth Congress we began the first testing of the plan whereby a committee on the judiciary of the American Bar Association cooperated actively with the Attorney General, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the State and local bar associations in behalf of the selection of Federal judges on the basis of their qualifications. I am happy to say that the first test was successful. It occurred with the nomination of a United States district judge for the southern district of New York. The weight of the organized bar was put squarely behind the nominee of high qualifications in preference to a candidate with strong party organizational support. This was a contest between partisan selection and nonpartisan selection for Federal judicial office, and the qualified candidate was nominated and approved.

I have expressed two aims in connection with the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee as it relates to judicial appointments:

First. To seek a balance in the Federal judiciary.

Second. To give full weight to the opinions of bar groups in relation to integrity, legal qualifications, and political philosophy.

I can see considerable merit in one of the proposals recently considered by the American Bar Association, suggesting that we establish by law a judicial yardstick of the qualifications for appointment to the Federal bench, to the end that such appointees be citizens of the United States and lawyers who have been admitted to the practice for a definite period of time before appointments and that a reasonable proportion of the Justices of the Supreme Court have a definite minimum of prior judicial experience in the circuit court of appeals, the Federal district courts, or the State courts of last resort, and that all Federal judges be prohibited from accepting assignments other than judicial assignments.

The growing practice of putting "the finger" on judges to fill executive posts is a matter of serious concern. Justices of the Supreme Court have been stripped of the black robes of judicial office and have been used in this manner. Supreme Court Justices, Federal circuit judges, district judges, and justices of the Court of Claims have been called upon to perform executive and other nonjudicial functions.

EXECUTIVE JOBS FOR JUDGES—AN UNDESIRABLE PRACTICE

Sometimes these assignments result in the permanent withdrawal of a judge from the Nation's judiciary. Sometimes a judge is merely on "lend-lease" for temporary executive duty and then is returned to the bench.

On still another occasion a judge leaves a judicial post to engage in executive activities and is subsequently appointed to another judgeship, often higher in rank than the one previously held.

Existing law does not provide adequate laws of conduct for all of the situations involved in this practice of shifting judges around like ribbon-counter clerks in a department store.

The propriety of taking men from the bench to fill executive posts is governed almost entirely by judicial ethics and public policy.

The architects of the Constitution embodied in the Constitution the vital principle of the separation of powers—legislative, executive, and judicial. They wisely gave to each the power to resist encroachment on the part of the others.

The strongest of these powers in the case of the judiciary is the independence of judges maintained by security and tenure of office, by fixed salaries, and by a clear delineation of jurisdiction.

"The judiciary," wrote Hamilton, "is in continual jeopardy of being overpowered, awed, or influenced by its coordinate branches."

It is reasonable to assume that it is difficult for a judge to maintain his integrity and independence if the practice becomes common of selecting judges for executive positions, carrying exceptional privilege and prestige.

A judge is the human embodiment of an office dedicated to impartial justice and fair dealing—an office which must have the highest possible public respect. A judge, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion. The high standard demanded of the Federal judiciary and its complete separation from executive and legislative branches should not be subjected to the erosion of exceptions. The business of judges is and should remain judging.

There is a list of at least a dozen prominent Federal judges who have been cleared by the President for duties other than those of the Federal bench, and the committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, in July of 1947 formally ordered prepared a report which declared that the practice of using Federal judges for the position of nonjudicial activities, is undesirable, because it holds great danger to the independence of the judiciary.

INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY ESSENTIAL FOR FREE GOVERNMENT

The foundation of our Government is based upon the integrity of the individual.

It has been said that the right to live under the rule of law administered by an independent judiciary is one of the lamps of freedom which must be kept trimmed and burning bright.

The only hope for the future of the world perhaps lies in a growing consciousness in the hearts and minds of the people of the world of such a sense of justice that they will

willingly submit to government by law and under law.

Carried to its logical conclusion, this, my friends, means that there should be increasing study of the judicial settlement of international disputes.

GUARANTIES OF JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE RAVAGED UNDER HITLER

The greatest single reason for maintaining an independent judiciary is that without it free people and free institutions cannot survive.

In Germany dictatorship brought a number of significant departures from the principle of an independent judiciary:

1. The creation of volks courts, or special courts, enabled the German dictatorship to take jurisdiction in broad categories. Political crimes, crimes against the administration or against the regime, fell into these special courts. The judges for these courts were specially appointed, and the right of appeal from their decisions was severely restricted.

2. In Germany, under a dictatorship, there were exemptions from the jurisdiction of the court for certain categories of cases. In this group were cases involving crimes committed by Jews. Such cases were assigned to the authority of the police rather than the courts.

3. The powers of the German minister of justice were considerably extended with regard to changes of jurisdiction or venue. This, of course, was a legal sleight-of-hand to make a mockery of justice under the law.

4. The tenure of judges was altered under Hitler. Originally, German judges could be removed from office only by an orderly disciplinary procedure. But this was changed to make their removal subject only to the discretion of the Fuehrer. That was true from the highest to the lowest court.

5. Under the German dictatorship, matters which were properly within the jurisdiction of the court were shifted to become administration matters. The police, for example, could take a man into protective custody and deny him any of his usual legal safeguards.

6. On April 26, 1942, the German Reichstag adopted a quitclaim on judicial independence, a resolution, which said that the Fuehrer, without being bound by the existing provisions of law, at any time was the supreme master of the court and could compel with all means at his disposal, if necessary, judges to fulfill their obligations as Hitler interpreted them, and that violations by any German of any obligation could be punished without any regard to the so-called vested rights.

Here we had a travesty on justice, justice handcuffed to the whims and the hatreds and the greed and the reprisals and the insanities of an egomaniac dictator.

THE RUSSIAN JUDICIARY AND "CLASS JUSTICE"

Today we are more concerned than at any time since the cessation of hostilities in the Second World War with events abroad which appear to threaten world peace and security.

Let us consider the Soviet conception of the judiciary.

In the last few days, I have had the opportunity of reviewing some of the notes which Dr. Vladimir Gsovski has prepared for the use of the University of Michigan in connection with a forthcoming publication on the Soviet private law.

The Soviet judiciary system was established with the advent of a new economic policy in 1922. The peoples courts in Russia which had been designed to take the place of the revolutionary courts were under constant reorganization. The courts tried minor offenses, but the major part of criminal jurisdiction was absorbed by the so-called revolutionary tribunals and the Cheka. Both of these institutions proceeded without the guidance of any definite substantive law.

FINAL LIFE-AND-DEATH DECISIONS WITH NO APPEAL

Krylenko, the former Commissar for justice, said that "the Cheka established a defacto method of deciding cases without judicial procedure * * * in a number of places the Cheka assumed not only the right of final decision but also the right of control over the court. Its activities had the character of tremendously merciless repression and complete secrecy as to what occurred within its walls * * * final decisions of life and death, with no appeal from them * * * were passed * * * with no rules setting the jurisdiction or procedure."

In Russia the revolutionary tribunals have existed apart from the peoples courts, and all of them had an indefinite jurisdiction over major crimes. Krylenko said:

"In the jurisdiction of the (revolutionary) tribunals complete liberty of repression was advocated, while sentencing to death by shooting was a matter of everyday practice."

With the new economic policy of 1922, the peoples courts and the revolutionary tribunals merged to a certain extent in a new judicial system, though the imposition of punishment in nonjudicial procedures did not come to an end. The Cheka was abolished but its functions were assigned to a new political administration—the GPU, which later became the OGPU. The OGPU had unlimited power to put to death, though this was subsequently altered to some extent.

By 1934, the OGPU was transformed into a federal peoples commissariat for the Interior, which could sentence in a nonjudicial procedure, and could undertake its own investigations. It could arrest on any criminal charge. It could dispose of the case itself by imposing a sentence of confinement in a labor camp for 5 years, or it could transfer the case for trial to court.

According to Gsovski's notes, the doctrine of impartiality and independence of the judge was repudiated by the Soviet jurists. A concept of class justice was set up in opposition to the traditional concept, though eventually the system made some recognition at least in theory of the impartiality of a judge. The courts apparently were not above class interests and were by nature an organ of the government power, a weapon for the safeguarding of the interests of a given ruling class * * * a club is a primitive weapon, a rifle is a more efficient one, the most efficient is the court * * * for us there is no difference between a court of law and summary justice. Accordingly, the Soviet court apparently is an organ of state administration and is presumably dedicated to carrying out a governmental policy with a judge who is a politician and a worker in the political field.

LOW LEVEL OF LEGAL TRAINING FOR SOVIET JUDGES

On the basis of such information as is available, it appears that about 64 percent of Soviet judges seem to lack any legal training whatsoever.

The Judiciary Act of 1938 appears to express the new Soviet attitude toward law. The Soviet laws apparently have to be enforced unconditionally. Vyshinsky, who was attorney general and a leading writer on questions pertaining to the Soviet judicial organization in 1941, said:

"Neither court, nor criminal procedure is or could be outside politics. This means that the contents and form of judicial activities cannot avoid being subordinated to political class aims and strivings."

Court decisions as judicial precedents are very dubious under Soviet law. Sometimes the constitution and the statutory provisions as well as the discussions of Soviet jurists are difficult to reconcile with actual practice.

AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY IN A FREE LAND VERSUS A CONTROLLED JUDICIARY IN A LAND UNDER A DICTATORSHIP

Here, then gentlemen, is the heart of our discussion. We in this land are striving to maintain a strong, liberty-loving, independent judiciary—a judiciary which can serve as a bulwark in the preservation of the freedoms of our citizens, a judiciary which can serve to protect us from any unwarranted assumption of power by the legislative branch or a strong executive, a judiciary which can maintain inviolate those rights and those privileges which are guaranteed to us under the Constitution.

In other lands these guarantees and these rights and these privileges and these freedoms do not exist. They do not exist because there is no independent judiciary to maintain them. They do not exist because the judiciary in other lands have become slavishly subservient to the executive branch of government, and because justice has been sandbagged into oblivion.

The world struggle today is a struggle for survival. It is a struggle between philosophies; a struggle between ideas; a struggle between ideals; it is a struggle between government by law and government by men.

Freedom will disappear unless those who enjoy it possess a living, dynamic sense of responsibility. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

PROPOSED CONFERENCE WITH STALIN

Recently, there appeared in the St. Louis Post Dispatch a stimulating editorial, stressing the need for making an additional attempt to get to an understanding basis with Joseph Stalin. As you know, there are those in America who feel that such an attempt would be useless; that we are dealing with the same type of mentality that Hitler possessed at the time of Munich. On the other hand, I believe that nothing could be lost by seeking to pry open that "wall of partition" that seems to exist between us.

I have stressed this idea on numerous occasions, and why? Because to a large extent, war settles nothing. The suggestion contained in the editorial was that General Eisenhower is the man who might do the job, who might serve to prevent a terrible conflict. No American is unaware of the world situation and the tremendous success that the leaders of Russia have had in taking over territories and peoples since the fighting war stopped. Of course, the conference that I propose does not mean that we should fail in any way to take adequate defense steps to preserve this country from any military eventuality.

It does mean that as a people which represents the highest attainment, industrially, economically, politically, and, we trust, spiritually, that we are aware—fully aware—of what another world war would mean and that every possible avenue to avert war must be explored.

We do not contemplate appeasement, nor do we contemplate securing mere written promises or agreements which the Russians have proved they can violate at will. What we are asking are actions—constructive actions—on the part of the Russians to demonstrate that they have the will, the intent, and the purpose for peace, and not mere words or pious pledges which they can violate.

I am satisfied that the American people—the common people, whom Lincoln said God Almighty must have loved because He made so many of them—have a real grasp on the situation and want their public servants to proceed with caution and yet with understanding (which means with their eyes open), with candor and frankness and without hate. The people of America know that we are living in a new world, because of the vast new continents of forces and discoveries which have been brought into human ken. They know that many of the

rules and procedures and landmarks of yesterday have no application to the world of today and tomorrow. Yet, they know that there are landmarks—spiritual landmarks—love, brotherhood, charity, human freedom—that remain and must be perpetuated if the race is to go forward. I say that our people know this and they have demonstrated it through their benevolent actions since the shooting stopped, by aid and comfort to the people of Europe and Asia—aid and comfort that measures in dollars, spent and contemplated, the sum of approximately $30,000,000,000.

CONCLUSION

It is the hope and prayer of all of us that our deeds will open the eyes of the blind who still live in a world of mental and spiritual darkness, who still think that the doctrines of Marx and Lenin—the doctrines of materialism are more potent than the ideas of the spirit. It is these factors that make this age so challenging for all of us, an age of great adventure, if we make it such, an age of truly great accomplishment, if we perform adequately the job before us. We know that in our pursuit of making this world a better world, that it can't be accomplished simply by our material largesse, but we must give of ourselves—meaning, giving ideas of political freedom, economic opportunity, high living standards, and the spiritual concepts to which we are heir. Only thus can we break down this wall of partition and achieve understanding between these two great peoples.

Shipments to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shipments to Russia," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of March 24. This editorial very pointedly expresses my own views with reference to shipments to Russia and the inconsistent policies of the Administration which make such shipments possible.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA

The inconsistency and outright asininity of the procedure of the Truman administration in dealing with Russia is beyond comprehension. One day the administration warns against Russian aggression and urges Congress to take special steps to meet a growing emergency, and the next day it provides Russia with the very materials needed to carry out those aggressive purposes.

For a long time the administration has clung senselessly to a program of dismantling German industry and shipping part of it to Russia and Soviet-dominated countries. This program is justified, against the widespread protests of American Congressmen, on the ground that it is required by agreements that Russia has long ago repudiated as it served her purposes.

The dismantling program in Germany is senseless enough. But even more senseless is the continued shipment from the United States to Russia of materials useful for war purposes. Amtorg agents roam over the United States buying up all manner of military and industrial materials, including aircraft engines and parts, and other supplies for war production plants.

One would have thought that we had learned our lesson before World War II, when Jap ships were allowed to continue buying scrap iron and other materials that were used later to shoot at our own boys. But it seems the administration learned nothing, and insists on continuing today the same crazy program with the Russians.

The latest instance is the loading of the 10,000-ton Russian freighter *Chukotka* at Jersey City on Monday, where work was delayed for 6 hours out of respect by longshoremen for picket lines formed by a veterans' organization. This ship, according to Representative WEICHEL, of Ohio, chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, was being loaded with $282,000 worth of industrial machinery. Included in the cargo were tractors, farm and industrial machinery, and automotive parts. Why in the name of common sense is this thing allowed?

The administration has been given power to stop these exports. Why hasn't it used that power? The lame excuse given by the Commerce Department is that the door will be closed, but that it is necessary that goods that are on the way to the ports shall not be stopped. Why can't they be stopped? Is this just some more buncombe like the story some time ago that the dismantling of German industry would be stopped, when it was not stopped?

It is time this Nation woke up and demanded an end to this procedure. It is time Congress demanded that the authority given the administration to control exports shall be used sensibly and in line with American interests. On Monday two other Soviet ships were berthed at United States ports for repairs. What are they doing here? The administration clung so long to a policy of appeasement toward Russia that it seems incapable of dropping that attitude, even at the moment that it declares Russia to be a menace to the peace of the world and the security of the United States.

The Case of the Navajos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last winter there was a great deal of publicity concerning the plight of the Navajo Indians. A group of thoughtful Albuquerque citizens requested Mr. E. L. Moulton, a prominent businessman and outstanding citizen of my State, to make a study and survey of the Navajo problem. Mr. Moulton has lived in New Mexico for many years and he is thoroughly familiar with all the conditions. He is familiar with the industries and the people of New Mexico. He made such a study, and has written an article dealing with the Navajo problem. I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Moulton be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have submitted the article to the Public Printer and have obtained an estimate of the cost of printing it. The estimated cost is $236.67.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMAZING PROPAGANDA—THE CASE OF THE NAVAJOS

(By E. L. Moulton)

The traveler in the seat beside me had the undeniable look of a man who had journeyed far. This interesting stranger had already confideded that he had been in Government service in India, and had flown back to visit his family in the States. As we sped along on the Chief I proudly drew his attention to the mesas and mountains of my own New Mexico as the beautiful landscapes moved past the train windows. He looked at it all for a moment and said, "Isn't New Mexico the place where all of the Navajo Indians are starving to death?" I replied, "You have just come from India. Where did you get that startling story?" To this he answered: "I read it not 3 days ago in a newspaper in Bombay, and day before yesterday I read the same thing in a New York paper. Both papers said the Navajos were freezing to death and starving to death; that the snow was several feet deep, and attempts were being made to drop food to the Indians from aeroplanes." Here it was again, the same fantastic story, and this time from India.

With practically no foundation in fact, it seems incredible that a nation and even the world could so quickly be swept by mass hysteria. In practically no time at all, New Mexico and Arizona were pictured as desert wastes where thousands and thousands of Indians woke up one morning and found themselves starving and freezing to death. According to press reports, all the way from Time magazine to the Communist Daily Worker, the Indians were destitute, were naked, and lying in the snow, had no food nor water nor medical care. The reports stated also that where the sheep had formerly grazed, now there was only a desert waste; that it had not rained for several years and the grass was all gone and erosion was carrying the red soil into Boulder Dam. And Time and sensational newspapers had pictures to prove it all. It was awful, they said. It even dwarfed the starving that was going on in Europe.

And immediately—right now—certain foodstuffs, cast-off clothing, and some money started to roll to Navajoland. The newspapers continued the starving song, the radios blared the same messages, and generous-hearted America responded. Soon truckloads and even trainloads were reported on the way.

As to the Navajo Indians, none has ever starved or frozen to death unless one became lost. And, according to the white men and women who live on the reservation, who are interested in the Indians' welfare and who are the Indians' very best friends, the Indians, instead of suddenly starving and freezing to death, are better off than they ever have been. And most of the Indians say the same thing. So why all this hysteria which has swept the country? It was puzzling to those who lived closest to the situation.

All kinds of organizations, particularly the General Federation of Women's Clubs of America, service clubs, and churches worked out quotas of food and clothing to be gathered and assembled for transportation to the reservation. America was again rushing to the rescue.

Finally, at the height of the emotional surge, some people who knew most about the condition of the Indians spoke up and thus took the edge off the hysteria. Among these was a Mrs. Arthur Newcomb, who had lived at a trading post of her husband's in the Navajo country for over 25 years. She had been chairman of the State Indian affairs

committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of America. Another was Dr. C. G. Salsbury, of the Ganado Mission, a Presbyterian school and hospital at Ganado, Ariz.

Mrs. Newcomb's statements were rather incorrectly reported by the press. But the readers learned from her that the scare stories were greatly exaggerated. She had lived there on the reservation for a long time. She has a most sympathetic interest in the Indians. Prior to her statement she had made a 1,000 mile trip over the reservation and spoke with clear knowledge of the situation. Dr. Salsbury, of the Ganado Mission, gave the press prepared statements. He spoke with authority. Twenty years among the Navajos had given him a perspective which few others had. With the aid of his church he had built a fine mission, an excellent vocational and training school and a first-class hospital. He completely refuted the statements regarding starvation and freezing. He said the only hungry people out there that he knew of were the hungry bureaucrats waiting for additional hand-outs from Washington. He went so far as to urge the complete abolition of the Indian Bureau. Other thoughtful students of the problem agree with him.

During the fall of last year, at the very peak of the hue and cry to save the Navajos from oblivion, a group of thoughtful men of Albuquerque suggested that the writer go to view conditions on the reservation, himself. The mission was to discover the real basis, if there was one, of the alarming stories about the Navajos.

During January of this year—the worst part of the winter—I made this special trip with an Indian trader who had spent more than 30 years of his life on the reservation. He spoke the language of the Navajos quite fluently and had personal acquaintances over the entire route we traveled. Being an official of the Indian trader's association, he knew practically all of the traders on the reservation. There are 106 in all. We called on about 20 of them.

I did not want to rely on the usual sources for information. I wanted to go into the hogans, or homes of the Navajos, to see if they were more uninhabitable than the pioneer home I had lived in myself in the north woods of Michigan when I was a boy. I wanted to see what they had to eat, what they wore and how they looked at their worst in those hogans. Then I wanted to see where they located those hogans, and why. Again, I wanted to try to find out why these primitive people loved so well those so-called barren lands. Also I wanted to see the ranges to learn whether there was any grass or not. I have been a sheepman most of my life, and after nearly 40 years of prayerful search for grass, I flatter myself that that is something I know considerable about. Also I wanted to see the sheep. I wanted to learn if they were dying of starvation for lack of grass. I wanted to learn also from the traders how they regard the charged plight of the Navajos, and also to learn, if possible, the relation of those Indians to those traders. And, finally, I wanted to see and learn about, if I could, the set-up of the Indian service itself at Window Rock, Ariz. If the Indians were destitute and starving, then I might be able to make some small contribution to their welfare.

I did not check the health question of the Navajos, except very lightly, for that subject was assigned to a medical man who is to take cognizance of that special question. I confined my study rather to the economy of the area, to the economic prospects of the Navajo, and the influence of the governmental policies on their welfare. I wanted to check the question of population and school facilities. For generally when you ask an alarmist, who is telling about the "starvation," how he proposes to remedy the situation, almost invariably he will say "schools and hospitals" are the answers, as if those things could satisfy a gnawing stomach.

At the outset it might be well to review briefly the historical background of the Navajo and to learn how they became wards of the Government. Very briefly it is as follows:

The Navajos are recent comers into the Southwest. Their language clearly indicates that they came from the North. Close relatives of the Navajos are the Indians of Alaska, along the Yukon River. When the Spaniards first contacted the Navajo Tribe, these Indians were small in number and lived almost entirely in what is now New Mexico.

The "Navabos," as they were then called, were, according to these earliest accounts, scattered, not particularly warlike, and of no special importance in the scene of early peoples of the Southwest. It was only later when they had derived agriculture and a knowledge of weaving from their neighbors, the Pueblos, that the Navajos began to settle down and achieve some solidarity. It was their stealing of cattle and sheep from the more sedentary occupants of the area that brought them to the notice of the larger populations.

When the Spaniards came to this country with horses, sheep, cattle, and dogs, the Navajos found that it was easier to forage for their living than to earn it by the sweat of their brow. These Indians would raid Spanish villages and the valley Pueblos and then ride away on their horses, taking corn and other food, and even abducting humans as slaves. This was easy and exciting and lasted for about 300 years.

It came to an end, finally, when the United States Government, in order to protect the pack trains of settlers and pioneers going further West, sent soldiers to subdue them. Gen. Kit Carson led the small army which destroyed their homes and crops and sheep. Recognizing this superior force, the Navajos surrendered in 1864, and between 7,000 and 8,000 of them were rounded up and taken to Bosque Redondo, near Fort Sumner, N. Mex. There they were located on good land susceptible of irrigation.

The Navajos, however, were very unhappy at Bosque Redondo and continuously pleaded to be permitted to return to their colorful lands of Arizona and northwest New Mexico. Finally, in 1868, they signed a treaty with the United States of America and returned to their homeland.

As treaties always do, this treaty with the Navajos provided many things. I name a few:

Article I: Each party pledges its honor to forever keep peace.

Article II: It provides for a reservation to be set apart for the use and occupancy of the Navajos forever, and upon which no person shall trespass without express authority of the Government.

Article VI: Provides for educational advantages, "especially of such of them as may be settled on the agricultural parts of the reservation." The Indians pledge themselves to "compel their children between the ages of 6 and 16 to attend school, and the Government for its part agrees to furnish a building for each 30 children between said ages who can be induced or compelled to attend school." Also a teacher competent to teach the elementary grades in English shall be furnished.

There were other important provisions, particularly the one providing that none of the land ceded shall be taken from them unless agreed to by at least three-fourths of all the adult male Indians occupying the same. The Indians also agreed not to steal and carry off white women or children, nor scalp white men any more.

This treaty of 1868 marked an unprecedented change in a human. From marauding, outlaw bands these Navajos changed almost overnight into one of the most peaceful and law-abiding groups in the world. The respect with which the Navajo people hold the memory of Kit Carson and his army, without bitterness, attests the true character of that race.

Eighty years have now passed since the signing of that treaty. And, in spite of charged neglect, he, the Navajo, has thrived in many ways. It is unnecessary to follow in detail what has transpired in those 80 years. We are considering the Navajo of today. Has the faith which the Navajo has kept with the white fathers only led the Indians to starvation and oblivion?

There has been recurring criticism of Indian administration. Some said it was expensive compared to the number of Indians administered. Others said it was inept or even corrupt. Scarcely a single observer or investigator ever gave the Indian Service any credit. From my personal observation, over many years, I believe many of these administrators have been conscientious, and much of their policy sound. However, the Indians chafed under much of this governmentalism, but the general public gave scant heed. There was seldom a story.

Finally some bright innovator with a flair for publicity hit upon a slogan that struck fire. It was properly timed—the approach of winter. The slogan was, "The Navajos Are Starving and Freezing to Death." It spread over the United States like wildfire. It would seem, too, that it was eagerly seized upon in Europe and Russia for propaganda against us.

In a few short weeks the Navajo story had been eagerly accepted by the American public. This emotionalism resulted in many misconceptions, mounds of cast-off clothing, and much assorted foods.

Politics of a very vicious kind entered into the relief problem on the Navajo Reservation. For a long time the Government has issued relief checks of $5 to $6 per month for the blind and disabled old people. We were told by many traders that this, together with food given them by relatives or friends kept them going quite well. A trader at Ganado pointed out to us two women in his store who were receiving these checks. The checks had just come in to him for distribution. We saw them. In November, after the big starvation scare the Red Cross also made available funds for that class of needy. But the amount was upped from $5 or $6 to about $20. The trader told us that the two old women he had pointed out to us were depositing that extra money with him because the $5 and $6 checks were sufficient for their needs.

Since this extra relief money is coming in from the Government, occasionally a large check in lump sum is sent to a local leader or supervisor for distribution to the needy. A trader told us how it is done by a local politico who has job aspirations. In fact, he wants to become the chief of the council.

On an appointed day he was to make distribution to the needy of that district. He came to the trading post. It was full of children and women. The politico would tap a boy and say, "You hungry?" The boy would say "Yes," and the boss would say, "O. K., here is $2." To a girl or woman he would ask, "Are you sick?" Receiving an affirmative answer he would say, "Here is $2." Then he might ask, "Is your aunt blind? O. K., here is $2." And so, on around. And when each was given about $2, he would show his bulging pockets with much more money, as if to say, "Well, the election is coming pretty soon and maybe you vote for me?" The trader predicts that that fellow very likely will become the chief of the council.

At the Government headquarters at Window Rock we saw and conversed with several Indian officials, among them being the public relations man of the Government and the livestock adviser. These men said they knew of no starving Indians, but did mention some suffering. They said also that the restricted

carrying capacity of the reservation was 585,000 sheep units. They thought it would carry more. A reservation official's wife told us especially of the fantastic clothing sent in, with which the Indians would have nothing to do. She was incensed over the whole thing and said she just detested the word "relief."

At the Government mess hall at Window Rock we met a man named E. F. Rentfrow, field man for United States Railroad Retirement Board. He had brought from Gallup in his car a pair of Life magazine photographers and writers. He said the latter were working up a story of the wonderful things the Red Cross had done to save the starving Navajos.

The Red Cross had at that time put out about $68,000. Mr. Rentfrow was trying to draw Life's men's attention to what the railroad unemployment fund was also providing. But they were not interested. That had no news value, they intimated. But the Red Cross—that is different, because the Red Cross always follows on the track of disaster. And, they were there to take pictures of how the Red Cross had saved the tribe.

Mr. Rentfrow advised us that under this railway unemployment plan of the Railroad Retirement Board the Navajo Indians in December received 2,200 checks totaling over $100,000. In January the payments amounted to $135,000. The plan is one under which all railroad employees are eligible after a certain term of employment.

As an example, suppose a Navajo worked 6 months on the railroad in 1947 and earned $1,000. Really he would earn more than that. Then, if there were no work the coming winter, or during a slack period, the Indian would receive $3 per day for 130 days while he is unemployed, to be paid within a period of 189 days. He must work only long enough to earn $150 in a given year to qualify for compensation the following year.

The large sums received by the Navajos in December and January attest the generosity and value of the plan. The payments for February, according to the regional office of the Railroad Retirement Board in Denver were about $125,000. Like amounts will be paid in March and April. The total unemployment compensation that the Navajos will receive between November 15, 1947, and May 1, 1948, is estimated at nearly $900,000, or nearly twice the amount of the emergency relief appropriation made by Congress last winter on account of the distress stories put out.

For fully 7 months of the year the Santa Fe, D. & R. G., and the Union Pacific Railroads can, and do, employ several thousand Indians. The roads like them. Right now, according to the Denver office of the Railroad Retirement Board, which also is the employment agency for the railroads of this region, there are on file requests for 7,000 Indians for railroad work. Should they average only 4 months of work each year (many do not stay that long) they would earn $5,500,000 during the year, as well as receive large unemployment payments during the midwinter months following when work is slack.

The board thinks there definitely isn't any reason why at least 10,000 of the able-bodied Navajos could not work in the railroad industry for at least 7 months of each year. All too often, however, the Indian does not take home as much as he should. It is being urged now that an attempt be made to arrange with the railroads to withhold from the Indians' wages a goodly portion of same for their dependents. At present from 20 to 80 percent of their compensation is sent home or taken home.

Most certainly the railroads offer opportunities for large numbers of able-bodied Indians at very good wages—and with annuity benefits on account of age or disability, as well as death benefits and widow and survivor benefits. We may well say that there is no disgrace in working on a railroad, particularly under such favorable conditions. However, since the indiscriminate relief program of this winter went into effect, the Retirement Board says it is practically impossible to get the men that can be used right now.

In recent months several magazines and many newspapers have published sensational articles about the Navajos. Also they have used faked pictures. One paper sent out its photographer to get shots of the Indians freezing. Near a trading post we visited, this photographer went out under the trees and scraped up some snow, because in spite of the stories of Indians wallowing in the snow, only a thin skiff had fallen. The photographer piled it up and then got some Indians to stand in it while he shot his pictures.

Another photographer took some pictures inside a trading post. He required that an Indian boy take off his shoes, because the story said they were without shoes. The February issue of Look magazine had an article by Will Rogers, Jr., at the head of which was a picture of an almost naked youngster standing in the snow. Some newspapers showed the same picture. On the face of it the picture is spurious. The so-called "starving" child is as fat as a butter ball. She was virtually stripped, but did hang onto the silver bracelet on her arm which could be sold or pawned for enough to buy warm underwear and velveteen for a dress. However, no Indian child ever stands out in the weather like that. Their hogans are always warm and the Indians have an abundance of fuel.

The wave of public emotion over the supposed destitution of the Navajos has been fostered by gross inaccuracies and some deliberate falsehoods. Here are some cases in point:

For several months an attorney from Washington, formerly in the Attorney General's office, has been on the reservation representing the Indians in their claims against the Federal Government, principally land claims. It is a legitimate and laudable assignment.

However, in a public address near the Reservation, this attorney charged a nearby city with gross municipal neglect because some Indians came off the reservation, became intoxicated, and were beaten up in fights. He threatened the city with national disgrace, or worse. Then he launched into a tirade about the horrible conditions on the reservation, which he could not charge against the city where he spoke, but against his erstwhile employer, Uncle Sam. He also said the Indians were starving. Specifically he said that 800 out of every 1,000 had tuberculosis and that infant mortality was seven times the national average.

As pointed out by that attorney, which follows the line used by most people who write such articles or make talks about the plight of the Navajos, the health situation is most terrible. Except for venereal disease, which is of rather recent incidence, the claim is made that health conditions have always been very bad. However, Government statistics, as well as those used by the alarmists themselves, hardly bear out the claim of excessive death from disease.

In 1868, when the treaty was made with the Navajos and they were returned from Basque Redondo, the Government reported that there were from 6,000 to 8,000 of them. In 1947 it was claimed that the total population was from 55,000 to 60,000. Probably the lower figure is nearest the number. Using a median figure, we may say that the tribe increased since 1868 from 7,000 to 56,000, or an eight-fold increase.

What about the balance of the United States? In 1870, nearest census date to 1868, the population of the United States was a little less than 40,000,000. Right now it is estimated at some over 140,000,000, or a gain of 3½ fold as compared with 8 fold for the Navajos. If there were a number of stragglers among the Navajos which the Army didn't take to Bosque Redondo in 1864, we have only to remind ourselves that between 1870 and 1947 several million white immigrants from Europe and elsewhere came into this broad land of ours.

Can one say that an ignorant, starving, and diseased people, as claimed, will increase in number in a given period seven or eight fold, while a virile, well-fed, and intelligent group can show a gain of only half as much or less? It is incredible that the Indian is that much better a progenitor. We believe the answer is that the population is less than claimed, probably not more than 40,000 or 45,000. Even at these figures, it doesn't appear that they are dying like flies.

Health conditions may be bad out there. I am not a doctor, although having lived a pioneer life I am accustomed to observing health conditions. On the reservation I was in a large number of hogans and I saw no signs of sickness. I heard not a single sniffle nor evidence of cold. I know there must be disease, but it is not very apparent.

Mrs. Arthur Newcomb, already mentioned, told us that for a number of years she was chairman of the State Indian Committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of America. A woman doctor from the United States Health Service inspected the Navajos' homes with Mrs. Newcomb. These typical Navajo hogans are octagonal in shape with a 2½- to 3-foot square opening in the dome to let out the smoke. The fire is built in a pit in the center of the room. The floor is of hard earth, usually bare.

The health service doctor, with Mrs. Newcomb, also examined some more nearly modern homes, which were square or rectangular log houses, in which a cook stove is sometimes used. This modern home is not nearly as sanitary as the old-fashioned hogan, the health service authority declared.

How the Indians regard hogans is illustrated in the life of Chee Dodge, a famous and well-to-do mixed-blood Indian. Chee had a large number of sheep and had accumulated a considerable fortune. He spoke English well and had many white-man friends. Some of these prevailed upon him to build himself a good home out near Crystal, N. Mex., where he had his sheep. This home was modern, with plumbing and heating facilities.

With some of Chee's acquaintances, I visited him about 20 years ago. He had a very attractive place but he didn't live there. He spent his waking hours and slept in a hogan which he had built for himself and his family a few hundreds yards from his modern home.

Apparently the greatest problem of the Navajo is to convince the white man that it is not essential that the Indian adopt all of our customs and habits. Whenever he tries it, either in homes or drinking, he suffers.

One of the bitterest complaints of the brash young attorney from Washington, already referred to, was regarding the stock-reduction program of the Government. He said that the Government Indian Service had wantonly destroyed the Navajo economy. He told the harrowing tale of when they, the Government, in 1934 took 1,000 goats out and shot them. "Would to God," he cried, "that those poor starving people had that goat meat now." When the young man was reminded later that in the same year 100,000 of the best sheep of New Mexico and about 25,000 cattle were also shot or otherwise killed, his jaw dropped. It was all done for the same reason. There was not enough grass for all the stock; there was very little, if any, sale for the animals, so part of the herds were destroyed to save the balance.

There are conflicting reports about range conditions on the reservation now. The extremists say there "ain't no grass." Recent

magazine writers have stated the grass is gone and the soil is washing down the Colorado River. At the same time, they condemn the Government for reducing the herds. The two viewpoints are irreconcilable. If there were no grass, the livestock must go.

Others say the range is good, but not enough sheep are permitted. The fact is that the ranges of the Navajo Reservation are in excellent condition now, and the sheep and cattle are in the best of flesh. The good range is due to a certain extent to a reduction in numbers of stock, but more particularly to the extra amount of rainfall the last season.

However, I know by long experience in the livestock business that no man can tell in advance just how much stock a given range will support. Because no one can foretell the rainfall. So the only safe course to pursue is to bend over backward in conservatism. The white-man ranchers of New Mexico and the other range States have definitely learned this. We have found out that we can make more money on a given range with a little more than half the stock that we used to run. The Indian is doing the same thing. A number of years ago the Navajos had poor lambings and 45- to 50-pound lambs at market time; whereas now they have good crops of lambs which are weighing 60 to 65 pounds or more. There has been a corresponding gain in the wool clip.

The sheep population is now about one-half of what it was a few years ago. The same thing is true of the white man's sheep of New Mexico. The reason of each is about the same. There was necessary reduction, but more important were the extremely high prices which have induced both white man and Indian to sell his ewe lambs. The writer did this very thing. This results in rapid diminishing of the herds.

Our friends, the alarmists, point out the terribly low per capita income of the Navajos and compare it with that of the balance of the country. Time and again we have read that figure of $82 per capita per year for the Navajo as against about $800 for the national figure. Again they falsify. Because the figures of 1940 are used for the Indian, but 1944 for the balance of the country. In 1944 the per capita income of the Indian was a little over $200 instead of $82 as stated. Considering the vast difference in the mode of living of the Indian, $200 per capita means no starvation. In fact, it is affluence. He has no fuel or water bills; no rent or taxes—only food and clothing to buy.

Probably the gravest criticism that is leveled at the Indian Service, at the Government itself, and even at the people of the United States, is our charged gross neglect of the Navajo Tribe in the question of education and educational facilities.

Nearly every critic invokes the treaty of 1868 to prove that we have grossly violated our solemn pledge to provide every 30 Navajo children between the ages of 5 and 19 with a schoolroom and teacher, and it is stated over and over again that whereas there are 22,500 children of school age—Rogers and many others put it at 24,000—provision is made for only 5,000 to 6,000, leaving about 16,000 to 18,000 without school. This, in our society, which is now so education conscious, is the crowning indictment of all.

However, the claims of the critics of the school system as to numbers of school ages are obviously false. The total population can't possibly be more than 56,000 at the most. Then, if there are 24,000 of school age, as claimed, over 40 percent of the total population must be included. It can't possibly be true because the school-age census for New Mexico, which includes our prolific Spanish-American population, is about 23 percent of the total population. Moreover, the school census for New Mexico consists of all between the ages of 5 and 18 years, inclusive, instead of ages 6 to 16, as provided by the treaty with the Navajos. On the New Mexico basis of 23 percent of the population, there would be, on the basis of the treaty, about 10,000 Navajo children for whom to provide schools instead of 22,500 to 24,000, as claimed by the extremists. Other extremists attempt to prove their claims of 24,000 of school age by saying that 67 percent of the total population, or 37,500, are under 25 years of age; that they die young. If there are 24,000 between ages 6 and 16, then there must be at least 11,000 under 6. So we would have a total of 35,000 between birth and 16. On that basis there would be only 2,500 between 16 and 25. The statement is preposterous.

A recent survey by the Indian Service showed that 8,100 of the Navajo children were in school instead of 5,000 to 6,000. This is about 80 percent of all of school age per the treaty. Incidentally, in New Mexico, which has an excellent school system and facilities, only 75 percent of the pupils of school age are in daily attendance.

The sensational claims of the growth in population, as well as the impossible claims of the number of school age, typify the careless and untruthful statements that are made about many things regarding the Navajo Tribe.

The Indian lives a very simple life. But can we say that it is not quite adequate so long as there is food? The balance he can quite easily provide. He pitches his hogan in a spot accessible to firewood and usually not far from water. He never lacks for fuel, has a very comfortable home, and does not miss so many of the things we have. But isn't it definitely true that thinking white people realize that our own civilization is entirely too complex; that we are nearly all under too terrific a strain as we attempt to meet our social and civic responsibilities, and our cultural needs. We have evolved a highly competitive life in which we attempt to build up a security for the future that we rarely secure or enjoy. Why must we feel hysterical, then, when the Navajo has escaped the main rigors of such doubtful blessings?

Very few of the sensational writers make any pretense of offering real proposals for the betterment of the Navajos. Some say schooling is the answer; others say the developing of an $80,000,000 irrigation project out of the San Juan River, which would provide homes for 2,500 extra families is the answer. They forget, or do not know, that 10,000 white families along the Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico have been clamoring, without success, for a like appropriation for years. But most of the alarmists say a reorganization of the Indian Bureau or its abolition is the answer. There is grave suspicion that many of such are in hopes of being in on the reorganization themselves. Possibly they are the ones who started the emotionalism.

The over-all problem of the Navajo is the same over-all problem that has faced the white man in America for a great many years. Sixty years ago one-half of the population of the United States was engaged in an agricultural economy. The need for people on the farm has declined until today only about 16 percent of the total population is engaged in agriculture. Therefore, many of us left the farms and did other things. The Navajo must make some form of adjustment also, and is doing so. We can help him. But the do-gooders who prefer to keep him on the reservation to make a museum piece out of him will not let him become practical as other peoples have, and are in his way.

The greater responsibility we can place on the Indian himself the sooner he will become a free citizen. He must learn by hard knocks, not be treated like a child. We brag of the fine work he did during the war. If he was self-reliant then, as all testify, then most certainly he can find his way around in civil life now.

The Navajos' rudimentary education has not been neglected entirely as claimed. Fully 75 percent of them, according to traders and well-informed persons, can speak English. Probably a majority of them speak three languages, which includes Spanish. Perhaps 50 percent have a fair education in other respects, which might fit them for a niche in society. There are large areas of our southern States which do not have as high an incidence of education and literacy as the much lamented Navajo Indian. And of real importance to him in being assimilated into the white man's life, there is practically no race discrimination against him.

All honest students recognize the deep love of the Navajo for his family and his native land. Also we know that he does not like to work continuously, and so far has little desire to accumulate wealth. The ideal condition for the Navajo, then, is his ability to secure work or the reservation, or not to exceed 75 to 100 miles distant. During the war about 2,500 of them worked at nearby Fort Wingate and were content because they could take time off frequently and go to the reservation for a "sing" or to visit. Others found work on the railroads.

All of this indicates that in addition to railroad work some type of industry adjacent to the reservation, at places like Winslow, Farmington, Aztec, and Gallup would be ideal. And the industry should be private industry—not governmental. The Indian Bureau and Indian associations should not oppose industry nor restrict it, but should encourage it.

People who really know the reservation and its capacity estimate that about 80 to 90 percent of the Navajos are self-supporting right there in their homeland. That would mean that on the basis of a population of 56,000, about 45,000 are self-supporting on the reservation. That would leave about 11,000 who should be supported by outside work. However, that does not mean that the full 11,000 must have jobs. Normally only 35 percent of all of us, white or Indian, need be employed, or are employed. Thirty-five percent of 11,000 is 3,800. Therefore, on a basis of this analysis, occupation for about 3,800 Indians is all that is required. That is very simple.

We used to call people who were foolishly sentimental over Indians or others, "yearners." The recent hysteria over the poor Navajo was the greatest outburst of "yearnism" yet to disgrace our national self-esteem. Such waves of emotionalism have been too typical of us in the past. This one has done us real harm here and abroad. It is time we outgrew such follies. The Navajo Indian is a smart individual. We should treat him as such. The Indian should have the same protection under law as any other American, the same privileges, the same responsibilities, as much education as is practical, or he can acquire. In a generation or two, the Navajo would then become as good a citizen as he was a soldier during the war. And at some definite time in the future, he should be given full autonomy and cease to remain a ward of the Government.

Cooperation for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial entitled "Congress and the People Must Now Cooperate for World Peace," written by Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, and appearing in the May 1948 issue of that publication.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND THE PEOPLE MUST NOW COOPERATE FOR WORLD PEACE

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor)

(The American people have been stunned by a great danger—the danger of another world war. Can they not now be electrified by a great hope—a hope that by wise and prompt planning we cannot only (1) check Russian aggression now, but also (2) so strengthen UN (the United Nations organization) as to make it prevent aggression and war hereafter? This article is an appeal to Congress and our people to formulate and implement that great hope.)

Nearly every great crisis is a twofold opportunity. It may result either in great evil or great good.

The present world crisis is no exception to this rule. It may be allowed to drift into humanity's greatest war—or the opportunity may be so used as to organize the world for more durable and lasting peace than it has ever before known. Which shall it be?

The answer to this question is largely up to the Congress of the United States. Our 96 Senators and 437 Members of our House of Representatives have come to their supreme hour. Only they can reassure a troubled Nation with a clarion call for so organizing the nations as to safeguard world peace. As we said in the concluding paragraph on this page last month:

"Once again here in 1948 humanity has a choice to make. Perhaps all our present tribulations may prove to be not just the death pangs of a world order that was cursed by war, imperialism, and want. Perhaps they may yet be recognized as the birth pangs of a new and nobler order that will give to all mankind under the United Nations a security and happiness never known before and a realization of 'the four freedoms' for which so many died—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, freedom from fear."

NEW CONDITIONS REQUIRE UN ACTION

Instead of a negative policy, America needs a positive policy. Instead of a policy of fear, a policy of hope. Instead of stopping with magnificently thorough plans for mobilizing America against possible war, we need some magnificent statesmanship to organize the whole world for peace. Our present problem is not one merely of stopping criminal aggression such as Russia has been guilty of. It ought to be and must be stopped. But our supreme need is not just (1) to halt it (maybe temporarily and ineffectively) by this and that nation acting together for the time being—but (2) also to develop an organization of nations that should throw the combined power of all countries against all such aggression in future. We grant that the United Nations cannot now do so. But Congress can give all America and all the world new hope if it will at once take some heroic action to give the United Nations power to prevent such aggression and war in future.

We repeat that it is in Congress that the people must evidently place their hopes if we are to have such a constructive program for world peace and hope. To the question, "Are other departments of Government—diplomatic, military, executive—using or bypassing the United Nations?" we see no answer except to say that they are too largely bypassing it. While giving UN occasional mention, their repeated emphasis is on force and war—on preparation for war—as the best guaranties of peace. That they do so honestly, we do not question. That they do so wisely, we question very much.

For generations military men have thought of force and military might as the one way to answer a threat of war * * * and of military victory in case of war as their supreme objective. But their present need is to rethink their problems in terms of the new age in which we live. Two truths are inescapable:

1. There is no isolation in modern warfare. Air power ignores all boundaries and all oceans.

2. There are no victors in modern warfare. War ruins victor and vanquished alike. Look at England today. Only recently the world's greatest and richest nation, it has been a victor in the world's two greatest wars—yet has become bankrupt and a virtual poorhouse. Another world war, even if America should win it, might leave America almost equally bad off.

What troubles America today, let us reiterate, is this: That our President, our diplomats, our military men do not present any great national plan for strengthening the United Nations while proposing incalculable billions for new military expenditures here and abroad. "But these are old, old pleas," the people say, "and all too often have ended only in war and ruin. Where are America's voices of faith and hope? Where are the men of leadership and statesmanship who can meet constructively the challenge of a new world in a new crisis?"

NO PEACE WITHOUT WORLD ORGANIZATION

The Congress seems America's one hope. Nobody who reads history can believe that world peace can be preserved by our Nation merely joining first with one nation and then another in opposition to some other nation or group of nations. As we said over and over again in all the years from 1919 to 1941 as we pleaded for some form of United Nations to prevent World War II—

What is the only way to preserve peace between persons? It is by having courts to settle this differences—and courts backed with power to enforce their decisions. What is the only way to preseve peace between nations? It is to have some kind of supreme court of nations with police power to enforce its decisions.

Fortunately both the American people and our American Congress are showing signs of their realization of the three supreme facts that confront us—

1. Some kind of world government with power to prevent aggression and war must ultimately be established.

2. The sooner this is done the better for all humanity.

3. It is much wiser and more practicable to strengthen and improve the present United Nations organization rather than try to establish a brand new such organization. In a recent Gallup poll American citizens voted overwhelmingly for such a policy.

CONGRESS MOVES TO REVISE UN

All through this article we have said that Congress needs to act. The great good news is that action has now begun and should be pushed to final success. Two able groups (composed equally of Democratic and Republican Senators and Representatives) have sponsored an official declaration by both Houses of Congress calling for a convention of all the countries to revise and strengthen the United Nations Charter. The declared aim is "that the United Nations organization shall be able to fulfill its stated mission as the principal and most effective instrument for world peace * * * strong enough to guarantee any member nation, however large or small and whatever its form of government, against armed violence by any other nation." Other specific provisions are:

1. The revision shall preserve the full sovereignty of member states except for acts of aggression and armament for aggression * * * and there shall be no veto in cases involving aggression.

2. There shall be a World Court with power to judge in specific matters dealing with aggression of both governments and individuals.

3. The official United States proposal for an Atomic Development Authority shall be adopted; the making of war munitions shall be reduced and controlled and international inspection of armament guaranteed; an effective world police force maintained.

4. If any nation refuses to support such a program for world peace, the other nations shall nevertheless go ahead with this program, but leave the door open for the other nation to come in at any time.

What America now needs is to have the entire membership of both House and Senate and all peace-loving Americans rally around such a program as is here presented. That it may be improved in detail no one will deny. But it does propose an American program for peace preparedness as far-reaching as our program for military preparedness. It is a great voice of hope. It is a declaration that men are not the blind victims of a fate leading them on to inevitable war. It declares rather that in the minds and souls of American men and women we have the qualities to meet and solve the supreme crisis of our times * * * and justify the faith of all the dead of two wars who died believing that out of their sacrifice would come a better world and a lasting peace.

The Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Postal Pay Bill," which appeared in the April 17, 1948, issue of the New York Journal and American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSTAL PAY BILL

The Civil Service Committee of the United States Senate has given its approval to a measure which, if finally adopted by the whole Congress and signed by the President, will increase the annual pay of each Federal postal worker by $800.

This would be a welcome addition to the income of the postal workers and certainly a well-earned one, but it will still leave the total annual pay of these essential Federal employees much less than adequate for the standards of living to which they are entitled.

The attitude of the Federal Government toward the pay of postal workers has long been not only niggardly but very strange and inconsistent, in view of the contrasting attitude the Goverment has often taken concerning the pay of workers in private employment, especially organized or unionized workers.

In several notable instances the most powerful figures in the Federal Government, including the President of the United States, have championed the cause of unions seeking higher pay from private employers, and

in all cases where Government agencies have served as arbitrators or mediators of such disputes the end product of Government intervention has been higher pay.

But when the Government itself has the employer's role, as in the case of the postal workers, it not only fails to see the justice or necessity of higher pay but persists in maintaining standards of pay that were actually below the levels of normal living before the war and are now insufficient to support the barest essentials of dignified and decent living.

In all cases in the recent past when Federal postal employees have had pay increases—and they went 20 years without any increase at all—they have been given reluctantly and only after overwhelming demonstrations of an approving public interest in the matter, and even then they have been woefully inadequate to serve the professed purpose of cost of living adjustment.

That will still be the case when the Congress has given its approval of the pending postal pay bill, as it seems likely to do—although an early summer adjournment might well defeat that intention, as has so often happened with similar legislation in the past.

The Congress again seems to be moving with extreme reluctance in the matter.

Even in the progress made thus far it has succeeded in emasculating the bill in a most indefensible and callous manner, by eliminating its retroactive provisions.

Obviously it will take another overwhelming demonstration of approving public interest to obtain final enactment of the postal pay increase measure, and in the meantime the loyal and efficient and indispensable postal workers and their families are compelled to maintain themselves and their homes according to a scale of living that is barely above the subsistence level.

The Congress should surely pass this helpful and deserved although still entirely inadequate bill for the increase of Federal postal pay, and it should not do so reluctantly as in the past but with recognition of the vital services to the country the postal workers perform with complete fulfillment of their patriotic responsibilities.

Doctors Advise United States Join World Health Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 19, 1948:

UNITED STATES URGED TO ENTER WORLD HEALTH GROUP

ASBURY PARK, N. J., April 18.—Urging prompt and aggressive action by Congress, the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry recommended today the ratification of the constitution of the World Health Organization. The action was taken at the closing session of the group's 3-day annual meeting.

Dr. William C. Menninger, chairman of the group, made public the resolution adopted by the entire membership of 150 physicians and psychiatrists, members of the American Medical Association and of the American Psychiatric Association.

The resolution endorsed the idea of health as formulated by the World Health Organization, as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. The belief was expressed that the achievement of health, thus defined, requires planning and other action of international scope and that the World Health Organization, as a permanent agency of the United Nations, is best fitted to accomplish these functions.

No indication was seen that United States participation would be detrimental to existing health services in this country. On the contrary, many of them would be enhanced, according to the group.

The Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, drawing its membership from American and Canadian specialists, was formed in May 1946, for the survey and study of various fields within and related to psychiatry.

Iowa Professor Derides Fear of Arab Military Might, Supports Jewish Claim to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the letters column of the Washington Evening Star of April 15. This is a letter bearing the name of Joseph Dunner, chairman of the political science department of Grinnell College, at Grinnell, Iowa. Dr. Dunner is widely known in the field of political science and economy, and, as he himself explains in this letter, he would never be accused of advocating American appeasement of the U. S. S. R.

WOULD LAUGH AT ARABS

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

As I write this letter the headlines of the press are carrying accounts of the fighting going on in the Holy Land. The British, whose task it would be to maintain law and order, seem to be decided to cow the Jewish population into submission, to break the power of the Jewish resistance movement and prevent illegal immigration of Jews to Palestine. Apparently, the men of the Foreign Office delude themselves into thinking that the appeasement of Arab leaders, like the notorious war criminal Haj Amin el Husseini, safeguards British oil interests in the Middle East and strengthens the lifeline of the Empire. From Mr. Austin's speech at Lake Success and remarks made by Secretary Forrestal, I take it that at least some of our policy makers are engaged in an attempt to copy the British example and to bring about a revocation of the position of our Government in the United Nations Assembly. Their excuse is the growing Soviet menace and the fear that Soviet Russia might use the partition of Palestine to intrench itself in the Middle East. For over 15 years—in my writings and lectures—I have warned against the imperialism and Red fascism of the Soviet Union. During the Second World War when our Government sacrificed Mikhailovich of Yugoslavia to the Communist Agent Tito, the Polish Government in exile to Beirut and his fellow Communists, I raised my voice in protest. When General Marshall was dispatched to China to bring about a reconciliation between the legitimate government of China and the Chinese Communists and fellow travelers, I protested against this policy, which in the end had to play into the hands of Moscow and which was destined to destroy the national independence of China. I think it is clear that I would be the last one to support any move that might strengthen the position of the Soviets in the Middle East.

I just do not believe—as Mr. Forrestal seems to assume—that the enforcement of the United Nations decision to partition Palestine would endanger the security of the United States. The Arab leaders have no place to go except to us. I would laugh at their threat to ally themselves with the Russians. Let them do it and lose all their feudal estates and privileges. As for Ibn Saud's oil, I would not pay him one cent more than it is worth on the American markets, and I would at last start a mass production of synthetic oil out of coal and shale (we have enough coal for the next 1,000 years). The Jews are entitled to the part of Palestine which they inhabit anyhow and to all those areas in Palestine which the Arabs consistently refused to cultivate. The Arab nations have over 1,000,000 square miles of land at their disposal. Their territories cry for more population. They do not need the 6,000 square miles of the proposed Jewish state. The Jewish DP's of Europe have physically and psychologically no other place to turn to than Palestine. Simple human justice demands that we should abide by the United Nations decision.

But apart from the principles of justice, even expediency should tell us that we must carry out the decision of November 29, 1947. For if we should fail to enforce it, if we should give in to the demands of the Arab leaders, no nation on earth would ever trust us again. By the scores the smaller nations will begin to appease the most aggressive power of our time—the Soviet Union—and the UN will be absolutely dead.

JOSEPH DUNNER,
Chairman, Political Science Department, Grinnell College.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant, entitled "The Plan Becomes Real."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLAN BECOMES REAL

Even with action in both Houses completed, the European recovery program must still be adjusted in conference and signed. But it will be. ERP, the Marshall plan, is henceforth a fact. From now on this is the reality with which not only the United States and the 16 Marshall plan nations, but all the rest of the world—most of all Russia—must reckon. By driving toward recovery it promises to relieve us of the burden of relief. It is bringing together, in a fusion of their economies, the free nations of Europe. All this is hopeful. But what matters most is that there is now at work in the world a wholly new and dynamic force. For the first time democracy has met the challenge of the postwar world.

Why this brilliant promise should be sullied by the House's vote on Tuesday to include Spain passes understanding. In overwhelming majority the House favors ERP because of its power to stop communism. But if the House wanted to give communism the biggest boost possible, it could have chosen no more devilishly effective way than to list El Caudillo Francisco Franco on the side of freedom. This totalitarian dictator would never have come to power without the help of Mussolini and Hitler. Every dictator does some good, else he would never be able to dictate in the first place. But no matter what can be said on Franco's behalf, he is a living reminder of the great evil against which the world fought its greatest war. The Communists will make hay with this vote, in Italy and elsewhere. Their most telling arguments in Europe, effective far beyond our realization here, are that the United States is a reactionary force, and that the Marshall plan has no purpose but to win us bases for a war to abolish the Soviet Union. By a vote of nearly three to one the House made it seem, before all the world, as though the Communists were right.

The fact that Spain might be strategically valuable to us in any future war does not change that fact. It is true that, just as we and Russia together fought Hitler, so if in the end we have to fight Russia, we would welcome Franco's help. But our job is not to set the stage for war. It is to stop Russia without war, which is incomparably the cheapest and surest way to do it. War helps communism, and hurts democracy. Fortunately the idea of aiding Franco does not set well in Europe. The other nations there are likely to refuse to welcome Franco to the mutual self-help that is an integral part of the Marshall plan. They have not forgotten that their sons, like ours, died fighting not for fascism but against it. It is not just Communist totalitarianism, but any totalitarianism that is the mortal enemy of democracy. After Tuesday's vote in the House, one wonders where the real threat in this country lies.

Let us not mar the greatest hope of the future with this error. For ERP is hopeful not only for itself but for still more in what it stands for. It shows that the country that now leads the free world has determined to attack the world's real evils. ERP is founded on recognition that, were this earth less devastated physically, less flabby morally, and less confused politically, communism would not stand a chance in Italy's election, or in any other way. What ERP stands for in the postwar world is the first real challenge that communism has had to face.

Bullets and Murder in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by T. O. Thackrey, which appeared in the New York Post on April 16, 1948:

LAST CHANCE

(By T. O. Thackrey)

Debate opens today in the UN General Assembly over the future of Palestine.

But bullets and murder in Palestine are deciding that every hour.

Is it a post-mortem the delegates believe they are holding?

But Palestine has not yet been destroyed despite the efforts of half the world to let a quarter of the world alone, to achieve the destruction.

Palestine lives.

The Jewish state has been formed.

Its resistance armies are ringed around its borders * * * determined, in the words of a Haganah hero, to die on their feet, if need be, rather than live on their knees, "But we will yet live on our feet," he cries.

The Balfour Declaration called that national home into existence nearly 30 years ago, chiefly out of gratitude to Chaim Weizmann, whose science enabled Britain to survice the 1914–19 phase of the German war.

The world assembled as the League of Nations imposed upon Great Britain a solemn trusteeship for the purpose of organizing and bringing into being this state.

The United States in 1924 agreed to British trusteeship provided the terms of the mandate were carried out, but reserving the right of intervention if the mandate were abused.

Since then nearly 30 commissions, at least a half-dozen of them international, have solemnly surveyed the Palestine area, and without exception agreed that Jews were entitled to a national home in Palestine, though often disagreeing as to its form.

Even after the noxious British white paper, in effect suspending implementation of the mandate and barring immigration until the war's close—and, as it turned out, forever after—the joint Anglo-American Commission unanimously recommended a Jewish state.

President Truman and Foreign Minister Bevin were solemnly pledged to carry out the report of this commission: It was named for that reason.

Neither did so. Each preferred a small portion of it—and not the same portion.

The General Assembly of the United Nations debated the matter last November, and ordered Palestine divided into a Jewish and an Arab state, with Jerusalem under trusteeship.

From this plan, the Jews were offered the smallest area yet proposed by any commission—but, despite the pin-point of the world's surface, agreed that even this portion was better than the no portion previously offered.

Immediately, the Arab states, including Syria, which is now a member of the UN Security Council, declared war upon partition, upon Jerusalem, upon the Jews of Palestine, and threatened war on any or all the other members of the United Nations seeking to make the decision good.

The great United States turned tail.

Great Britain, after having instigated the Arab stand, neutralized her troops in Palestine, armed the Arabs, and encouraged attack and war.

The United States assisted by embargoing arms to the area, where Arabs were well armed and Jews had been and still are blockaded by the British.

President Truman called for a reversal of American support of partition—betraying not alone his own policy of previous support—but a third of a century of consistent American policy.

And now the General Assembly begins a debate once more over Palestine.

The United States has constrained the Security Council to order cessation of fighting and of political activity in Palestine, but the order is worse than empty, since no effort is being made to apply it to Arabs in their attack upon Jerusalem and Judea—but only to apply it to Jews for daring to defend their homes and their very lives; for setting up the state the world promised but no nation secured or helped secure.

This is scarcely a new recital.

Only the members of the Security Council, the delegates to the General Assembly seem unaware of the facts; just as only these gentlemen and the makers of policy in Washington and Whitehall are unaware that men, women, and children they are sworn to defend are dying in Palestine while they debate—and encourage murder.

This then is a reminder of the facts.

As the debate drones on the war rolls up its massacres of the innocent.

But the General Assembly is in session.

The Palestinian declaration of independence will not go entirely unheeded in the debate.

Not all delegates—not every nation of the world—are as unmindful of the fatal consequences called for by the United States as are Great Britain, the Arab League, and the President.

The Assembly can do no less than refuse to alter its previous decision, rooted in justice and calling upon the world for enforcement.

Meanwhile, every hour of talk at Lake Success is another hour of pillage and death for countless numbers in Palestine.

The Assembly must act quickly and firmly to end the debate and reaffirm the course of justice it has ordered.

Recognition and support of the new state must be forthcoming while the world still has this last remaining chance to establish order, peace, and the integrity of the rule of law.

The people will respond to that challenge if their governments do not; and, responding, overturn any government that persists in so misrepresenting their sovereign will.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 8, 1948:

WANT TRADE ACT EXTENDED 3 YEARS—FOREIGN CREDIT BUREAU URGES ACTION TO AID UNITED STATES RESTORE COMMERCE TO NORMAL—HOUSE HEARINGS DUE SOON—UNITED STATES OFFICIAL SAYS WAYS, MEANS GROUP IS SLATED TO SET QUIZ ON LAW EXPIRING JUNE 12

A resolution calling upon Congress to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years from June 12, its expiration date, was unanimously voted yesterday at the meeting of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau in the Hotel Pennsylvania.

The resolution, presented by C. A. Richards, director of the export division of the Interchemical Corp., declared members of the FCIB believe that "in the unsettled condition of the world today, both economic and political, the United States Government should be given every needed authority to assist it in getting world or international trade back to normal conditions."

Mr. Richards pointed out that since the current extension of the law was passed in 1945, there have been several international developments which will have a considerable effect on the trade agreements under the act. He referred particularly to the general agreement on tariffs and trade signed at Geneva, the ITO Charter and the European recovery program.

EXTENSION IS URGED

"So far as all of these three important matters are concerned," he said, "there has not been time to evaluate properly their effect on international trade, and largely because of that and inasmuch as this is a Presidential year, I hope that Congress will extend the Reciprocal Trade Act so that suf-

ficient time can be given to really study what the effects will be after more facts are known.

"In the past, the most strenuous objections have been made by opponents of the act, based upon their fear of what might be done if the President had the power to act in reducing duties without asking for confirmation from Congress. Recently, however, there has been more opposition raised by the acts of the administration in permitting increases of duties abroad on certain items on which we did an export business. To what extent these increases will affect the over-all picture it is still too soon to know.

"The ITO charter will require confirmation by Congress and it is difficult to see whether that will have much effect upon our international trade for a year or more. What effect the ERP will have upon our foreign trade is also impossible to determine at the moment especially with respect to the reciprocal trade program."

Joseph A. Mack, acting regional director here of the Department of Commerce, told the meeting that legislation to extend the Trade Agreements Act has been introduced in the House and referred to the Ways and Means Committee, which is expected to announce public hearings in the near future.

REFERS TO CUBAN REGULATIONS

In response to a question dealing with the Cuban legislation, regulating relations between foreign companies and their agents, Mr. Mack reported the Cuban Government is presently giving serious consideration to rescinding or modifying provisions of the new regulations. The law, he added, is meanwhile not being applied. He suggested that pending a change in the regulations, it would appear to be most desirable for American business to defer any action on changes in representing either in new appointments or cancellations of existing appointments."

With respect to export licenses, it was brought out that the Department of Commerce is now considering some of the advantages of using special license forms on safety paper that will be practically fool-proof against erasures, changes, etc. Changes in procedure will be discussed with exporters.

Unsettled political conditions in Costa Rica it was stated, have brought business there to a standstill, excepting transactions involving the most essential foods. Importers were reported as stopping reorders from the United States or elsewhere for the present.

With respect to Sweden's import controls, reports received from the American Embassy in Stockholm indicated that goods covered by import licenses and already in the country are being given prior consideration in the location of dollar exchange.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1948.

Congressman E. A. MITCHELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MITCHELL: With reference to the margarine-tax-repeal legislation that is scheduled on discharge petition to reach the floor of the House on or after April 26, 1948, we thought it would be helpful to you to know our position with respect to such repeal. As perhaps you will recall, Mr. L. T. Newman, of New Orleans, represented our association at the hearing and asked for repeal of all oleomargarine taxes and occupational license fees and monthly reports required of wholesalers.

With reference to the measure as it may be voted on by the House, we would be very much opposed to any bill, compromise or otherwise, which failed to remove the burdensome restrictions on margarine dealers in addition to the occupational taxes.

Reporting receipts of margarine from manufacturers and sales to retail grocers and other retail outlets required of wholesalers costs our members who handle margarine anywhere from $50 to $100 a month.

The yearly cost thereof to such wholesalers in clerical work in making out these reports amounts to much more than the high license fees themselves.

We believe that the pure-food laws and local enactments can easily handle the matter of preventing margarine from being sold as butter.

We, therefore, earnestly request that no oleomargarine tax bill be passed that does not wipe out the regulation of dealers, including the monthly reports required of wholesalers.

Very truly yours,

R. H. ROWE,
Vice President and Secretary.

The Picture Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of April 19, 1948, entitled "The Picture Crisis." It deals with the matter of the return to Germany of the outstanding masterpieces of art recovered by our troops in a salt mine near Merkers and which have been on display here in Washington.

As the editorial points out, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has before the Senate Armed Services Committee a bill to retain these paintings in the United States for a definitely limited period and to permit their display at various points in the Nation under certain conditions. I think the bill deserves our full support.

The position of General Clay that the pictures should be returned immediately to dismembered Germany as proof of our good faith in the propaganda war now going on in Germany is an understandable one for a military occupation leader to take but I think that sometimes we can panic ourselves into going overboard on this business of impressing the Germans with our good intentions. With the Soviet Union busily engaged in Germany—in its section of Germany—with grabbing everything in sight and carting it back home, we are certainly at no disadvantage in that phase of the propaganda war. We have demanded no reparations or loot or booty. We are keeping a large part of the German people alive. We have accepted them into the Marshall plan. The Russians, on the other hand, cannot even be said to be taking only those things which are not nailed down. The concrete has never been poured which would baffle a Soviet reparation crew from removing plants and machinery from the Soviet zone.

The Philadelphia Bulletin says in this editorial:

Our position in Europe must be weak indeed if it can be endangered by the stay of the pictures in the United States for a few months.

I heartily concur in that analysis.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PICTURE CRISIS

Our commander in Germany, General Clay, wants the captured German pictures now in Washington rushed home to take their places in our propaganda front in the Reich. The Communists are claiming that we have robbed Germany of her art treasures and our general demands the pictures be hung up in German galleries to give the lie to the Reds.

Senator FULBRIGHT has a bill before Congress which would give the paintings a run around the United States before sending them back home.

Senator MYERS, of Pennsylvania, has suggested the pictures be exhibited in our Museum of Art while the Republican and Democratic conventions are meeting in Philadelphia.

The United States does not intend to imitate Napoleon, the Nazis, or other snatchers of other people's art treasures. The pictures will be returned to Germany. But the paintings really belong, not to Germany, but to humanity. Our position in Europe must be weak indeed if it can be endangered by the stay of the pictures in the United States for a few months.

Does the Army Want the Reserves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Donald Robinson, from Collier's for April 10, 1948:

DOES THE ARMY WANT THE RESERVES?
(By Donald Robinson)

If war should break out, high strategists in the Pentagon are counting upon the Seventy-seventh Division, a Reserve outfit in New York City, to be ready for combat shortly after M-Day, fully trained and equipped to resist any air, land, or sea-borne invader. At the present moment, however, the Seventy-seventh would have extreme difficulty in fighting off a troop of competent Boy Scouts.

At last count, the Seventy-seventh Division had less than 450 enlisted reservists assigned to it, not one gun, tank, or jeep to train with, and not even an armory in which to meet.

That the Seventy-seventh Division is getting any training at all for its wartime mission is due solely to the initiative of its own civilian officers; they have had, they say, virtually no help from the top brass in the Army.

Almost 3 years have gone by since VE-day, but investigation shows the Army has made little progress toward organizing the 1,140,000 veterans who volunteered to serve in the Reserve. It has not found time to assign most of them to units. It has no over-all program for training them. It does not even have any approved plans for keeping them in the Reserve. In fact, some experts maintain that there are factions within the Department of the Army which are actually hostile to the very existence of an Organized Reserve Corps.

"The Department of the Army has revealed a minimum of interest in the Reserves," says Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers' Association.

Over at the White House, President Truman's close friend and military aide, Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, himself a veteran Reserve officer, says, "The present indications are that the Regular Army does not want a Reserve."

This situation, in the opinion of some military observers, can have dire consequences. It is the Reserve which, in an emergency, must supply most of the officers and noncommissioned officers for any army America has to raise.

Here are a few facts:

1. As of September 30, 1947, only 189,998 of the 509,255 Reserve officers had been assigned to units, and even this figure was misleadingly high. Of the 189,998 total, over 80,000 were, according to General Evans, assigned to pools, not to real, functioning military units.

2. The 631,039 ex-GI's who signed up with the Reserves have been even more neglected. Merely 71,668 of them have been given assignments, and, again a large proportion of these went to pools.

3. Not one Reserve unit has been given adequate equipment, although millions of rifles, artillery pieces, and other material are lying idle or being shipped overseas.

4. Just 6,418 Reserve officers and 1,199 enlisted reservists received any sort of field training from the Ground and Service Forces during the first quarter of the 1948 fiscal year, the last period for which figures are available. The Air Force did a little better. It gave active-duty training to 18,891, of whom 1,981 were enlisted men.

5. To date, the Army has not formulated any real long-range program for Reserve training. The Army Ground Forces have not even issued a directive on training policies. At the most recent muster, only 28,000 reservists were enrolled in the Army's correspondence courses.

6. No permament policy has been adopted by which Reserve officers can obtain promotion. The Army says officially that it sees no urgency in the matter. Policies governing the promotion of enlisted reservists were, it is true, promulgated in December 1946, but because of what Army spokesmen call confusion in the field, few, if any, boosts in grade have been made. Most GI's who went into the Reserves as privates 2 years ago have been unable so far to win a single chevron.

7. Despite endless requests, no identification card has been provided for the Army Reserves.

As a result of this situation, authorities like General Evans declare that the morale of the Reserves is now at rock-bottom ebb. Thousands of them are refusing to answer Army communications. The enlisted men, over half of whom were top-ranking noncommissioned officers during the war, are described as even more fed up. Their condition, says General Evans, is "pitiful."

Typical of the feeling among reservists is that of a bemedaled major in Atlanta, Ga. "It's gotten so," he states, "that I'm actually ashamed of my Reserve commission."

This major has been assigned to a unit, but it is to one located in New York City.

"I've written the Army a dozen times," he says, "asking them to transfer me to a Georgia outfit. I've never gotten a reply. All I get are notices of meetings in Manhattan."

Some reserve training is going on throughout the country, but according to the Reserve Officers' Association, it consists almost exclusively of "the same old hokum, the same dull lectures and speeches that we all have heard a thousand times before." Not a Reserve unit has had any official schooling in the strategy to be employed in an atomic war. When the Seventy-seventh Division wished to include this subject in its training program, it had to evolve the tactical points for itself.

Luckily, some of the veterans in the Seventy-seventh had seen the effects of the Hiroshima destruction. Using their observations as a base, the staff of the Seventy-seventh has improvised procedures for the division to follow in defending itself against an atomic attack. These consist largely of methods for the dispersion of personnel and the employment of caves and other natural ground features in the protection of equipment.

In addition, the Seventy-seventh's staff has evolved its own plans for situations wherein the atomic bomb is used by us against an enemy. These include their ideas on how best to take advantage of the devastation wrought upon enemy troops and installations, what liaison arrangements must be made for determining when a locale is safe for the infantry to penetrate, etc. It is not certain whether such plans have any practical value. They are improvisations.

Out in San Francisco, a group of reservists was anxious to train itself, too. It called on the headquarters of Gen. Mark Clark's Sixth Army and asked for the loan of Signal Corps training movies.

"We can't show you those films," a high officer said. "They're restricted. They can only be seen by members of the armed services."

"But we are in the armed services," the reservists protested.

"Oh, no," they were informed. "You're just civilians."

They never received the films. Instead, they were sent a 5-year-old morale picture on why it was necessary to fight the Nazis.

A $30,000,000 CUT

Last year, the War Department allotted $56,000,000 to the Reserves, then slashed this amount to $26,000,000 when Congress directed it to pay veterans for their war-accrued furloughs. The only catch there was that in economizing to meet these payments, the Army cut its own funds a mere 10 percent; it reduced reserve appropriations 54 percent.

For the 1948 fiscal year, the Army initially allotted $56,000,000 again to Reserve activities—for both air and ground troops. This was just eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total budget, so low that even an economy-minded Congress balked. Congress raised the Reserve funds to $67,000,000.

The Army's attitude on appropriations led one statistician to compute that an average of $6,000 was being spent to keep organized, trained, and equipped each of the 1,070,000 members of the Regular Army and Air Force but just $48 for each reservist. It led General Vaughan to remark disgustedly, "On the basis of the Regular Army's allotments for Reserve training, each Reserve officer can look forward to 2 weeks' active duty once every 20 years."

A dearth of money, however, is not the main reason why so few reservists have been getting active-duty training. Instead of offering 2-week tours of duty, as it did before the war, the Army at first insisted that reservists spend from 6 weeks to 9 months in uniform. The usual civilian soldier, with just a fortnight's vacation each year, could not, of course, quit his job for such a long period of time. It was not until January 11, 1948, that the Army finally acceded to the widespread demand of the reservists and made 2-week active-duty stretches generally available. To many reservists, the Army's original insistence on the longer periods was simply obstructionistic tactics.

In the Air Reserve, conditions are said to be almost as bad. Some 60,000 World War II pilots accepted Reserve commissions on the Army's pledge of enough flying time to retain their combat skills. That pledge has not been kept.

The Air Force is giving training each year to only 9,600 of these 60,000 pilots. The rest must stay on the ground.

Even these 9,600 are not getting real training. They—the men who flew the B–29's and the P–47's—are obliged to fly antiquated AT–6 and AT–11 trainers. At that, they are being allowed merely 4 hours or less in the air a month.

"Can you imagine my feelings," one pilot, who did 76 missions over Germany, said, "when I went out to the Minneapolis Airfield to put in my flying time? I found Naval Reserve pilots flying top-notch Corsairs out of a $6,000,000 installation. All I could get was a couple of hours on a junky old trainer."

Air Force officials state that a lack of funds is really their trouble. They say they just do not have the money for servicing sufficient planes to provide all their Reserve pilots with air time. The explanation for why they are using the trainers instead of fast bombers and pursuit ships is also an economic one. It costs much less to fly an AT–6 than it does a P–47. The reservists' reply to this is, "Why doesn't the Air Force allot more of its funds to Reserve activities?"

At the core of the whole dispute over the Reserves is the relationship of the Regular Army and Air Force to their civilian components. In his last report as Chief of Staff, General Marshall urged that the United States rely for its security upon a small Regular Army, an efficient National Guard, and a well-organized, well-trained Reserve Corps. A large professional Army, is, he said, "dangerous to the liberties of the Nation."

Today, though the Regular Army and Air Force, with 1,070,000 men, are at their greatest peacetime strength in history, the National Guard has only a fraction of its authorized strength, and the Organized Reserve Corps is characterized by General Evans as "little more than a paper force" which is "shrinking and shrinking fast."

And this, believe it or not, is one thing for which Congress is not to blame.

That the National Guard now totals about 222,000 men, with small likelihood of reaching its goal of 682,796, is said to be no one's fault. The Guard planners set their sights high, on the assumption that universal military training would be established. But the experts do pass out blame for the impotency of the Reserves. They lay the responsibility for it on the doorstep of the big brass.

READINESS FOR M-DAY URGED

General Evans, speaking officially for the Reserve Officers' Association, charges that the Department of the Army is trying to keep the Reserves as an unorganized amorphous pool from which it can draw men as it needs them. This, of course, is contrary to the Reserve's wishes. They have asked that they be prepared for immediate use in time of emergency, that units of them be organized, trained, and armed for action on M-day, that each man receive his wartime assignment now.

The big battle over this issue started away back in 1944, when General Marshall began thinking about a postwar Army. He directed

that a study be made of the Army's civilian components, and named a committee of Regular Army, Reserve, and National Guard officers to do the job. After months of work, the committee recommended that an effective Organized Reserve Corps be established precisely along the lines advocated by the Reserves themselves.

General Evans, who served on that committee, discloses: "The general staff went all out in opposition to this plan. Every section of the general staff 'nonconcurred' in it. Luckily, General Marshall recognized the value of a good Reserve Corps and overrode the opposition of his staff."

At General Marshall's order, the War Department published a directive in 1945 providing for the development of a real, ready-to-shoot Reserve. General Eisenhower later reaffirmed this stand.

"If this plan had been implemented," says General Evans, "it would have given us an adequate national security program. But it wasn't."

He cites this as an example. Although the Marshall policy specifically banned the formation of any kind of pools, more than 500 composite Reserve units have been set up. "These," Evans states, "are nothing more nor less than the same old wartime pools which every officer and GI detested so much."

Disregard of the Reserves has taken many other forms, too, according to Evans. Until recently the Army did not allow Reserve officers to belong to officers' clubs on military posts, even to purchase at a post exchange.

When the Reserve Officers' Association petitioned Congress to extend commissary privileges to Reserves retired for physical disability, many of them veterans crippled by wounds suffered in action, the War Department opposed and defeated the move.

It would set a bad precedent, the Regulars argued, despite the fact that retired personnel of the Regular Army do have such privileges.

A SUGGESTION TO IMPROVE MORALE

In New York, one of the rare Regular Army officers concerned about the poor morale among reservists proposed to First Army headquarters that it arrange for the participation of a Reserve officer and enlisted man in the ceremonies at which President Truman was presented with a degree by Fordham University.

"It would help raise the prestige of the Reserves," he urged.

The proposal got exactly nowhere. First Army refused to suggest it to Washington. Only Regular Army personnel were on hand at the ceremony.

The Reserves say that some Regular Army officers have even been attempting to introduce the "caste system" into their ranks. An instance of this, reported by a Reserve officer, occurred at a meeting of Reserve paratroopers in Atlanta, Ga. Several score officers and enlisted men who had seen action in Normandy were present. They all were in civilian clothes.

The Regular Army colonel who presided at the session (his name is withheld out of consideration for the Reserve officer who told the story) was shocked to learn that the Reserve officers and enlisted men were sitting together.

"There is too much fraternization here between officers and enlisted men," he said. "I want it to stop."

One paratrooper captain was so annoyed that he got up and walked out. He has not been to another meeting. He reports that a large number of enlisted reservists have also stayed away.

Enlisted reservists as a whole have been particularly infuriated by this return to the military caste system. Many point to the fact that a War Department board, chairmaned by Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, itself severely condemned the Army for "irregularities and injustices in the handling of enlisted personnel." This board, in May 1946, demanded that the Army adopt "a new philosophy in the military order, a policy of treatment of men, especially in the ranks, in terms of advanced concepts of social thinking."

"Not only has the Army failed to carry out this recommendation," it was stated, "but it is actually trying to superimpose its outworn caste ideas on the civilian soldiery, too."

What does the Army say about all these varied charges? Recently, Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall was queried about them. He replied, "Since I became Secretary of the Army, in July, I have not had an opportunity to look into the question, so I have no notion of what is going on in either the Reserves or the National Guard."

Lt. Gen. Manton S. Eddy, speaking for the Army, had this to say: "The Army of the United States is a three-legged structure whose legs are the Organized Reserve Corps, the National Guard, and the Regular Army. Before anyone gives credence to charges that the Department of the Army is not interested in the Reserve, or any other component, he should realize that the Army is scarcely likely to chop off one leg of the structure for which it is directly responsible."

Other Department of the Army officials maintain that the Reserve picture is "really not as black as it has been painted." They say that they simply have not had sufficient time since VE-day to get all their plans for the Reserves in shape. They admit that only a small number of officers and enlisted men have been assigned to units but ascribe this to the fact that many reservists have not specifically applied for assignment. Army regulations ban the detailing of enlisted men to units without their consent. (But in this connection, the Reserve Officers' Association states that only 1 enlisted reservist in 24 has been contacted about an assignment.)

Officers on duty in the office of the Executive for Reserve and R. O. T. C. Affairs, an Army staff section in charge of Reserve matters, feel that the policies they have evolved are good ones. The difficulty has been, they declare, that some of their plans have not got General Staff approval, and that others which have been approved have not been adequately followed in the field.

STUDYING THE CIVILIAN PROBLEM

Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal is personally concerned about the entire situation. He designated a six-man committee, headed by Assistant Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray and including representatives of the Navy and Air Forces, to make a thorough investigation of all the civilian components of the armed services.

One point the Gray committee was asked to consider is why the Army and Air Reserves are in such poor condition when the Naval Reserve is flourishing.

On February 1, 1948, the Naval Reserve numbered 940,000, and was growing at a rate of over 12,000 a month. There was no evidence of any feuding between the Regulars and the Reserves. Morale was sky-high.

The Navy has a full-fledged program in operation for training its reservists. Naval craft have been made available to them at every sea and inland port. The Navy has also set aside 312 buildings and ship armories for the Reserves. In addition, it is building them 175 Quonset-type training centers. These will house everything from radio and radar equipment, machine shops, and gyrocompass rooms to libraries, lounges, and cooking galleys.

Today, Naval Reserve officers are welcome at every naval installation, can use ships' stores, officers' clubs, commissaries. To make sure there is no discrimination between the Regulars and Reserves on promotions, the Navy Department has instituted a new plan linking the two together. Each Reserve officer on inactive status has been assigned a Regular Navy officer as "a running mate." When the Regular becomes eligible for promotion, so does the Reserve.

Credit for the effectiveness of the Naval Reserve program is generally given to Jimmy Forrestal. While he was still Secretary of the Navy, he insisted that it make a real drive to keep its Reserves happy. It has. And so has the Marine Corps. Its Reserve is also reported to be in splendid condition.

What about the National Guard? Investigators will find it presents a mixed picture. Back under State control again, it is short of men but long on ambition, working hard to prepare itself as an M-day force.

Its published story today is that it is getting excellent cooperation from the Army. But there are those who remember when things were different.

For years, the Army had no use for the National Guard, and the sentiment was reciprocated. In a top-secret document written on July 12, 1944, shortly before he was killed in Normandy, Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair, commander of the Army Ground Forces, even urged that the guard be disbanded once and for all. He wrote General Marshall:

"One of the great lessons of the present war is that the National Guard, as organized before the war, contributed nothing to national defense. * * * It was necessary to make almost 100 percent replacements of commissioned officers with troops from the grade of major general down through the grade of colonel and to replace an extremely high percentage of officers of lower grade. * * * The structure of the National Guard was pregnant with disaster for the entire Nation."

A National Guard in postwar America, General McNair asserted, is, "unnecessary and undesirable." His official recommendation: "That the National Guard be dispensed with as a component of the Army of the United States."

THE GUARD FIGHTS BACK

The National Guard replied to this statement with accusation that the Regular Army had continuously discriminated against it. Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the powerful National Guard Association, told his group's 1946 convention that he had proof of 8,000 cases of discrimination. Maj. Gen. George E. Leach of the Minnesota National Guard declared, "I tell you, gentlemen, the General Staff at Washington is soulless * * * not anything human."

The association passed a resolution castigating what is termed "the unwarranted, unjustifiable and indefensible treatment accorded many of the nonregular officers in World War II" and demanding that it stop. Then it did more. It unleashed one of the slickest campaigns in history to "put the heat on" the Army.

With its strong political ties, it got countless governors to talk with Washington, got friendly Congressmen to apply a little judicious pressure, too.

When the War Department chopped its 1947 appropriations from $110,000,000 to $50,000,000 the guard arranged for an avalanche of protesting telegrams and letters to descend upon the Pentagon. After that, a delegation of guard lobbyists visited General Eisenhower.

"You can't do that to us," Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, adjutant general of Maryland, warned Ike.

The War Department bowed to this pressure and quickly restored $12,000,000 of the sliced funds. According to the National Guard Association, the Army has since leaned over backward to give the guard what it

wishes, including brand-new P–80's to fly and some $30,000,000 worth of surplus military facilities, among them parts of Camp Atterbury in Indianapolis and Jackson Barracks in New Orleans. However, some observers take with a grain of salt the statement of General Walsh that the National Guard is receiving "splendid support" from the Army. They suspect that the guard is courting Army favor because it fears current moves to consolidate it with the Reserves.

Training for the 4,200 guard units is going full blast, although some of Secretary Forrestal's associates are not pleased with the type of training it is getting. One point made by them is that the guard should be schooled now for disaster work, for civil defense, clearing away rubble, repairing utilities, in other words, against an atomic bomb attack. But this is not being done.

Recruiting for the National Guard has been slow. Oklahoma has done the best of any State in organizing units, Nevada, the worst. That Nevada got started at all was due to the activities of a group of Reno gamblers.

The legislature in Carson City adjourned without appropriating any State funds for the guard, and it looked as if Nevada would be left without one. This disturbed the patriotically minded operators of Harold's Club, a Reno gambling resort. It was bad advertising for Nevada, they felt. They therefore chipped in some of their own money and opened a drive for contributions from other private parties. Enough money was raised by them for the Nevada Guard at least to begin work.

At the end of last summer the National Guard throughout the country numbered about 100,000 men. An $850,000 recruiting drive was then launched, replete with top radio bands, street signs, and magazine advertisements, in the hope of raising guard rosters at the rate of a man a minute for 2 months, 88,888 in all. The hoopla notwithstanding, the drive fell about 13,000 short of its goal. Maj. Gen. Kenneth F. Cramer, chief of the National Guard Bureau, then sadly announced that it would be impossible for the guard to reach its projected M-day strength of 683,000 (about three times its prewar force) without the enactment of universal military training.

The red-hottest development on the entire Reserve-National Guard scene is the proposal recently made by Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan. The Chief Executive's military aide urged that the National Guard be entirely removed from State control and merged with the Organized Reserve Corps. The outraged cries that ensued made bedlams out of National Guard armories, Reserve meetings, and the columns of the country's press. Harry Vaughan couldn't have provoked a greater storm if he had come out for an end to all State sovereignties or a merger of the Baptist and the Catholic churches.

The Chicago Tribune called his suggestion "militarism gone mad." The New York Times, however, thought it one "that should be thoroughly explored, perhaps by a Presidential commission."

OPPOSED TO ARMIES FOR STATES

Vaughan, like President Truman (who is still Colonel Truman on the Army's Reserve records), has served in both the National Guard and the Reserves. Sitting in his office in the East Wing of the White House, Vaughan asserted that there is no reason any more for States to have private armies. He believes that Guard training suffers from joint Federal-State jurisdiction. He says:

"The present plan for our security force established a National Guard and a Reserve, units of which are found in every local community throughout our country. The functions of these overlapping units are identical. How much more efficient these citizen components would be, if combined into one force, subject only to Federal control.

"In the event of war, it's the Federal Government's responsibility to defend the Nation, not the States'."

Vaughan holds that legislation can be constitutionally enacted to transfer the Guard to Federal control. Such a law, he says, could provide safeguards to insure troops for use by States in an emergency.

"There is no necessity now for the governor of a State to have command of air force, tank, or field artillery units, as many do now. A governor's only need for troops arises in an emergency—a catastrophe, a hurricane, a race riot, or a strike that has got out of hand. For things like that, governors need only military police, not tank outfits or paratroopers. If the Guard is transferred to the Federal Government, the law can specify that the Army must automatically make available troops to any governor merely upon his telegraphic request."

To the statement of Maryland's General Reckord that his proposal is "contrary to the Constitution," General Vaughan replied, "It's no such damned thing. Actually, you can say that it has been unconstitutional for the Federal Government to have been paying all these years for the training of the National Guard."

Vaughan adds, "I discussed this idea with Harry Truman 20 years ago and he said then that if ever he were in a position to do something about it, he would. We are interested purely in national security, and any merger or elimination that will aid natonal security—that is, the greatest security for the fewest dollars—is what we want."

Naturally, the National Guard Association is objecting wildly to the merger plan. The Reserve Officers' Association has made no official move for or against it. However, its leaders are understood to support it. The Army favors the move, but silently. It doesn't care to antagonize the guard.

It's anyone's guess, of course, whether anything will ever come of the Vaughan suggestion. Or whether anything will be effectively done to straighten out the Reserves. Talk of a congressional investigation has been heard. Some experts are urging that President Truman appoint a board of impartial, qualified citizens to make a real probe and produce a program for how the United States can best handle the civilian side of its Army. A group like the Compton Commission which dug into the question of universal military training is recommended.

As one Reserve officer, Lt. Col. Kermit J. Berylson, of New York City, a distinguished veteran of 5½ years' service in the past war and 14 years in the Reserves, says, though, "Whatever they do, they'd better do it fast, or there won't be any civilian soldiers left to straighten out."

Accessories to Murder in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have risen on this floor again and again to protest against the betrayal of the most solemn covenants of the world's greatest powers in Palestine. I shall continue to make such protests as long as I retain my seat in this House and have a voice with which to speak.

In the New York Post for April 15 my friend, T. O. Thackrey, who is copublisher of that newspaper, and whose words I have quoted here often, rose to new heights of rhetoric in a front-page editorial which he grimly entitled "Accessories to Murder."

In words which not even my profound personal sympathy with the Zionist movement can match for their effectiveness Ted Thackrey writes to our President, and to the General Assembly of the United Nations, an open letter so moving that I fail to see how our leaders can ignore it.

It was written and published the day before the extraordinary session of the Assembly was to have begun debate on the tragic reversal of American policy; but everything in this editorial is valid now, today, and I hope that you and every Member will find time to read it.

I hope it will help you to understand the agony of world Jewry, and of sincere and right-thinking peoples everywhere, and to understand how large numbers of Americans could be brought to descend on Washington last week under the illusion that they were forwarding the cause of Zionism. Some of those bewildered pilgrims were, I am afraid, the victims of a cruel conspiracy to exploit them and the righteous cause which they espoused. However, the gesture they made was a gesture of desperation.

Under leave, I insert the text of the editorial in the RECORD:

ACCESSORIES TO MURDER
(By T. O. Thackrey)

Mr. President of the United States; delegates to the General Assembly of the United Nations; members of the Palestine Commission; members of the Security Council; gentlemen, I beseech you:

Ten thousand Arabian soldiers, 5,000 trained in Syria, are at the border of Palestine under orders to wipe out Jerusalem, to massacre the Jews of that Holy City and of Palestine, in open defiance of the basic purposes of the United Nations—though Syria remains a member by your sufferance.

More than 100,000 Jews are beleaguered in Jerusalem alone, food and water supplies being cut off for days at a time by Arab guerilla forces.

War is aflame in the Middle East, with more than 3,000 casualties—the greater number of them women and children—solely because Arabian forces have determined to complete Hitler's murderous work of massacre rather than permit the Jews to have the homeland promised by Great Britain, the League of Nations, the United States in its solemn treaty of 1924, and by the solemn word of every American President since then, including Harry S. Truman.

Yet the United States delegation, in the name of President Truman, tells the world assembled as the United Nations that we prefer to encourage this slaughter, rather than keep those promises.

Yet the United States delegation now seeks to find an excuse for war upon the Jews who have, after waiting 29 years for fulfillment of the world's promises, declared the existence of the Jewish state effective May 15—when Britain's mandate ends and the United Nations assume full responsibility.

Yet the Security Council, in the face of the known facts, solemly debates whether there is any "disturbance or threat to the peace" in the Middle East.

Yet the General Assembly is called into session at the demand of the United States, tomorrow, to deliberate whether it will, under pressure from Great Britain, Arabia, and the United States, revoke its action of November 29 when it declared partition of Palestine

and a trusteeship over Jerusalem the only just decision possible.

Yet the gentlemen from the United States solemnly speak of a trusteeship over all Palestine as though it would bring either justice or peace, in the face of flagrant failure to protect the Jerusalem trusteeship which already exists.

The excuse given by the American delegation is national security, dependent upon Arabian oil—when it is a well-known, thoroughly established fact, that our national security depends not one whit on Arabian oil, though the profits of private, nontaxpaying corporations do depend upon it.

Gentlemen, if you betray the General Assembly's solution, and war in unison upon the Palestinian Jews who have formed that nation in response to our combined promises, you will not dishonor Jews, but yourselves and the nations you represent.

You will find the trusteeship being spoken of even more difficult to enforce than the decision of November 29 which gives the world as a democratic ally the most progressive and enlightened force—the only progressive and enlightened force—in the Middle East—Palestinians.

Gentlemen, you cannot, you must not, choose dishonor and war and the completion of Hitler's bloody work, over honor and enforcement of the peace.

If you fail this test, no other tests will remain for you.

Every delay in supporting honor means that much greater a blood sacrifice—and for nothing except an alliance with Hitler's chief assistant assassin, the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, a notorious war criminal.

Choose, gentlemen. But choose with care—and with honor.

Federal Leave Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I invite the attention of the House to the editorial titled "Federal Leave Abuses," which appeared in the Fort Wayne, (Ind.) News-Sentinel of April 12. This cogent and forceful statement is particularly timely, since this Congress is currently considering proposals to increase Federal pay scales.

There is real merit in these proposals, for Federal salaries have risen far less than salaries and wages throughout the country. The Federal employee's pay has also lagged badly in this period of mounting prices. But quite obviously the money wasted through these abuses of the leave privileges would go a long way to improve the real income of Federal employees if it were merely applied productively. Here is another urgent reason for a complete overhauling of the classified service.

FEDERAL LEAVE ABUSES

President Truman, in vetoing the third tax reduction bill, accused Congress of a "reckless disregard for economy."

The Administration's glib use of "economy" is difficult to reconcile with a report of shameful abuses of sick and annual leave in the executive branch made by a subcommittee to the Committee on Appropriations.

Total annual leave accumulated by Federal pay rollers as of September 30, 1947, amounted to 44,561,076 days, the investigation revealed. This represents a total cost of about half a billion dollars, and an average accumulation of 26 days per employee. Total sick leave accumulated as of the same date, it was shown, amounted to 54,542,379 days. This represents a cost of about $600,000,000, or an average accumulation of 32 days.

Federal employees who take the maximum leaves available—and plenty of them do—of 26 days for vacation, 15-days' sick leave, 8 holidays, 104 Saturdays and Sundays, actually work only 212 days a year. That's 58 percent of the time. Nice work if you can get it—and millions "have got it," yet Mr. Truman speaks of economy.

It took a special investigation to expose these abuses. The executive branch does not keep annual over-all records on sick and annual leave statistics. That it should not wish to publicize this unlovely record, especially about the time a tax bill is vetoed, is understandable.

If the figures are an accurate criterion, Federal pay rollers are an ailing lot. Those under civil service get up to 15 days sick leave every year, a period that may accumulate to 90 days. For a 90-month period ending September 30, 1947, a total of 1,703,540 persons were subject to sick leave. Of this number 1,254,096—that's 73.6 percent—had availed themselves of the sick-leave privilege. The total was 10,808,444 days off, an average of 8 days for those reported ill. The sick leaves represent about $110,000,000 that wasn't working.

The subcommittee was told by many departments of sick-leave abuses. They consist of absences before or just after a week end, absences for longer periods than are actually required for medical treatment, and absences when staff reductions are about to be effected. Several ways of cheating Uncle Sam are disclosed. It is a favorite trick to take a Monday or Friday off, then charge it to sick rather than vacation leave. Some agencies noted high attendance on pay day followed by "much sickness" immediately after pay day. Many employees use sick leave as a right rather than as a privilege, taking advantage of it as it is accrued rather than as insurance against possible illness.

Needless to say, private industry could not afford such practices. At the end of 1 year Federal employees are entitled to 26 workdays of annual leave, which may be permitted to accrue to 60 workdays (12 calendar weeks), or even 90 workdays (18 calendar weeks) under certain conditions.

After 6 months of service, most companies give 1 week of vacation, as compared with 2½ workweeks for Federal employees. Most companies, after a year of service, give 2 weeks of annual leave, as compared with the 5 workweeks plus 1 day for Federal pay rollers.

Our remarks are not to be construed as an argument against vacations or sick leaves. As between Federal and private employment policies, it must seem apparent to most taxpayers that our National Government is liberal to the point of extravagance and waste. On the other hand, there may be business and industrial concerns that ought to liberalize their customs.

But one fact stands out: The administration is hardly in a position to scream "economy or weakened financial structure" when it is guilty of such atrocious waste in the use of its personnel. In the public interest, the Appropriations Committee should translate the subcommittee's recommendations for curative measures into a reform bill.

Western European Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the western European union, by Charles Edmundson, from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of March 21, 1948. I think this is one of the best articles on this subject I have seen recently. I know Mr. Edmundson is one of the most competent and intelligent commentators regarding the European union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WEST EUROPEAN UNION UNDER UNITED STATES PROTECTION DEVELOPING AS BLOCK TO RUSSIAN AGGRESSION—FIVE-NATION ALLIANCE AND COOPERATION OF 16 MARSHALL-PLAN COUNTRIES CITED; TRUMAN ADDRESS POINTS TO DECISIVE UNITED STATES ROLE; MEMBERS OF BOTH PARTIES SUPPORT IDEA ADVANCED BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT IN RESOLUTION MORE THAN A YEAR AGO

(By Charles Edmundson)

Western Europe, which was united under the Caesars and under Charlemagne but was cut up like a jigsaw puzzle in the upsurge of nationalism in the late Middle Ages, is taking historic strides toward achieving unity again.

On the military side, the move for unity is spurred by the desire of the European democracies to gain the strength to protect themselves from Communist imperialism. On the economic side, it is the urge to escape from the poverty of a twentieth-century industrialism strangled in a network of small medieval states.

Impelled by a desire to see Europe become economically and militarily able to care for itself, the United States has cast itself in the role of godfather of the movement for western European union. The Marshall plan was designed partly to afford incentive for economic unification. And with President Truman's speech to Congress last Wednesday, the United States became virtually committed to protect the European democracies militarily as they try to work out their salvation.

President Truman promised that "the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them protect themselves." In non-Communist Europe this was hailed as an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to Europe, from the Atlantic shore to the Stettin-Trieste line—which, incidentally, was the approximate extent of Charlemagne's Empire.

The core of western European union is the 50-year economic, political, and military alliance which Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg were signing at the very time Truman was delivering his memorable speech. The President referred to this as "a notable step in the direction of unity in Europe for the protection and preservation of its civilization."

VANDENBERG URGES UNION OF WEST EUROPEAN NATIONS

This was the first time that the movement for unification of western Europe had received the open, unqualified indorsement of

the administration. Before this Washington had been reluctant to set its official approval on the movement for European unity lest it drive out of the Marshall plan several nations timid about provoking Russia.

For more than a year a quiet struggle on this point has been going on in Washington. Senator FULBRIGHT (Democrat), of Arkansas, offered a resolution to place Congress on record as favoring a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations. Later he offered an amendment to the European aid bill favoring the "political unification" of the 16 Marshall plan nations.

The resolution for a United States of Europe was squelched in committee. But the amendment to the European aid bill was the subject of extended debate. The debate showed the Senate overwhelmingly in favor of the amendment in principle. But Senator VANDENBERG opposed it on the ground that while the United States might not mind giving offense to Russia, the Senate had to consider the feelings of Marshall-plan nations which were definitely timid toward Russia.

The Fulbright amendment was withdrawn, but not until after Senator VANDENBERG had said, "It is practically the universal opinion that the consolidation of western Europe along the lines of which the Senator (FULBRIGHT) is speaking is the pattern of realistic hope." Earlier Senator VANDENBERG had said of western Europe's acceptance of the Marshall plan: "It was a historic moment. Some day the United States of Europe may look back upon it as we do the Annapolis Conference which preceded the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia."

CHURCHILL, BRITISH LABOR JOIN IN FAVORING MOVEMENT

Sentiment in America for a united Europe is so strong that a change of administration should not affect United States support of the project. Besides Senator VANDENBERG's indorsement, a United States of Europe has been warmly urged by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, the Republican Presidential nominee in 1944, and by John Foster Dulles, the party's unofficial adviser on foreign affairs.

The movement is also above party in Britain. It has equal support from Prime Minister Attlee and Foreign Secretary Bevin of the Labor Government and from Winston Churchill, leader of the opposition, who urged the scheme upon President Roosevelt without success in 1943. Seventy-one members of the House of Commons, representing all parties except the Communist, have signed a resolution calling for a complete merger of western Europe and Britain into one federation, with a trading area including their colonial territories.

What has been formed up to now is not a United States of Europe. That would involve a greater pooling of national sovereignty than is under way now. But an economic groundwork is being laid which could become the fundation of such a union. In the past week, the thrust toward unity was marked by four main events:

First, Britain, France, and the Benelux nations signed their treaty of economic and military alliance, with a door provided through which other European nations may be invited to enter.

Second, the 16 Marshall-plan nations met in Paris to implement their pledges for economic cooperation. These look toward the reduction of trade barriers, the coordination of power, transport, and steel-making facilities, the eventual establishment of interchangeable currencies and exploration of the possibilities of a full customs union.

Third, France and Italy signed the protocol of a customs union, and the Scandinavian nations met at Stockholm and decided the time had come for them to accept the calculated risk of offending Russia by openly casting their lot with the other western democracies.

SOLUTION OF GERMAN PROBLEM IN A CONTINENTAL FEDERATION

Fourth, the punitive grip was softened in the Anglo-American and French zones of occupation in Germany and the two zones were admitted as members of the Marshall plan. If they behave well, they can look upon this as a probationary step toward admission into western European union.

Indeed, one of the most compelling features about western European unity is that it appears to offer an answer to the problem of what to do with Germany. Russia, of course, has her own plan. The strong pre-Hitler Communist Party has been revived under the leadership of Moscow-trained Germans, with the idea of winning control of the whole country and welding it into the Soviet sphere. The western democracies must offer an alternative to the Russian bid for German favor.

The various German states, such as Bavaria, Baden, Hesse, and Wuerttemberg, retain from the pre-Bismarck era considerable provincial pride and separate cultural identity. The ideal, so advocates of European unity urge, is to enroll them as separate members in a continental federation where German nationalism would be submerged in pride of membership in a more important group.

In this way the Germans could work off their inferiority complex and exercise their undoubted capacities in a constructive rather than predatory fashion. If all Europe west of the iron curtain were united, the Germans would be outvoted by more than 5 to 1, with little danger of their dominating the federation.

A creditable guaranty of protection by the United States seems to be basic to the movement for European unity. Except for England, there is no military strength worth mentioning in western Europe. There is nothing better than constabularies in France, Italy, the Low Countries, or Scandinavia. Neither is there an armament industry. Russia and her satellites have an estimated 1,300,000 soldiers in central Europe, and Russia has 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 more in eastern Europe and Asia.

DIVIDED EUROPE GIVES RUSSIA FREEDOM TO ACT

Ever since the Communist revolution of 1917, Russia has feared and opposed all efforts toward European unification. Lenin condemned federation as a threat to Russian security and his successors have followed this line without deviation. Senator FULBRIGHT says:

"The Russian fear must be understood in terms of what appear to be Soviet interests and purposes. Political fragmentation suits Russia perfectly, for it gives her great freedom of action on the Continent. She fears, however, that Europe will discover that it has at hand the means for achieving power comparable with that of Russia if Europe will only take advantage of the opportunity to unite."

Yet with control of all Europe east of the Stettin-Trieste line, Russia has established her classic strategy of defense in depth. The Russians can feel safer than at any time in the past hundred years. With only 130,000 troops in Europe, the United States could not keep Russia from overrunning the Continent. But that would be only the first chapter. Modern wars are fought with industrial capacity as well as with men and the United States and the British Commonwealth together have more than four times the industrial capacity of Russia. This, Russia is not likely to forget.

If the United States can show a determined front, the chances would seem to be against further overt Soviet aggression toward the West. Meanwhile, the achievement and protection of the movement for European unity seems to be the logical corollary of the Marshall plan. Senator FULBRIGHT and others have pointed out the folly of devoting fifteen or twenty billion dollars toward the reconstruction of Europe, particularly the rebuilding of its industry, if it is to fall into the hands of the only power in the world capable of making war against us.

But if with American aid a western European federation could be achieved, the expenditure would be justified. Such a union would become capable of enforcing order and protecting itself from aggression, so that the United States might not again have to send its treasure and men to help settle wars in Europe.

A united western Europe would have a population of 247,000,000, against a population of 310,000,000 for Russia and her satellites.

In industrial strength western Europe far outranks Russia and her tributaries. It has nearly twice as much steel capacity, fully twice as much electric power, 50 percent more coal than Russia.

POSITIVE, MAGNETIC IDEA NEEDED FROM THE DEMOCRACIES

A Brookings Institution study shows that, with colonial resources, Britain, France and the Low Countries compare favorably with the United States in natural wealth. That many of the raw materials lie across the water poses no great difficulty, for water transportation costs only about one-eighth as much a ton-mile as rail transport. The trouble is that Europe's division into small countries makes it difficult to exchange raw materials and finished products. Small markets prevent the economies of mass production, which is the key to American prosperity.

Small nations, moreover, are a set-up for monopolies, cartels, and other devices which stifle initiative and enterprise. In a large trade area like the United States, such tendencies are checked somewhat by the sheer number and variety of the corporations and industries which compete for the consumer's dollar—to say nothing of the Sherman Act.

Europe's impoverished people are attracted to communism, fascism, or other totalitarian formulas because they know that for them capitalism—pure or modified—is not working as it should.

Thus, while the United States centers attention on the danger that western Europe may go Communist because of Russian military pressure, it might go Communist of its own free will. The impressive gains which the Communists have made in Italy are by no means altogether the result of outside pressure but also are an internal development.

If the battle is to be won, the appeal which communism seems to exert for insecure and impoverished people must be countered by some positive, magnetic idea offered by the democracies. The idea of European federation might be such an idea.

The Marshall plan alone is not enough. Two-thirds of the money to be supplied in the first year will be pure relief. President Auriol, of France, sums it up thus: "Europe must unite herself if she wishes to recover and live, and if she does not want American assistance to be a gesture without a future or a humiliating charity."

Western European federation does not conflict with the United Nations but would come into existence with its blessing. The UN Charter specifically authorizes the formation of regional unions of this type. The alliance of Britain, France, the Low Countries, and Luxemburg provides that any steps taken against aggression shall be coordinated with the functions of the Security Council. If the existence of the veto power and its misuse by Russia has, as some contend, killed UN, western European union at least pays its respects to the deceased.

And if the time should ever become ripe for the "One World" dream of Wendell Willkie, its realization would be hastened because one of the most important areas of the world would already have been federated. It is hardly logical, meanwhile, to expect the whole world to become one unless a region such as western Europe, with a common cultural background and more or less common ideals, can find a way to unity.

Now Is the Time To Take the Profits Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 15 I introduced H. R. 6258, designed to tax the profits out of war by steeply graduated income and other taxes in order to provide for an effective national defense, to promote peace, to encourage actual neutrality, to discourage war profiteering, to distribute the burdens of war, to keep democracy alive, and for other purposes.

This measure is similar to the bill that was introduced by myself and 11 other Members of the House and by 50 Members of the Senate during the Seventy-sixth Congress.

The intent of the bill, at that time, was to put into practice one of the principles I preached when serving the Veterans of Foreign Wars from 1934 to 1936 as commander in chief. While we have gone through another war and much water has gone over the dam, it is my opinion that it is more important today than ever that we deter war by stripping it of all opportunity for undue profits. This bill is primarily a peace measure.

When we stop to think of the profits made in World War II and the nationally prominent persons who have been haled into court, we realize that there are similar cases that may have not yet been uncovered.

We must not forget that World War II cost us, to date, approximately $300,000,000,000 and that at the moment billions are being requested for rebuilding our national defense. Nor can we forget our national debt of over $250,000,000,000 and the high taxes paid by the American people as an aftermath of war.

President Truman told us some weeks ago that we are faced with another crisis and that we should build up our armed forces immediately as a bulwark against possible war. Any preparation for national defense should include, as a first step, the taking of the profits out of war expenditures.

God forbid that American boys ever again should be called upon to fight another world war. But if we should become embroiled in such a conflict, Congress should act in advance to prevent a repetition of the scandalous profiteering that marked the World War I and World War II periods.

This bill may need revision, which can be accomplished through hearings and appropriate amendments. However, I want to impress upon the membership of the House that its intent will not only provide the financial sinews of war, but it will distribute the financial burdens of war as well as prevent profiteering.

If 50 United States Senators and 12 Members of the House in the Seventy-sixth Congress felt that this type of legislation was necessary, then we have only to recall our experience with profiteers in World War II to realize that this bill should be enacted at the earliest possible date.

Ambassador Grew Urges Approval of Equality for Japanese in Immigration and Naturalization Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an eloquent and convincing statement in favor of my bill, H. R. 5004, given on April 19, 1948, before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House Committee on the Judiciary by one of America's most eminent and respected authorities on our relations with the Far East, the Honorable Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan and former Under Secretary of State:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, although I come before you as a private citizen, the matter which you are now considering is one which has commanded my attention many times during my years as a Foreign Service officer of the United States. This was particularly true during the 10 years spent in Japan just prior to and during World War II.

I have gone over the measure before you with a good deal of care, not as a technician, but to seek out its broad objectives and to determine to my own satisfaction the manner in which enactment of this bill would affect American policies and American interests. This bill seeks to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence and to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples.

This measure embraces two important questions, the extension of the privilege of naturalization to all qualified immigrants without reference to racial origin, and the extension of the use of national-origin based immigration quotas to the peoples of all areas of the Far East.

Concerning the first of these questions, it seems to me there can be little room for disagreement that any immigrant who is allowed to remain permanently in the United States should not only be permitted to seek citizenship but should be encouraged to do so. If, before the war, there were doubts concerning the deportment in time of crisis of the Japanese, Koreans, and other far-eastern people living in America, we have now had a conclusive answer.

All of those made immediately eligible to apply for naturalization papers under the first section of H. R. 5004 came to this country prior to July 1, 1924. Their children born here are citizens; it is a source of hardship and humiliation to both parents and children that the former may not gain citizenship. Without granting any special privileges whatsoever, passage of this measure will provide immediate relief at this point. It is wholly in keeping with American tradition that, in so deeply important a matter as citizenship, admission or denial be made only on grounds of individual behavior and qualification.

The second question—that of allowing universal use of immigration quotas by all peoples, including those of the Far East—is an issue with which I have long been familiar. It is my considered opinion that American relationships in the part of the world which this bill defines as the Asia-Pacific triangle can never be expected to become entirely sound until this country eliminates the humiliation inflicted by our exclusion laws.

These laws were based on two premises which time has proved to be in error.

(a) That the people of the Far East (and especially the Japanese) are not assimilable and therefore would not be loyal to the United States in the event of war with Japan, and

(b) These people maintained a lower standard of living than other ethnic groups and therefore created economic problems.

The war effectively disposed of the first contention. High military and civilian authority agree that there was no act of sabotage or espionage committed by a Japanese resident in Hawaii or the United States, before or during the war. Although forced by the circumstance of their ineligibility to American citizenship to remain citizens of Japan, the Japanese aliens resident in the United States and Hawaii proved themselves law abiding and cooperative during the entire war period. A considerable number, in point of fact, served the country of their adoption as language instructors, translators, and in the preparation of maps.

Their sons, the Nisei, proved themselves as loyal and effective troops, not only in the European theater, but in the Pacific as well. You may recall that General Marshall's report as Chief of Staff singled out the Nisei Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Combat Team for special citation for bravery. While it is true that disillusionment resulting from evacuation did cause a number of Japanese Americans to turn away from America, the overwhelming majority stood firm, even though their outlook was circumscribed by the barbed wire of relocation centers.

Time is disposing of the second contention. It is no doubt true that initially Japanese immigrants lived on a lower scale than their neighbors of older stock. This has been generally true of most immigrant groups. It is just as true that the second generation, those born on American soil, have improved the status of their parents just as have the sons and daughters of other immigrants. Today the Nisei, together with their parents, are living in all sections of the country, and it is entirely safe to say that their standard of living is that of the communities in which they live. I realize, of course, that this bill does not directly affect the Nisei. Nevertheless it is pertinent to point out that one measure of fitness of any immigrant group is the conduct of their children. As a matter of fact, much that is said of the Nisei may also be said now of the first generation.

It is also true that there have been no additions to the immigrant generation since 1924, and that this has helped to alleviate the pressure of economic competition. The

number of older Japanese who are able to work is constantly and rapidly declining. Had an earlier Congress seen fit to authorize a quota under the 1924 Immigration Act, the situation would have been substantially the same. An addition of 185 persons per year would have been entirely negligible. Such action taken in 1924 might have saved this country and the world much bitterness and hardship.

Let me say here that I do not favor throwing open the gates to unlimited immigration from the Far East or any other part of the world. In this respect H. R. 5004 is similar to the earlier laws which grant quotas to the Chinese and natives of India. Under the formula provided in this bill, the number of possible far-eastern immigrants will be only a few hundred more annually than present law provides.

From the standpoint of our relations in the Far East the number allotted to a given quota is not of primary importance. The question is one of principle, of recognition of the innate equality of peoples, of giving force to our own democratic beliefs.

I believe the present to be an exceptionally favorable time to take a step of this nature. The United States no longer has a general policy for far-eastern exclusion. The peoples of China, India, and the Philippine Islands have all been made eligible to citizenship. The stigma placed upon those who remain ineligible is accentuated.

The present is a time of great movement among these peoples, of realinement and choosing of friends. Burma is newly independent, Indonesia is seeking a new status—everywhere there is receptivity to new ideas. Nowhere is this more evident than in Japan, where a new leadership is emerging under our tutelage. It seems to me to be the height of folly to ask the support of democratic elements in these countries, yet at the very point where our democracy comes to test, to back away. If we want to hold our friends, we must support them. The ending of exclusion now would provide concrete proof of American good faith at a time when it is most important that new leadership be oriented in our direction.

The matter of Japan warrants particular attention.

There can be no question whatsoever that the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 undercut the position of liberal Japanese statesmen whose policy was based on friendship with America. In the sense that friends of this country were weakened, while the extremists were given a potent weapon with which to exacerbate Japanese-American relations, the policy of exclusion contributed largely to the final crisis.

In connection with this point, it is pertinent to recall a statement concerning the pending immigration bill made by Baron Sakatani during debate in the Japanese Diet some time in February 1924. I do not have the exact words used, but the statement was substantially as follows:

"If this bill is enacted by the United States it would lead to grave consequences. I do not mean to say by that that the Empire will go to war with the United States over this question. But what I do mean to say is that if the Japanese people are to be classified by the United States as an inferior race that action would seriously destroy the present desire of the Japanese people to cooperate with the other signatory nations in supporting the Nine Power Treaty and to observe the letter and spirit of that treaty in resolving our issues with China. If this bill becomes law, no one can foresee where that will end."

Of course, that is practically what happened. True, Baron Shidehara kept Japan in line until 1928, but once Baron Tanaka became Prime Minister (in 1928), the Nine-Power Treaty was relegated to the archives. In fact, what brought about Shidehara's downfall in 1928 was the charge that in keeping step with the other signatories, he had failed to protect Japanese interest in China.

By the time I reached Japan in 1932, the military was firmly in the saddle, and short of abject appeasement on the part of the United States, the hope for peace was already glimmering. The opportunity to improve relations by eliminating exclusion had already been lost. It is interesting to note that an entry in my diary for January 27, 1935, relating to repeal of the discriminatory provisions of the 1924 act, stated in part:

"I do not think that this is the time to approach the question; of course the act always rankles and always will, but to repeal the discriminatory provisions now would be interpreted by many as an indication of weakness and as a desire to placate the martial spirit of Japan, and while lovely editorials would be written about our graceful action in recognizing Japan as an equal, it would not in the slightest degree alter Japanese policy or tone down the military propaganda * * *."

Toward the end of my mission, it became clearly evident that the only possible hope for moderate leadership in Japan was through the complete disgrace of the military, and that only defeat in war could bring this about.

Defeated in war, the military leadership of Japan collapsed like a pack of cards. These men had forced their way into power through violence and the control of all avenues of information. They carried a misguided and uninformed people into a mad adventure which could have but one end. When their immunity to criticism was stripped away by defeat, liberal elements of Japan could once more emerge; nowhere in history has the repudiation of a defeated leadership been so complete.

Many observers have likened the reception accorded our initial occupation of Japan to the liberation of a friendly territory. How long this spirit may be expected to continue can hardly be forecast. The final outcome will depend upon Japanese leadership, for nothing is more certain than that at last all American troops will be withdrawn. In the meantime, we have our opportunity to assist in the development of leadership which will solidify the present trend of friendship toward this country.

When Japanese military might was at its zenith, it was unable to induce the United States to amend its immigration law. Now it is possible to accomplish as a matter of principle what then could have been considered appeasement.

There is a quality of loyalty about the Japanese which lies very deep. We have found the Japanese to be a desperate and implacable foe. Japan can be an equally valuable friend if mutual confidence can be built between us. There are realities in the world situation today which should impel us to strengthen by all means our bonds with nations whose friendship can be ours.

The Paradox of the Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, LaMotte T. Cohu, president of Trans World Airline, delivered an address entitled "The Paradox of the Air Lines" before the Society of Automotive Engineers in New York which I believe will be of interest in our consideration of aviation matters now pending before the Congress. Mr. Cohu calls attention to a number of problems which our commercial air lines are now faced with and suggests some changes in governmental policy which would be helpful in their solution.

TWA has its headquarters in Kansas City and I am personally acquainted with a number of its officials. Mr. Cohu has been connected with the aviation industry for some years, and I am sure that his remarks will be found of interest to those who are studying current aviation problems.

As a portion of these remarks I include excerpts from Mr. Cohu's address:

In 1947 the air lines of the United States carried more passengers and cargo, did it more efficiently, and lost more money than ever before in their history.

This startling paradox, of which there are few parallels in business history, is compounded from other paradoxes, confusions, miscalculations, and errors on the part of the air lines themselves, their suppliers, their regulating agencies, and the makers of basic Government policy.

This paradox has grown also out of many uncontrollable factors, such as the complexity of the airplane and its operation, the difficulties of rapid expansion, and the disruptions of the political and economic worlds.

I don't believe that we in air-line management can alibi for our errors; nor do I think we should blind ourselves to the causes of our plight. We should not deal lightly with the blunders of Government nor with the stark realities of basic economic upheavals. Our job is to find out why the paradox exists and to do all in our power to remove its causes. For we do know that a sound network of air lines is just as necessary for the social and economic welfare of this country, as for international security of the United States.

TRAFFIC INCREASED IN 1947 OVER ANY PREVIOUS YEAR

Taking domestic and international flag-carriers as a whole, every class of traffic—passenger, mail, express, and freight—increased in 1947 over any previous year. In 1947, for example, while passenger-miles flown by domestic air lines increased only slightly over 1946, they were nearly six times those flown in 1940. Domestic express and air freight increased 112 percent over 1946 and amounted to a volume of ton-miles 20 times the air express carried in 1940.

In the international field, the three American flag-carriers handled 85 percent of all air passengers arriving in this country over the North Atlantic route and 75 percent of those who departed, over the North Atlantic, for overseas points.

If all passenger arrivals from all foreign countries to the United States are considered for the year 1947, we find that the airplane brought in approximately one and one-half times as many persons as did surface vessels. This is an increase, in 7 short years, of more than 11 times in the volume of international air-passenger business.

REDUCTION OF AIR-LINE EMPLOYEES IN 1947

Yet, with all this growth and with the complexities of breaking-in new airplanes, as well as the costs of preparing for the inauguration of others, the number of employees on the domestic air-line pay rolls at the end of 1947 was approximately 10 percent less than those on the pay rolls a year earlier.

In TWA alone, the total number of employees has been reduced from over 17,000 (in the fall of 1946) to 13,000 at the end of 1947. And this reduction has been accomplished despite a 40.9 percent increase in the ton-miles of available capacity offered to the public.

Despite the record volume of business, and the successful efforts for improving efficiency, the air lines of the United States suffered losses of more than $22,000,000 in 1947. And, if the overseas air lines are excluded—and certain estimated profits for 1947 still depend upon undecided air-mail pay—the loss for all domestic air lines exceeded $20,000,000.

THE PARADOX IS NOT A 1-YEAR PHENOMENON

The early months of 1948 indicate that, unless rapid solutions of the underlying air-line problems are found, the results for the year 1948 may show a similarly discouraging picture.

Why this paradox? While the entire air-line losses of 1947 can be attributed to governmental policies—both general and those specifically affecting the air lines—I would be less than candid if I did not admit our own mistakes and, at the same time, recognize those uncontrollable factors which have cost the air-line business substantial sums of money.

In the wisdom of hindsight, it is easy to chide air-line management for its mistakes. And I realize that one of America's favorite indoor sports has become this critcism of air-line management's optimisms, errors, and struggles to plan the air transportation business on a sound footing with a vastly increased volume and scope. At the same time, these mistakes have contributed materially to the air-line paradox.

MISTAKE OF PLANNING TOO OPTIMISTICALLY

One of our principal mistakes was to plan too optimistically.

When, in 1944, domestic passenger business was nearly 50 percent above 1943 and when, in 1945, this same rate of increase continued, it was not easy to estimate where the growth of business would stop.

In the last year and a half we have experienced this same kind of problem with air freight, which has grown at a faster rate than our passenger business ever increased. But in 1944 and 1945, when the air lines had to plan for the postwar fleets and organization to meet their public responsibility for adequate transportation and their requirements for economic size, we were faced with expert estimates of a postwar passenger potential ranging from approximately 6,000,000,000 passenger-miles to 25,000,000,000 passenger-miles.

GENERAL ECONOMIC FACTORS AND GOVERNMENT POLICY—INFLATION: EFFECT ON TWA'S 1947 EXPENSES

Perhaps the greatest single cause for the paradoxical situation of the air lines arises from the inflation of prices, particularly in the last few years.

We have analyzed the effects of these increased prices on TWA. By taking the principal items of 1939 operating expenses and applying the cost per unit to our 1947 experience, we found some startling results.

The increases in the rates we pay for salaries and wages and the prices of materials and supplies, including gasoline and oil, account for almost $12,000,000 of our expenses. In other words, without inflation of prices, our $8,000,000 loss experienced in 1947 would have been a $4,000,000 profit, despite the fact that passenger rates were somewhat lower than in 1939, and mail pay was but a fraction of the 1939 rates per ton-mile.

A part of this inflation in prices can be laid to the disruptions of war. But a large part of it must be laid at the door of Government policy which encouraged undue wage increases during and especially immediately after the war, and which also encouraged wasted funds through many unnecesasry Government expenditures.

DILEMMA SHARPENED BY MAIL RATE REDUCTIONS

The dilemma presented by price increases is sharpened by the Government attitude toward mail rates.

At the very time postwar inflation was hitting the air lines, in 1945, the Civil Aeronautics Board reduced the service mail rate of the trunk-line carriers from 60 cents to 45 cents per ton-mile. While mail pay has become a decreasingly small percentage of our gross revenue, amounting to 7 percent domestically in 1947, the fact that the trunk-line operators have been asked to carry mail at a 25-percent reduction in rate below the amount paid during the war despite higher prices and costs, is strange indeed.

Had TWA received even the wartime service rate for the carrying of domestic air mail, its 1947 loss would have been reduced by $1,150,000, and had the 1939 air-mail rate been applied to both domestic and international air mail carried in 1947, TWA would have earned a profit of $3,500,000, instead of incurring a loss of $8,000,000.

GOVERNMENT MAIL POLICY: COST OF HANDLING AIR MAIL

Our governmental air-mail policy is confused, unrealistic, and not in accordance with the dictates of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Few persons realize why domestic air mail incurs costs far above those which are incurred for freight.

Air mail is handled as a top priority load.

A carrier is obliged to accept air mail, or risk fines, even if passengers are removed thereby.

In order to protect themselves and to give the post office the service it needs, most air lines allocate space and weight for air mail which cannot be sold in advance to passengers. This priority treatment is costly and justifies a service rate for mail well above the rate for passengers.

INCONSISTENCY IN INTERNATIONAL AIR-MAIL RATES

An interesting inconsistency in Government policy arises in international air mail.

If an American-flag carrier operating over the North Atlantic handles eastbound mail from the United States, it receives 75 cents per ton-mile to the foreign gateways.

If a foreign carrier handles the same kind of eastbound mail, it is paid $2.86 per ton-mile.

While American-flag carriers handle most of the eastbound mail, we have such startling paradoxes as the United States Government paying a foreign air line this attractive rate for flying thousands of ton-miles of mail during a time when our own American Overseas Airline was shut down by a needless strike called by an American labor leader.

FEEDER-LINE MAIL RATES

It has also seemed a little puzzling to me why the United States Government should place an inexperienced feeder-line operator into a local service and pay mail rates amounting to $20 to $100 per ton-mile, when a major air line like TWA is allowed only 45 cents per ton-mile for carrying mail over the feeder-type portions of its route. Yet the major air line is generally in a position to give superior mail service.

CAB AIR-MAIL POLICY DISREGARDS ACT OF 1938

The handling of air-mail rates has, to a very great extent, disregarded the clear dictates of congressional intent in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

In this act, Congress clearly stated that the rates set for air mail must reflect the need of each air carrier for compensation for the transportation of mail, sufficient to insure the performance of service under honest, economical, and efficient management as well as to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to an extent required for national commerce, the postal service, and national defense.

The record speaks for itself.

Not only has the service rate for the carriage of mail been below that required by the costs of rendering the service required and, in the international field, below that paid to the competitors of American flag-carriers, but the rate has been far below that required by the dictates of Congress itself.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY FACILITIES: NEED AND DELAYS

Another field of Government policy of considerable importance to the air lines is the program for the construction and modification of airports and airways facilities.

Most of these are clearly required in the interests of national defense, and many are necessary if we are to obtain a dependable and efficient air-line operating system.

Most of these improvements are beyond the reach of any single air line, not only because of their expense, but because they are public facilities necessarily open to the use of private flyers, nonscheduled air lines, and military pilots. As a matter of fact, some of our largest airports are used less by the scheduled air lines than by others.

In Kansas City, for the year 1947, only 27 percent of the total landings and take-offs were made by the scheduled air lines. Even at the crowded Chicago Municipal Airport, the scheduled air lines made only 64 percent of the total landings in 1947.

The need for these facilities has been recognized for some time and stands materially in the way of attaining dependable operation. Yet, even though the Federal airport program was approved by Congress in 1946, rather little has been accomplished.

AIR-LINE OUTLOOK NOT HOPELESS

I should be pessimistic, indeed, if I left with you the impression that the outlook for the air lines is hopeless. It would be a sad outlook if we in the air-line business felt we had to look forward to increasing our business and extending air travel to the air public only at increasing losses. Such an outlook would, of course, spell the end to private enterprise in the air-line industry.

I feel that there is much which can be done by the air lines themselves, their suppliers, their employees, and by State and Federal Governments.

As a matter of fact, the rude awakening from the easy profits of wartime years and the recognition of the economic problems involved in the postwar period have already led to many actions designed to put the air lines on a sound footing.

The main job of air-line management today is to improve the quality and dependability of service and to reduce costs. And by management I include every supervisor in our companies. We must improve the quality and dependability of air-line service and at the same time we must reduce the capital costs of expansion and the costs of operating our businesses.

I feel certain that when we have done so public opinion will force such changes in governmental policy that we cannot fail in becoming a sound and integral part of our Nation's economic structure.

This job on the part of management requires cost reduction through the development of efficient organization and methods of doing business and a cost consciousness on the part of employees who see their economic security bound up with the efficient operation of their air-line company.

The Story of Freedom's Silhouette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is surprising, yet true, that the identity of the figure represented by the statue atop the Capitol dome in Washington is unknown to the vast majority of native-born citizens of the Capital of the United States.

Since this statement is attested to by competent observers in Washington, it is little wonder that the most common question asked by tourists of Capitol officials is a request for the identity of the mystery figure perched 380 feet above street level since December 2, 1863.

Even legislators of many years' service have been known to be guilty of faulty memory when asked what has become Washington's $64 question.

The famous statue, which is called the Statue of Freedom, has an interesting history, as revealed by the following article titled "The Story of Freedom's Silhouette" by John J. Daly, which appears in the April 1948 issue of the National Republic magazine.

THE STORY OF FREEDOM'S SILHOUETTE
(By John J. Daly)

By the end of the June bride season, close to 500,000 sightseers will visit Washington, look at the Capitol dome, and go away without hearing the story of the statue atop the building.

Placed so high above the street level—380 feet—the human eye can hardly tell whether this is a statue of a man or a woman, whether it's a mythical god or goddess. Few know what it represents. Liberty, freedom, or the pursuit of happiness. It has even been called Miss America.

Through the years other names have been given this work of art.

David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, says the official name of the great bronze is Statue of Freedom. He should know.

An American sculptor, Thomas Crawford, created this work. He called his statue Armed Liberty. Crawford worked out all the details in the ancient city of Rome, where he had gone to study under the masters. He finished the model, but never had the pleasure of seeing his statue cast in bronze. The same ship that brought the plaster model to America also carried word of the sculptor's death.

That was back in 1857. The statue was swung into place on December 2, 1863, at noon. Booming of cannon from nearby forts and the hurrahs of crowds gathered on the Capitol lawn greeted the placement. The Nation was then in the midst of a civil war. As the statue had been authorized and designed long before this conflict there is in its motif no mention of this warfare even though the finished product presents as its theme the past and the present of America.

At the time the award was made, Jefferson Davis, later President of the Confederacy, was Secretary of War for the United States. Under his authorization, Crawford, the sculptor, was told to proceed with the work. Crawford and Davis then entered into a series of correspondence over the statue.

In his workshop on the Via del Orto di Napoli in the Eternal City, Tom Crawford set out to make his masterpiece for the young city then just reaching man's estate on the banks of the Potomac. He knew he had to meet the approval of Jeff Davis, the Secretary of War. As soon as the cast was in proper shape, photographs were taken. These were sent to Washington by slow-moving ocean vessels.

Receipt of the first set of photographs, several in number, drew this letter from Jeff Davis: "The second photograph of the statue with which it is proposed to crown the dome of the Capitol impresses me most favorably. Its general grace and power, striking at first, have grown on me as I studied its details.

"As to the cap, I can only say, without intending to press the objection formerly made, that it seems to me that its history renders it inappropriate to a people who were born free and would not be enslaved. * * * The liberty cap has an established origin in its use as the badge of the freed slave, and though it should have emblematic meaning today, a recurrence to that origin may give to it in the future the same popular conception which it had in the past.

"Why should not Armed Liberty wear a helmet? Her conflict being over, her cause triumphant, as shown by the other emblems of the statue, the visor would be up, so as to permit the display of a circle of stars expressive of endless existence and of heavenly birth."

Indeed, that's the way the head of the statue came to be adorned. The sculptor, on receipt of Jeff Davis's critique, dispensed with the so-called liberty cap and in its place fashioned a helmet, "the crest of which is composed of an eagle's head and a bold arrangement of feathers, suggested by the costume of our Indian tribes." That was Crawford's own description, and it pleased Jeff Davis.

Encouraged, Crawford went to work with renewed vigor. But he had other commitments. This work was shared with his Statue of Freedom. One of the major pieces was a statue of George Washington. So the Washington statue and Freedom went up hand in hand, so to speak.

It happened this way. Previously, on a visit to his native land, the young sculptor—Crawford was only 44 when he died—had entered a competition authorized by the city of Richmond, Va., for a heroic statue of the Squire of Mount Vernon. Crawford won.

This was the work he was engaged upon in his little studio in Rome when the Jeff Davis suggestion for a change in the Statue of Freedom came along. Only at that time they were calling it Armed Victory.

Six years of unflagging labor kept Crawford busy. He was the busiest sculptor in seven nations, as he afterward said. And it was this unrelenting drive that brought about his end.

Aside from the statue now atop the dome and the Washington equestrian statue, Crawford had also accepted from the United States Government an invitation to compete for sculptural decorations proposed as adornments to the Capitol. As a result of his ability, Crawford had received the award for the most exclusive commission of that period. As a result of this he made the marble pedimented doors to the Senate wing of the Capitol. Over one of these doors is a piece called History, over another, Justice.

Better American sculptors came after Crawford, not before. That was the dictum. Even his rivals admitted the man had a genius for work of this sort. This was proved when he laid plans for decorating the dome of the Capitol.

Up to that time the dome had been bare. Under Crawford's direction, years before the statue itself was finished, Italian workmen came to America to make the scene ready. They carved, in Massachusetts marble, Crawford's huge pedimented group with its busy unrelated figures now planted at each side of the central subject. It was about this time that the statue's name began to be shifted from Armed Liberty to Freedom. Crawford liked the idea of "Freedom." As he conceived the statue, it was an America—or "Freedom"—amply draped, secure in her laurel wreaths, eagle, and sun rays.

Crawford became a story teller through the medium of his statue. In his work, as it now adorns the Capitol, can be found the saga of the vanquished Indian, the career of the woodsman, the hunter with his quarry, the soldier in battle, the merchant, the mechanic, the teacher, and the pupil.

All these things are there, in the Statue of Freedom, on top of the Capitol dome.

Naturally, they cannot be seen because the statue is so high above street level and beyond the focus of human gaze. But there is a place where the visitors to Washington—and Washingtonians, too—may see all the glorious detail of Crawford's Statue of Freedom. That is in the National Museum.

There is a plaster model in the Arts and Industrial Building of the United States National Museum. This is the same model of the Statue of Freedom that was fashioned by the sculptor, Thomas Crawford.

Until this model was placed on public view, in 1890, it had lain in the basement of the United States Capitol, along with a lot of other valuable art—oil paintings and the like. They had all been there more than a quarter of a century, subject to dirt and neglect.

How the model of the Statue of Freedom ever got into the basement of the Capitol Building is something that no one seems able to explain. It was just part of the old-fashioned neglect that has always bothered democracy.

Up to that point, however, here is the history of the model.

Thomas Crawford finished his work shortly after New Year's Day, 1858—and gave a party in his studio. His friends then helped him prepare the plaster model for shipment. There seemed to be no hurry on that score, either. It was not until the Easter time that the statue was placed aboard a ship due to sail for America.

The boat carrying the plaster model of the statue sailed from Leghorn, Italy, April 19, 1858—bound for New York.

Less than 3 days out of port the ship sprang a leak. The leak continued for 30 days. On May 19, the ship put in at Gibraltar. There all the cargo—except the statue model—was taken off and the vessel caulked.

The same ship set sail again on June 26. But whoever hammered in the oakum failed to do a good job and by July 1 the ship was leaking badly again.

On the Fourth of July, when there should have been a good old-fashioned patriotic celebration aboard, water started rushing into the hold of the ship at the rate of 12 inches an hour.

That was bad business. Instead of singing and serenading, or even the lighting of a Roman candle or two—and there were plenty of these aboard—it was every man to the pumps. Not only did they man the pumps, but they started throwing cargo overboard.

As the records show, part of the cargo that hit the sea consisted of 250 cases of valuable rugs and 48 cases of citron. At one time they debated about throwing the model over the side of the ship. Had that hap-

pened, the present-day Statue of Freedom would not be there.

Even at that, the model came very near not getting to Washington. On July 27, in the year of the voyage, water was coming into the ship at the rate of 16 inches an hour. So the captain, knowing he could never make New York, drifted with the tide down to the Bermudas. There the vessel was condemned.

For a long time the ship lay in dock. Then it was sold. The new owner wanted no part of the Freedom model, so he ordered it taken off the ship and parked on a wharf. There it remained until word got to Washington. Promptly a vessel was chartered and sent to Bermuda with instructions to bring the model to the United States.

When the plaster cast arrived in the United States it was taken to Mills Station, a hamlet on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad outside of Washington. There it was cast in bronze by Clark Mills.

This work was begun in 1860. But it was 3 years later before the statue was hoisted to its final resting place. The task was not an easy one. There were no hydraulic derricks in those days.

A mechanical engineer, Charles F. Thomas, of 32 Eleventh Street, Brooklyn, got the job of placing the statue on the Capitol dome.

No one seemed to envy Mr. Thomas his job. Indeed, most of the trade believed he would fail. But he designed and erected a platform and then obtained a certificate from A. Lincoln, signed by the President himself.

While Thomas was building the pedestal and getting ready to place the statue in position, Clark Mills was doing the casting and making out bills. For his work in casting the figure he was paid $9,800.

For labor, iron work, and copper, there was a further expenditure of $10,996.82.

For the model, and for all his years of labor, the sculptor—true to art tradition—received only $3,000.

Thus, it cost the United States Government $23,796.82 to place the Statue of Freedom on top of the Capitol dome.

At the end of the casting, when it was simply and solidly based, the statue was taken by dray from the little town outside Washington to the Capitol Grounds. It was even a long time after this event that the statue found its permanent place over the Houses of Congress.

The Statue of Freedom was unveiled atop the Capitol on the opening day of the second session of the Thirty-seventh Congress—December 2, 1863—in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, by Hannibal Hamlin, of Maine, the Vice President of the United States.

Crawford, the sculptor, had planned on being present. But that was just another one of the disappointments that shadowed his life.

Several years before the unveiling, the sculptor had been in America to arrange some business matters and plan for other work. In the fall, he returned to Rome. His wife and children remained in the States. On the voyage, Crawford developed a serious eye trouble. Back in Rome he became absorbed in his work, paid no attention to his affliction. Finally he had to give up. Specialists found a malignant growth behind the orbit of his right eye.

His wife was summoned and he was taken to Paris for treatment. He was operated on and spent many months in a dark room. Then he was sent to London to recuperate, and to catch the first boat back to America. He never made the journey. Born in New York City, March 22, 1813, Crawford died in London on October 10, 1857.

In Washington, his statue—Freedom—makes a gorgeous silhouette against the sky.

Palestine—Establish It as a Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 the Anglo-American Committee which was established to investigate the situation in Palestine characterized Palestine as a land holy to Christians, Jews, and Moslems alike. The report suggested that it should be a land which shall be dedicated to the precepts and practices of the brotherhood of man and not to the concept of a narrow nationalism.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Armand Eisler, of New York City, has prepared a very interesting paper on this subject and his ideas merit consideration by this Congress. War is actually in progress in Palestine and the United Nations is impotent to cope with it. I include as part of my remarks Dr. Eisler's contribution to the thinking on the problem of Palestine:

CAN PALESTINE BE ESTABLISHED AS HOLY LAND?—OUTLINE OF A PEACE PROGRAM

Neither the Jewish Agency nor the Arab High Committee are the true representatives of the three creeds involved in the destination of Palestine. The fallacy of the past years repeated itself in 1946 and in 1947 by overlooking the intrinsic vocation of the Holy Land as a land of peace. The Anglo-American Committee of 1946 emphasized the point and did not fail to characterize Palestine as a land holy to Christians, Jews, and Moslems alike, a land which shall be dedicated to the precepts and practices of the brotherhood of man, not to those of narrow nationalism. But the report failed to derive from this truth the logical implications; it did not set Palestine apart from the political turmoil of civil strife now raging in that country. The report recommended to place the territory under the international trusteeship system of the UN. But it anticipated a political solution of the problem, which should have been reserved for the UN itself. It recommended the immediate admission of 100,000 Jewish immigrants. This was an explosive suggestion, by omitting to insist that the entry of 100,000 immigrants into Palestine be conditioned upon general disarmament in Palestine. The report, therefore, created a situation which has led to terror, savagery, and internecine warfare in the land of peace and finally to the intervention of the United Nations. This was the mistake, which is about to repeat itself in 1948.

Again the narrow nationalism culminating into cries for immediate independence and establishment of three small sovereignties bars the way toward peace and the unique destination of Palestine, the fulfillment of which might be of highest significance for the world.

According to the Charter of the UN, territories now held under mandate should be placed under the United Nations by terms of trusteeship agreements (articles 77 a and c). But the principles of these terms are essential for the UN land, which should be a land of mankind.

On this sacred ground a spiritual linkage should bind together the war-torn nations into a new commonwealth and establish Palestine as a holy land, for our time, of the three religions, a spiritual and social sanctuary of mankind.

The history of influence exerted by religious organizations might be a lesson warning to avoid the fallacies which may loom in the program establishing Palestine as the holy land. This holy experiment should not set up a land governed by clergymen, but ruled by the people themselves electing their government in the spirit of perennial religion, devoted to brotherhood and to human rights after the anti-Christian and anti-Judaic abominations of recent history. It would transform the present battleground of Palestine into the test ground of a kingdom of God, or a republic of God, a civitas dei on earth. The economic forces and integration of the presently struggling groups into this synthetic creation of history should be forged as a shield against the fear of becoming too transcendental and unpractical by the spiritual approach to political problems of urgent interest. As experience has taught, the political approach has thus far complicated the chaotic conditions of conflicting forces of nationalistic, religious, and social ideologies.

The peoples of Palestine cannot be appeased by the establishment of one or two independent states nor by a colonial trusteeship. Not a political compromise, but reconciliation between the diverging group minds can pave the way toward a solution of the problem, which is plaguing the world. Reconciliation can be attained on the common foundations of the three religions, which are attached to the holy land. A new approach should try to bring together the elected representatives of the three religions in order to contrive a program of cooperative federation, which would unite the worshipers of the one God in the sacred land of promise.

A study of the conditions of reconciliation on the foundations of a brotherhood of man is necessary, an inquiry into a plan of a cooperative and free supranationalistic commonwealth of the holy land governed by the elected representatives of the three religions concerned. An interfaith conference of Christians, Jews, and Moslems should be called upon in order to constitute a cooperative federation to dedicate the holy land to the brotherhood of man. This constitution should spiritualize the social ideals of our times and socialize the religious ideals of the religious tradition. Without infringing on the autonomy of worship of the individual, the constitution of Palestine based upon the religious-social foundations of the three religions would solidify the common spirit in common institutions and culminate in a new Jerusalem as envisioned by the Holy Scriptures.

The unfortunate phrase "with a view to the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly" (as contained in the resolution adopted by the Security Council on March 5, 1948) is again a pitfall, which should be ignored, the fatal partition scheme having already proved to be the detonator of violence and bloodshed. Here is an outline of the terms of the trusteeship agreement to be recommended for a peaceful solution in Palestine:

1. Palestine shall be a Holy Land dedicated to precepts and practices of the brotherhood of man.

2. For this purpose Palestine shall be placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations after the termination of the mandated administration.

3. The trusteeship shall last until the peoples of the trust territory determine and constitute self-government on a peaceful and democratic basis of equality, liberty, and fraternity.

4. The Holy Land shall be administered until the establishment of self-government according to point 3 (above) by the Trusteeship Council under the authority of the Security Council (art. 83 of the Charter).

5. The trust territory shall be indivisible and inviolate.

6. The chairman of the administrative authority shall be assisted by advisory councils composed each of an equal number of members elected by the peoples themselves of the territory.

The chairman shall have the casting vote of the councils in the case of dissension.

7. The councils are:

(a) The council for economic development and cooperation.

(b) The council for immigration and determining the absorptive capacity of the trust territory.

(c) The council for religious, cultural, and educational advancement.

(d) The council for the development of self-government.

8. The International Court of Justice shall establish regional chambers in Palestine with jurisdiction over violations of rights of man and the terms of the trusteeship agreement. Peoples and creeds concerned shall have access to the court.

Its decisions and advisory opinions are binding upon the peoples, creeds concerned as well as on the UN, its organs and its members.

These terms of a trusteeship agreement would insure both the way to self-government and to cooperation with the goal to establish a commonwealth of brotherhood, the Holy Land. "And all nations shall flow unto it * * * for out of Zion shall go forth the law."

Dr. ARMAND EISLER.

NEW YORK, *March 1948.*

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Winthrop G. Brown, Acting Director, Office of International Trade Policy, Department of State, before the import session of the Third Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference, New Orleans, La., Friday, April 16, 1948:

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON IMPORTS

Almost 200 years ago a Chinese Emperor sent a message to George III of England via the first commercial mission from Europe. It said:

"The stores of goods at the celestial court are plenteously abundant; there is nothing but what is possessed, so that there is really no need for the produce of outer barbarians in order to balance supply and demand. However, as tea, silk and porcelain produced by the celestial court are indispensable objects to the different states of Europe and to the kingdom, for this reason we have in our grace and commiseration established the foreign hongs at Macao in order that all daily needs may be duly supplied, and everyone share in our superfluous riches."

We today can be neither so complacent nor so condescending as that Chinese Emperor about the trade of our country with the rest of the world. For history and bitter experience have taught us that in order to continue prosperity in this country and in order to foster stable economic conditions throughout the world, trade must flourish among nations, and although we appear to be supplied with a plenteous abundance, we are definitely not in a position to call ourselves self-sufficient; nor to say that we have really no need for the produce of outer barbarians.

This afternoon we are primarily concerned with imports—why we need them, what the Government has done to help us obtain them most advantageously, and how the policies thus pursued are being used to serve our basic national interest.

Why do we need imports?

The United States is now the world's principal foreign trading country. Our exports are larger than those of any other country. Our imports are second only to those of the United Kingdom. Approximately 10 percent of the total agricultural and industrial production of the United States is sold abroad. To some people, an average export of 10 percent of our production may not seem significant, but businessmen know that a variation of 10 percent in a company's sales may mean the difference between black and red ink. Moreover, the 10 percent average obscures the fact that, for some products, exports take a fourth or even a half of the total United States output. In 1938 exports furnished a market for 29 percent of our production of tobacco, 31 percent of cotton, 12 percent of lard, 36 percent of dried fruit, 29 percent of sardines, 52 percent of phosphate rock, 36 percent of sulfur, 38 percent of rosin, 14 percent of industrial machinery, 14 percent of automobiles, 22 percent of office appliances, 12 percent of radios, etc. Even these figures do not tell the whole story, for the production of these products is often confined to particular States or localities upon which a shrinkage in exports would have a highly concentrated effect.

Our agricultural and industrial capacity expanded greatly during the war. Our agricultural output in 1947, for example, was one-third above the 1939 volume. When the world food shortage ends, the United States will be faced with agricultural surpluses, unless exports are maintained. Economic history shows that agricultural depressions precede and lead to industrial depressions. Prosperity of an industrial State is highly dependent upon the prosperity, not only of other industrial States that buy its manufactures, but also upon the prosperity of agricultural areas that buy manufactures from all States.

Everyone will agree that exports are beneficial. But the plain fact is that we cannot export unless we import (except by continuing foreign loans indefinitely without repayment). The real issue is not whether we want to import, but whether we want to import in order to export—whether we want a large foreign trade of exports and imports, a small foreign trade, or no foreign trade. The inescapable truth is that the most prosperous countries are those with a large foreign trade. The poorest countries are those with a small foreign trade.

That is the first answer to the question, "Why do we need imports?"

A second answer is that there are many primary products that we need to maintain our high standard of living, which come only from abroad. Every school child knows about the sources of coffee, tea, cocoa, bananas, spices, and the like. Our meals would be dull indeed were it not for these imports. But more important is the necessity for meeting our almost insatiable demands for primary raw materials to feed our industry. Some, like natural rubber, we do not produce at all. Others we do not produce in anywhere near sufficient quantities. We know, for example, that the United States is the world's greatest producer of steel. To make steel requires some 40 raw materials drawn from 57 different countries. For example, a ton of steel requires 14 pounds of manganese. Ninety-seven percent of our manganese is imported. We know that the United States is the world's greatest producer of automobiles. Thirty-one materials necessary for the car you drive come from foreign countries. As stated in an article in one of our leading journals, "How well you eat, how adequately you are clothed and housed, how good a car you drive—in short, how high is your standard of living," depends on imports.

Moreover, there are many raw materials which are of critical importance to our national security. It is essential that we maintain adequate stockpiles of these materials which we do not produce and conserve our resources of those which we do produce.

The Bureau of Mines reported to Congress in May 1947, that our known commercial reserves of 21 major minerals, including copper, lead, zinc, manganese, chrom, tungsten, mica, and petroleum are less than sufficient to supply 35 years of domestic requirements at current consumption rates. Imports of such minerals are necessary (a) to conserve dwindling domestic reserves, and (b) to supply domestic manufacturers with raw materials at costs that will enable them to compete against foreign manufacturers in fabricated products.

And in the gentler field of the amenities of life which are so important to a nation like our own which has so high a standard of living, come the fine luxury goods not economically produced in this country: Brandy and perfume, oriental rugs, certain furs, and things of that kind.

Another reason why we need imports is that they make jobs in the United States. Quite aside from the obvious fact that our factories could not operate without basic raw materials from abroad, every pound of rubber, every bolt of cloth, every case of glassware that comes into the United States has to be unloaded, warehoused, transported, insured, advertised, and marketed. This means jobs.

Most of the imports I have been describing thus far are essentially noncompetitive with United States products. They meet needs which we cannot meet from our own resources at all, or which we can meet only in part. They make up the great bulk of our imports. But there is also a considerable volume of imports which are more or less directly competitive with domestic production. Our people need and want those products, too, and the fact that they are competitive should not frighten us. Our country is the home of competition. Lack of competition means stagnation. Lower tariffs on these products will benefit our consumers. Yet it is a fact that indiscriminate lowering of tariffs on such products could have serious disrupting effects on certain segments of our economy.

This brings me to the second major aspect of this talk. What has this Government done to help us obtain the imports which we need and want in such a way as best to serve the interests of the producers and consumers of the United States?

During the period between World Wars I and II and up until 1934, we pursued a policy of economic isolationism. Though we had become a creditor Nation, we did not pursue the policies befitting a creditor Nation. Instead, we tried to insulate ourselves from the rest of the world. Rather than encourage other nations to trade with us and enabling them to pay for our goods with their goods, we raised our tariffs against them.

In 1934, however; this policy was reversed. In that year the Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act, giving the President power to enter into agreements with other countries for the reciprocal reduction of the highly restrictive barriers that were rapidly suffocating international trade.

It has been a long road of progress since the June night in 1934 on which the Trade Agreements Act was signed. Up to last summer, some 30 bilateral agreements had been negotiated under its authority, and our tariffs and those of the other countries were

appreciably reduced. But much still remained to be done. There were important countries with which we had no agreements, there were few tariff reduction agreements between other countries, and many of our tariffs were still unnecessarily high.

So, on the invitation of the United States, and under the sponsorship of the United Nations, 23 nations met together last summer at Geneva to negotiate for the reduction of their tariffs, to facilitate their imports from each other. And after 7 months of negotiation, they reached agreement—agreement on the tariff treatment of products which accounted prewar for over half the world's international trade.

The total import trade of the Geneva countries in products on which tariff action was taken was in the order of $10,000,000,000 prewar. The United States' share of the import trade in these products was about a billion and three-quarters dollars.

The tariff concessions granted were of three kinds: reductions in rates of duty, binding of existing rates against increase and binding of duty-free status. The United States obtained reductions in duty from other countries on products of principal interest to us accounting in 1939 for about $500,000,000 of our exports. We granted reduction in duty on imports into the United States accounting in 1939 for about $500,000,000. We bound the existing tariff rates on about $150,000,000 of imports and bound the duty-free status of about a billion one hundred million dollars of imports. We obtained corresponding concessions for our exports of approximately the same magnitude.

The products on which we granted tariff concessions in the Geneva agreement and in the 30 trade agreements which preceded it included those which are competitive with our domestic production as well as those which are not.

A few segments of the American economy argue that the Geneva agreement and the trade agreements program generally will ruin them by permitting a flood of cheap foreign goods into the United States market. One has only to talk to a few people from other countries to realize that the rest of the world is even more fearful of the effect upon their industries of a flood of imports from the United States. They recognize that our labor is more highly paid than theirs but they know also that it is better trained, better housed, better fed, and better educated, better equipped with machines, hence much more productive. Time and again the fears thus voiced in the United States have proved to be groundless.

In 1945, the House Ways and Means Committee took note of these claims and wrote in its majority report:

"Why are these claims made if it is true that they cannot be substantiated? The committee has discovered that, with few exceptions, the sole basis has been the fact that imports of the products concerned have increased, which increases the claimants considered were injurious per se. The committee discovered, in case after case, where such a claim of injury had been made, that the same conditions which made increased imports profitable also made possible a considerably increased domestic production. Under these circumstances, imports did not displace but supplemented the output of our industries in an expanded market in which prices were usually as good or better than before.

"To take the position, as many of these industries have, that substantial exclusion of the imports would have meant still greater domestic production is to assume, contrary to all experience, that exclusion could be carried out as a general policy with no effect on the size of the domestic demand. If we have learned anything from our experience during the depression, when we had virtually 100 percent of a very poor market, it is that a reasonably free flow of international trade is one essential condition to the existence of an expanding domestic market."

The truth is that demand is never static. More goods at lower prices produce more sales. More sales produce more income. More income produces more demand. And increased demand in great volume is coming from another source, because since 1940 our numbers in the United States have increased by 13,700,000, making a total United States population of over 145,000,000. Present predictions indicate an even greater increase to come, since it is estimated that by 1975 the population of this country will number between 166 and 185 million. A logical consequence of this increased population will be higher levels of production and demand in this country, and supplies of goods greater than in the past will be called for by these future Americans.

But quite aside from these important general factors in the situation the competitive aspect of imports is positively and specifically dealt with in the administration of the Trade Agreements Act. After the facts have been ascertained by study and public hearing concessions in our trade agreements are tailored to meet particular situations and to safeguard domestic producer interests. Some concessions are effective only during a particular season, when our producers may be largely out of the market. Others apply only to a limited quantity of imports, all other imports continuing to pay the original rate. Others apply only to imports over a certain value, or to products of a certain type. Still others combine several of these devices for facilitating the maximum increase in imports with a minimum adverse effect on domestic producer interests.

And to make assurance doubly sure, an escape clause is now being incorporated in all our trade agreements. Under this clause, if it is found after study that as a result of unforeseen developments and of a tariff concession, a product is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers, the concession may be withdrawn or modified for such time and to such extent as may be necessary to prevent or remedy the injury. If this is done, of course, other countries affected may withdraw substantially equivalent concessions.

I have described in some detail the part that imports play in our national economy, and I have described the mechanism of the Trade Agreements Act which we have used for so long to help increase our imports as well as our exports. You have heard from other speakers here the vast importance to the United States of our foreign trade, both ways. I have described some aspects of the great step toward facilitating international trade taken by the 23 countries assembled last summer at Geneva. I would like now to comment briefly on the special significance of our every action in the field of international trade today.

It is very fitting that we should be considering these problems at this particular time. For the world is making up its mind just now as to the direction in which international trade should go. And the United States must soon make an important and symbolic decision on this question when the Congress considers the President's request for a renewal of the Trade Agreements Act for a further period of 3 years.

After World War II economic conditions were chaotic in the extreme. Not only was there tremendous physical destruction of facilities for production, transportation, and communications, but there was also destruction of intangibles, such as breaking of business channels and liquidation of foreign investments. Shortages of food, clothing, fertilizer, raw materials, and machinery are still the rule. And during the war techniques for the control of trade by governments had been brought to a high degree of perfection. In almost every country imports and exports are being controlled by government as to quantity, source, and destination. International trade has been turning toward bilateralism and control.

Positive action on a wide scale was needed to reverse this trend and start trading nations moving again in the direction of multilateral international trade. No one nation, not even the United States, was powerful enough to accomplish this alone. It was important to act before the patterns of bilateralism and control had become too permanently fixed.

So the United States took the lead in an effort to secure international agreement that world trade would take its course along the broadening highway of multilateralism and equality of treatment rather than down the ever narrowing road of bilateralism, barter and political preference. In 1945 we put forward for the consideration of the peoples of the world our Proposals for the Expansion of World Trade and Employment. After three international conferences these have ripened into a Charter for an International Trade Organization agreed upon by the representatives of 54 nations at the conference just concluded at Habana. We also asked a large group of other nations to negotiate with us and with each other for the reduction of tariffs and the limitation and regulation of the use of other trade barriers. This invitation resulted in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I have given you an idea of the scope of tariff action taken in the general agreement. In addition to tariff concessions, the general agreement, like the trade agreements which we have previously negotiated, contains provisions designed to establish a liberal and multilateral trade policy, and to prevent the parties to the agreement from canceling out the concessions by the use of discriminatory and restrictive measures. These provisions are aimed to prevent or limit the use of restrictive import quota systems, exchange controls and discriminatory internal taxes and regulations. They require the nondiscriminatory administration of customs procedures and State-trading enterprises. Rules for customs valuation are established. Unconditional most-favored-nation treatment is to be applied by all the signatories so that no one country will receive more favorable treatment than any other. Exceptions are of course made to allow for the current extreme shortages of foreign exchange abroad and for other legitimate deviations. When you realize that the nations at Geneva account for over three-quarters of the world's international trade, you will understand what a step has been taken in turning the course of world trade away from bilateralism and control and toward expansion, competition, and equality of opportunity.

This unprecedented achievement in the field of international economic agreement was negotiated by the United States under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, which expires on June 12. The President has asked the Congress to renew this tried and tested instrument of our foreign economic policy, already four times renewed, for a further period of 3 years. Why?

There were only 23 countries at Geneva. It is important to bring many other countries into the general agreement. To do so they must negotiate reductions in their tariffs with the Geneva countries. The President needs the trade-agreements authority to participate in these negotiations.

If he does not have effective authority to negotiate because of failure to renew the act in appropriate form, we will simply have to say to countries wishing to come into the agreement that it is uncertain whether we can give effect to the results of any negotiation. Since the trade of most countries with the United States is highly significant to them, they will hesitate to come in on this basis. We will be keeping friendly countries out of this cooperative economic effort.

In the European recovery program we are embarking on a tremendous effort to help the countries of western Europe get back on their feet. The program recognizes the elementary fact that one of the prerequisites to their staying on their feet is to reduce the barriers to their race between each other and between themselves and the rest of the world. They should get into a position to earn their own way by selling their goods. The reduction of their tariffs on each other's goods and the extension of tariff reductions in their trade with the rest of the world is one good way of enabling them to pay their own way. In 1947 our exports to Europe exceeded our imports by nearly $5,000,000,000. We do not expect to close this gap completely by imports. Europe simply won't have the goods available for a long time. We can help close it by tourist expenditures, and also by buying the services which they have to offer, such for example, as shipping. But the best way to close that gap is by imports, which give our people things they need, which give many of our people direct employment, which establish a market for our goods abroad, and which maintain nations who think and feel as we do on a self-sustaining basis, bound to us by the friendly ties of mutually satisfactory trade. We should not, just as we embark on the European recovery program, give up our ability to participate with these countries in working out arrangements by which they can more completely pay their own way.

But most important of all, the Trade Agreements Act is a symbol to the rest of the world of United States willingness to participate in international economic cooperation. Its first enactment, 14 years ago, marked the reversal of the policy of economic isolationism which we pursued after World War I. Any action which could be intepreted as a repudiation by the United States of the trade-agreements policy would be considered by other nations as equally symbolic, and would jeopardize United States leadership in the fight for the kind of economic world in which we believe and in which private enterprise and free competition can continue.

Let us face facts. The economic system we believe in is on trial. It is being challenged by the Communist world as unworkable and as leading inevitably to disintegration and collapse, depression, and despair. Many non-Communist nations are doubtful whether the conduct of international trade can safely be entrusted to competition and private enterprise in the world of today or the world they see ahead for tomorrow. We believe that it can. And with the United States as a rallying point, other nations are prepared to give multilateral trade a try. So we must prove that our system will work. Nations that believe in freedom must come closer together economically as well as politically. We must keep and we must use every instrument to encourage and facilitate their doing so.

Congratulations to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us join with our Italian friends in extending heartiest congratulations to the citizens of Italy for their resounding democratic victory over the Communist forces.

Our friends and neighbors at home who wrote to their relatives and friends in Italy telling them of the benefits of the democratic way of life, and urging them to attain those benefits for themselves by opposing communism, played a great part in this democratic victory.

It proves again that the battle of the ballots can be won peacefully, provided we pursue a positive program of teaching the world the benefits of democracy, at the same time teaching the world communism has but one goal, and that is the enslavement of the world. We rejoice with Premier Alcide de Gasperi in the knowledge that the Communists will be excluded from participation in the next Italian Government.

Democracy has triumphed again.

National Cemetery in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions passed by the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a national cemetery within the Commonwealth

Whereas citizens of Massachusetts who were called to serve in the armed forces of the United States of America in World War II and who were in active contact with enemy forces at many places outside the territorial United States, and in their service to the Nation many made the supreme sacrifice; and

Whereas the bodies of these citizen-soldiers are now being returned to the home communities within the Commonwealth, it is desired that there should be provided a proper and suitable last resting place to be commensurate in dignity and beauty with the loyalty of their exemplary citizenship and also to provide a burial place for other veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery within the Commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 2, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In Senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

[SEAL] F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolutions in behalf of the displaced persons in Europe

Whereas in Europe today there are thousands of persons, innocent victims of the holocaust which has enveloped their country and swept the world, who cannot return to the country of their origin; and

Whereas these displaced persons are fugitives from religious and political persecutions and, in certain cases, subjected to indirect coercive methods of repatriation; and

Whereas the United States has endorsed the principle that compulsion should not be used on homeless persons, victims of war and power politics; and

Whereas certain congressional legislation is designed to use immigration quotas not exhausted during the World War II for the purpose of admitting persons in accordance with the usual safeguard of immigration requirements; and

Whereas these people, many of them of Polish origin, are thoroughly imbued with democratic ideals and are opposed to totalitarianism, would make good law-abiding citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts, in session assembled, recommends the passage of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge our fullest cooperation in this great task not only for ourselves, but for the great number of Americans of many origins whom we have the honor to represent; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Massachusetts Members of Congress, to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration, and to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

In house of representatives, adopted March 2, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy.
Attest:

[SEAL] F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Resolutions memorializing Congress in favor of the passage of the adjusted-compensation bill as advocated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact into law the adjusted-compensation bill as advocated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 2, 1948.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 8, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

[SEAL] F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Reflections on Bogota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

by Felix Morley appearing in Human Events:

REFLECTIONS ON BOGOTA

(By Felix Morley)

On February 11 of this year Human Events published an analysis of Communism in Latin American by Ralph de Toledano.

This article called attention to "the fact that a hard core of 500,000 Communists in Latin America is girding for battle with the North American way of living." It pointed out that the Communist-dominated Confederacion de Trabajadores de America Latina (CTAL), under orders from Moscow, has concentrated its strength in key areas where most damage can be done to the United States. The areas named were Cuba and Panama, from both of which Colombia is easily accessible.

There is nothing vainglorious in recalling this contribution by Human Events 2 months ago. It is cited merely to show how easily the catastrophe which has taken place in Bogota could have been foreseen, and guarded against. Yet the various Intelligence offices of the United States Government apparently did not foresee the catastrophe. And evidently no effective measures were taken to avert the tragedy which flared out on April 9.

The Communist putsch in Bogota was tragic because of the lives lost and the senseless property damage involved. But it was also disastrous because of the humiliation suffered by American diplomacy.

After elaborate preparation, the Ninth Conference of the American Republics is solemnly opened at Bogota. The Secretary of State of the United States attends to emphasize the importance which this country attaches to the gathering. A whole retinue of advisers, experts, and specialists is sent down from the Department of State. The advertised objective is to consolidate the Latin Republics against Communist infiltration.

Then, under the very nose of General Marshall, the Communists stage a well-planned, well-organized coup. The conference is not merely broken up and its dignity irretrievably ruined, even the official minutes of the proceedings to date are destroyed, and the whole solemn gathering reduced to a confusion which would be farcial except for the human suffering involved.

II

Undoubtedly this humiliation of General Marshall was the objective of the entire plot. The name of the American Secretary of State has become synonymous with the "Marshall plan" of "containing" communism with dollars.

Among the Latin peoples the loss of "face," of personal dignity, is almost as serious a matter as it is among the Chinese. General Marshall had already "lost face" in China. In Bogota there was opportunity to discredit him in the Latin world as well. The opportunity was seized. On April 9, a company of soldiers could have protected the conference rooms from pillage. Now all the Army of Colombia cannot put together the prestige which has been shattered.

This Machiavellian stroke was obviously timed to take place on the eve of the vitally important Italian general election. The point here was to suggest to the Italian people that the policies of the United States are thoroughly unpopular in Latin America, and that only venal and sycophantic governments favor them. If the Colombians, next door to the United States, do not respect General Marshall, why should the Italians? Even to pose that question, so dramatically, is to weaken the hand of Prime Minister de Gasperi, whose whole campaign in Italy has been based on the efficacy of American support.

Secretary Marshall had announced that if the Communists win in Italy, that country will be stricken from the role of those receiving assistance under ERP. The natural counterstroke to this was a move casting doubt on the efficacy and reliability of American assistance. Some stroke to that effect was anticipated and predicted. But our policy makers seem to have had no anticipation that it would be carried out in this hemisphere. Nevertheless, it should have been clear that one way to besmirch our role of good neighbor to Italy would be to discredit the good-neighbor policy where it has been most actively preached—in Latin America.

It is not by accident that the New York Daily Worker, official organ of the American Communist Party, concentrates on the "terrific black eye" given the Truman foreign policy by the Bogota revolt. That is the party line. That is the conclusion which Moscow wants people to draw. Again we have underestimated the subtlety of the forces which regard the United States as the principal obstacle to their drive for world dominion.

Writing in the Daily Worker of April 12, Joseph Starobin tells us the moral that Moscow wants to have drawn from the Bogota rising. "Colombia's common people," he says, "showed their anger with the semi-Fascist rulers whom Secretary Marshall nominates to chair conferences, the hated men who exploited Colombia's wealth in cooperation with Wall Street."

III

If the humiliation of the United States at Bogota could be concealed, our natural instinct would probably to be conceal it. But to laugh this one off is not possible, and fortunately it is also impossible to counteract the aftermath by calling for more airplanes, more generals, more atom bombs and more conscription of men and industry. Mobilization of brains rather than brawn is the urgent necessity posed by the Bogota episode.

Therefore, it is encouraging that the immediate reaction is a demand that the duplicating maze of intelligence services developed during the war be simplified and—if we must use the word—"streamlined." The present confusion is preposterous.

The armed services have their Intelligence departments, as is natural, and the FBI has established a solid reputation for its work in the domestic field. But, in addition, there is an incredibly complicated intelligence set-up in the Department of State. And, for the past year or more, there has been the hush-hush Central Intelligence Agency, which is charitably supposed to be coordinating all the other work of this character.

Merely to examine the intelligence set-up in the Department of State is to get an idea of the utter bureaucratic confusion which has developed. There is an Office of Intelligence Research, which incidentally has a whole separate "Division of Research for American Republics." Then there is a separate Office of Intelligence Collection and Dissemination. There is a separate "Division of International Security Affairs", within the Office of Special Political Affairs, and another "Division of Security and Investigations" within the Office of Controls. All these overlapping and conflicting agencies have been piled on top of the comprehensive area organization, which used to do first-class intelligence work without highfalutin names and titles.

It is not surprising to read, in a confidential report on the Department of State recently made to Congress, that:

"The Department has an overabundance of units, sections, branches, divisions and offices * * * there is a strong supicion that much of this lengthy, detailed organization is for the purpose of increasing the number of personnel that can be awarded a title."

IV

The intelligence work of the Department of State should either be greatly simplified or completely eliminated, for, as the Bogota episode shows, it is at present almost worthless. But in addition there should be a review of the entire noncareer service in this swollen Department. Something has been done to screen out the Communists and fellow travelers. But the number of plain simpletons, who got into the Department during the war, and stuck there, is an equally serious problem.

As an illustration of downright incompetence, I have dug from my files a copy of an interoffice memorandum prepared in the Division of Political Studies of the Department of State on December 30, 1943. It is an incredibly ill-informed prediction of Russian postwar policy, saying in part:

"The Soviet Union * * * goes no further than to insist that in eastern Europe the states may maintain complete autonomy and independence and any form of government which is not hostile to the Soviet Union. From the Czech pact, it is clear that Czechoslovakia will be permitted to maintain a democratic form of government based on her own choice of economic system. From the Italian pact, it is clear that the Soviet Union is prepared to permit even in this area any form of government except Fascist. * * *"

This palpably absurd analysis was written by a policy-making officer, who joined the Department of State during the war, and who has since received three promotions to his present $10,000 post as division chief. It is not at all an exceptional case. But it is illustrative of the type of wishful thinking on which American postwar policy has been based.

When policy is formulated on the basis of improbabilities, it is to be expected that eventually those called in to administer will find themselves faced with impossibilities. Then, to baffled minds, war comes to appear the only way out.

As long as the American Republic confined itself to its own business, the quality of governmental personnel was not a matter of great moment. Since Government was of secondary importance, bureaucratic incompetence could be tolerated.

But if the Republic is to follow the course of empire on which it has now embarked, its foreign policy must be conducted, like that of Soviet Russia, by a trained elite. It is not enough to create a labyrinth of overlapping bureaus, and to give grandiloquent titles to earnest but immature college professors. To do so is to invite humiliations like that of Bogota.

On such invitations it is unnecessary to inscribe R. S. V. P. They will be accepted.

The Tragedy of Yalta—Stumbling Block of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the concessions made at Yalta continue to be the stumbling block of world peace.

As a result of United States and Great Britain yielding to Russia on questions of postwar boundaries, the occupation of Germany, and the demand by Russia

for one-half of twenty billion in reparations from Germany has upset the plans for world peace and given Russia more than she was entitled to.

Russia also obtained more than she was entitled to from Japan and China and at the same time she has sought to take over all of western Europe she can get short of going to war to obtain.

I submit the following article from the Pathfinder which gives some additional details of Russia's advances since the close of World War II:

THE TRAGEDY OF YALTA

Three years ago this month, with hopes high, delegates of 46 nations met at San Francisco to draft a charter for peace.

But before the conference was 24 hours old, the wrangling started. As time passed one of the things that added fuel to the fire was the agreement of Yalta.

This accord, fashioned as a blueprint for peace, was drafted 3 months before the San Francisco conference. Its authors were President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin. They conferred for 8 days (February 4–11, 1945) at Yalta, Crimean Black Sea Riviera. The Big Three, the world was informed, reached general agreement on:

Poland's eastern border.

Occupying Germany.

Russia's share of German reparations.

"Free elections" in liberated countries.

The Crimea Conference was a turning point in the world's history, President Roosevelt told Congress. The world accepted it as such.

SECRETS

But at San Francisco, Molotov let the first telltale cat out of the Yalta bag which proved to be filled with concessions to Stalin.

Russia, the Yalta pact decreed, was to have 3 votes in the U. N. The extra votes went to White Russia and the Ukraine. It was like giving votes to New York and Texas.

Another Yalta by-product, disclosed at San Francisco, was the Security Council veto power. Russia has used the veto 23 times to block the will of the UN majority.

Yalta's biggest secret leaked out on the first anniversary of the Crimea accord. China, like Poland, had been sold down the river. Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to recognize the "Mongolian People's Republic," a Soviet puppet state trespassing in Manchuria. They also approved joint Russian-Chinese operation of Manchurian railways, let the Russians maintain a naval base at Port Arthur and "internationalize" Dairen. These are Manchuria's best ports. This deal gave the Russians a foothold in Manchuria, which contains 70 percent of China's industrial strength.

And that wasn't all, Stalin demanded and got the southern half of Sakhalin Island, which the Japs had taken from Russia in 1904, and the Kuriles, 32 islands stretching from Japan to the Okhotsk Sea.

PRICE

This was the price paid to get Russia into the war against Japan "2 or 3 months after Germany surrendered." It was exorbitant because Russia finally entered the already-won Pacific war 6 days before the final shot was fired. It was shameful because the deal violated the Atlantic Charter and the Cairo declaration of December 1, 1943.

The Atlantic Charter, signed by Roosevelt and Churchill, pledged "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." And the Cairo declaration, said Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek, decreed:

"All territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

The sellout of China was not the last of Yalta's secret deals. When the going got tough at the Moscow conference of foreign ministers in March 1947, Molotov dug into his portfolio and pulled out a secret Yalta agreement by Roosevelt and Churchill on German reparations. They had accepted "as a basis for discussion," the Soviet suggestion that reparations from Germany total $20,000,000,000, half to go to Russia. This whopping figure has been a big stumbling block in drafting a peace treaty for Germany.

The Yalta accord was, indeed, a turning point—in the wrong direction.

Lake Success or Lake Failure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Post of April 16, 1948:

LAKE SUCCESS—OR LAKE FAILURE?—DAY OF JUDGMENT OPENS IN SHADOW AS NATIONS OF WORLD DEBATE DOOM OF JUSTICE

It is like a scene on the Day of Judgment. The time is the day after World War II, that had been fought on land, on sea, and in the air. A shadow lies over a desolate world, for already it is the twilight before the darkness of another world war that will eclipse the previous ones and may mark the end of the age of man on earth. The world with its 2,000,000,000 human beings sends emissaries from all its nations to its greatest metropolis. For a year and more they debate, and search, and argue for and against giving a little strip of land, 12 miles wide, to a stateless nation that lives there, the most ancient of them all, to be called home.

The Sun rises and goes down; the streets are filled with people; cars run on winding highways; trains speed underground; and life goes on its way. But the sand runs low in the hour glass, and the weapons of destruction are piled high, and still the conscience of the world deliberates. To give the people of the Bible their Promised Land as agreed to by 55 nations at San Remo 28 years ago? To give them, perhaps, only the part that is this side of the Jordan? Or maybe only a strip 12 miles wide?

The nations of the world send emissaries from 12 of their number to investigate on the spot and to report. The emissaries return; the nations of the world again deliberate in commissions and vote, in committees and vote, in the plenum of the Assembly and vote. Finally, they appoint emissaries of five nations to give the narrow strip of land to this most ancient people.

The nations around the Holy Land move their bands there to destroy what Israel has built; and those on the isles of "The Ten Lost Tribes" (as the English say of themselves) send arms to the aggressors to make the destruction possible; and those in the land of the Star-Spangler Banner put an embargo on arms needed by the ancient nation for the defense of its home.

The nations of the world reconvene. They are given a last chance to make good the evil which they and their fathers and their forefathers did to a homeless people, to wanderers over the face of the earth since the day they lost their home in a war of independence with Rome and through all the generations when they were persecuted for being true to their faith and to their heritage.

But the nations repent of their openhandedness. A 12-mile strip? Too much. They were too generous. Return the judgment of the nations for reconsideration. Let us assemble together again at Lake Failure; it is certainly too much, a 12-mile strip.

* * * * *

Says the Prophet Isaiah (ch. 43): "Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled. * * * O, Israel, fear not: For I have redeemed thee. * * * Fear not: For I am with thee. * * * I will say to the north, give up; and to the south, keep not back; bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth."

In these days, in dark storerooms, missiles by the thousands are heaped, one of which sufficed to snuff out the breath of 70,000 people of Hiroshima. Whoever created this world—or did it create itself?—man can destroy it.

If the nations of the world, Christian and Moslem and Buddhist alike, sitting in their tribunal in this year 1948, will twist justice and empty it, and will stretch out their hand to extinguish the hope of the eternal people to return home, then:

"Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance. * * * All nations before Him are as nothing; and they are counted to Him less than nothing, and vanity" (Isaiah 40).

Information About Jeeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include two letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
April 19, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Permit me to refer to your communications of recent date, addressed to Secretary Forrestal and Secretary Royall, in which you requested information relative to the number of jeeps the War Department had overseas when the war ended.

Records currently available in the Office, Chief of Ordnance, Department of the Army, do not indicate the quantity of jeeps on hand in overseas theaters at the close of World War II. A recapitulation of records furnished to the Office, Chief of Ordnance as of November 30, 1946, indicates there were 78,421 jeeps on hand in overseas theaters at that time.

I trust that the foregoing represents the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

S. P. WALKER,
Colonel, GSC, Chief, Liaison Group Legislative and Liaison Division.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE FOREIGN LIQUIDATION COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1948.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your inquiry of April 5 addressed to the Secretary of State has been forwarded to the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner for reply. You ask how many jeeps in all have thus far been sold by the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner; how many jeeps does

the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner now have, and how many jeeps were originally and finally turned over to the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner since the war.

These questions are practically impossible of answer. The commodity classification used by the Army in preparing surplus declarations and the basis of FLC's records uses the expression "motor vehicles." In this are included all types of automotive vehicles of which jeeps are only one of many. In addition, the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner has made bulk sales, specified in the surplus declarations to a large extent only on a tonnage basis and not even by the commodity classification, of surplus property in France, Belgium, Pacific Islands, and the Philippines, to the respective governments of France, Belgium, the Government of China, and the Philippine Republic. The tonnage basis of declaration was required by the necessary return to the United States of Quartermaster and other Army personnel who, if present in the original numbers, could have prepared more detailed surplus declarations but in effect this was the only type of surplus declaration which could be accomplished under the circumstances.

It is regretted that the very nature of the procedures employed in the declaration and disposal of surplus jeeps precludes the compilation of the detailed information you have requested.

Sincerely yours,

FRED W. RAMSEY,
Foreign Liquidation Commissioner.

History Does Not Have To Repeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, when a conservative and sound business publication like the World's Business and Importers Guide states a principle, the Congress might well give careful study.

To that end I ask, Mr. Speaker, that I may extend my remarks and include an article, History Does Not Have to Repeat, which appeared in the March 1948 issue of the above-named publication:

HISTORY DOES NOT HAVE TO REPEAT

You would think that one international trade war would be sufficient for a lifetime. Oddly enough history seems to have little sobering effect on those who dwell in the ivory towers of isolationism. One has but to read the reports of any conference of nations in the last two years to quickly perceive that the sectional and selfish thinking which sent the old League of Nations down the disaster road still exists in many places.

Fortunately, however, the shortages of the last few years have done much to forcefully bring home to the citizens of all countries and their leaders the story of the interdependence of one nation upon another in this twentieth century world of specialized economies, and it will be harder to fool all of the people next time.

On the other hand, the leadership which the United States has taken both at Geneva and at the United Nations conference on Trade and Employment at Habana in spearheading the drive to reduce barriers to world trade is in reality foundation work that could lead to a long period of world peace.

It is in direct contrast to the twenties when the leading commercial nations of the world by successive acts raised tariffs to an unbearable point. Retaliation followed retaliation; exchange restrictions and import quotas jammed the channels of trade. Shipments of the world's goods went to a new low before the leading world powers found out that there was no such thing as self-sufficiency. The United States also discovered that economic isolationism will not work.

In 1934 the reciprocal-trade program was the first United States effort to scale down restrictions on world trade on a give-and-take basis. Goods that we needed flowed more freely to us and the market for our exports widened. Even to this day there is no evidence in the files of Congress that any United States industry suffered from this program. On the contrary, our trade and abundance grew.

Germany's 1939 Dusseldorf conference with the British industrialists was designed to expand the barter idea. Although the English would not go along, Germany tried it alone and found it only a stop-gap and not a solution. The lines of trade restrictions, however, were too sharply drawn to be quickly changed. One by one, leading commercial nations went to war for the survival of the fittest. But we all have a brand new shiny chance today.

If the world ever again becomes so foolish as to throttle world trade or stifle the movement of private venture or risk capital, there are headaches ahead. If we forget the Roman holiday of retaliation that preceded the last war, if the great world depression of the 1930's is no longer a memory to any of us, nothing can prevent history from repeating.

But it doesn't have to happen again—not unless we make it so.

United States Must Not Withdraw Under Russian Pressure From Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, leave having been granted, I shall insert after my remarks a column from the pen of Charles A. Guy, of Lubbock, Tex., which appeared in the Lubbock Evening Journal on April 5, 1948.

Mr. Guy discusses the Russian pressure to force American officials and personnel out of Berlin. He speaks from first-hand information about a problem which will be of continuing interest and importance to all Americans.

Mr. Guy is editor and publisher of the Morning Avalanche and Evening Journal, a couple of daily newspapers published at Lubbock which serve a wide area in western Texas. Mr. Guy, upon invitation of the Department of the Army and in company with a few other editors, selected from various sections of the Nation, spent several weeks in Europe in November and December of last year, studying conditions, particularly in Germany, Austria, and Trieste.

Upon his return to west Texas, Mr. Guy wrote a series of articles on the European situation which were printed in his own papers and reprinted in others. These articles were of superior quality, and were widely read and favorably received. They revealed a fine perspective and a fresh outlook; they were brilliant, yet down-to-earth. They were favorably commented upon by the Secretary of the Army and were reprinted in part by the Public Information Division of the Department of the Army.

A subsequent article, referred to above, is as follows:

The Russian-spawned ruckus in Berlin being what it is, we find our mind these days frequently wandering back to the German capital and the Americans we saw in it 3 months ago, while on a tour of occupied Europe as a guest of the United States Army.

The blood of other Americans would boil like our own, could they visualize what the Russians are trying to do in Berlin.

Briefly, the Reds are attempting not only to cut off food supplies to our troops and civilian personnel. They also are attempting to humble us—the people whose industrial might saved Russia at Stalingrad—in the minds of the Germans and all of Europe in order to further their aims at communizing the world.

Unless one has both studied the map of the Allied occupation of Germany and then seen the situation on the ground, it is difficult to understand just what the trouble is and how the Russians can ring Berlin with steel, halting transportation, and delivery of foodstuffs by means other than air.

Here in a nutshell is the picture:

Prior to the formal occupation of Germany, Franklin Roosevelt was duped by Joe Stalin—and, in turn, influenced stubborn and more realistic Winston Churchill to go along—in the setting up of the four-zone occupation of Germany.

In the deal the Russians, the British, the French, and ourselves—each were to take over one geographic section of Germany and administer it—along a four-power, over-all program to be correlated from time to time. Also in the deal, the Russians got the section surrounding Berlin, but the German capital itself was divided into zones similar to those operating in Germany as a whole.

Berlin thus became an island in the Russian-held sector and the Russians generously gave their Allies entrance and exit by one route, one paralleling highway route on the famed autobahn—the Hitler-built superhighway; and one plane route.

Hell-bent to make their zone in Germany part and parcel of the Communist orbit, the Russians, since the firing stopped, have turned to every trick in the trade to get their onetime fighting allies out of Berlin. This they must do to consolidate their holdings in the eastern part of Germany.

If they can drive the Americans out of Berlin—by threat of force, which they are attempting to do—they will show up the champion of a free world as a cowardly, soft, temporizing, dacadent nation, which in turn, will make it easier to scare other countries into submitting to the Communist yoke, a la Czechoslovakia.

When we think of Berlin, we think not so much of the American colony as a whole, but especially of the women and children of our nationality who are not only living decently and quietly, but who also are great contributors to easing the lot of the cold, the sick, the aged, and the hungry in the German population.

To see them used by the Russians as targets for discourtesy, and to visualize Russian attempts to starve them out of Berlin, is—to use an old expression—enough to make a minister cuss.

Those women and children are just like their counterparts here in Lubbock. When the Russians move against them, it's exactly like they were moving against our own neighbors.

When we think of Berlin, we think, too, of the United States commander in Germany,

four-star Gen. Lucius D. Clay who, as a captain of engineers served in Denison during the early days of the dam-building there.

General Clay told us in Berlin—and again, 6 weeks later, in Frankfurt—that as long as he has the say the Russians will never get us out of Berlin except through use of superior force.

He said it without quibbling. He said it simply, straight from the shoulder. He still is saying it, and Washington thus far is backing him up.

General Clay feels that the worst thing that could happen to us in the eyes of the people of this troubled world—and to the free world—would be for us to withdraw under Russian pressure, from the German capital.

No two-gun toter, no movie version of the "tough guy" general, Lucius Clay is a quiet man with piercing eyes. Slender, with hatchet features, he is the executive type. He has his finger on his job—a tremendous one, with many facets—to an amazing degree.

Not any part of the swashbuckler, the general looks at home in civilian clothes, in a private office, running a big business. Apparently cold and aloof at first glance, he is surprisingly human underneath. A bear for detail, he is as efficient as a piece of machinery. Although not antisocial, he dodges as much pomp and ceremony as he possibly can and still live up to his position.

More important, Lucius Clay doesn't scare easily. If the worst should come to the worst in Europe, he'd be right there with the men under him. Also with him in Germany is fragile Mrs. Clay—not in the best of health, yet driving herself day and night doing relief and rehabilitation jobs which American women have taken upon themselves in Germany.

If Europe should turn into a Dunkerque for us, the Clays would go down with all the rest—and they'd have it no other way if they could.

As we let our mind wander back to Berlin, we're glad Lucius Clay is the American No. 1 guy there.

He'll do nothing on the spur of the moment. He knows his job, the over-all picture. A thinker, he has his plans mapped for any emergency, however improbable of arising.

But the Russians won't frighten him. They won't humble the flag. They won't find Lucius Clay, or the men of his European command, down to the youngest GI, groveling at their feet.

And that's our very best bet of nullifying the Russian campaign of running Americans out of Berlin without a shot being fired.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1948

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment which I have just offered is to require that corn in processed form be used to the extent of 50 percent of the corn procured for export under the European recovery program. The bill already carries a provision under which at least 25 percent of the wheat procured and shipped abroad would be in the form of flour so that the work of milling can be done in this country and the byproducts, such as middlings, shorts, bran, and feed, can be utilized for feeding purposes here.

The amendment proposes to accomplish the same purpose for corn. There are many reasons to support this proposal. In the main, the products of corn which would be shipped abroad would be corn flour and cornstarch and the milling of these products would provide a substantial amount of employment in different centers of the country.

Secondly, it should be pointed out that cornstarch and corn flour would be merchandised in substantial cotton bags and these bags would be extremely useful for conversion into articles of clothing abroad in those areas where clothing is in short supply. But perhaps the most persuasive argument in behalf of the amendment springs from the fact that in the main European countries do not have good milling facilities for corn. It must be milled in available mills which are adapted to the grinding of wheat and the net result is that a high-grade quality production of cornstarch and corn flour cannot be produced in the mills abroad. This means an inferior product from the standpoint of nutritional and caloric value. That is highly important because the very purpose of the food commodities to be sent abroad is to build up the physical capacity of people to reconstruct their own industrial economy and this, of course, requires products where every element of nutrition is carefully preserved.

In addition to these factors, it should be pointed out that by sending abroad corn in the form of starch and flour there will be a substantial saving on terminal and transportation charges.

Finally, it should be pointed out that every bushel of corn, if processed on this side, will yield about one-half pound of valuable and nutritious oil. The milling facilities abroad would not permit of this oil extraction and in a sense it constitutes a loss.

I should point out that in 1946 and 1947 about 109,000,000 bushels of corn were exported. This is indeed a substantial quantity and when reduced to terms of flour and starch would mean much to the industry in the United States and even more to the people abroad in the form of a nutritious high-grade food product.

It may be because of the drought which produced an acute corn shortage in the Corn Belt that this will not be an immediate problem but let it not be forgotten that the program before us is of a long-range character and it is fair to assume that a monumental crop of corn will be produced in the years that lie ahead. We shall then be giving sustained consideration to increased exports of corn in place of other cereals and the problem of export processing will then assume important proportions.

It will, therefore, be in the interest of economy for the United States and for the countries abroad to receive corn in starch and flour form because the milling facilities in the United States can perform this job better than any country eligible for aid under the pending program.

I have no desire to burden the administrator with additional restrictions but inasmuch as provision has already been made for wheat, it is only fair that similar provision be made for the major crop of the United States, namely, corn.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the fourth of a series of articles written by Roger Stuart, well-known staff writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram newspaper on March 18, 1948. The article was written during Mr. Stuart's recent trip to Palestine, and should prove of interest to my colleagues. It is entitled "War Is Real, but Scenes of Racial Peace Provide a Hope for the Future." All of the Members of the House will benefit from reading this first-hand account of the scene in Palestine.

WAR IS REAL, BUT SCENES OF RACIAL PEACE PROVIDE A HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

(By Roger Stuart)

TEL AVIV, PALESTINE, March 18.—Major Timken of the Haganah, suntanned and lean, squinted through his glasses and shook his head.

"No," he said, "it won't be easy to get around here. In this city, yes. But outside—well, things are very difficult. I suggest every precaution be taken to avoid exposure to snipers. When walking in areas of danger—and you'll find them in every direction—keep to the side of the houses and take cover in case of emergency."

Warlike instructions. To one who had arrived in the Holy Land, by air, only 2 hours earlier, the words sounded strange. For, flying in over the Mediterranean, the scene had been anything but warlike.

The sea, blue and calm, suddenly had given way to land—cream-colored desert, with not a soul in sight. Then, as the plane had swooped down toward the airport, green fields and well-tended orange groves had come into view.

And at Lydda, 20 miles from Tel Aviv, the all-Jewish city on the coast, the bustle and confusion were merely what one would associate with any busy terminal the world over.

Travelers arriving and leaving. Officials scurrying about. The harried British customs inspector who, after looking over my passport and visa, had inquired: "Religion?"

To my question—what difference did it make?—he'd replied: "Really, sir, I can't say. But it's regulations. I must ask your religion."

BARBED WIRE SHOWING

At the airport, too, I'd noticed that there were both Jews and Arabs working in the place, along with Britishers; and nobody had caused the slightest bit of trouble.

But in Tel Aviv, modern and teeming, the picture began to change. Here business was going on as usual, with candy factories and milk mills operating at capacity and with home construction booming.

But there was something else. Road blocks, topped by barbed wire, appeared at frequent intervals, and every time you left your hotel to walk down the street, somebody—usually members of Haganah, the unofficial Jewish army—searched you for arms before allowing you to proceed.

Then night fell. No longer was it difficult to realize that Palestine is indeed a battleground. All night long, from 10 until dawn, you could hear the heavy sounds of explosions in the distance and closer by the rattle of rifle and machine-gun fire.

Palestine, the end of the long road for thousands of European Jews, is finding it difficult to welcome its newcomers. The frequent skirmishes between Jews and Arabs keep everyone on his toes. And people who ordinarily would be devoting most of their time to shop or farm are doing guard duty or—in the case of full-time troops—actually taking part in pitched battles.

BUILDING AMID WAR

The young soldiers, incidentally, are hard as nails. They drill 10 hours a day and learn both infantry and commando tactics. Haganah now has a trained army of 85,000, but it lacks freedom of movement.

The British still hold their mandate over the Holy Land. Though Haganah is a Jewish army, it must continue to operate largely in secrecy until the British withdraw their troops this summer.

"You see what I mean?" said Major Timken, after I had looked around a bit. He showed me the casualty figures of the night before: Dead—13 Jews, 47 Arabs; destroyed—two hotels, five houses, one office building.

Then confusing this picture of war and peace some more, I went to an office where records are kept on the registration of new businesses in the Holy Land. Despite the fighting—which hasn't reached the stage of out-and-out war, but may do so at any moment—despite uncertainty over the future, commercial enterprise is carrying on.

In 1 week I found 90 new companies had been registered, with total capitalization of more than $1,500,000. Eighty-eight of them were Jewish concerns. Two were Arab. Among them was a transportation company, an oilseed crushing plant, a bakery, 18 manufacturing establishments to produce shoes, fountain pens, tools, machinery, textiles, bakelite ware, and leather goods. Both of the new Arab establishments were movie theaters.

As for the British, their latter-day efforts at maintaining the peace are negligible. They still have more than 70,000 troops in the Holy Land, but they are not using them to keep lines of communication open between towns and cities, or to police the area, in the strictest sense of the word.

BRITISH FAVORITISM

How greatly the British may err in favoring one side over another is difficult to gage. But I have seen evidence that they're harder on the Jews than on the Arabs.

For one thing, although it is their invariable custom to disarm and arrest Jews found carrying guns, I have watched British troops pass un-uniformed Arabs carrying rifles time after time without so much as warning them to put their weapons away.

Meanwhile Palestine is shaping up for bigger battles. In addition to the local Arab and Jewish fighters, more than 3,000 Syrian and Iraqi troops have quietly penetrated the country, while another 6,000 well-trained Arab Legion soldiers from Trans-Jordan also are on Palestinian soil. Yet you can find communities where Arabs and Jews still get along well together. I visited one orange juice canning factory, for instance, where representatives of both groups were among the employees. And in farming areas northeast of Tel Aviv I have seen Jews and Arabs working side by side without friction.

Still the threats of Arab leaders sound ominous. "We never will allow partition to take place," I have been assured by some of them. "We will fight for decades, if need be, to prevent it."

To which David Ben Gurion, chairman of the Jewish Agency executive, replied: "We are not afraid. We will defend ourselves. Nothing will prevent the early establishment of the Jewish state."

President Truman's Address to American Society of Newspaper Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by President Truman at the annual dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans; I am glad to be here tonight to speak to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. You editors make a distinct and important contribution to the operation of government in the United States. Your frank expression of views on current affairs has great value to our people in helping them to form their judgments.

It is because of the influence you have upon the course of our democracy that I am glad to have this opportunity to discuss with you one of the major problems confronting our country.

I am going to talk to you tonight about inflation.

All of us have the foreign situation very much on our minds these days. This is proper, for we must devote a great deal of thought to our foreign relations if we are to succeed in working out the difficult international problems facing us. But we cannot afford to neglect our problems at home.

The success of our foreign policy depends to a very large extent upon the strength and stability of our domestic economy. The plain fact is, however, that our economy is in serious danger as a result of high prices and inflation.

Inflation may seem to you to be an old story. But there are some men in this country—men who happen to be in influential positions—who still fail to understand or who deliberately ignore the gravity of the situation and the need for forthright measures to meet it. They have tinkered with the problem of inflation—they have even taken some feeble steps in the right direction. But they have taken other steps in the wrong direction—steps that have made the problem much worse.

WILL KEEP THE "MENACE" TO FORE

For my part, I believe that inflation is so grave a menace to this country and to the world that I do not propose to let it be forgotten.

I believe that the Government has a clear-cut responsibility to deal with high prices. I believe that we know what measures the Government should take. I cannot sit by silently while inflation continues to creep up on the American people.

The basic facts which make this problem of such fundamental importance are plain. The world stands now at one of the decisive points in history. Emerging from the most terrible of all wars, people all over the earth are fixing anew the pattern of civilization.

By virtue of the strength with which we have been blessed, the United States is the chief support to those people of the world who are seeking to rebuild their civilization in accordance with the principles of democracy and freedom. The heart of our support is economic assistance. To be effective it must be coupled with sufficient military strength to give the free peoples of the world some sense of security while they rebuild.

This requirement must be met in large part from the production of American mines and factories and farms. Thus, a strong American economy is the bedrock upon which rest the hopes for establishing a peace of free men in the world. Without it we can provide neither aid, nor leadership, nor example.

The strength and vitality of our economy are being undermined by inflation. High prices are now working real hardship upon most American families. If unchecked, inflation will bring on economic consequences which will hurt every one of us.

SITUATION IS GETTING WORSE

This is not a new situation, but it is getting worse.

I have been calling attention to the hardships and dangers of high prices for a long time. I have repeatedly urged businessmen to exercise voluntary restraint in setting prices. Many of them have courageously done what they could to hold prices down. But they were not strong enough to stem the tide, and prices have continued to rise.

By last fall it had become clear that we could not place our main reliance on voluntary methods. On November 17 I presented to the Congress a 10-point legislative program for dealing with inflation. That program has not been enacted. And prices have continued to rise.

The program which I presented to the Congress was sound and necessary last November. It is still sound and it is even more necessary now.

The total demand for goods is still outrunning production. Competition for scarce items is still pushing prices up. Employment is at record levels, but the real purchasing power of most of our people is still losing ground to inflation.

In February there was a break in the market for wheat, corn, and other agricultural products. But agricultural prices did not drop for long, and they did not drop very far. The prices paid by housewives were affected hardly at all. The general level of prices has remained well above the already excessive level which prevailed in 1947.

And now there are new factors that have made the outlook for inflation considerably worse.

STEEL PRICES CRITICIZED

Some key prices have been increased, unwisely and unnecessarily. The outstanding case was, of course, the increase in some important steel prices. I believe that the businessmen who made these increases did not consider their far-reaching effect on the rest of the economy.

They made the regrettable decision to increase prices even though they were already making record profits. In the face of these actions, other businessmen, with a greater regard for the public welfare, have fought a losing battle to keep their prices down.

In addition to these price increases, inflation has been encouraged by some unnecessary interruptions to production. The outstanding example, of course, was the work stoppage in the coal industry. The serious effect of the loss of coal production shows the narrow margin of supply on which we are operating, and how quickly shortages of basic materials can cripple our entire economy.

Another new factor making for inflation is the bill recently enacted by the Congress reducing Government revenues by $5,000,000,000. This is dangerous from the standpoint of the Government's financial stability, because it is likely to result in a deficit in the next fiscal year.

It is also dangerous from the standpoint of high prices, for the additional billions of dollars of purchasing power will not be accompanied by any significant increase in production. It means simply that more dollars will be bidding for the same goods, and prices will be bid up accordingly. Furthermore, by eliminating the Government's surplus of receipts over expenditures, the tax-reduction bill will remove the most important single factor which has helped to hold prices in check during recent months.

PROPER CONTROLS HELD NEED

At the same time that taxes are being reduced, we are undertaking a program of assistance to foreign countries. We are also considering certain necessary additions to our national defense program. Both of these programs are of utmost importance, and we must have them. But they will result in strains on parts of our economy, which can add to inflation if we do not have proper controls.

In considering the effects of these programs, it is extremely important to realize that we now have practically no slack in our economy. We have substantially full employment. Factories generally are operating at top capacity. We cannot increase our plant capacity rapidly. We have only the normal growth in the labor force to count on for new manpower.

Under these circumstances, new demands for materials and production necessarily have a direct and telling effect on prices—unless the proper anti-inflationary steps are taken.

It is apparent, when all these factors are considered, that the danger of inflation has not diminished in the last few months. On the contrary, the need for the legislation I requested is even more urgent.

It seems to me that the basic question is clear. It is whether we take action in time to do some good or whether we delay until a crisis is upon us. It is simply a matter of taking out insurance before the house catches fire.

WARNS OF CONTINUING SPIRAL

If the cost of living continues to climb, wages and prices will continue to chase each other upward. The unhealthy boom will impose further hardships upon those who fall behind in the race. The greater the inflation and the longer it lasts, the greater the danger that it will end in unemployment, business distress, and recession or depression.

It is of little significance that no one can forecast the exact time when this will happen. The important point is that we cannot afford to let it happen at all.

Since I addressed the Congress 1 month ago today on the need for prompt action on the European recovery program, and on universal training and selective service, there has been a greatly increased interest by our citizens in national defense and in our foreign policy. This interest has been reflected in the enactment of the legislation to aid European recovery. But our domestic economy has been dangerously neglected. It should be neglected no longer.

I believe that the anti-inflation program I recommended to the Congress last November should be enacted at once. That program is balanced and well-rounded. It includes measures to reduce the excessive amounts of money and credit which are lifting prices. It includes measures to see that scarce goods are distributed fairly and to their most important uses. It includes measures to deal directly with specific high prices.

ANTI-INFLATION PLAN UPHELD

All these measures are reasonable and practical. They attack inflation in a direct manner. They offer a complete and consistent program to strike at the heart of the problem of high prices.

The measures I proposed are designed to hold prices down while keeping production up, and increasing it as rapidly as possible. They are designed to stop runaway prices, so that great numbers of American families will not be priced out of the market for the things they need. These measures are designed to insure that scarce goods are not wasted, but are used where they will be of the greatest benefit.

I wish to emphasize that the situation has already been made more difficult by delay. Additional delay will only add to the danger.

The American people must not be misled by those who oppose a reasonable anti-inflation program and a reasonable defense program. It has been said that the present administration is trying to create an economic crisis or an international crisis. The exact opposite is the truth. We are striving to avoid an economic crisis by protecting our prosperity while we still have it. We are striving to avoid a war crisis by being firm before it is too late.

The welfare of our own people, the effectiveness of our foreign policy, and the strength of our defenses all depend on our prosperity. Only if we preserve the soundness of our economy, through prompt and adequate measures to control inflation, can we contribute our full share to a peace in which freedom and democracy will be secure.

I believe that the people of the United States understand that we have a great opportunity and a great responsibility to lead the world through these changing and difficult times. I believe that our people have the faith, the wisdom and the unselfish devotion to the common good to take whatever actions are necessary to meet that responsibility.

We can succeed if we act courageously and act in time.

Increase Rail Workers' Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Congress recently enacted legislation increasing the retirement income payable to civil-service employees. At that time the great majority of the Members of this House indicated their awareness that retired workers are suffering real hardships as a result of inflated living costs. Congress, accordingly, did what it could to relieve the plight of these people, and at considerable cost both to the Federal Government and to Federal workers still in service.

There has recently been brought to our attention the similar plight of retired railroaders. I say "similar," but actually it is worse. The average annuity under the civil-service system was about $81 a month. The average railroad annuity is only $70.

Just imagine yourself trying to get along on $70 a month and support your wife besides.

The fact that we recognize the need for higher annuities for retired Federal workers, who were already drawing more than ex-railroaders, should in and of itself be all the argument necessary to persuade us to do the same for retired railroad people. But there is a further argument. Although the bill to increase Federal annuities will cost the Treasury and the employees money, railroad annuities can be increased without cost to anyone.

There can be no question in anyone's mind that Congressman ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio, is deeply and intelligently interested in the welfare of all railroaders.

He has introduced bill numbered H. R. 5993, providing for a modest increase, ranging from 20 to 25 percent, in the pay of retired railroad workers. Other bills have been introduced in the Eightieth Congress which call for far greater increases. Those other bills do not have the support either of BOB CROSSER or of that great legion of railroad men represented by the Railway Labor Executives' Association. The Railway Labor Executives' Association, speaking for 20 of the Nation's standard railroad labor organizations, urges us to support H. R. 5993 instead of the more lavish measures.

Is this self-sacrifice, or lack of foresight, or mere stupidity on the part of railroad labor? On the contrary. It is one more indication of their foresight and their wisdom. They know as well as we do that retired workers need more income. They also know that working railroaders, under the present schedule of retirement taxes, are carrying all the tax load they can handle. Finally, they know that it would be futile to increase the rate of retirement pay if, by so doing, you plunge into financial chaos the very fund from which all the retirement pay must come.

With those three objectives in mind, to increase annuities, to avoid increasing taxes, and to preserve the soundness of the retirement fund, actuarial estimates were made and careful study was given to the drafting of a bill. The result was Mr. CROSSER'S H. R. 5993, the only bill before the House which would increase railroad annuities without costing the railroads or their employees one cent more than their present tax schedule, and without seriously endangering the retirement fund.

This is certainly not a controversial question. We have demonstrated, by our action with respect to the civil-service system, that we recognize the plight of men and women who are past their working years. We have the word of the railroad men themselves—to whom protection of their retirement fund is certainly a paramount interest—that annuities can safely be increased in the modest degree provided by H. R. 5993. We are not faced with a decision involving taxes. All we are called upon to do is to pass this measure so that certain spare moneys in the railroad retirement fund can be taken out of the fund and placed in the hands of deserving ex-railroaders who are sorely in need of it. In short, we see the need; the means to

meet it are at our disposal; delay on our part, it seems to me, would be arbitrary, unfeeling, and completely without justification.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith to the Congress a joint resolution of the Long Beach chapters of the Air Reserve Association, Officers Reserve Association of the United States, Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, and the National Guard Officers Association relative to national defense:

Whereas in view of recent grave international developments which so closely parallel acts of aggressor nations which led to World War II and at the outset of which, found this country in a state of unpreparedness, and believing further that, should such present developments lead to armed conflict, sufficient time would not be available for this country to arm, we therefore submit the following resolutions and urge Congress take appropriate action immediately and allocate sufficient funds therefor:

Resolved by the Long Beach Chapters of the Air Reserve Association, Officers Reserve Association of the United States, Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, and the National Guard Officers Association (jointly), That—

1. In an effort to combat Soviet Russia's apparent plans for control of western Europe we extend aid to such countries not yet within her sphere of influence by means of the Marshall plan.

2. Expenditures for bringing our air strength to a level recommended by President Truman's Air-Policy Commission and Joint Congressional Committee Report on Air Power be immediately authorized.

3. Selective service be immediately employed to bring our armed forces up to fully authorized strength and that additional quotas be authorized as necessary to counter any present or forseeable danger from aggressor nations.

4. There be an immediate curtailment of all shipments of materials to Communist-dominated countries.

5. Mobilization procedures for reserves and trained veterans be implemented to a point where they can be made effective with the least possible delay.

6. The provisions of the industrial mobilization plan be implemented at the earliest practicable date and to include expropriation of the merchant marine and induction of its personnel immediately into the armed forces in the event of the outbreak of hostilities.

7. A form of universal military training compatible with our need and within the bounds of the economic stability of the country be adopted to supplement the above measures.

8. The secretary of the Council of Reserve Officers of the Armed Forces is hereby instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speakers of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Secretary of National Defense, the chairmen of the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations, the California Senators, and the Representative of the Eighteenth California Congressional District.

Congress and People Must Keep Shirts On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of April 7, 1948:

CONGRESS AND PEOPLE MUST KEEP SHIRTS ON
(By Louis Bromfield)

It is important that our citizens, and, in particular, our Congressmen keep their shirts on. It will have to be our citizens and our Congressmen who keep things under control, for it seems more and more certain that one cannot look to the administration or to the armed services for sane guidance.

Either the peril of war is not so great as we have been led to believe or there is much vital information which has been kept from the American people. In the long run the second alternative is as distressing and as dangerous as the peril of war itself, for it implies a break-down of democratic government.

Like many Congressmen and many good citizens, I have a strong suspicion of two things—that we are being taken for a ride by the brass hats and that the State Department finds a war scare convenient in covering up its sad record of ineptness and lack of concerted planning. Probably there is, in the situation, something of both elements. Under such conditions we must look to the Members of the Senate and the House, directly responsible to the people, to protect our rights and defend them from the military and the bureaucrats, both of which are inherently and eternally persistent menaces to the functioning of true democracy in the republican form. In all of this Mr. Truman, a victim of forces he clearly neither understands nor can control, is no help whatever to the people.

It is from time to time the fashion to criticize and ridicule Congress. I would not say that the criticism has always been unmerited but there is good significance in the sources of the criticism. Nearly all of it, much of it deliberately organized, comes from the brass hats of the armed forces, the bureaucratic lobbies and from the Communists. Those are indeed strange bedfellows and all of them are attacking the institution of directly elected representatives who are the watchdogs and the guardians of your liberties and future and mind.

That is a good fact and one never to be forgotten if those liberties and that future are not to be trampled upon. An elected President, with the great powers delegated to him under the Constitution and the powers which have been usurped from time to time by him, under stress of war and crisis, can never wholly be counted upon as a defender of the people's rights. Never was that more true than it is today.

Right or wrong, the immense and costly program proposed by the President and the armed forces can lead, if carried out in all details, only to economic and social disaster and depression. The crisis, if there is one, was largely created or at least promoted by the President and by the State Department.

It began with the secret agreements of a tired and weakened President at Yalta and Teheran and has grown under the directives of a weak and confused President, and under the succession of wavering and uncoordinated activities of the State Department, overstuffed, confused, and working a large part of the time against itself.

This column is written to remind all of us that our Congressmen are our best friends and defenders and that we must give them guidance while we look to them for guidance. Without Congress as a bulwark and protector of all of us, we could come quickly to an evil end at the hands either of a President or of the armed forces and the bureaucrats. It is a good fact never to be forgotten.

The Communists, who would like best of all to see Congress discredited and destroyed, are the worst enemies of democracy and the Republic. They ridicule Congress because Congress is the strongest bulwark against their machinations and their unprincipled tyranny.

I suggest that all of us keep on our shirts and instruct our good friends in Congress to do likewise. Work with your Senator and your Representative. They were created by the founding fathers to protect you against the humbug, the ambitions, the folly, and the errors of small men who find their shoes too big for them.

The American Standard of Living: How Can It Best Be Improved?—Reuther Versus Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish also to include a very interesting and enlightening discussion which took place on the five hundredth consecutive broadcast of the weekly radio program entitled "People's Platform," between the senior Senator from Ohio and Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW-CIO. This broadcast was on the CBS network from Station WTOP in Washington on Sunday, April 11, 1948, and was on the question: "The American Standard of Living: How Can It Best Be Improved?"

In the course of this discussion, the Senator from Ohio interrupted Mr. Reuther to ask him to "get rid of the demagoguery and all this political stuff and talk economics."

Mr. Reuther had just protested the tagging as socialistic proposals to help the little fellow and had remarked that this was what Mr. Herbert Hoover did when he was President. He had also referred several times to the Hoover-Taft economic theory that prosperity must trickle down from profits poured in at the top.

The alleged demagoguery of Mr. Reuther's remarks escapes me.

And, in view of the fact that the debate was scheduled for rebroadcast in the State of Nebraska 36 hours before the Presidential primaries, in which the Senator from Ohio was a contender for the Republican nomination, I wonder if there was not just a little bit—let us say, a chemical trace—of politics in the Senator's own remarks.

I say this not in derogation of political stuff and politics. Politics is the stuff that democracy is made of. I think that

the Senator from Ohio and Mr. Reuther were both talking economics and both talking politics. Their remarks are worth the consideration of the Members because, to my mind, they set forth two opposed points of view and do it well, so that public interest and understanding are promoted. I congratulate both the Senator from Ohio and Mr. Reuther for the clarity with which they set forth their conflicting views. The Columbia Broadcasting System is to be congratulated for having arranged the debate.

Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to the welfare of the American people, meaning the wage and salary earners, the farmers, the investors, the businessmen and industrialists, than the subject matter of this debate.

Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt all held that our system of government, our economy, our ways of doing business, were means to an end, not an end in themselves, and that the end objective was the welfare of the men, women, and children who make up our Nation.

In their fights against the insatiable money power and the growth of monopoly, they held that our Federal Government could and should do that which was necessary to protect and promote the welfare of people.

Over the protests of its own spokesmen, free enterprise again and again has been saved from self-destruction. Congress has enacted legislation against monopoly, against holding company abuses, against reckless manipulation of credit, against the destruction of our natural resources, against cutthroat competition of rates, wages and working conditions and, affirmatively, for the establishment of a measure of social security, minimum wages, and maximum hours.

During the war, we preserved a large measure of economic stability by wise legislation providing for priorities and allocations of materials, for price and credit control, and for emergency housing. At the end of the war, these were prematurely abandoned and runaway inflation has resulted so that, today, we are confronted with material bottlenecks, with so-called black markets in steel and other items, with shortages all along the production line, aggravating the inflationary danger.

We have now undertaken—and wisely undertaken—heavy commitments under ERP. This, together with the necessity for increased production for national defense, again intensifies the inflationary danger. This we brought out a few days ago by the retiring Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles.

In this debate, we find one spokesman arguing against Government action to promote economic stability, except in the narrow field of credit, and, on the other hand, the president of the world's biggest union, Mr. Walter P. Reuther, of the UAW-CIO, declaring that certain Government actions are essential in order to prevent the continued draining off of purchasing power into exorbitant profits while prices rise and workers' wages shrink in terms of real purchasing power.

At the end of the debate Mr. Reuther summed up by saying that his opponent thought a rising standard of living could best be brought about by letting profits rise to the top and trickle from the top down to the masses of wage earners and farmers on the bottom, while he, Mr. Reuther, contended that the way to maintain prosperity and have a high and rising standard of living for all the American people is to maintain purchasing power at the bottom so that the masses of wage earners and farmers can buy back steadily, year after year—without the unhealthy booms and busts that we have known in the past—the abundant production that our economy is capable of turning out. Mr. Reuther's opponent objected with some heat, declaring that he had said nothing of the sort.

I leave it to the readers of the text itself to decide whether or not Mr. Reuther's summary of the two conflicting proposals is fair and accurate.

FIRST ANNOUNCER. Senator TAFT and Mr. Reuther, what can we do now to get more of the good things of life for us all?

SECOND ANNOUNCER. From Washington, Columbia presents the People's Platform, with Dwight Cooke. This broadcast marks the anniversary of the five hundredth program of Columbia's People's Platform.

For almost 10 years the People's Platform has brought to its microphone prominent and well-informed guests to present in spontaneous discussion the spontaneous views on the vital issues of our time; today, another timely debate, as Republican Presidential candidate Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and labor leader WALTER REUTHER, president of the United Auto Workers, CIO, join Chairman Dwight Cooke to discuss the question: "How Can the American Standard of Living Best Be Improved?" We hear first from Mr. Cooke.

Mr. COOKE. On this five hundredth broadcast, it is a pleasure to see sitting around the table with me two Americans who represent important and powerful sections of thought about our future, the Presidential candidate and the president of the largest labor union in the United States of America.

Gentlemen, if you are both willing, let's jump right past how incredibly better the American standard of living is than any enjoyed by any other people in the history of the world. It's typical of Americans, I hope, that we don't sit back on our overstuffed laurels.

Mr. TAFT, what should we do to raise our standard of living and realize even better the potential in the American way?

Senator TAFT. First, Mr. Cooke, of course, the standard of living of any people depends on production. The more commodities and products of all kinds that are produced, the more things people have to eat, to wear, to use, homes to occupy; the greater the productivity of each workman, on the average; that is, the more he produces the more he has to enjoy, and the higher his standard of living.

The best way to increase his production is to give him better tools with which to work, better plant, and machinery. There can be no doubt that the great improvement which has occurred in this country in the past century is due to improvements in the tools of labor.

Therefore, the first answer to your question is: Encourage people and corporations to save and invest their money in productive enterprise.

Second, keep the market free from monopoly; keep collective bargaining free and equal. Competition is the best regulator of the distribution of the money after you get it, and of incentive rewards.

Third, plan Government spending and tax policies and Government control of credit, to keep the economic machinery running at full speed and thus prevent depressions which can reduce the standard of living more than anything else.

Fourth, reduce Government expenditures and taxation particularly for armament, when possible, so our production of civilian goods can be increased, instead of military goods.

Mr. COOKE. Mr. Reuther, what do you add to Mr. TAFT's suggestion here of production, competition, and the role of Government?

Mr. REUTHER. We have got to do more than just expand production. Our basic job in America is to achieve a balance between purchasing power and productive power. We have got to get the purchasing power in the hands of the American people, the workers in the city, and the farmers on the farm, so that they can buy back the goods we turn out in the factories and on the farms.

In 1929, and the years before that, we had production. And under Mr. Hoover we got into an awful jam because 36,000 families at the top of our economic pyramid had more income in 1929 than 12,000,000 families at the bottom of the pyramid.

That meant that the few on top had more than they needed, while millions on the bottom didn't have enough. This production part of the problem is only half of the problem. The other half, and the more important half at the moment, is distribution, purchasing power. At the moment prices are too high and profits are too high, and purchasing power in the hands of the people—workers, farmers, white-collar groups—is too low.

Unfortunately, Mr. Cooke, most everything that Congress had done in the past 6 or 8 months has moved in the direction of giving more to the people who already have too much and taking away from the people who need more. Take the tax bill, just as an example. The tax bill just passed by Mr. TAFT and his group in Congress gives a man with four in the family, with a $2,500 income, a $69 tax reduction, but gives a man with a $250,000 income a $34,700 tax reduction. This means more yachts and less bread and butter for the people.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Cooke, as far as the tax bill is concerned, we took a hundred percent of the taxes off 7,000,000 people and of course we took $69 off, but he wasn't paying very much more than that. The percentage of increase to the reduction given is a far higher percentage than all the lower income groups.

According to Mr. Reuther, he doesn't want to give the top people anything. Of course, a man paying $100,000 gets a 5 percent reduction, that's more than any man can get who pays less than $5,000. But as a matter of fact, though, Mr. Reuther's whole thesis is wrong. The reason prices are going up today is that there is too much purchasing power, more purchasing power because of savings and other circumstances than we can get our production up to. Consequently, the natural economic demand and supply forces prices up. We may get to a point where we need more purchasing power, but we are not there yet.

Mr. COOKE. Let's get back to the tax question now.

Mr. REUTHER. Senator TAFT, people can't eat percentages; they need bread and butter. You gave, in your tax bill, a worker with four in the family with a $2,500 income—you gave him a 3 percent increase in his purchasing power. After he pays his taxes he will have 3 percent more purchasing power than he had last year. And you gave a fellow who makes $250,000 with four in the family a 59 percent increase in the purchasing power he has.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Reuther, you say these percentages don't mean anything. A man with $2,500 and four in the family before

this paid about a hundred dollars. Now he gets a $69 reduction and he pays about $30, according to your own figures.

Mr. REUTHER. Why not give him more and take more away from the fellow who gets $250,000, because he can live on what he gets after he pays a high tax.

Senator TAFT. Your theory would simply exempt 25,000,000 people altogether, no taxes; put all the taxes on people who save money and accumulate them, the various savings that are necessary if you ever want to invest in new plants to give people new jobs—of course not. I mean you can go on the principle of taking 100 percent of all profits; or you can go on the principle of taking 100 percent of all incomes over $25,000, but the trouble is that kind of theory would simply get you back to a state socialism plan in which nobody saves any money any more.

Mr. REUTHER. Senator TAFT, that is the same kind of economic theory that we practiced under Harding and under Coolidge and under Hoover. That is the Hoover-Taft economic theory, and what happened under that theory? America went down the road until the purchasing power became so low and the productive power so out of balance that we got into the worst economic jam in the history of the world.

Mr. Hoover used to talk about prosperity being just around the corner; and we waited, and we waited, because the American people were behind the eight ball. We never got around the corner. We never got around the corner until we started to put purchasing power through our economy.

If we practice your kind of economics, the Hoover-Taft economics, we will go right back to another depression, because you have got to balance purchasing power with productive power.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Reuther, you are just simply advancing a socialistic theory that nobody ought to be allowed to save anything. How about talking about the present instead of the past? The purchasing power theory was the theory of the New Deal; it was absolutely wrong. You pumped purchasing power for 10 years and at the end of that time you had 10,000,000 people still unemployed. The whole theory that you want more consumer purchasing power—what happens to the product—the money that goes in? A certain amount of it has to be saved. In fact, the whole future of the increased cost of living depends on somebody saving—whether it is corporations, whether it is individuals. You want people to spend every cent they get, to give to people who spend it entirely for consumer goods. Then you will have exactly what happened, and depression continuing indefinitely in the United States.

Prosperity here depends upon a large percentage of the proceeds of our wealth being invested in new tools, new investments. It takes about six or seven thousand dollars to create one new job at good wages today.

Mr. REUTHER. Senator TAFT, the difference between you and me is this: I am not opposed to people saving, excepting I want the little fellow to be able to save. You want the corporation to do all the saving; you want the people who have already got too much to go on saving and getting more and more and more. The basis of prosperity——

Senator TAFT. No, no; I don't care to say——

Mr. REUTHER. Just wait a minute. This is not a Senate filibuster. Give me a minute, please.

The trouble with America is that the people that you are supporting, economically and politically, are the people who have already got too much of the things, and you want them to have a monopoly not only on the good things of life but also a monopoly on the right to save.

I want the little fellow not only to be able to buy enough food for his kids, to give them a decent home, to give them proper clothing, decent medical care and educational opportunity. I want him to be able to do that and still have a little bit left over.

Mr. COOKE. I want to make a bit of a filibuster, if I may here, gentlemen. In terms of a central point, each of you have made: On the one hand the question is the necessity of increasing production. Senator TAFT's point is that there is more than enough money and more than enough purchasing power now to buy what we produce; and on the other hand, Mr. Reuther's point is that we need considerably more purchasing power now. How are you going to do that?

Senator TAFT. Let me analyze Mr. Reuther's argument. He has got two things: First he talks about more consumer purchasing power to buy the things that are made. That is a fair point—I don't think it is material today, but certainly we have to keep consuming purchasing power in balance with saving. We don't want to get too much saving; we don't want to get too much consumer purchasing power.

His other point is just a plain socialistic point that he doesn't like the present distribution of wealth and he wants to distribute it a different way. Most people will spend the money. I agree with him. I think the more you can distribute equally, the income of this country among different people, the better; but you can take all the corporation profits, for instance, that he has talked about, and add it to income and it will add about 10 or 12 percent to the average income and, of course, half the corporations will close up and there won't be any jobs, and you will decrease the income again.

Mr. REUTHER. Let's look at two phases of the problem Senator TAFT has raised. He raised first of all the profit question, and then the question of competition. Let's take up the question of competition first.

Senator TAFT has been saying repeatedly the past couple of years that free enterprise under competition will bring down prices. That is all a very lovely theory. But in practice, because American monopoly controls basic industries in this country, free enterprise and a free market is just a myth.

On February 21 I was testifying before the Senate committee. Senator TAFT said at that time that prices were just about ready to come down. That was in February 1947, more than a year ago. Since then they have continued to go up more than 10 percent. Now, here is what happened since they smashed price control: Price control ended in November 1946. From November 1946 to January 1948 production only increased 2 percent. Prices went up 17 percent and the profits of 1,500 manufacturing corporations, according to the report of the National City Bank, went up 54 percent more in 1947 than in 1946.

Let's talk about competition for a second. Now, what happened——

Mr. COOKE. Let's let Mr. TAFT talk for a second——

Senator TAFT. First, may I inform Mr. Reuther that there is some monopoly and the monopoly ought to be gone after and prevented. Of course, he says you can't prevent it, so he wants a socialistic plan by which the Government, in effect, will in fact rule all industry and shall certainly regulate all prices and wages, and I prefer to say—and I believe very strongly—that competition can be enforced and that competition is bound to bring prices down.

These profits will take care of themselves in time. As a matter of fact, the President's report points out that the profits up to date have been well used. They have been reinvested.

The principal savings have been invested in expansion of plants. I think it can go on too long. I think as a steady diet the present profits are much too high, but competition will bring them down.

Just go back to the years 1932, 1933, and 1934 where for over 5 years there were no net corporation profits, and look what happened to employment. Look at the number—ten or fifteen million people out of work because there were no corporation profits.

Mr. REUTHER. Senator TAFT, you see, it is a very convenient excuse. Every time you start talking about helping the little fellow you conveniently put a Socialist tag on it. That is what Mr. Hoover did and——

Senator TAFT. Now look, Mr. Reuther, suppose you get rid of the demagoguery and all this political stuff and talk economics.

Mr. REUTHER. I am going to talk economics. I am trying to say that every time someone proposes something for the little fellow in the world, whether it is the worker or the small farmer, you get out a socialistic tag, but when the RFC gives billions and helps to bail out big corporations, subsidizes the railroads and the shipping interests, that, of course, is good American practice.

What I am advocating is no more socialistic than these other things, excepting it is an attempt by the people of America to try to have their Government help the little fellow instead of the big corporation. Now, getting back to this——

Senator TAFT. Mr. Reuther, I want to help the little fellow. Now, just let's——

Mr. REUTHER. How do you want to help the little fellow?

Senator TAFT. I want to help the little fellow, and I say the only way you can help the little fellow is to improve the plant, the machinery that he has, to increase the production in the United States, and not by a lot of Government bureau regulation. It has never helped the little fellow yet, and never will.

Mr. COOKE. All right, gentlemen, since you are both agreed you want to help the little fellow, let's go into three specific areas and see what kind of action both of you recommend so as to help the little fellow.

First of all, in the area of Government, as Senator TAFT just said: What do you want the Government to do, Mr. Reuther?

Mr. REUTHER. First of all, I think the Government has got to take positive action with respect to price control. It has got to roll back the prices of basic commodities and take that roll-back out of the profits of American industry, because those profits are scandalously high and they can afford to give up some of those profits in the way either of a wage increase or a price decrease.

Secondly, I think the Government has got to break certain serious material bottlenecks in order to release the productive power of the American economy.

The steel situation is very critical. We need about 10,000,000 more tons of steel production.

In Detroit, we have been suffering up there with a shortage of gas. Two hundred thousand workers were on the streets for 3 weeks, and we are threatened with another shortage.

We need 40,000 tons of steel to get a new pipe line in Detroit, to get gas in there. The Government has to get into these things.

I say let free enterprise do all it can, but where free enterprise puts its selfish interest, of private corporations, above the welfare of the people, the Government, as a democratic agency of all the people, has to move in to protect the public welfare, and I say in this case the Government has not done it. It has strengthened monopoly and made it possible for people who have got too much to get more at the expense of the great mass of the people.

Mr. COOKE. All right, now, Mr. TAFT, will you argue Mr. Reuther's two points and then go on with yours?

Senator TAFT. In the first place, you can take all the corporation profits and distribute them back to prices, and you get a 10-percent reduction in prices. You would close up half

the corporations in the country; you would throw millions of people out of jobs; you would interfere with the whole operation of the economic machine; competition would bring down the profits, but the total profits—that's the point I am trying to make—the total profits are only, I think, about 12 percent, or something of the kind, of the wages the people get. That is an immaterial factor.

What can the Government do? The Government, I think, can put its own house in order, can reduce the taxes, and the Government spending, because that simply adds to the prices and in the long run those taxes are passed right on to the consumer.

The Government, I think, is interested in seeing that the saving and spending is in balance, that agricultural production is in balance with industrial production, wages are in balance with prices, but the wages have increased more than prices in the last 7 years, and the actual conditions under the Government's operation has been that today the actual net income of workmen in the United States has increased about 42 percent over what it was in 1939. Per capita disposable income, real income that is, allowing for the higher prices, has gone up from $838 a person to $1,190 a person in '47.

Mr. COOKE. How about the whole area of price controls in the situation, Senator TAFT?

Senator TAFT. Well, price controls—in my opinion, nobody can do it right. The thing is bound to break down in time of peace. If it is successful in holding prices down, it discourages people from going ahead with new plants and new investments and more production.

Mr. REUTHER. You see, that is the whole point. Senator TAFT keeps talking about price control discouraging production. In the shoe industry—let's talk about specific industries. Shoes are things all the people need. After Senator TAFT and Congress destroyed price control, the shoe industry had its highest monthly production in July of 1946. Now, assuming Senator TAFT is correct, having gotten rid of price control, production should go soaring and ultimately prices should come dropping down. What happened? Since July of '46 the shoe industry has averaged 16 percent less production per month, and prices have gone up 50 percent.

Just look at the cotton-goods industry. Their production was the highest in November 1946. It has come down 12 percent, and prices have gone up 23 percent. Now, why? Because here you have got monopoly control, where these monopoly groups arbitrarily decide at what level of production they are going to operate, based upon how they can get the highest prices and greatest profits; not based upon the needs of the people.

If your theory is correct, that having eliminated price control, production will go soaring and prices will come tumbling down, then how do you account for the fact that in the shoe industry and the cotton-goods industry they have cut production and increased prices since you killed price control?

Senator TAFT. In the first place, I deny the fact. In the second place, when we had price control on shoes and cotton goods, nobody could buy a white shirt, nobody could buy the shoes they wanted, you couldn't get any of the things you wanted. Today you can buy anything you want in shoes or white shirts——

Mr. REUTHER. If you have the money.

Senator TAFT. If you have the money—and wages have increased 102 percent where the cost of living (shoes and cotton goods) has only gone up 70 percent. The workman is actually better off today than he was 8 years ago. Now, I think he ought to be still better off, surely. I think the way to do that is to get this cost down; and if the Government is permitting monopoly to go on, then the Government is highly to be condemned. I can assure you, Mr. Reuther, if there is one thing that I think is absolutely essential, it is the whole theory of free enterprise and free competition. And I am willing to go the limit in seeing that that competition is produced.

What happened is that there has been this very high purchasing power, wages outran prices. I am glad to see high wages, but they outran prices so that they produced a demand; inevitably a larger demand for the supply is going to raise prices. That condition will come to an end within a reasonable time, I think.

Mr. COOKE. Now you come into an area of what business should do about this problem. You want business to reduce prices—high profits in business——

Mr. REUTHER. I want business to take the $29,000,000,000 profits which they made in 1947, which was an all-time record—they had $17,500,000,000 left over after they paid their taxes—I want them to get some of that money back to the people in the form of purchasing power, either by reducing prices or by holding prices and increasing wages.

Industry last year, according to the National City Bank, the manufacturing industry made 17 percent net return on its investment. In the auto industry, for example, the automobile industry, 8 companies made 38 percent return on their investment in 1 year, in 1947, and after they paid their taxes they still made 22.2 percent. I say that is a scandalous profit, and the American people are entitled to participate in that wealth either in lower prices—and I would prefer lower prices to wage increase, but if prices are not rolled back, then wage increases are justified.

Senator TAFT. Well, now, in the first place the corporation net profits for 1947 were about $17,000,000,000. Wages were $128,000,000,000. So that actually that is about 13 percent. If you take half of it away you might increase wages 6 percent. On the other hand, if you take half of it away or take all of it away you are not going to have many corporations continue in business at all and give jobs. I think profits are too high, but also profits go up and down. For 5 years in the thirties there wasn't a single dollar of profits for corporations, and as many of them closed up, we had 10 or 15 million men unemployed. Those profits will come down as far as that is concerned.

Mr. REUTHER. When will they come down, Senator TAFT?

Senator TAFT. Sure, they will come down; they will come down just as fast as the competition brings them down, and in many fields today they are coming down. They were no higher in the beginning of 1948 than they were in 1947. And in many fields they are less than in 1947.

Mr. REUTHER. You challenge, Senator TAFT, the figures I gave on the shoe industry and the cotton-goods industry, and both sets of figures come from Federal Reserve Board reports, the most authentic Government report in this field. These are facts that nobody can dispute. And you——

Senator TAFT. The point is everybody is getting shoes, everybody is getting all the shirts they want; they have more income than enough to buy them. Of course, I think prices should still come down. I think profits should come down.

Mr. REUTHER. You should try living on a worker's family income and feed and clothe and shoe a lot of kids.

Senator TAFT. I want to steadily increase that income, Mr. Reuther, and in the last 8 years the net income of all workers on the average has increased 40 percent. If we can do another 40 percent in the next 8 years, no one could be more pleased than I. That is the purpose of our policy.

Mr. COOKE. Mr. Reuther and Mr. TAFT, you have made it clear how you think business should act. Let's finish this and talk about what you think labor unions should do.

Mr. TAFT, let's hear you first.

Senator TAFT. I think labor unions—I have no criticism of labor unions. I think they are entitled to get the wage that is justified in the industry in which they are, a return equal to the productivity of the things they are producing in that industry. I am in favor of higher wages. I do say a third round of wage increases—I don't think we ought to lay down a flat rule, but there isn't any doubt that in many industries the wage earner is entitled to more and ought to get more. Certainly up to the cost of living, but rather in accordance with the increased productivity. That is the best guide.

Mr. REUTHER. I have always taken the policy that labor has to make progress with the community and not at the expense of the community. That is why 2 years ago we advocated that we wanted to get wage increases out of the profits of those corporations and not out of consumers' profits. We are not fighting for more dollars, Mr. Cooke, but we are fighting for more purchasing power. If we get a wage on one hand, and it is taken away by a higher price increase on the other, we have made no progress, we have merely accelerated the speed of the economic merry-go-round. Our basic fight is for basic purchasing power—dollars that will buy things.

The farmer needs those purchasing-power dollars, the city workers need them. So, we are trying to make progress, not at the expense of the community and our neighbors—we are trying to make progress with them because we know the only way we can solve problems in a democratic society is for all the people to be pulling together, to try to make progress together.

Senator TAFT. Now, on that statement, Mr. Cooke, I agree 100 percent with Mr. Reuther. We can close with at least an agreement.

Mr. COOKE. Gentlemen, if I can give you a back-handed compliment—important as the things you are saying today, there is something even more important here, I think: the fact that you said these things here, the fact that two responsible Americans, a leading Presidential candidate and a leading labor spokesman, are willing to face each other and defend your convictions here on the People's Platform honestly, directly, and without any script but with plenty of figures. I might say it is out of such stuff that real freedom of speech is built, and it would be better for all of us if we had more Americans of your caliber, willing to be this frank and honest with your fellow citizens.

Mr. TAFT, how about a quick summing up of the points you made?

Senator TAFT. My statement is still the same. The Government is interested in keeping a balance between these different economic factors. People can't have a higher standard of living than the goods that are produced. The big thing is to produce the goods. The best way to do that is to see there is enough saving, whether it is through corporate profits or through individual savings, to put money into machinery and plant, to increase productivity and increase production. That is the big way in which we can improve the conditions of all the people and particularly the people on the lower-income level.

Mr. COOKE. Mr. Reuther.

Mr. REUTHER. Mr. Cooke, I think that fundamentally our problem is not only to expand production but to expand purchasing power to balance that expanded productive power. I think the fundamental difference between Mr. TAFT and me is that he thinks you can build prosperity from the top down. Now, I take the position you have got to build it from the bottom up.

Senator TAFT. Now I never said anything of the kind, Mr. Reuther. I never had any such idea at all.

Mr. REUTHER. You have got to broaden the purchasing power base of the American people. If you try to build prosperity from the

top down it gets top-heavy and it topples over, just as it did in 1929.

I want to build it this time on a solid basis. The American people fought a war, not to go back to something—they fought a war to go forward to something better and finer than they ever had before.

Mr. COOKE. Thank you, gentlemen. I have to go forward with a bit of closing. We could go forward for another hour, as Mr. TAFT has just indicated.

As we finish this five hundredth program, I want to take a second to thank my colleagues on the People's Platform. Its producer, Leon Levine, has been associated with it since its first broadcast, and Bob Allison, the youngster of the set-up, has only been director some 5 years. With their help I think it is safe to promise you all many more forceful and stimulating debates here on the People's Platform.

Thank you, gentlemen, for joining me today.

Palestine, a World Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following address given by R. W. Frazier, professor of government and history at Southeastern State Teachers College, Durant, Okla., which was given over radio station KSEO, Durant, Okla.:

Palestine is a territory administered by the British Government under a mandate from the League of Nations which came officially into operation in 1923. This territory lies at the southeast extremity of the Mediterranean Sea. It is bounded on the north by the Republic of Syria as bounded by the Franco-British convention of 1920; on the south by the Egyptian and Hajez territory. Palestine stretches through only about 3½° of latitude and is approximately 240 miles long, 23 miles wide in the north, 80 miles wide in the south, and has an approximate area of 9,000 square miles, or an area of about one-seventh of that of Oklahoma.

According to the 1940 census, the population was 1,544,530, of which 947,846 were Moslems, 463,535 Jews, 120,587 Christians, and the remainder, comprising Druses, Samaritans, Hindus, Bahias, and persons professing no religion at all, numbered 12,562.

Since the promulgation of the immigration ordinance of 1920, there has been an immigration of Jews to this territory. There is no ancient geographical term that covers all the area now known as Palestine. Until the period of the Roman occupation, the region was subdivided into independent provinces or kingdoms, different at different times, such as Philista, Canaan, Judah, Israel, Bashan, but these never united under one collective designation.

The extension of Palestine beyond the limits of Philista proper is not older than the Byzantine period. Now the territory is divided into districts; Jerusalem on the south and Haifa on the north. It has never belonged to any one nation by the title of national recognition, and historians have predicted that it never will. Therefore, after a tenure of 350 years by the Jews they lost it. What about the Arabs? Well, they occupied it for approximately 2,000 years. From the standpoint of tenure and possession, whom do you think has the better title or claim?

When Europe was involved in the darkness and ignorance of the Middle Ages, they preserved, extended, and, in due course, transmitted to the west, not only the accumulated stores of science and the philosophy of the Graeco-Roman civilization, but much of the best of Byzantine and Persian art, architecture, and literature. They founded the earliest universities in Europe. Their works in medicine, astronomy, chemistry, physics, geography, theology, ethics, logic, metaphysics, history, and poetry became the first textbooks of the West. They had even to teach us chivalry and good manners.

When the crusading knights were settling their differences by personal combat in the arena, the more civilized Near East was using law courts and fixed legal codes, of which Babylon had one of the oldest codes on commercial law. They remembered this legacy of their former glory. Yes; the Arabs have by far the better claim and their history has had a more impressive glory and continuity than that of any European power. Ninety-two percent of the Arab-speaking peoples are Moslem, which means that a common pattern of religious practice, law, buying and selling contracts, marriages, domestic institutions, private conduct, and public relation, holds them together by bonds that are akin to those of patriotism.

The Arabs in Palestine are opposed, rightly or wrongly, to any mass immigration of Jews. Therefore, the majority of the inhabitants of Palestine are opposed to such a mass immigration. But according to the principle of self-determination, which is the accepted principle of international justice, the affairs of a country must be governed by the wishes of the majority of its inhabitants, and any attempt of an outside country to override by force the wishes of such a majority is aggression. Therefore, the actions of Zionists, of Great Britain, and of America, in seeking to force on Palestine a mass immigration of Jews contrary to the wishes of the Arab majority constitute acts of aggression and are contrary to the principles of international justice, self-determination, and democracy.

It will not do to answer that the Arab majority in Palestine is acting wrongly in objecting to Jewish immigration, or that, owing to the sufferings of the Jewish people, the Arabs ought to welcome them. According to the principle of self-determination, the people of Palestine are entitled to decide what they ought to do. That is the essence of the principle. Our attempt to tell them what they ought to do and to impose our opinion in the matter by force or threats constitutes aggression.

We can see this principle more clearly if we apply it in a case nearer home. The majority of the inhabitants of the United States objects to the mass immigration law. Suppose some outside nation were sufficiently powerful to try to force the United States to admit non-Caucasian immigrants in hundreds of thousands against our will? We would certainly regard this as an act of aggression, notwithstanding that a good case might be made out of saying that our objection to non-Caucasian peoples is wrong. We must, therefore, allow the majority of the inhabitants of Palestine the right of determining such questions of right and wrong for themselves as we claim for the majority of the inhabitants of the United States.

It is true that such a situation creates grave difficulties for democratic government; it may be used as an argument of partition or for what has been called in India "communal representation." It shows that in applying democratic principles to such a country some special arrangement must be devised to protect the minority from oppression.

Thus it will be seen that the Arab case rests squarely on the admitted principles of international justice. It is a direct application of them to Palestine, and the logic of the argument appears, on the face of it, conclusive and unanswerable. Let us see, however, what case the Zionists can make against it. The Zionist case rests upon five main arguments. They are not usually tabulated and kept distinct.

The first argument is that Palestine was a Jewish land in ancient times. It was, for long ages, the national homeland of the Jews. Moreover, they did not leave it of their own free will; they were forcibly dispossessed. This gives them a claim to reenter and make of it a national home again.

What force, if any, is there in this contention? The question can only be answered after we have first decided what are the grounds of right by which any nation can claim the country which it occupies. The answer is clear. No nation has any right to the land it occupies except long possession. What right have Americans to live in, occupy, and control these United States? No right whatsoever except the fact that they have actually lived here for two or three hundred years. It is true that there were cases of so-called purchases from the Indians. But no one will claim that the general right of the American people to occupy this country is founded on such purchases. By and large, we just seized the land by any means that seemed at the time most convenient. The Indians were, in most cases, forcibly dispossessed. The American claim is based on what lawyers call long possession or proscription.

The Arabs have a far better claim to Palestine than the Americans have to America. For they have effectively occupied the country for nearly 2,000 years. There may have been always a small Jewish minority from the time of its white occupation until now. This would give the Jewish people in Palestine a right to vote and to proper treatment, just as it gives the same right to Indians in America. But that is all.

These conditions make it clear that the fact that Palestine was a Jewish land in ancient times cannot possibly give the Jews a right of mass entry there now. No matter how a people came originally into possession of a country, whether by aggression, war, or in any other way, we have in the end—that is to say, after a sufficiently long period—to admit their exclusive right to it, which means, of course, that all prior claims are extinguished.

The second argument is that Palestine has for the Jews a peculiarly sacred religious significance. Can we admit religious feelings as giving any sort of claim to mass immigration into a country? Would we allow such a claim in any other case? Obviously not. Thailanders, or Siamese, could not, in any other case, assert a right to migrate into India because they are Buddhists, and Americans, who are Christians, could not claim a right of mass settlement in Palestine on the ground that it has for them, just as much as for the Jews, a deep religious significance.

The third Zionist argument is that the British Government in 1917 promised the Jews that they should have a national home in Palestine. A moral claim is here based on the general principle of the sanctity of promise. On this ground the Arab claim of self-determination and the Jewish claim under the Balfour declaration have been described by a British commission as fundamentally a conflict of right with right. This is a very interesting piece of muddleheadedness. It admits, in the first place, that moral criteria of right and wrong should have application to the controversy. This is correct. It admits, secondly, that the Arab claim is based on the principle of self-determination and is therefore right. This is also

correct. It implies, thirdly, that the Zionist claim, based on the British promise, gives the Jews a moral right. But all this last suggestion proves is, that the royal commissioners were grossly incompetent as ethical analysts. Therefore, the question which has now to be asked is whether the British had any right to make promises about the disposal of Palestine contrary to the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants of that country. It is plain that, according to the principles of international justice, they had not. Their action in doing so was an act of aggression. Therefore, the Balfour declaration gives Zionist no moral claim, and if they insist on its fulfillment, they are accessories to aggression.

We now come to the question whether the homelessness of the Jews, to which we must add the frightful sufferings which they have undergone and are undergoing, the persecutions, and all the other horrors, can be made the basis of a claim to mass immigration into Palestine. We may list it as the fourth Zionist contention.

No human person can view these facts without profound feelings of pity and shame; pity for the victims, shame for the cruelty and the wickedness of our human kind. But we have to ask, What moral claims can be founded upon it? There arises, most certainly, a claim to generous treatment by every country in the world. But just because the fact yields an equal claim against all civilized countries—except that the claim is stronger against those countries which have been most responsible for the suffering—they cannot yield any special claim against Palestine. The claim is more against England, America, Russia, and France than any other country.

Thus, humanity has a duty to find a solution to the Jewish problem and to put an end to the persecutions and misery of the Jews.

But the solution is not Palestine. What the proper solution is, I shall discuss later. The considerations, which have just been adduced, show that the fourth argument of the Zionist has no more force than the others.

The last argument commonly put forward for Zionism is the fact that Jewish immigrants into Palestine have already enormously improved the country, and that further immigration will result in further benefits to it. This fact is to be admitted, and it is not necessary to go into any details here regarding the economic and cultural improvements made in Palestine by the Jews. They are well known. The question to be asked is whether they constitute a valid argument for Zionism.

Now, in order to promote a world peace, may we lay aside the question of legitimate claims and, above all things, try to solve the problem that would allay the sufferings of mankind and abrogate the fear from want as incorporated in the Atlantic Charter and follow the provision as incorporated in the Charter of the United Nations with Great Britain, holding the status as trusteeship for the sake of peace, order, and progress.

Under the Charter of the United Nations, the trusteeship terms for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system are to be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandates of a territory held under article 79, United Nations Charter. This means in effect that it is dependent upon Great Britain if Palestine is to become a trust territory, and that the terms of the trusteeship agreement must meet with Great Britain's approval first of all.

First. That a regional trusteeship board be set up under the trusteeship council for the purpose of working out a policy for Palestine of guaranteeing its security and of being responsible for the achievements of the basic objectives of the trusteeship system as defined in article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations.

(a) To further international peace and security.

(b) To promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its people, and the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

(c) To encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedom.

(d) To insure equal treatment in social economic and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations and their nationals, for the administration of justice without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of article 80 of the United Nations Charter.

Second. That the regional trusteeship board consist, in the first instance, of representatives of Great Britain, the Arab League, and the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Great Britain represents the Christian world, the Arab League represents the Arab world, and the Jewish Agency represents the Jewish world.

Third. That Great Britain be designated under article 81 as the administering authority.

Fourth. That the main political directive be given by the trusteeship council to the regional board by the achievement of Arab-Jewish cooperation in a binational Palestine based upon equal rights and duties for both peoples.

This would be a workable plan. But listen, my friends, who are now standing in the path of world order at this time? The answer is communistic powers. Why? Because they have designs on the Middle East. They would like to get possession of the strategic lines of commerce by expanding westward on the northern fringes of the Mediterranean Sea all the way to the Straits of Gibraltar, then expanding southward through the Dardanelles, Bosporus Straits, and the Suez Canal, thus blocking the English and American Navies also with their ships of world commerce out of the Mediterranean Sea, taking over the naval and commercial key positions of Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, and setting up their communistic designs to capture the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow of destiny—Palestine.

It is estimated by chemical engineers that there is in the Red Sea and adjacent territory a potential wealth of $5,000,000,000,000, consisting of approximately 42,000,000,000 metric tons of potassium chloride, magnesium bromide, magnesium chloride, calcium chloride, sodium chloride, and a supply of potash which may be considered inexhaustible. In addition thereto it is the world's greatest reserve of oil. With all of this wealth, together with the key position of geographical location, they could, and perhaps would, try to enslave the civilized countries of the Eastern Hemisphere by their communistic pattern of human servitude.

The Truman Doctrine, will perhaps, or should include all the countries bordering on the Mediterranean Sea in Europe and Africa together with the whole of the Middle East. Civilization is again being challenged. May we hope and trust that our leadership will arise to meet the occasion.

I don't want to go to Flanders Field, Anzio, Cassino, nor to the Island of the Seas where there were entombed 83,000,000 dead over two world conflicts, but I would accept the challenge of the lend-lease recipients, feasting on the altar of ingratitude and deception at the expense of a liberty-loving nation, that the mandates of the United Nations Charter must be ratified. With the spirit of the Good Samaritan and the Golden Rule, may I say:

"God, continue to give us men.
The time demands strong minds,
Great hearts, true faith, and willing hands.
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flattering without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking,
For while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds
Mingle in selfish strife, Lo! freedom weeps,
While wrong may, or could, rule the land
While waiting justice sleeps."

A Strong America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, with a strong America as their theme, almost 5,000 members of the Daughters of the American Revolution opened their fifty-seventh continental congress in Constitution Hall last night. It was my privilege to be a guest at this meeting and to share in the inspiration that came from the splendid program of this great patriotic organization.

The DAR has persistently fought the subversives who would destroy us, not only from without but from within. It has promoted Americanism among our youth by such fine things as essays and oratorical contests. It has kept fresh in the minds of our youth the glorious history of our forefathers. It has taught them that the only "ism" they should know is Americanism.

Mrs. Roscoe C. O'Bryne, president general, keynoting the theme of needed defensive strength in her address of welcome to the assembled delegates, said:

The uniform stand of our organization against communism, even at a period when such a position was not particularly approved, and when appeasement and compromise was more the order of the day, is now—with thinking people—receiving the support it has always deserved.

The highlight of the meeting was the message given by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who asserted that "the ravages of communism—of treachery within our very midst—are eating away at the foundations of our free Government," adding that America is the "spearhead, leader, banker, and vanguard of the forces of godliness and liberty." His message was so replete with good straightforward Americanism it should receive the widest dissemination possible. To that end, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I quote it herewith in its entirety:

THE DAR STILL ON GUARD

Madam President General, distinguished guests, and members of the Daughters of the American Revolution, one everlasting truth our forefathers handed down for us always

to remember is that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is a great honor and privilege for me to address the Daughters of the American Revolution. America may well be thankful that your fine organization, ever since it was founded, has been on guard for freedom. You have always exercised that vigilance which is the price of liberty. Yours has been a militant patriotism which did not take freedom for granted. You have worked at the task of keeping freedom a fact in the life of America.

You have done what has been expected of you, of course, so perhaps you have not always had the credit your wonderful service to your country has merited. You are the descendants of those who fought, who bled, and died, for freedom; so everyone takes the fact of your splendid patriotism for granted. Our forebears sacrificed, labored, fought to establish this great, free Government of ours. They struggled through hard years to set up in America a government by consent of the governed. They endured much and dared much that a free, constitutional government might be rooted in a free economy, a free society, and flourish in the atmosphere of liberty, enlightenment, and progresss.

I need not tell you the primary purpose of your organization always has been to preserve our American system. But I do want again to direct the attention of the country to that significant fact.

All these years your organization has been warning the American people to be on guard against treason within. No one can possibly evaluate the enormous good your organization has accomplished for the Nation in continually stressing the need for us to guard, as well as to live, our liberties.

Today you stand as one of the foremost organizations of the world for freedom. Your foresight has been almost the vision of seeresses. What has transpired in the world is what you have warned would transpire if ever the torch of freedom could be extinguished by those whose lust for power drove them mad.

America remains the last great bulwark of freedom. Out of all the countries and all the governmental and social systems in the whole world, only Americanism, only our free system has stood up under the stress of war hurricanes. Called upon to shed rivers of blood and to spend inconceivable sums of money to help the other countries of the world to stop aggression of despotism, we helped. After the conflict at arms had ended we were called upon to help feed the rest of the world and aid in binding up the terrible wounds of war. We responded.

We are today fighting forces as dangerous and very much more subtle than cannons, bayonets, and bombs.

Those forces are a combination of causes which have come to a crucial point at the same time. The ravages of communism—of treachery within our very midst— are eating away at the foundations of our free government. We will stop this plague of communistic disruption, but we have not begun to do that a minute too soon. A second danger is inflation and high prices. A third danger is a constantly expanding government with its attendant waste, contradictions, complications, high taxes, and inefficiency.

Liberty won for us by the blood and tears and toil of our forefathers and preserved for us by those thousands who have died or borne wounds in freedom's defense must not be lost. We must not permit any part of it to be filched from us by enemies within our gates. We must not lose it through indifference, intolerance, class or sectional jealousies, suspicions, or intolerance. We must not permit it to be destroyed by excessive taxation. We must not expose it to destruction from without by lack of an adequate defense. The Eightieth Congress has moved to lighten the heavy tax load somewhat, especially in the lower brackets. We must never forget that more governments have been wrecked by excessive taxation of peoples than by any other single cause in all history.

The power to tax is the power to take; the power to take is the power to destroy, if it is not carefully curbed by the people's Congress.

Now, just what is it you Daughters of the American Revolution and the rest of us citizens have been striving to save and nurture and perpetuate?

In less than 175 years America as a Nation has gone ahead farther and faster than any nation in the world. The American people have attained through their own efforts, under their own Constitution, and by reason of their Bill of Rights, the highest living levels, the greatest spiritual and cultural progress of any people in the world. We enjoy the greatest degree of luxury, the highest wages, the finest working conditions of any people on the globe. We have the finest educational system, the finest network of highways and railroads ever put together by men.

Our religious and political liberty is unequalled in all history. In times of peace we have achieved stupendous feats of production and progress. In war we have performed even more stupendous feats of arms.

That is the America our heroic men and women have gone forth in our wars to preserve. That is the America we must keep on the highroad of progress under the system of government, economy, and society which has enabled us to come so far in less than a century and three-quarters.

Let us look at an internal danger which threatens us as we strive to overcome the ravages of inflation. Why is our Government overexpanded?

It is in the very nature of all governments to grow bigger and bigger. They all tend to encroach more and more upon the rights and privileges of the individual citizens. The founding fathers understood that very clearly. They set up our American system of governmental checks and balances to guard against any one or two branches of the Government overbearing the other and destroying the liberties of the people.

The Congress is the people's special instrument of control over their Government. It was so designed by the founding fathers. The Members of the House of Representatives, and one-third of the Senate, are elected every 2 years.

Thus the people may, at the end of any 2-year period, change the Congress, or change their minds about how they want their Congress to legislate.

During wartime there is always the tendency for Government to set up all sorts of regulations. We can look back now and see that many of the 76,000 department regulations in the last war were contradictory, oppressive, and wasteful. They represented not a necessity of the war effort, but the bad government of bureaucrats who wanted to extend their powers over the people.

The Eightieth Congress has met with great difficulty in trying to recall those war powers. The greatest struggle we have had has been to cut back appropriations; to reduce the overexpanded bureaucracy. We are still facing demands for governmental controls. We are told inflation, high prices, and conditions in the rest of the world all require continued or reestablished controls and regimentation over the people. You may be assured we are on guard against centralized government.

We must prevent a great deception being practiced on the people. It is that we can have a few governmental controls, which can be exercised from time to time, but which will remain always just a few. It is the pretense that those controls will not tend to encroach upon the liberties and privileges of the citizens.

Now the fact is a Government with powers of control over part of the citizens' activities is under constant pressure to assume full control over the direction and speed of every part, big and little, in the whole economic machine. Such a Government could deny anyone the right to earn a living. A Government with such powers could make access to the necessities of life dependent upon obedience to its authority. It could tell you where you would have to live; what you would have to eat; how you should spend your leisure; how you must educate your children.

Now, there is the picture of the compulsory state in all its naked ugliness. We want none of that in America.

Controls necessary in war are not necessary in a peacetime economy. The objective of a war economy is to produce for the Government. A peacetime economy is to produce for 145,000,000 customers.

When the Government is the customer it knows what it wants. But how could Government bureaus at Washington know what 145,000,000 customers wanted?

Then, on what principle would the Government at Washington guide the national economy? Obviously, it would be on the principle that what somebody at Washington thought was good for the people would be done. That is exactly the principle on which the despotism of the Kremlin is based, and upon which the Russian economy operates.

No people ever entered into the compulsory state through a door on which the price of admission was plainly posted, except in case of subjugation. There are many other entrances. But underneath the high-sounding slogans and the glitter of paternalistic scrollwork, they are all the same. The American people will not be fooled if they know the nature of this political shell game.

Concentrated government is not successful government. It has always failed to give the people happiness, progress, or prosperity. It has failed completely under the test of the last few years. Look at Russia and see what has happened there.

For years, the Kremlin has held complete control of government, industry, agriculture, labor, and of every detail of the private citizen's life. The people are mere pawns. Yet that control has failed completely to produce efficient results. They have had worse inflation than we have had in the United States. Our tax rates are too high, but in Russia recently, they executed a 90 percent capital levy. Those who had saved lost $9 out of every $10 they had. Russian living levels are only about a tenth as high as ours here at home. The prices of all goods and services in Russia are many times greater than ours. Men are chained by governmental decree to their jobs in factories or on the land of the collective farms. Citizens are not permitted to have radios, telephones, automobiles, or any of the other comforts or luxuries of life. Wages are low and rigidly regulated by the rulers. Strikes are impossible. They would be settled, not by collective bargaining, but by the collective action of firing squads. There are grades and classes of living. The privileged rulers and their favorites deal at different stores than the rest of the people. They get better goods and lower prices. Most of the Russian people live in mud hovels, log huts, or else are packed into miserable, barren quarters which make even our crowded conditions seem highly luxurious.

Authentic statements on the Russian budget disclose that inefficiency, waste, graft and corruption are widespread, and were during the war.

They have nothing under the Soviet system which even remotely compares in excellence or equality with our American system and its blessings. It is strange, in the light of all this, that free government should be in the greatest peril it has ever been. But it is. All over the world selfish, ruthless, greedy, power-lustful men want to set up puppet governments which they can control. They are trying to enslave all mankind.

We are fighting this creeping plague of despotism. We are spending billions piled upon billions to oppose it. We must keep alight in the world the beacon of hope and the torch of freedom. We have fought through two world wars to uphold free peoples and free governments. I wish we might all be sure here tonight we will never have to fight another.

America is the spearhead, the leader, the banker, and the vanguard of the forces of godliness and liberty.

Our first concern, as we go about this tremendous task of trying to lead a cooperative world movement back to peace, sanity, and decency, is to look to our national defense. We must arm for peace, and to preserve peace. But we must have a defense, especially in the air, fully adequate to meet any need of the future. We know science has become a very important factor in our national defense. The Eightieth Congress recognizes fully the necessity of America having an invincible defense.

The action of the House in voting for a 70-group air force was a long step in that direction.

We must have an air armada which can carry our defense to any point from which an attack on us might start. It is our best insurance against war. It is an effective step toward the preservation of world peace. That is, and must continue to be, our real objective.

I want to assure you tonight Congress has undertaken diligently and aggressively to replace Communists and fellow travelers in Government by men and women who cherish our American way. We shall relentlessly pursue that work until the last Communist is put out of any position in Government.

Just as we must lead a cooperative movement for world recovery, we must also have a cooperative movement at home for domestic readjustment to peace. We are not going to get the production we must have, beat inflation, and make life richer and better in this country by fighting, bickering, suspicions and frictions between sections and classes, between management and labor, between labor and agriculture, or between Government and business. We have got to pull together to pull ourselves out of the situation in which war has left us. We must stand by our American way. That is why I tried, insofar as I could, to bring about an agreement to settle the coal strike.

We want peace in the world and peace at home. Political and industrial peace. Progress to higher cultural and spiritual understanding can come only in peace.

America must and will keep alight the beacon of hope for the rest of the peoples on the planet. We will keep aflame the torch of liberty that all men may guide their way. The way to do that is for us in America, under God, with faith in providence and faith in ourselves, to go forward under our free American system. God give us the faith and the strength to meet this challenge successfully. Upon our success depends the fate not only of America but of all the world.

Statements Relative to Unjust Taxation of Annuities of Retired Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully direct the attention of this House to the interesting matter discussed in the accompanying articles, which I have been given permission to publish in the RECORD:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *October 6, 1947.*

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Under date of February 28, 1947, I sent you a statement relative to what the retired Federal employees consider is an injustice in the Government levying and collecting a tax on the deferred compensation paid to them as retirement annuity under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1920, as amended to date. I attach hereto a copy of the statement submitted. As no action has been taken by the Congress toward giving the aged retired employees some relief from the high cost of living, and their present annuity reduced by taxation, I again bring the matter to your attention. I also present some additional argument in behalf of those retired employees who are not members of any employee organization, and will not be represented at any committee meeting.

In addition to the arguments advanced in the attached statement, that the taxation of the annuity of retired Federal employees is unjust and contrary to the intent of the retirement law, I present the following:

By reference to the amendatory income-tax law (Public 315, 78th Cong.) approved May 28, 1944; also the income-tax law (Public 453, 79th Cong.) approved November 8, 1945, it will be seen that in section 11 of the existing income-tax law it reads, "There shall be levied, collected, and paid," etc., etc. Note the word "levied" is used in connection with imposing the tax. In section 18 of the present civil-service-retirement law it states that:

"None of the moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, or attachment, or other legal process."

The income-tax law requires the levying of the tax, but the Civil Service Retirement Act specifically states that any of the money paid to retired employees as annuity shall not be subject to levy.

We feel that the collection of this tax on the annuity paid us, and what the Civil Service Commission recognizes as deferred compensation is unjust and not in accordance with existing law; in fact, is contrary to the provisions of section 18 of the present retirement law.

In view of the facts herein presented and in the attached statement, and the additional fact that the annuity is being paid in dollars of but little over half the purchasing value of the dollar when the annuity was agreed upon in 1930, we ask you and your committee to give early and favorable consideration to the pending bill, H. R. 291. The passage of this bill will clarify the existing law, and will give a little relief to those aged retired employees who gave the working span of their lives to the Government and are now existing on an inadequate annuity.

Yours very truly,

H. G. RICHEY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *February 28, 1947.*

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The following statement and plea is submitted in behalf of those retired Federal employees, who, when retired had to sever their connection and withdraw membership from any employee organization in which they were associated, in order to reduce their living expenses to the level of the annuity they were granted by the Government: Therefore they have no connection with any employee organization represented before your committee, and have no such representation, except through this statement, submitted by their representative whose signature is hereinafter affixed.

This statement is presented in favor of bill H. R. 291, now before the Committee on Ways and Means, and request is made that it be laid before the committee and be made a part of any printed record of any hearings held on the bill mentioned. This group of retired employees request the committee to give favorable consideration to this proposed legislation, and recommend it favorably to the House for consideration, and present the following reasons why it should be enacted into law by the Congress:

(a) The civil-service retirement law, as it now stands provides that (sec. 18) the annuity shall not "be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy or attachment, garnishment, or other legal process."

The wording of this section clearly indicates that the Congress which enacted this law intended that the retired employee should receive the full value and benefit of the annuity, without any reduction by any levy or legal process. The word "levy" as defined by Webster's New International Dictionary is "to raise or collect, as by assessment, execution, or other legal process; to execute or impose by authority, as to levy taxes, toll, tribute, or contribution." The wording of the existing law provides that the annuity shall not be subject to levy, and the dictionary says the word "levy" means to "impose by authority, as to levy taxes."

The word "levy" to the layman means taxes, and to date there has been no legal interpretation or decision that the annuities of retired Federal employees should not be free of taxes under the meaning of section 18 of the civil-service retirement law. Taxing the annuities is now done under a decision of the Treasury Department, the agency which collects the tax. That it is unjust to collect a tax on the annuity is shown by the fact that no legal action can be taken, under the law, against the annuity to collect any unpaid taxes. Therefore it would seem that the collection of a tax which cannot be collected by a legal process is an illegal tax and an illegal collection. H. R. 291 should be enacted into law to clarify and make explicit the intent of section 18 of the retirement law and the intent of the Congress which enacted the retirement law.

(b) The Railroad Retirement Act provides that—

"No annuity payment shall be assignable or be subject to any tax or garnishment, attachment, or other legal process under any circumstances."

The Civil Service Retirement Act provides that:

"None of the moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, or attachment or other legal process."

The only material difference in the wording of the same provision of the two different acts is any difference there may be between the meaning of the word "levy" and the word "tax." Webster's New International Dictionary defines the word "tax" as: "A sum imposed or levied upon the members of a society to defray its expenses; a charge or burden, usually pecuniary, laid upon persons or property." Note that the word "levied" has the same meaning as taxed. Comparison of the two sentences quoted from the two different acts clearly indicate that the two words, "tax" and "levy," were intended to mean the same thing. However, under the Railroad Act the annuity of the retired railroad employee is not taxed, while the retired Federal civil-service employee, under a ruling of the Treasury Department, has to refund,

or kick back to the Government, which grants the annuity, a part of that annuity in taxes.

That there has never been a meeting of official minds as to the justification of taxing the annuities is shown by the action of the Civil Service Commission in requesting an opinion from the Treasury Department as to whether the annuity was taxable or not; the Commission being in doubt. Any decision on this point should have been rendered by an uninterested agency and not by the agency which collects the taxes.

(c) The method of computing the annuity to be granted retired civil-service employees, was formulated in the act of May 29, 1930, and being based on the cost of living at that time was supposed, and intended, to give the employee a means of livelihood after retirement from active Government service. The dollars making up the annuity are just a medium of exchange for the necessities of life, such as rent, a certain number of bushels of potatoes, a set number of sacks of flour, etc. Since that annuity was set, as agreed upon, it has been automatically reduced by the continual increase in the cost of the necessities of life, so that the dollar of today will only provide about two-thirds the rent, potatoes, flour, etc., it could be exchanged for in 1930.

Then in addition to this reduction in purchasing value of the annuity, and corresponding lowering of the standard of living of the retired employee, his annuity is further reduced by the imposition of an unwarranted tax. To relieve these retired employees of this unjust taxation and reduction of annuity, bill H. R. 291 should be enacted into law.

(d) Congress has already enacted laws which increase wages in the private commercial and industrial field, and also granted, increases in salaries of present Government employees, to meet the rising cost of living, but no consideration has yet been given the retired employee. That loyal employee, who gave the working span of life to the Government, at a low salary, found, on retirement, that he had to lower his standard of living to the level of the annuity he was granted, and now he finds he must further retrench, as his annuity is reduced through taxation, and cost of living continues to rise. These aged retired employees, physically incapacitated by age or ailment from obtaining further employment to augment their annuity, seek relief by your committee, and the Congress, through the enactment into law of bill H. R. 291.

As representing the herein described group of retired Federal employees, I thank the committee for its kind consideration.

Yours very truly,

H. G. RICHEY.

United States-State Cooperation in Wildlife Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a noteworthy address by Chester S. Wilson, commissioner of conservation, State of Minnesota, at the North American Wildlife Conference, St. Louis, Mo., March 8, 1948, entitled "The States' Job in Migratory Bird Management":

THE STATES' JOB IN MIGRATORY BIRD MANAGEMENT

What I have to say here is based on information gleaned from various State conservation or game and fish departments, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, friends in Canada, representatives of Ducks Unlimited, and leading sportsmen and other conservationists from many parts of the country, as well as upon our own experience in Minnesota.

In a nutshell, the job of the States in migratory bird management is to throw all the weight they can swing wherever it will do the most good in helping to maintain migratory bird populations against increasing hunting pressure and other conditions incident to the so-called advance of civilization. State activities must, of course, be tied in closely with the operations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, public agencies in Canada and Mexico, Ducks Unlimited, and all other forces concerned in the common aim of migratory bird conservation on the North American Continent.

Much progress has been made with that program. Much more remains to be done. Past efforts have too often been hampered by friction, dissension, and lack of planning. No purpose would be served here by rattling old bones. In the suggestions which I have received from widespread sources there was one predominating note—bury the hatchets and join drives to get results. That is the spirit of this meeting.

To get maximum results every State department and every other agency concerned must undertake the work which it can do best, coordinated and supplemented by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service so as to secure effective teamwork and cover all points in the line. There are many holes in the migratory bird conservation line at present whereas at some points there is too much weight and duplication of effort. I do not claim to have all the answers for this condition. I shall simply attempt to hit some of the high spots in the hope that the resulting discussion will promote constructive action.

First, we need a candid review of the whole migratory bird conservation program to determine what should be done and who should do what. That means planning an effective division of labor between the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on the one hand and the States and other local agencies on the other. In the earlier years of development of the program following adoption of the treaties with Canada and Mexico, Federal agencies naturally reached out into many fields not adequately covered by the States. In consequence we now find that the total load which the Fish and Wildlife Service is trying to carry is beyond its means, resulting in proposals to increase the duck stamp fee to provide more money. It may well be that the Service can use more funds to good advantage. There is much unfinished and untouched work in the national and international field beyond the scope of State activities. However, before more funds are provided for Federal operations, an effort should be made to shift to the States as much work as possible, releasing Federal forces for broad-scale work beyond the capacity of the States.

The States themselves are largely to blame for the present condition, in which Federal agencies have bitten off more than they can chew to good effect. In times past State departments have been altogether too willing to lie down and let the Federal Government take over any field of work which the latter was ready to occupy, and in too many cases the efficiency of State agencies has been impaired by partisan politics, wavering policies, and frequent changes of administration. Recent years have seen a marked improvement in these conditions as State after State has adopted civil service and set its conservation house in order. The replies which I received to my questions give encouraging evidence that many State departments are ready, willing, and able to carry a much bigger share of the migratory bird conservation load than they have in the past.

More than that, the State agencies are in a position to enlist the cooperation of many vigorous organizations of sportsmen and other conservationists in handling local projects and supporting the general program. These organizations have gained great strength since the war through the addition to their ranks of thousands of young veterans who are interested in hunting, fishing, and outdoor recreation generally. There is a great reserve of untapped energy in State and local channels which is waiting to be harnessed and put to work.

So, the sooner we have a downward shift of work responsibility all along the line to make use of this store of local energy, while fully preserving the necessary coordinating authority of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the further we shall get ahead with the whole migratory bird management program.

I suggest the following general rule to be followed in making this shift and in coordinating work between Federal agencies on the one hand and State and local agencies on the other:

State and local agencies should do all they can and will do well, leaving to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service the job of directing and coordinating the program and supplementing State and local work wherever necessary to meet some essential need.

A second but no less important rule is that in assigning work to State and local agencies, regard must be had to local conditions, which vary greatly from one part of the country to another, and to the incentives arising out of those conditions which provide the motive power for local activity.

For example, in the Northern States within the nesting range of waterfowl, State departments and sportsmen's organizations will gladly spend much time, energy, and money in marsh restorations and other habitat improvement projects of great benefit to the whole country, provided only they are permitted to enjoy a modest share of the fruits of their labors. In Minnesota we have just started a large new project of that kind for restoration of the Roseau marsh areas near the Canadian boundary, for which we have already made a large direct contribution from State funds, with the expectation that future development will be handled as a Pittman-Robertson project. Similar projects are under way in other States.

Here may I digress to say with all the emphasis I can command that, despite occasional sour notes to the contrary, the rank and file of Minnesota sportsmen are good conservationists, ready to give as well as take, and prepared to cooperate wholeheartedly in an all-round migratory bird management program. This is manifested by the fact that when our State conservation department refused last fall to endorse vociferous requests from some quarters for an extension of the waterfowl season, our action was approved by the great majority of sportsmen and other conservationists of our State.

In Southern States within the winter range of migratory birds State and local agencies can cooperate in the maintenance of winter refuges, which are just as essential as the northern nesting areas. In the States of the middle section the chief need is for resting and feeding areas during migrations, with some habitat improvement for such species as may nest locally. There are some areas, of course, where local inhabitants see little of migratory waterfowl, and where they cannot be expected to contribute heavily either to local projects or the general program. In

such areas Federal agencies must be prepared to undertake the primary responsibility for such waterfowl conservation work as may be needed, with whatever cooperation State and local agencies can be persuaded to give.

In connection with or in addition to the general lines of work already mentioned, there is a wide range of activities in which State and local agencies must exert themselves if we are to have a successful, all-round migratory bird-management program. Time permits only a brief summary, falling under the following heads: (1) Education; (2) observation; (3) habitat improvement, and (4) protection and regulation.

Education is the spearhead of progress in this as in every other field of conservation. In this all-important line State agencies must take the lead, working through their own channels and through the schools, newspapers, radio, and other means of publicity, to spread knowledge of the facts, root out local and sectional selfishness, and arouse united support for an all-out migratory bird conservation program on a continental scale.

Complete and accurate observation of conditions is essential to success in planning operations and prescribing regulations pertaining to waterfowl and other migratory birds. There is urgent need for development of a better organized observation system, with uniform methods of observing and reporting data, to be prescribed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, with State agencies, Ducks Unlimited, and other organizations, and other public and private agencies throughout the continental range of migratory birds, cooperating closely with the Federal technical staff in observing and reporting essential information.

Habitat improvement includes not only the provision of large nesting, wintering, and intermediate protective areas already mentioned, but enlisting the ccoperation of farmers and other landowners in soil conservation, tree planting for watershed protection, fire prevention, control of drainage, cultivation, pasturing, and harvesting, and many other projects for protection of waterfowl habitat around lakes, marshes, and potholes, which State and local agencies can carry on effectively. Such projects are small in themselves, but in the aggregate they can make an immense contribution to the maintenance of migratory birds.

Last, but not least, comes regulation, indispensable to limit the annual take of migratory game birds to the harvestable surplus and to insure fair distribution of hunting opportunity throughout the range. Much of the heat attending this thankless jcb could be dissipated by enlisting closer participation in the annual processes by State agencies and local organizations of sportsmen and other conservationists. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has been widely commended for the progress already made in that direction through the practice of holding regional and local meetings with State officials, sportsmen's organizations, and others interested, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at the St. Paul convention in 1946. There is yet much room for improvement in this field, and State agencies can render signal service by promoting closer contact and better understanding between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the public.

With a more efficient observation system and closer contact with State and local agencies, it should be possible for the Fish and Wildlife Service to avoid premature decisions on regulations, which have drawn much criticism in the past, also to allow the States greater leeway, within general limits, in prescribing local zones and other measures of local application.

On the heels of regulation comes law enforcement, another thankless job for which the States must continue to assume chief responsibility. Some Federal forces are necessary, of course, to back up the State wardens in certain types of cases and to handle the work in areas where State machinery is inadequate. I find quite general approval of the proposal for strengthening the law enforcement arm of the Fish and Wildlife Service so far as may be necessary to do this job effectively, as long as the States are allowed to hold the front line wherever they are able and willing.

No greater challenge confronts the forces of conservation today than this problem of migratory bird management. I have confidence that we can meet it by the united efforts of all public and private agencies concerned.

Communists Dominate CIO Packinghouse Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Chicago Herald-American, Friday, April 9, 1948. This is the fourth and last of the series:

HELP LABOR ROUT REDS: BUSBEY

(By Charles Finston)

Representative BUSBEY, Republican, of Illinois, today charged that the Communist Party boasted of "playing a leading part" in the Nation-wide strike of 100,000 CIO packinghouse workers.

He added that the Communist Party, aided by many "front" organizations, is dedicated to overthrowing the United States Government by force. He disclosed the party's "master" plan for rebellion.

BUSBEY cited the April 1 issue of the Daily People's World, a Communist publication, in which John Williamson, national labor secretary of the Communist Party, was quoted on the packinghouse strike, thus:

"One hundred thousand packinghouse workers are picketing for a 29-cent-an-hour increase. Today the Communist Party continues, as in the past, to play a leading part in that fight."

BUSBEY replied:

"If all those shouting to stop communism in Europe are sincere, they will also do something about stamping it out here at home."

LABOR NEEDS AID

"Labor needs our assistance as never before. "Don't condemn labor, but lend a helping hand to the men in their efforts to throw off the Communist octopus."

BUSBEY charged that "Red rebellion by fifth column forces will be timed to coincide with military aid and assistance from Communist Russia."

MASTER PLAN

The lawmaker warned of the Communist master plan for revolution unfolded to Congress by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as follows:

"Their tactics require that to be successful they (the Communists) must have:

"1. Military aid and assistance.

"2. Plenty of guns and ammunition.

"3. A program of extermination of police, as they are the most important enemy and are termed 'trained Fascists.'

"4. Seizure of all communications, busses, railroads, radio stations, and other forms of communication and transportation."

RED INSPIRED

Preliminary investigation of the meat strike by BUSBEY uncovered evidence pointing to the walk-out of 100,000 workers as "Communist inspired and as such would be a step in the direction of preparing a Communist revolt."

BUSBEY linked Communists' aims to congressional reports showing that Communist leaders are still strongly entrenched in a number of big CIO unions.

USUAL POLICY

He said the strike of packing-house workers, first major labor walk-out in 1948, was started in defiance of President Truman's request to hold off until a fact-finding board probed demands for pay boosts.

He added:

"The policy of defying the Government is a consistent Communist tactic."

The Congressman, who is drafting demands for a full-dress congressional probe of the meat strike, charged the walk-out was similar in many respects to a great many major "treasonable work stoppages" in 1941.

He cited the Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee, which hindered manufacture of gunpowder, as an example. This strike was led by Harold Christoffel, now awaiting a prison sentence for lying about Communist affiliations to a congressional committee.

BUSBEY said there are signs already of a wholesale housecleaning by organized labor who see a threat to national security by maintaining Communists as union leaders.

MEMBERS LOYAL

Despite these Communist-inspired strikes, the House Committee on Un-American Activities reported the rank-and-file of the unions' members are opposed to communism.

Is Continuous War Our Destiny?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, are we now, after more than 170 years of effort to establish a Government which would give to the average man greater freedom, prosperity, and security—an effort which every nation, every people, admittedly concedes has been successful—to forsake that policy, follow in the footsteps of those who, like Alexander, sought to conquer the world?

Are we to devote our energies, sacrifice our freedom, our prosperity, and our security, and attempt by the use of dollars, and, if need be, by armed force, to conquer the world, impose our ideas, our ways, upon every nation?

If we follow the New Deal, the internationalists, and the militarists, we will, in the end, destroy the liberties of our people, our Republic.

The so-called unification act which the Congress, at the insistence of those charged with our national defense, adopted last year is being used in various ways to lay the foundation for a military Government.

A little light on the situation is given in an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of April 16, 1948. It follows:

WHAT MILITARISM OFFERS THE NEW DEAL

The Washington militarists, having called for peacetime conscription, revival of the

draft to fill up the ranks, a 70-group air force, and an increase in total strength of the services to 1,735,000 men, are now turning their attention to the economic organization of the Nation for war (they call it preparedness.)

So far Congress has shown almost complete docility in the face of these demands to return the country to the footing of 1941–45. Nobody knows what the defense chieftains have been telling Congressmen in secret session, but outwardly their statements do not suggest that they contemplate war immediately. If they don't, what is all this furor about?

In recent days steps taken toward economic mobilization would indicate that vast expeditions are about to be started overseas once more. Eleven thousand industrial plants have been canvassed for conversion to war, with an equal number still to be surveyed.

Mr. Truman has also called for appropriations to construct a fleet of 50 fast passenger ships convertible into troop transports capable of carrying nearly half a million men overseas in one movement. Also sought are funds for 170 fast new tankers. Meanwhile, the White House has halted disposal of all unsold Government war plants, together with their production equipment. All of these steps are in line with the secret total mobilization blueprint drafted by the Department of Defense, which would give the brass hats complete control of the Nation's economy and manpower.

These plans for total war are not susceptible of rational explanation in the light of Truman's problem of combating communism or of the statements of administration spokesmen that no line has been drawn which, if crossed by Russia, would start the shooting. In view of the Communist technique of infiltration and overthrow of governments from within, Truman might as well climb inside a bag and fight the air as try to stop the Russian pattern of conquest with a huge military machine. What, then, is the administration's war-mobilization fever all about?

An answer is suggested by the report just submitted to the President by his three-man Council of Economic Advisers, headed by Edwin G. Nourse. The Council asserted that for Truman to meet the burdens of the Marshall plan and the preparedness program, he needed an expanded version of his 10-point anti-inflation plan, including stand-by rationing and price controls. The economists also urged compulsory power to allocate materials, new tax boosts, control of credit through restriction of bank loans, restriction of consumer credit, Federal labor control, and new savings-bond drives.

Truman has been yammering for precisely this system of regimentation in message after message to Congress, most recently in the State of the Union message of January 7.

If Truman's goal is war-time regimentation of the Nation in days of peace, there is little mystery about the purpose of his emergency preparedness program. The country is not going to restore discredited New Deal state socialism of its own volition. But the scheme can be slipped over in the guise of a war crisis. Industrial mobilization for war—or preparedness—can accomplish all that Truman wants and can't get from Congress in the way of control of the civilian economy and social organization.

This is the explanation of why Truman and the militarists, who also want to get back to a war basis for reasons of appropriations, rank, perquisites, and power, are finding it to their mutual advantage to drum up a military emergency.

Federal-State Conservation Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding sportsmen's organizations in my State has recently directed my attention to the desirability of transferring certain Federal waterfowl refuges to the State of Minnesota. In studying this problem I find that, generally speaking, this transfer would be directly in line with the general policy which sound conservationists have advocated for some time past, that is, assumption by the States of greater responsibility for wildlife projects and operations, so far as they are ready, willing, and able to do so.

I have therefore introduced a bill to transfer the waterfowl refuges at Tamarac, Mud Lake, Rice Lake, and Talcot, Minn., to State control and operation. According to my information these were all established as waterfowl refuges, but in actual operation have been operated more or less for the benefit of upland game as well as waterfowl.

Admittedly the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for the general conservation and management of migratory game birds, and if these refuges were turned over to the State, they would necessarily be subject to the requirements of Federal authority respecting such game birds. There is no reason why these requirements could not be met just as well under State management as under Federal management.

There is no good reason why the United States Fish and Wildlife Service should operate any refuges in Minnesota for the benefit of upland game. That is clearly a proper function of the State, with the aid of Pittman-Robertson funds.

I feel confident that the State of Minnesota is ready, willing, and able to take over and manage the four refuges above named any time the Federal Government wants to transfer them to the State, and we believe the State of Minnesota can handle them at less expense, with at least as good results in general conservation of migratory waterfowl, and with better satisfaction to sportsmen and the general public than is now the case under Federal management.

My study of the foregoing subject also convinced me that what is needed is not merely the transfer of certain local Federal projects to the States, but a study of the whole problem of Federal and State relationships in wildlife conservation, with a view to working out better coordination and division of labor between Federal and State agencies. I also find there is widespread interest in this matter among State conservation or game and fish departments.

Because of this wide interest I have also introduced House Resolution 530, calling upon the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the whole problem of Federal and State relationships in wildlife conservation; with a view to working out better coordination and division of labor between Federal and State agencies.

Women in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Nation is again confronted with necessity for calling its young men into service in the interests of national security, I cannot see the wisdom of denying our young women the opportunity to serve their country.

In the armed services today, a great deal of work is purely administrative in nature. The opportunity for women to fill jobs once assigned exclusively to men is great. It would be inconsistent and illogical for this House to fail to recognize this and refuse to admit the WAC and WAVES to permanent status in the Military Establishment.

I do not believe that young men should be drafted to fill positions in the armed services which so many able, qualified women are now filling voluntarily.

Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, said in a letter to the House Armed Services Committee last July 24, that "a modern Army must have Wacs."

The Army—

General Eisenhower said—

has many essential jobs that women perform better than do men.

He added:

The time has come when we must stabilize the Women's Army Corps in order to offer those still in uniform and prospective members a career with prestige and security. We cannot ask these women to remain on duty, nor can we ask qualified personnel to volunteer, if we cannot offer them permanent status.

Several weeks ago, while I was in Texas on official business, the House Armed Services Committee voted against making the Wacs and Waves a part of the regular military and naval organizations.

I was opposed to the Reserve proposal in the committee and I would certainly have voted against that action, which I consider very unwise in view of the current military situation in this country.

It is my hope that the House will today correct this injustice.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 7, 1948, which is an accurate and effective commentary on the situation:

WOMEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

During the war the Wacs and the Waves did their jobs so well they won approval of

even the old hands who had opposed their entrance into the armed services. They often did the jobs to which they were assigned better than a comparable number of men would have done them. General Eisenhower says it is "plain efficiency" to give women the same status in the present military set-up that they had in the war. Admiral Nimitz, who calls himself a "fervent convert," takes the same stand.

The Senate has passed a bill which, except for the number concerned, gives equal status to men and women. But the House Armed Services Committee takes a different stand. It has reported a bill which would give women members of the military reserve status only.

Such discrimination is unfair and is resented by the women. It will not attract top quality personnel and will not have these ready for immediate duty if an emergency comes.

The House has kept several thousand Wacs and Waves in suspense for more than a year. Unless it stops dallying and agrees with the Senate in this matter, all women in the armed services, except nurses, will be mustered out when present legislation expires in June.

The women who braved the subs, the buzz bombs, and actual shelling merit better treatment than this.

Compilation of Pennsylvania Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, many veterans are not fully aware of the various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions which are available to them by virture of legislation enacted by the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I have for their information a compilation of such laws as prepared by my friend, Harry C. Martin, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 432 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pa.

I have had an estimate made and I find that the compilation will take two and a quarter pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $159.75. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONUS

Ten dollars for each month of active service (maximum $200) is paid to veterans of World War I, the Spanish-American War, and certain other engagements. Applications must be received by the Adjutant General not later than July 1, 1948.

A bill to provide a bond issue to pay bonus to World War II veterans was approved by the 1947 legislature. This bill must be approved by the next legislature and then submitted to the voters for referendum. No payment is possible until 1950. Proposed bill provides for $10 for each month of domestic service and $15 for each month of foreign service, up to $500 maximum. Veteran must have served at least 60 days in the United States armed forces or any of her allies between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945; if in service during above period, service until March 2, 1946, may also be counted. Veteran must have been honorably discharged or separated and must have been a legal resident at time of entering active service.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowance is provided for burial of veterans and their widows, through the director of veterans' affairs.

Veterans' organizations may be accompanied by a military band when parading for the purpose of interring a veteran.

Counties may acquire burial plots in any cemetery for the burial of veterans.

Power is vested in the department of military affairs to acquire land to be set aside as a State military cemetery for the burial of veterans.

Municipalities have power to acquire soldier burial plots.

The bodies of deceased veterans may not be turned over to the anatomical board of the State for the purposes of dissection by medical societies.

Counties are required to care for the graves of veterans.

Counties are required to provide flags to decorate the graves of deceased veterans on Memorial Day, such flags to be furnished to the various veterans' organizations for distribution in their respective communities.

Provision has been made for county registration of veterans' graves.

Cemeteries may not prohibit the erection of any headstone furnished by the United States or by any county of the State of Pennsylvania for a soldier's grave.

Counties are required to furnish, on application, markers and headstones for veterans' graves; or if a headstone has been provided by the United States, the county is required to furnish the foundation therefor.

State allowance is available for headstones for the unmarked graves of veterans of the Revolution and of the War of 1812.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A married woman may mortgage or convey her real property to the same extent as a married man, make contracts as if unmarried, and become surety on any bond, bail, or recognizance.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Acknowledgments are provided before employees of the department of military affairs and certified officers of local American Red Cross and veterans' organization chapters.

Administration of estates of members of the armed forces missing in action or prisoners of war is provided.

Evidence of death or absence of members of the armed forces may be admitted.

Affidavits required to accompany the petition or libel in divorce may be taken before any commissioned officer in the armed forces authorized by law to take affidavits and acknowledgments.

Protection is offered in certain proceedings in the orphans' court when notice cannot be given.

Removal of disability of minority for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights is provided.

Suspension of fiduciary powers is provided during war service.

When the contract of a fiduciary is made by him or approved by court inadequacy of price or an offer to deal on other terms shall not relieve the fiduciary of his obligation or constitute ground for any court to set aside the contract or refuse to enforce it.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Each local unit of a recognized veterans' organization and of the American Red Cross may designate one of its officers to take affidavits or acknowledgments subject to proper appointment by the secretary of the Commonwealth.

Employees of the department of military affairs whose specific duty is to assist veterans, their widows, children, and dependents in the prosecution of claims against the United States are authorized to administer oaths and affirmations in all matters pertaining to claims.

Persons authorized to take acknowledgments and administer oaths are required to perform such services without charge to veterans, their widows, orphans, or parents who may apply to them for the purpose of making affidavits to papers connected with or referring to the military service of a veteran.

Certified copies of birth, adoption, legitimation, death, stillbirth, divorce, and marriage certificates are furnished free by the department of health to members of the armed forces, either during or after service, as provided by the Uniform Vital Statistics Act of 1943.

Proper county and city officers are required to furnish, free of charge, death, birth, marriage, and divorce certificates.

Provision is made for establishing in the department of health a special file for birth records of veterans of the World Wars and for furnishing free copies thereof to such veterans.

Free recording of discharges by the recorders of deeds in the several counties is provided. The county pays the 50-cent fee to the recorder.

Unauthorized holding or willful destruction of discharge papers is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $100 or imprisonment not to exceed 3 months, or both.

Any city, borough, town, or township may establish a veterans' service center for assisting war veterans and their families.

It is the duty of the county director of veterans' affairs to assist war veterans and their families in securing their rights and benefits to which they are entitled under the laws of the State and the United States.

Powers have been granted the commission to investigate conditions of disabled World War veterans and assist in obtaining full benefits accruing thereto under the laws of the United States.

There shall be in the Department of Military Affairs a deputy Adjutant General in charge of veterans' affairs.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS—QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

State teachers' colleges shall cooperate with municipal, State, and Federal agencies in vocational rehabilitation education of veterans.

Disabled veterans may be placed in departments of the State government for placement training upon request of the Federal Board of Vocational Training. The State is not liable for payment of compensation or salary to any veteran during the time of such training.

Registration as pharmacists is provided veterans with 15 years' experience as assistant pharmacists, etc., upon oral examination and payment of $50.

School districts may contract with public or private agencies in connection with facilities for vocational education of veterans.

The dental council may issue, without examination, a dental license to veterans who served as dentists in the Army or Navy during the World War.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Educational aid in the amount of $200 per annum per child is extended to World War orphans attending any State-aided educational or training institution of higher education, business or trade school, etc.

Preference is extended to sons of veterans applying for admission to nautical schools.

Admission is provided to the Pennsylvania Soldiers' Orphan School.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Additional credits and preferences in appointments and promotions in the police forces of boroughs, towns, and first-class townships are allowed all veterans.

Five to ten percent additional rating is allowed on examinations for employment under the State board of housing.

Compensation due public officers and employers during military service is payable to dependent wives, children, or parents.

Leaves of absence are granted school employees in military service with preservation of rights and privileges. Compensation is payable to dependent wives, childen, or parents.

Preference of 10 points is given to veterans in examinations for the State police force and for barbers' licensure.

Preference is granted to veterans in employment of clerical help under the Veterans' Compensation Act.

Veterans are granted preference in public departments and on public works of the State with protected tenure.

Preference is granted to veterans, their widows or wives, taking any civil-service appointment or promotional examination for a public position under the Commonwealth or under any political subdivison. Contractors and subcontractors shall agree to such preferences.

Preferences, rights, and privileges are extended to veterans under civil service in State and local units.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Retirement rights of members of the Pennsylvania State police retirement system in active military service are preserved.

Retirement rights of members of the school employees' retirement association in active military service, superannuation retirement, or retirement on disability are preserved.

Rights of members of the motor police entering military service to pay increases are preserved. Upon resumption of duty following discharge, second-class privates shall be entitled to the next higher rank.

Workmen's compensation is payable to second-injury cases.

Status is preserved under the State civil service, placement on eligible lists are to be prepared after cessation of hostilities.

Reinstatement and preservation of retirement rights of members of the State employees' retirement system in active military service is provided.

Relaxation of experience requirements for candidates and preservation of tenure of office of mining inspector following service in the armed forces is provided.

War service is credited in computing service under the public school employees' retirement system.

Certain members of the National Guard and veterans are exempt from jury duty.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Payments under the Veterans' Compensation Act are exempt from attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

GUARDIANSHIP

Appointment of guardians in inter vivos gifts or under insurance or annuity policies is provided.

Notice shall be provided to the Veterans' Administration of proceeding for the appointment of a guardian of a veteran or a minor child, or incompetent dependent of a veteran on whose account benefits of compensation or insurance or other gratuity is payable. The Veterans' Administration is made a party in interest on the filing of an account by the guardian.

HOMES

Orphans of veterans may be admitted to the soldiers' orphans' schools.

Veterans may be admitted to the soldiers and sailors home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Veterans may be cared for in State-aided hospitals pending admission to a Federal institution.

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

HOSPITALS

Jurisdiction has been ceded to the Federal Government of 557 acres in South Lebanon, known as Veterans' Administration facility at Lebanon.

HOUSING

Veterans' housing authorities have been authorized to provide temporary emergency housing for veterans of World War II.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

It is the duty of the State veterans' commission to advise the department of military affairs with respect to the administration of certain laws relating to veterans; to recommend to the Governor legislation concerning veterans for submission to the general assembly, etc. Provisions have been made for preparing and printing a compilation of veterans' laws.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

The department of military affairs is directed to procure, at cost, and award a service medal to certain veterans of World Wars I and II.

Municipalities may not prohibit the wearing by employees of any service bar or insignia issued by the United States Government.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

County memorial halls shall contain auditoriums for public meetings of the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the county; rooms for meetings of veterans' organizations; rooms and places for the display and preservation of records, relics, etc.

Municipalities may plant memorial trees in honor of veterans.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is granted for foreign service to be counted double in calculating the period of service for retirement of an officer or enlisted man with increased grade.

Credit is granted for World War service with reference to retirement and service medals.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Certain cities and incorporated towns may appropriate money for Memorial Day and Armistice Day observance, to be expended through veterans' organizations.

Counties are required to provide flags for grave decoration on Memorial Day, such flags to be furnished to the veterans' organizations in the various communities.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to veterans of the Civil War, their widows and children.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Veterans and veterans' organizations may be permitted to keep machine guns as relics.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

Clubs licensed to sell liquor may waive or reduce club dues of members serving in the armed forces.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Appropriations are made to the State veterans' commission to provide the necessities of life for and to assist otherwise such Pennsylvania veterans of any war or their dependents as are sick, disabled or indigent.

Banks, trust companies, and building and loan associations may make loans to qualified veterans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

A constitutional amendment has been submitted relaxing restrictions on disposition of gasoline taxes.

Business and mutual corporations are permitted to make contributions for veterans' rehabilitation service.

Holders of World War adjusted-service certificates are not disqualified for relief.

A 1-year limitation has been placed on payment of unemployment relief orders issued by the veterans' commission for food, shelter, etc. of unemployed veterans under the Relief Act and provides for reallocation of noncanceled orders.

The veterans' commission has power to investigate conditions of World War veterans.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Military organizations are exempt from the cigarette tax.

Members of the armed forces and certain disabled veterans are exempt from payment of fee for resident fishing and hunting licenses.

Liquor licenses surrendered at time of entrance into the armed forces may be renewed within 1 year from date of discharge.

Tax paid for malt or brewed beverages sold to ship's stores and certain military organizations shall be refunded.

Operators' licenses may be renewed after discharge from military service without learner's permit, examination, or additional fee; renewal is not required while in active military service.

Cars owned by certain veterans' organizations are exempt from fees for certificates of title or registration.

Disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines may procure peddlers' licenses free of charge.

Renewal applications for professional and occupational licenses may be filed after termination of military service with no examination required, including veterinarians and nurses.

Real and personal property owned and used by veterans' organizations is exempt from tax.

Lien of taxes and municipal claims and the period for the redemption of real property, where the commencement of proceedings or actions for the collection of taxes, or municipal claims or sales for the collection thereof are stayed pursuant to the Civil Relief Act of 1940, or the period for the redemption of real property expires before the end of the 6 months after termination of military service, are extended.

Hospitals or clinics for care of veterans are exempt from general county assessment.

Payments under the Veterans' Compensation Act are exempt from tax.

War veterans' organizations are exempt from statutory requirements as to registration by the Department of Welfare and payment of a fee before soliciting funds, provided approval is first secured from the Department of Military Affairs.

Payment of State and county personal property taxes for any period during which the veteran owing the tax was a member of the armed forces in World War II may be paid until January 1, 1949, without interest or penalty. Any interest or penalty already paid will be refunded upon request.

UNIFORMS, ETC.

Unauthorized purchase, sale, etc., of a victory medal, service button or decoration granted by the United States Government,

is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $500, or imprisonment for a term not to exceed 1 year, or both.

Unauthorized wearing of the discharge button issued by the United States Government is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $100, or imprisonment for a period not to exceed 60 days, or both.

Unauthorized wearing or use of the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, etc., is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $100, or imprisonment for not more than 2 months, or both.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Provision has been made for State publication of the proceedings of conventions of certain veterans' organizations.

Exemption is granted from certain regulations governing the solicitation of moneys and property for charitable and other purposes, if approved by the department of military affairs.

Imitation or unauthorized sale of labeled artificial flowers of the American Legion, VFW, USWV, DAV, AMVETS, and Marine Corps League, is prohibited with a penalty of $50 fine or 10 days' imprisonment.

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of certain veteran organizations is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $100, or imprisonment for a period not to exceed 60 days, or both.

The department of military affairs may issue arms and accoutrements to veterans' organizations. The adjutant general is authorized to issue such arms as are not needed for the National Guard.

Cities and boroughs may appropriate money to any incorporated camp or post of veterans' organizations to be used in the payment of rent of any building, room, or rooms in which such camp or post has its regular meetings.

Counties, cities, and boroughs may furnish to organizations composed of veterans of the Civil War, of the Spanish-American War, of World Wars I and II, or veterans of any foreign war, or sons of veterans, a room or rooms in any public building for monthly meetings of such organizations.

County memorial halls shall contain auditoriums and rooms for the use of veterans' organizations.

Members of veterans' organizations are exempt from prohibition as to the wearing of military uniforms.

The Election in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

[From the Boston Herald of April 20, 1948]

DEMOCRACY WORKING

Reports of the Italian election up until last night told a story unlike anything that had been expected. To be sure, there had been virtual agreement by the experts that the Communists would be defeated, but even the most optimistic were apprehensive as to what drastic measures the Communists might take during or after the voting, especially if things went against them. In Washington, for example, there was plenty of sleeplessness and anxiety among State Department officials who knew perfectly well that if strong physical forces were brought to bear by the Communists a most serious international incident might result. Most disturbing of problems was what the United States would or could do in that eventuality. As of last night, it appeared that these fears were groundless.

Beyond the vitally important decision made by the Italian people was the significant fact, brought out so well in the dispatch from Rome by the Herald's Bill Cunningham published yesterday, that the Italian voters set an example of orderliness for those of us who are so much more experienced in the working of free elections. It is a tribute to the Italian people that they behaved so well, and to the De Gasperi government that it had matters so well in hand.

Equally striking was the extremely large turnout of voters. To find 80 and 90 percent of eligible voters getting out to the polling places is something to take notice of. It is the kind of example we Americans might well profit by. There has been a great deal of talk of undue outside influence by both the United States and Russia in this election. But the important fact is that such influence could go only so far. In the final analysis it was up to the Italian citizens themselves to make the vital decision. Rather than give up and let matters go by default, the Italian people marched to the voting places in a manner worthy of the admiration of all of those who believe in the democratic way. For here we had a remarkable demonstration of democracy at work right on the border line which separates the free world from the realm of totalitarianism.

The verdict, as it appears from the early returns, seems to prove once again that the Communists only win when the Red Army is present or threatening. When people are free agents they cannot be so blind as to vote themselves into chains. Only recently freed from the chains of fascism, and too close for comfort to those who are restrained by the chains of communism, Italians had every reason to reject the beguiling invitations of those from the east who would have made of each Italian a cog in the Communist machine.

To the champions of democracy in Italy, we can say at least a preliminary "well done."

Midway Airport, Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANK WILSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

LOVE FIELD AND FLIGHT FUTURE

The Senate's subcommittee restored Friday to the Civil Aeronautics Authority's 1948 fiscal program the appropriation for Midway Airport which the Lower House had eliminated. What happens next, if the subcommittee action is finally supported on the floor, will be up to the joint approval of both Houses.

Once more it is important to make the Dallas position fully clear and to have the serious situation which confronts the future of Love Field understood by every Dallas citizen.

For the moment, let's waive the fact that, from start to finish in this matter, the CAA kept its moves under cover; this when the CAA was fully cognizant of the final effect on the huge investment at Love Field and of the planning against Dallas interests which it was not only condoning but aiding. Let's waive—for the moment—the fact that CAA would not have recommended Federal improvements at Midway over the adverse engineering report on that site but for knowledge that it will be used. CAA can transfer no flights to Midway. That is the province of the Civil Aeronautics Board. But you can bet your bottom dollar that CAA would not authorize a site that the so-far-silent CAB does not intend to use.

As far back as 1942, documentary evidence exists in the report of the Braniff Airlines to its stockholders that the use of Midway for their Dallas-Fort Worth stops was planned by both Braniff and the American Airlines. They had joined in purchasing land and deeding it to the city of Arlington for that purpose.

The interest of these lines is comprehensible. Delta reported last year that it could save $12,000 a month by making the single stop. The two other lines, both larger, would save more. But there is no earthly reason why the air-fare-paying passengers and shippers of Dallas should be taxed much more to save the stockholders of the air lines this money. That is exactly what would happen if every flight were transferred to Midway. The 20- to 30-mile additional travel to the port and the absence of low-cost public transport would accomplish it.

If Midway is built with a congressional prohibition against the Civil Aeronautics Board ever authorizing transfer of a flight from Love Field to Midway, well and good. But no such recommendation has been made. The presumption is clear that, if Midway is built, CAB will make the transfer and Dallas' $12,000,000 investment in Love Field will wither on the vine. Fort Worth does not want Midway without the single-stop program. CAA would not dare to build it except for that purpose. Love Field is in danger if Midway is built.

CAA is holding a hearing Thursday in Austin at which at least two and probably more of the air lines have asked to be heard. You know their side. But let them answer one question in Austin and again in Washington: Is the saving of dollars to commercial companies subsidized by the American taxpayer and is using of port facilities furnished by the taxpayer justified at the expense of the passengers and shipper who, like Jones, always pay the freight?

The New Palestine Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Palestine Proposal," from today's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW PALESTINE PROPOSAL

The newest American plan for a settlement of the Palestine dispute is officially described by our delegation to the United Nations as "a working paper" only. It is "not to be regarded as a formal United States proposal."

Rather, it merely embodies certain tentative suggestions which it is hoped will stimulate suggestions from other delegations. So elaborate a disavowal of a firm purpose seems likely to arouse fresh doubts about the ultimate American position. And the highly tentative nature of the whole proposal is further emphasized by the fact that the plan itself, providing for a "temporary" United Nations trusteeship over all of Palestine, sidesteps all the more controversial issues involved—such as immigration and land policy—by referring these questions to a newly created Governor General of settlement.

Though the proposed trusteeship is thus described as temporary, and though the working paper specifically recommends that it be established without prejudice to the rights and claims of either Jews or Arabs "or to the character of the eventual political settlement," it seems clear that the plan in its present form would discard for all practical purposes the solution of the problem previously favored by our Government—namely, partition. This is because the trusteeship would remain in force until the Palestinian Jewish and Arab communities had agreed to an ultimate settlement, either through their representatives in a new Palestinian legislature or by the majority decision of both communities in a direct plebiscite, and because the continued opposition of the Arab community to any settlement based on partition may be taken for granted.

The American proposal would thus involve an apparently indefinitely continuing trusteeship, under which peace between the two communities would have to be maintained by the presence of some neutralizing force. That this force would have to take the form of troops provided by one or more foreign powers the American plan tacitly admits. But on the question of which powers would provide such troops the plan is silent, and Mr. Austin's supplementary statement on this point is limited to a declaration that while we will contribute troops if other countries also do so, at the resquest of the UN, we are not prepared to act alone.

Granting the hard facts of conflicting Arab and Zionist nationalism, it has been clear for some time that only some overpowering outside force could impose a peaceful settlement in Palestine. The questions still to be answered are who will provide that force and whether, as now seems probable, a trusteeship will not require an even larger force than would be needed for partition.

The Truth About Butter and Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Congress is considering the great questions that are associated with butter and oleomargarine, and many of the Members are perchance in utter confusion, it is refreshing to have a forthright statement on this important matter. The statement is made by the Cudahy Packing Co. This company is engaged in the business of slaughtering, processing, and selling meat and meat products, but also engaged in the production and sale of butter and oleomargarine, and in fact is one of the largest manufacturers of oleo in the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith this forthright statement included in a letter dated April 20 and addressed to me by the Cudahy Packing Co., of Chicago, Ill.:

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
Chicago, April 20, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company is engaged not only in the business of slaughtering, processing, and selling meat and meat products, but also in the production and sale of butter and oleomargarine. We are, in fact, one of the largest manufacturers of margarine in the United States today. Our interest in the controversy over the present oleomargarine laws is therefore not one-sided. We stated in a communication to Congressman ANTON J. JOHNSON, of Illinois, several weeks ago that we are not asking for repeal of any of the present laws relating to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. In our opinion, looking at the laws from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. In order that you may know the reasons for our position we shall set them forth. They are as follows:

1. The present laws are not unfair or unjust.

(a) The dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws. They protect his market for butterfat against unfair competition from an imitation product. Any businessman is entitled to protection against imitation of his manufactured merchandise.

(b) The consumer is not hurt by these laws.

The tax of ¼ cent per pound on oleomargarine not colored yellow is small. The license fees which must be paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and the manufacturer are also small when passed on to the consumer, as they undoubtedly are. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleomargarine per week every week of the year (156 pounds per year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents per year, less than 1 cent per week.

By comparison, the cost of adding vitamin A to oleomargarine is more than three times the amount of the tax, and the cost of advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from four to seven times the amount of the tax.

There is no reason why oleomargarine cannot be served white, which is its natural manufactured color, but if the consumer desires to color it, modern packaging enables her to do so without waste of time or product.

Nor have the present laws had any detrimental effect on our national diet or nutrition. Our per capita consumption of fats has increased steadily during the past several decades, rising from 39 pounds in 1912 to 51 pounds in 1941. It declined slightly during the war, but since then has been rising again.

When all elements are carefully considered it can be stated with fairness that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him. Among other things, we can thank these laws for placing the oleomargarine industry on its good behavior, and prompting it to use American-produced oils and to improve its product to a point where it approximates the palatability and nutritional equivalency of butter.

(c) The oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry, it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

Other industries in food, drugs, clothing, and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to a complete imitation of competing articles, and the oleo margarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color of butter.

(d) Our general economy would be seriously affected by a change in these laws.

The uncertain benefits that might accrue to cotton and soybean farmers are so insignificant compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine that we should all pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them. In 1946 only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income was attributable to oleomargarine. On the other hand, farm income from dairy products was over a hundred times farm income from items attributable to oleomargarine. Even if farm income attributable to oleomargarine were doubled or trebled, it would be small, less than 1 percent. Even for farmers who raised only cotton, but 1.45 percent of their cash farm income in 1946 came from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine. In the 10 leading cotton States, income to farmers from dairy products was 27 times as great as income from oleomargarine in the same year.

Farmers in certain States now raise soybeans. Taking this segment of the farming industry alone, but 5 percent of the income they enjoyed from soybeans came from oleomargarine in 1946.

To sum up, actually oleomargarine is not an important outlet for any farm product.

The following is an interesting extract from the booklet entitled "Oleomargarine and the Farmer," recently published by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

"During 1946 American consumers spent over $2,000,000,000 for the primary edible fats—butter, lard, vegetable shortening, and oleomargarine. Out of this $2,000,000,000 of consumers' money, the American farmer received over 60 percent, or $1,231,747,000, which was divided as follows:

	Cash farm income in 1946
Butter	$638,011,000
Lard	429,647,000
Vegetable shortening	124,712,000
Oleomargarine	39,377,000
Total	1,231,747,000

"Historical facts prove beyond a doubt that the quantity or poundage of fats used by the average American consumer stays about the same from year to year. Fluctuation occurs in the per capita consumption of the individual fats, but an increase in the consumption of one fat generally results in an offsetting decline in another."

Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most

of his cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.

Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.

2. Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow—in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "Yellow is the 'trade-mark' of butter." Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today) cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached not because of the Federal laws, but because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject and the record should be set straight.

3. The present 10-cent tax on the sale of yellow oleomargarine reduces the incentive for fraud and assists the Federal authorities in detecting the presence of any considerable quantities that might be palmed off as butter. The monetary incentive to sell yellow oleomargarine at the price of and in the guise of butter is unique in our economy. No other kind of product affords a parallel for comparison. With the quantities of butter sold being so huge and the price spread between butter and oleomargarine so wide, the incentive for fraud is unparalleled. Fraud would undoubtedly be practiced if the present laws were repealed. The frauds which existed when the sale of oleomargarine in this country was unregulated demonstrate this. Oleomargarine being more palatable and nutritions today, deception would be easier.

We should like to make clear at this point that in our opinion the regulatory tax on the retailer is scarcely necessary to effect proper regulation. It could well be removed.

4. Wherever large and healthy farm economies are in existence throughout the world, oleomargarine is under some form of Government restriction and regulation. This is true of practically all of the countries of western Europe. In Canada its threat to a healthy economy is considered so serious that the sale of oleomargarine is completely prohibited. It is only during periods of high prices like the present that Canada ever seriously considers modification of its extreme position on oleomargarine.

5. It has been claimed that present oleomargarine laws are a misuse of the Federal taxing power. Actually, only by levying Federal taxes can the Federal Government effectively watch the sale of oleomargarine. The pure food and drug laws are helpless in this regard because they have no jurisdiction over intrastate traffic. However, the Revenue Department can and does enforce the present laws.

We hope that you will study the considerations involved in this butter-oleomargarine controversy and that your decision will not be based upon the exigencies or pressures of the moment, which are transitory.

Sincerely,

F. W. HOFFMAN,
President, the Cudahy Packing Co.

A Grateful Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as we render thanks for the favorable results of the Italian elections, which, we dare to hope, may mark the end of the western sweep of godless communism, we must not forget our debt to those of our own number who labored long and effectively in the cause of freedom for Italy. Without detraction in any way from the noble efforts of other colleagues, especial mention should be accorded our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, who, with his able and attractively convincing wife, spoke on several occasions to the Italian people in their native tongue, exhorting them not to forsake the principles of democracy and not to submit to Communist enslavement.

Representative LODGE's well-timed and thoroughly justified call upon the Soviet Union to release Italian prisoners-of-war held in slavery was the subject of favorable comment in the editorial columns of the Washington Post last week. Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial is set forth below:

ITALIANS IN RUSSIA

On Wednesday Representative LODGE, of Connecticut, demanded the repatriation of the many thousands Italian prisoners-of-war who are still held captive in the Soviet Union. "I call upon the Government of Soviet Russia," said Mr. LODGE, "to release these men from slavery. I call upon Stalin's Italian gauleiter, Palmiro Togliatti, to help deliver these victims from the stinking hell-holes of oppression in which they are languishing."

Mr. LODGE cannot have any illusion that any attention will be paid to his demand by either Moscow or Signor Togliatti. Nevertheless, it was a shrewd stroke, for the speech will certainly be given publicity in Italy, to the further embarrassment of the Communists on the eve of the decisive election. Mr. LODGE touched the Communists at a sensitive spot. For it goes without saying that these prisoners, if returned to Italy, would have made the most effective propagandists imaginable for the anti-Communist cause.

How many Italian captives were taken by the Rusisans in the fighting on the eastern front is not clear. Italian estimates put the number of unrepatriated prisoners as high as 60,000. Soviet representatives have admitted that at least 46,000 were captured, about half of whom were said to have been repatriated after the Potsdam Conference. How many Italians may have perished in the Rusisan prison camps, no one knows. But if we may take as an index the experiences of Polish prisoners of war, as related in the Dark Side of the Moon, we can safely assume that the death rate has been very high.

Mr. Speaker, nor was it alone those in high places who exerted a profound influence on the course of the Italian elections. Perhaps even more was this crucial choice affected by the thousands of cables and letters from those in this country who were born, or whose parents were born in Italy. Out of the enthusiastic fullness of their grateful hearts they made known to their kinfolk and friends in their native land their deep concern that the country of their origin not succumb to totalitarian engulfment.

In my home city of Rochester, N. Y., for instance, where some of our finest citizens are of Italian descent, a 16-year-old high-school student, Miss Gina Trovato, press chairman of the Valguarnera Society of Rochester, prepared for the members of that active and flourishing organization, a moving message to her countrymen. This was copied, I understand, by hundreds of members of the society and transmitted to their relatives and acquaintances in the land of their origin.

Gina Trovato's extraordinary manifesto to the residents of Valguarnera, Italy, is an inspired message, and her action and that of the members of her society is a challenge to the complacency of those who would shut their eyes to the march of events in other parts of the world.

Miss Trovato's appeal to the Valguarneresi follows:

ITALIAN GIRL APPEALS TO HOMELAND

To the People of Valguarnera:

The Valguarneresi of Rochester feel the duty of turning to all of you, people of Valguarnera, in this hour of supreme anxiety for our motherland's destiny. We, who with love keep intact the remembrance of our faraway Italy, cannot convince ourselves that the 18th of April will mean forever the end of her liberty and the beginning of a dictatorial slavery.

You Communists, you who are sons of our Italy, you will bear this guilt if in these elections you will be selfish and will think of yourselves for the welfare of a foreign nation, which never in the past has smiled upon Italy, which never has been a friend to her.

Think of the 600,000 Italian prisoners in Russia who never came back to their families. What has become of them?

Think, instead, of all the Italians, think about us who from the far-away America send you this brotherly appeal for the well-being of our country.

Finally think with respect of America, mother of democracy; think about this continent which Columbus discovered, and which Italians have accepted with enthusiasm. America is always ready to receive the needy people. America is the motherland of all the people and as such she is the mother of Italians.

Communism is not suited for Italy.

Italy, being small in territory, and poor in natural resources, is forced to turn to other nations for help. In voting for communism, you will be voting not that Italy be free, but that Russia be her dictator, your owner, and you her slaves.

Be careful in choosing. There is an America for you, protector of free people, a land in which equality is better organized than in any other part of the world. America has helped Italy; she has helped her when the impact of the war left her destitute and destroyed.

America has done so much that people of Italy might smile again after bitter tears. Don't act in such a way that America can be sorry for what she has done and plans to do for Italy. We speak in this manner because we are sure of what we are saying, because we live under the Stars and Stripes and American democracy.

Listen to us, people of Valguarnera. It is we, those who in this prosperous continent have found liberty and well-being; it is we

who have struggled in order that people of America might recognize what Italy has contributed to the world. The time has arrived when all these years of sacrifices are in danger of being lost. If you vote against America, you will be voting against us, who are part of you.

America wishes Europe to be free, strong, united under the same ideals of well-being, peace, and love. The world which has come out of the recent war is looking with trepidation to the 18th of April which will spell the beginning of peace or war.

There is something, however, which is more potent than our words and even our thoughts: It is the light which upon the world radiates from Rome, our Eternal City, which God blessed, and where Christianity flourished.

Listen to us, people of Valguarnera.

Long life for Italy!

Public Servants Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement issued by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL, setting up Public Servants Week and the endorsement of the idea as voiced by Spencer Miller, Jr., highway commissioner of New Jersey.

I believe that all Members of Congress have an interest, as public servants, in this program for improving the standards of public service. This is an expression of the workings of American democracy and a formal recognition of public responsibility by a union of workers which merits wide recognition by the people of the United States.

The statements follow:

PUBLIC SERVANTS WEEK

STATEMENT OF ARNOLD S. ZANDER, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL

Public Servants Week was approved today by the board of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL, meeting at its headquarters here, for the purpose of focusing public attention on ways and means of providing better and more efficient service to the public by State, county, and municipal employees. The week tentatively chosen for 1948 begins Monday, June 7.

The federation will invite other interested groups in the United States and Canada to cooperate in making Public Servants Week a success. Days will be set aside for special services, such as safety and law enforcement, education, sanitation, conservation, public works, and health and welfare. Every public employee will be given a place of honor and an opportunity to demonstrate his work.

Among the objectives of the federation in establishing a Public Servants Week are:

1. Serving the public better.
2. Saving money for the taxpayers through increased productivity.
3. Recognizing merit and fitness in public employment.
4. Achieving reforms in public administration.

It is also a belief of the A. F. S. C. and M. E. that better public understanding of the work done by public employees will lead to greater cooperation by the public in crime prevention, in sanitation programs, in fire prevention, in conservation, in public-school educational advancement, and in all other endeavors of public employees to make the communities in which they work better places in which to live.

STATEMENT OF SPENCER MILLER, JR., NEW JERSEY STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER

Public service is a public trust. So runs an ancient maxim. The trust is discharged when those who are elected to public office serve the public without thought of self and place the public welfare above one's personal welfare. But public service is no less a career and a trust to the millions of public servants throughout the land who by examination and appointment constitute our civil service. They are the men and women who make our democratic institutions work and serve the public welfare.

I regard the idea of Public Servants Week, as conceived by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL, as typifying the workings of American democracy. The program of this federation of civil servants provides for better understanding by all citizens of the problems and operations of State, county, and municipal government. I believe that all public officials as they come to know the purpose of this program will give it their support. Every citizen, who is benefiting from increasing betterment of public services, should take advantage of this opportunity to encourage their public employees to give even better service and to weigh carefully and fairly the question of how much compensation is required to make the public employee a respected and respectable member of the community which he serves.

Midway Airport, Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANK WILSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Times-Herald:

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT IGNORE WAY FEDERAL MONEY IS SPENT

On the Senate subcommittee which heard the Dallas protest against the Midway Airport, and which has voted nevertheless to approve the CAA plans for this project, are several Senators who appear to think Congress should not disapprove any plans of the administrative agency.

These Senators seem to be under the impression that when the CAA plans an airport, Congress should merely vote the money without even glancing at the plans. In short, they would simply give the administrative agency a blank check.

However, this theory that Congress should not interfere with CAA plans does not square with the law under which the agency was created.

In section 8 of this law there is language which says that when the CAA submits requests for class A airports and larger, "the Administrator may consider such appropriations as granting the authority requested, unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by law or by concurrent resolution, and no such grants shall be made unless authorized."

In short, the law gives Congress the right to disapprove plans for class 4 or larger airports. And the proposed Midway project is several points above class 4 as planned by the CAA. Apparently, this is recognized by some of the Senators, for one of them has been quoted as saying that the law should be amended to give the CAA more freedom.

The House of Representatives has acted as the law specifies. It checked the plans for the proposed Midway Airport and cut out of the bill the appropriation of $11,000,000 in Federal money for the project. The same thing can be done by the Senate, which now has the omnibus under consideration.

As far as the suggestion that the law should be amended is concerned, one might well raise this question: Would it be right for Congress to give any spending agency absolute freedom to spend money as it sees fit? The money comes out of the pockets of the people. It is the duty of Congress to see that public money is spent wisely and economically.

The CAA is an administrative and planning agency. It has technicians. But even experts can make mistakes. After all, its technicians are only human. Congress should not take them to be infallible. Congress should keep its hands on the purse strings. The law is plain enough. The report of the subcommittee is not binding upon the Senate as a whole.

Address of Hon. John A. O'Donnell, of the Philippine War Damage Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Commissioner John A. O'Donnell, of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission, at the commencement exercises of Southern College, Cebu City, Philippines, on Sunday, April 18:

President Jereza, distinguished faculty members, honored graduates, students, and guests, it gives me the utmost pleasure to address you on this occasion. It is a tribute, I can assure you, which I will long cherish.

I have had the privilege of traveling extensively in my own country and elsewhere. In no land have I witnessed a more commendable desire for education and learning than exists in your Republic. When one observes children and young people here attending classes in the open air, because no other schools exist, when one sees them journeying long distances in all kinds of weather, under all types of conditions, to receive the teachings of their elders, he must indeed be proud and, yes, somewhat humble, at their desire to reach the fountains of knowledge.

Your college, founded some 21 years ago by your present president and director, Agustin Jereza, is one of the most notable of its kind in the Philippines. Your faculty members are able and eminent educators. Your graduates have achieved private and public success.

The courses offered here are varied and provide a wide range of study. Personally, I am somewhat prejudiced in favor of law, to say the least, having studied many a musty tome and briefed seemingly innumerable cases to prepare for my admittance to various bars in my own land. I am proud of the fact that members of the legal profession in the United States had much to do with shaping its destiny and instill in it the principles of democracy for which those who

have followed and those who are to come seek everlasting endurance. These included Jefferson, John Adams, James Madison, Webster, Clay, John Marshall, and Lincoln, to name a few. James Monroe, Franklin, Hamilton, and John Quincy Adams were skilled in foreign service. William Henry Harrison studied medicine and in those days physicians prepared their own pharmaceuticals. John Adams, John Quincy Adams, and Woodrow Wilson were educators. George Washington, himself, not only was a farmer, a soldier and a statesman, but in his youth studied civil engineering and helped to survey great tracts in some of the then almost unexplored areas of the Colonial territory.

Men of similar educations have taken part in the molding of many nations. They have done so in yours. I am convinced that many of you will make your own contributions to the welfare and development of your own Republic.

This day, April 18, 1948, will always hold great significance for you members of the graduating class, who have achieved honor for yourselves and credit for your school. It will be the date that marks your entrance into new fields of endeavor. But I would like to remind you that April, itself, has been of great and grave significance to multitudes of men and women throughout history.

On April 19, 1775, were fought the battles of Lexington and Concord, the first major encounters of the American Revolution. George Washington was inaugurated the first President of the United States on April 30, 1789. Fort Sumter, S. C., was fired on in April 1861, blowing the lid from the smoldering powder keg of the United States Civil War. So, too, did that same Civil War end in a month of April. Lee surrendered on April 9, 1865. Abraham Lincoln, the great American emancipator, was shot on April 14, 1865, and died on the following day, a martyr to his beliefs in the rights of free men.

The United States broke diplomatic relations with Spain in April 1898 and war was declared in the same month. On April 6, 1917, the United States declared a state of war existed with Germany in World War I, that ghastly episode in history which was surpassed in horror only by the Second World War. In that latter era of devastation only too many of you know and remember with somberness and sorrow that Cebu fell to the invader on April 8, 1942, and on the following day the tragic remnants of the heroes of Bataan laid down their arms.

These are only some of the historic events which have affected your country, mine, and others in the month of April. I recite them to you because today, in April 1948, men again talk of war and throughout the world uncertainty of the future prevails. The scientists of more than one nation appear to be pitted against each other in a race toward calamity. Political leaders and military forces of some countries seem determined to plot aggression even though their actions may cause the most horrible disaster that has ever been known. It is my belief that their actions are predicated on fear which in itself is based on lack of knowledge and understanding.

My country has sought peace. It has sought to relieve the suffering of many peoples. It believes in freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom from oppression. It continues to seek them and to believe in them. But I can assure you that the echo of the voice of that great American patriot who, in a day of long ago, cried, "Give me liberty or give me death," still resounds throughout the land. We cannot and will not tolerate aggression.

In these days when strife may seem imminent, and of that no one can be certain, it seems only fitting that we should remind ourselves of the unusually friendly relations that have existed between your country and mine for nearly half a hundred years. In particular I would like to point out some of the reasons why I am in the Philippines today and thus have an opportunity to be present at this ceremony.

In the days of its stewardship of the Philippines, the United States never intended to assume the role of a conquering power. From the time that it took control it endeavored to take steps to return that control to a people who for centuries had demonstrated their own love of liberty and freedom.

Finally, on July 4, 1946, the freedom that liberty-loving Filipinos had so long sought was granted and the independent Republic of the Philippines became an actuality. Before this action, however, the United States took another step in your behalf and this was the adoption of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act.

This act, unique in the annals of history, was predicated on two major fundamentals. The first of these was that for half a century friendly relations had existed between our countries and that during the sordid years of the Japanese occupation you had continued your hope and your friendship, had aided our civilians and military forces, and, as part of your suffering, had fought and died with us. The second reason was that because of your friendship and loyalty we wished to assist you in overcoming the financial devastation of the war and help you to get started on the road to economic recovery.

So it was that the Philippine Rehabilitation Act was adopted as a manifestation of good will. This act created the United States-Philippine War Damage Commission, and I am one of its three members.

I am sure that you know that the act provides for the payment of 800,000,000 pesos for private damages and losses resulting from some of the perils of World War II, such as enemy action, enemy attack, Allied action, and looting or other civil disorder growing out of the other specified perils of war. It makes no provision for the payment of compensation for loss of life or limb and, except under certain circumstances, excludes properties which might be classed as luxuries.

In general, only Filipinos and Americans who were resident here are eligible for payment. Certain friendly alien residents are also included, but their number is small. Enemy aliens and persons found guilty of treason, collaboration, or other acts of disloyalty are barred.

All losses for which damage is claimed must have occurred between December 7, 1941, and October 1, 1945. All claimants must be able to show evidence of some interest of ownership.

There are many ramifications of the act—many details—on which I will not dwell. The time for filing claims ended midnight February 29, 1948, 1 year after the original filing date of March 1, 1947. Only an act of Congress could have extended this filing period as it was established by the Congress in the Rehabilitation Act.

The Commission has received approximately 1,300,000 claims for private war damages. Claimants who submitted them value their losses at nearly 2,500,000,000 pesos. Obviously the 800,000,000 pesos authorized by Congress will not be sufficient to pay all approved claims in full.

The act provides that we must make provision for payment in full of all claims approved for 1,000 pesos or less and for a payment of 1,000 pesos on claims approved for greater amounts, before we can make larger payments. It is too early to predict what additional payments can be made. My colleagues and I can only hope that they will be substantial enough to materially aid in the rehabilitation of industry, agriculture, and business because we are well aware of the necessity of such rehabilitation.

To date we have made full or partial payments on about 53,000 claims in the amount of almost 17,000,000 pesos.

In addition to funds authorized for compensation for private war losses, the act contains an authorization for 240,000,000 pesos for restoration and improvement of public property and essential public services. Of this amount 114,000,000 pesos will be allocated to the War Damage Commission.

The allocation for the War Damage Commission, in agreement with the Philippine Government, will be divided on a priority basis so as to provide for a 92-percent restoration of hospitals, nearly 60 percent of waterworks and irrigation systems, 36 percent of schools, 34 percent of national government buildings, and 18 percent of government corporations.

Thus far the Commission has made awards totaling almost 44,000,000 pesos on some 300 public projects. Here in the city of Cebu awards of nearly 110,000 pesos have been granted. Additional awards for Cebu Province total nearly 1,500,000 pesos. Work is getting under way on several vital projects, including the Provincial Capitol Building, the Southern Islands Hospital, the University of the Philippines, Cebu Quarantine Station, the Cebu School of Arts and Trades, the Cebu Maternity House, the City Intermediate School, the Zapatera Elementary School, and many other schools and other projects in the city and in the Province.

To administer the Commission and to process the public and private claims is an enormous task as you can well imagine. All of our work, including the processing and adjudicating of private and public claims as well as the settlement of appeals and the winding up of our affairs, must be completed by April 30, 1951, as provided by the Rehabilitation Act.

When the enormity of our work is comprehended, it becomes apparent that the size of our staff, the vast majority of which is operating in the Philippines, is small. There are approximately 850 employees, of whom more than five-sixths are Filipinos and the rest Americans. They have come from many fields of endeavor. There are lawyers, engineers, people from trade and industry and commerce. We have former teachers and others from varied callings. It is my privilege to state unequivocally that they have performed their duties competently, loyally, and in a manner that has not only reflected credit on themselves but has been of immeasurable service to the Philippines and to the United States in its efforts here.

To me the accomplishment of our Filipino and American members of the staff in working together has been but typical of the achievements of our two peoples on a much larger scale. These achievements are clearly indicative that nations can work and live together on a friendly basis as long as mutual understanding and interchange of knowledge which such understanding requires exist.

In conclusion let me state that the accomplishments of Philippine schools have been remarkable, but they are not enough. Improvement of Philippine schools must continue. The havoc of the war certainly makes this job more difficult. Money which could have been used to improve the universities and schools is now being used to rebuild bombed and fire-gutted buildings.

In am happy to include among my good friends in the Philippines your secretary of instruction, the Honorable Manuel Gallego, and Mrs. Pecson, chairman of the senate committee on education. I know from my conversations with them and from talking to other Filipino leaders that all are determined to see that the schools are rebuilt and properly supported.

As a member of the War Damage Commission, in cooperation with my colleagues, I am indeed very happy to be a party to such a worthy undertaking. We are all in agreement that the road to a good education in the Republic of the Philippines must be made an easy one to travel for all Filipinos.

To you who are being graduated, and to you who will some day graduate, I say that it is my fervent hope that no men or groups of men lurking behind the iron curtain of unreason and unenlightenment can ever set into action forces which may dim the light of learning. It is my hope that you will be able to go forward in your own fields of endeavor, spreading your education for the benefit of others in a world in which those who have gained the greater knowledge will forever seek a better peace.

This Can Happen to Any State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I bring to the attention of the Members the text of a pamphlet just published under authority of the State of California, setting forth the facts regarding the so-called tidelands legislation which should be before the Congress in the near future. I hope that the facts here published will serve to dispel some of the incorrect and inaccurate barrage now being loosed against this proposed legislation in some quarters:

WHAT THE TIDELANDS ISSUE IS ALL ABOUT

(By Fred N. Howser, attorney general of California)

WHAT HAPPENED IN CALIFORNIA

On the morning of June 23, 1947, over 9,000,000 Californians awoke to discover that a 3-mile wide State-owned submerged area extending 1,200 miles had been clipped from their coast line. After that date this vast area would be under new management—the Federal Government. Thereafter they would be trespassers within that area which had been recognized as belonging to California since its admission to the Union in 1850.

On and after that morning of June 23, 1947, the Federal Government, and not California, would have dominion over and paramount rights in that twelve-hundred-mile marginal belt and all of the natural resources contained in it. This is fantastic, but true. This virtual Federal annexation was not accomplished by congressional action. It was accomplished by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *U. S.* v. *California,* in June 1947.

IT CAN HAPPEN IN OTHER STATES

The unique concept of law stated in that decision is such a startling departure from all formerly expressed legal doctrines that the decision has caused grave concern throughout the country. What happened in California can happen to every State in the Union. The United States Department of Justice has filed notice that similar actions will be field against other States.

LEGAL RULING CAUSES CONSTERNATION

The Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Government has paramount rights in such submerged lands for the purposes of national defense and international relations. As an incident to the exercise of such power the Federal Government under the decision had the right to take all the natural resources existing in that submerged belt. This is the first declaration that in the delegation of its powers under the Constitution there was a cession of property. By so disposing of the former long-standing principle that title to such submerged lands was vested in the States, title to inland waterways, reclaimed lands, ports and harbors, and natural resources in all the other States is similarly and gravely challenged.

TITLES HAVE BELONGED TO THE STATES

Title to all lands under navigable waters and reclaimed lands has been vested in the States under established law since the Thirteen Original States proclaimed their independence from the British Crown in 1776. Under English common law, title to all such lands vested in the crown. On July 4, 1776, the crown's titles passed into the hands of the people, not of the United States, for at that time there was no Federal Union, but into the hands of the people of each of the Original Thirteen States. Later, with the adoption of the Constitution and the formation of the Federal Union, certain rights were conveyed by the States to the Federal Government, but not title to these submerged or reclaimed lands.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY YEARS OF HISTORY BACKS STATES' CLAIMS

Fifty-two decisions of the United States Supreme Court have upheld these titles. Many of them have ruled that new States admitted on an equal basis with the original States acquired identical rights to the submerged lands. For 170 years the United States Government, Congress, and various governmental branches have recognized that title, to the degree that when the Federal Government wished to construct installations on or over these lands, it first acquired title to the land from the State concerned. For 170 years the States have been granting title and other rights to these lands to municipalities, individuals, or corporations or other business, education, charitable, or other entities.

DISASTER TO STATES

Many of our large cities are partially built on filled tidelands which are held by the present occupancy under grants of the State or by virtue of State laws. An attack on State titles is necessarily an attack on the title of all grantees and lessees of the State. All tide and submerged lands, filled and unfilled, and all lands under inland navigable waters are held by the State by virtue of the same legal principle, namely, by sovereign rights of the State.

THE PRESENT LEGISLATION THE ONLY RELIEF FROM CHAOS

S. 1988 and H. R. 5992 are not an attempt on the part of the States to take something away from the Federal Government. They are merely to protect and clear the titles of property over which the States have always exercised full and complete control and ownership since the founding of the Union.

WHO OWNS WHAT? MORE CHAOS

The Supreme Court decision, while declaring title did not vest with the State, rejected providing ownership by the Federal Government. This is a legal hybrid. It poses the legal question, "Button, button, who's got the button," but gives no sound answer. Congress, and only Congress, can give the answer as to where title should be.

GRAVE THREAT TO PROPERTY RIGHTS

If the Federal Government can seize 1 square foot of tide or submerged lands in any State and maintain its seizure, it will be the official duty of the Federal officer everywhere to complete the conquest of like lands in all States. The Government's action has affected title to facilities in every port in the land; in railroad terminals and rights-of-way, municipal airports, power, and industrial developments, mineral rights and leases, stores, offices, and schools, and the homes of thousands of Americans in scores of communities. For example:

Half of the city of Boston, including nearly all of the Back Bay area, the South and North Stations, and railroad rights-of-way leading to them, and millions of dollars of other property are on such filled-in land today.

Chicago's richest area, the famous Gold Coast, includes such structures as the Drake Hotel, the downtown campus of Northwestern University, on filled-in lands with titles worth hundreds of millions of dollars, traced back to the State of Illinois.

PANDEMONIUM TO PROPERTY RIGHTS

New York's vast harbor, through which the commerce of the world moves, depends on docks and piers which rise out of the Hudson or East Rivers, or New York Bay, built on grants made by the State to the New York Port Authority or to firms or individuals.

Much of the financial district of San Francisco, with its towering skyscrapers, is built on filled-in land. Title to this land is now thrown in doubt.

Much of the great harbor development of Los Angeles and Long Beach rests on land filled in from the Pacific Ocean and title goes back to the State of California. The great shrimp industry of Louisiana and Florida, the oyster industry and other fisheries, depend upon rights to the ocean bottom granted by the States concerned. Mineral rights have been granted by the States to individuals and corporations on the basis of the States' title to lands beneath the ocean and rivers—such rights as oil leases in southern California, Texas, and Louisiana. It is within the facts to say that scarce a railroad bridge across a river, a tunnel under a river, a pier or dock at an American port does not rest upon land the title or lease for which came from a State.

DECISION CAUSES NATION-WIDE ALARM

The Federal Government makes claim that they have no intention of asserting Federal authority over inland waters and filled-in lands. An examination of the principle of law under which the tidelands are held will demonstrate the fallacy of such a claim. Each of the States owns its tide and submerged lands by virtue of the principle of State sovereignty. The United States cannot successfully assert title to tidelands in any one State without destroying this principle. Title to lands beneath inland navigable waters, including lakes and rivers, is held by the State under the same legal principle as the tidelands. Millions of dollars' worth of bonds have been issued to cover port developments on every coast. These bonds are held by banks, insurance firms, small investors, etc., and these investments stand now to become valueless because the municipalities or port authorities issuing them will no longer have valid title to the land on which their facilities stand, unless remedial legislation is passed.

The Supreme Court's ruling has inaugurated a chaos and confusion over these titles this country has never before seen. Investments of municipalities and States and thousands of individuals are seriously impaired. Titles to these properties have been thrown into disruption and almost inextricable legal entanglements.

OIL NOT ISSUE, ONLY A SMOKE SCREEN

Stirred up by propaganda, some people might have the offhand opinion that this is essentially a controversy over oil. California is joined by 43 States in seeking corrective legislation, quitclaiming to the States title to submerged and reclaimed land. Only three States produce oil from tidelands. Even in California the State's interest in tideland oil is secondary to its concern over its coast line and its ports and harbors. California has 1,200 miles of coast line, of which not more than 15 miles contain oil wells. California has six major harbors. Title to the land is now seriously questioned by the Supreme Court decision, the total value of which, not including private investments, exceeds several hundred million dollars. The rentals from these harbors is three times as

much as the royalties received by the State from tideland oil.

It must be kept in mind that the Supreme Court decision held that the Federal Government—not the State—had full dominion over the resources of the soil under the 3-mile belt of California, including oil. These resources, now signified as under Federal authority, include kelp, shrimp, fish, oysters, sponges, and so forth.

OIL CONSERVATION BUG-A-BOO

They who argue against the position of the States say that Federal ownership of these lands will result in oil conservation. Conservation surely can be accomplished in different legal ways than by confiscation of State property without compensation.

The propaganda involving oil is merely a smoke screen by which the advocates of the Government's position have sought to cloud the issue. The real issue is the attack on the principle of State sovereignty under which all States from the beginning have held all lands beneath navigable waters. No other reason could have induced able and responsible attorneys for the non-oil States and the great portion of the Nation's attorneys general of California's sister States to take the firm position that their property and that of other States is threatened and that the pending legislation is essential to the welfare of the people they represent.

THE POWER OF CONGRESS

In view of the implications of the California decision, it is strongly believed that Congress should pass the present legislation before it, which recognizes and establishes State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters. Congress has consistently followed a policy for over 100 years of not asserting ownership in the tide or submerged lands underlying either the marginal sea or the so-called inland waters. This policy has been confirmed by affirmative action on the part of Congress on a number of occasions. This policy of Congress has been recognized by the Supreme Court and other courts in innumerable decisions. Congress on two recent occasions has refused to change or alter that policy upon being requested by certain officers of the executive department to do so. In 1938 and 1939 Congress rejected proposed joint resolutions presented to it whereby the ownership of the coastal waters of California and other coastal States would have been asserted on behalf of the United States. In 1946 the Senate and House of the Seventy-ninth Congress both passed a joint resolution quitclaiming to the States all lands below high water mark underlying all navigable waters within State boundaries except only those the United States had acquired by purchase, condemnation, or donation. While the President vetoed this joint resolution on August 1, 1946, its passage by both branches of Congress evidenced the continued adherence to this policy by Congress.

FEDERAL RIGHTS RECOGNIZED

The proposed legislation will not impair or interfere with the exercise by the Federal Government of its constitutional powers in relation to these submerged lands and navigable waters, and to the control and regulation of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs.

California expresses grateful acknowledgment for the indefatigable assistance it has had in opposing Federal encroachment in the tidelands case. An attack on the sovereignty of California is in turn an attack on the sovereignty of any State. I therefore wish to express our indebtedness for the indispenable assistance received in presenting the California position, to the Conference of Governors; Port and Harbor Authorities throughout the country; the National Association of Attorneys General; civic and professional groups; public officials and private citizens everywhere who see in the Government's present action the gravest kind of a threat to harmonious Federal-State relations.

APRIL 5, 1948.

John L. Lewis and the Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by George E. Reedy:

John L. Lewis has finally hollered "uncle" after one of the most crippling strikes in American history. He has ordered his miners to return to work. In fact, he has practically pleaded with them to go back and start digging coal.

It is fortunate for the Nation that Mr. Lewis arrived at this decision. Sooner or later he would have had to make it, anyway. He could not hold out against his Government forever. But he could have wrought almost "irreparable" damage.

Had he continued to play the part of a stubborn mule, he could have brought this country close to a miniature civil war. It would have been conflict that would have profited no one, but which would have weakened this country drastically.

By deciding to back down now, Lewis has avoided the full consequences of his irresponsible actions. His union is intact, and the Government still retains its prestige. But losses have been suffered by everyone involved in the whole affair.

The heaviest individual losses have been sustained by the miners themselves. In the first place, they have lost an average of $300 per man in wages. This is a heavy blow in these days of high costs of living.

In the second place, the miners have suffered, collectively, as a union. Had they remained at work, their welfare fund would have increased by about $5,000,000. Now they have lost that money and can never get it back.

Furthermore, a heavy blow has been struck at the prestige of organized labor. The public, whether rightly or wrongly, believes that Lewis acted irresponsibly. The resentment against his activity will probably affect every union in America.

The operators, of course, have lost heavily on their capital investment. All of the coal that would have been mined—had the miners stayed on their job—could have been sold at premium prices. The profits would have been tremendous.

These effects are sufficiently appalling when considered alone. But, unfortunately, the damage was not confined to the miners and the operators. Had that been the case, the Government would have been content to let them slug it out to a decision.

It is difficult to think of an industry in America that was untouched by the coal strike. The most dramatic reactions, however, were in the steel and automobile plants. Both were forced to cut their production drastically.

This, in turn, reached out to other industries. Steel is the lifeblood of American manufacturing. Without it the large majority of our plants must close their gates. It is the basic material desperately needed by practically all our production lines.

It is a double calamity that the coal strike should have occurred at this time. It clashed headlong with two important national commitments. One is to supply the democracies of the world with the goods they need to get back on their feet. The other is to rearm our country against aggression.

Both of these objectives have suffered severe set-backs. To attain them we must have coal, we must have steel, and we must be able to produce. We cannot bolster up European economy or prepare adequate defenses for the United States just by appropriating money and making promises.

The damage can still be repaired. It will be repaired if the miners go back to work today, as they probably will. But the whole affair has raised a serious question as to how far one man can be permitted to cripple the Nation's economy.

New York City Invites Members of Congress for a Week-End Tour April 30, May 1 and 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with their immediate families, are invited to visit New York City the week end of April 30, May 1, and May 2.

Our hosts for the occasion will include Mr. Hugo E. Rogers, president of the Borough of Manhattan, and the Commerce and Industry Association of New York City. They have prepared a program of entertainment involving an expenditure of some $30,000.

I am inserting, for the benefit of the Members of both branches of Congress, a schedule of events for the congressional tour:

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS FOR JOINT CONGRESSIONAL TOUR OF NEW YORK CITY UNDER THE AUSPICES OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC., IN COOPERATION WITH PRESIDENT OF THE BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN HUGO E. ROGERS ON BEHALF OF MANHATTAN'S GOLDEN JUBILEE COMMITTEE

FRIDAY, APRIL 30

1 p. m.: Leave Washington.

5 p. m.: Arrive Pennsylvania Station; proceed to hotels.

6 p. m.: Leave for Rockefeller Center.

6:15 p. m.: Buffet supper at the Rainbow Room, Rockefeller Center.

7:30 p. m.: Assemble in Studio 8-H, Rockefeller Center. Welcome, businessman; greeting, Borough President Rogers.

8 p. m.: Guests of Cities Service radio program, Highways in Melody, Station WNBC.

8:45 p. m.: Leave Station WNBC by busses to visit the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to see the overseas switchboard in operation with all foreign countries.

9:15 p. m.: Busses return delegation to Hotel New Yorker.

SATURDAY, MAY 1

8 a. m.: Leave hotels for Forty-second Street and Hudson River to board *Sandy Hook*.

8:30 a. m.: Breakfast on board the *Sandy Hook* and trip around Manhattan, with music and guides to point out items of interest over the loud speaker. Through courtesy of the Port of New York Authority.

10:45 a. m.: Dock at Pier 9, Old Slip, East River, party will proceed to—

11 a. m.: New York Stock Exchange. Joint delegation will be received by members of the exchange. Welcome, Emil Schram, president.

12 noon: Leave for city hall.

12:15 p. m.: Reception at city hall with Sanitation Band and Police and Firemen's Glee Clubs. Welcome, Mayor William O'Dwyer, Borough President Hugo E. Rogers. (Broadcast time may be available.)

12:45 p. m.: Leave for Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

1 p. m.: Reception and luncheon at Waldorf-Astoria Hotel as guests of Station WCBS. Greetings, official of Station WCBS, businessman. Style show to be televised from the stage of the ballroom by Station WCBS with seats available at rear of ballroom to watch reception.

3 p. m.: Leave for bus tour, with guides, of New York City and points of scenic, historic, cultural, and educational interest.

5:15 p. m.: Busses return to Hotel New Yorker.

7 p. m.: Reception at Hotel Astor by the president of the Commerce and Industry Association and the president of the Borough of Manhattan.

7:30 p. m.: Official dinner at Hotel Astor Roof under auspices of Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., in cooperation with the president of the Borough of Manhattan. Presiding, an officer of Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc. Introduction, Robert Christenberry, president, Hotel Astor. Welcome, city official.

9 p. m.: Entertainment, to be arranged by president of Hotel Astor, Robert Christenberry, and Robert D. Howard, banquet manager.

SUNDAY, MAY 2

9 a. m.: Leave Hotel New Yorker by bus for tour of United States Military Academy at West Point.

11 a. m.: Attend chapel service at Military Academy.

12:30 p. m.: Buffet luncheon. Greeting, Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Superintendent of United States Military Academy.

1:30 p. m.: Tour of Academy and Stewart Field.

3 p. m.: Leave West Point by busses for New York City.

5:30 p. m.: Board train to Washington, D. C.

9 p. m.: Arrive in Washington, D. C.

Each member of the party will have a lapel identification.

Bus service will be arranged for the full tour.

Because of the limited capacity of the rooms for luncheon and dinner, the joint congressional party will not exceed 500, including the Members of Congress and the Senate, their wives and families.

All events are in business clothes. No black tie or evening gowns. Travel light and come prepared to see New York and West Point and really enjoy yourself.

Arrangements under direction of Thomas Jefferson Miley, executive vice president, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.

It is evident from the above schedule that every effort has been made to make our visit to New York a pleasant and memorable occasion. All the big names in the theatrical world will have a part in the program. Washington's own Arthur Godfrey will act as master of ceremonies.

Our hosts in New York must know immediately the number in the congressional party so that necessary hotel reservations may be made at the Hotel New Yorker.

If you and your family plan on taking this gala trip to New York, please call my office, extension 366, immediately, and make your reservations.

Defiance of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, Miss., for April 19, 1948:

IT HAS ALL THE MARKINGS OF ANOTHER COMMUNIST PLAN

We regret to read, but are not particularly worried about the following Associated Press report from New York:

"Bayard Rustin, race relations secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a pacifist organization, said last night he will organize Nation-wide groups to resist Jim Crow everywhere.

" 'I serve notice to the Government that to the extent of my resources, I shall assist in the organization of disciplined groups across the Nation to advise resistance and to provide spiritual, financial, and legal aid to the resisters.' "

We regret to read this, because such an organized effort to defy the law will inevitably increase racial friction, set back and handicap the work of enlightened leaders of both races in the South to continue gradually solve the problem, and create new animosity that will impose hardship upon and take economic opportunities from countless innocent Negroes. And the victims, the ones who will get into trouble if the program is carried out in Mississippi, will more likely be misled and credulous Negroes than the organizers who would probably remain in the background.

Any such disciplined groups defying the law, however, would be handled by disciplined police and other law-enforcement officers, and we don't doubt their ability to handle any situation that might arise.

A Government investigation of Rustin's and his organization's affiliations, however, seems in order. The plan has all the marks of Moscow's creation, and would serve the prime Communist objective of creating internal disturbances in the United States while preventing the Nation's rearmament.

Mayor George W. Stanton, of Fitchburg, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the remarks of Solomon Rosenbaum, master of ceremonies, at the municipal inauguration in the city of Fitchburg, Mass., on January 5, 1948, in the city hall, Fitchburg, Mass., upon the occasion of the inauguration of the Honorable George W. Stanton as mayor of that city:

Ladies and gentleman, we now reach the zenith of these inauguration ceremonies—the administration of the oath of office to the mayor-elect of the city of Fitchburg, the Honorable George W. Stanton.

The gentleman who will administer the oath is very well known to all of us. He is a former mayor of this city, having served during the years 1908–9, and for many years has been, and still is, a distinguished member of the bench and bar.

By the very strength of his own ability and perseverance, he has risen to the heights of his chosen profession, and has been recognized for his great legal erudition by having been appointed a member of our State judicial system and he is today the senior special justice of the Fitchburg district court.

He has, for virtually half a century, been prominently identified with the public, civic, professional, fraternal, social, and philanthropic life of our city.

This community is indeed the richer and the better for his achievements, his sound judgment, and his wise counsel.

As a slight token of the affection and esteem in which he is so widely held, and in testimony of our indebtedness to him for so very much, he has been requested to administer the solemn oath of office to our mayor-elect.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege to introduce the Honorable M. Fred O'Connell. Judge O'Connell.

(Administration of oath of office to Mayor-elect George W. Stanton by Judge O'Connell, followed by prolonged and enthusiastic applause.)

Jewish War Veterans of the United States Parade in Chicago as Palestine Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this was the second great parade following the one in New York in which, according to the latest revised count, 60,000 veterans of World Wars I and II participated, and in which 250,000 citizens looked on and cheered. Another similar parade has now been held in Chicago. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States have been in the forefront of the fight against the betrayal of Palestine, and deservedly so. They believe in international justice, in the honoring of international commitments, solemnly arrived at, in a strong United Nations as a force for world peace, and in the implementation of the United Nations through an adequate security force. They have reiterated their willingness and ability to support with their membership and facilities a UN security force to implement Palestine partition and stop the armed defiance of the United Nations by the Arab states surrounding Palestine. The following address delivered by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, on the occasion of the Chicago parade, eloquently states the position of this great organization of which I am proud to be a member:

This is my first official appearance as your national commander in my own home city of Chicago. I am proud—very proud—that I have the privilege of being the leader of this great and fine American patriotic organization which, for more than 5 decades, was an important instrument for true Americanism. When a group of Civil War veterans of the Jewish faith created our

great organization more than 50 years ago, we inherited a sacred trust to give our all to this great land of ours as a small token for the privilege of being free citizens of this greatest and freest nation on earth.

I am particularly pleased to see with us today His Excellency, the great Governor of our State, a fellow-veteran who, like all veterans, typifies what the American veteran organizations stand for—courageous leadership in public office; and because some of our leaders have failed us, we are assembled here today. I desire to express my personal appreciation to all of you who have participated in this parade—and particularly to the Governor, who, by his presence, shares with you and me the conviction that we are fighting for a just cause.

It was my privilege 2 weeks ago to lead a similar parade in New York which, in the face of the administration's depressing record, came as a clear breath of air from the people themselves. Under our auspices, 60,000 veterans of the recent wars marched in a great parade in New York City. Two hundred and fifty thousand crowded the reviewing stand in the park to see and hear and to applaud, as Congressman JAVITS so eloquently described it in his historic address last Monday on the floor of Congress. For almost 3 hours the marchers passed in review until they reached the old New York Madison Square Park, where distinguished leaders addressed them. Among them was Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, a Republican; Congressman HOLIFIELD, of California, a Democrat; and Deputy Mayor John J. Bennett, as representative of Mayor O'Dwyer, who, as you know, was ill, and that great, courageous leader, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver. Thirteen States were represented in that parade, and our comrades from the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Spanish-American War, AMVETS and AVC, Catholic War Veterans, and others participated as units to demonstrate their sympathy and their devotion to the cause of justice for Palestine. The New York Times reported that among the marchers were "war-minded veterans, heads lifted proudly, who earned applause as they passed." The police inspector in charge said it was the biggest crowd ever in the park, according to the New York Times. This was the people's answer—this was New York's answer; and today, Chicago is giving its answer.

The interest of the Jewish War Veterans in the establishment of an independent democratic Jewish state in Palestine is based on the primary interest of all American war veterans in the security and welfare of our country. Let no bigot or subversive agent get any comfort out of our New York or Chicago demonstrations. America's welfare and America's security will, at all times, remain our main objective, and if we for a moment would feel that our own security is involved, we would be the first to abandon all parades and demonstrations for anything else but America's security. The Communists, both foreign and domestic, have been availing themselves of the Palestine crisis to "pose as a friend and defender of oppressed minority peoples." Neither you nor I will be fooled by such tactics. We have marched today for something more than justice to the heroic Jewish people in Palestine. We have marched together as living evidence that the American people are determined to retain their national honor and integrity. We have marched in the solemn recognition that to tolerate the death of a single defender of the Jewish community of Palestine is to compromise with every principle for which American veterans—whatever their religious belief or national origin—have gladly and proudly defended from the time our Nation was born.

Let us be perfectly clear as to what has been surrendered in our country's retreat—however temporary that retreat may be—from its first forthright and honorable position with respect to the partition of Palestine. What has been conceded is that United Nations ballots can be nullified by the bullets of any state or group of states in the United Nations organization that finds itself outvoted. It was the failure to resist this kind of veto power that murdered the League of Nations. And it is one of the prime assassins in the blood bath that followed that now leads the Arab hordes which assail the Jewish community of Palestine and make a mockery of a United Nations decree.

International law itself is challenged as never before. On December 11, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted a declaration against genocide—the extermination of entire human groups through physical, biological, or cultural means. Today, April 19, 1948, the so-called Grand Mufti of Jerusalem—miraculously delivered from the prisoners' dock at Nuremberg after World War II—is committing the crime of genocide against the Jewish community of Palestine. Nowhere in the world's ministries has a voice been raised putting this cutthroat on notice that he may be held accountable under international law for his savage crimes against a people who fought among the ranks of the free nations of the world. Instead, he has heard only the rich, pear-shaped tones of appeasement. Let those who have poured mellow words of concession into the Mufti's ears ask themselves whether they are accessories to the crime.

For us in America the basic issue in Palestine today is crystal clear. The proof of what I say is on this platform in this audience. We have come here today with a single purpose and a single loyalty. We cherish our country's honor. We cherish its devotion to the cause of political and individual freedoms for all peoples and all nations. We ask no new or special privilege for the Jewish people of Palestine. We ask only that, in a time of international tension and unrest, our country stand fast by its traditional support for the just cause of a people who seek to secure themselves in a way of life akin to our own. For this principle, we Jewish War Veterans marched with our Catholic comrades of Irish descent in the days of Ireland's heroic struggle against oppression and subjugation by the British, and no one would dare to challenge the patriotism of the Irish-Americans on St. Patrick's Day. We applauded and marched with them in the past, and for the same principle we marched with our fellow-veterans of Bohemian parentage before there came into being the nation of Czechoslovakia, and no one will dare to challenge the loyalty of the members of the Bohemian National Alliance who still today are hoping and praying that the country of their ancestors will again become a free democracy. And no one will dare to challenge the patriotism of our gallant citizens of Polish descent who, under the auspices of the Polish National Alliance and the Polish War Veterans, marched for decades to arouse sympathy and justice for the homeland of their ancestors. And so down the line—Italian-Americans, Lithuanian-Americans, German-Americans, Greek-Americans—all Americans in this great melting pot of ours, a Nation of nations that is great and strong because we are all united in our love for our land. And as we marched with them in the past, ours was a single devotion then, and it is a single devotion today. Resistance to injustice is the duty of every American. Therefore, let no one challenge our patriotism and allegiance; the record of our forefathers, our fathers, and our own in all the wars of this Nation is the best answer. It is the special obligation of Americans who have served our country in times of emergency. That is why the eloquent voice of the national commander of the American Legion, our great and good friend, James F. O'Neill, has been raised in behalf of prompt and effective implementation of the United Nations partition decision. For this is an issue that asks of the American veteran no loyalty other than his devotion to American principles of justice and fair consideration of the democratic aspirations of a peace-loving people. American veterans—whatever their religious belief—can have only one primary allegiance. That is the allegiance to our country's welfare and security. If we look clearly and honestly at what is happening in Palestine today we must be forced to only one conclusion. It is not the Jewish people of Palestine who have declared war on a decision of the United Nations. It is not the Jewish people of Palestine who are importing arms and ammunition for aggressive war on their neighbors. It is not the Jewish people of Palestine who are being aided by mercenaries of other countries in the reversal by force of a United Nations decree.

When we talk of truce or of trusteeship, or of any other device to restore peace to Palestine, let us remember that it is not the Jewish people of that country who have refused to comply with the decree of the United Nations. The violence and bloodshed in Palestine—the avowed intention to undermine and destroy the authority of the United Nations—is the crime of only one element of Palestine's population. It is the crime of the Arabs, and the instigator of that crime is the Grand Mufti. As American veterans, whose first concern is for the safety and stability of our own country, we must be perfectly clear on this issue. The Mufti and his cohorts have been our enemies before. Their brigades fought against us and our allies in World War II. They bore arms against us in the days when the armies of Hitler and Mussolini had the advantage in preparation and manpower. Today they seek to blackmail us with threats of canceling oil concessions—concessions which are far more necessary to the Arabs than they are to the American people.

Can we suppose that these ex-partners of nazism and fascism would spring eagerly to the support of the United States in the unthinkable event that this country ever became involved in another war? On this score the record of the Jewish people of Palestine is clear and unassailable. Twice in this century they have given of their youth and labor to the armies of the free governments. With their individual labor and initiative, they have brought industry and agriculture, education, and the physical and social sciences to the Holy Land that had been permitted to wither and decay under Arab feudalism. Let us not be deceived by the cunning propaganda of the Arabs and their British collaborators. There is no appetite among the Jews of Palestine for totalitarian nostrums. They have worked too hard for individual and political freedoms to substitute a fresh dictatorship for an age-old injustice. It is to us in America that they look for guidance and support in their struggle for independence, just as other subjugated peoples have looked to us since we cast off our own shackles in 1776. If we fail them now, we will wreck the hopes of millions of others of every race and creed who now yearn for deliverance from political captivity. Worse still, we will have failed the cause of our own security. For to risk the sacrifice of our honor and integrity is to risk the loss of valiant and proven allies.

Senator BREWSTER recently said that "* * * from the standpoint of our national security, the oil reserves of the Middle East are not worth a tinker's dam. This is the testimony of every competent and responsible military authority, in the event of any trouble," the Senator stated, "the American and British oil developments in the Middle East will simply serve the Soviet because logistics plus American-built transportation insure possession by the Red Army of the oil wells of the Middle East. Sacrificing our honor in Palestine for the utterly unattainable oil of Arabia is not only dishonorable—it is stupid." We hope and pray there never will be another war. We also know that the pious Jew of Palestine who always was the ally of democracy will always remain the ally of any force that fights for

democracy and liberty. And while the Grand Mufti and his hordes fought against us, the Jewish Legion of Palestine fought heroically to make the victories of the Allies possible in the Middle East. We are therefore grateful that distinguished members of both parties in the United States Senate have taken the same position as Senator BREWSTER and Senator TAFT, who only last week in a telegram to me said, "I maintain that a United Nations force to support partition is as practical as a United Nations to prevent partition." The Jewish War Veterans recommended last year the implementation of the United Nations decision by an international volunteer police force. We felt then, and we feel now, that it is not necessary to send a single American soldier to Palestine. An international police force will be sufficient to back partition until the Jewish militia is fully mobilized. Meanwhile, the lifting of the outrageous embargo has been demanded and, in the words of Winston Churchill, "the Jews of Palestine ask only for the tools," and when they ask for tools, that is all they ask—not subsequent lend-lease, relief, or American troops. Just give them the tools and the Sons of Macabi will know how to fight an aggressor, the same aggressor they fought side by side with us in World War I and World War II.

There is still time to stay a tragic reenactment of Munich. There is still time to inscribe into the pages of our history a final and conclusive rejection of appeasement and surrender to illegality and aggression. We must redouble our effort to uphold democratic processes and decisions so that we may see the achievement of a Palestine settlement based on justice and honor. We must end the embargo that has turned out to be the most effective weapon in the Mufti's arsenal.

This is the mission of all Americans. Upon its accomplishment depends our national integrity. Upon it rests one of the pillars of our national security. Upon it is pinned our hope that freedom-loving nations of the world will continue to look to us for leadership and support in the critical days ahead.

I desire to thank you again, and especially your State commander, Colonel Hershenson, for this splendid and orderly demonstration of today. Let us, as veterans, return to our homes instilled with the conviction that we have exercised our rights as free citizens of this great Nation of ours; that we are ready at any time to again if need be, defend our way of life to the last man, and that, at all times, we will first, last, and always have only one interest, one philosophy, and one conviction—what is good and what is best for America. In that spirit we have marched today, and we will march again until we feel that justice has been done. We do not want to, nor can we, sit by unconcerned and apologize for the action of our misguided leaders who, by the stroke of a pen and a little caucus somewhere in Washington or New York, shattered the ancient dream of those last remnants and victims of Hitler—the last of 6,000,000 who were murdered and who were looking to America to make good its solemn pledge and promise to take them finally to their homeland, where they can become useful and decent citizens in a new democratic state amongst the great nations of the world.

Air-Line Subsidy Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD a column by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post on Saturday, April 17. This article is entitled "Air-Line Subsidy Lobby," and is as follows:

AIR-LINE SUBSIDY LOBBY
(By Marquis Childs)

New nominations keep coming in for the Oscar for the year's most high-powered lobbying. With reinforcements swelling the ranks of the pressure boys from day to day in this era of bigger and better lobbies, the judges have an almost impossible task.

Claim to the honor is being pressed in behalf of the Big Five air lines that carry most of the country's mail and passenger traffic. And it's an impressive claim.

The Civil Aeronautics Board just awarded the Big Five—American, Eastern, TWA, United, and Northwest—an increase in mail pay which will cost the taxpayer at least an additional $5,000,000 over and above the twenty-one million they now get. The increase is proposed although Eastern Airlines will show a rate of profit computed by CAB at 36 percent after taxes, and the other four companies will average a 10-percent return.

There is a report that Senator HOMER FERGUSON and Senator STYLES BRIDGES are getting interested in an investigation into the whole mail-subsidy system. Such an investigation occurred not long after the Democrats came into power in 1933. It produced some sizzling facts about the power of the lobbies working for ocean and air mail subsidies and the tactics they employed.

Figuring out the actual cost of carrying the air mail, in relation to the subsidy payments, is something the CAB has never got around to doing. The question of cost, particularly when the air lines talk about it, is surrounded by such clouds of statistics, qualifications, and reservations that the ordinary person is left in a state of confusion.

But here is a significant contrast. With the new pay increase included, the CAB finds that the Big Five must get 58 cents a ton-mile as a "service rate" for carrying the mail. At the same time the Big Five have applied for, and CAB has approved, rates for carrying cargo as low as 12½ cents a ton-mile.

Since the air mail is business which does not have to be solicited, and since the ground handling is performed by the Government, it is extraordinary that CAB should find that carrying the mail costs almost five times as much as carrying cargo.

Put another fact alongside this. Ambitious young veterans have formed a number of air freight lines. For 2 years these small companies have waited for CAB to act on their applications to operate chartered routes. Thus far not a single application has been granted. Some of the little companies have had to fold up, a fact which one of the Big Five executives noted with smug self-satisfaction not long ago.

This is true even though cargo traffic and the development of cargo planes have lagged far behind both economic and military necessity. Every politician professes to be for little business and competition. Yet these veterans' air lines have not been given a chance to show what they could do toward developing the great potential of air cargo traffic.

One of the few experts to interest himself in this phase is Langdon P. Marvin, Jr. During his wartime service with the Navy, Marvin was chairman of the Air Cargo Priorities Committee, learning by actual experience in every corner of the globe how vital cargoes could be carried by air. To several congressional committees he has pointed out how urgent is the need for cargo development.

It is even more apparent on the military side. Military sources have estimated that 4,000 cargo planes would be essential at the outset of a war in which the new type German submarines would be used in large numbers. The certified air lines at present have fewer than 70 such planes.

It is not so much that the air lines are operating at a high ratio of cost to the Government. What is serious is that, so long as the cushion of the subsidy is there, the Nation is not likely to get the kind of expansion which is vital to national security both at home and abroad.

A thoroughgoing Senate investigation would look into the foreign field, too. Postoffice records show that Pan American Airways got $16,656,624 in mail pay last year and is petitioning CAB for $11,000,000 more.

In Joseph J. O'Connell, Jr., the CAB has a new chairman. A new member is still to be appointed. There is a chance to break away from the course of least resistance, which is increasingly to give everything to a few dominant companies. It will not be easy to change the pattern. But there is still time if there is also the will to make the change.

The Confused World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I lately had the opportunity of reading a speech made at the annual dinner of the Pilgrims by one of our elder statesmen. He has filled posts of importance in the Government in times past. I refer to Hon. James W. Gerard, our Ambassador to Germany when the revered Woodrow Wilson was President. I think so well of the speech that I am asking for the privilege of having it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have noted that Mr. Gerard, who has been a sage student of history and a careful analyst of domestic and foreign affairs, has not been called to testify or give his advice before the committees studying the momentous problems confronting us today, but I earnestly recommend to the Members of the House the reading of this speech.

The address follows:

Mr. Dunn, our distinguished guests, among whom I am especially proud to see Maj. Henry Hooker, who is perhaps the greatest friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt and who has been, therefore, appointed, as Mr. Dunn has told you, to represent the President at the dedication of the Roosevelt statue in London; President Truman certainly could not have made a better or more appropriate choice; I am sorry that Mr. Dunn brought up the fact of the Order of the Bath. I understand that after receiving it I was known in Tammany Hall as "Saturday Night Jim." [Laughter.]

It is with humility that I speak today, standing as I do in the place of that great statesman who so often stirred our society with his wonderful annual addresses. He was a truly great man.

When he first came to Columbia, he was an instructor in philosophy and I have often heard him dispute with the sole pupil in that class as to who was the most bored, teacher or pupil. He was a practical philosopher and he brought the little college at Forty-ninth Street and Madison Avenue, with classes of only 40 or 50, up to that great university, that colossus on the Hudson, which is the Columbia of today.

It was not alone as an educator and an executive that he displayed his talents. He certainly took a great hand in all civil and

political life in this country. He was honored and respected abroad. He never held political office but if he had been President of these United States, with his tact, his powerful personality, and the respect that he had won from all nations, we might have been spared all the troubles of the last 7 or 8 years. [Applause.]

He was ably seconded by his distinguished wife, and to her we extend our sympathy.

We miss his guidance in this century of fury, in these whirlwinds of misunderstanding that make a mockery of peace.

There is no issue before us which surpasses that of the question as to whether the world shall be dominated by Russia.

Genghis Khan was not the name, it was the title, of that remarkable Mongol whose armies in the Middle Ages invaded Europe and even defeated a great coalition on the soil of Germany. His name was Temujin which, in Mongolian, meant "steel." It is a curious coincidence in history that the name of the man who rules Russia today, Stalin, in Russian means "steel."

If we in the liberty-loving countries of the world do not unite, we shall become the slaves of Russia, and it is curious how few of the great statesmen of the world understand Russia today.

All through the ages, whether under the princes of Moscow, the Czars, or the Bolsheviki, Russia has always been seeking new lands, new peoples, new conquests. For instance, the great Crimea did not become a part of Russia until 1783. In the last century Russia invaded and took Merv, Bokhara, and Samarkand, and, still farther to the east, Manchuria, held for a while with Port Arthur until the Japanese war.

Always Russia has had its eye fixed on Constantinople. The last Greek-Roman Emperor of Byzantium perished when the Ottomans took Constantinople in 1453. One of his heirs became a Mohammedan and the other attempted to sell his rights to the Empire of the East, first to Charles VII of France and then to Ferdinand of Spain.

That, of course, absolutely disgusted the true believers of the Eastern Church in Russia, and his sister, the Princess Sophia, who remained a true believer, was married by Ivan the Great—not to be confused with Ivan the Terrible—and it was through that marriage that the Russians founded their claim to Constantinople.

At that time Ivan the Great assumed the title of Autocrat of all the Russias, and the double-headed eagle of Byzantium was adopted as the Russian emblem.

We must back up the Turks when they make a stand to control the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles as well as their own country.

Then, too, Russia has always been Communist, even under the Czars. When the Czar liberator, Alexander II, liberated the serfs about 1863, there were created the village mirs, or village lands allotted to serfs. A certain amount of land in common was distributed from time to time by the village elders, who even had the right to send people to Siberia. So when the unions of Russia were made into a union of unions, or Soviet, it was possible for those who now rule Russia to turn it into communism overnight.

The failure of the nations of western Europe to unite is the cause of many of our woes today. In England in the thirties and in the twenties you often heard people say, "Well, after all, the French are our hereditary enemies."

Decisions made in times of peace by nations are as decisive as the great battles of the past, and when France and England failed to agree, failed to stop the march of Hitler into the Rhineland, then were heard the first fatal trumpets of this world war. And when we at the close of hostilities did not force peace in Europe, while our armies were on the soil of Europe, while we possessed the greatest air fleet and the greatest Navy in the world, then we laid the foundations of the problems that harass us today. [Applause.]

It was thought to be a wonderful thing to create the United Nations at San Francisco. Orators spoke and flags waved at the Golden Gate, but in that time Russia clinched her hold on those nations which have now become her satellites and which have turned to communism.

The nations of Europe have joined but little in the attempt to resist Russia.

So it is that great opportunities passed. Friar Bacon, who was the magical alchemist of the Middle Ages, was popularly supposed to have created a bronze head which could speak. Suddenly one day that head said, "Time will be," and then, "Time is." In surprise, nobody questioned the head, and then the head said, "Time was," and relapsed into eternal silence. It has been "Time was" with many opportunities but much can be retrieved.

So it is with the utmost satisfaction, with relief, that we see the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, Bevin, organizing a League of Western Nations. If he wants to have the favor of that creation of ours in western Germany called Bizonia, the harsh treatment now being received by the German people must be mitigated.

To give you an example, there are now millions of Germans held as prisoners of war in violation of all the rules of war and the Geneva Convention.

But if Bevin can organize France and Italy and Holland and Belgium, and win the favor of Bizonia, and add China and the Western Hemisphere to the block, a block will have been created that will overawe any nation seeking to disturb the peace of the world. That league we must back up with all our military and all our economic power.

It is a curious fact that the first suggestion of this European league was made in our time by that greatest of all statesmen, Winston Churchill, speaking in this country. [Applause.] And it was first outlined in history by Henry of Navarre, King of France.

But if we are to be able to aid Europe, we have got to maintain our own economy. We have followed England in many things: Our laws are based on English law, so is our liberty of the individual, and that great shield of rights, the Bill of Rights, is copied from the rights extracted from William and Mary after James II had been driven from England. But there are certain things which we will not take from England and one is nationalization. [Applause.] They have already nationalized their financial world, the utilities, and now the railroads.

Nationalization can have no place in our economic vocabulary. [Applause.]

The people of England must realize that we, without taking account of our own resources, are trying our best to feed and help the world. We are cultivating the prairie lands of the West to get a great crop of wheat; by that we are risking a return to the horrors of the Dust Bowl. Many of our population, such as the sharecroppers of the South, are in worse case today than any of the inhabitants of England.

You know that the Roman Empire did not fall because of the incursions of the barbarians. It fell because of high taxes. Salvian, who lived about 450 in what is now Cologne, wrote that many preferred to endure the hardships of life with the barbarians to the exactions of the imperial tax gatherers. We are suffering from terrifically high taxes and from the disease of bureaucracy. And Claudian, at about the same time, wrote that the officials of the empire almost exceeded in numbers the rest of the population. [Laughter.]

Our great harvests, our unusual harvests, may fail, and we may not be able to aid England and the world forever.

When I was in London 11 years ago as the representative of President Roosevelt at the coronation, I noticed then a curious, numb indifference, and speaking at a dinner given to me by the Pilgrim Society there, I quoted those lines of Shakespeare:

"This jewel set within a silver sea
That serves it in the office of a wall,
Or as a moat defensive to a house
Against the envy of less happy lands,
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England."

I said, "That was all very well in Shakespeare's time but tonight 5,000 planes could rise from the Continent in the twinkling of an eye and destroy your fairest cities," and I asked them, "What are you doing about it?"

The answer came later when Coventry and other cities were almost turned to dust.

I notice today in this country the same curious, numb indifference. You gentlemen in this room are perhaps the most powerful body of men who can be gathered together in this country; shall we not, all of us, join in forcing the adoption of universal military service? [Applause.]

After the World War, we had nothing but kindly feelings to Russia. We were willing and able to aid that country ruined by war. We met with nothing but opposition and abuse, and yet, by a change of policy, Russia could bring peace to the world.

It is hard to understand why our Communists, or anyone, anywhere, should look to Russia where there is no liberty of the individual, where men are ordered to go and work where they are told at what they are told. Why, a trade-unionist would revolt against the system of piecework involved there. But, if the Russians like that sort of thing, that is their business and it is not for us to interfere or even to criticize. But it is hard to be friendly with a country where we cannot travel freely, where there is no individual liberty, no freedom of the press, and where the election, which is supposed to be the hallmark of democracy, is simply an endorsement of the ruling party.

There have been things which we have done which have aroused the resentment of Russia and perhaps make it harder to bring about that understanding between ourselves and Russia, that comprehension of us by Russia and Russia by us which is the sole hope of peace today.

For instance, at the close of World War I we invaded Russia. I happen to know that President Wilson was at first against that and suffered himself to be overpersuaded by the representatives of Great Britain. We sent a force to Archangel in north Russia which came in conflict with the Soviets. Men were killed. We sent another force to the eastern shore of Siberia. We collaborated, first, with the Japanese, until our soldiers were disguested by the conduct of the Japanese in beheading a number of Russian prisoners. That invasion, that attack, that interference with the life of another country the Russians find it hard to forget, just as we find it hard to forget their constant opposition and abuse, their killings and purges that have gone on since the Soviet came into the possession of the country.

I hope that the Russians do not take our kindly patience as fear. This Nation which, before the use of the atomic bomb, had defeated the Japanese, this Nation which accomplished the greatest feat in history, the landing of General Eisenhower on the shores of northern France, and then our driving the Germans across the Continent to final defeat—this Nation does not fear to stand, even alone, against any power on earth. [Continuous applause.]

Young Republicans and Republican Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution adopted by the Columbia University committee of the New York Young Republican Club from my district calls attention to the needs of young people, the hope of our political future. Under the leadership of Co-chairman Boris S. Berkovitch and Dee M. Coligar, the Columbia University committee is doing a highly constructive job:

Whereas the attention of millions of young voters is fixed this year upon the political contest that is before us; and

Whereas the political future of our country is dependent upon the convictions and attitudes of these young men and women; and

Whereas the most unwholesome elements upon the political scene—the left-wing groups in particular—have made it their policy to send their leaders and "front men" to address audiences at colleges, and wherever else young people assemble in large numbers; and

Whereas as a result of these and other methods the young voters of America are subjected to an unremitting propaganda campaign emanating from the sources above mentioned; and

Whereas the inspiration and enthusiasm of young people for American ideals must come not only from ideas but from men: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Columbia University committee of the New York Young Republican Club recommends that Republican leaders recognize and act upon the necessity for frequent and sustained face-to-face contact with young people, particularly in the form of public appearances at educational institutions and other meeting places of young voters and future voters; and, further, that such activity be made a specific part of the coming election campaign.

ITO Charter Hailed as Hope for Troubled World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the recent United Nations Conference on trade and employment at Habana, Cuba, which resulted in the completion of a final draft of a Charter for an International Trade Organization. I was deeply impressed by the friendly spirit of cooperation among the representatives of the 60 nations participating in this conference and by their realization that postwar economic recovery can amount to little in the long run without an organized plan for the world-wide elimination of trade barriers among the nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following statements regarding the accomplishments of the Habana Conference which appeared in the Department of State Bulletin of April 4, 1948:

THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES—COMPLETION OF ITO CHARTER HAILED AS HOPE FOR TROUBLED WORLD

STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Department of State announces the signing of the final act of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment at Habana, marking the completion of a charter for an international trade organization. The representatives of about 60 nations participated in the preparation of the final draft of the charter.

The charter is a momentous achievement and one from which the whole world will benefit. It is the product of more than 2 years of constant and conscientious labor by experts and representatives of the many nations who worked long and weary hours to reach agreement on a code of international economic activity which would be acceptable to all. First, the United States issued in December 1945 its proposals for the expansion of world trade and employment,[1] which suggested the formation of an international trade organization. This was expanded by the United States into a suggested charter in September 1946.[2] The following month a preparatory committee of 18 nations established by the United Nations modified this draft at London; in February 1947 further changes were made at a meeting at Lake Success; and in August 1947 a fourth draft was drawn up at Geneva. Finally, at Habana from November 21, 1947, to March 24, 1948, the present charter was prepared. Through this series of conferences the proposed charter received the fullest possible consideration and the utmost care in its formulation.

The charter will now be submitted to the various countries for acceptance according to the constitutional procedures established by each country. In the United States it will be submitted to the Congress for approval.

The completion of the charter is a clear and unmistakable demonstration of the ability of a major part of the world to work together for the common good. It goes far beyond study and recommendation. It contains numerous and detailed commitments which are mutually beneficial to the members. It is broader in scope and greater in detail than most, if not all, previous agreements between nations on economic relations.

Many of the changes and modifications made in subsequent drafts of the charter were suggested by interested groups in this country. The charter includes provisions recommended by the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, by business, labor, farm, and other organizations. As a result the charter is a live and meaningful document concerned with practical rules for encouraging the flow of international trade.

The main objective of the charter is the raising of living standards throughout the world. It proposes to do this by promoting the expansion of international trade on a basis of multilateralism and general nondiscrimination, by fostering the growth of production and employment, and by encouraging the economic development of backward areas. Its substantive chapters set forth a series of international commitments with respect to national policies regarding tariffs, customs administration, hidden restrictions on trade, import and export quotas, exchange controls, preferences and other forms of discrimination, state trading, subsidies, restrictive business practices in international trade, intergovernmental commodity agreements, the international aspects of domestic employment policies, economic development, and international investments. Other chapters outline the structure, functions, and procedures of the International Trade Organization.

The chapter on employment and economic activity emphasizes the fact that employment, production, and demand for goods and services are not only of domestic concern but are necessary for the well-being of all countries. Members agree to take action designed to achieve and maintain full and productive employment through measures appropriate to their political, economic, and social institutions.

The chapter dealing with economic development and reconstruction was, as it had been in the previous conferences on the charter, one of the most hotly debated sections at the Habana conference. Under the provisions of this chapter, members agree to cooperate with other countries through the medium of international agencies for the purpose of promoting general economic development as well as the reconstruction of those countries whose economies have been devastated by the war. The chapter specifies the principles which shall apply to the promotion of economic development and reconstruction and the treatment of international investment. It indicates the conditions and specifies the procedures under which particular measures, otherwise inconsistent with the commercial-policy provisions of the charter and with trade agreements made pursuant thereto, may be used to promote economic development and reconstruction. Similarly, the chapter delineates the particular conditions and procedures under which preferential agreements for economic development and reconstruction may be employed.

Almost a third of the charter is devoted to provisions on commercial policy. Under the provisions of the chapter dealing with this subject, members agree to extend to each other general most-favored-nation treatment and to undertake negotiations directed toward the reduction of tariffs and the elimination of preferences on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis. In general, the charter also prohibits the imposition of discriminatory internal taxes and regulations on foreign products. In view of the peculiar features of moving pictures as a commodity in international trade, special provisions were included to deal with cinematographic films.

Since quantitative restrictions on imports and exports can have an even more limiting effect than tariffs, taxes, or other similar charges, it was agreed that basically such quantitative restrictions would not be allowed. It was recognized, however, that under certain conditions and with regard to certain commodities it might be advisable to allow exceptions. The permitted exceptions are carefully enumerated and circumscribed, with safeguards to prevent their possible abuse. These exceptions include the use of import quotas on agricultural and fisheries products if they are necessary in connection with governmental programs restricting domestic marketing or production. Import quotas are also permitted for the purpose of safeguarding a member's balance of payments.

Safeguards are also included to insure that the interests of other members are not unreasonably prejudiced by the indiscriminate use of subsidies. A modification of considerable interest to the United States was made in the provisions dealing with export subsidies. Such subsidies may now be used without the prior approval of the organization, as had been previously required under the Geneva draft over the objection of the United States. They, however, must not be employed by a member to acquire more than

[1] Department of State publication 2411.
[2] Department of State publication 2598.

its equitable share of world trade in the particular commodity.

Since state trading has become of growing importance in recent years, the charter has included a section dealing with this aspect of commerce. This section provides that countries carrying on trade through state enterprises should conduct their commerce in accordance with the general principles of nondiscriminatory treatment which are applicable under the charter to private trade. In particular, state-trading enterprises are required to make their purchases and sales solely in accordance with commercial considerations and to give the enterprises of other member countries adequate opportunity to compete for such purchases or sales.

The charter also contains general commercial provisions dealing with freedom of transit, antidumping and countervailing duties, customs valuation, documents, and other formalities in connection with importation and exportation, marks of origin, and the publication and administration of trade regulations. These provisions are designed to reduce or eliminate the many burdensome restrictions imposed on trade through administrative devices, including the so-called invisible tariffs, which often prove to be more of an impediment to trade than the usual form of tariffs.

A final section of the chapter on commercial policy contains a number of special provisions. Of particular importance are the provisions which permit a member to withdraw tariff concessions in the event that they should lead to such relatively increased imports as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers. This is the so-called escape clause which the United States has included in previous trade agreements, notably the general agreement on tariffs and trade recently concluded at Geneva, to insure that domestic interests are adequately safeguarded. Also of interest in this section are provisions permitting the formation of customs unions and similar arrangements. Finally, the section lists a number of general exceptions to the obligations of the charter so as to permit measures for the protection of public morals, health, safety, and the like and to meet certain temporary exigencies arising as a result of the war, such as measures for the acquisition or distribution of commodities in short supply.

Closely related to the commercial-policy provisions of the charter is the chapter on restrictive business practices. This chapter requires that members shall take appropriate measures to prevent business practices, whether on the part of private or public enterprises, which restrain competition and foster monopolistic control whenever such practices have harmful effects on the expansion of production or trade. The charter sets up various consultative and investigative procedures to implement this obligation for the prevention of restrictive business practices.

The charter recognizes that primary products, such as agricultural commodities and minerals, are sometimes subject to special difficulties which necessitate special treatment of the international trade in such commodities through intergovernmental agreements. The charter therefore defines the general principles which are to govern intergovernmental commodity agreements, the circumstances under which they are to be used, and the procedures for developing and administering them. These provisions seek to safeguard the interests both of producer and consumer countries and to afford an effective solution to the particular commodity problem involved.

The remaining articles of the charter deal with the structure and functions of the International Trade Organization, procedures for the settlement of differences, and a number of general matters, including relations with nonmembers, general exceptions for national security reasons, methods of amending the Charter, procedure for withdrawal of a member from the Organization and for termination of the Charter, and requirements to be met for entry of the charter into force. The principal organs of the Organization will consist of a conference, an executive board, and a secretariart, including a director-general and his staff. Differences may be settled by consultation or arbitration between the members, or by reference to the executive board or conference, or to the International Court of Justice under certain circumstances. The Charter prohibits a member from entering into a preferential arrangement with a nonmember which prevents the latter from according to other members any benefit of such an arrangement. In general, members are prohibited from according to nonmembers treatment which, being more favorable than that accorded to other members, would injure the economic interests of the latter. Members are free under the Charter to discriminate against nonmembers if they so wish.

The Charter is to enter into force when a majority of the countries which signed the final act of the Habana conference have approved the document. However, if a majority fail to approve at the end of 1 year after the signature of the final act, then the Charter may come into force whenever 20 countries approve the Charter. If the charter has failed to come into force by September 30, 1949, those countries which have approved the Charter may consult among themselves as to whether and on what terms to bring the Charter into force.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am deeply gratified that representatives of more than 50 nations are signing today in Habana the charter for the International Trade Organization. This charter will now be sent to the government of each nation for ratification.

The charter for the International Trade Organization is a code of fair dealing in international trade. Member nations agree to work out mutually beneficial employment policies and ways of promoting economic development. The charter provides for limitations upon cartels and defines the proper scope of intergovernmental commodity agreements. It establishes standards for the conduct of international trade. The charter thus deals comprehensively with economic problems which heretofore have been dealt with piecemeal, if at all, in international agreements.

The charter has immediate significance to the efforts of the nations now working to repair the devastation and dislocation caused by World War II. Acceptance of the charter, in the spirit in which it has been framed, will stimulate the expansion of international trade upon which world prosperity depends. By supporting the growth of a proserous international trade, this code of fair dealing will contribute greatly to our efforts for a just and lasting peace.

The development of this charter is an example of the finest type of international cooperation. The action in Habana today marks the conclusion of one of the most difficult and important tasks ever undertaken at international conferences.

This achievement demonstrates that many countries can work together through the United Nations to reach sound agreement on complex international issues.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE C. MARSHALL, SECRETARY OF STATE

It is gratifying that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment has succeeded in producing a charter for an International Trade Organization.

Completion of the charter follows two years and more of intensive effort, including four meetings held under the auspices of the United Nations, to formulate a generally acceptable code of fair practice in matters affecting international commerce. Representatives of more than 50 nations have now produced a document which, when approved by the governments concerned, will bring into being an organization dedicated to these purposes.

In the development of the charter, widely divergent interests and points of view had to be reconciled. The present economic difficulties and special situations of many of the countries represented at Habana added to the difficulty of this task. The fact that agreement was finally made possible in these circumstances demonstrates that the most difficult common problems are susceptible of cooperative solution where there exists a common determination to succeed.

The course and outcome of the Habana conference also demonstrate the great immediate importance attached to both the ends and the means set forth in detail in the charter. Participating governments sent some of their leading men to the meetings and were intensely concerned, to the end of the negotiations, with the exact final terms of agreement. Chaotic economic conditions at present brought home the vital need for a statement of long-range objectives and for agreement upon the fair-trade policies to be used in seeking these objectives. The charter for the ITO is an answer to both needs.

The charter represents agreement on basic economic policies never before treated in a single general international agreement. It recognizes the degree to which national action over a wide area affects the economic well-being of other nations. Employment, economic development, international trade policy, intergovernmental commodity agreements, and cartel activity are dealt with, in each case with a view to assuring that national and international action in these fields will be directed toward a general raising of living standards throughout the world. The charter not only spells out in considerable detail principles to govern world trade but establishes procedures for making them effective. It provides for the establishment of the International Trade Organization to be the agency responsible for the administration of the provisions of the charter. The organization will furnish a forum for discussion and consultation regarding solution of international problems of trade and employment.

The acceptance of the charter will affirm the common economic goals of world recovery point the way toward those goals, and thus contribute to progressive expansion of world production and consumption through a growing and mutually profitable trade among all members on a fair basis.

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,[3] CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES DELEGATION

This is a day for history. There have been other conferences on international economic affairs. But none of them has undertaken a task so difficult as the one that is completed here today. None of them has come to an agreement concerning so many vital economic interests of so many States. None of them has produced a document so comprehensive as the Habana charter for world trade. Few, if any of them, have attained so notable a measure of success.

This is a momentous day for the United Nations. It marks the culmination of an enterprise that had its beginnings in the declarations of policy that were made in the Atlantic Charter in 1941 and in article VII of the mutual aid agreements in 1942. It marks the completion of 3 years of care-

[3] Made on March 23, 1948, at final plenary session of UN Conference on Trade and Employment and released to the press on the same date.

ful planning and almost 2 years of continuous negotiations. It marks the embodiment in a charter produced by more than 50 nations, of the principles contained in the proposals that were published by the United States in 1945.[4] It marks the end of 4 months of hard work here in Habana. And, as we look upon the result of these labors, we find that the time and the effort of all the many countries who have contributed to the Charter of Habana have been well spent.

The charter is complicated and difficult. It is long and detailed and technical. But behind its many chapters and its scores of articles there lies a simple truth. The world will be a better place to live in if nations, instead of taking unilateral action without regard to the interests of others, will adopt and follow common principles and enter into consultation through an international organization when interests come into conflict. And this, throughout the entire range of trade relationships, is what the signatories of the charter agree to do. Each will surrender some part of its freedom to take action that might prove harmful to others, and thus each will gain the assurance that others will not take action harmful to it. This may well prove to be the greatest step in history toward order and justice in economic relations among the members of the world community and toward a great expansion in the production, distribution, and consumption of goods in the world.

The International Trade Organization will deal with questions that nations have always held to be of the greatest importance. It will seek solutions for problems that have all too often been a source of irritation and ill-will. It will serve as a center where the peoples of the world, with their diversity of economic interests, can meet on common ground. The ITO will substantially complete the structure of international economic cooperation. It will provide a necessary supplement to the work of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and other specialized agencies. It will add strength to the United Nations itself.

It is difficult to realize that the charter designed to bring this organization into being is now completed. For we have been told, again and again, throughout these years, that it could not be done. The program was too ambitious. It would involve too many commitments. Circumstances and systems were too diverse. Fair dealing, in international trade, was old-fashioned and impractical. The disorganization caused by the war was too great. The problems of reconstruction were too pressing. Nations were too much preoccupied with immediate difficulties. They would not look to the future. The future, in any case, was too uncertain. It could not be done.

It has been done.

The charter is now ready for submission to the legislatures of the participating nations for approval.

This conference has afforded the world an impressive demonstration of the ability of nations to work out a comprehensive agreement on matters of vital importance under conditions of great difficulty. Interests have differed at Habana, but efforts to understand, to explain, and to agree have never failed. We have all gained in knowledge and understanding. We have achieved, through these years of working together, a voluntary agreement for our mutual benefit. In this achievement, a troubled world may well take hope.

[4] *Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment* (Department of State publication 2411).

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR WARREN R. AUSTIN,[5] UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE AT THE SEAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

I welcome the signing of the charter of the International Trade Organization as I would welcome the signing of a treaty of peace. The ITO is, in fact, in the nature of a treaty of economic peace, ending more than two decades in which protection and reprisal were far more common than cooperation. The full significance of the step cannot be appreciated without recalling the tariff rivalry of the 1920's, the restrictive nationalism of the depression years, the distortions caused by Nazi and Fascist trade aggression, and the tight controls imposed on almost all economies during the last great war. It was a trend relieved only by this country's sustained effort toward tariff reduction under the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

Thus the ITO is a turning point. It is the international organ, in the United Nations pattern, through which the world will work cooperatively to cut away the accumulated snarls which have entangled peacetime international trade.

The importance of this event in forwarding the interests of political peace is self-evident. As the ITO functions effectively, nations will be able to exploit more fully their natural economic advantages of geography, resources, and skills and to develop industrially. Workers and consumers will reap the benefits in increased employment and higher standards of living. The ITO influence on the flow of international trade can be expected to aid also in achieving international monetary stability. In short, commercial frictions are diminished, and energies can increasingly be devoted to peaceful pursuits.

Hand in hand with the ITO goes the reciprocal trade-agreements program, now up for renewal in Congress. The ITO charter pledges member states to negotiate for the reduction of tariffs and the elimination of trade preferences in much the same way that the United States, almost alone, has pursued reductions over the last 14 years. Consequently, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is the essential vehicle for carrying out ITO objectives and achieving our own aims under the ITO charter.

Moreover, extension of the act by Congress would be evidence of the good will of the United States toward world trade expansion. It would offer to the trade of other countries the prospect of entering the American market, but only in return for concessions providing wider markets for American goods. It would stimulate the expansion of commerce, increase production, and stabilize employment.

[5] Made on March 24, 1948, and released to the press by the United States Mission to the UN on the same date.

The Birth of the Lone Star—History of the Texas Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, all Texans are proud of the pioneers who fought for the independence of the territory which was to become the new nation of Texas in 1836. April 21 is an important date for all Texans as we celebrate the anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836.

April 21 is of particular significance to ex-students of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas as on this day we hold a muster with fellow Aggies wherever we are in this world in memory of those Aggies who have passed on.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to include in my remarks for the RECORD the following poem by Mr. George W. Winningham, of Mexia, Tex., entitled "The Birth of the Lone Star," which is a history of the Texas revolution:

THE BIRTH OF THE LONE STAR
(By George W. Winningham)
PART I. CAUSES OF THE REVOLUTION

Of good American stock they sprang,
Rocked in the cradle of the free,
Taught that the sacred rights of men
Are intertwined with liberty,
That Anglo-Saxon men are born
Equally free in sight of God,
The prince who lives in a castle grand,
The peasant housed in mean abode.

Such men were they, rugged and bold,
Who with their wives and children came
With Austin to the wilderness,
It's wild and virgin ways to tame;
Homes, schools, and churches did they build,
Rude houses made of logs and clay,
Yet worthy monuments of peace
In which we live and learn and pray.

By invitation were they here,
Peaceful vocations to pursue,
Far from the scenes of former paths
Where first life's flaming pennants flew;
'Mid dangers lurking ever near
From savage foes who lay in wait,
Impending perils now unknown,
They sought to build a future State.

Promised by Spain and then by Mexico
Those civil rights which freemen hold
Most sacred and inalienable,
More precious far than fine spun gold,
Rights men receive direct from God,
And which they guard with jealous care,
Lest puppet kings and despots foul
Destroy and rule by force of fear.

To worship God as one sees fit;
The opportunities to educate;
Bear arms solely in self-defense;
A trial by jury in the State;
To peacefully assemble
And wholesome laws themselves enact;
Enjoy the fruits of honest efforts:
Self-government in truth and fact.

These civil rights and many more
By freemen o'er the world enjoyed
Were prostituted or annulled
And brutal force instead employed.
No one was safe within the State
Save traitors to a noble cause,
No home in all the vast domain
But felt the weight of unjust laws.

However versed in ways of peace,
No growing town or hamlet fair
Escaped the prying eyes of troops
The government had stationed there.
Good men were locked in prison cells
Because they dared for liberty,
Despised and feared for what they were:
Freemen determined to be free.

A despot ruled with iron hand,
Ambitious, vain, with mad desire
To lead his warriors to the fray,
New fame and glory to acquire;
A despot void of Christian traits
To whom no patriot would kneel,
But with whose troops on battlefields
Would match the prowess of his steel.

PART II. APRIL 21, 1836

The vernal sun rose in the sky
To view the hostile camps astir
With solemn mien to plan the fight
Lest Fate again the hour defer
When freemen sally forth to meet
In mortal combat with the foe,
Despotic sons of a foreign race
Who put to sword the Alamo.

Likewise to view deserted homes
From which the colonists had fled,
Families of husbands gone to war
Or bivouacked with heroic dead.
They knew and all men since have learned
That rapine, murder, blood, and blight
The path of Santa Ana marked,
Hence safety lay only in flight.

And flee they did from hearth and home
On wings of terror and despair
To seek a friendly spot on earth
And rest their weary bodies there;
They asked no shelt'ring roof except
God's star-lit, far-flung skies above,
No bed except God's earth below,
But righteous ways of peace and love.

In creaking oxcarts and on foot,
Like nomads in a desert zone,
Astride their milk cows and on sleigh—
"Camped here today, tomorrow gone"—
For weeks they crowded path and road
In flight before the imps of hell,
And horrors of the hunted knew
Beyond the pow'r of pen to tell.

A force of four divisions strong
Spread desolation through the land,
Pillaged like vandal hordes of old,
Applied the torch with reckless hand;
No hamlet in the despot's path
Escaped the wrath of vengeance come,
Each fed the fiery hungry flames
To fiendish yells and roll of drum.

The fertile fields a barren waste,
Trampled to dust by alien feet;
Our government forced here and there
With scarce a place at which to meet;
Condemned as pirates and pursued
By fiends incarnate urged by hate,
Because they dared their all to give
To save the honor of their State.

The conquered Alamo stood out
In blood-stained, battle-scarred relief;
The charred remains of Fannin's men—
Betrayed!—spread shrouds of gloom and grief.
Such ruthless cruelty displayed
No man had ever seen before * * *
The living rendered life and limb,
The dead an extra sword-wound wore.

Such cruel and inhuman deeds
Imposed by imps released from hell
Would, ere the flaming sun should set,
Be rectified by sword and shell.
Out of the blood this day would know,
With bleeding heart by battle torn,
Its rightful estate to assume,
Destined a nation to be born.

PART III. SANTA ANA'S CAMP

The "Prince of Butchers," boastful, proud,
Self-styled "Napoleon of the West,"
Surrounded by a thousand men
All eager for the battle test,
Astride his steed rode here and there
Inspecting breastworks built by night,
Behind which frowning cannon stood
To belch forth death amid the fight.

Off to the right in tangled wood
While yet the stars hung in the sky
Three companies of troops were placed
To do for Mexico or die;
With orders from the despot's tongue,
"No mercy to the rebels show,"
They hid themselves there in the woods
To wait the coming of the foe.

A crack battalion of picked men,
From Matamoras near the sea,
Within whose breasts beat hearts of stone,
Hard hearts that know not Mercy's plea,
Pride of the warrior chieftain's eye,
Was stationed in the center field
To form the tyrant's battle line—
Inured to war they would not yield.

Upon the left, behind breastworks
Of saddles, sacks of bread and wood,
Protected by the cavalry,
The frowning cannon stood,—
No doubt the same relentless guns
Which belched with flaming breath
The shells which shook the Alamo
And brought its brave defenders death.

At 9 o'clock the venal Cos,
Under parole to fight no more,
So pledged to brave Ben Milam's men—
Infamous Cos!—rode in before
A column of five hundred troops
The war-mad tyrant's cause to aid,
Fired by the fate of Goliad,
A sacrifice which brave men made.

To rolling drums and loud huzzahs
Cos and his weary, footsore men,
Worn by the haste of march, stacked arms,
And joined the tumult and the din;
False hopes, perhaps, of victory
And minds imbued with festered hate
Impelled the minions to unleash
Their false tongues and to celebrate.

With fifteen hundred men or more,
(Two warriors to Sam Houston's one),
Choice troops fresh from the fields
Where crushing victories were won,
The camp grew careless and relaxed
Strict vigil which wise warriors keep
Lest weaker foes accept the dare
And silently upon them creep.

Self-confident and over-bold
The boastful Lord of Mexico
Midday lay down to seek repose,
Unmindful of the nearby foe,
To dream, perchance, of laurels won
On other fields to cannon roar,
While the decisive hour approached
When he'd misrule our land no more.

PART IV. SAM HOUSTON'S CAMP

Within a grove of virgin growth
Sam Houston and his warriors true,
Alert and yearning for the fight,
Marked time as precious moments flew,
Each fearless hero realized
Upon his sure unerring aim
Henceforth the flag would fly in peace
Or drape its folds in servile shame.

The "Raven" moved from group to group
Reminding each the longed-for hour
Was drawing nigh when Texas men
Would break for aye the despot's pow'r,
Reclaim the conquered Alamo
Where heroes dared to fight and die,
Keep plighted faith with Goliad
Or dead men prove the reason why.

Less than eight hundred strong they stood,
Brave men, twice numbered by the foe,
But urged by Freedom's voice to dare
The veteran troops of Mexico.
Inured to hardships of the farm,
Of war but little did they know,
Yet in defense of hearth and home
Each willing for his blood to flow.

At noon the officers assembled
In council to outline a plan
Of action in the coming fray,
But hesitation through it ran;
Some counseled 'twas unwise to wait,
Still others thought delay was best,
But the soldiers voted to expel
At once invaders from the West.

Why longer suffer them to camp
In peace on hallow'd Texas soil,
The land they seek to rend and crush
Whose homes they would despoil?
Why longer suffer them to breathe
The sweetness of our atmosphere,
Polluting it with putrid hate,
Embraced and kissed by death and fear?

The very grass on which they tread
Hangs low its tender blades in shame,
The trembling leaves on ev'ry bough
Their savage deeds of war proclaim—
Why let them count another day
Ere they the wrath of Texans know
And justice true demand of them
Blood for the blood they've caused to flow?

Send Deaf Smith with a trusted band
To Vince's Bridge and it destroy
So cowards, who in fear retreat,
Cannot its friendly spans employ.
And ere this day gives way to night
The turgid stream, which bears the flood
Of spring rains to the hungry sea,
Will crimson run with human blood.

Yea, patriots, the hour has struck
When despots from our land must go,
As liberty in love unfolds
The only flag we vow to know;
The hour has struck when Texas troops
Into the jaws of death must fly
And freedom gain for all the land
Or on the field of carnage die.

PART V. BATTLE OF SAN JACINTO

The fearless band of patriots,
Whose glory will forever shine,
At 3 o'clock midafternoon,
In silence formed in battle line
And on each brow the eye beheld
Determination written there
To charge the foe and victory win
Or else the fate of Travis share.

Across the low marsh on they moved
As noiseless as the calm of night,
No tones of fife nor loud-mouth drum
Announced their readiness to fight;
Swiftly they moved in deadly calm
Until the camp of foemen lay,
At rest, upon an eminence
Two hundred yards or less away.

Shrill yells which rent the atmosphere,
Followed by crash of shot and shell,
Awoke the sleeping Mexicans
Too late the mad charge to repel;
They wrung their hands in much surprise
And foolish orders cried in vain
To fear-crazed troops who milled about
O'er corpses of dead men quickly slain.

From throats of Sherman's charging men,
"Remember Goliad and Alamo,"
Burst forth to put the fear of God
Into the heart of every foe.
On up the slight incline they charged
In vengeful rage, on vict'ry bent,
With flashing swords and smoking guns
Wounding and killing as they went.

With empty guns as clubs of war
They charged the Mexican ranks anew,
And in a hand to hand combat
The list of dead and wounded grew;
A vision of the Alamo,
Soul-sickening scenes of Goliad
Rode on the bloody wings of battle there
To urge and cheer each Texas lad.

At last the despot's frightened troops,
Convinced their valor was in vain,
In desperation and despair
Their safety sought in flight to gain;
Across their path to check retreat
A turgid bayou outward spread,
But they into its waters plunged
And soon 'twas choked with maimed and dead.

But few who took the fatal plunge
In safety reached the farther shore,
And they, bereft of sword and gun,
Were helpless 'mid the battle's roar.
And so this mud-bespattered remnant,
Once Santa Ana's proud command,
With fear atremble did surrender
To warriors of Sam Houston's band.

And when the smoke of battle lifted,
Upon the field of carnage lay
Eight hundred dead and wounded foes—
Six hundred prisoners marked the day.
The despot fallen in disgrace,
His ensign from the breezes torn,
The Lone Star flag of freedom waved
In triumph o'er a nation born.

Claims of Japanese and Japanese-Americans for Property Losses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there is now being considered by the Congress a bill providing for adjudication of claims for property losses by the Japanese and Japanese-Americans evacuated on the west coast during the war.

In the February issue of the Christian Register there appears an able presentation of this problem of compensation for evacuees' property losses. The article in question is written by Mike Masaoka, who is the representative in Washington, D. C., of the Japanese American Citizens League.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Evacuation Claims—Justice Delayed," be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD at the request of the American Civil Liberties Union, together with an editorial from the Washington Post of April 8, 1948, entitled "Justice for Nisei."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVACUATION CLAIMS—JUSTICE DELAYED

(By Mike Masaoka)

The resettlement of Japanese evacuated from the west coast more than 5 years ago is a closed chapter. But the matter of compensation for evacuee property losses is still unfinished business. The President's Committee on Civil Rights, in its recent epoch-making report to the White House, has recognized the need for immediate disposition of this problem and has recommended prompt congressional action reimbursing evacuee losses.

Pending before the United States Senate is a bill, H. R. 3999, providing for the adjudication of evacuation claims. This measure was approved without a dissenting vote by the House of Representatives during the past eightieth session of Congress. A bill of similar character died in the final week of the Seventy-ninth Congress last year when an objection by a California Congressman halted unanimous House action after it had been approved by the Senate.

Today the oportunity is at hand to insure that justice will triumph. Christians who are uneasy concerning this tragic episode in our Nation's wartime life should ease their consciences by communicating immediately and directly with their Senators to see that no such fate will block this new bill. Christian leaders were among the first to recognize the injuries of evacuation; they were the first to demand the early restitution of losses suffered by the thousands of evacuees. The long fight for fair play and justice can be won by immediate and concerted action. Delay will only compound the injury.

The evacuation claims bill proposes no lump-sum payment to evacuees; it gives the Department of Justice authority to settle claims up to $2,500. The Department has authority to adjudicate claims in larger amounts, such claims to be paid in the same way as judgments in the Court of Claims.

The intangible damages, disruption of lives, loss of freedom and the attendant suffering can never be compensated for, but proponents of this bill believe that the very least that can be expected of a working Christian democracy is that an effort be made to indemnify these people for economic damages suffered by no other segment of the American population.

The military phase of the mass removal from the Pacific coast and Alaska of 115,000 persons of Japanese ancestry, two-thirds of whom were American citizens, is well known, but it has not been until the past year that anything resembling a full story of the evacuation has been told. Bradford Smith describes, in an article in the 1947 winter issue of Common Ground, the forced disposal of Japanese property following evacuation as "one of the greatest swindles in America's boisterous history," which is still going on.

The opportunity for this indiscriminate and wholesale grabbing of property was provided by the evacuation which Mr. Smith suggested might have been originated by pressure groups who had the most to gain from it. For it was not even suggested at the time of Pearl Harbor, was not recommended by the Pacific coast congressional delegation until more than 2 months thereafter and was actually carried out only after the Battle of Midway, when any presumed danger to the coast had been thoroughly dispersed.

Professor Eugene Rostow of Yale University called evacuation "America's worst wartime mistake" in an article he wrote for Harper's in September 1945. Milton S. Eisenhower, the first director of the War Relocation Authority, in discussing the initial phases of the evacuation with the Secretary of Agriculture, was moved to state: "I feel most deeply that when this war is over and we consider calmly this unprecedented migration of 120,000 people, we as Americans are going to regret the avoidable injustices that occurred." There have been many since who have expressed the belief that it was tragically unnecessary.

The story of the forced liquidation of assets and the loss or deterioration of evacuee property is not a pretty one. The evacuees were usually given 7 to 10 days' notice of the time they would be moved from their homes. But thousands got less time. They had no idea where they were going, how long they would be excluded from their homes. They were notified that they must report to a railway station or bus terminal at a stated hour, taking with them only the goods they would actually carry.

This meant that they must either sell or rent, loan or store, place in custodianship, or dispose of in some way all tangible property. This included farms, nursery stocks, growing crops, all kinds of farm machinery, trucks, hotels, restaurants, homes, furniture, and all the multiplicity of commodities owned by the 120,000 people.

The majority of the people to whom the Japanese entrusted their property and belongings felt pretty sure they would never return to the west coast. Some never did—they resettled in the East or Middle West, or they died on the battlefields in Europe fighting for the rights and liberties they believed in. Most tragic of all was that the Government had ordered the evacuation without providing for the protection of personal and other interests, leaving the Japanese victims to unscrupulous buyers and some outright rogues who became rich as a result of this human tragedy.

Of the Japanese-Americans who had anything to lose, says Bradford Smith, 95 percent suffered loss. Those who had little to lose made out worst of all, for their bit of leased land meant life. Their savings wiped out by evacuation, they had nothing to start again with.

What are some of the losses? The lessees of a business building in Los Angeles had invested $92,000 in the property under a long-term lease. At evacuation time they had to forfeit the entire amount before the lessor would cancel the lease. An evacuee in Petaluma, near San Francisco, arranged for a friend to manage her property. She returned to find her kitchen had been used as a chicken coop and the bedrooms as cow stalls. Another Japanese in Winters, Calif., rented his ranch to local Spaniards. Though the entire ranch was supramarginal during the years of the war, certain portions that were poorer than others were totally abandoned. All the equipment accumulated after 30 years of farming was wrecked or stolen. Even such things as water faucets were stolen. As a result of the evacuation, this farmer has suffered losses from negligence that borders on sabotage and looting such as can be associated with ransacking hordes of an invading army.

A certain Mr. Higashi operated a drug store in Los Angeles up to the time of evacuation. A Caucasian acquaintance, who was a man of some prominence in the neighborhood, called on Mr. Higashi at the relocation center and offered to assist the evacuee in selling certain property. Mr. Higashi gratefully accepted the offer. This man, whom we will call Mr. E, visited the center again and informed Mr. Higashi that all his apartment furniture and furnishing had been stolen. Mr. E said he believed he knew who had stolen the things, but without power of attorney to act in Mr. Higashi's name he was powerless to act. Higashi granted him the power of attorney. Mr. Higashi never received an accounting or any proceeds. In 1944 WRA officers conducted a thorough investigation of the activities of Mr. E and found he had no assets which would be reached by attachment; that he was definitely guilty of misappropriation and misrepresentation not only with regard to Mr. Higashi but also with regard to other evacuees. The facts assembled were presented to the Los Angeles district attorney's office, but that office stated that it was not interested in filing charges against Mr. E.

These are not exceptional cases. They are typical of the vandalism and mismanagement which dissipated evacuee assets and destroyed their property. Of the hundreds of cases involving theft and vandalism of stored property, there have been no criminal convictions.

The War Relocation Authority, which was in charge of the evacuees estimates that the evacuated Japanese left behind them in 1942 about $200,000,000 worth of real, personal, and commercial property. Actual loss from evacuation is estimated to run into many millions of dollars. Many evacuees who had leaseholds upon farms have lost them by transfer to operators of other racial groups during the years of exclusion. Many lost their prospects of income and security in their old age through inability to keep up payments on insurance policies. Others have lost property through inability to pay taxes.

WRA has learned since 1942 of the real and substantial losses resulting from evacuation and thefts by enemies and false friends; of the break-down of the nearly self-sufficient

Japanese communities; of the damage to family life by barrack existence; and of the chronological and mental aging of people already old and ready to retire at the time of evacuation.

People in Motion, the Government's study of the Japanese-Americans' readjustment since the war, reveals that the evacuees have not recovered from the financial losses they incurred. The extent of financial recovery is minute as compared to the millions of dollars' worth of business loss in the evacuation. Japanese-Americans have almost completely lost their enormous business in the fruit and vegetable market. The wholesale produce market is still completely lost to evacuees. Likewise the fishing industry, worth several millions is still "practically extinct." Such losses as these, of course, cannot be recovered under any evacuation claims measure.

But payment of accountable business and property losses which resulted from the evacuation is an obligation which President Truman, Secretary of Interior Krug, and other high administration officials have officially acknowledged.

Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior, testifying in support of the claims bill before the House Judiciary Committee, pointed out that the proposed measure was designed to ameliorate in some degree the losses suffered by persons of Japanese ancestry, "whose only crime was the unavoidable accident of birth" and who were compelled to forsake their homes and to abandon their businesses without being given a prior opportunity to prove their loyalty to the United States.

The record of 30,000 American soldiers of Japanese ancestry who served in the European and Pacific theaters of war attests to their innate Americanism. These persons had to bear the losses occasioned by the evacuation in addition to the wartime deprivation they shared with the rest of the American people.

President Truman, emphasizing the need for evacuee compensation, said: "It would, in my opinion, be a tragic anomaly if the United States were, on the one hand, to acclaim and decorate the brave Nisei troops who fought so valiantly and at such sacrifices overseas, while on the other hand, it ignored and left unredressed the very real and grievous losses which some of them, together with their immediate families, have suffered as a result of Government action in the midst of the same war."

As Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER told the lower House when the bill was brought up for consideration, "This bill, in a small way, will make whole those people who were the innocent victims of an order that probably should never have been issued—they should certainly be compensated because of the losses they suffered as a direct result of the evacuation. This would be simple justice—the kind of justice everyone in our country is entitled to receive."

Congressional action is the only practical solution to assure redress for the wrongs of evacuation. It will be an act of justice long delayed. We therefore appeal to all Christians who are anxious to see that justice and fair play are carried out to write their Senators now urging them to expedite passage of the evacuation claims bill.

[From the Washington Post of April 8, 1948]

JUSTICE FOR NISEI

The Japanese-Americans who were evacuated from the west coast in the emergency of 1941 and detained during the war in "relocation centers" suffered serious property losses as a result. It was not their fault that they were evacuated. They had committed no crime; not a single attempt at espionage or sabotage was ever officially attributed to them. But in the hysteria that succeeded the attack on Pearl Harbor the military commander in charge of the defense of the west coast decided that it would be safer to have them in the interior of the country. They were forced to dispose of homes and business interests in haste and in many instances at great sacrifice; some of them lost everything that they had owned in the way of worldly goods.

These people have sought no redress for the humiliation to which they were subjected or for the trespass on their constitutional rights as American citizens. But manifestly, as a matter of elementary justice, they are entitled to compensation for material losses incurred through no fault of their own. A bill for establishment of an Evacuation Claims Commission which would determine the compensation due them was introduced in 1946. It was reported favorably to both House and Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress and passed the latter body unanimously, but reached the former too late for floor consideration prior to adjournment. In the present Congress, the House has approved the bill, but the Senate has not yet acted. It would be a great misfortune if it were allowed to lapse again through carelessness or on account of the pressure of other business. There appears to be no question as to the desirability and justice of this legislation. Delay in enacting it can serve only to perpetuate a wrong and to aggravate the injuries which these loyal Americans have endured.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Moshe Shertok, head of the political department, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, before the United Nations Security Council, April 1, 1948:

The Jewish Agency for Palestine is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the two resolutions submitted by the representative of the United States to the two hundred and seventy-fifth meeting of the Security Council on March 30, 1948.

The first of these resolutions provides for a conclusion of a truce between the Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine under the auspices of the Security Council in consultation with the Jewish Agency and the Arab Higher Committee. In its final paragraph the draft resolution proposes that the Security Council should "call upon Arab and Jewish armed groups in Palestine to cease acts of violence."

Before defining the views of the Jewish Agency and the Jewish people of Palestine on the conclusion of a truce, I feel bound to comment upon the setting in which the United States draft resolution seeks to present the problem of restoring peace in Palestine. I fear that that setting distorts the picture in two vital respects. It conveys the impression, first, that the armed conflict now raging in Palestine is a purely local affair, affecting only the population of Palestine, Jewish and Arab; and, second, that the fighting has broken out as a result of both sides having fallen upon one another, so that both are now equally guilty, or at least as if it is impossible or immaterial to determine which is the attacker and which the attacked. Because of these misleading implications the resolution itself becomes a wrong starting point for the quest for peace.

For you cannot attack the root of the evil which now afflicts Palestine if you omit all reference to the central and salient feature of the country's disturbed condition—namely, the presence of Arab aggression from outside, sponsored and organized by Arab States, members of the United Nations, in an effort to alter by force the settlement envisaged by the General Assembly's resolution of November 29, 1947. I wish that it were easier to ascribe this omission to mere inadvertence, which the Security Council, by virtue of its primary duty to "suppress acts of aggression," will hasten to correct. For rarely in the modern history of international relations can an act of aggression have occurred in a manner more blatant, more scornful of concealment, or more exultantly arrogant.

The campaign of aggressive violence was launched amidst clamorous proclamations by the heads of Arab governments of their intention to use force against the Jews of Palestine and against any agencies of the United Nations which might proceed to carry out their lawful duties in implementing the General Assembly's resolution. These statements were swiftly translated into action. Armed forces were recruited under the direction of the governments of Arab States. They were equipped and financed from the resources of those governments. Their commanders were appointed by ministers and officials of Arab States under the chairmanship of one of their heads, namely, the President of the Syrian Republic. They have been despatched across the frontiers with arms and mechanized transport, in successive and open acts of frontier violation. They have launched attacks on peaceful Jewish villages and organized riots and bloodshed among the urban population. They have fastened their effective military control upon large areas of the country. As the Security Council deliberates week after week, in Palestine those Arab armed forces are moving into battle positions on what is still the territory of the British mandate, perfecting their organization and periodically breaking out into attacks upon the Jewish population in preparation and training for the major assault whereby they hope to intimidate the United Nations into final submission and impose a settlement of the Palestine question by force.

It is the presence of these foreign Arab forces on the soil of Palestine and the preparation of further incursions which constitute the main threat to law and order in Palestine today. But for these invasions from neighboring States, the security situation in Palestine would hardly have raised a problem which could not be quickly resolved; and the implementation of the plan adopted by the General Assembly would have involved no international crisis.

It is therefore astonishing to find the United States representative setting the problem of violence in Palestine in terms of a conflict between the "Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine." There is nothing secret or even controversial about the facts which I have tried to summarize. The Mandatory Power has reported to the United Nations Palestine Commission on three separate incursions which took place in January. The Mandatory Power has also reported to the Permanent Members of the Security Council on several further incursions which took place in February and March. The United Kingdom Government has made public further authentic information on this subject through official statements in the House of Commons. I believe that the United Kingdom representative here present will agree with me if, basing myself on official United Kingdom figures, I would estimate the total strength of these invading forces at approximately 7,500. From the same United Kingdom sources it can be deduced that these men come well armed and equipped, uniformed and organized in military formation.

The Mandatory Power, which has abdicated its responsibility as the guardian of the frontiers of Palestine and relegated itself to the role of a mere recorder of their violations, does not seem to have registered the direct responsibility of Arab governments for all these invasions save as regards an incursion from Syria on January 21, 1948, against which His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom lodged a protest of sorts with the government of the Syrian Republic and the Kingdom of Transjordan. The protest was ignored, no further action was taken by the United Kingdom, and incursions from Syria continued and became more open. But we need not resort to the good offices of the Mandatory Power to provide evidence that Arab governments have organized these invasions. The evidence is more direct and authentic. It comes from those governments themselves. It is revealed in recruiting regulations issued by the Syrian Minister of Defense; in photographs of the Syrian Prime Minister supervising the training of troops for war in Palestine at Quatana barracks in Syria; in the action of the Egyptian Government in allotting military barracks at Hilmiyeh and Helwan for the same purpose; in the assignment by the Egyptian Government of budgetary allocations for operations in Palestine; in the announcement of the Lebanese Prime Minister on February 25 of his government's intention to supply Palestine with arms, money, and men until there "will be nothing in Palestine but a military Arab state."

The evidence of these aggressive invasions and of the responsibility of the Arab governments for them is too voluminous for me to recite here. I therefore beg leave to submit, as written information, under rule 39 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, two memoranda on the subject with annexes. The Security Council should at least not fail to record this notorious aggression, even if it proves unable to suppress it.

This campaign of aggression raises two questions which are relevant in my submission to the first of the United States resolutions. First, there is a fundamental point of principle. Is it legitimate for member states to use force against a settlement adopted by the General Assembly? The representatives of Arab states in their statements before the Security Council have tried to evade the issue by arguing that member states are under no obligation to comply with a resolution of the General Assembly. Not to comply is one thing. Openly and actively to defy is quite another. So much for the aggressor states. But a more serious question arises in relation to the Security Council itself. Is it proper for the Security Council, having received conclusive evidence of aggression actually committed, to take no steps at all to suppress, nay, not even to condemn—nor even to record—that aggression? Is it a just interpretation of the Security Council's function in this question that it should obey the demand of the aggressor at pistol-point, and advocate a revision of a General Assembly resolution for no other reason than that the resolution is assailed by armed force? Does the United Nations seek in the case of Palestine a settlement on the basis of equity and mutual adjustment, or is it merely in pursuit of a settlement against which the Arabs will graciously condescend not to use force? It would be presumptuous on my part to elaborate on the point that the principle involved in these questions transcends even the grave episode which is under discussion and affects the very foundations of the international order.

It is all the more inadmissible for the Security Council to take no action against the patent external aggression which is in progress in view of the fact that there is a general agreement on the requirements of the Charter in this matter. Thus, on February 24, 1948, the distinguished representative of the United States on the Security Council took a keen interest in this matter of aggression. He said:

"Attempts to frustrate the General Assembly's recommendation by the threat or use of force * * * on the part of states or peoples outside Palestine are contrary to the Charter."

But on that very day of February 24, as though in direct response to Ambassador Austin's words, the mandatory power reported to the permanent members of the Security Council that "between 500 and 1,000 Iraqis, Lebanese, Syrians, Egyptians, and Transjordanians entered Samaria and Galilee across the Jordan and the Lebanese frontier."

Again, the representative of France declared in the Security Council:

"It is quite inadmissible that any state member of the United Nations in a territory which is not its own should by armed force oppose the efforts of other members of the United Nations to implement a resolution of the General Assembly. Such action goes much further than mere abstention from participation in implementation which the Charter allows. We are faced here with open revolt, which is clearly contrary to the Charter."

These exemplary words were spoken on March 5.

Yet on that day of March 5, according to British official sources, the notorious protégé of Adolf Hitler, Fawzi al-Kawukji, entered Palestine with his headquarters troops to assume command of the so-called Yarmuk formation. He was acting in conformity with the decision taken at a meeting which took place in Damascus on February 5 under the chairmanship of the President of the Syrian Republic, when, according to a first-hand report by the Damascus correspondent of the Cairo daily Al-Masri:

"Gen. Ismail Safwat was appointed commander in chief of the Arab Liberation Army, Gen. Taha Pasha al-Hashimi was nominated Inspector of the Liberation Armies, and Fawzi al-Kawukji was entrusted with the command of the Al-Yarmuk formation."

It is always a diverting experience to contrast the learned speeches of the Syrian representative here, replete with quotations from the Charter and protestations of loyalty to the ideals of peace, with the quite different aspect of affairs at Damascus. As a member of the Security Council, Syria is one of those states on which the members of the United Nations have conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

It is all very well for the Syrian representative on the Security Council to make here the bold assertion, as he did on March 16, that "the Arab states, including Syria, have not interfered by taking part in these encounters." The representative of Syria took no trouble to explain—the overwhelming body of evidence to the contrary—the fact that it was no less a person than the President of his republic who presided over the appointment of commanders of the Arab forces of invasion, the numerous statements made by the Syrian Defense Minister acknowledging his direction of the operations, the official proclamations of the Syrian Government regarding the recruitment of volunteers, the physical appearance of the Syrian Prime Minister and Defense Minister respectively at training centers and at the head of convoys driving toward the Palestine frontier, etc. It is on Syrian territory, under the direct charge of the Syrian Government, that armed forces are trained, equipped and dispatched across the frontier to commit aggression and attempt to overthrow a United Nations decision by force.

If the Security Council sees aggression going on before its very eyes and proceeds to fulfill the main objective of that aggression by recommending a revision of the General Assembly's resolution, the consequences for world peace must indeed be grave. These consequences entail a very heavy responsibility for the leading world power which sponsors the present resolution. To recapitulate, the United States draft resolution tears the problem out of its context and treats the conflict in complete isolation from the question as to who upholds and who defies the United Nations authority; it ignores the greatest feature of the Palestine crisis which is aggression from outside; it flies in the face of facts by diagnosing the crisis as the result of a mere local communal clash; by implication, it exonerates the aggressor states of all guilt; without even attempting to deal with the invasion of Palestine by foreign forces it misses the target by urging a local truce as a remedy. In brief, the resolution perpetrates a triple optical illusion: First, it arbitrarily separates the conflict from its international setting; second, it artificially reduces its scope; third, it wantonly creates a position of false equality between the Jews and the Arabs. In presenting the resolution, the representative of the United States, quoting from his earlier report, to balance the uneven scales, conjures up an imaginary "infiltration into Palestine * * * by sea, of groups * * * with the purpose of taking part in violence." In the resolution itself the Jewish agency and the Arab higher committee are put on an equal footing of culpability. The fact that it was the Arabs who started the offensive while the Jews reacted in defense is completely obliterated.

It is against this background that it is my duty to set before the Security Council the attitude of the Jewish agency and of the Jewish population of Palestine toward the proposals for a truce. That attitude was expressed in a letter which I had the honor to address on March 17 to the Secretary General in response to a question put to us by the United States delegation in the course of the consultations held by the permanent members of the Security Council. The letter reads as follows:

"I have the honor, on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, to submit the following reply to the question addressed to the Jewish Agency as to whether it would be prepared to enter into the necessary agreements to bring about an effective truce in Palestine.

"1. It must be emphasized that insofar as the term "truce" implies a conflict between two belligerents it does not accurately fit the facts of the present situation, in which, on the one hand, an attempt is being made by the Arab states and the Arabs of Palestine to alter by force a settlement approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations, while the Jewish community has been defending itself and the decision of the United Nations which it has loyally accepted.

"2. Subsequent to the adoption of the resolution of the General Assembly of November 29 on the future government of Palestine, the Jewish population in Palestine has been subjected to attacks by Arab forces, including armed bands from outside the country which, as the United Nations Palestine Commission has reported to the Security Council, are attempting to alter the resolution of the General Assembly by force.

"3. The Jewish people have in no case resorted to aggression against the Arab people nor do they seek conflict with them. At the same time the Jews of Palestine have been obliged to take measures to protect themselves from attack and to uphold their rights under the United Nations resolution.

"4. The moment that Arab aggression ceases Jewish armed reaction will also terminate. There must, of course, be a clear understanding that the cessation of Arab aggression will also include the stoppage of preparations for future aggression, the evacuation of foreign forces and the prevention of further incursion of armed bands into Palestine.

"5. It is assumed that any arrangement for a truce will be carried out within the framework of the implementation of the resolution of the General Assembly and in strict conformity with the timetable provided in that resolution."

It will be seen from this letter that the aim of avoiding violence in Palestine is one which the Jewish Agency and the Jewish people of Palestine wholeheartedly uphold. The sacrifice of young lives in defending the community against wanton attack is a source of continuing grief and sorrow, and the damage and casualties inflicted upon all elements of the population are a grievous burden. We long to end this sequence of bloodshed in the context of obedience to international law and without detriment to legitimate rights. Therefore the underlying idea of a truce is most welcome to us. We must only be concerned to pursue the aim in a manner that will ensure a real truce and lead to a lasting peace and not produce a mere breathing spell as a prelude to renewed violence under worse conditions. In particular the purposes of order cannot be separated from the purposes of law. Order cannot be purchased by setting law aside.

I now draw particular attention to paragraph 4 of our letter in which the Jewish agency stipulates "the evacuation of foreign forces and the prevention of further incursions of armed bands into Palestine" as indispensable conditions of any truce. There is no reality in "a truce between the Arab and Jewish communities of Palestine" when the Arab community is merely a subsidiary agent of aggression, when the Jewish community has no other interest but to defend itself and move forward to the fulfillment of an authorized international program, and when the source of aggression lies outside the control of both parties and flourishes unhindered in the very center of the country.

The Jews of Palestine can attach no validity to any assurance of peaceful intentions on the part of the Arabs so long as these foreign forces remain on Palestine soil, where they have no right of access, no jurisdiction and no internationally valid purpose to pursue.

We believe that we are justified in claiming their expulsion and that the fulfillment of this claim is both practical and necessary. No people anywhere in the world will voluntarily sign a truce with invading forces converging upon it and poised to strike. This would be not a truce. It would be a capitulation.

Moreover, the armed formations concerned are easily identifiable. The report of that memorable Damascus meeting of February 5, to which I have already referred, goes on to say:

"It was agreed to divide Palestine into four military areas, each of which will be under a commanding officer responsible to the commander in chief (i. e., Gen. Ismail Safwat, an Iraqi general, with his headquarters at Damascus). Certain internal powers, however, were granted to the Palestine Arab command in the Jerusalem area."

The location of the main formations of these foreign invaders can easily be found. Thus, on March 16, the battle order of Fawzi al-Kawukji's troops was, according to our information at that date, roughly, as follows:

The First Yarmuk Regiment of Syrian troops at Jaba village between Nablus and Jenin commanded by a Syrian officer, Mohammed Safa.

The Second Yarmuk Regiment of Syrian troops at Jenin, under Hashem Mohammad, an Iraqi.

The Al-Hussein Regiment at Attil village, commanded by Abdul Wahhab, an Iraqi.

The Al-Hasan Regiment at Tubas village, commanded by Mahmud al-Hindi, an Iraqi.

An Iraqi contingent at Ras ul-Ain, near the source of the Jerusalem water supply.

An Egyptian contingent at Gaza.

A Bosnian-Moslem contingent at Lydda.

The authority supervising the truce should not have much difficulty in locating any of these large units, though some individuals may be found to have merged with the general population.

It is clear from the above-quoted report of the Damascus meeting and from other local evidence that foreign commanders responsible to Damascus are in control of all Arab military operations in Palestine except in Jerusalem. In that city alone, the Arab Higher Committee, operating under the orders of the Mufti, has been awarded qualified freedom. Its role, according to a statement issued on Good Friday, is to organize force against any attempts to establish Jerusalem as an international city held by the United Nations in trust for mankind. It would thus be quite unrealistic to negotiate a truce with the Arab Higher Committee for any area except Jerusalem, where alone this local Palestinian body has some jurisdiction. So far as Jerusalem is concerned, the Jewish agency has already stated that it is prepared to negotiate a truce with the body which it recognizes as responsible for the disorders there.

I would also draw attention to the first paragraph of the letter quoted, which explains the inapplicability of the term "truce" to the situation now existing in Palestine. The parties confronting each other are the Jews, defending a lawful international decision, and Arabs both inside and outside Palestine who are, in the words of the United Nations Palestine Commission, "defying the resolution of the General Assembly and attempting to overthrow it by force." Neither in their aims, nor in the relation of their activities to the terms of the Charter, can these two sides justly be equated. In this respect, the United States draft resolution, ignoring any distinction between aggression and defense, between obedience to and defiance of an international judgment, offers the Security Council an escape from the basic conceptions underlying the Charter, with their clear differentiation between the legitimacy and illegitimacy of force, into a world where all force is identical, irrespective of the purposes to which it is applied.

In paragraph 5 of our letter of March 17, we stipulate that the proposed truce shall not hamper or delay the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution of November 29, 1947. It is obvious that to delay the implementation of that resolution would be no neutral act in the spirit of a truce, but a concession under pressure of violence to the main objectives of the attacking party. It is necessary to make this point clear since a situation may arise in which one of the parties makes the truce conditional on the suspension of the Assembly's resolution, while the other party makes it conditional on the maintenance of that resolution. It should go without saying that there can be no equation between the upholding of an international instrument and its violation. The Security Council, as an organ of the United Nations, can hardly take any other view. On March 5, the representative of France in the Security Council said:

"If the validity of the Assembly's recommendation and its binding character on certain states can be questioned, there can be no discussion as to its application to and its binding character upon all the organs of the United Nations, including, of course, the Security Council."

We fully share this conception of the binding character of the resolution and of the Security Council's lack of competence to set it aside. It is unreasonable to require one of the parties to the truce to sacrifice its rights in law in order that the other party, having won its aim, may desist from the violence by which it was achieved.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann, universally acknowledged as the greatest Jewish leader of our generation, stated last week in this connection:

"There has been a solemn judgment by the authorized tribunal. The duty of conciliation is to summon all parties to the obedience of judgment, not to adapt judgment to the will of the defiant party."

Mr. President, we do not deem it useful at this stage to go into all the detailed aspects of a truce negotiation. The main principle to be followed is to avoid any impression, under the terms of a truce, that violence is politically rewarded, that it is left free by the conditions of the truce to renew itself with even greater vigor when occasion arises, and that it is encouraged by the very circumstances of the truce to repeat itself in the future. I would only refer to one overriding question which should be cleared up before this resolution is voted. The maintenance of a truce requires an authority to supervise its observance by both parties, if and when they have agreed to its terms. This authority must also have power to take action against any violation of the truce by one of the signatories. Its particular function in Palestine must be to watch over the frontiers and prevent their violation. It seems to us that it would not be realistic to pursue this matter far without any assurance that such a supervisory authority is available. The United States can hardly be unaware that the issue of enforcement cannot be shirked in the Palestine problem, not even in the maintenance of a truce.

Finally, I should like to urge, on the basis of these submissions, that the resolution be amended to conform with the realities of the situation, the dominant fact of which is foreign aggression. As has been pointed out, the draft in its present form, is based on the illusion of an internal conflict, and if it is accepted as setting the line of a truce negotiation, it may prejudice the end it has in view, namely, the restoration of peace in Palestine and the elimination of violence as a factor affecting international policy.

I come now to the second resolution submitted by the representative of the United States. It is proposed that the General Assembly be convoked once again in special session "to consider further the question of the future government of Palestine." There is a curious, if not ironic, coincidence attached to this proposal. It is debated here today 1 year less 1 day since the same request was originally presented by the United Kingdom. It is phrased in language almost identical. A word has been added. The word is "further." This may, or may not, represent progress.

One may assume that this resolution, like the truce proposal, emanated from the consultations of the permanent members of the Security Council. The permanent members, it will be recalled, were asked by the Security Council:

"To consult and to inform the Security Council regarding the situation with respect to Palestine and to make, as a result of such consultations, recommendations to it regarding the guidance and instructions which the council might usefully give to the Palestine commission with a view of implementing the resolution of the General Assembly."

Up to this moment, no such suggestion has been made to the Security Council as to how the Assembly's resolution may be implemented. If there were any consultations on this particular subject, and if any conclusions were reached on their result, these have not been reported.

The Jewish Agency, for its part, did submit to the conference of the four permanent members of the Council its concrete proposals regarding the steps that might be taken by the Security Council with a view to insuring the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution. For the sake of the record and for the information of the nonpermanent members of the Security Council, I would, with the permission of the president, read here the text of these pro-

posals, made on March 12, 1948. They were as follows:

"1. To assume the responsibilities assigned to it in the General Assembly's plan for implementation.

"2. To determine any attempt to alter, by force, the Assembly's resolution as a 'threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression.'

"3. To determine that a threat to the peace does exist in view of actions by certain Arab governments.

"4. To call upon Arab member states to stop recruiting and organizing armed forces to resist the Assembly's resolution, and to withdraw their nationals already sent for this purpose.

"5. To call upon Arab states to stop their warlike propaganda and incitement contrary to unanimous resolution of Assembly against warmongering (October 12, 1947).

"6. To call upon mandatory power to prevent the entry of unauthorized foreign forces and to expel those already in Palestine.

"7. To instruct the Palestine Commission to proceed with all speed with all phases of implementation, with special priority to the establishment of Provincial Councils of government and the organization and equipment of militias.

"8. To call upon Member States to offer arms to parties cooperating with the UN Resolution and to withhold them from those defying it.

"9. To empower the Palestine Commission to take all steps which may assist in the maintenance of peace in Jerusalem."

These were the proposals which Dr. Silver put forward on our behalf at our meeting with the four permanent members of the Security Council. The Jewish agency is not aware whether this nine-point program was ever discussed.

In motivating his counsels of inaction to the Security Council, the representative of the United States has stated that it has been found impossible to implement the General Assembly's resolution by peaceful means. One may search the text of the resolution of the General Assembly in vain for any provision, express or implied, that unless it can be carried out peacefully it must remain inoperative. Threats of violence against implementation reechoed in the General Assembly and in the ad hoc committee on the Palestine question in the course of the discussions. They resounded till the very last moment before the voting. The General Assembly adopted its historic decision in the teeth of these threats. If it had intended to retreat and drop the plan when confronted by an attempt to resist it by force, what was the meaning of the express and emphatic provisions included in the resolution regarding the duties of the Security Council to take specific action if faced with such an attempt?

Yet the fact that the Assembly did not set peaceful implementation as a prerequisite by no means signifies that the implementation of the plan could not be carried out peacefully. What is undeniable is that the peaceful implementation of the plan would inevitably have been gravely jeopardized—as it has indeed been jeopardized—by the absence of an adequate force to back it up. But since when has the building up and maintenance of an armed force to buttress peace, national or international, become morally approbrious or politically unacceptable? History abounds with instances, of which the most tragic is the position of the democracies in 1939, when lack of force in defense of peace became the direct cause of war.

What has happened insofar as the partition plan in Palestine is concerned? A special international force to insure its implementation was not provided. The force which is in Palestine today by virtue of an international dispensation—the British Army—has refused to cooperate in the execution of the plan. Its very passivity served as a most powerful encouragement to the forces of disorder. But the role of the United Kingdom in the present Palestine crisis has not been purely passive. It is not merely that the United Kingdom as the mandatory power has chosen administratively to obstruct the plan. Its political attitude had more far-reaching and more calamitous effects. The policy of the United Kingdom in the Middle East is based on the active support of the Arab league. The United Kingdom cannot therefore divest itself from responsibility for the militant line of active aggression against the Jews of Palestine and armed defiance of the United Nations authority which its collective ally, the Arab league, has adopted and is steadily pursuing.

On the other hand, as regards arms for the Jewish population, a position of the most glaring inequality was created between the Jews and the Arabs. The United Kingdom has continued to supply arms to the governments of the Arab League, regardless of the fact that those very governments were in turn supplying arms for the anti-United Nations rebellion in Palestine. Only 3 weeks ago the Arab Legion in Palestine received considerable quantities of new British arms. At the same time, the United Kingdom has continued to blockade the shores of Palestine against any importation of arms by the Jews inside the country. Simultaneously armed Arab forces have poured in from outside before the eyes of the British forces which have maintained the role of mere onlookers. The mandatory power disarmed many Palestinian Jews and armed many Palestinian Arabs. Only a few days ago it passed to Arab attackers a quantity of arms which it took away from the Jews.

As to other governments, the United States has instituted an indiscriminate embargo on the exportation of arms to the Middle East, denying arms to the hard-pressed Jews in the same measure as to the Arab aggressors. Certain other governments are reported to be selling arms to the Arabs. The Arabs have seven states. The Jews have none. The Security Council has taken no action either to provide a force in support of the plan or at least to arm those defending it and themselves.

The sordid record of how every proposed step of the Palestine Commission has been impeded and obstructed is too well known to need repetition.

To sum it up, the will to implement the plan peacefully was not forthcoming. In the absence of that will, the way to implementation has not been found.

Yet despite all chicanery and indifference, the stream of life has proved irresistible. What is inherent in the nature of things and in the logic of developments is forcing its way through. Partition and the establishment of a Jewish state are actually in progress. The mandatory regime is disintegrating. The vacuum created thereby cannot but be filled. A new regime has already been born and is growing in the womb of the old. The Jewish state, potentially and actually, is an organic, integral part of Palestine. Come what may, the Jews of Palestine are determined to obtain the necessary arms and defend themselves and their state. Self-preservation and responsibility for the future of the Jewish people dictate their course of action. They have no other choice.

It is at this stage that the United States delegation has come forward with the proposal that a special session of the Assembly be called again to consider the problem of Palestine. It has been made clear, although the draft resolution itself is silent on this point, that what it would propose in the special session is a plan for a temporary trusteeship, without prejudice to the character of the final political settlement.

Our attitude toward this proposal has already been concisely stated, both in the immediate reaction of our representative at the Security Council and in the declaration adopted jointly by the Jewish Agency for Palestine and the National Council of Palestine Jews in Tel Aviv.

Trusteeship means denial or at least postponement of independence. We believe that we are ripe for independence. So are the Arabs. We challenge anyone to prove that we are not. We have passed the threshold of statehood. We refuse to be thrown back.

The United States Government cannot but be aware that the idea of trusteeship for Palestine has been thoroughly discussed by the UNSCOP and rejected by that body. Here is what the UNSCOP had to say in its unanimous recommendation II:

"Although sharply divided by political issues, the peoples of Palestine are sufficiently advanced to govern themselves independently.

"The Arab and Jewish peoples, after more than a quarter of a century of tutelage under the mandate, both seek a means of effective expression for their national aspirations.

"It is highly unlikely that any arrangement which would fail to envisage independence at a reasonably early date would find the slightest welcome among either Arabs or Jews."

The UNSCOP also pointed out in its comment to the unanimous recommendation III that a transitional period "would in all likelihood only serve to aggravate the present difficult situation in Palestine unless it were related to a specific and definitive solution, which would go into effect immediately upon the termination of that period."

But the United States Government, through its Chief Executive, has declared that partition still remained the ultimate goal of its Palestine policy and that the proposed temporary trusteeship was designed merely to pave the way for its peaceful achievement. One looks in vain for consistent reasoning to explain this deviation from the original program. If the reason for abandoning partition as an immediate objective is armed opposition, why should that opposition not apply to a trusteeship the only purpose of which is to serve as an intermediary stage leading toward partition in the future? If the Security Council capitulates to violence, why should not violence press its advantage further? Does not aggression feed on appeasement? If, on the other hand, what is meant by "eventual" partition is something quite different from what was resolved on November 29, 1947, how can the Jews be expected to submit now to a course calculated eventually to lead to their undoing?

Moreover we note that it is proposed to force a trusteeship upon a country ripe for independence without any assurance that a trustee is available, that means of enforcement can be supplied, that any section of the population will cooperate, that the General Assembly will approve an agreement, or that a working regime can be established by May 15. The charted course of implementation of partition is to be replaced by a leap into the perilous unknown.

At the meeting of the Security Council on March 24 the representatives of France and Canada stated that it would be necessary for them to have more specific knowledge of what was actually involved in the trusteeship proposal before they could commit their governments to support a reconsideration of the Palestine question based on the trusteeship idea. It is therefore surprising that not a single one of the crucial and intricate questions raised by trusteeship has been elucidated so far by the United States delegation. The second draft resolution still invites the Security Council to set out on a course with no clear destination, and no milestones on the way.

It is not too late to return to the path clearly traced by the General Assembly's resolution. That path represents the product of 8 months' continuous constructive international thinking. The reversal of the

process can only lead to chaos and to a crisis of confidence in the United Nations the results of which are incalculable. A clock may not be turned so sharply backwards without injury to its mechanism. The General Assembly of the United Nations, which is so precious an instrument for the peace and progress of mankind, should not be exposed to this rejection of its judgment and undermining of its authority.

In conclusion, I beg leave to call the attention of the Council to one specific problem of a most critical urgency—a problem which has a direct bearing on the question of truce. I refer to the situation in Jerusalem and to the responsibilities of the United Nations for the immunity, peace, and welfare of that holy city and its environs.

Under the plan adopted by the General Assembly a special international regime under the United Nations Trusteeship Council was decreed for Jerusalem. The exclusion from the Jewish State of Jerusalem with its unique historic associations for the Jewish people and the central place it occupies in its tradition and modern life was a most painful sacrifice. Eloquent appeals were made to the Jewish Agency during the Assembly session by representatives of powers big and small to realize the transcendent importance of Jerusalem to the entire civilized world and to let the city's universal associations take precedence over its predominantly Jewish character. In deference to an overwhelming consensus of world opinion the Jewish Agency accepted the idea of an international regime for Jerusalem. Since then the Jewish Agency has cooperated actively with the Trusteeship Council in helping to formulate a statute for Jerusalem as provided for in the Assembly's resolution. In thus subordinating Jewish claims to the fervently expressed interest of the Christian world, the Jewish Agency confidently expected that the United Nations would take all the steps necessary to secure the objectives which aroused such strong and widespread support in the General Assembly. It is tragic to record what has in fact happened.

The mandatory power has allowed the control of the old city of Jerusalem to slip into the hands of armed Arab bands and has taken no effective action to prevent the approaches to the city from being likewise dominated by Arab forces. Commanders appointed by the Arab High Committee, i. e. the Mufti, now control access to the gates of the Holy City and to the Holy Places. The Arab Higher Committee has recently announced its determination to use force against any attempt to establish Jerusalem as an international city, held by the United Nations in trust for mankind.

The cruel historic paradox which now threatens the fate of Jerusalem is not apparently realized by the civilized world. After centuries of neglect and depredation Jerusalem was conquered in 1917 by the British and Australian forces. The conquest ushered in a period of civilized rule for Jerusalem which has now lasted three decades. Jews formed the majority of the population of Jerusalem even before the British mandate. Today they are 100,000 out of 160,000 inhabitants. As the mandate now draws to an end, instead of coming under an international regime which would maintain the civilized standards of its government, Jerusalem seems about to fall, as most of its holy places have already fallen, into the clutches of the most fanatical and impious elements in the country.

One of the two henchmen of the Mufti, now in command, Sheikh Yasin Bakri, had boasted in public of his prowess in sniping at Jewish funeral parties on their way to the hallowed cemetery on the Mount of Olives. He has been photographed by Cairo newspapers in the act of directing fire from the walls of the Haram enclosure, the so-called Mosque of Omar. When we see other photographs of this person, photographs which have been submitted to this Council, receiving courtesy visits from the British area commander of Jerusalem, we are forced to assume that he is considered in some quarters as a suitable custodian of the holy sites. He has proclaimed another success: For the first time since Roman days Jewish worshippers are now forcibly prevented from having access to the Wailing Wall, the greatest sanctuary of the Jewish faith. Another agent of the Mufti now in a position of command, Abdul Kader al-Husseini, has a notorious record for his murderous activities during the 1936 rebellion and for his pro-Nazi collaboration during the war. He is now engaged in plans for cutting off the city's water supply and reducing its Jewish population to starvation.

I said that the Jews yielded to the international verdict. They did not yield in favor of Sheikh Bakri or in favor of Abdul Kader al-Husseini. If the international regime is not promptly instituted and effectively enforced, it will soon become a matter of elementary self-preservation for the Jews to do their utmost—maybe their desperate utmost—even alone and unaided, to save Jerusalem from a monstrous tyranny. But in such a case, the city would become a battlefield. It may indeed become a shambles. We consider that the United Nations is most solemnly bound to avert the catastrophe by assuming its responsibilities in Jerusalem, first and foremost the responsibility of insuring law and order and safeguarding access and supplies to the city.

The fate of Jerusalem disproves the assumption that Arab resistance is directed merely against the partition settlement and the Jewish state. Arab violence is the reaction to any policy which recognizes any specific non-Arab interest, whether Jewish or international, in any part of the country. The Jews will do their utmost to insure that this claim to exclusive Arab mastery is defeated in the area of the Jewish state. If the United Nations is unable to assist the Jews in that legitimate endeavor, let the United Nations at least prevent the triumph of Arab defiance of world opinion in Jerusalem, and by the provision of a proper force inaugurate an era of peace and order in a city which is sacred to vast multitudes of civilized mankind.

Increase in Annuities and Pensions Under the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom, in these days of "bundles of billions," that Congress has an opportunity to pass a bill which clearly benefits American citizens and does not cost anybody any money. Such an opportunity is now within our reach.

There is pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce bill No. H. R. 5993. This bill would give to a couple of hundred thousand deserving people money which they need in order to provide themselves with the barest necessities of life. Yet it requires no tax increases, no assessments, no contributions, voluntary or otherwise, on the part of anyone.

H. R. 5993 proposes to increase, by about 20 percent, the deplorably small annuities now being paid to retired railroad workers under the terms of the Railroad Retirement Act. The amounts of those annuities were modest enough in 1937 when they were established. During the intervening 12 years, while prices have skyrocketed, they have become ridiculously, even insultingly, inadequate as the sole income of these earnest, honest folk who gave the best years of their lives to the railroad industry without which America could never have been great.

I am not suggesting that an increase of 20 to 25 percent will bring these retirement pensions to a point where they are truly adequate. I understand, however, that the railroaders themselves prefer to settle for a small increase, that will alleviate to some extent the hardships being suffered by the aged pensioners, because a small increase is all that can be financed by their retirement fund, and they are determined to avoid either increasing taxes or endangering the fund.

Many extravagant demands are constantly being made by pressure groups of one persuasion or another. Rarely do we find a group of people like these who are so sober, sensible, and farsighted that they keep their requests well within the boundaries of reason. When we are fortunate enough to find them, it seems to me we should express our appreciation by granting their requests, especially when, as in this case, the need is unquestioned and the means to fill it are immediately available without further cost to anyone.

I urge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report H. R. 5993 favorably without further delay and prompt enactment by the House.

Women's Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 19, 1948:

WOMEN'S STATUS

Representatives of outstanding women's organizations, labor groups, and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor appeared last week before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in support of the equal status bill. The ultimate objective of this measure is abolishment of legal discriminations against women that are not justified by differences in "physical structure, biological or social function." In our opinion it provides a rational and practicable method of improving the legal status of women, in striking contrast to the proposed equal-rights amendment that would deprive women of essential legislative protection by insisting on complete equality of rights under the law without regard to sex.

It is not a mere coincidence that organizations leading the fight to secure better working conditions for women and free them from unjust social and economic disabilities imposed by law or custom are opposed to the equal-rights amendment. For much of the work that has been done to establish real, as distinguished from illusory, equality between men and women would be swept away by the equal-rights amendment. The equal-status bill, on the other hand, recognizes the need for legal distinctions based on sex and aims at removal of only those discriminatory laws and administrative regulations that reflect an irrational sexual bias.

So much for the ultimate objective of the bill, which, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, could be attained without much difficulty following its enactment. The difficult task, however, is to induce the State governments to revise or abolish laws that discriminate unfairly against women. It seems more than doubtful whether three-fourths of the States would approve the equal-rights amendment if presented for their approval. And if they did so, the Federal Government would be confronted by the formidable task of trying to compel all the States to modify their laws in accordance with general directives. The result would inevitably be to create legal confusion and endless litigation and to arouse profound resentment on the part of State governments because of Federal interference.

No such pressure is contemplated by the equal-status bill. It provides for the establishment of a Commission to study and review Federal and State laws affecting the status of women and to recommend legislation required to bring those laws into conformity with declared policy. The Director of the Women's Bureau, Frieda S. Miller, thinks that the legal situation as to discriminations against women is fairly well known. What is needed is an evaluation of existing laws to determine what changes are essential. If this spade work is well done, a basis will be offered for sound legislative action. The States would remain free to take or leave the Commission's recommendations. But it is our belief that the absence of compulsion would positively encourage the States to abolish laws affecting women's rights that are not in accord with present-day concepts of fairness and genuine equality of opportunity under the law.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial in the Milwaukee Journal, Milwaukee, Wis., bearing on the question of Federal aid to education. Particularly apt therein are the remarks that throw a light on the real discrimination that would result in the enactment of the bill as passed by the Senate under the guise of State option.

Following is the editorial:

FEDERAL SCHOOL-AID ADVANCES

Senate passage of the $300,000,000 Federal school-aid bill will be hailed as a great victory by public-school interests. They have been fighting hard for this a long time. And final passage would mean that public schools, at least, in all States, would get a little Federal money, with the "poorest" States getting the most.

All good Americans must grant the vital importance of improving our public schools.

Total expenditures for education should be increased greatly, no doubt. And a larger share should go into improving schools in the poorer communities, for our least privileged children.

But whether a general Federal school-aid bill is the best and most economical means of promoting these ends and whether this is the proper time for the Federal Government to assume even a little part of a brand-new obligation seems to us extremely doubtful. And even if the Federal Government ought to provide Federal school aid, we are firmly convinced that, in very important respects, the Taft bill is wrong.

The Taft bill promises that there will be no Federal control of schools. But if the Federal Government distributes money to the schools, it must exercise some control—to protect rights of children and also of the taxpayers who provide the money.

The Taft bill evades the issue of aid to parochial and private schools. It would let States decide whether Federal money should go to such schools or their pupils. If this so-called State option is constitutional, it is still wrong. Nonpublic schools and their pupils should enjoy exactly the same benefits, if any, under the Federal laws, regardless of State boundaries.

The Taft bill tolerates the rank discrimination between Negro and white schools in the South. If our Constitution and civil rights mean anything at all, they should mean that Federal money should not be used to perpetuate racial discrimination in our public school systems.

The Taft bill sets up a complicated formula for determining a State's ability to pay for schools and distributes Federal aid on a "per pupil" basis accordingly. "Well to do" States like Wisconsin would get $5 per child of school age while "poor" Mississippi would get $28.50 per child. This takes no account of the wide difference in costs of school operation in different States. The Taft bill also would dole out Federal dollars according to the number of children of school age, regardless of whether they are in public school or any school.

Except for the requirement of very low minimum expenditures, there is nothing in the Taft bill to impel States to greater local effort, better educational standards, or more economic administration. It might even help perpetuate uneconomic units and procedures.

The Taft bill is both dishonest and unfair. Its provisions are equivocal and evasive in dealing with fundamental issues. That is because it was fostered and fashioned by politicians seeking favor, and by interests obsessed with the need for Federal dollars for public schools, including teachers.

When the time comes, therefore, the House should decisively kill this measure. If Federal aids are really essential to a first-rate public-school system in America, the table should be cleared and a new start made, with everyone's cards turned face up and the public watching every play.

Europe's Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Europe's Economic Progress," which appeared in the Exeter News Letter, published in Exeter, N. H., April 15, 1948:

EUROPE'S ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Recent congressional action on the European recovery plan makes it interesting to note the findings of the Economic Survey Commission as to the trend of European recovery at the present.

The report of the Commission indicates that the European economic picture is looking up, that not including Germany and Russia industrial recovery on the Continent has reached 99 percent of the level of 1938 along the lines most necessary to reconstruction, notably in the output of coal, iron, and steel construction.

The survey in agriculture is not quite as optimistic, bread grains in the crop year of 1946–47 being only 75 percent of the volume before the war, and eggs and dairy products up to 70 percent of the prewar level. The survey notes, however, that European recovery, agricultural and industrial, by the end of 1947 is ahead of the recovery which followed World War I. In some places, notably in Norway and Sweden and in Belgium and Ireland, the survey shows that goods available for consumption have already reached a total greater than before the war.

The other side of the picture shows Europe's population in spite of the war increased about 12,000,000, that much of the increased production is being used to make up plant and equipment deficiencies resulting from the war, and that imports are greatly exceeding exports, making for an increasing and dangerous dollar deficit with the rest of the world, principally the United States. The trend is such that European countries cannot hope to sell anywhere near enough to pay for what they buy.

The over-all picture tends to show that most of the European nations are not in the helpless state that has generally been believed.

Oleomargarine Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
Chicago, April 20, 1948.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company is engaged not only in the business of slaughtering, processing, and selling meat and meat products but also in the production and sale of butter and oleomargarine. We are, in fact, one of the largest manufacturers of margarine in the United States today. Our interest in the controversy over the present oleomargarine laws is therefore not one-sided. We stated in a communication to Congressman ANTON J. JOHNSON, of Illinois, several weeks ago that we are not asking for repeal of any of the present laws relating to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. In our opinion, looking at the laws from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. In order that you may know the reasons for our position we shall set them forth. They are as follows:

1. The present laws are not unfair or unjust.

(a) The dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws. They protect his market for butterfat against unfair competition from an imitation product. Any businessman is entitled to protection against imitation of his manufactured merchandise.

(b) The consumer is not hurt by these laws.

The tax of one-fourth cent per pound on oleomargarine not colored yellow is small. The license fees which must be paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and the manufacturer are also small when passed on to the consumer, as they undoubtedly are. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleomargarine per week, every week of the year (156 pounds per year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents per year, less than 1 cent per week.

By comparison, the cost of adding vitamin A to oleomargarine is more than three times the amount of the tax, and the cost of advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from four to seven times the amount of the tax.

There is no reason why oleomargarine cannot be served white, which is its natural manufactured color, but if the consumer desires to color it, modern packaging enables her to do so without waste of time or product.

Nor have the present laws had any detrimental effect on our national diet or nutrition. Our per capita consumption of fats has increased steadily during the past several decades, rising from 39 pounds in 1912 to 51 pounds in 1941. It declined slightly during the war, but since then has been rising again.

When all elements are carefully considered it can be stated with fairness that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him. Among other things, we can thank these laws for placing the oleomargarine industry on its good behavior, and prompting it to use American-produced oils and to improve its product to a point where it approximates the palatability and nutritional equivalency of butter.

(c) The oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

Other industries in food, drugs, clothing, and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to a complete imitation of competing articles and the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color of butter.

(d) Our general economy would be seriously affected by a change in these laws.

The uncertain benefits that might accrue to cotton and soybean farmers are so insignificant compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine that we should all pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them. In 1946 only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income was attributable to oleomargarine. On the other hand, farm income from dairy products was over a hundred times farm income from items attributable to oleomargarine. Even if farm income attributable to oleomargarine were doubled or trebled, it would be small, less than 1 percent. Even for farmers who raised only cotton, but 1.45 percent of their cash farm income in 1946 came from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine. In the 10 leading cotton States income to farmers from dairy products was 27 times as great as income from oleomargarine in the same year.

Farmers in certain States now raise soybeans. Taking this segment of the farming industry alone, but 5 percent of the income they enjoyed from soybeans came from oleomargarine in 1946.

To sum up, actually oleomargarine is not an important outlet for any farm product.

The following is an interesting extract from the booklet entitled "Oleomargarine and the Farmer," recently published by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

"During 1946 American consumers spent over $2,000,000,000 for the primary edible fats—butter, lard, vegetable shortening, and oleomargarine. Out of this $2,000,000,000 of consumers' money the American farmer received over 60 percent or $1,231,747,000, which was divided as follows:

"Cash farm income in 1946

Butter	$638,011,000
Lard	429,647,000
Vegetable shortening	124,712,000
Oleomargarine	39,377,000
Total	1,231,747,000

"Historical facts prove beyond a doubt that the quantity or poundage of fats used by the average American consumer stays about the same from year to year. Fluctuation occurs in the per capita consumption of the individual fats but an increase in the consumption of one fat generally results in an offsetting decline in another."

Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most of their cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.

Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.

2. Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow—in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "Yellow is the 'trade-mark' of butter." Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today), cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached, not because of the Federal laws, but because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject and the record should be set straight.

3. The present 10-cent tax on the sale of yellow oleomargarine reduces the incentive for fraud and assists the Federal authorities in detecting the presence of any considerable quantities that might be palmed off as butter. The monetary incentive to sell yellow oleomargarine at the price of and in the guise of butter is unique in our economy. No other kind of product affords a parallel for comparison. With the quantities of butter sold being so huge and the price spread between butter and oleomargarine so wide, the incentive for fraud is unparalleled. Fraud would undoubtedly be practiced if the present laws were repealed. The frauds which existed when the sale of oleomargarine in this country was unregulated demonstrate this. Oleomargarine being more palatable and nutritious today, deception would be easier.

We should like to make clear at this point that in our opinion the regulatory tax on the retailer is scarcely necessary to effect proper regulation. It could well be removed.

4. Wherever large and healthy farm economies are in existence throughout the world, oleomargarine is under some form of government restriction and regulation. This is true of practically all of the countries of western Europe. In Canada its threat to a healthy economy is considered so serious that the sale of oleomargarine is completely prohibited. It is only during periods of high prices like the present that Canada ever seriously considers modification of its extreme position on oleomargarine.

5. It has been claimed that present oleomargarine laws are a misuse of the Federal taxing power. Actually, only by levying Federal taxes can the Federal Government effectively watch the sale of oleomargarine. The pure food and drug laws are helpless in this regard because they have no jurisdiction over intrastate traffic. However, the Revenue Department can and does enforce the present laws.

We hope that you will study the considerations involved in this butter-oleomargarine controversy and that your decision will not be based upon the exigencies or pressures of the moment, which are transitory.

Sincerely,

F. W. HOFFMAN,
President, the Cudahy Packing Co.

Unity in Military Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., on April 20, 1948:

HAPHAZARD MILITARY PLANNING

After the House of Representatives had voted for an Air Force strength of 70 combat groups, Representative CASE of South Dakota remarked, "This says to Stalin: Stop, look, and listen."

Premier Stalin has probably followed those directions already. If he has, he must have seen in this House action, and the events that led up to it, a demonstration of our military policy and planning which undoubtedly interested him much more than the proposed addition of 15 groups to our air arm.

The President of the United States and Commander in Chief of its armed forces had proposed an air strength of 55 combat groups. The Secretary of the newly created Defense Department had seconded that proposal. But the Secretary of the Air Force had recommended to Congress an air strength of 70 groups.

The House voted for this expansion without any apparent concern for the problem of finding men to operate, service, and administer these extra 15 combat groups. It would take around 75,000 more men to put a 70-group force into the air. But the House has made no move toward any compulsory

procurement of manpower to fill the armed services' thin ranks.

If the Soviet dictator, observing all this, concluded that the United States has no real military policy as yet, it is not hard to understand why. If he also concluded that America's new unification of the armed forces was not very unified, there are examples to justify that conclusion.

In fact, it seems pretty clear that the old fights and jealousies are still going on. The day before the House voted, for example, General Bradley, the Chief of Staff, had argued for an Army of 822,000 men before the House Armed Services Committee. Secretary of Defense Forrestal previously had proposed a force of 782,000 men.

The difference of 40,000 between the two figures is not too important. What does seem important is that the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Army cannot reach a compromise with their civilian superior, Mr. Forrestal, on this relatively unimportant figure. It might inspire a little more confidence if they could agree on the size of the Army we need before going to Congress for money to support it.

Several encouraging things are now being done to build up the country's defenses. One is the growing consciousness in Congress that they should built up. But the encouraging things are isolated and uncoordinated.

The lack of coordination is visible all along the line. Mr. Truman came to Congress a month ago to ask that military preparations be stepped up, but it is clear that the blueprint of those preparations is not finished.

Congress is showing more enthusiasm than wisdom at the moment. The Members lop off $4,800,000,000 of tax revenue before a budget is set up, and then the House votes two-thirds of that missing amount for airplanes alone.

Two costly wars may have taught our Government the need of being prepared. But it seems that the equal need of unity and planning in that preparation is a lesson that has still to be learned.

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, we hear it frequently suggested that, in order to avoid the horrors of war, our Nation should constantly urge those nations indicating opposition to us to confer with us in order to settle our controversies by reason instead of resorting to the use of force. We gladly approve every effort for peaceful adjustment. We know too well, however, how often sincere suggestions for peaceful settlements have been spurned. Instead of acting in harmony with the principle of right and fairness to all men, human beings who constitute the governments of nations are tempted constantly, as of old, to appeal to the selfishness and prejudices of their followers in order to have their support for continued power. Such governments urge policies and programs which would seem to give selfish, unfair advantages to their followers, who, however, finally learn that there is no advantage but instead great harm to them. All too often the people of such countries are deceived by such appeals to their selfish natures.

With a great blare of trumpets and wild appeals to the vanity of the people, the use of force, the resort to war, is urged by hypocritical leaders. The people are told that it is a holy war and that they must engage in it with all earnestness.

In order to prevent such terrible conflicts, right-minded men and women have long endeavored to devise means of assuring settlement of disputes on the basis of reason and justice. Many attempts have been made to organize the nations of the world into associations and leagues to prevent the repetition of wars, but thus far without success. The reason for the failure of all past efforts, it seems to me, is very clear. While, of course, it is our duty to help assure, if possible, the success of such plans as the League of Nations, the United Nations, and other like movements, I have, nevertheless, recognized the fact that they have lacked what is necessary to prevent disaster. The lack has been very apparent. They have all been associations of nations which, for the enforcement of their decisions, have depended upon the military assistance of member nations. The member nations naturally hesitate to give military support in such cases. The world will have the same experience with all plans for mere leagues and confederations.

There must be a world government. That world government must be established as an independent organization, and, being world-wide in its jurisdiction, its decisions must be absolutely supreme and final in every case in which it exercises its constitutional authority.

All the doubts and fears now expressed in regard to the establishment of a world government were urged likewise in regard to our National Government, established under the name of the United States of America. The 13 independent governments which hedped to frame the Constitution of the United States did not all approve the new Government when it was finally approved by the Constitutional Convention. Time and experience have shown, however, that the doubters were wrong. So it will be in regard to a world government when it is firmly established. That government, like all governments, regardless of the extent of their jurisdiction, should be established on the principles of democracy. The word "democracy" is derived from the two Greek words, demos, meaning "the people," and kratein, "to rule," and therefore means the rule of the people. This is the way in which a man's rights and true dignity may be fully respected.

The world government should have a constitution which would strictly limit its authority to the business of preserving and maintaining peace among all the nations of the world. It should not be allowed to interfere with the domestic policies of any nation. The world government should have a governing body consisting of a number of representatives from each country of the world, bearing the same proportion to the total membership of such body as the proportion which the population of such country bears to the population of the whole world, just as our House of Representatives is constituted.

The international government should be furnished with a force sufficient to overwhelm any nation or combination of nations which may refuse obedience to the constitutional decisions of the world government. All of the nations of the world should be prohibited from having military, naval, or any other kind of force, except a police force large enough to preserve domestic order within the boundaries of such country. A force sufficient to preserve domestic order is all that should be tolerated in the possession of any nation.

It should also be made an offense against the constitution and laws of the world government for any nation to provide for the conscription of men.

The manpower of the world government's military force, provided to compel complete obedience to the world government's decisions, should consist of volunteers. Such volunteers should be paid a salary or wage sufficiently large to attract men of high quality to service in the military or police force of the world government. In order to avoid, as much as possible, all jealousies and rivalries, the persons constituting the military force should be selected from each nation in numbers bearing the same proportion to the total force as the nation's population bears to the total population of the world.

In order that prompt action may be taken to prevent trouble from arising, the world government should have the right to send investigators into any country in the world where it has reason to believe that a violation of its regulations or decisions is occurring or is about to occur. Any invasion or violation of the territory of one nation by another should invoke immediate action by the world government. The offending nation would be ordered to stop, whether or not it might feel justified in its action.

In our municipal affairs the police prevent the use of force by one person against another, whether or not the person with whom the police interferes feels that he is right in regard to the matter in controversy. So it must be with groups of individuals called nations. Their disputes must be settled on the same principle as disputes between persons, and that is by the rule of reason.

It will be noted that I have not suggested any association or confederation among nations. It would be useless to do so. It is urged, by those who still delight in appealing to the vanity of their countrymen, that the proposal I have explained constitutes a surrender of sovereignty on the part of nations, including our own. Those urging this objection beat their breasts in righteous indignation, and argue that we must exercise absolute control in the settlement of disputes in which our country may be involved.

The fact is, that according to the principles of the most scientific form of government, namely, democracy, there is no surrender of sovereignty at all. The basic and ultimate unit of democracy, in whatever jurisdiction, is the individual.

The individual has rights which are inborn in him. Governments cannot create rights. They can only recognize existing rights, rights existing according to the laws of nature.

Thomas Jefferson said: "The God that gave us life, gave us freedom." That certainly supports the contention I have just been making, that the rights of the individual exist and did exist before human governments were ever established. It is proper, therefore, that the individual should regard himself as having important rights as a member of the smallest kind of government, namely the municipal government.

The rights and obligations of persons residing within the small unit of government called the municipality are of importance generally only to the people residing therein. Next we have, in the order of importance, the state or province, and the individual has certain specific rights and obligations in common with all other individuals residing within the boundaries of such state or province. Finally, the individual has rights in common with all individuals in the world, which can only be assured and upheld by a world government receiving its authority directly from all of the individuals in the world, acting as citizens of the world.

The exercise of his individual rights by one of the world's population would have as much force as the exercise of his rights as a citizen of a small community. His rights and obligations as a citizen of the world have been ignored heretofore, and it is now called surrender of national sovereignty because it is proposed to assert rights that existed eternally; but that, nevertheless, does not make it such a surrender.

The establishment of a government such as I have tried briefly to explain would, without the slightest doubt, assure the permanent peace of the world. I must say with all earnestness to you, my friends, that no more important duty, no more sublime cause, ever appealed for your earnest and enthusiastic support.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States guarantees equal opportunity to all of our people. We are failing to provide that equal opportunity to the children of America. There are wide differences in the inherent wealth of the 48 States. Many of them are unable to support and sustain adequate educational facilities in primary and secondary grades.

There is no question but that it is a responsibility and a legitimate function of the Federal Government to take immediate steps to assist our State school systems in adjusting this grave inequity. I do not believe any country in the world has a higher standard of teaching or a more loyal group of public servants than the school teachers of the United States. It is shameful that the average pay of school teachers last year was less than $1,500. No wonder that many of them have had to carry additional employment or to give up teaching entirely in order to make a decent living for themselves and their own families. These are the people in whose hands lies the great responsibility of educating our children. Their responsibility is certainly greater than that of domestic servants or day laborers, yet in many instances they earn less. The teachers of this country must be paid adequately if they are to perform their responsibilities effectively.

A reasonable level of compensation must be established for the teaching profession for another reason of equal importance. At the present time few are entering teachers colleges and normal schools for the obvious reason that to do so is simply to train oneself for a profession offering little more than poverty. We must make the profession of teaching attractive enough financially to keep up a steady flow of intelligent young people into this important work.

As an example of the unequal educational opportunities between various States you will find that per capita income in California was $1,429, Tennessee $649, West Virginia $688. The number of children from 5 to 17 years old per thousand population in California in 1943 was 172, Tennessee 249, and West Virginia 281. For education of children equaling that which California can offer, Tennessee is faced with the insuperable problem of raising three times as much money per capita, and West Virginia three and one-half times as much.

Facts about illiteracy in this country uncovered during the war were shocking. Nearly half of the rejections by selective service in August 1945 were for education deficiency. At a time of our greatest need for healthy, intelligent manpower it is estimated that the equivalent of 20 combat divisions were unable to serve because of illiteracy and educational disqualifications.

Knowledge and skill of our people is fundamental to our economic security. On it depends the inherent strength of our democracy. Our standard of living is directly related to education, for it is the prime factor which determines the level of income in a country.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2188, asking for appropriation of funds to assist the States in financing the education programs in public elementary and secondary schools. This bill calls for equalizing educational opportunity and I will continue to work diligently for its passage and the passage of other similar bills which have been submitted. The Taft bill has passed in the Senate, and a Federal-aid education bill has been reported by the Subcommittee on Education of the Committees on Education and Labor in the House. This legislation should be passed in the House so a Federal-aid-to-education bill can be put into effect immediately. Both of these bills properly provide that administration of education must be left with the State, and it is my firm opinion that it must remain this way.

The country needs educated men and women to shape and direct a competent and efficient government. Equal opportunity to learn is the birthright of every child born in America.

I am sincerely interested in having the teachers of my State, parents of school children, and those engaged directly and indirectly in our educational affairs express their own opinions as to ways and means of improving the situation. I have asked them to answer the following questions for me so that I can be better guided in my work for improvement in education.

1. What do you feel is a reasonable minimum teaching wage? _____
2. What is the total length of the school term in your school at present? _____
3. What are some of the improvements you feel are immediately necessary in our school system? _____
4. Do you believe, as I do, that Federal aid is a necessary positive means of improving our education in primary and secondary schools? _____

Name _____ Address _____
School_____

I will sincerely appreciate any additional comments you may wish to make. _____

Communist Links With the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, a very enterprising reporter attached to the Washington office of the St. Paul Pioneer-Press has been remarkably successful in ferreting out some vital information reflecting certain Communist links with the United States State Department. The reporter is Mr. Gustaf Nordin and his interesting findings are now running serially in the newspapers which he represents. Some of the disclosures reflected in these articles are most startling. They challenge the ingenuity of the Congress to take immediate action looking toward the overhauling and revamping in our entire intelligence system. Because I know that the information contained in these articles is of great interest to the Nation and of vital importance to the Membership of Congress, I include the first of these articles appearing in last Sunday's St. Paul Pioneer-Press as part of my remarks:

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The text of a telegram prepared by the late President Roosevelt for transmittal to Chungking, China, reached Moscow before the actual telegram left Washington in April 1945, according to material tucked away in a confidential House committee report dealing with State Department employees.

This disclosure comes under case history No. 52, that of 1 of 108 individuals termed "poor security risks," and whose operations have been scrutinized by investigators that included "the best FBI operatives" in the business.

The cases are reported in a closely guarded document in the files of the House Appro-

priations Committee. Names of Federal employees are replaced by code names such as "No. 52" or "E–9," but pertinent details are revealed on each. No. 52, for example, is described as a former ranking official, now occupying a high diplomatic post.

A State Department investigator wrote the following memo pertaining to No. 52 on October 25, 1947:

"In connection with my investigation into affairs of the Institute of Pacific Relations, I am in receipt of information which appears to be most incriminating against a State Department personality. My informant stated that (X–6) a special emissary for Franklin D. Roosevelt has divulged the following story and that, furthermore, information relating to this incident is in possession of United States Senator X–7.

"In April 1945, X–6 told my informant he was in London and was to depart shortly for Teheran. A few minutes before his plane left the airport, 50 miles from London, X–8, a high official in OSS, arrived at the airport seeking him.

"The OSS official told the President's representative that a telegram which had been prepared by President Roosevelt to send to Chungking, China, had been 'picked up at Moscow.'

"An investigation had precluded the possibility that the leak of information could have occurred in Washington because the information in the telegram reached Moscow before the actual telegram left Washington.

"The OSS official stated that a high official of the State Department (No. 52) had been observed contacting a man in Washington, and that this man, after leaving No. 52, had been followed to the Soviet Embassy. The OSS official was clearly disturbed by this occurrence and warned (the emissary) against divulging information of a secret nature which might reach No. 52."

A raincoat believed to belong to No. 52 was found on September 28, 1946, by guards in the men's room of the State Department Building, according to the secret report.

"In the pockets were papers which were believed to be those of a Russian language student. The subject does not know Russian and is not studying Russian and there is apparently no explanation for the papers found in his coat pocket," the agent reports.

The report concludes with the statement that "This case is in a pending status."

No. 52 is just one of several high-ranking State Department officials, several on the policy-making level, who are listed among the 108 security-risk cases on file with the House Appropriations Committee.

No. 50 was, until July 25, 1947, with an important policy board. He is described as a New Dealer interested in communism only as an experiment. He is reported to have had a mental break-down at one time and is suspected of another.

A penciled note in the file addressed to "David" and signed "M" dated January 28, 1947, states, "Place (No. 50) before committee as security hazard—possible break and embarrassment if Congress gets on this."

Also mentioned is No. 51. The report says he "is employed in the office of an assistant secretary." It is developed that he is supposedly friendly with "E–8," who is "very closely tied with Soviet espionage agents" and "E–9," who "had a very bad record of Communist Party connections."

"E–9, whose file reflects that he was without any doubt an active Communist, was employed by FEA in 1942. From there he was transferred to the auxiliary foreign service."

The report adds, "A memo of November 27, 1946, pointed out that No. 51 was pushing this individual's appointment and possibly he and this individual were both associates of E–10, an alleged Russian espionage agent."

A ranking official in the office of financial and development policy is under investigation, but, except for association with alleged Communists and collaboration on an article with a former editor of New Masses, the security information is very sketchy.

Another in high position—No. 54—was affiliated with the magazine Amerasia from May 1937 to November 1941. This is the magazine which was the center of a State Department probe of the use of Far Eastern State Department secret material. The associates of No 54 have included questionable persons.

The report quotes a memorandum in his file, however, in which the security officer wrote: "It is not believed by this office that the information at hand raises a reasonable doubt as to (No. 54's) loyalty to the United States, and, accordingly, security clearance is recommended."

The House agent reports: "There is no indication that further investigation is contemplated in this case."

No. 55, an employee in the Division of Internal Security, and her husband were cited in 1941 by a Senate investigating committee as members of the Communist Party. Another Government investigative agency reported likewise last September, adding that "the subject had been recently contacting a subject of a Soviet espionage case. This investigation is in a pending status."

No. 56, a special assistant to an Assistant Secretary of State, a student of Britain's Laborite, Harold J. Laski, contributed an article in 1937 to the publication, Science and Society, which on its face says "a Marxian Quarterly." He is listed as a friend of E–11, a suspect in a Russian espionage case.

Another important official in the Division of Occupied Areas, whose wife is with the Division of Research and Intelligence, is listed under case No. 59.

The security office late in 1946 said it had insufficient information to warrant their dismissal, adding: "However, in view of the fact that both are known to be close associates of individuals linked with Soviet espionage activities, this office will continue to keep their cases under active consideration."

The wife "was approved for top secret material" February 11, 1947, because "if there is not enough to dismiss them, then they cannot be denied access to top secret material."

An employee of the Foreign Service, No. 63, comes in for this comment in the report: "A memo * * * indicates that another governmental agency had received information that he was a recognized section leader of the Communist underground. A subsequent check with this agency (September 30, 1947) developed that in 1939, when he was with the Foreign Service Journal, he had a small Communist Party unit meeting in his home. The source of this information said that he was a leader of this Communist underground unit. His investigation is pending."

We Must Maintain Adequate Service to the Veterans in Counseling and Selective Placement for Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 last, at the regular Tuesday meeting of the New Milwaukee Aerie, No. 0137, there was adopted an important resolution showing a strong sentiment in my area for the maintenance in our Veterans' Administration of the service of counseling and selective placement for veterans' employment.

Following is the resolution:

Whereas counseling and selective placement is important in the Employment Services, Veterans' Administration, and vocational rehabilitation if the veteran is to receive maximum consideration and benefits; and

Whereas developments to date indicate that economy efforts in Federal administration have not given full consideration of the problems of the veteran that in our opinion these problems deserve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the veteran's affairs committee of New Milwaukee Aerie, 0137, Fraternal Order of Eagles, That we petition our Senators and Congressmen to support legislation that will give the veteran full protection and consideration as previously promised by the Government of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That specifically real effort be made to maintain an adequate status in the Veterans' Administration, and that the Employment Services be strengthened and maintained as real employment services and not allowed to disintegrate into unemployment services; and be it

Resolved further That counseling and selective placement services be maintained as necessary to the proper solution of the problems of the veterans of the United States of America.

European Recovery Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article on the European recovery plan by Ernest E. Williams, which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel on April 15:

GOOD EVENING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Today's Good Evening is written by Staff Writer Ernest E. Williams in the absence from the city of its regular conductor, Editor Clifford B. Ward.)

(By Ernest E. Williams)

The compromise European recovery plan has become law and soon dollars and beans will wing their way to Europe nominally to feed the hungry, actually to implement an American policy of intervention.

There probably is no American citizen who would begrudge aid to a starving European. That part of the plan is all on the credit side of the ledger.

But, this country's tacit policy of intervention brings again forcibly to the fore one of the most terrible political ironies of our time. That irony is inherent in our apparent determination to bolster forces of reaction in Greece and perhaps to a lesser extent in Italy. It is the same trap we fell in during the war with our policy toward Darlan in Africa and toward the questionable Franco regime in Spain.

We find ourselves in the indefensible position of building a bulwark not for the people of these countries but for the interests.

Why is Russian communism rampant in Europe today? It's not because of money and goods used as a tempting bait held out

to helpless people. It can't all be due to power pressure. It must, in the final analysis, be due to a job of selling ideas, of seemingly selling the people on tangible good to be derived from a political philosophy.

And therein lies our tragedy.

With our emphasis on money, foodstuff, and material, we are missing the boat on an opportunity to sell the most vital political philosophy of this era and of all time.

That philosophy is democracy and the phrase "of the people, by the people, and for the people," its most perfect enunciation.

We in America too often forget that we have more than material wealth, more than industrial strength and running water. We have a tangible, salable item in the American political philosophy of democracy.

Russian communism is not a new political concept. The dreams of Karl Marx have been hammered into a distortion, which when held to the mirror of history, reflect an image no different from the reaction of Italian fascism under Mussolini, of German nazism under Hitler, of the Roman Empire under Nero.

But American democracy is just as unique, just as vibrant a political philosophy in the world today as it was when first enunciated by our founding fathers in the eighteenth century.

It's a political philosophy that can be sold. It is one that must be sold.

Yes, let's load those ships to Europe with dollars and beans. But let's reserve a lot of cargo space for weapons to implement our battle for our own political philosophy. Not weapons in the sense of atomic bombs or death-dealing aircraft, but weapons made of democratic ideas forged in the tested fires of American history.

Aid for the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement of Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., at a hearing of the Interstate Commerce Commission April 6, 1948, on the question of granting drivers' licenses to amputees.

Mr. Strachan very ably makes the point that in the face of recent improvements in artificial limbs and the advances in the training in their use it is time for relaxation of Interstate Commerce regulations forbidding qualified amuptee drivers to obtain permits. Surely it should be the aim of the Federal Government to lessen the barriers to employment for these individuals rather than to raise additional ones.

The statement follows:

My name is Paul A. Strachan. I am national president and founder of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, an organization composed of citizens who are blind, deaf, hard of hearing, arthritics, cardiacs, amputees, polios, diabetics, epileptics, spastics, and others disabled by congenital defect, injury, or disease.

Our stand on the matter under consideration is, that, with proper safeguards to public safety, by means of proper examination of the individual, we contend that many amputees are perfectly capable, willing, and able to drive cars or trucks, in interstate commerce or otherwise, without danger to the public, or themselves.

Our federation has never advocated a policy which, in effect, could in any way be detrimental to the public interest, and we are just as much, if not in fact more concerned with public safety than is the ICC because, many of our people, being handicapped, are easy prey to road hogs, weekend and drunken drivers, etc., and, naturally, we have a deep concern for their welfare, as well as that of the nonhandicapped.

Therefore, our effort now is to endeavor to have a fair appraisal made of the abilities and capacities of the individual. On that point there are a number of factors to consider. One, naturally, would be the physical capacity of the individual to perform the work. Another, and possibly more important in its way, is consideration of the general character of the individual as to sobriety, steadiness on the job, and attitude toward the public's welfare.

I have known many amputees, and have watched, closely, for a number of years, development of artificial limbs, orthopedic and prosthetic devices, etc., as well as the various methods of prostheses employed. I want to assert that there is just as much difference between the devices and appliances and the prostheses applied today, and those before World War II, as there is between black and white.

I have not checked, personally, into all States, but I venture that road accidents caused by amputees have been negligible, and, today, there are thousands of amputees driving cars who have never had an accident of any kind.

AFPH is cognizant of the need for careful selection of drivers of cars and trucks, but it is our opinion that, first, the matter should be determined, upon examination by qualified and impartial physicians and others, in the public interest, and, second, that no blanket restriction on the part of ICC, directed to amputees or other types of qualified handicapped people, be continued.

A few months ago the Saturday Evening Post carried an article which pictured graphically the negligence of State licensing boards, and shows that, in many instances, no real examination of would-be drivers had been made, ere a license was issued. It seems to me there should be a general tightening up on the part of these boards, and that they be composed of individuals who would see to it that laxness in examination be abolished, but, that no person be denied the right to drive, or thus earn a living, simply because of some physical handicap.

We know, for example, that partially blinded people should not be permitted to drive; nor should epileptics, diabetics, certain types of cardiacs, and a few others. But, on the other hand, there are many drivers who possess some physical handicap, which is not a factor in safe driving. Among these would be the deaf, hard of hearing, certain types of amputees, polios, etc. We will join any group in promotion of safety campaign, in driving, in that regard, but we will not accede to any generalization that all handicapped people should not be permitted to drive.

Such rules would be unreasonable, discriminatory, unnecessary, and unfeasible. In my letter to Secretary Bartel, of the ICC, concerning Ray S. Johnson, of Bentonville, Ark., whose case, I believe, is responsible for this hearing having been granted, I gave certain illustrations and statistics pertaining to amputees in various types of employment, and I ask that that correspondence, including letters sent to me by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, be placed in the record of these hearings at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, I wish to present as evidence a copy of A Guide for the Placement of the Physically Impaired, issued by the United States Civil Service Commission, wherein will be found a list of several thousands of jobs shown to have been acceptably filled by amputees.

In my letter to Secretary Bartel I pointed out that the ICC cannot ignore the very palpable fact that there are today more than 28,000,000 handicapped people in our midst, and that is a very large segment of our total population. The efforts of our federation have been directed toward developing programs with ways and means to restore these handicapped, insofar as may be possible physically so that they may be able to earn a living. If barriers erected—perhaps in all good faith—8 or 10 years ago prohibit such people even having a chance to earn a living, then we feel that the whole cause of rehabilitation is jeopardized, if not made entirely worthless.

How can you ignore the 3,500,000 veteran disabled, of whom many thousands are amputees, for example? If they are not to be regarded as "safe drivers," then, why did the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom and humanitarianism, enact a statute which gave to every war veteran-amputee and paraplegic, a car? Is it possible that the Congress was so negligent as to the people's safety that, in passing such an act it deliberately invited more accidents? I prefer not to think that. I believe that Congress, as a whole, is more abreast of what has been done in the field of restoration of human beings to working status than is, for instance, the ICC.

I hasten to qualify that last statement by saying I do not believe that the members and staff of ICC, all of whom, no doubt, are eminent and honorable gentlemen, would, in any way, deny the privileges of citizenship—which, certainly, carry with them a right to earn a decent living—to any person, much less an amputee.

But, it is time to revise outworn rules and regulations, based upon the theories, practices, and knowledge of a bygone day. We are, Mr. Examiner, today living in the year 1948—not 1940–41. In the past 7 years, during which time, so I understand, there has been no revision of ICC rules governing these matters, we have seen the whole face of the world changed—and methods, and people, changed with it.

Because of great improvements in treatment, training, application, and use of mechanical devices, artificial limbs, etc., the amputee of today, in my judgment, is at least a 50 percent better man, physically, than was the amputee of 1940. Eminent physicians, therapists, and scientists, as well as manufacturers, have collaborated to develop ways and means to bring that amputee to a higher pitch of physical proficiency than ever dreamed of 8 or 10 years ago. The amputee of today, then, can cut the wood, draw and carry the water, build the fire, erect the buildings, run heavy machinery and, of course, he can drive a car, run a train, or do other useful labor that was not in the picture, at the time the present ICC rules were written.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, M. D., associate editor, New York Times, and former specialist in rehabilitation in the Army Air Forces, who is devoting much effort today toward restoration of the handicapped has written me, respecting my views on this matter, as follows: "I certainly agree with you 100 percent, and feel it is time that some of the archaic regulations should be altered."

We urge that the ICC immediately modify its rulings with respect to amputee drivers, and permit those as stated, who pass suitable and nondiscriminatory examinations, to qualify and receive proper permits to carry on their work.

Commodity Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following communication that I have received from Mr. Dean K. Webster, Jr., treasurer, H. K. Webster Co., Lawrence, Mass.:

APRIL 16, 1948.

WHY CONTINUE COMMODITY PRICE SUPPORTS?

The existing Federal guaranty of price support to certain agricultural commodities at 90 percent of so-called parity was designed to (1) encourage maximum production of food for our armies and allies for the duration of World War II, and (2) provide a cushion against a drastic decline of prices following the war should a condition of overproduction or lack of demand occur within 2 years after termination of hostilities. The termination of hostilities was declared to be as of December 31, 1946, making the termination of price supports of Steagall commodities December 31, 1948. As this date approaches there seems to be no thought in Congress or in United States Department of Agriculture of dropping the idea of Government price supports; all proposals to date seem to assume unquestioned the theory that the United States Government should guarantee agricultural commodity prices at some level. This blind acceptance is reminiscent of Hitler's philosophy that a lie told often enough and emphatically enough soon becomes accepted as the truth.

Without Federal Government now burdened with an astronomical quarter trillion dollar debt, with gigantic annual $40,000,000,000 budgets, with the burden of world leadership, ERP, and no end of military preparation before us, why must we blandly assume Uncle Sam can continue to guarantee prices of commodities indefinitely into the future with untold financial risk? There are commanding reasons why we should terminate price supports at the expiration of our present commitment December 31, 1948.

1. Our agricultural producers are among the most self-reliant and independent entrepreneurs in the whole population. After 5 or 6 years of prosperous agriculture, our farmers have built up considerable financial reserve and are well able to return to their own natural risk of market prices. If ever there will be a time when they can afford to dispense with price guaranties that time is now.

2. The time when subsidy and price support should again be properly considered, if ever, is when a period of disastrously low prices occurs, and when a solution to a dilemma is compelling. Now is most certainly not that time and there is no intelligence today wise enough to predetermine now at what levels price guaranties by Government will solve that future emergency.

3. Extending present price support guaranties or enacting a new scale of guaranties at acceptable lower-price levels will inevitably encourage excess production and hasten the day of burdensome surplus. Dropping all such ideas now (December 31, 1948) may help to postpone that type of emergency, it certainly will not hasten it.

4. The idea of Government subsidy and price guaranty is uneconomic and un-American. It was resorted to for emergency reasons and should be reserved strictly for emergencies. It has no place in our normal peacetime evolution of private enterprise, and production free from Government controls. It inevitably leads to more and more Government controls over production and marketing, so distasteful to our producers.

5. If continued, Government price support of commodities now on the list will surely lead to demand upon demand from producers of every known agricultural commodity, and why not eventually even mining and industrial commodities with equal fairness.

6. The cost of Government and the burden of bureaucracy have reached the point where national solvency as a free democracy begins to be threatened. The time to retrace our steps on measures which will multiply, not reduce, financial burdens and risk to our Federal Government is now. Price supports to commodities carry a future financial risk of astronomical proportions; they should be abandoned until and unless an emergency comparable with the early thirties occurs.

Respectfully yours,

DEAN K. WEBSTER, Jr.

American Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 17, there was held in the city of New Orleans the annual midcontinent business meeting of the Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference, cosponsored by Time-Life International and the city of New Orleans. On that occasion the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] delivered a very able and interesting address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My assignment tonight is to talk about American foreign relations—a subject which usually generates so much gloom that it may refresh you to hear me begin by striking an optimistic note. This optimism springs from the way in which the people of the United States have, in such a very short time, stretched their minds about our foreign relations. Our Nation's status has changed almost overnight from that of a remote young country to that of a great world power. We did not want this to happen. Many of us are still very sorry that it did happen. But the encouraging thing is that, regardless of how much we may dislike being a world power, we can see the facts of international life staring us in the face, and we are governing ourselves accordingly. These facts make an impressive list. Here they are, all 10 of them:

1. We know, for example, that the belief which traditionally grips us after every war that permanent peace will soon be definitely assured has never been a correct belief and is clearly an undependable doctrine today, although we still desire peace as fervently as we ever did and are willing to work and to sacrifice for it more intelligently.

2. We realize that we are no longer safely apart from the fury of modern war, and that, in any future conflagration, our country is sure to have the assault, in the early stages at least, brought directly to our own soil.

3. We are realizing that no kind of world government can ever be possible when what one of the principal parties wants is not government but tyranny—that the Thirteen Original States would never have joined together if Pennsylvania, for instance, had adopted the attitude which Russia manifests today.

4. While so-called peace machineries and charters still have real value and still exert a strong hold on the imagination of many Americans, we are seeing how dangerous it is to set up your infant peace organization before you have done the tough work of signing the peace treaties and thereby settling the questions left unsettled by the war.

5. We are learning that in the present test of strength with Russia it does not pay to run away. In fact, he who runs away often gets shot in the back.

6. Most of us appreciate the fact that we no longer face the question of whether or not we will meddle in foreign affairs. Unlike some of our Presidential possibilities, Uncle Sam is a candidate at this very moment, whether he wants to be or not, in the Italian elections which take place the day after tomorrow.

7. Although many of us are still headstrong and outspoken, we are finding out more and more that it is not enough for us to say and to do what we think is right regardless of the opinions of others. We must exercise enough restraint so that if an overt act does come, it is they and not we who will have committed it—so that it will be we and not they who have the undisputed moral leadership.

8. Indeed, most Americans instinctively realize that it is not in our interests to "pull out" and, as the phrase goes, "let the world stew in its own juice." We sense the fact that in international affairs it is well that there should be, in time of peace, nations with interests which are common to ours and that you are better off, in time of war, if you have allies. It may be that fate will be against us and that we will find ourselves thrown out of the world continent of Europe, Asia, and Africa. To me that would be dangerous and tragic in the extreme, and I do not think it is going to happen. But if it did happen to us, I hope that we would not take counsel of our fears, that we would pocket our losses—heavy as they would have been—and would go ahead. But we would assuredly be vastly better off if this did not occur.

9. Because we hope that there will be foreign nations who have strong common interests with us, most of us have come to the conclusion that it would be a splendid thing if the people of western Europe would voluntarily integrate themselves—economically, militarily, and, perhaps, some day, politically. I say "voluntarily" because of the many attempts to unify Europe by force under one ruler—the most recent version of which seems to be threatening now. But without applying pressure which would be resented, Americans do have the right to hope that Europe will integrate. We can extend our help when Europe asks for it. It is clear to the everyday man in Europe—and Time's public-opinion survey shows this belief—that as separate little countries the old nations are poor and weak, whereas, united, they can be prosperous and strong. They can indeed with their more than 200,000,000 productive people become a real power in the world. It is well that the ERP bill clearly implies that further appropriations from Congress will depend on the extent to which Europe has unified herself.

Looking a little into the future, we may soon have before us a proposal to extend aid in the form of military supplies to a western European armed force. If this force has a unified command and an agreed-to plan assigning definite tasks to members of this force in the event of an emergency, such aid may be a wonderful investment in future peace.

10. As a result of our expensive experience in many a foreign "rat hole"—that is, with many a foreign loan which failed—we have learned the lesson that we cannot possibly accept the moral responsibility for feeding the whole world for the very simple reason that we are not rich enough. It is therefore far better for the world and for the United States to invest in recovery rather than to spend for relief.

It is, I take it, because Americans today do realize the 10 truths which I have just listed that their representatives in Congress were able so overwhelmingly to approve economic aid to foreign countries on a self-help basis—a policy far-reaching in nature and hugely expensive in dollars. It is also, I believe, because we have learned these truths that Congress will soon enact legislation providing the manpower for our armed forces so that we may, in Washington's famous phrase, present a respectable defensive posture before the world. We did these things, let us well remember, in spite of the dire forebodings that our Government would be paralyzed because the President was a Democrat and the Congress was Republican.

So much by way of illustration of our American mind-stretching process.

Now, Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago all these things which I have just recited were emphatically not matters of common knowledge. In fact the realistic outlook which I have described was known to very few Americans and not many of them were at any time in the American Government. Credit for this growth in understanding certainly goes to men like Harry Luce whose magazines have so forcefully and so graphically depicted the facts of modern life to a vast and influential audience. Perhaps a little credit goes also to some of the men in public life who have used the sounding board which their office gives them in order to speak out. Fundamental credit, of course, goes to the American people for their adaptability and their mental mobility in a fast-moving situation.

Yes; we have stretched our minds a lot and after we have all congratulated ourselves on having done so, let us quickly realize that we have a lot more mind-stretching to do, a great many more new things to learn, about this world outside our borders. What are some of these things?

It is well said by many and deserves repeating that Russia's attitude, pernicious and criminal as it is, is unhappily not the only thing that is wrong in the world. There is a vast amount of human misery which has been and is being caused by Russia. There is also a vast amount which was caused by Germany. Finally there is much unhappiness which has been caused by other factors. There is no time to go into them all, but it must be clear that one trouble in the Old World is the vast overpopulation in relation to available natural resources; and that another trouble is due to the fact that the advantages of mass production and of technology which we in America know and use are not available to many of the people in the world, some of whom get the drawbacks of technology without its advantages. These troubles have created a cynical and hopeless attitude which has been made more violent by the destruction caused by the war and by the disappearance of the pacifying influence of the old European powers. To cap the tragic climax is the fact that in so many of the countries of the Old World many of the people who have the advantages of education, tradition, and material well-being have shown themselves unable or unwilling to rise to the occasion and have in many instances displayed a selfish and rapacious attitude which further embittered the rank and file of the people.

These are facts, ladies and gentlemen, and there is no use in shutting our eyes to them. They are the facts which create Communists. The Russians, believe me, are not smart enough to have single-handedly created the Communists of Europe. "Man's inhumanity to man," individually and collectively, had a large part in doing so.

This leads me to the big point, to wit: That we not only face an economic and a military challenge, but that fundamentally we face a political—a human—challenge of the very highest order, which is deserving of the most far-sighted and lofty statesmanship of which any people in human history has ever been capable.

Of course, by the word "political" I do not mean the narrow game called politics; I use it in its broadest sense to convey the idea that the people of the Old World are thinking about their future freedom—their freedom to worship, to speak, to assemble, to read, to write, to work, to loaf, to go and to come, to live and to have their being as they choose with due respect to the freedom of their neighbors. If we set up a Marshall plan which enables them once again to feed, clothe, and house themselves; if we send our munitions to help them stave off attack, we will have done a lot—but we still will not have met the fundamental human challenge, because, like ourselves, the people over there are as interested in what they are living for and in how they are living as they are in the act of keeping alive. In this war of ideas which is raging, many of them are ready to accept our ideas.

This means that we must develop clear-cut ideas regarding our hopes for the world and our aims for ourselves, and create the means which are both tactful and effective for presenting those ideas to the great masses of population outside our borders.

The job of stating our aims for ourselves—of preaching Americanism here at home—badly needs to be done. It is, of course, a prime function of our domestic political leadership—a function which it is not performing, a function which it should perform, because an enthused America, speaking through its Government, can make American democracy an article of export. Actually, the Christian concept of the dignity of man is the strongest revolutionary force in the world. But because we lack imagination or understanding, we have allowed the materialistic and brutal verbiage of communism to gain a greater export currency than our own belief which springs from eternal sources and can never run dry.

This means that in the conduct of foreign policy we need not only the knowledge of strategy so essential in these unsettled days; and the knowledge of economics at a time when economic recovery is the indispensable first step toward even a relatively free world; and the expert knowledge of recent history and foreign personalities so essential to diplomatic intercourse; and the knowledge of the arts of suggestion and persuasion without which there is no victory in the battle for the minds of men; but that we also need that capacity to understand and express the innermost yearnings of suffering humanity for decent treatment and a chance for the future. The soldier, the businessman, the career diplomat, the politician, the publicist, and, finally, the statesman all must play their part in this titanic adventure in foreign policy upon which fate has caused us to embark.

To speak for a moment of political skill, we hear many of our friends say that we must send lots of money to help our friends in those countries where there are political contests which may involve the possibility of a Communist seizure of power. Of course, we can agree that we must give all possible help. But this well-meaning comment fails to take into account the very obvious fact that it takes more than money to win an election, and that many an election has been lost by the side which had the most money.

For instance, we know that in spite of our great efforts and vast expenditures, we have been hugely unsuccessful insofar as the battle for men's minds abroad is concerned. It is accurate to assert that we have spent more than eighteen hundred million dollars in Italy since the war and during the same period the membership of the Communist Party there went from 60,000 to 2,500,000. To me that indicates something the matter with our public-relations policy—and when I say this I do not mean publicity; I mean political judgment. If this is the way public relations are to be conducted, we run the risk of having a sort of Marshall plan in reverse which will resemble the famous American political campaign in which one candidate spends most of the money while the other candidate receives all the votes.

There is much more involved here than money. Do you remember last June when Secretary Marshall made his speech at Harvard outlining the Marshall plan? Do you also remember that on that very day President Truman gave out an interview denouncing the Russian outrages in Hungary, thereby taking the front page away from the Secretary of State? That mistake was not due to lack of money. It was a lack of coordination, of headwork, and of careful planning.

We are engaged in a world-wide debate, but until the recent wholesome spurt of activity in connection with the Italian elections, the Russians have seemed to be doing all the debating. When we take tremendously significant steps—as we have been doing—we certainly should not exaggerate or puff anything up. Neither, however, should we play it down. We should not be afraid to use the apt word and the descriptive phrase and not wrap up a dynamic policy in the latinical phrases and verbal cotton batten of bureaucratic circumlocution.

I have just spoken of political skill. That is a necessary ingredient in a successful foreign policy and one which has at times been lacking. Let me now, as I conclude, speak of the stateman's role because that is the very heart and soul of the argument which I present to you tonight. Reflect for a moment that while the world struggle in which we are a leader can be called economic or military or cultural or political, and while we can propose, as some have recently done, that we rival the Soviet comintern or revive our wartime cloak-and-dagger services, this fight is fundamentally one for men's minds. The effort must, therefore, be made by ideas which appear to the aspirations of men's souls. To these thoughts and ideas all else is secondary. With such ideas we will win; without these all the money and cominterns and cloak-and-dagger services in the world will fail.

One thing is sure. Our ideas must emphatically mean that we do not uphold any regime abroad, no matter how corrupt, provided only that it is anti-Communist. At its best such a course would be stupidity; and at its worst it would be nihilism. In any event it would simply strengthen the Communist cause. We are not—we must not—be on the horns of a dilemma of which one prong is communism and the other prong is fascism. Our path does not lie in these blood-stained gutters to the left and to the right of us. There is a high road, an American road. This is the road which in their hearts the everyday people of the world want to follow. We have it within our power to hold aloft a torch which cannot only rival but easily surpass communism and the other violent doctrines of the dictators as a brightly shining attraction to all the weary people in the world, young and old, who are looking for a way out of their miserv.

Harriman Refuses To Resist Communism at Home, So Is Sent To Do It Abroad on a Salary of $25,000 Per Year—The Story of How Harriman Has Protected a Notorious Communist Fellow Traveler on the Public Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report I am making over the radio to my district about the bill being debated in the House at this time:

Today I want to report to you about the continuing fight Congress is waging to force the executive department of your Federal Government, headed by the President, to fire Communists and fellow travelers from the Government service. I want to report to you on a specific case—the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. I want to tell you how Congress is having to pass legislation to force the President and Secretary of Commerce to turn over to it letters and information in the files of the FBI about Communists Congress seeks to expose on the Government pay roll. I want to indicate to you how it is that Russia is possibly getting secrets on the atomic bomb with cooperation of our own governmental officials. It is a shocking story but one not uncommon in Washington. In the 6 years I have been in Congress there have been several hundred cases along the same line. Right here at the outset of this report, I want to tell you that the whole story on the case I will discuss today is available to you in official documents of the Congress I will be glad to send any interested citizen for the asking. My report will be based on these official documents, especially House Report No. 1753, made only the past week by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member. I will tell you, as we proceed, how it happens that my committee made this report.

First, who is Dr. Condon and why are we interested in him? Dr. Condon is Director of the Bureau of Standards. The Bureau is custodian of the Nation's top scientific secrets. It is the Nation's most important national defense research organization. It is engaged in projects at the present time concerning atomic energy, radar, proximity fuzes, instrument landing systems, jet fuels and other vital and secret projects that affect the security of our Nation. The Director of this agency has access to confidential records and information sought by virtually every foreign spy in the United States of America. It would seem to follow, therefore, that the Director of this agency of Government should, like Caesar's wife, be "above suspicion". Dr. Condon does not fit that description. He was appointed to his present post in 1945 by Henry Wallace, when Mr. Wallace was Secretary of Commerce. In spite of the split between Wallace and Truman, Dr. Condon holds his job. That, of course, should not be enough to disqualify him from public employment. Mr. Wallace in one of his infrequent lucid moments might have appointed someone who was not a follower or sympathizer with communism. So, let us look further into Condon's record. He has a most distinguished record as a top scientist. He was educated in this country and in Germany. He has held numerous Government responsibilities prior to his appointment as Director of the Bureau of Standards. As far back as 1941 he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research. The President also sent him to observe the effects of the atom bomb test made at Bikini Atoll, and similar jobs too numerous to mention.

While a director of the Manhattan or atomic bomb project, Condon wrote a letter to his superior registering his impatience with the security regulations set up to protect the secret of atomic energy.

Dr. Condon is a member of the executive committee of the American-Soviet Science Society which is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., an organization cited as subversive and as a Communist front by both the Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Condon has recruited 10 other scientists in the Bureau of Standards to membership.

A member of Condon's immediate family is a member of an organization cited as a subversive Communist-front by the Attorney General.

Condon frequently associates with diplomatic representatives of the Russian, Polish, and Czechoslovakian Governments. He has been entertained at their homes and has entertained them in his home, supplied to him by the United States Government.

He has associated with an individual who was dismissed from his job because of his Communist tendencies, and with others known to be Soviet spies and their friends.

It is conceivable that a person might associate with one or two individuals and have no knowledge of their Communist affiliations. However, when a person having access to vital information relating to atomic energy, associates with 30 or more individuals, whether directly or indirectly, who are engaging not only in the dissemination of communistic doctrine, but who are engaged in espionage activity, on behalf of the Soviet Russian Government, such association becomes a matter of national concern.

Condon recently wrote an article in the Saturday Review of Literature, in which he stated, "The restoration of freedom to science is one of the elements in the civilization we have been fighting for—freedom from secrecy and freedom from national barriers." No franker appeal has ever been made for free exchange of scientific knowledge between nations, at a time when the atomic bomb is our greatest safeguard. Dr. Condon as head of the Bureau of Standards has permitted numerous Russian Communist visitors to go through his Bureau, inspecting its secrets. On that point, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has the following to say in its official report:

"Exchange of scientific material with the Soviet Union is a one-way street and our Government is pursuing a dangerous and foolish policy of making scientific data available to the Soviet Union, since they will not permit us to inspect any of their bureaus, nor will they exchange any information with us. The Soviet Union, acting through its 'fronts,' has secured hundreds of thousands of patents from our Patent Office, and our present investigation along these lines reveals that even today they are continuing to order thousands of patents. We are convinced that what the Soviet Union is actually doing is setting up her own patent bureau by obtaining all of ours, at the rate of 10 and 25 cents each. We should like to point out that the Russian Government has refused to give the United States a single patent since 1928." The Patent Office is another bureau of the Department of Commerce, presided over by Secretary Harriman.

You will be interested, my friends, to know that Dr. Condon has been investigated by the FBI. On May 15, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, sent a confidential letter about Condon to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce. An investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities copied part of that letter but before he got through he was prevented from finishing his effort by orders of the Department officials. He did record, as it is set forth in House Report 1753, that the FBI files show Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C. from 1941 to 1944. Names of others are given in the report. I cannot pronounce these Russian names so will not use them here.

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities asked the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, to turn the FBI letter over to the Committee for examination, he refused on instructions of the President. When he was subpenaed by the Committee he still refused to bring it. The President issued a written order slapping censorship down on this letter and others of similar character which might show that Communists are working for the Government. To say that this is astounding, is an understatement. Last week our committee, on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction over legislation pertaining to the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Standards which is in the Department, ordered hearings on a resolution to require the FBI letter to be turned over to Congress. The Secretary of Commerce refused to appear as a witness. This is the same Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, who was appointed this week by the President as our $25,000 per year roving ambassador, charged with the responsibility to see that the $17,000,000,000 European recovery money, provided by our taxpayers, is used in such a way as to stop communism abroad. A fitting reward for his failure and refusal to combat communism at home. How long will these fatal inconsistencies in foreign policy be permitted to continue? Not beyond January 1948, I trust.

The committee reported the resolution favorably, notwithstanding objections of Secretary Harriman. It will pass Congress but the President will probably kill it with a veto. This just goes to show the importance of having a President who will practice what he preaches when it comes to getting Reds out of the Government of which he is head. It is futile to spend billions of dollars on atomic research and armaments if we are going to be betrayed by our own officials. The Congress and country would have never known of Gen. Benny Meyers or Gerhart Eisler or Hans Eisler, if Congress had not had access to the files of the executive branch of the Government so that it could expose these rats in the public trough. Now the Congress has publicly charged that Dr. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, is one of the weakest links in our atomic security. It is a grave charge. In justice to Condon, the administration and the Congress, all available evidence should be brought to bear on the subject. Why not? What has the administration to hide by refusing to let the FBI letter on Dr. Condon be made available in full to a proper committee of Congress?

Dr. Condon and other fellow-travelers in science, say Congress is retarding science by its attack on him. That is poppycock. Was J. Edgar Hoover retarding science when he wrote a three and one-half page letter to the Secretary of Commerce, warning him about Condon's association and record? Was Gen. Leslie Groves, director of the atomic bomb project, retarding science when he had Dr. Condon taken off a Soviet-bound plane in 1945, and refused to permit him to go to Russia as he desired, notwithstanding authorization of the trip by the State Department?

I grant that science may have been retarded by the arrest, conviction, and imprisonment for 10 years of Alan Munn May, professor of nuclear physics at Cambridge University, who was found guilty of the charge that he was a Soviet spy. His is not an isolated case. Other scientists are serving sentences in Canadian prisons for the same offense, friends of Condon's. Are we justified in having as a Government employee, especially one charged with secrets of national defense, any who apparently see nothing wrong in associating with card-holding members of the Communist Party and joining their associations? Is he not placing your welfare in jeopardy through such associations? Is not Congress entitled, in the public interest, to expose the fact and demand that the President quit protecting him and kick him out of office? Only the citizens of America, at the bar of public opinion can make effective and final answer to those questions. I have brought you the story. A story I could not, would not dare to tell over the radio, if I could not back every word of it with official Government records and documents, yours for the asking by card or letter to your Congressman.

In considering the case of Dr. Condon, I wish to emphasize that what is involved is not a question of freedom of speech or research. The ruthless push of Stalin through Europe, in the opnion of Congress, necessitates a revision of the policy and thinking of this Government and the people of the United States, regarding communism. We should bear in mind, that the Government is charged not only with the administration of public affairs, but it is also charged with the security of the people and the institutions of the United States. Whether we like it or not, we are engaged in a great epochal struggle; and not a struggle with guns, because the Communists don't fight that way, just yet. They didn't take over Czechoslovakia with guns, they merely employed the strategy of getting a few men in the government, and then a few more and then they took over the entire government without firing a single shot or calling out a single regiment of soldiers.

They are conducting exactly the same kind of campaign in other countries, including our own. In this country they haven't gotten as far as they have in Czechoslovakia and a score of other nations now behind the iron curtain but they have got pretty far. They have duped a man who was Vice President of the United States and he is now their idol and favorite candidate for President. And he is the same man who recommended and appointed Dr. Condon as Director of the Bureau of Standards, which has atomic and other secrets of national defense.

I have brought you this report as a public service.

Local Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last Saturday night, in Pittsburgh at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] delivered a very interesting address on local government, which I think should be carefully considered at this time. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pennsylvania and her people hold a place peculiarly their own in the history of human liberty. Since William Penn first established an asylum for the persecuted people of all lands, how many of the crises in the long struggle for liberty and freedom have taken place on Pennsylvania soil. How the heart of a Pennsylvania schoolboy must thrill at his first knowledge that the Declaration of Independence was signed, Valley Forge was endured, the Constitution of the United States was drawn up, and Gettysburg was fought—all in Pennsylvania. The achievements of Pennsylvania, both in war and peace, establish her right beyond any possibility of a doubt to the proud title she has always borne of the Keystone State. And so, Mr. President, I was flattered to receive, and it was a real pleasure to accept, the kind invitation of the Amen Corner of Pittsburgh. This pleasure was greatly enhanced from my point of view by the fact that the invitation came through your distinguished friend and neighbor and my dear friend and colleague, the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN. It is unnecessary for me to tell you what I am sure you already know: that General MARTIN'S wide knowledge and experience, his poise and tact, and his sound judgment have given him—and to Pennsylvania—a very important place in the councils of the Senate.

I am particularly glad to come to Pittsburgh. About a year ago a Pittsburgh man wrote an open letter to the Members of the Congress. He said that he had just paid his Federal income taxes. He was astonished to find his Federal taxes were 37 times as great as his local taxes. "A comparatively small amount (one thirty-seventh as much as my Federal taxes)," he said, "paid for all public-school facilities, all police protection, sanitary service, including street cleaning and garbage collection." He said further: "Unless we have embarked openly on a policy of confiscation of property of the citizens, Federal taxes must be reduced until they are in line with other taxes."

To see why this Pittsburgh man finds himself astonished, we need look only at three items: First, the size of the Federal debt, which has increased in the past 15 years over 1,200 percent; second, the number of employees on the Federal pay roll, which in the same period have increased over 300 percent; and, third and finally, the cost of the Federal Government has risen from less than $4,000,000,000 in 1933 to about $40,000,000,000 this year.

Today Congress is under constant pressure to extend the scope and character of the services rendered by the Federal Government. New avenues of spending are constantly being opened up. Every few days a bill is introduced to increase the powers of the Government in Washington. The effect of every one of them, if enacted into law, would be to make the Federal Government bigger and to cost the taxpayers more money; to enhance the scope and authority of the great octopus on the Potomac.

For my part, I am convinced that the only way out of the difficulties in which we find ourselves is to reverse this trend and return to the principle under which America grew great and strong—the principle of local self-government. I should like to address myself briefly tonight to the importance of governing ourselves, as near to the village pump as possible.

Something like 40 years after this experiment in government, which is known as the United States of America, was launched on this continent, a wise and observant Frenchman, M. de Tocqueville, came to this country to see why this novel experiment was working. He came to investigate what really made the machine tick. He gave this as his conclusion:

"The American practices the art of government in a small sphere within his reach; he accustoms himself to those forms which alone can insure the steady progress of liberty; he imbibes their spirit; he acquires a taste for order * * * and collects clear, practical notions on the nature of his duties and the extent of his rights."

If our experience of 112 years since this book was first published has shown us anything, it is that the active, informed, and intelligent interest of the individual citizen in the affairs of his local community must be aroused and maintained if we are to have good government at any level. The level of intelligence, efficiency, and integrity of the larger units cannot rise above the level of these qualities in the smaller units in which the citizen lives and works.

Thomas Jefferson was no doctrinaire visionary. He was a practical theorist. He sought certain results from government—chiefly the freedom and welfare of the individual.

Jefferson described the New England township system as "the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government." By an efficient system of local self-government, Jefferson hoped to accomplish two major objectives which are in effect complementary to each other: First, to make the management of governmental affairs subject directly to the oversight and control of the people; and, second, to avoid the creation of a bureaucracy of professional officeholders. The present tendency of the people to look to some higher authority for the solution of all their problems and a way out of all their difficulties must be reversed. This much is clear: the trend cannot be reversed if the State government's attempt to solve local problems by passing them on to the Federal Government.

There have been four periods in our history when the power of the Federal Government has been greatly enhanced at the expense of the State and local governments:

1. During and following the Civil War.
2. During and following World War I.
3. During and following the great depression of the early thirties.
4. During World War II.

We now find ourselves in the critical period following World War II. The question is: Shall the trend continue?

There are a number of ways in which the increase in Federal power has been accomplished:

1. Amendments to the Federal Constitution: The most important of these is the sixteenth amendment, which gives to the Federal Government the power to levy the income tax. It is interesting to recall that in the year 1894 Mr. Joseph H. Choate, appearing before the Supreme Court as counsel opposing as unconstitutional the first income-tax law, said to clinch his argument, as a reductio ad absurdum, that if such a communistic march be continued we might see 20 percent of a man's income taken as a Federal tax.

2. Encroachment by the executive: The executive department of the Federal Government has been able by a process of attrition to enhance the power of the Federal Government at the expense of the States.

3. Supreme Court decisions.

4. Treaties.

5. Emergency agencies.

6. Subsidies: I wish time would permit us to wander a little into the wonderland of Government subsidies. There are some 31 of them. Some keep prices up; some keep prices down. One thing they all have in common. Each is a method authorized by law, more or less explicitly, to siphon money out of the Federal Treasury.

Federal subsidies are part and parcel of the same process of centralization by which Hitler made 80,000,000 Germans goose-step and cry, "Heil Hitler." The first thing he

did when he came into power was to wipe out the states of the German Republic. Then, by subsidies, he undermined self-reliance and destroyed personal initiative. He removed the counterbalance of local government.

7. Grants-in-aid: In 1857 a bill was introduced by Congressman Morrill for the Federal Government to grant certain lands and money to the States for certain specified purposes. This bill was strenuously opposed by the Southern States as an attempted usurpation of the power by the Federal Government. After passing both Houses of Congress, President Buchanan, at the instigation and insistence of the southerners, vetoed the bill. In 1862, after the Southern States had seceded, the bill was again passed, and became law. It is known as the Morrill Act, and is conceded to be the inception of so-called Federal grants-in-aid to States. It is an interesting commentary on changes that have recently taken place in our political ideas that certain southern Senators are among the most active advocates of a bill for the purpose of extending and amplifying the principle of Federal aid into a new field of far-reaching implication; into the field of general education. This bill opens up a tremendous new field for spending Federal money. It recently passed the Senate, and incidentally practically all the southern Senators voted for it. It proposes to appropriate the sum of $300,000,000 annually, to be divided among the States for public education. While this bill was pending in the Senate a good lady wrote me from Excelsior Springs, Mo., that if this bill becomes law, and I quote her exact language: "The people will not have to pay more taxes for this aid. It is entirely from the Federal Government."

If the States want to remain independent and sovereign, they must perform the functions which fall within their sphere. Education is one of these functions. From the beginning of our Government, education has been regarded as a State, local, and private concern. Federal control of education, which would inevitably develop from Federal support, would in my judgment be hostile to the best interests of education in a democratic government. The pending bill disclaims any present intention to control or regulate what is taught and how it is to be taught, but amendments to this bill were proposed in the Senate at the very session at which the bill was passed, by able and distinguished Senators, the purpose and intent of which was to regulate what should be taught and how it should be taught. My colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri, Mr. DONNELL, proposed an amendment that would forbid Federal-aided teaching being conducted along sectarian lines, and the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. HAWKES, offered an amendment which would require instruction in the theory and principles of the Constitution. The bill in my opinion is simply a case of the camel putting his nose into the tent. We all recall the poem of our childhood:

"My nose is cold," the camel cried;
"Oh, let me warm it by thy side!"

And then:

The long and scraggy neck came next;
And then, as falls the strengthening storm,
In leaped the whole ungainly form.

It is significant that the proponents of the present bill were not particularly interested in the amount of money appropriated in the first bill.

Should this bill become law, it does not require prophetic vision to foresee the day when bureaucrats sitting in Washington will set up so-called standards or safeguards to be met or satisfied by the States in order to qualify for Federal aid. And then by means of such standards or safeguards the Washington bureaucrats shall determine what shall be taught, how it shall be taught, and by whom it shall be taught.

Then as the next step, we may see in the United States—God forbid—a ministry of education and propaganda, from its headquarters in Washington, guiding the thinking of the American people in accordance with the political ideas of the party then in power.

I am glad to be able to tell you that from conversations that I have had recently with influential Members of the House of Representatives, I am led to believe that this bill will not pass the House, and therefore will not become law.

In January of last year, the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, passed a resolution in which it was said:

"We Hoosiers—like the people of our sister States—were fooled for quite a spell with the magician's trick that a dollar taxed out of our pockets and sent to Washington will be bigger when it comes back to us. We have taken a good look at said dollar. We find that it lost weight in its journey to Washington and back. The political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been deducted. We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States. * * *

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully petition and urge Indiana's Congressmen and Senators to vote to fetch our county courthouse and city halls back from Pennsylvania Avenue. We want government to come home."

The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. The fever chart of liberty is a record of resistance, not of supine acceptance.

We are on warning to withstand all beginnings of encroachment. "For the saddest epitaph," Mr. Justice Sutherland said, "which can be carved in memory of a vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while yet there was time."

It is later perhaps than we think, but there is yet time to return in this country to the principle of local self-government.

In the closing days of the convention that framed the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin was asked what kind of a government was set up in the new Constitution. He said, "We have given them a Republic if they can keep it."

The record shows, as every American knows, that the men of Pennsylvania have always loved the Republic of our fathers. I feel sure that in the years to come you will do your full share to save it in its constitutional form as a Federal Republic—to cherish and preserve it for ourselves, for our children and our children's children.

The Inside of the United States Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] before the Amen Corner in Pittsburgh, Pa., last Saturday evening, April 17, 1948, the subject of the address being "The Inside of the United States Senate."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to meet again at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner. It means a lot to me to be able to pay tribute to a lifelong friend, Frank Wilbur Main, who has devoted so much of his time for the benefit of Pittsburgh, Pa., and the United States.

The unselfish contribution of his exact and thorough knowledge of governmental fiscal affairs and taxation has been a real example of patriotism at its best.

The Amen Corner, composed of men of all political and religious beliefs, is one of the best-known organizations of the United States. Its preaching of patriotism, tolerance, and hard work have done so much for the success of the greater Pittsburgh area. Its influence has benefited southwestern Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and northern West Virginia.

I am honored in being asked to introduce the distinguished guests who will speak to us tonight. I have been requested also to say a few words on the subject of the inside of the United States Senate. The first part of my assignment is a real pleasure. The last part is most difficult.

As you know, the powers and duties of the United States Senate are defined and limited by the Constitution.

It is truly a tribute to the wisdom and vision of the founding fathers that the Constitution they framed 160 years ago to meet the needs of a small nation stands strong and firm today as the fundamental law of the most powerful nation on earth.

Every patriotic American honors and reveres the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as the bulwark of individual liberty and the safeguard of our independence.

In its legislative function the Senate helps make the laws of our Nation.

It is empowered to give advice and consent with respect to important appointments and thus has a part in obtaining properly qualified men for high places in the Government.

The requirement that treaties be given approval by the Senate gives that body a powerful voice in international affairs.

The individual Senator is a part of the political machinery of our country and is responsive to the will of the people.

It is interesting to recall that a Senator from Pennsylvania represents more people than there were in the whole Nation at the time President Monroe announced his famous Monroe Doctrine.

He represents one-third as many citizens as there were in the whole country under President Lincoln.

He is concerned with the welfare of 10,000,000 people with a greater diversification of interests than any other State in the Union.

The daily work of a Senator has been greatly expanded since the early days of our Republic. His duties are divided into a number of categories, and I can assure you that each of these is a full time job in itself.

First there is the work on the floor of the Senate. This calls for a great deal of preparation, research, and study as well as most earnest soul searching to determine the course that is right. Much of a Senator's time is occupied in committee hearings.

Aside from these legislative duties there are demands upon his time and effort growing out of the special problems of individuals, industry, mining, agriculture, large and small business, the veterans, labor organizations, and many other interests.

Of course, the great majority of these represent legitimate requests but too many demands come from lobbyists and pressure groups who propose spending the taxpayers' money for their own pet projects.

Since Pennsylvania is a near neighbor of the Nation's Capital we have many visitors.

Most of them are kind and considerate but there are others with little knowledge of the subject under discussion in Congress who feel qualified to tell the Senator how to vote.

Let me tell you about two recent incidents:

One visitor was a soldier having only a few months in the Army and never out of the United States. He is now enjoying the privilege of an education in an outstanding college at the expense of the taxpayers. He came down to Washington to criticize our country for the small allowance he is receiving.

Another sent in his card stating that he did not desire to take my time but wanted to let his old commander know he is getting along in good shape. I knew the man and I immediately hurried from the Senate floor to greet this one-legged veteran. He was full of praise for the United States and what it meant to him. Every word he uttered was good Americanism and encouragement. I went back on the Senate floor entirely rested and ready to fight the battle to save America.

The mail that pours into a Senator's office is tremendous. In my own case I receive an average of a thousand letters a day. Many of these are helpful and encouraging—others are critical and demanding.

Some letters contain threats of political reprisal. Writers of such letters fail to realize that a Senator with any self-respect would not be swerved from what he conceives to be his duty just because it might cost him a few votes.

In the few remaining minutes of the time allotted to me I want to discuss some of the things that endanger America.

One of the dangerous things confronting America is the rising cost of government.

For example, here in Pennsylvania, from 1910 to 1940 the cost of townships increased from $6,000,000 to $41,000,000; counties from $30,00,000 to $196,000,000; school districts from $30,000,000 to almost $200,000,000. In the same period the cost of State government rose from $35,500,000 to over $300,000,000. The cost of Federal government increased from $693,000,000 to almost $9,500,000,000.

Much of the increased cost of government is due to overlapping and duplication and new functions of government.

The time has come to streamline all government. We must realze that unless State and local governments are given sufficient funds to carry out their proper functions they will eventually be crushed by the Federal Government.

For some time students of government have advocated assigning to each level of government certain duties and sufficient taxes to carry those functions.

It has been proposed that local government should control the public schools, the courts, elections, local police, and the care of the indigent. That the States should look after the mentally deficient, penal institutions, health, natural resources, roads, and higher education.

That the Federal Government should care for the veterans and have control of national defense, foreign affairs, rivers and harbors, and interstate relations where necessary.

We need decentralization of government. We need more government in the court houses, city halls, and borough, township, and school district buildings. This will be better and more economical government because the people can better supervise and understand it. Local government is self-government. It is home rule.

We all know that if the United States is to do the job that we are called upon to do, we must remain financially solvent. We must also be the most industrious nation of the world. We must produce more per hour and our output must be of finer quality.

We can only keep our Government solvent by depending less on government and thereby spending less money. We can produce more per hour by improving methods and rewarding a man for what he does.

There is another danger even greater to America than high taxes and the enormous public debt. It is the weakening of the moral fiber of our people. We are demanding something for nothing from our Government and in our relations with each other.

Many of our people are evading the law. A Senate committee investigating export licensing found hundreds trafficking in these licenses, many of which had been forged. Thousands are trading in black and gray markets. Many more examples could be given.

Many legislators are demanding subsidies and special privileges for their parts of the country. They are promising to spend the people's money in order to be elected to office themselves.

Unless we check these tendencies they will eventually destroy the free enterprise system. They are a menace to the American way of life which has always recognized the sacredness of individual freedom based upon the sovereignty of God.

Americans do not want to be regimented. They do not want to be restricted. They do not want to be controlled. But Americans must remember that if we put controls on one body or a price support on another, in fairness we must treat the others the same way.

That will impose some regimentation and restriction on everything and eventually will mean a partially socialistic pattern of government. It will end the America we have known and loved.

Do we have the courage of our convictions to such an extent that we will unselfishly fight for a strong, unhampered, dynamic America?

The Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears on the editorial page of the New York Times this morning an editorial entitled "Actions Versus Words." It deals with the manner in which the emergency which has arisen in the dispute over the matter of coal and the coal miners has been handled through the instrumentality of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. The editorial is well worth the consideration of all who are interested in the act and the way in which it is working. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIONS VERSUS WORDS

On June 20 of last year President Truman vetoed the Taft-Hartley bill, a measure which represented 5 months of study, hearings, and debate and which had been passed by heavy bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress. Congress promptly replied to this action of the President by repassing the bill over his veto.

In his veto message the President was unsparing in his criticism of this measure. "Its provisions would," he said, "cause more strikes, not fewer." He directed much of his attack to the so-called emergency procedure for dealing with strikes in key industries. This procedure, he declared, would be certain to do more harm than good, and to increase, rather than diminish, widespread industrial disturbances. The essential features of this section of the law, he pointed out, were "a Presidential board of inquiry, a waiting period of approximately 80 days (enforced by injunction) and a secret ballot vote. * * *" He saw little merit in the proposed board of inquiry, which he said, would serve "merely as a sounding board to dramatize the respective positions of the parties." Finally, he said, an injunction issued after a strike had started "would arouse bitter resentment which would not contribute to agreement." In summary, concluded the President, "I find that the so-called emergency procedure would be ineffective. It would provide for clumsy and cumbersome Government intervention, it would authorize inequitable injunctions, and it would probably result in a public confession of failure."

All this makes curious reading in the light of the events of the past 3 weeks. For it was to this same clumsy and cumbersome machinery provided by the Taft-Hartley Act that the President turned when John L. Lewis, with his customary arrogance and disregard of the public welfare, called his miners off their jobs on March 12 and proceeded to defy all peaceful efforts to end the walk-out and halt the creeping paralysis that was making itself felt at critical points in the economy.

When John L. Lewis was brought up short in December 1946, fined and compelled to order his men back to work, the instrument that stopped him was the Smith-Connolly Act of 1943, backed up by an injunction issued in the Federal court. When he was again forced to relinquish his grip on the throat of the American Nation last week it was the Taft-Hartley Act that gave the Government the power to achieve this. While the immediate issue which led to the conviction of Mr. Lewis and the imposition of fines totaling $1,420,000 against him and his union was contempt of court, the charge of contempt grew out of violation of an order issued under the same Labor-Management Relations (Taft-Hartley) Act. As Assistant Attorney General Morison pointed out in making his recommendations to the court:

"The national emergencies sections of the Labor-Management Relations Act require unions and employers who have it within their power to endanger by a strike or a lock-out the health and safety of their fellow citizens to sit down together in good faith to settle their differences before resorting to a strike or lock-out; or, if a strike or lock-out has occurred, promptly to end the work stoppage and attempt to resolve the dispute by collective bargaining."

Had the President won out last year in his fight to defeat the Taft-Hartley bill the Government would have found itself without an effective weapon to meet this latest challenge by Mr. Lewis.

Not the stanchest supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act have claimed that the "emergency" procedure of that measure was perfect. All such formulas are more or less necessarily characterized by a lack of complete finality. On the other hand they do recognize and give effect to the sound principle that a strike should be a final resort, and not a gun to be held at the Nation's head until the one wielding it has exacted his demands in full.

Today, we dare say, Mr. Truman himself must realize that this represents a very real forward step in the settlement of labor disputes in basic industry.

Steel Shortages Plague Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news items and summary of requirements for the European recovery plan:

[From the Journal of Commerce of April 21, 1948]

SHARP CAPACITY INCREASE BELIEVED NEEDED FOR STEEL

WASHINGTON, April 20.—The steel industry cannot produce enough steel to meet either expected peacetime or wartime needs of the United States, according to Robert E. Johnson, chief statistician of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.

Mr. Johnson suggests that stand-by capacity of another 10 to 20 percent be added by the industry.

GREATER CAPACITY NEEDED

New estimates of demand for the metal, prepared by Mr. Johnson, show that the steel industry should be ready to meet a demand for 100,000,000 ingot tons in 1955. Production at this rate will require output capacity of 110,000,000 tons since allowances must be made for shut-downs and repairs, Mr. Johnson says.

This is nearly 20,000,000 tons greater than current capacity and fully 15,000,000 tons higher than capacity will be after expansion plans now underway have been completed, Mr. Johnson points out.

He warns that his estimates assume continuing full employment, but adds that smaller output would cut into operations of steel consuming industries and would "automatically give less than full employment."

WAR NEEDS HIGHER

At the same time, he stresses that even larger capacity will be needed to provide a margin of safety for war emergencies. World War II production rose 10 percent above the figure that might have been expected for a peak peacetime year, but there were acute shortages.

Mr. Johnson's analysis was prepared for publication in the Military Engineer.

The steel industry is currently adding 5,000,000 tons of new capacity which will bring capacity over the wartime peak of 95,505,000. This postwar expansion program is currently costing $1,700,000,000.

ACCUMULATED NEEDS

Steel executives believe that with the completion of this expansion program the industry will be prepared to meet demand at least until 1950. A large part of the present demand is believed to represent the accumulation of wants for products made of steel, during the last war, when production went for war matériel.

When those wants are satisfied, it is felt that the demand would drop below capacity, unless new international emergencies arise.

[From the Journal of Commerce of April 21, 1948]

STEEL EXPORT QUOTAS REDUCED 2 PERCENT

WASHINGTON, April 20.—Second quarter export allocations for iron and steel products total 846,000 tons, down 2 percent from the January–March period, the Office of International Trade announced today.

They include for the first time specific figures for the 38 iron and steel products placed on the positive list by OIT since last December 31. They were licensed last quarter on an emergency basis.

OIT warned, however, that the quotas do not include 125,000 short tons of tinplate allocated for shipment in the second quarter, and that six products still have not been assigned quotas. It will mean a substantial increase in shipments over the allocations announced today.

The agency also said an undistributed reserve has been retained in each classification to permit countries not listed to receive small allocations providing they establish essential needs.

In addition to the new quotas, allocations are also made to "special projects of vital interest to the United States foreign policy," OIT said.

Summary of requirements for the European recovery plan for the 4-year period, shown by commodities to be furnished by the United States

[In millions of dollars]

Commodity	1948	1949	1950	1951
Steel and steel-making materials	441.0	381.0	375.0	[1] 368.0
Petroleum and petroleum products	576.8	623.3	641.1	[2] 619.6
Oil-equipment requirements	175.0	155.5	124.2	133.5
Agricultural implements	275.0	214.0	147.0	78.0
Agricultural tractors	78.0	52.0	48.0	40.0
Coal	269.0	225.0	126.0	54.0
Coal-mining machinery	80.0	54.0	46.0	40.0
Timber and products	95.9	92.6	87.3	[3] 75.0
Forest products machinery	16.4	15.3	13.3	12.3
Electrical equipment	150.0	175.0	125.0	50.0
Fertilizer:				
Nitrogen	58.0	46.0	16.0	-------
Phosphate	40.0	33.0	36.0	28.0
Potash	40.0	49.0	50.0	53.0
Inland transport:				
Freight cars	168.0	147.0	52.0	-------
Passenger cars	28.0	28.0	28.0	28.0
Special equipment	7.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Food, including grains, fats and oils, etc	2,100.0	2,000.0	1,800.0	1,700.0
Total	4,698.1	4,292.7	3,715.9	3,280.4
Grand total	$15,987,100,000			

[1] Includes: Crude and semifinished steel, sheets, tin plate, rich iron ores, scrap, pig-iron and plant equipment in the total amount of $400,000,000 during the 4-year period.

[2] Includes: Aviation gasoline, regular gasoline, kerosene, gas oils, fuel oils, distillates, lubricants, paraffin wax, and petroleum coke.

[3] Includes: Softwoods, hardwoods, hardwood ties, pit props, pulpwood, poles, and plywoods. Machinery indicated consists of logging equipment, tractors, sawmill machinery, veneer cutting and plywood manufacturing machines.

Compiled by Paul O. Peters, from vol. II, Technical Reports, Committee of European Economic Cooperation.

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the CIO has pledged itself to work for the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, more generally referred to as the Taft-Hartley Act, and to work for the defeat of all those who voted for it—it behooves each and every Member of Congress, yea, every loyal American citizen to do his part in an effort to enlighten others and to be enlightened regarding the claims of labor union leaders and some unenlightened union members that this act is antilabor. Much has been done to correct misinformation about this measure, and much remains to be done.

With this in mind I have consulted with representatives of labor, and with representatives of those who employ labor. The General Electric Co. being one of the largest industries in this country, and having had wide experience in the field of labor-management relations, is, I believe, well qualified to judge the merits of the Taft-Hartley Act.

General Electric accepts the idea of free labor unions as thoroughly in keeping with the basic freedoms guaranteed to all individuals and institutions by our Constitution and our way of life. They believe that these basic freedoms offer a special opportunity for business and labor organizations to work together for the good of customers, employees, stockholders, and the public in a way that will benefit each without penalizing any.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement which I received from General Electric in response to my request for their views on this all-important question:

IS THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT A "SLAVE LABOR" OR A "SAVE LABOR" LAW?

A lot has been said about the new labor law that Congress passed last June. Although the official name for the law is "The Labor Management Relations Act, 1947," the newspapers generally call it the "Taft-Hartley Act"; some unions have labeled it "The Tuff-Heartless Act" or the "Slave Labor Act"; and those in favor of the law have called it the "Save Labor Act," "The Free Labor Act," or the "Labor Emancipation Act."

In the midst of all the wrangling as to whether it is a good law or a bad one, most of us have been subjected to a barrage of propaganda which has left us generally confused. What are the facts about this new controversial law? What did Congress intend it to do? Why did the overwhelming majority of Congress, both Democrat and Republicans, vote to override the President's veto and pass this law?

The passage of the Taft-Hartley Act was not an accident. When the Wagner Act was passed, it came into existence because the conditions of the times demanded it. The wage earner's economic progress toward better wages, hours, and working conditions was seriously impeded because as an individual he had no equality of bargaining power in any real sense with his employer. Too large a segment of industry had not kept pace with the social and economic developments demanded by the times. Too many employers were still paying their employees wages that were inadequate to meet the higher standard of living that the same employees had helped to create. The situation had to be corrected and the Wagner Act corrected it by protecting the right of employees to bargain together and to engage in concerted activities. Under the Wagner Act the former abuses engaged in by some employers were outlawed, and unions were not only given their full place in the economic structure but also were accorded even a preferred and protected position.

Unfortunately, there were on hand, as there always are in all human situations, a certain number of opportunists who soon became top union officers. A few unions engaged in activities which could only fairly be described as racketeering—practices which not only were unfair to employers but also

infringed upon the individual liberties and desires of the workers who in too many instances had no real freedom of choice in the area of collective bargaining but were completely under the thumb of labor czars. This is not, of course, to say that most labor leaders were not sincere, earnest, and honest men who have performed notable service for their fellow workers, but in many unions there is no real "democracy" and in a few unions, particularly those dominated by Communist sympathizers, the individual worker was completely at the mercy of a boss who ran things his own way and ran roughshod over the dissenting individuals in the union.

In their lust for power and under the protective cover of the Wagner Act, a few of these bad labor leaders developed many techniques and procedures for the so-called advancement of labor which were wholly at odds with what many people felt were the rules of decent relations among our fellowmen. Coercive tactics were used in many instances to force employees to join unions and as the unions became more arrogant and power-drunk some labor organizations actually stopped real collective bargaining with some of the smaller employers—they merely would present the small employer, and in some cases even the largest industrial employers, with a contract drawn up by them with the admonition that the employer would sign the contract "or else." Further, secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes penalized both innocent employers and the public.

The hearings before the congressional committees considering new labor legislation last spring indicated that it was absolutely necessary to prevent such abuses, to better protect the rights of the individual worker, and to safeguard the public interest. It became obvious to the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress that corrective action was necessary, not to penalize labor or to deprive it of any of its legitimate rights and privileges, but to protect the public interest and to protect the interest of the individual workers by setting up checks and balances between management and labor. Because of the tremendous growth in size and power of labor organization, it was recognized that the individual worker in many cases had become so submerged that he had practically no rights, no means of protecting himself against a labor organization that had become unwelcome. Unions had ceased to be simple organizations which put workers in a better bargaining position in dealing with employers. They had become seats of a great power—one of the greatest private economic powers of the community. It was these things that brought about the Taft-Hartley Act.

It must be emphasized that the Taft-Hartley Act is not one-sided or partisan legislation. It is exactly the opposite. For the first time in the history of this country, the Federal law imposes obligations on both employers and unions. Do not get the idea that any of the restraints on employers provided by the old Wagner Act have been abandoned. They are still the law and the employer must still abide by them as much as he did before the present law was passed. The law is based upon the theory that industrial peace can be best promoted if employees, employers, and unions respect each others legitimate rights and if they recognize furthermore that the public interest is paramount.

Why do the unions react so violently to the Taft-Hartley law? The answer to that is relatively simple. It is just natural for anybody to resent restrictions on their actions, especially when those restrictions are needed for the good of all of us and, of course, in a few instances there are some union bosses who are Communists and who don't want to admit it. As we all know, the law withholds the services of the Labor Board from unions who fail to tell what they have done with the members' funds and whose officials refuse to file affidavits that they are not Communists or members of any organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government. Again, the unions naturally don't like the provisions of the law preventing employers and unions making contributions to political candidates. This provision of the law was designed, of course, to keep the unions from contributing directly out of their treasury to political campaigns just as corporations are so prohibited. Such contributions would be unfair to members of a union who do not favor the political decisions of the union bosses. The law does not prevent, of course, an individual from contributing money to any political party of his choice.

It is, of course, impossible in this brief consideration to mention all of the features of this very comprehensive law. However, in passing, let us direct our attention to the unfair labor practices now prohibited under the new law as a means of emphasizing again that whereas the original Labor Act outlawed employer unfair labor practices, the Taft-Hartley law outlaws unfair labor practices of both employers and unions. Continuing as unfair labor practices of employers under the new law are:

1. Interference, restraint or coercion of employees.
2. Domination of unions.
3. Discrimination in hire, or in tenure, terms, or conditions of employment.
4. Discrimination for filing charges or giving testimony under the act.
5. Refusal to bargain with a duly authorized union.

Unfair labor practices now made unlawful for unions are:

1. To coerce or restrain either employees or employers.
2. To coerce or attempt to coerce discrimination under union-shop contracts for any reason other than nonpayment of uniform dues or membership fees.
3. To refuse to bargain.
4. To engage in jurisdictional strikes or boycotts (the so-called "economic strikes" or "unfair labor practice strikes" are perfectly legitimate and protected under the act.)
5. To exact excessive or discriminatory fees or dues under union-shop agreements.
6. To engage in "featherbedding" activities.

The Taft-Hartley law is a complex law and is the most comprehensive labor legislation in the history of the United States. It is strongly recommended that a copy of the actual text of the law be obtained and studied by each citizen.

In many recent surveys that have been undertaken it has been indicated quite clearly that most of our citizens do not really understand what the law provides. Many of them have heard it is a "slave-labor law" and their offhand conclusion is that the law must be bad. However, the great majority of both union and nonunion employees interviewed have been in favor of each of the major provisions of the law when it was explained to them.

How has the new law worked in practice? The facts are that, despite the hysterical predictions to the contrary, we are enjoying an unprecedented period of industrial peace. According to preliminary estimates recently made public by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, strike activity in 1947 was far below the all-time high reached in the previous year. The number of strikes called during the year was down 28 percent as compared with the year 1946. The number of workers involved was down 52 percent and the number of man-hours of idleness was down 70 percent. Further, an analysis of the unfair labor practice charges filed against both employers and unions since the effective date of the act reveals that there has been no great rush by employers to swamp the Board with complaints against unions. Further, a large percentage of the unfair labor practice charges against unions have been filed by individual workers. It appears to be the opinion of the Labor Board that in general both employers and unions are adopting a very sensible, practical approach to their rights and privileges under the new law.

In closing, it appears appropriate to include a brief statement from the opinion of Judge Johnson J. Hayes in the recent case of *Textile Workers (C. I. O.)* v. *Amazon Cotton Mill Co.* (D. C. N. C. December 29, 1947):

"The Wagner Act established definite rights in favor of unions and of workingmen. They were given the right to organize without intimidation or coercion on the part of the employer and to select a representative of their own choosing to negotiate contracts in their behalf, and that law required the employer to bargain with the certified agent. The Taft-Hartley law reenacts every beneficent feature of the Wagner Act to perpetuate these rights * * *."

* * * * *

"Extremists in any cause frequently thwart the very cause they hold sacred. The overzealous friends of prohibition contributed unwittingly to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. There is nothing in the language of the Wagner Act nor in the Taft-Hartley Act which causes me to doubt for one moment that these laws were enacted for the purpose of providing and safeguarding to employees engaged in commerce the right to organize, the free right to choose a representative of their own to negotiate for them as to wages, hours, etc., and to require the employer in good faith to bargain collectively with the representative certified by the National Labor Relations Board."

Oleomargarine in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1948

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, letters are daily reaching my office from Ohio constituents regarding the so-called oleomargarine bill which will presently come before Congress.

At least two-thirds of these letters are from housewives who say "please vote in favor of the oleomargarine bill. I am tired of coloring my own oleo. I want to buy it already colored."

Some of the other letters say, "I am tired of paying this big tax on oleomargarine. Why should I have to pay 10 to 20 cents per pound tax on my oleo. Remove this unjust tax on oleo so that I may be able to buy it for half the price which I am now paying."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of butter and oleomargarine. My sole reason for making these remarks is to explain to the folks of Ohio that the passage or defeat of this particular bill will not affect the price or sale of colored oleomargarine in Ohio one way or the other. The State of Ohio as most of you know has a law which prohibits the sale of colored oleomargarine at any price. Unless the Ohio Legislature repeals this law then the housewife will still be compelled to color her oleomargarine just as she is now doing.

The Department of Agriculture has records to show the per capita amount of both butter and oleomargarine which is annually consumed in the United States. The records also show that if an individual ate his per capita quota in oleomargarine exclusively, no butter at all, that his entire tax for the year would be exactly 8 cents.

Again I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not arguing either for or against this tax. I am simply trying to point out to those who have written me and who seem to think that if this legislation passes that the price of oleomargarine will drop, or that they will be able to buy it colored in the State of Ohio, are due to disappointment. Unless as previously stated the Ohio Legislature acts to repeal the present law, the housewife will still color her own oleomargarine, and no drop in price will result from any tax reduction.

Investigations of Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in the course of investigations conducted by the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, of which I am chairman, we have disclosed startling evidence of the manner in which Federal bureaucracy spends the taxpayer's own money to guide his thinking and mold his opinion. It may surprise you to learn that our bureaucracy seeks to do the same thing on an international scale. Let me report an amazing example just recently disclosed.

I dare say the Members of this Congress have labored under the impression that the whole sad, sordid story of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was ended. We know, but would prefer never to be reminded, how the dupes and stooges of this administration frittered away American resources in Europe, dumping billions of dollars worth of our food, equipment, and supplies to rot and rust away while people starved and whole economies stagnated. We know how vicious black markets flourished and corruptionists fattened at our expense. And worst of all, we flinch at the memory of how often our substance went to strengthen and sustain the very forces of aggression which this administration at long last is trying frantically to halt.

We would like to put away these painful memories. We would prefer to close completely this inglorious chapter, which stands out particularly for stupidity in a long story of blundering international relations. We would prefer to leave UNRRA dead and buried under the mountain of its own stupid mistakes. But the remnants of that sorry organization think differently. The stragglers from that debacle are rallying to write their own history—at the trifling cost to the American taxpayers of $363,544.

Does the idea startle and shock you? I assure you that the project is actually under way. The very people who lost their shirts to Stalin, Tito, and the slick politicians of Europe, the very bunglers who have been completely repudiated by Congress are still desperately seeking to justify their existence as historians.

The bare, unvarnished facts of this sorry misadventure should be preserved for objective appraisal by the historians. We should indeed keep the record handy, just as an example of what not to do in international relations. But if history is to be served, we cannot trust the recording to the very people responsible for this spectacular failure. To do so would merely be to buy $360,000 worth of whitewash.

I know that seems a small item. In fact, it is barely a crumb among the billions we have broadcast, and which we are committed to lavish upon Europe. But it certainly can be more than a crumb to hungry people abroad. For example, CARE—Cooperative for American Remittances Abroad—sends nearly 41,000 calories abroad in a $10 package. Granting a European diet of 2,000 calories daily, this sum spent according to the CARE formula would feed 1,000 persons a full year. A diet of 2,000 calories is by no means generous. But our greatest living expert on relief, former President Hoover, has reported that many people in western Germany are trying to sustain life on as little as 800 calories daily. Can we in good conscience toss away even $360,000 to deodorize UNRRA when the money might be used to save lives?

Our committee has learned through experience not to be surprised by bureaucratic attitudes and activities which would have shocked and stunned us a year ago. But I confess that I encountered an official in the course of this inquiry who amazed me. This individual questioned the right of Congress even to inquire about this project. In effect, he told our committee that the affair is simply none of our business.

Of course, the American people merely carried 72 percent of the load in this costly failure. The poor American taxpayer may sweat and struggle to make these tremendous contributions. But in the eyes of our bureaucrats that does not entitle him to inquire through his Representatives in Government how and where and why his money is spent.

This UNRRA history project is shocking, indeed, but it is not unusual. In fact, it has become standard practice for Government agencies to write their own histories. Many such projects have come across your desks, although I imagine they usually went into your wastebaskets with little more than a casual glance. They certainly are never best sellers. In fact, they are not designed and written for that purpose. They are prepared to lend gloss and glitter which their writers hope will fool the historians.

The OPA had an impressive historical staff. So did War Assets Administration, the Petroleum Administrator for War, and many, many others. Literally, millions of dollars have gone down the drain for high-priced talent and extravagant printing jobs. And I can assure you that the bureaucrats will persist in the practice until we here in Congress call a definite halt.

This shocking UNRRA project is a good place to start. Let us nip this project immediately. And then let us move to put an end to this whole vicious business of bureaucrats wasting the taxpayers' money in writing their own epitaphs.

What of the Panama Canal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I delivered before the Cosmos Club in Washington, D. C., on April 19, 1948. The Cosmos Club of Washington, D. C., is composed of men who are distinguished in science, literature, the fine arts, a learned profession, or in public service. Its membership includes many of the most notable men of the Nation.

The address follows:

WHAT OF THE PANAMA CANAL?

I. INTRODUCTION

It is not my intention to attempt a really technical or scientific lecture on the Panama Canal. If you had wanted that sort of a talk, you would, quite naturally, have requested one of the engineers, of either past or present Canal experience, to be your speaker on this occasion. Rather, it is my intention to talk about the Canal in terms that any person of mature intelligence can understand, and about matters of interest to the average citizen of the United States. There is nothing at all mysterious about the Panama Canal, so let's keep it all in the open—just like an egg which has been exposed to the public view in a frying pan.

Canals are for several purposes according to their construction and intent—for the passage of ships under their own power from one body of navigable water to another, for carrying water-borne commerce between an inland port and the open sea, for the passage of Canal boat traffic through large areas of comparatively flat land, for the carrying of immense quantities of water for drainage, irrigation, or use in giant turbines to generate electric power. Canals have many uses, and they are as old as the civilizations of which we know. They have been used in our country since colonial days and are even now serving us well, from New England to California.

The particular canal we are considering is one for the transport of ships between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. The concept of its construction goes back these many years into the time when Spain was overlord of the countries of Central America. Then it follows down into the independence of the Republic of Colombia, and at last into the independence of the Republic of Panama. You remember that actual construction was commenced by the French under the guidance of de Lesseps and that considerable progress was made at that time. However, there were too many obstacles for him and his company to overcome, and work was suspended eventually,

leaving the newly dug areas to grow up with tangles of jungle vegetation.

Then the United States endeavored to make arrangements with the French company and with the Government of Colombia, by which it could take over the work for completion. This might seem like a comparatively simple matter, but it was far from that, for it was all mixed up in treaty stipulations, demands for unreasonable payments for work done and for treaty rights, political considerations by the Republic of Colombia, and so forth. As a result of these, negotiations bogged down, and it appeared for a time that the United States might lose out entirely. But at this point the people of the Isthmus of Panama, who would stand to gain tremendously by the construction of an isthmian canal, took a hand in their affairs. In a surprise move they declared the Isthmus to be an independent nation, under the name of the Republic of Panama, and indicated that the new Government was ready to negotiate with Uncle Sam.

Right here is where President Theodore Roosevelt came in with a bang. "Teddy" was never given to procrastination when he knew what he wanted. So he let it be known that the United States recognized the Republic of Panama as an independent state and that we were prepared to guarantee its integrity against all comers. He negotiated a treaty with Panama for the construction of a canal, for the acquisition of near-sovereign rights over a strip of land 10 miles wide to be known as the Canal Zone, for the use of areas needed for the defense of the proposed canal, and for other purposes incidental to the construction and operation of a canal. We then arranged with the French to take over their interests and were on our way.

The basic question, after work got underway was—should the proposed canal be sea-level or lock? I shall not go into this in detail here as I expect to discuss it rather fully somewhat later in this lecture, so suffice it to say that the decision was for a lock canal, for a three-level canal, with one set of locks at the Atlantic end to lift a ship in three stages from the Atlantic to the surface of Gatun Lake—a total lift of some 85 feet—and for two groups of locks at the Pacific end to lower the ship to the level of the Pacific, or vice versa.

Just here let me mention the quite unexpected fact that the Pacific terminal of the Canal, that is the terminal in the western ocean, is actually to the east of the Atlantic terminal, as the Canal runs in a southeasterly direction after leaving the Atlantic side.

II. THE PRESENT PANAMA CANAL

The Panama Canal is a great artificial elevated waterway that traverses the mountains of the isthmus. The summit level, about 85 feet above the sea, consists of Gatun Lake, formed by imponding the waters of the Chagres River by a dam at Gatun, and an extension of the lake through a vast land cut across the continental divide to Pedro Miguel. Gatun Lake has an area of 163.4 square miles and its water shed has an area of 1,320 square miles. The Canal Zone is located in one of the heavier rainfall areas of the world.

The Pacific end of the Canal differs fundamentally from the Atlantic end. At the Atlantic end, the locks are built in continuous lifts at Gatun and there are commodious anchorages conveniently located at both ends of these locks, thus offering flexible, safe and convenient navigation. The Atlantic end has functioned satisfactorily for more than 30 years, and it has received the acclaim of the shipping world.

At the Pacific end the locks are built in two sections separated by a small intermediate-level lake—surface 54 feet—with one lift at Pedro Miguel and two at Miraflores. This separation of locks, and the location of the Pedro Miguel locks squarely across the mouth of Gaillard cut is operationally unsound. It represents an original error in planning, not appreciated at the time because there had been no experience in operating ships under these conditions. The Pacific end of the Canal has been the subject of severe criticism for many years.

Now, more than 30 years of operations have revealed the defects and limitations of the present canal. The problem is to correct these defects on a sound basis. The first step is to state the premises upon which this discussion should be based.

III. THE BASIC PREMISES

To avoid vagueness and to ascertain clearly the objectives at which I aim, the following premises are accepted as basically correct:

1. The sole purpose of the Panama Canal is the safe and expeditious transport of vessels between the adjacent oceans.

2. The proper objective is the best canal for transiting vessels, that is, the best operational canal practicable of economical achievement.

The logical approach to this objective is obvious. First, there must be a definite statement of the problems of transiting vessels in the existing canal as determined by experience, and then we must have a study of them with a view toward their sensible and logical solution.

Now what are these problems?

IV. THE PRINCIPAL MARINE OPERATING PROBLEMS [1]

A study of the transiting of hundreds of vessels through the Canal, and the marine accidents incident thereto, has established conclusively that the present canal has seven major operational problems which must be considered in any basic plan for its improvement.

These problems are:

(a) Bottle neck at the Pedro Miguel locks.

(b) Double handling of vessels at the Pacific locks with the resulting lock accidents and loss of transit time.

(c) Effect of fogs in Gaillard cut.

(d) Lockage surges in Gaillard cut caused by the operation of the Pedro Miguel locks (3-foot maximum amplitude).

(e) Limited operating range of Gatun Lake (82 to 87 feet).

(f) Navigational hazards caused by the restricted channel in Gaillard cut (300-foot minimum width).

(g) Insufficient width of the present locks (110 feet).

(a) *Bottleneck at the Pedro Miguel locks*

The basic cause of this problem is the location of the Pedro Miguel locks immediately across the south end of the Gaillard cut. Accident studies and repeated operating experiences have shown that the location of these locks at Pedro Miguel was a serious error in original planning.

The main operational factors which contribute to this bottleneck are:

1. Very limited use of Miraflores Lake as a traffic reservoir.

2. Unsymmetrical operating conditions between the Atlantic and Pacific ends of the Canal resulting in traffic-control difficulties.

3. Double handling of vessels at the Pacific locks.

4. The number of accidents to vessels transiting the Pacific locks.

5. Increased time of transit by about 1 hour.

6. Endangering Pacific-bound vessels by forcing them to slow in Gaillard cut in a section where they are subject to cross winds and maximum surges.

7. Jamming of Pacific-bound traffic in a restricted channel between rocky banks when traffic schedules become disarranged.

8. Atlantic-bound vessels leaving Pedro Miguel locks to enter Gaillard cut under adverse conditions for maneuvering.

9. Impairment in operation and reduction in capacity of the Canal during fog periods and periods limited to one-way traffic in Gaillard cut.

The dangerous nature of the Pedro Miguel locks is established by its accident record during many years' operation of the Canal. From January 13, 1922, to July 13, 1942, the following marine accidents occurred at the respective locks of the Panama Canal:

Lock	Number of chambers	Entering	In chambers	Departing	Total
Gatun	3	87	41	24	152
Pedro Miguel	1	79	15	44	138
Miraflores	2	56	28	19	103
Total	6	222	84	87	393

As vessels in the locks are under reasonably good control, the accidents which occur inside the chambers are generally not as serious as those which occur in Gaillard cut but they are all costly and time consuming. The number of lock accidents to vessels inside the chambers is roughly proportional to the number of chambers at the lock concerned.

Although we cannot eliminate accidents in the lock chambers from consideration, the logical basis for comparison of the locks, insofar as navigational hazards are concerned, is the number of entering and departing accidents. The records show the following: Miraflores 75, Gatun 111, and Pedro Miguel 123. These figures indicate very clearly that the Pedro Miguel locks are the most dangerous locks in the canal.

(b) *Double handling of vessels at the Pacific locks and resulting lock accidents and loss of transit time*

This double handling of vessels at Pedro Miguel and Miraflores locks brings delay and hazard which is emphasized during the transit of each vessel. During World War II this factor was of special military significance because the additional structures placed above the gate machinery at the Pedro Miguel locks constituted serious hazards for aircraft carriers which have extended superstructures.

The separation of the Pacific locks into two sets of locks requires one additional approach, one additional lockage, and one additional departure by every vessel that transits the Pacific end of the Canal. These approaches and departures are conducted under unfavorable maneuvering conditions either in the narrow gorge north of the locks or in the small lake south of the locks. These conditions require more deliberate, studied, and cautious approaches and departures and are therefore time consuming. The time lost per transit approximates 1 hour. Quite naturally, this loss of time may be less for small ships and more for large ones.

(c) *Effect of fog on Canal capacity and operations*

Gaillard cut is subject to fogs of the land-radiation type. They occur with an annual average frequency of 1 night in 3 with a duration varying from 1 to 11 hours. At times, these fogs are so dense that the banks of Gaillard cut cannot be seen from transiting vessels. They are of greatest frequency and duration in the wet season. In the dry season they are relatively rare. In 1942 there were a total of 118 fog nights reported—110 in the wet season and 8 in the dry season.

Gatun locks and the adjoining anchorage in Gatun Lake are free from these land radiation fogs. The Atlantic locks, therefore, can and, when necessary, do operate on an uninterrupted 24-hours schedule.

At the Pacific end of the Canal, the Miraflores Locks and Miraflores Lake are also free

[1] Capt. Miles P. DuVal, USN, presentation before the Governor of the Panama Canal and his board of consulting engineers, May 13, 1947.

from these fogs. Thus at times Gaillard cut, when closed to navigation by fog, separates two fog-free terminal areas. The southern limits of fog in Gaillard cut are in the immediate vicinity of the Pedro Miguel Locks. Hence, a vessel from the Pacific terminus can reach these locks when there is fog in Gaillard cut but it cannot go farther. Because of the limited berthing capacity of the Pedro Miguel lock walls, the number of Atlantic-bound vessels which can tie up to wait for fog to clear is limited to the wall capacity. No Pacific-bound vessels can reach these locks during dense fog.

Because of the dangers to navigation in a restricted channel with rocky banks, fog in Gaillard cut is a very serious problem. Vessels do not enter Gaillard cut during fog, but wait for favorable visibility. At the Atlantic end of the Canal, vessels are not hampered by fog. They can assemble in Gatun Lake as a mobilization point, or at times they can proceed leisurely through the lake while waiting for fog in Gaillard Cut to clear. At the Pacific end there is no comparable summit lake or anchorage to serve as a reservoir for transit traffic. The capacity of the Panama Canal is thus reduced from its rated capacity of 27 ships per lock per day to the capacity of the Pedro Miguel locks during favorable weather in Gaillard cut.

(*d*) *Lockage surges in Gaillard cut (3 feet maximum amplitude)*

When the Pedro Miguel locks are operated, large volumes of water are drawn from Gaillard cut—about 3,800,000 cubic feet for each lockage or about 118,750 tons. Drawing this water from the end of the narrow Gaillard cut creates a tide-like wave that moves from the locks through Gaillard cut to Gatun Lake. From the lake the wave is reflected back toward the locks. It continues to oscillate between the locks and the lake, with a decreasing amplitude, until it disappears some hours later unless augmented by subsequent lockages at the Pedro Miguel Locks.

The maximum amplitude of this lockage surge is about 3 feet. The period of time from the origin of the wave until its return to the Pedro Miguel locks is 45 minutes. Its computed velocity is 36.4 feet per second or about 25 miles per hour.

When these surges pass points, discontinuities in the banks, or bends in the channel, they create local movements of water which have frequently caused vessels passing at the time to sheer. They also reduce the depth of the channel by half the amplitude of the surge. Both of these surge effects make navigation more dangerous. More than one vessel has struck the banks, sustaining serious damage and even sinking, presumably as a result of sheers caused by these lockage surges.

The force of lockage surge is well illustrated by the case of the steamship *Steelore*, a heavily laden and unwieldy ore vessel of 36,000 tons displacement, which developed a sheer while in Gaillard cut on an Atlantic-bound transit on February 17, 1942, struck the west bank near La Pita, ruptured some of her forward plates, and began to take water. The attending tug put her alongside the bank where she soon sank. Shortly thereafter, to the great surprise of those standing on the *Steelore's* deck, she rose perceptibly, moved forward several feet, and again came to rest. In this movement she parted some of the wire hawsers which had been made fast to bollards on the bank. This was a graphic demonstration of the tremendous power of these lockage surges.

(*e*) *Limited operating range of the Gatun Lake level (82 to 87 feet)*

In the wet season the inflow of water into Gatun Lake is sufficient for all purposes—lockages, power, and municipal consumption. In the dry season the inflow is insufficient to maintain the desired water levels. Because of this insufficiency of water in the lake for operating purposes in the dry season, the water level is brought up to its highest safe operating level of 87 feet near the end of the wet season to create a reserve water supply for lockages and for channel depths—a reserve which since 1935 has been augmented by the storage capacity of Madden Lake.

During the dry season the expenditure of water may reduce the level of Gatun Lake to a low level of approximately 82 feet. The volume of water between these two levels, 87 and 82 feet, thus represents the reserve water-storage capacity for the dry season. The corresponding minimum channel depths are 47 feet for the wet season and 42 feet for the dry season. But from these minimum channel depths one must subtract the surge factor of 1.5 feet in Gaillard cut to determine the minimum controlling depths in the cut, which then become 45.5 and 40.5 feet, respectively. The maintenance of proper lake levels at all times is basic, therefore, for the navigation of deep-draft vessels which, when passing through the restricted water of the cut at a speed of 6 knots, increase their draft about 1 foot by sinking and squatting.

(*f*) *Navigation hazards caused by bends and restricted channels*

A plot of the marine accidents along the Canal between Gatun locks and Pedro Miguel locks since 1914 shows that the more serious accidents have occurred mainly in Gaillard cut, especially just after a vessel rounds a bend. Gatun Lake in general is free of accidents because its channels are wide and vessels can go fast enough to have effective steering control. Navigation in Gatun Lake is comparable to that in a large bay. Accidents in it are not caused by channel restrictions but by other factors such as steering gear or machinery failures, violations of the rules of the road, errors in judgment, blinding rain, or strong winds.

The inherent dangers to navigation in the restricted channels of Gaillard cut are augmented by the channel form, curvature, lockage surges, and discontinuities in the banks caused by slides over many years. There is no wonder that Gaillard cut is the part of the Canal most feared by mariners and most dreaded by the pilots. It is the part of the Canal in which special precautions must be taken during the transit of unwieldy vessels. For example, the heavily laden ore vessels while transiting the cut are required to take tugs to tow from ahead, and large naval vessels are also accompanied by tugs and also are sometimes towed. Even these precautions are not always sufficient.

(*g*) *Insufficient width of the present locks (110 feet)*

The present locks are 110 feet wide. With few exceptions, they can accommodate the largest commercial vessels in the world. Because Panama is not located between the great centers of world population, commercial vessels of the largest sizes will seldom be routed on a schedule requiring a transit of the Panama Canal. There are, however, a small number of our largest warships that are too great in beam to pass through the present 110-foot locks. The last approved lock widths of the third lock project was 140 feet. The principal lock dimensions recommended in the Governor's recent report are 1,500 feet by 200 feet by 50 feet.

While the problems just enumerated are the principal ones to be considered in connection with safe and expeditious operations in the Panama Canal, there are several others which might be added. These would include the regulation of the level of the Miraflores Lake level, the control of traffic in the Gaillard cut, and the silting of the Pedro Miguel locks. I think, however, that we are now ready to consider the possible future development of the Canal in the light of past experiences and of present conditions.

V. THE CONGRESS DIRECTS A STUDY OF THE CANAL

The Seventy-ninth Congress, looking forward toward the modernization of the Panama Canal, enacted Public Law 280, approved December 28, 1945, which authorized and directed the Governor, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, to investigate the means for increasing the capacity and the security of the Canal to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense.

It will be noted that this law contains two significant word groups: capacity in relation to interoceanic commerce, and security in relation to the national defense. Previous laws on this subject concerned only capacity and interoceanic commerce without regard to security and national defense. Thus, this is the first basic Canal law in which the elements of security and national defense have been officially injected into the Canal question.

Because of the dual nature of the law caused by this injection of the security and capacity provisions, the meaning of the law is not explicit since it depends upon the relative importance one assigns to the two phases, that is, to capacity and security.

I believe the intent of Congress was to obtain a comprehensive investigation of all the pertinent facts relating to the subject. The law obviously required studies to be made of the lake canal, a sea level canal, and of canals at other locations without implying any mandatory recommendation for changing the present type of canal or for building a new canal for security purposes.

The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has kept in close touch with the Canal situation. It has studied available literature, consulted many authorities on the different phases of the investigation, visited the Canal to observe its operation, and examined the Governor's recent report, in which he recommends that the Canal be converted to a sea-level type as the "only means" or " meeting adequately the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense."

Available records show that a sea-level canal has long been the objectives of certain engineers who are both in and out of the Government service. It was contemplated in the report of the Interoceanic Canal Board of 1931. It was an important point injected into the 1939 third locks project.[2]

It might be noted here that until 1945 the engineering genius of the United States seemed so overwhelmingly in favor of the lake-type canal that the advocates of the sea-level type could not muster sufficient strength to launch a drive for it against the known opposition. But the advent of the atomic bomb in 1945 set up a favorable psychological atmosphere for securing a sea-level canal and it was seized upon promptly as a lever with which to launch such a campaign. Since that time "security" has been stressed by Canal authorities as the justification for a sea-level canal, under an interpretation of a law which, I understand, was drafted originally by those who afterward directed the investigation. It is not believed that any such extreme interpretation of the law was in the mind of the Congress which enacted the law, even though it may have been in the minds of those who prepared the original draft of Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress.

As far as I can ascertain, the greatest authorities on modern weapons of war who have given this subject serious attention hold uniformly that any canal would be critically vulnerable to the atomic bomb, regardless of type; that a sea-level canal would be in the same security class as a lake canal; that a sea-level canal could be closed for prolonged periods of time beyond any hope of speedy restoration; and that

[2] H. Doc. No. 139, 72d Cong., and H. Doc. No. 210, 76th Cong., and Panama Canal, Third Locks Project (pamphlet), 1941.

a sea-level canal cannot be considered secure in an atomic war. These same authorities also agree that the atomic bomb is irrelevant as a controlling factor in the planning of operational improvements for the Panama Canal.

Since the law authorizing the investigation recently completed contemplated the national defense in its broader sense, there are many aspects in the over-all strategic situation which must be considered in arriving at a correct evaluation of the strategic importance of the Canal. Among these are: The complete disappearance of Japanese naval forces from the scene of present-day international force; the building and maintenance of a two-ocean United States Navy with vessels of great speed and cruising radius; the possible change in methods and means of combat when any future war is compared with the one just fought; the transportation of fuel oil across the Isthmus by pipe lines; the numerous transcontinental railroads, highways, and air routes across the United States from east to west; and the possibility of transcontinental pipe lines for carrying oil or gas to the Atlantic or Pacific ports. We must also give thought to the increasing industrialization of the West and the Middle West—a condition which bids fair to continue as population centers shift toward the Pacific coast. All of these factors have reduced the strategic importance of the Canal far below what it was when opened in 1914 or even at the end of World War II; nor should the obvious fact be overlooked that the security of any isthmian canal rests more upon the combined military might of the United States than upon its physical characteristics or its type.

VI. THE SEA-LEVEL CANAL

The first question is: What is meant by a sea-level canal? In the minds of many it is a nebulous and alluring idea of a wide strait through which vessels can proceed safely and swiftly without stopping or even slowing. The concept is usually different from the viewpoint of each who contemplates it. To many it is an idea of beguiling simplicity. But to ship operators and engineers who have studied the subject, the sea-level canal is not the simple and plausible solution which it appears to be.

The sea-level plan proposed in 1931 and repeated in 1939 called for a channel 500 feet wide following the present alinement. The design of that channel with its sharp bends was such that a canal so constructed could hardly have been safely navigated. Because this plan utilized the excavation of the present canal, the project, as then visualized, might properly have been called a conversion.

The sea-level plan proposed in the Governor's report of 1947 differs radically from the 1931 plan in that it abandons the major part of the present canal alinement and contemplates a new canal with a new alinement somewhat removed from the present canal but intersecting it in five places.

The 1947 plan, therefore, cannot be considered a conversion of the present canal to a sea-level type. Instead it represents in every sense a vast new project. It would require the negotiation of a new canal treaty with the Republic of Panama—something not at all certain of attainment in view of our present differences with that Latin-American nation.

The execution of this plan quite obviously would require the virtual destruction of the present canal, the abandonment of the greater part of the excavations so far accomplished over many years at vast cost, and the construction of a new canal, knowing in advance that the new canal would be less economical, less practicable, and possibly less safe than the canal it would replace.

The plan for this new canal calls for digging through treacherous terrain a new channel of 60 feet minimum depth and 600 feet width at a depth of 40 feet; the construction of enormous tidal regulatory structures near the Pacific end; and extensive earth dams and other flood control installations on both sides of the canal to protect it from the periodic flood waters of the Chagres River valley—a plan that would place high lakes in the valleys on both sides of the sea-level channel.

This plan greatly increases the length of the hazardous restricted channel as compared to Gaillard cut in the present canal. It is obvious that navigation in this restricted channel of greater length would be more dangerous than navigation in the wide channels of Gatun Lake. Responsible engineers have stated that a sea-level canal could never be a true strait of Panama, as is claimed by some of its advocates.

The basic operational results of the proposed sea-level plan would be as follows:

(a) Extend the restricted channel length from 8 to 30 miles.

(b) Extend the collision, grounding, machinery, and steering failure areas to the same extent.

(c) Extend the length of channel subject to fog to almost the entire length of the canal (Miraflores to Gatun).

(d) Decrease the hours of fog-free operation.

(e) Create alternating currents of varying strengths in the restricted channels for both the controlled and the uncontrolled current operation.

(f) Endanger unnecessarily the security of transit in both peace and war, especially for large vessels if and when the canal should be operating as an open waterway with alternating currents.

A study of the marine operating problems of the Panama Canal indicates that the sea-level plan does not present a sound solution to the operational difficulties of the present set-up. The irrelevance of the security hypothesis is accepted by atomic experts. The elimination of these two issues, that is, of operational advantages claimed and of security, reduces the question to that of an increase in capacity. This can be achieved at a much earlier date and at far less cost by a modernization of the present canal.

VII. THE TERMINAL LAKE PLAN OF MODERNIZATION

The practical way to increase the capacity of the Canal is through the correction of the difficulties covered in the operational problems mentioned in section IV of this paper. This correction must include a twofold field. First, it must provide necessary operational improvements in the basic plan of the Canal, and second, it must contemplate the construction of a larger set of locks with correlated channel improvements for the accommodation of the largest vessels able to pass through the augmented locks.

On the Atlantic side, the problem can be solved very simply by the construction of the set of larger locks in the excavated site for the third locks project. This will salvage most of the work already performed at this site.

On the Pacific side the solution requires the reconstruction of the Pacific end of the Canal so as to place all Pacific locks near Miraflores in the same general manner as all Atlantic locks now are at Gatun. The changes at the Pacific end should include: (1) the removal of the Pedro Miguel locks, (2) the location of Pacific locks in continuous lifts near Miraflores, and (3) the creation of a summit level anchorage between the Pacific locks and the adjacent end of Gaillard Cut for use as a traffic reservoir.

In addition to these changes, the water level of Gatun Lake should be raised to its highest feasible level to supply deeper channels for navigation and more water for lockages.

This plan, known as the Terminal Lake plan, has been found sound from an engineering standpoint and is supported by many eminent interoceanic ship-canal engineers, such as Dr. R. H. Whitehead and Mr. W. G. B. Thompson, both of whom are here this evening.

This plan will improve and simplify canal operations by supplying a traffic reservoir at the Pacific end of the Canal to match the Gatun anchorage at the Atlantic end. It will eliminate lockage surges in Gaillard cut, reduce marine accidents, reduce the time of transit, mitigate the effects of fog on capacity of the Canal, and reduce maintenance and operating costs. It will provide for a possible future increase of capacity through the relatively simple and inexpensive method of building additional locks in the natural impounding perimeters of the terminal lakes. It seems to be the simplest, most economical, and most sensible method of modernizing the Panama Canal ever devised. It is a plan that utilizes nature rather than opposing it.

VIII. ESTIMATES OF COST

Statements have been published widely in the United States that money costs should not be considered a governing factor in the modernization of the Canal. This view is challenged as unsound, for additional billions of the peoples' money should not be spent unless it can be shown that such expenditure is essential to the safety of the Nation.

The following estimates from the Governor's report of 1947 are quoted:

Sea-level canal	$2,483,000,000
Lake canal (ultimate projected)	2,308,000,000

The inference to be drawn from these estimates is that the lake-type and sea-level type projects are in approximately the same cost status.

Official records show that from 1931 to 1947 the sea-level cost estimate increased from $994,563,000 to $2,483,000,000; and from 1939 to 1947 the lake type from $277,000,000 for the third lock project to $2,308,000,000 for the terminal-lake plan (ultimate projected). It should be noted that a large part of the increase in the lake type is for the many security and defense items included in the ultimate projected provision, and for the excessively large lock sizes of 200 by 1,500 feet, all of which seem quite unjustified for the proper modernization of the Canal on a common-sense basis.

Also, engineers with whom I have been in correspondence inform me that they consider the estimates for the sea-level canal to have been greatly minimized and those of the terminal-lake type considerably exaggerated.

However, regardless of what the final estimates may prove to be, it should be kept clear that the ultimate costs are of vital importance to both the taxpayer who has to advance the money (or pay interest on bonds in an equivalent amount) and to the ship operators who have to pay tolls to keep the Canal in operation. Saddling the enormous cost of a sea-level canal on the merchant marine would likely be such a blow that few ships could survive in ocean traffic now passing through the Canal. Even now the President is increasing the tolls on merchant vessels to meet current operating expenses of the present comparatively low-cost waterway.

The issues raised by the Canal question are so momentous as to require an independent investigation under congressional sanction and direction before this matter can be decided intelligently.

IX. PROPOSED INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION

The Panama Canal is again in a great historical crisis. The decisions involved are too great for any one man to shoulder—too great for the people to undertake to accomplish upon the recommendation of any one man or one particular professional group. Neither should they be dictated by any single agency of the executive branch of the Government.

The logical method of arriving at a sound determination of the complex subjects involved in the Isthmian problem is through that truly American device of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission representing the various interests involved, especially representing the paramount interest of the taxpaying people of the United States. With this view, I am sure many prominent Canal authorities, like Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher, also present this evening, will agree.

To accomplish this, I introduced H. R. 4833, a bill to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission of nine members, three from the combat branches of the armed forces and six from civil life, with one of the civilians designated as Chairman. It should be noted that this bill does not require that those appointed from civil life be engineers, although I assume that a considerable number of them would be of that profession. It does contemplate the appointment of the best qualified men of established reputations and backgrounds of experience, men in which the public may have every confidence. With a Commission such as this, there would be every reason to expect a final determination which both the people and the Congress could accept as the best within the scope of our present-day knowledge and ability.

A Triumph for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 21, 1948:

A TRIUMPH FOR DEMOCRACY

Justifying the hope that the western world had placed in them, the Italian people have won a smashing victory for their own sovereignty and independence and for the forces of liberty and democracy elsewhere. By the same token they have administered a defeat to the forces of Russo-Communist totalitarianism that have already engulfed half of Europe and sought to engulf Italy as well. Called upon to decide between these two forces in the most crucial election since the war, in which the fate not only of Italy but of all western Europe hung in the balance, the nation that only recently emerged from under the yoke of a Fascist dictatorship rolled up a two-to-one majority for the democratic coalition of Premier de Gasperi.

The credit for this victory belongs first of all to the Italian people, who turned out in record numbers to outvote the disciplined forces of the left. Beyond that this victory is a vindication of American policy, especially of the European recovery program and the offer of Trieste, which promise Italy bread and national self-respect, and against which the Communists could only offer guns for a civil war in behalf of Soviet domination. The "viva America" that went up from many Italian throats as they read the election results is proof that they understood the difference. Their choice of the American way against the Russian way, which is also the choice of all Europe wherever it is able to express a choice, not only makes the Italian victory an American victory as well, but should dispose of the leftists myth that America is unpopular abroad because it is not following leftist policies.

The final election returns must still be tabulated, but enough are at hand to assure a large majority for the Government coalition in both Houses of Parliament, and perhaps even an absolute majority for Premier de Gasperi's Christian Democrats. This should assure a strong and stable government, able to hold the Communists in check and prevent a repetition of the chaos that arose especially in northern Italy under weak governments after the First World War, and led finally to the rise of Mussolini and his Fascist dictatorship. The announced decision of Premier de Gasperi to keep the Communists out of the government is a guaranty that they will not be permitted to smuggle their Trojan Horse into the citadels of authority to capture the state from within, as they have done in so many other countries.

At the same time, reassuring as the victory is, it must still be viewed only as one victory in a continuing struggle. For the Communist defeat must be judged more in the light of their boastful expectations rather than in terms of their total loss. They have been routed in their former strongholds in the industrial north, but they seem to have gained in the agricultural south. And though their defeat may be expected to deprive them of many of their dupes, and perhaps end the shameful spectacle of professedly democratic Socialists acting as stalking horses for Communists, the latter remain a powerful, if no longer a decisive, factor in the Italian scene. Their talent for conspiracies, for sabotage, and for organization of underground armies will find new stimulus in their defeat.

In view of this, the Italian Government will have two major responsibilities. The first must be to observe the maxim that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. The second is to seek to ameliorate just grievances which the Communists can exploit for their own ends and with the backing of the Soviet power center. In both these policies the Italian Government will inevitably labor under handicaps imposed on it by the disarmament provisions of the peace treaty and by the consequences of a lost war. But having voted for staying up with the West instead of going down with the East, the Italian people can be assured that the West will do all it can to help them in their struggle. In that respect, we believe, the United States will not be found lagging.

Eamon de Valera

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by the Honorable Eamon de Valera, former Prime Minister of Ireland, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on March 30, 1948, which I feel will be of interest to the people of the United States. From coast to coast, the warm welcome extended to Eamon de Valera was a tribute from the heart of America. His visit to this country gave our citizens an opportunity to express the high regard in which they hold this fighter for freedom. He led the long, hard struggle to win back the independence of Ireland. As its first executive, he brought peace and progressive leadership to the young nation which was reborn during one of the most trying periods in world history. Under his wise counsel and prudent administration, Eire has prospered.

We of Irish descent are proud of Eamon de Valera. Born in the United States, he was taken by his folks to the old country to return the blessed freedom which America had given to so many of his forebears.

From the early days of the Revolution up to the present time, Irishmen have not only been in the vanguard of our armed forces, but have made outstanding contributions to the Government of these United States.

When we stop to think of it, we realize the close kinship which unites the people of Eire and the people of the United States. Both believe passionately in freedom under God.

A great statesman speaks, in the name of democracy.

Today 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland are completely free as a recognized sovereign, independent and democratic state. We in the 26 counties are as free as any people on the earth. Free to manage our own affairs, and to mold our own destinies, so far as the will of a people can do these things. For this independence we have to thank in the first place the efforts and sacrifices of the Irish people at home; next the aid we received from our friends abroad, particularly from those here in the United States—aid that was invaluable and indeed at times vital; finally and in the later stages we have to thank the more enlightened statesmanship in Britain—statesmanship that recognized that a free Ireland beside Britain is a far more valuable asset and a far better ultimate guaranty of security than an Ireland embittered through suffering wrong at the hands of Britain and one likely in consequence to side with Britain's foes in the days of other peril.

Unfortunately, the freedom I have mentioned extends only to 26 of Ireland's 32 counties. Six counties are still held by England as a part of the United Kingdom with the Parliament in London as the sovereign parliament. A local parliament for the six counties exercising certain subordinate powers has also been set up. The separation of the 6 from the 32 counties and the partition thereby of our national territory was effected by an act of the British Parliament passed in the year 1920. Previous to this partition, Ireland was a unity. The area cut off by this partition act was determined by no principle of right or justice. It corresponds to no natural unit, historic, geographic, or economic. Go through the whole Irish history since its history began, look up any map of the country made prior to 1920 and you will not find any evidence of any division such as that which now mars the face of our country. This division of Ireland originated not in any principle of right or justice but in British party politics during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. If you study the British party politics of that period you will find that the Tory Party raised the cry, "Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right," as a device to embarrass the Liberals under Gladstone and the Irish Party under Parnell in the campaign for home rule. The Tories defeated the home-rule efforts in Gladstone's day. Under Asquith a majority was secured in the British Parliament for a home-rule bill just before the commencement of the First World War. The Tories were once more determined to bring to nought and revived the old cry and actually arming their supporters in the northeastern part of our country. The Liberals then suggested that the home-rule bill should temporarily not apply to four of these northeastern counties in which the Tory supporters were in a majority.

But World War I began. The home-rule bill was suspended. Late in 1916 uprising

took place in Ireland and in December 1918 the Irish people in a national plebiscite self-determined themselves as an independent republic. The republic was solemnly proclaimed in the national capital by the elected representatives of the people on the 21st of January 1919, and the struggle to maintain that republic began. It was under these circumstances that the British Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, in 1920 had passed through the British Parliament the partition act, which cut off the six northeastern counties, as I have indicated.

Since then efforts have been constantly made by propagandists to make it appear somehow that this division of Ireland was a natural one and justifiable. They keep calling the area cut off Ulster, for example, to suggest that it corresponds to the ancient Irish province of that name. But the Province of Ulster consists of nine counties, not six. So that the portion cut off is but a part of Ulster. Ulster itself being partitioned as well as Ireland. One may wonder why Lloyd George and his fellow architects did not cut off the whole of the Province of Ulster and so justify the name. The reason is that if they had done so they could not depend on having a favorable majority in the larger area. They could cut off six because with the greater density of Tory supporters in the city of Belfast and its immediate neighborhood, the Nationalists in the six-county area taken as a whole would be outnumbered even though in the hinterland added on, the Tories were in a minority and the Nationalists in a majority.

The propagandists would like to believe that there is a uniform Tory political predominance throughout the whole six counties. That is completely at variance with the facts. In the pre-1920 constituencies of South Down, South Armagh, in the counties of Tyrone and Fermanagh and in Derry City, the second largest city in the six counties, there are substantial majorities against partition. These areas border on the free part of Ireland—the 26 counties and their inhabitants desire union with the rest of their fellow-countrymen. They are not allowed to exercise their choice and unite. They are kept separate from us by force. British troops are in occupation. Were these areas to be restored there would remain an area roughly of the size of two counties only in which there is a Tory majority desiring separation. Actually from the 6 counties one could cut off 4 counties and in these 4 counties there would be a majority that desires union with free Ireland. It is clear, therefore, that if the excuse for cutting off the 6 counties from the 32 be that you can get a Tory majority in that area, then by the same reasoning and on the same basis the blocked 4 counties in which you can get a Nationalist majority should be cut off from the 6.

To understand the iniquity of the partition as we see it in Ireland, one must always remember that it was only in Belfast and its immediate neighborhood that there is anything like a uniform substantial Tory majority and that even in this restricted area there is a Nationalist minority opposed to partition as great relatively as the Tory minority in the whole of Ireland.

Of course, were it to be accepted as a principle that a political minority in a nation are entitled to cut themselves off in whatever area they find themselves in a majority, no democratic state could continue to exist. When I was in this country nearly 30 years ago, I learned that certain States such as Maine and Vermont, remain constantly Republican, even when the majority of the people thoughout the Union vote for a Democratic administration. Would one grant to Maine and Vermont the right to cut themselves off from the United States and attach themselves, say to, Canada? I was also made aware that certain other States, some of those in the solid South, remain Democratic constantly even when a Republican administration is elected by the majority of votes in the country as a whole. Would these Southern States be permitted to cut themselves off because, although being a minority in the whole Nation, they were a local majority? I think not. If such a thing were permitted, the United States would soon cease to exist, and the efforts of Washington and Lincoln be made in vain?

I have spoken of the attempt made to suggest that the area cut off from the rest of Ireland—the six-county area—is a historic entity, viz., the province of Ulster, and shown you that is false. I have shown you likewise that it is false to suggest that the six counties is an area of homogeneous Tory predominance. I have shown you that in all but an area of roughly two counties the Tories or Partitionists are in a minority, and the anti-Partitionists or Nationalists are in a majority. One would expect, accordingly, that in the local governing bodies of these areas the Nationalist representatives would be in a majority. You would be mistaken, however. By gerrymander barefacedly carried out the Nationalists are cheated out of their democratic right. Although a minority in the local population, the Tories are in control of the local government authority. By gerrymander one Tory vote is made to count as much as two Nationalist votes.

I give you some examples:

Take Derry City, the second largest city in the six counties.

In Derry there are 27,000 Nationalist voters and 18,000 Tories. The Nationalists can elect only 8 members on the city council, the Tories elect 12.

One Tory vote is worth two Nationalist votes.

Next take the Urban Council of Dungannon: There are 1,900 Nationalist voters and 1,800 Tory. The Nationalists get only 7 members, the Tories 14.

Again, one Tory vote is worth two Nationalist.

Finally, take a rural area, the Castlederry Union area. Over 5,000, viz, 5,158, Nationalists can only get 6 seats, whilst under 5,000, viz, 4,990, get 16.

And here one Tory vote is worth much more than two Nationalist votes.

These are not exceptional instances. I could have selected not 3 but 23 such examples.

Are you surprised that with such examples before us we in Ireland smile a cynical smile when we see posing as champions of democracy those who are responsible for the continuance of this contempt of democracy. Do you blame us for regarding their fine professions as mere hypocritical lip service?

I have, I hope, shown you that the partition of Ireland was designed solely to maintain Tory privilege in the part cut off.

It is falsehood to suggest that there exists in the six counties some distinctive race of Nationalists which dictate separation and forbids union with the rest of Ireland. There is in the 6 counties an admixture of blood similar to that in the 26 counties. Almost 800 years of a fundamentally similar history and intermarriage have seen to that. Celtic, Danish, Norman, and Saxon strains in varying measure are to be found in all parts of Ireland. Catholics, Protestants, Presbyterians, Methodists are found in every province. The differences are in no sense difference in kind.

Ireland is a nation and it is one nation with its territory traditionally delimited by the ocean. None but a vandal hand would cut it up.

Today efforts are being made to bring the nations of western Europe together—to bring into a union states which have many points of differences and many diverging interests. How can we regard as sincere those who while professing to work for such a union insist on keeping divided a nation and a territory that are naturally one.

The Port of Hampton Roads, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a very instructive, informative, and interesting address delivered at the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce maritime affairs luncheon held April 16, 1948, by former Commander Raymond M. Bottom, of the city of Newport News, on the port of Hampton Roads, Va.

This address collects valuable information which I am sure will be read with interest.

Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the State chamber, I feel that a considerable distinction attaches to the fact that I, who live in Newport News, was asked to make this talk to you about Hampton Roads. You are meeting here in Norfolk, one of Virginia's oldest and her second largest city, center of maritime activity, shipping, shipbuilding, fishing and sea-borne industry, a community rightfully jealous of its past and ambitious of its future. Scores of Norfolk men could make you a better talk on Hampton Roads. But magnanimity rules here on these ancient shores and even at the risk of my promoting my own community—a sister increment in the Hampton Roads scene—I was nevertheless asked to speak, and if thus I was given this wonderful opportunity to put in a few preferential licks for Newport News and its advantages, I was also entrusted with the moral responsibility of not using the chance. And thus, also, is exhibited the trust and the mutual confidence that animate the people of these rival communities and this great and important section of our State.

It is my assignment to speak to you of the assets of Hampton Roads to Virginia. We here in this web-footed country of great natural resources have in the past been made to stand aghast at the lack of knowledge of our community on the part of some of our fellow citizens of the interior. A story is told that a few years ago the newspapers of the State carried a news article with a Norfolk date line saying that several hundred thousand dollars had been appropriated for the improvement of Hampton Roads. A prominent gentleman of the great Ninth Virginia District read the story and immediately registered a protest with the State highway commissioner against the expenditure of so large a sum of money on those roads when the highways in his section were suffering from meager and wholly inadequate allocations. Such a state of affairs is, I suppose, a reflection upon us here, for otherwise over the course of the 341 years, lacking 11 days, since the three little ships of Newport & Smith first came within the capes we would have done a better job of informing our State about ourselves. I must say though I've never heard of Norfolk and its sister cities accused of retiring modesty.

Actually Virginia grew and spread from Hampton Roads and its immediate environs. Until April 1607, when the Newport-Smith expedition came into the Capes and subsequently made its way to Jamestown to establish a colony that was to grow into what we are today, there had been even others within these waters, but thankfully they didn't take root. The date of the first known arrivals is established by some historians as 1498, when John Cabot, sailing out of Bristol in England,

reached land on this side of the ocean and explored the coast. Between then and 1607, both Italian and Spanish explorers are known—or presumed from the records—to have come into Hampton Roads—in 1524, 1526, 1566, 1570, 1571, 1573, 1588. In 1585 a Captain Lane explored the Roads and Elizabeth River from the Raleigh Colony at Manteo. From 1607 onward, a little at a time in the beginning, the area was settled and the roots spread themselves up the waterways and then to the westward to make Virginia a strong and sturdy new land of opportunity and resource. Truly here are Virginia's roots, and here is an asset the full fruits of which yet remain to Virginia to harvest.

As you look about Hampton Roads today an inspiring panorama of bustling activity greets your eyes. Strip it of the years and look upon it as it grew from the handful of adventurers who landed at Jamestown in May 1607. The land hereabouts was inhabited by about 20,000 Indians, who were in time to make life hard for the settlers. The population of the colony was somewhere around 2,000 whites when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth in December 1620. Although 5,000 additional men, women, and children arrived in the next 5 years, a census of 1634 enumerated only 4,914 whites of all classes, reflecting a bitter story of hardship, famine, sickness, and massacre. By 1649 the population of the area had increased to 15,000, and in 1666 there were 40,000 settlers in Tidewater. From then onward the growth has been steady. Today in the Hampton Roads area more than half a million of Virginia's people live, work, and play in or on the shores of this marvelous estuary. And there is yet room for a million more to share with us our local blessings and opportunities.

The asset value of Hampton Roads originates in the water itself. The James, the Nansemond, the Elizabeth River, and the York River flow into and make this great basin in which all the ships of the world perhaps, could find an anchorage and still have elbow room. Past the sentinels that guard it from the sea, Capes Charles and Henry, have moved ships bearing the Nation's destiny and holding in their custody our very lifeblood. But if the area is one of high romance and steeped in historical ties with the past, it is one also now of highest importance as a port and a center of seaborne trade. And while its principal wealth and strength finds its source in shipping and shipbuilding, a wide range of manufacturing operations have found the area advantageous in their purposes.

The port of Hampton Roads is a collective designation that embraces the port cities of Norfolk, Portsmouth, South Norfolk, and Newport News and the adjacent towns and cities. The collective advantages of the area exist and are made available without destructive competitive practices between the communities. The port occupies a place midway the eastern coast line of the United States, highly strategic both for war and peace. It is served by 8 trunk-line railroads, by more than 50 steamship lines providing overseas service to all parts of the globe and by many intercoastal, coastwise, bay, and river steamer lines. The interconnection between the elements of this comprehensive system of transportation, both within the area and into and out of it, has been so organized that shipping cargoes are routed and handled with the greatest dispatch and maximum economy.

Here are all of the accessories for the expeditious and efficient handling of all manner of cargo. Warehouses, docks, wharves, cranes, and every labor-saving and cargo-saving device known to modern trade and commerce are available to the use of Virginia industry and that of the wide hinterland beyond our borders. Important new port terminal installations are now under construction, providing still further for the efficient handling of commerce and trade.

The impact of Hampton Roads on the economy of Virginia may be measured by the statistics of some of its many operations. First there is shipping. In 1946, the last year for which total figures are available, the waterborne commerce in and out of the port totaled 24,736,426 tons, the highest of all time. The residue of that is reflected in jobs for thousands of people and revenues of hundreds of thousands of dollars in the State treasury. Hampton Roads has for a long time been the greatest coal transshipment port in America. The total dumpings in 1947 exceeded 30,000,000 tons, handled to the port by the three greatest coal-carrying railroads in the Nation. In 1 month in 1947 dumpings over the piers exceeded 3,600,000 tons, an average of 5,000 tons an hour around the clock. In 1946 foreign cargo out of the port totaled 7,551,193 tons, and one of the principal items in this, after coal, was tobacco. A total of 204,791 tons of this Virginia commodity valued at about $457,000,000 went overseas in that year over Hampton Roads piers. These shipments accounted for 53 percent of the total value of all exports from the port in 1946. Hampton Roads dominates the important shipment of unmanufactured tobacco in this country, a distinction that is of transcendent importance to Virginia, for the money that flows from this trade comes from the outside to add to our wealth and substance.

Hampton Roads has ranked fourth as an east coast port in foreign waterborne commerce but is fast creeping up on some of its competitors. Although the totals for 1947 are not yet available, it is believed that Hampton Roads came next after New York in export tonnage on the Atlantic seaboard. Is not that a distinction for Virginia? Does it not earn and encourage interest on the part of Virginia's businessmen in the further development of the port?

Beyond shipping there is centered here a thriving and prosperous seafood industry, producing wealth for the State at its source. The waters of Hampton Roads and its tributaries abound in sea food. John Smith himself exclaimed at the plentiful supply of fish and oysters and clams. He was author of what doubtless was tidewater's first fish story—certainly it is the oldest. Writing of their adventures on an exploration in the Hampton Roads area they said, "We found in divers places that abundance of fish lying so thick with their heads above water as for want of nets (our barge driving amongst them) we attempted to catch them with a frying pan, but we found it a bad instrument to catch fish with. Neither better fish, more plenty, nor more variety for small fish had any of us ever seen in any place so swimming in the water, but they are not to be caught with frying pans." Further they reported that chancing later to ground their boat on the channel bank at low tide, they spied many fishes lurking in the grass and Smith "sported himself by nailing them to the ground with his sword," and set his companions fishing in the same original manner and "thus", they reported, "We took more in one hour than we could eat in a day."

Virginia's sea-food industry, centered largely in the Hampton Roads area, is a valuable asset originating in a natural resource that is available for the using of it. There are no current measurements by which the present impact of this can be shown, but in 1943 the last year for which there is a figure, the value of sea-food products produced was nearly $6,000,000. If could be added to this the value of that taken by the nonprofessional fisherman, doubtless the sum would be substantially increased. The conservation of this natural resource is a matter of State-wide importance, not of Hampton Roads alone. This great asset has suffered trials and tribulations in the past originating in lack of understanding of the special problems involved in it of an unenlightened view toward it. It merits the interest of leaders in the State such as you to the end that it may remain the high asset it has been in the past. An indication of the potentialities in this exists in the fact that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, sea food and fisheries produced for the State treasury a total of more than $170,000 in special taxes of various sorts, licenses, and other fees applicable to the industry. During that year 3,503 tongers were issued licenses to take oysters, clams, and scallops from tidewater waters, a level of employment and livelihood for a number of people that is supported by few Virginia private industries. Again, the money that accrues from this industry, too, flows from without to add to the sum of our wealth.

Another prime asset of this bustling area is its shipbuilding industry, giving employment to thousands of our citizens and support to hundreds of local retail outlets whose sources of supply reach back into the State and in turn support farms, factories, and service establishments there. Here are two of the finest shipyards in the world, one a Navy establishment, the other a private enterprise, the source of the income of both coming largely from outside the State to bolster Virginia's substance. Other smaller yards, too, contribute their part to this flow of wealth, and collectively they form a prideful asset to the State's resources. The fact that in Hampton Roads there exist shipbuilding and ship repair facilities and abilities the equal of those anywhere in the world—and the superior of most—is most certainly a warming reflection for any Virginian. Here have been constructed the most powerful warships in the world and the largest and most luxurious passenger vessels ever built in this country. Here exists the capacity to meet any shipbuilding demands originating in our Nation's activities, either of war or peace, a capacity for bringing new wealth into the State, that earns the interest of every Virginia businessman.

The impact of foreign trade as I have briefly shown it to you together with the impact of a shipbuilding industry of such proportions as Hampton Roads possesses have a natural connection in our country's over-all foreign policy and particularly our merchant-marine policy. If our Nation shall continue to hold its place in world trade, a strong, well-manned adequate merchant marine is an indispensable necessity—a merchant marine possessing ships of sizes and facilities equal to the competition of our overseas neighbors and to the needs of our own commerce. The policy that controls this rests in political spheres, for it is still necessary that our country maintain subsidies to protect our workmen against the inferior standards of living of workmen abroad. We can exercise our influence in this—as we very well should—by making ourselves heard. Virginia businessmen cannot be silent or indifferent in this field for in it grows for us not alone the nourishing substance of trade and wealth, but comfort in the knowledge of a mother nation adequately equipped to meet the demands of a highly competitive world.

Yet another asset of Hampton Roads that spreads itself beyond our shores to benefit Virginia as a whole is the concentration here of great and important Army and Navy installations. Besides the Norfolk Naval Shipyard there is the far-flung Norfolk Naval Base and the Norfolk Naval Air Station, together with their many satellite installations. Here is the Armed Services Staff College, an institution of advanced learning for the brains of the armed forces. Here is the headquarters of the Army Field Forces, the headquarters of the Tactical Air Command of the Army Air Forces. Here also is the important and complete laboratory of the National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics, pioneering in solving the problems in the science of flight. All of these establishments contribute their quota of wealth to the area and the State. Here is the base of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet and here the great naval supply depot that feeds, nourishes, and supplies the Navy's

ships and shore installations. The aggregate of the impact of these increments of substance upon the community and the State would be most difficult to measure, but that they are of major import is a self-evident fact.

There are other assets that Hampton Roads provides for Virginia. Next, perhaps, to those that I have outlined is the asset as a recreation area. Here there are miles and miles of ocean beaches, of inland shores adapted ideally to the pleasure and recreation of mankind. Here there are waterways in abundance that lure the boatman and the fisherman. Here are coral strands that offer to our fellow citizens of the State every relaxation from the cares of business, every repose from the pressure of routine duty. In the summer, cooling breezes caress the weary body and anoint the fagged spirit. In the winter, the lure of ducks and of geese and of other game in abundance provides for the Nimrods every encouragement of their proclivities and every challenge to their capabilities.

Here, then, is Hampton Roads. It is the depot and the distributing center for its own and its great hinterland's products. Here coal and cotton and tobacco and fruit and vegetables and sea food and a hundred other vital commodities of human existence funnel through an important center to the places where they are used. Marine commerce could never outgrow this gigantic basin. It exists for your use. Discover Hampton Roads and its value to you and to Virginia. Interest yourselves in its advantages. Here is one of the world's greatest harbors, one of the world's greatest tobacco-export ports, one of the Nation's greatest centers of merchandise exchange, one of the world's greatest depots for transshipment of coal. Here is one of the Nation's greatest ports of embarkation and debarkation in times of national emergency. Every time the Nation gets into trouble Hampton Roads is rediscovered as a place of high national strategic importance. Here exists one of the world's great shipbuilding centers. Here are the roots and the beginning substance of Virginia. Can you not with us who live here feel a pride in it? A desire to see it expand in its usefulness to the State and its people?

We who belong here and know of our own knowledge of the tremendous opportunities that exist here would urge and encourage your interest and curiosity. We are potentially the greatest port on the Atlantic coast. The people of the Hampton Roads area cannot, though, by themselves make it this. All of Virginia, sharing the benefits from the assets that lie here, must participate in the furtherance of our influence and the enlargement of our capacity. Every Virginia businessman can help in the further development of this great State asset. If you should buy from abroad, you can see to it certainly that what you buy comes to you through Hampton Roads in United States-flag ships. If you ship abroad, you can exercise your influence in the same direction. When you have done so, you have helped develop an asset for your own business, for your own State. The largest part of Virginia can be served best and most economically through Hampton Roads in export, import, coastwise, and intercoastal commerce.

There are many agencies here purposed to serve you and your collateral connections. The facts of the port and its facilities offer to all of Virginia business the opportunity to partisan efforts in its own behalf. There are the Hampton Roads Port Authority, the State port authority, the Hampton Roads Maritime Exchange, the Hampton Roads Port Traffic Commission, the industrial commissions of Norfolk, Newport News, and Portsmouth, the chambers of commerce, all organized and equipped to help Virginia business and industry to greater benefits and profits through the use of the natural and man-improved facilities of Hampton Roads.

Here truly is one of Virgina's great and enduring assets. It stands ready to serve Virginia. It needs the support of Virginia citizens and the continuing interest of Virginia business. It is the gateway of Virginia and its hinterland to the world, a pulsating and vibrant port through which the world's goods and commerce can flow to and through Virginia. Here exist in abundance the facilities and accouterments that serve the well-being and contribute to the satisfaction of living. Here is the wealth of natural resources and the willingness of labor and of brain to put them to use. Diversity of industry, cohesion of interest, singleness of purpose highlight the Hampton Roads communities in their march toward supremacy in their service to Virginia and the Nation. Here opportunity exists for all of Virginia. Here exists the binding and exacting traditions of an honorable past which give character to local effort in a modern world gaged to the stimulation of competition for a pleasant and satisfying way of life.

There is here among the dwellers in Hampton Roads an intimacy with the waters and a love for them and a dependence upon them and a recognition of their usefulness to the purposes of mankind. It is hardly mere fancy that gave currency to the saying that Cape Charles and Cape Henry at the entrance to Hampton Roads are the Pillars of Hercules of the West. Historically they stand guard over seas that are the cradle of the great civilization of a new world, a new world of which Virginia was the stepping stone. Today they still exist to serve us and our needs in a world far more complex than ever has before existed

The sum of all of these substantial increments of wealth and well being impresses itself upon the community to make a variety and a diversity of interests. But also they, together with the conditions—geographical and physical—that are peculiar to the area make problems not found elsewhere in the State. These problems have not always had the sympathetic understanding elsewhere in Virginia that they merited and as a consequence the community has not advanced with the progress that otherwise could have been achieved. The problem of transportation across the many waterways, of bridges and ferries, has plagued us here. Little concession has been made to this inescapable peculiarity of a seaside community. We still have to acquire our bridges through the same means that lesser bridges in other parts of the State are provided, and are thus burdened by toll barriers that limit communication. With adequate funds for bridges to span the waters that separate the communities of Hampton Roads an impetus would be given to progress that would return benefits that would pay for the costs many times over. We need here in this problem the support and the backing of the far-sighted businessmen of the State to bring about the reordered principles that will let us have the funds necessary to major expenditures for bridges and ferries.

We need also a broader understanding of the functions of and opportunities open to our State port authority. It is the agency for the promotion beyond our boundaries of the interests of the port, to produce business for the port and its facilities, to enlarge the installations of the port for the service of ships and shipping, to collect and disseminate data, to study the problems of shippers and importers, to show the economies of trading through Hampton Roads. It cannot now, for the want of authority and of money, carry out these important functions. It should be an authority in fact as well as in name and it should be provided enough money to do a complete job of aggressive promotion and stimulation. It should be able to build docks, wharves, piers, warehouses, and other port installations wherever and whenever the need for its doing so to further the interests of the port should arise, issuing revenue bonds guaranteed by the State for the purpose. The fruits of the service it could thus render the State would make the money it costs a handsome and profitable investment. Here your influence is needed and your understanding of the opportunities that exist in such a program of so paramount an importance. Today Hampton Roads, looking backward upon 300 years of progress, looks ahead to greater opportunities. To serve State and Nation through Virginia's own gateway to the world overseas, a door through which an ever-growing stream of substance can come to us. We urge you to help us help it meet the opportunities that beckon us.

Communistic Infiltration Into the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include in my extension of remarks the second of a series of eight articles written by Gustaf A. Nordin, of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, dealing with the question of communistic infiltration into the State Department. These articles are proving very revealing, and I know that information contained in these and subsequent articles will be of great interest and benefit to the membership of the House.

LOYALTY OF 108 ON STATE DEPARTMENT ROLLS CHALLENGED

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—In the files of the House Appropriations Committee rests a document of some 40,000 words which seriously questions the loyalty of 108 present, past, and prospective employees of the State Department of the United States.

Only fragments of this carefully guarded document have been permitted to reach the outside world.

Within its pages are the findings of "the best FBI operatives" in the business.

Names of the Federal employees are not given. The sketches are in sufficient detail, however, to permit each employee to identify himself and to determine what the State Department, FBI, and House investigators think of them.

Case numbers 5, 9, 44, 52, 61, and 99 have been discussed in brief on the floor of the House of Representatives.

A few outsiders have seen copies of the coveted report.

Many of the 108 individuals are permitted to handle top secret material.

Although proof is not always present, the case histories conclusively show that the State Department is keeping on the pay roll employees who are considered poor security risks. They fall into that category even by taking the State Department's own description of who constitutes a security risk.

Hamilton Robinson, Director of the Department's Office of Controls, says, "The top investigation is made whenever evidence comes to the attention of the security people that there is some evidence of disloyalty, subversive activities, or things of that nature * * *. On the other hand, although we are going to try and get these people out of the Department, we must have evidence of a substantial nature to justify dismissal."

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, authorized a rider to the 1946 State Department appropriation bill which gives

the Secretary of State absolute authority to fire anyone if it is "necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

It does not require proof or a shred of binding evidence.

The question is simply one of "security." It is not to be confused with "loyalty," which comes under the jurisdiction of President Truman's special loyalty board directed by Seth W. Richardson. Any employee filed as a bad security risk has no appeal to the loyalty board or the courts.

The case history of No. 5 in the "confidential" report is one of the longest.

No. 5 was employed in 1945 in the Research and Intelligence Division. Eight persons, including six professors at Harvard and the University of California, a naval officer, and a fellow student, were interviewed and stated that No. 5 "has strong Communist sympathies." They said he "is either a party member or a fellow traveler."

He was discharged from a Navy school during the war for poor grades and for "pro-Communist activities."

LETTER FROM RUSS

"One person said that on several occasions he has seen letters addressed to No. 5 from the Soviet Embassy."

An official of Georgetown University in Washington, D. C., said he hired No. 5 to conduct an evening class in Chinese and later learned he was connected with Communist groups on the west coast.

He claimed a doctor of philosophy from the University of California in applying for the State Department position. He failed in his examination and did not receive the degree.

The Central Security and Intelligence Agency, commonly known as CSA, recommended his dismissal last June. A month later, Assistant Secretary of State John Peurifoy, in charge of administration, said he did not feel "that there was sufficient evidence against No. 5 in view of the fact that he had not been shown to commit any overt acts or to affiliate himself with Communist organizations."

DELEGATE TO RUSSIA

Last September 4, No. 5 was interviewed and he "stated that he would prefer a Communist regime in China to their present form of government although his views may be contrary to the State Department's policy." He admitted association with several organizations said to be Communist fronts. He is still on the pay roll as far as is known.

Case No. 9 "is also a case of a questionable security risk."

The State Department was in the middle of a word war over the future of Italy last September when No. 9 was sent to Milan as a Foreign Service reserve officer under the information and cultural program. Italy is today holding an election which pits the United States democratic system against the Russian totalitarian system.

No. 9 was a member of the trade unions delegation to Russia in 1927. AFL President William Green repudiated that delegation as communistic.

No. 9 was a sponsor of the New Theatre Guild, a Communist front; he is listed as a member of the American Civil Liberties Union, another alleged front; he is reported a member of the League of American Writers which was created in 1935 at the Congress of American Revolutionary Writers and is on Attorney General Tom Clark's list of subversive organizations; he is a member of the American Society for Cultural Relations in Russia, a predecessor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and he belonged to the Chicago branch of the North American Committee to aid the Spanish Democracy, a front to aid the Communist Loyalist government in Spain.

He has written books and articles showing Russia in "a very favorable light." He "revolutionized the educational system" in a small town while a superintendent of schools.

LISTED AS RED

He is reported "to have introduced a Russian primer in the school after having visited Russia in 1927."

The records in the industrial detail, Chicago police department, listed him as a Communist in 1930.

The Roman Catholic Church objected to his assignment to educational duties in Italy. A Foreign Service inspector notified the State Department that No. 9 "is a pedantic, tedious, conceited, impractical, pompous man who would enjoy the pleasures of the right, but popularity with the left."

The Central Security and Intelligence Agency reported in 1946 that "investigation disclosed evidence of a material nature tending to affect adversely No. 9's reputation, ideologies, and his loyalty to the Government of the United States and its institutions."

During Appropriations Committee hearings, Robinson, Director of the Office of Controls, was asked if No. 9 is still in the employ of the State Department. He replied:

"Yes, sir. It is awfully easy to damn a man on the basis of that kind of statement when it has not been examined. * * * You have to make reasonably sure in your own conscience that somebody is not getting a dirty deal."

Robinson's department recommended that nothing be done because "The available information is not sufficient to regard the subject as a security risk."

The Italian Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick, from the New York Times of April 21, 1948:

ABROAD—FIRST MAJOR VICTORY OF MARSHALL PLAN IS WON IN ITALY

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The largest vote ever polled in a free election—about 94 percent of the electorate—decided the fate of democracy in Italy. In weighing the reasons for a victory that surpassed the expectations of the most optimistic democratic leaders, this should be put first. It inspires more optimism than any of the other reasons because it proves that communism can conquer only by default or force. It has never won and never will win when the whole people consciously exercises a choice. The moral is that the world menace is not communism but the indifference or defeatism of democrats. The Communist Party is, or was, larger in Italy than anywhere, but it is always a minority, running on outside power, and a minority cannot prevail where the majority is alert, resolute, and free.

Why the Italian people turned out in force is another question. Many motives and various influences drew them to the polls. At least two-thirds of the population, according to the latest reports, voted for their religion, for the United States, for American aid, for Trieste, for the right to vote again. Voting itself, choosing among many parties, is in itself a little intoxicating to people who had no choice for so many years.

PEOPLE COUNT

A remarkable feature of the remarkable campaign was the ponderous silence at most of the enormous outdoor meetings. One felt in the listening crowds the sense of historic responsibility to which Italians readily respond. Perhaps nothing swayed the voters more than the belief that they were important. There is a moral in this, too; in a world where the individual has been made to feel helpless either by dictatorships or the magnitude of events, convincing people that they count is the best way to make them count.

The Pope was a powerful influence. Quite aside from his personal prestige, Italians would hate to see Rome diminished by losing its place as seat of the Holy See and center of Christendom. When the chances of Communist victory seemed high, Pius XII was resolved, he declared, to stay whatever happened. "We can only die," he said, "and for me that would be a release." But an independent church under a Communist regime would be impossible in the long run, and this consideration affected even anticlericals. There is no question that the religious issue played a decisive part in the outcome, especially in the villages, where the Communists counted on making dramatic gains. The village priest was pitted against the Communist boss, and while the parish was not so expertly organized and had no such material inducements to offer, it proved the effective counter to the Communist cell.

AID FROM AMERICA

American aid was an enormous factor. If any Italian did not know where his daily bread was coming from, it was not the fault of Ambassador James C. Dunn. A career diplomat hitherto regarded as a stickler for protocol, Mr. Dunn broke all precedents by going up and down the country publicizing and dramatizing the arrival of American supplies. These ships, unloaded at every possible port, do more than anything to point the contrast between what America does and what Russia says. It is hard to beat something with nothing, as Mr. Togliatti must have reflected as he sputtered against Mr. Dunn during a campaign that went far to wreck his thesis that if the party promised enough, threatened enough, worked hard enough, and made the most of made-to-order conditions in a country as poor as Italy, it could win by political agitation.

De Gasperi and his government made an effective appeal. They produced an impression of firmness, moderation, and honesty. The Trieste proposal changed many votes, but not so many as the flood of letters from Italian-Americans to their relatives and friends in Italy. Probably no single factor weighted the scales as heavily as this. Whole villages read these letters. They were discussed in the cafes. They were the witnesses that a confused and groping people believed. There is something very moving in the way these immigrants of yesterday rose to the opportunity of testifying for America and American intentions. In an hour of test, this is the best gage of the strength of the great union we have made out of the peoples of Europe.

All these influences merely emphasized the basic issue of the campaign. The Italian majority voted for freedom. They voted to be independent, to be themselves. They voted in response to the profound urge that moves all peoples who have known what it means to have liberty and what it means to lose it. Giuseppe Saragat, leader of the anti-Communist Socialists whose gains indicate that the Popular Front is broken, says that the election marks the rebirth of democracy in Europe.

This election is the first great political victory of the Marshall plan. The effect in Europe should be to spur the efforts and renew the confidence of the western nations. There is little chance now that the Communists can come to power in Italy, even by a coup. The opposing forces are fortified by a fresh infusion of courage and faith in

themselves. And that is a good omen for other countries. It means that the balance is tilted everywhere.

The effect in the United States should be to confirm our policy of backing recovery and make Congress and the people more than ever convinced that if we use every political, economic, and moral weapon we have, we can win the greatest political battle of all time without a shooting war.

Scrap-Iron Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the European recovery program plans to take 1,600,000 metric tons of scrap iron out of western Germany. Of this 1,320,000 tons will go to the participating countries in Europe, while only 280,000 tons will be sent to this country.

My colleagues in the House will certainly agree to my observation that this hardly seems to be a fair distribution, when one realizes the tremendous demands which the whole European recovery program will make on our own steel production.

Also, the March 1948 report of the official United States industry-Government scrap iron and steel mission to Germany has just warned us that we need an energetic American scap-iron export policy in Germany to sustain the continued top production in this country. I, therefore, suggest that this problem be reexamined both by the administration and by the new Administrator of the European recovery program.

Dr. Edward U. Condon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles which I referred to in my remarks today:

APRIL 12, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of April 9, 1948, in which you ask whether this Department desires to express any views with respect to House Resolution 522.

The resolution would direct the Secretary of Commerce to transmit to the House "the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon."

The Secretary of Commerce has previously declined to make available to the House Committee on Un-American Activities the contents of confidential files relating to the loyalty investigation conducted by that Department with regard to Dr. Condon. This refusal was in keeping with the well-established principle that it is in the public interest to maintain on a confidential basis reports rendered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The right of the Executive to maintain such reports on a confidential basis has long been recognized as his constitutional prerogative. The sound considerations of policy which support the assertion of this prerogative have been well stated many times. There is attached hereto a copy of an opinion rendered by Attorney General Jackson on April 30, 1941, addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. In that opinion, Attorney General Jackson took the position, with the approval and at the direction of the President, that records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are confidential documents of the executive branch and that congressional or public access to such records would not be in the public interest. The opinion points out that this view accords with the conclusion reached by a line of predecessors in the office of the Attorney General and with the position taken by the President from time to time since Washington's administration. It further points out that exercise of this discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary. For the sound reasons which support this position, taken by the executive branch since the founding of the Republic, I refer you particularly to pages 2 and 3 of Attorney General Jackson's opinion. Pursuant to this well-established policy, the President on March 13, 1948, directed all officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government to maintain in confidence all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees, including the reports of such investigative agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Compliance with House Resolution 522 would require a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of Commerce, to violate the President's directive in this regard. If there is anything well established under our tripartite system of government, it is that members of the President's Cabinet, although appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, are responsible to the President (*Myers* v. *United States*, 272 U. S. 52). Agreement by the House to the resolution would, therefore, raise serious questions of a constitutional nature. The resolution would constitute legislative interference with an important executive function of the President, namely, the supervision of those officers of the Government who are responsible to him. As stated by William Howard Taft in his book, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, 1916, at page 129:

"The President is required by the Constitution from time to time to give to Congress information on the state of the Union, and to recommend for its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient, but this does not enable Congress or either House of Congress to elicit from him confidential information which he has acquired for the purpose of enabling him to discharge his constitutional duties, if he does not deem the disclosure of such information prudent or in the public interest."

There is attached hereto a memorandum which points to the provisions in the Constitution and to the Supreme Court decisions which bear upon this subject and which reveals the unconstitutionality of the proposal embodied in House Resolution 522.

A brief reference to historical precedents relating to resolutions similar to House Resolution 522 will be helpful. In January 1807 the House of Representatives passed a resolution that the President of the United States be requested to lay before the House information in his possession, except such as he may deem should not be disclosed in the public interest, touching any illegal combination of private individuals against the peace and safety of the Union. The Burr conspiracy was then stirring the country. Jefferson had made it the subject of a special message to the Congress. Jefferson's reply to the resolution was in the form of a message to the House and Senate wherein he pointed out that he had received a mass of data, most of which had been obtained without the sanction of an oath so as to constitute formal and legal evidence, which he could not, without divulging private confidences and exposing names furnished confidentially to the Government, divulge to the House. (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, volume 1, page 412, January 22, 1807.)

Similarly, in 1843, a resolution of the House of Representatives called upon the Secretary of War to communicate to the House the reports made to the War Department by Lieutenant Colonel Hitchcock relative to the affairs of the Cherokee Indians, together with all information communicated by him concerning the frauds which he had been charged to investigate. The Secretary of War advised the House that he could not communicate information which Colonel Hitchcock had obtained in confidence, because it would be grossly unjust to the persons who had given the information. The House, however, claimed the right to demand from the Executive and heads of departments such information as may be in their possession relating to subjects of deliberations of the House. President Tyler, in a message dated January 31, 1843, said in part:

"And although information comes through a proper channel to an executive officer, it may often be of a character to forbid its being made public. The officer charged with a confidential inquiry, and who reports its result under the pledge of confidence which his appointment implies, ought not to be exposed individually to the resentment of those whose conduct may be impugned by the information he collects. The knowledge that such is to be the consequence will inevitably prevent the performance of duties of that character, and thus the Government will be deprived of an important means of investigating the conduct of its agents." (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 4, pp. 221–223.)

The reports of Colonel Hitchcock concerning the delegates of the Cherokee Nation were not communicated by President Tyler to the House. The reasons given by the President for the failure to send the papers and documents referred to were that suggestions, anticipated projects, views dealing with the personal character of persons, would not be of aid to Congress in legislation, and their publication would be unfair and unjust to a Federal official and inconsistent with the public interest.

Our first President, in his Farewell Address, cautioned against the dangers resulting from the encroachment by one branch of the Government upon the other. He wrote:

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism." (Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. I, p. 219.)

In view of the foregoing considerations, this Department recommends that House Resolution 522 be not favorably reported.

The Department of Justice has not had the opportunity to submit this report to the Bureau of the Budget.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

POSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT REGARDING INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS

It is the position of the Department of Justice, restated now with the approval and at the direction of the President, that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department and that congressional or public access thereto would not be in the public interest.

This accords with the conclusions reached by a long line of predecessors in the office of Attorney General and with the position taken by the President from time to time since Washington's administration; and this discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary.

APRIL 30, 1941.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Committee on Naval Affairs.

MY DEAR MR. VINSON: I have your letter of April 23, requesting that your committee be furnished with all Federal Bureau of Investigation reports since June 1939, together with all future reports, memoranda, and correspondence of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or the Department of Justice, in connection with investigations made by the Department of Justice arising out of strikes, subversive activities in connection with labor disputes, or labor disturbances of any kind in industrial establishments which have naval contracts, either as prime contractors or subcontractors.

Your request to be furnished reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is one of the many made by congressional committees. I have on my desk at this time two other such requests for access to Federal Bureau of Investigation files. The number of these requests would alone make compliance impracticable, particularly where the requests are of so comprehensive a character as those contained in your letter. In view of the increasing frequency of these requests, I desire to restate our policy at some length, together with the reasons which require it.

It is the position of this Department, restated now with the approval of and at the direction of the President, that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government, to aid in the duty laid upon the President by the Constitution to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest.

Disclosure of the reports could not do otherwise than seriously prejudice law enforcement. Counsel for a defendant or prospective defendant, could have no greater help than to know how much or how little information the Government has, and what witnesses or sources of information it can rely upon. This is exactly what these reports are intended to contain.

Disclosure of the reports at this particular time would also prejudice the national defense and be of aid and comfort to the very subversive elements against which you wish to protect the country. For this reason we have made extraordinary efforts to see that the results of counterespionage activities and intelligence activities of this Department involving those elements are kept within the fewest possible hands. A catalog of persons under investigation or suspicion, and what we know about them, would be of inestimable service to foreign agencies; and information which could be so used cannot be too closely guarded.

Moreover, disclosure of the reports would be of serious prejudice to the future usefulness of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As you probably know, much of this information is given in confidence and can only be obtained upon pledge not to disclose its sources. A disclosure of the sources would embarrass informants—sometimes in their employment, sometimes in their social relations, and in extreme cases might even endanger their lives. We regard the keeping of faith with confidential informants as an indispensable condition of future efficiency.

Disclosure of information contained in the reports might also be the grossest kind of injustice to innocent individuals. Investigative reports include leads and suspicions, and sometimes even the statements of malicious or misinformed people. Even though later and more complete reports exonerate the individuals, the use of particular or selected reports might constitute the grossest injustice, and we all know that a correction never catches up with an accusation.

In concluding that the public interest does not permit general access to Federal Bureau of Investigation reports for information by the many congressional committees who from time to time ask it, I am following the conclusions reached by a long line of distinguished predecessors in this office who have uniformly taken the same view. Examples of this are to be found in the following letters, among others:

Letter of Attorney General Knox to the Speaker of the House, dated April 27, 1904, declining to comply with a resolution of the House requesting the Attorney General to furnish the House with all papers and documents and other information concerning the investigation of the Northern Securities case.

Letter of Attorney General Bonaparte to the Speaker of the House, dated April 13, 1908, declining to comply with a resolution of the House requesting the Attorney General to furnish to the House information concerning the investigation of certain corporations engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp or print paper.

Letter of Attorney General Wickersham to the Speaker of the House, dated March 18, 1912, declining to comply with a resolution of the House directing the Attorney General to furnish to the House information concerning an investigation of the smelter trust.

Letter of Attorney General McReynolds to the secretary to the President, dated August 28, 1914, stating that it would be incompatible with the public interest to send to the Senate, in response to its resolution, reports made to the Attorney General by his associates regarding violations of law by the Standard Oil Co.

Letter of Attorney General Gregory to the President of the Senate, dated February 23, 1915, declining to comply with a resolution of the Senate requesting the Attorney General to report to the Senate his findings and conclusions in the investigation of the smelting industry.

Letter of Attorney General Sargent to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, dated June 8, 1926, declining to comply with his request to turn over to the committee all papers in the files of the Department relating to the merger of certain oil companies.

In taking this position my predecessors in this office have followed eminent examples.

Since the beginning of the Government, the executive branch has from time to time been confronted with the unpleasant duty of declining to furnish to the Congress and to the courts information which it has acquired and which is necessary to it in the administration of statutes. As early as 1796, the House of Representatives requested President Washington to lay before the House a copy of the instructions to ministers of the United States who negotiated a treaty with Great Britain, together with the correspondence and other documents relating to that treaty. In declining to comply with the request, President Washington said:

"* * * as it is essential to the due administration of the Government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office * * * forbids a compliance with your request." (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 1, pp. 194, 196.)

In 1825, the House of Representatives requested President Monroe to transmit certain documents relating to the conduct of the officers of the Navy of the United States on the Pacific Ocean, and of other public agents in South America. In his reply, President Monroe refused to comply with the request, stating that to do so might subject individuals to unjust criticism; that the individuals involved should not be censured without just cause, which could not be ascertained until after a thorough and impartial investigation of their conduct; and that under those circumstances it was thought that communication of the documents would not comport with the public interest nor with what was due to the parties concerned. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 2, p. 278.)

In 1833, the Senate requested President Jackson to communicate to that body a copy of a paper purporting to have been read by him to the heads of the executive departments, dated September 18, 1833, relating to the removal of the deposits of the public money from the Bank of the United States. President Jackson declined. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, p. 36.)

In 1835, the Senate passed a resolution requesting President Jackson to communicate copies of the charges, if any, which might have been made to him against the official conduct of Gideon Fitz, late surveyor general south of the State of Tennessee, which caused his removal from office. In reply President Jackson again declined to comply. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, pp. 132, 133.)

This discretion in the executive branch has been upheld and respected by the judiciary. The courts have repeatedly held that they will not and cannot require the Executive to produce such papers when in the opinion of the Executive their production is contrary to the public interest. The courts have also held that the question whether the production of the papers would be against the public interest is one for the Executive and not for the courts to determine. *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 169); *Totten* v. *United States* (92 U. S. 105); *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168, 190); *Vogel* v. *Grauz* (110 U. S. 311); *In re Quarles and Butler* (158 U. S. 532); *Boske* v. *Comingore* (177 U. S. 459); *In re Huttman* (70 Fed. 699); *In re Lamberton* (124 Fed. 446); *In re Valecia Condensed Milk Co.* (240 Fed. 310); *Elrod* v. *Moss* (278 Fed. 123); *Arnstein* v. *United States* (293 Fed. 946); *Gray* v. *Pentland* (2 Sergeant & Rawle's (Pa.), 23, 28); *Thompson* v. *German Valley R. Co.* (22 N. J. Equity 111); *Worthington* v. *Scribner* (109 Mass. 487); *Appeal of Hartranft* (85 Pa. 433, 445; 2 Burr trials, 533–536; see also 25 Op. A. G. 326).

In *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson*, supra, the court said:

"It is believed to be one of the chief merits of the American system of written constitutional law, that all the powers intrusted to government, whether State or National, are

divided into the three grand departments, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. That the functions appropriate to each of these branches of government shall be vested in a separate body of public servants, and that the perfection of the system requires that the lines which separate and divide these departments shall be broadly and clearly defined. It is also essential to the successful working of this system that the persons intrusted with power in any one of these branches shall not be permitted to encroach upon the powers confided to the others, but that each shall by the law of its creation be limited to the exercise of the powers appropriate to its own department and no other."

In *Appeal of Hartranft*, supra, the court said:

"* * * We had better at the outstart recognize the fact, that the executive department is a coordinate branch of the Government, with power to judge what should or should not be done, within its own department, and what of its own doings and communications should or should not be kept secret, and that with it, in the exercise of these constitutional powers, the courts have no more right to interfere, than has the executive, under like conditions, to interfere with the courts."

The information here involved was collected, and is chiefly valuable, for use by the executive branch of the Government in the execution of the laws. It can be of little, if any, value in connection with the framing of legislation or the performance of any other constitutional duty of the Congress. We do not undertake to investigate strikes as to their justification or the lack of it, but confine investigation to alleged violations of law, including of course violation of statutes designed to suppress subversive activity, and to general intelligence to guide executive policy. Certainly, the evil which would necessarily flow from its untimely publication would far outweigh any possible good.

I am not unmindful of your conditional suggestion that your counsel will keep this information "inviolate until such time as the committee determines its disposition." I have no doubt that this pledge would be kept and that you would weigh every consideration before making any matter public. Unfortunately, however, a policy cannot be made anew because of personal confidence of the Attorney General in the integrity and good faith of a particular committee chairman. We cannot be put in the position of discriminating between committees or of attempting to judge between them, and their individual members, each of whom has access to information once placed in the hands of the committee.

Of course, where the public interest has seemed to justify it, information as to particular situations has been supplied to congressional committees by me and by former Attorneys General. For example, I have taken the position that committees called upon to pass on the confirmation of persons recommended for appointment by the Attorney General would be afforded confidential access to any information that we have, because no candidate's name is submitted without his knowledge and the Department does not intend to submit the name of any person whose entire history will not stand light. By way of further illustration, I may mention that pertinent information would be supplied in impeachment proceedings, usually instituted at the suggestion of the Department and for the good of the administration of justice.

It is for the reasons given that I feel it my duty to decline your request, believing that in them you will find justification for my refusal.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. JACKSON.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIONS TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 522

The constitutional objections to House Resolution 522 may be briefly summarized as follows:

I. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

The Constitution provides: "The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States." (Art. 2, sec. 1, clause 1.)

Before entering on the "execution of his office," the President must take an oath: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States"; (art. 2, sec. 1, clause 7) and the President is also required to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." (Art. 2, sec. 3.)

While the Constitution does not mention the words "Cabinet officer" or "Cabinet member," it does provide that the President may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer of each of the executive departments, and the President is also given power, with the Senate's consent, to appoint the heads of departments. (Art. 2, sec. 2, clause 2.)

From 1789 until 1913, there were established 10 executive departments, all of which partake of one uniform system and function, to enable the President to perform his duties under the Constitution as the Chief Executive Officer of the Nation. The present attempt by Congress to interfere with the President's executive function is not new. Attorney General Mitchell, in an opinion to President Hoover, dated January 24, 1933, wrote:

"Attempting to have committees of Congress approve executive acts, or execute administrative functions, or participate in the execution of laws is not a new idea. Carried to its logical conclusion it would enable Congress, through committees or persons selected by it, gradually to take over all executive functions or at least exercise a veto power upon executive action, not by legislation withdrawing authority, but by the action of committees, or of either House acting separately from the other." (37 Op. A. G. 62.)

II. COURT DECISIONS

The rule of law which governs the exercise of the President's power, under the Constitution, to control the acts of the heads of departments, was stated by Chief Justice Marshall in *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 143, 144 (1803)), as follows:

"By the Constitution of the United States, the President is invested with certain important political powers, in the exercise of which he is to use his own discretion, and is accountable only to his country in his political character and to his own conscience. To aid him in the performance of these duties, he is authorized to appoint certain officers, who act by his authority and in conformity with his orders. In such cases their acts are his acts; and whatever opinion may be entertained of the manner in which Executive discretion may be used, still there exists, and can exist, no power to control that discretion. The subjects are political; they respect the Nation, not individual rights, and, being entrusted to the Executive, the decision of the Executive is conclusive" (p. 164).

The assertion has also been made that since Congress created the executive departments they necessarily have the power to compel the heads of those departments to obey its commands, rather than the President's wishes. Chief Justice Taft answered that contention as follows:

"But it is contended that executive officers appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate, are bound by the statutory law and are not his servants to do his will, and that his obligation to care for the faithful execution of the laws does not authorize him to treat them as such. The degree of guidance in the discharge of their duties that the President may exercise over executive officers varies with the character of their service as prescribed in the law under which they act. The highest and most important duties which his subordinates perform are those in which they act for him. In such cases they are exercising not their own but his discretion. This field is a very large one. It is sometimes described as political. *Kendall* v. *United States*, 12 Peters, 524 at p. 610. Each head of a department is, and must be, the President's alter ego in the matters of that department where the President is required by law to exercise authority" (*Myers* v. *United States*, (272 U. S. 52, 132–133)).

After citing instances of executive dealings with foreign governments and with domestic problems, Chief Justice Taft stated:

"In all such cases, the discretion to be exercised is that of the President in determining the national public interest and in directing the action to be taken by his executive subordinates to protect it. In this field his Cabinet officers must do his will. He must place in each member of his official family, and his chief executive subordinates, implicit faith * * *.

"The duties of the heads of departments and bureaus in which the discretion of the President is exercised and which we have described, are the most important in the whole field of executive action of the Government" (p. 134).

Finally, in *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602), the Court stated:

"The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others, has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. So much is implied in the very fact of the separation of the powers of these departments by the Constitution; and in the rule which recognizes their essential coequality. The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there" (pp. 629–630).

In *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135 (1926)) the principal question before the Court was whether the Senate had the power, through its own process, to compel a private individual to appear before one of its committees, in order that he might give testimony needed to enable the Senate efficiently to exercise a legislative function belonging to it under the Constitution.

After reviewing the legislative practice beginning with an investigation by the House of Representatives in 1792, the statutes relating to the compulsion of the testimony of private persons, and the court decisions, the Court thus stated its conclusion:

"So, when their practice [referring to both Houses of Congress] in the matter is appraised according to the circumstances in which it was begun and to those in which it has been continued, it falls nothing short of a practical construction, long continued, of the constitutional provisions respecting their powers, and therefore should be taken as fixing the meaning of those provisions, if otherwise doubtful" (p. 174).

The heart of the case, and the reason for the Court's finding that there was a legislative power to summon private persons for inquiry, was because of a practice, long continued, of summoning private persons before the Houses of Congress to give testimony and to produce papers.

Applying the principle of the Daugherty case to the long-continued practice by the executive branch to withhold confidential

papers from Congress and its committees, we find:

1. Ever since 1796 the executive branch has asserted the right to say "No" to the Houses of Congress when they have requested confidential papers which the President or the heads of departments felt obliged to withhold in the public interest.[1]

2. Beginning with the denial by a court, in a criminal trial, of a subpena for the production of a letter by President Adams in 1800,[2] the courts have uniformly held that they will not compel a President or head of department to give testimony or to produce papers which, in his judgment, required secrecy.[3]

3. More significant still is the fact that never in our entire history has either House taken any steps to enforce requests for the production of testimony or documents which have been refused by the executive branch. In the two famous debates on this subject, in the Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt administrations, it was admitted that it was useless to pass resolutions aimed at forcing compliance by the Executive with congressional requests for papers and documents when the Executive could ignore such resolutions.[4]

It appears clear, therefore, that we have, in the words of the Supreme Court in the Daugherty case, "a practical construction, long continued, of the constitutional provisions respecting their power, by the executive and legislative branches."[5] The long-continued practice of the executive branch to withhold confidential papers, in the national public interest, from the legislative branch, and the passage of no law by Congress to change that practice argue persuasively for the possession of such a power, under the Constitution by the Executive. It is not likely that the United States Supreme Court will lightly ignore more than 150 years of legislative acquiescence in the assertion of that power.

Our conclusion is fortified by the views of William Howard Taft, who wrote, following his retirement from the Presidency and prior to his appointment as Chief Justice:

"There is in the scope of the jurisdiction of both the Executive and Congress a wide field of action in which individual rights are not affected in such a way that they can be asserted and vindicated in a court. In this field, the construction of the power of each branch and its limitations must be left to itself and the political determination of the people who are the ultimate sovereign asserting themselves at the polls. Precedents from previous administrations and from previous Congresses create a historical construction of the extent and limitations of their respective powers, aided by the discussions arising in a conflict of jurisdictions between them."[6]

Referring to the Daugherty case, the Supreme Court, in *Sinclair* v. *United States* (279 U. S. 263), stated:

"And that case shows that, while the power of inquiry is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function, it must be exerted with due regard for the rights of witnesses, and that a witness rightfully may refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded or where the questions asked are not pertinent to the matter under inquiry.

"It has always been recognized in this country, and it is well to remember, that few if any of the rights of the people guarded by fundamental law are of greater importance to their happiness and safety than the right to be exempt from all unauthorized, arbitrary, or unreasonable inquiries and disclosures in respect of their personal and private affairs. In order to illustrate the purpose of the courts well to uphold the right of privacy, we quote from some of their decisions" (pp. 291–292).

Both the Daugherty and Sinclair cases dealt with private individuals who had refused to testify before Senate committees. We have noted the statement of the Supreme Court that there are bounds of power which Congress and its committees may not exceed in questioning private persons, whose rights are guarded "by fundamental law." The rights of the executive branch would seem to be guarded by the same fundamental law, the Constitution, which declares the executive branch to be independent of the other two branches, and gives it the right to resist unbounded assertions of inquiry. If, in the judgment of the Supreme Court, private witnesses may rightfully refuse to answer, the President and heads of departments have their rights not to answer inquiries requiring disclosure of confidential information, which they have asserted almost from the beginnings of our Government.

III. ACTION OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The foregoing decisions of the Supreme Court, which declare that the decision of the Executive is conclusive in matters involving the exercise of political and Executive discretion, have been acted upon by the House of Representatives. Thus, in 1879, during the administration of President Hayes, the House Judiciary Committee had to deal with the failure of George F. Seward, Consul General of the United States in China, to testify before the House Committee on Expenditures in the State Department. Seward had failed to produce records, pursuant to a subpena. The Judiciary Committee report stated that Seward was not in contempt for the following reason:

"And whenever the President has returned (as sometimes he has) that, in his judgment, it was not consistent with the public interest to give the House such information, no further proceedings have ever been taken to compel the production of such information. Indeed, upon principle, it would seem that this must be so. The Executive is as independent of either House of Congress as either House of Congress is independent of him, and they cannot call for the records of his action or the action of his officers against his consent, any more than he can call for any of the journals and records of the House or Senate" (Rept. No. 141, p. 3, 45th Cong., 3d sess.).

The report concluded by boiling the issue down to this narrow point: Who is the best judge, in a close case, of the propriety of divulging to any committee of the House "state secrets?" Is it the House or is it the President? We quote from the report:

"Somebody must judge upon this point. It clearly cannot be the House or its committee, because they cannot know the importance of having the doings of the executive department kept secret. The head of the executive department, therefore, must be the judge in such case and decide it upon his own responsibility to the people, and to the House, upon a case of impeachment brought against him for so doing, if his acts are causeless, malicious, willfuly wrong, or to the detriment of the public interests" (Rept. No. 141, pp. 3–4, 45th Cong., 3d sess.).

IV. CONCLUSION

In the light of the foregoing, the resolution appears to constitute an unconstitutional encroachment by the legislative branch upon the executive branch.

[1] William Howard Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers (1916), p. 129; Binkley, President and Congress (1947), pp. 44, 167; Finley and Sanderson, The American Executive and Executive Methods, pp. 199 ff.

[2] Trial of Thomas Cooper, Wharton's State Trials (1800), p. 667.

[3] *Marbury* v. *Madison*, supra, p. 2 of this memorandum.

[4] 43 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3730, 3732 (1909).

[5] 273 U. S. 174.

[6] Taft, Chief Magistrate (1916), pp. 1–2.

The Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD a sober and convincing statement regarding the procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In this statement 45 teachers in 27 American law schools in all sections of the country, including 38 professors and seven deans, have requested the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the committee, to avoid proceedings "tending to undermine or destroy our free institutions."

The announced hearings at which Dr. Edward U. Condon, Chief of the Bureau of Standards, was to have had an opportunity to appear publicly to answer charges made against his discretion and loyalty, was the occasion for the issuance of the statement.

Unfortunately, the hearings were postponed.

However, the suggestions and the criticisms offered by the law teachers are valid still, and if anything more valid and pertinent to the committee procedures today.

UNIQUENESS OF COMMITTEE SUGGESTED

I have read the statement with unusual interest and approbation because the uniqueness of this committee under the mandate of the rule, a point I have stressed before to this House, is accented, and because concrete suggestions as to improvement of the committee procedures are made which largely coincide with what I have myself suggested.

The professors condemned proclamations of guilt before hearings have been afforded the accused. They pointed out that a hearing which occurs after the conclusions have already been stated may degenerate into a mere effort to sustain the findings and thus lose its basic value as a means of learning the facts.

Suggested as necessary safeguards were six proposals providing the accused the rights fully to receive and answer charges, call witnesses, have the aid and advice of counsel, be permitted cross-examination of witnesses making derogatory statements, and have the case determined only on the basis of the material presented at the hearing.

The dignified examination of the methods heretofore followed by the committee supports the fears of those of us who have felt that the dignity of the House has been endangered on many occasions. The signers of this statement cannot be easily impunged on political grounds; their opinion must carry weight with all of us.

The full text of the statements and a list of names of the signers follows:

APRIL 15, 1948.

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: We who address this letter to you are teachers in American law schools. We are deeply concerned with the administration of justice and with the effectiveness of governmental processes. We have been troubled in the past by what we believe to have been the imperfect procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We are informed that on April 21 the committee, under your chairmanship, will hear charges against Dr. Edward U. Condon, of the National Bureau of Standards. The Condon case furnishes an occasion to reconsider the committee's procedural methods, with a view to minimizing the possibility of injustice now and in the future. We therefore respectfully submit to the committee through you the following observations and recommendations.

1. The successive chairmen and the several members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities have stressed that the committee's special function is to discover and expose un-American or subversive activities. This function is not ordinarily exercised with a view to recommending legislation, but is deemed by the committee to be an end in itself. The committee has therefore often employed disparaging publicity as a means of penalizing or discouraging those who have in its opinion engaged in un-American activities. The committee's proceedings lead to proclamations of guilt, rather than to generalized corrective proposals. Since these proclamations may, in their impact, be no less damaging than a judgment pronounced after trial, it is appropriate that they should be withheld until a full and fair inquiry has been made. A hearing which occurs after the conclusions have already been stated may degenerate into a mere effort to sustain the findings, and may thus lose its basic value as a means of learning the facts.

2. A well-understood distinction exists between legislative hearings and judicial trials. The methods of the latter cannot be transported bodily into the former. It is clear, however, that the committee's proceedings are not in all respects like the customary legislative inquiry. On the contrary, they generally involve individualized determinations which resemble those made through trial processes. It is entirely appropriate, therefore, that the committee should utilize judicial methods which generations of experience have proved to be useful and fair. Not only in the Condon case but in all similar matters with which the committee may later deal, the committee, we believe, should scrupulously observe the following procedural safeguards:

(a) Opportunity should be afforded an accused person to answer the charges against him.

(b) To this end he should be permitted to call witnesses in his own behalf as well as make an oral or written statement in his own defense.

(c) If the opportunity to meet charges is to be real, rather than merely formal, a person who under the committee's scrutiny should be fully apprised of the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire. The committee, moreover, should identity the witnesses upon whose testimony it has relied in commencing the proceedings and whom it intends to produce at the hearing.

(d) A person who is in actuality though perhaps not in legal contemplation a defendant in proceedings before the committee, should be allowed to have the advice and assistance of counsel;

(e) If testimony adverse to an individual's character or reputation is to be relied upon or published by the committee, the person who gives that testimony should be available for reasonably limited cross-examination;

(f) Conclusions which the committee may draw concerning an individual who has in effect been tried in a hearing before the committee should be based on the material presented at the hearing and should not rest on undisclosed material in the committee's files.

As the Supreme Court reminded us but a few days ago, *In re Oliver* (68 Supreme Court 499, 507), "A person's right to reasonable notice of a charge against him, and an opportunity to be heard in his defense—a right to his day in court—are basic in our system of jurisprudence; and these rights include, as a minimum, a right to examine the witnesses against him, to offer testimony, and to be represented by counsel."

Regardless of its past record, the House Committee on Un-American Activities should now adopt procedures which, in accordance with our American traditions, will protect basic rights. We are confident that the committee members join with us in devotion to these fundamental traditions and will be anxious to avoid any proceeding tending to undermine or destroy our free institutions.

Respectfully submitted.

Prof. Albert R. Beisel, Jr., Boston University School of Law; Prof. Jacob H. Beuscher, University of Wisconsin Law School; Dean Frederick K. Beutel, University of Nebraska College of Law; Prof. Arthur L. Brown, Boston College Law School; Prof. Clark Byse, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Prof. Willard B. Cowles, University of Nebraska College of Law; Prof. Kenneth C. Davis, University of Texas School of Law; Prof. E. Merrick Dodd, Harvard University Law School; Prof. Edgar M. Durfee, University of Michigan Law School; Prof. Ralph F. Fuchs, Indiana University School of Law; Dean Bernard C. Gavit, Indiana University School of Law; Prof. Walter Gellhorn, Columbia University School of Law; Prof. George W. Goble, University of Illinois College of Law; Dean Erwin N. Griswold, Harvard University Law School; Dean Earl G. Harrison, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Prof. Harold C. Havighurst, Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. J. Willard Hurst, University of Wisconsin Law School; Prof. Jacob D. Hyman, University of Buffalo School of Law; Prof. Louis L. Jaffe, University of Buffalo School of Law; Prof. Fleming James, Jr., Yale Law School; Dean Wilber G. Katz, University of Chicago Law School; Dean W. Page Keeton, University of Oklahoma School of Law; Prof. Frank R. Kennedy, University of Iowa College of Law; Dean Mason Ladd, University of Iowa College of Law; Prof. Thomas F. Lambert, Jr., Boston University School of Law; Prof. Elvin R. Latty, Duke University School of Law; Prof. Karl N. Llewellyn, Columbia University School of Law; Prof. Douglas B. Maggs, Duke University School of Law; Prof. Robert E. Mathews, Ohio State University College of Law; Prof. Myres S. McDougal, Yale Law School; Prof. Maurice H. Merrill, University of Oklahoma School of Law; Prof. William Robert Ming, Jr., University of Chicago Law School; Prof. Clarence Morris, University of Texas School of Law; Prof. Nathaniel L. Nathanson, Northwestern University School of Law; Prof. George E. Palmer, University of Michigan Law School; Prof. Max Radin, University of California School of Jurisprudence; Prof. Horace E. Read, University of Minnesota Law School; Prof. Kenneth R. Redden, University of Virginia Department of Law; Prof. Stefan A. Riesenfeld, University of Minnesota Law School; Prof. Russell N. Sullivan, University of Illinois College of Law; Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland, Jr., Cornell Law School; Prof. Lowell Turrentine, Stanford University Law School; Prof. Lewis Tyree, Rutgers University School of Law; Prof. M. T. Van Hecke, University of North Carolina School of Law; Prof. Bertram F. Willcox, Cornell Law School.

Exportation of Tobacco to Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me to the Senate Appropriations Committee on December 17, 1947, with reference to tobacco, and also to insert certain other parts of the hearings with reference thereto.

There being no objection, the statement, together with other excerpts from the hearings, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD, MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

TOBACCO PURCHASES FAVORED

Senator UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I understand that you are now considering additional appropriations to cover the expense in connection with the occupation of Germany and Japan for the balance of this fiscal year.

In view of the tremendous cost incident to the occupation of Germany, the pressing problem of the rehabilitation of Germany and its effect upon our economy, I avail myself of this opportunity to present some facts with reference to tobacco which I deem worthy of your consideration.

In dealing with our problems in Germany and other foreign countries, I think it is highly important that we make every effort to preserve markets for our products which have been historically export products. Unless this is done, we shall develop domestic problems which will seriously and adversely affect certain groups of our own people and segments of our national economy.

STATISTICS ON TOBACCO

When the colonists first came to America, they found the Indians smoking tobacco. By 1640 tobacco had become so important in the Colony of Virginia that it was made legal tender. As time passed, it became, and has remained, an agricultural product of tremendous importance to the United States and to the world.

There are now approximately 750,000 farm families engaged in the production of tobacco on approximately 550,000 farms in 21 States. There was produced in the United States in 1946 about 2,312,000,000 pounds of tobacco of all types, and its cash value was about $1,041,198,000. This amount, as I recall it, was about 4 percent of the total farm income in the United States in 1946. It is estimated that the 1947 crop will be 2,190,000 pounds, with a value of $945,000,000.

It is estimated that the tobacco industry, excluding farm labor and including the selling on warehouse floors, redrying, transportation, and manufacturing, affords employment far in excess of 200,000 people. The estimated value of tobacco products manufactured in the United States for 1947 is $2,750,000,000.

The receipts from Federal taxes on tobacco products in the United States in the fiscal year of 1946 amounted to $1,165,519,000, and, in 1947, an estimated $1,237,768,000. These figures indicate that taxes on tobacco products account for about one thirty-sixth of the total revenue collected by the Federal Government, and the amount of taxes collected is considerably more than the total amount paid to the farmers for the entire crop.

I present the above facts to show to this committee the tremendous importance of tobacco from the standpoint of agriculture, industry, and Federal revenue, and to emphasize its importance to our national economy.

EXPORT SITUATION

Throughout the years from 20 to 30 percent of our tobacco has been exported. Due to a shortage of dollars in foreign countries, and the disruption of foreign trade, our foreign markets for tobacco are now seriously endangered.

MARKETING QUOTAS AND LOANS

Under the marketing statutes now in operation, both flue-cured and burley tobacco are produced under quotas. The purpose of the marketing quotas is to keep production in line with consumption, taking into consideration the export trade.

This is intended to prevent the price to the farmers from falling below parity. The prices are supported by the Federal Government at 90 percent of parity. Under this procedure the Government loaned on 241,000,000 pounds of the 1946 crop the sum of $85,836,548, and it is estimated that the Government will lend on 306,000,000 pounds of the 1947 crop the sum of $127,000,000.

This means that at the end of this marketing season the Government will have loaned on tobacco the total sum of about $212,000,000, and will have on hand approximately 547,000,000 pounds of tobacco. This does not mean that the Government will lose this amount.

ACREAGE REDUCTIONS

After it has been redried and properly stored, tobacco is not a perishable product. The acreage for bright leaf flue-cured tobacco for 1948 has been reduced 28 percent by the Secretary of Agriculture under the 1947 acreage. The acreage for other types of tobacco will also be cut as much as necessary to bring production in line with consumption, both domestic and foreign. Although domestic consumption is still increasing, our export trade in tobacco continues to be of vital importance.

UNITED STATES EXPORT POTENTIAL IN GERMANY

During and since World War II, the wide distribution of American cigarettes in foreign countries, according to the information available, cultivated on the part of the citizens of the foreign countries a taste and desire for American tobacco.

We are told that this is true in Germany, and that today American cigarettes have almost become a medium of exchange among the German people. If it is possible to do so, this desire for our tobacco and tobacco products should be preserved.

The tobacco factories in Germany a number of years before the war used about 250,000,000 pounds of leaf tobacco annually. Only one-fifth of this tobacco was produced in Germany; the remainder was imported.

Roughly, one-half of the German population, or about 43,000,000 people, reside in the American-British zones. At this time, the German tobacco industry in these zones is processing 2,204,000 pounds of tobacco a month, which means, on an annual basis, 26½ million pounds of tobacco. This is less than one-fifth of the production of the industry in prewar years on the basis of the divided population in the existing zones. The present output of the German tobacco industry, therefore, meets only a fraction of the existing demand, based upon production prior to the war.

These figures, of course, do not take into consideration the fact that the distribution of American cigarettes in Germany since the end of the war has admittedly added to the desire for cigarettes by the German people, and has created a tremendous potential market for our tobacco and tobacco products. Certainly this market should be preserved. In my judgment, it can be done by furnishing to the German tobacco industry the type of our tobacco normally used in the production of cigarettes.

AMENDMENT REQUESTED TO PROVIDE, APART FROM ARMY FUNDS, FOR MAKING AVAILABLE TO GERMANY TOBACCO HELD BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

In view of the foregoing facts, I propose to this committee that it make available to Germany at least 100,000,000 pounds of tobacco now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the immediate use by the German tobacco industry in the production of tobacco products. This would be approximately 1 year's supply. It would not be necessary to send all of this amount at one time, but the total amount should be set aside and made available so as to assure the industry of continuous operations for at least 12 months.

This tobacco should not, in my opinion, be paid for out of the funds requested by the Army for the maintenance of the German people. It should be considered over and above such requirements and based upon what I consider sound business procedure for this Government, for the following reasons:

1. It would dispose of a substantial part of the surplus tobacco now on hand, would relieve the pressure on prices, and would tend to relieve the necessity of severe cuts in marketing quotas.

2. It would preserve a tremendous potential market for American tobacco and tobacco products which would mean much to this country when Germany has been rehabilitated and foreign trade is revived among the nations.

3. It would reestablish the tobacco industry in Germany and make some contribution toward its economic rehabilitation.

PURPOSE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Furthermore, it is the objective of our Government to place Germany on a sustaining basis as soon as possible, and thereby reduce and ultimately eliminate the tremendous cost now being placed upon this Government in connection with the occupation and maintenance of Germany.

The foregoing proposal would result in making available to the German people a large quantity of tobacco products made from American tobacco which, certainly, in some degree, would be a morale builder and, based upon the statements made by many people who have been in Germany, would probably increase German production both in agriculture and industry. Even a small fraction of increased production would reduce our expenses in Germany by an amount in excess of the cost of this proposal.

JUSTIFICATION FOR EXPENDITURE SUGGESTED

For a number of years it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives. I think I understand in some measure the seriousness of the problems which confront this committee, and especially in these days when it is necessary to guard Federal expenditures and maintain, as far as possible, a balanced national economy.

In the light of these objectives, in my judgment, the facts which I have submitted to this committee constitute a sufficient justification for the expenditure by our Government of the amount of money involved in this proposal, and I am sincerely of the opinion that it would be a good investment.

AMOUNT REQUESTED

Senator HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the amount of money involved would depend on the price paid for the tobacco. Now, what is the average price, the support price, at which the Commodity Credit Corporation has taken on this 540,000,000 pounds of tobacco that they have on hand?

Senator UMSTEAD. The average price, Senator HAYDEN, as I understand it, of the tobacco now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation would be slightly under 40 cents a pound, which would represent a cost for the 100,000,000 pounds of a little less than $40,000,000.

OBJECTIVE OF USE AS INCENTIVE GOODS

Senator HAYDEN. As I read your proposal, it is really to use this tobacco as incentive goods; that is to say, be placed in the hands of those governing Germany and using the tobacco in a way to get more production.

Senator UMSTEAD. Yes, sir. I did not use the word "incentive," but certainly it is the desire and the idea to use it so as to get more production in Germany, and also to reestablish the tobacco industry in Germany.

Senator HAYDEN. Here is a coal miner in the Saar. He has a stint of about so much coal a day. Now, they could say to him, "If you produce more coal, you get a package of cigarettes."

Senator UMSTEAD. Yes, sir; and yet make those cigarettes there in Germany, with German machinery and German labor.

Chairman BRIDGES. The reason you say that is because you think it affects our economy and our wealth, and eventually the United States might profit in this manner and increase German production.

Senator UMSTEAD. I do very sincerely. I think, sir, that it would decrease our necessary expenditures in Germany, and it would be a very distinct help to American agriculture, American industry, and to our Government.

GENERAL USE OF INCENTIVE POLICY

Senator BROOKS. Do you not think, Senator, that that is true of most goods that we send over there, that we ought to have a policy of incentive to production wherever we send this food and supplies?

Senator UMSTEAD. Of course. Assuming that we are giving them the necessities of life, I think if you make available to the German people tobacco products, that it will necessarily result in a higher morale, and will increase production.

ENDORSEMENT OF POLICY PROPOSED

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I served on the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations when Senator UMSTEAD was on the House Committee on Agriculture Appropriations, and during those years we had to deal with a great many problems that were related to the tobacco industry, and particularly the tobacco farmer, and in my opinion, Senator UMSTEAD is the greatest expert in the Congress of the United States on tobacco because he knows all phases of the industry from the time the plants are put out in the beds until the cigarettes are marketed better than any other man, and I am very gratified that he brought this full exposition of his views to the committee. I am heartily in accord with the policy that he has enunciated.

How to Beat the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "How to Beat the Communists," by Walter P. Reuther, which appeared in the February 28, 1948, issue of Collier's magazine.

I have received an estimate which indicates that the cost of printing the article will be $195.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO BEAT THE COMMUNISTS

(By Walter P. Reuther)

In 1939, in the course of our United Automobile Workers' negotiations with General Motors, William F. Knudsen, then president of the corporation, pointed a big forefinger at me and cried, "Now see here, Reuther, we don't want any commissars in America."

The answer I gave them is the answer I should give today to the question, "How can we stop communism?" It is an answer bolstered by 11 years' experience in the day-to-day struggle for CIO survival and growth in America's pace-setting auto industry.

"Mr. Knudsen," I said, "we auto workers don't want commissars any more than you do. But what you and other powerful leaders of American industry do about helping to make democracy work in bread-and-butter terms for the average man and his family will determine—much more than anything we auto workers do—whether we get commissars or not."

I fear that such an answer will not comfort or please those who have been stampeded by the present anti-Red hysteria into the belief that there is some easy formula for beating the Communists. But we have beaten the Communists in the United Automobile Workers and we can speak with authority. There is no formula. There is only the never-ending task of making democracy work, keeping it alive and fighting against injustice; expanding and enriching it by tangible achievement. Stopping communism is only a negative aspect of that positive, infinitely more important work.

There are quack cures for communism. Hitler cured it by killing the limited democracy of the Weimar Republic. Mussolini stopped it by throttling Italian freedom. We in the United States still have time to avoid these fatal extremes and to prove that democracy is a militant, up-to-date creed—with the moral strength and the practical political and economic know-how to meet the challenge of totalitarianism.

The press, reporting the result of the latest UAW-CIO convention, stated that Reuther had scored a decisive victory over Communist forces. But to call this Communist defeat a personal victory for me is to obscure the most significant development in the auto workers. Hundreds of thousands of UAW members, not only in Detroit and the other large industrial centers, but in Kokomo, Oshawa, Kalamazoo; in Canada, New England, and the deep South—these are the men and women who stopped communism in the auto workers by standing up, having their say, and being counted.

Communists cannot seize power in a nation or a union if the people are on their toes, if they know the issues, and are offered democratic leadership built around a positive program of action. The inertia and indifference of the average citizen or union member are the most valuable assets the Communists have. Working as a well-disciplined minority, they cultivate this passivity and thereby seek to immobilize the democratic majority—especially those individuals and groups capable of providing leadership and direction in the fight against both Red and black totalitarianism.

The momentum of a positive democratic program is the only final answer to both the commissar and the storm trooper.

From our experience in the UAW-CIO, we have learned that there are two major obstacles to be overcome before decent unionists and honest liberals are ready to fight the Communists. The first obstacle might be called the united-front psychology; the second, fear of the Communists' highly developed technique of name calling and character assassination.

We have just emerged from a period in which many non-Communist progressives made common cause with the Stalinists in the misguided belief that contemporary communism operates from ethical and moral perceptions of a certain validity. The delusion still persists in many quarters: Henry Wallace's third-party movement was fathered by it. The liberal who succumbs to the united-front lure believes that Communists are simply democrats-in-a-hurry. He points to their concern over civil liberties (when it suits the party line), their loud support for price and rent controls, their advocacy of full employment, health, social-security, and minimum-wage legislation. And he asks: "Since the Communists are going my way, why shouldn't I travel with them?"

The answer, of course, is that Communist concern for progressive reform under parliamentary democracy is little more than a temporary expedient, designed to enlist as many allies as possible against the day when the class struggle attains its climax in revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communist Parties of the world are the self-appointed midwives of this violent historical birth. Moreover, in the course of the last generation, Communists have come to identify the interests of the world's peoples with the needs of the Soviet Union. Their subservience to the Kremlin and their shifts on trade-union issues as Moscow winds veer can become the Achilles heel of the domestic Stalinists if honest progressives in the labor movement carry the fight to them.

An amusing consequence of Communist acrobatics cropped up in the Wayne County CIO Council. Shortly before the invasion of Russia, the Communist clique in a UAW local union had slipped a resolution condemning the imperialist war past a sparsely attended local membership meeting and had forwarded it to the council for endorsement, after releasing it to the press. The Nazi attack followed. The Communists maneuvered a special meeting at the same local and quickly passed another resolution reflecting the new, superpatriotic line. The imperialist blood bath had now become a holy crusade.

This resolution was also given to the press as the official position of the local and sent to the council for action. When the council met, the two conflicting resolutions from the same local were read—and a motion was made to refer both of them back to their source, with the recommendation that the local union make up its mind.

A MISTAKE THAT MUST BE AVOIDED

Progressives must expose Stalinist duplicity without qualms. To outlaw their party and drive them underground is not the answer. Such action would enable them to drape themselves in the cloak of martyrdom and would make more difficult the task of detecting their activities.

Exposure, not repression, must be our goal. We must get the Communists out of the political back alleys and walk them up Main Street in the full light of informed opinion. No sober public examination of their unadorned doctrine and purposes can fail to reveal them as frauds.

While the American Stalinists may quote democratic scripture for their purposes, they are neither good Democrats nor good Americans.

Yet many genuine liberals who understand that the Communists have only a provisional interest in the democratic process are immobilized by fear of Communist character assassination and abuse—and they are disgusted by the stupid and indiscriminate Dies-Rankin-Thomas brand of Red-baiting. Such indiscriminate lumping of the Communists and the non-Communists gives to the Stalinists the protective coloration which is their most effective means of defense. The hysteria engendered by the new "Republican Dies committee" is creating the same confusion, hitting the very witch-hunt pitch required by Communist startegists. The Communists know how to exploit this confusion, how to intensify it. Witch hunts rather than legitimate and sober exposure, moreover, lend an aura of righteousness to the Stalinists' own technique of abuse and slander.

We in the UAW took the Communists on without illusions. We were determined not to be diverted from our program by any amount of Communist invective or distortion.

We understood that the alternative to a finish fight was Communist control of our union. Such an understanding comes painfully; nobody enjoys the daily diet of vulgar insult in the Communist press which is the lot of those who challenge the party. Morris Muster, former president of the CIO Furniture Workers' Union, for example, resigned under the incessant hammering of the Communists, after releasing a bitter statement exposing the extent of their infiltration in his union. But he should have considered the fact that when decent unionists lose stomach for the struggle, they surrender the field to the Communists.

Honest progressives in the UAW had ample cause for disgust as the CP machine slipped into high gear in the preconvention struggle. The Stalinist bloc in the auto workers was responsible for publishing and distributing to the membership more than 2,000,000 pieces of literature.

In addition to a weekly propaganda paper, they prepared and circulated nationally a 35-page magazine called the Bosses' Boy, replete with distortion, fabrication, and forgery, which sought to prove that I was a clever servant of General Motors and the National Association of Manufacturers. Responding to a full report which I had issued to the membership, which had minced no words in describing the conflict within our ranks, the left-wing majority on the international executive board adopted a resolution reflecting the Communist view that I was a traitor and an agent of Wall Street.

"Fulfillment of Reuther's program," the resolution charged, "would put him in such distinguished company that the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 might well be called the Taft-Hartley-Reuther Act.

This association of my name with Taft was a prelude to the more ambitious maneuver executed shortly thereafter by a press agent hired by the opposition. It soon developed that I was being boomed for Vice President as a running mate with none other than Senator TAFT. This big-lie technique was perhaps brillant as a public-relations maneuver, but we exposed it, as a repeat performance of a campaign by the Communists during the war, when they advocated a return to piecework and speed-up in the auto plants.

To those who are just beginning to face the unpleasant necessity of combating Communists in their local unions, veteran groups and other organizations, we can offer only the simple recommendation: Names can't hurt you. We must have the courage to speak up.

Once committed to the struggle against Communists, honest liberals must guard against the temptation to join forces with or accept help from those whose only badge of fraternity is their anticommunism. It is fatal to resist communism by courting reaction. The chief weakness of American foreign policy is the predilection of our State Department for dealing with anybody who will promise to hate communism. And the most dangerous error into which any domestic offensive against Stalinism can fall is that of assuming that every foe of Communists is a friend of democracy.

THE GOVERNOR WASN'T HELPFUL

We did not make that mistake in the UAW. At the height of our campaign against CP infiltration in our union, Michigan's Governor Sigler descended upon Washington as an expert witness in the Red probe. Mr. Sigler's authority on the subject of communism derived from a few easy victories won on Michigan campuses over the American Youth for Democracy, latter-day name for the Young Communist League.

The Governor, however, identified as subversive several groups which were nonexistent or highly respectable, and one organization whose members included Detroit's chief of police and a score more of that city's more prominent residents. Mr. Sigler's stock as an expert on Communist-front organizations fell suddenly, but not until he had made highly damaging allusions to communism in the auto workers. The anti-Communist forces in the UAW, however, did not make the fatal mistake of regarding Sigler as a potential ally in our fight.

Anticommunism is not sufficient. Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Perón, Rankin, Bilbo, and Gerald L. K. Smith—all could pass that test. The fight against communism can be transformed from a self-defeating clash by night into an honest engagement in which decent people can participate without embarrassment only by a passionate belief in democratic values and the will to give those values practical currency in the lives of the people.

The next step in any democratic move to combat communism must be an awareness of how the Stalinist parties and their adherents function. Communist tactics in relation to the labor movement have shifted many times since 1917, but the central design has never altered. In 1921 the Third World Congress of the Communist International, legislating on the "duties of Communist activity," laid down the following imperatives:

"Communist nuclei must be formed for the daily work in the different branches of the party activities.

"These Communist units are the nuclei for the daily Communist work in military units, trade unions, etc. If there are a greater number of party members in the same factory or in the same union, etc., then the nucleus is enlarged into a faction, and its work is directed by the nucleus."

The same Comintern directive contained clear instructions for Communist action in the unions: "In those capitalist countries where a large majority of the proletariat has not yet reached revolutionary consciousness, the Communist agitators must be constantly on the lookout for new forms of propaganda.

"The factions must carefully prepare the participation of the Communists in conferences and meetings of the trade-union organizations. For instance, they must elaborate proposals, select lectures and counsel, and put up as candidates for election capable, experienced, and energetic comrades."

The Daily Worker stated on July 16, 1928: "Communism is a revolutionary tendency in the labor movement and the only representative of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism; as such it is opposed to all other tendencies within the labor movement."

This fanatical preoccupation with conquest of organized labor, this elaborate apparatus of propaganda and disruption, the Stalinists, over the past several years, have brought to bear on the United Automobile Workers, which they regard as the strategic union of the CIO.

We have beaten them. The story of how we did it reads almost like the report of an experiment in creative democracy, and provides a demonstration of techniques which can be applied in the larger struggle to save democracy in the world.

Communists have never had much success in converting workers in any industry to their dogmas. But where the Stalinists had not been able to convert, they succeeded in exerting an influence far out of proportion to their numerical strength by exploiting the innocence and ambition of men and women in positions of leadership.

The Communists have a complete political valet service which they offer to those in public life and in the unions who, for whatever reason, accept their current policies and fail to challenge their motives. Henry Wallace is the most familiar contemporary example of a man who has accepted this service. This CP service provides its customers with ready-made thoughts on all subjects, ghost-writes speeches, arranges meetings, engineers applause, and inflates egos as required.

Recipients of the service ultimately discover, however, that they have become boxed in, thoroughly dependent, and pliable instruments of the party linemen.

FEW REACH HIGH UNION POSTS

During the 12 years the UAW-CIO has existed as an international union, the Communists have placed only one party member in the top leadership and only two of the faithful on our international executive board. Yet they have prospered in our midst until recently, because they so skillfully cultivated persons who could be made, in some degree, to serve their purposes. It was through clever manipulation of such people that the Stalinists acquired an influence in the UAW vastly disproportionate to the numbers of their convinced adherents.

Working through such strategically placed victims, the Communists captured the leadership of a number of local unions and could count on assistance from certain members on the regional and international union staffs. Machine-made resolutions promoting the Communist line would pop up at union meetings, and Communist adeptness at parliamentary maneuver would get them by an unalerted membership.

The Communists are highly skillful in using the forms of democracy to subvert democracy. But in local after local union, non-Communist members, gradually and after many painful experiences, awoke to the party's contempt for the rank and file, to its methods of discouraging attendance at meetings, to its whole strategy of spreading conflict and sowing confusion.

The Stalinists suffered their first crucial preconvention defeat when their proposal to merge the Communist-dominated Farm Equipment Workers with the UAW was rejected by UAW local unions.

In the summer of 1947, a committee of UAW opposition board members had been meeting secretly with officials of the FE–CIO. Without prior notice, they presented to a UAW executive board meeting a plan for merging the two organizations, both of which have jurisdiction in the agricultural implement industry. What followed might be regarded as a controlled experiment in the technique of fighting Communists without succumbing to the Communists' own vicious habit of generalized abuse.

The FE merger proposal was a complete fraud. Its sponsors had only one objective: to bring 500 additional left-wing votes to bear in the UAW convention, then less than 5 months away. It did not provide for a true merger at all, but rather for the temporary establishment of a union within a union. Grant Oakes, FE president, admitted to a Daily Worker correspondent that the plan, if carried out, would set up a powerful and autonomous FE division of the UAW-CIO, throughout the United States and Canada.

FOR LEFT-WING CONTROL OF UAW

The FE was to enter the UAW with its staff intact; FE members, together with UAW members in the farm implement industry, were to be given special membership cards in an FE division of the UAW; the whole plan was in violation of the UAW constitution and organizationally unsound. It would have meant a retreat from industrial unionism to craftlike autonomy at a time when the industrial form of organization was under attack from Congress. But the Communists didn't care. They were making a bid for control of the Nation's biggest union. This was the showdown.

The plan was approved by the left-wing majority of the UAW executive board. UAW locals were given less than a month to debate the issues and set up a poll in which no alternative set of proposals would be available. Those of us in the leadership and ranks who favored real merger but opposed the provisions of the left-wing plan were placed in the uncomfortable position of blocking unity.

We went into the local unions with copies of the merger plan. Every time advocates of the measure waxed eloquent and general, we dragged them down out of the stratosphere by talking about the plan itself.

They railed at the Taft-Hartley Act. We insisted that all generalities be brought down to earth and measured against the specific provisions of the merger proposal. We were not against merger. We favored merger. But we objected to merger on the basis proposed. We knew that the FE merger maneuver was Communist-inspired. But to base our opposition to it on that ground would have confused the membership by involving them in a vague debate on the merits of communism.

The Communists would have cried, "Red-baiting," and they would have succeeded in pushing the plan through on the basis of their general appeal to unity. When left-wing rhetoric had subsided and we had placed the facts before the membership, the proposal was rejected by a vote of better than 2 to 1.

A spokesman for the left-wing group, interviewed by a reporter for the Detroit Free Press (July 20, 1947) after the vote, had this to say: "We give Reuther credit. His workers covered the country from coast to coast and down to the Gulf."

His credit should have gone to the workers he mentioned rather than to me, but the point is clear. We had beaten the Stalinists on the merits of the issue—but the issues were rescued from the fog of double talk and presented to the membership by hard work. That is the way to beat the Communists.

Since the UAW convention, we have offered the FE a sound unity proposal which their leadership has rejected. They have lost their zeal for unity.

An equally significant Communist defeat occurred at the last CIO convention. Here again, during debate on the foreign-policy resolution, the progressive forces won an important victory for democratic unionism which has implications wider than the CIO—and we won it by hitting hard at the issue.

The resolution on foreign policy was among the most important adopted by the CIO convention, for it contained a clearly implied endorsement of the Marshall plan. To the Communists, it was all-important, since they are always most sensitive in those areas where the interests of the Soviet Union are directly affected.

They recognized that the resolution itself was not so important as the interpretation it would be given by delegates and by the press. We, too, were fully aware of the importance of the setting. Secretary of State Marshall had been invited to address the convention.

What Marshall said before the CIO national convention was important, but more significant was the fact that he had been invited to address the CIO. For in its work of dispensing confusion to the hungry and troubled peoples of Europe, the Cominform would find it difficult to explain how the chief "agent of American imperialism and Wall Street capitalism" could be invited to

address the delegates of millions of industrial workers.

The Stalinists attempted to maneuver convention action on the foreign policy resolution in advance of Secretary Marshall's speech. We blocked such a move. Marshall spoke first and debate followed. The democratic bloc was ready. Van Bittner of the steelworkers took the floor. Anticipating the tenor of left-wing remarks, he gave the lie to Communist charges that Marshall was a warmonger. Other similar speeches followed, attacking Communist hyprocrisy.

Kehoe of the American Communications Association was the first speaker to echo the CP line. He had just finished attacking American policy in Korea and was in the middle of a free-speech peroration when Philip Murray interrupted him to inquire, "I assume that you also believe the heroes of Stalingrad are entitled to take the rostrum and the public platform in Russia to expound their views?" Kehoe replied lamely that he believed in free speech everywhere, even in Russia. The Communists were in full retreat.

VICTORY FOR DEMOCRATIC UNIONISM

The "secret battalion" had been licked before an international audience. Hundreds of thousands of decent unionists, watching from union offices throughout the land, had won new heart. They knew now that it could be done; they had just seen it done. And democratic trade-unionists throughout Europe who suffered the horrors of Nazi concentration camps knew they had friends and allies in the ranks of American labor in their struggle against the new totalitarianism of the left.

As delegate elections preceding our 1947 convention were held and the campaign got under way, the results soon proved the effectiveness and soundness of our policy of fighting the Communists on the basis of principles and program. We entered the delegate elections with a militant union program. It was printed on every piece of our campaign literature.

We made specific recommendations for strengthening the internal structure of our union. We emphasized a broad program for union members acting not as producers alone but as consumers and politically conscious citizens. We developed a concept of unionism as an integral part of the community, alert to all aspects of the community's life and sensitive to the relationship of its own function and the general good. We pulled no punches on the issues of communism and fascism, for we had no ulterior motives to hide. Whenever we could, we talked program, not personalities, in contrast to a left-wing campaign limited to personal slander and abuse.

It was our concern with program that provided our margin of victory in the UAW. Around our program we mobilized the energies of our people, the democratic unionist bloc. In every area where we clashed, militant democracy won out over Stalinist maneuvers.

In the Motor Building of the vast Ford Rouge plant, the leadership of the unit opposed our program. They fixed delegate elections for Sunday between 11 a. m. and 1 p. m., thinking that the inconvenient hour would discourage rank-and-file attendance and enable a disciplined minority to capture the delegates. It was a technique which had succeeded many times; this time it failed. We worked harder than the opposition.

We filled the hall and we elected 9 out of 10 delegates. The election was thrown out on a technicality by the leadership, and another election was scheduled. We went to work again. The results this time were perfect; we mobilized an even heavier vote and we carried 10 out of 10 delegates by better than 3 to 1. Hard hitting on the issues; hard work on the double. There is no easier or surer way for democracy to win.

The Communists made a particularly ambitious play for the allegiance of our Negro members. They had in the past had undeniable success in exploiting the legitimate grievances of Negroes, both as citizens and as unionists. But here, as in other areas, the Communists have been more interested in playing upon misery and exploiting legitimate grievances for their own purposes than in making a principled and consistent attack on the evils of prejudice and discrimination. The cleverness of the Stalinist appeal to race emotions cost the UAW democratic bloc the Buffalo convention in 1943, when we opposed election of a Negro board member-at-large on the basis of race alone.

We persisted, however, in efforts to obtain equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro members. Our stand was not so spectacular as the Communist approach. We appealed to Negroes, not as racial nationalists but as unionists and fellow Americans. We could, moreover, afford to be steadfast in our actions. Throughout the war period, for example, we continued to press for fair play in the plants and local unions, at a time when the CP members preferred to look the other way, regarding a prosecution of Negro grievances (or any legitimate unionist grievance) as an offense against their newly acquired superpatriotic line.

At the latest convention of the UAW, the vast majority of Negro delegates joined the democratic bloc. Not only had we been more consistent; we had not waited for Communist-front organizations to champion the cause of civil rights.

The lesson is clear; it can be applied elsewhere. An honest but inactive liberal is no match for a devious but aggresive totalitarian in any engagement where democratic values are at stake. Democracy needs more get-up-and-go.

The lessons we learned in the UAW can fortify free men everywhere who stand at the crossroads today. We mobilized a third force, resisting the interference and blandishments of democracy's enemies on the right and the left. We talked program, and acted to implement program. The challenge to make democracy work is particularly acute in America, where our great productive potential gives us the prime responsibility to provide leadership and sustenance to a world in crisis.

DOUBLE STANDARD MUST GO

Communism is in perpetual war with what democracy preaches, for it cannot abide the sanctity of the individual or the interplay of honest differences. But communism breeds on what democracy too often practices; it exploits the lapses of the democratic conscience and thrives on the shortcomings of democratic action. It is the task of democrats to bridge the gap between preachment and practice; we must wipe out the double standard in America, and in the world, which divides the masses of people from the minority that controls the preponderance of economic power. It is this double standard which embitters our society.

Democracy's heart is in the right place. It is grounded on the firm base of confidence in the intrinsic soundness and rightness of the ordinary person. Democracy affirms that the individual is more than a hired hand, more than a clock-card number, more than a servant of the authoritarian state. It rejects the Fascist and Stalinist notion that men must be herded and bullied through history's dialectic by vanguards and elites.

But you can't beat communism by throwing embarrassing questions at witnesses in a congressional hearing. You can't slug it to death with a club or a slogan. You can't burn it at the stake. You have to show it up in the market place of ideas, expose it by honest dealing. Communism breeds on hunger, poverty, human insecurity. The Catholic peasants of Italy have never read Marx or Lenin. But in desperation they will vote Communist for land and bread if Italian democrats fail them. Desperation knows and needs no ideology.

Whether in some small local union in some small American town or in the vast power vacuums of Europe and Asia, democracy needs program and the will to get up early and stay late in the running fight with totalitarianism of every stamp. Democracy needs less noise from the Thomas committee and more quiet labor in the vineyards Franklin Roosevelt had only begun to cultivate when he died.

We'd Better Get Right on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Post of April 21 on Palestine:

RESPONSIBILITY

(By T. O. Thackrey)

Warren R. Austin's opening statement before the UN General Assembly yesterday made out a perfect case for support of the Assembly's November 29 decision on partition of Palestine into Arabian and Jewish states, with a trusteeship for Jerusalem.

Unfortunately, the purpose of the speech was to delay—or kill—partition in favor of a trusteeship for at least three more years over all Palestine.

But in the United States effort to get the Assembly to reverse its decision, the American Ambassador has finally admitted what has been clear to the rest of the world since the effort to sabotage partition began:

"The primary reason why the General Assembly's resolution could not be carried out by peaceful means was Arab resistance. Some of this resistance arising out of Palestine is in clear violation of the United Nations and must be halted."

That's what the Ambassador said.

He did not add, of course, that Great Britain has supplied the arms for the attack; encouraged the murder of Jewish defenders of partition; has used its armed forces in Palestine to hamper Jewish defense, and been indifferent to its duty to repel invasion.

Neither did he add that the United States aided and abetted this Arabian warfare by embargoing arms to Palestine; by refusing to support the decision after having fought, together with Soviet Russia, to achieve it; by failing to take any action whatever to uphold the United Nations even when the Arabian states openly declared war within the United Nations Council halls; by making the false claim that Arabian oil was so vital to our national security that we could not afford to offend the Arabs by demanding that they cease making war or face being stopped by force.

Yesterday, however, the United States informed the Assembly that we are willing to send troops, together with other nations, into the Middle East. To support partition? No, to support trusteeship if it is voted. To prevent, if possible, the organization of an independent Jewish state at this time. To restore order, rather than restore justice.

To be sure the United States, in an effort to be persuasive, declared that the United States is still committed to partition. Only just not now. Not yet. Maybe later. Maybe. After a further period of bondage.

We also suggest, without demanding, that perhaps some immigration could be allowed into Palestine, in a limited way, over the next 2 years; that perhaps land ownership restrictions may be lifted so that some Jews can actually gain title to the soil they till or build upon.

All of this—if the Assembly will only reverse its November 29 decision, in favor of trusteeship; in favor of blocking the creation of the very state the United States still maintains it favors—eventually.

The United States recognizes that force will be needed to carry out trusteeships if it is voted, and is prepared to furnish troops if need be to that end.

Why not carry out the partition decision we profess to favor, but which is opposed by the same Arabian states now opposing partition?

The United States says Arabian aggression "must be halted," but must it be halted now, or after several thousand more Jewish lives have been sacrificed; after Jerusalem has been sacked; after partition has been effectively killed?

For the most part, the United States delegate made what would have been a great speech—had it been made on December 1 in support of the November 29 decision, instead of April 20 in opposition to partition now. It does indicate, however, that a few of the facts have begun to gain recognition even in the face of our anxiety to appease Great Britain and Arabia.

There was indeed a forthright speech before the Assembly yesterday, although it was not, unfortunately, by the American delegate—who lacked the vigor and vitality a just cause always lends to policy.

Sir Carl Berendsen, of New Zealand, called upon the Assembly to stand fast on its partition decision, and demanded force now to back it up.

"We supported the plan in November and we support it now," he said. He will not entirely lack followers. One, quite possibly, it appears, will be Soviet Russia. And they will be right—and we wrong.

We'd better get right.

Senator Wiley's Views on the American Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the March 1948 issue of the American Family, the national magazine of family life, contained a very interesting article on the subject of our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and his views on the American family. I believe that many individuals will be keenly interested in reading the text of this article, and accordingly I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNITED STATES SENATOR LOOKS AT THE AMERICAN FAMILY

"Please be careful about your words: children are growing here." The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin and chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee, recalls this little sign that he hung up in his living room during the early youth of Mrs. Wiley's and his four children. Folks evidently were mighty careful about their words and examples, because the Wiley children have now grown into as handsome and wholesome a family group as the American people would expect of a United States Senator's clan.

Senator and Mrs. Wiley count their three daughters, one son, and six grandchildren as their greatest blessings, and their greatest wealth. They agree with Browning that children are "God's best earthly gift." In fact, they feel very strongly that this gift from Heaven should be repaid in kind—that it is the most important duty and privilege of American parents to raise their children into worth while American citizens, servants of God and of their fellow man. Mrs. Wiley, like her three daughters, has been in the teaching profession and, therefore, takes with particular seriousness her obligations for sound instruction of youth.

Senator WILEY, a man of profound spiritual convictions (who leads the Senate breakfast group of spiritual communion), realizes the importance of the words of the Master, "Suffer the little children to come unto me for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven." It is a pleasure to see the Senator's kindly face light up as he explains one of the messages that this quote carries for him: "If each American parent were to engrave that quotation in his or her heart, the growing children of our land would not see or hear anything but gracious words and deeds, fine examples, inspiring messages to guide them in the formative years.

"When I see my grandchildren—these lovely clods of human clay given to us by God," says Senator WILEY, "I reflect that each of us is a sculptor of that soft, receptive clay. We can fashion it whichever way we will. We can make of it a masterpiece of human art which will be respected by all of our fellow men." The home to Senator WILEY is like a tabernacle. "If the American family lives up to its trust, this tabernacle can be a place of purity and cleanliness, a place of thriftiness and a promoter of industry, of warm comradeship, and true understanding, of varied recreation and sound instruction, of building and creating true values."

Senator and Mrs. Wiley have succeeded in putting their creed into their deed. Two of their children, like Mrs. Wiley, are Phi Beta Kappas, all four having attended their mother's alma mater, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis. Their only son, Marshall, now a father of two children himself, was an FBI agent during the war. He and his soft-spoken wife, also a former teacher, live in Chippewa Falls, Wis., where Marshall practices law; for a pastime he plays the piano and organ, and composes. His sister, Elizabeth, a teacher at La Crosse, Wis., gets a great deal of pleasure in composing verse.

Although the Wiley's third-born, blonde, petite, Rosemary, takes much deserved pride in her teaching record and in her Ph. D. degree in economics, she is naturally prouder still of her dumpling of a son, "Pabby" (Philip Alexander Bradley), whose father is a teacher at Harvard University.

Slim, trim Winifred, youngest of the Senator's children, likewise finds the business of raising her family of two boys and one girl a full-time, joyous task. It was her son, Alexander, Jr., who had the thrill of a lifetime the day he visited the White House with his granddad Senator to meet the President of the United States, another famous father, Harry S. Truman.

"By their fruits Senator and Mrs. Alexander Wiley are known"—by their splendid family representing the finest in American tradition.

The Senator has been a banker, dairy farmer, lawyer, and county district attorney. In the latter position, he saw and fought the evil of juvenile delinquency, and even today, in his high judiciary post, he oversees the work of the Department of Justice which is combating the youth-crime evil. "The fight against waywardness of youth," he says, "begins in your home and mine, in your neighborhood school and mine. Let us bear our responsibility to make of each of these sources the profound influences for good that they can and should be. That is the first step toward victory in the battle over juvenile delinquency."

Mr. and Mrs. Wiley have fought the good fight, as have countless American families, for the realization of the earthly Kingdom of Heaven for their dear ones, and they have succeeded.

The Jews of Palestine Make Their Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1776, the representatives of the American colonists threw off the galling yoke of Great Britain in a document which has become the classic of all declarations of human freedom and dignity and paved the way for the formation of the Union.

Just a few days ago, in another historic gesture, the Jews of Palestine declared their freedom from that same British yoke, which they have worn for 30 years, and their intention of establishing their own free and independent state.

Under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the document:

JEWISH DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Resolution unanimously adopted by the general council of the World Zionist Organization on April 12, 1948, at Tel Aviv:

"Whereas after 27 years of an oppressive foreign regime that had received Palestine as a trust on behalf of the world to establish a national homeland for the Jews, that trust was not fulfilled:

"Now, therefore, the Jewish nation will establish its own state and independence in its homeland.

"The Jewish state to be established will be ruled by justice, freedom, and equality for all inhabitants, regardless of race or creed.

"We call upon the Arabs of Palestine and the neighboring states for an alliance of peace and cooperation. Together we shall build a state as citizens with equal rights and in mutual respect, for our freedom is your freedom.

"Our lives are dedicated to defense, and the Lord of Israel will be our mainstay."

On this, the 3d day of Nissam, the general council of the World Zionist Organization, its highest unit, announces to the civilized peoples of the world, to the representatives of the United Nations and to the Jews scattered throughout the world that it has been decided to set up an organ of supreme authority of our national independence in Palestine.

In pursuance of this purpose, we declare that we refuse to remain a minority dependent on the sufferance of others. The mandate is about to end. On May 15 His Majesty's Government will surrender to the United Nations the trust it received from the League of Nations 27 years ago and which it has failed to fulfill. It departed from the spirit

of the mandate and replaced it with the selfish purpose of furthering its Middle East interests.

As a result of this policy, our refugees were refused entry in the hour of their direst need. They were interned instead and condemned to lead a life of danger, humiliation, and helplessness while the mandatory treated with our sworn enemies, the friends and allies of the Nazis. And while refusing entry to Jews striving desparately after a last refuge they opened our frontiers to hordes of invaders come to make a mockery of the decision of the United Nations. And now the mandatory is proposing to destroy the very foundation of our existence and leave the country in utter chaos.

To prevent this we have resolved this day that the termination of the mandatory government of Palestine shall in fact mark the end of all foreign domination in this country. With the termination of this mandatory rule, a government of the Jewish state shall come into being.

In this hour we turn to the Arab citizens of the Jewish state and our Arab neighbors. We desire to build our state in common with the Arabs as equal citizens. Their future and ours rest on common endeavor.

Sure in the justice of our cause, we are ready to give our all to its achievement and we call on the Jews of all lands, and especially in Palestine, to close their ranks for the carrying out of this, our sublime task. Assured in our faith, we appeal to all nations to grant us the right to our own salvation, and rest our trust in God, the Lord of Israel.

Needed: A Republican Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no problem before the American people today of more interest than the foreign policy of the United States. A few days ago Dr. C. S. Norborg, the publisher of American World Intelligence, spoke before the Altrusa Club of Washington at the Brookings Institution. His subject was Needed: A Republican Foreign Policy.

Dr. Norborg, a scholar and a practical politician, who during the war was in the Intelligence Section of OSS and who is thoroughly familar with international problems, pleads for a real definition of the American foreign policy, and it seems to me that his clear and constructive analysis is of vital significance, in view of the coming national election.

I have asked for the privilege of extending my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that I may include Dr. Norborg's speech:

NEEDED: A REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY—25 THESES ON A VITAL QUESTION

I

1. In time of war, involving the very survival of the Nation, politics takes on the character of a unison determination to crush the enemy of the state: The constitutional prerogatives of a political opposition become submerged in the sacred right and privilege to defend the Nation itself.

2. In a democracy, the continued possibility, after the war, of a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs rests in the main with the party in power during the war, until the people themselves in a free election can decide what foreign and domestic policies they wish to support.

3. Such a bipartisan approach is predicated upon the following conditions:

(a) That the party in power openly and consistently sought the advice and cooperation of the opposition—on an equal footing—in all matters pertaining to such peace discussions or even peace agreements as may take place during the war itself.

(b) That the leaders of the opposition party either directly participated in such fundamental decisions or at least were made to understand why such decisions were deemed necessary for the attainment of victory and consequent peace.

(c) That both parties, after the arrival of victory, conscientiously agree upon the necessity or desirability of continuing a bipartisan, national cooperation in the execution of foreign affairs, as far as they relate to the making of the peace and the rebuilding of the world economy.

4. It is to be expected that the more total a war has been, the more precarious the peace and the reconstruction will prove to be and that, therefore, the different parties within a free, constitutional democracy will tend to keep a united national front on questions of world affairs.

5. At the same time, it follows that if a war was total of character, the reconstruction and peace problems before a great nation will be of such a fundamental character that a bipartisan solution may become impossible because of honest and unbridgeable moral and political differences of convictions between the party in power and the party in opposition.

6. Inasmuch as a great world power is prevented from making any artificial distinction between domestic and foreign policy, a bipartisan agreement on matters of foreign affairs must sooner or later give room to objective and basic differences of conviction which may force the party in opposition to reestablish its own position in matters of policy, domestic and foreign.

7. While such a development psychologically may be felt as a loss by a citizenry that has become accustomed to a national-minded war psychology of bipartisanship or national unity, political prudence can, in such a turn of events, only see a valuable resurgence of the political-freedom spirit of a healthy democracy at peace. A democracy which denies its citizens a choice of political alternatives is already paying too high a price for an illusory unity.

8. For a great and free democracy to call its citizens to a national election in peacetime wherein the major parties tacitly agree to pretend that foreign policy is not under debate, would be a disastrous disservice to the voting citizens. Such a false bipartisanship would in reality mean that the citizenry would be deprived of a voice in the Nation's conduct in world affairs. It would also be a denial of the concept of the basic and organic interrelatedness of domestic and foreign policy.

9. Upon the foregoing premises it becomes the absolute duty for a major party in a great democratic Nation to define with the greatest possible care and clarity its position on the vital question of world policy.

II

10. Thus, while it is the imperative duty of the Republican Party in the 1948 election to state its foreign-policy principles frankly and in clear words to the American people, it is already clear that the present Democratic administration would much prefer to have the Republican Party remain a silent partner to its conduct of American world affairs.

11. Inasmuch, however, as the Democratic war administration constantly refused to take the Republican opposition into its top-secret dealings with our wartime allies, the Republican tendency to keep up a postwar "me too" bipartisanship in foreign affairs is not warranted by the facts. The Republican Party is not the coauthor of the agreements of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Neither should the Republican Party permit the Democratic administration to make it appear that Republican bipartisanship entails a coguilt on behalf of the Republicans for the dilemma and the frustration of postwar American world policy.

12. To be specific, the Republican Party must point out that it is not in any way responsible for the near fatal and immoral appeasement of the Kremlin, by which the Democratic administration robbed this Nation and all other decent nations of a morally founded world peace and international order and cooperation.

13. The Republican Party owes it to the American people to bring out and make crystal clear the immorality and unconstitutionality of the secret diplomacy by which the Democratic administration subjugated all of eastern Europe under the hammer and sickle.

14. Also, the Republican Party must disengage itself completely from any responsibility for the treacherous power politics by which the Democratic administration permitted the Kremlin to move into a dominating position in the Far East, looting Manchuria, frustrating Korea, occupying vast new non-Soviet territories and jeopardizing the century old American tradition of an open-door policy in this most vital area of the future world.

15. Further, inasmuch as the early appeasement by the Democratic administration of Soviet expansion led to the frustration and the panic which expressed itself in the so-called Truman doctrine, the Republican Party must not let its bipartisanship spirit mislead it to any blanket endorsement of any administration policy aiming at covering up and overcoming the disastrous mistakes made by the policymakers of the executive branch. Keeping free of the scare propaganda and hysteria of the present administration, the Republican Party must rediscover and define for the American people an American policy positively rooted in American convictions and American strength and not just in the unending threats of a tyrannical Moscow.

16. While the Republican record conclusively proves that the Republicans have gone out of their way to assist the Democratic administration in its policy of reconstructing the war-torn world, the Republican Party must refuse to take any responsibility for the inefficiency and reckless irresponsibility which continue to characterize American spending and foreign administration in almost every part of the world.

17. In contrast to these critical observations, the one thing which the Republican Party can take full responsibility for in the line of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs is the Republican whole-hearted acceptance and approval of the United Nations Charter. In fact, the Republicans might well criticize the haphazard way in which American timidity and appeasement have failed to make the United States assume true and clear leadership in the international organization for a just and lasting world peace built on moral principles.

III

18. In the light of the foregoing observations, it follows that the need for a clear and unified Republican foreign policy is of great urgency to the American people and to the rest of the world.

19. In an atomic age a great nation must relinquish as suicidal the traditional distinction between domestic and foreign policy.

20. The national necessity of a distinct Republican foreign policy is predicated upon the fact that the betrayal of first principles

from Teheran to Potsdam makes it politically impossible for the present administration to be honest and constructive in its world policy. The Democrats will of necessity have to pretend that their fatal mistakes and miscalculations since Teheran, Casablanca, and Cairo are part of some inevitable game of world power politics. Such is not the case. The facts are too odious and too tragic to be covered up by any dishonest bipartisanship between the two major parties. Neither world peace nor American destiny would be served by the Republican Party remaining silent on the past, present, and future aspects of American world policy.

21. For the political future of the United States as a dynamic and free two-party democracy, it is imperative that the Republican Party immediately set itself to a thorough examination of its new foreign-policy platform. The traditional, innocuous preachments on world affairs will no longer do.

22. A bipartisan arrangement in political affairs inevitably creates and feeds confusion. The result of the wartime and postwar bipartisanship in American world affairs has led, therefore, to a confused and ill-timed American policy abroad and dangerous confusion and uncertainty in American public opinion at home.

23. This confusion has infected even the circles of Republican leaders where big Republican names such as Hoover, Vandenberg, Taft, Stassen, Dulles, Wherry, Eaton, Judd, etc., represent so many divergent subjective opinions on fundamental issues that it can be safely said that Republicans individually may have basic convictions and insights on world affairs, but that the Republican Party, which today dominates the legislative branch, has no unified concept of world policy.

24. The confusion in the public mind and the confusion among leading Republicans on matters of world policy combine to warn us that a clear and positive definition of Republican world policy is a sternly intellectual work and cannot be left to the rush of a policy-drafting committee hastily put together by a Republican National Convention. Time is now.

25. The Republican world policy platform must, during the coming election, contain a message to the American people; its contents must be clear, courageous, and consistent.

Rayburn and Democratic Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Columbia Record, Columbia, S. C., dated April 16, 1948:

Chances of electing a Democratic President this year are none too good. The primary objective, therefore, should be to hold the Democratic Party together and to hold the seats now held in Congress. There is even a possibility, under capable party leadership, of obtaining a majority in the Senate, as the Columbia Record has several times pointed out. But this cannot be accomplished under weak leadership, which does not command the loyalty and respect of the rank and file of the party and of the party leaders, in the Congress and in the States.

The problem before the party, therefore, is to select such a leader. No new and untried leader will do. He must be a man who has fought the party's battles, demonstrated his own loyalty to party principles and is of such character and stature as will command not only the respect of the party leaders but of the public as well. In short, he must be a man fit to fill the Presidency, even if his chances of being elected are negligible.

Where is such a man?

Traditionally the Democratic Party has selected its most popular, successful and capable Presidential candidates from among that group of party leaders who as governors of States have made their records as impressive leaders in public life. There were Tilden, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, James M. Cox, Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

But in 1948 there is no Democratic governor in any of the States who meets the qualifications. The sweeping Republican victory of 1946 put the Republicans in charge of most of the important State capitols.

So the party might do well to turn to the Congress. There such a man might be found in the Senate in the person of the Democratic leader, BARKLEY of Kentucky, or in the House in SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. Without discounting the really splendid service which Senator BARKLEY has rendered, it would seem that RAYBURN more nearly meets the qualifications needed.

A progressive before the New Deal, author of some of the soundest legislation which the Democratic Party has put on the statute books, majority leader in the Roosevelt administration, and Speaker, and now the minority leader, an able debater less verbose than BARKLEY, thoroughly familiar with all phases of the Government, SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, is liked and respected by the thousands of men, Democratic and Republican, who have served with him in the House of Representatives through the years. As the nominee for President, he would command the support of all factions in the party, North and South, and he would put up a real fight.

When John N. Garner was nominated for Vice President in 1932, he was already the nominee of his party for Congress in the Texas district which he had long represented. He did not withdraw, and was elected both as Congressman and as Vice President, and then resigned as Congressman. If nominated for President, RAYBURN could do the same, and if defeated for President could remain in Congress as Democratic Party leader in the House.

If it is unity that the Democrats want, and preservation of the party organization in Congress and in the States, the party would do well to consider SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, or someone else like him—if it cannot find a more glamorous candidate to replace Truman.

On the Italian Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Walter Lippmann in his very knowing article which appeared in the Washington Post, April 22, 1948, in which he points out that "in the next few weeks as the new government is formed, the crucial question will be whether De Gasperi and Sarragat can agree on measures of reform and reconstruction, and on a distribution of offices, which will reunite the Socialists and bring them into a coalition with the Christian Democrats."

I am convinced that unless the needs of the Italian people are met, the gains that were made in this election to hold Italy as a democratic country will be lost.

[From the Washington Post of April 22, 1948]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ON THE ITALIAN ELECTION

Although figures and details are not yet available to prove it, it is highly probable that the Socialists have in considerable numbers already broken away from the Communists, and that its decisive defeat may mean the dissolution of the Popular Front. If that is correct, then in the next few weeks as the new government is formed, the crucial question will be whether De Gasperi and Sarragat can agree on measures of reform and reconstruction, and on a distribution of offices, which will reunite the Socialists and bring them into a coalition with the Christian Democrats.

Nothing less than this can offer durable hope of a stable government in Italy. We must not overestimate the present results of the election. The Communists were decisively defeated in the voting; the Christian Democrats got a good plurality; with the Sarragat Socialists and some of the more dependable splinter parties, there is a fairly big non-Communist majority. But a 60- to 70-percent majority, when it is a coalition, is not really good enough to govern Italy well during the trying years ahead. It needs to be enlarged and strengthened by a divorce between the Socialists and the Communists not only in the chamber of deputies and the senate, but also in the labor unions and in local politics.

Only when the Communists are isolated will their power to cause trouble be under effective control. To do this it is not only necessary to exclude them from the new government; it is necessary also to reunite and reorganize the Socialists so that they may be included in the government. This is, of course, primarily an Italian problem in which the statesmanship of De Gasperi and the views of the Vatican will be the determining factors.

But the influence of the United States is great. The security and sustenance of the Italian nation depend, unhappily, upon America, and therefore we shall be answerable for how wisely we exert our influence. We seem to have given the Italians the impression, as that admirable reporter Mr. Stewart Alsop has just said in a dispatch from Italy, that we are "a reactionary Santa Claus." The impression needs to be corrected. For unless the non-Communist coalition identifies itself with the reconstruction of Italy, not merely with antibolshevism and relief, the electoral victory we are celebrating today will gradually become rancid.

A wise policy on our part depends upon a true appraisal of the political situation in western Europe.

The Italian election has confirmed the experience of 30 years: That the Communists, without the Red Army, cannot get and hold the control of a European nation by elections, by propaganda, infiltration, or a coup d'etat. The Communist doctrine appeals only to a minority, less than 25 percent. It is a minority which can cause trouble but against the army and the police it cannot seize power.

The more trouble it causes the more it arouses the resistance of the other elements of the nation. When the Red army cannot intervene, the national forces can always defeat the Communists in an election and they can and they will crush the Communists if it comes to an insurrection.

But—and this is the critical proviso—if the non-Communists are not able to govern well, if the Communists make enough trouble to paralyze the government and the national life, then the beneficiaries of bad government and disorder will be a determined minority

of Fascists or Fascist fellow-travelers. That is what happened after the First World War and it may happen again after the second.

It is likely to happen unless we, who exercise such influence, understand that in western Europe—outside the reach of the Red Army—the real danger is not that the Communists will get the power. It is that constitutional governments, unable to govern well and to cure the discontent which the Communists exploit, will collapse as between the two wars they did in Italy, Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania, and be succeeded by warlike Fascist dictatorships.

If we are to avoid grave misunderstanding of the political situation in Europe, we have, I contend, to realize the radical difference between communism within and communism beyond the orbit of the Red Army. After the Italian election that is no longer a most probable hypothesis but the first postulate for a successful analysis and prognosis of European conditions.

The second postulate, which is not so conclusively confirmed but is nevertheless most probably true, is that outside the orbit of the Red Army in Europe, the real danger is not that communism will win but that it will provoke fascism.

This is, I believe, the substantial meaning of Mr. Churchill's remark in his memoirs that "fascism was the shadow or ugly child of communism."

ERP and Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following two articles written by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, well-known newspaper columnist, who won the Raymond Clapper award last year. These articles appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday and Wednesday of this week:

ERP AND CARTELS

I

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

We emerged victorious from history's most devastating war less than 3 years ago with some hopes that are fast fading in the confusion that grips Europe today.

One of our hopes was that the great German industrial monopolies, or cartels, which were the sinister power behind Hitler and provided the sinews of war, were to be broken up and the real war lords who directed them, the industrialists, were to be stripped of their control. Their influence ramified far beyond Germany into the rest of Europe and even into Britain and the United States through ties with big business and finance.

Our hope has been confounded. Many of the powerful financial and industrial figures are back in key places due to our lenient policy which now receives encouragement through the seductive propaganda to build up a strong Germany against Russia.

A few weeks ago our lenient policy came to its inevitable climax, and a shocking climax in contrast with the objectives we professed at the war's end. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, administrator of the United States zone, virtually annulled the law passed in February 1947 for breaking up the German cartels.

Too little note has been taken of this development which becomes most important now because of the European recovery program, beyond its obvious significance otherwise. ERP embraces Germany. The question naturally arises as to whether our economic help is to be employed to revive, restore, and entrench the rulers of the great cartels that were used to try to destroy us and who, if once again in authority, would seek to renew the control they exercised before over the economy and politics of Europe.

The Clay order came to light through a protest against it to the general by 19 members of the Decartelization Branch of the American Military Government. They were informed of the new order at a meeting at which Richardson Bronson, its head, read excerpts from a memorandum which he said had been approved in principle by the State Department.

According to the protest, which Representative SADOWSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the order stopped any further deconcentration action against any capital goods or heavy industries, continuing decartelization only against monopolies in consumer goods. Further it decreed that an official clean bill of health be given soon to any enterprises against which no action is contemplated, that there be a cessation of action against vertical integrations, that a "rule of reason" hereafter be used to guide further proceedings, and that no action be taken, specifically, against Henschel Co., a railroad locomotive monopoly that manufactured tiger tanks and other weapons, or against VKF, the so-called ball-bearing trust which is linked to SKF in this country.

In their protest, the 19 staff members said "it appeared to be the unanimous opinion of the staff of the Decartelization Branch, or at least no contrary opinions were expressed, that the order given by Mr. Bronson excludes from decartelization the principal group of monopolistic enterprises which the law says must be eliminated." The heavy goods industries, the protest continued, were "more repugnant to the purposes of the law than are concentrations of economic power in consumer goods industries." It stated that the effect of the new order would be to leave the fundamental concentrations of economic power intact while engaging in harassing attacks on small companies that would make enforcement "unpopular and completely ineffectual."

ERP AND CARTELS

II

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Previously there was discussed here the order early last month by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, administrator of our zone in Germany, which virtually brought to an end our program to break up the great industrial monopolies, or cartels, that played so important a part in the Nazi regime and the war it loosed upon Europe and the world.

The protest against this order by 19 members of the American Military Government's Decartelization Branch was quoted from. Evidence of the reduced scope of the program comes in a sharp cut in the personnel to carry it out.

This abrupt change in basic policy, which has been lenient from the start and has left a number of former Nazi and industrial overlords in key places, becomes significant at this particular time because of developments.

One is the beginning of operation of the European recovery program in which Germany is included. Will our aid be used to build up the power of former cartelists and preserve the monopolistic control that proved so dangerous to Europe as well as to us?

The other is the tension over Russia which has so excited our people that it now can be used as a screen behind which to build up a "strong Germany," as we hear it in subtle propaganda these days, and an excuse for letting the monopolies and monopolists alone and cooperating with them.

Because of Russia it is easy to confuse the whole basic issue. Russia is reported to be using the old industrialists in her zone, though in her case it seems to be a matter of closely controlling them and of really "using" them, rather than the attitude of cooperating with them, which appears to be more nearly the case with us. Out of all this, out of the conflict over policy with Russia, the cartelists would seem to be the gainers. They are in a position to play both sides against the middle, and that is an old game with them.

Restoration of German industry and the revival of German production have been put forth as essential to Europe's recovery, since Germany previously was the powerhouse of Europe, industrially speaking. There has been a very easy transition from this, with the scare about Russia, to a "strong Germany" as a bulwark against Russia—the theory of the "Cliveden set" in England before the last war—which has a military connotation beyond the original economic connotation.

At the outset, soon after the war, there was the Morgenthau plan for a pastoral Germany. That was attacked and ridiculed. It was abandoned long ago, but it is still exploited as the horrible example by the propagandists for a "strong Germany" who would now go clear over to the other extreme to cooperation with the German industrialists.

But there is another alternative, a middle way. Production can be brought up to restore Germany and Europe economically through an efficient decartelized, decentralized industry and without turning back complete control to a few Nazi industrialists with power over a monopolistic pattern such as existed before in Germany and with ramifications into the rest of Europe that gave it such tremendous economic and political power. It is who controls that is important.

We are about to embark upon another great enterprise in Europe in the European recovery program, from which much good could come. But if it is used to restore the power of the Nazi monopolists, then we are headed again along the road that we took after World War I, when the cartelists were left in control and gradually built up the war machine from which the world suffered so much. All they stood for we fought against. This is something to remember as we make our plans to carry out the European recovery program.

Logan Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the executive council, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, April 14, 1948:

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has invested approximately $50,000,000 in the General Edward Lawrence Logan Airport, which is operating at an annual deficiency of about $75,000, and should, as promptly as possible, be placed on a self-supporting basis; and

Whereas to accomplish this purpose the Department of Public Works, which is the operating agency, has been directed by act of the legislature to establish a schedule of charges at the airport on items including the sale of gasoline or other aviation fuels, oils, or other articles and supplies; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration has allocated $600,000 from Federal funds to Logan Airport under the terms of

the Federal Airport Act, which amount is urgently needed to assist in meeting the cost of large expenditures required to complete the development of the airport, but has refused to allow the Commonwealth to receive said sum unless the Commonwealth binds itself for 20 years not to impose any fee on supplies delivered at the airport for operation of aircraft other than a charge for the cost of services rendered by the airport in connection therewith; and

Whereas such interference by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the operation by the Commonwealth of Logan Airport as the price of receiving Federal funds, which represent only a small fraction of the money paid by citizens of the Commonwealth to the Federal Government, is without congressional warrant, would require violation of the Massachusetts statutes, and would seriously interfere with, if not make impossible, the operation of the airport on a self-supporting basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive council unanimously opposes such unwarranted interference by a Federal administrative agency; and be it further

Resolved, That each member of the Massachusetts delegation to the Congress of the United States be sent a copy of this resolution and be requested to take immediate action to protect the Commonwealth from such abuse of authority by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

More Help to Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1948, I requested the State Department not to further the march of communism and made the following remarks:

TRADE WITH COMMUNISTIC COUNTRIES

(Remarks of Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL, of Ohio, in the House of Representatives, Monday, March 22, 1948)

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the so-called reciprocal trade agreements have been a great detriment to American industry, and among those most vitally affected is the hand-glass industry of America. There are numerous plants throughout the country employing many thousands of men, yet the so-called reciprocal trade agreements would permit the cheap labor of Czechoslovakia to force down the wages and standards of the American workmen. If that were not bad enough, now Czechoslovakia is in the hands of the Russians, who will be signing for Czechoslovakia. This will not only further hurt the American worker, but will make Russia stronger in its march of communism. I do not believe the American workman should be hurt by unfair agreements against American labor and much less should the worker be stamped on by the heavy heel of communism. On Thursday last I requested the State Department not to recognize nor take the Russian signature of Czechoslovakia in this vital matter affecting the hundreds of American industries employing millions of workmen, and I protested as follows to the State Department on March 18 against this signature:

MARCH 18, 1948.

GEORGE MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.:

I am advised that Czechoslovakia is expected to sign the activation of the Geneva agreement on Saturday, March 20, at New York, and the State Department will accept the signature as consistent with its program of reciprocal trade. In view of the Marshall plan now before the Congress requesting untold billions to stop communism and the President's message of yesterday with reference to communism, it seems ridiculous that the United States should now accept such signature with reference to trade agreements and give to the Communists American dollars to further the march of communism. The State Department should not accept the signature of Czechoslovakia for further aid to communism, and I protest any such agreement with Czechoslovakia with reference to carrying forth the reciprocal trade agreements.

Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

The State Department advised today that on March 20 the Czechoslovakian Government said it would sign the protocol on March 20 which would go into effect on April 20, 1948, and that the State Department now has a special committee commencing a study of the proposed signature in the light of recent developments in Czechoslovakia.

Now such an agreement would have little meaning with the Communists in control and I believe not only that this study should be continued but this recognition of reciprocal-trade agreements should not be given to the detriment of American labor, let alone that whereby the Communists of the world help to oppress American workers not only in the great hand-glass industry of America but in many other industries throughout the land.

Mr. Speaker, today, in answer to my request that the State Department not give trade privileges to communistically dominated Czechoslovakia, I received the disappointing information that the State Department has decided to apply the provisions of the general agreement to Czechoslovakia, and accordingly, the President is issuing a proclamation to this effect. The letter from the State Department and its press enclosure follow:

APRIL 22, 1948.

The Honorable ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WEICHEL: I have further reference to your inquiry concerning the signature by Czechoslovakia of the protocol of provisional application of the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and to your desire to be informed of further developments.

After thorough study of the problem, the decision has been reached to apply the provisions of the general agreement to Czechoslovakia, and accordingly the President is issuing today a proclamation to this effect. The proclamation implements an obligation entered into by this Government more than 5 months ago, on October 30, 1947, when the general agreement was concluded at Geneva. Since Czechoslovakia has now placed the general agreement in effect with respect to the United States and the other contracting parties, this country as well as the other contracting parties is obligated to apply the agreement to Czechoslovakia.

The provisions of the general agreement commit the other contracting parties to accord equitable treatment for the trade of the United States and at the same time permit the United States to withdraw or modify any concession granted under the agreement if it should result in such increased imports as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers. In addition to this safeguard with respect to imports, the United States also exercises export controls to protect the American economy generally, to promote the objectives of foreign policy, and to safeguard national security. These export controls prevent shipment of goods contrary to the national interests of the United States.

There is enclosed a statement issued to the press today regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Acting Secretary of State.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
April 22, 1948.

The President today issued a proclamation putting into effect as of April 21, 1948, the provisions of the general agreement on tariffs and trade with respect to Czechoslovakia. The proclamation implements an obligation entered into by this Government last October 30 when the general agreement was concluded at Geneva with 22 other countries.

The attitude of the Government of the United States toward the events of last February in Czechoslovakia was publicly indicated in the joint statement of February 26, 1948, by the Secretary of State of this Government and by the Foreign Ministers of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France. It has not changed. These events, however, do not directly affect the legal status of the reciprocal obligations under the general agreement.

The President's action followed receipt of a communication from the Secretary-General of the United Nations informing this Government that the Government of Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol of Provisional Application of the general agreement and had thereby obligated itself to put the general agreement into effect. Since Czechoslovakia has now placed the general agreement in effect with respect to the United States and the other contracting parties, this country as well as the other contracting parties are obligated to apply the agreement to Czechoslovakia.

The general agreement is a trade agreement among 23 countries, completed last October after negotiations lasting 7 months. It is part of a world-wide program, sponsored by the United Nations and actively participated in by the United States, designed to reduce trade barriers and to restore international trade to an orderly and stable basis. It is the most comprehensive agreement with respect to tariffs and other trade barriers ever negotiated.

Czechoslovakia is the tenth of the Geneva countries to give effect to this agreement. The other countries which have done so, in addition to the United States, are the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Canada, Australia, and Cuba. The remainder of the 23 participants in the negotiations have until June 30, 1948, to put the agreement provisionally into effect. The obligations assumed by Czechoslovakia under this agreement and those assumed by other countries to Czechoslovakia are integral parts of the agreement.

Under the general agreement, Czechoslovakia grants concessions on products of interest to the United States representing approximately $31,600,000 in terms of 1937 trade and covering approximately 80 percent of Czechoslovakia's total prewar imports from the United States. The agreement includes substantial duty reductions by Czechoslovakia on a number of important items, such as apples and pears, raisins, prunes, and certain other dried fruits, canned fruits, and fruit juices, canned vegetables, passenger automobiles, and certain types of office machines.

Czechoslovakia and the other contracting parties to the agreement are committed to certain limitations with respect to the application of quotas, import restrictions, exchange control, and the conduct of state trading, which are important since they commit Czechoslovakia as well as other parties to the agreement to accord fair treatment to the trade of the United States. Should Czechoslovakia or any other contracting party fail to fulfill these obligations

of the agreement or adopt any policy which nullifies or impairs the tariff concessions, the application by the United States to that country of such obligations or concessions under the agreement as may be appropriate in the circumstances may be suspended.

The concessions made by the United States in the general agreement on products of interest to Czechoslovakia represent approximately $22,700,000 in terms of 1937 trade and cover approximately 64 percent of United States prewar imports from Czechoslovakia. Of the concessions granted by the United States, those on household china, table and kitchen glassware, jewelry, certain types of shoes and gloves, and hops are the items of principal interest to Czechoslovakia.

These concessions were granted only after public hearings and the most careful and considerate deliberation by various Government agencies acting in consultation to assure that domestic producers would not suffer serious injury as a result of the concessions. If, however, as a result of unforeseen circumstances, any of these concessions should result in such increased imports from Czechoslovakia as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers in this country, the United States is free to withdraw or modify the concessions to the extent necessary to prevent or remedy the injury. This provision thus safeguards the interests of domestic producers in this country.

In addition to this safeguard with respect to imports, the United States also exercises export controls to protect the American economy generally, to promote the objectives of foreign policy, and to safeguard national security. Since March 1, 1948, no shipments to European destinations, including Czechoslovakia, can be made without appropriate license. These export controls prevent shipment of goods contrary to the national interests of the United States.

SUPPLEMENTING PROCLAMATIONS OF DECEMBER 16, 1947 AND JANUARY 1, 1948, CARRYING OUT GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE AND EXCLUSIVE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH CUBA, RESPECTIVELY

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas (1), pursuant to the authority conferred by section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 1 of the Act of June 12, 1934, by the joint resolution approved June 7, 1943, and by sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 5, 1945 (48 Stat. 943 and 944, ch. 474, 57 Stat. 125, ch. 118, 59 Stat. 410 and 411, ch. 269; 19 U. S. C. (1946) 1351), the period within which said authority may be exercised having been extended by section 1 of said Act of July 5, 1945 until the expiration of 3 years from June 12, 1945 (48 Stat. 944, ch. 474, 59 Stat. 410, ch. 269; 19 U. S. C. (1946) 1352(c)), on October 30, 1947 the President entered into a trade agreement with the governments of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Kingdom of Belgium, the United States of Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, the Republic of Chile, the Republic of China, the Republic of Cuba, the Czechoslovak Republic, the French Republic, India, Lebanon, the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Kingdom of Norway, Pakistan, Southern Rhodesia, Syria, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which trade agreement consists of the general agreement on tariffs and trade and the related protocol of provisional application thereof, together with the final act adopted at the conclusion of the second session of the preparatory committee of the United Nations Conference on trade and employment which authenticated the texts of said general agreement and said protocol;

Whereas (2) on December 16, 1947, by proclamation 2761A the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States of America as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out said trade agreement on and after January 1, 1948 (12 F. R. 8866), which proclamation has been supplemented by Proclamation 2769 of January 30, 1948 (13 F. R. 467);

Whereas (3), pursuant to the authority conferred by said section 350, the period within which said authority may be exercised having been so extended, on October 30, 1947, the President entered into an exclusive trade agreement with the Government of the Republic of Cuba (T. D. 51819 (Customs)), which exclusive trade agreement includes certain portions of other documents made a part thereof and provides for the customs treatment in respect of ordinary customs duties of products of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States of America;

Whereas (4) on January 1, 1948, by Proclamation 2764, the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States of America in respect of products of the Republic of Cuba and such continuance of existing customs and excise treatment of products of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States of America as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out said exclusive trade agreement on and after January 1, 1948 (13 F. R. 25 and 26), which proclamation has been supplemented by said proclamation of January 30, 1948;

Whereas (5) said protocol of provisional application has been signed by the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic, and said Government has become a contracting party to said general agreement;

Whereas (6) I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, determine that the application of such of the concession provided for in part I of schedule XX of said general agreement which were withheld from application in accordance with article XXVII of said general agreement by said proclamation of December 16, 1947, as are identified in the following list is required or appropriate to carry out, on and after April 21, 1948, said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation:

Item, paragraph, and rates of duty

212 (second): 10 cents per dozen and 45 percent ad valorem.

217: ½ cent per pound.

218 (b) (first): 32½ percent ad valorem.

218 (c): All rates.

218 (e) (first): 12½ percent ad valorem, 50 percent ad valorem, 37½ percent ad valorem.

218 (e) (second): 37½ percent ad valorem.

218 (f): 30 percent ad valorem, 50 percent ad valorem, 50 cents on each article or utensil, but not less than 30 percent nor more than 50 percent ad valorem, identified only as to articles or utensils valued at less than $1 each.

218 (g): 25 percent ad valorem.

230 (d): 40 percent ad valorem.

339: 2½ cents per pound and 7½ percent ad valorem.

348: All rates.

350: 22½ percent ad valorem.

397: 40 percent ad valorem.

412 (second): 40 percent ad valorem.

412 (third): 30 percent ad valorem.

412 (sixth): 17½ percent ad valorem, 25 percent ad valorem.

710: 3½ cents per pound, but not less than 17½ percent ad valorem (second such rate).

780 (first): 12 cents per pound.

780 (second): 75 cents per pound.

909 (first): 22½ cents per pound, but not less than 20 percent nor more than 35 percent ad valorem.

909 (third): 22½ cents per pound, but not less than 20 percent nor more than 35 percent ad valorem.

911 (a): 22½ cents per pound, but not less than 20 percent nor more than 35 percent ad valorem.

911 (b) (first): 20 percent ad valorem.

915: $1.50 per dozen pairs, but not less than 30 percent nor more than 60 percent ad valorem.

1309 (second): All rates.

1413 (fifth): 17½ percent ad valorem.

1503 (first): 27½ percent ad valorem.

1503 (second): 17½ percent ad valorem.

1503 (third): All rates.

1503 (fourth): 37½ percent ad valorem.

1503 (fifth): 22½ percent ad valorem.

1510 (first): ¾ cent per line per gross and 12½ percent ad valorem.

1510 (third): 22½ per cent ad valorem.

1513 (first): 45 percent ad valorem.

1513 (second): 50 percent ad valorem (first such rate), 35 percent ad valorem (first such rate), 50 percent ad valorem (second such rate).

1518 (fourth): 60 percent ad valorem, 45 percent ad valorem.

1527 (c) (1) and (2): 55 percent ad valorem (first such rate), 65 percent ad valorem.

1528 (third): 10 percent ad valorem.

1528 (fourth): 30 percent ad valorem.

1530 (e) (first): 20 percent ad valorem (first such rate), 20 percent ad valorem (first such rate), 10 percent ad valorem (first such rate), 20 percent ad valorem (second such rate).

1530 (e) (second): 20 percent ad valorem.

1537 (b) (first): $1.50 per dozen pairs, but not less than 12½ percent nor more than 25 percent ad valorem.

1541 (a) (first): $2 each, but not less than 20 percent nor more than 30 percent ad valorem, 25 percent ad valorem, 28 percent ad valorem.

1541 (a) (third): 25 percent ad valorem.

1541 (b) (first): All rates.

1541 (b) (second): 30 percent ad valorem.

1544: 15 percent ad valorem.

1549 (a) (first): 50 cents per gross and 15 percent ad valorem.

1549 (a) (third): 50 cents per gross and 15 percent ad valorem.

1549 (b): 20 percent ad valorem.

1718: Free;

Whereas (7) I determine that, in view of the determination set forth in the sixth recital of this proclamation, the deletion of the second item 1527 (c) (2) from the list set forth in the seventh recital of said proclamation of January 30, 1948, is required or appropriate to carry out, on and after April 21, 1948, said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation;

Whereas (8) I determine that, in view of the determination set forth in the sixth recital of this proclamation the following amendments of the list set forth in the eighth and ninth recitals of said proclamation of January 1, 1948, as amended and rectified, are required or appropriate to carry out, on and after April 21, 1948, said exclusive trade agreement specified in the third recital of this proclamation:

(a) The deletion of the second item 1527 (c) (2), added to said eighth recital by subdivision (a) of part II of said proclamation of January 30, 1948;

(b) The modification of the third item 412 in said ninth recital to read as follows:

"412: Manufactures of wood or bark, or of which wood or bark is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for: Clothespins other than spring clothespins, 20 percent ad valorem";

(c) The deletion of the first item 1513 in said ninth recital;

(d) The modification of the last item 1513 in said ninth recital to read as follows:

"1513: Toys and parts of toys, not specially provided for (not including any toys described in item 1513 (second) of part I of

schedule XX of the general agreement on tariffs and trade):

"If wholly or in chief value of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthenware, or stoneware, 28 percent ad valorem.

"Other: 56 percent ad valorem;"

(e) The deletion of item 1527 (c) (2) in said ninth recital as changed by subdivision (d) of part II of said proclamation of January 30, 1948; and

(f) The modification of item 1530 (e) in said ninth recital to read as follows:

"1530 (e): Boots, shoes, or other footwear (including athletic or sporting boots and shoes), made wholly or in chief value of leather, not specially provided for (except boots, shoes, or other footwear made by the process or method known as welt, or sewed or stitched by the process or method known as McKay, or having molded soles laced to uppers; slippers for housewear; and moccasins of the Indian handicraft type, having no line of demarcation between the soles and the uppers) turn or turned:

"Boots and shoes: 8 percent ad valorem.

"Other, if for men, youths, or boys: 16 percent ad valorem.

"Huaraches: 8 percent ad valorem.

"Other, if for men, youths, or boys: 8 percent ad valorem";

Now, therefore, be it known that, acting under the authority of said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended:

PART I

To the end that said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation may be carried out, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do proclaim that, effective on and after April 21, 1948:

(a) The concessions provided for in part I of said schedule XX which are identified in the sixth recital of this proclamation shall no longer be identified in the eighth recital of said proclamation of December 16, 1947, and the rates of duty representing such concessions identified in said sixth recital of this proclamation shall be applied, subject to the applicable terms, conditions, and qualifications set forth in said schedule XX, and parts I, II, and III, of said general agreement, and in subdivision (a), other than exception (I) thereof, of said proclamation of December 16, 1947, including in each case any amendments and rectifications which have been proclaimed by the President, to articles of the kinds provided for in the descriptions of products in the column at the left of said rates; and

(b) The second item 1527 (c) (2) shall be deleted from the list set forth in the seventh recital of said proclamation of January 30, 1948; and

PART II

To the end that said exclusive trade agreement specified in the third recital of this proclamation may be carried out, I do further proclaim that, effective on and after April 21, 1948, the lists set forth in the eighth and ninth recitals of said proclamation of January 1, 1948, as amended and rectified, shall be further amended in the manner indicated in the eighth recital of this proclamation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

By the President:

——— ———,

Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, especially with reference to the President's demand for billions of dollars a year to stop the march of communism after he had built up Russia with machinery and heavy goods these past 3 years, even then the Congress just granted money in good faith under the Marshall plan. Yet, after all of this, today the State Department and the President go merrily on helping communistically dominated countries, and all to the detriment of American labor.

Repeal of Oleomargarine Tax in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to announce that our able Governor, the Honorable Alfred E. Driscoll, has signed the bill removing the tax on the sale and manufacture of yellow margarine. His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. ALFRED DRISCOLL, OF NEW JERSEY

New Jersey today repeals the injurious and discriminatory law against the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine within the borders of our State. The sponsor of this bill is to be congratulated. One way to reduce the cost of living is to remove inequitable, discriminatory laws and to permit our citizens to purchase freely food that is fit for consumption, healthful, and desirable.

Partition Plan for Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution concerning our Government's regrettable reversal policy on the Palestine partition plan. This resolution was adopted recently at a large mass meeting, in the city of Worcester, Mass., representing 10,000 Jewish people of the community.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the United States Government has repudiated the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947 to partition Palestine into separate Arab and Jewish states; and

Whereas this reversal of policy consitutes an act of disappointment since it violates the traditional American policy on Palestine as stated by two Congressional Resolutions on Palestine, repudiates the pledges of both major American political parties, and reneges on the partition decision of the United Nations—a decision which was brought about largely as a result of the decisive role played by our Government; and

Whereas in its recent statement of reversal the United States Government has committed an act of appeasement by bowing to the intimidation of those Arab states which have flouted the will of the United Nations on the Palestine decision; and

Whereas by thrusting aside the judgment of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the United States Government has struck a shattering blow at the future effectiveness of the United Nations as an international instrument for preserving and maintaining the peace and security of the world; and

Whereas the hundreds of thousands of Jews still languishing in the Displaced Persons Camps of Europe have been cruelly disillusioned by the very nation to which they look for salvation; and

Whereas the new United States proposal can only serve to aggravate the situation in Palestine and increase tension and bloodshed in that country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, Worcester Lodge No. 600, B'nai B'rith, Worcester Post, No. 32, Jewish War Veterans, Workmen's Circle Branches of Worcester, Damascus Lodge No. 50, Knights of Pythias, Worcester section, Council of Jewish Women, Worcester Zionist district, Senior Hadassah, Junior Hadassah, Mizrachi, Labor Zionist Organization of America, all organizations in the city and county of Worcester, Mass., do hereby express our deep indignation and our sense of hurt over this act of reversal by the administration of President Truman; and be it

Resolved, That we call upon the President to revoke this action immediately, lest our Government be instrumental in undermining the United Nations; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent immediately to President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, and to the Chief of the United States delegation to the United Nations, Warren R. Austin.

Dated this 7th day of April 1948, at Worcester, Mass.

Worcester Lodge No. 600, B'nai B'rith, by Abraham Palley, president; Worcester Post, No. 32, Jewish War Veterans, by Harry Entin, commander; Workmen's Circle Branches of Worcester; Damascus Lodge, No. 50, Knights of Pythias, by Henry M. Ritz, vice chairman; Worcester Section, Council of Jewish Women, by Dorothy E. Shuman, chairman; Worcester Zionist District, by Joseph Goldberg, president; Senior Hadassah, by Dorothy Smith, president; Junior Hadassah, by Sybil Horowitz, president; Mizrachi, by Jacob Weinstein, president; Labor Zionist Organization of America, by Arthur Rosenberg, president.

Attack of Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply distressed, as I know all the Members were, to learn of the violent attempt on Walter Reuther's life. I am relieved to learn of his progress toward a speedy recovery.

Mr. Reuther is an able, fearless leader in American labor. In the various offices he has held in the United Auto Workers union he has shown by his intelligent, dignified, and vigorous conduct his deep responsibility not only to his own union but to all of labor and to the American community.

Such examples of underhandedness and violence in our body politic should be of deep concern to all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following editorial from this morning's Washington Post in the RECORD at this time:

ATTACK ON REUTHER

Walter Reuther is one of those men who, while occupying private positions, are in-

vested with important public responsibility. He has won immense popular confidence and respect not alone because he waged a doughty, successful fight to eject Communists from controlling positions in the United Automobile Workers but equally because he has conducted the affairs of that union with responsibility as well as vigor. The whole country therefore was shocked at the news that an attempt was made yesterday to assassinate him and correspondingly relieved at the current information that his condition is improving. The attempt was a foul and vicious one for which no American could have sympathy, in any case, regardless of its target.

The event seems one more symptom of a spirit of violence and lawlessness which has become far too prevalent. No one yet knows anything about the source or inspiration of the attack on Mr. Reuther. He has, naturally, made enemies—on the extreme right no less than on the extreme left. The UAW executive board deserves commendation for the restraint of its statement and the injunction of caution it has laid upon union members. Nothing could be more unfortunate than violent reprisals for this attack. Indeed, it is worth noting, perhaps, that there is a kinship between the attempt on Mr. Reuther's life and the recent mob action against a Communist in Akron, Ohio, in respect of which the leader of the Auto Workers urged President Truman to protest. In these critical times especially, temperance and respect for the law need to be our watchwords.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act Now More Important Than Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the President has urged the Congress to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its present form for 3 years until June 12, 1951. He has stressed that such act would be "continuing evidence of the determination of the United States to contribute its full share to the reconstruction of a sound and growing world economy as the basis for enduring peace."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials—the first entitled "More Important Than Ever" from the New York World-Telegram of March 3, 1948, and the second entitled "Reciprocal Trade Act" from the Manchester (N. H.) Union of March 9, 1948:

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 3, 1948]

MORE IMPORTANT THAN EVER

President Truman has asked Congress for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This 14-year-old law authorizes the President to make agreements with other countries for two-way cuts in tariff rates and other barriers to international commerce.

The act, Mr. Truman says, is more important now than ever before. His reasons for saying that seem to us unanswerable.

With other nations, "we are engaged in a mighty endeavor to build a peaceful and prosperous world." Continued efforts to stimulate an increasing flow of trade among those nations are essential to success of that endeavor.

The reciprocal agreements "recognize the fundamental fact that trade is a two-way business." We can't go on forever exporting more than we import. Other countries must be able to sell their goods to us if they are to get dollars to buy our products and to repay our loans. When we import needed goods we improve the living standards of Americans as consumers, and at the same time we make it possible to maintain foreign markets for our producers. And the lowering of trade barriers encourages private trading and free enterprise, as distinct from government trading.

We believe that, as Mr. Truman says, the interests of domestic producers have been and will be carefully safeguarded in the negotiation of reciprocal agreements. We know that in the past the Republican Party has done itself great damage by championing high protective tariffs, represented as beneficial to industry and agriculture, but actually harmful to the vast majority of Americans. We hope that now, when so much is at stake, Republicans in Congress will not succeed in putting their party back on that road to disaster.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of March 9, 1948]

RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

President Truman has made a strong appeal to Congress for the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This act, which was originally passed in 1934, and which has been renewed from time to time since that date, expires on June 30 unless Congress takes steps to prolong it further.

Whatever may have been the earlier criticisms against it, our reciprocal-trade policy has become a cornerstone in our trade relations with other nations, and one of the outstanding evidences of our good faith in trying to facilitate world trade. For this reason the Reciprocal Trade Act should be renewed in order to avoid giving impetus to a return to economic nationalism with all the dangers that entails.

Reports, however, state that the President's appeal for renewal has aroused hostility in some Republican circles in Congress, where apparently a disposition exists to let the act lapse and the question of tariffs becomes once more a football of politics.

Such a return to trade isolationism can do neither the Nation nor the Republican Party any good. This is not only our judgment, but also that of some leading Republican authorities. For instance, the New York Herald Tribune, normally regarded as an authoritative voice in Republican affairs, points out that the safeguards written into the act at the time of its renewal in 1946 remove all but purely political objections.

These safeguards, as the Herald Tribune emphasizes, require:

1. That the Tariff Commission shall instruct the President regarding the point beyond which reduction and concession in tariffs cannot be made without injuring our domestic economy.

2. They provide that if such injury develops after a trade agreement is made, the President shall be authorized to withdraw or modify any tariff order he has given.

3. If other nations refuse to grant similar reciprocal benefits, they shall be denied a share in an agreement through an unconditional interpretation of the most-favored-nation clause.

These amendments to the act, sponsored by Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN in 1946, both Republicans, as the Herald Tribune points out, have made adequate provision against abuses. There would therefore seem to be no reason from a domestic standpoint why the act should not be renewed. And there is abundant reason from the angle of foreign relations why it should be renewed. We cannot afford today to give the impression abroad that the United States is returning to trade isolationism and thereby blast the whole structure of commercial cooperation that has been building up since the war.

Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. Eugene Kelty in the Tillamook News, published at Garibaldi, Oreg. The conclusions drawn by Mr. Kelty are ones which should be the subject of thought by every Member of Congress.

STRIKES

On 22 items on the front page of Monday's Oregon Journal, 6 heads were as follows:

"Exchanges still struck; sales uneven"

"Omaha Armour plant picket shot in clash"

"Stage negotiation session delayed"

"Metal trade tie-up looms on coast"

"Miners fail to show at pits; United States act due"

"New steel wage parley denied."

All unions aren't bloodsuckers; all employers can't be unregenerate Scrouges. There must be more give and take between the two, however, so that the public will not find itself continually caught between the hammer and the anvil. Otherwise there will be more drastic controls fixed on labor; otherwise there will be increased tendency toward Government ownership of business.

"Not by Might, nor by Power, but by My Spirit"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times for Wednesday, April 21, the following article appeared which is sponsored by the Quakers' the American Friends Service Committee. In the article they suggest three steps that should be taken in the direction of peace.

There is no doubt but that the people of the world want peace. The common people are looking for leadership that will bring peace and understanding in this troubled world. The leadership which the Quakers are taking in the direction of peace will have the support and commendation of all mothers and wives who had sons and husbands in the last war. This program will also have the strong support of those ex-GI's who had the experience of going through the bloody battles of the last war, and who on their return home found another war in preparation.

The article follows:

"NOT BY MIGHT, NOR BY POWER, BUT BY MY SPIRIT"

The world is aghast at the dread prospect of the United States and Russia competing for military supremacy.

This need not be; this must not be. War, or militarism to forestall war, means ultimate ruin for all. The American Friends Service Committee believes peaceful relations are possible between the United States and Russia. We do not minimize the issues that now exist between the two countries, but neither do we believe that war would settle these issues. It would only intensify them. We call for a faith that other means can be found which could lift us to a new level of life in which war is outmoded.

The world is ready to be quickened by a new spirit. It begs to be assured by reconciling deeds rather than words that under God there is one humanity. The hearts of men can still be kindled by a new vision of man's common and unfinished task—the building, under law, of a true parliament of nations.

The peoples of the world want peace. Freedom from fear and from violence, freedom from threat and from counterthreat, freedom to test the validity of ideas in daily life rather than on the battlefield, are what all nations want. Quaker workers in Europe and Asia tell us with one voice that people everywhere want to draw on America's faith in the future—not on our arsenal of weapons. This yearning of all people for a new approach to international affairs is the solid rock upon which the peace of the world can yet be built. If America has tried and failed to gain peace, now is the time to try again. Let us be infused with new faith. From the ashes of our frustration and despair let us rise with new determination to solve our differences with Russia in peaceful ways and in terms that will build a truly united world.

Here are three steps which we believe are a beginning in this new direction:

I. BEGIN PEACE TALKS NOW

Let a group of leading American citizens meet this spring to formulate proposals for a general settlement of outstanding issues between the United States and the Soviet Union. Let these proposals be widely debated and then laid before the American and Russian heads of government, urging that they meet again in new faith and with a fresh spirit.

II. STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS

Let the United States demonstrate now, in action, its loyalty to the United Nations and its determination to strengthen it as an instrument of world law and order. We believe Russia would respond to such a move. Let the United States join at once the World Health Organization and put adequate financial resources behind the International Refugee Organization. With a new burst of faith let us begin to put substantial funds into the instruments of peace instead of into vast military expenditures in preparation for war.

III. PROMOTE PERSONAL CONTACTS

Let American private organizations with experience in international affairs unite in undertaking a large-scale program to promote intercultural understanding between the United States and Russia. Let us make a new effort to arrange the exchange of students, writers, religious leaders, and industrial workers. Americans and Russians need to see themselves as they are seen by each other.

The American Friends Service Committee believes that there is widespread support and the divine assistance to sustain those who will embark on such a course.

"Not by might, nor by power, but by My spirit" can men escape the dreadful consequences of unceasing strife.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE (QUAKERS).
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Little Rock Post AMVETS Favors Admission of a Share of Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the Little Rock Post, No. 5, AMVETS, urging the admission of displaced persons to the United States:

Whereas there are in camps in Germany, Italy, and Austria nearly a million displaced persons of various denominations, composed of men, women, and children, 80 percent of whom are Christians, and 20 percent Jews, including 150,000 children below the age of 17; and

Whereas these displaced persons are unable to return to their own homes because of persecution or fear of persecution by reason of their race, religion, or political beliefs, and desire above all else to start a new life in a nation where there is freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of movement, and have demonstrated their faith that this Nation and others allied with it will do them justice: Be it

Resolved, That the Little Rock Post, No. 5, AMVETS, go on record as favoring the admission by the United States of its fair share of these displaced people, such share amounting to 400,000 over the period of the next 4 years, and urge the Congress to provide the legislation necessary to accomplish this result.

Reciprocal Trade Extension More Important Than Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of March 3, 1948:

MORE IMPORTANT THAN EVER

President Truman has asked Congress for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This 14-year-old law authorizes the President to make agreements with other countries for two-way cuts in tariff rates and other barriers to international commerce.

The act, Mr. Truman says, is more important now than ever before. His reasons for saying that seem to us unanswerable.

With other nations, we are engaged in a mighty endeavor to build a peaceful and prosperous world. Continued efforts to stimulate an increasing flow of trade among those nations are essential to success of that endeavor.

The reciprocal agreements recognize the fundamental fact that trade is a two-way business. We can't go on forever exporting more than we import. Other countries must be able to sell their goods to us if they are to get dollars to buy our products and to repay our loans.

When we import needed goods we improve the living standards of Americans as consumers, and at the same time we make it possible to maintain foreign markets for our producers. And the lowering of trade barriers encourages private trading and free enterprise, as distinct from Government trading.

If the law is extended, action must originate in the House. Republican leaders there are cold, if not openly hostile, to Mr. Truman's request.

Some of them would let the reciprocal trade program die next June. Others are afraid to do that. They realize the truth of what the President says—that this program has drawn the constant and increasing support of the American people, regardless of party affiliation. So they talk of extending it for a short period, until after the elections, and of crippling it with restrictions that would restore the old evils of logrolling in the making of tariffs.

We believe that, as Mr. Truman says, the interests of domestic producers have been and will be carefully safeguarded in the negotiation of reciprocal agreements. We know that, in the past, the Republican Party has done itself great damage by championing high protective tariffs, represented as beneficial to industry and agriculture but actually harmful to the vast majority of Americans.

We hope that now, when so much is at stake, Republicans in Congress will not succeed in putting their party back on that road to disaster.

America's Stake in World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Norman Burns, adviser, Division of Commercial Policy, United States Department of State, before the Rhode Island World Affairs Week, Upper Manning Hall, Brown University, Providence, R. I., March 20, 1948, which emphasizes the importance of foreign trade to the United States to the success of the European recovery program, and outlines the recent accomplishments toward elimination of artificial trade barriers in the negotiation of the multilateral trade agreement among 23 countries at Geneva, and in the completion of the proposed charter for an International Trade Organization at Habana:

AMERICA'S STAKE IN WORLD TRADE

When the President recommended to Congress, a few days ago, that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be renewed in its present form for another 3 years, he described the act as a time-tested and practical method of expanding world trade. He said that the act would stimulate an increasing flow of trade between nations and would contribute

greatly in our endeavor to build a prosperous and peaceful world.

It is a timely occasion to ask, What is America's stake in world trade? What measures are we taking to bring about an expansion in world trade? Does a flourishing international trade help to build a prosperous and peaceful world?

Citizens in a democracy have a right and a duty to ask such questions. They have a right to facts. They need not accept answers on blind faith. Democracy's great driving power comes from the force of informed public opinion, developed in honest, critical and free discussion. The vigor of this country springs from institutions such as the New England town meeting of yesterday, the Rhode Island world affairs week of today.

IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN TRADE TO THE UNITED STATES

America has a vital economic stake in world trade, because the United States is now the world's principal foreign trading country. United States exports are larger than those of any other country. United States imports are second only to those of the United Kingdom. Approximately 10 percent of the total agricultural and industrial production of the United States is sold abroad. To some people, an average export of 10 percent of our production may not seem significant. but businessmen know that a variation of 10 percent in a company's sales may mean the difference between black and red ink. Moreover, the 10 percent average obscures the fact that, for some products, exports take a third or even a half of the total United States output. Exports furnished a market for 29 percent of our production of tobacco (1938), 31 percent of cotton, 12 percent of lard, 36 percent of dried fruit, 29 percent of sardines, 52 percent of phosphate rock, 36 percent of sulfur, 38 percent of rosin, 14 percent of industrial machinery, 14 percent of automobiles, 22 percent of office appliances, 12 percent of radios, etc. Since the production of these products is often confined to particular States or localities, a shrinkage in exports would have a highly concentrated effect on particular localities.

The export market is particularly important now, because the United States greatly expanded its agricultural and industrial capacity during the war. The United States agricultural output in 1947 was one-third above the 1939 volume. When the world food shortage ends, the United States will be faced with agricultural surpluses, unless exports are maintained. Economic history shows that agricultural depressions precede and lead to industrial depressions. Prosperity of an industrial State, such as Rhode Island, is highly dependent upon the prosperity, not only of other industrial States that buy Rhode Island manufactures, but also upon the prosperity of agricultural areas that buy manufactures from all States.

Some people agree that exports are beneficial but are "doubting Thomases" about the benefits of imports. They want to export much but to import little. The plain fact is that we cannot export unless we import (except by continuing foreign loans indefinitely without repayment). The real issue is not whether we want to import, but whether we want to import in order to export—whether we want a large foreign trade of exports and imports, a small foreign trade, or no foreign trade. The inescapable truth is that the most prosperous countries are those with a large foreign trade. The poorest countries are those with a small foreign trade.

Imports are beneficial to the domestic economy, not only because they sustain exports, but also because they are directly useful in domestic production and consumption. A large part of our imports consists of products, such as coffee, tea, cocoa, bananas, spices, etc., which do not compete with domestic goods and which are essential for our standard of living. A second category of imports consists of primary materials, used in further manufacture in this country, of which the domestic supply is insufficient to meet domestic requirements. The Bureau of Mines reported to Congress, May 1947, that our known commercial reserves of 21 major minerals, including copper, lead, zinc, manganese, chrome, tungsten, mica, and petroleum, are less than sufficient to supply 35 years of domestic requirements at current consumption rates. Imports of such minerals are necessary (a) to conserve dwindling domestic reserves and (b) to supply domestic manufacturers with raw materials at costs that will enable them to compete against foreign manufactures in fabricated products.

A third category of imports, and by far the smaller part, consists of directly competitive products, such as high-priced textiles, glassware, etc. Lower tariffs on such imports would benefit consumers. On the other hand, a drastic reduction of tariff rates on such products would disrupt the domestic economy. It must be admitted, however, that high tariffs to eliminate foreign competition run counter to American ideas of increasing efficiency through the force of competition. In the long run, highly protected industries, when not stimulated by free competition, lag in technological developments. Protection spells stagnation. The American economy owes its vigor to competition.

American industrial efficiency is so great that even before the war our exports greatly exceeded imports. Hourly labor rates were lower abroad than in this country but the efficiency of our management, labor, and machinery is so great that the labor cost per unit of product, for practically all mass production goods, is actually lower here than abroad. Today, our exports are two and one-half times our imports. If exports are to continue at their present rate, imports must be increased.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

In view of the economic importance of our foreign trade, you may ask: What steps are we taking to safeguard our foreign trade? Do these measures coordinate our international economic objectives with our international political objectives?

The immediate step, of course, is the European recovery program, a short-term program to put Europe on its feet again. Its goal is full economic recovery in Europe. A prosperous Europe is necessary to maintain our foreign trade, because Europe is a keystone in the world economic arch. Europe is the principal market for our exports. Europe is also the principal export market for Latin American and Asiatic countries whose ability to buy our exports depends upon their sales to Europe. Our export trade cannot be maintained in the long run, unless Europe is prosperous.

A prosperous Europe is necessary, also, for international political stability. Economic distress in Europe breeds political turmoil, weakens the democratic peoples in western Europe who are friendly to the United States, and makes a fertile soil for Communist propaganda. The Soviet Union knows this full well. Not by accident or passing fancy did Mr. Zhdanov, secretary-general of the Russian Communist Party, declare that "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will make all efforts to see to it that the Marshall plan is not realized." A prosperous, stable, western Europe will contribute to world political stability and thus to our own national security. General Eisenhower's final report as Chief of Staff, February 1948, warned that if "our traditional friends in western Europe * * * become the pawns of totalitarianism, America's security would be in dire danger."

Wartime dislocation has made Europe unable to support itself. Western Europe is now importing more than six times as much from the United States as it sells to us. Its supply of dollar exchange is almost exhausted. Unless financial aid is given, Europe will be forced to cut drastically its imports from this and other countries. Western European food consumption is already one-third below the prewar level. Further cuts would constitute grave economic and political danger.

The European recovery program contemplates the expenditure by the United States of $17,000,000,000 in the next 4¼ years to make Europe self-sustaining again. Seventeen billion dollars represents 2 percent of our estimated national income in the next 4¼ years. This sum would enable western Europe to continue its imports from the United States and other Western Hemisphere countries at approximately the 1947 levels. The United States Senate has already approved the expenditure of $5,300,000,000 in the 16 western European countries and western Germany in the next 12 months (instead of the six and eight-tenths billion requested by the administration for the next 15 months). This proposal is now before the House of Representatives.

The European recovery program contemplates that the western European countries will take all possible measures of self-help. They obligate themselves to maximize their own production as quickly as possible, to standardize their equipment, to pool certain resources such as freight cars, to reduce their tariff barriers against each other, to explore the possibility of customs unions, etc. You have already seen evidence of such developments in the press within the last week, in the plan of the 16 ERP countries to set up a permanent commission for a European customs union and in the Brussels five-power mutual security pact.

The European recovery program is a costly program. Its alternative would be infinitely more costly.

THE GENEVA TRADE AGREEMENT

The principal long-run step to expand world trade is the Geneva Trade Agreement whereby 23 countries agreed to reduce their tariff rates and to bind tariff rates against increase on products that accounted for one-half of the total foreign trade of the world. The United States took the initiative in this effort—the most comprehensive attempt ever undertaken to reduce world trade barriers.

The reduction of artificial barriers to international trade will set the stage for an expansion of world trade that will improve economic conditions in all countries.

The Geneva Trade Agreement and the European recovery program complement each other. The European recovery program will put Europe on its feet again. The Geneva Trade Agreement will help Europe stay on its feet.

The United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Cuba put the Geneva Agreement provisionally into effect January 1, 1948. The other participating countries, namely, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, India, Pakistan, Burma, Southern Rhodesia, Ceylon, China, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Syria, Lebanon, Chile, and Brazil, are expected to put it into effect by midsummer of 1948. Of the Soviet satellite countries, only Czechoslovakia participated in the Geneva negotiations. The Soviet Union and the satellite countries, together with Czechoslovakia and Finland, account for about 8 percent of the world's total foreign trade (prewar basis).

Under the Geneva Agreement, the United States reduced its tariffs on $500,000,000 of our imports and other countries reduced their tariffs on $500,000,000 of our exports. That was a Yankee swap. During the seven long months of tariff negotiations at Geneva, from April 10 to October 30, 1947, one of the principal fears of other countries was that if they reduced their tariffs they would not be able to withstand the competitive power of American agriculture and industry. The Geneva countries reduced their tariffs not only to the United States but also to each other. The volume of trade covered by

their tariff reductions to each other was greater than the volume of trade covered by their tariff reductions to us. Hence, the Geneva Agreement will play a great influence in improving the trade of other countries with each other as well as their trade with us.

The United States negotiated the Geneva Trade Agreement under authority of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended to date. This act authorizes the President to reduce our tariffs, by not more than 50 percent of the rates existing on January 1, 1945, in return for equivalent concessions from other countries. Tariff reductions are made only after public hearings at which all interested parties are given opportunity to present information and views. Before making tariff reductions, the President must consult with the United States Tariff Commission and the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Labor, National Defense, and Treasury.

The Geneva trade agreement contains a so-called escape clause to guard against abnormal increases in imports of any particular commodity. The escape clause states that if, as a result of tariff concessions, imports enter "in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers" a country may withdraw the concession without obtaining the consent of the exporting country. However, if the concession is withdrawn, the other country is free to withdraw an equivalent concession.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires June 12, 1948, unless renewed—but the Geneva agreement, and other agreements negotiated under it, will continue in effect unless specifically terminated by the President.

The President recommended to Congress March 1, 1948, that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be renewed in its present form for another 3 years. He opposed crippling amendments that would preserve the form of reciprocity but would strangle its practical operation. The President stated that renewal of the act was necessary: (1) To enable the United States to negotiate tariff agreements with other countries that might want to join the Geneva agreement; (2) to enable the United States to negotiate revisions in the Geneva agreement when changing world economic conditions necessitate revision; and (3) to permit continued leadership of the United States in its program of expanding international trade in an "endeavor to build a prosperous and peaceful world."

The United States' economic leadership would be seriously jeopardized if other countries felt that we advocated economic cooperation for them but refused to follow it ourselves. Loss of economic leadership would affect adversely our political leadership. Political internationalism without economic internationalism is a house built upon sand.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE CHARTER

The United States is now participating with 57 other countries in the Habana Conference to formulate a charter containing a detailed set of rules that all participating countries would follow in their conduct of trade with each other. In international trade, as in domestic trade, we need to follow certain rules so that everyone knows what he can count on, so that business can be orderly. These rules will permit an orderly expansion of international trade. The rules cover such subjects as the reduction of trade barriers, nondiscriminatory practices in international trade, import quotas, export subsidies, customs formalities, measures to curb cartels, commodity agreements, the protection of foreign investments, etc. An International Trade Organization would be created that countries would join to carry out these agreed-upon rules.

The Habana Conference began its work November 21 and will adjourn shortly with a draft charter to be made public very soon. This charter will be submitted to Congress to decide whether or not the United States should join the proposed International Trade Organization.

CONCLUSION

The European recovery program, the Geneva trade agreement, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and the Habana charter—these are the principal economic instruments in our "endeavor to build a prosperous and peaceful world."

We believe that an expansion in international trade, economic recovery in Europe, economic prosperity in many countries make for political stability and peace.

As guidance in this endeavor to build a prosperous and peaceful world, I would like to quote the words of two great Americans, one a Republican who devoted most of his life to business, the other a Democrat who spent most of his long life in public affairs. Both were intimately familiar with the pattern of current world problems. Both approached the problem from the point of view of their own respective backgrounds. Both spoke from the richness of their varied experiences.

Wendell Willkie, believing in one world, concluded:

"Economic freedom is as important as political freedom. * * * There will be no peace, there will be no economic stability, unless we find the method by which we can begin to break down the unnecessary trade barriers hampering the flow of goods. Even our present standard of living in America cannot be maintained unless the exchange of goods flows more fully over the whole world. It is also inescapably true that to raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man everywhere in the world."

Cordell Hull, in his recent Memoirs, tells us:

"I, of course, never claimed that trade agreements would be an absolute panacea against war. * * * If, as I urged in my speeches during the First World War, something like the Trade Agreements Act could have been passed, instead of the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922, and other nations had seen fit to follow suit at once, the story might have been different. * * * Two major wars within a generation should have convinced all Americans that we are an important part of the world, that conflict abroad cannot but affect us, and that our welfare, peace, and security are tied in those of other nations. We have responsibility for leadership and cooperation which we cannot avoid."

A Further Proposed Drain Upon Our Treasury Under ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald April 22, 1948:

WHY SO HASTY, MR. HOFFMAN?

MORE BILLIONS FOR THE ERP?

Paul G. Hoffman was appointed Marshall Plan (ERP) Administrator only a few days ago, with general approval; but already he has murmured in a preliminary schedule of expenditures that even the five and three-tenths billions authorized for the ERP's first year "may prove insufficient to accomplish the degree of recovery we seek" in western Europe.

That is not the kind of talk which was expected from the man who, before he got this job, said repeatedly that the ERP must operate on businesslike lines, and that the Administrator's first concern must be to see that this drain on our resources did not become so great as to bankrupt the United States.

Congress was extremely generous (idiotically so, according to some) in authorizing the five and three-tenths billions. This hint by the ERP chief that he may be coming around for more before long will hardly make a hit with either Congress or the taxpayers.

A suggestion seems in order that Mr. Hoffman edit his public statements more carefully, not to mention cutting the ERP's garments to fit the huge swatch of cloth which Congress has given him.

The Techniques of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Bertrand de Jouvenel which appeared in Human Events for March 31, 1948, as follows:

THE TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNISM

(By Bertrand de Jouvenel)

The technique of seizing countries and subjecting their people has made enormous strides in 10 years. As an artist in the destruction of nations, Stalin is way ahead of Hitler.

A complaint was lodged at UN against the operation in Prague. But what is there to complain about? Our French Communist press made it quite clear that nothing has happened beyond a mere internal crisis, happily solved in a democratic manner. Where indeed is the upheaval?

Before the crisis, the Communist Prime Minister Gottwald presided over an all-party cabinet. After the crisis, Gottwald again presides over a cabinet where again all parties are represented. Why worry about the detail that three at least of these parties are represented by Communist agents who seized the party and newspaper offices by force, with the help of the Communist police. These slight shadows hardly mar the general picture of a regular democratic government formed according to normal constitutional procedure.

Undoubtedly it amuses the Communists to mock western creeds by using their trappings for a travesty. But we are not duped, and if we had been, Jan Masaryk's sacrifice would have disabused us.

Of course, the democratic disguise after the event is only assumed for a purpose of mockery. By contrast, it is used very competently indeed to achieve power. The procedure deserves attention.

II

Recalling Hitler's conquest of Czechoslovakia or his earlier conquest of Austria, one remembers the tramping troops, the churning tanks, and the big parades which underlined the achievement. Hitler relied on visible military means.

That was necessary in the case of Czechoslovakia because Hitler had no fifth column

there. It is a legend, nourished by the Communists, that Hitler possessed fifth columns in every country. In fact Hitlerism was primarily pan-Germanism and appealed only to German nationalism. Stalinism, on the other hand, is primarily a world enterprise. Soviet imperialism is unlimited in the range of countries it can subvert. Nazi imperialism had only a very limited range of countries where it could find substantial internal support.

Austria was the foremost of these Germanic countries. There nazism found almost the same measure of internal support that sovietism found in Czechoslovakia. With the strong Austrian Nazi Party, it should have been possible for Hitler to take over without the visible intervention of German military force. Nevertheless, the Austrian Nazis accomplished nothing, discredited themselves by their bungling, bloody attempt of July 25, 1934; and though they were very strong in 1938, they did not prepare the way—as did the Czech Communists—for the conquest of their country.

It was the threat of German force, first covert and then open, which brought Prime Minister Schussnigg to Berchtesgaden, which led him to take the Nazi Seiss-Inquart into his cabinet, which closed the Premier's mouth after he had promised to appeal to the people. And even with the Nazis in the cabinet, Hitler could not trust them to achieve political conquest by outwardly peaceful means. The Fuehrer had to march in with his army.

There should be more emphasis on the fact that there has been no sign of the Russian Army in the second conquest of Czechoslovakia. The whole job has been accomplished from the inside. There is nothing to show any intervention except Zorine's arrival from Moscow in mid-February, an easily overlooked crudity which can surely be avoided in the next operation. On the whole, therefore, the Stalin technique has been as smooth as that of Hitler was clumsy. A wit defines the Kremlin slogan: "The subjection of the people must be the work of the people themselves."

III

How is it done? Every school of strategy has its favorite maneuver, used in every instance with the slight variations demanded by circumstances. Let us analyze the Communist strategy for the seizure of individual nations. It has several subtle operations.

The first of these may be termed Operation National Anthem. It consists in identifying the Communist Party with patriotism, not, as formerly, with internationalism and antimilitarism. All the national idols which were formerly an object of mockery are now ostentatiously revered. In the United States, Jefferson and Lincoln are now patronized by the Communists. In France, the Joan of Arc anniversary used to be an occasion for Catholic celebrations. Now the Communists demand to be the first in honoring this admirable daughter of the people. The party is bringing out a series of popular booklets, celebrating the great Frenchmen. Our kings are not forgotten in this series.

Operation National Anthem makes possible Operation Unanimity, which we in France call Operation Lamourette from the name of a famous kiss exchanged by political enemies. Operation Unanimity leads to the formation of a "popular front" against "reaction," realized in France after the liberation but happily dissolved by M. Ramadier. In Czechoslovakia the "popular front" paved the way for the February putsch.

Operation National Anthem and Operation Unanimity are immensely profitable to the Communists. First, the appeal to the masses is enormously enhanced. A discovery the Marxists made rather late in the day is that the common man is a patriot, very sensitive to national glory. For years the progress of communism was blocked merely by its open contempt for national feeling. It was most important to wash off this blot and very useful to have General de Gaulle, or a writer like Francois Mauriac, testify that no better patriots could be found than the Communists. Operation Unanimity further gives a tone of respectability to Communists. Another discovery for Marxists is that the common man likes respectability.

In addition, Operation Unanimity places Communists—while still a minority—in control of governmental machinery. The use to which Nosek put his possession of the Ministry of the Interior appeared plainly during the crisis at Prague. He made the police a party weapon.

For the conquest of key positions, however, another operation is essential. This, in our crude French manner, we call Operation Cuckold. It is directed against the Social Democrats, or those whom, in America, you strangely call liberals.

In all European countries the Social Democrats have built up any number of powerful workers' organizations, unions, youth movements, women's movements, and so forth. Now, in a movement of brotherly love, the Communists propose to share their all with the Socialists. In fact they leave the chairmanships to the Socialists and take the less impressive secretarial jobs. Stalin has shown what can be done from a secretary's office. The work of organization centers there, and within a little time the unions are colonized by Communists.

Thus it was with the French CGT. Thus it was with the Czech labor federation. Like Frachon in Paris, Zapotocky in Prague was a party-liner. And a conference of 8,000 union delegates was scheduled in Prague for Sunday, February 22. These hand-picked men were on the spot at the decisive hour.

IV

I have left for the last an operation which is of capital importance in the whole procedure of conquest. It is Operation Smear, which we call Operation Basile, from the famous praise of calumny which all operagoers know. Operation Smear is designed to cripple resistance to the Communist seizure of power, and to do this well in advance.

During the period of Operation Unanimity, the Communists show a most generous disposition to get on well with all and sundry. But gradually it begins to be noised about that so-and-so is a Fascist sympathizer, or anti-Semitic, or pro-German, or Isolationist—or something. The rumor never openly originates with the Communists, but their accomplices, carefully dispersed in shadow newspapers and shadow societies, take it up. And, in the absence of any serious restraint upon libel, the smear proceeds gaily on its way. It is aimed at anyone who, while he may not even be an enemy of the Communists, is regarded by them as a possible element of strong resistance. So he must be purged, not by the Communists but by his own friends and associates, who may be themselves a little susceptible to this refinement of blackmail.

The whole point of Operation Smear is that if you can taint a few courageous people, then the taint can be easily extended to their less courageous friends, and to the friends of their friends. Thus Operation Smear eats up the bones of the resistance to communism.

Then the time comes for Operation Reichstag, thus termed in honor of Goering. Operation Reichstag consists in the discovery of a plot. But it must be a really bad plot, with capitalists and financiers and foreign powers involved. If the Nazis can be dragged in even at this late date, let us not despise their horror value. The accusations brought in Prague add up to a most fantastic story. But then the Communists are endowed with a surrealist sense of humor. The more unlikely the conspiracy, the more people are shown doing things out of character, the more they like it. It illustrates the character of the bourgeois society which, as students of Marx know, is a mystification. So if the priest can be depicted as hiding dollars in the sacred vessels, the old-fashioned radical serving as agent for the Nazis, all the better.

Such are, in brief, the methods by which communism seizes power. I have described the technique in France. But it is similar everywhere.

Air Supremacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morning Call, Paterson, N. J., for April 15, 1948:

CALL'S AIR SUPREMACY PLEA HEEDED

Quick on the heels of Air Secretary Symington's belated disclosure that Communist Russia is now building 12 times as many planes as we are, the House Appropriations Committee voted a two and one-third billions emergency fund appropriation to recreate our once dominant but already skeletonized air power. This congressional action on Tuesday followed the Call's plea to Congress last year and several weeks ago to regain supremacy of the air, in time to turn back any aggressor nation before it can get rolling on the road of conquest.

We contended that in modern mechanized warfare of mass-slaughtering bombs and guided missiles, air supremacy was far more urgent and vital to our national security than a mass youth program of compulsory universal military training. The announcement of Defense Secretary Forrestal on Monday that Russia has the secret of the atomic bomb (and no wonder in the light of the woeful negligence of the administration in guarding it) confirms that contention; for having the secret, the Communists behind their iron curtain will lose no time to make use of it and build their own atomic weapons with which to further intimidate and subjugate Europe, Asia, and then the world. That is, if a wingless America continues the Truman administration folly of scrapping our own air power and sending the precious scrap to Russia to build her own, as it has been doing right up to date.

Wings over America means security over America now as never before. Without those wings we would find ourselves helpless to drive back the Russian air armadas now in the making and designed for the atomic bomb attacks with which they visualize the realization of a demented dream to extend Communist tyranny around the world. A fleet of several thousand Soviet airplanes equipped with atomic weapons, such as Russia now clearly has in mind, could wipe out the finest army of 10,000,000 foot soldiers overnight and all their equipment to boot, except for one thing: an equally potent air force to hold the enemy at bay.

The Communists are not so wasteful with their limited metal resources as to make something they do not intend to use. Therefore the fact that they are at this moment engaged in fashioning a mighty air force just as clearly indicates they intend to use it for their aggressor designs, unless an American eagle of equal power rises to halt them.

Wide Support of Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Program—Failure To Renew Reciprocal Trade Program Would Be a Backward Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of March 3, 1948:

THE RECIPROCITY PROGRAM

President Truman's request for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will get the same hard sledding in Congress his other proposals have received. This is the first time a Republican-controlled Congress has been asked by the President to continue a step taken in the direction of lower tariffs. Last year the President turned Congress aside from an attack on the program by making concessions which appeased its opponents.

The heart of the Trade Agreement Act is the right given the President to make limited tariff cuts without the necessity of getting congressional approval. It is largely because of this provision that Secretary Hull and his successors were able to accomplish a considerable reduction in our tariff barriers.

If the Republican Congress now changes this to make every agreement subject to congressional or even Senate approval the chance for future tariff reduction is slim.

The United States has taken the lead in the postwar period in trying to get world agreement on lowering tariff barriers. If we now take a backward step ourselves the rest of the nations will have little confidence in our leadership or sincerity. The President deserves bipartisan support in this phase of our foreign policy.

Is America Immune to the Communist Plague?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT NODAR, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Frederic Nelson, from the Saturday Evening Post:

IS AMERICA IMMUNE TO THE COMMUNIST PLAGUE?

(By Frederic Nelson)

As more lights go out in Europe, it is time Americans began asking themselves how much this country has been softened up for a future Communist coup. We are often told that communism will have no appeal in a country in which the people's rights are respected and whose economy produces what people need. The experience of Czechoslovakia hardly supports that comfortable view. There is no evidence that the Czechs wanted communism or were particularly dissatisfied with the regime they had. On the contrary, trade was beginning to revive, unemployment was negligible, and enthusiasm for individual enterprise and democracy was strong. Yet Czechoslovakia is now going through her second subjugation in a decade. Could anything like that happen here?

At the moment, no Red Army is encamped along our borders. No daily radio barrage informs our leaders that they are on a purge list of the MVD and that, when the progressive forces have won the battle, heads will roll. We have distance and a strong economy and the atom bomb on our side. Are there any items to support the possibility of eventual Communist success in the United States of America? Perhaps that is putting it too strong, but there are soft spots.

The most serious inroads upon the democratic free-enterprise system are of a negative nature and have not been made by Communists at all. For example, our income tax as applied in recent years has weakened the investing class, thereby making it more and more difficult for private industry to improve and enlarge its plant facilities. The logical end is Government financing of industry, which would inevitably bring Government control. Thousands of people on both sides of the argument already regard this as inevitable.

For much the same reason, our endowed colleges and universities are in trouble. The yield from their investments has declined, and new donors are not to be found. Result: New prestige for Federal aid to education and, of course, eventually, Federal control of education. Communists have had no part in these developments, but they profit from the resulting drive toward centralization.

Another asset for the Communists is their ability to dominate certain labor unions in key industries. Since passage of the Taft-Hartley law, the majority in many unions has shaken itself awake and is trying to chase out the Communists. It is a tough battle, particularly as some Communist-dominated unions are stupidly petted by some industries as a foil to rival unions. That the Government has stood aside all these years and permitted control of unions to pass into the hands of men who only await the orders of Stalin to tie American ships to the docks, to snuff out American electric power or to stop the flow of strategic metals to our industries is an incredible monument to our age of fatuity. Current bungling efforts to make up for the past by witch hunts usually conducted by people who know little of Communist aims and methods could be equally disastrous.

Another point against the survival of our democratic system is the state of mind of an important section of America's intelligentsia. The 15-year New Deal propaganda campaign against success by individuals is still carried on in too many college classrooms. Young people are taught that the achievements of successful men are due solely to "social conditions"; that there is no "law of supply and demand," only the greed of rapacious businessmen; and that the function of taxation is not to raise money for public purposes, but to hamper the successful for the delight of the unsuccessful. College textbooks which reflect this defeatism were not writtten by Communists, but by depression-bred New Dealers. Nevertheless, their effect in weakening the influence of a capitalist economy has been tremendous.

The fact that Henry Wallace can gain the support of any adult American with an IQ higher than minus six is another cause for anxiety—at any rate, for long-pull anxiety. The Wallace movement indicates a moral slump as well as an intellectual one. As R. H. Markham wrote of Europe's Socialists in the Socialist New Leader recently: "Humanity is faced with the elemental issue: whether Communist tyranny shall submerge the earth or men shall win the desperate fight to remain free. Yet many Socialists have insolently and militantly taken the side of world tyranny." This is unfair to the Socialists, who have fought communism in most countries, but it is true of Henry Wallace's progressive forces. They have permitted resentment over the imperfections of our society to blind them to the iniquities of tyranny. How have they been persuaded to embrace this betrayal of the common man?

Whatever the reason, the Wallace movement provides a culture medium in which Communist propaganda germs spread and multiply. The eager liberal, with his mind fixed on racial equality, cheap housing, an end to lynching, or some other indisputably desirable goal, finds that the group which talks about these things faster and louder than anybody else is made up of Communists and their dupes. Playing upon his grievances, the fellow travelers neglect to explain that no totalitarian regime has corrected these defects. But the liberal feels misused and is not too critical of others who feel the same way. Herein lies the opportunity for what the Daily Worker calls a wider dissemination of Communist ideology and a growth of party organization. As communism spreads farther and farther westward in Europe, the prestige of American communism in left and middle groups will increase. The limit to this growth depends considerably on us.

There is no reason to fear an immediate Red coup in this country. On the other hand, America will not prove permanently immune to the dangers which assail other countries. A continuation of loss of faith in our own principles, unchallenged acceptance of the lying claims of other economic systems, infiltration of Communists and their stooges into key posts in the American system may well lead up to some morning when we shall find ourselves taking orders from mysterious and determined men of whose existence we had scarcely been aware.

This isn't a call to the boats, but a reminder that danger strikes the sooner when it is despised.

Protect the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, 2,000,000 dairy farmers of the Middle West are greatly concerned over the issue presented by measures to repeal the taxes on oleomargarine. In particular they resent the proposed repeal of yellow-colored oleomargarine taxes. That tax was imposed by the Federal Government to protect and encourage a slowly developing industry in the manufacture of dairy products in the middle west in 1886. The protection had become necessary because of the sale of oleomargarine as butter, whose coloring it was made to imitate. Then as now the oleomargarines were imitation products. They were made to sell, not on their own merits, but on the merits of creamery butter. From that time on, the makers of synthetic products have made constant endeavors to obtain the repeal of the law, and at the same time they have endeavored to perfect their own brand to more nearly resemble butter. Even in that ancient time the claims were made that oleomargarine was the equivalent of butter.

The development of the butter industry has been one of the most important to the Midwest States. It has led to the broadening of dairy production and the building of a billion-dollar industry. Thousands of creameries, many of them cooperatively owned by farmers, have been built to improve the quality of butter and improve the marketing facilities. That dairy industry forms the basis of a great industry whose sales approximate $3,000,000,000 annually. Those products have a food value all their own which is universally recognized.

Much is alleged in oleomargarine advertising, and also by the proponents of these measures, as to economy in the household by the use of oleomargarine instead of butter. The tax on uncolored oleomargarine is only one-fourth cent per pound, which is undoubtedly assumed by the manufacturers without appearing in the sales prices. The saving to the American housewife by the elimination of that small tax would be immeasurably small. In fact, the taxes paid on all oleomargarines cut a small figure in the cost of living.

Were the advocates of the reduction of the taxes to turn their attention to other taxes they might advocate much greater savings so far as the cost of living is concerned.

The big issue before the committee and before Congress is whether the great dairy industry shall be sacrificed to the profit of aggressive greed. About 600,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine were sold in this country last year. It is alleged that over 40 percent of the product was made by industries owned and controlled by one European cartel. The measures proposed to repeal the taxes represent the march of monopoly against the free enterprise of 10,000,000 dairy farm people. Some of those cartels engaged in the vegetable oil trade control supplies of such oils of the entire world. At present domestic oils may be used largely in the manufacture of oleomargarine, but it is only a matter of a little time when coconut oil, babassu oil, palm oil, and others will come flowing in to compete with the cottonseed oil and the soybean oil raised in the Middle West.

If butter can be driven from the markets of our country by the highly financed competition of monopolies, other dairy products soon will follow. If synthetic butter replaces the real article, we must expect the expansion of the sales of filled milk from which butterfat has been removed and vegetable oils substituted for it. Even now, cheese concoctions with much less percentage of butterfat content than real cheese are crowding into the cheese markets which have been so prolific in the production of that healthful food. Imitation ice cream will follow as a matter of course, with vegetable oils taking the place of cream and whole milk.

There are 23 States which have legislation taxing oleomargarine. Such laws have been introduced for the protection of the dairy industry, and bring relatively small returns so far as revenues are concerned. In some States the taxes are levied on oleomargarine containing foreign oils. In others, the flat tax is levied like that of Wisconsin.

The dairy people have no objection to the sale of oleomargarine as oleomargarine, but they have had practical experience in competing with oleomargarine sold as butter. The Federal Department of Justice has prosecuted numerous cases in which large amounts of oleomargarine were sold as butter. The removal of the tax and the general yellow coloring of oleomargarine by the manufacturers would lead to further abuses of the kind. There is no law which would prevent manufacturers coloring their oleomargarine lavender, purple, black, or any other color except that particular yellow color which is distinctive of butter as the public has come to know it.

The enactment of the measures before the committee to repeal or reduce the tax on colored oleomargarine will not affect enactments in the States placing revenue taxes on oleomargarine products. Those taxes will remain subject to the will of the people of the respective States which have enacted the laws.

During the World War the dairy people of the Middle West, as well as in all other sections of the country, responded to every call of the people of our country, as well as their Government, for increased production. They fulfilled every obligation placed upon them. Now that the war is over we find this fresh attack upon those same farmers who accomplished such wonders while their sons were in the fox holes of the war lines. Already the number of dairy cattle is declining. The present high price of butter affords the opposing interests an opportunity to press for repeal of oleomargarine taxes on account of household economy. It must not be expected, however, that these attacks will cease upon the passage of any bill before Congress taking the tax off colored oleomargarine. The decline in the dairy cattle population will be accentuated, and in only a matter of a little time the producers of whole milk will be called upon to meet a similar attack. Evaporated milk, condensed milk, cheddar cheese, and other forms of cheese, and the entire dairy production, will be made the targets of similar attacks from those who find a profit in their bombastic utterances regarding the merits of their products.

I append hereto an excellent article by Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, on Margarine and the Consumer. Mr. Swanton is a practical farmer, and is well acquainted with the dairy industry of Wisconsin:

MARGARINE AND THE CONSUMER

(By Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative)

The oleomargarine issue, as well as the product itself, has evolved through many stages during more than one-half a century of time. In this process of change has come change in consumer interest. With this have come conflicting viewpoints. Ethical, agricultural, and nutritional problems are at stake.

The issue today is largely whether two fats of vastly different origin and of somewhat different dietary standards are competing fairly or unfairly for consumer demand. Consumers and producers both have deep interest in the oleomargarine question.

Are producers of dairy products justified in their position that oleomargarine made and sold in the imitation of butter amounts to a trick on consumers and constitutes an unfair trade practice against dairymen? Are manufacturers and distributers of oleomargarine justified in trying to convince consumers that excise taxes on their products constitute the unfair trade barrier? Does the controversy involve misunderstanding between branches of agriculture and clash between sections of the country?

FARMER NETS LITTLE FROM SALE OF VEGETABLE OILS

To repeal or reduce excise taxes and licenses, to liberalize or tighten the extent to which oleomargarine may imitate butter—these questions do not involve conflict between branches of American agriculture. It is not an issue between cotton and soybean farmers on one side and dairy farmers, on the other. According to prewar figures, about one-half of 1 percent of the cotton growers' income was derived from the sale of oil used in oleomargarine. The use of soybean oil in oleomargarine accounted for only 5.3 percent of the grain-soybean growers' income in 1940.

It is not a conflict between the North and the South. Oleomargarine is made largely in the North. Domestic fats and oils used in oleomargarine come as much from the North as from the South. The oil industry is growing in the North. The dairy industry is growing in the South.

If there is a clash of financial interest it is between the millions of dairy farmers who derive two-thirds or more of their income from the production of butterfat marketed in butter, and the handful of corporations and individuals who process vegetable oils into oleomargarine made in the imitation of butter. In the sale of butter the dairyman gets about 62.8 of the consumer's dollar. In the three principal butter-producing States: Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, where 41 percent of the Nation's butter originates, 80 percent of the butter is made in cooperative creameries controlled entirely by dairy farmers living on and working family-sized farms. On the other hand, a few corporations control the bulk of oleomargarine made in America.

FARMER GETS MAJOR SHARE OF BUTTER INCOME

I think it is well for consumers to know something about comparable margins in the manufacturing of these two products. The price paid to the farmer for butterfat invariably exceeds the price per pound at which the butter is sold. As consumers you have the right to ask how this is possible.

The cost of manufacturing and distributing butter is taken out of "overrun." What is "overrun"? Butter contains about 82 percent fat, about 15 percent water, 2 percent salt, and 1 percent curd. This 18 percent of a pound of a pound of butter made up of water, salt, and curd is known as "overrun." It costs very little, while butterfat is the critical and difficult ingredient to produce. Because of the "overrun" which pays the cost of manufacturing and distributing butter is generally sold for less than the price paid the dairy farmer for the butterfat.

On the contrary in the oleomargarine industry the farmer receives far less for the oil than the consumer pays for the finished product. Yet "overrun" is also an important factor in the making of oleomargarine. Oleomargarine is about 83 percent vegetable fat, 14 percent water, 3 percent salt and curd, and a preservative. Apparently this 17 percent "overrun" is absorbed in oleomargarine manufacturing profits.

VEGETABLE OILS IN OLEO VARY WITH AVAILABILITY

Vegetable oils, much cheaper in cost than butterfat, constitute the body of oleomargarine. The oleomargarine industry has great flexibility in that it can quickly change

its source of fat supply, using whatever form of oil may be cheapest or most readily available. Oleomargarine uses cheap mechanical oil extraction processes. The butter industry depends upon the living biological processes of the cow that convert grains and grasses into milk proteins and butterfat.

Yet, in spite of these cost advantages, the price of oleomargarine fluctuates in relationship to the price of butter instead of being governed entirely by its own cost of production. In view of this oleomargarine price structure, have consumers any assurance that the oleomargarine interests will reduce consumer price to the extent that Federal or State excise taxes might be eliminated or reduced?

Consumers ask a question, "Why a tax on oleomargarine?" Obviously, the Federal tax of one-half cent per pound on uncolored oleomargarine is not a burden, nor does it restrict the use of this product. The 10-cent-per-pound Federal tax is applicable only when oleomargarine is colored butter-yellow. From the standpoint of food availability and digestibility, oleomargarine, not colored in imitation of butter, is just as nutritious and just as digestible as it is when colored butter-yellow. Hence, Federal taxes do not necessarily curtail the manufacture and distribution of oleomargarine.

DAIRYMEN RESENT ATTEMPTS TO IMITATE BUTTER

I think consumers should understand why dairymen feel that it is an unfair infringement for oleomargarine to be made in imitation of yellow butter. The farmer feels that butter has come down through the ages a basic food in the diet of civilized man. For thousands of years the natural yellow color of butter and its typical flavor have been universally recognized and accepted among all Caucasian people.

The producer and the consumer know that butter is both a food and a flavor. To them color and flavor are the evidence of its identity. They believe that the consumer is entitled to buy either oleomargarine or butter with the feeling of assurance that there will be no confusion, no uncertainty, no parading in false colors.

LABELING PACKAGE DOES NOT IDENTIFY OLEO ON THE TABLE

Labeling the package is not the answer. Oleomargarine colored butter-yellow loses its identity when taken from the labeled package to be served on the table, in the hotel, in the restaurant, or dining car. It is for this reason that many States, including Wisconsin, prohibit the sale of oleomargarine colored butter-yellow.

There have long been recognized ethical standards restricting imitations. For example Brookshire cheese is too close to Swift & Co.'s Brookfield trade-mark to be permitted. Will Rogers found out that "Illiterary Digest" was too similar to "Literary Digest." An automobile manufacturer was prevented from using a certain shape of radiator because it too closely resembled the Packard radiator design.

Why of all the colors in the spectrum do the oleomargarine people select the yellow color of butter? Why have the manufacturers of oleomargarine made every effort to duplicate the body and texture and melting point of butter? They have added 9,000 units of vitamin A per pound in an effort to approximate the vitamin A content of butter. The flavor of butter may also be added legally to oleomargarine so as to make identification almost impossible. A noteworthy deviation in legalizing these standards of imitation is the fact that the use of a preservative is permitted in oleomargarine but not in butter.

WHY NOT USE ANOTHER COLOR FOR OLEO?

With all this imitation permitted, there remains the feeling that consumers should be protected by a color identification so it would not be necessary to call on technical laboratory tests to determine whether it is butter or oleomargarine. If the product will sell in its own image, identified separately for what it is, there will be no basis for controversy. The dairy industry will guarantee never to imitate the color or characteristics of oleomargarine. Dairymen feel that asking the oleomargarine industry not to imitate the color of butter is only fair.

Peanut butter sells under its own characteristic brown color and its own typical flavor. Even though peanut butter uses the term "butter" still there is no controversy because there is no consumer deception.

And the question is asked: "Should it make any difference to the consumer which fat he is getting if in taste or color he can't detect the difference anyway?" Yes; for the same reason that consumers have a right to know whether or not the meat they are eating comes from a horse or a cow. Regardless of the fact that horse meat and beef are both nutritious and digestible, and when smothered with seasoning may taste the same, the consumer has a moral and legal right to know the difference.

IMITATION AND DECEPTION SHOULD BE PREVENTED

Most consumers will agree that deception is a factor to be discouraged in the world of food. Even if there existed nutritive equivalency, the element of imitation and deception should be discouraged and prevented. We are in for trouble if the time comes when we accept the principle that approximate nutritive equivalency of an imitation food shall be the criterion of legitimacy.

For example, there is the possibility of opening the door for filled milk which means the substitution of vegetable oils for butterfat mixed with condensed skim milk. This product is a positive threat to the health and life of babies raised on a formula, because, unlike butterfat, vegetable oil lacks the growth factor. There is also the threat of filled cheese and filled ice cream.

In this connection let me point out that in Germany, according to an article by Mr. A. Imhausen, published in Kolloid Zeitschrift in May 1943, a method had been developed for the manufacture of fatty acids and edible fats from petroleum products using a by-product of synthetic gasoline plants. As early as 1937 the production of "synthetic butter" was reported. Later than this, experiments in the production of synthetic fatty acids from coal were reported.

If we legalize consumer deception between butterfat and mechanically processed vegetable oils, then the next move may be the substitution of vegetable oils by synthetic fats made from coal and petroleum. In this connection here is what Mr. Imhausen of Germany says of these synthetic fats:

"The Public Health Bureau of the Reich has, by thousands of experiments under the leadership of Dr. Flossner, demonstrated the high value of synthetic fats and has released it as the first synthetic food material of the world for human nourishment." [Translation.]

IS THERE MUCH NUTRITIVE EQUIVALENCY?

Consumers should know that as between oleomargarine and butter, there is a question of nutritive equivalency. I quote from the American Medical Association Journal:

"Since the nutritional factors have not all been identified, and since butter contains numerous additional fatty acids of unknown nutritional value, the consuming public has a right to demand that the practice of identifying oleomargarine and butter, so that anyone can differentiate between them, should be continued."

The use of a preservative in oleomargarine which is not used in butter should be remembered when considering nutritional equivalency.

BUTTERFAT MAKES BUTTER QUALITIES UNIVERSALLY DEPENDABLE

Butterfat is more consistent in origin than the imitation product. This adds to the question of nutritional equivalency. Butter is created in the living mammary glands of the cow from grains and grasses she has consumed. However, in a short span of years the fat sources of oleomargarine have shifted many times. In 1925 oleomargarine made in this country consisted of:

	Percent
1. Animal fats	40.2
2. American vegetable oils (principally cottonseed oil)	14.4
3. Imported vegetable fats (principally coconut oil)	45.4

By 1933, the use of animal fats and American vegetable fats declined, while the use of imported vegetable fats had increased as follows:

	Percent
1. Animal fats	14.0
2. American vegetable fats	10.5
3. Imported vegetable fats (almost exclusively coconut oil)	75.5

In 1940, the percentages were as follows:

	Percent
1. Animal fats	9.4
2. American vegetable fats	79.7
3. Imported vegetable fats	10.9

Butterfat alone as compared with oleomargarine has superior dietary qualities. Consumer protection when oleomargarine is used lies in the hope that an adequate general mixed diet will be guaranteed and in the hope that oleomargarine will be adequately fortified with vitamin A.

BUTTER CONTAINS VERY ESSENTIAL VITAMIN E

The high nutritional value of butter is shown by recent experiment. Butterfat is found to be a very reliable source of vitamin E. Clinical reports now indicate that vitamin E is important in human reproduction. Also the most recent research work suggests interrelation of vitamin E and inositol in the prevention of muscular dystrophy in human beings. And a high degree of success has been reported for clinical use of vitamin E in the treatment of lumbago. According to the National Dairy Council, results of recent experimentation indicate that this interrelationship plays a possible role in the prevention of certain kidney ailments and heart disorders.

According to Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin department of biochemistry:

"The fat of milk is of most complex composition." He points to a difference in the chemical constitution of butterfat and vegetable oils. Dr. Hart further states:

"It is probably the difference in the constitution of the fatty acids of the saponifiable fraction, although it may be due to some unrecognized essential nutrient carried by butterfat but not carried by the vegetable oils. The mammary gland has synthesized something special for which there is at present no known substitute."

Since nutritional equivalency between oleomargarine and butter is not an established fact, it is vital that each product be readily and clearly identified for the consumer. Therefore, maintaining characteristic color difference is sound policy.

EXCISE TAXES PREVENT FRAUD AND DECEPTION

An important reason for Federal and State excise taxes is to police against fraud and deception. Racketeers have pawned butter-yellow oleomargarine onto the public as being butter. Reputable manufacturers are not doing this. It is to their interest as well as to the interest of consumers to suppress fraud in the sale of oleomargarine.

For example in 1931 a man with much sales ability got in with a reputable oleomargarine manufacturer as a New York-New

England distributor. His objective was to pawn a cheaper product onto the 20,000,000 people living in the eastern metropolitan area. He picked the responsible sounding name of Haddad Trading Company. He lined up two Boston citizens, Vincent Bruzzese, who was an operator of a small cheese plant, and a trucker by the name of DeMauro, whose name was well known in Boston police files. Haddad would provide the oleomargarine. These men would color and sell it as butter. Margins were wide and profits were great. Haddad would report sales at 20 or more Boston bakeries. Instead the product would go to Bruzzese and DeMauro. As the illicit profits accumulated he would pay the Illinois manufacturer and credit the "accounts" of the bakers who were not getting a pound of the product. He had some legitimate customers, but it was the fraudulent product that paid off. He did fool the manufacturer and the consumer for a while, but he was soon tripped up by the Internal Revenue people. This is but one of many similar cases prosecuted during the past 45 years out of funds provided by the Federal 10-cent tax on yellow oleomargamine.

VEGETABLE OIL NOT ALWAYS AVAILABLE IN QUANTITIES

Many consumers feel that inability to get oleomargarine in recent years is entirely the result of Federal and State taxes. This is not true. The chief reason is found in the short supply of vegetable fats and oils. When butter is available, consumer preference causes it to move in advance of oleomargarine unless the price margin between butter and oleomargarine becomes exceedingly wide and unless consumer purchasing power is extremely low.

Let us look at Wisconsin, one of two States with the highest oleomargarine tax in the Nation. In 1940, 1941, 1942, when butter supplies were ample and consumer income was good, butter was used. The 15-cents-a-pound oleomargarine tax yielded only $5 one year, $16 the next, and $7.70 the third. In 1943 the supply of butter was restricted but vegetable fats and oils for oleomargarine were still available. Then the tax yielded $7,541.43. In 1944 with butter still less available and with supplies of oleomargarine fairly ample, enough oleomargarine was sold in Wisconsin to yield a revenue of $159,249. In 1945 this revenue leaped up to $268,190. In 1946 it yielded $70,577. From January 7 to August 15, 1947, because vegetable oils were scarce, revenues declined to $27,651.

This shows that Wisconsin's 15-cents-a-pound tax did not prevent the use of oleomargarine. It shows that a shortage of vegetable fats and oils did curtail the use of oleomargarine. How high the State tax should be is a debatable question, but it should not be prohibitive.

WOULD DAMAGE SOIL

Complete loss of identity between oleomargarine and butter would tend to reduce the demand for and the production of butter. Normally in the United States 45 percent to 59 percent of our milk which is processed is made into butter. If butter production is drastically reduced, it would mean a decrease in total milk production. This would mean a decrease in the production of milk solids as well as milk fats. The over-all loss to general health would outrank the alleged benefits claimed by the handful of oleomargarine manufacturers.

Any discouragement to the dairy industry would tend to cause a shift from a livestock to a field-crop type of agriculture. With this shift will come loss in soil fertility, more soil mining and more soil erosion. All of this is of vital concern to consumers as well as to producers.

Hence it is seen that the oleomargarine question involves not only ethics in business—not only the question of trade barriers or unfair trade practices—but also it involves food policies basic to consumer health and welfare and changes fundamental to the permanency of American agriculture.

ITO Charter Maps New Path for World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of the Congress has already voted to adopt the Marshall plan for economic rehabilitation of the war-torn countries. It should be apparent that it will do little good to rebuild the factories unless the nations of the world are able to attain maximum utilization of the goods produced through trading with each other without artificial barriers.

The ITO charter recently completed at Habana provides the rules for international trade which may prevent economic warfare in the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Russell Porter from the New York Times of March 28, 1948:

ITO CHARTER MAPS NEW PATH FOR WORLD TRADE—NON-COMMUNIST NATIONS JOIN IN PLAN FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION

(By Russell Porter)

HABANA, March 27.—Final judgment on the success or failure of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment obviously must await the test of time.

The charter for the International Trade Organization, which 53 participating nations approved on Wednesday, is a long-range project.

Subject to ratification by the governments and legislatures of at least 20 nations, it is not expected to come into force before late next year. Its real tasks and major opportunities probably will not materialize until 4 years hence, or whenever the postwar transition period comes to an end. That is when, assuming the continuance of world peace and the success of the Marshall plan, the charter can take up where the Marshall plan leaves off.

Within such limits, however, it is possible to attempt a tentative evaluation. The most significant fact about the conference seems to this reporter to be that the overwhelming majority of the nations in the non-Communist world have made a free choice. Standing at the crossroads in history, they have chosen the road of international cooperation and turned their backs on extreme nationalism and economic isolationism.

THE WILL TO COOPERATE

Another highly significant fact that comes out of the Habana conference is that nations can cooperate effectively when they have a will to do so and when no one nation can exercise a veto power.

The atmosphere of fear and suspicion that has characterized our troubled postwar world enveloped the delegates to the trade conference at its opening 4 months ago and colored everything they did and said for many weeks. But it gradually receded during the long, hard process of democratic negotiations and debate.

Not the least important aspect of this demonstration of what can be done when nations want to work together with good will is that the problems involved the most delicate relationship between conflicting economic philosophies, systems, and interests.

The conference made it clear that virtually the entire non-Communist world, with exception of Argentina, has voluntarily accepted the international economic leadership of the United States.

Any realistic appraisal of the potential contribution of the charter to world peace and prosperity must take into account the question of whether the United States will continue to supply this leadership. The Habana Conference made it clear that no other non-Communist nation today has the economic strength or initiative to assume leadership if we abandon it.

Thus the course of future economic history now depends upon Congress, and beyond it the people of the United States.

Public opinion will be called on in the next few months to approve or disapprove the charter, which covers a broader scope and greater detail than any previous international economic agreement. It is designed to promote and maintain trade relations that will enable other countries to produce goods that they can sell to us for dollars. These dollars will enable them to pay for what they buy from us without asking further loans or gifts.

The charter goes far beyond any other international agreement in the commitments we, as members of the trade organization, must assume with respect to the international regulation of our foreign commerce—commitments that undoubtedly limit our freedom of action. It hits directly at the pocketbook nerve.

It is these commitments, however, that make it possible for the United States delegation to consider the Habana Conference a diplomatic triumph despite the compromises and concessions it had to make to get the signatures of the British and western Europeans on the one hand and the Latin-American and Arab states and other economically undeveloped countries on the other.

ECONOMIC WARFARE

Without these commitments prohibiting or regulating the use of tariffs, preferences, subsidies, import and export quotas, and other restrictions on world trade, it is pointed out, any country or group of countries could wage unrestricted economic warfare against us.

All kinds of barriers could be erected against our goods. State trading enterprises could make bilateral deals to discriminate against our trade.

This, it is held, would cause great pressure in the United States for retaliation. We might well be drawn into a complex network of import and export quotas, under State control, of foreign trade. From there it might be a necessary and easy step to put domestic trade under control.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS

If a highly centralized Federal Government were given the power to clamp down on free enterprise, it is asked what the effect might be on other aspects of our individual freedoms. The very vitals of our democracy and our free American way of life, it is emphasized, are involved here.

From the viewpoint of national defense it is held that the United States would be weakened if it had to wage economic warfare against other countries in the non-Communist world instead of having them associated with us in trade organizations, insuring our supplies of raw materials and markets for our heavy industries, which, in time of trouble, would become our war industries.

From the viewpoint of world peace and prosperity, it is added that the rest of the world could hardly realize its goal of raising its standards of living toward our level without the cooperation of an economically

strong United States able to help it with capital investments and technological skills. It could hardly resist Communist aggression without the support of the industrial potential of the United States for both war and peace.

POLITICAL DIVISIONS

That all this is not a bogey to frighten people into accepting the charter, it is pointed out, can be seen from the way in which the alternative has presented itself. Even while the Habana Conference was trying to establish a new world based upon freer multilateral and nondiscriminatory trade, the actual world in which we live was drifting toward further division into economic as well as political blocs, as shown by the news from Czechoslovakia in particular.

Thus, the people of the United States, as citizens of the world as well as of their own country, it is held, face the same choice as did the delegates at Habana—not between an admittedly imperfect charter and an ideal one, but between economic cooperation and the alternative of an economic war, which might very well lead eventually to a shooting war.

Work Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by June J. Joslyn, from the Oregon Daily Journal of April 14, 1948:

WORK WELL DONE

(By June J. Joslyn, executive director, Oregon Mental Hygiene Society)

We have long been accustomed to annual awards to persons who are outstanding in their particular fields. The Nobel prize, the Pulitzer prize, and the "Oscars" of the film industry are examples. Now comes a new award, one which is of great interest to the Oregon Mental Hygiene Society and to all agencies and individuals who are concerned with the care of those "forgotten people," the mentally ill.

This award has been made by the National Mental Health Foundation of Philadelphia and goes to Walter Starnes, a psychiatric aide at the Winter Veterans' Administration Hospital of Topeka, Kans., chosen the psychiatric aide of the year. In recognition of his outstanding service, Mr. Starnes received $500 and a citation.

Who is this Walter Starnes? He is a tall, slender, friendly Negro in his early forties. He was born of humble parents in Topeka and attended elementary school there. Moving to Washington, D. C., with his parents, he completed high school, but his college career was cut short because of financial difficulties. Following this disappointing experience, he was variously employed until 1942, when he entered the Army.

In military service he showed a great capacity for assuming responsibility and rose rapidly to a technical sergeant in the transportation corps. After his discharge, he learned of the need for psychiatric aides (attendants) at Winter Veterans' Administration Hospital and applied for a position. In April 1946 he began work there. It soon became apparent to his superiors that Mr. Starnes had unusual administrative ability, so he has been advanced to more and more responsible positions.

Mr. Starnes was nominated for the award by a hospital nominating committee which considered all entries submitted by patients and personnel. All private, Veterans' Administration, and public mental hospitals in the country were invited to submit nominations. The purpose of the award is to encourage higher standards for psychiatric aides who spend more time than any other hospital employee with the patients and who, if they are well trained, have tact, sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others, and a desire to help, can contribute greatly to the recovery of patients.

We congratulate Mr. Starnes on his selection for the award. We congratulate the Winter Veterans' Administration Hospital on its training course for aides and on its recognition of the importance of the psychiatric aide in a treatment program. We congratulate the National Mental Health Foundation on the establishment of the psychiatric aide of the year award and the five honorable mention awards of $50 each.

We hope that the hospitals for the mentally ill in Oregon—whether private, public, or Veterans' Administration—will take note of this award and that some day the psychiatric aides in our hospitals will be of the caliber of Mr. Starnes. This means careful selection, adequate on-the-job training, and a sufficient number of aides to meet accepted standards—about one aide to every eight patients.

Church, Civic Leaders Join in Tribute to Nuns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Catholic Action of the South:

CHURCH, CIVIC LEADERS JOIN IN TRIBUTE TO NUNS

NEW ORLEANS, April 15.—"Looking back over 100 years of splendid achievement for God and for country, we see the fulfillment of the prophetic words of the curé of Ars: 'All that grows at the foot of the cross is more than good * * * it is excellent.' And we pray that this centennial will mark the beginning of a new era of still greater prosperity and growth for the Congregation of the Marianites of the Holy Cross in our dear southland."

This tribute and this hope were offered by Most Rev. Jules B. Jeanard, bishop of Lafayette, in his stirring sermon at St. Louis Cathedral here Wednesday morning at the solemn pontifical Mass of thanksgiving, the principal event in the 3-day observance of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Louisiana Foundation of the Marianite Sisters. Most Rev. Joseph F. Rummel, archbishop of New Orleans, was celebrant, assisted by Very Rev. Christopher O'Toole, C. S. C., vice provincial of the Holy Cross Fathers, as assistant priest; Very Rev. Daniel C. O'Meara, S. M., deacon, and Rev. Henry C. Bezou, subdeacon. Very Rev. Harry L. Crane, S. M., provincial of the Jesuits, and Very Rev. Peter Quinn, S. M., vice provincial of the Marist Fathers, deacons of honor. Very Rev. Msgr. Charles J. Plauche, chancellor, was master of ceremonies.

The Mass was chanted by Notre Dame Seminary choir, directed by Rev. Robert Stahl, S. M.

Present in the sanctuary were Most Rev. Richard O. Gerow, bishop of Natchez, and 14 monsignori.

At the civic reception on Tuesday evening at the municipal auditorium, a capacity throng heard Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison express gratitude for the works of the Marianite Sisters and commendation for Catholic education. Rev. Leo Flood, C. S. C., pastor of Sacred Heart Church here, explained the source of the success of the work of the congregation, the spirit of Christ and the inspiration of Mary. "We who join with the Marianites in celebrating their centennial," Father Flood said, "should learn its great lesson of life, for the Marianite personifies the life of Christ and His mother, Mary."

His Excellency Archbishop Rummel touched upon the many contributions of the sisters in the fields of charity and education, lauded them for their contributions, and commended Rev. Mother Mary Xavier, present provincial superior, who directed the observance of the centennial.

Arthur A. de la Houssaye, general chairman of the large committee of arrangements for the centenary of the sisters, served as master of ceremonies. He presented baskets of flowers to Rev. Mother St. Odile, superior general of the congregation, from France, and to Mother Xavier.

The program was followed by the presentation of the spectacular pageant, A Canticle of Praise, by the students of all the Marianite schools in Louisiana. The pageant was planned by Mother Xavier.

A banquet commemorating the centennial, attended by more than 800 persons, including delegations from all communities where the Marianites have schools, was held Wednesday afternoon at the Roosevelt hotel. Attending were the Most Reverend Archbishop. Their Excellencies Bishop Jeanard and Bishop Gerow, and many monsignori and priests.

Monsignor Plauche, at the Archbishop's request, read a message from the apostolic delegate, informing the sisters that the Holy Father sent his apostolic blessing to the community, their alumnae, benefactors, and friends, and including the delegate's own personal good wishes.

A message of cordial greetings from President Harry S. Truman, who expressed the hope that the sisters "will continue unwearied in their noble calling of training boys and girls in ways of Christian citizenship."

Among many other messages were those from Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Deputy Chief of Staff, a former pupil of the sisters; Senator Overton, Representative F. Edward Hébert, Gov. James Davis, and Superintendent of Education Lionel Bourgeois. The Marianite community in India also sent greetings.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis H. Boudreaux, V. F., Lake Charles, reviewed the labors of the Marianites in the Lafayette diocese, and voiced gratitude for their labors and sacrifices. Rev. Leonard Robin, pastor at Plaquemine, compared their work in the archdiocese to a grain of mustard that has grown to a great tree. Commissioner Bernard McCloskey represented Mayor Morrison.

His Excellency Archbishop Rummel expressed gratefulness and commendation to Mr. de la Houssaye, the general chairman, who was toastmaster, for his excellent work, and to all the members of the committees. He cited the need for more vocations to continue such work as has been done by the Marianites, and concluded with words of praise for Mother Xavier and her community.

Open house was held at the Academy of the Holy Angels during Wednesday afternoon. At 6 p. m., Rt. Rev. Msgr. William J. Castel, pastor of St. Rita's Church, gave Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

The centenary closed Wednesday with a Solemn Pontifical Mass of Requiem at the academy chapel, by Most Rev. L. Abel Caillouet, auxiliary bishop of New Orleans, for the deceased Marianites of the State and their benefactors.

Here for the centennial and taking part in the various ceremonies were Very Rev. Albert F. Cousineau, C. S. C., superior general of the Holy Cross Fathers; Very Rev. William F. McGinnis, C. S. C., provincial in Canada; Mother M. of St. Odile, superior general, from Precigne, France; Mother M. of St. Cajetan, her assistant, formerly stationed here; Mother Rose Elizabeth, C. S. C., superior of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, from Indiana; Mother M. of St. Maximilienne, C. S. C., Montreal, Canada, and several other sisters superior and Brothers of the Holy Cross.

Casey at the Bat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Tom McGovern which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, April 20, 1948:

LYNN HEARTBEAT
(By Tom McGovern)
CASEY AT THE BAT

The press of the Nation will give acclaim today to the fact that 85-year-old Connie Mack yesterday led his Philadelphia Athletics to a double victory over the power-laden Boston Red Sox.

As one fortunate individual who happened to know a chap who knew a fellow who had two box seats for yesterday's American League opener, I wonder just how much the aging Connie had to do with the twin triumph.

For 20 long innings yesterday morning and afternoon, I peered into the Philadelphia dugout to ascertain if Connie was waving his familiar scorecard to his infielders and outfield patrol but not once was a sign evident.

He was there all right, no mistaking that, his fine posture and silvery locks so evident from many of the thousands of seats in the Fens. Not once, however, did a single member of the team go to him for instruction, or look to him for a signal. He sat there throughout the warm forenoon and the chilly matinee as if made of stone.

There will never be another Connie Mack, of course. If he is a passenger today, which many suspect, it's a seat he's earned the hard way over the years. He's been a shining example as a player and a manager to the athletes of 6 decades and even today he serves as an inspiration to young ball-players all over the Nation.

With baseball on the lips of most everybody today, I think it apropos if we dwell upon the famed Casey for a spell. Casey at the Bat is the acknowledged classic of baseball, its anthem and its theme song. Yet, when it was first printed under a pseudonym in 1888, in the San Francisco Examiner, it was received without enthusiasm and even without comment. It was not until De Wolf Hopper made it the feature of his repertoire that the verses entered the national consciousness. They were recited up and down the country; they were dramatically declaimed from the stages of countless theaters and raucously echoed from every barroom. They were attributed to several vociferous claimants, one of whom tried to collect illegal royalties from Hopper for making the poem famous.

In Famous Single Poems, Burton Egbert Stevenson gives sufficient evidence to prove that the poem was the work of Ernest Lawrence Thayer, who had been an editor and president of the Harvard Lampoon and who had been coaxed to California by William Randolph Hearst to contribute light verse and casual editorials to the San Francisco Examiner. Casey at the Bat was one of the many occasional pieces written by Thayer over the signature "Phin." Thayer thought it neither better nor worse than his usual output; he considered its vogue simply unaccountable and the controversy incredible. Resigning from the newspaper, he went back East, became a successful manufacturer of woolens, and was glad to be forgotten as a humorist. But no one who has ever yelled at an umpire or jumped to his feet at the crack of a bat can ever forget the mighty Casey and the Mudville nine.

"It looked extremely rocky for the Mudville nine that day;
The score stood two to four, with but one inning left to play.
So, when Connie died at second, and Burrows did the same
A pallor wreathed the features of the patrons of the game.
A straggling few got up to go, leaving there the rest,
With that hope which springs eternal within the human breast.
For they thought: If only Casey could get a whack at that—
But Flynn preceded Casey, and likewise so did Blake,
And the former was a pudd'n, and the latter was a fake,
So on that stricken multitude a deathlike silence sat;
For there seemed but little chance of Casey's getting to the bat.
But Flynn let drive a single, to the wonderment of all.
And the much-despised Blakey, 'tore the cover off the ball,'
And when the dust had lifted, and they saw what had occurred
There was Blakey safe at second, and Flynn a-huggin' third.
Then from the gladdened multitude went up a joyous yell.
It rumbled in the mountain tops, it rattled in the dell;
It struck upon the hillside and rebounded on the flat;
For Casey, mighty Casey, was advancing to the bat.
There was ease in Casey's manner as he stepped into his place,
There was pride in Casey's bearing and a smile on Casey's face;
And when responding to the cheers he lightly doffed his hat,
No stranger in the crowd could doubt 'twas Casey at the bat.
Ten thousand eyes were on him as he rubbed his hands with dirt,
Five thousand tongues applauded when he wiped them on his shirt;
Then when the writhing pitcher ground the ball into his hip,
Defiance glanced in Casey's eye, a sneer curled Casey's lip.
And now the leather-covered sphere came hurtling through the air
And Casey stood a-watching it in haughty grandeur there.
Close by the sturdy batsman the ball unheeded sped;
'That ain't my style,' said Casey, 'Strike one,' the umpire said.
From the benches, black with people, there went up a muffled roar,
Like the beating of the storm waves on the stern and distant shore.
'Kill him! Kill the umpire!' shouted someone on the stand;
And it's likely they'd have killed him had not Casey raised his hand.
With a smile of Christian charity great Casey's visage shone;
He stilled the rising tumult, he made the game go on.
He signaled to the pitcher, and once more the spheroid flew,
But Casey still ignored it, and the umpire said 'Strike two.'
'Fraud!' cried the maddened thousands, and the echo answered 'Fraud!'
But one scornful look from Casey and the audience was awed;
They saw his face grown stern and cold, they saw his muscles strain,
And they knew that Casey wouldn't let the ball go by again.
The sneer is gone from Casey's lips, his teeth are clenched in hate,
He pounds with cruel vengeance his bat upon the plate;
And now the pitcher holds the ball, and now he lets it go,
And now the air is shattered by the force of Casey's blow.
Oh, somewhere in this favored land the sun is shining bright,
The band is playing somewhere, and somewhere hearts are light;
And somewhere men are laughing, and somewhere children shout,
But there is no joy in Mudville—mighty Casey has struck out."

Preparedness Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address at the preparedness day dinner sponsored by the Dory-Flowers AMVETS Post, No. 75, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., held in the Ojibway Hotel, Sunday, April 18, 1948:

I am highly honored to be with you as the speaker for your preparedness day program. It is always a distinct pleasure to come to the Soo to see old friends, meet new ones, and renew acquaintances. The AMVETS are to be commended for arranging this program.

Preparedness should be foremost in everyone's mind, whether it be in the consideration of your personal life insurance, your local police force, or our national security. Your program today brings to mind the famous ride of Paul Revere in April 1775. We all know how Paul Revere warned the countryside of Lexington and Concord of the coming attack of the British—this by a prearranged signal of two lanterns in the Old North Church belfry if attack came by water and one lantern if by land.

However, it is not as well known that Paul Revere continuously and ardently fought oppressive measures imposed upon the Colonies by the British. This goldsmith took an active part in repealing the hated Stamp Act of 1765. He was the instigator and leader of the famous Boston Tea Party where colonists, dressed as Mohawks, raided the British ship *Dartmouth* and poured barrels after barrels of tea into Boston Harbor. You may ask, what is the parallel of the deeds of Paul Revere and the world situation today? Paul Revere was fighting for one thing—freedom. He was ardently opposed to acts of aggression and oppression.

"A specter is haunting Europe." This announcement was made a hundred years ago. It was made by the Communist League, in a manifesto written by Karl Marx. This specter is still haunting not only Europe but has its tentacles well rooted in every coun-

try in the world today. It has changed its character, it has gathered force, and it has won victories. Yet, today, as a hundred years ago, it still is an unfulfilled dream. The fact that it has not fulfilled its expectations does not make this menace less dangerous. Today we know that a century has not brought the fulfillment of the Communist goal. The years, however, have brought us to a time—now—when communism cannot be disregarded.

Seventy-seven years ago, Communists led a revolt that succeeded in controlling the city of Paris for several months.

Forty-four years ago, Lenin split the Social-Democratic Party of Russia into the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks—the Bolsheviks accepting the iron discipline called communism.

Thirty years ago, Lenin engineered the seizure of power in Russia known as the October Revolution. After 4 years of civil war, Russia became consolidated as the stronghold of communism.

Twenty-seven years ago Communist Russia went through the depths of famine and economic collapse.

Fifteen years ago, our Nation established diplomatic relations with Russia.

Seven years ago invasion brought once more a test close to the breaking point. That test was passed by Russia, with our aid, and eventually the common enemy, Hitler, brought about an alliance between Russia and the United States.

October 21, 1944, President Roosevelt—addressing the Foreign Policy Association—stated: "The very fact that we are now at work on the organization of peace proves that the great nations are committed to trust in each other."

February 17, 1945, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin signed a declaration at Yalta which stated: "By this declaration we reaffirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, our pledge in the declarations by the United Nations, and our determination to build, in cooperation with other peace-loving nations, world order under law, dedicated to peace, security, freedom, and general well-being of all mankind."

Since the meeting at Yalta, it has become clear that Soviet tactics are not free and peaceful as we know the terms. Today it is clear the Russian leaders believe they have a great opportunity. They hope that some, or all, of the weakened institutions of western Europe can be broken. Ordinary diplomacy cannot cope with that drive for power.

What is the motivating principle behind this drive of Soviet communism? The Communists have one goal—world revolution. That was Marx's basic principle and has been stressed with a singleness of purpose by Lenin and Stalin. They fanatically believe that as long as any other systems of government aside than dictatorship by the proletariat exist on this earth those governments are to be abolished.

As I said earlier—Paul Revere was fighting for one thing—freedom. Today, more so than even in the time of our forefathers, freedom is in jeopardy. That sinister octopus and international ideology, which we call communism, is sweeping the world. It has snuffed out more lights of freedom since VJ-day than the combined efforts of Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito prior and during the war.

When we speak of preparedness—from and against what are we seeking to protect ourselves? In the Army we were taught to view the situation realistically, with an open mind, and not to weigh our decisions with emotion. We must prepare to defend ourselves against two things—first, Russia as a nation, which includes all her resources and military strength, and, secondly, the Communist ideology. You cannot distinctly separate the two forces, but still they present entirely different problems.

It is common knowledge that in every country, including the United States, Communists hold positions of trust in practically every form of personal pursuit. Since our Government instituted diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union we have realized a large infiltration of Communists into our own Government. The purpose of the Communist International is to prepare for the day when they can overthrow governments either by ballot or force. You will find Communist workers not only in government, in labor organizations, in educational systems, but even in our churches. They work with the singleness of purpose of eventually striking at the heart of our way of life and converting our country, and other free countries, into proletariat dictatorships.

The heart of the Communist International, of course, is in Moscow. All Russia's leaders are Communists. While only 6,000,000 of the 250,000,000 population of Russia belong to the Communist Party, the Communists have nothing to fear inside Russia as other politica. parties are outlawed. Leaders out of Moscow pull the strings that control the efficient, ruthless Communist machines within each country.

Now, let us consider Russia as a nation. If the Communist workers within a country can assume sufficient strength to overthrow the government by internal means, there is no need for Russia to use her military strength toward that end. However, if the time comes when internal revolution proves ineffective and appears to be losing strength, Russia can be expected to use her military force to impose her ideology on other peoples. Such was the case of Poland.

What makes communism so attractive that it can successfully recruit a substantial following? First, it must be remembered that normally it is not the number of Communists that present a danger to free people, but it is the fact that they are so well disciplined, and the organization so efficient, that a small minority can assert a tremendous influence. The regular party leaders and trained disciples appeal to certain classes of individuals, particularly when there is economic unrest and instability. Their proletariat machine is constantly telling the laborer and the peasant that they are being shackled and bled by the government, international bankers, and the like. When a man is hungry or discontented with existent conditions, the promises of the Communists—that under the rule of the proletariat the capitalists and money interests of a country will be destroyed and control of government placed in the hands of the average man—has an immensely strong appeal. The individuals, dissatisfied with a system of free enterprise, are not told that under Communist rule in a proletariat dictatorship their economic condition certainly cannot improve, because they will have lost their individual freedom.

In Russia today labor cannot demand more wages; it cannot demand better working conditions. As a matter of fact many cannot even choose their own type of employment. All industries, every business is entirely controlled by the Government—and remember government in Russia means a few party leaders. That fact is not told to the dissatisfied groups in the various countries where Communists endeavor to secure a stronghold on the people.

Let us objectively view Russia today to determine what communism actually has to offer. In the first place private property is practically extinct. The right to acquire property is limited to the state. The right for an individual to employ labor for profit is forbidden. In other words, if Sault Ste. Marie were located in Russia any business such as the corner grocery, your garage, and this hotel—where others are employed—would be managed by government officials. As previously mentioned, a laborer has no redress of any grievance against management because management is the state.

How does the farmer fare in Soviet Russia? Chances are he owns no property but works on a collective farm managed by state officials from which he receives a wage in accordance with his share of the total production of the collective farms. If you were fortunate enough to own an automobile—which you wouldn't unless you were a high official in the Communist Party—you could not get up some morning and decide to take a trip to a neighboring town and just get in your car and leave. You would have to apply for a travel permit. You would have to tell some government official the reason for your trip, how long you plan to stay, and other details before you would be allowed to travel even if your destination were but 20 miles away. If you worked in a factory and should be fortunate enough to be one of the few chosen—due to your increased production during the year—to receive a vacation, you would have to take that vacation at a government-sponsored rest home at the site some government official may determine. Your recreation at the rest home is also planned for you and your time is actually controlled as to what you may do and when you may do it. The freedom we cherish—you do not find in Russia. All of you remember, only too vividly, the Government controls we had of necessity during the war. We know how distasteful even necessary wartime controls. So just take those controls as an example and multiply them tenfold and you get an idea how much individual freedom you would enjoy under a Communist regime.

The greatest danger of the spread of communism—and which to me is the basic difference in our own and the Communist philosophy of life—is that we are a Christian people and as Christians we believe in the inherent rights of the individual, that government is a tool society must have, in order to better serve and protect the individual and his rights.

The fundamental doctrine of the Communist International is atheism. Karl Marx's characterization of religion—as an opiate for the people—was readily accepted by the Communist leaders, who set about to destroy the church and stamp out religion.

On January 23, 1918, the famous decree, which separated the church from the state and the school from the church, was published. This was expanded under the Federal Soviet Republics in July 1918. This proviso made it impossible for the publication of any religious document, including the Bible, and made it illegal for any religious sect to own property; and it also prevented the administration of any type of social-service work by the church. Parochial schools were not permitted, while at the same time the decree expressly authorized the freedom of any anti-religious propaganda to be propagandized to the citizens of the Soviet Union. Consequently, it became extremely dangerous to worship—many religious leaders were imprisoned or killed and religious meetings were broken up and the worshipers and clergy were insulted by the Communist youth organizations on many occasions. This condition prevailed up until the beginning of World War II. The Soviet State then realized that it was to its advantage to reinstate religion for its moral contributions as long, of course, as it could be controlled.

So, today, you have in Russia so-called freedom of worship by the church, which, however, is entirely dominated by the Communist leaders. There is much apprehension in the minds of many Catholics today as to what will happen to the Vatican if Italy, which holds its election today, should become a Communist state. The Communists, for political expediency, have continually stressed that if they gain control of Italy, Catholicism will not be challenged; but you

can be sure of one thing, that if Italy should fall to the Communists eventually the Vatican will either be a prisoner of the Soviet Union or will be forced into exile, because the basic doctrine of the Communist International is materialism. Any doctrine which assumes that there is anything other than material forces—such as religion—is contrary to the basic philosophy of communism. So, you can see the issue is more than just a difference in economic and political philosophy. It is the difference between Christianity and atheism.

And at this point let me mention again that communism is endeavoring to propagandize even our churches. Some time ago one of our ministers took issue with me on the subject of the danger of communism. He endeavored to prove that Americans are needlessly alarmed over Russia's apparent aims and sent me a booklet titled "Behind Soviet Power" by Jerome Davis, endorsed among others by Henry A. Wallace as a book everyone should read. The copy sent to me was of a second printing (30,000 copies). The book is circulated among a certain denomination's 22,000 ministers, and contributions for additional distribution being solicited. I read that book carefully and will say only that history to date has proven the aims of Stalin and the Communist International other than portrayed in this book. It is difficult for me to understand how Christian freedom-loving people can close their eyes to realities and have their great desire for world peace—which we all share—used as an instrument for the Communist Party. We who believe in God have the most to lose by Communist conquest.

To effectively deal with the international problems confronting us and the world today, the President appeared before a joint session of Congress and asked for speedy enactment of the European Recovery Program, the reestablishment of selective service, and the establishment of universal military training. I voted for the European Recovery Program because of the belief that it may aid materially in combating the Communist forces endeavoring to overthrow the western European countries. The governments that will receive aid through ERP are anti-Communist governments but the Communists have gained control in many key areas of influence within their structure. If we refrain from assisting them, I am convinced those governments would have no chance of warding off Communist influence from within. When we aid governments of free peoples, we are in reality helping ourselves. If those governments can be sustained and encouraged to fight the cancerous Communist growth within their boundaries, we will have accomplished our aim—to prevent the growth of the Communist International. It is hoped that the European Recovery Program will stabilize the economy of western Europe. If that expectation is fulfilled, I believe you will find communism descending in those countries.

I have heard people say: "Why worry about Europe, if they want communism, let them have it." In the first place, let us remember it is not the majority of the people in those countries who will determine whether or not they will have communism. It is the well-trained minority which gains control and imposes its will on all peoples.

Let us assume we did nothing and permitted Italy and France to fall under the Communist heel. The rest of Europe, of course, could not hope to hold out against this influence. What would be the next step? Probably it would be Iceland and Greenland, and certainly South and Central America would be next where revolutions develop at the slightest provocation. Eventually we would find ourselves isolated in a sea of Communist states where all concentrated effort could be utilized to force the one last bulwark of free people into submission.

What about all the talk of increasing our military strength? Can we stop the spread of the Communist doctrine by military strength alone? Of course not. We could blow Moscow off the map and we still would not be halting this menace. The Communist headquarters would merely move to another city. The only way we can stop its spread is by our aid to free peoples so they can properly defend their own governments from this scourge. We must remember, also, that the Soviet state—controlled by the Communists—will not hesitate to use military force to gain its end if internal means fail. It would be futile for us to spend billions of dollars through the European Recovery Program if we do not indicate to Russia that we are of sufficient strength to stop any military aggression. To give power to our words, we must be militarily strong, as we have learned Russia only respects armed might—not words.

Now that we have determined all freedom-loving peoples, including ourselves, are being challenged on every hand, we must of necessity appraise our own defense. Ever since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, many people have lapsed into a false security because of our possessing the atomic bomb, which in itself is of no more protection to a nation than poison gas was in the last war. I sincerely doubt that the atomic bomb will ever be used again as a weapon of war. It will not be used for the same reason that poison gas was not used in the last war. The fear of retaliation by the same weapon, or an equally destructive one—such as biological warfare—would certainly make its use extremely dangerous to any combatant. I definitely believe the United States should retain the secret of atomic energy—if it is a secret—and maintain a moderate stock pile of bombs to be used as a countermeasure if—God forbid—such ever becomes necessary.

In viewing our national defense, we are prone to concentrate on just one branch of the Service or one phase of our defense program. Strong arguments have been presented in favor of building up a strong air force. Some claim what we need is a strong standing army. Some advocate that if we controlled the seven seas with our Navy, that would provide the necessary defense. Certainly, all branches of the Service are necessary for our protection. One is inseparable from the other and it would be foolhardy to concentrate all our strength in one branch, be it Army, Air Corps, or Navy. We are just as strong as our weakest branch of the Service. Our national-defense program must be balanced. I am confident this Congress will appropriate funds sufficient to enable the Air Force to expand from its 35 air groups to approximately 70, which will then provide the minimum protection for defense of our shores. A large increase in our air power would provide sufficient new business for our aircraft industry so it could maintain a moderate level of production. It is extremely important that moderate production be maintained to keep our planes up-to-date.

We know it has been impossible to secure through voluntary enlistments the required number of men for our ground forces. To remedy that situation, a plan of universal military training has been proposed for some time. As yet, however, such has not been acted upon favorably by the Congress. I am firmly convinced that if UMT had been adopted last year, there would be no need today for us to consider reestablishment of selective service. Last October, I spoke before a veterans' security meeting in Detroit. I stated at that time that if we did not adopt UMT, it would become necessary for us to have a large standing Army. Every war in the past has proven that our main strength does not rest with our professional military men but the bulk of our strength lies with our trained civilians.

Many people have asked: "What is the difference between UMT and selective service?" The difference is indeed a major one. Under UMT, trainees are not part of the Army. They are not subject to the Articles of War and military courts martial. They could not be sent out of the country and the training would be for not more than a year. Additional training would be given by service in the National Guard or Organized Reserves. The selective-service measure, as it will probably be submitted to the House in the near future, will doubtless provide for the drafting of nonveterans between the ages of 19 and 25, to serve a period of duty in one of the branches of the Service. They can be sent overseas and would be subject to the rules and regulations of the Service. The length of duty, according to the proposed legislation, is for a 2-year duration. I believe that if UMT had been established, sufficient men would have developed an interest and aptitude to have enlisted in the Regular Army. At least sufficient would have voluntarily enlisted so as to have kept our armed forces at minimum strength. However, the world situation today demands immediate strengthening of our armed forces. Consequently, at this stage UMT alone is not the answer. UMT provides for a long-range training program. Selective service would give us immediate results. It is my opinion that even if selective service is reestablished, that UMT should also be enacted so that we can keep our standing Army as a required minimum and have our UMT trained personnel making up our citizen reserve components. It is possible that selective service then could be discontinued after UMT has had a chance to operate.

If we do not take the necessary steps now to become adequately prepared, we are giving the Communist International the green light to use the Soviet Union's military strength to pursue its program of world conquest. I firmly believe in the statement of our first President, Gen. George Washington. He said in his first state of the Union message, January 8, 1790, and I quote: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." That statement is as timely today, as it was then, in our relationship with Soviet Russia. We must continue to use every diplomatic and Christian means to bring about understanding between nations. We must continue every effort to win the peace as is becoming a Christian people. To demand and hold the respect of a power which is materialistic in the extreme, we must back up our diplomacy with a "big stick."

May God protect your land and mine from the enemies of democracy both within and without.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at Columbia University, New York City, April 21, 1948, at a meeting of 400 historians, authors of outstanding books about Jefferson, and other prominent guests to honor Prof. Dumas Malone, of the Columbia faculty, whose new book, Jefferson, the Virginian, has just been published.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senators break in where angels dare not tread. Here I am at Columbia in the midst of a group of authors on Jefferson. I am invited because I wrote a book on Jefferson. My book had two purposes: to develop a thesis which I had worked at for some years, and to have a book come out for the time of the dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in the National Capital. Columbia has a place in the thesis because when my monograph on World Unity Through a Study of History was published in the Conciliation Series, President Nicholas Murray Butler wrote the foreword. The thesis was too startling for him, but he did say it was interesting. Before Thomas Jefferson, World Citizen, was published a copy was sent to President Butler and he replied telling me that he had read the book and that it was great. The point is this—the concept behind the idea of world unity throughout history had developed so from the time of the monograph to the time of the book that President Butler accepted the later idea readily.

President Butler has gone and you are to have another great president. President Eisenhower called me the chairman of his "board of directors" when he was Chief of Staff. I was chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

The Thomas Jefferson Memorial is completed. My book is out of print and the publisher out of business. The text in relation to the world unity thesis awaits further study. When one of the unwritten volumes of Dr. Malone is forthcoming, certainly there will be a place in it for those factors which made the world one in the century or two before Jefferson's time and which brought the thought of the East into the West, thus producing in Jefferson that universality of interest which made him a world citizen.

In this day of talk of budget balancing, I cannot refrain from telling the world that we built the Jefferson Memorial on a single appropriation, we never ran into any kind of a deficit, and we have $88 left. Jefferson would like that.

After a decade of hard study and much thought in the Orient and circling the globe in my twenties, I found myself teaching subjects I could not become enthusiastic over because of my world-wide experience. Our universities seemed to be interested in a very small part of the world. I gave my first course in the Orient in 1914. After the First World War the opportunity to do more came. I was ill prepared. How to bring Asia into our scheme of history or political science became a necessary task. In my course on Asiatic states, I found that even graduate students were completely lost in orienting themselves whenever I attempted a formal lecture. I made a comparative study of what happened in the East in such centuries as the twenty-third and the sixth B. C., the first, fifteenth, and nineteenth A. D. I discovered that, generally speaking, what was going on in the West was very much the same as what was going on in the East. For example, the Canon of Shun was developed almost the same time as the Code of Hammurabi. The great century of religious inspiration, the sixth B. C., affected both the East and the West. When we considered the fifteenth century we found the same restlessness in the east that produced Columbus' voyage in the west and that the orientals traveled farther and went in larger ships. The one-world idea today is not a startling one.

I saw the idea of progress burst upon a world that never conceived it although one of its great thinkers did in ancient times. I was surprised to watch people from my own land fail to recognize their own because of biased thinking. It was in 1912 when Theodore Roosevelt led his Progressives—one day a group of students marched in Pekin following a flag on which the characters read "The Put Foot Forward Party." That brought a laugh from our Progressive Americans because the Chinese were so funny. The Chinese drew a picture of progress. If I remember my Latin, the word "progress" comes from "progredior," which means a step forward. "Put foot forward" and to step forward are so different. The people of the East are so funny.

But people were not thinking in the terms of one world when the little thesis of "World unity through a study of history" was worked out. In fact, we thought more of the differences and the topsy-turveyness. Men wore trousers in the West, but women wore trousers in the East. Even that one is not good today. We ended our sentences with a period, but the Chinese began theirs with one. We got on our horses from the left side, but the orientals got on from the right. We shook hands with one another, but the Chinaman shook hands with himself. We took off our hats to show reverence, but the people of the East took off their shoes. None of which reflected history or told us what was in the hearts and minds of men. When doing my Chinese book, I found myself often attracted by East and West influences on each other. Associates of mine became interested and great studies have resulted.

When the time came for selecting inscriptions to go on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, I was made chairman of the committee. I thought I would find something that would impress our people as Lincoln's Gettysburg speech or his second inaugural have always done, or that we could place in the memorial something similar to what we have in the Lincoln Memorial. Jefferson has many great papers. His inaugural is a wonderful document, but Jefferson's greatness shows itself more in his miscellaneous writings and letters and in his advocacy of principles that became part of our American tradition. He was responsible for so much that has become American political habit that I abandoned the notion of finding quotations we could use and I decided, since I was limited to so many words, to take Jefferson's words, remove them from their time and original text and put in as many of those words representing as many political concepts which the American people accepted and make a unit of Jefferson's philosophy. This I put in four panels fitting the scheme of the monument. All of my selections were not accepted, but the scheme was accepted and most of the words follow my selection. What I sought was a monument to the American people and American democracy described in Jefferson's own words. The following is what I submitted:

"Man was destined for society. Society reserves to each individual freedom consistent with peace and order.

"All men are created equal, they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it.

"When we find our Constitution insufficient to secure the happiness of our people, we set it right.

"The people are the guardians of their liberty.

"God created the mind free. No man shall be compelled to support any religious ministry nor suffer on account of his beliefs. All men have liberty of religious opinion. Their morality is part of their nature.

"I know but one code of morality for men whether acting singly or collectively.

"God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slaves is despotism. These people are to be free.

"That people will be happiest whose laws are best. Those worthy by education without regard to wealth or birth should administer them.

"Equal application of law is fundamental. Females have equal rights with males. To preserve freedom crusade against ignorance; diffuse knowledge; follow truth; educate the people at the common expense. Health and morality must not be sacrificed to learning. Prevent the accumulation of wealth in select families.

"Make our hemisphere one of freedom. An attack on one is an attack on the whole.

"Our wisest policy is peace and friendship with all mankind."

Jefferson became, in everything I read, a world citizen. He was interested in soil conservation because his study of the world proved that we had to be careful. He wanted the plants of the whole world to contribute to the economy of America. His concepts on education were strikingly like those built around the three character classic. His religion was world-wide in its aspect and his notion of liberty was based upon the inherent rights in all men. His theory that nations are responsible for their acts and suffered or prospered as a result, that men and nations are bound by the same code of morals made him bigger and made him broader than any political thinker produced by any of the European nationalisms.

Jefferson's contribution to the Federal idea made him one of the creators of the modern political world. His notion that liberty could be maintained for man by permitting two types of government to control him, in a sense, creates in man a dual citizenship. The first government to direct him in his local affairs, but in those things that are common both to him and to others should be directed by a general government. Thus American federalism was created and made possible of universal application when the Constitution was set up and later, when the definition under that Constitution was evolved in the fourteenth amendment, it made world-wide government and citizenship a possibility. From these ideas come the political possibility of creating a world citizen without, in any way, detracting from local duty and right, state responsibility, and national loyalty.

When we decided upon the statue to represent Jefferson, we turned from the heroic Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence; the great Jefferson, the President of the United States; the farseeing Jefferson, the purchaser of Louisiana; Jefferson, the educator with his public school and public land system; Jefferson, the opponent of slavery; Jefferson, the father of West Point; Jefferson, the writer of the Northwest Proviso; Jefferson, the Governor. And we chose Jefferson, the matured citizen, still planning for his State, for his Nation, and for the world; the Jefferson who responded to the call of the State with dignity and with honor and with willingness to serve after he left the Presidency of the United States to become road supervisor of his county.

Jefferson, world citizen, seems big, but he was bigger even than that for he wrote to Adams and said: "You and I shall look down from another world on these glorious achievements to man, which will add to the joys even of heaven." Thomas Jefferson, world citizen, yes! Thomas Jefferson, a grasper of the eternal purposefulness of creation and big enough to advance the concept of progress which he took from another and transferred it into a theory of eternal progression.

Having said this much, it goes without adding that I rejoice with all of you over Dr. Malone's great work. The honor you have given me in letting me be part of you

today is most satisfying. My hope is that the three volumes yet to come will reflect the hearts of the thoughtful millions of the world who want America's existence to be purposeful in providing the place where the dignity of man, as Jefferson developed that concept, may produce not only the idea but the actual fact of everlasting progress.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the bill to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine is of special importance to a dairy State such as Iowa and will have a direct bearing on the income of our dairy farmers. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include therein the following telegram just received from the Iowa Creameries Association calling attention to the serious effect repeal of the oleomargarine taxes will have on Iowa's agriculture economy:

AMES, IOWA, *April 26, 1948.*
Congressman KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House of Representatives:

Any change in present oleo statutes will seriously affect Iowa's agricultural economy. Iowa's geographical location from consumer centers, our large number of relatively small dairy producers, and the use of our butter as a cushion in the entire dairy industry, demands that butter be protected against imitations. Iowa has lost and is losing hundreds of dairy producers because of the unfavorable butter situation.

IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
J. S. QUIST, *Executive Secretary.*

Republican Party Risks Deficit Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I issued today entitled "Republican Party Risks Deficit Financing."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN PARTY RISKS DEFICIT FINANCING

I believe that the Republican Party, through the reckless actions of some of its members, is risking Government deficit financing—the terrible evil which the party has crusaded against throughout the history of the New Deal. The Party is doing this through the actions of a few of its members who seem willing to out-New Deal the New Deal in vast and extravagant appropriations to outspend the spenders, outwaste the wasters, in a "me too" approach to appropriations, in going along with bloated budget requests of the Democratic administration.

I make specific reference to the Army civil functions bill, which, as recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee, would appropriate the colossal sum of $708,000,000 for river and harbor and flood-control work—most of it for new construction. This sum is actually $206,000,000 more than the current fiscal year appropriation, and is $102,000,000 more than was voted by the House of Representatives.

There is every indication that the Senate bill is loaded with nonessential, nonproductive and nonconsequential projects which could very easily be deferred, either indefinitely or for a given time until the competition for scarce construction materials is lessened.

The Republican Party is faced with the fact that it has necessarily voted vast sums for defense obligations and for foreign commitments. I personally have supported these sums, particularly because I believe that they are absolutely essential for peace and security.

I WILL ASK RECOMMITTAL OF CIVIL FUNCTIONS BILL

Now, however, in the Army's civil functions bill, which I will fight on the Senate floor and which I believe should be recommitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee, we are confronted with the same sort of ridiculous extravagance with the taxpayers' resources.

Considering the fact that the Republican Party has voted long overdue tax relief and is contemplating a still further tax reduction, we seem to be straight on the road to another Government deficit unless these nonessential funds can be pared.

WILL GOP BREAK ITS PLEDGE AND GO BLIND, BUGHOUSE, AND BATTY?

One of the lasting sins of the Democratic Party was that, as soon as it was elected to public office after 1932, it broke every single pledge it had made in its 1932 platform, particularly the pledge for Government economy. The Republican Party dare not risk being accused of violating its pledges. I think the Army's civil functions bill is a case in point, a crucial testing ground of whether we will continue to champion Government economy and conservatism or whether we will go blind, bughouse, and batty with New Deal concepts of extravagance.

CONGRESS REFUSED SELF-LIQUIDATING SEAWAY

Lastly, may I say that it is completely inconsistent for a Republican Congress to vote $708,000,000 as a gift measure for largely nonessential projects, when it refused to loan—with emphasis on the word loan, not give—around $400,000,000 for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, every cent of which would have been repaid through ship tolls and power fees, without damaging private enterprise.

James Graves Scrugham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21 (legislative day of Monday, March 29), 1948

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we do honor today to the memory of Members of this body whose voices are no longer heard except in our hearts, because they have gone on before us to that sweet rest and final reward which is to be accorded each of us in God's own time.

Among that company is JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, late United States Senator from Nevada.

It has been nearly 3 years, on the calendars of earth—but an infinitesimal instant on the calendar of Heaven—since JIM SCRUGHAM laid down his earthly tasks and moved onward and upward into the light of full knowledge; but our sense of loss at his passing remains fresh, and strikes poignantly whenever our thoughts turn, as they often do, to the days when he was with us.

When JIM SCRUGHAM went away, he left a void which will never be filled in the hearts of his friends and in the affections of the people of the great State which he served so long and so well.

I like to think of JIM SCRUGHAM as having gone on to a new frontier. He was a man who liked frontiers. He liked the challenge of a new frontier, and the opportunities it offered; opportunities for growth, and opportunities for service.

It was the lure of a new frontier which brought JIM SCRUGHAM to Nevada, 45 years ago. He was born in the great State of Kentucky, at Lexington, on January 19, 1880; and it was in the bluegrass country of Kentucky that he spent his youth and the earliest years of his manhood. He took his bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering at the State University of Kentucky in 1900, and received his degree as mechanical engineer from the same institution 6 years later.

He came to Nevada in 1903 as professor in the College of Engineering at the University of Nevada. He returned again to Kentucky the following year to take as his bride Miss Julia McCann, of Lexington; and he returned once more in 1906 to receive the degree of mechanical engineer from the State University of Kentucky. But his service as a member of the faculty of the University of Nevada was continuous for 14 years, from 1903 to 1917; and such were his attainments and his abilities that from 1914 to 1917 he was dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Nevada.

In 1917, JIM SCRUGHAM laid aside the robe of an educator and took up the burden of public service, which he carried with honor to himself and profit to his State for the rest of his life.

In that year of 1917, with war clouds already darkening across the Atlantic, JIM SCRUGHAM became State engineer of Nevada. A year later, when the war clouds broke and this Nation joined the conflict, he accepted a commission as lieutenant colonel in the Army of the United States and served throughout the war with the Corps of Engineers, returning to his post as State engineer when the war was over.

With his fine war record and his outstanding service as State engineer, JIM SCRUGHAM was a natural choice of his party for the highest State office, and the people of Nevada elected him their Governor in 1923.

He was elected a Member of the House of Representatives from Nevada in 1933, and he spent the remaining 12 years of his life in the Halls of Congress. He spent 9 years in the House of Representatives, becoming one of the outstanding leaders of that body and the chairman

of its Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. He came to the United States Senate in 1942, and served here until his death.

His service in Congress is part of the history of the great State of Nevada. As State engineer of Nevada, he had helped to negotiate and had signed the Colorado River compact of 1922, which laid the foundation for harnessing that mighty stream; the series of dams and reservoirs and power plants which are making the desert bloom and furnishing the electrical energy for a vast new upgrowth of industry in the West. He never lost his interest in reclamation and in the development of the West; and his achievements in that field, not only for his own State but for all the States of that great area, won him the everlasting gratitude of the people whose lives he lightened, whose efforts he helped bring to fruition, and whose communities he made to prosper.

I will not attempt to recount all of JIM SCRUGHAM'S many accomplishments for his State. Any history of the State of Nevada recently written, or which is written in the future, will recount those accomplishments in far greater detail than I could recount them here.

JIM SCRUGHAM'S opinion of what could be accomplished for his State was sure and his vision as to its needs was wide and clear. His mind was capable of dealing with any emergency. With great depth and breadth of nature added to this extraordinary keenness of intellect, the resources of his wisdom were sufficient for every day and for any exigency. His dynamic energy and his capacity to get things done in a simple, unpretentious way were so typical of him that they were taken for granted, where in a lesser man they would have been marveled at.

JIM SCRUGHAM'S friends in Nevada, whom he knew by their first names, were numbered in the thousands. He was most sincere in his desire to make and retain friends, and he was always outstandingly loyal to them.

To JIM SCRUGHAM'S thousands of friends, his loss was a personal matter, a sorrow which each one carries in his own heart. To the State of Nevada, the loss of JIM SCRUGHAM was the loss of one of its greatest and most able public servants.

For others have come after, and yet others still shall come,
But his place has not been filled, nor can it be.

For us here in the Senate, who worked with JIM SCRUGHAM, knew him well, respected him, admired him, and loved him, the memories of burdens shared with him, hands clasped, smiles exchanged, and help given and received, stay with us in our daily lives, to sweeten the bitterness of regret at his passing.

Here where he stood, we stand,
But not in tears.
Light from a better land
Vanishes fears.
He is beside us, free,
Whispering peace;
Telling how happy he
Found his release.

JIM SCRUGHAM was a man. We miss him. May God bless him and keep him.

Money and How To Finance the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Money and How To Finance the Marshall Plan, delivered by me, and broadcast over the facilities of radio station KSL in Salt Lake City, Utah, on April 20.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to talk about something everyone likes very much but which few people are thoughtful and know very little about—that is money. One of the greatest blessings that has come to us as Americans is that through long experience we have learned to know the worth of a good money system although we have not always had a sound money system. We have suffered through many panics and inflationary periods. We started with a sound money system because when we built our system, growing out of constitutional provisions, we built it around the most stable money then in existence, the Austrian and the Spanish dollars, and we made gold and silver the basic values in our money.

Before the adoption of our Constitution, like the rest of the world, we accepted anything in our trade relations that had a recognized value. Then we went through all of the interesting and sad experiences of financing the Revolutionary War with paper promises-to-pay. When the time came to redeem these Continental certificates our country was divided as to what should be done. In reality, it was utterly and completely impossible to do exactly the right thing because the Continental certificates had been abused in every conceivable way. Under the leadership of Hamilton and with the support of Jefferson we did for America what, in the long run, was not only the right thing to do but which gave us a constant theory in money practice. We kept the promises printed on the certificates and redeemed them. America's contracts and America's promises have in general been observed ever since.

Today, money is something based upon faith. The use of gold and silver, as far as the whole world is concerned, has almost gone out of existence because the actual value of gold and silver, comparatively speaking, has become so great that they have both fled from general circulation. Nevertheless, no other constant basis for money has been invented or been accepted by the world. All of the words which are put into our relief bills, promising to use the money which we lend and give to the rest of the world to stabilize currencies, will be of little avail until currencies can be stabilized on a basis in which all of the people have full faith and to which all people give credit. In bringing economic order to the world, we must find that stable element, pin to it, build it up, and then we will have created that trust which people insist upon having, if an entity is to become a real medium of exchange..

Foreseeing present world economic conditions, I recommended to President Roosevelt, at the beginning of the war, that American soldier boys and girls, wherever they were, should be paid in American dollars. I knew that if we did this we would give to the world that stable thing on which money recovery could be built after the war. I realized our allies would object because of their fear that it would affect their money adversely. But, had my suggestion been followed, the American dollar would have kept its proper level and other moneys would have found their proper level in relation and in ratio to it. What the various moneys of the world have got to do now to establish any kind of economic stability is to discover that level. It is not through any deliberate action on the part of anyone or any one government that the present value of the American dollar is only 60 cents, that the French franc, or the Japanese yen, or the Chinese yuan are where they are. The war, of course, is the destructive agency to all moneys of the world.

When the war ended, after President Truman became President and after I returned from Europe where I saw that our method of paying our men was contributing to the success of the black market, to inflation, and to the making of other moneys less valuable, I recommended again to President Truman that we pay our soldier boys in dollars and let those dollars find their comparative level. This suggestion, again, was not followed. The great need today in all foreign countries, with the exception of Switzerland, is the American dollar, and we find ourselves lending or giving these dollars in an attempt to bolster the various foreign money systems. But all the bolstering in the world can never be big enough and all the artificial acts can never be strong enough to bring world money values to their proper level. We can help, we can assist in bringing about that level, but we can never force it. Thus America finds herself and the world, too, finds itself in what is supposed to be a peacetime, with bigger problems than when objection was raised to the universal use of our American dollar.

I repeat, stability can become general only by building upon an already stable structure. That means that the moneys of the world must gravitate around the American dollar. It is the most stable money in the world. In fact the American dollar, today, is not only a symbol of thrift and economic independence, but it is actually the world's symbol of freedom and liberty.

Unconsciously, America has created a new kind of money in our War Savings bonds. We made it impossible for them to be used as collateral, we made it impossible for them to be transferable, but they are redeemable in cash at any time. Actually, what America has done is to set up a two-hundred-and-fifty-odd-billion-dollars reserve. This should be enough to save us from any money panic, if it is properly guarded, properly respected, and if values are not allowed to depreciate. I trust that those responsible for our future money policy will always realize how sacred that reserve must remain if crashes, unheard of in their extent, are kept from falling down on us.

No matter what suggestion we make, in an attempt to rectify our broken world, complicates our economy. The suggestion of any recovery plan for Europe immediately produces controversy as to whether we should consider the plan by itself or put some sort of curb on the inflationary spiral so that the dollars which go into the administration of that plan will remain the same in value and accomplish all the good contemplated. But in our complex life hardly any suggestion can be considered by itself alone. For example, we are now planning to spend more money than anyone ever dreamed we would after the war, yet at the same time we have reduced taxes. To many people, that these two things go hand in hand do not make sense.

I have suggested a plan for financing world recovery progams which I am sure would be healthful for us and for the whole world—that is, to consider our recovery efforts as

actions apart from our ordinary governmental expenditures. Of course, this does not mean saving money. If the United States spends money it spends money. But there are ways of raising money that are quite different and there are ways of accounting for money spent than the ways ordinarily used.

My plan is to float bonds to pay for all of the recovery programs. Sell recovery bonds backed up, of course, with American guarantee, allowing an interest slightly above the ordinary savings bonds interest, give the bonds the characteristic of ordinary bonds so that the bonds will seek their natural economic level, and sell them not only to the American people, but to people anywhere in the world. If we would do this we would create a new investment instrument which is needed. It would take some of the inflationary money from circulation. It would make it possible for the people most benefited to be contributors. It would remove, at least for the present, the question of appropriation for recovery from our normal expenditure budget and would, in general, create a psychological approach to recovery which would emphasize the unified and partnership idea connected with a mutual recovery program so that the people benefited the most may also contribute to the recovery and have a greater share in the responsibility for success. Then too, the peoples of the world would be more anxious to help themselves if their own money were invested in this program as well as that of the American taxpayer.

There are millions of dollars worth of foreign money which came to America during the war seeking not only investment but safety which could be directed into world recovery channels. In addition, we are trying to help curb foreign money inflation and whenever there is money inflation there is always hoarding or at least a holding back of investment in things which are not money. This plan would provide a release for this type of hoarding.

Everyone sees now that if our Government had followed my suggestion of paying our soldier boys, wherever they were in the world, in good American dollars, those dollars would have sought a natural level and would have created a world-wide money based upon the strongest promise to pay that there is in the world.

John Patt Becomes One of Cleveland's Star Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I respectfully submit herewith for insertion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press regarding Mr. John F. Patt:

JOHN PATT BECOMES ONE OF CLEVELAND'S STAR SALESMEN

The directors of the Convention and Visitors' Bureau have chosen wisely in electing John F. Patt as its president for the next 2 years.

In every way, Patt typifies the kind of leadership that the retiring president for 4 years, Louis B. Seltzer, said this community needs. Seltzer in his farewell message, outlined three community needs—vastly improved transportation and traffic, including rapid transit; getting younger men into top positions of civic responsibility; and investing money in its schools and colleges, particularly in research. He tied these together with a plea for an expanded, yet simplified governmental organization which would be cheaper and more effective in operation.

We believe there will be little argument on any of these goals. We likewise believe that John Patt has the intelligence, enthusiasm, and ability to push far along the road to realizing some of these aims. He impresses one with the feeling of youth and alertness at first glance, though he is older than he looks.

He is vice president of WGAR, which he organized 17 years ago. In that period he has constantly sought to make this a better city to live in. He has been president of the Rotary Club and the Advertising Club and an enthusiastic leader in the Community Fund and Red Cross.

He believes in Cleveland so firmly that he will find it easy to sell. It is his job, with the bureau staff, to bring here the great conventions that mean more than $6,000,000 a year to this city. We are confident that Cleveland will be easier to sell in the future, that it is on the threshold of one of its greatest periods of expansion and growth. Good luck, John, more power to you.

Oleomargarine Against Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a historical study of the Federal, as well as State, taxes on the sale of colored oleomargarine demonstrates clearly that this tax is directed at the prevention of fraud, misrepresentation, and deception in the sale of oleomargarine, a synthetic and substitute product in competition with butter. These taxes are directed toward protecting the consuming public as well as the great dairying industry of America. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I do not like to see a tax for the purpose of regulating fraud and deception if there were any other means of preventing such. Yet, this is the historic and present purpose of this tax, namely, the prevention of oleomargarine colored yellow from being sold and passed off as butter. The tax is not for revenue purposes but, as indicated, for the prevention of fraud and deception. Certainly it cannot be said, therefore, that the purpose of this tax is not a laudable one.

The legislative history of this tax indicates that it was first enacted to prevent the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine as butter. The taxing power has on several occasions been used for regulatory purposes, such as taxes imposed on the production of narcotics, white sulfur matches, and firearms, among others. Taxes on oleomargarine date from 1886. Uncolored oleomargarine is subject to a tax of only one-fourth cent per pound and colored margarine 10 cents per pound. Imported oleomargarine, irrespective of color, is taxed at the rate of 15 cents per pound. There are some 24 manufacturers of oleomargarine in the United States. Manufacturers and distributors of oleomargarine and margarine spreads are taxed $600, whereas wholesalers are subject to a tax of $480 if they distribute colored oleomargarine. Twenty-three States in the Union prohibit the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine within the borders of their States at any price, but such States impose no law or restriction against the sale of white or natural oleomargarine—margarines that are not colored yellow to look like butter. Tennessee, my own State, has an oleomargarine tax law which provides for an excise tax of 10 cents per pound on yellow-colored oleomargarine and no tax is imposed on uncolored oleomargarine. As indicated, these taxes are directed at the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine colored yellow similar to butter. Taxes, if any, on uncolored oleomargarine are negligible. Treasury Department officials indicate that oleomargarine taxes have little revenue significance. Thus, it clearly appears that these taxes are aimed at protecting the consuming public against the practice of fraud and deception.

Regardless of action taken by the Congress today with respect to oleomargarine taxes, these 23 State laws still remain in effect and still prevent fraud and deception in the sale of oleomargarine within these States. In other words, the passage of the pending bill will be absolutely futile as far as its affecting the sale of colored margarine to persons living within 23 States of the Union is concerned.

Can the laws of our State and our Federal enactments on these important subjects all be wrong? The purpose of these statutes is protective, not punitive. A study of the dockets of our Federal and State courts, which are filled with records of fraud cases resulting from the illegal manufacture and sale of bootleg oleomargarine in violation of Federal and State laws, will demonstrate this fact. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the hearings with respect to this repeal legislation and note that the proponents of repeal include oleomargarine manufacturers who have been found guilty of illegal and improper trade practices in the advertising and sale of their products. Unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in trade and commerce and the prevention of fraud in industry and the protection of the American consumers have long been problems with which the Congress has been concerned.

Let us take a look at the record.

In the matter of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *John F. Jelke Co., Inc.* (30 FTC p. 896), the Commission ordered this concern to cease and desist forever from using the words, first, "churn," "churned," "sunlit churnery," or any derivative of the word "churn," importing or implying that its product has been churned in a manner in which butter is made from cream; second, from using the words "fresh pasteurized milk" or "pasteurized milk" in the advertising and sale of its product.

In the matter of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Ohio Butterine Co.* (Stipulation No. 293, vol. 12, FTC p. 567), this company was ordered and they agreed to cease and desist forever from using in its advertising and sale of its margarine products the words, first, "made in the milkyway," "churned fresh daily from

pure wholesome milk in our giant sunlit churnery"; second, "made of fresh milk from select dairies"—the way choicest creamery butter is made, and so forth—third, from using "milk," "cream," "churn," "dairy," or "dairies," either independently or in combination with other words or pictorial representations in any way that may have the capacity or tendency to mislead and deceive the purchasing public into the belief that its product is that product known to the purchasing public as creamery butter.

There are also pending cases in which the word "churngold" is questioned as tending to mislead and deceive the public into the belief that margarine is churned in a manner similar to butter and in which the word "gold" is questioned as intended to signify the natural yellow color of butter. In addition, Mr. Speaked, it has been pointed out that from time to time the Congress has had to enact the Federal Filled Milk Act, the Pure Food and Drug Act, and other legislation, for the prevention of "confusion, deception, and substitution of goods" when sold in interstate commerce. The color of oleomargarine adds nothing to its nutritious value but simply aids and abets deception and fraud in its sale and use, by making the imitation product more like the genuine product butter. The hearings on the proposed oleomargarine tax repeal legislation contain citations of six illustrative cases in which thousands of pounds of oleomargarine have been illegally manufactured and sold and passed off as butter to the American public by means of fraud and deception. Time and again racketeers have pawned off colored oleomargarine on the public as genuine butter. Between the years of 1912 and 1926 the Bureau of Internal Revenue reported 29,846 offenses and the collection of taxes and penalties from violations in oleomargarine cases of more than $19,000,000. This involved the seizure by agents of more than 18,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine and 83 oleomargarine factories. Should these tax laws be repealed, it is reasonable to assume that some manufacturers of oleomargarine today will seize upon the opportunity of increasing the price of their colored oleomargarine and receive many millions of dollars of profit from the consuming public, while also engaging in unfair methods of competition. In other words, instead of the Government preventing the fraud and collecting the tax, we may expect oleomargarine manufacturers to collect for themselves, in the form of added mark-up prices, all or part of the sums now paid the Federal Government. Reputable oleomargarine manufacturers, of course, will not do such things, but the cases cited are too numerous to escape the conclusion that protection from the few who do engage in racketeering and fraud and deception is needed.

The present color laws now protect dairy farmers as well as the public from the uncontrolled sale of an imitation and substitute product. The repeal of this legislation would bring about great damage, seriously impairing and harming the dairy industry, reduce our dairy farmers' income and curtail the total quantity of dairy products.

Arguments have been advanced that the sale of cottonseed oil, used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, will improve the farmers' condition. Actually, the facts reveal that less than 10 percent of our cotton farmers' income from cottonseed is paid for by the oleomargarine industry, whereas, cottonseed sold for dairy feeds far exceeds this amount. In other words, the dairy industry assists the cotton industry far more and to a much greater extent than do the margarine manufacturers. Figures show that out of every dollar produced in the sale of butter, 76 cents goes to the farmer, whereas, out of every dollar produced in the sale of oleomargarine only 29 cents goes to the farmer. Oleomargarine manufacturers have sought to set farmer against farmer, on the basis of the manufacturers' self interest, in an endeavor to repeal laws taxing yellow colored oleomargarine. It has been well said that the farmers and dairymen want the public to eat all the margarine that the public wants when such is purchased on the basis of fair competition but our farmers and dairymen feel that the removal of the color laws would establish unfair competition for the dairy farmer. They want honest and fair competition. In the interest of a stable dairy industry—and that is certainly of interest to the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee—and in the interest of sound agriculture and the consuming public, it appears logical that the tax on colored oleomargarine to imitate butter should be retained. Personally, I have no quarrel with oleomargarine as a food. My main concern is that it should stand on its own feet and should not attempt to masquerade for something which it isn't—natural butter.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word in this connection about the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee as a great dairying district. The South is predominantly agricultural. However, I doubt if there exists anywhere throughout the South a district that is more predominantly and primarily a dairying district than the Fifth District of Tennessee. This district, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is situated in the heart of middle Tennessee—within the bluegrass section and crimson clover area of Dixieland. Possessed of a genial climate suitable for dairying, Tennessee has soils of abounding fertility and diversification. Nature seems to have endowed Tennessee—middle Tennessee—the great Fifth District of Tennessee—with a particular advantage and asset with its climate, its soils and grasses, its cattle and dairy herds—perhaps a combination of these factors has made this section the Jersey cattle area of Tennessee and the South. Pioneer and progressive-minded farmers and dairymen formed many years ago the Tennessee Jersey Cattle Breeders Association and three-quarters of a century later this association is continuing and functioning efficiently. Tennessee's Fifth District specializes in the breeding and producing of dairy cattle and the furnishing of foundation stock to other States—dairying is forging to the forefront as one of our most important farm industries. The term "Tennessee Jersey" has become a trade-mark in the dairy world. Tennessee Jerseys have won practically every honor of the breed for many years. It was a Tennessee cow that produced the first 900 pounds of churned butter in 1 year. A cow bred in Rutherford County, Tenn.—within the Fifth District—was the first cow bred in the South to receive a medal of merit. Tennessee cattle have won fame in the World's Fair and National Dairy Expositions. No district in any State has a record of greater achivement for breeding and production of fine Jersey cattle—and resultant milk production—than the Fifth District of Tennessee. As Representative of this recognized great dairying district and knowing of the importance of the dairying industry to the people of this section, I should not wish to cast any vote to hamper or impede the future growth and progress of farming and dairying, but, to the contrary, I want to lend my support to furthering the best interest of our farmers and dairymen and the protection of the consuming public from fraud and deception while also aiding one of the largest segments of our agricultural life—the dairy industry.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD some facts and figures relating to the importance of the agriculture and dairying within the Fifth District of Tennessee.

Total number farms in Fifth District of Tennessee

Bedford	2,303
Cannon	1,445
Coffee	2,049
De Kalb	2,022
Franklin	2,368
Giles	3,694
Lincoln	2,887
Marshall	1,929
Moore	656
Rutherford	3,365
Wilson	3,344
Total	24,962

Farmland acres in Fifth District of Tennessee

Bedford	287,115
Cannon	170,294
Coffee	212,724
De Kalb	190,241
Franklin	234,341
Giles	377,449
Lincoln	347,759
Marshall	226,221
Moore	71,162
Rutherford	390,000
Wilson	355,557
Total	2,862,862

	Milk sold	Butterfat sold	Total payment
	Cwt.	*Lb.*	
Bedford	401,555	37,250	$234,907
Cannon	110,150	27,984	56,241
Coffee	103,930	7,747	51,145
De Kalb	106,353	1,517	51,179
Franklin	76,039	263,248	75,593
Giles	770,307	3,968	366,328
Lincoln	650,001	1,630	309,857
Marshall	690,733	18,125	275,647
Moore	46,782	9,594	22,836
Rutherford	633,777	473,854	366,757
Wilson	431,644	268,297	243,721
Total	4,021,271	1,113,212	2,052,211

Source: All figures from Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, 1945, last figures available.

Alleged Disclosure of Radar Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1948, page A2260, I asked and received permission to print an open letter from Drew Pearson to Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, in charge of the Press Section of the Department of the Army. I desire at this time to ask unanimous consent to include the reply of the Department of the Army.

There being no objection, the reply of the Department of the Army was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Department of the Army, Public Information Division, Press Section]

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS

On December 19, 1947, Columnist Drew Pearson made certain allegations in his column under the heading "Radar secrets leak" appearing in the Washington Post, among other newspapers. Again, on April 6, 1948, in an open letter to Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, which was published in certain newspapers and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 14, 1948, an extension of the remarks of Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, he reiterated his allegations. To correct the impression given in these articles, following are the facts developed in the course of an intensive technical and legal Army investigation:

In December 1937 the Radio Corp. of America voluntarily proposed to the War Department that the company submit for consideration of the Department inventions made by RCA which were considered to have importance from a national defense viewpoint in order that necessary steps could be taken to keep the information secret. At this time there was no legislation requiring such action by the company (the so-called Patent Security Act, Public Law 700, was not passed until 1940), and the only way in which the War Department could exercise control over such inventions was to obtain an interest in them so that the Commissioner of Patents could be asked to defer action in the Patent Office.

Consideration of the RCA proposal and the legal problems involved following receipt of this proposal. Meanwhile the RCA started submitting selected inventions for consideration in keeping with their proposal.

In February 1938, RCA submitted three applications for patents to the (then) War Department for consideration as to their bearing on national security. Two of the patent applications in question applied to an impulse generator and the third to a signaling system. It was found that disclosures of the principles of radar were made in these applications, and on March 30, 1938, the War Department concluded that the Government had grounds for asserting a claim for a license on the impulse generator. There was, however, no evidence that the Government had a rightful claim in respect to the signaling system, which is the patent application on which Mr. Pearson has based his allegations.

But because both principles were considered of importance to the national security, the Secretary of War, in April 1938, wrote to RCA officials requesting an assignment in trust of both-type applications. This would have had the effect of placing the inventions under Army security control. No response was received to this request, but in the meantime another Government agency had initiated action to place the applications under Government control, thus satisfying the Army's security interests.

The two patent applications relating to the impulse generator had been prepared in the RCA patent department in 1937 and copies were sent abroad for filing in certain foreign patent offices in December 1937 under contractual arrangements then in existence between RCA and its foreign affiliates. This action was taken before the RCA patent department was advised of arrangements then being made with the Government for screening of inventions considered to be of importance to national defense. Their distribution abroad to foreign patent offices was a normal administrative action at that time. In contradiction of Mr. Pearson's claims, there is absolutely no evidence that the application for patent on the signaling system (U. S. Patent No. 2,401,717), was disclosed abroad prior to VJ-day.

In his column of last December, Mr. Pearson wrote:

"There was no excuse at that time (January 1938) for RCA filing the radar patent because of ignorance, since it had been working with the Signal Corps, and knew the vital importance the Army attached to it."

Actually, RCA was awarded a secret Government contract in 1936 to work on radar development. However, because of its highly classified nature, all research in this connection was carried on in a restricted area which, for all practical purposes, was sealed off from the RCA plant proper. Only selected personnel were engaged in the work, and RCA employees in general were entirely unaware of what was being done in the restricted area. This secrecy was maintained to such an extent that the patent department of RCA remained in ignorance of the classified project and had no knowledge of its nature at the time the impulse generator patent applications were filed. Documents from a highly placed RCA official to this effect are in the hands of Army authorities.

In June 1946—after controls had been lifted on these patent applications—the United States Patent Office issued three patents, two covering the impulse generator and the third pertaining to the signaling system. The first two were issued to William D. Hershberger, assignor to RCA, and the other to Hershberger and I. Wolff, assignors to RCA.

The patents were brought to the attention of the Army and it was noted that Mr. Hershberger had, until the fall of 1936, been a civilian in the Army Signal Corps engaged in certain phases of work on radar. In view of this fact and because of the similar work in radar conducted by the Army, an investigation was started to determine what rights the Army had in these patents. The result was discovery of a possible claim to rights in the impulse generator patents and a lack of evidence to warrant a claim based on Hershberger's work in the Signal Corps to that involving the signaling system mentioned by Mr. Pearson (U. S. Patent 2,401,717).

On the strength of these results, Maj. Gen. Harry Ingles, then chief signal officer, wrote RCA authorities expressing a belief in Government rights to the impulse generator patents; pointing out that there was some question of violation of security in that the impulse generator patent applications had been distributed to foreign affiliates of RCA, and that it appeared information contained in the impulse generator applications was similar to secret information to which Mr. Hershberger might have had access while working in the Signal Corps laboratories. No claim was made to Government rights in the signaling system.

RCA replied, after an investigation of its own, that Mr. Hershberger had not invented the impulse generator while employed by the Government, and that neither RCA nor the inventor had used any secret information furnished by the Army in drawing up the impulse-generator patents. It was further established that Mr. Hershberger was not one of the workers engaged by RCA on the secret project undertaken for the Army, and in fact he did not enter the employ of RCA until after work on the contract was completed and all records relating to it had been delivered to the Signal Corps.

In the reply, RCA requested a conference between technical experts of the Signal Corps and of the concern. This was held early in November 1946, with the outcome that a royalty-free license under the patents was offered the Government by RCA and accepted, thus giving the Government all necessary privileges of use of the patents. No basis was found during this meeting for allegations of security violation by RCA.

The over-all legal and technical investigation has brought the Department of the Army to the conclusion that all actions have been taken which are necessary and proper to protect the Government's interests in radar developments made by Mr. Hershberger while in the employ of the Signal Corps.

Mr. Pearson made the following statement in his December column:

"Suddenly, however, the Army cooled off (in its investigation). Something happened.

"Whether it had anything to do with the cooling off, it also happened that Gen. Harry Ingles retired as Chief of the Signal Corps on March 31, 1947, and is now holding an important job with the company which leaked the radar patent—the Radio Corp. of America."

The implications in Mr. Pearson's statement are not only unfair, but are absolutely without foundation, as proven beyond question in the course of the investigation into the entire situation.

In view of other implications by Mr. Pearson, it was emphasized that no legal action ever was instituted by the Government, since there were no grounds then, or are there any grounds now, for such a suit.

In fairness to the Radio Corp. of America and its president, Mr. David Sarnoff, the Army emphasizes that their voluntary submission of proposed patent applications at the time in question and their subsequent cooperation with the Department of the Army in every respect have been of invaluable benefit prior to the war, during the war, and since it ended.

Finally, it is an established fact that the basic principles of radar were well known abroad well before the alleged disclosures of the patent in question in 1938. Latest evidence in support of this is contained in the memoirs of Winston Churchill, wartime British Prime Minister, appearing in the April 19, 1948, issue of Life magazine. On Page 116 of that issue, Mr. Churchill stated:

"The possibility of using radio waves scattered back from aircraft and other metal objects seems to have occurred to a very large number of people in England, America, Germany, and France in the 1930's. * * * In February 1935 (3 years before the time referred to by Mr. Pearson) a Government research scientist, Robert Watson-Watt, had first explained * * * that the detection of aircraft by radio echoes might be feasible and had proposed that it should be tested. A special organization was set up, and a chain of stations established * * * for experimental purposes. By 1939 the Air Ministry * * * had constructed the so-called coastal chain, which enabled us to detect air-

craft approaching over the sea at distances up to about 60 miles.

"The Germans were also busy, and in the spring of 1939 the *Graf Zeppelin* flew up the east coast of Britain. She carried special listening equipment to discover the existence of British radar transmissions, if any. The attempt failed, but had her listening equipment been working properly the *Graf Zeppelin* ought certainly to have been able to carry back to Germany the information that we had radar, for our radar stations were not only operating at the time but also detected her movements and divined her intention."

From the above alone it is obvious that considerable progress had been made abroad in the field of radar for some years prior to 1938 and that the importance of the invention involved in Mr. Pearson's allegations has been exaggerated out of all proportion to its real place in the development of radar.

Palestine Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest international problems which has confronted not only our Nation, but all nations, is the unfortunate situation as it pertains to Palestine. All organizations or individuals who have followed the valiant fight which the Jewish people are making to establish a permanent home in Palestine, were indeed shocked and disappointed by the reversal of the United Nations decision abandoning partition in Palestine. The East Chicago (Ind.) Chapter of the American Christian Palestine Committee has set out compactly how the great majority of the people in the First Congressional District of Indiana feel about the wrong committed against the Palestine homeland for the Jewish people.

I hereby submit for the consideration of the Members of Congress a copy of this resolution sent by Charles C. Thornburg, chairman of the above-named organization:

Be it hereby resolved, That we express our profound shock and dismay concerning our country's reversal of position on the partition of Palestine. We view this reversal against a background of 30 years of implicit support of the Jewish National Home. Beginning with November 2, 1917, when President Wilson approved the Balfour Declaration and ending on November 29, 1947, when America cast its affirmative vote for partition, the record is consistent with pronouncements by every American President from Woodrow Wilson on, by congressional resolutions and party pledges.

We cannot understand this reversal of a record of three decades.

We cannot understand this desertion of the tens of thousands of Jewish homeless, to whom Palestine is the sole hope of a new home.

We cannot understand this forsaking of those Jews who, trusting America and the nations of the world, have devoted their lives against terrible odds to laying the foundation of a progressive, democratic Jewish state in Palestine.

We feel that our country's pledged word must not be sold—it must not be swayed by threats—we must remain faithful to our ideals, and forget oil or political expediency.

We therefore request as American citizens:

1. That America's voice be raised and its vote in the UN be used to the end that a Jewish National Home in Palestine be immediately established.

2. That in the event the Jewish people in Palestine declare the establishment of a Jewish state, America will immediately recognize its existence.

3. That the arms embargo be lifted so that the Jewish people of Palestine may adequately defend themselves against invasion.

CHARLES C. THORNBURG,
For the East Chicago (Ind.) Chapter of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

Views of Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon, on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which describes a speech given by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which appeared on March 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY AND BROTHERHOOD

The most fundamental premise of democracy and the underlying principle of the American brotherhood movement were irrefutably linked by Senator WAYNE MORSE in his recent talk on civil rights at the Brotherhood Week meeting at Temple Sharey Tefilo, East Orange. With his uncanny ability to turn the spotlight on the very core of the problem, it was apparent that he saw both movements based on "the essential dignity and integrity of the individual." In the first case, the emphasis is on the citizen as having that inherent right. In the second case, it is on his neighbor being accorded the same recognition.

The junior Senator from Oregon made it clear that the practical application of both principles is civil rights—the respecting and safeguarding of that "essential dignity and integrity"—which was the subject of his talk. He identified the meeting at which he spoke as a demonstration of "the universality of the spiritual basis of the brotherhood of man, but I think we have also demonstrated democracy in action; people of all faiths and, as I look over this audience I see also people of many races. This is democracy." Again, he recognized the parallel road to the two goals.

"It is important, it seems to me, that we approach the problem of civil rights from the standpoint of the spiritual basis of civil rights," he continued, "because if you will reflect for a moment you cannot escape the fact that democracy itself has a deep-rooted spiritual and religious base, and our rights, our political rights, stem from that soil."

MORSE took the late Mahatma Gandhi's belief in the "universality of God" as the premise for discussing the rights of the individual. The blessings of civil rights in America "are greater in quality and in quantity than in any other nation in the world, bar none, and there are many places in the world where they hardly exist in any degree whatsoever. Every totalitarian state knows not civil rights."

He considered Russia as a specific instance. "I have some liberal friends who are laboring under a great delusion and illusion that civil rights exist in Soviet Russia. The inescapable fact is that a communistic society is a police state because it is premised upon the proposition that the state is the master and not the servant. * * * Democracy lives only to the extent that practices of democracy are put to work—and in Soviet Russia there is no democracy."

In speaking on "Are Civil Rights a Reality in America?" Senator MORSE spoke as one who had been in the very middle of the fight. He has championed the cause of civil rights on numerous occasions and has weighed most bills that have been introduced into the Senate on the basis of their effect on its principles. He illustrated with actual cases and outlined the procedure necessary.

As he went on to prove that the exercise of civil rights is actually the principle of real democracy in action, he grouped them with the four freedoms and pointed out that of those the freedom of opportunity had received the least consideration. In that, the cause of brotherhood has suffered the most, despite the fact that it can in no way be separated from the most fundamental principle of democracy.

Results of Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to make known the replies to the questionnaire which in February 1948 I attempted to place in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. I regret it was humanly impossible to send a questionnaire to each citizen of my district, but I believe the replies received represent the opinions of the majority of the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District.

My district might well be considered the Main Street of our Nation. We have approximately 50 percent urban and 50 percent rural population; all labor and farm organizations represented; as well as large industries and small business; two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to each committeeman and committeewoman, both Democratic and Republican, labor groups, farm groups, attorneys, barbers, business and industry, housewives, newspapers, radio, professional groups—doctors and dentists, and so forth—public officeholders, salesmen, and educators. A total of 2,800 questionnaires was sent and the number of individual returns received—1,600—proves to me that the people are anxious to express their views

on issues which are before the Congress for consideration.

The questionnaire and results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE FROM HON. J. HARRY M'GREGOR, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SEVENTEENTH OHIO DISTRICT

1. Do you favor the Marshall plan as recommended by President Truman (giving or loaning $6,800,000,000 for the next 15 months and a further program of approximately $12,000,000,000 from April 1, 1948, to January 30, 1952)? (This includes giving or loaning money, food, and military equipment.) Yes, 20 percent; no, 80 percent. Total vote cast, 1,550.

2. If voting "yes" on question 1, how should distribution be made and by whom? Reply: Dissertative nature of replies makes tabulation impossible.

3. Do you favor a repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law? Yes, 5 percent; no, 95 percent. Total vote cast, 1,566.

4. If voting "yes" on question 3, what parts of the law should be repealed? Reply: Dissertative nature of replies makes tabulation impossible.

5. Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation)? Yes, 44 percent; no, 56 percent. Total vote cast, 1,103.

6. Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental profession and operation of our hospitals under Federal control? Yes, 5 percent; no, 95 percent. Total vote cast, 1,576.

7. Do you favor an immediate return to Federal price control (such as OPA)? Yes, 3 percent; no, 97 percent. Total vote cast, 1,604.

8. Do you favor the continuation of rent control? Yes, 69 percent; no, 31 percent. Total vote cast, 1,547.

9. Do you favor an increase of the minimum-wage rate from 40 cents to 75 cents per hour (law now is 40 cents per hour)? Yes, 25 percent; no, 75 percent. Total vote cast, 1,548.

10a. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production? Yes, 2 percent; no, 98 percent. Total vote cast, 1,599.

10b. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages? Yes, 2 percent; no, 98 percent. Total vote cast, 1,560.

11. Do you favor immediate admission into the United States of displaced persons? Yes, 13 percent; no, 87 percent. Total vote cast, 1,565.

Date _____

Signature _____

Address _____

Occupation _____

Please write on the back of this page your suggestions that might aid me in giving better service as your Congressman.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I asked my constituents to sign their names and give their occupations and this information enabled me to secure the opinions of individual groups concerning how they feel about the legislation that is paramount at present. Following is the percentage distribution of replies to the questions, according to occupational classifications:

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Question I. Do you favor the Marshall plan as recommended by President Truman (giving or loaning $6,800,000,000 for the next 15 months and a further program of approximately $12,000,000,000 from April 1, 1948, to January 30, 1952)? (This includes giving or loaning money, food, and military equipment.)

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	20	80
Attorneys	45	55
Barbers	22	78
Business, industry, salesmen	32	68
Farmers	20	80
Housewives	17	83
Labor	30	70
Newspaper and radio	45	55
Professionals	39	61
Public officeholders	22	78
Educators	65	35
Retired	28	72
Occupation not given	12	88

Question II. If voting "yes" on question I, how should distribution be made and by whom? Reply: Dissertative nature of replies make tabulation impossible.

Question III. Do you favor a repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	5	95
Attorneys	9	91
Barbers	16	84
Business, industry, salesmen	5	95
Farmers	3	97
Housewives	2	98
Labor	17	83
Newspaper and radio	5	95
Professionals	5	95
Public officeholders	0	100
Educators	9	91
Retired	6	94
Occupation not given	4	96

Question IV. If voting "yes" on Question 3, what parts of the law should be repealed? Reply: Dissertative nature of replies make tabulation impossible.

Question V. Do you favor legislation giving Federal aid to schools (allocation of Federal funds to assist in operation)?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	44	56
Attorneys	23	77
Barbers	53	47
Business, industry, salesmen	41	59
Farmers	47	53
Housewives	44	56
Labor	50	50
Newspaper and radio	30	70
Professionals	52	48
Public officeholders	25	75
Educators	70	30
Retired	30	70
Occupation not given	41	59

Question VI. Do you favor any type of Federal legislation placing the medical and dental profession and operation of our hospitals under Federal control?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	5	95
Attorneys	6	94
Barbers	11	89
Business, industry, salesmen	7	93
Farmers	10	90
Housewives	2	98
Labor	20	80
Newspaper and radio	10	90
Professionals	3	97
Public officeholders	8	92
Educators	10	90
Retired	17	83
Occupation not given	3	97

Question VII. Do you favor an immediate return to Federal price control (such as OPA)?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	3	97
Attorneys	4	96
Barbers	12	88
Business, industry, salesmen	5	95
Farmers	2	98
Housewives	2	98
Labor	18	82
Newspaper and radio	5	95
Professionals	5	95
Public officeholders	0	100
Educators	4	96
Retired	12	88
Occupation not given	2	98

Question VIII. Do you favor the continuation of rent control?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	69	31
Attorneys	53	47
Barbers	56	44
Business, industry, salesmen	52	48
Farmers	41	59
Housewives	45	55
Labor	64	36
Newspaper and radio	70	30
Professionals	64	36
Public officeholders	20	80
Educators	81	19
Retired	49	51
Occupation not given	81	19

Question IX. Do you favor an increase of the minimum wage rate from 40 to 75 cents per hour? (Law now is 40 cents per hour.)

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	25	75
Attorneys	17	83
Barbers	50	50
Business, industry, salesmen	28	72
Farmers	13	87
Housewives	28	72
Labor	50	50
Newspaper and radio	32	68
Professionals	24	76
Public officeholders	27	73
Educators	55	45
Retired	18	82
Occupation not given	23	77

Question X–a. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over production?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	2	98
Attorneys	7	93
Barbers	11	89
Business, industry, salesmen	2	98
Farmers	2	98
Housewives	3	97
Labor	4	96
Newspaper and radio	5	95
Professionals	3	97
Public officeholders	0	100
Educators	0	100
Retired	3	97
Occupation not given	1	99

Question X–b. Do you favor the President's demands that he have Federal control over wages?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
Total replies	2	98
Attorneys	4	96
Barbers	6	94
Business, industry, salesmen	5	95
Farmers	2	98
Housewives	3	97
Labor	5	95
Newspaper and radio	5	95
Professionals	3	97
Public officeholders	0	100
Educators	0	100
Retired	0	100
Occupation not given	1	99

Question XI. Do you favor immediate admission into the United States of displaced persons?

	Yes	No
Total replies	*Percent* 13	*Percent* 87
Attorneys	21	79
Barbers	13	87
Business, industry, salesmen	23	77
Farmers	22	78
Housewives	18	82
Labor	21	79
Newspaper and radio	45	55
Professionals	28	72
Public officeholders	18	82
Educators	64	36
Retired	32	68
Occupation not given	4	96

Mr. Speaker, I always welcome the opinions of the people I represent and find their suggestions submitted through this medium most helpful.

Japanese-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in every major war in which the United States has opposed a foreign power, there have been those whose unthinking patriotic zeal has led them to cast doubt on the loyalty of men merely because their ancestry was derived from the enemy country.

This was true in 1776 and again in 1812. In 1917 there was a ban on Beethoven. Happily, in World War II, no one sought to discredit our military leadership because of names such as Eisenhower and Nimitz. There were many, however, to whom such names as Sugimoto and Gosho, though carried by men born in America and brought up under our institutions, remained the names of the enemy.

The exemplary conduct of the men of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team in Italy, composed of Japanese-Americans, did much to dispel these suspicions, but many continued to question the willingness of the Nisei to face men of their parents' homeland.

The story of the Nisei intelligence teams in the Pacific battle area has come out but slowly, and then in fragments. The fact that these men helped to shorten the war against Japan by many months with the saving of thousands of American lives has never received the credit their service deserved.

In the course of his article in the April 10 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Col. Sidney F. Mashbir, wartime chief of the Allied translator and interpreter section of General MacArthur's headquarters, gives a brief and authoritative account of the devoted service performed by the Nisei in the Pacific. Speaking of the men under his command, he writes:

A majority of our translators were American Nisei. Had it not been for the loyalty, bravery, and ability of these Japanese-Americans, many phases of intelligence work in the Pacific would have fallen flat. I know that their faithful service to the United States saved many thousands of American lives and shortened the war by months. It must be realized that this group of men had more to lose than any others participating in the war. Had any of them been captured their torture would have been indescribable. To each Nisei outfit reporting for duty I said, "I won't lie to you. You're in as difficult a position as Jews in Germany. The vast majority of you are volunteers. You know what war hysteria has done to your families in the States. They have been put in concentration camps, some with good reason, others simply because of race. Undoubtedly, some of you are bitter. But you are good Americans. You have decided to serve your country where you will be most useful; nevertheless. I give you my promise that, if I live, I will make every effort within my power to see that your achievements are recognized by the American public."

Every word was taken to heart. Throughout the war we never had to take any disciplinary measures where our Nisei were concerned. When the Nisei got into combat zones they often were fired on by both sides. The Japs complicated this by infiltrating our lines with men garbed in American and Australian uniforms stripped off our dead. Finally we issued orders that every Nisei going to the front had to be accompanied by an American or Australian noncom or officer.

None of them ever showed the white feather, although ATIS Nisei accompanied assault units on every landing from Papua to the Philippines. More than 150 were finally given direct commissions. The rest were promoted several grades. An exceptionally high percentage were decorated or cited for valor.

My bill, H. R. 5004, on which hearings have just been completed before the Judiciary Committee, will grant the parents of these and other loyal Nisei the privilege of seeking American citizenship through the normal processes of naturalization. Surely this privilege should not be longer denied those who legally have been residing among us since before 1924.

Many, many years ago, a very wise man said, "By their fruits ye know them." I submit that by the gage of devotion to American ideals shown by their sons and daughters, the first generation immigrants from Japan have shown themselves to be of the sort which the United States has always been eager to count among its citizens.

Veterans Alliance of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following remarks:

I was visited today by James H. Howard, national chairman of the newly formed Veterans Alliance of World War II and by Thomas M. Dyer, national vice chairman in charge of membership.

This organization which has been incorporated in the State of Michigan and received a charter in March of this year has a purpose which is well worth bringing to the attention of the Representatives here assembled.

Please let me quote the founders of the organization:

To organize and advance a society of Veterans of World War II composed of men and women honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States of America; and to associate themselves together by councils, local, State, and national. To protect, uphold, and maintain the Constitution of the United States of America. To advance the aims, ideals, and purposes of all veterans, namely: Peace, equality, justice, and religious freedom and the preservation of our democratic form of government, for which these veterans sacrificed their lives and fortunes, to the end that, these inalienable rights shall not perish from this earth.

And to advance and foster the interest and work of hospitalization of the wounded, disabled, and unfortunate veterans of World Wars, and to help care for their widows and children. To promote a better understanding with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public or private agencies devoted to helping alleviate hardships, sickness, and economic stress of all World War veterans.

And to aid and help protect the Government of the United States of America and its State and local governments to combat by lawful means, the subversive principles of all who advocate the overthrow, by force, of our American form of government and to advocate and promote the principles of good American and the purposes incidental thereto.

The character of the founders appears to be worthy of note also. On the board of trustees is the Rev. Joseph T. O'Callaghan, S. J., of Worcester, Mass., who was a Catholic chaplain in the United States Navy during World War II and was the hero of the U. S. S. *Franklin* and the first chaplain to be awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor of any of the services. Mr. Howard served with the Navy in World War I and was a captain in the Army in World War II. He is first commander of Disabled Veterans, Chapter 45, of Detroit, Mich., World War II Veterans.

Dyer is past post commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and served with the Marines in World War I and with the Seabees in World War II.

Warren Wright of the board of trustees was a former treasurer of the State of Illinois and is State commander of Disabled Veterans.

I am pleased to see this group formed and I want to take this opportunity to wish them a successful organization and I hope and trust that the passing years will see fulfillment of their aims.

Nazi Munitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Drew Pearson that appeared in the Washington Post of April 23, 1948:

NAZI MUNITIONS
(By Drew Pearson)

A damaging piece of paper has just been found in Germany. It is a memo, written

during the war, asking authorization to erect a new crematorium big enough to burn 40 bodies daily at the Auschwitz slave-labor camp run by I. G. Farben.

This evidence is expected to clinch the guilt of I. G. Farben directors for their war guilt in helping to kill thousands of laborers drafted by Hitler from occupied Europe.

But just as this evidence was uncovered, a strange thing happened in Nuremberg. Gen. Telford Taylor, hardworking war-crimes prosecutor, got instructions to come home. Taylor, at first, demurred, but Washington insisted. Just out of the hospital after an airplane accident, Taylor obeyed orders and is now back in the United States of America.

Simultaneously, certain highly placed defense chiefs have started a quiet drive to save both the factories and the personnel of I. G. Farben, the Krupps, and other big Nazi munitions makers.

This is probably the most significant development in Germany today.

GENERAL CLAY OVERRULED

The shift in policy, it's important to note, comes direct from Washington. Gen. Lucius Clay, United States commander in Germany, has had nothing to do with it. In fact, he refused to sign one directive ordering the big munitions cartels exempt from decartelization.

After the war, it was unamimous Allied policy (1) that the big munitions plants should be broken up, (2) that Nazi munitions masters be punished for war guilt. This was not the Morgenthau plan, but was agreed on by such men as Eisenhower, Secretary of War Stimson and his successor, Secretary of War Patterson. They disagreed with Morgenthau that Germany should become an agricultural state, but they were emphatic that the big war plants be broken up, also that munitions makers guilty of plotting war be punished.

For, in 1932, it was the Krupps, the Thyssens, and the Ruhr industrialists who gave Hitler the money to take over Germany.

WALL STREET AND GERMANY

Incidentally, it was also the Wall Street firm of Dillon, Read & Co., of which James V. Forrestal was head, that loaned a lot of money to these same munitions makers. Today Forrestal is Secretary of National Defense, William H. Draper, former vice president of Dillon, Read, is Under Secretary of the Army, while Paul Nitze, another vice president of Dillon, Read, holds a key economic job in the State Department.

Finally, Philip Hawkins, son-in-law of Dillon, Read partner Draper, is chief of the property division of the American military government in Germany, and is the man who wrote the new memo decreeing a change in policy toward I. G. Farben and the Nazi cartels. This was the memo which General Clay refused to sign.

One year ago when he was a brigadier general serving under Clay in Germany, Draper gave a talk to visiting American business executives criticizing United States policy of breaking up Nazi cartels. On learning of this talk, Clay reprimanded Draper.

Jefferson Still Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brilliant address entitled "Jefferson Still Lives," delivered yesterday afternoon at Cape Henry, Va., by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am greatly honored at your invitation to address this three hundred forty-first celebration of the landing of the first settlers in Virginia in April 1607.

I am happy to be here because of the historic surroundings in which we meet, from which stemmed the early activities, which resulted in the formation of the State of Virginia and the United States of America. It would be difficult to find a spot in America more intimately associated with the early history of this country and the development of its democratic institutions.

Nearly three centuries and a half have passed in kaleidoscopic review since our earliest settlers landed here.

They came in search of political, economic, and religious liberty. Upon their safe arrival, they knelt upon virgin soil and offered their thanks to a generous Providence for their deliverance. They built their rude homes and began clearance for immediate cultivation, and, when they later settled in Jamestown, which is said to be the first permanent English settlement in America, they erected their house of worship.

Thus, they linked three indispensable qualities of a full and satisfactory life, namely, the soil, the domestic shelter, and the place of worship.

Three and one-half centuries have witnessed the most marvelous development of a great people and a great nation in all the history of mankind. The ascent of man from barbarism to civilization, from ignorance to enlightenment, from brutality to the high concepts of moral obligations, has been characterized in every field by the spirit of the pioneer.

In early Virginia and early America, those who became dissatisfied with what they thought was a crowding in on the freedom of their horizons, moved gradually and constantly westward to clear more land, to build more homes, more churches, and more political institutions. This was the process that settled America. This was the process which caused our forefathers to begin that long and glamorous, though difficult, trek, which finally encompassed the settlement of the entire mid-continent, from ocean to ocean, and, in more recent years, has caused us to go even beyond our shores in carrying the flag and the institutions of freedom.

In this hasty process of clearing and exhausting land, they left widespread areas which became incapable of sustaining large populations. Our Government and our people have but recently recognized the obligation to reclaim these wasted areas and to preserve the fertility of newer regions, in order that future generations may not find themselves impoverished upon them. In a sense, therefore, we are still pioneering in the knowledge and preservation of the soil. We are still pioneering in our effort to learn the science of the soil, just as we have pioneered to learn the science of the stars and all the elements of nature.

In this gradual process of settlement in midcontinental America, our forefathers pioneered in the establishment of government. They instituted the town meeting, which was an evidence of our democracy soon to become impractical because of the size and population of our country, but, in a sense, that ancient institution, the town meeting, is still preserved in local conventions where the people still express their will by voice or show of hands.

As the population grew, and the eastern seaboard became settled, and the injustices of a fading feudal system became more clearly outlined, new conceptions of liberty inspired the people. With only approximately 3,000,000 human beings fringing the Atlantic seaboard, the Thirteen Colonies declared their independence, and the Fourth of July 1776 was immortalized by the adoption of Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, declaring that, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Jefferson was not saying that all men are created physically, mentally, financially, morally, or socially equal, because he recognized, as we all recognize, the variations in the abilities and characters of men. He was not saying that all men of any particular color, race, origin, or religion, were created equal. He was saying that all men are created equal in the right to enjoy the blessings of a free government, in which they are permitted to participate, and whose just powers are derived from their consent. As a result of the immortal inspiration which these words gave to the fighting men and women of the Revolutionary period, a new nation was created, dedicated to these principles.

It was not a perfect democracy. It was not a perfect republic, either in its origin or in its fundamental conception of human rights: After the Constitution was adopted and the Nation was established, it became necessary to establish a Bill of Rights, which was done largely under the inspiration of Thomas Jefferson, whose philosophy had inspired the hearts of the Revolutionary patriots. But, even in the establishment of that Government, our forefathers were feeling their way in the pioneering of government. Many advances, from the position then taken, have been made. They were unwilling to trust the people to elect their Senators, but, now by constitutional amendment, every citizen of every State has a right to a voice in choosing his representatives in the National Legislature.

They were unwilling to bestow upon the women the privilege of suffrage, but by constitutional amendment, we have enfranchised the women of this Nation, and, while it has not brought the millennium politically, it has been recognized as an act of fundamental justice to those who must share in every activity that contributes to the full and adequate life of the American people.

Those who pioneered in the framing of our Constitution were compelled to make compromises; and, after they had made these compromises to the extent of producing a Constitution and submitting it to the Thirteen Colonies for ratification, so outstanding a patriot as Patrick Henry opposed its ratification on the ground that it would rob the people of the liberties which they had won in the Revolution. I think it is accurate to say that in a convention of 165 delegates, the Constitution was ratified by Virginia by a majority of 9, and this favorable action was largely influenced by John Marshall, George Washington, and James Madison, and was assented to by Jefferson on the theory that a Bill of Rights would subsequently be adopted, which he sponsored. Thus, Virginia played an outstanding part in the declaration of principles upon which the Revolution was fought, played an outstanding part in the writing and adoption of the Constitution, and, has, from that day to this, played an outstanding part in the interpretation and enforcement of the laws enacted by the Congress set up under this Constitution.

While there are no new territories to discover in the sense in which this was true

800 years ago, or even 100 years ago, and while there are no vast areas of wooded lands to be cleared up for cultivation, as existed in those early days, we are still pioneering in the development of human welfare, whether it be by government or by mutual cooperation of our people in every walk of life. The words of Jefferson, "That all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," is today challenged in vast regions of the earth's surface. Notwithstanding the fact that from time immemorial, throughout all the centuries, men have fought for political, economic, and religious liberty, have fought for the right to participate in their government, have fought for the ideal that those who may be compelled to fight for liberties have a right to enjoy them, we see the hideous monster of totalitarianism creeping over the earth to snuff out these individual liberties and to render impotent the ability of the people to realize them.

Twice in the last generation the Government and the people of the United States have engaged in global warfare in defense of the immortal and fundamental doctrines, which were and are the basis of our nationality. We have expended uncounted treasure and precious human blood to vindicate the rights of man and his ability to govern himself and to guide his destiny through democratic cooperation within a nation and with other nations.

We thought we had won the fight when Germany and Japan surrendered. But, we realize more fully now than ever before that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and we are not unaware of the fact that additional sacrifices may be essential before the right of the peoples to self-determination is clinched here and throughout the world.

We hope that the principles of democracy and freedom may be established without further human sacrifices. We believe that if all nations will approach the attainment of this goal in a spirit of cooperation and accommodation, without seeking to impose their will upon peoples beyond their borders by force or chicanery, that the world can look forward to a long era of peace and happiness, and economic and social and moral development.

But, to our sorrow, we have learned that these things cannot be taken for granted. Thus, while working for peace and for the establishment of justice throughout the world, we must keep our house in order, in order that we may not be taken unawares and by a lack of enternal vigilance lose our own liberties and our ability to help others to attain and maintain theirs.

Thus, we are still pioneers physically, morally, economically, intellectually, and politically, just as we are pioneers in medicine, education, and religion, and in the development of the instrumentality for human happiness. Government can no more become static than can medicine or science. The pioneering spirit will always actuate every liberty loving people, and so, as we meet here today on the three hundred and forty-first anniversary of the landing of the original pioneers of America, let us see to it that not only our Government, but all our social, intellectual, economic, and moral relations, exercise that originality and that fearlessness which drove our forefathers across untried seas and into the unknown wilderness of physical and political development. If we can continue to do this, without making government too powerful, or politics too ambitious, we shall justify the last words of John Adams on the Fourth of July 1826, when he said, "Jefferson still lives." Jefferson does live, and he must continue to live, and all that he spoke for and represented must continue to live, if democracy and freedom themselves are to continue to live.

Housing for Atlantic City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, the Senate passed the General Housing Act. Thus housing legislation is now squarely up to us. I hope we will act on it promptly and wisely. Housing remains an acute domestic problem, and we cannot permit ourselves to use international complications as an excuse for not passing legislation for the welfare of our people at home.

This legislation is of great interest throughout my district, but I want to address myself right now to a particular problem in Atlantic City. Mayor Joseph Altman thoroughly understands his local housing problem. The Housing Authority of Atlantic City is a successful and experienced body. Stanley Holmes Village is an outstanding example of the success of public housing.

Last week I met with Mayor Altman, Robert Watson, and State Senator Farley and listened to their problems. Since June 1941, Atlantic City has had a contract with the United States to extend and further develop Stanley Holmes Village by building with Federal aid a large number of new dwelling units for lower income families. This contract, of course, had to be suspended during the war, and since the war building costs have risen so much that the price limitations fixed under the present law still prevent Atlantic City officials from going ahead.

The old law provided that $4,000 was the limit allowed for a family unit, and also fixed a limit of $1,000 per room. Everybody knows that houses cannot be built for anything like that figure. What is needed, and needed now, is an amendment permitting the cost per room to go to at least $1,500, with the discretion in the Administrator to allow $250 per room more in communities where construction costs are exceptionally high.

If the Federal law were properly amended to allow for increased building costs, Atlantic City can revive its housing project, and build the long-awaited extension of Stanley Holmes Village.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received the following letter:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Atlantic City, N. J., April 19, 1948.
Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In 1942, the Atlantic City Housing Authority purchased land from the city of Atlantic City for the purpose of building extension to the Stanley S. Holmes Village.

Since 1942 nothing has been done by the housing authority to build this sorely needed addition to alleviate crowded living conditions, due to war conditions, material, labor, etc.

Can you use your good office, for the benefit of our people, to stimulate legislative action that will enable appropriation to warrant completion of this necessary project?

Friendly yours,
JOSEPH ALTMAN, *Mayor.*

My answer to this letter is that I will do everything within my power to help the mayor and commissioners of Atlantic City, and their Housing Authority, to get the legislation they need. I expect to confer with the United States Housing Authority on this subject at once. I believe I can obtain their cooperation. I, personally, know the great need for this project in Atlantic City, and I know the local administration is anxious to start building.

Mr. Speaker, I call this to the attention of the House because many other Members must have the same problem in their localities, and I urge them to join with me in the effort to get real effective housing legislation passed at this session.

Pertinent Facts on the Over-All Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr Speaker, at this time both Houses of Congress are giving consideration to what we generally call long-time agricultural legislation. It is imperative that on a question so far-reaching as the question of agricultural legislation that all who have occasion to cast his vote have in his possession all of the information possible in connection with this pending legislation.

Mr. Carl H. Wilken, of Sioux City, Iowa, an outstanding economic analyst, who has spent his entire life in the study of farm problems testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on Friday, April 23, and under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith his statement as given before that committee, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council, of Sioux City, Iowa. During the past 11 years, I have devoted full time to an impartial study of the effect of farm prices upon the economic welfare of the American people.

My purpose in appearing before this committee is to give you the benefit of our studies in connection with a permanent farm program. Any criticism which I may make is entirely the result of factual studies and I have no personal interest, political or otherwise.

In 1938 I appeared before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and pointed out specifically that the answer to our so-called farm problem, which is in reality our national economic problem, was an average of 100 percent parity for our annual farm production. My reason for that statement was a study of the record which reveals that for each $1 of gross farm income we will have $7 of national income. This turn of gross farm income is in reality an efficiency ratio and the seven times turn has been a practical constant for 25 years.

Since that time I have repeatedly pointed out this ratio to committees of Congress with the hope that some committee would take the time to check it for accuracy. I believe that if this committee had made such a study the approach would have been entirely different than S. 2318.

In commenting on the bill which you have before you, I want to point out that our farm production at the present time at the parity level assures a national income of $200,000,000,000. This means that each 1 percent of parity for agriculture means $2,000,000,000 of national income. In addition, each 1 percent of parity means 1 percent of employment in our nonagricultural industries and 1 percent consumption of goods.

In other words, legislation which results in only 90 percent of parity will mean a loss of $20,000,000,000 in national income, 10 percent unemployment in nonagricultural industries, and a drop of 10 percent in over-all consumption of goods produced. I feel, therefore, that this legislation is the most important of any legislation before Congress. Whether we pay the farmer an average of 100 percent parity is going to determine whether we remain a solvent and prosperous Nation as a foundation for a more prosperous and peaceful world.

PARITY EQUATION

My first step is to analyze the parity equation. The true equation of parity is the simple and direct relationship between prices paid by the farmer and the prices he receives. Any other additions will tend to dislocate the equation and bring about inaccuracy in computing parity prices.

For example, in the Agricultural Situation, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for February 1948, they list the price the farmer paid as 263 percent of the 1910-14 level the base period now being used. They give the price the farmer received during the same period as 279 percent. Dividing the prices paid into prices received, true parity on a basis of relative prices was 106 percent.

Under the present method of computing parity, taxes and interest are included. Using this index the farmer paid 248 percent of the 1910–14 period and received 279 percent. Using this formula the parity in February was 112 percent. The thing I wish to point out is that the inclusion of interest and taxes are short-changing the farmer 6 percent, in the calculation for parity which is now being used.

There has been some agitation to include labor in figuring farm parity. The record would indicate that the inclusion of interest, taxes, and labor in a parity formula are unnecessary and tend to confuse and disrupt its accuracy. I can readily understand how this demand has come about. The Department of Agriculture in testimony before some of the committees has made the point that the farmer is receiving much less than the industrial worker. It is evident that they haven't considered all the factors.

Again, for example, in the Agricultural Situation, in December 1947, they list industrial wages at 469 percent of the 1910–14 level. If this is compared with 301 percent, the price the farmer received in December, it appears at first glance that the farmer is receiving too low a price. But, the efficiency of labor is included in the wages received. To obtain a comparative wage for the farmer, the units of gross farm production have to be multiplied by price. In 1910–14 the gross farm production was worth approximately $7,100,000,000. In 1947, deducting Government payments and rentals, the gross farm income was approximately $32,000,000,000 or 450 percent of the 1910–14 income. If this in turn is corrected to apply to a smaller number of farmers producing farm products at the present time, wages for men in industry and agriculture are in approximate balance.

In calculating parity with the use of the direct price relationship, wages, interest, taxes, management, capital overhead, and a normal profit are automatically included in the price of finished goods the farmer buys. If farm prices are adjusted to a direct relationship with the price he pays, these factors are automatically included, and are always quite current.

I would like to call attention of the committee that we have in reality two parity equations. One, the monetary parity and the other the commodity parity. After a period of price stability they should be the same. For example, in 1925–29 the price of gold was $20.67 per ounce and commodities had a certain relationship to an ounce of gold. At the present time the price of gold as a result of the Bretton Woods Agreement is $35 per ounce. Therefore, true parity in terms of our monetary unit is 169 percent of the 1925–29 price level for all commodities. The prices paid by the farmer in February were an index of 263. Translating the gold parity to a comparative 1910–14 index, the result would be 261.95 percent. You will note that in February the prices paid by the farmer were at parity with the monetary measuring stick and in terms of commodities. If the prices received in February had been 262 percent of 1910–14, his percent of parity would have been 100.

In passing, I would like to point out that our present price level is not particularly inflationary. We have moved into a new price level approximately 210 percent above the 1935–39 average. This need not cause any great alarm. We have had similar happenings in the past. During the 1925–29 period in order to maintain full employment and prosperity, we had a price level 155 percent above the 1910–14 period.

With a much larger public debt resulting from World War II than from World War I, we will require our present farm price level, which is generating approximately $200,000,000,000 of national income at the parity level, if we wish to remain solvent and have full employment and prosperity.

PARITY PRICES DO NOT COST ANYTHING

The second point I wish to make is that parity prices for farm products because of the seven times turn of gross farm income into national income, do not cost society anything and do not increase the percentage of income spent for food. For example, in the 10-year period 1930–39, with farm prices averaging about 82 percent of parity, 1929 as 100, we had 81-percent employment. The public spent 24.28 percent of the national income for food (U. S. Department of Commerce). In 1946 with farm prices at parity and a little above we had full employment and the public spent 24.1 percent of its income for food. In addition for 24.1 percent of the income spent for food in 1946 the public received approximately 20 percent more goods per capita than they received in 1935–39. In other words, farm prices at parity give the public the maximum amount of units of food for the percentage of income spent for food.

Therefore if we permit farm prices to drop back to 82 percent of parity we will lose approximately 18 percent of $200,000,000,000 of national income and approximately the same amount of food consumption, bringing us back to 1935–39 levels.

ADJUSTABLE LOAN SUPPORTS

It would appear from the bill which has been prepared that the committee has proceeded on the theory that it would cost less to support farm prices with a sliding scale operating between a floor of 60 percent and a ceiling of 90 percent.

Averaging the income of the farmer at the various production and price support levels on page 38 of S. 2318, the farmer if he receives those prices at the production level used will have an average of 73.4 percent of parity. With each 1 percent of farm parity representing $2,000,000,000 of national income the average of national income would be approximately $146,800,000,000, or a loss of approximately $53,000,000,000 per year. Such a loss would force the United States into a depression and in turn this would precipitate world chaos.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Our experts have made a similar error in promoting a world wheat agreement which establishes a floor at $1.10 per bushel on wheat at the end of 5 years. One dollar and ten cents per bushel for wheat is approximately 50 percent of parity, and if that price is permitted to become the price of wheat, instead of $200,000,000,000 of national income we will have $100,000,000,000. Instead of reducing our price level to that of the buying power of the rest of the world, which in the case of the European nations under ERP is one-fourth of ours, the American price level must become the yardstick for world prices in ratio to present parity, or 169 percent above the 1925–29 price level.

If the rest of the world is to have a higher standard of living, they must have as a foundation a proper price for farm products. With 45 percent of the income of the world in the United States, the rest of the world cannot have prosperity without a prosperous United States, and, in turn, the United States cannot have prosperity without an average of 100 percent of parity for agricultural products.

Proper legislation should be based on the concept of a 90-percent-of-parity floor and an indirect ceiling of 110 percent—a condition which would automatically prevail if we had a flexible tariff at the parity level and 90 percent support prices. This would permit an average of parity.

The matter of proper farm prices is primarily a psychological factor. In 1947 we bought up $2,000,000,000 of gold at a price 69 percent above the 1925–29 price level for gold. If we will use the same psychology in supporting the price of basic nonperishable farm products at 100 percent of parity, or 169 percent of the 1925–29 level, we cannot have a depression in the United States with present farm production.

THE SEVEN TIMES TURN OF FARM INCOME

I realize that the committee will have the question: Which comes first, the $1 of gross farm income or the $7? During the past 10 years I have carefully traced through the relationship that exists between all groups in our economy. I am willing at any time to appear before this committee, with Dr. John Lee Coulter as a helper, and go through the detailed analysis of the farm-price equation. Last year, at the request of about 25 Members of Congress, I prepared our material in book form under the title "Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way" and mailed a copy of it to all Members of the Congress and the Senate. In this book I analyze each major segment of our economy in detail.

Briefly, the reason for the precedence of farm income can be found in the fact that 70 percent of all consumer goods consist of food, tobacco, beverage, and clothing. A drop in farm prices is almost immediately reflected in a loss in dollar exchange in 70 percent of our economy and a depression is inevitable.

In conclusion, for the record I wish to make the statement that if this type of legislation is passed, it will in a few years force the United States into a depression. The United States cannot afford to permit basic farm products to go below 90 percent of parity as a minimum. It's not a question of what it will cost. With 1 percent of farm parity representing $2,000,000,000 of national income, it

becomes a question of how much we will lose if we don't. It is much better to spend $1,000,000,000 in supporting farm prices at parity than to lose fifty to one hundred billion dollars of national income because of our failure to support them.

On the basis of my studies, I would suggest that Congress extend the present farm supports at 90 percent of parity and make a more careful check of the importance of farm prices. The records are available for such a study.

If such a study is made, the committee will find that all segments of our economy run at an almost constant percentage of the whole and in direct ratio to gross farm income. Lower price levels do not affect these ratios, and as gross farm income rises and falls, retail sales volume, total wages paid to labor, etc., rise and fall in direct proportion.

As an example, I would like to illustrate by using the total wages and salaries paid out in 1929 and 1946. Total wages for 1929–46 increased 121 percent. Expenditures for food increased 120 percent. These two factors always remain in balance. It is due to a simple law of exchange in which the producer is also the consumer.

I wish to thank the committee for their time, and I wish to stress the simple fact that for every $1 of farm income which is lost because of improper legislation the Nation will lose $7. Once this fact is understood by the public, we will be in a position to avoid future depressions.

Atom Scientists Hit Un-American Activities Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 23, 1948:

ATOM SCIENTISTS HIT UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES GROUP

CHICAGO, April 23.—The Atomic Scientists of Chicago said today that many of its members are severely critical of the House Un-American Activities Committee and believe it might discourage scientists from working for the Government.

The society, which represents scientists who worked on the Manhattan atom bomb project, conducted a poll among 103 of its members. Thirty-nine percent were directly critical of the committee, it said, while 33 percent objected to the committee's report on Dr. Edward U. Condon.

The House group charged that Dr. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, was one of the "weakest links in our atomic security chain." Dr. Condon denied the accusation and an Atomic Energy Commission loyalty check cleared him.

Three-fourths of the scientists polled said they would either decline or be reluctant to accept any Government job as the result of the committee's treatment of Dr. Condon.

Eighty-five percent said they agreed security measures were necessary but a majority said accused scientists deserved a fair trial.

They held that a man accused of disloyalty should be given the opportunity of defending himself.

Twelve percent said the committee's method in the Dr. Condon case made them decide to turn down Government offers, while 63 percent said they would be reluctant to take such jobs.

Eighteen percent said the committee's attitude toward Dr. Condon would drive the Nation's best scientific talent out of Government research.

What the World Wants Most

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject What the World Wants Most, delivered by Dr. Ralph W. Sockman. In the present charged atmosphere of more and more talk about the inevitability of war the Congress and the country should read a strong and beautiful sermon on peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two months ago we began our study of the Beatitudes. Through the irony of fate or through the leading of Providence, we have reached at this particular time the seventh Beatitude: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." When could these words of Our Lord come to us with more searching timeliness?

In a recent radio hour a questionnaire was submitted as to what the world wanted most from America. The answer arrived at was peace. And yet the sentiment everywhere seems to be that we are drifting steadily toward war. Our press headlines point almost daily to signs of its coming. Some news commentators, rather irresponsible ones to be sure, convey the impression that we will be at war within 60 days.

And now amid all these rumors of war we hear the words of Jesus: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Shall we dismiss this Beatitude as an idle dream, or can we do something about it?

There is an old Chinese proverb that the longest journey begins with the first step. The Christian peacemaker starts with God and himself. It is not accidental, in my opinion, that Christ's blessing on the peacemakers follows directly his Beatitude on the pure in heart. The Epistle of James sees the connection between purity of heart and peacemaking when it says, "The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."

We are so frequently told by professional patrioteers that there are some things which come before peace, and that one of these things is liberty. It is better, they say, to die on one's feet than to live on one's knees. Of course we should prize liberty. And certainly we should not grovel on our knees before dictators and regimentation. But according to the Bible there is something comes before both liberty and peace. And that something is righteousness. Purity of heart is the soil from which peacemaking stems. And not so many of our fellowmen would have to die on their feet as soldiers if more of us would first get on our knees before God to seek His righteousness.

James in his Epistle says, "Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" To be sure, it is an oversimplification of our world situation to imply that the warring passions within ourselves cause the present tensions between nations. There are economic, ideological, and dynastic issues. Nevertheless, just as we can study the elements of the ocean in a drop of sea spray, so we can see the root-causes of war-making by observing the tensions within ourselves. Furthermore, the unsettled conflicts of the inner life feed into the currents of international strife. The person whose own passions are out of control makes for restlessness around him. The man who is frustrated or feels inferior is ready material for the demagogue and the agitator. The person who thinks himself handicapped by poverty or injustice is an easy prey to communism or fascism. Personal pride and greed, fear and envy are easily fanned into national and class struggles.

Thomas à Kempis was therefore right when he said, "First keep thyself in peace and then thou shalt be able to keep peace among others." The peacemaker must first be pure in heart, which we tried to show last week means a will single to the good, an eye single to the good and the true, and a mind single to the good, the true and the beautiful. When we attain such inner purity of heart, there begins to steal over us what the Bible calls "the peace of God which passeth all understanding." Yes, it can come even in a world as tense and warlike as ours.

On the last night of his life, in the very shadow of the cross Our Lord said to his disciples, "My peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth, give I unto you." There is a peace of mind which the world cannot give or take away. And blessed are we if we make peace in our own hearts by being so in tune with God that like the apostle we cannot be separated from him "by death nor life, * * * nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come."

Having started with God and himself, the Christian peacemaker proceeds to radiate peace through God and his neighbor. The test of whether we are at peace with God is whether we spread peace among others. "If a man say, 'I love God' and hateth his brother, he is a liar, for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" Such is John's plain blunt way of putting it, and no sophistry can soften his statement. Jesus was equally direct, saying, "He that gathereth not with me scattereth." There is a centrifugal force of selfishness which separates men, and there is a centripetal force of love which unites them. And as between those two forces, there is no neutrality. We are either gatherers with the Christ-Spirit or scatterers with the devilish divisive forces.

The Christian peacemaker is a reconciling, gathering force through his very thoughts. Having pure motives in his own mind, he imputes worthy motives to others, giving the benefit of the doubt wherever possible. He lives in the presence of high ideals, which make angry disputes seem mean. In chemistry there are certain elements that will combine only when a third element is present, which, however, does not enter into the combination itself. These assisting elements are called catalyzers. The peacemakers often serve the purpose of human catalyzers. By their presence even though silent, they help others to get together.

By his words as well as by his thoughts, the peacemaker is a reconciling influence. He speaks his convictions when a moral issue is drawn. He enters into controversies to correct falsehood, but "speaking truth in love he grows up into him in all things

who is the head, even Christ." There are three levels of conversations. The highest is talk about ideas; the second highest is talk about things; the lowest is talk about persons. The peacemaker keeps above personalities in his conversations and controversies, seeking the truth without disrespect to those who differ with him, counteracting prejudice, suspicion and hatred by the sanity of his mind and the sympathy of his heart.

Not only by his thoughts and words but also by his deeds, the peacemaker is a gatherer rather than a scatterer. He does not merely discuss the problem of brotherhood between races and religions and nations, but he enters into experiences of fellowship with individuals of other groups. He prepares for world citizenship by practicing the principles of brotherhood in his own community, for he knows that if we cannot get along with our neighbors, it is futile to plan for a family of nations, and if we cannot keep our word as man to man, we cannot expect treaties to be sacred between nation and nation. The peacemaker takes seriously the words of our Lord which Matthew puts in the same chapter with the Beatitudes. They are familiar in sound but not in practice. Listen: "I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven."

Pretty searching commands, aren't they? But if we are to be children of God—and that is what the peacemakers are to be—we must obey them. And the only hope of keeping such commandments is by feeling ourselves children of a loving Heavenly Father. Only the sense of God's fatherhood can beget the family feeling in our local neighborhood and in our world community.

Perhaps you have grown impatient with me for spending so much time in stressing that the peacemaker must begin with God and himself and then work with God and his neighbor. You want to know how the peacemaker can stop war between nations? Well, I have been in Washington this week attending an interdenominational conference of church leaders called to stem the drift toward war. The churchmen recognize the menace of totalitarianism, but are convinced that the method of dealing with such ideas is not by resort to armed force but by the strengthening of social and political democracy, safeguarded by international law. They believe it is more realistic and effective in this atomic age to start our citizens thinking than to set our schoolboys marching. The church leaders interviewed many of our lawmakers and found them deeply concerned, and eager to represent the will of the people. If this is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, we the people must so think, talk, and practice peace that the contagion of our peace-mindedness will counteract the war-mindedness which has gripped the leading governments of the world. Peacemaking cannot be delegated to professional diplomats and professional soldiers. Peacemaking is your business and mine, and it must start at the grass roots.

What can you and I do when we project our peacemaking duty out to the realm of God and the nations?

For one thing, the peacemaker can and must keep his conscience with God. Now, if ever, the church and synagogue must show that they are guideposts of God and not mere weathervanes veering with gusty popular opinion. This Nation was founded by men who put into the Constitution that each citizen holds his conscience directly subject to God. Our founding fathers believed in the sovereignty of God and from that basic doctrine stem our ideas of right and our ideals of our rights. You and I must take our ideas of right from God as God gives us to see the right and not from popular polls. And certainly not from the Kremlin in Moscow. If the Kremlin adopts certain tactics, that does not make them right for us, and insofar as dictators induce us to copy their methods, they are conquering us by contagion. America is a so-called Christian Nation; the Soviet Union is run by a professedly godless Government. Is the world to see any difference in the tactics of the two nations? The Christian peacemaker says the world must see a difference, that our Nation which professes belief in God shall so conduct its domestic and foreign policies that the peoples which sit in the darkness of fear and poverty and hunger shall see a great light in our good works and glorify our Father which is in Heaven.

The peacemaker must keep not only his conscience with God but his head also. Anne O'Hare McCormick, writing a week ago in the New York Times, interpreted the recent Soviet actions in Berlin as a sign of recklessness. She said, "Anger, disappointment, and fear are not good counselors." How true. But remember, anger, disappointment, and fear are not good counselors in America any more than in Russia. We must not let our minds be clouded by them. We need an informed public opinion rather than an inflamed public opinion.

News commentators, press columnists, public officials, yes all of us, in private conversation and in public utterance, must beware lest we yield to the temptation of playing upon popular passions and fears. Of course, it is more popular to arouse anger and suspicion than to generate sanity and sympathy. We preachers know that it is easier to stir people against something than for something. It is the same psychology that draws thousands of people to see a fellow knocked out in a prize fight while only a few medical students go around to the hospital the next day to see him put together again. But the need of our broken world is for healing rather than for hating. The Christian peacemaker seeks the truth as free as possible from prejudice and passion, and is honest enough to follow the facts when he finds them. He knows that we must keep our heads lest we lose our lives.

Moreover, the peacemaker keeps his heart with God as well as his conscience and his head. By our means of communication the world has been reduced to a stage so small that we view all parts of it every day. But in condensing our world, we have condensed our news of it. On my visits to Europe the past two summers I discovered that the people there are not getting a true and adequate picture of America. And we are not getting the full picture of other countries. We therefore need imagination to see the human beings behind the headlines. We need to see the homes and hearths of foreign peoples, the hungry children and the haggard parents. We need imagination to supplement our information.

Yes, we need the kind of sensitized imagination which our Lord had when he so identified Himself with the poor, the weak, the outcasts, that He could say, "Whosoever hath done it unto one of the least of these hath done it unto Me." We must cultivate the Christlike art of putting ourselves in the places of other persons wherever they live. If a curtain were drawn across this studio I could not see from level gaze the persons at the other end of the room. But if there were a mirror in the ceiling I could look up into the mirror and thereby be able to look down into the places of those who sit behind the curtain. The world today is divided by curtains. But every time we look up to God the Father of all men, it is as if we were gazing into a mirror in the ceiling and that should help us to see better into the places of those who live in London or Rome or Moscow or Nanking. Today in our churches, aye in this service right now, we should be sensitizing our imaginations the better to see and feel how life looks to those in other lands.

The Christian peacemaker wants to help the needy of Europe and China not through fear but through Christlike charity. He desires to see the war-devastated lands restored to decency because we are brothers of the French and the Italians and not because we are enemies of the Russians or any other people. And he believes that if we keep pure our motives of relief abroad and keep sound our democracy at home, the frightened peoples of western Europe and the Orient will eventually look to Christian America and not to Communist Russia for light and hope. And remember, there is no victory unless the victors win the minds and hearts of men.

And if we keep our conscience and head and heart with God, we need not lose heart in this work of peacemaking. During the last war Leon Blum, former French Premier, was imprisoned by the Nazis. In his prison he wrote a book, All for Mankind, in which he said: "Nothing established by violence and maintained by force, nothing that degrades humanity and is based on contempt for personality, can endure." If Leon Blum, a great Jew, can hold to such a magnificent faith, certainly the Christian can do no less. And if communistic totalitarianism like nazism contains these evils, as we believe, then it cannot endure.

And if our Bible is not a book of false promises and Christ was not a deluded dreamer, then we can have faith that truth and justice will eventually triumph, that might does not make right nor long secure it, that war is not inevitable, that race for armaments does not insure peace, that world government can be established in God's family of nations, and that evil can be overcome with good. I, for one, refuse to believe that Christ went to the cross for a false hope. I still believe in Jesus Christ as King of Kings and Lord of Lords. And if he is the Prince of Peace, then "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God."

Prayer: O God of peace and grace, who hath made all Thy children of one blood, beget in us the spirit of brotherhood and teach us the ways of trust. Keep our own motives pure that we shall not imput meanness to our fellowmen. Help us so to love our own Nation that we shall make her beloved by others. Move the hearts of rulers to spare their people the misery of war and turn the instruments of hate into the tools of helpfulness that hunger and fear may give way to hope and happiness. Guide and strengthen the United Nations that the homeless may find homes and the restless may find peace. And O God, take each one of us into Thy keeping; we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Problems of Independent Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, independent bankers of the country have formed an association to oppose monopoly in the field of finance and generally to protect the interests of independent bankers. On February 24, 1948, the executive council of the association held a meeting in Washington for the purpose of considering its problems and conferring with representatives of the Congress and the Government of the United

States on legislation affecting the national financial system. At a dinner held at the Willard Hotel, at the close of the meeting, Mr. L. B. McBride, president of the association, delivered an address which will be of interest to all of us who wish to preserve a sound American banking system.

I ask unanimous consent to have the able address delivered by Mr. McBride printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Having introduced ourselves and our guests, it now seems appropriate briefly to endeavor to introduce our association.

Ours is an organization conceived in justice, necessity, and common interest; born of those basic principles of Americanism, without the continuance of which the America we have known cannot long endure; nurtured by those who still believe in that freedom of opportunity, which has been the bulwark of our civilization and which cannot long survive the competition of monopoly, private or public.

From a small beginning in a single State, we have grown to include banks in 11 of the 12 Federal Reserve Districts. Ours is an organization of small, generally corporate, enterprisers. Historically this has been a Nation of enterprisers. Monopoly does not pioneer, rather it invades only proven fields.

Of course, most of our landed frontiers have been taken into possession. But our frontiers in science, invention, and discovery—frontiers of the mind and of the soul—have hardly been touched. If the present trend toward monopoly be continued, one well may be concerned lest these frontiers never shall be developed.

Some 36 years ago—in 1912—the Toronto Star had this to say, editorially:

"To this accursed system of centralized capital and destruction of local industry, Canada stands indebted for a contracted population of 7,000,000 instead of 25,000,000 rightfully due it under a decentralized system of banks designed to sustain, to breathe the breath of life through the remotest, as well as the most insulated of its parts." But Canada did not do anything about it.

Of all monopolies, that of finance is the worst, because finance lies at the very root of all enterprise. Under the spell of monopoly, we rapidly are becoming a nation of employees. Enterprises, not employees, developed and built this Nation.

It is this monopolistic closing of the frontiers of opportunity—this reduction of our people to the status of employees—that destroys our sense of security and results in our growing demand for state socialism. Private monopoly affords a sure foundation for the demand for State socialism and State monopoly provides no real answer for any problem.

Already state socialism has asserted itself in all too many parts of the world, nor is our own fair land exempt from its presence or from loud clamor for its extension. Already state socialism has invaded our field of finance—and that by act of Congress.

Many Government-owned agencies and corporations have entered the banking field. Numerous other corporations and agencies have competed in that field with more or less Government support, including tax exemption.

Private monopoly in finance expresses itself in many forms, particularly including branch banking and the control of many banks through the instrumentality of holding companies. If our little bank could spread itself over most of Colorado, I assure you we would make Fort Collins a much better town—and that at the expense of our neighbors.

That size and strength are synonymous terms is an argument long since exploded by many a practical demonstration in times of stress.

Now pending in Congress is a bill ordinarily known as the banking holding company bill. In the Senate it is known as S. 829. It has had the unanimous approval of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, after lengthy public hearings. Either the bill itself or the doctrine it proposes, have been approved by 10 State bankers associations. It was indorsed by the supervisors of State banks at their meeting held in this city last fall.

From my point of view, that bill is not nearly as strong as it should be. But it does propose to place bank holding companies under some Government supervision. It would limit holding companies to the holding of bank stocks, if they are to hold bank stocks at all. It should be stronger—but it is a step in the right direction. We sincerely hope it may be enacted into law.

Some time ago this bill was submitted to the membership of the National Federation of Small Businesses, Inc. I understand it was approved by some 96 percent of those so voting.

Recently I received a letter from a student of the University of Indiana, who asked, among other things, for information relative to this association. Of course I was glad to reply and, in my closing paragraph, said this:

"The battle which the Independent Bankers Association is trying to fight—and in which it is making all too little progress—is a battle for the preservation of that which really is America. It is an effort to retain the fundamental freedoms of this Nation. It is an undertaking in which every forward-looking young person has a very vital stake. In short, it is your fight."

Gentlemen of the Senate: On behalf of the rank and file of Americans—the vast majority of our people—permit me to say to you that we are being ground between the two millstones of monopoly: Private on the one hand; public on the other. There is little we can do about it. There is much you can do about it.

Ours has been and is the greatest Nation on earth. Whether this is to be true a generation or two hence, well may depend on present conduct and decisions. These decisions must find expression through the Congress of the United States.

We have the same confidence in you today that we had when we joined with millions of our fellow Americans in placing you under that heavy responsibility that now is yours. The future of this Nation is in your hands. These are days of vital decisions.

International Trade Organization and the Reciprocal Trade Program Are Supplementary to the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Mr. C. Tyler Wood, deputy to the assistant secretary for economic affairs, before the New Jersey forum on the United Nations, Friday, March 12, 1948, which emphasizes the importance of the proposed International Trade Organization and the extensions of the reciprocal trade agreements program in the expansion of world trade based upon a revival of production in Europe attainable through the European recovery program:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION AND THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

In the Department of State we are constantly aware of the fact that foreign policy logically falls into two categories—long-term and short-term. The long-term policies are those which are as stable and as permanent as the traditions of the American people. They are the guideposts of our democracy. In order to meet the ever-changing world situation, however, we are constantly formulating short-term policies which involve a myriad of day-to-day negotiations with other nations and peoples. These short-term policies, in order to be effective, must always lie within the structure of our long-term policies and must always reflect the desires and aspirations of the American people. They must be administered within the framework of established traditions and the constitutional processes of this democracy.

The European recovery program essentially involves short-term policy. It is a plan to assist the 16 nations who are working together to achieve a self-sustaining economy in Europe by a definite date—1952. To the extent, however, that the individual and cooperative efforts of these nations result in monetary and fiscal reforms, and in the extension of trading areas through customs unions, the results of the European recovery program will be long-run results. Furthermore, the success of the European recovery program will have substantial meaning far beyond 1952 in terms of the prosperity which nations of the world will be able to enjoy and the atmosphere of security in which to enjoy it. Nevertheless, the European recovery program is an immediate and relatively short-term operation.

Of a more clearly long-term nature is our active participation in the founding of the United Nations and our continuing support of it. Here is a clear example of a determination now and for the longer future to pursue with other nations a policy of seeking to create a peaceful world founded on principles of justice, tolerance, and respect for the rights of others. One of the reasons for this policy is the close parallel between the principles on which our country was founded and the motives which called this new Organization into being. We believe that the United Nations provides man with his best hope for a just and peaceful world; we have given it our vigorous support, and we shall continue to do so.

Recognizing that mutual economic problems as well as political differences require cooperative solution if peace is to be preserved, the United States supported inclusion in the United Nations of an Economic and Social Council. This agency coordinates the work of a number of existing specialized international economic agencies and has sponsored the creation of new ones as needed. One of the agencies which it is sponsoring is the proposed International Trade Organization. While the machinery of ITO is necessarily intricate the underlying objective can be simply stated. It seeks to establish economic rules of fair play that are designed to create an expanded and mutually profitable world trade. It is based on the belief that people can accomplish more by working together than they can by working at cross purposes. To understand fully the vital role the International Trade Organization will assume, it is necessary to review some of the factors which called it into being.

Between the two World Wars, most nations applied increasingly rigid controls on foreign trade in what they conceived to be their own

interest and with little regard to the effect on others. When other nations felt such controls injured or discriminated against them, they retaliated in kind. Some deliberately used trade controls and currency manipulations to wage economic warfare for aggressive purposes. Whatever the motive, the result was a whirlpool pattern of restrictive action and counteraction that constricted trade within progressively narrowing limits. This was the dangerous trend that the United States sought to reverse by means of reciprocal trade agreements—a purpose it achieved with some degree of success until the outbreak of war brought almost all normal trade to an abrupt halt.

Increased trade barriers in various important parts of the world resulted from the war and its after affects. The war left many countries from their production severely curtailed. Their import needs were greater, but their ability to export was less. The United States was almost the only source from which many supplies could be obtained. Many countries thus had to buy from the United States, at a time when their dollar resources were dwindling, and found themselves forced to exclude all imports but those most urgently needed.

It also became necessary for the countries under greatest pressure to stop paying out dollars freely in exchange for their own currency. This meant virtually an end to one country's buying more from another than it sold to that country, and an end to financing the difference out of surplus accumulations of some third currency. Each country was faced with a need to strike a separate balance in its trade with nearly every other country. All the adjustments in this balancing process are downward—progressively and inexorably down to the levels of exports of those countries which have the smallest volume of goods to export. This process has a tremendous effect in reducing total trade volume. At the same time it eliminates normal competitive market forces in the choice of sources of supply, opens the way to all kinds of noneconomic pressures diverting the natural flow of goods, and sharply undercuts the resulting living standards of all concerned.

Probably no nation imposing these restrictive measures has the illusion that they are sound and offer a way out of its economic difficulties. There has been too much past experience with restrictionism for such measures to have any standing as more than temporary expedients. The difficulty is, however, that once forced into the grip of the restrictions required by the effort to balance separately their trade accounts with each other nation—a procedure called bilateralism—few nations have the economic strength single-handed to reverse the process and to win their way back to multilateral trade. Consequently, grave danger existed that the vicious system of bilateralism might become permanently fastened upon the world to the great detriment, not only of those countries caught in the toils of the system, but of our own interests in the United States as well.

The United States alone possessed the economic strength to lead the way back. We therefore made the initial suggestion that an international and coordinated attack on existing trade barriers be made by as many countries as possible. We urged that this international effort be under the sponsorship of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The Council has effectively guided the work of the past 2 years which has been designed to reduce present barriers to trade and to limit the restrictions on the trade of the future.

Real and heartening progress has been made. In the first place, we are now very close to securing international agreement to a set of principles of fair conduct of trade, including rules limiting as narrowly as possible the use of nontariff barriers to trade, such as quantitative quota restrictions, discriminatory internal taxes, burdensome customs regulations and the like. These principles of fair conduct are embodied in a draft charter for an International Trade Organization, which also includes a plan for an organization to interpret and watch over enforcement of the rules. Secondly, we have secured agreement with 22 other nations on wide-spread specific reductions in tariffs and other reductions of trade barriers. The tariff reductions and other concessions are contained in the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

As to the first of these—the International Trade Organization—the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment at Habana is bringing to a successful close the long and arduous task of drafting the Charter, which has initially proposed by the American Government in November 1945. Before becoming effective, the Habana Charter will have to be submitted to the governments concerned for their acceptance.

Analysis of the draft Charter, which is necessarily complex and technical in view of the wide range and nature of the subject matter with which it deals, would take more time than is available here tonight. I can, however, emphasize the fact that what the Charter contains is important to every producer and consumer in this country. The basic purpose of the proposed ITO, is to assure the orderly and mutually profitable development of world trade. It is designed to provide a recognized authority, with agreed rules and procedures, to guide the conduct of nations in their economic dealings. It is intended to curb selfish and willful economic actions which would disturb trade relationships and prove harmful to the common cause of peace and prosperity. It foresees reduction of artificial barriers to trade and elimination of arbitrary restraints that impede the natural flow and expansion of world trade. In short, the ITO is another and important element in the cooperative effort to integrate the resources, energies, and wills of all peoples to build a better, peaceful world.

Without waiting for the establishment of the ITO, a direct attack was made last summer at Geneva on a wide range of specific tariff barriers. A general agreement on tariffs and trade was negotiated by the United States and 22 other nations. The countries concerned account for more than three-fourths of all international trade. By the terms of this agreement, concessions were made by the 23 countries on products accounting for two-thirds of their trade. These concessions comprised reductions in duties on some products, guaranties not to increase prevailing low rates on others, and the binding of existing free treatment of still others.

We are particularly glad also that the general agreement eliminates or reduces many trade preferences. In the past the system of preferences has too often meant that because our produce was required to pay higher duty than like produce of preferred areas, our goods were shut out entirely from formerly large markets. This situation will now be greatly improved.

The United States obtained tariff reductions from other countries on products that in 1939 accounted for $500,000,000 of our exports. In exchange we granted tariff reductions on products that constituted about $500,000,000 of our imports in 1939. We also bound, i. e., agreed not to increase, existing rates of duty or free entry on approximately $1,250,000,000 of our 1939 imports and obtained similar concessions from other countries to a substantially equivalent extent. All in all this agreement, with its appropriate general provisions, is a landmark in commercial history.

The agreement has already been made effective by countries conducting about 85 percent of the total trade of the negotiating group, and the others will no doubt join in applying the agreement as soon as their constitutional procedures permit. Meantime, other countries may secure permanent enjoyment of the rates negotiated under the general agreement on tariffs and trade by themselves negotiating equivalent tariff concessions with the countries which concluded the agreement.

The United States is giving effect to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which has been an established element of American policy since 1934, when it was fathered and first administered by Mr. Cordell Hull. The act, as you know, authorizes the President within specified procedures to exchange selective concessions in United States tariffs for equivalent concessions from other countries.

Special emphasis is placed on the influence which our activity under this program has had upon the trade policies of other countries. First, in exchange for every concession we have made, other countries have made concessions in return, so that in all cases at least one other country's tariff has been liberalized. Moreover, when the authority is used for participation in simultaneous negotiations among a number of countries all of the participating countries negotiate additional tariff concessions among themselves, further promoting the lowering of tariffs and trade barriers throughout the world. That is exactly what was done at Geneva in the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

The opening up of world markets achieved by this agreement benefits the American economy in two ways. It helps to guarantee the future of American export trade. It helps also to bring about the greater imports which the United States should look forward to consuming in the future. Full production and higher consumption levels by our growing population call for a greater supply of all goods, including imports. Ultimately the continuation of efficient levels of production in American industries producing for export also depends upon expansion of imports. In addition, such expansion will mean more outlets for reviving European production and a speedier end to our recovery assistance. In short, it is in our own interest that imports, which since the war have lagged exceptionally far behind exports, be brought into better balance with exports.

The measures of which I have been speaking—the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the International Trade Organization—will not bring about improvement in the world's business affairs overnight. We do not expect, and do not want, for example, to increase exports beyond their present level, but, rather, to insure against a sharp curtailment of markets a few years hence. Also, these measures must be used in conjunction with other international agencies, such as the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, and the Food and Agriculture Organization, in the laborious task of undoing the mischief caused by unrestrained economic nationalism and intensified by the destructive forces of war. The fact is that the mechanism of world trade has been well-nigh wrecked, and it will require the utmost patience, good will, and industry to put it in good repair and get it into efficient operation again.

Freer world trade will lead to a great expansion in the production, distribution, and consumption of goods throughout the world, which is in the interest of all countries, including our own. The world's needs are neither constant nor fixed. Trade grows on trade. Sound development of the world's resources, wherever located, increases world trade. The United States is now the world's greatest industrial nation. Nevertheless, we have nothing to lose and everything to gain from the sound industrialization of other peaceful nations. The highly developed nations have always been our best customers.

Finally, and most important, is the fact that an expanded world trade will bring not only a greater degree of prosperity, but with it a strengthening of the foundations of free institutions. Experience has taught us that the United States cannot be an island of security in an insecure world—that we cannot remain the only free and prosperous country in a world of destitution and despondency. History proves that trade is one of the oldest and best means of combating isolationism and misunderstandings and of creating a common bond among peoples. Equally, denial of opportunity for trade expansion is almost bound to produce deep-seated antagonisms.

Today the United States is dedicated to the task of expanding world productivity and trade. We do so because we know of no better way of achieving world stability, world prosperity, and enduring peace. We know that we cannot achieve peace or prosperity for ourselves alone. That is why we are actively cooperating with other nations in the common pursuit of these objectives. The European recovery program is intended to provide the means for a revival of production in Europe. It is thus an important and immediate step toward our goal. The cooperative effort to lay the foundations for an expanded world trade through the International Trade Organization is a longer-range approach to the same goal.

Our venture is bold and it is not without risk, but I believe that if we follow the programs outlined here today, both we and those other nations who have given convincing evidence of their devotion to the cause of freedom and their will to succeed with us in this great endeavor will be well on the road toward a better world.

Reasons Why the Federal Oleo Laws Should Be Retained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, my district is overwhelmingly an agricultural district In the Minnesota Ninth lies part of the great Red River Valley, known over the world as the breadbasket of the world. Our farmers produce potatoes used for seed in all lands; much grain and poultry, thousands of tons of sugar beets and a majority of them sells milk products to creameries and cheese factories.

Our Minnesota farmers do not fear fair competition against their butter, since it ranks among the finest in the world. We sympathize with efforts of the South to bring up their economy and we know that if the general economies level of the Nation is raised that it helps all the people in every State.

I repeat we do not fear honest and fair competition with our butter. But the trouble is that, when oleomargarine is colored artfully, that it often is served to persons who think they are getting butter.

The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation has prepared a very fine summary of nine reasons why the Federal oleomargarine laws should be retained. I am going to insert that summary in the RECORD today in the hope that every Member of this House will read it before the final vote to repeal the oleomargarine taxes. It is something that can be read in a few minutes, and I am sure if you do analyze it fairly that there will be sufficient votes to retain the oleomargarine taxes as they are and protect that fine food product known as butter.

Here is the summary:

NINE REASONS WHY THE FEDERAL OLEO LAWS SHOULD BE RETAINED

Present Federal oleomargarine laws provide for a one-fourth-cent-per-pound tax on the uncolored product and a 10-cent-per-pound tax on the colored. They also provide for occupational taxes of $600 a year on manufacturers, $480 on wholesalers, and $48 on retailers of colored and uncolored oleomargarine. On wholesalers of only uncolored oleomargarine the taxes are $200 a year. The retailer of uncolored oleo pays a tax of only $6 a year.

These laws should be retained because:

1. They harm no one. They are not burdensome to manufacturers, handlers, or consumers. The trivial benefits that might be derived from their repeal would be far outweighed by the damage to our agricultural economy and to the consumers' interests.

Proof that the laws are not restrictive to the oleomargarine industry is the fact that since 1941 oleo sales have more than doubled; retail outlets have increased 64 percent. These are the figures of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The same authority shows some 260,000 retail oleo outlets—about every other food store in the Nation.

As for the consumers' interests, no one pays the 10-cent tax unless oleo is purchased yellow. The one-fourth-cent-per-pound tax is paid by the manufacturer and is a negligible amount per capita. The old contention that the home coloring of oleo is tedious and wasteful no longer holds water. Modern packaging enables a housewife who wants yellow oleomargarine to color it easily, quickly, and without waste.

2. Repeal of the laws would open the doors to fraud upon the consuming public.

Many believe that fraud is not possible in substituting colored oleo for butter because of the existence of the pure food and drug laws. Actually, these laws have no jurisdiction as long as the frauds are practiced within State borders. Only through the operation of present Federal tax laws can the Government reach within State borders to suppress and prosecute fraudulent practices.

To permit colored oleo without the present regulatory laws would invite widespread substitution of an inexpensive yellow imitation for a genuine product. Among the thousands of handlers of oleo—in warehouses, trucks, stores, restaurants, and elsewhere—there would be those who could not resist this lure of easy money.

3. Repeal of the laws would seriously damage an important segment of American agriculture and threaten the Nation's dietary standards.

Uncontrolled and ruthless competition of a low-cost product in almost identical imitation of butter would hurt butter prices and drive many farmers out of dairying. Unfortunately those who say "Let the consumers drink milk" do not have the answer to this dilemma.

To have enough milk to meet fluid demands in the slack season requires more than enough milk in the flush season. Some of this excess must go into butter. Without a butter outlet farmers would cut their herds toward the point where there would be insufficient fluid milk in the slack season. Cattle numbers would continue to decline. In the final analysis the question is whether America is to continue its meat and milk products diet, or revert largely to a grain and field crop subsistence.

4. Repeal of the oleo laws would not benefit any segment of American agriculture.

Soybean oil and cottonseed oil bring no more when sold for oleomargarine than when sold for other uses. If the oleo market disappeared, the other outlets would still be available. As it is, the oleo industry accounts for only 5 percent of the farm returns from soybeans and only 1½ percent of the farm returns for the total cotton crop. Even in its total, cottonseed oil accounts for only 7.26 percent of the cotton crop value. Of this, 3.27 percent comes from the shortening industry and 2.54 percent from other uses.

5. Repeal of the laws would be costly to consumers.

Already (in the city of Washington, D. C., for example) colored oleo has sold on the same day at 14 to 20 cents per pound more than uncolored brands. The tax is only 10 cents per pound.

If present laws were repealed, the production of colored oleo could be expected to virtually displace uncolored oleo. There would be nothing to prevent the colored product from being sold at substantially higher prices than the uncolored—with little or none of the uncolored available. At the same time the price spread between colored oleomargarine and butter might be great enough to accomplish the primary purpose of the oleo interests—to drive butter from the table-spread market.

6. Other laws already give oleomargarine a disproportionate competitive advantage over butter.

Oleomargarine already has been given competitive privileges which are denied to butter. It may be fortified with vitamins, flavored with butter flavor, and preserved with benzoate of soda. None of these—nor any other extraneous substances—may be added to butter.

7. Other imitations of good butter are taxed; why should oleo be exempted?

Adulterated butter—which, like oleo, is an imitation of good butter—carries the same per pound tax and the same manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers occupational taxes as does colored oleo. Renovated or process butter carries the same per pound tax as uncolored oleo. There is no reason why an exception should be made for oleomargarine.

8. Oleomargarine is not entitled to the color yellow.

The claim that oleo has as much right as butter to the color yellow is false. Oleo in this country is produced from the oils of cottonseed and soybeans. The oleo industry claims it must bleach these oils white because of Federal laws. The real reason is: when cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become gray; and when soybean oils are turned into fat they become green. So to have a uniform color the oleo manufacturers must bleach out the gray and green colors. It is impossible to produce a natural yellow oleomargarine from domestic oils.

Butter, on the other hand, is always yellow—although at some seasons of the year it is less yellow than at others. When color is added to butter it is for the sake of uniformity—not for the purpose of making it look like some other product. In tests run at the University of Wisconsin on four commercial milk supplies, it was found that the natural color of butter is at its lowest ebb during March and April. Even at this low ebb, it never went below 2.0 Lovibond tintometer units. Oleomargarine becomes subject to the 10-cent color tax when it exceeds 1.6 Lovibond units of yellow and red combined.

9. Repeal of the oleo laws would set the precedent for other imitation foods.

The relative nutritional values of oleomargarine and butter has no bearing on the repeal of the oleo statutes. Even if oleomargarine were identical in nutritional values with butter, the repeal of the laws would set a dangerous precedent. Such actions would establish the philosophy that an

imitation food product achieves full legal legitimacy if it is nutritionally equivalent to the product it imitates. The flood gates would be down to a whole category of simulated dairy products such as filled cheese, filled ice cream, and filled milk. Our standards of food products would be undetermined. Imitations and substitutions would take over our food industries.

Keystone in American Foreign Policy—An Intimate Message From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Neal Stanford that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, April 22, 1948:

KEYSTONE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Circle June 12 on your calendars.

Unless Congress renews the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by that date, this keystone in American foreign policy expires.

To the administration, the Trade Agreements Act epitomizes American leadership in the world.

During the 14 years since it was passed, it has become a symbol to the rest of the world of America's willingness to cooperate economically in the world.

That cooperation has been expressed not only in bilateral agreements under this act. It was apparent in the creation of the World Bank and Monetary Fund in 1945. It was recently evident in passage of ERP.

Last fall it was made clear at Geneva when 23 nations, doing 75 percent of the world's trade, made mutual tariff concessions on billions of dollars' worth of trade. It was obvious at Habana, this March, in the creation of the International Trade Organization that would extend America's reciprocal trade-agreements program.

It can be said that the administration is genuinely worried over the possibility of getting the act extended another 3 years. Its concern stems from the fact that the Republicans now control Congress, and it has been the Republicans who in the past have led the opposition to this approach to international cooperation.

The act has been renewed four times. In three of the four instances, a majority of the Republicans in Congress have opposed the program. The only time the Republicans, as a body, approved, the record shows, was during the war and when the act was extended for 2 rather than 3 years.

There seems reason, then, for the administration's alarm and concern.

Should Congress fail to renew the Trade Agreements Act, it would put itself in the anomalous position of pressing on others what it is unprepared to do itself. For in the ERP legislation, written by this Congress, there is a clause requiring the 16 participating countries to "cooperate to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries." As one administration official put it, "Does Congress not intend to practice what it preaches?"

Actually, the administration's fears are not so much that Congress will let the trade agreements program go by default, as that the Hill will load such crippling amendments on it as to make it useless.

There are three approaches the opposition in Congress is expected to take to draw the teeth from the present act.

First is to require some measure of comparative production costs in tariff negotiations that would doom agreement. For there is no recognized standard for measuring costs, the factors, and conditions varying so greatly from country to country.

Second is to insist that each agreement get congressional approval, thus scaring off all interested. Now, with the Executive given the power to write agreements of its own, foreign powers do not face the prospect of having months of negotiation vetoed by a suspicious Congress.

Third, Congress may suggest renewal of the act—but for a single year, rather than the normal three.

Or it could be a combination of these three approaches that would characterize Republican stratagem.

According to Gallup polls, a substantial majority of the American people favor extension of the Trade Agreements Act. And, interestingly enough, practically as many of those who indicated they were Republicans approved the program as did their Democratic brethren.

The GOP leadership, then, that would repeal this program appears somewhat less than representative of grass-roots sentiment. For that reason, as much as any, perhaps, the administration expects the opposition to try to hamstring the act with amendments rather than permit it to expire. Its enemies would like the fruits of defeat without the blame for surrender.

Fortunately, the administration is working to break down some of this congressional opposition to the trade program. It is working quietly and under cover to convince doubting Congressmen of the act's merit. Primarily, it hopes to impress on all and sundry that failure to renew, or renewal with crippling amendments, would be looked on abroad as surrender of American leadership in this field.

Bureau of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am making a radio address from Washington to New Orleans through the facilities of WNOE.

Although my address tonight will be directed primarily to the people of New Orleans I believe the subject to be of interest to everybody in the United States no matter where they reside.

I think too that the Members of this House should sit up and take cognizance of a situation which is fast becoming more and more deplorable.

Just how long are we going to sit idly by and let the autocratic bureaus of this country take over responsibilities and duties which belong to the Congress, the elected representatives of the people.

I am not being facetious when I say that the time has come to either abolish the Congress or abolish the Bureau of the Budget. Can we justify our existence if we sit namby-pamby by and let this bureau take over the running of this country.

I could go on ad infinitum but why do so, I believe the address which I am going to make tonight covers the subject and I submit it to you:

From Washington, good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

Do you know what the Bureau of the Budget is?

Have you ever heard of the Bureau of the Budget?

It is doubtful that one percent of the people in New Orleans to whom I am now addressing myself, have ever heard of the Bureau of the Budget here in Washington.

This, I am sure, is not typical of New Orleans, nor is New Orleans the exception to the rule, as applied to this observation. The same thing can be said for the people of New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Dallas, or Kalamazoo.

The average American citizen has never heard of the Bureau of the Budget. Certainly they know they have never voted to elect any individual to the Bureau of the Budget as their representative. If they have heard of the Bureau of the Budget at all, they believe it to be one of the numerous bureaus which have grown Topsy-like in Washington during the last decade. Yet the Bureau of the Budget plays the greatest role in the lives of American citizens of any governmental agency or individual in the United States, not even excepting the Presidency.

The shadow of the Bureau of the Budget casts its reflection on every American home, and plays an important and integral part in the life, well being, happiness, and future of each individual man, woman, and child in this country.

How many know and realize that the Bureau of the Budget today, a creation of the Congress, has become an uncontrollable Frankenstein, which menaces the accepted form of a Government supposedly controlled and directed by the elected representatives of the people.

We have heard bureaus and bureaucrats attacked on many fronts, yet few people know or realize that these many bureaus and bureaucrats who have been the target and object of so many attacks, are but mild zephyrs as compared to the cyclonic destruction of representative government forced upon the people of this country by the Bureau of the Budget.

Today the finger of accusation points unwaveringly at the Bureau of the Budget as the greatest menace and obstacle to this country's lack of preparedness and the defense of the Nation.

The Bureau of the Budget has been the instrumentality of crippling the great Army and powerful armada of freedom which this country possessed at the close of World War II. If our ground troops have been disarmed, if our Air Force has been grounded, if our Navy has been rendered impotent, it is because of the shortsighted, arbitrary policy and attitude of the Bureau of the Budget, under the direction of a small group of ineffectual, unenlightened group of individuals, headed by an inexperienced director who must assume the responsibility for such action, as the dubious genius head of the Bureau of the Budget.

During my many years of service as a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and now as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, the Bureau of the Budget has, like Banquo's ghost, always risen to haunt the proceedings of any program destined to keep this country fully prepared and ready to defend those principles which we, as Americans, espouse.

It is the Bureau of the Budget which time and again, repeatedly and repeatedly, has thwarted the aims of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps, and patriotic civilians who believed in preparedness, and who has defied the Congress through actions which have been inimicable to the best interests of this country, both at home and abroad.

If the international situation is one of confusion and chaos, as a result of the lack of stability on the part of our armed forces, it is because the Bureau of the Budget has been the sinister figure in rendering impotent the power of force which a potential enemy alone recognizes.

What is this Bureau of the Budget, you might well ask, that it wields such power?

Who gave this Bureau of the Budget such power over the lives of the American people, is a pertinent question.

The Bureau of the Budget, like so many other bureaus which have taken unto themselves powers not intended by Congress, was originally created in the act of 1921 by the Congress, to serve the purposes indicated by its name; namely, an organization to examine the expenditures and appropriations necessary in the conduct of the Government, and so advise the President.

Under the Reorganization Act of 1939, its duties were transferred from the Treasury Department to that of the executive, and its purpose was to assist the President in the preparation of the budget and the formulation of the fiscal program of the Government; to conduct research in the developments of approved plans of administrative management, and to advise the executive departments and agencies of the Government with respect to improved administration, organization, and practice.

In other words, the Bureau of the Budget was created by Congress to assist the President in a purely advisory capacity, and to give whatever advice and assistance the President sought in the conduct of his multiple duties as Chief Executive.

I have examined the law which created the Bureau of the Budget. Nowhere in that law do I find power delegated to the Bureau of the Budget to nullify legislation to limit the strength of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, to prevent the spending of money for rivers and harbors and other public improvements which Congress has authorized under the Constitution. Yet in actual practice the Bureau of the Budget has done all these things and more, until today, we find ourselves faced with a national emergency which would not otherwise exist had it not been for the dictatorial powers practiced and exercised by the Bureau of the Budget, and is yet not effectively challenged.

So far-reaching has become the power exercised by the Bureau of the Budget, and the usurpation of the right of the free people to control its Government through duly elected representatives, that the question of abolishing either the Bureau of the Budget or the Congress is not as farfetched as it would seem at first blush.

The time has come when the Congress must decide whether the Bureau of the Budget is to run this country, or whether the Congress is to run the country as prescribed by the Constitution.

Unsuspected and unrealized, the Bureau of the Budget has today become a civil Gestapo of obstruction and duress within the framework of our Government, exercising hitherto unheard of powers against the best interests of this Nation.

Let me demonstrate how far-reaching the Bureau of the Budget exerts its power. As an example, let us follow the course of proposed legislation. A Member of the Congress drops a bill in the legislative hopper. The bill is referred to the cognizant committee. The chairman of the committee then refers the bill to the department affected by the proposed legislation. The department in turn expresses its opinion, but before giving the Congress the benefit of that opinion, clears its expression with the Bureau of the Budget, and every opinion returned to a committee carries with it this last sentence: "The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the proposed legislation." In event the last sentence is a negative statement instead of an affirmative one, no action on the legislation is taken, except on rare occasions, which are too rare. In other words, the Bureau of the Budget determines for the most part what is good legislation and what is bad legislation.

This is not the worst situation, however. Here are specific examples of how the Bureau of the Budget has crippled the national defense of this country.

Shortly after VE-day, and before VJ-day, the Navy Department came to Congress with a proposal of maintaining an adequate peacetime Navy. It was a long-range program to protect the greatest Navy which the world had ever known. I well remember the joint sessions of the House and Senate Naval Affairs Committees, at which time these committees were taken into the confidence of the then Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, and the then Chief of Naval Operations, Ernest King, and other high-ranking officials.

The blueprint of peacetime operation of the Navy and its minimum requirements were placed before the committees. Several weeks of public hearings followed executive sessions, and it was determined by the Congress that an authorized strength of 550,000 personnel in the Navy was essential for the efficient operation of the proposed active and reserve fleets. Within a short period of a few hours of perfunctory hearings, the Bureau of the Budget cut the figure down almost 200,000. Under the procedure which is followed, the Navy Department was stopped cold in advancing its cause any further before the Congress, except within the limitations set up by the Bureau of the Budget.

On another occasion the Naval Affairs Committee was startled to learn that the Bureau of the Budget had issued stop orders of construction on certain battleships and cruisers under construction by authorization of the Congress. When Congress appropriated certain sums of money to be spent on Rivers and Harbors, and flood control, it was the Bureau of the Budget, through the medium of the President, which flaunted the Constitution, and decreased the appropriations in violation of the law.

Our military strength has sunk lower and lower since VJ-day. We are today but a shell, a hollow shell, of military strength. The proposed Army Reserve organization program has never been put into operation. The National Guard is far behind in its postwar reorganization. If these two plans alone had been carried out there would be no need at this time to consider peacetime selective service. Why weren't these essential programs carried out, you may well ask. They were not carried out because of the opposition and obstruction of the Bureau of the Budget. Testimony to this effect was given to the Armed Services Committee during the past week. When the National Guard asked for $110,000,000 to carry out its program, the Bureau of the Budget lopped off $60,000,000 with a snap of the finger.

At this very moment the Bureau of the Budget is very definitely and unnecessarily delaying legislation of vital interest to the National Guard. The obstructionist tactics of the Bureau of the Budget has bottled up action on three bills of vital interest and importance to the National Guard, and other Reserve components of the country.

It would be most interesting to the American public to know just how long the Bureau of the Budget has bottled the following proposed legislation: (1) The bill on a common commission for all nonregular officers; (2) The retirement bill for nonregular personnel; and (3) The armory construction bill.

I could go on ad infinitum, listing incident after incident, example after example, about how the Bureau of the Budget has jeopardized, not only the military safety of this country, but has worked an economic hardship on the people of the Nation through its unintelligent approach to national and international problems.

How long is the Congress going to stand idly by and permit such conditions to continue to exist? For my part I refuse to stand mute. I shall prepare legislation for introduction in the next Congress which will either abolish the Bureau of the Budget in its entirety, or specifically designate and spell out its limitations.

If we are to allow the Bureau of the Budget to continue to hamstring this Nation's preparedness, and void its defense, we can hope for nothing but disaster in the future.

The time has come to call a halt to the Bureau of the Budget's vicious practices, usurpation of power, and short-sighted vision. It is time that the power of the Government be exercised by the elected representatives of the people, and not the unelected power-drunk little people in the Bureau of the Budget.

The time for decision is at hand.

Socialization by Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith a speech recently delivered by Mr. Lane Webber, vice president of California Taxpayers Association, of Los Angeles, on a subject vital to our national interest, socialization by taxation. Mr. Webber is one of the best-informed men I know on the subject of taxation. His remarks are well worth the attention of all Members of the House who I trust will find time to read them.

SOCIALIZATION BY TAXATION

Taxation has become so bad, so involved, so intimate, and so general as seemingly to defy correction or serious attempts thereat. An oppressed and tormented people stagger under an unbearable burden of taxation, whose intricacies and complications not only balloon the burden and its impact but so bewilder the taxpayers as to render them almost helpless in understanding and action. They accept an intolerable situation, growing constantly worse, with a hopelessness that smacks of frustration. Must it get worse yet before it can get better, before the people demand corrective action, and how much worse can it get before becoming so chronic and destructive as to discourage if not deny timely and reasonable remedy?

Maybe only by incessantly dinning the enormity and influences and implications of wasteful Government spending and taxation can the people be aroused to action.

HOW BAD IS TAXATION?

How bad is taxation, and how does it affect our lives, our economy, our country, ourselves, and the world? Its filching fingers reach out at the unborn baby, grabbing at the food, medical care, and hospitalization of

its mother and the layette prepared for its arrival. Those grasping, itching fingers will follow and clutch at the child throughout its life and, like ghouls, desecrate its final resting place. Its every need, comfort, and luxury will be less plentiful and more costly, at school, play, home, work, business, and retirement, all because of taxes. No thing it will ever own or use can escape many of the myriad forms of taxation—ad valorem, income, sales, gift, excise, and inheritance—and the pyramided consequences of their application to the goods and services of others who produce, process, transport, and distribute the commodities and services necessary to living, and to death.

The cross of taxation, prenatal and postmortem, must be borne by all, in every walk of life. Shall it be to the crucifixion of individual liberty?

Even worse yet is the effect upon that baby's maturing and ultimate philosophy of government, of society, of humanity, and of freedom. If there shall be confused acceptance of the growing encroachment of government upon the rights and lives of the people, the exaction of much of their income, the continued pursuit of those paternalistic nostrums, such as: that government should support the people—not they it; that private enterprise or capitalism or industrialism has failed or is wrong; that the people are incapable of self-government and only some form of benevolent paternalism can correct fancied ills and produce that Shangri-La of Socialist millenium; then, individual self-reliance will disappear and with it individual liberty.

How bad is taxation? Its direct impact as approximating one-third of the national income is bad enough, but that is not all. As goods move through the modern system of production—from development as raw material, through processing, manufacture, transportation, distribution, and final sale—all these various taxes, on persons and things, "barnacle" onto the commodity and are paid by the ultimate purchaser or consumer. His money is the only source for payment of these taxes which form a part—a large part—of the price. So, in addition to their own taxes, consumers pay all the taxes encountered by the finished article on its way to market. Then taxation increases the cost of goods and services—the cost of living. This encourages demands for wage increases, which can be met only by raising the price of goods produced—immediately reflected in the higher cost of living. This suggests the need for another wage increase—completing one cycle in the spiral of inflation. Surely no one will deny that taxation increases the cost of living.

All admit Government spending is inflationary but some there are who contend taxation is deflationary, because it takes money (purchasing power) away from the people. Do you believe that? I do not. What use does Government make of its revenues? The very great part is paid directly to individuals, as wages, salaries, pensions, grants, aids, unemployment insurance etc., and much more finds its way to individuals through public works and payments for goods and services furnished Government under contract or otherwise. This increases the money in hand (purchasing power) of these people and adds to the flood of that purchasing power resulting from the waste of war spending. Hence taxation, by increasing operating costs and prices and wages, retards production, while Government spending adds to the excessive purchasing power that bids recklessly for goods in short supply and runs prices still higher. Wherefore, in such times and circumstances, taxation is inflationary. Remember, too, Government spending and taxation are inseparable—irrevocably. It scarcely need be added that Government spends "our" money less carefully and more wastefully than we would—but not for production and not for the reproduction of production.

LEARN AND USE FACTS

How bad is taxation? Few of you loyal members and interested guests of this association need be told but might be reminded. Examine the budgets and tax records of the city of Los Angeles (or your own home city), of the county of Los Angeles, of the school district of Los Angeles, or of the State of California, for 10-year periods from 1900 to date. Consult your Tax Digest, or the association staff, for these figures, and be prepared for a real shock. It would be torturous to inflict all these statistics upon you today, but let's look quickly at the State and briefly at the Federal Government.

CALIFORNIA PROBLEMS

California's budget for the current single fiscal year—1947–48—including capital outlay but excluding unemployment insurance, is more than the budget for the fiscal biennimum (2 years) immediately preceding. It is more than 70 times total State expenditures of 40 years ago—in 1908. It is some three times State expenditures of 5 years ago.

State Controller Kuchel, in his recent annual report, said the cost of California State government for fiscal 1946–47 increased 35 percent over the preceding year—or $118,-500,000 to a total of $455,700,000.

True, in later decades, the State has taken on and increased subventions to local governments, but their taxes have increased also. Taxation is taxation—no matter how "thick" you slice it.

The State's budget for 1947–48 (the current fiscal year) totals $771,000,000—against $11,000,000 40 years ago. The budget for next year—1948–49—now taking form to be submitted to the budget session of the legislature (next week), is officially said to be mounting toward a total of $1,000,000,000—"roughly." The word "roughly" is used advisedly—in all of its implications.

FEDERAL SITUATION

Having mentioned the Federal Government, let's turn the "taxescope" that way. During the war years, including 1941 and 1946 as such, the Federal Government collected in taxes $169,300,000,000 and spent some $383,500,000,000. For the eight preceding years taxes were $34,500,000,000, expenditures $58,600,000,000. Accumulating these items for the 15 fiscal years—1939 through 1947—produces the tidy totals: taxes collected $248,500,000,000, expenditures $485,000,000,000.

The fiscal year 1945 was the straw that humped the camel's back with a total tax take of $47,000,000,000 and expenditures of more than $100,000,000,000. Yes; in that one year this Nation spent more than it had spent from the inauguration of President Washington to the administration of President Hoover—140 years and including World War I.

PSEUDO SAVINGS

By 1947–48, and Herculean efforts, the Federal budget had been forced down to a mere $37,500,000,000 (still at least $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 too high), notwithstanding fanatical resistance of masquerading liberals and radicals who sought to continue vast wartime spending. Now even that pseudo saving is threatened, as the President's budget for 1948–49 calls for $39,700,000,000—without final determination as to the demands of the so-called Marshall plan and other foreign commitments.

Do you realize that the cost of operating the Federal Government, at the level recommended by the President's $40,000,000,000 budget, exceeds the costs of all our State governments by about seven times? That is, for every dollar the taxpayer pays to his State government about $7 must go to support the Federal operation. Apportioning that $40,-000,000,000 budget to the several States, on the basis of their Federal income-tax collections or payments in 1947, shows California's share to be $3,370,000,000—which is about seven times the estimated cost of California's State government for the calendar year 1947. Just a 10 percent cut in that Federal spending program would save the taxpayers of California $337,000,000. That is about three-quarters of the cost of our State government for that same period—the calendar year 1947. Only 20 years ago Federal taxes did not amount to much compared to State and local taxes.

Now, why all this burst about budgets?

BUDGETS MEAN TAXES

First, of course, because they mean spending and cause, compel, and fix our taxes. But there is something far more significant, sinister, and menacing in the movement of determination to keep Government spending high and continue the pursuit of the socialistic policies and programs that are restrictive and destructive of individual incentive, and necessitate additional and increasing expenditures (plus taxation) for the further development of these and related steps toward socialism that are certain to follow.

This poses the question implied in our title: Can taxation produce socialism, collectivism, or communism? My answer is "yes" and, in almost prohibitive brevity, I shall undertake to prove it.

SEED FOR SOCIALISM

If such spending—which begets, commands, and lives on taxation, the only source of revenue available to government—shall continue and grow, so also shall taxation—until its source shall be strained and drained and there be no more tax base or source. Government then takes over the ownership of property, and free government, private rights, and individual liberty disappear—replaced by some "ism." Whenever and wherever the private resources of the people are exhausted, some form of socialism results—the form depending, largely, upon the depths and dimensions of the misery that has accompanied and follows the strangulation of individualism by government spending and taxing. If the surviving or reorganized strongest group owns or appropriates physical properties, the new government may be a sort of fascism. If such group is strong but not strongest, collectivism is likely. If those possessing or confiscating property are absent or weak, socialism is probable. If the majority is radical and force used in the overthrow of the old government, communism is indicated. Here evidenced is the influence of individual ownership of property. From the standpoint of the people generally, there is no choice among them. All are totalitarian and personal freedom is subordinated to the will of a dictator or dictating minority.

Remember and reflect—within our own time: Russia, Italy, Spain, Germany. Then later other countries or peoples, such as: Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the little Baltic states—pulled or pushed by Russia—and France, Finland, Iran, Iraq, Arabia, Greece, and Turkey—now under Soviet pressure. It has happened elsewhere and can happen here.

Heavy, progressive taxation is the No. 2 point in the Karl Marx plan for socialistic conquest and ranks high in every other similar writing or program.

ENGLAND AN EXAMPLE

Perhaps England is the best example. Our mother country, the former cradle and citadel of freedom—going, going, gone Socialist; one of its Cabinet Ministers demanding abandonment of the hard-won concept that "an Englishman's home is his castle"; the Foreign Minister proposing redistribution of our gold holdings; a boisterous labor party

member publicly preferring acceptance of "pottage" from Russia to approaching the United States "with hat in hand"; coal mines, banks, railroads, shipping, utilities, insurance, trade, commerce, production, distribution, and lands already socialized or marked therefor. The Labor Government is now ordering private citizens to work where, when, and at what the "secretariat of the proletariat" commands. Is that freedom or serfdom? These are the descendants of Richard the Lion-Hearted, William the Conqueror, Cromwell, Lord Nelson, and Wellington, the contemporaries of Churchill and Montgomery. The only good now appearing from England's "noble experiment" in socialism is its demonstrating folly and failure. That should be an object lesson to us and to others.

There was no open revolution in England. How came socialism to England? Was it by the tax route? Did it happen there?

HOW ABOUT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?

Within our country, within our Government, there are those who believe in socialism, collectivism, or communism, and work tirelessly to bring about the master government, servant-citizen philosophy—a regimented economy in which the individual must work, live, worship, and think as ordered. They have sneaked into every segment of our society. It is purely coincidental that all of them urge high and increasing Government spending—social security, socialized medicine, Government-ownership—and supporting taxation at confiscatory rates on all incomes above a barely subsistent level?

CRADLE TO GRAVE

Why do they sponsor cradle-to-grave social security, Government-controlled pension and retirement plans, with tax-fed funds alleged to become actuarily self-supporting? There are three fundamental reasons. First, as constantly broadened and liberalized such schemes demand more and more tax money and hasten the exhaustion of the resources of the people. Second, more and more persons become dependent thereupon, less self-reliant, and easier prey for the ism vendors. And third, those supporting funds accumulating (at least on paper) have been invested largely in Federal bonds sold to finance paternalistic ventures, war and the like, and thus serve two socialistic purposes. The actual funds have been spent, but the paid-for obligations must be met out of subsequent taxation.

Then, as our political enemies well know, exorbitant taxation dries up savings—the only source of venture capital available to private enterprise—threatens its destruction and promotes the socialization of all business activities.

SOME BAD BYPRODUCTS

How bad is taxation? Let's consider and vivisect some of the bad byproducts of excessive taxation. First, of course, is the temptation to waste and political corruption that flows from and follows governmental possession of vast sums. Into the uses and purposes of centralized Government is drawn a huge pool that makes for power, but that stagnates into a cesspool that makes for citizen seduction, malignancy, and socialism. Politically inspired and dominated lust for power drives parties and men to policies and practices that corrode and corrupt the very fundamentals of free government and of individual liberty. The past 15 years are amply illustrative.

As instances witness:

Subventions and grants to the several States, with and without matching requirements but always imposing conditions or restrictions expressive of the Federal will although violative of the State's law or wishes—the donor dictating the terms of the acceptance of its "gifts" of the people's money—subverting and corrupting the sovereignty of the sovereign state; the initiation and prosecution of vast Federal projects, exempt from taxation and regulation, intended to compete with similar business ventures owned and operated by private enterprise, which is required to pay strangling taxation and submit to the most trying, if not sometimes damaging regulation.

The bestowal of special privileges—political or financial—upon populous groups within our society for the frankly admitted purpose of buying their votes and influence—the sort of bribery so candidly defined by that "illustrious patriot" in his satanic sophistry "tax and tax and spend and spend and elect and elect."

Subsidies for these, political pap for those—morally, physically, and economically a narcotic here, a seduction there, a bribe yonder.

Witness further: Social security, health insurance, medical care, public assistance, pensions, and retirement annuities, housing; Federal aids to education, loans to REA, tenant farmers, and construction projects; subsidies, parity prices; the printing and mailing (at taxpayer expense) of tens of tons of official socialistic propaganda; executive departments employing "public relations" forces to explain and popularize their conduct that speaks all too well for itself; rent, price, wage, credit, export controls, and material allocations; labor, working hours and conditions, regulations; supervision of railroads, banks, and utilities; soil conservation and crop control; Government ownership—the "regimented economy" graduating into the "planned state." The next—postgraduate—degree is "P. S."—the "police state." Is there some resemblance to the English version—with a slight Russian accent or undertone?

Given ambitious and unscrupulous leaders with socialistic tendencies, how easily can the fruits of taxation be socialism!

I have an almost holy reverence and devotion for my country, for freedom, the safety and security guaranteed by law and order, for opportunity, incentive, private enterprise, personal rights, and individual liberty—the composing elements or ingredients of the American way.

I have an almost infernal hatred for those who would destroy these, substituting therefor any of the "isms" spawned in the treachery and intrigue, the murder and misery, of alien lands tottering on the brink of collapse and catastrophe.

My every prayer concludes with a plea for the redemption of such of these not wholly lost, for the full measure of eternal punishment for those beyond redemption, and for the safety of that precept and concept of free government that—and that alone—can bring peace, progress, and prosperity to a Christian world.

AGGRESSIVE ACTION NEEDED

It is my sincere and studied conviction that our Republic, free private competitive enterprise, the American way, and individual liberty can be destroyed by government spending and taxation; that there are those who strive to that end, that conditions throughout the world and demands thereby made upon us contribute additionally to such threatened possibility; and that only the most informed, intelligent, aggressive, patriotic, determined, and united action on the part of the great body of truly American citizen taxpayers can save the United States from Socialization by Taxation—by asking less of government and demanding that it (at the national, State, and local levels) confine itself to the thrifty administration of the real and necessary functions of government—restricting government to governing, leaving business to business; and preserving that blood-bought freedom for which generations of our ancestors fought to the death and our later forefathers pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

United States Reversal on Palestine—Tragic Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the reversal of the position of the United States Government with respect to Palestine was a tragic mistake which is now beginning to bring the adverse consequences that should have been foreseeable. The General Assembly of the United Nations openly and democratically concluded that the partition was the appropriate solution of the Palestine problem. Partition never was given a fair chance.

Support of partition was abandoned by the United States in the face of armed interference and opposition by member nations of the United Nations. The United Kingdom insisted on assuming full responsibility for law and order in Palestine and has been turning its head from armed invasion from other countries. If the democratic process of settling international issues is to have any possibility of success, we cannot establish the precedent of retreating whenever members of the United Nations decide to openly and blatantly ignore the determinations of the majority and to upset majority decisions by armed intervention.

The prospects for adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the United States proposal for trusteeship are dim. If trusteeship is not adopted, and its dubious genesis and doubtful feasibility warrant its defeat, we must give full support to partition.

If the United States is willing to send forces to enforce trusteeship, which will be resisted by both the Arabs and the Jews, then it certainly should be willing to support partition which will at least have the acquiescence of one side. The proposal of our State Department is unsound on its face and it is to be hoped that undue pressure will not be exercised against other nations to support this proposition. It is really no solution but rather procrastination.

There is an intelligent and constructive program which can still be adopted and which should have the full support of the United States. This would include:

First, the immediate establishment of a trusteeship in Jerusalem in accordance with the decision of the United Nations on November 29, 1947. The Holy City must be saved from destruction. A truce could be achieved between the Jews and the Arabs within that city without prejudice to the solution for the rest of the country.

Secondly, the United Nations should immediately send a border commission to Palestine to report on the invasion of that country by adjacent states which are members of the United Nations and other sovereignties. The conflict to date has been seriously aggravated by the invasion of uniformed, armed, and identi-

fiable forces from other countries. This must not be allowed to persist. Unless these nations cease their invasion and withdraw their present forces they should be punished by economic and other sanctions. A respectable and dignified and representative border commission can provide the United Nations and the world with essential facts which can in turn provide the basis for sanctions against such violators of peace.

Thirdly, the United States should lift the arms embargo and provide arms for defense purposes. These arms can be supplied through the United Nations Commission on Palestine in order to assure that they will be used for defense and not aggression.

These are simple, just, and feasible measures. Our Government must act with courage and intelligence in meeting its responsibility in settling this problem. Up to this point this type of leadership has been lacking. It is still not too late to initiate the above program, to confine the problem to the boundaries of Palestine and to lay the groundwork for peace between Palestine Arabs and Palestine Jews.

Southern California's Future in the Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper presented to a meeting of Town Hall, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., on March 22, 1948; by Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer, department of water and power, city of Los Angeles:

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S FUTURE IN THE COLORADO RIVER

(By Samuel B. Morris)

THE PAST

This critical dry year, with its water shortages and its power shortages, should remind all of us that California is a semiarid State. We who live in southern California, especially those of us within the area of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, should be conscious of the vision, the daring, and the courage which built the works that now maintain our water supply in this critically dry year, and the provisions for power in Los Angeles.

Our power supply, created through vision, now enables the Department of Water and Power of the city of Los Angeles to deliver to the Southern California Edison Co., for transmission to power-short northern California, more than 100,000 kilowatts around the clock, enough energy to serve a community of a half million people.

Three thousand years ago, King Solomon, writing in an arid land, said: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." (Proverbs 29: 18).

True then, and still true in 1781, when King Carlos III of Spain, recognizing the semi-arid character of his domain in California, granted to El Pueblo de Nuestra Senora la Reina de Los Angeles all of the water of the Rio Porciuncula, now the Los Angeles River. That provision of land with water brought 11 families of 44 persons to found what is now the fourth city of our country.

For 100 years there was little growth in this sleepy Mexican pueblo, but arrival of the railroad in the eighties caused a great boom which brought the population by 1890 to 50,000 persons, including my family. Since then I have had the opportunity of watching the doubling of population each decade, until now Los Angeles has nearly 2,000,000 people; and, while Los Angeles County has continued to rank first in agricultural production, its metropolitan area has become a great manufacturing center, ranking the third metropolitan area in population and industry in the Nation.

Before World War II it had listed nine major industries, each producing over $25,000,000 annually, and more diversified industry than any other United States city. How is it that this semiarid, semidesert land of sunshine, where cattle and sheep died of thirst 70 years ago, could make possible such a tremendous expansion of population, agriculture, and industry? The existence of large ground-water bodies and the invention of the deep-well turbine pump brought irrigation to lands which previously had been dry farmed, and a great agricultural economy came into being.

THE VISION

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." True a little over 40 years ago, when William Mulholland saw that the Los Angeles River water would only suffice for about 300,000 population, and, with other leaders, envisioned and proposed a supply from the Owens River for a city of 2,000,000 people. This city, then, with only 200,000 population, bonded itself for $24,500,000 to bring this water 250 miles to Los Angeles, when Mulholland said, "If you don't get it, you won't need it."

Vision—in 1907. There was low-cost hydraulic electric power in the fall of this water along the aqueduct and, under the leadership of E. F. Scattergood, municipal ownership of power was extended throughout Los Angeles. It was only 10 years after H. A. Van Norman turned on the water of the completed aqueduct in 1913, and the old chief had said, "Here it is, take it," that Mulholland was studying routes to bring an additional 1,100,000 acre-feet from the Colorado River, a distance of 300 miles, including a pump lift of over 1,600 feet. A. P. Davis, chief engineer of the Reclamation Service had, already in 1918, conceived the great Boulder Canyon project for flood control, silt control, irrigation, power, and, later, by Mulholland's vision, a domestic water supply for some six or seven million people.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS

In the short time allotted, I shall not be able to completely review the history of California's developments on the Colorado River, but I should, however, like to enumerate certain of these which have been continuous from the first developments by Thomas Blythe in 1877, when he acquired about 40,000 acres of the Palo Verde Valley and filed upon nearly 2,000 cubic feet per second of Colorado River water.

The Palo Verde Irrigation District embraces an area of about 100,000 acres bordering and extending along the river for about 30 miles, and some 16,000 acres of adjoining mesa lands may be added to the district. About half the lands are now irrigated.

First filings by the predecessors of the Imperial Irrigation District in May 1895 were for 10,000 cubic feet per second. The Imperial District includes about 500,000 acres and is the largest irrigation district in the United States. It was originally supplied with water in 1902, through the Alamo Canal, which passed through Mexico and gave great difficulties of maintenance in this foreign country.

In 1904–5 floods broke through the headings of the canal, and water flowed across Imperial Valley and into the Salton sink, with disastrous results. The break was not finally closed until 1907. The Salton Sea had been created and much damage done. Through the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the All-American Canal was constructed and now affords a supply for Imperial and Coachella Valleys, the latter essentially a northern extension of Imperial Valley.

The Coachella Valley County Water District was organized in 1918, and the present irrigated area is about 18,000 acres. The Coachella branch of the All-American Canal is nearing completion and will bring Colorado River water to the vicinity of Indio. The Yuma project has provided irrigation for about 25,000 acres of lands in California since 1907.

The present net irrigated area in California by Colorado River waters approximates 500,000 acres, with a potential of twice that many.

THE COURAGE

The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California was incorporated in 1928, during a period of local drought and national prosperity. Comprised, originally, of 11 cities, it has grown to include some 20 cities, from San Diego to Santa Monica, of which Los Angeles constitutes about 62 percent of the assessed valuation and of the population served. Vision in 1928.

In 1931, despite depression conditions, the district voted $220,000,000 in bonds to construct the Colorado River aqueduct. It seems almost providential that this aqueduct should have been constructed during a depression, in a period of low costs, and despite a wet cycle with plenty of water available. Most dramatic of all was the extension of the aqueduct to serve the newly incorporated San Diego County Water Authority last December, just at a time when the reservoirs of the city of San Diego were running dry and a most calamitous condition impended. The cooperation of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, United States Navy, San Diego County Water Authority, and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California rushed completion of this aqueduct in time to avoid disaster. Had it not been for such completion, San Diego and its neighboring communities would be in the same situation as that in which Santa Barbara and Ventura now find themselves.

Today, the Colorado River aqueduct affords the only additional dependable source of water supply for the rapidly growing cities and industries throughout southern California, serving a population approaching 3,500,000. An additional million to a million and a half people living in southern California outside of the district are casting covetous eyes upon its supply.

The Boulder Canyon project has made all of this development possible. At first there had been the paramount problem of flood protection to Imperial Valley, which lies below sea level. The Colorado River, through the ages, flowing on top of its delta, has fluctuated between depositing its flow into the Gulf of California and into the Salton Sea. Continually, deposits of silt had built the river bed higher and higher, necessitating continuous increased elevation of dikes, up until the time that Hoover Dam was constructed. There were many years in which the total flow of the Colorado River was diverted by Imperial irrigation district, and in some of these years there was still a shortage in the valley.

There was the eternal problem of silt filling up the bed of the river, building up the beds of canals, and depositing itself upon rich agricultural lands, at a cost to the farmer of about $2 per acre annually.

Progressively, because of these conditions, came an increasing demand for large storage in the lower river, which, while needed for

river regulation, flood and silt control, and for irrigation, would also afford the basis for a great development of hydrcelectric power—low-cost power.

OUR STAKE IN THE RIVER

Then it was that William Mulholland conceived the idea of bringing a domestic water supply to Los Angeles and southern California, with low-cost hydroelectric power, provided by a dam on the Colorado River. The Kincaid Act, passed in 1920, provided the first funds for comprehensive study, and in 1922 the Fall-Davis report recommended construction of a high dam at or near Boulder Canyon, to provide for all of the afore-mentioned services, including navigation, an historic prime purpose of Federal expenditure.

The Swing-Johnson bill, providing for construction of a high dam at or near Boulder Canyon and for construction of the All-American Canal, was first introduced in 1922, but not, however, until its fourth introduction was it finally passed and approved on December 21, 1928, as the Boulder Canyon Project Act. This law provided that the cost of the All-American Canal should be returned without interest in 50 years in accordance with the reclamation law. It provided that, of the total cost of Hoover Dam, $25,000,000 should be allocated to flood control, and that this cost need not be returned until after the 50-year period provided for repayment with interest primarily from power revenues, supplemented by a small charge for domestic water storage. On the remaining cost of the dam, powerhouse, reservoir, and appurtenant works, originally based upon 4-percent interest, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, in 1940, reduced the interest to 3 percent.

The present installed capacity at Hoover Dam is 1,030,000 kilowatts, capable of generating more than four and one-half billion kilowatt-hours annually. The plant, one of the four largest in the world, is designed to receive four more generators, making a total plant capacity of 1,317,000 kilowatts. These additional generators will add to the peaking capacity of the plant but will not add to the kilowatt-hour production.

At Parker Dam there is an installed 120,000 kilowatt capacity, producing about 500,000,000 kilowatt hours annually. David Dam, now under construction about 70 miles downstream from Hoover, is designed to generate 225,000 kilowatts and furnish 800,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

Southern California interests, the Southern California Edison Co., the California Electric Power Co., and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, representing also the cities of Pasadena, Glendale, and Burbank, have constructed a total of seven transmission lines conveying power from Hoover Dam into southern California. Southern California irrigation, domestic water supply, and power interests have either paid directly or agreed to return to the United States, almost $550,000,000 for the construction of the dam and power plant, the All-American Canal, the Metropolitan Aqueduct, and the power transmission lines.

The power to be generated at Hoover Dam was allocated to all three Lower Basin States, in proportion to existing and anticipated needs. But California agencies alone made possible the building of this key structure in the Colorado River development, by guaranteeing repayment to the Government of every penny of the cost. This guaranty, and the additional investments of California agencies in other facilities, rest upon the integrity of contracts signed in good faith with the Secretary of the Interior, providing for delivery of the water necessary to operate them.

THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

The Bureau of Reclamation has just submitted its report on the Central Arizona project, authorization for which is sought in bills now pending in Congress. This report has been referred to each of the States of the river basin for its comments. The Colorado River board and the California State director of public works have received copies during the last month, and are now engaged in a detailed analysis. Comments on this report must be made within 90 days of its receipt.

It is interesting to compare this central Arizona project and its proposed financing with the Boulder Canyon project and its financing. The essential features of the central Arizona project are the construction of a high dam at Bridge Canyon, upstream from Lake Mead, which would furnish one-third of its power to provide for pumping of water from Lake Havasu behind Parker Dam, raising this water substantially 1,000 feet and conveying it through an aqueduct 241 miles in length to central Arizona. The Bluff Dam, on the San Juan River, and the Coconino Dam on the Little Colorado River would be constructed to catch approximately one-half of the silt which would otherwise be discharged into the Bridge Canyon Reservoir. The amount of water to be diverted is 1,200,000 acre-feet, substantially the same quantity of water authorized to be diverted by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, including the San Diego County Water Authority.

Arizona's need for this water, however, is not essentially a domestic need, but an irrigation need. It is contended that some 226,000 acres in central Arizona will return to desert unless an additional water supply is brought in from the Colorado River.

The average irrigated acreage in the period from 1940 to 1944 is said to be 566,000 acres, which is irrigated either by surface flow or by pumping from underground basins. This pumpage is estimated to be about 468,000 acre-feet in excess of the safe annual yield of the underlying ground-water basins. Much of this excess pumpage for new acreage has been during the flush prices of the war and postwar years. The total estimated cost of the project of $738,408,000 is allocated as follows:

Power (interest bearing)	$243,798,000
Irrigation (interest free)	397,693,000
Municipal (interest free)	16,605,000
Flood control (nonreimbursable)	6,641,000
Silt control (nonreimbursable)	28,097,000
Recreation (nonreimbursable)	37,459,000
Fish and wild life (nonreimbursable)	3,129,000
Salinity control (nonreimbursable)	4,986,000

It should be noted that the total of nonreimbursable costs to be contributed by the general United States taxpayer is more than $78,000,000, including $37,500,000 for recreation. Studies indicate that irrigation can pay relatively nothing beyond operation and maintenance cost. The total capital cost to be repaid without interest in 78 years is about 2 percent.

Power, however, is called upon to pay not only its own operation, maintenance, interest, and retirement costs but also to retire all but 2 percent of the irrigation cost. This is done by writing off the power investment with interest in 31.6 years and thereafter applying the total power income above operating and maintenance expense to the retirement of irrigation capital.

Power markets are primarily in southern California. The over-all effect of the project is that southern California power users will be called upon to pay something over $1,700 per acre to prevent certain irrigated lands, now worth $300 per acre, from going back to desert in central Arizona, while the irrigater in Arizona will contribute practically nothing beyond operating and maintenance costs.

It is also interesting to compare the prospective value to be received by the American taxpayer in constructing the central Arizona project, having an installed capacity of 750,000 kilowatts, with the St. Lawrence seaway, which is estimated to cost $720,000,000, of which $322,000,000 would be allocated to power and $398,000,000 to navigation, to be liquidated by toll charges on navigation. There would be 2,200,000 kilowatts of installed capacity and the entire project would be self-liquidating, returning all capital, with interest.

Tennessee Valley, also with about 2,200,000 kilowatts installed capacity, has cost $794,000,000, of which $462,000,000 has been allocated to power. The Boulder Canyon project and the associated developments of the metropolitan water district, with a total investment of about $550,000,000, provides 1,150,000 kilowatts of installed capacity, 1,212,000 acre-feet of water for domestic and industrial purposes for the requirements of some six or seven million people, and the irrigation of approximately a million acres of land.

It should be apparent from these figures that the central Arizona project, which, by the way, cannot be authorized under existing reclamation law, is economically unsound and should not be constructed even if water were available for its creation.

THE WATER SUPPLY AND THE SEEDS OF THE QUARREL

I should like, now, to turn briefly to the matter of water supply and the controversy between Arizona and California. It should be remembered that agencies within the State of California had been making a most rapid development and increasing use of the Colorado River. When these agencies sought construction of Hoover Dam, the other States of the basin, fearing California would establish a prior right to the entire regulated flow of the river, sought to have the various rights on the river determined before the project was authorized. In fact, California agencies had already appropriated the entire low flow of the river, so that they were in position to bring an action against upstream development in any of the other six States which would tend to decrease the summer low flow of the river.

In order to make such a determination, the Colorado River compact was entered into in 1922. Under this compact the consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water was apportioned to the upper-basin States, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, and a like 7,500,000 acre-feet was apportioned to the lower-basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California. In addition, the lower basin was given the right to increase its consumptive use by 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum.

The compact provides that the States of the upper basin "will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years." It also provides that if at some future time a treaty is executed between the United States and Mexico, covering Mexico's rights to Colorado River waters, such waters shall be supplied first from the surplus over and above the foregoing specified quantities to the upper and lower basins and if such surplus should prove insufficient, the burden of deficiency shall be borne equally by the upper and lower basins. It provides that further equitable apportioning may be made at any time after October 1, 1963. The compact failed to allocate any water to any of the States.

Six States ratified the compact by 1929, but the State of Arizona did not ratify it until 1944. The Boulder Canyon Project Act required that California limit itself in the use of the waters of the Colorado River by act of its legislature. It was thus provided that uses in California "shall not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of the waters apportioned to the lower basin States by paragraph A of article 3 of the Colorado River compact, plus not more than one-half of any excess or surplus waters

unapportioned by said compact, such uses always to be subject to the terms of said compact."

THE CALIFORNIA PRIORITIES AND CONTRACTS

On August 18, 1931, the several California agencies claiming rights to use Colorado River waters entered into an agreement apportioning among themselves the water of the Colorado River available to California under the terms of the compact, both as to amount and priority, as follows:

First. Palo Verde irrigation district.

Second. The Yuma project.

Third. Imperial irrigation district and Coachella Valley water district, and additional lands of the Palo Verde district on the adjoining mesa, a total of 3,850,000 acre-feet.

Fourth. The metropolitan water district and/or the city of Los Angeles, 550,000 acre-feet.

Fifth. The metropolitan water district and/or the city of Los Angeles, 550,000 acre-feet, and the city and/or county of San Diego, 112,000 acre-feet.

Sixth. A final priority to the agricultural lands above mentioned, of 300,000 acre-feet.

These amounts aggregate 5,362,000 acre-feet, for which contracts from the Secretary of the Interior have been in existence for many years. Upon the validity of these contracts the various agencies have made their investments. Upon the validity of these contracts, now under attack by Arizona, depends the future of this city and of southern California.

THE FAILING WATER SUPPLY

It should be noted that a considerable number of other additional projects in California requiring approximately 2,000,000 additional acre-feet of water, were excluded on account of lack of available water supply.

Two major elements have combined to reduce the available water supply. First, the period from 1930 to 1946 was substantially drier than any other period of record, although not as dry as indicated by tree-ring records. This has reduced the estimate of the virgin flow of the Colorado River from approximately 20,000,000 acre-feet per annum to a 50-year average of 17,720,000 acre-feet at the international boundary. For the period 1930 to 1945 the estimated virgin flow at Lee Ferry has been only 13,500,000 acre-feet per year, with a record low year of 5,500,000 acre-feet, and with 3 years, each with a flow of less than 10,000,000 acre-feet.

Secondly, the Mexican treaty allocated to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet, whereas the maximum amount of water used by Mexico prior to construction of Hoover Dam was not to exceed 750,000 acre-feet, and this figure had always been assumed to be the maximum right which might be claimed by Mexico.

Since signing the Colorado River compact in 1944, Arizona has secured a contract through the Secretary of the Interior for 2,800,000 acre-feet. Three hundred thousand acre-feet is allocated to the State of Nevada. A year ago, Arizona secured a reauthorization of the Gila project (to include the Wellton-Mohawk unit) providing for a Colorado River diversion of 600,000 acre-feet annually.

THE ARIZONA-CALIFORNIA CONTROVERSY

Now, the actual shortage of water on the Lower Colorado River results in substantially this: If California's contentions and interpretations of the Colorado River compact and its related documents are correct, Arizona will receive no water for the Central Arizona project; if Arizona's contentions are sustained, California will have substantially no water for the Colorado River acqueduct of the metropolitan water district.

The principal points of difference between California and Arizona are: (1) Arizona contends that the 3-B water is apportioned by the compact and that California by its limitation act has excluded itself from any part of this water. California denies this, contending that the 3-B water is unapportioned, and is part of the "excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact," of which California is entitled to use not more than one-half. (2) California contends that Arizona's consumptive use of the Gila waters must be charged against its basin allotment and its main take from the stream reduced proportionately. Arizona contends that it should only be charged with the depletion of the Gila under natural conditions rather than the amount consumptively used.

The Gila rises in New Mexico and flows through Arizona. The flow of the Gila River and its tributaries in central Arizona totals about 2,300,000 acre-feet per annum. Under virgin conditions, heavy evaporation, seepage, and transpiration losses resulted in an estimated virgin flow of the Gila River at its junction with the Colorado (just above the international boundary), of 1,300,000 acre-feet. Arizona claims this is the charge against her; California contends Arizona should be charged with its consumptive use of these waters. (3) There is also a difference of opinion between California and Arizona over the charging of evaporation losses which are not specifically covered by the Colorado River compact or by the contracts between the United States and California for the delivery of water.

OUR HERITAGE AND FUTURE

The blessings of our climate and its industrial and agricultural potentialities have induced the immigration of millions of people—and more millions are on the way. Nevertheless, Los Angeles and southern California are situated in a semiarid region. Certainly there is more land capable of development (and there may yet be more people) than the available water supply can care for. Through the vision, foresight, energy, and action of those who went before us, we have inherited and now enjoy an ample water supply for our domestic, irrigation, and industrial needs.

We have inherited a financial burden, also. Included in the more than $500,000,000 represented in works now delivering water and power to our Southland is a $220,000,000 bond issue of the metropolitan water district of southern California. That bond issue lies upon every piece of assessable property in the district—your home and mine—your business and your farm. Our reasonable growth for some years was thought to be assured. The central Arizona project would take the water from the great aqueduct built with that bond money. If that happens, the bonds must still be paid. More important, there will not be enough water for our destined growth.

Where there is no vision, the people perish. True today. The vision that brought the water of life to this area must not fade. Your inheritance must not fade. As each of you has found a better place to live, to progress and be happy, I suggest to you that your highest endeavor should be to pass on to those who come after you an even better place to live. An acceptance of the amenities of life in a great city limited to the obligation of paying taxes is not sufficient. A knowledge of the forces behind those amenities, a determination to advance the interests of your community through that knowledge, will keep the vision before you and pass it on to those who follow. Paraphrasing the statement of Mr. Mulholland in referring to the importation of water into this city, that "if you don't get it, you won't need it," I suggest to you that "if you don't keep it, you won't need it."

Water is, indeed, life to this community—you have it now—and what you have must be kept. I do not intend to be rhetorical in suggesting that every one make it his business to do what he can to sustain our way of life through the maintenance of a sufficient water supply to this otherwise insufficient land we live in.

CONCLUSION

There is no compromise possible now, and none of our rights on the river can be relinquished except under the persuasion of a decree of the United States Supreme Court. For 150 years Americans have sought to resolve their controversies through the processes of law. California cannot go to war against Arizona over this water controversy. Nothing remains but a legal solution by the highest court in the land. Our people, our industries, our farms need the water we claim to own, and none of it can be relinquished because of Arizona's pressing for an expensive and uneconomic diversion.

If we do not have a firm right to the water we claim, if we are to ultimately lose any of it, then it is far better to find it out now and plan accordingly for the future. If we do own it, the Arizona project, without its needed water, should not be built. Therefore, California must press for submission of its controversy with Arizona to the United States Supreme Court for a final decision, and every support should be given to the bills before Congress, which would refer this controversy to the Supreme Court.

Vision, courage, and enterprise made possible the Los Angeles of today. Water brought from the Sierra Nevadas in 1913 permitted growth and expansion of the city. Now, after 35 years, we have reached the practical limit of dependence upon our river- and aqueduct-water supplies.

Again, vision, courage, and enterprise brought Colorado River water into the city in 1941—water essential to our continued growth.

This water supply is now threatened and must be protected. It can only be protected if we, now, match the vision and the courage and the enterprise of those who preceded us. Securing its permanence is today's job.

True, indeed, in 1948—"Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Water, and only water, will be the limiting factor in the development of southern California. The responsibility of preserving that which has been created by the men of vision in the past is ours—yours and mine. If we fail, the future envisioned by those men is lost.

California's Power Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, there is a power shortage in California—not because there is not any power. Congress authorized the money to build dams but there are not enough transmission lines to carry the power generated.

Congress was short-sighted in the building of transmission lines—the will of the P. G. & E. carried against the will of Democratic western Congressmen. Remember back to February of 1946 when James B. Black, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., appeared before a special House committee on Interior Department appropriations.

Representative Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, asked:

The Bureau of Reclamation has represented that there is a prospect of a power shortage in the future. Do you say to this committee that there is no prospect of any shortage of power in the Central Valley?

Mr. BLACK. There is no prospect whatsoever, sir.

Representative JOHNSON. Is there any shortage now?

Mr. BLACK. There is none now. There has been none, and there will be none in the future.

Well, Mr. Speaker, 2 years after the president of P. G. & E. stated flatly to Congress that there would be no power shortage in California, the P. G. & E. was itself cutting off farm voltage for 6 or 8 hours a day without warning to farms. Mills and factories have shut down for lack of power. Men are out of work. Yet the president of P. G. & E. in 1946 denied unequivocally the likelihood of a shortage of electricity.

Every one suffers—the farmers, the manufacturers, the workers, the people generally. Everyone but the P. G. & E. They get their price at the expense of the people. They are carrying the peoples power on their own terms, setting aside Federal policy established by Congress. California's misfortune is today P. G. & E's gain.

The following Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation region II press release from Sacramento, Calif., dated April 14, 1948, is self-explanatory. What does the present leadership in Congress propose to do about all this—serve the people or P. G. & E.?

The Bureau of Reclamation at Sacramento today offered to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., on an emergency basis, the new Shasta power to become available tomorrow, April 15, when the third generating unit at Shasta power plant goes into production.

Phil Dickinson, acting regional director of the Bureau, said the action was taken "in view of the company's refusal to agree to a long-term contract providing for exchange service to the Government's preferential customers, and the failure of the California Utilities Commission to rule on the contract question which has been within its jurisdiction."

The Bureau's offer was conveyed in a letter to the company signed by Regional Director Richard L. Boke.

In Washington, D. C., Mr. Boke said the Bureau's letter "makes it clear that the arrangement must be on a temporary, day-to-day basis because of the fact that the California Public Utilities Commission has not as yet concluded on the several matters presented to it at the March 12, 1948, hearing and a determination on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation that all water releases at Shasta Dam be fully utilized for the production of electricity during the present period of critical power shortage."

In announcing the offer, Mr. Dickinson emphasized its temporary character and particularly pointed out that the action, which will get the new Shasta energy out to the consumers of northern California, does not preclude action by the State Commission on the question of provision of exchange service by the company for the Federal Government's own installations and other public agencies entitled to preference under Reclamation Law.

"That question," Mr. Dickinson said, "remains to be settled—if not by a ruling of the Commission then by a voluntary relaxation of the company's hitherto adamant position. Until it is settled, there will be no permanent contract for this energy; and if it is not settled by the first of the year, no power whaever can be delivered to the PG&E except on a day-to-day basis.

"The present situation most clearly points up the absolute necessity for an independent project transmission system," he continued. "This Shasta energy, which belongs to the people, should not be bottled up by a private company so careless of its public responsibilities and whose only interest in the initiative of public agencies is to hinder their development and impede their success.

"Whether or not the company agrees to service to preferential public agencies at this time, it is clear that the only finally satisfactory solution will be for the Government and the people to be independent of the utility monopoly, in order to bring the benefits of abundant, low-cost power to the irrigation districts, the municipalities and the industries of northern California. Completion of the entire authorized Central Valley project transmission system and steam firming plant at the earliest possible date offers the only security to California power consumers in this situation."

Who Are the New Capitalists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member of the House of Representatives and every thoughful man and woman in America who is interested in the long-time effects of our over-all tax policy should read a thought-provoking editorial carried in the April 24, 1948, issue of Business Week, a McGraw-Hill publication.

This editorial, entitled "Who Are the New Capitalists?" points out clearly that fewer and fewer Americans have money left, after living expenses and high taxes, to invest in American enterprises, either corporations or enterprises which they, themselves, want to set up.

Through the years, the amount of investment capital available from private sources has been drying up. That means, of course, that the American free enterprise system is withering. We in Congress, in effect, are to blame for having waited so long to institute tax reforms that will arrest this creeping paralysis and turn the tide back. We hear a lot about helping small business, and there are half a dozen public and private committees working to this end, including several congressional committees. Yet, no small business either can be started, or long exist, without capital—and, through our tax policy, we are strangling new business while they are still embryos.

I know that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, is aware of the factors to which I refer. I hope that he and his committee are studying every angle of the points raised by this thoughtful editorial, for, after we Republicans have won power in November, we should turn our first thoughts to tax reform.

Under permission to extend my remarks I include the editorial referred to:

WHO ARE THE NEW CAPITALISTS?

Americans, as individuals, have been steadily losing both their stake, and their role as enterprisers, in our business system. The people of this country, in the last 15 years, have made no direct investment in our enterprise system. As capitalists, we have handed the process of saving and investing capital over to institutions.

Some people, of course, have put new funds directly into business in this time—but others have withdrawn their money. The result: On balance, peoples' savings are channeled into new plants or machines or homes only through banks, insurance companies, or other indirect means.

What are the consequences—and causes—of this fundamental shift in our system?

One important result is that the capital market is dealing in small potatoes now. Americans last year saved 6 percent of their incomes after taxes. That is the lowest percentage since before World War II. But it is impressive in contrast to the late twenties. Then we saved only a little more than 4 percent of personal income.

But, while savings increased, new security issues of United States corporations have fallen from a total equal to more than 5 percent of the national income in the late twenties to about 2 percent in 1947. What's more, of 1947's $4,700,000,000 of new issues, only 13 percent was in common stocks. Bonds and notes made up three-quarters of the total.

Even in the 1920's direct private investment was relatively small. But it is even less now. People are saving more, but they put savings into industry only through indirect channels—debt and loans advanced by banks and insurance companies.

The same holds for unincorporated business, homes, and other investments. People are making far fewer direct commitments. This is true now. It was even truer in the depressed thirties, when individuals' direct investments were more than offset by the liquidations of other investments. All that individuals have saved out of personal income in the last 15 years has been salted away in bank deposits, insurance premiums, Government bonds, and similar passive or indirect investments.

DRAIN ON SAVINGS

Why is all this so? The first reason is that the people who save today are not the savers of 20 years ago. Most of the savings that upper-bracket people were willing to risk then in new ventures by direct investment are now going into taxes. Today's increased savings by lower- or middle-income groups go largely into insurance, pension funds, and the like.

Another reason is the low estate of the stock market, which discourages corporations from floating new equity stocks. That, too, perhaps can be traced back to high taxes and more passive savings, although the current lack of confidence is an important consideration.

Another important cause of the channeling of investment through institutions—and one somewhat in the realm of a consequence, too—is that corporations now pay out only about one-third of their profits in dividends. In the 1920's, they gave stockholders nearer two-thirds. Corporate dividends in 1947 were no larger than in 1929 in dollars and much smaller in proportion to everything else. That means the groups who might reinvest dividends directly in industry have less to reinvest.

All this comes down to a shortage of equity capital—particularly for new or small business.

Larger corporations can retain earnings to finance expansion. Established firms can borrow. But the shoe pinches the fields or companies that have no profit to plow back—and therefore too small an equity base on which to raise loan capital. This is perhaps one reason for the shortage of new home projects for rent. It is a reason for the stunting of the prefabricated housing industry.

In short, the whole trend of our economy for the past 20 years—and more—has been

to promote savings for security and to reduce, via taxation, savings for direct new investment in enterprise.

A SHORTAGE EXISTS

How serious is the resulting shortage of risk capital? There's still room for substantial disagreement on that subject. But there is no question that a shortage exists. And there is no question that the shortage is increasing.

Congress, however, has already set one remedy in motion. Cutting back tax rates on high-income groups will expand the supply of risk capital.

What else can be done? We can change the ground rules for the institutions that control capital—to permit them to put out more risk capital rather than loan capital. Housing projects constructed directly by insurance companies are one example. There is another: investment companies formed specifically to finance new and untried enterprises. Congress has before it legislation that would encourage investment and housing. And it can encourage financial institutions to invest in corporate stocks.

If the trend toward security through institutions is not reversed, it will spell the end of vigorous business enterprise. The first step is to knock some of the shackles off savings institutions. The second is to find out what more must be done to reverse the trend. The first is up to legislators. The second is up to business.

Resolution of Combined Veterans Committee of Germantown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I much appreciate the privilege extended to me to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Combined Veterans Committee of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., in tribute to Egbert Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, on the occasion of the celebration of their fiftieth anniversary on April 21, 1948, and to add my hearty congratulations and best wishes.

Whereas every citizen of the United States of America has the right and the duty to share in the maintenance and defense of his country and its institutions; and

Whereas readiness for defense is sound proof of fidelity; and

Whereas the veterans to whom this is addressed have long been acclaimed for their trustworthy American principles; and

Whereas they sounded the original call forming this committee for the combined observance of Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is founded in history that nations die out from the loss of their cherished customs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in this, its twenty-fifth year of remembrance of the honored war dead, the Combined Veterans Committee of Germantown congratulates and commends for valiant service to their country, and for leadership and faithfulness on this committee, our comrades of Egbert Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, on the occasion of the celebration of their fiftieth anniversary, April 21, 1948; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be communicated to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress; to the Governor of the Commonwealth; to the city council and to the mayor of the city of Philadelphia.

LAWRENCE K. BOUTIN,
Assistant Marshal.
JAMES A. RUSSELL,
Chairman.
CHESTER R. LANDER,
Secretary.

Communistic Infiltration in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the third of a series of eight articles written by Gustaf A. Nordin, of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, dealing with the question of communistic infiltration in the State Department:

INQUIRY HINTS RED INVASION OF UNITED STATES PAY ROLL

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The mysterious House committee report dealing with alleged State Department negligence in retaining employees considered "poor security risks" wraps together a puzzling story which, on the face of it, either means the Government has been successfully invaded by Communists and fellow travelers or overzealous investigations are being made by Federal security agents.

This document has not been released for publication.

It reveals, however, that some of the vital sections of American foreign policy have been laid bare to the inquisitive eyes of individuals suspected to be bad risks—so bad that in some cases as many as a dozen separate investigations have been made.

The guarded report provides 40,000 words of startling reading on 108 State Department employees. They represent only a fraction of the total 20,000 on the pay roll, yet enough to do serious damage to American foreign policy if the allegations in the report are reasonably accurate. A clean bill of health appears to have been granted a few involved in the report.

TEN IN OSS

At least 10 of the employees were formerly employed by the important wartime branch of OSS—Office of Strategic Services. A number of them were with the Office of War Information and transferred to the State Department when OWI went out of business.

A few are held poor risks because of morals; at least one for an alleged criminal record. Three have connections in various ways with the Soviet Embassy in Washington; one is a former employee of the Embassy another was working for the Soviet Purchasing Commission when employed by the State Department. Several were recommended highly by Prof. Harold J. Laski, of England, left-wing Laborite.

Five are known to have signed Communist election petitions.

Twelve are listed as being close associates or having connections in some way with suspected Soviet espionage agents.

ONE PRO-GERMAN

One is listed as pro-German during the war years, while in the Department. Practically all of them are suspected as members of the Communist Party or having communistic leanings.

Two were questionable employees because they had twice attempted to commit suicide.

Another was employed even though listed as a psychopathic case.

A study of the report reveals that the employees involved are scattered through every branch of the service.

The heaviest infiltration has taken place in the Office of Research and Intelligence, foreign service, and Office of Information and Education, the latter, especially in New York City.

If the employees are as questionable risks as painted in the report, they have managed to step into the right departments.

FIFTEEN ON INTELLIGENCE

Fifteen are reported in the Office of Intelligence Research. Its official duties are:

"Has the responsibility * * * for planning, developing, and implementing an integrated intelligence-research program for the Department and for coordinating it with those of other Federal agencies, in order to provide the Department with the foregin intelligence necessary for the formulation and execution of American foreign policy and to provide the National Intelligence Authority and the Central Intelligence Agency with studies pertinent to the national security."

Twenty-three are in the Office of Information and Educational Exchange, whose duties are:

"Has responsibility for the promotion among foreign peoples of a better understanding of the aims, policies, and institutions of the United States; the coordination of policy and action for programs of the United States in the field of international information and cultural affairs; the dissemination abroad of information about the United States; the promotion of freedom of information among peoples, etc."

IN MANY FIELDS

The Office of Foreign Service has seven on the committee list. This service has responsibility for the administrative leadership, management, and direction of the Foreign Service.

Others on the list are recorded as being with the Division of Map Intelligence, Research in the Far East, Financial and Development Policy Division, International Exchange of Persons, policy information specialist, Internal Security Division, International Labor, Health and Social Affairs, Division of Central Services, Biographical Information Division.

One is listed as a secretary to an American ambassador abroad, two others are attached to an Assistant Secretary of State office, and two are in high ranking diplomatic posts.

One employee was formerly attached to the Russian Embassy in Turkey.

Power Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, there is today a power shortage in California, just as some of us who have faith in the growth and development of this country predicted there would be.

Today, because of the selfish and blind opposition of the P. G. & E. and others, California finds itself facing an economic crisis. The following article by Richard Neuberger, written for Associated Cooperator, Oakland, Calif., appeared in this newspaper April 15, 1948.

I now include it, Mr. Speaker, so that Congress may know how California feels on the subject of our power shortage and where it places the blame:

POWER TRUST MISLED CONGRESS ON WESTERN NEEDS—BLOCKED BUILDING OF STORAGE DAMS BY FALSE CLAIMS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

While Congress denounces planning, the lights are going out in California.

The Pacific Northwest, locking in its mountain fastness 42 percent of all the potential hydroelectricity in the Nation, faces the worst power shortage in its history.

California ranchers are selling their cattle because no water is available for them to drink, and ranges are a parched, ugly brown.

But planning is an evil word, so no planning was done to avert a dearth of power and water which menaces the economic prosperity of the Pacific seaboard from Puget Sound to the Mexican line.

Why is there no planning? Who remembers back to February of 1946 when James B. Black, president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., stood before a special House Committee on Interior Department Appropriations? Asked Representative JED JOHNSON, of Oklahoma:

THE QUESTION

"The Bureau of Reclamation has represented that there is a prospect of a power shortage in the future. Do you say to this committee that there is no prospect of any shortage of power in the Central Valley?

"Mr. BLACK. There is no prospect whatsoever, sir.

"Representative JOHNSON. Is there any shortage now?

"Mr. BLACK. There is none now. There has been none and there will be none in the future."

Two years after the president of the P. G. & E. thus categorically assured Congress there would be no power shortage in California, the P. G. & E. was cutting off farm voltage for 6 or 8 hours a day without warning to farmers. Mills and factories have been shut down for lack of power. Men are out of work. Electric clocks lagged behind the sun's time. Yet the president of P. G. & E. in 1946 denied unequivocally the likelihood of a shortage of electricity.

AS GREAT AS WAR

When land blows away and animals die because of lack of water, America has lost forever some of its natural wealth. This is the inevitable result of the successful effort of monopolies to block the development of resources in the interest of all the people. In this connection, we cannot overlook the fact that only last week Fairfield Osborn, president of the New York Zoological Society, said that "the threat facing us through depletion of our resources is as great as that of war."

The Pacific coast is a curious region. It has immense valleys which are arid and gaunt. Their only natural vegetation is sagebrush. But in the mountains above these valleys vast quantities of snow fall each winter. Dams wedged into these gorges will impound water in deep reservoirs. It then can be let down to the valleys in judicious amounts, when needed. And the water dropping through the penstocks of the dams creates countless kilowatts of hydroelectric power.

But we haven't built enough dams, and thus the terrifying shortage of water and kilowatts. Men like James B. Black have scoffed at the necessity for further Government dams. When Bonneville Dam was completed in the Northwest the utility companies called it a white elephant. It was assailed as a "pork barrel" project. So no plans were made for the immediate construction of McNary Dam, the next upstream undertaking on the Columbia River.

AT CAPACITY

Bonneville now is strained to capacity. Fire hoses play on transformer banks to keep them from melting. Sawmills cannot get enough energy, yet these mills are on the banks of streams where lurk vast quantities of undeveloped power. But it will be another 5 or 6 years before McNary Dam relieves the power shortage. If McNary Dam were built now, surplus Northwest power could be delivered to California over 230,000-volt transmission lines.

Today nearly everyone along the coast recognizes the need for more power and irrigation projects on the rivers. This is realized on the farm, in union hall, in the offices of industry and management. Yet on the morning in 1937 that the late President Roosevelt dedicated Bonneville Dam, the national utility industry issued a report claiming that steam power was cheaper than water power. What did this mean? It meant that no further dams should be built, they apparently being a waste of the public's money. Now the coast, from Canada to San Diego, yearns for more dams.

PLANNING NEEDED

Intelligent planning is needed—planning which ignores selfishness and greed. Such successful private enterprises as Union Pacific and General Motors never could have developed without skillful planning. How without planning, can the people of the West synchronize their dry valleys with the cooling snowfields far away in the Sierras, Cascades and Siskiyous?

Slightly more than a year ago Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, veteran Republican Congressman from California's Fifth District, proposed that Columbia River water be piped southward to relieve the imminent shortage in his State. Ridicule greeted the suggestion. "Baron Munchausen, thou wert a piker," scoffed one newspaper, upon hearing of WELCH'S idea. Yet was WELCH so foolish?

UNITED STATES INTERESTED

The United States Bureau of Reclamation now concedes that the proposal has much merit. Indeed, the Bureau suggests on its own initiative that a study of the possibilities in the plan be undertaken at once. After all, the coastal lowlands along the Columbia have some of the heaviest rainfall on the continent: approximately 115 inches. The ponderous river is 7 miles wide at its mouth, and extremely deep. It has water to spare. A conduit to California would be fabulously expensive, yet it might double California's productivity and triple its population capacity. Can such benefits be measured at all in financial terms?

There is enough water in the West—if only it can be matched with the arid places. Along the Columbia 110 inches of rain annually drench the soil, and in California's choking valleys 8 inches add up to a generous year. But a flume from the Northwest to California would be a vast national undertaking. It would require extensive financing by the Federal Government.

Too Much ECA Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hoffman, Administrator of ECA, has indicated the past 2 or 3 days that the appropriation provided by the Congress will be inadequate. What the press reports have to say about the presentation made by Mr. Hoffman is very interesting in the light of press reports we have direct from Paris written by Michael L. Hoffman and as published in the New York Times, April 12, 1948. It is possible, as international matters are handled from time to time, for conditions to exist upon which Mr. Hoffman, the Administrator, may not have full information. Could it be possible that the American officials in Europe who are studying attentively the analysis of Europe's trade made by the Economic Commission for Europe, and the flow sheet of trade as it is occuring from day to day upon the basis of momentary facts, come to the correct conclusion that the Congress appropriated $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 more in financing ECA than is required?

Mr. Hoffman gives us some interesting information in his presentation which appears in the Times, and for the benefit of those who are interested, I here present his statement:

HUGE ERP SAVINGS NOW IN PROSPECT—UNITED STATES OFFICIALS IN PARIS FIND BASIS FOR REDUCTION OF $2,000,000,000 OR MORE

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

PARIS, April 11.—There is an excellent prospect that imports from the United States by countries participating in the European recovery program can be cut, over the period of the program, considerably below the levels estimated in the schedules presented to the United States Congress.

American officials in Europe are studying attentively the analysis of Europe's trade made by the Economic Commission for Europe that points the way to savings on the order of $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 in the ERP. These savings appear possible without sacrificing essential imports.

It has long been an open secret that the shopping list prepared by the Paris conference in September 1947 was, by the very nature of its construction, inflated. The State Department took out about $3,000,000,000 of "water," reducing the total to $18,500,000,000 for 4 years. But the State Department did not have a statistical basis for really finding out what made the Paris estimates too big.

SAVING IN OTHER PRODUCTS

This has been done by figures and analyses buried discreetly at the end of an appendix to ECE's recently published survey of the economic situations and the prospects of Europe. This shows that the estimates of both Paris and the State Department projected into the period 1948–51 huge nonrepetitive items in Europe's abnormal 1947 imports. These were contained in the more than one-third of total imports lumped under the heading "Other products," that is, products other than the 28 basic commodities listed by name.

ECE figures show that other products in 1938 were one-quarter of the total imports of the countries participating in ERP. They were nearly two-fifths of the total in 1947, principally because they included items like merchant ships, textiles, relief goods that Europe should not have to find dollars for to any great extent after this year.

NEED FOR SOME ITEMS TO END

According to ECE, the largest part of this category (other products) consists of items like textile manufacturers which were imported only in very moderate quantities before the war and the need for which will clearly disappear with the full restoration of European production.

"The remainder consists of investment goods—the need for which will presumably

come to end with the termination of the reconstruction period—or of manufactured products the demand for which will ultimately recede as European production expands."

As pointed out elsewhere in the survey, textiles and investment goods are among the European industries already nearly up to or, in some cases, ahead of prewar output. But if ERP estimates as they stand were followed, these countries would, by 1951–52, still be importing 229 percent of the prewar totals of these hitherto mysterious other products.

So many billions of dollars provided by American taxpayers and bond buyers have ruthlessly been wasted during the past several years that I am at all times seriously questioning the statements made by those who continually contend that the Congress has not provided the necessary billions of dollars, and that more and more billions of dollars are necessary.

Small Newspapers and Free Ads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial written by Mr. L. F. Reid, a well-known newspaperman, of Renville, Minn. Mr. Reid brings out the necessity of small newspapers being recompensed for the numerous demands made upon them by our Government. After all, space is all these newspapers can sell and Mr. Reid's viewpoint is, I think, very sound. Our newspapers gave much of their space to meet wartime demands and asked nothing in return for so doing. Surely, in fairness to them, the United States can pay for advertising matter our governmental bureaus send out during times of peace.

A CHANGE NEEDED

We received an advertisement from a Government department recently. It is something the public is entitled to get the facts of, regarding a Government job, paying $2,000 or $3,000 a year. The ad was alright, but just the same, as in other cases where the Government needs the same kind of publicity, a tearful plea was appended, asking us if we wouldn't please print it for nothing as the bureau in question had no money for the purpose. Isn't that too bad? Our Government throws billions of dollars around, sometimes judiciously and in some cases with little thought. Then, when they need 50 cents or a dollar for an advertisement they haven't got it.

I remember during the war. The newspapers and the other citizens of every community were gladly giving their shirts to advertise war bonds. This we figured to be our duty as long as Congress would not appropriate the money for this purpose. Then some Member of Congress, who thought the Government should pay for its own advertising the same as Tom, Dick, or Harry, introduced a bill to pay the newspapers for bond advertising. This raised a great furor. I remember that one of the Senators, and he was a good friend of mine too, said he would vote against it because it would pollute the press. One thing he forgot. He was getting $12,000 a year and some relative was his secretary, also getting a fat salary, but I wouldn't accuse him of being polluted. Matter of fact I think the man was just as sincere and unbiased as if he had done his patriotic duty and worked for nothing, the same as he wanted the publishers to do.

This matter of Government advertising should be gone into in a big way.

If the newspaper publishers, their organizations, and field men would all really get on the job, study this matter and present a common sense program of advertising and publicity to the Congress, I believe that a far more satisfactory solution of the problem could be reached.

As the matter stands, the Government needs publicity of various kinds in the newspapers. A program of paid publicity planned by the advertising men of America would bring far better results and be more satisfactory to all concerned than the present tin-cup method, which neither gets any of the needed publicity in the right mediums for the Government or any revenue for the newspapers.

Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include two resolutions adopted by the Reserve Officers of the Naval Services, Battle Creek, Mich.:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Whereas we believe that the right of the United States Navy to call members of the Naval Reserve to immediate active duty in the event of national emergency must be clear and certain if the Navy is to formulate definite plans for the emergent naval defense of the United States; and

Whereas we, the members of Battle Creek Chapter of RONS-NROA, are ready and willing to serve our country again in the event of national emergency, and believe that the services of naval reservists would be essential to prompt naval defense of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association advocates the prompt passage of legislation making clear and certain the right of the United States Navy to call all members of the United States Naval Reserve to immediate active duty in the event of a declaration of national emergency by the President of the United States.

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Battle Creek, Mich., Chapter of RONS-NROA.

ROGER N. TURNER, *Secretary*.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Whereas we believe the safety and security of our families, our homes, and our Nation is and must be primary to all other aims and endeavors; and

Whereas we believe the spread and growth of totalitarian governments stronger in present armed might than our Nation constitutes a serious threat to the safety of our families, our homes and our Nation; and

Whereas we believe an America strong in armed might is the best deterrent to armed conflict available against totalitarian governments: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That Battle Creek Chapter of RONS-NROA strongly advocates the adoption of universal military training as the best available means of building civilian reserves for the armed forces; and it is further

Resolved, That this association strongly advocates prompt passage of selective-service legislation by the Congress to make civilian reserves immediately available should the need for them arise.

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Battle Creek, Mich., Chapter of RONS-NROA.

ROGER N. TURNER, *Secretary*.

Animal Husbandry in the Hawaiian Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Dr. L. A. Henke, professor of animal husbandry at the University of Hawaii:

ANIMAL HUSBANDRY IN THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS

(By L. A. Henke, animal husbandman, University of Hawaii)

The casual visitor to Hawaii who limits his observations to what may be seen from a trip around the island of Oahu is likely to depart with the impression that sugar and pineapples constitute the major agricultural industries in the Territory. While this is true, livestock is an important third industry. Sales of livestock and livestock products produced in Hawaii in 1947 totaled $6,000,000 for beef cattle, $5,800,000 for dairy products, and $3,300,000 for swine. This total, about $15,000,000, represents about 8 percent of the total value of the agricultural crops produced in that year.

The islands have a total area of about 6,000 square miles. Twenty-six percent of the total area is in forest reserves which are very important from the standpoint of conserving water and preventing erosion; 27 percent are waste or nonagricultural lands; 40 percent is devoted to grazing, leaving only 7 percent as cultivated lands. The area devoted to livestock production is about 6 times as large as that devoted to the growing of sugarcane. To be sure, the ranches for the most part are inferior lands and include areas that are too steep for cultivation, rocky, covered with lava flows, too dry, or too high for crop production. In spite of this, cattle over the entire ranch area average about 1 head to 10 acres, and this ratio would be far better except for large tracts of arid and lava flow covered lands included in the ranches where 100 acres would not properly support 1 steer. Some ranches with good pastures may average 1 steer to 2 or 3 acres.

BEEF CATTLE

The beef cattle industry in Hawaii had its beginning in 1793 when the English navigator, Vancouver, landed Longhorns in Kealakekua Bay. These first cattle were protected by the Order of the King for a period of years, and by 1820 the three mountains of Hawaii and the plateaus and valleys between them were full of cattle. Mexican cowboys were introduced in 1832 to teach the Hawaiians how to handle these wild steers.

The Parker Ranch with a present area of about 300,000 acres and 35,000 high-grade Herefords had its beginning about this time.

There were times in the early history of the beef-cattle industry when the hides and the tallow from the cattle were in greater demand than the beef. Beef prices in general were not satisfactory until after annexation of Hawaii to the United States in 1898.

From the very beginning of the beef-cattle industry in Hawaii, steers have been shipped directly to market from the grazing areas without a supplementary period of concentrate feeding prior to slaughter. The obvious reason was and still is that the usual fattening feeds like corn were available in only small quantities and at high prices.

The number of beef cattle now totals about 130,000, and this number has remained fairly constant during the past 2 or 3 decades. Local production of beef totals about 16,000,000 pounds of dressed beef annually, and this supplies slightly more than half of the total beef consumed in the islands.

Improved English breeds of cattle were introduced to Hawaii beginning of 1850, and by 1900 they had completely replaced the Longhorns. While all three of the leading English breeds, the Hereford, the Shorthorn, and the Angus, were introduced to Hawaii and all of them are still found to a limited degree, the Herefords have become most numerous and now constitute over 90 percent of the beef cattle found in Hawaii.

DAIRY CATTLE

Dairying is largely limited to the production of fresh milk, and dairy cattle tend to be concentrated near the larger cities. The Territory has about 10,000 milch cows and total milk production for 1947 was about 32,000,000 quarts which is an average production of about 7,000 pounds of milk per cow per year. The per capita fresh milk consumption in the Territory has trebled in the past 25 years, and today the supply of fresh milk is not equal to the demand. Large quantities of canned and powdered milk are imported and are widely used to supplement the fresh milk supply.

Dairy cattle, especially near the cities where land is limited and very expensive, secure their roughage as soiling crops. A commonly grown soiling crop, Napier grass, will average about 70 tons of green forage per acre per year if irrigated and properly fertilized. Two locally produced byproducts, cane molasses and pineapple bran, are used as concentrates; but since neither of these carries an appreciable quantity of protein, soybean oil meal secured from the Middlewest is the most commonly used protein supplement. During the past year the price of this has ranged between $120 and $140 per ton.

Because of the high cost of concentrate feeds as well as high labor cost, milk prices are high, retail prices ranging between 25 and 30 cents per quart.

To a very limited degree, milk produced on the outside islands where production costs are lower is flown to Honolulu by air freight. The high cost of air freight, however, offsets the lower production costs on the outside islands.

SWINE

The English navigator, Captain Cook, who discovered Hawaii in 1778 left some swine at that time. The size of the swine industry is largely limited by the amount of available garbage. During the war years when so many servicemen were stationed on Oahu, the swine industry more than doubled. Experiments at the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station show that about 12 pounds of military garbage will produce 1 pound of increased live weight in swine. Garbage from residential areas has a much lower value. The usual concentrates fed to hogs in the Corn Belt are available in Hawaii only at very high prices and are not generally fed. Local by-products like cane molasses are utilized, as are cull fruits, vegetables, and other by-products.

All pork produced in Hawaii is consumed as fresh pork. Cured meats like ham and bacon and canned meats are imported in large amounts.

Most of the modern breeds of hogs have been introduced to Hawaii, but Duroc-Jerseys and Berkshires are perhaps most numerous at the present time.

SHEEP

The sheep industry reached its high point about 1885 when a total of 125,000 were found in the islands. Since that time, the number has decreased greatly as former sheep areas were given over to the grazing of cattle or in some cases planted to pineapples. It is estimated that there are only about 25,000 sheep in the Territory at this time, and these are concentrated in two places, the Humuulu Sheep Station of the Parker branch and on the island of Niihau.

Because of the limited size of Hawaii, it is not likely that the livestock industry will greatly expand; but even in its present size, it is very important in the economy of the Territory and provides a good source of income to many people who aspire to become citizens of the forty-ninth State in the Union.

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times of April 23, 1948:

FEDERAL LAWS ARE NOT THE ANSWER

Collier's magazine never has been noted as a protagonist—seldom as even a mild supporter—of the South in the social sectional problems that concern it. In fact, only a few years ago one of its editors wrote an article—published in Collier's—cussing out just about anyone in the South who dared to oppose Franklin D. Roosevelt—specifically naming this newspaper because it could not swallow Mr. Roosevelt's political sociology and because we looked on the late President's desire to perpetuate himself in office indefinitely as contrary to fundamental principles of Americanism in a democratic government as a Republic.

Consequently, it is important—and encouraging—to find Collier's now editorially taking the South's side on the issues involved in the Truman so-called civil-rights program, which actually is a suppression of rights program.

Collier's holds that there is something to both sides to the extent that of course lynching is evil and poll taxes that restrict suffrage certainly are not democratic. But, it points out also that Federal laws are not the answer to such problems as exist—heading its editorial, "We need something stronger than law."

"We think southerners," Collier's states, "are only telling the truth when they insist that Federal laws will never succeed in wiping out these injustices. It is axiomatic that no law, however well meant, can work unless it is supported by the majority of the people it affects. Northern intellectuals should know this fact of life from the Nation's experience with Federal prohibition.

"Well, both sides having a measure of right and a measure of wrong in their arsenals of argumentation, is there any discoverable factor that swings the scales one way or the other? We think there is.

"The factor is the unquestionable truth that the Negro's status in the South is getting better every day. He is some 90 percent better off economically than in the early years following the Civil War. Lynching is sliding toward the vanishing point. As for social equality, most Negroes apparently don't want it anyway, since they have their own social organization to satisfy their fraternal, religious, snobbish, etc., instincts.

"Federal laws didn't work these improvements. They have come about solely because they have been stimulated by the most substantial and respected people among the southern whites. They would have come a good deal more slowly, we think, if Federal laws had forced Mr. Whiskers to keep his nose eternally stuck into southern affairs.

"If all this is as true as we're convinced it is, then it follows that the best way to solve what remains of the Negro problem is to go on just about as we've been going since around 1870. That would mean: Let the northern intelligentsia howl its collective head off about the South * * * let southern and northern politicians make what political capital they can out of the question * * * but don't saddle the Federal Government with a bunch of laws which it cannot enforce. In other words, let the South work out its Negro problems mostly on its own—which it is doing anyway, and we think will continue to do."

All of which is pretty much what we have said in these columns so many times in the past, though perhaps in greater detail.

Up and Down With Dr. Gallup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll, published widely in the newspapers on Sunday, April 25, shows Harold Stassen with a slight lead in the field of Republican Presidential candidates. Mr. Stassen should take what comfort he can from it before the results of next week's Ohio primary are in.

Dr. Gallup's own qualifications of his figures, which are likely to be overlooked by those who read just the headlines, should be carefully noted. Dr. Gallup himself points out that these figures, and I quote, "Cannot be used to forecast primary results in any one State." End quote. It would be a serious mistake to take these Sunday figures as a forecast of Stassen's popularity in Ohio. Next Tuesday's primary will show that the Republicans of Ohio are solidly behind their able Senator, ROBERT TAFT.

Popularity as measured by the Gallup poll is a very changing thing. I can remember when Harry Truman was reported with a popularity of something like 76 percent, and today he shows up with about 25 percent. It will be interesting to watch what kind of a similar nose dive Stassen's rating on the Gallup score card will take after this primary next Tuesday.

Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Winston Churchill," which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union, published in Manchester, N. H., April 22, 1948:

WINSTON CHURCHILL

In a race of little men comes, every generation or so, a giant among men. It is, as a rule, easier to recognize these giants as we look back over half a century or more of time. But, once in a while, comes such a man whose greatness is so outstanding that even we blind contemporaries can hear the rustling winds of magnificence as we hurry by.

Such a man is Winston Churchill.

The New York Times is doing a great service in reprinting his memoirs, but the average reader will probably enjoy their reproduction in the weekly magazine Life, a little more because Life is able, by its very nature, to give the reader a large section of the memoirs in one bite, and it also has the advantage of being able to use colored photographs and dramatic type, to set off one of the most dramatic and colorful careers of all times.

Our readers are most sincerely urged to read the Churchill Memoirs in Life, the Times, or in book form, not only for the great, reverberating prose which sounds through this history, but to learn the lessons that have immediate application to the problems of our present day.

For instance, to those would-be appeasers of Russia in the postwar period after this war, Churchill points out the horrible results in blood and loss of money, and shattered hopes and dreams which followed in this war just completed, because the British and French and Americans shirked their duties in the 1930's.

Churchill points out what hope sprang when the League of Nations proposed to block Mussolini in his ruthless attack on tiny Abyssinia, and how it completely collapsed when Prime Minister Baldwin, that British apostle of normalcy and peace, would not back the idea of sanctions against Italy on the grounds that it meant war. Instead of cutting off the oil which would have stopped the Italian war in Abyssinia, they slapped Mussolini on the wrist.

As a result, Churchill points out, a fanatic, dreaming in Berlin, was emboldened to get over his fears and hesitancies toward world conquest, and Hitler invaded the Rhineland. Again the French, this time the foreign minister of France, came to England to see what the British would do, but the weakness which encouraged Hitler now kept Baldwin from backing up the French, and Hitler was allowed to get away with militarization in the Rhineland, and any chance of peace was lost. As Churchill pointed out, we must not repeat those kind of mistakes after this war.

Unfortunately, we have already done so much damage in appeasing Russia that we shall have to redouble, triple, and quadruple our efforts now if we are to make up for the long way we have slipped toward the edge of the cliff.

We have not quite gotten to the point where Ralph Wigram of the British Foreign Office said, after Hitler seized the Rhineland: "War is now inevitable, and it will be the most terrible war there has ever been. I don't think I shall see it, but you will. Wait now for bombs on this little house."

Wigram, feeling that his work over the years after the first war had failed to make people realize what was at stake, died shortly probably, in part, from his broken heart and discouragement, and the little house was bombed in the London blitzkrieg.

Churchill, in commenting on this, writes a line which probably sums up his entire philosophy of life and gives the key to his career. Speaking of Wigram he says: "My friend never seemed to recover from this shock. He took it too much to heart. After all, one can always go on doing what one believes to be his duty, and running ever-greater risks till knocked out."

That was the philosophy which Churchill cloaked in his immortally stirring reference to "blood, and sweat, and tears."

It is impossible to divine the plans of the Almighty. Dukes of Marlborough, were born and died until the seventh descendant of the victor of Blenheim married a belle from Brooklyn. A spark was struck, and that was Winston Churchill.

Whether he realized it or not, he probably did as much to save the civilized world as we know it as the first Duke of Marlborough, John Churchill, did to save England on the field at Blenheim.

If you want to forget the petty annoyances of housekeeping and shopping, or the office politics, and the first-class, little rats that one runs across so often in daily business life, or a difficult problem down in the barn, we urge you to read the memoirs as they started in Life magazine April 19, or in the New York Times.

Magnificent language will sweep over you as invigorating as a cool, autumn breeze from the summit of the White Mountains. Above and beyond the grandeur which sweeps away so much that is petty in our everyday life, Churchill presents lessons which we can turn to great, practical effect on the problems of this present day.

W. L.

Phosphate and the National Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a recent hearing at Salt Lake City, members of the House Committee on Agriculture heard a very fine address on the phosphate situation in this country by Dr. Elmer G. Peterson, former president of the Utah State Agricultural College, and executive director of the Utah Scientific Research Foundation.

Believing that the facts which were contained in this address are of interest to all Members of Congress, I have asked Dr. Peterson to reduce his remarks to writing and I am submitting the same herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

PHOSPHATE AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

The world population is now about two and three-tenths billions. The most authoritative estimates indicate that in the next 25 years this figure will reach nearly three billion, and increase over the present population of about 650,000,000 people. Two and one-half acres of land are needed for a minimum food supply for each person. With 4,000,000,000 acres of land, all that is left of our available acreage on earth, each person has less than 2 acres for his maintenance. America, if we could live alone, would be more fortunate than the average of the world because we have about 3⅗ acres of land per person. But we cannot, we have found, live alone with our relative abundance. We must share with the rest of the world, in some degree at least, because world peace, while it has many important prerequisities, the first is food. Hungry or starving people, do not observe boundaries or treaties, as has been said by our distinguished soil-conservation leader, Dr. H. H. Bennett. Self interest, if no other motive, prompts us and requires that we cooperate with the rest of the world in trying to solve the problem of food.

America has only 460,000,000 acres of good land left. We have been the most profligate people of all history in wasting our soil. We have destroyed already about one-fifth of our original arable land and one-third of the balance is seriously damaged. One-third of what is left is now in some jeopardy. Bad soil practice with resulting erosion is now costing the United States 500,000 acres of good land each year. It is estimated that from 1895 to 1930, we lost 1,000,000 acres each year.

This is, of course, a disturbing picture of what may happen to America. We are, as the above figures indicate, improving, but our present rate of exhaustion of the still fertile lands of the great Midwest and elsewhere is such that major calamity could overtake us and inevitably will overtake us unless we begin to restore the critical elements of soil fertility, which the removal of crops (stimulated by war need and present world hunger), erosion, and malpractice have taken from our soils at a dangerous rate. I shall mention particularly in this statement our phosphate problem in America, although a permanent soil fertility is not a matter of phosphate exclusively or of nitrogen or potash or of all three. It is a matter of careful attention to these three continuing needs and of a more thorough cooperation with nature in managing our soil than we are now exercising. (The need of maintaining intelligent people on our lands in order to provide good soil management practice is of greater importance than ever before in our history and it has always been a major consideration in maintaining national strength.) Phosphate, however, is the key element in soil fertility at present because of its depletion from our soils and because of the sources of phosphate are limited to our own rock deposits and to certain other deposits in Europe, Africa, Asia, and the islands.

America needs now a national attack on the phosphate problem. With the deposits in Tennessee nearing exhaustion and with Florida feeding this resource into not only the Southeast and the East but into the West and extensively elsewhere, we should take organized action to see to it that the large deposits of phosphate rock in the four Western States (Idaho, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana) are made available to the farmers of America, particularly to Midwest and far West farmers, and to the degree considered desirable to other peoples of the world.

These four States contain about one-third of the world's known supply of phosphate rock, and between 65 and 75 percent of the national supply. Florida contains the only other large deposit. The following list gives the approximate figures:

Idaho, 5,736,000,000 tons; 70 percent (or better) tricalcium phosphate.

Utah, 1,741,000,000 tons; 40 percent (or better) tricalcium phosphate.

Montana, 391,000,000 tons; 70 percent (or better) tricalcium phosphate.

Wyoming, 115,000,000 tons; 70 percent (or better) tricalcium phosphate.

Total, 7,983,000,000 tons.

The only other considerable deposits are in the following States, with the tonnages

estimated by Mansfield (U. S. Geological Survey) in 1940:

	Tons
Florida	5,081,539,000
Tennessee	195,151,000
South Carolina	8,798,000
Kentucky	836,000
Arkansas	20,000,000

The Florida estimates, it should be noted, are on deposits as low as 40 percent tricalcium phosphate. Idaho deposit estimates are on the basis of 70 percent tricalcium phosphate or better. If these estimates included deposits from 40 percent up to 70 percent and better, as in the case of Florida, it is estimated that the Idaho tonnage would be increased possibly as much as 70 percent.

Most of the more readily accessible privately owned deposits have already been purchased by various phosphate interests. The phosphate on federally owned land is large and open to lease. Tentative filings have been made on most of the better deposits. The present leasing laws, however, do not provide sufficient protection to the lessee and as a result practically no Government leases are maturing. An attempt is being made by Congress to liberalize these Federal leases. They should permit the proposed lessee to explore the deposit before making commitment as to expenditures for development and to protect him somewhat further in open bidding after investigation. Other important changes should be made in our leasing laws.

At present most of the development under way consists of stripping privately owned, Indian, or State-owned lands of surface rock which is being shipped to the coast or elsewhere for processing, much of it going as crushed rock to the Orient, under United States Army contract.

There are still sizable privately owned deposits open to lease or sale but, as stated, they are comparatively few. The qualifying factor in the deposits in this area is the faulting which has taken place which makes the mining of many of the larger and richer deposits expensive or prohibitive under present conditions. Later, of course, they will of necessity be utilized to a considerable extent when the other deposits have been exhausted.

The processing of the rock, by electric furnace, blast furnace, or sulfuric acid methods is very expensive, particularly electric furnace and blast furnace, and in the case of these two methods comparatively cheap electric power is required. The electric furnace method is particularly adapted to this area because with this process, elemental phosphorus or phosphoric acid is produced. These concentrated forms permit a wider shipping area. Our national committee estimated that these concentrated products could reach the Midwest area approximately from Missouri north and the Mississippi River west to the coast. Of course, with elemental phosphorus, the market area would reach far beyond this. It is likely that concentrated products will be produced here and shipped to, let us say, the Chicago or Mississippi River area and there compounded into less concentrated form such as triple superphosphate or superphosphate.

Considerable pressure is being exerted to enable the Columbia Basin Authority to extend its lines from the Northwest to this area. Congressional appropriations are necessary to extend these lines and thus make this power available. This is, of course, a matter for Congress to decide.

The vast bulk of the phosphate reserves are, you will note, in Idaho. They concentrate, roughly, from Montpelier north to Soda Springs. The estimates from Idaho are based, you have noted, on 70 percent (tricalcium phosphate) rock. If the estimate included rock as low as 40 percent, the Idaho tonnage would be greatly increased, possibly by as much as 70 percent or more. The Midwest must come here for phosphate. The deposits in Florida and Tennessee should be held, under any sane national economy, for the Atlantic seaboard States and the contiguous territory.

I believe that the national welfare would be served by special congressional provision for a frontal attack on this problem through provision for large-scale research and experimental studies to be made to determine the essential facts regarding phosphate, to include, among other things, the following:

1. The development of a commercial-sized experimental plant or plants to ascertain the facts regarding the processing techniques, including the problem of utilization of nearby coal, in the development of blast furnace and related processes—these plants to be sold to private or cooperative interests after the experimental period is over.

2. The furnishing to Congress of the essential data on the economics involved, including freight rates, in opening the western beds in the interest of the farmers of America, and particularly because of their vast production, the Midwest. It is not too much to say that the peace of the world is in considerable degree dependent upon the farmers of America, and they in turn are dependent upon fertile soil.

3. A further study of phosphate soil exhaustion under present practices and deficient supplies of fertilizer.

4. A greatly accelerated study of the adaptability of the various forms of phosphate to the varying soils and soil areas of the United States.

5. A study of the power problem including power rates, the practicability of development of additional power sites in or near the phosphate area of the West, and an analysis of the questions raised by possible power transmission from the area of (potential) surplus in the Columbia Basin to the phosphate area. Every encouragement, of course, should be given the intermountain power companies to enable them to supply this increasing need for power.

The above refer only to phosphate. Our present serious nitrogen impoverishment, in the West particularly, should be included in any comprehensive studies made. The whole great and grave question of soil fertility deserves careful and continuous scrutinizing. A permanent soil fertility is, of course, the first necessity of our country and the world.

Private industry and cooperatives will be obliged to carry the burden of the responsibility of initiating and administering this ultimately vast enterprise in the West, possibly to be the largest in aggregate in the world, by supplying the requisite commercial fertilizers. Government should, as said before, extend its experimental and educational facilities far beyond its present efforts.

Certainly such an enterprise merits the attention of Government in order that the necessary experimental and educational phases of the problem may be adequately developed, in the interest of industry, but particularly in the interests of the farmers of our country.

Maryland Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Maryland's laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, as compiled by Mrs. Meredith G. DuBor, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, room C, War Memorial Building, Baltimore 2, Md.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore I am hopeful that this résumé of Maryland's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Provision has been made for the burial of indigent veterans by the State.

A permanent registry of soldiers' graves is maintained.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgement is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces.

A civil-relief act has been enacted.

Complete administration by the administrator or executor of the armed forces may be effected, where the estate consists only of service pay, by advertising once as the orphans' court or register of wills may direct and filing therewith a statement.

Protection is given to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Revocation of letters testamentary of administration or of guardianship and reappointment of an executor, administrator, or guardian engaged in war service is provided.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

Holographic wills executed by persons serving with the armed forces outside the United States are valid and effective until 1 year after devisor's discharge if he is then living and possesses testamentary capacity.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

The legislature has recommended that the Governor grant a pardon to all parolees who have served honorably in the armed forces during World War II.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

The clerks of the several courts are required to furnish, without charge, copies of papers or records in their offices for use in connection with claims against the United States for benefits.

Free copies of public records are furnished for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The State registrar of vital statistics is required to furnish, without charge, copies of birth or death records for use in connection with claims against the United States for benefits.

Honorable discharge papers of persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States are recorded by the clerk of the court free of charge. Such records thereof are admissible in evidence in any court in the State.

It is the duty of the Maryland Veterans' Commission to assist veterans and their dependents with claims against the United States. The commission has authority to appoint a State service officer and necessary assistants.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Certificates equivalent to high-school certificates may be issued to members of the armed forces 17 years of age or older, upon examination in the usual high-school subjects.

State examination for license upon return to State of persons who were real-estate brokers at the time of entering military service is waived.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Preference rating is given to veterans in employment under any county or municipal civil service or merit system or ordinance. Veterans under 55 years of age may be exempt from any age limitation or requirement; chapter 904 is applicable to Montgomery County only.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

State police may be reappointed with preservation of seniority.

State, county, and municipal employees may be reinstated without loss of seniority rights upon application made within 90 days after termination of military service with preservation of rights in any pension or retirement fund or system.

The mayor and city council of Baltimore may, by ordinance, provide preferences to veterans in employment.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

The rights, privileges, and benefits enjoyed by veterans of other wars are extended to veterans of World War II.

GUARDIANSHIP

A uniform guardianship act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

The Maryland Line Confederate Soldiers' Home at Pikesville has been restored for use as a home for destitute soldiers.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

A veteran may be declared insane and committed to an institution.

MARRIAGE LICENSES, ETC.

Clerks of courts may waive the 48-hour waiting period wherever one of the contracting parties for whom a marriage license is sought is a member of the armed forces.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

The Governor may award medals or certificates to veterans of the Spanish-American or any subsequent war.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

A War Memorial Commission of 10 members, all veterans, have charge and custody of the war memorial building.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Casualty, fire, life, and miscellaneous insurance companies may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Relief is extended to veterans, their widows, and children.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Exemption from tax on free admissions to places of amusement, entertainment, recreation, or sport is provided.

Any motor vehicle or trailer known as the 40 and 8 boxcar owned and operated by the American Legion is exempt from automobile registration fees.

Certain commercial fishing licenses may be renewed within 1 year after termination of hostilities or 1 year from the date of discharge.

Any allowance for disability resulting from active service in the armed forces is exempt from income tax.

For any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1943, compensation up to $1,500 received for service in the armed forces or merchant marine, and mustering-out payments shall not be counted as gross income.

Income-tax obligations are canceled for persons who die while serving in the armed forces.

Time for filing returns by members of the armed forces is postponed until 3 months from the time such person returns permanently to the continental limits of the United States.

Refund is made of the unearned portion of the liquor-license fee when license is surrendered by licensee upon entrance into the armed forces.

Professional, trade, or calling licenses are renewed within 1 year after release from military service. This law is applicable to renewals under local ordinances and regulations and public general or local laws.

Property of veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

Real property purchased by survivors of the Civil War for the purpose of erecting monuments, and of laying out commemorative parks, is exempt from taxation.

UNIFORMS

Unauthorized wearing of military uniforms is declared a misdemeanor.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the Maryland legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 15 chapters throughout the State, maintains three full-time national service officers, under the direction of Philip I. Robrecht, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, room 709–C, St. Paul and Fayette Streets, Baltimore, Md.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its Congressional Charter of Incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 or more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947, and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co., has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager, John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities

to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil-service appointments, and last, but really first in importance, suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 1,525,753; total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low-absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low-accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

As a veteran of both World Wars I and II myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

The "Why" of Sandy River Smelt Runs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I wish to include as part of my remarks an informative article by Edward E. Brockmann, published in the Sunday Oregonian April 18, 1948, relative to fish habits and improved methods for the preservation of our fishery resources. The article follows:

THE "WHY" OF SANDY RIVER SMELT RUNS—AMATEUR ICHTHYOLOGIST ED BROCKMANN TELLS OF STUDIES OF FISH MIGRATIONS AND WORK TO GIVE ACCESS TO STREAM

(The author of this article through the years has earned the title of "watchdog of the Sandy." The Sandy River smelt runs have been more than a hobby with him and his efforts in great part were responsible for improvements made at the mouth of the river.)

(By Edward Edmund Brockmann)

About this time of year people of the Columbia and Sandy River area look for the return of the smelt to the rivers. The $64 question is: Will the smelt run in the Sandy this year? (This year the smelt did come just before Easter.) The other questions are: Why don't they run in other streams like the Willamette and the Clackamas? How far up the river do they go and why? Do they live or die after spawning? How and where do they spawn? How many eggs are in a smelt? How large are the eggs?

There are four varieties of smelt along the Pacific Coast of Oregon and Washington, and five recorded along the Canadian Pacific Coast. The Columbia River region smelt is known as the eulachon. They differ in their spawning habits and their time of spawning.

The silver smelt, Hypomesus pretiosus (Girard) 1854, is the fish that received a lot of publicity to preserve the smelt sands along the Lincoln County beaches recently. In 1934–35 when the coast bridges were being built, Dr. Thompson, scientist, made a study of the silver smelt near the Alsea River. His report was published in the magazine Ecology; his thesis laid the ground work in saving the smelt sands.

With the exception of the report of Dr. Richardson in 1836, and the work performed by Loyal Royal of the Washington game department in 1936, the eulachon of the Columbia River area received little attention from the scientists.

In the beginning of creation, as told in the book of Genesis, chapter 1, verse 20, God said: "Let the waters bring forth abundantly." If you want a definition of the word abundantly, come to the Cowlitz, Lewis or Sandy Rivers when the smelt are running in full force. In all the ages the command to bring forth abundantly has not been repealed or amended.

In 1936 the writer, in cooperation with Dr. Harlan B. Holmes of the Fish and Wildlife Service, conducted a preliminary examination of the Sandy River smelt. Here are some of the findings:

The eggs of the eulachon are small, averaging .85 millimeter in diameter (25.4 millimeters to the inch).

The Sandy and Cowlitz being glacial, the fine, almost powdery pumice deposit is ideal for the tiny eggs. The sands of the Willamette and other rivers are coarse and would crush the eggs.

On March 28, 1948, the writer secured three female smelt from the Sandy River run. Carefully removing the eggs from a seven and one-half-inch smelt, he placed them on a glass plate and counted 35 eggs to a lineal inch, which made 1,225 eggs to a square inch. The smelt had 72 square inches of eggs, a total of 88,200 eggs. This is about the average size of the female smelt. Some females are nine or more inches in length.

In Dr. Richardson's statement of 1836 he states the eulachon had about 25,000 eggs. Since this article was written in longhand and type was hand set, it is possible that a typographical error was made.

Since Dr. Richardson's calculations were considered authentic and have been used as reference by subsequent writers, the error was not discovered.

Smelt ascend the streams a few miles above tidewater. In 1936 the writer confirmed this by tracing the runs as far as a mile below Gordon Creek on the Sandy.

Temperature of the water is a deciding factor in causing smelt to run. They enter the streams to spawn. Usually the first smelt are reported in the Columbia at Oak Point, Wash. This year's run was first reported December 3, 1947. The previous year they were almost 3 weeks late.

From records kept and experiments made in a trough hatchery in 1936, valuable facts were learned that temperatures of 42 to 48 were necessary for spawning. The smelt entered the Sandy on March 27, 1936, when the water temperature was 42 degrees Fahrenheit. Subsequent runs show water temperatures of 42 to 44 in the Sandy when the run started. The Cowlitz run of 1948 proved that statement.

The Columbia River water is slightly warmer than the mountain streams west of Bonneville Dam. The Cowlitz River has its source in the Cascades and is about 200 miles long. In this 200-mile area the water becomes warmer. The Sandy is only 36 miles from the snow line on Mount Hood to Troutdale, therefore, the Sandy will be a few degrees colder and the runs of fish affected.

The first smelt entering the Columbia River are firm and the spawn is undeveloped. As the temperature of the Columbia rises the eggs develop. At about 42 degrees the eggs have reached the stage where the smelt are seeking their spawning grounds in the Cowlitz, first.

GROWTH OF EULAHON SMELT REVEALED BY RINGS

In 1947 all nature seemed to be in rebellion. There were storms along the Oregon-Washington coast and cold spring weather up until March 20. During this time the writer kept temperature records of the Sandy. About March 21 a warm spell of weather started. Temperature of the water went up to 44 degrees in the Sandy and 48 degrees at Bonneville.

The cold water on the lower Columbia River held back the smelt. Then a sudden warm spell caused the eggs to develop rapidly. The smelt that did not spawn in the Cowlitz became overripe and lost their spawn in the Columbia. Result: No Sandy River run. Swelt spawn along the shores of the rivers wherever a quiet eddy is formed by projecting rocks, snags and sandbars. When the fish are in hordes and ripe their spawn will be dropped in swift water also.

On leaving the body of a female smelt, the eggs are covered with a gummy substance.

As soon as the eggs touch rocks, coarse sand or snags they cling. This is nature's way of preventing them from being washed down stream.

As the water becomes warmer from the spring sunshine, the eggs develop and hatch. While the eggs are developing the melting snow of the upper mountains causes the annual spring freshet in the Columbia River.

Slowly the river rises and backwater forms in the Cowlitz, Lewis, and Sandy, slowing down the current and the spawning grounds of the smelt become vast incubators.

After the young smelt emerge from the egg it grows in this quiet water. When the rivers have reached their highest stage and receded, quietly the baby smelt goes down the Sandy and Columbia with the flood water to the ocean. Then when matured finds his way back to the glacial streams to repeat the cycle of life.

To arrive at some theory as to the age of the matured Columbia River smelt the writer and Dr. Holmes examined the smelt scales under two powerful microscopes.

The scales examined had from 10 to 16 growth rings evenly spaced. In measuring the distance between rings and groupings on salmon we can read its growth progress and estimate its age. Whatever growth takes place in the eulachon smelt is a continuous one. The rings are evenly spaced. Assuming that the young smelt emerging from the egg does not grow scales for 6 to 8 months, and assuming that the growth rings are caused by the dark lunar period, we have a period of 24 months before reaching maturity. When we go back over the records of 25 years on the Sandy River, we find that for a long while we had runs every other year. Dr. Richardson's opinion was that the smelt matures at 2 and 3 years. He apparently was correct.

Smelt travel upstream only a short distance, for beyond the flood stage height the water will be colder and the river more swift. In the lower stages of creation reproduction means death to the parents. The eulachon, having the habits of a salmon dies after spawning. Disintegration is rapid, and it is a common sight to see thousands of dead smelt in pools before silt of the river covers them.

Early in June, a few weeks after the young smelt have been hatched, the glacier-streams water becomes a gray or yellow white color. This is the first silt from the glaciers which protects the young fish from being found and devoured by his enemies—carp, suckers, sculpin, grayling, and trout.

PROJECT OF DIKING SANDY HITS LEGAL SNAGS

While nature provides defensive means for salmon by growing teeth, the smelt has none as far as is known. Yet the Creator was all wise in providing a superabundance of eggs to compensate for the losses.

The male smelt are the choicest for food. The ratio of males is about 40 to 1 female.

Smelt runs in the Sandy were declining around 1913. In 1926 the writer was appointed to serve on a committee of anglers to see if some way could be found to assist in restoring the runs.

In 1913 the Oregon Fish Commission engaged Powers & Quinn, engineers, to examine the Sandy below Troutdale. The engineers recommended a dike be built across the main river flowing upstream against the current of the Columbia and confine the stream flow to the Little Sandy, a branch of the Big Sandy, flowing downstream with the current of the Columbia.

Years went by and conflicting interests and lack of funds caused delay.

From 1926 to 1928 plans for the work were prepared by W. G. Brown, civil engineer, and estimates made of the work. Lack of funds and changes in the game commission caused another delay. The title to the bed of Little Sandy was also questioned.

In 1855 the Government gave title to the bed of the Little Sandy to settlers. In 1859, when the State entered the Union, the State of Oregon received title to beds of such streams that had not already been deeded. Therefore, the Sundial Ranch, subsequent owners, had valid title.

Since developing the Little Sandy channel would prevent the ranch from reaching Sundial Island, formed by the rivers, Mr. Swigert, manager, suggested that the commission buy the island of 400 acres for $75 an acre. This was far beyond the means of the commission. In February 1928, two anglers conferred with Mr. Swigert and arranged a tentative agreement to purchase a perpetual easement for the channel for $5,000, but the game commission saw no way of getting money for the project, which was condemned by some people.

In 1929, the first smelt bill was introduced in the legislature as a Multnomah delegation measure. The measure provided a 50-cent license fee, bag limit of 25 pounds a day and booths along the river where licenses could be secured. It also provided that the money so raised be used only for the development of the Sandy River for smelt fishing and angling purposes.

Hardly a legislative session passed without some tampering with the smelt law. One session the bag limit was increased to 50 pounds a day. Again, about 1935, it was increased to 100 pounds a day for a 50-cent fee. The 1947 legislature went back to the 50-cent feet and 25-pound limit per day.

LICENSES PAY FOR IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING RIGHT-OF-WAY

The 1929–30 smelt runs produced $2,386. In 1931, under Gov. Julius Meier, a start was made. Easement for channel was purchased for $5,000. The first diversion dam, 720 feet long and 5 feet high, was built for $2,360.

Through efforts of Representative William A. Ekwall, of Portland, the Army Engineer Corps made an examination and survey of the project in 1935. After a hearing, the high command at Washington did not approve. In 1938 Nan Wood Honeyman asked for a review. A public meeting was held at Troutdale. The high command again said "No."

In October 1937, a group of anglers held a digging party and tried to dig a narrow channel through the hump that would permit the water from the Big Sandy to start and cut its own way.

In November 1937 the game commission authorized an improvement in the diversion dam. About $15,000 was spent to increase the height to 8 feet.

In 1940 Senator Rufus C. Holman and Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL obtained an appropriation of $30,000 to complete the job, which had the approval of the United States Bureau of Fisheries.

On March 14, 1941, the weather was cold and Sandy temperature was 42 degrees when tthe first main run of smelt came into the Sandy through the new channel.

Besides the tourist interest in seeing the smelt run in the Sandy, the resulting license fees are paying for improvements in the river. Cost of improvements, including right-of-way, has been $44,463.63. Total sales of the 50-cent licenses have been $33,239.50, not including this year's sales.

In connection with the licensing of smelt fishing, the commercial fish commission of Oregon has increased its license fee since 1929.

It built a hatchery on the Sandy in 1938 and, thought the river is not as good as it should be, from 800,000 to 2,000,000 fish—chinooks, steelheads, etc., are being released yearly. The receipts from commercial smelt fisheries help maintain the hatchery.

The preservation of the salmon industry lies in developing the salmon streams below the dams. Each stream should contribute its share. In a $1,450,000 fish-saving appropriation bill now in Congress the Sandy River is listed for $175,000.

While Oregon was inaugurating the smelt bill in 1929, Washington enforced its bag-net license of $1 and allowed the people to take 50 pounds a day, while Oregon had a 50-cent fee and bag limit of 25 pounds. Washington abandoned her license fee entirely during the depression, but now has a 48-hour closed period on all kinds of smelt fishing each week end when smelt are running. The bag limit in Washington is 20 pounds per day free.

The Late Honorable Charles E. Winter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House of the death, at Casper, Wyo., on Thursday afternoon, April 22, of Judge Charles E. Winter. He served as a Member of this body for three terms, from 1923 to 1928, inclusive. Before coming to Congress, Judge Winter served as a district judge, and after leaving Congress he served as attorney general for Puerto Rico. He was a pioneer resident of Wyoming and he took an important part in the upbuilding of our State. He was truly an outstanding citizen, a lawyer of high standing, an eminent jurist, a public servant of the highest ideals and a great American.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert a portion of an article in the Casper Tribune of last Friday:

JUDGE WINTER SUCCUMBS TO LONG ILLNESS—FORMER DISTRICT JUDGE, CONGRESSMAN, AND PUERTO RICO ATTORNEY GENERAL DIES LATE THURSDAY AT AGE 77

Former Congressman Charles E. Winter died in the Memorial Hospital late Thursday afternoon, at the age of 77.

The "judge," as he was known affectionately to a host of friends in Casper and throughout the State and region, had been ill the last 6 months. He had been confined to the hospital since the 1st of March. Death came at 4:30 Thursday afternoon.

Funeral services are set tentatively for Monday at 2 p. m. at the Horstman-Gay chapel, with the Reverend Charles A. Nowlen, pastor of the First Methodist Church, officiating. Interment will be in Highland Cemetery.

Mr. Winter, a former district judge and Congressman, and a former attorney general of Puerto Rico, had been a resident of Wyoming 46 years and had resided in Casper since 1913. He followed the practice of law here over a long period, and in the latter years his son Warren was in partnership with him in the Casper office.

Judge Winter was closely identified with important movements for the development of the State. As an attorney in the copper mining town of Encampment early in the century, he became interested in mining policies and laws, an interest which continued throughout his lifetime.

The reclamation movement was coming into its own, and Judge Winter, quite naturally, was a leading proponent of such development, and his efforts in Congress were effectual in keeping the need for western projects before the attention of that legis-

lative body and the country in general. His principal work in this regard was his initiation of legislation for the Kendrick (Casper-Alcova) project and his continued activity in behalf of that project. Although he was unable to bring this question to a vote in the House during his tenure of office, his efforts in the House and those of John B. Kendrick in the Senate kept it alive so that it won final approval when the Public Works Administration was organized in 1933 for the purpose of launching projects which would be factors in fighting the depression.

His interest in mining and reclamation were components of a broader consideration of the Government's public-lands policy as it affects the Western States. Judge Winter was a consistent advocate of the return of the public lands to the States, feeling that the western commonwealths had an inherent right in the administration of the domain within their respective borders.

His study of the lands policy led him to publish a book, Four Hundred Million Acres, dealing with this question. The volume has been widely used as a text in several western universities.

Oleomargarine Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. (EDWARD) A. MITCHELL
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., in answer to his letter to all Congressmen urging the retention of the present taxes and licenses and other restrictions on the manufacture, sale, and consumption of margarine:

APRIL 24, 1948.

Mr. F. W. HOFFMAN,
President, the Cudahy Packing Co.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have been in the food business for the past 15 years, first working for a large corporation and finally, at present, serving as president of a small corporation.

During my years of service with one of the world's largest and finest food manufacturing and distributing organizations, I was taught that, as a member of the food industry, I was charged with the responsibility of protecting my distributor, my retail grocer, and my consumer, Mrs. American Housewife. I have carried this valuable lesson to my own organization and on into my first venture into political life as the Representative of the Eighth District of Indiana in the Eightieth Congress.

Your letter, addressed to all Congressmen under date of April 20, 1948, advocating the retention of the taxes, licenses, and other punitive restrictions on the manufacture, sale, and consumption of margarine, indicates that you do not hold with the theory that your company owes something to the distributor, the retail grocer, and the consumer.

Mr. Hoffman, you are not fooling anyone. The grocery trade knows that this sudden change of heart on your part is only for the purpose of protecting your investment in a newly acquired patent which allegedly makes it easier for Mrs. Housewife to color her margarine at home—and that if the present laws are repealed your gadget will no longer be in demand in many States. I think that the repercussions to come from the distributor, the retailer, and the consumer will cause your board of directors and stockholders to ponder the wisdom of your move. Certainly, by this action, you have not endeared your company to the distributor, the retail grocer, and the consumer of margarine because you are actually calling for the continuation of the nuisance value licensing of all grocers and wholesale distributors of this food product and the continued taxing of the consumers' table spread.

Frankly, if I were the chairman of your board of directors I would call for your resignation immediately and thereby prove to the distributors, the grocers, and consumers all over the country that the great Cudahy Packing Co. rejects your attempt to prostitute its good name.

Yours very truly,

E. A. MITCHELL,
Member of Congress.

To See Ourselves as Others See Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1948, I made an address at the banquet of the spring conference, Middle Atlantic region, Propeller Club of the United States, at the Hotel Chamberlin, Old Point Comfort, Va. In order that the text of that address may be available to those interested in the American merchant marine, I extend it in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, an industry will progress only if it knows its own good points and is able to sell them to the public. Merely to know that you are good, and to have your business associates and contemporaries know it also, isn't likely to get you very far. You must take your wares to the public—to the legislative halls of the Nation—to the leaders and the groups which direct or guide the thinking of the people—and you must demonstrate that your business is an essential one—that its prosperity means greater safety, higher levels of living, and assured employment for willing workers.

In a way, I think you should give due regard to the real sordid thinking in the amusing statement that "The dumb girl counts on her fingers, but the smart girl counts on her legs." That is good logic. People have been counting on their fingers since the dawn of recorded history, and there is nothing novel in it. Hands have been on display for thousands of years. They attract no particular attention. But legs! Now there's something new and novel. While we know they have existed throughout the ages on the female of the species, they have been kept fairly well concealed until recently—until the advance of science made it possible for every woman to have nylons of such excellence that they may change even a mediocre extremity into a work of art. And, gentlemen, you can learn a whole lot from the ladies. They have ascertained how to utilize their good points—their unique points—to the best advantage. The shipping industry can do the same thing, for it has many possibilities in the fields of service to the State and to the people, both collectively and as individuals. These should be developed with the utmost thoroughness.

Now, fundamentally, what are the purposes of ships? They do not exist for the sole purpose of allowing certain capitalists to earn a reasonable percentage on their investments. They do not exist merely to make jobs for personnel engaged in their operation. They do not exist just because shipbuilders (both executives and shipyard workers) find it necessary that they have something to build. No; ships are not for these purposes, but rather for two fundamental reasons: First, for water-borne transportation; and, second, for the exertion of national power through the instrumentality of a naval force. You can place almost every conceivable use of a ship into one of these two categories.

We are not concerned here with the second of these purposes—that is, the exercise of national power, except as ships of the merchant marine may be employed as auxiliary naval vessels, for all usual matters concerned with supply of a fleet in overseas operations will fall into the category of water-borne transportation. Our principal discussion will, therefore, concern the ships which carry goods at sea.

And let me say right here that, in my opinion, the shipping industry need not expect favors from American business—other than the favor of being allowed to carry the goods in the event it can do so under the American flag at no additional expense to the shipper and with no greater time element than if in foreign bottoms. Business is competitive, as you gentlemen have every occasion to know, and if American shippers are to compete in the world's foreign markets they must take advantage of the best rates available to them in either importing raw materials or in getting finished products to foreign ports. Successful business is not run on sentiment, no matter how beautiful that sentiment seems to the outsider.

I was quite amazed a few days ago to hear a witness before one of our congressional committees holding forth in an opinion that American shipping could be maintained in competition with foreign bottoms if our shippers would only utilize American-flag ships, even though they would be compelled to pay more than the going rate for the services rendered. In my opinion, such an idea is not only impracticable but is also thoroughly unsound. As I see it, the maintenance of ocean shipping is not the responsibility of the American businessman but rather of the Government of the United States. It is immaterial what flag covers goods in transit, so long as the shipment arrives on time and in good order, insofar as the consignor is concerned. What he is paying for is transportation, and, in general, I believe it will be found that services which are adequate for the needs, and minimum in cost, will be utilized in the same way a thrifty purchaser will buy the article suited to his requirements, having due regard to the quality and the cost thereof.

Now in this problem of foreign or domestic flag shipping, there are several factors which are of great concern to the Government and which may well cause the Government to encourage American-flag ships even at costs for services somewhat higher than those of their foreign competitors. Of course, in such event, these additional costs should be borne by the Federal Government and thus become a charge on all the taxpayers of the Nation rather than on any particular group or industry. Let us consider some of these matters for national concern.

First, the national defense. There can be no question but that an adequate merchant marine is an essential for the security of the Nation. Every war in which we have been engaged has demonstrated this need—the last two wars so dramatically that we have spent billions of dollars to provide maximum shipping in the least possible time. The cost of merchant ship construc-

tion alone for World War II was about $15,000,000,000 for the United States. Not only are merchant ships essential to conduct a war but they are essential, in reasonable tonnage, at the very commencement of hostilities. It thus behooves the United States to have a large merchant marine in being under its own flag, so as to have this essential element of national defense available if and when needed. The national defense is a function and a duty of the Federal Government and that Government should, therefore, provide the constructive measures which will maintain the required merchant ship tonnage ready for war use. It is likely that this can be done only through Government ownership of ships, or through governmental financial assistance in ship construction for private ownership, plus some sort of Federal aid in operation in nearly all areas of the high seas.

Second, the reliability of overseas service in time of emergency or crisis. To be dependent on foreign-flag ships in normal times of peace may not be inconvenient or unsatisfactory. If there is an ample service of such ships, both passengers and freight should move without delay or unnecessary expense. The real difficulty of such a situation comes when a foreign war breaks out and the ship-owning nations concerned withdraw their shipping, either due to fear of capture by the enemy or to war needs by the belligerents.

We had this condition in full force during the first years of World War I, before the entry of the United States as a combatant, when merchant shipping from our ports dwindled to such a dribble that exports piled up in seaport cities until we had to declare embargoes on shipments to the coasts. This, in turn, made prices on materials in oversupply, due to lack of shipment abroad, drop nearly to the vanishing point. Most of you older people can remember the desperate efforts made at that time to save the cotton growers of the South from bankruptcy. With the domestic market glutted with cotton, with overseas shipping almost nonexistent, with seaport warehouses jammed to the bursting point, and with no visible buyers for the current crops, a great drive was put on for the public to buy a bale at some ridiculously low price—as I recall it, at $10 a bale. You bought your bale for $10, let it stand outside subjected to the elements, and took a chance on getting a reasonable profit when the market improved or on a total loss in the event no such improvements came about. I believe that our entry in the war, brought about a sufficient improvement in conditions so the purchasers of this cotton did get off with a whole skin.

The people of a great nation should not be subjected to the uncertainty of ocean transport incident to a major dependence on foreign-flag ships. The welfare of the whole public is too precious to depend on this sort of a set-up. It becomes the duty of the Government to see to it that a considerable portion of our ocean commerce is transported in American-flag ships, and if such can be achieved only through financial assistance to the American shipping industry, then this furnishes a field in which such aid must be supplied by general taxation for the national welfare.

Third, the need of maintaining the shipbuilding industry. Ships can't be built without shipyards and skilled workers. Ship repairs of any magnitude can't be accomplished without the men and machinery essential therefor. Yet, in the event of war, we must go at once into a great shipbuilding program and we must be ready to accomplish repairs and conversions of almost any kind on short order. It then becomes essential that every maritime nation of any importance shall have a minimum number of active shipyards, and the highly trained personnel not only to man these yards, but to permit of a great dilution of skill in order that leadingmen, foremen, engineers, and designers may be drawn away in great numbers to furnish technical skill for shipyard expansion and for the hurried training of craftsmen for the new establishments.

I was much impressed by the marked withdrawal of skilled personnel from the established shipyards on the west coast during the recent war, when such new yards as California Ship at Los Angeles, Oregon Ship and Swan Island at Portland, the Kaiser Yards at Vancouver, Wash., and at Richmond, Calif., and several others came into existence. The older establishments were raided for skilled men—for men who were able to go into the new yards and take charge of their own sections or their own gangs and get things done in a workmanlike manner. When one tries to build ships in a hurry with men only partially trained, trouble and expense, and even downright disaster, come stalking in at the door to hound the manager and his executives. And just here, I should observe that, on the west coast, due to scarcity of competent leaders in this sort of work, even the Navy yards were not immune to loss of foremen and leadingmen, who were often offered just double the pay they were then receiving to induce them to accept jobs in new establishments. Here also, the Government has a big stake in the maintenance of an adequate group of shipbuilders and ship-repair men. This group is worth the reasonable financial consideration it requires to keep it in being.

Fourth, the obvious necessity of having a fully trained reservoir of manpower to go down to the sea in ships as rapidly as they can be built. Even good ships, without competent crews, are inefficient at any time, but particularly so in time of war. I do not advocate keeping up a big force of men in only a partially employed status, but, rather, the maintenance of sufficient peacetime crews for operation and for turn-over in the industry, together with adequate schools or training stations to train new crews and to assist in further expansion. I know, of course, that licensed personnel cannot be trained quickly, so I advocate the full use of the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point and of the maritime academies of the States to produce officers for the Naval Reserve and the merchant service.

Summing up these requirements of the National Government insofar as the ocean transportation pertains to the common good of all our people, and so justifies the expenditure of public funds in its maintenance, we find these four factors: National defense, reliability of overseas transportation, need for preservation of shipbuilding industry, and need for maintenance of trained seagoing personnel. A great nation which expects to hold its own in the world—more especially one which has reached the pinnacle of world leadership—must give deep consideration to its needs in relation to its surrounding waters, and must, in all justice to its people, furnish the financial aid necessary to guard its interests in maritime matters.

And now for the mention of some few conditions which have come to my attention as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House and also as a plain American observer. I make these comments with the kindest thoughts and ask that you think of them when you feel at times that the industry is misunderstood.

A year or more ago, the Maritime Commission had a surplus of tankers for sale to American citizens at reasonable prices. The industry was not interested—thought apparently that the need for privately owned tankers was satisfied and made no effort to add these tankers to its fleets. Then, with seeming suddenness, in the early months of 1948 the need for tankers became acute. Fuel oil couldn't be shipped fast enough to supply the demand, either domestic or foreign. Homes were cold. Members of Congress were flooded with protests. Tankers jumped into a demand comparable to that of a life preserver thrown to a man overboard. The tanker operators said that they had misjudged the possible demand for fuel oil.

But the question Members of Congress ask is, Why did they misjudge the situation so badly? We know they didn't do it deliberately because no competent businessman would do that. Then was it poor planning, or lack of vital information, or just gambling that we wouldn't have a cold winter? Gentlemen, such happenings as this fiasco in fuel-oil transportation during the recent cold months saps the confidence of the public in its faith in private enterprise. You may say that you didn't realize the vast conversion of heating plants from coal to oil—a conversion which has taken place largely due to the cleanliness and the ease of operation of an oil installation in comparison to one burning coal. The prompt rejoinder is, why didn't you realize it? There was nothing secret in the change. Its extent could have been known with considerable accuracy by keeping in touch with oil-burner manufacturers. The public, putting its faith in private enterprise, put its faith in you and it was let down. An industry should not get itself into such an unfavorable position.

Your accredited representatives appear before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and present quite opposite views in regard to the chartering of Government-owned ships. One faction says discontinue charters and compel operators to buy the ships, thereby contravening the acknowledged fact that such a policy would force many American operators out of business at the present time and throw a large part of our shipping to foreign bottoms. Another says, if you must charter, then do it on a definite ratio of charters to privately owned tonnage, thereby suggesting to the Congress that it lay itself open to charges of favoring unduly big business. And yet another advocates continuing charters on the "as is" basis, thereby allowing many operators to cover a considerable field in a relatively small investment. I do not wish to choose sides in such a controversy. What I want to do is to invite your attention to the undesirability of putting such technical problems up to the members of a committee composed of gentlemen unskilled generally in ocean-transportation problems. I know that is the way you have been doing in the past, but how much better it would be if you could thrash out your own problems and present a fairly united front before a congressional committee.

You have labor troubles on your ships and frequently it is difficult to know whether the ships' officers or the unlicensed personnel are responsible for these troubles. I know that the general tendency is to uphold the officers—to take it for granted that they are right. But that is not always the case, by any means.

In my visits to merchant vessels I have come to the conclusion that the licensed personnel is responsible for a great many of your difficulties. Such a condition can never be completely eliminated for even the best human beings will always have a certain percentage of error when under stress. Yet I think very much improvement could be achieved if seafaring people had recourse to certain arbitrators who were empowered by the industry itself to investigate and make reports to the parties to a dispute. I should not suggest any legal authority. Just that authority agreed upon by the operators and the unions so that each could have an impartial report upon the circumstances leading up to disagreements. I have no intention of being critical in this suggestion, but I have been struck forcibly so many times, in my talks with officers of both the Navy and the merchant marine, that here was one officer who seemed fair to me and that had

almost no trouble with his crews; whereas, here was another who seemed unfair and suspicious, and who complained bitterly about the worthless lot of men who served under him. I believe there is room for a great deal of improvement in your labor relations on board ship without going "soft" or injuring discipline in any way. In fact, I think that the so-called disciplinarians are quite unnecessary under normal circumstances. In my many years of service life, after I had once passed the stage of youth and inexperience, I found that the discipline of a ship pretty much takes care of itself if fairness and consideration become recognized factors on board.

Now let me bring out a zone of misunderstanding on the part of the public in which sea-going personnel is consistently blamed for troubles brought about by shoreside workers, such as stevedores, walking bosses, checkers, teamsters, etc. To the public, anything which prevents the scheduled sailing of a ship, anything that prevents the prompt loading or unloading, is immediately pinned on the crew of that ship.

Your seagoing personnel may be lily white in its every aspect of shipboard life, but the public just doesn't think of it in that way. If there are Communists in evidence in the shore gangs, then to the public the ship becomes infested with these undesirable citizens. If there are petty thieves in the hold gangs and packages are broken open for pilfering, then the public just naturally takes it for granted that your whole outfit is a pack of crooks making money on the side by looting the cargo entrusted to its care. I realize that this is a difficult nut to crack but it is one which should be given deep consideration for I find that points like these are the first rejoinders one gets when attempting to advance the interest and the welfare of the merchant marine among Members of Congress. They decline to draw lines of demarcation. They consider all connected with shipping to be tarred with the same brush. We should do our best to change this conception.

In this address I have set forth four reasons why I believe the merchant marine is entitled to the assistance of the Federal Government, that is, to assistance at the hands of the taxpayers of the Nation, and I have also set forth four phases in which I believe that the shipping industry may be able to advance itself in the esteem of the American people. I hope that I have not stepped on anybody's toes, but we shall move forward only when we truly understand the picture of the merchant marine as viewed by the general public.

The merchant marine should have a great future. It deserves a great future. We must see that it achieves that great future, in the firm belief that, in doing so, we are advancing the interests and aiding the national security of the United States.

The Disabled Veteran's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, a disabled veteran of both World War I and World War II has written a prayer to Congress which he has requested me to call to the attention of the Members. The title is "The Disabled Veteran's Prayer":

In yonder place there is a grave,
Some day my bones must fill it,
Pray let me live and linger on,
As long as God doth will it.
I served my land through two world wars,
Each day that grave draws nearer,
The Stars and Stripes I'm proud I served
No flag on earth is dearer.
I'm broken now from whence I served,
That this dear land be free,
Reinforcement I am needing now,
Like my country needed me.
Don't wait until I am dead and gone
Then write my name in fame
For the man has no enjoyment,
When he only is a name.
So if there are pensions, pomp, or flowers
To assist me through the strife
Don't save them to adorn my grave
Pray give them while in life.

—*Arthur A. North.*

SEGUIN, TEX.

Confirmation of Atomic Energy Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 26, 1948:

CONFIRM THE ATOMIC COMMISSIONERS

The Republican Party will make a sad spectacle of itself, indeed, if it follows Senator TAFT's lead in playing politics with our master weapon, the atomic bomb.

The Senator suggests that the Senate delay confirmation of the reappointment of Chairman Lilienthal and his colleagues on the Atomic Energy Commission until after the election. The Senator, of course, is assuming that come January there will be a Republican President, who would appoint other men.

This political maneuver would degrade the jobs of managing the atomic energy project to the low patronage level of second-class postmasters, deputy marshals, and Senate doorkeepers. It's about as rank and rancid as proposing that no top staff officers in the Army, Navy, or Air Force be designated until after election.

The fissionable atom, and the world race for its development—which may prove to be a race for survival—know no politics. Neither that nor any other consideration in the Nation's defense and security can wait for elections.

President Truman appointed the present members of the commission in October 1946. They were recess appointments. Congress met in January 1947, but delayed confirmation until April. Through all those months the work of the AEC was slowed down and the morale of its personnel damaged while Senator MCKELLAR spearheaded a campaign of abuse, vilification, and hatred against Mr. Lilienthal and some of his associates. Every conceivable charge and smear was raised, but none was proved, and in the end the vote to confirm was overwhelming.

Senator TAFT was one of the small minority who voted against Mr. Lilienthal last year. If he knows any new reasons why Mr. Lilienthal should not be confirmed, let him stand on the Senate floor and state his reasons. Then sit down and permit the Senate to vote.

The commission in the last year, from all accounts, has done a good job. It has rekindled the morale of its scientists and administrative officers, it has continued the manufacture of improved atomic weapons, it has made the products of nuclear fission available for protection of health and improvement of agriculture and industry. It is making serious efforts to develop peacetime uses for this greatest man-made force.

Having investigated all five commissioners to the point of exhaustion just a year ago, having then confirmed them all, having seen them do a good job meantime, the Senate, in our opinion, should confirm them again—and promptly.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS COMMUNION BREAKFAST AT HUDSON, MASS., SUNDAY, APRIL 25, 1948

Calling for an invincible national defense organized along modernized scientific lines and spearheaded by overwhelming air power capable of instant action, Congressman PHILBIN deplored the activities of war mongers who, he declared, were causing unnecessary hysteria in the Nation.

"Air power is defense, offense, and peace power combined," the Clinton Congressman said. "Together with guided missiles, rocket bombs, atomic war heads, and biological agents spreading disease germs, jet-propelled and radio-directed planes and huge bombers carrying air-borne troops and lethal explosives, air power can achieve mastery of the global airways, keep potential enemies from striking vitally at the United States and enable us to carry out our international commitments in behalf of the free and democratic way of life.

"The American people and the Congress, despite obstructionists, are prepared to carry out such a program and to build a balanced armed-forces system which will secure the Nation against any eventuality. It is regrettable that influential leaders in high places in the armed services, imbued with ancient and outmoded concepts of strategy and tactics, still insist upon the mass soldiery of Julius Caesar's time. They are of the same reactionary mentality as those who court-martialed the late Gen. Billy Mitchell and drummed him out of the Army in disgrace because with vision and courage he dared to assert the then growing importance of air power. Free Americans carefully trained in modern scientific techniques, and not regimented puppets specializing in mass ground formations, can best secure the United States.

"If war comes at all in the foreseeable future it will come in two ways, first, by direct attack by the Soviets, or second, by aggression or infiltration by the Soviets against free nations who are alined with our Democratic freedom-loving bloc and whose domination by the Soviets would eventually threaten our own security. Of course there is also the possibility of an incident or episode which would

constitute the spark setting off world-wide war conflagration.

"There is little likelihood of a direct attack upon our Nation by Russia at the present time. Red leaders better than anyone else know the deficiencies of their slave system—their inferior industrial potential, their lack of formidable sea power, their backward development in the air, the comparative inaptitude of their fighting forces. For these reasons it is also unlikely that they would deliberately incite war indirectly by attacking or seeking to undermine additional friendly democratic nations. But unquestionably serious tension exists in our relations with the Soviets, in fact there are tensions stimulated by Moscow front-line directed conspirators in very many parts of the world including the Western Hemisphere as evidenced by recent events at Bogota.

"Consequently we must maintain our armed forces at a high pitch of efficiency and of such a character, through the help of overwhelming air power and air-borne units, and modern weapons that they can instantly respond to an emergency affecting our safety.

"Of course the Army and Navy must be ready at all times and in the traditional voluntary American way historically so successful in the past, we should shake off the lethargy and indifference of brass-hat leaders and build an adequate organized reserve, National Guard, Air Reserve, and Civilian Reserve components to round out our fighting resources. It is not necessary to militarize the whole country to provide for the common defense.

"Let us not lend ourselves to war-mongering or frutless hysteria. The masses of no country, including Russia, want war. The world is yearning for peace, for amity, for the elimination of hatreds, brutality, and oppression, for a human brotherhood that will permit all races and peoples to live in unity and harmony.

"If statesmen would be worthy of the traditions of our Nation and mindful of the future destiny of America, instead of inviting war they would devote themselves earnestly to setting up a real offensive for peace. If this course, instead of a more belligerent one, were pursued perhaps the problems of reconciling present divergent national interests would not be so insoluble as they appear."

Politics Creates Palestine Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman, on November 29, 1947, permitted himself to force through the United Nations Assembly a recommendation for the partition of Palestine he rendered a great disservice to his own country. His action was the result of political pressure on an extensive scale and it is now revealed as a "political boner" without excuse. Those who cheered him on November 29 now jeer him because he had the courage to reverse his position in the interest of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Father Ralph Gorman, C. P., has appropriately called attention to the present dilemma in Palestine, and I include his statement as part of my remarks and recommend it to all Members of the Congress:

PALESTINE DILEMMA

The problem of a Jewish state in Palestine has reached a point where it threatens to develop into one of the greatest tragedies of the postwar world. The part the United States has played in creating this situation does no credit to the statesmanship or intelligence of those who direct our foreign policy.

For years we sat back and heckled the British over their administration of the Palestine mandate. When the British found it too hot a potato to handle, we induced the General Assembly to take over and vote partition of Palestine into independent Jewish and Arab states. The effect of all this has been to make a bad situation worse.

American backing for the Zionist cause has come chiefly from politicians and from kind hearted people with a laudable sympathy for the sufferings of the Jewish people but a meager knowledge of history and geography. The former are trying to outdo one another in advocating zionism in order to capture the Jewish vote. The latter see in Palestine a refuge for the persecuted Jews, but forget that unless the Arabs are willing to give up a territory rightfully theirs, rivers of blood—much of it Jewish blood—will redden the sacred soil of the Holy Land.

It is perfectly clear that only force can effect a partition of Palestine—and that means American force. The UN has no military contingents; it would be the climax of stupidity to invite participation of the Russians; the British are withdrawing; and the small nations would be asinine to burn their fingers pulling our chestnuts out of the fire.

The arguments against the use of American military forces in Palestine are so cogent that even professional politicians should recognize their validity. There is very slight probability that Congress would ever grant the necessary authorization and appropriation of funds. A volunteer force could not be raised in time—even if it were authorized—and the Regular Army hasn't the manpower to add a combination police job and guerrilla war to its present defense and occupation tasks. The British have been using nearly 100,000 men in Palestine with no visible results. Nor should we overlook the fact that the first casualties among our boys fighting in Palestine would enkindle a flame of anti-Semitism in this country.

In this matter we cannot ignore our vital interests in the Middle East. Any attempt to partition Palestine by force would arouse the hostility of all Arabs and Moslems spread over territories that extend from the East Indies to the northwest coast of Africa. Not only are we and the British dependent on this area for oil, but in case of war with Russia it would be of the utmost importance to have friends rather than enemies in this strategic link between Asia on the one hand and Europe, the Mediterranean, and Africa on the other.

We should be honest enough to admit our mistake, give up all idea of enforcing a partition of Palestine, and seek a new solution. This should not be as difficult as it might seem, as both Jews and Arabs should realize by this time that unless an agreement is reached the consequences will be tragic for both of them and perhaps for the world.

The Arabs should realize that over half a million people who have come peaceably to the shores of Palestine, who have bought land, cultivated and irrigated it so that the deserts bloom, who have enriched the country with new industries and raised the general standard of living cannot be deprived of all rights and pushed back into the sea.

The Jews must realize that they cannot take over a land that has been Arab for 1,300 years because their ancestors lived there 2,000 years ago, that Arab fears are not unfounded that the Jews, through outside help and unrestricted immigration, may succeed in taking over the country and in pushing the Arabs back into the deserts beyond the Jordan.

Palestine cannot and should not be partitioned forcibly; Jews and Arabs are too intermingled in large sections of the country to make an equitable division into two states, and they are too divided to rule themselves as a unitary, independent nation.

The only possible solution, it appears to us, is the division of the country into districts with local autonomy, subject to a central federal government under the trusteeship of the UN. The functions of the UN would be to protect the fundamental rights not only of Jews and Arabs, but also of the millions of Christians who look to Palestine as the birthplace of their religion, a land made sacred by the life and death of Jesus Christ.

FATHER RALPH GORMAN, C. P.

Assisting American Agriculture in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a general summary of the program accomplishments of the agriculture conservation program in my State for the year 1947. This record is so outstanding, I desire to include it in my extension of remarks.

In the past year, 71,124 Oklahoma farmers and ranchers responded by spending $14,000,000 for soil conservation and improvement. Fifty-one percent of this amount was paid from public funds and 49 percent was furnished by the farmers themselves.

The summary follows:

PREVENTING EROSION

Terraces, contour practices, sodded waterways, contour strip cropping, field strip cropping, and pit cultivation are means of preventing erosion. Such practices were carried out on 37,415 farms in 1947 on a total of 2,421,836 acres. Each county committee in the State placed special emphasis on the construction of terraces during the past year and the acreage terraced was more than double the acreage terraced in 1945.

Cropland in this country is being lost at the rate of 500,000 acres each year because of erosion and depletion. In view of the increasing population and but few additional acres that can be brought into cultivation, the problem will have an effect on every person in the country. To check erosion losses and to assure continued adequate food production are major objectives of the agricultural conservation program.

Seventeen percent of the funds available as assistance payments in Oklahoma last year were spent for practices of this type.

RESTORING DEPLETED MINERALS

Have you ever watched a long freight train go by pulling as many as 75 freight cars? Such a train can carry a great many tons of minerals, but it would take 110 trains of this size to haul the 380,621 tons of limestone and the 34,488 tons of phosphate applied to Oklahoma farm land under the 1947 agricultural conservation program.

Four hundred and ten thousand seven hundred and five acres were treated with min-

erals during the year just passed on 18,147 farms.

Twenty-one percent of Oklahoma's share of the funds for the 1947 program was spent as assistance to farmers applying these minerals. Farmers themselves paid the part of the cost in excess of the practice payments, amounting to $1,110,250.

The application of these essential, body-building minerals to our farm land is a phase of the program under which not only the farmers but the entire consuming public benefits.

SOIL-IMPROVING CROPS

The nitrogen content of much of our Oklahoma soil has been depleted by long periods of cropping. Experiments have proven that the cheapest way to replace nitrogen in the soil is by the use of legume crops.

The ACP program helps farmers pay a part of the cost of legume seeds, such as yellow hop clover, lespedeza, white Dutch clover, Austrian winter peas, hairy vetch, and others. In 1947, 10 percent of the funds available to the State was used for this purpose.

Farmers received assistance in the purchase of legume seed used on 475,753 acres of land on 28,116 farms. More than a million dollars was contributed by the farmers toward the purchase of the seed.

PASTURE IMPROVEMENT

Several pasture-improvement practices were included in the 1947 agricultural-conservation program, such as seeding grasses and legumes on land on which pastures were being established, over-seeding established pastures with legumes, mowing pastures, drilling wells, removing noxious growth that competes with grasses, withholding grazing during the period of seed formation, and the construction of fireguards.

One million one hundred ninety-six thousand eight hundred and forty-seven acres of Oklahoma pasture and rangeland were improved by use of these practices during 1947, at a cost of over $2,000,000. Farmers bore 60 percent of the cost of the practices, with the remainder coming from Federal funds.

FARM PONDS

Seventy thousand dams for farm ponds have been built in Oklahoma under agricultural-conservation program provisions since the program started in 1936. An additional 97,000 such dams are needed in the State.

Sixteen percent of the 1947 ACP program funds for Oklahoma was used in the construction of dams on 7,494 farms and ranches. Of the total cost of construction 49.5 percent was paid by farmers and $1,137,555 was from Federal funds allotted to the State.

Over 15,000,000 cubic yards of dirt were used in the construction of the dams completed in 1947, enough to make a dam 10 feet high from the Texas border to the Kansas border through the center of the State, a distance of 260 miles.

Distribution of good watering places gets a better distribution of grazing, prevents overgrazing near watering places, increases production per acre of grass, and farm ponds constructed for this purpose play an important part in flood control.

COVER CROP PRACTICES

The farmers who planted 228,721 acres of cover crops on 9,918 farms during 1947 were using an effective means of protecting and improving Oklahoma farm land. These cover crops consisted of ryegrass, summer cover crops of legumes and nonlegumes, and small grains not harvested for grain or hay.

Five percent of the funds available, amounting to $346,712, was used to help meet the cost of these practices. Farmers paid an additional $611,000 or 64 percent of the cost of cover crop practices.

In addition to protecting the land from wind or water erosion, many of the cover crops were used as improving crops in the form of green manure.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES

The work required and the materials and equipment used in carrying out conservation practices in the volume shown in this report has resulted in substantial industrial development in Oklahoma in the past few years. In 1947 more than 1,800 individuals and firms had investments of more than $10,000,000 in equipment, materials, and plant facilities for furnishing limestone, phosphate, seeds, pond and terrace construction direct to farmers in Oklahoma in lieu of cash payments.

The State and county committees are entitled to a large measure of the credit for this industrial development. Working directly with firms and individuals they have pointed out the need for, and assisted in working out detailed plans under which the firms and individuals are furnishing materials and services, many of which would not have been available to the farmers of the State otherwise.

As a result, 10 times as much agricultural limestone and 10 times as much phosphate was used in Oklahoma in 1947 as was used in 1942. Great increases have also been made in the use of cover crops, terracing, and pond building. The agricultural producing plant of this State is better able to meet demands for greater farm production. The land that has received attention through conservation practices is in better shape to continue production at high levels.

The Oklahoma State Committee of the Production and Marketing Administration, who administer this program, are as follows: Charles T. Cameron, chairman, Haskell, Okla.; Lyle L. Hague, vice chairman, Cherokee, Okla.; Amos E. Pittman, member, Beaver, Okla.; Willie L. Hutcheson, member, Frederick, Okla.; Paul E. Moellenkopf, member, Antlers, Okla.

Faulty Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of April 25, 1948:

FAULTY FARM PROGRAM

The House Banking Committee has voted for a blanket 2-year extension of the present farm price-support program, which even now is costing taxpayers millions of dollars.

The farm program needs to be done over completely. The Secretary of Agriculture says so. Farm organizations say so. And the Agriculture Committees of both Houses have bills which propose at least some improvement.

But the Banking Committee would keep for two more years such projects as the potato-support program which has cost taxpayers $140,000,000 in the last 2 years. And the peanut program which is pricing goobers out of the market.

This matter is of great importance to all the people of the United States, to city consumers as well as farmers. Republican leaders should try to come up with a bill that is in the general interest.

We don't think Government price floors for farmers should represent cost of production plus a profit.

That is what the House Banking and House Agriculture Committee bills would do for many crops. They would keep wheat prices to farmers up to around $2 a bushel, cotton at 25 cents a pound and above, and corn at $1.30 a bushel or more for two more years.

Let's be sensible.

Britain Wants To Stand on Her Own Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an item from the London Daily Express under date of January 15, 1948, which clearly and emphatically indicates the attitude of the British toward the Marshall plan:

[From the London Daily Express of January 15, 1948]

A POLICY FOR BRITAIN—REJECT, WITH THANKS, NEW OFFER OF DOLLAR AID ON THESE TERMS

Mr. Snyder, United States Secretary of the Treasury, states the financial terms on which Marshall aid will be offered to ourselves and other proposed beneficiaries.

The United States will insist on a balanced budget in Britain, with appropriate changes in taxation. Further, it demands that at the proper time, Britain shall bring her currency into line with what Americans deem to be its true value.

In short, the United States will supervise the financial policy of this country, its taxation policy, its foreign exchange policy and, therefore, its trade policy.

This would, of course, be an unprecedented invasion of Britain's sovereign rights.

INTRUSIVE DOLLARS

None of the objects which Mr. Snyder mentions is, in itself, undesirable.

Nor can anyone justly complain if a lender puts forward the conditions on which he is prepared to assist his client.

But it would be intolerable were the United States to acquire the right to say where, when, and how the British Government should adopt these courses.

DUTY: STAY FREE

It therefore becomes the urgent and manifest duty of Britain—her duty to herself, her people and her future—to declare that the American proposals are utterly unacceptable.

The British people are not prepared to sell their financial independence for the cigarettes, prunes, and dried eggs of the Marshall plan.

Stand on your own two feet!

[From the Economist of July 12, 1947]

ECONOMIC CONTROLS

The second major aspect regarding which silence has been complete is that of monetary policy. Throughout the war finance was a camp follower, and funds were raised at 2½ percent. But the consequences were that tremendous inflation of money supply occurred. This has been one of the basic problems in the American economy ever since. And ever since the war cheap money generated through monetization of debt has continued to pile up inflationary fuel and certainly has been a factor in the intransigent upward trend of prices. This was a consideration in the veto of the tax-reduction bill

and is clearly a political issue of first importance for 1948.

Is the financing of the "five or six billion dollars" to follow the same plan, leading to more debt monetization and inflationary tendencies? The only alternative would seem to be to find some way to increase savings, but neither of the two known methods can be used with ease; higher interest rates are anathema to the Treasury, and many followers of "modern" theory, of course, doubt their effect on the rate of savings, while the imposition of any kind of rationing as the 1948 election approaches seems unthinkable.

[From the Economist of September 13, 1947]

BRETTON WOODS

Mr. Snyder in London. * * * The meetings of the International Bank and of the Monetary Fund are taking place behind closed doors. Whether they are also taking place behind closed minds is difficult to ascertain. That these two Bretton Woods institutions were designed for a world very different from that which in fact exists at present is, by now, painfully obvious. So far both of them seem to prefer the policy of waiting until the world for which they were designed arrives rather than of adapting themselves, if they could, to the conditions of today.

Table showing over-all financing of Europe's purchases in the Western Hemisphere, Apr. 1, 1948–June 30, 1949

	Western Hemisphere total	Earn	Loan credit	ECA	Uncovered
	Million dollars	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
United Kingdom	4,273.4	48.1	9.5	39.1	3.3
France	1,944.4	16.4	9.5	75.5	------
Netherlands	1,178.2	15.4	14.9	66.0	3.7
Italy	1,122.8	15.2	10.0	80.2	------
Belgium	987.4	35.3	21.4	38.2	5.1
Sweden	497.4	71.4	12.7	7.3	8.6
Switzerland	445.4	100.0	------	------	------
Austria	271.6	4.3	7.4	89.4	------
Denmark	265.3	9.1	23.4	63.8	3.7
Norway	263.3	45.9	30.3	15.9	7.9
Greece	235.4	25.8	------	58.9	15.3
Iceland	195.3	16.9	------	76.8	6.3
Portugal	166.8	100.0	------	------	------
Turkey	86.7	85.0	------	14.8	.2
Western Germany:					
Bizone	1,442.5	4.4	56.9	30.8	8.3
French zone	144.2	8.7	------	87.5	3.8
Saar	24.3	12.5	------	83.9	3.6

Failure To Extend Reciprocal Trade Act Would Be Step Toward Isolation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune of March 4, 1948:

TRADE AGREEMENTS

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will expire next June 12, and President Truman has asked Congress to renew it for another 3 years. On the basis of previous Republican votes on this issue, it would appear that the act faces serious danger. It was last renewed in 1945, when the Democratic Party still controlled both branches of Congress.

The Trade Agreements Act was designed by former Secretary of State Hull, and it has formed the basis of our foreign economic policy for the last 14 years. Its purpose is to reduce trade barriers between nations, and contribute to the flow of international trade. Since these are the aims of all our recent steps to improve relations among nations, refusal to renew the act would be interpreted as a step backward, toward isolation. That would be unwise now, when we are trying to rebuild the economy of western Europe at substantial cost.

In earlier days, when tariff walls were dependent wholly upon legislative action, there was a great deal of logrolling and backscratching in Congress over tariff rates. No one would care to return to those practices. But if it proves impossible to obtain renewal of the Trade Agreements Act without some concessions, we think it would be better to make those concessions than to lose the entire principle of this legislation.

Some spokesmen in Congress have declared that both House and Senate must have veto power over agreements which are made by the executive department under this law. Speaker MARTIN of the House has said it would be impossible to get the act extended unless the Senate, at least, is given power to confirm or reject such agreements. Unqualified renewal of the act, we believe, would be best; but MARTIN'S suggestion would not necessarily be fatal to the intent of the law, and might prevent a complete return to methods which were discredited in other years.

Postal Employees Deserve Adequate Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. Sam Conrad, chairman of the legislative committee of the San Francisco Post Office Clerks' Union, Local 8, in which he encloses an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of Saturday, April 17, 1948, entitled "The Postal Pay Bill."

Mr. Conrad says:

We of Local 2, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, feel that this editorial expresses our grievances in regard to our salary legislation better than we postal employees are able to do.

The editorial follows:

THE POSTAL PAY BILL

The Civil Service Committee of the United States Senate has given its approval to a measure which, if finally adopted by the whole Congress and signed by the President, will increase the annual pay of each Federal postal worker by $800.

This would be a welcome addition to the income of the postal workers and certainly a well-earned one, but it will still leave the total annual pay of these essential Federal employees much less than adequate for the standards of living to which they are entitled.

The attitude of the Federal Government toward the pay of postal workers has long been not only niggardly but very strange and inconsistent, in view of the contrasting attitude the Government has often taken concerning the pay of workers in private employment, especially organized or unionized workers.

In several notable instances the most powerful figures in the Federal Government, including the President of the United States, have championed the cause of unions seeking higher pay from private employers, and in all cases where Government agencies have served as arbitrators or mediators of such disputes the end product of Government intervention has been higher pay.

But when the Government itself has the employer's role, as in the case of the postal workers, it not only fails to see the justice or necessity of higher pay but persists in maintaining standards of pay that were actually below the levels of normal living before the war and are now insufficient to support the barest essentials of dignified and decent living.

In all cases in the recent past when Federal postal employees have had pay increases—and they went 20 years without any increase at all—they have been given reluctantly and only after overwhelming demonstrations of an approving public interest in the matter, and even then they have been woefully inadequate to serve the professed purpose of "cost of living adjustment."

That will still be the case when the Congress has given its approval of the pending postal pay bill, as it seems likely to do—although an early summer adjournment might very well defeat that intention, as has so often happened with similar legislation in the past.

The Congress again seems to be moving with extreme reluctance in the matter.

Even in the progress made thus far it has succeeded in emasculating the bill in a most indefensible and callous manner, by eliminating its retroactive provisions.

Obviously it will take another overwhelming demonstration of approving public interest to obtain final enactment of the postal pay increase measure, and in the meantime the loyal and efficient and indispensable postal workers and their families are compelled to maintain themselves and their homes according to a scale of living that is barely above the subsistence level.

The Congress should surely pass this helpful and deserved although still entirely inadequate bill for the increase of Federal postal pay, and it should not do so reluctantly as in the past but with recognition of the vital services to the country the postal workers perform with complete fulfillment of their patriotic responsibilities.

Protest Repeal of Oleo Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin are awake to the threat to their great dairy industry by the oleomargarine monopolies. They realize that this is only the first of the attacks which will be made. They know that others will follow.

In the hundreds of letters I have received from the farmers and dairymen of the Ninth District, which has more than 30,000 dairy farms, the writers evidence a complete understanding of the misleading propaganda published by the oleo makers and their lobbyists. They recognize the work of the powerful financial special interests which are seeking more millions in profits by and with the consent of Congress.

It is impossible to find space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to publish even excerpts from all the communications I have received. But the two I have selected for publication bring information which should be read by all who recognize the value and importance of the more than 2,000,000 dairy farms to the welfare of our country.

The letter from Mr. F. W. Hoffman, president of the Cudahy Packing Co., is a devastating answer to all the claims made by the proponents of the present measure. This company is an extensive producer of oleomargarine. It is opposed to selling oleomargarine as butter.

The Lindina Local, Farmers Union, with a membership of nearly 200, at Mauston, Wis., is a fair and logical statement of the attitude of the thousands of Wisconsin dairymen who are justly alarmed over the proposal of the oleo interests to damage and possibly destroy the great creamery interests of our State. The following are the letters:

THE CUDAHY PACKING CO.,
Chicago, April 20, 1948.

Hon. MERLIN HULL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company is engaged not only in the business of slaughtering, processing, and selling meat and meat products, but also in the production and sale of butter and oleomargarine. We are, in fact, one of the largest manufacturers of margarine in the United States today. Our interest in the controversy over the present oleomargarine laws is therefore not one-sided. We stated in a communication to Congressman ANTON J. JOHNSON, of Illinois, several weeks ago that we are not asking for repeal of any of the present laws relating to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. In our opinion, looking at the laws from the standpoint of the welfare of all segments of our economy, no change need be made. In order that you may know the reasons for our position, we shall set them forth. They are as follows:

1. The present laws are not unfair or unjust.

(a) The dairy farmer is entitled to the protection of these laws. They protect his market for butterfat against unfair competition from an imitation product. Any businessman is entitled to protection against imitation of his manufactured merchandise.

(b) The consumer is not hurt by these laws.

The tax of one-fourth cent per pound on oleomargarine not colored yellow is small. The license fees which must be paid by the retailer, wholesaler, and the manufacturer are also small when passed on to the consumer, as they undoubtedly are. Applying the total of all these taxes to a family that consumes 3 pounds of oleomargarine per week, every week of the year (156 pounds per year), the total amount of taxes does not exceed 40 cents per year—less than 1 cent per week.

By comparison, the cost of adding vitamin A to oleomargarine is more than three times the amount of the tax, and the cost of advertising the leading brands of oleomargarine normally runs from four to seven times the amount of the tax. There is no reason why oleomargine cannot be served white, which is its natural manufactured color, but if the consumer desires to color it, modern packaging enables her to do so without waste of time or product.

Nor have the present laws had any detrimental effect on our national diet or nutrition. Our per capita consumption of fats has increased steadily during the past several decades, rising from 39 pounds in 1912 to 51 pounds in 1941. It declined slightly during the war, but since then has been rising again. When all elements are carefully considered it can be stated with fairness that these margarine laws have helped the consumer rather than hurt him. Among other things, we can thank these laws for placing the oleomargarine industry on its good behavior, and prompting it to use American-produced oils and to improve its product to a point where it appropriates the palatability and nutritional equivalency of butter.

(c) The oleomargarine industry has not been hurt by these laws. Over the past several decades sales have been on a gradually ascending curve. If any hurt has come to the oleomargarine industry it has been self-inflicted. During the past several decades the industry has encouraged rather than discouraged the consumer to take the time and trouble to color her oleomargarine yellow. All of the industry's advertisements have encouraged this practice. Had the industry, on the other hand, spent its millions of advertising dollars encouraging the consumer to serve oleomargarine white, she would probably have become accustomed to using it that way today.

Other industries in food, drugs, clothing, and shelter have gotten us to change our living habits without resorting to a complete imitation of competing articles and the oleomargarine industry could and should do the same without imitating the color of butter.

(d) Our general economy would be seriously affected by a change in these laws.

The uncertain benefits that might accrue to cotton and soybean farmers are so insignificant compared with the certain disastrous effects that would be produced for dairymen by reducing the tax on yellow oleomargarine that we should all pause and examine carefully the implications of these laws before tampering with them. In 1946 only two-tenths of 1 percent of farm income was attributable to oleomargarine. On the other hand, farm income from dairy products was over a hundred times farm income from items attributable to oleomargarine. Even if farm income attributable to oleomargarine were doubled or trebled it would be small, less than 1 percent. Even for farmers who raised only cotton, but 1.45 percent of their cash farm income in 1946 came from cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine. In the 10 leading cotton States income to farmers from dairy products was 27 times as great as income from oleomargarine in the same year.

Farmers in certain States now raise soybeans. Taking this segment of the farming industry alone, but 5 percent of the income they enjoyed from soybeans came from oleomargarine in 1946.

To sum up, actually oleomargarine is not an important outlet for any farm product.

The following is an interesting extract from the booklet entitled "Oleomargarine and the Farmer" recently published by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation:

"During 1946 American consumers spent over $2,000,000,000 for the primary edible fats—butter, lard, vegetable shortening, and oleomargarine. Out of this $2,000,000,000 of consumers' money the American farmer received over 60 percent of $1,231,747,000, which was divided as follows:

	Cash farm income in 1946
Butter	$638,011,000
Lard	429,647,000
Vegetable shortening	124,712,000
Oleomargarine	39,377,000
Total	1,231,747,000

"Historical facts prove beyond a doubt that the quantity or poundage of fats used by the average American consumer stays about the same from year to year. Fluctuation occurs in the per capita consumption of the individual fats but an increase in the consumption of one fat generally results in an offsetting decline in another."

Twenty-five percent of our dairy farmers depend largely upon the sale of cream for butter manufacture to maintain their dairy cows. If the oleomargarine laws were repealed over a million of this type of farmer would, in our opinion, be forced to sell most of his cows. The permanent reduction in this segment of our cattle population would affect not only our supply of milk and cream but also our supply of meat.

Inasmuch as butter traditionally has served as the outlet for all surplus supplies of milk after all other milk products (including bottled milk, ice cream, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese) have been supplied with their requirements, it is quite apparent that any action adversely affecting butter could create chaotic conditions in the supply and cost to the consumer of all other dairy products. It might well be that in the event that the price of butter were unduly depressed, bringing about substantially reduced production of milk in the over-all in this country, the price of bottled milk and all manufactured dairy products would at times be increased substantially to the consumer.

2. Butter alone is entitled to the yellow color because it alone is always naturally yellow—in varying shades thereof. It is morally entitled to make the claim: "yellow is the 'trademark' of butter." Oleomargarine, on the other hand, if processed from vegetable oils from American farms (as it is largely today) cannot be made a natural yellow. These oils are bleached, not because of the Federal laws, but because it is necessary to remove undesirable colors. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misleading propaganda put out on this subject and the record should be set straight.

3. The present 10-cent tax on the sale of yellow oleomargarine reduces the incentive for fraud and assists the Federal authorities in detecting the presence of any considerable quantities that might be palmed off as butter. The monetary incentive to sell yellow oleomargarine at the price of and in the guise of butter is unique in our economy. No other kind of product affords a parallel for comparison. With the quantities of butter sold being so huge and the price spread between butter and oleomargarine so wide, the incentive for fraud is unparalleled. Fraud would undoubtedly be practiced if the present laws were repealed. The frauds which existed when the sale of oleomargarine in this country was unregulated demonstrate this. Oleomargarine being more palatable and nutritious today, deception would be easier.

We should like to make clear at this point that in our opinion the regulatory tax on the retailer is scarcely necessary to effect proper regulation. It could well be removed.

4. Wherever large and healthy farm economies are in existence throughout the world, oleomargarine is under some form of Government restriction and regulation. This is true of practically all of the countries in western Europe. In Canada its threat to a healthy economy is considered so serious that the sale of oleomargarine is completely prohibited. It is only during periods of high prices like the present that Canada ever seriously considers modification of its extreme position on oleomargarine.

5. It has been claimed that present oleomargarine laws are a misuse of the Federal taxing power. Actually, only by levying Federal taxes can the Federal Government effectively watch the sale of oleomargarine. The pure food and drug laws are helpless

in this regard because they have no jurisdiction over intrastate traffic. However, the Revenue Department can and does enforce the present laws.

We hope that you will study the considerations involved in this butter-oleomargarine controversy and that your decision will not be based upon the exigencies or pressures of the moment, which are transitory.

Sincerely,

F. W. HOFFMAN,
President, the Cudahy Packing Co.

LINDINA LOCAL, FARMERS UNION,
Mauston, Wis., April 15, 1948.

Hon. MERLIN HULL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HULL: We, the officers of Lindina Local Farmers Union, Mauston, Wis., were instructed by our membership of 199 members, at a meeting of April 13, 1948, to write you regarding the present effort being made to remove the Federal tax on margarines.

Much has been said by the margarine interests, most of it directed toward the housewife, leading her to believe that the dairy interests, by their selfishness, are causing her to pay high prices for table spreads. This we know is not true, as the present tax on white margarine is not large enough to make any difference in the purchase price of the so-called substitute

However, if this same housewife wishes to deceive either herself, her family, or her friends, and color her substitute yellow, in an effort to imitate butter, the natural spread, the Government now imposes a rightful tax on this sort of substitute. Now the margarine tastes just the same, it has the same consistency, the same melting point without color added, so just why should anyone who objects to using butter, go to the bother to imitate this universally accepted spread—butter.

There has been a concerted drive for the past few years by those both inside and outside Government to dispose of this rightful tax on the imitators, as is evidenced by the cost-of-living figures given out by various governmental agencies in the past few years. Such cost-of-living figures always start out with butter, milk, meat. It never starts out with shoes, shirts, and dresses. Nor does it give the relative increase in cost of machinery to be used by dairy farmers. These things are essential, too, to maintain a family, but does one ever hear about the exorbitant cost of these items? No, the Government economists have landed squarely on the dairy farmer, and are determined to make him, probably the hardest working of all farmers, the scapegoat, and their excuse for keeping a job.

We farmers here in this part of Wisconsin are especially interested in safeguarding our butter market. All of us have our savings, present and future, tied up in a plant to produce dairy products. The capital outlay required for a dairy farmer is much greater than that of the one-crop farmer, in that housing and storage space must be provided for dairy cattle, not mentioning the large outlay of machinery necessary in operating this type of farm. This same plant, which is now used for the production of dairy products, cannot be converted without almost a complete loss to other types of farming.

We dairy farmers also believe that dairy farming is the type best suited to Wisconsin in that such type of farming best adapts itself to soil conservation, which is so essential to this country's future. The Department of Agriculture, through its Soil Conservation Service, has advocated grassland farming to the greatest extent possible in this rolling country. The farmers have complied, and it follows that dairy farming is the only type of farming that will fit into this picture.

We farmers have no quarrel with those who make margarines, except that we think that the only plant which should be allowed to manufacture butter is that of a dairy cow. By allowing manufacturers to make a so-called substitute, copying everything possible, even the color of the natural product, without paying for stealing that natural copyright which has been so firmly established by merit over scores of years, would constitute a body blow to the dairy industry and a breach of common law.

There is every reason to keep the present tax on butter substitutes, the best being that butter, while it is but one of the manufactured products of the dairy industry, remains the base for the price of cheese, fluid milk, and cream, as well as all the other products which are made from milk. Another reason for protecting this butter market is that a large percentage of the butter manufactured in the United States today is made by farmers' cooperatives, thereby returning the entire yield from these products to the farmers themselves. We have every reason to believe that margarine manufacturers make their price on "what the market will bear" rather than on what the basic ingredients put into the product costs them from various sources. We realize that the margarine manufacturers have a few soybean and cotton farmers on their side, but we wonder what sort of a percentage return these farmers are getting for their product.

We therefore urge you to make every possible effort to retain, if not raise, the present tax on the manufacture and sale of margarine for the future of the farmers of the State of Wisconsin, for the future of the soil of the State of Wisconsin, and for the future of the State of Wisconsin itself.

Let's stop pushing the farmer around.

Yours very truly,

LINDINA LOCAL, FARMERS UNION,
GEORGE SEEBECKER,
President.
ARTHUR F. ROBINSON,
Vice President.
ARTHUR G. STEFFEN,
Secretary.

Needed Pay Increase for Post-Office Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter with supporting exhibits from a group of post-office clerks in Portland, Oreg., which I am including as part of my remarks in order to bring this pertinent material to the attention of all the Members of the House. The letter follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 21, 1948.*

Hon. HOMER ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Attached is a copy of a comparative budget of a Portland, Oreg., post-office clerk for March 1947 and March 1948 showing clearly the amount of increase of all phases of the cost of living of a typical family. The budget further points out the many items of ordinary usage which this family has been forced to drop as prices continued to rise and they were forced to curtail expenditures in every direction, trying to live within the salary of a United States post-office clerk.

It is difficult to imagine a top-grade employee of an important governmental agency being forced to quit taking a daily newspaper, cancel his wife's insurance, and being unable to buy any clothing whatever for his family—all because any increase in his salary to meet increased costs of living is controlled by the Congress of the richest nation in the world, and that Congress continues to dilly-daily with pay-increase legislation for more than 1 year after the need for action became imperative.

The undersigned post-office clerks employed in the Portland, Oreg., post office certify to the correctness of the picture of the struggle to exist as portrayed in this actual budget of one of their own number, knowing because of having passed through the same series of heartbreaking retrenchments, and who know all too well how low the morale of their fellow worker has fallen as he has waited month after agonizing month for his employer, "the slowest deliberative body in the world"—every Member which is publicly in record favoring immediate increase in his pay—to get around to enacting the necessary legislation that will take him out of his situation of genteel poverty and restore his self-respect to the level which is the birthright of all normal American citizens.

The undersigned post-office clerks plead with you to give this budget careful study and then do what your conscience must tell you to do.

Have it read on the floor of Congress.

Have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

And then do everything in your power to see that S. 1949 is enacted into law as speedily as possible, without further delay, including the retroactive amendment to January 1, 1948, and take yourself out of the classification of being an unfair employer who does not pay a living wage.

Lee C. Swafford, R. E. Klink, G. L. Rasmussen, Hubert A. Armstrong, F. M. Kingwell, Frank K. Stevens, Jack W. Cadwell, Edward L. Rood.

Budget for March 1947

1. Groceries (minimum standard healthful diet for adults and 3 children)	$63.02
2. Mortgage loans [1]	42.18
3. Insurance [2] (all types)	21.53
4. Water	2.00
5. Pin money [1] (including some streetcar fare, parking lot, hair lotion, etc.)	12.11
6. Electricity	8.61
7. Fuel	6.25
8. Automobile [1] (gas and maintenance)	16.59
9. Telephone	4.03
10. Medical expenses (all)	10.05
11. Milk (averaging 2 to 2½ quarts per day)	8.28
12. Newspaper [1]	1.50
13. Ice	3.75
14. Garbage removal	1.00
15. Clothing [1] (for 2 adults and 3 children)	4.80
16. Withholding tax	2.20
17. Property tax (monthly average allowance)	.75
18. Church offerings	5.00
19. Recreation or amusements [1]	4.80
20. Post office retirement checkage against pay	12.10
21. Household general expenses [1] (utensils, wax, etc.)	2.28

[1] Items which have subsequently been dropped for lack of funds.

[2] Includes wife's insurance which has subsequently been dropped for lack of funds.

22. Miscellaneous (i. e., dental, garden seed, haircuts, etc.)	$3.75
Total actual expenses	236.58
Gross income	241.66
Actual expenses	236.58
Total able to lay aside for savings	5.08

Budget for March 1948 (as compared to budget for March 1947)

1. Groceries (cheapest food possible, providing only a subminimum of the requirements for a family of 2 adults and 3 children)	$94.55
2. Mortgage loan [1]	------
3. Insurance [2] (all types)	25.25
4. Water	2.00
5. Pin money [1] (can't afford)	------
6. Electricity	9.01
7. Fuel	14.62
8. Automobile [1] (gas and maintenance) forced to sell	------
9. Telephone	4.35
10. Medical expenses (increase due to substandard living conditions)	32.50
11. Milk (averaging 2 to 2½ quarts per day)	14.25
12. Newspaper [1] (canceled in April—cannot afford increased rate)	1.50
13. Ice	4.60
14. Garbage removal	1.00
15. Clothing [1] (for 2 adults and 3 children—forced to drop allowance)	------
16. Withholding tax	3.60
17. Property and State tax (monthly allotment)	4.50
18. Church offerings (reduced from 1947)	4.00
19. Recreation or amusements [1] (cannot afford)	------
20. Post office retirement checkage against pay	12.50
21. Household general expense [1] (stamps, haircuts, funeral flowers, etc.)	------
22. Miscellaneous (petty cash, dental, etc.)	11.10
23. Loan payments	20.00
24. Bus fares (interurban, to and from work)	12.10
25. Bus fares, for family, for shopping, doctor, etc.)	5.30
Total actual expenses	276.73

Savings: None. Bonds: None. Gross income: $250.

[1] Items canceled for lack of funds due to high prices and low income.
[2] Forced to cancel wife's insurance.

NOTE.—Deficit being made up by loans from friends and selling belongings.

Below is listed the minimum requirements, as submitted by a Portland, Oreg., regular postal clerk, tenth-grade pay ($3,000 per annum), for himself, wife, and three children, ages 1, 3, and 4 years. Be it noted that the same clerk is a Navy veteran, and like thousands of others desires a home of his own, for which at present-day high prices he can neither afford the down down payment nor even the monthly payments under the GI loan bill. It is respectfully requested that each item be carefully noted on this sheet and his budget sheets of March 1948 and March 1947. All actual expenses are backed up by itemized books which have been kept by his wife, a former accountant. Further, be it kept in mind that this clerk is a "top pay" grade clerk, and the majority of other clerks in the lesser pay brackets, beginning at $2,100 per annum, are being forced into bankruptcy, losing their homes, or at least losing credit standings which years of faithful payments to creditors have established.

Item	Minimum requirements if income afforded	Actual average
1. Medical expenses (expense has been increasingly high resulting from poor diet, poor shelter, poor clothing, and a general subminimum standard of living).	----------	$30.41
2. Insurance (all types except wife's which had to be dropped due to lack of funds).	----------	25.25
3. Milk (2 to 2½ quarts per day, although family of 5 could use 3 per day)	----------	13.33
4. Groceries (this consists of the cheapest food obtainable, affording only a subminimum standard of diet)	$150.00	95.00
NOTE.—This allows only 21 cents per meal per person.		
*5. Pin money (i. e., shaving needs, small gifts, etc.)	15.00	----------
*6. Newspaper (forced to cancel)	1.75	----------
7. Bus fare (interurban, to and from work only)	----------	15.00
8. Family bus fare (shopping, doctor, dentist, etc.)	----------	4.00
9. Fuel	----------	15.00
10. Water	----------	2.00
11. Electricity (12-month average)	----------	9.25
12. Ice	----------	4.60
*13. Household general expense (utensils, wax, polish, etc.)	5.00	----------
*14. Clothing allowance (5 persons—wearing donated clothes)	25.00	----------
*15. House payment (or building loan—note item No. 2 on 1947 and 1948 budget sheets—were forced to sell auto to liquidate mortgage payments on building loan of $42.18 per month). At present living in double garage, built by selling all our bonds, savings, and auto. At today's low income, can build no further	42.18	----------
16. Federal withholding tax	----------	3.60
17. State and property tax (monthly average)	----------	4.50
18. Telephone	----------	4.35
*19. Recreation or amusements (cannot afford)	5.00	----------
20. Church offerings	----------	4.00
21. Post office retirement checkage against pay	----------	12.50
22. Loan payments	----------	20.00
23. Garbage removal	----------	1.00
24. Miscellaneous (stamps, haircuts, etc.)	----------	20.00
Total average expenses	----------	283.79

*All items marked with asterik have been dropped for lack of income

Gross expenses	$283.79
Gross income	250.00
Net deficit: (deficit being made up by loans from friends and by selling of household furnishings and personal belongings)	33.79

Outstanding debts as of this date, April 16, 1948, $151.90.

SUMMARY

Income necessary to provide a minimum standard of living is arrived at by adding the above figures in the column headed "Minimum requirements if income afforded" to the actual average of present budget:

Minimum requirements if income afforded	$148.93
Plus present-day actual expenses	283.79
Required minimum monthly income (at present-day prices)	432.72

NOTE.—In order to provide the minimum income necessary at today's prices, it would require an increase of $2,181.64 in annual pay.

As testimony and as example of the seriously low pay of postal employees, the following pay situation is presented:

In Portland, Oreg., today, a beginning apprentice hod carrier starts at $1.77 per hour. He makes per month, including Saturday overtime pay, approximately $435. In many cases he is entitled to travel allowance and subsistence pay of approximately $5 to $6 per day additional. This would boost his possible income to from $575 to $600 per month. Further, as each number of required apprenticeship hours are completed his hourly pay also increases.

In Portland, Oreg., today, a journeyman bricklayer makes $22.50 for 8 hours' work. For Saturday work, he makes $50 for 8 hours' work. His pay at this rate is approximately $790 per month, not including possible travel and subsistence pay which could boost his income to approximately $940 per month.

Compare these figures to the present pay of substitute postal employees at $1.04 per hour, and no overtime differential. Also compare it to the annual pay of a postal employee whose substitute service finally qualifies him for a regular appointment beginning at $2,100 per annum.

It is respectfully requested that all the above figures be kept in mind. Further, that the budgets listed in attachments A, B, C, and D only provide the barest necessities of life. An annual increase in the base pay of postal clerks in the amount of $1,000 would be only 50 percent of the actual needs to place the buying power of their dollars on a near level with today's high cost of living.

SUMMARY

Possible yearly income of an apprentice hod carrier: $5,220 to $7,000.

Yearly income of newly appointed regular postal clerk: $2,100.

The facts speak for themselves. Although a $1,000 increase in annual pay is insufficient, it is the least amount which should be considered.

Furthermore, the increase in our base pay should be retroactive to at least January 1, 1948, to enable us to liquidate at least a portion of the debts which have been forced upon us.

Reciprocal Trade Program Benefits All the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Record of March 9, 1948:

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Congress is considering extension of the 14-year-old Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. President Truman says the legislation is more important than ever. He seems to have backed up his claims with undeniable evidence.

The trade pacts which the law authorizes two-way cuts in tariff rates, thus eliminating certain barriers to our trade with the nations with which we make contracts. Not for always can we expect to export more than we import. There are some commodities which we will always import. Why not import them from nations who will cooperate with us in tearing down trade barriers for mutual aid. From such nations we can buy what we need and to them we can sell our

surplus. As the years pass, there will be more and more commodities which we will be unable to amply supply for our own needs. We talk of stock-piling certain commodities essential to war. We must make progress with the stock-piling program, and we will need the trade agreements law to facilitate the program.

Sometimes the law seems to pinch small segments of the American people. On a much broader scale it benefits all the people.

The proper treatment of the trade situation lies somewhere between the high protective tariff of the past and the free trade condition which some ultra-liberals would foster.

We must have a high rate of export. This is best attained by businesslike agreements with friendly nations.

The trade-pacts plan has been kind to us in the past. It can be more so in the future.

Let Congress Accept the Truman Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 23, 1947, the Washington Post carried the following heading in bold type across the top of the first page: "Truman wants disloyal employees fired."

The Washington Times-Herald of the same date carried the following heading: "Truman wants Reds fired from United States jobs."

Likewise the Washington Star of the same date had for its heading, "Truman wants FBI to weed out all disloyal Federal workers."

These headings that gave so much encouragement to those of us who have been trying for years to get the Communists and their fellow-travelers out of various executive departments of the Government were due to the Executive order prescribing procedures for the administration of an employee loyalty program in the executive branch of the Government released by President Harry S. Truman the night before.

Members of Congress were encouraged by the fact that maybe at last the President of the United States was sincere in his desire to cooperate with the Congress in weeding out all subversive employees. As a consequence the Congress appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, $11,000,000 to accomplish the long-overdue job of removing subversives that were taken into key Government positions by the hundreds during the Roosevelt dynasty. Seven and one-half million dollars were marked for the FBI for its part in investigating the loyalty of employees and $3,500,000 went to setting up a Federal loyalty board in connection with the United States Civil Service Commission.

I regret to report that the Loyalty Board set up under the President's Executive order over a year ago has not processed a single loyalty case to date. My confidence in the sincerity and efficiency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in doing a job of this kind prompts me to say that I have not the slightest doubt but what the Federal Bureau of Investigation has performed its responsibility under this Executive order in a most commendable manner. However, one must not lose sight of the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is only an investigating agency which reports its findings regarding certain individuals and has no authority whatever to remove anyone from the pay roll. Removing the Communists and fellow travelers from the pay roll of our Government is up to the responsible head of each department or agency, as stated in President Truman's order.

Every day it becomes more and more manifest that the President's so-called loyalty program was not launched, and is not being prosecuted, in good faith. Last Thursday the House of Representatives passed a resolution by a vote of 300 to 29 directing the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. William Averell Harriman, or his successor, to turn over to the House of Representatives a letter dated May 15, 1947, from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce, upon receipt of this resolution from the House of Representatives, transmitted it to the President. President Truman has defied the will of Congress, and to a question asked him at a news conference regarding the resolution he commented by recalling that Andrew Jackson said in 1832 on a Supreme Court decision by Justice Marshall, "The Chief Justice made his decision, now let him enforce it."

The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly and uniformly held that both Houses of Congress have an inherent right to demand, and get, any and all information pertinent to pending or proposed legislation; that Congress cannot divest itself of that right; and that both Houses of Congress have the power to punish for contempt committed against them.

In punishing for contempt, either House of Congress may order the imprisonment of any person found to be in contempt of either House for any period not to exceed the session at which the contempt is determined. The contempt may be punished by confinement in a designated jail, or any other place either House may determine.

During recent years, by the actions of noisy minorities, including Communists and fellow-travelers, there has sprung up a tendency to resist Congress when it seeks information in support of pending and proposed legislation, by officials of the Government appearing and refusing to produce demanded official records or to give testimony in response to congressional subpenas. These refusals have been based upon claims that, to comply, would injuriously affect the public interest, would be contrary to the public interest, would cause embarrassment to an agency of Government, and the like—all excuses having no foundation in law or precedent.

It is high time that the Congress and the people of this country realize we are playing with fire—yes, a life and death struggle for the preservation of our republican form of government, and the liberty and freedom that have been ours under it.

Quite apparently, this resistance by Government officials is inspired by a desire to prevent Congress and the public from ascertaining their official doings; and, since many such bureaucrats are known to be Communists or to have communistic leanings and associations, it is likewise clear that they want to conceal what has been accomplished toward the weakening, undermining, and overthrow of our Government and the destruction of our traditional institutions.

As for the President's part in these unholy acts of resistance to orderly processes of government:

Congress is supreme in the legislative field, as one of the three coordinate branches of this Government, and the President is the Chief Executive for the execution of the laws passed by Congress, whether with his approval or over his veto, as may be the case. The President took an oath to uphold, enforce, and support the Constitution of the United States, and when he counsels and advises officials of the Government to resist the processes of the Congress, he flagrantly violates his oath of office, and sets himself up as the final arbiter of what laws shall and shall not be enforced.

In direct opposition to the screaming headlines on March 23, 1947, President Truman has been constantly doing things to prevent the effective operation of his much heralded loyalty program. So flagrant has become the President's conduct in thwarting the will of Congress in the Condon case, among others, that many people must question his good faith concerning the loyalty program.

Employment by the Federal Government is a privilege, not an absolute right, as many erroneously claim; and the power to discharge persons from the public service, with cause cannot be questioned seriously and with any show of reason. It is common knowledge that Communists advocate the overthrow of this Government; and anyone, from the President down to the lowest, who protects Communists or those who aid them in the Federal jobs is just as guilty as those they protect.

The various departments and agencies of Government have all been created by the legislative body and Congress, therefore, is entitled to records and documents upon request. We would be justified in withholding certain appropriations until the various heads of departments and agencies demonstrate their willingness to cooperate in matters of this kind. It is high time Congress has a showdown with those who try to subvert this Government and its orderly processes. Members of Congress are the duly elected Representatives of the people of the United States and are responsible to them for the preservation of our constitutional form of Government. The time for action is now.

Inasmuch as President Truman has thrown a challenge to Congress, let us accept the challenge and meet the issue head-on.

Therefore I respectfully ask the Members of the House of Representatives to

do three things: One, bring before this body Mr. Harriman, the former Secretary of Commerce, for contempt; two, pass a law, over the veto of the President if necessary, making certain records and files available upon demand to properly appointed committees of Congress; three, withhold certain appropriations until there is respect and cooperation between the executive branch of our Government and the legislative branch.

Let that be our decision and then enforce it. Let us by our deeds show the people that we mean it when we say we want the Communists out of our Federal Government and let us stop just giving the idea lip service. We must act.

Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, and Eufaula Reservoirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 29, I appeared before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions of the War Department urging the committee to follow the President's recommendation for appropriations for the next fiscal year for the Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, and Eufaula Reservoirs, all of which projects are in my congressional district.

Under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include my statement before the committee:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM G. STIGLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, OKLAHOMA SECOND DISTRICT, BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT, URGING BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FORT GIBSON, TENKILLER FERRY, AND EUFAULA RESERVOIRS, THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1948

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the distinguished members of this committee for granting me the opportunity to appear before you in support of the President's recommendations for appropriations for the next fiscal year for the Fort Gibson, Reservoir, Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, and the Eufaula Reservoir, all of which projects are in my congressional district.

FORT GIBSON DAM AND RESERVATION, ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, OKLA.

The Fort Gibson Dam and Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, and is a key project in the system of authorized reservoirs for prevention of floods in the Arkansas River Valley, downstream from the Grand (Neosho) River, which comprises an area of 886,000 acres. It is a multiple dam providing for flood control, power, and irrigation. The present estimated cost of the project is $39,600,000. A total of $12,753,000 has been appropriated to date.

The President, in his budget request, asked the Congress to appropriate $9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949 for continuing work on the dam, relocations, land acquisition and equipment contracts.

Under a break-down obtained by me from the chief engineer of the War Department, if Congress appropriates the money asked for, the application of funds will be as follows:

Construction of dam under present contract	$2,915,000
Relocation of highways, railroads, and utilities	5,135,000
Furnishing turbines and generators under continuing contract	500,000
Continuation of land acquisition	350,000
Miscellaneous features for public health and safety	100,000
Total	9,000,000

I had occasion this past summer to visit this project and go over it extensively. It is well underway and construction will be about 33 percent completed by June 30, 1948. The access road to the dam site, a field office, and relocation of telephone lines from the dam-site area have been completed. Construction of the concrete dam, earth embankment, power intake structure, gates and other appurtenances is in progress and 26.7 percent complete. Acquisition of lands is about 75 percent complete. Contracts for relocation of highways have been awarded, and plans and specifications are complete for the railroad relocations. Plans for hydroelectric power installation are being prepared, also for reservair clearing and other construction features.

The initial power installation will consist of four 12,300 kilowatt units, and the ultimate installation will consist of six such units, a total of 73,800 kilowatts. The estimated energy generated by the initial installation will average 150,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. The total average annual benefits are estimated at $2,558,300, and the benefit to cost ratio is $1.29.

The regulation of stream flow afforded by the hydroelectric power installation will aid the existing navigation project on the Arkansas River. In addition, extensive recreational facilities will be provided in the vicinity of the project. Also, an outlet will be made through the reservoir from which the city of Muskogee, Okla., can obtain municipal water supply.

The reservoir will have a total storage capacity of 1,287,000 acre-feet, of which 922,000 acre-feet will be reserved for flood control and 365,000 acre-feet for power. The reservoir will extend about 39 miles upstream and will require the acquisition of 78,255 acres of land, 19,100 acres of which will be permanently inundated by the power pool.

If sufficient funds are made available in succeeding years to prosecute work on this project at an economical rate, I am advised by the chief engineer that it should be completed in the fiscal year 1952, with production of power from the initial installation starting in March 1952.

I therefore hope, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that you will look with favor upon the President's request and grant the $9,000,000 which has been requested.

TENKILLER FERRY RESERVOIR, ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, OKLA.

Coming now to the Tenkiller Ferry Dam and Reservoir, I wish to say that it was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 1946, as a unit in the system of reservoirs for the multiple-purpose development of the Arkansas River Valley. The present estimated cost of this project is $22,750,000. A total of $3,123,000 has been allotted to date.

The President, in his budget request for the next fiscal year, asked for $3,600,000. The Chief Engineer breaks down the amount as follows:

Construction of embankment under present contract	$1,860,000
Continuation of construction of outlet works and diversion tunnels	900,000
Work on turbines and generators under continuing contract	$550,000
Continuation of land acquisition	75,000
Relocation of county roads and utilities	215,000
Total	3,600,000

The project as a whole will be about 14 percent complete on June 30, 1948. The access road and initial portion of embankment is under way and 18 percent complete. I am advised that bids will be accepted for construction of outlet works and diversion tunnels in the near future. Plans and specifications for the construction camp are in progress. Engineering studies and investigations and planning and design of other construction features are also in progress. The land for the dam site and working area has been acquired.

The location of this reservoir may have no special significance to the committee but for the purpose of the record, the dam site is located on the Illinois River 13 miles above its confluence with the Arkansas River and about 7 miles northwest of Vian, Sequoyah County, Okla. The dam will be a rolled earth-fill structure about 2,950 feet long with an average height of 156 feet.

The reservoir will have a total storage capacity of 1,230,000 acre-feet of which 600,000 acre-feet will be reserved for flood control and the remainder for power drawdown and storage. The reservoir will extend about 25 miles upstream and will require the acquisition of 27,400 acres, 12,500 acres of which will be permanently inundated by the power pool.

The power installation will consist of two 17,000-kilowatt units. The estimated energy generated by this installation will average 102,400,000 annually. The total average annual benefits, so I am advised by the Chief Engineer, are $1,216,000 and the benefit to cost ratio is $1.07.

This reservoir also is a very important unit in the system of reservoirs for flood control, generation of hydroelectric power, and other purposes in the Arkansas River Valley. The project will primarily benefit about 863,000 acres of land in the flood-plain areas of the Arkansas River between the mouth of the Illinois River and the backwater limits of the Mississippi River, with incidental benefit to the lower Arkansas River Valley below Pine Bluff, Ark., and the lower Mississippi River Valley. Flood losses in the Arkansas River Valley were tremendous in 1941, 1943, and 1945.

I have been advised by the chief engineer that if sufficient funds are made available in succeeding years to prosecute work on this project it should be completed in the fiscal year 1953 and production of power should be started in September 1952.

I therefore urge, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that the full amount of $3,600,000 be granted for this project.

EUFAULA RESERVOIR, ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, OKLA.

I come next to the Eufaula Reservoir, which was authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act approved July 24, 1946, as a unit in the approved plan for development of the Arkansas River Basin. This reservoir is the key project in the multiple-purpose plan for development of the Arkansas River Valley for flood control, navigation, generation of hydroelecpower, and other purposes. The construction of the reservoir is absolutely necessary to control sediment originating in the Canadian River Valley before operation of the navigation project on the lower Arkansas River is feasible. In addition, the project provides a larger measure of needed flood control to the highly developed flood-plain areas of the Arkansas River downstream from the mouth of the Canadian River, and

to the lower Canadian River, containing 800,000 acres and 12,000 acres, respectively. Benefits from the power development will extend over several States. The present estimated cost of the project is $69,500,000. A total of $500,000 has been appropriated to date for advance planning.

The President in his budget request for the next fiscal year asked the Congress to appropriate $3,000,000 for furthering engineering studies in connection with the project and for construction work on preliminary features.

The Chief Engineer of the War Department breaks down this amount as follows:

Land acquisition for working areas	$400,000
Construction of access road to dam site	350,000
Construction of construction camp and field office	300,000
Construction of initial portion of embankment	1,200,000
Relocation of United States Highway No. 69	450,000
Relocation of Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. R.	300,000
Total	3,000,000

The detailed plans for the project are being prepared and will be completed prior to June 30, 1948.

The dam site is located on the Canadian River 27 miles above its mouth and 30 miles south of Muskogee, Okla. The dam will be a rolled earth-fill structure with a concrete powerhouse and a controlled overflow spillway. The total length is 3,195 feet, and the maximum height will be 100 feet above the valley floor.

The reservoir will have a total storage capacity of 4,420,000 acre-feet of which 1,460,000 acre-feet will be reserved for flood control, 1,560,000 acre-feet for power, and a conservation pool for dead storage and storage of sediment of 1,400,000 acre-feet will be provided. The reservoir will extend 40 miles upstream and will require the acquisition of 163,000 acres, of which 126,000 acres will be permanently inundated by the power pool.

The power installation will consist of three 30,000-kilowatt units, a total of 90,000 kilowatts. The estimated energy generated by the power installation will average 277,600,000 kilowatt-hours annually. The total average annual benefits that will be derived from the project are estimated at $4,980,000. The benefit to cost ratio is $1.50.

In view of the great importance of this project and it being the key reservoir to all the units, I cannot urge too strongly, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that the full $3,000,000 be granted.

Retirement Benefits of Railroad Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, when Robert Browning wrote, "Grow old along with me! The best is yet to be, the last of life, for which the first was made," he certainly did not know what it was going to be like to try to get along on an old-age retirement income in 1948.

I am thinking particularly today of the retired railroaders who, after a lifetime of hard work, much of it dangerous, find now that their troubles are far from over. Instead of settling back to enjoy the leisure they have certainly earned, they are forced to scramble around trying to find a way to support themselves and their wives on the king-size sum of $70 a month, or maybe only $50.

Just imagine trying to live on $50 a month, with food prices the way they are. How can these people be decently fed and housed, to say nothing of being adequately clothed, or getting any pleasure out of life, on an income of $1.65 a day? There are thousands of "old rails" in that situation.

The means to improve the lot of these good American citizens and to lessen their hardships to some slight extent is ready to our hand. House bill 5993, which has been introduced by Representative CROSSER, who has consistently sponsored legislation beneficial to the railroad workers, is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and will never make a retired railroader rich. It will increase his retirement pay by a modest amount, ranging from 20 to 25 percent of his present annuity.

Personally, I should like to see the railroad pensions increased by twice that much. I am supporting H. R. 5993, however, because I respect the wishes of the railroad men themselves, both working and retired, who want above all else to keep their retirement fund in sound financial shape. The 20- to 25-percent increase provided by H. R. 5993 is the greatest drain the fund can stand, unless retirement taxes are raised also, and everybody agrees that the present tax schedule is as much as the working railroaders should be asked to carry. They do not make much money—about 17 cents an hour less than comparable workers in other industries—and they have their hands full as it is.

But passage of H. R. 5993 would add nothing to their burden or to the burden of the railroads. It would simply take certain moneys which it has been determined can be spared from the railroad retirement fund and transform it into some of the necessities of life for about 214,000 men and women who devoted their working lives to the operation of the vital arteries of our economy—the railroads.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 25, 1948:

T-E-W HOUSING BILL

The Senate is entitled to warm commendation for its passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill free from the emasculating amendments which some Members attempted to attach to it. It is a comprehensive bill intended to bring about the construction of 1,500,000 dwellings annually for the next 10 years. Senator TAFT described it as about nine-tenths private housing and one-tenth public housing. It is especially gratifying, however, that the Senate kept the section on public housing over which most of the controversy arose.

As explained by Senator TAFT, the public-housing section would provide for the construction of 500,000 dwelling units in the next 5 years. That is a modest program. Any lesser attention to public housing would deprive the bill of the balance which its sponsors are seeking to preserve and thus open it to the charge that it would benefit only middle-income and upper-income groups. The inescapable fact is that millions of self-supporting American families cannot provide themselves with decent housing at present costs. Senator TAFT estimated that more than half the country's veterans are in this predicament. Intolerable living conditions with grave repercussions upon the moral and intellectual life of the Nation will be inescapable until better housing can be provided through the use of public funds.

The idea that this sensible attack upon the slums means competition with private enterprise persists among some real-estate operators. But conservative Senator TAFT exploded it to the satisfaction of most disinterested persons. The families eligible for public housing under the terms of this bill cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as prospects for privately built and managed housing. Their only hope for enjoyment of a decent environment lies in efficient public housing operating in a field that private enterprise has never been able to touch.

We hope that the House, too, will pass the bill, with the public-housing section retained. As to the aid which this measure offers to private housing there is much less controversy, although some legislators fear that its improved methods of financing residential construction will contribute to inflation. This is a very real problem, but the country's housing requirements are so urgent that we think the inflationary threat must be balanced against the great benefits that would come from a stepped-up housing program. This conflict of aims has been carefully weighed by some of the ablest men in Congress and they have found no reasonable alternative to pressing ahead with a balanced and limited expansion of the housing industry. We suspect that, if the House gives the problem as much careful attention as the Senate has done, it will come out with the same answer.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, 10 months ago the administration asked the countries of Europe to tell us what they wanted us to give them. Since then there have been oceans and oceans of favorable publicity whipped up by both official and unofficial sources for the so-called Marshall plan. Despite all this favorable furor, Elmer Roper, a former member of the PAC faculty tells us that only 39.3 percent of the American public were generally favorable to

ERP. This is less than two out of every five persons.

In the same survey, he tells us that 46.6 percent did not have enough information to make up their minds about it. There has been great difficulty in getting concrete information on this plan. I hope the Appropriations Committee is getting the necessary details. This large sum of money should not be approved unless it can be justified by facts not now known to the Congress or the American public.

This is too important a measure for us to blindly follow a leader. We should not vote for something that the majority of the American people do not approve.

Mr. Roper tells us that 77 percent of the people who have heard about ERP think that it is a plan to help sick and hungry people. This means that three-fourths of our people do not know that it is a plan to subsidize the socialized governments of Europe. They do not know that sick and hungry Europeans can only get what they are able to buy from their own governments. I wonder how many Americans would approve the plan if they knew this vital fact.

Government Favoritism of Co-ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the question, "Shall co-ops be taxed on the same basis as all forms of proprietary businesses are taxed?" is one of the burning questions that confronts the Ways and Means Committee and the Eightieth Congress. Extensive public hearings on this question were held last fall by the Ways and Means Committee and those hearings brought out the following interesting facts in connection with that question.

LEGISLATIVE ADVANTAGES GIVEN CO-OPS

Co-ops have had three distinct advantages granted them by legislative action that are not enjoyed by other forms of business enterprise, namely:

(a) The privilege of Federal income tax exemption—Revenue Act, 1913–26.

(b) The privilege of forming associations in restraint of trade—Capper-Volstead Act, 1922.

(c) The privilege of selling stocks without having same approved and registered by the Securities and Exchange Commission—Securities and Exchange Act, 1933.

The testimony presented before the committee was to the effect that under present-day conditions these three legislative advantages should be reviewed to determine their necessity, their fairness, and their equity. The testimony also showed that the Federal Government had set up special banks to lend money to co-ops on extra favorable terms, and that the county agricultural agents whose salaries are paid by taxes are engaged in boosting the business of co-ops over that of taxpaying businessmen.

FARMER CO-OPS VS. CITY CONSUMER CO-OPS

Farmer co-ops are primarily marketing co-ops. Their objective is to secure for the farmer-producer a fair market price for his goods, thereby increasing the farmer's income. City co-ops, on the other hand, organized and operated mostly by labor unions, are primarily purchasing co-ops. Their objective is to secure consumer goods as cheaply as possible in order to lower the cost of the goods to their customers. Therefore consumer co-ops are in direct conflict with marketing co-ops because their aim is to reduce the price of the farmer's produce. Between the two the gulf is wide and deep.

Actually the difference goes deeper than the surface ideology, because the city consumer co-op has as its announced aim the final elimination of the profit system and the substitution of the co-op system. What this will mean to the American farmer is evident by what it has already brought about in other parts of the world where chains of labor-owned consumer co-ops are enforcing their demands for cheaper and cheaper farm products by buying farms and operating them. This is being done in both England and Scotland. By sheer weight of numbers—60,000,000 city workers vs. 10,000,000 farmers—the city consumer co-op movement will dominate the future if allowed to expand rapidly. The imposition of Federal income taxes upon these consumer co-ops will provide a measure of protection to the American farmer and his capitalistic investment.

In attempting to classify co-ops one should do it on the basis of co-op objectives. Farmer-marketing co-ops have as their objective the securing of better prices for their patrons' products through cooperative marketing activities — a proper, legitimate function under our American system of economy. This function closely parallels the collective-bargaining functions of organized labor, and is therefore a logical part of our American way of doing business. The bad co-op, on the other hand, has an entirely different objective. It is best expressed by quoting the words of Mr. Charles D. Egley, manager, Farmers' Union Livestock Commission, St. Paul, Minn., and State representative of the Minnesota co-ops. Mr. Egley says:

> The profit system concentrates wealth in the hands of the few; it exploits the masses; robs them of their purchasing power, as a result of which they cannot buy back what they produce. * * * To solve this problem it is, therefore, our opinion that we must get rid of the profit system and replace it with the cooperative system. Then business would be operated at cost for use and service to all the people, not to the few.

Production for use, not for profit, as we know, is a socialistic program.

CONCLUSIONS RESULTING FROM THE HEARINGS

(A) Present laws and Treasury rulings that favor co-ops over other forms of business enterprise are as inappropriate today as city ordinances regulating horse-and-buggy traffic in an age of automobiles and airplanes, and they should be changed to conform to present-day actualities. These laws and rulings may have been proper and necessary when they were adopted, but they have outlived their usefulness. Co-ops, now doing an annual business of over $12,000,000,000 per year, have outgrown their swaddling clothes and should be treated as grown-ups.

(B) Tax exemption for cooperatives should be recognized for what it really is—a palming off on the rest of us of the burden that otherwise would be carried by the exempted outfits. Public policy may dictate the desirability of exempting organizations that are of an exclusively charitable, educational, or civic character, but organizations of a business character, doing business in competition with private business, no matter how they are owned, should not be exempt from paying their fair share of taxes. To allow these organizations tax exemption is, in effect, to subsidize them and to compel their competitors to contribute to the payment of the subsidy.

The editorial taken from the April 7, 1948, issue of the Nebraska Cooperator, a paper dedicated to the interests of co-ops and edited by Mr. L. S. Herron, of Omaha, Nebr., presents in a sane, sensible manner the controversy over whether co-ops should be taxed. Mr. Herron in his editorial also tells how and upon what they should be taxed. This editorial in a co-op paper is a clear indication that the rank and file of farm co-op members are fair-minded and are willing to be taxed on the same basis as all forms of proprietary businesses are taxed. All they ask is a square deal and no punitive or destructive taxation shall be placed upon them.

The editorial follows:

MAY SEE NUB ON TAXING CO-OPS

Maybe Members of Congress are not activated wholly by political expediency in their apparent decision not to enact now any legislation to change the application of the income tax to cooperatives. Perhaps they are learning that under the Constitution there is not as much they can do about it as the opponents of cooperatives have urged.

The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution gives Congress "power to lay and collect taxes on income." But the Bureau of Internal Revenue has ruled, and the rulings have been sustained by repeated court decisions, that sums distributed by cooperatives as patronage refunds, no matter in what form they are paid, are not income to the cooperatives making such distribution.

Since Congress cannot make income to cooperatives of sums that are not income to them, it cannot enact valid legislation to tax cooperatives on their patronage refunds. Such an enactment would not stand the test of constitutionality. Maybe Members of Congress are beginning to realize this. If so, their hesitancy to enact legislation affecting the income-tax status of cooperatives may be based on sound factual considerations.

Congress could validly repeal the exemption of farmers' cooperatives. Farmers' cooperatives that meet the requirements for and obtain exemption not only pay no income taxes on their patronage refunds, but have the advantage of immunity from taxation on sums placed in undistributed surplus or paid as interest on shares. This is the real sore spot in the whole issue of taxing cooperatives.

In hesitating to favor the repeal of this exemption, many Members of Congress may be moved by political expediency. They have declared themselves in favor of farmers' cooperatives—and, besides, members of farmers' cooperatives hold the balance of political power in some 20 States. For the sake of clean hands and fairness, however, farmers could well consent to the repeal of this exemption.

Following the radio debate on March 2 on the question "Are cooperatives unfair competition to other business?" by Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator, for the affirmative, and Jerry Voorhis, executive secretary of the Cooperative League for the negative, the vote received by Radio Station WGN ran 91.6 percent "Yes" and 8.5 percent "No."

This heavy affirmative vote, as reported by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, appears to have been the result of a special appeal made to businessmen by the National Tax Equality Association. These businessmen, evidently, were not voting on the merits of the arguments made by the speakers, but were expressing their opposition to cooperatives and what they believed to be their unfair tax advantage.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives also reports that following this debate the members of the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington received more than 20,000 letters and telegrams. These ran about 100 to 1 in favor of repealing section 101 (12) of the internal revenue code, the section providing for exemption from the income tax of farmers' cooperatives that meet certain requirements.

It seems to us that farmers' cooperatives might well agree to the repeal of this section. The immunity it gives exempt cooperatives from income taxes on sums added to undistributed surplus or paid as interest on shares is a bit of special privilege that, on the basis of fairness and equity, cannot be defended.

A good many farmers' cooperatives have already renounced this exemption. The case of the cooperatives would be immensely strengthened if they would all do so and consent to its repeal. This would rob the anticooperative campaigners of the only valid and effective tax argument against cooperatives.

Private Channels of Trade and Established Channels of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letters I have received from governmental departments. Some of the issues raised in the communications have been discussed in the committee on which I am privileged to serve, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 19, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I regret the delay in answering your letters of April 2 and 6 dealing respectively with the questions of whether a private owner of a plant rehabilitated under the European recovery program would have to repay funds used in this connection and whether persons who have never been in export trade before would be permitted to enter the business under the European recovery program.

With respect to the first question, it is expected that the Economic Cooperation Administration will deal with foreign governments and that these governments will work out their own arrangements with private citizens owning plants. The Department would expect that the question of whether aid was extended by the United States under a loan or grant would have no bearing on the arrangements worked out by the foreign government and the private owner. It would expect, moreover, that when a foreign government obtained equipment from the United States for the rehabilitation of a given plant, the owner of the plant would be expected either to raise the necessary local capital to pay for it through private sources or to borrow from the government under terms of repayment. In the latter case, of course, he would have to repay the government.

With respect to your second question, the Department of State assumes that the intent of Congress in prescribing normal trade channels was not to exclude new entry into the exporting business. It is recalled in fact that in working out provision 112 (h) of the bill the words "private channels of trade" were used in preference to the expression "established channels of trade" in order to avoid the connotation that only existing exporters would be used. In the use of normal trade channels, of course, it is anticipated that the Economic Cooperation Administration will not undertake direct procurement in this country but the exporters will continue to seek outlets abroad in the usual fashion.

The foregoing interpretations of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 have been made by the Department of State, despite the appointment of Mr. Hoffman as Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, because of its knowledge of the background of the legislation. They express the Department's views only, however, and should not be construed as speaking for Mr. Hoffman.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. BEARD,
Counselor
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1940.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letter of April 6, addressed to Secretary Harriman, has been referred to this office for reply.

There are no regulations which would prevent a person from entering the export business to ship goods to Europe under the Economic Cooperation Act. Further, the export regulations are not being administered to preclude new traders.

We trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS MCINTYRE,
Assistant Director.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 21, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of April 6 inquiring whether a person who has not been in the exporting business may enter the business of exporting to Europe goods that will aid countries included in the European recovery program.

As you know, the Economic Cooperation Administration, which is to administer the European recovery program, has not yet had time to complete its organization, operating procedures, and programs. It is believed that most of the program will be carried out under normal trade practices between individual United States exporters and individual importers in foreign countries.

Prospective entrants into export trade are therefore faced primarily with the usual problem of locating and selling to private foreign customers in competition with established exporters from this and other countries.

I hope the Department may have other opportunities of assisting you.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.,
Assistant to the Secretary for International Trade.

American Committee for a Free and United Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 23, an important meeting was held at the New York University Faculty Club, convened for the purpose of organizing a special committee to enlist American support for a free and united Europe.

With Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, one of the authors of the congressional resolution endorsing the principle of European federation, which I jointly sponsored in the House of Representatives, serving as its president, and Hon. William C. Bullitt acting as vice president, this luncheon meeting laid the ground work for American support of the forthcoming European conference on federation.

This meeting, in which members of the parliaments of the 16 Marshall plan nations will participate, opens in The Hague on May 7 under the honorary presidency of Winston Churchill, and will inaugurate work on preparation of a draft of a constitution for a United States of Europe.

Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, who serves as general secretary of the European Parliamentary Union, and who has worked actively for so many years toward the goal of European federation, predicted that completion of the constitution will be effected at the September convention at Interlaken, Switzerland, and subsequently submitted to the governments of the nations involved.

For many years various groups interested in European union have contemplated the calling of a constituent assembly, for the purpose of creating such a federation. On March 11 the British all-party committee of members of Parliament of the House of Commons for Parliamentary European Union forwarded copies of its approved motion, endorsing creation of a European Council, to the members of the other western Europe parliaments, with a suggestion that similar moves be made on the part of the other free governments of Europe. It was expressed at this time that all possible steps should be taken immediately to bring about a federation of western Europe. This union would be a political one, strong enough to save European democracy and the values of western civilization. An emergency policy has been advocated to secure immediate cooperation between the countries of western Europe, and a long-term policy designed to bring into being a federation of Europe.

Although steps are being taken by the 16 Marshall-plan nations to actively work toward western union for the purposes of the European recovery program, leaders of the movement also feel that it is imperative that private and independent activities for the unity of Europe must be initiated now, if the establishment of such unity is to be lasting and on a long-term basis.

Such a federation would be constituted with an economic and political bill of rights, with the prevention of war, the creation of prosperity, and the insurance of personal liberty, as the aims of the union.

The very fact that these western European nations have already valiantly indicated their willingness to sacrifice sovereign rights to achieve this federation is encouraging indeed, and I am most hopeful that the forthcoming conferences to be held in Europe will be supported by free people everywhere. It can well mean the beginning of a real United States of Europe.

I would like to include at this point the following two news clippings giving an account of the recent meeting of the American Committee for a Free and United Europe which was held in New York:

[From the New York Times of April 24, 1948]

NEW GROUP BACKS FEDERATED EUROPE—PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND EDUCATORS FORM COMMITTEE TO SUPPORT "FREE" BLOC ABROAD

A special committee formed to enlist support in the United States for a "free and united Europe" was organized formally yesterday at the New York University Faculty Club, 22 Washington Square North, during a luncheon meeting called by Count Richard N. Coudenhove-Kalergi, founder of the pan-European movement.

Organized by representative American legislators, public officials, and educators, the committee has been incorporated, with central headquarters at 120 Broadway. Its objective, according to Count Coudenhove, will be to cooperate with the movement for a United States of Europe; to keep the American people informed about the operations of the projected European federation, and to develop closer ties between this Nation and Europe. The Count said the committee would work closely with the supervisors of the Marshall plan.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT has been named president of the new organization and William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to France, its vice president.

BOARD MEMBERS NAMED

The committee's national board, it was said, will include: Former President Herbert Hoover, Representative Hale Boggs of Louisiana, former Representative Clare Boothe Luce, James A. Farley, Robert Moses, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth, Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College, and Norman Thomas.

Also Dr. Harry Woodburn Chase, chancellor of New York University; Dr. Stephen Dugan, Gen. William J. Donovan, Representative Christian A. Herter, the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, president of Fordham University; Robert L. La Follette, Jr., Allen Dulles, John W. Davis, and George N. Shuster.

Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, who was a member of the prewar isolationist wing in Congress, also is listed as a member of the committee's national board.

Count Coudenhove reported that Winston Churchill had called a conference of European organizations interested in a federation of Europe to be held May 7 at The Hague. The conference will be attended by representatives of the pan-European movement.

The conference has been called to plan for a parliamentary congress that will meet next September in Interlaken, Switzerland, to draft a final constitution for the proposed United States of Europe.

Declaring that the United States of Europe probably would be ready for full-scale operation next year, Count Coudenhove predicted that Russian opposition would not block the success of the western European alliance.

SOVIET ACTIONS HELD AID

"Actually the Soviet Union is primarily responsible for the rapid progress made in the movement for a United Europe," he said. "Russia provided the western European countries with a common danger which convinced them that their main hope for security lay in the formation of a closely knit federated organization."

The Count listed the prevention of war, the creation of prosperity, and the insurance of personal liberty as the basic aims of the forthcoming European federation. He said the organization would be, in effect, an economic, political, and cultural union of nations.

The union, he said, would be based on a common foreign, economic, and military policy and a common bill of rights. In order to block the possibility of a western European dictatorship, he asserted, the executive branch of the federation would not be placed in the hands of one person, but several individuals representing different nations.

The constitution draft for the federation, which has been drawn up for ratification by the nations of western Europe, he said, provides for a democratic selection of representatives to the organization.

"Membership in the federation's house of representatives," he declared, "will be determined by the parliaments of member nations. The various member states will elect representatives to the senate. Both legislative houses will join in selecting the executive board of the organization."

Asked if Spain would be permitted to join the union, Count Coudenhove said the Spanish Government would be eligible to apply for admission as soon as it becomes democratic.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 24, 1948]

UNITED STATES COMMITTEE TO ASK FEDERAL UNION OF EUROPE—COUNT COUDENHOVE-KALERGI ANNOUNCES FORMATION; FULBRIGHT HEADS GROUP

Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, who has labored for 25 years to promote a federal union of European nations, announced yesterday the formation of the American Committee for a Free and United Europe to enlist American support of his project.

The committee was formally constituted at a luncheon in the New York University Faculty Club, 22 Washington Square North, over which William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to France, presided. Mr. Bullitt was named vice president of the committee, and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, author of a congressional resolution endorsing the principle of European federation, will be president. Former President Herbert Hoover and Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat, of Montana, will be members of the national board.

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi said he would leave next week for The Hague to attend a conference on European federation in which members of the parliaments of the 16 Marshall plan nations will take part, along with representatives of churches, labor unions, and other interested groups. The conference, opening May 7 under the honorary presidency of Winston Churchill, will be followed by a meeting of the council of the European Parliamentary Union to prepare a draft constitution for the United States of Europe. Work on the constitution will be completed at a convention at Interlaken, Switzerland, September 8–11, after which it will be submitted to the governments of the nations concerned.

The proposed United States of Europe will provide common foreign, economic, and military policies for its member nations, enforce a common bill of rights, and organize a monetary union and a single currency, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi said. Other functions of government will be left to the member nations, which will retain political independence while sacrificing part of their sovereignty, he said. The constitutional convention will decide how to apply this division of authority to the practical problems of government.

He predicted that the USE would be set up and operating within a year. The economic cooperation of the 16 Marshall plan nations and the military alliance of the five western-union nations are preparing the way for federation, he said.

Members of the national board, in addition to Mr. Hoover and Senator Wheeler, are as follows:

Representatives Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Christian A. Herter, Republican, of Massachusetts; former Representative Clare Boothe Luce and former Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr.; former Ambassador John W. Davis; William J. Donovan, former Director of the Office of Strategic Services; James A. Farley, former Democratic national chairman.

Also, Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War; Park Commissioner Robert Moses; Chancelor Harry Woodburn Chase, of New York University; the Very Reverend Robert I. Gannon, president of Fordham University; Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College; George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College; Dr. Stephen Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education.

Also, Allen Dulles, president of the Council on Foreign Relations; Philip D. Reed, president of the General Electric Co.; Alice Roosevelt Longworth; H. V. Kaltenborn, Dorothy Thompson, and Norman Thomas.

The executive board consists of George E. Warren, member of the board of trustees of Columbia University, chairman; Richard S. Childs, chairman of the National Municipal League, vice chairman; Clayton Fritchey, editor of the New Orleans Item, second vice chairman; Frederick W. Gehle, vice president of Chase National Bank, treasurer; Prof. Arnold J. Zurcher, New York University, secretary; and Prof. John Keur, Brooklyn College, assistant secretary.

The committee will have its headquarters in Mr. Warren's office at 120 Broadway.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I made over Station WWJ in Detroit, Mich., on Monday, April 26, 1948:

Ladies and gentlemen of the Detroit area, at the conclusion of my remarks on April 12 over the facilities of this station I promised to devote this evening's broadcast to the Taft-Hartley Act, because it is of such great

importance to the workers in the Detroit area.

Approximately 1 year ago the Congress of the United States was in the midst of the debate over the Taft-Hartley Act. This legislation was then the first order of business on the Republican agenda. Neglected was much-needed legislation in the fields of health, housing, education, and social security. Antilabor measures were the majority's order of the day.

The Taft-Hartley Act was finally passed over the President's veto and in face of the unanimous opposition of American labor. As the ranking Democratic member of the House Labor Committee, I am proud of the fact that I led the opposition in the fight to keep the Taft-Hartley Act off the statute books. I voted against the act because, as I then stated, it was designed to strike a body blow at wage earners, to weaken their organizations, and to suppress their legitimate rights. I pointed out that the preservation of labor's bargaining strength was necessary to the maintenance of adequate purchasing power among wage earners and essential to the economic welfare of the entire Nation. The bitter lesson of the 1920's and 1930's is proof enough of this principle.

During the debate on the Taft-Hartley Act I declared that while its sponsors ranted against power, they licensed the powerful to oppress the workingman; while they spoke against the concentration of Government authority, they created an agency with more power over labor and management than ever before in our history; while they condemned bureaucracy they imposed administrative requirements on the National Labor Relations Board that would require its staff to be expanded threefold and substituted two agencies where one existed before; and while they protested their love for labor they placed their stamp of approval on government by injunction and the suppression of labor's legitimate rights.

It is now 8 months since the Taft-Hartley Act went into effect. What has been the experience under the act during this brief period? On April 1 Senators JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and CLAUDE E. PEPPER, of Florida, and Congressman AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, and myself, minority members of the "Watchdog Committee," issued a report reviewing the operations of the Taft-Hartley Act. In this report we stated that our investigation compelled us to recommend the immediate repeal of the act to avoid serious injury to our economy. We made this recommendation because we were convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act would result in industrial unrest and would undermine the bargaining power of wage earners. And we stated: "The shopkeeper, the small businessman in each community fully appreciate the extent to which their continued prosperity is dependent upon industrial peace in their communities and upon the payment of a living wage to their customers. Farmers know that they must depend upon the wage earner to purchase the bulk of their produce. Indeed, the economy of the whole country is affected by the ability of labor to obtain a fair share of the national wealth for its services. This ability, we believe, depends upon the wage earners' bargaining strength."

We pointed out also that "This basic economic fact is not new, although the framers of the Taft-Hartley Act appear to have rejected it."

Some of the other conclusions reached by the minority are of particular interest and importance to the American public. We found:

1. The Taft-Hartley Act has not resulted in a reduction in the number of strikes. On the contrary, the act has already been the direct cause of work stoppages throughout the country. Moreover, through the encouragement offered to antiunion employers and through the justified suspicion and resentment aroused among wage earners, the act has created an atmosphere in which friendly bargaining relations cannot survive, and has laid the basis for future industrial unrest.

2. Experience with the restrictions on union security agreements has already revealed serious defects. These restrictions have resulted in widespread resort to bootleg contracts and have created special problems in industries such as the maritime and building trades which have the problem of short-term employment and high turn-over from one employer to another.

3. The tremendous number of union-shop elections has impaired the ability of the National Labor Relations Board to discharge its functions. In the first 6 months of the act's operation alone, over 7,700 requests for such elections were filed with the Labor Board.

4. Union-shop elections have resulted in an extravagant waste of taxpayers' money. It costs approximately 40 cents per ballot to run such elections. The proposed elections among the 2,500,000 workers in the building construction industry alone will cost the taxpayer over $1,000,000.

5. The results of union-shop elections thus far establish the fact that the average American worker is not opposed to union security agreements as the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley Act claimed. In almost 99 percent of the 6,000 elections already conducted, the union-shop proposal has been endorsed by a majority of the eligible employees. What is equally significant and impressive is the fact that the vote in favor of such provisions was in excess of 90 percent.

6. The increasing backlog of Labor Board cases is seriously delaying the expeditious settlement of disputes. At the end of March, there were 12,000 cases awaiting action by the Board. This fantastic backlog of cases equals the total number of cases filed with the Labor Board in an entire year under the Wagner Act. Obviously, no Government agency can properly and efficiently deal with this problem.

Moreover, lawsuits do not contribute toward peaceful industrial relations. As the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board recently observed—"a successful law suit, prolonged and bitterly fought, leaves wounds that can disturb the victor as much as they gall the vanquished. In the long run, also, Government will either lose the confidence or gain complete control over the people it is supposed to serve, if it is forced to adjudicate all the controversies between industry and labor."

7. The existing sweeping prohibition against secondary boycotts is restricting legitimate trade-union activities. It compels union members to scab against their own fellow members and thus contribute toward their self-destruction. It bars unions from taking effective action against secondary employers whose resources are being used to defeat union bargaining demands.

An example of the first type of case is found in a situation which recently confronted the International Association of Machinists. That union was engaged in a strike at a large steel mill. The mill, in order to avoid the economic consequences of the strike, contracted out its work to four other shops which were under agreement with the machinists. Because of the act's prohibition against secondary boycotts, the union's members in the four shops were required to work on the struck work. The effect of the prohibition in this situation was to compel the union's own members to lend support to the employer in breaking the strike.

8. The use of the labor injunction fully justified the conclusion that the era of government by injunction is being revived. All the injunctions except one, obtained by the Labor Board's general counsel, thus far have been obtained against labor organizations. These injunctions in many instances have been used to curb proper trade-union activities. Their use has weakened the union's hands at the bargaining table.

This development is of the greatest importance. It constitutes one of the most serious threats to trade-unions and to industrial peace in this country. It ignores 50 years of experience which have shown that the labor injunction leads to industrial unrest and destroys the wage earners' confidence in our courts.

9. The act is already being used to harass unions with litigation. An example of this use is the case of the International Typographical Union. Thus far, 18 charges have been filed with the Labor Board against this one union; 9 complaints issued; 4 administrative hearings held; 1 sweeping injunction issued by the court; and 2 damage suits filed in the civil courts. Obviously, the defense of these many suits is a threat to the financial well-being of the union.

10. The enlargement of the meaning of coercion to a point where it now includes legitimate trade-union activities confirms the fear that this provision, when applied to labor organizations, would provide a weapon for improper interference with labor's legitimate concerted activities.

11. Finally, the members of the minority of the watchdog committee condemned the failure of the Republican majority to take immediate steps to repeal the prohibition against union political activity. We believe this action necessary in order to prevent the continued invasion of constitutional rights.

The prohibition against union political expenditures has already been declared unconstitutional by the Federal district court. Its defects have been widely recognized not only by Democrats, but by Republicans. In view of the general recognition of the defects of this provision, the failure of the Republican majority to take immediate action in the Congress is inexcusable. This failure permits only one conclusion: That the Republicans seek to tie the hands of labor in the elections this fall.

Since August 22, 1947, the effective date of the Taft-Hartley Act, Republicans and many employers have been flooding the country with propaganda in an effort to sell this antilabor legislation to the American wage earner. The radio, the newspaper, and even cartoons are being used in this drive. This campaign is a significant reflection on the Republicans' absurd claim that the Taft-Hartley Act was intended to benefit the American wage earner. If this were so, there would be no need to spend thousands of dollars for propaganda to convince the wage earner. The act would speak for itself. The act does speak for itself, and it tells an entirely different story than the one the Republicans would have you believe.

There is much more to say on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act—but my time is limited. I want to stress this fact in conclusion. The only way to have true and free collective bargaining in this country is to maintain equality of bargaining power between labor and management. A weak union, like a single employee, cannot stand up to concentrated capital and get his just share of the goods produced. When wage earners fail to get the necessary purchasing power the economy of the whole country suffers.

The Wagner Act recognized this fact and sought to correct the inequality in bargaining power between labor and capital. The Taft-Hartley Act would upset this equality—at a time that the Justice Department reports "the concentration of economic power in American industry today is at the highest point since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act" in 1890 and at a time that industry is making the greatest peacetime profits in its history.

The Taft Hartley Act ignores a century of experience in labor-management relations in this country. It rejects the basic principle

that the Nation's economy and a free collective bargaining system requires that labor be able to deal with management on equal terms.

Because I was convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act would injure the welfare of this country, I fought against its passage. Because I am convinced that the Taft-Hartley Act, if permitted to continue as law, will eventually result in serious harm to the American wage earner and to the Nation's economy, I will continue to fight for its repeal.

I thank you and good evening.

Stassen's Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. HOWES MEADE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a statement was made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] to the effect that Harold E. Stassen would be defeated in Ohio by Senator ROBERT TAFT. It has taken a great deal of courage on the part of Mr. Stassen to enter this race against Senator TAFT in his home State. It was only after a great demand by so many Ohio voters that Mr. Stassen enter the primary there that he consented to become a candidate in 11 of Ohio's districts and to put forth 1 candidate in the delegate-at-large election.

It appears from reports received from qualified and unbiased observers in Ohio that the Stassen steam roller, motivated by the will of the great American people, will continue on in the great State of Ohio.

Mr. Robert L. Riggs, ace reporter and widely known political observer, has been covering the campaign of both Stassen and TAFT in Ohio. He reports as follows in an article appearing in his newspaper, the Louisville Courier-Journal, under date of April 26, 1948:

STASSEN CAMP'S CONFIDENCE GROWING IN OHIO—BACKERS WISH HE'D ENTERED BIGGER SLATE

(By Robert L. Riggs)

CLEVELAND, April 25.—The scent of victory is so strong in the nostrils of Harold E. Stassen's supporters that they now are saying their champion has made only one mistake in Ohio.

His error, they say, was in entering candidates for only 23 of the State's national convention delegates instead of filing a full slate of 53.

So encouraging is the news they're receiving from the 11 congressional districts in which Stassen delegates are entered that his supporters hesitate to accept it as true.

But they are working themselves into a state of mind to believe that all 22 district candidates and the one delegate-at-large candidate pledged to Stassen will win in the primary election a week from Tuesday.

REST BELONG TO TAFT

The Stassen people cannot take from Senator ROBERT A. TAFT his 30 unopposed delegates. But they are beginning to believe if they had contested every delegate seat they would have left the Ohio favorite son with only a handful of delegates to take with him to the Philadelphia convention.

The bold assurance with which Stassen operates is illustrated by a step he took immediately after his thumping victories in the Wisconsin and Nebraska primaries.

It has just come to light that after those primaries Stassen sent telegrams to the three New York lieutenants of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey and to a Taft leader in Texas.

He proposed that the three contenders get together for a conference designed to promote party welfare in the November election.

The offer was rejected by Dewey's men.

Stassen insists he was not trying to arrange a political deal before the convention. That, of course, was the interpretation the Dewey people placed upon his telegrams.

To the contrary, Stassen says, he simply was following a custom he established in Minnesota. There, whenever he won a primary contest, he immediately invited the defeated Republican candidate to confer with him about the November campaign.

Stassen's implication is that Nebraska and Wisconsin have made him the leading contender for the Republican nomination. That, of course, contains more affront to the Dewey and Taft people than would a proposal for a preconvention deal.

The Stassen assurance is increased by yesterday's Gallup poll figures. In them, he has forged to the front for the first time in the year and a half since he announced his Presidential candidacy.

Although Stassen's Gallup poll lead over Dewey is small—31 percent for him, and 29 for Dewey—it is the first time the Minnesota candidate has led all others.

HAS AN ADVANTAGE

Added to the Wisconsin and Nebraska outcome, the poll figures give Stassen a psychological advantage over TAFT in the Ohio contest.

Similarly, a first-rate showing by Stassen in this State would be beneficial to him in his show-down fight with Dewey in the Oregon primary May 21.

Stassen already has left the Ohio scene, flying to Oregon for one speech there tomorrow night. He returns to the East immediately after that speech. He will not be back in Ohio until May 3, the day before the election.

Dewey is taking no chances on a last-minute Oregon campaign, as he did in Wisconsin and Nebraska. He will fly to Oregon Saturday for a 3-week campaign in that and other Western States.

TAFT, still irritated that he has to spend his time campaigning in his own State instead of directing his party program in the Senate, will devote next week to touring Ohio by bus, airplane, and automobile.

His wife, Mrs. Martha Taft, the more effective campaigner of the two, will pound away on an Ohio itinerary of her own until election day.

Reference was made in part to the Gallup poll. It might be well to quote the report of Dr. George Gallup in full:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of April 25, 1948]

STASSEN EDGES DEWEY AND TAKES LEAD IN POPULARITY AMONG THE REPUBLICANS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., April 24.—Following his victory in the Wisconsin and Nebraska primaries, Harold E. Stassen for the first time heads the list of Republican hopefuls in national popularity within the ranks of GOP voters, the latest American Institute of Public Opinion survey finds.

Stassen's margin of lead today is, however, a narrow one, with Dewey close on his heels, followed by General MacArthur, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, and Senator ROBERT A. TAFT.

Stassen's victory in the two primaries has boosted his national popularity rating in much the same manner as Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's popularity as a Presidential candidate soared in November 1946, when he was reelected Governor of New York by a 700,000-vote majority.

HOW THEY RANK

The latest institute survey on candidate popularity covered the period from April 9 to April 17. Since some of the interviewing was done prior to the Nebraska primary April 13, the present poll results do not reflect the full effect of voter-reaction to Stassen's victory in Nebraska. The coast-to-coast standings of the various candidates were found to be as follows among voters who classify themselves as Republicans:

	Percent
Stassen	31
Dewey	29
MacArthur	16
Vandenberg	10
Taft	9
Warren	2
Martin	1
No choice	2

The last previous poll, reported March 28, showed the candidates as follows in terms of popularity among the GOP rank and file:

	Percent
Dewey	34
MacArthur	19
Stassen	15
Vandenberg	13
Taft	12
Warren	3
Martin	1
Saltonstall	1
No choice	2

Three important qualifications need to be emphasized in respect to this and all polls dealing with preconvention candidate popularity.

1. National figures cannot be used to forecast primary results in any one State, for the obvious reason that differences of opinion exist between sections of the country, and even between States within the same sections.

The three open primaries held to date, in New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Nebraska, have all shown different results, and demonstrate why it is impossible to apply a national figure to a single State election.

2. Candidate popularity must be assessed with two considerations in mind. The question is not simply what a man's popularity is within his own party, but also what his probable vote-getting strength might be if he became the party's official nominee running against the opposing party.

Some Republicans, who are far down in the list in terms of popularity within their own party, show up very well when pitted against President Truman and Henry Wallace in a "trial heat." Senator VANDENBERG, for example, runs virtually as strong a race against Truman as does either Dewey or Stassen in the latest institute trial heats, reported April 11.

CONVENTION DECIDES

The popularity rating within the ranks of the Republican Party do not and cannot reflect a candidate's voting strength among independent voters and among those voters who may shift from the Democratic Party—two groups who may very well decide the 1948 election.

3. The final selection of the nominee to head the Republican ticket rests solely with the convention delegates who will meet in Philadelphia June 21. Delegates are free to choose any man they want, regardless of the man's popularity with Republican voters.

Hence institute poll results on candidate popularity in no way constitute a forecast of the outcome of the nominating conventions, any more than they constitute a forecast of how any one particular State will vote in a Presidential primary before the conventions.

In today's balloting, Dewey was found leading in popularity among Republicans in the eastern and middle Atlantic sections.

In the east central section as a whole, Dewey and Stassen were running about even in popularity. In the west central area and in the far West, which includes the Rocky Mountain States, Stassen leads Dewey.

Who Won the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the final surrender to Adolf Hitler took place yesterday when the White House shamefacedly announced that two Nazi saboteurs had been secretly spirited to Germany and there turned loose to pass on their secrets of spying to a new generation of Nazi aggressors.

It was less than 6 years ago that these vicious criminals, trained in the spy schools of the German gangster government, sneaked into the United States, landing on Long Island in the dead of night, intent on crippling America's industrial arsenal.

These were spies—enemy spies.

Caught, they squealed like the rats they are, and their six fellow plotters were executed. Today these same rats are free in Germany, subject only to minor controls by the American military commander.

Mr. Speaker, American citizens whose only crime it was to carry out the noble dream of democracy of our Constitution and Declaration of Independence have been harried from Government service, crucified by public charges they had no chance to answer, reduced to poverty and disgrace. Hardly a voice has been raised in their defense.

Yet these two vicious Nazi spies, agents of a depraved government with which we were locked in mortal combat, are forgiven and free, aided by the combined might of the Department of Justice and the National Defense Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask; and the families of a million brave Americans killed or maimed in war ask; and 15,000,000 veterans of war with Hitlerism and fascism ask: Who won the war?

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pike County (Ill.) Republican of April 21, 1948:

UMT MUST NOT BECOME AMERICAN LAW

Let's be honest about it and call it by its right name—conscription.

Militarists try to polish it and hide the worm at the core by calling it UMT (universal military training).

The Army and Navy are trying to sell it to American customers under utterly false pretenses. They are wrongfully using taxpayers' money in an effort to sell spurious goods to these same taxpayers. Forrestal for one has brazenly admitted this illegal use of taxpayers' money. He should be impeached.

Let's examine this wormy fruit the militarists in this country are trying to sell us. Let's go to the core of it and expose the ugly worm in it.

Conscription has never prevented a war. The militarists lie when they say it is a war preventive. We challenge them to show one iota of truth in what they say.

For 150 years the nations of Europe have wasted their substance on conscription without preventing a single war. We call history to witness in support of this statement.

Militarists try to fool the people by asserting that UMT would make for national security. We challenge that statement and assert to the contrary that it would make for national insecurity.

Nations with conscription usually are the losers in a war. Nations without it are usually the winners. There's good reason for that.

The only area of the earth where so-called universal military training has been tried is the Continent on which all the major wars have been fought. Historical facts suggest that conscription is an inviter and not a preventer of wars.

Congress is unjustly compelling Americans at this time to send billions out of our husbandry to governments that have squandered and exhausted their own substances by conscription and its inevitable results.

It seems strange that a system so thoroughly hated and despised by our ancestors who fled from it, a system that drove many of them to brave the dangers of the stormy North Atlantic to escape it, a system linked in every textbook as a contributing factor to war, can be foisted upon this Nation as a measure for peace. Is the age of reason entirely extinct?

It is estimated that this so-called universal military training will cost $2,000,000,000 a year to build up the same kind of system in our country that is costing us other billions to prop up foreign governments that have exhausted themselves by reason of it. Does that make sense?

Think of what two billions a year could do for us in constructive instead of destructive undertakings.

There are those so bold and so adverse to truth as to urge that conscription of youth into military camps is a character builder. There are those who extol it for its alleged educational values, its self-discipline values, its health values, its crime-prevention values.

Let's give a moment's thought to these perversions. Let's ask ourselves one simple question. If we were going to spend $2,000,000,000 for these purposes, would we choose military camps for the purpose? Wouldn't the military camps be the least likely agency we would pick for the job?

They tell us it makes for national security. Are we ready to desert the wisdom of Patrick Henry who said that he knew of but one way to judge the future and that is by the past? All the history of the past is against what the militarists say.

That the proposed system makes for insecurity instead of security is truer today than ever before.

It would deaden the Nation's capacity and shrivel its financing for scientific concentration in preparation for any future war that, if it should come, will be a war of the sciences and in which massed armies would have no place except for mass destruction.

It would waste time and money in giving inadequate training for all when only a small percentage would need this kind of training in any war of the future.

It would absorb professional officers who should be giving their time to perfecting intelligence and scientific services. It would fail entirely to train technicians who will be the most needed in any future war.

More than all else, this proposed plan would give us a false sense of security and strength, just as it has the defeated nations of the past. This expensive delusion has always led nations to an ostrich-blind exposure and they have invariably paid the penalty.

A million of the Nation's youths in military training would take the time of some 100,000 professional military men who cou'd be better engaged in scientific and intelligence fields. It is estimated that it would take 230,000 to operate UMT.

So far as preparedness is concerned, we would vastly weaken ourselves if we drained off 3 out of every 10 professional officers to spend their time training boys in elementary military routine. And suppose war should come. Are we to believe that we would call up these few-months-trained boys rather than recall the ablest fighting team history has ever seen? The error of such reasoning is apparent to everyone, and is most obvious to the veterans themselves.

We have drawn freely in this editorial on the findings of John Henry Martin, former consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who in a recent issue of Look magazine presented the most convincing exposé we have yet seen of the falsities and absurdities incident to the claim that UMT is the answer to national security and preparedness. Mr. Martin's military analysis of UMT was presented under the title, "The case against universal military training."

In concluding his analysis of UMT, Mr. Martin says:

"Universal military training is an unsound proposal. It must not become American law."

International Information and Educational Activities of the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, Members of Congress had assurances from high places—to be specific, from Secretary of State Marshall himself—that undesirable employees roosting on the State Department roles would be dismissed. I, personally, was told that competent men would be placed in charge of the international information and educational activities. Subsequently, members of the House Appropriations Committee were led to believe that there would be a complete reorganization and streamlining of the Department and that, especially in its informational activities the Department would seek to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and those of other countries and to correct misunderstandings abroad about the United States.

It has been definitely established that the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs has full authority delegated to him by the Secretary of State to clean out inefficient personnel, to get rid of the

loafers and deadhead employees, to fire those workers who have been or are affiliated with organizations and groups listed as subversive by the authorized investigative branches of the Congress and Government. The old alibi of "not being able to fire incompetent or subversives because of civil service red tape" will not work. It has been established clearly and definitely that under special legislation the State Department can fire any member of its force at any time, with or without cause, and is not bound by the cumbersome and delaying tactics of the President's Executive order.

It is less than a month ago that the Appropriations Committee revealed the appalling inefficiency and incredible duplication of effort in the State Department. It brought to the attention of the House the numerous subversive elements at work within the Department—men and women whose records proved beyond any reasonable doubt that they are working against the welfare of this country and who, evidently, are being protected in their jobs by men in high places in this administration. I charged at that time and I charge again today that there are men in the State Department responsible for the screening of employees for loyalty and security who are not fitted for their jobs, and who are not protecting the interests of this country in these critical days. So far as I know, little or nothing has been done to improve or correct this situation, either by Secretary Marshall or his key subordinates.

I can reveal at this time, however, that as a direct result of our persistent probing and exposures, several of the most dangerous security risks have been separated from the Department's pay rolls, notably one key employee in the International Broadcasting Division. I have been reliably informed that others are in the process of being fired. This is very significant in view of the vehement denials which followed our revelations. It is a late start and much damage has been done, but better late than never. I hope it is the beginning of a trend.

We have been unusually patient with Secretary Marshall. Since he took office, he has had ample time and opportunity to fire the chiselers and hire some competent, loyal Americans to help him clean house. Had he done so when we first advised him to reconvert the State Department into a thoroughly American institution we would not have the spectacle of Members of Congress having to check over the incredible drivel which the Department foists on the world as the Voice of America.

It was developed in our hearings that these scripts are prepared under contract by commercial broadcasting companies. One would suppose that with millions of dollars made available to the Department for the administration and production of the Voice of America, these scripts would be carefully checked for policy and content. But such is not the case, the reason being the age-old bureaucratic excuse of insufficient personnel—never, of course, an admission of inefficient personnel.

With 184 high-salaried persons employed in the International Broadcasting Division, we are told that the commercially written scripts are not reviewed before broadcast because of lack of personnel. Included in this staff are 20 editorial assistants State Department officials testified that there are 132 fifteen-minute scripts submitted to them each day, many of which are prepared from the same basic text. I do not know of any business office that could not handle such an assignment with that number of employees on hand.

On March 10, 1948, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs George V. Allen appeared before our subcommittee and gave every indication that he would take seriously the recommendations we made to him. I sincerely hope he will follow through. Upon being questioned about a sample broadcast placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, he described it as a very trivial broadcast. "Trivial" was hardly the correct description. The broadcast was one of a series sent to my office for perusal by the State Department. By no stretch of the imagination could any be termed "first rate." A few could squeeze into the second-rate classification. The great majority, however, consist of such trashy jargon that they are an insult to any listener, whether he be in the Congo or Chicago.

One could almost suspect the writers of this twaddle of a Machiavellian plot to ridicule the American people and present them to the rest of the world as morons and neurotics.

At a time when people the world over are crying for food, clothing, and shelter, the State Department broadcasts a travelog of insipid chatter over whether or not beet sugar is red. It dribbles away expensive air time describing a spectacle in the great State of Wyoming, not its scenic wonders or virile citizens, but Indian girls, feathered and naked, readying for a foot race; $10 on the one with the blue handkerchief. I bet that made a great hit with overseas listeners.

Beamed to the Spanish-speaking world at a time when the State Department should have been on its toes alerting the South American Nations to the proposed Communist-inspired sabotage of the Pan-American Conference, we find this scintillating dialog:

NARRATOR. There was a time when all the inhabitants of Cheyenne were outlaws, including the mayor.

VOICE. I suppose he was elected by his own gang, like in the movies.

NARRATOR. Of course, the laws of the State, even to this day, forbid the treasurer general to serve more than 4 years.

VOICE. Why?

NARRATOR. The governing officials in those days gave a very original and very human explanation: Everyone has the right to get rich, but anyone who cannot do it in 4 years, should look for some other business.

The script goes on to describe some two-gun johnnies hanging around a railroad station. This, let me remind you, is classed as "entertainment" by the international sociological experts in the State Department. This is the sort of stuff which is supposed to educate foreign listeners on the American way of life.

Just about the time the Russians were manipulating their treacherous Czechoslovakian coup, the State Department was polluting the air with a 15-minute dialog between a fortune-telling, crystal-gazing mother and her lovesick son. The background of this masterpiece was a carnival. After much incoherent gibberish the boy talks the old lady into going to Peoria with him. How is that for a morale builder in times of crises?

About the same time, the Russians were on the receiving end of another bit of diplomatic whimsey. Remember, this was beamed to the Russian people in the hope of impressing them that we are a freedom-loving, peace-loving people, who believe in liberty and justice for all. The Voice, however, chose to sound off with an analytical history of the Atlantic Monthly, followed by a recitation on the tonnage and servicing required by the British trans-Atlantic liner, *Queen Mary*. That certainly must have struck a responsive chord in the hearts and minds of the Russian people.

Recently Spain was treated to a review of the prospects of the National and American baseball leagues. Apparently that is the State Department's spring tonic for combating dictatorship.

Those of us who have read the scripts, listened to the Department's officials talk vaguely about "potential listening audiences" and pull imaginary figures out of a hat when guessing at the number of short-wave sets in operation in this or that country, have no great expectations as to the net result of this Voice of America experiment. We know that no one can correctly estimate the number of short-wave sets in service in any given country or locality. No one knows how many, if any, persons listen to these international broadcasts. What we do know is that it would be the ultimate in self-deception to believe that anyone with the strength to switch off the reception dial would punish himself by voluntarily listening to the drivel which the State Department passes off as an educational, informational, and entertaining program.

To the tune of $100,000 per hour per year, 22 hours per day, 365 days per year, this Voice of America is an expensive pastime. If we must be burdened with it, let us try to enhance its value by making it a real voice from America, and not a synthetic squeak concocted by a few self-styled propagandists and writers who have not the faintest conception of what made and makes this Nation the greatest power on earth.

More Farm-to-Market Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the Federal Aid Highway Act the House passed a few days ago and sent to the Senate will be approved by that body without changing the amendment with reference to farm-to-market roads.

The Members of the House realize that the greatest need for road improvement

in the Nation today is in the rural sections. The effort of the House was to increase the building of all-weather roads in rural communities.

The House amended the original act to make certain that moneys appropriated by the Federal Government and matched by the State for farm-to-market roads must be so spent. The amendment specified that principal, secondary, and feeder roads shall include county and township roads and that the State highway department must cooperate with township trustees and other appropriate county road officials.

Under this act the Federal Government appropriates $150,000,000, which when matched by Federal funds, provide $300,000,000 a year to be expended on farm-to-market roads.

During the years just ahead this legislation should get the farmers out of the mud and on to real all-weather roads. Since coming to Congress I have been keenly interested in such legislation and I am glad to note the progress we are making.

Letter of Chamber of Commerce of Monroe, La., to Lieutenant Governor Coolidge, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF MONROE-
WEST MONROE, LOUISIANA, INC.,
April 21, 1948.

The Honorable ARTHUR W. COOLIDGE,
Lieutenant Governor,
Commonwealth of Massachusetts,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We have read with interest and surprise your comments about the South which were carried in an Associated Press item under date of April 12: interest aroused by your concern over the number of Massachusetts industries that are moving to the South; and surprise that the Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which has long been regarded by a great part of the American people as the seat of American culture, and the home of much that is fine and decent, would lose his self-restraint to such an extent that he would resort to vulgar name-calling. It is to be regretted that the renowned taciturnity of Calvin Coolidge is not exhibited by all members of his family. We are pleased, however, to learn that bad manners are not limited to southern politicians.

Has it ever occurred to you, Governor Coolidge, that there may be some sound economic reasons for the southward migration of many of your industries? Businessmen are hard-headed realists, and are not easily taken in by mere talk. If you will take the trouble to investigate, you will find that in the great majority of cases, southward expansion of industries has occurred only after a lengthy study of all the economic factors involved. In many instances, your northern firms employ the services of highly trained industrial engineers who spend weeks, and sometimes months, exploring all the facilities of the region under consideration; and, strangely enough, the bulk of these engineers are themselves from the North. From your own experience you should know that successful politicians are often experts at pulling the wool over people's eyes, but have you ever tried it on an engineer?

For a moment, let's look at what a typical southern city has to offer an industry; and since I don't wish to be guilty of the same indiscretion as you—that of talking about something with which I am unfamiliar—let's talk about the cities of Monroe and West Monroe and the trade area of northeast Louisiana, which this chamber of commerce serves. We have an assured, adequate supply of essential raw materials—natural gas, crude oil, clays and sands, timber and cotton, all available in large quantities. Proven reserves of natural gas in northeast Louisiana are 2,400,000,000,000 (that's right) cubic feet, and 407,000,000 barrels of crude oil. Northeast Louisiana has slightly over 5,000,000 acres of merchantable timberland, of which approximately one-fourth is pure pine stands, better than half is pure hardwoods and the remainder is mixed pine and hardwoods.

Lying in the center of one of the world's largest natural-gas fields, this area is assured of an unlimited supply of fuel at industrial rates as low as can be found in the country. Where in Massachusetts, or elsewhere in the North, can you obtain natural gas for as low as 10.5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet? Our water supply is unlimited, with sources in both the Ouachita River and artesian wells. Three railroads and 10 truck lines serving this city provide cheap and adequate transportation at favorable rates, to say nothing of barge service on the Ouachita River. We are served by one major air line, with two others presently petitioning the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to serve us.

Southern labor, which you have characterized as a "raw mass, inexperienced and undisciplined," has amazed northern industrialists by the facility with which it has been trained to perform skilled work, and by the length of its training period, which has proved much shorter than that required by northern labor. You fail to realize that, unlike your own labor, our people here are almost all native-born Americans and, as such, are not prone to subscribe to ideologies which make for political and social unrest. Check with the United States Department of Labor and see for yourself what a small portion of strikes and other labor upheavals troubling the Nation the past few years have occurred in the South. Even you will be surprised.

Because southern population is spread out, and not concentrated in such large cities as is much of New England's population, living costs here are relatively lower, and the southern laborer can afford to work for a relatively lower wage. Any manufacturer will tell you that his pay roll is the largest item of his overhead. The lower wage in the South is a great advantage to the industrialist, and does not work an undue hardship on the laborer, either.

The Southern climate, about which you express such abhorrence, has proved a boon to industrialists in the savings it has effected in construction costs. For instance, one of your own Massachusetts furniture manufacturers is just completing a new plant here in Monroe at a cost which would be impossible in the North. Located on 26½ acres within the city limits, (which incidentally cost him only $16,500) it has a manufacturing floor space of 74,000 square feet. The foundations, 5-inch reinforced concrete floor and the building itself have been erected at a total contract price of $1.725 per square foot. This sort of thing is not happening in Monroe, alone; it is to be found all over the South, and the reasons for it are obvious and sound.

It is true, Governor Coolidge, that the South still has a great many disadvantages. Our schools still leave much to be desired; the freight rate structure throughout the South still favors the North; our labor has not yet developed all the skills of our Northern brethren. But here is where the great difference lies; instead of wasting our time in such idle and senseless recriminations as you, we are doing something constructive about it. In the past 4 years Southern States have, percentage-wise, made greater progress in their public schools than any other section of the country—we are spending much more money for education. We are bringing into our area industries which make use of raw products grown or mined in the South, thereby reducing the cost of the finished product to the Southern buyer. Our labor is rapidly acquiring new skills with which to do a better and higher paid job. We are working hard, Governor Coolidge, and we shall continue to work hard.

It is the spirit of the people in the South which is making this area prosperous, and which will make it even more prosperous in the future. We have taken many leaves from the Northerners' book, and are putting them to good use. May we suggest to you that, if you want to promote the welfare of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, you take a leaf from the Southerners' book. Cut out the foolish talk, and get to work.

Very truly yours,

H. G. BAILEY, Jr.,
Manager.

The Courage of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 7, 1948:

POLITICS TO THE CONTRARY
(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—It seems only fair to record that President Truman's veto of the tax-reduction bill ran counter to his own political interests. He took an extremely unpopular course in his veto. This was indicated by the overwhelming shout with which the House and Senate overrode it. In the House, the vote went against him, four to one (311 to 88). In the Senate, the majority was eight to one (77 to 10). Congress is conscious of the political implications in the matter, whether the President is or not.

Mr. Truman grimly stuck to his guns. He just felt tax reduction is bad for the country in the face of the present international situation. Mr. Truman may be right or he may be wrong. But it is hard not to feel that in running boldly against the popular desire he showed considerable courage.

If Mr. Truman now runs for election, his adversaries can point to him as the man who did his best to keep taxes high. They can point to the fact that they were the ones who succeeded in passing out the $5,000,000,000 in tax relief. With perfect justice they can say that, if left to the President, this lightening of the taxpayers' burden would never have been made. Mr. Truman pretty certainly lost votes by opposing the cut.

Mr. Truman took this unpopular course even though his own political prestige is running low. Few people to whom this correspondent talks believe that he has much chance of being elected, if he runs. I noted on March 3 in this correspondence that the

Democrats might decide not to nominate Mr. Truman at all. In the month since then, the Democratic anti-Truman sentiment has been growing steadily.

It is against this background that Mr. Truman grimly reaffirmed his opposition to tax cuts. Perhaps he felt that with his two earlier vetoes he could not change his position in any case. He had the comfort of knowing that veteran Presidential adviser Bernard Baruch had just told a Senate committee that he, too, felt a tax reduction unwise and that outstanding economists, like Prof. Sumner Slichter, of Harvard, take the same position.

The proof of whether Mr. Truman is wrong or right almost certainly will not come till after the November election. Mr. Truman argued that with a proposed $39,700,000,000 budget, with an additional $6,000,000,000 foreign aid program, a new, minimum, $3,000,000,000 armament program, and requests for the draft and UMT, the Treasury cannot stand knocking off $5,000,000,000 in taxes. His opponents took the contrary position, and so voted. The issue is settled.

Will the new tax cuts be canceled out by Federal "economies"? Republicans have held control of the congressional purse strings for 2 years, yet Federal costs are rising, not dropping. This is because so much of the budget now is devoted to military costs, past, present, and future, and to fixed charges. Some reductions can and should be made in the administration of Federal bureaus, but most of these are petty compared to such items as interest on national debt, veterans' payments, costs of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and foreign aid.

Taxes are undoubtedly high; in some cases almost insupportable. But it is generally agreed that the cause of high prices is the competitive scramble of too many dollars for too few goods. That is Mr. Truman's argument, anyway. Pouring $5,000,000,000 more purchasing power into the contest, he asserts, will send up prices but won't produce more goods. If Mr. Truman is right—and we can only hope he isn't—the thing to watch for now is more inflation.

Fresh from the tax victory, congressional leaders give assurance that they will restore taxes the minute the need appears. To the Truman sound-money school this promise had dubious value, like promising to repair the brakes of the car in case they prove defective coming down the next mountain.

Mr. Truman may be wrong in all this. But at least he appears to deserve credit for sticking to his guns when political expediency pointed to a different course.

Louisiana Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Louisiana.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by V. M. Vegas, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 2566 Gladiolac, New Orleans 17, La., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

An allowance is provided to cover expenses of attendance of a firing squad from National Guard or veterans' organizations at the burial of a deceased veteran.

A permanent registry of graves of veterans is maintained.

Board of Commissioners of Camp Moore Confederate Cemetery provides appropriations for grave care, etc.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces may be admitted.

Protection is extended homesteaders during military service.

Protection is extended members of the armed forces holding land warrants to locate on State lands.

Disability of minority is waived for a veteran to contract under the GI bill of rights.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting is provided for qualified voters in military service.

Method of qualifying as a candidate in the primary for elective office is modified with reference to those persons absent by reason of service in the armed forces.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

The Department of the Treasury administers a fund covering allowance and payment of claims from moneys received from the United States for account of back pay to Spanish-American War veterans.

State commissioners are authorized to administer oaths in connection with claims for benefits.

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The State service commissioners are authorized to certify to the correctness of documents in connection with claims for benefits.

The fee for recording discharge papers is limited to 25 cents.

Administrative functions of the office of State service commissioner has been transferred to the department of public welfare.

It is the duty of the Director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs and parish service officers to aid veterans of any war in which the United States was engaged and the relatives, beneficiaries, and dependents of such veterans, to receive from the United States any and all compensation, hospitalization, insurance, or other aid or benefit to which they may be entitled.

It is the duty of the State service commissioner for State veterans of the Spanish-American War, etc., to aid veterans who served in the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Chinese Boxer Rebellion and the relatives, beneficiaries, and dependents of such veterans, to receive from the United States any and all compensation, pension, hospitalization, burial, benefits of soldiers' homes maintained by the National or State Governments, or other aid or benefit to which they may be entitled. This office is now under the Department of Public Welfare.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Preference is given to children of soldiers, sailors, or marines who were killed in action or died from other cause during World Wars I and II in obtaining scholarships to State colleges—amount, $300.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

Thirty-seven thousand and five hundred dollars is appropriated annually to the State board of education to provide education and on-the-job training to veterans of World War II.

Eight hundred thousand dollars has been appropriated to the State board of education to provide vocational agriculture development and other vocational opportunities for World War II veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Time is extended for persons serving in the armed forces outside continental United States to qualify for the office to which they may be elected or appointed.

Leaves of absence are given, while serving in the armed forces, to any appointive State official not within the classified service, including officials serving on State commissions, boards, and in the executive branch; public officers; notaries public, and teachers.

Preference is given to veterans and their widows in both State and New Orleans civil service.

Benefits are preserved under the teacher retirement system.

The departments of Louisiana American Legion, DAV, VFW, and Amvets shall nominate persons to the Governor for appointment as members of the Veterans' Affairs Commission.

The Director of the Department of Veterans' Affairs must be a veteran.

Honorably discharged veterans formerly employed by State or local units must be restored to their former positions after discharge if application is made within 40 days of such date and are still able to perform their former duties.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Confederate veterans, their wives or widows, may be admitted to the Confederate soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act.

Inmates of the soldiers' home may have special treatment at the Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat Hospital of New Orleans.

HOUSING

Five hundred thousand dollars has been appropriated to the State Board of Education for constructing and equipping veteran housing units on campuses of Northwestern State College, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Southeastern Louisiana College, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Louisiana Negro Normal and Industrial School, and Southern University.

LAND SETTLEMENT

Protection is extended homesteaders inducted into the armed forces with regard to establishment of residence.

The 6-month period within which warrants to locate on lands belonging to the State is extended for members of the armed forces until 6 months after the end of World War II.

Veterans of World War II may homestead land.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

War memorial civil centers may be established in each parish.

The Memorial Hall at New Orleans contains Civil War relics and is under supervision of Louisiana State University.

The old State capitol has been dedicated as a memorial to Louisiana veterans of World War II and may be used by all veteran organizations for offices, meeting places, and as a museum.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans or their widows.

RECORDS

The assessor of each parish keeps records of all Confederate veterans. The State board of public welfare keeps a record of all Confederate pensioners. The adjutant general has a permanent registry of all veterans who are buried in the State.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Certain Confederate veterans, their wives, or widows are exempt from peddler's license tax and from certain business and occupational privilege taxes or licenses.

Annual or renewal fees for professional and occupational licenses are waived during active military service and for two calendar years following discharge.

Registered pharmacists' annual renewal fee, etc., is waived during active military service.

Homestead exemption is continued during World War II and until the applicant has completed his enlistment with the armed forces.

Single veterans have an additional income-tax exemption of $1,500 ($2,500 if married) for the years December 31, 1945, to December 31, 1950, inclusive.

Contributions or gifts made within the taxable year to veterans' organizations and their auxiliaries may be deducted from gross income tax.

UNIFORMS

Veterans are exempt from the regulation prohibiting civilians from wearing the uniform of the United States Army or Navy.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the Louisiana Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 19 chapters throughout the State, maintains three full-time national service officers, under the direction of Philip L. Smelko, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, room 201, Annie Haynes Hall, 501 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, and two others, under the direction of Roland A. Neyrey, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, 333 St. Charles Street, New Orleans.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation, Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942, active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year, ending on June 30, after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth-Third Union Trust Co.—has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co., of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veterans' abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War II myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Harriet Sizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, too seldom do we pay timely tribute to those who have made great contributions to our lives. It is, therefore, gratifying to learn that my home city, Corpus Christi, Tex., is giving recognition to the unselfish and untiring efforts of a woman who for nearly 30 years has brought comfort and encouragement to a large proportion of the families in that city through her practice of the nursing profession.

May 4 has been proclaimed Harriet Sizer day in Corpus Christi and a testimonial dinner will be held on the night of May 3. At that time the registered nurses of district 17, the Nueces County Medical Society, and the people of Corpus Christi will gather to express their gratitude for her contribution to our community.

Harriet Sizer was born May 4, 1878, in Winnimac, Ind., and was graduated from the Chicago Polyclinic Hospital in 1901. She served in the United States Army for 3 years and was a member of one of the first contingents of nurses to go overseas during the Spanish-American War. It was Corpus Christi's good fortune that she chose to make her home in

that city in 1920, and since that time she has organized and operated three hospitals.

Throughout the years Mrs. Sizer has been more than a nurse, more than a hospital superintendent. To the thousands upon thousands who have been treated in her hospitals, she has stood as a bulwark against fear and hopelessness. Her calm, motherly care has not infrequently played as great a part in strengthening the weak as the medicines she dispensed.

Mrs. Sizer's work has brought her into close touch with the needy, and it is doubtful if even the doctors and nurses who have served with her know the full extent of her welfare work.

She has given her strength to community progress and welfare; she has been a loyal worker and a fine friend. Her life stands as an example of the usefulness which can be achieved by a single individual whose course has been directed by an inexhaustible capacity for love and public service.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the general public and newspaper editorials are urging Congress to support President Truman's request of a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

This act expires on June 12 next, and unless Congress acts promptly to authorize its extension the results will certainly prove embarrassing if not very damaging to the cause of world peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excellent editorial on the subject which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star on April 26, 1948:

IT MUST BE RENEWED

There are more than a few Republicans in Congress—especially in the House—who would like to do away with the Riciprocal Trade Agreements Act either by refusing to renew it or by amending it to death. Their threat is an extremely serious one. If they have their way, if the wiser heads in their party do not prevail, the repercussions will be world-wide, and our friends abroad will have good reason to wonder whether our right hand knows what our left is doing in the conduct of foreign policy.

For the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—which will expire on June 12 unless Congress renews it—has been a key part of our dealings with other nations for the past 14 years. Its fundamental purpose has been to promote a freer flow of world commerce, to eliminate retaliatory tariff walls, and to serve peace by stimulating a mutually enriching international exchange of goods on a fair quid-pro-quo basis. In short, it has been an integral part of our foreign policy—an indispensable economic support to the political aspects of that policy.

Indeed, with our reciprocity program, we have given the economic lead to all nations. Thus, as far as the postwar era is concerned, we have preached the principles of that program in taking the initiative to establish the World Bank and the World Monetary Fund. We have preached them, too, in connection with our successful effort last year to get 22 governments to join with us in the historic and far-reaching Geneva tariff agreement, and they constitute the animating spirit of the 53-nation charter of the International Trade Organization recently negotiated at Habana. Above all—and this is of very great importance—they have been written into the legislation enacted by Congress for the European recovery program, under which the 16 participating countries are expected to pledge themselves to reduce barriers to increase the exchange of goods among themselves.

In such circumstances, if Congress failed to renew the reciprocity program, it would be telling the world, in effect, that we do not believe in practicing the good things we have preached. Worse, by thus committing a supreme act of inconsistency and backtracking, it would be spreading confusion among all our friends abroad, upsetting the operations of the ERP, and planting the impression everywhere of an American drift back to the days of high protectionism. In other words, despite our political internationalism, our economic role would take on a distinct isolationist slant, with the result that our over-all foreign policy would seem to be at war with itself.

But it is not only for reasons of this sort that the Trade Agreements Act should be renewed without crippling amendments. In the modern world such an act is essential. Without it there can only be tariff wars in which everybody will ultimately be the loser. From the standpoint of our own self-interest, strictly in terms of dollars and cents, we need reciprocity for the sake of American markets abroad. If we do not have it, if our overseas customers run up against high protectionism here, then they will not be able to sell enough to us to acquire the money they must have to buy from us. And that is the kind of process that leads to factory shut-downs and deep economic depression.

Accordingly, looked at in any light, either as an instrument of foreign policy or as an instrument to promote our own prosperity, the reciprocal trade program—which includes escape clauses guarding against serious injury to our domestic producers—must be renewed substantially in its present form. If it is killed off or allowed to fall apart, the responsibility for the consequences will rest preponderantly on the Republicans. The consequences could be very grave. To invite them would be to take a reckless gamble with the best interests of the Nation.

The Condon Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. VAIL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. P. Ives, from the Baltimore Sun of April 26, 1948:

ON STICKING TO THE FACTS IN THE CONDON MATTER

(By C. P. Ives)

In the uproar over the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, a good many of the facts, including the major fact, have been forgotten. The major fact is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities raises no question of Dr. Condon's loyalty. As a committee spokesman put it in a recent address in the House:

"The very essence of our report concerning Dr. Condon had to do with his associations, affiliations, and indiscretions. We did not charge Dr. Condon with being disloyal. * * *"

But if the charge is not disloyalty, what is it? The House committee paraphrased it by calling Dr. Condon "one of the weakest links in our atomic *security*." The word I have italicized is the key word "security."

What is the difference between loyalty and security? Simple enough, and largely explained by the dictionary meanings of the two words. A man is disloyal if he puts the welfare and safety of another country over that of the United States.

A man is a poor security risk, however loyal, if he lacks discretion, if he talks too much, if he is unwise in his associations, if through carelessness or dumbness he behaves in a way which foreign agents might find it easy to twist to their advantage.

The distinction is carefully noted in the procedures which the Government has worked up to protect itself and the interests of the American people in these grave and somber times. For there is not one but two protective programs in the Government.

There is a loyalty program resting on an Executive order of the President and issued a year ago. And there is a security program, imposed by statute and covering the sensitive agencies—the armed services, the State Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Dr. Condon has undergone the loyalty test at the hands of a Commerce Department loyalty board and emerged with an unqualified loyalty clearance by unanimous vote of the board. There are, however, some notable claims about the Condon loyalty test made by the House Un-American Activities Committee spokesman in his House address.

It will be remembered that the Un-American Activities Committee report on Dr. Condon was released on March 1. A Commerce Department spokesman stated shortly thereafter that the Department loyalty board had cleared Dr. Condon some days before, on February 24.

The House committee spokesman now claims, however, that the unanimous clearance of Dr. Condon by the Commerce loyalty board came not before but a matter of hours after the House report had been released. And this despite the fact that the board had been considering the matter a full 10 months previously.

The committee spokesman also stated that in order to complete the clearance on what appears to have been a basis of urgency, one of the board members, who had left the Department employ, was reached by long-distance telephone to secure the final vote needed to make the report unanimous.

But the most important point about the Commerce loyalty board proceeding is that, as suggested above, it did not touch Dr. Condon's standing as a security risk at all. Yet, obviously, the question of security is just as important as the question of loyalty.

The agency responsible for testing Dr. Condon on the security ground is the Atomic Energy Commission with which his atomic work in the Bureau of Standards is connected. And the interesting thing is, that as recently as Friday, the Condon security matter was described as still pending at AEC.

In other words, though controversy has raged about Dr. Condon since the House committee released its report March 1; though that report stated that the AEC had carried the Condon matter as a pending case in the previous November; though it is now nearly the first of May, there is as yet no formal and publicly acknowledged clearance on security for this controversial figure.

Nor is this the only instance of surprising administrative slowness in the Condon

case. As stated above, the Commerce Department loyalty board cleared Dr. Condon on loyalty grounds. This clearance seems to have been accepted by the Un-American Activities Committee, though it is demanding the Commerce papers in the case.

But when the Commerce Department first refused to surrender these papers to the House committee, it announced that as an extra precaution on the loyalty matter it would ask the top loyalty review board, headed by Mr. Seth Richardson, to review the Department loyalty finding.

At the week end, however, the Richardson board had not yet even taken jurisdiction. Normally the Richardson board advises department boards before, rather than after, they have made their findings. Interagency discussion of this technicality seems to be the delaying factor in getting the resurvey of the Condon matter started.

Now there is a salutary rule of law that the courts will not intervene in a pending case until the administrative remedies have been exhausted. By analogy it perhaps can be argued that congressional investigating committees ought not to investigate until executive and administrative investigations had been completed.

But then the question arises, how long ought the congressional committees to wait for slow-motion administrative action? In anything the congressional committees do, they must proceed fairly, with full hearings to persons reported on, to be sure. But how long should they wait for administrative action? That question is bound to pick up steam as the Condon matter stays in the headlines.

The Tidelands Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, as it is very probable that the Congress will this week consider the question of the tidelands, it is imperative that all Members of the House be intimately familiar with what we are attempting to do here. We are engaged in a States' rights controversy, a fundamental issue at the time our Constitution was adopted. And in all probability had there not been a disposition on the part of the Thirteen Colonies or their representatives at that time to preserve unto themselves all the rights possible except those specifically given to the Congress, there never would have been a United States of America.

On many sides of our life today is this very right being threatened. It is deserving of a more serious approach than is all too often given it. I should like, in connection with the tidelands case, to include the following statement made by the very able attorney general of the State of North Dakota, Nels G. Johnson, before the Judiciary Subcommittee of the United States Senate on S. 1988:

The States' rights controversy, which all the people assumed was settled by the Civil War, is again present. It has been precipitated in recent years by the ever-growing authority and power of the Federal Government. The growth of the Federal Government and the alarming rate at which it has, in the past 15 years, taken over functions formerly performed by the States, has caused concern to the sovereign States of the Union, and is one of the modern problems of government that must be solved unless all citizens are to concede that under modern conditions a strong centralized Federal Government can perform the functions formerly belonging to the States better than the States were and are able to do them. There are a great many people who do not believe that the Federal Government can perform many local functions as effectively as the States, and that further encroachment upon State sovereignty by the Federal Government is dangerous to our continued liberty.

When our Constitution was framed and adopted, our forefathers were definitely attempting to avoid the formation of a Federal Government with too much authority. History had demonstrated to them that too much authority in a centralized government was dangerous. Modern history of the immediate past proves that our forefathers were right in their apprehensions in that connection.

Our forefathers also knew that government close to the people was the best and more easily controlled to effect their wishes and desires. A government close to the people, and in their local control, was the aim and desire of the founders and framers of the United States Constitution. The result of the adoption of the Constitution was a dual system of government, consisting of States and a Federal Government of defined delegated powers.

As early as the time of Aristotle, the ancient philosopher, who lived between 384 and 322 B. C., the Greeks recognized that the aim of democracy was to give the people a chance to share in the government to the utmost. Aristotle said:

"If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the Government to the utmost."

This truth so well expressed by a philosopher of the most ancient of democratic countries was known to our forefathers. Yet it is a fact that we Americans are beginning to forget it.

American history tells us that it is extremely doubtful whether the Constitution would ever have been adopted by the Thirteen Colonies, then existing under the Articles of Confederation, if the people had not felt that the only power to be exercised by the United States Government was such power as had been delegated to it in the Constitution. While the Articles of Confederation had not produced the cohesive strength necessary in the formation of a nation, the fear of a powerful Federal Government was actual and real to our forefathers and the Constitution was an attempt on their part to keep the tendency toward centralization of Federal authority within certain bounds. The Constitution, therefore, was so constructed as to contain checks and balances to limit Federal power and at the same time create a sufficiently strong National Union.

The fear of too much central authority in the Federal Government led to the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution in December of 1791. Articles IX and X of these amendments state:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people" (art. IX).

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved in the States, respectively, or to the people" (art. X).

All authority of the United States Government must find its basis in the Constitution and the laws enacted pursuant thereto. Yet it is a fact that as it is now being interpreted and construed, local governmental power, historically and generally conceded as belonging to the States, is said to reside in the Government of the United States. It is generally conceded that the sphere of power, which, except for the delegated powers of the United States Government, embraced all power left to the States, is getting smaller and narrower in scope. There is a marked tendency in the Federal Government to find means and methods to expand the Federal power, particularly is this true in the last 15 years or so. This tendency leads to the question: Even in these United States is such tendency wholesome?

This tendency is a departure from our original constitutional concepts. Under the guise of economic emergency and war, many functions performed by local and State governments have been, and are being, performed by the Federal Government at Washington, D. C., or under its direction through its bureaus, commissions, and corporate entities throughout the United States. The local administration of functions carried on by the Federal Government involves a local administrative set-up imposed upon the State either by law or regulation, and is made the basis for the acquiescence of the local authorities before participation can be obtained in the funds provided by the Federal Government to carry on the functions involved.

Centralization of power in the recent past in European countries has resulted in the two world wars. Untold millions of the people of the earth have become pawns and peons of dictatorship and centralized authority of government. Unbridled sway and power of these centralized governments have resulted in squelching all effort of the people to express themselves or assert their rights and liberties.

One of the prevalent evils of our times in the United States is the constant and unchecked growth of our Federal Government, which now has grown to such staggering proportions that it cannot be encompassed by the imagination of men, and which has resulted, and is resulting, in larger and bigger requests for money to carry on the functions now being exercised by the Federal Government. The growth of government and its functions exact a price which the taxpayers of our country may not be able to pay, and which will thwart all individual initiative, if continued much longer, and at the same time may completely undermine all free enterprise.

Government, whether in our country or any other, feeds on power. The larger it becomes the greater its demand for personnel and governmental officials, and the greater its expansion, the greater will be its needs for money, and the more personnel involved in government, the greater will be the efforts of that Government to find and perform functions to keep it active and to justify its continuance and support.

The foregoing may seem unrelated to the submerged land controversy focused by the United States Supreme Court, in the case of the United States against California. Yet, it is not. That case has announced a doctrine of law which if allowed to stand will call for greater governmental personnel, greater authorization of Government power to the centralized Federal Government. In fact, the case carries implications that defy the imagination of anyone as to the possibilities of the further expansion of Federal power and its dominion over the mineral resources of the Nation, particularly those under submerged lands, both inland and coastal. The right of the Federal Government to the oil in the submerged lands off the coast of California is based upon a doctrine pronounced in the California case, and which may, for lack of a more appropriate term, be designated as the paramount right doctrine. Under this doctrine, if correct, and allowed to remain the law of the land, as pronounced by the United States Supreme Court, the Federal Government may ultimately claim a paramount right, in the interest of national defense and security, in all

the minerals of the States. If this doctrine is a proper basis for the decision in the California case, questions arise: Where does this doctrine originate? Does it come from any constitutional authority delegated to the Federal Government? Is it based upon any law enacted pursuant to the Constitution? It appears that there is neither constitutional nor statutory authority for the pronouncement of this decision. It comes only from the desire of the governing officials to perpetuate their rule.

The doctrine arises out of a philosophy of government that seems to exist in the minds of those who continuously, either by direct or indirect means, are seeking further centralization of authority in the Government of the United States, and who feel that the functions originally and still belonging to the several States of the Union can better be performed by the United States Government. The doctrine announced in the California case, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, would serve as a basis for the Federal Government, by plausible argument, to take over still more functions formerly belonging to the States. The implications of the decision are such as to alarm the sovereign States of the Union. The doctrine announced in the case is a wedge which ultimately must produce, and will tend to produce, further centralization of authority in the Federal Government. It may ultimately destroy our dual system of government and destroy all States' rights.

The decision is a complete departure from the constitutional theory upon which our Government was founded, because the paramount theory used as a basis for the solution of the controversy between the United States and California over the oil in the soil of the submerged lands for 3 miles off the coast of California cannot be found within any of the delegated powers of the Federal Government. It appears to be a pure invention of a rule of law founded in the desire of the promoters of centralization to infringe further upon State sovereignty and take over what has concededly belonged to the States, recognized as such since the formation of the Union, and the admission of the States that came into the Union after its formation.

The trend toward centralization of power in the United States Government has already gone too far; and if the health of our dual system of government is to be retained, it is imperative that no further extension of centralized authority be granted either by the Congress or by judicial interpretation of the Constitution.

In his great book, the Epic of Freedom, written by John T. Flynn, he said:

"Two powerful urges push men throughout history. One is the yearning to be free; the other the yearning to be secure. Both must be achieved. We have achieved the second in a greater measure than any other people. That goal is yet to be won in its fullness. But at the present moment—as the world seems to sink down in a long night of despotism—we are so preoccupied with the second of these primitive yearnings that we have all but forgotten the epic struggle by which we attained the first."

In our yearning for security, it has become the thought of many that to provide it adequately, we need a powerful Central Government; a Government that acts from the top down, which is in utter conflict with our original theory of government. Are we going to find a solution to our yearning for security more easily in such a Government than one that is operated from the bottom up, starting with the individual citizen and the local units of government close to him? That was our theory of government when our dual system was established, and in my estimation, it should continue to be our theory of government. We need, of course, a wise combination of both. That combination lies in adhering to our dual constitutional system. We have already swung too far away from it, and it seems to me that there must be at least a partial return.

The effect of the California decision can mean nothing but further centralization of authority in the Federal Government.

As the Constitutional Convention adjourned, the members were touched by a sense of awe at what they had done. Washington sat with bowed head in the President's chair. The scene is described as follows:

"The aged Franklin, amidst the prevailing silence, rose, A half sun with its gilded rays was carved on the back of the chair occupied by George Washington. Franklin said: 'As I have been sitting here all these weeks, I have often wondered whether yonder sun is rising or setting. But now I know that it is a rising sun.' As Franklin, with others, left the building, someone in the crowd outside asked him what kind of government they had set up. He replied: 'A Republic—if we can keep it so.' "

The California decision is but another wedge that may ultimately go a long way to destroy the Republic. In my humble opinion, our chance of keeping this Government a Republic must rest on our constant and persistent endeavor to keep properly balanced the powers of the States as against the Federal Government, and that whenever the Federal Government encroaches upon the rights and sovereignty of the States, then we must make a partial return to a proper balance. Too powerful a central government in any country has always spread in its wake loss of freedom and liberty.

"The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it." (Woodrow Wilson.)

I am opposed to the federalization of the minerals involved in submerged lands affected by the California decision. For the reasons that I have already stated, I believe that the Congress should enact Senate bill 1988 and return to the States the rights which, prior to this decision, existed in the States, to utilize and control the mineral resources within their tidal waters.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Program Urgent Job for the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 13, 1948:

URGENT JOB FOR THE GOP

For almost 2 months Republican leaders of Congress have ignored President Truman's appeal for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

If they continue to ignore it, the act will expire June 12, less than 2 months from now, and some of them would like to let that happen.

However bright the Republican Party may consider its political prospects at this time, we do not believe it can afford—and we know the country cannot afford—the consequences of such a mistake. The 14-year-old reciprocal trade program has become a pillar of America's international economic policy. Its continuance is, as Mr. Truman has said, essential to success of America's present effort to help other nations build a peaceful and prosperous world.

The act authorizes the President to make agreements with other countries for two-way cuts in tariff rates and other barriers to the flow of world commerce. It recognizes the fundamental fact that trade must operate in both directions; that we must buy as well as sell; that obstructions to trade among nations are breeders of depression and war.

Mr. Truman has not abused his authority under this law. Whether he stays in the White House only until January, or for 4 years more, there is no reason to believe he would abuse it. There is every reason to dread the effect of depriving him of that authority. It would amount to serving notice on the world that the Republican Party intends to take America back toward economic isolation—over the old, disastrous road of logrolled high protective tariffs.

The President has said, correctly, that the reciprocal trade program has drawn the constant and increasing support of the American people, regardless of party affiliations. Republican leaders in Congress should act quickly to extend this program.

The Revival of Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. VAIL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, from the Washington Times-Herald of April 25, 1948:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Throughout the world this week, those who live according to Jewish tradition will celebrate the Passover, one phase of which is the commemoration of the redemption of a people from slavery.

At the Seder feast, where the family is gathered, it is repeated year after year:

"Because we were slaves unto Pharaoh in Egypt and the Lord our God brought us forth from thence with a strong hand and an outstretched arm."

And then the tale of slavery and redemption is told again and again.

To many, slavery seems remote and possibly exaggerated. Yet slavery was for many centuries, and even among the most civilized peoples, a normal state of society.

Among theocratic peoples, slavery was less usual, but in communities where the military gained ascendancy and which were therefore organized for war, present or potential, slavery came to have a usual and appropriate place.

Before its institution, prisoners of war or entire races were massacred; however, when slavery came into being, such prisoners were no longer killed off; they were put to work or were sold as household servants.

The Golden Ages of Greece and Rome were products of slave states; the Ottoman Empire thrived on a slave base. As Arnold J. Toynbee puts it: "The Ottoman padishahs maintained their empire by training slaves as human auxiliaries to assist them in keeping order among their human cattle.

"This remarkable institution of making soldiers and administrators out of slaves—an idea which is so congenial to the nomad genius and so alien from ours—was not an Ottoman invention.

"We find it in other nomad empires over sedentary peoples—and this precisely in those which have had the longest duration next to the Ottoman Empire itself."

Whether we refer to slavery or serfdom, it began to disappear during the middle of the nineteenth century and has since been viewed with abhorrence by all peoples who live in what we generally refer to as the civilized world.

Yet the institution of slavery has been restored as a result of the last war. How many millions of human beings are now slaves, laboring without human rights, in mine and mill and factory beyond the Urals, no one knows accurately. I have seen estimates ranging from 20,000,000 to 30,000,000.

These are not only prisoners of war but also prisoners of peace. Among them are displaced peoples like the Sudeten Germans who were uprooted from homes where their ancestors had dwelt for nearly a thousand years; among them are intellectual leaders from Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; among them are personalities who, having opposed Hitler, branded themselves as democrats and therefore were offensive to totalitarian Communists; among them are brilliant German scientists whose value is their great knowledge. These are slaves.

This revival of slavery is the total rejection of human progress. It is an inevitable result of the Stalinist theory that the state can do no wrong; that whatever the state does is right if those who control the state find it necessary.

It is a violent attack upon the American conception of the inalienable rights of the individual person, right beyond the power of the state to grant or to cancel because they exist not by order of terrestrial authority but by the grace of God.

Aristotle speaks of natural-born slaves and in his politics he seeks to lay down a moral basis for this institution. He is capable of placing human slaves and domestic animals in the same category.

It surely has been assumed during the twentieth century that we have moved far away from that concept of any human being, anywhere on the face of the earth.

But here we are in the middle years of what started out to be a glorious age not only for the western peoples, but for the entire human race—and we witness a restoration of the institution of slavery. We have marched back as far as we had marched forward.

This is the central crime of World War II and the sorrow of it is that such a body as the United Nations does not even protest this infamy. We have become too stonily brutalized even to note that slavery has been restored.

Entomology and Plant Quarantine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the strange things in the life of every nation is the fact that, peculiarly, plants from which food is derived are all too often challenged by some vicious insect that destroys millions of bushels of grain in the course of one single year.

There is need to be ever alert on the part of the people and on the part of the Congress to correct and corral this condition.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a statement made by the distinguished gentleman, Dr. Jonathan A. Munro, of the Agricultural College of North Dakota, before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, United States Senate, on the subject, Entomology and Plant Quarantine:

My name is Jonathan A. Munro and I live in Fargo, N. Dak. I have been professor of entomology and entomologist of the North Dakota Agricultural College Experiment Station since 1926. Before that time I was instructor in the department of entomology at the Kansas State College, and prior to that I was associate editor of the Family Herald and Weekly Star, Montreal, Canada, and for a time field supervisor for the Soldier Settlement Board in Saskatchewan, Canada. I completed my undergraduate work at the Ontario Agricultural College, my master's degree at Kansas State College, and doctor's degree in entomology at Cornell University.

The North Dakota Agricultural College is a land-grant institution, and was established by the constitution of that State in 1889. My work is in the field of agriculture and my time is divided between research and teaching. Because it is my responsibility to be familiar and cope with the insect problems affecting farm crops and livestock in my State, I am fully familiar with the insect pests of major importance in that area.

The most destructive insect pest to agriculture of North Dakota at this time is the wheat stem sawfly. It was first recorded from native grasses in 1890 and was named the grass stem sawfly. At that time it was not known to attack small grain. However, the following prophetic statement was then made: "The economic importance of this species arises from the fact that it may be expected at any time to abandon its natural food plant in favor of small grains on which it can doubtless successfully develop."

In 1895, only 5 years later, James Fletcher, then entomologist for the Dominion of Canada, first announced its destructive attack on wheat in Manitoba. Since that time, as the acreage of native grasses has been decreased by bringing wild land under cultivation, the sawfly has been shifting its destructive feeding more and more to wheat and to some extent other small grains. The area of sawfly damage has become increasingly extensive. It occurs widely in North Dakota, Montana, and the adjoining prairie Provinces of Canada. Heaviest damage in North Dakota occurs in the northwestern third of the State, where sawfly has caused an approximate loss of 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 bushels of wheat annually for the past 7 years. In Montana the loss is approximately the same. In the prairie section of Canada, where the sawfly's changing food habit from grass to wheat was first recorded, it is responsible for the loss of millions of bushels of wheat annually.

Part of this loss is due to the feeding of the sawfly larvae in the developing stems. Such activity causes shrinkage of the kernels and lowered productivity of the heads. Investigations conducted by the North Dakota Agricultural College Experiment Station in 1947 revealed that the sawfly shows a decided preference for the more vigorous, high-yielding stems and reduces their yield upward of 9 percent. The magnitude of this type of loss had not been previously realized.

An additional type of loss which has long been known is due to the breaking over of stems that have been mined and weakened by the larvae. As the grain is nearing the ripening stage, the larvae which has bored downward within the stem reaches the base. At or close to the ground line it cuts a V-shaped groove completely around the inside of the stem, so that it breaks over easily at that point. It then retreats to the base of the stem and plugs the stem tightly with its chewings directly beneath this groove. It is thus well protected against the weather and most other hazards. The breaking of the stem at this point provides an escape for the insect after it transforms to the adult winged stage the following spring. Even the burning of dry stubble fields is of no avail once the larva has retreated to its hibernating place in the base of the stem.

The amount of grain lost in fields by sawfly will vary largely according to the degree of infestation, the delay in harvesting, the amount of breaking over as influenced by rain and high winds prior to harvesting, the density of the stand, and the variety of wheat grown. If the stand is heavy and the percentage of infested stems is high the loss may reach 50 to 60 percent of the crop, especially if harvesting is delayed and stormy weather intervenes. Fields which are harvested promptly, or as soon as the grain is sufficiently ripened, suffer minimum loss through fallen and unrecovered heads.

Observations conducted in 1947 by the North Dakota Agricultural College Experiment Station on two neighboring fields of the same variety of wheat, grown on the same type of soil, and handled under similar conditions, except for delayed harvesting of one field, demonstrated the role of early harvesting in prevention of loss caused by breaking over. Both fields averaged within 1 percent either way of a 20 percent infestation. One of the fields was harvested by August 9 and showed a loss from sawfly of less than 1 bushel per acre. The other field, harvested September 6, showed a loss of approximately 2¼ bushels per acre. Often the infestation runs up to 60 percent, and occasionally higher, when the loss becomes increasingly greater.

The adult sawflies emerge from the stubs of grasses and small grains in June. After mating, the females lay their eggs within the stems of the developing plants. She does this by means of a sawlike apparatus located at the tip of her abdomen which she thrusts into the stem to deposit the egg. A female will normally lay about 50 eggs and usually but 1 to a stem. Upon hatching, which requires 1 week, the larva begins feeding within the stem as it bores its way downward to reach the base before the grain is ripe.

There is little as yet to recommend to the grain grower to hold loss to the minimum except early harvesting of fields, and using the most effective harvesting equipment. Special fingerlike attachments placed in front of the cutter bar tend to pick up the fallen straws and retrieve many of the heads which would otherwise be lost. Cutting the stubble as low as practicable is also an aid in recovery of fallen heads. Occasionally a horse rake is employed to glean as much as possible of the fallen grain, but is only partially effective because the cutter bar clips many of the fallen stems near the head and leaves the portion to be salvaged too short to be picked up by raking.

Efforts to eradicate the overwintering larvae from fields by early fall tillage are at times effective but do not prevent invasion of the fields by the adult flies which emerge from surrounding untilled wheat stubble-fields or grassland. The effectiveness of shallow tillage is believed to be due to its exposing the larvae to abnormal temperatures and the drying effect of the weather. Well distributed rainfall followed by a moderate snow cover can offset to a large extent any controlling effect from such tillage. Plowing to a depth of 6 inches in fall or early spring (before the flies emerge) buries the sawflies beyond all possibility of emergence, but the practice is inimical to soil-conservation policy in that it aggravates soil blowing and erosion.

Funds are urgently needed to provide for trained personnel and facilities for a thorough study of the insect and the development of more effective and practicable control measures than now exist. This would involve research to work out the biology and habits of the insect and a thorough testing

and evaluation of various possible control measures, including (1) application of the newer insecticides to the field margins in an effort to destroy the invading flies, (2) the development of a resistant variety of hard spring wheat which has better milling and yield quality than the present resistant Rescue variety now in use in certain areas, and (3) experimentation on the relative effectiveness of helpful tillage and crop rotations which would be consistent with soil-conservation practices.

In a full-scale approach toward the solution of the sawfly problem there must be close cooperation and coordination of effort between the entomologists, plant breeders, and soil conservationists.

Communistic Infiltration in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks the fourth of a series of eight articles written by Gustaf A. Nordin, of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, dealing with the question of communistic infiltration in the State Department:

FORMER SOVIET WORKER HANDLED SECRET UNITED STATES DATA

(This is the fourth in a series of eight exclusive articles making public for the first time the findings of special agents who investigated alleged subversive activities in the State Department of the United States. The probe was made by a congressional committee to determine what the State Department was doing to rid the Federal pay roll of poor security risks.)

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—A young woman employed more than 3 years as a correspondence secretary in the White House joined the Soviet Embassy staff in Washington in 1944, and a year later was rehired by the State Department to handle highly confidential cablegrams.

She is case No. 107 in a House Appropriations Committee report currently being kept under cover.

The girl, daughter of Russian-born parents, resigned last August on the basis of the information supplied to committee agents.

She is a native of New Jersey, is 29 years old, and became a typist for the Soviet Information Bulletin at the embassy here after being employed in the White House job during most of the late President Roosevelt's third term. She was making $2,700 as a White House correspondence secretary.

In February 1945, according to the committee information, she went to the State Department's Personnel Division and offered to accept any position at $1,800 a year.

She was employed. A month later, the report continues, she specifically requested a job in the office of a certain high official and was transferred to that office from the Personnel Division.

Her duties in that office were the receiving, screening, and distribution of all cablegrams for the high official. She also handled important documents of international and economic significance.

In applying for Government service, she gave as reference the names of two Soviet Embassy employees.

All of this is recorded in No. 107's personnel file as of July 27, 1945.

A memo from the Office of Controls, November 17, 1945, to a former Assistant Secretary of State, pointed out the above facts and stated that for the subject to have been an employee of the Soviet Embassy she must have been accepted politically by them.

On February 12, 1947, the Security Office disapproved clearance for No. 107 to accompany the American delegation to the Moscow conference of foreign ministers.

"Several witnesses," the report goes on, "reported the subject as pro-Russian. One informant said the subject had described John Foster Dulles as a Fascist and she was against General Bor, the anti-Communist general of Poland, and also disliked General Mihailovitch of Yugoslavia." The latter was disposed of by Marshal Tito when he took power and turned Yugoslavia into Russian-Communist satellite.

Her transfer from a highly confidential position to some other job in the Department where she would not easily have access to important information was recommended several times but apparently not carried out. Her dismissal also had been recommended by the Central Security Agency in June 1947. She resigned in August.

Case No. 108 is an entirely different type. In this instance, the House committee agents report that unfavorable security information about No. 108 had been ignored.

The man was employed by OWI in 1944 and later transferred to the State Department as a public-affairs officer for the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

His record shows, according to the report, an arrest in 1935 for passing three worthless checks totaling $100; dismissal from a Missouri college; alleged failure to make restitution to the college of funds advanced to him for which he gave a note; the passing of a worthless check in 1934, a university professor being the victim, and alleged padding of expense accounts while traveling for another college in 1930 and his dismissal from the college.

An Iowa hospital reports that in 1935 the employee was diagnosed as possessing a psychopathic personality.

The hospital director said that although in a certain number of cases there is improvement with maturity, the lack of constitutional stability always makes such individuals a poor risk for a responsible position. No. 108 lot his job last October because of a reduction in force.

An Ancient Wrong Needs Righting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Des Moines Register of April 22, 1948:

AN ANCIENT WRONG NEEDS RIGHTING

The Gold Star Mother of a Congressional Medal of Honor bearer is not a citizen. She cannot become one. She is that ugly thing, an "alien ineligible to citizenship." As such she is subject to various discriminations in California, the worst of which is a legal ban on the owning of land. The country she adopted has named a United States Army transport *Sadao Munemori* after her fallen son, but it will not extend to her the simple rights of citizenship.

Why? Because she was born in the wrong part of the world. Congress has corrected this situation for persons born in China, India, and the Philippines, as a gesture to our wartime allies. But the fathers and mothers of some of the most gallant soldiers in our own armed forces are still excluded.

Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, introduced a bill to correct this situation last winter. Hearings on it started April 19.

"The privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race or sex, or because such person is married," says JUDD's bill—and high time, too.

The bill sets up a system of nominal quotas for the remaining Asiatic and Pacific countries, as was done for China and India, so that we shall not be flooded with immigrants, nor the racial composition of the country materially changed by immigration.

Congress could right an ancient wrong at no cost to anybody, and strike an effective blow in the world-wide propaganda war with Communist Russia by passing the Judd bill.

Patriotism: Its Duty and Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the finest discourse on patriotism ever to come to my notice is the speech of the Most Reverend John Ireland, D. D., which I include with my remarks. This speech was delivered in New York City on April 4, 1894, to the New York Commandery of the Loyal Legion. The author was later archbishop of St. Paul and was much beloved and respected in Minnesota and elsewhere by persons of all creeds and callings for his searching intellect and for his high patriotism.

This speech may also be noteworthy as being the first to use the word "un-American." It follows:

THE DUTY AND VALUE OF PATRIOTISM

(By Most Rev. John Ireland, D. D.)

Commander, companions, to speak of patriotism is my evening's task. An easy and gracious one it ought to be. Patriotism is personified in my audience. The honor is mine to address the country's heroes, the country's martyrs. At country's call you quickly buckled your armor on, and rushing where battle raged, you offered for country's life the lifeblood of your hearts. Many of you bear upon limb and face the sacred stigmata of patriotism. Your tried hands are doubly pledged in purest unselfishness and bravest resolve to uphold in the reign of peace the loved flag which in days of war they carried over gory fields above stain or reproach. I could not, if I would, close the portals of my soul to the rich and sweet inspirations which come to me from your souls.

I shall define patriotism as you understand and feel it. Patriotism is love of country, and loyalty to its life and weal—love tender and strong: tender as the love of son for mother, strong as the pillars of death; loyalty generous and disinterested, shrinking from no sacrifice, seeking no reward save country's honor and country's triumph.

BEAUTY AND VALUE OF PATRIOTISM

Patriotism. There is magic in the word. It is bliss to repeat it. Through ages the human race burnt the incense of admiration

and reverence at the shrines of patriotism. The most beautiful pages of history are those which count its deeds. Fireside tales, the outpourings of the memories of peoples, borrow from it their warmest glow. Poets are sweetest when they re-echo its whisperings; orators are most potent when they thrill its chords to music.

Pagan nations were wrong when they made gods of their noblest patriots. But the error was the excess of a great truth: that heaven unites with earth in approving and blessing patriotism, that patriotism is one of earth's highest virtues, worthy to have come down from the atmosphere of the skies.

The exalted patriotism of the exiled Hebrew exhaled itself in a canticle of religion which Jehovah inspired, and which has been transmitted as the inheritance of God's people, to the Christian church: "Upon the rivers of Babylon, there we sat and wept, when we remembered Sion. * * * If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand be forgotten. Let my tongue cleave to my jaws, if I do not remember thee, if I do not make Jerusalem the beginning of my joy."

The human race pays homage to patriotism because of its supreme value. The value of patriotism to a people is above gold and precious stones, above commerce and industry, above citadels and warships. Patriotism is the vital spark of national honor; it is the fount of the nation's prosperity, the shield of the nation's safety. Take patriotism away—the nation's soul has fled, bloom and beauty have vanished from the nation's countenance.

The human race pays homage to patriotism because of its supreme loveliness. Patriotism goes out to what is among earth's possessions the most precious, the first and best and dearest—country; and its effusion is the fragrant flowering of the purest and noblest sentiments of the heart.

Patriotism is innate in all men; the absence of it betokens a perversion of human nature; but it grows its full growth only where thoughts are elevated and heartbeatings are generous.

Next to God is country, and next to religion is patriotism. No praise goes beyond its deserts. It is sublime in its heroic oblation upon the field of battle. "O glorious is he," exclaims in Homer the Trojan warrior, "who for his country falls." It is sublime in the oft-repeated toil of dutiful citizenship. "Of all human doings," writes Cicero, "none is more honorable and more estimable than to merit well of the commonwealth."

COUNTRIES ARE OF DIVINE APPOINTMENT

Countries are of divine appointment. The Most High "divided the nations, separated the sons of Adam, and appointed the bounds of peoples." The physical and moral necessities of God's creatures are revelations of His will and laws. Man is born a social being. A condition of his existence and of his growth to mature age is the family. Nor does the family suffice to itself. A larger social organism is needed, into which families gather, so as to obtain from one another security to life and property, and aid in the development of the faculties and powers with which nature has endowed the children of men. The whole human race is too extensive and too diversified in interests to serve those ends, hence its subdivisions into countries or peoples. Countries have their providential limits—the waters of a sea, a mountain range, the lines of similarity of requirements, or of methods of living. The limits widen in space according to the measure of the destinies which the great Ruler allots to peoples, and the importance of their parts in the mighty work of the cycles of years, the ever-advancing tide of humanity's evolution. The Lord is the God of nations, because He is the God of men. No nation is born into life or vanishes back into nothingness without His bidding. I believe in the providence of God over countries, as I believe in His wisdom and His love, and my patriotism to my country rises within my soul invested with the halo of my religion to my God.

OUR OWN COUNTRY

More than a century ago a trans-Atlantic poet and philosopher, reading well the signs, wrote:

"Westward the star of empire takes its way.
The first four acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day:
Time's noblest offspring is the last."

Berkeley's prophetic eye had descried America. What shall I say in a brief discourse of my country's value and beauty, of her claims to my love and loyalty? I will pass by in silence her fields and forests, her rivers and seas; the boundless riches hidden beneath her soil and amid the rocks of her mountains, her pure and health-giving air, her transcendent wealth of nature's fairest and most precious gifts. I will not speak of the noble qualities and robust deeds of her sons, skilled in commerce and industry, valorous in war, prosperous in peace. In all these things America is opulent and great, but beyond them and above them is her singular grandeur, to which her material splendor is only the fitting circumstance.

America born into the family of nations in these latter times is the highest billow in humanity's evolution, the crowning effort of ages in the aggrandizement of man. Unless we take her in this altitude we do not comprehend her; we belittle her towering stature, and conceal the singular design of Providence in her creation.

THE COUNTRY OF HUMAN DIGNITY

America is the country of human dignity and human liberty.

When the fathers of the Republic declared: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," a cardinal principle was enunciated, which in its truth was as old as the race, but in practical realization almost unknown.

Slowly, amid sufferings and revolutions, humanity had been reaching out toward a reign of the rights of man. Ante-Christian paganism had utterly denied such rights. It allowed nothing to man as man; he was what wealth, place, or power made him. Even the wise Aristotle taught that some men were intended by nature to be slaves and chattels. The sweet religion of Christ proclaimed aloud the doctrine of the common fatherhood of God, and the universal brotherhood of men. Eighteen hundred years, however, went by, and the civilized world had not yet put its civil and political institutions in accord with its spiritual faith. The Christian Church was all this time leavening human society and patiently awaiting the promised fermentation. This came at last, and it came in America. It came in a first manifestation through the Declaration of Independence; it came in a second and final manifestation through President Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation.

In America all men are civilly and politically equal; all have the same rights; all wield the same arm of defense and of conquest, the suffrage; and the sole condition of rights and of power is simple manhood.

THE COUNTRY OF LIBERTY

Liberty is the exemption from all restraint save that of the laws of justice and order; the exemption from submission to other men, except as they represent and enforce those laws. The divine gift of liberty to man is God's recognition of His greatness and His dignity. The sweetness of life and the power of growth lie in liberty. The loss of liberty is the loss of light and sunshine, the loss of life's best portion. Humanity, under the spell of heavenly memories, never ceased to dream of liberty, and to aspire to its possession. Now and then, here and there, its refreshing breezes caressed humanity's brow. But not until the Republic of the West was born, not until the Star-Spangled Banner rose toward the skies, was liberty caught up in humanity's embrace, and embodied in a great and abiding nation.

In America the Government takes from the liberty of the citizen only so much as is necessary for the weal of the Nation, which the citizen by his own act freely concedes. In America there are no masters, who govern in their own right, for their own interest, or at their own will. We have over us no Louis XIV saying: "L'état c'est moi"; no Hohenzollern, announcing that in his acts as sovereign he is responsible only to his conscience and to God. Ours is the government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The Government is our own organized will.

THERE IS NO STATE ABOVE OR APART FROM THE PEOPLE

Rights begin with, and go upward from the people. In other countries, even those apparently the most free, rights begin with and come downward from the state. The rights of citizens, the rights of the people, are concessions which have been painfully wrenched from the governing powers. With Americans, whenever the organized Government does not prove its grant, the liberty of the individual citizen is sacred and inviolable. Elsewhere there are governments called republics: universal suffrage constitutes the state; but once constituted the state is tyrannous and arbitrary, and invades at will private rights, and curtails at will individual liberty. One Republic is liberty's native home—America.

The God-given mission of the Republic of America is not only to its own people: it is to all the peoples of the earth, before whose eyes it is the symbol of human rights and human liberty, toward whom its flag flutters hopes of future happiness for themselves.

Is there not for Americans a meaning to the word, "Country"? Is there not for Americans reason to live for country, and, if need there be, to die for country? Is there not joy in the recollection that you have been her saviors, and glory in the name of America's Loyal Legion? Whatever the country, patriotism is a duty: in America the duty is thrice sacred.

A DUTY OF JUSTICE AND OF GRATITUDE

The duty of patriotism is the duty of justice and of gratitude. The country fosters and protects our dearest interests—our altars and hearthstones—pro aris et focis. Without it there is no safety for life or property, no opportunities of development and progress. All that the country is, she makes ours. We are wise of her wisdom, rich of her opulence, resplendent of her glory, strong of her fortitude. At once the prisoner Paul rose to eminence, and obtained respect from Palestinian Jews and Roman soldiers, when he proudly announced that he was a citizen of Rome—civis Romanus. And today how significant the world over are the words: I am a citizen of America—civis Americanus.

Duty to country is a duty of conscience, a duty to God. For country exists by natural divine right. It receives from God the authority needful for its life and work: its authority to command is divine. The apostle of Christ to the gentiles writes: "There is no power but from God, and those that are, are ordained of God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." The religion of patriotism is not sufficiently considered, and yet, it is this religion which gives to country its majesty, and to patriotism its sacredness and force.

NEXT TO GOD IS COUNTRY

As the part to the whole, so is the citizen to the country; and this relation is the due measure of patriotism. The country and its interests are paramount to the citizen and his interests. A king of France, St. Louis, set

to his device this motto: "Dieu, la France, et Marguerite." It told the order of allegiances: God first, next to God country, next to country family, one's self the last—the willing and generous chevalier, even unto death, of family, country, and God.

Allegiance to country is limited only by allegiance to God. God and His eternal laws of justice and righteousness are supreme, and hold first claims upon conscience. A country which exacts the violation of those laws, annuls its own moral authority and becomes an aggregation of human wills, which physical force alone sustains. "To God, that which is God's; to Caesar, that which is Caesar's." In olden paganism the state arrogated to itself supremacy in ethics as in temporals, and ruled consciences. Under this tyranny of the soul freedom's last ray vanished; the last vestige of human dignity was effaced. Christ made men free; He brought back the state to its proper orbit; and, restoring truth upon earth, He restored manhood to man, and to country the effulgence of the skies.

THE SUPREME TEST OF PATRIOTISM

It is fortunate for a people that from time to time supreme emergencies arise testing its patriotism to the highest pitch. If patriotism remains dormant for a long period it may lessen in strength, while the reflection and self-consciousness which resolute action awakens result in a fuller estimate of the value of the country and institutions which it is the duty of patriotism to defend.

A supreme emergency did arise for the people of America.

There had been, indeed, patriotism intense and sublime in the Revolutionary War, when

"In their ragged regimentals
Stood the old Continentals,
Yielding not."

But had this patriotism survived? Notable changes had come over the country. The population had been made much more eclectic; commerce and industry, usually unpropitious to sentiment and exaltation of soul, had engrossed the public mind; the spirit of democracy, in its workings toward individualism of character, might have unfitted the citizen for sacrifice in behalf of the general weal. I was in Europe when the civil war broke out, and I well remember the tone of the public press regarding the American situation. It was asserted that patriotism was unknown to Americans, and that a free government like ours, compelled to rely upon volunteer service, could not muster a large army of defenders. The proclamation of President Lincoln calling for 75,000 soldiers was received as the venturesome act of despair, and a quick dissolution of the Union was prophesied. At home there were not a few whose thoughts were those of the unfriendly Europeans.

On the morning of the 12th day of April, in the memorable year of 1861, a cannon ball swept over the waters of Charleston Harbor, aimed with deadly intent at the Star-Spangled Banner, floating above the walls of Sumter. War was declared against the country.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WAR

How much there was at stake. Scarcely can we at this moment recall without trepidation the awful significance of the contest.

At stake was the union of the States, the strength and life of the country. What constitutes each State, from the Atlantic waters to those of the Pacific, strong, hopeful, palpitating with giant life and ready for giant progress? This only fact: that the States are one nation, and that, at home and abroad, one flag symbolizes them. A northern republic, a southern republic, a western republic—the nations would despise them. The Republic of the United States—the nations fear and honor it.

At stake was the plenary recognition of human rights in our own country. In contradiction to the Declaration of Independence, men were held as slaves—forsooth, because of color; in practice, America had failed as yet to be the ideal country of manhood and human dignity. Had rebellion triumphed, slavery would have been confirmed, and the Declaration of Independence formally and permanently belied.

At stake was liberty for the world—the stability of a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. The Union disrupted, its shattered fragments prostrate over the land, as the broken and desolate columns of once famous temples in Grecian and Roman regions, liberty, shrieking over the ruins, would have hastened back to caverns of gloom, her friends abandoning hope, her enemies rejoicing and confident. The death of the Union implied a century of retrogression for humanity.

Deep and soul-rending was the ceaseless anxiety of freedom's sons during the dreary years of America's Civil War. At every rising of the morning sun the heavens were questioned:

"Oh, say, can you see by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming?
Oh, say, does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

O God of nations, we, this evening, thank Thee; all was well; American patriotism was on guard; and the day came when, at Appomattox, one flag unfurled its beauteous folds over both contending armies:

"'Tis the Star-Spangled Banner; Oh, long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

THE RESULTS OF THE WAR

Two things in our Civil War amazed the world—one, the number and courage of our volunteer soldiers; the other, the ability of the commanders. In other countries, large standing armies, years of careful training for men and officers, are the prerequisites of successful warfare. In America the Chief Executive of the Republic waves his wand, and armies spring up as by incantation. One motive rules them, the saving of the country; they are most daring in deed; the leadership is most skillful. The records of their battles are studied in wonderment by famed warriors of Europe. Especially did the skilled leadership in our armies astonish Europeans. I met recently in Paris a well-known general of Russia. He said, "War is a science of high degree; at the commencement of the contest the Government of the United States had at its disposal only a handful of trained officers; the war, moreover, was to offer in its varied operations unusual difficulties; and yet the command throughout the vast Army was admirable in skill of planning and execution."

Great the sacrifices which the war in defense of the country demanded. But great the results. No one now doubts that America is patriotic, and that a free people may be relied upon to defend its country. The United States is respected by the nations of the world; they remember what it was capable of when divided; they understand what it is capable of when united. The victory of the Union brought peace and prosperity to conquerors and to conquered; today the conquered rejoice no less than the conquerors that the Old Flag has not lost one star from its azure ground. The seal of finality has been set upon the Union, the god of battle ending disputes, and deciding that we are a Nation one and indestructible. Slavery has been blotted out, and the escutcheon of free America is cleansed of blemish. Liberty is without peril in her chosen home, and from America's shores she sends her fragrant breathings across seas and oceans. The quickened march of republicanism and democracy which the present times witness through the southern continent of America, and through Europe, goes out from the great heart of the triumphant Republic of the United States.

The sacrifices! Each one of you, companions, says in truth: "Quorum pars magna fui." The results! They are yours, since the sacrifices were yours which purchased them. This great Nation is your especial belonging: you saved it by the libation of your blood. By you the Star-Spangled Banner was guarded, at the peril of your life, in its hour of trial; let others love it and seek its smiles: they cannot have for it your passion, and, were speech allowed it, accents of sweetness would flow out to you which others should not hear.

PATRIOTISM IN TIME OF PEACE

The days of peace have come upon our fair land: the days when patriotism was a duty have not departed. What was saved by war must be preserved.

A government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as proposed by the founders of the Republic, was, in the light of the facts of history, a stupendous experiment. The experiment has so far succeeded. A French publicist, De Maistre, once dismissed with contempt the argument drawn from the United States in favor of free institutions in Europe, remarking: "The Republic of the United States is in its swathing clothes; let it grow: wait a century, and you will see." The Republic has lived out a century, it has lived out a mighty civil war, with no diminution, assuredly, of vigor and promise. Can we say, however, that it is beyond all the stages of an experiment? The world at large is not willing to grant this conclusion: it tells us, even, that the Republic is but now entering upon its crucial crisis. New conditions, indeed, confront us: new perils menace us, in a population bordering on the hundredth million and prepared quickly to leap beyond this figure, in plethoric and unwieldly urban conglomerations, in that unbridled luxury of living consequent on vast material prosperity, which in all times is a dreaded foe to liberty. It were reckless folly on our part to deny all force to the objections which are put to us.

Meanwhile, the destinies of numerous peoples are in the balance. They move toward liberty, as liberty is seen to reign undisturbed in America; they recede toward absolutism and hereditary regimes, as clouds are seen darkening our sky. Civil, political, social happenings of America are watched the world over with intense anxiety, because of their supposed bearings upon the question of the practicability of popular government. A hundred times the thought pressed itself upon me, as I discussed in foreign countries the modern democracy, that, could Americans understand how much is made to depend upon the outcome of republican and democratic institutions in their country, a new fire of patriotism, a new zeal in the welfare of the Republic, would kindle within their hearts.

For my part, I have unwavering faith in the Republic of America. I have faith in the providence of God and the progress of humanity: I will not believe that liberty is not a permanent gift, and it were not if America fail. I have faith in the powerful and loyal national heart of America, which clings fast to liberty, and sooner or later rights wrongs and uproots evils. I have no fears. Clouds cross the heavens, soon a burst of sunlight dispels them. Different interests in society are out of joint with one another, and the social organism is feverish, it is simply the effort toward new adjustments; in a little while there will be order and peace. Threatening social and political evils are near, and are seemingly gaining ground; the American people are conservatively patient; but ere long the national heart is roused and

the evils, however formidable be their aspect, go down before the tread of an indignant people.

DANGERS TO A GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE

The safety of the Republic lies in the vigilant and active patriotism of the American people.

There is a danger in the ignorance of voters. As a rule, the man who does not read and write intelligently, cannot vote intelligently. Americans understand the necessity of popular instruction, and spare no expense in spreading it. They cannot be too zealous in the matter. They need to have laws in every State which will punish, as guilty of crime against the country, the parent who neglects to send his children to school.

There is a danger—and a most serious one—in corrupt morals. A people without good morals is incapable of self-government. At the basis of the proper exercise of the suffrage lie unselfishness and the spirit of sacrifice. A corrupt man is selfish; an appeal to duty finds no response in his conscience; he is incapable of the high-mindedness and generous acts which are the elements of patriotism; he is ready to sell the country for pelf or pleasure. Patriotism takes alarm at the spread of intemperance, lasciviousness, dishonesty, perjury; for country's sake it should arm against those dire evils all the country's forces, its legislatures, its courts and, above all else, public opinion. Materialism and the denial of a living, supreme God annihilate conscience, and break down the barriers to sensuality; they sow broadcast the seeds of moral death; they are fatal to liberty and social order. A people without a belief in God and a future life of the soul will not remain a free people. The age of the democracy must, for its own protection, be an age of religion.

Empires and monarchies rely upon sword and cannon; republics, upon the citizen's respect for law. Unless law be sacred a free government will not endure. Laws may be repealed through constitutional means, but while they are inscribed on the statute book they should be observed. The lowering of the dignity of law, by deed, teaching, or connivance, is treason. Anarchical explosions, mob riots, lynchings, shake the pillars of the commonwealth; other violations of law, the determined defiance of municipal and State authority by the liquor traffic, the stealthy avoidance of payment of taxes and of custom duties, sear consciences, and beget a fatal habit of disobedience. A law-abiding people only is worthy of liberty and capable of guarding its treasures.

THE PURITY OF THE BALLOT

What shall I say of the purity of the ballot, of the integrity of the public official? I touch upon the life threads of the Republic, and words fail to express the solemnity of my thoughts. The poet Virgil places amid horrible torments in his hell the man "who sold his country for gold, and imposed upon it a master; who made and unmade laws for a price."

"Vendidit hic auro patriam, dominumque potentem
Imposuit; fixit leges pretio, atque refixit."

The poet had a righteous sense of the enormity of the crime. The suffrage is the power of life or death over the state. The one licit motive in its use is the public weal, to which private and party interests should be always sacrificed. The voter making misuse of the trust deserves to be disfranchised; the man who compasses the misuse, who weaves schemes to defraud the popular will, deserves to be proscribed. The public official is appointed for the people's good, and is sworn to work for it; if he prostitutes his office, legislative or executive, to enrich himself or his friends, he has "sold his country for gold," and he is a traitor. The distribution of office, or of administrative power, must be based on fitness; the spoils system in politics inevitably leads to public corruption, treacherous and unsafe administration, and the ultimate foundering of the ship of state.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP—THE SOLE STANDARD

Storms are passing over the land, arising from sectarian hatred, and nativist or foreign prejudices. These are scarcely to be heeded: they cannot last. Day by day the spirit of Americanism waxes strong; narrowness of thought and unreasoning strife cannot resist its influences.

This country is America: only they who are loyal to her can be allowed to live under her flag; and they who are loyal to her may enjoy all her liberties and rights. Freedom of religion is accorded by the Constitution: religion is put outside state action, and most wisely so; therefore, the religion of a citizen must not be considered by voter or executive officer. The oath of allegiance to the country makes the man a citizen; if that allegiance is not plenary and supreme, he is false to his profession; if it is, he is an American. Discriminations and segregations, in civil or political matters, on lines of religion, of birthplace. or of race, or of language—and, I add, or of color—is un-American, and wrong. Compel all to be Americans, in soul as well as in name, and then, let the standard of their value be their American citizenship.

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM IS NEEDED

Who will say that there is no work for patriotism in days of peace? If it need not be so courageous as in war, it needs to be more watchful and enduring: for the evils against which it contends in peace are more persevering, more stealthy in the advance, more delusive in the attack. We can easily imagine that a country, invincible in war, may go down to its ruin amid the luxuries and somnolence of prolonged peace. Hannibal won at Thrasymenus, but he lost the fruits of victory in the vineyards and orange groves of Campania.

The days of war, many hope, are passing away for good, and arbitration is to take its place. This may be desirable, for war is terrible. Yet, it is not easy to see what is to be so serviceable in electrifying the Nation's patriotism, and communicating to it an ardor which refuses during many years to dim its glow. Certain it is that under the reign of peace we must, in season and out of season, look to the patriotism of the country, that it suffer no diminution in vigor and earnest work.

American patriotism is needed—patriotism intense, which speaks out in noble pride, with beating heart: Civis Americanus—I am an American citizen; patriotism active, which shows itself in deed and in sacrifice; patriotism public-spirited, which cares for the public weal as for the apple of the eye. Private personal civic virtue is not uncommon among us; more uncommon is public civic virtue, which watches the ballot and all approaches to it, which demands that public officials do their duty, which purifies public opinion on all matters where country is concerned. This patriotism will save the Republic.

From whom primarily does the Republic expect this patriotism? From her veteran soldiers.

This patriotism, America, thou shalt have. I speak for veterans. I speak for their brother citizens.

Noblest ship of state, sail thou on over billows, and through storms, undaunted, imperishable! Of thee I do not say: "Caesarem vehis—thou carriest Caesar." But of thee I say: "Libertatem vehis—thou carriest Liberty." Within thy bulwarks the fair goddess is enthroned, holding in her hands the dreams and hopes of humanity. Oh! for her sake, guard well thyself. Sail thou on, peerless ship, safe from shoals and malign winds, ever strong in keel, ever beauteous in prow and canvas, ever guided by heaven's polar star! Sail thou on, I pray thee, undaunted and imperishable!

To the Eternal Credit of Sigmund Janas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Scripps-Howard Daily News, Washington, D. C., April 21, 1948, entitled "Salute."

As the House knows, I have been critical when, in my opinion, any air line has been negligent in its operations, causing the death of passenger and crew alike, and many times on this floor I have criticized certain of the carriers on this point. Many other Members have likewise done the same thing.

However, few of us take time to say a good word when everything goes well. Only the screaming headlines announcing tragedies bring forth our expressions. Today I rise to pay my great respects and most sincere compliments to the enviable record of the Colonial Airlines, of which my close friend, Sigmund Janas, is president. This splendid public servant, operating the most dangerous itinerary in the United States, is celebrating its nineteenth year without one fatality to either passengers or crew. The Colonial Airlines operates from Washington, D. C., up through New York State and into Montreal and Ottawa, Canada, a route which is extraordinarily dangerous in winter. In addition to this, it flies across the seas to Bermuda. In 19 years Colonial has flown over 192,000,000 passenger-miles, with no accident to mar its perfect record. For this achievement, the Congress should say "Well done."

In spite of its record for management and careful operation for the safety of the public, Colonial has received less consideration from the Civil Aeronautics Board than any common carrier in the Nation. Many other carriers less able to serve the public have had much more sympathy from the CAB than has this splendid air line. One of these days I hope that some Government agency will have respect and give some consideration for a job well done.

The News' editorial follows:

SALUTE

You don't praise the waiter when he brings the soup hot; you just holler when its cold. You don't hooray the street cleaning department if things are neat in your block; you just blister the city fathers if the litter gets too thick. You never remember the motor in your car as it ticks off mile after mile; you just crab when it imitates a coffee grinder. And the Casey Joneses that cannon ball their No. 3's in on time year after year are unsung heroes; only the wrecks of Old 97's are celebrated in the ballads. Air lines fly millions of miles each year without so much as a dented wing tip or a kind word; the crashes make the headlines.

That's just human nature. Everybody expects things to work right, and it is the thankless function of the news gatherer to report them when they don't.

But some performances are so superb that it makes us happy to report the news. Such a performance, for instance, as Colonial Airlines'. Last Monday this company, whose

planes connect Washington with Montreal, Ottawa, and Bermuda, began its nineteenth year without fatality to either passenger or crew, after flying more than 192,000,000 passenger miles.

Such a record of no accidents is no accident. It spells care and intelligent devotion in its organization from top to bottom.

We salute Colonial Airlines.

Editorial by Mark Twain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO ISACSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a newspaper editorial commenting most trenchantly on the war fever now being spread throughout our country by the bipartisan framers of our Nation's foreign policies.

This editorial appeared on April 26 in the New York Post, but the observations it presents are those of a man who in his time was accounted one of the most beloved citizens of a whole world. That man was Samuel Langhorne Clemens, better known to the world as Mark Twain.

Mark Twain has been dead for generations, but his words are as alive today as when they were written; alive with meaning, with warning, with appeal to reason for his countrymen, in our times as well as in the last century.

EDITORIAL BY MARK TWAIN

Now that the Secretary for Defense has made it clear that in his belief our total national income is really insufficient to provide the kind of war machine he would like to see created,

And now that the President, driven by the twin devils of misplaced patriotic fervor and fear, is persuaded that all-out preparation for war is in reality a method for avoiding it,

And now that a majority of the Republican-dominated Congress aided by a majority of the minority Democrats has been persuaded that Russia, rather than hunger, insecurity, poverty, disease, and ignorance, is an enemy to be thwarted by bullets rather than reason,

And now that normally sane and intelligent citizens are being frightened into believing that if only the witch of communism can be burned at the stake, evil will somehow miraculously disappear from the world,

The time has come once more to reprint the timeless chapter from Mark Twain's Mysterious Stranger, recently presented in a week-end edition of the New York Post and the Home News.

In one of the most striking and bitter passages he ever penned, America's greatest philosopher-humorist, Samuel Clemens, at the end of the nineteenth century, wrote the following lines, which might well have been poured out last night to meet today's deadline, it is so timely for us today:

"I can see a million years ahead," he wrote, "and this rule will never change in as many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful, as usual, will shout for war. The pulpit will warily and cautiously object, at first.

"The great big mass of the Nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war and will say, earnestly and indignantly, 'It's unjust and dishonorable and there is no necessity for it.'

"Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded.

"But it will not last long. Those others will outshout them and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity.

"Before long, you will see this curious thing: the speakers stoned from the platform and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men, who in their secret hearts are still at one with the stoned speakers, as earlier, but do not dare to say so now.

"And the whole Nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth. And presently such mouths will cease to open.

"Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame on the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities and will diligently study them.

"And thus he will, by and by, convince himself that the war is just and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception."

It requires no profundity to recognize that the pattern forecast by our nineteenth century prophet is being repeated, as he predicted. The signs of the times are unmistakable.

Nor will it be averted unless we are determined that in this election year, while the people still retain the privilege of deciding their own fate, we shall send to represent us in the Congress and in the White House only those men who recognize that our production for peace must always outweigh our preoccupation with production for war, or we are doomed.

Prudence demands that we shall not discard the weapons of defense until we have secured the collective means for enforceable peace, but it also demands that our emphasis, our resources, and our energies must be for the most part spent in creative rather than destructive programs.

The real war—one glorious enough to engage all the fervor and all the energy of every human being except those determined upon suicide for themselves and destruction of all that gives life meaning and hope—is the war against insecurity, prejudice, ignorance, slavery, bigotry, hunger, and hate.

None of these was ever killed by a bullet, or wiped out by a bomb.

This Is War in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the invasion of Palestine by the armies of Transjordania is war—war against the Jews; war against the United Nations; war against civilization and decency.

What will America do?

The British Foreign and War Offices have conspired with our own Division of Near Eastern and African Affairs against the hopes of free people, and this vicious war of aggression, defying the assembled power and might of the earth, all moral scruples, and the traditional policy of the United States in the horrifying result.

Words do not exist with which I can express my scorn and contempt for those who, for a tankful of oil, have thus betrayed the peace and the future.

This is not a Jewish problem. This is not something in which only the lives, the safety, and the bitter hopes of the 8,000,000 communicants of world Jewry are at stake. This is a situation in which the lives of young men who never heard of Mohammed and have but the vaguest notion of Judaism may be wasted for the sake of the black gold of Araby and for the British Empire.

One thing, and one thing alone, can save American honor and world peace: an instant and complete disavowal of the stupid policies of the British and of the American State Department, and an immediate intervention by a substantial United Nations police force to resist Arab aggression and fulfill the dishonored promises to the Jewish people.

The British could, if they would, stop this invasion instantly. Their failure to do so will lay them open to suspicion of having instigated and encouraged war against the United Nations.

I speak with assurance.

The Transjordanian State exists wholly on British sufferance, on British money, by British action creating it. The Transjordanian Army—the 15,000-man Arab Legion, doubtless the most efficient desert fighting force in the world—is trained, armed, paid, and led by the British. The commanding general is a British subject.

The Arab Legion is supported by an annual British subsidy of £2,500,000—approximately $10,000,000. The British Empire is broke. That money must come from the United States, from our loans. It can come from nowhere else.

Jack Kroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1948, one of our colleagues delivered a bitter attack on Jack Kroll, national director of the CIO political action committee.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that Members of this body, while enjoying congressional immunity, see fit to use the well of this House to make intemperate remarks regarding respected citizens of our country.

Jack Kroll is, and has been, a citizen of the State of Ohio for many years. He enjoys the respect, not only of the members of organized labor but of officials of industry, management, and other groups. He is a fine and patriotic citizen of the United States, and I herewith insert in the RECORD a statement which he has given to me in answer to the charges made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]:

My attention has been called to remarks concerning CIO-PAC and me personally,

made on the floor of the House of Representatives on April 26, 1948, by Representative EUGENE COX, of Georgia.

I have no desire to engage in a name-calling contest with Representative Cox. I do, however, resent deeply the attacks Representative Cox has made on my status as an American. When I was 9 months old my father, Marks Kroll, brought me to this country from London, England, where I was born. Five years later, on March 27, 1891, my father was naturalized in Rochester, N. Y. The court of record is the Monroe County Court, the clerk of court at the time being William Oliver.

From the day he received his naturalization paper until the day he died, my father cherished that document as his most prized possession. It was framed and hung on the wall of our dining room as long as he lived.

Under the provisions of title 8, section 714, of the United States Code, I acquired citizenship through the naturalization of my father. At no time have I been under the necessity of registering with the Department of Justice, or any other agency, as an alien and, therefore, I have never done so. In informing the House of Representatives to the contrary, Representative Cox was in error.

Since the day I was 21, I have voted proudly in every general election and in most primary elections. And the organization I head has as one of its major activities the urging of every American citizen to register and vote for whomever he chooses. In the district Mr. Cox comes from only 7 percent of the people voted in the last election.

And I might add that I can claim to being a better Democrat than Representative Cox, who, according to the record, voted against his own party and with the Republican opposition 50 percent of the time in 1947.

Represenative Cox's attacks on CIO and our revered leader, the late Sidney Hillman, are not new, nor have they gained an iota of accuracy with the passage of time.

Italian Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sumner Welles, from the Washington Post of April 27, 1948:

ITALIAN ELECTIONS

(By Sumner Welles)

FIRST STEP AGAINST COMMUNISM

More than two-thirds of the Italian people have rejected communism. They have decided that free democracy is better than a police state directed from Moscow. They have shown they believe that their own self-interest links them to the west.

Many of us seem complacently to think that this means that Italy's course is now definitely set. In reality the elections mark only the first step. If the Italian people are to remain free they will need our support for a long time to come.

The Communist Party of Italy is still the most powerful in western Europe. The elections showed it has little popular strength. It is going to seize every chance it can get to discredit democratic government and to sabotage the European recovery program. It will increase rather than lose its hold upon the mass unless the new democratic government remedies those social and economic ills that are the chief reason for communism's appeal.

The living standard of most Italians is miserably low. Overpopulation and the lack of natural resources are national handicaps that can only be surmounted when there is once more a peaceful world economy. If the help we give Italy during the next few years is used as it is intended, production will increase, employment will be restored, and the general living standards will rise. But only the Italian Government itself can cure such evils as the present feudal system of land tenure and the appalling gap between the impoverished masses and the privileged few. Radical social reforms are more needed in Italy than in any other part of western Europe cutside of Spain and Portugal.

Until the western democracies have all met successfully the social challenge which each faces, in greater or lesser degree, they will not have won their contest against communism.

The Kremlin, however, sees that present trends are favorable to the west. The Brussels pact is one indication. The Italian elections, the organization of the 16 western European nations and the customs union between France and Italy are others. Conditions have been improving in Great Britain and in France. The recent policies of the three major powers in western Germany are contributing to recovery. In Norway and in Denmark popular opinion is demanding incorporation in the western bloc. Only in Sweden does the illusion still persist that isolation is possible.

There is increasing evidence of growing hope and a will for unity among the western democracies.

If Russia is prepared to gamble, she will move westward this year before American rearmament becomes a reality and before the European recovery program can make itself felt.

But in view of the hardening of the determination of the west, it is more likely that she will for the time being merely consolidate her recent gains from Finland to Czechoslovakia, and from Hungary to the Balkans, while continuing to probe for soft spots in Asia and the Near East.

That means, of course, that for an indefinite period the world will be divided into two spheres of influence. It also implies a prolonged contest in power politics, with the United States one of the two chief contestants.

In the long struggle that looms ahead the Soviet dictatorship enjoys one major advantage. Its policy is ruthless. It is consistent. It is also infinitely patient.

American policy cannot be ruthless. It has often been inconsistent. Recently it has shifted as often as the controlling influences exerted upon the Executive have changed. In the years that lie ahead those who conduct our foreign policy are going to be subjected to every conceivable kind of domestic pressure. There will be the politicians who, because it will be popular with their constituents, will claim that the European recovery program should be halted before the objectives sought are even in sight. If there is a momentary lull in the international scene, the taxpayers will want to know why they should pay for rearmament. With our characteristic impatience, many of us will applaud the demands of the sentimentalists, the fellow travelers, and the peace-at-any-pricers that the President sit down with Stalin and reach a settlement.

The United States does not want war. So far as we can tell neither does the Soviet Union at this time. But the surest way of making war inevitable would be a reversal of our present policy and a premature settlement.

The western democracies are apt to concentrate upon the immediate objectives. The masters of the Kremlin shape their policy to reach objectives that can often only be attained in the distant future.

The danger of war will be eliminated when some government in Moscow reaches the conclusion that Russia's power, persistence, and patience are matched by those of a united west. Only then would the United States be warranted in trying again to negotiate the settlement which can create a one-world, rather than a two-world, order.

Federal Aid to Education in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press:

MISSOURI WOULD LOSE

Let's take a look at Federal aid to education strictly from the standpoint of our own State. Senate bill 472, which would subsidize the educational systems of the 48 States, has passed the Senate and now awaits committee action in the House. If it passes, we in Missouri will pay $1.56 in taxes to receive $1 in Federal aid.

According to the Missouri public expenditure survey, our share in the cost of the Federal subsidy would be $6,211,000, while we would receive only $3,975,000 as our share of the funds. The remaining $2,236,000, together with $92,062,000 from 31 other States, would go to the 16 poorer States, whose grants under the program would exceed their share of the costs by more than 200 percent.

It becomes obvious, then, that Federal aid would actually curtail this State's ability to better its educational standards by draining it of much-needed funds. Also, the benefits of the school reorganization bill recently passed by the Missouri General Assembly to eliminate inefficient and expensive school districts would be nullified by Federal aid, which would tend to encourage the continuance of such districts by subsidization.

Federal aid would place Missouri at a disadvantage in securing teachers in competition with other States because of the ratio of the funds collected from the State to those it received in return. With the procurement of teachers an ever-increasing problem, we most certainly could not afford such a condition.

Missouri has proved that it can meet its educational problems without costly Government interference, and there is every indication that other States can do the same.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Elmo Roper, the PAC professor of public-opinion polls, tells us the public is confused on the Marshall plan. He tells us that 46.4 percent of those who have heard about it think that giving

away our hard-earned production will create prosperity at home. This certainly shows how confused public thinking is.

The only kind of domestic prosperity promoted by ERP is the type of boom that will go bust when we stop giving away our hard-earned dollars to keep it booming. Those who shout the loudest against a boom-and-bust economy have been among those making the most noise for ERP, a boom-bust venture if ever there was one. Those areas of American agriculture and industry that will get the dollars directed to them and away from the things Americans want better get ready for a bust.

Perhaps one of the most confusing things about the whole ERP is whether or not it is a program to stop communism. Mr. Roper tells us that 45.6 percent of those who have heard about the Marshall plan think it will stop the spread of communism. Yet, Mr. Bevin in his Paris report tells us that the success of the plan depends upon increased trade with countries behind the iron curtain. Mr. Hoffman, in his first press conference after his appointment, told us he hoped that trade between the free countries of Europe and the Russian satellites can be built up. By this confusion ERP has won the approval of those who think ERP is a program to promote trade between Soviet Russia and the rest of the world as well as those who think it is a program to help contain communism behind the iron curtain. I submit, Mr. Speaker, we should not pass any appropriations until we know just what the program is. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will tell us in its report whether this is a program designed to supply goods to Communist countries or a program to help stop communism by refusing to supply countries behind the iron curtain with goods which later may be used against us.

Toward Stable Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Toward Stable Prices," which appeared in Foster's Daily Democrat, published in Dover, N. H., April 16, 1948:

TOWARD STABLE PRICES

The head of one of the country's principal retail associations recently said this: "Stability of prices is what we need. * * * We must face the economic facts of life and control the inflation of money and credit and do all we can to increase supply of goods through greater production. Management must be willing and intelligent enough to take only reasonable profits, and labor must restrict its demands to reasonable wages and produce an honest day's work for an honest day's pay."

The belief is prevalent in some quarters that the peak of the commodity price spiral may have been reached. At the same time, it would be unsafe to assume that this is necessarily true. It is very likely that the economy may again be subjected to strong inflationary pressures—such as the spending of very large sums for national defense. In that event, the most effective kind of cooperation between the Government, industry, labor, and consumers will be necessary if runaway inflation is to be prevented.

It is idle to talk of a return to prewar prices. If that should occur a severe depression would inevitably result. Our whole economy is now geared to an extremely high national income, record wages, nearly full employment, and a stupendous debt coupled with the biggest Government budgets we have ever had in time of peace. The spokesman for retailing was simply pointing to some basic truths which we are apt to overlook in these confusing days.

Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 28 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, at the Roosevelt memorial services held at Hyde Park, N. Y., April 12, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a deeply moving experience to join in these memorial services at Hyde Park for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Most of you who are listening to me are Americans, for whom President Roosevelt was a great and inspiring leader during 12 of the most critical years of your country's history.

But Franklin Roosevelt truly belonged to the whole world, as few men in history have ever done. When he died 3 years ago today the people in Europe and Asia and Africa, as much as in America, were all united in their sorrow.

For people everywhere he was not only a great leader of a great nation. They trusted him and believed in him as a friend—the kind of friend who unwaveringly believed in them, who believed in the capacity for goodness and greatness of all the ordinary men and women of this world.

As a Norwegian I know how great an inspiration Franklin Roosevelt was to my own people during the dark years of the Nazi occupation of my country. This capacity of his to inspire the best in people was one of his most remarkable qualities. He was himself possessed of rare courage and faith. This courage and this faith he communicated to hundreds of millions of people who never saw him, or even heard his voice, in every corner of the earth.

No one will ever be able to measure how great an influence this was in the winning of the war, but I know that it was very great.

After I came to this country I learned from friends here how much this ability to call forth the courage and the faith of men had meant to the people of the United States at the very beginning of President Roosevelt's administration. It was in his first inaugural address—in the very first paragraph of that address—delivered in the depths of the world-wide economic disaster of 1933, that he said:

"First of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror."

Today, as in 1933, too many people are afraid.

People are afraid in America. They are afraid in Russia. They are afraid in the small countries like my own. The governments, too, are acting as if they were afraid.

I think that if we are going to make the United Nations work and prevent another war, we shall have to begin by a reaffirmation of the courageous faith for which Franklin D. Roosevelt stood. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

There was another quality that endeared Franklin D. Roosevelt to all mankind and was a source of his greatness. I cannot find the exact word to describe this other quality, but it was a wise and tolerant humanity, a capacity for understanding, an ability to seek out and build upon the greatest common denominator among peoples of differing faiths and interests.

It was especially this quality in Franklin D. Roosevelt, I believe, combined with his tremendous courage, that made him a great political leader for his own country and the greatest statesman for the world of his time.

In his last speech, the speech written on the eve of his death and never delivered, he had written:

"Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world at peace."

This is not only a statement of the appropriate field of effort of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

This is the essence of the work to which all of us have jointly set our hands in the United Nations itself.

Looking backward, we can see more clearly in the light of what has happened since how essential it was to the future of our civilization that the United Nations was born before the war ended.

We owe that accomplishment more to Franklin Roosevelt than to any other man. He began working for the establishment of the United Nations a few days after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He saw what the nations, united in their struggle for life, could accomplish in a terrible war, and he drew the logical conclusion that this great alliance also could build the peace, and safeguard humanity's happiness and progress through joint efforts hereafter.

Before he died the essential agreements on the form and powers of the Organization had been reached at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta.

These agreements made it possible to keep together in one organization, on a permanent basis nations of very different ideologies and interests who had been brought together as allies only by the attacks of Nazi Germany and Fascist Japan.

President Roosevelt and those who built the United Nations with him knew that the years following the war would be immensely difficult. They foresaw conflicts of power and ideology and the strains and stresses of readjustment that must follow so great and widespread an upheaval.

They decided that a world-wide organization was the only possible answer. It had to be an organization of clearly limited powers because it had to contain within it sovereign nations as different in their history and government as the Soviet Union and the United States. It had to contain within it the old nationalisms of Europe and the rising new nationalisms of Asia and Africa. It had to provide for diversity in unity.

The choice did not lie and does not lie between world government and a cooperative organization of sovereign nations. The choice lay and still lies between the United Nations and no world organization at all.

Now, 3 years later, the United Nations is the only hope we have of holding the world together during this dangerous period of peacemaking. It is the only hope of preventing another war in which there could be no victor, no vanquished, but only universal destruction for both sides.

People everywhere are shocked and sick at heart to hear so much talk of another war so often and so soon after the terrible destruction and slaughter of millions of people in the last war. They have every right to be shocked and sick at heart.

There should be an end to war talk.

I do not believe any government anywhere in the world is so utterly mad as to contemplate starting another war.

The governments of the world should stop talking war and start working harder for peace.

There are many means to work for peace.

Cooperative efforts at reconstruction like the European recovery program, in which 16 nations of Europe and the United States have joined, is one means.

Another is for the great nations to try to settle their differences instead of merely threatening each other.

For many months now there has been no serious attempt by any one of the Big Five countries at negotiation of the major differences about the peace treaties.

Such efforts should be continuous. They should never stop.

Negotiation, conciliation and compromise are all possible without sacrifice of any vital principle. They are not only possible. They are the only basis upon which a peaceful world can be built. They are the way of the United Nations. There is no other way except the way of war.

The Councils and Assembly of the United Nations have been the only regular meeting grounds between East and West. But even in the United Nations there has been a tendency among the great powers to take up positions and stand upon them, rather than seriously to seek a settlement of differences between them.

I have heard it said that the United Nations is dying. On the contrary, the United Nations is very much alive. It is doing very well indeed except when one or the other of the big powers fails to use it as it should be used or to live up to the terms of the Charter. That is the trouble.

The boycott, the bypass, and the backdown are not the way to make the United Nations stronger, or the way to serve the cause of peace.

There is nothing wrong with the United Nations Charter except the failures to live up to it.

There is nothing wrong with the machinery of the United Nations except the failures to use it.

Today, 3 years after the death of its principal founder, the United Nations is in fact by far the most extensive organized effort in all history to build a peaceful world.

Every hour of every day the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies goes on—not only at Lake Success, but all over the world. Constructive work, the foundation building, the work for peace that never gets into the headlines.

This is the long work of which Franklin D. Roosevelt was thinking the day before he died when he wrote that "if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world at peace."

All peoples, I remind you, includes both Americans and Russians. All kinds includes both Communists and capitalists, as well as the great majority of the world who are neither one nor the other. It includes peoples of every race and every culture and every creed.

The United Nations way is a hard way, a long way, a way that demands patience and wise tolerance in equal measure with loyal courage and firm faith. But it is the only way to peace.

The United Nations way is just as right today as it was 3 years ago, and it will be just as right 3 years, or 30 years, from now.

The world has lost Franklin D. Roosevelt the man.

It must never lose the memory of his courageous faith in the ability of mankind to build a peaceful world or of his wise and tolerant humanity that showed the way to do it.

He left us a reminder of the road we must follow when he said, a few weeks before the San Francisco Conference:

"The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man, or one party, or one nation. It cannot be an American peace, or a British peace, or a Russian, or a French, or a Chinese peace. It cannot be a peace of large nations—or of small nations. It must be a peace which rests on the cooperative effort of the whole world."

Let us return to the path of peace. Let us follow the United Nations way with the same faith as his in the capacity of men and nations to rise above the mean and evil to the great and good.

Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of an address delivered by me at Cambridge, Mass., on April 23, 1948. The portion which I ask to have printed is on the subject Bipartisan Foreign Policy.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bipartisan foreign policy is a misnomer. In China, South America, and Palestine we have had a democratic foreign policy with disastrous results.

Senator VANDENBERG was not consulted by the administration on our relations with South America or China while conditions drifted steadily from bad to worse. Circumstances finally compelled him to voice publicly his views on these two fields of foreign policy 1 year ago at Cleveland in the absence of consultation by the administration.

Only yesterday Senator VANDENBERG stated on the floor of the Senate that he had not been consulted on Palestine either last fall nor in the last few weeks concerning the complete reversal of our position on partition, "although the Senator from Michigan was clearly known to favor viable partition as the best basis of settlement."

In these three fields, excluded from bipartisan cooperation, American foreign policy is most conspicuously failing. Not a hand was clapped at Bogota when General Marshall announced the Presidential proposal of a $500,000,000 grant for South American rehabilitation. What a commentary on our relationships and the failure to prepare the ground.

In China we were insisting Chiang should take the Communists to his bosom at the very time we were denouncing Communists as vipers elsewhere in the world.

Palestine stands today as a pitiful spectacle of American indecision and vacillation.

For each of these tragic situations the Democratic administration must bear full responsibility in the absence of any adequate consultation with those responsible for the formulation of policy in the Republican Congress.

President Truman yesterday proclaimed his rights to use American troops anywhere in the world that he desired for such purpose as he deemed best and based his declaration on the use of American troops in the past by other Presidents.

Senator VANDENBERG meanwhile, on the floor of the Senate, was making quite clear the twilight zone in which American troops had been used for protection of American life and property by other Presidents in many instances but carefully pointing out that under the United Nations Participation Act careful provision was made for implementing any agreement in the Security Council on armed forces by congressional action.

The specification in the congressional act as to legislative implementation would clearly exclude any implication of Presidential authority to use troops under the United Nations Charter without congressional authority.

The authority of the President to use American troops "to protect American lives or property" is clear as pointed out by Senator VANDENBERG. Beyond that field we enter a twilight zone where all should tread with care in the present unsettled state of world affairs.

For many months I have urged the modification of the embargo to permit arms and munitions and American volunteers to go to those who are upholding the decision of the United Nations.

American foreign policy has been conspicuously successful in the fields where bipartisanship has prevailed

The United Nations Charter—the greatest step forward in American foreign policy in this century—evolved by Cordell Hull with the full cooperation and constant consultation of Senator VANDENBERG and his Republican colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations—was approved by the Senate by a vote of 89 to 2—by the very Senate that was supposed to be "the graveyard of treaties."

The European peace treaties and the Marshall plan are bearing fruit already with full and speedy congressional cooperation and approval.

The Republican record is clear. The Republican Party can be counted upon to extend bipartisan cooperation to every field of foreign policy as a Republican administration takes over next January. Politics must cease at the water's edge. Only in this way can America come to command the respect and confidence of the nations of the world by reason of the consistency and continuity of its position in world affairs.

An Economic Issue for the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An Economic Issue for the Republicans," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of April 27, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—AN ECONOMIC ISSUE FOR THE REPUBLICANS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—There is dissatisfaction with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and some of the compacts made by the Executive under its permission which the House Republicans have decided first to hear in secret. Some of the objections come inexplicably from industries where the profit yield, based on net worth, has vastly increased since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was legislated. Others are based stubbornly on the high-tariff doctrine of the Republican Party many years ago.

The administration, however, is pressing vigorously for renewal of the act, which expires in June, and it has one argument that was not previously available in such strength. This is that if the United States is to continue to lead the free nations of the world toward the common foreign economic policy that is widely accepted as a preventive of war, the legislation should not terminate; that this leadership has been expressed in the Bretton Woods agreements, the Geneva-Havana tariff pacts, the European recovery plan, and the 16-nation committee for cooperation with the objectives of the ERP. Of this international structure for peace, says the administration, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is both cornerstone and keystone and must be preserved.

Thus is presented a political problem for the Republican leaders of the majority in Congress, in whose ranks is the bulk of the opposition to renewing the trade-agreements act. No prospect exists, as before, that a majority in Congress will try to repeal the legislation; there is no stomach for that venture now. But it could be emasculated by amendments; this is the tactic that is expected; and the Republican leadership has the responsibility of defeating it or giving the Democrats an opportunity to turn many votes in the Presidential campaign.

BEARING ON THE CAMPAIGN

These are the votes of citizens who in 1940 swallowed their dislike of the New Deal, of Mr. Roosevelt and of his breach of the two-term precedent partly because of the majority Republican record in foreign-policy legislation. They firmly believe in the world economic measures of which Cordell Hull was the pioneer and principal sponsor and of which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is a base. If the Republicans enter the campaign with the lifeblood of this legislation on their hands, they may encounter opposition which otherwise they would not have met.

The administration will probably be obliged to yield on one amendment, favored by thoughtful and unselfish critics of the act who have no wish to cripple its operation. This is the proposal that, after a reciprocal-trade agreement is submitted by the Executive to Congress, it shall take effect within a certain number of days if not rejected by majorities in the House and the Senate. That reserves to Congress in revenue measures, and to the Senate in what amount to treaties, controls that are established both by the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

But there are other amendments which may be urged that are definitely crippling. One is to require affirmative action by Congress on each agreement before it can become effective. The rules of legislative procedure are such that a small group could use this device to kill each pact as soon as it was made by the Executive. Another proposal is to regulate tariff concessions on comparative "costs of production," for which no reliable statistics can be compiled. Shall, for example, the cost of production in a multiunit industry be the cost of the most inefficient producer or the mass manufacturer with the best management? And how can it be exactly related in soft-currency countries to any standard of cost that is fixed by Congress for the United States?

THE ROLE OF CLAYTON

The answer is that no such computations are practicable and that the principal hope of many who urge them is to destroy the RTA by indirection. This attempt has been made ever since 1934, when it was established for 3 years. The act has since been renewed from time to time over Republican opposition, and its next date of expiration is June 12. Meanwhile, open hearings are barred, while Republican committee chairmen jockey over whether the Geneva-Habana pacts shall go to Foreign Affairs or to Ways and Means, where the whole concept has ancient enemies.

The administration's case will be stated and directed by Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, now an economic adviser to the Secretary and a veteran of these battles. Since retiring from his formal office in the Department, Mr. Clayton has engaged in the ITO conferences at Geneva and Habana which have furthered the leadership of the United States in the economic field.

He can be relied on to make the most of the powerful reason to renew the RTA that grows out of the European recovery plan, for which Congress has appropriated billions and ratified as a long-term project. In the ERP bill Congress required the 16 nations to make treaties with the United States that, among other provisions, include this commitment:

"Cooperation with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the participating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries."

If Congress should fail to renew, or should emasculate, the RTA, it would be forbidding the United States to do the very things it requires of the nations under the Marshall plan.

Democratic Principles as Defense Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, because there is widespread recognition of the efficacy of a positive implementation of democratic principles and ideals as the most potent defense against the spread of communism, it occurs to me that the hopeful and inspiring editorial on world-wide developments of this year, appearing in the Sunday New York Times of April 25, 1948, should be brought to the attention of as many Americans as possible. Therefore, I request unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTRAL ISSUE

It may be a good thing sometimes to stand back a little from the swift rush of events in this tremendous spring of 1948 and ask what all this will seem to mean a few years from now. At the moment we are apt to become lost in details: a defeat in Czechoslovakia; a defeat, tempered by some evidences of a still sturdily independent spirit, in Finland; quarrels in Berlin and Vienna; a resounding democratic victory in Italy; the practical beginnings of what may become a European union; the first shiploads of ERP supplies starting overseas; or, at the moment less evident in the news but crucial in their impact on the future, the beginning months of freedom in India and Pakistan and the slowly and uncertainly resolving turmoil in China.

We may think of these events in terms of a contest of ideas, each major idea with power behind it—and in the case of the United States, a power that is being determinedly increased. But we may also regard what is happening as democracy's attempt to recover from a sickness which almost killed it. It was not the strength of nazism and fascism that made Hitler strong and Mussolini apparently strong. It was the weakness of democracy. It is not the strength of communism that has menaced western Europe since 1945. It is the weakness of democracy.

After the democratic victories of the Second World War it may seem inconsistent to speak of democracy's weakness. The democracies did, in fact, resist with magnificent resolution the direct attack made upon them by the Axis Powers. That Britain stood after Dunkirk, that America turned so decisively from peace to war, these are among the miracles of history. But democracy needed not only to be physically defended. It needed a new affirmation. It needed a new faith. We cannot say that it had this affirmation and this faith during the final decisions of the war, nor in the occupation policies followed in the late enemy countries, nor in the agreements of expediency that were made with Russia.

But we can say now that the tide of democratic faith has turned, and has risen. We may even date the beginning of the turning, namely, with Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard last June. Looking back, one sees that the outstanding point in this speech was not the offer of American aid to Europe. That offer was indeed put forward, and without it Europe would not have made the economic or the psychological progress she has actually made. But the gist of the Marshall plan was the principle that if the nations of western Europe would pool their interests, sink their nationalistic rivalries, and work democratically for a common future, then European civilization could be saved—and not merely saved but developed beyond the height of even its loftiest past glories.

These past glories could not be expressed primarily in material terms, though they could not have been achieved without a degree of material security. They came out of an exuberance of the human spirit, resting on freedom of the individual. They came out of a challenge to the future. It is this challenge to the future that is being attempted now—with what success the next year or so, perhaps even the next few months, will tell.

Communism, whatever its pretenses, is a retreat into the past—into the ant life of dead empires, into security attained by the sacrifice of freedom. It is an abdication, as the recent cultural circus in Russia revealed, of the rich and creative phases of individualism. We cannot believe that many human beings, confronted with the choice, would willingly make that abdication. And they will not be confronted with the choice if the democracy of the West roots itself firmly in economic well-being and then reaches for the stars.

This is the decision and adventure of our time, to which every event contributes ad-

versely or otherwise. We must not only hold the old lines of democracy, but we must push them forward; we must not maintain them passively but with passionate enthusiasm. If we do this, if we attack in the field of the idea and of the spirit, we lessen correspondingly the danger of war. For no dictator would ever dare assault a truly awakened and resolute democratic western world.

Foreign Relief Causes Higher Prices at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, Economic Cooperation Administration officials are telling us the European recovery program will not send domestic prices up. This reminds me of the boys who told us that the first and second rounds of wage increases would not send prices up. Apparently there are some people who have not yet learned that when you increase the effective demand for a limited supply of goods the price is bound to rise.

It may be that in the case of ECA the rise in some products has already taken place. These prices may not go any higher. However, if this is the case, ECA will serve to keep high prices which might otherwise come down within the reach of the average taxpayer. Those who really want to know what Government expenditures for foreign relief do to prices in this country should read an article which appears in the current issue of American Affairs entitled "Uncle Sam in the Wheat Pit." For your convenience I am including a copy in these remarks. It is well worth reading. It shows how Commodity Credit Corporation purchases over a 5-month period increased the price of wheat by almost 50 percent, and still they tell us that purchases for foreign countries will not increase prices.

[From American Affairs of April 1948]

UNCLE SAM IN THE WHEAT PIT

As an operator in the wheat pit, your Uncle Sam fools everybody, because his mind is not on the money. If you think you saw him coming when he was going, or going when he was coming, that means that you have the suspicious nature of a speculator and imagine that he acts by stealth and subtlety. If he turns speculators upside down and shakes the grain out of their pockets, that is because he wants the wheat. He does not even have to be right. If he is wrong, he charges his losses to the United States Treasury. His agent is the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is a corporation totally owned by the United States Government. It was organized purposely to operate in commodities. It has a capital of $100,000,000 and a borrowing power of $4,750,000,000 at the Treasury.

Now, the facts are these: In July 1947 the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared in the wheat pit as an insatiable buyer and bought steadily for 21 weeks, higher and higher, as if necessity had suspended the meaning of price. Here is the way it bought the wheat:

Week ending—	Bushels bought	Week's closing price
July 3	1,362,175	$2.17¼
July 11	4,077,267	2.26¾
July 18	3,133,314	2.32¾
July 25	19,291,382	2.35¾
Aug. 1	32,948,664	2.31¾
Aug. 8	15,717,423	2.33
Aug. 15	9,414,600	2.36⅛
Aug. 22	9,606,698	2.44⅝
Aug. 29	7,300,788	2.52¼
Sept. 5	3,328,400	2.64
Sept. 12	2,251,545	2.77
Sept. 19	9,658,539	2.70½
Sept. 26	9,100,231	2.67½
Oct. 3	25,006,322	2.83¾
Oct. 10	16,082,621	2.91¾
Oct. 17	12,264,740	3.02¼
Oct. 24	8,969,052	3.12½
Oct. 31	7,662,387	2.89¾
Nov. 7	2,067,569	2.93½
Nov. 14	6,990,908	3.02½
Nov. 21	8,685,118	3.03¼

The rise of roughly a dollar a bushel in the price was not owing entirely to the urgency of this buying. Partly it was owing to a wheat famine propaganda organized by the Government while its agent was buying the wheat. That was to tell people that there was not enough wheat to go around. In order to relieve hunger in Europe we should have to eat less wheat ourselves and feed less of it to our chickens and livestock. So meatless and chickenless days to save grain. Any private speculator, trader or merchant behaving in that manner—crying up the price of the commodity he was buying—would be gathered up by his friends and sent to an asylum for examination. And all of this buying was for a relief program that was as yet nonexistent, except in the mind of executive Government. In November, the President called Congress in special session to enact the interim aid bill for Europe. Before the bill was passed, that is to say, before the money had been appropriated, the Commodity Credit Corporation already had the wheat for Europe and was ready to ship it. The price then was above $3 a bushel. At that point the Commodity Credit Corporation suddenly disappeared from the wheat pit. The Government stopped buying. Then the Secretary of Agriculture blandly announced in Detroit that there was plenty of wheat, in fact more than enough. When 450,000,000 bushels had been sent to Europe, the remainder would be perhaps 100,000,000 bushels more than we ourselves could afford to eat or feed at $3 a bushel, and "the stubborn fact of that hundred million bushels (ha, ha,) is going to catch up with the speculator some day."

For several weeks after this, speculators went about testing their senses by touching familiar objects. Then one of them decided that what he saw was really there and sold a million bushels for a fall. The fall in a few days was 50 cents a bushel. On this decline the Commodity Credit Corporation could have bought more wheat to swell the European relief program. It had the power of discretion and the money, too. But it stood aloof and watched the fall. The Secretary of Agriculture said the price was too high; the Government was going to wait until the price stabilized itself.

For the curtain on this act of a play that might be called "The Wheat Famine That Got Lost" you may read the front page of any newspaper on the third day of the terrific slump on the grain markets. One wide headline was on the White House press conference. The President held up to the reporters on his chest a chart that showed the cost of living to be jumping off into space; and this was to point the moral that unless the Congress gave him the power to keep prices from going up there would be a crash. Under another wide headline was the news of the crash of commodity prices, and what was the Government going to do to stop the liquidation?

On the same day, Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas, whose parliamentary existence is the Senate's carbuncle, was saying he knew why the Government had bought wheat as high as it could. The idea was to scare the country into rationing and price control. That seemed fantastic. The Senate was scandalized and turned upon him angrily for saying it. Some farm-bloc Members of Congress, on the other hand, blamed the Government less for causing the price of wheat to rise and then for letting it fall, and suspected a political motive.

Anybody might know that a rise of a dollar a bushel in the price of wheat during 6 months, followed by a fall of 50 cents in 6 days, would throw the economic body into a convulsion, involving dangerously every organ, function, and faculty. If this had been the work of private speculators in the wheat pit, public indignation would have been extreme, unreasoning, and morally justified. But the Government did it; and you are left with a bitter question. Which would you prefer really—a government that possessed the intelligence to pursue a bad intention adroitly or one that could inflict a shock like that by sheer stupidity?

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a statement attributed to Secretary Marshall in a speech before the chamber of commerce yesterday as reported in the Washington Post today. The Post said:

Marshall told the chamber members it was urgent that the Nation make its foreign policy consistent. He pointed out that Great Britain had solved the same problem years ago, thereby becoming a dominant world force.

There must, he said, be no doubt about the ability of the United States to accept responsibility. When we step out beyond the borders of our own country, he continued, we must do so as a unit and not as a welter of political parties.

The Secretary lauded passage of the European recovery program during an election year as an example of the type of unity he meant. He said the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act coming up soon for extension is another test.

The Trade Agreement Act which expires June 12 must not now be thrown overboard, Marshall said, just after its basic policies of free world trade have been confirmed by the $5,300,000,000 Foreign Aid Act.

"We will destroy ourselves in world leadership if we abandon it," the Secretary said.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of today entitled "Star Chamber Methods."

STAR CHAMBER METHODS

The merits of the case for extending the Trade Agreements Act are overshadowed for the moment by the decision of a Ways and Means Subcommittee to conduct hearings on this issue in secret. The present plan is

to allow proponents of the trade-agreements extension bill 3 days beginning next Monday. Then the opponents will have 3 days to present their views. The press and the public are to be excluded from all these sessions. We think that Congressman DOUGHTON is justified in complaining that such procedure, in consideration of so vital an aspect of our national policy, borders on star chamber methods.

Members of the subcommittee say that this procedure is a matter of expediency. Last year they held 7 weeks of hearings on the subject of tariff policy. All they wish to hear now, they say, is a brief summary of the arguments pro and con, and this can be more readily kept on a factual, nonpartisan basis in executive sessions. From the narrow viewpoint of expediting legislation on this controversial subject these arguments carry a good deal of weight. But mere expedition of the bill is a minor consideration. The type of bill that is to emerge is the most important factor. A determined effort is being made by some groups to discard the trade-agreements program or limit extension of the act to 1 year at a time when the United States is imposing a policy of economic cooperation and reduction of trade barriers upon other countries through the European recovery program. To foster such a purpose behind closed doors would be a strange perversion of democratic principles.

The argument for closed hearings and nonpartisan testimony proves too much. It indicates a desire to avoid controversy on a subject on which public opinion is likely to run strongly against what a majority of the committee apparently wishes to do. In other words, the secret hearings appear to be a device for minimizing criticism. Not only is this a reversal of the democratic process by which public issues are brought out into the light of day for full and free discussion. It also flies into the face of the Congressional Reorganization Act which contemplated that committee hearings should be open to the public. To be sure, the act allows exceptions by majority vote of the committee concerned, but we can see no legitimate excuse whatever for making an exception in the present case.

The subcommittee has succeeded only in putting itself on the defensive from the very beginning. Its secrecy leads inevitably to the assumption that what is contemplated can best be done in the dark. If anything less than a full extension of the Trade Agreements Act, in conformity with our bipartisan foreign policy, should come out of the committee in these circumstances, it would be properly subjected to double suspicion and attack.

Oleo Tax—The Farmers' Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARCH 17, 1948.

EDITOR, LIFE MAGAZINE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: We note that Life magazine has joined the oleomargarine lobby by urging its readers to write their Congressmen, protesting against the taxing of oleomargarine. While it might be within the jurisdiction of editors of Life magazine to comment on an issue of this kind, we do question the appropriateness of their entering the field of lobbying in behalf of one side of the controversy by urging their readers to write their Congressmen.

Your editorial takes the position that people who are engaged, or might engage in the olemargarine industry, have changed that they used to be of a fraudulent character and disposition which may have warranted the passage of the existing laws, but that this is now all changed. Records continue to show that there are still numerous violations of the provisions of the law. The only thing that has minimized fraud in the sale of oleomargarine has been the taxing provision, enforcement of which is in the hands of the Internal Revenue Department. Remove this and fraud will become exceedingly rampant. No person eating at a restaurant or hotel would be certain of what he was being served, regardless of what he may have ordered.

The only tax which might be interpreted to be excessive is when oleomargarine is colored yellow in imitation of butter. Even renovated butter carries the same tax as uncolored margarine and adulterated butter carries the same tax as colored margarine, namely, one-fourth cent and 10 cents per pound, respectively.

The oleomargarine interests have spent millions of dollars to try to convince the public that it is in their interests to change these laws and have enlisted the support of newspapers and other publications by flooding them with their propaganda.

Even the president of the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Mr. Paul Truitt, upon questioning in the Congress, repudiated the statement contained in your editorial that the country would save 52,000,000 bushels of grain which could be exported to a hungry world instead of its being fed to cows and churned to butter. At least that is what the makers of oleomargarine figures.

There are many other laws passed by the Congress and similarly designed to protect the public interests, such as the truth-in-fabrics law and the law prohibiting the sale of filled milk because of the fraudulent practices carried on by these people before such control laws were enacted.

It is our opinion that the people who are asking for the repeal would suffer most if it were granted to them.

Yours very truly,

MICHIGAN MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
H. F. SIMMONS,
Secretary-Manager.

Has the Marshall Plan Failed Already?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by W. K. Kelsey, whose column is known as The Commentator, and who is highly regarded as one of our best news columnists. This article appeared in the Detroit News of April 27, 1948:

THE COMMENTATOR
(By W. K. Kelsey)

HAS THE MARSHALL PLAN FAILED ALREADY?

Isn't it high time that the Government of the United States became more confidential with the people on this matter of war?

Testimony as to the probability of war, the proximity of war, is offered to the committees of Congress behind closed doors. Eventually, fragments of this testimony are vouchsafed to the press, and the people then discover that apparently they have been misled.

There was a terrific build-up, which went on for months, about the necessity of rebuilding western Europe over 4 years, at a cost of $18,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000 or more, to save that section of the world from communism. No sooner have we voted the money for the first year than we are told that war has been brought appreciably nearer.

We urged the nations of western Europe to get together, as part of the plan for their salvation. So five of them form a defensive alliance, and immediately it appears that because of this action we have got to get ready, in a great hurry, to defend them.

If what the Truman administration was telling us last fall and last winter, about what we must do to stave off communism without resorting to war, was valid then, why isn't it valid now? If everything we have done and everything we have advised in relation to western Europe has brought war that much nearer, why don't we get sore at the administration? Or is it true what they say about Russia?

CAUSING WAR BY TRYING TO AVOID IT

The argument of the administration now appears to be that because we have voted money for Europe's rehabilitation, we have made it the more necessary for the Russians to advance westward before Europe grows stronger; that because we have advised the five nations to get together economically and defensively, we have made it clear that Russia must move in on them before they become vigorous enough to resist; and that therefore we must hustle to train armies and build armaments and man foreign bases, to save western Europe from Russian armies that have only to march in and take over.

In other words, all that the Marshall plan has accomplished, if the Government's experts are to be believed, is to create a situation which calls for putting the United States on an immediate war basis.

At least, it appears that this is what congressional committees have been told; and now the fragmentary testimony is being released to arouse the people to a sense of their danger, so that more young men will be taken from their homes and pressed into service, and more billions will be poured into the creation of more armament and more shortages of essential materials.

Western Europe had to be given hope, lest in despair the people turn to communism. Now western Europe must be armed, lest it be conquered by the Communists. And at the same time we ourselves must arm, to fight a third war in Europe, to prevent Russia from taking over the entire continent.

What is the administration trying to do—elect Henry Wallace? It has 6 months in which to accomplish that feat, and at the rate it is proceeding, that seems a sufficient time.

What the people are not being told is what evidence the administration has that the Politburo is preparing for war.

The existence of 100 divisions of infantry in the active army, and another 100 divisions in reserve, is mooted. Is this fact, or is it fear?

If it is fact, is Russia's preparation due to a desire to conquer Europe for communism, or are the Russians scared lest the cry for American armament and help for the arming of western Europe portends an attack on the Soviet Union?

In short, are we doing, or getting ready to do, just those things which will not save us from war, but will make war inevitable?

Let the administration come clean.

SEND EISENHOWER TO TALK WITH STALIN

If the commentator were President of the United States at this juncture, he knows what he would do and what he would not do.

He would not sit back and say that if there is to be any consultation with Russia, Prime Minister Stalin must initiate it and come to this country for the purpose.

He would draft Ike Eisenhower to go to Moscow, or any other place agreeable to Mr. Stalin, for a heart-to-heart talk with that gentleman, to see if some basis of agreement cannot be reached. He would pick General Eisenhower because he believes that Ike, better than anyone else, can talk for the American people. General Eisenhower is outside the Government, outside the alarms and excursions of the Capital. He is diplomatic and he is firm. He is not concerned in politics; he is not politically ambitious; he is taking no sides in the campaign, and he is free to represent the people of this country who do not want war and who believe the people of Russia do not want war.

President Truman plays the piano, but he is not a composer. He is no Verdi. In Rigoletto, Verdi had two people singing on one side of a thick wall, and two people singing on the other, and they harmonized in a famous quartet.

We have the thick wall; we have the Politburo singing on one side, and the administration singing on the other, and they don't harmonize at all. We need a composer who will jump over the wall and see if he can't bring two jittery chorouses together. Maybe not even General Eisenhower could do it; but it is better to try than to fight.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is at present pending in the Congress of the United States legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools. This legislation is being studied by the Senate and the House of Representatives Committees on Education and Labor. It is my sincere hope that the committees will expedite these bills and bring them before the membership for a vote, which in my opinion should be unanimously in favor of their enactment.

At the moment when the world is torn apart with strife, and in spite of all the suggestions and proposals brought forth to cure the present ills of mankind, it is my sincere conviction that education will again take the position as the foremost contribution in solving some of the world and local problems. Most of us realize that the basic factor for the success of the way of life of which this country is proud is the stress which has been placed on education from the earliest time in our history. At this time it is important for our country to expand and improve this educational program in every conceivable manner. A position of world leadership in international affairs has been thrust upon the United States of America. It is a position from which this country can never withdraw, since the eyes of the world are focused on our Nation. Both in our international activities and in our domestic pursuits, we must provide inspiration for the peoples of the world who are seeking to rehabilitate their countries. Such inspiration or example can only be found in a country which is operating at maximum efficiency in every aspect of its society.

Although we have progressed far in our educational accomplishments of the past, there remains much to be done to improve our educational system. We can be proud of the fine work that has been done by school teachers and administrators in our elementary and secondary schools. However, these patriotic and loyal citizens have worked at a disadvantage. They have been underpaid and have lacked sufficient facilities and governmental support. It is only by surmounting this basic handicap through Federal assistance, such as is proposed by this legislation, that we can expect to dissolve the obstacles in the way of educational expansion and improvement.

The State of Arizona is the "baby State" of this country, and the rapid rate of progress and development has placed a great burden on our schools. The increase of population has required great changes in our educational system and the further development of education in Arizona requires all the assistance which our Federal Government can render.

This is unquestionably highly desirable legislation. I am thoroughly convinced that education is the basis of every hope for the future and for the continued development and progress of our country. For these reasons I believe it is imperative that the Eightieth Congress enact this legislation which will make possible the necessary advances in our national program of education.

William S. Knudsen Is Dead—He Was Born a Dane; He Died an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, what William Knudsen was, what he did, how he lived, makes him representative of the tens of thousands of Americans of Danish origin. His family was not wealthy. He was 1 of 10 children. When he first came to the United States—a stranger to our customs and our language—he worked at $10 a week as a mechanic.

His rise was history, American history. In this land of opportunity, he climbed to the management of a great industrial empire. At the very heighth of his career, he left his position at the top of the great automotive industry to serve his adopted country. No man served more valiantly. He traveled a distance of more than 10 times around the world to get the guns, the planes, the ships, and the tanks rolling off of American production lines. When final victory was won—and only then—he went into hard-earned retirement. The sincere gratitude of his countrymen, their heartfelt prayers, accompanied him.

Not every American of Danish origin could give to his Nation what William Knudsen gave. Yet, all of them did give—and they are giving this very day—to the full limit of their abilities. They are strengthening our Constitution by consecrating themselves to the orderly observance of law. They are bulwarking American economy through their uncomplaining hard work. They are keeping alive American ideals in their God-fearing support of religion.

William Knudsen needs no monument, no memorial. No mere product of the sculptors' art will preserve his memory for posterity. His is a greater tribute. The many thousands of Americans of Danish descent will not forget him. He lives on in them. They will continue the fight for the goals which he set—to preserve America, to make this Nation prosperous, and to keep this Nation free.

No End to Relief Under Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the most significant paragraphs of the recent analysis made by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe on the European recovery program.

A scrutiny of these statements by economic experts shows that the estimates made in connection with the recovery program are dangerously overoptimistic and that the plan, therefore, will run into trouble. Now, when the propaganda for the so-called Marshall plan has blown away, we are getting information which certainly is of a sobering character, inasmuch as it proves that the whole plan was conceived in overoptimism, and that at the end of 1951 Europe still will be utterly dependent upon American assistance.

The observations made by the Economic Commission follow:

I. EUROPEAN EXPORT-IMPORT TARGETS

The group of 16 countries taken together would have to export some 50 percent more goods to the rest of the world to pay for the same amount of goods that they were importing before the war, assuming no change in the prewar relationship of export and import prices. (Commission report, p. 164.)

On the side of exports the CEEC plans provide for very large increases. Total exports are planned to be some 42 percent above the prewar level by 1951, which implies an increase of some 115 percent over the 1947 level. Imports to the United States alone are planned to increase by 60 percent as com-

pared to prewar and by some 116 percent over the 1946 level.

* * * As regards the distribution of imports, the State Department estimates provide for rather larger imports from countries other than the United States at the beginning of the program, but the estimated amount coming from the United States declines less rapidly in the ensuing years than is the case in the CEEC figures, with the result that the final position in 1951 is about the same in both cases. There is a more significant difference in the distribution of total exports in that the State Department envisages a much greater orientation toward the United States market and much smaller exports to "other nonparticipating countries." Exports to the latter group will be $840,000,000 less than in the CEEC estimates, despite the fact that the State Department figures also include exports from the dependent territories, a considerable part of which went before the war to China, Japan, India, and other British Dominions, and other countries outside the Western Hemisphere.

* * * The State Department figures show a smaller excess of imports over exports for the early years, but the excess tapers off less rapidly so that in the final year the deficit on trade account is somewhat larger than in the original estimates of the CEEC. In both cases, however, the trade deficit is still over $3,500,000,000 in the final year of the plan. (Commission report, p. 187.)

Unless, therefore, the prices of the raw materials and foodstuffs which the western European countries import fall considerably in relation to the prices of the manufactured goods which they export, substantial changes in the scale and pattern of imports and exports beyond those envisaged in the present plan will ultimately be necessary. It was seen from the analysis in the earlier parts of this survey that, owing to the overvaluaiton of most European currencies, the cost of the goods which Europe imports has not really risen in terms of the goods which she exports, despite the fact that food and raw material prices have risen relatively to manufactured goods in the world markets. It would therefore be unsafe to rely on a future improvement in the terms of trade making a substantial contribution to the solution of the problem. (Commission report, p. 190.)

II. THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

The balance of payments on current account shows a smaller deficit in the State Department estimates than in that of the CEEC (at constant prices) due to the fact that the former assumes a very much steeper increase in the net receipts on invisible items, presumably largely due to differences in the anticipated income from tourist traffic. The difference in the distribution of exports as envisaged by the State Department has, moreover, the effect of reducing substantially the expected future dependence on the restoration of multilateral trade and currency convertibility. The net balance with other nonparticipants in favor of the CEEC countries would, according to the State Department estimates, be only $446,000,000 in 1951 at 1947 prices (or within a range of three hundred to seven hundred million dollars allowing for the possibility of price changes), as contrasted with $1,038,000,000 in the CEEC report (or $1,800,000,000, if the anticipated price reductions of the CEEC are taken into account). The deficit in the balance of payments with the United States alone is put at $1,540,000,000 in the final year according to the State Department estimate, and at $3,081,000,000 on the basis of the CEEC estimates. (Commission report, p. 188.)

Of the total of $21,000,000,000 for the period April 1944 to June 1952, six countries (Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Germany) account for some $18,000,000,000, or 85 percent of the total. The over-all deficit of the Netherlands is almost as large as that of the United Kingdom, while that of Belgium is only 38 percent lower than the United Kingdom's over-all deficit. Among the European countries only in the case of two—Switzerland and Turkey—is a surplus anticipated over the period. Surpluses are also shown, however, for most of the overseas dependencies. (Commission report, p. 189.)

As indicated in part 3 of this survey, the ultimate solution of the balance-of-payments problem would probably involve a reduction in the scale of imports, as well as an increase in the scale of exports in comparison to the prewar levels. (Commission report, p. 190.)

III. THE DOLLAR PROBLEM OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

As to the distribution of the balance between the different areas, the striking feature is the difference in the anticipated position of the United Kingdom compared with most of the other countries of the group. The United Kingdom shows a large deficit of $6,655,000,000 with the Western Hemisphere, more than one-half of which is offset by an anticipated surplus (of $3,800,000,000) with other nonparticipating countries. Thus in the case of the United Kingdom the anticipated deficit with the dollar area is considerably larger than the total deficit; in the case of the other CEEC countries the dollar deficit is considerably smaller than the over-all deficit. The problems of financing the adverse balance are therefore rather different in the two cases. While the United Kingdom has a special dollar problem, the ultimate solution of which would pre-suppose the possibility of multilateral settlements on a large scale, the other CEEC countries have a special problem of financing their deficits with the countries outside the dollar area. (Commission reports, pp. 189–190.)

IV. CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON SPECIAL IMPORT ITEMS

(a) Coal and oil: It has been questioned whether the coal-production plan is sufficiently comprehensive to meet the requirements. From the point of view of its effects on both the balance of payments and European industrial production it has certain weaknesses. In the first place, there is no margin for unforeseen emergencies. Secondly, it still relies (although only to a modest extent) on the import of coal from the United States at the end of the period. Finally, and most important of all, is the fact that it presumes (as will be shown in the following section) a very considerable change-over from coal to oil consumption during the next 4 years, the result of which will be the substitution of increased dollar expenditure for fuel oil in the place of the present dollar expenditure on coal. (Commission report, p. 167.)

(b) Crude steel: Tables XXX and XXXI give the CEEC estimates for the production, consumption, and net exports of crude steel and finished steel. They show that in comparison with 1938, production of crude steel will rise by 73 percent and the consumption of crude steel by 83 percent for the 16 countries. On the other hand, the production of finished steel is planned to increase by 86 percent, while the consumption is to rise by 66 percent. The plans provide, therefore, for very much larger imports of crude steel and larger exports of finished steel than before the war; net imports of crude steel are to be 2.7 million tons in 1951, while they were negligible before the war, and net exports of finished steel are to be about 4½ milion tons as against only 600,000 tons in 1938. It is apparents from these figures that the plans of the 16 countries provide for very much larger steel consumption both for the purposes of exports in the form of finished steel and engineering products, and for higher home requirements. It must be borne in mind, of course, that owing to the reduced production and exports of western Germany, European output or European exports as a whole would show much smaller increases. (Commission report, p. 172.)

The plans, as will be evident from the figures given in table XXX, are vulnerable in that they assume considerably higher imports of crude steel from outside Europe than was the case before the war. (Commission report, p. 175.)

(c) Food: These estimates of import requirements are in some cases—notably cereals and meat—higher than the supplies that are likely to be available. The total dollar deficit of the agricultural import program (allowing for exports), on the basis of the CEEC figures, rises from $5,100,000,000 in 1947–48 to $5,800,000,000 in the following year, and then falls to $5,400,000,000 by 1950–51—a large part of these annual deficits being accounted for by imports of cereals, fats, and meat. (Commission report, p. 176.)

(d) Timber: In spite of the heavy overcutting by the Germans in some countries during the war, the CEEC countries have continued cutting well in excess of growth, and production today is not much lower than the prewar output.

With total requirements very close to the prewar level, the proportion of total consumption to be covered by imports has only risen from 31 percent to 36 percent, but there is a large shift in the sources of imports. Before the war, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Baltic states supplied about 25 percent of western Europe's sawn-softwood requirements, 30 percent of their pulpwood, and 40 percent of their plywood. Last year shipments from this area were negligible. This had a substantial effect on western Europe's adverse trade balance with the United States. (Commission report, pp. 180–181.)

(e) German railroad system: Apart from the wagon situation, there is another serious weakness in the transport system of western Europe. The transport organization of the countries of western Europe is suffering as a result of its close interdependence with the German system. The situation in western Germany is very serious; the shortage of raw materials and labor has prevented even some of the most urgent repairs from being carried out, with the result that a very high proportion of wagons is unserviceable, that part of the tracks (particularly the sidings) have not been restored, and that the locomotive park is insufficient. The neighboring countries depend on the German system, not only for their coal supplies from the Ruhr but also for the transit movement of a large quantity of internationally traded goods, which cross Germany from north to south as well as from east to west. The danger that the German system may not be able to carry the traffic has been ever present since the end of the war and is not yet completely averted. Any restoration of normal traffic conditions in the CEEC countries would, therefore, entail major efforts to reestablish the efficiency of the German transport system. (Commission report, p. 184.)

Mississippi Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Mississippi.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws, as compiled by Gaddis M. Williams, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 202 War Memorial Building, Jackson, Miss., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Counties may donate money for burial of indigent Confederate pensioners.

Counties may donate money for the location, marking, care, and maintenance of graves of Confederate dead.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by persons on active duty with the armed forces.

Wills executed by deceased servicemen during World War II may be admitted to probate.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

American Legion post service officers are given powers as notaries in connection with matters of claims against the United States by veterans of all wars, their heirs, and dependents. Such officers may not charge for services.

The State Service Commissioner and assistants are authorized to administer oaths and affirmations, to take acknowledgments, and to perform all other duties required of notaries.

The bureau of vital statistics is required to furnish, without charge, to veterans of certain wars, or their authorized agents, copies of birth and death certificates required to adjudicate claims before the Veterans' Administration, if requests for same are accompanied by a statement from a service officer or an officer of the Veterans' Administration to the effect that the veteran is unable to pay the 50-cent fee.

Chancery clerks are required to furnish, without charge to veterans, their dependents, or authorized representatives, certified copies of records of honorable discharge and other certificates of service.

Free copies of public records may be secured for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Honorable discharges and all certificates of service of veterans of the armed forces of the United States are to be recorded by the chancery clerk free of charge.

It is the duty of county departments of public welfare to aid veterans, their relatives, beneficiaries, or dependents to receive from the United States aid or benefits to which they may be entitled.

It is the duty of the service commissioner and assistant commissioners to aid veterans of all wars since 1898, their relatives, beneficiaries, or dependents, to receive from the United States aid or benefits to which they may be entitled.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

A special bar examination may be given for certain law students within draft age.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leaves of absence are given to all officers and employees of the State, any county or municipality, with preservation of status and reinstatement upon termination of military service.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Confederate veterans, their wives or widows, may be admitted to the Beauvoir Soldiers' Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Farm and home aid is extended to veterans.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans, their widows, and servants.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTIONS FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Free hunting and fishing licenses are available to residents who are members of the armed forces.

War risk insurance, other benefits or relief for injured or disabled members of the military or naval forces and salaries, compensation, etc., received for military service are exempt from income tax.

Veterans with 50 percent or more disability are exempt from privilege tax on certain occupations.

Payment of poll tax is not required for voting in primary elections during military service.

Attorneys in the armed forces are exempt from payment of State bar association dues.

The Confederate soldiers' home is exempt from taxation.

Homesteads owned and previously occupied by persons serving in the armed forces are exempt from taxation.

War veterans may renew their drivers' licenses without payment of additional fees because of their lapse. They obtain a renewal in the same manner as if their expired licenses were current, by the payment of only one fee.

INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

Two million dollars has been appropriated to aid in the training of veterans in Mississippi in educational institutions, half of which is earmarked for housing facilities, equipment, materials, and supplies.

HOUSING

Legal authority has been granted to cities and counties to obtain housing facilities and operate housing projects to provide living quarters for veterans and their families, including authority to provide sites and construct sewers, streets, and other facilities.

Banks, insurance companies, and other lending agencies are permitted to amend their regulations to permit veterans to borrow money for home building under the GI bill of rights.

Minority disabilities have been removed for veterans under 21 years of age who desire to enter into legal contracts for home building under the GI bill of rights.

The homestead-exemption law has been amended to permit a veteran who purchases a home under the GI bill of rights, without any cash equity in the home or farm so purchased, to be eligible for complete homestead exemption if otherwise qualified.

The State building commission has been authorized to subdivide into lots to be sold to veterans at noninflationary prices 153 acres of State-owned land known as the Tripps Crossing area, bordering Highway 51 just north of Jackson.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of veterans' organizations is punishable by imprisonment for not more than 30 days or by a fine not to exceed $20, or both.

Municipalities may purchase, construct, or lease buildings to house veterans' organizations.

Municipalities may make donations to veteran organizations for World War memorials.

Members of associations composed of veterans are exempt from prohibition as to wearing of uniforms.

The State has been authorized to convey 40 acres of State-owned land to the city of Jackson and Hinds County for the purpose of constructing a war memorial stadium which will seat 35,000 people.

The State has been authorized to deed the State park known as American Legion State Park to Allen Post, No. 62, of the American Legion at Louisville, Miss.

* * * * *

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the Mississippi Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 14 chapters throughout the State, maintains two full-time national service officers, under the direction of Michael P. Fedorak, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Jackson, Miss.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship,

the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; the department of public relations and employment, headed by my good friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national-service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am quite proud to be one of its members.

Can It Happen Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city.

The Communist plan for taking over Greater Detroit, as outlined by Editor Floyd J. Miller, should challenge every loyal American. What happened in Bogota, Colombia, could happen here in our own favored land.

The editorial is as follows:

PERSONALLY SPEAKING

(By Floyd J. Miller)

CAN IT HAPPEN HERE?

The Communist plan for taking over Greater Detroit includes the following steps in South Oakland County:

1. Seizure of all the police headquarters in Royal Oak, Ferndale, and the other municipalities. This calls for control of the very important radio system and the radio equipped scout cars.

2. Seizure of all radio stations and suppression of newspapers.

3. Seizure of telephone central offices.

4. Imprisonment or shooting of all officials likely to prove most resistant.

The list includes several other bold and ruthless moves, but I won't bother to give any more of it.

Where did I get this information, you ask?

I drew it up, as any of you might do, after reviewing some of the startling revelations of Communist activities in this and other countries. One of the most outstanding of these was James Sweinhart's series, published in the Detroit News and in some 30 other large daily newspapers.

Many other newspaper and magazine articles have given detailed evidence of the elaborate preparations made by the international Communist organization for years.

There was a time when many people who were neither Communist nor Communist victims laughed at such an idea. It was preposterous. It was fanciful imagination; witch hunting with trimmings. They expressed these opinions in many letters to newspapers.

Naturally, those who were following the Communist line also did everything in their power to pooh-pooh this idea. They encouraged as many others as possible to do the same thing. Altogether they made quite a showing.

It is rather difficult for us Americans, reared in our tradition of democratic government, to believe that these things can happen. As long as all the explosive results were in far-off countries, our doubts continued to loom large.

Now the harsh realities are creeping closer and closer to us. We no longer look on them as fantastic fiction. Instead, we know them as powerful realities which may crush out our very existence.

The recent uprising in Bogota, Colombia, was a striking example. I remember reading the first news of it in a daily paper which in the same issue printed the letter written by a supposedly well-informed schoolman. He branded the Sweinhart articles as impossible imaginings.

All the professor's arguments were completely demolished by what actually happened, and it was not in far-off Europe or Asia. It was in a South American capital—only 4 hours' plane flight from our own shores.

The evident aim of the uprising was to break up the conference of American nations in Bogota. The Communists abroad certainly would have pounced on this as showing the weakness and inefficiency of democracies. Unfortunately for this plot, the conference continues.

No evidence has yet been produced publicly to prove that the man whose act started this uprising was a Communist. Certainly the assassination of Jorg Eliecer Gaitan, leader of the liberal party in Colombia, was the signal for an uprising which could not have been spontaneous.

What happened instantly bore all the earmarks of modern communistic revolutionary technique. The central radio station was seized and used, both to alarm and confuse Bogota, and to signal revolutionary leaders in other cities.

Small but skilful armed bands took possession of Bogota's main traffic centers, held the police and troops paralyzed by uncertainty, and turned loose rioting mobs to pillage, loot, and burn.

Two groups lent themselves readily to this sort of uncontrolled mob action. One comprised the Indian population, who could grab more in 5 minutes than they could possibly obtain in any other way during all the balance of their lives.

The second was made up of youngsters from 13 to 17 years old. Hundreds of them joined in the disorder. Meanwhile attempts were made to start outbreaks simultaneously in several other Latin American nations. This could not have been possible without detailed advance planning.

Not without reason is Bogota called the "Athens of Latin America." Its leaders of all factions perceived the necessity of putting down this attempt at revolution. They have succeeded and have made it possible for the Pan-American Conference to continue. Some of these men I met during the Inter-American Press Congress in Bogota 17 months ago. They are intelligent patriots who understand that revolution is not the way to reform.

They are also smart enough to understand how narrow an escape their nation had. They are tremendously shocked, I know, by the realization that in their very midst a foreign-dominated group had been planning all the details of revolution for many months.

And some folks are naive enough to believe that the same activity has not been going on right here in the United States, and especially in the vital State of Michigan.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

By invitation of the gentleman from Kansas, Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I

had the privilege of joining the subcommittee which made a week's survey of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. Hearings were held at Amarillo and El Paso, Tex., and Juarez and Chihuahua, Mexico.

Much has been written about the program of foot-and-mouth disease. It was unfortunate that the poor cooperation between our country and Mexico caused the original program to fail. It failed because it was impossible to continue a slaughter and burying program of the diseased and infected cattle. It must be understood that the primary essential part of the economy of the Mexican peon is his oxen, cow, and goat. To kill these animals without an immediate replacement meant that his family would starve. The Mexican Government found it was impossible to continue such a slaughtering of the animals which belonged to these small land owners without facing a complete disruption of their economy and even a revolution in Mexico.

It might also be cited that the mules which this country assisted Mexico in replacing the oxen that had been killed, have not proven satisfactory. The mule needs grain and hay. He has to be tethered at night. The oxen, after a day's work could be turned out to graze, but they always return in the early morning for water and another day's work. This is not true of the mule. He simply disappears. Many of these mules have died because of the lack of feed. It seems impossible to change the habits of the Indian and the Mexican who for hundreds of years have depended upon the oxen and the old Egyptian plow. The tractors we sent to Mexico were not satisfactory. They needed repairs. They need gasoline and oil which are not to be had. The ground, in most instances, is so stony that the use of the tractor is prohibited.

In driving some 300 miles into Mexico one finds that the cattle of northern Mexico are very thin. The land has been overgrazed because there was no place to take the surplus cattle. Drought has added to their miseries. It is estimated that nearly 500,000 cattle may starve to death unless rain comes within a short time.

Mexico has set up a number of canning factories—some of them very modern and able to handle several thousand head of cattle a day. The cattle they are presently killing, after a careful scraping of the bones for all the meat, yield about 150 to 200 pounds of meat. It is not, at present, a very profitable operation. The only salvation for the cattlemen in northern Mexico is that of sending their cattle to canning factories or through a sharp freezing of meat which may be exported to other countries.

The canning industry of northern Mexico has the complaint that our Department of Agriculture insists that the meat put in cans must be cooked for 90 minutes at 260 degrees, while that from Argentina, where the live virus prevails, is cooked only 40 minutes at 170°. The canned meat from Argentina comes to this country while the Mexican meat is barred. Some of this difficulty seems to come from the fact that the Mexican Government has not adopted certain sanitary standards for the canning of their meat. They also complain that the price received by Argentina is more than they are permitted.

The Commodity Credit Corporation seems to control the price of the meat. At their suggestion I have sent a letter to the head of the Bureau of Animal Industry suggesting that he review the regulations with a view to keeping them more in balance with those of Argentina.

Mexico, heretofore, has sent between five hundred and seven hundred thousand cattle into the United States. That can no longer be permitted because of the danger of bringing foot-and-mouth disease into this country. The State of Chihuahua and, in fact, all the Northern States of Mexico are guarding very carefully their own borders. No cattle are permitted to move from one State to another. It is a precaution the cattlemen themselves are taking to protect their herds. The herds in northern Mexico are well blooded—generally the white face or some other type of well-blooded cattle. The Mexican cattlemen made no suggestions that they should permit their cattle coming into the United States. They have accepted the inevitable and are trying to make the best of a rather bad situation.

The cattlemen in Mexico are giving 100 percent cooperation with our country in an attempt to keep the disease below the buffer zone. The procedure being followed at the present time is that of establishing a buffer zone near the upper level of the diseased territory. This zone is about 300 miles south of Brownsville and about 800 miles south of El Paso, Tex. This zone is 30 or 40 miles wide. The program calls for cattle being cleaned out of the zone, and when it is clean, new cattle are brought to the area. The zone is then moved farther south in an attempt to clean up all infected stock.

They are also using a vaccine which gives the animals an average of about 6 months' immunity against the disease. The use of a vaccine is of dubious value. The Mexican soldiers are guarding the line and putting up the buffer-zone fences across Mexico. All cattle getting across this zone are promptly killed, for which no indemnity is paid.

It is my understanding that Guatemala on the south has a similar buffer zone. It is my belief that if the disease breaks out in northern Mexico and gets near our border that the proper procedure would be to clean out an area 50 miles wide on our own side and kill all cloven-hoofed animals who enter this zone. This would be severe medicine, but it takes severe measures to handle so treacherous a disease.

I do feel that one of the big causes of the failure in Mexico was that of not having a competent supervisor with authority to carry out a good program. Such a man has been suggested to the Secretary of Agriculture. It is hoped that he will make the nomination promptly in order that a sound disease-eradication program can be put into effect. The cause of much of the failure to date can be charged against our own Department of Agriculture because of the short-sighted unbusiness like and, yes, undiplomatic type of program, they are trying to force on the sovereign people of Mexico. It should be remembered that the level of understanding is very low in Mexico. The Indian and the Mexican just could not understand why his oxen, cow, and goat should be slaughtered, when no immediate provision was made to supply their families, with the meat and milk they required. It meant starvation for that family. A long-term educational program must be conducted if the proper understanding of the foot-and-mouth disease is to be had.

It is my opinion that the present number of United States employees in Mexico could be drastically reduced. The killing program is no longer being carried out and the work should be greatly lightened. I also feel that if this country became arbitrary and coercive in their attitudes toward Mexico that the Mexican Government might eventually invite the United States employees engaged in eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease to go home. I believe this because they did stop the killing program. It is a delicate proposition when dealing with a sovereign country and writing directives which are not to the liking of the countries involved. Some of these recommendations must proceed at the top level, with the State Department and the President participating.

There is another item, Mr. Speaker, that deserves the attention of the Congress. We found that the United States maintains three patrols along the Mexican borders. The Immigration Patrol under the Justice Department; the Customs Patrol under the Treasury Department, and the Livestock Patrol under the Agriculture Department. The latter patrol, at the present time, has about 200 men. This seems excessive due to the very few number of Mexican cattle near the United States borders. Certainly these three patrols ought to operate in complete harmony. This is not being done. There ought to be some consolidation of patrols in the interest of economy and efficient operation.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity of joining with the subcommittee in the study of foot-and-mouth disease. I believe, as a physician, I can appreciate some of the problems facing the veterinarian profession in their efforts to eradicate foot-and-mouth disease. It is my considered judgment that this virus, has reached its peak in Mexico and is now loosing its grip.

I can remember in this country when influenza swept our Nation and a great many of our people had the disease. There were many deaths. It reached its peak within a few months and gradually declined. Today one seldom thinks or hears about the epidemic of influenza. The same can be said of other virus diseases which affect the human race. These germs can become active and again infect large groups of people. We should also remember that it takes but 2 or 3 years until we get an entire new group of cloven-hoofed animals in a territory. These animals could likewise be infected by the carriers remaining in the territory. It seems quite likely very few new cases of foot-and-mouth disease will appear in Mexico, during the next year.

Unless this country is eternally alert, it may lull us to sleep and eventually we could have a carrier in the United States and a full-blown epidemic. Our livestock are not immune to this virus as the stock in other countries where they have had the disease for many years seem to be immune.

The one great hope as I see it is that of pushing forward with a scientific laboratory which will eventually produce a vaccine which will not only cure but prevent this dread disease. The Congress has taken the step to erect such a laboratory. I am confident that we will get the same results as we did with the Rinderpest disease. A vaccine was produced in less than 2 years which completely mastered this almost otherwise 100-percent fatal disease in livestock. I have every confidence that our scientific men working together can get just as positive results with foot-and-mouth disease.

Truman Should Talk to Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter from Mrs. Anna Nelson Clausen, of Kimballton, Iowa.

No doubt there are some who will not agree with all of Mrs. Clausen's suggestions and observations. I am sure, however, that every sound-thinking American feels, as does Mrs. Clausen, that President Truman should have talked to Joe Stalin face to face long ago. Why not, Mr. President?

KIMBALLTON, IOWA, *April 1, 1948.*

Mr. BEN F. JENSEN,
Congressman, Seventh District,
Washington, D. C.:

I am writing this letter to you, but also ask you to read it in Congress and also present it to Mr. Truman. I am deeply grieved that our President is preparing for a third world war.

Do you or anyone else think Roosevelt would have done that? No; he would himself have gone directly to Russia and try to seek an understanding instead of threaten to make war against the Russians. Is this not a disgrace to the United States, when God saved them from all destruction and gave them victory that they now start preparing for a third world war? Should this Government of ours not learn to make peace instead of war? Are there no Christians or God-fearing people in our Government? It is about time that our President set aside some days for prayer for world peace instead of calling all our 18-year-olds in for training, and they have to fight for what this Nation's leaders and others can't agree about. In this supposed-to-be civilized day and age they still just kill people to have peace. If they now start again, is there much for the mothers of the United States to live for, when they take the boys that now grow up, the ones that did come safely home? What is peace to these mothers when you, our Government, just take them out for slaughter as we do hogs and cattle?

I think it would be wonderful if our President would go across and talk to the rulers of other countries, especially Russia. Why is it our innocent boys always have to go to war to save our money-mad men and profiteers who want war and also our big Army men who don't want to do other work than just prepare for war? If our rulers of this Nation and others of the other lands who can't agree had to go to the front and fight it out among themselves I wonder if there would be war? No, never, no.

How much better it would be if they would send food and clothing to all those starved people. And, for goodness sake, bring our American occupation army and all Americans home and quit sending war material over there, and then send them some missionaries to teach them God's word. But, no; our Government never does anything like that. Palm Sunday I was listening to a Lutheran minister from Waterloo speaking to a confirmation class. He said, "If there ever was a hell on earth, we are living in it right now," and he said he did not mean gangsters and criminals of the underworld, but he meant the way our Government was run. As he spoke to these boys and girls, he spoke of how little they had to look forward to if we were getting ready for another war.

Is it not terrible to think that all the mothers and wives who have gotten their dear ones home again now have to look forward to see them go again? What of all those poor innocent boys who lost their lives in the last war? Certainly they could not have fought for freedom. How great was the talk of how wonderful when we could again live in peace. How can Mr. Truman expect people to vote for him when he is for war?

Our President should be a man who could show other nations the way to peace, instead of showing that we want war.

I have been president of the Amvets Auxiliary for 2 years and have visited hospitals where all those poor helpless boys lay and will suffer for the rest of their lives, and, oh, all the help that they need at these hospitals from auxiliaries. Why don't our President and other leaders from Washington, D. C., go visit these hospitals and then think and work up a way for peace, instead of training more boys for war? It is high time our Government turns more to God to help it in dealing with other countries. Why can't our Government let other countries run their own business? Our rulers would not want other countries to come here and run theirs. Why not do unto others as you would have them do unto you? And why not outlaw the manufacture of the atom bomb, which will mean the end of America as well as other lands, and, please remember, they might fall on Washington, D. C., as well as on the people in the country.

I am enclosing a clipping from a church paper and also a piece from the Shoppers' Guide of Audubon, Iowa, and a piece written by Wallace from the Des Moines Register. He may not be just what our Government needs, but he surely is bringing the truth to the people. If he was good enough to be Mr. Roosevelt's helper, he should also have a chance to come out and tell the truth—but how the truth does hurt. We surely do need a clean-up in our Government, as all we hear wherever we go is just war talk. It's enough to make all mothers and wives crazy.

Please, Mr. JENSEN, as you are a man from our own country, do help get these troubles of this Nation settled, and do, please, get some understanding with Russia for peace.

This letter may not be written too well; but again I want to tell you the mothers of America or other countries don't want war—only our money-mad men in the East want it.

I expect an answer to this letter soon.

Yours truly,

MRS. ANNA NELSON CLAUSEN,
(Just a Danish Lutheran woman member of the Elk Horn Lutheran Church).

Alarm Over Nazi Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 28, 1948:

ALARM OVER NAZI CARTELS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The apparent trend in our policy in Germany toward collaborating with cartelists, industrialists, and bankers who helped to promote the Nazi onslaught upon the world has reached the point that Senators who are aware of the dangerous implications of such a course are becoming disturbed and aroused.

One, Senator KILGORE, Democrat, of West Virginia, went to the White House to call President Truman's attention to recent developments in Germany, among them the order by Gen. Lucius Clay, American Administrator, that very nearly nullifies our policy established by Congress for breaking up the great monopolies and cartels. This order, as was revealed here a few days ago, was protested by 19 members of the American Military Government's Decartelization Branch. They said it was represented as having been approved in principle by the State Department.

Also disturbed by developments in Germany is Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming.

The developing situation has become particularly important because of the European recovery program which includes Germany and which must not be used to revive the cartel system and restore to power those who worked hand in glove with Adolf Hitler. Senator KILGORE is anxious that the ERP set-up here under Paul Hoffman include persons familiar with the cartel system, its key figures, and how they operate, so this danger can be avoided.

News dispatches from American correspondents in Germany bring further corroboration of the trend in policy that is disturbing Members of Congress. Two of the most powerful banking figures of the Hitler regime are about to assume important roles in the new trizonal bank of the German states. Herman Abs, a former director of the Deutsche Bank, has been selected by the board of directors as president of the new bank, and August Schniewind, formerly a director of the Reichsbank, as chairman of the board. While their selection is subject to approval by the tripartite Allied Banking Commission, the dispatches report that this is expected.

All this is strange and amazing. For a report nearly a year ago by General Clay on an exhaustive investigation made for him identified Herman Abs as an influential member of the Deutsche Bank when it was operating as an economic arm of the Wehrmacht in exploiting the resources of occupied Europe and as a key figure in the seizure of French and Belgian properties in Luxemburg, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia.

Other dispatches tell of further developments in the protest of General Clay by 19 Decartelization Branch members. The Deputy Military Governor of the American Zone, Maj. Gen. George P. Hays, has issued a memorandum accusing the 19 of being disloyal for their protest. When this provoked an uproar among other officials the general hastened to say this did not mean they were

un-American or affiliated with communism, but that what he meant was that continued criticism of policy by those by whom it was to be carried out was disloyal. Two of the 19, Francis W. Laurent and W. Johnston Avery, have resigned. They formerly worked under Thurman Arnold here in the Justice Department's antitrust division.

Even the Pilgrims Learned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from one of the prominent papers of my congressional district, the Plymouth Mail, of Plymouth, Mich., entitled "Even the Pilgrims Learned—If You Want To Eat, You Must Produce." There is so much good Americanism and common sense in it that I believe it merits careful reading and consideration.

Early Pilgrims were communistic—land was tilled by everyone; everyone shared the harvest equally.

It failed. It always does; you can't change human nature.

The starving Pilgrims begged help from capitalistic Britain. That always happens too. But help was too far away.

So, in 1623, the Pilgrims got wise. They allotted land on which "every man was to set corne for his owne perticuler." The opportunity for work was there; if they didn't take it they were told they wouldn't eat.

The profit system worked wonders as it always does if it isn't tampered with—more land was planted, it was cultivated better, the people "wente willingly into ye field to set corne," they had their biggest harvest—and the colony, perhaps America itself, was saved from starvation and death.

It is exactly the same today: the more you produce efficiently, the more you have. You cannot get something for nothing. Since time began, efficient production is the only security any man can ever have.

Yes, the time is near when we must declare that we are for free America or we are for Russian slavery. There is going to be no middle-of-the-road business about this question.

In Support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a telegram that I received today from the mayor of Detroit and other prominent citizens of Detroit, in support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; also, two editorials that appeared in the Detroit News:

DETROIT, MICH., *April 27, 1948.*
Congressman GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

To make Detroit a better place to live and to help solve Detroit's critical housing shortage we urge your unqualified support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill without crippling amendments.

Eugene J. Van Antwerp, Mayor of the City of Detroit; Henry Fink, President, Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.; Walter P. Reuther, President, UAW-CIO; Harry S. Toy, Police Commissioner, City of Detroit; Dr. V. E. Blue, Personnel Director, Chrysler Corp.; George Edwards, President, Detroit Common Council; Mrs. Zao Woodford Schroeder, President, Detroit Federation of Women's Clubs; Frank X. Martel, President, American Federation of Labor; Ben Levinson, President, Michigan Mortgage Corp; William J. Norton, Director, Children's Fund of Michigan; Hon. Judge Ira W. Jayne, Circuit Court; Eero Saarinen, Saarinen & Saarinen; Patrick V. McNamara; Leon B. Gridley, Director, Servicemen's Bureau; Hon. Judge Paul Krause, Recorder's Court; Robert McWilliams, President, Junior Board of Commerce; Rev. Raymond E. Clancy, Archdiocese of Detroit; Hon. Judge William Cody, Circuit Court; Alvin E. Harley, Harley, Ellington & Day; August Scholle, President, Michigan CIO; Hon. Judge Carl Weideman, Circuit Court; Rabbi Leon Fram, Temple Israel; H. Augustus O'Dell, O'Dell, Hewlett & Luckenbach; Hon. Judge Louis J. Schneider, Circuit Court; Amadeo Leone Smith, Hinchman & Grylls; Rev. Dr. O. E. Starrett, Central Methodist Church; Helen Fasset, City Plan Commissioner; Mrs. Mary M. Streit, Secretary, Thirteenth Congressional District Republican Organization; Hon. Judge Arthur Sempliner, Circuit Court; Clair W. Ditchy, Secretary, Detroit Citizens' Housing & Planning Council; Robert W. Kelso, President, Detroit Citizens Housing and Planning Council; Elmer Kiehler, C. Howard Crane Associates, Inc.; Rev. Robert L. Bradby, President, NAACP; Dr. Bruce Douglas, Health Commissioner; Branson Gamber, Derrick & Gamber; Edgar M. Branigan, County Clerk, Wayne County.

[From the Detroit News]
FOR MORE HOUSING

As a matter of Republican policy, determined by the Senate GOP policy committee, whose chairman is Senator TAFT, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill was scheduled for the Senate's consideration. When it passed the Senate Thursday, not a vote was cast against it.

Practically the same bill died in the House once and, by present indications, it may die there again.

The House GOP policy makers will be shortsighted to the point of blindness if they bury or materially cut this measure.

The housing shortage has grown worse and costs of homes have gone sky high while Congress, through 2 years, failed to provide Government backing of a postwar housing program.

Considered as a 10-year plan, the goal 15,000,000 new city and farm homes, the benefits seem afar off.

Its liberalized provisions for home loans and for insuring loans would be immediately effective.

The assurance it gives of Government aid of slum clearance would be particularly welcome in Detroit.

Authorization of more Government housing projects, to contain 500,000 low-cost units, the most controversial feature, doesn't go far in that direction. We believe that, like the Senate, the House also should take this step to make low-rent homes available and put a brake on construction costs.

The Senate voted 49 to 35 to keep the public-housing section in the bill.

The measure's encouragement of privately financed housing is designed to assist low-cost building chiefly. The GOP Congress cannot creditably quit its job in this campaign year without taking comprehensive and definitely promising action to relieve the nationwide housing shortage.

[From the Detroit News]
AS WE SEE IT

The Senate finally has passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, but known opposition to the measure in the House suggests it has a long, hard pull before becoming law.

Basically, the TEW bill is a recognition that housing, as a social problem, has outgrown the ability of both private enterprise and local government to cope with. This does not, however, suggest to us, as its enemies charge, that the measure is socialistic. The Federal Government interests itself in construction of roads and aids to education. Are these more vital to the public health and welfare than adequate housing?

From the standpoint of exclusively public housing the TEW bill provides only for construction of 100,000 low-rent units a year for 5 years. This is not an elaborate program.

A much more important feature is a provision whereby slum areas can be cleared and rehabilitated through deflating land values and enabling private enterprise to carry on large-scale construction programs with assurance of a reasonable rate of return. That is a long way from being socialistic.

The measure, if it becomes law, should do a lot for Detroit. But we will have to contain our enthusiasm, for a long time—until the attitude of the House is considerably changed.

Appeal for an Undivided Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the partition of the historic Irish Nation is a question that is engaging the minds of thoughtful people not only in Ireland, Britain, and the United States, but even throughout Western Europe.

The importance of this question not only from the point of view of the Irish people, but having regard to the interests of the United States, cannot be stressed too much. On April 3 last at the Hotel Astor in New York City more than 2,600 people sat down to luncheon to welcome Hon. Eamon De Valera, T. D. Among those who addressed the gathering in tribute of welcome to the Irish leader were Very Rev. Robert I. Gannon, president of Fordham University, Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, and Col. Martin H. Meaney, commanding officer of the old Sixty-ninth Regiment, New York. His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman delivered the invocation at the function.

Mr. Speaker, in the disturbed conditions of the world today, I am sure that

the great majority of our fellow citizens favor the reunification of Ireland and the abolition of the border which separates 6 counties from 23 counties of that historic land. The ties that bind the peoples of the United States and Ireland are strong and enduring. The traditional friendship of the Irish Nation for the United States has been strengthened through the generations by the contribution of the sons and daughters of Ireland in the building of our Republic. In the anxious days that lie ahead, I think that a statesmanlike effort should be made to restore "The Lost Province" to Ireland. It will be an evidence of good faith on Britain's part, and it will be of immeasurable benefit in cementing the good relations that should exist between the free democracies of the Western World.

Eamon De Valera, a native-born New Yorker, has captured the imagination of our people even as he holds a strong place in the affections of the Irish people everywhere for his 30-year fight for the unity and independence of Ireland. He states a clear and convincing case for the abolition of the partition of Ireland and has offered a statesmanlike solution for the reunification of his country. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. De Valera at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on April 3, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, your Eminence, Excellencies, Right Reverend and Reverend Fathers, ladies and gentlemen, I want at the outset to express my thanks to the committee that has arranged for this very distinguished gathering in this room. I know the trouble they must have taken to succeed as they have succeeded.

I know that it is not the first time that a New York committee has arranged to give me a reception; and, indeed, I was very sorry that they had that trouble on two or three occasions without result, because it was not possible for me to come. When I got the invitation recently to come to this country I gladly availed myself of it. I wanted to see the friends of Ireland here, and I wanted to see a number of the old friends who, during the years that had intervened, never ceased to show their interest in our cause.

In my talks here in the United States I have generally selected two topics and attempted to deal with both in the same speech. I have found, however, that to do so meant keeping my audience inordinately long. You naturally would like to know what is the situation in Ireland today, and how the present position has been secured. You would like to get some details of the history of the struggle. I know that it will be particularly interesting, and I am always tempted to give it. But on this occasion I will confine myself rather to the second topic; namely, the position as it now is.

The present and the future are the things that matter most in a time like the present. History can be safely left to look after itself. The story of the efforts that were made in Ireland will be available to you, I have no doubt, otherwise than from my lips, although I, having been, so to speak, at the center, have perhaps a more intimate knowledge than many could have.

IRELAND'S STATUS

Now the position in Ireland today is this: We in the 26 counties of Ireland are as free as the people in any country in the world. That part of Ireland is completely free. We may make our own laws, choose our own policies, mold our destiny insofar as it is permitted to human beings to do that.

The aim of our people throughout their long struggle has been achieved so far as that part of Ireland is concerned. Our constitution declares us to be a sovereign, independent, democratic state. We are all that. And if we could say that of the whole of our country, then we could truly say that the aspirations of the Irish people have been achieved. [Applause.]

Unfortunately, we cannot say that. Our country has been cut in two. Six of the 32 counties of Ireland have been cut off, without any reference to the people of Ireland. The people of Ireland in a plebiscite held in the general elections, which were indeed a plebiscite, held in the year 1918, by an overwhelming majority, decided to declare their independence and to establish a republic, a republic for the whole of Ireland. [Applause.] The vote was overwhelming. The vote took place at a time, you will remember, when the world had been listening for several years, during World War I, to the declarations of the various powers involved in the war to the effect that the war was being fought for the freedom of all small nations, to see that no nation should have the right to extend its policies over another nation, but that each nation would be permitted to choose its own policy, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid.

WILSON DOCTRINE

These were the words, you will remember of your own President—President Wilson. These words and these ideals stirred the imagination of the people of the whole world. They saw in them a hope of getting a real foundation for peace, a peace that might endure, a peace, at any rate, that was not going to be threatened by the natural desire of a nation held in subjection to get its rightful freedom.

And, mind you, it was not merely the President of the United States who held these ideals. These ideals were held and these statements made by the statesmen of Britain; and made also by the statesmen of France. It was at that time, then, that the Irish people determined to form an independent republic. But these principles that were so eloquently enunciated were not going to be put into practice. We in Ireland had to struggle and to endure great suffering before these principles would be admitted, even for 26 of our counties. But they were denied to us by partition. Our country was cut in two by an act of the British Parliament passed in the year 1920. Six of the counties were cut off.

Now, these six counties were not cut off on any just principle. A suggestion is made by the propagandists that there is in that part of Ireland a different people; that there is something peculiar in the inhabitants of that part of Ireland which distinguishes them from the inhabitants of the rest of Ireland.

There is no truth in that.

The fact is that in Ireland—we are, in all Ireland, mixed. You will find there the blood of the ancient Celts, mixed with the blood of the Norman, the Saxon, and even the Dane. We are mixed throughout the country as a whole. It is inevitable that after some seven or eight hundred years of possession, domination, invasion, implantation by another power, that should be so. So that there is in fact no racial difference between the people who inhabit the 26 counties and those who inhabit the country as a whole. [Applause.]

An excuse, of course, had to be given. But the fact is that this partition of our country had its origin in British party politics and in nothing else. Those of you who know English history, the history of the end of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, would know the Tories opposed the granting of home rule in Ireland, and the liberals, under Gladstone, supported by the Irish Party under Parnell wanted home rule. The Tories at that time, to defeat their rival party, the liberals, raised the cry, "Ulster will fight, and Ulster will be right." That cry was fairly effective. But, just before World War I, the people of Britain were converted by a majority to the cause of home rule for Ireland. It was true that it was a limited measure, yet in quick time a home rule bill was passed. But the Tories, to prevent it from being put into effect, again raised the old cry, "Ulster will fight," and they set out to arm their supporters in the northern part of Ireland, because there are—well, a greater number of Tory supporters in that part of Ireland than in any other. They set out to arm them for the purpose of once more preventing home rule from being granted to Ireland.

HOME RULE SUSPENDED

The result was that when World War I began home rule was suspended. The Home Rule Act was suspended, and it was suggested that four of the counties of Ireland should be excluded from its operation. The war was on: the volunteer movement had made progress. Easter week had taken place. Ireland's independence, established by a plebiscite, to which I have already referred had taken place. Ireland's independence as a republic was declared in our national capital on the 21st of January, 1919. [Applause.]

And so, when Mr. Lloyd George introduced his Partition Act, it was done after the Irish people had indicated quite clearly what their desire was. It is suggested that Ulster is the area cut off. They want to give the historic name of Ulster to that area. You know, most of you, I am sure, that the historic province of Ulster consists not of six but of nine counties, and that in cutting off six Mr. Lloyd George partitioned not merely Ireland but the province of Ulster as well.

You may ask why, as they desired to have the name Ulster for the area cut off, they did not cut off the whole province. The answer is that in the province as a whole the Tories would not have that secure majority which they desired. If they cut off the nine counties, the Tories would not be in the majority in that area.

They cut off six, because, taking the six as a whole, the concentration of Tory opinion in the city of Belfast and its neighborhood was sufficient to give them a majority in that area. It is wrong to think that there is throughout the area of the six counties a uniformly predominant political Tory opinion. That is not so. The Tory opinion is dominant—and when I say "Tory" I mean of course, partitionists, because the partitionists began with the Tories, and it was really a Tory device—so those who support partition I shall continue to call Tories; because to call them Unionists might suggest that they were in favor of the union of Ireland.

These Tories are in a majority only in the immediate neighborhood of the city of Belfast.

Now, if the principle on which Ireland was to be cut off was that nobody was to be included in the state—that there was no area to be included in the state in which there was a local majority against the union with the rest of the county—that could apply only to an area around Belfast; to an area that is not much more than two counties. If you were to follow me with a map and look at the parliamentary constituencies that existed before 1920, starting from the east, you would find that in South Down, in South Armagh, in the whole County of Tyrone, there are in each case local majorities that are against partition, and that desire union with their fellow countrymen. [Applause.]

It is clear, therefore, that if these were cut off, the principle is not being acted upon—the principle which they pretend to uphold the principle that in a local area—that even in a local area you shall not have in the state any people who object to being

in it. These areas comprise a total area of more than half.

Again, if you take four out of the six counties, a block of four out of the six counties you will find that in these four there is also a majority who want union with the rest of the country. Now, these areas in which there is a majority for union are areas that adjoin our territory, and if you were drawing a line on that principle that I have been indicating, the border should not run as it runs at present but would only run around Belfast.

The question is, Why are these people cut off? If it is right to say that Ulster must not be coerced, what about these people? Are they not being coerced? Are the people in South Down, South Armagh, in Tyrone, and in Fermanagh and Derry City, not being coerced at the present moment? They are, of course, being coerced. [Applause.] They are held separate from their fellow countrymen by force and by nothing else. British troops are in occupation in that area, and it is quite obvious, therefore, that, again, the principle that I have indicated is not being put into effect.

But is it a right principle in any case? Would it be right to cut up a country on the basis of such a principle? I say that if you were to accept such a principle there is no democratic state in the world that could maintain its integrity—none.

When I was here in the United States some 30 years ago I got to know something about American politics, and I was told that there were certain States in this Union which time after time voted in the same manner. They voted that way whether the majority was Democratic or Republican. For instance, Maine and Vermont, I was told [laughter] were always Republican in the majority; even though the Nation as a whole had voted for a Democratic administration. What would you think if that principle that I have been talking about were applied to your country? Do you think that the people in Maine and Vermont, because they happened time after time to differ from the majority, when the majority was a Democratic one, would be entitled to cut themselves off from the remainder of your country and attach themselves, say, to Canada? [Applause.]

Again, I heard of the solid South, and I heard of States in a bloc that, even when the majority vote was Republican in this country, still held to their old Democratic views. Do you think that you could permit the States that were of that opinion—were Democratic States—that you could permit them, even if there were a bloc of them, to cut themselves off from the Union and attach themselves, say, to Mexico? [Laughter.] Of course you wouldn't.

Of course, you know perfectly well that if you were to do that there would be an end to the union of the United States of America; that it would mean the end. And, of course, in our case it is precisely the same. We cannot admit that principle.

But we do say that the principle, even, is not applied; that coercion, which is supposed to be the thing that is not to be used, is, in fact, being used against the people in at least one-half of the area of the six counties. [Applause.]

Another thing would follow, of course, if you were to attempt to work on that principle, and that is that you would very rapidly find yourself in an absurd position, because in no case would you find opinion so homogeneous as to be absolutely the same in any one area. You will find within any region areas that are, by a majority, partitionists; you will find within it an area where there is a minority opposed to partition. And if you choose out that particular area, there would be a majority in that area; and then you would have a continual process of cutting off one section within another.

As I say, the principle is one which would reduce democracy to an absurdity. But it is not applied even to the extent to which it could be applied; and, in any case, we do not admit it as a just principle.

IRISH OWN IRELAND

The position, then, in Ireland is that this ancient nation of ours, that has been one through all its history, has been cut in two. Read the history of Ireland from the beginning, from the earliest recorded history of Ireland. Look at any map of Ireland that has been published before 1920. You won't find in that history or on that map any evidence of a division such as the division that exists there today.

The area cut off is not a historic entity. It is not a natural geographic entity. It is not an economic entity. It is not a natural entity of any kind. It is purely artificial. And is it any wonder that the people in Ireland resent that? And that they naturally resent the attitude of the powers that maintain that against their will?

Now, I was going to talk, at the beginning about the methods by which we won the freedom that we have today. And I was going to say that we have to thank for that, in the first place, the efforts and the sacrifices of the people in Ireland itself. Next, we have to thank the invaluable aid which was given to us by the friends of Ireland abroad, particularly by the friends of Ireland here in the United States of America. [Applause.]

That aid was, as I know, at particular times, vital to us. The truth would require me to say also that in the latter stages we have to thank in no small measure a more enlightened statesmanship in Britain. That is statesmanship which recognizes that a free Ireland, an Ireland that has no cause for enmity against Britain, is a far greater asset to Britain than could be an Ireland occupied by British troops, and, consequently, an Ireland that would inevitably be driven to side with Britain's foes when Britain was in danger. [Applause.]

That wiser statesmanship was responsible for our being able to end the quarrel with Britain so far as the 26 counties are concerned. But so long as the same old domination continues as far as a part of Ireland is concerned, so long will there be in Ireland a natural desire to drive the English out. [Applause.] And for that purpose there will naturally be an inclination on the part of people—a large number of them—to think that that can be done only by a defeat of Britain.

POSITION DANGEROUS

Now, we are in a very dangerous position in the world today. We are drifting into world war—into another war. The world is going into world war III. The word "drifting," indeed, I suppose, is not an appropriate word; because, to an average person, it would seem that we are dashing into world war III with sails full set.

We in Ireland are likely to have made upon us in world war III the same demands or the same appeals as were made in World War I and in World War II. No question has been asked me since I came to the United States of America more frequently than this: What will Ireland do in case of another war?

I have had to point out that the decision in that matter is a decision which must be taken by the representatives of the Irish people when the time comes and in the light of all the circumstances. I have had to point out that the decision of a small nation to join in a war is no light one.

The decision of small nations to join in a war is fraught with far graver consequences than those which might follow such a decision on the part of a great nation. In the case of a small nation, unable to provide its own means of defense, it has to beg for everything that it requires, and it will not get the things necessary for its defense, and it will not get these things unless the great powers think it serves their purpose to give them; that it helps toward the winning of the war from their point of view. When the war is in progress the big nations can influence its conduct; the small nation is dragged along at the heels of the greater nations. It has no power to determine how the war should be conducted. And if the side on which it has fought should be victorious, it has no power whatever to determine what should be the conditions of the peace.

That is not so with the greater nations, who have in their own strength the power to determine whether the things for which they fight will be the things which will be secured in victory or not. A small nation has no such power.

Again, if it is defeated, a small nation can be utterly destroyed, effaced from the earth. A large nation, a great nation, is in no such danger. It may suffer defeat, but its very size is a guaranty of its ultimate survival.

So that you see when small nations go to war it is for them a matter literally of life and death. It is, therefore, not a light matter, and it certainly is not a matter in which anybody, in advance of the actual circumstances, should dare to pronounce his opinion. I am not going to pronounce any opinion as to what Ireland would do in a coming war.

But this I do know, that in the First World War we were asked and told to enter the fight for the freedom of small nations. We knew that those who asked us—at least some of those who asked us—could not be sincere in their pretense that that was really what they were fighting for. Because if they were sincere, they could give freedom to one small nation—one of the oldest of the small nations—without shedding a single drop of blood or waging war with anybody. [Applause.]

WAR POSITION

We had something of the same situation in World War II. Isn't it quite clear that if we in Ireland see the rights of small nations trampled upon, we are not likely to believe the professions of those who trample upon these rights and at the same time say that they are out championing the rights of small nations? [Applause.] It is similarly true that if we hear people championing democracy as a form of human political organization, and if they say that they stand for the democratic rights of peoples, while at the same time they in practice flout these principles, as I have indicated they have been flouted in the six counties of Ireland, we think it unreasonable to believe what they say.

[There were cries of "No" from the audience.]

Do you think it reasonable that we should think of them as engaged in a crusade for democracy? [More cries of "No."] It is quite clear that the Irish people would be fools if they allowed themselves to be deceived simply by professions of that kind.

Now, I have said that democracy is flouted in the six counties. I have given you certain indications of it. I will give you, perhaps to drive the matter home, one or two others. I have told you that in the areas which I have mentioned, in four of the six counties and in the parliamentary constituencies of South Down, South Armagh, Tyrone, Fermanagh, and Derry City, there are Nationalist majorities; that is, majorities in favor of union with the rest of the country. There is a system of local government in these areas.

Would you not expect that, there being Nationalist majorities, the local councils in these areas would reflect that, and would have Nationalist majorities? But that is not, in fact, the case. I will take a few examples. I would like you to believe that they are not examples specially chosen—specially selected, or exceptional examples.

I am going to take only three. I could have got 23 instead of 3. I am going to take a city, a northern town, and a rural area, as examples of the areas to which I have been referring.

Take for instance, Derry City. In Derry City there are 27,000 Nationalists and only 18,000 Tories; 27,000 Nationalists; 18,000 Tories. You would expect that the local council, the city council, would have a Nationalist majority. But it has not. The 27,000 can elect only 8 representatives, whereas the 18,000 elect 12.

GERRYMANDERING

How is that done? By a system of gerrymandering. I believe you know what that means. Twenty-seven thousand can get only eight representatives; 18,000 get 12. That means that one Tory vote is as good as two Nationalist votes. Is that democracy? [Cries of "No" from the audience.] Will those who stand for that and maintain it set themselves up as champions of democracy? And, if they do, are we supposed to believe them? [More cries of "No" from the audience.]

In the town of Dungannon, the urban area of Dungannon, there are 1,900 Nationalist votes and only 1,800 Tory votes. By some exception, in an exceptional case, you might possibly think there would be a Tory majority. But you would not expect to have a Tory majority regularly. However, 1,900 Nationalists can elect only 7 representatives; whereas 1,800 Tories can elect 14. Again you have a case where one Tory vote counts as much as two Nationalist votes.

Now let me take a third example, the Castle Derring rule area. There there are over 5,000—I needn't give you the figures—somewhat over 5,000 Nationalist votes. There are under 5,000 Tory votes. But the 5,000 and over Nationalists can only get 6 representatives; and the under 5,000 can get 16. There, again, you have an example of where one Tory vote counts for more than two Nationalist votes.

That is secured by a system of gerrymandering which is universal throughout the area, a system that is blatantly acted upon. Do you think that we can believe those who are responsible for that are truly champions of democracy? [Cries of "No" from the audience.] I am sure that nobody who knows the facts will blame the Irish people if they are skeptical about all professions of championing the rights of small nations, when our small nation, that has been one for all its history, has been cut in two; and that they will be doubtful of all who talk about democracy when they continue to see democracy flouted as it is in this particular area.

IRISH SENTIMENT

There is no doubt about Irish sentiment; there is no doubt about Irish ideals. We, really, in Ireland, do stand for the freedom of small nations. We, really, in Ireland, do stand for democracy. [Applause.] We, in Ireland, are prepared to join any world organization based upon these principles—that acts upon these principles. And we are prepared to take our part in any combination of states that will put these principles into practice. [Great applause.] But we are not prepared to allow ourselves to be deceived or to be made fools of.

As I said, we are facing a very dangerous condition in the world today. It is a terrible thing to think that after two World Wars, which should have taught us human beings a lesson, we are just resigning ourselves to a third. I did not have, I must say, personally, very much hope in the new organization that succeeded this last war, the UNO. [Applause.] It lacked the one thing that was necessary, the one thing that was essential, and that was good will on the part of its members. That good will was apparently absent from the beginning, and it is idle, then, to think that an organization of that kind, when good will is lacking, can effect any useful purpose.

I have said a few times that I was rather glad that we had not been elected to the UNO, for the reason that, if we had, I was afraid that I would, as the representative of Ireland, be found leading the way in breaking up UNO [applause], because I felt that it was dangerous to have an organization of that sort when the organization was clearly not going to do the things which were originally intended it should do.

The League of Nations might have achieved success. I, for one, did not think that the absence of any particular state, even the United States, necessarily vitiated the League of Nations. I knew that the United States was likely always to be on the side of the preservation of peace and the maintenance of world order, and although the United States [applause] was not a member of the League of Nations, I always counted it as a member when anything vital was concerned. It was a tremendous thing to have in the League of Nations a number of states in Europe already banded together—already cooperating, even to the extent that the Charter of the League of Nations required them to cooperate. That was a tremendous step in the advance; and the thing that was wrong, in my opinion, with the League of Nations at that particular time, was that it adhered to the penal clauses of the Versailles Treaty. If the Versailles Treaty had been separated quickly from the League of Nations, then the League of Nations, in my opinion, would have promised far higher hopes than anything the UNO has ever promised, because, after the last war, at any rate, the victors were of one general mind and that is not the case today.

RUSSIA WAR THREAT

Well, then, I do not see how we are going to get an organization that will give us peace. Every nation is troubled. We in Ireland are troubled, naturally. The small nations run, as I have said, always greater dangers than the big nations run. We can only hope and pray that those in whose power this terrible issue lies, will be wise.

I cannot understand why Russia, for example, is acting as she is acting. I can speak freely, because I know nothing more than the average man knows; but it seems to me that the action of Russia today is bringing war closer, and making it inevitable. If we could get the people in Russia and elsewhere to realize that this thing does mean war and could get them to realize that unless the rights of nations be respected, they will be involved in another war—a war which will have consequences even more disastrous than those of the war through which we have just passed—there might be a solution.

It is, then, a time for us in Ireland, of very grave anxiety. We want to play our part in the world in trying to bring about a better world, and we appeal to all those who are themselves outraging the principles for which we would like to stand, to give up outraging these principles; to admit the right of Ireland, as the right of other people, to their freedom; to admit that democracy ought to work in Ireland as it works elsewhere.

That is the request that I have to make on behalf of our people. I would like our position to be understood by the people of the United States. I would like our friends in the United States to use their influence to see that the wrong is righted. [Applause.]

PEACE HOPE

It will mean peace anyhow, if it is righted—peace between two neighboring peoples, the peoples of the two islands, Ireland and Britain; two islands off the coast of Europe, two islands from which as mother lands, a large part of the world has been colonized. Peace between these two nations would mean a great deal. To bring about that peace, all that is necessary is again to respect certain fundamental principles.

Doesn't it appear absurd to any who looks at it, to see an effort being made to unite Europe today—nations that have been separated for centuries—to try to unite these people who have many divergent interests, to try to unite these; while at the same time you separate and tear away something that is already naturally one?

We, in Ireland, look with suspicion upon the efforts that are made to get rid of customs values, and so on between nations when a customs value has been inflicted upon us. These things that are done against us can be righted without shedding one drop of blood—without doing damage to anybody—if a good example is shown in that it is possible that that good example might be acted upon elsewhere. [Applause.] But the wrong that is done is an excuse for wrong elsewhere.

And again I say we are asking our friends in this country to try to use their influence to bring about justice—justice for our Nation and for our people.

I am very glad that I have had this opportunity of coming to the United States. I regret that my coming should put our friends to so much bother. But I do believe that they have been willing to do it, and that you have been willing to sacrifice your time to come here because you love that ancient Ireland of ours which has stood throughout the centuries against oppression—which has refused to allow itself to disappear as a nation; which has refused to allow itself to be absorbed by a neighboring nation. Because you love that country, I feel that I am not altogether unjustified in asking so much pains from you. [Prolonged applause.]

Prevention of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a large delegation of people from Los Angeles has arrived in Washington to urge that some constructive procedure be followed by the United States in order to establish permanent world peace. This delegation is made up of 48 serious-minded loyal American citizens who are deeply concerned with the fear that our present foreign policy and our preparations for national defense may lead to war which might otherwise be avoided if we proceeded along constructive diplomatic lines with less evidence of power politics and military preparedness. Four members of this delegation headed by Dr. Robert B. Pettengill, director of the School of Social Sciences of the University of Southern California, together with Rev. Dean Johnson, Rev. William Morwin, and Mr. John Raymond called on me to discuss this question recently. A statement of what they believe should be done to bring about peaceful understanding among the nations of the world is as follows:

SPEAK UP FOR PEACE

Recent acts of our Government and of Russia have drawn our two countries closer to war.

War menaces American lives as well as American freedoms.

We have ignored the United Nations and gone backward to the old European methods of power politics and military alliances which led to World War I and World War II.

These methods will lead us to world war III. They must be changed.

Let us return instead to the American tradition of peace and justice through a federal union of nations.

In the American way, the citizens speak.

Let us organize a peace plane to carry to Washington our demand for a constructive peace program.

Our country should work through the United Nations and other international organizations to strengthen them, not outside them nor against them.

Peace requires prompt and decisive steps toward world government.

The United States should call together the nations of the world to amend the United Nations Charter. Or we should call a world constitutional convention.

Let us work through a supranational government to stop aggression and totalitarianism. Let it police the world in our stead.

This is the democratic way, the American way, the Christian way.

Our lives and our liberties are at stake.

Let us speak up while there is yet time.

They are firmly of the belief that the United Nations should be implemented, supported and strengthened so as to bring about a better understanding among the nations of the world.

I agree with them that we should use every means possible to avoid war but at the same time we must seek an honorable and respectable peace without appeasement or agreeing to concessions that will give Russia the impression that we condone or approve her evident desire to impose communism upon the nations of the world weakened by the ravages of World War II. We must not permit our national defenses to become demoralized and at the same time we should not appear among the nations of the world as if we were preparing to fight an aggressive war.

The United Nations Charter should be amended so that the use of the veto power would be much more limited than is permitted now. Russia has used the veto power promiscuously instead of judiciously and as a selfish and defensive weapon for her own interests.

One of the most illuminating statements I have read recently on preventing war is the following excellent editorial recently written by David Lawrence:

PREVENTING WAR

(By David Lawrence)

"War" is really the expression of a deep-seated impulse—the impulse to human friction. It, therefore, doesn't begin when armies open fire on one another or end when the guns are silenced. It begins in the hearts and minds of men and women long before the bugles sound and the drums play. It continues long after the last of the heroic dead have been buried or the returning armies have been demobilized.

Unless we are willing to face the true origins of war, we shall not know how to isolate the germs that make it epidemic. Unless we are willing to make searching examination of the causes of human friction, we shall not understand the cure for either external or internal war.

In a sense, we are at war every day on some front. The litigation in our courts is war. The quarrels and controversies in the home are war. The selfish search for gain at the expense of another, accompanied by an unscrupulous use of money or economic power or public power, is war. The bitter manifestation of racial, religious, or social prejudices by one class in human society against another, breeding a comparable bitterness and resentment in the bosoms of those who are the objects of such hate, is also war.

We shall not understand war between nations unless we understand friction between individuals. All the pent-up anger and indignation which the individual feels when he is the victim of what he considers to be an injustice is multiplied many times when embodied in the collective passions of an inflamed people. We have national hates just as we have individual hates. We have national selfishness and greed just as we give vent to individual selfishness and individual greed.

FACING THE TRUTH

We may concede that the world of individuals has again and again violated the Christian ethic but we at the same time must concede its perennial strength and far-reaching persistence through the centuries. Our failures, on the other hand, cannot be minimized.

We do not like truth because sometimes it is unpleasant, it is inconvenient, and also it is frequently expensive in pride as well as money. This, nevertheless, does not and cannot alter the basic principles of human ethics. We know in our consciences the difference between right and wrong, though, to be sure, we may rationalize a thousand explanations for failing to perceive that difference.

So it is with nations. We know wherein we have erred. We know full well what we neglected to do before 1939, before 1914, before these devastating fires started 'round the world. We know now every bit as much as we ever will know as to the true causes of international war. The facts are there, the truth is engraved on the tablets of history. When will we begin to admit that truth? When will we begin to see that all wars are man-made and that they are the direct result of the unwillingness of man to face truth and correct his conduct to conform with truth?

THE POWER OF MORAL FORCE

The solution of human friction, and hence, of war, lies in the honest exercise of moral force.

The use of physical force becomes necessary only when moral force fails.

And moral force fails not when our adversaries turn away from morality, but when we find ourselves incapable of transmitting to our adversaries a sense of morality—when we fail to teach by example or to convert these same adversaries.

We fail at this point only because we ourselves do not live up to the standards of behavior which we so often extol but do not follow.

When leaders are willing to sit in honest judgment on their own sins of omission and commission, when cabinets are willing to submit to impartial questioning of the most intimate details of their prideful decisions, when errors of policy are openly confessed, there is no power of evil on earth which can stand long against the irresistible power of such declared truth.

This age still scoffs at such preachment as being impractical or in the realm of the ethereal. But an age that knows only organized murder as a means of settling disputes cannot afford to scoff long as the destruction of a whole civilization becomes possible.

The urge to study, to learn, to know the power of moral force is today a direct challenge to us all. For we have learned that physical prowess alone cannot prevent war or bring peace. Can we not give moral force the opportunity it deserves?

War is not an isolated phenomenon. It is a direct consequence of individual evil and can be cured by the force of individual good. A chain reaction of conscience-guided acts on the part of individuals in positions of influence and responsibility can set moral force in motion throughout mankind. It can win the ultimate victory of all times—the ending of war as an instrument of national policy.

Security will never come merely from an accumulation of superior weapons of physical force. Security must be derived eventually from the existence of a mutual trust among peoples and governments guided by conscience.

But how is conscience instilled where the mind of the brigand dictates the conduct of government? It is a task of conversion that must reach into the hearts of sovereign peoples who permit brigands to rule them.

It is not a task that can be accomplished in a brief span of time. It requires the patience of years. It requires ingenuity, resourcefulness, common honesty and the courage to acknowledge wrong where wrong is done to others. The time to prevent war is long before passions have been aroused and when the seeds of friction are being sown.

Difficult? Yes; but we of the living cannot ignore the sacrifices of our heroic dead. There are hundreds of thousands of bereaved mothers and fathers and sisters and brothers who will not cease to ask every day a simple question: "Why have we found no better way than war to settle disputes?"

The better way must be sought through the conversion of nations.

SPIRITUAL STATESMANSHIP

The institution of government is weak or strong in accordance as the individuals who control it are weak or strong. Those individuals are themselves effective or ineffective in government only as they are faithful or unfaithful in their personal lives to the basic truths or principles known as the Christian philosophy.

We shall see, therefore, no widespread application of Christian philosophy by nations unless their respective leaders are ready and willing to sacrifice the indulgences of their own lives in a complete surrender of self to God's will and guidance.

But how?

We must be ready to teach in our own homes to our children not just the rituals of this sect or that religious creed. We must lay the foundations of spiritual understanding without which all religious rituals are meaningless. What real difference does it make if we, as individuals, have differing conceptions of this or that theological dogma? It would be a dull world if imaginations had to be limited or faith had to be standardized.

The individual right to freedom of worship is conceded in modern society as a basic freedom. But we must cease to put so much emphasis on our differences and begin to put more emphasis on our points of agreement. There must be statesmanship in the field of spiritual education.

IMMUTABLE PRINCIPLES

The job is not collective. It is individual. We stand some day before God alone—we have no mentors at our side. We stand there not in groups or as an organization or as a government, but as individuals—responsible as the trustees of a human life bestowed upon us by God. We are accountable to Him from the beginning to the end. We can never escape individual responsibility.

The convulsions of history may transform the map of nations or the abodes of individuals but the basic ingredients of human behavior remain the same. Circumstances change but principles are immutable. Constitutions may come and go, laws may be repealed or amended, but the codes of morality and the compensations of a righteous life do not change.

If we understand the true will of God, we will not compromise with truth in national or international affairs. We will dedicate ourselves to the rule of conscience, whether in business, in the professions, in factories and on farms, or above all in the relations of government to government. And when enough persons do that, war will come to an end.

Our Greatest Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Our Greatest Threat" which appeared in the Hampton Union, published in Hampton, N. H., April 22, 1948:

OUR GREATEST THREAT

Much hullabaloo is going on these days about the Communist menace in this country. That it is a menace, we do not deny.

Nevertheless, we must not forget for one moment that there is another and far more dangerous threat facing our American way of life. Surprisingly enough, this danger stems not from these card-holding members of the Communist Party, but from the thousands of otherwise patriotic citizens whose thinking has been warped and distorted by the smooth-sounding left-wing propaganda which has been, and is flooding the country.

These confused Americans are the first to deny that their aims are identical with those of the Moscow-directed agents in this country. But as dupes of this same philosophy, they have become convinced that the free enterprise system which has made us the most envied country in the history of the world is now done for and must be abandoned.

We need only to look at what's happened to other Nations which have turned to a socialistic form of government for our answer. Individual opportunity and initiative withered and died. The common man—for whom these advocates of a planned economy promise great things—become a mere cog in a bureaucratic machine, subject to the whims and decisions of a regimented autocracy.

So, don't be misguided by labels. Communism happens to be a serious problem now, but Americans want no part of a socialistic program, whatever it may be labeled.

Communistic Infiltration in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the fifth of a series of eight articles written by Gustaf A. Nordin of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch dealing with the question of communistic infiltration in the State Department:

SECURITY PROBE INVOLVES HIGH UNITED STATES OFFICIAL

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—An American Air Force colonel, in charge in 1946 of the air intelligence division, informed his superior officer that a high official of the State Department had tried in August to "sell" communism as against capitalism to a major about to leave for Rome.

The intelligence officer declared that the State Department official, a chief in the research and intelligence division, may have been testing the Air Force major to determine his mental ability to cope with such a problem. The colonel then came to this conclusion:

"No. 77 may have been slyly trying Major X–13 and experimenting with the mentality of a typical Army air officer.

"If X–13 got the impression that State wanted the United States air attaché to favor communism over the established United States Government, then No. 107 is wrong.

"If No. 107 is wrong, then he should not be advising Air Force attachés going into the field."

The memo is one of the interesting notations in the 40,000-word, unpublished House Appropriations Committee report dealing with State Department personnel.

The major, X–13, was to be attached to the United States Embassy in Rome. According to the Air Force intelligence officer, whose official views are quoted in the House report, employee No. 107 "undertook, for better than an hour, to belabor Major X–13 for his unbalance toward capitalism and to excuse it on the basis that the capitalistic press of the United States was undoubtedly the source of the major's bias. Further, he proceeded to sell the advantages of communism would bring to the United States and to Italy were it the system prevalent."

HINT MISUNDERSTANDING

According to other information in the report, these briefings by the State Department of air attachés were routine, lasting about 15 minutes. The one with Major X–13 lasted 1½ hours, partially because the major got himself involved in a long defense of capitalism.

No. 107 later admitted, according to the report, that "it was quite possible the major could have misinterpreted his remarks as a preference for communism or socialism."

The investigation of No. 107 was reopened after a speech October 19, 1947, by J. Raymond Walsh before the Sunday Night Forum in Philadelphia. Walsh, a well-known liberal, spoke on "The witch hunt in Washington." During the talk, according to the House document, Walsh stated that "a close personal friend of his came to New York City recently and had a talk with him about the purge in the OSS section of the State Department that week because of the prying of the investigators."

He identified his friend as No. 107.

No. 44 in the carefully guarded House committee report was employed from 1932 to 1945 by the Soviet Purchasing Commission and its subsidiary, Autostroy.

He went with the Department of Commerce first and applied for State Department employment in September 1946.

A central security investigator interviewed Victor Kravchenko, the internationally known former Communist who fled Russia and was permitted to remain in the United States by act of Congress recently.

Kravchenko is reported to have said "that No. 44 had to be a Communist Party member, or a strong sympathizer, in order to hold a position with the Soviet Purchasing Commission as long as he did, or in fact for any appreciable length of time."

No. 44 was appointed January 2, 1947, as an economic analyst in the Research and Intelligence Division.

Also in the list of 108 employees, most of whom are considered security risks by the House investigators, is No. 47, who came to the United States from Germany in 1943, was employed in the State Department in 1946 on the basis of an advance security clearance.

The report lists a January 7, 1947, Government investigator which gave information "that his brother and sister may be possible agents of the Comintern and that they are active in Communist activities." A month later the CSA wrote that it had concluded an investigation that "discloses evidence of a material nature, tending to affect adversely the subject's loyalty to the Government of the United States and its institutions."

Two months later, another derogatory report was filed by an investigative agency, but according to the House document, "no subsequent action was taken until the subject submitted his resignation on May 26, 1947."

Suppression of Pertinent Facts Undermines American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address that I made last evening in New York City upon the occasion of my fourth reelection as president of the National Republican Club:

Officers and members of the National Republican Club, I wish to express my gratitude this evening for the confidence in me that you have so generously displayed in reelecting me as your president for a fourth 1-year term. I can report progress for the club during the past year, perhaps not as much as all of us would have liked to have seen, but the prospects ahead appear more than bright with the election of a Republican President of the United States this fall improving with each passing day. Our membership continues at a high level, the clubhouse and its facilities appear to be giving excellent satisfaction if the fact that the members and their friends are taking more and more advantage of them is any evidence. The Lincoln dinner this year was outstanding in its attendance and enthusiasm, and we are especially thankful to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, for taking the time from their busy affairs to be with us and for delivering such stimulating and stirring addresses. Let me express appreciation to the officers, chairmen of committees, and the members of the club who have contributed so much to our success and without whose cooperation your president could not this evening give so favorable a report.

There is one great question before America today. It is asked on every side. It is asked vocatively, mutely, in a thousand forms, by all of us encompassed in the nationalistic civic gamut that runs from patriotic interventionist to patriotic isolationist, as we strive mutually to secure and better this country of ours. As I phrase the question, it is: Have scientific and industrial discoveries and development forced upon us at this time participation in global government? It is the historical question of the era for us and perhaps for the world as well, but how can America and its electorate decide when it is not fully conversant? How can its legislators properly evaluate and determine when they are not fully apprised? You do not know what happened at Yalta. I do not know what happened at Yalta and I am a Representative empowered by you to help shape American destiny. And what I have just said applies not to Yalta alone but to other conferences well known and not so well known.

The American people educated with a view to vote intelligently have not abandoned belief in government by open covenants openly arrived at, but they are fast learning not to expect it under the present Administration.

Greater confusion than that which descended upon the workers constructing the Tower of Babel prevents us from understanding not only our own and foreign governments and their objectives, but also one another. The body politic of America is being sickened by the propaganda blasts blowing hot and cold out of the maelstrom which is our present Federal Administration. We are confused, as only a direct and forthright people can be confused, by tortuous and devious ways. We are handicapped by Machiavellian suppression of the truth and deliberate distortion of the facts. I cry out against the malign forces at work to bewilder and bedevil until it is impossible to arrive at a logical conclusion out of well-rounded understanding. A conflicting mass of half-baked departmental-inspired material floods the press, garbles the radio and weights the mails. Statements are issued by everyone, fully informed or no. Hearsay is full of question marks. Opinion is used the way a drink-crazed wagoner uses a whip, lashing out with no clear sense of direction.

This is particularly unfortunate in this troubled age of civic chaos when political ideologies compete for believers, cohorts and power; singularly tragic when we are so eager for a well-reasoned plan to lead out of perplexity to solution of what, in the final analysis, must be a simple problem since it is merely finding a way to live peacefully together in such prosperity and enlightenment as is obtainable under technocracy.

Because of the vast and devastating war-induced collapse of great blocks of the earth, we in America have been called upon to rescue the world and help to bring about its recovery. Generosity is basic in us, conceded in history and currently attested by Lord Beaverbrook's Daily Express. It was demonstrated by our enthusiasm for the Friendship Train which proved more graphically than governmental financing ever could that we are not unwilling to share with our needier foreign brothers.

It appears to me that now, however, with all our largess there goes political consciousness. No longer are we willing to give for the sake of giving. When we disburse funds to Greece, we are lending to bolster democracy, and whatever country we underwrite financially is indiscriminately labeled democratic no matter how reactionary its leaders or how incapable its population of understanding freedom as we know it. It seems to me when after World War II we acted frankly in a banking capacity and made outright business loans to ex-allies and countries such as war-maladjusted Finland, we had more integrity as a Nation than we have today, when with jingoistic words we sanctimoniously deliver our cash with counting house hands which we know, short of war, can do no more than fumble with the political card houses in which so many nations now dwell.

Our traditional and historic stand, phrased colloquially, has been to live and let live. We have dealt and traded with monarchies, republics and democracies, and, let this not be forgotten, unfortunately with dictatorships. We prospered so operating, all the while guarding and cherishing our democracy. Except when we embarked, slogan-laden upon costly crusades, we interfered in nowise politically with the governments of other nations. The trend today in our diplomacy seems to be to prepare us to govern the world by indirection on the strength of feeding it the fruits of our people's labor.

Our taxpayers have already loaned $22,000,000,000 out on foreign lands since the recent fighting war stopped. That sum produced little or no perceptible improvement that I could observe when abroad with the Herter Congressional Committee on Foreign Aid last fall, yet we are being called upon for many billions more. Charles F. Kettering, the great inventor and engineer, has the knack of stating obscure facts in simple terms so that all may understand. Since the war's end he indicated most people have been baffled by the seeming inability of our Nation to return promptly to its prewar economy. Within our own boundaries they see no visible destruction. All our cities and buildings are intact. What is overlooked is that we used $600,000,000,000 worth of materials and services in the prosecution of the war. Kettering reminded those who heard him at the Machine Tool Congress that this $600,000,000,000 would replace, according to the tax value, every important city in the United States. "In fact," he said, $600,000,000,000 is more than the total appraised value of all property in the United States. And they say we didn't lose anything."

America's true wealth, of course, is in its concept and people, but both could be jeopardized by the loss and dissipation of our material assets. When so many nations look to us for staples and hope for arms, and the front pages blare forth the glaring failure of our dollar diplomacy in many quarters of the world, especially South America, it is time for moral and economic reflection. Dollars will not make America great but there are among us financial wizards so bankrupt spiritually that they are, shall I say intrigued, by the idea that the United States could benefit from another war. America as conceived and nurtured through liberty to freedom, is in its very elemental essence opposed to a thing so abhorrent and vicious, so unthinkable. This false and murderous philosophy of beneficial war, instantly rejected by the knowing and ethical, if permitted to spread would abase us as a nation and might force us into militarism. It is not to the credit of our generation that the half-century about to close marks the bloodiest in all history. It will be recalled how effective the issue of keeping us out of war proved for both Wilson and the latter Roosevelt. Why should it be left to Henry Wallace to cry out against war so reiteratively as though we had all lost our last vestige of moral sanity and were for it? We are not for war.

We will fight if need be; we will prepare for war, and we should prepare, but we want no war for prosperity or idle talk of it. Wars do not make prosperity, but they do make for profits for a few unscrupulous individuals—black marketeers with an anti-social viewpoint. These ruthless opportunists are quick to grasp the coat tails of solid businessmen before they cease rocking from the increased tempo of a suddenly created duration. The racketeers come out of it far richer proportionately than the law-abiding executive geared to peace. If there are American imperialists who want war, they might keep in mind the fact that modern methods of financing all-out effort call for price controls and high and higher confiscatory taxation.

The extraordinary thing about the now famous Marshall plan, a bit of wishful world thinking if there ever was one, is that it was labeled a plan long before the nebulous general himself knew what he wanted. The avidity with which it was seized and spread into thousands upon thousands of columns of print show the insatiable desire of our tense and frightened public to be informed as to how affairs foreign relate to those domestic. As I said some years ago, the burden of history is on the contemporaneous, and we in this atomic age are concerned for posterity as never before. Only the other day New York City saw traffic stopped for the first time by an overflow of attendance at a lecture—a lecture given by Arnold J. Toynbee, whose Study of History is, I doubt not at all, the great book of our century. A historian like Toynbee perceives, points out, and records with reflective detachment, but it is the electorate that is charged with civic building. Today the electorate, deprived of needful knowledge, is running around in circles making history's bricks without factual straw.

I would like to be indulged for a digression which came out of my recent personal experience, since I believe it is germane to taxation and welfare, domestic and foreign. At the close of the special session last December the House of Representatives unanimously adopted my resolution to investigate questionable trade practices, and I was subsequently named to head a committee to do so. It is now at work dealing with what the nationally syndicated columnist Frederick C. Othman writes of as A Gray Market Edged With Black, calling our committee the medium by which the public can be informed about the black marketeers who have driven up the cost of furnaces and refrigerators for you and for me, to say nothing of the home-seeking veteran.

The value of a Congressional committee of inquiry lies in its wide power to acquire information with great speed, present the facts to the public, and make recommendations for such legislation as may be proven necessary. So our committee focused upon the basic commodity, steel, and found its way directly to the core of the trouble. Whether the remedy is through administration or legislation, or perhaps both, is to be determined, but there is no doubt of the necessity for immediate action. To convey what I mean exactly, I shall be obliged to go into detail, but as briefly as possible to make my point.

To most people the words "steel scrap" connote the residue of manufacturing processes, or the accumulation of worn-out machinery or material, which has little or no intrinsic value. It would come as a distinct shock to such people to learn that this scrap plays a vital part in the basic economy of the country, and that in the event of a national emergency the failure to have enough on hand would very seriously jeopardize our safety. We do not have an adequate supply at the present time—our reservoir is depleted and there appears to be no way to replenish it from domestic sources.

From 1934 to 1940, more than 20,000,000 tons of scrap was shipped abroad, largely to Japan, Great Britain, and Italy. During the last war the Nation's resource of potential scrap was depleted by an estimated 123,800,000 tons due to export of steel and steel products. (This tonnage represents about 8 years' potential supply of purchase scrap for the steel industry at peak rates.) Our present supply of scrap is negligible in that it constitutes only a 3- to 4-week supply. This situation is having an adverse effect on our national economy by greatly retarding the steel production and thus causing further inconveniences, shortages, and higher prices.

It is estimated that during 1947 our country lost approximately 7,000,000 tons of steel due primarily to the lack of scrap. We therefore find ourselves in this position:

1. Capacity steel production is geared to an adequate supply of scrap. Our scrap pile has been lowered alarmingly and this situation has seriously curtailed our steel production and has contributed to a great extent to gray-market activities in spiraling costs of steel and steel products.

2. All domestic sources of scrap have been thoroughly explored.

3. Most of our purchased scrap is procured from industrial manufacturing plants which, in the event of a national emergency, would be converted to military production. During this conversion period—which in World War II lasted 6 months—no scrap would be generated. It has been estimated that this would cut our steel production 35 to 50 percent. This might well prove disastrous.

4. The only readily available source of scrap today lies in foreign countries. In the bizonal area of Germany alone, there is an estimated 10,000,000 tons of steel scrap surplus to the needs of the German economy. Some of this I saw myself. If we could ob-

tain a share of this it would do much to relieve our present domestic difficulties and add greatly to our national safety. My committee has held exhaustive hearings with experts in the industry on this matter and we are doing everything in our power to obtain the cooperation of the Departments of State, Commerce, and National Defense to put into effect immediately a program which would insure the prompt return of a portion of this scrap to the United States. There are no transportation difficulties involved. I have been advised by the Maritime Commission that there are adequate bottoms to return this scrap as fast as it can be prepared for shipping and that the transportation costs would be sufficiently low to make the project economically attractive.

I might further point out that under the present foreign-aid bill, it is estimated that the United States will be called upon to furnish, among other things, approximately ten and one-half million tons of steel and steel products annually to various members of the 16 participating nations. It occurs to me that we would be asking very little in return if we insisted upon receiving a token payment of scrap in sufficient quantities to replenish our reservoir at least to the extent that it is being sucked dry by commitments under the aid bill.

I believe that our national security should take precedence over all other considerations when economic foreign policies are being determined. I believe also that our domestic economy should receive the fullest consideration, and would like to inquire of you, or of anyone for that matter, how the Marshall Plan, or any operations for war or peace, could be effectively implemented if steel is in scant supply. Such a condition might lead to rigid controls, possibly even with the military in authority, but to these things let us have recourse only as a last resort.

I was almost alone in deprecating the appointment of General Marshall as the first high-ranking military man to hold the office of United States Secretary of State. It was at our Lincoln Dinner, not of this year, but of last year, to be exact February 12, 1947, that I had this to say of him: "He has a difficult task in reconciling the psychology of the soldier with that of the diplomat. We will await with interest, and without too much confidence, the outcome of efforts at such reconciliation." I will leave it to your good judgment to decide, particularly in the light of the recent Bogota incident, whether or not reconciliation has been made.

When I commented upon the ascendancy of Marshall, chilled though I was by foreboding premonition, well knowing that danger of militarism from within the Government cannot be discounted and that our economy could easily be sent tottering by men who are as prodigal of gold as they are fond of brass, I deliberately selected understatement as my medium of expression. Marshall had just been heralded into office by ovation and acclaim, our own leaders raising no alarm, so committed were they then to the bipartisan foreign policy that nimbly jumps party lines in the hope of impressing foreign audiences with a political sister act uncontracted for by our voters. Admittedly in times of crisis in representative governments, representatives and people alike forego party differences, but here in the United States the Democrats have for 14 wearing years strung crises, one after another, like black pearls upon a chain. Are all the pearls genuine, or are some of them being carefully cultured in Democratic laboratories where irritating sands are slipped into otherwise contented oysters, foreign or domestic? Is the chain unending?

How can we trust these emergency-benefiting bureaucrats who led us into today's uncertain maze, to lead us out again? We cannot. Happily we do not have to. In November we have a national election. Speaking as a New Yorker, though president of this club which has a Nation-wide membership, I could not do otherwise than congratulate my fellow New Yorkers upon the outstanding candidacy for the highest office in our land of our great Governor, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, a proven administrator and a campaigner of high order. With the Republican Party so increasingly in the ascendency it is only natural that there would be many contenders, most of whom are members of this club. This is altogether healthy for our party and the high plane and fine spirit in which these contenders are carrying on their several campaigns is according to the best traditions of the Republican Party, particularly exemplified by New York's favorite son.

After a candidate has been determined upon at Philadelphia in June there arises the important question of the platform to adopt, preparation for which will have been the subject of discussion among members selected from every State who form the Committee on Resolutions of the National Convention. How this will be shaped to meet the complicated problems of today and tomorrow, both at home and abroad, will tax our best party minds to an extent fully equal to that which confronted those who assembled in Philadelphia for the long summer months in 1778. Surely we must strengthen our moorings and at least within the Republican Party recognize proudly that the most advanced liberals today are those who safeguard religious and civil rights by holding fast the lines of constitutional democracy, not for our sake alone but for the sake of the entire world, and until such time as the Soviet cliques lose their grip on the captive masses which they so falsely pretend to serve.

During the past decade we Americans have labeled so much that we dislike communistic that the word, applied loosely to bullying labor leaders, visionary liberals, and just plain crackpots, has become a weapon of the unthinking to cut short discussion. "Wolf" has been cried so often and so loud that some have quietly wondered if there really is a wolf. There is a wolf, and it is the International Communistic Alliance, the new Cominform, which is on the prowl and hungrily eyeing America. When in February in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted several speeches and editorials delivered and written by Cominform calculators and zealots, my remarks prefacing it were picked up in a manner most complimentary to me and used as the subject of an editorial in the Washington Times-Herald by Frank C. Waldrop. After rightly remarking "Nobody can be a Communist and a good citizen of the United States of America," he observed that this hard-to-come-by material is now available for national study and analysis for the professors who "for years have been ducking the problem" of communism.

Too many of us have been ducking hard thinking on this problem. Nations, groups, and individuals confronted by communism either resist or submit. Consciously or unconsciously, we go on the defensive against it, seeking merely to hold it off. Admittedly, we have battled communism in our unions, but to large degree as a victimizer and wrecker of labor; and we have pridefully pointed out the success of our free-enterprise system, though only to have it thrown back in our teeth as capitalist imperialism; but to win out over communism we must take the offensive. I do not mean the offensive in war, but in the battle of the ideologies. I am groping, as everybody else is, as to the best method to pursue. However, I am convinced that the right method is not through the lip service and complacency of our Federal Government as exemplified by President Truman when he expressed appreciation to Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, for his resignation from the American Anti-Communist Association, and wrote him over a year ago, saying, "People are very much wrought up about the Communist bugaboo, but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe, so far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people."

In closing, I say to you with all the earnestness I can command that before we can make any effective headway against communism abroad we must show competence to scotch the communistic adders who lie ready to strike out at us here at home.

The Oleomargarine Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, a vote for the bill to remove the tax from colored oleomargarine was not a vote against the dairy interests. There will always be a market for butter at top prices. The producers of butter need have no apprehension on that account. Oleomargarine is suitable to everybody's means and legislation making it generally available at prices which everybody can pay is based in sound public policy. As the situation is now, butter has a monopoly which it cannot even begin to fulfill. We are performing a service to the Nation when we bring oleomargarine within reach of everybody, so that as between butter and oleomargarine the purchaser may exercise his choice according to his inclination and his pocketbook.

Why the United States Needs a Man Like Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Jewish Courier:

WHY THE UNITED STATES NEEDS A MAN LIKE EISENHOWER

Friday, March 26, was an historic day for our country. Two sons of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Elliot and Franklin Jr., announced their support of a draft Eisenhower movement. This followed closely upon the announcement of a similar stand by Col. Jacob M. Arvey, chairman of the Cook County Democratic Organization. Arvey's statement is of great significance inasmuch as he is outstanding figure in the Democratic Party in Illinois. These factors, together with anti-Truman sentiment in Democratic ranks in New York State and elsewhere, seriously reduce Truman's chances for nomination at Philadelphia this summer. This is evidence that American democracy is still alive and the wishes of the American people can still be evidenced in the scope of national politics.

In the stormy seas of present international politics, the American people require a firm hand on the rudder of their ship of state.

They give growing signs of dissatisfaction with the aimless veering and back-tracking of the present administration.

Let us consider the present situation in its historical background. Every war is followed by a period of great social unrest and change. These postwar periods of crisis produce either social reaction or social revolution. The two great wars of our generation have given birth to both extreme trends. On one hand we have today the impulse of the Russian revolution; on the other hand, we have the counteracting world reaction. Each movement is desirous of enlisting all mankind behind its standard.

Uncle Sam finds himself between the Red Bear and the White Lion. Soviet Russia and Great Britain face an historical crisis today on the levels of clashing imperialistic interests and class conflict.

We have heard little from Winston Churchill of late and it seems as if he were far removed from the scene of events. But actually he is the guiding brain behind the events which seem to be leading to a third World War.

Between two World Wars, two contrasting political doctrines arose, in relation to the problem of the Russian Revolution: The Wilson-Roosevelt doctrine, based on American democratic principles; and the Churchill doctrine based on the foundations of royalism and traditional British imperialism.

After the close of military operations against Germany, Churchill and Clemenceau attempted to destroy the Russian revolutionary regime by military intervention. They considered the revolution in Russia a threat to the principle of monarchy in general. To destroy the Russian Revolution Churchill organized foreign intervention and helped to bring about civil war. He and Clemenceau supported the forces of Denikin, Kolchak, and other White leaders. The net result of these ventures was to increase the support of the Russian people behind the Red regime and thus to defeat Churchill's major purpose. The arms and equipment which Churchill gave the White leaders during the Russian Revolution fell into the hands of the Bolsheviks and became the foundation of the Red army. We now face a similar situation for the arms and equipment which we are now sending to Greece may also fall into Communist hands.

Woodrow Wilson, and afterward Franklin D. Roosevelt, did not consider the Russian Revolution as a vital threat to the United States. Wilson and Roosevelt did not countenance Red scare plots; they could not view backward Soviet Russia as a serious competitor to the American way of life. For them the system of government under which the Russian people lived was purely an internal affair of the Russian people themselves.

Wilson and Roosevelt believed in American democracy as a spiritual force which was mightier than any communistic system. Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt were the great standard bearers of American democracy of their times, leading their country on the broad way of the traditional American way of life, between the forces of violent social revolution and of black reaction. Wilson and F. D. Roosevelt converted American democracy into a moral force operative throughout the world today; they presented the world with an alternative to dictatorial communism and aggresive imperialist reaction. The death of Roosevelt removed the barrier between the immediate friction of left and right in the American way of life. Today, winds from abroad blow our standard erratically about, because we lack a flag bearer of the strength and stature of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, or Roosevelt.

A man like Eisenhower is needed at the head of our Government today. His quiet firm words would make more of an impression on Stalin and the rulers of Soviet Russia than Truman's confusion. Eisenhower executed the American hostilities against nazism and fought for the democratic principles of Wilson and Roosevelt. He is not one who would easily surrender the fruits of American sacrifice.

Shortly after Roosevelt's death, Churchill made his Fulton speech which was apparently adopted as the policy of our State Department. Now we can find in Europe only two violent extremes: the Russian dictatorship and the British imperial policy.

It is tragic today that we cannot perceive anywhere in Europe evidence of the true American way of life, which is in fact a greater social force than Churchillian reaction or communism.

The fundamental distinction between the Churchill and the Wilson-Roosevelt doctrines is that the former is purely political in motivation and disregards entirely the religious and ethical principles which are the core of the American democratic code. In the writings of Churchill we can see that one king is worth more to him than the millions of the common people.

The Wilson-Roosevelt principles take heed of the worth of an individual life and of the masses of common people; and they take account of a responsibility to God for the actions of the rulers of nations.

Roosevelt's genius enabled him to act closely with Churchill in the prosecution of the war. But simultaneously, knowing how Churchill had helped to cause the debacle of Wilson's plans, he shrewdly avoided being drawn into the snare of Churchill's imperialist policies. When Roosevelt wrote the Atlantic Charter with Churchill, he well understood that his cosigner had in his heart to make of the Charter what he had once made of Wilson's Fourteen Points. But despite his mental reservations, Roosevelt was strong enough to enact the Charter for its value, and yet be able to maintain his own American policies.

Logically, the United States as the mightiest and richest country in the world must use its power as a moral force. She has the duty to spread American-type democracy among the peoples of the world. If we must fill the political vacuum created by the decay of the British Empire, let us at least not be intellectual slaves of Toryism. Let us establish American democracy in all corners of the British Empire in which we are forced to resume responsibility. Then we will not have inherited the sickness which now infects the body of the British Empire. Then Americans will be welcomed everywhere as friends. Then certainly we will have a superior moral prestige over Russian communism in the eyes of the world, and of the Russian people. We will have the respect of every civilized community by demonstrating that, in the actions abroad which have been forced upon it, the American way of life seeks to spread the social good based on the concepts of religious justice and the value of individual lives; and not merely to establish imperial hegemony by virtue of her superior force of wealth and arms.

If Roosevelt were alive, there would be no Communist regimes today in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Jugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. Not that we would have found it necessary to wage an open fight to achieve this result, for real Americanism in our foreign policy would have won over the sympathy of heart and mind of the peoples of these countries, and of their leaders.

Roosevelt's way would have cost the American citizen less than the Marshall plan and would have achieved better results. UNRRA would have been retained as an instrument of mercy; foreign relief would not have been converted into a diplomatic weapon. Americans would be aiding and feeding the victims of the Nazis, and thus be gaining their enduring friendship, rather than their present suspicion. We would not now be pouring our Nation's wealth down a rathole in feeding the Nazis who cannot become our friends, since they are unable to interpret the morality of charity and mercy as anything other than weakness.

Likewise in Greece, we would now not be pouring our resources into a monarchic regime which represents only wealth and reaction. In Greece, as a blunt matter of fact, we have lost all pretense of feeding the common people, or of strengthening democracy.

Roosevelt would have won over all the Greeks. By not favoring the right, which Churchill had brought into favor by military intervention, social and political reforms could have been possible; communism itself would not have grown to its present proportions. And there would be no civil war in Greece today, with the ominous threat of Russian intervention. Russia would have neither excuse nor justification for intervention in Greece. We may learn, to our sorrow, that imperialistic intervention breeds more of the same.

The United States is by character and tradition democratic and nonimperialistic. The clouding of our present foreign policy by imperialism is due to British influence.

In his Fulton speech, Churchill clearly outlined the foreign policy we have followed ever since. This was a tragic moment in our history. Truman had been elected on the same ticket with Roosevelt by supporters of Roosevelt and Roosevelt's foreign policy. Morally, Truman was obligated to maintain his predecessor's program.

If Truman had kept his promise to continue Roosevelt's traditionally American and democratic pattern, and if he had retained the administrators whom Roosevelt had selected he might have been able, though he lacked Roosevelt's genius to maintain the mighty tradition of Jefferson and Lincoln, of Wilson and F. D. Roosevelt.

The Marshall plan at its outset was truly American in nature. It was designed originally to transfuse economic blood into the moribund body of Europe; and to prevent its infection by the disease of communism. In this situation, Churchill again strove through the channels of the Bevins and the Hoovers to give the Marshall plan a Tory and imperialistic slant. In January 1948 Mr. Hoover who found the White House doors open to him for the first time in a decade and a half, and who had advised the Truman administration to send supplies to Nazis, this same man came forward with a substitute plan to sabotage the original purposes to the Marshall plan.

It is most interesting to compare and study the different understandings Hoover and his fellow Republican, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, have of the purposes of the Marshall plan. VANDENBERG is the cofather of the bipartisan Marshall plan. He may be considered a major theoretician of our foreign policy. The purpose of the Marshall plan for him is, by extended aid, to establish complete real recovery which will automatically halt the spread of communism in Europe.

For Hoover, the purpose of the Marshall plan coincides with Churchill's conception. It is to obtain from the United States means for strengthening the military power of European opponents to Soviet Russia. Like Churchill, Hoover does not concern himself with the real economic recovery of Europe. Their end is war, not peace; a forlorn crusade against Soviet Russia, not the economic well-being of civilization. This viewpoint clarifies therefore the details of his proposal which included curtailing the European relief program to a mere 15-month period, reducing the initial appropriations by more than four billions from the proposed $6,800,000,000 asked by the administration, broadening the scope of aid to include Ger-

many, Japan, Korea, and China; and finally he proposed to impose strict conditions on all the countries aided by the plan—conditions which far exceeded those thought necessary by the administration. VANDENBERG himself was aroused to reply to Hoover the following day in testimony before his committee which was conducting hearings on the European relief program. He testified that: "The 4-year commitment is an indispensable factor in the plan."

Simultaneously Mr. Bevin announced his plan to form a western European bloc to combat a ruthless attempt by Russia to dominate the continent of Europe. This proposal—warmly greeted by the conservatives in Parliament—merely repeated the plan for uniting Europe against Soviet Russia which Churchill had announced at Zurich in September 1946. Immediately following Bevin's proposal, Churchill called for a quick reaching of an understanding with Russia before Russia could produce an atom bomb. Churchill called for a Big Three conference. When a politician of Churchill's stamp speaks of peace and the quick attainment of an understanding between east and west, we may be sure he intends war. He well knows that a necessary condition for the success of a Big Three conference is the reaching of preliminary understandings at lower echelons. Knowing that these preliminary meetings of minds are impossible in the present situation, his purpose in calling for an immediate settlement can only be to force matters to a crisis and a resultant war. Thus are the proposals of Hoover, Bevin, and Churchill linked to one end.

The British, whose empire is in grave straits, have nothing to lose in this game. Tory or Labor, their governments consistently have pursued a policy of using the United States in rescuing the British Empire from its critical situation.

The peoples of the United States and Great Britain have failed to appreciate the significance of Churchill's diplomacy, to comprehend that his peace talk hides an intent toward bringing about the third world war in the immediate future.

The people of every country in the world, in the United States and Great Britain as in Soviet Russia, do not want war. People of every occupation and every role in society, the working man, the small entrepreneur, the white-collar man; or the housewife, the mothers and the fathers—one and all are horrified by the thought of another war. This response from the man on the street in the United States as well as in Soviet Russia. From recent experience he knows how terrible war is. He, himself, has seen that war is hell.

Who, then, contemplates war today? Only the actual leaders of governments, whether of right or left. Only men intoxicated with power can be blind to the implications of war, and once the war is started, it is the people who will be driven to the slaughter by propaganda, fear, and force.

After a modern war is ended the people perceive that it produced nothing but casualties. In modern war even the victor loses.

What this country needs is a man like Eisenhower to guide us back to the American way of life. A man who has the understanding and interest of the common people the same way that Roosevelt did. Compare Eisenhower's action of bringing American Congressmen to Germany at the end of the war to view first hand the evidence of German atrocities in order to give them some idea of the problems of the Jews, and Truman's action of abandoning the Palestine plan because it conflicted with American and British oil interests. A man with the strength and integrity of Eisenhower could arrive at an understanding with the Russian leaders in the same manner as Roosevelt and Stalin reached agreements, not through the threat of war but through peaceful ways, keeping the principle of the American way of life.

Truman's doctrine is the Churchill doctrine. Churchill's intervention policy after World War I, only led to a strengthening of communism in Russia, and set the stage for World War II. Truman's intervention policy after World War II is strengthening communism throughout the world and leading us toward world war III. We must consider the significance of another great war. With the discoveries in the field of atomic and bacterial warfare the next war will mean the destruction of all mankind.

In our present great crisis Providence will help us to elect a man who will put an end to this era of fear and distrust and remove the danger and threat of a war which will destroy us all.

Our great need, our direct necessity now is that we in the United States elect a President of General Eisenhower's type. General Eisenhower, at this fateful period in our history, is more than a strong man. His ability and forceful leadership would inspire the Congress to operate in true American concepts of statesmanship.

General Eisenhower knows the Nazis, the Fascists; he fought them. He understands their destructive and completely materialistic mentality * * * their desire to conquer by brute force. He would know how to guide us away from war; a war that would only create a resurgence of fascism or communism.

America, since the earliest days of the founding fathers has won through real democracy and justice. We can meet our problems in no other way.

The world problem can be solved, not by war, but by high religious values and moral principles.

Amendment Submitted on H. R. 6274

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I presented to the Armed Services Committee this morning an amendment to the selective-service bill, H. R. 6274. It is substantially the same language that was adopted in 1916 as a part of that year's National Defense Act and again in 1940 as a part of the selective service and training law of World War II.

The amendment follows:

On page 43, after line 11, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 16. The President is empowered, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the presently authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such products or material as may be required in the interest of national defense, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry.

"Compliance with all such orders for products or material shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies or equipment for the armed forces, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry or the responsible head or heads thereof owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of Defense, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of Defense, then, and in either such case, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, in addition to the presently authorized methods of purchase or procurement, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the appropriate branch, bureau or department of the armed forces to manufacture therein such product or material as may be required, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

"The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just: *Provided,* That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant."

Efficiency of New England Shoe Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Post on Monday, April 26, 1948:

NEW ENGLAND SHOE FACTORIES EFFICIENT—BETTER RECORD THAN PLANTS ELSEWHERE IN NATION

New England shoe factories reduced their man-hour requirements per pair during the war more than any other shoe-producing area in the United States, according to a report released by Wendell D. Macdonald, regional director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor. In men's shoes, for example, labor

requirements per pair in this region decreased by 8.8 percent between 1939 and 1945, compared with a 1.2-percent drop for the Nation as a whole.

FAVORABLE PRODUCTIVITY

For women's shoes, the decrease was even more substantial, amounting to 30.5 percent against a reduction for the country of 15.3 percent. In juvenile shoes, the comparison was less striking, although even in this group New England's performance in reducing labor time was better than that of the other regions.

The favorite productivity trend was largely the result of attaining capacity operations during the war years after producing at lower capacity than other regions in 1939. This enabled shoe factories in New England to obtain greater than average benefits by smoothing out the seasonal fluctuations which had man-hour requirements high prior to the war.

The Government report indicates an average reduction for all types of 8.8 percent in factory man-hours expended per pair between 1939 and 1945, for the Nation as a whole. This reduction in labor may be attributed to several wartime factors, including decrease in number of styles, higher levels of output, and greater emphasis on shoes of simple construction.

Factors unfavorable to efficient operations during the period under study were short supplies of materials and a severe shortage of labor in many establishments. Furthermore, technological developments which contributed to higher productivity in many other industries were meager in the shoe industry, states the report, which is based on data supplied by 151 shoe factories accounting for 25 percent of the Nation's shoe production in 1945.

Savings in direct productive labor time, which accounts for over 90 percent of the labor consumed in shoe manufacturing, was responsible for the reduction in man-hours per pair in all regions. In contrast, indirect or overhead labor increased sharply during the period studied.

Talking Jerusalem to Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Post on April 27, 1948:

TALKING JERUSALEM TO DEATH

(By T. O. Thackrey)

The United States delegation in the United Nations, under the guise of pressing for protection of Jerusalem, is actually engaging in a filibuster against positive action at once to safeguard the Holy City.

Trusteeship for Jerusalem as a free city was authorized as a part of the General Assembly decision last November 29.

Seeking to impose the United States proposal for a trusteeship over all of Palestine upon the Assembly, bringing about the death of the November decision which also ordered the setting up of a Jewish and an Arabian state under UN auspices, the United States is seeking to broaden the Jerusalem trusteeship, on which all but the Arab nations are agreed, to cover all Palestine.

The intention is twofold:

1. To block the political action already taken by the world Zionist organization in proclaiming the Jewish state effective May 16.

2. To reverse the November 29 decision in its entirety.

Jerusalem is now under siege.

It is in process of being destroyed because of the attack upon it by Arab States in defiance of the United Nations' decision; it is being defended by the Haganah army, which has the primary task of protecting the lives of the nearly 100,000 Jews beleaguered there and facing certain massacre if the Arabs gain control.

If the United States continues to oppose the plan put forward by Ambassador Parodi of France for immediate action on the Jerusalem trusteeship authorized by the General Assembly, there will be little left in Jerusalem to guard or defend by the time the speeches have been concluded.

We are, in effect, talking Jerusalem to destruction, just as we are seeking at the same time to talk the partition plan into destruction.

How low can our moral position sink?

Have we not besmirched our national integrity sufficiently already by our alliance with the war criminal Mufti, our partnership in Arabian oil paid for with Jewish blood and American honor, our arms embargo, our understanding with the British to cooperate in exposing Judea to merciless attack without protest?

Must we also demonstrate that we are quite willing to permit the destruction of Jerusalem, rather than act promptly to safeguard it in accordance with our obligations?

We continue to appease our foes and traduce our friends in the Middle East.

Now that Russia has joined the Trusteeship Council, we must recognize that our petty and dirty political game must be discontinued sooner or later, and that the shabby excuse of seeking to exclude Russia from a Palestine settlement is impossible in any case.

We must eventually return to the solution worked out in the first instance with Russia's cooperation, and with the strong support of Australia and New Zealand and Canada—the partition decision.

Every hour of delay in acting to implement the Jerusalem trusteeship means weeks of delay in supporting the only possible course in Palestine—and in those weeks, that too may prove impossible.

The time to talk is past.

The time to act is here.

That action should include:

Immediate protection for the Jerusalem trusteeship.

Warning through the United Nations that Arab nations attacking the UN decision will be expelled if they persist.

Warning directly by the United States that war on the UN is war on us—and that we are prepared to support the majority.

Blockade of Arabian arms imports.

Recognition of the Haganah as the only force capable of enforcing the UN decision in Palestine and in Jerusalem.

Immediate assistance to the UN forces based on Haganah.

Recognition by the United Nations of the new Jewish state established in accord with the Assembly decision, and prepared to take over at once, in advance of British withdrawal.

Instruction to the Palestine Commission to proceed to set up, if possible, the Arabian State called for by the Assembly.

Full support of our present solemn commitments.

No amount of future talk will restore Jerusalem if we fail it now.

No future excuses by the administration will bring back to life those brave defenders of international honor we are killing—with talk.

South Carolina Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of South Carolina.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws as compiled by Henry D. Green, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, Seaboard Park, Columbia, S. C., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Funeral expenses are provided for Confederate pensioners.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Oaths may be administered to subscribing witnesses of certain instruments.

Evidence of presumed death or absence may be admitted.

Testimony of a person in the armed forces may be admitted where such person has already testified in such case.

Insurance, compensation, and pension paid by the United States to executors, administrators, or heirs of deceased war veterans are exempt from claims of creditors.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Certain instruments are recorded.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free birth and death certificates for persons called into military service or for filing claims for benefits are provided.

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The fee for a certified copy of the record of discharge papers is limited to 50 cents.

Discharge papers, deeds, or mortgages are recorded free.

It is the duty of the State and county service officers to assist veterans with claims against the United States.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Restrictions as to age limit of 21 years may be waived by local boards of public-school trustees in favor of veterans.

Special bar examinations are available for qualified residents serving in the armed forces outside of the United States.

State aid is extended to public schools offering special courses to veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Veterans of World Wars I and II are admitted to State colleges and institutions of learning free of tuition.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid in the amount of $150 maximum per annum per child is extended to children of disabled or deceased veterans of World War I with free tuition at State-supported college or university.

Children of members of the armed forces stationed in the State may attend State educational institutions for the fees charged to citizens.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Additional points are added to the earned rating of a war veteran, his wife or widow, upon an examination conducted under any merit system within the State.

Leaves of absence are given to public officers and employees with reinstatement after termination of military service, preservation of seniority, efficiency ratings, etc.

Preference is given to veterans in all public departments and on all public works of State and county.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Road construction contracts must contain a clause giving preference in employment to veterans.

EXEMPTIONS FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money paid by the United States for insurance, compensation, or pensions to executors, administrators, or heirs of certain deceased war veterans is exempt from claims against such veterans.

GUARDIANSHIP

A uniform Veteran's Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of such veteran, to receive certain benefits in behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Confederate veterans, their wives, widows, sisters, and daughters may be admitted to the Confederate home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

PENSIONS

Pensions are exempt from claims of creditors when paid to executors, administrators, or heirs.

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans, their widows, and certain colored servants.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Clerks of court must call to their assistance the head officer of the posts of the American Legion to furnish a perfect list of persons entitled to register discharges.

A historical commission has been created to collect, arrange, and preserve relics, documents, and material concerning soldiers of the State during the Revolutionary, Civil, and World War periods.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and other financial institutions may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Athletic contests in which a junior American Legion team is a participant are exempt from admission taxes.

State income-tax returns are allowed the same exemptions as those allowed by the Federal Government.

Persons in the armed forces of the United States are exempt from road and poll taxes during World War II and for 12 months thereafter.

Certain fees paid by an optometrist are refunded upon his entrance into the armed forces, with renewal of license within 1 year after discharge.

All pensions payable to any person by the United States or any State thereof are exempt from property tax.

Property of veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

Certain veterans are exempt from road duty.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Sale of artificial poppies or forget-me-nots other than in a regular place of business, except for veterans' organizations, is prohibited.

The unauthorized wearing or use of any badge, insignia, etc. of certain veterans' organizations is punishable by fine and imprisonment.

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia is a misdemeanor.

Copies of the World War I service roster were furnished to American Legion posts and auxiliaries.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the South Carolina legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which at the present time has some 10 chapters throughout the State, maintains two expertly trained full-time national service officers, under the direction of George L. Shankle, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Fort Jackson, S. C., who extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its Congressional Charter of Incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before Jan. 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper, containing information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead such an organization.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department for claims, headed by William E. Tate, a former South Carolinian; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my long-time good friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, it has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

This outstanding record of service by the DAV makes me very proud to be one of its members. I am sure its accomplishments merit the consideration and support of the entire country.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 29, 1948:

TEST FOR REPUBLICANS

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act deserves, and should be given, the 3-year extension for which President Truman has asked Congress.

Its principle is sound. Its adoption, 14 years ago, marked a great advance in America's attitude toward international commerce. In it we recognized the fundamental fact that trade between nations is a 2-way business—a matter of buying as well as of selling.

The authority it gives the President to make agreements with other nations for mutual reduction of tariff rates and other barriers to the flow of world commerce has not been abused. There is no reason to fear that Mr. Truman would abuse it in the future.

And, as he has said, the reciprocal-trade program is more important now than it has ever been in the past. For, with other nations, we are engaged in a mighty effort to build a peaceful and prosperous world. We are urging those nations to contribute to the success of that effort by lowering their trade barriers. It is emphatically our duty to continue to set a good example.

Yet many Republicans in Congress always have resented the idea of a President, especially a Democratic President, holding the authority granted by the Trade Agreement Act. They long to return to the old days, when tariffs were fixed by the congressional logrolling of blocs and groups, each seeking "protection" from some special interest and all combining to injure the vast majority of American consumers and producers.

These Republicans would like to let the act die quietly, next June 12. They don't dare to do that in an election year, for they realize the truth of Mr. Truman that the reciprocal trade program has drawn the constant and increasing support of the American people, regardless of party affiliation.

So, apparently, they intend if they can to cripple the act with amendments and to renew it for 1 year, meanwhile hoping that in 1949 a Republican President will help them to get rid of it.

As a first step in this scheme, a House Ways and Means subcommittee is to hold hearings behind closed doors. There is no respectable reason for such secret proceedings. Their plain purpose, we think, is to keep the public ignorant of what is being done to the Trade Agreements Act until it is too late for protests to be effective.

We want to register our protest right now. An American about-face toward economic legislation, such as these Republicans seem to have in mind, would be a tragedy to this country and to the world. It could mean failure of the European recovery program, loss of billions of American dollars, and defeat of the world's best hope for enduring peace. In this issue the Republican Party, seeking control of the White House as well as of Congress, faces a crucial test of its fitness for the momentous responsibilities of the next 4 years.

Racial Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a plan for abolishing segregation in this capital of world democracy. It is entirely possible. It has won tremendous and unanimous approval throughout the Nation in the Negro press, especially all editions of the Courier.

It was just openly brought forward by Mr. Von Blaine in a letter to Mr. Drew Pearson, which I am now inserting in full.

I ask the considered, intelligent, and sincere support of the Eighteth Congress and all American people.

The letter is as follows:

Mr. DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PEARSON: I am a Negro businessman and an avid follower of your newspaper column and radio broadcast. During your last few Sunday broadcasts you have announced a number of attactive prizes for the best letter on how to make democracy work. You seem sincere and much in earnest when you make an appeal to American people for principles that are humanitarian, and in your sincerity you have impressed me and a great majority of the American people and surely the greatest majority of Negroes who comprise no little segment of the American population.

My contact with a great majority of self-respecting and right-thinking Negroes is of no little means, and, having discussed you with other Americans who hold the public ear, I have come to the conclusion that for the sake of humanity and man's faith and belief in God; for the sake of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, you could go down in history in the minds of peoples the world over if you would put as much interest and enthusiasm and work in bringing about a solution to the civil-rights problem here in America by advocating and sponsoring the plan that I shall propose to you.

First of all, Mr. Pearson, you and I must agree as practically all other Americans do, that America's No. 1 domestic problem is civil rights and the Negro. President Truman has rightly and forcibly taken a stand, leaving no doubt as to where he stands on this issue. He has carved his niche in the hearts of freedom-loving peoples by his devoted and sincere desire to see the elimination of man's inhumanity to man here in America, along with Abraham Lincoln.

The greatest cause for the misunderstanding between the races is segregation itself. Legislation as a remedy, is only a step toward the solution of the problem. The final and telling step will have to come from within the hearts of men themselves and that can only come by patience and tolerance. This cannot be accomplished overnight as we all know, but can only be accomplished by a series of steps in the right direction. Getting the races adjusted to one another is similiar to one's first airplane ride. There is first a fear and reluctancy until one is comfortably seated and in the air. Once he lands safely, his fears are somewhat dissipated. After several air trips, he feels much more secure because he has been exposed to what he thought was a harrowing experience.

I sometimes wonder if the white people who instinctively fight the issue of civil rights and progress of the Negro really have ever given thought as to what a Negro, living in what we call a democracy, has to be exposed to. I would like to take you on a trip with me by car from Washington, D. C., through Chicago to California and let you see and experience with me the inconvenience of a Negro traveling in this so-called free and democratic land. On the first leg of the trip, we would have to travel from here to Chicago before we could sit down and eat a complete and decent meal, and if we became tired and wanted to sleep, we could not find accommodations anywhere until we reached Chicago. Just imagine traveling a distance of 2,500 miles and being able to stop only three places and receive half-suitable accommodations.

The civil-rights issue is something that everyone talks about but few do anything about. As aforesaid, I have talked with a large number of alert Negroes before writing you this letter and there were differences of opinion as to whether you would give it the same sincere and earnest attention as you did the Friendship Train and Letters to Italy Campaign. Here is my plan submitted to you and which will be released to the press throughout the country.

Since Washington, D. C., is the Nation's Capital and it is supposed to be the capital of world democracy, let us begin here with a plan to inspire volitional support and active participation in making democracy work and live, by declaring a 6-month moratorium on segregation in all public places such as churches, hotels, restaurants, theaters, public parks, and other places of a public nature, where the general public may go unrestricted. An appeal to the proprietors, operators, and supervisors of such places, to lift the barrier of segregation for that period of time, by you and other leading and outspoken exponents of human rights, would, in my estimation, bring forth warm and earnest volitional support of such a program. At the same time it would act as a barometer and as a sieve to bring out the shortcomings and, also, the loopholes that would give those, who sincerely are working for democracy, a basic understanding and foundation upon which to build a true fellowship between the races. I purposely omitted such institutions as schools, bureaus, and the like, because of the complicated nature of their structure. If the Government buildings, auditoriums, public vehicles, and ball parks can be utilized by members of both races without friction, this plan should be also feasible.

The American populace, which comprises all races, creeds, and colors may also be likened unto the human body. Each segment is an important part of that body with special functions to perform. To neglect one segment or organ of the body is to retard the over-all growth and progress of the body as a whole. For a clean, healthy, and vigorous body, all parts must work in unison and also perform their particular functions without restraint.

Here are a few of the paradoxes of segregation. At the Union Station, here in Washington, Negroes may be seated and served at any table, whether the table opposite them is occupied by white persons from Alabama, Mississippi, or Illinois. Leaving the Union Station, a Negro has to travel 10 or 15 blocks before he can be served again. Washington has had three Negro judges; all have made enviable records and the present Negro judge, adjudicates whether the principals be white or colored. The majority of Government cafeterias make no discrimination in the service of their employees. In the majority of cases it is the will of the Cabinet officer who heads that department. Negroes are not allowed to drive busses and streetcars here in the District but are not restrained from

sitting in any section. Yet and still, I cannot see the difference between the Negro taxi driver driving white passengers and a Negro bus driver driving white and colored passengers. British subjects of darker hue are accorded every protection by our Government, out of courtesy to Great Britain as long as they have a passport, but American Negroes, whose brithplace is their passport are rejected and restrained just as vigorously. In a recent controversy, relative to the integration of Negroes in the white fire companies here, some very vitriolic remarks were made by some fire officials in opposition thereto. However, during a fire, when a Negro and white company respond, they both help to put out the fire. Fire and the resulting ravishes thereof know no color. I fail to see the difference in integration in the fire department and in the police department, the latter of which has functioned smoothly along this line.

If this plan should succeed in Washington, it would set a glowing example to the Nation at large and the world, of the will to do and conquer the unconscious prejudices of man's intolerance. It can then be submitted to various other sections of the country, because surely the eyes of the Nation and the world will be focussed on Washington for that period of time.

I would deeply appreciate hearing from you on this plan.

With consideration of my great respect for you, I remain,

Very truly yours,

LLOYD VON BLAINE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a beautiful tribute to mother made by Mr. Victor W. Wheeler, of Charlotte, N. C.:

MOTHER

America pauses today to pay honor and homage to mother. In every mansion and humble cottage human hearts beat faster as in every breast there wells up the most noble and holy thoughts of mother.

Like the love of God, of which she is the embodiment, mother cannot be fully comprehended for the length, breadth, height, and depth of her love for her children.

It seems almost improper and undignified to honor mother with flowery words of adulation, for she is like a great cathedral which, when one enters, fills the soul with everything that satisfies and sanctifies. In her presence we receive her benediction and, under her columned arches, are sheltered as by the feathered wings of our Heavenly Father.

We stand in reverent silence before her as our hearts are made purer and our thoughts loftier. Her voice is sweeter, far, than the echoed melody of the organ pipes.

Mother is love—as God is love. She is the center and circumference of the universe, the balance wheel of man, the comfort and joy of her children, the purifying and sustaining influence of all human life.

Mother is synonymous with love as light is with life. To try to live without mother would be as impossible as to try to live without oxygen.

As Christ is the head of the church, so mother is the head and center nerve of the family. As Christ unites into one all believers, so mother unites her husband and children into a perfect bond of love and union around the family hearth.

As Christ is always ready with outstretched arms to succor all who would come unto Him, so mother loves, believes, prays, and is always ready to embrace to her bosom her children, regardless of time, sin, or circumstance.

Mother's love is as high as the heavens, as wide as the hemispheres, as deep as the ocean, and as round, complete, and beautiful as the sun.

If I could talk for a thousand years I would utterly fail to exhaust the height, length, breadth, and depth of the love of the most precious name on earth—my mother.

The Late President Manuel A. Roxas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as it must to all men, death came altogether too soon to President Manuel A. Roxas of the Philippines. It came with a staggering suddenness at a critical time in the national life of the world's newest Republic and it removed from the scene one of the best and sincerest friends of the United States in any foreign capital—a dynamic practicing friend of democracy everywhere.

There are many in the Congress of the United States who knew President Roxas personally. There are few students of public affairs either in Congress, or outside this body, who were not familiar with his accomplishments in the field of government, and his capacity for leadership.

Manuel Roxas laid down his very life on the altar of democracy. He died in the service of mankind. His last words, expressed but a few hours before he was taken from this world, were in consecration of his efforts and those of his countrymen to the fundamental concept of freedom, a pledge of undying friendship to the United States of America.

Into the hearts and minds of those who heard him in what proved to be his valedictory at Clark Field, he carved with his words this everlasting memorial and pledge:

If war should come, I am certain of one thing—America and the Philippines will be found on the same side. The freedom-loving peoples of the world do not want war, but will be forced to take a stand and fight when they must do so to preserve their liberty.

That was not mere rhetoric. President Roxas' career had already established the genuineness of his expression. Few leaders in the last war had their performances subjected to more searching examination than were his. In the welter of the fight to save mankind from enslavement under forces which he, and we, detest, he braved the certainty of misunderstanding of motives, kept his eyes fixed on the goal, and when he had fought the good fight and won, he invited scrutiny of his record. The people of the Philippines who had shared his fight gave their answer when they elected him to be their President.

Manuel Roxas carried the scars of warfare in a gravely ill body, but none but his immediate confidants in government knew the extent of his illness. He fought the problems of peace as he had fought those of armed conflict. He went down fighting, as he knew he would, and he stands today as much a martyr to his cause and his country as any man in the history of the Philippines.

There are valuable lessons to be drawn from his death as there are to be drawn from his life. It is hard for surviving humanity to find consolation in the death of a loved one, but it has been truly said that "greater love hath no man than that he lay down his life for his fellow men."

Manuel Roxas is dead. But the spirit of Manuel Roxas will live on, to keep fresh in the hearts of his countrymen the principles of sacrifice to the ideal that is the dignity of mankind, the preservation of the freedoms with which every man is endowed when born.

It is fortunate that the reins of government have passed into the hands of another liberty-loving Filipino, a man who, like Roxas, considered that life without liberty is in fact life not worth living. He is Elpidio Quirino, who was Vice President and Secretary of Foreign Affairs in the Roxas government. Like the deceased President, Quirino is a sterling and a proven patriot, an honest, sincere friend of the United States. He was schooled in peace and in war, and by association, in the fundamentals of government and democracy which elevated Manuel Roxas to the highest office within the gift of his people, and is a fitting successor to the Presidency.

Like Roxas, Quirino is well known to many Members of this body. He gained first-hand acquaintance by his most recent visit to the United States only a year ago.

The world has embraced the Philippines into the family of nations—and with mutual benefits. The United States bows in grief at the death of Manuel Roxas. We realize that the burdens that have fallen upon Elpidio Quirino at this time in the life of his nation are exceedingly heavy. We pray for him and for the Divine guidance necessary to carry on the work of his beloved predecessor.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that I have been privileged to know the late President Manuel A. Roxas and to be numbered among his friends.

I first came in contact with Manuel Roxas in 1933 when as a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, I sought to acquaint myself with the views of the people of the Philippines with regard to the pending question of independence. I was privileged to address the House of Representatives of the Philippine Legislature at that time when Manuel Roxas was the distinguished speaker and guiding spirit of the assembly. It was while

holding that lofty office that I was honored as the guest of the speaker at a luncheon which followed my impromptu remarks before the legislature.

It was at this gathering of some of the foremost sons of the Philippine Islands that I was accorded the privilege of meeting Elpidio Quirino, who now accedes to the Presidency. The friendship and understanding which grew up between the late and beloved Manuel Roxas and Elpidio Quirino and myself dates back to that meeting and I hope continues to the end of our days.

I shall pray for the well-earned and peaceful repose of the soul of my late and beloved friend, Manuel Roxas, and I shall always remember my equally good friend his successor, President Elpidio Quirino, as I plead for strength, courage, and enlightenment before the throne of Him from whom come all good things.

Inter-High-School Choir of Rochester, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, to the Nation's Capital, with spring, come thousands of our young people from all over this great country. They carry home with them unforgettable memories of their visit to the seat of their Government.

Today we welcome to Washington a fine group of young men and women, who come here, not so much to be ministered unto as to minister. They have brought with them their rich, melodious voices. They are the inter-high-school choir from that city, perhaps unequaled, certainly unsurpassed in cultural attainments, as well as in many other respects, not the least of which is the civic pride of the citizens, the city of Rochester, N. Y.

The inter-high-school choir sang last evening at the annual dinner of the American Chamber of Commerce, yesterday noon at the Washington Rotary Club. and yesterday afternoon at Walter Reed Hospital, where their reception was so generous that they were nearly required to make their exit by force. This evening they will appear on a broadcast with the United States Army Air Forces Band.

Tomorrow morning, Friday, at 10:15 o'clock, on the front steps of the Capitol they will make their last appearance in Washington.

To all my distinguished colleagues and the members of their staffs who can spare the time from their arduous duties, the most cordial invitation is extended to take advantage of this unusual treat. You will find that in music also the well-known maxim is exemplified, "Rochester made means quality."

Speech of Archibald Stevens Alexander at Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the speech delivered by Mr. Archibald Stevens Alexander at the New Jersey State Democratic Convention in Trenton on April 27 upon his election as temporary chairman of the convention. Mr. Alexander is the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate. His speech follows:

First, let me thank you for the honor you paid me in electing me as temporary chairman of this Democratic State convention, and let me thank the party for the honor of being its candidate for the United States Senate. I am deeply sensible of my obligation to the people of New Jersey as a representative of one of the two major political parties.

We are met here to fulfill an important part of the success of democratic government as developed in this country. Our people choose their representatives at stated intervals on the basis of three things: the records of the parties, the individuals whom the parties have nominated, and the platforms on which they are running. The records are made and the candidates are chosen. It remains for us to state the things for which our party stands in this critical year.

First, a word as to our general position. In domestic affairs we are neither the party of reaction and inertia nor the party of radical, sudden change of the kind familiar in the world's recent history. We believe in our American way of life, in an economy of free enterprise and competition, in the opportunity of the individual to make his own life and his own way, without dictation by the Government. On the other hand, we also believe that every citizen is entitled to his Government's protection against exploitation and against the hazards of old age, ill health, and unemployment.

Our general position in foreign affairs is also easy to define. The voice of Woodrow Wilson still warns us against isolating ourselves from the rest of the world, even if that were possible; but we also reject the notion that the simple solution to the world's and our own problems is to turn the other cheek to Russia.

Our party, then, stands for an approach to our national problems, domestic and foreign, which is basically different from either the Republican approach or the radicals.

What specific policies and measures do we believe in? The resolutions committee will undoubtedly cover them fully. But there are some matters about which I feel strongly and which I should like to mention.

As to foreign affairs:

1. The United States must continue effective aid, as begun under the Marshall plan, to other free and friendly countries. This should be done without waste and on a self-help basis, to enable the recipient countries to take care of themselves as soon as possible.

2. Our tariff policy must be geared to the Marshall plan and to the United Nations. This country must have foreign trade. There is a strong humanitarian reason for this; and also you will find that many of our business concerns are dependent on a relatively small volume of foreign trade for a high percentage of the net earnings which enable them to stay in business.

With the present impoverishment of most of the rest of the world, it will be impossible for us to have foreign trade unless we either give away our products or buy foreign products. I should not want to see the American taxpayer saddled forever with the burden of buying American products to be given away to foreign countries. The sound alternative is to encourage other countries to get back on their feet, by buying their exports.

To make it possible for us to import raw materials or finished products from abroad, we must avoid high tariffs. American consumers will benefit from this policy, as the tariff paid of course, increases the price at which the product is sold in this country.

But at the same time we must be sure that competition from foreign products does not endanger any sound American industry which is essential for defense and does not cause permanent unemployment.

I, therefore, favor progressive reduction of trade barriers by the United States in accordance with a long-term plan looking to conservation of our own resources like petroleum products and other minerals. This should be accomplished by trade treaties with other countries containing adequate escape clauses and so far as possible negotiated within the framework of the United Nations.

3. We must strengthen the United Nations to give it the power to maintain peace in the world. Until it can do so, we must make absolutely sure that we can defend ourselves.

Congress, in consultation with the executive branch of the Government, should agree on amendments to be proposed to the United Nations Charter. These should provide for (a) the curtailment or abolition of the veto, now the exclusive right of a few large powers, (b) the establishment of a world security force, so that the international law may be enforced between nations very much as our laws are enforced between individual American citizens, (c) the drawing up of an adequate body of world law for acceptance, if it desires, by each country which wishes to see world civilization preserved and improved, and (d) the adoption of means to prevent indirect, subversive aggression like the recent Communist coup in Czechoslovakia. Power to do this might, for instance, be found in a provision permitting the United Nations, when it believes there has been interference from outside a country, to call and supervise an election in that country—so that now in Czechoslovakia, for example, instead of a one-party election of the Russian model, a free election would be held to determine what form of government the Czechs and Slovaks really wish.

4. In the meantime, we should do well to remember the cruel methods used, first in Poland and most recently in Czechoslovakia, both brought back to life after World War I by President Wilson. We gave them democracy and free elections; the commissars took them away. I sincerely hope we shall live to see the rebirth of their liberties. We ourselves, cannot take the terrible risk that the iron curtain with the words "made in Russia" will also ring down on us. We must have an integrated selective service and universal military training program. Only those with ulterior motives should criticize America if she learns the lesson history has twice taught in 30 years and if she refuses to make the old mistake of appeasement. Knowing how to defend yourself does not make you a bully.

5. We must promptly help to find permanent homes throughout the free world for the displaced persons who are still stranded in old Nazi concentration camps in Europe. So far the present Republican Congress has not seen fit to provide the laws required for this purpose. The United States must do its share and persuade others to do theirs.

No one who saw what those people suffered can forget, or fail to try to right the wrong.

And we must continue to seek justice for the Jewish people. The United Nations, at our urging, agreed to the partition of Palestine and the recognition of the Jewish national homeland. Thereupon, the Arab nations, though members of the United Nations and subscribers to its charter, refused to obey its decision. As soon as possible we should proceed, through the United Nations, to carry out partition to which we rightly remain committed. Meanwhile, every effort should be made to avoid needless bloodshed.

Perhaps the most important thing of all is for us to be realistic about Russia. Congress and the administration must agree on a policy and then enlist the wholehearted support of the American people.

We do not know what the Kremlin plans or wants, but we must decide what we want and what we cannot stand for. If it is vital to us that Russia should not take over Canada, let us say so. If it is vital for us that Russia should not take over France, let us say so. Two world wars were caused in part because Germany was not told beforehand what would make the European democracies fight.

The President has already begun to shape the policy we should follow. In Greece and Turkey we have spoken and acted; otherwise they would now be Russian satellites. In Italy we have spoken and acted instead of waiting for the first move and finding it was the last. Italy has freely chosen and, because her choice was free, she has aligned herself with western civilization. Once again she is the country of Garabaldi and Cavour, entitled to the world's thanks for adhering to her time-honored principles of liberty and freedom, and we are proud of those Americans of Italian descent who gave Italy their advice and encouragement at this critical hour. These are the products of firm and timely action, taken both by the administration and the people. They probably mark a turning point in history and the beginning of the world's convalescence. Let us continue to furnish leadership, as befits this mighty country, steadfastly, conscious of the righteousness of our cause and never belligerently. We hope, in time, to convince Russia, too.

As to domestic affairs, the goal is clear. We must remain strong at home. Here are some of the things our party believes we should do:

1. No statistics are needed to prove that inflation is here. Think of the price of milk, of eggs, of butter, of clothing, of other necessities. Then remember what the price was at the end of the war. Why have these prices doubled or more? Why do the housewives and the family provider find that higher wages buy less?

The answer is simple. The demand for our products, throughout the world, exceeds the supply. In the absence of controls, the demand pushes prices up. The President foresaw this. Last year he asked Congress for the power to prevent it; he presented a broad program for curbing inflation, including a request for stand-by authority to place ceilings over the price of vital commodities. But the Republican Congress, elected in 1946 on the pledge of a sound economy and the unfulfilled promise of fair prices, refused, and still refuses, to give the President the necessary power. The result is that prices climbed at a dizzy rate. The vast majority of the people—those who depend on their wages, their salaries, the earnings from business—find they can no longer afford to buy many things they need.

The Republican Congress has made a serious and tragic mistake. It has no right to ignore the country's welfare, even though the people might have given the credit for controlling prices to the President.

We should be armed with national legislation which will permit the executive branch of the Government to place ceilings over the prices of certain basic commodities, such as staple foods and fuel. These ceilings, together with continuing rent control and the regulation of electric, gas, telephone, and railroad rates, which we have long accepted, would assure us of being able to buy the necessities of life at stable prices.

I am against Government interference with business when it can be avoided. But no government is worthy of the name in modern times which cannot deal with inflation.

2. Labor-management relations must be improved. Continuation of the present situation, the strikes and the loss of pay and production, are a serious threat to the common welfare. The solution should be sought in a return to voluntary action, not in centralized Government control. I believe that the Taft-Hartley law lays too much stress on the Government's role. You remember that in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany one of the first steps taken by the dictators was the substitution of government orders for free bargaining between management and labor. We, on the contrary, must encourage free, strong, educated, and enlightened union membership and leadership, aware of labor's great stake in a sound, free enterprise economy. Thus aware of its stake, labor will be our staunchest defense against dictatorship, whether from the right or the left.

Congress should obtain a prompt report by an impartial group composed of representatives of labor and management, with representatives of the general public in the majority. This report should propose a new law in place of the Taft-Hartley law, which should then be repealed. I believe the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed because its many unfair provisions impair its valid objective and because it has not brought peace to labor relations. But I believe that we must retain an effective means of dealing with a great strike such as we have just witnessed in the coal industry; the citizens of New Jersey must not be at the mercy of anyone with the power to deprive them of a necessity of life.

3. We should strengthen and encourage our American economy of free enterprise and competition. We should not look with hostility on any group of Americans; taxes should not be punitive in purpose and should be reduced when revenues are sufficient to meet expenses and to make a start on reducing the national debt; and our party believes that it is our free economy, combined with social justice, which has enabled this country as a whole to have incomparably the highest standard of living in the world. But we must not stand still. We must provide protection for all our people against the hazards of old age, unemployment, and ill health; we must make available decent housing to all our citizens, particularly our veterans, at a fair price; and we must prevent the wasting of our natural resources, lest to profit this generation we disinherit our descendants.

4. We must translate into fact what is written in the Federal Constitution and in our recently adopted New Jersey Constitution, forbidding discrimination and guaranteeing equality under the law, regardless of race, creed, or color. No group in this country must have just cause to look with yearning at the lot of those under other forms of government.

There are many other issues, but these will show where our party stands. The Republican Congress has taken its position, and so has our Democratic administration. To me there is no doubt which is right.

Here is the score:

Foreign affairs:

1. Marshall plan. Enlightened Republicans made the issue nonpartisan, but it is fair to point out that the idea originated with the Democratic administration and that on the final Senate vote the majority of the voters for the plan came from the Democratic Party, while the majority of the negative votes came from Republicans.

2. On tariffs the Republicans have already begun to revert to their old isolationist high-tariff position. This will retard world recovery and weaken the Marshall plan.

3. On restoring our strength for self-defense: The President long since asked for action, which the Republicans have delayed until this very day.

4. The President requested, but the Republicans have not provided, adequate means for bettering the plight of the displaced persons.

5. I hope that the strengthening of the United Nations and the establishment of a clear, firm policy toward Russia will be advocated by the platforms of both major parties.

On the domestic issues discussed here is the record:

1. The Republican Congress has refused to act on the President's request for discretionary power to control prices. Present high prices are the direct result of Republican inaction.

2. Though some labor abuses required remedying, the Taft-Hartley law is not the answer. It has not brought peace to labor relations. It should be replaced.

3. Extension of social-security coverage and other needed social legislation were proposed by the President. The Republican Congress has done nothing.

4. The Republican Congress has failed to provide for adequate housing at a fair price for all our citizens, and particularly our veterans.

5. On civil liberties the President has taken the lead, thereby showing great courage. The Republicans have so far limited their action to chortling over the political gains they hope for.

In conclusion, I should like to express our faith in the future. We are a strong, richly endowed country with a matchless heritage. We are now the leader in the front rank of civilization. We are proud of this opportunity for leadership and confident that, if we but do our best, we shall not fail ourselves or the world.

Increase of Pay of Post Office Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 29, 1948:

RAISE POST OFFICE PAY

Speaking of spending United States Government money, we think some of it ought to be dealt out in the form of permanent pay increases to the Nation's approximately 300,000 post office employees—letter carriers, clerks, supervisors, railway mail men, etc.

About 85 percent of these people work in cities, where living costs are high; and, though they got a modest raise in 1945, they are still far from overpaid. The basic salary is $2,100 a year in the clerk and carrier services, which account for 250,000 of the 300,000 postal workers.

MAKE IT $800 PERMANENTLY

The Senate Post Office Committee has reported favorably on a bill for a permanent increase of $800 a year; the House Post Office Committee is willing only to grant a hike of $585 on an annual basis until June 30, 1949.

Of the two plans, we like the Senate permanent $800 one much better. It seems fairer, is more generous, and does not have the Indian-giving aroma which clings around the House scheme to throw the boys and girls an extra $585 for a year or so and then cut them back.

While tossing the billions to Europe, Asia, and elsewhere, couldn't Congress at this session kindly bring itself to toss a few bucks to some of our own people, and some of our best public employees?

Hollywood Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared recently in the Hartford Courant.

I insert it in the RECORD so that future historians will have it available when they write The U. S. A. of 1948:

HOLLYWOOD FABLE

The ink was hardly dry on the final decree when a special courier rushed it by air to the waiting groom. The bride, with practiced hand, was arranging her trousseau. Outside the masses lined the streets and clamored for a sight of Bunsyn Byrner, who was making her twelfth trip up the aisle. The groom, a veritable novice who had made the journey only nine times, was none other than Wally Wopping, scion of an old family that could trace its bank account back to the First World War. Lulubelle Parsnips gave a blow-by-blow account. "She's dining daintily," she told the throng, as she watched the charming Bunsyn attack a king-size porterhouse. "And like all brides, she's a bit fluttery."

The flower girls were Beryl, Cheryl, Meryl and Zeryl, daughters of the bride by her ninth, eighth, seventh, and sixth marriages respectively. They were winsome in their strapless evening gowns. Little Daryl, from the fifth, was garbed in purple tails and carried the ring on a specially designed pillow, stuffed with peach fuzz imported from Transjordan for the occasion. A unique electrical installation transformed the pillow into a tiny marquee that methodically flashed the title of the bride's last picture. "It's all too, too, charming," reported Lulubelle.

In response to roars from the crowd, the bride-to-be appeared on the balustrade and clasped her hands above her head in chummy greeting. She was flanked by her bridesmaids, Ethyl and Bethyl, children by her second and third marriages, six publicity men, four photographers, legal counsel, and none other than the great Faryl McGaryl. He, of course, is best known for his colossal production, The Bride Counted Thirteen, starring Bunsyn Byrner and now probably playing at local theaters.

At that moment the strains of a string quartette, invisible because they were hidden gold-brocaded palms, gave off with Here Comes the Bride, Bunsyn sighing daintily, murmured to Athyl, her oldest daughter: "That sounds familiar." All laughed heartily and turned to proceed with the nuptials in what Miss Parsnips declared was "a ceremony that tops anything these old eyes have seen in a long time." Then Miss Parsnips added, "Love makes the world go round," coining a phrase.

Sacrifices on the Altar of the Oleo Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the production of butter in the United States has already fallen 200,000,000 pounds since 1944, while the consumption of oleo has increased in the same period 150,000,000 pounds. Since 1944 the number of milch cows in the United States has decreased by 2,500,000. Inasmuch as the State of Wisconsin produces a large part of the fluid milk in the United States, this means that Wisconsin dairy farms have lost a great share of the 2,500,000 milk cows that have been shipped to packing houses during the past 4 years.

During this time our population has increased. We now have over 145,000,000 people in this country. Marriages have also increased at the rate of 500,000 a year. There were nearly 4,000,000 babies born in the United States last year.

There is no question that the passage of the oleo bill will result in a greater scarcity of milch cows. This will mean a continued scarcity of milk in this country. With a continuous increase in our population and an increase in the number of babies, it is inevitable that there will be a growing increase in the demand for more milk, while the supply of milk is on the down grade. The answer can only be higher prices to the consumers of milk. If milk goes up 5 cents a quart, and the ordinary family buys an average of 1 to 10 quarts of milk a day, that will mean an increase in the cost of living for the ordinary family for milk alone of $18.25 to $182.50 a year.

While the 26 oleo-producing corporations are making huge profits in the sale of oleo at exorbitant prices, there are more than 3,000,000 dairy farmers in the United States that are being seriously affected, with many of them disposing of their entire dairy herds.

In Wisconsin over 80 percent of the butter is produced in cooperative creameries that are controlled by dairy farmers who live on and own their family sized dairy farms. They are the good American citizens who would be sacrificed on the altar of the Oleo Trust.

Senator Vandenberg Warns Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of a history-making speech by Michigan's senior United States Senator, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, during the Michigan Chamber of Commerce dinner at the Statler Hotel, Washington, Monday, April 26, 1948:

Above everything else tonight, America and the civilized world want peace—thus far largely denied to anxious humanity by the attitudes of Soviet Russia and her satellites. It is a universal prayer which rises in countless different tongues from every family hearthstone round this globe—including, I am sure, the great Russian people themselves. The heart of the world cries out for peace.

But it must be peace with justice and with honor or it is nothing more than another armistice with new aggression. It must be peace which stabilizes human rights and fundamental freedoms or we have lost every objective for which we fought two world wars, and for which—though God forbid—we could be forced to face a third, though never, never, never through our voluntary choice.

It cannot be a Munich peace—because appeasers merely precipitate the very disasters from which they seek to flee. It cannot be a Yalta peace—because unwise and complacent compromises start chain reactions which are dangerously misread as tokens of weakness and surrender. It cannot be a Wallace peace—let's be quite frank about it—because communistic fraternity sooner or later produces but one kind of unity—the kind that Jonah enjoyed when he was swallowed by the whale.

But it can be peace based upon the reborn pledges of the Atlantic Charter to which we all faithfully subscribe in a bond of blood. It can and must be peace stemming from the revitalized obligations of the tortured United Nations Charter which bears all our signatures. It can and must be a peace which proposes to live and let live according to the free choice of free men in a free world. This emphatically includes the Russians. It can and should be peace which guarantees the Soviets the same protection against hostile conspiracies which we require in kind. It can and should be peace which safely releases the Soviets to concentrate upon that same internal, progressive rehabilitation which they so greatly need and which, in turn, is equally the need of their presently terrorized neighbors. It can and must be peace on a two-way street. I continue to believe that this is not impossible—if we make our own position immutably plain and if we give effective leadership and cooperation to the nonaggressive forces of democracy elsewhere which ask only the independent privilege of ordering their own lives.

What, then, is our position? I conceive it to be this:

First. We do not covet an inch of alien territory or a dollar of alien reparations. I say it proudly; no aggression by us is feared by any other people, though this is the most powerful Nation in the world. We are not imperialists by any stretch of the imagination. On the contrary, we have given ample evidence of prodigal unselfishness in our devotions to the dignity and the freedom and the brotherhood of man. We still want and we still pursue a people's peace.

Second. We are selfish only in that we recognize our own stake in the indivisibility of peace and world stability. Therefore, the peace and the stability of others—the maintenance of independent nations which live by self-determination—the integrity of collective security among the peace-loving peoples of the earth—the survival of democracy—even more intimately, the survival of western civilization—these are of direct concern to us. They are the direct concern of peace.

Third. We respond, within necessary conservation of our own resources, to those who strive to help themselves in pursuit of these objectives. Thus, for example, the

great European recovery program aids 16 independent nations to remain independent and to integrate their common restoration of self-reliance and their common defense of the peace-hopes by which men live. The continuity of our aid is dependent upon the continuity of their progress. This is a blueprint for peace. Italy has just demonstrated some of the wholesome possibilities.

Fourth. We aim no aggression at anybody. We have chosen no foes to fight unless they first choose us. Despite bitter aggravation upon occasion, we cling tenaciously to the council table as preferable to the battlefield. It will not be our fault if this option is withdrawn. We want universal limitation upon armaments, dependably protected against bad faith. We would strengthen and revitalize the United Nations, which is still the world's greatest peace potential despite the terrific strains which have been put upon it before it has even yet been allowed, thanks to Russian intransigence, to perfect its contemplated peace machinery. We have not yet even scratched the surface of the possibilities of its regional arrangements, as exemplified in the Rio treaty. There can be vital progress in this procedure—and I venture to predict there will.

Fifth. Meanwhile, we are realists. We do not propose to be isolated in a world that has been communized by conquest. We do not shut our eyes to the cold, hard facts that there are those in the world who respect nothing else but force. We shall adequately prepare ourselves for any such argument if there still be those who mistakenly think of us as pacifists-at-any-price. And we are suicidal fools if we do not root out and destroy any treason at home which may dream of bringing world revolution to the United States.

In conclusion, I think I would say this to Marshal Stalin tonight:

1. Something is wrong with your diplomacy or with ours—or with your objectives or with ours—if we cannot find a formula for world peace instead of world war in an atomic age which makes the price of victory too great to pay.

2. You should understand, with complete conviction, that we greatly respect the great Russian people and their inalienable right to rule themselves to suit themselves, precisely as we insist upon this right for ourselves and others.

3. You should understand, with complete conviction, that we are just as determined as you are (in respect to your fears of Axis resurgence) that military aggression from any source, and no matter what guise, shall never curse the earth again, and we are enlisted in this cause for keeps.

4. You should understand, with complete conviction, that we are prepared for enlightened, progressive cooperation with every land which invites and deserves our mutual good will.

5. You should understand, with equal conviction, that we cannot be driven, coerced, or pressured into positions which we decline voluntarily to assume; that we will not bargain in human rights and fundamental liberties anywhere on earth; and, underlying everything, that we shall not surrender to Communist conspiracies in the United States.

Reward for Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, time wears on, and nothing is done in regard to the bills to provide for a cost-of-living increase for the employees of the Post Office Department or, so far as that is concerned, for all Federal employees who are certainly feeling the pinch of sky-high prices, which common sense tells us are going higher, thanks to the wrecking of price controls by this Republican Congress.

In that connection, I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave, the text of an editorial published in the New York Daily Mirror of April 23, 1948, and forwarded to me through the courtesy of Max Rosenson, of New York, vice president of the Empire Branch of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

I hope that all Members will take time to read this straightforward discussion of the pay needs of the postal workers, and I hope especially that the members of the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service will read it carefully.

The matter follows:

REWARD FOR LOYALTY

Congress has before it legislation which would increase permanently the pay of Federal postal workers $800 a year. The figure is not lavish. Indeed, it will do no more than raise the income level of the hard-working people in the postal service to a point where they can break even.

This legislation should be promptly and overwhelmingly passed.

Strangely enough, however, it has bogged down in the welter of priority legislation which includes socialization schemes, billions for foreign countries, and benefits for organized labor—legislation which would help almost everyone except the loyal men and women who conduct, every day in the year, the most efficient postal service in the world.

Postal workers are not organized as are labor unions.

They are restrained by law from taking part in politics.

They do not have the right to strike, and they do not want such a right.

The service is made up of men and women of a high degree of education and skill who have devoted their lives to Government careers.

Next to the law courts, it is the oldest public service in the United States of America, the first post office having been established in 1691.

And it is the one Government agency close to the American people in their everyday lives. Everybody knows the postman, but perhaps not one American in a thousand comes in contact with a judge or other Federal officer.

Yet the postal workers went for 20 years without a single raise, until 2 years ago.

But since that first raise in 20 years, the cost of living, as gaged by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has gone up nearly 30 percent.

Also since that time, organized labor has gone through one, two, and is now engaged in a third round of pay hikes, and these organized unions have in nearly all cases had the support and blessing of the Federal Government which has treated its own postal workers so shabbily.

The plain, shameful fact is that workers are literally being starved out of this vital service, though the postoffice largely pays its own way with its own revenues.

Many Congressmen are justifiably concerned with the expenditures necessary for the Nation's defense.

But the time has come, we think, when the Government must distinguish between its necessary and loyal employees and the thousands of pay roll joyriders who still infest Washington and the Nation, many of them persons who have hopped from agency to agency and bureau to bureau since the early days of the New Deal.

As Senator BYRD has pointed out, much of the defense program could be financed by cutting the fat from the Federal bureaucracy.

The Congress should raise postal pay to decent standards—then make up the amount, many times over, by sending back to honest work about one-third of the more than 2,000,000 Federal employees—the third that is paid by the people for loafing on the people's time.

West Virginia Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of West Virginia.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information an outline of such laws, as compiled by Orval F. White, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 805 West Virginia Building, Huntington, W. Va., assisted by other members of that department and Huntington Chapter No. 2, as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Each county provides for the burial of indigent veterans, but burial may not be made in a cemetery or cemetery plot used exclusively for the burial of indigent persons.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Disability of minority is waived for veteran or spouse to contract under the GI bill of rights.

Administration of estates and trusts of those members of the armed forces presumed to be dead is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The State registrar is required to furnish free copies of birth and death records to State and county welfare departments and to organized charities for use in presenting claims to the United States or the West Virginia Relief Compensation Department.

Honorable discharges are recorded free of charge.

A State department of veterans' affairs has been created to aid, assist, and advise veterans.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

County boards of education may enter into contracts with the Veterans' Administration for education of veterans in special classes of elementary and high schools. The State superintendent of schools has established a division of veteran and adult education.

Teachers' certificates are renewed after termination of military service.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

An annual appropriation of $5,000 is provided to aid resident children of soldiers, sailors, or marines who died while serving, or as a result of having served, in the armed forces during World Wars I and II in the amount of $300.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leaves of absence are granted public officers entering military service with preservation of status and merit rating.

Preference ratings are extended to veterans on written examinations for positions in departments of public assistance, health, unemployment compensation and conservation.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Service allowance is considered in determining teachers' salaries.

War service credit is extended to members of the department of public service under the State retirement system.

War service credit is extended to teachers under the State teachers' retirement system.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

The council of defense has prepared and distributed a bulletin explaining benefits and opportunities available to veterans.

MEDALS

Distinguished service medals may be awarded to citizens of the State who served, or shall hereafter serve, in the armed forces of the United States in time of war.

MEMORIALS

Counties may erect veteran memorials and maintain same.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

The adjutant general is authorized to prepare and publish, in book form, a complete roster of all West Virginia soldiers, sailors, and marines who served with the armed forces of the United States in recent wars.

Provision has been made for placing the State flag in the Navy Cantonment Center at Pearl Harbor in commemoration of the brave boys from the State of West Virginia who defended the island on December 7, 1941.

TAX EXEMPTION; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Estates of certain deceased veterans are exempt from payment of forfeiture for failure to return property for taxation.

Certain veteran organizations are exempt from license taxes and fees for holding boxing, sparring, or wrestling contests.

Free hunting and fishing privileges, both State and county, are granted to members of the armed forces on leave or furlough.

All annual professional and occupational license or registration fees are remitted during active service in the armed forces.

VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS

Veterans' organizations have been granted certain powers under the law regulating benevolent associations.

Registration of an emblem or other insignia which resembles that of a veterans' organization, or so nearly resembles as to be calculated to deceive, is prohibited.

Copies of the roster of West Virginia soldiers, sailors, and marines in recent wars are furnished to veterans' organizations.

All property belonging to benevolent associations not conducted for private profit is exempt from taxation.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the West Virginia Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 15 chapters throughout the State, maintains three full-time national service officers, under the direction of Richard H. Frazee, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Huntington, W. Va.

These experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $3.50.

DAV SERVICE-TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 handicapped veterans of World War II to become National Service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947, and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical to set forth here, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department of legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are civilians, and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil-service appointments, and, last, but really first in importance, suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 1,525,753; total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy task, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veterans' abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Taxes and Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News:

A WORD TO THE WISE

England has learned to its sorrow that oppressively heavy taxes invite ruin; the worker loses his incentive to produce when government takes the biggest bite from the fruits of his labor; investors and management become disheartened when most of the rewards for risking venture capital and exercising business initiative disappear into the Federal Treasury.

That must not happen here, and it need not if the public and the Nation's lawmakers heed the advice of business leaders—suggestions such as the long-range Federal tax program proposed by the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce. In effect it is tax relief for the pump primers of the free enterprise system—the investors and corporations—a relief already provided for individuals, and a relief that must be extended to business if the Nation's economy is to continue on a high level of employment and prosperity.

Along with the proposed tax reductions, and obviously corollary to them, the chamber offers a 10-point program for the reduction of Federal expenditures. The suggestions all have been made many times before—curtailment of Federal grants and subsidies, consolidation of Federal agencies, paring of padded Government pay rolls—but not enough has been done to carry them out. The reason is not hard to find: The public has not been insistent enough on these budgetary reforms, but it would be insistent if each citizen would realize the extent to which waste in Government deprives him of dollars on each pay check—a new spring hat for his wife, for example, or a new tire for his car.

There are a number of conscientious Congressmen striving to effect these reforms—Indiana's Representative ROBERT A. GRANT, of the tax-conscious House Ways and Means Committee for one—but every step forward they take is resisted by the disciples of bureaucracy. The path to Federal sanity in spending and taxation would be much easier for responsible lawmakers if more citizens would cheer them on.

Price Reductions by United States Steel Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, we note with pleasure and appreciation the constructive announcement of Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless, president of United States Steel, of price reductions for a wide variety of his company's products. At this time, then, I feel it is only fitting that we also publicly express our admiration of one of our colleagues who, last February, in addressing this body, advocated such a move on exactly the same grounds as those now accepted by this corporation.

On February 23, Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, the gentleman from the Fortieth New York District, spoke to us of the farseeing and constructive leadership demonstrated by the three leading steel companies in the past—United States Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and Republic Steel—urging them to admit their mistake in announcing a rise in steel prices and to return to their previous price schedules. He pointed out their ability to do this without serious financial loss to themselves and their stockholders, in view of their greatly enhanced profits for 1947 over 1946, and urged the move as a curb to inflation and ever-rising living costs.

Congressman KEATING at that time also said to these corporations: "A return to your previous price schedule will be hailed throughout this great country, not as an exhibition of weakness, but of greatness."

United States Steel has accepted this opinion, has announced its cut in price, amounting to about $25,000,000, and has found the favorable reception to it our colleague promised, when he displayed his usual astuteness and vision in his appeal to these corporations. Let it not be said of this body that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country."

The Tragedy of Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, not alone the American system, but civilization itself, was jarred to its very foundations the other day in Jersey City, N. J., when the body of James J. Donnelly, Jr., was returned to his family for burial from the battlefields of the Pacific where he distinguished himself on all occasions. Eight marines from the Bayonne naval base were assigned to act as pallbearers, a long established tradition down through the generations.

Yet this tradition was arrested in this vicinity by the contemptible rules of the AFL United Funeral Chauffeurs and Helpers Union. The desires of the family who reared this boy were pushed aside. The righteousness of Christian religion had no place in the picture; only the almighty union who has grown to greatness fostered by help in high places chose to dictate the methods of burial.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald which tells the story of the burial of James J. Donnelly, Jr., of Jersey City, N. J.:

HOW TO LOSE FRIENDS AND ENRAGE PEOPLE

James J. Donnelly, Jr., of Jersey City, N. J., enlisted in the Marine Corps August 13, 1942. He fought through Bougainville and Guam, and for 17 days on Iwo Jima. The bullet bearing his name found him on Iwo, while he was trying to rescue a wounded pal.

Young Donnelly's body was brought home last week and sent to his family for reburial. Eight marines from the Bayonne naval base were assigned to act as pallbearers at the funeral scheduled for Monday of this week.

A UNION AT A FUNERAL

At that point, the AFL United Funeral Chauffeurs and Helpers Union of Jersey City stepped into the picture. This organization in its majesty decreed that the eight marines could not be active pallbearers for one of their own men killed in line of duty. Union rules required that six members of the funeral chauffeurs and helpers outfit must carry the casket from the funeral home to the church, and then place it in the hearse.

Protests were filed with union officials, but they stood their ground. The organized pallbearers went through with the performance as scheduled. Only after the casket reached the grave were the marines permitted to take active part in the services.

The deceased's mother remarked that "If a boy gave his life fighting for his country, I think the least the union could have done is to permit him to be borne on the shoulders of his comrades."

But that made no never mind to the union. The six union pallbearers had to get theirs regardless.

Some fellow once wrote a book called How To Win Friends and Influence People. If Bill Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, should ever feel the urge to write a book telling his boys how to lose friends for union labor, and enrage a lot of people he might well lead off with this Donnelly funeral incident.

The Origin of UMT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Tuesday, April 27, 1948:

THE ORIGIN OF UMT

Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, adjutant general of the Maryland National Guard, testified before the House Armed Services Committee that Chief of Staff Marshall and the Regular Army were determined to institute peacetime conscription as early as the surrender of Germany in May 1945. He and Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, spokesman for the Reserve Officers Association, agreed that the Regulars have consistently neglected and discouraged the guard and Reserve components ever since because they wanted conscripts and not civilian soldiers.

Marshall, now Secretary of State, has maintained a continual clamor in company of President Truman and the chieftains of the professional services for universal military training. They have worked up a war of nerves with Russia and use this engineered emergency as the pretext for demanding UMT. They do not confess that conscription has been their object for years, and that they deliberately set out to destroy the National Guard in 1940–41, after it had been mustered into Federal service, in pursuance of their strategy of rendering the Regular Army all-powerful.

The sordid story of this campaign is told in a manuscript by Maj. Gen. Henry D. Russell, the original commander of the Thirtieth Division, National Guard, largely recruited in Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. The Guard officers of this division were driven out of their commands so that the Regulars could take over. In his narrative General Russell cites a memorandum drafted July 12, 1944, by the late Gen. Lesley McNair, installed by Marshall as chief of the Army ground forces. It was addressed to the special planning division of the War Department.

This memorandum consisted of a whole string of shameless libels on the National Guard, whose valiant contributions to the national defense were brushed aside with the contemptuous remark, "One of the great lessons of the present war is that the National Guard, as organized before the war, contributed nothing to the national defense."

General McNair showed himself as ignorant of the Constiution as he was unappreciative of the patriotism of the citizen soldier when he added, "Our Constitution, in its preamble, gives 'to provide for the common defense' as one of six purposes of the Federal Government." By the "Federal Government" he obviously meant the Executive—the President and the War Department. He made no mention that it is Congress which is assigned the constitutional power of providing for the common defense by raising and supporting armies, maintaining a navy, making the rules for their government and regulation, calling forth the militia of the several States, and governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States.

But, said General McNair, "to provide for the common defense" is the most important duty of the "Federal Government," and he added, "It is not only improper, but dangerous, to share this great responsibility with the States." Having delivered himself of this dictum, General McNair concluded:

"Under the present assumption for postwar organization of the Army, it is considered that there will always be Federal troops on call for emergencies and that the National Guard as organized before the war is unnecessary and undesirable." He, therefore, recommended:

"a. That the National Guard be dispensed with as a component of the Army of the United States.

"b. That there is no objection to organizing State troops as a State guard or State police, with Federal aid if advisable or forced."

Thus the Regular Army blandly decreed the execution of the militia as authorized by the Constitution.

Not quite a year after this memorandum, on June 28, 1945, about a month and a half after Germany's surrender, General Marshall came out to Camp Grant, near Rockford, to address the seventh semiannual service command conference. He there said that "all plans for the postwar period revolved around compulsory training." He said that "we have to start things in the War Department about a year in advance. We have been at this (organization of the postwar Army) a bit longer than that now." That is, the Regular Army since the middle of 1944 had been planning peacetime conscription.

This, then, is the true story of what is back of the drive for conscription. The Regulars hate and fear the National Guard because it is composed of citizens who make soldiering a patriotic duty. They are not at their country's service for the rank, promotions, pay, perquisites, and power that there may be in it. The Army must destroy them to tighten its clutch on the Nation's Military Establishment, convert it into a professional enterprise, and thus assume every post of command.

No citizen who looks at the genesis and motives of universal military training can fail to regard this development as sinister evidence of the vaulting ambition of the militarists of America.

Communistic Infiltration in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 29, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, because of the expressed interest of my colleagues in the series of articles written by the Washington correspondent of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, Gustaf A. Nordin, revealing startling facts about communistic infiltration in the State Department, I include in my extension of remarks the sixth of a series of eight articles:

OSS FIRED MAN FOR BEING "TOO ANTI-RED," SECRET REPORT SAYS

(This is the sixth in a series of eight exclusive articles making public for the first time the findings of special agents who investigated alleged subversive activities in the State Department of the United States. The probe was made by a congressional committee to determine what the State Department was doing to rid the Federal pay roll of "poor security" risks.)

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The application for employment of a "known Communist Party member" remains in the active list at the State Department, while another employee was dismissed by OSS because he was "too anti-Soviet to be employed." He was refused State Department employment reportedly for that reason.

These two cases are among the many fantastic reports woven into a long, 75-page unpublished document now held by the House committee on appropriations.

Case No. 25, who is the alleged Communist Party member who has applied for a job, is one of a dozen in which it is reported contact existed between State Department employees and suspected Soviet espionage operatives during and after the war.

The brother of case No. 25, also employed by the Department, has been recommended for dismissal for security reasons. On last report, as shown in the House document, final determination is still pending in both instances.

No. 25 applied for a position as administrative officer at $8,197 per annum. Investigation of the case began April 9, 1947.

"Another governmental investigative agency advised, on April 13, 1947, that a reliable informant said No. 25, who is employed by the Civil Service Commission, is a member of the underground Communist group in Washington, D. C.," the House committee data reveals.

WIFE INVOLVED

"This informant further advised that the subject and his wife paid a social call on December 11, 1945, on a functionary of a Soviet espionage ring in Washington and on December 29, 1945, his wife contacted the wife of another Soviet espionage functionary and identified herself by saying her husband was acquainted with the functionary.

"The informant also advised that a brother of the subject was a member of, and active in, the Jackson Heights, Long Island, branch of the Communist Party in 1944. Further information was obtained to the effect that the subject himself has been a member of the Communist Party."

But in the case of No. 90, placed in the House report for contrast, the OSS employee was not so fortunate as to keep his Federal job.

No. 90 was born in Russia. He was investigated in 1946 for a position on the Russian desk of the Office of Information and Education.

The investigation "disclosed that he was a refugee from the Red revolution in Russia and that he was naturalized in New York City in 1927. He was employed by OSS from February to December in 1942 and then requested to resign. This was a year after the United States entered the war and Russia was an ally.

FORCED TO RESIGN

When interviewed, No. 90 said he was "forced to resign because of Communist pressure, and that C-29 of the Jewish Telegraph Agency, and Vladinar Stepanovasky, an NKVD agent in the United States, had openly stated that he was too anti-Soviet to be employed by OSS."

According to the report, this was confirmed by the OSS supervisor and a high State Department official.

No. 90 "was very highly recommended by several witnesses as an able man and as a democratic American who supported democracy for Russia and opposed communism." The Personnel Division, however, advised that No. 90 apparently "did not have qualifications for the job" in OIE.

No. 12, investigated a number of times before he resigned December 13, 1946, was described as "the greatest security risk the Department has had." Among other things, the file reflects that "he furnished material to a known Soviet espionage agent and that he has had consistent contact with a long list of Communists and suspected Soviet agents."

No. 21, a native of Posen, Poland, was naturalized in New York in 1942, then employed by the OSS, in 1946 with UNRRA, and last year applied for a position in the State Department's Division of Research for Europe. Despite derogatory information, the case was still active in the application file, according to the House report.

CONTACT FOR REDS

"Information received from another governmental investigative agency on May 2, 1947, indicates that No. 21 was a contact of E-1, a known Communist and suspected espionage agent. In speaking of going to Germany when he was with the OSS, he told her, 'I think the Russians will dominate the situation; they deserve to. The inefficiency of the AMGOT in Italy is terrible,' " the report states.

No. 67 was employed as a consultant with the State Department in the Division of Research in 1946. He was cleared May 16, 1946, as to "character, ability, dependability, general reputation, and loyalty."

"On June 7, 1946, a Government investigative agency advised that the subject is a known contact of E-15, a subject in a Russian espionage case. The subject has played bridge and exchanged language lessons with persons in the Soviet Embassy, Washington, D. C. He also is a known contact of Jessica Smith, of Soviet Russia, today."

The State Department security official contended, however, that the information is not sufficient, and that the words "known contact," used by the investigator, "mean nothing, especially since the subject was connected with Russian affairs in ONI and would naturally seek out persons who possessed knowledge of the language."

EMBASSY EMPLOYEE

The report adds that No. 67 in 1934 "addressed a letter to a Congressman in behalf of an acquaintance of known Communist sympathies being held in Finland on espionage charges."

No. 93 was employed as a file clerk in the American Embassy in Paris, France, in December 1946. The report says: "Both the subject and her husband are known contacts of two suspects in an investigation of Soviet espionage activities in the United States."

"Another Government investigative agency advised that the subject's husband has transmitted back to the United States, Communist literature of party fronts in France and in a communication he listed principal functionaries of the Communist Party in France.

"Investigation conducted by CSA in March 1947, developed no degrogatory information concerning the subject.

"A memo in the file dated July 16, 1947, stated that the subject recently sent a copy of a Communist publication to one of the Soviet espionage subjects who had previously given the subject names of well-known Communists she could contact in France."

The Embassy in France was instructed to investigate.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Members of the House examine a very enlightening editorial published by the Jamestown (N. Y.) Shopping Guide under date of April 1, 1948, which I am inserting in the RECORD. I am inserting this information for the benefit of those who have been swept off their feet by the propaganda emanating from the State Department and other governmental departments as to the necessity of the Marshall plan. The information that is coming to light seems to indicate that the Marshall plan is fast developing into an international as well as national scandal. It might not be possible but it certainly is the function of those who see their own country being weakened to stand up and defend it against the intrigues of selfish groups.

I am sure that all of this information which is now being revealed should come to the attention of the Appropriation Committee before it commits itself to the full amount asked for by the socialistic regimes abroad to foster the type of government which we have been fighting and will have to continue to fight if we are to preserve our private-enterprise system to maintain the high standard of living which our people now enjoy.

The following is the editorial to which I have already referred:

KILLING OUR FOREIGN BUSINESS

The Marshall plan is being sold on a propaganda basis that, to preserve prosperity here, we need the export trade to protect us from an imagined depression. That we could well afford to give away the things we make, to create business, we are told. Does it ever occur to those who present this idea that, if we have anything to give away, we give it to our own people?

Let's peek behind the iron curtain of Washington propaganda and double talk and see just how this plan formulated by Socialist Bevin and adopted by Truman, Marshall, and Congress, will work out.

Even before the plan has a chance to work, Secretary Harriman, of the United States Department of Commerce, has slapped licenses on all shipments to 40 countries in Europe to restrain United States exporters from making shipments there, to allow dear old England to capture the business.

Last year Congress gave the Department certain powers to license exports. There are some fairly respectable excuses for licensing, if properly practiced. It can prevent the diversion of scarce items from the domestic market. It also can be used to prevent shipment of munitions and the tools that make them to Russia.

The Commerce Department set up a licensing system, effective March 1, which export technicians charge makes it virtually impossible for small exporters to meet their foreign orders. Individual licenses are acquired for each transaction, with a few unimportant exceptions. Small concerns cannot contend with the red tape involved.

The excuse for these restrictions is that they will prevent unnecessary drains on dollar resources of countries in line for Marshall plan hand-outs. Those nations are already safeguarding the same dollars through stringent import licensing rules.

It would be assumed that, if Harriman (former Ambassador to Russia), along with Truman, were really sincere in wishing to stop shipments of vital materials to Russia, he would, under this bureaucratic set-up, stop such shipments. Truman appeared before Congress to deliver a scare talk about war with Russia. Yet, a week later, Catholic war veterans found it necessary to picket a 10,000-ton Russian freighter at Jersey City, loaded with farm tractors and industrial machinery headed for Russia. These veterans were seeking a Nation-wide boycott against shipments that might be used in war against us. They tacked a large sign on the side of the Russian ship: "Supply today—draft tomorrow." When Members of the House put Harriman's "experts" on the pan, their alibi was that licenses for these shipments had been issued before March 1. But—this was on March 20—3 weeks later. Can you imagine Joe Stalin waiting 3 weeks to stop shipments of vital materials to the United States? Then, there are those 46 bomber-plane engines shipped from New York to Russia and Poland.

A week after Truman's scare talk it was developed in a House committee that the State Department had a secret deal with poor Czechoslovakia, whereby American importers would bring in millions of shoes (to create unemployment in our factories), in exchange for shipments of heavy machinery and high-grade steel, which Russia could use for war making. This gives you a slight idea of just how sincere these Washington war talkers are about preserving peace and stopping Russia, either in a cold or hot war. They still play the pre-Pearl Harbor game, at which they are experts.

England's slogan is: "Export or die." The $3,750,000,000 loan vanished with no permanent results. England needs continuous income from world trade and cannot get it by fair competition because her Socialist system imposes heavy labor costs per unit.

The United States products introduced to other countries are becoming firmly established, because our factories produce good merchandise at low cost.

The Commerce Department is deliberately sabotaging American exports to leave the

field clear for British competitors of American firms. The beer-storage tanks are being purchased by a Government beverage monopoly in Turkey. The British cannot make them in the present state of their industry. A British firm has the contract, however, and now is seeking bids from American manufacturers, with a middleman's profit for itself. The new plan is for England to be the merchant for Europe, with American exporters to sell to England. The British stooges in the Department of Commerce are quite willing to inflict unemployment on people working for American companies if by so doing the British drive for exports can be fostered.

WHO FEEDS THE FIRES OF INFLATION?

In the months to come you will hear countless statements about increased profits or increased wages causing inflation. Most of these will be alibis, to inflame the people into thinking somebody else is guilty of feeding the fires of inflation.

The bedrock fact is that the main cause of inflation—high prices compared to income—is an increased amount of money as compared to the amount of goods produced. Only your Government can increase the amount of money in circulation. Neither the manufacturer, retailer, or labor union can do this to you.

A chart of the American Federation of Labor traces this out in a graphic manner. In 1939, when production stood at 109, the Government had $34,400,000,000 in money circulating; today the production stands at 187, but there are $116,500,000,000 in circulation.

The fantastic Marshall plan only aggravates inflation, at a serious economic period in our history, and forces everybody to pay more for everything they purchase, because demand leaps far ahead of supply; the Government steps in and becomes a competitor against the taxpayer-consumer who is saddled with the cost of the give-away plan. Mr. John Q. Public gets it coming and going.

This year there is a bumper crop of coffee, with every promise of cheaper coffee to all. In step the Marshall planners to buy 31,700,000 bags—135 pounds each—of coffee, at a cost of $940,000,000, boosting coffee prices to every consumer by 15 cents per pound more than would otherwise be necessary. So on right down the line on every item you purchase.

Mr. Truman's "police state" price control cannot dam the ever-growing flood of money inflation his planners let loose on the people. This has been proved again and again, in country after country. We must attack inflation at the root—excess money supply.

To Secure the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of today. Let us not repeat a sad experience. I have a constituent whose business takes him to Europe very often. He recently returned from his third trip since the close of the war, which also included visiting some of the middle eastern countries.

The editorial fits in so well with the story he gave me yesterday that I feel we should consider this advice carefully. A good firm stand now, showing Russia that we will not tolerate her bluff any further will, without a doubt, stop a war. I am anything but a war monger and that is the reason I believe we must act quickly to show Russia that our attitude is to guarantee to help the cooperating European nations to help themselves. I believe Russia is scared and if we wait in anticipation of an attack by 1952, the date some of our military authorities feel is the time needed for preparation and the time Russia may have the atomic bomb, we will be missing the boat. Firmness right now and our decision to show these European nations our sincerity to participate in this effort of reconstruction is vital. Also it would appear to be good business to protect these billions of dollars we are sending to Europe in the form of food and American goods. However, we must insist that these nations themselves cooperate to the fullest extent. In the meantime let us get working on a plan to revise the United Nations so it will become effective. It certainly is not working today, and this or a similar organization is the final answer to guaranteed universal peace.

The editorial follows:

TO SECURE THE PEACE

This newspaper has for some time been convinced that the economic aid extended under the European recovery program must be accompanied and supported, if it is to accomplish its great and peaceful purpose, by a firm military guaranty to the European west. If we have learned anything from the history of the last 30 years, we have learned that security is as critical a factor as food or industrial production in the welfare of societies; and a plan for western European economic revival which is bitterly opposed by the Soviet military empire and constantly threatened by its great armies is unlikely to succeed unless it is buttressed by as strong a defense as its participants can mutually supply. As the chief single participant in this magnificent effort of reconstruction, the United States cannot much longer postpone decision upon the form, amount, and character of its own contribution to the common security.

These questions are being actively explored in Washington, both by the administration and by Congress. Some at least of the basic principles which should shape the answer are already growing clear. In the military, as in the economic, sense, Europe, in the last analysis, can only be defended by Europeans; in the military, as in the economic, field, an American guaranty can only be a guaranty to help the Europeans help themselves. But if the Military Committee of the Western European Union, now meeting in London, shows a capacity to plan in concrete terms of divisions, air groups, staff coordination, and command arrangements, then they must have unequivocal and unmistakable assurance of American support.

This assurance must also be in concrete terms. It must guarantee aid in amounts sufficient to prevent a war, not simply to hold out promise of ultimately winning one after years of blood and effort and after Europe has been reduced to a final shamble in the process. The Europeans could sustain an attack for some weeks or more. Only a guaranty which gave assurance of effective aid, on the ground and within that time, could do much either to sustain the Europeans in their recovery efforts or to insure that no attack will be made. These considerations define some of the requirements. They mean a program of military lend-lease. They mean enough American rearmament to provide a modicum of immediately available military strength for Europe. They mean bipartisan support for the guaranteed policy, in order to give it the certainty of firmness and continuity. This newspaper believes that they also mean a definite treaty commitment, to run at least through the life of the economic recovery program, embodying the actual commitment already involved by the presence of our occupation forces in Germany.

The treaty should be fully in consonance with the United Nations Charter. Many have recently pointed out that under article 51, which conserves the collective as well as the individual right of self-defense, this is entirely possible as the Charter now stands. The Brussels Treaty was based on article 51. The United States could formally adhere to it under that article, as it has already adhered to the Rio de Janeiro Treaty for mutual defense of the Western Hemisphere. And such a course, so far from being contrary to the spirit or purposes or the Charter, would be fulfilling them; for it would be using the collective effort of the powers to buttress the peace, now while it is still possible to do so, rather than allowing it to degenerate in futility into another world war.

A glance at the past is instructive. The great powers did nothing after 1918 to use their collective strength for peace while it was still possible to preserve it; when war finally caught up with them, they had no strength left with which to avert it. That grim history cannot and must not be repeated. It is no denial of the United Nations if we act collectively now to secure a peace which individually we may never again be able to recover.

Pending Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered before the annual meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Association of New Jersey on March 30, 1948:

I am happy to be back here with you tonight. Not only because it is always good to be with friends but also because it gives me special pleasure to be present at your annual meeting inducting Milton MacDonald as president of your association.

You have already shown your esteem for Mr. MacDonald by making him president of this association, for which I have such high regard. You are fortunate to have such a president, because he has demonstrated on many occasions his able leadership, his vision, and his genius for organization.

This is not idle praise, nor, if I am in a position to judge, will these qualities of Mr. MacDonald be idle assets during the critical months that are ahead for us who are so vitally interested in housing. Mortgage lending is now interrelated with political, economic, and social forces that all have their effects on your operations.

I was asked to give you a report this evening on the current housing legislation that is now before Congress and to review with you the report made by the Joint Congressional Committee on Housing.

The report embodying the Joint Housing Committee findings was prepared by Senator FLANDERS and adopted on March 13. Senator FLANDERS stated that the recommendations

contained in the report placed primary emphasis on expanding and improving the private-housing industry. It is also brought out in the report that the committee feels certain problems of urban and rural slums and housing for families of very low income can only be solved through direct Federal financial assistance, and the report recommends the passage of legislation similar to the provisions contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Eighteen main points are stressed in the housing program recommended by the joint committee. They are:

1. Enactment of comprehensive housing legislation aimed at an annual housing-production rate of 1,250,000 to 1,500,000 dwellings per year and establishing a firm national housing policy that the resources of the Federal Government will be used to provide the aids needed to achieve decent homes for all American families.

2. Establishment of a program of technical housing research in the Housing and Home Finance Agency aimed at achieving lower housing-production costs through the development of more modern and efficient production methods.

3. Joint studies by the Department of Commerce and the Housing Agency of the materials requirements of a housing program of this size, with recommendations on the action needed to overcome shortages.

4. Joint efforts by these two agencies to secure voluntary allocations agreements from building-materials producers to secure sufficient supplies of building materials for housing.

5. Vigorous prosecution by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission of restraints of trade in the production and distribution of building materials.

6. Further expansion by the Department of Labor of its apprentice-training program for building-trade craftsmen.

7. One-year extension of FHA title VI mortgage insurance, with revisions to restrain further inflation in housing costs and to furnish added emphasis on the financing of rental housing.

8. Extension and broadening of the financing aids for manufacturers of housing and the establishment of additional financing aids for large-scale site construction of lower cost housing.

9. Authorization of RFC loans for the acquisition of cost-reducing machinery and equipment by housing producers.

10. Establishment of secondary mortgage market in the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assure a continued flow of credit for residential construction, with appropriate safeguards against inflationary pressures.

11. Revision and improvement of FHA's permanent title II mortgage-insurance program so as to provide greater incentives for production of lower-cost housing.

12. Establishment of additional FHA insurance programs to stimulate greater production of lower-cost rental housing. These would include special financing and technical aids for cooperative housing projects, with particular emphasis on veterans' cooperatives, and a program of yield insurance to encourage direct equity investments in rental housing by private lending institutions.

13. Establishment of Federal aids to municipalities for slum clearance, with authorization for Federal loans of $1,010,000,000, and for Federal grants of $500,000,000 over a 5-year period, with localities participating on a 1-to-2 matching basis.

14. Provision for Federal financial assistance to communities for a maximum of 500,000 additional low-rent public housing units over the next 5 years.

15. Authorization of a long-range program of aids for farm housing through the Department of Agriculture.

16. Special aids to provide housing of the special type needed by veteran paraplegic cases.

17. Resolution of appraisal differences on GI home loans as between FHA and the Veterans' Administration.

18. Studies by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the best standards to apply concerning the maximum permissible number of dwelling units per acre in rental housing projects financed with FHA insurance.

With regard to pending housing legislation, I shall try to give you a few of the highlights of the congressional plans that have been discussed in Washington. You must, however, appreciate that these plans are still in formulative stages and the situation may have changed even since I left Washington this afternoon.

The Senate last Thursday passed the Flanders bill which extends title VI for 30 days—until April 30, 1948, and increases the insurance authorization by $400,000,000. The bill also amends section 603 by striking out "necessary current cost" and substituting "value." Yesterday this Senate bill was passed by the House with some amendments, so that it will again have to be considered by the Senate before being sent to the President for signature. There seems to be every indication that title VI will not be allowed to expire on March 31.

The House of Representatives has passed the Wolcott bill extending and amending title VI of the National Housing Act, and the bill has been sent to the Senate.

Briefly, the provisions of the Wolcott bill are:

1. Two billion dollars increase in title VI insurance authorization with not less than $800,000,000 of this amount earmarked for section 608 rental housing and $200,000,000 allotted to two-, three-, and four-family dwellings under section 603. The remainder to be available for single-family dwellings under section 603.

2. Extension of title VI for 1 year—to March 31, 1949.

3. Amendment to section 603 which substitutes "valuation" for "necessary current cost" as a basis of determining the maximum mortgage amounts.

4. Authority granted the Commissioner to increase interest rates up to 5 percent under special circumstances and in specific areas.

5. Bases the maximum mortgage amount under section 608 upon $8,100 per dwelling unit rather than $1,800 per room.

6. Addition of a new section 611 which provides for a blanket mortgage with release clause provisions and the insurance of construction advances.

7. Section 609 is amended to include provision for interim financing.

This brief sketch of the legislative picture shows the question of housing and mortgage financing is one that is uppermost in the minds of many Americans today. It is receiving the serious study it deserves. Perhaps it is too soon to express the optimism I feel—at least, it is not too soon to say that private lenders and builders have made great progress in planning in the last decade—and appear to be ready to carry that progress forward to the accomplishment of new goals.

I am aware of the fact that there is considerable concern as to the availability of mortgage financing, and I do not want you to think that I have avoided discussing this situation. There is, however, very little that I can tell you at this time because, although reports have been received that this may be a factor in the volume of housing produced this year, the picture is very confusing at the moment because of the high volume of title VI applications being filed by approved mortgagees.

Changing times and conditions must be met by all of us, whether engaged in private business or Government activities. To the extent that the Federal Housing Administration may effectively do so within the framework of its legal limitation, you may be sure we shall not fail to meet each new challenge with appropriate action.

The Lamps of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the North Carolina Democratic Club of Washington, held in the club building in the city of Washington last evening, the Honorable Joe L. Blythe, Democratic national committeeman from North Carolina, was guest of honor and delivered a very able and timely address, which I now submit for the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks.

Mr. Blythe is a distinguished North Carolinian, an experienced legislator, and a beloved statesman. He has served many terms in the senate of my native State and has taken an active part in the political, civic, and social life of our Commonwealth. He fully appreciates the dangers of the world in which we live.

The speech which I am submitting for the RECORD was not made in the spirit of partisan politics. Although Senator Blythe is an outstanding Democrat, he spoke last night as an American, and I hope that his speech will be read throughout the Nation.

The speech follows:

Mr. President, members of the North Carolina Democratic Club of Washington, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a very high honor to have been invited to come here to address you, the North Carolina Democratic Club of Washington, on this occasion.

Some time ago I was unfortunate enough to be confined to bed, due to a physical disability, for a period of several weeks. During this time I had a chance and a desire to take inventory of my faith in a great many things and one of them you need not guess about, because when we are concerned about our personal welfare, we are apt to examine ourselves more closely than ever.

So in giving thought to a subject I might discuss before you tonight, I wondered if it would not be a pretty good idea for us North Carolinians to reexamine ourselves, and my conclusions will probably be disappointing to you, because I believe I know that the uppermost thing in your minds is North Carolina politics today, and that will not be my subject. However, I will probably refer to this, at least, indirectly, later on.

You know North Carolina Democrats have always been conservative and deliberate in acting upon questions that involve the welfare of the State. Her record in all of her existence has been one of generally good government. A few times, perhaps, we have thought she made some mistakes, but on the whole, when the Democrats of North Carolina speak, they have the right answer. In these days of lost horizons and conflict of ideas, I think it well to reexamine the basis of our political faith.

Those who first came to the shores of this country and landed on the Carolina coast in 1587, at Jamestown in 1607, and Plymouth Rock in 1620, numbering only a handful of people, were seeking to escape the strangle

holds of the European legal and political set-ups and to establish a new home where freedom and opportunity could be had. They did not believe in the divine right of kings nor the union of church and state. They did believe in freedom of speech and the press, the freedom of worship according to conscience, and the right of trial by jury. In brief, they desired to elevate the individual to that stature where each person would be his own king, making his own decrees concerning his life, liberty, property, and his God.

They were willing to be loyal to England as a mother country so long as Parliament and the King did not impose undue restraint on their personal liberty and property. But when George III needed money to carry on his European wars and sought to impose burdensome taxes on the colonists to help fill his war chests, the colonists, lead by North Carolina, promptly declared their independence of the mother country, and took to arms to defend their position. This war of independence ended successfully for the colonists, left them free and independent, but without a central government. To remedy this situation, the 13 States formed a loosely-knit confederation which lasted 12 years. In Philadelphia during 1787 a convention was called for the purpose of providing a central government. After much deliberation and debate a constitution was drawn up to provide for this central government—a government to be safeguarded with checks and balances.

Now when this new constitution was submitted to the States for ratification it was understood that the constitution contained only a delegation of authority, that is all power which should rightfully belong to a free people, originated with the people and this new central government could have only those powers which the people, through their representatives, chose to give it. All of the rest and remainder of the rights which belong to a free people remain with the people. The States were slow to ratify this new charter of delegated authority—this new government of centralized control. The people remembered that most of their personal freedom had been denied in the mother country by a strong central government. They said the President would become a king—a king who would issue decrees—decrees which might put a man in jail without cause and keep him there without trial, or require him to worship in a church other than his choice, or to pay taxes in support of that church—all of which they feared and did not want. They feared the unwritten language of the constitution more than its positive statements, they insisted that the personal freedoms be written into the language of the Constitution. So these guarantees of personal freedom were added to the Constitution in 1791 and are now referred to and greatly cherished throughout the world as the Bill of Rights.

You will recall that North Carolina and Rhode Island refused to ratify the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was included, and because of this insistence North Carolina was not in a position to vote for George Washington when he first became President.

The State constitutions adopted by each of the 13 States contained guaranties of personal freedom in much the same language as that of the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution. It seems that our forefathers wanted a double check in order to make sure that if the Federal Government should collapse, then each State would become a sovereign government and the citizens would retain their cherished personal freedom under the State constitutions at least.

Thus, it will be observed that the founding fathers had uppermost in their minds the preservation of personal liberty for which they had come to this country in the first instance and had fought the War of the Revolution to preserve. It was freedom of conscience and speech and the right to have and to hold property which guided them to the shores of this country and which strengthened their arms in their fight to retain this new freedom.

It was a generally accepted view of these early States that each was sovereign of its own internal affairs. It was also generally accepted that the Federal Government was formed to repel invasions by an enemy and for the common security of all the States. Indeed, more than one of the States threatened from time to time to withdraw from the Union. In fact, during many debates in the Halls of the Senate, Members from the northern group of States threatened to pull out of the Union, but it was not until 70 years later that the rights of secession were cleared and a further amendment adopted whereby the right to secede from the Union was forever denied. Although no State has attempted to secede during the past 75 years, yet we read continually about debates taking place in Congress on States' rights. This is a throw-back to the original idea of independence and self-determination to be enjoyed and a freedom to be exercised by each of the States.

The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution provides dual citizenship. Thereby we are citizens of the State in which we live and of the United States. Thus, the protecting arm of both governments is about us in the protection of our life, liberty, and property.

With the passing of years, the 13 Original States, located along the Atlantic seaboard with a population of 4,000,000, have increased to 48 States reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific with a population of more than 140,000,000 people. This growth and expansion has brought many new problems to our people. The division of duty between the States and the Federal Government becomes more and more complicated. Generally speaking, the States have been able to prevent the central Government from overlapping a great deal of authority in managing their internal affairs. However, during recent years the tendency has been for the States to gradually yield more and more authority to the Federal Government.

By common consent it is admitted that because of our position of world leadership among the nations, we should have a strong central Government, fully capable of dealing with international problems, but at the same time there are many, very many, who believe that this power should be limited to foreign affairs and should have no application to the domestic affairs of the States.

It is thought that, except as expressly conceded by the Constitution, every State should be able to determine for its people, through its State legislatures, policies concerning education and the training of its youth; health regulation; the kind and amount of taxes which should be levied; the location and type of highways which should be used, except as it would apply to projects such as the national parkways; the conservation and development of its natural resources; all rules and regulations concerning its police power for the control of crime; the prescribing of qualifications for voting and the control of all elections for public office, etc., it is thought that at least control of these functions should remain close to the people, and that these duties have not been delegated to the central Government.

Thus, I pay tribute to the patience and foresight of the men who set up the framework of a democracy which has endured for more than 150 years, wherein men could work and achieve, have an opportunity to attain their full stature in accordance with the plan of the Creator of us all. It must not be lost sight of that we have fought two World Wars to maintain the freedom provided and guaranteed by this Constitution. It was solely to perpetuate freedom and to write it in the basic law of the land that our forefathers insisted on the Bill of Rights becoming a part of our fundamental law. It was to extend freedom and hope to the enslaved nations of the world that two great world leaders met in the stormy waters of the North Atlantic and adopted another great charter. Freedom cannot be preserved by a weak and vacillating people. A philosophy of government which counsels a people to take the road of least difficulty and appeasement is not the voice of freedom. When the people of a community or State decline to cope with them and shift their responsibility, they are on the verge of abandoning their priceless heritage of freedom.

During recent months the Congress of the United States has been called on to keep the light of freedom burning in the European capitals and to prevent a black-out of the lamps of liberty in the remaining democracies of the world. This issue obscures all domestic questions which are now before our people. Indeed, there is no local issue within the United States of such paramount importance to our people as the question, Shall the lamps of freedom be extinguished one by one until the democracy of our country remains as the only lighthouse of freedom yet undimmed in all the world?

You ask me, How will the people of North Carolina vote in the coming fall election? I ask of you whether the party, the candidate, or the survival of freedom will then be the uppermost issue in the minds of our people. If freedom is safe, then our people will be willing to discuss candidates; if freedom is in danger, then the call to arms will supersede all questions as to whom the people will charge with the responsibility to preserve it.

Now, you North Carolinians who live here in Washington have a very grave responsibility to discharge and that is to exercise your rights and privileges at the ballot box. You who live under the very dome of a Central Government which guarantees freedom for us all, are in a better position to know and understand the responsibilities of a citizenship in a state which has kept a high degree of democracy which is superseded by none, and I charge you as your national committeeman to exercise your right of franchise and let all of us North Carolinians join together in keeping the lamps of democracy lighted.

Removal of Oleo Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that far too much emphasis has been placed on the supposed benefits the cotton farmer will receive by the passage of the pending bill. The farmers have a ready market for all their cottonseed at all times and have been receiving a fair price during the past few years. The small amount of seed that is used for oleomargarine purposes would not make or break the cotton farmer. I have some of the largest cotton farmers in the United States located in my district and a few large Guernsey dairy herds.

I have not received a letter from either the dairy farmers or the cotton farmers relative to the oleomargarine tax. However, I have been flooded with letters

from housewives, hospitals, and the consuming public in general requesting that the tax on oleomargarine be removed.

The idea of taxing one farm product in competition with another farm product does not meet with my approval. The $600 license required of small grocery stores before they can sell oleomargarine is almost prohibitive in small towns and communities. The small grocery store operator is not financially able to pay a $600 license to sell oleomargarine and by this act alone all the people in these respective communities are prevented from purchasing any type of spread for their bread as they are financially unable to purchase butter at the present price.

This matter was thoroughly discussed and debated before the Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, and there was very little argument presented in favor of the dairy farmers who are protesting the removal of this tax.

It is my sincere opinion that people who are financially able will continue to purchase butter and by removing this tax the people who have been unable to purchase butter can and will be in a position to purchase a cheap bread spread with the same health benefits as butter.

I certainly believe that this tax would have been removed long before this date if this matter had been called to the floor of the House for a vote, especially during the war days when it was almost impossible for the average person to purchase a pound of butter.

I do hope this bill will pass without any amendments unless it be some amendment to prevent cafes and hotels from serving oleomargarine when they were supposed to be serving butter.

The removal of restrictions from the manufacture, sale, and use of oleomargarine will aid both American farmers by enlarging their markets and will aid American consumers by enlarging the supply of fats and oils, which are now well below requirements.

I am firmly of the opinion that by the removal of the tax the sale of butter will increase as well as the sale of oleomargarine. Thousands of families will have the first opportunity in years to secure a bread spread and as soon as they are financially able they will purchase butter in preference to oleomargarine.

I certainly cannot understand how the opponents to this bill could contend that the repealing of the tax on oleomargarine would destroy the dairy industry. My opinion is that we could easily double the use of pure unskimmed milk in this country and keep the dairy industry in excellent financial circumstances even if they did not sell a pound of butter. Both oleomargarine and butter are byproducts and should be treated on the same basis under all fair competitive conditions.

Statistics show that we do not produce sufficient butter to supply the people of this country. The butter supply at the present time runs about 38½ percent below the amount we had for consumption per capita in 1925, which shows that our population is increasing and our butter production is decreasing.

The people of this country deserve to have some type of bread spread without having to pay a high tax or, in certain cases, a high license fee.

The total consumption of butter and oleomargarine per capita in 1947 was a total of 16 pounds against 36 pounds recommended by the Government as a healthy diet.

You can see from the above figures that we could easily double our output of both oleomargarine and butter before we have a surplus of this type of fat.

In the health and growth of children we cannot begin to evaluate what it would mean if we were able to feed them pure unskimmed milk. Those are the fats so necessary for good healthy children.

It is my sincere opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this whole argument on the part of the dairy lobby is unfounded and time will prove that by removing the oleomargarine tax the dairy industry has not been injured in any respect.

Why Trade Concession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ansonia (Conn.) Evening Sentinel of April 24, 1948:

WHY TRADE CONCESSION?

Prior to the election in Italy the Government of the United States announced in no uncertain terms that it would discontinue ERP to Italy if its government fell into the hands of the Communists. That was reasonable, and most Americans who do not wish to be taxed to support Communist police states were in agreement.

Czechoslovakia has fallen under the control of the Communists and is undergoing the process of sovietization.

Favorable trade concessions are not direct dollar hand-outs but they represent economic assistance to the country to which they are granted. Why, therefore, did President Truman feel obligated to sign the articles of trade agreement with Czechoslovakia? Those agreements were negotiated with the free government of that country. Why should they be binding under the conditions which now exist in that Communist-dominated country? These questions have been raised by Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON who is puzzled by a policy which enacts measures enormous in scope to aid free governmental systems throughout the world and at the same time becomes a signatory to an agreement granting favorable trade concessions to a country now dominated by the U. S. S. R.

Mr. PATTERSON argues that the workers of Czechoslovakia are no longer free to bargain upon conditions of employment. Let us say that under a sovietized government, the government is the employer, the government runs the unions, and the government determines what names shall appear on the unopposed ballot in the ordered affirmations it substitutes for free elections to perpetuate itself in power.

Mr. PATTERSON sees in the signing of reciprocal trade agreements with Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia a measure which puts American workingmen into competition with those held in involuntary servitude.

It would appear that by granting trade concessions to Communist-operated police states the United States is nullifying the very purpose of the ERP. How about it, Mr. President? And where does the element of reciprocity enter into the agreement now?

The Julius Rosenwald Fund Completes a Magnificent Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, almost crowded out by news of world import is a short item in today's newspapers about the Julius Rosenwald Fund, which will close shop on June 30, having spent more than $22,000,000 since 1932. The Associated Press gives a summary of the remarkable record of this fund, established by a great philanthropist who was wise enough to insist that the principal be expended in one generation. He designated that it should be used solely "for the well-being of mankind." This great man was chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and he had a genuine interest in people who were deprived of adequate opportunities.

We of the South are particularly grateful for the work of the fund in the improvement of school facilities for Negroes. With the cooperation of southern leaders the agency has performed a notable service and has enabled many southern communities with their meager resources to improve health and education facilities for the Negro population. The Associated Press article included the following comments:

Edwin R. Embree, president of the fund, said today the fund had "followed the instructions of its founder in expending principal as well as income. Mr. Rosenwald did not believe in perpetual endowments."

Embree said the fund had been used "to enrich and equalize opportunities for all Americans," but added: "Opportunities in America are not yet nearly equal." He stated:

"Negroes who make up 10 percent of our total population are under legal disabilities in every Southern State and suffer social and economic handicaps throughout the Nation. Many other groups are subject to prejudice and discrimination. Yet the progress has been tremendous.

"Negroes now rate in education, health, economic status, far above the total populations of all but a few very favored nations."

WHERE MILLIONS WENT

Embree listed expenditures as follows:

Five million dollars for 5,357 rural schools for Negroes in cooperation with southern States and counties.

Five million dollars to Negro colleges, especially the four major university centers in Washington, Atlanta, Nashville, and New Orleans.

Two million dollars for development of health services for Negroes.

A million and a half dollars for pay clinics and other facilities for persons of moderate means and establishment of hospital insurance.

Two million dollars for fellowships for advanced training of 600 Negro and 250 white southerners.

Three million dollars in the general field of race relations "in an effort to bring full democracy and free participation by all groups in all phases of American life."

Four million dollars in general education and the support of general social agencies.

Tidelands and States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5992 deserves our approval. The reasoning behind the bill is basic and fundamental, and our failure to approve its principle would constitute the desertion of a most fundamental concept of our American system.

As a Representative of the State of North Dakota at large, I have no interest in the economic controversy involved in this tidelands bill, for North Dakota is an inland State. But as a Representative of the people of the State of North Dakota, and as a Member of the United States Congress who has sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, I am deeply concerned over the possible destruction of the basic principle of government involved, and I urge the approval of this bill.

We will be told by opponents that there is a grave issue of national security involved. I challenge this thinking. The several States have always proved their patriotism and willingness to cooperate in war production and defense, and if the need is shown, they will always, I am confident, go all out to defend this Nation. We have little to fear on that score.

Other extraneous issues will be injected by the opposition, but when the whole problem is boiled down it is simply an issue of whether we wish to uphold the principle of States' rights, or whether we wish to forsake this concept which has been an integral and basic part of our Government through its incorporation into our Constitution.

I would like to point out briefly the difficulties we face today as a result of the failure of our administration to adhere to this basic principle. The Federal Government, by subterfuge and the cry of "emergency," has been very successful in taking over both rights and duties which were by general agreement, and custom inherently States' rights and duties.

Our Federal debt has mounted beyond comprehension. Our fiscal budget has multiplied times 10 during the present administration's reign. All the evils often decried by our Republican leadership, and voiced by the voters and taxpayers, have resulted directly from this expanding and bureaucratic program whereby the Federal Government has taken over and assumed the rights and duties of the several States.

Under our Constitution the Federal Government was granted certain specific powers, all else were reserved to the States. In this way for more than a century of our history this Nation grew and prospered and became what it is today. We were never beset with autocratic government which has been the lot of the rest of the world, because we did reserve to the people the right of self and local government. We divorced Washington from that degree of control which can rule the life of every citizen and can and will lead to autocracy in government. We must turn from this trend at once. Here the issue is clear-cut and well defined. Today we must act to preserve our system of States' rights.

We have seen how foolhardy it is to turn power to a group of greedy politicians who seek office in perpetuity. We must not be propagandized by them, and their spokesmen, into believing that no basic departure from our Constitution is in the offing if we defeat this bill.

Unfortunately the highest court of the land has forsaken the Constitution, which provides the basic and governing set of rules for this country. This court has seen fit to disregard the clear and plain language of the Constitution. At one time this court was the protector of the people against government by monopoly and growth, but it too has been changed in recent years.

Today, then, Congress is the only remaining champion of that document, the Constitution of the United States of America, which all of us swore to defend upon taking office. There can be only one answer to the basic question involved here today. We must protect our States' rights by voting for H. R. 5992.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of April 27, 1948:

WHY THE TARIFF SECRECY?

A Republican decision to bar the public and press from congressional hearings on extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act forebodes ill for the keystone of our foreign economic policy. Star chamber tactics can only conceal a desire on the part of certain Congressmen to scuttle or weaken the Trade Agreements Act in effect since 1934.

The decision to hold secret sessions, taken on a strict party vote of 5 to 4, is an inexcusable denial of our democratic processes. Every effort should be made to have the decision reversed before the hearings of the Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade begin on May 3.

The Trade Agreements Act, giving the President authority to negotiate and lower pre-1934 tariff duties by as much as 50 percent, will expire June 12 unless Congress extends it. The act has already been extended four times, after full and open hearings before Democratic Congresses.

President Truman is appealing for a 3-year renewal of the act. There is Republican talk of a 1-year compromise. Coupled with the decision to hold secret hearings, the compromise talk adds up to serious trouble ahead for our economic foreign policy.

The aid we have already extended to foreign countries and the aid just provided them under the bipartisan foreign aid program are parts of a continuing effort to put these countries back on their feet and restore a healthy world trade. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, by lowering trade barriers and stimulating the flow of goods between nations, is essential to the success of the recovery program.

The substance of the problem was clearly stated by Woodrow Wilson in his message vetoing the Fordney Emergency Tariff Act in March 1921.

"If we wish to have Europe settle her debts, governmental or commercial, we must be prepared to buy from her," the President wrote, "and if we wish to assist Europe and ourselves by the export of either food, raw materials or finished products, we must be prepared to welcome commodities which we need and which Europe will be prepared, with no little pain, to send us. Clearly, this is no time for the erection of high trade barriers."

Nonetheless, we got them 3 months after Harding took office. Still later, we got the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, which was written behind closed doors and gave the special interests the high-tariff protection they sought.

Are we now headed down the same road? Do we never learn from the mistakes of the past? There is no more vital question before the American people than that of reciprocal trade agreements. The question should be settled out in the open, in the traditional American way.

Role of International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an instructive letter from my favorite expert on international law, who happens to be my father. This appeared in the New York Times of April 22, 1948:

ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW—ITS OBSERVANCE HELD ESSENTIAL TO THE PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In this time of trouble, when so many of our American hopes appear to be frustrated, and when again the world is filled with rumors of impending conflict, one often hears it said that international law, from which so much was hoped, has failed. On the other hand, there is much discussion as to the restatement and codification of international law with a view to making it more certain and more adequate to present conditions. A commission of the United Nations is now engaged in this very work.

It seemed that there exists some confusion of thought in regard to the subject, and that it might be worth while to make an attempt at clear thinking regarding the rule of that law today. This confusion appears to arise from a widespread misapprehension as to the real function of international law. It must be remembered that it is not something

calculated of its own weight to bring about the millennium. International law is an instrument or a byproduct not more uncertain of ascertainment than constitutional or some other branches of public law, and its observance is essential to the progress of civilization. It is and can only be the resultant of some measure of international confidence and some consensus of action among the nations.

As such an instrument, expressive of the will of the community of nations, however imperfect that community may have been in the past, and unfortunately still is, we must do all in our power to perfect it. Despite certain gaps and inadequacies, it has for more than a century and a half resolved important legal controversies.

SUBORDINATING NATIONAL POLICIES

This has only been possible as the natural resultant of a common respect for law and a willingness, in certain cases at least, to submit national policies to judicial settlement due to the conviction that no armed conflict must ever again take place between them. This attitude was exhibited in the famous Alabama arbitration, as well as in the somewhat more recent ones of the Bering Sea Seal Fisheries, the Venezuela-Guiana Boundaries, the North Atlantic Fisheries, and the Alaska Boundary. National feeling on both sides has been aroused over these controversies, and a war psychology might easily have been aroused had not the good sense of both American and British public opinion insisted on leaving the matter to the long and dreary arguments of lawyers instead of attempting to settle it through the horrors and destruction of war.

I know of no arbitration or judicial settlement that has ever failed for lack of law, and I cannot believe that codification, however useful it may be for educational purposes, will seriously affect the international situation. The fundamental problem arises not from any inadequacy of international law, but in the insistence of nations upon supposed national interests or policies to the exclusion of settlement through law and diplomacy.

These conflicts between law and policy, the fundamental causes of war, constitute problems of international organization, and we did cherish the hope that the United Nations might, in the end, be strong enough to resolve that dichotomy. I realize that such hope has been dissipated largely by recent notorious events upon which it is unnecessary to dwell. Unless the vague and rather theoretic world community of the past can become an actuality of paramount power, nations will continue to pursue policies deemed essential to their supposed vital interests; no changes or ameliorations in the formulation of the rules of international law can change that salient certainty.

AN EDUCATED OPINION

To bring about any such result is more than a matter of international negotiation or politics; back of this there must be an educated opinion throughout the world, insistent that right be combined with might so that international law may have behind it forces of public opinion similar to those that have so long prevailed among the English-speaking peoples. Otherwise foreign policy is something completely amoral, since the worship of the state is exclusive of all respect or regard for a community of nations. It is because the Russians are subject to no such educated opinion that international affairs are in so sorry a predicament.

The remedy, if any, can only be brought about by an enlightened statesmanship acting in accord with the dictates of history and within the limitations of human nature as we have known it through the centuries. No restatement of law by jurists, or even international commissions, can be of any more practical avail than can the formulation of ideal declarations of the rights of man; to think otherwise is to cherish delusion and further frustration.

It is useless to blame international law or to think that, even if it could be perfected from the standpoint of the theorist or jurist, we would be any better off. Unless the dominant powers of the world, who, in the end, make international law, are willing to subordinate their own supposed immediate interests to the rule of law, it is an error to think that any such result can be brought about by lawyers and publicists—however learned and upright. Understanding to that effect among the nations of the West, even though it cannot certainly assure world peace, would mark a step in advance in man's long journey through savagery and barbarism toward civilization—that fragile flower which man's inventive genius can apparently destroy, but which man's morality may well prove insufficient to maintain.

FREDERIC R. COUDERT.

NEW YORK, *April 18, 1948.*

And Still Another Marshall Plan in 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is not for us to say whether or not there will be another Marshall plan. Britain seems to be deciding that question before the present Marshall plan is in operation. Are we still only a colonial possession?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Daily Mail, a newspaper published in London, under date of April 6, 1948:

ANOTHER M-PLAN IN 1951?

Britain, almost alone, is keeping her head above the European floodwaters of inflation and closing the huge and growing gap in dollar trade, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe says in a report issued in Geneva today.

Its report—greatest survey of European economy ever undertaken—believes Europe will need something like a new Marshall plan in 1951. Otherwise it must reduce living conditions and continue to depend on America.

This is how the Commission (according to Reuter) sees Europe's postwar problems:

Figures tell how the battle of the gap is being lost:

In 1938, Europe's exports to the United States covered 45 percent of imports; in 1946 they covered 20 percent; in 1947 they covered 15 percent.

Cause, inflation, rigid bilateral agreements, wrong type of products, and generally high prices.

Effect, Europe internally trades luxuries like cars while essentials are unobtainable—particularly the goods Germany used to send eastern Europe.

Remedy, Europe must concentrate on luxury and light industrial products for United States markets.

PRICES

It must cut down imports of heavy industrial products and speed its own heavy industries to supply them instead. The prospects for this "appear reasonably good."

Britain's prices, says the report, have not risen with those of other European exporters. Her exports to the United States have gone up steadily from £8,665,000 in the first quarter of 1946 to £13,056,250 in the third quarter of 1947.

Key year the report tries to foresee is 1951. Referring to a new Marshall plan it says:

"Agricultural production then will be below prewar level, even if Europe's plans are fully realized." And it concludes:

"Even if Europe's production plans are fully realized, too, the attainment of equilibrium by the end of 1951 cannot be assured without a reduction in standards of living."

Address by Hon. Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech made by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of the State of Illinois, which was delivered on Sunday, April 18, 1948, on the occasion of the parade of Jewish War Veterans and their comrades in Chicago.

The address follows:

This is a truly inspiring occasion. This parade of the Jewish War Veterans of the Chicago area and their many comrades from other veterans' and civic organizations is a convincing demonstration of American unity and devotion to justice and right.

I congratulate your State commander, Col. Harry G. Hershenson, and your national commander, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, of our Illinois National Guard, both on the idea behind this parade and on the effective way in which it has been carried out.

For 52 years the Jewish War Veterans have rendered effective service to the highest ideals of American life. The efforts of this organization have stimulated the great contribution which Jewish citizens have made to the military history of our country, including the many heroic deeds of American fighting men of the Jewish faith in World War II. At the same time, the organization has worked constructively to promote a better understanding among Americans of all faiths and to make America a freer and happier land, not only for its members but for all of us.

Very properly, the Jewish War Veterans today are concerned with the world-wide effort to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine. In that they have the support of thinking Americans of every creed. The establishment of a free Jewish state in Palestine has long been a cherished dream of world Jewry. Today it is a star of hope in the darkness which hangs over hundreds of thousands of unfortunate Jews in Europe. It has also become for the American people generally a symbol of the new era of freedom and justice which we have hoped to see established in the postwar world.

For that reason, Americans generally applauded the action of our Government when it took the lead in obtaining the decision of the United Nations to proceed with the partition of Palestine and the creation of separate Arab and Jewish states. For the same reason, we were shocked and ashamed when the President of the United States retreated from that forthright position and proposed a new trusteeship plan which gives freedom and security to neither Arab nor Jew and which only postponed action which must eventually be taken if we are to be true to the dictates of our own conscience.

Americans do not like retreat in war or in peace. They particularly hate retreat where fundamental moral principles are involved. Americans generally condemned the

Roosevelt-Truman policy of retreat when the liberties of Poland and the Baltic States were offered as a sacrifice to the godless communism of Soviet Russia. They were sickened by the same policy of retreat which enabled Stalin to extend the iron curtain over all the Baltic states and finally Czechoslovakia. The final retreat on Palestine is a confession of the impotence of the United Nations to enforce its decisions and a confession by our President that our national administration lacks the capacity and the courage to stand up for the convictions of the American people.

Demonstrations such as this gathering here today, and the great parade staged in New York a few weeks ago prove that despite the retreat of the national administration, the American people have not abandoned the program for a free Jewish homeland. As a nation we must not abandon the policy which we declared in the Coolidge agreement of 1924, ratifying the Balfour Declaration, and to which each of the major political parties in America has committed itself in one national platform after another. Even more important, we cannot abandon the principle behind that policy, whether it is applied to Palestine, to Poland, or any other corner of the world, without endangering the liberty and security of our own Republic.

In the nineteenth century, Abraham Lincoln taught us that this Nation cannot exist half slave and half free. The lesson of the twentieth century is that the world cannot exist half slave and half free. We fought and won a world war when one system of modern slavery challenged our liberties. The tragedy of these days is that our postwar compromises with slavery have again brought us to the point where we can count only on our own resources to protect our American freedom.

In this hour we need, above all, real unity of all Americans and a common dedication to the preservation of the ideals of America. Because this meeting today demonstrates that unity and that dedication, it offers hope that a free Jewish homeland will yet be established and assurance that the blessings of our free America shall be preserved.

The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is very little being said these days about the size of our national debt. It is possible that the reason for this is that it is not a pleasant fact to consider when the Congress is planning many huge expenditures of doubtful wisdom or utility. It might be well for us to compare the fiscal situation of our country with that of other countries which feel they are being imposed upon by the insistence of the Marshallites and Bevinites that they accept the money whether they desire it or not.

I wish to reiterate what I have said many times on the floor of the House and that is we can be of little help to the world unless we keep our finances in order, make our Government work, drive out the Communists holding key positions in our own Government, and preserve and protect our free-enterprise system against the socialistic system in England which we are now supporting at the expense of the taxpayers of this country.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article from the Chicago Tribune under date of March 28, 1948:

BALANCE SHEET SHOWS EUROPE'S RICHES TOP UNITED STATES—TIME FOR ACCOUNTING, ECONOMIST FINDS

WASHINGTON, March 28.—Startling facts concerning the wealth of Europe, as compared with the resources of the United States were disclosed to Congress by Representative ANGELL, Republican, Oregon, who placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of tables compiled by the World Assets Audit Association, Inc.

These statistics, said Robert Doane, chairman of the association, refute the idea that the fabulous wealth of the United States is equal to or even in excess of the entire combined wealth of the remainder of the world.

TIME FOR THOUGHT

"This exalted misconception has been manifest even more particularly of the popular notion as to the income of the American people," Doane wrote. "As long as we naively look upon American wealth as the world's great contingent reserve to be drawn upon after every world political debauch, we are likely to pay a rather high price for our valor or ignorance.

"Yet when we find ourselves living in a world where the active civilized working population has expended nearly two trillion on warfare in a single generation, or 30 years, to destroy nearly one-third of its productive physical wealth, it appears about time that we sat down and began taking a sober accounting of things."

The World Assets Association was formed a year ago as an agency to tabulate the wealth and resources of nations of the world.

INCOME COMPARED

One table compares the national income of European nations with that of the United States. The European analysis gives the figures on the 16 European nations benefiting under the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan and also gives data on western Germany (under allied control), eastern Germany (Soviet-controlled), and Russia and its satellite countries.

The Marshall-plan nations seeking American aid, the table shows, had total receipts from private and Government sources in 1946 of $94,000,000,000. Russia's national income was given as sixty-one billions; total income of all Europe was disclosed as one hundred and seventy-five billions, compared to two hundred and three billions for the United States in the same period.

HERE'S BALANCE SHEET

A comparative balance sheet for Europe and the United States for 1946 was also provided. Despite America's huge physical assets, its great national debt and other liabilities have stripped it down to a net worth position of less than half Europe's total, the table shows.

The balance sheet follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Total assets	Long-term liabilities	Net worth
Marshall plan nations:			
United Kingdom	178,200	99,800	78,400
France	74,100	14,100	60,000
Italy	33,400	41,100	−7,700
Sweden	42,600	2,800	39,800
Norway	8,300	1,300	7,000
Denmark	11,700	300	11,400
Iceland	300	100	200
Netherlands	19,600	4,800	14,800
Belgium	22,500	5,100	17,400
Luxemburg	972	300	672
Switzerland	39,300	2,000	37,300
Portugal	16,900	300	16,600
Greece	5,000	300	4,700
Turkey	11,600	1,100	10,500
Austria	5,700	10,400	−4,700
Eire	6,600	300	6,300
Germany (western)	97,600	150,000	−52,400
Nonparticipating nations:			
Soviet Union	338,500	16,006	322,494
Estonia	1,170	1,500	330
Latvia	2,300	3,000	−700
Lithuania	2,400	3,500	−1,100
Finland	6,700	1,000	5,700
Poland	18,300	21,000	−2,700
Czechoslovakia	16,700	2,000	14,700
Hungary	8,300	19,000	−10,700
Bulgaria	6,800	2,000	4,800
Romania	13,600	5,000	8,600
Yugoslavia	13,300	13,000	300
Albania	1,000	2,000	−1,000
Spain	76,000	7,000	69,000
Germany (eastern)	56,600	10,000	46,600
Europe	1,136,042	440,106	695,936
United States	1,208,200	869,500	341,700

Long-term liabilities in the table include all private and public long-term obligations and tentative reparations claims.

Assets include cash on hand and in banks, receivables, and inventories.

New York Young Republican Club Supports Implementation of Palestine Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is from the Young Republican, March 1948 issue, a publication of the New York Young Republican Club:

BOARD APPROVES UNITED STATES ARMS FOR PALESTINE

The board of governors, at the March 2 meeting, passed a resolution prepared by the foreign affairs committee, advocating the establishment of units to enforce the partitioning of Palestine as recommended by the United Nations General Assembly. Under the terms of the resolution the United States would make available its share of troops to accomplish such a result.

The text of the resolution read as follows:

"Whereas the prestige of the United Nations requires that recommendations of the General Assembly be implemented by force if necessary; and

"Whereas violent conflict in Palestine threatens world peace as well as the effectiveness and the security of the United Nations agencies assigned to partition Palestine and to establish a permanent United Nations trusteeship control of Jerusalem: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Governors of the New York Young Republican Club urges—

"1. That the United States delegate to the Security Council advocate and approve the immediate establishment of an armed force subject to the control of the United Nations, adequate to implement the General Assembly's recommendation for Palestine, such force, if practicable, not to include contingents from nations having territories or

important commercial interests in the Middle East.

"2. That Congress authorize the President, if so requested by the Security Council, to make available units of the United States armed forces, or to permit the release of volunteers from our armed forces, including Organized Reserves and National Guard, until the restoration of peace and order in Palestine."

Give the People a Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Louis Bromfield, in an article in the Washington Sunday Star of April 25, calls attention to a situation that many people are concerned about. He clearly points out that the Democrats and Republicans today afford but little choice to the people when voting upon the issues. Recently a constituent wrote and demanded to know the difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. Mr. Bromfield points out that there is no clear division of policy between the Republicans and the Democrats. The time has come for the Republican Party to be the opposition in the fight against entrenched bureaucracy and increasing Federal expenditures. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including the article to which I have referred:

PARTY SYSTEM SHAKE-UP DUE—GOP, DEMOCRATS FAIL TO DRAW CLEAR LINE ON POLICY

(By Louis Bromfield)

Strange but encouraging things appear to be happening on the national front. They have upset completely the pundits, the prognosticators, and the pollsters. All three, I believe, are destined for further upsets before the two major political conventions have finished their work and the Democratic and Republican candidates are chosen.

It seems to me that out of all the travail and confusion one thing is clear—that somehow, one way or another, there must emerge a conservative and a progressive party. That is really what all the shootin' is for.

EVIDENCE AGAINST WALLACE

For a long time it has been evident that the two-party system upon which this Republic is based cannot function properly with two parties both of which possess radical, center, and reactionary wings. There eventually has to be a realinement in which the issues are clarified, and under which a voter may make a choice and have a reasonable certainty of getting what he is voting for. This may come about through the reorganization of the two major parties or it may come about through the birth of a new party and the dissolution of one of the two older ones.

Judging from early primaries, the evidence is that the American people do not want Mr. Wallace and his barbarian cohorts, nor do they want to return to the days of McKinley and Mark Hanna. They are looking for a candidate and a party which fills the middle-of-the-road position; but it must be a road which leads forward and not backward, and upon which the traffic is moving. Mr. Stassen's strength seems to be one strong indication of this fact. More perhaps than any other candidate he represents this tradition, which is essentially and politically the American tradition.

BOTH BIG PARTIES CONFUSED

At the moment the Democratic Party represents a shambles in which all the elements are battling each other. Essentially it represents—with the southern reactionaries on the one hand, and the organized labor forces on the other, with its center detached and functioning as a separate division—nothing at all. Moreover the division and shattering of its organization and its utter lack of leadership have immensely weakened its significance and potentialities.

The Republican Party is less badly off, but is almost as confused. There is again a radical, a center and a reactionary wing—all about equally strong. To date it is less seriously split than the Democratic Party, but no one can quite make out whether it is a progressive, a center, or a reactionary party. On the score of able men and leadership, however, the Republicans are better off than the Democrats.

And this is where Mr. Wallace and his motley army with labels and banners come in. Thoroughly, and in a hopelessly confused way, they represent radicalism. Wallace's nameless, faceless party is likely to poll a great many more votes than have been predicted, unless the whole situation is substantially clarified. Yet a great many of the votes he will attract will not be votes for Wallace or his party or his confused ideology; they will be the votes of people cast in protest against the confusion, division, lack of policy and direction displayed by the major parties.

NO CLEAR DIVISION OF POLICY

Mr. Wallace is, of course, inconceivable as President of the United States, and the presence of the Communists and fellow travelers in any major American political party is equally inconceivable. But if his party displays strength at the polls in November it is not inconceivable that it might become the nucleus of a new progressive-radical party which would greatly clarify the existing confusion and lack of concerted policy in the two old parties. Stranger things have happened in politics, even in this country.

The fact remains that there is no clear division of policy between the two major parties.

There Are Two Harry Trumans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following splendid editorial by E. T. Leech, editor of the Pittsburgh Press, taken from the Scripps-Howard Washington Daily News of April 27, 1948:

TWO HARRY TRUMANS

(By E. T. Leech)

Radio, movies, and all the amazing new devices for almost instant transmission of voice, words, and pictures have brought the American people close to its public figures. Or so we often are told.

But it doesn't always work that way. The miracle of instant communication which lets a whole nation hear a man speak also may serve to keep it from knowing what he is like.

I saw this happen. Much comment has been made in editorials and other articles about two entirely different Harry Trumans who spoke before a banquet of the American Society of Newspaper Editors at the Statler a couple of weeks ago.

The first Harry Truman read to a national radio audience a dry and unmoving speech in the faltering and unimpressive manner which has come to be regarded as typical of Mr. Truman. For 15 minutes he inflicted on the banquet guests and the unseen audience something which had been written by somebody who thought it was what he ought to say.

And then, with the broadcast ended, this man laid aside his manuscript with obvious relief. And for half an hour a very human, earnest, good-natured, and intensely sincere gentleman who looked like Mr. Truman delivered a moving address.

Surely it couldn't be the President. With neither manuscript nor notes, he was speaking so easily. There were little flashes of wit aimed at both the editors and himself. There were emphasis and deep earnestness in his words. No halting or fumbling. And, above all, such warmth as could not fail to win conviction.

Because this was one of those speeches which are labeled "off the record," no part of what Mr. Truman said can be told.

Actually, there wasn't anything which could not have been said to the whole American people. And which they wouldn't be far better off for hearing. It left an audience which included some of the President's severest critics feeling better for having had a chance to see him and hear him with his guard down.

It is a fiction to believe that anybody can speak to a big audience in a completely confidential manner. But politics is so cautious that it clings to the make-believe.

Sometime—and that real soon—President Truman should break through that caution, get away from his ghost writers, and reveal himself to the people. If he would speak to them from the heart, as he did the other night to that limited audience, it would cheer and hearten millions. It would cause them to feel that this man is honestly and deeply trying to preserve peace. That he is prayerfully and in great humility trying to do what is best both for humanity and America. That he is tolerant and well disposed toward others. And that he has no selfish ambitions to dominate either this country or the world.

In short, if the President could break through the barrier around him, the people would get a glimpse of an intelligent, but somewhat average, American citizen trying to do his level best in the toughest job on earth.

And, incidentally, the Democrats would have a real candidate.

But it's doubtful that Mr. Truman can emerge into the open before the whole Nation and the world. It is hard for any public figure to do so.

The very problems created by world-wide, instant circulation of words and voice serve to offset the advantages which they would seem to create. With the possibility of better understanding which modern communications create there is also the ever-present chance of misunderstanding. A world figure has to be on his guard. It is hard for him to be himself.

And so public figures have come to surround themselves with artificial barriers that shut off the real man from popular view. Every utterance is carefully screened and weighed. Ghost writers prepare, under all the handicaps of compromise and rewriting and cautious phrasing, utterances which the speaker is supposed to deliver with conviction.

If a man isn't artificial, is not a good actor, he may botch the job. As Mr. Truman has so often done.

What, then, will it be when television becomes widespread? When the candidate

must face both the damper of the microphone and the handicap of blinding lights and cameras?

To have popular appeal, will we have to get candidates who are photogenic for the news reels, have voices adapted to radio, and can make a hit on the television screen? If so, we may have to go to Hollywood or Broadway for our nominees. Then heaven help the Nation.

Maybe we just haven't adjusted ourselves to the fact that fast, world-wide communications present great problems as well as advantages.

Take-Home Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said on the floor of the House yesterday. Federal employees, for whose salaries we are directly responsible, have been particularly squeezed in the wringer of inflation. In addition to being abused from early morning to late at night, spied on, smeared, terrified, and belittled, they have not enough to live on. Despite the slight increases in their basic wage scale in 1945 and 1946, given them in the last Congress, their salaries buy less now than they did in 1946. Even after the last general salary increase in July 1946, 60 percent of all Federal workers still received less than $2,600 a year, and many of them less than $2,000—which is $1,200 less than the minimum budget of a family of four. This budget is based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics study, which is lower than the Heller budget of the University of California.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a comparison of the salary—take-home pay—of a top-grade clerk or carrier with the cost of living, as determined from the tables of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, entitled "The Sad Case of Our Post-Office Employees," together with an analysis of one of the main reasons for low efficiency in the Postal Service entitled "Another Sad Case—The Post Office as Employers":

The sad case of our post-office employees

	Gross pay	Retirement deduction	Income tax, man and wife	Income tax, family of 4	Take home pay, man and wife	Take home pay, family of 4	Cost of living index, U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics	What take home pay should be, from cost-of-living figures
							Percent	
1935 to 1939	$2,100	$73.50	----------	----------	$2,026.50	$2,026.50	100.0	$2,026.50
1941	2,100	73.50	----------	----------	2,026.50	2,026.50	105.6	2,140.50
1942	2,100	105.00	$120	$25	1,875.00	1,970.00	114.0	2,315.00
1943	2,250	112.50	175	45	1,962.50	2,092.50	122.4	2,480.00
1944	2,400	120.00	284	84	1,996.00	2,196.00	125.7	2,550.00
1945	2,450	122.50	295	95	2,032.50	2,232.50	128.5	2,610.00
1946	2,950	147.50	317	127	2,485.50	2,675.50	141.6	2,870.00
1947	3,050	152.50	336	146	2,561.50	2,751.50	161.0	3,265.00
1948	3,100	186.00	344	154	2,570.00	2,760.00	169.0	3,430.00
					17,509.50	18,704.50	----------	21,660.00
Amount necessary to equal cost-of-living increases from 1941 to 1948	----------	----------	----------	----------	4,150.00	2,955.50	----------	----------
If an increase of $1,000 is voted now, the figures will be	4,100	246.00	520	317	3,334.00	2,537.00	169.0	3,430.00

Providing the cost of living remains stationary (which is very doubtful), this would place the man and wife $100 under, and the family of four $100 over the cost-of-living figures as shown in the table. This is not unreasonable in view of the fact that during the past 8 years they have lost from $3,000 to $4,000 per employee.

July 1943, $300 temporary bonus.

July 1945, Public Law 134 reclassification of salaries.

July 1946, increased to $400.

July 1942, retirement deduction increased from 3½ percent to 5 percent.

July 1948, retirement deduction increased from 5 percent to 6 percent.

Income tax for 1948 figured from 1947 tables will be reduced slightly.

It is sincerely hoped these figures will help to show the necessity for an immediate and permanent increase of at least $1,000 per year.

ANOTHER SAD CASE—THE POST OFFICE AS EMPLOYERS

One of the main reasons for low efficiency in the postal service is the very low starting salary, which is not high enough to attract the type of men with the intelligence and ability to learn and perform the work efficiently. Below are some figures for comparison:

	1935 to 1939	1948	Requested $1,000 raise
Gross pay	$1,700.00	$2,100.00	$3,100.00
Retirement deductions	$59.50	$126.00	$186.00
Income tax:			
Single man	----------	$262.00	$436.00
Married man	----------	$167.00	$336.00
Take-home pay:			
Single man	$1,640.50	$1,712.00	$2,578.00
Married man	$1,640.50	$1,807.00	$2,678.00
Cost of living index, United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (percent)	100.0	[1] 168.8	----------
What take-home pay should be from cost of living figures	$1,640.00	$2,770.00	$2,770.00

[1] Jan. 1, 1948.

The table shows that during period from 1935 to 1939, which is taken as normal, we could offer a new employee $1,640.50 in take-home pay. This amount is equivalent to $2,770 in purchasing power at today's prices. Actually, we offer a single man $1,712 and a married man $1,807, which is less than is offered in industry for laborers. If a $1,000 permanent raise is voted, the take-home pay would be $2,578 or $2,678, which would still be $100 or $200 less than the cost-of-living figure. However, this amount would be much more attractive to the young, ambitious, intelligent, and capable men, who are so needed at this time by the Post Office, to put it back on an efficient basis.

The position of postal clerk, especially in the larger offices, is a complicated job, requiring the committing to memory two or more schemes of distribution, in addition to miscellaneous office routine. In addition to schemes, a window clerk must be familiar with the rates, regulations, and schedules of all types of postal service, to give the public the correct information and service to which they are entitled as our patrons.

The position of letter carrier requires a good physical condition, a neat appearance, a knowledge of postal rates and regulations, a friendly smile, and, among other requirements, being able to deliver the mail anywhere, and in any kind of weather.

If these figures are given some consideration, I am sure you will agree that an immediate and permanent $1,000 raise is very necessary, to get the postal service back on an efficient basis.

Why the Rent Decontrol of Bremerton?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1948, I called upon the Housing Expediter to make public the data upon which he relied in decontrolling maximum rents in Bremerton, Wash. Since that time the Expediter has given me a copy of the survey on which his action was based. This survey, in my opinion, not only fails to support the decontrol action but affirmatively shows that the housing shortage in Bremerton remains critical and that the continuance of rent controls is necessary. Time permits me to point to only a few of the salient facts contained in this report. Although it had been reported earlier that 540 units in public projects were vacant, the assistant director and the disposition officer of the Bremerton Housing Authority supplied data showing that some projects are being terminated and others are being converted to low-cost housing. Consequently, the number of persons to be rehoused from the terminated projects far exceeds the vacancies in the projects still available for rental. An earlier report that there were 300 vacancies in private dwellings was likewise exploded. Mr. C. A. Fulmer, president of the First Savings and Loan Association, stated that, from his observations, there might be 300 vacant houses, but these were not available for rent; these were being held for sale. Six real-estate firms reported no listings whatever for rental and two firms reported a total of three listings for rental. The Bremerton Sun for February 2 and 3 carried advertisements of 34 units for rent—nearly all furnished—of which all except seven or eight were rented by February 4. H. H. Magill, formerly chairman of the local rent advisory board, stated that most of the homes available for rental are shacks. The commandant of the Bremerton Navy Yard, Rear Adm. Ralph W.

Christie, stated that employment in the navy yard in Bremerton is static and no decrease is anticipated in the near future. The navy yard is the predominant activity in Bremerton.

The Housing Expediter's action in decontrolling Bremerton, Wash., in the face of clear evidence showing a tight housing situation and in violation of the terms of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is a convincing demonstration that these actions should not be taken without a public hearing after due notice having been held in the local community.

Military Uncertainty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the country is aware of the uncertainty in our military and State Department policies. Mr. Walter Lippmann correctly calls the turn in an article which appeared this morning in the Washington Post. I include it as part of my remarks:

MILITARY GUESSWORK

In a valiant effort to make intelligible what the Army and Navy Register has called a welter of confused recommendations Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin mentioned uncertainty as to whether the emergency, which Mr. Truman described in his St. Patrick's Day message, is short term or long term. This is, I think, the chief explanation of the Forrestal-Symington, the Air Force-UMT-draft controversy and confusion.

The Pentagon, having received no clear directive from the President as to whether to prepare for a near or a distant military showdown, finds itself trying to guess what the Russians intend to do. But since the Pentagon cannot be sure that it is guessing right, it is but natural that it should be divided and confused.

So Mr. Symington and his constituents in the House of Representatives want to prepare for war in 1952, the theoretical date when they have decided to think the Russians will have atomic bombs. The orthodox sponsors of the UMT are also trying to get ready for a theoretical war several years hence. Mr. Forrestal is trying to balance the conflicting pressures (so far as one can judge) on the theory that we ought to prepare a little for all the different possibilities.

But if we ask ourselves why we have been discussing extra military measures since the middle of March, the answer must surely be that in the judgment of the administration there has been a change in the international situation since the events in Czechoslovakia, Finland, Berlin, and Vienna. This was also the judgment of the western powers of Europe; otherwise they would not so hastily have signed the Brussels alliance.

What does this all add up to? It adds up to the judgment that the emergency is now and near—that this is the critical period, that if there is to be a show-down it will not be when Mr. Symington has the perfect jet-propelled Air Force of 1952, and when the UMT enthusiasts have a great trained Reserve some years hence, and when Great Britain and France have recovered under the Marshall plan and are rearmed in the distant future.

If all the governments of western Europe and our own have not been having an unnecessary fit of nerves, this is in truth the critical period. What will count is the military power which can be mobilized at once, and deployed at once, so that there may be a force in being. Our paramount need, then, is not preparedness for a theoretical M-day but a mobilization of what we have and can quickly produce.

That this is the critical period might have been debatable before the Truman message and the Brussels pact. It is not debatable now. For while it could have been argued in March, though wrongly, it seems to me, that the Czechoslovakian and Finnish actions were merely the cold war and not the opening of a military phase, our own actions—whatever the original Russian intentions—have changed the situation. Our decision to rearm and to support a military alliance in Europe would be in the highest degree reckless and irresponsible if we did not now act on the assumption that the Russians will do something drastic before a long program of rearmament can be completed.

It is simply inconceivable that they will remain passive, waging only a cold war, while Mr. Symington gets ready to exterminate them with atomic bombs in 1952. Therefore, the adoption of his program under present circumstances would on any prudent calculation provoke countermeasures for which, having invested everything in the Symington program and Symington strategy, we should be unprepared.

It is not safe to threaten Russia with destruction in 1952, leaving Europe undefended in the meantime. The only safe and wise thing to do is to mobilize at once a defensive and a deterrent force for the support of Europe.

If we decide to do that, the welter of confused recommendations from the Pentagon may be replaced by a coherent military program. With such a program, the State Department will be in a position to clarify its own policies. It will be able to give the western union the only kind of guaranty that means anything—a guaranty that we are determined to defend it against invasion.

The State Department will also be in a position to be firm with Russia without appearing provocative to all Russians and to most Europeans. For it will then be able to say concretely to the Kremlin that we are preparing for war if they attack, but that we are not preparing to attack them—that we are redressing the balance of power which is upset because they are in the middle of a defenseless continent; and that on the basis of this defensive military stalemate we look forward eventually to a negotiated settlement, not to a war, in which Europe will become the buffer between us, not the battlefields on which all of us destroy each other.

Transfer of Federal Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my respects to the jet-propelled operation now going on in this body in which we are standing by witnessing the impairment of the efficiency of the Federal Security Agency and, what is even more remarkable, the arbitrary transfer of the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

To my mind this is an omen of things to come should the Republicans obtain full control of both the legislative and executive branches of government next year.

Let us see exactly what is happening, Mr. Speaker.

A few weeks ago the majority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments recommended to this House that the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would have transferred the Bureau of Employment Security dealing with unemployment compensation, from the Federal Security Agency to the United States Department of Labor where it would have been coordinated with the United States Employment Service. The chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Michigan, gave as a prime reason for voting against the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 the fact that the Hoover Commission to study the operation of the executive branch of the Federal Government is to make a report next January. The chairman and the majority of his committee argued that any reorganization, such as transfer of these agencies, should be postponed until the Hoover Commission had given the Congress the benefit of its wisdom.

Now we find that the House Appropriations Committee has scrapped the recommendation of the House Committee on Executive Expenditures and is recommending that we do the exact opposite of what the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 proposed. We are asked to ignore the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and to go ahead full steam in defiance of the advice of the Committee on Executive Expenditures that we wait until the Hoover Commission reports.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is a jet-propelled operation because of the timetable on which we are operating:

The House Appropriations Committee report was filed at high noon yesterday, Tuesday, April 27.

The Rules Committee met yesterday afternoon and gave this deficiency bill, H. R. 6355, a rule waiving all points of order, which means that no member can make the obvious point that the transfer of the United States Employment Service from the Labor Department to the Federal Security Agency is flagrant and outrageous legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Rules Committee obtained permission to have until midnight last night to file its report on H. R. 6355.

Today, the entire matter is before us, and I dare say that, with the exception of the persons handling the legislation, not a single Member of this body knows completely and thoroughly what we are talking about and what we are about to vote upon.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation under the gun.

We are witnesses to what may be characterized as a legislative lynching of the United States Employment Service as now located in the United States Department of Labor.

The rule of the House by the late Uncle Joe Cannon was an easy-going, horse-and-buggy affair compared to the ruth-

less, supersonic speed with which this measure is being taken past our startled and, I must confess, bewildered eyes. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that the spirit of Uncle Joe Cannon is looking down today upon our operation with gentle wonder and reluctant admiration for the improvements in parliamentary efficiency—let us say nothing of justice and equity—that have been brought about under the present majority leadership.

We are flying in the face of the best judgment of the President, the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of Labor, and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, Mr. Oscar Ewing, who testified before the Senate Labor Committee that he believed the proper location for the United States Employment Service and for the Bureau of Employment Security was in the United States Department of Labor.

Consistent with this arbitrary action, robbing the Labor Department of its major remaining functions and reason for existence, is the action of the House Appropriations Committee in slashing funds for the operation of the United States Employment Service, the Bureau of Employment Security, and other functions of the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I will support an amendment striking out the provision for transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency, an amendment restoring the full amounts requested for these two services in the agencies where they are now located, and also an amendment restoring the full amount requested for the other services of the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we may have a roll-call vote so that the friends of the services offered by the affected agencies may know who took part in this operation and who stood by protesting but helpless to prevent the irreparable damage that is about to be done to our whole social-security program.

The Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a most enlightening letter from the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, as I assume other Members of Congress have done. Now, this committee appears to be a genuine national public-interest group concerned for the welfare of the Nation at large. This is not just another selfish pressure group. I am impressed by the outstanding caliber of the membership of this committee. I want to call especial attention to the prominence of the officers.

The honorary chairman of the citizens committee is the Honorable Cordell Hull, in my estimation one of our greatest Secretaries of State. Many in the House had the good fortune to serve with him. Mr. Hull shares the honor with another great Secretary of State, the Honorable James G. Blaine, of developing the principles of reciprocal trade in the United States. Mr. Blaine is sometimes called the father of reciprocity, Mr. Hull the father of the United Nations.

The operating chairman of the citizens committee is a great industrialist, Mr. Gerard Swope, who started in the electrical industry as a workman and reached the top. Thomas D. Watson, a vice chairman, another industrialist, is well known for his many services to the public. Anyone not familiar with his activity may be amazed at the listings of his services in Who's Who.

Charles P. Taft, another vice president, the son of a great Republican President, is himself the president of the Federal Council of Churches in America, said to represent 27,000,000 members.

W. Randolph Burgess, the treasurer, is an outstanding banker who devotes much of his time to public service.

I not only commend this list of officers for your examination, but suggest that you also examine the wide, able, cross section of American people in the general membership.

The letter from the committee suggests that there should be public hearings and debate on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. According to a statement by my colleague [Mr. DOUGHTON] apparently the majority members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means are holding secret hearings behind closed doors. I do not understand such a deviation from the democratic processes. I hope the American press will resent this breach of the principle of the freedom of the press. The Washington Post said editorially this week:

If anything less than a full extension of the Trade Agreements Act, in conformity with our bipartisan foreign policy, should come out of the committee in these circumstances, it would be properly subjected to double suspicion and attack.

I support the reciprocal trade program, among other things, because I believe with an editorial in the Charlotte Observer of April 27, 1948, when it concludes:

Just as one man cannot be prosperous unless the whole community is prosperous—except in cases of rank exploitation—so the United States cannot be prosperous in a world of paupers. If we do not make it possible for other countries to earn their dollars by selling their goods to us, we can prepare to make the European recovery program permanent.

Under unanimous consent, I desire to have the following letter from the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade with the membership inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

(Hon. Cordell Hull, honorary chairman, Charles P. Taft, vice chairman; Gerard Swope, chairman; Thomas J. Watson, vice chairman; W. Randolph Burgess, treasurer)

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR
RECIPROCAL WORLD TRADE,
New York, N. Y., April 23, 1948.

The Honorable CHARLES B. DEANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DEANE: The Congress of the United States can be proud of the high statesmanship it has recently displayed in passing the European recovery program by an overwhelming majority. So that the same level of statesmanship may continue to give hope, courage, and strength to a world trying to withstand totalitarian aggression, the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, representing 175 Americans from all sections of the Nation and from many walks of life, urge you to support an immediate 3-year extension of the present Trade Agreements Act through enactment of House Joint Resolution 335.

It is in the best tradition of a freely functioning democracy that the Congress should periodically review basic legislation affecting our commercial relations with other nations of the world. It is "good medicine" for us all that such a review should come at a time of international crisis; because this puts the spotlight on our sincerity in seeking world stability and peace, not through force of arms but through creating a pattern and a climate in which the peoples of free nations can freely trade for their mutual and collective welfare.

On June 12 the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will automatically terminate unless it is again renewed. Originally enacted in 1934, it has had an unbroken life through four successive extensions (1937, 1940, 1943, and 1945); and each such extension has reflected a progressively larger measure of bipartisan support. For that matter, it has put into effect a policy first enunciated by the Republicans in 1897.

RTA is in no conceivable sense "free trade." It is middle-of-the-road economics, just as the democracy we are fighting to retain is middle-of-the-road politics between fascism and state controls on the one hand and communism and state controls on the other. Thus it is an important symbol of the one way of life that can enable democracy to survive. The American people are now embarking on a course which makes RTA a vital, working part of the machinery we have set in motion through ERP and with billions of our wealth at stake. ERP is not just a single panacea nor should it be a mere hand-out; it is an agreement between the United States and 16 nations and China, under which we engage not merely to provide funds but also to maintain a word-trade policy which alone can make those funds productive over the long term.

With the promise implicit in RTA that there will be a world in which goods and commodities can continue to be exchanged with mutual advantage, the European nations will have the incentive to rebuild their economies. If that promise is withdrawn, they will continue to accept the material help of ERP, and we shall continue to enjoy a synthetic prosperity on our cash and credit; but just as surely, if the broader purpose of ERP is frustrated by our own retreat into economic isolationism, these nations will have to make adjustments for that future when the flow of material help ends. And these adjustments can lead only to totalitarianism in one form or another.

We are purposely refraining from discussing the stock objections to RTA, because an examination of them shows no point that has not been thoroughly debated and discarded in the original passage and subsequent extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Furthermore, an escape clause was written into the general agreement on tariff and trade negotiated with 23 countries at Geneva a year ago, and it will be automatically written into any future agreements. It instructs the bipartisan United States Tariff Commission to investigate all complaints of danger or threat of danger to any American producers, and to recommend to the President appropriate adjustments in any trade agreement, where the facts justify such action as a protection to American industry or agriculture.

There is abundant evidence that the Nation as a whole recognizes the past achievements of the trade agreements program and wants to see it continued for another 3 years in its present form, as a vital part of our whole foreign-policy structure. Recent public polls show a substantial majority in support of the trade agreements principle, and the response to the formation of this citizens' committee offers fresh proof that the country favors this legislation.

We therefore hope that we may count on your active interest in having House Joint Resolution 335 proceed promptly through public hearings and debate, and your vote for this measure which will assure continuity in our basic foreign economic policy.

Cordially yours,

GERARD SWOPE,
Chairman.

OUTSTANDING AMERICANS WHO COMPOSE THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCAL WORLD TRADE

John Abbink, New York, N. Y.; Charles Francis Adams, Boston, Mass.; Winthrop W. Aldrich, New York, N. Y.; Frank Altschul, New York, N. Y.; Charles W. Armstrong, Salisbury, N. C.; William L. Batt, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, Washington, D. C.; Murray R. Benedict, Berkeley, Calif.; Willis H. Booth, New York, N. Y.; W. P. Fuller Brawner, San Francisco, Calif.; Ronald Bridges, Berkeley, Calif.; Edward E. Brown, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, Washington, D. C.; B. C. Budd, New York, N. Y.; Harry A. Bullis, Minneapolis, Minn.; William R. Burwell, Cleveland, Ohio; James S. Carson, New York, N. Y.; F. H. Chapin, Cleveland, Ohio; Percy Chubb, New York, N. Y.; Evans Clark, New York, N. Y.; Henry deWard Collier, San Francisco, Calif.; William W. Coleman, South Milwaukee, Wis.; Arthur H. Compton, St. Louis, Mo.; Karl T. Compton, Cambridge, Mass.; John B. Condliffe, Berkeley, Calif.; Lyle Cooper, Chicago, Ill.; H. W. Culbreth, Columbus, Ohio; Leland W. Cutler, San Francisco, Calif.; Col. Edward Deeds, New York, N. Y.; Ralph V. Dewey, Berkeley, Calif.; John S. Dickey, Hanover, N. H.; W. J. B. Dixon, New York, N. Y.; Alvin Dodd, New York, N. Y.; Donald W. Douglas, Santa Monica, Calif.; H. C. Dunlap, San Francisco, Calif.; Ferdinand Eberstadt, New York, N. Y.; Clark M. Eichelberger, New York, N. Y.; Alvin C. Eichholz, San Francisco, Calif.; J. D. Fletcher, New York, N. Y.; Marion B. Folsom, Rochester, N. Y.; Kirk Fox, Des Moines, Iowa; Clarence Francis, New York, N. Y.; Berent Friele, New York, N. Y.; Ray Gibbons, New York, N. Y.; Roy W. Gifford, Detroit, Mich.; Harry D. Gideonse, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York, N. Y.; Dwight K. Grady, San Francisco, Calif.; William L. Gray, Boston, Mass.; Robert L. Gulick, Jr., Berkeley, Calif.; Bernard F. Haley, Stanford University, Calif.; Helen Hall, New York, N. Y.; Harry Hawkins, Medford, Mass.; Marion H. Hedges, Washington, D. C.; Henry H. Heimann, New York, N. Y.; Wilson L. Hemingway, St. Louis, Mo.; W. R. Herod, New York, N. Y.; George Watts Hill, Durham, N. C.; Charles D. Hilles, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Alger Hiss, New York, N. Y.; E. O. Jewell, New Orleans, La.; Hallett Johnson, New York, N. Y.; Eric A. Johnston, Washington, D. C.; Henry P. Kendall, Boston, Mass.; P. A. Kinnoch, San Francisco, Calif.; Admiral Emory S. Land, Washington, D. C.; Roger D. Lapham, San Francisco, Calif.; Fred Lazarus, Jr., Cincinnati, Ohio; John C. Leslie, New York, N. Y.; Paul W. Litchfield, Akron, Ohio; Robert F. Loree, New York, N. Y.; E. Russell Lutz, San Francisco, Calif.; Frederick Chadwick McKee, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Clark H. Minor, New York, N. Y.; James D. Mooney, Toledo, Ohio; Mildred B. Northrop, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Edward A. O'Neal, Florence, Ala.; Kenneth Parker, Janesville, Wis.; Philo W. Parker, New York, N. Y.; Clifford Patton, New York, N. Y.; James S. Patton, Denver, Colo.; Walter Perker, Oakland, Calif.; Robert B. Pettengill, Los Angeles, Calif.; Curt G. Pfeiffer, New York, N. Y.; Warren L. Pierson, New York, N. Y.; Allan M. Pope, New York, N. Y.; Jacob S. Potofsky, New York, N. Y.; C. A. Richards, New York, N. Y.; Morris S. Rosenthal, New York, N. Y.; Beardsley Ruml, New York, N. Y.; Gen. David Sarnoff, New York, N. Y.; Rose Schneiderman, Washington, D. C.; Theodore W. Schultz, Chicago, Ill.; Harold Sheets, New York, N. Y.; Robert E. Sherwood, New York, N. Y.; James T. Shotwell, New York, N. Y.; Earl O. Shreve, Washington, D. C.; Eugene Mo.; A. B. Sparboe, Minneapolis, Minn.; Eugene Staley, Palo Alto, Calif.; Maxwell S. Stewart, New York, N. Y.; Anna Lord Strauss, Washington, D. C.; William S. Swingle, New York, N. Y.; Myron C. Taylor, New York, N. Y.; Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Washington, D. C.; Walter C. Teagle, New York, N. Y.; Harry E. Terrell, Des Moines, Iowa; Eugene P. Thomas, New York, N. Y.; Wilbert Ward, New York, N. Y.; R. F. Warner, New York, N. Y.; Edward H. Watson, Rochester, N. Y.; Sidney J. Weinberg, New York, N. Y.; Leo D. Sitterley, New York, N. Y.; Spyros Skouras, New York, N. Y.; Tom K. Smith, St. Louis, Welch, New York, N. Y.; Mrs. Norman deR. Whitehouse, New York, N. Y.; John P. Wilson, Chicago, Ill.; Shepherd L. Witman, Cleveland, Ohio; Mrs. Louise Leonard Wright, Chicago, Ill.; Henry M. Wriston, Providence, R. I.; Carl M. Wynne, Chicago, Ill.; Arnold Zander, Madison, Wis.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] at the Jefferson-Jackson Democratic banquet in Phoenix, Ariz., on February 19, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: (1) Those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. (2) Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe depositary of the public interests."

Thomas Jefferson made that statement. In doing so, his description fits the major political parties today like a glove. Republicans fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes; the Democratic Party identifies itself with the people, has confidence in them, cherishes and considers them as the most honest and safe depositary of the public interest.

Let me demonstrate the wisdom and truth of Jefferson's statement. In 1935, the Congress under the leadership of the Democratic Party passed the Social Security Act. Today over 8,000,000 workers are permanently insured, about 35,000,000 additional workers are currently insured for retirement and death benefits. Repeatedly, President Truman has urged the Congress to modernize and expand social security coverage. The Republican leadership in Congress promised the workers of the Nation to exert every effort to expand social security coverage. They have had two opportunities to make good on this promise. In both cases they have proceeded in a direction directly opposite to the one our Nation should pursue.

Last year the Republicans passed a tax bill which would have increased the take-home pay of the $1,200-a-year man by 1 percent, and of the $300,000-a-year man by 57 percent. The man for whom the Republicans' hearts bleed is the man in the $300,000 bracket. This year they have proposed a tax bill that leaves a married man with a net income of $4,000 a year paying 868 percent more taxes than he did in 1939, and the $500,000-a-year man paying only 13 percent more.

The Republican position on high prices changes with the daily fluctuations of the market. Last fall Senator TAFT said, "Exports should be curtailed to reduce domestic prices," and during the recent slump in the commodity market others of his party have asserted we should step up our exports in order to stabilize the market.

In other words, the Republicans are trying to work both sides of the street in an effort to divert attention from the fact that they themselves are responsible for today's high prices and will be responsible for any recession or depression precipitated by those high prices.

Republican feeling for the little people of our country is epitomized in the statement made by Senator TAFT last fall in California—he said the answer is "eat less." He went on to say that during the war people found they could make shoes, suits, and dresses wear much longer than they ever thought possible. While fighting in the Congress for programs and policies which increase already bloated profits, this candidate for the Republican nomination recommends that the little people of the country "eat less," and make those tattered clothes wear longer.

Depression and hard times are spawned in a period of skyrocketing prices. The Republicans lit the fuze that started prices skyward—they, therefore, will be responsible for loss of mass purchasing power which may touch off a depression.

Today, the Congress of the United States—House and Senate—is controlled by the Republican majority. That majority in turn is controlled by Senators and Representatives of the Eastern and Midwestern States. This explains, in part at least, why reclamation and hydroelectric development in the West has been in jeopardy ever since the new majority took control on January 1, 1947. Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation are 27 percent below the President's combined budget request for fiscal 1948. On January 22, 1948, the so-called Rockwell bill was jammed through the House. The Rockwell bill could not have passed the House of Representatives without the support of the Republican leadership. That leadership has therefore put itself on record with what it intends to do to power and irrigation in the West. Best estimates are that the bill would raise the power rate at Grand Coulee by 44 percent, raise the power rate on the Central Valley project in California by 17 percent, and worse yet—would render the central Arizona project, the Colorado Big Thompson, the central Utah project, and the Missouri Valley project economically unfeasible.

Repeatedly the President has called upon Congress to raise the floor under wages to 75 cents an hour. The Republican majority in Congress is strangely cool to this appeal. One year ago I joined with other Senators in introducing legislation to increase the minimum wage to 65 cents, with a progressive increase to 70 cents after the first year, and 75 cents after the second year. The Republican leaders have not even permitted this bill to reach the hearing stage in committee.

In 1933 the Democratic Party inherited from the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover triumvi-

rate a Nation characterized by the Dust Bowl, 50-cent wheat, bankruptcy, wholesale farm and home mortgage foreclosures, bread lines, and national despair. Wool was selling for 8 cents a pound, fat steers for 4 to 5 cents, top lambs were bringing 6 cents. For twelve long years, Republican helmsmen had steered this Nation by the boom-and-bust charts that are still cherished and preserved in the Republican pilot house. Today the custodians of those boom-and-bust charts are a new triumvirate—REECE, MARTIN, and TAFT.

In 1933 the Democratic Party rejected, and we emphatically reject now, the thesis that boom and bust is inevitable. We rejected then, and we reject now, the thesis that the masses of our people must periodically be subjected to the suffering and heartbreak of boom and depression—bankruptcy, loss of homes, undernourishment, and poverty. We rejected then, and we reject now, the thesis that private enterprise means dictatorship by concentrated wealth. On the contrary, we subscribed then, and we subscribe now, to the thesis that our system of private enterprise can and must be responsive to the welfare and aspirations of all our people—that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people must be sensitive constructively to the problems of the people.

In conformity with these convictions what has the Democratic Party done since 1933?

We created a Securities and Exchange Commission to protect the public against issuance and marketing of worthless securities.

We created a Federal Deposit Insurance System to insure bank deposits of our citizens.

We established a Home Owners' Loan Corporation to protect our people from losing their homes and the Federal Housing Administration to enable more people to own their homes.

We enacted legislation creating a system of social security and old-age assistance.

We gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a blood transfusion and enabled it to play its proper role in the restoration of financial credit for the business enterprises of the country.

We enacted a fair labor-standards act establishing a floor under hourly wages and protecting women and children against exploitation. Through the Wagner Act we guaranteed the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively.

The Democratic Party has long recognized and been sensitive to the fact that the farmers of this Nation and the land they till are cornerstones to our national welfare. In 1933 our farmers were impoverished, in the Midwest their land was literally "up in the air," and throughout the country our topsoil was being shoveled into the sea through erosion. No nation can long endure which fails to conserve its land resources. No major occupational group in our highly integrated economy can long remain prosperous alone. Prosperity must be shared, if it is to be sustained.

Acting upon these tenets, the Democratic Party enacted a farm program designed to increase the farmers' share in our national income and, at the same time, to conserve for posterity fertility of the acres he tills.

Seven-league strides have been made under the soil-conservation program launched and fostered by your Democratic leaders. Yet this is one of the programs which suffered from the economy ax of the present Republican majority in the Congress. The Republicans chant over and over again the claim that they are practical businessmen; yet they don't know their investment from their expenditure. In soil conservation, as in western reclamation, the Republicans think only of today.

The record of the Democratic Party is a record of achievement—not for special groups, not for big business, but for the people. It's a record of which I am proud—a record which justifies the support of every thinking American at the polls in 1948.

We rededicate ourselves and our party to the Democratic objectives so clearly voiced by the President of the United States. He has shown the way to maintenance of prosperity. He has clearly outlined our best hopes for peace.

Marshall-plan legislation will soon come before the Congress. Every American citizen has a stake in this program. Every Republican Presidential candidate—there are as many of them as candidates for Governor of Arizona—will feel compelled to express his views.

In the welter of argument which will ensue, let us not forget these basic facts:

It is infinitely more difficult to create than to criticize. Thinking and planning the Marshall-plan scale required creative genius, perception, and understanding.

The European recovery plan submitted to the Congress by President Truman demonstrates global understanding and creative thinking—creative planning.

The architects of this historical enterprise—Truman and Marshall—did their job well. The criticism of Taft, Dewey, and other Republican leaders is puny by comparison. It is for these men of lesser stature to search the plan for a dollar here or a dollar there. They who did not contribute to its design are free to criticize the details of the edifice—it is the only role they know.

These are the goals of President Harry S. Truman:

First, to secure fully the essential human rights of our citizens.

Second, to protect and to develop our human resources.

Third, to conserve and use our natural resources so that they can contribute most effectively to the welfare of our people.

Fourth, to lift the standard of living for all our people by strengthening our economic system and sharing more broadly among our people the goods we produce.

Our fifth goal is this: To achieve world peace, based on principles of freedom and justice and equality of all nations.

We stand behind him in the unremitting fight against oppression. We support his call to action in the fields of health, education, social welfare, and housing. We believe with him that we can increase our annual output by at least one-third and lessen poverty in our generation.

We are with him in the continuing fight to develop the West, to reclaim lands, to provide irrigation and reclamation. We respond to his challenging program for a stronger economic system and the enlargement of our industrial capacity within the free enterprise system.

We stand united behind him in support of the United Nations, and a United States that is strong.

Finally, we believe that country, not party, is the concern of our President.

We have pride in such leadership.

California in Review After a Century of American Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago the area which is now California, as well as some additional territory, was ceded to the United States by Mexico pursuant to a treaty referred to as the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. California was then a remote and also a romantic place. However the white man had made progress in the settlement of California. The Franciscan Fathers had established 21 missions extending from San Diego on the south, to Santa Rosa on the north. Each of these was a small civilized Christian community. Many of these missions are still intact and all of them are in the process of restoration. I merely mention this to show that the history of California is imbedded in the civilization of Spain and Mexico, its western colony in North America. In these missions some of the activities, which today, are the basis of our economic life in California were started. For instance, the missions raised things by means of irrigation. By this I mean they stored water during the rainy season for use on the lands during the dry, hot summers. Fruits, vegetables and grapes were grown in the missions. Each mission was a separate and independent economic unit, where the things required for the life of that day were raised.

On January 24, 1848, gold was discovered on one of the branches of the American River by James Wilson Marshall. This started one of the greatest gold rushes in the history of the world, which reached its peak in 1949.

In 1850 California was admitted to the Union.

Curiously some of the greatest migrations in the history of the world have been to California. The first one was the famous gold rush. The next one came in the thirties during the depression and the recent one has brought to California 3,000,000 new people since 1940.

The Stockton school system has performed a distinct service in asking Dr. Rockwell Dennis Hunt to deliver a series of lectures as part of the centennial celebration in California this year, while we are commemorating the discovery of gold. Next year we will celebrate the gold rush and in 1950 we will hold the hundredth anniversary in commemoration of the admission of California into the Union. Dr. Hunt is a noted educator. He has been active in various fields of education, but he has devoted his major efforts to the study and interpretation of history. Several histories of California or aspects of its life in the past have been written by him. As much as any man that I know of, he is able to interpret the historic and romantic events that occurred in California during the years 1848, 1849, and 1850. I hope that every Member of the House will, and I wish every American could, read the lectures which I shall place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and were delivered by Dr. Hunt and sponsored by the Stockton public schools in my home town of Stockton, Calif.

Dr. Hunt's article follows:

CALIFORNIA IN REVIEW AFTER A CENTURY OF AMERICAN CONTROL

THE HIDDEN PARADISE

(First in a series of eight public centennial lectures, by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D., Director of the California history foundation of the College of the Pacific,

under the sponsorship of the adult division of the Stockton schools, Stockton, Calif., and the San Joaquin County centennial committee, William E. Gilmore, Chairman, January 20, 1948, Philomathean Club, Stockton, Calif.)

This is the week!

We are fairly beginning the great centennial celebration in California this very week. In the air, over the radio, in the papers, it is in your minds, everywhere—this is the week!

The great gold discovery changed the course of history.

The president of the constitutional convention of 1849, Dr. Robert Semple, in his opening address said, "We are now fellow citizens occupying a position to which all eyes are turned." Again we may say, now, in connection with this great celebration, "Fellow citizens, we are occupying a position to which all eyes are turned."

It wasn't always thus. For long, untold ages California was concealed from the world. California was a hidden paradise.

Last week we talked about history beginning at home. It is appropriate for us now to inquire, What is this home? Where? In what does it consist? What was here before the white man came?

Thus it is appropriate that we peer behind the curtain and catch at least a glimpse of the California that was in ages past. Before doing so, however, we must enlarge our concept of history, for history is served by many handmaidens.

First there is geology, which teaches of the creation and construction of the earth itself; the various ages, slow-moving processes. Then there is geography, by which we learn of the surface of the earth, its topography, its climates, etc. These contribute to history. Then there is anthropology, which deals with physical organization of the human being, and teaches us of the differences in races, tribes, and nations. Following anthropology we make use of archeology. And archeology oftentimes, by means of excavations, brings to life that which is hidden by means of relics and mementoes of the past of various kinds, all shedding their lights upon the history in which we are engaged. Not only that, but it is very familiar to you that in history we deal with politics, with economics. In fact, all of the disciplines of the mind are involved in the equipment of the thorough historian.

George Elliot Howard it was who widened and modernized the maxim of Edward Freeman. Freeman's maxim, you remember, was, "History is past politics; politics are present history." But Dr. Howard said, "History is past sociology; sociology is present history." All these, and others, are handmaids in the study of history.

Now what is California? What was California? In the first place, I do not know how many of you could give the latitude and longitude of California. A very simple question. But I doubt if many of you ever thought that California extends as far east and west as it does north and south. California is a territory of 700 miles from north to south, averaging something like 200 miles from east to west. Latitude 32° and 45' to 40° north, and the eastern boundary from the north down to Lake Tahoe on the one hundred and twentieth meridian, west longitude; but from Cape Mendocino to the bend in the Colorado River down near Arizona it is just about as far east and west as it is north and south from Siskiyou to San Diego. There are 159,000 square miles; over 100,000,000 acres, in the area of our great State; large enough to exceed in area the total of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania. Its extent along the coast line of the Pacific would be on the eastern seaboard from Connecticut to the southern part of South Carolina and the middle of Georgia.

California is not simply a place on the map. It has great characteristics. The striking characteristic of California, perhaps more than any other one big thing, is the great bowl or trough between its two ranges of mountains. These mountains are the Sierra Nevada on the east and the Coast Range on the west. These include, and border, the great central valley, 500 miles long, anywhere from 20 to 50 miles wide, containing 20,000,000 acres of ground. A great empire in itself. All hidden during these early years.

During geologic, paleontologic, and all the early prehistoric times, it was hidden from mankind. Even with the infrequent presence of the American trappers and traders, and during the presence of the Spanish people along the range areas, California still remained hidden from the world at large. The great curtain descended and kept it in an almost perfect state of isolation. There were these great features. This valley is one of the greatest valleys of the entire world.

If "Egypt is the gift of the Nile," and that is a saying of Herodotus, we may say that the great central valley of California is the gift of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, with all their tributaries.

What a paradise this was before the white man came. Before the Americans came.

We have some glimpses, some intimation, of the character of the life that was here; and the activities that were going forward even before the white man came and before the American arrived in California.

Think of the great, wonderful resources that were here. The great natural resources of any State or Territory consist chiefly of the forests, the water, the mineral deposits, and the land itself. When you stop to think of these in California as they were before the coming of the whites, you are inclined to say the resources in California were inexhaustible. Not only that—and we wish to refer to this matter again—but then there were the great features of nature. The highest peaks in the continental part of the United States are in California, as well as the lowest depressions, with slight exceptions, on the face of the earth, far below sea level.

California has the oldest and the largest living things presumably on the face of the earth in the form of our great sequoia trees. There were exaggerated expressions, but it is impossible to exaggerate the truth, of what we could find, and did find, in this great State of ours. Think of the trees. Not only the sequoia gigantea but the redwood—the sequoia sempervirens; the pines; sugar pine and yellow pine, and others, a dozen varieties in all; in the State of California.

Think of the oaks. Only tonight as I walked along Pacific Avenue just after sunset it was a gorgeous scene. I wish you could have turned your eyes toward the sunset at that time. The coloring was wonderful, and there were those oak trees, which are one of the glories of the San Joaquin Valley, standing out against the colored sky. There was the carmine, and the yellow, and the golden, with a leaden cloud overhead. A brilliant scene it was. And these trees, barren of their leaves at this season of the year, silhouetted against that wonderful background of that gorgeous colored sky. I glory in the great oak trees of the great Central Valley of California, and I glory in the great sugar pines in the higher ranges of the mountains; and who does not take pride in these vast forests of ours?

Then I would like to mention that in the days before the Americans came in numbers, California presented a veritable hunter's paradise. There were not only the trees, the mountains, the lakes, the rivers, and the coast line, but the wildlife of the country. There were the bears—the black bear and the grizzly bear, and some mention the cinnamon bear, which in great numbers came down often to the swamplands and the tule lands. There were the antelope by the thousands; and deer in uncounted numbers; and elk. Some elk had the habit, or practice, of swimming from the mainland across to Mare Island with each season, enjoying the pasture there, and then swimming back to the mainland. There were all types of carnivorous beasts. The life of the fauna was wonderful. No wonder we are trying to preserve some of it now from extinction. There was the California condor, the eagle, and the feathered game; the graceful swan; several varieties of geese; ducks; quail; and grouse. California was truly a hunter's paradise.

The best literary writer could exhaust his supply of adjectives in describing what he saw or what was present in California. He would speak of the majestic sequoias, the beautiful lakes, the graceful waterfalls, the enchanting landscape, and he would exhaust his vocabulary of adjectives before he described all that we have in this hidden paradise of ours which we call California.

Now all this becomes a part of the heritage for us, and it makes California not only interesting from the standpoint of the people but likewise from the standpoint of being a geologic wonderland, a place of geography that is majestic in its character, magnetic in its drawing power, with a coast line a thousand to twelve hundred miles in extent, having its wonderful bays and harbors.

What would have happened if Francis Drake had sailed through the Golden Gate and on into the Sacramento or San Joaquin River and had been made acquainted with the great interior of California? As it was, the first New England is in California and not back on the Atlantic seaboard. What would have happened, no man can say. It might well be, however, if Drake had come through the Golden Gate and into the interior and had seen the wonderful opportunities here, that this whole territory might even now be a part of the far-flung British Empire.

So many of the features of early California have escaped our notice that I am pausing to call special attention to some of them. I think of these resources, mentioned just a moment ago. We have our mineral deposits with more than 50 different minerals in the State of California. You know the list of the main minerals: the gold, silver, lead, copper quicksilver, and tin, although that is scarce; zinc, and other minerals, and the most valuable of all, the petroleum, is a mineral product. Wonderful. But let us warn ourselves they do have a limit.

Then I think of the great resource of water. Water has become the chief problem for the future of California. It is clearly recognized in the southern part of the State. It is recognized here; One of the most serious questions that confront the people is—now—the question of water, the conservation of the water supply. I call attention to the fact that water, to be truly conserved, must be used over and over again. It must not be allowed to run off into the ocean with one use or no use at all. In one place, for example, seven different uses are made of the water that starts in the small mountain stream called the Santa Ana River before the residue of it reaches the ocean. It goes underneath the surface of the ground; is used again; here one place for irrigation; another place for the city drinking water, after being purified, and on again until in some instances as high as seven different uses may be made of that water. That is true conservation—not the failure to use it, but to use it in a proper manner.

"Conservation" has come to be one of the great words in our recent vocabulary. Conservation of water not only for the purposes of use in irrigation and drinking but for development of power. By no means have we yet reached the limit in the development

of power in California. We have gone a long way, but we have not gone the full length and we need to go further in the development of water for the power to drive our machines and to give us that which will speed up the technic of our modern civilization.

Then I think of the land itself. The land, 159,000 square miles in California, is mostly mountainous; far more that is not tillable than what we cultivate in the State. There are all kinds of land, some of it the most fertile in the world. The delta land, which you know about in this very close vicinity, is some of the most productive soil that can be found anywhere. There also is the other extreme of the barren desert land which produces nothing. And then there is that which has been reclaimed. We have one of the greatest reclaimed areas in the world today, that of the richly productive Imperial Valley, a garden spot instead of the barren desert of 50 years ago.

The hidden processes must be brought to light and we must develop more and more the practice of true conservation.

One of the greatest evils—and you are all familiar with it—in regard to the wasting of our land arises from erosion. Thousands of acres have been washed away and ruined for ages or for many years because of carelessness and lack of providing in a statesmanlike manner for the control of that water and its further use in the service of mankind. Conservation has come to be a great word.

Now all this hidden paradise, this great Utopia, suggests that we ought to know something about the name California itself. It is not necessary to take time for details. I call your attention, however, to the fact that many, many guesses and speculations were made regarding the name California. Where did it come from? What does it mean? Not until 1862 was it found out definitely where the name came from; and still we do not know how it happened to be applied to our hidden paradise. There came to light through the studies of Edward Everett Hale, in the year 1862, the medieval romance which in its translation is called "The Exploits of the Esplandian," and which was read very widely by the literary people of Spain at the time of Columbus and immediately following the discovery of America. In that romance, which was the most fictitious of fiction and carried things to a great extreme, there appears this statement: "Know ye that at the right hand of the Indies there is an island named California, very close to that part of the Terrestrial Paradise, which is inhabited by black women, without a single man among them, and they lived in the manner of Amazons. They were robust of body, with strong and passionate hearts and great virtues. * * * And there ruled over that island of California a queen of majestic proportions, more beautiful than all others, and in the very vigor of her womanhood." That was Queen Calafia. And thus we have learned rather definitely that the name "California" came from that Spanish romance, which, in turn, came from a story dating back centuries into the early middle ages; but how it came to be applied, or who applied it to California, or to what part of California, we do not know. That is still hidden from us. This beautiful California, our own California, was pictured on many of the early maps as an island.

In order to get a true perspective of California history today we need to look at the geologic wonderland, to the geographic proportions of this territory, to the exciting wonders that present themselves on every hand, as well as to the problems that now are before us; because no longer is California isolated as a hidden paradise.

Beginning especially with the great discovery of gold in 1848; with the constitution framing of 1849, and accentuated by the great celebrations during the present year and the two succeeding years, California is known to all the world, but we who are favored to live here, and to enjoy it, should know it better. In order to love our fair California more truly we must know her better.

Thus, this is our heritage—the hidden land, the modern Utopia, this great paradise. The curtain is raised. We may now view it. We may enter upon our own rich heritage; enjoy it; study the various periods that came before us: the Indians; the Spanish regime; the period of the Mexican Republic; and, finally, the trappers and traders, the settlers, the homemakers of the Americans, and the building on these shores of the great Commonwealth of the Pacific.

This is ours. Let us enter into it, and enjoy it, and know it better. [Applause.]

Soil-Conservation Program in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a strong advocate of soil conservation. When we destroy our soil and it becomes unproductive, we have destroyed our greatest natural resource. It is very pleasing to me to see our Government appropriate money for a soil-conservation program.

Under extension of remarks, I recently inserted in the RECORD a summary of the agricultural-conservation program for the State of Oklahoma ending December 1947.

I have now obtained a summary of soil-conservation practices in the eight counties which I have the honor to represent. It shows county allocation of funds, number of farms participating, percent of total cropland on participating farms and the accomplishments of the major soil-building and soil-conserving practices carried out.

Much progress has been made in my district in soil-conservation practices. The total number of different farms in the program for 1946 and 1947 is 9,653 compared to 8,107 for the 1947 program year.

There was a total of 2,138 farms that had soil-conservation district agreements and received technical assistance by the Soil Conservation Service, which participated in the 1947 agricultural-conservation program. Under my extension of remarks I desire to include the summary by counties in my district showing the 1947 accomplishments for all the major practices of the agricultural-conservation program, as follows:

1947 accomplishments for major practices, by counties, Congressional District No. 2

County	County allocation 1947 funds	Number farms participating in program	Number SCD agreement farms participating in 1947 ACP	Percent cropland in program	Terraces constructed		Dams constructed	
					Linear feet	Acres benefited	Cubic yards dirt moved	Number ponds built
Adair	$43,116	923	81	59.7	158,105	1,052	15,538	28
Cherokee	51,717	952	223	45.4	116,713	1,165	127,105	127
Haskell	60,122	915	149	44.4	81,383	407	82,133	86
McIntosh	93,100	1,165	414	46.1	307,296	1,550	142,336	123
Muskogee	128,452	1,482	314	43.5	716,455	5,900	130,604	81
Okmulgee	90,100	960	260	41.0	925,619	5,600	157,101	153
Sequoyah	49,785	661	208	34.2	60,721	729	102,676	111
Wagoner	108,175	1,049	489	51.5	785,002	10,384	134,080	111
Total	624,567	8,107	2,138	45.2	3,151,294	26,787	891,573	820

County	Phosphate		Limestone		Seeding grasses and legumes		Contour farming	
	Pounds spread	Acres treated	Tons spread	Acres treated	Pounds sowed	Acres seeded	Number farms	Acres
Adair	1,153,000	5,016	0	0	280,627	14,469	8	121
Cherokee	659,800	3,299	513	256	284,466	18,382	10	163
Haskell	703,400	3,512	2,057	1,033	265,685	19,240	68	2,766
McIntosh	563,000	960	11,576	5,788	368,056	17,607	199	9,113
Muskogee	1,172,600	5,177	13,339	6,669	646,793	44,268	142	6,252
Okmulgee	850,000	2,650	8,569	4,285	267,639	16,543	209	8,885
Sequoyah	336,000	1,115	5,181	2,590	234,970	12,297	20	244
Wagoner	1,293,000	6,586	11,397	5,698	408,949	23,166	162	3,686
Total	6,730,800	28,315	52,642	26,319	2,757,185	165,972	818	31,230

Insurance and the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on April 28 before the luncheon session of the United States Chamber of Commerce which is meeting here in Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSURANCE AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, at the outset let me express my appreciation to Mr. Earl O. Shreve, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and to Mr. A. L. Kirkpatrick, manager of the Insurance Department of your Chamber, for their cour-

tesy in extending an invitation to me to address this distinguished representative gathering of insurance company executives and key men in Congress, Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission.

I should like to precede my specific comments by a few general observations on the major problem, as I see it, of our times—that of adequacy to the tremendous spiritual challenge with which we are confronted.

JOB FOR EVERY CITIZEN AND LEADERS

Everything in life is "on the march". In the realm of science, we are breaking over the horizons. It has been called the age of technology, and yet men of the scientific mind say that we have "only touched the hem of the garment" of the new discoveries.

But, these discoveries run largely in the field of the physical. Talking with a man the other day who had just come back from Europe—and I had the same experience last summer—he said that we, in America, because of all our blessings must become cognizant of what we have here and reflect our appreciation of being Americans by begetting a new light in our eyes and a great song in our hearts.

Let us be frank about these Communists. There is a certain fervor about their activity; there is a blind devotion by the followers thereof to their cause. This all evidences what history demonstrates—fanatic zeal for outworn causes. We, who have so much, must go through a rebirth of appreciation of what we have; otherwise, we may lack the eternal vigilance which is necessary to preserve our birthright.

Let me repeat to you what I said to the American Bar in Cleveland this year, after returning from abroad: "In this age of material splendor and achievement, we must not forget the spiritual wisdom which constitutes the real framework of our national life. We must fight decadence at every turn. The world needs spiritual splendor, spiritual ideas of honesty, purity, unselfishness, love—more than our goods. Without these ideas, our goods will prove to be only palliative. We know that material remedies for moral ills are ineffective. Many nations are at the ebb-tide of spiritual vitality. Our age will determine which of the rival revolutionary philosophies shall sweep this generation of men. You and I cannot stand idly by. There must be no feeling of 'What's the use,' or resignation to this impact of communism." By giving of ourselves, that is, by giving of what constitutes the American way of life, to others, we will sense a rejuvenation in our own selves and we will ward off the impact of communism.

It is a glorious era of high adventure and action, of fermentation of ideas, of overrunning of ancient barriers and concepts.

Now, gentlemen, with that in mind—and that is my message to you as leaders of opinion—I'd like to discuss the specific subject for which you and I have come together today.

Mr. Kirkpatrick has asked me to begin this discussion by reviewing the Supreme Court's decision in the Southeastern Underwriters case.

In compliance with that request, I will briefly review this history, though I am certain that this group particularly is already familiar with the decision and the subsequent passage of Public Law 15.

HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAW 15 AND STATE REGULATION

On June 5, 1944, the Supreme Court of the United States in the historic case of the *United States* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Association et al.*, reversed a doctrine that had stood for three-quarters of a century and held that the business of insurance was commerce—and that when conducted across State lines it was interstate commerce, and therefore subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Three-quarters of a century earlier, the Supreme Court had ruled in effect that insurance was local business and not commerce.

The principle laid down in the Southeastern Underwriters Association case left the validity of State regulation of the business in many of its most important phases—in serious question. Moreover, many groups of the casualty, surety and fire and marine business, where rate-making collaboration had been practiced, felt that a continuation of such a practice following the decision would be a violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

This historic decision, which affects the insurance industry so directly, resulted from criminal prosecution which the Department of Justice brought against the Southeastern Underwriters Association in the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

As this group knows, the indictment alleged that there was a conspiracy to fix and maintain arbitrary and noncompetitive premium rates and to monopolize trade and commerce in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act.

A demurrer to the indictment was sustained in August of 1943 but on appeal, the Supreme Court reversed the district court.

After the Southeastern Undewriters decision, it was apparent that the insurance industry was going to be required to put its house in order, in line with its newly defined status under the Federal Antitrust Act and related Federal laws. The States and the industry looked to Congress for relief.

While the case was still pending, the various fire-insurance groups were interested in securing a law which would in some respects exempt the entire insurance business from the antitrust laws. That proposal became the storm center of a legislative struggle and the Supreme Court decision was handed down before the Judiciary Committee (of which I am now chairman) took any action on the proposal.

MORATORIUM (PUBLIC LAW 15) PASSED TO GIVE STATES OPPORTUNITY TO PROTECT PUBLIC INTERESTS

After the decision, Congress was confronted with a new situation, and, as we all know, the State insurance commissions, acting through the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and various other groups, sought some type of compromise legislation.

As an outgrowth of these efforts, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported out a so-called moratorium bill which Congress passed on February 27, 1945, after a long legislative battle. The bill was signed on March 9, 1945, and became Public Law 15 of the Seventy-ninth Congress (ch. 20, 1st sess.).

This group, of course, is familiar with Public Law 15 which in effect made the Sherman Antitrust and related acts inapplicable to the business of insurance until January 1, 1948. It would leave the Sherman Act—even during the moratorium period—applicable to boycott, intimidation, and coercion. It also provided that after the moratorium period, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act were to be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

The act evidences the basic idea that continued regulation and taxation of the insurance business by the several States was in the public interest. It might be said that the law attempts to safeguard regulatory and taxing power of the States, while at the same time asserting the jurisdiction of Congress over the interstate aspects of the business. (The case of *Prudential* v. *Benjamin* (328 U. S. 408) in the Supreme Court has been cited as an example of the degree to which the States are free to tax under this mandate. In the case of *Robertson* v. *the People of the State of California* (328 U. S. 461), the Court apparently sustained to some extent the right of the States to continue to regulate independent of Public Law 15. This case arose prior to Public Law 15 and involved statutes prohibiting the sale of insurance in California by an unlicensed agent of a nonadmitted company.)

It is apparent that the insurance business is a combination of local interest, national interest, corporate interest, and individual interest—all adding up to a public interest.

SUMMARY OF STATE ATTEMPTS AT REVISION OF STATE REGULATORY LAWS

The passage of the moratorium and its subsequent extension offered an opportunity to the States to revise their laws and insure practices to meet the responsibilities of the industry and the States themselves in our modern economic life. The law, as you know, was amended to extend the moratorium date to June 30, 1948. That extension resulted from S. 1508 which was introduced by Senator McCARRAN and myself. As chairman of the committee, it was my privilege on July 1, 1947, to report the bill favorably, and on July 25 this bill was approved by the President and became Public Law 238. The moratorium will expire on July 1 and that will mean that for the first time in its history, the insurance business will then be operating squarely under the four Federal antitrust and fair-trade practice acts except to the degree that they are regulated by State law.

As background, we know, of course, that the all-industry committee and an insurance commissioners committee agreed upon certain model rate regulatory bills. From such information as I have (which may not be complete), I present the following brief summary:

Before 1947, a few States had enacted rate regulatory measures though most of them waited until the 1947 legislative sessions. There were some 43 States where such legislation was probably necessary.

In the 1947 sessions, some 35 States attempted to enact rate regulatory bills, some of which were combined fire and casualty and some of which were handled as separate bills. Prior to the 1947 legislative sessions, eight States had enacted rate regulatory legislation, although some of the eight amended their existing measures in the 1947 legislatures.

Rate regulatory laws, largely along the line of the commission's and all-industry committee recommendations, were enacted during 1947 in 35 States and 2 Territories. Rate regulatory bills are still pending in the District of Columbia and Missouri, where the sessions were adjourned until 1948.

Fair-trade practice measures substantially similar to the commission's and all-industry committee drafts, were enacted in 15 States. In California, Utah, and Washington, and some few other States, new insurance codes included provisions which differed from the all-industry NAIC recommendations dealing with unfair trade practices.

Someone has said that 90 percent of the job of meeting the challenge of Public Law 15 lay in enacting casualty and surety and fire and marine rate regulatory laws. It was alleged that unless rate regulatory laws were enacted in these fields, State regulation of the business was likely to collapse. Fire and inland marine rate regulatory bills were introduced in 36 States in 1947 and became law in 32 States.

In other words, in 1947 alone, 30 States and 2 Territories enacted casualty and surety rate regulation laws. Thirty-two States and 2 Territories enacted fire and inland marine rate regulatory laws. These figures are exclusive of those laws which amended existing rate regulatory statutes only with respect to one of these items. Thirty-nine States then have enacted casualty and surety rate regulatory laws since Public Law 15. Forty-one States since Public Law 15 was passed have enacted fire rate regulatory laws; 42

States have comprehensive laws regulating casualty, surety rates other than, or in addition to, workmen's compensation insurance rates.

INTENT OF CONGRESS IN PASSING PUBLIC LAW 15

Now, where do we go from here? Let me first note that Public Law 415 itself was entitled, "An act to express the intent of Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance." This is a significant emphasis-expression of intent.

Before the decision in the case of the United States versus the South-Eastern Underwriters Association, insurance was regarded as intrastate commerce. This decision upset that applecart, and that is why Public Law 15 came into being.

1. By this law, Congress created a pattern for collaboration between Federal and State Governments in the building of a system of regulation. In so doing, Congress assumed control and by applying the legal principle of permission and collaboration, made the pattern.

2. This pattern was that insurance is to be regulated in the public interest, and that if the States do not adopt necessary regulatory laws before July 1, 1948, the business of insurance will thereafter be subject to all Federal acts mentioned, to other Federal laws which may be applicable, and to such further acts as Congress may then find it necessary to adopt to supplement existing Federal laws.

TYPES OF REGULATION CONTEMPLATED

3. There are three types of regulations contemplated by the act. They are:

(a) Regulation national in character, which includes employer-employee relationship and fair labor standards—which necessarily should be uniform nationally. Therefore, Congress reserved to itself exclusive control by providing that the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act shall apply to the business of insurance, the same as they apply to all other interstate commerce. The Sherman Act, as far as it proscribes agreements to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, and acts of boycott, intimidation, and coercion, has application.

(b) The second class of regulation which the act deals with is that which has heretofore or may hereafter be created by Congress regulating interstate commerce generally. You will remember that such laws are not to invalidate, impair, or supersede State laws, except when these acts specifically relate to insurance.

(c) The third class of regulation is where Congress says that with respect to matters contained in the Sherman Act (except in relation to boycott, coercion, and intimidation), and in the Clayton Act, and in the Federal Trade Commission Act, that within the scope of these acts, after July 1, 1948, there must be actual regulation by these acts or by State law.

Section 2 (b) of Public Law 15 uses the phrase that to the extent such business is "not regulated by State law." Now, the present congressional policy substantially is that the public interest can be better served by State regulation of all phases of insurance.

MEANING OF WORD "REGULATION"

What does "regulated" mean as used in the statute?

You will remember that the plan set up by Congress contemplates that insurance is to be regulated by the States. My thought about the word "regulate" is that it means giving direction by rules established by State law and by enforcement of those rules. The purpose of the regulation of the business of insurance is to protect the public interest and as long as the rules of the State adequately protect the public interest, it would appear that insurance business, when conducted in accordance with such rules, is regulated by State law.

PUBLIC INTEREST IS PARAMOUNT

You and I know that the best way for any segment of our economy, including the insurance industry, to avoid Federal controls is to demonstrate a capacity for self-regulation in the public interest.

Statutory regulation usually results from a belief in Congress that in the absence of such regulation, the business covered by the regulation would not be conducted in the public interest.

The invitation of Congress to the States in connection with the insurance industry has been based on the element of public interest.

It is obvious that any business with assets of almost $40,000,000,000 and with an annual income of more than $6,000,000,000 is subject to scrutiny and study.

WHAT SHOULD INSURANCE INDUSTRY DO?

In anticipation of this scrutiny and study, your industry, of course, can develop two programs:

1. An adequate, intelligent program of self-regulation, consistent with State regulation; and,

2. An adequate, intelligent program of presenting the story of your industry to the public—a so-called public-relations program.

Along with these programs, there is an obvious need for foresight which anticipates public needs as yet relatively unknown. In other words, it is possible for the insurance industry to offer insurance protection to the public before the public is conscious of a need for protection in certain new aspects of our daily life.

INSURANCE INDUSTRY AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Your industry grew to greatness under a system of free enterprise. It is my hope that it can continue to grow under a system of free enterprise. I want to see it as free from Federal regulation as is properly consistent with the public interest. Your industry is a great industry, part of the economic life blood of America.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN OUR ECONOMIC LIFE

The role of Government in our national economic life is not creative in the same sense that private enterprise is creative. In many respects the role of Government is like that of the underwriter in your industry. As we know, a good underwriter tries to have fewer and lower losses so that insurance rates and costs may be lowered.

That is the function of good Government. Government to some degree at least attempts to underwrite our economic life.

I have great faith in the desirability of meetings such as this one today. I do not believe in placing an unwarranted stress on the role of Federal Government in any business, and I do believe that much of the future of rate regulation by the States must necessarily result from intelligent administration and from close cooperation between State administrative agencies and your industry.

Nevertheless, it is helpful and even essential for Congress to be kept informed as to the extent of the progress of State rate regulation and the progress of your industry.

I want to assure you that your opinions and the opinions of your coworkers are always welcomed, and I should like to have you feel free to direct them to me or to the committee at any time.

Your industry has been confronted with a tremendous challenge since the enactment of Public Law 15. You have been confronted with the problem of making large-scale adjustments affecting a tremendous portion of the insurance industry. Your industry has made noteworthy efforts to meet this challenge and I have every confidence that this group and all of the leaders in your field will be equally active in securing effective administration of the State regulatory provisions so that your industry can look forward to the future with confidence.

INSPIRING FUTURE OF UNITED STATES INSURANCE

Gentlemen, I do want to summarize a few additional points.

1. The first is that the insurance industry is necessarily interested in the entire American economy. The investments of the insurance industry are so interwoven with every part of our economic life, that the prosperity of our entire country will inevitably be reflected by prosperity in the insurance industry, based on its investments.

2. The insurance industry has a future which is bright and challenging. In every field, the borders of insurance are being pushed back and ever new uses are being found for this wonderful means of assuring security. I need only make reference to the terrific expansion of automobile insurance where it is expected, for example, that there will be 40,000,000 car registrations in the United States very shortly, as against 34,500,000 automobiles registered but 8 years ago. Already today, almost 9 out of 10 cars are insured.

In the last quarter of a century the casualty business has grown tremendously. Back in 1920, casualty-insurance premiums written in the United States by casualty-insurance carriers of all types—stock, mutual, reciprocal, and other—hit a total of $537,221,669 as against $95,497,652 in 1910—an increase of almost 500 percent in the space of a single decade.

Old established insurance firms which had been handling fire and marine began to open up casualty departments.

By 1930 casualty premiums for all United States carriers had almost doubled over 1920, and had reached a total of $1,066,516,017. During the year 1946 the total of premiums written in the United States by all casualty-insurance carriers had reached $1,973,834,116.

I might mention, too, the vast expansion of insurance in the field of aviation which has only really begun to be used for peacetime activities, for freight and plane charter service, for aviation crop dusting and other uses.

INSURANCE INDUSTRY AND FREE COMPETITION

3. A third point which I should like to make is that the insurance industry must necessarily be subject to the same rules which govern our American free-enterprise system and that is that there shall be free and open competition. Agreements which throttle competition and which establish prices at noncompetitive levels, are in complete variance with our conception of free enterprise.

I do believe, however, that Government can throttle free enterprise if it overregulates industry.

4. The fourth point I want to make concerns the streamlining of insurance law. Right now, the insurance industry is confronted with a problem of reviewing 48 volumes containing the insurance laws of the various States. These volumes contain around 30,000 pages, each reflecting the views, opinions, and prejudices of hundreds of legislators throughout our varied land. I believe that the statutory deadwood which has accumulated in the insurance industry must be periodically house cleaned, just as the Congress of the United States must house clean its statutory deadwood.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, gentlemen, I want to point out that we have briefly reviewed the background of Public Law 15 and have considered Congress' intent in passing it and what some of the possibilities for the future are. I have indicated some specific points which we must bear in mind in reviewing the problems of the insurance industry, such as the need for free competition in it, and the necessity for confidence in its future.

I do want to conclude on this note of hope and enthusiasm. I said at the beginning that I was talking to leaders of the insurance industry and I mean that very sincerely. It

is the purpose of leaders to lead, and by that I mean to reflect optimism, confidence, yes, humor—as I tried to point out in my little book, Laughing With Congress—to reflect vision.

It is the purpose of leaders to translate that vision into constructive actions, aiding Government to better serve the general welfare.

I have indicated, I believe, that Congress intends to encourage self-regulation by the insurance industry and to stimulate equitable State regulation rather than attempting to superimpose a strict Federal pattern upon each one of the 48 States.

Let us then go forth from this room, to use words that I have stated before, with a song in our heart and with a light in our eyes, for on that basis, we can be sure that the American insurance industry and all industry will march ahead to the bright horizons of tomorrow.

Which Party in 1948?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Which Party in 1948?", delivered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] at the Harvard Law School Forum, Cambridge, Mass., on April 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHICH PARTY IN 1948?

The Harvard Law School Forum asks us, "Which party in 1948?" I undertake to say that the Democratic Party, on the basis of its record of accomplishment and leadership is entitled to a vote of confidence.

This is no time for a protest vote. There is serious business ahead—the election of the President who for the next 4 years will be charged with responsibility for the administration of our Government. On the manner in which our Government is administered, and on the policies which we shall follow, will depend the fate of free society in the modern world. When I speak of free society I speak of a society in which the individual is free.

On this basic issue the Democratic Party has a record of achievement, and in President Truman it has a leader who has met the problems of the postwar world with frankness, with foresight, and with courage.

Everyone knows where he stands and what he is trying to accomplish. No one knows where the Republican Party stands or what it proposes to do.

For 2 years there have been several confident aspirants busily engaged in pursuit of the Republican nomination for the Presidency, and each of them has been campaigning against President Truman, but none of them has as yet been able to give the country a clear prospectus of Republican policy.

REPUBLICANS FAIL TO PRACTICE WHAT THEY PREACH

They have preached economy and have denounced the expansion of Government, but words and actions would be difficult to reconcile. Governor Dewey, who would teach the Congress how to reduce expenditures, himself is the author of the largest State budget ever presented to the Legislature of New York. A favorite son from the far West, who was elected Governor largely upon the cry that his Democratic predecessor had spent too much money, is the sponsor of the largest expenditures ever made in the State of California; and in Minnesota the same record of increasing State expenditures under Republican sponsorship proves the plain fact that government in the modern world is a service to the people which, despite all political protestations, cannot be had without expenditure.

Witness the fact that only last Thursday the Republican Members of the United States Senate voted 24 to 18 in favor of public housing as recommended by President Truman and as provided in the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill. When this vote was cast, the opinion was freely expressed in the cloak rooms that the bill would not survive in the House of Representatives. But Republican Senators who supported this measure were supporting a measure calling for new public spending.

Witness the fact also that Senator TAFT supported Federal aid to education originally sponsored by the Democratic Senators, THOMAS of Utah, and HILL, of Alabama. Thus, whether the Republican candidates for the Presidency are governors, former governors, or, like Senator TAFT, Members of Congress, they have been driven by inescapable necessity to support measures calling for new appropriations.

Yet in the face of the increase in the cost of Government, Republican leadership has chosen the most critical year in the postwar period to reduce the receipts of the Federal Government. At the same time, this Republican Congress is the most expensive in history. Its expenditures for its own use were almost 50 percent greater this year than last, when it had the excuse that the Legislative Reorganization Act was being put into effect. By this year these expenditures are 73 percent greater than the cost of the last Democratic session in 1946. The cost of congressional employees has jumped from $3,028,795 under the Democratic majority in 1946 more than 100 percent to $7,079,025 under the Republican majority this year. Thus do GOP actions belie GOP pretensions.

TRUMAN GIVES AMERICA FIRST BALANCED BUDGET IN 17 YEARS

Though confronted with unprecedented postwar expenditures for the Military Establishment, for the rehabilitation of veterans and the occupation of foreign soil on which the war was fought, President Truman on the 30th of June last gave the Federal Government its first balanced budget since the middle of the Hoover administration 17 years ago. This surplus of June 30, 1947, was achieved under a Democratic budget laid down by President Truman and enacted by the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress.

This fiscal achievement has been obscured by the fact that Republican candidates for President and Republican leaders with their highly organized publicity staffs have been endeavoring to divert the attention of the people from the realities of our national problems to conceal their own lack of a positive and unified program on every phase of national policy.

Now that the chips are down in the preconvention battle for the Republican nomination, the disagreements of Taft and Dewey and Stassen with respect to Republican policy will become more clear, but this I undertake to say: On its record in the Eightieth Congress the Republican Party in 1948 is led by men who in all essentials are looking to the past and not to the future. On the basis of its record when it last had control of the Executive, on the basis of its complete failure throughout the Roosevelt administration to offer any program but reaction, and on the basis of its demonstrable failure in the Eightieth Congress to offer any solutions for the world-shaking problems which bear down on the people, the Republican Party offers nothing to the citizen who wants a free world with international peace and a high standard of living for the masses.

With respect to the new party, the party of Henry Wallace, it need only be pointed out that the electoral triumph for freedom and democracy which was achieved last Sunday in the Italian elections would have been utterly impossible if Henry Wallace and Senator TAFT, representing as they do the extremes of left and right, had had their way in their opposition to the Marshall plan. If their leadership had prevailed, communistic imperialism would now be sweeping into a vacuum which would have been created in western Europe by a repetition of the isolationist follies which followed World War I. A free society is a society of free individuals, and the people of America cannot sustain such an ideal by casting futile votes for a party which is doomed to defeat in a campaign in which the United States must continue to exercise world leadership for freedom, for peace, and economic justice.

TWO GREAT ISSUES ARE AT STAKE

There are two great issues which will be at stake in the elections of 1948.

First, the secure establishment among the nations of the world of a practical and just method of keeping the peace, and,

Second, the establishment here in the United States of a practical and just method of preserving economic order, of preventing disastrous inflation, and of maintaining a stable high standard of living.

These two issues are inseparable and upon them the Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Truman, furnishes the program and the record which can achieve the solution.

When the Marshall plan was first announced upon the campus of Harvard University by Secretary George R. Marshall, with the approval of President Truman, it was immediately greeted with a chorus of opposition by the isolationists of both the right and of the left. I do not hesitate to pay my tribute of admiration to the leadership of Senator VANDENBERG who courageously espoused the plan and brought it out of the Foreign Relations Committee, but let no one close his eyes to the fact that the proposal came from the administration, which never deviated for one moment in pressing it upon the Congress and the country. Let no one forget that the voice of criticism in isolationist quarters has been only subdued, but not silenced. Every American who knows how essential it is to peace and freedom in the world that democratic ideals shall not give way before totalitarian theory must also realize that the Democratic Party, now as in the time of Woodrow Wilson, is the party of international peace based upon the principle of self-determination for all peoples.

The vast majority of the people of America want to be sure that this country shall not invite a third world war by withdrawing into the shell of isolationism, or by stripping itself of military power at the behest of those who would close their eyes to communistic imperialism. If the free world and the peaceful world in which we believe, if the system of private property and a really free competitive enterprise is to survive, then the people of America cannot entertain the possibility of a new depression. We cannot save the world unless we avoid economic chaos here at home. On this issue, as on the international issue, the Democratic administration again presents the record of constructive leadership.

REPUBLICAN ROAD BLOCKS TO PEACE AND PROGRESS

It was a Democratic Congress—the Seventy-ninth—which enacted the full-employment law, and it was President Truman who made it law by signing it. This is the law

which declares as a matter of public policy that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources to foster and promote a free economy and to avoid depression by promoting "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

It was resisted by Republican leadership in the Seventy-ninth Congress and, even though it is the law, it is being resisted now by Republican leadership. The cost of living rises and Republican congressional leaders decline to act. Repeatedly President Truman, in his messages and in his speeches, has asked for laws capable of meeting the situation, but the proposals are pigeonholed in committees while corporate profits rise to unprecedented pinnacles and the masses of the people in the lower income brackets are day after day finding it more difficult to meet their necessary outlays.

Inflation has always preceded depression. The boom has always preceded the bust, but if a bust should come now because Republican leadership prefers to let things drift rather than to allow the Federal Government even to attempt to hold prices in check, then we also will have the economic confusion which in Europe has brought the totalitarian doctrine in its trail.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS DANGEROUSLY DRIFTING

Thus, with the hopes of the world depending upon the maintenance of a sound economy here in the United States, the Republican party offers no leadership. Confronted with the absolute necessity of new huge expenditures to maintain our armed forces and to lay the basis of world recovery, with a surplus on hand in the Federal Treasury and the Nation carrying the greatest debt in history, a debt that was incurred to fight World War II, Republican congressional leadership deliberately chose to cut the Federal receipts in order to reduce income taxes. With the interest on the national debt running at $5,000,000,000 a year they insisted upon cutting the revenues of the Government by $4,800,000,000. They acted like corporate directors who with a mortgage debt coming due and money in the Treasury to make a payment on account, decided instead to declare a dividend.

The Marshall plan had been voted, new military expenditures for the Army, the Navy and the Air Corps were certain to be incurred, the reports of the congressional fiscal experts clearly indicated that tax reduction would mean a deficit in 1949 so the Republican leadership took $3,000,000,000 of the surplus which could have been used to reduce the debt in 1948 and transferred it into the fiscal year 1949 so as to cover up the sorry effect of their fiscal folly.

I know that they pretend that tax reduction will increase revenues, but that is a delusion already proved to be baseless by the experience of the last Republican national administrations. Five times during the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regime the Republican Congress reduced taxes, and the result was that we not only did not increase revenue, but we did not pay off the debt of World War I. Instead, we ran headlong into a depression, so that the Hoover administration bequeathed to President Roosevelt in 1933 a government already deep in deficit spending and burdened by a debt of $22,000,000,000.

TRUMAN STEERS A STRAIGHTFORWARD COURSE

There are Republican Members of Congress who do not agree with the refusal of Republican leaders to attack the problem of inflation, just as there were Republican Members of Congress who refused to follow the isolationists, but these gentlemen are not candidates for the Republican nomination for President, and there is little likelihood that they will write the Republican platform. On the other hand, the record of the Democratic administration is clear. It has pursued a straightforward course on both the international front and the domestic front, a course designed to maintain a peaceful world in which men shall not become the puppets of arbitrary power. On this record the Democratic party deserves a vote of confidence.

The Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF UTAH

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Senate Committee Ponders How Much To Increase Minimum Wage," by Lowell Mellett, from the Washington Star of April 20, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER HAND—SENATE COMMITTEE PONDERS HOW MUCH TO INCREASE MINIMUM WAGE

(By Lowell Mellett)

The age-old question of the laborer and his hire once more confronts Congress. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has begun hearings on two bills to amend the wage-hour law, enacted 10 years ago. Both would increase the present minimum wage of 40 cents an hour. One, offered by Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, chairman of the subcommittee, would raise the figure to 60 cents; the other, introduced by Senator THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah, and Representative MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, would raise it to 75 cents. There are other differences.

The forces chiefly responsible for obtaining the present minimum—including all of organized labor and many churches and civic organizations—are lined up against the Ball bill in favor of the Thomas-McCormack bill. They contend that anything less than 75 cents is an unrealistic approach to the present cost of living. While the 40-cent minimum served to eliminate much of the sweatshop industry of the late 1930's, they say that social blight is in a fair way to return unless Congress faces the facts of life as they exist for millions today. Two years ago the Senate approved a minimum of 65 cents, in keeping with provisions of the original bill for raising the wage floor when changing circumstances made this necessary, but the House took no action.

PHILOSOPHY BEHIND ACT

Underlying the original act was the philosophy that an ever-expanding economy is possible in America and should be promoted, and with this should go a steadily rising standard of living for all people, most particularly those in the lowest income levels. That, it was believed, furnished the only sound foundation for the country's future prosperity, the only assurance of the purchasing power essential to industrial and commercial growth.

This basic concept, it is argued, is lost in the Ball bill. The approach of the latter is held to be little different from that of a reluctant employer bargaining with his employees over a new contract and granting only the concessions he cannot withhold. It even provides machinery for lowering the minimum wage in case the national economy should shrink rather than expand. If the purchasing power theory is valid, this provision could actually help to bring about such a shrinkage. Or, so labor's economists argue.

Under the Ball bill it would be possible to set up different wages for different regions. This is based on the long-held notion that the cost of living is higher in some sections than in others. The newer notions, held by the bill's opponents, is that the cost of living scarcely various between one section and another; what varies is the standard of living, not the cost.

OTHER DIFFERENCES IN BILLS

Industry committees, under the Ball bill, could base their estimates of adequate wages on what it costs a single worker to live, rather than on the cost of sustaining a family. This would result in single workers getting the preference in employment over married men and women.

The Thomas-McCormack bill would reduce the number of exemptions under the present law, bringing under its protection a few million workers not now covered, including seamen and some classes of farm labor. The Ball bill would increase the classes not covered, such as workers in food processing industries, laundries and other service industries. Seamen would continue to be excluded.

Generally speaking, the Thomas-McCormack bill tightens up the present law in line with experience and the decisions of the courts. It is claimed that the Ball bill, because of many new and intricate provisions, would result in years of new litigation.

Both parties in their platforms are pledged to improve the present law.

Are Railroads Going Back to the Old Days?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, every once in awhile we have reason to question whether railroads are going back to the old days of high-handedness. The following article on a situation in New York City which affects directly a considerable number of investors in my district seems to be harking back to these old days; an explanation is certainly called for, and it should be made:

[From the New York World-Telegram of April 21, 1948]

STOCKHOLDERS WARNED THAT RAILROADS HEDGE ON RENEWING GROUND LEASE FOR 277 PARK AVENUE

(By James L. Holton)

John A. Bolles, president of the 277 Park Ave. Corp., in a letter to the corporation's stockholders today, warned that ownership of this $6,000,000 12-story apartment building is in jeopardy in the present halted negotiations for a renewal of the ground lease.

The present lease will expire on September 30 next. It was made by the New York Central Railroad Co. and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, whose vast network of trackage entering Grand Central Terminal extends beneath this block as well as others in the vicinity.

RAILROADS REFUSED OFFER

Efforts to renew the lease for 277 Park Avenue—the luxury-type building takes in the entire block from Park to Lexington Avenues, between Forty-seventh and Forty-eighth Streets—have been unavailing since March 1947, Mr. Bolles explained to his stockholders.

After numerous meetings and conferences last fall the 277 Park Avenue Corp.

proposed a reinstatement of the original lease, made in 1923, which granted two renewal options for 21-year terms. This offer was rejected as not acceptable, Mr. Bolles said in a letter from Richard E. Dougherty, New York Central vice president, on January 8 last.

NOW WON'T NEGOTIATE

"Since then we have sought to continue negotiations, but the New York Central has made no effort to keep them alive," Mr. Bolles added.

"Should the railroads refuse to grant a new lease, they would by their refusal assert ownership of a $6,000,000 building for the erection of which they did not invest or contribute a single penny," Mr. Bolles went on. "Such action would be unprecedented in a situation in which the owners have not 'milked' or abandoned the property."

Crux of the present difficulties to renew this 277 Park Avenue leasehold with the railroads apparently goes back to the thirties, when ownership of the building went through reorganization. Most of the original bondholders in about 1936 turned in their bonds for stock.

Mr. Bolles, however, reported that 86 percent of present stockholders, owning approximately 50 percent of the stock, are original investors.

But during the thirties the railroads consented to a modification of the original lease, and between 1936 and 1941 the only rental from the building were the net proceeds from the operation of the property.

Then in September 1943 on the expiration of the original 21-year term, the railroads offered the present 5-year lease which, Mr. Bolles says, the corporation "was compelled by circumstances to accept."

OFFERED ORIGINAL RENTAL

Mr. Bolles has called a meeting of the more than 2,000 stockholders for May 7 at the Hotel Commodore to discuss the situation. He explained the rejected proposal called for $247,000 yearly ground rent, the same sum called for under the original 1923 lease, plus a modernization program for the building to cost between $750,000 and $1,000,000.

"The proposal stipulates this work will be completed within 5 years or within such shorter period as the railroads may reasonably propose," Mr. Bolles stated. "Further, we offered to establish a fund of $300,000 as a guaranty the work would be done.

"Finally, as additional assurance of good faith, we agreed that failure to complete the work within the allotted time would constitute a default."

SAYS HE IS OPTIMISTIC

Mr. Bolles concluded his letter:

"Whether upon consideration of the strongest kind of moral obligation or upon advantages to be derived by the lessors from a competently operated building, the justification for reinstatement is undeniable.

"We shall continue our negotiations directly with the railroads. We have the utmost faith in the ultimate result, for we cannot conceive that confiscation of a $6,000,000 property will be condoned by the public, including the stockholders of the railroads, in this age of economic and social enlightenment."

The Builders of the Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Builders of the Bomb," published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE BUILDERS OF THE BOMB

Because the Republican Party may elect a new President next fall, a number of Republican Senators now contend that there should be no action at this time to confirm Mr. Truman's renomination of the five present members of the Atomic Energy Commission to succeed themselves in office. The Republican argument goes on to say that the choice of members for the AEC ought to be the responsibility of the new President, if he is elected.

It is a poor argument for it ignores the fact that it was Congress itself that chose to make the terms of all five members of the AEC expire simultaneously on August 1 of this year, so that it would have an opportunity to review the work of the Commission before the beginning of the 5-year staggered terms provided for in the law. And it is on this basis—the basis of work performed—and not on the basis of whether it is possible or probable or completely in the bag that the Republicans will elect the next President—that the merit of these five renominations should be judged.

On this basis we are confident that facts call for approval by the Senate. A congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has had an opportunity to observe closely every move that the AEC has made during its first 18 months in office. We believe that the members of this congressional committee, both Republican and Democratic, are in a position to testify to the truth of the President's statement that during this period a gigantic and successful atomic-energy program has been put into forward motion.

We agree with Mr. Truman's observation that to reject these nominations now, or to tinker with law for the purpose of making these positions a prize of the next election, "would restore the pall of uncertainty which surrounded the development of this country's atomic-energy program from the Japanese surrender until the spring of 1947, when the present Commission was confirmed," and that the result of such uncertainty would be adverse from the point of view of national defense.

We therefore urge prompt and favorable action on the five renominations.

Present Crisis of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me in Chicago on April 17 before the National Conference of Students for Democratic Action:

It would be a fine thing if I could take my allotted time today to recite the goals achieved and the objectives gained by the fighting liberals of the past. It would be a fine thing if I could so honor the valiant men and women whose tradition we today inherit and if, at the same time, I could say to you, "This much has been accomplished. These battles have been won. You, the liberal leaders of the future, can forget these old campaigns. You can go on from here." It would be a fine thing to say, if it were true. But it is not true.

You must fight the old fights over, while you take on the new ones too. You will have to watch the polls like your grandfathers did to see that votes are counted while you grapple with the facts of nuclear fission they never heard of. The great men of the past won you a beachhead to stand on. They gave you a record to live up to. From their achievement you can measure the intelligence, the courage, and the dedication to be required of you. That is all. The major issues they fought for are still unresolved. The gains they made are threatened.

I am going to talk about one small sector of that endless fight to develop the abundant resources of this Nation for the benefit of all the people, not the profit of a few. To give you one specific example of that timeless conflict, I am going to describe the current fight on TVA, and what it means to liberals everywhere. It will indicate the size of the job of Americans who believe in democratic action.

None of you were around in the twenties. None of you sat in the Senate Gallery and saw the gallant lonely figure of George Norris as he stood there day after day earnestly, patiently presenting his case, little by little educating his fellow Senators, the press, and through them the people. Some days he spoke to less than a dozen Members. Again the Chamber would be crowded. Read those debates if you want to find out if you've got what it takes in the way of work and courage for the job ahead. For 10 years he pleaded with his fellow Senators to dedicate a dam on the Tennessee River and a chemical plant nearby—both surplus from World War I—to public purpose; one to provide low-cost electricity, the other to experiment in producing new types of fertilizer to restore the fertility of worn-out soil. That was the beginning of the modern chapter of the TVA story, which is, in all, a tale of more than a century.

For days and months and years he fought. Facts were his weapons. Facts about engineering. Facts about economics. Kilowatt hours, acre feet, chemical formulae, all these are a part of the record he made. From comparative rates for electricity in the homes to relative mortality statistics he made his case for the right of the people to have the benefit of the development of the resources which are our national heritage. He made his case against the bitter opposition of the private utilities, the fertilizer companies, against the long cold war of sectional prejudice. One by one he fought off bills which would have turned the facilities over to private companies before his job of education was completed. Steadily he advanced his own proposals. Little by little he gained ground. Go through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for those years and see the gradual changes in the roll call. At first, only a little group, largely from the West and Midwest, voted with him. Steadily the number grew. Until at last, almost 20 years ago now, the first bill for government operation of the properties the Government owned at Muscle Shoals was passed. Try to measure the brains and energy and steady endurance that went into that victory. The nights of study, the days of discussions with technical questions reduced to laymen's comprehension, and public policy made brilliantly clear.

If the record of that fight seems dull to you, you haven't the imagination it takes to fight on the side of the liberal. It is not dull. It is magnificent. One by one every objection was patiently answered. One by one every argument was presented. One of the most dramatic stories of our times is written there. The story of a man giving every ounce of vitality he had to the job of learning, and teaching what he learned in a public forum. That's the way liberal leaders have to work. That is the hard and sober pattern you will have to follow.

Would you have the courage to start all over again when the bill which was finally passed after years of heartbreaking effort received what we call a pocket veto from a silent President? That great liberal did. He came back with another bill in the next session of Congress. He stayed on the floor all day and all night to break a filibuster when the enemies tried to talk the bill to death. George Norris and his colleagues broke that filibuster. They went without lunch and dinner and breakfast. Through a day and a night they stayed on the floor. You could see them from the gallery, alert to take advantage of every parliamentary break. They won again. And another President returned that bill to Congress "without his approval." Would you keep on fighting then? A liberal has to. Senator Norris did, and understanding in the country was piling up. The job of education had been well done. The people were no longer fooled by utility propaganda. In 1933 a new Congress adopted the act creating TVA and it was approved by the great President who had recommended its passage, Franklin D. Roosevelt. A milestone was passed. Some liberals may have thought the job was done on this particular issue so far as the Tennessee Valley was concerned. Some of them thought there would be no more conflict—that the private utilities would yield to the will of the people's representative three times expressed and finally affirmed by the Chief Executive. They were wrong. The fight went on.

It moved to another sector. Injunction followed injunction in court after court. Twice the Supreme Court of the United States heard distinguished counsel for the private utility companies argue that in creating this public power system Congress had exceeded its constitutional limitations. Those companies tried to deny the people of the Tennessee Valley the benefit of the power that would be developed when the projected series of multipurpose dams was completed, to limit these consumers to the power supplied primarily for the profit of the private companies. The Court held otherwise. All three branches of the Federal Government in Washington stood together for the public interest, the Congress, the President and the Court.

At the same time, down in the Tennessee Valley itself the people in their own communities were registering their approval of this new Federal statute. In spite of utility opposition in cities, towns, and villages, men and women voted to purchase from the private companies the electricity distribution systems which then served them, to buy their power at wholesale from the TVA, and deliver it to the consumers themselves. So a purchase contract was negotiated. TVA bought the generating and transmission facilities. Local bodies bought the distribution systems, and this country's single experiment in public ownership and operation of a whole power system was begun. Of course the Federal Government owns vast hydro facilities in other parts of the country. Municipal plants are common. But here is the only area where a publicly owned system is the sole supplier of power.

The TVA power system was on its way, and liberals took time to realize that TVA was much more than a power system. It was more than the first integrated public power system. It was the first attempt in this country to develop all the natural resources of an area together, to consider the problems of land and water and trees as one problem, to follow nature in a system of Federal administration rather than to divide the job of resource development to fit the jurisdictional compartments into which Federal Government administration is traditionally split. It was the first attempt by Congress to apply modern principles of management to old problems.

TVA IS A MODERN DEVICE FOR GOVERNMENT IN A MODERN WORLD

Congress told TVA to see the problems of the Tennessee Valley and its potentialities as a whole, to aid in developing all the resources—not just the river—for the people's benefit. It was a big job. The Tennessee River itself was a wild, uncontrolled stream—now overflowing its banks to spill its flood waters into the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, a little later just a muddy trickle. It was potentially a great artery of commerce, but a dependable navigable channel had never been created despite a century of piecemeal improvements. The river was useless to the people and the land of the valley was worn out. The pressure of floods, erosion, and too much corn, cotton, and tobacco had robbed it of fertility. The forests of the valley were denuded. There was little industry; the income of the people was low.

Not only is the job of resource development usually split between a dozen agencies of the Federal Government, but in all of them the power of decision is in Washington. In contrast, Congress told TVA to get out in the field, to make its decisions close to the place where problems arise, not by remote control from the Capitol. Congress established the broad policies for TVA to follow and then said, in effect, "We'll hold you responsible for results." Unlike any other agency, TVA selects its own employees, it designs and builds and operates the dams; buys the land it needs; handles its litigation and settles its claims; purchases its own material and equipment and disposes of surplus property. Red tape and alibis are cut. The Board of TVA was given the tools to do the job.

This is a venture of considerable importance to liberals. The future of this Nation depends on good public administration. We can't sit back and talk about bureaucracy—waste, red tape, inefficiency, and delay. It's up to us to do something. New schemes must be tried out. Old practices abandoned when they are found wanting.

By 1940, when I was elected to my first term in Congress, liberals were enormously pleased with the way the TVA scheme of administration worked out. Compared with the old-line departments, it was a paragon of efficiency. We began to feel secure about this one public project. TVA was a going concern, a success. Some of us thought it would be invulnerable to attack on the basis of its fine record.

TVA AND THE WAR

With World War II everyone discovered what those of us who were watching closely already knew. Because of TVA, this underdeveloped area had become the arsenal of democracy. You know that story, perhaps as well as I do. You know how TVA broke world records to build new dams to meet power needs, how it met incredible schedules and impossible goals without a single strike or bonus. You know how the skies of Europe were patrolled by bombers made from aluminum produced by power from TVA, how chemicals and munitions poured out. You all have read how, in one of the worst droughts in history, TVA kept war plants going all day and every day—supplying power way beyond its contractual commitments with never a single break in service. Everyone now knows why the Oak Ridge plant was built in Tennessee. This was American enterprise at its best. This was a terrific test for this great new public development, and the TVA met it. Nowhere can you find a better record of hope fulfilled and vision justified. In this connection, all that I have said is equally true of the great public-power developments of Grand Coulee and Bonneville in my own State of Washington.

If liberals can ever relax and think a conflict over, we should have been able to do so then. Here at last was a well-managed Government enterprise to answer all the stupid clichés about bureaucrats. Here was a region using new tools to build a stronger Nation. Here labor and management were showing a pattern of cooperation unrivaled anywhere. Here was an agency to which the people of the area it served were devoted. Even the private utilities seemed impressed. But if any of us thought TVA was secure and that we could go on from there, we were wrong.

Three years later TVA is under fire of the major utility guns. In Washington today a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is considering the demands of private utilities that a ceiling should be placed on the development of the South. The story of the twenties is repeated. The same arguments are used. Some of the same people are leaders of the opposition. This is the same battle Senator Norris waged 20 years ago. Now it is your fight, too.

THE POWER TRUST ORGANIZES ITS CAMPAIGN

The Power Trust came out in the open in July 1945 when the National Association of Electric Companies, representing half of the utility industry, opened its offices in Washington. Mr. Purcell Smith is in charge, a former president of the Middle West Corp., I am informed, the successor company to Samuel Insull's Middle West utilities. He is paid a salary of $65,000 a year, I understand, to direct the association's lobbying and propaganda activities.

Attacks on TVA were mild in the beginning of this new phase of the private utility fight while the all-out drive was to prevent, in the face of a growing public demand, the creation of a Columbia Valley Authority and a Missouri Valley Authority. People in my part of the country and in the Midwest had observed what had happened in the Tennessee Valley. They wanted to have a decentralized efficient Federal administration. They would like to get rid of floods and red tape at the same time. All the propaganda tricks of the Power Trust were trotted out. They were familiar to the liberals of the twenties. They will be new to you. Even I have had a short acquaintance with them. In costly advertising campaigns the people were solemnly assured that the creation of a CVA or an MVA would mean the economic dictatorship over a great region by a board of three men not responsible to the people. All that is nonsense, of course, although it was repeated in the recent Nebraska campaign by a prominent Republican Presidential candidate who placed. He should have and perhaps did know better. The three men would simply administer the limited Federal powers now in the hands of a combination of Cabinet officers, not elected by the people either. The only difference is that the three board members would not be political appointees and that they would have their headquarters in the region, not in Washington.

Can you answer such propaganda? Do you know that the Corps of Engineers, under the Secretary of War, built dams and developed rivers before TVA existed; that the Secretary of Agriculture helped promote soil conservation, while the Reclamation Service, under the Secretary of the Interior, built and operated reclamation projects, including power production? If you are going to accept the responsibilities of liberals, you will have to be prepared on such issues. You must be equipped to stop the free flow of misinformation which frustrates the understanding of the people. Of course, the people ought to have whatever type of administrative device will serve them best, but the people have got to have the facts on which to base a decision. So far on this issue the liberals have fallen down on this job.

To halt a CVA and MVA was the first job the utility propagandists undertook. They did it. But they will never feel safe in exploi-

tation so long as TVA exists. People still move freely in this country. They go down to see the Tennessee Valley. Farmers from North Dakota and Wisconsin, bankers from Wyoming, editors from Missouri and Washington. They talk about what they see. Tall tales from Purcell Smith can never obliterate the memory of majestic dams, conceal green fields, hide growing prosperity. So after some reported soul searching, the utilities decided that they must stop the TVA power system in its tracks. That is what they are out to do. This is how they are trying to do it.

THE UTILITIES WOULD PUT A LIMIT ON TVA POWER PRODUCTION FACILITIES

TVA is asking Congress this year for funds needed to begin construction of a new steam electric-generating plant. As everyone knows, presumably even private utilities, the whole country is just squeezing by on its present power supply. If we are going to take care of normal industrial growth, let alone expanded national-defense requirements, our supply of power must be greatly increased. In the areas which the utilities themselves serve, they are planning—in most cases somewhat belatedly—to expand their own facilities for generation by from 30 to 35 percent. But while planning this expansion in their own facilities, the utilities have had the arrogance to open an all-out drive to block an appropriation for the new plant needed by TVA.

The financial pages of the metropolitan dailies are full of their stories. Editorials in trade journals repeat their patter. Last week their representatives with the expensive Mr. Smith appeared before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to urge rejection of the item. Cutting down appropriations for public plants is no new undertaking for private utilities. Last year they tried with some success to limit the scope of the western public power projects. At least, and to give them their due, they had a point to argue there. A selfish point, and one I do not endorse. They do have systems in the general areas where western plants are located. They may honestly be concerned about their future. The situation in the Tennessee Valley is different. They do not serve the people there. They have no investment or responsibility there. They are not trying to defend themselves against competition. They are simply saying that expansion of power production—and therefore of industry—in the Tennessee Valley must stop. Instead of a program of dynamic growth which TVA assures, they propose a program of industrial and agricultural stagnation, for electricity today is the life of agriculture as well as industry. When the private companies try to put a ceiling on industrial development in the Tennessee Valley, they are following an old pattern. There was a ceiling on progress when they were responsible for service. The utilities thought 797,000 kilowatts of capacity was adequate to serve the area now served by TVA, and that 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year was enough electricity for the people to use; that electric service to 1 farm in every 28 was a nice profitable level of rural electrification. They had no faith in the area's development. These sturdy apostles of private enterprise took no risks when they provided power supply. One of the arguments they used against TVA was that the power to be produced was not needed, that it would go to waste for lack of a market to absorb it. In 1935, when TVA predicted that a power shortage was impending by 1937 unless capacity was expanded, representatives of the private power industry appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee to challenge TVA's position. One of the utilities' spokesmen, representing Commonwealth & Southern Corp., complacently declared: "This area is now abundantly supplied with power and in addition has surplus capacity to provide for future growth for the next 6 years, based on most optimistic estimates of service to rural, domestic, and industrial consumers."

What actually happened? Electricity sales for the very next year—1936—exceeded utility predictions by 23 percent. Nineteen hundred and thirty-seven sales were 9 percent above those forecast by the utility experts for 1940, and what have been the results after 15 years of TVA? A system of 26 dams together with steam plants now supplies power for the largest integrated power system in the world. The high-cost low-use policies of the private companies have been abandoned. TVA's installed generating capacity will soon reach a total of 3,000,000 kilowatts in contrast to the 797,000 formerly provided by the private companies. Today, 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year is produced instead of 1,500,000,000. More than 50 percent of the region's farms are now electrified instead of 1 in 28, in 1933, and new farm customers are going on the cooperatives' lines at the rate of about 5,000 a month.

And now the managers of the TVA power system whose estimates of load growth have been as uniformly right as the private companies have been uniformly wrong say additional power will be required. And the utilities step in to say to the Tennessee Valley, "This far you have gone—you shall go no farther."

SECTIONALISM VERSUS REGIONALISM

Do you liberals realize the significance of this? Can you distinguish regionalism as exemplified by TVA from sectionalism as advocated by the private power companies? In 1933, the Tennessee Valley was way behind the rest of the country in economic development. It hasn't yet caught up. But it is on the way. Today it is a region with new industries, a new economy, and a new confidence in its own future. Even before the war, business expansion in the valley was remarkable. Between 1933 and 1939, the number of manufacturing establishments increased 53.5 percent in the valley as compared with 30 percent for the whole country; wage earners employed in manufacturing increased by 41.8 percent in the valley, as against 30.2 percent for the country as a whole; wages paid factory wage earners by 56.8 percent in the valley, as against 46.5 percent for the Nation; and the value of manufactured products by 68 percent for the valley, as against 53.7 percent for the United States. You statisticians and economists know what that means. It means TVA has helped private business in the Tennessee Valley. Think that over when you get a slip with your electricity bill attacking TVA on the grounds that it is unfair to private enterprise. Who is on the side of the free enterprise competitive system in this fight? More than 1,800 new private businesses have started in the TVA power service area since 1933. These are not nationalized stores or shops or socialized factories. Nor have they moved from other sections of the country. They represent a net gain in national production. The income of the people is rising. In 1933, the people of the Tennessee Valley paid 3 percent of the Federal income taxes. Last year their share was 6 percent, an increase of 100 percent. In 1945, the people of the Tennessee Valley had $680,000,000 more to spend than they would have had if their per capita income had remained in the same relation to the national average as it was in 1933. This is no conflict between public and private enterprise. If the private utilities win this fight, they will win it at the expense of all other private business, those which are developing in the valley, and those outside which find expanding markets there. If they win it, they will win it at the expense of our national security. A limit on power supply for an area whose heavy chemicals and light metals are produced affects us all. If they win it, they will win it at the expense of the American taxpayer for TVA's ability to return the Federal power investment to the Treasury will be threatened. If they win it, they will win it at the expense of our democratic institutions for it will mean that the people's will can be defied by one single private industry—an industry whose personal fortune will not be directly affected in any way by the decision.

In the Columbia and the Missouri Valleys, the private utilities are weeping crocodile tears for the local rights they claim will be impaired if a development like TVA should be begun. While in Washington, they boldly try to abrogate the decisions made by the people in the valley of the Tennessee.

If they win this fight, it will show that the Congress of the United States is not committed to a program of full development of all the resources of all the country, but only a few selected areas, and that the private power companies are going to make the selection.

This issue transcends the question of public ownership of power. This is the question of public ownership of government. This is our fight. They must not win it.

Educational Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Educational Crisis," which appeared in the Daily Athenaeum, the West Virginia University student newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL CRISIS

Education is the greatest single factor responsible for man's progress. The average American takes the attitude that anyone can go as far as his capabilities will permit in the American educational system. He accepts our present system wholeheartedly, finding no need for improvement.

A recent survey, however, made by John R. Steelman, Presidential assistant, on "Science and Public Policy," throws a wet blanket on this complacency by indicating that half of our ablest high-school graduates do not attend college because their families cannot afford the expense.

One of the most serious results is the acute shortage of research scientists which threatens national defense, including further development of atomic weapons. Unless corrective measures are taken, both numbers and quality of scientists will continue to drop.

Even more serious is the fact that because of this extreme shortage of scientists, it is doubtful that the 600,000 students now enrolled in science and engineering can be adequately trained unless broad action is taken to provide facilities and scientist-teachers. Low salaries in the teaching profession is largely responsible. Since 1940 salaries have increased only from 20 to 30 percent, while the cost of living has risen nearly 60 percent.

Economic factors are the chief elements hampering scientific training. If half the country remains complacent to education while the other half advocates revising the system, the problem will be deadlocked. There is no reason why the two beliefs can-

not be modified to make steps agreeable to both possible. The neutral way of preferring either one attitude or the other is not wise under present conditions.

Mr. Steelman's plan is neither too conservative nor too radical. He advocates a program of national financial aid to colleges and universities. Good instruction is a basic requirement to build a sound foundation for future scientific progress.

Adequate salaries, therefore, are necessary to draw able scientists back into the teaching profession. He further recommends a national system of scholarships and fellowships to encourage the qualified to go to college.

A Veteran's Thanks for Training Received Under the GI Vocational Training Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. DOUGLASS BUCK
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an unusual letter from a veteran of World War II who, having finished his training under the GI vocational bill, expresses in no uncertain terms his gratitude to the Government for the opportunity afforded him to improve his station in life.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *April 14, 1948.*

Hon. C. DOUGLASS BUCK,
Senator from Delaware,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUCK: As a constituent I have a request to make. However, I think you will find that this request of mine is a rather different one.

I am a veteran of the recent war, 25 years old, married, and soon to be a parent. Recently I completed a 2-year course in accounting at a resident school in this city. I attended college under Public Law 16, having a 10-percent disability.

The groundwork has been laid, now follows the reason for this letter. In essence, it is this:

I feel that I owe a debt of gratitude to someone or someones for the schooling I have just completed, the privileges I have enjoyed while acquiring the knowledge I now possess, and for the future opened to me through this additional learning.

Now then, I recognize this debt and wish to acknowledge it. But how am I to do so? And to whom? To the general public of the United States whose taxes have paid for the benefits I have availed myself? Or to the members of the Congress of the United States for possessing the farsightedness (or maybe it was pure altruism) to provide the entitlements I have used?

I realize that I did not voluntarily join the ranks of the military. As a matter of fact, I actually resented uprooting myself to be absorbed into the Army. I was not too concerned with the fact that my country was in peril and that my small contribution was essential. I remember many times when I would gladly have departed from the regimentation of the service if I had had but a strong enough excuse. Remember this, sir, I was not at all willing.

But, was I asked if I had enlisted before I was allowed to place myself under the wing, so to speak, of the Government? I was not. Did the general public ask if I were, or had been, a model soldier, and did I deserve or earn the right to the privileges extended to all honorably discharged servicemen? The public did not.

This acceptance at "face value," as it were, has made a tremendous impression on me. It leaves me with a feeling of "butterflies in the stomach." It makes me want to sing out with the joy of being alive. It creates practically an obsession with me to be a good citizen, a moral and honest man, a sincere, and devoted parent. It almost envelops me in chauvinism.

For my own piece of mind, I felt that I had to convey my thoughts to someone who could help me express my thanks and to assure everyone that this gift of education shall not be used selfishly to further my own personal ambitions, but, rather, to gain a place of responsibility in my community and to further the doctrine of democracy—or more to the point, the doctrine of living and enjoying life to its fullest with every neighbor regardless of his religion, color or beliefs. I want to regard his possessions, his loves, his ideas, his gods, and his ambitions as inherently and forevermore his.

I could elaborate more fully on this topic, but I fear that to do so would detract from the main theme of this letter—the fact that I recognize my debt and wish to acknowledge it.

Will you please accept my burden and express my gratitude in a way you think best? I would appreciate your doing this very, very much.

Yours sincerely,

M. ROBERT FELTON.

Proposed Offering of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Senator from New Hampshire to Robert K. McConnaughey, Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and a letter to the Senator from New Hampshire from the Kaiser-Frazer Corp., regarding the proposed offering of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. stock.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
April 26, 1948.

ROBERT K. MCCONNAUGHEY, Esq.,
Acting Chairman, Securities and
Exchange Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCONNAUGHEY: I have been reading with interest news reports on the pending hearings by your Commission on the proposed offering of Kaiser-Frazer Corp. stock, the offering for public sale of which was withdrawn sometime in February 1948. It appears from the information that I have available that the Commission's investigation centers upon alleged activities of the security dealers in various parts of the country and the underwriting houses which entered into a contract with Kaiser-Frazer Corp. for the purchase and sale of the common stock which the underwriters subsequently terminated.

In particular, I have noticed the allegations made by Otis & Co. that the Commission has not included in the scope of its investigation an inquiry into the registration statement and the alleged market manipulation by Kaiser-Frazer Corp.

While I am reserving judgment as to the merits of this controversy, I cannot dismiss the strong possibility that the Commission itself may not be free of responsibility in connection with the Kaiser-Frazer stock issue. I believe that the public is entitled to a full explanation of the Commission's actions in connection with this stock issue, and I am considering the advisability of recommending to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that it make a complete investigation. For these purposes, I ask that you supply me as quickly as possible with answers to the following questions:

1. I understand that the agreement between the underwriters and the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. was not entered into until after 5 p. m. on February 3, and that this agreement reduced the number of shares which the underwriters were committed to buy from 1,500,000 to 900,000; and that this agreement reduced the expected proceeds to Kaiser-Frazer from about $17,000,000 to approximately $10,300,000 gross, and after the so-called stabilization expenses to about $7,700,000. Despite these fundamental changes, it is my understanding that the SEC permitted the registration statement to become effective at 5:30 p. m. on February 3—which is less than one-half hour after the transaction was entered into. I raise the question whether this was not totally inconsistent with the purpose of the Securities Act and the Commission's regulations, which are designed to provide a sufficient waiting period after the registration statement is filed to enable the investing public to appraise the merits of the issue. In connection with this aspect of the matter, I should like to have answers to the following questions:

(1) At what hour was the SEC first advised of the agreement between the underwriters and the Kaiser-Frazer Corp.?

(2) Was the information telephoned to the SEC? If so, by whom, and to what official or officials of the SEC.

(3) Was this information or the registration statement as affected by this information considered by the Commission before the registration statement was made effective? If not, what official allowed the registration statement to become effective, and by what authority did he do so?

(4) Has the SEC in any other case allowed registration statements to become effective on similarly short notice after amendment which comparably changed the size and character of the offering?

2. I notice that the SEC authorized the offering to be made merely on the basis of a registration statement and prospectus which by no means reflected the facts as to the offering, if for no other reason because of the changes that had been made in the transaction on February 3, and required only that a sticker be attached to the registration statement and prospectus. I ask that you answer the following questions with respect to this phase of the matter:

(1) Who authorized this to be done? Was the propriety of this act considered by the Commission? If not, what official of the SEC authorized this, and by what authority?

(2) Did the Commission consider whether the information on the sticker with respect to the so-called stabilization operation in which Kaiser-Frazer Corp. had spent $2,500,000 to acquire 186,000 shares of its own stock constituted an adequate disclosure of this transaction?

(3) Did the Commission consider whether the statement of net proceeds on the sticker was misleading in that it did not show that

the corporation would actually realize $2,500,000 less than the amount that it would receive from the underwriters, because that $2,500,000 had already been spent in the so-called stabilization operation?

(4) Did the Commission consider whether the reduction in the number of shares to be sold and the reduction in net proceeds to the corporation actually made false and misleading the representation in the registration statement as to the purposes to which the proceeds of the issue would be applied. In other words, the registration statement was drafted on the theory that the corporation would receive in excess of $17,000,000 to expand production, acquire and invest in various facilities. It is perfectly obvious that these purposes could not be accomplished if the corporation would get only $7,700,000. Nevertheless, the sticker recited merely that "In the event all of the stock is not sold, the corporation may not be in a position to increase its production to the extent stated * * *." My question is whether the Commission itself considered this aspect of the situation; or if it did not, whether any official of the SEC did so; and if so, what is that official's name?

3. I notice that the Commission's investigation and hearing have been limited as described above, and do not include, among other things, the accuracy or completeness of the registration statement which the Commission has cleared. This raises the question in my mind as to whether the Commission made an adequate investigation of the accuracy and completeness of the registration statement before it was cleared. In connection with this phase of the matter, I ask that you answer the following questions:

(1) Did the SEC make any investigation of the accuracy and completeness of the registration statement? If so, describe the investigation in detail, naming the officials of the Commission who did the work, and setting forth the consideration that was given to this subject by the Commission itself.

(2) Please supply me with all memoranda and drafts thereof prepared by engineers, accountants, analysts, lawyers, examiners, and other members of the Commission's staff, stating which of these were transmitted to the Commission and stating what consideration, if any, was given to each of them by the Commission.

(3) What discussions and communications, by telephone or otherwise, were had between officials of the Commission and members of the Commission with persons connected with the issuer, any of the underwriters, and the accountants for the issuer. Please supply me with all letters, memoranda, records of telephone conversations, etc., from the issuer, underwriters, and accountants, or any persons connected with any of them, to any officials of the SEC concerning this proposed stock offering. Please be careful to see that these documents include, among other things, all communications relating to so-called year-end adjustments, particularly of inventories and guaranties on automobiles sold.

(4) Did the Commission know of the profits made through black-market sales of steel, as testified to recently before the Congress? If so, how were such profits treated in the accounts, and why was disclosure not required?

4. I also note that the Commission's investigation does not include any inquiry into the market operations on February 3, 1948, in which the issuer purchased 186,200 shares of its own stock. In this connection, I should like you to answer the following questions.

(1) At what time was the Commission asked whether Kaiser-Frazer Corp. might use its corporate funds to buy its own stock?

(2) Did the Commission approve this, and if so, which Commissioners voted for it; and what subordinate officials were involved in this.

(3) Was the Commission advised from time to time during the day of the volume of stock being purchased by Kaiser-Frazer Corp.? If so, were these successive purchases approved, and if so, by which officials of the Commission?

(4) Were records or memoranda of such conversations or approvals made: If so, please furnish them to me.

(5) Did the Commission investigate whether there were any actions by the issuer or its representatives prior to February 3, 1948, which were calculated to create an artificial market price for its stock?

5. I have seen disturbing statements with respect to the possibility that the purpose of the proposed issue, in whole or in part, was not disclosed, and that its proceeds were in fact to be used in whole or in large part not to increase production but to reimburse the corporation for about $10,000,000 which had been used to pay off a loan to the Bank of America upon which various insiders of the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. were liable, individually or through companies that they owned. I understand that this loan was approximately in the amount of $10,000,000. In connection with this phase of the matter, I ask that you answer the following questions:

(1) Does the SEC know the facts with respect to the above, and if so, what are they?

(2) Did the SEC consider or investigate this subject before it cleared the registration statement? If so, give me the details.

(3) If it is true, as I understand it to be, that the proceeds of the issue were to be used in whole or in part to replace working capital used for the purpose stated above, why did not the SEC require this to be clearly disclosed in the registration statement?

I shall appreciate your furnishing me the answers to the above requests as soon as they are prepared. Please do not wait until all of the answers are completed, but furnish them to me as they are available.

Sincerely yours,

CHAS. W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee.

APRIL 29, 1948.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your press release and letter to the Securities and Exchange Commission of April 26, 1948, regarding the SEC inquiry into the repudiation by Otis & Co. of its contract to purchase Kaiser-Frazer stock, stated: First, that you have "in particular noticed the allegations made by Otis & Co." Second, that you are "reserving judgment as to the merits of this controversy." Third, that you are "considering the advisability of recommending to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that it make a complete investigation."

The astounding facts revealed to date evidently were not brought to your attention by the parties who caused you to notice in particular the allegations made by Otis & Co. Therefore, you were wise in reserving judgment.

You may count on me to answer any questions. For on February 11, 1948, immediately following the run-out by Cyrus S. Eaton and Otis & Co. on the Kaiser-Frazer stock purchase, I issued a statement saying:

"It is our opinion that the circumstances under which managers for the underwriters have acted call for immediate investigations and full public hearings by appropriate authorities.

"We desire to make it clear to the public that we propose on behalf of the company to present promptly to the proper authorities all the facts pertinent to this situation and to ask that complete investigations be undertaken."

We not only have testified under oath before the SEC inquiry but also before the National Association of Security Dealers, whose responsibility it is to police the conduct and ethics of its members.

Your inquiries cannot help but call your attention to the fact that Otis & Co.'s own lawyers, as well as underwriters who were partners of Otis in the transaction, gave testimony under oath before the SEC in absolute variance with sworn testimony by Cyrus S. Eaton, chief owner of Otis & Co.

Who committed perjury? I am certain that in considering whether to recommend congressional investigation, you will want the official findings on this question.

The SEC evidence discloses that Mr. Eaton endeavored to induce his copartners in the underwriting to welsh on the contract with Kaiser-Frazer.

The Nation's press has stated that "never in the history of American finance is it recalled when an underwriter deliberately walked out on a firm contract to market securities." A lasting service can be done for the public and the financial world by the Government and courts seeing to it that underwriting contracts are not reduced, Hitler-fashion, to mere scraps of paper.

If the Cyrus Eaton scrap of paper technique succeeded, then—as I told Mr. Eaton on February 4 when he tried to threaten and coerce me into letting him run out on his contract—investment bankers could tear up a contract whenever no profit was in sight. The scrap of paper practice would destroy the American financial structure; yes—if it spread—it would wreck the foundation of the sanctity of contracts upon which our whole business system is built.

You could discover by examining the weeks of questioning by the SEC and the shocking evidence accumulated—who were the wolves of finance in sheep's clothing, or, to put it as bluntly as it deserves, who acted like Dr. Jekyl and Mr. Hyde.

The more you dig into the affair, the more you will find skeletons in dark closets that must be exposed.

Cyrus Eaton warned me, as he admitted on the witness stand, that "Hell will be a-popping," when I refused to be intimidated by him into letting him break his bargain. He thereafter unleashed sneak attacks against the interests of Kaiser-Frazer stockholders, employees, and dealers. When these hidden attacks were in full fury, we wired him on February 28 as follows:

"Our attention is called to the fact your secretary telephoned financial editors of various periodicals, stating that Kaiser-Frazer Corp. had obtained a $10,000,000 loan and that such loan was made necessary because of reduction in sales and that the prospectus recently filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission did not make complete disclosure.

"Those statements have no basis in fact, with the exception of the statement that the loan in sum of $10,000,000 has been obtained. The obtaining of such loan was made necessary upon default of your company under underwriting agreement dated February 3, 1948.

"We will hold your company and you personally liable for spreading any false rumors of the character referred to herein."

However, the attacks by Mr. Eaton, his press agents, lawyers, and employees continue growing in brazen libel and falsity. As a mere example, in a false, malicious, libelous statement released to the press on April 28, Otis & Co. claimed it had issued nothing to damage Kaiser-Frazer previous to the SEC hearings—a claim refuted by the accumulated evidence indicated above. Mr. Eaton will be brought to account for damages inflicted.

Since your letter evidenced interest in Kaiser-Frazer affairs, you will want to know that the American public is not being completely misled by the unscrupulous, malici-

ous, undercover, and open attacks being waged against this automobile company. I will be delighted to present evidence that Kaiser-Frazer sales for weeks past have been the highest in its history. Orders are far exceeding our production. We have just increased Willow Run factory operations to a 9-hour day and 6-day week in the face of mounting demands for our cars.

Yet innocent people are being injured by Cyrus Eaton. You can cooperate to see that justice is done in behalf of Kaiser-Frazer's 20,000 employees, 35,000 stockholders, 4,000 dealers, and tens of thousands of other workers whose welfare is wrapped up in the success of Kaiser-Frazer.

Respectfully yours,

KAISER-FRAZER CORP.,
HENRY J. KAISER,
Chairman of the Board.

Confirmation of Atomic Energy Commission Nominees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from J. H. Rush, secretary-treasurer, Federation of American Scientists, dated April 27, 1948, relating to the confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commission nominees. The letter was published in a recent issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFIRMING AEC NOMINEES—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION MUST BE FREE FROM PARTISAN POLITICS, IT IS SAID

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A new effort is developing in the Congress to make a political football of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, not content with the blistering defeat he suffered in opposing the confirmation of David Lilienthal as chairman of the AEC last year, is coming back for more. Press reports indicate that a compromise deal is being arranged among Republican Senators whereby the present commissioners would be confirmed for an interim period of 11 months, after which time a presumably Republican President could submit new appointments.

This proposal, subverting the clear intent of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, is supported by some well-meaning Senators in the hope of avoiding another unseemly family row in an election year. Senator TAFT, as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, is in a position to force a fight if the majority do not bend to his will.

LAST YEAR'S HEARINGS

A sorrier scheme than this has seldom been seen in Washington. The Senate hearings and floor debate on the AEC confirmations last year were prolonged and exhaustive. They provided ample opportunity for exploration of all the pertinent issues—and some which were not pertinent. That contest elicited one of the strongest, most broadly representative and most overwhelming expressions of public opinion on record. A veritable parade of eminent witnesses passed before the Senate section of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, men of high attainments in science, law, industry, education, Government. Almost without exception they endorsed David Lilienthal.

The Senate committee, under the chairmanship of Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, recommended confirmation of Lilienthal almost unanimously, the lone holdout being Senator TAFT's right bower, Senator BRICKER. In a memorable speech on the Senate floor Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG tore apart the specious arguments of the opposition and cleared the way for the decisive vote for confirmation which followed.

These matters are history. There is no new issue. Yet Senator TAFT would create another hiatus in our atomic energy development by keeping the commissioners dangling for 11 months pending action by the next President.

It must be crystal clear to any thoughtful person that the administration of atomic energy must be kept free from partisan political influence. This principle of nonpartisan administration, which applies to the FBI, the FCC, the CAB, the Bureau of Standards, and other quasi-technical agencies, is doubly essential to the stability of our atomic energy enterprise. The damage done to its development by the year-long hiatus before the policy of civilian control was established has been generally recognized.

POLITICAL CAPRICE

The task of the AEC is complex and difficult. It is not one which any man can grasp quickly or to which many competent men will be attracted. The present Commission has made commendable progress during its 16 months' tenure. But it cannot go ahead with the firmness and confidence demanded of it, if its members must wait upon caprices of party politics.

Republican leaders will do well to take a long look at the consequences before yielding on so vital an issue to the dictate of a man whose power has so little popular basis as Senator TAFT's. Consistent policy, both in the Republican Party and in the Nation, will not be achieved if crucial issues are to be concealed behind a false front of party unity which deceives no one.

The nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission should be confirmed without delay.

J. H. RUSH,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Federation of American Scientists.

WASHINGTON, *April 27, 1948.*

Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 18, 1948

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee adopted on the occasion of the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C.

The convention was attended by 372 registered delegates from 44 States and the District of Columbia, in addition to many others who failed to register, guests, visitors, and so forth, and who represented both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, city, State, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; chambers of commerce, waterway, flood-control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations; transportation interests; with memberships totaling several millions.

I am certain that this insertion will be of interest to the citizens of our country.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

FOREWORD

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, realizing its duty under its articles of incorporation and the civic duty of its officers and members to keep the American public properly and intelligently informed in the matter of the development, improvement, conservation, and utilization of the water resources with which we are blessed for the multiple purposes of navigation, flood control, drainage, power development, irrigation, and allied uses; to solicit the support of the American people so informed; to prepare for the increasing needs of a great Nation at peace; and to emphasize our considered views as to the requirements necessary in the premises, unanimously adopts the following resolutions:

APPROPRIATIONS

We are cognizant of the benefits of national import to be gained from adequate appropriations for all phases of our national public-works programs and we commend to the deliberate consideration of the Congress the program for the protection of the Mississippi River basin as given to them by the President of the United States in his message to them on July 16 last. We urge that this program be expanded to include the entire United States. In complying with the President's desire the help of Congress, in providing an adequate program of appropriations, is vital to the safety and future prosperity of this great Nation and to remove the threat of floods which produce timidity and hesitancy on the part of the people in promoting the potential wealth of our Nation. To deny funds for this essential flood protection; for adequate improvements to our rivers and harbors in the interest of ever-increasing commerce; or for irrigation of our arid but fertile lands would preclude optimum construction progress and deprive the Nation of the benefits of its natural resources. These great public works projects must continue at a pace consonant with the rapid growth of our Nation, thereby giving to a patient and industrious people the aid they need to contribute their full part to the general welfare and progress of the Nation. In the light of these truths we strongly urge that the Senate restore cuts made by the House in the appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the President for rivers and harbors and flood control for fiscal year 1949, and such additional sums as were recommended by the Army engineers to the Bureau of the Budget.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

In considering appropriation legislation for worthy river and harbor, flood control, reclamation, and other public works projects attention of the Congress of the United States is invited to rising costs of labor and materials. The cost of construction work generally has risen to the extent that it now takes $1.81 to accomplish what $1 would accomplish in 1940. With this fact in mind the Congress and the public should be less apt to be misled as to the amount of funds required for these essential works and the amount of work that can be accomplished with every dollar appropriated.

CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS

The economical and orderly progress of construction of our public works projects is

contingent on the stabilization of our price structure. The time has not yet arrived when our contractors can safely forecast the events of the future to the extent necessary to submit bids for long range projects with the necessary degree of confidence. Contingencies over and above those normally encountered have to be anticipated which results in inflated bids. Remedial action is recommended on the part of contracting officers in formulating price adjustment agreements to serve both interests equitably.

COOPERATION

We submit that the successful initiation and rapid completion of many of our Federal projects requires complete and continuing cooperation between Federal, State, and local agencies whereby the innumerable problems peculiar to each locality must be considered and solved. Delay in developing the required cooperation retards progress and results in excessive carry-over of appropriated funds, the amounts of which may threaten the future appropriations essential to orderly progress. In the future as heretofore we offer our efforts to aid professional relationships between the agencies involved to the end that costly delays may be avoided.

SOIL CONSERVATION, REFORESTATION, AND DRAINAGE

We commend the excellent work of the Department of Agriculture in the interest of preventing wasteful soil erosion, in replenishing our forests through reforestation, and in its improvements for retardation of run-off. We believe this work, fully coordinated and integrated as it is, with the major drainage and channel improvements under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers gives a well-rounded flood control and land-improvement program for all watersheds. Accordingly we advocate the prosecution of these worth-while improvements as rapidly as may be consistent with the fiscal program of the Government under the established and experienced agencies as presently provided by law.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

We maintain our position with respect to the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands in the 17 Western States by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The excellent work of that Bureau in planning, executing, operating, and maintaining Federal projects for irrigation should be vigorously prosecuted. The need of bringing all cultivable lands into food and fiber production for our increasing population and our newly accepted world responsibility make it urgent for the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate funds to provide for rapid progress on this work in the Western States. We also endorse other activities of the Department of Interior such as the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Water Resources Branch of the United States Geological Survey. The studies conducted by these services in wildlife conservation, in stream gaging, and underground water investigations, contribute to the successful consummation of projects for flood control, soil erosion, water recreational facilities, irrigation, and related water uses and should have adequate funds for their continuance.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The United States Geological Survey has for over 50 years, in close partnership with the State governments, collected fundamental hydraulic data which are a prerequisite to the intelligent and economical planning, design, and operation of the Nation's river and harbor improvements.

These water investigations of the Geological Survey, to a great extent, are supported by annual appropriations from about 225 State and municipal agencies which are traditionally matched dollar-for-dollar by Federal funds.

Such cooperative programs conducted by the Geological Survey eliminate a duplication of work, effect a material saving in cost to the Federal Government, and enable the States to exercise a guiding hand in water resources surveys.

Such programs are not being expanded at a rate in keeping with the needs of river and harbor development planning because of insufficient Federal funds.

We urge the Federal Congress to adequately support the Geological Survey's program of water investigations, both surface and ground waters, and to provide adequate funds to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, the appropriations for such work by the cooperating State and municipal agencies.

FLOOD CONTROL ON TRIBUTARY STREAMS

The national flood-control program is a continuing and progressive one in which, of necessity and quite properly, the earlier phase consisted of providing flood relief to the lower valley of the Mississippi River, followed by later phases of expanding this program to other major streams.

In pursuance of this program it has been necessary that many upland regions have suffered the loss of the productivity of large areas dedicated to the creation of impounding reservoirs for the benefit of the lower reaches of such major streams and have received only scant benefit from such reservoirs.

There is an ever-increasing need for protection along the tributaries and upper reaches of the major streams in order to provide relief from overflow of the bottom lands and from constant loss of soil along the stream banks in the upland regions.

It is the opinion of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress that the time has arrived when, in furtherance of the national flood-control policy, greater attention should be paid to the needs of the tributary valleys in the prevention of overflow and erosion of banks and the attendant enhancement of land values and productivity.

The Congress of the United States and the Corps of Enginers are urged to adopt a policy of recognition of this need for flood protection along tributary stream and, wherever possible without detriment to protection along major streams, to site impoundment reservoirs and other protection works in such manner as to provide the greatest protection possible to properties along the tributary streams themselves.

POWER POLICY

Since its inception the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been steadfast in its objective of promoting worthy and orderly development of our water and land resources. In pursuing this policy in connection with the incidental but important benefit of hydroelectric power available at highly desirable and economically justified multiple-purpose projects, it is the consensus of this Congress that further legislative studies are recommended with a view to improving, if necessary, the present national policy for the generation, distribution, transmission, and sale of the power generated at Federal dams.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS

This Congress has not had the advantage of studying the most recent reports on proposals for a sea-level canal at Panama but we are familiar with earlier reports on this subject and we concur with military strategists that in this day of aerial bombing a sea-level canal is the only type of canal not vulnerable to air attacks which would render a canal inoperative for years. We accordingly advocate a sea-level canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and we urge the Congress to enact legislation with this in view.

BEACH EROSION

We have given thought to the havoc which has visited our seacoasts at many places in the form of hurricanes and destructive tides resulting in devastation which has brought discouragement to those who have struggled to make them of benefit and service to the health and wealth of the Nation. We are appreciative of the help in the nature of surveys and reports that have been furnished by the Beach Erosion Board of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and we urge greater accomplishments in accordance with its recommendations including where necessary legislative action by the Congress of the United States with a view to providing the protection for which there is such a vital need.

STREAM POLLUTION

The record will show that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been concerned for many years with the increasing menace from pollution of our rivers and streams and the imperative necessity for workable legislation and enforceable regulations on this subject. Fully cognizant of the complications involved in the division of State and Federal jurisdiction in this matter and of the difficulties of reaching a solution agreeable to all concerned, we believe the urgency of the situation warrants thorough study and prompt action by the Congress of the United States. We approve the principle of utilizing established and experienced governmental agencies for this purpose and are opposed to the creation of a new and untried agency that would inevitably increase costs and decrease efficiency. We further recommended that wherever needed Federal grants in aid be authorized.

FEDERAL BARGE LINE

We believe it would be unwise and inadvisable to liquidate the Federal Barge Line. This agency has performed an excellent service to the Nation in pioneering cheap waterborne transportation which has resulted in passing on to the people savings far in excess of the cost of establishing and operating the barge line. We recommend that the Congress appropriate funds required for the modernization and operation of the Federal Barge Line.

SUBMERGED LANDS

We reaffirm our position condemning the assumption by the United States of title to lands or resources in lands under navigable waters of the United States and are basically in favor of the States' rights and the rights of individuals that we believe to be guaranteed by the Constitution. We are accordingly in favor of legislation such as the pending bill, S. 1988, providing that legislation is amended so as to remove any question whatsoever of it affecting the rights, powers, and authority of the United States and its agents in Federal public works and improvements to navigation that have been or may be duly authorized and constructed under the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

We commend the Federal agencies for the excellent manner in which they have implemented congressional authorizations in cooperation with each other and with State and local governmental agencies, all of which has resulted in material additions to recreation areas and facilities available to the public. These areas and facilities have contributed manifestly to the health and pleasure of a multitude of our people in providing camping areas, fishing and hunting grounds, and for the operation and care of small craft for fishing and pleasure. It is our recommendation that the public recreational use of reservoir areas continue under the administration of the department having jurisdiction of the project in order that the maximum recreational use may be made of the area without interference with the operation of the reservoir for its primary purpose.

REGIONAL AUTHORITIES AND EXISTING AGENCIES

We are fully cognizant of the painstaking care with which the established agencies of the executive department of our government have planned for the future in their programs of public works. If these plans should be discarded, the time-tested organizations disbanded, and the responsibilities placed in new and inexperienced hands—boards with "carte blanche" authority for unlimited and uncontrolled expenditures—it is our considered opinion that the future progress of important public works programs would be relegated to an unimportant position in the economic picture, while lesser and unrelated activities of questionable value would be extolled as being imperative. In the interest of economy and good administration on the part of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior we hereby state our position to be one of strict opposition to the creation of Regional Valley Authorities or to the extension of such authorities. The mature opinions of the established agencies are respected by the Congress and by the public and there can be no better reason for public works to be continued under their jurisdiction.

A FALLACIOUS PROPOSAL

Technicians and planners have been holding meetings with a view to advocating legislation designed to create a super agency similar to the old National Resources Planning Board which was legislated out of existence several years ago. The idea is that this new agency will rank above all existing agencies and pass on all reports and recommendations for Federal public works prior to the submission of these recommendations to Congress.

This scheme is both useless and inadvisable because it would duplicate and overlap presently existing agencies. The Bureau of the Budget now has a division composed of engineers which performs the identical functions of the proposed super agency.

We submit that such proposed agencies do not save money but do increase the cost of government.

DUPLICATION AND OVERLAPPING

We subscribe to the often proved fact that if savings in government are an objective they can be accomplished only by curtailments and not through the often tried reorganizations which have always resulted in increased expenditures.

Organization of all governmental construction works in one department will result in the law of diminishing returns affecting such an excessive consolidation with inevitable red tape, inefficiency, duplication, and overlapping as the result.

The broad science and art of engineering is an indispensable part of practically every civilized activity. In many cases it is a service, in principle like chemistry, stenography, even cooking—a means to an end, not an end in itself. To consolidate all engineering in one agency is a departure from this principle, will produce unsound organizations, uneconomical operations, and create a situation not unlike one that would obtain should all of the doctors or all of the stenographers in the Government service be consolidated into one service.

We agree with the following statement by Mr. Daniel W. Bell, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with respect to reorganization:

"We found in studying the situation and hearing various groups of interested parties who came in to talk the thing over, that there was no such thing as a logical grouping by major functions. It depends upon your point of view. Each man who is interested in a particular line of activity feels that in a logical grouping of major functions everything touching his activities should be grouped together, but as most of the activities touch more than one major function one cannot do that unless he puts everything in one pot."

MERCHANT MARINE

Our national security and economic welfare are contingent on an adequate privately owned and operated merchant marine. The maintenance of an adequate merchant marine requires the construction of additional ships and this is conditioned on assurance to the owners that long time operating aid under the subsidy provisions of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act will be forthcoming. We, accordingly, urge that the Congress authorize operating subsidy contracts over a period of time sufficient to warrant investments in vessels for the development of a merchant marine sufficient for our needs.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

We have always been convinced, and now reaffirm our conviction, that the best interest of the beneficiaries of public improvements for navigation, flood control, and allied purposes and for shore and beach protection are being served by the Corps of Engineers. The considered opinions of this mature agency of the Government warrant the highest respect by the United States Congress, the State and local agencies with whom they cooperate and by this body. The emergencies of peace and war confronting the Corps for more than a century have been squarely met and the common good for the greatest number of our people has been accomplished in the most advantageous manner. We believe that the consistent and orderly development of our water resources can best be accomplished through the well-laid plans and consistent efforts of the Corps of Engineers.

The Italian Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following very interesting and very enlightening editorial which appeared in the Il Progresso Italo-Americano, a newspaper published in New York City, N. Y.:

MOMENTOUS VICTORY FOR MANKIND

The Italian elections, with their resounding triumph of the democratic forces and crushing defeat for totalitarian communism, marks an epochal event and turning point of history.

The people of Italy have spoken. They have spoken freely, clearly, and forcefully. Their voice has been heard around the world. From Iceland to Korea, the impact and consequences of their overwhelming support of democracy will be felt for many a year. So much was at stake in this election. No one can even try to imagine what would face the world if communism had won. Humanity has been given another chance to build a free and peaceful world.

In the face of Communist bluster, bluff, and bombast on a scale unequaled in the annals of politics, the Italian people went to the polls and calmly and unmistakably made their choice. They chose freedom. They spurned every form of totalitarian slavery. They picked friendship and collaboration with America for world reconstruction and peace. They rejected every ruse and trick to lead them to a satellite status in the Russian orbit. They cut through a defense forest of lies and fantastic promises to take the highways of individual freedom, human dignity, economic progress, and virile national independence.

OUR GREAT BONDS

Yes, I am happy and proud that our kinsfolk and friends in Italy responded so eloquently and effectively to our letters, to our cables, to our radio appeals, to our pleadings for the maintenance and strengthening of the Italian Republic. Yes, the men and women of Italian flesh and blood, over there and over here, have shown, at a most critical hour in the life of nations, that the bonds between the two great peoples are not merely physical but also spiritual and indestructible. Once again, when the fate of civilization hung in the balance, when mankind faced the grim prospect of an age of darkness, the Italian people gave the world new hope, new cheer, new light. So it was in the days of the rising great city republics of centuries ago. So it is now when the ranks of world democracy are pressed and beset by barbarous bolshevism.

What a superb demonstration of the vitality and continuity of the spirit of liberty. What a magnificent tradition. How reassuring a manifestation of vigorous democracy after decades of fascism and years of invasion, occupation, and war to have so vast a proportion of a nation turn out to vote. And this was no Balkan plebiscite or Cossack round-up in which people are herded in military trucks, regimented, and carted off to vote. Here was unfettered and unmolested, living and thriving democracy at work—at its best. As an American, and particularly, as an American of Italian descent, I can only wish and hope and pray that an equally large proportion of our own country's total number of eligible voters should go to the polls next November to elect a President and Congress.

URGENT TASKS—SOLEMN DUTIES

The liberty-loving folks of all lands can draw much inspiration from the decision rendered by the Italian people. Not only have the Italian people repudiated the Communist brand of totalitarianism, they have put a stamp of crushing disapproval on every other type of totalitarianism, on every expression and organization of neo-fascism. This is the meaning of the colossal vote for the party of Christian Democracy led by De Gasperi. This is the meaning of the surprising support won by the genuine democratic Socialist organization headed by Saragat and Lombardo. This is the real significance of the poor showing made by and the deep disintegration which has set in in the party directed by Nenni.

Granted that not all the men, nor all the money, nor all the horses of the King in the Kremlin could help the Communists sneak into the seat of government. Granted that without the sympathy, solidarity, and support of the American people, democratic Italy could never have survived the desperate and despicable onslaughts of Oriental despotism. But that is not all. During the war, our country called upon the Italian people to overthrow the Fascist dictatorship, break the Axis and join us and our allies as an active cobelligerent. The people of Italy then answered our call promptly and vigorously. America has again called upon the Italian people after the war to line up with the ranks of democracy. Once more the Italian people responded to our appeal—with a fervor and force which stirred the peoples of the world as no event has done in many a year.

To the people of Italy we made promises during the war and after the war, during and after the elections. Time and again America has raised their hopes. We must now make good our promises far better than we did in the past. If we fail to translate our promises into performances this time, the great election victory shall have been in vain, fatal disillusionment will set in, and the

gates to Communist chaos and dictatorship will be reopened wide. The election results must speed the most energetic and earliest measures by America and its democratic allies to fulfill the plea and the promises that Trieste be returned to Italy, that Italy be accorded membership in the United Nations, and that the entire iniquitous treaty imposed at Russia's behest be cast on the scrap heap of history. There is no better way of our strengthening democratic Italy and making her an impregnable bulwark of democracy and peace.

GENEROSO POPE.

Palestine Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday night, April 23, over a National Broadcasting Co. network from the studios of WRC here in the City of Washington, I delivered an address on the subject of Palestine. Because I think that all of the light possible should be thrown on this subject I am herewith inserting the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Most of you know that on last November 29 the United Nations Assembly, largely as a result of American pressure, recommended that Palestine be partitioned, and that a sovereign Jewish nation be carved out of the mandated territory. Fortunately our representative in the Security Council reversed America's position and the recommended partition has not been consummated. However, the cry for partition goes on.

Let us, therefore, examine a few facts. Who are the Jews that demand partition? Do they have any rights to partition? Would partition benefit them or anyone else?

A campaign for a national home for Jews has been carried on for many years by a world-wide organization of Zionists. Zionism is perhaps a natural growth. We all know that the Jews have been maligned and persecuted. Anti-Semitism has been a curse and a disease. It was anti-Semitism that gave a mad paperhanger a sordid vehicle on which to create the Nazi Party and ride to power in Germany. The Nazi persecution of the Jews is of course the blackest page in modern history—a page that must not be repeated here or elsewhere.

Let's attribute worthy motives to the Zionists. Let's assume that their clever, militant, aggressive, sometimes lawless, campaign for a Jewish nation is a form of escapism; a desire to set up a city of refuge for oppressed Jews.

Is there any need for such a refuge? Would not the creation of a Jewish state defeat this objective?

According to Rabbi Bernstein, adviser to General Clay on Jewish affairs, in recent testimony before the House Committee on Immigration, there are now some 11,000,000 Jews in the world, distributed as follows: Almost 6,000,000 in America, some 500,000 in Austria, less than 20,000 in Germany, about 20,000 in Italy, about 180,000 in Hungary, about 20,000 in Czechoslovakia, almost 500,000 in Palestine, most of whom have gone there since World War I as a result of Zionist promotion; about 300,000 living elsewhere among Arabic peoples, some 2,500,000 in Russia, and a few scattered elsewhere. Rabbi Bernstein, a recognized authority, states there is no anti-Semitism in Russia. Why would there be? The backbone of the Bolshevist Party in Russia was Jewish. Many of the leaders of Russia today are Jewish. Looking the world picture over from the Jewish viewpoint, there would appear to be little reason why Jews should wish to flee the lands wherein they now live. Persecution is now largely extinct. There is no reason why they should not become useful and respected nationals in all countries in which they live as most have become in America.

Now aside from the question of desire, do the Jews have any right to gerrymander a Jewish nation out of Palestine wherein Arabs outnumber Jews nearly 3 to 1? According to the Jewish encyclopedia and Jewish history, most of the Zionists come from a group of eastern European Jews whose ancestry is non-Semitic. Their ancestors were known as the Khazars. They never lived in the Holy Land at any time. They migrated from Asia to the area of southern Russia around the first century. They embraced Judaism as a religion during the seventh century. They adopted Jewish names and the Hebrew alphabet as a basis of their writing. They developed Yiddish which is no more like Hebrew than English is like German or Swedish. They only have a common alphabet. In other words, a big majority of those who now want to go into Palestine have no blood kinship whatsoever with the Hebrew children. Now, what of the Hebrews themselves? The Arabs lived there before the Hebrews, and the Arabs have lived there in undisputed possession for 13 centuries since all semblance of Jewish sovereignty ended. The Jews maintained no semblance of a national home in Palestine for longer than 375 years, and that was more than 2,000 years ago.

Is there any religious basis for the Jewish claim to a sovereign state in this area? Jerusalem is much more a Holy City in the Christian faith and in the Moslem faith than in the Jewish faith. The Moslems worshipped toward Jerusalem a hundred years before they worshipped toward Mecca. There is nothing in the Bible or elsewhere giving the Jews any religious or political right to set up a nation in this area.

Let us look a little further into Zionism. The Zionists, mostly eastern European Jews, wanted to create a Jewish nation in the area of Poland after World War I. Woodrow Wilson sent a great and distinguished American Jew, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., to Europe to investigate the claims and contentions of the Zionists. Henry Morgenthau, Sr., returned and filed a scathing denunciation of the entire Zionist program. By way of introduction to a treatise on the subject, Mr. Morgenthau said, "Zionism is the most stupendous fallacy in Jewish history. I assert that it is wrong in principle and impossible of realization; that it is unsound in its economics, fantastical in its politics, and sterile in its spiritual ideals. Where it is not pathetically visionary, it is a cruel playing with the hopes of a people blindly seeking their way out of age-long miseries."

Now the Zionists contend that first the British and next the Americans have promised them a Jewish nation in Palestine. Neither the British nor the Americans have made, or have had any right to make, any such promise. The British, of course, took over Palestine as a mandate following World War I. The Zionists always cite the Balfour Declaration as the charter of their claims. The Balfour Declaration said only this: "His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, nor the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." The Zionists further contend that several American Presidents and both political parties have pledged allegiance to their cause, and further contend that the American Congress, in 1945, passed a resolution to this effect. It is quite true, shamefully so, that as a result of Zionist political and economic pressure in this country, several Presidents have paid lip service to Zionist aspirations. Both political parties had a plank on the subject in their 1944 platforms. The Democratic platform spoke of "a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth," while the Republican plank used the language, "a free and democratic commonwealth," omitting the word, Jewish. The resolution which a naive Congress passed for political purposes in 1945, read as follows: "Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights."

Now what would be the result if America should seek to implement a partition of Palestine and underwrite a Jewish nation? There are 40,000,000 Arabs living in the seven Arabic nations surrounding Palestine. There are 100,000,000 Arabs in the Near and Middle East. They are Moslems. Allied with them in close religious ties are some 300,000,000 other Moslems. The land area of the peoples over whom Islam holds sway constitutes about one-half the world's surface, and one-half the world's people. Already there is an Asiatic League to resist the Zionist campaign to set up the proposed Jewish state. American activities in the matter to date have done our prestige and leadership throughout this half of the world great damage. Should an American soldier set foot on Palestinian soil in support of a Jewish state, it would alienate the friendship of the whole Moslem world, and make of them hostile enemies. It would open wide the doors of communism and give the Russians an entree they long have sought but could not otherwise obtain. It would create disunity at home as well as destroying our influence abroad. It would stimulate as nothing else could the growth of anti-Semitism in this country. It would, in all probability, initiate world war III.

That the Zionist program is playing into the hands of communism seems too obvious for argument. Russia ardently supports the partition of Palestine. Just this week some 3,000 Communists, most of them Jewish (without the blessing or support of the Jewish Committee, however) came to Washington to lobby for a partition of Palestine and the creation of a Jewish state.

Again the methods and techniques of Zionist promotion have been, and are, doing great harm to the cause of unity and peace. While Anglo-American friendship may not be essential, it is certainly important in the promotion of peace. Yet for several years we have permitted the American Zionists, without protest from Americans generally, to furnish the brains and the munitions and the money to dynamite British trains, blow up British arsenals, and kill British soldiers. We have seen our press filled with numerous insults to the British people and the British nation.

Persecution begets persecution; violence begets violence. Those who live by the sword perish by the sword. These are age-old truths which the Zionists seem to forget.

Some of the Jewish organizations of America, with intelligent patriotism, are seeking to defeat the Zionist program. The

American Council for Judaism should, in particular, be pointed out for praise. Its distinguished president, Lessing J. Rosenwald, and those associated with him, have been of outstanding service. On their letterhead appears the language: "Our nationality is American; our religion is Judaism; our homeland is the United States of America."

All immigration into Palestine, either Jew or Arab, or otherwise, should be stopped. Some form of trusteeship or mandate may be necessary for a time. Eventually, however, and the sooner the better, there must be created in Palestine not a sovereign Jewish state, not a sovereign Arab state, but a sovereign state of Palestine in which Jew and Arab have equal rights and privileges, a state in which all would be simply Palestinians.

The partition of Palestine is without moral or legal justification whatsoever, and is not for the best interest of anyone, least of all the Jews.

For the sake of Christian, Moslem, and Jew, for the sake of American principles, prestige, and leadership, for the cause of peace and justice throughout the world, we must repudiate definitely and finally the program and aspirations of world Zionism for the creation of a Jewish state in the Holy Land.

Independence of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, again this year, on May 3, the Polish people all over the world celebrate the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791. The Polish Constitution, which ranks with our Declaration of Independence, was one of the most liberal, the most democratic of its day. It recognized the equality of all men and granted religious liberty to all.

No people in history have demonstrated a greater appreciation of freedom than the Polish people. No people have sacrificed more or are willing to sacrifice more for freedom than the Polish people.

Poland's independence, lost in 1795, was not again established until 1918, after World War I. The constitution adopted in 1791 became the foundation of the Polish Constitution of 1919.

This new, independent democracy, in its 20 years of independence between World Wars I and II, grew in population, in industry, in shipping, and in international importance.

Unfortunately, the geographic location of Poland places it in the midst of turmoil and strife, whenever unrest breaks out in Europe. At a time when other small countries had bowed to Hitler, Poland was the first country to offer military resistance to Germany's mighty armored forces. The people of Poland were really enslaved. The Russians engulfed them from the east, while the Germans advanced from the west.

Despite the fact that their cities were destroyed and looted, and most of their able-bodied men and women taken from the country for slave labor, more than 100,000 Polish soldiers fought on in behalf of Poland, outside their native land. They fought side by side with the Allied troops in many parts of the world.

Certainly everyone believed that when the end of the war came, Poland would again be restored to its rightful place in the world as a free and independent nation. After the declaration of the "four freedoms" in the Atlantic Charter, we did not believe that the representatives of our country and Great Britain would agree to the partitioning of Poland. And in addition to the partitioning, the so-called free election placed that country securely behind the iron curtain. She was freed from the Nazis to suffer further oppression under Russia. She is denied the right to have a government which represents the will of her own people. She has none of the "four freedoms."

We cannot permit any country to reach out and take possession of one small European nation after another. We must throw our wholehearted support behind efforts to promote, through truly constructive forces, the political freedom and economic well-being of all the peoples throughout the world, and to utilize international machinery as fully as possible.

The peace of the world depends upon the nations of the world functioning and negotiating together for a peaceful settlement of international problems. Therefore, I believe that the machinery of the United Nations should be strengthened so that it will have power to take action against aggressor nations, and be in a position to defend the smaller nations. If the success of the United Nations becomes endangered by unreasonable exercise of the veto power, then the veto system should be abolished.

Our Government, and the governments of all the democracies, must proceed to make the United Nations practical and effective. Then the restoration of full freedom and independence to Poland and the other small nations of Europe will be possible. I pledge my full support toward that end.

California Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

Senate Joint Resolution 12

Whereas on the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the original States, as successors to the English Crown, became the owners of the tide and submerged lands within their respective borders, and such ownership was retained by them on the adoption of the Constitution and never has been relinquished to the Federal Government since; and

Whereas the State of California was admitted to the Union on a basis of equality with the Original States, possessing and enjoying all the attributes of sovereignty residing in the Original States, including the ownership of the tide and submerged lands within its borders; and

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of the United States versus California has held that "the United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of inland waters, extending seaward 3 nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein"; and

Whereas this decision casts a cloud upon the title of the State of California and all of its subdivisions or persons acting pursuant to its permission, to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of the State of California extending seaward 3 miles; and

Whereas the Supreme Court has declared that the power to determine the question of ownership resides in the Congress; and

Whereas the State of California, its subdivisions and persons acting pursuant to its permission have spent enormous sums of money improving and developing the tide and submerged lands along the coast of California, which improvements and developments are in jeopardy unless the Congress enacts legislation to remove the cloud on the title to said lands created by the Supreme Court decision; and

Whereas the State of California has developed and made available for public use, a system of beaches and parks at great cost and expense to the people of California, and these State-owned and operated beaches and parks have been developed to the point where they are now used and enjoyed by approximately 22,000,000 people per year; and

Whereas the State of California, its cities, counties and other political subdivisions have made improvements to tide and submerged lands for many purposes including but not limited to harbor developments, piers, docks, wharves, jetties, recreational facilities, and industrial sites; and

Whereas the State of California has had for many years a full and complete set of laws designed for the conservation, regulation and management of its natural resources in such fields as mining, forestry, beaches and parks, oil and gas, public lands, soil conservation, fish and game, and harbors and navigation, and the State has provided for adequately staffed and financed administrative agencies to carry out these laws; and

Whereas the State of California, its subdivisions and persons acting pursuant to its permission have made the investments, improvements and developments herein set forth in good faith upon the assumption that the State of California was the owner of, and had dominion and jurisdiction over the tide and submerged lands lying off the coast of California; and

Whereas for many years prior to the Supreme Court decision, many agencies of the Federal Government have recognized the ownership, dominion and jurisdiction of the State of California over these tide and submerged lands; and

Whereas the cloud created by the decision of the Supreme Court not only affects the investment, development, and improvement already made on and to the tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, but it will prevent further investments in and development to and improvement of these tide and submerged lands off the coast of California, to the detriment of the people of the State of California and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly). That the

Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact legislation now pending before the Congress, to remove the cloud created by the Supreme Court decision by quitclaiming to the State of California and the other respective States of the United States and to their subdivisions and to persons acting under and pursuant to their permission, ownership of, title to, and dominion over the lands beneath the tide waters and navigable waters of the United States a distance seaward 3 miles; so that the State of California together with the several States may continue without interruption the title to and dominion and jurisdiction over said lands, thereby perpetuating what has been considered for more than 160 years in good faith to be a proper sphere of State jurisdiction, dominion, and ownership; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and to the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to send copies of this resolution to the mayors of all California cities and the chairmen of all boards of supervisors of California counties and urge that they, in their local areas, continue unabated their valiant battle for the reaffirmation, by the Congress and the President, of California's unquestioned title to its tide and submerged lands.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
President of the Senate.
J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate.
SAM L. COLLINS,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

I, Frank M. Jordan, secretary of state, do hereby certify that J. A. Beek, whose name is subscribed to the foregoing certificate, was at the time of such subscription the duly qualified secretary of the Senate of the State of California and as such secretary is the proper officer to execute said certificate; and I further certify that the aforesaid J. A. Beek, secretary of the Senate of the State of California, did execute this certificate in my presence.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the great seal of the State of California to be affixed hereto this 27th day of March 1948.

FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.

Resolution of the City Council of the City of Long Beach petitioning the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon and adopt bill S. 1988 or H. R. 4999, pending before the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively

Whereas, under certain acts of the legislature of the State of California, as respectively set forth in Statutes of California 1911, page 1304, Statutes of California 1925, page 235, and Statutes of California 1935, page 794, the State of California did grant to the city of Long Beach "all of the right, title, and interest of the State of California, held by said State by virtue of its sovereignty, in and to all of the tidelands and submerged lands, whether filled or unfilled, bordering upon, under and situated below the mean high-tide line of the Pacific Ocean, or of any harbor, estuary, bay or inlet, which are within the corporate limits of said city," in trust, to be used by the city solely for the establishment, improvement, and conduct of a harbor and for the construction of wharves, docks, piers, and structures necessary or convenient for the promotion and accommodation of navigation and commerce, and for public parks, parkways, highways, and playgrounds; and

Whereas the ocean frontage of the city of Long Beach on San Pedro Bay, bordering the Pacific Ocean, consists of 8.11 miles, and the submerged lands within said city limits conveyed by the aforesaid grants consist of 13,027 acres, of which 580 acres have been reclaimed and filled at the expense of said city, and harbor improvements have been constructed and are under process of construction at a total cost exceeding $33,000,000, providing for in excess of 12,000 lineal feet of wharves and docks, accommodating 25 berths, 17 miles of railroad trackage, open and covered cargo storage areas consisting of in excess of 170 acres; and in addition to said harbor improvements, the city has reclaimed and improved approximately 250 acres of tide and submerged lands, at a total cost of in excess of $3,500,000, providing for 5 miles of public beaches, parks, and recreational areas; and

Whereas the total tonnage of cargo handled during the 12-month period ending December 31, 1947, over said municipal docks constructed upon reclaimed tide and submerged lands, including imports and exports, amounted to 1,144,035 tons, and the city received during said period revenue for the use of said harbor facilities incident to the movement of said cargo the sum of $697,500.45; and

Whereas in the case of *United States of America* v. *California*, No. 12 Original, the United States Supreme Court, on June 23, 1947, rendered a decision holding that the Federal Government has certain paramount powers with respect to the "three-mile marginal belt" lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California and outside the inland waters of the State of California, and that the State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein; and

Whereas it is believed that San Pedro Bay constitutes an inland water body of the State of California, and that all of the tide and submerged lands granted to the city by the State heretofore mentioned lie within San Pedro Bay as such bay is demarked from the "3-mile marginal belt"; however, such matter has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court in said litigation; and

Whereas in the Government's brief in the case of *United States of America* v. *California*, the theory of State ownership of inland navigable waters and tide waters is attacked as "erroneous," "unsound," "wrong," "fallacy," and a "legal fiction," and it is believed that the theory announced by the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in said case as the basis for the decision rendered therein can be equally applied to the title and ownership of all lands underlying inland waters; and

Whereas the expenditure of millions of dollars of public funds by the city of Long Beach in the development of tide and submerged lands conveyed to it by the State has been made in good faith and in reliance upon the rule of property that the title to said lands has vested in the States and their grantees as announced by more than 50 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and confirmed by 244 decisions of Federal and State courts, 31 rulings of Secretaries of the Interior, and 49 opinions of Attorneys General of the United States:

Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Long Beach resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. The city of Long Beach, by and through its city council, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon and adopt bill S. 1988 or H. R. 4999, pending before the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, or similar legislation, whereby the Federal Government shall recognize, confirm, establish, and vest in the respective States and their respective grantees and all persons lawfully entitled thereto title to and ownership of all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use said natural resources in accordance with applicable State law, to the end that by said legislation the city of Long Beach shall not be disturbed in its rights, title, and possession in and to lands beneath navigable waters within its corporate limits conveyed to it by the State of California, and the right and power to control, develop, and use the natural resources within such lands.

SEC. 2. That the city attorney be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to present to the Members of Congress and the appropriate committees thereof all matters pertinent to favorable action on and adoption by the Congress of bill S. 1988 or H. R. 4999, and/or similar legislation, and transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from California.

SEC. 3. The city clerk shall certify to the passage of this resolution by the City Council of the City of Long Beach, and cause the same to be posted in three conspicuous places in the city of Long Beach, and it shall thereupon take effect.

Resolution condemning Federal seizure of California tidelands

Whereas the State of California has always owned, in trust for the people of California, title to lands within the 3-mile offshore limit; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now claiming title to these lands and the improvements thereon, as well as the State's income therefrom, in defiance of the sovereignty of the State and of its citizens; and

Whereas the Federal Government's claim embraces the completely un-American doctrine of confiscation without process of law and without compensation; and

Whereas Congress has once passed, and undoubtedly will again pass, legislation repudiating this expropriation of California's coast line and marginal lands; and

Whereas President Truman has once vetoed, and may again veto, this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That the Bellflower Chamber of Commerce hereby records its determination to resist this invasion of States' rights and of people's rights by the Federal Government; and

2. That we notify Congress of our unqualified support of Senate bill 1988 and H. R. 4999, now before Congress, nullifying the Federal seizure of California's tidelands; and

3. That we urge upon President Truman his repudiation of confiscation as a weapon of democracy by supporting the fundamental rights of the people at issue in this controversy; and

4. That as evidence of that support we recommend for his signature Senate bill 1988 and H. R. 4999, confirming California's right and title to the lands involved in this dispute.

BELLFLOWER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
HAROLD L. JACOBSON, *President.*
EDWARD B. KENNEDY,
Secretary-Manager.

Resolution condemning Federal seizure of California tidelands

Whereas the State of California has always owned, in trust for the people of California, title to lands within the 3-mile offshore limit; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now claiming title to these lands and the improvements thereon, as well as the State's

income therefrom, in defiance of the sovereignty of the State and of its citizens; and

Whereas the Federal Government's claim embraces the completely un-American doctrines of confiscation without process of law and without compensation; and

Whereas Congress has once passed, and undoubtedly will again pass legislation repudiating this expropriation of California's coast line and marginal lands; and

Whereas President Truman has once vetoed, and may again veto, this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That the South Gate Chamber of Commerce hereby records its determination to resist this invasion of States' rights and of people's rights by the Federal Government; and

2. That we notify Congress of our unqualified support of Senate bill 1988, now before Congress, nullifying the Federal seizure of California's tidelands; and

3. That we urge upon President Truman his repudiation of confiscation as a weapon of democracy, by supporting the fundamental rights of the people at issue in this controversy; and

4. That, as evidence of that support, we recommend for his signature Senate bill 1988, confirming California's right and title to the lands involved in this dispute.

R. W. WILSON,
President.
JOHN H. LEGRAND,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution of the State Bar of California

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *California* has the effect of depriving the State of California lands and natural resources of enormous value within its constitutional boundaries, to wit, the lands and resources along its entire coast line within the 3-mile belt; and

Whereas California, since its admission to the Union, has exercised full powers of ownership and dominion over such lands and resources as a sovereign State, and the Federal Government, at all times prior to 1937, both by its courts, its executive departments, and its congress, has recognized and acquiesced in California's ownership thereof; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in the past has rendered numerous decisions which indicate that the Court then believed that California was the owner of the soils and resources therein under all navigable waters within its constitutional boundaries, whether inland or not; and

Whereas in full reliance upon its own longstanding official claims of ownership and also in full reliance upon the recognition and acquiescence in such ownership by the Federal Government, and in reliance on the said decisions of the United States Supreme Court, California has granted large areas of said lands to its municipalities which, in turn, have leased or granted many parcels of such lands to their citizens who, in turn, have expended enormous sums of money in improvement thereof, and said municipalities and the State itself have also expended large sums of money in the improvement and development of said lands, all in reliance upon the recognition and acquiescence of the United States and the decisions of its courts; and

Whereas the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *California* not only deprives California and its municipalities and citizens of their titles, as aforesaid, but it leaves the question of actual ownership of the soil of the 3-mile belt entirely undetermined, ignoring the settled principle of real property law that all land within the boundaries of a State, title to which is not vested in any other owner, belongs absolutely to the State as sovereign; and

Whereas said decision has resulted in creating confusion and uncertainty as to the title of enormous areas of valuable filled lands which were formerly submerged, as well as lands now submerged, which have been granted or leased by the State; and

Whereas said decision of the Court is predicated on a theory heretofore unknown in American constitutional law and unsupported by any former decision of any court: namely, that in the exercise of its constitutional powers the United States may appropriate to its own use, without compensation, natural resources existing within land wholly within the boundaries of the State and not the property of the United States; and

Whereas this doctrine, if carried to its logical conclusion, might permit the Federal Government to appropriate without compensation, minerals, forests, and other natural resources in State or private ownership anywhere which it deemed essential to the performance of its constitutional functions; and

Whereas the said decision of the Court specifically recognizes that the question of the ownership and disposition of said lands and resources is within the "congressional area of national power," and assumes that Congress will not "execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State bar of California urge upon the Congress the necessity of taking appropriate action (1) to vest in California and the other States full power to control the development and exploitation of all natural resources beneath all navigable waters within their respective boundaries in accordance with State law, and (2) to release to and confirm in California and every other State the sovereign right of such States to the ownership of all land and natural resources beneath all navigable waters within the boundaries of such States;

Resolved, further, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Resolution of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach petitioning the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon and adopt bill S. 1988 or H. R. 4999, pending before the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively

Whereas under certain acts of the Legislature of the State of California, as respectively set forth in Statutes of California, 1911, page 1304, Statutes of California, 1925, page 235, and Statutes of California, 1935, page 794, the State of California did grant to the city of Long Beach "all of the right, title, and interest of the State of California, held by said State by virtue of its sovereignty, in and to all of the tidelands and submerged lands, whether filled or unfilled, bordering upon, under, and situated below the mean high tide line of the Pacific Ocean, or of any harbor, estuary, bay, or inlet, which are within the corporate limits of said city," in trust, to be used by the city solely for the establishment, improvement, and conduct of a harbor and for the construction of wharves, docks, piers, and structures necessary or convenient for the promotion and accommodation of navigation and commerce, and for public parks, parkways, highways, and playgrounds; and

Whereas the ocean frontage of the city of Long Beach on San Pedro Bay, bordering the Pacific Ocean, consists of 8.11 miles, and the submerged lands within said city limits conveyed by the aforesaid grants consist of 13,027 acres, of which 580 acres have been reclaimed and filled at the expense of said city, and harbor improvements have been constructed and are under process of construction at a total cost exceeding $33,000,000, providing for in excess of 12,000 lineal feet of wharves and docks, accommodating 25 berths, 17 miles of railroad trackage, open and covered cargo storage areas consisting of in excess of 170 acres; and

Whereas the total tonnage of cargo handled during the 12-month period ending December 31, 1947, over said municipal docks constructed upon reclaimed tide and submerged lands, including imports and exports, amounted to 1,144,035 tons, and the city received during said period revenue for the use of said harbor facilities incident to the movement of said cargo the sum of $697,500.45; and

Whereas in the case of *United States of America* v. *California,* No. 12 Original, the United States Supreme Court, on June 23, 1947, rendered a decision holding that the Federal Government has certain paramount powers with respect to the "3-mile marginal belt" lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California and outside the inland waters of the State of California, and that the State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein; and

Whereas it is believed that San Pedro Bay constitutes an inland water body of the State of California and that all of the tide and submerged lands granted to the city by the State heretofore mentioned lie within San Pedro Bay as such bay is demarked from the "3-mile marginal belt," however, such matter has not yet been determined by the Supreme Court in said litigation; and

Whereas in the Government's brief in the case of *United States of America* v. *California,* the theory of State ownership of inland navigable waters and tide waters is attacked as "erroneous," "unsound," "wrong," "fallacy," and a "legal fiction," and it is believed that the theory announced by the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in said case as the basis for the decision rendered therein can be equally applied to the title and ownership of all lands underlying inland waters; and

Whereas the expenditure of millions of dollars of public funds by the city of Long Beach in the development of tide and submerged lands conveyed to it by the State has been made in good faith and in reliance upon the rule of property that the title to said lands has vested in the States and their grantees as announced by more than 50 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and confirmed by 244 decisions of Federal and State Courts; 31 rulings of Secretaries of the Interior, and 49 opinions of Attorneys General of the United States:

Now, therefore, the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. The city of Long Beach, by and through the board of harbor commissioners of said city, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon and adopt bill S. 1988 or H. R. 4999, pending before the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, or similar legislation, whereby the Federal Government shall recognize, confirm, establish, and vest in the respective States and their respective grantees and all persons lawfully entitled thereto title to and ownership of all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use said natural resources in accordance with applicable State law, to the end that by said legislation the city of Long Beach shall not be disturbed in its rights, title, and possession in and to lands beneath navigable waters within its corporate limits conveyed to it by the State of California, and the right and power to control, develop, and use the natural resources within such lands.

SEC. 2. That the city attorney be and he is hereby authorized and requested to present to the Members of Congress and the appropriate committees thereof all matters pertinent to favorable action on and adoption by the Congress of bill S. 1988 or H. R. 4999 and/or similar legislation, and transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from California.

SEC. 3. The secretary of the board shall certify to the passage of this resolution by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach, and it shall thereupon take effect.

SEC. 4. The secretary of the board shall cause this resolution to be published once in the Long Beach Independent, the official newspaper of the city of Long Beach.

Do Your Own Thinking and Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, an organization called the State Lawmakers Directory, of Houston, Tex., has published an article explaining the Labor-Management Relations Act which Congress passed over Mr. Truman's veto last year. It is entitled "Do Your Own Thinking and Voting" and is addressed to workers, their wives and mothers. It is a clear and forceful presentation of the provisions and purposes of the act, and should be studied carefully by every worker in the United States. The article is as follows:

DO YOUR OWN THINKING AND VOTING

To Workers, Their Wives and Mothers:

In June 1947, after Congress had enacted the Taft-Hartley labor-relations law over the veto of President Truman, the CIO executive board demanded its repeal and the defeat of 331 Congressmen and 68 Senators who voted for it. This executive board is made up of highly paid labor leader politicians.

The CIO claims 6,000,000 workers out of a total organized labor membership of 14,000,000 throughout the United States and a fund of $15,000,000 to put an abrupt ending to the political careers of three-fourths of the House membership and two-thirds of that of the United States Senate.

The seriousness of this threat made it necessary for some disinterested agency to conduct a far-reaching investigation of the law itself and an unbiased examination of the effect it was having upon those individuals and groups coming under its provisions.

The law empowers State legislatures to greatly strengthen the Federal statute by measures enacted by the State legislature guaranteeing every person the right to work regardless of membership or nonmembership in a labor union. Since 18 States now enjoy the benefits of this States' rights provision, an agency in close contact with State lawmaking bodies was selected to make the survey. Accordingly, the State Lawmakers Directory of 7,500 members of the 48 State legislatures directed the inquiry.

The factual findings of the unbiased, bipartisan institution, whose membership is 53 percent Republican and 47 percent Democratic, follow:

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Practically all the complaints against the Taft-Hartley law came direct from, or were inspired by, labor leaders and not from the rank-and-file workers.

The law was designed and is operating to deprive the labor leaders of most of their wartime powers, whereby they ruled with an iron hand.

No longer can a labor racketeer sell, barter, or trade the God-given right to work.

Unreasonably large or unfair union dues or initiation fees are now prohibited. No longer must the willing worker pay monetary tribute to a racketeer in order to get a job or keep it.

The compulsory check-off is illegal after July 1, 1948, and union dues and fees cannot be deducted unless authorized by the worker.

Those who protested loudest and longest at the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law were the Communists.

COMMUNISTS CANNOT HOLD UNION OFFICE

The record of Communists in union office is that they always betray their union following if it is necessary to advance Communist Party interests.

As a citizen a union member still has the right to hold any political opinion that may appeal to him. The law does not bar Communists from union membership. It only prohibits unions with Communist officers from using the Labor Relations Board's facilities.

Communists who seek the destruction of labor unions and our system of free enterprise are outlawed from union leadership.

Before a union can take its case to the Labor Board its officers must take an oath that they are not affiliated with the Communist Party.

All union officials must swear allegiance to the United States of America just the same as a Congressman or any other public official.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

No longer can a worker be discharged for opposing union policies with which he is not in sympathy. The union can expel him but it cannot force his employer to fire him, even in a union shop. This insures the union worker absolute freedom of speech in union matters.

The worker can vote on whether or not he wants a union shop. Workers have a right to oppose a union just the same as they have the right to join one.

No longer can an employee be fired at the whim of a hot-headed union official.

A worker cannot be made to join a union by threats or the use of violence.

A man looking for a job cannot be denied employment simply because he does not belong to a union. After being hired he must join a union in 30 days if a majority vote of plant employees has so decreed.

A worker can now talk directly with his employer regarding working conditions.

A worker can now go directly to the Labor Board for relief from any unfair labor practice by either the employer or the union.

Union leaders by themselves cannot make a contract for a union shop. A vote of the workers is required first.

Thirty percent of the employees of a plant can, by petition, call for an election to organize or disband a union shop. In an election the majority rules.

The Taft-Hartley law encourages the practice and procedure of collective bargaining by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization and designation of representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment.

STRIKES AND PICKET LINES

The worker is protected from loss of work and pay resulting from jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts since both are now illegal.

The right to organize, to bargain collectively, to strike and to peacefully picket still exists and is fully guaranteed.

In event a union orders a strike in violation of its contract a worker who loses time and work can recover in court from the union.

A worker cannot be forced to strike against his will. Protection is provided for the workers who oppose a union when it strikes while seeking to organize a plant. If the union tries to coerce him into joining he can complain to the Labor Board. The Board has the power to order all coercion stopped. The worker who wants to join a union is likewise protected against coercion by his employer.

The union cannot have a worker discharged for crossing a picket line if he desires to go to work during a strike.

A worker may refuse to cross a picket line during a legal strike but if he declines to cross it during an illegal strike the employer has the right to fire him.

UNION MANAGEMENT

Unions are required to make statements showing how much money they receive and how it is expended.

The union member is given the right to know how its union spends its funds.

The law requires that money paid by the workers and employers into union health and welfare funds must be used exclusively for that purpose.

The worker can now protest if his union leaders are drawing excessive salaries and expense accounts.

Plant guards cannot belong to a union subject to control of union officials representing production workers.

The law declares supervisors to be the agents of management and cannot be recognized as a labor union.

The National Labor Relations Board now functions as a judicial body and is no longer prosecutor, investigator, and judge all at the same time.

The Taft-Hartley law protects the rights of the public, as well as those of the employee and the employer in connection with labor disputes.

This law has brought about relations between American labor and management that were never more cordial and satisfactory.

Respectfully submitted.

STATE LAWMAKERS DIRECTORY.
HOUSTON, TEX., *April 1948.*

Montana Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Montana Standard of Butte, Mont., which discusses the present excellent condition of Montana agriculture as well as the opportunities for future development:

MONTANA ADVANCES FROM THIRTY-FIRST TO TWENTY-SEVENTH IN AGRICULTURE

Montana agriculture advanced last year from the rank of thirty-first among the 48 States to twenty-seventh. The State's income from agriculture which set a new all-time high figure advanced along with that of all 48 States. Montana farmers, receiving

$397,350,000 ranked just ahead of Alabama and just behind Virginia. The cash income of Montana farmers for 1947 represented a 31-percent increase over the $303,438,000 received in 1946.

Iowa led all the other States in cash farm income, receiving $2,368,962,000 last year. Following in order were California, Texas, Illinois, Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska. These were the first seven. Ranking last was Rhode Island whose farmers received only $21,930,000 in cash income.

Farm income for all the States was $30,134,744,000, a new all-time record.

Last year was the most prosperous agricultural year in the history of the Nation, as well as in Montana. Only four States received less income from agriculture in 1947 than in 1946. They were North Carolina, Florida, South Carolina, and Delaware.

The most hopeful aspect of the farm situation insofar as Montana is concerned is that it is one of the few States which still has the prospect of continued agricultural progress. Not nearly all of Montana's land and other farm and range resources have reached their top potential production.

Montana can still look hopefully to the future. It can expect to increase its production year after year for many years to come. One of the greatest potentialities lies in increased irrigation. There are more than 2,000,000 acres of Montana land on which irrigation is feasible.

Arizona's Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Arizona's laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, compiled by Thomas R. Philipy, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, who has his offices at the Veterans' Information Center, 20 South Second Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them under certain circumstances and, therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Arizona's veteran laws will come to their attention. This summary is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowance is available for burial of indigent veterans, their wives or widows. Burial may not be in a potter's field.

A county shall apply to the United States for a suitable headstone and have same set in place.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A Uniform Acknowledgments Act provides for acknowledgment of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

A conservator shall be appointed for property of persons absent in the armed forces.

Persons in active military service are entitled to exemption of property from sale for delinquent taxes during the war and for 1 year thereafter.

Disability of minority has been removed for a veteran or spouse qualified under the GI bill of rights.

Testamentary capacity has been acknowledged of members of the armed forces aged 18 years or upward.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Persons in military service are entitled to absentee registration and voting.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

No charge is to be made for an acknowledgment to any document for use in connection with a claim for pension, compensation, insurance, or other benefits to be presented to the United States or any bureau thereof.

The Uniform Guardianship Act provides for free copies of public records for wards of the Veterans' Administration. Public officials are required to issue, without charge, certified copies of public records for use in making a claim for pension, allotment, allowance, compensation, insurance, or other benefit to be presented to the United States.

All discharge papers are to be recorded by county recorders free of charge.

It is the duty of the veterans' service officer to assist veterans and their dependents in obtaining any Federal or State awards to which they are entitled. Annual appropriations are provided.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Veterans are awarded preferential rating of five points in civil-service examinations in any city, town, county, or other political subdivision of the State.

The Employment Security Act provides for preservation of benefit rights.

A member of any fire company shall be reinstated after discharge from military service.

Public officers and employees shall be restored to former positions upon completion of military or naval service.

Veterans' service officers shall be veterans. Veterans of World War II are eligible.

Teachers' Retirement Act provides for war service credit.

GUARDIANSHIP

The Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act of 1945 provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HEALTH PROTECTION

Abatement of health menaces in areas adjacent to military establishments has been provided.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

The Uniform Guardianship Act provides for commitment of an incompetent veteran to a Federal hospital.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

The Land Settlement Act provides benefits to certain veterans.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Building and loan and savings and loan associations may make loans to veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights.

Relief has been provided for veterans and their dependents through the veterans' service officer and veterans' relief commission. Appropriations are provided annually.

Second injury fund benefits to veterans have been provided.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, ETC.

Special hunting and fishing licenses for soldiers are provided at a nominal fee.

Military compensation is exempt from income tax up to $1,500 with an extension of time for filing returns.

Annual liquor license fees are waived during military service.

Beauty culturists, etc., are entitled to renewal of certificates without fee after termination of military service, and are exempt from fees during military service.

Exemption has been granted from the motor-vehicle tax to veterans and their widows.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Local units of war veterans' associations are exempt from the requirement of publication of articles and from payment of filing fees.

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations has been declared a misdemeanor.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the Arizona Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 11 chapters throughout the State, maintains three full-time national service officers, under the direction of C. C. Bierman, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Phoenix, Ariz.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

Then, Mr. Speaker, following this informative summary, the same able authority comments in general on the benefits to disabled veterans by this great organization. This is also a splendid statement which I am glad to include.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation, Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down-payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value for disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts—all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

Prize-Winning Science Students Have Melting-Pot Parentage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, some time ago there was held in Washington a very interesting gathering of young Americans under the auspices of Science Service, which was conducted and sponsored by the Westinghouse Co. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release by Science Service entitled "Prize-Winning Science Students Have Melting-Pot Parentage," to show the great richness of the American people, the many different countries that have contributed to our citizenship, and how wide is the diversity of the nationalities represented in that select group of young men and women who received outstanding recognition at this remarkable meeting.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIZE-WINNING SCIENCE STUDENTS HAVE MELTING-POT PARENTAGE

WASHINGTON.—America's traditional function as melting-pot of nationalities seems to have operated strongly in the parentage of the 40 top-flight high-school seniors who will be in Washington from February 27 through March 2 for the finals of the Seventh Annual Science Talent Search for the Westinghouse Science Scholarships.

Although a majority of the 40 are of native American stock on both sides, it is not at all a large majority. Twenty-five of the students state that both their parents were born in this country; 4 have 1 native-born and 1 foreign-born parent each, and 11 are of wholly immigrant parentage.

Five of the winners were themselves born in Europe; One is Miss Ursel J. Blumenheim, of Forest Hills, N. Y., who comes from Germany. Three New York boys were born in what was the Austro-Hungarian empire before World War I; Gerhard Rayna, who is of Hungarian stock; Walter J. Scheider, who was born in Czechoslovakia; and Kurt W. Kohn, born in Austria of Polish-Czechoslovak parentage.

The foreign-born parents represent a wide range of nationalities. Four of them came from Russia and four from Poland. Three each were born in Czechoslovakia, Greece, and Hungary, and two each in Armenia, Austria, and Germany. France, Turkey, and Yugoslavia are represented by one parent apiece.

Small families are the rule. Among the 40 winners, 11 are only children, and 15 have only 1 brother or sister. Eight belong to three-child families, and two to families of four children. One girl and one boy can boast of four brothers or sisters each. No family of more than five children is represented.

Professions of the fathers are highly varied. The list includes engineer, manufacturer, farmer, salesman, forester, patent agent, machinist, real-estate broker, restaurant manager, optometrist, builder, radio operator, export manager, wood technologist, accountant, appraiser, elevator manager, sheet-metal worker, missionary, teacher, and school executive. Two paternal occupations have a unique look; green chain grader, and research analyst for the War Crimes Commission.

Twelve of the students' mothers have occupations outside their homes. Professions represented are teacher, musician, missionary, designer, editor, secretary, bookkeeper, social worker, sales clerk, and corsetiere.

Four of the winners have only one parent living. Approximately 62 percent of the winners' fathers and 52 percent of their mothers attended college.

The 40 winners of the Seventh Annual Science Talent Search were chosen on the basis of a three-hour science aptitude examination, personal recommendations, scholastic records, and a 1,000-word essay on "My Scientific Project." The competition was open to all high-school seniors; about 16,000 entered.

The Science Talent Search is sponsored annually by Science Clubs of America, administered by Science Service. The search is made financially possible by the Westinghouse Educational Foundation.

Trade Between Montana and Alaska Over Alaskan Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Miles City (Mont.) Star dealing with the possibilities of trade between Montana and Alaska by way of the Alaskan Highway.

Early this week I had the pleasure of attending a dinner, sponsored by the Montana Chamber of Commerce, at which Mr. Bill Rice, of Great Falls, discussed his experiences as the operator of a trucking concern which uses the highway. Mr. Rice is convinced that the highway offers splendid opportunities for the development of business relationships between Montana and Alaska which will be beneficial to both. Several Montana businessmen plan to fly to Alaska in May to discuss these opportunities, and I am certain they will be successful in developing new trade.

Mr. Rice assures us that trucks can compete with ships in supplying Alaska with most of the articles needed in the Territory. Such competition should be instrumental in the development of sound economic conditions in Alaska. In this manner, the Alaskan Highway will prove its worth in peace as well as war.

As the following editorial points out, Great Falls, Mont., is the starting point for both air and highway traffic to the Territory.

ALASKA EYES MONTANA'S ELECTRIC CITY

It is an item of general interest that many people of Alaska complain of being tied so strongly commercially with leading cities located in the Pacific Northwest, that they are

looking for a new outlet. Our Montana city of Great Falls is considered as an excellent point for commercial shipping to Alaska.

It is not that some of the large centers of population have the advantages of ocean and plane transportation, but, rather, that with the expanding of Alaska's economy, largely in the way of increased production, more than one outlet into the United States is deemed to be desirable, if not necessary.

What Alaska needs, in the opinion of many people of Alaska, is an augmentation of transportation facilities. This means more in the way of establishing trucking facilities. Not only trucks to take products out of Alaska, but to carry products to that area.

It having been demonstrated that trucking to and from Alaskan points is possible, there is every reason why such a service should be expanded and thus provide another route which would bring products of Alaska to the States and over which return consignments purchased could be transported. Such a plan would confer a considerable number of economic benefits upon the people of Montana, as well as elsewhere here in the Northwest.

Great Falls is excellently situated, and would be the logical point in Montana first to be reached by transportation over the highway leading to and from Alaska. The city would expand with the increased population, and opportunity given to attract a wider attention to the potentialities extant in the Treasure State. Every community in Montana should favorably react to the possible establishment of Great Falls as the southern point on a new Alaskan outlet, and feel elated that perhaps we can exercise universal pride in the fact that we will have one city, at least, with a big, metropolitan population—a city big enough to be modest about it.

Necessity for a Federal Pay Raise to Employees of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the Federal pay-raise bill be reported out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for final legislative action. The time of adjournment of the Eightieth Congress draws near and still we have not given our Federal employees the salary raise which they so richly deserve. Inflation continues to mount and the purchasing power of the dollar continues to decrease. This means that Federal employees' wages will buy 30 percent less food, clothing, and other necessities of life than the same wage purchased 2 years ago. These are undeniable facts and it does not take the committee months to learn them. Unless action is taken soon on this matter the Members of the House may be forced to file a discharge petition on this legislation, as they were forced to do on the oleomargarine bill. I hope this will not be necessary and I am confident that it will not be necessary. The committee in charge of this bill I am sure realizes the urgency and it is my sincere hope that they will report a good bill within the next 2 weeks. It is also my hope that the legislation will carry a retroactive provision insuring the effectiveness of the raise as of the first of the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point a statement which I recently made before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the subject of Federal employees' pay raise:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your committee.

I appear in behalf of the Federal employees of my district to urge the early reporting of a bill providing realistic pay increases. I believe a substantial raise is justified on the basis of the increased cost of living which no one can deny.

I have received many letters and some attention-compelling postcards of an unusual size which I now display for the attention of your committee. Approximately 3,000 signatures of post-office and Federal employees are signed thereon. One important factor we should all keep in mind is that these Federal employees must of necessity petition the Members of Congress for justice in their pay rates. They are not permitted by Federal legislation to use their combined economic strength to compel attention to their needs. The function of government must be continuous and Congress in its wisdom has denied Federal workers a basic right which is considered an important part of our free-enterprise system, the right to strike. In so doing, Congress became morally responsible for equitable periodic adjustments in the real wages—purchasing power—of our Federal employees. Unless we discharge that moral obligation, we have, unwittingly perhaps, denied and even defrauded our faithful Federal employees of economic rights which are accorded to both organized and unorganized groups of workers in our society.

The general membership of Congress looks with confidence to your fine committee to bring to the floor an equitable bill which will discharge our wage-adjustment responsibility. Your committee in its wisdom can, and no doubt will, decide the amount of the pay raise necessary to obtain parity with employees in private industry doing comparable work. Statistics have been furnished you from reputable sources, which prove beyond doubt that the cost of living has advanced drastically since the last basic pay raise. We know that a conservative estimate of the cost-of-living advance since June 1946 is between 26 and 27 percent. An annual salary of $3,200 should, on this basis, receive an $800 advance. I might state at this time that I was a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee during the years 1943 and 1944 when the O'Brien bill was passed, and so I am familiar with the problem of Federal employees.

I do not want to impose on the time of your committee unduly. However, I would like to advance at this time a basic formula which I believe would automatically and scientifically adjust Federal wages and pensions annually.

Our present method of determining wage changes is haphazard and usually occurs long after the need is established. The result is injustice, and loss of morale with Federal employees. Reduction in the standard of living occurs during periods of inflation. Wage increases always lag far behind the increase in the cost of living. Wage decreases are made quickly when cost of living drops.

I believe that time lags could be shortened and maladjustments could be minimized by recognizing and adopting a scientific formula for real wage adjustment. I believe the Federal Government could and should set the example.

The general outline of this formula is as follows:

1. Dollar wages, in order to be equitable to employees, should be constant in purchasing power.

2. This objective can be attained by raising or lowering annual wages according to the rise and fall in the cost of living as measured by the Consumers' Index. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Cost of Living Index.)

3. Adjustments in Federal wages should be made at the beginning of each fiscal year.

4. Wage adjustments should be made for each ensuing year, based on a 5 percent or more change in the Consumers' Index of the preceding year.

Time does not permit me to go into details on this plan; if it is of interest to the committee, I am sure that you have access to experts who could assist in working out the details.

I believe that a scientific formula for annual wage adjustments would bring to the Federal employee a feeling of security and confidence in his Government, which he does not have at present.

I believe that it would establish a basic wage adjustment formula, based on justice and standard of living, rather than the unjust variability of an elastic dollar unit.

I believe that it would eliminate a great deal of the political pressure on Congress, and relieve your committee from long hearings on wage adjustments, so that you could concentrate on other important functions of government.

I know that the standard of living of Government employees would be far more stable than it has been throughout the years, and I do not believe that it would cost the Government a great deal more than the present "fix the roof after the leak ruins the plaster" method.

In the field of Government pensions to our disabled veterans and social-security recipients, we would introduce a stable policy of justice which at present fluctuates with every rise and fall in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Increase of Compensation for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Journal:

FORGOTTEN MEN AND WOMEN

Unless Congress shows more speed in considering increased pay for post-office employees, who are obviously receiving inadequate compensation for their services while the cost of living continues moving upward, the postal service may face serious problems since vacancies under the existing financial schedule cannot be adequately filled because of the low salary authorization now in effect.

Some rays of hope have appeared recently at Washington in connection with proposals to raise the income of the postal workers, who rather appropriately have begun to be termed the "forgotten men and women" in Government employ, but efforts to obtain proper salary adjustments for these loyal and patient employees have not reached the stage where they warrant the encouragement they deserve. There must be much more pronounced progress toward that end if the remedy for one of the most distressing conditions confronting Federal employees is to become effective before widespread depletions are noted in the personnel in post offices throughout the Nation. Congress is

the ony authority which can correct the injustice. Its decision is essential for meeting the needs of the postal service workers. It should get busier and enact the required legislation.

Although the situation at the National Capital is far from offering promise of the necessary relief, there have been some heartening activities reported recently. The Senate committee, with nine members attending a hearing of the proposed salary legislation, decided to report to the Senate a measure providing for a raise in pay of $800 per year in the basic salary for all regular employees of the postal field service. The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service agreed to report an amended bill providing for an increase of $585 per annum, by a vote of 17 to 1. These committee reports, although the amounts favored are considerably below those provided for in the bills, indicate that some strides are being made toward having Members of Congress appreciate the importance of granting postal employees more compensation. It shows the development of concern for the welfare of these Government workers as well as concern for the service itself.

The salary adjustments, obviously, have not kept pace with the inflation spiral which affects the public generally and has by no means been in line with the increasing cost of living. Two pay adjustments in recent years have been absorbed by the mounting prices involving all necessities of life. There has been no raise in pay since $500 on graduated scale was added about 3 years ago, making the year's compensation around $2,900. The increases in question totaled only 38 percent in comparison with rise in living costs amounting to more than 60 percent. This, of course, is evidence of the need of more consideration for the postal employees, who, despite this heavy handicap, go about their very essential public work with loyalty and patience along with the knowledge that they are really "forgotten men and women" who are unfairly treated as long as their salaries are too low for them to make ends meet properly.

That the postal employees, clerks, postmen, and others are valuable public servants none can deny. They have expenses to take care of, including the support of their homes, education of children, and maintenance of adequate savings for future obligations and requirements. These expenses can not be satisfactorily met with the present inadequate pay the Government is allowing them.

Public opinion is their recourse. It should be made known to Congress promptly with the exhortation that the necessary legislation not be longer delayed.

Dawn of Hope in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State, the Honorable George C. Marshall, on Wednesday announced the creation of the office of special assistant for Palestine affairs in the Department of State and the appointment of Gen. John H. Hilldring to fill the new post.

Under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of a congratulatory message I sent to the Secretary of State, which expresses my hopefulness for the new direction of Middle Eastern affairs.

I am also inserting an editorial from the New York Post of Wednesday, April 28, which was written and published before there was public knowledge of the new position in the State Department, but which is very relevant to the problems which face General Hilldring, and charts the course which the United States must follow in Palestine to retrieve our lost honor and prestige.

Following is the text of the telegram dispatched to the Secretary of State April 28, 1948.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.:

I have just learned with the deepest approbation of your creation of the office of special assistant for Palestine affairs in the Department of State and of your appointment of the Honorable John H. Hilldring to fill that post. I know that I speak for an overwhelming majority of the American people, and especially for the American Jewish community, when I take the liberty of assuring you that this is the most reassuring step in American policy in many months. The people of the United States, and indeed of the whole world, have a confidence in General Hilldring based on their knowledge of his integrity and competence. The only reservation I feel compelled to make is that officers will still remain in the Division of Palestine Affairs, in whom neither I nor other progressive and democratic Americans have confidence, or can have confidence, because of the past, even though they will be subject to the direction of General Hilldring.

Nevertheless, I tender to you my congratulations and my thanks for this statesmanlike move, and to General Hilldring my congratulations and best wishes and the assurance that I am at his service.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

The editorial from the New York Post follows:

DAWN OF HOPE

At long last, and after the needless sacrifice of hundreds of lives, the United Nations is taking its first step toward bringing about peace with honor and justice in Palestine.

Tentative truce arrangements are being made for Jerusalem at this, the 11th hour. Thus an infinitesimal fraction of the decision of the General Assembly last November is moving toward actual accomplishment.

Decisions on the character of the United Nations force, and in particular on the type of Governor General to carry out the trusteeship, remain before we may take much heart, but a beginning is being made.

An outstanding choice for the Governor Generalship would be Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, former Assistant Secretary of State and member of the UN delegation which worked so earnestly to bring about the Palestine decisions the United States seems now bent on trying to reverse.

As a courageous and conscientious official he could be counted upon to obtain the maximum results with minimum force and minimum friction.

Incidentally, had his advice been followed, the United Nations arm would today be in Palestine, and the security of Judea assured. He was the first to point out that the Assembly decision gave the greatest hope for peace and justice, and that immediate organization of an enforcement body would avert warfare of the type now threatening Palestine from all five peace-loving Arabian members of the United Nations.

What may be accomplished for Jerusalem in the next several days, could have been assured for all Palestine as well, months ago, if the United States had stood firmly on its then propartisan commitment.

It can still be accomplished, but greater sacrifices will have to be made, to be added to the tragic sacrifice of life already made by the fighters of Haganah in defense of the newly formed homeland in Judea.

Jerusalem is a key to peace with honor, which must be pursued with firmness and with honor. If this beginning is successful, it will be another demonstration that principle is not merely the most practical, but the only guide to the achievement of respectable solutions to the remaining, greater problem.

Recognition of the Jewish state, support for its defense forces, and unequivocal return to support of the United Nations' November decision in full, is the only possible course.

The Arabian war challenge is not merely a challenge to Judea—a challenge being met with great courage and deep devotion—but a full-scale declaration of war on us and all members of the majority voting for the Palestine decision.

It is couched in those terms.

The United States has only one honorable course: Strict warning to any nation—including not only Arabia but Great Britain as well—that we are prepared, not with pious resolutions but full, all-out assistance—to support our pledges with our resources, and if need be with our lives.

Only thus can we regain the moral leadership we have so sadly lost since the turn of the year.

HENDERSON BLAMED FOR PALESTINE DISGRACE

I am including also a brief Associated Press news story which places the blame for the betrayal of the Palestine partition plan squarely on the shoulders of Loy Henderson, chief of the Division of Near Eastern and African Affairs in the State Department, and the individual to whom I was chiefly referring in the text of my congratulatory message to Secretary Marshall.

LOY HENDERSON ENGINEERED PALESTINE SWITCH, EDITOR SAYS

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., April 29.—The United States decided to kill the Palestine partition plan a few days after its passage by the United Nations General Assembly and weeks before serious fighting erupted in the Holy Land, the magazine UN World said today.

Ladislas Farago, senior editor of the privately owned magazine, accused a small but influential group in the United States State Department of seizing the opportunity provided by the intensification of the "cold war" late in 1947 to make the administration renounce its propartition stand. He said United States oil companies also fought the partition policy.

The article named Loy Henderson, Chief of the State Department's Near Eastern Division, as the blue-printer of the new American policy.

The Henderson plan, now official American policy, envisions a final Holy Land solution patterned after the so-called Morrison-Grady plan, Farago said. That plan, drafted some years ago by Herbert Morrison, of the United Kingdom, and Henry F. Grady, of the United States, would grant a limited autonomy to a small Jewish area in a centrally controlled Palestine, about 1,500 square miles, as compared to the 5,000 they would control under partition.

Farago also said two British generals have agreed with Arab leaders to carve up Palestine among the surrounding Arab states. He named them as Brig. Patrick Andrew Clayton, veteran "lone wolf" British master spy of the Middle East, and Gen. Glubb Pasha, British commander of the Arab Legion.

HILLDRING APPOINTMENT HAILED

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am including a news story from the New York Post

discussing the probable effect of the Hilldring appointment on Palestine and describing something of his views and background.

HILLDRING RETURN HINTS UNITED STATES TO SHIFT ON ZION

(By John Hohenberg)

LAKE SUCCESS, April 29.—The United States strove today to hold its faltering lines in the UN for the proposed temporary trusteeship over Palestine instead of partition.

But with the sudden return of Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring to the State Department an authoritative forecast of changes in American policy indicated a retreat from trusteeship was in sight.

Before the 58-nation General Assembly Political Committee, the immediate reaction of Philip Jessup, American spokesman, was an assertion that this country's position was "clear and unchanged."

The American delegation, moreover, issued an official denial that any new plans were contemplated—just as similar denials were made when the shift from partition to trusteeship was widely reported.

CONFIRMS PARLEYS

Yet a member of the delegation confirmed this newspaper's account last Friday of joint American-British-French efforts to agree on a short form trusteeship of 6 months, with Jewish immigration set at about 50,000 and wide autonomy being granted to Jewish areas. But, it was stressed, no agreement had been reached yet.

Another indication of softening came from the Arabs when Egypt's Mahmoud Bey Fawzi hinted Palestine's Arabs might agree to a small amount of immigration in the form of displaced persons if other nations would accept the bulk of them.

All of this, of course, remained unsatisfactory to the Jewish Agency, which insists on setting up a Jewish state in Palestine May 16, the day after the British withdraw.

DIPLOMAT CAUTIOUS

A distinguished diplomat, thoroughly conversant with sentiment both at the White House and the UN, bolstered Jewish caution with a warning against overoptimism that President Truman's selection of General Hilldring, an outstanding advocate of partition, would mean an immediate return to the partition plan.

Instead, he depicted the probable course of events as follows:

1. The American project for a long trusteeship of Palestine would be dropped, either through withdrawal or its defeat in the General Assembly.

2. The short-term proposal then would be tried, provided Americans, British, and French reached agreement.

3. If that failed, not through design but through process of elimination, nothing would remain but for the United States to acknowledge that partition still was in effect and should command UN support.

This newspaper exclusively reported yesterday that the White House was negotiating with Hilldring to resume his official connection with the Palestine problem. Early editions reported he was reluctant to accept a nomination as Governor General of Jerusalem, and later editions elaborated:

"Even if he maintains his refusal to stand for the Jerusalem post, he may be offered a position either in the State Department or as a White House adviser."

Confirmation through official announcement in Washington came last night, and both United States officials and foreign delegates joined in hasty speculation on the meaning of the appointment.

It was recalled that Hildring, former Assistant Secretary of State in charge of occupied territories, left the United States delegation last fall after playing a leading role in winning the adoption of partition by the General Assembly November 29.

It was known Hildring opposed bitterly the arms embargo clamped on by the United States immediately after the passage of partition, since it served to cripple Zionist efforts to prepare for the defense of the nascent Jewish state.

Moreover, he didn't see eye to eye with such antipartition advocates in the State Department as Loy Henderson, chief of the Division of Middle East Affairs, who now may be expected to move on shortly to some diplomatic post in a Middle East country.

For these and personal reasons he dropped out of the picture and divided his time between his western ranch and occasional lectures. Only Tuesday night he delivered an address before 3,000 persons in San Francisco's opera house on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal.

During his absence, Defense Secretary Forrestal, Henderson, and others perfected the trusteeship proposal which the UN has kicked around aimlessly for nearly 2 weeks, refusing to do anything about it.

Reports from Washington held that President Truman was dissatisfied, but that he still insisted trusteeship must go through on a temporary basis to defer partition. So far as is known, the President still hasn't changed his mind on that yet.

But from the unhappy situation of the United States delegation in the UN, Mr. Truman may find the decision will be made for him by the 57 other assembly members.

The Condon Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. P. Ives, from the Baltimore Sun for April 26, 1948:

ON STICKING TO THE FACTS IN THE CONDON MATTER

(By C. P. Ives)

In the uproar over the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, a good many of the facts, including the major fact, have been forgotten. The major fact is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities raises no question of Dr. Condon's loyalty. As a committee spokesman put it in a recent address in the House:

"The very essence of our report concerning Dr. Condon had to do with his associations, affiliations, and indiscretions. We did not charge Dr. Condon with being disloyal. * * *"

But if the charge is not disloyalty, what is it? The House committee paraphrased it by calling Dr. Condon "one of the weakest links in our atomic 'security'." The word I have quoted is the key word—"security."

What is the difference between loyalty and security? Simple enough, and largely explained by the dictionary meanings of the two words. A man is disloyal if he puts the welfare and safety of another country over that of the United States.

A man is a poor security risk, however loyal, if he lacks discretion, if he talks too much, if he is unwise in his associations, if through carelessness or dumbness he behaves in a way which foreign agents might find it easy to twist to their advantage.

The distinction is carefully noted in the procedures which the Government has worked up to protect itself and the interests of the American people in these grave and somber times. For there is not one but two protective programs in the Government.

There is a loyalty program resting on an Executive order of the President and issued a year ago. And there is a security program, imposed by statute and covering the sensitive agencies—the armed services, the State Department, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Dr. Condon has undergone the loyalty test at the hands of a Commerce Department loyalty board and emerged with an unqualified loyalty clearance by unanimous vote of the board. There are, however, some notable claims about the Condon loyalty test made by the House Un-American Activities Committee spokesmen in his House address.

It will be remembered that the Un-American Activities Committee report on Dr. Condon was released on March 1. A Commerce Department spokesman stated shortly thereafter that the Department loyalty board had cleared Dr. Condon some days before, on February 24.

The House committee spokesman now claims, however, that the unanimous clearance of Dr. Condon by the Commerce loyalty board came not before but a matter of hours after the House report had been released. And this despite the fact that the board had been considering the matter a full 10 months previously.

The committee spokesman also stated that in order to complete the clearance on what appears to have been a basis of urgency, one of the board members, who had left the Department employ, was reached by long-distance telephone to secure the final vote needed to make the report unanimous.

But the most important point about the Commerce loyalty board proceeding is that, as suggested above, it did not touch Dr. Condon's standing as a security risk at all. Yet obviously the question of security is just as important as the question of loyalty.

The agency responsible for testing Dr. Condon on the security ground is the Atomic Energy Commission with which his atomic work in the Bureau of Standards is connected. And the interesting thing is, that as recently as Friday, the Condon security matter was described as still pending at AEC.

In other words, though controversy has raged about Dr. Condon since the House committee released its report March 1; though that report stated that the AEC had carried the Condon matter as a pending case in the previous November; though it is now nearly the first of May, there is as yet no formal and publicly acknowledged clearance on security for this controversial figure.

Nor is this the only instance of surprising administrative slowness in the Condon case. As stated above, the Commerce Department loyalty board cleared Dr. Condon on loyalty grounds. This clearance seems to have been accepted by the Un-American Activities Committee though it is demanding the Commerce papers in the case.

But when the Commerce Department first refused to surrender these papers to the House committee, it announced that as an extra precaution on the loyalty matter it would ask the top loyalty review board headed by Mr. Seth Richardson to review the Department loyalty finding.

At the week end, however, the Richardson board had not yet even taken jurisdiction. Normally the Richardson board advises Department boards before, rather than after, they have made their findings. Interagency discussion of this technicality seems to be the delaying factor in getting the resurvey of the Condon matter started.

Now there is a salutary rule of law that the courts will not intervene in a pending case until the administrative remedies have been exhausted. By analogy it perhaps can be argued that congressional investigating committees ought not to investigate until

executive and administrative investigations had been completed.

But then the question arises, how long ought the congressional committees to wait for slow-motion administrative action. In anything the congressional committees do, they must proceed fairly, with full hearings to persons reported on, to be sure. But how long should they wait for administrative action? That question is bound to pick up steam as the Condon matter stays in the headlines.

Hon. James V. McClintic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, this past week Oklahoma lost another distinguished son when the Honorable James V. McClintic passed away.

I am glad to have the privilege of paying this tribute to him. No words of mine, however, can add to the laurels he won and wore so well as a citizen of our great State. His name will forever be identified with the progress of Oklahoma. For 20 years, he represented the important Seventh Congressional District and before retiring from Congress became a recognized authority on naval power. He was courageous, a man of vision, and sound.

After the termination of this great man's services in Congress, he served his country during the last emergency as liaison between the War Department and the Congress. He then retired, as he said, "To do a lot of fishing and enjoy life." And now his voice is stilled and we hear him no more.

Mr. Speaker, being a friend of the deceased was a great privilege. He had a full life and made a great contribution to this country. His smile was infectious and his stories good. His legion of friends called him Sunny Jim. What an appropriate title. One that all could covet. His kind and gentle manner will be greatly missed by those of us who knew him well.

In the words of a poet, may I say:

Farewell, dear friend, none can fill your seat
Within the sacred circle of our love
And so we'll count you present when we meet
And greet you once again in realms above.

Salary Increases for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has before it many pressing problems demanding attention, but none of them are more deserving of our speedy consideration than that of providing an adequate and permanent salary increase for our faithful and efficient postal employees.

No other group of Government employees has given more loyal service. They are truly deserving of the fairest treatment by the Congress at this time.

All Members of Congress have received many letters from the postal employees in their own districts, telling them how difficult it is to meet the high cost of living under present salary schedules. Their incomes are not adequate to pay for raising and educating their children and to meet their food and rent bills or pay the interest on their mortgages.

We have all become convinced of the very real need for some kind of relief for these postal workers. We should take action to provide them with that relief to the extent and in the form that the need requires.

I strongly support a pay raise of more than $585 for post office workers, and I believe that such a raise should be a permanent increase rather than a temporary one.

In no case should this increase be less than the $585 proposed in the Rees-Butler bill recently approved by the House Civil Service Committee.

In view of the amount of time and effort spent by the House committee on this subject during the last months, I feel bound to abide by its decision. It has had the full benefit of all the testimony and statistics relating to the problem.

It seems essential to me that the Congress make any postal increase a permanent increase so that retirement benefits will thereby be increased, too. Let us not forget our older postal employees who have given many faithful years of diligent service in this branch of the Government.

By increasing retirement benefits through a permanent salary raise, the Congress will be expressing our national appreciation to these older men who have served so well, and, in a measure, will be fulfilling our obligation to them.

Excise Taxes on Essential Items Should Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1948

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, one of the phases of current taxation which should not be overlooked by the Eightieth Congress is that concerning excise taxes. Many of these taxes as presently constituted seem to have been levied without regard to rhyme or reason and at least should be modified as soon as possible.

For example, the consumer does not generally realize it, but he pays an excise tax on domestic gas and electric ranges. This tax at the present time amounts to 10 percent at the manufacturing level, and it is marked up by the dealers. In effect, every American who buys a stove has to pay a much higher price for an essential commodity because of this inequitable tax.

Last year approximately 3,500,000 gas and electric ranges were manufactured in America with the Kalamazoo and A–B Stove Cos., both located in my district, among the leading producers. During the same year there were about three quarters of a million homes built, not including automobile trailers and other means of abode. It is estimated that a minimum of 800,000 new homes will be built this year and it is safe to assume that all of them will require new cooking equipment—this figure not including trailers.

Why should persons who have to buy new gas and electric ranges be discriminated against? Why should they be called upon to pay an excise tax on an item so essential in daily life?

People who buy new vacuum cleaners formerly had to pay an excise tax, but Congress removed that tax in 1943. Washing machines never have been burdened with excise taxes. Certainly gas and electric ranges are as equally essential in homemaking as vacuum cleaners and washing machines. No one here will deny that. Then why should the purchasers and manufacturers of ranges be discriminated against?

I urge the Congress, Mr. Speaker, to get busy and do something about this unfair situation.

When we look at other fields in which excise taxes are levied we find the same type of discrimination. One wonders what type of mentality was employed in fixing the current excise-tax schedule which includes so-called luxury taxes on oil, talcum, and other necessities. To tax young mothers who purchase necessary articles for bathing babies is, in my opinion, the most stupid and fantastic procedure on record. Can any Member of Congress, or even the tax experts employed by Congress, defend such a tax?

In fact, taxes on all toilet preparations should be repealed—and now. Toiletries are no longer considered luxuries. They are considered necessities. Witness the tremendous purchases of toiletries made by the armed services during World War II.

The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has introduced legislation to abolish taxes on toiletries. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will report this legislation to the Congress at an early date and will amend the bill (H. R. 4287) to include gas and electric ranges and all other items that are essential in American home life.

Removing or modifying these excise taxes will not only correct inequities now existent, it will serve to stimulate business in practically every retail and wholesale enterprise; it will bring prices down and do much to prevent inflation in other fields.

The House has passed legislation introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] to correct some of the inequities in the photographic-supply field, but this bill is still stymied in the Senate Committee on Finance. At the time this bill passed the House, Members made no attempt to include other items because we understood other legislation to take care of toiletries, jewelry, and stoves would soon be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, these excise taxes were voted by Congress as a war measure. The war has been over 3 years. Action to modify or abolish these taxes is long past due.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the National Association of Retail Druggists during their convention in Chicago, October 12 to 16, 1947:

Whereas the National Association of Retail Druggists believes the excise tax on cosmetics is discriminatory taxation in that it levies a tax on daily necessities of life on a large class of employed women of limited income; and

Whereas the excise tax on baby preparations which are absolutely necessary is a heavy burden on a great number of families with low income; and

Whereas the excise tax on some luxury items such as fur-trimmed garments usually purchased by those in the higher-income bracket has been eliminated; and

Whereas the excise tax on necessaries of life adds materially to the high cost of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Retail Druggists, in convention assembled on this 16th day of October 1947, goes on record for the repeal of the excise tax on cosmetics and baby preparations; that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Representatives and Senators in Congress and that they be asked to assist in promoting legislation to bring this about.

Mr. Speaker, 6 months have passed since this resolution was adopted by an organization representing 30,000 retail druggists of America. Do you not think it is time we at least consider the wishes of these businessmen and the consumers of toilet necessities?

Strong Defenses for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. Omar N. Bradley from the New York Times of April 28, 1948:

TEXT OF GENERAL BRADLEY'S ADDRESS URGING STRONG DEFENSES FOR AMERICA

(The text of the address by Gen. Omar N. Bradley before the magazine forum of the National Association of Magazine Publishers last night follows:)

In a world where hundreds of millions go hungry and homeless, where men fear their neighbors more than they trust them; where thoughts warp with suspicion and disease—the challenge to America has become an appeal from all mankind to save itself from destruction.

It is to the United States that freemen look for the light and hope of the world. Unless we dedicate ourselves completely in this struggle, unless we combat hunger with food, fear with trust, suspicion with faith, fraud with justice, and threats with power, nations will surrender to the futility, the hopelessness, the panic on which war and catastrophe feed.

By their response to this trial, the American people will either help shape this world for the benefit and freedom of mankind, or they will default and miserably forfeit the future to wickedness, oppression, and chaos.

We live in an age where a mountain village in Greece, an outpost in Korea, a railroad line into Berlin, can strike sparks of grave danger to the peace of the world. We have come face to face with the truth that no nation can live alone; that the dangers as well as the hopes of the world are inseparable from our own.

Even treaties of peace will not obscure the sores that make for war. While these sores continue to run unchecked they work to produce a disaster that may sooner or later again sweep the earth. The world cannot live in peace half slave, half free. It cannot live in peace half hungry, half fed. It cannot live in peace half naked, half clothed. It cannot live in peace half homeless, half sheltered.

And more than that, it cannot hope to survive in fear, panic, and perpetual tension.

WARNS ON APPEASING EVIL

However, the American people will not avert the consequences of chaos, fear, and the constant threat of aggression either by appeasing or ignoring those dangers. They are the forces of evil, and there is no compromise one makes with evil, without the danger of succumbing to it.

But by the same token, let it be clearly understood that there is no answer to our dilemma in the appalling prospect of war. For while chaos, poverty, and fear are the carrion on which war feeds, each new conflict only leaves behind it fresh carrion to start another.

If we are to avert another conflict, what we must do is first clothe ourselves against the danger with a cloak of power that would smother all threats of aggression. And then in unity with all free peoples put our intellect, power, wealth, resources—yes, and our freedoms—to work in rebuilding the world. To make it a fit place—not only for heroes—but a fit place for peace. If this would seem visionary and idealistic, then remember that peace is an elusive vision; that ideals are not easily achieved.

In the face of these inexorable requirements for the future, let us ask ourselves this evening if democracy can continue successfully to reconcile its popular opinion and the exigencies of each day with this vast and long-term challenge. For I hold this challenge is nothing less than the fate of the world.

Our generation has witnessed two earth-shaking wars and profound changes in the world's strategic and power balance. The maps that I studied as a boy are almost as unrecognizable as Magellan's charts today. States, kingdoms—and even empires—once considered unassailable ramparts of the modern world have crumbled, changed hands—changed borders—in some cases to shrink or totally disappear.

WAR PROSPERITY DECRIED

Likewise America has changed profoundly in the last 10 years. Almost unscathed by conflict, we have emerged confusedly from the war to find that war and prosperity came hand in hand.

Actually, this is a dangerous delusion—psychologically as well as in fact. I am afraid that war loses some of its fear to those people who fight it on an overtime pay check or on a cost-plus contract. The immoral companionship of prosperity and war may have blinded some of us to the realization that all war ultimately is a process of destruction. War destroys wealth; it does not produce it. It impoverishes States; it does not enrich them.

Now for the first time in these United States, critical shortages are apparent in the once bountiful natural resources of our frontier Nation. The growing complexity of manufactured products and the reduction of our resources have conspired to increase our dependence from year to year on the output of other nations. Our machinery of production must depend for its life on fuel and materials from distant lands. And our economy of distribution requires markets for the goods that have been produced. A crisis in Mexico, China, or Arabia must ultimately and in due time affect the life of the citizen in New York or California just as surely as if it had occurred in Ohio.

Moreover, those very elements that favored our security and national development have already been radically changed in this first half of the twentieth century. Ocean barriers have been greatly narrowed by the age of flight. The strength and influence of friendly powers who shared with us a community in aspirations and ideals have been savagely reduced in the wake of war. But of deepest significance among these changes of our time is the ascent of America into such a dominant position among nations that our every movement—foreign or domestic—brings effects and repercussions throughout the entire world.

WORLD LEADERSHIP DISCUSSED

It may be time for us to look humbly upon ourselves, to ask if we are equipped spiritually and matured politically to cope successfully with so momentous a role. This Nation must stand without apology as a resolute champion of human rights over police powers, of political liberty over protective custody. For the United States has already become the guidepost of nations who see in democracy not only assurance of man's personal freedom but the light of his economic opportunity as well.

As important as spiritual greatness and physical strength is the vision and perspective with which we point our way. In other words, we dare not flutter between convenient paths when the world is following our footsteps. We must ask if we can exercise our responsibilities honestly and intelligently—if public opinion is to be focused solely on the affairs of the passing day; if acclaim is rendered to the convenient, the facile, the expedient solution—regardless of the trouble it may generate for the future.

Surely our steps must be better measured than ever before in our history. They must be taken with knowledge of their risks, their benefits, their costs—the power they will require if we are to move sturdily and progressively forward. Vacillation is not conducive to a leading role in world affairs. For when we appeal throughout the world to men of good faith to stand bravely and at our side, we are asking them to risk their lives on the good faith of our pronouncements.

To decide intelligently on these issues that affect the course of civilization, the American people must be as well informed on world affairs as were citizens in the ancient city-state when all could debate at the public forums. In our press, radio, and magazine industries the American people have a conscionable, free, and responsible forum on public affairs. A free press is the lifeblood of a democratic state. For if a government is to serve the welfare of its people, then that government must constantly quicken to the mind and the temper of those people. That mind, that temper—factually informed and honestly voiced—must have constant expression through our journals of information and opinion.

PRESS RESPONSIBILITY URGED

Wherever liberty has been stamped out in the lives of people, it was because truth and fact were first obliterated from what they read. Even in the world community of nations, there can be no safe reliance upon justice in lieu of power until all member nations are clearly responsive to the will and conscience of their people. And there can be no expression of will, no growth of conscience without truth and fact, without a free and vigilant press to bring it to the people.

By the same token freedom of the press cannot survive without responsibility in its

expression. For that reason, it is you—the editors and publishers—who hold in your own hands a vast share of the responsibility for safeguarding the most essential of our freedoms. And similarly it is your conscience, your good judgment, your political morality, your intellect, and above all your integrity that will help blaze the paths in which we shall walk.

If the United States is to fulfill the great role to which it has ascended, then we must free ourselves from the temptations of day-to-day expediences and pursue instead reasoned, intelligent, articulated policies of long-term impact and meaning. As editors and publishers with the sources, the facts, and the intellectual judgment with which to chart our way and review our progress, you are the ones who must constantly seek the long-term rational viewpoint. This is true not only in the conduct of international affairs, but it is equally true in our economic evolution, our social progress, our political objectives, yes—and even in our military institutions.

Even though this long-range view may sometimes lack the heat of day-to-day events, its historical objectives are of vital interest to the public. For most people are always ready to sacrifice for their children and nothing is more important to them than the future of those children—whether they shall be free; what kind of a world they will live in; whether they will have in their own lifetime the oil, minerals, timber, the fertile soil and opportunity that was given to us.

FOR ARMY RECRUITMENT

In my own task as a soldier dependent for manpower and material upon the understanding of our people, I am doubly concerned with the need for public awareness of our long-term obligations.

I am already indebted to you—as is the United States Army— not only for your wartime editorial aid but for your immeasurable good works in our campaign for voluntary recruitment. Whatever the pattern of legislation granted us for repair of the Army, we shall continue to rely first upon the free and voluntary recruitment of willing soldiers. And in just that same measure, we shall continue to lean heavily upon each of you and the good services of your advertising council.

Presumably the United States is now creating a security establishment to resemble both in pattern and structure our immediate needs in a future war. Security forces are of no effect in averting a war unless they contain combat capabilities that will enable them to fight and win.

Yet at this time, let us ask ourselves frankly, if we are not stooping to a dangerous expediency with a check-book plan for defense. Because it is easier to write a check than to lend our sons to service, we have welcomed the opportunity to buy security at a reasonable price. We are bold in our clamor for national defense just so long as it pinches our pockets, not the careers of our sons. We may have forgotten that democracy—like all good things—requires men to serve it if they are to benefit by it. I fear the results of short-term check-book thinking and I must candidly ask if this easy way is the right way; if this "cheaper" way will not prove costly in the event of another war.

FINDS MACHINES NOT ENOUGH

I was taught to fight freely and liberally with machines in an effort to save the lives of my men. But at no time did these machines ever become a substitute for sufficient and well-trained troops.

Today, in the face of every lesson of war, we are in danger of convincing ourselves by wishful thinking that we can purchase security by building machines less painfully than by calling on men and their spirit. Machines can certainly speed the winning of war and reduce its cost in human lives, but they cannot win a war by themselves.

Your armed forces have two missions of equal importance in the event of conflict. The first is to defend our homeland from enemy attack; the second, to strike at the enemy's heart. Our only certain and safe guarantee against enemy air attack is to seize and hold the bases from which his aircraft could fly. And in like fashion, the only certain and telling method of supporting an air offensive against the enemy is to strike at him from bases where that attack can be sustained. To seize and hold those bases, for air defense as well as attack, that is the D-day mission of your Army troops.

Without these bases resolutely held all the machines in the world could not save our cities from the ordeal of air attack. Ground units for such critical and demanding role cannot be developed overnight. They must be trained, disciplined, and conditioned—you can't use a butter knife for a scalpel.

BALANCED FORCES NEEDED

American armed strength is only as strong as the combat capabilities of its weakest service. Overemphasis on one or the other will obscure our compelling need—not for air power, sea power, or land power—but for American military power commensurate to our tasks in the world.

In pursuit of this objective, the Army has no desire to push its own program wilfully but will continue to subordinate freely its own best opinion to whatever agreements may be reached through the machinery of unification.

Obviously, we must sacrifice and take costly action to meet the perilous demands of this hour. But as we build barricades against the dangers that confront us, our measures must always be in consonance with the long-range substance of our national health, our resources, and our beliefs. We dare not risk hasty action in fear, anger, injury, or panic. That is a time for deliberate judgment, for candor, for reason, for truth.

Of paramount concern in the minds of most men today is the march of communism with its threat to peace and freedom throughout the world. Communism contests the basic tenets of our democratic life and in practice today is using its power—secretly and openly—to undermine all efforts toward stable peace.

To adjudge the nature of this peril, we must view communism as a long-range project pursuing its objectives ruthlessly and expediently with power as well as conspiracy. Communism can shift in its day-to-day positions without swerving from its ultimate objectives. It can employ principles and labels, alliances and friendships, logic and treaties callously, recklessly, with indifference to truth and good faith.

For communism is a weapon clenched in the hands of a powerful few; it can be wielded without recourse to conscience, morality, or the will of its people. But even though the tactical advantages of communism are great ones, communism lacks the human spirit that a democracy acquires from the men whom it serves. It offers no sound social structure to the hungry and homeless so long as they are possessed of the instincts of civilized men. For communism is the abnegation of freedom, the repudiation of rights, the gallows on which freedom hangs in the nations of eastern Europe.

WOULD PROVE DEMOCRACY

Nevertheless, it faces us today—a power of formidable means—militarily strong, politically agile and crusading in its message. We have convincing reason to believe that it will desist from aggression only when free nations are united in arms and only when they are stoutly defended.

But armed force alone is not the final answer. We must demonstrate conclusively that democracy is more attractive, more progressive, more productive, and more resolute than any totalitarian system.

For communism is not only a manacle chained to the hands of unwilling states. It is a bait, a plausible bait to which millions of people have sprung in joblessness, despair, and hunger.

Knowing this, we cannot fight communism only with anticommunism. To be anti-Communist we must be consistently and courageously pro-Democratic in our preachments and practices throughout the world.

We must stand ready to champion human rights whenever they come in conflict with property, privilege, or prejudice—as readily as we would defend those rights from aggression and oppression.

I am convinced that the United States must stand plainly, and honestly before the entire world and say to free peoples everywhere that the measure of democracy is a man's personal freedom—that human rights must prevail against the State.

For only so long as freedom remains a force for human welfare, so long will men cherish freedom in their hearts and defend it with their lives.

From this fact there is derived the strength of our leadership in the world. From it, likewise, must that leadership be sustained.

We must not let the shape of this present danger, however serious, be allowed to warp or to misshape the foundations and the structure of our own good house. Ideals and principles rise high above the clouds of war and live on through destruction to guide humanity to a better future. They have a power in themselves, greater than that of the atom.

Our democracy is solidly built because it rests on human rights. But to make it last through the generations, to help it weather the storms that it must face, we must wisely and faithfully reinforce it—not only for our own protection and for our children's future, but for all the vast and fervent hopes of civilization.

The Tidelands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very vitally interested in the passage of H. R. 5992, generally known as the tidelands bill.

I represent an area which has one of the longest coast lines of any congressional district in the United States. Counting bays and inlets, I doubt if any district has more tideland area which, because of its peculiar productiveness, would be more affected by the legislation now under consideration.

I have naturally studied the many ramifications of the legal battle that has been raging since the so-called California tidelands case. The terminology in which the lawyers' comments are usually phrased is often difficult for lay minds to grasp. However, I have found a lawyer's opinion which is clear and concise and couched in language which can be understood even by those of us who do not have the benefit of a legal education. Therefore, I commend it to you and take pleasure in placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of the Honorable Manley O. Hudson, formerly judge of the World Court, as he

presented it to the Joint House and Senate Committee on Tidelands on February 25, 1948:

I am delighted to have this privilege once again of sitting down with a congressional committee. I have been honored by an invitation to appear before you today on behalf of the great State of Texas in support of 45 other States, and I have gladly accepted that invitation because of the significance of the issues which are now before the Congress.

I am one of the small group of men in this country who busy themselves with international law. The subject was one of my preoccupations when you, Mr. Chairman, and Senator DONNELL, and I were growing up in Missouri, almost 40 years ago. I have held a professorship of international law at Harvard for the past 25 years, though during 10 years of this period I served as Judge of the World Court at The Hague.

In the course of my professional activity, I have given attention to the congeries of problems associated with the term "marginal sea." I was a member of the American delegation at the International Conference on the Codification of International Law at The Hague in 1930, which dealt with the subject. In preparation for that conference, I was the Director of the Research in International Law organized in this country which drafted a convention on territorial waters, and I was interested to see that in United States against California the Supreme Court cited our draft. During the past few years, I have also participated in the discussions of this question at different times on behalf of several States. I recite these facts, Mr. Chairman, merely by way of setting forth my qualifications in assuming to take up any of the time of the committee.

Will you permit me, Mr. Chairman, to try to lay out the situation in which I think the Congress finds itself today. There are some aspects of the situation which bear on the conduct of our international relations, and in dealing with them I shall be only too happy if I can be of any assistance to the committee. Yet I think that we must bear it in mind that the law of nations has no application to the relations between our States and the Federal Government, nor does it regulate the relations between the Federal Government and our own citizens. It is a law governing relations between independent nations, and as such, it is useful in analyzing the Court's opinion in United States against California, and it may have some relevance to the problems presented by the proposed legislation which you are considering.

The Congress is now in this position. On October 27, 1947, the Supreme Court decreed it to be the law that:

"The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights, in and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward three nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein."

This applies only to the submerged lands on the California coast. It is a reversal of what all competent people had taken to be the law relating to those lands—that is a capital fact which I feel sure the Congress will have no disposition to ignore.

It is also a fact that our coastal States other than California now fear that their own submerged lands may be clouded by the fate as those of California—if I have not mistaken the situation, the Federal Government is about to initiate proceedings which may place those States in the same jeopardy as California. The result is a veritable pandemonium. The alarm is Nation-wide. 'The decree of last October has opened a Pandora's box from which germinating influences may spring to upset acquired titles and established procedures. These titles and procedures exist in vast areas of this country in which our citizens have been wont to invest their energy and their capital, not for one but for scores of phases of our national economy.

The necessity of some action by the Congress has been intimated by the Court itself. As I see it, two courses are open for you to pursue. Perhaps there are others, but I shall stick to the two which have been proposed to you.

One course would be for you to proceed to implement the decree of last October. As it related to the Federal Government, that decree stopped short with the declaration that the Federal Government is "possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands and minerals and other things underlying" California's marginal sea. It left in doubt the precise content of those paramount rights, of that dominion and power. Of course, it did not assume to say how the rights, the dominion, and the power will be exercised by the Federal Government. Nor did it lay down exact bases for a linear measurement of the coastal lands to which these rights and power will apply. We have the explanations supplied to us in the opinion of Mr. Justice Black which was adopted by a majority of the Court. It is a scintillating, a titillating, and some may say a speculating opinion, but it does not supply the answers to the problems I have stated. The Court itself assumed "that location of the exact coastal line will involve many complexities and difficulties" (p. 4).

Of course the decree of last October was in no way a pronouncement on the constitutional power of the Congress. That power remains wholly unaffected. Congress therefore has a free hand to decide upon the modalities which would enable the Federal Government to exercise its paramount rights, its dominion and power. Indeed, there can probably be no exercise of them without congressional authority, and I understand that a bill is now before the Congress to that end.

Instead of implementing the decree of last October, the Congress can adopt an alternative approach to the present problems. It can decline to continue the existing law as it has been declared. It can seek another solution as more in the public interest. It can forge the law of the future along lines different from those which have been laid down by the Court.

The adoption of this alternative course, which is embodied in S. 1988, would not reflect in any way on the prestige or authority of the Supreme Court. Nor would it set any new precedent. Indeed, quite recently, the Congress decided upon the adoption of a course alternative to that of implementing the law as laid down by the Supreme Court. In 1944, the Court declared in *United States* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association* (322 U. S. 533) that the Federal Government had a broad power to regulate insurance as interstate commerce; yet promptly in 1945 the Congress moved to declare that "the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest" (59 Stat. 33).

Let me also take from British history an example of legislative independence. Mr. Justice Black referred (p. 12) to the English case of *Queen* v. *Keyn* (L. R. 2 Exch. Div. 63), as having cast doubt as late as 1876 on the littoral state's dominion over the 3-mile belt. He could have added that soon after the decision was handed down, in which the fulminating opinions covered reams of paper, the British Parliament enacted corrective legislation because—in the words of John Bassett Moore—it "considered it imperative to adopt legislation nullifying its [the decision's] effect for the future, besides declaring it wrong as to the past" (Moore's Collected Papers, vol. 7, p. 294).

Now, if in its wisdom the Congress thinks it to be in the public interest, you are perfectly free to follow your insurance precedent of 1945, you are free to do what the British Parliament did in 1877, and nullify the effect of the California decree for the future, even if you do not declare that decision "wrong as to the past."

I have now outlined two alternative possible courses which have been proposed to the Congress: (1) to proceed to implement the law as promulgated in the decree of last October; (2) to lay down for the future the continuance of what was thought by Federal and State courts, by executive agencies of the Federal Government, and by the entire legal profession of the country to have been our law over a period of at least 100 years.

If I have accurately stated the alternatives before you—I repeat that I may not have exhausted the possibilities—I submit that your choice will be made, not so much on the law of the present or of the past, as on the basis of policy. You will appraise the whole situation as it has developed in the past, you will weigh the conflicting claims which are now advanced, you will take into account the varied interests of the Federal Government and the States and of many thousands of our citizens which are involved, you will appreciate the consternation and confusion which have been produced, and you will decide upon that course which in your judgment will best serve the interests of this country in the future which lies ahead of us. You have an opportunity to declare a policy which will meet our national needs, and to enact a law for the future which will bring about no "injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission." (Mr. Justice Black, at p. 19.)

Now in this confidence, Mr. Chairman, let me proceed to consider with the committee the pending bill, S. 1988. I find some significance in that number, Mr. Chairman. It reflects the nature of the choice which confronts you. You are to lay down the law which may regulate important segments of our national economy over the next 40 years—perhaps until the year 1988. I realize, that Thomas Jefferson limited his provision to 19 years, taking that as the period within which a majority of the adults living at any moment will have passed to their rewards. In the mechanistic age in which we live, I suggest that you need not be so modest—why not look forward 40 years?

Having the honor to appear here on behalf of Texas, I should like to descant upon its special position in this matter. What American is not fascinated by the rich history of that great State? Yet I must leave it to be developed before you by an expert—the able attorney general of the State. I shall content myself with some passing reference more especially to Texas' past international status as it relates to the matter under discussion.

For almost 10 years before its admission into the Union, Texas played a role—a creditable role, may I say—as an independent sovereign nation. In this, its position among our States is unique. As a part of Mexico before March 2, 1836, Texas had the gulfward boundary fixed by the Spanish law which continued to be in force in Mexico after the revolution there. That Spanish law was based upon the general principle of international law which prevailed throughout the Western World during the eighteenth century, that a littoral state has control of the seas bathing its coasts, at least to the extent of cannon range. That was a principle of the general law, and Spain gave effect to it, in its decrees and treaties of the

eighteenth century, by adopting a 6-mile limit for certain purposes (Fulton, Sovereignty of the Sea, p. 569); in later times it seems to have claimed a 5-mile limit around Cuba. So far as my researches go, Spain never adopted a 3-mile limit.

A few months after Texas declared its independence, the first Congress of the Republic fixed the gulfward limit of its territory at 3 leagues from shore. The action was not in violation of the international law of that time—indeed, it would not violate the international law of today, for the 3-mile limit now exists only as a minimum for the marginal sea and many countries now claim a wider belt. The Republic of Texas did not stop there, however. It drew its law of 1836 to the attention of certain other governments; and it is significant that thereafter, without advancing any objection to the 3-league limit, the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands recognized the Republic of Texas and made treaties with it.

When Texas was admitted into the Union in 1845, the resolution of Congress of December 29, 1845, approved the Texas Constitution of August 27, 1845, which in article 13 (2) continued in force the preexisting Texas laws, including the 1836 law on the 3-league limit. Moreover, that limit found confirmation when the United States concluded the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo with Mexico in 1848, for the treaty set the boundary between the United States and Mexico to "commence in the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land." Again, in the Gadsden Treaty of 1853 that provision was repeated.

Let me mention also that under the Spanish law in force in Texas from 1836 to 1866, the Republic and later the State, held title to all subsoil minerals. The release of title to private owners by the Texas constitution of 1866 did not apply to the minerals in submerged lands which Texas has never released to any sovereign or to any individual.

So much by way of a footnote to the history which has placed Texas in a special position. I shall not take time, at this point, to refer to the subsequent history.

Texas is not called upon at this time, however, to defend her special position. She has willingly joined with 45 other States in advocating the proposed legislation to clear up the clouds and confusions which result from the decree in *United States* v. *California*. She has joined with them in seeking from the Congress the establishment of a policy implemented by legislation which she believes to be in the interest not only of Texas, not only of the coastal States, but of the Nation as a whole.

In arriving at the formulation of such policy, I am sure the Congress will take account first of all of the history with regard to this matter. From a time which antedates the admission of Texas, it was deemed to be established in our law that the boundaries of the States along the sea were coterminous with those of the United States. This was phrased very aptly in the opinion of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts in *Commonwealth* v. *Manchester*, in 1890 (152 Mass. 230)—the case which was later before the United States Supreme Court—as follows:

There is no belt of land under the sea adjacent to the coast which is the property of the United States and not the property of the States.

Many States acted on this view, and I believe that I can safely say that the view was not doubted in any competent legal circle in this country until 1937. Yet I find in Mr. Justice Black's opinion the disturbing phrase "conceding that the State has been authorized to exercise local police-power functions in the part of the marginal belt within its declared boundaries" (p. 14). Are we to infer that in a part of the territory within its boundaries a State is limited to the exercise of "local police power?" That would be a doctrine of constitutional law which I never learned at school, which I had never even conjectured could be acceptable to American courts or American lawyers. The members of the committee can appreciate better than I what the folks at home may think of such a doctrine.

This raises the question of a littoral State's position in its marginal sea. Let me refer to international law for a moment, though in doing so I must repeat that international law does not govern the relations between our Federal Government and the States. International law has been clarified over the years. We had a useful international arbitration in 1909 between Norway and Sweden in the Grisbadarna case before a tribunal of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. In that case the tribunal referred to "the fundamental principles of the law of nations, both ancient and modern, in accordance with which the maritime territory is an essential appurtenance of land territory, whence it follows that at the time when, in 1658, the land territory called the Bohuslan was ceded to Sweden, the radius of maritime territory constituting an inseparable appurtenance of this land territory must have automatically formed a part of this cession." (Scott, Hague Court Reports, pp. 121, 127.)

Then we have the formulation of the principle by the International Conference on the Codification of International Law at the Hague in 1930; it reads as follows:

"The territory of a coastal state includes also the airspace above the territorial sea, as well as the bed of the sea, and the subsoil."

These are fairly representative statements as to the international law on the nature of the marginal sea. They express, also, the thought which has dominated our national life. As early as 1782 a committee of the Continental Congress referred to such parts of the sea adjacent to the coast as "are deemed appurtenant thereto." (Crocker, Marginal Sea, p. 630.) And in 1804, in *Church* v. *Hubbart* (2 Cranch 186), Chief Justice Marshall said that a "seizure of a vessel, within the range of cannon, by a foreign force, is an invasion of that territory" of the littoral nation. As a matter of international law, then, there can be no doubt that the littoral sovereign holds its marginal sea as part of its territory, as appurtenant to its land territory.

Now I think this conclusion may have some importance in considering the history of our national law on this matter. If the marginal sea is appurtenant to the land, it would seem that its status would not be different from that of the land, with respect to the relations between the Federal Government and the States. I repeat that this is a national, and not an international, matter—especially since we are dealing with lands inside the boundaries of both State and Nation. For 105 years, from 1842 to 1947, the Supreme Court had no doubt that the marginal sea was to be treated as the land itself, that it was a part of the littoral State's territory, appurtenant to its land territory, as subject to the sovereignty of the State as the land itself, but of course subject also to the delegated powers of the Federal Government as to such matters as defense, international relations, navigation, and admiralty and maritime jurisdiction.

A clear intimation of the Supreme Court's views came as early as 1828 in *Rhode Island* v. *Massachusetts* (12 Peters 657), when it said: "When a place is within the boundary, it is a part of the territory of a State; title, jurisdiction, and sovereignty are inseparable incidents."

In 1842, in *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Peters 367), it was said that in their sovereign character the people of each original State: "hold the absolute rights to all their navigable waters and the soils under them, for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the general Government."

Then in 1845 came *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 Howard 212), which reaffirmed the principle. Reaffirmations followed all through the years. I shall not burden you with the list, but I would mention specifically *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (1873) (18 Wallace 57); *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (1876) (94 U. S. 324); and *Illinois Central Railroad Co.* v. *Illinois* (1892) (146 U. S. 387). Let me pause here to quote from the last-named case:

"It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by tidewaters, within the limits of the several States, belong to the respective States within which they are found * * *, subject always to the paramount rights of Congress to control their navigation so far as may be necessary for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the States."

As late as 1935, in *Borax Consolidated* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10), Chief Justice Hughes said:

"The soils under tidewaters within the original States were reserved to them respectively, and the States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction in relation to such lands within their borders as the original States possessed."

It is an imposing array of pronouncements—as imposing for their consistency as for the repetition. Mr. Justice Black says, with becoming modesty, that the Court "has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then," that is over a period of a hundred years, "believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not" (p. 15). He could have added that for generations lawyers, good lawyers, careful lawyers, all over the country believed the same thing, that they advised their clients that such was the law, and that acting on that advice their clients invested millions of their money and years of their energy in improvements and installations.

Mr. Justice Black does not say, though I think it was contended before the Court, that these pronouncements were dicta. Certainly this was not true in *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois*, where the Court itself said:

"We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes applies, which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over the ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea, and that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other, and subject to the same trusts and limitations."

Yet let us suppose that the pronouncements were obiter, were not required for a decision on the issues presented. How does judge-made law grow? What is the path it takes? I suggest that its course often lies from dicta to dissent, and from dissent to decision. Let me put it in the words of the late Justice Holmes:

"One mark of a great lawyer [Holmes said] is that he sees the application of the broadest rules. There is a story of a Vermont justice of the peace before whom a suit was brought by one farmer against another for breaking a churn. The justice took time to consider, and then said that he had looked through the statutes and could find nothing about churns, and gave judgment for the defendant." (Holmes, "The Path of the Law," in Collected Legal Papers, p. 195).

Now let us look at Mr. Justice Black's approach. After 100 years of repetition and reiteration by the Court, "we are not persuaded," he says, "to transplant the rule of ownership as an incident of State sovereignty in relation to inland waters out into the soil beneath the ocean, so much more a matter of national concern." (p. 14). The figure of speech is engaging, though some of

us may have difficulty in seeing that the blank marginal sea outside of San Francisco Bay is more a matter of national concern than the bay and the beautiful structures which adorn it. Let us pass that point. One who studies the history of the matter must question the direction of the transplanting itself. Which was the idea transplanted by the Court during 100 years? Was the rule as to State ownership of the beds of navigable inland waters transplanted to the marginal sea? Or was not the rule as to ownership of the marginal sea transplanted to the navigable waters of the bays and rivers? I think even a casual reading of the judicial pronouncements will show it was the latter. In the English case of the Royal Fishery of the River Banne, decided in 1610 (80 Eng. Rep. 540), it was said:

"The reason for which the King hath an interest in such navigable river, so high as the sea flows and ebbs in it, is, because such river participates of the nature of the sea, and is said to be a branch of the sea so far as it flows."

To give an American interpretation to the same effect, the Supreme Court said in *Barney* v. *Keokuk* that the principles applicable to tidewaters "are equally applicable to all navigable waters." There is the progression. The original planting was in the marginal sea; the transplanting was in other navigable waters. Not from the inland waters to the marginal sea, but from the marginal sea and tidewaters to navigable waters inland.

One more point seems to be basic to the views adopted by a majority of the Court. Mr. Justice Black speaks of the "acquisition, as it were, of the 3-mile belt," (p. 13). One pauses over the words "as it were." Why not acquisition pure and simple? Was the insertion of these three words, which so constrict what follows, an afterthought? Was it due, one wonders, to the cogent statement by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in dissent that "ownership implies acquisition in the various ways in which land is acquired—by conquest, by discovery and claim, by cession, by prescription, by purchase, by condemnation?"

Now it was said that "acquisition, as it were, of the 3-mile belt [has] been accomplished by the national Government," and that "protection and control of it has been and is a function of national external sovereignty." It is true that Jefferson's proposal in 1793, following suggestions by Continental writers, had great influence in reducing the cannon-range test of the marginal sea to a 3-mile limit. That was the extent of his contribution, however. The cannon-range rule existed long before 1776, and Chief Justice Marshall referred in 1804, in the passage I quoted from *Church* v. *Hubbart*, not to a 3-mile rule, but to the cannon-shot rule as giving "territory to the littoral sovereign. I can only conclude that in 1776, before any "accomplishment by the national Government," the Original States were entitled to the marginal sea on their coasts.

The Court's dating of the acquisition after 1776 led to the enunciation of a principle which, so far as I know, is wholly new in our juristic thought. This is to the effect that "insofar as the Nation asserts its rights under international law, whatever of value may be discovered in the seas next to its shores and within its protective belt, will most naturally be appropriated for its use." (P. 13.) Our States have delegated to the Federal Government control of our international relations. This constitutional power it exercises for all the States and for all the people. Must its exercise be rewarded at the expense of the States, so that "whatever of value may be discovered" in consequence must be "appropriated" for the use of the Federal Government? To me this is a startling doctrine of public trust. The Government of the United States has just been engaged in a terrible war, conceived to have been fought in defense of every part of the United States. Its successful exercise of the constitutional war power has now made it possible for Americans to go back to their daily work unmolested by the Nazis and Fascists whom we overcame. The resumption of our normal lives meant that a few days ago an oil gusher was brought in in the West Texas field. Should this now be subject to appropriation for the use of the Federal Government because of its valiant discharge of its public trust? If so, the doctrine should be a bonanza to the lawyers of this country.

In our relations with other countries, the marginal sea comes down to us, Mr. Chairman, out of a long and tortuous international history. Within our own country, as between the Federal Government and the States, we dealt with our marginal seas along lines established by 170 years of our national thought and national history, without contestation and without dispute. So far as I have ever heard, the working of our Federal system in this regard produced no popular dissatisfaction, and it has never impeded the Federal Government in the discharge of its delegated powers. I think the history must weigh heavily with you in taking your decision as to what shall be the law in the future. Mr. Justice Frankfurter put this point very persuasively in his statement that "there are obviously at stake many far-reaching, complicated, historic interests, the proper adjustments of which are not readily resolved by the materials and methods to which this Court is confined." Naturally, therefore, he concluded, the Congress is the "appropriate agency" for the determination of the issue.

I have not dealt with all of the "far-reaching, complicated" questions with which you are faced. Some of the practical problems can better be discussed by the State officials whom you have heard or will hear. May I only repeat that Congress is not stymied by the law laid down in the decree of October 27 last.

I trust that I have not seemed to overemphasize the historical element in this picture. It can be outweighed only by the most convincing and the most impelling considerations of a nonlegal nature, and I believe you will not find such to exist. One hundred years of Supreme Court pronouncements under which we have lived and prospered in peace and in war, upon which our industries have flourished and our national economy has been based, present not only a sure guide for the future. They point also to the preservation of the Federal system which orders our national life. That is the heart of the case which the States present to you for the enactment of S. 1988.

Veterans' Homestead Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has today approved for reporting an amended version of H. R. 4488, the so-called veterans' homestead bill which would amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to permit the Veterans' Administrator to charter veterans' homestead associations, composed of at least five veterans, for the purpose of providing housing for veterans. Substantial aid would be given multiunit housing to be sold to or rented by individual veterans. Average cost of each family unit limited to $10,000. Authority expires July 25, 1957.

Individual single-unit houses could be built by associations and sold to an individual veteran provided outside financing was obtained. Homestead associations could not supply the permanent financing of individual units.

Association financing to be obtained from Veterans' Administrator at not more than one-fourth of 1 percent more than he is required to pay Secretary of the Treasury for the capital required. Loans may be amortized over 40 years for rental multiunit housing and 32 years for housing held on a mutual or cooperative basis.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to advance the following amounts: $1,000,000,000 per year for 5 years to Veterans' Administrator for loans to veterans homestead associations and such other sums as are necessary to maintain a restricted secondary market for future title III home and farm loans; $750,000,000 for 5 years for Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, building and loan associations and similar institutions to make loans of $9,000 or less more readily available to veterans—preference to be given in distribution to those institutions in areas needing capital expansion for veterans' housing and willing to make 100 percent loans to veterans; $100,000,000 for 5 years to Secretary of Agriculture — acting through Federal land-bank loans or Farmers Home Administration loans—to provide farm-loan financing to veterans. All of the above, except funds for Federal Works Administrator, are on a revolving fund basis and no direct appropriation is required; $200,000,000 to Federal Works Administrator for grants on the customary 50 percent matching basis, for sewer, water, and like facilities required for the veterans' housing.

Incontestability clause for GI loan guaranties is included to encourage participation in loan program. This incontestability clause carries out the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Housing, which has, as you know, gone so thoroughly into this problem.

The only nonreimbursable expenditure required will be the $200,000,000 for the use of the Federal Works Administrator in providing grants to the States in the construction of public and community facilities needed by the various homestead associations.

This bill also relies almost entirely on the individual enterprise and initiative of veterans working in their home communities, and contemplates their ability to provide housing for themselves, including rental housing at net prices considerably below comparable current offerings.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held numerous hearings on this subject, and has had the advice and counsel of every agency of the Federal Government concerned with housing. The bill which was approved by the committee today contains many changes from the original draft, and it is believed by all those participating in the formulation of the bill that it goes far toward offering a solution for the tremendous need

for veterans' housing. Up to the present time the vast majority of World War II veterans have had little real help in obtaining homes. This bill is designed to correct that situation. I firmly believe it is the only legislation now pending which will enable these veterans, who comprise at least 80 percent of all our veterans, to acquire homes on terms which they can afford.

Oil Shortage Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over Station KSL on April 20, 1948:

During the war period we accepted the shortage of many everyday items as a war necessity. If we could not buy enough meat or gasoline we reassured ourselves that when the war was over we would again enjoy the privilege of buying in a normal market, unrestricted by rationing.

In the intermountain States the official removal of rationing restrictions has permitted our return to living, as usual, that is, we can buy in accord with our taste and pocketbook. However, many of the people in these United States are not so fortunate.

Do you know that for the past 2 years gasoline and fuel oil have been rationed to the millions of people living on the Atlantic seaboard? The lack of gasoline for pleasure driving is an inconvenience which does not seriously impair the health or security of our people. On the other hand, when a shortage of fuel oil makes it impossible to adequately heat our homes and offices we are faced with a serious situation. During the past severe winter the fuel oil shortage became so acute that many homes were entirely without heat for prolonged periods. In some areas, schools, churches, and public buildings were closed because oil was not available for heating.

Undoubtedly you are asking why? What is responsible for this condition? We usually associate shortage with a cutting of supply. However, such is not the case in this instance since figures indicate an ever-increasing production, but that increase has been more than offset by an expanding demand. You will be astonished to learn that the per capita consumption of petroleum products in the United States for the year 1947 was 608 gallons, while in the year 1938 the per capita consumption was only 367 gallons.

Let me tell you some of the reasons for increased consumption.

There are 1,000,000 more passenger cars on the road than there were in 1941.

There are 1,633,000 more trucks on the road than there were in 1941.

There are 38,600 more busses on the road than there were in 1941.

There are 1,000,000 more tractors on farms than there were in 1941. The agricultural gasoline consumption has doubled from 1941 to 1946.

Diesel-oil purchases by the railroads for the first half of 1947 are up 42 percent from the corresponding period of 1946. Furthermore, 92 percent of all locomotives on order by railroads are Diesels.

Fuel oil used in generating electricity by utilities for the first half of 1947 was up 46 percent above the first half of 1946.

The fact is that consumption is higher for the year 1947 than it was at the peak year of the war—1945. Today we are using more oil and oil products than the entire world used before the start of World War II. In 1946, 6 percent of the world's population, that is the United States, consumed nearly 65 percent of all the oil produced.

Now let us take a look at our oil production. In 1937 we produced 1,279,000,000 barrels of oil. In 1945, the peak war year, we produced 1,714,000,000 barrels of oil. In 1947 we produced 1,856,000,000 barrels of oil—an increase of 8 percent over the 1945 production peak.

During the past 10 years our production has increased 31 percent, while our demand has increased 42 percent; and the present trend indicates that consumption will far outrun any foreseeable production increase.

By way of quieting any rumors as regards our exports, let me say here that our imports and exports are practically in balance.

The story thus far has presented only the need and supply of peacetime requirements. There is one other source of consumption that we must not overlook and that is the military demand. Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, recently told a congressional committee that, and I quote:

"Petroleum is the primary source of motive power for military forces. * * * In World War II our armament depended on oil * * * the volume of liquid fuel shipped overseas was nearly 16 times that of food. * * * During the last war the peak consumption of oil for military purposes and the programs supported by the military was 1,375,000 barrels a day."

In speaking of future need, Secretary Forrestal said, and I quote again:

"It now appears that the United States military and civilian needs for a major war effort would exceed by at least 2,000,000 barrels a day the foreseeable production from the continental United States."

Oil is our most quickly depleted natural resource and there is no reuse of "scrap." Because of the speed with which it can be withdrawn it is essential to find new oil fields each year to keep up reserves of oil that would otherwise be diminishing. Most of the oil structures that are easily recognizable have been tested. For several years the rate of new oil fields discovered has been less than required to maintain reserves.

In view of our serious petroleum situation, that is, rapid increased consumption as against depleting oil reserves, it is necessary that we take immediate action to make available adequate oil supplies for known but undeveloped sources.

In the interest of our present needs and future national security I have introduced a bill, known as H. R. 5814, to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the State of Utah for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal.

As far back as 1920 personnel of the Bureau of Mines and students of the University of Utah completed experiments which revealed that Utah bituminous coals yield from 30 to 45 gallons of excellent oil per ton. And one body of coal in southern Utah, which is yet untouched, yields from 65 to 80 gallons of oil per ton. These oils extracted from the coal have been refined into excellent motor fuels and other oil products. The patents for these processes have been offered to our Government if it will but utilize this source of oil supply.

Contrary to popular opinion this processing is not expensive, it will give us oil for $1.50 to $2 per barrel. If the semicoke byproduct were sold at the same price per ton, and well it might be, as raw coal at the coal mines, this byproduct credit would more than charge off the entire cost of oil processing.

I want to make it clear at this point that this semicoke product, aside from being a smokeless fuel, is easier to ignite and regulate than raw coal, and that it gives 20 percent more heat per ton. Further, it is said to be superior to coal for use in all domestic appliances.

America's fear of an oil shortage can be quickly overcome by extracting untold billions of barrels of oil from vast beds of oil-rich coal in Utah. It is estimated that in Utah alone there is enough oil-rich coal to supply the Nation's current needs for 200 years; and if, after removing the oil, the semicoke residue were converted into gas for synthesis of liquid fuels, then this coal resource would supply all the motor fuels for the United States for 500 years.

I trust that I have answered the question—why an oil shortage exists. That shortage can be overcome if my bill for the production of oil from coal is approved, and I hope that Utah will become the pioneer State in developing a new source of petroleum supply.

Communistic Infiltration in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, again I ask permission to include in my extension of remarks the seventh of a series of eight articles written by Gustaf A. Nordin, of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch. The previous six articles have proven to be of great interest to my colleagues in the House. I am sure this article will prove to be of equal interest in further revealing the communistic infiltration in the State Department.

"AMERICA'S VOICE" HELD DOMINATED BY RED FACTION

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The New York headquarters of the State Department's Office of Information and Educational Exchange, which controls all news material on the "Voice of America" program beamed to Europe, virtually has been taken over by "fellow travelers, pseudo-liberals, and outright Communists," according to a House committee investigation not yet disclosed to the public.

On the basis of the information written into the 40,000-word House Appropriations Committee document, the international information division is dominated by questionable security risks.

News broadcasts keyed to both western and eastern Europe are twisted to include Communist propaganda, it is charged.

"Daily Guidance Bulletins" are circulated among the employees, instructing them how to follow a certain line, and often it allegedly follows the Communist Party line.

United States foreign policy is put in a bad light, while the Rusisan policy is apparently given every possible break except when a Government investigation is underway, it is indicated in the report. If someone is investigating, the broadcasts improve.

It is claimed that a woman—No. 78—is the "moving spirit" behind the "closely knit sect, the members of which protect each other and continuously assail anyone who dares to disagree with their way of thinking."

She is described as the spearhead and dominant leader of this group.

No. 78 "is responsible for the control of script and news material which is used in the broadcasts of Voice of America programs and is in charge of the policy control desk

which acts as a clearing house or monitoring desk for all scripts which are used on the broadcasts to Europe."

"It has been obvious," the agent reports, "that the script which is cleared through the policy control desk has, from time to time, been altered or changed in a very subtle way and that it has been noticed that the alteration is invariably favorable to the Soviet Union or to the Communist Party line in the United States."

Other employes contend that "it is unhealthy to oppose" this clique.

EISLER STUDENT

No. 79, holding a ranking position in this office, studied music in the New School for Social Research in 1938 under Hans Eisler, who was recently deported. It is pointed out that this association may have been a mutual interest in music and nothing more.

No. 81 reportedly "stands high in Communist circles." The report ties him to several Communist meetings, after one of which he was arrested for disorderly conduct. He was formerly with OWI, then transferred to the New York office of OIE. The list of close associates within this clique goes on in the report, but there is much similarity.

An investigating agent made this comment in compiling the House document.

"It would appear that No. 78 belongs to a rather closely knit group of individuals, superior and subordinate to her, and constituting a substantial part of the employees of the policy information desk * * * This group * * * is unfortunately placed in the most critical positions in the international broadcasting division. This group, especially No. 78, is charged with the responsibility of composing daily guidance bulletins which instruct all the various desks as to the type of material to be used in the daily broadcasts abroad, indicating which material should be stressed, played up to, or modified."

A year ago the following change took place in a commentary dealing with the new youth directive regarding Germany, according to the House document:

The original script read—"But democracy is not a doctrine as national socialism was a doctrine. Democracy means basically nothing else but the honest acceptance of a handful of rules for life in the community."

It was changed to read—"Contrary to national socialism, democracy is not a doctrine; basically, democracy means only the honest acceptance of a handful of rules for Communist life."

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark.:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

This discussion is not over limited aid to a comparatively small number of schools. On the contrary I am referring to the various and persistent attempts to pass legislation to provide Federal aid for all public schools in all the States of the Union.

I am not referring to any particular bill since there are usually several introduced each year and since they carry largely the same provisions.

Some of the people supporting present bills frankly admit that these represent only a beginning, while increasing amounts of aid would be expected to follow rapidly after the principle had been adopted. Those acquainted with how Federal projects grow and grow and grow would naturally expect the Federal Government within a decade or so to be carrying the chief burden of public education and making all the decisions of policy.

There are also certain leaders who believe that private schools, now educating half of our children, should be largely eliminated. It is not difficult to visualize, after the nationalization of the public-school system (and in view of recent Supreme Court decision making the teaching of religion under any circumstances illegal in the public schools), that legislation would be sought requiring all students to attend public schools for the purpose of national indoctrination.

Consequently, what we are really discussing now is whether or not we want to exchange our present public-school system, with locally controlled public schools, and a large number of private or church related schools, for one nationally financed and nationally controlled educational system. To such a change there are many and serious objections of which I want to discuss two.

TOO MUCH WASTE

First, such a change would create an almost unbearable financial burden. The Federal Government of the United States does not have a good record for economical operation of anything. Moreover, the longer any political organization operates the more hangers-on it tends to accumulate.

It could hardly be expected that a federally operated school system would function any more efficiently than does the Federal civil service. Yet the waste of manpower and treasure therein is common knowledge. Some experts believe that the civil service pay rolls should be cut down by 50 percent and that greater efficiency would be obtained thereby. Scarcely any informed person will argue that the civil service pay roll could not be reduced by one-third.

It is reported that each employee on the Federal pay roll should be able to bring in from 5 to 10 votes at election time. This might be one reason that it is always so difficult to reduce the number of people on Government salaries. Should our public school system become federally controlled I would definitely expect it to become a very wasteful operation. If the waste became only one-third of the costs that might well be anticipated the waste alone could well amount to $2,000,000,000 a year. (Most American Indians are educated in Federal schools. The cost per student is several times greater than in our present public schools, which proves my contention.)

Since we already have such a heavy national debt that there is some concern as to whether or not we shall meet present obligations and maintain the stability of our economic order, it is assuredly to the interest of the Nation that we keep control in our educational system as close as possible to the people being served and paying the bills, which means local, county and State management.

THE ANEMIC STATES

It is sometimes argued that the poorer States are not able to support an adequate educational program within their own borders. But sending our money to Washington and having it sent back is a poor way to help. If the Federal Government would eliminate its own present wasteful spending and reduce income taxes by only 10 percent that alone would help even the poor States much more than passing back to them this present proposed aid. For the Federal Government to take from Arkansas $98,000,000 a year in income taxes and then offer back $6,000,000 in aid because of Arkansas's poverty doesn't make sense. It sounds about as reasonable as if a doctor should drain three quarts of blood from a man and then exclaim, "Why you look anemic. I am sorry for you. Out of my well-known liberality I am going to give you a half-pint of blood."

NO MONEY IN WASHINGTON

It should be remembered that Washington has no money to give anybody. Washington can only tax the States to get money with which to aid the States. We should remember, moreover, that such aid will always be weighted with a group of bureaucrats and political hangers-on, to be paid by the same States that are getting the aid. So, in the name of economy and common sense, let us keep local responsibility and operate as economically as possible.

FEDERAL CONTROL

In the second place, Federal aid would mean undesirable Federal controls. All declarations to the contrary notwithstanding, controls do go with financial assistance, and our Federal Government has no record to the contrary. In fact, the Supreme Court of the United States has already declared, in the case of farm subsidies, that the Federal Government may control that which it subsidizes.

We can all remember when, at election time, WPA workers were told, "Remember who your friends are when you vote."

The Supreme Court was supposed to be above political pressure, but most of us can remember a great deal of talk about "packing the Supreme Court." To believe that Federal aid would carry no Federal control is to be extremely naive.

When Federal aid bill S. 637 was being debated on the floor of the Senate, it was amended to control not only the aid offered therein but to control that which it supplemented.

When we recall powerful efforts witnessed in our own generation to get political influence into nearly every American institution, it doesn't take much imagination to see Federal control of the American school system following any general Federal-aid program.

Should America nationalize her educational system it is my conviction that such a move would within one generation be followed by the nationalization of American industry, distribution, and agriculture. I would look upon the nationalization of American education as a decisive step in the development of the totalitarian state.

THE ONE NATION

At this point we should remember that the one nation among the Allies which was able to arm itself for war against the Axis Powers was not a socialized state. The one nation able moreover to loan arms to its allies in that was not a socialized state. The one country now being called upon to help all the rest of the world is not a socialized nation. The one nation with the greatest educational system in the world and now providing higher education for more young people than all the rest of the world put together is not a socialized state. I am not one of those who believe that in order to remain great we must now suddenly discard the way of life that made us great.

THE BRITISH EXAMPLE

Just 2 years after England voted to nationalize her industries she was forced to vote power to the Government to tell any man or woman (with certain exceptions) where to work and what to do, with penalties for disobedience or absenteeism. We want none of it. But if we nationalize our educational system, it is my guess we will get all of it.

ARKANSAS CAN

As an Arkansas citizen I am fully aware of our own educational problems in one of the poorest States. But we have tripled our

per capita income since 1939. Many scores of new industries have been started in the State and we can support an adequate school system. What Arkansas needs most is a suitable reorganization of her own outmoded system rather than Federal aid to support a badly organized system.

DREAMERS DREAM

The day will never come in this Nation or any other when the dreamers can't dream up more plans to spend money on social projects and on education than this Nation or any nation can afford. Comparatively speaking, America is already spending far more for education and providing higher education for far more people than any socialized state has yet dreamed of.

THE REAL NEED

What America actually needs today is deep moral purpose in her educational program rather than a more extravagant system. While educational advantages have increased greatly over the past 40 years the juvenile crime wave has increased just as fast. While 30 years ago we thought education was the answer to juvenile delinquency we are now disillusioned. The nearer to the soil are the controls of education, the greater degree of moral purpose it has, judging from 300 years of experience in our own country.

Our grammar schools are controlled from the bottom. Those whose only training has been there are most unanimous in their desire to keep the fundamentals of our American way of life. It is in our higher institutions of learning, whose control is farthest from the people who finance them that we find the greatest percentage of students affected by foreign ideologies that would destroy our own way of life.

Individual freedom is the foundation of American prosperity. Federal aid would contribute to a final about-face in a system which has succeeded in making America the most desirable place in the world in which to live. May we with courage determine to pass on to our children the great heritage of freedom which our fathers so proudly passed to us.

Tidelands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify before public hearings several weeks ago, affirming Maryland's opposition to the tidelands decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *California*, and I rise today in support of H. R. 5992, confirming and establishing titles of States to lands beneath navigable water within State boundaries, and natural resources within such lands and waters, and providing for use and control of said land and resources.

I have always supported legislation providing for State ownership and shall vote today for full State ownership of submerged lands and the power to use such lands in any manner that does not interfere with constitutionally delegated Federal powers.

The State of Maryland owns approximately 1,600,000 acres of submerged lands of which substantially all is covered by the tidal waters of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. In addition, the State owns 61,440 acres of submerged land on the Atlantic Coastal Plain within 3 miles of the shore. In and around the city of Baltimore millions of dollars have been invested in port facilities in reliance on ownership of the submerged lands by the State. During 173 years the State of Maryland and its citizens have derived great benefit from the submerged lands belonging to the State. There are 275,000 acres of oyster beds, of which 8,638 have been leased for a period of 20 years to private oyster growers. The oyster bottoms not under private cultivation are being cultivated by the State for the public. The State of Maryland derives each year from the fish, crab, and oyster industries conducted on the submerged lands belonging to the State approximately $110,000, and the State appropriates each year for the promotion and development of the oyster and fish industries the sum of approximately $500,000.

In the brief time permitted me, I cannot discuss the law involved in the California tidelands case. But suffice it to say, this decision disregards the rule of property law that is as old as our Nation itself. In fact, the whole theory of Federal and State relationship is violated by this extraordinary decision, and I share and wish to express the amazement and resentment of the people and the public officials of Maryland over it, and this new ideology of government which would establish and enable the Federal Government to confiscate the tidelands and submerged lands within the boundaries of our State or any State in the Union.

There is involved in this matter much more than meets the eye—much more, perhaps, than can even be dreamed of. Only last week we read in the press of the recent discovery of significant geological structures underlying the Continental Shelf from 20 to 75 miles from shore in the Gulf of Mexico, and that these structures may, like the similar domes lying inland from the Gulf, contain vast stores of petroleum recoverable by modern drilling techniques.

Unless the tidelands decision is refuted by the Congress, what is there to prevent the Federal Government from asserting paramount rights in and power over all of the lands of the different States, whether they be submerged lands of the Atlantic Coastal Plain and the Chesapeake Bay, or whether they be in the beds of the Gulf of Mexico, adjacent to Texas.

If the United States can take from the States the title of the land under navigable waters, or assert paramount rights thereto, then the Federal system and the rights of the sovereign States under that system will become a mockery. Our last vestige of the Federal system created by the Constitution will be gone. For these reasons, and being a believer in States' rights, I cannot urge too strongly the passage of this legislation recognizing and affirming State ownership of these tidelands, submerged lands, and their natural resources to the States in accordance with their heretofore long-recognized rights.

History Begins To Measure Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution, entitled "History Begins to Measure Roosevelt."

When the final chapter is written I am sure that it will be clear that Roosevelt was one of the truly great personalities of our generation and the greatest leader of our time.

HISTORY BEGINS TO MEASURE ROOSEVELT

(By Ralph McGill)

"A tree is measured best when it is down."

History has begun to measure Franklin D. Roosevelt. There are many persons trying to measure him in many ways. Some seek to belittle him. Some, perhaps, exaggerate.

But the inexorable slide rule of history does not err.

Two events have occurred which indicate this historical measure. Both redound to the credit of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Memoirs of Winston Churchill are appearing in Life magazine. In the second installation of the issue now current (and these memoirs should be required reading), Britain's vital war leader gives as his studied opinion that had it not been for lack of vision on the part of Neville Chamberlain, Franklin D. Roosevelt might well have halted the rush toward war in 1938, and might even have prevented it.

BOLDNESS

Roosevelt (and this even his critics will admit) was not a provincial. He knew geography in terms of geopolitics. He knew the meaning of world currents and events. He knew if a world war came we could not avoid it. So, he moved with characteristic boldness.

Mr. Churchill reveals that in January of 1938, Franklin D. Roosevelt sent a secret message to Mr. Chamberlain, Sumner Wells being its bearer. The President was worried about the deterioration of the international situation and was proposing in the secret message, that he sponsor a meeting in Washington of certain governments to discuss the situation. But first, he wanted to know Britain's attitude toward the proposal. Germany would have been invited and could not have refused. Italy also would have been put on the spot, here on the greatest sounding board in the world insofar as information is concerned.

REBUFF

Chamberlain rebuffed the invitation, almost rudely, out of his own vanity and inexplicable self-confidence. It was this almost childishly impetuous course which was hastening the resignation of Secretary Attlee. Mr. Churchill comments on the disaster of the rebuff, and on the high statesmanship and courage of Roosevelt, and concludes, without reservation, that no event could have been more likely to have held off, or even prevented, war than the arrival of the great power of the United States in the circle of Europe's growing tensions. The rebuff, he says, even after all these years, still leaves one breathless with amazement.

Chamberlain proceeded on to Munich and war.

PREPARED

And Roosevelt, rebuffed, nevertheless saw what was coming and moved on to the 40 destroyers deal, to lend-lease and to selec-

tive service. When war did come, we were at least started with preparation. How much he dared may be seen in the fact that less than a week before Pearl Harbor the extension of selective service passed an isolationist Congress by one lone vote.

So much for that. History has begun to measure in another field.

SOCIALISTS

France is the key to Europe. The Communists are strongest there in the labor movement. The French Socialist Party, unfortunately for us and for western civilization generally, has become a white-collar party.

It became so in the same years that Franklin D. Roosevelt was dealing with like developments. The real collapse of the French Socialist Party, and the success of the Communists, began with the same sort of situations in French labor circles as this country saw in the creation of the CIO. French labor was organized in the fields largely untouched by craft unions.

The French Socialists, led by Blum, withdrew from the French developments, crying out that it was an effort to embarrass the Socialist government of Leon Blum.

The Communists gleefully took full control, with the results we have today.

ROOSEVELT

One of the clubs with which the critics of Franklin D. Roosevelt belabor him is the fact that he took over political direction of the CIO.

History, always patient, now begins to demonstrate the wisdom of that, and the benefits of it for the United States and for labor. If the Roosevelt administration had withdrawn from it, and opposed it, there would have been some group to take over control. Seeing how successfully the Communists infiltrated into some few CIO unions, we now know what would have happened had Roosevelt acted as did Blum. We would not now have labor opposing communism and Wallace's third party. We would have had a third party long ago, with considerable strength, and with Communist control.

History records that Franklin D. Roosevelt's bold action was not merely wise, but of great value to this country. The world was in revolution. Measured by our status quo standards of time, Roosevelt's move was radical. We now see it was conservative and is producing today, in anti-Wallace and anti-Communist strength, conservative reactions when measured by world events.

"A man is measured best when he is down."

Dr. Townsend for Wallace Party, According to Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, about 1 year ago I called to the attention of the House facts which caused me to believe that Dr. Francis E. Townsend was following the definite left wing—Moscow party line—in the United States. I served notice to the Members of this House that in my opinion this so-called, or self-styled pension leader was using the just and good old-age pension cause as a bait to induce people, or should I say dupe innocent and unsuspecting citizens to support left-wing radicalism in the United States. I have been criticised by Dr. Townsend and some of his followers for my action. However, I have not noted any change in what I have been able to discern of the policy of either the doctor or his radical paper, the Townsend National Weekly.

That I was correct in my former statements, and that this so-called Townsend movement is merely a front for Communists and fellow travelers is made more apparent now by published statements carried in the public press which link the doctor and his organization along with the Communists and others in support of their Henry Wallace for President. One of these published reports appeared in the April 28 issue of the Baltimore Sun and is as follows:

DR. TOWNSEND FOR WALLACE—OLD-AGE PENSION ADVOCATE ENDORSES THIRD PARTY

(By Howard Norton)

MOLINE, ILL., April 27.—Unqualified indorsement of Henry A. Wallace and his third party by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, originator of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions, is contained in a written statement from Dr. Townsend, released here today by Wallace's tour headquarters.

Written in the venerable doctor's own shaky hand, the statement, addressed "to Townsendites everywhere," reads:

"Since Henry A. Wallace has had the initiative and courage to propose a new political alinement of the people, free from the domination of the great financial interests with their powers over the press and other means of communication, I believe it to be the course of wisdom for all to support with all our political strength the new party of which he is the leader."

STATEMENT PREPARED APRIL 11

The statement was prepared by Dr. Townsend on April 11, in the course of his stay in Chicago during the meeting of the national Wallace-for-President Committee there.

It was given by the pension-plan leader to Mrs. Isabel Lurie, of Topeka, Kans., director of the third-party movement in that State.

The purpose of the statement, according to Mrs. Lurie, was to assist her in securing the cooperation of Kansas Townsendites in circulating third-party petitions.

The statement was made public today after Wallace managers were apprised that certain Townsendite publications last week printed what purported to be denials by Dr. Townsend that he had ever expressed support of Wallace.

United States on the Side Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 24, 1948:

UNITED STATES ON THE SIDE LINES

Two months from today 35 nations will meet in the historic Palais des Nations in Geneva for the first World Health Assembly. A representative of the United States will be present, but he will sit on the sidelines as an observer. For while the United States has joined all of the other eight specialized agencies of the United Nations, the House of Representatives has not as yet ratified our participation in the World Health Organization. We took the initiative in the conception of the WHO at the San Francisco conference and in its organization at a New York conference last year, but at Geneva we will have no voice in the selection of a Director General or a permanent site for the organization and will not help plan its global programs of tuberculosis control, venereal disease control, and health protection for mothers and children.

As usual, that day the "Voice of America" will be beamed to all Europe to tell them of the American way of life and our desire that the remainder of the world have those benefits which the democratic way of living has given us. But while representatives of the U. S. S. R., Yugoslavia, the Ukraine and 32 other nations sit around conference tables planning a health program for the world, the "Voice of America" will not be heard. The failure of the House of Representatives to act on the participation of the United States will save the people of this country approximately 1½ cents per person this year, but will give the eastern European countries unchallenged access to the world's greatest forum on health.

The Tidelands Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the bill now being debated by the House has been fully explained. The issue is clear: Should the Federal Government, at this late hour, insist upon title to our coastal tidelands that has throughout our history been recognized as belonging to the respective States?

In June of last year the Supreme Court handed down a decision in the celebrated California case that seriously threatened the validity of such title. This bill would remove that cloud and confirm title in the States.

Texas, which has a tremendous coastline, retained ownership in its public domain when it entered the Union. The term public domain has been held to mean all of the lands not privately owned at the time of annexation, including the land under the sea along the coastline. At least that was the understanding for a hundred years. This has been a legacy of almost priceless value to the people of Texas.

Income from such submerged lands has helped support our public schools, and oil developments from the public lands has given our State university one of the richest endowments of any similar institution in the Nation. Oil discovered on public lands covered by salt water has given our public domain value not dreamed of a hundred years ago when the Congress in effect relinquished claim to it rather than assume a $10,000,000 debt owed by the Republic of Texas.

The original constitution of Texas which Congress approved had this provision relative to property rights:

The rights of property and of action which have been acquired under the Constitution and laws of the Republic of Texas shall not be divested * * * but the same shall

remain precisely in the situation which they were before the adoption of this constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what were those boundaries then defined? While Texas was an independent nation, the Texas Congress established its boundaries, as follows:

Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River running south and west along the Gulf of Mexico three leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande, thence up the principal stream of said river.

It thus appears crystal clear that at the time of annexation of Texas the United States confirmed in Texas a right not only to the marginal coastal area, but even to the three leagues adjoining the coastal line. And despite this evidence of title to the tidelands, the Federal Government, as a result of the Supreme Court decision last year, is asserting a claim to those lands.

All revenue from tidelands oil leases goes to our permanent school fund in Texas. The value of these contested lands has been estimated at $1,000,000,000. So Texas has a tremendous stake in this legislation, as do all States regardless of their location. The basic rights of individual States against Federal encroachment are involved.

By this bill the Congress will reaffirm a historically recognized fact and will give the various States a quitclaim deed to the marginal sea. It should be enacted and forever remove any question or doubt from the subject of State ownership of submerged lands and tidelands.

Defense of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Great Council of Virginia, Improved Order of Red Men, assembled at Old Point Comfort, Va. I would like to call to the attention of the House a resolution adopted by that organization concerning its stand against communism and other ideologies which threaten our democracy. The resolution is as follows:

GREAT COUNCIL OF VIRGINIA,
IMPROVED ORDER OF RED MEN,
Norfolk, Va., April 24, 1948.

The Great Council of Virginia, Improved Order of Red Men, in great council session assembled at Old Point Comfort, Va., on the 22d day of April 1948, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Improved Order of Red Men, strictly an American order in origin and founded upon the principles of freedom and patriotism; and

"Whereas dictatorships have thrown down the challenge to democracy, and the time has come when we, as Improved Order of Red Men, must prove ourselves worthy of our heritage as defenders of democracy; and

"Whereas we believe the upholding of these principles to be the foundation upon which our democracy was builded: Therefore, be it

"Resolved—First. That the activities of any person or organization which would deprive this country of these principles of freedom, secured by our forefathers, be condemned.

"Second. That the menace of communism throughout the world, whose object is the overthrow of democracy and the suppression of freedom of thought and the expression thereof through a controlled and censored press, be heartily condemned.

"Third. That we, as Improved Order of Red Men, reaffirm our belief in these principles of freedom and democracy upon which our order was founded and rededicate ourselves to the defense of these principles by the utilization of all means at our command."

JAMES Y. OLD,
Great Chief of Records (Secretary), Great Council of Virginia, Improved Order of Red Men.

Farm Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, all through the war our farmers worked, day and night, to meet the staggering demands for food from our armed forces and from all our allies. We also sent uncounted millions of dollars worth of so-called lend-lease food to an ungrateful and treacherous Soviet Russia.

We promised our farmers that, as soon as the war was over, they would get the farm machinery they needed and which they so patiently had waited for. I do not have to tell my colleagues that we are still a long way off from fulfilling that promise.

I must ask, however, how it happens that we are now planning to ship $122,100,000 of agricultural machinery abroad. I raise this question because I understand that one European nation alone is about to be given more than half of all this agricultural machinery. Believe it or not, under the ERP schedules, France and her colonies are down for no less than $55,200,000 and $8,100,000 of farm machinery, respectively, or a total of $63,300,000. All the other nations must share less than France takes alone.

By comparison, may I point out that that agricultural nation, Italy, is down for only $1,700,000 worth of American farm machinery. Mr. Speaker, the French requirements seem so grossly out of line that someone must have padded those requirements, beyond rhyme or reason.

This House cannot forget that the French farmers, during the seeding season 1946–47, took a million acres of wheat out of production. And that at a time when our American farmers were breaking their backs to meet the world's food needs.

Why, I ask, should we now take critically needed American farm machinery from our loyal American farmers in order to flood France with agricultural machinery? Not only that, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, as now shown by the official ERP commodity schedules, that the French during the next 15 months—when we are shipping them our farm machinery—plan to export agricultural machinery in the amount of $17,500,000.

Could it be that the French expect to export some of the machinery they receive from this country into those countries dominated by Russia?

The United States News of April 30, 1948, reports that the value of British exports is close to the highest level ever reached. They are exporting automobiles, and farm machinery to this country. This could not be done unless they were receiving similar material under ERP free of charge. We are paying good American dollars for what they export to this country. A leading British firm just accepted an American firm's order for 45,000 light tractors. This would amount to $50,000,000 and is the biggest ever placed by America for British goods.

The President has indicated that Czechoslovakia should be permitted to receive exports from this country under the Geneva agreement. This country has already opened up trade agreements with the Belgians, Britain, and France. Certainly these exports will find their way to help strengthen the communistic economy of Russia. There is no iron curtain on exports to Poland. They want and are getting farm machinery and electrical equipment from the West. All of this, Mr. Speaker is made possible by the passage of ERP.

I am hoping that the Appropriations Committee will look into some of these strange deals of shipping our farm machinery and other essentials to Europe and the communistic countries, and at the same time deny our farmer the right to priority that he so fully deserves. I shall continue to lift my voice in opposition to that strange plan of bleeding this Nation white and denying the American farmer the machinery and oil which is necessary to produce food to feed the world.

In Memory of William Tyler Page

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on the morning of last Sabbath, April 25, 1948, to attend a dedication service at Saint Columba's Episcopal Church, Forty-second and Albemarle Street NW., in Washington, D. C.

At this service Hon. John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, presented to the parish a magnificently wrought pulpit of beautiful wood which was dedicated to the memory of a beloved former Clerk of this House, the Honorable William Tyler Page, and made a reality by the interest of many of his friends and associates.

The pulpit was accepted in the name of the parish by Mr. Reginald B. Looker, in the presence of the large congregation, which included John C. Page, son of William Tyler Page.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the prayer and sermon delivered by the rector, the Reverend C. Randolph Mengers, and also the American's Creed which was authored by William Tyler Page.

The matter referred to follows:

PRAYER

Remember Thy servant, William Tyler, O Lord, according to the favor which Thou bearest unto Thy people, and grant that increasing in knowledge and love of Thee, he may go from strength to strength, in the life of perfect service, in Thy heavenly kindom; through Jesus Christ, our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost ever, one God, world without end. Amen.

Bless, O Lord, and sanctify, we humbly beseech Thee, this pulpit, to be used for Thy glory. Send forth faithful laborers into Thy harvest, and grant that they may be clothed with righteousness, and that Thy word spoken by their mouths may have such success, that it may never be spoken in vain. Grant also, that the people may have grace to hear and receive what they shall deliver out of Thy most holy word, or agreeable to the same, as the means of eternal salvation; that in all our words and deeds we may seek Thy glory, and the increase of Thy kingdom; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Forasmuch as Almighty God did mercifully accept the purpose of His servants David and Solomon to build His Temple at Jerusalem, and hath been graciously pleased, in all succeeding ages, to receive the gifts of those who have willingly offered of their substance, and nothing doubting but that He favorably alloweth this charitable work of ours in setting apart this pulpit to His service and glory.

We therefore, in behalf of this parish, accept the offering, and dedicate this pulpit in memory of William Tyler Page, and to the honor and glory of the Holy and Eternal Trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.

SERMON

"Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

It has been with deep gratitude that today we have dedicated in this church this pulpit to the memory of a great man. It is a most fitting memorial to him, for his life was a living sermon.

It was my privilege to know him during the last year of his life here, and in that only too brief a time, to sense some of the things that have been said of him by those who knew him intimately. In the recollection of many of these we have seen a pattern which is the basis, or at least should be the basis, of sermon preparation. Sermons are not merely after-dinner speeches, or should I say before-dinner speeches. They are not the addresses that one gives before a club or any gathering of people. Sermons to be truly sermons have a pattern which is vastly different from the ordinary speech which is given.

Sermons are born of God, they are nurtured in the bosom of the family of Christ, where the needs of people are seen and felt they grow under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and they move people to action, not lull them to somnolence.

I feel confident that William Tyler Page, as he sat here in this House of God, Sunday after Sunday, was preparing the sermon which his life was giving to all those who came under his influence.

He was preparing it as all good sermons should be prepared, first of all in the fellowship of Him who is Lord of all. It is not without significance that we have over our altar that great window given by him when the church was built, as a constant reminder of Christ the Lord. It is the Lord God omnipotent who reigneth, and who reigneth as the window depicts, over the world.

As William Tyler prepared his sermon first in the presence of the Lord God, so with him for whom our church is named, St. Columba. We do not have much information about the early life of this man. We know that he was of noble birth, and that very early in his life he decided that there was only one king who would rule over him and under the leadership of the Lord God, he established a series of monasteries from which the gospel, the good news of Christian salvation was preached.

Being human, he made mistakes; for example, when he waged war with a neighboring abbot because the abbot would not let him keep a manuscript which he has written in his abbey. But the Lord God still reigned in his life, and under the leadership of the Master he made amends and worked hard and diligently to win others to the allegiance of the Master.

It goes without saying that today a vast majority of our people are confused, and I dare to say that their confusion comes because they have lost sight of the Lord God omnipotent. Freda Utley, in the current issue of Human Events, says that "The Christian principle which had been the shield of American liberties and the source of its strength had been forgotten." Mr. Shearer in his letter recalls how Mr. Page, when writing the American's Creed, which was based upon his knowledge of the Christian creed, said that "The creed of my country, like the creed of my church, is not to be an expression of something new, but, rather, a compilation of the old, the tried, and the best."

It is when the affairs of men and nations are in the tremendous flux they are in at the present time that we need to reach out to the "old, the tried, and the best" for stability. We are all conscious of the mounting costs in the country of the care of the mentally disturbed, because their number is increasing incredibly; we are conscious of the mounting expenditure for those things which people are buying to soothe their nerves. They are only reflecting the lives of people who have lost sight of the Lord God omnipotent, who are blindly searching for something which will give to them stability.

The sermon that we have to preach to our day, like all good sermons, is that which is born of Him who must reign supreme over all the world.

Sermons to be good sermons must have motion; they must move from point to point. With William Tyler as well as with our patron saint, Columba, we find lives who moved from the bosom of the Lord God and were nurtured within the bosom of the family of Christ who were conscious of the needs of people, which is the church. It was there that they sought and found the strength which enabled them to translate their vision of the Lord God into a living reality.

Even in the short time that I knew William Tyler Page, I found this true. He was with singular regularity a devoted member of the fellowship of Christ. To some, church going, like many other things in life, loses its vitality by becoming a habit; or it becomes motivated by fear. But I do not believe that that was true of Mr. Page. There was a deep love in his heart for God, an intense loyalty for the Christian fellowship as expressed in the "old, the tried, and the best," the church. It was within the fellowship that he found the strength which God gives in the sacraments and in the word and in the preaching of the word.

It was true of St. Columba as he founded the church in Scotland. Starting as he did from the island of Iona, he established churches throughout the country, preaching, converting, baptizing, and bringing the power of God through the sacraments of the church because he felt the needs of people for the fullness of life which God gives.

Noble C. Powell, Bishop of Maryland, once said in an address that one must "waste time with God to gain eternity." It is said of Martin Luther that the more work he had to do, the longer each day he would spend with God. Certainly to consciously "waste time with God" is to bring to us the power to see clearly in a Christian way, the issues which confront us in daily living. As individuals, as a Nation there can be no such thing as spending too much time with God. We live in a country which was founded upon divine principles. Our founding fathers' fathers were men who sought and relied upon divine guidance. It will be in adherence to these principles and in emulation of their practice that our Nation can continue to give not leadership alone, but Christian leadership to our generation.

It is not an easy task, and I am sure that we all are conscious not only of our own limitations, but of the opposition that lies around us. Here is where we are desperately in need of guidance of the Holy Spirit. I am sure that there were times when some of you wondered why it was that William Tyler Page did what he did when he did it. And I feel confident that many times he was moved by the Spirit to do it. Why? For the very reason that his life, like the sermon it was, was born of God and was nurtured in the bosom of the fellowship of Christ and was then guided by the Holy Spirit.

We, too, have sermons to preach in our public lives and in our private lives. There are many who will read those sermons in the actions we do; they will be influenced by the things we say. It may be that because we have this day been in the presence of the Lord God and have experienced His power and have seemed conscious of the needs of people, that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, His Kingdom shall be advanced by you.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation in many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

WM. TYLER PAGE.

Fundamental Defenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the Fifty-seventh Continental Congress, National Society, DAR, national defense meeting, April 21, 1948:

Madame President General, members of the fifty-seventh congress, and friends, it is with a sincere appreciation of the privilege of addressing this congress of the Daugh-

ters of the American Revolution that I stand here this afternoon. As I look out over this great audience I find myself thinking of the tremendous power represented here, the great force for constructive living. My imagination runs far out until I seem to envisage the world as it could be if all this power, all this force, were to be released and directed toward the fundamental needs of our beloved country and of the world. Never was there a time in all history when mankind so needed that which we as women have to give of sanity, calm judgment, and the will to peace.

Our Revolution forebears broke the external bonds that bound the Colonies to the King. They took upon themselves the full responsibility for the establishment of a dream—they gave us a great heritage for which we in our turn must carry full responsibility.

Let us by all means rejoice that we are of such stuff, but let us not delude ourselves into inaction. Let us be alert to the dangers that are on every hand. Let us remember that guns and bombs are not the only methods of destruction. These function in the visible, the material areas—but the new weapons are invisible, they attack the mind, the morale, the very heart and soul, and they are being used with experienced skill by a power that has grimly asserted its purpose to control the world.

I don't know what the years have taught you—but I have found that if I am to keep a reasonably balanced point of view I must seek out facts and then face them with every atom of courage that is in me. That takes a curious kind of determination, because it is always such a temptation to color the truth to one's own hopes and dreams.

Let us look at ourselves for a moment, we women of a Nation that has declared its trust to be in God.

We came into being because a few men had a great vision, a wonderful dream. We were told in no uncertain terms that we would have to be constantly vigilant. We were told also, that the real dangers to our way of life would not necessarily come from without. We were warned that we would encounter all manner of danger and that our freedom would endure only as long as we were true to the vision and the dream.

We were given a rich and beautiful land in which to bring this dream through to reality. In the century and a half of our life as a nation we have built a material prosperity such as was never before dreamed of and our formula is giving ever-increasing opportunity to more and more of our people. But we have not attained our goal—there is yet much to do and the doing takes first of all the courage to face conditions as they are, not as we would like to believe them to be. Nor can we look just at ourselves because, whether we like it or not, we have become a vital part of an agonized world.

One of the results of such examination reveals that all peoples of the believing world have a common foe, a foe who has made the state his god, and who worships at his altar with fervor, fanatacism, undeviating purpose, and unfaltering zeal. An enemy who declared 100 years ago that he intended to control the entire world even though more than 75 percent of mankind were exterminated in the process. An enemy who through the pen of the brilliant novelist Constantine Simonov in November 1946 issued this call to battle to the writers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

I quote: "An ideological war on a world scale is now being waged with unexampled ferocity." And, "there can be no respite in the ideological war." And, "our enemies find that we are stubborn and unpleasant. We have no intention of changing however unpleasant they find us. We take that as a compliment, coming from our enemies.

"We declare at the tops of our voices, to the whole world, from the tribune of our art, that we are fighting and shall continue to fight for communism; that we consider communism the only worthy future for mankind; that our Communist ideals were, are, and always shall be unchangeable; and that no one can ever cause us to falter."

This is what we face—not next year—or 10 years hence, but now; not only in Europe, in China, in Latin America, but right here in our own land.

This is not a moment when we can be apathetic about this great country of ours, or about her place in the world. It is not a moment when we can continue to permit carelessness and unawareness to permeate the highways and byways of her life.

Russian Communists have set up the state as their god and they worship at that altar with a passion and a devotion that gives them a basic and fanatic strength difficult to meet and to conquer.

Here in this country of ours we seem to have lost something vital of the faith which lived in the hearts of the early settlers. This cannot be disregarded for it is dangerous when a nation turns away from its God.

Shall I tell you of a conversation I had 2 years ago in Ankara, Turkey? A most interesting Turk and I were talking of the changes brought about by the great Kemal Pasha—Ataturk, as they call him— he who with one stroke stripped the women of their veils, literally throwing them out into responsibility, changed the language, the capital, the whole structure of life, for religion, too, went. Knowing the man beside me to be a professing Moslem I had the temerity to ask him what, if anything, the young people were taught in religious matters. "Oh, Madame, that troubles many of us who are older, very deeply, for we know that a man cannot build well except he establish his house under the will and with the blessing of Allah. I am frankly very anxious for these young people of ours. Without religion they can be so easily the prey of strange and destructive ways."

I had not expected my own thoughts to be expressed at a lunch table in the capital of Turkey. He, too, was thinking of the influences of the vast country to the north whose daily pressures were growing constantly stronger. The state as god, horrible to contemplate for one who knew that in Turkey's past Allah had been truly worshipped and upheld, and the minutest ways of life had felt His power.

Man is a spiritual being and his need to worship at some shrine, to sacrifice at some altar, is part of his very essence. Take from him the vision of an infinite being and he will fasten upon something, be certain of that. Deprive him of the certainty of his own divinity he will bind himself to all that is carnal within himself, and reach an ultimate need of self-destruction.

Is it not important that we face the possibilities that lie before any people who lose their grip upon the great unalterable fact that because God is, we are? The signs along the way are many that we are not vigilant, that we are not watchful, that we are not even wary.

And what of our children, the greatest riches any country can possess?

Before a congressional committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress when the National Neuropsychiatric Institute Act was being considered, Dr. Parran—for so long the courageous head of our Public Health Service—testified that over 8,000,000 (more than 6 percent of the population) are suffering from some form of mental illness. * * * Probably 10,000,000 of the current population will require hospitalization for mental illness at some time during their lives. Will this build a strong America?

You will recall that Selective Service reported a total of approximately 5,000,000 mentally or physically unfit for military duty in World War II.

Is that a strong America?

We know there are many wonderful homes in America from which go out fine, steady, strong, constructive citizens. Let us be deeply grateful that this is so. But, must we not face the tragic fact that there are all too many homes that contain few restraints, little respect, less reverence? Can we who are women escape the timeless fact that woman is the keystone of the arch, the matrix of the life force that makes and keeps a home the center of a nation's life? Police records in many places suggest that broken homes are the most frequent cause of crime and waywardness among our youth. Is it not our responsibility to face the desolation so many of our children face and then set about the rebuilding? Women of the war-torn countries are having to rebuild the external shells of their homes out of the rubble left them. Is our task so very different? Is it any less imperative?

The riches of a country are in its children. What of ours?

Let us look for a moment at the influences we have permitted to surround their recreations—the hours that are such potent ones in setting their standards. What about the newspapers, the movies, the magazines, the radio? Are they wholesome, fresh, clean? Do they teach loyalty, honor, reverence? I but suggest these things. There is not time to do more.

Nor does the influence of the emphasis of our news, our magazines, our movies and our radio stop at our frontiers. One American movie of the kind usually sent to foreign countries can undo the work of years and build a deep antagonism against what they very naturally interpret (especially with the help of the Communist propaganda with which they are constantly flooded) as the result of our way of life. Just the other day a visitor, recently arrived in the United States, said to a friend of mine: "I am so very glad to have found that in spite of what your movies have taught us to believe, there are some wholesome, happy homes in America. But I confess to being shocked by the lack of discipline and restraint I see on every hand."

Yes, we do lack discipline. As a matter of fact we resent it, and do not accept the idea that there is need of it, forgetting that we are part of a universe, that we are but temporary dwellers upon a planet which is disciplined by the stresses and strains, the pushes and pulls that constitute its balance in this same law-governed universe.

How are we going to bring to our people the vital importance of restraint, of obedience, of reverence, of respect for themselves and for others? This is of importance, for the strength of a nation lies in the restraint and self-discipline of its people. We have let it slip from us. We have let freedom be interpreted as license.

If many of our homes lack these restraints, what of our schools?

How well the school superintendents know the difficulties of discipline! Why? Because all too many parents resent the teacher's efforts toward discipline when it touches their own (probably tragically undisciplined) child and are in the superintendent's office early the day following to demand an apology from the teacher—often even his or her dismissal.

I repeat: How are we going to bring to our people the vital inescapable importance of obedience, of reverence, and respect not only for themselves but also for others?

I sound, perhaps, as if I thought our children a hopelessly impossible lot, which is not at all true. To me they are magnificent, even though often tragically so because we have not given to them the foundation stones of physical and mental health and have let them believe life to be an undisciplined experience and so are sending them out unequipped to meet the difficulties which they will have to face and conquer if

America is to play her destined part at this moment of her life.

Perhaps most of all have we permitted our own lukewarm patriotism to becloud their vision of this wonderful country that is ours and theirs. Where are the stars that should be in our eyes, not just on our flag? Are they dimmed because we have been building material success, material wealth? Is it because in our haste to reach material goals we have made machines greater than men? Where is the willingness to sacrifice that America may be strong to lead the believing nations to a bloodless victory over the cold forces of the relentless enemy?

It isn't so many years since pioneer women loaded the muskets for their men, carried the waterbuckets to put out the fire flung over the stockades by a ruthless enemy. Our woman's job isn't finished, friends. We are still needed to do these same things in a different way. Fire is being thrown over our stockades today. Where are our bucket lines; where is our powder?

Isn't it pretty dangerous to let the fire of Communist propaganda be hurled or insinuated into our schools and colleges, our organizations, our labor unions, into our very Government? Isn't it pretty dangerous to permit the continuance of conditions that can be used so readily by the highly skilled, seemingly omnipresent agitators?

To me it is of the utmost importance to ask ourselves: What are the foundation stones of a strong, free America? In what condition are they today? What can we as women of the twentieth century do to put out the fires being thrown over our stockades? More seriously still: Are we, as free citizens of this wonderful country, ready to take over woman's responsibility to pick up the rubble the men have left us and out of the experience of too many wars face the difficulties, the discouragements, the sacrifices, the weariness of body and soul that it will take to destroy the enemy within and without our gates and begin the building of a clean, new world?

How? Surely not with fear nor even with timidity. Not with trembling hearts, but with a serene and glorious faith in America's ability to prove herself worthy of her destiny. Not with the arrogance of material power, but with the radiance of certainty that the dream that conceived us, the vision that brought us into being still rides before us and will dissipate the clouds that now obscure the sun. We need only to face up to our weaknesses, taking a strong hold upon them and with fresh courage, with reawakened, intelligent patriotism, renew the fundamental security that can be found only when men and women accept the responsibilities, the restraints, and the disciplines of true freedom.

Daughters of our revolution, upon us far more than upon those who have joined us in later years, rests the responsibility for vigilance, for passionate loyalty, and for courageous action.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a release from Rider and Keister of 33 West Forty-second Street, New York, dated March 5, 1947, and entitled "Majority of Business Paper Editors Endorse Reciprocal Trade Agreements as Vital to World Economic Peace," as follows:

MAJORITY OF BUSINESS PAPER EDITORS ENDORSE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AS VITAL TO WORLD ECONOMIC PEACE

The reciprocal trade agreements program sponsored by the State Department was endorsed by a majority of the business paper editors who participated in an opinion survey conducted by the National Conference of Business Paper Editors, it was announced today. A majority of the editors also urged a reduction of trade barriers on an international scale as a means of combating nationalism, promoting international prosperity, and fostering world economic peace, which, in their views, is essential to political peace.

The editors of the Nation's leading business, trade, and professional magazines affiliated with the Associated Business Papers cautioned, however, that true reciprocity must be achieved. They emphasized that the domestic industry and the high standard of living in the United States should be protected at the proposed 18-nation reciprocal trade agreements negotiations.

In their support of the principle of reciprocal trade agreements, the majority gave these reasons:

1. To maintain full production, high national income, and a high level of employment the United States must have a large volume of exports to take care of production in excess of domestic needs. The only trade that will support our industries is worldwide in scope.

2. Reciprocal agreements sensibly drawn and properly administered, will break down tariff barriers, encourage international free trade relations, promote good will, and insure world economic health.

3. Sound foreign trade is a two-way business. Volume of imports and exports is directly dependent on the degree to which restrictions on initiative and enterprise are removed.

4. It will be impossible for other nations to purchase our excess production unless we in turn are able to buy either their raw materials or finished products.

5. The United States should foster effective agreements whereby domestic industry will have an even chance of obtaining foreign markets in competition with Great Britain's empire preferential trading agreements.

6. Since most of the foreign nations now have a managed economy of varying degrees, really free trade is no longer a practicable possibility, and reciprocal agreements appear to be the only alternative means of restoring trade freedom.

7. The United States is not self-sufficient and it is only through foreign trade that we can build up our depleted stock piles of vital raw materials necessary for national defense, such as tin, copper, oil, uranium, high grade lump iron ore, lead; and strategic alloy elements as nickel, cobalt, tungsten, and vanadium.

True News Helps Keep the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. TWYMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the column of Sydney J. Harris, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Monday, April 26, 1948:

TRUE NEWS HELPS KEEP THE PEACE

(By Sydney J. Harris)

We're having trouble with Russia, and we're probably going to have more—but that's no reason for all the war talk you hear on every side.

Rumors and loose talk may not start wars, but they certainly get people in a mood to accept what they think is inevitable. Yet no war has ever been inevitable.

The responsible portion of the American press is doing its best to sift the facts from the rumors, and refuses to print any story that is not fully substantiated. Unfortunately, not all the American press is responsible.

Two weeks ago, we received a wire from one of our men abroad. It was a confidential message to the editor. Our correspondent had spoken to a world-renowned lady journalist who had just come from Washington.

She told him that two high Washington officials—both of Cabinet rank—had informed her that the Russians are killing on the average of one American soldier weekly. Washington, she added, is concealing this from the American people for fear of inflaming public opinion.

ACCURACY

This was shocking news, if true, and we immediately set our Washington bloodhounds to work on it. It was quickly found that there was not a word of truth to the rumor.

As a matter of fact, only three Americans have been killed by the Russians in the 3 years since the war. These were all isolated, individual cases, which might happen between any two contiguous armies.

"According to information here," our Washington report ran, "we have probably killed more Russians than the Russians have killed Americans." So much for Russian aggression against the United States Army.

There are grave problems to be worked out, and it may be doubtful that Russia and America can operate in their different spheres of influence without collision. But war is inevitable only if we think it is, only if we act as if it were.

The Russans, I am convinced, don't want war any more than we do. The trouble is that while no one wants war, no one is willing to give up the things that make for war.

"The cause of all these troubles," wrote Thucydides, on the tragic war between Athens and Sparta, "was fear and ambition, inspired by greed." His words are as true today as they were then.

Rhode Island Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention an outline of Rhode Island's laws affecting veterans, their dependents and organizations, as compiled by John P. Riley, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 76 Dorrance Street, room 204, Providence, R. I.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and, therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of

Rhode Island's veteran laws will come to their attention.

I request that this compilation of Rhode Island's laws relating to veterans be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONUS

A bonus of $200 is payable to World War II veterans who served honorably in active duty between September 16, 1940, and September 2, 1945, inclusive. It is also payable to those who served in the merchant marine at any time during the period December 7, 1941, to September 2, 1945. Claimant must have been a resident of the State for a period of not less than 6 months immediately prior to entry into service and must not have received a bonus from any other State because of such service. An eligible veteran who served in both the armed forces and the merchant marine may not receive double payment. In case of death of an eligible veteran, next-of-kin may receive payment.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Deceased indigent veterans may be buried at the expense of the town or city. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Relatives or friends are permitted to conduct the funeral.

A firing squad may attend the funeral of any veteran.

Soldiers' burial plots are properly cared for in North Cemetery in Bristol.

Provision has been made for the care of neglected and abandoned graves of veterans.

The director of social welfare has control and supervision of funds for decorating and installing metal markers on the graves of veterans.

Headstones may be provided for veterans' graves at the expense of the town or city.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Estates of members of the armed forces missing in action, etc., may be administered.

Estates may be administered upon submission of certificates of presumptive death.

Disability of minority is removed from veteran and spouse to contract under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The adjutant general has the power to protect civil rights of persons serving in the armed forces.

Protection is granted to families of servicemen from strangers pretending to obtain promotions, furloughs, or other benefits for the men in service upon payment of compensation for their services.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting with exemption from registration requirements is extended to members of the armed forces.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of birth, marriage, or death records required in connection with actual or prospective service in the armed forces are available.

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Town clerks or registrars are required to furnish, without charge to veterans or their dependents, copies of vital records for use in presenting claims to the United States or to the several departments of the local or State governments.

Honorable discharges of veterans are recorded free of charge.

Record of discharge once filed stands as evidence so long as the legal residence of the person remains in the State.

The department of social welfare prepares and prosecutes before the United States Veterans' Administration all claims of veterans for compensation, disability allowances, insurance, and pensions.

Officers of soldiers' home may prosecute pension and bounty claims without expense to the claimant.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed in action or died while serving in the armed forces between April 6, 1917, and June 2, 1921, and/or have since died from injuries incurred and/or have become disabled as a result of such service. No amount is specified.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Certain racing associations in the State are requested to give employment preference to veterans.

Disability compensation is not to be deductible from wages received from the State.

Veterans are eligible for appointment as firemen or policemen in any city or town of the State.

Time is extended for filing certain claims with the unemployment compensation board.

Leaves of absence are granted to State civil-service employees with reinstatement upon termination of service in the armed forces.

Preference is extended to veterans in State civil service.

Preference is granted to veterans in public departments and upon all public works of the State.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act and the State retirement laws.

Rights of civil-service employees on leave of absence are protected.

Honorably discharged veterans of World War II, upon reemployment by a prior employer, are given, in addition to seniority rights they left, additional rights equal to the time served. Veterans applying for employment within 1 year after honorable discharge are given credit for seniority rights equal to the time served in the armed forces.

Public office or employment is not forfeited by war service.

A veteran is reinstated by his former employer if request is made within 40 days after honorable discharge from the armed forces.

Public officers and employees are reinstated after military service under the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940.

Officers appointed by the director of social welfare to be in charge of the State's administration of veterans' relief, of graves' registration, and the commandant of the soldiers' home must be veterans.

State employees on military leave with the Armed Forces are blanketed into the State civil service without examination.

The advisory council for the Rhode Island soldiers' home must be composed of veterans.

Veterans of World War II are entitled to service credits under the Civil Service Act.

War service credit is given for purposes of computing retirement of State police and to certain teachers on leave of absence if they return to active teaching within 6 months following discharge from the armed forces.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

All benefits or privileges granted to veterans of any previous war are extended to veterans of World War II, including members of the American merchant marine.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans may be admitted to the Rhode Island soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

For the purpose of erecting a hospital to accommodate disabled veterans, certain State lands may be conveyed to the United States Government.

An appropriation of $25,000 has been made to provide hospitalization for families of servicemen.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Credit is given for war service with reference to the award of service medals to members of the Rhode Island National Guard.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is given for time spent in the active service of the United States.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Armistice Day celebrations may be held in armories.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Rolls of honor have been prepared in cities and towns containing the names of persons in military service.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

A veterans' retraining and reemployment committee, appointed by the Governor, promotes the creation of local veterans' retraining and reemployment committees and veterans' information service centers in every community where needed. Cities and towns are empowered to create such committees and to maintain information service centers.

Banks, trust companies, loan and investment companies, and domestic building and loan associations may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

The city of Newport is authorized to issue $100,000 in bonds for construction of public projects to provide employment for returned veterans of World War II.

Relief is extended to veterans and their dependents.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTIONS FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Hunting and fishing licenses held by persons in the armed forces are extended.

Operators' licenses are continued during military service with renewal without examination upon return to the State. Refunds are made upon surrender of automobile registration plates after induction into the armed forces.

Any honorably discharged war veteran who has lost one or both of his arms, hands, feet or legs, or by reason of paraplegia, drives a specially constructed pleasure motor vehicle, is forever exempt from annual registration or license fees.

Free license may be issued to veterans to peddle merchandise, junk, etc.

Veterans are exempt from the poll tax.

Professional and occupational licenses are renewed after discharge from the armed forces.

Electricians' certificates are renewed within 4 months after discharge from the armed forces without examinations.

Veterans are exempt from fee for license to act as an insurance broker.

Exemption is granted from payment of interest on delinquent property taxes during military service and for 6 months thereafter.

Property of veterans' organizations to the extent of $100,000 is exempt from taxation if actually used and occupied by such organization.

Property of veterans or their unmarried widows is exempt from taxation to the amount of $1,000.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

An annual appropriation is made to defray expenses of the encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans.

Veterans' organizations may conduct bingo or beano games under certain circumstances.

The unauthorized wearing or use of registered insignia, badges, etc. of veterans' organizations is subject to a fine of $20 for each offense.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

Associations of veterans may parade in public with firearms.

Armistice Day celebrations may be held in armories.

Members of veterans' organizations are exempt from the prohibition as to the wearing of uniforms.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the Rhode Island Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 15 chapters throughout the State, maintains four expertly trained full-time national service officers, under the direction of Maurice H. Pion, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Providence, R. I., who extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's war disabled veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE-TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the 10th and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May, 1947, and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical to set forth here, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, an insurance agent in private life, who has had a broad background of 28 years of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

The national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV service foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice, my friend. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate, they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

More Housing Than Ever Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph H. Deckman, chairman of the public housing committee of the Home Builders' Association of Metropolitan Washington:

MORE HOUSES THAN EVER BEFORE

(By Joseph H. Deckman, chairman, public housing committee, Home Builders' Association of Metropolitan Washington)

America, through private enterprise, now has more good, safe, and sanitary housing than ever before. And this kind of housing is growing faster than the population of our country. Nearly everybody now wants to live in this fine housing, and nobody wants to wait. This rather healthy economic condition has created a housing situation which many people think of erroneously as a housing shortage. This situation has been complicated and aggravated by the fact that the available housing is not located exactly where people would now prefer to live and also by the fact that some people now can afford to buy or rent more housing than they actually need. This maldistribution and overconsumption magnify the illusion that a shortage exists. Before this illusion and

misconception of the real facts drives us to ill-advised governmental measures or expensive experiments, we should clearly understand the facts underlying the housing situation. Thus we naturally come face to face with the fact that there is no shortage of housing but a serious housing situation caused by factors other than a real shortage.

The above statements are corroborated by the United States Department of Commerce in the Bureau of the Census Report dated October 29, 1947, and identified as series P 70—No. 1. In order to justify the statement that there is no housing shortage, certain salient facts from the above-named report will be presented in column form and later explained. The page number on which each statement in the Government report may be found is noted.

The first significant fact is that the total housing available in the United States in 1947 was 41,700,000 units. Of this total, 37,500,000 units are not in need of major repairs. This means, by allowing four persons per unit, that 166,800,000 people can be housed in America today. Taking the good units at 37,500,000 and multiplying by four, it is apparent that 150,000,000 people can be housed in good, safe, sanitary housing. Based on a population of approximately 145,000,000, it can be said that there is enough adequate housing for all. From these facts it is obvious that any difficulty in obtaining housing accommodations is due to a maldistribution of the population and not a shortage of housing.

The second salient point in the table is that only 1,900,000 rental units out of a total of 15,333,000 rent for more than $50 per month. This is even more significant when it is compared to the average annual earnings per full-time employee in the United States as stated in a booklet entitled "National Income, Supplement to Survey of Current Business" for July 1947, published by the United States Department of Commerce. The average annual earnings for 1946 were $2,357. It is to be noted that with full employment and higher wages this figure would be greater in 1947. Based on one-quarter of a person's salary being allotted to housing, it could be safely stated as not necessary for any of the population to exceed this unwritten rule were it not for the fact that we have today a maldistribution of population caused by migration during the war years.

On the subject of rents it may be noted from the chart that the median private rent in 1946 for all housing in the country was $29.33 per month and the median rent of urban occupied units was $31.64 per month. Compared to these figures is the median rent of public housing in 1945 of $36.61 per month as given in testimony by Mr. Philip Klutznick, then Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the General Housing Act of 1945, part 1, chart 25.

This median rent for public housing is for used housing the same as private rents because no new public housing has been built since 1944 in quantity. The public rent was much higher in 1947 as these rents have been greatly increased owing to the fact that they have not been subject to the rent controls placed on private housing.

Current population and housing report, October 29, 1947

Number of housing units in country (p. 1)	41,700,000
Percentage of owner occupied housing units (p. 1)	55
Number of nonfarm tenant dwelling units (p. 1)	15,333,000
Number of nonfarm units renting for more than $40 per month (p. 1)	4,167,000
Number of nonfarm units renting for less than $20 per month (p. 1)	4,167,000
Number of nonfarm units renting from $20 per month to $40 per month (p. 1)	7,000,000
Number of units renting for $50 per month and more (p. 2)	1,900,000
Median rent of all occupied rental units (p. 2) (per month)	$29.33
Median rent of urban occupied rental units (p. 2) (per month)	$31.64
Median rent of rural nonfarm units (p. 2) (per month)	$18.62
Percentage of housing units not in need of major repairs (p. 1)	90
Percentage of urban housing units not in need of major repair (p. 1)	93
Percentage of rural nonfarm units not in need of major repair (p. 1)	89
Percentage of rural farm units not in need of major repair (p. 1)	81
Percentage of urban units containing inside flush toilets and private baths (p. 1)	84

From the statistics in the table it can also be seen that the propaganda program of the public housers to the effect that the lower third of the population is ill housed, is a complete falsehood.

Based on the fact that the vast majority of slums are located in the cities, any attempt to paint a picture of wholesale slum conditions in metropolitan areas is ridiculous in the light of the facts set forth.

With 84 percent of the urban housing containing inside private flush toilets and private baths, and with 93 percent of the urban housing not in need of major repairs, it can be conservatively estimated that not more than 10 percent of the housing in our cities can be classed as slums.

These areas, it is also pointed out, could be cleared up at no cost to the taxpayer by the promulgation and enforcement of proper housing codes and sanitation laws at the local level.

From the foregoing it should be quite clear that what we have in this country is a maldistribution of the population; not a housing shortage.

Rent control is playing a great part in this maldistribution by depressing rents to the level that single men and women can afford to rent family housing accommodations and by so doing keep them off the market where these units could adequately house the veterans and their families. Rents are by far the lowest item in the cost of living today and have been depressed well below anything that is reasonable and just. This fact is brought out in the table beyond any question of a doubt as it can be seen that not over 13 percent of the rental housing is renting for more than $50 per month and approximately 50 percent is renting from $20 to $40 per month. Just under 25 percent of the rental units are renting for over $40 a month, and the same quantity is renting for less than $20 per month.

The pressure for a Government housing program is unfounded, based on the facts herein set forth and should not seriously be considered by Congress. With new house construction continuing at a million a year rate, the critical points in housing will soon be cleared up by the normal functions of the free enterprise system. The present high level of housing production is due directly to the removing of rent and building control on new construction. However, rent control on existing units is still causing this housing to be removed from the rental market. Therefore the lifting of all control on rent would rectify this condition and stop the conversion of housing units into commercial use which would mean that each new housing unit created would add to the total supply and the sum total would increase at an accelerated rate.

Any Government program, according to Senator TAFT, would not build a house for approximately a year after the enactment of a housing act. Any such program embodying public housing as a vehicle to provide dwelling units would be a costly deterrent to the solution of the housing problem. If there is any Government necessary in housing it should only be at the national level through the use of the Federal Housing Administration and at the local level by the enforcement of municipal housing codes and sanitary laws.

Mature reflection on the unvarnished truth about the housing situation leads one to the unescapable conclusion that private construction should be aided to the fullest in doing the housing job.

To supply new housing in the lower-cost bracket as desired requires the all-important tool of adequate finance. At present there is no financing worth the name for good minimum standard housing.

If the Government really wants new low-cost and low-rent housing supplied in quantity it should concentrate on providing financing for this type of construction.

For years financiers have been laboring under the false impression that builders should leave large portions of their working capital in each project they build. Due to this attitude the building industry has been the most harassed and underfinanced of all American industries.

If this concept of finance is changed for minimum standard housing, either by the Government or by conversion of the money lenders, then low-cost housing can become a reality.

Low-rent and low-cost housing is the soundest of all investments on today's horizon. All that is needed is a new Moses to lead the financial experts out of the wilderness of de luxe construction.

Reduction of Trade Barriers—Rhetoric or Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Winthrop G. Brown, Acting Deputy Director, Office of International Trade Policy, at the World Trade Conference of the Cleveland World Trade Association, on Friday, April 2, 1948, entitled "Reduction of Trade Barriers—Rhetoric or Reality," as follows:

REDUCTION OF TRADE BARRIERS—RHETORIC OR REALITY

For months past, vast stacks of newsprint, oceans of ink and hours of radio time have been employed to tell us about political controversies and disagreements among nations. On the economic side, by contrast, the story is of a measure of real progress. It is of this progress that I want to talk to you today.

Ten days ago at Habana, the representatives of 44 nations, meeting under the auspices of the United Nations, reached agreement on a Charter for an International Trade Organization, to be submitted to their governments for acceptance. This Charter is a broad code of international economic conduct. It is the culmination of over 2 years of international effort, and at the final session of the conference William L. Clayton, head of the United States delegation, had this to say:

"There have been other conferences on international economic affairs. But none of them has undertaken a task so difficult as the one that is completed here today. None of them has come to an agreement concerning so many vital economic interests of so many states. None of them has produced a document so comprehensive as the Habana Charter for world trade. Few, if any, of them have attained so notable a measure of success."

Five months ago, at Geneva, the representatives of 23 nations, also meeting under the auspices of the United Nations, reached agreement on a general agreement on tariffs and trade, containing rules for the conduct of many aspects of their trade with each other and providing for the tariff treatment of products accounting for over half the world's international trade. This agreement has already been put into effect by the principal trading nations represented at Geneva.

To answer the question implicit in the topic suggested for this talk requires an examination of the background of these two rather momentous documents, of what it is that they seek to accomplish, and of the extent to which they may be expected to accomplish it.

After World War II economic conditions were chaotic in the extreme. Not only was there tremendous physical destruction of facilities for production, transportation, and communications, but there was also destruction of intangibles, such as breaking of business channels and liquidation of foreign investments. Shortages of food, clothing, fertilizer, raw materials, and machinery are still the rule. And during the war techniques for the control of trade by governments had been brought to a high degree of perfection. In almost every country imports and exports are being controlled by government as to quantity, source, and destination. International trade has been turning toward bilateralism and control.

Positive action on a wide scale was needed to reverse this trend and start trading nations moving again in the direction of multilateral international trade. No one nation, not even the United States, was powerful enough to accomplish this alone. It was important to act before the patterns of bilateralism and control had become too permanently fixed.

The United States, therefore, in December 1945 proposed the international adoption of certain rules for the conduct of international trade, and invited a considerable number of countries to negotiate with it and with each other for the reduction of tariffs and the regulation and limitation of the use of other trade barriers.

This action found a ready response. One of the first acts of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations early in 1946 was to appoint a committee of 18 nations to prepare for a United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment. This committee adopted as the basis for its deliberations the suggested charter for an international trade organization, published in September 1946 by the United States. At London in the fall of 1946, at Geneva in the spring and summer of 1947, and at Habana at the conference just completed, the charter has been debated and refined and improved. It is now ready for submission to the legislatures of the participating countries for their approval.

The invitations to tariff negotiations were accepted. The negotiations took place. The general agreement on tariffs and trade has, for the most part, been put into effect.

What are the fundamental beliefs that have motivated all this effort?

They are, first, the belief that excessive barrers to world trade must be reduced so that the volume of trade may be large. This does not mean a world of completely free trade. It does mean a world of open trade—readier access to world markets, greater opportunity for specialization, more active competition, larger industrial output, increased labor productivity at lower production costs.

Second, the belief that international trade should be multilateral rather than bilateral. This simply means that trade should consist of buying and selling among the traders of many nations, rather than through a series of separate agreements between pairs of nations. Sales should not have to be confined to buyers who agree to deliver equivalent values in other specified goods. Traders should be able to buy and sell where they please, exchanging goods for money, and money for goods. That is multilateral trade. Bilateral trade, on the other hand, is close kin to barter. Such a system limits the number and size and kind of business transactions to the capacity of the weaker partner and, therefore, holds down the volume of world trade, freezing it into a rigid pattern that cannot be accommodated to changing conditions.

Third, the belief that international trade should be nondiscriminatory, that each country shall give equal treatment to the commerce of all other nations. We have seen the results of trade discriminations during the years between two world wars—nations playing off trade with one country against that with another in a global game of political chess. Almost inevitably trade discriminations develop political aspects, and the competitive clashes which in private enterprise are merely stimulating become national issues and involve national pride when they occur in government-to-government dealings.

Fourth, the belief that progressive trade policies must be supported by consistent policies for stabilization in the field of certain primary commodities. Prolonged and drastic fluctuations in world markets for these commodities can create widespread hardship and unemployment and thus undermine the very foundations of a cooperative world economy. Machinery and rules should be provided for reaching inter-governmental agreements to govern temporarily the production and marketing of such commodities when they are in burdensome world surplus.

Fifth, the belief that though nations may choose to use different systems of trading, it is possible for them to work in harmony. Therefore, an effort should be made to find rules which, for example, will govern the operation of state trading enterprises in international trade so as to place those countries using such a system as nearly as possible on the same basis as those relying on private enterprise.

Sixth, the belief that it is essential to develop the resources of underdeveloped areas and to make the fullest use of the resources of all areas. Increased production and increased consumption lead the way hand in hand to increased prosperity, and one's most highly developed neighbors turn out to be one's best markets.

Seventh, the belief that the availability of machinery for easy international consultation, the obligation to consult, and agreement in advance on the rules of the game are the surest guaranties against economic warfare.

And so, under this charter nations which join the ITO would agree:

1. To take measures designed to maintain productive employment and buying power within their own borders as a means to stimulating trade, avoiding measures which would create difficulties for the economies of others.

2. To encourage private and public international investment and to recognize the need for economic advancement of less well-developed areas.

3. To negotiate for mutual reduction of trade barriers.

4. To eliminate discrimination in international trade, except in exceptional and clearly defined circumstances.

5. To lower the invisible tariff of customs administration.

6. To conduct international trade between private and public enterprises according to principles of nondiscrimination and fair dealing.

7. To curb and regulate international monopolies and cartels.

8. To accept a code of principles to govern the formation and operation of intergovernmental commodity agreements, which should be fair to producer and consumer alike and give producers and consumers an equal voice in their negotiation and operation.

9. To consult with other members about contemplated action which might affect them adversely.

The same basic beliefs also underlie the general agreement on tariffs and trade, which, you will recall, is the second document which I mentioned at the beginning of this talk. When the United States put forward to the world its proposals for rules to govern international trade and for an international trade organization, it had available also a mechanism for more concrete action—the mechanism of the Trade Agreements Act. Accordingly, as I said, it invited a considerable number of other nations to negotiate with it and with each other for the reduction of tariffs. As a result, 23 countries, representing over three-quarters of the world's international trade, met at Geneva, and, after 7 months of negotiation, reached agreement on the text of an agreement which specifies the tariff treatment of products which account for over half of the world's trade. Imports of these products by the Geneva countries prewar amounted to over $10,000,000,000, of which United States imports were about a billion and three-quarters.

The tariff concessions granted were of three kinds: Reductions in rates of duty, binding of existing rates against increases, and binding of duty-free status. The United States obtained reductions in duty from other countries on products of principal interest to us accounting in 1939 for about $500,000,000 of imports. We granted reduction in duty on imports into the United States accounting in 1939 for about $500,000,000. We bound the existing tariff rates on about $150,000,000 of imports and bound the duty-free status of about $1,100,000,000 of imports. We obtained corresponding concessions for our exports of approximately the same magnitude.

The general agreement also contains provisions designed to prevent the participants from canceling out tariff concessions by imposing discriminatory and restrictive measures, such as import quotas, exchange controls and manipulations, internal taxes and regulations, and the like, and from evading the undertaking to grant unconditional most-favored-nation treatment. This agreement has already been put into effect by Australia, Canada, Cuba, Belgium, France, Holland, Luxemburg, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

This was more than just agreement in principle. It was concrete action. It showed that the most important trading nations meant business when they professed to believe in the expansion of trade and the reduction of trade barriers. It showed they could work together in that effort. It showed that commitments such as those contained in the ITO Charter have meaning.

I have outlined the background of the ITO Charter and the general agreement on tariffs and trade, telling you something about why they came into being and what they seek to accomplish. And now I must try to answer the question implicit in the title of this speech. Is this all worth while? Will it do what it sets out to do?

Granted that the problems at Geneva and Habana were complex, granted that the area of agreement was extensive, granted that the charter is one of the most comprehensive, and the general agreement one of the largest

international documents ever signed—just how should they be evaluated?

It would be easy to say that the rules which they lay down are riddled with exceptions; that the principles accepted are too vague to be meaningful; that a mere promise to consult is not much guaranty of good behavior; that the tariff concessions made will not really hurt any domestic industry no matter how uneconomic; that to agree on principles of multilateral trade under present world conditions is to ignore realities and live in an ivory tower; that it is foolish to go to all this trouble under the appalling uncertainties of the present day; that the wiser course would have been to wait until conditions were stabilized, until the shape of things to come could be more clearly discerned. All of these things could be and are being said, and each of them contains a modicum of truth.

But it can also be said that the deepest need of the world today is agreement and a sense of direction. Nations can no longer solve their problems alone. National boundaries have long since ceased to confine either depression or prosperity. When things are uncertain and confused, when there is a likelihood of nations working at cross purposes, when there is a common need and wide differences of opinion as to how to meet it, then is the time to reach agreement on the direction in which nations are to go. Geneva set the direction of over three quarters of the world's trade and took the first steps along the course thus charted. Habana was the next step in developing the long-term pattern of international economic relations. The establishment of the International Trade Organization will give that pattern stability and substance.

It would have been easy to pursue a cautious policy and wait for more normal times before seeking international agreement in the field of trade. But events do not wait for the cautious man to make up his mind. The time to mold the clay is when it is still on the wheel and before it has set into a pattern we do not like. We believe in the kind of trade policy I have described. The trend was in the other direction—toward a thickening mass of restrictions, discriminations, bilateral deals, and governmental interferences in foreign trade, with their inevitable extension of controls into domestic trade. So we acted. We assumed the leadership in the fight for the kind of world-trade pattern under which private enterprise and free competition can continue. We tried to obtain agreement that the course of international trade would be set away from bilateralism and control and toward expansion, competition, and equality of opportunity. We have succeeded.

The ITO charter has been criticized with equal vehemence on the grounds that it is so idealistic that it won't work and conversely that it has so many exceptions that it won't work.

It is true that the Charter is idealistic. This is nothing to apologize for. It sets up ultimate objectives toward which all countries can agree to work. But it is also realistic. It recognizes facts and faces them. It is not afraid to provide clear exceptions designed to meet abnormal conditions such as the present emergency. The exceptions are, however, carefully defined. Many of them are temporary; all of them are limited in extent; and no nation will be able to use any of them except under conditions upon which all nations have agreed. If it were not for the exceptions the Charter would not be practical and it is because it is practical that it can be expected to work. I would add that it will work also because it does not represent the point of view of any one nation or group of nations. We cannot bury our heads in the sand and refuse to recognize that not all nations share our views as to just what the rules of the trade game should be. We must work out a way in which nations of differing views may work together toward common objectives.

I quote again from the words of Mr. Clayton at the final session of the Habana Conference:

"The Charter is complicated and difficult. It is long and detailed and technical. But behind its many chapters and its scores of articles, there lies a simple truth. The world will be a better place to live in if nations, instead of taking unilateral action without regard to the interests of others, will adopt and follow common principles, and enter into consultation through an international organization when interests come into conflict. And this, throughout the entire range of trade relationships, is what the signatories of the Charter agree to do. Each will surrender some part of its freedom to take action that might prove harmful to others; and thus each will gain the assurance that others will not take action harmful to it."

The general agreement on tariffs and trade also contains exceptions to its general provisions which I mentioned earlier. These exceptions are, of course, made to allow for the present extreme shortages abroad in production and foreign exchange. But these exceptions, like those in the Charter, are closely defined, their use limited, and the conditions under which they must be abandoned are clearly set forth.

It would be less than honest of me to say that our foreign sales of exportable products will increase immediately because of these tariff concessions from other countries. They will not. In the long run, United States commercial exports cannot increase until the rest of the world is better able to pay for them. Profitable trade must be reciprocal and there is very little real reciprocity when our exports of goods and services are exceeding our imports by $11,000,000,000 a year, as they did in 1947.

But tariff concessions in a wide area of world trade—such as were achieved at Geneva and are looked forward to under the ITO—will inevitably facilitate, liberalize, and encourage world trade. People work and produce when they see a chance to exchange their products for things which they want and cannot produce for themselves. That is human nature. As world production and trade conditions begin to return to normal, as exceptions cease to be operative, as United States producers again face competition in foreign markets, the tariff concessions embodied in the general agreement will give easier access to those markets for the goods which United States agriculture and industry must sell abroad in order to maintain the level of economic activity in this country. Even while shortages of dollars exist, the concessions will help to expand trade between so-called soft-currency countries, and the general provisions will limit the use of controls to the cases where they are really needed.

The general agreement was negotiated by the United States under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, which expires on June 12. The President has asked the Congress to renew this tried and tested instrument of our foreign economic policy, already four times renewed, for a further period of 3 years. Why?

There were only 23 countries at Geneva. It is important to bring many other countries into the general agreement. To do so they must negotiate reductions in their tariffs with the Geneva countries. The President needs the trade-agreements authority to participate in these negotiations.

If he does not have effective authority to negotiate because of failure to renew the act, we will simply have to say to countries wishing to come into the agreement that it is uncertain whether we can give effect to the results of any negotiation. Since the trade of most countries with the United States is highly significant to them, they will hesitate to come in on this basis. We will be keeping friendly countries out of this cooperative economic effort.

In the European recovery program we will be embarking on a tremendous effort to help western Europe get back on its feet. The program recognizes the elementary fact that one of the prerequisites to their staying on their feet is to reduce the barriers to their trade between each other and between themselves and the rest of the world. They should get into a position to earn their own way by selling their goods. The reduction of their tariffs on each other's goods and the extension of tariff reductions in their trade with the rest of the world is one good way of enabling them to pay their own way. We should not, just as we embark on the European recovery program, give up our ability to participate with these countries in working out arrangements by which they can more completely pay their own way.

The Trade Agreements Act is a symbol to the rest of the world of the United States' willingness to participate in international economic cooperation. Its first enactment, 14 years ago, marked the reversal of the policy of economic isolationism which we pursued after World War I. Any action which could be interpreted as a repudiation by the United States of the trade-agreements policy would be considered by other nations as equally symbolic, and would jeopardize United States leadership in the fight for the kind of economic world in which we believe and in which private enterprise and free competition can continue.

I began with a description of accomplishment in the field of international economic relations. I have for a time been discussing doubts, seeking to dispel them. Let me end with a word as to the basic significance of the Habana and Geneva agreements.

Their basic significance is the fact and the extent of agreement. Never before in the history of the world have so many nations reached agreement on so much practical action and over so wide a range of principle in their economic relations. In a troubled world, ravaged by storms of controversy and disagreement, nations have come together in agreement on matters of basic economic importance. They have agreed on a pattern for their trade. They have taken concrete steps to put it into effect. They have shown that the United Nations can be made to work.

The issue today is more than just trade. It is more even than the preservation of free enterprise. It is the struggle for freedom itself. In this struggle the system we believe in is on trial. We must show the world that it will work. Nations which believe in freedom must come closer together economically as well as politically. Some of them did so at Geneva. More of them did so at Habana. What was accomplished there does not cure our economic ills nor win the battle for freedom. But it gives solid cause for hope that those ills can be cured, and that the battle can be won—if we continue the fight.

Causes and Cure of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 30 (legislative day of Thursday, April 22), 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I find myself in full accord with Chester Bowles in his penetrating analysis of the malady of communism now threatening the

world. In a very able article appearing in the New York Times Magazine of April 18, 1948, Mr. Bowles presents a vivid picture of the causes and cure of communism. He covers extensively the conditions in various countries of the world which have created this grave threat to peace and human welfare.

The governments of the future must, more and more, be interested in the welfare of people as well as in the protection of property. Illiteracy, poverty, disease, and tyranny can no longer be tolerated in the modern world. If we are to have peace we must ponder carefully the advice which Mr. Bowles gives in his splendid article. If we are to preserve democracy in this country, we must block the march of monopoly and provide economic and social reforms essential to the general welfare and national prosperity.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Bowles' article printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED A PROGRAM FOR AS WELL AS AGAINST—AMERICA MUST FOSTER REAL REFORMS ABROAD, NOT SIMPLY OPPOSE COMMUNISM

(By Chester Bowles)

Our military experts constantly assure congressional committees that the only real measure of security lies in our store of atom bombs, ocean-going shipping, and B–50's; our trained Reserves, strategic bases, and ability to manufacture unlimited supplies of equipment. What they say is right, as far as it goes, but it doesn't go nearly far enough.

There are only 145,000,000 of us and we live in a revolutionary world of 2,000,000,000 people. Under such circumstances, our success in stopping Soviet aggression without war, or in winning the war if it finally comes, may depend more on the strength of our ideas than on our military might, important as the latter may be.

Even though our military force were double its present size we could not expect to impose our leadership by force or the threat of force. The people of the world will follow our leadership only if they believe in us, and they will never believe in us unless they are confident that we are their sincere champion and friend.

In order to win them we must first understand them. We must understand their hopes and their fears, their attitude toward us, the Soviet Union, and their own governments—and, most important of all, their yearning for some semblance of economic security.

Our ability to develop such understanding and to establish enlightened policies in regard to the peoples of Asia, Europe, Africa, and South America will shape the future. If we choose to think in terms of governments instead of people, and to base our decisions on strategic concepts rather than moral and humanitarian principles, we may stumble into a catastrophe.

Before World War I, Africa, Asia, South America and much of Europe were the happy hunting ground of the great imperialistic nations. Most areas which were not actual colonies were in the grip of autocratic rulers, who cared very little how their subjects lived and died.

Between 1910 and 1920, the people of the so-called backward areas began to awaken to the possibilities of a more secure existence.

The Yat-sen revolution in China, the Gandhi revolution in India, and the Lenin revolution in Russia were expressions of this awakening.

These three revolutions were advanced in varying degrees in the period between the great wars. They were further stimulated by World War II; first, because it introduced peoples everywhere to the promise of modern industrial technology; and second, because it created political vacuums throughout the world.

Today, in the age of atomic energy, sonic flight, and the miracles of modern medical, industrial, and agricultural sciences, the vast majority of people in Asia, Europe, Africa, and South America are still struggling for a bare existence. Today, 80 percent of them still lack the shelter, food, and clothing necessary for reasonably decent living. More than 1,000,000,000 men, women, and children are still suffering various stages of malnutrition.

The world's people are still hungry, but they are no longer asleep. At last they are beginning to realize that the poverty which cramps their existence is unnecessary; that, contrary to the teachings of their fathers, human misery is not an act of God.

The development of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism are the most dramatic expressions of the revolutionary upsurge of the masses. Communist leaders have gained mass support not solely because they are ruthless but also because they have succeeded in identifying their movement with the hopes and aspirations of the millions who seek a more adequate existence for themselves and their children.

When the Communists speak of democracy they obviously do not mean our version of the Bill of Rights. The Communists believe that the state is omnipotent and that individual human beings are unimportant. A Communist government is inevitably a tyrannical government. Its continued existence is dependent on the secret police and the concentration camps.

Yet the limited kind of democracy which the Communists describe to backward peoples has a valid appeal, as far as it goes. It offers them the promise of steady employment, educational and welfare advantages, and medical assistance in relation to need. In return for these promises, the individual is forced to work productively, to serve the state loyally, and to accept the directives of the party hierarchy without question.

The average American believes not only in political democracy but in economic democracy as well. He has been called upon to fight throughout our long history against the domination of vested economic interests. Moreover, in view of the strength of the opposition, his fight has been remarkably successful. Through his efforts in behalf of broad land ownership, minimum-wage legislation, labor unions, cooperatives, social security, the income tax, child-labor laws, public schools, fair-employment practices, and a hundred other devices, we have gone a long way toward the ideal laid down in President Roosevelt's economic bill of rights.

When our State Department speaks of democracy in international terms, however, its concept seems limited. We have consistently stressed political democracy—the right of all citizens to vote in free elections, the right to criticize their government, to express their own ideas, to read varying opinions, to work where they please in a job of their own choosing. But we have failed to emphasize the peasants right to land ownership, the city workers right to his fair share of food and shelter, the right of people everywhere to a decent minimum of education and health.

The Communists have taken advantage of our failure by posing as the one great power which really concerns itself with the interests of the hungry millions. Communist leaders exclaim, with telling effect: "Communism stands for economic democracy, which means higher standards of living through state planning. America stands for political democracy, which you cannot eat and which will not protect you when it rains."

Two months ago I spent a day with a group of peasants near the town of Keczkemet in southern Hungary. When I asked them if they felt more or less democratic than before the war, they answered in surprise:

"Of course, we are much more democratic. Since the land reforms, we are no longer forced to work for the great landowners for a few florins a day. Now we have our own 20 acres, something our families have prayed for for a thousand years. Now we can work in our own way, and plant the crops we want to plant, with the knowledge that there will always be a steady market for them."

When I pointed out that their letters were censored and their newspapers were controlled by the Communists, their answer was a simple one:

"We don't get any letters and we don't read any newspapers."

Sooner or later the people of Hungary, as well as other nations, will realize that the promise of higher living standings cannot be fully met unless it is accompanied by the right of every citizen to criticize his government and, on occasion, to vote it out of office. But this lesson will not be learned overnight.

The economic democracy advanced by the Communists through state planning, state ownership, and land reforms has a direct and practical appeal to the hundreds of millions who have never known anything but poverty and oppression. The tyrannical aspects of communism, which are so shocking to those of us who have grown up in the political democracies of the West seem less important to a majority of the people in Asia, Africa, eastern Europe, and South America, for the simple reason that political oppression in one form or another has always been an accepted part of their lives.

Communism has won many victories in the last 2 years. It will win many more in the years to come unless we overhaul some of our present policies. Under existing conditions, vast sections of the world are an easy target for Communist organizers.

Take China, for instance. Three out of every four farmers are tenants, many of whom are held in almost feudal servitude. Only a small fraction of the people are able to get enough to eat. Three out of every four are unable to read or write. Seventy percent of the national budget is going to war purposes. The Chiang Kai-shek Government is a dictatorship ridden with graft and incompetence.

Some countries in South America have made substantial economic and social progress under democratic governments, but they are the exception. In South America as a whole, 10 percent of the people own 10 percent of the land, and most of the peasants are landless. The rich and the poor are poles apart and the masses have been oppressed for generations.

In the countries of the Near East, lands fabulously rich in oil and other resources, illiteracy, poverty, and malnutrition are the rule. In India and southeastern Asia, the pattern is again repeated. In this densely populated area live one-third of all the world's people under conditions which are a disgrace to the age.

With the exception of Czechoslovakia, the eastern European countries which are now under Communist domination have a long history of poverty and oppression. The masses have been pushed around for generations by the ruling groups with little regard for their welfare or convictions. Greece and Italy, Portugal and Spain are in the same tradition.

Generally speaking, there are two forces in all of these areas which are opposed to the growth of world communism. First, the feudal land owners, semi-Fascist industrialists, and old aristocracy, which fight communism not because they object to dictatorships as such, but because Communist dictatorships threaten their own power and

positions. Second, the liberal democratic forces which fight communism because they cannot and will not accept police state tyranny.

The only hope of establishing mass opposition to communism abroad lies in supporting consistently the democratic groups which share our concept of human freedom. But this we have often failed to do—sometimes because these groups were weak, sometimes because we were opposed to their economic ideas, sometimes because of the pressure of our military strategists.

Worst still, we have been inclined to throw our support behind reactionaries simply because they dislike communism as much as we, and are in position to use force in opposing it. With an able assist from Communist propaganda, this has served to identify us in the minds of hundreds of millions of people with the forces which they view as the primary obstacle between themselves and a future of security.

As Secretary Marshall pointed out courageously and vigorously 15 months ago, the Chiang Kai-shek Government is a corrupt dictatorship. And yet, since VJ-day we have supplied the Chinese Government with hundreds of millions of dollars worth of arms, military equipment, and aircraft.

Last December we led the way in swinging world support behind the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. Then, a month ago, under pressure from our military strategists, we surrendered.

We have ducked the issue of Fascist Spain in the councils of the United Nations. With the exception of our brief campaign against Perón, we have accepted the friendship and support of military-ridden dictatorships in South America, Portugal, and Turkey.

In Greece and Italy, where our position has been dominant, our inability or unwillingness to insist on long overdue economic and social reforms has seriously weakened our position with the people. A year ago we were told that $400,000,000 would secure the Near East and clear the guerrillas out of Greece. Instead of conditioning our aid on the establishment of an efficient, liberal government, we first gave the money and then offered our proposals. Our belated effort was an honest one. But because we had given away our trading position, the Greek Government has been in a position to stall and to reject; in 12 months the guerrillas have increased their forces 400 percent, and more funds are required in a hurry.

In Italy we have held a position of great influence since the liberation in 1943 and 1944. We have invested nearly two billion American dollars for relief and rehabilitation. Our economic and political experts sit in the councils of the Italian Government. But because our representatives themselves were opposed or because we had taken away their trading position, the essential reforms have not been forthcoming. As a result, there is a danger that the Communists will either win the election, which takes place today, or come so close to it that they will control the government.

The Italian Communists have gained, to some extent, by stealing some ideas right out of the settlement of our American west. In south Italy, Anne O'Hare McCormick reports that the Communists have won widespread support by promising specific plots of land to the peasants if they win today's election. This idea could have been suggested by a study of the upsurge of economic democracy in America under Andrew Jackson 120 years ago when the slogan Vote Yourself a Farm resounded throughout our own land.

Many members of the present Italian Government are honest, conscientious men. Perhaps they would do better if they cared less for the good opinion of us Americans. In Italy, last January, I asked a government official why scarce commodities, such as building materials, were not distributed to those in the greatest need; why the scanty supply of food was not rationed; why black markets were allowed openly to flourish; why the great estates, many of which are owned by Fascist supporters of Mussolini, were not purchased by the Government and divided among the peasants, who actually till the land.

He looked at me in amazement. "We understood that you Americans were opposed to all such measures," he said. "We thought you were anxious to see us duplicate your free enterprise system in Italy."

In support of his position, he quoted to me generously from recent economic speeches by Senator ROBERT TAFT. I pointed out that America was rich enough to afford Senator TAFT, but that Italy was very poor. Clearly, my views were strange to him, and disturbing.

What are the alternatives to our present policies? How can we strengthen our strategic position with the 2,000,000,000 people who do not live in North America? How can we best avoid war? And, if war comes in spite of our efforts, how can we be sure to develop the maximum support behind us?

Obviously, the answers are not simple. But let me offer a series of proposals.

First, we must make it clear to the Soviet Union that we will resist further agression against duly elected governments by every means at our disposal. This we are doing now—somewhat hysterically.

Second, we must moderate the influence on the State Department of the Secretaries for Defense, the Army, Navy and Air.

Secretary Marshall's statement on China was enlightened and liberal. His concept of the European recovery program has been along the same lines. Unfortunately, old associates in the War and Navy Departments have given him but little opportunity to develop that kind of thinking to its logical conclusions.

I am sure that they are able men in the business of war, and we should listen to them attentively on questions of preparedness. But the maintenance of the peace is a complex and vastly different subject.

Third, we must awaken the American conscience on the subject of political democracy. Three-quarters of the world is colored—brown, black, or yellow. As long as we accept the Negro only as a second-class citizen, we cannot hope to win the confidence and friendship of Asia and Africa.

This is not an easy problem. The prejudices with which we must struggle are deep-seated. Nevertheless, as a matter not only of morality but of national security, this issue must be met.

Fourth, we must put a stop to the present inflation and learn how to cushion the ups and downs of the business cycle. As we eliminate the danger of unemployment, clear our slums, and provide adequate housing, we will strengthen both our democracy at home and American prestige throughout the world.

Fifth, we must take our stand unequivocally beside the hungry and oppressed people all over the world in their fight for increased economic security. We must convince them that we stand wholeheartedly for long overdue economic and social reforms, and that with our help they can achieve higher living standards and political freedom, too.

Let me be specific. American and British oil companies have contracted for the oil reserves of the Near East. The terms of these agreements lay the oil industry open to the charge of ruthless exploitation. Surely, the oil companies are entitled to a fair profit for their technical contributions to the production, transportation, and refinement of Near Eastern petroleum products. Since our national security is involved, it is the responsibility of our Government, however, to make sure that the price which is paid is a fair price.

Through the International Bank, we can promote river valley developments on the TVA model on the Tigris, Euphrates, and Jordan. We are in a position to bring pressure on the rulers of this medieval area for long-needed reforms designed to raise the standard of living, of literacy, and of health—reforms which can be largely financed by oil royalties.

The European recovery program offers us an unusual opportunity in Europe. It is a bold concept for which Secretary Marshall deserves full credit. The fact that three out of four Senators and Representatives supported it purely as a stop-communism device does not mean that it cannot bring untold economic benefits to the 250,000,000 men, women, and children of western Europe.

The question lies in how the money will be used. Will we attempt to further a narrow concept of private capitalism or will we work to raise living standards by the most practical means, even though, on occasion, this involves government ownership? Will we continue our present laissez-faire program in Greece and Italy or will we insist on the basic reforms to which the people are entitled? How about similar reforms in Portugal and Turkey?

We could establish an economic embargo against Franco Spain with an offer of broad Marshall plan aid to any Spanish democratic government which will put a reform program into effect. Will we do it, or will the military strategists say "No"?

We could take up the case of the oppressed millions in South America in ringing terms and offer our tangible help, under specific conditions, in improving their living standards. If we did so, we would capture the imagination of people not only in South America but throughout the world.

This same approach could be applied to India, not merely to compete with communism when it starts to gain a foothold, but before communism gets its start. A reasonable amount of material aid could, with the aid of American technicians, help in raising the living standards of the people whom Gandhi and Nehru have awakened from their long slumber.

In all parts of Asia we should throw our weight vigorously against the last vestiges of European imperialism.

Mr. James Yen has developed a plan for eliminating illiteracy in China within 10 years. His plan also calls for widespread education in agriculture and the development of new techniques for democratic county governments. The total cost of this program would be $200,000,000 annually—less than one-half the sum just voted for aid to Chiang Kai-shek. If we offered to finance such a program, we would identify ourselves with the progressive elements in the new China which is emerging. Together with aid for river developments and modern transportation systems, we would go far toward restoring our prestige among the peoples of the East.

Economic, social, and political proposals of this kind will touch the hearts and the imagination of the hungry, seething millions all over the world. Offers of material aid, however, will not be enough. We will need bold, imaginative leadership to go with it. If we are successfully to combat communism and lay the basis for lasting peace, we cannot afford to compromise with inefficiency and graft, with reaction or fascism.

We must demonstrate that we, as Americans, stand not only against tyranny in any form, but for the sweeping economic and social reforms which are so long overdue, and the lack of which now provide such an easy opportunity for the Communists.

If we should adopt such a policy, it would be an unprecedented feat for democracy. Historically, great nations have lost their position of leadership because as they grew prosperous they have tried to stand still. Gradually, they lost touch with a world which is forever on the march. As they lost touch, their fears for their own security have

increased, and with the increase in their fears came even greater conservatism—slowly emerging into out-and-out reaction.

Our own country has already been caught up to a frightening degree in this age-old cycle. Unless we are able to reverse the present trends, we may, within the next generation, go the way of the Roman Empire of Constantine.

The spotlight of history is upon us. If we expect to survive as a great Nation, we must stand for something more progressive than atom bombs and B–36's.

A bold program of economic, social, and political democracy, skillfully conceived and aggressively programed, is the one means by which America can continue to develop as a symbol of hope in a world of 2,000,000,000 people who are determined not to go back.

Trade Agreements—The Cross-Examination of the Honorable William L. Clayton, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 3, 1948, a subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am the chairman, will go into executive sessions for the purpose of preparing its report on the trade agreements program which it has had under investigation and study since early in March of 1947. Unless extended, the Presidential authority to conclude trade agreements with foreign nations will expire on June 12, 1948.

Commencing early in March of 1947 and continuing well into May of the same year, the Ways and Means Committee conducted comprehensive public hearings on the trade agreements program, during the course of which everyone who desired to be heard—and their number was many—was permitted to testify. More exhaustive hearings could not have been had.

Among those who presented themselves for examination was the distinguished Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, the Honorable William L. Clayton, who, in answers to questions which I then propounded, presented the case for the extension of the trade-agreements program, with the administration of which he has long been intimately connected.

As the questioning brought to light many interesting phases of the trade-agreements program which had not been theretofore, or since, the subject matter of general discussion, I am constrained to ask, in the interest of better understanding, that my questions and his answers, together with the illustration statistical charts to which we referred be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, the transcript of the testimony to which I have just referred, taken from the printed public hearings of March 28, 1947, is the following:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. CLAYTON, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. GEARHART. Aside from the hopes which are said to spring eternal, the administration of the Trade Agreements Act has to date been a complete failure, has it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir.

Mr. GEARHART. Do you feel that the purposes which the original act was supposed to serve have been achieved?

Mr. CLAYTON. They are being achieved; yes, sir. We are not through yet.

Mr. GEARHART. That brings me back to my first question.

It is the hope of success that spurs you on, is it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think that is always one of the things that spur us on to difficult accomplishments. But we have, we think, a very worth-while record of the past to justify the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, will you say that the program has been a success on the record achieved to date?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir. I do.

Mr. GEARHART. You are familiar with the Trade Agreements Act, of course?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GEARHART. You recall that it recites, in the first part of the act, the reasons why it was enacted and the purposes it is hoped to serve?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GEARHART. And they are, are they not, these: For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States.

Mr. CLAYTON. Right.

Mr. GEARHART. And as a means to achieving that end, it is the purpose to restore our American standard of living; overcome domestic employment; overcome the economic depression; increase the purchasing power of the American public; and to establish and maintain a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce.

Well, would you say that the American standard of living was restored, prior to the advent of the war economy?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, I think it had materially been restored. It was probably the highest in the world and is still today the highest in the world.

Mr. GEARHART. Oh, yes; that is very easy to say today, but we are just emerging from a war economy and the benefits are still with us, and they are good as far as economics is concerned.

Certainly, the trade agreements program is not claiming in any manner credit for war economy, are they?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, but under the trade agreements program, our exports to countries with which we had trade agreements increased much more rapidly than it did to countries with which we did not have trade agreements.

Our imports likewise increased much more from countries with which we had trade agreements than the other countries.

Mr. GEARHART. I am not admitting that assertion, because I do not feel that is true, and I can demostrate to the contrary.

I want to come to that a little later.

I want to take up each one of these points. You say that the trade agreements program has restored the American standard of living. In order to apply the test, we will have to apply the test for the years that the act was on the statute books, up to the years in which the war economy was entered, is that not correct?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GEARHART. Therefore, if it has restored the American standard of living, it must have done it between the time of enactment and the time that Hitler's soldiers began marching in September 1929.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; but I did not claim, Mr. Gearhart, and I do not claim, that the improvement that took place in the American standard of living, between 1934 and 1937, or 1938, was due entirely to the Trade Agreements Act. I do not claim that.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, the fact remains that the per capita income of the people in 1929 was $635 and that in 1938, after 5 years of reciprocal trading, or, rather 4 full years of reciprocal trading, it fell to $500 per capita.

Mr. CLAYTON. What was it in 1932? 1933?

Mr. GEARHART. That is the reason why you asked us to pass this act, because it was down very low in 1932 and you were going to restore it.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. So the record shows you have not and did not within that period of time restore the standard of per capita living.

Mr. CLAYTON. We restored it to some extent, Mr. Gearhart, and the Trade Agreements Act really only had 4 years. There was only a lapse of 4 years between the time it was passed and the beginning of the war, or, say, 5 years, and within that time agreements had to be negotiated and you had to allow some time for them to come into effect, and for there to be any effect.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, I will ask you to remember that answer when you start telling about how we made greater gains with countries with which we made agreements over countries that we did not have agreements with, because if the argument is good one way it is also good the other way.

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. GEARHART. Then we were going to recover domestic employment. The record discloses that in 1929 we only had 1 percent unemployment, and in 1938 we had 20.3 percent unemployment, and that during the entire period in which the reciprocal trade agreement was in effect, unemployment in the United States never fell under 10,000,000 and during several of those years, it rose as high as 13,000,000. So we cannot say that under this program, unemployment was done away with or that the employment standard of 1929 was restored, can we?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly not. It will take a long time, Mr. GEARHART, much longer than the time between the enactment of a trade agreements program and the beginning of the war to overcome all the tragic mistakes that were made in the first 12 years following the First World War.

No doubt you remember most of those, and no doubt you remember the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that was passed in 1930, and the tragic mistakes, the tragic circumstances of that act. It will take a long time to overcome that.

Mr. GEARHART. And again I do not want to appear, by not challenging your assertion right now, that I agree to anything of that kind at all.

The Smoot-Hawley Act, as we call it here on this bench, in spite of the care we take to avoid it, was a good tariff law. It only raised the tariff ad valorems 1.6 percent over the preceding act.

Mr. CLAYTON. On the average. You had many schedules raised 100 percent.

Mr. GEARHART. And all the additional benefits all went to agriculture. Practically none to industry. And the free list was enlarged under the Smoot-Hawley Act over the preceding tariff act.

Mr. CLAYTON. You and I know about that, both.

Mr. GEARHART. Under the preceding tariff act, of which the Smoot-Hawley tariff law was just a continuation, we enjoyed the greatest prosperity for a long period of time that this country had ever known. It is time that some people raised their voices in defense of that tariff act which has been so long maligned by people who have had political objectives to serve.

Mr. CLAYTON. I can answer that.

Mr. GEARHART. You have given a good dog a bad name. That is all there is to that.

Mr. CLAYTON. I can assure you that is not true.

Mr. GEARHART. Let us pass that. I do not want to be diverted at this moment. I will take that subject up in a moment.

I will ask you some very good questions about the Smoot-Hawley Act, to determine whether or not it really is such a bad piece of legislation.

Now, did your reciprocal trade agreements program end the economic depression?

Mr. CLAYTON. No; we do not claim that it did.

Mr. GEARHART. But other countries that did not have any trade agreements act, managed to get out of the depression and to get themselves above the line where they were in 1929, did they not?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes. They had not gone as far astray as we had in the period after the First World War.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, taking 1929 as 100 par, the best that we could achieve by 1938 under this reciprocal trade agreement program, which was going to restore our once favorable economic condition, was to get back to 72, whereas England was able to go to 115 in the same period of time, but she did not have the restraining influence of a reciprocal trade agreements law. So much for that.

Did we increase the purchasing power of the American public?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think so.

Mr. GEARHART. We find that in 1929, we had a national income of $83,300,000,000. In 1938, despite the help of the reciprocal trade agreements law, we were only able to achieve a national income of $64,200,000,000.

Mr. CLAYTON. What was it in 1932? About $45,000,000,000, was it not?

Mr. GEARHART. To restore the national income of 1929 the thing you were setting out to do, was it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; we did it.

Mr. GEARHART. Restored it from that tumble into the depression bottom?

Mr. CLAYTON. We helped to do it.

Mr. GEARHART. Did you accomplish it?

Mr. CLAYTON. We think so.

Mr. GEARHART. According to my information, our national income in 1938 was but $77,100,000,000. However, I will take that up with you in a moment or two.

Mr. CLAYTON. All right.

Mr. GEARHART. And I will demonstrate to you that nearly all of the recovery, from the bottom of the pit in 1932 to 1938, this in nearly all branches of human activity, was made between 1932 and 1935 under the Smoot-Hawley Act. In some instances, as much as 100 percent of the recovery that was achieved by 1938.

Well, if I demonstrate that to you, will you still say that the reciprocal trade agreement helped restore the national income?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. And still it was all restored before you had your Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. Do you still say that?

Mr. CLAYTON. But it was not.

Mr. GEARHART. But I have the figures here.

Mr. CLAYTON. All right.

Mr. GEARHART. We will just pass that for the moment. Then the final promise was to establish and maintain a better relationship among various branches of the American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce. I do not know what you think about that. Did you establish a better relationship between these various activities within the United States?

Mr. CLAYTON. I am not sure, Mr. GEARHART, exactly what that language means. I do not know what it means.

Mr. GEARHART. I would have to agree with you. That is a little obscure. At least it is so comprehensive that it is a little bit difficult to answer that question.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is.

Mr. GEARHART. But coming from an agricultural area, I cannot fail to note the fact that, in 1929, one-third of the people of the United States derived their living from agriculture, but that, in 1938, under the influence of the so-called scarcity program and the reciprocal trade-agreements program, the agricultural population of this country fell to less than 25 percent, or less than one-fourth of the people of the United States.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, that probably has an answer, too.

Mr. GEARHART. So the administration of the reciprocal trade-agreements program did not make agriculture more attractive as a vocation or profession, did it?

Mr. CLAYTON. I cannot speak definitely in answer to that question. I can only say that, as we all know, the trends for 100 years have been in the direction of a reduction in the number of people dependent upon agriculture, and an increase in the people living in the cities and dependent upon industry and commerce. That trend is still going on.

If you get figures today, I imagine you will find a still smaller part of our population living on and dependent upon the farms.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, the cutting of the tariff on agricultural products and the bringing into this country of tremendous quantities of agricultural commodities from abroad that could have been raised here, do you think that had anything to do with the reduction of the agricultural population of the United States during the period that the reciprocal trade-agreements program was in effect?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not. I think there could have been as much influence on the other side due to increased exports from this country, which certainly helped the economy as a whole and agriculture in particular.

Mr. GEARHART. Did you ever stop to think that the difference between one-third of the people of the United States and one-fourth of the people of the United States is 10,000,000 people?

Mr. CLAYTON. I had never stopped to think of it.

Mr. GEARHART. That is approximately true, is it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. It is easy to calculate it, but I do not see anything very significant in that, Mr. Gearhart.

You have got a trend throughout the world, particularly in the United States, due to technological improvement and all that sort of thing, by which it takes fewer people all of the time, a smaller percentage of the total people to produce the food and clothing for the rest of the people, due to technological improvement in production.

And that has not reached its limits by any means, yet.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, I asked you if you saw any significance in the fact that the difference between one-third of the people of the United States and one-fourth of the people of the United States is approximately 10,000,000, and the fact that we had unemployment roll in the United States during the administration of the reciprocal trade agreements program which never fell below 10,000,000.

Mr. CLAYTON. I think it would be very easy to draw an unwarranted conclusion from that. Yes; I do.

Mr. GEARHART. Do you think that is merely coincidental?

Mr. CLAYTON. What is coincidental?

Mr. GEARHART. The fact that the unemployment rolls in the United States were from 10,000,000 to 13,000,000, and 10,000,000 people were driven from our farms.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; I think that is coincidental. I do.

I do not think they were driven from the farms. I think a great many of them came naturally from the farms to the cities just as they are doing today.

Mr. GEARHART. All right. The different items that I have listed; restoring the American standard of living, overcoming domestic employment, ending of economic depression, the increasing of the purchasing power of the American public, and the establishment and maintaining of better relationships; those four things which were going to be improved through the administration of a reciprocal trade agreement law, according to the figures I have cited, none of them have been improved or restored to the high standards we enjoyed in 1929. But I want to be fair with you. They were subsidiary purposes. They were not the main purpose of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

The main purpose recited in the act of which these that I have named are means, the main purpose as recited by the act, is the expanding of foreign markets for the products of the United States.

Now, I want to ask you a definite question: Have the foreign markets of the world been expanded for American products as a consequence of the administration of the reciprocal trade-agreements program?

Mr. CLAYTON. The reciprocal trade-agreements program helped to attain that result; yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Then you assert that they have been expanded?

Mr. CLAYTON. They were expanded over what they were at the time the reciprocal trade-agreements program was passed; yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you sure of that?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, I have some figures here that I obtained from the League of Nations. I could not get them from any American agency, though I asked them time and time again for them, including your State Department.

It seemed to me that the enlargement of the figures, when the national income of the world was rising, did not give the reciprocal-trade agreement people any basis for claiming the credit, because we hit bottom in 1932, and there was only one way to move, and that was upward, and all the whole world moved upward from 1932.

All of them moved faster upward than did the United States. They did not have any reciprocal trade-agreements program to hold them back, or to build their hopes upon. All of the other countries of the world merely adhered to their old system of what you call high tariffs. But they got up much faster than we did, according to the record.

England, as I pointed out a moment ago, made 115 points plus, taking 1929 as a par 100, and we only achieved in that same period of time, 72. Still below the 100 par of 1929.

So, the important thing is knowing as the figures grow larger with the enlargement each year of national incomes of the world, and the peoples of the world, the important thing to know is how did we fare in percentages.

Now, in percentages, have we expanded our foreign markets?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. We have?

Mr. CLAYTON. We have. You were claiming a moment ago that we made great progress under the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill during that period you are talking about now.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes. I am saving that for you and you are going to get the proof of that.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. I will give you the figures on that.

Mr. CLAYTON. Of course, the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill practically destroyed our foreign trade and brought about retaliations from over 30 nations in the world, retaliations against our trade, against our export, retaliation in every way they could think of almost, economically, and specifically was that done as the result of the passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, and still you call it a good tariff bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes, sir; and I will take that up with you a little later on, too.

Now, if the Smoot-Hawley tariff law did create a spirit of retaliation in the outside

world, you will have to admit you have not corrected it with the reciprocal trade-agreement program, have you?

Mr. CLAYTON. We are correcting it to some extent and we are correcting it all the time and we are going to correct it a good deal before we get through.

Mr. GEARHART. That is a promise, is it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. If not completely corrected, we think, in time, we will completely overcome the great harm that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill did to our commerce and to our relations with foreign countries.

Mr. GEARHART. All right. Now, let us take a look at the other side of the world. You say that you have with this program improved our foreign trade opportunities in foreign markets.

Mr. CLAYTON. It improved our trade. It helped to increase our trade.

Mr. GEARHART. Has it, now?

I have divided the years in these groups and I think you will agree it is fair. I took the years 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929, as the bumper years under the Macumber protective-tariff law. Then I set up another group of years which I have denominated the depression years, 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, and 1934.

And you know what happened in 1934. That is the year you passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. CLAYTON. Right.

Mr. GEARHART. I class all years from 1930 to 1934, inclusive, as depression years. Then I have taken 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 and I call them the trade-agreement years.

And I have then applied the test of those years to every important market in the world. And I have the figures in respect to dollars and the figures relating to percentages.

Now, in the case of the United Kingdom, I find that under the Macumber tariff law, which was just 1.6 percent different in ad valorem from the horrible Smoot-Hawley Act——

Mr. CLAYTON. That is average.

Mr. GEARHART. That in those 4 years, our share of the United Kingdom market that was ours to enjoy was 16.6 percent. That is, the people of the United Kingdom bought from the United States 16.6 percent of all of their out-of-country purchases.

And then we go down to the depression years, when purchasing power fell off, and we find that England, though then looking for cheaper markets, bought 12.2 percent of all of her out-of-country purchases from the United States.

And then we get the trade-agreements years, and Mr. Hull had induced the American people to adopt that law on the promise it was going to get us back to where we were in the good old days of Republican protection, and we find that our percentage, our slice in the British market went on even below what it had been in the depression years, down to 11.5 percent of all of their out-of-country purchases.

So, can that be taken as proof that under the administration of this act, we have expanded our opportunities in foreign markets?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. GEARHART, percentages are sometimes very deceptive. With the chairman's permission, I would like to tell a very brief story that illustrates my point.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. GEARHART. You have my permission as well, since I have control of the time for this moment.

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly. There was a lumber camp in the Northwest years ago where there were 100 men employed and there were 2 women. One of the men and one of the women were married, and then the clerk of the camp entered in the journal, "One percent of the men in this camp have just married 50 percent of the women."

In percentage, it was correct, but it was a little bit deceptive.

Mr. GEARHART. That reminds me also of a story of a man who was selling meat sandwiches. He advertised "rabbit sandwiches." Finally, when haled before the village magistrate, he admitted that the rabbit meat was just 50–50, one rabbit to one horse. Yes, calculations do sometimes mislead.

But that has not anything to do with what I am asking you about. Neither of our stories have, though I enjoyed the interlude.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right. And may I comment on your statement about the British purchases?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes.

Mr. CLAYTON. In 1930, Congress passed the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. We had these retaliations, as I have told you, by over 30 countries in the world, protests and retaliations.

In 1932, at Ottawa, a conference was held of members of the British Empire, and the British Empire preference system was set up.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; but I was saying that,

Mr. CLAYTON. Excuse me. I would like to finish that.

Mr. GEARHART. I want to go over that quite at length. I would like to have your views on that subject.

Mr. CLAYTON. I would like to finish my statement.

In 1932 the British Empire preference system was adopted at the Ottawa Conference. That was a measure of self-defense. They had lost substantially their markets in the United States because of the passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, and our high protective policy, in which in many cases the index rose in 1931 and 1932 to over 100 percent of the value of the product.

They had lost those markets, and they had to bring together their resources and the markets of the United Kingdom, of Great Britain, and conserve those markets to themselves.

Now, we were still feeling the effects of that action all through the 1930's right up on to the time of the World War, in spite of the reciprocal trade agreements program. We had done something to correct some of these very high tariffs, excessively high tariffs, and the situation that arose from them. We had done a good deal to restore good relations with these countries, and trade with these countries, but we could not overcome all of the harm that this action of the United States has caused, and we have not been able to do it yet. It is still going to take some time.

Mr. GEARHART. With all due respect to you, Mr. Clayton, I do not agree with a word you have said about retaliation, because I do not think there is any evidence to reveal it, and certainly the other departments of our own United States Government do not agree with you.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, I believe so.

Mr. GEARHART. Granted, but I do not want to touch that now. I want to take up these other things. I am working on the promise of an expansion of American opportunities in foreign markets.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Because I have not only investigated the United Kingdom market but every other important foreign market. I have before me and hold in my hands the figures supplied me by the League of Nations, revealing that which has occurred in both the trade-agreement countries, and the non-trade-agreement countries, during the years I have mentioned.

Now, for instance, take Italy, a non-trade-agreement country.

In the Republican protective tariff years, we enjoyed 19 percent of all of the out-of-country purchases of Italy.

In the depression years it fell to 13.3 percent of all of the out-of-country purchases of Italy.

And under the so-called reciprocal trade agreement years it went on down still further to 12.2 percent.

Now, you say, "Why, Italy is not a reciprocal trade agreement country," but under your so-called most-favored-nation principle Italy gets all of the benefits that go to all the trade-agreement countries. The only difference is that it does not have to concede anything in order to get them, so our business with a non-trade-agreement country should grow faster than our business with a trade-agreement country, because they get the cuts and get them for nothing. But notwithstanding this, with Italy, our business in the reciprocal-trade-agreement years went still lower than it had been at the bottom of the depression.

Take France. Now, we are back to a trade-agreements country.

Mr. CLAYTON. Could we deal with one of them at a time? I would like to comment on your statement about Italy.

Mr. GEARHART. All right.

Mr. CLAYTON. You say our trade should have grown faster with Italy than with any other country.

Mr. GEARHART. Than any other agreement country?

Mr. CLAYTON. Than any other agreement country, because we had no agreement with Italy and she got her cuts without making any corresponding concessions.

Mr. GEARHART. That is right. It should have. But it didn't.

Mr. CLAYTON. You are talking, I believe, largely about our trade, if not altogether, about our shipments to these countries; in other words, our exports to these countries.

Mr. GEARHART. I am talking about our share of the total out-of-country purchases of Italy; our little piece of the pie.

Mr. CLAYTON. That would be our exports to Italy.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, the concessions to which you refer, though, that Italy benefited from because of our agreements with other countries, and had to pay nothing for, is an argument against any increase of trade with Italy, for the simple reason that while we gave concessions, they were applicable to Italy on imports from Italy, and we had no agreement with Italy; and according to your own arguments, she made no concessions on our exports to Italy, and therefore, from the standpoint of our trade with Italy, our shipments to Italy, there is no reason why Italy, being a non-trade-agreement country, should have bought more goods from us than before. Quite the contrary.

Mr. GEARHART. Why should she not? She got her goods into our market cheaper, did she not?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; she did, but she did not have to spend the money in the United States. She could spend it somewhere else.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; and we could get our goods into her country under the same old terms, could we not?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; but under no concessions.

Mr. GEARHART. But Italy had a better access to our market than she had under the Smoot-Hawley Act, but not during the depression years. The same access to the Italian market was open to us under the reciprocal trade agreement years as before, and still our business got worse with Italy.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; but I can answer that.

Mr. GEARHART. All right.

Mr. CLAYTON. Simply answering your argument that our business should have improved faster to Italy than to the trade agreement countries, because we had made concessions to Italy for which she had to pay nothing, the payment for concessions is concessions by the other country in respect of our exports to it. You are talking about our exports to Italy. Italy did not reduce her tariff on her imports from us, because we had no trade agreement with them.

Therefore, your argument is not a valid one, with all due respect.

Now, let me take this further comment: Italy did not gain most-favored-nation

treatment from us if she discriminated against our trade any way whatever. The most-favored-nation clause is extended only to those countries that do not discriminate against our trade.

Mr. GEARHART. Wait a minute there.

Mr. CLAYTON. May I just finish?

Mr. GEARHART. I want to know more about that.

Mr. CLAYTON. Please, may I finish, and then you may come back to that.

During the period to which you refer, Italy was getting ready for war under Mussolini and was making bilateral trade agreements with other countries and channeling her trade to those countries that she thought would be useful to her in case of war, just as Germany was doing.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes.

Mr. CLAYTON. Do not forget in that period we had all kinds of currents and developments and trends to contend with in our international trade.

We knew what was happening in Germany. We knew what was happening in Japan. We knew what was happening in Italy. They were all three countries that in normal times we had a very large trade with; but during the period that you are discussing, they were all three getting ready for war and were trying, first of all, to make themselves self-sufficient as far as they could and, in the next place, were trying to direct their trade with countries they thought would be most useful to them.

Mr. GEARHART. You have listed a lot of arguments why the Italian result as shown by these figures can be explained.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right.

Mr. GEARHART. All right. I can take you to another country to which none of those arguments can be applied, and still you get the same result, a loss of the markets——

Mr. CLAYTON. All right.

Mr. GEARHART. During the period of the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

Now, you say something about withholding the benefits of the most-favored-nation principle from Italy. As a matter of fact, Italy was never deprived of the benefit of the unconditional most-favored-nation principle as applied to commerce.

Mr. CLAYTON. I did not say she was.

Mr. GEARHART. You implied it very strongly.

Mr. CLAYTON. I did not mean to. I meant to say in regard to Italy or any other country with which we do not have a trade agreement, the most-favored-nation principle applies only if, and so long as, they do not discriminate against our trade.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; but, as a matter of fact, and in the face of the record, no nation on the face of this earth was deprived of the benefit of the unconditional-most-favored-nation principle, except that for awhile Australia was, and all of the time Germany was, is that not correct?

Mr. CLAYTON. I cannot answer that "Yes" or "No," Mr. GEARHART. I do not know.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, I think the young man with you will verify that.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am informed that it is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. That is correct. And now we go down to the case of France.

France is one of your early reciprocal trade agreement countries, and we find that in the protective-tariff years we had 12.2 percent of all of the out-of-country purchases.

During the depression years we fell down in France to 10 percent.

And then, in the trade-agreement years, we went on down to 9.8 percent, our share in her total out-of-country purchases.

How about your explanations that you gave with respect to Italy? Will you apply them to France?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir.

Mr. GEARHART. Take Canada. Canada is one of the early trade-agreement countries, one of our best customers.

We find that in the protective-tariff years, as I have defined them, Canada bought 67.4 percent of all of her out-of-country purchases from the United States.

In the depression years, Canada's purchases from us fell down to 60.3 percent of her total out-of-country purchases.

And under the trade-agreement years, the percentage goes on down to 59.4 percent.

Now, how do you account for the fact that our percentage share in the Canadian market fell off during the beneficent influences of the Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. CLAYTON. It is practically the same. Nine-tenths of 1 percent different.

Mr. GEARHART. That is right, but it is all going in the wrong direction.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right; in the wrong direction; but the preference system accounted for that.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, we have the Netherlands, another trade-agreement country. In the tariff days, when we treated all countries alike and made them pay for their entry into the American market, we enjoyed 10.1 percent of the market of the Netherlands.

In the depression years we went down to 7.1 percent.

In the trade-agreement years we came up 1 percent to 8.3 percent.

There is the only country that I find on my list where it turned upward.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am glad we found one.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes, sir.

In Belgium, in the protective tariff years we enjoyed 10.3 percent of the Belgium market.

In the depression years it went up to 10.7 percent, but in the trade-agreement years our share dropped down to 8.5 percent.

Well, now, I could go on and read into the record the figures in respect to all of these markets, but they all tell the same story.

The trade-agreement countries and the non-trade-agreement countries, they all tell the same story. But, at that, I think the non-trade-agreement countries and the trade-agreement countries should tell the same story, because all of the benefits that go to an agreement country also go to a nonagreement country, and, if anything, the non-agreement country is the one that should be more appreciative. It gets its entry into the American market under more favorable conditions without the necessity of giving anything to us in return.

That is correct, is it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. During the period that you mention, Mr. GEARHART, our export trade in the whole foreign trade increased materially, and it increased much faster with trade-agreement countries than with the other countries.

Mr. GEARHART. I am getting to that, too, and I do not think, really, when we analyze it, that you will be able to stick to that statement. Not wholeheartedly, though you might cling to it tenaciously. You have got a job to do.

But that brings us down to the discussion with a country with which we never had a trade agreement, one which excused itself whenever the subject was broached. That is Japan. They stood on the side lines and got the benefit of every agreement that was made without giving us anything in return.

Japan merely jumped on the "gravy train" and did not pay a nickel for the ride. So we find that in the protective tariff years, as I have defined them, we enjoyed 29.3 percent of all of the total out-of-country purchases of Japan. And in the depression years, our share went on up to 31.7 percent of all of the total out-of-country purchases of Japan; and in the trade agreement years, our share still went on up—32.7 percent.

Now, do the trade agreement proponents claim they are entitled to the credit, if any, for the improvement of our trade with Japan?

Mr. CLAYTON. No. That was due to the acquisition in this country of certain essential materials that she could not get anywhere else.

Mr. GEARHART. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask the unanimous consent to include this tabulation in the record at this point.

Mr. REED (presiding). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The tables are as follows:)

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
UNITED KINGDOM				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	6,030,825	100	1,112,005	18.4
1927	5,929,057	100	974,208	16.4
1928	5,818,380	100	917,080	15.7
1929	5,944,873	100	952,083	16.0
Average				16.6
The depression years:				
1930	5,080,506	100	748,131	14.7
1931	3,901,130	100	472,689	12.1
1932	2,465,254	100	293,772	11.9
1933	3,784,324	100	425,716	11.2
1934	3,685,815	100	413,001	11.2
Average				12.2
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	3,705,962	100	429,015	11.5
1936	4,219,976	100	463,785	10.9
1937	5,081,564	100	564,137	11.1
1938	4,495,847	100	576,854	12.8
Average				11.5
ITALY				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,006,688	100	218,141	21.6
1927	1,051,340	100	204,237	19.4
1928	1,153,015	100	211,198	18.3
1929	1,120,381	100	187,259	16.7
Average				19
The depression years:				
1930	912,432	100	133,496	14.6
1931	606,603	100	69,137	11.3
1932	424,126	100	56,850	13.4
1933	655,136	100	98,267	14.9
1934	657,146	100	82,092	12.4
Average				13.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	642,446	100	72,607	11.3
1936	440,361	100	65,270	14.8
1937	733,520	100	80,966	11.0
1938	593,021	100	70,405	11.8
Average				12.2
FRANCE				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,931,917	100	253,359	13.1
1927	2,077,444	100	266,853	12.8
1928	2,094,674	100	243,083	11.6
1929	2,284,757	100	281,371	12.3
Average				12.2
The depression years:				
1930	2,058,424	100	241,007	11.7
1931	1,654,469	100	148,979	9.0
1932	1,168,488	100	113,664	9.7
1933	1,885,715	100	194,666	10.3
1934	1,517,210	100	143,872	9.4
Average				10.0
Trade agreement years:				
1935	1,384,554	100	118,032	8.5
1936	1,520,194	100	151,123	9.9
1937	1,701,782	100	161,914	9.5
1938	1,336,600	100	153,126	11.4
Average				9.8

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
CANADA				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	927,329	100	609,720	65.7
1927	1,030,893	100	687,023	66.6
1928	1,108,956	100	719,436	64.8
1929	1,265,679	100	868,012	68.5
Average				67.4
The depression years:				
1930	1,248,274	100	847,442	67.8
1931	906,613	100	584,407	64.4
1932	452,614	100	263,549	58.2
1933	401,214	100	217,291	54.1
1934	511,275	100	291,775	57.0
Average				60.3
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	544,720	100	308,509	56.6
1936	632,801	100	368,127	58.1
1937	808,058	100	490,000	60.6
1938	672,670	100	421,521	62.6
Average				59.4
NETHERLANDS				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	979,220	100	103,445	10.5
1927	1,022,346	100	107,673	10.5
1928	1,078,929	100	106,796	9.8
1929	1,106,424	100	109,409	9.8
Average				10.1
The depression years:				
1930	972,139	100	84,943	8.7
1931	760,879	100	59,547	7.8
1932	552,370	100	34,459	6.2
1933	822,156	100	52,849	6.4
1934	699,623	100	46,633	6.6
Average				7.1
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	633,753	100	43,883	6.9
1936	647,394	100	46,015	7.1
1937	853,265	100	75,052	8.7
1938	778,250	100	84,367	10.8
Average				8.3
BELGIUM				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	751,284	100	85,575	11.3
1927	808,286	100	88,971	11.0
1928	888,932	100	86,119	9.6
1929	990,341	100	94,702	9.5
Average				10.3
The depression years:				
1930	864,420	100	86,347	9.9
1931	666,385	100	58,447	8.7
1932	456,898	100	39,543	8.6
1933	716,988	100	67,208	9.3
1934	638,194	100	46,529	7.2
Average				10.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	630,532	100	47,756	7.5
1936	720,641	100	49,912	6.9
1937	927,752	100	79,916	8.6
1938	765,518	100	84,084	11.0
Average				8.5
DENMARK				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	424,959	100	68,923	16.2
1927	444,162	100	67,221	15.1
1928	465,234	100	60,860	13.0
1929	480,677	100	64,071	13.3
Average				14.4

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
DENMARK—con.				
The depression years:				
1930	463,409	100	52,059	11.2
1931	367,961	100	38,708	10.5
1932	214,829	100	16,479	7.6
1933	320,187	100	19,226	6.0
1934	304,697	100	18,509	6.0
Average				8.2
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	291,082	100	15,283	5.2
1936	329,736	100	17,532	5.3
1937	369,385	100	19,247	5.2
1938	354,728	100	27,920	7.8
Average				5.8
SWEDEN				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	398,673	100	53,354	13.3
1927	424,768	100	53,628	12.6
1928	457,732	100	67,474	14.7
1929	477,784	100	70,057	14.6
Average				13.8
The depression years:				
1930	455,463	100	61,439	13.7
1931	363,448	100	44,977	12.3
1932	213,303	100	23,058	10.8
1933	320,141	100	32,953	10.2
1934	339,000	100	39,912	11.7
Average				11.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	373,080	100	47,729	12.7
1936	418,388	100	54,064	12.9
1937	541,205	100	74,932	13.8
1938	524,579	100	85,294	16.2
Average				13.9
SWITZERLAND				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	455,636	100	36,252	7.9
1927	482,490	100	42,429	8.7
1928	512,171	100	47,062	9.1
1929	515,785	100	46,173	8.9
Average				8.6
The depression years:				
1930	487,527	100	39,528	8.1
1931	427,458	100	31,370	7.3
1932	330,047	100	22,183	6.7
1933	506,458	100	29,483	5.8
1934	457,166	100	24,574	5.3
Average				6.6
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	408,336	100	22,592	5.5
1936	368,965	100	20,952	5.6
1937	412,227	100	28,944	7.0
1938	363,322	100	28,648	7.8
Average				6.4
ARGENTINA				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	757,931	100	186,886	24.6
1927	825,103	100	209,757	25.4
1928	807,256	100	187,439	23.2
1929	820,018	100	216,112	26.3
Average				29.7
The depression years:				
1930	618,217	100	136,204	22.0
1931	344,702	100	54,420	15.7
1932	215,034	100	28,968	13.4
1933	484,911	100	61,537	12.6
1934	502,360	100	44,782	14.8
Average				15.7

Value of total imports for specified foreign countries and the proportion coming from the United States—Continued

[Value of figures in thousand dollars—old gold, 1926 to 1932, inclusive; currency, 1933-38]

	Value of total imports	Percent	Imports from United States	Percent
ARGENTINA—con.				
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	324,099	100	46,564	14.3
1936	388,197	100	56,512	14.5
1937	469,082	100	76,824	16.3
1938	430,374	100	75,960	17.6
Average				15.6
BRAZIL				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	390,682	100	114,626	29.3
1927	387,542	100	111,186	28.6
1928	442,290	100	117,511	26.5
1929	416,626	100	125,552	30.1
Average				28.6
The depression years:				
1930	251,011	100	60,638	24.1
1931	132,230	100	33,212	25.1
1932	108,131	100	32,532	30.0
1933	313,970	100	66,034	21.0
1934	207,738	100	49,045	23.6
Average				24.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	224,796	100	52,328	23.2
1936	246,718	100	54,661	22.1
1937	330,554	100	76,410	23.1
1938	295,369	100	71,518	24.2
Average				23.1
GERMANY				
Protective-tariff year:				
1926	2,380,336	100	381,528	16.0
1927	3,380,587	200	492,645	14.5
1928	3,340,700	100	483,452	14.4
1929	3,201,681	100	425,676	13.2
Average				14.5
The depression years:				
1930	2,475,648	100	311,272	12.5
1931	1,602,390	100	188,520	11.7
1932	1,111,560	100	140,968	12.6
1933	1,694,199	100	194,573	11.4
1934	1,752,600	100	146,743	8.3
Average				11.5
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	1,674,187	100	96,891	5.7
1936	1,699,707	100	93,581	5.5
1937	2,198,506	100	113,506	5.1
1938	2,430,602	100	182,562	7.5
Average				5.9
JAPAN				
Protective-tariff years:				
1926	1,120,271	100	320,504	28.6
1927	1,033,137	100	319,394	30.9
1928	1,019,310	100	290,311	28.4
1929	1,021,687	100	310,519	29.5
Average				29.3
The depression years:				
1930	763,595	100	218,739	28.6
1931	609,929	100	168,954	27.7
1932	402,384	100	143,325	35.6
1933	652,355	100	211,276	32.3
1934	678,282	100	228,663	33.7
Average				31.7
Trade-agreement years:				
1935	709,697	100	232,507	32.7
1936	802,076	100	246,062	30.6
1937	1,088,344	100	365,502	33.5
1938	757,775	100	260,667	34.3
Average				32.7

Mr. GEARHART. Now, in testing whether or not we have prospered under the so-called reciprocal trade agreements law, I want to get back to when the recovery was made, such recovery that we did achieve, after we hit the bottom of the depression in 1932.

I asked the Tariff Commission to make this study for me, and I am going to call your attention to the facts and figures from the chart that they have furnished me.

I have asked them to show on the chart, the recovery that was made between 1932 and 1938, with a separate calculation for the years of 1932 to 1935, and for the years 1935 to 1938, and I have asked them to do the same thing on the same basis and make the same calculations with respect to the years from 1932 to 1939.

Now, in national income, we find that the increase to 1935 in the total increase to 1938, was 65 percent.

In agriculture, the increase that was made between 1932 to 1935 was 99.6 percent of the total recovery to 1938.

And in manufacturing, the recovery between 1932 and 1935 was 89.4 percent of the total recovery to 1938.

Take it by distributive shares. The net income of incorporated businesses. The recovery that was made by incorporated businesses between 1932 and 1935 of the total recovery of 1932 to 1938 was 100.2.

Then the net income of unincorporated businesses, we find that the recovery that was under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act during the year 1932 to 1935, was 87.7 percent of the total recovery to 1938.

Now, I just wanted to ask you in view of these figures, and there are many, many more classifications that I am passing over for the sake of brevity, if this so-called Smoot-Hawley Act was so terribly bad that in a great many instances all of the recovery we achieved up to 1938 was made under its provisions and before there was any reciprocal trade act on the statute books, does that indicate that we were being retaliated against and they were invoking measures to get even with us and all sorts of things of that kind?

Mr. CLAYTON. Recovery from what?

Mr. GEARHART. From where we were when we hit the bottom in 1932.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. On the way upward. There is only one way to go, and that was forward.

Mr. CLAYTON. That was recovery.

Mr. GEARHART. And we got up higher quicker and faster under the Smoot-Hawley Act than we did after the Trade Agreements Act was enacted.

In many instances full recovery was achieved under the Smoot-Hawley Act and before the Trade Agreements Act was enacted. It can even be said that those trade-agreement years were in many an instance merely a drag on recovery.

Mr. CLAYTON. Have you finished?

Mr. GEARHART. Contributing nothing to recovery.

Mr. CLAYTON. May I speak?

Mr. GEARHART. I am waiting patiently.

Mr. CLAYTON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GEARHART. I would like to hear your explanation of that.

Mr. CLAYTON. Recovery, Mr. GEARHART, from the most terrible depression that the world has ever known, induced partly by the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, which was enacted in 1930.

You have got recovery from 1932 on. Let us see what happened from 1930 down to 1932 under the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

Mr. GEARHART. And it was still in effect?

Mr. CLAYTON. And it was still in effect.

Mr. GEARHART. And all the world came down with us.

Mr. CLAYTON. And, as I say, there was only one way to go, as you said, after 1932, because we know we hit bottom then.

Mr. GEARHART. That is right.

Mr. CLAYTON. There was only one way to go and it went, and in 1932, under the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, which was enacted in 1930, and had 2 full years to run.

Mr. GEARHART. All right, I am still asking you the question: How do you account for the fact that all of the recovery in many important classifications was made under the Smoot-Hawley Act and before you got the Trade Agreements Act on the statute books, and, also, that in many instances, this in important classifications, there was no recovery made at all when the Trade Agreements Act was in effect?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; but in the important particular with which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was expected to deal, foreign trade, there was a very substantial recovery from the time it was enacted up to the beginning of the war. It was a very substantial recovery, and we think the reciprocal-trade agreement had a great deal to do with that.

Mr. GEARHART. Then, in the face of the record, you say that, despite the record, that the Smoot-Hawley Act had nothing to do with recovery?

Mr. CLAYTON. I beg your pardon?

Mr. GEARHART. In the face of the statistics, the Smoot-Hawley Act had nothing to do with recovery. We had recovery already, did we not?

Mr. CLAYTON. Not in foreign trade. Not in exports. In exports, we had a very substantial recovery in our exports from this country, from 1934 up to the time the war began and we think the reciprocal trade-agreements program played a part in that recovery.

Mr. GEARHART. And still you insist in saying that though I have just introduced in evidence the figures showing the percentages in reference to the total out-of-country purchases of all of the important countries in the world, which show that we lost instead of gained.

Mr. CLAYTON. By the percentage; yes. I believe the actual amount was much bigger.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; but the national income and the world income had gone up all the way across the board. Increased purchasing power ought to account for larger purchases, should it not?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. It was expected to come up.

Mr. CLAYTON. But our increase was much more with countries we had trade agreements with.

Mr. GEARHART. I am going to take that up with you, and I think we are going to reach the conclusion that that is a rather extreme statement.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this tabulation from the Tariff Commission, supplied at my request, may be put in the record of the meeting at this point.

Mr. REED (presiding). Without objection, it will be inserted at this point.

(The table is as follows:)

United States foreign trade: National income by industrial divisions and distributive shares, and farm income; actual and percentage increases in selected years

Item	Actual increase of various years over 1932, the low point of depression			Increase to 1935 as a percentage of total increase to—	
	1935 over 1932	1938 over 1932	1939 over 1932	1938	1939
Foreign trade of the United States:				*Percent*	*Percent*
Exports of United States merchandise	$667,000,000	$1,481,000,000	$1,547,000,000	45.0	43.1
General imports	724,000,000	637,000,000	995,000,000	113.7	72.7
National income (total)[1]	15,756,000,000	24,237,000,000	30,866,000,000	65.0	51.0
By industrial divisions (total):					
Agriculture	2,609,000,000	2,619,000,000	2,876,000,000	99.6	90.0
Manufacturing	6,573,000,000	7,353,000,000	10,748,000,000	89.4	61.1
Finance	380,000,000	1,391,000,000	1,496,000,000	27.3	25.4
By distributive shares:					
Salaries and wages	4,589,000,000	10,154,000,000	13,209,000,000	45.2	34.7
Net income of incorporated businesses	5,314,000,000	5,304,000,000	7,874,000,000	100.2	67.4
Net income of unincorporated businesses	4,627,000,000	5,273,000,000	6,302,000,000	87.7	73.4
Farm income and net cash available to persons on farms after farm expenditures:					
Cash income, including Government payments	$2,916,000,000	$3,425,000,000	$3,941,000,000	85.1	74.0
Cash income from farm marketings (excluding Government payments)	2,343,000,000	2,943,000,000	3,134,000,000	79.6	74.7
WAGES, FACTORY AND FARM					
Wages, factory and farm:					
Factory (average weekly wages)	$3.08	$5.25	$6.81	58.7	45.2
Farm (average monthly wages without board)	1.36	7.30	6.94	18.6	19.8

[1] Average national income, 1932-35, inclusive, $47,129,000,000; average national income, 1936-38, inclusive $66,879,000,000.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, Agricultural Statistics and Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, we are going to go into that tariff, the terrible Smoot-Hawley Act. Would you call that a high tariff?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly I do, because in 1932, it was an average of 50 percent or a little over 50 percent of the value of all dutiable imports to the United States. I call that a high tariff.

Mr. GEARHART. It was just a 1.6 percent higher tariff, higher than the preceding tariff under which we enjoyed the greatest prosperity that the world ever knew.

Mr. CLAYTON. On the average. On the average, we enjoyed the prosperity, Mr. GEARHART, the greatest prosperity that the world ever knew, in spite of the tariff we enjoyed it, because we made foolish, reckless loans abroad throughout that period, of enormous sums of money, billions of dollars which we could not recover, and with the proceeds of the loans, the foreigners bought our goods.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Clayton, if you had placed the greatest blame on the loans, I would go along with you, but when you put the blame on the poor Smoot-Hawley Act, you are not fair, I think, because it is just the same tariff bill as the preceding bill, increasing just a few levies on a few agricultural products. It is practically the same old Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act.

Mr. CLAYTON. I can point out to you, Mr. GEARHART, and I can give you the facts from our records that on many industrial products, the duty under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff bill, exceeded 100 percent of the value of the product. If that is not a high tariff bill, I do not know what it is.

Mr. GEARHART. All right. Let us apply that test to the different tariff bills in the different countries.

Let us take the United States and call it a par of 100.

Spain's tariff rates on that basis were 465; Turkey's tariff rates were 359.6; Germany's tariff was 279; Brazil's tariff was 239.4; Greece's tariff was 166; Hungary's tariff was 160; Italy's tariff was 150.5; Mexico's tariff was 149; Egypt's tariff was 130; Switzerland's tariff was 128; United Kingdom was 118.3; Argentina was 110; then you get to the United States, 100; Japan's tariff crowds us at 98; Belgium is 96; France is at 85; and Canada is at 76.3.

And then we get down to the Netherlands and Sweden. They are, respectively, 37.4 and 32.8.

Mr. CLAYTON. That has an answer, Mr. GEARHART.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, if the United States had, as you say, such an awfully high tariff that all of the other countries were angered and retaliated against us for that reason, how do you account for the fact that most of them were complaining when they had higher tariffs than we did?

Mr. CLAYTON. All these countries, in Europe particularly, and I am not sure about South American countries, but all of these countries in Europe had a much higher percentage of their imports composed of absolutely free items, than we had in the United States.

Mr. GEARHART. That brings us to an interesting point. Do you know whether or not the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill increased the free list or decreased it?

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, I do not know, but I do not think there is any substantial change, so far as the value of the imports is concerned.

Mr. GEARHART. I have that here for you, too. I have the exact figures, and I want to be accurate. If you will bear with me.

Under the Fordney-McCumber Act, 63.8 percent of the items were on the free list. Under the Smoot-Hawley Act, 66.7 percent on the free list.

So, did the increasing of the free list make all of these other countries that had higher tariffs than we had want to retaliate against us?

Mr. CLAYTON. I am only telling you, Mr. GEARHART, and I can give you chapter and verse on it, that there were protests and retaliations on the part of over 30 countries in the world against the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Have you divided those between those that were anticipatory from those that were made after the act was on the statute books?

Mr. CLAYTON. No; I think all of them were made after the law was passed, or the bill was passed.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, then, what right has any country to protest an American tariff which is lower than theirs, and which places two-thirds of the importable items on the free list?

Mr. CLAYTON. I have not examined your figures of percentages of tariff. I assume they are correct, of course.

Mr. GEARHART. These are correct.

Mr. CLAYTON. But there are many different ways of arriving at these calculations, and making combinations, etc. I have not had an opportunity to examine them, so I cannot comment very much on them. I am only telling you these things as facts.

Mr. GEARHART. I am hoping to get you to see the light. I know that these figures are correct. These figures have stood the test of time. They have never been questioned heretofore.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am only telling you as a fact that over 30 countries did protest against the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Though the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill only increased the levies 1.6 percent, and also increased the free list 2.9 percent, you say that kind of a tariff is one which would and did arouse anger and wrath all over the world, despite the fact that the preceding tariff, under which we carried on with them a colossal trade, was quite unobjectionable. Can you explain why?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. GEARHART, it could be very easily true. I am sure that the figures you have given me are correct. You could very easily increase the number of free items from 62 percent or 63 percent to 66 percent and still have the percentage of imports into the country with the tariff much smaller under the Smoot-Hawley bill than the other bill, and I would just like to work those figures out, and I think we will find that is true.

I do not have them before me. I think we will find that is true.

For the most part, any increase in the free items in the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill were negligible items which did not bring much in the way of imports.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, on the dutiable articles the rate was 40 percent. As I said, slightly higher than the preceding tariff, but only on agricultural products. If that 40 percent angered all of the outside world, why did they not retaliate against us when we had a still higher tariff of 40.7 percent, the Payne-Aldrich Act? We did not anger them then, did we?

Mr. CLAYTON. My figures show the average rate on dutiable goods imported into the United States in 1932 under the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was over 50 percent.

Mr. GEARHART. Not according to these figures. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was a 40-percent act.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, that is according to the figures in the State Department.

Mr. GEARHART. But if we harken back to the Dingley tariff law, it will be noted that the dutiable rate under that act was 46.1 percent. Did the world rise up against us then? If not, why not?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not remember. I was not familiar with that, but I am only telling you what actually happened.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; and I am merely trying to demonstrate to you that you have embraced and taken unto your heart something as fact which is not true. You should not take such things to heart, Mr. Clayton.

Mr. CLAYTON. Evidently, these countries thought they had a right to protest and retaliate because that is what they did.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, you have told us so much about retaliation.

I want to apply and to insert into the record another little test. In determining if we have such a terribly high tariff that it has offended all of the outside world, it might be well for us to take a look at the customs receipts of ours and other nations in the world. Ours and their customs receipts ought to reveal whether we are gouging the outside world with an exorbitantly high tariff?

If I am able to show a customs receipt per capita of a whole lot less than any other country, would not that help a little in deciding this question? My figures are for 1929. What does Australia take from customs receipts?—$22.55 per capita.

Canada takes $20.83 per capita.

Great Britain, $15.90 per capita.

Chile, $11.73 per capita.

Switzerland, $11.63 per capita.

Sweden, $7.05 per capita.

Union of South Africa, $6.19 per capita.

The United States takes only $4.80 per capita, all this as of 1929.

I will ask at this time that this tabulation, Mr. Chairman, be included in the record of these hearings at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so ordered.

(The table is as follows):

Customs collected per capita in United States and leading countries, 1929

Australia	$22.55
Canada	20.83
Great Britain	15.90
Chile	11.73
Switzerland	11.63
Sweden	7.05
Union of South Africa	6.19
United States	4.80
France	4.43
Germany	4.19
Netherlands	3.45
Italy	3.07

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. GEARHART, I would like to say this about the figures you have just read. It could easily happen if you were to cut a tariff rate half in two, cut the tariff rates half in two in the United States, you might double the customs revenue collected.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, with your permission, I want to pursue the subject of retaliation a little further.

You have testified several places that the depression was largely caused by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and, as I suppose, the preceding McCumber Act is completely exonerated. You say the whole world was aroused against us and in retaliation closed the markets to us, further that the British devised their imperial preference system in order to get even with us.

Not only have you made those statements, but they have been made by others who have preceded you as witnesses before this committee. And they have been repeated upon public rostrums by those who have spoken in favor of the program.

In fact, the argument has been dinned into our American ears so many times that most people have assumed it must be true. The State Department has advanced that idea as an argument time and again when the Trade Agreements Act has been up for extension. How about the other departments of our Government? Do they all agree with what the State Department has so long asserted?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not know that all of them do. Some of them certainly do because they are represented on the Trade Agreements Committee which passes upon questions of reduction in import duties in trade agreements.

May I just correct one thing you have just said, or two things you have said?

One was that I have made the statement that the depression was largely caused by the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. I do not think I have ever said that, Mr. GEARHART. What I have said has been that the depression was widened and deepened and prolonged by the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

You also said that the British adopted the imperial preference system to get even with us. I, frankly, think they adopted it for their self-protection, because they lost their markets in the United States largely because of that.

Mr. GEARHART. Why, of course. Every country imposes tariffs to protect its own standard of living—the wages of its people—and every country that imposes restrictions on our trade is not to be condemned. They are simply looking after their own; and the thing which makes me feel badly, and which makes those of us who understand this picture feel a little aggrieved, is that no one seems to be very deeply interested in protecting the standard of living of the American people or the business opportunities of the citizens of this country.

Mr. CLAYTON. But that is not true, Mr. GEARHART.

Mr. GEARHART. Do you wish to comment, Mr. Clayton?

Mr. CLAYTON. I would like to discuss with you at any time, here or anywhere else, your thesis that the high protective tariff has anything to do with helping maintain a high standard of living, or has anything to do

except really to lower the standard of living. I would be glad to discuss that with you at any time.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, I do not want to get away from this.

Now, you have said that there was retaliation and that the British imperial preference system was the result of our high tariffs in the United States. I just wondered if I could call as a witness here another gentleman in the employ of the Government of the United States, who is regarded as a pretty good authority by some of us. That is Dr. Thomas R. Wilson, Chief, British Empire Unit, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

He has written an article on the British imperial preference system, and he tells of its history, when it started, and why, demonstrating that it was well on its way long before the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was ever thought of.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right, there was some.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, let me read to you what Dr. Wilson has to say in this official publication of the Department of Commerce, dated June 3, 1944, under the title "British Imperial Preference System":

"Under the colonial policy, the guiding principle in tariff matters was that duties on British imports into the colonies should be wholly for revenue purposes, while the duties on foreign imports into the colonies should be both for revenue and for the protection of British trade and industry. In keeping with this principle, the colonies were permitted to levy uniform duties on British and foreign goods, and, in addition, the imperial authorities levied duties on foreign products imported into the colonies, thus creating a system of preferences in favor of British goods."

And that begins in the seventeenth century.

Mr. CLAYTON. But it was done in a very small way, up to the time of the Ottawa Conference.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; that is the straw to which you must grasp and upon which you must hang your argument.

I continue to read:

"The preferential system grew, and, by 1840, the articles on the preferential list totaled 82 items. In 1842, preferences were provided on 375 items.

"Following this first break in the then traditional Empire policy, more conferences were held and more colonies granted preferential tariff rates. The years of the adoption of the first preferential rates in various parts of the Empire were as follows: Australia, 1906."

What were they retaliating against—"New Zealand, 1903; Union of South Africa, 1903; Newfoundland, 1900; British India, 1927."

Canada was 1898.

Now, some of the preferences were set up long before the Smoot-Hawley bill was enacted in 1932. Others afterward. Some of them were set up when the Underwood Tariff Act, for revenue only, was on the statute books.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right.

Mr. GEARHART. Preferences were set up when duties were so low in the United States that our tariff levies were offensive to no one, regarded as merely revenue measures.

So, I think it is stretching things too far to say that the Empire preference system was set up as a retaliation when the preference system was in the process of developing ever since the seventeenth century, when, as the record discloses, they enlarged it. They merely put the finishing touches on it in 1932. You say it was all done as a protest against the American tariff policy.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think I said it was done as a protest. I think I said it was done as a protective measure to the British Empire because of the difficulty which they faced in their foreign trade, due to the tariff policy of the United States.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, other witnesses besides yourself have not been so restrictive in their definition. Others who have appeared here on behalf of the State Department asking for extension of this act, have insisted that the British preference system was a direct consequence of the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, a retaliation, purely and simply.

Now, I have read so much of this kind of stuff that I am growing sick at heart. The misinformation that is put out by the State Department is appalling at times.

As an awful example take this statement which you put out under the title "California and Foreign Trade." Its craftily devised falsehoods are most discouraging to anyone who revers truth. When I say "you," I, of course, am talking about all of those who are employed in the State Department; of no one in particular. I do not mean to be personal at all.

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. GEARHART. You set up the old gags, as I would call them, and they go out to the world and they are read by the people who do not have the time to analyze such things as the truth.

For instance, as you have repeated here, and I believe you thought your statement was true, because it has been repeated so many times. You asserted our business with the trade-agreement countries had increased very rapidly and business with non-trade-agreement countries had increased slowly.

Mr. CLAYTON. Excuse me. I said business with trade-agreement countries had increased more than with non-trade-agreement countries.

Mr. GEARHART. And I think you gave the percentages; did you not?

Mr. CLAYTON. If I remember correctly, the exports to trade-agreement countries, after the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act, up to the beginning of the war, increased about 64 percent, whereas to the non-trade-agreement countries, it was around thirty some odd percent.

Imports, likewise, from the trade agreement countries, increase more than imports from other countries.

Mr. GEARHART. Let me get this exactly right. The figures are 62.8 percent and 31.7 percent. Those are State Department figures and, I think, the figures you were endeavoring to quote. You came very close.

Well, how do you get at those figures? In the first place, you had to exclude a lot of trade agreement countries that had bad figures, in order to bring up the average to 62.8 percent. You had to exclude Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, and the United Kingdom, Newfoundland, and other self-governing British colonies, with which agreements have been concluded.

Do you think it is fair to tell the American people that you have made this percentage gain with trade agreement countries when you deliberately exclude from consideration the nations that I have just listed, every one of which was, at the time you gave those figures out, a trade agreement country?

Mr. CLAYTON. Excuse me a moment, Mr. GEARHART.

Mr. GEARHART. And do you know what the result would have been if you had included them?

Mr. CLAYTON. Excuse me a moment, please.

That could only have been done, Mr. GEARHART, because of the dates on which the agreements had been concluded. I do not have before me the documents to which you are referring, and I do not know why these countries were excluded, as you have mentioned, but I think I can assure you that the State Department would not put out any false or misleading information.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, they were trade agreement countries, and they were excluded, and the result would have been, if they had been included, that the business would have been increased with the trade agreement countries, not 62.8 percent but 39.1 percent?

Mr. CLAYTON. May I ask you if that document does not give the reason for the exclusion?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; it is explained down at the bottom of the page in very small type.

Mr. CLAYTON. What is the explanation, please?

Mr. GEARHART. I read most of it a moment ago. This is all of it:

"These figures do not include Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, and the United Kingdom, Newfoundland, and self-governing British colonies with which agreements have been concluded, but where the period during which the agreements had been in effect is too short to justify inclusions for the purposes of this comparison."

Mr. CLAYTON. I think that is a valid reason.

Mr. GEARHART. That is a reason but not a valid one; if you put them in, you get 39.1. If you think that is a valid reason, how about the purposeful inclusion of a lot of other countries with the non-trade-agreement countries all of which were involved in wars and revolutions and things of that kind—wars and revolutions which prevented them from participating in world trade at all.

If it is fair for you to exclude in order to raise the percentages and to make them look good, is it fair to include other nations that were out of world trade to make the figures look bad for the non-trade-agreement countries?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. GEARHART, we would not exclude the countries which were excluded with which we had trade agreements to make the figures look good. We would only exclude them due to the very short period within which the trade agreement was operable at the time the figures were made. To have included them would not have given a true picture. They were excluded because the effect would not be correctly shown on the trade-agreement countries for the period that we covered.

Mr. GEARHART. All right. By the same token, do you present a true picture when you include in the nonagreement countries China, for instance, which was at war in Manchukuo and Hong Kong and Shantung, and out of world trade? Do you think it was fair to include Italy, which was at war with Ethiopia and Albania? And Spain, torn apart in revolution? Or Germany, which had already moved into Austria and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. CLAYTON. Italy might have needed to do more foreign trading because of the existence of the Ethiopian war. I do not know. The trade we had with China was not appreciable; in any event, in most years; in some years it was very big.

Mr. GEARHART. That is just the point. That illustrates it absolutely. You pick out the countries you want to make your trade agreements with and you have the choice of those countries. You pick the best with the biggest trade and you list only those that look good, and when you find some that look bad and bring down the percentage you toss them aside and do not count them and figure the percentage without them. In order to make the percentage with the trade-agreement countries look big and beautiful and a great achievement, you dump into the nonagreement countries a lot of nations that we do not have any business with of no consequence at all—nations which were involved in war and were out of world trade entirely.

Is that a fair question to make a calculation upon? Is that fair to the American people when you go in and tell them that the business with the trade-agreement countries increased 62 percent, and that the business with the non-trade-agreement countries fell off to lower than 39 percent?

Mr. CLAYTON. May I answer that, Mr. GEARHART?

Mr. GEARHART. Those are questions having to do with ethics, and they are not the only ones I could raise.

Mr. CLAYTON. With all due respect, I do not think your statement of the matter is a correct one, and I reiterate that the State Department, in putting out this information, has tried to put it out in a fair and accurate way, and I believe that it has.

Mr. GEARHART. All right, then, I am getting back to this pamphlet called California.

You make this statement in this pamphlet, which goes out to the people and the people read it, and they think the business in the trade-agreement countries just blossomed like a rose under the influence of trade agreements, and that the other business is falling off to nothing at all because they did not have a trade agreement.

I have given one example of juggled figures which, I think, should be considered carefully, at least by those who are here to hear your testimony.

But, now, I want to get down to something you know much more about than I do. I am going to read a statement made in this record about cotton, and I will ask you, was it calculated to deceive?

I am reading from page 11 of this California and Foreign Trade pamphlet, under the title "Cotton."

"Cotton was grown on 316,292 acres on 5,316 California farms in 1939. The value of cotton exported from California custom's districts in 1938 exceeded the value of cotton produced within the State in that year, since cotton from Arizona and other States was also shipped from California ports. However, the exportation of $29,000,000 worth of cotton and the growing of $17,000,000 were of very considerable importance to the State economy. Seven different countries have made concessions to the United States on cotton as a result of the trade agreements program, and Swedish imports of raw cotton from the United States increased from $2,926,000 in 1933 to $7,137,000 in 1938."

The CHAIRMAN. Does it give it in bales?

Mr. GEARHART. That is what I am getting to.

"In 1938, 31 percent of all United States cotton was sold abroad."

Well, we looked into the bales, and the only reason that figure is raised from $2,926,000 to $7,137,000 is that the price of cotton went up. There was not appreciable or any increase in poundage in the export of cotton to Sweden, acreage, or production at all.

Now, that is going out into my district, and the people are going to read it, and they are going to think that this reciprocal trade agreements program is just wonderful, of what it has done for us. But when you get the record on the bales of cotton, it tells quite another story. You find that in 1933, the bales of cotton sold to Sweden were 74,675, each bale being a 500-pound bale, and in 1934, before you had the trade agreements, we sold Sweden 90,441.

And in 1935, when the reciprocal trade agreement was in effect, it dropped down to 87,754 bales.

In 1936, it went up to 91,987 bales.

In 1937, it went to 100,589 bales.

And in 1938, it drops down again to 89,821. That is fewer bales than we sold the Swedes before we had the so-called reciprocal trade agreement with Sweden.

Now, I think that the misrepresentation of things of that kind is reprehensible. I have not had time to digest the whole pamphlet carefully. I have merely skimmed through it. I picked out cotton, because I knew you were an expert on it. The American people should not be fooled by innuendo any more than by direct statement.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Gearhart, I do not intend to fool anybody, I assure you.

Mr. GEARHART. I know you would not be a party to such deception.

Mr. CLAYTON. I had not seen that document. I had nothing to do with the preparation of it, and it would be difficult for me to comment on the things you have read without going carefully into the matter. I think it would be very easy to exaggerate the importance of the reciprocal trade agreements program in connection with any exports of raw cotton from this country. I think we can find much more useful examples of advantages of the program than in that way.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, I want to talk about agriculture.

Mr. CLAYTON. Of course, I would not be fair to the subject if I did not call attention to this: That on the figures you have read there, while the baleage exported in the 2 years under discussion was practically the same, the value in the later year was considerably greater than in the former year, and as you say, that was due to an advance in the market. But an advance in the market can be due to a greater outlet for the product, a bigger market for the product, and certainly to some extent, we think that the reciprocal trade-agreements program contributed to that. Not only for American cotton, but other American agricultural products.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, there was a candidate for President in 1932 who made a speech in Baltimore. That candidate was later elected. In the campaign, he said:

"I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program. Every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

Was that promise kept by those who had charge of the negotiation of the reciprocal trade agreements under this Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, Mr. GEARHART, Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act, and I think that it has been administered, I know, fairly and properly.

That is the only statement I want to make on that.

Mr. GEARHART. Upon how many agricultural items was the tariff reduced in the reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. CLAYTON. I really do not know.

Mr. GEARHART. Can your young associate give us that figure?

Mr. CLAYTON. We can easily give you a list for the record, Mr. GEARHART. We just do not have it in our heads.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, it is 364, if I remember correctly; and they were reduced on an average of 40 percent.

Can you tell me the number of agricultural items that were frozen at the tariff level?

Mr. CLAYTON. No; I cannot.

Mr. GEARHART. If I remember correctly, it is 97.

Can you give me the number of agricultural items that were frozen on the free list?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir; I cannot.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, it is 90.

Mr. CLAYTON. I cannot at this moment. I can get it for you if you wish it.

Mr. GEARHART. It is 90, if I am not mistaken and I have the figures in my office, and I will see that the record is properly corrected. It is just about what I have said.

Now, what has been the effect of these slashes on agricultural items? Well, I happened to have called upon the Tariff Commission to give me the figures on this. Taking 1934, as the year of the beginning of the reciprocal trade-agreements program, I find that our imports of competitive agricultural products increased, by 1940, by 57 percent.

So the farmer got some competition from abroad as the result of these cuts in the tariff.

How about his exports, which is the way the American farmer makes a little money, by selling things abroad? Again, taking 1934 as the first year and 1940 as the last, we find that the export of agricultural products fell off to minus 30 percent that much less than what they had been in 1934. I stated that rather awkwardly, but I think you understand me.

Now, could we have a comment on that?

Mr. CLAYTON. I will gladly comment on it. I do not understand your figure at all. I thought you said in the beginning that the exports of agricultural products fell 30 percent. Now I just understood you to say they fell 100 percent and 30 percent more, did you not?

Mr. GEARHART. You are going to have to help me interpret this. I may be a little confused, but I have the statement from the Tariff Commission, and it says that the imports between 1934 and 1940 increased by plus 57 percent and the exports, which is the way the American farmer makes money, in 1940, were minus 30 percent. What do they mean by minus 30 percent?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think the 1940 exports were 30 percent less than the 1934 exports. I think that is what it means.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, I do not want to go into what that means, but anyway, the imports here were plus 57 percent and the exports were minus 30 percent.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes. I think that is correct on the interpretation of the figures as you have read them. I would be glad to comment on them.

Mr. GEARHART. I would be glad to have your comment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, and before the comment occurs, I will ask that this tabulation from the Tariff Commission be incorporated in the record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so ordered.

(The table is as follows:)

United States imports for consumption, 1934 and 1937–40

[Value in millions of dollars]

A. FROM ALL COUNTRIES

Year	Value			Percentage increase over 1934		
	All products	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products	All products	Agricultural products	Nonagricultural products
1934 [1]	1,635	821	814			
1937	3,010	1,579	1,431	84	92	76
1938	1,950	956	994	19	16	22
1939	2,276	1,118	1,158	39	36	42
1940	2,541	1,286	1,255	55	57	54

B. FROM TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

1934 [1]	1,061	513	548			
1937	2,006	1,037	969	89	102	77
1938	1,285	612	673	21	19	23
1939	1,551	718	833	46	40	52
1940	1,776	876	900	67	71	64

C. FROM NON-TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

1934 [1]	574	308	266			
1937	1,004	542	462	75	76	73
1938	665	344	321	16	12	20
1939	725	400	325	26	30	22
1940	765	410	355	33	33	33

[1] Imports from the Virgin Islands have been deducted from the reported totals for 1934 to permit comparison with the later years.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce. Figures for 1934 from an arrangement of the basic data by the U. S. Department of State making the agricultural and nonagricultural groups comparable with those of later years.

United States domestic exports, 1934 and 1937–40

A. TO ALL COUNTRIES

Year	Value			Percentage increase over 1934		
	All products	Agricultural products	Non-agricultural products	All products	Agricultural products	Non-agricultural products
1934 [1]	2,099	733	1,366			
1937	3,299	798	2,501	57	9	83
1938	3,057	827	2,230	46	13	63
1939	3,123	655	2,468	49	[2]—11	81
1940	3,934	516	3,418	87	[2]—30	150

B. TO TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

1934 [1]	1,272	400	872			
1937	2,140	535	1,605	68	34	84
1938	1,970	583	1,387	55	46	59
1939	2,106	457	1,649	66	14	89
1940	2,842	361	2,481	123	[2]—10	185

C. TO NON-TRADE-AGREEMENT COUNTRIES

1934 [1]	827	333	494			
1937	1,159	263	896	40	[2]—21	82
1938	1,087	244	843	32	[2]—27	71
1939	1,017	198	819	23	[2]—41	66
1940	1,092	155	937	32	[2]—53	90

[1] Exports to the Virgin Islands of the United States have been deducted from the reported totals for 1934 to permit comparisons with the later years.
[2] Decrease.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. CLAYTON. To begin with, prices of agricultural products, in general, advanced materially between 1934 and 1940 and the figures you have read are dollar figures, and that would have accounted a good deal for the increase in imports by 57 percent.

If you were to get volume, I think you would find there is not much difference. That is on the imports.

As regards the exports, our Government had adopted, for the period of 1933, on a price-production program for basic agricultural products, which constitute the great bulk of our agricultural exports, as, for example, wheat and cotton and tobacco and products of that kind. The effect of adopting the price-production program was to put our prices principally for cotton and wheat above the world market so that foreign countries could buy in other markets a good deal cheaper than they could in the United States, and that accounts largely for the falling off in the exports of our agricultural products.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, under the reciprocal trade-agreements law, you have the power to raise tariffs?

Mr. CLAYTON. Right.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, when there was this tremendous increase of agricultural products, why did you not do something to protect the American farmer against the influx of that?

Mr. CLAYTON. During that same period, Mr. GEARHART, production increased domestically very materially also, and buying power increased, and the ability of the market to absorb the increased amount was such that I do not think I could go into that right now. I would have to look at the individual items and study them individually, but I do not think that on the whole that production was needed in regard to these particular agricultural products.

Mr. GEARHART. Did you make any effort?

Mr. CLAYTON. Further production?

Mr. GEARHART. Did you make any effort to ascertain how many acres in the United States were being displaced by reason of this flood of agricultural products from outside the United States?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think you will find any flood of agricultural products coming into the United States. This figure of 57 percent would have to be examined very carefully to see what kind of production it was, to what extent the volume increased. The volume may not have increased at all. I do not know. Maybe it did. I am only saying you have got to look at the details of the thing before you can draw a worth-while conclusion, in my opinion.

Mr. GEARHART. Do you know that between 1935 and 1939, inclusive, that 345,363,165 acres were displaced in the United States by the importation of competitive agricultural products from without?

Mr. CLAYTON. I beg your pardon. How many acres?

Mr. GEARHART. In the 5 years, 345,363,165. In other words, it would require them that number of acres for an American farmer to have raised the competitive agricultural products that were brought in the United States during those years.

Mr. CLAYTON. We have not got much more than that in cultivation in the United States in total.

Mr. GEARHART. I am talking about 5 years. The average per year is 69,072,638. And instead of having 300,000 cultivated acres in the United States, if we had raised these products, we would have had 369,000,000 cultivated acres in the United States and 10,000,00 people who had to go to the cities and look for jobs would have been able to stay on the farms to grow those products which we imported.

Mr. CLAYTON. I dare say many of these products you have got on that list could not be raised here.

Mr. GEARHART. I have excluded everything like coffee and bananas and things of that sort that cannot be raised in the United States, and I have included only those things which are raised in the United States and raised here in great quantity.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, Mr. GEARHART, I am sure you have tried to make your figures just as accurate as possible, but to say that 70,000,000 acres of cropland was displaced in the United States per year by reason of imports, I just do not think that can be substantiated.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, agricultural economists apply formulas which are recognized among those of that profession as reasonably accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there, Mr. GEARHART, would you permit an interruption?

Mr. GEARHART. I would, gladly.

The CHAIRMAN. If those figures are correct, Mr. Clayton, would you say that so far as American agriculture is concerned, in the reciprocal trade policy, it has bogged down?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir; I would not.

The CHAIRMAN. Notwithstanding the fact that 70,000,000 acres have been displaced annually through imports of competitive products, that you still maintain that reciprocity, as understood by this administration, is a good thing for the farmer?

Mr. CLAYTON. To begin with, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that a careful examination of the figures will substantiate the interpretation that Mr. GEARHART has put on them. I just do not believe it will.

Now, in any case, agriculture has more to gain by the success of this program and more to lose by the failure of it, than any other part of the domestic economy. There is no question about that.

There is no question about that, Mr. GEARHART. Your own State is now a very substantial producer of wheat. It produces a good deal of cotton. It produces a lot of other things which cannot be consumed in total in the United States. They are going to have to be exported. I said this morning, and I want to repeat, that we are producing now in the United States a surplus of wheat of 600,000,000 bushels which, at today's price, is worth $1,500,000,000. That is surplus over and above what we can eat. You have got to find a market or store it or destroy it or stop the farmers from producing it.

You go on into tobacco, and we are exporting over $400,000,000 worth of tobacco per year. What are the producers of that tobacco going to do if they lose the markets for it?

Cotton is even bigger figures.

Dairy products and eggs account for nearly $500,000,000 of our exports last year.

Now, there is only one thing to it. Either we are going to have to take more imports so that people can continue to buy these products and pay for them, or you are going to have to produce less of them, one or the other.

Mr. GEARHART. That is exactly what I wanted to state. If I have given the impression that I am opposed to trade agreements by the criticism of the administration of this so-called Trade Agreements Act, I have given the wrong impression. I have all my life been an advocate of reciprocity, but I think there are some things which are done down in the State Department that verge on that for which they lock up people at St. Elizabeths.

What is the idea when you talk about horse trading? Where does anyone get the idea there is any horse trading involved in this program? We give 1 horse to 1 country and get 1 horse back from that country and then we give 107 additional horses, 1 to each of all of the countries of the world. Is that trading as David Harum would have traded?

I think it is utterly absurd that we should apply the principle of the unconditional most-favored nation to our end of every agreement that we make when the other party country to the agreement declines to do likewise. Ours is a "give away" policy to every nation save one, the signatory nation.

Mr. CLAYTON. Will you give me a few minutes uninterrupted to answer that?

Mr. GEARHART. I want to point out that when you receive concessions from one country you are never going to get concessions that amount to a hoot for the simple reason that the concession we made to that country is also given to every other country on the face of the earth, and if that country does not get something which every other country in the world does not share, why should that country give us anything of value—and they do not, and they will not.

What they do, when they make an agreement with us, is to immediately nullify what appears on the surface of things as a concession. As did France, when she signed an agreement with us. Almost the next day she depreciated her currency 66 percent thereby wiping out everything she gave us. Belgium, immediately following the signing of her trade agreement with us, the very next day almost, depreciated her currency 29 percent. Switzerland depreciated hers 31 percent. Netherlands, 22 percent. The United Kingdom, 17 percent. Finland, 9 percent. Sweden, 6 percent. And so runs the story.

Why did they depreciate their currency? Simply to wipe out benefits they gave us in the reciprocal trade agreements. That very instant. And we, in the United States, evidently knew all about it and assented to it, for we never withdrew the benefit of the most-favored-nation principle from any of the offending nations, or did anything about it at all.

Those are the things which amaze us. I do not think we farmers, from out West, believe that this program is being administered to gain American opportunities in foreign markets, except, possibly, in the interest of the cotton plantationists, the tobacco growers, and those firms or industries which compose the so-called metalworking industries—automobiles, rails, and rail equipment, electrical appliances, agricultural implement, office equipment, and typewriters and

calculating machines, refrigerators, radios, and things like that.

We see this program is being administered for their benefit alone, and at the sacrifice of almost every other small industry in the United States, almost all the little manufacturing concerns, almost all agricultural enterprises—agriculture in particular.

And you cannot escape the conclusion I have arrived at because the big benefits are going to those industries.

In respect to the loan of $3,600,000,000 to the United Kingdom, we find when we read Punch, which is England's magazine that tells the stories in cartoons, that the money is being spent for just the items I pointed out. Forty percent of it is going for nonessentials, so the cartoons reveal. One picture is worth a thousand words, so the Chinese say.

As Mr. KNUTSON suggests to me, is it not sort of an international community chest we are operating? From which, incidentally, the industries I have named are getting all the benefits and every other industry in the United States is suffering.

I know we have agricultural industries that have got to have exports. I know that so well that I worry about it. We have got to sell much of our agricultural products outside of the United States, and, according to State Department notices, we are going to cut the tariff on raisins, which means, instead of exporting 50 percent of domestic production out of the United States, we are going to have to find a foreign market for an additional pound for every pound that is imported as a consequence of the tariff cut.

And peaches. Dried peaches. Canned peaches. Pears. Processed pears. All export crops, and still you are going to cut the tariff in respect to each of them.

Even though we know we have got to sell a certain percentage of these commodities outside the United States, announcement is made that we are going to cut the tariff more, which means that we have got to sell still more abroad.

And if I had not been fighting for years against the cutting of the tariff, you would have had raisins, grapes, peaches, apricots, pears, figs, almonds, and a host of other things hanging on the ropes, along with pottery, jeweled watches, glassware, and many other things.

We pointed out the imports of almonds had increased four times during the war. Foodstuffs are needed to feed Europe's hungry. We asked you to intercede with them to urge them to eat their own almonds, but the State Department would not listen. So the market price of almonds in the United States went down, and many a farmer has lost considerably, all this because of the increased competition of imported tree nuts these last 6 or 8 or 10 or 12 months.

So, the farmer is worried because he knows from these figures all around us, that he is being sold down the river, for the benefit not of agriculture but for the benefit of tobacco growers and cotton merchandisers and metal fabricators. They are the ones who will get the benefit, not the farmers.

The interests of the American people are not the same everywhere in this country. There is much competition within our borders. Industry and agriculture are everywhere fighting for dear life. All of these producers are American citizens. But are they accorded the equal protection of our laws?

We think every man, woman, and child is entitled to equal protection from his Government, and we do not think our Government should sell the farmers down the river. We do not think you should sell the jewel watch manufacturers down the river, or the glassmakers, the pottery people, or any other people just to help the business position of the metal fabricators down in Flint or Detroit. We want an equal break, and we want equal protection by our Government, and if we do not get it, we are going to have more acres displaced and more farmers leaving their farms, going into the cities, to get into the unemployment lines; all this if a dreaded recession overtakes us.

Would not the automobile people in the United States have a better market if you would let the farmer put those 80,000,000 acres to work and give an opportunity of livelihood to Americans to the extent of $10,000,000?

Would not the automobile people then have a better market right here in the United States than in an imaginary fourth-rate market on the other side of the world?

Mr. CLAYTON. The answer is "No."

Mr. GEARHART. I hardly expected you to agree.

The gentleman from New York has given me a very, very interesting chart that I would like to ask your unanimous consent to have included in the record at this point.

Mr. REED (presiding). It is so ordered.

(Chart omitted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. GEARHART, you made a long statement there, and it had a good many questions. I think I have most of them in mind, and I would like to comment on them.

In the first place, you are opposed to the most-favored-nation principle. I would like to remind you that is a good, old Republican principle that was first enunciated, I believe, by Charles Evans Hughes, when he was Secretary of State in 1922, and it was incorporated in the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program. That principle provides we shall not make agreements with other countries which discriminate against any country so long as they treat us fairly and do not discriminate against us. I think it is a sound principle of foreign policy.

Let me finish, please, sir, and then you can comment.

Now, economically, it operates in this way: We usually make these agreements with foreign countries regarding the commodities of which they are the principal operators, or in which they are principally interested.

And we generally make them for a certain kind of commodity. As, for example, if we were making a trade agreement that had to do with laces. An agreement with France. It would be the kind of laces that are usually produced in France. So that the exact concession made in the tariff on that particular kind of lace might not apply to the laces made in Belgium or Switzerland, and other examples could be given.

So that the making of an agreement with one country in which we make a concession does not take away the incentive of some other country to make an agreement with us so that they might get concessions in the particular kind of goods that they expect to sell in our country. It does not do that.

Now, the alternative to that would be to set up a series of discriminations against other nations in our foreign economic relations which would cause bitterness and certainly sow the seeds of discord and conflict, and I do not think we want to follow that kind of a foreign policy.

Now, I have been very surprised to hear you protest against the reduction of tariffs on export commodities, crops, and manufactures, which have considerable surplus which has to be sold and is sold in the foreign market.

I want to say to you that so far as any impact on American producers is concerned, that is the kind of reduction in tariff that can be made with the least harmful effect on the producer, for the simple reason that the fact that he does sell in foreign markets in the world, is proof positive that he is able to compete against foreign producers.

He cannot go with his product into Europe or Latin America in competition with other foreign producers, unless the unit cost of the production, the quality and the service, and so on, are such that he can compete and sell his product.

I think you will admit that is true and it is in respect to these commodities that cuts in tariff can be made with the least harmful impact on the producers of those commodities.

Now, you say that these reductions are made for the benefit of the cotton and tobacco producers and a few metal-working industries.

Look at your list of exports from this country and you will find that the list of industries and agricultural products that are dependent upon foreign markets to absorb the surpluses that are produced here, is much greater than your statement has indicated.

You have left out wheat. I have told you that this year we must export $1,500,000,000 worth of wheat or we will have a glut on the market, and serious repercussions on the wheat producers.

You have left out dairy products and eggs, and I have told you we have exported nearly $500,000,000 worth of dairy products and eggs.

And there are many other things that we expect that we have got to maintain export markets for. Otherwise we are going to have those products produced in surplus which cannot be taken care of, and the situation will have to be met in some other way.

Now, I just want to reiterate that we are exporting today over $3,000,000,000 worth of farm products, which is $500 on the average for every farm family in the United States.

I just ask you if agriculture is not deeply interested in preserving those markets, if they possibly can do so.

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; and you know they cannot be preserved.

Mr. CLAYTON. I beg your pardon?

Mr. GEARHART. You know they cannot be preserved.

Mr. CLAYTON. No; I do not.

Mr. GEARHART. You fully appreciate, do you not, when the crops come in next year all over the world, that they are not going to have to import food from the United States to keep from starving.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not know that.

Mr. GEARHART. This is a war consequence which makes it possible for us to sell these tremendous quantities of foodstuffs outside the United States. Food is one thing that the people in every country, with the exception, possibly, of England, that every country of consequence, can raise for themselves, largely, if not entirely.

So these markets you are holding up to me that we are enjoying right now, are necessarily temporary markets, and we think you should take a long-range view of it year in and year out, affording special protection to those industries which face a very, very uncertain future.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not follow that.

Mr. GEARHART. You spoke of the principal supplier principle. That was once a beautiful phrase. We have heard a lot of that during the hearings on the First Trade Agreement Extension Act. We hear very, very little of it now. It is the first time it has popped up for me for a long time. Is it possible that this principle no longer controls the negotiation of tariff cuts?

Only a few years ago, I had to make the fight of my life to prevent a cut in almonds in negotiations with Turkey. Turkey had only sent to the United States 500 pounds in 5 years. But, notwithstanding, the State Department proposed to use Turkey as the vehicle for the cutting of the tariff on almonds. We were lucky enough to be able to beat that. But after that, who can talk of the principle of the principal supplier?

Then you talk about the most-favored-nation principle being a fair one, and, therefore, it should be applied by the United States.

All right. Ever since 1934, we have been applying the principle of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment in the agreements we have negotiated with some thirty-odd countries. Well, today, there is not a single nation signatory to any one of those agreements which is applying the principle of the unconditional most favored nation to their end of it. In other words, after all these years of reciprocal trading, we have not gained one convert, not a single other nation in the world now applies the most-favored-nation idea to its commercial arrangements. We are the only nation that does that. If we cannot get any other country to agree with us, how can you say today, and expect me to give you full credence, that they are going to be offended if we do not apply it to our end of the agreements we negotiate?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. GEARHART, all that have agreements with us will apply it with reference to their trade with the United States. Otherwise we do not apply it to them. It is a mutual thing. It is a reciprocal thing. We do not give something for nothing. These countries must treat our trade in the same way or at any rate to the same effect as regards tariffs and quotas, and all that sort of thing, as they do every other country. Otherwise we do not apply the principle to them.

Mr. GEARHART. You want me to believe that every other country in the world, Mr. Clayton, which enters into a trade agreement with us, cutting the tariff for us in their country, generalizes its concessions to us to every other country on the face of the earth?

Mr. CLAYTON. I did not say that.

Mr. GEARHART. Of course, none of them do it, but we do it.

Mr. CLAYTON. You can hardly use that as an argument that in applying the principle ourselves, we do ourselves an injury, because if they would adopt the principle, it would mean that in case of a cut in the tariff of our exports to them, they would have to give everybody else the same cut. Suppose they do not do it. You can hardly argue that failure to do it is a disadvantage to us.

Mr. GEARHART. No; but it emphasizes the utter absurdity of the United States generalizing our end of the agreement to the entire world. When they do not do it they are in a position of making a deal with every country on the face of the earth to their advantage. Because of the pursuit of our American policy, we deprive ourselves of the opportunity of making an agreement with any other country by which we might gain advantages in that country on those particular items. It is just absurd. They give us nothing for what we give them, generously and without qualification.

Mr. CLAYTON. I wholly disagree with you.

Mr. GEARHART. That does not help anything to say so. The facts speak for themselves.

Mr. CLAYTON. I reiterate that it is a principle adopted by Charles Evans Hughes when he was Secretary of State under President Harding in 1922.

Mr. GEARHART. The then Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, offered to apply the principle of "most favored nation" to commercial matters, and no country on the face of the world accepted the proposition. He merely advocated it, and his proposition was conditional.

Mr. CLAYTON. We expect in the adoption of the International Trade Organization, the setting up of the International Trade Organization, to work out principles of adoption of the application of the "most favored nation" principle, with all countries that are members of that organization.

Mr. GEARHART. We think that the United States could do a much better job for its citizens if it would negotiate those agreements on a bilateral basis. If it did that, I would be out there shouting for you and singing your praises everywhere, but then we could make real horse trades. You cannot make them now with anybody. Not even a country with which you sign an agreement gives you anything worth a whoop, because they know they will get nothing in return that every other nation in the world is not going to get as well.

Mr. CLAYTON. I wholly disagree with what you have said, and the facts will not bear it out, Mr. GEARHART, with all due respect to you. We have made agreements with 29 countries, in which we have applied this principle, and they have been very advantageous agreements to the United States. We have a quid pro quo for everything we gave, and moreover, we will make a great many other agreements, I hope, under this act in the next 18 months.

Mr. GEARHART. What did you get from Japan?

Mr. CLAYTON. We have no agreement with Japan.

Mr. GEARHART. That is just the point. She got the benefit of all of the agreements that we had with all of the other countries.

Mr. CLAYTON. As long as she did not discriminate against us.

Mr. GEARHART. She did not discriminate against us simply because she applied her tariff to us unilaterally, the same as she applied it to other countries. She applied a Smoot-Hawley tariff bill to the world, and that is exactly what every other nation in the world is doing today.

Mr. CLAYTON. As long as she did not discriminate against us, she got the benefit of the most-favored-nation principle, and when she did discriminate, she did not get that benefit.

Mr. GEARHART. She got the best that we offered any nation and did not compensate us for any of the concessions in our market.

Mr. CLAYTON. On the particular products on which there had been a reduction.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, this agreement seems to be fundamental. I want to ask you one or two questions about the ITO. The ITO is one thing, and these reciprocal agreements are another thing. You hope at Geneva to bring the two things together?

Mr. CLAYTON. We hope at Geneva to work out both things, that is right.

Mr. GEARHART. And then bring them together in some tie-in?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not think so necessarily. The ITO would have some responsibility and some function to perform in connection with agreements between nations with respect to their trade, to their economic relations, but the trade agreements that we make with these countries will not be a part of the ITO.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, that is another question, or suggests another question. We are now announcing that we are going to make agreements with 18 countries. We have never heretofore, in the years of the reciprocal-trade agreement, negotiated on the wholesale basis, have we?

Mr. CLAYTON. We are not going to do it here.

Mr. GEARHART. Do I understand that we are going to have separate agreements with each country?

Mr. CLAYTON. We will have separate negotiations with each country on the particular items of export and import that we have an interest in with that country.

Mr. GEARHART. All right, when we get through, are we going to have 18 agreements or 1 agreement with 18 signatories?

Mr. CLAYTON. In effect, it is 18 agreements, because each agreement involves a different list of commodities.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, then are you going to have all countries sign one agreement, or is each country going to sign a separate agreement?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is a matter of procedure that has not yet been completely worked out. However, I will say to you that each country will sign a separate schedule.

Mr. GEARHART. I understand that that will be necessary.

Mr. CLAYTON. The general provisions of the agreements are pretty much the same with all countries. There will be an escape clause that will be in identical language for every agreement, and there will be other principles that will be identical in all of the agreements, but the commodities involved will be different in each.

Mr. GEARHART. I am not questioning your legal right to have one agreement with multiple signatures, or of 18 individually. You have that right under the trade-agreements law, but you have never heretofore had more than one signature on one agreement. There is always the United States and one other nation. If you are going to have one agreement with 18 signatures, I would like to know the facts, so that I can visualize this thing and get closer to it.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is possible that it may be done that way in the end, Mr. GEARHART, but the negotiations will take place separately with each country, and with reference to the commodities that enter into the trade between our country and that particular country.

Mr. GEARHART. What I want to know is, are you planning to bring 18 nations into one agreement?

Mr. CLAYTON. That may be. It may be done that way, or it may not. As I told you a moment ago, the actual form of the agreement and actual way of writing the agreement and signing it has not been definitely determined.

Mr. GEARHART. Then, if you are going to tie them together, or if you are going to sign them separately, what additional provisions are you going to put in the trade agreements that are different in kind and character from previous agreements?

Mr. CLAYTON. There will be an escape clause in every one of them.

Mr. GEARHART. You have had that in all of your agreements for a long, long time.

Mr. CLAYTON. Not the Mexican type. It related to third countries, and it has been invoked recently in the case of the agreement with Canada, but we had not had a general escape clause such as the Mexican agreement contains.

Mr. GEARHART. As a matter of fact, you had a series of escape clauses in agreements. Also, as a matter of fact, the Mexican form is an agreement which you have finally agreed upon, is it not, as the perfected escape clause?

Mr. CLAYTON. It is a different type of escape clause from the kind that we had in the other agreements. We did have in practically every agreement something which said that because of the generalization of the tariff concession on any commodity, if the imports into the United States from third countries of the commodities covered in the agreement, or any commodity covered in the agreement, within such volume as to seriously injure, or threaten to injure, any producer in the United States, we had a right to withdraw that concession. That had to do with third countries and not the country with which the agreement was made.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you not going to have any provision or escape clause insofar as it affects the country that signed the agreement with us?

Mr. CLAYTON. We are doing that now. We have not done it heretofore, except, I believe, in the case of Mexico, and later, Paraguay,

which was made after the Mexican agreement.

Mr. GEARHART. That is what I mean. You have perfected the form of the escape clause in the Mexican agreement.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is a different clause. It is a different thing. It dealt with a different thing, and what we propose to use now is the type of escape clause in the Mexican agreement, which had not been theretofore employed.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, what provisions are you going to put in these 18 agreements, or this 1 agreement or 2 agreements, whatever way you split it up, and what clauses are you going to put in there which will point to or relate to the ITO?

Mr. CLAYTON. I just do not have those provisions, Mr. Gearhart, and I cannot state to you precisely just what that will be. We still have to negotiate the whole business.

Mr. GEARHART. Now, is not the purpose of the State Department to put special provisions in the agreements that are now under negotiation, which will tie the signatories to those agreements to do something in relation to the ITO?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, and I think one particular provision probably will be that for any country which does not belong to the ITO the most-favored-nation principle will not apply. I think that will be one of the principal things that we would try to negotiate. That would be in the ITO charter.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you going to bind the signatories to these reciprocal-trade agreements to become members of the ITO?

Mr. CLAYTON. No, that will not be done, but the ITO charter will deal with them.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you going to bind the signatories to the reciprocal trade agreements to submit a dispute arising under the reciprocal-trade agreements to the ITO for decision?

Mr. CLAYTON. I am not sure, Mr. Gearhart, whether we will attempt to do that in the way in which you have stated it or not. I would have to give consideration to that question. I cannot answer it directly.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, if you are going to transfer the decision on disputes arising under the reciprocal trade agreements to an international organization on which we have one vote, do you think maybe the other 17 are going to get very excited over disasters that may overtake us industrially and will rush to our aid?

Mr. CLAYTON. They do not have to get excited and they do not have to rush to our aid. We do not need their excitation, and we do not need their aid. All we need to do is employ the provisions of the agreement, which has an escape clause which we can exercise unilaterally.

Mr. GEARHART. In those contracts are you going to put some provision in that will give the right to the ITO to hear complaints against the high or low tariffs of a country member?

Mr. CLAYTON. No; the ITO will have no right of decision regarding what the tariffs should be of any member whatsoever.

Mr. GEARHART. Does not the charter of the ITO, which is suggested by the State Department, provide that a country can file a complaint against the country whose tariff laws they think are discriminatory?

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, discriminatory; yes. They can file a complaint but it does not give the ITO the right to dictate to us or any other country as to what the tariffs shall be.

Mr. GEARHART. However, the ITO can pass on that complaint and can issue a directive to the offending country to correct that which has been complained against?

Mr. CLAYTON. It cannot.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you sure?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you sure it does not provide that?

Mr. CLAYTON. It does not.

Mr. GEARHART. Then, cannot the ITO issue a suggestion to the offending nation that it correct it?

Mr. CLAYTON. Surely. That is different.

Mr. GEARHART. And then, if the offending nation does not correct it, it will be excommunicated from ITO and from all of the benefits that have accrued?

Mr. CLAYTON. No. The ITO charter does not provide that a nation may be expelled from membership in ITO if it does not follow the suggestions of the ITO about the reduction of its tariffs.

Mr. GEARHART. Does the ITO acquire any right to determine what goods shall come in and what goods shall go from any member nation?

Mr. CLAYTON. Positively not.

Mr. GEARHART. Then, what do you mean when you talk about and set forth under your ITO charter that no nation shall be permitted to export unemployment?

Mr. CLAYTON. It does not state it shall not be permitted to export unemployment.

Mr. GEARHART. What does it say about exporting unemployment?

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, it has something to say about it, but it does not say it shall not.

Mr. GEARHART. Will you explain what you mean by the phrase "exporting unemployment?"

Mr. CLAYTON. I expect you know about as much what it means as I do. I have an idea that it means that if a country excessively subsidizes its exports, the Government pays a part of the cost of production or gives an export subsidy of some kind for the purpose of putting its goods in other countries, in competition with other countries—that that is a type of exportation of unemployment.

Mr. GEARHART. That is one type, and probably that can be corrected by force of public opinion, if nothing else. But suppose the American automobile industry, by sheer efficiency should manufacture a cheap automobile and send it to England in such quantities that the English automobile factories should be closed. What could England do under the ITO to correct that situation?

Mr. CLAYTON. They do not need the ITO to correct that.

Mr. GEARHART. They would correct that by passing a tariff bill?

Mr. CLAYTON. No; they just would not give the fellow in England that wanted to buy those cars the dollars with which to pay for it. That is simple.

Mr. GEARHART. Suppose the Englishman has his money in his pocket.

Mr. CLAYTON. If he has any dollars in his pocket, he has to turn them over to the Government. The Government has control of the handling of them. He might have his pockets full of pounds sterling, and that does not buy the car. He has to get dollars to pay for the car, and they will not give the dollars to him.

Mr. GEARHART. That is just the point. In every other country, when the domestic industry suffers because of excessive importations from abroad, their government immediately flies to the aid of that industry.

Mr. CLAYTON. No; that is not true.

Mr. GEARHART. But in America that policy does not seem to appertain, because we have stood idly by and watched the destruction of the jeweled-watch industry, and they have pleaded for assistance to this Government, and the Government has offered them none. Because of unwise tariff policies which this country has refused to correct, others have gone to the wall.

Mr. CLAYTON. The jeweled-watch industry is doing a large business and making money, so far as I understand, in this country.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Clayton, there were 22 great jeweled-watch industries in the country a few years ago. I have in my pocket one of the watches made by one of those companies, the Howard Watch Co., the finest watch that ever came from any watch-making factory. That company is today out of existence.

There are only 3 other great American jeweled-watch companies left, and there used to be 22. You know the names—Hamilton, Waltham, and Elgin. All of the rest are gone. They are holding on by the skin of their teeth, and if you listen to your radio, you will listen to Bulova and Elgin. There are Swiss watches and German watches and everything but American watches. Do they get any relief from the State Department or from Congress?

Mr. CLAYTON. You go back far enough and you will find a great many American industries in which the number of units of operation and production have greatly decreased in the last few years.

Mr. GEARHART. Well, I must stop from sheer exhaustion. But I want to thank you, Mr. Clayton. I think that we have made a good record.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am satisfied with it.

JUGGLING FIGURES AND CONTORTING FACTS TO JUSTIFY TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, when the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton, made use in his testimony before this committee of the rather threadbare and thoroughly untenable assertion that our exports to trade-agreement countries had, during the administration of the trade-agreements program, increased much more rapidly than had our exports to nonagreement countries during the same period, I recall that I once asked my friend, Dr. John Lee Coulter, who is, incidentally, one of the greatest living experts on foreign trade, to make a careful study and analysis of the facts and figures upon which such assertions are based in order that the truth might be revealed.

Because the report which Dr. Coulter released in response to my request demonstrates quite conclusively some startling facts and conclusions which should be brought to the attention of the committee and country, I ask that the results of this study, a document which this eminent scientist has entitled "Unfortunate Use of Statistics by the Government in Connection With the Trade-Agreements Program" may be spread upon the pages of these hearings.

And in tendering this most interesting manuscript for inclusion in the record of these hearings, I cannot help but wonder who it could have been that so ingeniously juggled the figures and contorted the facts and then palmed them off upon the then Chief Executive, who, trustingly, incorporated them in his message to the Congress on March 26, 1945.

But all this notwithstanding, Mr. Chairman, the report of Dr. Coulter to which I have just referred speaks for itself. It is the following:

"UNFORTUNATE USE OF STATISTICS BY THE GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

"In order to make it appear that the Trade Agreements Act has served a useful purpose and, among other things, that it has resulted in a measurable increase in volume of mutually profitable foreign trade, Government agencies have resorted to the use of combinations of figures which call for objective examination.

"The most recent illustration of such use of statistics in this manner is the statement put out over the name of the President in the form of a special report to Congress about a month ago, on March 26, 1945.

"In this special report the then President is quoted as saying:

" 'The record of how trade agreements expand two-way trade is set forth in the 1943

report of the Committee on Ways and Means. This record shows that between 1934–35 and 1938–39 our exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent, while our shipments to nonagreement countries increased by only 32 percent; between these same periods our imports from agreement countries increased by 22 percent as compared with only 12 percent from nonagreement countries. The disruptions and dislocations resulting from the war make later comparisons impossible. The record, published in 1943, is nevertheless as valid today as it was then. We know, without any doubt, that trade agreements build trade and that they will do so after the war as they did before. All sections of our population—labor, farmers, businessmen—have shared and will share in the benefits which increased trade brings.'

"This quotation, or the same figures, have now been used during testimony before the Ways and Means Committee by several witnesses and on several occasions. The table to which reference is made appears on page 7 of the report of the Ways and Means Committee above referred to, and reads as follows:

[Values in millions of dollars]

	Average 1934–35 value	Average 1938–39 value	Increase	
			Value	Percent
Exports (including reexports):				
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 758	[1] 1,232	475	62.8
Total, nonagreement countries	[2] 992	[2] 1,306	314	31.7
Total, all countries	2,208	3,136	928	42.0
General imports:				
Total, trade-agreement countries	[1] 774	[1] 942	168	21.6
Total, nonagreement countries	[2] 772	[2] 868	97	12.5
Total, all countries	1,851	2,139	288	15.6

[1] These figures do not include Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela and the United Kingdom, Newfoundland, and non-self-governing British colonies with which agreements have been concluded but where the period during which the agreements have been in effect is too short to justify inclusion for purposes of comparison.

[2] The apparent discrepancy shown by these figures in comparison with the other totals is due to the noninclusion of trade with Ecuador and the United Kingdom and its Crown colonies.

"Attention is particularly called to the exclusion of Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, and the United Kingdom and Crown colonies, because of the short time the trade agreements were in effect. The trade experience of this group of countries excluded from the table was as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Average, 1934–35	Average, 1938–39	Increase	
			Value	Percent
Exports (including reexports)	476	662	186	39.1
Imports (general)	329	362	33	10.1

"The first observation is that the trade experience of the group excluded by Government spokesmen was even worse than the experience of all of the non-trade-agreement countries combined (excluding countries at war). Little wonder that they were excluded from the table.

"The second observation is that during 1938–39 several countries were already in a state of war or interior revolution and yet these were all thrown in with the non-trade-agreement countries. These included Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, and China (including Kwantung). Actually exports to that group fell off $20,524,000, and imports from them fell off $14,714,000 between 1934–35 and 1938–39. If it was proper to exclude one group of nations to make a good showing for the trade-agreements group, would it not be equally proper to exclude countries engaged in war or revolution in order to get a fair comparison?

"For the record, it must be remembered that Japan seized Manchuria during 1931–32 and the invasion of China began in 1937. It must also be remembered that Italy attacked Ethiopia in December 1934, and the invasion of Albania began in April 1939. In the case of Spain, while the Republic was established in 1931, the revolution began in April 1936 and was not completed until March 1939. German occupation of Austria was during 1938 and the seizure of the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia took place during the first 10 days of October 1938. The general invasion of Czechoslovakia began in March 1939. The invasion of Poland began September 1, 1939.

"Separating these two groups, we have made a comparison of our exports to and imports from by groups of nations, which will be bound in the table.

"From the table it appears that when contrast is made between (1) the completed trade-agreement countries in effect during all of 1938–39 and (2) the non-trade-agreement countries carrying on normal trade, the increase in value of exports to the trade-agreement countries was 62.8 percent while the increase in exports to the non-trade-agreement countries was 57.3 percent, or differed only slightly. From this there is no indication that exports were stimulated as a result of trade agreements.

"When we turn to an examination of general imports (without again listing the countries omitted from the trade-agreements group or those included in the non-trade-agreements group) we find that (1) imports from trade-agreement countries increased 21.6 percent while (2) imports from the other non-trade-agreement countries increased 24 percent. These were naturally substantially the same, since concessions to one were extended to all—except Germany.

"The only other point of significance is that exports increased almost three times as fast as imports. This is entirely accounted for by the tremendous volume of exports of automotive equipment, electrical and industrial machinery, agricultural implements, office appliances, etc. These items were largely exported by important domestic industries who believed that the world market was getting into position to absorb very large quantities. Actually, exports of these items increased between 1934 and 1937 about 120 percent."

Here again, the point of greatest significance is that when the countries in a state of war or revolution are excluded the exports were larger in amount and increased at a more rapid rate to the non-trade-agreement countries than to trade-agreement countries, as follows:

Increase to trade-agreement countries, $144,322,366, or 117.9 percent.

Increase to non-trade-agreement countries, $216,267,277, or 126.4 percent.

In addition to the reason just stated for more rapid expansion of exports over imports, it is important to remember that during 1937–38–39 important agricultural products were exported with benefit of export subsidies. Furthermore, many foreign countries were already beginning to build stock piles in anticipation of a possible outbreak of new international conflicts. It was during this period that the United States exported unusual amounts of iron and steel scrap, high-octane gasoline, and many other materials particularly needed in connection with military operations. All of these factors tended to stimulate exports entirely apart from any possible influence of foreign concessions in reciprocal-trade agreements.

For detailed comparisons of exports to and imports from trade agreement and other groups of countries, see following table:

United States exports and imports for the period 1934–35 contrasted with those for 1938–39

[Values in millions of dollars]

	1934–35 average	1938–39 average	Increase [1]	
			Amount	Percent
Exports (including reexports):				
To trade-agreement countries with agreements in effect during—				
All of 1938–39	757	1,232	475	62.8
Part of 1938–39 [2]	476	662	186	39.1
To non-trade-agreement countries:				
Those in war and revolution	473	452	−21	−4.5
All other	502	790	288	57.3
Total exports	2,208	3,136	928	42.0
General imports:				
From trade-agreement countries with agreements in effect during—				
All of 1938–39	774	942	168	21.6
Part of 1938–39 [2]	329	362	33	10.1
From non-trade agreement countries:				
Those in war and revolution [3]	324	309	−15	−4.5
All other	424	526	102	24.0
Total imports	1,851	2,139	288	15.5

[1] Minus sign (−) denotes decrease.

[2] Ecuador, Turkey, Venezuela, United Kingdom, and the Crown colonies.

[3] Germany, Italy Spain, Japan, China, and Kwantung.

Mr. KEED. If it is convenient to Secretary Clayton, I would like to adjourn now, for your benefit and for the benefit of the others here, until 10 o'clock in the morning. Would that be satisfactory to you, sir?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir.

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Liberty magazine for May 1948:

REDS IN THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

(By Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, as told to Stacy V. Jones)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Representative THOMAS, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and a member of the House Armed Services Committee, recently returned from Panama.)

Panama is bustling with the agents of many lands these days, and one of the largest and most active delegations is the Russian. For example, the head waiter of one of Panama's leading cafes catering to Americans is a Russian who got to the Isthmus from Shanghai. The United States Army afforded him transportation part of the way, through the

complaisance of a captain to whom he had been useful in China. The man has no great need of the cafe patrons' tips, as he had $25,000 in a Panama bank.

He is now under surveillance of American Intelligence as one of Stalin's secret agents.

The head waiter is only one of the Soviet nationals that have been coming in in a startling influx since the beginning of last year. They travel with the approval of their government, which is not lightly given. Their occupations include those of automobile dealer, engineer, fur trader, and steamship operator, but there is reason to believe that their chief interest is in the 10-mile-wide strip of land administered by the United States—the Panama Canal Zone.

The little republic is also one of the principal centers of Communist Party activity in Latin America. Although the Communist Party of Panama was ostensibly disbanded in 1943, when the Comintern was dissolved, it has an active successor in the People's Party (Partido del Pueblo), which maintains several fronts and affiliated political groups. Communist agents move freely to and from Panama, the crossroads of the world. Some of them, traveling as employees of our Government-owned ships, carry messages from leaders in New York.

The refusal of the Panama Assembly last December to approve a treaty extending our use of 13 bases needed for the defense of the Canal was brought about by Communist propaganda and Communist-led demonstrations. Partly as a result, the Canal is at the mercy of any enemy with modern weapons. What I am about to reveal about the lack of Canal defenses may startle the American people but can cause no surprise to the military intelligence agencies of the U. S. S. R.

I can think of no fortification, base, or port more important to the defense of the United States than the Panama Canal. As long as war is fought partly on the sea, and as long as military men and matériel are transported by ship, it will be vital to us. Our rail transport, which was overtaxed in World War II without suffering attack, could be crippled by a few atomic warheads dropped on strategic yards. Our ships must be able to ply between our ports on the two oceans by the short Canal route.

If world war III comes, it will come without notice, in a surprise attack of far greater violence and extent than that at Pearl Harbor. We must recognize and meet the enemy before he reaches our shores. Twenty-four-hour vigilance is needed at the Canal, with all the modern weapons and skills. We have some radar but with a radius of only 150 miles at best. We have only 16 antiaircraft guns, of the 90- and 120-millimeter types, to defend the whole Canal, and only 8 of them—4 on each side—are fully manned. We have no searchlights. The mine fields are not laid. Many of the mines are not in good condition, and days, even weeks, might be needed to put them in perfect shape. The Air Force, what we have of it, is good, but the whole defense lacks the spirit of alertness.

We have in the Zone only 6,000 soldiers, including Quartermaster, Ordnance, Medical Corps, and Headquarters Detachments, so that in case of hostilities they could do little more than care for the wounded and bury the dead. Instead of one antiaircraft battalion we should have 18; and instead of our nondescript combat team, a division.

I had hoped that the experience of World War II would teach us a lasting lesson. Pushed back inside the 10-mile strip, we should now be doubly alert. But in my opinion, based on interviews with many persons of high and low rank, and on data supplied the congressional committee of which I am chairman, we are closer to 1937 (the first time I visited the Canal), when we had nothing, than to 1940, when we had a little.

Our weakness must be obvious to the foreign espionage agents who busy themselves about the Republic of Panama. The Russians have the special advantage of the Communist fifth column that runs through Central America and is particularly strong in Panama.

Panama's Communist movement began about 1925, with organization of the Tenants' League and the General Syndicate of Panamanian Workers. Their founders were Cristobal L. Segundo, now president of the People's Party, and Eliseo Echevez, who is also active in it. In 1933 the Communist Party of Panama came into the open under that name, linking itself with the Comintern in a public manifesto, and carried on for 10 years. Its successor, the People's Party, has always been small and, although it is the core of the movement, has never gained enough signatures to be recognized as a qualified political party.

The most important Communist front in Panama is, however, big enough to get onto the ballot. This is the Socialist Party of Panama (Partido Socialista de Panama), organized in 1935 by a lawyer who had been associated with Segundo and Echevez in the early Tenants' League and Workers' Syndicate. Other fronts, or useful affiliates, are the People's Party Youth, the National Union of Women, and the important Syndical Federation of Panamanian Workers.

The importance of the federation lies in its affiliation with the network of other Communist-dominated organizations in Central and South America. It is a unit of the Confederation of Latin-American Workers (usually called the CTAL from the initials of its Spanish name, Confederacion de Trabajadores de America Latina). The CTAL is headed by Vicente Lombardo Toledano, of Mexico City. The federation and the CTAL are affiliated with the Soviet-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions.

Several of the Panamanian Communist leaders have taken courses of instruction in Russia. In addition to the party directives, they have contact with the U. S. S. R.'s agents in Colon and Panama City. Dr. Celso Nicalos Solano, who is general secretary of the People's Party and is regarded as its intellectual leader, carried a Soviet Union flag in a student demonstration against the American treaty last December.

What, you may ask, can these people do inside the Canal Zone, which is ruled and policed by Uncle Sam? There are 172 known members of the People's Party among the Canal workers, and the actual number may be much higher. And for some reason we have permitted organization of Local 713, United Public Workers of America (CIO). One explanation I received was that this was preferable to waiting until Toledano came from Mexico City to do the job.

There would be no objection to organization of the Canal workers by an American union of good standing, but we are flirting with danger in admitting one so flagrantly Communist-controlled. Abram Flaxer, president of UPWA, has been active in the affairs of the Communist Party since 1936 and has loyally followed its twisting line. He has not publicly avowed membership, but the Committee on Un-American Activities concluded 4 years ago that he indisputably belonged to the party.

On May Day in 1946, 3,000 persons paraded in Panama City, denouncing "Anglo-American imperialism" and demanding establishment of diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R. The next day May 2, "Operation Panama" was launched to recruit the Canal workers for UPWA. In charge was Leonard Goldsmith, who had signed Communist Party election petitions in New York and had been connected with a number of fronts. An associate was Robert Weinstein, director of organization for UPWA, who is listed by the Philadelphia police as a Communist Party member. Among the Panamanians who joined in the drive were officials of the People's Party and former officials of the Panama Communist Party.

Local 713 has about 12,000 members, although it has claimed 19,000. Most of its members are silver workers of Jamaican or other West Indian extraction, and two-thirds of them live ouside the Zone. Though I don't suppose many are actually Communists, they can be manipulated.

The local union is pledged not to strike against Uncle Sam. But an incident of last October indicates what may be expected. Then 500 dock workers employed by the Panama Railroad Company went out, tying up much of the Canal's shipping. The dock workers don't belong to local 713, and its officers disclaimed any knowledge of the strike, but they undertook to mediate it. The walkout was well organized and timed. Investigators concluded that local 713 had pulled all the strings.

In the hemisphere set-up, the Communist Party of the United States is considered the major section, giving advice and assistance to its Latin-American sisters. Certain crew members of the *Panama*, *Cristobal*, and *Ancon*, ships owned by the Panama Railroad, who are thus government employees, are known to carry literature and messages to Communist units in Panama. A stewardess whose name was given to me attends frequent extreme leftist meetings. Seamen are known to have been in contact not only with Communist groups but with Russian agents on the isthmus. Many of the sailors are aliens, and these seem to get preference in the hiring.

Two American Navy veterans, for instance, applied to the captain of the *Panama* in New York for jobs on the ship, but were referred to the National Maritime Union for clearance. The NMU refused them cards, and later sent the ship three Nicaraguans who had been in the United States only a short time.

Sabotage by employees of the Canal is more to be feared than strikes. A heavy charge, even of conventional explosives, set off in the narrow Gaillard Cut could block shipping. If the dam, dikes, or locks holding in the great artificial Gatun Lake were breached, the lake would spill into the sea, and the Canal would be useless for from one to four years, depending on the damage.

Actual aggression could come in several ways. The Canal might be attacked by long-range bombers from Asia. Besides, Russia now has some of the largest submarines in the world. At the end of World War II she received some of Germany's biggest underwater craft. Small airplanes can be launched from the decks of the largest German-type submarines, and the Canal locks could be blown up by this means.

Military leaders are uncertain whether a determined enemy could be prevented from putting the Canal out of business even with the 134 bases we had from 1942 to 1947, but obviously we are ill off without them. The Communists discovered that they could turn the pride and nationalism of Panamanians into hate for the Colossus of the North, and they must be credited with a signal victory in the rejection of the treaty.

In September 1946 the People's Party began holding demonstrations demanding the return of the bases and denouncing Yankee imperialism. The Soviet flag hung from a bandstand at one meeting. That winter, members painted signs on public buildings reading, "Return the bases," "Bases and no threats," and "Remember Rio Hato." The big B–29 base, which we have now surrendered, was at Rio Hato. In May of last year another anti-American meeting was informed that the United States was about to swallow Panama in 36 bites. Student groups joined in, and a speaker told a spring meeting at the University of Panama, "Don't fear the Yankees, because the U. S. S. R. will always help us." Last summer the drive was

stepped up by the Communist-controlled Federation of Students.

The climax came in December when, after 15 months of negotiation the assembly took up the agreement to extend the use of Rio Hato for 20 years and a dozen other islands and mainland bases for 5. University students and schoolboys fought police in the streets of Panama City with sticks, stones, and bottles, and 40 civilians and police were injured in one day. Professors and pupils, even in girls' schools, went on a general strike for 10 days. Parents were enlisted. Ten thousand women attended an outdoor protest meeting. Handbills in red lettering denounced Yankee imperialism, and called on Panama's youth to defend the country's integrity and to save Panama from Yankee fangs.

President Enrique A. Jiminez and other sober statesmen tried to tell the country that the threat of Communist aggression meant that the bases should be manned for joint defense. The students' reply was that there was no danger of war.

The University of Panama is a hotbed of Communists and extreme leftist sympathizers. The head of the university himself is far left of center, and perhaps three-quarters of the faculty are leftist sympathizers.

Panamanian Communists have influence, not only in education and machine politics, but some have connections in the Canal administration. For example, a leading woman leftist, who is strongly suspected of being a Communist, is married to a man who holds a responsible job in the Zone.

The number of Russian residents in the Republic is still growing, and 50 are reported to be waiting in Shanghai for Panama visas. Fifteen Russian vessels passed through the Panama Canal in the 6 months ended with January. They were of the fishing type and all sailed westward, probably from Odessa to Vladivostok. One anchored offshore on the Atlantic side for 3 or 4 days, during which its officers and most of its seamen came ashore in small boats. They made contact with known Russian agents and with leading Communists. It is notable that the bank accounts of some of the agents showed an appreciable increase after the visit.

While the Russians woo Panama, the friction between Panamanians and our nationals continues to increase.

Cities outside of the Zone are put "off limits" for our military personnel from time to time. The situation is so tense that explosions may be expected. Communist agitators exploit as racial discrimination such distinctions as the gold and silver classifications which grew out of early payment of United States citizens in gold and others in silver. The complaints are against both Jim Crowism and wage differentials.

The silver workers are easy marks for any professional organizers who promise them higher wages and better living conditions, and understandably so. Our Government should indeed bow its head in shame at the conditions under which it forces some of the Canal workers to live. I have talked to silver employees who have been with the Canal for many years and are paid only $20 a week. Their families live in squalid barracks or tenements, 12 families to a tenement, 1 family to a room. Some families as large as 10 persons are crowded into a single room, and no facilities except a common toilet for the whole tenement house.

We couldn't do more to encourage communism if we offered Communist Party cards to all Canal Zone employees.

One thing we can do without delay to counteract red propaganda is to improve these wage and housing conditions.

If we cannot soon get back the bases, especially Rio Hato, we should negotiate for sites in other Central American countries. At the Canal we need the best warning systems and air defenses that military science can develop. And our first line of defense is, of course, intelligence. This activity should be expanded in Europe and Asia as well as in Central and South America.

The recent report to Congress by the Governor of the Canal recommends construction of a sea-level route at Panama instead of the present lock system, chiefly because it would be less vulnerable. It would cost $2,500,000,000 and take 10 years to build. Before undertaking that or any other improvement we must make sure where we stand on security at Panama.

At Washington, suggestions have been advanced that a cut be made somewhere else—perhaps in Nicaragua. But there, too, local enmities might be aroused against us. It comes back to one diplomatic problem for all of Central America—counteracting the anti-United States campaign directed from Moscow.

Milwaukee Journal Lauds Mundt Bill, H. R. 5852, for Curbing Communist Activities in the United States—Praises Un-American Activities Committee for Approving It—Urges Early Favorable Action by Congress—Advises Congress Opposing Communism at Home Fully as Important as Opposing It Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress from our larger cities and from areas where American Communists have their lairs are being flooded with postcards and telegrams urging them to defeat what the Moscow propagandists call the Mundt police-state bill. So that the Congress and the country may better understand just exactly what is in this legislation, H. R. 5852, which appears on our whip notices as one of the items which may come before Congress next week, I wish to call attention to the following thoughtful and analytical editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Nobody has ever accused the Milwaukee Journal of being a reactionary journal or a tool of Wall Street. It is doubly significant, therefore, that this great Midwestern newspaper, published in the largest city of progressive Wisconsin, should give H. R. 5852 such unqualified and enthusiastic support.

Mr. Speaker, it is even more significant that this morning both the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Times Herald—two great newspapers which are frequently as far apart as the two poles on foreign policy and domestic legislation—carry lead editorials supporting this legislation to curb and circumscribe the activities of the Communist Party and its numerous front and dupe organizations. Numerous other newspaper writers and columnists have also given this new approach to the communism problem—the technique of disclosure—their wholehearted support. Fulton Lewis, Jr., and other radio commentators have spoken out vigorously in its support.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, only the Communists and their closest allies and associates—their dupes, their front organizations, and their nests of fellow wanderers—have spoken out in opposition to this constitutional and orderly method of turning the light of day upon the illicit acts and institutions of American Communists.

Our committee expects to place a copy of this legislation and our committee report in the hands of each Member of the House before this matter comes before you next week. We solicit your careful study of this legislative proposal—the first to come from the Un-American Activities Committee in its history. Into this bill, we have put the experience and education which we have acquired in nearly 10 years of investigating and studying the sneak-thief tactics of Communists in America and abroad.

H. R. 5852 does not outlaw the Communist Party. It does not ban it from the ballot or deny it use of the mail, free assemblage, freedom of speech, or of press. It does not make the Communist Party illegal, Mr. Speaker, but it does make illegal certain conspiratorial activities which seek by stealth to overthrow our Government and to replace it with a totalitarian regime controlled and dominated by a foreign power. Only if it can be shown that this shoe fits the foot of American Communists can it be contended that H. R. 5852 outlaws the Communist Party.

From the loud wails one reads in the Communist Daily Worker, it appears that there must be many members of the Communist Party in America who are worrying guiltily that judicial procedure will be able to demonstrate that they are engaged in a conspiracy to subjugate America's interests to those of Soviet Russia. If that can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of our courts of law, the time is amply here when legislation should provide a penalty which will fit the crime. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5852, does precisely that.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal]

DEALING WITH OUR COMMIES

If democracy is going to combat communism in this country, there must be rules for the conflict. Action must be taken to stop the Communists from cheating, from dealing under the table, from marking the cards, and stacking the deck. Otherwise we are asking for our own destruction.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities lays down some rules in a bill to be submitted this week. It offers a program by which it believes American democracy can retain its traditional freedoms and rights, and yet deal with the conspiratorial Communist movement.

"We are willing," the committee has explained, "to permit the theories of communism and democracy to clash in the open market place of political ideas in America, but we insist that communism not be allowed to have the unfair advantages in this conflict of the unrestricted use of illegal means, the cloak of secrecy and fraud, and the assistance and direction of a foreign Communist dictatorship. We believe that if its criminal activities are prosecuted, its false fronts exposed, and its foreign assistance

and direction cut away, the Communist movement in the United States, standing alone for what it is, will be overwhelmingly defeated."

This problem of dealing with communism, while still preserving fundamental American liberties, is of major importance. Here is how the Un-American Activities Committee proposes to do it:

1. Isolate American Communist leaders from the rest of the world, particularly from the Soviet Union. Provide stiff penalties for any American Communist leader found guilty of conspiring against the United States.

2. By a policy of constant exposure, attempt to draw the support of so-called innocents away from the Communist Party and its front organizations.

3. Require registration of all members of the Communist Party, responsibility for this to rest on party leaders.

4. Require registration of all Communist-front organizations and the clear labeling of their propaganda as coming from quarters so stigmatized.

5. Deny Government jobs to members of the Communist Party and penalize Government executives who knowingly employ Communists.

6. Forbid issuance of passports to any member of the Communist Party.

7. Discontinue and forbid all tax-exempt status to Communist-front organizations.

8. Order deportation proceedings against all Communist registrants found to be aliens.

The committee does not ask the outlawing of the Communist Party. It does not attempt to draw and quarter every minor Communist or innocent dupe. It does, as Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, its principal author, declares, "attempt to strike a body blow at the American cadre of the Soviet-directed Communist conspiracy."

The committee bill provides one distinct departure from present law: It proposes a new definition of conspiracy.

At present, conspiracy against the United States, except in wartime, must have the characteristic of employing force and violence. The committee recommends that conspiracy henceforth cover subversion of the interests of the Nation by abetting the objectives of the world Communist movement, by disrupting trade and commerce, or by advocating the destruction of government in the United States with the aim of establishing a Communist dictatorship.

For a conviction, it would be necessary to prove that a man, as a Communist leader, was engaged in a conspiracy with others to promote subversion. Penalties would run as high as a $10,000 fine and 10 years of imprisonment.

The committee approach to this whole problem seems sound and realistic. If we are to deal successfully with this problem of American communism, it must be along lines such as these.

Congress should definitely pass a measure such as this at the present session. It is just as important as are the measures to oppose communism overseas.

Oil: The Key to National Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in this age of mechanization no single industry is so important to the Nation's well-being—in peacetime as in wartime—as the oil industry.

The health of the Nation's economy rises and falls in direct relation to the health of the oil industry. It is a great misfortune and injustice that an industry of such importance should receive only negative attention from the Government. By negative attention, I mean that the Government has always shown a ready enthusiasm for imposing controls, regulations, and restrictions upon the oil industry, while at the same time it has failed to display a comparable interest in measures designed to keep the oil industry in good health.

OIL INDUSTRY NEEDS STEEL

Today the Nation's petroleum supply situation is too critical—and too much of our national security is at stake—to permit a continuation of this lackadaisical approach to the industry's problems. It is time for us to face one inescapable fact: The oil industry needs steel.

Producers need steel, refiners need steel, transporters need steel, and they should have it. Oil may well be the key to our safety in the days ahead, and it is imperative that the industry receive the steel it needs to supply the oil that our security demands.

TEXAS IS KEYSTONE STATE

Because Texas is the keystone State in the Nation's oil supply structure, I have studied the oil industry's ever-changing needs carefully through my years in Congress.

COLONEL THOMPSON, ONE OF WORLD'S MOST ABLE AND PRACTICAL OIL AUTHORITIES

Because the urgency of the current oil-supply problem demands action, I recently wrote to the chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, Col. E. O. Thompson, outlining my views on what should be done now to meet this crisis. Colonel Thompson, as members of the Armed Services Committee of this House know, is one of the best-informed, most able, and most practical authorities on oil and its problems in the Nation.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Colonel Thompson discussing the oil-supply problem and a copy of the letter I received from him in reply:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1948.

Col. E. O. THOMPSON,
Texas Railroad Commission,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR COLONEL THOMPSON: It is gratifying to note that the Texas Railroad Commission has begun a timely round of State-wide MER hearings. Your commission is to be commended for this effort to increase the State's oil production at a time of serious need.

The seriousness of the petroleum-supply problem cannot be overemphasized. For a nation whose entire economy—both in peace and war—is dependent upon petroleum products this country has been entirely too apathetic to the difficulties besetting the industry.

As a member of the Special Oil Committee of the House Armed Services Committee, I have been—and shall continue to be—greatly concerned with the alarming question of what we would do for oil in the event of another war. Our minimum daily demands in wartime are estimated at 8,000,000 barrels daily; our maximum daily capacity is about 5,500,000 barrels.

What would we do if called upon to supply that 2,500,000-barrel deficit tomorrow? I don't know and I have found no one who will say with assurance just how that question could be answered. But I do not think we should wait until an emergency forces us to find the answer—or be destroyed.

Time may be running out for us, so far as the chances of solving the petroleum supply problem is concerned. I do not think we should blissfully await a day of crisis before planning for the future.

It is my belief that the President should immediately appoint a Nation-wide commission of outstanding and qualified men—who have a sound, practical knowledge and acquaintance with the realities of the petroleum industry's problems and needs—to study the situation and formulate a long-range program to guide the Nation in preparing to meet its future petroleum needs.

Recommendations from such a group would, I am sure, be beneficial in steering the Nation away from what might be hastily conceived, short-sighted, and unnecessary regulations and controls.

For the present I am convinced that certain phases of the petroleum supply question should be dealt with immediately, particularly in view of the unprecedented domestic demand. There are certain things which can be done, and I think should be done, including these:

1. Needs of the petroleum industry should be made the first order of business by the steel industry. The steel companies should be called upon to give the petroleum industry—producer, refiner, and transporter—the steel it needs now. If this is not done voluntarily, I believe the Government should step in to see that steel is allocated in sufficient quantities to the petroleum industry. It is senseless to expand oil-consuming industries without enabling the oil industry to expand and meet the added demand.

2. Following Texas' example, all States should immediately review the performance records of their fields and bring all fields up to the MER.

3. The title to the tideland areas of the Nation should be cleared quickly by quitclaim legislation, and every stimulant and incentive should be given for thorough development of this rich deposit of oil.

4. The appropriation of the United States Geological Survey should be augmented to expedite geological exploration of the public lands, and the terms of leasing should be revalued to provide added incentive for exploration.

5. To avert or relieve any temporary "spot shortages," we should import as much oil as necessary, without injuring the domestic industry.

6. Renewed efforts should be made to strengthen and rigidly enforce gas-conservation measures throughout the United States.

7. Added steel supplies should be made available for construction of gas pipe lines into heavily industrialized areas so that gas may be used instead of fuel oil for industrial consumption.

8. Federal funds should be made available to supplement State activity in research for improved methods of secondary recovery.

9. Federal funds should also be made available to stimulate research in new methods of drilling.

These steps could, I believe, take us a long way toward relieving the current "tight" situation in national petroleum supply. The over-all question cannot be answered by piecemeal actions, however, and I believe we should move now to chart our course for the future.

Any comments you might have on this discussion would be appreciated and helpful to me. I am sure the other States would do well to follow the course of conservation and sensible development pioneered by the Texas Railroad Commission through the years.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., April 23, 1948.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: I am in receipt of your most interesting letter of April 17, in which you review the oil situation of America.

Having appeared before your special committee of the House Armed Services Committee, I was particularly impressed with the thoroughness and the serious type of inquiry which your committee has been making. The questions asked by the members of your committee in those hearings show the concern of the Congress on this serious situation which confronts the oil industry and our Nation from a defense standpoint.

You point the situation clearly when you call attention to the fact in your letter that the estimate of wartime oil demands are placed at 8,000,000 barrels daily, whereas our present national production as of April 17 was only 5,414,360 barrels and you pose the question what would we do to supply the additional 2,500,000 barrels if they should be needed tomorrow, or at some early date.

I think you are eminently correct when you say that we should not wait until the emergency forces us to find the answer or be destroyed.

You have, in your letter, very clearly pointed out some of the most important things that should be done in order to augment our petroleum supply from domestic sources in this country, and you have hit upon the most important one in your first enumeration; namely, that steel companies should be called upon to give the petroleum industry—the producer, the refiner and the transporter, the steel that it needs now. I firmly believe that if the steel is made available, the industry will get the job done and promptly Hundreds and hundreds of people want to drill wells but cannot do so for lack of steel.

If there be no steel strikes and if there be no strikes in the oil industry, and if imports are kept at their present level of some hundred and two thousand barrels per day in excess of exports, I believe that we will be able, short of greatly expanded military demands, to avoid rationing this summer. However, the matters that you touch upon and deal with so intelligently are to me compelling.

Your letter so completely covers the situation that I am taking the liberty of giving it to the press.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST O. THOMPSON.

Keynote Speech by Hon. James P. Kem, of Missouri, at Missouri Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a keynote speech delivered by me at the Republican State Convention at St. Louis, Mo., on May 1, 1948.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, fellow Missourians, we are met here for a patriotic purpose; to discharge a civic duty. Ours is the proud privilege of selecting certain important agents of government, and of declaring in a critical hour the principles of the great Republican Party of Missouri.

We know that our cause is just. We know that our cause is right. We of the Republican Party stand steadfast on the principles of the Constitution of the United States. These are the guideposts to the American way of life.

The Republican Party directed the course of the Government for 46 of the 72 years from 1861 to 1933. In that era the United States became a strong, prosperous, and enlightened nation. The United States commanded the respect of the world. Its solvency, philanthropy, humanity, latent military power, economic resources, its system of private enterprise, and scientific development challenged the admiration of the world. This result was not achieved through the WPA, the OPA, exorbitant taxes, or starry-eyed schemes designed solely to entice votes. Nor did these blessings come through encouragement of idleness by placing unemployment on a salary, or prodigal buying of potatoes by the Government and burning them in kerosene-lit bonfires.

The Republican pattern of statesmanship contained no hint of quackery, no specter of communism, no double talk on international affairs, or wavering on international responsibilities. There was never a threat of yielding the goal of public service in a frenzied reach for power.

On the contrary, the Republican Party did then and does now advocate thrift, economy, self-reliance, and individual initiative; representative government without the lash of regimentation and private enterprise without hobbling restrictions.

The times now impose upon the Republican Party new opportunities for molding and forming public opinion. We realize fully that we are not living or carrying on our work in the mood or under the conditions of 1854, when the party was founded.

Disraeli once said, "I am a radical because I want to eradicate that which is bad. I am a conservative because I want to conserve that which is good." To defend and maintain the Constitution of the United States, our laws, our form of government, and the right of men to live their lives in freedom from the tyranny of others, is our party's province. In this spirit, we dedicate our efforts to the welfare of our country.

Some of the leaders of the Democrat Party pride themselves on the fact that they never look back. They liken themselves, we understand, to some sort of a mythical bird that is always looking forward.

Here in Missouri, we have known longer and better than have our brethren in any of our sister States the sinister record of the Pendergast machine and its corruption, vote stealing, and public plunder. Here in Missouri we know too well the history of Pendergastism with its public dishonor and private shame.

Here in the home state of Mr. Truman, why the Democrats dislike to look back may be easily understood. They don't dare look back. We Republicans may look both forward and backward with equal satisfaction. We recall the past of our party with pride; we look to the future with confidence.

Here in the very heart of the nation, we recognize the Republican trend. We discern an unconquerable uprising of the people to end the fumbling in the Governor's office in Jefferson City, and the bungling in the White House in Washington. As Americans we want more of the kind of government given us by the Republican Congress that reversed the ruinous, radical New Deal Democrat trend to socialism and destruction.

As Missourians we want more of the kind of government given us by the Republican legislature that has done so much to redeem the state from years of Democrat misrule.

STATE GOVERNMENT

For several years past, Jefferson City and Washington have had this in common: In each, a constructive, able, and industrious Republican legislative body has been confronted by a stubborn, non-cooperative, and alas!—sometimes irritable, Chief Executive. In view of the difficulties under which they have labored in this respect, the achievements of the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth General Assemblies of Missouri have received unstinted admiration on every side. In 1944, for the first time in many years, the Republicans gained control of both houses of our general assembly.

The following year, at a special election, the citizens of Missouri adopted a new state constitution. This made necessary the revising and rewriting of more than 9,000 Missouri statutes in order to make them comply with the new state constitution.

This was a Herculean task, but it was a long-awaited opportunity. The new constitution made possible the accomplishment of many proposals the Republicans of our state had long urged, but could not get adopted over the opposition of the Democrats.

As an example, the Republicans were able to revamp the state's entire system of revenue collection. The Democrat minority fought this bitterly to the end, and even after the state constitution was adopted, tried to defeat the bill setting up the department.

Under the wise and economical administration of the great wartime Governor of Missouri, Forrest C. Donnell, a huge surplus of money piled up in the state treasury. The Republican leaders impounded this fund in a special post-war reserve.

This fund has been carefully guarded and judiciously spent. Every effort of pressure groups to raid it has been successfully resisted. The fund at one time reached a total of $45,000,000. May I ask a question—a serious question? Would money have accumulated in the state treasury had the Democrat plot to steal the governorship in 1941 been successful?

Constructive labor legislation was demanded by the public and passed by the legislature in response to this demand.

Abuses of the unemployment compensation law received intelligent attention.

The Sixty-fourth General Assembly wanted the facts about our schools, and made a year-long investigation and survey. Laws were enacted providing for voluntary consolidation of small school districts in order to provide more efficiency at less cost, and for a more equitable distribution of the state's school funds.

The session of the General Assembly which recently ended was one of the most economical in the history of the state, although it appropriated more money than any other legislature. This seeming paradox is due to the fact that although more money was appropriated by the legislature, much of it came from savings in the war years. All of it was appropriated with the greatest care.

We of the "Show-me State" have taken a good look at the self-seeking groups that have captured control of the Democrat Party in our state. These political bosses have been riding a one-eyed mule—a left-eyed mule—that is always leaning to the left, and more to the left—and now finds itself right near the ditch.

Yes, the time is ripe for some important changes. And the people—come November—are going to make a clean sweep. Above all, they are going to put a Republican in the Governor's office—a Republican who has his feet on the ground—a Republican who knows the value of calm deliberation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We shall bring decent, wholesome, truly progressive state and local government to the

State of Missouri. We shall be equally vigilant and determined to contribute to stability, soundness, and order in the all-important executive department of the Government at Washington.

Let us, therefore, proceed to what is always an essential part of the deliberations of a Missouri Republican convention. Let us consider the state of the union, and, first, our domestic affairs.

CONGRESS

The Republican Congress has fulfilled its pledges to the people. We have cut taxes despite three indefensible vetoes by President Truman. We have given the people tax relief that was long overdue—relief that was necessary to keep America strong; relief so that the great mass of workers would have more "take-home pay;" relief to replenish the wells of investment capital so that business, farming, and mining and the countless service pursuits would expand and provide more jobs.

Continuation of wartime taxes in peacetime is intolerable. Taxes must be fair and reasonable if a free, competitive enterprise system shall survive.

The Republican Congress has made a good start in eliminating unnecessary bureaucrats from the Federal pay roll. It has done so despite the stubborn resistance of the Truman Administration and the ill-tempered refusal of the Democrat heads of the departments to cooperate with the committees of Congress.

Mr. Truman said his spending budgets were rock-bottom and could not be cut without wrecking the Government. The Republican Congress disagreed. It lopped off billons of dollars from the President's spend-and-spend and tax-and-tax budgets.

We passed the Taft-Hartley labor-management relations act over President's Truman's purely political veto. This law attempts to adjust fairly and adequately the rights and responsibilities of three groups: the employees, the employers, and the public.

Important provisions of this bill grant legal rights to workingmen never before possessed by them, and provide methods of protecting the public welfare. The law establishes fair rules of conduct for all. It extends to labor relations our cherished principle of "equal justice under the law."

Long after experience proved that the Wagner Act was grossly unfair and insufficient, the stubborn, obstinate leadership of the Democrat Party refused to permit its "rubber stamp" Democrat-controlled Congress to enact a single amendment. We cannot expect a law as far-reaching as the Wagner Act or the Taft-Hartley Act to be in perfect or final form when first enacted.

Experience always proves the need for changes. The Republican Congress may be depended upon to make such changes in the Taft-Hartley Act as experience shows to be necessary or advisable. This new labor-management law is proving itself to be, as it is intended to be, a bill of rights for the average man.

The Republican Congress was further given a mandate by the people to free them of controls by busybody Washington bureaucrats and snoopers. And so we have repealed 76,000 controls, rules, regulations, and directives, and cut red-tape by the mile. As a result, our people may again enjoy the blessings of freedom to produce the necessities and good things of life.

And incidentally, our Federal Treasury, with a return of the free-enterprise system, is able to use some black ink, instead of red ink, once again. We got the Government out of the red; now we are going to get the Reds out of the Government.

On a thousand fronts of our national economy—factory, farm, and mine—the Republican Congress strengthened and paved the way for our people to re-establish the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

These are a few of the achievements of the Republican Congress. Let us, by way of comparison, now take a swift look at the executive department of the Federal Government, for 16 years past dominated by the radical New Dealers, aided and abetted by Democrat machine bosses exemplified by the Pendergast gang in Missouri.

EXECTIVE DEPARTMENT

It is to be regretted that the American people could not do in 1946 what they wanted to do. It is a pity that when they repudiated the Truman Administration, they could not then clean house from top to bottom.

The Republican Congress has made a great record in holding the line for the American way of life. In doing so it has had to battle constantly on the Executive front with a warring, quarrelsome, Democrat Party—falling apart at the seams, as it is driven toward a regimented police state by its radical New Deal masters of the Truman Administration.

The one-horse shay of F. D. R. ain't what it used to be. After 2 years with Mr. Truman supposedly in the driver's seat, it has broken down—completely. All that is left are a few "bolts" and "nuts." Speed the day when the "nuts" all "bolt."

Due to incompetence in the White House and the accumulated deadwood in the innumerable boards, bureaus, and commissions created wherever the whim or fancy of the New Dealers led them, the Executive branch has been running wild. The buzzards of privilege, the hangers-on and camp followers of the radical cabal have been having a field day. Scarcely a day passes that a new scandal in the Truman Administration is not uncovered by congressional investigators.

As one example of how things have been going in the Truman Administration, let us look at the notorious and malodorous Pauley case. The fireworks started when the President of the United States denounced in no uncertain terms those who had been guilty of speculating in food.

And then the embarrassing fact came out that the chief of these speculators was none other than a prominent member of the President's own inner circle, Ed. Pauley, former treasurer of the Democrat National Committee and chief money raiser for the 1944 campaign.

Even the President's physician, General Graham, was speculating on the side, or to use the Attorney General Clark's expressive phrase, "trafficking in human misery."

STEALING EVIDENCE AT KANSAS CITY AND NEW MADRID

Let us look at another illuminating incident in recent history—the notorious theft of the ballots at Kansas City. This occurred less than 24 hours before Attorney General Clark was scheduled to appear before a Senate committee to explain his whitewash of the vote fraud cases.

The American people have been patiently awaiting the announcement of the arrest of those suspected of this foul crime. Not one has been found. The people ask why. And the people are not going to be satisfied until these criminals are brought to justice.

More recently, evidence wanted by the FBI in New Madrid County, Mo., was stolen. Again, no arrests have been made. Missourians ask: Is this, too, a "perfect crime"? A Senate committee, headed by Senator FERGUSON, is now preparing a detailed inquiry into the failure of the Attorney General to effectively investigate and prosecute the vote frauds which occurred in the Democrat primary in Jackson County at Kansas City in 1946 and the chain reaction of fraud and criminality set off when Mr. Truman personally intervened in this primary. To use Mr. Truman's apt and expressive phrase, "The outfit is still going good." Shame, Mr. President, shame.

Yes, the American people have had enough. They are going to do something about it next November. New Dealers call themselves liberals. Heaven forbid! They are reactionaries who seek to forge chains for the people's liberties. They preach liberalism; they practice tyranny and fraud.

MR. TRUMAN AND PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. Truman advocates the policy of Government control over prices. He once stated that price controls belonged to a "police state." It would have been more accurate to say that peacetime price controls are a direct importation from Moscow. They are as foreign as the Kremlin to our theory of government and to our economic system. But to Mr. Truman price ceilings are apparently more sacred than the canopy of heaven.

COMMUNISTS IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

With the election approaching, there is another state of affairs which the Truman Administration would dearly love to have us forget. The President, for some months now, has been doing his best to shoo the old Communist and fellow-traveler pals of the Roosevelt family and Mr. Wallace away from his door.

He has repudiated the Communists in speeches and news conferences and has at least not tried to dampen down the current scare over a possible early war with Russia. That is all very well, even if it does come a bit late in the day; but there are still large numbers of Federal Government jobholders who are either Communists., fellow-travelers, or subversives of other types. These constitute Joe Stalin's highly dangerous fifth column.

It is a black page in American history that so many members of un-American groups have been welcomed into high places in the Government by the New Dealers.

While our Government is spending billions and billions to quarantine communism in Europe and Asia, it is high time to stop the spread of communism in the American Government service. We appreciate that it is difficult for a Democrat President to be under the necessity of discharging members of his own party for disloyalty to their country.

We are going to do our part to relieve Mr. Truman from further embarrassment by electing a Republican President in 1948. We are going to change leadership from the White House down—a result essential to the continued safety of the American nation.

TREND TOWARD CONCENTRATION

All through the disastrous New Deal there has been a dangerous trend toward concentration of power at Washington and away from the liberty of the individual. Centralization of governmental authority is the road to dictatorship. Call it New Dealism if you wish, but a stinkweed by any other name smells the same.

It is a trend alien to our republican form of government. It violates the fundamental concept of the American way in which the Federal, state, and local governments each have their clearly defined orbits, with all sovereignty remaining in the people.

The device used to accomplish the revolutionary trend has been to spend and spend, tax and tax. All of this has been done under the illusion, to quote Harry Hopkins, the right arm of the New Deal, "The people are too damn dumb to know."

Like the Lilliputians in the story, the pygmies at Washington have fastened down the giant that is America. You may depend upon it that the people are going to loose themselves come November.

The people have seen the cost of their Federal Government rise from less than $4,000,000,000 in 1933 to about $40,000,000,000 this year. They have seen the Federal pay rolls increase in number from 500,000 in 1933 to 2,000,000 today.

At the polls next November the people will restore true liberalism, bring government back home, re-establish the proper orbits of Government—Federal, state, and local—and open the springs of personal initiative and private enterprise that are the genius of America.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Throughout this battle for restoration of good government, the country and the Congress have been plagued by failures in foreign policy by the New Deal Democrat administrations, past and present.

Fellow Missourians, the hard, inescapable fact is that international affairs now largely dominate our domestic affairs. Eighty percent of the entire cost of our Federal Government now goes for national defense, aid to foreign countries, prevention of war, and liquidation of past wars. The proportion is rising at a staggering rate.

Much of the cause for the high cost of our Federal Government;

Much of the cause for high prices;

Much of the clamor for police-state methods, restoration of strait-jacket wartime controls, rationing, and re-establishment of 76,000 rules, regulations, and directives—

All of these stem from unspeakable confusion and unbelievable inconsistency in our foreign relations—a terrible betrayal of the soldiers and sailors who gave their all on the altar of liberty—an undeserved let-down for millions of Americans at home who did their bit for victory in war.

The vacillation and confusion in foreign policy, the appeasement of Soviet Russia that has brought immeasurable grief to the liberty-loving world and tremendous cost to our people in goods and dollars—these must and shall give way to forthright leadership in the White House.

Now let us take a look at some of the shocking failures of New Deal Democrat administrations in foreign policy—or did they plan it that way?

Mistakes made at Quebec, Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam paved the way for communism and Soviet Russia's expansion program.

At these so-called Big Three conferences were made the deals, some of them in secret, that now afflict the liberty-loving peoples of the world and make America the last hope of civilization.

Out of these conferences, without the approval of the Congress or the American people, came the deals to appease Russia and give to the men of the Kremlin their opening and opportunity for expansion of their tyranny.

At these conferences, with nonchalant abandon, there was scribbled a new map for the world. Great masses of people were transferred across their traditional boundaries. Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe were crucified and placed behind Russia's "iron curtain."

At Quebec was made the inhuman, stupid, revengeful deal to hold Germany down to an agricultural state—the plan proposed by former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

Adoption of the Morgenthau plan and its futile execution delayed the recovery of all Europe for years, and sowed the seeds for communist expansion. This ill-fated scheme has already cost the American people billions upon billions of dollars.

Since the war ended in Europe, the United States, through various agencies, has poured $20,000,000,000 into Europe. And the end is not in sight.

Germany before the war and for many years was the heart of industrial Europe.

The Morgenthau plan sought to hold the children of Germany for generations in bondage for the sins of their fathers.

It may seem incredible in our land, where the immortal Lincoln held, after the Civil War, that the immediate duty was to bind up the wounds of war and to be charitable and helpful, that the representatives of our Government should agree to such an unholy program. Yet they did agree. President Roosevelt shuddered at this plan when he thoroughly understood it. President Truman attempted for a long, costly period to carry out the Morganthau plan.

Now turn to Italy. Picture in your mind's eye for a moment our young men of the Armed Forces landing on the bullet-swept beaches of Sicily and at Salerno—fighting their way over the mountains and through the valleys on to victory and liberation for the people of Italy.

We held then in our hand the destiny of Italy. Through bungling and fumbling we lost a precious opportunity gained by bravery and sacrifice.

The very Communists who have been causing all the trouble in Italy since liberation were allowed to come back from exile and from their classes in revolution at Moscow, to peddle their revolutionary wares.

In China, the same story, the same blundering diplomacy. At Yalta, China, too, was sacrificed to Soviet Russia. The world mapmakers at Yalta appeased Russia at the expense of China; gave Russia all of Sakhalin; stepping-stones to America in the Kuriles; and the best half of Korea—all of which jeopardized our position in the Far East. Why? Did Russia defeat Japan? What legal or moral right had our President to barter away the rights of China?

The record of the Truman Administration in China is a shameful betrayal. While declaiming against communistic aggression in Europe, Mr. Truman actually sought to have the Chinese Government take into its Cabinet Communists from northern China, into the government where they could carry out the pattern of Russian expansion by infiltration so familiar to us now.

The foreign program of the Truman Administration is costing billions of dollars of the American people—your money that is badly needed at home. Mr. Truman and General Marshall already have military missions in Greece, Turkey, and China. Let us hope—fervently hope—that the fathers and mothers of America will not be asked to send their sons to shed their blood in remote sectors of the earth to correct the errors of stupid diplomacy.

Now, because of betrayal of the American people and the justice for which they stand, the specter of communism directed by Soviet Russia is a grim threat to our peace and security.

We must build a national defense so strong that neither Russia nor any other aggressor nation will be tempted to attack us; but a powerful armed force is not the complete answer.

Creating "spheres of influence" in remote places of the earth, infested with armed men paid by American money and directed by American military missions—is not the answer.

Continuous pouring of billions of dollars into freedom-loving countries, prostrated by the war—is not the answer.

Tempting friendly foreign countries to live beyond their means, or beyond our means—is not the answer.

Lasting love cannot be bought with gifts.

Lasting friendship between nations cannot be won by dollars.

All history proves this to be true.

War is the result of bankrupt diplomacy.

Had the majesty, strength, position, and power of our great country been exerted at the council table in Teheran, Quebec, Yalta, and Potsdam, our country would not today be hearing frightened, frantic, desperate appeals from abroad.

What, then, is the answer? The answer is to re-establish in our foreign relations—to practice once again—certain principles that are as lively as the oceans, as eternal as the hills. These are truth, justice, honor, integrity, and the Golden Rule.

KEYNOTE OF THE CONVENTION

The time for deliverance is at hand. We of the Republican Party have a rendezvous with destiny. We accept the challenge. We buckle on the armor of candor, courage, and patriotism. With the Stars and Stripes as our standard, the Constitution of the United States as our guide, and the welfare of all the people as our inspiration, let us resume the march.

This, then, is the keynote of Missouri's Republican State Convention: To fight with all of our might for the sound, sensible, forward-looking principles of the Republican Party to the end that all our people, in State and Nation, shall enjoy security, peace, prosperity, and happiness.

America is going forward.

America is going Republican.

The President's Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the President's so-called civil-rights program, delivered by me over the radio in Wilmington, N. C., on April 24, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the 28th of last February I issued a statement to the press of North Carolina expressing regret that the President had seen fit to recommend to Congress enactment of the so-called civil-rights program, which includes an anti-poll tax, antilynching and FEPC bill, all of which are now pending in Congress. It is my view that all Democrats in the House and Senate should oppose enactment of any one of these, and that every effort should be made by Democrats everywhere to prevent any such program being put into the party platform at the national convention this year.

Undertaking to pass such legislation would be unwise at any time, and particularly now when we are struggling with so many problems of vital concern at home and abroad. Such an undertaking would result in bitter disagreement and division among our people at a time when unity is so essential to success. Furthermore, the bills referred to constitute an unwarranted invasion of State sovereignty, and, in my opinion, go beyond the limits clearly fixed by the Constitution of the United States.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

For many years we have not had in North Carolina any law requiring payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting. I am opposed to such a requirement and am proud of the fact that North Carolina abolished it years ago. I should like to see it abolished by all of the States. But this should be done by the States themselves and not by the Federal Government. My position is that the Federal Government has no right under the Constitution to pass an act to determine to any extent the qualifications of voters in the several States. If a State law requiring payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting violates the Constitution, the remedy lies in the courts, where it can be tested at any time. On the other hand, if such a State law does not violate the Constitution, then clearly Congress has no constitutional power

to legislate upon the subject and seek to superimpose qualifications of its own choosing.

Despite the fact that North Carolina has long since abolished payment of poll tax as a requirement for voting this question is, nevertheless, of profound importance to our State and Nation because of the principle involved. It is not easy to think of anything that the Federal Government could do more potentially dangerous than undertaking to control qualifications for voting. If this is done no assurance would be left that the Federal Government would not come ultimately to determine all qualifications for voting and take charge of the election machinery that has been controlled by the State since the foundation of the Government. Few things could be further from the objective and intent of the founding fathers. Yet such a bill has been passed by the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate.

ANTILYNCHING BILL

There is also now pending in Congress an antilynching bill. In my opinion this is purely a political measure. If it should be enacted into law it would be an assumption by the Federal Government of police power which it has no right to exercise, and which would be detrimental and unwise even if it had such right. If this may be done, and if this is done, then why, it may be suggested, does Congress not have like power and authority to pass Federal laws against criminal assault, arson, burglary, murder, or any other act made unlawful by the laws of the States? That is the direction in which this measure unmistakably points.

It is not my purpose to discuss the pending bill in any detail, but it must be pointed out that it undertakes to punish the innocent for the unlawful acts of the guilty. Under its terms the law-abiding citizen who is at home with his family at night, would be penalized because of the unlawful acts of others, of which he could have no knowledge. It proposes to make liable in heavy damages any county from which one may be taken who is unlawfully put to death elsewhere, or in which one may be unlawfully put to death who has been brought from elsewhere. If Congress has the constitutional power to levy such penalties against a county, which is but a subdivision of the State, it has the power to put a county out of existence. The line of demarcation between the police power of the Federal Government and the police power of the States has always heretofore been clear. It should be kept so beyond any question of doubt if our dual system of Government is to be maintained in keeping with the wisdom and foresight of our forefathers, and the clear mandates of our Constitution. Enactment of this antilynching bill would break over this clear line of demarcation. This would be but the beginning. If the Federal Government may take over the police power of the States and penalize its subdivisions in this one instance it may do so in all, and any constitutional guarantee to the contrary would be gone. In my judgment such legislation would be dangerous to the rights and liberties of citizens everywhere.

THE FEPC BILL

The third measure now pending in the Senate is entitled "National Act Against Discrimination in Employment," generally referred to as the FEPC bill. This proposal would cover, with but minor exceptions, all who are engaged in business affecting commerce. This means that the proposal would apply to practically all operations of any moment. If enacted into law this bill would make it unlawful for an employer coming within its terms to hire, discharge, or in any wise discriminate against any individual because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. It would make it unlawful for a labor union to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or be intended to deprive such individual of employment opportunities or adversely affect wages, hours, or conditions of employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. In other words, it would eliminate by Federal control the free choice of employment by both employers and employees.

It proposes to set up a Commission with power to investigate charges, issue complaints, conduct hearings, and issue orders dealing with matters of employment. This would mean that the Federal Government would employ and send into each of the States a great force of inspectors, investigators, and Federal policemen to pry into the minute details of every business affecting commerce, and would result in unparalleled chaos and confusion. Such a law would benefit no one. It would disrupt business and retard progress in social, racial, and industrial relations. It would apply with equal force to employers and to labor organizations. It would bring the strong arm of the Federal Government as never before into the operation of business. The mutual agreement of employers and employees as to who might best suit the needs of any business affecting commerce, and as to who might be most deserving of employment and promotion, would be set at naught by the edict of some Federal agent or board ruling to the contrary. Such legislation would be unwise at any time, and especially now when we need and must have the maximum output from our industrial facilities. Such proposal, in my judgment, goes far beyond anything the Government has heretofore done or attempted under its power to regulate interstate commerce. In North Carolina it would not work. Disorder, friction, and bitterness would be the result. The Federal Government has no moral or legal right to force upon the people conditions such as would be created by this law.

I am unalterably opposed to the above-mentioned measures. When the Federal Government exercises the power to determine who shall vote and take charge of elections; when it takes over the police power now exercised by the States and units thereof, and when it undertakes to interfere with and pass upon the hiring and firing of the employees of all who are engaged in a business affecting commerce, then in truth and in fact, the State lines will have been wiped out, and the power reserved to the States in the Constitution will no longer exist. Then indeed would we have in Washington a police state regulating and controlling the suffrage, the individual liberties and the business of the people in every State of the Union. Have we not already gone far enough in that direction?

If it be the purpose of such a program to protect minority groups in America it will fail. Minority groups as well as majority groups always lose when a Government seeks to go beyond the powers of its Constitution and take unto itself centralized, unauthorized authority under the pretext of protecting the rights of the people. Such has been the beginning of the downfall of free governments through all time. In my opinion, every minority group in America should view with alarm these measures which, if enacted and followed in due time by others of the same type, will ultimately wipe out our dual system of government and leave us subject to a centralized government in Washington never dreamed of by the founders of this Republic, and the thought of which is repulsive to those here in this country who wish to see freedom and democracy continue to prevail under constitutional law.

Today constitutional government everywhere is seriously threatened. Our own Republic is put to the test as never before. The Congress of the United States is faced with the gravest problems on every hand. Surely this can be no time to weaken the fabric and the structure of our Constitution and our dual system of government by legislation that would spread discord and bitterness among our own people.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the statement released by me on this subject many weeks ago has resulted in criticism from those in North Carolina who believe in and sponsor and advocate this type of legislation. The statement that I am now concluding will undoubtedly bring upon me more criticism from that source. But the questions involved are fundamental and as one of the representatives of the people of this State I deem it my duty, regardless of consequences, to advise them with some particularity of what is proposed in Congress, and state without equivocation my own opinion of the dangers and far-reaching effects such legislation would inevitably have upon the social, economic, and governmental structures of our country.

This issue is clear. I have no desire to avoid it. The bills I have discussed are not only pending in the Senate but are definitely set for action. Those who favor these measures will press hard for their passage either at the present session or some later session of Congress. They strike hard at the fundamentals and endanger the safety of our form of government. They tend to undermine the basis upon which has always rested the State government that we cherish and love. I shall continue to oppose enactment of these measures in this or any later Congress of which I may be a Member. I will appreciate the aid and support of all who agree that no such proposals are, or could be, in the best interest of North Carolina.

Cost of ERP—the Marshall Plan—to the Taxpayers of the Forty-fifth New York Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have had several requests from the taxpayers in the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York asking the cost of the European recovery program—the Marshall plan—as it affects the taxpayers in the counties, cities, towns, and villages in the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent.

This information is supplied by the Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library and, of course, it is official and factual.

The amount would be even larger if the $3,750,000,000 gift to Britain were to be included. What the cost to my taxpayers will be when the 1951 ERP or new Marshall plan as now proposed by Britain and the other 16 nations is brought forward and adopted no person can accurately predict.

If each county, city, village, and township were to submit a bond issue for the respective amount allocated to each civic subdivision the vote on the respective bond issue would be of interest. The result might indicate quite clearly whether it is the responsibility of a Representative to squander the taxpayers' money on international boondoggling

programs or to protect his constituents from such raids on their resources.

Under leave to extend I am inserting the official record of the cost of ERP—the Marshall plan—to the taxpayers whom I have the honor to represent and protect from these foreign devastating rackets:

European recovery program apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties, towns, and cities in the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York

Counties, towns, and cities	Population, 1940	Share of foreign aid proposed under European recovery program 1948–52 (population × $129.11) based on $17,000,000,000
	I	II
Allegany County	39,681	$5,123,214
Alfred	1,410	182,045
Allen	416	53,710
Alma	780	100,706
Almond	1,234	159,322
Amity	1,935	249,828
Andover	1,996	257,704
Angelica	1,410	182,045
Belfast	1,213	156,610
Belmont	1,146	147,960
Birdsall	306	39,500
Bolivar	2,628	339,301
Burns	1,187	153,254
Caneadea	1,089	140,601
Centerville	559	72,172
Clarksville	766	98,898
Cuba	2,507	323,679
Friendship	1,932	249,441
Genessee	1,188	153,383
Granger	484	62,489
Grove	568	73,334
Hume	1,577	203,606
Independence	1,110	143,312
New Hudson	601	77,595
Rushford	967	124,849
Scio	1,353	174,686
Ward	250	32,278
Wellsville	7,641	986,530
West Almond	390	50,353
Willing	836	107,936
Wirt	1,348	174,040
Cattaraugus County	72,652	9,380,100
Allegany	3,919	505,982
Ashford	1,340	173,007
Carrolton	1,235	159,451
Cold Spring	596	76,950
Conewango	952	122,913
Dayton	1,725	222,715
East Otto	732	94,509
Elko	125	16,139
Ellicottville	1,790	231,107
Farmersville	778	100,448
Franklinville	2,762	356,602
Freedom	947	122,267
Great Valley	1,215	156,869
Hinsdale	1,079	139,310
Humphrey	424	54,743
Ischua	503	64,942
Leon	755	97,478
Little Valley	1,601	206,705
Lyndon	391	50,482
Machias	1,362	175,848
Mansfield	620	80,048
Napoli	570	73,593
New Albion	1,747	225,555
Olean	1,432	184,886
Olean City	21,506	2,776,640
Otto	642	82,889
Perrysburg	1,805	233,044
Persia	2,671	344,853
Portville	2,593	334,782
Randolph	2,206	284,817
Red House	299	38,604
Salamanca	313	40,411
Salamanca City	9,011	1,163,410
South Valley	240	30,986
Yorkshire	1,410	182,045
Allegany Indian Reservation	1,151	148,603
Cattaraugus Indian Reservation (part of)	205	26,468
Chautauqua County	123,580	15,955,414
Arkwright	688	88,828
Busti	4,336	559,821
Carroll	2,086	269,323
Charlotte	1,146	147,960
Chautauqua	3,819	493,071
Cherry Creek	1,088	140,472
Clymer	1,244	160,613
Dunkirk	672	86,762
Dunkirk City	17,713	2,286,925
Ellery	2,088	269,582

European recovery program apportioned on a Nation-wide per capita basis as applied to the population of counties, towns, and cities in the Forty-fifth Congressional District of New York—Continued

Counties, towns, and cities	Population, 1940	Share of foreign aid proposed under European recovery program 1948–52 (population × $129.11) based on $17,000,000,000
	I	II
Chautauqua County—Con.		
Ellicott	8,041	$1,038,174
Ellington	1,073	138,535
French Creek	694	89,602
Gerry	1,073	138,535
Hanover	5,846	754,777
Harmony	1,473	190,179
Jamestown	42,638	5,504,992
Kiantone	849	109,614
Mina	818	105,612
North Harmony	1,453	187,597
Poland	1,625	209,804
Pomfret	7,782	1,004,734
Portland	2,965	382,811
Ripley	2,250	290,498
Sheridan	1,826	235,755
Sherman	1,101	142,150
Stockton	1,651	213,161
Villanova	877	113,229
Westfield	4,638	598,812
Cattaraugus Indian Reservation (part of)	27	3,486
Total for Forty-fifth District	235,913	30,458,727

Details will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Committee on Un-American Activities

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in 1945 at the opening of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I offered the amendment to the rules that created the standing Committee on Un-American Activities.

That committee has rendered wonderful services in exposing subversive elements and has probably taken more abuse than any other committee of Congress has ever known.

Complaint has been made from time to time that we have not brought out corrective legislation. I am inserting at the end of my statement in the RECORD a bill our committee has reported, and which will be taken up in the House for passage this week.

I hope each and every one of you will read it carefully.

Now let me read you some of the reasons why the Congress should act promptly. I see from the newspaper this morning, the Washington News, that 32 American writers like Russia better than they do the United States. I want to call your attention to the names of some of them. In fact, I will put all their names in the RECORD.

The first two mentioned are Howard Fast and Alvah Bessie, both of whom have been cited for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions regarding their alleged Communist activities.

The article containing the list of authors is as follows:

Moscow, May 3.—Thirty-two American writers, painters, and composers prefer Russia's current leadership and policies to those of the United States, an open letter to the publication, Literary Gazette, said today.

Among the signers were Writer Howard Fast, author of Citizen Tom Paine, and Screen Writer Alvah Bessie. Both have been cited for contempt of the United States Congress for refusing to answer questions regarding their alleged Communist activities.

The letter said the Americans would help the Russian cause by "writing new books and painting new pictures." It added that they would not permit America to go Fascist, even though they faced oppression like the prosecution of Hans Eisler and the arrest of Mme. Joliot-Curie.

(This was an obvious reference to the deportation of Eisler and the short detention of Mme. Joliot-Curie on her arrival in New York recently.)

HERE'S THE LIST

In addition to Fast and Bessie, the letter was signed by:

Marc Blitzstein, Hollywood composer-playwright; Walter Bernstein, Phillip Avergood, Ben Field, Barbara Hales, Robert Hotney, Sidney Finkelstein, Charles Humboldt, V. Jerome, Meridel Lesseur, Ray Love, A. B. Medgill, Carleton Moss, Joseph North, Isador Schneider, Howard Selsam, Samuel Sillen, Raphael Sawyer, Ira Wallach, Theodore Ward, Mark Weber, Doxie Wilkerson, Arnot Dusseau, Nelson Ahlgren, James Allen, Herbert Apteker, Thomas Ball, B. A. Botkin, Richard Boyer, and Lloyd Brown.

The letter from the Americans answered a similar one from 12 leading Soviet artists, including Soviet Journalist Konstantin Simonov, asking what side American intelligentsia favored.

Literary Gazette said the Americans replied they sympathized with Russian ideas despite the oppression they faced in a country whose President set himself up as an art critic and where the capitalistic rulers have only contempt and horror for artistic work.

"Our capitalists know the strength of culture," the Americans were quoted. "They want to point out to us what we must and must not say in defense of their system."

INSULTS PAINTERS

"Our President takes upon himself the role of art critic. After several elementary lessons he egotistically insults painters."

The letter did not elaborate on the reference to President Truman and art lessons.

The letter said the writers wanted to share the public duty which had been assigned to the intelligentsia of the Soviet Union and that the writers would work to break the chains with which capitalism bound them in the United States.

"Verses and music used in State Department broadcasts to Europe very often are created by people who were despised all their life by hypocrites who now pretend to respect them," the letter said.

"We hope that your letter and our answer will be the beginning of a close and fruitful connection between us which will give us the opportunity to exchange thoughts and speak together against the voice of death," the letter concluded.

(The Literary Gazette evidently reprinted the letter from an American magazine, Masses and Main Stream. Samuel Sillen, editor of the latter publication, said the edition containing the letter had been on sale at newsstands for a week.)

Mr. Speaker, so far as the individuals named are concerned, who have come here from foreign countries, if they want to go to Russia, I am willing to cancel their citizenship papers, if they have any,

and let them go back to Russia at once. The sooner the better.

But to show how generous I am, so far as the ones are concerned who were born here, and who are misfits in this country and would rather live in Russia than in the United States, I am willing to give them a one-way passport and let them go to Russia along with the others—and stay there.

At this point I am inserting the anti-Communist bill reported by the Committee on Un-American Activities, which seems to have stirred consternation in the Communist camps—as anyone can see by reading the Communist Daily Worker.

The bill referred to reads as follows:

A bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948."

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial rather than a democratic basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the destruction of free democratic institutions, the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a democratic or representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism and brutality.

(3) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship, and among the methods commonly used to accomplish this end in any particular country are (A) the disruption of trade and commerce, (B) the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict, (C) the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government and institutions, and (D) corrupting officials of the government and securing the appointment of their agents and sympathizers to offices and positions in the government.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such political organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as "Communist fronts," which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such "Communist fronts."

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiated their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorships, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions and make it necessary that Congress enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on, or advancement of views on, any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, with respect to which, having regard to some or all of the following considerations:

(A) the extent and nature of its activities, including the expression of views and policies,

(B) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies, of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act,

(C) the extent to which its views and policies are the same as those of such foreign government or foreign organization,

(D) the extent to which it supports or advocates the basic principles and tactics of communism as expounded by Marx and Lenin,

(E) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization,

(F) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement,

(G) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives,

(H) the extent to which its members or leaders are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives,

(I) the extent to which (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists; (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis, and

(J) the extent to which its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization,

it is reasonable to conclude (i) that it is under the control of such foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization, or (ii) that it is one of the principal instrumentalities utilized by the world Communist movement in carrying out its objectives.

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist political organization and other than an organization having substantially all the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party) with respect to which, having regard to some or all of the following considerations:

(A) the identity of the persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein,

(B) the sources from which an important part of its support, financial, or otherwise, is derived,

(C) the use made by it of its funds, resources, or personnel, and

(D) the position taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy,

it is reasonable to conclude (i) that it is under the control of a Communist political organization, or (ii) that it is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2, or (iii) that its views and policies are in general adopted and advanced because such views or policies are those of a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or such world Communist movement.

(5) The term "Communist organization" means a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

(6) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.

(7) The term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone) or within the District of Columbia.

(9) The term "final order of the Attorney General" means an order issued by the Attorney General under section 13 of this act, which has become final as provided in section 14 of this act, requiring an organization to register under section 8 of this act as a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person—

(1) To attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual;

(2) To perform or attempt to perform any act with intent to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship;

(3) Actively to participate in the management, direction, or supervision of any movement to establish in the United States such a totalitarian dictatorship;

(4) Actively to participate in the management, direction, or supervision of any movement to facilitate or aid in bringing about the establishment in the United States of such a totalitarian dictatorship;

(5) To conspire to do anything made unlawful by this subsection.

(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both such fine and imprisonment.

(c) Any offense punishable under this section may be prosecuted at any time without regard to any statute of limitations.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

SEC. 5. (a) Section 401 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or", and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(k) Committing any violation of section 4 of the Subversive Activities Control Act, 1948, provided he is convicted thereof by a court of competent jurisdiction."

(b) Section 403 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (g), (h), (i), or (k) of section 401, no national can expatriate himself, or be expatriated, under such section while within the United States or any of its outlying possessions, but expatriation shall result from the performance within the United States or any of its outlying possessions of any of the acts or the fulfillment of any of the conditions specified in such section if and when the national thereafter takes up a residence abroad."

EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful for any member of a Communist political organization, knowing or believing, or having reasonable grounds for knowing or believing, that the organization is a Communist political organization—

(1) to seek or accept any office or employment under the United States without revealing that he is a member of such organization; or

(2) after 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to appoint or employ any individual as an officer or employee of the United States, knowing or believing that such individual is a member of a Communist political organization.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be unlawful for any member of a Communist political organization, knowing or believing, or having reasonable grounds for knowing or believing, that the organization is a Communist political organization—

(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

(2) after 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act, to use or attempt to use a passport theretofore issued.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to, or renew the passport of, any individual knowing or believing that such individual is a member of a Communist political organization.

REGISTRATION AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Each Communist political organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Attorney General, to register as a Communist political organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist political organization.

(b) Each Communist-front organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Attorney General, to register as a Communist-front organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-front organization.

(c) The registration required by subsection (a) or (b) shall be made—

(1) in the case of an organization which is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization on the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such date;

(2) in the case of an organization becoming a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization after the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such organization becomes a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be; and

(3) in the case of an organization which by a final order of the Attorney General is required to register, within 30 days after such order becomes final.

(d) The registration made under subsection (a) or (b) shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the following information:

(1) The name of the organization.

(2) The name and last-known address of each individual who is at the time of the filing of such registration statement, and of each individual who was at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement, an officer of the organization, with the designation or title of the office so held, and with a brief statement of the duties and functions of such individual as such officer.

(3) An accounting, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, of all moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes for which expended) by the organization during the period of 12 full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(4) In the case of a Communist political organization, the name and last-known address of each individual who was a member of the organization at any time during the period of 12 calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(e) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to file with the Attorney General on or before February 1 of the year following the year in which it registers, and on or before February 1 of each succeeding year, an annual report, prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the same information which by subsection (d) is required to be included in a registration statement, except that the information required with respect to the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection shall, in such annual report, be given with respect to the calendar year preceding the February 1 on or before which such annual report must be filed.

(f) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe—

(1) accurate records of the names and addresses of the members of such organization and of persons who actively participate in the activities of such organization; and

(2) accurate records and accounts of moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes for which expended) by such organization.

(g) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to send to each individual listed in any registration statement or annual report, filed under this section, as a member of the organization in respect of which such registration statement or annual report was filed, a notification in writing that such individual is so listed; and such notification shall be sent at the earliest practicable time after the filing of such registration statement or annual report.

(h) In the case of failure on the part of any organization to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by this section, it shall be the duty of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) and of the secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary) of such organization, and of such officer or officers of such

organization as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, to register for such organization, to file such registration statement, or to file such annual report, as the case may be.

KEEPING OF REGISTER; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SEC. 9. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain in the Department of Justice a register of all organizations which are registered under section 8, and such register shall be known as the "Register of Communist Organizations." Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations shall be listed separately in such register.

(b) Such register, together with the registration statements and annual reports filed under section 8, shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection.

(c) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and to the Congress annually (and at any time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this act, including the names of the organizations listed in such register and of the data (including the names and addresses of the individuals listed as members of such organizations) contained in registration statements and annual reports filed under section 8.

MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any individual to become or remain a member of a Communist political organization, knowing or believing, or having reasonable grounds for knowing or believing, that it is a Communist political organization, if (1) such organization is not registered pursuant to section 8, and (2) the period of time designated in section 8 for registration by such organization has expired.

USE OF THE MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

SEC. 11. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 8, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Attorney General requiring it to register under section 8, or for any person acting for or on behalf of such organization—

(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: "Disseminated by ———, a Communist organization;" or

(2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank: "The following program is sponsored by ———, a Communist organization."

DENIAL OF TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTION

SEC. 12. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income-tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution (1) such organization is registered under section 8, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Attorney General requiring such organization to register under section 8.

(b) No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year (1) such organization is registered under section 8, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Attorney General requiring such organization to register under section 8.

CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) Whenever—

(1) in the case of any organization which is not registered under section 8 of this act, the Attorney General has reason to believe that such organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization (or the Attorney General is requested, by resolution of either House of Congress, to investigate whether such organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization), or

(2) the Attorney General receives from any organization registered under section 8 an application that he make a finding that the organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, and by order cancel its registration and relieve it from the requirement of making further annual reports, and such organization, in support of such application, presents evidence which, in the opinion of the Attorney General, makes a prima facie showing that the organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be,

it shall be his duty forthwith to institute and conduct a full and complete investigation to determine whether such organization is in fact a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be. The Attorney General shall not make such a determination with respect to any organization without first affording to it, after timely notice, an opportunity for a hearing.

(b) For the purposes of such investigation the Attorney General, or any officer of the Department of Justice authorized by him, may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by the Attorney General or any such authorized officer. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena the Attorney General may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(c) The testimony in any hearing conducted under this section shall be reduced to writing and filed in the office of the Attorney General.

(d) If upon an investigation pursuant to clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section the Attorney General determines that the organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, he shall make a report in writing in which he shall state his findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 8 of this act.

(e) If upon an investigation pursuant to clause (2) of subsection (a) of this section the Attorney General determines that the organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, he shall make a report in writing in which he shall state his findings as to the facts and shall by order cancel the registration of such organization and relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports. A copy of such order shall be sent to such organization.

(f) If upon an investigation pursuant to clause (2) of subsection (a) of this section the Attorney General determines that the organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front, organization, as the case may be, he shall make a report in writing in which he shall state his findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order refusing to cancel the registration of such organization and to relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14. (a) Such organization may obtain a review of an order issued under subsection (d) or (f) of section 13 in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in the court, within 60 days from the date of service upon it of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Attorney General be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Attorney General, and thereupon the Attorney General shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the Attorney General. Thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and shall have power to affirm or set aside the order of the Attorney General. The findings of the Attorney General as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Attorney General, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Attorney General and to be adduced upon the proceeding in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Attorney General may modify his findings as to the facts, by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and he shall file such modified or new findings, which, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, and his recommendations, if any, with respect to action in the matter under consideration. If the court sets aside an order issued under subsection (f) of section 13 it may enter a judgment canceling the registration of the organization and relieving it from the requirement of further annual reports. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 28, sec. 347).

(b) Any order of the Attorney General issued under subsection (d) of section 13 shall become final—

(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Attorney General has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Attorney General has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; or

(4) upon the expiration of 10 days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the Attorney General be affirmed or the petition for review dismissed.

PENALTIES

SEC. 15. (a) Any person failing to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by section 8 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000; except that in case such failure is on the part of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) or secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) or secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary), or any other officer, of an organization required to register under such section 8, the punishment for such failure shall be a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or both such fine and imprisonment. For the purposes of this subsection, if there is in effect with respect to an organization a final order of the Attorney General requiring it to register under section 8, each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

(b) Whoever, in a registration statement or annual report filed under section 8 of this act, willfully makes any false statement or willfully omits to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statement made or information given not miseading, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(c) Any person violating any provision of this act for violation of which no penalty is provided by section 4 or by subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 16. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the recent issue of the New York State Taxpayer some pertinent facts are set forth with reference to Federal aid for schools.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the article in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK STATE AND FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

Passage by the United States Senate of a bill to provide Federal aid for schools once more turns the spotlight on New York State's role as the big-hearted, big-money backer of Federal spending.

Depending on whose figures are used, New York State will pay from $3 to $5 in taxes to get $1 in Federal aid. The $5 figure is derived from the estimate of Senator IRVNG M. IVES without whose vote, together with the votes of Senators from other States which also lose in the Federal aid deal, the bill could not have been passed.

The complex formula in the bill introduces a new and dangerous principle in public spending. It relates the amount to be spent for a specific purpose—in this case schools—to a governmental statistic: income payments by States. Even a sponsor of the bill, Senator TAFT, confessed he could not explain how the United States Department of Commerce arrived at its income payment figure. The relationship is such that the higher the income payment of a State, the more it must spend for schools to qualify for any Federal aid beyond the minimum of $5 per pupil.

Such a scheme places a triple burden on States such as New York: support of their own schools at the highest level of expenditures per pupil; payment of Federal taxes at far higher than its proportionate share per capita; and the short end of the deal in receipt of aid from these same taxes because it qualifies for only the minimum unless it boosts its own spending even higher.

In fairness to New York and other higher income States, the formula ought to take into account income after, rather than before, taxes. If that were done, some of the difference between States would be leveled off and one of the arguments of the school aid lobby would lose much of its force.

This shifts the entire concept of support of government from decision by the citizen on how much he is willing to pay for a service of Government. Now, Government, in effect, tells him he must pay at least 2 percent of his income, collectively for education.

A grave danger also rests in the fact that no actual dollar amount is established as the fair cost of education. Instead, everything is relative and in that foggy state of uncertainty which inevitably seems to develop when educators deal with cost of their product. Neither is there any acknowledged measure of quality.

If this scheme works, efforts will be made to relate other types of spending to income payments. If the educators succeed in having at least 2 percent of a statistical income figure spent for education, the health bureaucrats will start to cut their percentage slice out of the income pie. The social security people will go out for an even larger slice and presently the average individual, who now is allowed to use for himself less than a third of what he earns will be a twentieth century serf who slaves to earn income for public officials to spend for him.

Early in the Senate debate of the Federal Education Aid bill, someone raised the question whether Federal aid actually was not a device for the redistribution of wealth. The question is one on which all persons privately employed or self-employed should reflect seriously.

During the debate—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of it will provide at least a day and an evening of reading—various curious arguments were used. Some of these are likely to leave a logical person wondering how much of an advance in education actually has been made.

One such argument is this: We have just authorized $7,000,000,000 for the European Recovery Plan, therefore we ought to spend $300,000,000 (in addition to what States are spending) for schools. That is like arguing that because a family has just had a heavy medical expense it ought to buy a new car.

Another argument was that more should be spent for education because of the large number of selective-service rejections due to low educational level. Yet no evidence was produced to show that those rejected were mentally capable of reaching a higher level even if they had every educational advantage. The unwarranted assumption is that education will cure everything.

In connection with this same selective-service argument it should be noted that proponents of the bill—to overcome opposition which has previously defeated it—emphasize that the Federal Government will exercise no control over the spending of the money. Without control over the spending there can be no assurance that it will in any way remedy the selective service-condition of rejections or even reach the uneducated children of some States.

The strongest argument for the bill is that some States are less capable of supporting their schools than others.

The talk of these States of the inadequacy of their State taxes would be far more convincing were it not for the surpluses which most of them have, the increases in yield from existing State taxes which they are enjoying and the low-tax advertising which some of them use to attract business and industry from the same States they are asking to help support their schools.

Sometimes it pays to have a "poor mouth" so long as the States which are on the paying end are willing to be philanthropists, or just plain suckers. When legislators from those poor States are smart enough to talk their neighbors into paying their school costs, one begins to wonder what is wrong with whose school systems, particularly in arithmetic.

Congress, prior to the passage of the Federal education-aid bill, provided the ideal solution to the poverty plea of the States which benefit from Federal aid to education. It adopted, over the opposition of some of the same people who want Federal aid, a tax-reduction bill.

In every instance the amounts which the taxpayers of the so-called poor States will save is greater than the amount of aid they will get under Senator TAFT'S bill. Here is the list:

[Amounts in millions]

State	United States tax saving	School aid
Alabama	$36.1	$13.0
Arizona	18.3	.8
Arkansas	18.3	8.9
Georgia	50.3	8.4
Kentucky	38.9	12.3
Louisiana	46.2	6.8
Minnesota	73.6	3.5
Mississippi	16.9	10.7
New Mexico	9.2	2.8
North Carolina	48.5	19.4
North Dakota	10.1	1.3
Oklahoma	37.0	9.4
South Carolina	21.0	10.8
Tennessee	46.6	9.7
Texas	163.7	9.5
Utah	13.7	1.1
Vermont	6.4	.6
West Virginia	30.6	10.2

If these States are so concerned about their schools, let them tax this income to support their schools instead of asking New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and others to do it. Then, if spending money for schools has all of the virtues claimed for it, their citizens will soon boost their incomes to a point where their representatives in Congress no longer have to go begging to their neighbors.

Such a solution would involve less of the social therapy principle which led to widespread abuses in the spending of State funds

for social welfare in New York City and more of the self-help principle. Taxpayers of New York State can at least give a cheer for the United States Senators from Texas who turned down a chance to grab something out of the Federal Treasury.

No matter what halo of benevolence and sanctity may be attached to it, Senate approval of the Federal aid bill was in fact and above all else a victory for the powerful and persistent lobby which has worked for it for years. This lobby threatens those Members of Congress who opposed its demands and infers political support of those who comply with its wishes. Some Members of Congress fear it.

The passage, while it may be considered a political asset by some of those who worked and voted for it, will be no victory for education in the United States if—as many fear with such good reason—it proves the first step in surrendering the public schools to Federal bureaucratic control.

Churchill on British Socialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of an article or dispatch from London, dated April 30, appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of May 1. The dispatch is headed "Churchill says Socialists live on United States dole."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL SAYS SOCIALISTS LIVE ON UNITED STATES DOLE

LONDON, April 30.—Winston Churchill reminded the Labor Government today that it is living on the charity of the greatest capitalist free-enterprise state in the world—the United States.

The wartime Prime Minister and Lord Woolton, chairman of the Conservative Party, addressed 5,000 persons at Albert Hall. The meeting was sponsored by the Primrose League, women's branch of the Conservative Party.

"While Socialist ministers are boasting of their achievements and of the benefits they have given the public—of which the public is not always conscious—they seem to forget that they are living on the charity of the greatest capitalist free-enterprise state in the world—the United States," Churchill said.

Production and Sale of Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very short address on the subject of the repeal of laws governing the production and sale of oleomargarine, delivered by Will W. Henry, manager of the Dairy Cooperative Association, of Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my belief that the drive to repeal laws governing production and sale of oleomargarine is a further step on the part of selfish interests which will lower our standards of living, affect our health adversely, and over the long time trend tend to destroy permanent agriculture.

The dairy farmer is not opposed to consumers using oleomargarine if they want it, but does object to it being dressed up like butter so that the average consumer would not be able to distinguish one from the other.

Oleo interests have copied the butter style package where it is sold; they use a yellow container, they add artificial vitamins, they churn it in milk to give it a butter flavor, and now they want to add the color of butter itself to make the camouflage complete.

There is still an unknown growth factor or growth factors in butter important to growing children that the oleo interests have not been able to copy artificially. Most mothers and fathers want to know whether they are getting butter or oleo.

If oleo is as good as claimed, why don't people use it in its natural whitish state? Color adds nothing to its nutritional value, still some folks tell me they get so they can't eat it unless it is colored. This aversion must be purely psychological.

The first Federal law governing oleo was passed in 1886 with about one-fourth cent tax to bring it under Federal control. Then in 1902 to give the Bureau of Internal Revenue a more powerful weapon against racketeering, a 10 cents per pound tax was placed on colored oleo only. Pure food and drug people were powerless to cope with the situation within the States, but this law made Federal control effective.

The 10-cent tax is charged only on colored oleo. If colored in the home for home consumption there is no such tax.

It is reasonable to believe that the oleo interests are good merchandisers and if allowed to add color in the factory, there is no doubt in the mind of many that the price of oleo would creep up much closer to that of butter.

Permanent agriculture can be maintained over a long period of time only through the raising of livestock and dairying in particular.

Production of meat and dairy products takes the least from the soil and makes for permanent agriculture and good nutrition of our people. People who live on crops of the soil only are not as a rule very progressive.

You will find peoples who have meat and dairy products in their diet the leaders of the world.

Do we want to discourage permanent agriculture?

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Laurence Piatt, a Colorado farmer. It seems to me Mr. Piatt has presented some sound arguments which I believe reflect the views of a goodly number of farmers in the Midwest.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCLAVE, COLO., *April 7, 1948.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: In your Weekly for April 3 you explained the plans for future farm legislation, and asked for opinions.

I wish to say we are very foolish not to adopt a system that will allow us to carry over at least a half year's supply of grain and feed—also all other nonperishable farm products. We can never tell when we will find ourselves facing war, drought, or other disaster. Let's sell our surplus during the poor years instead of crowding everything we raise into the markets one year and doing without in poor years.

This is how my normal granary plan would work. If we have 100 percent surplus, plan normal production for next year. For 50 percent surplus plan 150 percent production, for 150 percent surplus, plan only 50 percent production, for 150 percent surplus plan 80 percent production, etc. This could not apply to fruits and vegetable production, but it sure would help the livestock and poultry industry. They would not have to sell off their flocks and herds during drought periods as there would always be a supply of feed in storage for a year ahead.

We have the curse of having too much one year and no market. Next year, we have too little and too much demand. This allows speculators to buy up short crops and double the price to consumers. Then we farmers get blamed for the high cost of living. One example—onions that the farmer gets 3 cents a pound for are now selling for 23 cents a pound here. The price of grain and hay has halved and doubled so much in my county recently that I am sick of looking at market reports. I have lost a third of my income selling crops at the wrong time. Speculators and local grain buyers have cheated me of the other one-third. In my community the local grain elevators drop the price of grain from 20 to 50 cents a bushel at harvest time. They do this to steal the crop from the poor farmer who has no granary, or who is in debt and forced to sell under pressure of a mortgage.

I say our supply and demand market system is the rottenest scheme of robbery ever protected by any government.

We must develop a normal granary plan and govern farm prices according to the cost of production and prevailing economic conditions. Why try to work out complicated formulas? Every other industry gets paid according to costs. Why don't we get paid according to costs?

As I have said before, our idea of raising all we can to produce wasteful surpluses will someday cause us all to go hungry and cold.

A lot of our land is now lying in the river deltas because farmers received such poor prices for their work that they had to rob the soil to exist, instead of caring for the soil and applying soil-conservation methods. More of our greediness is shown by plowing up the Dust Bowl. When another drought strikes, our fertile pasture land will again be a sea of soil drifts and our irrigated valleys will be choked with suffocating black dust storms. I can see no reason for all this threatening waste of resources just to keep a group of "suitcase" farmers and speculating racketeers happy.

We farmers need a steady reasonable price for our work. If we had a fair price we would not mind being allotted our share of production. We would have enough money to fertilize, summer fallow, or apply soil-conservation methods to our soil and ranges. It

would keep our soils in a high state of productivity.

Yours truly,

LAURANCE PIATT.

Letter From James Boyd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter written to me April 29, 1948:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1948.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of April 24 addressed to Dr. Schroeder, at the beginning of World War II the Germans had seven coal-hydrogenation plants in operation, and one plant was in operation in England. While Great Britain had kept abreast of German developments up to the beginning of the war, during the war Germany made considerably more progress than Great Britain. These facts came to light during the extensive examination of the German synthetic-fuel industry by American and British technologists after the war ended. German research on synthetic fuels continued unabated during the war, but there was no further construction of synthetic-fuel plants once the war had started.

Up to the end of World War II Germany was the only country that had carried out an extensive program of research and plant construction utilizing the Fischer-Tropsch process for the production of oil and gasoline from coal. They had nine plants in operation during 1939 using this process which were furnishing about a third of their total gasoline.

The French had one small plant operating by the Fischer-Tropsch process which was built before and operated during the war. This was built largely through the guidance of German technologists, and the French were not, in general, as efficient in its operation as the most modern German plants.

The only work which was going on in the United States on the Fischer-Tropsch process was a small amount carried out by the Bureau of Mines in 1929 and 1930. This was on a small laboratory scale. No further work was done in this country between 1930 and 1943 or 1944. About that time and as the result of the passage of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, the Bureau of Mines resumed its work on the Fischer-Tropsch process, and a number of industrial organizations also started pilot plant work. As you know, at the present time there is extensive work in both industry and the Government in this field.

To answer your question directly, the Germans were certainly preeminent in processes for making oil out of coal and lignite at the start of World War II. Both that country and England probably had more information on the synthetic liquid fuel processes than the United States at that time. At the present time, however, and as a result of intensive work in this country and information made available to us, both English and German, at the close of the war, I believe the United States is now the most advanced country in these fields.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you but I would be glad to supply any additional facts that are available.

Cordially yours,

JAMES BOYD,
Director.

American Civil Liberties Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1948

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby insert the following letter sent to me by the American Civil Liberties Union:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York City, April 27, 1948.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: In the RECORD of March 15, page A1585, some questions are raised concerning the nonpartisanship of the Civil Liberties Union in its defense of the principles of our bill of rights. The union is challenged to "cite one instance where the American Civil Liberties Union has defended a single person of the so-called right."

The record is too long to cite more than a few in recent years. Notable among them are:

1. The defense in the courts in five States of the right of Gerald L. K. Smith to freedom of assembly.

2. The defense in the courts of New Jersey of German-American Bundists prosecuted for mere speeches under a law which the State supreme court held void.

3. The repeated defense of Russian anti-Soviet refugees claiming political asylum in the United States.

4. The defense of anti-Communist trade union members expelled by Communist officers for their activities.

5. The defense of free speech for employers against unions, notably in the Henry Ford case in the courts.

6. Support of the Miami Herald and the Los Angeles Times charged with contempts of courts.

7. Assistance to Jan Valtin, well-known anti-Communist writer, in securing his naturalization.

8. Assistance in the defense of the members of Mankind United, an anti-Communist California religious group charged with sedition for opposing United States entry in the last war.

9. Condemnation of the sedition trials in Washington, D. C., of 30 alleged Nazi supporters on the grounds of the unconstitutionality of the 1940 Smith Act and of mass conspiracy trials.

But the charge is persistently made that because the American Civil Liberties Union defends the rights of Communists it must have sympathy with communism. It would be just as reasonable to charge us with sympathy with any of the above "clients" whose rights we have defended. The proportion of cases affecting Communists handled by the ACLU is small. They have their own defense agencies. We act whenever occasion requires to defend their rights on precisely the same basis as others. To do less would be to fail to live up to our clear obligations. What we defend in all cases is the principles of the Bill of Rights, not any particular client.

This is, in our view, the essence of American democracy, which appears not to be understood by our critics, both in Congress and out.

Yours sincerely,

ROGER BALDWIN.

Consumers, Beware!—H. R. 2245

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a news release which I have just sent to the newspapers in my district. It sets forth my views on the oleo bill. I also include an editorial from the Washington Post under date of May 1, 1948:

THE OLEO TAX-REPEAL BILL

A sound and free economy in this country rests on a prosperous agriculture and an active industrial production. That is my firm conviction, and I shall work toward that end. This calls for fair prices for farm products and gives equal buying power to the farmer. One dollar earned by the farmer is turned over seven times, and thus it means prosperity for the industrial worker as well. Now let us consider the oleo-tax bill for what it really is, keeping in mind that in Wisconsin dairy farming is our largest industry.

The real issue in the fight over repeal of oleo taxes is an economic one. One branch of American agriculture—the cotton and soybean farmer—are attempting to expand their markets at the expense of the dairy farmer. So the problem should be recognized as a contest between the dairy industry and the manufacturers of oleo.

Margarine manufacturers have led the people into believing that repeal of the taxes means cheaper butter substitutes at a time when butter prices are high. Yet they have not said that this will bring lower prices. The reverse seems true, because it will be natural for them to make colored oleo only, once the tax is repealed. In Washington today white margarine sells for 40 cents a pound, but the price of the colored is 55 cents. This is a spread of 15 cents on each pound.

If this policy is adopted by the manufacturers, then they will benefit and not the consumers. If users can buy only colored oleo, the price will be increased for 90 percent of the users who now buy white margarine and color it themselves.

In addition to a price increase for oleo, it is almost certain that the price of milk, ice cream, and all dairy products will rise. A reduced milk supply will follow when herds are reduced, and then there will be less beef and veal for the meat markets. It is a fact that the dairy industry furnishes 40 percent of the meat supply in this country. So when the dairy farmer loses his butter market it will have a considerable impact on the cost of the food basket for every consumer in the Nation.

It is interesting to note that in February of this year more margarine was produced than butter. Total production was 80,418,176 pounds, an increase of 12,668,098 pounds for the same month of 1947. Butter production was 77,145,000 pounds, or a decrease of 20,000,000 pounds for the same period. It is evident that the farmer is losing his butter market, and this means an increase in all other farm products.

If oleo is in all respects the equal of butter, as some contend, why should it not stand on its own merits? Why is it necessary to fortify it with vitamins and color it like butter? They now ask the right to sell it as an imitation for butter. I think this is unfair.

It is my opinion that the dairy farmer is entitled to the protection that the Federal oleo tax provides. He is part of the basic industry of our country, and it is penny-wise and pound-foolish to take away or reduce his butter market.

[From the Washington Post of May 1, 1948]

CONSUMERS, BEWARE!

The bitter debate that preceded House passage of the bill abolishing Federal taxation of margarine was the outgrowth of a clash between representatives of rival producer groups rather than a contest between spokesmen for the dairy industry and for consumer groups. The dairy interest has a powerful lobby and so have the margarine manufacturers. And we are inclined to believe that these lobbies and the producing groups behind them had a deal more influence in determining the outcome of the battle over the tax-repeal bill than pressure from consumers.

That being the case, it is important to emphasize the stake that the consumer has in the tax-repeal legislation. He has been led to believe that repeal of the margarine taxes will mean cheaper butter substitutes at a time when butter is selling at prohibitive prices for many families. There is, unfortunately, no ground for assuming that the tax repeal would, as a matter of course, lead to reduction in margarine prices. All it would do is to put the manufacturers of margarine on a basis of competitive equality with butter producers. In the event of repeal it will be up to margarine producers to decide whether consumers are to be given the benefit of the abolition of taxes on colored margarine by a reduction in price equal to the amount of such taxes.

Since most housewives now buy the cheaper uncolored margarine, on which the Federal tax is only a fourth of a cent per pound, they will not in any case be perceptibly benefited by the tax-repeal measure. They will, however, be spared the labor of coloring the product, if untaxed colored margarine is made available at prices no higher than those now charged for the uncolored product in the States permitting colored margarine to be sold. Will the margarine industry play fair with the public and concentrate its efforts on expanding its sales at low prices instead of boosting prices for colored margarine and making these higher prices effective by discontinuing sales of uncolored margarine in areas where colored margarine can be sold?

A good many Congressmen opposed to repeal of the taxes have charged that the low-income groups were only being used as a front to carry on a fight between producer groups. And they have predicted that, if the repeal bill becomes law, margarine manufacturers will be the only gainers—the consuming public, the loser. That could happen, since margarine, even at higher than present prices, would still be much cheaper than butter. Moreover, the existence of a sellers' market for the product makes it possible to raise prices for margarine without sensibly curtailing consumer buying. But any far-sighted manufacturer surely realizes that the battle to emancipate margarine from discriminatory restrictions and prohibitions has only begun. If the industry were to take advantage of the repeal of Federal taxes on its products to exploit consumers, hopes of inducing State governments to abandon restrictions that are much more repressive than Federal taxes would probably go glimmering.

Air Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the New York Journal-American, one, an editorial written 10 years ago by William Randolph Hearst, the other, an editorial published under date of January 21, 1948, both being on the subject of air power.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Written by William Randolph Hearst 10 years ago, this editorial is reprinted from the New York Journal-American of March 27, 1938]

CITIZENS, CONSIDER CAREFULLY THE EFFECTIVE WAY TO DEFEND YOURSELVES AND YOUR COUNTRY

The way to defend the United States of America from attack in any form by any hostile power is with airplanes.

The way to halt and hamper an invading army is with airplanes.

The way to destroy an attacking fleet is with airplanes.

The way to defend our coasts and our interior cities, too, from the most destructive hostile armament of all—a force of bombing airplanes—is by a force of defensive airplanes, larger and better and more effective than that of the invaders.

The next war will be fought in the air and won in the air.

Of course, auxiliary defense forces will be necessary.

It is not contended here that airplanes alone could completely defend this widely extended and varied country and coast line to the best and fullest advantages.

But airplanes will be, and must be, the main arm of defense, and the immediate arm of defense, and the determining arm of defense.

They are the modern arm of defense and of destructive offense.

They are the quickest to build, and the cheapest to provide, and the easiest to operate.

If we had by far the most effective airplane force in the world, no hostile airplane force could ever reach our shores.

The hostile planes would be destroyed far from our borders.

And if a few straggling planes avoided destruction in the far away airplane battle, they could do but little damage before they were hunted down and destroyed by our victorious planes.

If we had the greatest and most effective airplane force in the world, any navy attempting to attack our shores would be vitally damaged and virtually crippled long before it reached our shores, and so made an easy prey for our defensive Navy.

If we had immense airplane forces, any attacking armies landed in Canada or Mexico and invading from there could be harassed, and hampered, and halted by destroying roads and bridges and railways, until our own armies could be assembled and deployed to repel the invading armies.

Furthermore, in the battles of the armies, our superior aeroplane forces would be of conclusive importance, eliminating the enemy's air fleet, interfering with the enemy army's advance, destroying supplies and communications, supporting our own Army's counterattacks, and absolutely determining the issue.

A well-trained Regular Army is desirable for the United States as a nucleus around which the citizen soldiery may rally when war occurs or impends.

A powerful Navy is extremely desirable, in fact absolutely necessary.

And especially necessary for purposes of defense is an extremely strong submarine force.

But no Navy can defend our coasts and our cities from powerful hostile aeroplane attack and no Navy would even try to.

It would be practically eliminated in the attempt.

The record of the World War shows that navies for the most part were bottled up in their respective ports.

So that even if it were possible to build and maintain navies large enough to defend our east coast, and our west coast, and our Gulf coast from naval attack, they would still not be able to defend these coasts against aeroplane attacks.

They would not be able to defend the Panama Canal against aeroplane attack; and with the Canal bombed, ships could not be transferred from one coast to the other.

However, our defensive aeroplane fleets could be transferred from one coast to another in 12 hours, and they would not have to go through any canals.

The only thing which would impede the transfer would be a superior hostile aeroplane force, and the essential of completely effective aeroplane defense is that no nation shall have superior air forces to ours.

What is more, with our area and our mail and commercial aeroplane routes, domestic and foreign, and our consequent host of commercial aeroplanes, auxiliary to the military planes, no nation could have a superior or equal aeroplane force to ours.

That is, provided, of course, that we have intelligence enough to realize the possibilities of air defense, and the necessities of preparing for it by liberal construction of military planes, and by proper encouragement of auxiliary commercial planes.

The expense of complete aeroplane defense is small in construction cost, and in cost of maintenance, compared with the expense of creating and maintaining other defenses on a sufficiently great scale to be of any real value.

But no matter what the cost, other defenses of armies and navies can never be entrely adequate without a great aeroplane force.

The cost of extensive coast defense armament alone—with numerous fortifications, and much heavy artillery, and thousands upon thousands of air defense guns spread over our enormous coast—would alone equal the cost of a supreme aeroplane force.

And not only has coast defense artillery no mobility, but it has no actual efficiency against an invading air force, which could fly 5 miles above it, out of range and out of sight, and then descend to destroy interior cities, which could not possibly have sufficient defense in such situations.

There has been immense increase in aeroplane efficiency since the great war.

There is greater efficiency being developed every day.

The lesson of the present wars in China and Spain is not only that cities can be destroyed by planes, but that battleships can be destroyed, and land forces rendered almost impotent by sufficiently great aeroplane concentration.

The whole morale of the communities attacked is destroyed from the air.

The most notable superiority of the Japanese over the Chinese is in the air.

The most notable superiority of the Franco forces in Spain over the government forces is in the air.

With that air superiority, Japan is prevailing over China, and Franco is prevailing in Spain; notwithstanding the great superiority of their opponents in manpower.

Every day, with the progress in aeroplane construction, aeroplane defense becomes more and more the one chief defense to be relied upon by a nation which wants war kept from its confines.

Every day the failure to provide complete air defense lays our country more and more open to attack by air—attack which no armies or navies, no matter how powerful, can repel.

The way to defend America from the ravages of war—and the only way to defend it—is in the air.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

[From the New York Journal and American of January 21, 1948]

THE WINGS OF SECURITY

Within 5 years' time, the safety—and even the actual existence—of the United States as a free Nation will depend upon aviation.

We shall need, before the end of 1952, nearly 10,000 combat planes of all categories, including "70 groups of 6,869 first-line aircraft" in the regular air force; an air National Guard "of 27 groups with 3,212 first-line aircraft" and "an adequately equipped 24-group Air Reserve" consisting of 8,1000 aircraft "which must be created and kept in a proper state of organization."

Furthermore, the Navy air arm, which is now "adequate," needs "procurement funds" to replace World War II aircraft which are "rapidly becoming obsolete."

To provide all this, and to be ready to meet instantly the exigencies of war, the aircraft manufacturing industry must be fostered.

In addition, ample "aeronautical research and development" is "essential to the national defense and to the national welfare."

And finally, the civil airlines—"now passing through one of the most serious crises in their history"—must be "kept strong and healthy" to give the necessary "airline service to the public" and to be always available as "a potential military auxiliary."

The foregoing paragraphs summarize in its main points the excellently informed and informative report just made to the President by his Air Policy Commission.

The program will cost money; but this consideration is qualified by important points.

The major point is that we are now spending large sums of money on military and naval aircraft, but we are not spending quite enough to accomplish the purpose of insuring our national security.

Congress should provide the balance without fail; for, as the Air Policy Commission says:

"Relative security will be founded only in a policy of arming the United States so strongly (1) that other nations will hesitate to attack us or our vital interests and (2) that if we are attacked, we shall be able to smash the assault at the earliest possible moment."

Congress can provide the money in the course of its action on the President's budget by the wise and simple expedient of substituting security for socialism.

Even if the President's so-called "social welfare" schemes were all good; which most of them certainly are not, there would be a total lack of patriotism, and even of common sense, in "reforming" the Nation and not preparing ourselves to defend the Nation from the terrible ravages and impoverishing consequences of a destructive war.

The Hearst newspapers heartily commend and endorse the findings of the Air Policy Commission, for these are the recommendations which the Hearst newspapers have been making for many years.

The Commission has performed a public service of the highest order in formulating and presenting, after painstaking inquiries, the precise methods and policies that must prevail in aviation.

Meanwhile, Congress must remember that machines are useless without men.

Along with air preparedness we must have universal military training.

Both are necessary to keep America out of foreign wars and to keep foreign wars out of America.

United Public Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Washington Post of May 2, 1948]

RED RIDER

The House of Representatives furnished another instance on Thursday of the mischief entailed in attempts to determine policy through appropriation measures. It attached to the appropriation bill for the Federal Security Agency a rider forbidding the payment of salary to any employee belonging to a union whose officers do not sign anti-Communist affidavits. And on the same day, spokesmen for the House Appropriations Committee openly threatened to hold up all funds for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments as a means of blackmailing the administration into surrendering the FBI file on Dr. Edward U. Condon. In either case, such use of the power of the purse would amount to an indefensible encroachment upon the orderly processes of government.

The rider to the FSA appropriation is aimed primarily at a labor union, the United Public Workers of America, in which a number of Federal employees hold membership. Its leaders have refused to sign non-Communist affidavits. The purpose of the rider, according to its author, Representative KEEFE, is to force the union members to change their leaders. Desirable as it is to relieve any union of Government employees of Communist leadership, we do not think this is the right approach. Congress, after consideration by the appropriate legislative committee, provided in the Taft-Hartley Act that unions, the leaders of which did not sign non-Communist affidavits, could not have the privilege of appealing to the National Labor Relations Board. The present appropriation bill would, in effect, amend the Taft-Hartley Act so far as Federal employees are concerned. It would deny Government employment to all members, Communists and non-Communists alike, of any union the leaders of which failed to sign non-Communist affidavits. That is an overly drastic remedy which cannot be justified on the ground that the aim is desirable.

The effort to compel surrender of a confidential executive file by the withholding of needed funds is a naked piece of coercion. Congress can at any time, of course, apply its appropriation power in such a way as to destroy the Government. It can, if it chooses, make the pressure on the President still stronger by refusing to appropriate money for the armed services. It can, through its hold upon the purse strings, subvert both the judicial and the executive branches of the tripartite American system.

But to acknowledge that it possesses the power of a Samson is not to say that it ought to use that power irresponsibly to wreck the temple of which it is but a coordinate part.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of May 2, 1948]

SQUEEZE ON UPWA

There is ample reason why Congress should try to get rid of officers in Government unions who will not sign anti-Communist affidavits. But there is grave doubt that the House-approved method will accomplish this purpose and there is cause to believe that it will do considerable harm.

The House is approaching the problem by attempting to put the squeeze on UPWA. This union has shown extreme leftwing tendencies and is president, Abram Flaxer, has refused to say whether he is a Communist. The desirability of driving this union, as presently constituted, out of the Government agencies, or, as an alternative, getting Federal workers out of the union, is hardly open to question. The problem is how to accomplish this without doing more harm than good.

Whatever one's suspicions may be, there has not been any formal finding that this is a Communist-dominated union. It has not been found that its officers, or any of them, are Communists. So far as the statutes go, this union stands on the same legal footing as any other. So the House, Congress not having taken a direct approach, is seeking to make a flank attack against UPWA. And it is doing this by the distasteful and blunderbuss method of attaching riders to appropriation bills which forbid the payment of salary to any Federal worker who belongs to a union which has not subscribed to the anti-Communist affidavit provision of the Taft-Hartley law. This means that, unless UPWA officials file the affidavits the Federal employee members must either resign or lose their jobs.

This is a much more drastic penalty in aid of the affidavit provision than is contained in the Taft-Hartley law. The only penalty there is to deny the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board to nonconforming unions. But here the penalty is loss of employment. And that penalty is to be imposed without any specific finding of wrongdoing or illegality against either the union or the individual member. Two years ago, after Congress had tried to get rid of three employees in the executive establishment by cutting off their salaries, the Supreme Court held the attempt to be unconstitutional, asserting that "it accomplishes the punishment of named individuals without a judicial trial." The UPWA case is not an exact parallel, but it is too close for comfort.

There is a further question as to whether the House intends to be consistent in this matter. Some 1,700 employees of the Government Printing Office, for example, are members of the International Typographical Union. The officers of that union have refused to sign the affidavits, but no one supposes that they are Communists. Is Congress going to make the non-Communist members of the ITU at the Printing Office lose their jobs under this rider device while their non-Communist brethren in newspaper composing rooms are merely denied access to the labor board under the Taft-Hartley Act? If the answer is in the affirmative, then how is the GPO going to function, and how can one possibly justify shutting down the GPO to get at suspected Communists in UPWA?

The fair inference is that the House has leaped without looking. The Senate ought

to take a careful look at all aspects of this proposal with the aim of making it more practicable.

Subversive Activities Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 30, 1948, and one from the Washington Times-Herald of the same date. Both of these editorials discuss the subversive activities control bill which will soon be brought before the House by the Un-American Activities Committee. From reading these editorials, I believe that the Members of the House will be impressed by the fact that this bill represents a sane and fair approach to the difficult and complex problem of controlling subversive activities in the United States. The editorials follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of of April 30, 1948]

THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES BILL

It is impossible to read the bill on which the House Un-American Activities Committee has agreed without feeling that this is a really serious effort to deal with the problems which Communist conspiracy has forced upon democratic society. Mr. MUNDT, who sponsors it, and Mr. NIXON, who had a large hand in its preparation, have quite clearly tried to get away from the wilder extravagances and suppressions associated with Chairman THOMAS' conduct of the committee. They have no less clearly tried to come to grips with some of the basic difficulties of the problem which many liberal minds too easily evade.

Their preamble is a finding of those facts about Communist conspiracy which everyone knows, about which everyone is worried, but which it has seemed so difficult to bring within the purview of democratic law and method. The bill itself then boldly proceeds to deal with these facts. It seeks to do so in two ways. It makes it a crime, subject to a maximum penalty of $10,000 and 10 years, to attempt in any manner to establish a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control in the United States. The principle here is correct. That is a real crime against democracy; it is a greater crime than the incitation to violent overthrow which has long been the shibboleth of the statute books, and much more accurately defines the real danger against which democracy can unquestionably claim the right to defend itself.

Applying the principle may be another matter. Some will feel that the crime, as defined, is impossible of proof; others may feel that the definition is dangerously loose and wide. However that may be, the committee has at the same time advanced on a second front. In making it a crime to attempt to establish totalitarian dictatorship, it has not made it a crime to belong to the Communist Party. Instead, it has sought simply to enforce complete disclosure—of membership, officers, sources of funds and objects of expenditure—on Communist organizations. Others who, like Mr. Morris Ernst, have advocated this approach have felt constrained to make it a general one, applicable to all parties. The committee, remembering New York State's legislation against the Ku-Klux Klan, has bodily taken the bull by the horns and endeavored to write definitions both of a Communist political organization and of a Communist-front organization specific enough to stand up in the courts and clear enough to permit reasonable court enforcement of the requirements of registration and disclosure.

The principle is here, again, a sound and moderate one. Again, the question of practicability arises; while the attempt simultaneously to control communism by disclosure while prohibiting it, under criminal penalty, from advancing Communist dictatorship may involve difficulties. Though it is not necessarily inconsistent, it can open opportunities for either laxity or abuse in enforcement that demands study. One cannot quickly judge all the intricate possibilities in this bill; one can say, however, that it represents an earnest and thoughtful effort to meet the problem with which it deals and that it deserves equally earnest and thoughtful consideration.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 30, 1948]

THE REAL CRUSHER

At last there is a plan before the country for crushing the Communist Party in the United States openly, legally, and completely. It needs only to be put through Congress and into the hands of the Attorney General.

If the Attorney General enforces its provisions, no American can safely be a Communist and few will be fools enough to try. If the Attorney General slops his enforcement job, his neglect will be obvious and his impeachment and expulsion from office will be easily accomplished.

This plan for crushing communism is laid out in H. R. 5852 and was drawn up by Representatives KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, and RICHARD M. NIXON, Republican, of California, after long weeks of hearing testimony from some of the country's most renowned and expert constitutional lawyers.

Curiously enough, many of the most vehement of these witnesses were former New Dealers, among them such as ex-Ambassador Adolf A. Berle and Donald Richberg, general counsel to the old Blue Eagle of NRA.

These New Dealers were extremely skillful legal draftsmen in their day, as everybody knows, and wrote laws which have stood Supreme court tests again and again. With such ingenious talent advising them, Messrs. MUNDT and NIXON have produced a bill that has more teeth than three crocodiles. It is a real crusher.

Among other things it refuses passports to Communists, requires the Communist Party and all its members to register with the Department of Justice, makes it a criminal offense for a Communist to work for the United States Government, and more important, makes it a criminal offense to hire a Communist on a Federal job.

But the heart and center of the plan is contained in just one sentence:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to attempt in any manner to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship the direction and control of which is to be vested in or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign organization, or foreign individual."

Communism cannot live in the same country with a law like that. Congratulations to Messrs. MUNDT and NIXON and to the House Committee on Un-American Activities for having brought the bill into being. Let's have it as law, quick. And if Mr. Truman vetoes it the country can get just that much more measure of his administration while Congress is putting the law through over the veto.

Greek Royal Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an exchange of letters with the Department of State regarding a newspaper article which alleges that King Paul, of Greece, is paid $40,000 a month and that he and the Queen of Greece are German, the latter having had seven brothers in Hitler's army. Believing that these accusations were false or based on half-truths, I requested a report from the Department of State, and am placing this report in the RECORD, which refutes the false charges:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1948.

Hon. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ACTING SECRETARY: I refer to a newspaper article by Mr. Harold L. Ickes inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 1, 1948, under an extension of remarks by the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois. This article alleges, among other things, that the King of Greece is paid $40,000 a month and that he and the Queen of Greece are German, the latter having had seven brothers in Hitler's army.

I was in Greece last October for a period of some 4 weeks and during that time traveled extensively throughout Greece. I found a great love and respect for King Paul and Queen Fredericka. I found that Queen Fredericka has done more to alleviate the suffering of the Greek people than anyone in Greece or outside of Greece. After traveling around Greece, I went back to Athens and met King Paul and Queen Fredericka. I came away with the feeling that they were two of the most sincere and most democratic persons that I have ever met.

Any information the Department of State may be able to furnish me with regard to the compensation of the Greek royal family and its alleged German affiliations would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, Sixth Texas District.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 26, 1948.

The Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TEAGUE: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 16, 1948, requesting information on the compensation paid the Greek royal family and on its alleged German affiliations.

The Department is informed that for the 15-month period ending June 30, 1948, a total of 3,200,000,000 drachmas was authorized in the Greek budget for the compensation and all household and establishment expenses of the King of Greece, as well as for the expenses of the heir to the throne and other members of the royal family. The expenses to be covered by this appropriation include salaries of personnel attached to the office of the chief of state, building repairs, transportation, etc., and it is therefore not comparable with the salary paid to the President of the United States. The appropriation is in Greek currency and not in foreign

exchange and none of the funds provided by the Congress for aid to Greece are being used for this purpose.

At the effective rate of exchange in Greece through official channels, currently around 9,000 drachmas per dollar, the amount provided would be the equivalent of some $24,000 a month. However, inflation in Greece today has resulted in an actual value of the drachma considerably less than this official conversion figure would indicate. Roughly, the real value of the funds would not exceed $20,000 in the United States in terms of their relative purchasing power. It is believed that this is one of the lowest appropriations for the office of chief of state of any European country. The figure cited in the newspaper article of $40,000 a month was presumably arrived at by converting the King's civil list at the theoretical "legal parity" of 5,000 drachmas to the dollar and dividing by 12 instead of 15 months, and it of course disregards the nature of the appropriation.

It is a matter of record that King Paul and Queen Frederika, then Crown Prince and Princess, left Greece at the time of the German invasion of their country in 1941 and remained abroad associated with the Greek Government in exile during the entire war, in which the Government participated actively on the side of the Allies. King Paul was born in Greece. His father, King Constantine, was born in Greece. His grandfather, King George I, was a Danish Prince who was installed on the Greek throne as a youth in 1863. Queen Frederika was born in Germany, styled "Princess of Hanover, Great Britain, and Ireland." Her formal education was completed in the United Kingdom and at a school for American girls in Florence, Italy. She was married in Athens at the age of 20. According to a standard work of reference, which contains most of the foregoing information, Queen Frederika has four brothers, not seven, and two are listed as having served in the German Army.

As you will recall, the late King George II returned to Greece in 1946 as the result of a large majority vote in a plebiscite informally observed by United States and British experts. Upon his death on April 1, 1947, he was succeeded by his brother, the present King Paul.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Texas Faces Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Texas Faces Tomorrow, a very excellent speech delivered by my friend and neighbor, Mr. John Ben Shepperd, of Gladewater, Tex. Mr. Shepperd is the president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The speech follows:

TEXAS FACES TOMORROW

(An address given by John Ben Shepperd, of Gladewater, Tex., president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, before the Business and Professional Women's Annual Bluebonnet Festival at Fort Worth, Tex., April 19, 1948)

Madam Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to participate in this twenty-third annual celebration of your impressive bluebonnet festival.

I have been asked by your gracious club officers to speak on the subject, Texas Faces Tomorrow. That is a happy choice for I hope the glorious history of our past achievements will inspire Texas to face the future with the loyalty, certitude, and intelligence shown by our forefathers throughout the era of the Republic of Texas and the entire history of our State.

As Texas faces tomorrow, what lies ahead for us? We can only guess at the future—but that future looks bright and promising. Texas has led every other State in industrial expansion since the end of the war, according to a recent report of the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies. Although sixth in population, Texas is out front in new industrial development. Our postwar expansion is estimated at $230,000,000, while California, ranking third in population, trails Texas with an estimated $141,000,000.

The trend toward decentralization, plus an abundance of nautral resources, have been powerful factors favoring Texas. In addition, Texas has great stretches of land to accommodate new factories, new industries, and new workers. It also has a friendly spirit which welcomes the new arrivals and makes them feel at home.

Texas has been blessed with an infinite variety and diversity of soil found in only a few places on the earth which means that almost any crop grown in the United States can also be grown in Texas. It has as many rainfall zones as the entire country and its soil types and length of growing seasons will accommodate every major type of agriculture. The United States is comprised of three primary natural environments—the Great Eastern Woodland, the Great Western Plains and the Great American Desert. All three of these environments meet in Texas. In no other State are these natural conditions found to exist.

Add to these features the third longest coastline of any State in the Union and you have all the natural elements for a great economy.

To help us in our exploitation of an ideal soil and geographical location, we are also given an ideal climate. Our location astride the subtropical, high pressure, low rainfall zone in the Northern Hemisphere, and our proximity to the Gulf Coast give us the most favorable of weather conditions as well as a location advantageous to world trade.

Nor is this all. Under our magnificent soil lie some of the world's greatest mineral deposits, making Texas the leading State in total value of minerals produced since 1935.

An idea of the tremendous avenues of development which face the Texas of tomorrow may be gained by briefly considering the great strides that have been made in the past 100 years. Just a century ago Texas was a wild, undeveloped country, with a sparse population, no adequate highways or railroads. Only five towns had more than 2,500 persons, and San Antonio, the principal city, boasted 8,235.

But since then our population has leapt to 7,000,000. Sixteen thousand miles of railroads crisscross the State; 25,000 miles of hard surfaced highways have been built. Our 1947 assessed property valuation for ad valorem taxes was $5,000,000,000 and our State treasury took in $343,000,000 in 1946. We are leading the Nation in the production of myriad items: cotton, oil, gas, natural gasoline, carbon black, sulphur, cattle, sheep, and wool, goats, mohair, horses, and turkeys. We rank high in the development of many other products.

All this natural wealth about which we boast has been here for millions of years, and we didn't put it here. In fact, it has taken us 100 years to discover some of it, and much of it was known to exist for a long time before we did anything about it. Our natural resources may be divided for the purposes of this discussion into two classes—physical and human. We have listed our physical endowments, and on the human side we find that we possess enthusiasm and pride in our State and its heritage. But our physical-natural resources mean very little unless we develop them by proper and wise use of our human resources. I hope our heirs, looking back upon the second century of Texas' statehood will be as proud as we are of the first 100 years. Texas has given us everything; are we giving everything for Texas?

Wealth from raw materials comes not only from their production, but also from the manufacture of those materials into finished goods. It seems upon examination that we have been producing for 100 years for other States to turn our resources into manufactured goods. Texas produces one-fourth of America's raw cotton, but employs less than 10,000 people in the manufacture of textiles. North Carolina manufacturers, using a good part of our cotton output, employ nearly 200,000, and to cap it all sell us the finished product at an additional profit to them.

Missouri raises 3 million cattle and 1½ million sheep; Texas raises more than 8 million cattle and nearly 10 million sheep. Yet Missouri has a leather-products industry of $150,000,000, and employs 40,000 people, who receive $26,000,000 in wages annually. But Texas, the greatest producer of raw materials, employs less than 1,000 people in leather-goods manufacture, and these are paid less than $1,000,000 in wages.

We like to talk about our oil and the wealth it brings our State; the schools we build, and the children we educate with the taxes it brings us. Yet even this natural resource is not being utilized to its utmost. We are told that two-thirds of our oil recovered is used, while a full third is wasted. In 1946 Texas wasted 1,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas every day. The Texas Railroad Commission has done much to enforce conservation, but any loss here is a real loss. Natural gas is a most valuable asset. From it can be produced synthetic rubber, plastic substitutes for rubber and silk, ammonia, glycerine, toluene, and other important chemical products. There has been much controversy over the wisdom of exporting so much gas. I am not going to discuss the merits of either side, but I will point out that we are exporting 46,000,000,000 cubic feet annually, which is being used to make goods and jobs in other States.

We have spoken of our rich soil and its growing proclivities. Yet it is an alarming fact that millions of acres of valuable topsoil are being washed away annually. This loss of topsoil has caused cotton, corn, and oats yields to drop sharply. These declines mean that the farmers' production costs have risen. The land has become drier and harder to work, and rainfall cannot soak in. Rainfall run-off has led to greater flood damages. Water supply for all uses has become more and more scarce, river beds have filled up and reservoirs become choked with silt.

We have mountains of iron ore close to my home in east Texas. It has been there for a long time, but pig iron wasn't produced from it until last October. Today it is bringing a premium price and several hundred Texans who were formerly picking cotton are now employed at good wages. If we were shipping that ore to Birmingham, as we do other raw materials, these jobs with good wages would also be there and several hundred of my neighbors would still be picking cotton. Whenever we create a manufacture of raw materials we create jobs that did not exist before, and every new job means wages—and more wages mean more purchasing power. More purchasing power means better health, better homes, better

education for the manufacturers and the consumers all along the line.

Texas is in some respects like the newly rich millionaire, who, unused to wealth, spends his fortune and not always to the best advantage. We are being lavish and wasteful with our human as well as our physical resources. We have prided ourselves on our system of free public education, our State colleges and universities, and our religious schools. But let us see if we are creating the finished product, or merely turning out the raw material.

The University of Texas in 1940–41 graduated 25 students with a master's degree in engineering and only 2 with a doctor's degree. The university ranked sixteenth in the granting of these degrees. At the same time, MIT awarded 205 masters' and 28 doctors' degrees. Since 1920, four Texas institutions (the University of Texas, Texas A. & M. College, Rice Institute, and Texas Tech) awarded bachelor's degrees to more than 8,000 engineers. Yet the Texas State Board for Registration of Professional Engineers listed only 4,500 registrants in good standing in a report covering a recent year. Many of those on the list had moved to other States since registering. It would appear that we have wasted our human resources as well. Our young people have gone elsewhere for their advanced training and remained away where the opportunities for employment were better

There is another field which remains almost unexplored and undeveloped. In the Texas of tomorrow I hope something is done to properly publicize our State so that more and more tourists will come visit us each year.

The tourist trade is big money. Ask California and Florida. The legislatures of those States realize that and have gone to great lengths to make sure that tourist dollars are spent within those States. Without being facetious, I ask, "What do those States have that Texas doesn't have?" And again without levity, the answer is, "Nothing."

Texas is a sportsman's paradise. For the fisherman we have the finest tarpon and other salt-water fishing on the Gulf; beautiful Lake Texoma, formed by the Denison Dam on the Red River, should know national renown as a dream spot for vacationers. Other of our inland lakes are stocked with the finest black bass, goggle-eyed perch, and bream, while our mountain streams are a delight to the fly fisherman. For the man who likes to shoot, Texas is really a happy hunting ground. No scenery anywhere can match that of our Big Bend country, the Palo Duro Canyon, El Capitan, or a sunset over the Gulf of Mexico. Yet Texas does not get its proper share of tourist trade and tourist dollars.

The 1947 report of the Texas Highway Department contains some interesting figures. Last year nearly 4,000,000 tourists spent $178,562,365 in Texas. That's a lot of money—enough to pay the heads of 44,640 families a salary of $4,000 annually.

The State government itself benefited by more than two and a half million dollars in gasoline tax money spent by tourists. Yet the Texas Legislature has repeatedly refused to join more than 40 other States in providing funds to advertise itself to money-spending tourists and prospective industrialists. States which advertise their advantages as tourist centers report they have doubled and quadrupled their annual invasion by tourists. There is a great untapped source of income here for Texas. If 4,000,000 tourists will spend $178,000,000 in our State without our appropriating 1 cent to attract them, think of what could be done with a Nation-wide advertising and publicity program to sell Texas as a vacation State.

It is up to us to help make the Texas of tomorrow completely productive. We are like a new machine and it has taken us a little time to realize our horsepower and to get broken into the possibilities of competitive statehood.

Now, we must develop our leaders from within our citizenship—leaders who will help us assume economic, political, and social responsibility for the life of our State. No Texan worthy of the name can be content to boast of past glories and present greatness of which he is but the heir. Each must make his own contributions to the greatness of Texas rather than to remain satisfied with what others have accomplished.

We have inventoried our possibilities, analyzed our opportunities, and now we must put into action a concrete program which will take advantage of them. I advance for your consideration a few recommendations which I think are both objective and practical, and which I believe in sufficiently to work toward bringing about.

1. One of the most important needs of growing Texas is a coordinating and integrating agency. Let us create within our State government a board of development—an agency adequately financed and completely independent of politics. Its objective would be to provide for the orderly and sound over-all development of the State's economic, industrial, and recreational potentialities.

This agency should make an inventory of the State's resources—recreational and industrial—even to the remotest community. It should have a research department which would analyze and determine the extent of these resources and their best possible uses. These findings should then be publicized widely throughout the State and the Nation and every assistance given to industrialists, workers, tourists, and others interested in visiting, locating in, or doing business in Texas.

The board of development should divide Texas into regions for more effective operation and keep in closer touch with regional needs. Regional offices should maintain a running inventory of local needs, resources, and potentialities. Small-business clinics should be conducted to keep local businessmen in touch with constantly changing local and State needs and potentialities, and to increase the know-how of the small-business man and manufacturer. In short, the board of development I have proposed could be a most vital factor in guiding the Texas of tomorrow, in an efficient and orderly manner, toward the fullest realization of its vast potentialities. Other States have shown us the way. Let us profit by their example.

2. Earlier today, in a speech at Temple before the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, I suggested that Texas businessmen and other individuals could make a real contribution toward better government by endowing a nonpartisan Better Government Foundation. This foundation would work to give us better and more efficient leadership in government, and to encourage more active and intelligent participation in public affairs on the part of more of our people. The business of government, whether local, State, or national—is big business. No other business, directly or indirectly, affects so many people every day of their lives. Yet in the past we have been content to allow as little as 25 percent of the eligible voters of Texas to direct the affairs of our State.

Use of the ballot is the most effective leveling influence in our American system. It is the only means of participation by many of our citizens in their government. The failure of so many to exercise this privilege allows well-organized minorities and subversive groups to have power much greater than their strength, thereby leaving business, industry, and good government at their mercy. Our leadership in the more important business of government is too often selected in a random, hit-or-miss fashion, by this minority of our citizens, with little regard for ability.

Since the business of government is so important, why not set up an endowed foundation, financially independent and not subject to pressure, to study our problems of government and our candidates for public office. It should also dramatize and promote the necessity for a broader participation in our government. To me it seems like just plain good business to remove the evils of minority rule and get more people interested in public affairs to a point where we can truly have reflected the will of the majority. The savings and general benefits resulting from a more efficient and able administration of government would soon repay the Texans of today, to whom I propose such a Better Government Foundation to aid the Texans of tomorrow.

3. Applied research must be increased and enlarged. Soil conservation districts have done excellent work in checking soil losses, but there is still much to be done. All Texans must be made aware of how closely their futures are linked with soil conservation.

4. There must be a complete review of conservation laws and a new program developed to conserve our natural gas.

5. Texas capital should be encouraged to develop Texas resources. We must break the present economic circle whereby our raw materials are exported, processed, and then sold back to us at substantial profits to others.

6. There should be a complete analytical study made of higher and elementary education and the present inefficacy of our graduate work corrected.

7. Finally we must pool our leadership—political, economic, religious, and educational in a common and long-range effort for the betterment of our State. Texas faces tomorrow in the spring of its development, hopefully and confidently. The Texas of tomorrow depends, in a great measure, on how wisely and prudently we Texans of today plan that future. The responsibility is great. Are we ready to meet that responsibility? Only you can answer that question.

What Do the American People Want From Their Politicians?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Edmund J. James lecture on government, on the subject What Do the American People Want From Their Politicians? delivered by me at the University of Illinois on April 28 last.

Mr. President, let me say, most facetiously and in the utmost good humor, that I recommend the reading of this lecture on the subject What Do the American People Want From Their Politicians? to the newly announced group in the Senate of progressives in the Republican Party. We welcome a new group of nine progressives who, by the newspapers, are going to do what they can to keep the Republican Party from going reactionary. However, I call their attention to the fact that we have another group of liberals which predated the new progressives for quite some time, and we

are very proud to call ourselves constitutional liberals.

I hope that in due course of time the newly designated group of progressives will finally come to accept constitutional liberalism as I sought to elucidate it in this lecture. We constitutional liberals will always welcome them to our fraternity.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Oregon when he referred to a statement in the press that eight or nine Republicans have resolved themselves into a band of liberal progressives or progressive liberals. As one who has been assumed for many years—and I hope justly—to be a progressive, and also a liberal, I accept the challenge very gladly, and I join with the Senator from Oregon in welcoming to our liberalism this new group of progressives among Republicans—these eight or nine men. And let me add, may their tribe increase.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an enjoyable honor for me to return to an academic environment and discuss with you tonight some problems of political ethics. For some 20 years I lived and taught in an academic environment where, as you well know, the motivating drives are a search for the facts and a teaching of the truth as the facts found in academic research develop the truth. I regret to say that the political environment of America, particularly of Washington, D. C., bears little resemblance to an academic environment. The yardstick of cause and effect reasoning which measures the findings of truth as products of academic research in both the social and pure sciences, as well as for that matter in the arts, is very frequently laid aside by the professional politician. He cannot afford to permit the principles of logic or the disclosures of fact to direct his vote on any issue if such a vote would run counter to the prejudices or selfish economic interests of pressure groups which were powerful enough to elect him and which he knows may be powerful enough to defeat him for reelection. Then, too, there is party policy which requires mumbo-jumbo party loyalty from the professional politician, with the result that the master voice of the machine boss serves as a nerve block to independence of judgment on the merits of issues.

Granted that political science is not a pure science because of the fact that so much of the impurities of human nature pollute the stream of American politics; nevertheless, I venture to suggest that a more realistic and functional teaching of government and politics in the high schools and colleges of America would help build a much needed political sewage-disposal system for protecting the health of American democracy.

It is no flattery when I say that here at the University of Illinois you have builded a deserved reputation in political science, law, and the social sciences generally for leading the students into a more realistic understanding of the differences between democratic government in theory and politics in practice; between Hamiltonian theories of political aristocracy and Jeffersonian theories of human rights; between the static constitution of John Marshall and the dynamic constitution of Holmes and Brandeis; between the exploitation by a laissez-faire economy and the paramount duty of a representative government to promote the general welfare by protecting the weak from the exploitation of the strong.

The Edmund J. James lectures on government are but one exhibit among many in evidence of the program of this great university to introduce its students to the realisms of democratic government. In preparation of this lecture I read the several series of James lectures which Prof. Clarence A. Berdahl so thoughtfully sent to me. They constitute an excellent seminar reading and discussion course in political problems. They are a living scholastic monument to the memory of Edmund J. James and a deserved tribute to his educational statesmanship. His daughter, Mrs. George E. Frazer, through her endowment of this lecture chair in government, has honored not only the memory of her distinguished father but has carried forward his faith that democratic processes in America will be secure and effective only so long as there is public understanding and enlightenment concerning them.

The subject question which I raise in this lecture, What Do the American People Want From Their Politicians? can be answered in many ways. The wisecracker might answer "Too much," and not be wrong. Or he might answer "The impossible," and still be right. The blind partisan who prejudiciously thinks that every detail of the party's program is synonomous with the national welfare might answer, and probably would, "Complete party regularity." How well I know that answer. How unsound I also know it to be. Unsound first because no party platform hatched from the hot incubator hotel rooms of political convention compromises and deals can be expected always to place the ideals of self-government by a free people under a written constitution above political expediency and prejudiced appeals to very much needed blocs of votes. Hotly contested campaigns waged at political conventions by powerful and ambitious supporters of candidates for the Presidential nomination frequently permit little consideration of principles of political idealism when it comes to adopting a party platform.

"Party regularity" is an unsound answer to the question in the second place because the American people who vote, including both registered party members and independent voters, indicate time and time again that they do not approve of politicians placing party regularity above the public's best interests. An examination of the voting returns in most northern States in recent elections will show not only that independent voters give greatest emphasis to what the individual candidate stands for, but that even a majority of the registered party voters of both major parties with increasing frequency have scratched their ballots in accordance with their views of the man rather than their views of his party level. This attitude of the public creates many problems for political parties, but it is one of the political realities which both major parties need to remember when they come to write their political platforms. They need to remember that the American voters are wise to political platform sophistry and hypocrisy. They need to remember that the forces of political education, the impact upon our people of world events with all their implications for the future, the strains and stresses of our complex living problems, the fears and sense of insecurity that are gnawing at the hearts of most Americans these days leave little patience for political platitudes.

It is solutions to specific problems and issues which the American people want from their politicians. It is less politics and more statesmanship which the people want. It is an exercise of honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as they present themselves on specific issues that the American people want from their politicians. It is cause to effect reasoning rather than buck-passing ability and rationalization which the people want.

They are sick and tired of being told that depressions are part of the price we pay for liberty because they know it need not be so if more politicians would represent the people rather than have so many represent special interests which are still powerful enough in America to elect many men to office. The people know that there is no excuse for so many millions of our homeless being priced out of owning a home or being forced to pay triple prices for shacks that frequently are not as well constructed as chicken houses on a modern poultry farm. They know that the inflation boom which has turned the American dollar into a 50-cent piece, based on 1939 values, could have been and still could be checked in part by a Congress willing to recognize that free enterprise does not mean license for the owners of capital and sources of production to profiteer at the expense of the many as the result of a short supply created by an unbalanced war economy. The people are disturbed by the encroachments upon inalienable rights set forth in the Constitution by powerful economic interests which are able to force through the Congress laws which transgress those rights. The people are beginning to see that many politicians are rationalizing legislation which invades the realm of inalienable rights by trying to convince the American people that the economic welfare of the country, the complex industrial system of the country, the material comforts of the country, the uninterrupted production of the country justify and make reasonable a limiting of inalienable rights. This materialistic approach to democracy is creating great tensions in our body politic. Many people are disturbed. Resentment is growing. All is not well in our democracy. Politicians and our political parties need to take heed of the fact that as the American people have risen in defense of inalienable human rights embodied in the spiritual values of democracy as epitomized in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution when those rights were endangered by totalitarianism abroad, so, too, will they in due course of time repudiate any attempt to transgress those rights through government by the privileged few at home. We are witnessing in America today a resurgence of Hamiltonianism and a suppressing of Jeffersonianism. It is not surprising that economic dislocations, inflationary prices, failure as yet to win the peace, labor excesses, monopolistic profiteering, inequitable taxes, Russian aggression, growing class-conscious conflicts at home and abroad, the danger of another war, and the on-every-hand manifestations of greed and selfishness have left the average voter perplexed, disillusioned, and sick at heart over politics and politicians. It is to be expected that in such a period of social and political flux our people generally should be routed a bit from holding fast to an abiding faith in the spiritual values of democracy. However, the politicians and our political parties will make a grievous mistake if they interpret the hysteria of the moment for crystallized public opinion on the basic issues of the day. In due course of time they will be repudiated at the polls if so many of our politicians continue to look upon democracy as a form of government motivated by values of materialism rather than by human rights.

They will discover that the American people will never endure any form of economic fascism or any form of communism, because the people know that economic fascism, even by big business, and any form of communism, even by a class-conscious third party in America, will mean the end to personal liberty. The Lincoln view of the superiority of human rights over property rights is no political cliché in our American ideology of representative self-government. Any sacrifice of individual freedom to the economic advantage of the owners of property or to the economic comfort of the general public strikes at the roots of the inalienable personal rights set forth in our Constitution. We cannot have those rights and eat them, too. We cannot respect them only when it is economically advantageous to do so and

still preserve them. Lip service of praise for individual liberty, followed by legislation which sets forth procedures so restrictive in nature as to make effective exercise of individual liberty impossible, will never check encroachments upon the democratic way of life.

For a time, millions of dollars spent for propaganda in stirring up public opinion against some group within our society which, through lack of self-discipline and statesmanlike leadership, has seriously injured the public through unjustifiable excesses will result in the passage of unnecessarily extreme legislation. For a time, special interest groups riding the crest of public indignation, much of which they have helped create by propaganda techniques, can awe a Congress into passing extreme punitive legislation for the handling of social and economic problems.

The Taft-Hartley law is the product of government by propaganda and pressure. It relates to a subject of labor excesses, in which field some legislation was needed. Too many in labor had forgotten or were willing to trample on the democratic principle that one's individual rights are relative in that they must bear a nontransgressing relationship to equal individual rights of other persons. However, as time passes, more and more people will see that what was needed was not punitive legislation but legislation which sought to balance the interests and rights of labor and employers and thereby protect the best interests of the public. Legislation which was fitted into the framework of voluntarism in recognition of the fact that the economic and social problems of wages, hours, conditions of employment, pensions, job security, production output and the many other facets of free collective bargaining are not basically legal issues at all. What was needed was a Congress which recognized that any law which attempts by the punitive force of government to force either free workers or free employers into a governmentally dictated economic mold is more than likely to endanger the inalienable rights of the individual.

Is it any wonder then that concern is growing throughout the Nation over the problems and methods which Government must use to enforce the Taft-Hartley law? Is it any wonder that those employers of the country, in increasing numbers, who recognize that collective bargaining is here to stay, are becoming more uneasy month by month over the implications of the Taft-Hartley law? It will take time, much time, possibly too much time for people generally to comprehend fully the limitations upon individual liberty not only of the worker but of the employer, too, which are encompassed in the Taft-Hartley law. It will probably take a decade, but during that decade an old historical pattern will be woven once again in the tapestry of our national life. It will be the pattern of resentment. It will depict again that free men will struggle even against odds to prevent the Government from becoming the master instead of the servant of the people's freedom. We are yet too close to this new struggle to appreciate the costly price we have paid for the Taft-Hartley bill. If we should suffer a depression, if unemployment should stalk our streets again, if the civil war within the house of labor should end, if a chain of events such as those which crystallized labor unity after the Haymarket riots, and which eventually led to the Norris-LaGuardia Act, should repeat themselves, the public would soon understand that the Taft-Hartley law is based upon a principle of government by force in a field of economic and social relations where voluntarism is the essence of government by law. Industrial peace is much to be desired. Uninterrupted production should be the goal of management and labor. They should recognize that it is their mutual obligation to maintain uninterrupted production, and maximum production at that, through good-faith collective bargaining based upon the give-and-take of fair play voluntarism, conscionable compromise, and peaceful procedures free of compulsory dictates of government. They should not ignore the fact that excesses of either labor or management or both always give rise to the danger of extreme legislation.

However, the public has responsibilities in the field of industrial controversy, too. The public's elected representatives should give voice to those responsibilities and stand up against waves of public indignation which seek to express themselves in demands for legislation that encroaches upon constitutional guaranties or is so extreme in nature as to intensify class-conscious feelings. Congress did not counsel calmness and reasonableness when it passed the Taft-Hartley law. It did not think through its proposals for enforcement and administration. It did not weigh the implications of throwing upon the common-law courts of the country, in the last analysis, the burden of attempting to settle, as though they were questions of law, the highly social and economic problems of industrial relations.

I find it rather amusing to note the growing irritation in Congress among those who voted for the Taft-Hartley law when their attention is called to criticisms of the law by increasing numbers of employers who are beginning to see that they were sold a pig in a poke. In recent weeks I have noted that an increasing number of Members of Congress are hedging a little on the Taft-Hartley law and are beginning to suggest that maybe it needs not some slight but some basic revisions. They are concerned about the increasing number of scholarly analyses of the Taft-Hartley law which are pointing out the danger of the law's reestablishing government by injunction in this country.

They have no satisfactory answer to the criticism that it is irreconcilable with the principle of freedom of choice, so basic to individual rights in a democracy, for the Government to say to supposedly free workers in America, either work in the mines for 80 days under court order or go to jail for contempt. They, too, are becoming fearful that if it is proper by law to force workers to exercise that choice for 80 days, nothing would prevent a wave of congressional hysteria from making it 160 days or twice that figure. Thus we find a wave of reflection sweeping public opinion these days. That innate sense of American fair play plus our ingrained love for individual liberty is causing increasing numbers of Americans to see the unfairness, injustice, and transgression upon individual freedom in any law which in part forces men to work for private employers for 80 days or go to jail. This resentment is likely to injure the prestige of our courts just as Government by injunction before the Norris-LaGuardia law kept our courts under political attack. This principle of freedom from economic dictates by our courts, this right not to be directed to work for another man for his profit for any period of time, this struggle against the Hamiltonian theory of making the courts the strong arm of capital, is nothing new in American industrial history. The Taft-Hartley law only presents it in a little different form. I have no doubt that, to the extent that the administration and enforcement of the Taft-Hartley law jeopardizes individual rights so that they cannot be enjoyed in their full measure by free men, the law will in due course of time be changed by the Congress. In the meantime, I have confidence that the courts of the land, with final appeal to the Supreme Court, will eliminate from the law those sections which I believe will and should be found to be unconstitutional. However, the sections which place within the jurisdiction of common law courts the power to settle labor disputes by injunction in my opinion are not unconstitutional. Rather, they are administratively unsound and in the long run unworkable.

I have discussed the Taft-Hartley law in this lecture for the primary purpose of laying the foundation for a point of political ethics which I wish to discuss as my final answer to the question, "What do the American People Want From Their Politicians?" I think you will agree with me that public opinion in this country last year thought it wanted the Taft-Hartley bill made law. I think you will agree that most people who wired their Congressmen and Senators to vote for the Taft-Hartley law had never read the law and were not familiar with its details. Neither were they familiar with its administrative weaknesses or its probable unconstitutional sections. Nevertheless, the pressure campaign was on and thousands upon thousands of citizens wired Congress to pass the bill. All the public opinion polls showed large majorities in favor of passage of the law. My party made a vote for the law a test of party regularity.

I voted against the Taft-Hartley law. I voted to sustain the President's veto. Query: Did I violate the ethical obligation of a Member of the Senate to carry out the will of the people in accordance with the intent of our representative form of government?

I think not, but before I tell you why, I want to cite another example which illustrates this ethical problem. Last year I was one of two Republicans who voted against the Knutson tax-reduction bill. That bill was considered as another acid test of party regularity. However, there was no clear evidence that the American people wanted that bill passed. This year I would have voted against the Knutson House tax-reduction bill, but I voted for the Millikin Senate tax reduction bill. I think the American people wanted that bill passed. This year I would still vote against the Taft-Hartley bill if it were before us for original passage. Is there a thread of sound consistency in my voting record on these bills compatible with the ethical duty of a Senator to put into law the will of the people? I think so, and I offer my discussion of that question of political ethics as my answer to the one question which college students put to me most frequently, namely, "When do you think you are justified in voting your convictions as against what appears to be public opinion?" I am convinced that my approach to that question, insofar as carrying out the mandate of representative government is concerned, is in accordance with what the people want from their politicians.

With apology for illustrating the point with personal references, I shall use my votes on the Taft-Hartley bill and on tax bills during the past 2 years as the basis for my discussion of this ever-interesting question of political ethics. I discussed it at some length in the Senate on March 22 of this year when I announced my reasons for supporting the 1948 Millikin tax-reduction bill after having been one of the leaders in the fight against the 1947 Knutson tax-reduction bill. In the course of that speech I pointed out that I had not changed my views on taxes and that I still stand in support of everything I said on taxes in my 1947 major speech under the title "A Progressive Republican Tax Program." I pointed out that such being true it was quite proper that the question should be asked me, in view of your opposition to the Knutson tax bill of 1947, what is your explanation or your rationalization or your excuse for voting for the 1948 Millikin bill? I had what I consider to be a series of very good reasons for voting for this tax bill, but reasons which nevertheless should be accompanied with certain very definite warnings to the American people concerning the fiscal policies of the Federal Government as represented by the policies expressed in the Millikin tax bill.

In listing my reasons for voting for the 1948 tax bill in contrast to voting against the 1947 tax bill, I want to make the following points:

First, I endeavor in my position in the Senate to carry out to the best of my sights what I consider to be the basic theories of representative government as contemplated by the founding fathers of the Constitution. I would point out to the American people that there is constantly confronting one in the position of a United States Senator the ethical problem of adjusting his honest convictions on the merits of issues to his duty always to carry out what he concludes to be the crystallized dominant majority opinion of the people at any time on a given legislative subject. That produces a great conflict of conscience sometimes because it is so easy for one in my position to assume that the majority opinion at a given time on a given issue coincides with his personal convictions on that issue when sometimes that is not the case. But once he becomes convinced that his personal convictions on a given issue are out of line with the dominant crystallized opinion of the country, then I say, under our representative form of government, he has the duty to bow to that opinion, because the people through him have the right to have a fixed, crystallized public opinion put into law. I do not mean that it becomes a Senator's duty to vote for just any law, because there are some other ethical considerations relating to one's duty in the Senate that he must take into account before he votes on any given piece of legislation. Once he is convinced that the people want legislation on a certain subject, even though his personal convictions lead him to believe that it is unwise at the time to pass that type of legislation, I say it is clearly his duty as a representative of the people to do what he can to bring about legislation that is sound and that will carry out the dominant will of the country.

Relating that proposition to the 1948 tax legislation, although I have personal fears of drastic tax reduction at this time, I am perfectly convinced that the American people today, by an overwhelming majority of sentiment, are saying to the Members of the Congress, "We want and we expect you to pass tax-reduction legislation."

I think it would be a false assumption that the American people are saying to the Congress, "We are asking that you pass the 1948 Millikin bill," because, let us be frank about it, the great majority of the American people are not familiar with the details of the bill. If we are going to be intellectually honest about the proposition to which I am addressing myself, we must admit that relatively few people in the United States are to any considerable degree whatsoever familiar with the details of any bill pending before the Senate. So there does rest upon us as individual Members of the Congress the ethical duty of ascertaining for ourselves whether or not a given piece of legislation, in this instance the Millikin tax bill, will carry out what I am satisfied is the clear mandate of a majority of the American people, who are asking for tax-reduction legislation.

So in balancing these ethical duties which confront us in carrying out the solemn trust which is ours, imposed upon us by the people through a representative government, we must ask ourselves in this instance whether this particular piece of legislation is sufficiently reasonable, sufficiently sound, and sufficiently proper from the standpoint of the public interest to effectuate with reasonable effectiveness and a minimum of damage to the public welfare what has become the crystallized majority public opinion of the people on tax legislation.

To that question I found that in all intellectual honesty I could answer in the affirmative, and I could make that answer because of the great differences not only between the Millikin bill and the Knutson tax bill of the last session of Congress, but also between the bill as modified, as amended by the Millikin committee, and the Knutson bill which passed the House of Representatives in the present session of Congress.

At the risk of boredom I want to repeat from a little different angle this ethical problem which confronted me as a representative of the people of my State on this tax legislation, namely that they have the right to expect me to do what I can to bring about the best tax-reduction bill that can be enacted at the present session of Congress without at the same time passing a tax bill which is so detrimental to the public interest that I, in good conscience, would have to say: "It is better, it is much better, that I vote against this bill and tell my people why I am against the bill, than to vote for a bill which I think is so unsound from the standpoint of the public welfare that it would not be a proper way of carrying out a public mandate requesting a tax-reduction bill."

After literally many hours of study of the bill, and after wrestling with some very deep convictions on serious questions of taxation confronting the people, I found myself in a position where in all honesty I was free to tell the people of my State and the people of my country that I believed a vote for this bill was the proper vote to cast on the merits of the bill. Hence I voted for it. But I voted for it only after putting in the RECORD some very serious warnings concerning our fiscal policy which I believe need to be issued to the American people at this time.

There is another angle to the ethical considerations I have raised. One only has to sit as a Member of the Senate fully to understand and appreciate the problems of ethics that confront him in seeking to carry out the principles of a representative government and at the same time maintain in the Senate complete intellectual honesty as an individual person and citizen.

I state this angle of political ethics in this way: I could never see my way clear, no matter how strong I felt public opinion was on a given issue, to vote for a piece of legislation which I believed to be either unconstitutional or which I was convinced would not, in fact, because of its provisions, carry out the intent of the American people as expressed by a mandate in a given demand for legislation on a particular subject. I can say to you that this point is very difficult to get across to the American people; I suspect perhaps it is politically unwise even to try to explain it to the American people because it is so easy for opponents to misrepresent it and take it out of context to one's political detriment. Nevertheless, I think it is a point which must be driven home to our people, because I know of many in my State, as well as elsewhere in the country, who do not fully understand this very fundamental principle of representation in the Congress of the United States. They seem to be laboring under the illusion that we are a pure democracy in the sense that our only duty in the Congress of the United States is unqualifiedly to support every public prejudice, every temporary opinion on the part of the American people, and immediately put into effect such views on the theory that they represent true majority opinion.

I call that making a Gallup-poll approach to our job in the Senate, and I would have the American people ponder the fact that representative government will never be safe in America if we continue to increase the tendency on the part of both the people and the Congress to do the job of legislating from the standpoint of a Gallup-poll approach. It is a serious trend in America, and when my mail says, "Can you not read the Gallup poll?" my answer is, "Yes." I can read the Gallup poll on various issues; but I also know that the Gallup poll seldom expresses fixed, crystallized public opinion on any issue. I am not ready to turn the job of legislative statesmanship over to the Gallup poll or over to any similar device for determining public opinion. I grant that such polls are very helpful in helping us determine what public attitudes are on certain legislative issues, but Senators make a mistake if they think such polls reflect any careful and thorough analyses of a given piece of legislation by the public. The job of analyzing legislation rests upon us, and the people have the right to expect us to check legislation for weaknesses and abuses as well as for unconstitutional provisions. More than half the time—yes, I think more than three-quarters of the time—such polls as the Gallup poll merely reflect public attitudes including public prejudices. No matter how impolitic it may be, I once again say that I am never going to make a Gallup-poll approach to my job in the United States Senate. If my remaining in the Senate is dependent upon making that type of approach, I shall take my licking in 1950, firm in the conviction that I shall have made a record in support of a very sound principle of representative government, a principle to which the people themselves eventually will agree once they thoroughly understand it. It is permanent public opinion; it is crystallized public opinion; it is public opinion based upon a careful analysis of the facts involved in a given piece of legislation which it is my duty to represent in the United States Senate, and no other type of public opinion.

On June 5 of last year I discussed, in somewhat different language, the same ethical problem which confronts a Member of the United States Senate in carrying out crystallized, fixed, permanent public opinion on a given issue. It caused a great deal of consternation in some circles in my State when I announced in the course of that speech that I would vote against the Taft-Hartley bill.

In the course of that speech I said that I would have to vote against the Taft-Hartley bill, that I would have to vote against that bill on the basis of my study of it, even though public opinion in my State—and in the Nation—showed by the polls that the people seemed to think that they wanted the Taft-Hartley law passed. It was my explanation of my position on the Taft-Hartley bill which was so completely overlooked by the press and which did me such a grave and unfair political injustice. I pointed out as clearly as I can use the English language that I could not vote for the Taft-Hartley bill because I was satisfied that it would not fulfill the desire of the American people for legislation which would check labor abuses. I was convinced that the American people did not understand the weaknesses of that bill. I was satisfied that they were not familiar with its procedural shortcomings, and were unaware of the fact that its great procedural weaknesses would defeat the very purposes which those groups in America had in mind when they urged, by polls, telegrams, and letters, the passage of such a measure.

I was confronted by the proposition of political ethics which I am trying to explain and discuss in this lecture, namely, how far a Member of the United States Senate, in the exercise of intellectual honesty, can justify going in voting for a given piece of legislation simply because there is a tremendous wave of public pressure urging its passage when he is convinced that there is very little public understanding of the weaknesses and shortcomings and the serious defects of the legislation itself.

So I say today, as I said on June 5, 1947, that if I were presented today with the identical problem which confronted me then with relation to the Taft-Hartley bill, I should again cast a negative vote. I should cast that negative vote for the same two main reasons which I set forth in my speech on June 5, 1947.

First, because I think the American people are entitled to receive from me, as a student of labor problems, a vote based upon my knowledge of labor legislation and upon my

honest conclusion, after studying the Taft-Hartley bill, that it involved certain unacceptable procedural weaknesses and injustices, including procedural violations of a basic principle of American jurisprudence, namely, that there must be uniform application of legal procedures to all people upon whom the law is to be applied if we are to retain equality of justice in America. Because the Taft-Hartley law violates that basic principle, and because the record which has been made under the Taft-Hartley law since its enactment verifies the position I took on June 5, I should have to say to the American people, impolitic as the statement might be, that given the same choice I had on June 5, 1947, I would cast the same "no" vote. I say that because I could not, in intellectual honesty, vote for a bill which, because of its violations of basic procedures of equality of justice I deemed to be so detrimental to government by law that a vote for it could not be justified. Under such circumstances I think it is my duty to vote "no" and then go before my constituents and give my reasons for voting against such a measure even though I may be satisfied at the time most of my constituents think they want me to vote for such a given piece of legislation because they are laboring under the mistaken notion that it will accomplish the legislative objective which they have in mind.

The second reason why, under like circumstances, I would cast the same "no" vote today that I cast on the Taft-Hartley bill last June is the reason I set forth in that June 5, 1947, speech, namely, that I was convinced that the proposed law contained unconstitutional provisions. I am still convinced of it.

There is an ethical consideration, an ethical duty resting upon each Member of the Congress of the United States which rises high above effectuating a temporary public opinion in support of a law which the public itself has never carefully analyzed. That is the ethical duty of never violating the oath of office which one takes when he undertakes the solemn obligation of serving his people in the United States Senate.

So, if at any time I am honestly and sincerely convinced that a given proposal for a law is in fact unconstitutional, as I was convinced the Taft-Hartley bill was unconstitutional, I shall vote against the proposal, no matter how strong the public demand for it may be.

Why do I say that? I say that because the people of my State and the people of the Nation sent me to the Senate to sustain and support the Constitution, and to live up to my oath to support it and sustain it.

Thus I think there is a mandate from the American people which supersedes all other public demands and which is basic in the American system of representative government, namely, the mandate that we shall vote in the Senate of the United States in accordance with our honest convictions as to the constitutionality of any piece of legislation brought before us. Whenever I cannot square such legislation with my convictions as to its constitutionality, then I shall vote against it. I agree that all reasonable doubts should be resolved in favor of constitutionality, but when careful analysis of a bill such as the Taft-Hartley bill leaves one convinced that it contains unconstitutional sections he should vote "No."

When I made my major speech against the Taft-Hartley bill, I pointed out that I considered certain of its sections to be unconstitutional; and although those sections have not yet reached the United States Supreme Court, it is interesting to note that already there is a growing recognition on the part of employers and public groups generally that there are features of the law which are unconstitutional. Being of that opinion at the time I voted on the bill, it seems to me that if I were to be true to my oath of office, I had no other course of action to follow but to live up to my oath and vote against the bill. It is interesting to note that one section of the bill has been declared unconstitutional by a lower Federal court, and I believe the court's decision will be sustained when the issue reaches the United States Supreme Court. Those of us who opposed the Taft-Hartley bill during the course of the Senate debate challenge this section of the law along with others on constitutional grounds.

So much for an explanation of my vote against the Tart-Hartley bill even though public opinion polls showed strong public support of the bill. Now what about the comparison of that "no" vote with a "yes" vote on the 1948 tax bill, especially in view of my "no" vote against the 1947 tax bill. There is nothing unconstitutional about the 1948 tax measure. In my opinion, to a considerable degree it will carry out the mandate of the American people for tax-reduction legislation. It is workable legislation; of that I have satisfied myself. It is legislation which is fair, provided certain very serious complications do not develop in the world scene in the months immediately ahead. But if those complications should develop, then I say to the people of my State and to all of the American people that it will become incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to meet in extraordinary session, as I am sure it will, and proceed to pass additional tax legislation which will contain provision for the maintenance of a Federal revenue sufficiently high to protect our national security.

It is quite a different bill from the Knutson bill passed by the House of Representatives. I cannot stress that point too strongly in this statement of my reasons for my vote for the 1948 tax bill. I say that because if the only choice we had were the bill which came to us from the House of Representatives, then I think I would have had no course of action to follow but to say to the American people, "I think the House bill is so drastic and so detrimental to the fiscal stability of our Government that I feel compelled to vote against it, and then to tell you why, on the assumption that if you, too, knew the reasons, you would not want me to vote for it." One can call that the political risk of representative government from the office-holder's standpoint, but it is also a test of statesmanship as to whether one is willing to run the gantlet of what I call the political risk of representation by voting against a piece of legislation if he honestly believes that the proposed legislation, if enacted, would be detrimental to the welfare of the people and if he honestly believes that if the people knew of the weaknesses and the defects of the bill, they too, would want him to vote against it. In other words, determining what is majority opinion also involves a consideration of the element of timing, because the majority opinion that counts, the majority opinion that I think a representative should seek to serve, is the majority opinion which he believes would exist if all the people had all the facts which he has when he comes to vote on a given piece of legislation. I call it the political risk of representation, and I studied this piece of tax legislation from that standpoint.

I studied at great length the many representations which had been made to me by constituents who have made a very careful study of tax legislation. I studied the representations which came to me from farm groups, from labor organizations, from chambers of commerce, from all groups that have taken the time in the last few months to make a detailed and careful analysis of various proposals for tax reduction. I came to the honest conclusion—and one can say little more in explanation of a vote—that, regardless of some of the shortcomings of this bill, I believed that if all the American people took the time to study the bill in detail their mandate for tax reduction would be the same; they still would say "Vote for tax-reduction legislation." I think they would say that this bill should be passed. I do not think that would be true if the choice we had were only the House bill. I think public opinion would be greatly different if today we were to offer to the American people the House bill, and they took the time to study it in detail, with no choice offered them to vote for the Millikin bill. I would be perfectly willing to stand by the assertion, and accept my political responsibility for it, that the American people would agree that the bill passed by the House was too drastic, went too far, and was not sufficiently safe for the economy of this country to be passed at this time. In other words, I am saying that I think under the able leadership of the Senator from Colorado there has been brought forth a bill which would cause the American people, on the basis of careful study, to say to me, "Yes; we think you ought to vote for that bill."

There is a great deal of subjectivity in the problem which confronts the individual Senator in determining for himself what his political duty is in connection with his vote on any given piece of legislation. I recognize that there is much subjectivity in my mental processes which have caused me to reach the conclusion that if all the details of the 1948 tax bill were thoroughly understood by the American people, they would tell me to vote for it. Likewise, there is much subjectivity in my conclusion that if the only choice I gave them were the Knutson bill in its House form, they would give me a contrary mandate. Nevertheless, that is my honest opinion. One cannot explain to anyone else's satisfaction, on the basis of objective criteria, I admit, the subjective processes which cause one to reach a certain conclusion. But I wish to repeat that I voted for the 1948 tax bill because I think it does not violate sound public policy at this time, whereas I think the more drastic bill which the House of Representatives passed would violate it, and would leave me in such a position that I would have to run the political risk that I previously spoke about, by voting against the House bill, and then telling my constituents why I voted against it, in the firm conviction that once they knew, they, too, would agree.

As to the merits of the 1948 tax bill, I wish to say that the bill is much more than a mere modification of the percentages of existing tax rates in that it seeks at least to make some progress in the treatment of gross inequities in the tax structure. I find it a great improvement over the bill which the Senator from Colorado offered to the Senate last year and which I voted against. As I have said so many times, the real problem of tax reduction in the United States is not basically a problem of readjusting tax rates by way of percentage juggling or modification; the real tax problem that confronts us is the problem of tackling the gross inequities which exist in our present tax structure, and which make it so difficult for us to go forward with an expanding economy and to maintain Government revenues at a level sufficiently high to meet our domestic and international obligations. If we leave those inequities in the tax structure and merely give the American people some downward cuts in tax-rate percentages, we shall have given them no real tax reduction. I use the word "real" in the sense and with the meaning that the word "real" is used when we speak of "real wages." I say that if all we do is to modify the percentages of tax rates, we shall have given the American people no real tax reduction.

After the passage of time—and I do not think very much time either—the so-called dollar savings realized from a tax reduction

resulting only in a downward reduction in percentages will be eaten up by way of a further depreciation in the value of the American dollar. I think it would have been one of the worst types of public fraud to have passed the type of tax bill which was offered last year, which for the most part consisted only in a juggling of percentage rates. I said then, and I repeat now, that a tax bill which does not seek to come to grips with some of the gross inequities of the present tax structure which are preventing an expanding economy from going forward will further depreciate the value of the American dollar.

We cannot change economic laws. If the inflationary spiral is permitted to proceed upward and the value of the American dollar to proceed downward, the final result, of course, is going to be an economic collapse; how soon, not being a prophet, I cannot tell; but I point out such a danger is a very real and serious one.

So I am not interested, even in a Presidential election year, in offering the American people a tax bill which does nothing but juggle percentages in the rates of taxation. But the Millikin bill, which we passed did much more than that; it goes much further than merely making adjustments of percentages in tax rates. It is a bill which shows definite progress in the direction of at least starting to eliminate some of the gross inequities in our tax structure. Therefore, I was able to vote for it and at the same time square my vote with my general view that we must keep Federal revenues high if we are to solve our national financial problems. I think that the elimination of tax inequities is essential to increasing our tax revenues through an expanding economy. There were many things about the 1948 bill I did not like, but I felt that taken as a whole it was better than the existing tax structure and met, in a measure, the public demand for tax reduction. However, in struggling with the ethical question, "will my vote promote the national welfare?" I was greatly concerned over the failure of the bill to come to grips with the national debt problem. Thus I said:

"When I say we are headed for economic insolvency in this country unless we proceed to revise our fiscal policies in such manner so that we can go forward with an expanding economy and meet our international and domestic obligations. I mean the maintenance of a balanced budget over the years. I may add that the danger will be greatly increased if we do not come to more realistic grips with the national debt than we have done so far in the Congress of the United States.

"The Senator from Colorado, in an exchange with me in the debate last year, pointed out that one of the tax principles on which he stands is the principle that in times of great prosperity and high income we should tax high and pay our debts, so that in periods of business recession and depression we can lower taxes and decrease our payments on the debt. At that time I said in the debate that he and I were in complete agreement as to what is the most important underlying principle which ought to govern tax legislation, and I repeat that today. But I want the RECORD to show that although I am going along with this tax bill, Mr. President, I think it is a grievous mistake, even in a Presidential election year, for the Congress of the United States to adopt a budgetary policy which does not include at least a minimum payment on the national debt of $5,000,000,000.

"I am willing to venture the suggestion now, Mr. President, that the American people, in the not too distant future, will come to recognize that statement of mine as being essentially sound. Every businessman knows that he cannot justify a fiscal policy for his business which does not provide for an annual retirement of his debt in an amount at least equal to the carrying charges on the debt. I should like to hear from any businessman in America who denies that premise, who will deny that at a time of high income in his business, of high profits, of high prosperity, he should proceed to retire the debt on his business by an amount at least equal to the carrying charges on his debt. Of course, most businessmen will tell us that it is sound debt retirement practice to pay much more than that. If it is good practice in an individual business in times of high prosperity to pay more than the carrying charges on a business debt, then it is a good rule to apply to the public debt. The American people, not the Government of the United States, owe a debt which is, in round figures, approximately $260,000,000,000. It is a public debt. It is the debt of all the people of the country. The carrying charges on that debt are in excess of $5,000,000,000. I understand that they amount to $5,250,000,000.

"I say, Mr. President, we ought to practice good business policy in Government, also, and as politicians, we ought to have the courage and the vision to tell the American people that they should tighten their belts and pay annually at least $5,000,000,000 on the national debt. With the international situation what it is with the potential dangers in that situation, with the potential future expenditures that may be imposed upon us in case things shall not go so well internationally, the debt will become greater, rather than smaller. So, Mr. President, I register again this year, as I did last year, my dissent from the proposition that we should pay only $2,500,000,000 on the national debt. That is only half enough as a minimum.

"Mr. President, my faith in the sound judgment of the American people is such that I still believe that if we made the economic facts known to the people, if they understood the relationship of the public debt to their own individual prosperity, if they understood the relationship of the debt to maintaining a solvent Government, they would say, "If you can prove to us, if you can satisfy us, that you have cut all unnecessary Government expenditures to the bone, that you have economized without adopting a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, we are ready to say you, as Senators and Congressmen, should authorize the paying of at least $5,000,000,000 on the debt."

I hope that my discussion of the reasons behind my votes on the Taft-Hartley bill and the 1948 tax bill will illustrate for you both the subjective and objective factors which produce votes in the Senate. I hope also that this discussion of my wrestle with problems of political ethics will show you students that there is a practical relationship between classroom theories of representative government and representative government in practice. I hope for something else too, namely, that you will ponder the question as to whether or not I am right in my view or just indulging in wishful thinking when I say that I think what the American people want most of all from their politicians is an exercise of an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as established by the evidence made available to them. If I am right about that, then constitutional liberalism can move forward with the enlightenment of the people. Even against odds, it has a fighting chance of preserving representative government in America by ever seeking to accomplish the full measure of its primary objective of protecting the economic and political weak from the exploitation of the economic and political strong, but doing it within the framework of a private property economy and in accordance with the legal principles and guarantees of our Constitution, including its precious bill of human rights.

I close by suggesting that unless we rededicate ourselves to such a faith in government by free men and back up that faith by maintaining free men in political office in this country, representative self-government in America will continue to be weakened and will not forever endure. In pondering our ethical obligations to constitutional liberalism, from which stem our rights as a free people, let us take strength and inspiration from those lines of Louis Untermeyer which bespeak so well his philosophy of political liberalism:

"Ever insurgent let me be,
Make me more daring than devout;
From sleek contentment keep me free,
And fill me with a buoyant doubt.

Open my eyes to visions girt
With beauty, and with wonder lit—
But let me always see the dirt,
And all that spawn and die in it.

Open my ears to music; let
Me thrill with Spring's first flutes and drums—
But never let me dare forget
The bitter ballads of the slums.

From compromise and things half-done
Keep me with stern and stubborn pride—
And, when, at last, the fight is won,
God keep me still unsatisfied."

Are We Acting Fairly With the Polish People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is a great historical anniversary for Poland, and it is also an anniversary for the history of democracy. On May 3, 1791, the Parliament of Poland adopted a constitution inspired by the great movements of the time, and it was the first constitution to be voted on the European Continent. Yes, earlier than the one of France. Whereas the French Constitution was the outcome of a revolutionary upheaval marked with terror and blood, in Poland the constitution was a document of the democratic spirit of a nation, a document that, trying to do away with medieval privileges, gave equality to a great part of the population and promised equality to the Polish peasant. But this manifestation of brotherhood within a nation, unfortunately, could not succeed in a period where Poland was surrounded by enemies fearful of that very same progressive spirit which had inspired the Constitution of America across the ocean and was spreading all over Europe. So Poland as a state was wiped off the map for 150 years, and it was only in 1918 that she regained her freedom.

All of you know what the brave nation of Poles endured in the period of occupation during the recent war, and how heroically she resisted.

I submit that a nation who on that 3d of May 1791 already ventured to be the first in Europe to introduce such progressive reforms, a nation who suffered so enormously during two periods of subjugation and so actively fought on for her freedom—I submit that such a na-

tion deserves some attention on our part; that it is worthwhile on that anniversary day to take a look at how that country is doing now.

Our attitude toward the present Government of Poland is something I need not dwell upon. Many among us are against that Government. We expressed this attitude of ours on many occasions, and not only by words, but by action. But meanwhile we forgot about the people that are there, people who are working hard and building their country anew. We forgot about it that in withdrawing from Poland—I repeat, from Poland—our help, we are withdrawing that help from 24,000,000 Poles who are laboring in the sweat of their brows, who are doing their utmost to build anew their shattered towns, to operate their depleted factories, to gather their crops out of a soil rendered fallow by the oppressor, to tear their coal out of the earth, that precious coal which is a prerequisite of the reconstruction of Europe as a whole.

We refused Poland any post-UNRRA relief, we are opposing a loan for Poland from the World Bank, we are making things difficult for Poland at every occasion. And these difficulties are affecting mainly the Polish people, and not, as we take it, merely the Polish Government. I suggest that we cannot suspect Great Britain, our friend, of being friendly to communism. Nevertheless, I read in the London Times of April 22, and I quote:

> Two big credits for borrowers in Poland have been opened by London banking houses. The total amount involved is £7,500,000. The larger credit is for £6,000,000, running for 3 years and designed to cover the purchase of capital goods by Poland in this country. It has been granted by Lazard Brothers and Lloyds Bank to the National Economic Bank of Poland. The smaller credit is a revolving credit, under which short-term bills can be drawn by the Polish borrower up to a maximum amount of £1,500,000 outstanding at any time, for the purchase of wool. This has been granted by Kleinwort & Sons to the Polish Commercial Bank.
>
> The credits are a natural consequence of the recent Anglo-Polish trade agreement and have been guaranteed by the Export Credits Guarantee Department. They will be repaid out of the proceeds of Polish exports of food and other goods to the United Kingdom. The trade agreement contemplated an increase in British imports from Poland during the next few years.

What is it that Poland needs this money and aid for? She needs it for reconstruction, for reconstruction of her coal mines in the first place, and Polish coal is a commodity by which a major part of Europe is being supplied with today. Let us not forget that despite all that we are doing in order to make Poland turn her back on western Europe, two-thirds of Poland's entire export of coal is going to the west. Industries in several European countries would have been stopped if it were not for Polish coal. I read from the New York Times, April 25:

> WARSAW, April 24.—Poland and Sweden signed a 1-year trade agreement today, effective May 1. Under it Poland will send 4,000,000 tons of coal, coke, and other exports to Sweden, valued at 280,000,000 Swedish crowns ($77,840,000). She will receive from Sweden cellulose, iron ore, machinery, and horses valued at 150,000,000 crowns ($41,700,000).

It is worth while noting that according to that treaty Poland is extending to Sweden a credit of $36,000,000.

In this same New York Times I read on April 27 that the output of coal reached in Poland 5,782,000 tons in March.

All this is no surprise to me, and it should not be to anybody. Almost a year ago Col. R. L. Harrison, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture wrote in his released report to the Secretary of State after his visit in Poland:

> The industrial section of Silesia presents a scene of bustling activity. As a matter of fact, it is by far the most active industrial area members of the mission have observed outside the United States.

It is an irony of fate that it was just on the basis of that report that we refused Poland our aid, a very important aid because it was to consist of grain for a hungry population.

Poland requested two kinds of aid: Credits for the purchase of modern mining equipment that could enlarge her production and consequently her coal exports, and grain for her population. Both were refused by us, and for reasons purely political which actually on the one hand were void of economical and, on the other hand, of humanitarian motives. In spite of that, Poland managed by herself, as we can see from the results. And in spite of our attitude, Poland does not reciprocate. There is no doubt that a continuous busy trade among eastern and western Europe is in the interest of the western European countries whom our administration tries to put on their feet economically, by way of ERP. Without that east-west trade the operation of the ERP will be much more difficult, and in any case will cost us a great deal more. Eastern Europe is a potential European granary, and consequently has less to lose by the disruption of such trade. A correspondent from Geneva writes on April 30 in the New York Times:

> The potential expansion of trade between east and west Europe is greater than Washington's plans seem to envisage. The plan of the Paris Economic Conference originally included the revival of food and certain other imports from eastern Europe by the end of the recovery program period. If a revival of this trade does not develop, it is recognized on all sides that Europe's need for dollar aid will continue indefinitely beyond the end of the recovery period.
>
> What European economists think the United States Government does not fully appreciate is that this trade could not only recover its prewar importance, but in certain key sectors could make a rapid and substantial reduction in western Europe's dollar needs during the recovery program period.

Although we are doing everything to alienate Poland, all the official declarations of the Polish Government tell the same story: "We want trade with the west and we will keep on exporting to the west."

Since the war we have dumped over $3,000,000,000 into Germany. At the same time, while the United States shows a negative attitude toward Poland and does not want to render her any assistance, an additional one and a half billion dollars are being assigned to the reconstruction of Germany—a Germany that twice within the span of our lifetime caused world wars in which also our American youth fought, bled, and died. This Germany that brought about such untold catastrophe, this Germany that extinguished millions upon millions of human lives, is being pitied by us now. And yet poor Germany is already today in a position to export to this country luxury cars. In New York you can buy a Daimler for $7,500 without being placed on a waiting list.

Our policy toward Germany is bound to embitter the Poles. I would like to stress here that whereas among the Polish émigrés abroad and the Poles at home there exist sharp differences in political opinion, there are no differences with respect to the German question. On the German question all the Poles are in agreement. Their capital was shattered to the ground by a German general Von Dem Bach. Under his command, more than 200,000 civilians in Warsaw were put to death. And yet our military authorities in Germany refuse to give that man up for trial, along with three other Nazi generals who did similar things.

There are no Poles to whom the question of the western frontiers of Poland could present a controversial problem. To all of them the frontiers on the Oder and Neisse Rivers are final. Those western territories by now have been settled by 5,000,000 Poles. This was done under the greatest of hardships. They are now bustling with economic activity—transportation has been not only restored but further developed, factories are running, mines are being operated.

All Poles are watching with anxiety as we are stowing away one and a half billion dollars into a country which, as experience has taught us, is only waiting for the moment when it will be able to wage war again. All Poles must be surprised that the history of the last World War and the period between the wars did not teach us anything.

The Poles have every reason on earth to hate the Germans. And nevertheless, the Polish policy toward the Germans is not a policy of revenge. Although for six long years of war Germany did not recognize anything but a policy of biological extermination of the Polish Nation, Poland has declared several times that with a democratic Germany who would not covet the idea of revenge and the bringing up of another war, Poland will entertain good neighborly relations. Poland already shows her readiness to entertain trade relations with Germany, and she is exporting her potatoes to all three zones. The fact, however, that Poland does not desire Germany's starvation does not mean that she should want Germany to be rebuilt ahead of Poland. And that is a very understandable and natural desire.

Speaking today about Poland on the occasion of the constitution of May 3, I would like to recall the traditional bonds of friendship existing between the United States and the Polish Nation for almost two centuries. Such Poles as Kosciusko and Pulaski fought on our soil for a free

America. That friendship and interest for America is still alive in Poland. Let me cite an instance: In the Publisher's Weekly issued in January, I noted with genuine satisfaction a record of American books imported by Poland:

1937	$2,300
1938	2,900
1946	250,000
1947 (first 9 months)	230,000

This is more than the total amount of American books imported by Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Sweden taken together. To cite another instance: There have been more Polish students studying on fellowships in the United States in the years 1945–48 than in the whole period of 1918–39. Although these are only two examples, it is nevertheless the expression of a general attitude.

Despite the whole complicated political situation, despite the growing dissent between East and West, the Polish people are showing both by their economic and their cultural policies that they regard these frictions as wrong, and they actually express their desires for peace, trade, and commerce by constructive action.

By their heroism during the war they deserve the help of the world, because they were the first ones to defend themselves, arms in hand, against the Nazi invasion. By their economic efficiency and the results obtained for a considerable time, without help from the outside, they have proved that they are a people worthy of receiving our loans and credits. By their economical policy they have proved that they desire help not for selfish reasons, but that the goods produced by them are being shared by every needy nation.

I am of Polish extraction myself, and I know that the Poles are a proud people. They are not beggars. If we persist in our present policy, they will turn away from us in disappointment and bitterness much as they do not desire to do it. I am afraid that we are forgetting people who were our faithful friends and allies. I think that the best way of paying our tribute on this traditional Polish anniversary is by asking ourselves whether we are acting wisely and justly with the Polish people and the Polish Nation.

Review by William E. Bohn of Book by Henry A. Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very penetrating review of the book recently written by Mr. Henry A. Wallace. The review is by Mr. William E. Bohn, and it appears in the May 1, 1948, issue of the publication The New Leader.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOME FRONT—HENRY WALLACE AND GOD

(By William E. Bohn)

Henry Wallace believes in God. Whether God believes in Henry Wallace has not yet been revealed. The Wallace campaign and especially, his last book (Toward World Peace. Reynal & Hitchcock; 121 pp., $1.75) present curiously interesting problems. There have been a good many rumors about the authorship of this campaign material. We are told on good authority that it is produced by a brain-trust close to the Communist Party. The reading of this last book weakens my faith in any such reports. These chapters have all the qualities of the hazy, hortatory, and hallucinary Henry.

Twice in this slender volume the leader of the third party proclaims his faith in God. These statements of faith have relevance as part of the author's declaration of innocence of Communist taint. He is accused of being a follower of Stalin. He replied: "No; I can't be a Communist, for I believe in God." The implications of this argument, however, he never follows through. Just why a clever fellow could not reconcile belief in the Supreme Being with faith in the Politburo he never elucidates.

But the attitude of prophetic authority is consistently maintained. This man is not merely one among a host of humble and democratic believers. He has a special commission to speak for the Creator and Ruler of the universe. Functioning under the terms of this commission, he has no hesitation about according the Stalinists a favored position as teacher's pets. It is true that their dialectical materialism is logically heretical and that they are a bit careless about the gentleness and mercy so highly commended in the New Testament. But otherwise they are good people who can easily be accepted in Preacher Wallace's church.

But the rulers of non-Communist countries are a thoroughly bad lot. The "reactionary capitalists" who control the United States of America, are, naturally, the lowest of the low. The imperialists who rule Brittania are next to the bottom grade. And so it goes. The more civilized and democratic a country is, and the closer it is to our own land, the worse the rating that is given to its ruling groups. The psychological drive at the bottom of this way of ranging men and nations seems to be a relentless guilt complex. The writer seems to feel that the evils of the world are chiefly due to American sins. The guilt of other countries varies directly with their nearness to us. Those farthest removed and most different from us have the best chance to be saved.

Except for those of Russia, Wallace and his new party are against all rulers, capitalists and military leaders. In their view, the people of the United States did not select their rulers. Otherwise, how could the people be so good and the rulers so bad? In advance of election day he has accepted the authority to speak for the people. And not only the American people. He also stands for the common people of China, India, Africa and all the islands of all the seas. His mandate from God authorizes him to voice the views of all the poor and humble against the rich and strong. With the exception, that is, of the poor and humble of Russia. There is never the slightest hint that they might have cause for complaint against their rulers. But the rest of the little, creeping, common folks badly need a friend—and here he is, offering himself freely and not too modestly.

THE FAITH IN LEADERS

One strange thing about Henry Wallace's statement of faith is its implicit lack of confidence in the common people. They are little and weak and poor and so make a powerful appeal to the author's sympathies, but they are nowhere credited with much in the way of good sense. In this country people have been voting for more than 150 years. Yet we are told that "organized groups" came in and took over the Government. So democracy needs "to develop a sense of direction and participation. This means continuous education and inspiration by leaders who have in their make-up a complete allegiance to the long-time welfare of humanity." In Wallace's philosophy as in that of Stalin the poor, dear people are to play the part of docile sheep.

This attitude is especially striking whenever the third-party leader gets to talking about trade-unionists. Such union officials as William Green and Philip Murray were elected to their positions by the votes of their members, but this fact carries little weight. They are among the great and strong and must be opposed on behalf of the small and the weak. Therefore, Wallace, a complete outsider as far as the trade-union movement is concerned, does not hesitate to pronounce sentence against them. "These leaders are betraying labor," he says. The implication is that his leadership would be better. Such passages must make interesting reading for active trade-unionists.

THE CREDENTIALS OF LEADERSHIP

Since history began, the credentials of the self-selected leader have consisted chiefly of an overwhelming conviction of his own goodness and wisdom. These qualities are not to be vulgarly proved in the marketplace of thought and action. If one were to judge Wallace by a checking up of the statements and assumptions of this volume, the conclusion would be that he is neither wise nor good. He is, for one thing, very careless in his handling of facts. I could have filled my entire column with quotations easily recognizable as perversions of the truth. I do not believe that the former Vice President is consciously lying. I think that he is swept along by his general notion of his mission and that he has the sort of mind which is not particular about such details. Someone really should ask God whether a chap who is so slap happy about facts would be a trustworthy leader for even the poorest among the poor or the lowliest among the low.

The Strike of the Packing-House Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30) 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on last Friday I discussed the packing-house workers' strike. In connection with my remarks of last Friday I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some correspondence between Mr. Ralph Helstein, president, United Packing House Workers of America, and Mr. E. Howard Hill, president, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; an editorial from the Des Moines Register of April 24, 1948, entitled "Iowa Farmers Are Directly Affected"; an editorial entitled "The Packers Should Cooperate," by K. M. Landis, 2d, in the Chicago Sun-Times of April 29, 1948; an article entitled "Butchers Sense Packers Creating Meat Price Crisis"; and an article entitled "Short Supply

Termed Cause of Meat Price Hikes," published in the Moorhead (Minn.) Daily News of March 30, 1948.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, April 19, 1948.

Mr. RALPH HELSTEIN,
President, United Packinghouse Workers of America, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. HELSTEIN: Here in Iowa the Farm Bureau has recently completed a series of district meetings over the State with farm leaders. These meetings were not called for the purpose of discussing the strike situation, but the importance of it and the way that farmers are being affected naturally occupied a considerable part of the discussion.

Many farmers are forced to feed livestock which would have been marketed several weeks ago could they have found an outlet. They are forced to use feed that they had intended for their new crop of livestock, and many of them are running out of feed entirely. It certainly is costing farmers a lot of money and waste when they have to feed $2.25-a-bushel corn to hogs that are docked for excess weight when they are sold.

May I suggest that the packers and the union involved in the strike each choose a representative to serve on an arbitration board and let these individuals choose a third person. Let this committee of three, after a complete and thorough study, recommend a settlement and then both parties abide by the recommendation.

It is urgent and imperative that the packing plants be opened quickly so that farmers can get their livestock to market. The farmer is caught as an innocent, but yet a vitally affected, bystander in this controversy. We insist that this disagreement be settled at an early date.

Sincerely yours,
IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
E. HOWARD HILL, *President.*

UNITED PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., April 22, 1948.

Mr. E. HOWARD HILL,
President, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR MR. HILL: Prior to the commencement of the strike on March 16, we had, as you may undoubtedly know, accepted a proposal submitted by the Federal Conciliation Service to submit the issues in dispute to arbitration. Subsequently, before the Board of Inquiry appointed by the President, we proposed that that Board be converted into a private arbitration tribunal for the purpose of making a final decision and giving some meaning to a board set up under the Taft-Hartley law.

Those proposals were categorically rejected by the packers. We are very appreciative of the problems faced by the farmers and we agree with you that a prolongation of the dispute places special burdens on the raisers and feeders of livestock. Feeling as we do, therefore, with due consideration to the requirements of the public interest, we are prepared to stand by our previous suggestion to submit this issue to arbitration.

The method of arbitration proposed by you in your communication of April 19 would be acceptable to us and we are perfectly willing to name the union's representative to such a tribunal upon receiving advice that the packers have made a similar commitment.

In view of the events of the past few weeks, it would appear that the arbitration proposal made you should be considered in an entirely new light and that responsible persons should seek avenues for resolving this dispute.

Sincerely yours.

RALPH HELSTEIN,
President.

[From the Des Moines Register of April 24, 1948]

IOWA FARMERS ARE DIRECTLY AFFECTED

When Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, proposed an arbitration board to settle the packing strike, a spokesman for Wilson & Co. asked "What authority does Mr. Hill have to make this proposal? It is difficult to comment because we do not know what direct bearing Mr. Hill has."

We can answer that question.

Howard Hill is president of an organization whose membership covers well over half of Iowa's farmers. Iowa farmers produce more meat animals than farmers of any other State.

They produce, year in and year out:

One-fifth of the Nation's hogs, leading all other States by a big margin.

One-twelfth of the Nation's beef, leading all States (even Texas).

That isn't all.

Iowa is among the top States in the proportion of its livestock which is sold to packing plants. Many States have considerable farm slaughter and small butcher-shop slaughter. Iowa's meat industry is almost completely commercial. It is dependent upon the packing industry to handle its product.

That gives Howard Hill plenty of authority, we would say.

[K. M. Landis 2d column in the Chicago Sun-Times of April 29, 1948]

THE PACKERS SHOULD COOPERATE

Our attention has been directed to many outside matters of late, to the Italian election, the Bogota riots, and the tension in Berlin.

As a result, the strike of the CIO packinghouse workers against the big four packers has had a hard time getting a place in the papers.

For the most of us it has been a kind of minor annoyance, not to be compared for excitement to the contemptuous activities of John L. Lewis.

But a couple of bizarre incidents recently have attracted more than passing notice. One of them involves Armour & Co., whose profit before taxes last year was five times what it was in 1939.

Nobody paid any attention when this company, after accepting President Truman's appeal to resume wage negotiations, walked out at the first meeting, and announced plans to break the strike.

But in Chicago last week a picket was crushed beneath the wheels of a trailer truck that was driven on police signal through the picket line at Armour's soap plant. He left surviving a wife and child.

At the coroner's inquest, the deceased was accused of assaulting the truck, and Armour's attorneys went into circuit court to obtain an injunction against any further violence.

No doubt there has been violence on both sides, but the incident which occurred at the Cudahy Packing Co. plant in Kansas City, Kans., was especially noteworthy.

"You're to crack skulls if they ask for it," said Police Captain Dahlin in a pep talk to his force before clearing the main plant gate of pickets.

Fleeing for safety to their union hall, the pickets were closely pursued by 70 policemen, led by Dahlin. After breaking down the door, the police tackled defenseless men and women with equal courage. Here is the Associated Press summation:

"In a matter of minutes after police arrived the hall was empty. Broken glass littered the floor. Some union members jumped through windows to escape club-swinging policemen. Women screamed. Chairs were over-turned. Blood was spattered on walls and floor. Ten persons, two of them women, were treated at hospitals."

According to Captain Dahlin, no arrests were made. Certainly this was a curious victory for law and order. On the very same day the Wilson Co. demanded that the Government abandon its mediation efforts which would "only prolong the strike."

Who's running this Government anyway? It seems to me that the big four packers should be a little more cooperative, considering the help they have been getting.

[From the Moorhead (Minn.) Daily News of March 30, 1948]

BUTCHERS SENSE PACKERS CREATING MEAT CRISIS—RETAIL DEALER "TAKING IT IN NECK" FROM WHOLESALE ADVANCES

(By Brice Worthington)

Moorhead and Fargo butchers were grumbling today over what they sensed was an unjustifiable condition created on the meat market that was causing them to take a profit licking that ranged from 5 to 10 percent gross.

The opinion of most of the meat dealers was that the difference between the livestock market and the wholesale price of meat was inconsistent with normal times. They complained they must figure on a smaller gross profit and volume sales to come out.

COMPARISON TO JUSTIFY COMPLAINT

One butcher drew a comparison to justify the complaint. He indicated that normal wholesale prices run about double the livestock market price. He said the live market today is 20 to 22 cents on pork loin, for instance, and that one packer was asking 50 cents for that particular cut.

ONLY ONE FAILS TO CONCUR

Only one retail meat dealer among seven of the larger operator in these twin cities who were contacted by this writer in a survey today failed to concur in the general concensus of opinion.

Most of the protesting meat retailers asserted that they felt the retail dealer was "taking it on the neck" while the packers were profiting by unjustifiable wholesale price advances. Still another admitted that unexplainable wholesale advances had been encountered by his market, but he was hesitant to put his finger on just why the condition existed.

One Fargo dealer was especially vociferous in his complaint. "I think the packers are using the strike as an excuse for the high prices, while they are contrary to the law of supply and demand. Mind you, the strike is their current excuse. I think they use just any excuse they can get hold of, and the strike is the reason for the present higher prices," he said.

"I CAN'T UNDERSTAND MATTER"

A Moorhead butcher pointed out developments since last fall. "I'm sure the packers are unloading at a profit now," he said. "Last fall they tried to get us to load up, preaching that this spring would see market shortages and higher prices. They now are trying to justify their arguments of last fall, when the market break of a couple of months ago changed any possibility of that situation."

This meat dealer went to length to point out things "I cannot understand about this matter."

"The consumer demand is down a little," he explained. "The prices lessened the demand some, but it seems to be natural attitude that started earlier in the East and seems to be beginning to appear here.

We are getting back to a phase of normalcy in buying, but we are not experiencing a consistent drop in wholesale prices."

FIVE TO TEN PERCENT LOSS

This dealer said the loss he is having to take in his normal expected gross profit ranges from 5 to 10 percent, depending upon the particular cut of meat.

A Fargo dealer who concurred in the opinion that the wholesale rate was unfair, said his firm was taking "at least a 10-percent licking." Right after the strike came the price on just about everything jumped from 5 to 6 cents higher, while the live market didn't change appreciably.

"They said the demand was greater, but we didn't have any more calls for business to reflect this."

CONTRASTING VIEWS

The opinion of another large Fargo dealer was in complete contrast. "Our gross is running about the same," he indicated, "and we have experienced no losses in gross percentages. We are big buyers and it might be that the smaller buyers are getting a bad time, but we have absolutely nothing to complain about at our place."

The butchers who objected to the existing wholesale market conditions explained that they were forced to take a cut on their normal profit due to the high wholesale levels. "We cannot ask our customers, whom we know are not making enough to pay it, to dole out the money that would be expected if we marked up the cuts the normal amount. They have to eat and we have to live. If we charged the full mark-up, one of these days we'd have no customers."

THING OF THE PAST

As one Moorhead butcher put it, "The old 30 percent gross mark-up is a thing of the past. It's all baloney. We are getting no more than about 12 percent now."

Another Moorhead dealer pointed out a condition that he cannot understand in the beef market. Research during the war, he explained, developed by-products from the carcass that provide a good revenue from pharmacy houses. The large packers work in volume that makes it worth their while to capitalize on these by-products.

BYPRODUCT REVENUE

"The proportionate beef price is in line so far as the live market goes," he explained. "But this is not taking into consideration the added revenue realized from the byproducts. There is a margin there what you might expect to be passed on to the consumer. But it isn't."

He explained that butchers cannot force the packers to pass on this additional saving because "small operators can get beef a little cheaper by buying from the packer than he can by cutting his own."

Another butcher had a different angle. "We got both barrels when the strike came. The price on pork loins jumped quickly from 38 to 55 cents. They were capitalizing on anticipated Easter business and using the strike as an excuse for the advance. The prices now are moving back to normal, but not before we butchers took it in the neck."

[From the Moorhead (Minn.) Daily News of March 30, 1948]

SHORT SUPPLY TERMED CAUSE OF MEAT-PRICE HIKES—AREA MEAT SUPPLIES "REASONABLY" GOOD; DEALERS CITE FACTORS

Four local wholesale meat dealers today indicated that meat supplies were "reasonably" good in this area, and most gave the opinion that higher wholesale prices recently could be attributed to the "short supply."

Firms that were not affected by the United Packing House Workers of America (CIO) strike indicated that the walk-out could have some small bearing on the supply, but emphasized that other factors also entered in.

OTHER FACTORS

A Swift & Co. spokesman gave the opinion that the strike could have affected the supply to a degree, but also pointed out such factors as bad roads and plentiful money in the pockets of farmers who are not pressed by need in bringing their animals to the market, entered into the picture.

The John Morrell & Co. office indicated that it had nothing on storage and all operations were off the line. The firm, like Swift, was not more than indirectly affected by the strike.

Armour & Co. reported that the supply of beef and pork was reasonably good. This plant was most affected on smoked meats and sausage. The freezer stock is almost all gone, a company spokesman said. The company only had about three carloads of frozen stock at the outset of the strike and will be all out by tomorrow.

Armour's sales were reported to be down by about 50 percent. A company spokesman, discussing the prices as related to the strike, indicated that the beef price was affected somewhat, but that pork did alter seriously, especially in this area.

HIGHER PRICE LEVEL

Armour production losses at West Fargo are offset by production at its Grand Forks plant, which was not affected by the strike.

The Northwest Sausage Co., an independent outfit which jobs meat from six different packers, pointed to a definite higher price level. "We operate on a percentage basis," one of its officials said, "and our price is directly related to what is charged by the packer."

One packer indicated that cow prices had reflected a short supply 3 weeks before the strike occurred, and the walk-out merely accentuated the situation.

Unification of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Marshall Andrews, reporter on the Washington Post, on the subject Cry of Unification Still Far Cry From It. I believe this article is worthy of the careful consideration of every Member of Congress:

CRY OF UNIFICATION STILL FAR CRY FROM IT

(By Marshall Andrews)

Confusion over the Nation's military needs is further confounded by a strange double-barreled contradiction:

1. Unification has not unified the armed services.

2. Many Members of Congress and most citizens assume that it has.

The result of this situation is an understandable impatience with the Military Establishment at its inability to get together and advise the country with some unanimity what it needs for security. Having given the armed forces what was termed unification, Congress and the public expect it to work but find that it does not.

What the armed services got, of course, was a compromise. It was a compromised compromise at that, very different from the sort of unification from which so much was promised back in 1946.

It started out as a compromise of seemingly irreconcilable differences between the Army and Navy. It was further compromised in committees of the House and Senate. Still more compromises were written into the bill on the floors of both Houses, and finally it was radically compromised in conference to adjust differences between versions passed by House and Senate.

As it was ultimately enacted and signed by President Truman July 26, 1947, this compromise unification measure bristled with assurances that nobody would be hurt by it. The Navy was guaranteed its Marine Corps (for which there had previously been no statutory provision) and its aviation. The Air Force realized its dream of a quarter century and was set up as a separate arm.

ASK NO GUARANTIES

The Army, which had fought the unification fight from the outset, received no guaranties and asked for none. And it had compromised out of the bill what it considered absolutely essential to the success of unification.

That was a chain of command within the Military Establishment, headed by a Chief of Staff and coordinating the efforts and activities of all three services through a joint staff with members from all three. Lack of such a chain of command, Army officers now contend, was responsible for the criticism heaped upon the Military Establishment because of its unreadiness when called upon for a program to carry out President Truman's St. Patrick's Day request for strengthened military muscle.

What had happened was this:

Called upon to submit such a program, the Military Establishment had no central planning organization to draw it up on the basis of the Nation's over-all need and to compel compliance of all services with such a balanced plan. Instead, each service submitted the postwar program it had prepared after VJ-day which, of course, was loaded in its favor.

TOTAL COST NINE BILLIONS

The total cost of this three-headed monster was $9,000,000,000. President Truman promptly whacked it down to three billion and told the Military Establishment to meet that figure. With no central planning organization, no joint staff, it simply could not be done in the limited time available, if at all.

So the Armed Services Committee of Congress, particularly that of the Senate, got the job of doing what should have been done by a unified military establishment. What they received from the military establishment was another compromise, hastily arrived at, unconvincing and supported with reluctance by the Air Force. Under pressure from committee members this unstable support collapsed and the unified military establishment was caught with its unity down.

Convinced that they had ended possibility of any such embarrassing contretemps when they unified the armed services last year, members of the committee and of Congress were outraged. Many were vociferous in denouncing armed force inefficiency and their cries were taken up by numerous special writers and radio commentators who also thought unification was a fact.

It was Congress itself, however, which had withheld from the military establishment the instrument of command, which is vital to military efficiency, and left in its place only the right to compromise, which is fatal.

FIRST PRESENTED IN 1944

In order to understand the course of evolution whereby the present hydra-headed unification came into being, it is necessary to go back to 1944, when victory was in sight and the armed services began thinking of the future. The first recent plan for unification was presented to Congress then.

From April 24, 1944, until May 19, the House Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy held hearings on the subject. The Army presented a plan for unification; the Navy was noncommittal and recommended further study. The committee decided the time was inopportune for going ahead with unification.

During the hearings, the Joint Chiefs of Staff set up a committee with two representatives from each branch to study the matter. A year later, on May 15, 1945, former Chairman Walsh, Democrat, Massachusetts,

of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, suggested to the Navy that it go into the matter of an alternative to unification. On June 19, then Navy Secretary Forrestal appointed Ferdinand Eberstadt to make such a study.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff's committee reported April 11, 1945, that a majority favored a single military department, only Admiral J. O. Richardson dissenting. It also reported that a majority of Army officers consulted favored unification, as did almost exactly half of Navy officers interviewed.

Eberstadt's report was handed to Forrestal September 25, 1945. It opposed establishment of a single department and favored three coordinated arms, each headed by a civilian of Cabinet rank and tied together by a system of committees and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

PROPOSED SINGLE DEPARTMENT

On October 17, 1945, the War Department presented a plan for unification to the Senate Military Committee. This plan proposed a single military department headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank, a civilian Undersecretary, and three or more civilian Assistant Secretaries to coordinate research, procurement, legislative affairs, information, and the like.

Militarily, the three services would be headed by a Chief of Staff with a Joint Staff to coordinate military functions. Each service in turn, would be headed by a Chief of Staff and there would be a fourth Service of Supply and Hospitalization, also headed by a Chief responsible to the Chief of Staff.

There, then, are the opposing views at the start, and the clear line of cleavage between Army and Navy thinking on unification. Debate between the services grew warm, then acrimonious. So bitter did this dissension over unity finally become that President Truman stepped in and, in a message to Congress, endeavored to find a point of agreement.

On December 19, 1945, he laid down a seven-point program for unification. His plan included the Army's single department and Chief of Staff. These recommendations were written into a bill, which also included many of Eberstadt's recommendations, by a Military Affairs Subcommittee and this bill was favorably reported by the full committee May 13, 1946.

This compromise, however, was vigorously opposed by the Navy in hearing before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, which did not report it out.

President Truman once more stepped in to halt the Army-Navy debate which now raged hotter than ever. He ordered the two Departments to get together and stop their public quarreling.

So two officers were appointed by the services to work out a compromise. These officers were Maj. Gen.—now Lt. Gen.—Laurie Norstad of the Air Forces, and Vice Adm. Forrest Sherman of the Navy. There was no Army officer, although Norstad was then War Department director of plans and operations.

Meanwhile, the Army-Navy quarrel had so broadened that it involved congressional committees on both sides of the fence. On May 15, Walsh and Chairman VINSON, Democat of Georgia of the House Naval Committee, wrote to Forrestal that it was doubtful if Congress would agree on any bill providing for a single department. They were promptly chided by the Democratic whips in both Houses for their "presumption" in speaking for Congress as a whole.

Although the subcommittee bill was revised, opposition continued so strong that Mr. Truman finally asked that it be dropped. Norstad and Sherman were still at work on their compromise.

WAR AND NAVY AGREE

Then, on December 16, 1946, the War and Navy Departments announced agreement on a unification bill. The President pronounced it "an admirable comprise" and "a thoroughly practical and workable plan of unification." It was a compromise indeed, but how workable and practical time alone could reveal.

This plan contained 12 principal points, including a single department under a civilian secretary with a separate air force and Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force without Cabinet rank. There would be no chief of staff and no joint staff. A Council of National Defense, a National Security Resources Board, and a Central Intelligence Agency were provided for and the Joint Chiefs of Staff retained.

This compromise represented a horse trade between the Army and Navy on the single department and the chief of staff, the Navy accepted the single department in exchange for elimination of the chief of staff. The Navy's acceptance still was grudging, however, since the conferees reported that they were in disagreement over the single department.

The Air Force got its semiautonomy, which was the largest single advantage derived from the compromise. The Navy swallowed the single department, but in considerably diluted form, and gained statutory recognition of its right to its own aviation and Marine Corps. The Army lost its Chief of Staff and gained nothing except the theory of unification.

PLACED ON STATUTE BOOKS

This was the version which, after further compromise in Congress, was enacted and placed on the statute books. The present National Military Establishment functions under its provisions.

Contrary to widespread belief the Military Establishment is an exceedingly loosely knit organization. Its chief, the Secretary of National Defense, exercise no real authority, since his supposedly subordinate Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air may go over his head to the President at any time.

It has no military chain of command and no planning organization for the establishment as a whole, with the result that it is virtually impossible for it to act in any matter as a concerted whole. Without such a chain of command it is unwieldly, inarticulate, and fumbling.

Ironically enough, Secretary of Defense Forrestal is one of the chief authors of his present dilemma. As Secretary of the Navy he fought real unification valiantly and long and now finds himself hampered by lack of the instruments he considered oppressive.

In testimony before the House Expenditures Committee April 24, 1947, he envisaged the difficulties in the complex task of integration and unification of our Defense Establishment, but felt proper selection of the three secretaries of the arms would overcome them.

"There will be," he said, "no room for friction and, if it occurs, disaster could be the result."

He finds himself now caught in friction so great as to generate a degree of heat hitherto unknown in relations between the services. And he is powerless to modify it without the proper instruments ready to his hand.

Nor is this pervading heat in any manner lessened by the belief, official and private, that unification has unified.

Teaching of the Constitution in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, during Senate debates on the Federal aid-to-education bill, S. 472, I submitted an amendment to establish the requirement that the Constitution of the United States be taught at certain periods in elementary and secondary public schools within those States receiving Federal funds for educational purposes.

I regret to say that my amendment was not adopted because the majority of this legislative body claimed it would be the first step in the control of education in the States by the Federal Government.

I need hardly state now my consistent opposition to all Federal controls which lead to the destruction of our rights and freedoms, but I do not believe the teaching of the Constitution in educational institutions is an infringement of those rights.

In our effort to defeat the spread of false ideologies through vast monetary contributions, we should not ignore the fact that our ability to do so was made possible by our forefathers when they adopted the Constitution and, through this immortal document, provided the American people with the freedoms and opportunities now possessed by few other nations.

If we wish to preserve the foundation of our system of free men—the Constitution of the United States—it stands to reason that the citizens must know its meaning, practice its doctrine, and appreciate its value. How better can this be done than through the education of the youth of America—its future citizens—during its formative period? "Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined."

I am informed that 43 States have made some kind of an effort to require the teaching of the Constitution, but under varying conditions. It is gratifying to me to know that constructive work along this line has been done by the school system of the important city of Newark in my State of New Jersey.

Mr. President, so that Newark's outstanding example may be followed by other school systems throughout the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of April 27, 1948, by Mr. John S. Herron, superintendent of schools, Newark, N. J., together with his report on the monthly conference with principals and supervisory staff, dated October 1, 1947. I urge all who are interested in the training of the future citizens of America to read these statements.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD. as follows:

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Newark, N. J., April 27, 1948.

Hon. ALBERT W. HAWKES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAWKES: I wish to acknowledge receipt of a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing a reprint of your address entitled "Shall We Teach the Constitution in Our Schools." I do not need to tell you that I am in sympathy with that which you tried to bring to the attention of the Congress. Perhaps the legislators were afraid of legislation which would still further tell the schools what to do.

Nevertheless, I want you to know that our Newark schools have been specifically working upon this problem since last September when at the first meeting I held with

principals I directed that in all grades from the eighth year through the senior high school the Constitution of the United States should be reviewed and restudied, particularly with reference to the provisions of the Bill of Rights. We do make provisions at certain times in certain grades for the teaching of the Constitution, but nevertheless, young people are prone to forget. With the communistic threats so imminent, I feel that all young people should have driven home to them year in and year out the blessings of a free America and the fundamental privileges and rights and duties which are theirs as the result of our own Constitution. I feel that school people should meet the communistic challenge by seeing to it that the future citizens of the United States not only know the basic principles of democracy, but that they show an enthusiasm for it and be able to go out and meet the challenge of communistic ideology as it is slyly used to subvert them. As Patrick Henry said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Last April, at a meeting of superintendents of larger cities at Los Angeles, we adopted a resolution calling upon all school systems to teach democracy and the Constitution. Later, in November, at the national meeting of State commissioners of education, that body also came out with a similar resolution.

Even though your proposal was not accepted, I am sure the publicity attendant thereon will bring to a great many school people the necessity of facing this issue squarely.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. HERRON,
Superintendent of Schools.

NEWARK, N. J., *October 1, 1947.*

To: Principals and supervisory staff.

From: John S. Herron, superintendent of schools.

SUPERINTENDENT'S MONTHLY CONFERENCE WITH PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORY STAFF

Topic: Consolidating the improvements in education while stressing fundamental objectives.

A year ago the superintendent presented this topic for consideration by the schools as embracing the objectives of the school system for the year 1946–47. He now asks that principals and teachers hold to the same guiding outline for the present year. These objectives, which are repeated herein, will be valid ones for many years to come, even though emphasis may be varied from time to time.

The solid and substantial elements of education, as of life, remain permanent and valuable. Down through the ages man has sought to improve himself and his environment through the avenue of education. Change has ever been, and will continue to be, a constant and dominant characteristic of life. But the ideals of truth and beauty and improved human relations constitute permanent values for which all mankind will ever continue to search.

Today America holds the torch of enlightenment for a distraught world. To America and the democratic way of life, millions of people look with anxiety as they hope and yearn for freedom and happiness. The schools of America must live up to their mission to strengthen the bonds which will keep men free.

The future citizens of the United States must know the meaning of democracy; they must be trained to appreciate the blessings of a free America; they must be taught through practice the fundamentals of the democratic way of life; and they must know the history of their country and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, including its very heart, the Bill of Rights.

SCHOOL OBJECTIVES FOR 1947–48

1. Some gains which should be consolidated and held permanently:

(a) Respect for the child as a person. This signifies that the teachers are sympathetic and understanding, but nevertheless fair and firm.

(b) The school relieved of undue artificiality and characterized by an approximation of the natural.

(c) The program of the school based on the principle of balance.

(1) A time for play and a time for work.

(2) A time for freedom and a time for discipline and self-control.

(3) A regard for the individual but an equal regard for the group.

(4) A time for browsing and a time for drill.

(5) A time and place for leadership, and a time and place for followership.

(6) Etc., etc.

(d) The school as a community school.

(e) The recognition of functional pupil guidance as vital in the school program.

2. Some specific objectives to be kept before us:

(a) The responsibility of the school to develop an understanding of, a faith in, and a devotion to democracy. This presupposes training pupils in the practice of democracy within the school.

(b) Newark's program of good will and understanding as a basic principle of democracy.

(c) The teaching of the fundamentals of all subjects. Upon the completion of a given unit of a course of study, there are certain minimum fundamental knowledges, habits, and skills, which the pupils of a class or a group shall have mastered. (This generalization is conditioned by a recognition of individual differences.)

(d) The necessity for a rational type of systematic testing. (This world sets up a performance test through which every individual in adult life is judged.)

3. Study of the Constitution of the United States: As an added emphasis to subtopic (a) of the preceding section (section 2), the following directive to principals is given:

Please formulate a school plan for an intensive or a continuing study or review of the Constitution of the United States with particular reference to the Bill of Rights, the checks and balances in the framework of government, the protection of the individual and minorities against the rights of society, etc. It is proposed that this phase of citizenship study be begun in the eighth year and be taken up in each succeeding year of high school. An annual review of the essential elements of democratic government, as exemplified in the Constitution, is little enough time to devote to this instrument of freedom, especially when democracy is under attack on a world-wide scale by Communists.

In the study of the Constitution, the communistic threat to America and the peoples of the world should be met in the schools through an intelligent, logical dissection of communistic philosophy and communistic activities which would trample on human rights, destroy freedom as we know it, and scrap the Bill of Rights. What is said here with reference to communism holds with equal effect for fascism or dictatorships wherever they are found in state governments. However, the primary aim and purpose of this study is to educate American youth to appreciate the virtues of democracy to the end that they will be prepared to defend its principles and to improve its functioning.

If the time element must be considered, then for practical purposes it may be stated that all subjects and activities of the curriculum should relinquish some time in the schedule in order that due study or review may be given to the foundation principles of American democracy.

4. Clean literature campaign: Principals and teachers are requested to lend fullest support to the local campaign inaugurated by the Welfare Federation Youth Council and the joint Parent-Teacher Associations of Newark to rid all newsstands of the city of salacious and indecent magazines and periodicals.

American Participation in European Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address entitled "American Participation in European Recovery," by James D. Mooney, president and chairman of the board of Willys-Overland Motors of Toledo, Ohio, which was delivered on March 18, 1948, at the annual banquet of the American Society of Tool Engineers in Cleveland, Ohio:

AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN RECOVERY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and gentlemen of the American Society of Tool Engineers, your officers have very kindly and indulgently, and at some considerable risk, asked me to speak on American participation in European recovery.

I say, "at some considerable risk," because your officers have hit upon a very novel idea in asking somebody like myself to speak on an economic problem, and particularly an economic problem in the international field.

Economic problems, as you gentlemen very well know, resolve themselves very quickly into practical problems of production and distribution; however, these economic problems may lie generally in the fields of food, clothing, shelter, fuel, or transportation. Furthermore, economic problems in the international field resolve themselves immediately into problems of production and distribution, the practical means for whatever we might consider doing about feeding starving people, or keeping them from freezing to death, or encouraging them to get up from the slough of despond and help themselves.

I say, now that your officers have taken considerable risk in asking an engineer like me, or you, to discuss these problems. We have spent our lives in solving such production and distribution problems, but during the past 20 years it has become fashionable to exclude men like you and me from taking a hand in providing the solutions for economic problems, particularly if they lie in the international field. The idea seems to be that engineers are all right for making war—the country needs engineers for the mass production of ships and planes and guns and ammunition. The country also needs engineers for the use and maintenance of these weapons in the field of military operations, where modern warfare expresses itself in the mass destruction of the enemy's army and navy, and even his civilian population.

But when peace comes, the engineer is shoved aside, in spite of the huge reconstruction problems that present themselves, and in spite of the fact that the engineer, by training and temperament, is more at home in these construction problems, these economic problems, these problems of production and distribution, than he is in the field of war.

The engineer has been shoved aside by the politicians and their satellites, men lustful for power and mumblers of ideological abracadabras.

Accordingly, I am very grateful to your officers who have asked me to make some

practical observations on European recovery and some suggestions for American participation in European recovery.

I have had many years of experience in the production and distribution of automobiles in Europe, but I want to make it quite clear that I haven't any quick or ready or smart answers to the infinite variety of complicated political and economic problems over there. On the other hand, in the light of this same experience, I do think it is about time for us Americans to agree on certain principles that should guide our participation in European recovery.

My purpose tonight, then, is to identify these principles as a guide to the difficult road that lies ahead.

WE ARE READY TO HELP

I think we can begin by agreeing that we are ready in America to sacrifice deeply, to take a lot of skin off our own comfortable hides in order to contribute generously to European recovery.

We are ready to feed the hungry of Europe.

We are ready to supply Europeans with the machinery and equipment and technical know-how to reconstruct their production facilities.

We are ready to help them with their railroad and highway transportation equipment in order to put their distribution systems in better physical condition.

We are ready to supply or finance the supply of raw materials they need in Europe to feed their production facilities.

So much for what we are ready to do.

AN IDENTIFICATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR HELP

Now, I want to identify some of the principles and conditions under which we should help Europe, or any other part of the world.

First, in anything we do we should assume that we Americans have a right and an obligation to guard our own country's long-term enlightened self-interest. An old-fashioned, homely way of putting this is, "Charity begins at home."

Second, it is about time for us to drop the use of such threadbare ideological terms as communism, fascism, and socialism and deal with the international situation in terms of practical power politics. It is about time for us to play ball with the various countries and political power groups who have shown their readiness to play ball with us.

Third, it is a natural corollary of my second point that our occupation forces overseas, whether they are to be considered in Europe or in the Far East, should be maintained only from a strategic military standpoint, and not at all for the purposes of ideology, like making the Germans or Japanese democratic. The American taxpayer is much too "busted" to be able to afford any longer the support of such foolish ideological ventures.

THE ROAD TO PEACE

Fourth, the road to peace during the next several years logically follows the course of our effectively encouraging the development of the production and military strength of the western powers and the political coherence of these western powers. In other words, the road to peace lies in the following direction:

(a) Our maintaining our own production and military strength.

(b) Our assisting our traditional ally, England, and the British Empire to reconstruct her production and military strength.

(c) Our working with the British to reestablish France within the hegemony of western powers.

(d) Our working with the British and French to reestablish German production for the benefit of western Europe and the British Isles.

So much for the political frame within which we should participate in European recovery.

The frame, as you see, is designed for peace. It is based on practical power politics, and on the recognition of the obvious fact that the only real threat to our own American peace, and the peace of the world today is aggressive, belligerent Russia.

ARREST THE TREND TOWARD STATISM

Next, I want to make to you a recommendation in the field of economics for European and world recovery. This recommendation again will be aimed at insuring world peace, and will be based on the recognition of the value of relieving the economic tensions throughout the world. Wars and revolutions are caused principally by hungry bellies.

Before pitching into this recommendation, I want to remind you that most of the countries in Europe, and as a matter of fact, most of the countries in the world, are operating their economies, their production, and distribution schemes, their uses of money, with a high degree of state control. You may call it communism or socialism or fascism, or New Dealism, according to your mood.

The ideological boys began beating the drums for statism shortly after World War I, and the politicians were quick to see the opportunities for consolidating their positions of power in dominating the national life of their respective countres. The movement throughout the world into statism was encouraged by our own so-called New Deal. World War II gave the politicians the golden opportunity of further rationalizing state controls, with the result that the world finds itself today crushed by the consequences of statism, and people everywhere are suffering economic tyranny, ruinous taxes, slick and dishonest money, and general stagnation in production and distribution.

Therefore, I say that an important principle that should guide American participation in European recovery is that our friends in our own Government must take steps, when they ask us to make sacrifices for aid to Europe, to arrest the trend toward statism in our own country, and in the countries to which we loan goods and money.

RETURN TO HONEST MONETARY PRACTICES

Because an extended discussion of statism as it is expressing itself in the strangulation of economic life throughout the world is a topic all by itself, I shall confine myself to one important area in this general field, the area of paper money and gold.

During the past 20 years, the various governments throughout the world, including our own, have broken all the rules of the game for the use of paper money and gold as media of exchange. We find ourselves, therefore, here, and throughout the international field, without these useful instruments with which to reconstruct the production and distribution of the world.

There is no use talking seriously about European or world recovery unless we are ready to step up to a return of honest money. Honest money means that we must abandon the Keynesian theories, the so-called managed currencies, and pegged and dishonest rates for the international exchange of currencies and gold.

We must set up free markets for the conversion of any country's paper money into the paper money of any other country at exchange rates arrived at in open auction markets. Further, as the opening step in the process of stabilizing paper moneys in terms of gold and returning to the gold standard, we must set up free markets for the conversion of paper money into gold at prices for paper money vis-a-vis gold arrived at in open auction markets.

To sum up my remarks on honest money I want to make this statement with all the emphasis at my command:

A return to honest monetary practices would have more effect on European and world recovery, on the economic life of the world as expressed in production and distribution, than any of the recovery plans under discussion at the present time.

To put it another way: The world is eager and ready to go to work. The labor and tools are available. The management skill is available for planning and putting into operation the production and distribution schemes needed to feed and clothe the peoples of Europe and of the world. But we need honest money to finance the production facilities, and we need honest money to serve again in the field of distribution as a means for facilitating the exchange of goods.

ENLIST SKILLED MANAGEMENT

Now I come to my last general recommendation for the guidance of American participation in European recovery, a recommendation for the management control of such funds as the Congress may make available for recovery.

I need hardly remind you gentlemen who have spent your lives in the fields of management and the creation of productive facilities that no plan or project ever works out any better than the character and capacity of the men you pick to carry it out. Accordingly, my recommendation is that when the administration is set up for the control and use of such American money as may be approved by the Congress, steps should be taken to enlist American skilled management in the effective use of the funds for production and distribution.

Steps should be taken to go outside the fields of bureaucracy in recruiting management skills because the Government pays its workers badly and does little to attract skilled technical help.

Obviously there would be a practical advantage in dealing with European recovery by subcategories such as food, industries, distribution, and transportation. This would result naturally in the corollary that skilled management in these respective fields should be made part of the administration organization for the most effective and direct use of the money appropriated.

This leads me to the suggestion that our Government consider making management contracts with various American corporations and groups so that the skilled management personnel of industry could function in the various specialized fields, in harmony with the general policies sanctioned by the Congress and executed by the general administration group for the European recovery plan.

CONCLUSION

Well, that's my story, gentlemen. I should like to say by way of conclusion that I hope that our country will continue to discharge its responsibilities in the world situation. We are disturbed and miserable confronting the spectacle of these starving, wanting millions among our neighbors. Among these neighbors in Europe we have countless ties of blood. We admire and respect the traditions of these respective countries. We want to continue to be generous and helpful.

From our own standpoint of American self-interest we want to be helpful in reconstructing the road back to peace.

We want to participate not only fully but also effectively in European and world recovery.

United States Policy Makers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relative to the foreign policy of the United States, published in the Saturday Evening Post of May 1.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEVIL'S ADVOCATE MIGHT HELP OUR POLICY MAKERS

To get the low-down on a client's case, the best lawyers make a thorough study of the case of the opposition. The traditional ecclesiastical position of devil's advocate has much to commend it. Such saturnine counsel at the State Department or in the White House, stating Premier Stalin's case from time to time, might have given American officialdom an earlier understanding of their own. Within the framework of Marxist dialectic, the Communists have a case, and we Americans have done our best to help them prove it.

The Russian case rests on the perhaps preposterous idea that American foreign policy is conducted with some consistency and with understanding of its consequences. As devil's advocate, we should like to point out here that a Russian Communist, observing American willingness to pour out lives and treasure in behalf of the Soviet Union, assumed that we had accepted the consequences of Russian victory—namely, Russian domination in Europe. At Yalta we agreed to Russian control over Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. To be sure, we injected various second thoughts like "free and unfettered elections" or "final delimitation" of boundaries at the peace conference. But Russians, always thinking in strategic terms, assumed that the important thing was that they were to occupy the territory. Things like "free elections" could be defined later to suit circumstances.

After the war, Stalin watched us dismantle German war plants and discuss solemnly the possibility of reducing to a pastoral society what Stalin would certainly regard as the eastern barrier against communism. What would be more natural than to conclude from this that America had accepted the logic of the war's outcome and was waving Soviet Russia on into western Europe? Stalin has every reason to ask: "Why did you help us win the war, do your best to render Germany impotent for the future and consent to our occupation of eastern Europe, if you didn't intend that we should take you at your word?"

Our answer is that we thought Russia understood free elections as we understand them, and that, anyway, we can't permit the hordes of communism to pour into western Europe just because we opened the gate. All we were doing, we explain, was to use Europe to play American politics. We talked about a "tough peace" with Germany because we were genuinely outraged by Nazi bestiality and because we wished to placate certain people in our midst; but that didn't mean that we were inviting the Communists to take over. If we withdrew from Berlin and Prague after virtually taking them, that was done to improve our relations with Russia, and the Soviet conclusion that we were handing these areas to Russia for keeps just isn't fair. In short, we went on making up public-relations reasons for doing things, whereas Stalin, who thinks like Von Clausewitz and regards wars as a means of advancing national interest and not as material for slogans, hurled his Red legions into the breach.

In a sense, there is a case for our belief that Stalin tricked us. Actually, however, we tricked ourselves by refusing obstinately to study and understand Marxian reasoning. We dealt with the Russians as if the long history of world communism, its aims and methods could safely be ignored. Behind the crisis of 1948 lies the bland ignorance and placid assurance of our dealings with Russia from 1942 to 1946. No matter what happens from now on, it's impossible to forget that—at any rate, not for an even second-rate devil's advocate.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the letters which came to me requesting that I vote for H. R. 2953, Federal aid to the States for educational purposes, stress two arguments.

One is that the teachers are underpaid. Conceding that argument to be true, does it follow that the teachers in the wealthier States will receive more money if the proposed legislation is enacted?

Teachers in the so-called poorer States might receive greater compensation if Federal aid is extended. But certainly, in a State like Michigan, which in all probability would contribute $4,000,000 more than it would receive, I cannot believe that the financial condition of the teachers would be improved by this proposed plan.

As to the second argument that the wealthier States, Northern States, must help educate children of the other States, because those States are poorer and cannot educate those children, I lack complete information. Hence, on that phase of the question, I quote from an editorial of April 25 from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., which reads as follows:

THE FALLACY OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

The case against Federal aid for schools is identical in principle with the case against any Federal intrusion in State rights or assumption of State responsibilities, but in actual fact the case against Federal school aid is, in our opinion, the strongest case that can be brought against any form of Federal aid in purely State and local activities. There are many reasons why Federal school aid should be unthinkable that do not apply to some other forms of Federal aid.

For one thing, so far as the South is concerned it does not make sense for Southern States to contend that the Federal Government can't handle our Negro problems for us but must help handle the educational problems of our children.

But, the major point concerning Federal aid for public schools is simply that the cry of "poor States" having to have help from "rich States" is pure fallacy.

The States with the recognizedly poor school systems and low educational standards are, as a group, right around the top in the amount of State revenue—via taxes—available on a per capita basis.

The States with the best school systems, and recognizedly high standards of education are, as a group, well below the low-education standard States in per capita revenue.

Low educational records and standards are not a case of States being too poor, but too tight. Most of them, the records show, are somewhat like a man with a million dollars in a bank saying he's broke because he hasn't any cash in his pocket and he doesn't want to write a check.

The States have the revenue—particularly Louisiana—to handle their school problems if the money is well spent where it goes for education, and not spent where it now goes into waste or extravagance.

Aside from these facts, it has become obvious recently that considerable of the statistical data used in support of Federal aid for schools are obsolete and inaccurate.

For one thing: The National Education Association bulletin data on amount spent per school child in various States assume, without investigation that we can discover, that this is the maximum those States are able to spend. Why such assumption?

For another thing: That same data on amounts spent per child by different States are reached, in the latest bulletin we have received from that organization, by taking the amounts spent per year per child in the single year of 1920, the single year of 1930 and the single year of 1940 and averaging the three.

Actually, especially in Southern States, the amount per educable spent in the various States has taken its biggest leap upward since 1940 and, consequently, the 1920, 1930, 1940 figures used to prove the need for Federal aid are obsolete, inaccurate, and thoroughly misleading.

To prove this in at least one case: Through the 1920, 1930, 1940 formula, Louisiana's expenditures on public school education are listed as $26 in round figures per child per year.

Actually Louisiana now spends something over $50 per child per year—nearly double the NEA bulletin figures.

Now, as to the cry of "poor mouth," with the data to be presented here on State revenue coming from the Tax Foundation in New York, and the school data coming from official sources in surveys conducted by the Times for a considerable period of time:

Louisiana has a per capita revenue of $50.07—"per capita" covering every man, woman, and child of any and every color.

In the Army-Navy records on grades made by high school graduates taking Army-Navy college entrance examinations during the war, the students from 47 States averaged higher grades than the students from Louisiana—this State was last.

Yet, 39 of those 47 States have a lower per capita State revenue than has Louisiana.

Viewing from another angle, again using wartime draft records:

Twenty States, on a sampling of draft records which Selective Service looked on as fully representative of the entire draft, showed zero per cent of their white draft rejections were due to educational deficiency. That means that while they might have had some white draftees rejected for educational deficiency, the number was too small to list in a percentage table.

Ten percent of Louisiana white draft rejections were for educational deficiency and only seven States had a worse record.

Of the 40 States with a better record on educational draft rejections than Louisiana, 32 have lower per capita State revenue than this State.

What is true of Louisiana in relation to educational standing and State revenue standing is pretty much true of the other States supposedly too poor to maintain good school systems. The fallacy in most previous data on this subject is, as we said, the fact that it is pre-1940 data and does not apply to the present. As an example of this:

In 1941, the average per capita State revenue of the 16 richest States in the Union was 46 percent higher than the average per capita revenue for the 16 poorest States.

Yet in 1947 this percentage difference had shrunk to less than 14 percent, and the present average per capital revenue in the 16 poorest is as great as was the average for the 16 richest only 2 years ago.

And, in percentage of increase in States' revenue since 1941, most of the so-called poor States have made far greater increases than the so-called rich States. For example,

the highest increase in per capita State revenue in the 1941–47 period is found in Mississippi—121 percent, with Arkansas next with 109 percent. Of the top 10 States in percentage of increase, five are southern and two are border States. Louisiana's per capita revenue increased 52 percent in that period. While it is quite true that purchasing power has decreased, what has happened in one State in that respect has happened pretty well everywhere.

The big point in all of this is that most of the low-education States have, as a whole, more State revenue per capita than most of the high-education States.

States can handle their educational problems if they have efficient government, obtain revenue to the extent that they should and as they should.

There is no question that there is need for higher pay standards for school people, higher education standards in many places, more money, and better spent money for education—but on what basis do these assumptions carry the assumption that this must be done through Federal aid and that Federal aid is the only recourse? The whole trouble is that most people are viewing school problems under the entirely incorrect assumption that State and local governments can't handle the problem and have exhausted their resources to do so.

Federal aid has a definite place in the national economic program, as Governor Jester, of Texas pointed out Thursday. That place is not in school aid—as he frankly stated—but in such things as waterways and highways involving many States and not merely localized activities. Federal aid, in our opinion, should not enter into purely operational costs of any State or localized activities.

And, anyone who thinks that the school-aid bill passed by the Senate and pending before the House cannot be an opening wedge for Federal intrusion rights into our public education philosophies and practices need only remember that the plans for the second wedge already have been announced. The second wedge is found in the report of President Truman's commission on higher education proposing the spending of billions in tax money to push the Federal hand of bureaucracy into higher education—colleges and universities.

When the handwriting on the wall is drawn in letters a mile high, it is not difficult to read—for those willing to look and see.

Golden Anniversary of Greater City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, today the House passed unanimously House Joint Resolution 371, which I introduced, authorizing the issuance of a special 5-cent air-mail postage stamp in commemoration of the golden anniversary of the consolidation of the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond, which boroughs now comprise New York City.

In connection with observance of the golden anniversary by New York City, I wish to insert the following interesting facts which have been submitted to me by the Honorable Grover A. Whalen, chairman of the committee for the golden anniversary of New York City:

In 1898, the five boroughs or counties of the greater city of New York were joined together by legislative action that had been undertaken 30 years before. Before that year Manhattan and Bronx Boroughs made up New York City. Brooklyn was an individual city, and Queens and Richmond Boroughs were separate entities with many scattered small communities.

New York's population in 1898 was 1,500,000 persons. After the consolidation in 1898, it was 3,000,000. Today it is in excess of 8,000,000, slightly smaller than Greater London. New York is the world's capital and a leader in world affairs.

The consolidation of the boroughs opened the door for New York's greatness of today. For more than 30 years, Andrew H. Green, one of New York City's most devoted citizens, worked to bring about the consolidation. He was aided by hundreds of equally devoted, but not as well-known, residents of New York City, Brooklyn, the Queens County communities, and Staten Island.

The golden anniversary observance this year fittingly focuses attention on the city government and those basic private industries whose operation was essential to the city's growth and development. They are communications, public utilities, transportation, and the needle-trades industry. Emphasis, also, is being placed upon the hometown phase of the city. It is a home town for more than 8,000,000 persons, who live in New York, work there, and find relaxation, stimulation, and opportunity for development in the greater city.

There are in the five boroughs many distinctive communities whose neighborliness is as appealing and as cohesive as the smaller cities and towns of the country. Every race, religion, and cultural strain is represented in New York. The New York Bible Society printed the Bible in 83 different languages for distribution in New York City. There are more persons of Italian extraction in New York than in Rome, more of Irish extraction than in Dublin, more of Russian extraction than in Kiev, and those of German extraction are in larger number than most of the cities of Germany.

New York in all its phases will be presented to the world at the golden anniversary commemoratory events. Notable among these events are the International Air Exposition at New York's International Airport on July 31 to August 8. It will be the greatest air show of all time. Many Members of Congress, governors, mayors, and representatives of all members of the United Nations will be present on July 31 when the President of the United States dedicates this, the largest of the world's airports. Every type of military plane and civilian airship will be demonstrated at the exposition in every air flight tactic.

The exposition of the city at the Grand Central Palace will show by means of artistic and informative exhibits the operations of the city's 102 departments. Included in the exhibits will be a miniature city subway and a midget water system. New York draws its water supply from the Catskill Mountains more than 150 miles away. The subway is the largest railroad system in the world.

Among the many other events of the golden anniversary will be a demonstration-parade on Fifth Avenue, the famous street of pageants, on June 12, an international dance festival at City Center, September 21 to October 20, and a music festival that will continue throughout the summer and fall.

In addition, the boroughs will have individual observances that will emphasize the peculiar and particular traits and attributes of the boroughs.

Cuba Commemorates Fiftieth Anniversary of Liberation From Spanish Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 19, 1948, in Habana, Cuba, the President of the Republic of Cuba, Dr. Ramon Grau San Martin, addressed the citizens of his country on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the passage of the joint resolution by the Congress of the United States proclaiming the independence of Cuba.

It is with pleasure that I insert the President's address at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Cubans, Cuba and the United States commemorate today the fiftieth anniversary of the joint resolution adopted by the Congress of the United States recognizing the inalienable right of the Cuban people to be free and independent.

The idea of the liberation of Cuba, which was born from a historic impulse of high democratic sense, always had the warm support of the countries of the hemisphere. Many were the American countries which gave valuable help and humanitarian refuge to the Cuban liberators in their struggle for the liberation of their oppressed country.

The spiritual understanding toward Cuba also sprang in the land of Lincoln and Jefferson, where democracy flourished in all its strength to be the pride of America and the world. At the time the last battle for liberty in America was being triumphantly fought in Cuba.

Our war of independence, which was organized by the watchful political genius of Martí and carried on by the combined action of Gómez and Maceo, had come to a point where the colonial enterprise seemed to be lost irremissibly. The last gesture made by the metropolitan power to appease the intrepid and increasing impulse of independence of the Cuban patriots was the granting of self-government. But it was useless. A new star in the constellation of the free States of America struggled to appear.

The American nations, forged in the battle for liberty and independence, could not remain indifferent to the Homeric struggle in which the Cubans were engaged. The liberation of Cuba, therefore, was a matter of great historic significance in which the sentiment and prestige of the American world was committed because of its desire to impose, among other conquests, the right of the peoples to the free determination of its destinies.

The general opinion of the United States became more unanimous in favor of the independence of the island. The press and the most outstanding men of the country contemplated our cause with enthusiastic sympathy, siding with us entirely in this terrible fight which was taking place on Cuban soil between freedom and oppression.

The solidarity spirit of the joint resolution of Congress was the happy termination of a long process of intelligence between the Cuban patriots and the great North American people. It marked the beginning of a new fruitful stage in the relations between the two countries and came to seal, in an eloquent way, a friendship that would later on develop on historical collaboration.

At the evocation of that spirit, Cubans and Americans were to march together from then

on, to defend and to strengthen liberty in the world. And years later, over and over again, new and different circumstances were to unite them in the struggle to restore violated rights. With equal creative impulse, with equal force of conviction, they were to follow a cause to protect the most cherished treasure of America—liberty.

It is with legitimate joy that we celebrate today a date of noted significance in American history which proves the great value and strength which represents the understanding between men for a common determination of mutual cooperation. The joint resolution of the Congress of the United States is a noble gesture of liberality and solidarity that the Cuban people will never forget and that can be presented to the world as a magnificent example of sincere and constructive friendship.

Maine Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Maine's laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, as compiled by Ralph T. Warren, national service officer of Disabled American Veterans, who has his office in the Veterans' Administration Center, Togus, Maine.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Maine's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A State allowace of $100 is provided for burial of indigent veterans or their widows. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Cities and towns may pay for the burial and be reimbursed by the department of health and welfare.

Cities and towns are required to decorate veterans' graves on Memorial Day.

Provision has been made for the care of graves of veterans of any war.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgement is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces after 1 year after such declaration by the United States Army or Navy.

Disability of minority is removed for veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights.

Proof of wills is provided when subscribing witnesses are absent in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Voting rights are enjoyed by inmates of national soldiers' homes.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the uniform guardianship act.

Record of death recorded under direction of the register of vital statistics shall state whether or not the deceased was a war veteran and, if a veteran, of what war.

The clerks of the judicial courts must furnish copies of recorded discharges for a fee of 25 cents.

Town clerks shall record discharge or release papers of persons who served in the armed forces in time of war or insurrection. The fee is 25 cents.

The department of health and welfare is authorized to receive Federal funds to be used in furnishing information to veterans concerning their rights, benefits, and so forth.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Graduation from a class A secondary school of this or another State is sufficient preliminary education under the educational requirements for taking the examination for admission to the bar by a World War II veteran.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed while serving in the armed forces of the United States during World War I or II, or died as a result of such service. Amount, $150 per year per child with free tuition at State institutions of college grade.

The Department of Institutional Service shall operate the State Military and Naval Children's Home for rearing and educating gratuitously children of soldiers and sailors of the State where such children are poor and neglected.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Cities and towns may appropriate funds for employment of veterans.

Honorably discharged officers or enlisted personnel who served during any foreign war and who are not members of the National or State Guard may be appointed by the Governor as staff members or as aides-de-camp.

Leaves of absence are granted to county attorneys, county commissioners, clerks of court, and disclosure commissioners in the military or naval service of the United States.

Leaves of absence are granted to public officers and employees with preservation of pension rights, seniority, and reinstatement within 90 days after discharge from military service excepting in cases of foreign service.

Preference is given to veterans or their widows and to wives of disabled veterans (5 and 10 points) in appointment in the classified service.

Benefit rights are preserved under the retirement system for State employees.

Benefit rights are preserved under the teachers' retirement system and the Unemployment Compensation Act.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Children of veterans may be admitted to the State Military and Naval Children's Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Care is provided for certain insane members of the armed forces.

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

A Soldier Settlement Act has been enacted.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

The department of health and welfare may receive Federal funds available to the State for publishing information beneficial to veterans and their dependents.

MARRIAGE

Forfeiture of tribal membership by marriage outside of certain Indian tribes is not applicable to any Indian member serving in the armed forces.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Cities and towns may raise funds for the purpose of erecting and care of suitable monuments or memorials in memory of those who died in the Civil War or World Wars I and II.

PENSIONS

Pensions of $12 monthly are paid to veterans of the Spanish-American War and of the Philippine Insurrection, their widows, dependent children, parents, or sisters.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Cities and towns may appropriate funds for the rehabilitation and employment of veterans; also for physical fitness.

Inmates of Veterans' Administration facility at Togus have their settlement in the respective towns in which they had a legal settlement when connection with such facility commenced.

The Development Commission has been expanding postwar public works reserve funds.

Relief is extended to veterans and their families in their own homes.

Relief is extended to wives, children, and parents of World Wars I and II veterans.

Savings banks, trust companies and building and loan associations may make loans to veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights.

TAX EXEMPTION; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Free fishing licenses are issued to residents now serving in the armed forces and to veterans of World War II for 2 years after such war.

Soldiers stationed in the State and employees and soldiers regularly employed at the Veterans' Administration facility are classed as residents of the State for the purpose of obtaining fishing and hunting licenses.

Free liquor licenses are issued to certain clubs or associations for the sale of malt beverages to members of the armed forces, to be consumed on the premises where sold.

Operator's license may be renewed without payment of fee upon the application of any person serving in the armed forces.

Operator's license may be renewed following service in the armed forces.

Certain veterans are exempt from poll tax.

Payment of poll tax is exempted during active service in the armed forces of the United States.

Estates to the amount of $3,500 of all veterans, or their widows, who shall have reached the age of 62 years or are receiving a pension or compensation from the Veterans' Administration for total disability, or otherwise disabled, shall be exempt from taxation.

Property of veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Incorporation is provided to American Legion posts.

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of certain veterans' organizations is punishable by a fine of not more than $20 or imprisonment not to exceed 30 days or both.

Veterans' organizations have been extended parade rights.

Most of the above legislation has been enacted by the Maine Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of veterans' organizations.

Mr. Warren, the national service officer at the Veterans' Administration Center in Togus, extends all types of service to veterans and their dependents, free of charge, more particularly in the development and

prosecution of their justifiable claims for various benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled under existing Federal and State laws.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before Jan. 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the DAV national headquarters takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the Disabled American Veteran semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati, the Fifth Third Union Trust Co., has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department of legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during times of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War I myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

The Late Orville Zimmerman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, our whole country suffered a great loss in the death of our dear colleague, Orville Zimmerman. He was a real American in every sense of the word. While tolerant and charitable in his views he was uncompromising when it came to fundamentals. He believed in our form of government, and, best of all, he lived it. He saw through the sophistry and casuistry of those who would undermine our great system of government with the clear, penetrating eye of the true American. It always did me good to discuss fundamentals with Orville Zimmerman.

I knew him best, however, as the friend of the American farmer. The American farmer never had a better posted, a more sympathetic friend, than Orville Zimmerman, and too, he had the courage of his convictions and on all occasions threw the strength of his great mind and fighting ability behind every effort to improve American agriculture. For years a faithful member of the House Committee on Agriculture, his clear thinking and wise counsel as a member of that great committee did much to bring into being our great agricultural program.

In his passing the farmers of America have lost a loyal champion, the American people a great patriot, and I have lost a dear friend.

Address to Postal Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is a genuine pleasure to include the speech of my distinguished colleague from the Fourth District of Connecticut, Hon. JOHN DAVIS LODGE, addressed to the fiftieth annual convention, Connecticut State branch, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, in Norwalk, Conn., on Sunday, May 2, 1948.

This talk was broadcast through the facilities provided by radio stations WNLK, Norwalk, and WLAD, Danbury, Conn. It was a happy privilege to attend and participate in this affair commemorating the golden jubilee of this organization.

The speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is, of course, a great pleasure for me to return to Fairfield County to participate in the fiftieth annual convention of the Connecticut State Branch of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks. I am honored by your invitation, and I appreciate the opportunity to be with you on this occasion.

I am happy also to greet our Congressman at Large ANTONI N. SADLAK, who, in his first term in Congress as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has given unremitting attention to postal problems. We have good reason to be proud of him.

Now much has happened since the Eightieth Congress convened in January 1947. World War II has created grave and delicate problems—problems for which there are no easy solutions. We must meet these problems. We must meet starvation with food, misery with recovery, despotism with strength, and cynicism with faith. Many of these problems are in the field of foreign affairs. Since I am a member of the Com-

mittee on Foreign Affairs, I have had occasion to study these vital matters and to hear the testimony of Cabinet officers, officers of the armed services, diplomats, businessmen, labor officials, and other citizens from many walks of life.

The European recovery program is a vital aspect of our foreign policy on which the Congress acted with intelligence and dispatch. In fact, I think it can be said that the manner in which this legislation was enacted is a conspicuous example of the operation of our representative form of government at its excellent best.

This generous gesture on the part of the American people—this unprecedented law—is in effect a strategical measure with relief characteristics. Without it, we can be fairly sure that western Europe would succumb to the Communist infection, thereby jeopardizing our national security. With it, there are still many things to be done. One of these is the strengthening of our Military Establishment, and as to this, I think I can assure you that important security measures will be passed by your Congress before it adjourns in June.

There are many other phases of our foreign policy which we must bring forward on a concurrent front. The threat to peace and freedom, which it was hoped had been disposed of by our victory in World War II, is in fact more formidable, more complex, and more urgent than ever.

But it is well to bear in mind that just as what happens in Italy, in Poland, and in Hungary is of great interest to us in America, similarly what happens in America has repercussions abroad. Foreign affairs and domestic affairs are to a large degree interdependent. Our attitude toward domestic affairs is to a considerable extent a measure of our attitude toward foreign affairs. We must meet the threat to liberty not only by measures designed to contain the virus of communism but also by affirmative action which will produce an increasingly better life for an increasing number of people, not only outside our frontiers but at home.

A national problem of paramount importance is inflation. Inflation and the high cost of living are a byproduct of the war and of the unsound fiscal policies of the present administration. This is a domestic problem which the administration has failed to understand. The President has talked of symptoms rather than causes. However, that is no reason why loyal postal employees should be penalized. That is no reason why the postal workers of America should carry more than their fair share of the sacrifice which all Americans are called upon to make in the cause of peace and freedom. The postal workers of America have always borne their part of the national burden. For many years they have represented the sturdy kind of patriotism which is a badge of true Americanism. I know that, as in the past, they are ready and willing to do their duty in the preservation of the kind of America which we all love. They are already carrying a heavy load. In my opinion, it is too heavy.

The postal workers have never been overpaid. For 20 years they received no pay raise. Since the last pay raise the cost of living has risen so high that a further increase is clearly indicated.

I believe that the postal service should be made attractive to capable young men in order that there may be healthy competition for the positions available and in order that the fine traditions of this important public service may be maintained.

I believe that a pay raise will not only benefit you but that it will also benefit the postal service and the American people.

As you know, many bills concerning this matter have been introduced. It is generally conceded that an increase in wages for members of the postal service is justified. I believe that the question has been debated long enough and that the time for action has arrived. I believe further that there will be action and that a bill providing for a substantial increase in the salaries of postal workers will be enacted before the Eightieth Congress adjourns. The postal workers of America are entitled to an increase in pay. They can never be adequately compensated for their loyalty, their courtesy, and their sense of service. Such things are not for sale. They can, however, be accorded a decent living wage.

You may be sure that I shall do my level best to bring this about.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution favoring a broad plan of national relief from our housing problem, which was recently endorsed by the Queens County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of New York:

Whereas the housing problem, particularly as it affects the veterans of the United States of America, has now become the most pressing problem of the times, in our national affairs; surpassing in immensity the international relief program as being advocated by our present national administration; and

Whereas, the efforts, to date, of our National Government have been scandalously and disgracefully amiss and delinquent in coping with this grave problem; and

Whereas there has been brought to the attention of this body as there has been brought to the attention of the Nation as a people, countless instances of inadequate temporary housing for our veterans, disease, social degradation and familial discontent, resulting from the squalor and discomfort which have been hopelessly foisted upon them; all of which have been particularly emphasized during our present seasonal cold and storm; and

Whereas at present time our National Government sees fit to establish spacious, healthy homes for the foreign personnel of the United Nations, for individuals who never in their lives experienced such comparative luxury; and never earned the undying gratitude of a humble Nation in the manner in which our veterans are entitled to receive it from our grateful citizenry; and

Whereas there seems to be no foreseeable relief by the way of reduction of housing costs; and

Whereas it moreover appears that the inflationary trend, we find ourselves embroiled in, finds support, to some degree, from those in Federal authority, thus lessening almost to the point of desperation, the hope of downward prices, in all commodities, and particularly homes; and

Whereas many veterans who have purchased homes out of sheer necessity now find themselves financially shackled and in constant fear of losing their dearest possession—their home; and

Whereas this body feels constrained, by all that is fair and just, to bring this heinous condition to the attention of those in a position to rectify same, in full knowledge that this year will above all other years be long remembered at the polls: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That the Queens County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States go on record favoring a broad plan of national relief from our housing problem, involving in its purpose some reasonable form of outright governmental financial subsidy to the veteran in his quest for adequate housing; the working details of said plan being left entirely to the more astute minds in our Congress; but in no event shall said plan obligate the veteran, even in the ultimate, with the burden of bearing complete cost of a home, by reason of long-term repayments, or otherwise.

Endorsed and approved under seal, Queens County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of New York:

A. W. TEEPLE,
County Commander.

Official:

JOSEPH D. MORELLO,
County Adjutant.

Mississippi River National Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over radio station KWK, St. Louis, Mo., May 2, 1948:

Tonight I'd like to discuss a project that means much to the Middle West generally, and to the State of Missouri and the city and county of St. Louis in particular. It is the proposed Mississippi River National Parkway.

Last week the House of Representatives in Washington unanimously passed a bill authorizing the expenditure of some $200,000 for a Federal survey of the route which this parkway would take. I introduced that bill. It is now up to the Senate to act favorably and I think it will. The measure has the assured support of at least 20 Senators from the 10 States that stand to benefit from such a national parkway that will some day soon—we all hope—extend from Itasca State Park in Minnesota (the headwaters of the Mississippi) down to its mouth in the Gulf of Mexico. Legislatures of seven States bordering the Mississippi River have already approved the project, and, doubtless, the balance will soon do so.

The bill that I introduced—and which passed the House last week—provides specifically for a thorough governmental survey of the entire area. It will be conducted by the Interior Department and the Federal Works Agency through their National Park Service and Public Roads Administration, respectively, in cooperation with local and State agencies. The survey will follow in general the course of the Mississippi River. In addition to recommending routes that will open up unbounded scenic panoramas for the Nation's travel-hungry tourists—now seen only from the air—the survey will also consider the national defense and recreational features. Since the parkway will travel through rural areas principally, it will open up many new routes—farm-to-market routes.

The advancement of a nation toward its obligation of providing a better life for its people is in proportion to its vision and comprehensive planning ability. Here in the Middle West we can look on both sides of the country and find ample evidence that the far West and the East have in effect stolen a

march on us. I refer to the great national parks of Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Rocky Mountain, in the West; Smoky Mountain National Park, in the East, reached by the great Blue Ridge national parkway through Virginia and the Carolinas. I would like to emphasize that, even when completed, the proposed Mississippi national parkway will cost only a fraction of what it took to put these other parks and parkways on the map.

The launching of this project in the reasonably near future will permit the affected States to release their correlated developments and to arrange their programs of land acquisition while historic and suitable recreation sites are readily available. The necessary procedure to establish such national parkways has already been set by the Federal Government. The Government, through the Secretary of the Interior and the Public Roads Administration, determines the location, based upon careful surveys and studies such as the one authorized by the House of Representatives last week.

I would like to give you a few reasons why this proposed national parkway through the Mississippi Valley is deserved and desired:

In the first place, one-fourth of the population of the Nation resides in the 10 midcontinent States bordering the Mississippi River. More than 6,000,000 passenger automobiles are registered in these States and 10,000,000 more are within 1 day's drive of the proposed parkway. The parkway will provide a most inviting driveway and display the many distinctive features of the beautiful and remarkable Mississippi Valley.

The hazards of mixed traffic and the mounting number of big trucks in interstate commerce warrant the separation of commercial from passenger vehicles on certain trunk routes for tourists and so-called travel trade as a matter of public interest and personal consideration, over and above the safety factors. This tourist volume of business in the Mississippi River Valley amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars annually and can be greatly expanded by an attractive parkway. North and south travel is equally as vital to the future welfare of the cities along the Mississippi River as east and west travel is at present to the Nation at large.

I need hardly mention the attractiveness of the scenery throughout the length of this parkway from the precipitous cliffs and rolling timber country of the north, through the agricultural and industrial areas of the middle section to the cotton country of the South.

It is the plan to use, wherever possible, existing roads and areas that are best equipped with approaches to and from the parkway. In this connection I'd like to point out to St. Louisans that the parkway will logically connect up with the proposed superhighway from Jefferson Barracks to downtown St. Louis. This roadway could then be a link from the historic Jefferson Memorial Plaza to Jefferson Barracks, which area may well become a national monument.

People travel thousands of miles to see the famous Panama Canal locks—yet, there are more locks right on the Mississippi River, and they would become much more accessible with the completion of the parkway. Each of these locks has a pool—actually a lake, some of them miles long—that abound with fish and game. The boating and recreational potentialities on every one of them is almost beyond comprehension. All that is needed is the opening up of the areas to the public.

The "Father of Waters" touches many of the most historic points in the Nation, many of them at present inaccessible, and the parkway would provide the necessary travel way between these interesting places. It will not monotonously follow the river banks, but will wend its scenic way between the populous centers in the valley, through the most alluring agricultural and attractive territory to assure variety of colorful outlooks and charming land and water vistas. Such a parkway couldn't miss reviving and stimulating interest in the Mississippi River and its history.

It will take time to survey, obtain rights-of-way, construct roadways, and landscape the parkway areas. Therefore, the sooner we in the Congress act on this project, the sooner all public agencies can arrange and dovetail their development programs to fit the ultimate plan and avoid duplication of effort and save money. Federal survey expenditures which I was able to get authorized by the House last week will expedite estimates of the actual cost of the parkway and give us all a clear picture of the best possible routes to be followed.

The early approval of the parkway plan, as recommended by the Federal Government's surveyors, will greatly encourage the various States in the Mississippi Valley to enter upon an enlarged program of development of parks and public reservations that will be intelligently planned and improved in conjunction with this parkway.

Just as St. Louis is called "the city surrounded by the United States" so it becomes the center of the new national parkway. Therefore, it logically would become the center of tourist traffic, bringing many millions of dollars more into the St. Louis and St. Louis County area. Since De Soto discovered the Mississippi 400 years ago, there is still no continuous highway on either bank of the Mississippi from the source to the mouth.

The citizens of St. Louis and St. Louis County can look forward to a pleasant drive south in the winter along the alluring travel route, or north during the summer. With the pent-up desire for travel, curbed during the war years now about to be satisfied, the full use of the highway is assured, not only by St. Louisans, but by the entire Nation. This parkway, with its alluring travel routes, will provide the way to vacationland. No other area will obtain the manifold benefits of the parkway as much as St. Louis. And in the construction work itself of the parkway, St. Louisans will benefit. This is a useful public-works project—not leaf raking or another WPA New Deal "made work" project. This is something the entire Nation will enjoy and marvel at permanently. Something that will make our community and our great river known to all America—and to all the world.

Ever since this bill passed last week, my mail has been heavy with congratulatory messages—mostly from you people right here in St. Louis. I hope to answer each one personally, but let me say "thanks" now to all of you. Here is what one enthusiastic St. Louisan wrote—and I quote: "I can think of no action by Congress which would be more appealing to the tremendous population of the Nation residing in the 10 States bordering the 'Father of Waters' than to realize that such an authorization bill had actually become a law." You may be sure that such messages are greatly appreciated.

It should be borne in mind that this is a long-range project. Before you build, you have to make a plan. Before you buy land, you have a survey made. Before we develop a great national parkway we should have both a survey and a plan. Since it takes time to develop these preliminaries for a project of this scope, we are hopeful that there will be little delay in the measure passing the Senate. The physical feasibility and human desirability of this parkway has been checked with many Federal and State planning, park, highway, conservation, and biological officials familiar with this valley. The Parkway Planning Committee is an interstate group of officials designated by their respective governors to coordinate this worthy project. This is not a project being foisted on anybody. This is something the people themselves want. I dare say that, but for the war, the Mississippi National Parkway would today be a reality—or at least well on the way.

It should be pointed out that the parkway would not be an entirely new highway, duplicating or paralleling present routes. Wherever possible, existing highways, bridges, and park areas will be utilized to reduce the over-all cost. In general the parkway area, as envisioned by planners now, will contain 100 acres per mile, plus parkway easements of 50 acres per mile, averaged over the gross length of the main parkway route and a main parkway area minimum width of 200 feet.

Due to the proximity in numerous locations of picturesque bluffs close to the Mississippi River at high-water stages, and the narrow range of location of existing railway facilities, the parkway may be constructed over or under such precipitous cliffs and caverns and around and across river bends and through back country, as will best diversify the rugged, wooded, and open pastoral scenery, water vistas, and historical landmarks. Always a dominating factor will be the economical cost of land acquisitions and parkway road construction. The whole area, as in other national parks, is expected to be under the complete supervision of the National Parks Service—Department of the Interior.

Our Glass Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. LOVE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of April 29, 1948:

OUR GLASS INDUSTRY

"Despite the protests of Representative FRANCIS J. LOVE, President Truman has put into effect a tariff and trade agreement negotiated with Czechoslovakia before the Communists seized control of that country," says a current news dispatch from Washington.

We desire to commend Congressman LOVE, who represents our First West Virginia Congressional District, for the fight that he made in this respect, even though he was overruled by President Truman. And we believe the glassworkers of our area will be thoroughly grateful to Congressman LOVE for the fight that he is waging to help save their jobs for them.

If cheap communistic-dominated glassware is permitted to enter our country from Czechoslovakia and drive our home-made glassware out of our own domestic market, it would be a tragedy of devastating proportions. As matters stand now the former United States protective tariff is at the lowest level in 100 years.

"Under this theory," said Mr. LOVE, "many of the industries that made our country strong will be destroyed. It is ridiculous to grant tariff concessions to those governments which foster ideologies in opposition to the United States Government."

Incidentally it was revealed that those who drew the treaties believe that Czechoslovakia should supply the United States with cheap glassware and that our skilled glassworkers should find new jobs in other industries such as making automobiles.

We do not believe the glassworkers of our area will endorse any such a policy but that they, like Congressman LOVE, will resist it bitterly and with all the strength they possess. Our considered view is that Congress ought to reclaim the tariff-making power so recklessly delegated to President Truman and his executive department aides.

They have shown a regrettable disposition to use the tariff as a political weapon—a very dangerous procedure which cannot fail to have ill effects on United States workers.

Only a Prosperous America Can Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial with reference to tax reduction:

ONLY A PROSPEROUS AMERICA CAN BE FREE

In the next few weeks 50,000,000 American workers will get from the Congress of the United States a real incentive to work.

This incentive is called a tax cut. Beginning May 1, the withholding tax on incomes will be reduced, giving everyone a much-needed increase in take-home pay.

But the tax cut will have a far more important effect. It may be literally a life-saver for American employment and production—and, hence, for the stability of the world. It will help to do two things which must be done if our economy is to continue to furnish good jobs and good earnings.

1. It will generate part of the private funds for investment in common stocks—the "risk capital" which we need to sustain prosperity.

2. It will provide part of the incentives necessary to make American business management still more effective.

These two predictions are not advanced as matters of opinion. They are based on facts reported by McGraw-Hill field editors.

These facts show why the reductions in upper-bracket income-tax rates are most significant for our continued prosperity. For the first time in more than 20 years the tax burden on people who can afford to risk their savings has been lightened. To find out what this will mean to the economy, McGraw-Hill field editors all over the Nation asked a group of business executives making $15,000 a year or more how they will use the money which the tax cut gives them. Here is what they said:

1. They plan to save—not spend—three-fourths of the money they keep as a result of tax reduction.

2. They plan to invest one-half of these savings in common stocks. If all persons making over $15,000 follow this pattern, they will make available about a half billion dollars of risk capital for American industry.

3. They also will switch some of their present savings from bonds and bank accounts to common stocks. This might easily add a billion dollars or more to the supply of risk capital.

The one-half billion dollars of tax savings and the funds switched from other investments into common stocks is not enough to end the shortage of risk capital. But it is a start.

Before passage of the tax law risk capital had been growing increasingly scarce.

One measure of the scarcity is that last year only four-tenths of 1 percent of national income went into new common stocks. In 1925, a year of normal prosperity, almost 3 percent of national income was invested in new common stocks.

Another measure is that between 1940 and 1947 people actually reduced their holdings of corporate stocks and bonds by nearly a billion dollars. During the same period, people salted away almost $150,000,000,000 in such safe havens as cash, bank deposits, and Government bonds.

This drought of risk capital hit us just when we need a vastly increased flow of risk capital to finance the expansion and improvement of our American productive machine. We need risk capital to search for new oil fields and to build new pipe lines and refineries. We need capital to expand our overloaded electric and gas utilities. We need it to finish reequipping our air lines and railroads and bus lines. We need it to modernize our textile production. We need it to keep pace in the magical, booming chemical industries. We need it to launch the new industry of television.

We need capital for all this work and for much more besides. And we must do all this work if we are to keep the United States dynamic and if we are to create new and better jobs.

The tax cut comes just in time. As the last editorial in this series showed, the flow of risk capital must double or triple if we are to avoid a cut-back in industrial expansion next year. A major reduction in industrial expansion because of a shortage of risk capital would menace our prosperity. Whenever capital expansion has sagged, the whole economy has sagged. That is the record. That is why every American has a crucial interest in breaking the shortage of risk capital.

The tax reduction now going into effect helps relieve that shortage. In my opinion, we need still other tax changes to assure enough risk capital for healthy industry and healthy employment.

We should encourage the rapid depreciation and replacement of plants and equipment to keep America efficient.

We should eliminate the double taxation of stockholders' incomes.

We should permit full averaging of good years and bad in calculating income tax payments.

We should cut tax rates again as soon as we can.

The tax cut of 1948 will prime the flow of capital. We must keep it flowing.

The tax cut also encourages our successful men and women to work harder and more effectively.

The McGraw-Hill editors collected some solid facts to show how seriously heavy taxes have discouraged business leaders. Here they are:

1. One out of seven persons the editors questioned said that they had turned down positions with greater responsibilities because heavy taxes would take most of the greater pay that went with the harder job.

2. Six out of ten executives would be more inclined to accept a more responsible job now that taxes will let them keep more of the added pay such a job would bring.

We all have a stake in incentives which make men work harder, especially talented men. The more we each work, the more we all have.

The tax reductions so far made will leave the Government more than enough revenue to meet all its expenses, including the proposed defense expenses, and still reduce the national debt. If more defense money becomes necessary, vigorous economy on less essential Government expenses will make possible both stronger military defenses and a better tax system. We need both.

Only a prosperous America can be strong enough to remain free—and to help keep the rest of the world free.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, Jr.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

WHAT THE TAX CUT WILL DO

"What will upper bracket taxpayers do with their tax savings?

"What can business expect as a result?"

To answer these questions, McGraw-Hill field editors interviewed a carefully selected sample of business executives earning $15,000 a year or more. Here, for the first time, are solid facts that show how tax reduction will effect the supply of risk capital and business incentives. These are the results:

1. How much of your tax reduction will you save? Seventy-four percent.

2. How much of your tax savings will you invest in common stocks? Fifty-two percent.

3. Will lower taxes lead you to switch some of your investment in bonds to stocks? Yes, 28 percent.

4. Have you passed up an opportunity to invest in a new business in the last 5 years because the return after taxes did not justify the risk? Yes, 40 percent.

5. Will lower taxes make you more inclined to take a risk on a new business? Yes, 80 percent.

6. Have you turned down the opportunity to take a bigger job in the last 5 years because taxes would take too much of the additional income offered? Yes, 13 percent.

7. Do you know of actual cases of executives who have turned down bigger jobs or more work because of taxes? Yes, 38 percent.

8. Will lower taxes make you more inclined to take on a bigger job or more work? Yes, 59 percent.

Margarine Versus Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Woonsocket Call of March 15, 1948:

MARGARINE VERSUS BUTTER

Many Federal taxes are burdensome, but none is so flagrantly unjust as those restricting the sale of margarine, the poor man's substitute for butter.

The end of the disgraceful discrimination is in sight. The House Agriculture Committee began public hearings last week on 18 bills calling for the repeal of all special taxes on margarine, and it learned that public opinion is solidly behind the proposed repeal.

Committee members heard nutrition experts and other disinterested witnesses testify that margarine is fully as wholesome and nourishing as butter.

Typical was the observation of Dr. H. J. Deuel, Jr., professor of biochemistry and nutrition at the University of Southern California School of Medicine, who testified that butter is in no way superior to margarine.

The powerful dairy interests, who have succeeded in hamstringing the sale of margarine through oppressive levies since 1866, have their backs to the wall now and they are nearly ready to concede defeat.

Housewives learned during the war that oleo is in no way inferior to butter as a table spread. Butter lost thousands of its satisfied customers when its price rose to a dollar a pound and higher. That was when margarine began to increase in popularity.

So it is not surprising that consumers are supporting the move to eliminate the unnecessary taxes on oleo. Every penny counts in this era of skyrocketing prices.

The final argument for removal of the taxes is that margarine is the only food product against which such discrimination is practiced.

We would conclude that the case in favor of margarine is a strong one.

Communistic Infiltration in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I include in my extension of remarks the eighth and final article of a series written by Gustaf A. Nordin, of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, having to do with communistic infiltration in the State Department. Many of my colleagues have been amazed at the revelations made by Washington Correspondent Nordin. Individually the articles have been startling; collectively they are astounding. The information contained in this series of articles proves without any question of a doubt that the intelligence system of the United States needs drastic and immediate overhauling and revamping.

The article follows:

SOLON ASSAILS RISKS IN STATE DEPARTMENT

(This is the eighth and last in a series of exclusive articles making public for the first time the findings of special agents who investigated alleged subversive activities in the State Department of the United States. This probe was made by a congressional committee to determine what the State Department was doing to rid the Federal pay roll of poor security risks.)

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—Congressional leaders are determined that any doubts in connection with employment of personnel in the State Department should be resolved in favor of the United States rather than the employee.

Most Republicans and Democrats will accept the views expressed by Representative KARL STEFAN, Republican, Nebraska), chairman of the State Department Appropriations Subcommittee in its report to the House recently:

"Officers or employees who are suspected in the slightest degree should be encouraged to resign."

That is a mild approach in comparison with the views of others who cannot understand the continued employment of men and women whose loyalty or association with poor security risks is tolerated.

The Stefan report to Congress discussed briefly the extensive hearings held on the security phase of the State Department "and the employment of individuals who were considered poor risks from the security angle."

Committee investigators disclosed in these hearings, reports on 108 former, present, and prospective State Department employees.

"The committee does not feel that the Department has been as diligent as it might have been in the selection of its personnel and has not sufficiently exercised the prerogative given it under the so-called McCarran rider, contained in appropriation acts for this Department for the past several years," STEFAN reported.

The official report, which summarizes the employment history of the 108, is still being held by the House Appropriations Committee. Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, New York, a conservative who would fire all of them if he could, is chairman of the committee.

Although that report has been publicized exclusively in this series of copyright articles it may never be released by the Taber committee.

The fundamental issue involved is whether these employees are security risks. A cloud will hang over the State Department as long as such reports as gathered by the Taber committee are in existence and not brought into the open for explanation.

Representative TABER declared on the floor of the House that the investigations made by the special agents "demonstrate beyond any question that the first thing for the United States to do is to clean up the State Department and get rid of those whose incompetency and disloyalty is a menace to the United States and to the successful prosecution of any type of foreign policy."

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, Missouri, ranking minority member of the committee, counters that the FBI investigations have not "produced evidence which would justify the committee in bringing anyone up here for questioning. In these unsupported charges, we have reached a new era in political partisanship."

The State Department officials in charge say that the evidence is insufficient to warrant dismissal.

Congressional leaders, clamoring for action under pressure of a United States-Soviet war of nerves, claim that the connections of these employees make it imperative that the interests of the country supersede the protection of the employee.

Hamilton Robinson, in charge of the State Department's Office of Controls, prepared an order in which he defined who constitutes a security risk.

The first point is:

"A person who engages in, supports, or advocates treason, subversion, or sedition, or who is a member of, affiliated with, or in sympathetic association with the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Parties, or of any foreign or domestic party, organization, movement, group, or combination of persons who seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means or whose policy is to advocate or approve the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their right under the Constitution of the United States; or a person who consistently believes in or supports the ideologies and policies of such a party, organization, movement, group, or combination of persons."

Participation in one or more of such parties or organizations, or their "fronts," contribution of funds, attendance at meetings, registration to vote in such parties, or signing election petitions for party members, are major factors, according to Robinson's order. He said the department also would consider written evidence or oral expressions by speeches or otherwise, of political, economic or social views, which throw a light on the security chances this country is taking with such employes.

The information filed with the Taber committee in this secret report exposes practically all of the 108 employees investigated. If the investigations were objective and are factual, few, if any of the 108, should have been retained in employment or, in the case of job applicants, should not be considered as proper State Department risks.

TABER tells his colleagues: "I just want to tell you that I do not go off half-cocked. The investigations of the committee indicated a very large number of Communists on the rolls of the State Department. The very least that they have there now is 14, and those cases instead of resulting in immediate dismissal as the interests of the United States required, have been dragged on and on for 6, 8, and 10 months."

"I do not know whether anyone is entitled to wonder whether we are getting American representation in the State Department."

Most of the findings of the special agents appear to support Representative TABER'S charges of communism in the Department.

During House debate on this issue; during public hearings on high-salaried Americans in private business who refused to state their Communist connection, the question is constantly asked, "Why should these people, all of them living far better and much freer than anyone in the Soviet Union, desire to transform America into a Communist dictatorship?"

The answer is generally that these "intellectual giants" hope to become "commissars."

That view is perhaps best expressed in article 12 of the Communist constitution:

"The principle applied in the U. S. S. R. is that of socialism: From each according to ability, to each according to his work."

Washington Evening Star Lauds Mundt Bill, H. R. 5852, To Curb Communist Activities in the United States, To Require All Communists To Register With the Department of Justice, To Deny Them Federal Employment and Passports, To Require Them To Identify and Register Their Front Organizations, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, after over 10 years of studies, investigations, hearings, and discussions on the nature, the methods, and the menace of the Communist Party in the United States and elsewhere, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has brought out the first piece of legislation in its career for the purpose of curbing and controlling Communist activities in this country. This legislation, H. R. 5852, known as the Mundt bill, or the bill to control subversive activities in the United States, packs into a few short pages the full experience and knowledge of our committee from the standpoint of utilizing all legal steps available to protect the United States from the subversive un-American groups who would destroy this Republic from within.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to secure a rule on H. R. 5852 tomorrow or Wednesday and we hope to get this legislation before the House for consideration before the end of this week. In the meantime, I urge all members to study this bill carefully and to read the report which accompanys it and which is now available. We covet the support of all patriotic Americans from every walk of life and from all political parties in the enactment and enforcement of this legislation.

Up to now, so far as I know, only the Communist Party, its intimate circle of controlled satellite, or front organizations, and the frenzied fringe which Mr. Wallace is trying to forge together into something called a political party, are in opposition to this legislation. Sir, we are proud of the enemies H. R. 5852 has produced. The Daily Worker, PM, and a few equally pink and pathetic apologists for Communists are attacking the Mundt

bill in every issue. On the other hand, it has secured the high praise of the Milwaukee Journal, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Times-Herald, the Washington Evening Star, and a large number of other progressive and patriotic American newspapers, columnists, commentators, and feature writers.

As typical of the important and serious-minded support which H. R. 5852 has attracted, Mr. Speaker, I now call attention to the following editorial from the May 1, 1948, issue of the Washington Evening Star:

A THREAT TO COMMUNISM

There is good reason for the big uproar which the Communist Party is kicking up over the Mundt bill to require registration of its members. For Representative MUNDT and his committee colleagues, after lengthy and serious study, have produced an anti-Communist measure which, if passed, would constitute a real threat to the party as now operated.

The Mundt bill undertakes a more conservative and, at the same time, a more effective approach to the communism problem than the various prior proposals for outlawing the party. Even the Federal Bureau of Investigation has objected to plans for making the party illegal for the very sound reason that to do so would merely drive communism underground and thus complicate the task of keeping it under surveillance. The registration measure would recognize the right of the Communist Party to exist—but in the open only—and not as a foreign-controlled conspiratorial organization bent on setting up a foreign-dominated totalitarian dictatorship.

The outstanding provisions of the bill, which has received the unanimous approval of the committee, are, first, that it shall be illegal to attempt to set up a totalitarian dictatorship directed or controlled from abroad; and, second, that the Communist Party must file with the Attorney General annually a list of its officers and members and a detailed financial report. Organizations designated by the Attorney General as Communist fronts would be required to list their officers, but not their members. Members were excluded because it was feared that innocent persons might be needlessly pilloried by such a provision.

It is not surprising that William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party; Eugene Dennis, executive secretary, and other party leaders have raised a storm of protest. They have declared they will instruct party members not to register. Of course, the sponsors of the bill do not expect that all Communists would register. But if the FBI finds a bona fide party member who has not registered, it will have legal cause for arrest and prosecution. The law requiring registration of submachine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and other gangster-type weapons operated much the same way. Gangsters did not register their guns, but when one was captured with unregistered weapons on him the Federal Government was empowered to act.

The Communists already have challenged the constitutionality of the registration plan on the ground that it would set up classes of citizens. It may well be that the courts would not take kindly to the legislation. But the courts have upheld laws requiring registration of such classes of citizens as lobbyists and agents of foreign principals. All in all, the Mundt bill gives evidence of thoughtful consideration of an extremely perplexing security problem. It undoubtedly has defects that need correction. But its over-all objectives are so meritorious that Congress should find time for full debate of its provisions.

California in Review After a Century of American Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a lecture by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.:

CALIFORNIA, CHILD OF SPAIN

(Second in a series of eight public centennial lectures by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.)

Dr. HUNT. Before beginning the lecture proper I think I should mention a new book that is coming out that many of you would be interested to acquire. That is the new book which is to contain the papers published in the June 1947 Quarterly of the California Historical Society. It is to be the Gold Discovery. These are probably the most valuable papers published in recent years on that subject, and will be coming out in book form and may be purchased by the public in the very near future.

California, a child of Spain. Last week the lecture considered The Hidden Paradise, before California was revealed to modern enlightenment, and what did those people find here when they came? Those who came were chiefly from Spain. Spain was the greatest colonizing nation in the world at that time, the time of Columbus, Cortez, Cabrillo, and a part of the great far-flung territory to be colonized reached up even into California.

I start by giving you two quotations, very brief. First from Charles F. Lummis, who was a great admirer of the Spanish pioneers. He wrote about them very interestingly, and said: 'They were Spaniards who first saw and explored the greatest gulf in the world; Spaniards who discovered the two greatest rivers; Spaniards who first knew that there were two continents of America; Spaniards who first went around the world." The second quotation is from Hubert Howe Bancroft, well-known historian, who declared: "A hundred years before John Smith saw the spot on which was planted Jamestown, thousands from Spain had crossed the high sea, achieved mighty conquests, seizing large portions of the two Americas." When the Spanish discoverers came to reveal this hidden paradise they found the only human inhabitants to be the Indians. Therefore it is appropriate to make some remarks about the California Indians.

I wish to state that many of the accounts and descriptions of the California Indians of earlier days are very inaccurate and unscientific. That is quite natural, and yet we must make proper discount when we read many of these older accounts. One of the best of the earlier writers was Stephen Powers, connected with the United States Government in the Bureau of Ethnology, whose published report of 1877 was probably the best description of the California Indians up to that time. I think a scholar who has made splendid scientific contributions toward our enlightenment on the Indians and the population of the prehistoric type of the southwest was Professor Bandelier; but the modern writer who is perhaps best recognized now is Professor Kroeber of the University of California, at Berkeley. His handbook is probably the best single volume on the California Indians.

The Indians of California stood in rather striking contrast to many of the noble red men of the East. They had not the aquiline nose; they had not for the most part the warlike spirit; they had not the promise of some kind of "happy hunting ground"; and in various ways they differed from the eastern Indians, particularly the more warlike tribes of the Rocky Mountains and western regions.

The population of the Indians of California has been the subject of much speculation. Nobody knows exactly how many Indians were here, but perhaps as good an estimate or guess as may be made would be that there were approximately 135,000 to 140,000 Indians in California at the time when Spain came to occupy the land. And that was a denser population than was to be found in practically any other part of the Nation at the time.

The Indians of California undoubtedly originated from Asiatic peoples, and very likely came to this continent by way of Alaska, across the Aleutian Islands. We do not, of course, have all the records of these things, because there were no written records; but we have rather strong inferential evidence that the Indians were of Asiatic origin. Properly speaking, there were scarcely any tribes of Indians in California. There were tribal bands and large numbers who clanned together, but not in the organized form of some of the Indian tribes of the East. They had wide varieties of languages and dialects, so that sometimes the people of one region or district could not even understand the Indians 30 or 50 miles away and could not converse together. They were very secretive, exclusive, not very nomadic, moving about from place to place only comparatively slightly, and for the most part were very peaceful and even shiftless, oftentimes very indolent.

The culture of these California Indians was of a rather low level; in fact, most of them might be called paleolithic men; that is, those of the old stone age, or from another standpoint they might be called upper savages, or lower barbarians, depending on the classification that is used describing these levels of culture among aborigines.

The Indians, from the physical standpoint, were not, usually speaking, as attractive as the Indians farther east. They were not tall and dignified; their faces were not prepossessing, although there were marked exceptions to any generalization that might be made. When I say they were peaceful, that is a generalization, but there were some who were very warlike and some who were excellent fighters. When I say they were rather homely in physical appearance, I also remind you that there were some exceptions to that rule, and that some individuals could be cited of the greatest dignity and very personable Indians, indeed.

The food of these Indians was of all manner of objects that were at all edible and some that you and I would not think at all edible. Many of them were not very bold hunters. They had great respect for the grizzly bear and seldom wished an encounter with the grizzly. They were not very able hunters from the standpoint of the deer and the antelope, although they captured some, more likely by trapping and trailing than by shooting with the bow and arrow. And yet they depended for the most part upon vegetable food, not to say however, that they did not make use of a good many of the lower forms of animals, including snakes, lizards, and rodents of various kinds. One of the choice delicacies, when they could find such an object, was the young hornet, or yellow jacket, before being hatched out from the honeycomb. That was a succulent sort of confection for them. They subsisted very largely upon acorns and depended more upon acorns than upon any one thing in many localities. In other localities where they lived, almost half of their food came from grasshoppers. I have no objection to their eating snails and grasshoppers and various other items and articles; but they are not attractive to us.

The homes of these Indians were far from attractive to us; their wickiups were very poor contrivances. They were indeed, to use a plain term, filthy in their manner of living, in their own so-called homes, and when conditions became unbearable they would move out and construct another home instead of cleaning house, and would burn up what they had left behind. The clothing of the Indians was very meager, nothing at all usually when the weather permitted, on the part of the male, and very little indeed on the part of the women. One of the objects of the missionaries was to see that they paid better attention to their clothing and to their food and to the general manner of their living.

Their weapons were not very strong. They did not amount to very much. The weapons that they used might be a club or a bow and arrow, but they were not very powerful. They stood in awe when they saw the Spanish rifles and heard the explosion which made a terrible noise—they had never seen anything of the kind before. Tools they had were very simple, indeed.

Now I do not wish to convey the impression that they were simply dumbbells, or that they had very little of common sense. They adapted themselves to the conditions; life was easy for many of them in the valleys of the San Joaquin and Sacramento and in the foothill districts. Why should they toil; why should they work and put themselves out to do things that were unnecessary from the standpoint of their way of living? And then again they had some rather beautiful customs and crafts. They were excellent basket weavers, and they learned to make simple tools. They could make boats. In some cases along the shore line they could make a canoe that would be large enough to held 10 men. They even became so skillful that they could make a boat that could carry them from Catalina Island to the mainland and back again to the island. They also, I think, had a good, deep sense of religion of their own kind, not what you and I would call religion at all, but more of animism, of mystic type, and what to us would be deemed incredulous and unbelievable; no set doctrine or teaching along that line, but many myths and legends were preserved from father to child and so on down through the generations.

Now, what has survived on the part of these Indians? The Indians themselves when they came in contact with the Spanish people did not suffer, in fact on the whole they were elevated, and their numbers were kept up very well. But when they came in contact with the early Americans who entered California, then they suffered. The contact was ruinous to them; it was tragic and most of the Americans treated them in a shameful manner. Some even wiped them out and would not hesitate to shoot down Indians as a matter of playful joking, and some would make notches on their muskets or on their implements to indicate how many Indians they had killed wantonly. Almost extinct they became. Now, however, for a number of years they have been better cared for, and many of them are in schools and institutions, and are among our useful citizens in a good many instances at the present time. It is pleasant to record that the United States Government has been giving better care, none too good yet, but much better care and attention to the preservation and uplift of the American Indians in California than in the early days.

A good many names have been left to us of Indian origin. I mention Siskiyou, Klamath, Mono, Napa, and others will occur to you as being of Indian origin, appearing now on our maps.

So much for the Indians; but I must pass to the coming of the Spanish people, introducing that subject by the use of the three C's, capital C's: Columbus, Cortez, Cabrillo. Columbus opened the way. Cortez carried on to further progress on our western shores, and Cabrillo became the actual discoverer of Alta California. In the meantime, one other name should be mentioned, and that is Balboa, who discovered the Pacific Ocean from the Isthmus of Panama. So there we have the setting, the background, for the discovery and final occupation of Spanish colonial California.

Cabrillo in 1542 sailed into the bay of San Diego, gave it a name which was changed a little later, and thus he became the discoverer of our California. Then he proceeded to the north and made considerable distance toward the north. He had an unfortunate accident and he died before the expedition was completed. Ferrelo, his understudy, his second in command, proceeded to the north as far as the southern boundary of Oregon. And that was the opening by the Spaniards of the west, and the coast of the Pacific all the way from San Diego to the southern part of Oregon.

I mention just one other name for the present, because there are many that are obscure and we cannot take the time to discuss them, and that is the name of Vizcaino. Vizcaino came north in 1602, landing at Monterey. He found a bay there, dropped anchor at the great Vizcaino oak, and there looked about him and thought he had found almost the perfection of a harbor. He wrote about it and his description is lively and glowing and was long regarded as a guide for later navigators. We may regard 1602 as perhaps the main year as the sequel following the actual discovery by Cabrillo and by Ferrelo. Then there follows a long period of inactivity so far as Spain is concerned; but in the meantime other foreigners were coming, to some extent.

I mention particularly Francis Drake, who came in 1579 and made land at what we now call Sir Francis Drake Bay, north of San Francisco, and not a part of San Francisco Bay. There he and his men stayed for several weeks, and in a formal manner took possession of the vast territory in the name of good Queen Bess—Queen Elizabeth of England. He named that Nova Albion, or what we now call New England. And thus it is clear the first New England was not on the Atlantic borders at all, but long before Plymouth or Jamestown there was that New Albion out here on the Pacific. It was he who left a bronze plate that only a few years ago was spectacularly discovered, purely as an accident. That bronze plate, according to the best critics, was pronounced authentic as having been left there in a faraway date in 1579. Then there are other foreigners who might be mentioned, but let us pass on to a more active period.

That is the period when Spain is becoming ready, very tardily, to occupy the land and set up a colony in California. You may remember that the Jesuits had control of the missions of Lower California, or Baja California, before our upper California was entered and settled; but in 1767 the Jesuits were expelled. They had fallen into disfavor with the royal power in Spain and were expelled from the Spanish territory at different points, including western America. It was then, after a good deal of uncertainty, that the territory of Lower California was allotted to the Dominican Order in the Catholic Church, and Alta California to the Franciscan Order. Thus we have the series of missions in California that are called the Franciscan Missions, simply because it was the Franciscan Order of the church that was given charge of that territory for missionary purposes.

Now the settlement of California is of a threefold nature. First is the religious aspect; second, there is the military aspect; and, third, the civil or governmental side, which comes in a little later. It seems to me to be appropriate tonight to give particular attention to the religious settlement in California because that proved to be the most important and most effective of all these different aspects.

It has been said that the history of England is the history of her church. It might similarly be said the Spanish history of California is the history of the Franciscan Missions, by far the most effective element in the occupation and civilizing processes of our early California. Let's look at that a little while. Junipero Serra was appointed, to his great delight, father-president of the Franciscan Missions. The man in charge of New Spain, representing the King of Spain, was called the viceroy, or the vice-king, and he had the prerogatives practically of a king. He was the supreme officer of New Spain or Mexico. Thus, the father-president, Junipero Serra, was responsible to him as was also the highest military officer.

The military officer in that expedition which came to San Diego in 1769 was Gaspar de Portola. Captain Portola and Father Serra, then, were the joint commanders of the military and the missionary factors to settle the territory. Now this occupation began under very difficult and trying circumstances. Scarcely had Father Serra been at San Diego for 2 or 3 days, a very short period, before he was eager, because he was a man of unquenchable zeal, to push on and have a location at Monterey. After establishing a mission at San Diego he had a burning desire to have a mission established at Monterey. For that purpose he and the others depended upon the description of Vizcaino of that bay. Thus the expedition that was sent out just a little bit later to locate Monterey for the purpose of settling a mission and also, of course, to guard against the encroachments of the Russians from the north. That was an expedition of the greatest sort of difficulty, and as you remember, Monterey was not identified; the description did not seem to check or tally with what they actually found. They passed by the very place they were looking for, and San Francisco Bay was discovered. Then the straggling remnants of the party that went on that perilous expedition could hardly get back to the headquarters in San Diego. Some were famished and almost dead, and yet good Father Serra was unwilling to give up the enterprise. It has often been said that if it had not been for the prayer and apparently miraculous happening of the providential appearance of the ship with the supplies of food that California would have been completely abandoned. Now we do not know exactly what would have happened, but we do know that not only Father Serra but also Portola—both of them—were strong in faith and strong in the purpose of going forward with the conquest of California. I need not detail to you that the second expedition in search of Monterey was more successful and that Serra himself established a mission at Carmel, near Monterey, which became the second of the series of missions, which very soon became the headquarters for the father-president himself. Thus we have San Diego and Monterey. I shall not even try to detail the founding of all the other missions. Suffice it to say, Father Serra was himself the founder of nine Franciscan missions. Others followed.

In the meantime, and I wish to return to this, we must remember that presidios had been founded, first at San Diego, then one at Monterey; later on, one at San Francisco, and one at Santa Barbara. Now the mission was the headquarters for the religious activity, but it was used by the State also, and the Government's use of the missions did not always harmonize with the purpose of the missionaries themselves. For example, the State used the mission largely for propaganda purposes and for purposes of extending the empire, whereas the sincere padres earnestly desired, at least most of

them did, the conversion of the aborigines, the saving of the souls of the Indians. They were deeply moved, even obsessed with that passion. It was certainly a burning passion in the breast of Junipero Serra. So there were a good many clashes between the State authority and the religious authority. Each was more or less parallel to the other in power and influence, but they clashed on numbers of occasions.

Then the third factor in the settling of California was the pueblo. I cannot speak in very glowing terms of the first pueblos that were established in California. They came rather late. The first one to be founded, under Governor Neve, was San Jose, in 1777, on the Guadalupe River; not a very prepossessing lot of colonists there, ignorant and not of the highest type, by any means; and then a few years later, 1781, the pueblo of Los Angeles was established, or founded. This pueblo had perhaps an even more unpromising group of first inhabitants, about 44 persons in all. None of them was able to read or write. Only two of them were of real Spanish blood and others having more of Indian or Negro or other blood than the true Castilian type. I could speak of them in rather deprecatory terms, as very unpromising, and yet this was the beginning of what has come to be known as the City of the Angels. Those were the two pueblos. Then there was an attempt to form a pueblo over near Santa Cruz called Branciforte. That was not a success. Even with the unpromising beginnings, both San Jose and Los Angeles did continue to exist and develop into thriving cities later on, but Branciforte did not, and the start that they made there, so far as they made any real start at all, was transferred to Santa Cruz later; and thus we have only the two real pueblos, or towns, as we may call them.

Now going back we review the picture of these three factors. The towns were ruled by reglamentos, or regulations or statutes, that were provided by the Viceroy or his representatives. The missions were ruled by the word of the father-president, and he was practically supreme in power in that respect. The presidios were controlled by the comandantes, the military authorities. The common magistrate of the pueblo was known as the alcalde. These did not all harmonize by any means, but they were the three different factors in the settlement and occupation of California.

What was life in the missions like? It would be interesting to go into much detail if there were time. The Indians were a very unpromising lot to be converted to Christianity, but that made no difference. If we have respect for the truth, we must have great admiration for many of the padres who were so devoted through self-denial, self-abnegation, sacrifice of all kinds, men of high type and good learning, coming to put forth their earnest efforts, their wholehearted labors, to the conversion of these crude aborigines. Sometimes it was months before they received a single convert. Then there were the neophytes, or the initiates, the converts, who came in larger number. The largest number, perhaps, at any one time in all the missions combined was something over 20,000. There were 21 missions in all. The last two, San Rafael and Sonoma, or San Francisco Solano, were founded largely as outposts against the possible encroachments of the Russians from the north, thus having as much, probably more, political than truly religious significance.

The pathway between the missions, none farther to the interior than about 30 miles from the seacoast, came to be known as El Camino Real. It was about 1 day's journey from one mission to the next on foot, sometimes an easy day's journey, and good Father Serra who made visitations frequently to different missions as time gave him opportunity, always stopped in at each mission, always welcomed with glad acclaim. He was held in great reverence by the devoted people, as well as the padres, and that trail known as El Camino Real came to be more or less a beaten trail. But please do not think of it as simply one definite trail from north to south and south to north, because there was much deviation, and in addition to that main trail route there were some of the asistencias, or chapels, or secondary buildings for worship, which were at the side and thus the padres moved apart from the main trail and would not be confined to that one track by any means.

How did these people receive the gospel of the Catholic Church? They received it largely as a means of securing some food and clothing and did not realize to what extent they were to be held as servants, and some would say, as slaves in the missions themselves. Rather frequently, then, there were desertions. Some of these neophytes ran away to the mountains and had to be brought back and were punished with severe floggings and other punishments. They were taught different things. They were taught the catechism. They were taught in some cases the rudiments of music and even a little in art, in craftsmanship, in tanning leather, in making different products, in weaving and to some extent, in the cultivation of the soil and in the tending of the sheep and the cattle. Now they were directed in those respects and many of them learned a great many things from the Franciscan Fathers. They produced much. The cattle multiplied. There were thousands of horses and many sheep and the products, as you know, were exchanged by a process of barter for the products brought around Cape Horn by the Boston ships. It was against the law, technically, for such barter to be carried on, but the padres and the merchants from New England paid little attention to the technical law in that respect. The mission was a benevolent despotism. I say benevolent, because it was well-meant and there was much kindness and much justice, but the government was despotic. It is not my purpose to go into a detailed criticism pro and con of the character and the routine and the life in the Franciscan missions. I pay my respects, however, to those fine-spirited and well-meaning, devoted leaders like Serra, like Palou, Crespi, and others who were in charge of that great work.

The buildings themselves of the missions show a type of architecture which has come to be the outstanding feature of that whole period. These buildings are in many cases now restored, and in other instances are still to be restored. That is a subject that is of great importance and interest in itself.

I mention two or three other names of those who were leaders in the mission work. First, there is the biographer of Serra, and it is fortunate we have his biography. It is a leading source of information of that period and that man. That is Palou. Next I mention the actual successor, the legal successor, of Serra, who was Lasuen. Both of these were men of high quality. In fact, Mr. Bancroft places Lasuen ahead of Serra himself because of his loving spirit and his fine type of genteel leadership.

Now in the meantime the government of California had developed, but very slowly and very backwardly. The man at the head of the government was the Governor himself who, of course, was under the viceroy of New Spain. There were at least 10 different Spanish governors in a period from 1769 down to 1820. Most of these men were men of no very considerable moment. They do not stand out as great statesmen; but there are two men who are great in their qualities of leadership, not governors, and not missionaries, but who did more for California than anyone else except the leading missionaries themselves, perhaps. The first of these is Jose de Galvez who came appointed by the royalty of Spain as the visitor general or inspector general in New Spain, including California. He saw some of the same kind of things, objectives, and visions, that Junipero Serra saw and he helped very greatly in the development of California although he did not himself come into the province.

The other leader that I mention, whose contributions might be described in great detail, was a viceroy of New Spain. His name was Bucarely. Many of the viceroys we care very little about, but this official was a man of outstanding qualities, whose name should be mentioned in any history of California.

So we have these three great leaders and I have put them in this order, Junipero Serra, Bucarely, Jose de Galvez, all important in that period of the history of our State.

Another institution grew up under the leadership of the Spanish Castilians chiefly, which became the principal factor in the life of the times, and that is the rancho. In addition, then, to the mission, the pueblo, and the presidio, we have the rancho, and the ranchero became a very important personage in our history and in connection with the life of California. It was around the life of the ranch, the big land holdings of these Castilians, for some of them were very fine and high-type men, that much of the flavor and fragrance of California history abides.

The life of California is largely to be found in connection with the caballero, the ranchero, the large holdings of these people. And that suggests, beginning as early as the time of our Revolution in America, there was the first land grant. Land was plentiful. The land grant known as the Verdugo Ranch, or San Rafael, was in 1776; and from time to time there were other grants, not by the acre but by the league. A full land grant might be 11 leagues of land, running into many thousands of acres. Why? Because there was no need for restraint. No limitation was placed upon the amount of land that a person might hold and in some cases a landholder held as high as 50,000 or even more acres of land. Then life centered about these ranches. The homes were there, the adobe homes, with earth or dirt floors. The large families were conspicuous, a family of 11 or 17 children. They were intermarried to a considerable extent. There was only a small population of this higher class of Californians, and yet their life was very lovely and picturesque and that helped very materially to accept the thought of California being the child of Spain.

Just the other day we had a great celebration of the centennial of the gold discovery. One of the speakers at Coloma was Eugene Biscaluz, sheriff of Los Angeles County. It was his great uncle who discovered gold in 1842 not far from Newhall, about 40 miles from Los Angeles. Another prominent man who took part in many such activities is Leo Carrillo, a direct descendant of three or four generations of Californians, and Mr. Carrillo, of the first Californians, was one of the pure type of Castilian blood, ranking high in his general culture and manly character. These and others like them constituted the main force of the population. Then there are many of those who worked under them, not exclusively the Indians, although largely the Indians, who became vaqueros. The home was a place of great interest. We could find a great deal to emulate in the home life of these early Californians. I shall not dwell upon that subject because it more properly belongs to next week's lecture.

I would like to take a little time now to give you a list of names or terms of different types referring to the life of Spanish California. Many of these are familiar to you already, but a "pass in review" would be of service, I believe.

Regarding the government itself the pueblo, presidio, viceroy, have already been

used; reglamento, the regulation or the statute; the alcalde—the alcalde came to be known as a kind of judge or administrator or magistrate of vaguely-defined powers, but sometimes earlier it applied to an Indian who was placed over other Indians as a foreman working in a mission. Then there was the plaza, or public square. There was the encomienda, which is a kind of trustee system for controlling the Indians. There was the rancheria, which was the name of the Indian village itself. There was the poblador or pobladores, the settlers that came to live about the pueblos and constituted a part of its population. There was the junta, and so forth, all pertaining more or less to the government of the colony of California and its localities.

In regard to the missions the word padre is commonly used to represent father, and the word fray, or its abbreviation Fr., a member of a religious brotherhood and it is an expression which means brother and not father. There was the neophyte or novice who was known as the convert or the initiate in the case of the mission; the mayordomo, who was the headman or kind of foreman over the Indians or group of Indians. We use commonly the word adobe, meaning a brick which is sun-dried and made out of the sticky earth; and the asistencia, which is a secondary building for worship on the side, such as that near Redlands—not a full-grown mission but a chapel, or assistance to the mission.

On the ranch life we have such words as caballero, a fine gentleman of the period; the rodeo is the round-up pertaining to the cattle chiefly. The matanza is the slaughter of the cattle which occurred annually and sometimes semiannually. There was the carreta or ox-cart, which was familiar; the fandango, which applied usually to a general kind of dance with the concomitants of that dance; the fiesta or occasion for festivity of some kind; the siesta, an after-dinner nap which was so common and which we have forgotten how to take, as a rule. There was the gringo, an American usually, or an English-speaking person who came; the sombrero, the broad-brimmed hat; the rebozo, a scarf which was worn by the women; the mantilla, a beautiful shawl, part of the clothing of the fine ladies, the senoras of that time. There was the serape, the cloak worn by the gentlemen; the tortilla, a kind of food, a cake made out of cornmeal usually. The tulare, means simply an area of tules, and the wickiup is a name for the poor Indian habitation, and very poor, indeed, it was, as a rule. The temescal is the sweat house, or the assembly room of these Indians and that was used for a variety of purposes, as we know. Paisano, countrymen or foreigners. In that connection may I refer you to one book called Western Words? This book, published by the University of Oklahoma Press, is a dictionary of the range, pertaining not simply to California alone, but to the whole of the Southwest and it is the most comprehensive compendium of such words that I know of, compiled by Raymond F. Adams. Western Words, a dictionary of the range, cow camp, and the trail.

Permit me to spend a few moments before closing to pay further tribute to some of the great missionary leaders of California, because I sincerely think that the most potent factor in the settlement of Alta California was the missions. Enough has been said perhaps already about Junipero Serra. One thing more: his name was first presented as the Apostle of California who should be recognized in the great Statuary Hall of Washington, D. C., when there was the choice of two persons to represent each State. Junipero Serra was chosen by acclamation as the first Representative of California. At the proper time the statue there was unveiled with ceremony, and now for a number of years there is in process, within the Catholic Church, the thought of canonizing him so that he will be known as a saint. I have great reason to believe that in the not-distant future he will be sainted in the church. Palou, who was associated with Serra so intimately, and loved him so devotedly, deserves also a word of tribute. He desired the mission labor among the savages of America above everything else. He worked in Baja California for a good many years before coming to Alta California. He was made temporary president of the missions following the death of Serra, but he was never officially and legally actual president. His greatest service, perhaps, is in preparing the life or the Vida of his great predecessor and leader, Junipero Serra. "A diligent student," says Bolton, "devout Christian, loyal disciple, tireless traveler, zealous missionary, resourceful pioneer, successful mission builder, able administrator, fair-minded historian." Then comes the real successor of Serra, Lasuen. Lasuen became president of the missions in 1785. He had a service of 30 years in this territory of Alta California. He had a sweet temper and he was benevolent in character, affable, possessed untiring zeal, and employed real common sense. When he died in San Carlos, he was buried alongside his master, Serra, at that head mission.

Jose de Galvez, called the "man of the hour," was a man of great energy and Visitor General for New Spain, appointed in 1765 to safeguard the Spanish possession against the possible encroachments of the French, the British, and the Russians. The expedition to Monterey was ordered by him. He had a conception of the permanent occupation of the territory and helped the missionaries, particularly Serra, perhaps more than anyone else. Bucarely, the great viceroy, was the chief functionary in advancing the cause along with Galvez for several years. The main object of him and of others was to increase the royal revenue. They were not so directly interested in the matter of the missionary zeal and the missionary enterprise as such, but they used the church as a function of the state in order to advance the cause and to increase the royal revenues. He gained special recognition and especially there was great influence from him as a result of Serra's visit to New Spain and to the viceroy in the year 1773. The discovery of the land route from Sonora to Monterey, to a large extent, must be attributed to this great viceroy, Bucarely.

Summing up, then, there are these names that are worthy of remembrance when we think of California of the Spanish period. Beginning with Columbus, Cortez, Cabrillo; carrying on, Ferrelo, Vizcaino, Kino, and Salvatierra in Lower California; Serra, Palou, Lasuen, Crespi, Anza, Garces, Portola, Galvez, Bucarely, Governor De Neve, and the names of foreigners that come within the same period—Drake, Captain Cook, Captain Gray, Perouse, the Frenchman; Rezanov, also Kotzebue, the Russians, and all that that meant, and then Vancouver, whose report was one of the most valuable of all the accounts of navigators of the Pacific at that time. The later subject of the conquest or the acquisition of California must refer to a number of early Americans, also, but these will be presented later. Truly, California is the child of Spain, and we do well to recognize that fact; we do well to appreciate the heritage that is ours from Spain, and we must not forget that with the excitement of the present day about gold and about the early American pioneers, there was something back of that, a tradition which will be explored more fully in next week's lecture, that we must not forget. We must treasure the fact that California is indeed a child of Spain. [Applause.]

Recovery in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stewart Alsop, from today's Washington Post:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

THE SUM AND THE PARTS

ROME.—Will the European recovery program make possible a real recovery in Italy, or can a free Italy survive only as a permanent pensioner of the United States? As the political placards are torn down, as the excitements of the election fade into memory, that remains the great conundrum, not only for Italy but for every nation of non-Soviet Europe. Moreover, with the Communists increasingly isolated, with a stable government at last in prospect, the European recovery program should have a fair test here.

Especially among Italian conservatives and nationalists, there are those who predict flatly (and with an odd lugubrious pleasure) that the test is bound to fail. These gloomy prophets are by no means fools, and their reasoning is worth hearing. Its key is a word which the reporter in Italy always sooner or later hears in every conversation with an Italian, whether Premier Alcide de Gasperi or a chance acquaintance in a lobby. The word is "emigration." For as one observer rather brutally put it, "The Italians must export to live, and most of what they must export is Italians."

The facts are simple. There is a net yearly population increase of between 400,000 and 500,000 on this crowded peninsula. Except by emigration (or by those traditional methods, famine, and war) there is no way in which this constant increase can be controlled, first, because this is a Catholic country, and second, because the Italian peasant or worker has always regarded a large family as a form of old-age insurance.

Premier de Gasperi hopes to find living space abroad for 200,000 Italians every year. Yet even if this hope is fulfilled, the pessimists point out, the Italian population will still shoot up a million people every 4 years. And how can this poor country, they ask, a country without natural resources, hope to feed and clothe and shelter these people? Even now there are almost 2,000,000 unemployed, many agricultural workers live little better than animals, and millions of industrial laborers work only part time, 20 or 24 hours a week.

The central and eastern European markets for Italy's delicious fruits and vegetables are largely cut off. The world's rich, squeezed by taxation even in the rich United States, no longer buy Italy's fine silk and Carrara marble and specially built luxury cars. Without native raw materials, Italy cannot hope to compete in world markets in heavy industry. And, above all, everywhere in the world the doors are closed or closing on Italy's teeming population excess. Italy could survive in the Old World of open borders and open markets, but not today. Thus the European recovery program is no more than a means of postponing, for 4 short years, the inevitable catastrophe.

Thus argue the pessimists, in this immoderately cheerful country. There is a

certain grim logic in their reasoning; yet it is interesting that not one of the hard-hearted American experts here subscribe to this reasoning. The experts do not maintain that Italy is certain to recover. But they are unanimous in maintaining that Italy can recover.

Much will, of course, depend on the Italians themselves. More than is generally realized has already been accomplished. Inflation has been controlled. Production is on the increase. Reconstruction of the vast war damage is under way. The Italians are eager to work; no one can spend even a week or so here without sensing the enormous vitality of the Italian people.

Much remains to be done, and Premier de Gasperi, although he expects opposition from the conservatives in his own party, is determined that it shall be done. He and his advisers speak of tax reform, land reform, irrigation schemes, plans for the reorganization of the chaotic Italian industry.

Yet even all this, and here again the experts are unanimous, will not be enough. Italy can recover, but Italy cannot recover alone, as a separate economic and political entity. To this extent the prophets of doom are entirely correct.

To a remarkable degree, the conviction is growing here that the European whole is greater than the sum of all its parts; that not only Italy but England and France and all the western European nations can only recover permanently as integral parts of a politically and economically unified western Europe. The more fareseeing go further, predicting that the recovery of Europe, even after unification, will depend upon the political and economic organization of the whole non-Soviet world. Only thus, it must be admitted, can fundamental solutions be found for such problems as the Italian population surplus.

These ideas have already found preliminary expression in the western union, which Italy may soon be invited to join. Yet the western union is no more than a start. Italian Foreign Minister Carlo Sforza has remarked half jokingly that he expects Europe to be united in about 80 years, some 70-odd years too late. Certainly there are immense obstacles to real western European unity. Yet the ruthless policy of the Soviet Union will continue to act as a lash driving the western European nations to unite. And the United States, in the European recovery program, has provided the means. Thus it is at last possible to hope. That is at least something of which Americans may be proud.

PM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune regarding the purchase of the PM newspaper by Joseph Barnes and Bartley Crum:

PM'S REBIRTH

Everyone who has known the rich cargo of hopes, ideals, and loyalties with which a newspaper venture is freighted, must rejoice when one is saved from shipwreck. That PM will continue means much in human terms; that it will come under the new leadership of Mr. Joseph Barnes and Mr. Bartley Crum means much in professional terms. Both are men of integrity and ability. Their beliefs, translated into practical journalistic values, can do a great deal to invigorate an enterprise begun in the most hopeful of atmospheres, which turned to disillusionment when enthusiasm for causes dominated objective newsgathering.

For the Herald Tribune, the departure of Mr. Barnes is cause for regret. He served this newspaper long and ably—a rewarding person to know and a stimulating fellow-worker. In a calling which resists mechanization so strenuously as does journalism, in which personality and the constant, informal exchange of ideas is so important, Mr. Barnes' capacity for friendship no less than his quality of mind and wide experience are beyond price. They proved so on the Herald Tribune; they are certain to be no less important for PM. And with respect and affection, we wish him and his new undertaking well.

Shortage of Oil and Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had a call from my home town of Kimball, Nebr., in regard to the shortage of gasoline and oil in that section. They are now rationing gasoline to all tourists, and unless additional gas and oil can be supplied it will be impossible to carry on full farming operations. This condition, I am told exists in many of the farming sections of the Midwest.

We all know of the shortage of oil in New England last winter. There were many speeches made on the floor of this House about this serious problem.

A look at the shipments under the European recovery program—ERP—indicates that the oil supplied to the countries under ERP will be a vital factor in further shortages in this country. Under the ERP the American oil exports to the 16 participating countries during the first year are placed at 21,700,000 metric tons, costing $479,000,000. To this must be added the shipping costs. It will take 2,300 oil tankers of 10,000 tons displacement to carry the oil to Europe. We note under the ERP that the United Kingdom is down for $130,500,000 worth of American oil. The British press has protested this waste of American dollars when England could get all the oil she needs within her own sterling area.

Now, let us look at petroleum equipment. Under ERP the United States exports of petroleum equipment to the Marshall countries is in the amount of $192,200,000. Of this the United Kingdom gets $120,100,000. England expects to export from the United Kingdom $156,800,000 worth of petroleum equipment. It is noted that of the British petroleum equipment, $70,400,000 worth is going back into the Western Hemisphere, while $86,400,000 goes to nonparticipating countries.

Mr. Speaker, does this mean reexport of American equipment? Does this mean that some of the British equipment can go to the Soviet Union or Soviet-controlled countries?

The United States News of this week indicates that several countries behind the iron curtain are now receiving imports from the countries we supply under the Marshall plan. Does that mean that American goods going to the Marshall plan countries, eventually find their way into Russia? The United States News in its official report shows that England is now exporting far more than she ever exported before. Some of those exports are coming to this country. They consist of automobiles, farm machinery, textiles, and many other items which, of course, England needs at home. She is able to export to this country because, under the Marshall plan, we give her material which she needs. She in turn intends to flood this country with the same material, apparently in order to get American dollars. This country pays cash for what they get from England, while we give her, under the Marshall plan, about $1,300,000,000. Does this make sense?

Mr. Speaker, unless there is a different arrangement whereby sufficient oil and gas can be retained in this country, the American farmer will not be able to produce the food so badly needed by this country and the world.

I understand that attention is being given to the continuance of the Emergency Petroleum Commission. This Commission will be set up in all the States, and an effort will be made to allocate gasoline and oil to these areas where shortages appear. This should be done without delay, for unless it is done and measures are taken to insure sufficient supplies of gas and oil in this country, not only New England, but many sections of the country will suffer from the cold because of the lack of oil to supply their heat.

You who voted for the Marshall plan may well have time to reflect upon the shortages and inflation resulting from the Marshall plan. Inflation is nothing more than having more money than goods. The cure is to have more goods than money. This just cannot take place when they continue to ship from the country many of the scarce items so badly needed at home. There should be some sober thinking upon this problem.

Giving Away a National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the May 2, 1948, Sunday Star:

GIVING AWAY A NATIONAL ASSET

The oil and minerals lying under the marginal sea belong to the people. But what people—the people of the coastal States, or the people of all the States?

When the question went to the Supreme Court, the decision last June was in favor of all the people of all the States. That, at least, was the implication of the ruling which found that the United States, not California, has "paramount rights" to oil under the tidelands off California's coast.

But in spite of that, and for the second time, the House has overwhelmingly decided in favor of the States. By yesterday's vote of 257–29, it renounced, on behalf of the United States, all claims to the rights in controversy. It gave title over these lands to the few States involved, leaving to these States, rather than to the Federal Government, the exploitation of what may be fabulous riches.

Congress took comparable action 2 years ago, while ownership of these lands were still in question before the courts. In vetoing the legislation then, President Truman took the position that if the United States owned the mineral rights, they should not be given away. If the States owned them, then no further legislation was necessary. His veto was upheld.

The Senate probably will pass, by a narrower margin, the bill approved by the House yesterday. The President, it has been said, will veto it again. He would have even stronger grounds for that disapproval than he had 2 years ago. For if the Supreme Court decision of last June can be correctly interpreted as vesting ownership of tidelands deposits in the people of the United States, the action of Congress is to give away that property and place it in a handful of States.

That is wrong. If the geologists are correct in their assumptions, tidelands oil in known locations and that which is yet to be discovered represents a highly important national resource which should be husbanded in the national interest. The question of State rights, shrewdly capitalized by California and a few others, has won tremendous support, as indicated by the House vote yesterday.

But in view of the implications of the Supreme Court decision, the effect of the House legislation is not to confirm a right. The effect is to confer a new right on the States which did not previously exist and to repudiate the Supreme Court's findings as to where these rights really lie.

The gain thus made for State rights is at the expense of what should have been a national policy of conservation and development in the interests of the whole country. Legislation designed to effect that policy, drawn up by the National Government in the interests of all the people and based largely on national defense needs, has been sidetracked in Congress and permitted to lapse in committee while national rights are renounced in favor of a grab by a few States. If this legislation prevails, the people of all the States have not been well served by their representatives in Congress.

Railroad Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should take prompt and favorable action on legislation to increase railroad-retirement annuities. This is provided in H. R. 5993, introduced by Representative CROSSER, of Ohio, and which has the endorsement of the 20 railroad unions represented by the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

H. R. 5993 would increase by 20 to 25 percent the amounts payable to railroad workers after they retire, with the higher percentage increases going to the lower-income group. Figures show that the average annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act is only about $70 a month. In many thousands of cases it is $50 or less. Most of the retirement rates now being paid were established in 1937. Living costs are estimated to have risen about 70 percent during the last 11 years.

Although other bills have been offered that would provide greater retirement incomes, the railroad-labor organizations consider H. R. 5993 as the most desirable. They feel that it will best accomplish a threefold purpose—give necessary relief to retired workers, avoid increase in retirement taxes, and assure the continued soundness of the railroad retirement fund.

While the retirement fund is in good condition, I am advised that there is no considerable surplus. I am also informed that there was much thought and study devoted to this subject, in determining that the fund could support an increase in annuities. Now that the matter has been gone into thoroughly, it is the considered opinion of those best qualified to render an opinion, that the railroad-retirement system will not be endangered by the modest increases proposed in H. R. 5993.

It should be kept in mind that the increases can be granted without increasing the amount of money now required to be paid either by the railroads or by the employees. No additional tax will be necessary.

Under the present law and present economic conditions a railroad man approaching retirement age is in a difficult position. Even if he has saved up a nice sum of money and owns his home, if he retires he will be faced with the hazard of steadily decreasing savings and perhaps ill health which frequently comes with advanced years. The present annuity payments are of little real assistance; in many cases practically none at all. Surely retired railroad employees who have served well and faithfully for so many years are entitled to the assurance of better protection in their later life.

There is another measure, H. R. 5875, which should likewise be adopted. This legislation, also sponsored by Representative CROSSER, would increase the amounts payable for each day on which a railroad worker is eligible for unemployment-insurance benefits, either because he is ill or because there is no job for him.

The necessity for H. R. 5875 is evident when it is considered that the rates paid to jobless railroaders in the lower-income groups have not been increased since 1940 when it is estimated that living costs were 65 percent lower than they are now.

There is sufficient money in the railroad unemployment insurance fund that the railroads are claiming the tax rate should be reduced. Therefore there can be no doubt that the fund can well support increases ranging from 45 cents to $1.25 a day in benefits for the unemployed.

When the railroad unemployment insurance system was established, the drafters of the legislation kept the benefits down to a point where, according to the best estimates available at that time, they could be financed by a payroll tax of only 3 percent. In 1946 Congress determined that some liberalizations could be made in the act without any tax increase, and this was done.

While the cost of living has continued to increase since 1946, at the same time wage increases and maintenance of a period of high railroad employment that began during the war have brought unforeseen sums into the unemployment insurance fund. The larger the fund the more it earns in interest. There is now a substantial reserve, while on the other hand the benefits it provides have become wholly inadequate. Just how far the benefits should ultimately be increased and what additional improvements can be made without increasing the existing tax rate are matters requiring a careful study which is now being made. In the meantime, however, with ample funds available, there is no reason to deny to those unemployed because of illness or lack of work a benefit increase that will restore their purchasing power to the level Congress established when it set the 1946 rates.

There is general agreement that the unemployment insurance fund can support a 25-percent cost-of-living increase in unemployment benefits without impairing its soundness. H. R. 5875 would provide that 25-percent increase.

I have outlined the provisions of H. R. 5993 and H. R. 5875, why these provisions are needed, and how they are to be financed. The provisions are simple, the need urgent, and the financing available without cost to the taxpayer, the railroads, or the railroad employees. These two bills should be enacted into law without further delay.

I also wish to refer to H. R. 5711, a bill to which I am opposed. This measure, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative SIMPSON, would reduce unemployment insurance contributions from the railroad companies at the expense of the employees. The companies see the large reserve fund as an opoprtunity to lower their taxes. Suppose, however, that a severe depression period is encountered. There is nothing to show that the fund could survive that experience if it is weakened by the tax cut proposed in H. R. 5711. This bill would have the disastrous effect of reducing railroad taxes immediately from the present rate of 3 percent to a mere one-half of 1 percent.

The railroads obtained rate increases and opposed increases in wages of their workers on the grounds that the companies have to pay unemployment tax. Despite the fact that the average nonoperating railroad worker draws less than the average worker in comparable jobs in other industries, the railroads now seek a tax reduction which it is estimated would give them around $120,000,000 a year.

The opposition of the railroad employees to H. R. 5711 is justified. The bill should be defeated.

I have high regard for the railroad brotherhoods which have for many years led the way in behalf of forward-looking labor legislation. They represent the most conservative, most reasonable, and most progressive element of labor.

I was glad to have a part in making adoption of the Crosser bill in 1946 possible. It will be recalled that this measure was being held up in the Ways and Means Committee, and the only way in which it could be brought before the House was through a petition discharging the committee from further consideration of the legislation. I was one of the 218 Members of the House who signed this petition. When the bill was in the Committee of the Whole there were certain amendments introduced by opposing forces and which were protested by the railroad workers when the measure was reported back to the House. I realized that the workers were correct in their protest, and I voted against the crippling amendments which were killed by the House. The defeat of these amendments made it possible for the Crosser amendments to become law.

I believe in the principle of organized labor; in the right of the workers to organize and work for their mutual protection and welfare. I have always recognized that right, and my record in public life will show that I have been friendly and sympathetic to the cause of the railroad men. While a member of the Louisiana Legislature I made a most vigorous and practically single-handed fight for enactment of the full crew bill. In the legislature and in Congress I have always voted for legislation that I felt was necessary for the best interests of the workers, and I will continue to do so at every opportunity.

Colorado Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, many veterans and their dependents are not familiar with the various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them by the laws of the great State of Colorado. It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to present an outline of such legislation as prepared by Charles S. Taylor, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 120 State Office Building, Denver 2, Colo., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowance is provided for burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Relatives or friends may conduct the funeral.

The State is authorized to acquire and maintain burial grounds, the management and control of which is vested in certain veteran organizations. No charge shall be made for burial space in such grounds.

County allowance is provided for headstones for graves of indigent soldiers.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence of presumed death or absence may be admitted.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces or merchant marine.

Wills may be proved if attesting witnesses become incompetent or are unavailable in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the United States Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Free copies of public records are available for use by veterans or their dependents in obtaining benefits.

The adjutant general furnishes certified copies of World War enrollment records to any post of the American Legion free of charge

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge.

The board of county commissioners of each county shall appoint a county veterans' service officer.

It is the duty of the Colorado Department of Veterans' Affairs to assist veterans or their dependents in securing benefits to which they are entitled under State or Federal laws. Annual appropriations are provided.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Loans are available to World War veterans for educational purposes.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, AND SO FORTH

Military service benefits under the Unempoyment Compensation Act were extended to July 1, 1947.

Veterans have preference in civil-service appointments.

Preference is extended to veterans in municipal fire departments which are under civil service.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Employment status is preserved under the Civil Service Act.

Rules and regulations have been promulgated giving to war veterans identical credits and preferences as are given by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Contributions were waived until June 30, 1943, while a member of the State Retirement Association was in any branch of the armed forces engaged in national defense.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION

Money received from the United States as pension is exempt from execution, attachment, or other legal process.

GUARDIANSHIP

The Uniform Guardianship Act provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or minor child of a veteran to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives, and widows may be admitted to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Rights of veterans are established with respect to the sale and improvement of State lands. For each day of service a credit of $1 is given veterans in the purchase of such lands.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, insurance companies, and building and loan associations may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Veterans are extended second-injury fund benefits.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Exemption is granted from gross-receipts tax of proceeds from boxing contests or exhibitions held by certain veteran organizations to provide recreation for persons in active military service.

Combined fishing and small game hunting licenses are available for members of the armed forces upon application and payment of $1 fee.

Exemption is granted, beginning after December 31, 1944, of compensation of members of the armed forces for military service not in excess of $1,500, mustering-out pay, and all payments made to dependents.

Members of the armed forces are relieved from State income-tax liability during period of military service, plus period of 1 year.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of certain veterans' organizations is unlawful, punishable by a fine of not to exceed $20 or imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both.

The unauthorized use of the letters "GAR" is declared a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not less than $100, or by confinement in the county jail for not less than 6 months, or both.

Armory privileges are extended to veteran organizations.

Gross-receipts tax of proceeds from boxing contests or exhibitions held by certain veterans' organizations to provide recreation for persons in the active military service is waived.

Most of these laws have been enacted through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time the DAV has some 36 chapters throughout the State of Colorado, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans with their problems in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains four national service officers on a full-time basis, under the direction of Brian J. Thornton, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, 102 Keith Building, Denver 2, Colo.

These DAV experts extend all types of service to veterans and their dependents, free of charge, more particularly in the development and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled under existing Federal and State laws.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before Jan. 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members.

DAV SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 handicapped veterans of World War II to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

The members of the tenth and last class of such trainees received their diplomas in May 1947, and are now completing their job training in all parts of the country.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has, each year, been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspapers, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all existing and pending legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, opinions of the Attorney General, Comptroller General, and VA Administrator, VA regulations, service letters, circulars, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a badly wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The National Service Headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my good friend, Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has its office manager, John E. Feighner, as assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil service appointments, and last, but really first in importance—suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled—1,525,753; total monetary benefits—$132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service reports.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens agree with the DAV that the Federal Government should bear the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were incurred in or aggravated by his military service.

To prove service connection of a disability, however, is not an easy thing to do, except where official records show its inception in service. An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established.

Many different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though actually service-incurred or aggravated.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veterans' abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of both World Wars I and II, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Land of the Free" written by the Honorable James A. Farley, and appearing in the Elks magazine:

LAND OF THE FREE

(By James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp.)

I am grateful for the opportunity presented by the Elks magazine to discuss Americanism, a subject so vital, not only to us of today, but to the future of our country and the peace of the world. Americanism is the one "ism" that sums up all that America has been, is, and can hope to be. It is the only philosophy of government that has ever recognized the God-given right of man to carve out his own destiny, to share in his own government and to make his own laws.

I know of no forum from which one may speak more effectively, or to a more understanding audience, than from the pages of

a magazine representing an American-born fraternity with a membership of more than 900,000 American citizens of sworn loyalty and an unsurpassed record of service in peace and war.

Americanism is an impelling subject. It is an interpretation of the kind of democracy which must win the battle for world peace if there is to be any peace at all. We are living in a period of world stress and America must recognize the implications of these times. Never in all history was there a time when so many people of so many nations have been starving, homeless, and gazing into a hopeless future. These are truly "times that try men's souls," times when there cannot be too much restatement of values or reiteration of the principles that all Americans hold dear. This is our America and the people of no other country in this war-ravaged world enjoy the privileges and blessings that are ours. It is true that war has brought about maladjustments in our economy and its impact has jolted our lives out of prewar complacency, but the most vehement denouncers of our democracy cannot deny that our people are better fed, housed, and clothed than any other people anywhere in the world. This is the answer to those who would substitute the doctrine of Karl Marx for the Declaration of Independence, and the Internationale for the Star-Spangled Banner. The sometimes terrifying aftermath of war must not be permitted to cloud the clear vision of the American people, nor can we permit the enemies of America to inject their poison into the pure stream of democracy that flows through the hearts of the American people, to keep America always the land of the free.

War is a devastating experience. It is the young, the strong, the virile who must fight. It casts its shadow over millions of homes and its utter futility, its needless waste, its wanton slaughter, shake faith in the civilizing influence of centuries of culture and progress. Each succeeding war, always more terrible than the last, breeds fear of the next war, and since that day when man's scientific attainments enabled him to smash the atom, the acrid smoke of the atomic bomb has lingered in the nostrils of mankind and all look with shrinking dread for the next war to destroy civilization.

This Nation of ours has known six wars, excluding the Revolution, which lighted an inspiring new beacon of liberty for all the world to see and wrote a new chapter of government and human relations. It has had its grim period of internal strife out of which came a Nation "one and indivisible" forever. America has never known defeat. The great virility of our country, its unbeatable qualities, are attributed by other nations to our vast natural resources, our great ports, enormous industrial plants and the productive ability of our people. But there is a deeper reason for our unequalled record both in peace and in war, an underlying cause for our triumphs on the battlefield, a factor that transcends all material considerations and inspires our men and women, peace-loving as they are, to sacrifice loved ones, homes, even life itself, when danger threatens America.

I have traveled the length and breadth of our country many times. I have made many visits to each State in the Union. I have not gone as a casual visitor, but with the determined purpose of studying conditions and learning to know their people. I am personally acquainted with hundreds of citizens in each State. My correspondence with my fellow citizens down through the years has been enormous. From my own contacts and observations, I have sensed the spirit of America to the extent that I am willing to attempt to define that all-pervading spiritual essence that we call Americanism. There are 140,000,000 Americans and, I venture to guess, as many definitions of Americanism, but all put together and reduced to their simplest form may be summed up in the word freedom; the freedom that exists only in America, and is democracy in its best form.

Freedom is the blood and bone and sinew of America, the underlying force, the inner power that creates the spirit singular to our Nation. Freedom and Americanism are synonymous, and I am thinking of freedom in the terms of what it holds for our future, and its effect upon the future of the world.

Let us examine this remarkable force called freedom that we cherish by instinct and tradition, a freedom we fought for, not only for ourselves, but for people throughout the world. Our freedom is credited with being little more than a century and a half old. However, freedom was in the air when the first Pilgrim landed on the shores of Massachusetts. It impregnated all of those who followed them, and when, on July 4, 1776, the Liberty Bell announced to the world that the Continental Congress had cut all ties with the Old World, the hearts of the Colonists already were aglow with liberty's flame, and they went forth to achieve victory. The victory they won gave to the world its greatest nation and a system of government founded in the late eighteenth century and essentially unchanged since that time. In this chaotic world of today, it holds out the one hope for the freedom of mankind.

Our freedom has carried five generations, through successive stages of progress, to living standards that have astonished the world. It does not owe its origin to any of the decaying governments of the past. Our form of government was born of virile and independent thought. It is predicated upon the Declaration of Independence, the greatest charter of human liberty ever penned, a document that kindled a new light in the darkness of a world where monarchs ruled by divine right, and whose words were the sole arbiter of man's destiny. Our forefathers, in defiance of the rulers of the world, declared that "all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," among them "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Never since the caveman discovered fire had human kind discovered anything so important to human progress as this philosophy upon which was builded a government of, for, and by the people, a government with a minimum of hampering laws, a government that gave unrestricted opportunity to individual enterprise, and developed in our people the stamina and spiritual strength that have carried America onward and upward through the years.

Our freedom couldn't be patterned after any other form of government, for when America declared herself free and independent there was no real freedom anywhere in the world. The faith and industry of our people, developed through our system of free enterprise, has paced the world spiritually and materially. From the earth and from the depths of the sea, and from the skies above, we have plucked our resources and our men of science have directed them into many channels. Our manufacturers have produced at enormous speed the things that science and invention have designed for the convenience of man. Men of religions, of all faiths and creeds, teachers, poets, philosophers, and authors, have inspired us to greater efforts and pointed the way to higher standards and better living. American enterprise has been so truly a happy blend that when war came and all of Europe stood with backs to the wall before the might of Nazi aggression, our productive ability was turned into a gigantic effort that enabled America to supply the Allied armies with money, food, and manufactured matériel of war that brought victory to our united arms.

There are those who attribute our success to great natural resources, but nature has been bountiful to other countries of the world. Raw material exists everywhere, but the free enterprise, the untrammeled initiative is not there for its development. Some attribute our success to peculiar national characteristics, but they forget that we are peopled by comparatively recent arrivals from practically every quarter of the globe. But we are descended from a line of ancestors who, since America was born, looked toward our country with longing eyes and who subconsciously implanted in the hearts of their offspring a faith in America that made them Americans even before they landed on our shores.

These people, of many races and diverse faiths, coming from many lands where they had been virtually slaves of the state, found that here in America every individual was on his own; that no higher authority attempted to order their lives; that they were free to worship the God of their fathers; that great resources were here to be developed by individual initiative and industry. They realized how precious was the heritage of liberty bequeathed by those men of faith and vision who penned the Declaration of Independence and framed our Constitution.

Much is said of the American way of life. We hear it eloquently discussed as though it were a social and political philosophy, a chart for the guidance of the lives and activities of men and women. But the American way of life is not a theory; it is not a system of philosophy; it is not a guide to thinking, reasoning, or living. It is the amalgamated habits and characteristics of our people acquired through years of uninhibited relationship with their fellows, through free enterprise, free thought, free expression, and self-government. Those who follow the American way of life reap the reward of their own labors, worship in their own way, accept a full share of responsibility of government. The American way is the way of freemen—it is democracy, the foundation of America's strength, the rock upon which is erected the well-being of our people.

In America the government belongs to the people. In the dictator countries, the people belong, body and soul, to the government. In America every citizen is a partner in the business of government and must bear his share of individual responsibility. America, by virtue of its strength, power, and resources, is in a position of world leadership—every loyal American must back this leadership to the full limit. Democracy, the American way of life, is challenged by powerful forces, and should the will of these forces prevail, the hope of peace in our time will never be realized.

But America will rise to the responsibilities of world leadership, and the American people will give their full support to democracy's cause. They did not give American lives to win democracy on the battlefield only to lose it on the diplomatic field.

Freedom is a dynamic, liberating force. One need walk only to the nearest playground or college athletic field to discover why we won the war. Beyond question we are the greatest competitors in the world. I do not advance this as an American boast, but rather as a manifestation of the liberating force of freedom.

The American knows no limit of achievement because no limit exists in America. Our children sense it at an early age because it is born in them. Our youths think only in terms of winning whatever they attempt. Victory is the image always before them; defeat is almost impossible for them to conjure. Considered alone we call it the competitive spirit; actually it is the chief product of freedom. It, more than anything else, accounts for American ingenuity in the field of production, and victory on the field of battle.

Tolerance for each other's thoughts, for each other's religion, for each other's race, are all manifestations of freedom. There is the demand for justice, for equal treatment

under the law; there is the conviction that opportunity is unlimited for all. And we must not overlook an outstanding American trait: sympathy for the underdog. We love to see him win because we feel he is a victim of injustice. This is one of the deepest roots of our Americanism.

What American has not experienced the thrill of seeing some highly touted competitor overcome by some little fellow who was not given a chance to win? It sets American crowds on fire with enthusiasm and it explains a great deal more than we think. It explains why we never have conceived might to be right; why we never have worshiped might as an end in itself; why the superman never has appealed to the great mass of Americans.

Can any of us picture an America with only one political party that always won, an America with all of its enterprises owned by the state, an America with only one press and that the Government's? Yet it is the imposition of these things upon the underdog that threatens the world today, and it is the spirit of America, deep rooted in the hearts of our people, that is going to fight with courage, strength, and resourcefulness to preserve the democracy for which our blood and treasure were poured upon the battlefield.

It is little wonder that Hitler underestimated America, that he was contemptuous of democratic ways. It is a matter of concern that some of our allies in war, nations that we saved from annihilation by the Nazi war machine, are now following the Nazi line, seeking, not to find a peaceful solution of the world's ills, but to take advantage of the misery and destitution wrought by war, to wipe the spirit of liberty from the face of the earth.

Hitler is dead. The once proud German nation that followed his lead is crushed and broken beyond recovery. His fate should be a lesson to the enemies of democracy who are pouring out their vituperative abuse against America, making their absurd charges against American leadership, fomenting hatreds that they hope will weaken our leadership of the democratic cause.

To the totalitarian mind the workings of the free spirit are incomprehensible. The totalitarian thinks only in materialistic terms. He cannot grasp the fundamental fact that robots may fight an orderly and relentless battle, but it is the free man, fighting with heart and mind to preserve his sacred heritage, who must triumph. The superiority of the fighting qualities of free men over the slaves of the state has been demonstrated in two wars, although it is evident that the totalitarians have not profited by these lessons. They still dream, as Hitler dreamed, of world conquest.

During the war our people had a taste of totalitarian restrictions made essential by military necessity. These have been employed in every war since the Nation was founded. But in adopting these restrictions it was with the idea of getting rid of them at the earliest moment. Our people were willing to endure them, to make any sacrifice to win the war, but they were a taste of totalitarian government they did not relish.

After each World War there have been those who, seeking a totalitarian toehold, an entering wedge for more restrictive government measures to come, advocate the retention of the Government hand, which worked so well in waging war, on the controls of peacetime enterprise. President Wilson was thus counseled and, for the record, I want you to read what he said in his state of the Union message delivered just a few weeks after the end of World War I:

"So far as our domestic affairs are concerned, the problem of our return to peace is a problem of economic and industrial readjustment. That problem is less serious for us than it may turn out to be for the nations which have suffered the disarrangements and losses of war longer than we. Our people, moreover, do not wait to be coached and led. They know their own business, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose and self-reliant in action. Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would speedily become hopelessly entangled because they would pay no attention to them and go their own way. All we can do as their legislative and executive servants is to mediate the process of change here, there, and elsewhere as we may. I have heard much counsel as to the plans that should be formed and personally conducted to a happy consummation, but from no quarter have I seen any general scheme of reconstruction emerge which I thought we could force our spirited businessmen and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliancy and obedience."

We can demonstrate no greater attachment to Americanism than to lend our support to this doctrine at this time.

As for those who wish for a continuance of a totalitarian government in times of peace because it worked well in war, they are putting the cart before the horse; in fact, they are urging that we do without the horse altogether. Let them remember that it is our freedom in peace that has been our strength in war. We gave up a great measure of freedom to achieve victory. Let us not forget that the American people want all those freedoms returned and will have them just as soon as national emergencies permit.

I am a firm believer in public opinion. Examined over any reasonable period of time, public opinion is wise opinion. But its wisdom is in direct ratio to the people who contribute to it, and public opinion, from coast to coast, has finally realized that America has come of age and taken its place in the family of nations. Modern transportation and methods of communication make us close neighbors of every nation on earth and the word neighbors has taken on vast new meaning.

I do not hold that we are giving up this Americanism that is our very own, born of our concept of liberty and freedom of enterprise. But we have assumed a new role forced upon us by our strength and power and that is the role of leadership of the democracies of the world. In accepting this responsibility we become citizens of the world. We all have our political affiliations but we are, first of all, Americans and, accepting as we must the obligations of world citizens, we must remain first—Americans.

We must realize that old divisions of opinions among us have all but disappeared. We must eliminate the words "isolationist," "interventionist," "internationalist," and "nationalist" from our vocabularies. In the light of world conditions today they mean nothing.

It is easy to unite in war. When survival is the common thought of us all, we are one, whether we speak of nations or individuals. But the making of peace is far more difficult. The fear of tomorrow drives men and nations to unwise decisions. The history of their short-sightedness at the peace table is the history of succeeding wars.

The United Nations, upon which people throughout the world placed high hopes, already is divided. Cherished visions of "one world" and utopian peace, a brotherhood of nations, have been rudely dispelled. Two blocs at the peace negotiations are assured: each is in irrevocable opposition to the ideologies of the other.

But what we need today and will need in the months to come is wisdom, not extravagance of thought. Extremists—those who would sacrifice America to some global superstate or those who would sacrifice the future peace of the world on the altar of blind patriotism—must be ignored. They are not wise counselors; they are special pleaders who ignore the common good. They shout the loudest but do not say the most.

There is an uncommon amount of common sense in America. Wisdom is the product of straight thinking applied to knowledge. Our job is to keep informed and clear-headed. While extremists wring their hands because they are not getting what they want (and we may be assured they will never get it), the American people can perform no greater service than to maintain reasoned judgment.

Totalitarian governments respect only material strength. Therefore, America must be strong. Much as our people dislike it, for their own protection we must have an Army and Navy and Air Force to command the respect of our potential enemies. We are in the game now; never again must our runners be caught off base. But, as world leaders, we must stay within the framework of democracy and its basic principles of liberty, equality, and justice for all. Upon these principles rests our Americanism and in them lie all hopes for peace, both at home and abroad.

Abraham Lincoln Passed to His Reward 83 Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1948

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was 83 years ago April 15 that Abraham Lincoln succumbed to the effects of an assassin's bullet and thus ended the Great Emancipator's good work on earth.

On February 8, 1948, in old Ford's Theater, where the fatal shot was fired, a large group of patriotic people gathered to commemorate Abraham Lincoln's birth. This program was sponsored by the Lincoln Group of Washington, D. C., of which Mr. Burt Sheldon is president. It was my high honor to act as master of ceremonies for this program and to be introduced by my good friend, Mr. H. A. Tolson, Assistant Director of the National Park Service.

The National Press Club Male Chorus sang several appropriate songs under the leadership of Reinald Werrenrath. An excellent address was delivered by Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, retired grandson of the great Civil War general.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this address in an extension of my remarks so that the American people may read with profit to themselves and America during these days of world reconstruction. Would that another Abraham Lincoln might soon appear among us, to unite all the peoples of the world into one band of friends and peaceful neighbors.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(An address made by Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III (retired), at the Lincoln Museum, Ford's Theater Building), on February 8, 1948, to commemorate Lincoln's birthday on February 12, 1809)

Obviously it is beyond the power of human ingenuity to devise a government which will of itself grow with a nation's growth, to foresee and provide in advance for every problem of an ever-evolving and progressive civilization. More cannot be asked than that it comprise an orderly method by which such

growth may be accomplished, and sufficient checks to prevent constant change and confusion, lest it be, like a rudderless ship, the plaything of every shift of wind, of every gust of demagogic oratory. The Ship of State, like the most beautiful of human useful inventions, the sailing ship, must conform to tide and wind but offer to each sufficient resistance to hold her course, and she must have a definitely fixed course and masters who can be trusted not to change it without sufficient reason.

Such a government was designed under Washinton's personal supervision—something quite new in ships of state and necessarily to some extent an experiment; and with the great strength of his personality and calm good judgment, he launched it and started it on its world-famous voyage. It fell to Mr. Lincoln's share to prove its internal strength sufficient to withstand the most critical strains of the centrifugal forces resulting from the existence side by side of opposed economic conditions and racial differences. It is clear from his public statements and writings that his first thought and his principal purpose throughout his administration was the preservation of the Union. He saw the moral obliquity of slavery, he boldly advocated the stopping of its territorial expansion and the consideration of means and methods for its gradual elimination; but abolition, as far as he was concerned, was secondary to the preservation of the Union:

"My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slaves, I would do it; if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

When so wise a man, and the patriots who supported him, thought the preservation of this Government worth the sacrifice and labored for it through the ordeal of those four bloody years, we may well set a high value upon our heritage and refuse to change it without long and weighty consideration, refuse to exchange it for any mess of foreign pottage, however spicily flavored with the sauce of rhetoric and attractively served on a platter of golden promise.

While Mr. Lincoln in his great wisdom foresaw the struggle that was to result from slavery, while he preeminently could not be confused by the hope of compromise and shook the indifferent out of their apathy with his clarion call that "A house divided against itself cannot stand"—"I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," which echoed and reechoed throughout the land, nevertheless he would not take any aggressive steps to compel acceptance of his views by the South. With his misguided compatriots, who were breaking up their country under the erroneous plea that abolition was to be forced upon them and their property in slaves confiscated without due process of law, he reasoned mildly and clearly stated the issue for which they were assuming the responsibility: "In your hands my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. I am loath to close. We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature." Leader as he was of a great moral cause, convinced that "if slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong," still he was against compulsion, he was willing to accomplish his ends by legal means, by the slow but surer methods laid down in the Constitution, confident that right would win and firm that even those, who in his opinion were so bitterly defending a great national wrong, should not suffer injustice at the hands of the Government, nor have their property confiscated without due compensation. And we know that he was sincere, for he took no steps inconsistent with his statement. And how he was abused for his so-called weakness; but history will in consequence forever put the responsibility for the war upon the South and her factious leaders. In such an emergency it is much easier to be violent than right. In the hurricane, in the midst of which he was called to the helm, he did not put on more sail; he beat up into the wind, away from the lee-shore, until the Cape of Good Hope was passed.

Once the war was unavoidably forced upon him, once secession was a fact and the country could not be saved except by the reconquest of the South, then he was equally firm and determined in carrying it to a successful conclusion in the only way left open by the country's enemies. Great as were the special war powers conferred upon him by Congress, it was not always possible to provide in advance against every eventuality; and he never hesitated to assume responsibility for necessary action in an emergency, even when it could be argued with some plausibility that he had exceeded his authority or infringed upon the letter of the law. The Emancipation Proclamation was a war measure, an arbitrary act, but the world sympathized with its high purpose and recognized its timeliness, and approved. As he said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." He had sworn to sustain the Constitution, and this he did without hesitation, interpreting his powers on the broad and common-sense assumption that they were intended for the accomplishment of this purpose, not to impede it. The all-important thing was to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that "when ballots have fairly and constitutionally decided, there can be no successful appeal back to bullets." Without general acceptance of this principle, representative republican government is but a makeshift device for passing from one despotism to another, for the development of demagogues and for the selection of tyrants.

* * * * *

He deliberately selected for his Cabinet his strongest rivals, the leaders of the various groups of his own party who had themselves hoped to carry off the nomination for the Presidency and doubtless were convinced that they were better fitted for that high and difficult position than the little known and comparatively inexperienced lawyer from Illinois. How he used their services so effectually, with what wisdom he profited by their special knowledge and talents, is a matter of history. While too long to sketch even at this time, there is no greater proof of his mental balance and moral grandeur. Naturally men of such ability and strength, as the members of this great war Cabinet, did not and could not always agree; that they did serve the country so faithfully and so effectively through such troublous times, and in general followed Mr. Lincoln's leadership so loyally in all great things, is evidence of their greatness and patriotism and magnanimity, as well as of his, and has caused their names to be written of gold in the annals of our land. We cannot do honor to the great President, without including a tribute to his great Cabinet and to the many other Government officials, both military and civil, who sympathized with his high purpose and without whose support he could not have accomplished it. He would have been the last person to wish their services to the national cause to be undervalued.

* * * * *

The soft answer that turneth away wrath seems to have been always ready for his use. Often it took the form of a parable or the jesting narrative of some country or village experience; always it contained a concise statement of or analogy to the very quintessence of the question under consideration, so kindly and humorous that offense could not be taken at a difference of opinion, and so sagacious and wise that it made support of any contrary opinion impossible. Often the most serious public questions were treated in the form of a story; while this shocked the pompous and the fastidious, the people understood the situation better for his homely presentation of it, for its not being wrapped in oratory—and after all it was the people whom Mr. Lincoln wished to convince and whose confidence in his sound judgment gave his policies the votes needed.

Tales were constantly brought to him of Secretary Chase's efforts to undermine him—of the Secretary's friends calling him incompetent, abusing him, saying that he should be impeached. He answered such tales with the question, "Well, that does not make it so, does it? * * * Mr. Chase is a good Secretary. The people believe in him and take his money. That is what we want, is it not? * * *. When I was a boy I worked on a farm. We plowed corn and I rode the horse, while a neighbor's boy held the plow. The horse was lazy. I pounded him with my heels and the neighbor's boy threw clods at him, but he would not go much till one day a bluehead lit on his back, close to the roots of his tail, where he could not switch him off. Then the bluehead put in his work and the horse put in his work. The neighbor's boy said, 'Abe, knock that bluehead off.' I said, 'No, you don't; is not that just what we want to make him go?' Well, if Chase has anything in his head that will make him work for the Republic, is that not just what we want?"

* * * * *

In the early days of his law practice, he met the argument of a fluent opponent who was not meticulous in his regard for the truth by telling the jury of a river steamboat he remembered that had a very small boiler and a very large whistle, so that whenever the whistle blew the steam pressure was so reduced that the engine stopped. "Gentlemen of the jury, you must not blame this man for what has been going on; he knows nothing about it. It is with him as with that steamboat; he seems to be a man of integrity when he keeps his mouth shut, but when he opens his mouth he shuts his intellect. He knows nothing of what has been going on. You must not blame him."

Even in his great Cooper Institute speech he was not afraid of a simplicity of metaphor and language, which is so convincing as to prove the highest eloquence: "You (of the South) say you will not abide the election of a Republican President, you will destroy the Union; and then you say the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon us. That is cool. A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, 'Stand and deliver or I shall kill you and then you will be a murderer.'"

To the delegation of clerygymen who came to him with the message, "God has sent us here to tell you that you must emancipate the slaves," he answered: "Well, that is real queer, isn't it? I thought I was running this thing; if God has anything to say I should think He would say it to me, wouldn't He, instead of going off to that wicked city to tell you about it?"

But Mr. Lincoln was one of the great orators of the world. Some of his speeches are among the most precious jewels of English literature. Wholly free from rhetorical embellishments and useless ornament, couched in the simplest language, understandable to everyone, carrying immediate conviction by their incontrovertible argument, they are most remarkable for the fitness of each word

to its purpose and for the clear thought they express. They burn with the unequaled and illuminating light of the sun, not the fascinating twinkle of the stars or the illusive glamour of the moon. It is evident from them that Mr. Lincoln's mind worked in a clear medium and without eccentricity or aberration; all the eloquence in the world could not have produced them, had he not thought straight and had the soundest of sound judgment. And at times sincerity of purpose and the perfection of expression for a great thought gave his utterance a dignity and sonorousness like unto the best passages of the Bible.

* * * * *

Were we not convinced that the right conquers in the end, though the ways of providence are not always clear to us and we may, in fact, sometimes be mistaken as to what is right and what is wrong, this world would be for most of us but a hopeless place and life a desperate ordeal. It is, therefore, reassuring to find the deep faith with which Mr. Lincoln approached his task and the continual expression of his sense of a beneficent almighty Deity. Once he said, "If it were not for my firm belief in an overruling providence, it would be difficult for me in the midst of such complications of affairs to keep my reason on its seat."

Then there is the fragment of a meditative memorandum of September 1862, found after his death, well worth quoting: "The will of God prevails. In great contests each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both may be and one must be wrong. God cannot be for and against the same thing at the same time. In the present Civil War it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party, and yet the human instrumentalities, working just as they do, are of the best adaptation to effect his purpose. I am almost ready to say that this is probably true, that God wills this contest, and wills that it shall not end yet. By His mere great power on the minds of the contestants, He could have either saved or destroyed the Union without a human contest. Yet the contest began, and, having begun, He could give final victory to either side any day. Yet the contest proceeds." This attitude of mind was fundamental: Faith with common sense, entire freedom from bigotry and dogmatism together with a deep religious sense. To fully develop its scope and effect, it would be necessary to review all his public speeches and state papers; it must suffice here to have called attention to it and to the persistence with which he tested each step by the question, "Is it right?"

In no other way have our great national leaders differed more basically from the general run of conquerors and rulers, and yet they were certainly the most practical and hardheaded of men. I cannot resist the impulse to quote two short statements as typical examples of this new and American attitude toward public questions which seems to me to have set the standard for a new grade of statesmanship, one wherein the obligation of a duty to perform is inseparable from leadership and the honors of public office.

When President Lincoln handed my grandfather his commission as lieutenant general, with which went the chief command of all the Union armies, he said: "General Grant, the Nation's appreciation of what you have done, and its reliance upon you for what remains to be done in the existing great struggle, are now presented, with this commission constituting you lieutenant general in the Army of the United States. With this high honor, devolves upon you, also, a corresponding responsibility. As the country herein trusts you, so, under God, it will sustain you. I scarcely need to add, that, with what I here speak for the Nation, goes my own hearty personal concurrence." To this, the reply was: "Mr. President, I accept the commission, with gratitude for the high honor conferred. With the aid of the noble armies that have fought in so many fields for our common country, it will be my earnest endeavor not to disappoint your expectations. I feel the full weight of the responsibilities now devolving on me; and I know that if they are met, it will be due to those armies, and above all, to the favor of that providence which leads both nations and men."

Any historical sketch of Mr. Lincoln's life, must narrate the story of one of the greatest struggles in all time and describe the various phases through which one of the most momentous of moral questions was finally settled. The military problem alone, the absolute conquest of a territory exceeding in area the aggregate of Germany, Austria, Hungary, Holland, and Belgium (if we consider Texas too, we may add nearly all of Spain and Italy), and this large territory cut by great rivers and mountain chains, with but few railroads and roads, without any vital point which could be taken and all ended, and worst of all, as Mr. Lincoln himself pointed out, defended by over a million Americans in arms under the most able commanders—this military problem was itself one of the most stupendous in the annals of war. Manifestly such a ponderous section of history cannot be summarized in one short address; moreover, I have not felt that your patience would outlast an attempt even to sketch Mr. Lincoln's personal political career, with the main features of which you are doubtless familiar; nor to follow the interesting course of our foreign relations during his administration. It must suffice to say that, in the latter, he set us an example of good sense, fair dealing, and sagacity in maintaining the national dignity against lack of sympathy in foreign lands without becoming involved in hostilities. Although he initiated no new foreign policy, he left us one principle—to fight only one war at a time—which contains the essence of diplomatic wisdom, and to the disregard of which Hitler and Tojo evidently owed their downfall.

Time and a due regard for your patience do not permit me to pursue the subject of President Lincoln's example further. The subject is indeed inexhaustible; so I have limited myself to pointing out some of his characteristics and words, which seem to me to offer examples for emulation and guidance for us in our desire to be good citizens.

Today the theorists, the economists, the pacifists, the Communists, and all the other "ists" are organized and with all the manifold means of propaganda now at their command, are barking their wares from every street corner. Is it not time for the thinking and reliable part of the population to make itself heard? I believe, as President Lincoln did, in the good sense of the plain people; but they are too much inclined to "let George do it"; too ready to let the peddler of political patent medicine sell his wares to them "just to see what it is like."

It has been said that every nation has the government it deserves. Certainly, in a republic such as ours, we have the kind of Government we select or allow our neighbors to select for us. Let us not be deterred by the thought that we are too insignificant to make ourselves felt, that our part in the community life is too small to be effective. This is true only individually, and there are very few individuals who do not command sufficient influence with their friends and neighbors to carry several along on any public subject. Let us rather remember, that public opinion and the "will of the people" is but the sum of the opinions of individuals such as you and me; and let us repeat as our political creed Mr. Lincoln's own words:

"I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right; stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong."

New Mexico Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, many veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the State of New Mexico.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by Thomas C. St. John, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, post office box 1036, Albuquerque, N. Mex., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Friends or relatives may conduct the funeral.

Provision has been made for detailing a firing squad for duty at burial of veterans entitled to burial in a national cemetery.

County clerks must keep a record of the name, age, service, and death of every veteran.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator may be appointed for property of persons serving in the armed forces.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Proof of wills may be made where subscribing witnesses are in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

The director of veterans' affairs and executive assistants of the veterans' service commission are authorized to administer oaths and affirmations and execute attestations and certificates in all cases where their officers of the State authorized to administer oaths may do so.

County clerks are required to furnish, without charge to a veteran, a copy of his marriage license, to be used and filed with the Veterans' Administration.

Free copies of public records are furnished to the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The director of public health is required to furnish, without charge, copies of birth and death certificates to veterans or to the Veterans' Administration for use in establishing and determining claims.

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge by county clerks.

Certificates of insurance issued to veterans under the United States Adjusted Compensation Act may be filed with county clerks for safekeeping and without charge.

It is the duty of the Veterans' Service Commission to disseminate information regarding all laws beneficial to veterans, their widows, and children, to assist them with claims against the United States or in establishing all rights and procuring benefits to which they may be entitled under the laws of the State or of the United States.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed while serving in the armed forces in World War I from April 6, 1917, to July 2, 1921, or died as a result thereof. Amount—$150 maximum per child per year, with free tuition in State institutions of secondary or college grade.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Employees of the Veterans' Service Commission are required to be veterans.

The Veterans' Service Commission maintains an employment service for veterans.

Returning veterans have been granted reemployment rights.

Employees in public or private positions must be reinstated after discharge from military service without loss of seniority. All rights and benefits are preserved.

Public officers must be reinstated after discharge from service in the armed forces.

GUARDIANSHIP

The Veterans' Service Commission is authorized to act as administrator or executor of estate of deceased veterans, or as guardian of incompetent veterans or of minor children.

Notice of the filing of the annual account of a guardian must be provided the Veterans' Administration where the person under guardianship is in receipt of financial benefits from the Administration.

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Jurisdiction of State lands of the Veterans' Administration facility have been ceded to the United States.

Voluntary or emergency commitment of incompetent veterans to the Veterans' Administration hospital is provided.

A War Mothers' National Memorial Hospital Association has been created to render hospital service to veterans, their dependents, and dependent descendants.

MEDALS

Medals are given residents who were members of the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery and served in the Philippines under General MacArthur.

MEMORIALS, ETC.

A war memorial has been authorized in Las Vegas, not to exceed $20,000.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Grateful acknowledgment has been made of an undying debt of gratitude to the heroic sons of New Mexico who fought in defense of the Philippines.

Protestation has been made against the use of the designation "Two Hundredth Coast Artillery Anti-Aircraft" by any unit, regiment, etc., of the United States Army other than New Mexico's own historic regiment which so gallantly fought on Bataan and Corregidor.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, trust companies, and building and loan associations are authorized to make loans to veterans under the GI bill of rights.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Contributions to posts or organizations of war veterans are allowable as deductions in computing net income tax.

Amounts received as pension, family allotments, and allowances under the provisions of the War Risk Insurance and Vocational Rehabilitation Acts or the World War Veterans' Act, or as pensions or bonuses from the United States for services rendered by the beneficiary, or another, in the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war, or as a State pension for services rendered by the beneficiary, or another, for which the State is paying pension or bonus, are exempt from income tax.

Persons in the armed forces may file their State income-tax return within 6 months after cessation of hostilities.

A nonresident member of the armed forces may operate his own foreign vehicle within the State until the expiration of his license; a State license may then be purchased at 50 percent of the regular annual license fee.

Veterans are exempt from road taxes.

Professional and occupational licenses are retained during military service and reinstated within 1 year after discharge.

Property to the amount of $2,000 of veterans and their unmarried widows is exempt from taxation.

Veterans may apply property-tax exemption in partial satisfaction of motor vehicle registration fees.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $100 or imprisonment for not more than 60 days.

Members of associations composed of veterans are exempt from the prohibition as to the wearing of a military uniform.

Much of the above-mentioned legislation has been enacted by the New Mexico Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

At the present time there are some 24 chapters of the DAV throughout the State, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers, who assist veterans with their problems in their own communities.

In addition to this State-wide service, the DAV maintains three full-time national service officers, under the direction of Denvel D. Adams, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

These DAV experts render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualifies him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts—all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service Officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil service appointments, and last, but really first in importance—suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 1,525,753; total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of services extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching-method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Good Laws, Bad Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3 (legislative day of Friday, April 30), 1948

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement or release entitled "Good Laws, Bad Laws," issued by G. C. Stevenson, executive secretary of the Montana Petroleum Industries Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD LAWS, BAD LAWS

In an age that is ridding itself of most other superstitions, a credulous belief in the magical properties of a law seems to be spreading at an epidemic rate.

Even that popular phrase: "There ought to be a law" is a half-humorous, half-believing expression of the new superstition.

As if, by the simple enactment of a law, any kind of law, we could cure all the world's ills, and subdue our individual everyday problems. As if many of these ills and problems had not been caused, in the first place, by laws.

Long before the present trend toward law worship had reached full tide, Americans were warned against this sentiment to which so many of them seem to be succcumbing. They were warned by no less an authority than Theodore Roosevelt, who said: "It is difficult to make our material condition better by the best laws, but it is easy enough to ruin it by bad laws."

If we can all recognize the essential nature of laws, we shall not fall into the way of worshiping them blindly or of expecting more from them than they can achieve. A law cannot build houses and roads or produce progress and prosperity. At best a law is only an intention. Everything depends upon its faithful enforcement and administration.

But if a good law's power for good is limited, a bad law's power for evil is beyond calculation. One single ill-conceived statute can cause injury, hardship, and injustice beyond the hope of future repentance to repeal.

All who endeavor to educate the people on public affairs should take care to explain the powers and properties of laws. Then the people will know they should not expect too much even from good laws, and they cannot fear too much laws that are bad.

G. C. STEVENSON,
Executive Secretary,
Montana Petroleum Industries Committee.

Production and Marketing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the agricultural leaders in my district and a great friend of agriculture who spares no effort in time or money to make the program a success and for years a member of the State committee of Arkansas, Mr. Kit Phillips, of Benton County, has written me a letter which I think the membership of this House should have. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

I am concerned over the amount of the appropriation for conservation and land use (triple A) for this program year (1949 fiscal year) and reports that if it is increased over that indicated by House action that it could not be used effectively this year. Farming plans, as you know, are flexible and changes could easily be made in individual plans to secure more conservation if funds are available. Many conservation practices are executed in the summer and fall and there would be no loss but rather a big increase if the appropriation is increased.

The appropriation should be increased to at least $300,000,000 with sufficient funds for proper administration by farmer-elected committeemen. The appropriation as approved by the House ($150,000,000) would be insufficient to carry out an effective conservation program and present administrative funds are not sufficient to properly train committeemen to effectively administer the program. If the annual appropriation for assistance and for administration is stabilized at a sufficient level it will increase the effectiveness of conservation and benefit the entire Nation.

The present limitation of $500 assistance to an individual farmer does not increase conservation on small farms, but works against more conservation on larger farms. Needs for conservation are based on cropland and not on individuals. The large operator is in very little better position to pay the entire cost of conservation on his big acreage than is the small operator on his small acreage. It should also be remembered that on large farms there are numerous tenants who benefit from conservation as well as the operator. Conservation payments are for assistance to execute conservation practices and not income payments to improve social conditions, though they will improve as farm conditions improve. The only limitation should be need of the land and not maximum assistance to an individual.

Increases in small payments should be available to increase units of conservation assistance, materials, or services, and not to reduce out-of-pocket unit cost to the farmer. Such a change will increase over-all conservation through increasing units of conservation executed by individual operators.

Services now available through action programs are vitally needed by farmers in their work by producing farm products and maintaining soil fertility and should be maintained. I do not believe there is any duplication of services to farmers; but if any consolidation of programs and agencies should become necessary, farmer-elected State, county, and community committeemen should administer the programs. Recommendations by farmers and committees should remain the basis for setting up such programs. Information work necessary to the administration of the programs should be handled by committees and the extension service should provide educational material for farmers on subject matter and experiment-station results of practices.

Marketing quotas should remain available and price supports should be maintained at their present levels through purchase and loan programs on all commodities necessary to the national economy.

Very truly yours,

KIT PHILLIPS.

A Strong People Cannot Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MITCHELL JENKINS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May commemorates the signing, on that date in 1791, of the Polish constitution, one of the world's great documents of freedom. Like the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the Declaration of Independence, it will live forever in the annals of freedom.

I take as my theme today, the conviction of so many proponents of freedom throughout the world today—the conviction that a strong people cannot die—and the Poles are a strong people. Since the middle ages, the activities of eminent Poles illumined the records

of foreign nations. Nikolaus Copernicus, the astronomer; Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciusko, heroes of the American Revolution; Frederic Chopin, composer; Ignace Paderewski, pianist; and Marie Sklodowska Curie, discoverer of radium, were all Polish. This creative genius advanced our civilization; they, and many other Poles gave their toil and labor to the world.

During the course of her history, Poland has played an important part in world affairs. As early as the fourteenth century, the Teutonic knights tried to Germanize Polish lands. They were defeated by King Jagielo in the battle of Grunwald. The German desire to conquer Poland, however, never ceased to exist. It was the main reason for the partitioning of the country by force between three neighboring empires. Thrice in 23 years, the Kings of Prussia, the Emperors of Austria, and the Tsars of Russia tried to make Poland disappear from the map of Europe. They succeeded in 1795, for more than a century, but they never conquered or subdued the spirit of the Polish people, who showed their desire to live, and to be free, by many bloody insurrections.

In 1831 the Poles revolted against the Tsars—they were repressed. In 1863, another revolt was crushed—thousands died for liberty in a full year of guerrilla warfare. In 1905 revolution in Russia supported the struggle of the Polish people for freedom, but at the same time, while one part of Poland became a reservoir of industrial production for the Tsars' empire, another part became a larder, as well as an arsenal, for Germany and the Poles still were not free. Bismarck and the Tsars tried to suppress the use of the Polish language, the schools, and Polish culture, but they could not stop the growth of Polish longing for liberation from foreign rule.

When war came in 1914, her chief oppressors, Germany and Russia, faced one another on Poland's soil, and with an iron hand they ruled a people who wanted liberty. In 1917, Poland's 120-year dream came true. Although two-thirds of her wealth was destroyed, and many of her cities and villages ruined, she was a free country.

The new Poland freely elected a parliament in 1919 and in 1921 gave the people a democratic constitution. A free nation began to live, but this freedom was short in duration. With Hitler in power, Germany once again began to menace Poland. The Fuehrer, aware of the weakness of Poland, claimed Polish territory, but the heroic Polish people defended their rights and when, on September 1, 1939, the Nazi invasion occurred, World War II had begun. Despite its heroic resistance, the Polish Army was defeated; 3,000,000 Poles were deported to Germany for slave labor; schools and churches were again suppressed; the western provinces were incorporated into the Reich, while millions of Polish people were persecuted and sent to death factories at Oswiecim, Tremlinka, and Maidanek. Over 6,000,000 Polish citizens were murdered. But while the country was terrorized, the people of Poland carried on partisan and guerrilla warfare that reached its climax in the Ghetto uprising and the Battle of Warsaw. There 250,000 people were slaughtered by the Germans, and the city of Warsaw was systematically blown up, building by building, while the Russian troops, relying on the Yalta agreement, rested on their arms only 7 miles away and complacently watched the destruction of the democratic element of Poland.

Peace found Poland more devastated than any other country in the world. In her prostrated condition she once again fell prey to a foreign oppressor. Today she lies under the heel of a government which takes its orders from Moscow. A shattered nation, she is again suffering from the oppressions of a new tyrant. She is denied the right to have a government which represents the will of her people. But the fires of freedom still flame in the hearts of the Polish people. They will grow greater and greater, and while patriotic Poles live, that fire will never die out. Once again she will know freedom, as the fruit of her long devotion to the cause of liberty, and in the words of their own national anthem, "Poland is not lost as long as there is life." Mr. Speaker, I repeat, a strong people cannot die.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Will Facilitate Stock-Piling Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenwood (Miss.) Commonwealth of March 10, 1948:

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Congress is considering extension of the 14-year-old Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. President Truman says the legislation is more important than ever. He seems to have backed up his claims with undeniable evidence.

The trade pacts which the law authorizes provide two-way cuts in tariff rates, thus eliminating certain barriers to our trade with the nations with which we make contracts. Not for always can we expect to export more than we import. There are some commodities which we will always import. Why not import from the nations who will cooperate with us in tearing down trade barriers for mutual aid. From such nations we can buy what we need and to them we sell our surplus. As the years pass, there will be more and more commodities which we will be unable to amply supply for our own needs. We must make progress with the stock-piling program, and we'll need the trade agreements law to facilitate the program.

Sometimes the law seems to pinch small segments of the American people. On a much broader scale it benefits all the people.

The proper treatment of the trade situation lies somewhere between the high protective tariff of the past and the free trade condition which some ultraliberals would foster.

We must have a high rate of export. This is best attained by businesslike agreements with friendly nations.

The trade pacts plan has been kind to us in the past. It can be more so in the future.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, education in its broadest sense is the only sure foundation upon which a strong democracy can be built. The welfare and progress of the country as a whole is dependent upon standards that we maintain in our schools. At the present time our schools serve 23,000,000 customers making education the biggest business in the United States with respect to the number of persons affected. Since the attainment of our citizenry is so important in maintaining and improving the democracy of this country, it raises the question as to what responsibility the Government should bear in assuring equal educational privileges to our children. I think the Federal Government does have a great responsibility; for that reason I am urging the immediate passage of H. R. 2953, or similar legislation.

Probably never before has the need of providing adequate education of the Nation's children been more evident than now. Long ago the Federal Government recognized its obligation to the people by affording them educational opportunities, in that it has distributed funds for educational purposes among the various States from money derived from the sale of public lands. In other ways Federal grants for educational purposes have been made in limited amounts for specific purposes. Today, when we advocate a greater Federal contribution to the States for educational purposes we certainly are not without precedent.

In my own State of Utah the State long ago recognized the principle and necessity of equalizing educational opportunities through the medium of a school-equalizing fund. The people of my State recently amended their constitution to provide a minimum standard of education for every child in the State, totally ignoring county or school-district boundaries. It makes no difference in what part of the State the school child might live or how poor a school district might be, the child is entitled to a minimum standard of education. If the school district in which he lives desires, and is financially able, it may contribute any amount it may desire to give educational advantages beyond the minimum State requirements.

It is true that we who favor legislation proposing to provide Federal assistance for education are of the firm conviction, and advocate, that the various States should have full control of the expenditure of any money furnished.

The States in turn, should give an accounting of the money spent so that Congress might know that it was spent for the purpose for which it was appropriated. Furthermore, we believe that the various States should be the sole judges as to the recipients of any financial aid.

It seems to me that Federal aid for the equalization of educational opportunities can be justified upon the most rational basis. Why should a child in one section of the country enjoy extraordinary educational advantages while a similar child in another section must be content with the most inadequate opportunities? In this instance we are dealing with American children who are not confined within the boundaries of any county or any State. He may be a citizen of one State today and another State tomorrow. His post-office address is of little consequence when we consider his future usefulness to the Nation.

A comprehensive survey of educational costs clearly indicates a vast difference in the per capita per school child outlay for education varying in amounts from $44.80 per pupil in one part of the country to $198.33 in another part. The obvious question may well be asked: Why do not the States with such a low per capita outlay do something about it? The facts are that in nearly every instance these States with a low per capita outlay for education are actually imposing more hardship and a greater burden on their taxpayers than the States that are making the highest per capita contribution. Thus the only effective way that the educational advantages can be equalized is through a contribution from the Federal Government to States with low tax incomes whose tax levies for education are already excessively high.

During the school year 1945 and 1946, the latest year in which figures are available, the total Federal aid to public, elementary and secondary education, excluding money expended for the school-lunch program, averaged $1.56 per child between the ages of 5 and 17 years. This, in spite of the conceded fact that a properly educated people is the Nation's greatest natural resource.

Legislation now in committee calls for an additional contribution from the Federal Government for educational purposes. The contribution is infinitesimal compared with the appropriations we are making for other purposes. Can we afford additional contributions for the education of the Nation's children? During the past month Congress has authorized the expenditure of $3,500,000,000 for European recovery. During the next year, very likely before the program is finished, if expectations are realized, the program might well cost up to $17,000,000,000. Actually, some of these countries we are assisting under the European plan are now spending a greater percent of their national income for educational purposes than does the United States. In addition to the European recovery program we will authorize before this session of Congress adjourns great amounts for national defense. This defense program within the next few years will cost the Government between fifteen and twenty billion dollars a year.

Our defense program must, of necessity, give more and more consideration to the intellectual ability and physical stamina of our people. It is not necessary for me to recall the great number of young men who were rejected for military service, in the last war, because of educational and physical defects. Those rejected for mental deficiencies ranged all the way from nine-tenths of 1 percent to 26 percent in the various States, which is alarming and is a condition which should not exist in a great free country such as the one in which we live.

During the school years of 1945 and 1946 the American people spent $2,600,000,000 for the instruction of their children and operation of their public schools. During the same year the American people spent $2,700,000,000 for tobacco and $7,000,000,000 for alcoholic beverages. In terms of value the comparison of these items is shocking. A little rationing and self-denial on these luxury items could pay for a considerable amount of education.

In the past few years the school districts have found themselves in a serious situation because of the lack of qualified teachers. Thousands of teachers have left the profession for employment in war plants and private industries that offered greater financial returns. If this trend is not reversed, and soon, our public schools will be in a most serious condition. Already employment scouts for industry and business are descending on the halls of higher learning in their annual drive to hire the bright young men and women who will get their sheepskins next month. We cannot allow this Nation, the richest in the world today, to lose its preeminence as a leading Nation of the world in universal public education.

It is true that our public-school teachers have been and still are terribly underpaid; everyone recognizes that. But it is not entirely the plight of the teachers the proposed legislation attempts to solve. The teachers' pay is a secondary consideration to the general welfare of the American children. This session of Congress must not adjourn without passing Federal-aid legislation. If we do not do something to make it possible to increase the pay of our teachers we will find ourselves in a worse condition next year than we are now. When the full impact of European recovery and defense plans are felt we will find the defense areas and industries again outbidding the schools for intelligent, dependable employees. We must afford our teachers an incentive and security whereby they will be able to remain in the teaching profession. We cannot afford to lose more of our specially trained instructors.

The immortal Jefferson, the foremost exponent of universal education, said:

> Enlighten people generally and tyranny and oppression of body and mind will vanish like spirits at the dawn of day.

Long before Jefferson expounded this doctrine, Confucius put it this way:

> There being instruction, there will be no distinction of classes.

It is apparent to all of us that we are living in a world filled with economic and political confusion. If we are to combat totalitarianisms, from either the right or the left, we must implement economic security with a strong, dynamic, Nation-wide system of public education.

Veterans' Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, only 6 weeks remain before the contemplated adjournment of the Eightieth Congress. Many pressing problems are crying for our attention. I feel that the problems incident to defense and national security are the most pressing. Next in importance is the problem of housing. We must do something about it.

I say that it is the duty of the Banking and Currency Committee to bring out a housing bill so that we can discuss it, debate, and vote on it. There has been too much dilly-dallying, too much talking, too much politicking, too much ratiocinating with the subject of housing. In my home city of St. Paul, with a population of some 350,000, the need for adequate housing, especially for veterans, is most acute. Demonstrative of the situation is an article from the St. Paul Dispatch for Friday, April 30. I include it as a part of my remarks:

VET HOUSING LACK WORSENS, REQUESTS FOR HUTS INCREASE

(By Irving Lipove)

The veterans' housing problem is a bigger headache now than it was 2 years ago when a program was launched to alleviate the acute shortage. This was revealed today by Arthur Coleman, housing manager of the city's eight army-type hut camps, who said there is a waiting list of some 1,700 veterans and their families for the structures that can accommodate only 480 families.

And each day brings more applications.

At present every camp is filled to capacity. There have been only 108 vacancies since the project was started in 1946, with about 75 percent of that number occurring in the fall and winter months.

Of the applications on hand, 170 are classified as "extreme personal hardship" cases, Coleman reported. These include veterans who have been evicted, those who face eviction and persons whose poor health requires a change in living conditions.

He cited these examples: A veteran whose small child's health failed because of a crowded home and no outdoor recreation area in which she could play; a veteran whose wife could not climb stairs due to a heart ailment; a veteran who couldn't continue to live in a second-story home after both his legs were amputated as the result of an accident.

Those and all other "extreme personal hardship cases" usually are given priority whenever a vacancy occurs, Coleman explained.

He said there are 112 families living in the huts at Duluth and Case, 100 at East Fifth and Kennard, 90 at Cottage and Kennard, 60 at Dale and West Arlington, 48 at Oxford

and Carroll, 36 at Victoria and Jefferson, 24 at Milton and Jefferson, and 10 at Louis and St. Anthony.

Due to the sharp increase in applications for the homes, Coleman said only applications from veterans with families are being accepted now. Persons pleading emergency cases in connection with poor health must present a report from a doctor, he added.

The huts were erected by the city for the families of veterans who served in World War II, with the exception of former merchant marines and civilian war employees.

The Army-type hut camp projects were started 2 years ago after Robert F. Peterson, commissioner of the parks, playgrounds, and public buildings department, was appointed chairman of St. Paul's Temporary Housing Committee by the city council. Coleman was named housing manager.

Both Peterson and Coleman said the present hut housing shortage will remain about the same for a long time to come.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from today's Washington Post:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
SENSELESS SABOTAGE

The next few weeks will bring a concrete and most significant test of the condition of the Republican Party. Will the men who are manifestly the most popular with the mass of the Republican voters—Stassen, Dewey, and Vandenberg—be upheld or repudiated in the field of foreign policy by the Republican organization in Congress? The test will come before June 12 on the question of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which expires on that day.

Since it was first passed in 1934, the act has four times come before Congress for renewal—in 1937, 1940, 1943, and 1945. On all these occasions it could fairly be said that, though there were many Republicans who supported it, it was a measure of the Democratic Party, based on its traditional views in favor of moderate tariffs, and therefore one which the Republican Party, long committed to high protection, could reasonably oppose. But this is no longer the case. The Republican Party can no longer oppose the extension of this act without repudiating its own solemn and precise commitments, now the law of the land and an integral and essential part of the Nation's foreign policy.

The Economic Cooperation Act was passed by the Senate on March 13. The vote was 69 to 17. It was passed by the House on March 31. The vote was 329 to 74.

This law says (section 115) b (3) that the participating countries are required to conclude agreements with the United States providing among other things for cooperation "to reduce barriers to trade among themselves and with other countries." If the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is not renewed or is nullified by destructive amendment, this country will not be able to negotiate and conclude the agreements which the law of Economic Cooperation Act requires.

The law itself will have been nullified by the Congress which passed it. The great policy on which is staked so much of our hope of security and peace will have been repudiated. What Congress did with its right hand, it will have undone with its left. The damage will be irreparable. For by an act of this Congress, made after full deliberation, the good faith and honor of the Nation are now fully and wholly engaged in carrying out the letter and the spirit of the European recovery program.

How could a default, a nullification, a repudiation be explained? How could the moral credit of the Government in its dealings with foreign powers be restored? On what ground should we then stand in opposing those who, having made solemn international commitments, restore to devious ways of evading, avoiding, and subverting them?

It must not be supposed, it cannot be presumed, that the Republicans in the House who are involved in this matter are conspiring to subvert the foreign policy of the United States. Almost certainly they have not yet understood what they are doing. They have not yet heard from the national leaders of their party, from the men among whom, if they expect to win the election, they will select their candidates. These men are bound to speak to them promptly and unequivocally, and to make them realize that they are no longer dealing with the traditional domestic issue of high and low tariffs but with a crucial element of a policy in which the vital interests of the Nation—its peace and its security—are directly involved.

The opponents of an extension of the act are, of course, entitled to make their case. But if they make their case in the open, we shall see that they are trying to protect themselves against imaginary injuries. The chief producing interests behind the opposition in Congress are not now suffering from unemployment, or from severe competition in the domestic market, or from cutthroat prices, nor are they doing unprofitable business.

Quite the contrary. A compilation made by the National City Bank of New York of the net income of the leading corporations in the industries supposed to be affected adversely shows that never have they been so prosperous. The 44 leading companies making chemical products earned over 17 percent on their net worth last year, after charging off depreciation, interest, taxes, and other charges and reserves. For 45 cotton goods companies the return was 36 percent; for 9 woolen goods companies it was 21 percent; for shoes and other leather products it was 21; for glass products over 17 percent. These industries cannot argue that they are being hurt. All they can say is that they are afraid that they might be hurt some time in the future. That is not a sufficient reason for wrecking the foreign policy of the United States.

As a matter of fact these fears are for the immediate future—that is to say for the next 3 or 4 years—demonstrably groundless. What is the economic trouble in Europe? Is it not the low productivity of Britain, Germany, and the other industrial countries? What is the best that we hope to see accomplished by the utmost exertion of the Europeans? Is it not that in the course of 4 years they may be able to produce enough to meet their own most urgent needs and to pay for the bare necessities which they must import?

How, then, can these American industries imagine that such feeble European industries are going to invade the American market and flood it with goods and ruin their profits? The trouble with Europe, which ERP is set up to alleviate, is that European industries cannot produce enough. And yet here are American lobbyists trying to argue that the productivity of Europe is about to ruin them.

There is no sense in it. And while it would be wrong to wreck ERP even if they lost some of their profits, to wreck it when their profits are enormous and their competitive position is invulnerable would be a most senseless piece of political sabotage.

The Consumer Decides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1948

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address entitled "The Consumer Decides" by W. W. Vandeveer, president of the Allied Oil Co., Inc., which was delivered on March 31 before the Ohio Petroleum Marketers Association annual convention at Columbus, Ohio:

The headlines in our newspapers today—and every day—present a world in turmoil. In this world-wide instability, one important and controlling factor is the reserves of oil in the Middle East—oil reserves that are essential to relieve the pressure on our domestic petroleum industry, especially in case of a shooting war.

With the fate of the world—with our fate—being decided in far-off places like Italy, like Palestine and Greece (and note how close these places are to the Middle East), we still find a Heselton bill hanging over our heads. We still find our elected representatives badgering us with attempts to nationalize the oil industry.

What is their objective? Do they want to accomplish here what has already been effected in Russia, in Yugoslavia, in Bulgaria, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in Latvia, in Estonia, in Lithuania, in Rumania—the so-called satellite countries?

In each of these countries a disorganized majority was brushed aside by an organized minority of leftist fanatics to set up totalitarian dictatorships. We also have our leftists and fanatics—in government office and out—who are striving to create more confusion and further disorganize the majority, and pave the way for our national enslavement under their minority power.

Can these fanatics show where bureaucratic control of an industry, anywhere at any time, has resulted in increased production—in more goods for more people, in as great a recognition of individual freedom? When these men in Government—and out of Government— can show us, not just claim, that a bureaucratic, nationalized oil industry can out-produce our free, competitive oil industry without enslaving the majority, I will be the first to subscribe to any plan that they present. Until that proof is given, I will keep on working for the American system where the consumer is our dictator.

I'm a supporter of free enterprise, first of all because I was born into that system. But my Dutch ancestors came here 300 years ago from their own personal choice because they resisted the government control by minority of the individual in Europe and were willing to work for an opportunity to establish individual freedom here.

As long as the consumer is the boss, we have free, private, competitive enterprise. If we dethrone his highness, the American consumer, and start taking all our orders from a Government bureau, a national oil board, a petroleum industry commissar, or a privately owned monopoly, we would dump not only free enterprise but we would also choke off the free flow of goods to the consumer. When state planning or a cartel

replaces free, consumer choice, scarcity is substituted for abundance. All history proves that planned economies result in one thing: a more equitable distribution of starvation.

The consumer, thank goodness, is still your boss and mine in America.

A recent publication of the United States Department of Commerce stated: "It has been said that an oil company can divide a barrel of crude oil into as many petroleum products as it wishes. Actually the oil company does not make the decision. The decision is made by the consumer whose demands for certain petroleum products determine what the company does." In other words: Under our system the consumer decides what kind of products will be made and in what volume.

Today I would like to discuss this power of the consumer on the petroleum industry and in our entire political economy. I am sure that the direction of our economy by multiple, free, consumer choices rather than by bureaucratic or autocratic decrees is what the vast majority of us want. On the record, it is the system that produces the most goods and services for the enjoyment of the greatest number of people. While I am sure it is the system we prefer, I am not so sure that we have been strengthening this system during the past 15 years.

In some ways it is a wonder that after 15 years of perpetual crisis—of self-created emergencies—of world-wide disturbances that we in the United States still direct our economy to the production of those things which the consumer freely chooses to buy, instead of being directed by take-it-or-leave-it decrees issued by Government. This consumer type of direction is not inevitable. It is not universal. It is not the basis for many foreign economies. We could lose it here before we actually realized it was gone.

Unfortunately, we in the United States have been drifting to a far different arrangement through persistent, small encroachments of Goverment bureaucrats and by almost imperceptible changes in our own thinking. We have been retreating from the road of free enterprise. During the 1930's, especially, many of us began to look to Washington for help instead of putting forth the extra effort to get over the hump by ourselves. At the same time the apostles of Government planning and Government control fostered and promoted the trend away from self-reliant, free enterprise.

Today this attitude of omniscient planning still hangs on in all branches of our Government—executive, legislative, and judicial. But worse than that, the ranks of business, of labor, and of agriculture are infested with the attitude that we must depend on Government to solve all problems for us.

We can be thankful that this drift to Government dominance of our economic life has not been completed. So far, no commissar can shoot an American wildcatter because he brought in another dry hole. No American car owner has to know Joe to get a pint of gasoline for a Sunday afternoon drive. No American farmer has to prove he voted the right ticket to get a tractor. And fortunately, no American jobber will be sent to the salt mines because his bulk handling losses exceed 3 percent.

The Russians, the Czechs, the Polish, and many others are not so fortunate. In those areas free competitive enterprise never took hold or else lost its vigor. In some countries, private monopolies or cartels restricted production and paved the way for the totalitarians. The economy ceased to satisfy the consumer and gave way to dictated state economies. Just as surely, if we fail to satisfy the needs and wants of the American consumer, he will turn to the apostles of government dominance with their utopias built on half-truths frosted with glib promises.

To avoid such a change, we must work to make free, competitive enterprise function effectively to meet the consumer's demands—and keep him sold on the advantages he gets from living in a free economy.

Keeping our progressive system requires real self-reliance, real ingenuity, and real results. It requires real missionary zeal in selling the two fundamental characteristics of our political economy—free enterprise and democratic government.

American industry has not been doing too good a job of explaining our accomplishments, our efforts, and our objectives to the consumer. And I include the petroleum industry in the list of industries that have failed in their public relations. It is of the gravest importance that we learn how to do that public-relations job. Somehow, some way, we must convince the American consumer that we are doing more than just trying to make a profit at his expense. He must be convinced that all of us are putting forth real effort to get him what he wants and that we give him more than any Government-controlled industry ever has or could begin to deliver. He must become aware of the fact that we deliver more goods for his benefit and do it without corrupting or destroying his personal freedom and free, personal choice. These freedoms he would have to relinquish under any system of Government control.

During recent months we have again heard opportunistic politicians sounding the tocsin for Government control of the oil industry. In some instances they have been goaded and guided by members of the industry. Complaints from within the industry have been used as a springboard for new threats, new schemes, new legislation for governmental direction of the petroleum industry. However, as Mr. Yocom, of NPN, so ably commented on one such bill, we must all recognize that the petroleum industry is a unit and that any attempt to legislate against one segment of that industry could not result other than in the enslavement of the remainder, as well. In other words, like the girl in the story, there is no such thing as being slightly controlled; it has to be all or nothing.

Gentlemen, I do not claim that free enterprise in this industry or any other industry can create miracles. I say the record shows that free enterprise will do the job better, will do the job faster, and will do the job cheaper than any other system. Even more important, the job is done without enslaving the mass of people.

Right today there is a real shortage of oil products. It is not universally acute, but it is very real. Although the shortage of certain products in local areas has been an inconvenience to you and to me and to the general public, it fortunately has not resulted in widespread hardship or suffering.

The reasons for this condition you know. During the war the normal growth of the industry was retarded to a very critical extent. The steel for drilling, transportation, and terminals was diverted to tanks, guns, and ships. At the end of the war, military petroleum requirements remained far above prewar levels. But skyrocketing civilian requirements made an even greater impact on demand.

Prewar facilities were out of balance with postwar demand. An imbalance developed between current demand and current supply, sharply concentrated in limited areas to certain products—especially furnace oils. Current forecasts of qualified petroleum economists indicate that new demand this year will still pace the significant increases in supplies of some products.

Now, does that mean that the petroleum industry is falling down on its job? No. It means that the industry cannot meet a greatly multiplied demand in less time than it takes to drill new wells, lay new pipe lines, build additional refineries, and expand the entire framework of distribution. Even a free industry cannot eliminate the time factor. However, free enterprise, unrestricted by bureaucratic bungling, will shorten the time needed to do the job. You cannot drill an oil well with law printed on paper. It takes steel. You cannot make a new pipe line out of a Government decree. It takes steel and time. You cannot erect a new refinery out of blueprint paper. It takes steel, time, and labor.

What kind of a job has the industry done? Let's take a look. Back in 1920 United States refinery runs totaled a little over a million barrels a day. By 1941 we had boosted it to 3,861,000 barrels a day. Last year—despite the wartime restrictions on expansion—refinery crude runs averaged over 5,000,000 barrels daily.

Up to 1913 the oil industry operated to produce more and more kerosene—the product demanded by consumers. When consumer demand shifted to gasoline, the industry created newer, more efficient methods to squeeze more gasoline from a barrel of crude oil. With the recent shift in emphasis of demand to distillates, kerosene, and fuel oil, another general change resulted in higher relative yields of those products.

Before the war, only 16 percent of the American farms had tractors. Today nearly two-thirds of American farms are mechanized and have increased their demand for fuels and lubricants. Before the war, oil burners were being installed at the rate of about 150,000 a year. During the past 2 years we have been installing oil burners at over 3½ times that rate. Commercial heating installations have increased by almost 50 percent against prewar use. Everywhere we turn we find an unprecedented demand for oil products.

What did the oil industry do last year to meet this demand? We completed over 33,600 oil and gas wells to establish a new record for drilling. We laid nearly 8,000 miles of new pipe lines. New discoveries increased our known crude-oil reserve by over 600,000,000 barrels in spite of record-breaking oil production.

As an industry we met the demand for 70 percent more distillate—50 percent more kerosene—40 percent more gasoline—than the American consumer required before the war. We did it by hard work—by sweat and strain and individual ingenuity. The demand would not have been met if we had used up our energies and manpower trying to teach a Government oil bureau what makes the oil industry run.

What is planned for 1948? A survey made by the American Petroleum Institute indicates that the industry has committed itself to spending $4,000,000,000 in facilities of all kinds during 1947 and 1948. Nearly 35,000 new wells will be drilled—with more wildcats than ever before. Nearly 19,000 old wells will be equipped with pumps to increase or maintain their output. The magazine, World Oil, estimates that 10,000 miles of new pipe line will be completed. Refinery output will be increased. Secondary recovery will be further expanded. New terminals will be built.

And who is directing us to this effort and expenditure? The ultimate consumer. We are working to give him what he wants. In the long run we cannot afford to legislate or regulate against his demands. I am no more in favor of making the manufacture of oil burners illegal than I am of discontinuing the manufacture of new cars, new trucks, new tractors. True, the manufacture of equipment should keep an eye on the quality and the quantity of the fuels available for use in his equipment. That is his responsibility in a free economy.

I say the record of the free enterprise oil industry is good. We are giving the consumer what he demands and we are doing it without threats from up on high, without slave labor and without concentration camps. Show me the collectivized industry in any country—in any period of history—that can equal our record.

Regarding the record of the oil industry, the March issue of Fortune says: "It is an industry, that, since crude first spouted from the ground at Titusville, Pa., has shown marvelous capacity for adaptation, change, and growth. The oil industry does not need a master plan. It may well need public encouragement to resist Government overtures to set up a new NRA."

Now, what part have the independents played in these accomplishments? What part will they play in the future? By his very existence and continued growth in a competitive economy the independent producer, the independent refiner, the independent marketer, and the independent jobber has proved himself essential. Given free, competitive opportunity, I know that the independent can operate successfully in any branch of the petroleum industry. But he cannot meet subsidized competition whether that subsidy is a Government subsidy of freedom from taxes enjoyed by the co-ops or the subsidy by an integrated company whose profits in one branch of the industry are used to make up the losses in another division.

In this respect, I resent the confused attitude of the Government in its dealings with the oil industry. Washington is riding off in two directions at once. Justice Department, Small Business Committee and some legislators are flailing the major integrated companies for subsidizing certain branches of their business with profits from other operations. At the same time Government bureaucrats are exerting pressure on integrated companies to absorb increased crude oil costs—and, in effect, to subsidize their refining and marketing operations. What happens to the unsubsidized independent? That, my friends, is of no interest to some elected officials who need votes—it is of no interest to some appointed officials whose tenure in office is certainly not determined by the independents.

Unfortunately, some independents have lost their self-reliance and self-confidence and are still looking for someone in Washington to solve their problems for them. Free enterprise and aggressive action have given way to an attitude of let George do it. This listless, defeatist attitude is better characterized as no enterprise rather than as free enterprise.

The no-enterprise system would make guaranteed profits the law of the land. It is the old delusion of getting something for nothing—of rewards without effort or without risk—of profits for me at the expense of someone else.

As just one example of this irresponsible attitude, I have observed that some furnace-oil jobbers have increased their business by several hundred percent since 1941, without adding a single gallon of new storage capacity. Those jobbers want to leave all the risk and all the extra effort to the refiner or the marketer.

Basically, as a nation we have two roads we can travel—the road of planned poverty or the road of progressive, competitive, free enterprise.

If we choose the first, we restrict production and ration consumption. In the end the consumer will have no freedom of choice. Arbitrary limits, set by bureaucrats, will freeze and shrink our capacity to produce.

If we choose the second road, the consumer is free to choose and industry is free to exert every effort and all its ingenuity to meet the expanding demands of the consumer. There is no limit to our progress.

As a free industry we have helped to put nearly 30,000,000 cars on American highways and speeded economical, mass transportation. We have helped to mechanize American farms and to take the work load off the back of the farmer. We have brought the comfort of automatic heat to American homes and we have helped put faster, bigger American planes in the air. In doing this job, we have established a long-run price record which trends to ever-greater value to the consumer for his dollar. Nothing like this has ever happened under any other system in the history of the world.

This performance can continue if we all take responsibility ourselves for the solution of our own problems. Individual effort unity of purpose, teamwork in the industry and in the Nation will assure more goods, better goods, at lower prices for more and more consumers.

Let us keep the consumer in the driver's seat. If we take our orders from him, we won't be liquidated by a Kremlin in Washington or Moscow. If we meet the challenge of his expanding demands, we will not have to bow to the restrictive decrees of government, of cartels, or any other monopoly. If we maintain an economy where the consumer has a free, individual choice, we will keep the door to further progress open wide. Through that door you and I can march to even bigger things—as freemen.

Postal Pay Increase—Recognition of a Vital Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER R. JONES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following excellent editorials appearing in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on April 13, 1948, and in the Lake City Herald, a Washington State weekly paper, on April 15, 1948, relative to the need for early consideration of legislation providing for pay increases for postal employees consistent with the increase in cost of living:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of Tuesday, April 13, 1948]

THE POSTAL PAY BILL

The Civil Service Committee of the Senate has given its approval to a measure which, if finally enacted, will increase the annual pay of each Federal postal worker by $800.

This would be a welcome addition to the income of the postal workers and certainly a well-earned one, but it would still leave their pay much less than adequate for the standards of living to which they are entitled.

The attitude of the Federal Government toward the pay of postal workers has long been not only niggardly but very strange and inconsistent, in view of the contrasting attitude often taken concerning the pay of workers in private employment.

In several notable instances the most powerful figures in the Federal Government, including the President of the United States, have championed the cause of unions seeking higher pay from private employers. In all cases where Government agencies have served as arbitrators or mediators of such disputes the end product of Government intervention has been higher pay.

But when the Government itself has the employer's role, it not only fails to see the justice or necessity of higher pay, but persists in maintaining standards of pay that were actually below levels of normal living before the war and are now insufficient to support the barest essentials of dignified and decent living.

In all cases in the recent past when Federal postal employees have had pay increases—and they went 20 years without any increase at all—they have been given reluctantly and only after overwhelming demonstrations of an approving public interest in the matter. Even then they have been woefully inadequate to serve the professed purpose of cost-of-living adjustment."

Congress again seems to be moving with extreme reluctance in the matter.

Even in the progress made thus far it has succeeded in emasculating the bill by eliminating its retroactive provisions.

Obviously it will take another overwhelming demonstration of approving public interest to obtain final enactment of the postal pay increase measure. Meanwhile the loyal, efficient, and indispensable postal workers and their families are compelled to maintain themselves on a scale barely above the subsistence level.

Congress should surely pass this helpful and deserved although still entirely inadequate bill for the increase of Federal postal pay, and it should not do so reluctantly but with recognition of the vital services to the country the postal workers perform with complete fulfillment of their patriotic responsibilities.

[From the Lake City Herald of April 15, 1948]

POSTAL EMPLOYEES FORGOTTEN AS LIVING COSTS SPIRAL HIGHER

Mr. Congressman, what are you doing about the pay raise for the postal employees? You gave them a raise on January 1, 1946, and then forgot them. While other groups were given pay raises each year since then, and prices continued their upward trend, you overlooked these workers' need for a salary adjustment.

The present wage scale for the post office clerks and carriers ranges from $2,100 to $3,100 a year. The amount paid each individual is dependent upon the length of time he has been in the postal service. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the dollar today is worth 60 cents as compared with the 1939 dollar. In terms of the 1949 dollar, the post office people's purchasing power is now between $1,260 and $1,860—now what kind of a living wage is that?

These people are Americans, Mr. Congressman. We once spoke proudly of the American standard of living. It is unfair and unjust that the last Americans to be considered for a wage increase, when prices go up, are the civil-service servants who work for the Post Office Department.

Perhaps we take them too much for granted. The mail is tucked into the mail box in the morning, and we forget the men who get it there. And sometimes when we sit down at our desk and find the mail neatly stacked and ready for us, we think of the fairy tales of our childhood days, and of the magic wand the fairy godmother waved to accomplish the slightest wish. To us the mail service is like the magic of the fairy's wand. We don't turn a hand, but there it is, ready for us every morning. It isn't magic that gets it there—it is the hard demanding work of a loyal group of men.

We Americans are proud of the postal workers' motto—"Neither sleet, nor snow, nor the gloom of night, can stay these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." The philosophy is the backbone of the postal system, and we want it kept a reality. There is only one way to accomplish this—adjust the postal workers' salaries upward, in line with the present high living costs.

Should bureaucratic of governmental economy endanger the most efficient of all our public services? No. We the people, want these faithful men to enjoy the rights of all Americans—the rights upon which our Constitution was founded—freedom, equality, and justice for all.

Come Mr. Congressman, let us give postal workers proper financial remuneration to express our gratitude for a job well done.

To the readers: You can do your part. Clip this out, sign it with your return address, and mail it to your Congressman. That will be your way of saying thank you to a group of men—our mailmen.

The Draft and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARVE TIBBOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa., April 30, 1948:

THE DRAFT AND UMT

A Republican spokesman in the House declares that the Senate's proposal to combine the draft and universal military training is stupid and will result only in confusing the people.

The combined plan would draft young men of 19½ through 25 years, inducting them for 2 years' service, while youths from 18 to 19½ would be called up for 1 year of training and service entirely within the United States.

Whether this proposal is feasible must, of course, be left to military authorities. Whether it is acceptable will depend on Congress. But it will be far more stupid, we think, if Congress fails to enact at this session a measure which will provide an adequate supply of manpower for the military forces, and at least start setting up the machinery to make a reserve of military strength available.

Since the Italian elections affairs in Europe have quited down somewhat. But that does not mean Russia has abandoned the principles of aggression on which her whole Communist system is predicated. It merely means that Soviet authorities are lying low awhile, in the hope that the hornets' nest they stirred up with their Czechoslovakian outrage will quiet down again—and let them plan and prepare another.

If the Marshall plan is to succeed, Europe must have a sense of security against external aggression. It can be given that feeling of security only if it knows that the United States will be in position to act swiftly, if swift action is needed. Twice Europe has held off aggressors alone until we had time to prepare. The European countries, sensible of their own weakness, know they cannot do that again.

And unless they have assurance of prompt military aid from the United States in an emergency, we fear that our economic program for European recovery will be less fruitful of quick and lasting results. For no man can build his future with confidence, if the threat of its destruction looms constantly over him.

Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from my friend and neighbor C. C. Elrod, of Siloam Springs, Ark., enclosing the following compilation which he had written. I think it is good, and, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD:

Arkansas can duplicate:
The coal of Pennsylvania and iron of Alabama.
The asphalt of the isle of Trinidad.
The cement beds of Scotland.
The brick, slate, and clay of West Virginia.
The copper of the shores of Superior;
The granite of Maine and marble of Vermont.
The glass sand of Illinois.
The pearls of the Caspean.
The horses of Kentucky and mules of Missouri.
The cattle of Wyoming and hogs of Iowa.
The corn of Kansas (and by the way some 4 years ago a Siloam Springs boy took first prize for the tallest stalk of corn at the fair in Des Moines, Iowa).
Oil and gas fields of Texas and Oklahoma, or Pennsylvania.
The sugar cane of Louisiana and rice of as good quality as grown.
The cantaloupes of Rocky Ford and the largest watermelon ever grown was grown in Arkansas, 195 pounds.
Apples with 30 percent better quality and 30 percent more juice (by chemical test in 1915) than California; and as fine berries as are grown.
The sunrise of the bay of Mandalay and the only diamond fields in America.

Impact of Agricultural Appropriations, 1949, on the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last week I appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with respect to certain fiscal items involving the Nation's agriculture and thousands of interested farm groups in my State. I ask unanimous consent that my statement made at that time be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, all items in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal 1949 are of interest to farm groups in the State of Washington. There are several, however, which are of particular interest and I appear before you today to present a case for these programs.

The Market News Service gathers and disseminates price and condition information on agricultural commodities. Information is tailored as nearly as possible to the needs of the area the particular office serves.

In the State of Washington, the Department of Agriculture for some years has maintained a Market News Service in Seattle, and more recently one in Yakima. The fruit, vegetable, poultry, dairy, and livestock producers and distributors have come to rely on this service for authentic market information.

The farm director of one of the larger Seattle radio stations had this to say about the Market News Service. I quote from a recent letter he addressed to me:

"Not only is this information, which is broadcast by all large radio stations in Seattle, of concern to farmers, but consumers find it of value in making purchases of produce items. Housewife programs on this station use it consistently, advising listeners of the best buys in produce items. These broadcasts, in many instances, have been responsible for the removal of temporary surpluses and gluts of locally grown produce items."

Seattle shows the heaviest volume of receipts of fruits and vegetables of any Northwest city—9,203 cars by rail in 1947. Washington ranks fourth or fifth among the States in annual rail shipments of fruits and vegetables.

Total cost of maintaining the Seattle Market News Service office is approximately $11,000 per year; of Yakima, $13,150 per year. Prior to July 1, 1947, the State contributed $2,250 toward maintenance of the Seattle office and $5,000 toward the Yakima service.

The State legislature in 1947 failed to appropriate funds to finance its share of this important activity. During fiscal 1948, the reports have been underwritten by interested individuals and enterprises. I am informed that effective July 1, 1948, these voluntary sources are withdrawing their support. Obviously, I cannot speak for the State legislature, but there is good reason to believe it will provide funds to resume participation in this work when it meets again in January 1949. In the meantime, however, this vital farm service will be discontinued unless the Department of Agriculture is given sufficient funds to finance the entire cost of the Yakima and Seattle offices for this limited emergency period.

The House approved an appropriation for the Market News Service totaling $1,626,250. This includes the Federal share of funds required to finance the Yakima and Seattle offices. I request your committee to increase this item $8,000, thereby providing for continuation of the Seattle and Yakima services through fiscal 1949 and until the State legislature has an opportunity to review the entire problem.

The committee may question the propriety of the Federal Government assuming full responsibility for the Market News Service in Washington State, as I am here recommending. There are at least three bases on which such action is justified. First, the expense, $8,000, is minute in relation to the value placed upon the news service by the agricultural interests of the State. Second, to discontinue the service this year and thereby incur the expense of reestablishing these offices next year, would offset, in part at least, the $8,000 I am requesting. Third, I have been informed by the Department of Agriculture in response to an inquiry that the Market News Service in a number of States is financed entirely by the Federal Government. The programs in these States (Colorado, Missouri, Georgia, and Massachusetts) are comparable to the market news program conducted in the State of Washington.

I sincerely hope your committee will act favorably on my request that the item for Market News Service, as it appears on page 52, line 7, of H. R. 5883, be increased by $8,000.

May I at this point place in the RECORD communications supporting this request from the Washington Co-operative Farmers Association; the National Grange; Northwest Produce Association, Inc.; radio station KJR, Seattle; United Dairymen's Association; American Marketing Association (Puget Sound Chapter); Washington State Farm Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I now want to discuss as briefly as possible several items in the appropriation for the Forest Service, funds for rural electrification, House action on funds for the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, and soil conservation.

THE FOREST SERVICE—FOREST PRODUCTS RESEARCH

The budget, as it reached the House, included an item of $1,250,000 for Forest Products Research. The House reduced this request by $250,000, leaving the appropriation for 1949 at $1,000,000. Attached to this statement is a letter from the International Woodworkers of America, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg., and a letter from the Western Forest Industries Association, also of Portland, protesting this action. I will submit these letters for the record, but wish to quote from the first of these communications. The International Woodworkers state:

"Perhaps the most disconcerting development was in connection with funds for Forest Products Research. The appropriation for the current year is $250,000 less than the previous year. The 1949 appropriation, as recommended by the House, would be cut another $250,000, giving the Forest Products Laboratory only $1,000,000. A year ago it had $1,500,000.

"Forest Products Research can help materially to stretch our dwindling timber reserves and make them meet more of our national needs for wood products, and at the same time provide more employment in the Northwest and other forest regions."

On the same subject, the Western Forest Industries Association letter states:

"One of the most practical activities of the Department of Agriculture has been the research program at the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. Investigations carried out there have been of inestimable value to the Nation as a whole and to the forest industries in particular. Wood is probably of greater importance to the welfare of the country than any other crop."

I concur wholeheartedly in the stand of these organizations concerning House action on the appropriation for forest products research. I hope your committee will restore the $250,000 reduction made by the House.

DEVELOPMENT OF FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

The budget estimate for forest development of roads and trails in 1949 was $9,750,000; and for forest highways $5,300,000. The House allowed the full $9,750,000 for forest roads and trails, but reduced by $300,000 the amount for forest highways.

Last year I appeared before this committee, urging that the Congress adopt a 5-year program involving expenditure of $15,000,000 per year for access roads in our national forests. I pointed out that such a program would place our national forests on a sustained-yield basis and that the additional price of stumpage, made possible by access roads, would return to the Treasury over a 10-year period the full amount of the expenditure. Further, I emphasized that at the end of the 10-year period the Federal Government would have these roads free and clear for use in perpetuity in conjunction with the program for sustained yield. I urge again now that your committee give serious consideration to this sound business proposition.

It is my understanding that about $7,000,000 per year is required to maintain present access roads and forest trails. Under the $9,750,000 appropriation allowed by the budget and the House for this purpose; therefore, there will be available only $2,250,000 for new construction.

I have just pointed out that $15,000,000 a year is required for new construction over the next 5 years to put the national forests on a sustained-yield basis. If the House figure is permitted to stand the Forest Service will be about $12,500,000 short of the investment required to do the job which ought to be done.

On this point, I would like to quote again from the letter of April 16, addressed to me, by the Western Forest Industries Association:

"Both the Budget Bureau and the House recommended an appropriation of less than $10,000,000 for forest-road development, including maintenance of existing roads and the construction of new ones in national forests. We understand that the maintenance of old roads will require at least $7,500,000, leaving very little for new construction. Many miles of new roads are badly needed to open up large areas of overmature timber, which should be harvested now before more of it is lost through decay and insect attack.

"* * * If such public roads are not built only the largest firms can bid for public timber, and hundreds of small, independent concerns are frozen out. In the long run, under the appraisal method used by the Forest Service, the timber itself pays the cost of road construction. * * * A proper system of access roads permits the spreading of harvesting operations over a large area, instead of concentrating them in one location."

The International Woodworkers of America have this to say on the same problem:

"We know that some of these (large interests) are arguing that they can build most of the logging access roads that are needed. To get a proper development of logging roads that way, the public timber would have to be sold in huge blocks, which only the largest firms could finance. So, if there is to be any equality of opportunity in obtaining Government timber, the Government must build an extensive system of main-stem logging roads so that timber may be sold in smaller blocks. Moreover, if the Government timber is to be sold on a rational basis—cutting the ripest stands first—main-stem roads must be pushed into the back country where some of the ripest timber is, bypassing some of the least ripe timber which is in more accessible areas."

Again I concur in the point of view expressed by these people in the industry who know first hand the necessity for access roads. I hope your committee will accept this expert testimony together with that given by the Forest Service itself and approach this particular appropriation with the long-range view definitely in mind.

FOREST HIGHWAYS

You have already heard testimony from the State highway officials on the urgent need for additional funds for forest highways. In 1944 the Congress authorized a 3-year postwar program involving expenditure of $25,000,000 per year. The $5,000,000 included in the present budget is a far cry from the program authorized.

TIMBER SALES

The Department requested an appropriation for 1949 of approximately $3,915,000 for timber management. The House reduced this amount about $200,000, leaving the net appropriation of $3,715,000.

The Forest Service, in calculating the amount required for timber management in 1949, predicated its request upon a program involving the sale of 4,000,000,000 feet of timber during the year. The appropriation approved by the House will force a reduction in this program of some 200,000,000 feet. Since the Department receives for timber sold about $5 for every dollar spent on the program, it seems rather expensive economy to reduce the budget request by $200,000, thereby depriving the Treasury of roughly five times that amount.

The volume of timber sales the Forest Service can administer is almost directly related to the funds Congress provides for this purpose. I am hopeful your committee will review House action on this item. I personally think careful review will reveal the false economy inherent in the House action.

NATIONAL FOREST PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT—RANGE USE

There are two other items in the Forest Service budget which I think bear scrutiny. The House reduced by $100,000 the budget request for fire control in the national forests. It reduced by $125,000 the amount requested for supervising grazing of livestock in the national forests. Overgrazing in the national forests is directly related to the problems of flood control and soil conservation. The necessity of protecting the national forests from fire hazards is too obvious to require explanation. Your committee has already received testimony from the Department on these items. Appropriations for these purposes come under the heading of conserving and protecting a vital national resource.

SOIL CONSERVATION

I am sure the committee is keenly aware of the necessity of conserving the soil resources of our Nation. During the current session a number of Senators have taken the floor to speak on this vital subject. Recently Senator KILGORE, who has long been an advocate of sound soil-conservation programs and practices, made these statements to the Senate:

"Originally we had approximately 560,000,000 acres of good cropland and our topsoil averaged 9 inches in depth; today it averages only 6 inches and on millions of acres it is all gone. * * * We certainly cannot go on as we have for the last 50 years. About one-quarter of our cropland, approximately 110,000,000 acres, is now being damaged by erosion at a rapid rate. * * * In a very literal sense, our lives depend upon the soil. In view of these facts, how can we justify reduced funds for any of our conservation services? How can we afford to continue to lose the equivalent of 500,000 acres of cropland a year?"

For operations, the House allowed the Soil Conservation Service $44,000,000—$6,000,000 more than the Budget request. This is a splendid step in the right direction. Lest we err by pointing with pride to this amount as adequate, and to direct the committee's attention to the target at which we should be shooting, I submit the following facts:

The $6,000,000 addition to the Budget request will permit the organization of approximately 250 new districts in fiscal year 1949. Each district now in operation averages about 350,000 acres of farm land. The number of farms per district averages between 2,300 and 2,400. Present appropriations permit the Soil Conservation Service to employ one technical soil conservationist and one helper per district. With this meager staff, around 150 farms per district per year can be surveyed. At the current rate of progress, it will take us, as a Nation, from 50 to 75 years to formulate and get into operation plans for all farms in the Nation.

Personally, I think the Congress should be looking toward a program which will cut this period to a maximum of 20 years. To accomplish this objective, the appropriation for 1950 should be stepped up to a minimum of $50,000,000 and within a period of 5 to 10 years we should be investing a minimum of $90,000,000 per year in this work. From that point on, the amount of money needed to carry the work forward would gradually diminish until at the end of the 20-year period, appropriation needs would drop to a figure somewhat below the present level.

It is already too late to get such a program under way. Time and the elements continue taking an extravagant toll of our soil resources, even while we debate the subject in committee today.

Under the AAA program, payments are authorized to those farmers who follow soil-conservation practices approved by the Department of Agriculture and its county committees. Last year the Congress appropriated about $264,000,000 for soil-conservation payments and authorized a program for the current year of $150,000,000. The House appropriated the full amount of last year's authorization and approved a 1949 program totaling $225,000,000.

I regret that the program for this 1948 crop year was not maintained on a minimum of at least last year's level. It is impossible to drop from a program involving participation by farmers of the Nation at a $264,000,000 level to a $150,000,000 level, without losing a great deal of the ground we had gained.

The Department of Agriculture has had to reduce almost in half the payment to each farmer for approved soil-conservation practices. As a result, many farmers have dropped out of the program. In most cases their decision to refrain from participating is not motivated by lack of interest, but rather by inability to spend out of their own pockets the additional funds required to carry on practices at the former level.

The reduction from a program of $264,000,000 to one of $150,000,000 made it necessary for the farmer to finance a larger share of the practices he had adopted. It is only natural, therefore, that those financially unable to continue sound conservation practices but whose acres are in greatest need, would be the ones who have dropped out of the program.

In view of the importance of our soil to the life of the Nation, in view of the rapidity with which thousands of acres of cropland are being destroyed, and in view of the increasing loss of fertility, I urge this committee to authorize a program of soil-conservation payment for fiscal 1950 of not less than $300,000,000. In my judgment, the $225,000,000 authorization, approved by the House, is inadequate. Soil-conservation research, the work carried on by soil-conservation districts and soil-conservation payments are investments in our agriculture plant which will pay rich and continuing dividends through the years.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

For rural electrification, the House approved a loan authorization of $400,000,000 for fiscal 1949. In addition, the first deficiency appropriation bill of 1948 contained a $175,000,000 item for the same purpose. On this basis, the Rural Electrification Administration will have available for loan in fiscal 1949 approximately $500,000,000.

Last year I appeared before this committee to plead for restoration of the $25,000,000 which the House had cut from the $250,000,000 budget request. The recognition by the House Agricultural Committee and the House itself of the vital importance of rural electrification, as exemplified by this year's action, is in sharp contrast to the situation which prevailed a year ago.

I am sure all of us who over the years have fought to bring electricity to the farms of the Nation are pleased with the action the House has taken. I feel confident your committee will sustain the House judgment. The very generosity exhibited by the House committee in regard to the loan authorization brings with it a problem which demands attention by your committee.

For administrative expenses, the House approved the budget figure of $5,000,000. This figure was predicated on the loan authorization of $300,000,000 contained in the President's budget and upon the assumption that since REA operated last year on a $5,000,000 budget, it could do so again this year. Your committee is well aware of the fact that you cannot operate a $500,000,000 program in 1949 with the same administrative budget as the $225,000,000 program in 1948. I think your committee should sustain a $400,000,000 authorization voted by the House. I think you must reexamine the adequacy of the $5,000,000 approved for administrative expenses. Certainly it is false economy to provide REA with these additional loan funds, which it sorely needs, and at the same time refuse to give it sufficient money to do an adequate administrative job.

In my judgment, one to one and one-half million dollars must be added to the $5,000,000 the House has provided for REA administration. I hope your committee will call the REA Administrator back if necessary to determine the minimum additional amount required by him to discharge the additional heavy responsibilities we are placing upon his agency by making the additional loan funds available.

RESEARCH AND MARKETING ACT OF 1946, HOPE-FLANNAGAN ACT

In its report, the House committee recognizes the inestimable value to agriculture of research in marketing of farm products when it states:

"The committee believes that, if carefully planned and not too rapidly expanded, the program of research provided by the act * * * will have proven to be one of the greatest pieces of work for the advancement of American agriculture."

No one can quarrel with this basic premise. However, reasonable men may legitimately differ as to what constitutes "too rapid expansion of the program."

The Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President recommended an appropriation of $19,000,000 for 1949, to progress research under this act. Apparently they reached the conclusion, after thorough study, that a $19,000,000 budget does not violate the House criterion "if properly planned and not too rapidly expanded."

The House cut the budget request to $12,000,000—$9,000,000 to maintain at this year's level projects already under way, and $3,000,000 to begin research in distribution authorized under title II of the act.

Farmers in my State are deeply interested in the work to be carried on under the Research and Marketing Act. I think it will be helpful to this committee, as you consider possible revisions in the House figures, to know what certain farm groups in Washington State have to say on specific projects which they hope can be carried forward with the funds you appropriate.

At their annual convention in Spokane, November 10–12, 1947, the Washington-Idaho Wheat Growers' League adopted a resolution which reads in part:

"We highly commend the Bureau of Plant Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture and the State College of Washington in establishing the Western Regional Wheat Laboratory at Pullman, Wash., to conduct research in methods of testing wheat and to assist plant breeders in developing wheat varieties better adapted to the needs of millers, bakers, and producers. It is highly essential that this laboratory have additional trained personnel and equipment. * * *

"We recommend that additional funds be made available through the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 to purchase the equipment needed and to hire a sufficient number of trained cereal chemists and other research workers so this laboratory can adequately perform the functions for which it was created."

On March 30, 1948, the Washington State Fruit Commission, serving the soft tree fruit industry, wrote to me in support of adequate appropriations for research under this act. A part of the letter reads as follows:

"Our commission represents the more than 3,000 soft-tree growers of the State. * * * In recent years certain virus diseases common to stone fruits have become a serious menace to our cherry, apricot, and peach industries. * * * Because it is a national problem, Federal funds have been made available in the past and are urgently needed now.

"After mature thought on this subject on the part of our soft-fruit people, we earnestly desire that you do what you can to increase funds available for virus research of stone fruits as a part of the Hope-Flannagan appropriation."

These views, expressed by sound agricultural groups in the State of Washington, are indicative of the support your committee will receive from farmers generally, in any action you take to insure adequate financing for needed projects developed under the Research and Marketing Act.

In conclusion, I wish to reemphasize the thought implicit in what I have said about each of the items covered in this statement; namely, Federal funds invested wisely in our great agricultural plant represent the premium our generation in America should legitimately pay to insure a going concern for those who will inherit from us the land upon which human life depends.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Anent Cash Rewards for Cartoonists," the other "Socialized Medicine and Communist Purpose." These editorials were presented by the National Physicians Committee For the Extension of Medical Service. This committee is a nonpolitical, nonprofit organization for maintaining ethical and scientific standards and extending medical service to all the people.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANENT CASH AWARDS FOR CARTOONISTS

"The lady doth protest too much, methinks."—Hamlet.

The National Physicians Committee announced in a full-page advertisement in Editor and Publisher's issue of February 28—"Cash awards to cartoonists" in 14 amounts totaling $3,000.

The first rule of the contest stipulated that applications for entering the contest must have the approval of the "publisher." This is the evidence that there was no desire to influence the editorial policy of any publication.

A newspaper in an Ohio town took violent exception to the proposal. In a near column length editorial, it announced that its cartoonists would not enter the contest and said: "The reason is simple. Space on our editorial page is not for sale." Was such an announcement necessary? The editorial further stated: "More than that, we shall ask our cartoonist, Mr. White, to refrain from drawing any cartoon on this subject during the 3 months of your contest." Under certain conditions not doing is as reprehensible as a sin of commission. If the homestead is in flames a fire extinguisher should be used.

Editor and Publisher in its issue of March 6 publishes a story devoted to the editorial in the Ohio town newspaper. Also from its Olympian heights it wigwagged an alert to all editors of all newspapers in the form of a column-length editorial. It said in part: "The contest rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs." The word bribe is a harsh term.

A cartoonist from a Minneapolis newspaper—who, presumably, read this editorial comment—published a graphic illustration

March 11 expressing his indignation. Editor and Publisher, in its issue of March 20, reprints the Minneapolis newspaper cartoon and the comment and carries a three-quarter column editorial again warning editors and cartoonists.

It is difficult to understand the persistency of this questioning. Almost it would seem that Editor and Publisher is fearful of the venality of some and maybe a shade overzealous in its determination to protect the virtue of others.

This is America. In this country, issues are clarified through controversy. It is the land in which, as yet, differing opinions can be expressed without fear. That all do not think alike on this issue is evidenced by letters now in our files. An editor wrote:

"I understand perfectly about your cartoon contest and am in favor of it. In fact, when you talk to this newspaper, you are talking to convinced Christians who believe the same way you do about the evils of nationalized medicine. To show that we do, I enclose a cartoon which I would like to enter in your contest."—Editor.

A publisher wrote: "I feel that you are entitled to the whole-hearted cooperation of every newspaper which is dedicated to the perpetuation of our democratic system of government. With kindest regards, believe me to be—most sincerely yours."—Publisher.

These two letters clearly indicate the thinking and the attitude of scores of editors and publishers.

It is understood and accepted that in this ethical controversy a mere layman could not express a useful opinion. However, with real humility and after consultation, the belief is expressed that the American people expect and have a right to demand two things from their newspapers:

1. Objective reporting and uncolored news covering events transpiring throughout the world.

2. Editors with convictions who explain issues and fearlessly espouse causes in keeping with their beliefs.

Such editor, in these times of deadly peril, are essential to self-preservation.

Tomorrow, we may be faced with the horror and devastation of atomic, global war. In times of such stress, cherished institutions are destroyed and freedom-gains, the result of centuries of effort, may be forfeited. These can be affected by both foreign and domestic policies.

Implicit in the program of the national administration are so-called social gains for the people. Actually some of these are measures of reaction and retrogression. The most dangerous and menacing item on the agenda is compulsory health insurance—providing for the political distribution of health services in this country. England, today, is the tragic victim of the cumulative effects of such procedures. The inadequacies of a panel system led to the enactment of a free-medical-care-for-everybody law. British physicians have refused to attempt to practice medicine under the provisions of this statute. Free enterprise institutions cannot survive the establishment and operation of such a system.

Any steps, within the limits of propriety, are justified that will aid in preserving our Christian concepts and perpetuating our American way of life—lest we meanly lose the last best hope of earth.

We believe that the bribery intimation by Editor and Publisher is strange indeed—if not actually puerile. It is unthinkable that the editorial policy of self-respecting newspapers even remotely could be affected by $3,000 in 14 awards open to thousands of newspaper. If this were true, Vishinsky's vitriolic diatribes against the "capitalistic press" could be understood.

Our objective in offering cash awards to cartoonists is clear-cut and definite. The exclusive purpose was to stimulate those who believe as we believe on this issue and to encourage efforts that may result in clarification and understanding. There is an urgent, desperate need for explanation that will make possible accurate appraisal. Never again should there be too little—too late.

To the intrepid, clear-thinking editors and cartoonists, who are aiding in the accomplishment of this clearly defined purpose, we tender our thanks and our appreciation.

NATIONAL PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE FOR THE EXTENSION OF MEDICAL SERVICE,
JOHN M. PRATT, *Administrator.*

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE AND COMMUNIST PURPOSE

"Men have been sometimes led by degrees, sometimes hurried into things which, if they could have seen the whole together, they never would have permitted the most remote approach."—Edmund Burke.

If essential to understanding, the American people should be atomic-bomb-blasted into a consciousness of the meaning of so-called socialized medicine. So systematic and persistent have been the efforts of its sponsors and so adroit and misleading has been the propaganda that the people are becoming inured to the acceptance of a compulsory sickness insurance tax. Socialized medicine is a key mechanism of the Communists for the conquest of this Nation. The menace is immediate. The danger is of today. Socialized health care was not designed to provide better medical care for more people. Always it has been adopted and used to create economic dependence and consolidate political control.

There is a chronology that provides conclusive evidence. Prince Otto von Bismarck invented compulsory sickness insurance. He introduced it in Germany in 1883. By 1892, it covered all workers and most dependents. The purpose was to place the masses of the people under obligation and render them subservient to the State. Afterward the bureaucratic machinery erected became the greatest single strength for Adolf Hitler in his ruthless rise to power.

Lloyd George, in 1911, introduced a somewhat similar system in Great Britain for the same purpose. Its inadequacies and its relative ineffectiveness led to the necessity for extensions and the enactment of a free medical care for everybody law. Against this law British physicians have rebelled.

Compulsory sickness insurance became a major plank in the platform of the International Labor Organization in 1927. The leaders of Russian communism adopted the system. In 1930, the Communist International adopted this mechanism as a key issue in their program for world revolution.

The International Workers Order is the Moscow dominated Communist Party agency assigned the task of forcing the issue of compulsory sickness insurance. Under instructions, leftist representatives in labor unions became the crusaders. Through their influence and pressures, endorsements were secured from AFL, the CIO, and PAC. The so-called liberal fronts within the medical profession—namely, the Committee for the Nation's Health and the Physicians Forum became active lobbyists and propagandists. So-called progressive Senators and Congressmen were sold and welcomed the opportunity of sponsorship—Senators MURRAY, PEPPER, CHAVEZ, TAYLOR, MCGRATH, and Representative DINGELL of Michigan. The Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board provided the inspiration, the manipulated statistics, the literature, the propaganda and the bills for introduction in Congress.

The United States officially became a member of the ILO in 1934. This membership entailed a responsibility on the part of representatives of member nations to use their efforts and influence to extend social insurance—including sickness insurance—through the exertion of pressure on legislative bodies. In this manner there was established a bureau of the Federal Government pledged to the promotion of a device that is considered to be the most potent single instrument in the program of the Communists for world conquest.

Since 1935 representatives of our Social Security Board have been active in the development of the ILO, serving as directors and members of its executive committee. The extent to which they have gone to impose this strictly totalitarian concept on the people of the United States is now a matter of official findings by a committee of the Congress.

Excerpts from the third intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments read:

"Our first report deals exclusively with activities calculated to build up an artificial, federally stimulated public demand upon Congress for enactment of legislation for compulsory health insurance"; and

"Your committee concludes from the testimony that most, if not all, of this literature distributed by the CIO, the AFL, the Farmers' Union, and the Physicians Forum originates in, and emanates from the Bureau of Research and Statistics in the Social Security Board"; and

"Suffice it at this time for your committee to report its firm conclusion, on the basis of the evidence at hand, that American communism holds this program as a cardinal point in its objectives; and that, in some instances, known Communists and fellow travelers within the Federal agencies are at work diligently with Federal funds in furtherance of the Moscow party line in this regard."

There is no dearth of evidence. It is conclusive. The sequence: Germany, England, the ILO, Russia, Communist International, the Communist Party of the United States, the International Workers' Order, the Social Security Board, the AFL, the CIO, the PAC, the Committee for the Nation's Health, the Physicians Forum, the Farmers' Union, and scores or even hundreds of front organizations that are used in the over-all efforts.

There are in this country sincere, responsible, truly patriotic American citizens who, with unimpeachable motives, lend their positions and their substance to the promotion of compulsory sickness insurance. They do not comprehend. Actually it is merely a device for centralizing and consolidating political control. It is an instrument of world revolution leading to Communist conquest.

The people do not know this. They should be told. The editors of newspapers should tell them.

NATIONAL PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE FOR THE EXTENSION OF MEDICAL SERVICE,
JOHN M. PRATT, *Administrator.*

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on yesterday there were some comments concerning the reciprocal-trade-agreement program and the necessity for its continuance. Today I read in the Christian Science Monitor of May 3 a very able editorial on the subject entitled "A Warning From History." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WARNING FROM HISTORY

Republican congressional leaders appear dangerously disposed to destroy the reciprocal trade-agreements program. They are naturally tempted to put the tariff-making process back in the hands of Congress, where logrolling has always produced higher trade barriers. One step in that direction would be to limit renewal of the Trade Agreements Act to 1 year and load it with restrictions.

This would not heal the breach within the Republican Party on this issue. True, the political prognosticators are saying there will be a Republican President next year. But those who think that would solve the Republican problem might well note the comment of a Republican who, as a Cabinet member, witnessed the troubles of two Republican Presidents with tariffs. We quote from the memoirs of Henry L. Stimson:

"With the best will in the world, no Republican seemed able to stave off the logrolling of special interests. * * * What happened to Mr. Taft in 1909 was to happen to Mr. Hoover in 1930. Both times it was hoped that this logrolling orgy would be the last one, and both Presidents set much store by their success in setting up Executive tariff commissions to establish the basis for a sensible tariff. Both times their hopes proved unfounded. Both times the new and higher tariff promptly became highly unpopular."

In both cases also the increased rates became a major cause of dissension in the Republican Party.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to insert a newspaper clipping and an editorial in the RECORD, I am very pleased to include the results of the Gallup poll taken across the country when people were asked the question "People who live in Washington, D. C., do not now have the right to vote for their city officials. Do you think they should or should not be allowed to vote for their local government officials?" The poll shows that 77 percent of the citizens in the country feel that the people who live in Washington should have the right to elect their own city officials and I would point out that if the no-opinion vote was eliminated the returns would show 86 percent in favor of home rule for the District of Columbia.

This is very impressive and shows the definite interest that the country has in this question, which will soon come before Congress. The report on the Gallup poll follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE IS FAVORED BY 77 PERCENT THROUGHOUT NATION

(By Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

Across the Nation, 77 percent of Americans believe Washingtonians should have the right to vote for their city officials.

The results of a special poll of a cross-section of the Nation's opinion show that 13 percent of Americans believe those who live in the District of Columbia should not be allowed to vote for local government officials.

The remaining 10 percent had no opinion.

(The results showed that sentiment in the Nation for District suffrage is stronger than in the Capital itself. Reports of the Washington Post poll have showed that approximately 7 out of 10 Washingtonians favor local self-government.)

Breaking down the results by sections of the United States, they show that sentiment for District of Columbia suffrage is strong in Eastern and Midwestern States where 79 percent of the cross section of citizens interviewed were in favor of Washington home rule. Sentiment for home rule was weaker in the South and far West, but still overwhelmingly in favor.

Democrats indicated a shade more enthusiasm for home rule than Republicans and independents.

A cross section of the voters of the country were asked this question:

People who live in Washington, D. C., do not now have the right to vote for their city officials. Do you think they should or should not be allowed to vote for their local government officials?

The national results are as follows:

	Percent
They should have the right to vote	77
Should not	13
No opinion	10

Eliminating the no-opinion vote gives the following figures for the Nation:

Eighty-six percent should have the right to vote.

Fourteen percent should not have the right to vote.

By parties:

	Percent
Democrats:	
Should	78
Should not	11
No opinion	11
Republicans:	
Should	76
Should not	14
No opinion	10
Independents:	
Should	77
Should not	14
No opinion	9
By sections of the country:	
Eastern States:	
Should	79
Should not	11
No opinion	10
Middle Western States:	
Should	79
Should not	12
No opinion	9
Southern States:	
Should	75
Should not	14
No opinion	11
Far Western States:	
Should	71
Should not	17
No opinion	12

I am also glad to include in my remarks an editorial entitled "Right To Vote" appearing in the Washington Post for May 4, which is very apropos and to the point:

RIGHT TO VOTE

Dr. Gallup's latest poll suggests that almost 9 out of every 10 Americans who have any opinion at all on the subject believe that the people of Washington should be allowed to vote for local government officials. Only 14 percent of those polled would deny Washingtonians the type of suffrage offered through the Auchincloss bill. The poll must be taken, therefore, as an emphatic indorsement of the current movement to restore local suffrage to the District. Nor is it surprising that Americans throughout the land overwhelmingly favor extension of voting rights to their fellow citizens living in the Capital City. The right to vote is everywhere regarded as a foremost American heritage. The surprising—indeed, shocking—fact is that the representatives of the people in Congress assembled have for 74 years denied to an increasing population here any share in this common heritage.

The Freedom Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there have been many editorials written about the so-called Freedom Train now touring the country. I came across one which I think is the finest editorial I have seen, expressing what we all feel about the Freedom Train. It appeared in the Spokane Daily Chronicle of April 10, 1948. It is written by one of that newspaper's very able writers, David L. Kirk, and I ask unanimous consent to place it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY WE ALL BE WORTHY OF THE FREEDOM TRAIN

(By David L. Kirk)

I'm going down next Tuesday to have a word with Ben Franklin. He will be in town that day with his old crony, George Washington, and they'll be swapping yarns with Abe Lincoln and Francis Scott Key, and Roger Williams. It would be effrontery of a sort, wouldn't it, to stay at home, refusing to greet such a group of guests?

They'll be down at the Freedom Train. They won't be there in tangible form, but who would be so rash as to say they will not be there in spirit? They have brought along more than 100 of the Nation's most cherished documents for me to see. They are making a 33,000-mile trip to be here, one of 330 stops on a journey designed to reawaken Americans to the realization that they have in the Government of this country the treasure of the ages, and that it is in danger of slipping away.

Ben Franklin will be somewhere around that train and I want to see him. I want to bow my head in humility and reverence to a man who really was a man, in the days when it took real courage to be an American.

I want to talk to him about the time he flew his historic kite and stole the secret of lightning, to ask him about his discovery of the Gulf stream ocean current, and about his work as a publisher. But most of all I just want to sit in silent admiration and contemplation of the man who was so devoted to his country that he went to the Constitutional Convention in a sedan chair, too old and feeble to walk.

I'd like to see George Washington and ask him what river it was across which he threw a dollar. He would grin, for he was a really human fellow, and say: 'The big mystery is how I happened to have a dollar."

I'd like to see the man who was courageous enough to hang on at Valley Forge and after his funds were gone and his generals were sulking in the tents of disloyalty. It would be good to see the set of his jaw and to realize that this country was good enough to die for 170 years ago just as it is today.

Then I think I could turn to the fellow standing before the priceless documents on

the Freedom Train, standing there with his hat on and his hands in his pockets, saying to a companion: "C'mon, let's go. We've seen everything." I'd say to him: "Brother, if we don't wake up in this country we haven't seen anything."

Let me look at the original manuscript of the Gettysburg address, the biggest package of power and inspiration and beauty ever bundled up in 2 minutes.

Let me come humbly to the side of the tall, kindly man who said that when a boy has died for this beloved land of ours he places upon me an obligation to finish "the great task remaining before us."

Somehow I can't let Abe Lincoln get out of town without saying to God: "Thank you for this deliverer. Make me worthy to shine his shoes."

It will be inspiring to see the original manuscript of the immortal verse written by a young Washington attorney as he saw the banner of his country still floating above Fort McHenry after a night of bombardment.

"Oh say does that Star-Spangled Banner still wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

I wonder. I wonder whether enough of us still think it is worth the trouble it will take to keep it there. I wonder whether Roger Williams' credo of religious freedom still means enough to the men and women of today to impel them to prove worthy of their salt.

And all the other freedoms and privileges; shall we sell them for a mess of political pottage, let them be swallowed up by predatory powers, sit stupidly by while a group of schemers and soap-box orators lay the groundwork of betrayal?

I don't want to be one of that crowd. I like to think that I have decency enough and common sense enough never to sell America short.

God make me worthy to set foot upon the Freedom Train.

Reply of Kenneth F. Kressler to Defense of Russian Foreign Policy by Charles Spencer

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Kenneth F. Kressler, made on Tuesday, April 20, 1948:

Fellow citizens of the Lehigh Valley, recently over this station a speaker who styles himself "Chairman of the Communist Party of the Lehigh Valley" made an address on behalf of the Presidential candidacy of Henry Wallace.

It took the form of a defense of Russian foreign policy; a denunciation of our own; and a diatribe against the American system of free enterprise. In other words, it was a typical Russian Communist harangue, such as you may read any day in the Daily Worker or hear any day from soap boxes in Union Square, in New York City.

Tonight, because the speaker injected my name into his attack upon American institutions for which I fought and for which I stand, I consider it my right now to set him straight on some of the warped and distorted concepts which shape his beliefs.

The speaker to whom I refer, Charles Spencer, is an admirer of, and a believer in the communistic Russian way of life. I am a believer in, and admirer of, the free American way of life. Those two ideologies are diametrically opposed. There can be no compromise—ever—between them. One must ultimately perish from the earth, because between them there is no common ground. We are in a death struggle for survival, a struggle in which World Wars I and II were preliminary bouts. The forces representing democracy as against totalitarianism emerged victorious from both. Now the shooting's over, the cold silent war between the two goes on relentlessly, as it must, to a finish.

Mr. Spencer's criticism of me was made because I made the statement at an American Legion banquet that if Russia should attempt to conquer the United States or force her philosophy of government upon us as she has upon the countries of eastern Europe and is trying to force upon Italy, France, and Germany, we should again forget the ties that bind us to our sons and daughters and send them forth to protect the American way of life, that way of life which has given more of the good things of life to more people over a longer period of time than any system of government ever devised by man. That is exactly the way I feel about it.

How does he feel about it? Does he propose that instead we urge upon our children that they abandon the land of their fathers, their loyalty to their Nation, and not go forth and fight if we are attacked? But rather that they should submit to a tyranny that holds God and religion in contempt, denies free speech, as a matter of fact, denies all of the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

If he does, it is understandable, because Mr. Spencer is against the American way of life, and advocates its overthrow. That is the public policy of the political party of which he is an elected official, and for which he is spokesman. However, I can't help asking him at this point how far he would get in Moscow or Leningrad speaking against a communistic form of government. Yes, he can get away with speaking against our way of life here in America, but he really would be given the works by Uncle Joe if he spoke against communism in Russia.

But I maintain that if he and his fellow Communists feel that way, if they prefer Russia to the United States, they forego their American citizenship, adopt Russian citizenship, and work for their ideals from that base. I do not believe they ought, under protection of American citizenship, and American right of free speech, espouse the overthrow of those very rights here in our own midst, like so many termites in the foundations of a fine, strong building.

And I think there is a great measure of sheer ingratitude in the viewpoint of Mr. Spencer and his fellow party members and their fellow travelers. Suppose we grant that their devotion to Soviet Russia is sincere. Then how do they square their hatred of America and American free enterprise with the fact that since the outbreak of the war Soviet Russia received from the United States $11,681,393,782 in the form of lend-lease, direct loans, and UNRRA relief?

Mr. Spencer, denouncing our current proposal to spend $3,000,000,000 for universal military training, pointed out that $3,000,000,000 would enable us to construct a 10-room school building in every county in the United States.

What does he think we might have done with that eleven and a half billions that we sent to Russia? We could have used that to great advantage here at home. How do Mr. Spencer and his Communist friends square that with their statement that our industrialists want another war so they can make more profits?

Where does he think that $11,500,000,000 for Russian relief came from? He knows perfectly well it came from taxes paid by American industries and American workers. He knows there is no profit in giving away $11,500,000,000.

He says the Taft-Hartley law, the Un-American Committee of Congress, and universal military training are all a part of the same plan for Wall Street to rule the world.

But he knows they have no Taft-Hartley law in Soviet Russia. They don't need any because there aren't any labor unions there to be regulated.

He knows there is no un-Soviet committee in Russia because there they do not ask questions of suspects of subversion. They send them to concentration camps or put them against a wall and shoot them.

Do the Communists lull themselves into the belief that the American public is unaware of the fact that 30,000,000 Russians have been murdered by the Communists in the last 25 or 30 years because the spark of freedom was fermenting in them and they opposed the ruthless Communist regime?

Communists should know there is no need of a universal military training program in Soviet Russia, although their standing army is six times the size of our own. They have a permanent program and their recruits are not even conscripted—they are dragooned.

Mr. Spencer denounces what he distortedly terms an "American war for profit." He says that is inspired by American free enterprise as personified by what he called Wall Street.

Yet, while the United States was sending that $11,500,000,000 worth of coal, petroleum, iron, timber reserves, food, and clothing to Russia, at the same time Russia was seizing 274,000 square miles of territory—of other people's fertile productive lands—containing a population of 24,355,000 persons.

How do these Communists define the word "profit"? They rant of American aggression, How do they define the word "aggression"? Which is guilty of seeking profit? America or Russia? Which is guilty of aggression?

Now why is it, if Russia, under a communistic form of government, is superior to that of our own free government and free enterprise, that in an emergency she was compelled to look to the United States for help to the extent of $11,500,000,000?

Well, here is one striking example. The largest automobile factory in Soviet Russia covers 1,200 square acres of ground. It employs the usual Russian forced labor, never has any strikes, and it is, like all Soviet enterprises, a government monopoly. It has been in existence for 21 years.

During all those years, that factory has produced a total of 600 cars. Our factories, under American free enterprise, and manned by free American labor can produce more in a day.

Often it is difficult for us here in free America to understand men and women submitting to the tyranny of dictatorship. We cannot comprehend how any among us could embrace a doctrine so repugnant to ourselves. Yet if we will examine the record of history, we will learn—probably to our astonishment—that freedom is a rarity in human existence. The average human mind is not conditioned to it. The real aristocracy is the aristocracy of freedom, not that of wealth, or birth, or social position.

Look at the record: Since the beginning of the Christian era, approximately 40,000,000,000 persons have lived upon this earth. Less than 3 percent of that 40,000,000,000—or about 1,000,000,000—have led free lives. The balance have had their lives ordered for them, either by ancient tribal chiefs, or modern kings or dictators.

Men and women must be educated, then, to freedom, for it is not their natural state.

But once they have risen to that estate, once they have attained the knowledge and strength of purpose which entitle them to freedom, then they will sell it dearly. It is their most precious heritage and possession.

During the last war, believers in communism tried to sell to the American people

the idea that if they were against Stalin, they were for Hitler.

Nothing could have been more absurd. Those who were against Stalin were automatically against Hitler, too. They were against a political and economic system of totalitarianism, and the brand name in which it was packaged was of little importance.

Totalitarianism and nazism and communism are pretty much one and the same thing. They all amount to compulsion and that, in the last analysis, is the question—what is it we want—compulsion or freedom? When you come right down to cases, the war which now is raging under the surface, and which may break out into the open no matter how we blind ourselves to the possibility—that war is capitalism versus totalitarianism.

Propagandists have made the term "capitalism" connote something ugly and sinister. Yet actually capitalism is free enterprise, and free enterprise is the American way of life. The three terms are almost interchangeable.

Mr. Spencer, his fellow Communists in America, and his fellow Communists who have had the better taste to remain in Russia, all profess to despise capitalism. By actual count, in his address he used the terms "Wall Street," "banker," or "capitalist" exactly 17 times in the course of a 15-minute radio address. He used them in the form of epithets.

Where does he think that life-saving $11,681,393,782 which went from capitalistic United States to Soviet Russia came from? He knows where it came from. So did Russia, when she was panhandling it to bolster her own Communist-rotted industrial machine so she would be strong enough to fight a war.

Why didn't Communist Russia spurn the capitalistic help, refuse to accept the Wall Street coal, petroleum, iron, timber, food, and clothing, and use her own? Why? Because she didn't have those things—and capitalist America did have them, and to spare.

Our capitalistic system has given the world a convincing and irrefutable demonstration of which is better—the American way, or communism. It has been so completely convincing that the Communists attempting to overthrow our way of life realize they can never accomplish their purpose by sheer salesmanship alone.

So they resort to the tactics of spreading confusion and unrest. They employ distortion. They seek to array group against group, and thus sow discord and hate. Therein lies their only hope of disrupting America.

That is the motive behind such venomous and malicious and distorted harangues as that which I have unmasked in its naked untruth tonight.

Mr. Spencer, I don't know you personally, and you don't know me personally, but even if I do believe in the American way of life, the United States Constitution, and government by law rather than government by dictators, and while you believe in the philosophy of communism and the brutality and the coercion and the lack of freedom, the murder, the heartaches, the misery and the suffering that that system has brought to Russia, believe me that I talk to you without rancor or bitterness. You nor none of your fellow Communists could believe as I do in Voltaire's famous statement, "I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it."

Nevertheless, before you continue to advocate that the United States should give up the atom bomb, that the United States should disarm, and before you further advocate that Russia add Italy, France, and Germany to her group of satellites, take a little time and get acquainted with the philosophy of Washington, of Franklin, of Jefferson, of Wilson, and, above all, of Abraham Lincoln in place of the philosophy and the beliefs of Stalin, Lenin, and Marx, which have poisoned your mind. The way of the latter leads to darkness and death. The way of these American patriots leads to freedom and life and happiness for all mankind.

The Accountant Has the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GREGORY McMAHON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph Hendershot:

ASK ACCOUNTANTS—THEY HAVE FACTS AND FIGURES ON PRICES AND PROFITS—ARE TRUSTWORTHY

(By Ralph Hendershot)

We have no desire to put the accountancy profession on the spot, but we have a strong conviction that the man in the street could benefit a great deal from the observations the people in that branch of business could make. Nor are we referring to help in making out income taxes, although they are mighty handy for that, too.

But we have been discussing inflation, the high cost of living, prices, profits, wages, etc., for several years now without getting anywhere. Corporate managements tell us the prices they charge are reasonable, labor leaders tell us wages are too low, the corner grocer is sympathetic but not otherwise helpful. Everyone seems intent upon passing the buck.

The fellow who probably could really set us straight is strangely silent. And the reason apparently is that no one has ever thought to ask the top-flight accountant for his views. He is the chap who goes about with a stethescope especially equipped to take soundings on corporate balance sheets and income accounts. He can spot at 100 yards any irregularities which may have occurred in translating a corporation's financial health into figures.

COULD HELP CONGRESS

We would like to suggest, therefore, that when congressional committees want to know something about the hard facts of business life they call in some of these experts. It is true, of course, they might encounter a great deal of hedging, but a few well directed questions probably would produce many more facts than they are accustomed to getting.

Obviously, when a representative of labor is put on the stand he offers testimony which will help to build up a case for higher wages and shorter hours. And when an industrialist gets an opportunity to sound off, he is apt to put the blame for high prices on labor, the Government, or anyone other than his own organization.

The consumer has a pretty strong conviction that someone is picking his pocket, but he can only guess as to who it might be. The conflicting stories he hears leaves him in a state of such confusion that he is about ready to call down a curse on the houses of everyone even remotely connected with business operations. He probably would be willing to dump the entire kettle of fish in the lap of the Government, except that he does not trust the politicians either.

DEVELOPS HIGH STANDING

It may be only a theory, but the accountant is supposed to be impartial. We make this point because he gets his bread and butter from corporations. From our observations, however, we are convinced that he has developed his professional integrity to a rather high degree over the years. His standing, we would say, is as high as that of the physician or attorney.

Certainly the accountant has the facts, and it stands to reason he is much less biased than those who have been heard from time to time over the last several years on the vital subjects of prices and profits. Why not ask him what he thinks?

Removing the Tax on Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD F. YOUNGBLOOD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I have already said regarding legislation to remove the discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine, I would like to add these further comments, for the benefit of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for their consideration of this vital subject.

First, I am definitely and unequivocally in favor of the passage of H. R. 2245, which will remove the taxes on "the poor man's butter." I voted for its passage when it came to the floor of the House for my vote and I signed the discharge petition which brought it from the Committee on Agriculture to the floor.

In order to better understand the purpose of the bill, it might be well to go into the background and history of oleo legislation. The Federal Government years ago enacted the following provision of law:

> Upon oleomargarine which shall be manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or use there shall be assessed and collected a tax at the rate of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, except that such tax shall be at the rate of 10 cents per pound in the case of oleomargarine which is yellow in color.

The law then defines "yellow in color." Thus under existing Federal law oleomargarine can be sold in any color except yellow and the tax assessed is merely one-fourth of 1 cent per pound. It is only when the manufacturer sells oleomargarine colored to imitate butter that the 10 cents per pound tax is levied. The Federal law also imposes certain license taxes upon manufacturers and wholesale and retail dealers. The dairymen contend that there is no sound reason why oleomargarine cannot be manufactured in a distinct color so as to clearly identify it as oleomargarine and not have it imitate butter. They point out that ice cream, Jello, and hundreds of other food products are sold in various colors, shades, and combinations. They insist that in view of the historical importance of butter to the dairy industry, it is an unfair trade practice to permit the manufacturers of oleomargarine to color their product so that the consumer in a hotel

or restaurant may think he is eating butter when in fact he might be served oleomargarine. In this connection it should be noted that the legislatures of many States enacted legislation years ago imposing taxes on oleomargarine and butter substitutes and also imposed a scale of license fees. It should be pointed out that even if the Federal Government did repeal the existing tax on oleomargarine the tax levied by the States would also have to be repealed before any substantial benefit would accrue to the purchaser of oleomargarine. In my own State of Michigan the sale of colored oleo is prohibited entirely.

It should be pointed out at this time that the Federal law provides for an annual tax of $600 on manufacturers of colored oleo. An annual tax of $480 is also imposed on wholesalers of colored oleo and a $200 tax is levied on wholesalers of uncolored oleo. In addition, retailers pay $48 per year for the privilege of selling colored oleo and $6 per year for a license to sell uncolored oleo. Naturally these taxes all add to the final cost of the product and increase it possibly even more than the 10 cents per pound direct tax on oleo.

Now, the manufacturers of oleomargarine contend that their product is wholesome and nutritious and that it is made under ideal sanitary conditions out of vegetable oils. They point out that peanut oil, cottonseed oil, and soybean oil, together with certain animal fats, are used in the production of oleomargarine and that this product therefore contributes to the income of the domestic agricultural producers of these products. They contend that the tax on oleomargarine is punitive in character and that the American consuming public should have the right to buy oleomargarine at as low a price as possible.

With the latter statement, I agree wholeheartedly. The present taxes amount to a subsidy for the dairy and butter industries at the expense of the workers in the cities. I have many times opposed the present ruinous, inflationary farm subsidies and oleo taxes are just as ruinous and discriminatory in addition.

It has been impartially and satisfactorily established that butter is no more healthful than margarine. The workers in the cities are forced to color this wholesome product at home or, as an alternative, pay 10 cents per pound extra for the spread they use on their bread.

Removal of this tax is a step which this Congress should and must take. I feel this so strongly that I have introduced such a bill. I plead with you gentlemen to do all that you can to help my people and your people at a time when they need our assistance the most. Let us consider the housewife first. Amongst all the groups who clamor for attention in our National Capital the voice of the mothers of America is seldom if ever heard. I feel compelled to speak for her now. The housewife is at present almost unable to make ends meet. It is our duty to pay heed to her great necessities and for at least this once prove to her that the great Government of the United States is aware of her problems and really desires to help her.

Here Is Where Some of the Taxpayers' Money Is Spent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have called attention to the fact that millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is being spent as gifts to the large landowners with little to show for the expenditures.

The following is a list obtained on April 12, 1948, from N. E. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, of the operators receiving $10,000 checks in Arizona, while most of the farmers of the Nation received $20 to $60 per year:

Name and address of payee	*State in which payment was made*
Arena Norton, Inc., Phoenix, Ariz.	Arizona.
Ashfork Livestock Co., Ashfork, Ariz.	Do.
Les P. Barkley, Somerton, Ariz.	Do.
Bogle Farms, Inc., Chandler, Ariz.	Arizona, New Mexico.
Cedar Springs district, Cedar Springs, Ariz.	Arizona.
Chinle district, Chinle, Ariz.	Do.
C. O. Bar Livestock Co., Flagstaff, Ariz.	Do.
Denny Livestock Co., Seligman, Ariz.	Do.
Ellsworth Bros., Higley Ariz.	Do.
Fort Defiance district, Fort Defiance, Ariz.	Do.
Goodyear Farms, Litchfield, Ariz.	Do.
Greene Cattle Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	Do.
Joseph L. Hodges, Buckeye, Ariz.	Do.
J. G. Boswell Co., Litchfield, Ariz.	Arizona, California.
Kayenta district, Kayenta, Ariz.	Arizona.
Klagetoh district, Klagetoh, Ariz.	Do.
Lukachukai district, Lukachukai, Ariz.	Do.
Howell Manning, Tucson, Ariz.	Do.
L. M. McLaren Products, Inc., Yuma, Ariz.	Do.
Pinon district, Oraibi, Ariz.	Do.
S. & W. Ranches, Bisbee, Ariz.	Do.
Second Mesa Livestock Association, Keams Canyon, Ariz.	Do.
Tees Nos Pos district, Shiprock, N. Mex.	Do.
Tuba City district, Tuba City, Ariz.	Do.
Yavapai Cattle Co., Prescott, Ariz.	Do.
McDaniel & Sons, Somerton, Ariz.	New Mexico, Arizona.

Arizona had farm marketings of only $182,574,000 in 1947, which is less than six-tenths of 1 percent of the total farm marketings of the Nation.

Think of giving out these $10,000 Christmas presents when people with an annual income of as low as $600 are paying Federal income taxes. On the basis of Arizona payments it would take $43,000,000 a year to pay the subsidy just to the large landowners.

Think of giving out these $10,000 checks when our econmy has yet not been able to provide the mine workers a fair old-age pension after the miners have risked their lives every day for 20 years so that the wheels of industry could turn and the homes of the Nation could be heated. One could and would expect that this senseless procedure would come to an end.

The following is an official table showing the farm marketings in 1947, but this should be interpreted as income from marketings and not as net profits by any means.

Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, 1947

	In thousands of dollars
Alabama	360,001
Arizona	182,574
Arkansas	490,001
California	2,144,538
Colorado	516,654
Connecticut	145,570
Delaware	81,598
Florida	354,377
Georgia	492,081
Idaho	359,880
Illinois	1,869,729
Indiana	1,079,751
Iowa	2,368,962
Kansas	1,266,671
Kentucky	579,258
Louisiana	309,133
Maine	171,636
Maryland	233,231
Massachusetts	193,772
Michigan	719,484
Minnesota	1,335,556
Mississippi	473,439
Missouri	1,080,676
Montana	397,350
Nebraska	1,125,513
Nevada	40,944
New Hampshire	59,443
New Jersey	278,822
New Mexico	181,939
New York	822,582
North Carolina	743,951
North Dakota	736,927
Ohio	1,052,485
Oklahoma	695,005
Oregon	376,350
Pennsylvania	767,172
Rhode Island	21,930
South Carolina	302,582
South Dakota	671,099
Tennessee	495,938
Texas	1,974,575
Utah	151,949
Vermont	109,443
Virginia	413,471
Washington	611,455
West Virginia	125,156
Wisconsin	1,051,210
Wyoming	148,821
Total	30,174,744

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Apr. 19, 1948.

The 14 dairy corporations of the Nation showed $4,000,000 less net profit in 1947 than in 1946. The price of farm products may have shown a net increase of 25 percent in 1947 over 1946, but dairy prices increased by 9 percent, and the Wisconsin milk prices showed a 2 percent gain and Minnesota an increase in milk prices of less than 1 percent in 1947 over 1946.

The Displaced Persons in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Anne O'Hare McCormick, which appeared in the New York Times on May 3, 1948:

THE DP'S AND PALESTINE: FOOTNOTE TO THE CHAPTER

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

In a kind of ironic footnote to the war for Palestine, intensifying while the world looks on in helpless horror, there came out of the House Judiciary Committee last week a bill to admit 200,000 displaced persons into this country over a 2-year period. The bill is hedged around with as many restrictions and priorities as if this little group of homeless people—exactly the same human material of which this Nation is made—were cargoes of dynamite intended to blow up the economy of the United States. One of the meanest of the proposed conditions is that the number allowed to come in under this bill would be charged up to the immigration quotas of their respective countries of origin for years to come.

It is folly to imagine that this measure has any real bearing on the Palestine question. If the United States and other countries had opened their doors from the beginning to the persecuted and outcast Jews of Hitler's Europe, the pressure on Palestine as their only refuge would certainly have diminished and there might have been a chance of settling the problem of the Palestinian state more gradually, without the present uncontrollable violence. Now it is too late. The Stratton bill provided for the admission of 400,000 DP's, and if it had been passed a year ago it would have given us a better conscience, saved thousands of human beings from death or deepening despair and eased the tension in the camps that makes our rule in Germany more difficult. But it would have had little effect on the tension in the Holy Land.

WHO THE DP'S ARE

The first reason for this is that the DP problem is not a problem of resettling Jews. Although it has been explained a thousand times, Americans are slow to realize that more than 80 percent of the displaced persons waiting in Germany to be disposed of are non-Jews, and that the great majority of the Jewish fraction wish to go to Palestine and not to America. It is equally hard to disabuse the American mind of the idea that the DP's are Communists.

Actually we are the slowest to take in these victims of war and Soviet conquest. Poorer and smaller countries regard manpower as an asset. They want labor for farms and mines, help for overworked housewives, skilled workers to aid in industrial production. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Canada, Brazil, and Argentine have already made place for many more DP's than we have. Since last July Great Britain has found work and shelter for nearly 50,000, twice as many as any other country, and they are coming in regularly at the rate of 5,000 monthly.

The British, it should be noted in parentheses, are making an intelligent effort to make the newcomers part of a national community which is peculiarly homogeneous. As soon as they land in England they are sent to five instruction centers for an 8-week course in the customs and currency of the country, and this is followed by courses of technical instruction, where they are trained for work in coal mines, textile factories, and other undermanned industries. They begin at once to learn English from expert teachers, and English ways of life from volunteer groups who take them to police courts, theaters, clubs, and sports fields. Doctors, lawyers, engineers, chemists, farmers, dressmakers, cooks, they come from all the countries of central and eastern Europe, and are integrated into English life with a rapidity that surprises the officials in charge of the resettlement.

PRECEPTS CONTRADICTED

But the resettlement of DP's is a problem in itself, a problem that has hung fire for 3 years now, not because it is not easy to solve but because we are too indifferent or stupid to comprehend that it costs us more as taxpayers to keep them in camps in Germany than to permit them to work for their living here, and too callous to feel that to dehumanize people anywhere is to detract from human dignity everywhere. Displaced persons in territory under American rule, as in our zone in Germany, are a living contradiction of our lofty precepts exalting human values.

If the Palestine question could ever have been answered by finding other refuges for the Jews, which is doubtful, that stage has long been passed. The desire for a homeland has created a nation where there was no nation and inflamed the Zionists with as fierce a national spirit as exists in the world.

Resettlement in other parts of the world is an answer for the DP's, but it is no longer an answer for a great part of the pitiful remnant of European Jewry. What might have been is one thing. What is, is another, and events in Palestine at this moment underline another lost opportunity to solve a problem by the easy way instead of the hard way.

Within smaller confines, Palestine is like Europe. In Europe the uneasy armistice has not broken down, but it cannot hold long unless the power vacuum is filled. The Federal Council of Churches is the latest and most impressive organ of opinion to issue an appeal for a positive program for peace. This cogent statement expresses the troubled thought and profound desire of millions of Americans of all faiths. But no doubt its authors would be the first to admit that the initial step toward peace is to remove the temptation to war by strengthening democratic Europe to stand in the way of further aggression and by working for an international force to carry out decisions the United Nations cannot presume to make until it has means to enforce them.

"Authorization" for Post Office Mice Extermination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following article by George W. Bragdon appeared in the Hartford Times of April 27, 1948. To say the least it contains a good laugh and it may even cause a little thought on the subject of Government red tape.

ONCE UPON A TIME—POST OFFICE MICE RAN FREE—THEN CAME AUTHORIZATION

(By George W. Bragdon)

See the mice. They are playing on the floor. They're lucky mice because they have so much floor to play on. They live in the post office.

See the men. They are clerks. What are the men doing? They're trying to scare the mice away. Shoo, mice. But they come right back. The mice are not afraid.

Why aren't they afraid? Because they're post office mice. Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from completion of their rounds. They know they are Government mice. Before you can catch them you have to go through Government red tape. Even mice know you can have fun playing with red tape.

Now what're the men doing? They are making a protest. They have gone to the boss. He is John F. Heneghan, acting postmaster. The postmaster says he cannot catch mice until he has traps.

And he can't buy traps until after writing to Washington. That's the way things are done. When you get the answer from Washington it has a long name. It is an authorization.

Now what are the men doing? They're setting traps. They have the authorization. They have one dozen mouse traps, four rat traps and poison.

But where are the mice? They are not playing any more. Here and there one peeks from his hole. There are not enough left for a good game of tag. The traps caught 32.

What are the mice thinking? They learned their lesson. Even the mice know now that Government red tape will trap you if you play around long enough.

The Wounded Shall Never Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years statesmen and philosophers have sought after ways to get people to cooperate as well for peace as for war. During the war, confronted by a common crisis, community cooperation is usual, normal, and necessary. When the danger is not so apparent, when the cause is not so directly a matter of life and death, cooperation may be as necessary but it is not nearly so normal.

During the last war, almost our total population cooperated magnificently in all the war services. Since the end of the fighting, not so many have continued.

It would seem valuable, then, when we find people cooperating for peaceful goals, that we study this cooperation so that others may apply it. Such study is especially valuable, when that cooperation is democratic in composition and serves the best ends of democracy.

An outstanding example of democratic cooperation for democratic goals is to be found in the 52 Association of the United States, Inc. This group, which has for its motto "The wounded shall never be forgotten," began in New York City in February 1945 when 52 business and professional men agreed to pay $52 a year each, so that in each of the 52 weeks of

the year, they could entertain a group of 12 patients of local Army and Navy hospitals.

Did "52" achieve its original purpose? Was it only another wartime group, born with war patriotism to die with the end of the war? There are now not 52 but 1,200 business and professional men in New York, 400 in Chicago, a women's auxiliary in New York, only 7 months old, with a membership of more than 700, and the firm groundwork for a national organization to serve the wounded wherever they may be.

The evening parties of dinner and theater, and relaxation, have continued steadily Monday through Friday, each week in the year. In addition, 52 carries on many other recreational activities for the wounded. Every Thursday afternoon, it gives a ward party in one of the 10 Army, Navy, or veterans' hospitals in the New York metropolitan area, for 75 to 150 bed- and chair-ridden patients. In response to patients' requests, 52 has traveled twice to Valley Forge General Hospital, at Phoenixville, Pa., a distance of 110 miles from 52's headquarters at 840 Eighth Avenue, New York City. These ward parties are memorable occasions for the wounded guests of 52, since each party includes a very elaborate buffet dinner, fine entertainment, the distribution of many valuable gifts, and a warm feeling of good fellowship between hosts and guests that is all too rare in this troubled world.

Every Wednesday, throughout the summer months, 52 runs a fishing trip for 15–20 patients in a specially chartered fishing boat, which leaves the Long Island pier at 8 a. m. after the boys have enjoyed a good breakfast together with their hosts. On these fishing trips, completely away from hospital routines, the boys enjoy the roast turkey, baked ham, chocolate layer cakes and other delicious goodies with the healthful relaxation that comes with a day in the sun on the sea.

Every other week in the summer, 75 to 100 patients, with about 10 hosts and hostesses, take an all-day boat ride up the Hudson, to Bear Mountain Inn, where they have a special luncheon and spend the afternoon in wholesome recreation.

In 1947, 52 ran 328 dinner parties, 28 hospital-ward parties, 15 all-day fishing trips, 3 boat rides, and arranged for attendance of hospitalized veterans at 190 performances of plays and 122 athletic events, including the World Series baseball games. The wounded of every State in the Nation were 52's guests. While half of the patients entertained came from homes in New York State, next in order of frequency were the wounded from Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia.

52 has received thousands of letters from grateful veterans and servicemen, from their families and friends and from their physicians, all paying tribute to the work of the 52 Association.

If entertainment were the only way in which 52 remembers the wounded, it would be an important cooperative venture. But 52 has gone much further than that.

Since February 1946, 52 has been operating a professionally staffed free job placement and counseling service for disabled veterans in its small but attractive and efficient quarters at 840 Eighth Avenue, New York City. Because 52's service is small, it is able to give highly individualized service to each man who needs it. With the active aid of 52's members, the professional counselors on the 52 staff are able to provide competent, personal service of a very high quality and effectiveness. Disabled veterans learn about 52's placement and counseling service when they are party guests, on the recommendation of their fellow wounded, and on referral by the New York State Employment Service, the veterans' hospital and regional offices, and the leading voluntary services in the community.

Throughout the year, 52 carries on a continuous program of interpretation to the general public, to employers, and to disabled veterans to spread improved understanding of the principle that "Ability—not disability—counts." It arranges displays, plans special meetings with trade and community groups, conducts mail campaigns, all designed to improve employment opportunities for disabled veterans "not because of pity, patriotism, or gratitude, but because they can do a week's work for a week's pay as well or better than the next fellow." Continuously, 52 seeks to convince the community that it is important to employ disabled veterans and thereby give meaning to their victory.

In 1947, 52 gave counseling service to 1,116 disabled veterans. Of the 706 who sought employment assistance, 290 severely disabled veterans were placed in suitable private employment and training.

Since its founding 52 has served 25,000 disabled and hospitalized veterans with its entertainment and counseling services. From time to time it has also presented special gifts: Pianos, typewriters, rehabilitation equipment, and cash funds to hospitals and veterans' groups.

The chief service of 52 is that it relates the veteran to the nonveteran, the disabled to the able-bodied. 52 acts almost as the voice of conscience in the world that all too quickly forgets the unpleasantness its own stupidity has caused.

52 represents a unique combination of principles and practices that sets it apart from most other welfare and veterans' service groups. 52 weaves the varied strands of the community together in a glowing tapestry of unselfish service which is highly democratic, without distinctions of race, creed, color, national origin, or political interests of its guests or its members. 52 entertains in a luxurious way—not wastefully, but not institutionally or stingily. 52 does not depend on a limited group of "angels"; because of its broad membership base, the work of 52 is also without angles. It does not permit individuals to exploit the wounded, or 52's work for the wounded, with commercial tie-ins, with publicity aspects that do not help the wounded directly and exclusively. 52 does not dun its members or the community with frequent, fund-raising attempts, since it relies on membership dues for the bulk of its income. 52 is sustained and regular; it is not a spasmodic, one-shot kind of remembrance at holiday seasons. 52 is a remembrance through devoted service; not a remembrance through monuments or speeches.

Because the 52 Association remembers the wounded with regular, personal, high-quality, dignified, and democratic services for their social and economic adjustment, I have considered this enterprise worthy of this extended mention.

A few months ago, 52 was presented with a certificate of achievement from the Surgeon General of the Navy, Capt. W. D. Small, commanding officer of St. Alban's Naval Hospital. The citation reads:

> Through their efficient organization, their generously assigned funds, and their competently managed activities, they have provided for thousands of patients dinners, entertainment, attendance at athletic events, and participation in fishing and beach parties, furnishing thereby not only needed recreation but also contributing to the development of essential self-assurance among seriously handicapped men. Through their job-placement and counseling service they have afforded analysis, advice, and assistance at critical times to many patients. By their patriotic initiative, their appreciation of the problems of the men, and their wholehearted cooperation, they have justified their motto in full measure and have rendered meritorious services of outstanding value to the Medical Department of the Navy.

After a 52 ward party in the Castle Point VA Sanitarium for tubercular patients, one veteran wrote:

> In the short period you were here, we returned to normalcy. Seeing people who cared enough to spend their time and give so willingly of it, was one of the finest things that has happened to this guy in particular and most of the boys in general. It wasn't so much the food and entertainment, which were both so good, but the thought behind all of it. Being able to talk to people who were in no hurry but genuinely interested in us, with time for a smile and a friendly word, well, it just was a tremendous aid. I suppose I had become a bit bitter and cynical due to what I had heard, but your enthusiasm, interest, and genuine friendliness once more convinced me that this land of ours contains the greatest people in the world.

From a veteran who lost both of his legs in the "Battle of the Bulge" came this note:

> I'd also like to thank you for the wonderful job you all have gotten me. I'm getting along fine and am really settled here. I think rehabilitation is the most important thing for the severely disabled veteran. I was really going batty doing nothing for over a year. Now at least when I go to sleep I can't think of anything more important than getting up for my job. I'll never forget the 52 as long as I live. God bless you all.

Can we not all learn a lesson from 52? Can we not realize finally that we can cooperate democratically and actively for causes greater than ourselves without being engaged in mortal, martial conflict? Is it not apparent that with decent purposes, with understanding methods and planned programs, we can act like human beings, remembering and serving our less fortunate fellow citizens?

The work of the 52 Association is important for the continued welfare of the wounded—but it is also important for the continued welfare of all of us—for it demonstrates that democracy works. 52 shows that there is room and need for the initiative and imagination of individual citizens working together for the common good. Our way of life is not in danger so long as we have such inspiring signs of strength in the daily lives of our men and women, working together, without regard to religion or race, concerned with only needs and the possible creation of a better, fuller, happier, more peaceful life for all. The wounded must feel, when they are served by 52, that they have served a grateful, devoted Nation. Through 52, America tells the wounded, with action, not words, "We have not forgotten."

Marshall Plan Already Shows Sign of Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of misunderstanding and misconception concerning the so-called Marshall plan which proposed to aid Europe's recovery.

Because of the great interest in the subject, I am glad to insert into the RECORD a letter dated April 26, addressed to me by Dr. Christopher Norborg, publisher of a weekly foreign affairs newsletter known as American World Intelligence.

Because Dr. Norborg points out some very important facts, I am sure the letter will be of interest to other Members of the House.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
April 26, 1948.

Hon. HAROLD HAGEN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your vote against the so-called Marshall plan has impressed me very much. It was as courageous as it is now already proving to have been correct. We who know the tremendous pressure which the administration's propaganda machine brought to bear upon the Members of Congress in this matter can well realize what moral courage it took to vote according to one's best conviction based upon available facts.

However, as so often happens when one sticks by one's principles, the facts show a tendency to come forth and defend the position one has taken. I am just writing you these lines to suggest to you that the facts supporting a rejection of the so-called Marshall plan are already here. They are also very clear as you may see from the following brief survey of things we now know.

The famous British writer, Dr. Brogan, has recently said, "America has plenty but not plenty for all the world." In that brief statement, one finds the keenest criticism which can be raised against our concept of our whole postwar foreign-aid program. The present administration, supported by a misunderstood bipartisanship on the part of certain Republican leaders, has fallen into the mistake of continuing what is basically a lend-lease philosophy of foreign assistance. Whatever the European governments call for is actually accepted as a statement of overall European needs. Our country has now given better than $22,000,000,000, and inside facts reveal that during the next 4 years at least an equal amount of American billions will be washed down the drain of a relief program which in its very nature cannot create real reconstruction.

You may have seen the Washington wire to the Wall Street Journal, stating that the new administration for ERP, or as it is now called "ECA" (Economic Cooperation Administration), is already bogged down in red tape and diplomatic secrecy. In fact, it is now obvious that the global planners of the State Department sent along to the House Appropriations Committee a rehash of the European commodity reports without even telling the staff of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman what was up.

When one examines the European requirements, as they are now defined in documents presently before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, one discovers some very strange and disturbing facts, as for example:

1. The 16 participating nations will make little or no effort to get long-range credits. In fact, they will depend upon having their imports from America financed by the ERP, under Mr. Hoffman, to an extent as may be found from the following percentage figures for the individual countries: Portugal, 0; Switzerland, 0; Sweden, 7.3; Turkey, 14.7; Norway, 15.9; Belgium, 38.2; United Kingdom, 39.1; Greece, 58.9; Denmark, 63.8; Netherlands, 66; Iceland, 67.4; France, 75.5; Ireland, 76.8; Italy, 80.2; Germany-Bizone, 30.8; Saar, 83.9; French Zone, 87.5, and Austria, 89.4 percent. (The Bizone also gets $822,000,000 from U. S. Department of Army.)

It is almost unbelievable that America shall be asked to underwrite the world's economy of nations like the Netherlands, Ireland, and Italy to a degree which surpasses even what we used to do for Puerto Rico and the Philippines.

2. Then we get to the export of cotton. The estimates call for a staggering total of $623,200,000. It is more than ominous that while the original Paris report of August 1947 did not even mention cotton, this export item has now become the biggest single item aside from food. There is some very disturbing information from London indicating that we are in fact using the ERP to underwrite the Anglo-American cotton cartel. I trust that the Congress will look into this angle.

3. At a time when we need every foot of timber in this country, the ERP for 1948–49 expects the United States to furnish Europe with 1,835,000 cubic meters of timber. Of this, more than half, namely, 947,000 cubic meters, will find its way to Great Britain, a country which has raised its timber import requirements for next year to the incredible total of 10,704,000 cubic meters. Why not go slow on timber export until we have built houses for our own ill-housed veterans?

4. You will recall that during the two first years after the war we were forced to send war-devastated Europe tens of millions of tons of very expensive American coal. In the meantime, European coal production has recovered to a remarkable degree. And all experts agree that it is a very expensive thing to ship American coal thousands of miles across the Atlantic, except in cases where there is absolute, catastrophic needs. Yet, we find that next year's ERP requirements call for a continued export of American coal in the amount of 30,136,000 metric tons, at an estimated cost of $271,200,000. Let me, for example, call your attention to the proposed coal exports to France, herself a great coal producer (estimated 1948–49 production, 53,000,000 metric tons). The ERP plans to give France 10,500,000 metric tons of American coal at the staggering cost of $94,500,000 to the American taxpayers. The fact is that if the French coal industry was operated at a better production level, France could take care of all her own coal needs.

5. Inasmuch as you are from a farming district, which I personally know very well, your constituents may be interested in the fact that the ERP plans to export agricultural machinery in the amount of $122,100,000. Comparatively speaking, that is not much of a figure although one does not quite understand this panicky speed about mechanizing European farming. However, when one finds that of the total export of agricultural machinery to Europe, we are going to let France and her dependencies have a total of $63,300,000 in 1 year, one begins to believe the rumor from the Paris meeting that the French padded their requirements beyond rhyme and reason.

Also, when our American farmers were breaking their backs to feed the world, the French farmers went on a sit-down strike in 1946–47 and took a million acres of wheat out of production. It seems very strange that we should honor such behavior by taking farm machinery, so badly needed on American farms, and ship it as a gift to French farmers who, if they worked more, could more than feed the whole French population.

This letter is already getting to be rather long. From the above-stated facts you will realize, however, that the so-called Marshall plan is so shot full with questionable devices and estimates that one can only congratulate those Congressmen who had moral courage enough to stand up and demand that we at long last begin to show prudence in whatever help we are giving to overseas nations. The American people want to help the world back to recovery. In my humble opinion, however, it is about time that the American people were given the true facts in matters of foreign affairs.

Sincerely yours,
CHRISTOPHER NORBORG,
Publisher, American World Intelligence.

The Shameful British Record in the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be very anglophobic to feel a strong sense of nausea when contemplating the shameful record of Great Britain in the Holy Land.

It is a record of double talk, double cross, and double dealing.

Entirely aside from the conflict in policy between the Office of Colonial Affairs on the one hand and the Foreign and War Offices and the American Department of State on the other, British policy in the whole Mediterranean area has been one of commercial exploitation and military advantage for three centuries.

This is a depressing record of political opportunism and imperialism, no different perhaps than Great Britain's equally opportunistic history in other quarters

of the world, but marked by a greater cynicism in its shifts and reversals and broken promises. In the Middle East the British were not dealing with primitive savages, such as the civilized world deems fit prey for enslavement; here the British were dealing with cultured and civilized peoples who had established a highly democratic way of life, enlightened and advanced, while Winston Churchill's forebears were still worshiping stones and painting their bodies with colored earth.

NO HONOR IN THE ENGLISH

This is not to suggest that it is less to be deplored that a great nation should break its word with savages than with those of a contemporary culture; what I am suggesting is that the Jews and the Arabs themselves had codes of conduct in domestic and in international relationships leading them to the belief that there was honor in the English.

Obviously, both were mistaken.

With equal obviousness, by following the British lead our own Department of State has led the United States into the same embarrassing and dishonorable position—our State Department and our Military Establishment, I should say.

Mr. Speaker, to savor the full flavor of our ignominy, I urge you and all Members of this House to read with care the documented history of the British exploitation of the Middle East presented by the Nation Associates in a publication which I am sure you have on your desks. That is a devastating indictment of the mightiest empire the world has ever known; to paraphrase Mr. Churchill, never have so mighty a people conducted themselves so small.

The British record as published by the Nation is too lengthy for inclusion in the RECORD; but, under leave, I am inserting the salty comment from the Washington Post dated today in an editorial entitled "New Turn in Holy Land":

NEW TURN IN HOLY LAND

British anxiety to get out of Palestine has now been succeeded by British anxiety to get back. A thousand troops have been rushed to Haifa, and they are said to be merely a vanguard. Evidently there has been some miscalculation on the part of the British authorities. The official explanation is the seriously deteriorating situation. The situation is, in truth, one of disintegration, but this is no surprise to anybody, let alone the British. It was because of the expected disintegration in Palestine that the British asked for the intervention of the United Nations. A stalemate in the United Nations allowed events to proceed according to anticipation. The Holy Land has disintegrated into de facto partition, civil war, and a drubbing for the Arabs in the initial stages of conflict. Could it be that there has been some disintegration among the Arabs to account for British concern?

Color is lent to such a theory by the reports of refugees from Haifa, Jaffa, and Jerusalem on their way to Transjordan. They tell a story of ineptitude in the Arab command and division in Arab councils. The story throws some light on the ex-Mufti and chairman of the Palestine Arab Higher Committee, Haj Amin el Husseini, and the top commander of the Arab fighting forces in Palestine, Fawzi el Kawukji. During the war this brace of scoundrels were Hitler's coadjutors. They are fanatically anti-Ally, let alone anti-Jew. They don't care what has happened or what will happen at Lake Success. They are simply committed to the extermination of the Jews as a preparatory move to the elimination of all western influence in the Middle East. Evidently the duo are just as oblivious to the Arab League, in spite of the Arab League's subventions of the notorious Mufti. It is reported that they violated an undertaking to avoid a pitched battle with Haganah. The cooler heads at Cairo knew that any defeat might damage if not destroy the prestige of Arab arms. This is exactly what happened, and the damage to Arab arms, according to the refugees, has extended to the anti-Zionist cause.

What has happened of late weeks has demonstrated the absurdity of the contentions which succeeded in paralyzing United States action after the Assembly action on partition. The decision, it was said, jeopardized America's oil supply in the Middle East in case of war with Soviet Russia. After working on the military, and getting them so frightened that they added their influence to the Arabophiles among the diplomats, Aramco now admits that Arabian oil would be unobtainable, anyway. This was extorted out of Aramco officials last Tuesday by the Senate Special War Investigating Committee which is accusing Aramco of an overcharge in dealings with the Navy. Whatever the merit or demerit about the overcharge, they certainly oversold the anti-partition case to our naive defense officials.

Now the myth about a united Arab world waging a holy war against all and sundry seems on the verge of explosion. Even the Arabs in Palestine are disunited. Left to themselves, they would doubtless run out the rascally Mufti and his military chieftain. Neither of them was at the April 28 war conference at Amman, Transjordan capital, when the invasion of Palestine was discussed by the Arab chieftains. Nor was there present, apparently, any representative of Arab Palestine. As one of the refugees said to the Associated Press, "Could you talk of fighting a war for liberation of America and ignore all Americans?" The irreducible fact is that the Arab world is seething with such unrest and interpasha jealousy that the Arab states are afraid of any sizable outward movement of their troops. It is this disintegration, no doubt, that has sounded the alarm in Britain and sent British troops hurrying back to Palestine.

Government by Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

GOVERNMENT BY PROPAGANDA

(Text of broadcast by Samuel B. Pettengill over ABC network, Sunday, April 25, 1948)

Last Sunday I spoke of the great need to send your strongest and best men and women to Congress. One reason we need that kind is the fact that a supercongress is growing up in Washington that is dwarfing the Congress established by the Constitution.

I refer to law-making by propaganda by the executive departments. Propaganda that uses money paid by all taxpayers, and by members of all parties. Propaganda by men who are not elected by anybody, who often work in the dark—in short, a new invisible government.

With the huge funds at their command, they mold public opinion so effectively that they often determine the result in advance of a vote by your representatives in Congress.

This subverts the principles of a representative government. It is illegal, and as I shall point out, in many cases it is in violation of criminal statutes.

CONGRESS MUST TAKE ACTION

Yet it goes unpunished, and will continue to go unpunished until we get a Congress that will deny this superlegislature the use of public funds, and until we get a Department of Justice that will put these culprits in jail.

When the executive branch of any government—by the use of public funds—controls the thinking of the people, a congress or parliament becomes superfluous — even though it may be kept, as a political Charlie McCarthy, to give a pretense of legality to what is in fact a perversion of representative government.

Government by propaganda has been an indispensable factor in the development of the idea of an all-wise, indispensable man—call him duce, fuehrer, leader, or any other name.

ENDOWED FOR 25 YEARS

For 25 years the world has witnessed the sinister growth of this idea. It is found in the thought police of Japan, in the total censorship of Russia, in the huge propaganda machines of Mussolini and Hitler—controlling the press, radio, public platform, motion pictures, the theater, and, to some extent, even music, art, science, and the pulpit.

As a German writer puts it, it was intended "to render the parliamentary system * * * incapable of independent action * * * to make the Reichstag powerless as a law-giving and policy-forming body."

Goebbels, the Nazi minister of propaganda and enlightenment, made internal resistance to Hitler impossible by feeding out to the German people only what Hitler wanted them to hear, by coloring and suppressing public information, by forbidding criticism, and so making a farce of popular elections and a pious fraud of voting in the German Congress. The same tactics are at work in the new puppet government behind the iron curtain.

If free debate of government policies had not been crushed, it is wholly possible that Hitler would not have been able to plunge Germany into war.

A DANGEROUS THREAT IN AMERICA

Executive propaganda is one of the most sinister developments in the modern world. We, who believe in a free society, must stop its growth here. It has already made serious headway.

From this indictment, we exclude the constitutional right and duty of the President to make recommendations of legislation to Congress. We exclude his official radio addresses and press conferences. We exclude the testimony of Cabinet members for committees of Congress. We exclude the official reports of Government departments.

All these are legitimate. And, of course, we exclude the expression of opinion and the advocacy of public measures by any person or organization who use their own money, and not the taxpayers' money.

All these are part of the machinery of free government. But this is the practice that we must indict—the use of public funds, outside of the legitimate channels I have described, to mold the thinking of the public in order to build fires under Congressmen and Senators, to destroy their independent judgment, and force them to do the will of lobbyists in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

IT VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION

This propaganda is an evil thing for several reasons. It violates the Constitution which vests all legislative powers in the Congress of the United States.

It is immoral. It uses taxes paid by those who oppose a public measure in order to enact it into law.

It forces Republicans to finance a policy favored by Democrats, or vice versa.

It is dishonest because it presents only one side of a question, and suppresses legitimate public information.

It is dangerous because it is wirepulling by a small number of zealots who often work in secret.

In foreign affairs, it gives the American sympathizers, or stool pigeons, of foreign governments the power to influence American legislation and appropriations. It escapes cross-examination at a public hearing on equal terms with all others before congressional committees.

It thus rests public policy on the lopsided views of a few fanatics, rather than on the broad understanding which comes from full, fair public debate on the floor of Congress.

Let me tell you how this new engine of government operates. I must refer to actual cases; but you will understand that I do not here and now, necessarily condemn the measures themselves. Let's take the Bretton Woods scheme to stabilize international money systems and support the economy of foreign governments. This was an important policy costing billions of dollars.

SOLD TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

How was it sold to the American people and to Congress by this superlegislature using public funds to propagandize one viewpoint only?

The Treasury Department distributed 890,000 pieces of literature favoring the Bretton Woods scheme. How many pieces in opposition? Exactly 210—890,000 against 210. This is a ratio of over 4,000 to 1 in favor of Bretton Woods. That was loading the dice and that was not playing the game. Every wire was pulled—press, radio, college lecture hall, even the pulpits in the churches.

By the time Congress voted on it, the American people had heard practically only one side of the question. On the Marshall plan, just enacted, all wires were pulled again. Officials of the State Department made speeches before cotton, tobacco, wheat, corn, and dairy farmers and other organizations telling them how they would benefit financially from these huge appropriations.

Important bills are introduced and Members of Congress cannot find out what public officials wrote them or what motives, interest, or reasons they had for promoting them.

THE LEND-LEASE MONSTROSITY

A notable example was lend-lease in 1941. It was impossible for any Congressman, or Senator, to find out whose idea it was, although a determined effort was made to disclose that fact.

It was not until long afterward that its apparent originator was discovered to be Britain's Prime Minister Churchill.

Such is the super legislature that you do not elect, can't see, talk to, argue with, or defeat at the next election.

Another device is for some department chief to telephone—at public expense, of course—to governors, mayors, and party bosses back home to put the heat on Congressmen and Senators to force them into line.

One United States Senator has said: "The purpose of this propaganda is to control the legislative branch of the Government. The machine has developed to such proportions that many Members of Congress are afraid to challenge its power. It is growing with lightning speed. Its growth increases its power, and its power means a further increase in its growth."

OUR FEDERAL "THOUGHT CONTROL"

Last May, the House of Representatives created a subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda in the Executive Departments. Congressman HARNESS of Indiana, the chairman of that committee, says:

"When Government propaganda is successful in shaping public opinion to its own predetermined objectives, we have arrived at a system of Federal thought control which closely parallels the mechanics of dictatorship."

Mr. HARNESS reports that in 1946, the executive agencies spent $75,000,000 in publicity and propaganda activities. That is 25 times as much as the law permits a national political party to spend in a Presidential campaign. That makes the executive branch of Government the most powerful lobby in America.

Forty-five thousand Federal employees devote all, or part, of their time to publicity and propaganda. These busy beavers issue an endless stream of press releases, ghost-written speeches, radio scripts, motion-picture films, pamphlets, etc.

When you hear half a dozen radio commentators all giving you the same "line" on Bretton Woods or any other public measure, you can guess who is the Svengali who hypnotizes these Trilbys of the air to sing the same tune.

WAR DEPARTMENT HIRED EXPERT

To promote universal military training the War Department hired a New York "expert" to tour the country at taxpayers' expense, and conduct radio panel discussions loaded with advocates of the measure.

This "expert" asked the radio audiences to write letters to the stations, adding that the letters would be forwarded to the proper people in Congress.

In addition, military airplanes were used to fly hundreds of influential civilians to military reservations, in order to line them up for this policy. They also discovered a submarine in the Pacific Ocean at just the right moment for maximum effect—as if we were the sole owners of that ocean.

The Social Security Board, Public Health Service, and Children's Bureau send their agents all over the country to beat the tomtoms for socialized, or political medicine.

These traveling lobbyists—at your expense—set up so-called health workshops and drum up trade with social welfare workers, women's clubs, labor unions, and all others susceptible to the service of humanity—and the possible hope of jobs for themselves. They have even sent their missionaries—at your expense—on junketing trips to England, New Zealand, South America and Japan.

Much the same story can be told about public housing.

BOLD DEFIANCE OF LAW

All this is done in defiance of a law which provides that no money appropriated by Congress shall be used to pay for any letter, printed matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by his vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress. That law provides fine and imprisonment for anyone violating it.

And yet, so far as I know, no one has ever been indicted for violating that law.

Such is the superlegislature, the new ministry of propaganda and enlightenment. It is heading America toward an all-powerful executive and a one-party state. It may help to explain why Republican and Democratic leaders so often agree on a bipartisan policy which denies to the American people an honest discussion and free and full debate on all great public questions.

It is an additional reason why you should elect strong men to Congress who will refuse to appropriate to these lobbyists in Government the funds with which they tell you what to think.

An End to Racial Exclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1948

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial taken from the April 27, 1948, issue of the San Francisco Chronicle.

If additional proof were needed that the people of the United States are ready to eliminate racial discrimination in American immigration and naturalization laws, that proof was furnished during the open hearings on H. R. 5004, held April 19 and 21 before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Naturalization and Immigration. Particularly impressive in view of past attitudes, were the resolutions in support of this bill passed unanimously by the boards of supervisors of San Francisco and Los Angeles, as well as the testimony of my colleagues, Hon. BERTRAND GEARHART and Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER. There was no equivocation in their recognition that new times require a new and constructive approach to this problem in which elemental justice and national interest are so strongly united.

Additional evidence that west coast Americans are ready to take leadership in this matter is to be found in this editorial. It follows:

AN END TO RACIAL EXCLUSION

The American people are ready, from signs that appear here and there, to take the final step toward eliminating the last vestiges of racism from the laws governing immigration and naturalization of citizens. It is high time.

Endorsements of the Judd bill to abolish racial exclusion, now being heard by a House Judiciary Subcommittee, indicate that support for it is widespread. Favorable testimony is coming from quarters that would have been in strong opposition 20 years ago. We are learning lessons.

The Judd bill, sponsored by the Minnesota Congressman who once was a missionary in China, puts all Asiatic and Pacific peoples on a quota basis for immigration, the same basis which applies to immigrants from Europe, Australasia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere. It does for the Japanese, Koreans, Siamese, Samoans, and other Asiatic-Pacific peoples what the United States has already done for the Chinese, Filipinos, and Indians—lifts the color bar. The bill would admit about 185 Japanese annually and no more than 100 of each of 10 other nationalities. Thus it would add a trifling 1,185 at the maximum to the present yearly immigration totals.

Of greater importance numerically, the Judd bill would lift the bars against naturalization of ineligible aliens already residing in the United States. Most of these are Japanese, of course. By the last census there were 47,000 Japanese aliens on the mainland and 37,000 in Hawaii. Barred from citizenship because of racial origin, these alien Japanese are mostly elderly, having entered the

country before the exclusion law of 1924. To enable them, and the Koreans, and the Polynesians, and all others now barred to take out citizenship papers would be a logical, consistent development of democratic practice. As an incidental result, it would clearly knock the props out from under the California alien land laws, which would be a very good thing.

Hawaii, as represented by its Delegate to Congress, is strong for the Judd bill, and Hawaii's involvement with the results of such legislation would be greater than that of any State.

Congress should pay special heed in considering this question to the advice of Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan. American relationships in the Far East, Grew warns, can never become entirely sound until this country eliminates the humiliation inflicted by our exclusion laws.

Just so; no one can say what part exclusion played in bringing about Pearl Harbor, but it was not negligible. And even with Pearl Harbor past and avenged, until we eliminate racial exclusion entirely we will continue to find the good name of the United States under a cloud, not only in the Orient, but in Europe, in the United Nations, and wherever our precepts are measured against our practices.

Inflationary Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of inflationary problems found in the Monthly Business Review of April 15, 1948, submitted to me by Mr. C. V. Vosper, of Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTHLY BUSINESS REVIEW BY THE EXECUTIVE MANAGER OF NACM

APRIL 15, 1948.

DEAR MEMBER: Inflation is an ancient goldbrick. From time to time it is given a modern setting. On the surface it looks so appealing and attractive that it is as readily accepted as though it were genuine. In truth, it is the fraud of the ages. Its historical background is as old as the hills; its consequence as destructive as the four horsemen. It leaves ruin, privation, hopelessness, and strife in its wake. It prevents an orderly flow of commerce. It liquidates the fruits of thrift. It robs the people of life savings. It sends the old to their graves prematurely. It is a poison virus which, once it takes hold, seldom releases its grip until the victim surrenders or collapses.

Let us look at present-day inflation from the viewpoint of the average skilled worker. Like most of his fellow workers he is a first-rate citizen, the backbone of the Nation. He has a family. He is of middle age. He and his family have been careful and saved for a rainy day. He has protected his family with insurance. He has put aside some money for a better education for his children than he was privileged to enjoy. Being a loyal citizen, he has bought steadily of Government bonds—not many, because he couldn't afford many—but through the years he has regularly saved and a part of his savings he has entrusted to his Government.

His wife has worked hard. She, too, has made sacrifices for her family. She has thriftily done the buying. She has mended all and made some of the children's clothes. She has by example in her daily life been an ideal to her children, and she has not neglected their spiritual needs. She and her husband in fact have day by day built for their family a heritage far beyond any money value.

BUYING POWER OF THE 1948 DOLLARS

The husband now has an average wage of $2.25 an hour. Ten years ago he earned $1.40 an hour. His union leaders tell him they have served him very well. He is making about half again as many dollars as he made 10 years ago.

Ten years ago he had savings of $2,500. Today he and his wife have $4,500 in a savings account. Isn't he prospering? Ten years ago he carried $5,000 of life insurance for his family. Today he has $10,000 of insurance protection. Ten years ago he had $2,000 in bonds or local building and loan stock. Today he has $4,000 invested in this type of security. He owns a car in which he drives to work and with which he can take his family shopping, visiting, or to a picnic on Saturday and Sunday. He paid $1,000 for it about 7 years ago.

When he tells his wife they are doing well and getting along fine, she agrees with him, not wanting to seem unappreciative of his fine effort. Now and then, however, she wonders whether everything is as rosy as it appears or as her husband assures her. She knows that a dollar buys very little at the store. She has just sent away for a school catalog to try to help decide on a small college for Jimmy. She gets a bit of a shock when she sees that the cost is now $1,000 a year including room and board. It used to be $600. She knows she has been cutting corners on her meat and her groceries because things are just so high she is forced to do so.

Last week she heard at the church supper that Aunt Sarah who for years has taught most of the children in the community had to move to a cheaper flat. She could not afford to pay the increased rent she was asked. Her salary had gone up so little and rent and other necessities had gone up so much.

Day before yesterday the retired minister had asked her whether she had a few odd chores or handyman jobs he might do around the house. It seemed with these high prices his meager church pension would no longer enable him to make ends meet. Jim, her husband, was also a bit upset because when he looked at a new car he found it would cost him $1,800 instead of the $1,000 he had paid for the car he now owned. When he went to the city hall to pay his taxes he learned they, too, were considerably higher these days. Then there was his income tax, not much as incomes taxes go, but many, many times what he used to pay. In addition there was the social security tax that was taken out of his pay. He thought of that reflectively. He asked his wife, Mary, "Do you suppose when we are entitled to the social security payments, they will buy so little that we will find ourselves in the same position as Mr. Cronin and have to go out and work at odd jobs to supplement it?"

INFLATION DISCUSSED IN THE FAMILY CIRCLE

Then one night young Jimmy came home and told of someone at the high school talking about inflation. He explained in detail and with examples what he and his classmates heard. It wasn't really news to Jimmy's mother because she knew how high things are. Jim, to be sure, has been so busy at his job he hadn't given it as much thought. But Jim and Mary always talk things over with their oldest son. They are a part of his life and share his problems. They find his subject very interesting; it hits home so. So, for several evenings the three of them get into a huddle and have a down-to-earth talk on inflation, what they think causes it, and what can be done about correcting it. They come up with some interesting conclusions and ideas to stop it.

First, Jim wonders whether they were not in fact better off when he was getting $1.40 an hour. The $1.40 would really buy more than a wage of $2.25 does today. Mary figures it all out on her grocery bills and she knows Jim was better off. She finds Jim has to work a bit longer now than he did 10 years ago to enable her to buy the same amount of food she needs to take care of the family. Jim is not sure. He soon changes his mind, after Mary reminds him of the fact that the twenty-five hundred good, hard-saved, real dollars they had in the bank 10 years ago are no longer as good as they were. She says it seems as though today a dollar will only buy about what a 50-cent piece bought 10 years ago. Jimmy says that she is right and inflation has taken $1,250 from them. But says Jim, "We now have four thousand five hundred in the bank." Mary reminds him that they really only have $2,250 of 1937 purchasing power if a dollar is only worth 50 cents. And this, she emphasizes, is $250 less in purchasing power than they had 10 years ago.

"How about the bonds we own?" asks Jim. "The money we invested in them is now only worth half its price. And our life-insurance protection is only half its value."

"Yes," says Mary, "I actually have less than I had 10 years ago to take care of things if something, which pray God never occurs, should happen to you."

"Of course," says Jimmy, "the home you own is worth an inflated price, but if you sold it you would have to pay more to buy a new one and it probably wouldn't be as well built."

Mary says, "Jim, there is something wrong here and if things are going to continue like this, what is the use of saving? We might as well spend our money as we go along before it is worth even less."

But Jim had a different idea which his wife agreed was worth considering. "Let's get busy and see whether we can't restore the value of our savings so that they are worth what they were. Let's see what we can do to try and not let them take from us that for which we worked and saved."

And what could this hard-working family do to stop this inflationary tax? They could do everything, for the power that they and others like them possess is so great they do not realize its potentiality. Let's assume they talk this thing out and come up with the logical answers as I believe the average American workers would if the problem were thoroughly understood by them.

A PLAN TO RESTORE FULL VALUE TO DOLLAR

Here is a line of action which would, to be sure, require courage, but which in the end would be worth the effort.

First, let the men in the shop talk it over with other men in the shop and with their union representatives. If enough do, results will follow. Let them tell their union representatives that the new wage increase they want to get for them is necessary if things keep going sky-high. But let them ask whether a wage increase without a production increase won't make them poorer. Let them be insistent that what they need more is a plan of action that will make their present wages have better buying power. Let them tell their leaders to get back of a stabilization-of-wage program and put all their effort on getting value back into the dollar. Let them know that they are not so interested in getting more dollars that are worth 50-cent pieces as a wage increase. Such a wage increase is a "phony" and it just takes away value from the hard-earned dollars they have saved. In fact it increases inflation.

Second, let the men in the plant tell the management of their company they must be given the best possible tools and equipment so they can produce more. They can suggest a committee be named of management and labor to study new ways and methods to produce more. They can promise the company they will do the best day's work they can to produce more and that when they do, they can say that they will have earned more money. Furthermore, if the company doesn't agree to improve its machinery and give them the best equipment they should demand it. They can emphasize it is time they get back their hard-earned dollars and the company, too, must help them do so.

Third, the committee they get together can call on the city and county officials and their Congressman, and they can tell them that if they continue spending money the way they have been doing, they will vote them out of office. At election time they can say they will have a committee go around to let every voter know that no politician is going to give them any more bunk about what the Government through his party is doing for them. They are a large part of the Government and they can insist they are going to do something for themselves for a change.

AN HONEST REPLY TO FEDERAL PATERNALISM

Fourth, when the Government comes along with a lot of pension, sickness, health, and other plans, they can make certain these programs are not going to be paid for by chiseling away the dollars they have saved. If they can put these plans into effect without inflating their money, they can say they will pay for them. They always do pay for them in the end, anyway. They will not, however, listen to a lot of glittering promises from politicians that all of this is what they are going to do at the expense of the rich or at the expense of business, or the Government. The Government has no money except what they and others give it, and there aren't enough rich people to pay for all these things. As for business, they know they make it or break it.

If the politicians say that we have to keep taxes high because the Government has a huge debt, the men can counter with an ultimatum that it is time they learned to run the Government on less, for that is what they have to do in their own family budgets.

They can insist that they are through being inflated to the poorhouse. They can say "These high wages you are talking about are the bunk, and we want you to pay us our wages in real dollars. Anybody that tries to stop us is in for a fight. And our wives are going to lay off buying things that are out of line."

Of course, these men know it will take the edge off the easy-looking days we are having, but if they make it known they don't propose to accept any more bubble gum money for their sweat and toil they will get action. And if the politicians blame it on the war, they can tell them it's been over for 2 years and maybe if they used better judgment in the first place, we wouldn't be in so many wars. They can say they are boiling mad now over the way they have to sweat to pay taxes to pay a part of the bill the Government has on its hands for helping Russia. What, they can ask their representatives, were they thinking of when they gave their hard-earned money to Russia and didn't see to it at the time that we wouldn't be in the present jam? They can also say that the high number of dollars the company and the farmers are making are like their wages because, after all, they're only 50-cent dollars, too. They can say, "We want to get more wages all right but we mean to get more by producing more and being paid hundred cent dollars instead of the 50-cent pieces we are getting today. Unless the company makes a 100 percent dollar they can't pay it. And for our part we intend to produce more so as to help make our dollars real."

They can preach the gospel of unselfishness and self-reliance. They can show when business, the farmer, wage earner, community, and in fact, all the people run to Washington for help, they in the end add to their problem. Furthermore, they make it difficult for a Congressman or Senator to protect their savings.

Yes sir, their dander is up, they can tell their Representatives, and since they in fact are a large part of the Government, they propose to help run it from here on out. They can say "We have a great country here and we are going to make sure our kids have it too."

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. HEIMANN, *Executive Manager.*

Crippled Children Aided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I know the Congress will be glad to learn that the Mount Edgecumbe Orthopedic Hospital near Sitka, Alaska, is doing its job well.

Dr. Philip H. Moore, orthopedic surgeon, describes this forward step in the improvement of the health of Alaska in the May issue of a publication called Alaska's Health, issued by the Territorial Department of Health in cooperation with the United States Children's Bureau and the United States Public Health Service.

At a time when tuberculosis kills 19 times as many among Alaska groups as it does on the average in the United States, it is important that we observe that a cooperative program in behalf of crippled children is effective. The proposals for similar cooperative attacks on tuberculosis, in my judgment, will be similarly effective.

I attach Dr. Moore's statement on progress at Mount Edgecumbe Orthopedic Hospital:

ALASKA PROGRESSES IN CARE OF CRIPPLED CHILDREN

(By Philip H. Moore, orthopedic surgeon, Mount Edgecumbe Orthopedic Hospital)

One evening not long ago I happened by the door of one of the wards of the Mount Edgecumbe Hospital, where we are treating the crippled children of Alaska. What I saw there was a sight and a memory I am sure the people of Alaska would like to share with me. There was a group of boys and girls assembled in the center of the ward. One of these boys had a guitar, and as I stood in the doorway the soft strains of a popular western song, sung in the finest harmony, came to my ears. About this smaller group there clustered 20 or 30 other children, some of them lending their voices to the song, some of them just sitting and listening. As I glanced about each one assumed the proportions of an individual and special problem. Here lay a group of children with casts on their bodies; there sat a child with his arm held high in a cast while others were supporting their weights on crutches. Two were in wheelchairs, several were on frames in beds, and a few had simple casts on arms or legs. Every one of them was on his way back to a more useful place in the world.

This was a far different sight from that which met the eye in April of 1947 when the orthopedic hospital first opened. While we have not accomplished all our objectives, we have come a long way toward establishing within the Territory a recognized orthopedic center for the care of Alaska's crippled children, without distinction as to race, color, creed, or economic status. Believing the people of Alaska should know more about the details of what we are trying to do at our Orthopedic Hospital I shall attempt, in brief, to outline our program.

While major credit for initiating a program of orthopedic care within the Territory goes to our far-sighted health commissioner, Dr. C. Earl Albrecht, such a program could not have been accomplished without the approval and advice of the United States Children's Bureau and the assistance of the Territorial Crippled Children's Services, the Alaska Crippled Children's Association, the Alaska Native Service, and many other public-spirited organizations and individuals.

What sort of a program has been carried on by the orthopedic hospital staff? In order to determine more accurately our orthopedic problem and needs, a series of case-finding clinics were held throughout the Territory during the summer of 1946. These clinics were held in a good proportion of the population centers throughout Alaska and to these came children from the surrounding areas by boat, rail, bus, and plane. Over 300 children were seen because of orthopedic defects, and a large number of these children were selected as needing hospitalization as soon as possible.

Hospital beds were provided in the following manner. The Territorial department of health contracted with the Alaska Native Service to hospitalize these patients at the Mount Edgecumbe Hospital on a flat rate per day payment basis. Under this plan, the Alaska Native Service contracts with the Department of Health to furnish the hospital facilities while the Territorial department of health pays for hospitalization of cases under its Crippled Children's Program. The Territorial department of health also furnishes the services of an orthopedic surgeon and an orthopedic head nurse. This has been a very successful arrangement and is an excellent example of how the united efforts and cooperation of several agencies can accomplish what is thought to be the impossible. Almost immediately patients were selected and sent to this orthopedic center and the number of patients now under treatment in the hospital is 55.

In addition to those treated in the hospital, there are about an equal number who receive orthopedic care on an out-patient basis.

Two other services are rendered by the orthopedic surgeon. The first of these is assisting in the care of crippled children who live in the outlying districts where there are no doctors. This is done by correspondence with the public health nurse who resides in the area and has knowledge of the patient. The second service is one of consultation with the private physicians in the Territory. Many of the physicians are availing themselves of the opportunity for free consultation by correspondence. This service includes X-ray interpretations and consultation in diagnosis and treatment regimens.

It will also be of interest to the residents of Alaska to know something of the equipment at the orthopedic hospital. The hospital facilities and equipment at Mount Edgecumbe are second to none in the United States. On a recent visit to many similar but larger institutions in the States it was observed that the equipment at Mount Edgecumbe Hospital is equal to that found in any of the large orthopedic centers outside. Our hospital is provided with the most modern

surgical equipment and, in addition, has a completely furnished physiotherapy department. A facility to be completed at the hospital in the near future is a brace shop.

No description of our activities would be complete without mention of the unique opportunity at Mount Edgecumbe to contribute to the knowledge of orthopedic treatment, especially as it pertains to tuberculosis of the bone. A program of research in the treatment of bone tuberculosis is in progress at the orthepedic hospital at the present time.

We are proud of the progress that has been made in the short time since this new orthopedic service was instituted. The people of Alaska can be proud, too, since their individual and collective interests and their loyal support have been vital factors in its growth and development. We can now say that a distinct step has been made in the direction toward the time when Alaska will be completely self-sufficient in caring for her own sick and handicapped.

This Is Not Foreign Policy—This Is Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD another one of the brilliant editorials on Palestine written by T. O. Thackrey and published in the New York Post.

This editorial, from the Post of May 2, points out succinctly the bad faith of Great Britain in supporting the puppet state of Transjordania with money borrowed from the United States, and in taking no steps to restrain the threats of aggression by Transjordania's kept monarch, King Abdullah, against Palestine.

LAST CHANCE FOR AMERICA

(By T. O. Thackery)

The key to peace or war in Palestine is Transjordan, virtually a British crown colony, owing its armys to British subsidy and its creation as a state to the British Foreign Office. It was created from Palestine.

The key to Transjordan is Great Britain, therefore, rather than the other members of the Arab League, most of which have become anti-British and antialien, despite Britain's pro-Arab policy and United States appeasement of Saudi Arabia.

The key to Great Britain is the United States, which depends upon both financial and military accord with this country for its very life.

The United States and Great Britain, seeking to promote the "cold war" with Soviet Russia, have made much of the Soviet use of the veto in the United Nations, her previous boycott of the Trusteeship Council, her refusal to be bound by the findings of the Balkans and the Korean commissions of the United Nations, or to participate in their deliberations.

This flouts the very purpose of the United Nations, weakens and thwarts it, according to us.

But if a strong case can be made there, how much stronger a case is the one against Great Britain, whose every act of noncooperation with the United Nations on Palestine has been met with our tacit approval; whose encouragement of war on Palestine's Jews is further fed by our arms embargo; whose flouting of the Assembly decision brought, not our protest, but a reversal of policy so that we, too, joined with Great Britain and the Arab League in wrecking the United Nations authority at the one point where we had labored successfully to bring about an agreed solution with Soviet Russia.

Transjordan, holding the longest Palestine border, openly threatens war, provides access for guerillas, murderers bent on the destruction of Jerusalem and Judea, and we are silent, both in Washington and Lake Success.

Had the Transjordan threat been uttered by Soviet Russia, instead of the Arab League, would we have been silent?

The answer is that together with Great Britain we have vigorously and determinedly screamed of "Red aggression" and pointed out the harm to the United Nations idea at every turn, but Russia is a large and powerful state, while Transjordan is a British crown colony, supplied with funds borrowed from us.

Do we fear Transjordan, then, and not Russia? Are we determined to ally ourselves with Arabia to destroy the Jews and the United Nations, in the name of keeping peace where there is no peace, while we court war at every turn with the Soviet Union?

This is not foreign policy—this is madness.

We are drowning in a visionary sea of oil in the Middle East, when our own self-respect, our very self-preservation, and the interest of every citizen, the future of the United Nations which is our only present bulwark against war, demands that we wipe the oil from our eyes, see the crime we are abetting clearly, and act promptly to return to our November 29 position.

To do so we must act, not talk, trusteeship in Jerusalem fully backed by our forces if no other, or in conjunction with any other.

To do so we must warn Great Britain, master of Transjordan, that we will not permit the United Nations decision to be wrecked by her failure to stop the warfare she is able, but unwilling, to stop.

To do so, we must recognize Judea, supply its defense forces if need be; and use our power for justice, rather than for appeasement of evil and the benefit of oil profiteers.

The Palestine Commission of the United Nations, by acting now in recognizing Judea as the state called for by the UN, can point the way.

Unless we travel that road before May 15, the United Nations is lost, our future is mortgaged to war and greed, and our only potential democratic ally in the Middle East will be subject to massacre.

Keep Red Hands Off Science Foundation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Walter Trohan which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 26, 1948, concerning the efforts of certain Reds, pinks, and fellow-travelers to get their hands on the science foundation bill now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

This country is literally teeming with scientific spies who have been working overtime trying to get the secrets of the atomic bomb in order to turn them over to our enemies. They whine to high heaven when the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any other committee of the House or the Senate, attempts to review their records.

The fate of this Nation is now in the hands of the Congress of the United States, and it is the duty of every Member to join in exposing these enemies within our gates before it is everlastingly too late.

The article referred to follows:

SHAPLEY GROUP SEEKS CONTROL OF UNITED STATES RESEARCH—PUSH $15,000,000 BILL FOR FOUNDATION

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—Minutes of the intersociety committee for a national science foundation, a group of scientists promoting a bill to spend $15,000,000 a year on research, disclose that the group intends to pick the personnel of the foundation when and if it is approved by Congress.

Prominent in lobbying for the legislation is Dr. Harlow Shapley, director of the Harvard University Observatory. He is a member of various organizations designated by Attorney General Clark as subversive. Shapley is vice chairman of the group which would make the selections.

Shapley has a long record of affiliation with groups which the House Un-American Activities Committee has labeled as communistic or Communist fronts. Recently he was disclosed as the master mind of the Committee of One Thousand, a group formed to press for abolition of the House committee.

CITE HIS AFFILIATIONS

Shapley was a member of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which, the House committee cited as a Communist front organized to defend Communist teachers in a report March 29, 1944. He was a member of the League of American Writers, which was described as a front organization in three committee reports.

He was revealed in the columns of the Daily Worker as the signer of various letters supporting the aims of organizations, described by the committee as Communist fronts, and of appeals in behalf of Communists such as Gerhart Eisler and Earl Browder.

Minutes of a meeting in Chicago last December 28 of the executive committee of the group sponsoring the research bill, report:

"The executive committee agreed upon the desirability of preparing a list of persons to be proposed to the President for membership of the National Science Foundation if and when one is established.

"It was agreed that the committee's recommendations should be ready for submission immediately upon enactment of the proposed legislation."

Members of Congress have learned that the list has been prepared and is now ready for submission to the White House upon passage of the bill.

The science foundation bill is sponsored by Senator SMITH (Republican of New Jersey) and Representative WOLVERTON (Republican, of New Jersey). Neither was aware until recently of Shapley's record in the House Un-American Activities Committee, they said.

A science foundation bill, lobbied for by Shapley, was passed last year by Congress, but was vetoed by President Truman because he considered the organization unwieldy and because, as it was drawn, it would have vested determination of vital national policies in the executive group of the proposed organization.

In the new bill, scientific research related to national defense has been removed from the province of the foundation. The most important of these are atomic bombs, bacteriological warfare, biological warfare, and climatological warfare.

Atomic fission is in the province of the Atomic Energy Commission. The use of germs to spread disease, the attacking of functions of the body, and the use of climate to carry disease are being developed within the Military Establishment.

DIRECTOR IS POWERFUL

It has been reported that the last three already have reached a high stage of development and that the United States could employ them with devastating effect on any enemy.

Under the revised science foundation bills, all authority would be invested in a director, who would be a dictator in the field of Government scientific investigation. The executive council feature of the former bill has been removed, so that the director is not subject to its supervision.

The foundation is opposed by groups interested in research on heart disease, cancer, and infantile paralysis. These organizations would suffer, they say, if the Government were to take over, since funds for research in their fields would be reduced.

Also it is argued that the hand of bureaucracy would slow research. At present it has been indicated that exception will be made for these groups under the pending plan.

The foundation could be expected to take over all research ultimately, it has been warned.

Draft and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thought-provoking letter regarding the draft and military service which I have just received from a constituent of mine, Mr. Arthur G. Poor, of Clifton, N. J.

Mr. Poor is the father of two veterans, and as his letter indicates, he has given this matter a great deal of thought. I am sure his views will be of interest to many Members in their consideration of this most vital question.

His letter is as follows:

THE DRAFT AND UMT

The United States must have the finest fighting force in the world.

That's easy—a draft, universal military training, or a combination of both.

No; it's not that easy.

We are at peace; we are a peaceful people trying to determine how to keep ourselves strong in a world which may be torn asunder at any moment.

Many men sit in Congress elected by the people trying to figure the answer.

Haven't they forgotten the human equation? They glibly talk of this age group or that age group as if playing with dominoes. Numbers.

Before the men who are believed to be honestly trying to work out a solution for a strong Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps finally make up their minds let them forget numbers and ages for the moment and concentrate on humans.

Let's start with the mother whose oldest son of 25 was killed in the last war. Is her 18- or 19-year-old now to be drafted? Or, at least temporarily, has that family done enough for its country?

Or the family that had one son wounded who is still in a hospital (may never get out). Is their second son now to be drafted? Or has that family done enough for the moment?

Or my own family with a son in the Marines for 3 years, two of which were fighting in the Pacific; a second son 2 years in the merchant marine carrying supplies to Africa and Europe. The sleepless nights, the waiting for mail, the fear of opening an official letter. Is our third son to be drafted? Or have we, as a family, done enough temporarily for our country?

Or who will be drafted and who won't? At what stage in school or college will 18-year-olds be called?

Again, will someone decide that chemists are needed. Therefore chemical students will be exempt? Or engineers? Already the aircraft industry has asked for draft-free status.

During the last war when our country was in dire peril, we saw these things happen. We saw punctured eardrums, hay fever, sinus overrule draft boards. We saw boys fresh out of college hid in chemical laboratories to escape the draft. We saw families buy farms so sons could be classified as essential farmers, we saw conscientious objectors who had never had a spark of religion get out of fighting, we saw a certain religious sect bravely letting others save their homeland.

We heard of so many cases of influence of certain people to keep their sons in this country that all of the stories couldn't have been merely rumors. We saw with our own eyes that these families didn't worry.

Yes, the human side is forgotten. Are those who suffered the most before to again be called upon to suffer? Are those who escaped before to escape again? Are those who put patriotism above all before now to be called upon again?

How many men in official positions—Congressmen, Senators, Cabinet officials—have sons who will be affected by the "numbers" they are now playing with?

If, as is perhaps necessary, we are going to have some kind of draft for our youths or some form of military training, what assurance is our Government going to give them that while they are on duty there will be no strikes? No slowing down of production to back them up? No walking the streets, no picketing by some who may be deferred?

And who is to assure them—the youth of our country—that everyone will be working, that there won't be big lines in front of the unemployed insurance windows of those who seek to get out of working, or that race touts, gamblers, bookies, playboys will be made to go to work?

There is more to it than just passing a draft act—there's the human side that must be reconciled first.

Who, in time of peace, can say that to interrupt a college boy's life has less effect than to interrupt a clerk's life? Who can say that in time of peace it is more fair to draft a schoolboy or college student than a married man? Who can say in time of peace that a chemist's assistant, an engineer, or what not shall be exempt and a student called? Or that a farmer's son is necessary to the farm but a son is not necessary to a business?

Yes, we've lost sight of the human factor.

We need to be strong. Most people advocate immediate strength.

If immediate strength is the question, the answer can be worked out. Perhaps we should—

Let all who were registered and exempted in the last war, who didn't do their share, be immediately called into service—no more excuses. This could be done from present records and the age groups of the last draft could be used, setting a top age of perhaps 35 years.

Then and only then might we work out an honest, fair universal military training program which would take our youth and train them. Surely we have the brains in this country to combine military training and schooling so that both the boy and the country will benefit. Surely we have the brains to insist that labor and management must back these boys up.

But above all let's not forget the human side of people at peace and the human side of people who really suffered not so many years ago. Let us not forget that in the past we have been concerned with different generations; now we are talking of almost the same generation—the same parents. We are talking of those who sacrificed before, or those who escaped before. We must be careful.

Don't forget the human side.

A. G. POOR.

States' Rights and Local Self-Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a recent radio address by Gov. Beauford H. Jester at the Texas Democratic barbecue in Fort Worth reflects the opinions of a great majority of the Democrats of Texas. We are proud of our stand on the States' rights issue to preserve local self-government. The practice of concentrating authority and control in our National Government can only be done at the expense of local government with a resulting loss of interest and participation on the part of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address by Gov. Beauford Jester to the people of Texas on April 20, 1948:

My fellow Democrats and my fellow Texans, I am indebted to the Lone Star Chain and its affiliated stations for this opportunity to report to you on a matter of considerable importance to Texas and the Democratic Party.

It is always a heart-warming occasion when Texas Democrats get together. One can feel at once the glory of Texas and sense the proud traditions of our great party.

I have participated in recent conferences of southern Governors in protest against President Truman's so-called civil-rights program. In doing so, however, I have made it clear that I was not speaking for the Democratic Party of Texas; that Texas Democrats would speak for themselves.

Having been signally honored by the Democratic Party of Texas, I did not think that I could, in good grace, attempt to anticipate its wishes.

And I am not now attempting to speak for the Democratic Party of Texas. With your indulgence, however, I would like to set forth my views and recommendations upon the important questions involved for the consideration of my fellow Democrats.

The Democrats of Texas have momentous decisions to make when they meet in Brownwood on May 25.

Fortunate as we are tonight to be assembled in that great confraternity of freemen which is the Democratic Party, we cannot fail to be aware of the world crisis in the

affairs of men. We meet in troubled times. We southerners are troubled in our own house.

In our concern over the destruction of sovereignty and freedom overseas, we cannot overlook the fact that our own sovereignty and our own basic rights of free government are jeopardized.

Here is the problem which all men who call themselves Americans, Democrats, and southerners have to face: How—under the stress of tremendous pressures, both internal and external, both political and economic—can we preserve freedom at home?

The immediate question is: "How can we hold back the onrushing tide of centralized government which threatens to sweep away the liberties inherent in home rule?"

The danger is not to southerners alone. It just happens that, at the moment, we are the target.

Mr. Justice Louis Brandeis once said—"The greatest dangers of liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."

Not only are we threatened by insidious encroachments; we find the menace aggravated by political expediency and ambitious opportunism.

Every one of President Truman's antisouthern proposals would destroy home rule by Federal law. Regardless of the debatable merits of the various proposals, none of them could be carried out without a destruction of local self-government.

As our distinguished senior Senator, TOM CONNALLY, put it, the proposals call for a "lynching of the Constitution." The sharp totalitarian dagger is concealed beneath a false cloak of democracy. It is in the current fashion for noble-sounding labels to be applied to acts of aggression.

It is not civil rights which the President proposes—it is civil aggression. The President has launched a campaign of aggression upon the sovereignty and civil rights of the Southern States in the vain hope of winning the votes of antisouthern minorities in the boss-ridden cities of the North and East.

It is a significant fact that President Truman's proposals are almost a carbon copy of the civil rights plank in the Republican national platform. And I am sure that they have a parrot-like sound to members of the Henry Wallace cult.

There has been much concern that the majority might destroy the rights of the minority, but here we have an example of the minority attempting to destroy the rights of the majority. Majorities have civil rights, too. States have civil rights.

We must remember a warning sounded by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He said—"to bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems in danger."

For several generations the South has suffered much from the Republican Party and press. Southerners generally have forgiven the Republican North for the Civil War, but they can never forget the brutal oppressions of Reconstruction, or the persecutions and goadings since. In late years the South has become the target of communistic agitators and a shallow-minded fringe of Henry Wallace liberals. The South has had to bear up under campaigns of abuse and vilification.

Although the Democratic Party has been kept alive through lean and perilous times by southern votes and southern money, the South has been deprived of fair and equitable representation in the councils of the party.

But the most unexpected and cruelest wound has come from the dagger blow of a trusted friend. The South has been stunned by President Truman's attack upon our sovereignty and social institutions. The civil-rights program was proposed for the sole purpose of getting Negro votes in the so-called doubtful States.

Stripped of the sanctimonious piety with which they were delivered, President Truman's antisouthern legislative proposals are an offensive combination of carpetbagger technique and back-stabbing morality. They are in the same cast as the force bills of Reconstruction days, and calculated to achieve the same political purpose.

This is not simply a matter of white supremacy. And in that connection it is most regrettable that the President has seen fit to create a white-supremacy issue in the South. It is regrettable also that the President should have raised the issue of sectionalism by chastising one section in order to appease and gratify another section of the country.

A little over a year ago the President gave hope to a troubled world by the enunciation of the Truman doctrine—a doctrine which declared that all of the peoples of the world should have the right of self-determination—that people should be protected in the right to preserve their institutions from being subverted by outside influences.

Apparently the Truman doctrine is good enough for foreign states, but it is too good for the Southern States.

I was among the first to say that our President had accomplished many worthwhile and statesmanlike things under trying conditions. When he has sought to be a statesman, he has always earned public respect and popularity; but in his party politics he has accepted dangerous counsel.

In our concern for the freedoms of people elsewhere, we must not sleep upon our own rights. We must not permit our freedoms at home to be destroyed by political expediency. The right of local self-government, the right of self-determination—these are the fundamental liberties of a free people.

Franklin D. Roosevelt summed it up this way: "As the individual is protected from possible oppression by his neighbors, so the smallest political unit, the town, is, in theory, at least, allowed to manage its own affairs, secure from undue interference by the larger unit of the county, which in turn is protected from mischievous meddling by the State.

"This is what we call the doctrine of home rule, and the whole spirit and intent of the Constitution is to carry this great principle into the relations between the National Government and the governments of the States."

When the Democrats of Texas last assembled in convention, they declared that the greatest freedom is guaranteed by local self-government. Texas Democrats called upon our congressional delegation to resist Federal encroachment in the fields of local government and to halt the dangerous trend toward centralized control in Washington.

The effort of the Truman administration to confiscate the tidelands of Texas and other coastal States is another dangerous blow aimed at States' rights and local self-government. This projects an ideology alien to American freedoms. It is the opening door to nationalization of industry. It is a further attempt to centralize power in Washington at the expense of home rule and private rights.

Let me say here that if the Congress fails to pass the tidelands legislation and reassert State ownership to the tidelands, Texas stands to lose millions upon millions of dollars for our public-school fund.

We are grateful to our Texas delegation in Congress for their opposition to confiscation of our tidelands and their resistance to antisouthern legislation.

On the capitol grounds in Austin there is a monument erected to the memory of those who "died for States' rights guaranteed under the Constitution."

We cannot, in respect to their memory, sleep upon our rights. We cannot, in self-respect, accept the cynical insult which has rewarded our loyalty. We cannot be faithless to our heritage. We cannot be faithless to the party which we have cradled and nursed through generations of defeats and victories.

No, we cannot be faithless to our own people of all races and of all creeds, who, in a growing spirit of good will, in a method of self-determination, are working out their destinies together.

It will be remembered that the Declaration of Independence charged that George III fomented "domestic insurrections amongst us." Now we are confronted with proposals which would create strife and civil commotion in the Southern States.

The President's proposals would make a futile attempt to legislate social equality. Segregation is for the States to maintain. The people of the South will not tolerate having social equality forced upon them.

Bad laws do not make good neighbors. Enforced associations create strife and resentment. Legislation cannot make friends more friendly nor neighbors more neighborly. Social equality cannot be legislated. Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, opposed efforts to create social equality by law.

Forcing an employer to accept any person whom he did not desire to employ for any reason whatever would be a high-handed act of despotism. The FEPC must not be forced upon Texas and the South. It is anything but a fair-employment law.

We have resented the holier-than-thou attitude, and the smug sanctimony of the northern agitators who have been carping about the mote in our eye without recognizing the beam in their own.

We should not, however, allow our natural resentment and indignation over this officious meddling to blind us to the responsibility of improving the lot of our less-fortunate citizens. The last State Democratic Party platform took cognizance of this responsibility.

We can say with pride that a great measure of progress has been made in the advancement of the Negro race in the South. White people are undertaking to improve the lot of the Negro with an awakened sense of responsibility and, for the most part, with complete good will.

My message to the fiftieth legislature dealt extensively with the need for betterments for the colored race. I am gratified to say that the legislature enacted a splendid program for Negro education. I am sure this is only a beginning.

Although Texas has not been disgraced by a lynching for a long time, I believe all of our people would favor specific State legislation which would help to prevent mob violence in the future.

Our murder statutes are quite adequate, but a specific antilynching statute might well serve to answer our northern critics. I shall recommend to the next legislature strong legislation designed to reinforce our laws against mob violence of every type.

Federal control of the ballot box is a sure road to national corruption and dictatorship. One of the bulwarks of American liberty has been that suffrage has remained in the province of the States. Texans alone must have the right to say what kind of State taxes we shall levy and how we shall register our voters. If there is to be any abolishing of our poll tax, Texas, not Washington, must do it.

My fellow Democrats, our wrongs are great and our wounds are deep, but in our righteous indignation we must not be further harmed by the consequences of our own anger. However bitter we are in the knowledge of our grievances, we must not retaliate

blindly and rashly. Resolute determination is more likely to solve our problems.

What recourse do we have? Where can we go? What can we do about it? The melancholy fact is that the outlook is not too bright for the South. But we do have a fighting chance to save our sovereignty and our institutions. Let us review the situation.

There is the hope that the President will abandon his attempt to punish loyal Democrats in order to whet the intolerance of those who hate the South. It is possible that the President and his malaprop political advisors have now seen the folly of trying to out-promise Henry Wallace.

The results in the recent New York City congressional race should have demonstrated the futility of appeasement politics.

It is encouraging to see that the President has, at last, abandoned the shameful gestures of appeasement which he and Senator MCGRATH were making to Henry Wallace.

I have not given up hope that the President may abandon his anti-Southern program and will seek to reestablish an accord with the South.

As a practical matter, the South can gain nothing by imitating Henry Wallace and forming another party. We know that a Republican administration is certain to force anti-Southern legislation upon us, just as Republican administrations imposed upon us the shackles of reconstruction. We can know for certain that Henry Wallace and his Russia-Firsters will adopt an anti-Southern platform.

Our only real hope is that we may be able to force the Democratic Party to reaffirm its traditional belief in home rule and local self-government; and, then, that we may be able to win a Democratic victory in November.

Being Democrats by birth, by tradition, and by belief, we have no voice in the conduct of national affairs save through the Democratic Party. If we destroy that party, we will have destroyed our franchise. Political parties are the instruments through which the people govern themselves. As loyal southerners, and as loyal Democrats, we cannot desert the Democratic Party. But we can make our voice heard within the councils of the party once more. We can regain our rightful representation within the party. Inasmuch as we are certain of our fate at the hands of either Wallace or the Republicans, our only recourse is to demand justice from our party and work for its victory at the polls.

The brutal truth is that the South has been reduced to a negligible factor in the nomination of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. The abrogation of the two-thirds rule has brought about the desperate courtship of minority groups at the expense of the party's lifelong Democrats.

On several occasions, Texas Democrats have declared for restoration of the two-thirds nominating rule in Democratic National Conventions.

You may be sure that President Truman would never have embarked upon his anti-southern program if the two-thirds rule were still in effect. The entire Solid South can now be out-voted in a national convention by four of the more populous States in the North and East.

The two-thirds rule must be restored, not merely for the benefit of the South, but for the benefit of the whole party. For unless you can unite two-thirds of the Democrats of this Nation behind a candidate, there isn't a chance of a Democratic victory.

Let me urge that we send an instructed delegation to the Democratic National Convention—a delegation instructed to work for those principles upon which our birthright of freedom is founded. We should instruct the Texas delegation to use every means to write into the Democratic national platform a plank which will reaffirm the Democratic Party's traditional belief in States' rights and home rule.

The Texas delegation must be instructed to fight for the preservation of our tidelands; to fight against the efforts to deprive Texas of the right to control her own water resources for the benefit of her farmers, ranchers, and local subdivisions of government. Our delegates must be instructed to fight against the mischief-making proposals that our social institutions be destroyed by fiat of Federal law. We must send men and women to Philadelphia who revere and hold proudly the traditions of the South. We must send men and women who will battle to right our wrongs with a valiance and spirit worthy of our Confederate fathers.

Let me suggest, however, that if we are to instruct our delegates effectively as to principles, we must leave them uninstructed as to candidates. A delegation instructed as to principles is without bargaining power if it is also instructed as to candidates. We have no means of persuading a candidate to stand upon the platform which we desire if we pledge our support to him in advance. The South has been abused, neglected, and taken for granted for too long a time. Why should we put the Texas votes in the vest pocket of any candidate without first making a strong effort to have that candidate stand on a platform which protects our rights?

If the national convention should reaffirm the ancient Democratic doctrine of States' rights, President Truman—or any other nominee of the convention—could not fail to accept it as a mandate.

The principles involved are far more vital to Texas and the South than any candidate. The Texas delegation must be left free to work for the nomination of a Vice Presidential candidate acceptable to the South.

The situation is extremely fluid. There are too many contingencies which cannot now be foreseen; therefore, we should not tie the hands of our delegates when it comes to voting for Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees.

I trust that the Brownwood convention will select loyal and outstanding Democrats for the delegation to Philadelphia and for our Presidential electors.

No matter how aggrieved we may feel, and no matter how deep our resentment, I do not believe that Texas Democrats should bolt the party. I say again that we must work out our differences within the party. As Mr. Justice Brandeis once said, "Let us seek for betterment within the broad lines of existing institutions."

Being a Democrat, and having been elected Governor of this State by Democrats, I intend to vote for and support all of the Democratic nominees. I want to be a party builder, not a party bolter.

The South cannot regain its rightful voice and position in the Democratic Party by destroying that party. If the Democratic Party is to be defeated—a prospect which I, for one, am not ready to accept—let it go down with the flag flying. The party has held together in victory, it must not disintegrate in defeat. Should there be defeat this year, the South must be prepared to cradle the rebirth of a greater Democratic Party. Democrats who believe in the Constitution must rebuild the party—not new and strange elements in it who would use it for new ideologies.

I predict that in the coming years of crisis, the American people will not long be able to do without the bold vision and the broad humanitarian principles of a Democratic national administration.

As Democrats, we have much of which we can be proud. The Democratic Party has a record unsurpassed in the field of humanitarian achievement. Its lasting glory is that it has advanced and uplifted mankind. Its bold vision, its concept of world responsibility, its telling blows for freedom—these have become the one hope in a despairing and chaotic world.

There lies before our party the need for even greater achievement. We must hold before us the shining idealism of Woodrow Wilson. We must live the Wilsonian faith in a greater destiny for mankind. We must keep before us the vision of a world in which moral right shall prevail over the evil forces which seek to enslave the minds and souls of men.

Let us now strive for justice and right in the Democratic Party. Let us do our utmost to put our Democratic House in order. Let us go forth from the Philadelphia Convention as a united party. Let us then do battle for the Democratic principles which are the only salvation of the world.

Let us make of the Democratic Party a challenging force to the enemies of liberty. Let us make of the party a finer instrument of free government and home rule.

Good night, and thank you for listening.

A Sure-Fire Formula To Bring on World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, you often hear it said, "There won't be war if we prepare overwhelming military strength."

Is that oft-repeated claim well-founded? Or is it simply shrewd propaganda by those who gain from military expansion and war?

Historically all-out military strength has required cruelly oppressive taxation.

But in peacetime no people will long endure back-breaking taxes simply to support gigantic "military brass." Domestic discontent appears. To suppress this resistance to militarism war becomes a "must." Recent examples of how nations have taken this downhill ride into war have been Germany, Japan, and Italy.

Most modern wars have been waged by rulers promising peace, but overburdened with defensive military preparations.

These wars have proven repeatedly the truth of Talleyrand's warning to Napoleon, "You can do anything with bayonets, sire, except sit on them." Talleyrand knew that when a nation has mobilized for war the politicians and the generals must maneuver it into actual war or lose their prestige and power.

In 1940 war preparedness in America went into high gear. By November 25, 1941, Secretary of War Stimson was writing in his diary these words:

> The question was how we should maneuver them (the Japanese) into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves.

Twelve days later war arrived. Does Stimson's comment help to clear up the mystery of Pearl Harbor?

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming quite popular to wrap yourself in the flag and shout for unlimited war spending. Every American wants an adequate defense. More than that, every American is perfectly willing to pay for a margin on the

excess side in order to have that adequate defense.

But does $120 per capita on war spending here now as compared with a per capita burden in Canada of $20, and in Britain of $60, indicate defense spending or something more?

A wild spree of spending on the military now is no service to America. It is more likely that it is a service to any potential enemies. Surely they would like nothing better than to see us overload ourselves with military spending as France did after World War I.

Already we are spending the fantastic sum of $8,014 per man in military service. This compares with $7,277 per man at the height of hostilities in 1944–45.

The probable consequences of military debauchery now would seem to be one of these:

First. Global war, generated from American sources if the Russians determine to avoid open conflict.

Second. A reign of militarism and inflation in the United States which will reduce the people to serfdom.

Third. A let-down in several years that would find us, like our armed forces at Pearl Harbor, with plenty of strength but everybody asleep either physically or psychologically.

These possibilities confront Congress. Hitler propagandized the German people into accepting the idea that communism was more dangerous to them than all-out militarism and regimentation at home. Must we repeat his performance? Or was Hitler right?

Gold Star Wives and Their Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 30, 1948

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Nation has been generous in providing educational and training benefits for the veterans of World War II. I think it was proper to assist these men and women who had their schooling interrupted by service in the armed forces, and the Nation as a whole will be benefited due to the fact that these individuals have acquired skills and professions which will enable them to render more valuable services.

The widows and children of our deceased servicemen have not been provided for so generously. In most instances, the war widow has one or two small children to support and on a pension of $78 per month for herself and child, her problem appears impossible of solution during these periods of high prices. They have had to resort to using family savings which they had hoped to use for their children's education.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have observed the fine manner in which the officers of the Gold Star Wives of America have represented these war widows. I wish to commend Mrs. Marie Jordan, founder and past national president of the Gold Star Wives and present executive director, for her efforts in successfully organizing this group and for presenting the group's views on legislation to members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Other officers of the Gold Star Wives have been most helpful, and I trust Mrs. Ruth Dutcher, national president, and the other officers will be successful in their continued efforts to provide some measure of security for widows and children of deceased servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that all of us desire to see our children properly educated and cared for. Those men who were killed in World War II cannot of course fulfill this desire, but we who did return from the service can provide the legislation which will assist these widows and children. I will continue to support the legislation I introduced during the first session of the Eightieth Congress to provide educational benefits to these dependents of deceased servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a fitting tribute to Mrs. Marie Jordan, founder and past national president of the Gold Star Wives of America, 1740 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., which is very ably presented in a feature article appearing in the Vet-Times on April 24, 1948, by Carita Laurence:

(By Carita Laurence)

WASHINGTON.—Twenty-six-year-old Marie Jordan, whose husband, Pvt. Edward H. Jordan, was killed on November 25, 1944, while fighting with a mortar detachment north of Aachen in Germany, has been busy since she was 23 fighting on behalf of the 210,000 widows and orphans of the American men who died in World War II.

The pretty little brunette, 5 feet tall and weighing less than 100 pounds, has big blue eyes, curly brown hair swept up and away from an alert face, and moves and talks quickly, laughing between sentences.

In the living room of her apartment in New York City, she first organized the Gold Star Wives of America in June 1945. Since then the organization has opened a national headquarters office in New York, expanded to 73 cities and has recently opened a legislative office in Washington where Mrs. Jordan is now in charge of pushing legislation on Capitol Hill.

While president of the Gold Star Wives, Mrs. Jordan toured the United States, talking to war widows, finding out what their problems were and planning for the promotion of national schemes to help them. At the end of her trip she conducted a Nation-wide survey of the economic status of war widows and their children.

About 105,000 women in the United States were left widows by the war, Mrs. Jordan says, and about the same number of children were left orphans. However, only half the widows are mothers so that 52,000 of them have an average of two children each to support. "I'm below the average," says Mrs. Jordan, "since I have only my one 4-year-old son, Edward Patrick, to bring up." He goes to nursery school during the day while his mother is working at the office of the Gold Star Wives.

The office was recently opened in a Washington building bought by some veterans with the plan of filling it with veterans' organizations or ex-servicemen setting up their own businesses. Known as the Veterans' Enterprise Building, it is at 1740 K Street NW.

Mrs. Jordan's survey found that the average monthly income of childless widows is $213 because nearly all these women work. But the average income of the widow with one child is $44 less a month—or $169—since 79 percent of the mothers feel that they should not leave their children while they are still very young in order to go out and earn more money.

Present pension pay is $60 a month for the widows, $18 a month for the first child and $15.60 for each additional child. The monthly pension for a widow used to be only $50 and the increase to $60 was one of the congressional measures for which Mrs. Jordan actively campaigned.

Even before the recent opening of the legislative office in Washington, Mrs. Jordan had testified before committees of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. Her little boy accompanied her to the hearings and used to sit beside her in the committee rooms while she urged the Congressmen to provide more Government aid to the wives and children of the men who died in the war.

In May 1946, she flew to Europe to attend the Memorial Day ceremonies at Margatten, Holland, and to survey the United States military cemeteries abroad. "But," she said, "I certainly was glad to get home even though I was gone only 2 weeks. People just don't seem as friendly over there."

Now she is spending her days talking to Senators and Congressmen trying to get revision of the social-security law so that 20,000 war widows will receive social-security benefits now denied them because of the disproportionate length of their husbands' wartime service and their employment before entering the armed forces.

At the same time Mrs. Jordan is lobbying for the extension of GI educational benefits to both widows and orphans. For approximately the same amount involved in the recent subsistence increases granted GI students, Mrs. Jordan claims all the war orphans of World War II could be given 4 years of college education, the cost amounting to about $500,000,000 over a period of 20 years. She sees no reason why the children of the men who were killed should not get the same benefits their fathers would have received had they come back from the war.

She is also pressing for the Federal Government to pay for the training of widows so they may earn a good living to support themselves and their children; 81,750 are interested in training for an occupation. Most of them, she says, only wish to take short courses such as stenography. Half the war widows would like to be able to buy their own home with the help of Government guaranteed loans so this is another measure Mrs. Jordan is engaged in advocating.

The Government is not asked to furnish all the aid required, however, Mrs. Jordan pointed out. Chapters of the Gold Star Wives have organized funds for sending war orphans to summer camps and they are now engaged, under the direction of the national headquarters and Mrs. Jordan's leadership, in raising money for a fund to provide needed medical care to the families who cannot afford to pay for medicine and doctors.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Citizens Committee for Reciprocal World

Trade, relative to a telegram sent in protest to various Republican leaders, by the listed women's groups relative to renewal of reciprocal trade agreements:

Representatives of seven women's organizations today sent a wire of protest to Republican leaders, Mr. Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee; Senator Robert A. Taft, Representative Joseph Martin, Representative Charles Eaton, Governor Thomas E. Dewey, Harold Stassen, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, and Mrs. Robert Macauley received the following telegram:

"On last Friday, Mr. BERTRAM W. GEARHART, Chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee of the House, which started closed hearings today on the renewal of recipropal trade agreements, said in discussing the decision to hold secret hearings:

" 'I can't see that any useful purpose would be served by listening to spokesmen for a bunch of ladies' sewing societies reading statements on the legislation that have been prepared by the State Department.'

"As spokesmen for large women's groups who have previously testified in favor of RTA we deplore that statement, and certainly hope it does not represent the viewpoint of the rest of your party. We do not deny that women sew. We do wish to remind you that women also buy at least 80 percent of the consumers' goods in the United States, that we furnish the manpower which wins wars, and that we also vote. Our witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee have been as competent as any who have appeared there, and need no help in preparing their statements. Even if we could we would not wish to escape our responsibilities as citizens of a democratic country. As such we have protested closed hearings on a subject so basic to international peace as our trade relations with the world.

"Dr. BESSIE C. RANDOLPH,
President, Rollins College; Chairman, National Committee on Legislative Problems, American Association of University Women.
"ANNA LORD STRAUSS,
"President, League of Women Voters.
"Mrs. JOSEPH M. WELT,
"President, National Council of Jewish Women.
"Mrs. ARTHUR FORREST ANDERSON,
"President, National Board, Young Women's Christian Association.
"ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN,
"President, National Women's Trade Union League.
"LOUISE LAIDLAW BACKUS,
"Interim Chairman, Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace.
"Mrs. ANNALEE STEWART,
"President, Women's International League of Peace and Freedom."

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast which was made by me via short wave from radio station WRUL direct from Boston, Mass., to Warsaw, Poland, on May 1, 1948:

To Polish people the world over, May 3 signifies a national observance, the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish constitution 157 years ago. We in America, whether or not we are of Polish descent, pay tribute to the principles of democracy and liberalism embodied in that constitution. Though the constitution of the United States had been adopted but 2 years prior to that of Poland, both documents were inspired by the same love of freedom and were enacted to safeguard that freedom.

The Polish constitution not only obliterated weaknesses within the parliamentary and social system of Poland itself, but served as a forerunner of liberalism in Europe. In 1791 when this document was formulated, Poland was in a state of upheaval and the nations surrounding her—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—formed a powerful bloc of autocratic states. Yet, without internal revolution, the people of Poland, their parliament and their king decided to declare to the world that in their nation the people are the authority—the parliament and king are but the administrative forces of that popular authority. Such a decision set a new mark in liberalism in Europe.

But this assertion of democracy did not forestall the invasion of Poland by foreign powers but 4 years after the establishment of her constitution. The mighty monarchies of Russia, Prussia and Austria invaded Poland, partitioned Poland and destroyed the sovereignty of Poland.

Aggression on Polish soil has been repeated. Invasion by Russia in the nineteenth century is parallel to that of the eighteenth century. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers again consolidated forces in Poland and together, communism and nazism, reduced Poland to a shell of a nation and a mockery of democracy. Totalitarianism has emerged the victor and the Polish people, the vanquished. As in the eighteenth century when the leaders of Poland, who were in power following the nation's conquest by surrounding autocracies, were not representative of the Polish people, so today the leaders in power have not the sanction of the populace. The Warsaw Government, exercising full control in Poland, is a puppet of the Soviet Government and the Polish Government in Exile, now in London, is condemned by Russia. Why? Because that exiled government represents the Polish people's choice. The leaders forming the government in exile well remember the May 3 constitution and its reinstatement is their goal. Since 1946, the Warsaw Government ordered the abolishment of any celebration of Poland's National Day. Instead, the government ordered the observance of the Red May 1.

But nationalism is strong, particularly in the Polish people. On May 3, 1947, Poland saw proof of its nationalism. That day cities were flooded with flags, Polish not Russian flags. Squads of government police were dispatched to municipalities and ordered the removal of the flags. The people refused to obey. And those flags came down only when the police agents themselves tore them down. A similar demonstration of nationalism took place in the ancient, learned city of Krakow, where university students paraded in honor of National Day. Soviet tanks swept through the streets, firing upon the students. Many were killed and wounded.

Evidence of Polish patriotism met with Communist brutality. Should the people of Poland demonstrate their repudiation of Soviet domination this coming May 3, there is little doubt that regrettable reprisals will follow.

The past and present show the success of totalitarian aggression in Poland. But what of the future? Will this success continue? It can only be stopped by checking the Russian trek across the European Continent. Poland is but one nation, deprived of freedom and robbed of sovereignty. Other countries have followed in her path. The result is the continuous increase of Russian strength which in turn is bringing about the division of Europe into two different camps; one the Russian bloc of nations in the east, including Poland which is central Europe; the other, the western democracies.

The Marshall plan for aiding 16 democratic nations in Europe proves that America is fulfilling her promise to help her former allies secure their democratic governments and restabilize their war-battered economies. The recent Italian elections give new promise that an intended Communist sweep across the Continent will be balked. All those opposed to communism, not only in Europe but the world over, rely heavily on America to assume the initiative in preventing communism, from infiltrating and dominating where it is not wanted. Thus America has an international mission—to help free peoples remain free and to safeguard them from predatory neighbors. There is no better time for America to realize her world responsibility than the present. With the coming observance of Polish National Day, the bond between the Polish and American people is strongly felt, not only because both fought for democracy but because both succeeded in giving to their nations a constitution based on freedom and declaring to the world that the principles they cherish will be protected.

Broadcast on Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast made by me over WHDH in Boston, Mass., on May 1, 1948, to commemorate the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791:

Mr. RAMEY. I welcome the opportunity to join in paying tribute to the Polish spirit of freedom which will be commemorated on May 3, the day Poland adopted her democratic constitution in 1791. The bond between Poland and America is strong not only because today there are more than 6,000,000 Polish-Americans in this country, but also because both nations made vast and vital contributions to each other's civilization and to world democracy.

Mr. GROOM. The bond between Poles and Americans is, indeed, strong today. The Poles look to America for help in regaining the freedom lost in 1939 to totalitarian powers, and not Poland alone, but all former democracies of Europe seek this aid from the United States. Action in behalf of Poland would benefit not merely that one country, but central and eastern European nations as well. This action is vital because American aloofness from problems abroad threatens our own economic, political, and social security.

Mr. RAMEY. I agree with you Mr. Groom, that America cannot isolate herself from international affairs, as world wars have proved that the security of one nation means the security of all nations, and that democracy endangered in one nation results in a threat to world democracy. We are much concerned today with rehabilitating Europe and in the theory that a reconstructed Germany with a stabilized economy will provide a sound basis for a stabilized central Europe. Were we as much concerned with peace, we would realize that a peaceful nation should be the pivot of a peaceful Europe. Poland, the largest nation of central Europe, consists of

a basically peaceful people and did she not prove herself important to sound world economy?

Mr. GROOM. Yes, Congressman RAMEY, Poland contributed to the stabilization of world economy, particularly during the period between the two world wars. When countries during that time faced depression and chaos, Poland played a vital part in maintaining international trade on an even keel by her exports to Europe and abroad, of agricultural produce and her imports of goods for manufacture.

Mr. RAMEY. The importance of Poland's economy today can easily be seen if we consider how eagerly and quickly Russia effected a Soviet-Polish economic pact.

Mr. GROOM. What is the significance of this agreement, Congressman RAMEY?

Mr. RAMEY. The significance is not apparent if we consider only the factual statements of the treaty, but these statements must be interpreted in terms of gains and losses for both Poland and Russia. The provisions of the treaty are: First, that Russia grants Poland credit up to $450,000,000 in the purchase of investment goods within a 3-year period, from April of this year until April of 1952; the second provision, that Russia agrees to sell to Poland 200,000 tons of grain on credit also; the third provision, that Russia agrees to build as well as equip the steel mills at Gliwice, located in Silesia, the fertile coal region.

Mr. GROOM. Don't you think, Congressman RAMEY, that these terms clearly and immutably establish Russia as the creditor and Poland as the debtor?

Mr. RAMEY. Exactly, Mr. Groom. Russia allows Poland to purchase goods, machinery to produce those goods, food and steel, but for these favors granted she can demand returns. This relationship has two inherent dangers: (1) The creditor can take as repayment what it wants, that is, material, or labor; (2) the creditor can strengthen itself at the expense of the debtor. Present-day Poland finds her economy disrupted and depleted. On the surface, the economic pact appears an act of disinterested generosity on the part of the Soviet. Poland needs credit and materials and Russia is supplying those needs. However, this aid ties the two nations more closely together.

Mr. GROOM. I should like to add at this point, that Poland is not only indebted but dependent. The European recovery plan only provides for western democracies and since Poland is classified as Communist, she is ineligible for aid under the Marshall plan. Russia has taken advantage of this situation and in turn granted recovery aid to Poland. By extending credit to Poland, does not Russia prevent the Warsaw Government from seeking outside aid?

Mr. RAMEY. Yes, Mr. Groom. Should Poland have negotiated for foreign help—obtained steel, grain, machinery through import, she would have faced the necessity of repaying through coal shipments and coal exported to European nations would prove beneficial to the European recovery plan; thus Russia precludes coal shipments to western Europe, hinders the Marshall plan, yet insures coal export to the Soviet.

Mr. GROOM. I think it important to point out that this credit extended on the part of Russia is not a financial grant, but constitutes surplus goods exported from Russia over the value of goods the Soviet, in turn, receives from Poland. Increased production has resulted in Poland, but we should not overlook the fact that Russia benefits, for the Soviet can successfully demand first call on goods exported and on the amount exported. Not only Poland, but also the satellite nations of eastern Europe are of tremendous economic value to Russia in providing a nearby source of supplies to bolster her economy. These satellite countries are conveniently located along Russia's western border and what is more, are ethnically related to Russia. Has not the Soviet continually emphasized to the peoples of this area that they are ethnically related to her?

Mr. RAMEY. Russia has stressed that eastern nations are bound to the Soviet through the tie of Slavism and that a union of all Slavic peoples without regard for national boundaries would result in mutual advantage for them. Yet, on the other hand, America, too, has an ethnic link with these eastern European peoples. Fifteen million Americans are descended from natives of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia alone. Today peoples of these nations are numbered among the thousands of displaced persons interned in camps in Europe, who would be grateful for refuge in America. Immigration of Poles to America would not mean admitting a people alien to Americans. Did not Poland aid America in establishing her freedom?

Mr. GROOM. Poles came to America as early as the seventeenth century, settling in Virginia, and their descendants migrated eastward and joined the Thirteen Colonies in its struggle for self-sufficiency and freedom. Polish heroes such as Kosciuszko, Karge, and Pulaski were leaders in the American Revolution and the aid of their brilliant militarism helped bring about our victory. They offered their services to America while their national homeland was being invaded by three surrounding autocratic powers—Austria, Russia, and Prussia. This invasion resulted in the dismemberment and partition of Poland, but the ideal of democracy survived. Only with the collapse of these powers in 1918, did the Polish Republic emerge. But the Republic was short-lived, as 1938 brought the German invasion followed by Russian aggression.

Mr. RAMEY. The years of 1938 and 1939 were crucial not only for Poland, but for the rest of the world, for Poland was the first nation to meet the Nazi war machine. She relied on the aid promised by France and England, but to no avail, and alone she withstood the invasion. And the end of World War II did not bring an end to Polish suffering. Again the Allied Nations did not come to her aid, but instead glib promises were made at the conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam for guaranteeing Polish freedom without any concrete suggestions how to make good that guaranty. The Three Allied Powers promised for Poland, free elections, settlement of her boundary line on the west at the Oder and the Dnieper Rivers, greater access to the Baltic Sea and the right of Poles to settle on reacquired territory.

Mr. GROOM. Since the promises made at the Allied conferences were not carried out and Russia has violated the agreements by assuming the leadership of Poland, should not the United States be free from adhering to pacts long since void?

Mr. RAMEY. We have not only moral but legal grounds for no longer remaining bound to compacts of Tehran and Yalta. Russia has violated in spirit and deed the promises to permit free elections, the right of all democratic parties to function, the privilege of such parties to submit candidates. Yet the government which resulted from the elections of January 1947 was not representative of the majority of the Polish people, but of the Communist Party.

Mr. GROOM. One-party rule was the goal Russia aimed to institute in Poland as she had done within her own nation. One-party rule also was the goal for Polish economic and social life. Wasn't this unification powerfully carried through in Poland's agrarian system?

Mr. RAMEY. One of the most revolutionary changes in Poland since Russian domination began, took place in agricultural life. Most of the land in Poland formerly was concentrated into large holdings by a minority of wealthy landowners. Agrarian reforms brought about the dispossession of the landowning classes together with the liquidation of private capital. Any privately owned property now existing is limited to small holdings and privately owned business is likewise limited to small enterprises. The problem of small holdings aggravated by the lack of proper means of cultivation served the Soviet leaders as an instance to point out to the Polish peasants the advantage of farming and marketing collectively. Russia pressed Poland to undertake the collective agricultural system which is the basis of Soviet agrarianism.

Mr. GROOM. Unification not only took place in agriculture, but also in other phases of Polish life. Key industries passed under state control; commerce and finance as well as the labor movement came under government. Also, education and the press passed under state control so that minds would learn only what and how the state decreed. All phases of life are controlled by a single unit and Poland not only has lost her sovereignty but become an integral part of the Soviet system, an unwilling part of totalitarianism.

Mr. RAMEY. Totalitarianism did not end with World War II, nor with the destruction of fascism and nazism. Those were two aspects of totalitarianism and communism is a third.

As communism continues to spread, from east to west of Europe, individual nations become weakened as the Soviet becomes strengthened. The Polish people are keenly aware of this situation and we Americans cannot ignore it. We need only remember that today Poland signifies Soviet conquest and democratic defeat.

Donovan Urges Five-Point Program To Combat Red Subversive War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan and appearing in the Washington Star of May 3, 1948.

Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, an unofficial United States observer of the opening phases of the recent war in Europe, organized even before American entry into the fight in 1941 the now famous Office of Strategic Services. Active in Government service since 1922, he won the Congressional Medal of Honor in World War I, and has since been awarded other American decorations and numerous foreign orders.

An outstanding American, one well qualified by actual experience to know the intent and objectives of communism, and the methods and tactics of the Communists, his views warrant the consideration of all Americans.

DONOVAN URGES FIVE-POINT PROGRAM TO COMBAT RED SUBVERSIVE WAR

(By Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan)

NEW YORK, May 3.—The American people are accustomed to think of war as fought only with military weapons—armies and ships and planes and shooting. But there is a phase of war other than shooting, this is subversive war, and this war is now in progress.

The Soviet Union is waging it not by its Red Army but by the Communist Party of

Russia and its fifth columns throughout the world, against our country, against all other democracies, against all democratic movements.

When President Truman appeared before a joint session of Congress on March 17, he made clear that we do not intend to let Russia dominate all of Europe and he called upon the Nation to prepare for war if the Soviet Union did not heed the warning.

MARSHALL MORE SPECIFIC

Secretary of State Marshall was more specific. He pointed out that diplomatic protests will mean nothing to Russia if she thinks we are unprepared to fight. "Diplomatic action without the backing of military strength in the present world can lead only to appeasement," he said.

Soviet tactics on every question, on disarmament, on the use of United Nations machinery, must be appraised in the light of the Bolshevik conviction that an Armageddon, an ultimate armed clash for the mastery of the world, is unavoidable.

The Russian fifth column is different from the Nazi fifth column. The Nazis had small groups of adherents in the democratic countries, and their espionage apparatus was more limited. Nazism had no real base in the United States.

TRAINED IN MINORITY CONTROL

The Communists fifth column, on the other hand, seeks to identify itself with every social grievance. Russian espionage and subversive operation are made up of trained and skilled spy technicians and intelligence officers, propaganda specialists, experts in the spreading of rumor.

Instruction is planned so that the agent will find it as easy for a minority to operate a labor union, or a pacifist league, or any other such movement, as it is for a minority group to control a large corporation when most of the stockholders take no active interest in the management.

In all countries the Communists stress the tactical importance of the channels of public information. They give strict attention to the development of their own press abroad, popular dailies and weeklies as well as technical Marxist monthly and quarterly journals.

PLAN INFILTRATION

These tactics provide for the infiltration by Communists and sympathizers into radio, movies, book publishing, and even music and other arts. Stress is placed on the seizure of newsprint and printing forms. Special care is taken to develop the Communist control of labor in key industries—industries rated as of special importance either for war making or for disrupting a nation's economy.

All war aims at the surrender of the mind—the conversion of the will to resist into a willingness to accept defeat. To attain this object, the weapons used are not exclusively military; propaganda can also be effective—all means, both moral and physical, tending to convince the enemy that it is better for him to yield rather than to resist.

Steadily the Soviet sneak-up war has eaten into our strength in Southeastern and Western Europe, the Middle East, China, and Korea—wherever our interests have been in conflict with those of Russia. Our bastion of western Europe has been steadily disintegrated by an invasion which we have up to this moment let go by default.

FIVE-POINT PROGRAM

Now that we know Russia's intent, now that we see the pattern of her tactics and understand the significance of her warfare—this is the way we must meet this subversive offensive:

1. We must perfect our intelligence services so that we may quickly unmask Soviet intentions and develop those techniques of unorthodox tactics which World War II has demonstrated to be essential.

2. We must counter Soviet subversive attacks, and help to build resistance in countries Russia attempts to subjugate.

3. We must take the offensive on the psychological front and assist our allies in assembling facilities for getting the truth to the Russian people.

4. We must adopt a firm policy of immediate reprisal against the Soviet Union for every indignity or physical injury or unlawful imprisonment of our men in military service.

5. We must use our economy as a weapon against the Soviet Union and not permit her to use it against us.

AID PLAN NOT ENOUGH

Our real danger lies in the fact that if we permit Russia to outmaneuver us, to seize bases important to us, to penetrate our inner defenses under a strategy of disunity, the day may come when, if we should feel it necessary to fight, we should not be able to get on our feet to do so.

The Marshall plan is vital. But in my view it is not the final solution. We must avoid the danger of regarding it as a kind of economic Maginot line. If we do not support it with other weapons, and if then it should fail, either because of sabotage or for any other reason, this failure would be exploited to our hurt.

In the Marshall plan and its effects, the Soviet Union sees the restoration of the economic and industrial life of a free Europe under democratic governments. It recognizes that this would block the Soviet effort to separate western Europe and the United States.

WAR ISN'T INEVITABLE

I do not believe war is inevitable. Why should the Soviet Union run the risk and uncertainties of a shooting war, when through the chaos of the present peace it can continue to acquire vast territory and an industrial potential?

We must assert our moral leadership and uphold the remaining free institutions of western Europe. Our defense is not solely dependent upon our fleets or our planes or our armies. Our defense is dependent on the belief of other countries that we, as a people, have a vitality of body and spirit upon which they can draw. That is the help we must give them—the spirit to resist while we renew our strength and our skill.

We can't buy our way out of this subversive war. We must force our way out against a resourceful and determined opponent who knows what he wants and is single minded in his purpose.

We have seen in the operations of the Soviet Union that subversive action is made the more effective if there is the threat behind it of a strong, trained, and developed military force. Therefore, to counter such subversive action, we must have such a force.

MUST INTENSIFY RESEARCH

In addition to increasing our naval force and our present ground force divisions, we must intensify our applied research and develop a program in aerodynamics, power plants, and electronics that will make available the most modern piloted aircraft and guided missiles.

We must also have an effective warning system and an adequate defense system of interceptor planes and ground weapons. We must have ready for immediate retaliation a force of combat planes with a range and altitude and speed which will enable them to impose heavy punishment upon any nation that attacks us.

To man and operate these weapons, we must have carefully trained soldiers, sailors, and airmen whose minds and wills can stand the strain. This can be attained only by conscription to meet the immediate danger.

For the first time in our history we see that we are faced with the danger of insecurity. We must not run away from the compelling fact that we shall get security only if we stand up and equip ourselves in a moral and a practical sense to achieve it.

Money-Saving Main Dishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to a constituent:

MONEY-SAVING MAIN DISHES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: The Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture has recently prepared a recipe booklet entitled "Money-Saving Main Dishes," which contains about 150 tested recipes for main dishes that will be welcome in every home and by every housewife.

I am sending your family one of these booklets and I hope the recipes will prove interesting as well as a source of household economy and an aid in the food conservation program for your family.

You will find in this booklet recipes running the gamut of main dishes from such choice morsels as "eggaroni" to "roast turkey quarter," and "Scotch meat patties."

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Member United States Congress.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlanta Constitution of May 3, 1948:

KEEP RECIPROCAL TARIFFS

The Republican Congress pretty soon will have to decide whether to extend the President's authority for making reciprocal trade agreements or again to force the Nation into a shell of relative isolation.

Every international move the United States has made since the war has hinged in some way upon the elimination of as many trade barriers as possible. As a prerequisite to the Marshall plan we asked the participating countries to arrange for freer trade among themselves. We took the lead in international trade conferences which already have resulted in lowering of many tariff barriers. Even the United Nations itself is interested in promoting unfettered trade.

How can this Nation say to others that they should lower tariff barriers if we plan to drop our own program for reciprocating?

The tariff is nothing more or less than a subsidy paid by the consumers for the protection of American industry. There can be little if any objection to preserving home industry that is of critical importance or economically sound. But consumers will object, and strenuously, to paying higher prices in order to afford greater profits, or in order to keep alive an industry which is not economically suited to this country.

Moreover, nearly all economists agree that the only way to assist Europe and the world to recover is to purchase their goods. That is the only way the countries of western Europe ever can repay us for the Marshall plan loan. Commerce never has been a one-way street. If we would sell what we manufacture, we must buy what other nations can produce better or more cheaply than we.

The objectors to continuing reciprocal tariff agreements are chiefly from among the specialized interests. Virtually all big business is in favor of lowered tariffs. The United States Chamber of Commerce likes the idea. The big labor organizations favor it. Some dissent is found among agricultural groups, depending chiefly on whether their products rely on an export market.

The United States has had one disastrous experience with high tariffs. The Hawley-Smoot tariff of the late 1920's virtually choked off our foreign trade, hastening and making more severe the world depression that followed. It should be clear by now that we can no more live in economic isolation than we can live in political isolation.

Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 3, was the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary of Poland's Constitution. Ordinarily, we should be able to join with the Polish nation in celebrating 157 years of freedom under that constitution, but today Poland's condition is tragic. After the long struggle of the Polish people over the years to acquire the constitution, their country has had to bow under the heel of a foreign dictator and the people are living under alien supervision. To me, world history shows no more tragic event than this.

The time should soon come when the democratic nations of the world will insist on total freedom for Poland. Certainly those nations have nothing to be proud of in the condition under which Poland lives. No one with any sense of logic or knowledge of recent history could for one moment say that the agreements at Tehran and Yalta were in the interest of the Polish people, when that nation was not even consulted about the agreements. As a result of those agreements, we see Poland under the Soviet dominated government at Warsaw.

However, we shall continue to celebrate each year the anniversary of the Polish constitution in the hope that the tragedy of Poland will not be forgotten and that the faith of the Polish people in eventual freedom and liberty will be kept alive.

Oleomargarine Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, the vote in the House of Representatives last week to repeal the discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine demonstrated the fact that the American housewife made her voice heard over the powerful opposition of the dairy lobby.

The American housewife who has been fighting the battle of inflation, stretching the family dollar to meet ever increasing costs, has won a victory even though a minor one. The Senate's concurrence in the House action on this measure and final passage will not give any great measure of relief from high food costs. The small reduction in price for margarine that will result from the removal of the tax will make but a few pennies difference in the weekly food bill of the families who use it. It will make a greater difference in relieving the housewife from the burdensome task of preparing and coloring margarine.

I voted to repeal this burden on America's low-income families. I feel that every possible action that can be taken by Congress to alleviate the hardships brought upon the majority of American families by high living costs should be taken as forthrightly as was this step in voting the repeal of the margarine taxes.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I take pleasure in inserting in the RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Santa Fe New Mexican on April 30, 1948, entitled "Proper Federal Function" and dealing with the necessity for prompt enactment of the Federal aid to education legislation now pending in Congress:

PROPER FEDERAL FUNCTION

The House is considering the Senate-approved Federal school aid bill which will, if finally enacted, provide $300,000,000 annually for the Nation's elementary and high schools.

The money, it is intended, will be allocated on the basis of need, with the greater part going to the States that are economically less favored and therefore are unable to provide acceptable educational standards. Southern and Southwestern States will receive the bulk of the money, with New Mexico tentatively slated for about $3,300,000 a year.

While no State will receive less than $5 for each school child between the ages of 5 and 17, some States will receive as much as $28 per child in order to provide as nearly as possible educational funds more nearly equal to what is spent in richer States.

None of the money can be spent for capital improvements, such as building new schools, New Mexico's greatest need in the educational field at this time. The Federal funds would, however, open the possibility of releasing other State funds for building purposes.

The measure has been critized both from the standpoint that it is not a Federal function to provide school aid (although in one form or another this has long been done), and that it is discriminatory in that States which cannot or will not help themselves would be helped by taxpayers in others who meet their responsibilities to the fullest. New Mexico needs educational aid but not because the State has shirked its responsibility. The per capita expenditure in New Mexico for education is exceeded only by South Dakota.

As for the argument that education is not a Federal function, it may be pointed out that the Federal Government now appropriates money for highways, airports, and innumerable other internal improvements. Certainly the raising of the national educational standard is as important to the country as any of these.

The matter of discrimination in the proposed allotment of educational funds should be no more offensive to the richer States than is the system of alloting Federal highway funds which has operated satisfactorily for some 30 years.

Increase Rail Worker's Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has recognized the fact that retired workers are suffering severe hardship as a result of inflated living costs by its passage of legislation increasing the annuities payable to retired civil-service employees.

There is another group of retired employees whose plight is even worse than that of the civil-service annuitants, the retired railroad employees, who are presently forced to subsist on an average monthly annuity of $70. That $70 will only equal half the purchasing power anticipated when the present annuity rates were established.

Congressman CROSSER, of Ohio, has introduced a bill, H. R. 5993, that will provide a modest increase ranging from 20 to 25 percent in the annuity rate for retired railroad workers. This increase is to come from the railroad retirement fund and not from the Treasury, not from the taxpayers. This increase will be possible to accomplish with no increase in the tax rate for the railroads or the railroad employees. Other bills have been introduced in Congress providing for larger increases in the annuity rate than the 20 to 25 percent of Mr. CROSSER'S bill. The Railway Labor Executives Association has wisely given its backing to the Crosser bill. They have based their stand upon the actuarial studies made to determine the fairest increase that could be made in retirement fund, and that would need no additional tax burden on the railroads or their employees to support it.

The real problem facing the retired rail employees must be recognized and they must be given relief. There is no controversy here. Congress has recognized the need for increasing the annuities of retired workers. There is no problem of appropriation of public money or taxation. The problem is apparent, the solution is certain and sound, and the way is clear. These deserving retired railroad workers must be given the fair consideration they are due and that H. R. 5993 will provide.

Atom Renominations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Herald of May 2, 1948:

ATOM RENOMINATIONS

The stupendousness of atomic energy, its newness in results achieved, and its possibilities for the future make it imperative that its development be kept free from politics. There is danger that it won't if certain Republican Senators have their way. With a prospective Republican victory at the polls in November, they wish to tamper with the Truman reappointment of the present five members of the Atomic Energy Commission on the grounds that the new President, when, as, and if, should have the freedom of selection.

Such no-appointment or limited appointment tactics defeated the purpose of Congress a year ago in providing a probationary period of 12 months for the five Commission members in which they should prove their worth. This year is up on August 1. Actually, their service has run a year and a half. The consensus is that in this period, Chairman Lilienthal and his four fellow members have done their work well. On April 20, the President urged their continued service in staggered terms from 5 years for the chairman progressively down to 1 year for the fifth member. This is the post test-period schedule that Congress itself propounded.

The commissioners deserve to have their work weighed on its merits, not on the gamble of November balloting. The Nation, too, deserves the benefits of sustained application to the atom task of the five who have carried it thus far, without the intrusion of man-made uncertainty and doubt to mar the progress.

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the boss on the job of building the first atomic bomb and a physicist, not a politician, is quoted on the danger to atomic projects of uncertainty of personnel and tenure. "They'll all suffer, and some will suffer desperately," he says.

Tht atom bomb had few challengers as the best-kept secret of the war. Atom supremacy rather than absolute hush-hush has characterized the development period since the summer of 1945. Now with defense preparations again a national issue, and with our atomic energy advantages a bone of contention with the Soviet over the months, it is imperative that supremacy be retained. Secrecy is one element in atomic dominance. Sustained effort (which the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has had the chance to supervise) is another. This is no time for tinkering with atomic proficiency or statute. We think the five renominations, under the staggered terms of the law, are in order.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, all patriotic and loyal Americans rejoice in commemorating the 3d day of May as Poland's national holiday. It is altogether fitting that we recall on this day that one of the world's greatest documents of freedom was signed on May 3, 1791, only 4 years after our great document of liberty became the basic law of our land.

As the Representative of a district in which there are many patriotic Americans of Polish ancestry, I join with them in the regret that the aftermath of the greatest war in all history has again placed liberty-loving Poland under the indirect domination of a foreign power. The betrayal of Poland is a sad commentary in world history. The love of freedom and religious liberty is very dear to the hearts of all Polish people. Its record, including our own, is replete with the names of patriotic heroes of Poland or Americans of Polish descent. I refer to Pulaski, whose memory every American reveres, and Kosciusko, the Polish patriot, who, when denied liberty in his own land, came to America to assist the Colonies in their fight for independence.

Today Poland's sons scattered throughout the various parts of the globe and some 250,000 in displaced persons camps, dare not place their feet upon Polish soil for fear of unjust reprisals. In today's Poland which emerged from Tehran and Yalta Conferences, freedom is reported to be nonexistent. The American press and our diplomatic service testify to this fact. As long as this status quo is permitted, as long as the United States does not repair the harm done Poland and other countries similarly mistreated in the Tehran and Yalta secret dealings, until then, there will be no peace in the true sense of the word. Justice demands that Poland be redeemed from the yoke of Soviet domination which was thrust upon her at a time when she was too weak to resist.

I hope the day may soon be near when the light of freedom for which the people of Poland so valiantly fought and died, will again shine over its fair land.

Is a Powerful Air Force Required Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky:

IS A POWERFUL AIR FORCE REQUIRED NOW?
(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

There is general agreement that until the UN becomes effective, a strong America is the surest guaranty of peace.

But what kind of strength should we have?

What we need, to safeguard the peace, is the right kind of strategy, implemented by the right kind of weapons.

The industrial skills and scientific knowledge behind the American strategy must, of course, be kept to ourselves. They are national treasures. But we can afford to let the world know about the over-all strategy.

Realization that America is prepared to fight the most advanced kind of war, on the highest technological level, can only act as a brake on aggressive appetites.

The logical defense for us is one that flows from our own genius. It is inherent in our leadership in technology, our gift for high quality.

A security program based directly on those American potentials could not be matched by our possible enemy in 100 years.

We have a head start.

If war comes, we are likely to confront the Eurasian Continent, with its vast resources and manpower. In terms of quantity, we would be outnumbered.

Common sense dictates, therefore, that we prepare now to circumvent the potential enemy's quantity. We, not the adversary, should dictate the arena of battle and the weapons.

Our superiority in war is the same as in peace, namely industrial technology and in the quality of our people. As a Nation, from childhood, we are used to mechanical gadgets, fast-moving motorcycles, cars, airplanes. We know electronics through radio and television. That is why we must fight a war on the highest scientific levels. That means in the third dimension—with air weapons.

At last people are beginning to grasp a fact which I tried so hard to convey after atom bombs were exploded on Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Bikini: The mere possession of a stock pile of A bombs will not be the deciding factor in a future war.

They are worthless until delivered to the target, the heart of the enemy's war-making set-up.

Of what use would our atomic bombs be if the enemy were able to retain effective control of the air over his territory? Our first job will be to seize the air over his nation while denying him access to our skies. Then we can pound him into impotence at our leisure, with atom bombs or TNT or any other explosive.

Superior means of delivery—the science, skills, and equipment for dominating the air ocean—are even more vital than a sheer atomic stock pile.

Any future conflict will resolve immediately into battle for control of the skies. Unless we are ready to win that battle, atom bombs will not save us.

We are officially assured that our methods of producing atomic explosives will be kept secret. But, logically, it is more important to conceal our know-how in aerodynamics and electronics.

Air strategy fits the character and talents of the American people. It is one that cannot be canceled out by sheer numbers of the teeming hordes of Eurasia.

I advocate that we channel our national wealth and energy overwhelmingly into the air.

Teamwork, a grand American principle, is our strength. But lately its meaning was missing.

Suppose a football coach ruled that no one had a right to score until every player had carried the ball a proportionate number of yards toward the goal. That kind of share-

and-share-alike teamwork will not work in football—nor in national defense.

It appears to me that we devise a team, not to support strategy for victory, but devise the strategy to justify the team.

War's object is to destroy the enemy's industrial capacity. This can be achieved in only three ways:

1. Destroy the enemy's armies, and thus lay hands on his industrial set-up. That we cannot do because we are outnumbered on the ground.

2. Impose a naval blockade to starve the enemy. That is out of the question because Eurasian land mass is fully self-contained.

3. Destroy the enemy's whole industrial complex, his war-making capacity, from the air. That is the only road to victory open to America and peace. We must prepare to travel it without wasting our substance on outmoded strategies and weapons in which we start with two strikes against us.

Fortunately, airpower is the very method in which we are best equipped to maintain superiority.

The fact that we are still preparing for old-style surface warfare, when we should be concentrating on the weapons which bypass the enemy's surface strength, seems to me cause for serious alarm.

When Admiral Nimitz recently compared security set-up to a three-legged stool, implying that each of the three services carries an equal load, he was describing a past that is gone forever. True, we beat Japan on that three-legged principle. But why? Only because Japan was too weak industrially to take advantage of our dispersal of resources.

In a future war, the weight will certainly not fall equally on all services. We need not a three-legged stool but a firm and broad pillar of air power, with the Army and Navy as supporting elements at its base.

The present approach is as if we faced the problem of crossing a river. Our strategy makers are building a bridge, digging a tunnel, providing ferry service, and hopping it with air transport so that each service may cross the river in its own way and get the credit.

We seem intent upon squandering resources to provide for every conceivable sort of strategy—when we ought to devote them to the once-decisive strategy in which we hold superiority and cannot be overtaken by any potential enemy.

I suggest that the members of our national defense team henceforth realize that their greatest contribution to victory may lie in dignified self-restraint. The younger, swifter player—the player whom the enemy cannot match for 100 years—must have the right-of-way in terms of wealth, materials, and labor power.

It is regrettable that propaganda has exaggerated the atomic weapons. It means universal destruction, anyhow, so why bother with strategic thinking and preparations.

If the whole world could be scared to the same degree there might be some warrant for such propaganda. But more backward countries are largely immune to it. The people know only as much as their governments think is good for them.

Thus we only succeed in generating defeatism among our own people by overstressing atomic awfulness.

Let us spread the truth that atomic bombs, though terrible, do not eliminate the science of war. As I have already emphasized, the new explosive is useless unless a nation has superior means of conquering the medium through which it must be delivered—the air.

Our superior technology is not an accident but the product of our political and economic freedom. It is an advantage in which we are ahead of any potential enemy by 100 years. A strategy based on that advantage—on our industrial leadership—can give us a century of peace, provided it manifests itself through a realistic plan in being.

No totalitarian society can compete in quality with free enterprise. To match us on our own technological level, it would have to free its individual creative forces by giving up regimentation and by acquiring an ideology akin to ours. In that case the danger of war would evaporate.

America must recognize that air power is the supreme and decisive weapon of our time and act accordingly.

In its strength lies our last best hope of peace.

Because in its strength lies our guaranty of victory—the great dissuader of any aggressor.

Let America insist on this decisive strength. That they and their children may sleep tonight and a year from tonight—and 10 years and 50 years from tonight—in peace.

American Reds Endorse Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, 32 American writers and artists have gone out against Uncle Sam by directing a letter to the Moscow Literary Gazette stating they favored Russia in the present cold war and accused United States capitalists of killing off free speech.

These American degenerates, so far as their patriotism is concerned, are known left-wingers and Communists, none of them famous, some of them connected with the motion-picture industry. Two of them, after having been brought before the Un-American Activities Committee, have been held in contempt of Congress.

The names signed to the letter which was widely published in Russia are: Nelson Algren, James S. Allen, Herbert Aptheker, Thomas Bell, Walter Bernstein, Alvah Bessie, Marc Blitzstein, B. A. Botkin, Richard O. Boyer, Lloyd L. Brown, Arnaud D'Usseau, Philip Evergood, Howard Fast, Ben Field, Sidney Finkelstein, Barbara Giles, Robert Gwathmey, Charles Humboldt, V. J. Jerome, Meridel Le Sueur, Ray Lev, A. B. Magil, Carlton Moss, Joseph North, Isidor Schneider, Howard Selsam, Samuel Sillen, Raphael Soyer, Ira Wallach, Theodore Ward, Max Weber, and Doxey Wilkerson.

It is unfortunate that these men cannot be sufficiently punished for such acts which so plainly prove their disloyalty to our country. Doubtless if they were living in Russia and wrote such a letter to the American press, they would be shot as traitors. It is too bad that they could not be herded on a boat and shipped to Russia, consigned to live there in that country they seem to like so well for the rest of their lives. However, they remain on high salaries here in America and exert their radical and poisonous efforts to destroy this country where they live like kings compared with the Russian plane of living.

The Congress must at its earliest opportunity enact further legislation designed to stop the spread of communism here. We must destroy communism here, before it destroys our Government.

North Dakota Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not acquainted with the legislation that has been enacted in their behalf by the people of the great State of North Dakota entitling them to various legal rights to benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions which they enjoy.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by Thomas J. McNeese, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans, who, together with one assistant, maintains a full-time office with the Veterans' Administration regional office at Fargo, N. Dak.

The résumé of these State laws is as follows:

BONUS

Ten dollars for each month of active service is paid to certain members of the First North Dakota Infantry who served in the border service under the call of the President, dated June 19, 1916.

A resolution to provide for issuance and sale of bonds for payment of a bonus to World War II veterans was approved by the State legislature. If approved by the voters in the 1948 elections, it will be necessary to enact a law to administer the act.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Owners of cemeteries are required to furnish the adjutant general with a list of veterans' burial places, who must keep such records. Undertakers must show on death certificates any military record.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Disability of minority is waived for veteran or spouse to contract under the GI bill of rights.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting is extended to electors in the armed forces.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Free copies of public records may be furnished for wards of the Veterans' Administration or for veterans or their representatives.

Provision is made for recordation of discharge papers.

County veterans' service officers are created and duties outlined, one for each county.

Veterans' service commissioner has power to inspect confidential records when information is needed by a member of the armed forces or a dependent.

The veterans' service commissioner in the Department of Veterans' Affairs investigates pending claims of veterans and acts as guardian for incompetent veterans. Annual appropriations are provided.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

World War I service is credited in election or appointment to any position or office in State or local unit in which length of service in a particular vocation, profession, or trade is one of the qualifications necessary to election or appointment.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

The sum of $200 per year is made available for any child of a deceased veteran of World Wars I or II between the ages of 16 and 21 years whose father or mother was killed in action or died from wounds or other causes during the period of the war in which he or she served, who died or was declared wholly incompetent thereafter of service-connected disability, who desires to attend the State university, State agricultural college, any State normal school or teachers college, or any State trade school or junior college, and who is unable to attend such institution, school or college without such financial assistance. This financial aid is used solely for tuition, board, room, rent, books, supplies, etc., provided that the child of a deceased veteran shall be admitted to any educational institution maintained by the State free of charge.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

The commandant, subordinate officers, and members of the board of trustees of the soldiers' home must be veterans.

No vacancies may be declared in public offices by reason of absence of incumbents in the armed forces.

Preference is extended to all veterans in appointments in public departments or upon all public works of the State and local units, including State highway patrol.

Benefit rights under the Unemployment Compensation Act are preserved.

Reinstatement in public office is provided upon termination of service in the armed forces.

Reinstatement of officers and employees of the State and political subdivisions following service in the armed forces is provided.

Veterans are granted war-service allowance in the fire or police departments under the Pension Act.

War service is counted as teaching service under teachers' insurance and retirement law.

War-service credit is allowed employees of certain cities under the city-employee pension fund.

GUARDIANSHIP

The Veterans' Administration must be notified of the filing of the annual account of a guardian in cases where the person under guardianship is entitled to benefits from the administration.

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their wives and widows, may be admitted to the soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Compensation of deceased veterans is subject to claim for expenses incurred for treatment at the State hospital, the State school, or the State sanatorium.

LAND-SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

The State land department is authorized to accept bids of returned veterans on sale of original grant lands.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDINGS, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

County commissioners in certain county seats without memorial buildings are authorized to equip rooms in the courthouse suitable for use by veterans.

County commissioners are authorized to construct memorials or other suitable recognition to veterans of World Wars I and II.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Commendation has been made of the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry, composed of officers and men from North Dakota, for its part in driving the Japs from Guadalcanal.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks and building and loan associations may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

A postwar rehabilitation reserve fund for the benefit of veterans has been set up.

Financial aid and assistance is extended to disabled veterans during a period of waiting for relief from the Federal Government or any agency established for the relief of veterans. An appropriation of $125,000 is to expended through the veterans' aid commission.

A veterans' emergency aid fund has been established to provide aid and relief for veterans of the armed forces.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Any disabled veteran owning an automobile under provisions of Public Law 663 of the Seventy-ninth Congress (cars for amputees) is exempt from payment of registration fee with exception of $1 for license plates.

Whenever an employer employs a veteran on-the-job trainee under Public Laws 16 or 346, the premium for workmen's compensation coverage and any compensation paid thereunder is based on a minimum weekly wage of $30.

Land used as a public park or monument ground belonging to any military organization is exempt from taxation.

Resident licenses to hunt, trap, or fish are issued to nonresident members of the armed forces.

Military compensation is exempt from State income tax. Extension of time is granted for filing returns and for payment of tax on nonmilitary income.

Certain nonresidents in the military service are exempt from automobile registration requirements.

Registration privileges are extended to professional engineers after termination of military service.

Barbers' certificates may be restored without payment of fee after discharge from service in the armed forces.

Real and personal taxes are postponed until 6 months after the end of World War II.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Unauthorized wearing or use of badge, button, or insignia of a veterans' organization to obtain assistance is punishable as a misdemeanor.

Armory privileges are extended to veteran organizations.

One representative of a veterans' organization of World War I shall be a member of the Public Welfare Board.

Parade rights are extended to veterans' organizations.

Appointment of the veterans' service commissioner is made from a list of three adopted by a committee composed of heads of certain veteran organizations (USWV, VFW, American Legion, and DAV).

Members of associations composed of veterans are exempt from the prohibition as to the wearing of a military uniform.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted through the active sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

The DAV, which has some 27 chapters throughout the State, maintains volunteer or part-time service officers in each, who extend assistance to veterans and their dependents in their own communities.

The department of North Dakota of the DAV has as its commander C. C. Foster, of Minot, with E. D. Podell, of Cavalier, as his adjutant.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

According to its congressional charter of incorporation, Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active war service in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending June 30) after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an outfit composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department for claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments it has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice must be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

It is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

What Should Be Done To Improve the Panama Canal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN C. SNYDER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting in the RECORD an article, What Should Be Done To Improve the Panama Canal, and the sequel to that article, prepared by an experienced and distinguished engineer of the United States and of West Virginia, Harry O. Cole.

Mr. Cole was resident engineer of the Pacific division of the Panama Canal. He knows the Panama Canal and the problems related thereto. Every Member of the Congress, as well as the public generally, should know of his judgment and conclusions on the proposal to rebuild or improve the Panama Canal.

I urge every Member of the Congress to take the necessary time to read these invaluable discussions.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE TO IMPROVE THE PANAMA CANAL?

(By Harry O. Cole, formerly resident engineer, Pacific division)

Some weeks ago, I prepared an article in reply to one in the Engineering News-Record, of May 1, 1947, by its editor, Waldo G. Bowman, entitled "Puzzle in Panama."

Recent developments in Washington, however, have taken the problem of redesigning the present Canal out of the realm of engineering speculation and have placed it squarely before the American people.

On December 1, 1947, President Truman transmitted to the Congress Governor Mehaffey's report recommending the conversion of the present lock canal to sea-level.

The New York World-Telegram of December 1, 1947 states: "Brig. Gen. Joseph C. Mehaffey, Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, proposed to Congress today that the Canal be converted into an atomic-bomb-proofed, sea-level waterway at a cost of $2,483,000,000."

The New York Times of December 2, 1947, quotes the Mehaffey report to the effect that the present canal "is totally lacking in security to meet the future needs of national defense." The report further holds that, "A sea-level canal would be much less vulnerable to atomic attack than the present waterway, with its system of locks. 'After the explosion of an atomic bomb dropped directly into the canal, traffic could be restored, provided the necessary personnel and equipment were available, within a period of a few weeks, with full allowance for the difficulties involved in removing radioactive debris.' "

It is extremely difficult for me to understand the basis upon which these statements are made. It is well known that an atomic bomb explosion can completely incapacitate, for an indefinite period, any canal, lock or sea-level; not even a direct hit is necessary to effect such a closure. I cannot see, therefore, why the question of the atomic bomb should be raised in a discussion of the relative advantages and disadvantages of a sea-level as opposed to an improved lock-type canal.

On the basis of some 6 years' experience with Isthmian problems, in the building of the present canal, and some 35 years responsible charge of designing, estimating of costs, and constructing of important works, I should like to set forth in a few words my views on this important question.

TO CONVERT TO A SEA-LEVEL CANAL

1. A sea-level canal will, of course, require many long, earthern barrier dams to intercept and divert the Chagres and many smaller rivers and to create flood or storage reservoirs. It has been estimated that some 30 miles of such dams will be required. At least some of these dams will have to be built in and through soft mud swamp bottoms 100 to 150 feet thick in the present Gatun Lake area. In the event even some of these dams were to be ruptured by rocket and other destructive bombs, sections of the sea-level canyon would immediately be flooded and possibly entirely filled up with mud and rock, thus putting shipping out of business for months.

2. At the present time the greatest menace to shipping in the Canal is fog; ground radiation fogs occur almost every night and at least parts of the daytimes during the wet season, from May to December. The fog-bound area is usually confined to the section of about 10 miles between Pedro Miguel and Gamboa, which is the Gaillard cut. A sea-level canal would have to be cut about 90 feet deeper than the bottom of the present Gaillard cut and would reach approximately from Pedro Miguel to Gatun. This would result in creating a fog canyon during the wet season, three times the length of the present Gaillard cut, that would impede shipping far worse than it now is in the lock canal.

TIDES AND TIDAL LOCKS

The difference in amplitude between the tides on the Atlantic and Pacific ends of the Canal of approximately 20 feet would cause a current oscillation of from 5 to 6 miles per hour through the long narrow cut of the sea-level canal four times every 24 hours. This current, to be controlled, would require the construction of a twin set of tidal locks, with gates at least 72 feet high (top elevation at plus 16 and botton at minus 56).

TRAFFIC MAINTENANCE

My personal experience with unpredictable slides and floods in the building of the present canal leads me to believe that to convert the lock canal to sea level and at the same time maintain the present and ever-increasing traffic through it, over the long period of years required to build it, without interruption, would be the next thing to human impossibility. I, therefore, consider the view expressed in the Mehaffey report that only 7 days' stoppage of shipping will be required during conversion, and that for the drainage of the Gatun Lake, is entirely unfounded and in conflict with the experience of those of us who constructed the present canal.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO LOCK CANAL

In view of the obvious impracticability of converting the present lock canal to a sea-level canal, what plan should be adopted for the proper improvement of the present lock canal?

1. Build a new and modern set of three locks in flight and perhaps alongside, a set of three small locks in flight for small ships (taking advantage of, insofar as possible, excavation already made under the 1939 third-locks program) located southwest of the present Miraflores locks.

2. Build required dams and spillway to raise the present 54-foot Miraflores Lake level to the 85-foot level of Gatun Lake.

3. Remove entirely the present Pedro Miguel lock structures and convert the Miraflores Lake into a Pacific terminal basin.

4. Build additional modern locks, presumably, at the location proposed under the 1939 third locks program, located northeast of the present Gatun locks.

5. Make further improvements in the alignment of the Canal channel between Gamboa and Gatun.

These points are substantially in accord with the terminal lake plan.

What benefits would result from the changes here proposed?

These modifications will bring about a reduction of shipping hazards due to (a) fogs in Gaillard cut; (b) wall and bank suction, surges, groundings, and sinking of ships in Gaillard cut; (c) the bottleneck of and the silting up of the Pedro Miguel locks.

Adequate locks and adequate water supply will be provided for expeditiously handling all classes of ships regardless of size, for generations to come.

I am further convinced that not to do these things, would be almost as great a mistake as to build a sea-level canal.

ESTIMATED COSTS AND TIME FOR COMPLETION

It is my considered opinion that (1) to revamp the present lock canal as outlined above, the cost will be from five to seven hundred million dollars (depending upon amount of improvement in the alinement), and the time required to complete, 5 to 6 years; (2) to convert the present lock canal to sea-level, the cost may run anywhere from two and one-half to five billions of dollars, and the time to complete, perhaps 20 years.

SECURITY

With the rapid increase in tempo of inventions, particularly in radar control of aiming, directing, and long-distance delivery of powerful destructive bombs to definite targets, such as the huge soft dams and sea-level canal banks would offer, who is there among us to say that any canal, lock or sea-level, can be made safe or secure from destruction?

CONCLUSION

When there have been revealed the hazards, the huge costs and doubtful efficiency of a sea-level canal as opposed to an improved lock-type canal, I refuse to believe that the American people, the Congress, or the engineering profession will be willing to shut their eyes and take the gamble.

If they do, they would court temporary destruction of the present canal, disruption of the world's maritime shipping, and, possibly, throw our Nation into bankruptcy.

The present lock canal has served our Nation well during two World Wars. If the lock canal is improved as proposed, there would be no danger of shipping stoppage during modification. Such an improved canal will amply fulfill all shipping requirements better than a sea-level canal.

We are already in debt some $260,000,000,000 and are now talking of making a gift of some twenty more billions to rehabilitate the war-torn countries of the world. Under these circumstances, why wastefully and unnecessarily further burden the American people?

HARRY O. COLE,
MORGANTOWN, W. Va., *December 18, 1947.*

SEQUEL TO "WHAT SHOULD BE DONE TO IMPROVE THE PANAMA CANAL"

(By Harry O. Cole, formerly resident engineer, Pacific division)

From the beginning of the history of the Panama Canal, there has never ceased to exist a great desire on the part of some engineers for a sea-level canal at Panama to join the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. There still are those who dream of a Straits of Panama. Count de Lesseps built a sea-level canal across the Suez Desert. He promised France to build a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama. He failed to conquer the two greatest problems, the Continental Divide and the great Chagres River. This failure is a matter of history.

In 1904 the United States took over and after scorching debate decided to build a high-level (85 feet) lock canal. This proved to be one of the most fortunate decisions ever made by this or any other Nation. The United States harnessed the Chagres with a huge dam at Gatun and put it to work supplying water for the lock Canal, and as a result those who built the Canal only had to make a much smaller gash in the great Continental Divide. Both of these monsters must be conquered before a sea-level canal is possible. Almost all studies, reports, and even proposed modifications to the present lock Canal have been distorted, colored by and based on the smoldering hope of certain engineers that sometime a sea-level canal would be built.

Notwithstanding the fact that there is now on record abundant evidence, data, and first-hand knowledge from actual experience in the building of the present high lake lock Canal to show that a sea-level canal at Panama is neither feasible nor practical as to time and cost, on December 1, 1947, Governor Mehaffey submitted to Congress his report, recommending that the present Canal be converted to sea-level at a cost of approximately $2,500,000,000.

The Governor's report shows conclusively, to my mind, that the judgment of those responsible for it has been warped and distorted out of all proportion in the recommendation for the conversion of the present high-level lock canal to a sea-level canal.

Had I not had some 6 years actual experience in the struggle with the behavior of the peculiar formations of the terrain, the slides, fogs, floods, and tides, in the building of the present lock canal, I, too, in all probability, like most of the American people, would not be aware that many of the statements made in the Governor's report are fantastic and basically unsound.

As will be shown later in this article, fundamental mistakes already have been made, and others were about to be made, in regard to this canal, but fortunately were not carried out, and now, in my opinion, if the recommendations contained in the Governor's report are carried out, a mistake of infinitely greater magnitude will be made.

I, therefore, feel it my duty to my country to help bring to the attention of the American people some of the inherent weaknesses in a sea-level canal at Panama. I shall begin by making an analysis of the fundamental mistakes previously made.

MISTAKE NO. 1: PEDRO MIGUEL LOCKS

To my mind, the greatest fundamental mistake made in the design of the present Panama Canal after the United States took over in 1904 was the location of the Pacific locks, and their division into two sets of locks, two lifts at Miraflores and one lift at Pedro Miguel, and the placing of the small 54-foot level Miraflores Lakes between them. Locating the Pedro Miguel Locks directly in the throat of the South end of the Gaillard cut proved to be a great handicap to shipping operation throughout the entire Canal for the following reasons: (a) By creating a bottleneck to shipping; (b) by being the direct cause for surges, wall and bank suction in the Gaillard cut, causing many accidents to occur in the narrow 8-mile channel; (c) by preventing the construction of a ship anchorage basin on the Pacific end of the Canal at the 85-foot level to balance that of the 85-foot level of the Gatun Lake on the Atlantic end of the Canal.

MISTAKE NO. 2 (WAS NOT COMPLETED): THIRD LOCKS AT PEDRO MIGUEL

The fundamental mistake No. 1, of locating the Pedro Miguel locks in the throat of the Gaillard cut, would not have been cured by adding the proposed larger third lock, on the opposite side of Cerro Paraiso as it was planned to do, but on the other hand, would have greatly increased the shipping hazards in the Gaillard cut, due to the surges and curves created by the location of the new lock (140 feet by 1,200 feet). It has been shown that the drawing of water for the present lockages at Pedro Miguel creates surges which pulsate back and forth in the narrow rock-walled confines of the Culebra cut for a distance of many miles. These surges attain a rate of 25 miles per hour, and are extremely hazardous.

Furthermore, the navigational hazards in the Canal would have been greatly increased under the 1939 plan, because the channels connecting the new larger locks would require sharp angles not only in the immediate approaches to the locks, but also in entering Culebra cut.

The present hazards of these restricted waters therefore would have been greatly increased, had the 1939 third locks program been carried to completion.

It is therefore apparent to me that, to have built the third lock at Pedro Miguel would have been a blunder of the first magnitude.

(POTENTIAL) MISTAKE NO. 3: CONVERSION OF CANAL TO SEA-LEVEL (ACCORDING TO MEHAFFEY PLAN)

A great flood in the Panama Canal

Anyone who has read the report of Governor Jay J. Morrow on the Great Flood in the Panama Canal, of October 1923, as published in the Military Engineer (Mar.–Apr. 1924, pp. 100–06), and noted that "It is probable that the inflow into the Gatun Lake in the maximum periods was as high as 250,000 to 300,000 cubic feet per second," cannot but be thankful that a lock canal was built in lieu of a sea-level canal in 1904–1914.

I am sure that had President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of War Taft, and the Congress decided to build a sea-level canal at that time: (a) we would not have had any canal during during World War I, (b) that the Canal would not have been completed before this great flood of 1923; and (c) that the effects of this flood would have been so disastrous as to have destroyed the Canal for many months or even years.

Without further reference to the details of the enormous damage inflicted by the great flood of 1923, which might have been repeated by later floods, let us suppose that Congress authorizes the conversion of the present Canal to sea level, over a long period of years, at a cost of three or four or five or more billions of dollars, and during that long period of construction, other floods similar to that of 1923 should occur. The answer is that they would have destroyed the Canal.

Also, let us suppose that during that long period of construction another war should take place. Heaven forbid that either should happen, but have we any right to proceed on the premise that neither will happen?

Yet we are told in the Governor's report that "a sea-level canal cannot be destroyed by the enemy, nor even by an atomic bomb, dropped directly into the Canal."

I have already stated in my article of December 18, 1947, that, "It is well known that an atomic bomb explosion can completely incapacitate, for an indefinite period, any Canal, lock or sea-level; not even a direct hit is necessary to effect such a closure." Can any man refute that statement?

This is only one of many statements in the Governor's report which cause me to feel that Public Law 280 is not being fulfilled. In his report, the Governor has, in my opinion, grossly exaggerated the benefits to be derived from a sea-level canal over that of a lock-type canal, without indicating any of the disadvantages and, in addition, tried to make it appear that it will be practically atomic-bomb-proof, as opposed to the vulnerability of a lock canal, and for that reason is a military necessity, etc. I consider this report to be so much in conflict with the known facts as to render it untrustworthy and unsound.

My understanding of Public Law 280 is that it was enacted for the purpose of securing for Congress an unbiased report, by the best engineering minds—on the best method of improving the shipping and security conditions at Panama or elsewhere. This I do not consider the Governor has done.

I could point out many other reasons why I feel that this voluminous report should not be adopted, but I shall refrain from doing so at this time.

My great desire, as a member of the American engineering profession, is that, whatever the final decision, for Panama or elsewhere, with regard to the Canal, it will prove to have been a wise decision and not another mistake.

CONCLUSION

It seems to me that from the very beginning of the building of this Canal, all thinking has been colored and distorted by the desire of certain engineers to build a sea-level canal. The tides alone, with amplitudes differing greatly at the two ends of the Canal with a range of 20 feet at Balboa and 2 feet at Colon, stymie that desire, requiring a huge, cumbersome tidal-lock-control system, possibly more vulnerable to attack in wartime than the present locks, with the Canal still, in fact, not a sea-level canal.

This important Canal problem is yet far from having been thoroughly thought out to its final conclusion.

Why not lay aside all the past illusions and desires and place this problem in the hands of a completely independent, interoceanic canals commission composed of experienced canal engineers of the highest caliber, who can be depended upon to render an unbiased report and, once and for all, settle this vitally important question?

In my opinion, the bill which Congressman WILLIS W. BRADLEY, on January 6, 1948, introduced in the Congress (H. R. 4833) will, if carried out, furnish the final solution.

HARRY O. COLE.

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., *January 26, 1948.*

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGIA L. LUSK

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a telegram from the New Mexico division of the American Association of University Women representing the views of 650 women urging passage of H. R. 2953:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *May 2, 1948.*

Hon. GEORGIA LUSK,

House of Representatives:

One hundred twenty-four members of the American Association of University Women, assembled in State convention representing 650 members urge with all possible emphasis that H. R. 2953 be reported out of committee placed before the House and voted on at an early date. We feel that this is an essential matter for international as well as domestic security.

Mrs. DAVID SWANSON,
State Secretary, New Mexico Division, American Association of University Women.

The Handwriting on the Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, according to BLS—Bureau of Labor Statistics—the CIO steelworkers' unions have 1,860 local unions. The United Electric Workers have 1,180 local unions. The United Public Workers' unions have 455 local unions. None of these unions have filed the anti-Communist affidavits.

THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed over the President's veto on June 23, 1947.

On February 11, 1948, the National Labor Relations Board ordered a decertification election to determine whether a group of employees still wished to be represented by a union that had not complied with the non-Communist affidavit and registration requirements of the Labor-Management Relations Act.

It was the first time the Board ruled on the application of the new law's decertification provisions—section 9 (c) (1). It was also the first time that the Board directed that the name of a noncomplying union be placed on any ballot. The union involved was the United Steelworkers of America—CIO.

Upon a petition filed by Arthur Hays Howard, an employee of the Harris Foundry & Machine Co. at Cordele, Ga., the election was ordered to be held in the plant within 30 days. The plant had 248 employees.

This election was held on March 4, 1948, and 198 valid votes were cast. Of this number 138 voted against the United Steelworkers of America and 60 voted for it. On March 16, 1948, the National Labor Relations Board decertified this union as the representative of the employees.

It seems to me that this is fair warning to some labor leaders that they must either conform with the requirements of the Taft-Hartley Act or else answer to their membership. No labor organization can be certified by the National Labor Relations Board as the representative of employees, nor can it secure a union-shop agreement, nor file a complaint with the Board against any employer unless it has prior thereto filed with the Secretary of Labor, "in such form as the Secretary may prescribe" certain organizational data and a financial report of its receipts and disbursements.

In addition, each officer of every local, and of the national or international labor organization with which it is affiliated, must have filed with the Board a non-Communist affidavit before it can be certified as the representative of the employees in any plant, secure the benefits of a union shop or have the right to file a complaint of unfair labor practices against an employer with the National Labor Relations Board—Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, section 9 (f) (g) and (h).

Official figures by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, based upon union figures, show that the American Federation of Labor has 104 internationals, 42,115 locals in the United States, and 7,200,000 members; the CIO has 37 national unions, 9,150 locals in the United States, and 6,000,000 members—claimed; and the independent unions have an estimated membership of 2,400,000.

On April 30, 1948, the Labor Department advised that 76 of the 104 international unions and 10,519 of 42,115 locals of the American Federation of Labor had complied with the Taft-Hartley Act by filing statements with the Secretary of Labor; that 23 of the 37 national unions and 1,633 locals of the 9,150 locals of the CIO had complied; and that 761 parent organizations of independent unions, having one or more subsidiary organizations, and 1,317 locals have also filed with the Secretary of Labor.

On May 3, 1948, the National Labor Relations Board reported the following statistics of full compliance with Communist-affidavit requirements — section 9 (h)—of the Taft-Hartley Act:

As of May 3, 1948

1. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

(A)	Number of unions:	
	AFL	83
	CIO	28
	Independent	40
	Total	151
(B)	Number of officers:	
	AFL	1,054
	CIO	223
	Independent	491
	Total	1,768

2. LOCAL UNIONS

(A)	Number of unions:	
	AFL	5,806
	CIO	886
	Independent	1,230
	Total	7,922
(B)	Number of officers:	
	AFL	53,652
	CIO	8,569
	Independent	10,808
	Total	73,029

Of course, I realize that there are some labor leaders who feel that they are so big and powerful that they can thumb their noses at Congress and ignore these provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am in favor of letting these big shots wait until their membership dehorn them.

But when it comes to the Communist-dominated unions, such as the UEW and the UPWA, I favor a thorough investigation of their local and international officers and finances to assist the decent element in these unions to free themselves from Communist control.

Archbishop Stepinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, the crime against freedom and liberty perpetrated by the Yugoslav Government by the trial and imprisonment of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac has gone unnoticed by our Government long enough.

The subsequent beating, jailing, and killing of priests in Yugoslavia and other Communist-dominated countries prove conclusively, as was contended at the time of the archbishop's trial, that the offense against him was part of the Communist pattern and plan to restrict religious freedom everywhere.

The United States has rightfully assumed world leadership in championing the cause of human rights and fundamental freedoms. It is time the United States initiated action to bring about the release of Archbishop Stepinac.

The Committee for the Liberation of Archbishop Stepinac of 75 Lewis Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., has submitted to me a resolution adopted unanimously at their

recent meeting held at the Academy of Music, Brooklyn, N. Y., which I commend to the Congress:

RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING THE RELEASE OF ARCHBISHOP STEPINAC

Whereas in the summer of 1946, the public sentiment of the world was shocked by the arrest of Most Rev. Aloysius Stepinac, Archbishop of Zagreb and Roman Catholic Primate of Croatia, which was followed by a farcical political trial on charges of collaboration, and his condemnation to imprisonment at hard labor for a term of 16 years; and

Whereas since that date the Yugoslav Government has kept the archbishop a prisoner in close confinement, depriving him of all opportunity to exercise his ecclesiastical functions, to practice his civil rights, and even to attend the funeral of his mother; and,

Whereas this action, coupled with the killing of hundreds of priests and nuns, the seizure of religious property, and the suppression of the religious press, points to an organized campaign to exterminate organized religion, and especially the Roman Catholic religion, because of its unflinching opposition to atheistic communism; and

Whereas the other nations of the world, individually and collectively, have failed to take any effective steps to remedy this glaring injustice, despite their professed adherence to ideals of religious and civil freedom: Be it therefore,

Resolved, That this mass-meeting of American citizens, assembled in the Academy of Music in Brooklyn, N. Y., on this 15th day of March 1948, representing organizations with a membership of over 200,000, hereby protests the silence of our Government in this vital case; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand the adoption by the present Congress of the resolutions introduced therein by Representatives ROONEY, POTTS, ROSS, and KERSTEN, providing for official action by our Government and by the Security Council of the United Nations, in accordance with the provisions of its Charter, to condemn these actions by the Government of Yugoslavia as violations of freedom, and a threat to the peace of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask the national political parties to adopt, at their forthcoming national nominating convention, resolutions pledging themselves to nominate candidates for national offices who will work for the early righting of this monstrous injustice; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn all attempts to prevent the putting of pressure on the Yugoslav Government under the pretext that this would be a violation of its internal sovereignty, as being direct invitations to totalitarian depotisms to tyrannize over their freedom-loving subjects without fear of reprisal or punishment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be furnished to the press, to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, to the Members of Congress from this area, to the American delegates on the Security Council and on the UNESCO body of the United Nations, and to such other officials as are in positions to contribute to the liberation of Archbishop Stepinac.

Taft-Hartley Act on the Credit Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Beaver Dam (Wis.) Daily Citizen:

ON THE CREDIT SIDE

The full report of the Congressional Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations—watchdog committee for short—puts the committee's O. K. on the Taft-Hartley Act, which it describes as functioning successfully.

Because the majority of the committee favors the law, no efforts to change it have been made during the present session of Congress. If the strike picture for the remainder of the year indicates that the law needs strengthening, the job probably will be inherited by the next Congress.

In spite of the wails which are still coming from President Green, of the AFL, President Murray, of CIO, and various other union leaders, there is plenty of statistical evidence at hand to warrant the conclusion that the law is working to the advantage of labor, management, and, most of all, the American public.

It is a matter of record, for instance, that there has been a decline in strikes as a result of the provisions which require a 60-day notice of disputes and which make secondary boycotts illegal. That is the public's gain.

Labor has strengthened itself in popular esteem by the elimination of some Communist sympathizers from official positions. The profit to management comes from the greater security it enjoys as a result of its right to sue for damages when contracts are violated by the unions.

All these are majority judgments and, of course, will make no impression on irreconcilables like Green and Murray. But backed up by figures as they are, they give the law a respectable credit rating.

Scout Education for Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Scout Education for Citizenship," delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, at Wheeling, W. Va., on April 27, 1948, before the Boy Scout Council for that area.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOUT EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP

In a way, it may seem somewhat presumptuous for me, from outside your Scout movement, to undertake to talk tonight about scouting to you, who are experts. Any Tenderfoot Scout can tie a knot better than I can. Yet, on the other hand, it might be valuable for you to get the point of view of an outsider like myself, on why the youth of this country needs the kind of education the Scout program is giving.

Although I may be an outsider as far as your Scout organization is concerned, I am very much of an insider when it comes to the boys you are seeking to serve, and our country, which will ultimately benefit because of the training your Scouts are receiving.

You, too, in this group, are concerned about our country and our boys, because certainly you would not have left your homes and come together on this occasion, busy men and women, to give your service and your time, unless you were thoroughly convinced that boys need some special kind of education if they are to grow up right, and that the Boy Scouts of America is the agency to give it to them.

The other day someone asked me what I thought of the world outlook. I replied, "When I look on the older generation, now so largely in power, the generation to which I belong, and reflect on the problems which have been ours, and the crises we have met successfully, the present uncertain future of all peoples—all things—my heart is heavy. But when I fix my attention on a group of boys, the new generation, my heart leaps with faith and hope."

I do not need to dwell upon the situation throughout the world today. Wiser and better-informed people than I are filling the air waves and pages of newsprint with their comments and their predictions. Misunderstanding and suspicion and tension burden the peoples of the earth.

But there is one thing on which we can base our confidence and our hope of a better day to come, and that is our young people. Think of the unexhausted energy of youth. What boundless vitality and enthusiasm and devotion are wrapped up in boyhood. Consider the average American boy. Think of his unspoiled powers. The agility of his muscles. The quickness of his eye, his ear undulled, his curiosity keen, his memory sharp, his unspoiled emotions ready to admire, and his willpower to be directed.

But think, too, how easily he is affected by the influences that we offer him. Bad influences, all too often. Statisticians tell us that the average age of the men who are inmates of prisons and reformatories is 26, or even younger. And even more serious is the fact that five-sixths of these young men had the seeds of weakness, that later caused their downfall, cast across their character in the period of their boyhood or early youth. This has tremendous significance to you and me and all who are interested in the future welfare of our country.

But, thank God, boys are even more easily affected by good influences than by bad. I have known and talked with many young people personally, in the course of my lifetime of experience, and the result justifies me in going on record to say that boys are far more responsive to high and noble ideals, than to those forces which are demoralizing, provided the ideals are presented in a way that the boys can understand, and that appeal to them as worth while.

I cannot understand the person therefore who is not aflame with enthusiasm for an organization and a program that is designed to do both these things. You men and women here tonight are acting on behalf of the Nation's chief asset—boyhood. When you reach a man you are dealing in addition, but if you reach a boy and line him up with the forces that make for decency, law and order, and good citizenship you are dealing with a multiplication table. Tonight you are dealing with the fate of the coming years.

I would like to ask you what you feel makes a nation great. More extent of territory does not contribute greatness. Russia has more square miles of territory than any other nation on earth. Nor does volume of population indicate greatness. China has the numbers, some four hundred million. But that is not what constitutes the greatness of the Chinese people. Nor does the volume of public or private wealth or of natural resources constitute true greatness. Am I not right when I say that neither education nor technical training by itself make a nation great? Germany was one of the best trained nations of modern times. Education and training build armaments and teach people to be skillful in using weapons, but that is not greatness. No, the real greatness of a nation is its people. It

is their ideals, their character, their spirit that makes it great. And these are determined largely by the influences that we bring to bear on the boys and girls, the youth of our country. What America, this land we so much love, will be 30, 40, or 100 years from now depends pretty much upon what is happening to those boys who are shooting marbles in the streets and lanes of our cities and villages, right now.

Democracy is always on trial. Every epoch is a critical epoch for the world and for the individual country. What makes one period more successful than another in our history, and all history proves it, is that in one period we raise up a more unselfish and patriotic group of citizens than we do in another. That is the great difference. There are always problems, important, tremendous. One of the great needs today, in my opinion, is not merely to teach boys skills for this trade or that profession, but to give them a firm background of those things which will make them strong, intelligent, capable, unselfish and honest citizens. That is what we need today.

Do not make the mistake of thinking that we can leave this tremendously important responsibility to the schools. Mere schooling is not education. Our schools are doing a grand work under great handicaps. But whereas a boy is influenced by his school for a few hours daily during a few years of his life every other experience of his life is also an educational experience, and often the most vital part of his education, for better or worse, is received outside of his school.

Of course, one of the boy's great educational experiences which affects his entire life is his home. It is a fact that most young men who get into trouble with the authorities had bad conditions at home when they were boys. The value of a good home is impossible to estimate.

The church should be a major factor in a boy's education. Unfortunately, often it isn't. They tell me that nearly half of the boys in America do not have any church affiliation. To any serious-thinking person that is a terrible indictment of the parents of those boys. Religion should be a compelling force in the life of every adult or youth. If a boy is handicapped by the lack of religious training his whole later life may be warped. One reason why I am strong for the Boy Scout movement is that it emphasizes the importance of religion in a boy's life. Every boy needs to be taught that if he is to be rewarded in the world to come he must do two things in this life; he must honor the divine command, which is, "Love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, thy whole soul and thy whole mind." Then he must do something else; "And thy neighbor as thyself."

This is the basis of your twelfth Scout law which says, as you are all aware, that a Scout is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties and respects the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion. I wish that could be a law not only for Boy Scouts but for every citizen in the United States. There would be no bigotry; there would be no intolerance; we would hear nothing of racial persecution. No government is greater than the religious convictions of its citizens. No godless country can hope to endure.

It seems to me that some of the problems that face us today are rooted in lack of character which is the essence of any religion. The forces today which make possible our great army of criminals and make some of our people an easy prey to subversive propaganda are public apathy, lack of interest in honest law enforcement, and public laziness concerning the power of the ballot. Good politics is a great and beneficial thing. But corrupt politics is a criminal thing and breeds criminals.

The past 30 or 40 years have seen the development of many agencies to give boys and girls something positive in the way of training, to equip them for their responsibilities as citizens. For the most part, their aims and programs seem to me admirable. The Boy Scouts of America is one of these which I value highly because it is set up in a way that is typical of our democratic way of life.

When we strip down to the essentials we find, do we not, that what we here in America value more than anything else is our free institutions and our representative, democratic government. The Boy Scouts of America is one of the most thoroughly American institutions that I know of. In the first place, it is a voluntary organization. The boys join because they want to. It depends on the action of the American people as citizens in their private capacity, not on Government action. Next, it is open to all boys, of every race and religious belief. Then, it is run by the boys themselves. They have their own boy leaders, learn their own scouting, and stand on their own feet. They learn how to do things for other people instead of waiting to have other people to do things for them. This develops the kind of men who will insist upon democracy and all that goes with democracy—free speech, free press, respect for the convictions of the other fellow.

Now any program of training that we offer boys has got to be something they like, or they won't take it. It has to be based on something that they enjoy doing, and more than that, that they think is worth doing. Every boy has a yearning to be an adventurer, to stand out among the rest of the gang as daring and skillful. A lot of kids get into trouble with police for misdemeanors that have their foundation in nothing more vicious than a desire to show off. Give them a chance to prove their skill in something more constructive and their need for adventure will be satisfied.

For instance, there is the case of a Boy Scout from my own New York City, not so long ago. It seems that on a hot day he went over to a public beach in New Jersey to go swimming. The water was very rough and the undertow was strong. But at the time that this Scout, whose name was Bob, was taking his swim, there were plenty of others enjoying the water. Apparently, two men got further out than they realized; suddenly they were hundreds of yards from shore and unable to get back because the waves were mountainous and the undertow was pulling them out, strong and hard. They shouted for help. Bob was on shore and heard them, and immediately this boy, 13 years old, dove into the water and swam out to their rescue. One of the men he rescued weighed about 170 pounds, and he struggled in his terror when the Scout reached him; but the Scout knew what to do, for he had learned something about life saving in his troop. He kept out of the man's way and finally managed to get him in what they call a "chin carry" and towed him to shore. But the Scout did not stop there. He borrowed a coat from one of the women on the beach, spread it on the sand and laid the man on it. He gave him treatment, and back he went to help the life guards who had gone out to rescue the other victim.

For this, the boy got a gold medal and the eternal gratitude of two men and their families. Now, no boy who has the training and the skill to do something like that is ever going to be satisfied with the cheap or vicious diversions offered by the streets of New York City. He's got something wonderful to do.

Another thing I feel is valuable in the Scout scheme of organization is that it teaches boys to do things together. There's no effort to develop prima donnas; instead, the emphasis is placed on the group. The small group works as a team under its own boy leader. The Scout troop camps play and work together. We need a lot of that teamwork in this country. There is a tendency on the part of some leaders and some groups to try to play solo. We all need to get together and pull together for the good of all of us. The time to learn that life has to be a give-and-take affair, with the emphasis on the give, is when we are young. In a Scout troop the boy can't help but get the habit.

In the Scout troop the boy has companions of his own age, who take part with him in wholesome activities. The influence of good companions on the growing boy is well known. But in your organization the boy has even more. He is brought under the leadership of upright, unselfish, idealistic men, men whom he must respect because they know how to do a hundred things that he thinks worthwhile, such as building a fire in the rain, setting up a tent, or taking a hike by compass. Good companions and good leadership are an important part of education for citizenship.

I like to think of the more than a million and a half boys in your organization who day by day, as they steadily approach manhood, are being educated for the responsibilities of citizenship in a democracy. In a few short years, we of the older generation must turn over to them the management of this Nation's affairs. From their ranks will come the executives, the businessmen, the scientists, the legislators, the governors. I have no doubt that somewhere in your vast organization perhaps, who knows, among the Scouts of your council, there's one who will some day be President of the United States.

It is a solemn responsibility which you men face as leaders in this great movement for training youth. You dare not be mediocre in your efforts. You are dealing with the greatest generation our country has ever known. We can safely trust the situation to their hands if we equip them for the task ahead We see in these great tides of youth capacities of vision, of heroism, of adventure, and of sacrificial devotion that, with the help of God, will make it possible to meet the supreme demands of their day.

Proposed Revision of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the necessity for revision of the United Nations Charter, delivered by me in New York City yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States is faced with the dilemma either of conquering the world or conquering war. Only through revision of the UN Charter is there the slightest hope of conquering war.

The United Nations under its Charter has demonstrated its inability to cope with the problem of maintaining world peace. Frustration and panic are its achievements to date. Hate has displaced hope in the world, and fear has supplanted confidence. Due to its impotence, world unity has disintegrated into two bristling armed camps ready to strike. War is on everyone's lips.

Palestine, a relatively insignificant issue has revealed the tragic weakness of the Char-

ter and proved its utter failure. Instead of bold action, solid integrity, and strength, we witness indecision, legalistic nonsense, and the wringing of hands. We are experiencing the most pitiful demonstration of vacillation since the League of Nations gave birth to World War II.

Three fundamental changes in the Charter are indicated:

(1) The elimination of the veto right in the Security Council, but only in matters of aggression and armament for aggression specifically defined;

(2) The elimination of the present back-breaking armament race by providing world-wide control and inspection of atomic energy and a quota limitation on the production of all other important weapons;

(3) The elimination of aggression and international misconduct by creating an international police force backed up by the armed forces of the member states.

The adoption of these changes in the Charter does not mean the scrapping of the present United Nations. All of its constructive provisions would remain intact. The object of revision is to strengthen the United Nations in the field of security where it has notably failed. We must give it a stronger arm to deal with aggression and preparation for aggression, and we must provide it with a world judge and a world policeman to enforce its decisions.

Article 51 of the United Nations Charter seems to be all things to all men. Under it we promote regional military pacts and we create political blocs directed against Russia, and at the same time we sit with her at the counsel table and give lip service to world unity. We justify this contradictory action as being well within article 51. Pretense is not a virtue. If the United States and Russia are determined to slide into world war III, article 51 provides a convenient lubricant to grease the skids.

The chief objection leveled at revision is that Russia will not accept it. This is by no means certain. Russia insists she is primarily afraid of war instigated by the capitalistic powers. A revised Charter would guarantee Russia, as well as all other member states, against the launching of the rapidly developing preventive war which today is just around the corner. Furthermore, through the quota limitation on armaments, Russia would achieve military equality with the capitalistic democracies. What could be fairer than this?

However, let us suppose that Russia flatly refuses these revisions. Does this mean that the United Nations must remain weak and impotent while the armament race gathers speed? Indeed, it does not. In that case, the United States and other like-minded states reluctantly would go ahead without her and set up a mutual-defense organization in accordance with article 51 of the Charter. This organization, comprising about four-fifths of the earth, would be so strong that Russia could not possibly compete with it. Sooner or later she, too, must join.

Since it ought not be our policy to fight first and reason afterward, we should offer Russia revision as our own last-ditch ultimatum before we start the dropping of atomic bombs in the preventive war which is now being seriously discussed.

I refuse to believe that any great people do not yearn for an honorable settlement of all international differences on the basis of justice, decency, and fair play, but if Russia plans otherwise, the sooner we uncover her perfidy the better. If Russia turns her back on the protection which revision affords, she will put the world on notice to countercheck her every move.

Those who resist revision are playing with fire and are assuming a terrible responsibility. If they alone might starve and freeze and bleed and burn it would not be quite so bad, but millions must pay with their lives for the stubborn folly they now pursue.

Address by Hon. Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, at a Meeting of Michigan Commercial Secretaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand an extract from remarks made by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] before a meeting of the Michigan Commercial Secretaries in Washington, D. C., on April 26. I think these remarks are right to the point and relate to one of the vital subjects being considered by the American people. Therefore I ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Another thing in which you are greatly interested, I am sure, is communism in America.

Why are you concerned with it? It is not because you expect that Communists will take over the Government and we will adopt communism as our form of government. We do feel, however, that Communist members or fellow travelers, working in our policy-making departments, affect our Government policies and by sabotage may weaken our Government and affect our national lives.

If we do get into a war with the Soviet Union, then we might expect real and serious trouble through Communists in key positions in American industry and Government.

The Nazi fifth column was composed mostly of aliens and people of one nationality. This is not true of the Communists in this country. Many of them are citizens; they are of all nationalities, and often American-born. That is why we have more to fear from them than we did from the bund.

Communism is not a "political party." Attorney General Francis Biddle on May 28, 1942, made a finding in the Harry Bridges case that the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is "an organization which believes in, advises, advocates, and advances the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

We can assume that the Attorney General had information in the files of the Department of Justice from which he could make such a finding. He was a lawyer and had been a Federal judge. Therefore, it is to be presumed that he was drawing a conclusion from facts.

If Mr Biddle's findings were true, it would appear we have a Federal law since 1940, prohibits communism in America.

Section 10, title 18, of the Criminal Code provides it shall be unlawful for any person—

"(1) To knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence, or by the assassination of any officer of any such government. * * *

"(3) To organize or help to organize any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage the overthrow or destruction of any government in the United States by force or violence; or to be or become a member of, or affiliate with, any such society, group, or assembly of persons, knowing the purposes thereof."

Let us assume that the facts Attorney General Biddle had are now in the Attorney General's files. I suggest a test case against the National Secretariat, which consists of two members, the 12 members of the National Executive Board, and the 50 members of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States.

If such a case were successful, it would have the effect of (a) making the Communist Party in America illegal; (b) it would destroy many of the Communist-front organizations which plague us; (c) those who claim to have innocently joined such an organization would actually see the red flag; (d) it would seriously affect the raising of money in this country by the Communist Party; (e) it would have the effect of forewarning all in America that if they knowingly join, they, too, were violating the United States law and could be criminally prosecuted.

Here we have had a law since 1940, we have had evidence in the files of the Attorney General's office since 1942. Why has no action been taken by the Attorney General? Isn't it time for action rather than just for the collection of evidence?

The Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Need Something Stronger Than Law," which appeared in the April 24, 1948, issue of Collier's magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED SOMETHING STRONGER THAN LAW

When President Truman called recently for a lot of civil-rights law—antilynch, anti-poll tax, anti-Jim Crow, etc.—either he stirred up a true hornets' nest down South or (as seems more likely at this writing) he only handed southern Democrats a promising chance to make a husky bid for restoration of the two-thirds rule at the next Democratic convention.

What's the truth about this civil-rights question, anyway? It fans up the fiercest passions, and it traces back to the first hope-he's-still-burning-in-hell scoundrel who kidnaped the first Negro from Africa for slavery in the American Colonies.

It seems to us that most Americans who do any thinking and arguing on the subject are at one and the same time right and wrong.

Northern intellectuals, who make southerners see red with their continual nagging at the South and their demands for Federal civil-rights laws, are surely right in principle. Lynching is a foul crime. Poll taxes are unjust when they keep any one group of people from voting. Jim Crow cars or trolley and bus sections are discriminatory. It is

unfair to freeze Negroes out of good jobs for which they could qualify. And so on.

On the other hand, we think southerners are only telling the truth when they insist that Federal laws will never succeed in wiping out these injustices. It is axiomatic that no law, however well meant, can work unless it is supported by the majority of the people it affects. Northern intellectuals should know this fact of life from the Nation's experience with Federal prohibition.

Well, both sides having a measure of right and a measure of wrong in their arsenals of argumentation, is there any discoverable factor that swings the scales one way or the other? We think there is.

That factor is the unquestionable truth that the Negro's status in the South is getting better every day. He is some 90 percent better off economically than in the early years following the Civil War. Lynching is sliding toward the vanishing point. As for social equality, most Negroes apparently don't want it anyway, since they have their own social organizations to satisfy their fraternal, religious, snobbish, etc., instincts.

Federal laws didn't work these improvements. They have come about solely because they have been stimulated by the most substantial and respected people among the southern whites. They would have come a good deal more slowly, we think, if Federal laws had forced Mr. Whiskers to keep his nose eternally stuck into southern affairs.

If all this is as true as we're convinced it is, then it follows tht the best way to solve what remains of the Negro problem is to go on just about as we've been going since around 1870. That would mean: Let the northern intelligentsia howl its collective head off about the South. Let southern and northern politicians make what political capital they can out of the question, but don't saddle the Federal Government with a bunch of laws which it cannot enforce. In other words, let the South work out its Negro problems mostly on its own—which it is doing anyway, and we think will continue to do.

A Policy for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, our citizens are aroused, as never before, to the necessity of adherence to a policy which will eliminate war and will make for enduring peace. As typical of this awakened and intelligent interest by outstanding citizens, I might mention a communication I have received from Judge Jacob M. Moses, a citizen of sterling worth of Maryland. He sent me, with approval, a statement from the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists of Princeton entitled "A Policy for Survival." In order that many others may have the opportunity to read and digest this pronouncement, I request unanimous consent to insert the statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POLICY FOR SURVIVAL

"No one has the right to withdraw from the world of action at a time when civilization faces its supreme test." (A statement by the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists.)

I

Two years ago this month the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission was in process of formation. Now the discussions on international control of atomic energy are about to be adjourned indefinitely, perhaps never again to be resumed. One of the most fateful events in history has passed almost unnoticed. Its importance must be realized: its lesson for mankind must be made clear.

To clarify the importance of the collapse of these discussions, we reiterate here our six-point statement, published originally on November 17, 1946:

1. Atomic bombs can now be made cheaply and in large number. They will become more destructive.

2. There is no military defense against atomic bombs and none is to be expected.

3. Other nations can rediscover our secret processes by themselves.

4. Preparedness against atomic war is futile, and if attempted, will ruin the structure of our social order.

5. If war breaks out, atomic bombs will be used and they will surely destroy our civilization.

6. There is no solution to this problem except international control of atomic energy and the elimination of war.

Every scientific development in the intervening 17 months has supported the accuracy of this statement. Yet the negotiations by which international control of atomic energy was to be achieved have collapsed.

II

This is a time for taking stock of reality and facing up to the facts. The most salient fact confronting our civilization is that the hope of one world is frustrated. Today two hostile worlds are in full contest: The eastern bloc headed by the Soviet Union confronts the western democracies.

Three possible lines of policy are emerging in the West:

1. The first policy is that of the preventive war. It calls for an attack upon the potential enemy at a time and place of our own choosing while the United States retains the monopoly of the atomic bomb. Let us not delude ourselves that victory would be cheap and easy. At the outset the Russians must occupy all of Europe up to the Atlantic seaboard from which they could be dislodged only by large-scale bombardment of cities and communication centers. No military leader has suggested that we could force a Russian surrender without a costly ground force invasion of Europe and Asia. Even if victory were finally achieved after colossal sacrifices in blood and treasure, we would find western Europe in a condition of ruin far worse than that which exists in Germany today, its population decimated and overrun with disease. We would have for generations the task of rebuilding western Europe and of policing the Soviet Union. This would be the result of the cheapest victory we could achieve. Few responsible persons believe in even so cheap a victory.

2. The second possible policy is maintenance of an armed peace in a two-bloc world which, historically, has always led to war. This course would lead to rebuilding the strength of western Europe economically and militarily to a point where, allied with the United States, it would confront the Soviet bloc with overwhelming strength. This would entail tremendous and steadily accelerating armaments expenditures over an indefinite period, enforce a lower standard of living on the people, and might betray our moral position by propping up anti-democratic regimes as counterpoise to the Russians. But it could have no termination save in a war begun at a less advantageous moment than the preventive war and thus ending even less favorably.

3. A third possible policy is the drive for world government, which has little support among governments but has growing and powerful support among the peoples of the west. Stripped of the enthusiasm of its friends and the misapprehensions of its enemies, the world-government movement looks toward a creation of supranational authority with power sufficient to maintain law among nations. Initially and at every step the door would be open to all nations to federate with the supranational authority and submit to its limited jurisdiction.

Is this a hopeless perspective? We think not. The American proposal for international control of atomic energy was accepted in its essentials by the nations outside the Soviet bloc. Through its aboliton of the veto power in the field of atomic energy, it would have had the effect of transferring sovereignty in this field to the international authority. In substance this was a world government in a limited sphere.

The first two suggested policies lead inevitably to a war which would end with the total collapse of our traditional civilization. The third indicated policy may bring about the acceptance by the Soviet bloc of the offer of federation. If they will not accept federation, we lose nothing not already lost. If, as seems probable, the world has a period of armed peace, time and events may bring about a change in their policy.

We have then the choice of acceptance, in the first two cases, of the inevitability of war or, in the latter case, of the possibility of peace. Confronted by such alternatives, we believe that all constructive lines of action must be in keeping with the need of establishing a federal world government.

III

World government can be achieved, but cannot be achieved overnight. In the meantime statesmen must confront today's problems and attempt to solve them, lest there be no civilized world left to govern. The course of events has indicated a growing dependence on armaments at a time when armaments cannot be adequate for purposes of national defense, and a decreasing use of the processes of negotiation and conciliation.

There are no serious negotiations going forward anywhere in the world between the two great powers—the United States and Soviet Russia. Almost everywhere the pattern is the same—total collapse of discussion on the most important problems—in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, in Berlin, in Korea.

We hope for discussion and negotiation at the highest governmental level—if need be, in secrecy in the initial stages—keeping in mind at all times the ultimate goal of peace through world government. We understand and share the distaste among democratic people for secret negotiations. But we see no hope under present conditions for any settlement to come out of public negotiations in which each statesman is the prisoner of his national prestige.

This call to negotiation does not mean appeasement. Every member of this committee was opposed to Munich at the time of Munich, and we are equally committed today to the maintenance of the spiritual and physical bounds of freedom throughout the world. We are deeply disturbed by the conversion of Czechoslovakia into a police state.

IV

We make public our position in the belief that in a democracy it is the duty of every citizen to contribute to the clarification of issues and to the solution of the great problems which confront all of us. Scientists have a special position in the tragic situation in which mankind exists today. It is through the work of the scientific community that this great menace has come upon humanity and now threatens to destroy our civilization.

We are all citizens of a world community sharing a common peril. Is it inevitable that because of our passions and our inherited customs we should be condemned to destroy ourselves? No one has the right to withdraw from the world of action at a time when civilization faces its supreme test. It is in this spirit that we call upon all peoples to work and to sacrifice to achieve a settlement which will bring peace.

Albert Einstein, Chairman, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N. J.; Harold C. Urey, Vice Chairman, University of Chicago; Harrison Brown, University of Chicago; T. R. Hogness, University of Chicago; Joseph E. Mayer, University of Chicago; Philip M. Morse, Brookhaven National Laboratory; H. J. Muller, University of Indiana; Frederick Seitz, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

(Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists, 118 Nassau Street, Princeton, N. J., April 12, 1948.)

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial and an article from the New York Times of May 3, 1948, dealing with the displaced persons problem, its bearing on the Palestine situation, and its treatment by the Congress.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND THE DP'S

For over a year Congress had the opportunity to deal with the displaced-persons problem on a bold and humanitarian basis. It had before it the Stratton bill to admit 400,000 of these "stateless" men, women, and children from the DP camps over a 4-year period, as a way of inducing all immigrant-receiving nations to open their doors and solve this human problem. Churches, civic groups, labor organizations, industrialists, and Government leaders strongly supported this measure at congressional hearings. But the Stratton bill has, to use the well-worn phrase, "died in committee."

Congress now has before it two new bills. Both are inadequate. Both have strange restrictions. But since it is not likely that the principles of the Stratton bill will be adhered to, at least during the present session, the better of the two bills deserves a realistic attitude. This is H. R. 6163, introduced into the House by Representative FELLOWS and just approved by the House Judiciary Committee. Its chief provisions are that 200,000 DP's be admitted in 2 years, charging these admissions off against 50 percent of the regular quotas; the 15,000 DP's now in the country on temporary permits, facing possible deportation, be allowed to become American citizens; priorities be given (a) to farm laborers, physicians, dentists, and skilled workers, and (b) to blood relatives of American citizens or aliens now here; war orphans be admitted outside of the quotas.

With the backing of House Republican leadership, the Fellows bill has an excellent chance of passage. But two serious defects must be remedied. For the mortgaging of future quotas would mean that such countries of origin as Estonia, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, with already absurdly low quotas, would be mortgaged for from 13 to 166 years. The second defect would deny the benefits of the new bill to some 20,000 DP's living not in the European DP camps but in Shanghai.

But the Fellows bill has at least the virtue of being sufficiently flexible to permit its administration. This is one virtue not discernible in Senator WILEY'S bill, S. 2242—if, indeed, that discriminatory bill has any virtue at all. The Wiley bill would throw a bone to the DP's, permitting 50,000 a year to enter for 2 years on a highly selective basis that would favor one DP group over another and end in breaking up families.

There has surely been enough misery piled on cruelty for the DP's. The House can mitigate it somewhat by throwing out the jokers in the Fellows bill and speeding its passage. Then it is to be hoped that the Senate will offer a more humanitarian solution.

ABROAD—THE DP'S AND PALESTINE—FOOTNOTE TO THE CHAPTER

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

In a kind of ironic footnote to the war for Palestine, intensifying while the world looks on in helpless horror, there came out of the House Judiciary Committee last week a bill to admit 200,000 displaced persons into this country over a 2-year period. The bill is hedged around with as many restrictions and priorities as if this little group of homeless people—exactly the same human material of which this Nation is made—were cargoes of dynamite intended to blow up the economy of the United States. One of the meanest of the proposed conditions is that the number allowed to come in under this bill would be charged up to the immigration quotas of their respective countries of origin for years to come.

It is folly to imagine that this measure has any real bearing on the Palestine question. If the United States and other countries had opened their doors from the beginning to the persecuted and outcast Jews of Hitler's Europe, the pressure on Palestine as their only refuge would certainly have diminished, and there might have been a chance of settling the problem of the Palestinian state more gradually, without the present uncontrollable violence. Now it is too late. The Stratton bill provided for the admission of 400,000 DP's, and if it had been passed a year ago it would have given us a better conscience, saved thousands of human beings from death or deepening despair and eased the tension in the camps that makes our rule in Germany more difficult. But it would have had little effect on the tension in the Holy Land.

WHO THE DP'S ARE

The first reason for this is that the DP problem is not a problem of resettling Jews. Although it has been explained a thousand times, Americans are slow to realize that more than 80 percent of the displaced persons waiting in Germany to be disposed of are non-Jews, and that the great majority of the Jewish fraction wish to go to Palestine and not to America. It is equally hard to disabuse the American mind of the idea that the DP's are Communists.

Actually we are the slowest to take in these victims of war and Soviet conquest. Poorer and smaller countries regard manpower as an asset. They want labor for farms and mines, help for overworked housewives, skilled workers to aid in industrial production. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Canada, Brazil, and Argentina have already made place for many more DP's than we have. Since last July Great Britain has found work and shelter for nearly 50,000, twice as many as any other country, and they are coming in regularly at the rate of 5,000 monthly.

The British, it should be noted in parentheses, are making an intelligent effort to make the newcomers part of a national community which is peculiarly homogeneous. As soon as they land in England they are sent to five instruction centers for an 8-week course in the customs and currency of the country, and this is followed by courses of technical instruction, where they are trained for work in coal mines, textile factories, and other undermanned industries. They begin at once to learn English from expert teachers, and English ways of life from volunteer groups who take them to police courts, theatres, clubs, and sports fields. Doctors, lawyers, engineers, chemists, farmers, dressmakers, cooks, they come from all the countries of central and eastern Europe and are integrated into English life with a rapidity that surprises the officials in charge of the resettlement.

PRECEPTS CONTRADICTED

But the resettlement of DP's is a problem in itself, a problem that has hung fire for 3 years now, not because it is not easy to solve but because we are too indifferent or stupid to comprehend that it costs us more as taxpayers to keep them in camps in Germany than to permit them to work for their living here, and too callous to feel that to dehumanize people anywhere is to detract from human dignity everywhere. Displaced persons in territory under American rule, as in our zone in Germany, are a living contradiction of our lofty precepts exalting human values.

If the Palestine question could ever have been answered by finding other refuges for the Jews, which is doubtful, that stage has long been passed. The desire for a homeland has created a nation where there was no nation and inflamed the Zionists with as fierce a national spirit as exists in the world.

Resettlement in other parts of the world is an answer for the DP's, but it is no longer an answer for a great part of the pitiful remnant of European Jewry. What might have been is one thing. What is is another, and events in Palestine at this moment underline another lost opportunity to solve a problem by the easy way instead of the hard way.

Within smaller confines, Palestine is like Europe. In Europe the uneasy armistice has not broken down, but it cannot hold long unless the power vacuum is filled. The Federal Council of Churches is the latest and most impressive organ of opinion to issue an appeal for a positive program for peace. This cogent statement expresses the troubled thought and profound desire of millions of Americans of all faiths. But no doubt its authors would be the first to admit that the initial step toward peace is to remove the temptation to war by strengthening democratic Europe to stand in the way of further aggression and by working for an international force to carry out decisions the United Nations cannot presume to make until it has means to enforce them.

Down South—Global Recovery and State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Thurman Sensing, director of

research of the Southern States Industrial Council, at Nashville, Tenn., showing what the $6,300,000,000 proposed to be spent on global recovery under the so-called Marshall plan will cost each one of the Southern States; and also showing the debts of each one of those States.

I particularly call attention to the fact that according to Mr. Sensing's statement, Mississippi's debt amounts to $65,748,000, and that her proportionate share of this $6,300,000,000 will be $100,800,000, or an average of more than $1,200,000 for every single individual county in the State.

It will probably be said that the people of Mississippi do not pay as much taxes per capita as do the people in some of the richer States. But that is a mistake; they pay it through indirect taxes, through tariff, through discriminatory freight rates, excessive interest rates, and other charges that really place upon them a heavier burden per capita than that borne by the people of many of the so-called richer States without the benefits which those richer States derive.

In other words, if they do not pay the Federal taxes directly, they pay the man who pays the taxes; or pay the man who pays the man who pays the taxes. It comes out of them after all. And the same thing may be said of the people of the other agricultural States. They really bear the heaviest burdens of them all.

Mr. Sensing's article reads as follows:

The Congress has recently approved an initial—and the word "initial" should be emphasized—appropriation of $6,300,000,000 toward the global recovery plan. This sum was to be made available for the first 15-months' operation of the plan.

When the Marshall plan was first proposed, no amount of money was mentioned. When this broadened into the European recovery plan, to extend over a 5-year period and to aid 16 nations of western Europe, the sum most usually mentioned was $17,000,000,000. Some considerable objection arising to mentioning any total sum, and certainly to committing the Nation beyond the next fiscal year, the total sum was dropped from consideration and all mention of amounts was confined to the initial appropriation.

The whole movement later enlarged into the global recovery plan, and it was generally understood and realized that once this Nation embarked upon the plan, we would have to see it through. Estimates as to its eventual cost have ranged as high as $100,000,000,000 and never less than $17,000,000,000, and we now find the Administrator of the plan, Paul G. Hoffman—supposedly a conservative businessman—in one of his very first public statements, stating that the initial appropriation of $6,300,000,000 for the first 15 months is probably not enough.

It is not the purpose of this article to discuss the advisability of the United States entering upon a global recovery plan, even to consider whether it was the lesser of two evils; it is the purpose of this article to give us some conception of what we are getting into from the pure dollar and cents viewpoint. Let's at least know what we are doing.

The vastness of the costs of war and public debts in these later years is such that it is difficult for the average person to have any conception of what the total figures actually mean. The immensity of the figures has confused our thinking. This is unquestionably true of our national debt, now standing at approximately $260,000,000,000, and it is still true as we consider the cost of global recovery.

Perhaps as good a way as any to bring the meaning of the figures down to us is to break them up on a state level. It perhaps did not sink in on many of us just what the initial appropriation toward global recovery meant financially, but when we consider our State shares of this $6,300,000,000 on a pro rata population basis, and compare these shares with our State debts, we begin to get some idea. These figures, so far as the Southern States are concerned, are set forth in the following table:

	State debt 1946	State's share of initial appropriation ($6,300,000,000) for global recovery plan
Alabama	$63, 522, 000	$132, 300, 000
Arkansas	134, 619, 000	88, 200, 000
Florida	1, 269, 000	88, 000, 000
Georgia	8, 358, 000	151, 200, 000
Kentucky	5, 656, 000	132, 350, 000
Louisiana	158, 034, 000	107, 100, 000
Maryland	34, 699, 000	81, 900, 000
Mississippi	65, 748, 000	100, 800, 000
Missouri	63, 545, 000	176, 400, 000
North Carolina	101, 868, 000	163, 800, 000
Oklahoma	27, 261, 000	105, 000, 000
South Carolina	75, 595, 000	88, 000, 000
Tennessee	76, 500, 000	138, 600, 000
Texas	12, 187, 000	302, 400, 000
Virginia	22, 530, 000	119, 700, 000
West Virginia	68, 226, 000	88, 000, 000

The comparisons are striking. And we must remember that this is just the beginning. And let's not forget that the only source from which the Federal Government can obtain the money with which to finance this plan is from the people back in the various States. And if we would like to know what global recovery will finally cost us, we can only multiply the figures in the right-hand column by the algebraical equation "x".

In this connection it might be pointed out that if someone should be curious as to his State's share of the present national debt and would like to get hold of a real figure, he could ascertain that sum by multiplying the figures in the right-hand column by 40.

The Road to War—History Repeats Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1948

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, anyone familiar with the demands made upon Congress by President Roosevelt's administration, with the legislation adopted by the Congress in answer to those demands, and with the pressure of undercover maneuvering as it is now known, will see in the present situation a repetition of the policy which involved us in World War II.

In the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 4 is an editorial entitled "The Next Step," which reads as follows:

THE NEXT STEP

The Truman administration and the bipartian boys in Congress are now talking about a military guaranty for the five-nation western European coalition alined against the Soviet Union. A revival of lend-lease to rearm these countries and such other allies as can be mustered is also recommended.

Before proceeding to these objectives, the schemers thought it prudent to get the Marshall plan passed under false pretenses. It was said originally that the country had the choice of passing the Marshall plan, with its contemplated expediture of $17,000,000,000 in aid to western Europe over 4 years, or reconciling itself to great expenditures for rearmament against Russia. The Marshall plan was going to stop communism.

Now that the Marshall plan is passed, we learn that it will not, after all, save us the necessity of spending billions on a huge air force, adopting peacetime conscription and a stoppage draft to fill up the ranks, and resigning ourselves to wartime controls over production, materials, manpower, prices, etc. The administration is asking all of these things.

Not only will the Marshall plan fail to save us from these things at home, but it is now admitted that the Marshall plan is not going to save non-Communist Europe from communism. Military guaranties and a return to lend-lease are demanded for the benefit of the very same nations which were supposed to be going to be able to stave off communism if only they were given the benefits of the Marshall plan.

All of this is dreadfully reminiscent of Mr. Roosevelt's progressive steps in 1940–41, when, at first, we were told that we were not going to get into Europe's war; next, that all aid should be given the nations opposing the dictators, but that this help would stop "short of war"; then, that convoying and the dispatch of troops to Iceland and other points within the war zone were not going to put America into the war, but would keep the war away from America's shores; and, finally, that it was our war, here is Pearl Harbor, we have been attacked, and now please pick up your gun and start firing.

As before, the American people are taken a little distance along the road at a time, beguiled with promises like a reluctant horse enticed with a carrot. The campaign for resumption of lend-lease has been well prepared by the usual lieutenants of New Deal foreign policy: General Marshall, the Secretary of State; Senator VANDENBERG, the me-too Republican champion of the bipartisan sell-out; Representative EATON, the native Canadian who is VANDENBERG'S opposite number in the House; and by such other bipartisan Republican servants of New Deal foreign policy as Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire. Last week the build-up proceeded as follows:

Tuesday. Marshall closeted himself with Vandenberg, Under Secretary of State Lovett, and John Foster Dulles, bipartisan Republican adviser of Vandenberg. VANDENBERG emerged to make a speech broadly hinting that the United States would take the lead in strengthening UN through regional defensive alliances.

In Congress on the same day MERROW demanded an American commitment to go to war if Russia crossed any of a series of lines drawn in front of the approaches to the Atlantic, the nations of western Europe, the Dardanelles, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the Persian Gulf, China, and the islands of the Pacific. He asked a flat military guaranty to the coalition of Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg.

Marshall, in a speech that day, called for continuity of foreign policy (meaning his and Truman's foreign policy) and full support of that policy by the country (meaning 100-percent bipartisanship).

Wednesday. Marshall announced that the administration was considering some form of military lend-lease for the five members of the western European coalition, while Representative EATON announced that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which he is chairman, had asked the State Department for new lend-lease in behalf of non-Communist foreign nations.

Friday. It was denied that Truman would ask Congress to revive lend-lease. Senator CONNALLY, former New Deal chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said, however, that the request would originate with the State Department, which amounts to the same thing.

Lend-lease will not only hasten the pace of this country toward national insolvency but will put the United States into a position everywhere in the world where it can be taken into war whenever Russia, one of its satellites, or one of the countries to be taken under the American wing chooses to start the firing. We shall surrender the power of decision over our own acts and subject ourselves to whatever fate foreigners design for us.

If Congress caves in once more, we shall be on the threshold of war just as we were in 1941.

Under our system of government, if the people so lack confidence in the courage of their youth, in the ability of the producers of this country and in the diplomacy of those who think first of America; if we now want to dictate the policy of other nations and are prepared to fight one war after another to accomplish that purpose, our people have the privilege of so doing.

It does seem to me, however, that being, as Churchill admitted, the foremost military nation in the world, we should have with us men with enough diplomatic ability to keep us out of world war III without sacrificing any of our sovereignty. We should not again make the same mistake we made which involved us in World War II.

New Jersey Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of New Jersey.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by Harry Cole, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, post office box 512, Brookdale Farm, Red Bank, N. J., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCE AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance not exceeding $250 is provided for the burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Counties may acquire burial plots for such indigent veterans and provide for maintenance of same.

Municipalities may appropriate money for maintenance of certain cemeteries where Revolutionary soldiers are buried, and they may contract with certain societies and associations for the care of such grounds.

It is the duty of the county to decorate graves of veterans on Memorial Day.

County superintendents maintain records of veterans' graves.

Registration of veterans' graves is provided by the department of economic development and the department of health.

Provision has been made for the care of neglected graves.

A county allowance is provided for headstones for veterans' graves.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Disability of minority has been removed for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

A conservator may be appointed for persons serving in the armed forces.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and administration of oaths, validation is provided for certain instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Administration is provided of estates of persons missing in action, etc.

Wills executed by deceased servicemen may be admitted to probate.

Limitation of action period in case of claims of those in the armed forces is extended.

Persons in the armed forces, though absent from the United States, may adopt minor children of spouses.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

Deeds of trust executed by persons in the armed forces are valid.

A minimum age of 17 has been fixed for enlistments in State military forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

Release from penal and correctional institutions is permitted for examination for military service. Special pardons are provided after honorable war service.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Public officers may not charge for an affidavit, certificate, or service rendered to veterans in the preparation of claims for tax exemption.

Bureaus of vital statistics report deaths of veterans to county superintendents, who keep a record of the veterans' graves. Death certificates carry the name of the war and social-security number of the deceased veteran.

Veterans are exempt from record search or copy fees when the record is to be used in connection with a claim for pension, admission to homes, exemption from jury duty, or in lieu of lost discharge.

Copies of public record for wards of the Veterans' Administration are provided free under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Certified copies of discharge papers are issued to veterans and their families with the fee limited to 50 cents.

Honorable discharges are recorded free of charge.

The Adjutant General, as State service officer, is charged with the duty of assisting veterans and their dependents with claims against the United States. Municipalities may operate service bureaus.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Diplomas, degrees, or other credentials may be awarded to certain junior students of the public schools or educational institutions upon their entrance into active military service.

Certain veterans, upon graduation from a chiropractic school recognized by the Federal Vocational Training Board, are entitled to a license to practice the science of chiropractic.

Disabled war veterans, upon admission to the bar, are entitled to certain lawbooks without charge.

Federal vocational certificates are recognized as preliminary work qualifying for the study of accounting, architecture, law, and nursing, in some cases.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed in action in World War I or died from other causes while serving in the armed forces of the United States between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921. Amount, $150 maximum per year per child.

Educational aid is provided to children of veterans killed in World War II. This is the duty of the Department of Economic Development.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Veterans may be appointed as detectives in first-class counties.

Employers who require a birth certificate as a condition of employment, promotion, etc., shall accept, in lieu thereof, from an employee who is a veteran the honorable discharge of such veteran.

The age limit is fixed at 22 to 35 years for appointment to the State police.

Veterans in any public service are included in all veterans' preference laws.

Leaves of absence are extended to public officers and employees in military service, with retention of rights.

The maximum age limit for public employment is lowered by the period spent in military service.

Pension rights are provided on retirement from public service.

Police and fire department appointees absent in war service may join pension funds.

Civil-service preference is extended to veterans of World War II, their wives or widows, both State and municipal, including preference for disabled veterans.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Pension rights of public officers and employees, including county employees, serving in the armed forces, are preserved.

Rights, benefits, etc., of school employees in the Red Cross are preserved.

Status of legal newspapers forced to suspend publication during military service of the owners is preserved.

Maintenance of civil service and veterans' preference laws upon consolidation of local units is provided.

State employees who have held positions for not less than three consecutive years and have veterans' tenure shall be part of the classified civil service.

Officers and employees of the public school system must be reinstated after discharge from military service with preservation of status and pension rights.

Pharmacists' licenses may be renewed without payment of fees after service in World War II.

Certain veterans may be retired with pension rights available to the widow.

Veterans may be reinstated in municipal employment within a limited time after discharge.

All honorably discharged veterans who have served for three or more years are exempt forever from jury duty.

Rights of veterans have been established with respect to tenure of office in public service.

Service in World War II shall not count toward compulsory retirement under any pension or retirement law affecting State, county, municipal, or school district employment.

State, county, or municipal employees are permitted to join State employees' retirement system after induction into the armed forces.

The State employment bureau extends aid to veterans.

The State superintendent of burials is required to be a veteran.

Tenure of certain war veterans in public office, employment, or position has been established.

Veterans in the public service are entitled to leave of absence to attend State and na-

tional conventions of veterans' organizations as duly authorized representatives.

Veterans may withdraw from the county retirement system without prejudice.

Veterans may withdraw from retirement system when serving as court attendants in second-class counties.

Veterans' preference is applicable to office of State director of aviation.

Veterans who were decorated in the World War are entitled to certain advantages relating to promotions in State and municipal service.

War service credit is considered in determining advancement in grade and increased pay of firemen, policemen, and motor vehicle inspectors.

War-service credit is considered in determining teacher seniority. Veteran teachers may retire after 20 years of service.

War veterans are permitted to withdraw from the State employees' retirement system.

World War veterans in the police department in cities of the first class are entitled to certain advantages relating to promotions.

A State retirement commission has been created to study all pension and retirement requisites of veterans.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Wages of World War veterans are not subject to garnishment for debt contracted prior to the war.

GUARDIAN AND WARD

Special letters of guardianship empower the guardian to give written consent to the enlistment of the ward in the armed forces in time of war.

GUARDIANSHIP

The county public guardian of incompetent veterans lend assistance to guardians of incompetent veterans.

Parent or guardian may administer estates of less than $100 in realty or $500 in personalty without appointment.

Receipt, investment, etc., by a guardian of personal property valued at less than $1,000, to which the ward shall become entitled from any source other than the Federal Government, is regulated.

A modified Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Disabled veterans, their wives or widows, may be admitted to the soldiers' home at Vineland.

Disabled veterans may be admitted to the soldiers' home at Menlo Park.

The Arthur Brisbane property at Allaire has been donated to the State for use as a convalescent home for veterans.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act.

Legislative approval has been given for a Federal hospital for veterans in the State.

HOUSING

Municipalities may contract jointly for erection, maintenance, and operation of permanent housing units.

County park commissions may use lands for veterans' housing.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

Provision has been made for compilation of all laws of the State relating to veterans of the wars of the United States.

A veterans' legislative commission has been created.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Medals are provided for service in the Civil War, Mexican Border War, Spanish-American War, and World War I.

Testimonial to battleship *New Jersey* has been provided.

MEMORIALS

Municipalities may construct hospitals, schools, etc., as permanent memorials.

Battle of the Wilderness Memorial Park has been established as a memorial to the Twelfth New Jersey Regiment of Volunteers.

State highways have been designated as memorials as follows: State Highway Route 9, VFW Memorial Highway; Route 6, United Spanish War Veterans Memorial Highway; Route 10, American Legion Memorial Highway; Route 24, Military Order of the Purple Heart Memorial Highway; Routes 28 and 29, including a section of Route 22, Blue Star Drive, with roadside rests and parking strips to be constructed as a memorial to World War II veteran State employees.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Status of National Guard in Federal postwar military policy has been determined.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Counties may appropriate money for observance of Memorial Day.

Municipalities and counties may appropriate money to the Grand Army of the Republic or to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War for the observance of Memorial Day and other patriotic holidays.

PENSIONS

An annual pension of $500 is paid for life to blind veterans of any war, including World War II. This is administered by the Department of Economic Development.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

All military records capable of being separated from civil records, preserved in any State department or in the office of the clerk or surrogate of any county shall be transferred to the office of the adjutant general for preservation.

The State librarian has been directed to prepare and publish a history entitled, "Participation of New Jersey in the World War," as a memorial to World War veterans.

Municipalities are to canvass persons connected with the armed forces.

Provision has been made for the compilation of the records of Revolutionary War soldiers.

The archives of the adjutant general's department shall include all available records of officers and men, movements and operations of the military and naval forces of New Jersey in all the wars in which its troops have participated from the earliest colonial period.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

A State commission for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped has been created.

A savings bank may invest moneys deposited with it in loans to World War I veterans secured by adjusted service certificates issued under the act of Congress known as the World War Adjusted Compensation Act.

Bank loans are available to veterans to establish or reestablish themselves in a small business or a profession.

Banks, savings banks, building and loan associations, and trust companies, may make loans to qualified veterans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights. Such loans are exempt from taxation.

A commission on veterans' benefits has been established.

A joint legislative commission has been created to study the subject of benefits for veterans of World War II.

The ceiling has been increased from $200,000 to $1,500,000 on the fund for payment of benefits under the workmen's compensation law to persons totally disabled as a result of second injury.

Municipalities may make appropriations to organizations formed to honor and assist men and women in the armed forces.

Withdrawal is permitted of certain funds on deposit in a closed bank where such funds were deposited to the account of any national association of war veterans and where such funds are to be used for the purpose of relieving distress among needy, unemployed, and disabled veterans. No withdrawal shall exceed the pro rata share that the fund would be entitled to in final liquidation.

Settlement rights are preserved during military service.

Soldiers' home board may extend relief to veterans outside the home.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Members of the armed forces home on furlough may fish or gun without a license.

Moneys received from war-risk insurance or adjusted-service certificates are exempt from inheritance tax.

Alcoholic beverages sold to military organizations are exempt from sales tax.

Loans to veterans under the GI bill of rights are exempt from taxation.

Drivers' licenses of servicemen are continued in force without payment of fee until 180 days after discharge.

Registration fee is refunded to person entering any branch of the military or naval forces of the United States.

Certain disabled veterans are entitled to free license to act as insurance agents or brokers.

Certain veterans are entitled to free licenses to act as real-estate brokers or salesmen.

A special license may be issued to veterans (without cost) to hawk, peddle, and vend goods, wares, or merchandise, or solicit trade within the State. Such license is restricted to the county wherein the licensee resides.

Veterans and their widows are exempt from poll tax.

Veterans are exempt from a municipal poll tax.

Barbers' registration certificates or permits may be reissued after discharge from military service without payment of certain fees.

A certificate of registration of a pharmacist may be renewed after discharge from military service.

Licenses to practice beauty culture may be renewed without examination within 2 years after discharge from military service.

Licenses to practice professional engineering or land surveying may be renewed without payment of fees during active military service.

Property of veterans' organizations in existence prior to June 18, 1936, is exempt from taxation.

Property owned and used by a corporation organized to provide instructions in agricultural pursuits for crippled soldiers and sailors of the United States is exempt from taxation.

Real and personal property of veterans, their widows, and members of the armed forces is exempt from State, county, or municipal taxation to a valuation of $500.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Provision has been made for the printing of proceedings of the Grand Army of the Republic, Spanish-American War Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars by the State.

The forget-me-not or its replica has been recognized as the souvenir of the Disabled American Veterans and the sale thereof is restricted to such organization and its auxiliaries.

The poppy or its replica has been recognized as the souvenir of the deceased veterans of World War I and its sale is restricted to nationally recognized veterans' organizations and their auxiliaries.

The veterans' special peddler-license law is restricted by prohibiting the hawking of flags, magazines, artificial flowers, etc., emblematic of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or any veterans' organization, unless peddler has 3 months' residence in licensing county.

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor.

The unauthorized wearing or use of the registered name or insignia of a veterans' organization is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not exceeding $100 or imprisonment for not more than 60 days.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

Minors may participate in rifle practice on ranges of organized rifle clubs of veterans' organizations.

Municipalities may lease property to veterans' organizations without expense to such associations or at a nominal rent.

Municipalities may provide quarters in municipal buildings for veterans' organizations.

Rooms are available in county buildings for use of veterans' organizations.

Camp and garrison equipage, ordnance, or other military stores may be loaned, temporarily, to certain veterans' organizations.

Unused school property may be transferred to veterans' organizations.

Municipal governing bodies may convey real property to veterans' organizations where not needed for public purposes.

Most of the above-mentioned laws have been enacted by the New Jersey Legislature during recent years through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

Most of the 39 DAV chapters in the State, whose membership dues average about $5 annually, maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers.

In addition to such State-wide service, the DAV maintains seven full-time National Service officers, under the direction of John W. Bill, at the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, 20 Washington Place, Newark, N. J.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

To provide gainful employment for all disabled veterans, the DAV has developed a Nation-wide man-job-matching method program, under the supervision of my long-time friend, Millard W. Rice.

Organized in 1920 and chartered by Congress in 1932, the DAV is composed exclusively of men and women who were wounded or disabled as a result of their service to the United States in time of war.

As a veteran I have observed the outstanding contribution that the DAV has made in rendering such service to veterans and their dependents.

Americanization Parade Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, May 1, there was revived in the city of Vandergrift, Pa., what is known as Americanization Day. It was the custom prior to the Second World War to hold a parade and celebration on this date, sponsored jointly by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A few days before the first of May the commanders of the two veterans' posts were called into the local Army recruiting station and asked to cancel the parade. United States Army headquarters in Pittsburgh denies any knowledge of this incident. However, a further check showed that orders had emanated from the War Department in Washington preventing Army units from participating in the parade. Therefore, no Army units were permitted in this parade, nor was the Pennsylvania National Guard.

Now the reason given for this action was that it was feared that Communists would create difficulty. Mr. Speaker, I participated in that parade, and there was no sign of a disturbance. It was just a case of seeing ghosts in every corner. The impression prevails in my district, where Vandergrift is located, that the War Department was interfering with the people's right of free assembly.

It seems to me that May 1 is a fitting date for an Americanization parade. It is ridiculous that the War Department should fear that demonstrations on that date in the United States will be taken by Russia to be for the same purpose as their own celebrations. It is particularly hard to understand how anyone could think that a demonstration sponsored by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars could have any taint of communism or that they would be so careless as to permit an incident to occur. The people of the city of Vandergrift are most patriotic, and the position of the War Department seems indefensible. However, I have asked Secretary Royall, of the Army, for a full explanation of that position.

With permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include here an editorial from the Greensburg Morning Review entitled "Forget the Ghosts," which deals very ably with this subject:

FORGET THE GHOSTS

It is all right to keep a sharp eye on the Communists and fellow travelers in this country, but there is no use of people getting so excited that they start to see Communist ghosts under the beds.

Considerable excitement was created in connection with the resumption of the traditional May 1 Americanization parade at Vandergrift last Saturday after a lapse of 6 years, but the parade was held anyway, although there were not nearly so many units in the line of march as anticipated and although State and special police mingled with the crowd to guard against any possible unpleasant incidents.

There are at least a couple of places in this county where fear of the Communists stirring up trouble might be justified, but Vandergrift is not one of them. The people of Vandergrift are pretty good Americans, and the left-wingers have never received any encouragement there.

The commanders of the Vandergrift posts of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars claim that an effort was made by the Army to have the Saturday parade called off. The Army denied this, but the National Guard units which were scheduled to parade canceled their plans and in other parts of the State service and National Guard units followed the same policy.

This nonparticipation policy of service and National Guard units in events staged on May Day appears to have had its origin with Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, military aide to President Harry S. Truman. A letter of his is being quoted, in part, as follows:

"It has been their experience that any celebration of that kind the 1st of May in the United States is pictured and advertised in Russia as being a Communist celebration. The Russian people cannot understand why any May 1 celebration throughout the world is not in their honor."

Let us hope that General Vaughan does not get the idea of trying to call off the Fourth of July celebration for fear it might coincide with some Russian holiday.

The Government-controlled newspapers and radios of Russia misrepresent practically everything the American people do or say to the people of the Soviet Union, so why get excited about a misrepresentation of events staged in this country on May 1?

The Uncommon Nature of the Common People Whose Cash Finances the Presidential Campaign of Henry Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Americans for Democratic Action, at 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., have published an interesting monograph entitled "Henry A. Wallace—the First 3 Months." Among other things, this publication lists the contributors to the Wallace-for-President campaign as listed with the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, here is what the Americans for Democratic Action publication says about these contributors and the nature and size of their contributions:

SOME OF GIDEON'S ANGELS

Henry Wallace has claimed that his Presidential campaign would be financed by nickels and dimes and dollars from the little people of America. As a matter of fact, during the first 2 months of 1948, there were more big contributors—over $1,000—to the Wallace campaign than to the Republican and Democratic Parties combined.

Out of $90,834 collected by the GOP in this 60-day period, only eight contributors were over $1,000 and the largest was $2,500.

Out of the $15,832 collected by the Democrats, seven contributors were over $1,000 and the largest was $3,000.

But out of $87,078 collected for Wallace—both by the National Wallace for President Committee and the Progressive Citizens of America—$48,500 came from 22 large contributors of $1,000 or more. Four of the gifts were for $5,000—the largest amount allowable under the law—one was for $4,000 and one $3,000 and three for $2,500, two for $2,000, and the rest in $1,000 chunks. One of the top contributors of $5,000 came from a known Communist, Frederick V. Field, once a contributing editor to the New Masses and a principal financial contributor to that magazine before it folded.

Here are the other contributors, as listed in statements filed with the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives:

Nina Dexter, Los Angeles, Calif	$5,000
Barbara Klein, New York City	5,000
Bernard L. Ades, New York City	5,000
Robert Sales, New York City	4,000
Vera Sales, New York City	1,000
Mrs. Frazier McCann, New York City	2,500
Mrs. Anita McCormick Blaine, Chicago, a cochairman of the Wallace-for-President committee	2,500
Miles Sherover, New York City	2,500

Mrs. Luke Wilson, Bethesda, Md., wife or mother of the PCA legislative representative	$2,000
Paul Tishman, New York City, a member of the board of PCA who participated in the draft-Wallace board meeting December 15	2,000
Dorothy Certak, New York City	1,000
Robert L. Soles, New York City	1,000
E. Y. Harburg, Broadway lyricist	1,000
Louise R. Bramsten, New York City	1,000
Ralph E. Shikes, New York City	1,000

(All the above contributions were made through the Wallace-for-President committee.)

The following were made to the Progressive Citizens of America:)

Mrs. Elinor S. Gimbel, board member of the PCA who participated in the draft-Wallace December 15 board meeting	$3,000
Anita Wilcox, New York City	1,000
Saul Z. Sokolov, Valpariso, Ind	1,000
Dorothy Chertak, New York City (see above)	1,000
Theodore Shapiro, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1,000

Mr. Speaker, since this list has been publicized by Americans for Democratic Action so many have wondered about the background and political activities of these large contributors to the third-party movement that the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in response to these requests, has prepared a summary of the associations and activities of these donors of big gifts and large campaign contributions. Since the summary is rather extensive, I am including it in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in order to save our committee staff the necessity of preparing separate reports in reply to the many inquiries coming in on the men and women listed in the monograph of the Americans for Democratic Action. Readers may form their own conclusions from the information listed in the files of the Un-American Activities Committee.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, one might observe that perhaps this list of contributors to the Wallace campaign throws some needed light on the question of why it is that Henry A. Wallace so persistently abuses and castigates the House Committee on Un-American Activities and why he alone of all the candidates for President now seeking the office has gone out of his way to defeat the passage of H. R. 5852, which proposes to curb Communist activities in this country by exposing them to the bright sunlight of public inspection.

The information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities follows. It provides an interesting commentary, indeed, on what some people consider to be liberalism in these confusing and complicated times.

[Information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, April 29, 1948]

Subject: Frederick V. Field; Nina Dexter (Los Angeles); Barbara Klein (New York City); Bernard L. Ades (New York City); Robert Sales (New York City); Vera Sales (New York City); Mrs. Frazier McCann (New York City); Mrs. Anita McCormick Blaine (Chicago); Miles Sherover (New York City); Mrs. Luke Wilson (Bethesda, Md.); Paul Tishman (New York City); Dorothy Certak (or Chertak), (New York City); Robert L. Soles (New York City); E. Y. Harburg (New York City); Louise R. Bransten (New York City); Ralph E. Shikes (New York City); Mrs. Elinor S. Gimbel (no city shown); Anita Wilcox (New York City); Saul Z. Sokolov (Valparaiso, Ind.); Theodore Shapiro (New York).

A search of the records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities revealed information concerning the names listed above, as follows:

FREDERICK V. FIELD

A catalog of the International Publishers lists a book written by Frederick V. Field. The International Publishers was cited as the "Publishing agency of the Communist Party" in a brief for the United States in the case of William Schneiderman (p. 145). In Report No. 1476, dated January 3, 1940, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities had this to say about the International Publishers: "Through the medium of the International Publishers, * * * extensive Soviet propaganda is subsidized in the United States. Both the American Communist Party and the Soviet Government are involved in this ostensibly commercial concern which distributes foreign-subsidized books and pamphlets in the United States (p. 8).

Frederick V. Field has contributed to the following issues of Political Affairs, a monthly magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism (according to its own advertisement): November 1946, pp. 988–1000; January 1946, pp. 31–41; May 1946, pp. 309–496; January 1948, p. 51.

Frederick V. Field, in 1947, was secretary of the board of trustees of the Jefferson School of Social Science, as shown in the following sources: Daily Worker, of March 29, 1947 (p. 6); Spring Catalog, April 14, 1947, which lists his New York City address as 575 Avenue of the Americas; the Summer, July-August 1947, catalog (p. 2); the Catalog for September-December 1947 (p. 1).

In Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, we find that "In 1941, the Communists established a school in New York City which was known as the School for Democracy (now merged with the Workers School into the Jefferson School of Social Science)." Attorney General Clark cited the Jefferson School of Social Sciences as an "adjunct of the Communist Party," on a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board. (See press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated December 5, 1947.)

A news release dated December 26, 1941, of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was signed by Frederick V. Field. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited by former Attorney General Biddle as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7446). The organization was cited as "subversive" and included on a list furnished by Attorney General Clark for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (See press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission dated December 5, 1947.)

In report 1311 of the Special Committee on un-American Activities, we note that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was organized in the summer of 1940, only a few weeks before the launching of the seditious American Peace Mobilization. It is not surprising, therefore, that the views and policies of the two organizations ran along parallel lines, and further that both of them were completely in harmony with the policies and views of the Communist Party. The Special Committee on un-American Activities also cited the organization in its report No. 2277 of June 25, 1942.

According to a printed program of the Communist Political Association's San Francisco meeting concerning the United Nations Conference, May 17, 1945, Frederick V. Field was one of the speakers. The Daily Worker of March 5, 1941 (p. 2) lists the name of Frederick V. Field as one of those who signed a statement to the President of the United States, defending the Communist Party. Mr. Field was identified in this source as being from New York City.

The International Press Correspondence (official organ of the Communist International) in its issue of October 5, 1935, Vol. 15, No. 50, p. 1263, lists Frederick V. Field as a member of the Thaelman International Release Committee. Ernst Thaelman was a jailed Communist leader of Germany.

Frederick V. Field has contributed to the Daily Worker, as shown in the following issues: The Worker (Sunday edition of the Daily Worker) of May 25, 1947 (p. 4); Daily Worker of July 17, 1947, page 2; Daily Worker, October 17, 1947, in which source he is identified as being from New York; the Worker of January 18, 1948, page 4 (southern edition); and a speaker at the Daily Worker Forum of Five Hundred, according to the March 19, 1948 issue, page 7.

The Daily Worker is "the chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party. * * * this newspaper is, and has been for a little more than 20 years, the Communist Party's newspaper. * * * the Daily Worker was founded in response to direct instructions from the Communist International in Moscow. * * * For 17½ years, the pages of the Daily Worker were filled with subversive propaganda, advocating insurrection, class war, the violent overthrow of the United States Government, and the destruction of American institutions." (Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944, pp. 59, 60.)

Frederick V. Field's affiliation with New Masses, is shown by the following references: He was a speaker at and sponsor of the New Masses Anti-Cliveden Rally, as shown in the April 14, 1942, issue of that publication. He was a member of the board of contributing editors of the publication, according to the Daily Worker of November 18, 1942 (p. 6); New Masses of July 13, 1943, p. 2, lists him as an associate editor; the July 13, 1943 issue contains an article by him, on page 16; the August 24, 1943 issue contains an article by him; he contributed to the September 14, November 2, November 30, 1943 issues; he was a member of the reception committee of the Thirty-second Annual Artists and Writers Ball, sponsored by New Masses, as shown in the issue of November 30, 1943; he contributed to these issues, January 4, February 22, April 25, May 23, 1944, September 11, 1945, April 30, June 25, September 10, 1946, and June 10, 1947. He is named as associate editor of the publication, in the March 14, 1944 issue; as managing editor in the April 30, 1946 issue; managing editor in the July 22, 1947 issue; and contributing editor of Masses and Mainstream (New Masses and Mainstream combined to publish Masses and Mainstream as of March 1948), as shown in the first copy of that publication dated March 1948, volume 1, No. 1.

Frederick V. Field was listed in the March 5 (1946) Daily Worker as one of the sponsors of the Win-the-Peace Conference held in Washington, D. C., April 5–7, 1946. The national committee to win the peace was included on a list of subversive organizations furnished by Attorney General Clark for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (See U. S. Civil Service Commission's press release of December 5, 1947.)

Frederick V. Field was also affiliated with the People's Radio Foundation, Inc., as an individual endorser and/or stockholder, according to a leaflet, FM People's Radio Foundation, Inc. Attorney General Clark also included the People's Radio Foundation,

Inc., on his list of subversive organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board, according to the press release of the United States Civil Service Commission dated December 5, 1947.

The name of Frederick V. Field has been found in various publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities; however, the organizations with which he was shown to be affiliated and which have been cited, are covered in the foregoing information.

BERNARD L. ADES

The files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal the following information concerning Bernard L. Ades:

An article in the Daily Worker, November 7, 1931 (p. 3), stated that Bernard Ades was the defense attorney for the International Labor Defense in Maryland. The International Labor Defense was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942; March 29, 1944, and as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" by Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942 (p. 7444).

The Daily Worker on January 27, 1934 (p. 3), stated that Bernard Ades, attorney for the International Labor Defense, faced disbarment in Baltimore, Md.

The Daily Worker on March 17, 1934 (p. 3), designated Bernard Ades as a speaker at the Workers School Forum in Baltimore. The Workers School was cited as "an official Communist Party school" in H. R. 1311 (p. 168).

On September 29, 1937, the Daily Worker (p. 2) listed Bernard Ades as a speaker before the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944 and January 3, 1940.

Bernard Ades performed accounting services for the Civil Rights Congress, cited as subversive by Attorney General Clark (see press release of the United States Civil Service Commission dated December 5, 1947). The Committee on Un-American Activities concluded, after an investigation, that "the Civil Rights Congress is an organization dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party, that the organization is controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it, and that in carrying out its defense aims, the organization has at the same time engaged in a campaign of vilification against the American Government." (See Rept. No. 1115, dated November 17, 1947.)

Bernard Ades, of 68 West Two Hundred and Thirty-eighth Street, Bronx, signed the 1942 State-wide nominating petition for the Communist Party candidates (p. 2860).

The National Committee of the International Juridical Association, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, listed Bernard Ades as the representative of that committee from Maryland, on an undated letterhead of that organization.

Bernard Ades was an endorser of the National Negro Congress in 1936. The National Negro Congress was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; March 29, 1944; and as a subversive organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle in Executive Order No. 9300, issued February 5, 1943.

Under the list of contributors to the Civil Rights Congress is the following:

"Contributions of $500 or more: Bernard Ades, 505 Fifth Avenue, New York City." (See report on Civil Rights Congress dated November 17, 1947, by the Committee on Un-American Activities.)

MRS. ANITA M'CORMICK BLAINE

The records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal the following information on Mrs. Anita McCormick Blaine:

The Daily Worker of January 11, 1938 (p. 2), listed Mrs. Anita McCormick Blaine as a signer of the Manifesto of the Union of Concerted Peace Efforts, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

MILES SHEROVER

The records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal the following information on Miles Sherover:

The pamphlet Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943 (p. 4), listed Miles M. Sherover as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was also cited as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark. (See press release by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 5, 1947.)

Miles M. Sherover was listed as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in a memorandum issued by the council March 18, 1946.

The name of Miles M. Sherover appears in the list of sponsors of a dinner forum on Europe Today, October 9, 1941, which was held in New York, N. Y., under the auspices of the American Committee To Save Refugees, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944. Another sponsor of the dinner forum was the United American Spanish Aid Committee, also cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities March 29, 1944.

The following quotation was taken from testimony given before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities by Mr. Robert E. Halpern November 21, 1938:

"The CHAIRMAN. Who were some other people connected with the Soviet-American Securities Corp., when you were with them?

"Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Miles Sherover.

"The CHAIRMAN. Does he live in New York?

"Mr. HALPERN. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. What was his position?

"Mr. HALPERN. He was president of the corporation prior to my becoming president." (Public hearings, vol. III.)

The following quotation was taken from the testimony given before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities by Mr. D. H. Dubrowsky, September 27, 1939:

"Mr. WHITLEY. Will you tell the committee what you know about an organization known as the Soviet American Securities Corp., 30 Broad Street, New York City?

"Mr. DUBROWSKY. Well, that is one of the many rackets. That is another one.

"Mr. WHITLEY. How does that work?

"Mr. DUBROWSKY. Oh, that is simple.

"Mr. WHITLEY. Is that another medium through which funds are raised in America to propagandize the country?

"Mr. DUBROWSKY. It was conceived by a certain Miles Sherover. He sold the idea to the state bank of the U. S. S. R. back, I believe, 4 or 5 years ago. He told them that a simple way to raise money for the treasury of the Soviet Union would be to sell bonds, Soviet bonds. And there are plenty of gullibles in the United States who would buy them. The means and method of selling were rather unique. If you recollect, in 1933 there was almost an epidemic of failures of banks in the United States. They appealed to every Russian residing in the United States, or Americans of former Russian nationality, as well as the liberal and the fellow-traveler, that the safest method of keeping his dollars was to buy Soviet bonds, because the money would be kept in the state bank of the U. S. S. R., which does not fail. Only capitalist banks fail. And, gentlemen, you would be surprised that hundreds of thousands of dollars of these Soviet bonds have been sold in the United States." (Public hearings, vol. of 1939, p. 5332.)

MRS. LUKE WILSON

Mrs. Luke I. Wilson (believed to be the same person as Mrs. Luke Wilson of Bethesda) attended a dinner given in Washington, April 7, 1947, by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, according to a list contained in the committee files. A letterhead of the organization lists her name as of June 4, 1947, as a member of the executive board, Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

In a report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, dated June 16, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities has concluded that the organization "is perhaps the most deviously camouflaged Communist-front organization. When put to the following acid test it reveals its true character: 1. It shows unswerving loyalty to the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy. 2. It has consistently refused to take sharp issue with the activities and policies of either the Communist Party, United States of America, or the Soviet Union. 3. It has maintained in decisive posts persons who have the confidence of the Communist press. 4. It has displayed consistent anti-American bias and pro-Soviet bias, despite professions, in generalities, of love for America" (p. 17).

PAUL TISHMAN

A letterhead, dated April 11, 1947, of the Progressive Citizens of America, lists the name of Paul Tishman as vice chairman of the group. PCA Politics, published by PCA, New York State chapter, October 1947 (p. 2), also referred to him as vice chairman of PCA, New York State chapter. The Progressive Citizen for December 1947 gave the same information.

In testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities in July 1947, Mr. Walter S. Steele, chairman of the national security committee of the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies, revealed that Paul Tishman was one of the vice chairmen of the Progressive Citizens of America. (P. 148 of the testimony.) Further, in the same testimony, Mr. Steele had this to say regarding the organization:

"Progressive Citizens of America enters into the political pressure propaganda campaigns and marches of the leftist variety. * * * The organization has been particularly critical of current changes in the foreign policies of the Truman administration, and advocates an appeasement attitude toward Russia and her satellite countries. * * * Communists cooperate wholeheartedly in keeping the Progressive Citizens of America in the limelight, and the latter utilize considerable space in announcing scheduled gatherings in the Communist organs." (P. 149 of the testimony of Mr. Steele.)

DOROTHY CERTAK (OR CHERTAK)

According to the records of this committee, Dorothy Chertak was a delegate to the woman's international congress against war and fascism, as shown in Fight, official publication of the American League Against War and Fascism (the August 1934 issue, p. 10). She was listed in the Daily Worker of May 1, 1936 (p. 5) as luncheon secretary of the American League Against War and Fascism in New York City. She was shown in the Peace Year Book, 1939–40 (p. VIII), as secretary of the anti-Nazi committee, New York City division, American League for Peace and Democracy.

The American League Against War and Fascism "was organized at the first United States congress against war, which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later, at Pittsburgh, No-

vember 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. There was, however, no fundamental change in the character of the organization. It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before. New verbiage was introduced in conformity with the new line of the Communist Party, but this only served to high light the Communist Party's continuing control of the organization." (Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, p. 53.) The American League Against War and Fascism was also cited in the special committee's report of January 3, 1940; the American League for Peace and Democracy was cited in the Janu-3, 1940, report, as well as the one dated June 25, 1942.

Attorney General Biddle said that the American League for Peace and Democracy "was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7443).

Dorothy Chertak was a member of the executive board of the American Committee To Save Refugees, as shown in a folder of the organization, as well as in a bulletin, Spot News, page 1. The American Committee To Save Refugees has been cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization. (Rept. 1311, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 49.)

ROBERT L. SOLES

The only reference to Robert L. Soles found in the records of this committee was in testimony of Mr. Walter S. Steele before the committee in July 1947:

"Mr. STEELE. In the field of newspapers, magazines, and bulletins, the Communists, Red fronts, and fellow travelers are well represented." (Mr. Steele has listed under this category Salute magazine, treasurer of which he stated to be Robert L. Soles.) (See public hearings, July 21, 1947, pp. 33 and 37.)

(NOTE.—Salute has not been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities.)

E. Y. HARBURG

A printed program of the Writers Congress held in 1943 contains the name of E. Y. Harburg as a member of the Seminar on Song Writing in War. The American Writers Congress, sponsored by the League of American Writers, was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944. (The League of American Writers has been characterized, as well as citations shown, on page 4 of this memorandum in connection with Frederick V. Field.)

A dinner invitation of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee lists the name of E. Y. Harburg as a member of the National Reception Committee for Madame Irene Joliet-Curie. (Invitation dated Mar. 31, 1948.) The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee has been cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944. The members of the organization's executive board and the executive secretary were cited April 16, 1946, for contempt of Congress. They were indicted April 1, 1947, and convicted June 27, 1947. (Washington Star of June 28, 1947, pp. 1 and 6.)

Attorney General Clark included the organization on a list of "subversive" groups submitted for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (See press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission dated December 5, 1947.)

A letterhead, dated May 11, 1946, of the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York includes the name of E. Y. Harburg as a public sponsor. The letter states that "The Civil Rights Congress of New York is officially being launched—national in scope, local and regional in action."

Attorney General Clark cited as "subversive" the Civil Rights Congress "and its affiliated organizations" on a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board. (Civil Service Commission press release of December 5, 1947.) The Committee on Un-American Activities has investigated the Civil Rights Congress and its conclusion has been quoted on page 4 of this memorandum.

RALPH SHIKES

Ralph Shikes, according to testimony of Mr. Walter S. Steele before this committee in July 1947, is educational director of the National Progressive Citizens of America. He is shown on the December 1947 issue of The Progressive Citizen, as editor of that publication.

MRS. ELINOR S. GIMBEL

Elinor S. Gimbel has been affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as follows: She was a speaker before the group as shown in the Daily Worker of October 25, 1943, page 3; in a report of the director of the group to the members of NCASF, March 7, 1945, she is listed as vice chairman of the committee of women; her signature appears on greetings to the women of the Soviet Union, sponsored by the women's committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 9, 1948 (p. 5); she is listed as vice chairman, New York Committee of Women of the NCASF in the Call to a Conference on Women of the USA and the USSR in the Postwar World, November 18, 1944, in New York City.

In Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, it was found that "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship." Attorney General Clark included the organization on a list of subversive groups which was furnished for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (See U. S. Civil Service Commission's press release of Dec. 5, 1947.)

A letterhead dated February 26, 1946, of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee lists the name of Mrs. Elinor S. Gimbel as one of the national sponsors. (The Joint Anti-Fascist Committee citation appears in this memorandum in connection with E. Y. Harburg.)

The name of Mrs. Elinor S. Gimbel, New York City, appears as one of the sponsors on an "Urgent Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights" held in Detroit, Mich., April 27 and 28, 1946 "to organize an offensive against the rising Fascist aggression in the United States." (A citation on the Civil Rights Congress appears on page 4 of this memorandum in connection with Frederick V. Field.)

In testimony of Mr. Walter S. Steele before this committee in July 1947, in a discussion of the National Negro Congress, the name of Mrs. Elinor S. Gimbel is mentioned as one of the sponsors of the tenth convention of the congress. Mr. Steele further states that "according to Communist reports, police raided the meeting of the labor division of the congress at the convention, arresting 37 of its members. Listed among those it claims were taken to jail were * * * Elinor Gimbel." (P. 94 of Mr. Steele's testimony.)

Further in Mr. Steele's testimony, he stated that "as an example of the manner in which Red fronters operate through Progressive Citizens of America, I call attention to the 22 simultaneous public protest meetings held in New York City earlier this year in an attempt to 'stop anti-labor legislation.' The meetings were under the auspices of the movement. Speakers at these meetings included * * * Elinor S. Gimbel * * *." (P. 149 of Mr. Steele's testimony.)

LOUISE R. BRANSTEN

The records, files, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal the following information concerning Louise R. Bransten:

Louise Bransten was listed as an endorser of the Committee for Citizenship Rights on a letterhead of the organization dated January 10, 1942. The Committee for Citizenship Rights was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

Louise Bransten was listed as a member of the national executive committee of the American League Against War and Fascism in the September 1936 issue of Fight (p. 28). The American League Against War and Fascism was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944. It was cited as a Communist front organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle, in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942. Attorney General Francis Biddle found that this organization was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442.) The organization was also cited as a subversive organ by Attorney General Clark. (See press release, U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 5, 1947.) The publication Fight was cited as a Communist front periodical by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

An article in the September 1936 issue of Fight listed Louise Bransten as a speaker at an antiwar rally held at Palo Alto, Calif., under the auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism.

The Daily Worker of May 11, 1936 (p. 3) listed Louise Bransten as the trade-union secretary of the American League Against War and Fascism.

The letter head of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated September 22, 1938, listed Louise Bransten as a member of the legislative staff of the organization. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, March 29, 1944, and found by Attorney General Francis Biddle to have been "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7442.)

Censored News, a leaflet, listed Louise Bransten as an endorser of the Schneiderman-Darcy Defense Committee. The Schneiderman-Darcy Defense Committee was listed as a Communist-front committee by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.

Louise Bransten was stated to be the secretary of the Civil Rights Council of northern California in the People's World of March 22, 1941 (p. 1). The October 16, 1942, issue of People's World (p. 2) listed Louise R. Bransten as a signer of the petition for the pardon of Festus Coleman sponsored by the Civil Rights Council of San Francisco. The Civil Rights Congress and its affiliated organizations were cited as being subversive organizations by Attorney General Clark. (See press release, United States Civil Service Commission, December 5, 1947.)

"Louise Bransten, Civil Rights Council of Northern California," was listed as a sponsor of the American Peace Mobilization in the program of that organization's meeting in New York City, April 5, 1941. The American Peace Mobilization was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle described it as having been "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942,

p. 7442.) He also said: "The most conspicuous activity of American Peace Mobilization was the picketing of the White House, which began in April 1941, in protest against lend-lease and the entire national defense program. * * * On the afternoon of June 21, 1941, he (Frederick V. Field, national secretary) suddenly called off the picket line around the White House." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7444.) The American Peace Mobilization was cited by Attorney General Clark as "subversive." (See press release, U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 5, 1947.)

Walter S. Steele, in his testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on July 21, 1947, said: "In the field of newspapers, magazines, and bulletins, the Communists, Red fronts, and fellow-travelers are well represented." Under this heading he listed: "Soviet Culture, issued irregularly, is published by the Committee of the American Russian Institute, 101 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. The chairman is Louise R. Bransten" (pp. 33 and 37). (Neither of these, the organization or the publication have been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities.)

Charter of American Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Lucien O. Hunter, Jr., post commander, at a luncheon given in honor of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., by AMVETS Post No. 19, Monday, May 3, 1948, in the Speaker's Dining Room, United States Capitol:

Speaker MARTIN, Mr. Adamy, and members of the post, the House of Representatives AMVETS post wishes to express its appreciation to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., for his loyal support and encouragement in the passage of the American Veterans of World War II congressional charter, which was enacted into law July 16 of last year.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this charter gave AMVETS the honor of being the first and only World War II veterans' organization to be recognized officially by Congress.

The charter will allow our group to use public buildings for meeting places and permit it to participate in the administration of State funds for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans. It extends the same legal status held by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans, which are the only other charter holders.

Mr. Speaker, for the passage of this charter and other veteran legislation this post is truly grateful to you, and to express our appreciation still further, the House of Representatives post in a regular meeting, May 1, adopted House Post Resolution I, and at this time I ask our post adjutant, Richard G. Jefford, to read this resolution.

(The resolution is as follows:)

"Whereas because of the loyal enthusiastic support of the Honorable JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., distinguished and able Speaker of the House of Representatives, the American Veterans of World War II are now a national organization with a charter granted by an act of the Congress; and

"Whereas the honorary membership of said Speaker in Post No. 19 of the American Veterans of World War II is a treasured distinction and a jealously guarded honor; and

"Whereas the members of said post are continuously reminded of his gracious loyalty; and

"Whereas his distinguished leadership in national problems, and the able manner in which he conducts the affairs of high office are a continual source of inspiration: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the thanks of Post No. 19 of the American Veterans of World War II are due and are hereby tendered to Speaker JOSEPH WILLIAM MARTIN, JR., for his devoted interest, his wise counsel, and his inspiring example as a great leader of this Nation.

"Attest:

"LUCIEN O. HUNTER, Jr.,
"Commander."

The program of the luncheon follows:

PROGRAM OF LUNCHEON GIVEN IN HONOR OF HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., SPEAKER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY AMVETS POST NO. 19, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, MAY 3, 1948, IN THE SPEAKER'S DINING ROOM, UNITED STATES CAPITOL

History of AMVET White Leaf Clover, by Clarence Adamy, national executive director of AMVETS.

Flower of Normandy, "Remember me the honored war dead."

MENU

Chilled fruit cup
Braised top sirloin of New York beef
Duchesse potatoes New green peas
Spring salad
Strawberry ice cream
Demitasse Rolls and butter

MEMBERS, AMVETS POST NO. 19, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Officers

Post commander, Lucien O. Hunter, Jr.
First vice commander, Allan M. Ames.
Third vice commander, Karl Standish.
Adjutant, Richard G. Jefford.
Finance officer, Jack W. Watson.
Chaplain, W. Howes Meade, M. C.

Members

Hon. W. Howes Meade, Hon. Horace Seely-Brown, Thomas Tear, Kenneth Rowan, John P. Ridgely, George E. Jones, Albert D. Merriam, Olga M. Miller, William H. Palmer, Gilman G. Undell, John W. Macinnis, Emma L. Jackson, Francis J. Dailey, Dorothy K. Lundeen, Earle D. Chesney, John O'Callaghan, Emma R. Nease, Robert M. De Lisle, Elmer C. Hume, Jr., Ivan P. Gillett, Thomas H. Cleary, Frances de la Montanye, Dorsey J. Bartlett, Murray C. Bernhardt, Irvin W. Swanson, Curtis A. Christianson, Richard B. Daley, Richard S. Tribbe, Homer A. Cook, Mary U. Gallagher.

Flower committee

Olga Miller, chairman; Emma Lou Jackson, Frances de la Montanye, Shirley Ware, Nellie Denton, Cecelia Salvage, Robert Dunn, William Bassett, Louis Sanchez, Robert Steele.

Democracy Now Has Its Biggest Job To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me before the convention of the Texas Hotel Association at San Antonio, Tex., on April 27, 1948, entitled "Democracy Now Has Its Biggest Job To Do":

Ladies and gentlemen, democracy does now have its biggest job. That job is to stay alive. The last war was the greatest and most encompassing war of all time. The effort of this country in that war was the greatest undertaking by any nation. It also was the most unselfish project of a nation in history. We asked for nothing as a reward for our effort. We asked only that the world should never again see such a war. All people of right mind and heart fervently hoped and prayed that it would never happen again.

Because of that desire, the nations of the world met at San Fransicso for the purpose of planning an organization which could accomplish that end. We were perfectly sincere in our efforts and undertakings at that Conference. We showed our good faith in all of its deliberations. One major nation held back and gave evidence of refusing to agree to the covenants there proposed. Russia showed reluctance. Finally, Molotov came in person and Russia agreed to sign the Charter of the United Nations. Many of us were fearful that her agreement might not be in good faith. Many were afraid that we were witnessing the beginning of efforts which would result in a mere scrap of paper. However, all agreed that this additional undertaking was worth the effort and that we were perfectly justified in making that effort. Notwithstanding our disappointment in the conduct of the United Nations to date, I am of the opinion still that the United Nations should have been undertaken. Its lack of success thus far does not, in my opinion, justify our ceasing that effort at this time. With all of its disappointments and irritating failure, I believe that we should still continue to lend our support unless it becomes abundantly apparent that its usefulness is entirely destroyed.

As time has gone on it appears as if Russia did not intend to openly violate the covenants it made in writing, but had a better form of procedure. Russia did not demobilize upon the conclusion of the actual fighting of the war. Indeed, she has not yet disarmed.

In accordance with the demands of the people of our democracy, our demobilization proceeded at a rapid pace. Notwithstanding that rapid disarmament, it was too slow for the American people, who had no bitterness against other nations of the world. Our people believed in the commitments made by the nations of the world—that disagreements and disputes were to be submitted to the United Nations for peaceful and orderly settlement and without resort to arms. Therefore, they demanded immediate disarmament. Being a democracy, the people got what they wanted.

At the conclusion of hostilities we had the finest, best-equipped and best-trained armed services—on the ground, on the sea, and in the air—that have ever been assembled. They were disbanded. The men who had organized, trained, and equipped that force viewed its disbanding with deep misgivings. The magnificent Air Force was not demobilized in an orderly fashion; it simply disintegrated. The great Nation which had put approximately 15,000,000 men under arms during the struggle; the Nation which had surprised Hitler and all of his totalitarian nations by its ability, even though a democracy, to organize and mobilize for war; the Nation which fought two major wars at the same time, and won them both, was reduced to 639,000 ground troops and an air force of 401,000. With this meager force, we faced the necessity of occupying Germany, Japan, and Korea. Still it remained the strongest Nation in the world in finance, industrial, potential, and intelligent population.

Through the many years of peace which the world enjoyed prior to the first World War, a condition existed which accentuates the difficulty of the present time. Europe

during those years was divided into spheres of influence. There was a very delicate balance of power. There was Great Britain with her great navy. There was France, the mother of democracy. There was Germany with her army and industrial development. There was Russia with her natural resources and millions of population. And, there was the great democracy of the Western Hemisphere—the United States. No one nation and no two nations could dominate the world. This balance of power was disrupted by the First World War with the defeat of Germany and the revolution in Russia, followed by the years of bloodshed which attended the entrenchment of communism. Hitler with his Nazis overran a great part of Europe and brought on a war which resulted in the destruction of Germany, the impoverishment of Great Britain, the crushing of France, and chaos in Italy. Therefore, only Russia remained in Europe as a strong and powerful nation. No nation remained which was capable of challenging the power of Russia and her Asiatic rulers. Only one other dominant nation existed in the world. That was the United States. For the first time in modern history has the world seen only two dominant nations. The situation is complicated by the conflicting systems of government and ideologies of those two nations.

Hitler had sought to subjugate Europe. He was actually a pupil of the men in the Russian Kremlin. They must have regarded him as a very inept pupil. His ideology was based upon the glorification of the Nazis as the super race. He sought to take over one country after the other by the use of his great armed force. His system was based upon force and super race. He was able to subject one nation after the other with the military machine he had provided. He then had nothing to offer the conquered people nor attract them into his scheme of things. The Belgian, the Dutchman, the Frenchman, the Pole, the Czech could find nothing in his Nazi system to which they could cling. Always they were faced immediately by the fact that Hitler's ideology glorified only the Nazi. There was no appeal to those of other races or nationalities. They must remain forever the conquered people of Nazism.

The Communist system is far more insidious and far more dangerous. She has her powerful army and air force. But equally important, she has her technique of boring from within. She has found a place in her ideology for groups of all races and nationalities. She utilizes all minority groups. She attempts to appeal to those of every occupation. Basing her campaign on these various groups within their own countries, she has spread her ideology. Her grants go into all countries and recruit supporters by the subtle plea of better times to those who feel they have not secured a fair share from their own country, or minorities she can convince have been the object of persecution.

Here quite apparently lies the reason she was willing to enter the United Nations. This vast network and years of effort made her feel secure that she would not be required to violate covenants of the Charter, openly and as a scrap of paper, but violate them more efficiently. Through those loyal to her first, and their own country second, she had been able to set up in many countries her Communist parties. Without firing a shot, Poland was overrun. Romania succumbed. Most recently, strong democratic Czechoslovakia found herself with a Communist government.

Greece was marked for conquest and would probably have been taken ere this had there not been timely support from the United States. That support gave the Greeks the power to withstand the efforts of the small band of guerrillas which attempted to overrun that country.

It is still evident that the United States cannot hope to live safely in a world without friends. We cannot hope to enjoy peace and protect our democratic way of life if all of the people who believe in our system of government, and in our system of free enterprise, are held in subjection by the only other major nation of the earth, and it committed to the Communist system of economy. At the same time we saw that our traditional friend, Great Britain, was so impoverished by a long and gruelling war that she could no longer carry on without assistance. France, the victim of long years of occupation which had sapped her resources, found herself unable to reestablish her economy and ease the plight of her people. The Communists, without a majority which could control the government, called their minority groups on strike to paralyze the nation. They rioted in the streets to produce the confusion in which communism prospers and grows. Italy, with an election approaching, was beset with loud and vociferous campaigning with promise of prosperity and plenty, should the Communists secure control of the Government. Finland and the Scandinavian countries were faced with demands that they enter into "mutual assistance pacts."

All of this confusion was produced in countries whose resources had been drained by war. There was a shortage of coal, steel, and electricity which prevented the reestablishment of their industries. Having no industry, there was no work. The ravages of war and drought left the people without food and clothing. To people reduced to such proportions, any talk which promises better times and relief from hunger, cold, and misery is appealing. It has been truthfully said that a hungry man has no mind, only a stomach. The father seeing his family in such destitution can be expected to take violent action. He would be less than human if he did not, in his extremity, seize upon any plan or any program which promised relief and life for himself and his family. The utilization of these extreme conditions is a favorite tactic of Russia.

With western Europe in this condition, the United States attempted to help. There were two phases to the problem. First was the humanitarian problem of giving immediate help during the past winter to keep the people alive. That problem did not necessarily involve any question of international politics or advantage. It was charity and the type of an appeal from the needy and suffering to which the people of the United States will always quickly respond. The other phase of the problem had to do with the rehabilitation of these countries so that the condition would not recur with the coming of each winter. That meant that basic industries must be rehabilitated, farmers given the means to make their land productive once more, and steps taken generally to revive the economy of those nations. At the same time the economy of the United States could not stand the constant recurring demands.

This latter program is not charity. It is plainly and simply international politics. General Marshall first suggested the plan. He briefly outlined that an orderly approach should be made to the problem. The nations should evaluate their own economy on a long-range basis as to the amount and character of aid required to establish their economies. That those nations invited would be permitted to participate if they gave assurance of working together toward recovery and the maintenance of the democratic ideal and system of government. That the United States would undertake to assist, to the extent that our economy would permit, those countries whose best efforts were inadequate.

The Marshall plan has now become the European recovery program. It has passed the two Houses of Congress by overwhelming votes and is beginning to operate. Let me reiterate, it is not charity. It was not suggested nor adopted out of any sense of charity. It is one of the major links in our program to save western Europe from domination by Russia. Its purpose is to keep them as our friends and on our side in the maintenance of democratic governments in the world. It was supported with equal fervor by Republicans and Democrats alike and it was advocated and supported as good business for our own Nation. Its benefits are already becoming apparent. There is hope in western Europe again. Those people now have reason to believe that there is a future after all. The long months and years of hopeless despair are now beginning to brighten. There is the will to live and to remain democratic.

Let me point out this very significant fact. Russia has always been able to take over any country she desired when her army was either in the country or when her army surrounded any country. Russia has not been able to take over the government of any country which her army did not either occupy or surround. Greece has not fallen and, after a heroic struggle, Italy is still democratic. Not only still democratic, but democratic by a larger majority and safer margin than heretofore. Italy was not surrounded, though Communists were on her border. Italy and Greece got help from the United States. The Communists in Italy who worked upon individuals, assuring the worker that he would own the factory if communism came, the farmer that he would have additional land and equipment under the blessings of communism, were counteracted by the evidence of aid coming from the United States. The assurance which came to Italy by the adoption of the Marshall plan prior to her elections had no small part in that victory. The tangible evidence of aid which had already arrived supported that election. People would rather be free. People without hope cannot make easy choices as to the future. Starvation and misery make a man easy prey for the blandishments of the Communist.

I repeat, it is most significant that the nations which have succumbed to communism were either occupied by, or surrounded by, the Russian Army. Is it any wonder then that Russia appreciates and capitalizes on the strength of her Army and Air Force? Is it any wonder that she believes in force? Her infiltration is remarkably effective and she has been able to have people of every nation on the ground, trained and ready to take over, but she has been successful only when they were backed and supported by the millions still under Russian arms.

With this experience on her part, how powerless she must regard the representatives of our own powerful United States. They argue and reason. Their logic may be the best, but to Russia it will have little power until it is backed by military force sufficient to impress the men of the Kremlin. I have sat in closed sessions with many of the men who have represented us at various conferences. They have told us how helpless they feel when they know that Stalin or Molotov is looking over their shoulder to see how many troops back up their arguments. Our representatives of the military who conferred both while we had large forces in Europe and in recent times remark as to the different attitude.

I regard it as absolutely essential that we let the world know now that we propose to increase our armed services, and that we propose to keep prepared in the future. I was a Member of Congress in 1939, 1940, 1941, and throughout the war. Too many things are happening now which remind me of those terrible days of 1939, 1940, and 1941. During those years a dictator was on the prowl over Europe. A dictator is prowling in Europe today. For weeks past, I have been sitting in the Committee on Armed Services in the consideration of the bill for selective service. In 1940 I sat in the Committee on Military Affairs on the Selective Training and Service

Act. I have seen and heard many of the same people in 1948 whom I heard in 1940. They tell the same story now that they told 8 years ago. They preach sweetness and light. They urge conferences, more conferences. Notwithstanding the exercise by Russia of the power of veto on every major proposal not in accordance with her desires, they still urge that the matter be referred to the United Nations. They urge that Stalin is of no danger to Europe, the United States, or the World, in the identical language in which they said the same things about Hitler. A proposal for an army of 837,000, an air force of 502,000, and a navy of 556,000 is certainly not an excessive number for a nation of this size, wealth, and national resources. It is certainly no more than adequate for the only nation remaining in the world which can protect democracy. It is certainly not too large when the only other dominant nation in the world has, with her satellites, about 265 divisions at her disposal and an air force of many thousands of planes.

This force is the minimum that this Nation can afford to support during times such as these, when all of the world is troubled and there is crisis and distress.

We must have a balanced force. Balanced between the land, the sea, and air force. The bill we are now considering provides for a force in balance. The 70-group Air Force, for which I have been fighting during the past few weeks, does not throw the services out of balance. It creates balance between the forces. I do not want to see the Air Force build large numbers of the conventional types of planes which were used in the last war. Research and development are going ahead. Jet propulsion has increased the speed of planes. I don't want to prepare for a possible future war in the air with planes which were adequate for the last war. That means bombers of much longer range and greater carrying power. It means the character of bomber which can carry the atomic bomb to the farthest corner of the earth and return its crew safely to the United States. That plane has not been built, nor has it been designed.

It takes time to design and build new planes. No plane, the design of which began after Pearl Harbor, participated in the last war. That being true, we must start procurement now. The program I advocate does not contemplate more than 1,500 planes next year. During that year, Russia is expected to build more than 1,000 planes every month, or about seven times as many as we do next year. But I am interested a whole lot in our getting about 5,600 planes in 1953, the 70-group program will do it. They will be 1953 models and not the planes conceived prior to 1941.

The greatest security we can provide for our Nation is an air force in being capable of defending our shores. No nation is now capable of reaching our country in sufficient force to mount an attack, except by air. We must be prepared to turn back such an attack. More important, we must have each nation in the world convinced that we can not only return such an attack, but we can bomb her cities and her industrial areas with such devastating effect that she will know better than to attempt an attack upon us. We have the atomic bomb. No other nation has it. So long as we alone have it, all must be convinced that we have the planes which can deliver it to their own land. Where other nations have perfected the atomic bomb, we must be able to deliver more and bigger bombs to them than they can deliver to us.

I served as a member of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board. For many weeks we reviewed the aviation potential of other countries, including Russia. We reviewed the time table upon which we must base our calculations as to when Russia will have the atomic bomb. It is no coincidence that our 70-group program contemplates that we will not have all of those groups in being until 1953, the year our time table indicates that Russia will have the atomic bomb

For an armed service to operate as a team throughout the world it is essential that each be of proper size to operate in coordination with the other two. Therefore, let me make it clear that even if we had 70 fully equipped and operating groups in our Air Force today, we would still require an army large enough to capture, hold, and protect overseas bases from which that air force would have to operate. We would have to have a navy large enough to transport that army overseas and keep it and the air force supplied so that both could operate.

I am afraid that some may take the position that an enlarged Air Force will eliminate the necessity for either a system of selective service now or a program of universal military training for the long-range program. It does not. In the present condition of the world, I feel that our way is clear and our program self-evident. The safety, protection, and welfare of our Nation require the European recovery plan, the 70-group air program started now, selective service, and universal military training. They are each a part of the whole. We are one of the major nations. As such we have a responsibility which we cannot shirk. As such we must be prepared at all times to discharge that responsibility.

That this Nation may be permitted to continue as a haven in which to enjoy the blessings of the government designed by our forefathers is our first duty. We do not own it. We hold it in trust from those who designed, organized, and maintained it and those who through succeeding wars fought, suffered, and died that it might continue, grow, and prosper. It is our sacred trust to pass it on to our children as good, and better, than we received it from our forebears. Therefore, we must strive to maintain our free institutions and the system of free economy which has made it great, prosperous, and the hope of the world. We cannot be unmindful that Henry Wallace is not the only one in this Nation who would cast reflections upon our system and our efforts. He is the most vocal. But he is out in the open and we can all watch his activities. There are others equally active but not so loud. Their exposure and elimination from places of influence is just as necessary as the assured defeat of Henry Wallace and his crackpot followers.

These are troublesome and parlous times. These are times which require our best efforts. These are times not of our own making, but times and conditions which have been presented to us. They challenge our ability to meet and overcome them. The American people, individually and collectively, have always been the best adapted to meet whatever condition may arise. We shall do so again. That we may do it in unity and cooperation, is the most important part now. Being prepared and united, we shall meet these world conditions with the same outstanding success as we have met all others. This is our job. Democracy now has its biggest job.

The Italian Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Joseph G. Harrison, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for May 3, 1948, on the Italian election:

POSTSCRIPT—ITALIAN ELECTION

THE WIDE HORIZON

(By Joseph G. Harrison)

ROME.—A few second thoughts on the Italian election have occurred to interested outsiders here in Rome. And while these late impressions do not question the size of the Christian Democratic victory, they are somewhat sobering. For they deal with what did not happen in that crucial election. They are:

1. The Italian Communists did not take the kind of beating which some Italians and apparently many Americans believe they did. Despite the size of the clearly anti-Communist vote, there is no good indication that any sizable number of Italian workers deserted the Communist Party.

On the contrary, there is excellent evidence that they did not. In the official Communist newspaper, L'Unita, one of the top-ranking Italian Communists and a member of the Cominform, writes:

"Those who are now singing over the burial of the Communist Party make us laugh. Not only did our party stand against the attacks which came from all sides, but it made great forward strides between 1946 and today. It increased by several million the number of votes it received on June 2, 1946. I believe that it is the first time in history that a Comunist Party in the short span of a year and a half, given the conditions of the political struggle of the last few months, succeded in winning the confidence and the vote of millions of men and women."

Does that sound like whistling in the dark or like self-deception? Those who think so may turn out to be wrong. It will be recalled that in the April 18 and 19 election, the Communist-Socialist Popular Democratic Front received 8,025,990 votes. The other day I was discussing the election outcome with an Italian Socialist newspaperman who has friends high in party circles. He told me he believed that the Communists had won three-fourths of the votes received by the Front—or 6,000,000 votes. This estimate I have heard given in other circles as well.

The Communist vote in 1946 was 4,356,686. In other words, there is good reason to think that the Communist vote in the 22 months separating the 2 elections rose by 35 percent.

Where the Communists did lose, however, was in the fact that the Socialist Party, with which they are allied, seems to have lost, according to estimates, between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 votes. Thus the Communists may be stronger, but their ally is much weaker, which detracts from the Communists' overall effectiveness.

2. Communism is not finished in Italy—not yet. No party which can attract an estimated 6,000,000 votes under the relentless pressure to which the Communist Party was subjected is either weak, moribund, or resourceless. The only thing which can end the threat of communism in Italy is for the Christian Democrats to solve so many of Italy's deep and fundamental problems during the next 5 years that communism will lose its attractiveness for the Italian industrial worker and poor peasant.

If the Christian Democrats fail to solve these problems, it is perhaps not unreasonable to assume that communism will flourish and spread. Having voted for the Christian Democrats, Italy expects them to do the job. If they do not, communism will benefit.

3. Neither Premier Alcide de Gasperi nor his Christian Democratic Party won a large following among the masses of Italian industrial workers. An analysis of the votes cast in each of Italy's industrial areas shows that the left-wing parties, but particularly the Communist, still command the alle-

glance of the overwhelming majority of all Italian labor, other than those working on the farms of southern Italy.

It is true that the percentage of left-wing votes went down in industrial areas and the percentage of Christian Democratic votes went up. But this is not particularly hard to explain. It arises from the fact that some 3,200,000 more persons voted this time than in 1946 and the majority of these were brought out through anxiety over communism.

Furthermore, it would be no exaggeration to say that among the 12,751,841 Christian Democratic voters there were 3,000,000 or possibly 4,000,000 persons who are either not particularly sympathetic to that party or who are actually antipathetic to it. There is not a correspondent in Rome who does not know one or two persons who, while preferring to vote for some other party, voted for the Christian Democrats because they had been warned not to disperse their votes and to vote for the one main anti-Communist Party.

It is an interesting and significant fact that most of those who voted for the Christian Democrats, although out of sympathy with that CD program, find their greatest point of disagreement in Premier de Gasperi's strong pro-Vaticanism.

4. Premier de Gasperi will not have an easy time. As mentioned above, the Communists will grow by de Gasperi failures, and it is therefore reasonable to assume, knowing how the Communists have acted in the past, that they will do all in their power to cause him to fail.

In this policy they will have strong cards in their hands. Present laws protect, if not actually encourage, strikes. Between them, the Communists and Socialists control about 85 percent of Italy's 6,000,000 organized workers, and the all-powerful secretary-general of the Italian General Confederation of Labor, Giuseppe di Vittorio, is a shrewd, tough Communist.

To break strikes which the Communists might call to sabotage recovery in Italy, Premier de Gasperi would need troops. And the use of troops would, in all likelihood, have two results: (a) further alienating the industrial masses and increasing their already intense dislike of the Christian Democrats, and (b) swinging the Christian Democratic Party further to the right in a search for sympathetic allies. It is to the right of the Christian Democrats that one finds the pro-Fascist, antiworker, antipeasant elements which form one of the greatest dangers to Italian democracy.

5. Contrary to what might be expected, the Vatican is not 100 percent happy over what has happened in Italy. Of course, the Roman Catholic hierarchy is glad that the Christian Democrats won such a heavy vote.

But that is not, from a clerical viewpoint, the whole story. The Vatican cannot help but remember that despite the terrific pressure brought to bear, despite the fact that churchmen from Pope Pius XII on down to the humblest village priest asked for and worked for a Communist defeat, 8,000,000 Italians voted for the Front.

What is the conclusion to be drawn from this fact? Not that these 8,000,000 voters were necessarily anti-Vatican or anti-Catholic, but rather that, having been confronted with a choice between following the word of the Pope and that of a party directed from Moscow, they chose the latter.

Those familiar with the care with which the Vatican approaches such crises as these know that in such cases the hierarchy tries to avoid putting too difficult a choice before the faithful, since it realizes that a person who has decided against the church in one instance will find it easier to do so in the next. Finally, the hierarchy realizes that, having helped the Christian Democrats to win, the Communists will force it to share the blame for every CD failure. No, this was not an election in which the Vatican could win a 100-percent victory.

Address of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAYTON E. PHILLIPS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at a Republican State Convention, Nashville, Tenn., Friday, April 30, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Republicans, it is good to be in Tennessee. I am particularly pleased to have been invited to make this keynote address. The Volunteer State has made many contributions to American statesmanship over the years. At a critical period in our history it gave the Nation a President, "Old Hickory," whose steadfast devotion to Americanism kept the ship of state from grounding in dangerous shoals. Three Presidents Tennessee has contributed, the other two being James K. Polk and Andrew Johnson. Not the least of Tennessee's great contributions to America came in World War I when your State gave many brave men, including that "one-man army" Sgt. Alvin C. York.

Tennessee has given us able, conscientious Republican Representatives in the Congress.

Today a son of Tennessee handles the helm of the Republican National Committee, and helps to guide the destiny of the grand old party.

One reason I thoroughly enjoy being in Tennessee is because it is still so typically and frankly American. Your scenery is high among the show places of the United States. Your great Smoky Mountains, and the rolling country to the lowlands of the Mississippi River on your western border; the great Tennessee River which flows into Alabama, and then curves back to flow through Tennessee and Kentucky into the Ohio, all lend charm and beauty to your great Commonwealth. Your forests of oak, yellow pine, gum, yellow poplar, hemlock, and chestnut still contribute much to the Nation's needs and wealth. Your mineral products such as coal, iron ore, and the many other valuable minerals add more wealth to our Nation. And in that connection let me say I am happy the country's basic coal industry is back to work. I am glad I was able to have a part in bringing to an end that dangerous and costly situation.

Agriculture is important in Tennessee. And not the least of your prolific crops down here is educational institutions. I find you have some 50 institutions of higher learning; 22 colleges and universities; 6 professional schools; 5 teachers' colleges; 9 junior colleges, and 8 Negro colleges.

If I were to go on enumerating the beauties and attractions of the State of Tennessee, I would not have time to talk about anything else. But I am here to talk to you today about how we are going to keep America the kind of an America we know and love, and Tennessee the kind of grand, old Tennessee you know and love.

I come to you today with pride in the accomplishments of the Republican Eightieth Congress, and with a sense of great encouragement over the change in trend. The Eightieth Congress has broken the hold which a political monopoly has had on this country for 16 years. We have at last begun the journey back to the ways of freedom, sound government, and sane thinking. The road the New Deal was traveling was toward a permanent, highly centralized Government, with regimentation, and Federal controls over all the people, over business, over all the activities of the Nation. It was leading us to a concentration of power at Washington, which, in a little while longer, would have ruined our American system of free constitutional government, free economy, and free society.

The citizens of Tennessee, like the citizens in other States, have viewed the events of the past 16 years with increasing uneasiness. They saw, in 1932, the national administration taken over by a crew of opportunists, political adventurers, and crack-brained theorists, who had banded together to give this country what they called a New Deal.

That motley crew had a conception of a New Deal which included a radical departure from the tried, tested, American principles of republican government. The New Deal of their conception was a vest-pocket edition of state socialism. It embraced controls over industry, labor, and all the citizens. It consisted of one-man government. They wanted to maintain a political monopoly rule through the technique of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. To promote this technique the New Dealers brought forth manufactured emergencies and counterfeit crises, one after another. At elections the New Dealers chanted, "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream." The country has been kept in a constant state of anxiety. It is a tribute to the firm faith of our people in our American system that the Nation's economy wasn't completely wrecked.

Next November we are going to change both the horse and the rider. The people of this Nation are going to let the Republican elephant pull us back to the solid shores of sound government, and a strong, safe, solvent America.

The New Deal has a black record in its 16 long years in public office. It is a record of deficit spending and high taxes; of waste of public funds. It is a record of un-American policies; of bureaucracy on a binge; of coddling Communists; of bungling foreign relations. It is a story of utter failure at the peace table. It is a record of utter inability to deal constructively with our many domestic problems, including inflation. It is a record of responsibility for high prices; of a total disregard for States' rights.

The New Deal split the Democratic Party wide open. The patriotic Jeffersonian Democrats found themselves in a most unhappy situation. Let me say at this point that the Republican Party welcomes the help of millions of patriotic Democrats who never have had any more sympathy with the New Deal than we have, but whose concern, like that of all good citizens, is for the welfare of their country. The greatest contribution the South can make to its own welfare, and to the national good, would be to have two strong political parties. You folks know the South has long been retarded because of its one-party monopoly. You of Tennessee have a wonderful opportunity to combine with other States to lead a movement to lift the South to greater influence in the Nation by laying aside the halter of one-party domination.

The American people have at last come to a full realization of what the New Deal has meant to do. It can hoodwink them no longer.

The Republican Eightieth Congress has kept faith with the American people. We achieved the first balanced budget this country has had in 16 years. The New Dealers have persisted in refusing to help make that a fact. For that they can be excused. They never saw a balanced budget before. Therefore, they can't recognize its advantages. They seem to think it is something to be carefully avoided.

We promised the Nation we would reduce the burden of taxation. The administration policy was that a reduction in taxes would leave too much money in the hands of the people. We Republicans are still old-fashioned. We believe, like you folks here in Tennessee, in more money in the pockets of the people instead of less. We also believe in more government under home rule and less government at Washington.

We fought a long, hard battle on two fronts at one time. One was to cut appropriations so we could reduce taxes. The administration resisted appropriation cuts and tax reductions in every way they could think of. They even laid off border guards along the Canadian border, and left the country wide open to the influx of criminals from other countries who had sneaked into Canada to try to get into the United States. They even threatened to lay off mail carriers and delay the mails.

Three times we passed a tax-reduction bill. Three times the Chief Executive vetoed the bill. The last time we passed it over his veto, with the help of many patriotic Democrats, who put their country's welfare above the administration's demands. It was such an overwhelming vote to override the veto as to constitute one of the worst defeats any administration has ever experienced.

Under that tax bill more than 71 percent of all the benefits are reaped by those in the lower income brackets. We also contrived to grant incentive tax reductions as a powerful inducement for venture capital to go into production. We know high taxes do not stop inflationary spirals any more than governmental controls do.

Look at Russia. In no country in the world does government have a more despotic control over its people, their lives and all their activities than does the Kremlin in Soviet Russia. That control has existed for many years. What is the result? Russia has prices far higher, in terms of actual labor-hours, than does the United States. Russia's inflation drove her prices upward constantly. The Kremlin finally resorted to a capital levy of 90 percent to pay for the inefficiency and the corruption in their management of government. Out of every $10 their citizens owned they took $9. But that did not stop inflation. Russia has had all of the inefficiency, all of the bureaucratic abuses, and failures, and falsities, any other country has had, and in much more aggravated form. When anybody tells you centralized control, or high taxes, or regimentation of the people constitute an answer to inflation and high prices, just point your finger at Russia and say, "Look."

We Republicans know high taxes are a terrible drag on production. They are a millstone on the necks of consumers. Twenty-three cents of every dollar the American housewives have been taking to the market went to the tax-gatherer. Those 23 cents did not pay for a nickel's worth of food, or clothing, or furniture, or service. The people are still tax-ridden on everything they buy. But after next November, with a Republican President in the White House who will cooperate with a Republican Congress, we intend to cut the overgrown bureaucracy down to peacetime size.

We started to put an end to waste and extravagance and inefficiency by a reduction of between two and three billion dollars in the 1947-48 budget. This reduction of governmental extravagance, and the trimming down of a sprawling, spendthrift bureaucracy, must go along with tax reduction.

The Republican Congress was determined that the blind, the aged, and other unfortunate citizens, unable to maintain themselves, should have at least some of the comforts as well as the bare necessities of life. The tax bill we passed helps to do that.

We did not give empty promises for relief to those in the lower brackets of income. We knew they had to have action. Upon them the high prices, and that 23 cents of taxes hidden in food and clothing prices, bear with the greatest hardship. Therefore, the new law relieves 7,400,000 of those lower-income citizens, many of them in your own State of Tennessee, from paying any taxes at all. That, my fellow Republicans, is how we have kept faith with the people on our promises to balance the budget and to give the Nation tax relief.

A joint congressional commission is at work now to determine how and where we can cut the functions the Federal Government has usurped from the State and local government levels, and return those functions where they belong. That commission will report to the Congress in 1949. We will then cut Government costs more, and look at the tax question again.

We are maintaining our pledge to sustain the value of the dollar. We intend to prohibit further depreciation of our currency. We intend to make payments on the national debt. But we don't intend to starve the present generation to death trying to pay off the astronomical debt of this country too fast. Our veterans, and the other young people, must have encouragement. They must have their chance to get ahead in life. They must have their chance to establish homes, to raise happy families, to have something for a rainy day and old age. We must protect our younger citizens from repressive government and from having their pockets picked by the tax gatherer to pay for the spendthrift policies of irresponsible bureaus in Washington.

We promised the American people that when the Republicans came to power we would drive the Communists out of Government and replace them with men and women who believe in our American system. When the New Deal came to power there came to Washington a strange assortment of outright Reds and parlor Pinks. They infiltrated into important governmental posts. They used their influence to obtain important assignments outside the Government service for their friends and fellow travelers. From these posts of vantage they began to undermine our institutions. They carried on a very clever and carefully prepared propaganda to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress.

Next year, with a Republican in the White House, we intend to clean every last one of the Communists out of places of power, influence, and trust. We intend to man the governmental machine with people who are imbued with a love of liberty. With people who have faith in Government by consent of the governed. With people who believe, as you in Tennessee believe, that liberty in a cabin in the Smokies is better than a palace in slavery.

After next November rolls around, we intend to restore the Government to the hands of the people. We know home rule is the best possible antidote for communism in America.

As we clean out the Communists at home, we are moving through aid to Europe to prevent the spread of communism abroad. All Americans naturally shrink from having our Nation exert any influence, or exercise any interference in the affairs of other countries. But we had to face the fact that America is the last bulwark of liberty. We are the only Nation left on the face of the globe with the power, the productive capacity, the united people, and the devotion to freedom necessary to the leadership of a world-wide cooperative movement to stop the onward march of communism.

I am vastly encouraged by the results of the recent elections in Italy. I feel that my appeals to the foreign-born groups, and those of foreign extraction, to write their friends in their native land of how America really lives, and to send personal photographs as proof, have borne wonderful fruit. We now know the effects of these letters and photographs were widespread in the Italian election.

I congratulate the loyal American citizens of foreign birth and descent on their splendid accomplishment. They have rendered a signal service to the cause of liberty.

The Congress has created a joint commission to oversee the administration of foreign aid. We intend to see that those multiplied billions which must come out of the toil and sweat and privations of the American people shall be spent with the greatest efficiency and economy in helping to put back on their feet the nations of the other liberty-loving peoples.

The Republican Party has throughout all history been the party which faced the facts with courage. We face the fact today that we must have a national defense capable of meeting any enemy of the future on his own ground. No longer can we base our defense of America upon our own shores. Our defense must be capable of striking—and striking first and hardest—at those points where an offensive might be launched against us. To that end we have, over the objections of the administration, insisted on voting funds for air power which the air experts want, but which, for some reason, the administration objected to. We have gone along with the air experts. I was happy to have had a part in the leadership for this cause.

We must build up an invincible force for peace. Force is the only language understood by power-mad men willing to destroy civilization in their greed for domination over their fellow men. The time has come when the fate of the world is to be decided. Either we will have peace through the leadership, the strength, and the power of America, or we will have war until civilization is destroyed, and the globe is a festering field of slaughter. Men who have known freedom will never submit to living in slavery. We want peace with all the world, and in order to have that all the world must have peace. One of the Republican aims is to prepare America with the strength necessary to carry forward effectively her demands for durable world peace.

Now, as we make these moves to reduce inflation, to increase production, to lower prices and improve quality, to build an adequate defense, we are following out a considered, integrated policy instead of a haphazard, catch-as-catch-can, day-by-day political game of "vote, vote, who's got the votes?"

We Republicans are convinced that the interests of labor, agriculture, and management are mutual and inseparable. We intend to see, therefore, when we take over the administration next year, that the relationships shall be just, tolerant, and cooperative. Such a policy of cooperation is for the best interests of labor and agriculture as well as of management.

As we arm for peace, to make America so strong lawless men will not dare go on marauding expeditions across the world, we intend to get back to the spiritual values in our own Government. Integrity and straightforward dealing with the people must be the rule. Only a profound devotion to the spiritual values, to the principles of right, honesty, and justice, upon which our forefathers founded this Nation, can enable us to prosper and progress. Only upon such a foundation, with a profound faith in providence, can we stand, as we perform this stupendous task of trying to rescue the world from the wreckages of war, and restore sanity, progress, and peace.

So, then, the country calls for a Republican administration. The Nation needs it. The world will benefit by it.

In conclusion, let me assure you that the Grand Old Party is on the march to the White House. America can again be filled with hope. Our victory at the polls next November will be assured if we continue our efforts.

We must not let overconfidence cause us to relax our efforts until the polls close on next November 2. Every precinct worker, every county chairman, every State chairman must continue to carry to the people the truth of what the Republican Eightieth Congress has accomplished, and what a full Republican administration can accomplish.

When a Republican administration takes over after next November, America will again turn back to our own system of freedom under the Bill of Rights, which has given us the greatest, richest Nation in this world in a short period of 175 years.

Let me say to you folks in Tennessee that every man and woman in America ought to thank God every day of their lives that we live in this Nation. The whole world may well send their thanks to high heaven that America exists today. The Republican Party is America's hope of return to sound government, sound Americanism, and sound progress. America is the world's hope for peace, progress, a return to spiritual values, and the preservation of civilization.

When November 2 rolls around victory will come to us.

When victory does comes to us, may God give us the wisdom and courage to restore civilization, to achieve peace and progress in America, and to help achieve peace and progress for all the liberty-loving peoples in the world.

Hon. George A. Dondero, of Michigan, Keeps Tab on Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Plain Talk magazine of May 1948, entitled "They Knife General Clay," which was written by Mr. Blair Taylor.

Mr. Taylor points out that Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Governor of the American zone in Germany, has been wrestling with the Soviet Union on two fronts. One has recently culminated in the "battle of Berlin," which has made the Nation's front pages, but the other is not so well known. It is his struggle with the Soviet fifth column in the ranks of the American military government—AMG—in Germany.

Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO has been instrumental indirectly in ridding the military government of two such incumbents, namely, Heinz Norden, who was publisher of Heute—Today—in Munich, the AMG's German-language picture magazine published for our men in the service, and, secondly, George Shaw Wheeler, who was in a key AMG post—that of chief of the denazification branch of the Manpower Division, and later on the staff of Brig. Gen. Frank McSherry.

These are but two examples of men sent to Germany as advisers and workers under General Clay and who have hampered his work. Even the German Social Democratic leader, Dr. Kurt Schumacher, charges that the Americans would rather deal with the Bolsheviks than with them and that their influence was "duck soup" for the Kremlin followers.

I commend to every Member of the House the reading of Blair Taylor's article which follows and which gives you a picture of the obstacles placed in the path of our American military government:

THEY KNIFE GENERAL CLAY

(By Blair Taylor)

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, governor of the American zone in Germany, has been wrestling with the Soviet Union on two fronts. The story of his dispute with the Soviet high command, culminating in the recent battle for Berlin, has been graphically detailed on the Nation's front pages. Not publicized, however, is the story of his struggle with the Soviet fifth column in the ranks of American Military Government (AMG) in Germany. The story has come out piecemeal in scattered reports from Germany and in occasional disclosures made in Congress.

The entire problem of Communist penetration in AMG, the most sensitive of American agencies abroad—the one which constitutes our political counterbalance to the Red Army might in the heart of Europe—could properly be made the subject of an intensive congressional investigation. There are plenty of leads available for exploration.

So successful has the Kremlin-can-do-no-wrong crowd been in penetrating various levels of AMG, that one high officer on General Clay's staff was quoted in the New York Times as having described Washington efforts to ferret out Reds at home as "an obscene Red hunt," echoing Moscow's propaganda cry. Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, who has been keeping tabs on the situation, stated recently:

"For some time I have tried to find out what lies behind the brazen curtain which hides the activities of our so-called 'military' government in Germany. The lining of this curtain is red plush, muffling the crass stupidity of some of our administrative officials, and more particularly the far-from-stupid machinations of Communist sympathizers who have wormed their way into American agencies and bureaus."

It was Representative DONDERO's exposé of Heinz Norden as a fellow-traveler which led to the latter's ouster as publisher of the AMG's German-language picture magazine, Heute (Today), in Munich last year. Norden is perhaps typical of the many pro-Communists who managed to secure positions of influence in the AMG set-up. The record shows that Norden was active in the now-defunct American Youth Congress, a Communist-front which had arranged the booing session on the White House lawn during Soviet-Nazi pact days. It also shows that he helped finance another front, the American League Against War and Fascism; that he had translated a number of party-line books. In describing his ouster, Norden told the New York Herald Tribune:

"My real 'crime' is that I am an uncompromising liberal. There simply seems to be no more room in military government for liberals."

Norden had something there. Uncompromising liberals—those refusing to kowtow to Stalinist machinations—were driven out of AMG at the behest of the Communists. The same tactics were used in New Deal days in Washington to rid Government agencies of antitotalitarian liberals, whom the Stalinists fear more than they do conservatives. Peculiarly, despite his long-standing record, Norden was cleared by an AMG loyalty board. In giving him his walking-papers, General Clay included a letter praising him for having "contributed materially to the accomplishment of our broad objective in Germany to reorient its people to a more democratic way of thinking."

George Shaw Wheeler was another friend of the Kremlin who turned up in a key AMG post—that of Chief of the Denazification Branch of the Manpower Division. This job entailed weeding out Nazis from the reviving postwar German labor movement. Wheeler had been a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, another defunct Communist front, while he was a $4,600-a-year employee of the Department of Labor in the 1930's. Testimony later presented before the Civil Service Commission indicated that he followed every twist and contortion of the Communist line since then.

Wheeler had a field day in Europe. Unlike other officials who found it difficult to get into Soviet areas—even on official business—Wheeler and like-minded friends managed to junket frequently in lands beyond the iron curtain. On one occasion the Yugoslav Government placed a special plane at his disposal. After touring Marshal Tito's new democracy, Wheeler returned to his office and spread many a wonderous tale about "Titoland." Associates also recalled this strange coincidence—every time Wheeler and his subordinates went into the field, that area would have a rebirth of Communist activity.

A routine Civil Service Commission check finally caught up with Wheeler. The evidence was damning. His dismissal was ordered. But back in Washington, he put up a fight. Assistant Secretary of Labor David A. Morse appeared in his behalf. Wheeler's reinstatement was ordered. He returned to his old job in Europe on the staff of Brig. Gen. Frank McSherry.

The news aroused Representative DONDERO, who charged on the floor of Congress that the presence of such a man at a most important outpost of our armed forces is a distinct and dangerous hazard. Finally, Army Secretary Kenneth Royall saw the light. He announced he had received unfavorable information about Wheeler's background. Wheeler's contract was not renewed, a euphemism for being fired. He is now employed with the approval of the Communist-dominated Government of Czechoslovakia as an instructor in the technical high school in Prague, where, Representative DONDERO pointed out, he was given a warm welcome.

Wheeler, however, was succeeded by his best friend and associate, Don Snyder. Another friend, Dennis Courtney, was retained as secretary of the Manpower Division, handling all top-secret documents in the Division.

Courtney even wrote a defense of Wheeler's activities for Stars and Stripes, the Army paper, some of whose civilian editors are pro-Stalinist.

One out-and-out Stalinist publication, the German-American, published in the German language in New York City, which boasted Gerhardt Eisler as a contributor, won AMG approval for circulation in the American zone. It was shipped from the United States and widely distributed in Germany until the outbreak of the current crisis in Berlin.

Much of the Stalinist influx into AMG can be traced to the time when the present Assistant Secretary of Labor, David A. Morse, served as director of the Manpower Division in Germany. In that position Morse's immediate superior was General Clay and, under him, Morse was directly responsible for hiring AMG personnel. He hired Wheeler, Courtney, Snyder, et al.

A former NLRB attorney in New York, Morse went into the Army in 1942. He was assigned to military government and was AMG's labor director in Italy. In 1945, after VE-day, he left the Army, went into the Department of Labor, and soon was being touted by the CIO for the post of Assistant Secretary of Labor. This boom was promoted by Lee Pressman, then CIO chief counsel and semi-official dispenser of Washington patronage to

left-wingers. The American Federation of Labor put up a howl when Morse was first mentioned for his present post. AFL leaders charged that Morse was a stooge of Pressman, and that in Germany he had promoted the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), the Kremlin's spearhead in the ranks of international labor.

Under Morse's directorship, the Manpower Division established liaison with the WFTU, and Morse's subordinates frequently traveled to Paris to confer with WFTU's pro-Communist secretariat. The apparent aim was to line up the renascent German labor unions with the Stalinizing WFTU.

Brig. Gen. Frank J. McSherry, who succeeded Morse, is a professional Army man and no Communist. A protegé of the late Sidney Hillman, General McSherry had worked for the Labor Division of the wartime Office of Production Management, which Hillman headed. In his AMG post, General McSherry made no secret of his attempts to get labor representation on all German economic advisory bodies, as was the practice in the wartime United States. In early 1946 he was quoted by the Associated Press as having told a press conference that "the new Germany would have to be built around the working classes, because all German industrialists have been imbued with the twin philosophies of superiority and aggression."

How this worked out in practice became evident nearly 2 years later at a hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Questioned by Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota, as to the amount of Communist infiltration in German economic groups, Lawrence Wilkinson, head of the AMG's economic branch, conceded that the Communists had won a far greater proportion of posts than their numbers warranted. In Bavaria, for example, where the Communists could not elect a single deputy to Parliament, they managed to pack many offices with party members, apparently with the approval of AMG officers. They threw out elected mayors and replaced them with Communists. A list is on record.

German and other Communists turned up in numerous editorial posts on American-licensed German newspapers. Wilhelm Necker, who had a questionable political background, headed DANA, the AMG-backed monopoly for German news wire service, and was responsible for the bulk of news appearing in German newspapers in the American zone. He was finally dismissed. Radio was likewise infiltrated. A commentator on Radio Munich, named Gessner, specialized in assailing German officials opposed to communism. One day he didn't show up and had reportedly trekked to Moscow. Recently he has "commentated" over the Russian-controlled Radio Berlin.

In this set-up an anti-Communist German newspaperman or radio commentator had two strikes against him, even when he belonged to the Social Democratic Party, a pro-American leftist group. This was brought out forcefully by Dr. Kurt Schumacher, leader of the German Social Democrats, at a recent Socialist meeting in New York.

"Many times we felt that the Americans would rather deal with the Bolsheviks than with us," he said. Thus, while the set-up was duck soup for the Kremlin followers, anti-Communists found obstacles in their path. Who was responsible? The blame really belongs to certain Washington wartime officials. New Deal bigwigs did not think that Communist infiltration, which from 1942–46 was at its peak in Government agencies, mattered much. Wasn't the Daily Worker all out for winning the war? (It was, while Russia was in the war on our side and we were shipping lend-lease materials to her.) The Communists opposed strikes, and some west coast industrialists even thought that Harry Bridges was a nice guy because he was then against work stoppages.

Communist infiltration was heaviest in the Office of War Information. To be anti-Communist at the Fifty-seventh Street, New York, offices of the OWI meant you were a friend of Hitler—or so the Stalinist cells there said. The OWI specialized in broadcasting to the world tales of glorious Soviet achievements. Now its Red carrier pigeons have come home to roost.

In 1948, more and more OWI-pampered "specialists" and propagandists are turning up as Cominform agents beyond the iron curtain. Latest example is Adolf Hoffmeister, the new Czechoslovak Ambassador to France. An admitted Communist, Hoffmeister sat out the war in New York as head of the OWI's Czechoslovak broadcasting division. Many OWI people—because they could speak German, for one thing—went into AMG. Many of them, as it turned out, were more interested in promoting what might be called SMG (Soviet military government).

Some of the blame may properly be laid at the door of Robert P. Patterson. When he was Secretary of War before the unification of the services, Mr. Patterson was the top official responsible for AMG.

Mr. Patterson, who today heads a committee for promotion of the Marshall plan, the Kremlin's bugaboo No. 1, was a fall-guy for the Kremlin-can-do-no-wrong crowd. They clustered around him. They advised him on many questions of policy, men such as David Wahl, an employee of the Board of Economic Warfare, whom the former secretary admitted consulting on some matters.

Wahl's record caused the Civil Service Commission to order his dismissal, but the order subsequently was reversed. The record shows that at one time he headed the Cooperative Bookshop in Washington. This bookshop, part of the network of Communist propaganda outlets throughout the country, was the center of Communist intrigue in the Capital and made a convenient hang-out for local Communists. The works of Stalin, Lenin, Foster, Dennis (and at that time, Browder) poured out of the bookshop into the homes of many Government workers. Yet Wahl consulted with the country's top Army officials on policy matters.

Under conditions that permitted ousters of Communists to be mysteriously reversed, the comrades and their comrades found it not too difficult to infest General Clay's staff thousands of miles away. The Georgia-born son of a United States Senator, General Clay has been an Army man all his life, having graduated from West Point in 1919. After a long, successful career in the Engineering Corps, he was thrust into military government, not knowing much about political administration, and admitting it.

Consequently, he relied on his staff, whose members he did not select personally but who were mainly assigned from Washington. An Army man does not question his official staff. He thinks of its members in terms of T. O.'s and efficiency ratings. The pro-Communist staff members managed to keep in the background, doing their underhanded work quietly and efficiently. General Clay was content with efficiency and getting things done. He was harassed by the disciplinary problems of black marketeering and high living among Army and civilian personnel in Germany. Many AMG men made no bones about their intention of getting all they could. Many of them did. Stories embarrassing to General Clay began appearing in the papers back home. Congress voiced concern. General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, as Chief of Staff, ordered an investigation. Appropriations were at stake. All this played into the hands of the Stalinists who continued to stab General Clay in the back, unnoticed for the most part.

Much of this dirty work was done in AMG's decartelization branch. Deputy director of the branch was Russell A. Nixon, an outstanding fellow traveler. It soon became obvious that Nixon was more interested in defending Russia's interests than America's. Even before he left his post, Nixon accused the United States, France, and Britain of a so-called plot to rob Russia of her share of the spoils. With his chief, Col. Bernard Bernstein, Nixon fought General Clay's political adviser, Robert Murphy, hammer and tongs. Finally, he was discharged.

Returning home, Nixon showed his true color—an indelible red. He appeared before several Communist-front groups to charge that the United States sought to create a so-called western bloc against Russia. He accused top AMG officials with pampering Nazis, mainly I. G. Farben industrialists. His charges were picked up and broadcast to the world by radio Moscow. The State Department, forced to reply, charged that Nixon's assertions constituted a "clear disservice to the cause of the Allied Nations" and "threatened both the relations of the United States with its allies and the effort to gain control and power of disposition of German external assets."

In other words, Nixon was more interested in seeing Russia get those assets. Currently, Nixon is Washington representative of the Communist-line United Electrical Workers (CIO). At the union's Boston convention last year he was complaining bitterly about Army efforts to keep Communists and their cohorts from working in plants manufacturing secret military equipment: "This policy threatens creation of a new blacklist on a scale never known before in the United States."

James S. Martin, who later became chief of the decartelization branch, resigned in a huff soon after, charging that the United States "had dirtied its hands in Germany" and was seeking war with Russia. It wasn't long before Martin was addressing Communist fronts. At one dinner he spoke along with Andrei Vishinsky, master of the bloody Soviet purges.

Also active in the decartelization branch was Richard Sasuly, who worked with Nixon in the investigation of I. G. Farben, the German-controlled international cartel. Sasuly was drafted into the Army in 1943. After VE-day, he became a civilian employee of the War Department, landing in Nixon's charge. Returning home, Sasuly wrote a party line account of the investigation, which was brought out by Boni & Gaer, left-wing publishers.

An inordinate number of fellow-travelers also cropped up in the American staff at the Nuremberg war-criminal trials. This is the chief explanation for the alacrity with which the Russians managed to capitalize on the trials for propaganda purposes.

Assistant prosecutor at the Nuremberg spectacles was Drexel A. Sprecher, who had belonged to the Washington Bookshop, the National Lawyers Guild, and the American League for Peace and Democracy. Another assistant prosecutor was Abraham L. Pomerantz. Forced to resign, Pomerantz returned home. Immediately he, too, began to bemoan the so-called witch hunts against Communists here. An enrolled member of the American Labor Party, which has become a Communist subsidiary, Pomerantz charged that "we are providing American justice for Nazis, but Nazi justice for Americans." Pomerantz' most recent antic, as reported by the Daily Worker, was in joining O. John Rogge, former Assistant Attorney General, now promoter of the Henry A. Wallace candidacy, and Louis F. McCabe, described as a constitutional lawyer, in demanding that the Government discharge a Federal grand jury sitting in New York. The jury is investigating—you guessed it—Red espionage in America.

Prevention of War With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in this morning's Washington Times-Herald, containing the views of Rev. Father Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, from whose law school I was privileged to graduate 25 years ago. Father Walsh has been a student of communism and the Red influence since World War I and is a recognized authority on this subject:

ONLY STRONG DEFENSE CAN AVERT SOVIET WAR, FATHER WALSH WARNS—EITHER UNITED STATES OR RUSSIA WILL LEAD WORLD, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY PRIEST SAYS AFTER 6-MONTH TOUR

(By Bert Wissman)

The world can avert another shooting war, but the American and Soviet systems are "irrevocably irreconcilable" and "one or the other must conquer" in the cold war fight that is under way for world leadership, Father Edmund Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University, asserted yesterday.

The best that the war-weary people of the globe can expect in the years immediately ahead is an "armed truce" in which the United States best weapon is a ready Army and expansion of the Marshall plan, said Walsh, commenting on his recently completed 6-month tour of Europe and the Far East.

A student of communism and the Red influence since World War I, Walsh told reporters at a press conference marking his return to the university's foreign service school:

"War can be averted by the one argument Soviet Russia respects—power. All other appeals are futile."

The internationally known priest said his years of study of Marxist line of attack for world domination convinced him the Soviet would have no hesitancy in using the atom bomb on the United States if convinced we would be knocked out by the blow and unable to retaliate.

"If they (Russia) get the atom bomb—and in quantities—God help us," he said, estimating that in 3 years the Soviet will have the secret of the deadly missile. America's hope for salvation is to keep ahead in the development of the weapon and thus keep its present advantage, he thinks.

PRAISES MARSHALL PLAN

America and the democracies scored a smashing victory in the cold war in the April elections in Italy but now is no time to rest on the oars, Walsh warned.

"The violent and undisguised attack on the Marshall plan (from the Reds) during the Italian electoral campaign is a sure index that at long last we are on the right track," the Jesuit priest asserted.

His studies, he emphasized, convince him the Soviet and Stalin fear that the plan will upset Russian calculations for communizing Europe. This type of cold war will "cut the ground from under the feet of the Marxian dialectic," he continued.

VICTORY CALMS EUROPE

The victory of the democracies in Italy is a direct result of the economic and social future offered the peoples, he went on. Three other factors were main contributing causes, he believes. One of these was the suggestion that Trieste be returned to Italy. Another was the part played by Pope Piux XII, and the third was the general Italian revival of Christian consciousness.

The victory has ended the uncertainty and fear that was present in some European countries and opened the door for further blows against the Red influence, he said.

OTHER NATIONS SAVED

If the iron curtain had covered Italy, three or four more new victims of communization would have been added in the near future, he asserted.

The election, he further continued, is proof of what can be done by taking the initiative and meeting communism on its own ground. It should be a final blow against any further calls for appeasement policies, he believes.

The priest, who spent several months in Japan, said the administration of Nippon under General MacArthur had successfully blighted communism, and deplored that a similar iron-hand policy had not been adopted for Europe.

LISTS SOVIET OBJECTIVES

Walsh thinks that the defeat in Italy will bring Soviet repercussions elsewhere in the world. The Soviet, he said, does not want a shooting war now, but seeks to prolong the war of nerves to achieve four objectives:

1. Strengthen domestic support among the Russian population.
2. Increase subversive activities to capture wavering nations.
3. Consolidation and arming of the satellite Balkan confederation.
4. Obstruction of the Marshall plan in hopes of a depression here that would write finis to the program.

Walsh was on the scene at the recent Italian election and said it could best be described as the greatest debate of modern times—democracy and freedom versus Marxism and regimentation.

Peace in Palestine Is Not Enough; We Must Return to the Principles Adopted by UN Last November

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the weird idea of a Palestinian trusteeship has been dropped; a truce commission is now in Palestine on a hopeless errand; the mandate of Great Britain ends in 10 days; and no one has a plan.

It is not too late for the United States to retrieve its international honor by going back to the partition plan and enforcing.

In that connection, I am inserting in the RECORD under leave the following editorial from the New York Post of May 4 which explains lucidly the requirements of the situation:

PEACE ALONE IS NOT ENOUGH

The peace being proposed for Palestine is the peace of the prison, the peace of the serf, the peace of the grave.

This is not enough.

Peace—a just and secure and lasting peace—can be wrought for Palestine even yet but it will require more than a truce in which defender and attacker are treated as though they were equally criminal.

A true peace in Palestine may be achieved only by a complete return to the principles of settlement outlined last November by the General Assembly during the last period of American and Russian cooperation.

Then, only the Arab States, seeking still the destruction of the Jews, still left alive after Hitler's pogroms, and Great Britain, seeking a bitter satisfaction from a reign of terror attendant upon her resignation of the League of Nations mandate, were opposed to this just peace.

Since, the United States has been backing Britain in the dirty game of competing to see which can offer Arab feudal lords the greater number of lives from Jewish Palestine in payment for oil concessions.

Now trusteeship is again proposed—dressed up in a short-term proposal, renewable for added 30-day periods indefinitely; now that it is evident that the long-term trusteeship advanced by the United States to kill partition and the Jewish state could never win approval of the Assembly.

The second proposal—indeed any proposal—can succeed only if it is based exactly upon the Assembly's November decision.

1. Establishment of Jerusalem as a direct United Nations protectorate, as a free city in which all nations and all races shall enjoy equal rights in the heart of the Holy Land.
2. Recognition of the Jewish state already established in Palestine in the areas set aside for that purpose by the United Nations.
3. Economic union with the remainder of Palestine, set aside for Arabian domination.

No proposal for truce or trusteeship can possibly bring peace to Palestine, let alone justice, unless it contains in specific terms these three points and most important, sets a specific date, in the not too distant future, at which the Jewish state already set up will be recognized and supported by the United Nations, the United States and the powers originally voting for partition.

A stand-fast truce, with neither Arabs nor Jews advancing or retreating, is a farce unless based on the conditions set forth above, since guerrilla raids on Jewish territory must be answered with resistance in force if Jewish Palestine is not to disappear—and it will not disappear.

A practical solution—so appealing to the petty politicians who have usurped the place where statesmen are needed in making our own national policies—without sacrifice of the Assembly points, can be obtained and peace reign, if the United States will fight for it.

Recognition of the Jewish state and confirmation of the borders set forth in the Palestine Commission report is the first step.

Establishment of trusteeship over Jerusalem backed by force is the second.

Acceptance of British-dominated Transjordan as the effective governing force for Arab Palestine, and agreement to economic union with Jewish Palestine is the third.

This plan even the British could scarcely object to, since Transjordan is its puppet, and military bases would be freely granted in exchange for the added power, plus continued British subsidies.

The United States and the democratic world would be richer by an ally—Judea—in the Middle East, to offset whatever fretfulness Saudi Arabia might display over losing possible Palestinian booty—a fretfulness sure to disappear under the continuing flow of American dollars for oil.

Some variation of that plan will emerge—if not now, then in a future made more uncertain by the increasing desperation of the defenders of Judea and the increased rapaciousness of unchecked Arabian adventurers.

Only lives and honor will be sacrificed by further insistence by the United States

on its unrealistic and dishonorable opposition to such settlement.

And, incidentally, settlement now would revive the United Nations from the grave we have been digging for it with our cowardice, our avarice, and our stubbornness.

Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Conference on Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, since I have referred to an address of mine before the Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Conference on Government, which touched briefly on the international situation, I ask unanimous consent that my entire speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a Philadelphian as well as your United States Senator, I am doubly pleased to welcome you to Philadelphia for this truly fine experiment in the techniques of applied politics. Philadelphia would always be happy to play host to a group such as yours, but there is added significance to your visit here this year in view of the fact that the two major political parties will be holding their national conventions here in a few months.

It is nice to know that there will be at least one model political convention in Philadelphia this year.

The Republican convention in June and the Democratic convention in July will, I suspect, be anything but model. They may even be somewhat rough and perhaps bitter, as deliberations of such momentous import are almost bound to be when the stakes involved are as high as they will be in those two conventions.

I gather that as students of government in some threescore of our Pennsylvania colleges and universities you are not as much concerned here with telling the practicing politicians what to do and showing them how to do it as you are in learning for yourselves of the problems and operating procedure of a national convention.

Therefore, whether your discussions and decisions here this week end have any influence whatsoever on the outcome of the nomination battles and the platform fights at the national conventions, you are to be congratulated for carrying through on this important contribution to your own knowledge of politics as a science. I know that you will benefit greatly from the lessons you teach yourselves and each other by actual participation in the forms of politics in this 3-day intercollegiate conference on government.

The more widespread is the knowledge of how politics actually operates in practice, the better for all of us and for our democracy. The more the people know about politics in action and how it works, the better they can protect themselves against the wrong kind of politician. At the same time, those of us who are in politics or are political officeholders and are sincere in the desire to do the right thing in the public interest will benefit and benefit greatly by having that many more citizens aware of some of the problems we have to face.

Those problems are not just our problems as officeholders. Fundamentally they are your problems and you should be aware of them—acutely aware of them. The things we do in Washington, the decisions we make in the Congress, touch you intimately; they may affect the prices you pay for necessities, your education, particularly those of you studying under the GI bill, your chance at a job after graduation, your very lives and safety.

Congress doesn't operate in a vacuum and neither does the National Government, the agencies of the executive department. Politics is a year-around activity in Washington conducted with the gloves off. I am speaking now of politics in the highest sense as the science of government. It is not just a game which some of us who are elected to office engage in in isolated detachment from you and the rest of the people in America, nor is it just something which becomes important around election time.

What you do here, then, this weekend, is important only insofar as it contributes to your knowledge of American politics and of the factors which affect political decisions.

Youth is inherently impatient with imperfection, particularly in Government and in political leaders, but I think you young people will find yourselves becoming, as a result of this conference, a little less impatient with, a little more tolerant of, the imperfect compromises which characterise democracy and the operations of American political forms, such as political parties.

For instance, when you vote on your choice of a Presidential nominee, even though your nominations are to be nonpartisan and even though you can make your choice from among millions of eligible Americans with no restrictions as to party affiliation or party loyalty or party faction, I think you will find that you have no unanimous choice and that no man—or woman—suits you in every respect as your personal selection for President. The person each of you endorses will be the one who, all things considered, appears to you best fitted for the job and who, compared to others you might consider, has virtues which, in your mind, outweigh his shortcomings. Compromise? Of course.

Similarly, when you write your model platform, it will be a platform which will suit none of you entirely. I say that, first of all, on the assumption that this group of Pennsylvania college students is a representative one, reflecting a true cross-section of the sentiment in 56 different schools throughout the State. I say it, furthermore, despite full knowledge of the fact that on the fundamental issues of American political theory—democracy, freedom of the individual, equality, true justice for all, tolerance—in a short phrase, the American theory of political decency—Pennsylvanians think pretty much alike, even though they may disagree violently on aspects of day-to-day economics and party politics.

We are not necessarily a homogeneous group by religion or national origin, but we're pretty much homogenized, here in Pennsylvania, to the extent that we have always, since the days of William Penn, sincerely tried, I think, to get along with each other in mutual understanding and mutual respect. We don't have the tensions here which are so marked in some other localities, largely, I suppose, because we are so diversified in our backgrounds and so closely acquainted with the respective cultures our families and our ancestors have contributed to the great culture of Pennsylvania.

The point I am trying to make is that if a group of Pennsylvania college students such as yourselves—all students of American government—all reasonably close to the same age—all highly literate—all freshly alert to your responsibilities as citizens in a democracy (I assume you wouldn't be here for this conference if you weren't) and all, or certainly most of you, probably of similar economic levels somewhere generally close to the so-called middle class—if you find it hard to agree on a platform of principles for our Nation, as I am sure you will, then just imagine the conflict and the controversy which go into the actual formation of such a set of principles by one of the major political parties.

There you have deep and sometimes frightening fundamental differences of concept. Sectional and geographic interests clash almost violently. Economic theories collide. These things happen within both national political parties.

Now you might suggest that the parties purge themselves of their dissidents and let the present Democrats who think as Republicans do on some issues get out of the Democratic Party and join the Republican Party, and vice versa. That has been suggested before, many times. To some extent it is continually happening. It can never be done completely, for there will always be issues in which some Democrats and some Republicans think alike and on which other Republicans and other Democrats have a mutually opposing view. The parties could reshuffle—yes; but the intraparty squabbles would still continue—on new issues.

That being the case—and historically and traditionally it has always been the case—the problem of platform writing in actual practice seems to work out as an exercise in ambiguity and illusion. The objective has usually been to draft a set of ringing platitudes of the widest possible mass appeal. I have no doubt that the performance will be repeated at both conventions this year, as it has in past years.

Is the writing of platforms therefore futile? I am not sure I know the answer to that question, but my own view is that these platforms do serve a useful purpose. Depending upon how specific they are, they reflect the extent of unanimity within a party on some particular issues. Depending upon how important those particular issues are to an individual voter, in relation to other issues, the voter has some guide as to the degree of trust he can lodge in that party on those things which are most important to him personally.

But the guide is not always reliable. Often, as a matter of fact, it is very unreliable. Just to cite one example, let's take this civil-rights issue. Restricting it, for the moment, just to Pennsylvania alone, we had complete unanimity in both parties in the 1946 election on the matter of FEPC legislation. The platforms were straightforward and direct.

Do we have FEPC legislation in Pennsylvania?

We can pass civil-rights legislation in Congress, the entire program, if there is determination on the part of those Members of Congress from the North that it be passed. We could get cloture in the Senate if that sort of determination prevailed. The platforms call for it; at least the platforms of the two parties in the Northern States.

Political platforms, if they are to mean anything, if they are to carry weight and influence with the voter, must be more than pious banners behind which marches an army of candidates with their fingers crossed. To mean anything to the voters, platforms must be identified inseparably with the candidates they purport to speak for. They must be backed by performance. They must be spelled out in detail by each candidate who runs for an office in which he would have the opportunity, if elected, to influence the carrying out of platform promises and principles.

This, of course, can be carried to extremes. Although I mean no disrespect to the offices, for they are important to our democratic system, nevertheless, I am amused, as I believe you are, to see candidates running for prothonotary or justice of the peace on pledges

to win the peace or guarantee full employment or cut income taxes or put a car, or a family, in every garage. Contrariwise, it is discouraging, disillusioning, and infuriating, when a candidate to an office in which he can influence platform performance forgets his pledges and his promises once he has safely won the election.

When an incumbent officeholder runs for reelection, there is the opportunity to match his latest campaign pledges with his past voting record and from his record determine just how far into his cheek he carries the tongue which speaks such glowing promises of future performance.

In the case of Congressmen, however, it is often so very difficult to dig out a man's record, his real record, that is, as shown in his votes on crippling amendments to bills or his votes in committee or his votes to recommit—as against the easily ascertained but misleading record of votes on final passage—that the electorate is often in the dark as to what their Representative actually does stand for.

I have for some time been contemplating the introduction of a resolution to provide for the printing and distribution by Congress of these actual voting records of individual Members of Congress. Senator MORSE has such a provision as one of many in an extremely controversial resolution he introduced last year—one which contains so many hot potatoes, legislatively speaking, that it has little, if any, chance of ever getting out of committee. I have discussed with Senator MORSE the idea of breaking this one feature away from his omnibus bill, which is a bill to carry out further reforms of Congress and congressional practices of reticence and secrecy, and introduce it separately. He appears quite willing to go along with me on the idea, and I hope we can proceed on it shortly.

I don't think it is fair to the average voter to be forced to subscribe to a commercial service—usually a rather expensive one—to know how his Congressman voted on an obscure amendment to cripple rent control, or turn the Marshall plan into an inadequate dole instead of a reconstruction program, or give the natural-gas pipe-line companies a free gift of hundreds of millions of dollars from the consumers' pockets, or otherwise violate pledges he may have made in running for election.

Not every American could possibly read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day, even supposing he could get a copy—which, in most cases, he can't. The newspapers find it physically impossible to print all of the news of national affairs which their readers should have if they are to be thoroughly informed on what is going on in the Congress—and if the newspapers could print it, many Americans would have neither the time nor, alas, the interest to read it. In my own case, with a staff to help me winnow out the important from the unimportant before passing along to me those things I should know about in order to keep up with legislation in the Senate alone, I am simply appalled sometimes at the mass of material I must go through.

That is my job, and I am not complaining. I asked for the job. I can't expect every voter to be familiar with all the things which I, as a Senator, must try to learn about.

At the same time, however, it isn't fair to the people that they should have to take so much on faith insofar as their elected officials are concerned. Often they know so very little about the performance of the men they have elected to office, particularly to Congress, that good men have been voted out of office and drones have been kept in office only because of their political affiliations. And the party label in some notable election instances has won or lost support from the electorate not on the basis of the record it built over a previous 2-year period or 4-year period but on the basis of some transitory situation prevailing at election time.

In 1946, for instance, when men like Jerry Vorhis were unseated—and I use him as an example because he had just previously been designated as one of the ablest and hardest working Members of the entire House—the issue which licked them was a shortage of meat.

Meat is important, of course. I like it, too, but the meat shortage of 1946 was artificially created for political purposes in order to wreck price control. Price control was wrecked, and we again found meat available, but at a price many Americans haven't been able to pay. And now, as we head into the 1948 campaign, meat is going to become short again, and so is gasoline, and it might be interesting this fall to see how those who clamored for the end of price controls as the solution to all of our shortages will explain these forthcoming famines in popular American wants.

Speaking as an American and not merely as a Democrat, speaking as one who wants first to see the American political system demonstrate to the world in this period of political upheaval that our democracy can function with reason and justice, I think it would be most unfortunate for our country if once again outstanding Congressmen are defeated solely because some people can't get meat.

I say that even though my party would no doubt this year benefit from a repetition of the same hysteria as led to our losing the Congress in 1946.

The meat situation, and particularly the price of what meat there will be, is a fair campaign issue in 1948, but only as a part of a much greater issue—the whole inflation picture. Congressmen who helped to bring on inflation in 1946 and who have since refused to take any steps to curb it are vulnerable, and extremely so, in the coming election. But that issue is one issue among many.

I do not intend to go into the issues of the 1948 campaign because I know you have invited competent spokesmen for both the Democratic and Republican Parties to present their party viewpoints later today. It would hardly be fair for me to take advantage of your kind invitation to speak to you in order to promote my own party. At the same time, however, for a political officeholder such as myself, who is in the midst of the constant political battling going on in the Congress every day, to make a nonpolitical speech on politics is a difficult assignment, and if party politics does crop into my remarks, or if they have up to now, I apologize.

I understand that the plans for your conference provide for the formulation of 12 specific planks in your model platform, going through the alphabet from agriculture to veterans' affairs. I will be very curious to see your finished product.

I presume that each delegation has been preparing for this conference by digging up the basic data in these various fields. That alone justifies the entire concept of this conference.

In the field of agriculture, for instance, if you know the basic principles which govern our soil conservation and price-support programs, our agricultural research activities, and similar aspects of national agricultural policy—aspects which, no doubt, will find their way into your platforms—then you are tremendously better informed than are most Americans, other than farmers, on how a large part of your tax dollars are being spent. The price-support program, incidentally, is so roundly misunderstood by most nonfarming Americans that the impression has become widespread that this minimum-price policy for necessary farm commodities is responsible for today's outrageous prices for most foods.

I have no intention of going down through the list of platform subjects on your agenda. I know you will discuss and deliberate and, yes, and compromise among yourselves in reaching your decisions in the true democratic fashion.

I do want to make one comment which I think justified. It bears on the subject of foreign policy, which, I am sure, will be one of the storm centers of your conference. I gather from the mail I receive in Washington from college students in Pennsylvania that many of you believe the national administration and Wall Street and the oil interests and Gerald L. K. Smith and the non-Fascists or somebody have invented a world crisis and manufactured a tense international situation.

Believe me, that is no more true today than the same charge was when it was made against some, but not all, of the same groups less than 10 years ago.

I never was an isolationist. I don't believe in isolationism now. I believe pretty deeply in the whole idea of the United Nations and of collective action for peace. I bitterly oppose emotional hysteria, whichever side it comes from. I have tried to get at the facts. I have studied the testimony of men I trust. I hate war, as most Americans hate war. I think, I pray, war can be avoided, can be outlawed.

But there is no sense in shutting our eyes to the fact that nearly 3 years after the end of the bloodiest of all wars, and after the start of what was to have been the final achievement of world-wide decency, we have a United Nations bereft of any policing effectiveness at all; we have no more agreement on the international control of atomic energy than we had at the time of Hiroshima; we are drifting in a world where the forms exist for peace, but where the mechanics of peace cannot function.

I want freedom for myself and for my children and for all of our people. I am convinced we cannot remain free in America, if, one by one, the peoples of other nations are to be drowned in totalitarianism, with all freedoms crushed and destroyed. The throttling of freedom in Czechoslovakia by a disciplined and militant minority aided by the threat of aggression and invasion from the border—met by the freely expressed choice of the fiercely democratic and freedom-loving Czechoslovakians—was one of the saddest blows to freedom—to all freedom—to our own freedom in America—since 1938 when the Czechs, then too, were the first victims in the mass extinction of decency on a whole continent.

I think our course in Europe as necessary as was our course in 1941 when lend-lease was born; as the course which was necessary and which we should have followed but didn't in 1931 in Manchuria, later in Ethiopia, later in the months and years preceding Munich.

I ask that you keep these things in mind.

In closing, I want to say a word or two about the young lady who helped organize this fine intercollegiate experiment in Government and politics 14 years ago when she was a student at the University of Pittsburgh and who is now your executive director, I refer, of course, to Miss Genevieve Blatt, the deputy State treasurer of Pennsylvania.

Gen Blatt, to my mind, personifies the opportunities which exist in politics today for intelligent, hard-working, patriotic, decent, public-spirited American youth. Genevieve holds what is termed a political job. She was appointed to it. Believe me, she earned that place in only one way—on merit. She didn't get it because some ward chairman owed her or her family a favor. She didn't get it in order to curry favor with some pressure group. She didn't get it by compromising on scruples or principles and engaging in political muck-raking.

She didn't start out in politics as deputy State treasurer, of course. She got a job

down in the ranks and worked at it diligently, meanwhile getting ideas on improving the offices in which she worked to make them better offices. That's still the best politics of all.

We in the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania are proud of Genevieve Blatt. She represents the finest type of politician—an informed student of political science who has learned her politics by actual participation in politics; who believes politics can be decent and should be decent and plays politics accordingly.

She brought to politics more than a narrow knowledge of pressure groups and sectional interests—she brought to politics and she represents in politics a firm devotion to the public interest. She has learned how to work for the public good through the most appropriate and obvious channels—through political action in a political party. Gen has learned how to get things done.

I don't know how many, if any, of you young men and women from our Pennsylvania colleges aspire to political careers, either elective or up through the ranks of appointive or civil service jobs or within the party organizations themselves. Believe me, there is room in both parties for young men and women who are devoted to the American political system and who are willing to work at politics to promote what they consider to be the best interests of the people. Our parties need that kind of person and need it badly. If they get it, if young people come into active politics and bring their enthusiasm and ideals with them, they are doing something really wonderful for all America.

How better, in a democracy, could we do something wonderful for ourselves?

Utah Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Utah.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by Owen R. Thomas, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 350 East Seventh Street, North, Logan, Utah, as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

An appropriation has been made for the purpose of marking the graves of deceased veterans buried within the State. The adjutant general is authorized to establish and maintain a centralized collection of the records thereof.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator may be appointed by the probate courts for the property of missing members of the armed forces.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Proof of wills may be established where subscribing witnesses are unavailable by reason of service in the armed forces.

Protection is afforded persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting and registration is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

A department of veterans' affairs has been created with an advisory council. This department aids, assists, counsels, and advises veterans and their dependents.

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The county recorder is required to furnish copies of the record of honorable discharges and other military records free of charge to veterans, their parents, brothers, sisters, and lineal descendants.

Honorable discharges and all orders, citations, and decorations of honor are recorded free of charge.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Central Utah Vocational School at Provo, Utah, has been made a State school under control of the State board of education. Veterans are given priority.

Appropriations have been made to the State board for vocational education in school districts of 140,000 population or more. Veterans are given priority.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leaves of absence are granted State and local officers and employees with preservation of rights and reinstatement after termination of military service.

Preference is given to veterans and their widows under the Highway Patrol Civil Service Act as to qualification, appointment, promotion, discipline, reemployment, and tenure of office.

Preference is given to veterans and their widows on all public work projects.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAND SETTLEMENT

The Alien Land Act has been repealed, removing the bar to participation of Nisei veterans.

MEMORIALS

City commissioners, city councils, town boards, and boards of county commissioners may erect and maintain memorials in memory of veterans of any war. Provision has been made for a tax levy.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks, building and loan associations, insurance companies, and other organizations may make or buy or sell any loan guaranteed in full or in part by the Federal Government under the GI bill of rights.

Relief is extended to Civil War veterans and their widows in their own homes.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Any taxpayer may deduct from gross income gifts made to veterans' organizations.

Compensation for service in the armed forces during the years 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944, and for 1 year after the end of World War II, is exempt from individual income tax. The date for filing is postponed until the third month after return to continental United States or after the end of World War II, whichever date is earlier.

Operators' and chauffeurs' licenses held by members of the armed forces are extended.

Exemption is granted from renewal requirements and payment of fees on professional and occupational licenses during military service and for 6 months after discharge.

Property of disabled veterans, their unmarried widows, or minor orphans, to the amount of $6,000, is exempt from tax.

Veterans of World War II are granted the following income-tax exemption for the tax years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949: $2,700 for a single veteran and $3,300 for a head of a family or married person living with husband or wife.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc. of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

Most of the above laws have been enacted by the Utah Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV maintains three expertly trained full-time national-service officers, under the direction of Ernest W. Vannatter, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Salt Lake City, who extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of Government benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50 if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department of legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil service appointments—and last, but really first in importance—suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 1,525,753; total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which subsequently have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service records.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War I myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Our Floundering Army Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I took the floor of the House to speak of the confusion that exists within our National Military Establishment as a whole. Today I would like to discuss another aspect of our national security—the Army Reserve program. It is my belief that we are faced here, in this specific instance, with the same kind of indecision and confusion that exists in over-all aspects of our national defense.

On April 1 of this year, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Army calling his attention to the fact that charges were generally being made that the Army Reserve program was floundering and that the general consensus was that the reasons for its present condition could be attributed to a "poorly conceived and executed" Reserve program. I asked the Secretary to comment on those charges and I listed specific questions concerning the Army Reserves and requested answers. By April 21, I had not received a reply, and I again wrote the Secretary and requested answers to the questions I had posed. On April 22 a reply, dated April 15, was brought to my office.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the correspondence I have referred to at this point in the RECORD:

APRIL 1, 1948.

Hon. KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been greatly disturbed by reports from Army Reserve unit commanders in Wisconsin.

It is charged that the Reserve officers are receiving little cooperation from the Army in the organization and training of their units, that the units are receiving little or no equipment with which to train, and that there seems to be a lack of intelligent planning in the whole program.

This feeling seems to be general, according to a survey recently conducted by Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas. He found that 91 percent of the department presidents of the Reserve Officers' Association claimed that the difficulty with the Organized Reserve Corps of the Army and air services involved either a poorly conceived and executed Reserve program; insufficient Reserve units, both as to number and as to type; lack of proper facilities or inadequate training equipment.

I believe strongly in well-trained, well-equipped Reserve units. I believe they are absolutely vital to our national security. I have predicated my support of universal military training on the fact that such a program is absolutely necessary in order to provide a steady flow of men into our civilian components. This view is held by others, including the Secretary of Defense, who testified only a few days ago that UMT was needed as part of a long-term program, and that it was principally necessary because it will provide annually for the civilian components of the Regular forces some 850,000 men who will have had basic training.

I am still convinced that UMT is necessary to provide a flow of men into the civilian components of the armed forces. I strongly question, however, the advisability or the logic of channeling more men into a program which suffers from mismanagement, poor planning, lack of equipment, and general neglect. Yet, if the allegations of those at the critical, or troop, level are true, that is exactly what is being asked of the Congress by the Secretary of Defense when he calls for the immediate enactment of UMT.

The purpose of this letter is to pose three questions: (1) Is there any basis for the serious charges that have been levelled at the Army Reserve program? (2) If there is, how did these conditions come about? (3) If there is, what is now being done to correct those conditions? I will not consider as a satisfactory answer a referral to the Committee on Civilian Components.

To amplify:

I want to know particularly why there should be "a poorly conceived and executed Reserve program," under any circumstances if such is the case.

I want to know particularly why there should be a lack of training equipment, if such is the case. To quote from a unit commander in my district, "We (the Government) can give tanks and guns to civilian organizations to plant on their courthouse lawns; we can issue equipment to high school ROTC units; we can give tons of uniforms to be sold by War Surplus, and yet, the ORC has a hard time getting one paper clip per 1,000 men."

I want to know particularly:

1. The number of officers and men in the ORC, the number being effectively used, and the number assigned to each type of unit (A, B, and C).

2. The number of Reserve units of each class, the number fully equipped according to plan, the number partially equipped, and the number with no equipment.

3. The funds assigned to Army Reserve program for the fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949, including the amount requested by the Army, the amount allowed by the President, and the amount appropriated by the Congress.

I want to know particularly if there is any restriction upon the efforts of a unit commander to expand his unit. To quote from a unit commander in my district, "I asked to be allowed to expand my unit, which I could do, was told 'no,' and that 'we (the Army) have placed the matter on our project list.'"

I will be vitally interested in your reply. I regret that it is necessary for me to ask these questions—3 years after the end of World War II and during a period when a cohesive, intelligent, and well-organized armed force was never needed more.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 21, 1948.

Hon. KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Three weeks ago, on April 1, I asked you in a letter for certain information regarding the Army Reserve program. To date, I have received neither acknowledgment nor reply.

In view of the fact that the Congress is considering legislation that will provide additional men either indirectly through selective service or directly through universal military training for our Reserve components, I am extremely anxious to know just what kind of a Reserve program is presently in existence. As I told you in my previous letter, all evidence I have received so far has indicated that the Army Reserve program is floundering. If such is the case, I would find it difficult, in good conscience, to support legislation which would add more men to a program which is not utilizing the trained men it already has.

In order that I may consider this proposed legislation with all of the facts before me, I hope that you will see your way clear to furnish me very shortly with the clarifying information which I asked for 3 weeks ago.

Yours truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 22, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your letter of April 21, 1948, wherein you make reference to your letter of April 1, 1948, asking for certain information regarding the Army Reserve program.

It is regretted that a reply to your letter of April 1 was somewhat delayed. However, I trust that the Secretary's letter of April 15, 1948, satisfactorily covers the information you desire.

Your interest in the Army Reserve program is sincerely appreciated and if I can be of further assistance to you in furnishing such additional information that you may desire, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK L. RUFFNER,
Major General, United States Army,
Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

APRIL 15, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: I appreciate your letter of April 1 indicative of your interest in the Organized Reserve Corps. In reply I propose to discuss the Reserve program, the difficulties in the implementation to date and Department of the Army action to overcome these difficulties.

In view of the support which has been available to date I cannot agree that the program is poorly conceived and poorly executed, although all concerned recognize the fact that it is not completely satisfactory. This does not imply that the fault lies entirely with the Army or any other specific agency since many factors are involved. It is true that during this period of organization Army administrative errors have been made but when recognized, are the basis for corrective action, as with other Army activities. Three very important factors which have retarded the program are lack of universal military training, lack of inactive duty training pay, and lack of armory facilities.

The Organized Reserve Corps program is based upon War Department-approved policies relating to the Organized Reserve Corps and the National Guard. These policies were formulated by representatives of all components of the Army of the United States and approved October 13 1945. The policies were subsequently clarified to establish the priority of M-day force units amongst the three components, i. e., the Organized Reserve Corps to supply only those M-day units which the Regular Army and National Guard cannot organize, equip, train, and maintain.

The policies with regard to the ORC were implemented by War Department circular, which established a 6-year training program. Under this plan the first 2 years or interim period is utilized for building units up to strength, for equipping them, and if possible to start training. Actually, progress under this plan has been reasonably satisfactory with over 6,500 units already activated and in varying degrees of effectiveness engaged in some phase of training.

The entire Reserve-component program with a large troop basis both for the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps is predicated upon universal military training. Without universal military training, it has been impossible adequately to implement the program insofar as personnel is concerned. Lack of inactive duty training pay has, of course, adversely affected training and to some extent personnel procurement. As you know this pay has just recently been authorized by the Congress.

In general, it may be said that lack of funds to furnish certain requirements is the basic factor in the present status of the program. Limitation of funds has affected availability of armory and other facilities, supply of equipment, procurement of caretakers, and to a certain degree, availability of instructors.

The Department of the Army has not been indifferent to the desire of the Reserve officer actively to contribute his military service for the Nation's defense, on the contrary, the problem has been given the most serious consideration and constant study participated in by representative Reserve officers. Quite understandable impatience to progress more rapidly and efficiently in full development of the planned Reserve program has been noted, complaints investigated, and efforts made to improve conditions within the means available to the Department and in keeping with the priority of urgency in our over-all defense plans.

In summary the situation appears to be as follows: An extensive program was set up predicated upon certain assumptions which to date have not materialized. The situation is not satisfactory but a degree of progress has been made on a firm base for ultimate development on standards desired and expected by the Department. The rapid activation of units, initiation of active duty training within the limitation of funds, and the recent favorable action of the Congress on inactive duty training pay all mark progress toward our objective. Passage of universal military training coupled with favorable action on legislation now pending in the Congress on armory construction will give the Reserve program the means so necessary to vigorous development. Furthermore, the Department of the Army now proposes early action on extensive mobilization assignment, the organization of training units (to replace the unsatisfactory composite group method of instruction), a long-range promotion plan, and other measures, all designed to forward the program and all in accordance with the expressed desires of the Reserve Officer Corps.

Your specific questions are answered in table A, attached.

I want to reiterate my appreciation of your interest in this matter.

You may rest assured that the Department of the Army recognizes the importance of the Organized Reserve Corps in our over-all plan for national defense, appreciates the patriotic service of those so unselfishly contributing to the solution of its many problems and is striving to implement the Reserve program effectively so that the personnel and units of the Reserve Corps will be prepared to fulfill their missions in the national defense team.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Secretary of the Army.

TAB A

Question. Is there any basis for the serious charges that have been leveled at the Army Reserve Program?

Answer. There is some basis. Major deficiencies are listed in my letter. However, adequate funds and passage of pending legislation would enable the Army to materially resolve the deficiencies.

Question. If there is, how did these conditions come about?

Answer. Recent passage by the Congress of the inactive duty training pay bill satisfies one of the deficiencies which has been a chief cause of inadequate support. Legislation presently under consideration, if previously provided and implemented, would have made it possible to avert many of the present difficulties. Also we must recognize that the uncertainty concerning Universal Military Training has been reflected in the retarded full development of a sound Reserve program.

Question. What is being done to correct these conditions?

Answer:

1. The Army has requested the Congress to pass Selective Service and Universal Military Training and it is hoped that both will be enacted.

2. The Department of the Army has under study fund requirements for emergency needs for the expanded Army and contemplates the inclusion of adidtional money for the support of the Organized Reserve.

3. Within the availability of funds and personnel the Department of the Army is constantly reviewing the Organized Reserve Corps Program and making appropirate revisions to improve and expedite its accomplishment.

4. Provision of adequate armory facilities is contemplated as the result of the bill now before the Congress.

Question. The number of officers and men in the Organized Reserve Corps, number being effectively used and the number assigned to each type of unit (A, B, and C)?

Answer. 1. The number of officers and men in the ORC.

	Unassigned	Component groups	Class A	Class B	Class C	Total
Officers	62,250	167,059	158	6,233	43,133	278,833
Enlisted men	325,008	90,717	422	12,382	21,927	450,456
Total	387,258	257,776	580	18,615	65,060	729,289

2. The number being effectively used.

The above personnel, whether assigned to units or in composite groups, are organized

so that training can be conducted to a degree comparable to our available means and in proportion to the time permitted by funds and available to the individual. In the case of composite groups instruction has frequently been of necessity very general in nature and has not been satisfactory to the Reserve officer. This fact is recognized and remedial measures proposed, include extensive mobilization assignments and the organization of training units, i. e., units not in the mobilization troop basis but organized for training purposes only.

Question. The number of Reserve units of each class, the number of fully equipped according to plan, the number of partially equipped and the number with no equipment?

Answer:

Class	Number of units	Fully equipped	Partially equipped	No equipment
A	59	None	59 have 30 percent.[1]	None.
B	887	do	887 have 25 percent.[2]	Do.
C	5,897	do	5,897 have 25 percent.[3]	Do.

[1] The percent shown refers to total "T/O&E" equipment.
[2] The percent shown refers to "authorized home training" equipment for B units.
[3] The percent shown refers to "authorized home training" equipment for C units.

Question. The funds assigned to Army Reserve program for the fiscal years 1947, 1948, 1949, including the amount requested by the Army, the amount allowed by the President, and the amount appropriated by the Congress?

Answer (excludes Air portion):

Year	Amount requested by Army	Amount allowed by President	Amount appropriated
1947	41,461,366	21,761,257	21,761,257
1948	67,500,000	23,000,000	27,731,560
1949	56,560,444	28,000,000	Unknown

Question. Is there any restriction upon the efforts of a unit commander to expand his unit?

Answer. Units can be expanded to the classification authorized in the Department of the Army Troop Basis based on priority requirements. All units are initially activated in class C status (officers only). Those scheduled to expand to class B (officers and enlisted cadre) are so designated when requirements are met, on approval of major commands concerned. Those scheduled to expand to class A (full strength) are so designated on fulfillment of further requirements and on approval of the Department of the Army. Although there are some instances where C or B units could expand and desire to expand to a higher classification, the only restrictions contemplated are those dictated by the approved classification in the Department of the Army Troop Basis which is a reflection of Army-wide requirements for all components.

I should like to comment, Mr. Speaker, upon the reply sent to me by the Secretary of the Army, but I would like, first, to make my position in this matter very clear.

I have publicly announced my support of universal military training. If we take seriously the recommendations of every responsible military leader since Washington, namely, that the principle underlying our military establishment is a comparatively small regular establishment supported by well-trained citizenry reserves, then we must provide a steady flow of trained men into the civilian components from the bottom as attrition reduces their strength from the top. I know of no other way that this can be accomplished except by a system of universal training.

But, as I said on the floor of this House on April 2:

> We cannot support UMT blindly. We recognize that it will not provide defense in and of itself but only as it contributes to the strength of the civilian components which it supplies. It would be useless to pass this legislation unless we are assured that our Reserve program is a sound, well-managed and cohesive part of an intelligent whole.

It was for this reason that I was so concerned with the charges leveled at the Army Reserve program—charges which suggested that, even if universal military training were put into effect at once, or in 6 months, we would be unable to utilize and train further the basically trained men it would produce because of the lack of an intelligent reserve program. Furthermore, it seemed clear to me, even should universal military training fail of enactment, that the inevitable effect of the draft laws we are presently considering would be to increase substantially the number of men in our civilian components. In either case, I was understandably concerned over what would happen to these men once they joined or were assigned to the Reserves. I felt that we could obtain a partial answer by examining our present Army Reserves, which, of course, together with the National Guard, receive the bulk of the trainees.

Having received the Secretary of Army's reply, I cannot truthfully say that I am reassured. Mr. Royall's reply may be fairly characterized, I believe, as a qualified admission that the charges which have been so generally leveled at the Army Reserve program are substantially true. In other words, our Reserve program is not yet a sound, well-managed, and cohesive part of an intelligent whole.

Furthermore, it is doubtful if it can be put on that basis in time to make full use of the additional manpower for which the Army is now asking. It is for this reason that I am taking the time of the House today to discuss the reasons for our present lack of a Reserve program and to suggest remedial action.

I have said that the Secretary's reply shows that the Reserve program is not satisfactory. Let us examine the reasons advanced by Mr. Royall to show why this is so.

His letter states:

> Three very important factors which have retarded the program are lack of universal military training, lack of inactive duty training pay, and lack of armory facilities.

Let us examine each of these factors.

First, the lack of universal military training.

What is universal military training? It is simply a system designed for one thing: trained manpower procurement. It has no other reason for being. The implication, then, in the Secretary's reply is that a lack of trained manpower has prevented, in part at least, the development of a satisfactory Reserve program. Let us see how this stands up in the light of the figures which the Secretary has supplied to me.

The number of officers and men in the Organized Reserve Corps, as of the date of the letter, was 278,833 officers and 450,456 enlisted men, or a total of 729,289. This applies to the Army alone. This force of three-quarters of a million men represents, to a great extent, World War II trained manpower. It represents probably the best kind of trained manpower that any reserve forces anywhere or at any time will ever receive. Yet, with this manpower available and anxious to be welded into a workable program, the Secretary states categorically that lack of universal military training, or manpower procurement, is one of the very important factors which have retarded the program. That is the accepted argument of Army leaders. It is palpably untrue.

It may be better stated that the lack of a Reserve program, or a seriously retarded program, is one of the very important factors which have prevented the enactment of universal military training. It seems clear to me that until the Army can demonstrate that it can effectively use more Reserves, that it can provide results for the sacrifices universal military training entails, that the chances of securing its passage are very small indeed. And I believe failure to enact UMT would be a tragic error.

Let us examine the use that is being made of the almost three-quarter million men that the Army now has in the Organized Reserve Corps.

Under present Army regulations, Reserve units are classified as A, B, or C. Class A units have complete strength in officers, men, and equipment. These are M-day units. Class B units have a full strength of officers, a cadre, or nucleus, of enlisted men and certain training equipment. Class C units have assigned a full strength of officers only, plus training equipment.

Mr. Royall states that:

> Under the (6-year training) plan, the first 2 years, or interim period, is utilized for building units up to strength, for equipping them and, if possible, to start training. Actually, progress under this plan has been reasonably satisfactory with over 6,500 units already activated and in varying degrees of effectiveness engaged in some training.

Using Mr. Royall's figures, let us examine the program to see how well the interim period, which has long since ended, has been used to build units up to strength, to equip them and to start training.

We now have 59 class A units. These units have 158 officers and 422 enlisted men. This is an average of 2.7 officers and 7.2 enlisted men per unit. None of these units has more than 30 percent of their equipment.

We now have 887 class B units. These units have assigned 6,233 officers and 12,382 enlisted men. This is an average of 7.1 officers and 14 enlisted men per unit. None of these units has more than 25 percent of their authorized home training equipment.

We now have 5,897 class C units. These units have 43,133 officers and 21,927 enlisted men, or an average of 7.3

officers and 3.7 enlisted men per unit. None of these units has over 25 percent of their authorized home training equipment.

These figures truly demonstrate the present ineffectiveness of our Reserves, an ineffectiveness largely brought about by failure to build units up to strength. But much more revealing is an analysis of the remainder of the Army Reserve force.

It will be noted in the Secretary's letter that reference is made to the possible organization of training units to replace the unsatisfactory composite group method of training.

Reservists tell me that the composite group has probably done more to undermine the morale of Reserve members who have been assigned to them than any possible type of organization that might have been conceived. A composite group is made up of officers of all branches of service and all grades, none of whom have been given a wartime assignment. These groups are nothing more than an unorganized pool. It is readily apparent that it would be impossible ever to evolve a satisfactory training program for such a conglomerate group.

Yet we find that 167,059 officers, or 60 percent of the total, are assigned to composite groups, and that 90,717 enlisted men, or 20 percent of the total enlisted strength, are similarly assigned.

Are we to expect that similar entirely unsatisfactory assignments, both from the Army's point of view and from the reservists' point of view, would be made from the increased flow of men that UMT would produce? If it has taken the Army 3 years to recognize the debilitating effect of composite group instruction, how long will it take to replace it with a more satisfactory type of training?

But to return to our analysis of the Secretary's figures. If the lack of universal military training, or manpower procurement, has seriously retarded the Reserve program, how can we account for the number of officers and enlisted men who have received no assignment whatsoever?

Sixty-two thousand two hundred and fifty officers, or 22 percent of the total number of officers, and 325,008 enlisted men, or 72.3 percent of the enlisted men, have no assignment whatsoever in our present Reserve program.

Certainly, these revealing figures clearly dispose of the argument that "a lack of Universal Military Training" or manpower procurement, has, up to this date at least, retarded the Reserve program.

What of the other retarding factors? One other important retarding factor, the Secretary states, has been lack of inactive duty training pay.

Inactive-duty-training pay may certainly be conceded to be an incentive, but it is readily apparent from the figures I have quoted that little or no effort has been made to train reservists on a volunteer basis as was the case prior to World War II. The failure, for instance, to create a proper and adequate troop basis for all of the officers and men in the ORC and the failure to assign officers and men to these troop basis units certainly cannot be charged against the fact that there was no inactive-duty-training pay.

I suspect that this is another straw man, set up for the convenient use of the Army to cover up its neglect of the Army Reserves. It is interesting to note that the inactive-duty-training pay has been authorized by this Congress and that for over a year, the Army has been anticipating the passage of this bill. Yet, today, there is no implementing regulation available to indicate just how the law will operate. Reservists, doomed to disappointment once again, had expected that an implementing regulation would be available immediately upon passage of the act.

It is difficult to see how the lack of this training pay could seriously have hampered the development of a sound Reserve program.

What of the third retarding factor mentioned by the Secretary?—lack of armory facilities?

It is recognized, of course, that additional armory construction will be necessary to provide for a fully developed Reserve program. But, has lack of an armory construction program retarded the organizing of units, the assignment of officers to units, the contacting of enlisted men, the assignment of enlisted men to units, the allotment of wartime assignments to officers and enlisted men—in short, the development of a sound Reserve program? Of course, it has not. This third factor again has the strange appearance of another Army straw man.

Furthermore, if armory construction is so vital, the Army had better begin to push an armory construction program at once. What is believed to be the Army's armory construction bill has been submitted to the Speaker. But, there has apparently been no serious effort to get immediate action upon it. On the contrary, the letter of transmittal states:

> Turning next to the Organized Reserve program, it was recognized early in the planning stage that these Reserves would require training facilities located in or near population centers. Therefore, in the interest of efficiency and economy, plans were developed so as to afford maximum use of existing and projected National Guard facilities for all components of the Army of the United States.

I am further informed that the House Armed Services Committee will be unable to act upon the Army's proposed bill until it receives more specific information from the Department of Defense concerning the exact details of the program.

Mr. Speaker, if the lack of armory facilities is a retarding factor in the development of a sound Reserve program, why have we heard so little about it until this late date, and why are detailed requests for specific projects not forthcoming?

Consider this fact, too. If universal military training were to begin operation tomorrow, in 6 months it would have turned out approximately 400,000 trained young men. The bulk of these men would go into the Reserves for another 6 months of training. If lack of armory facilities is hampering the development of our present Reserve program, what would be the effect of the sudden entrance of these men into our Reserve units? With the fastest possible action, armory construction might be authorized in this session of Congress. But, unless the Army already has fully developed plans as to where these armories shall be built and as to the order of priority, construction would probably not be begun for at least a year or 6 months. Construction would take at least a year. In the intervening 18 months, universal military training would have produced 1,200,000 men, of whom the greatest share would wind up in the Reserve program. If lack of armory facilities prevents the formation of a sound Reserve program, how could these men possibly receive their 6 months' additional training?

There is something strikingly contradictory in the Secretary's assertion that universal military training should be passed immediately in order to give impetus to a Reserve program, and to his complaint that lack of armory facilities has retarded the development of a Reserve program.

Following this line of reason, we should either wait to pass universal military training until we have armory facilities, or we should pass universal military training because lack of armory facilities will not greatly hinder the further usage of the trained men we will receive from that training program. You can take your own choice. In either case, the Secretary's argument falls.

The plain fact is, Mr. Speaker, after we examine the factors advanced by the Secretary as retarding the Reserve program, that not one of them is valid. The plain fact is that neither a lack of universal military training, a lack of inactive duty training pay, nor a lack of armory facilities, either alone or together, has prevented the development of a sound Reserve program.

We come now to the last of the reasons advanced by the Secretary of the Army for the sorry state of our Army Reserve. He states:

> In general, it may be said that lack of funds to furnish certain requirements is the basic factor in the present status of the program. Limitation of funds has affected availability of armory and other facilities, supply of equipment, procurement of caretakers, and to a certain degree, availability of instructors.

Let us examine this assertion.

It will be noted from the figures supplied by the Secretary that in no case has the Congress appropriated less money than was requested by the President in his budget, and, in each case, the budget requested less money from the Congress than the Army had originally asked.

I have searched the hearings before the Appropriations subcommittee for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948.

In fiscal 1947 I find that the Army testified that the sum requested from the Congress would be sufficient for its needs. I find that $30,000,000 of the $56,000,000 originally appropriated for both the Army and Air Force Reserves was subsequently transferred to the account, "Pay of the Army." In 1948 the Army testified that the $26,000,000 remaining would be sufficient for Reserve needs.

Surely, the Secretary is not referring to fiscal year 1947.

In fiscal 1948 I can find no serious attempt on the part of the Army to increase

the appropriation requested in the budget. On the contrary, that appropriation was increased by some $4,000,000, and I am told that the increase was made possible only by the intervention of the Reserve Officers' Association, who realized the inadequacy of the President's request.

Surely the Secretary is not referring to fiscal year 1948.

If he is referring to either of these years, and we must assume that he is, since they are the only two applicable years, then how can we square his assertion with the following table which is taken from the summary budget statements of the Budget for Fscal Year 1949:

Budget appropriations and expenditures

ORGANIZED RESERVES (INCLUDES ARMY AND AIR FORCE)—CODE 053

Appropriations:	
Actual, 1947	$56,000,000
Actual, 1948	67,828,000
Recommended, 1949	80,000,000
Expenditures:	
Actual, 1947	15,112,969
Estimated, 1948	49,000,000
Estimated, 1949	75,000,000

Source: Budget for Fiscal Year 1949, p. A80.

If lack of funds is the basic factor in the present status of the program, if limitation of funds has affected availability of armory and other facilities, supply of equipment, procurement of caretakers, and to a certain degree, availability of instructors, how can we account for the fact that the Army is not able to use the funds which has been made available to it, up to this juncture?

A more realistic picture of the question of adequate funds has probably been given by the executive director of the Reserve Officers Association in his testimony before the Committee on Civilian Components of the Secretary of Defense:

> The Marine Reserve, with approximately 80,000 officers and men, have a budget of $20,000,000, which is approximately $250 per individual.
>
> The Navy Reserve, with about 1,000,000 officers and men, has an annual appropriation of approximately $160,000,000, which is about $160 per individual.
>
> The Army and Air combined, with a total strength of approximately 1,200,000 men received an annual appropriation last year of approximately $67,000,000, which is approximately $56 per individual.

Then, he goes on to make this startling request:

> We * * * need the backing of the Department of Defense in presenting to the Congress of the United States the need for adequate appropriation for the Reserve program for Army and air. The Appropriations Committees naturally give great weight to the recommendations of the various departments on the matter of appropriations, and unless we can feel that somewhere near the adequate amount of money is being requested to create the proper Reserve programs we are entering a losing battle before we start.

Thus, the true story on the question of adequate funds for the Reserve program boils down to this: The Army has neither asked for sufficient funds to develop a sound Reserve program and, furthermore, it has failed thus far to use the funds which have been appropriated for it.

If the funds appropriated by Congress are inadequate, what represents an adequate appropriation for a sound Reserve program? There is only one governmental department that can tell us, and that is the Department of the Army. Evidence shows that it has until this point been singularly silent as to what its actual requirements are. Until the Army gains its tongue it is certainly too much to expect the Congress to tell the Army that its requests for Reserve funds are entirely inadequate.

So much for an analysis of the factors advanced as reasons by the Secretary of the Army for the pitiful state of the Army Reserves.

The first three factors—lack of universal military training, lack of inactive-duty training pay, lack of armory facilities—are shown to be scarcely valid at this point, and, in fact, in the case of UMT and armory facilities, are shown to be contradictory. The last factor—inadequacy of funds—may be true, but it is not proved by the Army's effort to utilize the funds it now has, and it has been demonstrated that the reason for any possible inadequacy of funds may be traced back, to a large degree, to the Department of the Army itself.

What, then, is the basic cause of our floundering Reserve program?

A national magazine found the situation so appalling that it published an article recently entitled "Does the Army Want the Reserves?" Can this be the reason for the failure of the Army to develop a sound program? I hesitate to subscribe to this belief, even though the available evidence tends to justify the propounding of that question. I cannot believe that the Army, which is committed to a policy of a well-trained citizenry as a keystone of our Military Establishment, which has advocated conscription of our youth in order to build up our Reserves, would deliberately seek to sabotage the Reserve program.

I particularly hesitate to accept this belief because General Bradley only a short time ago testified before the House Army Services Committee that the Army's plans cannot be considered sound unless the guard and the Reserves are to be made effective and that without adequate Reserves as now contemplated, the Army must recast its concepts and recommend to the Congress a far larger standing army than is under consideration here today. In fact, under questioning, General Bradley said that he would not be asking for selective service today if the Army was backed up by an adequate Reserve force.

It is hard to reconcile General Bradley's statements concerning the overwhelming importance of a sound reserve with the treatment being given the Reserve program as I have described it here today. Certainly he, at least, recognizes the importance of our civilian components to a sound national defense. It can only be hoped that the Army will begin to reflect some of its leader's enthusiasm.

But if the Army wants the Reserves, what, then, is the basic cause of our floundering Reserve program?

We can only guess, of course, but I think our choice narrows down to two factors, neither of which I hope can be true.

Either the Army is using a weakened Reserve as a club with which to speed up passage of universal military training, or the Army is badly fumbling the Reserve ball through lethargy, confusion, or downright inefficiency.

If the first is true, I believe I have demonstrated that the Army is only defeating its own purpose. A poorly organized Reserve program cannot be used as an argument for universal military training; it can only be used as an argument against the enactment of a program which would only waste trained manpower on an ineffective Reserve. Until the Army shows that it means business with the Reserves, I predict that universal military training will never be accepted by the American people—and in fact it should not be accepted.

The Secretary's assertion that "the entire Reserve component program with a large troop basis is predicated upon universal military training" appears to have been translated to mean "we can do nothing with our Reserve components until we secure passage of the universal training bill." Realizing the controversial nature of this legislation, this attitude may well be compared with basing our strategic plans upon the assumption that we should do nothing for national security until we find out whether Russia intends to go to war or to stay at peace. I cannot imagine the Army making that assumption. Would it not be far the wiser course for the Army to weld as quickly as possible what it now has in the way of Reserve manpower into an effective, well-organized force? If it could then be demonstrated to Congress, as I assume it easily could, that the force was threatened with progressive deterioration because it was not receiving a steady flow of trained manpower, would not then the case for universal military training become infinitely stronger?

It is difficult to ascribe common sense to this cause for the present state of our Reserve program. That leaves us with either lethargy, confusion, or downright inefficiency on the part of the Army.

If this is the case, it must be speedily done away with. We have evidence in the Secretary's letter that it is now realized that something is wrong and that something should be done about it.

Early action is contemplated on extensive mobilization assignments. This means that officers and men will be told what their wartime assignment will be and permits them to prepare for that assignment. The Reserves have been waiting for 3 years for this.

Early action is contemplated on the replacement of the unsatisfactory composite groups. The Reserves have been waiting for 3 years for this.

Early action is contemplated on a long-range promotion program. Today the Reserve officer has no idea as to what he must do in order to advance himself. The Reserves have been waiting for 3 years for this.

The Army is making a new survey of what it actually has in the way of Reserve officers and their desired assignments. This was begun on April 20. It

is tragically late, but it is an indication that the Army is now starting to move.

These are only first steps. Much hard work and intelligent planning must be initiated before we even have a good start on the kind of Reserve program that is vitally needed. Reserve officers are disgusted, have begun to lose interest, and their morale is low. As far as the enlisted men are concerned, their enlistments will shortly begin to run out, and we face the prospect of losing all of them unless their interest can be revived by the promise of early action on the part of the Army.

All that actually is required is a will on the part of the Army that something shall be done at once and a command decision to put that program into immediate effect. That is the answer to the entire Reserve problem. Let us hope that we can achieve that effect without further prodding or investigation on the part of this Congress.

Celebration of the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Dickinson College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered recently on the occasion of a special convocation at Dickinson College, in Carlisle, Pa., marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of that outstanding educational institution—the first to be established in America west of the Susquehanna River, and the alma mater of Pennsylvania's only President, James Buchanan, and of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney.

In that address I made the assertion that we in America must do more than merely try to "stop" communism with our dollars and our assistance abroad—although this aid is vitally necessary—but that we must also export to the whole world our most precious American possession—our idea of freedom and what it means. World peace, in my view, depends upon world-wide defense of the dignity and the nobility of the individual human being—on freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a Pennsylvanian, I am proud and happy to join tonight in this salute to Dickinson College on its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, for in honoring Dickinson, we Pennsylvanians are really honoring ourselves and our collective heritage as citizens of this Commonwealth.

We can, and, of course, do, take pride in the age of this school—in its distinction as the oldest college west of the Susquehanna, and as one of the first 10 American colleges to be established. But these are lesser reasons why we in Pennsylvania are proud of Dickinson. Far more than age, far more than the fact that it was founded 3 years before the Declaration of Independence, far more than the glories of its past—which are certainly impressive in themselves—the most impressive thing about Dickinson is that today, as it has been through most of its history, but particularly as it is today—Dickinson College is synonymous with learning, with thorough teaching, with the highest of educational standards; it is academically one of the great colleges of America.

Thus it would not make any difference to us in Pennsylvania how old or how young it were, we would still be proud of Dickinson. The fact that its traditions carry back so far merely mellows our regard.

I say this in full knowledge of the fact that this special convocation observing the century and three-quarters of service which Dickinson has given Pennsylvania and the Nation is an occasion designed to encourage reminiscences on events past and greatness of other years and generations. Dickinson's past is important educationally, as distinct from the mere historical, in that it has remained steadfastly true to the principles on which it was founded 175 years ago, and true to the trust which was lodged in its founders by the founders of our own Commonwealth when they deeded this frontier site to your school.

Age in an educational institution is, as I said, impressive, but not necessarily indicative. There are today, throughout the world, schools and universities far older than Dickinson, far older than any American college; yet, in some notable instances they have nothing to commend them but their history and their past glories.

Just the other day, for instance, in Prague, a fine old university marked its anniversary with a special convocation. It was 600 years old. It had been founded in 1348. Scholars, statesmen, humanists had attended its classes, even as men of similar attributes have attended yours.

But, in contrast to this happy event here tonight at Dickinson College in historic Carlisle, Pa., the six hundredth anniversary convocation of Charles University, in Prague, Czechoslovakia, was an event of extreme sadness, not only for the freedom-loving Czechs, but for all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

For Charles University today is an assembly line for mass production of a uniform idea. It is seeking to turn out students as our automobile plants in Michigan are turning out cars—in identical patterns, shaped by identical molds in identical lines.

A great man, a world symbol of political decency, spoke that day at Charles University, faltering tearfully through a written speech which referred to the universal freedom of the spirit based on man's respect for man and on common tolerance.

There was apparently no attempt on the part of the Communist dictatorship in Czechoslovakia to suppress those words that day by Czechoslovakia's prisoner-President, Eduard Benes. To the Communist overlords of Czechoslovakia, the words of President Benes, the reference to freedom, no doubt conformed entirely to the official Communist line for totalitarian regimes invariably identify the word freedom with their own variety of mental slavery.

There was, however, no doubt in the minds of free men—of free peoples in free nations who know the Benes character—that his references to freedom that day were made bitterly, longingly, nostalgically. And the Czechoslovaks knew, too—for in the brief 20 years between 1918 and 1938 they had known freedom well, only to have it twice snatched away within the last 10 years.

There is more of the real Czechoslovakia, of the freedom of the spirit of its people and its culture, to be found in a little classroom shrine to that nation erected in the University of Pittsburgh 10 years ago than is to be found today in all of Charles University in Prague, and yet that was a fine and noble school.

It will, I trust, become once again a fine and noble shrine to learning and to truth. Until it does—and until universities throughout the world become free in their search for truth, as is Dickinson College and other American colleges founded in the image of Dickinson, then a cloud hangs over your school, too—just as it hangs over the freedom of all peoples everywhere when freedom is denied anywhere.

Education is more than the conquest over illiteracy and the accumulation of various professional skills—education is the process of learning to seek out and discover truth while rejecting all else in the constant search for the truth. Education of that variety cannot exist in a vacuum; it is a creature of the society in which it lives, and it flourishes or dies in direct relationship to the level of freedom of that society.

Society is organized into the ways of freedom by politics. Politics determines whether schools flourish, as Dickinson has flourished, or die internally, as Charles University in Prague has died.

That was just as true 140 years ago when Pennsylvania's only President, James Buchanan, whose one hundred and fifty-seventh birthday you will observe tomorrow, studied in Old West at Dickinson and was, as he later put it, "a tolerably hard student." The biographers attribute a large measure of the early success in law and politics of this log-cabin boy to the compelling oratory he developed in the literary society of Dickinson College. But unless law and politics have changed drastically in the past 140 years—and I doubt they have changed that drastically—it required more than oratorical skill for Buchanan to have won the great popular esteem which accompanied his rise up the political ladder from State assemblyman to Congressman, Senator, Secretary of State, and President.

There have been occasional blatherskites to use a good old word who have risen to momentary prominence in American politics on the strength of lung power and of oratory. But fundamentally, those Americans who have remained alive to succeeding generations as among our outstanding figures have had to have a whole lot more. They have, without exception, been basically decent men with uncompromising devotion to truth and to freedom—and that means freedom for the other fellow's opinions as well as for our own. Buchanan had that, and undoubtedly Dickinson helped to give it to him.

There is very little likelihood that Dickinson ever again will have alumni serving simultaneously as President of the United States and as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, as you once did nearly a century ago when Buchanan was President and Roger Brooke Taney, Chief Justice, particularly inasmuch as no other college has ever been able to match that record. Nevertheless, there is no reason why every Dickinson man cannot serve his fellow citizens—and his country—as those two did, and as many other Dickinson men have done, through public service or political action. Politics is everybody's business. It must be yours.

Dickinson men have served in every war since the war which established our Nation, and many here today are, I know, veterans of this last and most bloody war of all.

All of these wars were fought in behalf of fundamental American ideals, and they all resulted in smashing military victories for the United States. But the victories on the battlefields, important as they were and vital as they were to the independence and preservation of the United States, did not automatically guarantee victory for the ideals for which the wars were fought.

The goals, the ideals were achieved, insofar as they have been achieved, by political action, by determined, united political action on the part of the people of the United States.

Such a victory was achieved by our people after the Revolutionary War. Without that war the Constitution could never have been written in the form it was. But the drafting and adoption of the Constitution was a long and hard-fought battle which extended far into the postwar peace, and it made that particular victory secure by making us internally strong and united in our independence.

In contrast, after the First World War when we and our allies won a smashing military victory, that victory was fritted away, politically—it was lost by us and by all of our allies, lost because the people, including, I am sorry to say, the people of the United States, failed to carry through politically on the military victory, failed to organize a world politically in which peace could endure. And so we had World War II.

The success of allied arms in this last struggle has given us another chance, probably our last chance, to organize a decent world. As a people we have learned well the lessons of our failures after World War I and we have repudiated isolationism in favor of collective international action in the economic and political spheres. We have learned that the battle for freedom is never-ending; that when we lay down the weapons of war we must wage peace.

The outlook for enduring peace is not rosy; neither is it hopeless as some would believe. Our Government is moving calmly but boldly and courageously in trying to help nations and peoples who are still free to retain their freedom of action.

We are thoroughly aware as a nation and as a people of the fact that freedom cannot endure in nations where hunger and starvation and misery invite totalitarian solutions. And so we are providing from our vast treasure here in America a portion of our goods to speed the recovery of industrial production among nations where freedom might otherwise die.

The Marshall plan must be more than a dole, a bribe to Europe to reject communism. It must represent the dynamic spirit of democracy in action; it must carry with it the deep sense of justice which characterizes our own political system.

Without the Marshall plan, communism would undoubtedly sweep through most, if not all, of Europe. It certainly would have swept over Italy and Greece by now. But it is not enough merely to stop communism in those and other countries. Our goal must be to encourage those people to expand their democracy into full flower.

And we here in America must breath dynamic new life into our own freedom, into our own democracy, by making it work fairly and justly and decently for all of our people.

On this great occasion marking the anniversary of a long and proud Dickinson tradition, we can pay our tribute to the vision of the men who founded this school, and the things it stands for, only by making sure that we are doing our individual best every day to make American democracy work the way it was intended to by the men who organized your college and contributed to its growth.

Part 1 of a Two-Part Address Delivered by Henry A. Wallace at York, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a two-part speech by the Honorable Henry A. Wallace be printed in the RECORD, with part one of the speech appearing in today's RECORD and part two appearing in the next issue.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HENRY A. WALLACE AT PENNSYLVANIA PEOPLE'S CONVENTION, PENNSYLVANIA WALLACE COMMITTEE, MARCH 7, 1948, AT WILLIAM PENN HIGH SCHOOL, YORK, PA.

PART I

While I was speaking in Duluth, Minn., last Sunday evening a radio commentator was telling his several million listeners that I would withdraw from this fight if the Democratic Party discarded President Truman as a candidate for reelection.

If this is a prediction, it is just as likely to be fulfilled as a prediction that the Pittsburgh Pirates will win the American League pennant.

If it is alleged that I have made such a statement, I can only say that it is like many another alleged statement. It bears no resemblance to fact.

While we are started on this subject of the poisoned channels of communication, I want to take a minute to pay tribute to an exception—to the York Gazette and Daily and its publisher. Josiah Gitt is my idea of a truly fine American.

I would like to tell you a little story about Jess Gitt and the kind of American he is. You have all read in your newspapers, unless you confine yourselves to the York Gazette—you have all read that in making this fight I was responding to the pleas of some allegedly shady characters.

Well, of all the allegedly unsavory characters who urged this course upon me, none made such an impression as that fine American Jess Gitt. Early last December I talked with Jess Gitt in New York. He was with some other folks who came to ask me to run as an independent candidate. They wanted me to help in building a new political party. Some of these people put the proposition in a purely personal sense. Maybe they thought it was flattering. They said it was up to me whether or not we would have a new party.

But not Jess Gitt. He put it differently. He said: "Look here, I'd like you to run. I think it would help, but, whether you run or not, there's going to be a new party. The times and conditions demand it."

With Jess Gitt this was no question of personalities. He knew the facts. They added up to the need for a new political alinement in America. He was determined to help get that new alinement, whether Henry Wallace said "Yes" or Henry Wallace said "No."

I like Jess Gitt. And I think that Jess and you and I are getting that new alinement.

Let's return to this fantastic observation that I would withdraw if Harry Truman stepped aside or were pushed aside. Harry Truman is not the issue. The doctrine which carries his name is an issue and it was in the plans of the men who are running the Government long before they told Harry Truman about it.

Those men and their plans won't be changed by the simple substitution of another servant of the same interests.

Our course wasn't dictated by personality likes or dislikes. It was determined by actions. We aren't running a popularity contest between Truman's piano playing and GLEN TAYLOR'S guitar strumming. (If I listened to both, I'm not sure, but it could be that I'd prefer Harry at the piano to GLEN at the guitar.)

This is a problem of grave public issues and all the commentators can't reduce the 1948 campaign to a simple selection from personalities.

Let's examine these issues very briefly:

First, and foremost, there is the question of preserving fundamental American civil liberties. Without such liberties we lose the basis for progress. Full civil liberties are an absolute necessity for changing our present war policies to peace policies. Those who want support for evil policies will find that we are standing strong against the idea that the word "peace" is subversive.

We are organizing to fight back because our civil liberties are being undermined by both the Administration and the Congress.

A million private citizens, all moved by some unexplained desire to destroy our country, couldn't do as much damage to American freedom in a year, as the Thomas committee did last week when it attacked Dr. Condon of the Bureau of Standards. They weren't concerned about Dr. Condon. They were interested in frightening all scientists into silence.

With public funds this committee of democracy-hating Congressmen is subverting and imperiling American freedom. They are being aided and abetted by the publishers who report their slanders and libels as part of the campaign to intimidate all Americans into silence, into acquiescence.

The craven movie moguls have bowed to the un-American Committee's onslaught against writers who dared think, artists who dared feel, and cameramen who dared photograph the truth, beautiful or ugly, wherever they found it. A small group of utterly unscrupulous men think they have discovered that you can stifle freedom by slanders, lies, distortions and innuendoes.

They are wrong. They are dead wrong. We are going to prove them wrong. If they think their intimidation will carry them through an election next November they are in for a surprise. They have underestimated the power of the secret ballot the last real refuge of the freedom-loving American whose livelihood is imperiled if he speaks out in the present atmosphere of fear.

They have tried to intimidate all scientists with their attack on Dr. Condon. They are planning to move into the campuses of our country with a campaign to intimidate teachers and students. The mere threat has frightened some schools, some teachers, and some students into silence, but the resistance movement is growing. It is armed. It is armed with ballots. If we can preserve the right to a free choice in the privacy of a voting booth they can and will be defeated.

Is there any leading bipartisan paying lip service to civil rights who will speak up against the Un-American Committee? Where is the voice of President Truman? Have we heard from Mr. Stassen? Mr. Vandenberg? Mr. Dewey? Mr. Taft?

We have not. And we shall not. The Un-American Committee is a bulwark of strength to both of the old parties. As it frightens men into silence it chokes off discussion of fundamental issues—bread-and-butter issues—issues of vital concern to every single American. The Republicans and Democrats were prepared to put on their regular phoney wrestling match this election year. They were prepared to ignore the questions of war or peace, of monopoly control of our economy, of the robbery—through inflation—of the wages and savings of American workers and farmers.

But something new has been added. The wrestling match is no longer a frame-up. There's a new party in the ring.

No one can measure or appraise the real strength of the new party before the November elections, but our opponents know that we are strong and that we are getting stronger. They are as fully aware of the problems of the people as we are, but they will not move to solve them because the masters of the American economy, the monopolists who own the old parties, will not let their political hirelings tackle fundamental issues.

We have them panicked. Lip service and the old pass-the-buck game just won't work with a new party in the field.

They know that we shall continue to blow away the clouds of red smoke under which they have carried out their programs of robbery. The distraction of a Communist menace is only good for a short run at best. It doesn't take long for the people to recognize that the Communists didn't kill OPA and send prices sky high; that the Communists haven't moved Wall Street and military men into key Government jobs; and that the Communists aren't responsible for the restrictions on civil liberties, the maintenance of the poll tax, the continuation of segregation and discrimination.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the past 9 months I have spoken in eight of our great Southern States. I have found in the South a great reservoir of liberalism. I have found that the masses of people believe in fundamental democratic principles. I have found that the farmers and workers, both Negro and white, want to break the rule of the southern bourbons. I have found them well acquainted with the fact that their political figures are mostly tools of the men who run colonial empires from oak-paneled offices in Wall Street.

In these southern trips I have found that the large, unsegregated audiences welcome simple declarations of fundamental American principles. I know that if they get the support of the people in the rest of the Nation, they will break the rule of the undemocratic Democrats.

The President, if he means what he says about civil rights, can take leadership in organizing a dramatic demonstration which will help these people mobilize their forces in the fight for freedom.

Specifically, I urge the President and the other bipartisan crusaders for civil liberties in Bulgaria and Hungary to join me in a trip south—in a trip to mobilize the large freedom forces there. These men who want to train a million young Americans every year for what they call the protection of democracy; these brave crusaders should make personal, front-line appearances in the fight against fascism here at home.

Mr. Truman: Requisition that Freedom Train for a 2-week trip into the South. Invite Senators Taft and Vandenberg, Mr. Stassen and Governor Dewey to go along. And, if you will, invite me.

Let us ride that Freedom Train into every major city in the South and hold in each city large, unsegregated meetings which will warm the hearts of freedom-loving people the world over and give courage to the great people of the South who want and need assistance in breaking the old barriers to freedom.

Such a trip will do more to advance the cause of human freedom the world over than all the billions you have given to the Army and Navy.

While nothing would give me greater pleasure, I have no reason to expect that the democratic leadership will accept this suggestion or take any other "get tough" action against undemocratic practices here at home.

Quite the contrary.

The administration, no less than the House Un-American Committee, is engaged in a frontal attack on civil liberties. It is using the same technique of intimidation—of frightening people out of using their freedoms. It is attempting to intimidate all foreign-born residents, citizens and noncitizens, by arresting Communists—radicals, whose only chance for political success would come from the Government's failure to meet the problems of the people.

It is the administration which is prosecuting trade-union leaders for political activity, which is attempting to enforce the suppression of the democratic actions of the labor movement.

Sometime back I made the prediction that the administration would use the Taft-Hartley Act with all the fervor of the great corporations themselves.

Yesterday there was a little news item tucked away in the papers which supported that sad prediction. On Friday the President used the Taft-Hartley Act to deprive the employees of the Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corp. in the atomic energy laboratory at Oak Ridge of their right to strike. These workers and scientists seeking a 15-cent an hour wage increase, find the Government using its powers to limit their fight—all of which provides an interesting contrast to the simple manner in which Ben Fairless decrees a $5 a ton increase in semifinished steel.

This Federal action under Taft-Hartley is only a start.

As the leaders of organized labor present just demands for wage increases in industry after industry, we can expect the administration to take similar action. A threat of such action was contained in recent stories of the negotiations of the packing-house workers.

The Taft-Hartley law is a major weapon of those who seek to suppress our civil liberties.

Less than 3 years after the end of a war against fascism, the civil liberties of Americans are in graver peril than when Nazi armies were on the march. But the peril is from within, not without. The danger comes from no foreign foe. It comes from Americans. It doesn't come from private citizens, but from highly placed officials and Members of the Congress of the United States.

Writers, artists, scientists, teachers, workers, and foreign-born Americans are feeling the effects of the attacks on free speech. They know that free speech which costs them their jobs is not free. It is far from free. The bipartisans have raised the price of honest, forthright expression way beyond the means of the average citizen. Yet they are worried—for everywhere in this great land they find that there are average citizens willing to pay that price to fight for freedom, and they know that for each free-speaking American there are a thousand others who will speak their minds in the privacy of the voting booths.

The men who have raised the cries of "Red," "Communist," and "Russia" aren't worried about communism. They are worried about democracy. They are worried about the wrath of the people as real wages shrink, savings vanish, and insecurity mounts. These are the results of their criminal policies of talking war and wasting our national wealth in a mad arms race.

The people are fighting back. The new party is providing a means for fighting back. The robbery of the American people won't continue after November, unless the campaigns of intimidation and suppression of civil liberties are carried to new extremes. The people are crying "Stop thief" and the thieves are beginning to hear us.

Delaware Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. DOUGLASS BUCK

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention an outline of the State laws of Delaware relating to veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, compiled by James B. King, national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans, who has his office with the Veterans' Administration, Dravo Building, Wilmington, Del.

By his work, Mr. King has rendered a valuable service to veterans of my State and their families. As most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them under certain circumstances, I am hopeful that this résumé of Delaware's veteran laws will come to their attention, and to aid in achieving this, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Annual appropriations are made for the burial of indigent veterans.

Provision has been made for funerals for servicemen who were killed in action or who died while overseas and were brought back to their home State for burial.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces and admission of evidence.

A conservator may be appointed for persons serving in the armed forces.

Evidence may be admitted of presumed death or absence.

Protection is afforded persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Proving of wills of members of the armed forces is provided.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting is provided for members of the armed forces.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Notaries public may be appointed without cost to the Spanish-American War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion. Free notarial service is available to veterans.

Free transcripts of public records are furnished by registrar of vital statistics and registrar of Wilmington.

Certificates of discharge are recorded free of charge.

Muster rolls and other records may be deposited with the Adjutant General for safekeeping.

The Adjutant General is directed to assist veterans, their families, or dependents in adjusting claims with the Government.

A service officer and an assistant service officer are provided in the office of the Adjutant General to assist veterans and their dependents.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of soldiers, sailors, or marines who died while serving in the armed forces during World Wars I and II, or who have died since or may hereafter die as a result of such service. Amount: $250 maximum per year per child.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Aides-de-camp may be appointed to persons who served in the armed forces with rank of colonel.

Leaves of absence are granted to employees of the mayor and council of Wilmington while in military service.

Leaves of absence are granted to State employees, superintendents, principals, teach-

ers, or other school employees while in military service.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

War-service credit is considered in computing period of continuous service required under the pension-fund acts for police and firemen in the city of Wilmington, when compelled to perform compulsory military service under the Selective Training and Service Act.

GUARDIANSHIP

Provision has been made for the appointment of a trustee or a guardian to receive, on behalf of a veteran or other person, moneys payable by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance or any other bureau, officer, or department of the United States Government.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An annual appropriation is made authorizing the State board of trustees of the State hospital at Farnhurst to establish traveling convalescent clinics for veterans and their immediate families.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

A committee has been established to provide a suitable medal for presentation to World War veterans.

Provision has been made for awarding the conspicuous Service Cross to persons in military or naval forces performing conspicuous acts of valor.

MEETING PLACES, ETC.

A State appropriation has been made to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union to maintain a soldiers' rest room.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Credit is given for time spent in Federal service with reference to service medals.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

An annual appropriation is made to the American Legion, VFW and USWV for proper observance of Memorial Day.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

A Bureau of War Records has been provided in the office of the Adjutant General for the deposit of records, relics, etc.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

An annual appropriation is made to the USWV for aid to indigent veterans in times of distress.

An annual appropriation is made to the Board of Vocational Education for the rehabilitation of citizens wounded or otherwise impaired as a result of service in World War II.

Domestic life, fire, marine, casualty, or workmen's compensation insurance companies may invest in mortgages guaranteed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Veterans are granted second injury fund benefits.

Aid is provided to needy blind veterans.

TAX EXEMPTIONS, EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Motor vehicles owned and used by veterans' organizations in charitable or public welfare work are exempt from automobile registration fee.

Commissaries, ships' stores, and voluntary unincorporated organizations of the Army or Navy personnel operating under War or Navy Department regulations are exempt from State cigarette tax.

Compensation received for service in the armed forces is exempt from income and gross income tax.

Pensions for disabilities resulting from active service are exempt from income tax.

Certain veterans are exempt from auctioneer's license requirements.

Veterans are exempt from book-agent license requirements.

Certain veterans are exempt from peddler's license requirements.

Property of the American Legion, VFW, Polish Army Post, No. 48, and property used for soldiers' rest rooms is exempt from taxation.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of certain veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not to exceed $20 or imprisonment not to exceed 10 days.

Appropriations are made to the American Legion, USWV, and VFW for operating expenses.

Annual appropriations are made to the American Legion, VFW, and USWV for Memorial Day observance.

Notaries public may be appointed for veterans' organizations without cost. Appointee's authority is restricted to business within the scope of the organization and he shall serve without fees.

It is the privilege of veterans' organizations to assist the adjutant general in the collection of records, relics, etc., for the Bureau of War Records.

An annual appropriation is made to the USWV for aid to indigent veterans in times of distress.

Most of these laws have been enacted by the Delaware Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5 or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV SERVICE-TRAINING PROGRAM

Realizing the need for extending assistance to all veterans and their dependents after the close of World War II, the DAV entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration and the American University in Washington, D. C., back in 1944, to train some 400 World War II handicapped veterans to become national service officers. An intensive 6-month special course was set up, followed by 18 more months of on-the-job training in three different regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, under the supervision of old-time, long-experienced DAV service officers.

This is the most intensive and ambitious program yet attempted by any veterans' organization to provide, without cost to the applicants, expert aid and assistance in the solution of the many problems confronting veterans and their dependents.

No veterans' organization has any more extensive and effective Nation-wide service staff to take care of the problems of all veterans and their dependents, and particularly those who have service-connected disabilities, than the DAV.

During the more than 28 years of its service activities, the DAV has sponsored and supported much liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents.

Liberalized application of such laws, too numerous and too technical here to set forth, has each year been brought about by numerous conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration and other governmental agencies.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities, which qualifies him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati, the Fifth Third Union Trust Co., has for 28 years been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing laws, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

DAV SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The DAV has freely rendered technical help to thousands of disabled veterans each year in obtaining compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, pensions for dependents of deceased veterans, vocational training, civil-service appointments, and last, but really first in importance—suitable, gainful employment.

During the past 18 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the DAV have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 1,525,753; total monetary benefits, $132,512,111.87. In the past year the DAV national service officer on duty with the Veterans' Administration regional office

in Wilmington has handled 849 claims with monetary benefits totaling $9,167.44.

Additional compensation payments thus obtained for thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to procure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. Many liberalizing precedents have been established by the decisions obtained, which, subsequently, have proved of value to hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot be computed from service reports.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,100,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War I myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Keynote Speech at Missouri Democratic State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the keynote address delivered at the Democratic State convention, at Jefferson City, Mo., May 3, 1948, by Gov. Phil M. Donnelly:

KEYNOTE SPEECH BY GOV. PHIL M. DONNELLY

We stand on the threshold of another great election campaign.

In primaries and in conventions the people of this Nation, through their ballots or through their selected representatives, will decide upon the candidates of the great political parties who will enter the general election next November.

In making their choice for nomination they will express their preference for the different candidates.

In the general election in November they will weigh well not only the candidates but also the parties, their policies, programs, and performances.

It will be their solemn responsibility as citizens of the greatest democracy on earth to decide between the candidates and the parties, and to set the course of history for the years to come.

Today it is our great privilege as Democrats to contemplate with the greatest pride the record of achievement throughout the years of our party—the oldest political party in the Nation—that party that has governed our great country for more than half the years of its history. The party whose achievements and accomplishments in the interest of all the people have brought the greatest of blessings to our citizenship.

We recall the advances in democracy brought about in days long ago under such Democrats as Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson. The stirring contests waged successfully by them and by their administrations on behalf of the average citizen have made our Nation what it is today.

We also recall the enormous achievements in progressive legislation that have taken place during the past 16 years. Under the leadership of one of the greatest Presidents this Nation ever produced—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—our Nation established a fundamental principle in the policies of our National Government. That principle was the simple fact that our National Government is responsible for the welfare of the people, economic, social, and political. The humanitarian philosophy of the Democratic Party was translated into legislation affecting the general welfare of the people of the United States.

Some of the actual accomplishments of those Democratic administrations will bear this out:

Social security was made a fundamental issue and a settled policy of our Government.

The bank deposit guaranty law restored public confidence in the Nation's Government and the banks and saved the country from possible revolution into which Republican misrule had taken it.

The Federal farm program, including Soil Conservation, the Federal Land Bank and other agricultural agencies were of assistance to every farmer in the land.

The ordinary citizen was protected from the rapacious greed of the speculator through legislation, bringing about proper regulation of the security and commodity exchanges.

Rural Electrification brought the advantage of electric power and light to the farm many years before this would have been possible through private agencies.

The Veterans' Reemployment Program, the GI bill of rights and other veterans' legislation accorded veterans of World War II a square deal and the opportunity to prepare for and to enter upon civilian life under favorable conditions.

These are but a few of the positive accomplishments of democratic administration for the betterment and safety of our country and the welfare of its citizens.

On the other hand, what is the record of the last Republican national administration?

Look back to the 1920's for the answer and what do we find? The contrast is startling. Legislation for the benefit of the few against the many. Sponsorship of doctrines of false prosperity, stock market speculation and inflation. Government in the hands of reactionary, standpat leadership that finally brought our country to the brink of ruin and despair.

In those days there was no social security, no old age pensions, no help for the farmer who faced the loss of all he had. No help for the small-business man. You remember those days and the tragedy those reactionary policies brought upon our country.

The record is plain and the basic difference between the two parties is proven by the history of those years.

During the past 3 years our National Democratic administration has continued to function in the interest of the people. In spite of the opposition of a Republican Congress our President, Harry S. Truman, has carried on the duties of the Presidency with honor, courage, and patience.

Decisions that affect the whole world are made almost daily by this native Missourian. He assumed the Presidency in the crucial closing months of the war, and successfully led our Nation to final and complete victory. He made the great decisions of the surrender of our enemies with firmness and sound judgment. He negotiated with the Russians as long as fair negotiation was possible.

He sponsored the Marshall plan, hailed throughout the world as the most effective course which could be taken to stop the spread of communism and to aid in the revival of the economies of the free nations of the world. The foreign program of President Truman and the National Democratic administration has the overwhelming support of the American people and of every freedom-loving nation on earth.

On domestic matters, President Truman's appeal to the Republican Congress for effective measures to halt inflation is a step every citizen of this country should approve. A metropolitan Missouri newspaper recently stated:

"It is said this latest warning will fall on deaf Republican ears as did his 10-point plan of last November. Perhaps so. But time and the continuing rise of prices is bearing out the President. Anyone who buys a beefsteak, or an automobile or a suit of clothes knows that the dollar is constantly shrinking in value. Now the country apparently is in for another round of wage increases. The dance goes on."

He sponsored other measures and plans for domestic recovery that called for increased production and prosperity. He saved the Nation from a great fuel crisis. He backed private enterprise, and urged policies to stimulate business activity. He sought to restore our foreign trade and the markets of the world. He labored for economic reconstruction at home and abroad. He urged that business, labor, agriculture, and Government work together to make possible the full benefits of our economic system. He is working constantly for world freedom and world peace.

He should have the respect and admiration of the citizens of Missouri, and he is entitled to the support of this convention.

Do the people want to turn from Democratic leadership in the interest of farmers, the small-business man, the workers, the professional people, the common citizens of this country? Do they want to restore power in this Nation to the reactionary Republican old guard? Do they want to put our Government in the hands of those who ruined it before?

The people of Missouri will have another decision to make next November. Shall con-

trol of our State government be retained by Democratic officials or shall it be turned over to inept Republican hands?

The present Democratic State administration was elected on a platform which contained the following pledge:

"We pledge to the people of Missouri, if intrusted with the administration of the government of this State, a strict business and economical administration with due regard to the welfare of the people of Missouri and the proper discharge of the State's business."

I am here today to report to you that we have carried out that pledge.

We have carried it out in spite of the fact that we have been hampered and handicapped by the petty partisanship of a Republican legislature.

One of the first acts of this Democratic administration was to clean up the mess at the State penitentiary. It had become common knowledge that conditions at the penitentiary were rotten. The convicts were running the prison. In the years 1942 to 1944 every red-blooded American was sacrificing everything to the war effort; many articles of food including sugar and meat were rationed, yet sugar was used by the hundreds of pounds in distilleries by convicts in the penitentiary. These distilleries were destroyed early in 1945. Choice meats stolen from the cold-storage lockers were peddled about the institution. Popular brands of fine liquors were sold at fabulous prices within the walls of the prison. Electric motors, tools, furniture, rugs, and many other similar items disappeared.

Laws enacted by the general assembly meant very little. A 2-year sentence to the penitentiary meant 10 or 11 months. In some instances additional time off the sentence could be purchased from a convict clerk at the rate of 50 cents a day.

Convicts roamed the streets of Jefferson City at will. Prison guards augmented their salaries by week-end trips with prisoners, expenses paid by the prisoners.

State treasurer's drafts amounting to thousands of dollars were stolen in the accounting office of the penitentiary and cashed by guards and ex-convicts. One draft alone amounted to $9,500. Another for $1,500. Many others were cashed by guards in Jefferson City and small towns in north Missouri.

The canteen fund at the prison was short approximately $5,700. A large part of the funds appropriated for the first 6 months of 1945 for this administration had to be used to pay the 1944 deficiencies of the former administration.

For 3½ years we have been repairing the damage done by the former Republican administration in the prison factories, cell blocks, kitchens, light and water system, the farm lands and farm buildings—all accomplished with approximately the same amount of funds as was appropriated for the former Republican administration.

That same record was written in almost every State institution—inefficiency, mismanagement, waste, and destruction.

In this administration when a condition was found at one of the State training schools that needed correction, action was taken to clean it up. The passage of legislation was necessary. The Republican House of Representatives delayed the passage of a needed bill for over 21 days and tried to inject politics into the situation. Their efforts failed because public opinion was against them. We took action at Boonville. The Republican leadership of the House delayed, procrastinated, and played politics.

The people of Missouri adopted a new constitution which became effective March 30, 1945. The Republican legislature has consistently flouted that constitution.

One of its provisions was that for 15 years from the date the constitution takes effect the general assembly shall appropriate for each year out of the general revenue fund an amount not less than that produced annually at a tax rate of 1 cent on each $100 assessed valuation of the real and tangible personal property taxable by the State, for the exclusive purpose of providing a State park fund to be expended and used by the agency authorized by law to control and supervise State parks, and for the purpose of operation, maintenance, development, control, regulation, and restoration of State parks and State park property as may be determined by such agency.

The amount provided annually by such constitutional provision was approximately $400,000. Although the general assembly was requested to make such appropriation for the year July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946, the general assembly appropriated only $128,500. The Republican legislature tried to cripple the park board by refusing to appropriate the funds required by the constitution and as a result the park board did not have the use of approximately $290,000 the first year of this administration, and therefore, substantial improvements in the parks were delayed for more than a year.

Another provision of the constitution that the senate of the general assembly violated related to the department of education providing for the appointment of the members of the State board of education whose terms are for specified periods of time.

The Governor appointed three members of this board which the senate refused to confirm. Although one member was appointed July 8, 1947, another November 26, 1947, and another February 13, 1948, and although the senate did not recess until April 2, 1948, no meeting was called by the senate for the purpose of confirming them.

In refusing to confirm these appointments I charge the Republicans of the State senate with playing politics with the educational system of this State. The board of education of all boards should be free of politics.

The general assembly has violated the intent and purpose of the constitution by remaining in continuous session.

The constitution provides that on extraordinary occasions the governor may convene the general assembly by proclamation, wherein he shall state specifically each matter on which action is deemed necessary. The legislature by remaining in continuous session defeats the intent of this provision of the constitution.

My predecessor was a Republican. The general assembly was Democratic but when the business of the Democratic general assembly was finished it adjourned. It did not recess. It did not keep employees needlessly on the pay roll at the expense of the taxpayers. We did not try to tie the hands of the governor by remaining in continuous session.

It is not the function or the prerogative of the general assembly to determine what is an extraordinary occasion or what is an emergency requiring the convening of the general assembly. That is the duty of the governor, as provided in the constitution, and any attempt on the part of the general assembly to usurp this authority is a violation of the purpose of the constitution.

The Republican legislature deliberately sought to hamper, hinder, and cripple the operation of the executive departments of the State government.

They did this by denying these departments, which are operating under Democratic officials, adequate funds for the necessary employees with which to carry on their work.

They made reductions in the appropriations for the personnel in the offices of the Democratic elected officials. For instance, the appropriations for the State auditor, State treasurer, and attorney general were all reduced. This was done for petty political reasons. The adoption of the new constitution and the laws enacted to implement it and the creation of many new constitutional and statutory departments have greatly increased the work of the attorney general's office. He has been called upon for a great many legal opinions and advice on all of these matters. Yet, the Republican legislature has actually reduced his appropriation for the employment of assistants by 15 percent from the 1943–44 appropriation.

The State revenue department, which collects all the revenue of the State, had an inadequate appropriation for the present fiscal year and has now had its appropriation for employees reduced by $35,000 for the coming fiscal year. This action was not only partisanship at its worst, it was poor business. There are over one and one-half million tax returns which should be audited. These include the State income tax, sales tax, and the different types of intangible tax, such as general intangible, bank tax, building and loan, credit institutions, and credit unions. The field force for this department for this fiscal year is inadequate to cover the State properly, and it is impossible to provide needed regional offices for the convenience of the taxpayers. These tax returns cannot be properly audited by the staff provided by these appropriations.

Although more motor vehicle license plates are sold than ever before, and collections in this department have increased, and although three new acts of the legislature requiring additional personnel for their operation have been enacted, namely, the outboard motor registration law, the financial responsibility law, and the use-tax law, and have been placed under the jurisdiction of this department, the department has to operate under reduced appropriations.

Another example of the shortsightedness and partisanship of the general assembly was its treatment of the important department of public health and welfare, one of the largest departments of the State government.

The Republican General Assembly drastically reduced the appropriation for the Bureau of Vital Statistics in the Division of Health to a point so low that the issuing of birth and death certificates was delayed from 3 to 4 months because of inadequate funds with which to employ the necessary help. Many members of the legislature came to this department to find out why some of their constituents could not obtain these important certificates without delay. This was the result of their own failure to provide for the basic needs of an important branch of the State service.

The Director of Public Health and Welfare has jurisdiction over 12 institutions. In addition, the legislature this year passed a bill transferring to the State the St. Louis City Sanitarium and the St. Louis Training School and placed said institutions under the control of the Department of Public Health and Welfare. Yet, when the Director of this department requested from the legislature a paltry few thousand dollars with which to permit the employment of one or two more employees in addition to the one employee in his office, this was refused.

It is almost inconceivable how the head of a department of this size can carry on the heavy responsibilities and discharge the many duties of his office, which provides general supervision over all of the health and welfare programs and institutions of the State. This is one of the new departments created under the constitution of 1945 and, although provided for, the legislature failed to furnish sufficient funds to permit this department to function as was intended by the framers of the Constitution.

These are but a few instances of cheap politics played by the Republicans in our legislature who, with callous indifference,

have been willing to sacrifice efficiency in the State government in favor of political considerations.

But while the Republicans have been willing to sacrifice good administration in government for their own ends, they have been eager enough to appropriate money in other directions, where they might receive some political benefit. So much so that they overappropriated the anticipated revenues for the coming fiscal year by $1,950,000, even though these revenues are expected to be greater than ever before in the history of the State.

Since the inception of the major welfare programs in Missouri, the Democratic Party has steadfastly stood for proper and adequate care of the aged, dependent, and homeless children, and unemployable persons forced to turn to State assistance for their livelihood. These welfare programs came into being in Missouri under a Democratic administration. In 1935 the first old-age assistance law was enacted by a Democratic general assembly, and in 1937 Democratic legislation made possible assistance to dependent children. Previously, in the depths of the depression, the first State-wide general assistance program was launched to care for those in need.

The Democratic Party in Missouri should continue to foster and preserve the rights of the underprivileged and should pledge its support to those welfare programs which will provide the greatest measure of care and security to the less fortunate citizens of this great State.

The Democratic State administration has supported the national policy on agriculture. Sixteen years of national Democratic administration have brought great benefits to farmers. Farm income was never higher. Farm debt has been cut in half since 1929, and net farm worth is at a new high.

The College of Agriculture and the State department of agriculture have rendered increasingly greater service to Missouri farmers. A striking example of agency cooperation is found in the progress of soil improvement in Missouri. The decline of soil fertility in our State, once rapid and alarming, has been slowed down, and in recent years we have been restoring our damaged lands. A fair rating of relative progress shows Missouri to rank first, second, or third among all other States in actual accomplishment of the principal items of soil improvement.

Farm cooperatives are recognized as an important segment of our system of free enterprise. These associations of farmers should be encouraged and supported. They provide a powerful bulwark against monopoly and render enormous benefits to the farmers themselves.

These are some of the accomplishments of the Democratic Party, and these are some of the failures of Republican leadership.

As we, the Democrats of Missouri, face the days ahead, let us keep these records straight.

Let us remember that fear of war is a very real thing. Let us remember that a Democratic administration is taking the most effective possible means to forestall that conflict. Let us remember the dangers of inflation and that Democratic leadership and measures have provided the only effective brake on inflation. Let us recall that the Democratic Party is the only party in America today that promises real leadership for progress, and therefore there is no occasion for voters to go off on a tangent of irresponsible leadership. Let us keep in mind the great ideals and the fundamental principles of the party of the people.

As we enter the great political campaign this fall, let us take courage in its achievements. Under the banner of this great party, with hope and courage high, we cannot, we will not fail.

Rio Grande Death Watch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the middle Rio Grande flood- and silt-control problem is coming to the consciousness of the Nation. The State has, since the early twenties, struggled with it, but has found itself unable to cope with the task. Today, a century after the American occupation, Congress is forced to take a hand.

To the end that the Congress and the Nation may be in position to appraise the problem, I have sought permission to place in the RECORD, in three parts, an article published in the spring New Mexico Quarterly Review—an article entitled "The Story of a Dying River," by Arthur W. Hamilton, who lives in the lower end of the river at Mesilla Park, N. Mex. Of necessity, I have had to condense the article by omitting observations not directly in point on the problem before us. Those portions of the article placed in the RECORD, however, are verbatim and exactly as they appeared in the New Mexico Quarterly Review, except for the topic headings.

The article is as follows:

RIO GRANDE DEATH WATCH—THE STORY OF A DYING RIVER

(By Arthur W. Hamilton)

CAUSE

Scores of statistic-laden studies treating with the Middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico have been turned out during the past 30 years. The authors of this sizeable body of regional literature reflect in their writings a common belief that what they have seen is appalling.

APATHY IN THE FACE OF DANGER

However, as with most erudite and statistic-laden works, this body of literature has been read by only a few of those most intimately concerned—the people of the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Many of the Spanish-American villagers along the river and in the mountains cannot read English, and those who can have no ready access to this material. Most non-Spanish city dwellers—the Anglos, so-called—are too busy. They have restaurants and stores and garages to operate and offices to get to at 8 o'clock in the morning. It does not seem important to them that the bottom of the river that flows past their homes is an inch higher this year than last. What has that to do with feeding the customers or selling shirts? Let the farmers worry about the river.

AWAKENING TO DANGER

At last the ill-boding superlatives applied to the farms, range lands, and surrounding mountains of the Middle Rio Grande watershed drew the attention of a few men with large investments in the valley—men who stood to lose a great deal of money if steps were not taken soon to remedy the conditions that attracted geographers and caused water and sedimentation experts and soil conservationists from all over the world to term the middle valley watershed and its river system the worst example of land abuse on the North American Continent.

Here was a definite threat to the wealth and position of substantial citizens. Articulate by virtue of money and influence, this solid group began to drive the story into public consciousness. Now newspapers in the middle valley carry daily items to hammer home awareness of the dangers consequent to land destruction. Pressure is exerted on Congress to vote funds for dams and reclamation work. The plight of the Spanish-American villagers is revealed in all its sordidness.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFUSED

In Albuquerque, New Mexico's largest city, the chamber of commerce even risked frightening new business away by admitting that the city's existence is subject to the whim of nature—a sudden spring thaw to melt the heavy snow cover in the mountains might bring down rampaging floods to endanger every building in the business section. The chamber went to the extreme length of making public the fact that insurance companies refuse to issue policies against flood damage in downtown Albuquerque.

The noted geographer, J. Russell Smith, in a paper presented before the Association of American Geographers at Cambridge, Mass., in December 1938, referred to the Upper Rio Grande Valley as "The doomed valley of the Upper Rio Grande—the most striking example of regional suicide." He included the entire Upper Rio Grande, from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the New Mexico-Colorado line.

Smith is backed in his estimate by Ward Shephard, who, in his book Food or Famine, says: "Nowhere on this continent and almost nowhere in the world is there to be found such a dramatic example of the break-down of a whole watershed and its river system."

ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS AGREE

Almost without exception engineers and scientists who have studied this area have weighted their reports with statements equally ominous. It is made clear by these men that the area below Elephant Butte Reservoir at the southern end of the valley, temporarily productive under irrigation from stored water, will share the fate of the middle valley when once the sediment brought down unceasingly by the river fills the reservoir to the point where water storage is less than the annual withdrawal for irrigation.

Thus do engineers, scholars, and scientists tend toward common conclusions to point up the fact that the people of the Middle Rio Grande Valley live in a blighted country.

They are simple and forthright conclusions, with a common base—the misuse of the land which has stripped protective grasses and trees from forest and range lands, allowing waterborne silt and mud to be carried down to choke the river system. As a result of this misuse, the farms can no longer feed the rural population. The cities and towns along the river are under constant threat of destruction by flood. And, finally, if no corrective measures are taken, unchecked deterioration of the land will destroy civilization in the valley.

A CENTURY AGO—SPANISH SETTLEMENT

One hundred years ago the ranges of the middle valley watershed were deep in rich, soil-covering grass. The forests stood in the foothills and on the mountains to check the downrush of water from melting snows. The bottomlands were protected by billions of tiny roots and millions of towering trees from the insidious, throttling silt of the uplands that was later to descend and engulf them. The Rio Grande and its tributaries were rivers then, and not, as they have become since, exaggerated arroyos—resposi-tories for mud and breeding places for useless, water-consuming salt bushes and trees.

Many centuries ago the Indians, and three centuries ago the Spanish settled the valley—but slowly, and with few people. Although the Spanish brought sheep and cattle with them, their demands of the valley's

resources were light. They grazed their livestock close to the valley settlements. There was no heavy grazing of the higher grasslands, no intensive cutting of timber in the mountains. Even during the Mexican period, when herds were expanded, from 1821 to 1846, range damage was confined to areas immediately surrounding the settlements, and no widespread deterioration of the valley's resources took place.

A CENTURY LATER—AMERICAN CASUALTY

After 1846, when the United States acquired New Mexico from Mexico by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the picture changed quickly. The Middle Rio Grande watershed became a casualty of America's westward expansion.

When the Santa Fe railroad brought its rails across the Colorado line in 1879 to provide New Mexico stockmen access to national markets, the number of livestock increased rapidly. In the 20 years between 1870 and 1890, the number of cattle and sheep on the watershed ranges jumped from 449,000 to 1,727,000. The soil-holding grasses were increasingly displaced by clumpy ring grass, snake weed, and annuals that offered diminishing protection to the thin topsoil. Widespread timber cutting in the hills and mountains contributed to the rapid runoff of rainwater, speeding the destruction of the grass cover in the lower range lands, resulting in accelerated silt production.

The ranges could not support this vast number of grazing animals. The herds were, perforce, gradually reduced until the livestock population was lower than at any time since 1870. The grazing capacity of the land declined more than a third.

Meanwhile, during the time of increase and through the time of decrease enforced by reduced forage, the ranges produced immense quantities of silt to wreck the drainage system. This silt is even now being poured into Middle Valley rivers at an unbelievable rate. The Mississippi River, long termed the "Big Muddy," carries in flood stage only one-tenth as much silt as an equal volume of Rio Grande flood water.

Renewal of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement to the Ways and Means Committee on behalf of Florida fresh vegetable growers and shippers by the Florida Growers Association, Orlando, Fla., in regard to the proposed renewal of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

The Florida Growers Association opposes renewal of the Trade Agreements Act because the agreements negotiated thereunder by the Department of State—

1. Have not improved the living standards of citizens of other nations or made it possible for them to buy American products, but have actually helped to concentrate the profits from foreign trade in a few hands, thus defeating the economic objectives of the act.

2. Have not gained us true friends in other nations because the masses resent our aiding their exploiters to become richer. Thus, the political objectives have not been attained, and aid and comfort has been given to the exponents of communism.

3. Have permitted American capital, equipment, and know-how to be used in other nations to exploit labor in order to produce or manufacture items which can be marketed in the United States at prices with which the domestic producer cannot compete unless he reduces wages.

Eighty-three percent of the fresh tomatoes marketed in the United States during the 1946–47 season (December through May) were produced in Mexico or Cuba as contrasted with only 14 percent during 1938–39. Cause: Their low labor costs—$1 to $1.25 per day (United States). Effect: United States markets periodically flooded; millions of dollars lost to domestic producers, with no corresponding saving by the consumer. Beneficiaries: The Americans who finance and market the crops, not the Mexican or Cuban farmers. Losers: The American farmer and his workers; the American economy.

In 1938 the Congress decided that exploitation of domestic labor was bad, not only for the worker but for the economy of the Nation as a whole. The Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted to wipe out the unfair competitive advantage of the domestic employer who paid extremely low wages.

The Trade Agreements Act, as now administered, permits American capital to evade the principles of this law and to exploit labor in foreign nations. Result: The domestic producer is undersold in the American market and the living standards of the domestic employer and worker suffer.

Free traders contend that American producers can, through greater efficiency, afford to compete directly with products of low-wage nations, blissfully ignoring the fact that the same technical knowledge and equipment can be transferred to the low-wage nation to produce there efficiently the low-cost products that are dumped onto the American market the domestic producer has helped to create.

In the case of perishable agricultural products, no efficient method of mechanical harvesting can provide the mature, garden-fresh products desired by the consumer—it's still a selective process requiring hand labor.

WHAT IS OUR NATIONAL POLICY?

Ninety percent of American production is domestically consumed. Do we want to impoverish the domestic producer and lower the purchasing power of the domestic worker in order to give away the remaining 10 percent in foreign lands? Or would it be better to first assure that our domestic economy is maintained at a high level?

ABOUT COMMUNISM

How can we best combat communism in other nations? Is it by policies which perpetuate the exploitation of workers in other countries, and at the same time constitute a serious drain on our domestic economy and threaten our living standards, or would it be best to prove in our own Nation that democracy and capitalism can work, and are not decadent, as the Communists claim?

AN AFFIRMATIVE POLICY

Let's tell the world that we want to keep our living standards high, and that we want to encourage the improvement of living standards in other nations by permitting the entry, with little or no duty, of products which are produced by foreign employers who pay living wages which would permit the foreign citizen to buy our products. The Communists are promising the masses just that, but we have the opportunity to deliver.

This would necessitate the adoption of a flexible tariff policy, under which an impartial fact-finding body would study living standards, competitive conditions, and other related factors, and determine a tariff rate for each commodity from each principal producing nation which would place the domestic and foreign producer on a fair competitive basis.

WE AREN'T THE ONLY PRODUCERS WHO COULD BE AFFECTED

What products, either raw or manufactured, are produced in the United States, which could not be produced far more cheaply in foreign nations with living standards lower than our own, if reduction or removal of tariffs permitted American capital and technology to produce these commodities abroad with exploited labor, for sale in the United States? How long could our domestic economy survive?

Lever Bros. Co., of Cambridge, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent, and also a news item:

MAY 5, 1948.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: I enclose herewith for your information a clipping from the New York Herald Tribune of May 5, setting forth the fact that Lever Bros., which as you know is a British institution with a branch in Cambridge, Mass., is engaged in an extensive expansion program.

In 1944 it bought the Pepsodent Co.; in 1947 it bought Harriet Hubbard Ayer, the cosmetics firm; last month it bought the Luxor cosmetic line from Armour & Co.; and, it has now bought the Rayve Creme Shampoo and the Hedy Wave Home Permanent. Altogether it is somewhat amazing that subsidiaries of a British corporation are able to extend their operations in the United States, and, yet, the British never have money to pay their debts.

In another clipping, which unfortunately I have mislaid, it is set forth that the Socony Vacuum is buying oil from the Anglo-Iranian Co. for shipment into the United States from Kuwait and Persia. This fact indicates that the British have a surplus of oil which they can ship to the United States and which we will have to pay for at the same time that we are pouring over a billion dollars into Britain this year for the Marshall plan.

In the light of these facts I hope that the time will come when we can get rid of the internationalist gang who are running this country for the benefit of other countries.

With best regards, believe me,
Sincerely yours.

LEVER BROS. BUY RAYVE, HEDY LINES—ACQUIRES CREME SHAMPOO AND WAVE HOME PERMANENT

Acquisition of Rayve Creme Shampoo and Hedy Wave Home Permanent by Lever Bros. Co., Cambridge, Mass., was announced yesterday by Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros. Mr. Luckman said the products would be manufactured and merchandised by the company's Pepsodent division.

The new businesses, with their trademarks and good will, were acquired from William R. Warner Co., manufacturer of pharmaceuticals and toiletries. Terms of the transactions were not disclosed.

The transaction also involved two other Rayve products, Rayve Creme hair dressing, and Rayve Caress hair dressing. Rayve Creme Shampoo, first introduced to the public in June 1944, is one of the leading sellers

in the field. Hedy Wave Home Permanents were introduced in January of this year in the rapidly expanding home permanent field.

Mr. Luckman pointed out that acquisition of the products was another step in the Lever expansion program which started a few years ago. In 1944 Pepsodent Co. was bought and made a division of the Lever organization. In July 1947, Harriet Hubbard Ayer, the cosmetics firm, was acquired, and last month the Luxor cosmetic line was purchased from Armour & Co.

The Filipinos Are With Us—Their Pro-American Attitude Is Proverbial—We Must Not Forget or Fail Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vicente Villamin, the well-known Filipino writer, lawyer, and economist, published an article in the Mânila Bulletin in the Philippines which should be read by all Members of Congress and the officials of the administration.

The Filipino leaders, according to Mr. Villamin, have declared clearly that in case of war the Philippines will stand by the side of the United States as a belligerent. That is a magnificent attitude. No other nation has said as much. No other nation has assured us that they will be with us in case of war. The Filipinos alone of all peoples have done so.

This Congress should take notice of that. We are extending aid in billions of dollars to European countries. We have not even given the Filipino veterans who fought under our flag what they deserve in veterans' benefits.

I hope Mr. Villamin will give Congress the facts of the matter. He told me that two members of the Philippine Congress, Hon. Ramon Magsaysay and Hon. Atilano Cinco, have arrived in Washington to work for the veterans' bill, H. R. 4073. Father E. J. Haggerty, the guerrilla padre, is also here to help as a volunteer like Mr. Villamin.

They will need to work very hard to get their bill acted upon because of the many measures pending before Congress and because of other considerations of a political nature.

Mr. Villamin's article follows:

PHILIPPINE BELLIGERENCY

(By Vicente Villamin)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Philippine Secretary of National Defense Ruperto Kangleon is quoted in an Associated Press dispatch from Manila as saying that the Philippines would not hesitate to join forces with the United States in a war with Russia and that the Philippine Congress would be asked for an emergency additional appropriation of 132,000,000 pesos ($66,000,000) to equip fully at least 45,000 ground troops.

The heroic proportions of this rearmament program are clear from the fact that the amount asked for is equivalent to over 50 percent of the national budget and the increase of the army personnel is over 200 percent of the present force. In comparison, Secretary of Defense James V. Forrestal asked the American Congress for the same purpose an amount equal to 8 percent of the budget and an increase of about 25 percent in the armed forces, besides limited conscription and universal military training.

Other foreign countries, outside of Russia, are hardly preparing militarily for war. The bulk of the six-billion-dollar American aid is intended to be used for the improvement of the economic condition of the participating countries in the hope that their people would not stagger into communism in sheer desperation.

In the event of war, they would expect to receive lend-lease assistance from the arsenal of democracy that is America. Besides that, it is generally believed that the next war will be a competition between scientific weapons that they do not have and will cost them too much to obtain.

These realities make the Philippine war attitude all the more impressive. And when it is considered that the Philippines is in financial straights and is not included in the American foreign-aid act, the ECA, the decisiveness of its attitude is really formidable.

It is assumed that Secretary Kangleon's statement represents the policy of the Roxas administration just as a similar statement by Secretary Forrestal expresses that of the Truman administration. It makes the Philippines the first and only country in the world that has come out clearly, saying that she will range herself with the United States as a belligerent in case of war. If other nations would follow suit with the same avowal of self-sacrifice and determination, world war III might be averted, with Russia sobered to the terrible realities.

Nations go to war when they have a casus belli, that is, cause justifying resort to war. In the present instance, outside of the general proposition that democracy is in a death duel with communism, the Philippines to date has no specific cause for war with Russia. Therefore, her decision to go to war on the side of the United States must be taken as a deliberate expression of her attachment to and solidarity with that country. For that action, Russia, to which sentiment has hardly any compelling force, might display a punitive vindictiveness when war comes by sending to the Philippines one of her secret engines of destruction.

It is the expectation that if and when the United States goes to war the Philippines involuntarily would be involved in it. The involvement would come when the enemy attacks the American military establishments on Philippine territory, with the fighting not restricted to the military area. But if he fails to attack and the country does not become a battleground, she will not or need not be formally in the war at all. She could help the United States in every way possible. And it would still be prudent for her to be prepared for any eventuality.

The belligerency status of the Philippines in case of war will produce certain foreseeable results. If she is a belligerent and she is not a battleground because the enemy has not attacked her territory, it is probable that she will be asked by her ally, the United States, to send troops to China, Korea, or Manchuria to fight the Communists there alongside the American soldiers. But if she is not a belligerent because she has not declared war for the reason that she has not been attacked, no Filipino troops will be sent to the mainland of Asia to fight the enemy of the United States.

The Kangleon statement morally commits the Philippines, subject to constitutional processes, to declare war on her own volition and, of course, on her own responsibility. Without a scintilla of doubt, this constitutes the central foreign policy of the Republic of the Philippines, announced, significantly if unwittingly, by the Secretary of National Defense instead of the Secretary of Foreign Affairs.

The statement came at the very moment when the American Congress had all but approved an appropriation of $6,098,000,000 to help certain foreign countries, including China, to fight the menace of hunger and communism and the Russian threat. If it had come sooner and had been properly exploited, the Congress might have included the Philippines as one of the recipients of the aid. Later, several Congressmen told the writer that it was an oversight because nobody mentioned it or reminded them of it.

The forthright pro-American attitude of the Philippines, when understood by the American people, would touch them to the quick for its singular unselfishness and its splendid spirit of loyalty and solidarity. If the Philippines had been inclined to be selfish, she would have adopted the all-too-common strategy of fence sitting and lure the United States to offer financial and military assistance for her to come down to terra-clara and be counted as an active collaborator in the cause of democracy.

Thus, when everything is said and done, it will be admitted by all who would know the facts that America can depend more on the Filipino people than on any other people on the face of the earth to stand by her through thick and thin, in war and in peace, now and in the future. The relations of the two countries are truly beautiful and nothing should be done to diminish or demolish their efficacy and splendor.

In the Philippines there will be cynics, skeptics, and assorted mountebanks who will say that the rearmament program is really intended for the Huks, PKM's, and other dissidents. That would only prove that there is free speech there. It could not be the intention. The government must protect the country from enemies.

The Railroad Strike Can Be Averted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are very much concerned with the possibilities of a railroad strike next Tuesday, May 11.

I sincerely trust that ways may be found to avert this calamity because no one can possibly benefit by such a strike and millions upon millions of people will be adversely affected. I have just recently returned from Chicago, and while there I took advantage of the opportunity to talk to many of the railroad employees who will be affected by such a strike.

I also wish to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the facts surrounding the negotiations of the present contract of the three brotherhoods which finally landed on the desk of Dr. John Steelman, Assistant to the President, to determine if there is a possibility he might work out an agreement before it becomes necessary to send it to the President.

There are less than 10 percent of the railroad employees involved in the present negotiations, and over 90 percent have accepted the 15½ cents an hour

increase in wages. The Emergency Board appointed by the President of the United States under the Railway Labor Act has recommended that the three brotherhoods be given the same amount. To be more specific, a 15½ cents an hour increase was granted to approximately 1,035,000 nonoperating railroad employees effective September 1, 1947. This was the direct result of arbitration. Then on November 1, 1947 a similar increase became effective after negotiation for approximately 170,000 conductors and trainmen. Thus, by November 1, 1947 over 1,200,000 railroad employees, or over 90 percent of the total, had received a wage increase of 15½ cents an hour through arbitration or negotiation.

During the spring of this year the Emergency Board appointed by the President held hearings in Chicago for 33 days, at which time all parties of interest were given a full hearing. In its report to the President dated March 27, 1948, after extensive hearings, the Emergency Board recommended a wage increase of 15½ cents an hour effective November 1, 1947, for the three brotherhoods, namely: the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America. In addition, the Board also recommended certain changes in working rules which were subject to controversy between the parties of interest.

The people are deeply interested in having this strike prevented due to the fact that the railroad brotherhoods down through the years have had an enviable reputation among unions in being able to keep their unions free of any taint of communism and radicals. The brotherhoods under the Railway Labor Act have been able to negotiate contracts that have brought many benefits to their members over a long period of years without crippling the economy of our country. It was because of this fine record of the railroad employees that the Railway Labor Act has been held up as a model of negotiation and arbitration of labor disputes.

The recommendations of the Emergency Board, which have already been accepted by the railroads, would be retroactive to November 1, 1947, and any remaining differences can be taken up in the very near future when they start negotiations on a new contract. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my plea today is to the officers of the three brotherhoods to favorably consider the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board, not only for the benefit of their own members, but for the benefit of all railroad employees and the people of the entire Nation who will be affected by a railroad strike at this time.

Mr. Speaker, most of the railroad employees are fearful that another so-called work-or-fight bill may be presented to the Congress by the President, which, if passed, will completely wreck the entire Railway Labor Act and the advantages they have enjoyed under it.

Speaking for the good of the railroad employees of America and having their interests in mind, I say we cannot and must not have a railroad strike at this time. If the officers of the three brotherhoods really have the interest of labor at heart they will not force one now.

Inasmuch as the members of the unions have not had an opportunity to express themselves on the recommendation of the President's Emergency Board, it seems to me the only fair thing to do at this hour is for the men representing the three brotherhoods in the present negotiations to agree to a temporary truce until they can submit to the membership of their unions the proposition recommended by the President's Emergency Board in order to get an expression from the rank and file as to how they feel regarding its fairness.

With that thought in mind I have sent the following telegram to Dr. John Steelman today:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 6, 1948.*

Dr. JOHN STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
White House, Washington, D. C.

Inasmuch as members of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the Switchmen's Union of North America have not yet been given opportunity to express their personal opinions on recommendation of President's Emergency Board, I respectfully suggest you endeavor to obtain agreement from officers of three brotherhoods to defer contemplated railroad strike scheduled for May 11 until such time as vote of membership can be taken. This suggestion is submitted in a sincere effort to avert a national catastrophe which will surely result if strike takes place.

Congressman FRED E. BUSBEY.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of W. Averell Harriman, United States special representative in Europe, before the Subcommittee on Tariffs of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, on House Joint Resolution 335, a joint resolution to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, May 5, 1948:

I am exceedingly sorry that I am not able to appear personally before this committee. I am just on the eve of leaving for Paris to assume my new duties as United States special representative in Europe. Nevertheless, I do want to present to the committee my views on the importance of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act.

The program of economic cooperation for European recovery, which has been generously and wisely supported by an overwhelming majority of the Congress, involves a real sacrifice on the part of the people of the United States. This sacrifice is being made willingly because it promises the strengthening of the free countries of Europe and peace and security for the United States. But I am sure the people and the Congress are determined that this wisdom and generosity shall not be wasted, as they would if the program should fail to achieve its purpose of restoring the war-devastated countries to a position where they can stand firmly on their own feet.

I consider it my duty, therefore, to point out how seriously this program would be jeopardized if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should not be renewed before its expiration on June 12 or should be renewed for only 1 year. Termination of the act at this time would cut short an auxiliary program that is vital to European recovery, and any change in the act that appeared to forecast a change in our policy toward the reduction of barriers to trade would be taken by the free world as an abdication of the leadership the United States has been providing.

Last year at Geneva, under the authority of that act, the United States concluded a multilateral trade agreement with 22 other countries. But this was only the beginning of the job that urgently needs to be done. The Geneva negotiations, for example, did not include Italy, Greece, Portugal, Eire, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, or Iceland, all countries included in the European recovery program. With some of these countries we have no trade agreement of the kind contemplated by the act; with others we have old agreements, concluded before the war and in need of revision.

An agreement that would reduce tariffs and other barriers to trade between any one of these countries and the United States can make it easier for that country to sell us its goods and therefore can speed the day when it can pay for the food and equipment it needs out of dollars that are earned—not given or loaned. This sort of stimulus is badly needed. Exports from the United States are running billions of dollars a year ahead of our imports. The economic recovery of western Europe will not be sound or lasting until its trade with the rest of the world is brought more nearly into balance and trade with the United States must be a large factor in that balance.

Moreover, in the law establishing the Economic Cooperation Administration, Congress included an essential provision, namely, that the countries which participate in the benefits of the program should undertake to cooperate with each other—and with other countries—for the reduction of barriers between themselves and between themselves and the rest of the world. I am confident that these countries are ready to carry out these policies which the United States considers vital to their recovery, and we must be in a position to participate in the carrying out of this program which we have asked them to undertake. It is essential that the extension of the Trade Agreements Act be for a sufficient period to permit this program to be carried out.

If this country were not in a position to participate effectively in a program for expansion of trade, our inability to act would come as a severe shock to the rest of the world. It would shake their faith in our unity of purpose and even in the ultimate success of the European recovery program itself.

It is only through consistency in our foreign policies that we can hope to hold the confidence of the people of the world. If we should, after 14 years, abandon or weaken the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program, at the very time this program is most needed for world recovery and for the stability of our own economy, there can be little doubt that the confidence in the consistency of our policy would be shaken. On confidence in the steadfastness of the United States at this moment in history rests the hope of the free people of the world for peace and stability.

Ohio Primary Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a part of John O'Donnell's column on the editorial page of the Washington Times-Herald of May 6, 1948, which, in my opinion, properly evaluates the results of the Ohio primary election:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

The Taft-Stassen fight for Ohio presidental delegates hasn't turned out to be as decisive or dramatic in its result as the boys who love color and the unexpected in these political scraps hoped that it might have been.

The Ohio Senator hasn't been hit hard enough to hurt. The unorthodox but beautifully organized and well-heeled young contender from Minnesota failed to score any such impressive victory as he marked up to his credit in the Wisconsin and Nebraska primaries.

In fact, the Stassen band wagon was definitely slowed down—but it didn't stop.

The TAFT backers here in Washington are proclaiming—not too violently—that the results are an outstanding victory for the senior Senator from Ohio.

When TAFT gets the overwhelming majority of Republican delegates in his native State and Stassen wins in districts which were sources of tremendous New Deal and CIO voting power in the last 16 years, the results don't mean much.

To repeat a pet tag line that F. D. R. frequently used to describe such political situations:

"The Dutch have conquered Holland."

On the over-all picture as of today, it seems likely that Governor Dewey, of New York, Senator Taft, and former Governor Stassen, will be running neck and neck at the first roll call in Philadelphia with none of them having more than 300 delegates and none under 250.

The crucial test of strength will pivot on the issues: Which candidate can hold his delegates most firmly in line?

Who can first nail down those early ballots which will be cast for the favorite sons—ballots which will be decisive in the race to reach the winning 548 mark before the restless delegates are suddenly stampeded for a dark horse—such as General MacArthur, Governor Warren, of California, Speaker of the House Joe Martin, or any of the other Republican hopefuls?

From the Ohio returns the Taft forces take comfort in these results:

1. The sole Stassen candidate in the Statewide contest for the nine delegates-at-large posts was swamped by the Taft supporters, despite the fact that the Stassen entry, Carrington T. Marshall, former Ohio chief justice, had never been defeated for public office, had a potent name as a vote getter and was a single shot candidate.

2. Stassen's victories in Ohio duplicated the trend of his Wisconsin primary vote. In districts where the Roosevelt New Deal had won impressive victories in the past—Cleveland, Youngstown, Toledo, etc.—it was obvious that a large portion of the former New Deal vote entered the Republican fight to cast its ballot against TAFT just as in Wisconsin the same voting strength entered the Wisconsin Republican primary to vote for Stassen against General MacArthur and Governor Dewey.

3. Stassen's bid for the labor vote in Ohio's industrial centers, which took the form of his most severe criticism of the Taft-Hartley labor legislation, has stiffened the opposition to Stassen among Republican leaders in Congress who will have powerful posts of control in the Philadelphia convention—the very spot where Stassen now needs influential friends.

Political veterans from Ohio will insist that it's nothing new for Ohio to refuse her favorite sons a solid block of votes in a Presidential convention. In that politically sensitive State all party leaders have enough rebellious rivals in their bailiwicks anxious and able to kick up a rumpus.

In 1936, for example, TAFT was again the favorite son. The late Sen. Bill Borah of Idaho filed as a candidate and without making a speech or attempting any primary campaign, picked off four Ohio delegates from districts where the leaders just didn't care for the Taft organization.

And back in 1920, when the Ohio Republicans were backing then Sen. Warren G. Harding as their favorite son, former Governor Lowden, of Illinois, walked away with nine delegates.

The Democratic side of the picture is beginning to develop some exciting angles even at this stage of the game as interesting as the Taft-Stassen fight in Ohio and the coming Dewey-Stassen brawl in Oregon.

A Clarion Call to All Lovers of Liberty Under Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD some comments with reference to a broadcast recently made by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill. Mr. Pettengill's patriotic appeal will be criticized by those who are in political league with the subversive elements now operating within and without our Government, but his clarion call for action is timely and should be heeded:

GOVERNMENT BY PROPAGANDA

(Text of broadcast by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill over ABC network, Sunday, April 25, 1948)

Last Sunday I spoke of the great need to send your strongest and best men and women to Congress. One reason we need that kind is the fact that a super Congress is growing up in Washington that is dwarfing the Congress established by the Constitution.

I refer to law making by propaganda by the executive departments. Propaganda that uses money paid by all taxpayers and by members of all parties. Propaganda by men who are not elected by anybody, who often work in the dark—in short, a new invisible government.

With the huge funds at their command, they mold public opinion so effectively that they often determine the result in advance of a vote by your representatives in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no sensible person could doubt the wisdom and accuracy of this statement.

This subverts the principles of a representative government. It is illegal, and as I shall point out, in many cases it is in violation of criminal statutes.

CONGRESS MUST TAKE ACTION

Yet it goes unpunished, and will continue to go unpunished, until we get a Congress that will deny this superlegislature the use of public funds, and until we get a Department of Justice that will put these culprits in jail.

Mr. Speaker, does any person dispute this?

When the executive branch of any government—by the use of public funds—controls the thinking of the people, a Congress, or Parliament, becomes superfluous—even though it may be kept, as a political "Charlie McCarthy," to give a pretense of legality to what is in fact a perversion of representative government.

Government by propaganda has been an indispensable factor in the development of the idea of an all-wise, indispensable man—call him Duce, Fuehrer, Leader, or any other name.

Mr. Speaker, here again I have warned the House of the fact that the same technique of these dictators is being followed so far as propaganda is concerned.

ENDOWED FOR 25 YEARS

For 25 years, the world has witnessed the sinister growth of this idea. It is found in the thought police of Japan, in the total censorship of Russia, in the huge propaganda machines of Mussolini and Hitler, controlling the press, radio, public platform, motion pictures, the theater, and to some extent even music, art, science, and the pulpit.

Mr. Speaker, a book entitled "Power," published many years ago, pointed out how propaganda could completely change the ideology of a nation with reference to government.

As a German writer puts it, it was intended "to render the parliamentary system * * * incapable of independent action * * * to make the Reichstag powerless as a law-giving and policy-forming body."

Mr. Speaker, are we going to permit a small group, through propaganda paid for by the taxpayers, to destroy the confidence of the people in their Congress?

Goebbels, the Nazi Minister of Propaganda and Enlightenment, made internal resistance to Hitler impossible by feeding out to the German people only what Hitler wanted them to hear, by coloring and suppressing public information, by forbidding criticism, and so making a farce of popular elections, and a pious fraud of voting in the German Congress. The same tactics are at work in the new puppet government behind the iron curtain.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot tell the people that we are unaware of what the subversive interests are doing by the use of the taxpayers' money to weaken and destroy representative government.

If free debate of government policies had not been crushed, it is wholly possible that Hitler would not have been able to plunge Germany into war.

A DANGEROUS THREAT IN AMERICA

Executive propaganda is one of the most sinister developments in the modern world. We, who believe in a free society, must stop its growth here. It has already made serious headway.

From this indictment, we exclude the constitutional right and duty of the President to make recommendations of legislation to Congress. We exclude his official radio addresses and press conferences. We exclude the testimony of Cabinet members for committees of

Congress. We exclude the official reports of Government departments.

All these are legitimate. And, of course, we exclude the expression of opinion and the advocacy of public measures by any person or organization who use their own money, and not the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we can all agree with what Mr. Pettengill has to say with reference to the right of the President to make recommendations of legislation to Congress and his other rights enumerated by Mr. Pettengill.

All these are part of the machinery of free government. But this is the practice that we must indict: the use of public funds, outside of the legitimate channels I have described, to mold the thinking of the public in order to build fires under Congressmen and Senators, to destroy their independent judgment, and force them to do the will of lobbyists in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

IT VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION

This propaganda is an evil thing for several reasons. It violates the Constitution, which vests all legislative powers in the Congress of the United States.

It is immoral. It uses taxes paid by those who oppose a public measure in order to enact it into law.

It forces Republicans to finance a policy favored by Democrats, or vice versa.

It is dishonest because it presents only one side of a question, and suppresses legitimate public information.

It is dangerous because it is wire-pulling by a small number of zealots who often work in secret.

In foreign affairs, it gives the American sympathizers, or stool pigeons, of foreign governments the power to influence American legislation and appropriations. It escapes cross-examination at a public hearing on equal terms with all others before Congressional committees.

It thus rests public policy on the lop-sided views of a few fanatics rather than on the broad understanding which comes from full, fair public debate on the floor of Congress.

Let me tell you how this new engine of government operates. I must refer to actual cases but you will understand that I do not, here and now, necessarily condemn the measures themselves. Let's take the Bretton Woods scheme to stabilize international money systems, and support the economy of foreign governments. This was an important policy costing billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it would be an astounding disclosure if the people were to be told what it has cost them for departmental literature distributed by Government agencies to subvert their thinking.

SOLD TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

How was it sold to the American people and to Congress by this super-legislature using public funds to propagandize one viewpoint only?

The Treasury Department distributed 890,000 pieces of literature favoring the Bretton Woods scheme. How many pieces in opposition? Exactly 210—890,000 against 210. This is a ratio of over 4,000 to 1 in favor of Bretton Woods. That was loading the dice and that was not playing the game. Every wire was pulled—press, radio, college lecture hall, even the pulpits in the churches.

By the time Congress voted on it, the American people had heard practically only one side of the question. On the Marshall plan, just enacted, all wires were pulled again. Officials of the State Department made speeches before cotton, tobacco, wheat, corn, and dairy farmers, and other organizations telling them how they would benefit financially from these huge appropriations.

Important bills are introduced and Members of Congress cannot find out what public officials wrote them or what motives, interest, or reasons they had for promoting them.

THE LEND-LEASE MONSTROSITY

A notable example was lend-lease in 1941. It was impossible for any Congressman or Senator to find out whose idea it was, although a determined effort was made to disclose that fact.

It was not until long afterward that its apparent originator was discovered to be Britain's Prime Minister Churchill.

Such is the superlegislature that you do not elect, can't see, talk to, argue with, or defeat at the next election.

Another device is for some department chief to telephone—at public expense, of course—to governors, mayors, and party bosses back home to put the heat on Congressmen and Senators to force them into line.

One United States Senator has said: "The purpose of this propaganda is to control the legislative branch of the Government. The machine has developed to such proportions that many Members of Congress are afraid to challenge its power. It is growing with lightning speed. Its growth increases its power, and its power means a further increase in its growth."

OUR FEDERAL "THOUGHT CONTROL"

Last May, the House of Representatives created a Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda in the Executive Department. Congressman HARNESS of Indiana, the chairman of that committee, says:

"When government propaganda is successful in shaping public opinion to its own predetermined objectives, we have arrived at a system of Federal thought control which closely parallels the mechanics of dictatorship."

Mr. HARNESS reports that in 1946, the executive agencies spent $75,000,000 in publicity and propaganda activities. That is 25 times as much as the law permits a national political party to spend in a Presidential campaign. That makes the executive branch of government the most powerful lobby in America.

Forty-five thousand Federal employees devote all, or part, of their time to publicity and propaganda. These busy beavers issue an endless stream of press releases, ghost-written speeches, radio script, motion-picture films, pamphlets, and so forth.

When you hear half a dozen radio commentators all giving you the same line on Bretton Woods or any other public measure, you can guess who is the Svengali who hypnotizes these Trilbys of the air to sing the same tune.

WAR DEPARTMENT HIRED EXPERT

To promote universal military training the War Department hired a New York expert to tour the country at taxpayers' expense, and conduct radio panel discussions loaded with advocates of the measure.

This expert asked the radio audiences to write letters to the stations, adding that the letters would be forwarded to the proper people in Congress.

In addition, military airplanes were used to fly hundreds of influential civilians to military reservations, in order to line them up for this policy. They also discovered a submarine in the Pacific Ocean at just the right moment for maximum effect—as if we were the sole owners of that ocean.

The Social Security Administration, Public Health Service, and Children's Bureau send their agents all over the country to beat the tomtoms for socialized, or political medicine.

These traveling lobbyists—at your expense—set up so-called health workshops and drum up trade with social-welfare workers, women's clubs, labor unions, and all other susceptible to the service of humanity—and the possible hope of jobs for themselves. They have even sent their missionaries—at your expense—on junketing trips to England, New Zealand, South America, and Japan.

Much the same story can be told about public housing.

BOLD DEFIANCE OF LAW

All this is done in defiance of a law which provides that no money appropriated by Congress shall be used to pay for any letter, printed matter, or other device "intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by his vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress." That law provides fine and imprisonment for anyone violating it.

And yet, so far as I know, no one has ever been indicted for violating that law.

Such is the super-legislature, the new ministry of propaganda and enlightenment. It is heading America toward an all-powerful executive, and a one-party state. It may help to explain why Republican and Democratic leaders so often agree on a "bi-partisan" policy which denies to the American people an honest discussion and free and full debate on all great public questions.

It is an additional reason why you should elect strong men to Congress, who will refuse to appropriate to these lobbyists in Government the funds with which they tell you what to think.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty for those who believe in free government and who are here to represent the people to take legislative steps to stop the appropriation of the people's money for the use by agencies of the Government which are spending that money to entrench themselves in power as well as weaken the form of government that supports them. We are rapidly on the way to nationalization, which can only be stopped by people who treasure liberty and who have courage to resist becoming taxpaying slaves to bureaucracy.

Walter Lippmann Sees Progress Toward a Solution in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that so distinguished a thinker and publicist as Walter Lippmann can find grounds for optimism in the Palestine situation. For myself, I confess that the outlook seems dark and dreary. While the spokesmen of the great powers in the United Nations talk, the lives of human beings are needlessly sacrificed to the strange British god of Empire, and nothing is done to insure that the pledges of America and Great Britain and of the United Nations will be carried out.

Nevertheless, because Walter Lippmann is a skilled observer of great human sympathies, I read his column in this morning's New York Herald Tribune with hope and interest, and under leave I am inserting it in the RECORD.

Mr. Lippmann at least clearly points out that the kingdom of Transjordan is no more than a British puppet, and that the acts of aggression performed and threatened by King Abdullah could be

quickly ended by the British if they threatened to stop the flow of money for the support of the Arab Legion, which is, as a matter of public record, British-armed, British-trained, British-led, and British-clothed and fed.

TODAY AND TOMORROW—TOWARD A SOLUTION IN PALESTINE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The statement made to the United Nations on Palestine by the British Colonial Secretary, Mr. Arthur Creech-Jones, is an auspicious event. That is not only because it is the most sensible and useful contribution yet made to the discussion, but because it shows that Great Britain, now that she is about to be relieved of her thankless burdens as the ruler of Palestine, is preparing to take a leading part, which no one else can take, in working out a general settlement.

British leadership is indispensable to a settlement because, as a matter of fact, what has to be settled is the relationship between the Jewish state, which already exists de facto, and the Arab kingdom of Transjordan, which is a British protectorate. In this situation Britain has a dual role; as one of the great powers in the United Nations, responsible for making and keeping peace; as the one great power which by treaty and by its military and financial connections is responsible for the conduct of the only Arab state which can wage a serious war or make a genuine peace in Palestine. These two roles are not contradictory but complementary.

What Mr. Creech-Jones has proposed is that the United Nations give up the notion of creating and imposing a new regime in Palestine, and that it concentrate its efforts on mediation between the Jewish and the Arab communities. To do this he suggests the appointment of a commission, which would hold, so to speak in escrow, the legal titles to the undivided assets of Palestine, and would seek to arrange a truce, then presumably a treaty of alliance or confederation, between the de facto provisional governments of the Arab and the Jewish communities.

This suggestion disposes of the false problem which has so confused and obscured the real problem. It does away with the imaginary problem that partition was something that had to be enforced by an international army, that a unified country had to be divided forcibly from the outside. It does away with the imaginary solution that partition could be renounced or abandoned. It recognizes the plain fact that partition has occurred, that "services, once run by the central government, are now in the hands of Jewish and Arab communities; and that, psychologically, a new sense of responsibility toward the maintenance by each community, of its own life, has been created."

The real problem, therefore, is not whether Palestine is to be partitioned, or whether it ought to be, but how—since partition has occurred—a truce, a peace, and finally some form of confederation can be negotiated and accepted. In this the role of Transjordan is crucial. For events have shown that the Arab guerrillas in Palestine are no match for the Haganah, and that they lack the organization and the force to establish a provisional government. It is reasonably certain that they must lean on King Abdullah andn his little Transjordan Army.

It follows that the military truce, which everyone must desire, will have to be arranged between the Haganah and the Transjordan Army, and that a political peace will have to be negotiated between the Kingdom of Transjordan and the provisional government of the Jewish state.

For that there is needed the mediation of Great Britain, closely and sympthetically supported by the United States, and operating with the moral authority of the United Nations.

It is fairly evident that the real problem, as respects King Abdullah, is how to enable him to enter Palestine for the purpose of annexing the Arab territory and of making a treaty with the Jewish state. Obviously neither the British Government nor the United Nations can permit him to enter Palestine for the purpose of annexing the whole of it. They are bound to restrain him from doing that. But they have at the same time every reason to make arrangements by which he is invited to come in to the Arab territory peaceably and to participate in the negotiation of a treaty of settlement.

That requires the exercise of British influence to restrain him from aggression, and of British statesmanship, with American and United Nations support, to make the enlargement of his kingdom an orderly process. Almost certainly it requires also a promise of reinforcements by which he can protect himself against conspiracies and assassinations on the part of the Grand Mufti and his other Arab enemies. For it is the danger of being stabbed in the back that almost certainly stands in the way of his playing the part which is so greatly in the interest of his kingdom, his dynasty, and of the peace and prosperity of Palestine.

It would seem to be indicated, therefore, that Britain and the United States should strengthen the military position in Trans-Jordan, that they should in fact make that sparsely inhabited but strategically important country their principal military position in the Middle East. What needs to be done to solve the problem of Palestine needs also to be done to solve the problem of maintaining the position of the western world in the Middle East.

The place to halt the British withdrawal from the Middle East is in Trans-Jordan. There is no other place of comparable importance where a firm footing can be established. The political situation in Iraq and in Egypt is notoriously insecure for the British, and therefore for all of the western countries. Iran is inaccessible. Turkey, though vitally important, is too exposed. Saudi Arabia is too far away. Cyrenaica is not strategically related to the vital position at Suez.

If the western powers—and primarily Britain and America—are to remain in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Middle East, they must have a real foothold somewhere. They cannot rely solely on the paper pacts with the Arab states which Mr. Bevin has with so much persistence and so little success been trying to use as a substitute for actual power. These pacts are all very well, and they may come to have some substance if at some specific, strategically central place in the Middle East, Great Britain, with American help and support, creates a center of power, and therefore of influence and authority.

Pay Increase for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a letter just received from certain postal employees in Louisiana, petitioning for a pay increase for all employees of the Post Office Department. I also ask to have reproduced a splendid editorial from the Shreveport Journal on this same subject.

This legislation has been pending in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House for the entire term of this session of Congress but has recently been reported. It has been kicked around considerably without yet becoming law. The postal employees are entitled to some action on this measure before adjournment of Congress; and I urge again that the Post Office Committee take aggressive steps to push a suitable pay measure through Congress within the next week or two. The pay increase legislation has been stalled long enough. It is time to act.

COUSHATTA, LA., *May 3, 1948.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: Enclosed is an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Journal under date of April 28, 1948.

The undersigned postal employees of Coushatta Post Office respectfully request that you have same printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under extension of remarks.

Thanking you for this and past favors, we are,

Respectfully yours,

M. A. Conly, Jr., Clerk; Ivy T. Hunter, Jr., Clerk; Surrey E. Hunter, Clerk; Walter O. Hunter, Clerk; Mrs. Elizabeth A. Townsend, Substitute Clerk; Odie Howard, Substitute Rural Carrier; Charles J. Brown, Rural Carrier; John F. Dry, Rural Carrier; Elmer W. Masingill, Rural Carrier; H. Rex Stothart, Rural Carrier; B. Russell Taylor, Substitute Rural Carrier.

FORGOTTEN MEN AND WOMEN

Unless Congress shows more speed in considering increased pay for post-office employees, who are obviously receiving inadequate compensation for their services while the cost of living continues moving upward, the postal service may face serious problems, since vacancies under the existing financial schedule cannot be adequately filled because of the low salary authorization now in effect.

Some rays of hope have appeared recently at Washington in connection with proposals to raise the income of the postal workers, who rather appropriately have begun to be termed the "forgotten men and women" in Government employ, but efforts to obtain proper salary adjustments for these loyal and patient employees have not reached the stage where they warrant the encouragement they deserve. There must be much more pronounced progress toward that end if the remedy for one of the most distressing conditions confronting Federal employees is to become effective before widespread depletions are noted in the personnel in post offices throughout the Nation. Congress is the only authority which can correct the injustice. Its decision is essential for meeting the needs of the postal-service workers. It should get busier and enact the required legislation.

Although the situation at the National Capital is far from offering promise of the necessary relief, there have been some heartening activities reported recently. The Senate committee, with nine members attending a hearing of the proposed salary legislation, decided to report to the Senate a measure providing for a raise in pay of $800 per year in the basic salary for all regular employees of the postal field service. The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service agreed to report an amended bill providing for an increase of $585 per annum, by a vote of 17 to 1. These committee reports, although the amounts favored are considerably below those provided for in the bills, indicate that some strides are being made toward having Members of Congress appreciate the importance of granting postal em-

ployees more compensation. It shows the development of concern for the welfare of these Government workers as well as concern for the service itself.

The salary adjustments, obviously, have not kept pace with the inflation spiral which affects the public generally and has by no means been in line with the increasing cost of living. Two pay adjustments in recent years have been absorbed by the mounting prices involving all necessities of life. There has been no raise in pay since $500 on graduated scale was added about 3 years ago, making the year's compensation around $2,900. The increases in question totaled only 38 percent in comparison with rise in living costs, amounting to more than 60 percent. This, of course, is evidence of the need of more consideration for the postal employees, who, despite this heavy handicap, go about their very essential public work with loyalty and patience along with the knowledge that they are really forgotten men and women who are unfairly treated as long as their salaries are too low for them to make ends meet properly.

That the postal employees, clerks, postmen, and others are valuable public servants none can deny. They have expenses to take care of, including the support of their homes, education of children, and maintenance of adequate savings for future obligations and requirements. These expenses cannot be satisfactorily met with the present inadequate pay the Government is allowing them.

Public opinion is their recourse. It should be made known to Congress promptly, with the exhortation that the necessary legislation not be longer delayed.

Dr. H. A. Morgan Has Made Notable Contribution to Tennessee and the Southland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan, Vice Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has announced that he will retire on May 18. Many of us had hoped that Dr. Morgan, in spite of his advanced age, would continue as a member of the Board with TVA and accept appointment for another term.

Dr. Morgan has made a great contribution to the welfare of the South and of the State of Tennessee. When history records the achievements of the South's leading citizens I doubt if any in recent years will surpass those of Dr. H. A. Morgan. As dean of the College of Agriculture of the University of Tennessee, and as president of that great institution, Dr. Morgan set the pace for a new era in agricultural development in the Volunteer State. He not only taught and advocated advanced and modern agriculture methods, but he kept in close contact with the farmers of all classes, and he personally inspired them to follow these methods which would improve the soil and products of their farms.

I have known Dr. Morgan since I went to the University of Tennessee in 1920. Under him that institution made its most notable progress. Dr. Morgan knew practically every student that attended the university. He enjoyed visiting people in their homes and in personally advising individual farmers on the solution of their problems.

Dr. Morgan had a great dream the future Tennessee and the Tennessee Valley would play in the advancement of our Nation. He found an opportunity of working toward this aim when he was appointed a member of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority by Franklin Roosevelt in 1933.

During his 15 years of service on the Board he has courageously helped direct the Tennessee Valley Authority on the course and for the purpose for which it was found. The result speaks for itself. Dr. Morgan is dearly loved by the people of the Tennessee Valley. We honor and respect him. We hope that in his retirement he will continue to be of counsel to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to the farm organizations, and the people with whom he has worked throughout these many years. The ideals and principles of Dr. Morgan, as president of the University of Tennessee, and as Vice Chairman of Tennessee Valley Authority will be followed in the continued growth and progress of these two fine institutions.

DR. CURTIS TO FILL VACANCY

The President has nominated Dr. Harry A. Curtis to succeed Dr. Morgan on the TVA Board of Directors. Dr. Curtis was chief chemical engineer of the TVA from 1933–38. During that time many of us who are so vitally interested in the TVA had an opportunity of knowing him and we have a high estimate of the work he did with TVA. Dr. Curtis is an outstanding engineer, a man of finest principles and ideals. I am certain that he will make an excellent member of the Board of TVA and that he will have the full support and confidence of the people of the Tennessee Valley.

Washington Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Washington.

I am, therefore, pleased to present for their consideration and information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by James E. A. Burns, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, room 212, Moore Hotel, 1926 Second Avenue, Seattle, Wash., as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans, their wives, and widows. Relatives or friends may be allowed to conduct the funeral.

Plots in the veterans' cemetery at Olympia are available, free of charge, for the burial of veterans.

Death certificates shall set forth the military record of the decedent.

Contracts have been entered into to provide for perpetual care of the State veterans' plot in the Masonic cemetery at Olympia.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Evidence of presumed death or absence may be admitted.

Wills executed by deceased servicemen may be admitted to probate.

Limitation of actions affecting persons in the military service is provided.

Protection is granted to persons acting under power of attorney for persons in the armed forces.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 is applicable in proper cases in all courts of the State.

Testamentary capacity of servicemen 18 years of age or over is acknowledged.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting (including spouses) is provided.

Copies of discharges certified by county auditors are prima facie proof for all purposes of the services rendered, citizenship, place and date of birth.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN SECURING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

A Veterans' Rehabilitation Council has been created, consisting of one member from each congressionally chartered veteran organization, and one other member. An appropriation of $1,000,000 has been made. This council approves expenditures by veteran organizations for assisting veterans and their dependents in the prosecution of their claims against the United States, rehabilitation service, etc.

The State registrar is required to furnish, without charge, certified copies of birth or death certificates to veterans and their dependents, for use in connection with claims for compensation or pension pending before the Veterans' Administration.

Honorable discharges are recorded free of charge.

A county statistics commission has been established to assist veterans.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

School districts establish and maintain vocational and general educational programs for veterans.

Two school quarters of work credit is extended to veteran students in any law school in the State if such veterans served for a period of at least 1 year prior to September 1, 1945.

A 2-year special course for veterans has been established at the University of Washington law school.

Fee exemptions are extended by the University of Washington to all honorably discharged World War I veterans and those of World War II who are no longer entitled to vocational rehabilitation under Public Laws 16 and 346.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid amounting to $250 maximum annually per person with free tuition has been extended to resident children of veterans who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during World War I and who died in action or as a result thereof.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

A county statistics commission maintains records of employment, businesses, etc.

Entrance credit is extended on police and fire service examinations.

Credit is given for time spent in active service in the armed forces in computing retirement benefits for judges of the supreme and superior courts.

Members of the fire department in cities and towns are given up to 5 years' credit toward retirement for service in the armed forces.

Members of the police department in first-class cities are given up to 5 years' credit toward retirement for service in the armed forces.

Preference is given to veterans and their widows in public departments and on public works of State and county.

Preference is extended to veterans for appointment or employment by the liquor control board.

Ten-percent preference is given to veterans in competitive examinations for public offices, positions, or employment in State municipal corporations and all political subdivisions.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

Credit for war service is given former veteran employees under the State employees' retirement system and the State patrol retirement system if employment is resumed within 1 year of discharge.

Reinstatement is provided for officers and employees of the State and local units, and privately employed persons, without loss of seniority rights, if application for reinstatement is made within 40 days after being relieved from military duty.

Credit for war service is extended veteran teachers in public schools under the teachers' retirement system upon proof of such service and a contribution to the annuity fund.

The directors or officers of a corporation granted leave of absence for military service are exempted from liability for the acts of the corporation.

Veterans representing various service organizations serve on the advisory council to aid the director of the Veterans' Department.

Veterans who are graduates of accredited law schools are admitted to practice without examination.

Veterans employed in the department of game prior to service in the armed forces who resume employment within 1 year of discharge are accredited with such service in computing benefits.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as pension from the United States is exempt from execution, attachment, or seizure under any legal process whatever.

GUARDIANSHIP

Banks or trust companies may act as guardians without bond.

Notice is given of certain proceedings under the guardianship laws to an agency, bureau, or department of the United States Government through which any compensation, insurance, pension, or other benefit is payable.

HOMES

Through contracts with the Federal Government, veterans, their wives, or widows may be admitted to a soldiers' home or colony.

Improvements have been made at the State Soldiers' Home and the Washington Veterans' Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

Facilities are offered veterans at McKay Memorial Hospital.

LAND SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Preference is given veterans under the Land Settlement Act.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

A Division of Veterans' Loan Insurance is established in the Department of Finance, Budget, and Business to guarantee federally guaranteed loans under the GI bill of rights with an appropriation of $5,000,000.

Life insurance companies, fraternal benefit societies, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, etc., may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Upon recommendation of veterans' organizations relief is extended to veterans and their families.

County statistics commission is authorized to prepare veterans' postwar rehabilitation.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Any honorably discharged resident veteran of World War II who shall have been graduated from any accredited law school prior to service may be admitted to practice law and to membership in the Washington State Bar Association.

No license is required by a veteran selling goods other than his own manufacture. No county, city, or political subdivision shall charge a license fee on any business established by a veteran under the GI bill of rights.

Gross sales or the gross income received by corporations whose principal purposes are to furnish volunteer aid to members of the armed forces and to carry on national and international relief are exempt from tax, including sales tax.

Gifts made to any organization of veterans which may be organized is exempt from tax.

War risk insurance is exempt from tax.

Operators' licenses are continued in force without renewal during military service and for 90 days following discharge.

Professional and occupational licenses are continued in force and effect without payment of renewal fee during military service and for 6 months thereafter.

Property of veterans' organizations and the American Red Cross is exempt from taxation.

Free hunting or fishing licenses are granted resident veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars.

All honorably discharged service-disabled veterans 65 years of age or over, who have been residents of the State 5 years immediately preceding application, are granted free hunting license.

TRANSPORTATION PRIVILEGES

Common carriers may provide free or reduced rate transportation to inmates of soldiers' homes.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Armory privileges are available to veteran organizations.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve armory at Tacoma is to be constructed.

Counties and cities shall furnish free quarters for exclusive use of nationally recognized veterans' organizations.

County aid is extended to veterans and their families through veterans' organizations.

Realty and personalty of all veterans' organizations is exempt from State, county, and district taxation.

Most of these laws have been enacted through the sponsorship and cooperative effort of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

At the present time the DAV has some 32 chapters scattered throughout the State of Washington, most of which maintain volunteer or part-time service and employment officers to assist veterans with their problems in their own communities.

In addition to this service on a local level, the DAV maintains four full-time national service officers, under the direction of Perry E. Dye, at the Veterans Administration regional office, suite 514, 905 Second Avenue Building, Seattle, Wash.

Other service officers who devote their full time to service work are as follows: Dan Hosauer, 414 Masonic Temple, Yakima; August Waseca, 505 City Hall, Spokane; and C. L. Dickinson, 516½ Main Street, Vancouver.

These DAV experts render all types of service to veterans and their dependents, free of charge, more particularly in the preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled under existing Federal and State laws.

Johnson Bill Should Be Passed—Monopoly in Radio Against Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the smaller radio stations in the cities and communities of our Nation play an important part in the life and economy of the people which they serve. Small radio stations bring to the people in the locality where they are located intimate local news and programs which the people of that section wish to hear. It is important that nothing be done to prevent the development and service rendered by these small local stations. We must see to it that no monopoly in radio is established. I think the Johnson bill, which is now pending in Congress, is definitely in the public interest and it should be enacted into law.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I made on April 26 in support of the Johnson bill before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I am in favor of the Johnson bill. I feel very strongly that any assignment of frequencies or increased power which would tend to centralize control of radio broadcasting in this country in the hands of a few big stations is against the national interest. The many small radio stations over the Nation are the backbone of our free and democratic radio system. They make the same contribution to the entire radio field that the small newspapers throughout the country contribute to the great free American press.

Allowing a few of the larger stations the privilege of increasing their power to a point which would blanket large areas of our country may mean the eventual dissolution of most of the smaller stations. These small stations which form an important part in the life of the communities which they serve could no longer attract the advertisers who sustain them. These small stations play an important and forceful role in the life of the American small-town community. They are able to serve their individual localities with an intimacy and understanding which is only possible because they are a part of the community, its politics, its civic endeavor, its religion, and its everyday business life. The dispersal of thousands of small stations all over our country is strong protection against the possibility of radio and its tremendous power of influence ever falling into the hands of a few individuals who might conceivably use it for selfish ends against the best interests of the American people.

I wish to emphasize that I am for continued healthy progress and technical development of our radio system. However, I believe that above all the principle which recognizes the importance and the rights of the small station must be preserved.

Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report which I made on H. R. 4488, a bill providing for veterans' homestead associations, I also include the testimony of Horace Russell, attorney, of Chicago, Ill., former general counsel for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

[H. Rept. No. 1848, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

PROVIDING FOR VETERANS' HOMESTEAD ASSOCIATIONS

(Report to accompany H. R. 4488)

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4488) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new sections:

"'VETERANS' HOMESTEAD ASSOCIATIONS

"'SEC. 511. (a) In enacting this section to alleviate the existing housing shortage, it is the intent of the Congress to provide means of ownership and financing, within the framework of our private-enterprise system and without vast expenditures of public moneys, whereby veterans themselves, associated together within their own communities, can build, buy, or rent homes upon terms which veterans can afford; and to provide the public facilities essential to such homes without the imposition of additional financial burdens upon veterans who may be owners thereof or tenants therein.

"'DEFINITIONS

"'(b) As used in this section, except where the context otherwise requires, the term—

"'(1) "Association" means a veterans' homestead association chartered pursuant to this act.

"'(2) "Housing" means permanent type of housing; does not include transient housing, such as tourist cabins, motor courts, or apartment hotels; but may include multifamily dwellings or single-family dwellings, whether located on contiguous or scattered sites.

"'(3) "Improve" as applied to real property shall include (a) grading, landscaping, and any other site development; and (b) construction, repair, remodeling, or demolition (whether for salvage or reuse) of buildings and other structures thereon.

"'(4) "Real property" means land, whether or not improved, and any buildings or other structures thereon, including fixtures and personalty attached thereto.

"'(5) "Public facilities" includes public highways and parks, roads, streets, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, bus stations and bus stops, water storage, purification and distribution works, sewage, garbage, and refuse collection, treatment, and disposal facilities (including trunk and lateral sewers), fire stations, fire equipment, and fire plugs, street-lighting facilities, schools, community centers, and recreational facilities.

"'(6) "Veteran" means any person described under the provisions of subsection 500 (a) of this title.

"'SEPARABILITY

"'(c) If any provision of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this section, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"'ORGANIZATION OF VETERANS' HOMESTEAD ASSOCIATIONS

"'(d) The Administrator is hereby authorized, subject to the provisions of this section and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the organization, incorporation, examination, operation, and regulations of associations to be known as "veterans' homestead associations," and to issue charters therefor in such forms as he may prescribe, and to consent to the amendment of any such charter: *Provided*, That a certified copy of all such charters shall be filed in each county where such association operates.

"'QUALIFICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

"'(e) Five or more veterans of ability, good character, and responsibility as determined by the Administrator, may apply for a charter hereunder. Each association shall determine its own rules of eligibility for membership therein subject only to the conditions that (1) membership shall be limited to veterans; (2) no veteran shall become or remain a member unless and until his accumulated payments to the association, in accordance with subsection (j) shall equal or exceed $100; and (3) no veteran shall become a member of an association until he has executed and filed with the Veterans' Administration an affidavit to the effect that he is not a Communist and does not belong to any subversive organization.

"'PRIMARY PURPOSE OF ASSOCIATIONS

"'(f) Each organization shall be organized and shall operate on a nonprofit basis. It shall have as its primary purposes (1) to acquire and improve real property to provide housing to be sold to veterans for occupancy by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents; (2) to acquire and improve and to operate and maintain real property to provide multiunit housing, including such commercial and community facilities as may be reasonably necessary or desirable to facilitate the use thereof for residential purposes, to be rented to veterans for occupancy by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents; and (3) to acquire and improve, and to operate and maintain real property to provide multiunit housing, including such commercial and community facilities as may be reasonably necessary or desirable to facilitate the use thereof for residential purposes, to be owned or held by the members of the association on a mutual or cooperative basis, to be occupied by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents. To this end, and pursuant to rules and regulations issued by the Administrator, each association shall provide maximum opportunity and priority for the purchase or rental of such housing, first, to members of such associations, and, second, to nonmember veterans.

"'NUMBER OF ASSOCIATIONS

"'(g) The Administrator may, in his discretion, charter one or more associations in any locality; and he may, in his discretion, refuse to charter any proposed association upon his finding that the veterans in the locality in which it is proposed that such association would operate are or will be adequately served by an association or associations then already chartered for operation in such locality.

"'POWERS OF VETERANS' HOMESTEAD ASSOCIATIONS

"'(h) Under rules and regulations issued by the Administrator, each association shall have the following powers:

"'(1) Subject to the provisions and limitations of this section, to purchase, or otherwise acquire, any real property or leasehold or other interest therein, whether improved or unimproved, to subdivide, construct improvements on, repair, modernize, renovate, maintain, and operate any such property, and to purchase, or otherwise acquire, any personal property necessary or desirable for any of the foregoing.

"'(2) Subject to the provisions and limitations of this section, to hold, sell, or contract for the sale of, lease, rent, mortgage, or otherwise deal with, encumber, hypothecate, or dispose of any acquired property; all on such terms and conditions as may be deemed proper and consistent with other provisions of this act: *Provided, however*, That so long as any association is obligated to the Administrator on acccunt of advances or loans made under subsection (m) hereof no association may pledge, mortgage, or otherwise create a lien upon or encumber any real property to which it holds title without the consent of the Administrator: *And provided further*, That each unit sold to or held in cooperative or mutual ownership by an eligible veteran shall be reported to the Administrator, who shall charge against such veteran's guaranty benefit the maximum amount so chargeable if a loan for the full purchase price or cost of such unit had been guaranteed or insured under this title, and shall pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent of the amount so charged to the association to be credited upon the obligation of such veteran to the association, unless such charge and such payment are required to be made otherwise to finance the purchase of such unit.

"'(3) To purchase, construct, improve, or otherwise provide, to receive grants for, and to maintain and operate public facilities (which shall include for this purpose gas and electric distribution lines and facilities) reasonably necessary or desirable for the housing provided by or of the association, where such public facilities are then not otherwise available for such housing: *Provided*, That no association shall operate any mercantile establishment or other commercial enterprise, or operate any amusement enterprise.

"'(4) To borrow money as may be required within the purposes and limitations of this section, and to execute notes or other obligations therefor.

"'(5) To build up and maintain reasonable reserves: *Provided, however*, That such reserves shall not exceed in the aggregate 5 percent of the total obligations of such associations outstanding from time to time.

"'(6) To make, adopt, repeal, and amend bylaws; to employ and to pay reasonable salaries to, the employees of the association for services performed. Employees need not be veterans.

"'(7) To exercise such other powers, not inconsistent with this title, as are appropriate for the conduct of the business of the association.

"'(8) To require that all officers and employees of the association who handle funds of the association be bonded by an approved surety company in an adequate amount.

"'ANNUAL AND OTHER REPORTS OF ASSOCIATIONS

"'(i) Every association shall file, with the Administrator, not later than 45 days after the close of its fiscal year, an annual financial statement and shall also furnish to him such other financial statements, at such other times as he may require. All such reports shall be in such form and in such detail as may be prescribed by the Administrator. The Administrator shall make, annually and at such other times as he deems necessary, an examination of the financial books, records, and affairs of each association, in the manner customary for supervision of fiduciary institutions.

"'PAYMENTS BY ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

"'(j) Members of an association shall not be required to pay dues. Each association shall provide in its bylaws for the payment by each prospective member of the sum of $100 to be credited on the books of the association to the credit of such persons. The sums so paid shall not bear interest. Each such sum shall be entered on the books of the association as a credit to the member making such payment for possible application either (1) as payment on a home purchased by such member from the association; or (2) as security for rent on a home rented from the association by such member. Each association shall provide further, in its bylaws, that a member may voluntary withdraw from such association at any time and may receive back an amount equal to the amount of his payment to the association (unless such payments shall have been applied as payment on a home purchased by such member from the association or is held by the association as security for the payment of rent), but only after 1 year following the date of the initial payment and then only upon 60 days' notice to the association.

"'LIMITATION ON COST AND AMOUNT OF HOUSING

"'(k) No association shall purchase or improve, or contract for the purchase or improvement of, or otherwise acquire or contract to acquire, any real property, unless, in the opinion of the Administrator, (1) the estimated final cost of the proposed housing (exclusive of related real property designed for commercial operation), as determined by the amounts of firm contracts for the acquisition of real property, the improvement thereof, the construction of buildings and the acquisition of related personal property, plus an amount equal to 5 percent of such contracts plus an allocable share of the estimated indirect or overhead costs and expenses of the association, fairly attributable to such housing, will not exceed a sum equal to the product of the number of family units in such housing multiplied by $10,000; (2) such housing will afford living accommodations for sale or rent to veterans at prospective prices or terms favorable in comparison with any like or similar living accommodations currently available in the locality; (3) the total number of units thereby provided will not be in excess of either the number of members of such association or the number of veterans in the community who may reasonably be considered, in the opinion of the Administrator, prospective purchasers of or tenants of such units.

"'SALE OR RENTAL OF HOUSING OR REAL PROPERTY

"'(l) (1) Subject to such exceptions as the Administrator may approve, all real property of an association shall be sold or leased for such prices or at such rents, as the case may be, as shall reasonably represent the actual cost thereof to the association, including (i) all costs of acquisition, construction, or improvement; (ii) interest on and amortization of obligations of the association fairly attributable to such housing; (iii) direct costs of operation and maintenance of such housing; and (iv) an allocable share of the overhead or indirect costs and expenses of the association fairly attributable to such housing, plus a reasonable contribution to the reserves to be built up and maintained under subsection (h) hereof, nor shall any sale by an association of a commercial unit, or of a dwelling unit other than the sale of a cooperative interest in a multiunit structure, be financed by an association.

"'(2) Any deed or other instrument made by an association for the sale of its housing shall provide that such property shall not be conveyed or otherwise disposed of by the purchaser voluntarily within 3 years from the date of acquisition of such housing by such purchaser unless it shall first have been offered for sale back to the association at the original price paid to such association by such purchaser, less any depreciation which shall have occurred by that time and plus the fair value of any improvements which such purchaser shall have made to such property: *Provided,* That no association may use the property as security for additional loans after deed has been delivered to a veteran, even though the association retains an interest in the property.

"'(3) As a condition to every sale of housing by an association to a veteran, such veteran shall furnish to such association an affidavit stating that he has not theretofore purchased any housing from any association which has not been offered for sale back to such association and he does not own any housing acquired from any association chartered under this title.

"'(4) As a condition of every sale by an association to a veteran, such association shall furnish to such veteran an affidavit stating that no other veteran has purchased the property and if the property has been repurchased from a veteran by the association, the association will guarantee the title as free and clear of encumbrances, except those to be assumed by the new purchaser.

"'(5) Every lease made by an association shall contain a prohibition against subleasing without the consent of the association.

"'LOANS BY ADMINISTRATOR TO ASSOCIATIONS

"'(m) The Administrator is authorized in his discretion to make either short-term or long-term loans to any association, upon either a secured or unsecured basis, for any of the purposes authorized by this section for which funds may be required by such association, including initial working capital and development expenses preliminary to the commencement of actual construction of housing. Advances made on a short-term basis may be refunded on a long-term basis, or may be repaid upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe.

"'(1) The interest rate charged to an association on any such borrowings shall not exceed by more than one-fourth of 1 per cent per annum that rate currently payable by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"'(2) Any loans so made by the Administrator, except as to advances made for interim or temporary purposes, shall be repaid—

"'(i) Within a period of 40 years, if the proceeds of such loan are employed by the association to acquire or improve, and to operate and maintain, multiunit structures to be rented;

"'(ii) within a period of 32 years, if the proceeds of such loan are employed by the association to construct or to purchase, and to operate and maintain, multiunit structures sold or held on a mutual or cooperative basis;

Provided, That cash receipts incoming to an association by reason of the sale of any other housing shall be transferred or paid to the Administrator for credit upon the obligations of the association to the Administrator. Each association to which any such loan may be made shall make, issue, and deliver to the Administrator, its note in the principal amount of such loan. Each such note shall be a nonnegotiable, unconditional obligation of the association, issued against its general credit, and payable from its general assets

"'TAX EXEMPTIONS

"'(n) Notwithstanding any provisions of the Internal Revenue Code or any other law to the contrary, the net earnings of any association shall be exempted from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or other local taxing authority.

"'(o) Subject to the provisions of subsection (n) hereof, no State, county, municipal, or other local taxing authority shall impose any tax upon any such association or its charter and franchise, capital, reserves, property, surplus, loans, or income, greater than that imposed by such taxing authority on other similar local nonprofit associations.

"'FUNDS OF ASSOCIATION

"'(p) The funds of an association may, as provided by its bylaws and in accordance with rules and procedures issued by the Administrator, be deposited in any bank or banks. No association shall invest its funds in any securities except obligations of the United States of America, or obligations unconditionally guartanteed by the United States as to the payment of both principal and interest, or obligations of a State, and, in any event no such investment shall be made except with the approval of the Administrator or pursuant to rules and regulations issued by him.

"'DISTRIBUTION OF EARNINGS

"'(q) At the end of any fiscal year any net earnings remaining to an association, after fully providing for the payment of all debts and obligations of such association, then due, and after providing for the reserves then currently required, shall be set aside in a special account to be used (i) for the reduction by the association of its notes or other obligations then outstanding, or (ii) with the express approval of the Administrator, for any other lawful purpose of the association.

"'DISSOLUTION OF ASSOCIATIONS

"'(r) (1) If the members or directors of any association shall knowingly violate, or knowingly permit any of the officers, agents, or servants of such association to violate any of the provisions of this section or of the rules or regulations issued thereunder, the charter, and all the rights, privileges, and franchises of such association shall be forfeited. Such violation shall, however, be determined and adjudged by a proper district court of the United States in a suit brought for the purpose by the Administrator, in his own name, before such association shall be declared dissolved.

"'(2) Any association may, at any time, apply to the Administrator for its voluntary dissolution, and if, in his judgment, adequate provision shall have been made for the payment in full of all debts and obligations of such association, he shall promptly effect such dissolution.

"'(3) Upon any dissolution, whether voluntary or involuntary, the net assets of an association, remaining after payment in full of all its debts and obligations, shall be liquidated under the supervision of the Administrator and the proceeds thereof shall be covered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"'(s) In any event upon the maturity of all obligations owing to the United States for the financing of properties held for rent under this section, such properties shall be transferred and conveyed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs who shall dispose of them for the benefit of the United States and, after payment from the proceeds thereof of

any other obligations of the association which it may be proper to so pay, shall cover the remaining proceeds into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"'(t) The power of the Administrator to issue rules and regulations for the effective implementation and administration of this section, pursuant to the provisions hereof and not in conflict herewith, shall include, but not by way of limitation, the power:

"'(1) To provide for such supervision of associations as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of this section.

"'(2) To provide for the reorganization, consolidation, merger, or liquidation of any association or associations.

"'(3) To appoint a conservator or a receiver to take charge of the affairs of any such association, and to require an equitable readjustment of the assets, liability, and surplus of the same; and to release any such association from such control and permit its further operation: *Provided*, That in any case where the Administrator appoints a conservator or receiver shall act primarily for the protection of the creditors of such association.

"'(4) To delegate and authorize successive redelegation of any authority conferred upon him by or pursuant to this section, to any official or employee of the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator shall not act through, or delegate any such authority to, any other agency or any official or employee thereof.

"'CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

"'(u) (1) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with an association (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud an association, or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Veterans' Administration or of an association, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Veterans' Administration or an association, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any bond, note, or other obligation, or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, shall be guilty of a felony and punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"'(2) Any veteran who willfully and knowingly makes any false statement in the affidavit required by section 511 (1) (3) to be furnished by him to an association in connection with his purchase of housing from such association shall be guilty of a felony and punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"'MATURITY OF GUARANTEED OR INSURED LOANS

"'(v) Notwithstanding the 25-year limitations set forth in 500 (b) of this title, any loan made to a veteran for the purpose of purchasing a home from an association may have a maximum maturity not in excess of 32 years.

"'TIME LIMITATION

"'(w) The authority of the Administrator to issue charters to associations and to make loans to associations hereunder shall expire July 25, 1957.

"'ADVISORY COUNCIL

"'(x) There is hereby authorized to be established an advisory council to aid and advise the Administrator in the execution of his duties in relation to veterans' homestead associations. The council shall consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be chairman; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency; and six representatives of the public to be appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be recognized leaders in the fields of finance, real estate, business administration, construction, labor, and housing. The members of the council shall not receive any compensation for their services on the council, but the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to provide that the members receive a reasonable per diem allowance for each day of actual service, and in addition thereto be reimbursed for their necessary traveling expenses while on the business of the council.

"'GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES ESSENTIAL TO VETERANS' HOUSING

"'SEC. 512. (a) The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make grants to States, political subdivisions thereof, other public bodies, and to associations for the construction, repair, improvement, or extension of public facilities wherever the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall find that such public facilities are necessary for or will facilitate the more effective use within the community of housing provided and to be provided for veterans under section 511 hereof.

"'AMOUNT OF GRANT

"'(b) The amount of any grant made hereunder shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, of the public facilities provided therewith.

"'GENERAL CONDITIONS OF GRANT

"'(c) No grant shall be made hereunder unless—

"'(1) the public facilities for which such grant is made shall be determined by the Federal Works Administrator to conform to any applicable over-all State, local, or regional development plan approved by competent State, local, or regional authority; and

"'(2) the public body or association to which such grant is made shall give assurance, satisfactory to the Federal Works Administrator, that (i) it will adequately maintain the public facilities for which such grant is made; (ii) the assessments or other charges which would otherwise be imposed for the provision of such public facilities will be reduced by an amount equal to the grant; and (iii) in the case of a public body, it will make available, for the housing for which such public facilities are provided, all other public facilities it then provides for other housing generally, and upon like terms and conditions.

"'SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF GRANTS TO ASSOCIATIONS

"'(d) No grant shall be made hereunder to any associations unless (in addition to the conditions specified in subsection 512 (c) hereof)—

"'(1) the Federal Works Administrator shall determine that the type of public facilities for which such grant is made are, under applicable local law or practice, customarily provided in the first instance by real estate developers or builders; and

"'(2) such association shall agree to transfer such public facilities after completion, without compensation, to an appropriate local public body, if and whenever any such local public body may be willing to dedicate such public facilities to public use and to maintain them under the conditions specified in subsection 512 (c) hereof.

"'DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

"'(e) The Federal Works Administrator may delegate and authorize successive redelegation of any authority conferred upon him by or pursuant to this chapter to any official or employee of the Federal Works Agency.

"'SOURCE OF FUNDS

"'(f) For the purposes of this section the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Federal Works Administrator the sum of $200,000,000 to remain available until expended in carrying out the provisions of this section and for administrative expenses incurred in connection therewith. Any part of such sum not so expended on July 25, 1957, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"'INVESTMENTS IN LENDING INSTITUTIONS

"'SEC. 513. (a) In order to make funds directly and immediately available so that persons eligible therefor may obtain loans for the purposes of section 501 of this title, the Home Loan Bank Board is hereby authorized on behalf of the United States to make investments in shares, certificates, deposits, and accounts in (1) savings banks, (2) cooperative banks, and (3) such savings and loan associations, building and loan associations, and similar institutions as are members of a Federal home-loan bank or are insured institutions within the meaning of title IV of the National Housing Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, such investments to be upon the condition that all such funds shall be carried in a separate account and shall be used for the making of loans for an initial principal amount of $9,000 or less for the purposes specified in section 501 of this title, which are guaranteed or insured under this title. Repurchases of such investment shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by said Board, but no institution shall be required to repurchase in any 1 year an amount in excess of 4 percent of the total amount invested in such institution under this section: *Provided*, That any such investment may be voluntarily repaid in whole or in part at any dividend or interest date.

"'(b) In its distribution of such investments among eligible institutions the Board shall give preference to those institutions that—

"'(1) are located in those areas where there exists a greater lack of capital for the making of loans under this title; and

"'(2) are ready and willing within the limitations of this title to make loans to veterans for 100 percent of purchase price or cost, provided the other attributes of good lending practice are present in the inidividual loans.

"'FARM LOANS FOR VETERANS

"'SEC. 514. (a) The Federal land banks, without regard to the limitations or restrictions of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 636 and the following) and any other statutes, are authorized—

"'(1) to make loans to any veterans eligible under this title for any of the real-estate purposes defined in section 502 of this title and to purchase such loans made by other lenders, provided such loans are to be or have been guaranteed or insured under this title; and

"'(2) to receive and deposit in trust with the proper Farm Loan Registrar to be held by him as collateral security for farm loan or other bonds, lien instruments securing such loans, and to issue or cause to be issued farm loan or other bonds with respect thereto.

"'(b) The Farmers Home Administration, without regard to the limitations and restrictions of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong.) as now or hereafter amended save and except subsections (2) and (3) of section 44 (a) of the above-mentioned act, is authorized to make loans to any veteran eligible under this title for any of the purposes defined in section 502 of this title: *Provided*, That such loans meet the requirements of this title and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Administrator. Prior to the making of any such loan the Farmers Home Administration shall require of the veteran and receive a certificate of eligibility issued by the Veterans' Adminis-

tration, and upon the completion of such loan the Farmers Home Administration shall report the loan to the Administrator who shall charge against the veterans' guaranty benefit the maximum amount chargeable if the loan had been guaranteed or insured, and shall pay to the Farmers Home Administration an amount equivalent to 4 percent of the amount so charged, to be credited upon the loan.

"'SECONDARY MARKET

"'SEC. 515. The Administrator is authorized to purchase, at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as "par," any real-estate loan guaranteed under sections 501 or 502 of this title subsequent to the effective date of this section: *Provided*, That, (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom the evidence of guaranty was originally issued; (2) the original dollar amount of loans purchased at par from any seller under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the aggregate original dollar amount of all loans eligible for purchase under this section which such seller has originated after the effective date of this section, and that not to exceed an additional 25 percent of such aggregate dollar amount shall be eligible for purchase at not to exceed 98½ percent of par; (3) not more than 50 percent of the original dollar amount of the loans originated by a lender during any calendar year shall be eligible for purchase at par, nor more than 25 percent at a discount; (4) the original amount of the loan shall not exceed $10,000; (5) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase; and (6) the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that at the option of the Administrator the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not in excess of one-half of 1 percent per annum of the unpaid balance, as may be provided in such agreement: *And provided further*, That the Administrator shall refuse to purchase any loan which in his judgment does not reflect acceptable credit and security requirements in its origination. The Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par.

"'PROVISION OF FUNDS

"'SEC. 516. (a) For the purposes of section 511 of this title the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums, not in excess of $1,000,000,000 per annum, as may from time to time be requested by said Administrator during the 5 years next succeeding the effective date of that section.

"'(b) For the purposes of section 515 of this title the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums as he shall request from time to time between the effective date of that section and the expiration of the period of time in which loans may be offered for purchase thereunder. After the last day on which the Administrator may purchase loans under that section, he shall, with due allowance for outstanding commitments, cause to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, that part of all sums in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (f) of this section, and all moneys received thereafter, representing unexpended advances or the repayment or recovery of the principal of obligations purchased pursuant to section 515 of this title. Interest collected by the Administrator on such obligations in excess of the amount payable by him to the Treasurer of the United States under subsection (c) of this section, together with any miscellaneous income or credits, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said obligations. The Administrator shall have power to invest such reserves, or any unexpended part thereof, from time to time in obligations of the Government of the United States.

"'(c) On advances by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsections (b) or (f) hereof, the Administrator respectively shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the advance.

"'(d) For the purposes of section 513 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Home Loan Bank Board such sums, not in excess of $750,000,000 per annum, as may from time to time be requested by said Board during the 5 years next succeeding the effective date of that section.

"'(e) For the purposes of subsections 514 (a) and 514 (b) of this title the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums, not in excess of $100,000,000 per annum as may from time to time be requested by said Secretary of Agriculture during the 5 years next succeeding the effective date of those subsections. The said sum of $100,000,000 or such portion thereof as is requested by the said Secretary of Agriculture shall be allocated by him to the Federal land banks and the Farmers Home Administration, respectively, in such amounts as he may deem appropriate to carry out most effectively the purposes of subsections 514 (a) and 514 (b) of this title. Such sums as may be available under this subsection to the Federal land banks may be borrowed by them at such rates of interest not in excess of 2¼ percent per annum, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture.

"'(f) In order to make available the sums payable under subsections (a) through (e), inclusive, of this section and in subsection (f) of section 512 of this title, and to effectuate the purposes and functions authorized in sections 511 through 515, inclusive, of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended are hereby extended to include such purposes. Said sums, together with all receipts hereunder, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, in special deposits accounts, and shall be available, respectively, for disbursement for the purposes of section 511 through 516, inclusive, of this title. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Federal Works Administrator, respectively, shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in said accounts as in their respective judgments are not needed for the purposes for which they were provided, and not later than July 25, 1957, they shall, respectively, cause to be so deposited all sums in said accounts and all moneys received thereafter in repayment of outstanding obligations, or otherwise, except so much thereof as they may respectively determine to be necessary for purposes of liquidation. Without regard to any other provisions or limitation of law, or otherwise, except the provisions of this title, said Administrator, Board, Secretary of Agriculture, or Federal Works Administrator shall, respectively, have authority to exercise any and all rights of the United States, including without limitation any and all voting rights, to take or cause to be taken such action as in their respective judgments may be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the custody, management, protection, and realization of such investments, to determine their respective necessary expenses and expenditures, and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for and audited, to make such rules, regulations, and orders as they may, respectively, deem necessary or appropriate for the carrying out of the functions hereby or hereunder vested in them respectively, and, except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of their respective functions hereunder to, such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as they may respectively designate.

"'INCONTESTABILITY

"'SEC. 517. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive as to the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and as to the original amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against a holder, defenses based on the fraud or material misrepresentation of such holder, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, under regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, defenses to payment of any part of the guaranty or insurance.

"'SECTION 505 (A) TERMINATED

"'SEC. 518. No loan made to a veteran at any time subsequent to ninety days after the effective date of this section may be guaranteed by the Administrator under section 505 (a) of this title.'

"SEC. 2. The title of this bill is amended so as to read: 'A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for veterans of World War II homes, and the public facilities necessary therefor, through veterans' homestead associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans.'

"SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the 'Veterans Homestead Act of 1948'."

GENERAL STATEMENT

The proposed bill is designed to enable World War II veterans to acquire homes and farms at prices and rentals which the great bulk of veterans can afford. To achieve this broad purpose, the bill provides aid to veterans through two major channels: (1) To build homes at actual cost for veterans through Government loans to veterans' homestead associations, and (2) to bolster the present consumer credit supports available under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to veterans who need such aid to buy homes and farms.

Veterans' homestead associations can build homes at prices and rentals within the average veteran's ability to pay, through the elimination of speculative profits, of profits presently realized by inflated allowances for contingency costs, of landlord profits, through Federal grants for public facilities necessary for housing through lower interest rates, and through longer amortization periods.

The preservation of the advantages of the GI loan at the present 4-percent interest rate is aided by supplementing the ability of private lending institutions to make these loans, by affording Government secondary market support, by making Veterans' Administration guaranties incontestable, and by supplying money for GI-home loans to lending institutions through the Home Loan Bank Board,

and for farm loans to Federal land banks and to the Farmers Home Administration.

These objectives can be realized under the proposed bill at far less direct or indirect cost to the Government than the costs involved in any alternative housing proposal now under consideration by Congress. At the same time the proposed measure is designed in a manner calculated to temper the inflationary aspects usually attendant upon Government credit supports.

Of all members of our citizenry, the veteran and his family are unquestionably the hardest hit by the current housing shortage. Despite the efforts of the home-building industry in achieving the current level of house production, there is abundant evidence that the great majority of veterans are not able to meet the prices of these homes, and further, those veterans who can meet them are experiencing great difficulty in obtaining favorable financing terms. Any legislation aimed at alleviating this shortage must, in all fairness, give real meaning to veterans' preference by giving veterans an effective competitive position in thair attempts to buy or rent suitable shelter.

The initial attempt of the Congress to afford a housing credit assistance to veterans, through title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, has until recently proved to be the greatest single housing aid which the Government has made available to veterans. More than 100,000 World War II veterans have solved their housing problem by purchasing homes under the Service Readjustment Act. Since the fall of 1947, however, the GI-loan program has been progressively hampered by an increasing tightening of credit and by excessive housing costs and prices, caused at least in part by the diversion of materials and labor into upper-bracket housing priced far above the ability to pay of the vast majority of prospective veteran purchasers.

This bill is designed to reverse these trends and put the veteran once again in the housing market. It will help the veteran help himself.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

Section 511. Homestead associations

Section 511 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, on the application of five or more veterans, to grant charters in nonprofit veterans' homestead associations for the purpose of acquiring or constructing housing for sale or rent at actual cost to veterans. Such associations would be authorized to borrow money from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs at an interest rate of one-quarter of 1 percent in excess of the cost of the money to the Government. Loans to the associations would be repayable to the Administrator on either a short-term or long-term basis. Long-term loans would be amortized over a period of 40 years if the housing constructed or acquired is held by the associations for rental to veterans, or over a period of 32 years if such housing comprises multiunit structures to be sold or held on a cooperative or mutual ownership basis. The associations would be empowered to construct single-family dwellings, either urban or rural, for sale to individual veterans, but individual purchasers would be required to finance such purchases through local financing institutions, and the associations would be required to apply the proceeds of such sales upon the indebtedness of the association to the Administrator. Where units in multiunit structures are sold or held on a cooperative or mutual ownership basis, the associations would be permitted to finance the cost over a 32-year period. Veterans purchasing single-unit housing from an association could obtain loans guaranteed by the Administrator under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act amortizable over a 32-year pericd.

The estimated cost of units to be constructed or acquired by an association could not average more than $10,000 per unit, and the associations would be compelled to sell or rent such units at prices reasonably representing the cost to the association. The associations would be regulated and supervised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Approval would be denied for the purchase or construction of units in excess of local veteran demand, or involving a cost found to be too high locally in comparison with the current price or rental of similar units.

Membership in associations would be limited to veterans of World War II and each association could otherwise prescribe its own bylaws defining eligibility to membership in the particular association. Each veteran desiring to become a member would be required to deposit $100 with the association and to file with the Administrator an affidavit to the effect that he is not a Communist and does not belong to any subversive organization.

The net incomes of associations would be exempt from Federal taxation and State and local taxing authorities would be precluded from imposing any taxes upon associations greater than taxes imposed in the locality upon similar nonprofit corporations (similar authority now exists for Federal savings and loan associations). Associations would, however, be required to pay normal property taxes. Associations could be dissolved or placed in receivership by the Administrator, if necessary, by suit in the Federal courts. Upon dissolution of any association the net assets of the association remaining after payment of its obligations would be covered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. An Advisory Council is provided to assist the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the execution of his duties with regard to the associations. Authority to charter associations and to make loans to them would expire July 25, 1957.

It is expected that an association will actually undertake its construction through private building contractors, but that through the award of firm contracts, the elimination of speculative profits, the cut-back or recapture of contingency margins, the advantageous financing, the land-development grants, and the elimination of sales expenses, the net cost to the association of each unit constructed will be substantially lower than the price of any comparable units which could otherwise be made available to veterans. Once completed, the monthly carrying cost or rental of the individual units, due first, to the lower initial cost, and second, to the longer repayment periods in conjunction with low-interest rates, will be substantially less than veterans could obtain under either existing facilities or those contemplated by other pending legislation. Prior review and approval by the Administrator of each project proposed by an association will insure against unwise or unsound activity. Annual audit of the associations' accounts and records will, with other proper regulatory and procedural requirements, supply needed safeguards to assure against improvident or inefficient operations.

Section 512. Grants for public facilities

As an integral part of this broad attack on the veterans' housing shortage, section 512 is intended to offset the present scarcity and high cost of improved land. It authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to aid State and local governments or associations by 50 percent grants for streets, water and sewer, and other similar facilities wherever the Veterans' Administrator finds such community facilities necessary for effective use of the housing provided under section 511 of the bill. Subsections (c) and (d) contain safeguards to assure that the public facilities will conform to local standards and will be adequately maintained, as well as that the veterans and their families will receive the benefits extended. Where the grant is made to an association, the bill provides for the transfer of the completed public facilities to the appropriate local government.

This section will substantially lower the first cost of the home as well as the annual assessments and other charges usually imposed on home owners for public facilities. It will also assure that these vital facilities are ready to serve the veteran when he moves into his home.

Perhaps the $200,000,000 here authorized is not enough to finance all the community facilities that may be required for the new housing under the bill. It will, however, fulfill the most urgent needs. It is contemplated that the remainder will be provided through usual channels without Federal aid.

Federal aid for local community facilities has ample precedent. During the war, more than $300,000,000 was granted by the Federal Government to local public bodies for public facilities related to housing for industrial workers. This committee believes that the Congress has at least as great an obligation to the veterans.

Section 513. Investments in lending institutions

Section 513 authorizes the Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, and institutions (savings or building and loan associations, etc.) that are members of a Federal Home Loan Bank or insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. For this purpose the bill would make available to the Board such sums, up to $750,000,000 per annum, as the Board may request during the 5 years following the enactment of the bill.

This section is designed (1) to relieve the current shortage of capital for loans to veterans for the purposes of section 501 of title III, since the inability of veterans to obtain financing under the present provisions of title III in many localities is daily becoming more acute; (2) to assure that mortgage money will be available to permit the financing through private institutions of homes constructed by veterans' homestead associations under section 511 (f) (1) of title III as added to the act by this bill.

Funds provided under this section may be used by the specified classes of institutions only for loans not over $9,000 which are made for the purposes of section 501 of title III (purchase, construction, improvement, and repair of homes) which are guaranteed or insured under that title. A limitation of $9,000, on loans made with such financing, is placed in the bill to provide an incentive to builders to provide homes for veterans within that amount, and to channel these funds into housing the purchase price of which is realistically within the repayment ability of the great bulk of veterans. Preference must ge given by the Board to institutions in areas where money for veterans' loans is otherwise scarce. The institutions in which this money is invested will pay dividends or interest to the Government, just as they do to private investors. Rates currently paid by these institutions average between 2 and 2½ percent per year, and are generally more than the average cost of money to the Government.

This provision will relieve credit stringencies throughout the country by the use of the facilities of existing privately owned and managed institutions, the staffs of which are already well experienced in the same type of lending, and which in fact originated up to 80 percent of all veterans' home loans in the earlier stages of the title III program. Assurance is provided to institutions who accept these funds for investment that precipitous governmental action in demanding withdrawal will not upset their normal cash position. This assurance is given in the provision limiting required repayments in any 1 year to not more than 4 percent

of the total amount thus invested in the institution; however, any investment may be voluntarily repaid to the Government in whole or part at any dividend or interest date.

There is ample precedent for the making of such investments in these institutions. By a provision added in 1935 to the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was authorized to make investments in shares of Federal savings and loan associations and in shares, deposits, and investment certificates of any member of a Federal home-loan bank or any institution insured under title IV of the National Housing Act. The statute provided that $300,000,000 of the total authorized bond issue of the Corporation should be eligible for purposes including these investments. One of the major purposes of the provision was to increase the funds then available for home financing.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its subsidiaries made such investments in a total amount of about $275,000,000. These investments have been most satisfactory, and repayments have been well in advance of schedule. The outstanding balance of the Treasury investment had been reduced to less than $1,000,000, and about $45,000,000 has been received by the Government as dividends.

Section 514. Farm loans

Section 514 is designed to make farm credit available to veterans on favorable terms. Funds for farm loans at so low a rate as 4 percent are limited in many agricultural areas and as a result many World War II veterans qualified to succeed in farming have been unable to find any lender to make them guaranteed or insured loans.

Federal land banks are authorized by this section to make farm real-estate loans to veterans under title III without regard to certain of the limitations and restrictions under the Federal Farm Loan Act and other statutes. It also authorizes the Federal land banks to purchase such loans made by other lenders and to pledge loans so made or purchased as security for farm-loan or other bonds and to issue or to cause to be issued farm-loan or other bonds secured thereby.

The Federal Farm Loan Act limits the ratio of all loans made by the Federal land banks to 65 percent of the "normal agricultural value" of the farm real estate and authorizes the issuance of bonds secured by such loans. Section 500 (d) of the amended Servicemen's Readjustment Act removed somewhat similar restrictions from national banks and other lenders in the case of GI loans, but did not remove restrictions on Federal land banks. Federal land banks are a large factor in farm real-estate lending and are now prevented by restrictions which this section seeks to remove, from being of service to World War II veterans in connection with guaranteed or insured loans. This section and section 516 (e) provide methods by which Federal land banks can obtain funds for these loans.

This section also authorizes loans to veterans under the Farmers Home Administration Act in that loans so made are to be charged by the Administrator to the veteran's gratuity entitlement and the 4 percent gratuity payment is to be made thereon just as if guaranteed or insured.

Private lending institutions are encouraged to make guaranteed or insured farm loans to World War II veterans through the secondary market facilities under section 515.

Section 515. Secondary market

Section 515 establishes a long-range Government secondary market for home and farm loans which are guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. The need for such a market has become more and more pronounced since the expiration on June 30, 1947, of the Government market administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The problem is by no means confined to lenders in rural communities where there is a dearth of mortgage money, nor to those lenders which have reached a saturation point in their ability to make additional GI loans in the absence of assured secondary market support for a portion of their further commitments. The incentive for lending institutions in urban areas as well to invest in 4 percent GI mortgages has been greatly weakened apace with the recent firming of yields in the money market. The efforts of the lack of an adequate secondary market are evident in Veterans' Administration statistics showing the trend of GI home-loan applications received during recent months. The number of home-loan applications has declined sharply since September 1947. By March 1948 receipts were 43 percent below September 1947. The phenomenon of a decline in GI home-loan activity during a period when new home completions have been approaching a near-record peak is largely attributable to the aggravation of the secondary-market problem.

The secondary market provided for in section 515 of this bill is designed to include safeguards ample to prevent abuse of the market and to encourage lenders to sell GI loans to the Government only in case of acute future need.

The major provisions of the market and the supporting reasons for the inclusion of each provision are these:

(1) A market for farm loans, which were not eligible for sale to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation market, is established. The extension of the market to include farm loans will fill a conspicuous void and, by encouraging private lending institutions to make farm loans at the 4-percent maximum interest rate permitted by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, will enable veterans to obtain liberal financing from lending institutions in their local communities.

(2) Only loans made after the effective date of the enabling legislation are eligible for purchase by the market. Inasmuch as the purpose for creating the Government secondary market is to provide additional GI home and farm loan credit where it is now nonexistent or difficult to obtain, the market does not and should not apply retroactively to loans already made to veterans.

(3) Loans are eligible for sale to the market for a term of 5 years from the date of origination of the loan. This provision is deemed necessary to prevent the recurrence of a flurry to sell GI loans such as the one which took place just prior to the termination of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation secondary market by Congress on June 30, 1947, and more important, to introduce a stabilizing influence upon the mortgage portfolios of lending institutions. The firm assurance to the lender that he may sell a fixed percentage of his loans at any time during the 5-year period after origination should encourage him to hold his GI loans as earning assets and to sell them only in case of real need.

(4) Each lender is limited in the amount he can sell to the market. He can sell no more than 50 percent of the original amount of his future loans at par, and an additional 25 percent at a discount of 1½ percent, i. e., at 98½ percent of the outstanding balances. This provision will require that the lender retain a substantial proportion of his GI loan portfolio and will prevent entry into the program of lenders with slender capital who would count on selling 100 percent of their loans to the market as fast as turn-over would permit.

(5) The Administrator is directed to refuse to purchase any loan which, in his judgment, does not reflect acceptable credit and security requirements in its origination. This provision is included to permit the Administrator to screen out those mortgages made without full adherence to the usual standards of good lending practices, so that the Government's risk of loss may be minimized.

(6) No loan may exceed $10,000 in original amount. The intention of this limitation is to induce lenders to give preference to the financing of low-cost homes.

(7) No momentary limitation has been placed upon the aggregate dollar amount which may be used by the Administrator for the purchase of eligible loans. This is intended to allay the fears that lenders might have that they might be excluded for lack of funds in the market, when they should find a real need to sell some of their loans. A market with a limited amount of funds, on the other hand, would encourage lenders to rush their loans for immediate sale to the Government.

Section 516. Provision for funds

Section 516 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to make available to the respective agencies of the Government specified, the sums alloted to each of them to accomplish the objectives of the bill. These sums are as follows:

(1) To the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for loans to veterans' homestead associations, up to $1,000,000,000 per annum for 5 years, and such sums as he may from time to time request for operation of the secondary market;

(2) To the Home Loan Bank Board up to $750,000,000 per annum for investment in eligible institutions for 5 years;

(3) To the Secretary of Agriculture for loans to Federal land banks, and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act, up to $100,000,000 per annum, for 5 years; and

(4) To the Federal Works Administrator for grants for public facilities, up to $200,000,000.

Advances on account of these sums are required to be deposited by the Secretary of the Treasury on request of the respective agency. Such advances, until repaid, with the exception of the Federal Works Agency grants, and moneys made available to Federal land banks, carry interest at rates fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States. The interest rate on loans to Federal land banks is to be such rate, not in excess of 2¼ percent per annum, as is fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury. This maximum rate is specified in the light of rates currently payable on land bank bonds, to assure their continued ability to make guaranteed loans at 4 percent per annum, which is their current rate on loans. Moneys for such advances are to be obtained by the Secretary of the Treasury by using the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, the purposes of which are extended for such financing.

Broad discretion with respect to the management of such funds, within the specific purposes and limitations defined in the bill, are given to the various agencies. It may be pointed out that in their respective exercise of this discretion and the related functions these various agencies will not be engaged in financial activities novel to their present operations, but rather, will merely augment and extend somewhat the various services which are typical to their customary duties, and in which their officers and employees are well experienced.

Section 517. Incontestability clause

Section 517 of the bill adds an incontestability provision to title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to cover the evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on loans made under that title. The inclusion of this provision will encourage lenders to participate or increase participation in the title III

loan program in that more positive assurance will be given to lender participants as to the extent of their risk in making loans to veterans. Both the need and the solution thus to be supplied follows the precedent afforded in the insurance of mortgage loans by the Federal Housing Administration. The proposed provision closely parallels in purpose and scope the provision added to the National Housing Act in 1939 to encourage lender participation in the FHA program (53 Stat. 806, 12 U. S. C. 1709 (e)).

Section 518. Termination of second mortgage loan guaranty

Section 518 proposes the deletion from the GI bill of section 505a, which permits the guaranty of a second mortgage loan in conjunction with a primary loan insured by the Federal Housing Administration. This form of combination loan, while much less advantageous from the standpoint of the veteran, is more advantageous from the standpoint of the lender. In many cases the combination loan costs the veteran up to 10 percent more than would a straight section 501 loan in a corresponding amount. Section 505a is not in fact achieving its purpose, since down payments are as frequently required to cover the balance above the combination loan as they are in section 501 loans. Moreover, the combination loan, affording as it does three layers of price support, is regarded as being more inflationary than the 501 loan. It is thought that if eliminated from the GI loan program at this time, when accompanied by the secondary market provisions of section 515 and the incontestability clause (sec. 517), the impact of the deletion upon the ability of the veteran to get home-loan financing will be negligible, and will net a benefit rather than a detriment to veteran borrowers as a whole.

Estimate of cost

It is not possible to estimate the probable cost of this bill. However, it should be noted that all funds authorized to be expended under the program, with the exception of the $200,000,000 for grants for essential public facilities are repayable to the Treasury with interest. It is the belief of the committee that the ultimate actual cost to the Government will be low when contrasted with the beneficial results to be attained, or with the prospective cost to the Government of any comparable housing production aids.

RAMSEYER RULE

In accordance with the provisions of clause 2a, rule XIII, House of Representatives, the changes made in existing law by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is in black brackets; new matter is in quotation marks; existing law in which no changes are proposed is shown in roman):

Title III of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended):

TITLE III—LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

Chapter V—General provisions for loans

SEC. 500. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be eligible for the benefits of this title. Any loan made by such veteran within 10 years after the termination of the war for any of the purposes, and in compliance with the provisions, specified in this title, is automatically guaranteed by the Government by this title in an amount not exceeding 50 percent of the loan: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000 in the case of non-real-estate loans, nor $4,000 in the case of real-estate loans; or a prorated portion thereof on loans of both types or combination thereof.

(b) Loans guaranteed under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the parties thereto, subject to the conditions and limitations of this title and the regulations issued pursuant to section 504: *Provided*, That the liability under the guaranty within the limitations of this title shall decrease or increase pro rata with any decrease or increase of the amount of the unpaid portion of the obligation: *Provided further*, That loans guaranteed under this title shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding 4 percent per annum and shall be payable in full in not more than 25 years, or in the case of loans on farm realty in not more than 40 years: *And provided further*, That (1) the maturity on a non-real-estate loan shall not exceed 10 years; (2) any loan for a term in excess of 5 years shall be amortized in accordance with established procedure; (3) except as provided in section 505 any real-estate loan, other than for repairs, alterations or improvements, shall be secured by a first lien on the realty, and a non-real-estate loan, except as to working or other capital, merchandise, good will and other intangible assets, shall be secured by personalty to the extent legal and practicable.

(c) An honorable discharge shall be deemed a certificate of eligibility to apply for a guaranteed loan. Any veteran who does not have a discharge certificate, or who received a discharge other than honorable, may apply to the Administrator for a certificate of eligibility. Upon making a loan as provided herein, the lender shall forthwith transmit to the Administrator a statement setting forth the full name and serial number of the veteran, amount and terms of the loan, and the legal description of the property, together with the appraisal report made by the designated appraiser. Where the loan is automatically guaranteed, the Administrator shall provide the lender with a loan guaranty. He shall also endorse on the veteran's discharge, or eligibility certificate, the amount and type of guaranty used, and the amount, if any, remaining. An amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed shall be paid to the lender by the Administrator out of available appropriations, to be credited upon the loan. Nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any guaranteed loan or the assignment of the security therefor.

(d) Loans guaranteed hereunder may be made by any Federal land bank, national bank, State bank, private bank, building and loan association, insurance company, credit union, or mortgage and loan company, that is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed under this title may be made by any national bank, or Federal savings and loan association; or by any bank, trust company, building and loan association, or insurance company organized or authorized to do business in the District of Columbia, without regard to the limitations and restrictions of any other statute with respect to—

(1) ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property;

(2) maturity of loan;

(3) requirement for mortgage or other security;

(4) dignity of lien; or

(5) percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

(e) Any loan proposed to be made to an eligible veteran by any lender not of a class specified in subsection (d) may be guaranteed by the Administrator, if he finds that it is in accord, otherwise with the provisions of this title, as amended.

Purchase or Construction of Homes

SEC. 501. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing residential property or constructing a dwelling to be occupied as his home or for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, or improvements in property owned by him and occupied as his home, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment of the property purchased or constructed or improved;

(2) That the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and

(3) That the price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property or for the cost of construction, repairs, or alterations does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

Purchase of Farms and Farm Equipment

SEC. 502. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing any lands, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, supplies or implements, or for repairing, altering, constructing or improving any land, equipment, or building, including the farmhouse, to be used in farming operations conducted by the veteran involving production in excess of his own needs, or for working capital requirements necessary for such operations, or to purchase stock in a cooperative association where the purchase of such stock is required by Federal statute as an incident to obtaining the loan, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any such purposes in connection with bona fide farming operations conducted by the applicant;

(2) That such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

Purchase of Business Property

SEC. 503. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for the purpose of engaging in business or pursuing a gainful occupation, or for the cost of acquiring for such purpose land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, tools, inventory, stock in trade, or for the cost of the construction, repair, alteration or improvement of any realty or personalty used for such purpose, or to provide the funds needed for working capital, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any of the specified purposes in connection with bona fide pursuit of gainful occupation by the veteran;

(2) That such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such business or occupation;

(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such business or occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such business or occupation; and

(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property, or the cost of such construction, alterations, or improvements, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

Regulations

SEC. 504. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations not inconsistent with this title, as amended, as are necessary and appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title, and may delegate to subordinate employees authority to issue certificates, or other evidence, or guaranty of loans guaranteed under the provisions of this title, and to exercise other administrative functions hereunder.

Secondary Loans

SEC. 505. (a) In any case wherein a principal loan, for any of the purposes stated in sections 501, 502, or 503, is approved by a Federal agency to be made or guaranteed or insured by it pursuant to applicable law and regulations, and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, or a part thereof, the Administrator, subject otherwise to the provisions of this title, may guarantee the full amount of the second loan: *Provided,* That such second loan shall not exceed 20 percent of the purchase price or cost: *And provided further,* That regulations to be promulgated jointly by the Administrator and the head of such agency may provide for servicing of both loans by such agency and for refinancing of the principal loan to include any unpaid portion of the secondary loan with accrued interest, if any, after the curtailment thereon equals twice the amount of the secondary loan.

(b) Any person who is a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, as provided in section 500 hereof, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

Procedure on Default

SEC. 506. In the event of default in the payment of any loan guaranteed under this title, the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator who shall thereupon pay to such holder the guaranty not in excess of the pro rata portion of the amount originally guaranteed, and shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty: *Provided,* That prior to suit or foreclosure the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator of the default, and within 30 days thereafter the Administrator may, at his option, pay the holder of the obligation the unpaid balance of the obligation plus accrued interest and receive an assignment of the loan and security: *Provided further,* That (1) nothing herein shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the veteran as may be agreed upon by the parties to the loan and approved by the Administrator; and (2) the Administrator may establish the date, not later than the date of judgment and decree of foreclosure or sale, upon which accrual of interest or charges shall cease.

Loans on Delinquent Indebtedness

SEC. 507. Any loan made to a veteran, the proceeds of which are to be used to refinance any indebtedness of the veteran which is secured of record on property to be used or occupied by the veteran as a home or for farming purposes, or indebtedness incurred by him in the pursuit of a gainful occupation which he is pursuing or which he proposes in good faith to pursue, or any delinquent taxes or assessments on such property or business, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

(1) Such loan became in default or the delinquency occurred not later than 10 years after the termination of the war;

(2) Such refinancing will aid the veteran in his economic readjustment; and

(3) The amount of the guaranteed loan does not exceed the reasonable value of the property or business, as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

Insurance of Loans

SEC. 508. (a) Any loans which might be guaranteed under the provisions of this title, when made or purchased by any financial institution subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia, may, in lieu of such guaranty, be insured by the Administrator under an agreement whereby he will reimburse any such institution for losses incurred on such loan up to 15 percent of the aggregate of loans so made or purchased by it.

(b) Loans insured hereunder shall be made on such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Administrator may prescribe within the limitations set forth in this title. The Administrator may fix the maximum rate of interest payable on any class of non-real-estate loans insured hereunder at a figure not in excess of a 3 percent discount rate or an equivalent straight interest rate on nonamortized loans.

(c) The Administrator shall pay the same amount on each loan insured hereunder as he would be required to pay under the sixth sentence of section 500 (c) hereof if the loan were guaranteed rather than insured.

Powers of Administration

SEC. 509. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title as now or hereafter amended and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator may—

(1) Sue and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

(2) Subject to specific limitations in this act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal or interest or any portion thereof, security or other provisions of any note, contract, mortgage, or other instrument securing a loan which has been guaranteed or insured hereunder;

(3) Pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such guaranty or insurance;

(4) Pay, compromise, waive or release any right, title, claim, lien or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption;

(5) Purchase at any sale, public, or private, upon such terms and for such prices as he determines to be reasonable, and take title to, property, real, personal or mixed; and similarly sell, at public or private sale, exchange, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of any such property; and

(6) Complete, administer, operate, obtain and pay for insurance on, and maintain, renovate, repair, modernize, lease, or otherwise deal with any property acquired or held pursuant to this title: *Provided,* That the acquisition of any such property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction of, on, or over such property (including power to tax) or impair the rights under the State or local law of any persons on such property.

(b) The powers by this section granted may be exercised by the Administrator without regard to any other provisions of law not enacted expressly in limitation hereof, which otherwise would govern the expenditure of public funds: *Provided,* That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this section if the amount of such contract exceeds $1,000.

(c) The financial transactions of the Administrator incident to, or arising out of, the guaranty of loans pursuant to this title, and the acquisition, management, and disposition of property, real, personal, or mixed, as incident to such activities and pursuant to this section, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

Effective Date

SEC. 510. This title as amended, shall be effective from the date of enactment: *Provided,* That any application for guaranty of a loan filed within 90 days after such date may be approved under the title as it existed prior to amendment: *And provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to affect any contractual right under any certificate of guaranty issued thereunder.

(H. R. 4488 as introduced:)

Be it enacted, etc., That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, approved June 22, 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VII—VETERANS' HOMESTEAD ACT OF 1948

"Chapter XVI.—General provisions

"Short title

"SEC. 1600. This title may be cited as the 'Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948.'

"Declaration of Policy

"SEC. 1601. In enacting this title to alleviate the existing housing shortage, it is the intent of the Congress to provide means of ownership and financing, within the framework of our private enterprise system and without vast expenditures of public moneys, whereby veterans themselves, associated together within their own communities, can build, buy, or rent homes upon terms which veterans can afford; and to provide the public facilities essential to such homes without the imposition of additional financial burdens upon veterans who may be owners thereof or tenants therein.

"Definitions

"SEC. 1602. As used in this title, except where the context otherwise requires, the term—

"(a) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the Veterans' Administration.

"(b) 'Association' means a veterans' homestead association chartered pursuant to this act.

"(c) 'Housing' means permanent-type housing with modern sanitary and sewerage-disposal facilities; does not include transient housing such as tourist cabins, motor courts, or apartment hotels; but may include multiple-family dwellings or groups of single-family dwellings constructed or operated as units, or constructed for sale or sold for operation as cooperative enterprises by the tenants thereof.

"(d) 'Improve' as applied to real property shall include (a) grading, landscaping, and any other site development; and (b) construction, repair, remodeling, or demolition (whether for salvage or reuse) of buildings and other structures thereon.

"(e) 'Real property' means land, whether or not improved, and any buildings or other structures thereon, including fixtures and other personalty attached thereto.

"(f) 'State' means any State of the United States, any Territory or possession thereof, and the District of Columbia.

"(g) 'Veteran' means (i) any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war,[1] and who shall have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or (ii) the surviving and unmarried spouse of any such person.

"(h) 'Note' means a short-term obligation maturing in 12 months or less, issued by an association pursuant to this title.

"(i) 'Bond' means a long-term obligation, maturing over a period of more than 1 year, issued by an association pursuant to this title.

"(j) 'Public facilities' including public highways and parks, roads, streets, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, bus stations and bus stops, water storage, purification and distribution works, sewage, garbage and refuse collection, treatment and disposal facilities (including trunk and lateral sewers), fire stations, fire equipment and fire plugs, street-lighting facilities, schools, community centers, and recreational facilities.

"Separability

"SEC. 1603. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"Chapter XVII—Veterans' homestead associations

"Organization Authorized—Administrator to Issue Charter

"SEC. 1700. The Administrator is hereby authorized, subject to the provisions of this title and under such rules and procedures as he may prescribe, to provide for the organization, incorporation, examination, operation, and regulation of associations to be known as 'veterans' homestead associations' and to issue charters therefor pursuant to such standard form thereof as he may prescribe.

"Chartered Associations Subject to Rules and Procedures

"SEC. 1701. A veterans' homestead association to which the Administrator shall have issued a charter pursuant to section 1700 hereof, and which shall have accepted such charter, shall thereafter, so long as such charter remains in effect, be eligible to all the benefits of this title and shall be subject to all the provisions of this title and the rules and procedures of the Administrator issued hereunder.

"Qualification for Membership

"SEC. 1702. Five or more veterans, of ability, good character, and responsibility as determined by the Administrator, may organize a veterans' homestead association. Each association shall determine its own rules of eligibility for membership therein subject only to the conditions that (a) membership shall be limited to veterans; (b) no veteran shall become or remain a member unless and until his accumulated payments to the association, in accordance with section 1707, shall equal or exceed $100; and (c) the number of members, at all times, shall be at least five.

"Primary Purpose of Associations

"SEC. 1703. Each association shall be organized and shall operate on a nonprofit basis. It shall have as its primary purposes (a) the contraction or purchase of housing to be sold to veterans for occupancy by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents; (b) the construction or purchase and operation and maintenance of housing to be rented to veterans for occupancy by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents; and (c) the making of loans to veterans for the purchase of housing to be occupied by them personally, together with their families or dependents. To this end, and pursuant to rules and procedures issued by the Administrator, each association shall provide maximum opportunity and priority for the purchase or rental of such housing, first to members of such association and second to other veterans.

"Number of Associations

"SEC. 1704. The Administrator may, in his discretion, charter one or more associations in any locality; and he may, in his discretion, refuse to charter any proposed association upon his finding that the veterans in the locality in which it is proposed that such asscciation would operate are or will be adequately served by an association or associations then already chartered for operation in such locality.

"Powers of Veterans' Homestead Associations

"SEC. 1705. Under rules and procedures issued by the Administrator, each association shall have the following powers:

"(a) Subject to the provisions of section 1708, to purchase, or otherwise acquire, any real property or leasehold or other interest therein, whether improved or unimproved, to subdivide, construct improvements on, repair, modernize, renovate, maintain, and operate any such property, and to purchase, or otherwise acquire, any personal property necessary or desirable for any of the foregoing;

"(b) Subject to the provisions of section 1709, to hold, sell, or contract for the sale of, lease, rent, mortgage, or otherwise deal with, encumber, hypothecate, or dispose of any acquired property, all on such terms and conditions as may be deemed proper;

"(c) Subject to the provisions of section 1708, to lend money to veterans to enable them to finance the purchase of or construction of residential properties for occupancy by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maturity of any such loan exceed a period of 30 years;

"(d) To purchase, construct, improve, or otherwise provide, to receive grants for, and to maintain and operate public facilities (which shall include for this purpose gas and electric distribution lines and facilities) reasonably necessary or desirable for the housing provided by or of the association, where such public facilities are then not otherwise available for such housing: *Provided*, That no association shall operate any mercantile establishment or other commercial enterprise, or operate any amusement enterprise for which any admission or fee is charged.

"(e) To make, issue, sell, and deliver its bonds and notes in the manner and to the extent provided in this title;

"(f) To build up and maintain reasonable, permanent reserves, under rules and procedures to be issued by the Administrator and subject to his semiannual review, which shall not exceed in the aggregate, however, 3 percent of the total principal amount of bonds and notes of such association, outstanding at the time; and

"(g) To make, adopt, repeal, and amend bylaws; to employ, and to pay reasonable salaries to, the officers and other employees of the association for services performed (which officers and employees need not be veterans), and such other powers, not inconsistent with this act, as are customarily enjoyed by nonprofit corporations and are necessary or convenient for the conduct of the business of the association.

"Annual and Other Reports of Associations

"SEC. 1706. (a) Every association shall file, with the Administrator, not later than 90 days after the close of its fiscal year, an annual financial statement and shall also furnish to him such other financial statements at such other times as he may require. All such reports shall be in such form and in such detail as may be prescribed in rules and procedures issued by the Administrator.

"(b) The Administrator shall make, annually and at such other times as he deems necessary, an examination of the financial books, records, and affairs of each association in the manner customary for supervision of fiduciary institutions.

"Payments by Association Members

"SEC. 1707. Members of an association shall not be required to pay dues. Each association shall provide in its bylaws for the payment by each prospective member, periodically, by installments or otherwise, of the sum of $100 to be accumulated on the books of the association to the credit of such person. The sums so paid shall not bear interest. Each such sum shall be entered on the books of the association as a credit to the member making such payment for possible application either (1) as payment on a home purchased by such member from the association; or (2) as security for rent on a home rented from the association by such member. Each association shall provide further, in its bylaws, that a member may voluntarily withdraw from such association at any time and may receive back an amount equal to the amount of his accumulated payments to the association (unless such payments shall have been applied as payment on a home purchased by such member from the association), but only after 1 year following the date of the initial payment and then only upon 60 days' notice to the association.

"Limitation on Cost and Amount of Housing

"SEC. 1708. (a) No housing shall be constructed or purchased by an association unless, in the opinion of the Administrator, the estimated final cost of such housing when completed (exclusive of related real property designed for commercial operation), as determined by the amounts of firm contracts for the acquisition of real property, the improvement thereof, the construction of buildings, and the acquisition of related personal property, plus an amount equal to 5 percent of such contracts plus an allocable share of the estimated indirect or overhead costs and expenses of the association, fairly attributable to such housing, shall not exceed a sum equal to the product of the number of family units in such housing multiplied by $10,000.

"(b) No association shall maintain and operate as rental property any housing (exclusive of related real property designed for commercial operation) having a depreciated cost exceeding a sum equal to the product of the number of family units in such housing multiplied by $10,000.

"(c) No association shall construct or purchase, or contract for the construction or purchase of, or otherwise acquire or contract to acquire, a total number of family housing units in excess of either (i) the number of members of such association, or (ii) the number of veterans in the community who may reasonably be considered, in the opinion of the Administrator, prospective purchasers of or tenants in such units.

"(d) An association shall not make any loan to any veteran for the acquisition or construction of housing (i) if such housing includes more than one family unit; (ii) if, in the case of acquisition, the current market value of such housing is, in the judgment of the association, less than the amount of the loan; (iii) in excess of $10,000, plus necessary closing costs; (iv) which in the opinion of the association is beyond his ability to repay.

"Sale or Rental Housing

"SEC. 1709. (a) All housing of an association shall be sold or leased for such prices

[1] By Public Law 239, 80th Cong., termination of present war fixed as July 25, 1947.

or at such rents, as the case may be, as shall reasonably represent the actual cost thereof to the association, including (i) all costs of acquisition, construction, or improvement; (ii) the reserves to be provided in accordance with section 1705; (iii) interest on an amortization of bonds or notes of the association fairly attributable to such housing; (iv) direct costs of operation and maintenance of such housing; and (v) an allocable share of the overhead or indirect costs and expenses of the association fairly attributable to such housing.

"(b) Any deed or other instrument made by an association for the sale of its property or any mortgage or other instrument supporting a loan to a veteran for the construction or purchase of housing shall provide that such property shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of within 10 years from the date of acquisition of such property by such purchaser or borrower unless it shall first have been offered for sale back to the association at the original price paid to such association by such purchaser or at the acquisition cost to such borrower, less any depreciation which shall have occurred by that time and plus the fair value of any improvements which such purchaser or borrower shall have made to such property.

"(c) As a condition to (i) every sale of housing by an association to a veteran and (ii) every loan by an association to a veteran for the purchase or construction of housing, such veteran shall furnish to such association an affidavit stating that (i) he has not theretofore purchased any housing from any association which has not been offered for sale back to such association and (ii) he has not theretofore obtained any loan from any association for the purchase or construction of housing and sold the property thereby acquired without first offering it back for sale to such association; (iii) he does not have outstanding any loan obligation to any association chartered under this title; (iv) he does not own any housing acquired from any association chartered under this title.

"(d) The terms of any sale of housing made by an association shall, among other things, grant to the purchaser the right to pay, at any time, the full amount of the purchase price or the full amount of any mortgage given in connection with such sale.

"(e) Every lease made by an association shall contain a prohibition against subleasing.

"(f) Every sale or loan made by an association shall contain a prohibition against leasing without first giving the association the right to select the lessee and fix the consideration and conditions of the lease.

"Loans by Administrator to Associations

"SEC. 1710. In order to provide interim financing for associations, pending the issuance of bonds as herein provided, the Administrator is hereby authorized to make loans to associations to provide—

"(a) initial working capital for an association;

"(b) development expenses preliminary to the commencement of actual construction of housing; and

"(c) funds to enable an association to make loans to individual veterans for the purchase or construction of housing, preliminary to the completion of such purchase or construction.

Each association to which any such loan may be made shall make; issue, and deliver, to the Administrator, its note in the principal amount of such loan. Each such note shall be a nonnegotiable unconditional obligation of the association, issued against its general credit, and payable from its general assets, shall bear interest at the rate of one-half of 1 percent per annum payable semiannually, and shall be payable within such period (not exceeding 12 months from the date of issuance thereof) as the Administrator may determine. Upon application by an association the Administrator may, in his discretion, renew any such note, for successive periods not exceeding 12 months each, in the event he determines that, at the time of the application for such renewal, the issuance of bonds would not then be to the best financial interest of such association. Payments of interest on and principal of such notes shall be made to the Administrator, and the money so paid may be used by him for the making of further loans hereunder.

"Bonds of Associations

"SEC. 1711. (a) For its permanent financing every association is hereby authorized to, and shall, issue its long-term bonds. The bonds shall be negotiable unconditional obligations of issuing association, payable from all its assets and secured by a mortgage or other lien upon all or any part of the real or personal property or assets, or revenues and income of such association as shall be specified in said bond.

"(b) The bonds shall be in such forms and denominations, mature serially within such periods, not exceeding 40 years from the date of issuance thereof, bear such rates of interest, be payable as to both principal and interest at such items, but subject to such other terms and conditions and be issued in such manner and sold at such places as may be authorized by the Administrator, pursuant to rules and procedures issued by him.

"(c) Under rules and procedures issued by the Administrator, (i) bonds may be issued under and secured by an indenture of trust, and (ii) the bonds or indenture may provide for the addition, release, or substitution of security.

"(d) To the extent appropriate, as determined by the Administrator, the proceeds received by an association from the sale of its bonds shall be used to redeem its notes.

"(e) No association shall issue any bond if the issuance thereof would bring the aggregate of the principal amounts of all bonds of such association, then issued and outstanding, to a total sum in excess of the aggregate amount derived by multiplying $10,000 times each of the family housing units constructed, purchased, remodeled, or financed, or otherwise acquired, or financed by such association, for subsequent sale as housing units or for subsequent maintenance and operation as rental housing units, or acquired by veterans under loans from such association, exclusive, however, of property designed for commercial operation.

"(f) The aggregate principal amounts of all bonds issued by all associations shall not exceed the sum of $2,000,000,000; and the Administrator shall not authorize the issuance of any bonds in violation of this subsection.

"(g) No association shall issue any notes or bonds except as authorized by the Administrator, pursuant to rules and procedures issued by him.

"Guaranty of Bonds

"SEC. 1712. (a) The bonds of any association, issued pursuant to section 1711, shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed upon their face by the United States of America as to the payment of both principal and interest, and in the event that such association shall be unable, or shall not, make any such payment upon demand when due, payments shall be made to the lawful holder of such bond by the Administrator. To the extent of such payment the Administrator shall succeed to all rights of such lawful holder.

"(b) The bonds of any association, issued pursuant to section 1711, shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States of America or any officer or agency thereof.

"Tax Exemptions

"SEC. 1713. (a) Notwithstanding any provisions of the Internal Revenue Code or any other law to the contrary, the interest payable and paid on any bond of an association, issued pursuant to section 1711, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States of America.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provisions of the Internal Revenue Code or any other law to the contrary, the net earnings of any association shall be exempted from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or other local taxing authority.

"(c) Subject to the provisions of section 1713 (b), no State, county, municipal, or other local taxing authority shall impose any tax upon any such association or its charter and franchise, capital, reserves, property, surplus, loans, or income, greater than that imposed by such taxing authority on other similar local nonprofit associations.

"Sale of Bonds

"SEC. 1714. The Administrator shall act as fiscal agent for every association in the sale of bonds. He shall, in his discretion, determine whether such sale shall be by negotiation or by open competitive bidding, and shall issue rules and procedures governing the conditions of the offer, the receipt of bids, and the sale. In no case shall any bonds of any association be sold for a sum less than the aggregate principal amounts thereof. The Administrator shall charge no brokerage fee in connection with such sales of bonds, but he may withhold from the proceeds of any such sale an amount equal to his actual costs of handling the offering and sale of such bonds. The moneys so withheld may be used by the Administrator for the making of loans to associations pursuant to section 1710.

"Funds of Associations

"SEC. 1715. The funds of an association may, as provided by its bylaws and in accordance with rules and procedures issued by the Administrator, be deposited in any bank or banks. No association shall invest its funds in any securities except obligations of the United States of America, or obligations unconditionally guaranteed by the United States as to the payment of both principal and interest, of obligations of a State, and, in any event no such investment shall be made except with the approval of the Administrator or pursuant to rules and procedures issued by him.

"Distribution of Earnings—Dissolution of Associations

"SEC. 1716. (a) At the end of any fiscal year any net earnings remaining to an association, after fully providing for the payment of all debts and obligations of such association, then due, and after providing for the reserves then currently required, shall be set aside in a special account to be used (1) for the purchase or redemption by the association of its notes and bonds then outstanding, or (2) with the express approval of the Administrator, for any other lawful purpose of the association.

"(b) If the members or directors of any association shall knowingly violate, or knowingly permit any of the officers, agents, or servants of such association to violate, any of the provisions of this title, the charter, and all the rights, privileges, and franchises of such association shall be forfeited. Such violation shall, however, be determined and adjudged by a proper district court of the United States in a suit brought for that purpose by the Administrator, in his own name, before such association shall be declared dissolved.

"(c) Any association may, at any time, apply to the Administrator for its voluntary dissolution, and if, in his judgment, adequate provision shall have been made for the payment in full of all debts and obligations of

such association, he shall promptly effect such dissolution.

"(d) Upon any dissolution, whether voluntary or involuntary, the net assets of an association, remaining after payment in full of all its debts and obligations, shall escheat to the United States.

"Regulations of Administrator

"SEC. 1717. (a) The Administrator shall have power to issue general rules and procedures for the effective implementation and administration of this title, pursuant to the provisions hereof and not in conflict herewith.

"(b) The Administrator may by rules and procedures provide for such supervision of associations as he may deem necessary to the proper administration of this title and the protection of holders of bonds and notes.

"(c) The Administrator shall have full power to provide in the rules and procedures herein authorized for the reorganization, consolidation, merger, or liquidation of any association or associations, including the power to appoint a conservator or a receiver to take charge of the affairs of any such association, and to require an equitable readjustment of the assets, liability, and surplus of the same; and to release any such association from such control and permit its further operation: *Provided*, That in any case where the Administrator appoints a conservator or a receiver for any association, such conservator or receiver shall act primarily for the protection of holders of bonds and notes issued by such association.

"(d) The Administrator may delegate and authorize successive redelegation of any authority conferred upon him by or pursuant to this title, to any official or employee of the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator shall not act through, or delegate any such authority to, any other agency or any official or employee thereof.

"Criminal Provisions

"SEC. 1718. (a) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any bond, note, or other document in imitation of or purporting to be a bond or note issued by an association; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged or counterfeited bond, note, or other document purporting to be a bond or note, issued by an association, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any bond or note issued or purporting to have been issued by an association; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish as true, any falsely altered or spurious bond or note, issued or purporting to have been issued by an association, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with an association, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud an association, or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Veterans' Administration or of an association, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Veterans' Administration or an association, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any bond, note, or other obligation, or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Any veteran who makes any false statement in the affidavit required by section 1709 (c) to be furnished by him to an association in connection with his purchase of housing from such association, or in connection with any loan which he may obtain from such association, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 1719. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administrator—

"(a) for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to enable him to carry out his administrative functions under this chapter;

"(b) for the making of loans to associations pursuant to section 1710 the sum of $100,000,000 to remain available until expended. *Provided, however*, That, upon the expiration of authority to make such loans, any balance then remaining, together with all moneys from time to time thereafter received from associations in payment of such loans, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts;

"(c) such sums as may be necessary to make guarantee payments on bonds as provided in section 1712.

"Time Limitation

"SEC. 1720. The authority of the Administrator hereunder (i) to issue charters to associations, (ii) to make loans to associations, and (iii) to authorize the issuance of guaranty bonds hereunder, shall end 10 years after the termination of World War II as declared either by Presidential proclamation or by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"Chapter XVIII—Public facilities essential to veterans' housing

"Grants by Federal Works Administrator Authorized

"SEC. 1800. The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make grants to States, political subdivisions thereof, other public bodies, and to associations for the construction, repair, improvement or extension of public facilities wherever the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall find that such public facilities are necessary for or will facilitate the more effective use within the community of housing provided and to be provided for veterans under chapter XVII hereof.

"Amount of Grant

"SEC. 1801. The amount of any grant made hereunder shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, of the public facilities provided therewith.

"General Conditions of Grant

"SEC. 1802. No grant shall be made hereunder unless—

"(a) The public facilities for which such grant is made shall be determined by the Federal Works Administrator to conform to any applicable over-all State, local, or regional development plan approved by competent State, local, or regional authority; and

"(b) The public body or association to which such grant is made shall give assurance, satisfactory to the Federal Works Administrator, that (1) it will adequately maintain the public facilities for which such grant is made; (2) the assessments or other charges which would otherwise be imposed for the provision of such public facilities will be reduced by an amount equal to the grant; and (3) in the case of a public body, it will make available, for the housing for which such public facilities are provided, all other public facilities it then provides for other housing generally, and upon like terms and conditions.

"Special Conditions of Grants to Associations

"SEC. 1803. No grant shall be made hereunder to any association unless (in addition to the conditions specified in section 1802)—

"(a) the Federal Works Administrator shall determine that the type of public facilities for which such grant is made are, under applicable local law or practice, customarily provided in the first instance by real estate developers or builders; and

"(b) such association shall agree to transfer such public facilities after completion, without compensation, to an appropriate local public body, if and whenever any such local public body may be willing to dedicate such public facilities to public use and to maintain them under the conditions specified in section 1802.

"Delegation of Authority

"SEC. 1804. The Federal Works Administrator may delegate and authorize successive redelegation of any authority conferred upon him by or pursuant to this chapter to any official or employee of the Federal Works Agency.

"Appropriation Authorized

"SEC. 1805. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this chapter and for administrative expenses in connection therewith not to exceed $200,000,000 to remain available until expended."

(H. R. 4488 as reported:)

That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after section 510 thereof the following new sections:

"Veterans' Homestead Association

"SEC. 511. (a) In enacting this section to alleviate the existing housing shortage, it is the intent of the Congress to provide means of ownership and financing, within the framework of our private enterprise system and without vast expenditures of public moneys, whereby veterans themselves, associated together within their own communities, can build, buy, or rent homes upon terms which veterans can afford; and to provide the public facilities essential to such homes without the imposition of additional financial burdens upon veterans who may be owners thereof or tenants therein.

"Definitions

"(b) As used in this section, except where the context otherwise requires, the term—

"(1) 'Association' means a veterans' homestead association chartered pursuant to this act.

"(2) 'Housing' means permanent type of housing; does not include transient housing such as tourist cabins, motor courts, or apartment hotels; but may include multifamily dwellings or single-family dwellings, whether located on contiguous or scattered sites.

"(3) 'Improve' as applied to real property shall include (a) grading, landscaping, and any other site development; and (b) construction, repair, remodeling, or demolition (whether for salvage or reuse) of buildings and other structures thereon.

"(4) 'Real property' means land, whether or not improved, and any buildings or other structures thereon, including fixtures and personalty attached thereto.

"(5) 'Public facilities' includes public highways and parks, roads, streets, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, bus stations and bus stops, water storage, purification, and distribution works, sewage, garbage, and refuse collection, treatment and disposal facilities (including trunk and lateral sewers), fire stations, fire equipment, and fire plugs, street-lighting facilities, schools, community centers, and recreational facilities.

"(6) 'Veteran' means any person described under the provisions of subsection 500 (a) of this title.

"Separability

"(c) If any provision of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid the remainder of this section, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"Organization of Veterans' Homestead Associations

"(d) The Administrator is hereby authorized, subject to the provisions of this section and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the organization, incorporation, examination, operation, and regulations of associations to be known as 'veterans' homestead associations,' and to issue charters therefor in such forms as he may prescribe, and to consent to the amendment of any such charter: *Provided,* That a certified copy of all such charters shall be filed in each county where such association operates.

"Qualification for Membership

"(e) Five or more veterans of ability, good character and responsibility as determined by the Administrator, may apply for a charter hereunder. Each association shall determine its own rules of eligibility for membership therein subject only to the conditions that (1) membership shall be limited to veterans; (2) no veterans shall become or remain a member unless and until his accumulated payments to the association, in accordance with subsection (j) shall equal or exceed $100; and (3) no veteran shall become a member of an association until he has executed and filed with the Veterans' Administration an affidavit to the effect that he is not a Communist and does not belong to any subversive organization.

"Primary Purpose of Associations

"(f) Each organization shall be organized and shall operate on a nonprofit basis. It shall have as its primary purposes: (1) to acquire and improve real property to provide housing to be sold to veterans for occupancy by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents; (2) to acquire and improve and to operate and maintain real property to provide multiunits housing, including such commercial and community facilities as may be reasonably necessary or desirable to facilitate the use thereof for residential purposes, to be rented to veterans for occupancy by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents; and (3) to acquire and improve, and to operate and maintain real property to provide multiunit housing, including such commercial and community facilities as may be reasonably necessary or desirable to facilitate the use thereof for residential purposes, to be owned or held by the members of the association on a mutual or cooperative basis, to be occupied by themselves, personally, together with their families or dependents. To this end, and pursuant to rules and regulations issued by the Administrator, each association shall provide maximum opportunity and priority for the purchase or rental of such housing, first to members of such associations, and second, to nonmember veterans.

"Number of Associations

"(g) The Administrator may, in his discretion, charter one or more associations in any locality; and he may, in his discretion, refuse to charter any proposed association upon his finding that the veterans in the locality in which it is proposed that such association would operate are or will be adequately served by an association or associations then already chartered for operation in such locality.

"Powers of Veterans' Homestead Associations

"(h) Under rules and regulations issued by the Administrator, each association shall have the following powers:

"(1) Subject to the provisions and limitations of this section, to purchase, or otherwise acquire, any real property or leasehold or other interest therein, whether improved or unimproved, to subdivide, construct improvements on, repair, modernize, renovate, maintain, and operate any such property, and to purchase, or otherwise acquire, any personal property necessary or desirable for any of the foregoing.

"(2) Subject to the provisions and limitations of this section, to hold, sell, or contract for the sale of, lease, rent, mortgage, or otherwise deal with, encumber, hypothecate, or dispose of any acquired property; all on such terms and conditions as may be deemed proper and consistent with other provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That so long as any association is obligated to the Administrator on account of advances or loans made under subsection (m) hereof no association may pledge, mortgage, or otherwise create a lien upon or encumber any real property to which it holds title without the consent of the Administrator: *And provided further,* That each unit sold to or held in cooperative or mutal ownership by an eligible veteran shall be reported to the Administrator, who shall charge against such veteran's guaranty benefit the maximum amount so chargeable if a loan for the full purchase price or cost of such unit had been guaranteed or insured under this title, and shall pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent of the amount so charged to the association to be credited upon the obligation of such veteran to the association, unless such charge and such payment are required to be made otherwise to finance the purchase of such unit.

"(3) To purchase, construct, improve, or otherwise provide, to receive grants for, and to maintain and operate public facilities (which shall include for this purpose gas and electric distribution lines and facilities) reasonably necessary or desirable for the housing provided by or of the association, where such public facilities are then not otherwise available for such housing: *Provided,* That no association shall operate any mercantile establishment or other commercial enterprise, or operate any amusement enterprise.

"(4) To borrow money as may be required within the purposes and limitations of this section, and to execute notes or other obligations therefor.

"(5) To build up and maintain reasonable reserves: *Provided, however,* That such reserves shall not exceed in the aggregate 5 percent of the total obligations of such associations outstanding from time to time.

"(6) To make, adopt, repeal, and amend bylaws; to employ and to pay reasonable salaries to the employees of the association for services performed. Employees need not be veterans.

"(7) To exercise such other powers, not inconsistent with this title, as are appropriate for the conduct of the business of the association.

"(8) To require that all officers and employees of the association who handle funds of the association be bonded by an approved surety company in an adequate amount.

"Annual and Other Reports of Associations

"(i) Every association shall file, with the Administrator, not later than 45 days after the close of its fiscal year, an annual financial statement and shall also furnish to him such other financial statements, at such other times as he may require. All such reports shall be in such form and in such detail as may be prescribed by the Administrator. The Administrator shall make, annually and at such other times as he deems necessary, an examination of the financial books, records, and affairs of each association, in the manner customary for supervision of fiduciary institutions.

"Payments by Association Members

"(j) Members of an association shall not be required to pay dues. Each association shall provide in its bylaws for the payment by each prospective member of the sum of $100 to be credited on the books of the association to the credit of such persons. The sums so paid shall not bear interest. Each such sum shall be entered on the books of the association as a credit to the member making such payment for possible application either (1) as payment on a home purchased by such member from the association; or (2) as security for rent on a home rented from the association by such member. Each association shall provide further, in its bylaws, that a member may voluntarily withdraw from such association at any time and may receive back an amount equal to the amount of his payment to the association (unless such payments shall have been applied as payment on a home purchased by such member from the association or is held by the association as security for the payment of rent), but only after 1 year following the date of the initial payment and then only upon 60 days' notice to the association.

"Limitation on Cost and Amount of Housing

"(k) No association shall purchase or improve, or contract for the purchase or improvement of, or otherwise acquire or contract to acquire, any real property, unless, in the opinion of the Administrator, (1) the estimated final cost of the proposed housing (exclusive of related real property designed for commercial operation), as determined by the amounts of firm contracts for the acquisition of real property, the improvement thereof, the construction of buildings and the acquisition of related personal property plus an amount equal to 5 percent of such contracts plus an allocable share of the estimated indirect or overhead costs and expenses of the association, fairly attributable to such housing, will not exceed a sum equal to the product of the number of family units in such housing multiplied by $10,000; (2) such housing will afford living accommodations for sale or rent to veterans at prospective prices or terms favorable in comparison with any like or similar living accommodations currently available in the locality; (3) the total number of units thereby provided will not be in excess of either the number of members of such association or the number of veterans in the community who may reasonably be considered, in the opinion of the Administrator, prospective purchasers of, or tenants of such units.

"Sale or Rental of Housing or Real Property

"(l) (1) Subject to such exceptions as the Administrator may approve, all real property of an association shall be sold or leased for such prices or at such rents, as the case may be, as shall reasonably represent the actual cost thereof to the association, including (i) all costs of acquisition, construction, or improvement; (ii) interest on and amortization of obligations of the association fairly attributable to such housing; (iii) direct costs of operation and maintenance of such housing; and (iv) an allocable share of the overhead or indirect costs and expenses of the association fairly attributable to such housing, plus a reasonable contribution to the reserves to be built up and maintained under subsection (h) hereof, nor shall any sale by an association of a commercial unit, or of a dwelling unit other than the sale of a cooperative interest in a multiunit structure, be financed by an association.

"(2) Any deed or other instrument made by an association for the sale of its housing shall provide that such property shall not be conveyed or otherwise disposed of by the purchaser voluntarily within 3 years from the date of acquisition of such housing by such purchaser unless it shall first have been offered for sale back to the association at the original price paid to such association by such purchaser, less any depreciation which shall have occurred by that time and plus the fair value of any improvements which such purchaser shall have made to such property: *Provided,* That no association may use the property as security for additional loans after deed has been delivered to a

veteran, even though the association retains an interest in the property.

"(3) As a condition to every sale of housing by an association to a veteran, such veteran shall furnish to such association an affidavit stating that he has not theretofore purchased any housing from any association which has not been offered for sale back to such association and he does not own any housing acquired from any association chartered under this title.

"(4) As a condition of every sale by an association to a veteran, such association shall furnish to such veteran an affidavit stating that no other veteran has purchased the property and if the property has been repurchased from a veteran by the association, the association will guarantee the title as free and clear of encumbrances, except those to be assumed by the new purchaser.

"(5) Every lease made by an association shall contain a prohibition against subleasing without the consent of the association.

"Loans by Administrator to Associations

"(m) The Administrator is authorized in his discretion to make either short-term or long-term loans to any association, upon either a secured or unsecured basis, for any of the purposes authorized by this section for which funds may be required by such association, including initial working capital and development expenses preliminary to the commencement of actual construction of housing. Advances made on a short-term basis may be refunded on a long-term basis, or may be repaid upon such terms and condition as the Administrator may prescribe.

"(1) The interest rate charged to an association on any such borrowings shall not exceed by more than one-fourth of 1 percent per annum that rate currently payable by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(2) Any loans so made by the Administrator, except as to advances made for interim or temporary purposes, shall be repaid—

"(i) within a period of 40 years, if the proceeds of such loan are employed by the association to acquire or improve, and to operate and maintain, multiunit structures to be rented;

"(ii) within a period of 32 years, if the proceeds of such loan are employed by the association to construct or to purchase, and to operate and maintain, multiunit structures sold or held on a mutual or cooperative basis;

Provided, That cash receipts incoming to an association by reason of the sale of any other housing shall be transferred or paid to the Administrator for credit upon the obligations of the association to the Administrator. Each association to which any such loan may be made shall make, issue, and deliver to the Administrator, its note in the principal amount of such loan. Each such note shall be a nonnegotiable, unconditional obligation of the association, issued against its general credit, and payable from its general assets.

"Tax Exemptions

"(n) Notwithstanding any provisions of the Internal Revenue Code or any other law to the contrary, the net earnings of any association shall be exempted from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or other local taxing authority.

"(o) Subject to the provisions of subsection (n) hereof, no State, county, municipal, or other local taxing authority shall impose any tax upon any such association or its charter and franchise, capital, reserves, property, surplus, loans, or income, greater than that imposed by such taxing authority on other similar local nonprofit associations.

"Funds of Association

"(p) The funds of an association may, as provided by its bylaws and in accordance with rules and procedures issued by the Administrator, be deposited in any bank or banks. No association shall invest its funds in any securities except obligations of the United States of America, or obligations unconditionally guaranteed by the United States as to the payment of both principal and interest, or obligations of a State, and, in any event no such investment shall be made except with the approval of the Administrator or pursuant to rules and regulations issued by him.

"Distribution of Earnings

"(q) At the end of any fiscal year any net earnings remaining to an association, after fully providing for the payment of all debts and obligations of such association, then due, and after providing for the reserves then currently required, shall be set aside in a special account to be used (i) for the reduction by the association of its notes or other obligations then outstanding, or (ii) with the express approval of the Administrator, for any other lawful purpose of the association.

"Dissolution of Associations

"(r) (1) If the members or directors of any association shall knowingly violate, or knowingly permit any of the officers, agents, or servants of such association to violate any of the provisions of this section or of the rules or regulations issued thereunder, the charter, and all the rights, privileges, and franchises of such association shall be forfeited. Such violation shall, however, be determined and adjudged by a proper district court of the United States in a suit brought for the purpose by the Administrator, in his own name, before such association shall be declared dissolved.

"(2) Any association may, at any time, apply to the Administrator for its voluntary dissolution, and if, in his judgment, adequate provision shall have been made for the payment in full of all debts and obligations of such association, he shall promptly effect such dissolution.

"(3) Upon any dissolution, whether voluntary or involuntary, the net assets of any association, remaining after payment in full of all its debts and obligations, shall be liquidated under the supervision of the Administrator and the proceeds thereof shall be covered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(s) In any event upon the maturity of all obligations owing to the United States for the financing of properties held for rent under this section, such properties shall be transferred and conveyed to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs who shall dispose of them for the benefit of the United States and, after payment from the proceeds thereof of any other obligations of the association which it may be proper to so pay, shall cover the remaining proceeds into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(t) The power of the Administrator to issue rules and regulations for the effective implementation and administration of this section, pursuant to the provisions hereof and not in conflict herewith, shall include, but not by way of limitation, the power:

"(1) To provide for such supervision of associations as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of this section.

"(2) To provide for the reorganization, consolidation, merger, or liquidation of any association or associations.

"(3) To appoint a conservator or a receiver to take charge of the affairs of any such association, and to require an equitable readjustment of the assets, liability, and surplus of the same; and to release any such association from such control and permit its further operation: *Provided*, That in any case where the Administrator appoints a conservator or a receiver for any association, such conservator or receiver shall act primarily for the protection of the creditors of such association.

"(4) To delegate and authorize successive redelegation of any authority conferred upon him by or pursuant to this section, to any official or employee of the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator shall not act through, or delegate any such authority to, any other agency or any official or employee thereof.

"Criminal Provisions

"(u) (1) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with an association (i) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (ii) with intent to defraud an association, or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Veterans' Administration or of an association, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Veterans' Administration or an association, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any bond, note, or other obligation, or draft, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, shall be guilty of a felony and punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(2) Any veteran who willfully and knowingly makes any false statement in the affidavit required by section 511 (1) (3) to be furnished by him to an association in connection with his purchase of housing from such association shall be guilty of a felony and punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both.

"Maturity of Guaranteed or Insured Loans

"(v) Notwithstanding the 25-year limitation set forth in 500 (b) of this title, any loan made to a veteran for the purpose of purchasing a home from an association may have a maximum maturity not in excess of 32 years.

"Time Limitation

"(w) The authority of the Administrator to issue charters to associations and to make loans to associations hereunder shall expire July 25, 1957.

"Advisory Council

"(x) There is hereby authorized to be established an advisory council to aid and advise the Administrator in the execution of his duties in relation to veterans' homestead associations. The council shall consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be chairman; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency; and six representatives of the public to be appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be recognized leaders in the fields of finance, real estate, business administration, construction, labor, and housing. The members of the council shall not receive any compensation for their services on the council, but the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to provide that the members receive a reasonable per diem allowance for each day of actual service, and in addition thereto be reimbursed for their necessary traveling expenses while on the business of the council.

"Grants for Public Facilities Essential to Veterans' Housing

"SEC. 512. (a) The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make grants to States, political subdivisions thereof, other public bodies, and to associations for the construction, repair, improvement, or extension of public facilities wherever the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall find that such public facilites are necessary for, or will facilitate the more effective use within the community of housing provided and to be provided for veterans under section 511 hereof.

"Amount of Grant

"(b) The amount of any grant made hereunder shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost, as determined by the Federal Works Administrator, of the public facilities provided therewith.

"General Conditions of Grant

"(c) No grant shall be made hereunder unless—

"(1) the public facilities for which such grant is made shall be determined by the Federal Works Administrator to conform to any applicable over-all State, local, or regional development plan approved by competent State, local, or regional authority; and

"(2) the public body or association to which such grant is made shall give assurance, satisfactory to the Federal Works Administrator, that (i) it will adequately maintain the public facilities for which such grant is made; (ii) the assessments or other charges which would otherwise be imposed for the provision of such public facilites will be reduced by an amount equal to the grant; and (iii) in the case of a public body, it will make available, for the housing for which such public facilities are provided, all other public facilities it then provides for other housing generally, and upon like terms and conditions.

"Special Conditions of Grants to Associations

"(d) No grant shall be made hereunder to any association unless (in addition to the conditions specified in subsection 512 (c) hereof)—

"(1) the Federal Works Administrator shall determine that the type of public facilities for which such grant is made are, under applicable local law or practice, customarily provided in the first instance by real estate developers or builders; and

"(2) such association shall agree to transfer such public facilities after completion, without compensation, to an appropriate local public body, if and whenever any such local public body may be willing to dedicate such public facilities to public use and to maintain them under the conditions specified in subsection 512 (c) hereof.

"Delegation of Authority

"(e) The Federal Works Administrator may delegate and authorize successive redelegation of any authority conferred upon him by or pursuant to this chapter to any official or employee of the Federal Works Agency.

"Source of Funds

"(f) For the purposes of this section the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Federal Works Administrator the sum of $200,000,000 to remain available until expended in carrying out the provisions of this section and for administrative expenses incurred in connection therewith. Any part of such sum not so expended on July 25, 1957, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Investments in Lending Institutions

"SEC. 513. (a) In order to make funds directly and immediately available so that persons eligible therefor may obtain loans for the purposes of section 501 of this title, the Home Loan Bank Board is hereby authorized on behalf of the United States to make investments in shares, certificates, deposits, and accounts in (1) savings banks, (2) cooperative banks, and (3) such savings and loan associations, building and loan associations, and similar institutions as are members of a Federal home-loan bank or are insured institutions within the meaning of title IV of the National Housing Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, such investments to be upon the condition that all such funds shall be carried in a separate account and shall be used for the making of loans for an initial principal amount of $9,000 or less for the purposes specified in section 501 of this title, which are guaranteed or insured under this title. Repurchases of such investment shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by said Board, but no institution shall be required to repurchase in any one year an amount in excess of 4 percent of the total amount invested in such institutions under this section: *Provided*, That any such investment may be voluntarily repaid in whole or in part at any dividend or interest date.

"(b) In its distribution of such investments among eligible institutions the Board shall give preference to those institutions that—

"(1) are located in those areas where there exists a greater lack of capital for the making of loans under this title; and

"(2) are ready and willing within the limitations of this title to make loans to veterans for 100 percent of purchase price or cost, provided the other attributes of good lending practice are present in the individual loans.

"Farm Loans for Veterans

"SEC. 514. (a) The Federal land banks, without regard to the limitations or restrictions of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 636 and the following), and any other statutes, are authorized—

"(1) to make loans to any veterans eligible under this title for any of the real-estate purposes defined in section 502 of this title and to purchase such loans made by other lenders, provided such loans are to be or have been guaranteed or insured under this title; and

"(2) to receive and deposit in trust with the proper farm loan registrar to be held by him as collateral security for farm loan or other bonds, lien instruments securing such loans, and to issue or cause to be issued farm loan or other bonds with respect thereto.

"(b) The Farmers Home Administration, without regard to the limitations and restrictions of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong.) as now or hereafter amended save and except subsections (2) and (3) of section 44 (a) of the above-mentioned act, is authorized to make loans to any veteran eligible under this title for any of the purposes defined in section 502 of this title: *Provided*, That such loans meet the requirements of this title and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Administrator. Prior to the making of any such loan the Farmers Home Administration shall require of the veteran and receive a certificate of eligibility issued by the Veterans' Administration, and upon the completion of such loan the Farmers Home Administration shall report the loan to the Administrator who shall charge against the veterans' guaranty benefit the maximum amount chargeable if the loan had been guaranteed or insured, and shall pay to the Farmers Home Administration an amount equivalent to 4 percent of the amount so charged, to be credited upon the loan.

"Secondary Market

"SEC. 515. The Administrator is authorized to purchase, at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as 'par,' any real-estate loan guaranteed under sections 501 or 502 of this title subsequent to the effective date of this section: *Provided*, That, (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom the evidence of guaranty was originally issued; (2) the original dollar amount of loans purchased at par from any seller under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the aggregate original dollar amount of all loans eligible for purchase under this section which such seller has originated after the effective date of this section, and that not to exceed an additional 25 percent of such aggregate dollar amount shall be eligible for purchase at not to exceed 98½ percent of par; (3) not more than 50 percent of the original dollar amount of the loans originated by a lender during any calendar year shall be eligible for purchase at par, nor more than 25 percent at a discount; (4) the original amount of the loan shall not exceed $10,000; (5) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase; and (6) the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that at the option of the Administrator the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not in excess of one-half of 1 percent per annum of the unpaid balance, as may be provided in such agreement: *And provided further*, That the Administrator shall refuse to purchase any loan which in his judgment does not reflect acceptable credit and security requirements in its origination. The Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par.

"Provision of Funds

"SEC. 516. (a) For the purposes of section 511 of this title the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums, not in excess of $1,000,000,000 per annum, as may from time to time be requested by said Administrator during the 5 years next succeeding the effective date of that section.

"(b) For the purposes of section 515 of this title the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums as he shall request from time to time between the effective date of that section and the expiration of the period of time in which loans may be offered for purchase thereunder. After the last day on which the Administrator may purchase loans under that section, he shall, with due allowance for outstanding commitments cause to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, that part of all sums in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (f) of this section, and all moneys received thereafter, representing unexpended advances or the repayment or recovery of the principal of obligations purchased pursuant to section 515 of this title. Interest collected by the Administrator on such obligations in excess of the amount payable by him to the Treasurer of the United States under subsection (c) of this section, together with any miscellaneous income or credits, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said obligations. The Administrator shall have power to invest such reserves, or any unexpended part thereof, from time to time in obligations of the Government of the United States.

"(c) On advances by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsections (b) or (f) hereof, the Administrator respectively shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the advance.

"(d) For the purposes of section 513 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Home Loan Bank Board such sums, not in excess of $750,000,000 per annum, as may from time to time be requested by said board during the 5 years next succeeding the effective date of that section.

"(e) For the purposes of subsections 514 (a) and 514 (b) of this title the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums, not in excess of $100,000,000 per annum, as may from time to time

be requested by said Secretary of Agriculture during the 5 years next succeeding the effective date of those subsections. The said sum of $100,000,000 or such portion thereof as is requested by the said Secretary of Agriculture shall be allocated by him to the Federal land banks and the Farmers' Home Administration, respectively, in such amounts as he may deem appropriate to carry out most effectively the purposes of subsections 514 (a) and 514 (b) of this title. Such sums as may be available under this subsection to the Federal land banks may be borrowed by them at such rates of interest not in excess of 2¼ percent per annum, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(f) In order to make available the sums payable under subsections (a) through (e), inclusive, of this section and in subsection (f) of section 512 of this title, and to effectuate the purposes and functions authorized in sections 511 through 515, inclusive, of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended are hereby extended to include such purposes. Such sums, together with all receipts hereunder, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, in special deposits accounts, and shall be available, respectively, for disbursements for the purposes of sections 511 through 516, inclusive, of this title. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Federal Works Administrator, respectively, shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in said accounts as in their respective judgments are not needed for the purposes for which they were provided, and not later than July 25, 1957, they shall, respectively, cause to be so deposited all sums in said accounts and all moneys received thereafter in repayment of outstanding obligations, or otherwise, except so much thereof as they may respectively determine to be necessary for purposes of liquidation. Without regard to any other provisions or limitations of law, or otherwise, except the provisions of this title, said Administrator, Board, Secretary of Agriculture, or Federal Works Administrator shall, respectively, have authority to exercise any and all rights of the United States, including without limitation any and all voting rights, to take or cause to be taken such action as in their respective judgments may be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the custody, management, protection, and realization of such investments, to determine their respective necessary expenses and expenditures, and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for and audited, to make such rules, regulations, and orders as they may, respectively, deem necessary or appropriate for the carrying out of the functions hereby or hereunder vested in them respectively, and except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of their respective functions hereunder to, such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as they may respectively designate.

"Incontestability

"SEC. 517. Any evidence of guaranty or insurance issued by the Administrator shall be conclusive as to the eligibility of the loan for guaranty or insurance under the provisions of this title and as to the original amount of such guaranty or insurance, except that nothing in this section shall preclude the Administrator from establishing, as against a holder, defenses based on the fraud or material misrepresentation of such holder, and except that the Administrator shall not, by reason of anything contained in this section, be barred from establishing, under regulations in force at the date of such issuance or disbursement, whichever is the earlier, defenses to payment of any part of the guaranty or insurance.

"Section 505 (a) Terminated

"SEC. 518. No loan made to a veteran at any time subsequent to 90 days after the effective date of this section may be guaranteed by the Administrator under section 505 (a) of this title."

SEC. 2. The title of this bill is amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for veterans of World War II homes, and the public facilities necessary therefor, through veterans' homestead associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans."

SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the "Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948."

STATEMENT OF HORACE RUSSELL, ESQ., OF RUSSELL & BRIDEWELL, ATTORNEYS, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Chairman, and members of the committee, my name is Horace Russell. I am engaged in the private practice of law at 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago. I reside at Glencoe, a village north of Chicago, where I have resided for the last 10 or 11 years.

Prior to that I was for 6 years general counsel for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation from 1932 to 1938. Prior to that, I practiced law in Atlanta, Ga., and am a native of Rankin County, Miss.

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I have been very much interested in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 from the beginning, because it is the greatest home-ownership plan or program that has ever been devised, and I have studied home ownership for some 30 years in this country. I made a close study of it when the act was passed and have discussed it in many States in the Union.

Among other things, I am general counsel of the United States Savings and Loan League, and the savings and loan associations made about 90 percent of the loans under the bill for several months although in recent months the banks and insurance companies have increased their volume of lending under the bill.

There is reasonable debate on the question of whether the Government should at this time amend the bill at all in my judgment. One side of that debate is if you amend it substantially with respect to loans and provide more credit, it will push the price of building and the price of housing up more. I think that is undoubtedly correct because we have been employing all of the housing labor and all of the building material that have been available in building houses. The contention is that the more money and credit there is the more will be bid for homes and that will tend to increase the prices.

On the other hand, the veterans' organizations uniformly, I believe, have insisted upon something being done.

About $3,500,000,000 of loans were made under this bill last year. This year there will be, if you do not amend the bill, perhaps one to two billions loaned under the bill, about half of what was loaned last year.

Now, that is because when the bill was enacted mortgage institutions had large volumes of cash and Government bonds and desired greater holdings in mortgages, and they proceeded at a high rate of speed to lend money under this bill, going up to a rate of more than three billions last year.

At the moment and for the foreseeable future there is a demand from other sources of investment, including mortgage investments, for a substantial volume of these available funds at somewhat higher rates that will undoubtedly restrict lending under the bill as the bill stands now. This is, and as far as we can see in the future, substantial.

Now, coming to the draft of the bill that you have before you. I have studied it very carefully. It is a broad-gage program. It is carefully designed to take care of all the problems that have been presented in this situation.

For instance, the incontestability clause. That is one of the last sections of the bill. My clients have not been interested in it because they do not sell mortgages to any great extent, and the incontestability clause is primarily to make mortgages salable by country banks and others who sold them.

I submit to you the incontestability clause will cost the Government no appreciable sum of money and it will substantially increase the veterans' loans in certain areas.

The FHA has an incontestability clause much stronger than the one contained in this bill; when that insurance is granted it is insured, and nobody can contest it except for fraud perpetrated by the owner. This incontestability clause will expedite substantially the secondary mortgage market in which my clients have no substantial interest.

Coming back to the beginning of the bill and discussing the first four provisions of it:

First, the veterans' homestead associations. I want to point out to you ladies and gentlemen since the twenties we have had no means of financing rental housing except FHA apartment-house financing. We were building in the twenties, as all of you know, apartment houses in substantial volume. I don't have the figures before me, but it was some several hundred thousand units a year in the twenties.

We have done a great deal about farm credit and home financing, but we have done very little, and only the FHA have provisions for commercial apartment-house financing and rental-housing financing and that is not going very fast, as we all know, and it is fairly expensive.

Let me turn for a few minutes now to the veterans' homestead program for rental housing and what we have available.

In the first place, this draft will make available interim financing as well as permanent financing, and interim financing is one of the hardest problems in building a big rental-housing project.

In the second place, this will make funds available for rental housing at $3.16 a month per $1,000 for principal and interest. Therefore, a $5,000 unit in rental housing under this bill would cost only about $16 a month for principal and interest, plus taxes and insurance, which is from $20 to $25 a month and what is important is that will pay all the money back with all of the interest on the money. It is completely self-liquidating. Now, contrast that with what is in the market today for the veteran. I follow apartment house building, although my clients do not lend money generally on apartment houses, and I have studied it for many years. Look at it in Washington, Chicago, or any city, and it costs $10 a thousand per month for rental. The FHA is guaranteeing private rental apartment house loans, insuring mortgages, but those rental charges are about $10 per month per thousand. If you have a $5,000 unit the rent would have to be $50. If you build one in Chicago at $10,000, the rent is going to be somewhere near $100 per month per unit.

So, from the standpoint of rental housing, this bill will provide veterans with rental housing at a monthly rental of somewhere from $30 to $50 a month, depending upon the amount of money you spend to produce the rental housing, and I think that com-

parison is attractive, I think it is particularly attractive, when you consider that there is no subsidy in that proposal at all. The veterans who organize those associations and build those apartment houses and live in them, contract to pay all of the money back with interest to the Government, and it is a local project which they devise and develop and live in at home. It is wholly different to a: the public housing we have heard about. It is true, I don't like the idea of coming to Washington and asking for money out of the Treasury for such purposes or any other purposes, but if you want to make a complete analysis of the situation, you will find this draft provides the only means that has been suggested, that does without a subsidy, something that the veteran can carry in rental housing.

Now, let me take a paragraph on cooperative housing. First, I will say I don't think cooperative housing will work. I have studied for 20 years and tried to find the means of developing some cooperative housing, but there is many a slip betwixt the cup and lip between the development and the operation of cooperation housing, but there is a great clamor for cooperative housing.

Under this draft, the carrying charge for cooperative housing would be about $4 per month per $1,000. The rental housing is put on a 40-year basis and cooperative housing on a 32-year basis. Therefore, cooperative housing under this bill can be produced for about $35 to $55 a month per unit to live in, which includes principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and management costs.

Now again I point out that with respect to rental housing and with respect to cooperative housing this is the only proposal that takes care of the interim financing and goes up to 100 percent financing. This is the only proposal that takes it out of the hands of the speculator.

Now you ladies and gentlemen know as well as I do, perhaps not as well, because I have been in a lot of them and studied them, that the cooperative and rental housing today has always entirely been developed by the speculator and they have come out pretty well.

This is the only proposal that comes out from any source that eliminates that speculative aspect. It is true under this bill a veterans' homestead association will have to employ its architects and contractors, but the typical rental project of the past has been one some speculator developed and he came out 20 years later with a million dollars and he came out pretty well during the 20-year period.

Under this bill the veteran will get the advantage the speculator got, and I see only one objection to this and that is it calls for the money out of the United States Treasury, but it is all fully repaid, principal, and interest. It has none of the evils of Federal taxation and local taxation the original draft had. Both of those questions have been completely clarified in this draft.

Now that is all I have with respect to the veterans' homestead association, including rental houses and cooperative houses.

Under the bill the veterans' homestead association could build housing projects, that is, of individual houses and I see no serious objection to that, and that helps to solve a problem of developing project houses in the United States. Only a few contractors have undertaken it.

There has been a suggestion, I understand, to authorize these associations to go into the contracting business generally to build individual houses. Now I understand this bill to be a draft intended to do what otherwise would not be done, a draft to supply for veterans something they could not otherwise get.

I submit to you as to the project rental housing, the project cooperative housing, even the building of projects of individual housing, we are dealing with some problems that are very difficult at the moment, and the veterans probably will not be able to get that on a reasonable basis unless legislation of this type is passed.

As to the building of isolated individual houses, if you include that in the bill, you will hand to the Veterans' Administration, for administration, a problem which is wellnigh incomprehensible. This is a big act. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation repaired about 500,000 houses. I drafted that program and worked on it. It was quite an undertaking and we were up to over 20,000 employees.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Chairman, may I interrupt?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand from your statement under this bill individual private homes can be built?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, the bill provides for individual private homes in projects, according to the draft I have.

Mr. ALLEN. Could an individual private home under this bill be built on a farm?

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill does not provide for a veterans' homestead association to build except in projects of more than one house.

Mr. ALLEN. Under this bill an individual home could not be built?

Mr. RUSSELL. As now drafted the veterans' homestead association would have no power to build an individual home.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from the Veterans' Administration, Mr. King, explain that?

Mr. KING. I believe the gentleman does not have the draft which includes the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. I just want to ask the committee to indulge me for one or two questions.

Let me ask you this, and I will preface it by saying this: What we want is to get a sound, constructive program to provide housing for veterans and one which will not be socialistic or communistic, or anything of that sort, and we want it sound and predicated on a good business foundation.

Now, will this bill do that?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion it will. Of course, the money is coming out of the United States Treasury, but it is wholly self-liquidating.

Mr. ALLEN. It is true it is coming out of the Treasury, but the home-owners' loan came out of the Treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right.

Mr. ALLEN. And the money we spent for the boys to go overseas came out of the Treasury, but this is self-liquidating.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is similar to the HOLC?

Mr. ALLEN. Could I ask you this, and don't answer unless you want to.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this on the record?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, Madam Chairman.

How does this bill, from the experience and study you have given it, how does this bill compare as to soundness, etc., with the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman has asked me a question that isn't very hard for me to answer at all, but I have no words to express it, sir.

This bill promotes local enterprise and private home ownership. It does not interfere with local or Federal taxation in any way. It is self-liquidating.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is a $7,000,000,000 public-housing bill to be paid for by you and me and taxpayers for other people to live in.

Mr. ALLEN. In a nutshell, from your 30 years' experience in this work, as a practical builder and attorney and one who has had experience from Rankin County, Miss., to Chicago——

Mr. RANKIN (interposing). And Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. ALLEN. And Atlanta, Ga. I beg your pardon. Is it your belief this is a sound and economical method for the veterans to get housing?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is, sir.

Mr. ALLEN. Thank you.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I make this one explanation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have always been of the view that the Government ought to do extraordinary things, even in the field of business, when there was an emergency. I think there is an emergency with veterans' housing, and I think this encroachment in the field with Government money is justified.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose, when this bill gets to the Senate, if it does, and the Senate should adopt that amendment striking out the word "veteran" and make it apply to everybody, would you favor it then?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, sir; and for the reasons I just explained, Mr. RANKIN. I don't think everybody is confronted with the emergency the veteran is. The veteran went to war, and he lost just about enough earnings during the war to build himself a house and he came back, and I think he has a situation different from you or me. My boy was in the war 4 or 5 years, and I lost my other boy. I think the veterans have a situation different from other people and I don't think you could justify this reaching into the Treasury for the public generally, and I justify it only as far as veterans are concerned.

Mr. RANKIN. You are aware of the fact that the Senate has passed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. So, in view of the fact they have passed it, I am just wondering if they would not attempt in the Senate, and probably successfully, to amend this bill to throw it onto everybody, and if so, whether or not you think we should pass such a measure, or refuse to pass it, if that should be done?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Rankin, and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I would say this, if I were in the House of Representatives, I would certainly put it up to the Senate. I would not be willing to make any prediction about what the Senate would do. However, I would point this out to you, that if the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill becomes law, it will have the effect of the public housing group grabbing all building materials for 500,000 houses right now, materials that the veterans are trying to get, and they would store it away in some warehouse, and they won't produce a house for about 2 years and they will create with that action the greatest chaos that can be imagined in the veterans' home-building market.

Beyond that, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill purports to create a bureaucracy in Washington to control housing throughout the United States, which is wholly inconsistent with the American theory of free enterprise.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, they could grab all the materials, but they are going to give most of this to the European recovery program.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are going to grab most of it.

I want to tell you of a little experience. When we tried to get the pipe to connect 30 feet, 30 feet of pipe, I had a client that sent a truck all the way to Cicero, Ill., 300 miles away to get the pipe to connect those houses and we found out the public housing crowd had stored right in the city of Chicago enough of that kind of pipe to connect every house in Chicago.

Mr. RANKIN. You know where Goshen is, don't you?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANKIN. You can't get steel for rural power lines to build lines for farmers around Goshen because of this monopoly, and now we understand they are going to ship this steel abroad.

Mr. RUSSELL. If you pass the bill, I don't believe the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will pass the House.

Mr. Ross. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. Ross. You have made the statement you think this is a good bill for the veteran and the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

Mr. Ross. Madam Chairman, I think the gentleman should be commended, and if there is nothing else we should continue to read the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are three other brief comments I should like to make, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Ross. I don't want to take up the morning considering the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill when we are considering the Legion bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next thing in this bill is the secondary market provision.

The secondary market is recommended by the Administration and everybody else pretty nearly. Unfortunately the recommendations which have been made would not inure materially to the benefit of the veteran. This secondary mortgage market and this secondary market provision will inure specifically to the benefit of veterans. This secondary market will not take as much money as some critics say. It will only provide a backstop which enables the country banks and other lending institutions which might need their money in 25 years, to realize it.

If this is passed, the country bank will make the veteran a loan at a slight loss and it will earn that money back. This secondary market is devised to the extent that if it functions at all, it will function exclusively for veterans and it will result in the making of a great deal more veterans' loans than a secondary market will deal with.

Heretofore, when we had the secondary market we made about $4,800,000,000 worth of loans and only about 1½ percent were sold in the secondary market, and it was a looser secondary market than this. This is pretty well tied up.

The two other things I want to comment on are first, section 513, which would authorize the Home Loan Bank Board, exactly as in 1933, 1934, and 1935 to invest in savings banks and savings and loan associations for individual loans.

I would like to point out to the committee that the Government invested $275,000,000 at the bottom of the depression. It didn't cost the Government any money. In fact, the Government made money, made a handsome profit on the transaction, and substantially all of it is now paid back to the Government. There may be $5,000,000 outstanding, but there is no question but the Government profited in that operation.

This will insure availability of money for the individual housing because under this, if there is not an institution in which to invest, it is perfectly permissible to organize one.

The other point is the farm credit question. I have less knowledge of that than I have of urban home financing, but I am completely sold on that phase of it. I was born and raised on the farm in Mississippi, and I don't think we have ever in this country done quite our proper share toward the agricultural element of our population, and I think this veterans' loan program illustrates it as well as any other.

I looked at charts yesterday which indicate that about a third of the veterans who were farm boys got about 5 percent of the loans that have been made. So, I think it is fully justified to put up $100,000,000 a year for 5 years at the disposal of the Secretary of Agriculture to be employed through the land banks and the Farmers Home Administration. It seems to me to be fully justified, and with the 5-point program you have in this draft, I say to you, if you pass this legislation, it will put this veterans' loan program over.

More than 1,000,000 veterans have been financed by this program.

More than 50 percent have paid no cash at all, and they are financing the veterans at the rate of 30,000 a month. Now under this program and this draft it will insure the continuance of this program, not on a too liberal basis, but on a substantial basis of 2½ to 3 billion dollars a year against the 3½ billion dollars last year so I think the the bill is a good bill as drafted. It is entirely self-liquidating. It covers all phases of the problem, and I can say to you from my experience and observation in this field of business that this program will function.

I have said to this committee heretofore that the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 would function. It has functioned up to more than $7,000,000,000, which is the biggest mortgage operation in the history of the world up to now. It has provided the longest term loan with the lowest interest rate and the highest percentage of value ever provided, and the veterans have made good on it. The payment record is very good, and I say to you, with this legislation, it will complete the loan program under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. Ross. May I ask just one or two questions there, Madam Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. That is a very fine statement.

Mr. Ross. Even if the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill becomes law, do you feel that this bill should still be enacted?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I do think so, and I think it will be all the more important to enact this bill if that did become law, and for this reason. If this is not enacted and that is enacted it means the veterans will be paying $10 per $1,000 per month for rental housing, which means $75 to $150 a month for rental housing, and to the extent he gets financed, he will pay 5 percent for individual home financing.

Our clients are in the loan business. We can make more money under the FHA than under this bill, but I say to you, if you pass this, and don't pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, you will enable the veteran to——

Mr. HUBER (interposing). I have enjoyed your testimony immensely, but I am just wondering in your official capacity as general counsel for the United States Savings and Loan Associations, whether you are a little bit biased against the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a possibility I am a little biased. I will say ever since I was a little boy I was against taking money out of the Treasury for unnecessary public purposes.

Mr. HUBER. I recall a time too, when the business houses and banks were closed and they were coming running down to Washington.

Mr. RUSSELL. I remember that very, very well. I was practicing law in Atlanta at that time and president of the chamber of commerce. I came to Washington and helped get $5,000,000,000 out of the Government for HOLC and other agencies.

I think the Government ought to do anything in an emergency. On the other hand, I have one comment I would like to make to illustrate that.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to the fact that the depression to which the reference was made, was caused by the Federal Government, that is, the Federal Reserve Board contracting the currency below the danger point.

Mr. HUBER. I would not name anybody.

Mr. RANKIN. It was done through the Federal Reserve of which Eugene Meyer was the head.

Mr. CROW. President Roosevelt closed the banks.

Mr. HUBER. I was trying to leave politics out.

Mr. Ross. What is it Mr. HOFFMAN says, "regular order"?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on regular order?

Mr. CROW. I was going to ask Mr. Russell a question.

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. CROW. You say last year three and one-half billions were loaned under the GI bill and this year it will be between one and two. What is the cause of that? It is the shortage of money to loan under the GI bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. First, I will say the $3,500,000,000 is just my recollection and the other is my estimate. The estimate is based upon the approximate speed of the veterans' loan now. They have come down from $50,000 a month to $30,000 a month in the last 6 months and I think they are still coming down.

Mr. CROW. Under this bill we have authorized the construction of single-home units, but they will have to be financed under the old GI bill.

Will there be any money available to finance the homes built under this bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the provision that is here in this draft, if they pass this draft, including the secondary market, that you will greatly increase the availability of funds for individual veterans' loans. I can't say there will be money available for everyone who wants a loan.

I think one should consider that what you are trying to do is to supply the reasonable demand.

Mr. CROW. Do you find the veterans are trying to get rental housing or get separate houses to live in and own?

Mr. RUSSELL. The very great majority of the 15,000,000 veterans in this country dreamed of a home, a house they want to live in, and they still want it. Lots of them are going to get it eventually. More than a million have so far. The clamor for rental housing arises in the big cities and some of the extremists in the country that don't want to assume responsibility for the country, they just want to run it, and it is a small segment of the population, but I think, in justice to that small segment, some provision should be made.

Mr. CROW. You, as an attorney in Chicago in regard to these cooperative houses, have you searched any titles for people that own them?

Mr. RUSSELL. I attempted to pass on some of those titles. Most of them were cleaned out by the depression. I don't know of any that came through, so that the title was cleaned up in the foreclosure proceedings.

Mr. CROW. What title did he have?

Mr. MATHEWS. What does a person have title to when he owns an apartment on the third floor of the building? Everybody has tried to find out.

Mr. RUSSELL. In most group associations and apartments the title is vested in the corporation and the owner owns stock.

Mr. Ross. What would the owner get under this bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill is wide open as to organization. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would undoubtedly make regulations.

Mr. RAMEY. It is very seldom I have complimented witnesses because I have never been much for the Alphonse and Gaston business in the committee room.

However, I want to say you have answered questions with as much clarity as I have ever seen, and I have never known a witness who would attempt to do.

I think William James said none of us complain if we rearrange our prejudices. All of us have prejudices we seek to eliminate, which leads me to say this:

We will never get a perfect law. We have a law against murder, but folks still shoot other folks and get electrocuted.

It seems to me the best thing to do is move on and pass it out because no law will be perfect and no law will be enacted that will not be violated.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

My final word, Madam Chairman, is that the Veterans' Administration has done the best job on the administration of title 3 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 that I have ever seen, and I think they have done the best job that could ever be done.

I think you can rely upon their advice in connection with what they can do under this project.

Mr. RAMEY. And to ask a question about what the Senate will do or what someone else will do, we can never state what any other group or any other person will do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have a question?

Mr. CROW. Do you think it would help the veterans to secure loans under the GI bill if the loan guaranty were increased from $4,000 to $5,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would help with some of the big loans at the moment. The lender can loan up to $8,000 or $10,000 under the present guaranty—a 100-percent loan.

I would point out, however, even if the guaranty were increased, it is still a practical limit for veterans because you have under the law a provision to make the loan consistent with the ability of the veteran to pay. You are going to tell the lender he cannot loan 100 percent, while the real reason for that, in the great majority of cases, is that the law says he can't loan to the maximum if the payment is inconsistent with the income or anticipated income. That puts a cap on the top amount of the loan anywhere. So the increase in the amount of guaranty would not make any appreciable difference. It would in some cases where the veteran has a substantial income.

Mr. CROW. I would like also to compliment you on your fine statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. DONOHUE, have you any questions?

Mr. DONOHUE. What is the average income of the veteran in the Chicago area?

Mr. RUSSELL. I serve on several boards of directors and look at reports every week and it appears to be around $3,000 or above in the Chicago area. It is perfectly astounding to me, but that happens to be the figure. I haven't got the actual statistics with me.

Mr. DONOHUE. What would be the carrying charges to the veteran? What would be the carrying charges on a house of $10,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. $52.25 for 25 years and $60 for 20 years. You have got to add taxes. With taxes it would be $60 or $70.

Mr. DONOHUE. What is the tax rate in Chicago?

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a little above 3 percent.

Mr. DONOHUE. When you say 3 percent that would be what?

Mr. RUSSELL. $25 a month, $300 a year on $10,000.

Mr. DONOHUE. So there would be your taxes and your water rates?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DONOHUE. And your insurance.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the tax assessment is not always as high as the actual value of the house so that taxes generally are somewhat lower than that figure.

Mr. DONOHUE. Say if you assume the veteran's income was $3,000 a year, $60 a week approximately, the carrying charges on a $10,000 house would run about $80 or $85.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right, in Chicago. Now I can go in the suburban area, and as far as that is concerned where I live, I can build a house for $8,000 or $9,000, and the taxes will be much less and he can carry it from $40 to $60 a month, and many of them are doing that.

Mr. DONOHUE. What is the average cost of construction per room in the Chicago area?

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, within the city of Chicago it is pretty close to $2,000. In the suburban area it is somewhat cheaper.

Mr. DONOHUE. The further removed you become from the urban area, the less is your income?

Mr. RUSSELL. I work in town which is 21 miles away and it takes me 25 minutes to get to the office. It would cost $2,000 or $3,000 less and the cost can thereby be reduced very materially.

Mr. DONOHUE. Haven't you found the average veteran hasn't any cash payment to make?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I haven't found that. I have a client who has made over 1,000 veterans' loans and you would be surprised how many of them have voluntarily paid a substantial amount of cash and they didn't have to.

That client of mine has made hundred percent loans right straight through. The monthly payment is in a different amount. That is all.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chairman, I suggest the gentleman be permitted to submit for the record any supplemental statement he wishes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES. What is the average cost of housing in the Chicago area, veterans' homes?

Mr. RUSSELL. Within the city of Chicago the average cost is probably $11,000 or $12,000.

Mr. JONES. Are you familiar with the development near Evanston?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. I happen to have a daughter that lives there.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. What is the average cost of that development?

Mr. RUSSELL. In Evanston?

Mr. JONES. About 15 miles from Evanston.

Mr. RUSSELL. I don't know which project you have reference to. I live the fourth village beyond, Glencoe, but when you get into the village which adjoins Evanston there are plenty of veterans' houses being built around $9,000 or $10,000 and there are a great many being built at $20,000.

Mr. JONES. I was only interested in veterans' housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Most of the veterans' housing west or northwest of Evanston is being built from $9,000 to $15,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

Mr. MATHEWS. May I also thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell, I will be glad to have the hearings printed and it is my intention to send every Member of Congress a copy of this particular part of the testimony.

We thank you for your valuable contribution and are extremely grateful.

Are you likely to be in Washington again at any time in the near future?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We may get in touch with you again.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be glad to respond.

(Whereupon, at 11:10 a. m., the committee proceeded further in executive session, at the conclusion of which the committee adjourned.)

How To Write Your Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, May 4), 1948

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. It is an extremely good article and I think should have wide distribution, which I hope it will get.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WRITE YOUR SENATOR

(By Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Republican, of Connecticut)

Perhaps the best way to tell you how to write your Congressman is to describe the various types of communications which we receive and to show the relative values we place upon them.

There is on my desk, as I write, a stack of several hundred mimeographed post cards. They are exactly alike, except for the signatures—and some of those appear to be in suspiciously similar handwriting. The particular subject with which these cards deal doesn't matter here; the fact is that I can be fairly sure that these cards were not individually initiated and are perhaps a primitive form of pressure politics.

We also receive a number of mimeographed letters, again exactly similar except for signature. The difference between these and the post cards just mentioned is that our office staffs must spend more time in opening and processing them. Such form letters are a source of very little help because we never know whether the writer believes or understands the form he has signed or completed.

Telegrams concerning legislation are not very effective. They are usually so brief that they contain merely a statement of opposition or support, with no attendant reasons. The other day I received about 500 telegrams within a few hours. I am sure that the matter which they dealt with was in the interest of the 500 senders, but the wording was so similar that I again felt the wires were not individually initiated.

Effective letters are those which are individual expressions of opinion; the less formal, the less dogmatic, the less stereotyped, the better. An individual writing to his Representative in the Congress should avoid doing certain things. For example, if someone writes me simply that he favors rent control, the letter cannot have great weight, since the writer gives no reasons or personal experiences. If, on the other hand, he describes fully and completely what would happen in his personal case if rent controls were relaxed, I can get a clear and useful picture of the problems involved.

The fact that a very high percentage of the messages coming into the office of a Congressman or a Senator merely say, in effect, "I am opposed to this," or "I favor that," is most unfortunate. The legislator himself cannot take one or another side of an issue without giving his reasons, and when he receives a communication which gives only an opinion and no reasons, his inclination is to grant it less consideration.

Another point that I believe should be taken into account when anyone writes his Senator or Congressman is the point of objectivity. Obviously, a representative of the people is not expected—nor does he usually seek—to represent any one segment of society. Consequently he is far more likely to pay serious attention to letters that indicate the writer is aware of the rights and beliefs of other people, that the move he suggests is best for the general welfare. An objective letter is especially valuable now when so many powerful pressure groups are organized to persuade Congress to serve their own ends.

A type of letter which I believe serves no purpose—except perhaps a negative one—is the "threat" letter. This demands certain action and says the writer will not vote for the representative unless he votes for or against a certain bill. As a matter of fact, I believe most Senators and Congressmen are likely to react entirely the opposite from the way the writer would like them to react

in most cases. Also, since the Congressman feels the writer of such a letter is likely to be some one who has never voted for him anyway, the loss of that vote will not be anything new.

If, in writing to Congressmen, our people would think of them as human, sincere, and seeking information in order to serve their constituencies best, they would serve their own purposes better. Facts and personal experience speak far more loudly than any unreasoned advocacies. The average Congressman is usually seeking the real opinions of his constituents if for no more realistic reason than that he needs to reflect those opinions accurately to be reelected. He is not usually swayed by pressure campaigns but he is influenced by—and welcomes—honest objective opinions—particularly when they give him an insight into the personal experiences and problems of his constituents.

Smith College Republican Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the results of a mock Republican convention conducted at Smith College, Northampton, Mass., on May 4, 1948, at which time I had the honor to preside as permanent chairman, and my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, ROBERT J. CORBETT, gave the keynote address.

The gathering was particularly striking because of the exuberance and honest enthusiasm of the young ladies, who very seriously considered the political foundation of our party, and in convention assembled, nominated Harold E. Stassen as candidate for President, and the Honorable Earl Warren, of California, as the candidate for Vice President. During the convention proceedings a platform was adopted virtually without dissent, which I desire to have placed in the RECORD, to demonstrate the objectives which are sought by the young people who subscribe to the Republican faith.

I believe that I may state without equivocation that my colleague, ROBERT CORBETT, and myself were both pleased and edified by the grand manner in which the Smith College students conducted themselves at this, their first mock National Republican Convention.

SMITH COLLEGE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

As we meet to consider the problems of government and our people, we are aware that the world is far from the peace for which we fought a war. In many countries men's lives are in constant danger from starvation from war, or from political tyranny. We feel we must do our utmost to secure peace by strengthening international government, helping starving nations to rebuild their economies, and bringing to a halt the political and military aggression of Soviet Russia.

Mindful of this solemn hour and humbly conscious of our heavy responsibilities, the Republican Party in convention assembled presents herewith its principles and makes these covenants with the people of our Nation.

1. United Nations: As a means toward furthering a lasting peace, we favor the revision of the charter of the United Nations by eliminating the single-power veto and establishing an effective international police force. To this strengthened United Nations we would give the power to inspect and control atomic energy on a world-wide basis.

2. European recovery program: We support the Marshall-Vandenberg plan and pledge that aid will be given to any qualified nation deserving it that is not communistic in nature nor Communist dominated. The administration of this program must be continued on a sound and business-like basis. We also favor aid for China under a similar program.

3. Military preparedness: In this time of crisis America must remain strong. Selective Service, Universal Military Training, a well-trained air force, and the continuation of a research program are vital to our security.

4. Russia: As Russia is now threatening the peace of the world by aggression, we condemn the shipment to that country of heavy machinery and any materials that could be used for war. Moreover, the infiltration of Communists into the United States must be stopped.

5. Palestine: We favor the partition of Palestine to give a home to the millions of Jewish people driven from their native lands by tyranny. Such a decision would be enforced by an international police force.

6. Tariff: A high protective tariff is a threat to peace; our tariff should be lowered and reciprocal trade agreements extended.

7. Domestic policy: We pledge ourselves to the protection and extension of civil liberties at home through a constitutional amendment prohibiting the poll tax as a condition for voting in Federal elections, Federal legislation against lynching, the establishment of a permanent fair employment practices commission, and the removal of Government ownership in competition with private industry.

We wish also to alleviate poverty in America and pledge our support to:

(1) Extension of existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered, and

(2) stimulation of Federal and State plans to make medical and hospital service available to those in need without disturbing doctor-patient relationships or socializing medicine.

8. Agriculture: Abundant agricultural production is essential to our economy. For the establishment of a strong and helpful program, we propose:

(1) the assurance to the farmer of a market price that is fair and equitable in comparison with labor, business, and industry by means of support prices and commodity loans, but not by subsidies.

(2) consolidation of all government farm credit under a nonpartisan board.

(3) support of the principle of farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives.

(4) a comprehensive program of soil, forest, water, and wildlife conservation and development, and sound irrigation projects, administered as far as possible on State and regional levels.

9. Labor: In order to maintain a fair balance between management and organized labor, we unreservedly support the Taft-Hartley law, but will work for the repeal of the clause pertaining to the non-Communist affidavits.

10. Business: Small business, as the basis of American enterprise, must be preserved and aided by changes in taxation, by eliminating excessive and repressive regulation and government competition, by the enforcement of laws against monopoly and unfair competition, and by providing simpler and cheaper methods for obtaining venture capital necessary for growth and expansion.

11. Taxation and finance: We shall eliminate from the budget all wasteful and unnecessary expenditures and exercise the most rigid economy. The national debt must be reduced and the tax program coordinated more closely with the Federal budget. We will reduce immediately the rates of taxation on individual incomes, on corporations, and on consummation as far as is consistent with the payment of normal expenditures of Government in this postwar period.

12. Good faith: The acceptance of the nominations made by this convention carries with it, as a matter of private honor and public faith, an undertaking by each candidate to be true to the principles and program herein set forth.

CONCLUSION

The essential question at trial in this Nation and throughout the world today is whether men can organize together in a highly industrialized society, succeed, and still be free We must and can prove that the American idea of democracy and free enterprise by private enterprise is a structurally strong and stable government and, to quote from the founder of our great party, "that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Protection and Support of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I desire to include a tribute to the Small Business Committee of the House whose work and activities on behalf of small business are quite properly drawing commendations from all sections of the country.

In a recent item appearing in our press, the National Federation of Small Business had this to say of the help and support to small business given by the Small Business Committee. In a letter to Chairman PLOESER, the director of the Washington office of the NFSB, Mr. George J. Burger, stated:

The small business institutions of this Nation are looking more today to the Small Business Committees of the Congress for rightful help than ever before, and a further encouraging indication is that small businessmen of this Nation now realize what it means to them to have small business committees functioning in the Congress in their behalf.

The full press item follows:

An overwhelming majority of members of the National Federation of Small Business went on record today favoring a $25,000 tax exemption on corporate income. A bill (H. R. 5818) that would grant such an exemption was introduced recently in the House of Representatives by Congressman WALTER C. PLOESER, Republican of Missouri, chairman of the House Small Business Committee.

The federation which has more business and professional men as members than any similar organization in the Nation was polled on the Ploeser bill. Returns from 122,000 showed 85 percent for the bill with 13 percent against, and 2 percent not voting.

As the result of the sentiment expressed by the membership, C. Wilson Harder, president of the federation said, "We stand ready to assist in every way to have this legislation acted on favorably by the Congress."

He told Mr. PLOESER: "Small independent business is now, more than ever before, looking to your committee and to Congress for some sign of hope in the present desperate plight of small business."

In notifying Congressman PLOESER of the results of the poll, George J. Burger, director of the Washington office of the federation, wrote: "The small business institutions of this Nation are looking more today to the small-business committees of the Congress for rightful help than ever before, and a further encouraging indication is that small-business men of this Nation now realize what it means to them to have active small-business committees functioning in the Congress in their behalf."

Mr. Burger further hailed the antimonopoly activities of the committee, saying they constituted "constructive moves" which will "eventually go a long way in preserving the life of small business of this Nation."

The federation's survey came on the heels of a similar survey made by the committee to the Nation's bankers. More than 85 percent of the replies favored the tax-exemption bill.

Dean Everett Fraser, Law School, University of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, Dean Everett Fraser, one of the Nation's outstanding educators and a nationally recognized authority on the law of property, is retiring as Dean of the Law School of the University of the State of Minnesota.

He will be hard to replace. He was a competent administrator and teacher. It has been said that the whole art of teaching is only the art of awakening the natural curiosity of young minds for the purpose of satisfying it afterwards. Certainly this is true in the field of law and this art was possessed by Dean Fraser in great quantity. His own lectures on property were masterpieces of lucidity in which his clarity of expression served to establish a high standard for his students to attempt to equal in the subsequent practice of their profession. In a field that some believe to be filled with doubts and uncertainties he weighed the conflicting views and presented the law with a finality that was almost mathematical. I sympathize with future students who will be denied the benefit of associating with his clear logical mind.

An editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Star on April 29 states:

DEAN FRASER RETIRES

Eighteen years ago Everett Fraser became Dean of the University of Minnesota's school of law. In that time the stature of the school has risen until now, as he retires, it is perhaps one of the two top law schools in the entire Midwest.

Not only has he been able to attract and keep well-qualified people at the university's law school, but he has been a great teacher in his own right. And in addition to his duties as dean he continued to teach at least one law course. With apparently effortless ease and order he spelled out the problems of law clearly and logically for all those who came to hear him.

We got Dean Fraser from Canada by way of the Harvard Law School. Rarely have our neighbors to the north done better by us.

Dean Fraser was born at North Lake, Prince Edward Island, Canada, on August 24, 1879, the son of Robert and Elizabeth Stuart Fraser. He attended Prince of Wales College, Prince Edward Island; Dalhousie College, Halifax, Nova Scotia; and received his LL. B. from the Harvard University Law School in 1910. He served as assistant professor of law, 1910–13; professor of law and dean of the law school, 1914–17, at George Washington University; and professor of law, 1917–48, and dean of the law school, 1920–48, at the University of Minnesota. He was reporter on Torts for the American Law Institute and is the author of many books and articles on the law of property.

Mr. Speaker, our colleges have many fine, competent educators who have a talent for teaching, but I never saw one whose abilities in this direction exceeded those possessed by Dean Fraser. He has made a real contribution to legal education in America.

The U. S. A. and the UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

THE U. S. A. AND THE UN

In opposing projects now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee for drastic reorganization of the United Nations, "with or without Russia," Secretary Marshall puts his finger on the fundamental problem confronting the world. That problem, he says, is not the creation of new machinery which would merely wreck the United Nations, but rather the removal from the minds of the Soviet leaders of certain "misconceptions" which now prevent the effective functioning of any kind of peace machinery.

In taking this stand Mr. Marshall agrees with Foreign Secretary Bevin, who told the House of Commons that the main reason preventing agreement with Russia is its demand that every settlement must be designed to further Communist objectives. But Mr. Marshall is more specific. He lists the Soviet "misconceptions" to be: First, that different systems cannot live side by side in peace, and, second, that domination of the world by a single system is inevitable. But these two "misconceptions" are part of the fundamental Communist dogma which is the guiding star of Soviet foreign policy.

That dogma is the work of Lenin, who declared it to be inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist side by side with imperialist states. It was endorsed by Stalin, who as early as February 9, 1946, changed the wartime party line of cooperation with the west and urged the Soviet Union to prepare for wars that were inevitable as long as capitalism exists. The same theme is hammered home daily in all the Soviet propaganda. It found its climax in Molotov's pronunciamento last November that capitalism has become a hindrance to progress, that it is approaching destruction, and that we live in an age when all roads lead to communism.

This domga, deriving straight from Marx, is a product of the same mistake that led Hitler to disaster—the mistake, namely, of believing that western democracy is decadent and moribund, and that one good push, or a series of pushes, will give it the coup de grâce and justify the Marxist faith in the inevitability of the Communist triumph. As long as the Soviet leaders follow this line, a durable agreement with them is impossible. The question, then, is how to disabuse their minds of their mistake.

The proponents of revision would do this by strengthening the United Nations to enforce "world law," by abolishing the veto in the organization of resistance to aggression, and by organizing a world police force based on an abstract quota system irrespective of any strategic considerations. Since nobody expects Russia to agree to this, the exclusion of Russia and its satellites is accepted as a foregone conclusion. But that is the counsel of despair. For quite aside from the fact that the United States itself would not surrender its own veto in matters of war or peace, these plans propose, in effect, that the United States and all democracies secede from the present United Nations and form another partial organization operating in the same international climate. Such an organization, as Mr. Marshall points out, would destroy the last world forum for continuing talks with Russia.

In contrast, Mr. Marshall adheres to the policy he is pursuing—the policy of strengthening the United Nations without destroying it, and invoking its authority wherever possible, while at the same time using both the reserve powers of the Charter and the power of the United States itself to promote international peace and security and to restore a healthy political and economic life. That policy expresses itself in the proposals to curb the veto, in the creation of the little assembly, in the Truman doctrine, the foreign-aid program, and in the support of regional organizations under the Charter, such as the Organization of American States and the West European Union.

The aim of this policy is to restore an international equilibrium, or balance of power, which will dispel the Soviet misconceptions about the weakness of the west and bring the Soviet leaders to "a more realistic view of what is possible and what is impossible in the relationship between the Soviet Union and the world at large." In other words, it is a policy designed to bring the Soviet leaders to an appreciation of the maxim followed even by a man of blood and iron like Bismarck—the maxim, namely, that "politics is the art of the possible"—and thereby arrive at a modus vivendi which will permit both systems to live. On the success of that effort hangs the hope of peace.

Hearings on Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of May 2, 1948:

A HIGH-HANDED DECISION

There is nothing to justify the decision of the House Ways and Means Committee to bar the press and public from the hearings scheduled to begin tomorrow on legislation for a 3-year renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. As if to add insult to injury, moreover, the decision would arbitrarily limit the hearings to 6 days and allow no one to testify except a small group of witnesses described as technical experts. Not in a long time has a congressional body shown less regard for public opinion or for the traditional American procedures followed in important matters of this sort.

The 14-year old reciprocal trade program is an integral element of our foreign policy because it serves as a key economic counterpart to the political aspects of that policy. Despite polls showing overwhelming popular support for it, however, there are those who are disposed to kill it off or nullify it with crippling amendments. Among them is Representative GEARHART, chairman of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee in charge of the legislation. If he had his way, little would be done to extend the life of the enterprise beyond June 12, the date when it must begin to fall apart unless Congress takes action in the meantime to renew it.

In view of his hostility, therefore, Mr. GEARHART hardly makes a good case for the secret hearings when he defends them on the ground that "I can't see that any useful purpose would be served by listening to spokesmen for a bunch of ladies' sewing societies reading statements on the legislation by the State Department." That is a frivolous and unwarranted belittlement of the patriotic concern of numerous private groups for the continuation of reciprocal trade. Beyond that, it is a decidedly poor justification for star-chamber proceedings. The House Ways and Means Committee ought to get down off its high horse and remember that this is America.

The High-Tariff Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Edson:

THE HIGH-TARIFF LOBBY

(By Peter Edson)

A House Ways and Means Subcommittee under the Honorable BERTRAND W. GEARHART, of Fresno, Calif., is this week holding secret hearings. Press and public are barred. The subject is extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

As a matter of fact, the so-called executive session hearings aren't so very secret after all. The bill's opponents have oiled up their duplicating machines and are grinding out copies of their statements.

This opposition is worth inspecting in a morning line-up. It's made up of what's left of the once powerful high-tariff lobby.

Expert witnesses whom the committee will hear in opposition include:

1. Matthew Woll, president, Wage Earners Protective Association. This is a high-tariff pressure group organized in 1928. It takes in about a dozen AFL unions that have been sold on the idea that low tariffs threaten their jobs. They are the painters, paperhangers, bookbinders, wire-weavers, operating engineers, photoengravers, pottery, glass, hat, cap, and millinery workers.

Incidentally, AFL President Bill Green and CIO President Phil Murray are for the reciprocal-trade-agreements program and will testify against Woll.

2. Albert Goss, grand master of the National Grange. Spokesman for other rural groups, the Farm Bureau Federation and National Farmers Union, will testify for the bill.

3. H. Wickliffe Rose, president, National Tariff League.

4. Dr. John Lee Coulter, consulting economist for the tariff league. Rose and Coulter are the two top high tariff lobbyists.

5. Dr. Claudius T. Murchison, Washington representative for the Cotton Textile Institute.

6. Arthur Besse of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers. He is regarded as the most vocal of Trade Agreements Act opponents. Both Murchison and Besse represent mill owners who fear the competition of low-priced foreign textiles.

7. Dr. Robert F. Martin of the Vitrified China Association, which wants to keep out foreign-made dishes, glass, crockery, and pottery.

8. Prof. R. F. Adams, California University economist.

9. Albert McC. Barnes, New York customs lawyer.

Goss is the only one of this group registered as a lobbyist, according to the January statements filed under the Congressional Reorganization Act. But this is all the real opposition there is left to the Hull program.

Curiously enough, the Communists are just as much opposed to the trade-agreements program as are the high-tariff Republicans. One Dr. Varga, a leading Russian economist, has in recent articles in the Moscow New Times attacked United States trade agreements as a device by which America can get a strangle hold on the economic life of countries making such treaties. Varga calls trade agreements more Yankee imperialism. So, for entirely different reasons, the tariff lobby and the Commies seem to be in bed together on this one.

Statement of the World Peace and Brotherhood Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include the brief statement of the World Peace and Brotherhood Mission which visited the Capital this week. I think that their suggestion of a positive peacebuilding program is one which the Congress should keep forever in mind.

STATEMENT OF THE WORLD PEACE AND BROTHERHOOD MISSION

Our mission includes 83 men and women, young and old, from city and rural areas of 14 States and from 12 Christian denominations and 8 other organizations. As Christians, representing more than 100,000 others, we bring to you our concern relative to the world situation.

We are a spiritual mission bearing witness to our deep Christian conviction that in this serious and difficult hour we must, as a Nation, confessing our sins, turn and walk in the ways of peace as taught by Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. The evidence of history confirms this conviction that there is no other way.

We propose two courses of action:

I. Reverse the movement toward war and the militarization of our country by the following means:

A. Cease war propaganda.

B. Restore true civilian control in the Government.

C. Take the profits out of war.

D. Defeat such war-provoking measures as: Universal military training, selective service, or any other form of conscription or compulsory military service.

E. Defeat the 70-group air force bill.

F. Discontinue building of atomic bombs and dismantle the present stock pile.

G. Defeat any bill to give military aid to European countries.

H. Disarm unilaterally.

II. Plan and implement a positive peacebuilding program, with willingness to spend as much for peace as we have for war:

A. Strengthen the United Nations by full and democratic participation:

1. Pass bill providing a $65,000,000 loan for erection of permanent United Nations buildings.

2. Join World Health Organization and International Relief Organization.

3. Increase financial and moral support of United Nations and its agencies.

4. Use United Nations for all agreements between nations.

5. Work to expand United Nations into full world government.

6. Work for international disarmament and abolition of conscription.

B. Create a Department of Peace, with full Cabinet status, to work continuously in developing means of creating and maintaining peace in the world.

C. Solve our own internal problems—economic, social, cultural, educational, racial, and moral.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

PERSONNEL OF PEACE MISSION

California

1. S. L. Barnhart, Empire, minister.
2. James Brecheisen, 3371 Nineteenth Street, San Francisco, minister.
3. George Burcham, route 8, box 1059, Modesto, minister.
4. John I. Coffman, box 595, McFarland, minister.
5. Albert Crites, Live Oak, local brethren service worker.
6. D. H. Fouts, Waterford, farmer.
7. Raymond A. Graber, 2357 Modesto Avenue, Oakland, minister.
8. Herbert W. Hogan, La Verne, history instructor, La Verne College.
9. Mrs. Ruth Hogan, La Verne, housewife.
10. Andrew Juvinall, 306 East Clay Street, Stockton, minister.
11. Paul S. Longenecker, route 2, box 738, Lindsay, minister.
12. Ed Lander, 616 North Pacific, Glendale, minister.
13. Glen I. McCune, 327 A Street, Bakersfield, minister.
14. Willard McDaniel, Chowchilla, minister.
15. Bob McInnes, 2042 Forty-sixth Street, San Francisco, student.
16. Dr. W. O. Mendenhall, 550 East Hadley, Whittier, former president of Whittier College.
17. Esther Meyers, 2051 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland, supervising teacher of weekday religious education for Oakland Council of Churches.
18. W. H. Meyers, route 6, box 328, Fresno, rancher.

19. John H. Price, 1335 Los Robles, Del Paso Heights, minister.
20. Mrs. Sara Ramsey, Alpine, minister.
21. Martha Rupel, 1623 East Vila Street, Pasadena, relief worker for Brethren Service Commission.
22. David Studebaker, 1746 Thirty-fourth Avenue, San Francisco, minister.
23. Paul B. Studebaker, 105 Sierra Drive, Modesto, minister.
24. Mrs. Carolyn B. Threlkeid, 170 Tamalpais Road, representing F. O. R. and WILPF.
25. Lee Whipple, 612 East Street, Marysville, minister.
26. John E. Jones, 5525 Turner, Fresno, school teacher.

Idaho

1. F. H. Barr, Eleventh Avenue, Nampa, minister.
2. Merlin Clark, route 1, Meridian, minister.
3. J. Allen Dunbar, Greenleaf, teacher, merchant.
4. Robert Holloway, 1735 Fifty-fourth Avenue East, Twin Falls; high-school student.

Oregon

1. Noah Cosner, Broadbent, farmer.
2. Mabel Downs, 1428 Northeast Stanton Street, Portland, high-school teacher.
3. Fern S. Sage, 8000 Southwest Fifty-fourth Avenue, Portland, president Washington Council of Church Women.
4. Kelsey E. Hinshaw, 800 E Street, Newburgh, minister.
5. LeRoy Lapp, route 2, box 596B, Grants Pass, representing young people's department.
6. Albert D. Leinbach, 3813, Southeast Gladstone, Portland, veteran, student.
7. Esther V. Leinbach, 3813 Southeast Gladstone, Portland, student.
8. Alice B. Plympton, 360 North Twenty-first Street, Corvalis, retired teacher.

Washington

1. Elmer E. Beckman, 308 Northeast Everett, Camas, minister.
2. Clement Bontrager, route 3, box 244A, Kent, minister.
3. Mr. and Mrs. Roy F. Everett, 4029 University Way, Seattle.
4. Thelma Gordon, Fifth and Seneca, Seattle, minister.
5. Ray C. Roberts, 4029 University Way, Seattle, businessman.
6. Leojard W. Holden, 114 North E Street, Tacoma, teacher and counselor.
7. Robert B. Shaw, box 144, Bathwell, minister.
8. Fred Shorter, 3208 Franklin, Seattle, minister.

Ohio

1. Glenn H. Bowlby, 1131 Hoover Place NW., Canton, minister.
2. Virgil Cassel, 820 Wayne Avenue, Greenville, insurance agent.
3. Newton D. Cosner, 813 Coburn Street, Akron, minister.
4. W. Fyock, 2146 South Union Avenue, Alliance, minister.

Indiana

1. Galen Bowman, New Paris, minister.
2. Mrs. Lura A. Hoover, route 5, Goshen, housewife.
3. Paul E. McBride, route 1, Lakeville, youth worker.
4. Ralph Petry, Goshen, minister.
5. M. Sherman Pressler, Coldwater road, Fort Wayne, religious worker.

Illinois

1. B. Wayne Crist, 406 South Congress Street, Polo, minister.
2. Ruth Early, 22 South State Street, Elgin, secretary.
3. Julian Griggs, 22 South State Street, Elgin, peace worker.
4. Alvin F. Klotz, Milledgeville, minister.
5. Raymond Laury, 608 South Ashland Avenue, Chicago, minister.
6. Arthur Litwiller, Milledgeville, hardware dealer.
7. Clifford Paul, Lanark, minister.

Iowa

1. W. H. Brower, South English, minister.
2. Dr. U. H. Hoefle, 213 East Third Street, Vinton, chiropractor.
3. Virgil I. Marshall, Adel, Sunday-school superintendent.
4. Paul E. Miller, Adel, minister.

Kansas

1. Paul K. Brandt, Quinter, minister.
2. Lester Hostetler, North Newton, minister.
3. Mrs. Anna Michener, 1829 University Avenue, Wichita, housewife.

Missouri

1. Lee Kendall, Norborne, minister.
2. Ralph Loomis, Box 149, Columbia, minister.

North Dakota

1. Edward C. Zook, Cando, minister.

New Mexico

1. H. M. Coppock, Miami, minister.
2. Lawrence E. Lehman, Clovis, minister.

Nebraska

1. Foster Myers, Carleton, minister.

Michigan

1. J. Perry Prather, 7178 Seyburn, Detroit 14, minister.

New York

1. Ann Heckman, New York University, New York, student.

Washington, D. C.

1. Barbara Huston, 941 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C., housewife.

Shades of Pinkerton—Taft-Hartley Act Takes United States Back to Government by Injunction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in an obvious attempt of Armour & Co. to break the morale of the membership of organized labor we are seeing day by day how the operations of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act tramples the rights of labor and turns back the clock to the days of government by injunction and hired strikebreakers. It seems the company is far more interested in breaking the union than it is in arriving at any just settlement of the present strike.

To date all efforts of Federal conciliators to resolve differences have failed, while the company resorts to all sorts of methods in an effort to shake the morale of the union members. If Armour & Co. would put as much energy into collective bargaining in good faith I am confident the strike could be quickly settled to the mutual satisfaction of all parties.

In this connection, I herewith include with my remarks an account of the strike as it is given in an article appearing in the May issue of the Labor News Review, East St. Louis, Ill.:

SHUT-DOWN 100 PERCENT EFFECTIVE AT ARMOUR'S PLANT

Armour & Co., locally, has decided that when it is impossible to break our members' morale through phony telegrams, letters, telephone calls, threats of seniority loss, and personal visits from foremen, salesmen, and other supervisory forces, that the NAM-sponsored Taft-Hartley Act is the logical weapon to use. That act has nullified the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction act, and permits wholesale use of the old union-breaking stunt by injunction.

Armour & Co. has resorted directly or indirectly to this ancient unfair labor practice four times during the long strike of the CIO Packinghouse Workers' strike. Local Union No. 42, whose 1,800 members are employed by Armour & Co., have valiantly resisted all of the attacks, whether obvious or the other kind, by innuendo, whispering, slimy underground methods in their bitter, hard-boiled attempt to crush the wills of our people, who only ask a fair decent living wage, not one which reflects the cost of living, arrived at by the dubious figures supplied by Bureau of Labor Statistics, which can never tell the story of the packinghouse workers' life, at a $1.12 per hour average wage.

Men workers get $1.02 for common labor, and women workers classed as unskilled get 91½ cents, but the bug in the ointment is that 40 percent of our members receive the lower rate and yet work less than 40 hours per week, ofttimes 36, 37, or 38 hours per week. Layoffs are very frequent in this business. Armour first obtained an injunction against the East St. Louis Junction Railroad to force them to give service. Then the railroad obtained an injunction against local 42, its officers and members to drive our pickets from the Armour railroad gates and to establish picket line 250 feet from said gates.

The rail crews still would not cross the picket line, and then Armour asked for an injunction against the East St. Louis Junction Railroad in Judge Wham's Federal court. The railroad men resumed service through one gate and only giving daylight service. The death of Judge Wham's wife and this service resulted in no injunction being issued. Now, after Armour announced to the whole Nation by radio and press that negotiations would not be resumed and their plants would be opened Monday, April 19, fooling terribly farmers, workers, and consumers, they seek a sweeping injunction to drive our pickets from National Stock Yards, Ill., and ask that we be limited to four pickets for the whole plant.

Shades of Pinkerton, and the thugs of other days! How the policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt have been trampled by the nefarious NAM Taft-Hartley Act. Government by injunction. Arouse, you who toil, and smite the framers of this abomination. Crush the enemies of labor under your weight of votes. Resist with all your might. Register. Vote. Lest organized labor perish before this avalanche of American fascism.

Public Found Leaning to United States of World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Elmo Roper which appeared

in the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1948.

WHAT PEOPLE ARE THINKING

(By Elmo Roper)

PUBLIC FOUND LEANING TO UNITED STATES OF WORLD

What has appeared to many in recent months like an inevitable clash between East and West, today holds a promise of a kind of peace; the peoples of western Europe seem to be choosing the side of democracy in the political struggle with communism. But that peace hangs on a thin thread. We are still in the critical period, and many basic decisions for peace remain to be made.

A recent survey of the American people conducted for Time magazine brought into sharp focus the nature of the decisions we have to make.

Before the competition between Russia and America took on overtones of possible armed conflict, most of us were satisfied to let whatever differences there were between us be worked out over the conference table at the United Nations. The American people have not given up hope that the UN can be made to work at some point in the future. They do not want it disbanded. But they are not now abundantly optimistic about the chances that the UN alone can keep the peace. Time asked a cross section of the American people:

Have you happened to read or hear about an organization called UN, or the United Nations?

	Total percent
Have heard or read about it	89.3
Have not heard or read about it	10.7

The 89.3 percent who had heard of the UN were then asked: "From what you know of the United Nations so far, do you think it has a good chance, only a fair chance, or a poor chance of being able to maintain the peace?"

	Total percent
Good chance	18.6
Fair chance	41.0
Poor chance	22.0
Undecided about chances	7.7

The prevailing estimate is that the UN has only a fair chance to keep the peace. People do not want to write off the United Nations. But implicit in their answer is the feeling that other measures in addition to working within the UN are necessary if war is to be avoided.

The belief that the UN has no better than a fair chance to succeed should not be taken, however, as an indictment of United States participation in a world organization. Far from it—although there is a temptation on the part of some supernationalistic people today to try to laugh off international cooperation. These people usually say that we should rely on our military and economic strength alone. Time asked: "If there were no United Nations and we relied solely on ourselves, backed up by the atomic bomb, do you think we would have a better chance for peace than we now have or not?"

	Total percent
Better chance	16.5
Poorer chance	67.0
Express no opinion	16.5

By a margin of 4 to 1 the public rejects the notion that peace can be secured by reliance on military strength alone. This decisive majority should serve as a warning from the people that they will not accept strong defenses as a substitute for world organization. It is true they want strong defenses now, but it is likely that the people look on our preparedness as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for our efforts to build the peace through international cooperation.

Yet if the people don't give the United Nations a high vote of confidence in its ability to keep the peace, and if they turn down the idea of depending upon our armed strength alone, what other possible course of action do they see ahead? The American public was asked: "If we were to have a voting power in proportion to our population and economic strength, would you like to see us join now with other democracies to make a United States of the World?"

	Total Percent
Should join United States of World	43.4
Should not join United States of World	37.8
Express no opinion	18.8

More Americans say they like the idea of forming some sort of government of the world than say they are opposed to the idea. The results seem to indicate that national sovereignty is far less a barrier with the people than it has been before—and perhaps less of a barrier than it is to some of their leaders. The real hope for peace today among many people seems to lie in going beyond the stage of world organization represented by the United Nations.

Moreover, world government, in the opinion of many, has already begun to be formed. What might be the beginnings of a single western European nation have come out of the initial meetings of the 16 nations who will receive aid under the Marshall plan. Five European countries have founded the western European union, designed to foster common economic development and joint military defenses. Some signs now indicate the possibility of a fairly early inclusion of the other Marshall plan countries in the new federation. The American people, too, approve of the western European union. They were asked:

"Do you think it would be a good idea or a bad idea for the democratic countries in western Europe to form a United States of Europe with a plan of government something like the United States of America?"

	Total percentage
Good idea	70.4
Bad idea	12.1
Express no opinion	17.5

Many people in this country seem to see the first step toward a United States of the world in this federation of European nations. Next week I shall discuss the results of a poll among the people of five western European nations on the subject of this western European federation. A new hope for peace seems to be emerging among the democracies.

The Truth Is Coming Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, it was just about a month ago that the so-called European recovery program became law. Since that time the truth has gradually been coming out. Scarcely a day passes by but what some Member of this House gives some information which we did not have at the time we voted. Some of the facts are startling. Last week the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] told us how this program would permit the British to drink more wine than they did before the war. Tobacco is to keep the British budget in balance. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] told us how large quantities of our much needed agricultural machinery is being shipped to European countries so that they can export it at a profit while American farmers go without. A recent public opinion poll showed that many European people did not want the so-called Marshall plan. Still another showed that very few American citizens know what it was all about. All these things add up to the crisis-confusion that was created in order to rush through this program before the Congress had the facts.

One of the voices raised for quick passage of ERP was that of the editorial page of the New York Times. This proud and generally respected publication prints all the news it thinks fit for the American public to read. In general, this great newspaper has not thought that facts in opposition to the Marshall plan were fit for their readers. This is the same publication which last November called Congress "painfully slow," and only last January was happy to observe, "there is no major articulate opposition to some sort of ERP." Many of us on the floor were pointing out that ERP would act as a subsidy for socialism and a damper on free enterprise, but the New York Times did not think much of such arguments. However, on May 2, less than 1 month after the ink was dry, the New York Times had this to say on its editorial page:

> The prevailing ideal in the United States is to allow as much freedom of enterprise as is possible without obvious damage to the common welfare. We believe in this freedom and we think it makes for progress and efficiency. * * * In most of Europe and perhaps all of Asia we have to admit an opposite tendency. To some extent the circumstances under which ERP is being, and has to be, administered encourages this opposite tendency.

And again:

> The individual entrepreneur starting with a little shop and trying to build a big business is not the key character in ERP. There is inevitably a great deal of government control which can hardly be distinguished from state socialism.

A public-opinion poll recently showed that only one out of every five Americans knew that ERP would help socialist governments. The vast publicity in favor of this movement failed to mention this important fact. It seems that now the bill has been passed, the American public may be told. I hope the Members will bear this in mind when the time comes to vote on the appropriations for which the State Department asks to foster world-wide socialism.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I now include the full New York Times editorial:

THE ROOTS OF FREEDOM

> If a cold war, a war of ideas or a political war—whichever name one cares to give it—can be compared with a military war it might be said that today's bloodless conflict has reached the point reached in the Second World War when Britain had repulsed the German daylight air attacks and had begun to hit back. At the moment communism is being held within its lines; it has suffered a defeat in Italy and it cannot achieve a resounding victory in any area in which elections are really free. This result has been reached by several kinds of pressure: by the prospect of ERP and a resulting recovery in

western Europe; by Russian mistakes in extending arbitrary control over the satellite states; and by the manifest determination of our own and other democracies to undergo such sacrifices as may be necessary for military defense.

But this degree of success—not final, not yet secure but certainly hopeful—presents new problems. In Italy and in France, the Communist drive has to be overcome by recruiting(?) democratic forces in the economic middle classes and by persuading labor that its just desire can be attained under the democratic system—as they could not be under communism. Whether we like it or not this persuasion, in most European countries, involves the promise of a certain amount of socialization. It involves more socialization than we in this country think desirable.

It is not that we have here a pure capitalism in the sense in which Adam Smith or Ricardo would have used the word. Our capitalism is adulterated or mitigated (according to one's point of view) by innumerable restraints on management, on labor, on investment, by taxation which puts a large part of the national income into the hands of the National Government, and by a social security system, still in its infancy, but bound to grow. The Government itself is in business through such agencies as TVA, the RFC, the Panama Canal, the Export-Import Bank, and so on. But the prevailing ideal in the United States is to allow as much freedom of enterprise as is possible without obvious damage to the common welfare. We believe in this freedom and we think it makes for progress and efficiency. If a relatively free capitalism represents the right wing in today's line-up (and we cannot be sure which is "right" and which is "left" when an arbitrary dictatorship like that of Russia is described as "leftish") then we are the world's right wing.

In most of Europe and perhaps all of Asia we have to admit an opposite tendency. To some extent the circumstances under which ERP is being, and has to be, administered encourages this opposite tendency. The individual entrepreneur, starting with a little shop and trying to build a big business, is not the key character in ERP. There is inevitably a great deal of Government control which can hardly be distinguished from State socialism. We may not welcome this development. Some voices have been raised against a policy of granting or lending funds to build up socialist governments. And it is indeed unfortunate if the individual opportunity possible under a relatively pure system of free enterprise is diminished for the sake of greater security; some of the adventure and richness thus passes out of life.

Nevertheless, we have to realize that we cannot make over the rest of the world in our own image. If we are wise we will concentrate on two basic elements; first, the redress of just grievances, such as feudal land systems, bad housing, and starvation wages; second, on a truly democratic procedure. We must prove that democracy can redress grievances, so that desperate people will not be driven into communism. We have a right to insist that whatever is done shall be done democratically, so that whatever policies are voted in can be voted out again if a majority of the electorate so desires. What we do not have a right to demand is that the majority shall agree with us. It is the democratic system that counts, not the good or bad results it produces. In the long run we must have faith that it will produce good results.

The bond that ties the free world together is the majority's freedom to choose. We can deal on equal terms with any nation in which that freedom exists. We can associate with such nations confidently and generously, and by such association, as by our preparations for military defense, we can lessen the danger of a military war.

Elaine May, of Kleberg County, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, Elaine May, Kleberg County, Tex., is an outstanding young lady. Her character, initiative, faith, and courage deserve national recognition. The account of her accomplished young life is a thrilling testimonial to the strength and character of young Americans, and will, I am sure, inspire those who read this record.

Under unanimous consent, I insert a letter from Miss Ruby Butts, Kleberg County home demonstration agent, concerning Miss May:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Kingsville, Tex., April 22, 1948.

The Honorable JOHN E. LYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Elaine May is a Kleberg County 4–H girl and district XIV winner in the national 4–H Camp contest.

Elaine has done outstanding work in the field of leadership; she has been a member of a 4–H Club for 7 years and has been president of her club for 5 years. The other 2 years she held the office of secretary. She has been a member of the county-wide 4–H organization since it was organized, elected to membership by her club, and has been president of the county-wide organization for the past 2 years. She has directed recreational training for 4–H members and adults in the county for the past 2 years; she leads songs and directs folk dancing and other games. Elaine has been clothing demonstrator for her club for 2 years and is clothing leader this year as well. She makes most of her own clothes and helps with clothing for her smaller sisters.

This year her mother has been ill and Elaine has had much of the responsibility for keeping the family, consisting of her parents, Elaine, an older brother, and eight smaller sisters and brothers, and a married sister, her husband, and small baby, well fed and supplied with clean clothes. Two other married sisters have helped too, Elaine admits.

In spite of spending 1 day each week at home to do the family laundry, and occasionally another day for more help at home, Elaine has been able to maintain her position at the head of her class. She will graduate this spring with one of the highest averages in her class, and plans to attend the Texas College of Arts and Industries in Kingsville next year. Elaine is a leader in school in more ways than just high grades. She is president of the student council, editor of the annual, assistant editor of the high school paper, cheer leader of the pep squad, chosen best-liked girl, and was a nominee for sweetheart of the FFA.

Elaine has had her share in services to her community and church too. She has helped with the community dinners, for which Vattman community is famous, for a number of years. She has sung in her church choir for several years and has for some time been assistant organist. Recently she has been made choir leader and organist for the church.

Should Elaine win the trip to National 4–H Camp it will not be the first honor she has won in 4–H work. Last year she won the county dress revue and a trip to State 4–H Round-Up and was county winner in the National Records Contest.

Elaine plans to continue her 4–H work though she will be in college next year. She is an outstanding 4–H girl and Kleberg County and district XIV are very proud of her.

Sincerely,

RUBY BUTTS,
Kleberg County Home
Demonstration Agent.

Congressional Prodding Produces Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am more than ever convinced that constant investigations and recommendations by congressional committees can and will bring about some highly desirable changes in the operation of our Federal agencies. Even such well established and firmly entrenched departments as the Army and Navy have admittedly benefited from persistent and continual prodding by the Armed Services Committee and its subcommittees.

Last summer, for instance, the Subcommittee on Procurement and Supply, of which I am chairman, conducted rather extensive hearings in the San Francisco Bay area. As a result of these hearings we wrote a fairly comprehensive report of our findings and made numerous recommendations. May I call your attention to a portion of our report, as follows:

We encountered a particularly interesting situation in connection with Army administration on local levels. To our surprise, we found that there is no central military agency in the San Francisco Bay area which is kept reliably informed on the details of Army technical activities being performed in this very vital region of the United States. To our great surprise, two officers from the Army General Staff had to travel across the country to San Francisco to tell our joint committee what supply and other technical operations are being conducted by the Army in the San Francisco Bay area.

On the other hand the Navy, whose administrative structure is reputedly far more compartmentalized than that of the Army, has immediately available in the San Francisco area, through the western sea frontier, a number of officers who coordinate administratively the logistic and other operations of the fleet on the Pacific Coast.

This situation led us to the following conclusion, namely: That the Army should give serious thought to providing a coordinating instrumentality on local levels to insure that some agency or person in each area will keep in intimate touch with the administrative operations of all Army supply activities in that region. We see no necessity for expanding on this point; its need would appear to be perfectly obvious. Actually we were at a loss to understand how the Army can function with reasonable efficiency when each of its tremendous installations, many of which are located virtually side by side, seems to have little or no knowledge as to what the others are accomplishing or the manner in which they are functioning. The General Staff officers who appeared before our joint committee apparently were the only people in the San Francisco area who knew in detail as to the over-all operations, and for that matter the detailed operations, of the

enormous Army depots operating over the entire region.

We were advised that the commanding general of the Sixth Army exercises no administrative control over these technical installations. They all report to Washington for administrative control.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that, with respect to supply activities, Subcommittee No. 6 of the Committee on Armed Services should explore the difference in operation in this respect between the Army and Navy and determine whether the Army system or Navy system requires modification.

Mr. Speaker, neither the members of my subcommittee nor I claim to be military experts. However, we do feel that we can pick out mistakes when we see them and we always try to make recommendations that will prove helpful not only to the services themselves but to the country as well. The fact that our suggestions have not been unavailing in this instance is indicated by the following press release:

ATLANTA, 1948.—Aimed at determining how best to place under the command of an Army commander all of the installations within the geographical limits of his territorial command and in determining the essential factors involved in maximum decentralization of Army activities now retained in Washington, D. C., the Third Army area, with headquarters in Atlanta, has been selected as a testing ground for instituting departures from long-standing military command practices in this country.

Conferences have been under way at Fort McPherson for the past 2 days between representatives of the Department of the Army in Washington, Army installations in the Third Army area, and Third Army headquarters laying the groundwork for the test which will commence on October 1, 1948, and continue for a 6-month period ending March 31, 1949.

Currently Army commanders of the six Army areas in the United States are responsible for training and employment of tactical troops, but technical and administrative service installations, such as quartermaster depots, ordnance arsenals, engineer districts, Army hospitals, etc., in the Army areas are under the command of the respective Service chiefs in Washington. For purposes of the test, which will be known as a territorial command test, all of these activities and installations in the Third Army area will be placed under the command of Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., commanding general, Third Army, at Fort McPherson.

Although such a plan is unique in military annals in this country, it is essentially the same as that governing oversea theaters of operation during World War II, where Army commanders acted as territorial commanders and were charged with the responsibility and jurisdiction over all Army activities in their particular sectors.

The Third Army area, which includes North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, was selected as the logical area for the test because it contains in some degree, all of the Army activities existing in the other five Army areas, without any of these activities being on such a scale as to unduly complicate the test. The New Orleans Port of Embarkation, ordinarily in the Fourth Army area, is being attached to the Third Army for the period of the test.

The territorial command test will place an additional 8,000 military personnel and 20,000 civilians under the jurisdiction of Third Army headquarters.

Lt. Gen. H. S. Aurand, director of logistics, Department of the Army, Washington, is representing the Department of the Army in monitoring these tests.

Statement of Father Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Father Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University and regent of the School of Foreign Service, one of the outstanding Catholic priests and educators of America, has just returned from a mission that took him to Japan and Europe. His statement to the Nation on conditions abroad is vital, if one is to properly understand the situation existing in the world.

Dr. Walsh has been absent from the United States since early November 1947, in the Far East and Europe. Spending over 5 months in Japan, he returned by air to Europe, where he witnessed the recent crucial electoral campaign in Italy. He resumed his duties at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service yesterday.

STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE

Japan is the most tranquil area in the Far East and the people have been spared the postwar strife and bloodshed which is exhausting so many other regions of Europe and Asia. By the courtesy of General MacArthur I was enabled to visit and study a wide expanse of territory, inspect numerous educational and religious institutions, see Japanese families in their homes and compare the progress towards reconstruction with that achieved in other devastated regions. Due to the firm hand and the enlightened administration of the Supreme Commander, communism has not been permitted to challenge legitimate authority in Japan nor obstruct the orderly processes of rehabilitation.

An impressive memorial church is being planned at Hiroshima, where I spent considerable time. Non-Christians as well as Christians are contributing to its erection. The people of that stricken city regard the projected shrine as a memorial to those who perished there by the atomic bomb and whose death served to hasten the end of the war. They seem to cherish no resentment against the Americans who dropped the bomb but rather visualize the future church as a thank-offering in gratitude to the dead whose sacrifice saved so many others from further suffering and their homeland from complete destruction.

What was decided in Italy on April 18 was not merely the proportion between Communist and non-Communist delegates for the new Parliament but whether or not the Communist domination of Europe could be halted. Italians cast their ballots as an act of faith, not so much for De Gasperi and his party as against Togliatti. The basic issue was America versus Soviet Russia—the Marshall plan or surrender to the totalitarianism and atheism of Moscow. The overwhelming response has proved what can be done by resolute men jealous of their liberty and responsive to a free and open exposition of the true issue facing western civilization in this critical moment of history. For months the buildings and the walls of Italy were plastered with campaign posters; groups of people argued and gesticulated until midnight on every village green and in public places from the Alps to Sicily; the Communists had every facility to harangue, publish their literature, hold great public meetings, parade, demonstrate, and distribute the subsidies of Moscow. It was the greatest debate of modern times held in a forum where so much history has been decided.

The results go far deeper than a vote of confidence in the government of Signor de Gasperi. The effects will be felt in Turkey and Greece, which now feel heartened to hold and defend those outposts in the Mediterranean; the repercussions are felt in France and the surviving free societies of western Europe where the program of European unity and solidarity can now be developed with greater confidence. If Italy had fallen into the lap of Moscow, and if the iron curtain had progressed that far westward, not one but three or four new victims of the creeping imperialism of Marxian communism would surely have been involved. And communism would have advanced that much nearer to the English Channel and the Atlantic world.

Whereas a month ago there was uncertainty, fear, hesitation, and divided counsel among some European statesmen who might have hesitated to back a losing horse, there is now new confidence, new hope, and new faith in the program sponsored by America for the salvation of Europe. Though April 18 may figure in history as the date of the turning of the tide, it is no moment for the democracies to rest on their oars. The politburo in Moscow is made up of trained revolutionaries for whom insurrection is an art. They still have substantial fifth columns in Italy and France, and no abandonment of the conflict should be anticipated. The pressure will undoubtedly be continued not necessarily by exercise of outright military power, which is not Moscow's strategy at this stage, but by the devious maneuvers which succeeded so smoothly in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I do not believe their objective is immediate war, as Moscow is too realistic to court open armed conflict with the power of America until the Soviet Union is in possession of a supply of atomic bombs, or something worse. The risk involved in a premature attack would be enormous, and a miscalculation could be fatal.

Their present program would appear to be to prolong the war of nerves and thus achieve four objectives: (1) The strengthening of domestic support among the Russian population and in satellite lands; (2) the weaning away of any wavering Europeans from adherence to the ideals of western democracy, coupled with increased subversive propaganda in Latin America; (3) the consolidation and arming of Russia's Balkan confederation; (4) obstruction of the Marshall plan for the recovery of Europe until a hoped-for depression in the United States cripples that formidable adversary. All these contingencies, however, are at the mercy of an accident or an incident, or they might be swept aside in some quick decision of the Politburo to profit by some unusual opportunity. In particular, Soviet Russia fears two specific weapons—the atomic bomb and the success of the Marshall plan, which Moscow rightfully considers a program to remedy that economic distress and sense of insecurity which are her two most precious assets in creating a revolutionary situation.

The violent and undisguised attack on the Marshall plan during the Italian electoral campaign is a sure index that at long last we are on the right track. Beginning with aid to Greece and Turkey, American foreign policy, acting affirmatively and vigorously, has finally taken the initiative to purchase time by expending dollars not for emergency relief alone but to rehabilitate the countries of western Europe through a long-range, constructive economic policy, at the same time taking every available means to restore our dissipated military strength, particularly our

air power. We saw for the second time how futile appeasement could be and how ineffectual it was to be forever arriving breathless and too late at some point where a break-through had already occurred. The best way to avoid the tragedy of a third world war is to wage war in terms of the economic and social needs of the moment and thus cut the ground from under the feet of the Marxian dialectic. The hotter we make the logistics of the cold war, the colder will become the danger of a shooting war—unless the hotheads at Moscow or in a satellite camp decide to challenge the challenger by embarking on a desperate gamble of overt military aggression. That is not outside the possibilities and must be faced with realism in any program of national defense.

Oklahoma Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Oklahoma's laws affecting veterans, their wives, widows, children, orphans, and their organizations, compiled by R. R. Cockrell, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 1728 Northwest Thirty-sixth Street, Oklahoma City 2, Okla.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and therefore I am hopeful that this résumé of Oklahoma's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A county allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Relatives may be allowed to conduct the funeral.

Cemetery and graves of soldiers now located on property of Union Soldiers' Home has been placed under the supervision and care of the Adjutant General.

It is the duty of the Confederate Memorial Commission to locate the burial places of Confederate dead within the State, ascertain probable cost of securing title to plots not in public cemeteries, fence same, and provide appropriate markers therefor.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A conservator may be appointed for the estate and property of persons absent with the armed forces.

Acknowledgment is made of legal instruments and administration of oaths.

Evidence of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces may be admitted. This is applicable to proceedings had in administration of interstate estates or for the probate of wills or the termination of life estates or joint tenancies.

Disability of minority is removed for qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Preservation of status is provided for legal newspapers forced to suspend publication by reason of owner's induction into the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

County clerks are required to furnish copies of record of discharge papers free of charge.

County court clerks and the registrar of the Bureau of Vital Statistics are required to furnish copies of vital records; orders in guardianship proceedings, etc., free of charge to veterans or their dependents for use in perfecting claims against the Veterans' Administration.

Free copies of public records are furnished for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Honorable discharges of veterans are recorded by the county clerk free of charge.

An appropriation is made to the VFW for the appointment of a service officer to assist members of the armed forces, veterans, their families and dependents, and to pay other expenses necessary and incident to such service work.

The Soldiers' Relief Commission appoints service officers and claims representatives and assists veterans and their dependents. Annual appropriations are made.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Diplomas, certificates, or degrees are awarded to qualified seniors of high schools or colleges at the time of entering military service.

Public school privileges are extended to those unable to complete the twelfth grade while of legal school age by reason of service in the armed forces.

Registration privileges are extended to nurses having prior military service.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Determination of status is made under the Employment Security Act.

Veterans of World War II are exempt from the statutory requirement that a candidate for county superintendent of schools must have taught school for 18 months during the last 5 years prior to such candidacy. Such veterans, however, must meet the other statutory requirements.

Leaves of absence are given public officers and employees and for persons in private business called into military service for 1 year or inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act with reinstatement without loss of status or seniority.

Leaves of absence are given to railroad employees compelled to enter military service.

Veterans are granted preference in appointment of a memorial hall custodian.

Provision is made for the reemployment of persons who left positions with the State, or any county, city, town, or school district, to serve in the armed forces on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the end of World War II.

Receipt of readjustment allowances under the GI bill of rights disqualifies a veteran from receiving unemployment compensation for any week during which he is otherwise entitled to receive such benefits.

Members of fire departments in cities and towns must be reinstated within 90 days after termination of service in the armed forces, without loss of status or seniority.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received by a disabled veteran as pension or compensation is exempt from execution or attachment.

GUARDIANSHIP

Court costs are not required in any proceeding to appoint a guardian to approve or authorize the ward to enter the armed forces.

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been enacted with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Confederate and World War I veterans, their wives and widows, may be admitted to the Confederate home.

The Union Soldiers' Home has been abolished. All property, including buildings, equipment, etc., has been placed under the supervision of the State board of public affairs for the use and benefit of the State.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An appropriation is made to the regents for higher education, to be used for the hospitalization of war veterans at the State university hospital at Oklahoma City. The legislature, by resolution, transmits to the State regents for higher education the budget needs of the State university hospital for the hospitalization of war veterans.

Appropriation is made for the Oklahoma State Veterans' Hospital at Sulphur.

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Hospital care is provided tubercular veterans at the soldiers' tubercular sanatorium.

It is the duty of the soldiers' relief commission to provide hospital care for veterans. Veterans are admitted to the separate ward building established at the Central Oklahoma State Hospital at Norman.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

The Governor is authorized to purchase and execute appropriate scrolls on behalf of the State and its citizens, expressing appreciation for the patriotic service rendered by the citizens of the State who have lost their lives in defense of the country during World War II.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIALS, ETC.

A room in the historical building is designated as the Soldiers' Relief Commission room.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to Confederate veterans and their widows.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

All expenditures for the relief of disabled veterans shall be made by the Soldiers' Relief Commission with the approval of any executive officer of the American Legion.

Any State banking association may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

Use of the university housing authority property is granted for postwar rehabilitation.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Fishing and hunting licenses are not required of members of the armed forces during World War II and for 6 months thereafter.

Veterans' organizations are exempt from gift tax.

Deferment of collection and time of filing State income tax of persons in the military service is provided.

The first $1,500 of the yearly salary of members of the armed forces received during World War II for any taxable year since December 7, 1941, is exempt from income tax. Such persons need not file a return until 6 months after their return to the United States following the end of the war, whichever is later. Persons not filing a return since December 7, 1941, are excused.

War-risk insurance, adjusted-service compensation, etc., is exempt from inheritance tax.

Operators' and chauffeurs' licenses are extended during military service with an expiration date 6 months following discharge.

Certain veterans are exempt from license fee or tax to give illustrated lectures, magic-lantern exhibitions, and similar entertainments.

Hawking and peddling privileges are available to needy or disabled veterans without payment of privilege tax.

Licensed embalmers and funeral directors are exempt from payment of renewal fees during active military service.

Personal property of veterans and their widows is exempt from taxation.

Exemption of $100 (household goods, tools, livestock, etc.) and $200 (other personal property) is granted to veterans of all wars in which the United States participated as a belligerent.

Protection of homestead exemptions is granted to persons in the armed forces.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Unauthorized wearing or use of badges, pins, or insignia of veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not less than $25 nor more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days.

Logan County is authorized to transfer disused jail property for the use of veterans' organizations.

County commissioners are authorized to lease, rent, or donate any room in the courthouse for use of veterans' organizations for socials, reading rooms, etc.

Rooms are provided in the historical society building for the use of veterans' organizations.

Veterans' organizations may use armory buildings at convenient times.

Most of the above laws have been enacted by the Oklahoma Legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veterans' organizations.

At the present time the DAV, which has some 17 chapters throughout the State, maintains five full-time expertly trained National Service officers in the State of Oklahoma; three, under the direction of Kenneth McMurray, at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Oklahoma City; and two, under the direction of Joseph T. Smith, at the Veterans' Administration regional office in Muskogee.

These DAV experts render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosection of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902), in cash, or by a down payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the DAV semimonthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad experience in various local, State, and national DAV activities which qualifies him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are, therefore, generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are or have been dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who in the future may be called upon to make similar sacrifices will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate, they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of World War II myself it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System, May 3, on the subject, Should We Have National Health Insurance?

National health insurance as set forth in the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill is a compulsory form of insurance which takes a cut from the pay envelope of every worker in the country. This is matched by the employer. Make no mistake in your thinking—this bill is a form of compulsory health insurance. A national health program would be controlled by salaried bureaucrats. The medical student, the physician, and the public would be offered a regimented practice, federally supervised and controlled.

A poll of the governors of the 48 States, as to their opinion on national health insurance or socialized medicine in one form or another, showed that not one single governor expressed himself in favor of such a plan. The governors of our States are mighty close to their people. They are closer than the bureaucrats and politicians in Washington. Their combined opinion on compulsory national health insurance should be a proper reflection of public opinion throughout the Nation.

Any health insurance should be on a voluntary basis. There are many prepayment plans now working. A fine example of this is the Blue Cross or Blue Shield voluntary prepayment plans of insurance. These plans are being enlarged and are working very successfully. Any plan must be under local control. The individual must have a free choice of his physician. The present patient-doctor relationship must not be disturbed.

A health program should include education on a broad scale. The individual should be stimulated to acquire better health because physical fitness helps him to enjoy the fullness of life. A health program should include sound preventative public health measures. Prevention is far better than cure. This could be accomplished through State health departments at the State and county levels. It would help to get a better distribution of physicians; it would help in building

health centers in sparsely populated areas. This program could well include Federal aid to assist the States. Most of them would be entirely self-supporting.

National Health Insurance under the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill would cost $10,000,000,000 a year and require three to four hundred thousand Federal employees to operate the scheme. The plan proposes to give protection to the individual from the embryo to the grave. The plan requires a complicated and complex set of rules and regulations with final direction at the Federal level. It would not be pleasing to the patient, the doctor, or the taxpayer.

I made three trips to Europe in the last 20 years and had a close view of the medical care in the countries visited. It was the type of care which the people of this country would not tolerate. The doctors were forced to see from 60 to 70 patients each morning. There were long lines of people waiting to get into the clinic. They came by street car and bus and saw the physician they did not know, on an average of from 2 to 3 minutes. There was no personal interest in their particular case. These people were under a national health insurance law. I saw physicians operating on clean surgical cases without using face masks or rubber gloves. They were chattering like magpies over the open abdomen. I followed these cases through the wards where they were assigned. The nursing care was indifferent. The odor coming from these infected incisions, which started as clean surgical cases, left a stench in the nostrils that one does not soon forget. The service lacked that close, personal contact of sympathy, cheerfulness, understanding and confidence in the doctor. No amount of scientific care can take their place in the dark hours of sorrow and trouble, so common to all of us. I have found, as a physician, that these intangible things are important. Fame may die, honor may perish, but loving kindness is immortal. You do not get loving kindness in the type of medicine I saw practiced in Europe.

The proposed national health program does not spring from our tradition, nor from the public spirit. It is the offspring of a foreign ideology. Every country having it has shown that medical education becomes static and medical progress has been set back many years. It has meant robot, political medicine. It has been directed by politicians and not by men and women, scientifically trained and devoted to the relief of suffering humanity.

It is hard to understand why the left-wing element in this country continues such a desperate, stubborn, and relentless attempt to fasten socialized medicine upon this country. They should realize that if medicine is socialized, labor and all industry eventually will be socialized. We would all give up a part of our freedom. Great masses in Europe have been denied freedom and crushed under the tyranny of socialism and regimentation. We ought to look at those countries who have lost their freedom to relearn and appreciate and keep alive the most humanitarian concept of all times—our traditional American freedom.

The high type of leadership and medical care in our country has been tested in the crucibles of time and economic hardships. Our hospitals and our medical and scientific care are now the envy of the world. You folks supporting national-health insurance call it a great humanitarian ideal. It just doesn't work that way. National-health plans which might have had some chance of succeeding in Europe, certainly do not apply to the United States. Our Government should be the servant of the people. The people should always rule. The personal whims of a dictator would stomp out the freedoms of our people. He inflicts his personal ideas and ambitions and his private greed upon the very foundation of America. Compulsion always does that. Why substitute another method which has failed to produce health conditions equal to those existing here?

I am certain that the great majority of the American people, when they fully understand the meaning of compulsory health insurance, would have no part of such a program. They would not want a political medical machine where their family physician would become a memory of the past. They prefer to make their own free choice of physician and hospital. They would not tolerate the type of care the people of Europe must undergo under their national health insurance plan.

Socialized medicine would require so much paper work by the physician, that he would have ink on his fingers instead of iodine. It would cause the American people to lose some of their traditional American freedom and they would do a mental, physical, ritualistic goose-step with the tune being played in Washington.

Idaho Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE McGREGOR GOFF
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, most veterans are not fully aware of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions, as extended to them, under certain circumstances, by the laws of the great State of Idaho.

I am, therefore, pleased to present, for their information, an outline of such laws, as compiled by Keith D. Christensen, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 619 Grove Street, Boise, Idaho, as follows:

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

County allowances are provided for burial of indigent veterans, their wives, or widows. Relatives or friends may be allowed to conduct the funeral.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgement is made of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

Administration is provided for estates of absentees, including prisoners of war.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

No fees are allowed notaries public for services rendered in the matter of a pension claim or a claim to be presented to the Veterans' Administration to secure benefits under the World War Veterans' Act.

No public officer shall charge a veteran, his widow, orphan, or legal representative a fee for administering an oath for procuring any pension, bounty, or back pay, or for administering an oath and giving the certificate required on any voucher for collection of periodical dues from the pension agent.

Free copies of public records are provided for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

A public official shall not accept fees for issuing copies of discharge papers or other public records to be used in a pension claim or a claim under the World War Veterans' Act, or for making search for such records.

Discharge papers are recorded and indexed free of charge.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Academic work in the armed forces is considered equivalent high school work for applicants for professional or occupational licenses. No applicant may be denied license for failure to hold a high school diploma.

School districts have been granted powers to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of veterans.

Teachers' certificates are continued in force during military service.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Leave of absence is granted to county officials when required to be absent by reason of being in the military service.

Preference is given disabled veterans in State, county, and municipal work of any kind. In any merit system when competitive examinations are required, veterans are to be given 10 points in addition to their earned rating. Employers refusing to hire veterans must file a report giving reasons for refusal.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

GUARDIANSHIP

Guardians may be appointed by probate courts for estates of prisoners of war.

Notice must be given to the Veterans' Administration or other agency, bureau, or department of the United States regarding certain proceedings under the law on guardian and ward.

A Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans may be admitted to the soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAND-SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

Preference is given to veterans in the settlement of the Carey Act lands.

MEETING PLACES, MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES, ETC.

State and local appropriations are provided for erection of war memorials.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Provision has been made for the deposit of records, relics, etc., of the Civil War in the Grand Army of the Republic headquarters for safekeeping.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Banks may make loans guaranteed under the GI bill of rights.

Annual appropriations are made for financial relief and assistance to veterans and their dependents.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Certain veterans are exempt from fish and game licenses, including servicemen on temporary furlough.

Members of the military and naval forces of the United States who are lodged in the State are permitted to purchase resident fish and game licenses irrespective of residence.

Collection of tax on the income of persons in the military service is deferred.

Veterans are exempt from the road poll tax.

Payment of fees for professional and occupational licenses is exempt while in the military service and for 6 months after discharge; this is applicable to prisoners of war as of July 1, 1942.

Certain veterans are exempt from property tax.

World War veterans' organization buildings and memorials are exempt from property tax.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Provision has been made for formulation of corporations of veterans.

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 90 days or by fine not to exceed $200, or both.

The American Legion and other veterans' organizations are to determine the kind of war memorial to be erected in each county.

Veterans' organizations have the right to parade with firearms.

World War veterans' organization buildings and memorials are exempt from taxation.

One thousand dollars is given to each county by the State for a veterans' memorial.

The DAV, which has some 21 chapters throughout the State, maintains 3 full-time national service officers, under the direction of John B. George, at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Boise, Idaho.

These DAV experts extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, more particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and factually eligible.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for and by America's disabed war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its Congressional Charter of Incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a downpayment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30), after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the national headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper, since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and of its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as it office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war-wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turnover record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran of both World Wars I and II myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV, and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Science Foundation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT NODAR, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. NODAR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 25, 1948:

SHAPLEY GROUP SEEKS CONTROL OF UNITED STATES RESEARCH—PUSH $15,000,000 BILL FOR FOUNDATION

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—Minutes of the Inter-Society Committee for a National Science Foundation, a group of scientists promoting a bill to spend $15,000,000 a year on research, disclose that the group intends to pick the personnel of the foundation when and if it is approved by Congress.

Prominent in lobbying for the legislation is Dr. Harlow Shapley, director of the Harvard University Observatory. He is a member of various organizations designated by Attorney General Clark as subversive. Shapley is vice chairman of the group which would make the selections.

Shapley has a long record of affiliation with groups which the House Un-American Activities Committee has labeled as communistic or Communist fronts. Recently he was disclosed as the master mind of the Committee of One Thousand, a group formed to press for abolition of the House committee.

CITE HIS AFFILIATIONS

Shapley was a member of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which the House committee cited as a Communist front organized to defend Communist teachers in a report March 29, 1944. He was a member of the League of American Writers, which was described as a front organization in three committee reports.

He was revealed in the columns of the Daily Worker as the signer of various letters supporting the aims of organizations, described by the committee as Communist fronts, and of appeals in behalf of Communists such as Gerhard Eisler and Earl Browder.

Minutes of a meeting in Chicago last December 28 of the executive committee of the group sponsoring the research bill, report:

"The executive committee agreed upon the desirability of preparing a list of persons to be proposed to the President for membership on the National Science Foundation if and when one is established.

"It was agreed that the committee's recommendations should be ready for submission immediately upon enactment of the proposed legislation."

Members of Congress have learned that the list has been prepared and is now ready for submission to the White House upon passage of the bill.

The science-foundation bill is sponsored by Senator SMITH (Republican, New Jersey) and Representative WOLVERTON (Republican, New Jersey). Neither was aware until recently of Shapley's record in the House Un-American Activities Committee, they said.

A science-foundation bill, lobbied for by Shapley, was passed last year by Congress, but was vetoed by President Truman because he considered the organization unwieldy and because, as it was drawn, it would have vested determination of vital national policies in the executive group of the proposed organization.

In the new bill, scientific research related to national defense has been removed from the province of the Foundation. The most important of these are atomic bombs, bacteriological warfare, biological warfare, and climatological warfare.

Atomic fission is in the province of the Atomic Energy Commission. The use of germs to spread disease, the attacking of functions of the body, and the use of climate to carry disease are being developed within the Military Establishment.

DIRECTOR IS POWERFUL

It has been reported that the last three already have reached a high stage of development and that the United States could employ them with devastating effect on any enemy.

Under the revised Science Foundation bills, all authority would be invested in a director, who would be a dictator in the field of Government scientific investigation. The executive-council feature of the former bill has been removed, so that the Director is not subject to its supervision.

The Foundation is opposed by groups interested in research on heart disease, cancer, and infantile paralysis. These organizations would suffer, they say, if the Government were to take over, since funds for research in their fields would be reduced.

Also, it is argued that the hand of bureaucracy would slow research. At present it has been indicated that exception will be made for these groups under the pending plan.

The Foundation could be expected to take over all research ultimately, it has been warned.

Interests of Domestic Producers Safeguarded Under Reciprocal-Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post of March 3, 1948:

MORE IMPORTANT THAN EVER

President Truman has asked Congress for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This 14-year-old law authorizes the President to make agreements with other countries for two-way cuts in tariff rates and other barriers to international commerce.

The act, Mr. Truman says, is more important now than ever before. His reasons for saying that seem to us unanswerable.

With other nations, "we are engaged in a mighty endeavor to build a peaceful and prosperous world." Continued efforts to stimulate an increasing flow of trade among those nations are essential to success of that endeavor.

The reciprocal agreements recognize the fundamental fact that trade is a two-way business. We can't go on forever exporting more than we import. Other countries must be able to sell their goods to us if they are to get dollars to buy our products and to repay our loans. When we import needed goods we improve the living standards of Americans as consumers, and at the same time we make it possible to maintain foreign markets for our producers. And the lowering of trade barriers encourages private trading and free enterprise, as distinct fom Government trading.

If the law is extended, action must originate in the House. Republican leaders there are cold, if not openly hostile, to Mr. Truman's request.

Some of them would let the reciprocal-trade program die next June. Others are afraid to do that. They realize the truth of what the President says—that this program has drawn the constant and increasing support of the American people, regardless of party affiliation. So they talk of extending it for a short period, until after the elections, and of crippling it with restrictions that would restore the old evils of logrolling in the making of tariffs.

We believe that, as Mr. Truman says, the interests of domestic producers have been and will be carefully safeguarded in the negotiation of reciprocal agreements. We know that, in the past, the Republican Party has done itself great damage by championing high protective tariffs, represented as beneficial to industry and agriculture but actually harmful to the vast majority of Americans. We hope that now, when so much is at stake, Republicans in Congress will not succeed in putting their party back on that road to disaster.

The Beauty and Barber Shops' Just Claim for Excise-Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although the war has been over for almost 3 years, we still find a wartime tax oppressing beauty and barber shops and I feel that adequate relief should be given at this session to this industry whose individual units are small but whose economic health affects 3,000,000 beauty and barber shop owners, operators, and dependents.

H. R. 3825

Last June while the Ways and Means Committee was conducting hearings on revenue revisions I heard the plaintive pleas for relief by representatives of the beauty and barber shops who pointed out the inequitable, discriminatory hardship suffered by the industry as a result of the law and regulations thereon imposing a 20 percent excise tax on cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops in rendering services. What I heard at the hearings confirmed what I had been told by Mr. Kenneth Green of the Green Supply Co., of Lincoln, Nebr., a company that supplies beauty and barber shops with what they need to furnish services. My good friend and constituent, Ken Green, has been telling me for years the complaints he has received from beauty and barber shop owners in my district regarding the operation of the law and regulations which impose a 20-percent tax on the cosmetics which they use in their shops. In addition, my office has received numerous complaints from beauty and barber shop owners in my district regarding this unjust, inequitable, discriminatory tax.

Having studied the matter, I came to the conclusion that the beauty and barber shop industry was entitled to a change in the procedure in the method of imposing taxes on both cosmetics sold over the counter and cosmetics used in rendering services. The only way this procedural change can be effected is by removing the 20-percent excise tax on bulk cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops. A reduction of the tax will not bring about the desired and necessary procedural change which will help this small-in-size but large-in-numbers industry. Accordingly, I introduced H. R. 3825 last June which corrects this industry's hardship by removing the 20-percent excise tax on bulk cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops in rendering services. H. R. 3825 does not disturb the 20-percent tax on cosmetics sold at retail. Beauty and barber shops who sell cosmetics at retail will still be subject to the 20-percent cosmetic tax the same as other retailers of cosmetics. The amount of revenue which the Government will lose if H. R. 3825 becomes law is trivial. Reliable sources indicate that this tax brings in a little over $4,000,000 annually.

The beauty and barber shop industry's excise-tax hardship is its only legislative problem at the Federal Government level. This problem has been discussed and deplored by all segments of the industry throughout the length and breadth of our Nation. Recently, industry representatives presented about 70,000 petitions to members of the Ways and Means Committee asking them to report favorably H. R. 3825. These petitions were gathered in only 25 congressional districts and were signed only by beauty- and barber-shop owners and operators. So eager is this industry for relief that I am informed that petitions signed by more than 500,000 shop owners and operators could be obtained. Every barber and beauty operator is being pushed around in a most ridiculous manner by the operation of the existing law.

H. R. 3825 should be enacted because:

First. It removes the tax on bulk cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops which adds to the cost of operating a shop. Shop revenue is derived mostly from rendering services and the cosmetics used are the beauticians' and barbers' tools. A 20-percent tax is too high on the tools of trade of this industry.

Second. If a barber wants to sell a bottle or two of hair tonic he must sign a certificate that scares him to death. Appended hereto is one of those certificates. No one could figure out what it means, but the beauty shop owner or the barber does understand that if she or he should happen to use a bottle of oil purchased for the purpose of resale that the certificate says something about, "$10,000 fine or 5 years in prison." They just throw up their hands and cannot operate under such a law and regulation and as a result many do not sell at retail and lose profits they could use when income from services fall off. H. R. 3825 would effect a procedural change which would do away with the necessity of signing these obnoxious, frightening certificates.

Third. This tax is difficult to administer since beauty shops are both retailers and consumers of cosmetics. A realistic enforcement of the tax law would cost the Government an amount of money which would be entirely out of proportion to the trivial amount of revenue received from the tax on cosmetics used in shops.

I am happy that so many of my colleagues in Congress feel as I do about the unjust, inequitable operation of the present tax on beauty and barber shops. Four bills, identical to H. R. 3825, have been introduced in the House of Representatives. Moreover, as a result of having talked to a large number of the Ways and Means Committee members and having received communications from other Members I have every reason to believe that a majority will support H. R. 3825.

I intend to keep working for the removal of the unfair tax on beauty and barber shops since I feel this industry is in need of tax relief to preserve its economic health.

CERTIFICATE OF PURCHASE FOR RESALE

GREEN SUPPLY CO.,
Lincoln, Nebr.:

I operate the _____
(State name of beauty or barber shop)
Located at _____
(State address)

and hereby certify that all retail package sizes (as distinguished from professional package sizes) of toilet preparations and cosmetics which I purchase from you shall be resold by me and not used in the operation of my beauty (or barber) shop.

I understand that if any of the above articles purchased for resale are used by me in the operation of my beauty or barber shop, or resold by me at retail, I will be liable for tax on such use or resale. It is understood that the fraudulent use of this certificate to secure exemption will subject the undersigned and all guilty parties to a fine of not more than $10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both, together with costs of prosecution. The undersigned also understands that he (or she) must be prepared to establish competent evidence that the articles were actually purchased for the purpose for which stated in this certificate.

_____
Name of shop

_____
Owner or agent

_____
Address

Dated _____

The Treasury Department will not interpose objections to this form of certificate of purchase for resale.

Both Judiciary Committees of Congress Sponsor the Modernization of Our Presidential Elections

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1948

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which Senator WILEY is chairman, has joined the House Judiciary Committee, of which Representative MICHENER is chairman, in favorably reporting a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of President and Vice President.

The Senate resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 200, is identical with House Joint Resolution 9, as reported by the House Judiciary Committee, and which is now pending on the House Calendar.

The adoption of this proposal would be an outstanding event in the political history of our country. It would remedy the glaring defects of our present method of electing the President. It would provide a system of election which would fairly, accurately, and reliably reflect the will of the American people at every Presidential election.

Heretofore, in connection with House Joint Resolution 124, which is identical with that reported, I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy, and I trust comprehensive, discussion of the problems involved in the election of the President. I have assembled these statements in pamphlet form, which I would gladly supply to anyone on request.

Today I want to emphasize the simplicity, the soundness, and the importance of the plan of election sponsored by these two committees of Congress.

The substantial proposals of the amendment are as follows:

First. That each State retain its voting power in electing the President as now provided in the Constitution. Each State would retain electoral votes equal to the whole number of its Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Second. It would abolish the electoral college, the Presidential electors, and consequently the present method of electing the electors. The people would elect the President by a direct vote as they now elect Senators and Representatives.

Third. The unit system of computing the State votes would be abolished. Instead of the whole electoral vote of the State going to the plurality candidate, it would be divided between the candidates in exact proportion to their popular votes within the State.

Fourth. The present system of breaking deadlocks in the electoral college by an election in the House would be eliminated. Under the plan proposed there would be no deadlocks in the election. If, because of death or other reason, no person is qualified to take the office at the beginning of the term, the President would be selected in such manner as Congress would by law provide under the twentieth amendment.

THREE FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES

So, the three fundamental changes proposed by this amendment are: (a) the abolition of the electoral college and electors; (b) the election of the President by direct vote of the people; and (c) the computation of votes, by dividing the electoral votes of each State among the candidates in exact proportion to their popular votes, the candidate receiving the plurality of electoral votes in the Nation to be elected.

There is no rash innovation in any of these proposals. They are simple, sound, and fair. They are in harmony with, rather than offensive to, conventional methods of election.

THE VOTING POWER OF EACH STATE

The Constitution provides for only three classes of elective officers: the President, the Senators, and Representatives in Congress.

Each State has a right to participate in the proceedings of Congress by two Senators in the Senate and a number of Representatives in the House in proportion to its population, not less than one to each State.

Each State is given electoral votes equal to the whole number of its Senators and Representatives in Congress. In other words, each State by the terms of the Constitution has the same voting power in the selection of the President as it has in the Congress of the United States.

This arrangement was made in the Constitutional Convention as part of a compromise by which the small States were induced to come into the Union.

This plan of the Constitution makes the electoral vote a common unit of the States for the expression of the Nation's will in the election of a President. With the recurring census every 10 years, the relative strength of each State is readjusted to correspond to changes in its population in proportion to the whole population of the country.

The amendments pending in the two Houses do not propose to change this rule of the Constitution to take from any State, even from the smallest, the two electoral votes assigned to it by the Constitution regardless of population.

An attempt now to eliminate that two-vote assignment would be comparable to a proposal to eliminate the Senate itself.

The electoral vote has served a very useful purpose in establishing and preserving the relative voting strength of the States. In the first place, it assures each State voting power in proportion to its population. In the second place, it is the necessary means of allotting two votes to each State regardless of population. It simply assures the small States the same number of votes in the election of the President as they have in Congress.

ELECTION BY DIRECT VOTE

We now have a dual system of electing the President. He cannot be elected by a direct vote of the people. He can be elected only by the vote of the Presidential electors. The first election is when the electors are chosen by a vote of the people at the November election. The second and actual election occurs when the electors so selected, at a later date, by a majority vote, elect the President. So at the first election the people choose the electors; at the second election the electors choose the President.

The Constitution provides that each State shall appoint Presidential electors in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct. The State legislatures have provided that the Presidential electors may be selected by a direct vote of the people of the State. This is a right granted by the State and one which the State legislature may at any time revoke.

That was done in the State of New Jersey in 1812 when the Federalists, in control of the legislature, 3 days before the election repealed the law giving the people a right to vote and itself chose the Presidential electors pledged to the candidate the legislature desired.

The original provision which established the electoral college composed of the Presidential electors intended that the electors should consist of a limited group of wise, patriotic men who would use their own discretion in selecting a President for the United States. Not many years expired before it was apparent that the plan was wholly impracticable. The people properly concluded that they wanted to select the President themselves instead of leaving the selection to the uncertainties of an unpledged limited group. The only method within the Constitution by which they could do this was by the Presidential elector pledged in advance to vote for a specific candidate. Thus in voting for such a pledged elector the voter would indirectly participate in electing a President.

The electors, deprived of their discretionary power, for 148 years, have performed no useful service other than to comply with the Constitutional provision which required the President to be elected by the votes of Presidential electors.

The Presidential elector is a useless encumbrance upon the electoral machinery of the Nation. In addition to that, the dependency of the Nation on the vote of the elector carries the uncertain element of human frailty due to his possible lack of qualification to vote, or to the possible intervention of death, disability, or criminal interference with the casting of one or more votes that might change the result of an election.

The proposed amendment would abolish the electoral college and with it eliminate the Presidential elector. The people would vote directly for President as they now vote for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The function of the elector would no longer be of any use whatever and there would be no justification for his retention as part of our electoral machinery.

The electoral vote, however, would be retained as the common unit for the expression of the voting strength of the State in the final computation of the results of the election.

THE UNIT VOTE ABOLISHED; VOTES TO BE COUNTED AS CAST

The great indictment of the present system of electing the President is that it utterly fails to provide a just or logical basis of computing the results of the election as a measure of the votes between the States.

The plurality candidate in the State carries its whole electoral vote regardless of whether he secured as much as one-half of the votes of that State. The votes of minority parties in the State, whether they be Democrat, Republican, or independent parties, receive no credit whatever. The whole vote of the State is computed as if cast for the plurality candidate. Minority votes are thus disfranchised at every Presidential election in every State in the Union.

The plurality candidate gets credit for the votes for his opponents as well as for those for himself. His credit for votes cast for his opponents in the State may exceed the number cast for him, yet he gets credit for 100 percent of the total votes of the State.

Let us illustrate. Suppose two candidates running against each other. One carries New York by a trivial plurality, and the other receives a small plurality in Nevada. Thus, the popular votes of the two are equal, or substantially so. Let us assume that each candidate has a combined popular vote in the two States of 3,000,000. As computed under the unit voting system, one candidate would have three electoral votes and the other 47. Under the proposed plan each candidate would have 25 electoral votes.

Is such a system of computing votes fair, just, or sensible?

If one candidate received 1,000,000 votes in a small State and another 1,001,000, why should the whole vote of that State be credited to the candidate who had only 1,000 more votes than the other? Why should 1,000,000 votes in one State count for nothing and for 10 electoral votes in another?

Under the unit-voting system the plurality candidate in the State, whether or not he has a majority vote, gets credit in the electoral college, as follows:

A. Votes cast for him.

B. Votes cast for his opponents.

Another illustration. Assume there are three or more candidates. Take a State with 3,000,000 population; 1,200,000 votes are cast (40 percent of the population). Candidate A gets 600,000 votes, or 50 percent; his 2 opponents equally share 50 percent. A gets the credit for the 50 percent of the votes cast for him and the 50 percent more the votes cast for his opponents, with the result that he has 12 electoral votes and his opponents none.

Under the proposed amendment, A would get 50 percent of the electoral votes, or 6, and his opponents would receive a like number in proportion to their popular votes in the State.

If the plurality candidate was a minority candidate and received, say, 40 percent of the vote, he would have 480,000 popular votes and his opponents 720,000. The plurality candidate would receive the 12 electoral votes and his opponents none.

He would get credit for his own vote amounting to 40 percent of the total and also get credit for 60 percent of the votes which were cast for his opponents. In other words, the winning candidate would receive more credit for the votes against him than from those cast for him.

Under the proposed plan, candidate A would receive 4.8 votes and his opponents 7.2 votes distributed among them according to their popular votes in the State.

Can there be any doubt as to which of these two methods of computation is preferable? Who can assign any sensible reason for retaining such a system of election? Such a method of computing votes is indefensible.

Another illustration as to the operation of the unit computation of votes where three or more candidates are involved. Mr. C is a third-party candidate. It is generally assumed that he will not carry a single State. Let us assume, for illustration, that he might receive 3,000,000 popular vote. Not a single one of those votes in the final computation would be credited to Mr. C. Every vote cast for him would in effect be credited as if cast for one of the candidates of the major parties in each State, depending solely upon which party happened to have a plurality within that State. The independent voter would get no credit for his vote, which would, in fact, be credited the opposite of the way he voted. This is certainly a haphazard way to compute votes in a serious and important election.

NO POLITICAL FAVORITISM

There is no political favoritism in the plan proposed. It will give either party and every party the better advantage of a fair count.

The inherent inability of the unit voting system to reflect public sentiment accurately is apparent. It is said that the average variation between the electoral vote and the popular vote from 1876 to 1940 has been 18 percent, sometimes favoring one party and sometimes another, but never accurately registering public will.

From 1876 to 1892, inclusive, we had the longest consistently close vote between the parties in the history of the Nation. The electoral vote varied less from the aggregate popular vote due to the two large blocks of solid States along political lines. The Republican block of States was larger than the Democratic block. These two large blocks kept the statistics more nearly even in the aggregate than usual, with a slight disadvantage to the Democrats. The Democrats had a plurality of the popular votes in four of the five elections, but twice lost the Presidency by fairly substantial variations of the electoral vote from the popular vote.

In the five elections from 1928 to 1944, inclusive, the total Republican vote was a little over 98,000,000, and the total Democratic vote a little over 115,000,000. The Democrats had an average edge of about 13 percent of the vote as between the two parties, yet the Democrats received 1,964 electoral votes, while the Republicans received only 692. While the Republican popular vote was over 41 percent, its electoral vote was only slightly over 26 percent, a variation of approximately 15 percent in favor of the Democrats at the expense of the Republicans. The Democrats, with 54 percent of the popular vote of the Nation, received approximately 74 percent of the electoral vote.

In the election of 1944, about 44 percent of the total vote of the Nation was credited to candidates other than those for whom the votes were cast. In effect, 44 persons out of each 100 who voted had their votes computed contrary to the way they were cast. Over 16,000,000 cast for Dewey were credited to Roosevelt, and over 5,000,000 votes cast for Roosevelt were credited to Dewey. Such a system of computing votes manifestly has no proper place in the most important pop-

ular election in the world, that for President of the United States.

Innumerable statistics showing the vagrant quality of the present method of computing votes could be presented, but I content myself by referring to the hearings for many similar examples available to those interested.

BREAKING DEADLOCKS

In case there is a deadlock in the electoral college, the Constitution provides for breaking the deadlock by a vote in the House of Representatives. In such an election in the House, each State, regardless of its population has but one vote, and that vote is cast according to the majority vote of the Representatives from that State. Where there is a tie vote among the Representatives of the State, the State has no vote.

Thus there are 48 votes in the House, with a majority of the votes cast controlling the election.

No argument is needed to show the improvidence of trusting the election of the President to an election where votes are so computed and so unrepresentative of the people of the Nation.

AN UNFAITHFUL SYSTEM

In fact, the great weakness of our present method of electing the President, is that it was never designed for the political party system that we have in this country. It was planned for a nonpartisan government that has not existed in this country for 148 years.

The election of the President by presidential electors; the unit vote; the method of crediting the pulrality candidate with the votes cast for his opponent; the improvident method of election in the House; all of these betray the inept weakness of the system. Each of these things makes it impossible for the present method to be relied upon as a faithful method of selecting a President. It is not impossible that in the long run the continuance of such a method will again inevitably lead to abortive results highly obnoxious to the Nation.

POLITICAL INERTIA

At the conclusion of 100 years of our Government under the Constitution Charles O'Neil, writing at length on our Federal electoral system, pointed out the lack of information and indifference of the public, and particularly the lethargy of our political leadership as being primarily responsible for this inept system of election. Somewhat despairing, he wrote:

Some great and grievous wrong must be perpetrated before a change can be effected. The people must be legally robbed of the Presidency two or three times before they will take an interest in the subject. Yet, the lessons taught should not be forgotten, the warnings given should not go unheeded.

Brave, patriotic, and magnanimous will be the party which will inscribe on its banner, "Reform is needed in Presidential elections. The interest of 60,000,000 people are at stake."

Now the interest of 145,000,000 people are at stake. This Congress will be credited with a great historical contribution to the service of the Nation if it would approve the amendment now offered to it by the Judiciary Committees of the Congress.

I have dwelt upon the mechanics and the ineptitude of our method of electing the President. We cannot minimize, however, the inherent advantages that would follow by giving the voter in every State the right to have his vote counted as cast, a system that would discourage sectionalism, a voting system just, fair, impartial in its operation, and that would unfailingly reflect the will of the Nation as established by the Constitution.

Under the present system the strife to carry the great States is induced largely by the desire to secure credit for the votes denied the minority. That is a purpose wholly unworthy of a popular system of government for any nation, and particularly for the greatest democratic nation in the world.

A minority group, compact and well organized, even a small percentage of the voters, can in close elections control the whole electoral votes of States, and possibly be responsible for the election of the President. They can exact promises and influences to the detriment of the public and far out of proportion to their numbers. The possible influence of such groups in enforcing their demands and the yielding and catering to them has become one of the demoralizing influences of our public life.

Under the plan proposed, these militant groups will be assigned the power justly due them because of their numbers. They will be able to register their own votes, but not to control the total vote of any State of the Union.

Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 5, 1948:

HOUSING MEASURE HELD UNITED STATES BARGAIN—TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL VITAL IN NATION'S WAR ON SLUMS, FLANDERS DECLARES

Tested according to American standards of individual initiative and of equality of opportunity, the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill offer this country a bargain in housing, Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, declared last night. He addressed the National Public Housing Conference at dinner in the New Yorker Hotel.

"Equality of opportunity does not exist today in the slums and bad housing condition of this country," Senator FLANDERS said. "Private initiative and freedom cannot thrive under home conditions which create warped minds and warped bodies.

"The correction of these housing conditions has become a social responsibility. It is a reponsibility that in this complex modern civilization can no longer be solved at the level either of the town meeting or the State legislature. It has become a national problem which requires the action of our National Government."

Charging the Nation's building industry with failure to "achieve the efficiency and economies of the modern industrial system," Senator FLANDERS said that some attempts toward modernization were constantly thwarted by local laws and intra-industry agreements. He asked his audience to picture the number and type of automobiles we would have today if they were built by housing-construction methods, with local makers buying parts at neighborhood hardware stores and putting them together with pliers and screw drivers.

PROVISIONS CALLED HELPFUL

The housing bill, as passed by the Senate, is awaiting presentation to the House by the House Banking Committee. It contains provision for a comprehensive program of research for the development of techniques and materials to facilitate mass production of housing. This provision was introduced by Senator FLANDERS in an amendment and should have a long-range effect in helping the building industry to catch up with modern methods, he said.

Because the industry cannot and will not speed up overnight, however, Senator FLANDERS declared, provisions for early construction of public housing and for slum clearance, with Federal financial aid, have been included in the bill.

However, he stressed that the principal objective of the bill was to provide decent housing in both urban and rural areas, mainly by helping private industry to do its job. The objective cannot be reached by clearing slums and failing to build new homes, the Senator held, nor can it be done by building only for the indigent, and slighting the more successful workers who yet cannot afford the costs of sanitary, adequate dwellings without Government subsidy.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, a sponsor of the bill, addressed the group by telephone from Washington. He praised the bill as passed in the Senate, saying that it might well prove decisive in the housing emergency. Expressing the hope that private industry would soon supply needed new construction, Senator TAFT declared that the measure was sufficiently varied in its provisions to meet the needs of many communities with respect to housing projects.

KENNEDY ALSO BACKS BILL

Representative JOHN KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, also endorsed the bill, and urged public support of efforts to bring it out of committee and onto the floor of the House for an open vote.

Tribute was paid to Mrs. Mary K. Simkhovitch, recently retired vice chairman of the New York City Housing Authority and a founder of the conference, during the dinner, of which the Citizens Housing and Planning Council and the United Neighborhood Houses were cosponsors.

At an earlier session yesterday the Right Reverend Dan P. O'Connell, of Galveston, Tex., belittled the argument that it is "socialistic' to build public housing for those who lack it and cannot pay for it.

"It isn't socialistic to build jails, reform schools, penitentiaries, or to provide public health service," he said. "But," he added, "if it is socialism to provide needed homes for young Americans, I'm a Socialist."

A similar tack was taken by Theo. J. McGee, president of the conference, who said:

"Through indifference and neglect, malignant slums have been allowed seriously to infest every American city, and today possibly 8,000,000 families and more live in houses denounced as unfit for human habitation. These houses were built by American capitalism and constitute a part of the American way of life. In this product of free enterprise we can take no pride.

"If, however, private enterprise can offer a better means of producing low-cost housing, we shall be fully willing to cooperate."

Tennessee Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAYTON E. PHILLIPS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an outline of Tennessee's laws affecting veterans, their dependents, and their organizations, compiled by Gus Canaday, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, 2813 Sherbourne Drive, Nashville, Tenn.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them, under certain circumstances, and, therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Tennessee's veteran laws will come to their attention.

The outline is as follows:

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgments and oaths are admitted to instruments, depositions, and affidavits by members of the armed forces.

Evidence of presumed death or absence of a member of the armed forces is admitted.

Protection is afforded persons acting under power of attorney granted by members of the armed forces.

Disability of minority is removed as to contracting for veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights or State legislation.

Wills may be probated where subscribing witnesses are absent in the armed forces. This provision is applicable until 10 years after the close of World War II.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration and voting is provided.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Copies of records in the county register's office may be obtained for a fee of $1. Certified copies of discharges is legal evidence thereof.

Free copies of public records are available for wards of the Veterans' Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

The war records bureau in the adjutant general's department furnishes each county with a complete list of those who served in World War II. Any records in the bureau's possession will be furnished, upon request, to the department of veterans' affairs without cost.

Discharge papers are recorded free of charge in the register's offices of the various counties.

Counties and municipalities may establish service offices to assist veterans.

A department of veterans' affairs has been established with a director and assistant directors in each congressional district to assist and advise veterans concerning laws for their benefit. This department now performs services previously imposed upon the ex-servicemen's bureau in the adjutant general's department.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

State and county teachers' certificates and certificates of county superintendent of public instruction held by veterans of World Wars I and II have been extended.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of World War I veterans who were killed in action during the war or died as a result of such service. Amount—$150 maximum per annum per child. Free tuition is granted at State institutions of secondary or college grade.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

The city charter of Knoxville has been amended to allow 5- and 10-point preferences to veterans, their wives or widows under civil service.

Five- and ten-point preference is given to veterans in State civil service.

Preference is given to veterans in the appointment of reporters for a general or special court martial or a court of inquiry.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act.

County election commissioners and other State and county officers are reinstated upon termination of military service for the remainder of the term for which elected.

Veterans are given credit for time spent in the service in computing experience for any position.

Members of the armed forces may participate in the Teachers' Retirement Act.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Money received as pension from the State of Tennessee is exempt from execution, attachment, or garnishment.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

All rights, privileges, and immunities granted to veterans of World War I are extended to veterans of World War II.

GUARDIANSHIP

A Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act has been created with modifications, providing for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Veterans, their widows and orphans may be admitted to the Confederate Soldiers' Home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

LAWS ON VETERANS' BENEFITS

The department of veterans' affairs has correlated all laws—Federal, State, and local—enacted for the benefit of the armed forces, veterans, their families and dependents.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Veterans who are entitled to receive the National Guard service medal must be issued an additional clasp indicative of wartime service.

PENSIONS

Pensions are paid to veterans of the Civil War, their widows and servants, and to the veterans of the Mexican War.

Amounts received for old-age assistance are deducted from Confederates' pensions.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Compilation of records pertaining to soldiers and sailors who served in World War I under enlistment from Tennessee is deposited with the State librarian for safekeeping.

The war-records bureau in the adjutant general's department has charge of compiling the records of those who served in World Wars I and II. Appropriations have been made for this compilation.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTIONS FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Proceeds of a life-insurance policy payable by the Government of the United States, whether issued prior or subsequent to enactment of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by Congress, is exempt from inheritance tax.

Drivers' licenses are renewed without examination after termination of military service.

Free auto licenses are granted to disabled veterans who have been given a car by the United States.

A disabled or indigent veteran of any war, or any peacetime soldier, sailor, or marine who was disabled in regular service, owning less than $2,500 worth of property and doing business with a capital stock of not exceeding $500, is exempt from payment of State-imposed privilege taxes. The exemption is available in conducting over 140 different businesses, including undertakers, embalmers, operating of skating rinks, real-estate agencies, photographers, produce dealers, etc. Only one exemption is available.

Certified public accountants are not required to pay renewal fees while in military service during World War II.

General contractor's certificates of license are continued in full force and effect until 1 year after discharge from military service.

TAXATION

Performance of military duty is accepted as satisfactory evidence of payment of poll tax prior to April 15, 1949. Members of the armed forces may receive credit toward 1 year's poll tax for each 30 days' service in such forces, such credit constituting payment of the tax.

UNIFORMS

Veterans are exempt from prohibition on wearing the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The right of the American Legion to hold property, etc., has been established.

The unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc. of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor and subject to a fine not exceeding $25, or imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both.

Armory privileges are extended to veterans' organizations.

Much of the above legislation has been enacted by the Tennessee legislature through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations.

The DAV, which has some 18 chapters throughout the State, maintains four expertly trained full-time National Service Officers, under the direction of Lowell M. McGowan, at the Veterans Administration regional office, White Bridge Road, Nashville, Tenn., who extend all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled.

DAV MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for and by America's disabled war veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official voice of America's disabled defenders.

According to its congressional charter of incorporation—Public Law 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the DAV is open only to those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of ailments or disabilities incurred during, or by reason of, active service during time of war in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it.

More and more wounded and disabled veterans of World War II are becoming active members of the DAV.

Eligibles may become life members of the DAV upon payment of a fee of $100 ($50, if born before January 1, 1902) in cash, or by a down-payment of $5, or more, plus such installments as will complete payment of the full fee by the end of the second succeeding fiscal year (ending on June 30),

after which, if not fully paid, a carrying charge of $5 per year would accrue. A growing percentage are becoming DAV life members. Annual membership is available at $5.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, the National Headquarters of the DAV takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans Semi-Monthly newspaper containing accurate, up-to-date information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State and national DAV activities, which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization, and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for 28 years, been the depository for the funds of both the DAV and its incorporated trusteeship, the DAV Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co., of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan; and the department of public relations and employment, headed by Millard W. Rice. In addition to these service departments, the DAV service headquarters has as its office manager John E. Feighner, assistant national adjutant. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are themselves war wounded or disabled veterans.

These DAV national officers know all about the technical complications that disabled veterans must overcome factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of the rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law, as legalistically interpreted and as administratively applied.

Understanding such vexatious problems by personal experience, DAV national service officers are naturally more sympathetic than are nondisabled veterans or civilians and are therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with technical requirements to prove legal entitlement to benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worthwhile results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turn-over record, a low accident record, a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been demonstrated that to hire disabled veterans in just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers and taxpayers generally.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are, or have been, dependent upon these heroes, so that other young men who, in the future, may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that if they, too, should also be so unfortunate they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

As a veteran myself, it is a pleasure for me to commend the service program of the DAV and I am sure it merits the consideration and support of the entire country.

Tax Relief for Working Widows of War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr, Speaker, on March 28 last year I introduced H. R. 2850, which was designed to grant additional tax deductions from gross income for certain necessary expenses which fall most heavily upon those with modest incomes.

Among these items was included the expenses paid by a working wife, or widow, for nursery care or wages of a housekeeper. Although this bill erroneously and unfortunately became known as a baby sitter bill, it was, of course, never contemplated that there should be an expense deduction beyond the amount necessarily paid for housekeeping and nursery care during the period when the wife or mother was required to be at work.

I was given a brief hearing on this bill last year. To the members of the Committee on Ways and Means now engaged, I understand, in consideration of revisions in the Revenue Act, I recommend further careful consideration of the views then expressed regarding proposed amendments to section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code.

A special situation has, however, been called to my attention which seems to me unusually deserving. It would be covered by my previous bill. It embraces, however, a much more limited category of taxpayers, who, it seems to me, have a peculiar claim for special consideration. These are the widows of the men who fell in World War I and World War II. Many of them have been forced by their widowhood to go to work to support themselves and their children.

This situation was called forcibly to my attention by the national treasurer of the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans. Accordingly, I have introduced today a measure which would add a new subsection to section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for a tax deduction for necessary expenses paid to a nursery or housekeeper by a working widow of a World War I or World II deceased veteran. These brave women, who are struggling to carry on as they know their husbands would want them to do, and are finding it, in countless instances, extremely difficult to keep their heads above water and furnish comfortable support to their children, deserve, not alone our commendation, but this tangible evidence that we, as legislators, are conscious of the problem which they face and ready to lend a sympathetic ear.

The cost of this relief will not be great. Its far-reaching and beneficial results will be extensive.

Very properly, this Congress has enacted several measures designed to assist in various ways those who answered their country's call in time of war. We must never allow ourselves to forget, however, that some of those with whom we served, never returned to their families and their homes. They are not here. They never will be here to speak for themselves. To them, it is not within our power to give anything except our homage and respect. To their loved ones, however, we can repay in part the debt owed by a grateful Nation to these fallen heroes, in lightening, in some measure, the financial burden which they must undergo through the loss of the breadwinner of the family.

On behalf of these working women, widowed by war, I bespeak support for this measure from the Committee on Ways and Means and the Members of the House.

Failure To Extend Reciprocal Trade Program Would Be To Shirk Duties of World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baton Rouge (La.) State Times of March 4, 1948:

SHALL WE DOUBLE BACK?

The arguments are old and badly shopworn, but there's more than a possibility that extension of the reciprocal-trade law may be beaten by men like Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, and Representative KNUTSON, of Minnesota, if they can work up a scare over the recent decline in farm prices. They

have been battling for a return to high tariffs almost since the reciprocal-trade law went into effect 14 years ago.

President Truman has asked Congress to extend the law three more years. It shouldn't take any oratory to convince Congress that the trade policy of matching tariff concessions is more important today than it ever was at the depths of the depression of the 1930's.

Yet opponents of the measure will haul out the old argument that any lowering of tariffs "may seriously injure many vital domestic industries." That's what Senator BUTLER has been saying for years. That's the argument he used in opposition to the tariff adjustments agreed to by the United States with 22 other nations last year.

Through these agreements, we matched corresponding reductions by the other countries. The talks at Geneva, Switzerland, leading to these agreements were almost wrecked last year by the selfishness of the wool bloc in Congress. Remember the occasion—when, during the preliminary negotiations in Geneva, a dozing Congress approved a bill which would have made it almost impossible for Australians and South Africans to sell their wool to the United States. The bill was later killed, but its passage almost wrecked the conference in Geneva.

A standing argument against lowering the tariff on imports is that this would allow cheaply made foreign goods to flood the country, to the disadvantage of American labor and capital. It just isn't so at this date, nor is it likely to be so anytime within the next few years, considering the lack of productivity of the rest of the world.

Domestic producers interests have, if anything been over-safeguarded since the reciprocal trade law was passed 14 years ago, They will continue to be protected; their lobbies are more than powerful enough to see to this.

There is no valid argument for killing the reciprocal trade law. Its extension will be as much a morale builder as a direct stimulus to international trade. If we double back in our tracks and do not extend the law, we will have returned to isolationism and shirked one of our duties of world leadership.

Ominous Secrecy of Closed Hearings on Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 28, 1948:

IN OMINOUS SECRECY

By a strict party vote, a House subcommittee decided to conduct closed hearings on a measure to extend the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. Congressman DOUGHTON, who managed this law while the Democrats were in control, protested that "this may mean a return to the secrecy in which the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was written behind closed doors, with high-tariff lobbyists for special interests."

This might be discounted as a partisan objection except that there is much factual evidence for Mr. DOUGHTON'S fears. This Congress showed its high-tariff tastes in the wool bill which President Truman killed by veto. House leaders have declared that they mean to subject every reciprocal tariff-reduction deal to approval by Congress, which would bring on the kind of old-style logrolling that led to the Hawley-Smoot Act. And when President Truman signed a mutually beneficial agreement to exchange nonmilitary goods with Czechoslovakia, Republicans tried to create an impression that he was trafficking dangerously with potential enemies, and threatened tighter restrictions in the extension of the law.

In these circumstances, closed-door proceedings inevitably suggest an effort to put through a quick reversal of the popular 14-year-old freer-trade policy without bringing down the flood of protests which open hearings would produce.

General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from General Wainwright dealing with the great work Gen. Douglas MacArthur has carried on in the Pacific. He feels, as do many Members of Congress, that General MacArthur ought to be brought back to the United States to give testimony before the several committees in Congress on the Japanese situation.

The letter follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
NATIONAL VETERANS COMMITTEE
FOR MACARTHUR FOR PRESIDENT,
New York, N. Y., May 6, 1948.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: There is no question more important to the future of the United States and the western world than that of our national preparedness. No man in this country suffered more because of our lack of preparedness, except possibly myself, than Douglas MacArthur. General MacArthur, through bitter personal experience, knew in every phase—from air to ground and naval—what lack of preparedness can do under the vicious attack without warning of an utterly ruthless enemy. He knows exactly what preparedness means to the United States through his long struggle back to victory in the Pacific—when he not only had to fight the enemy against overwhelming odds but struggled continuously to obtain personnel and equipment.

General MacArthur knows better than any man living that whatever assault may be originated from the air must be finally determined on the ground. He knows only too well that the present enemies of the United States and our world desire first to accomplish their objectives of the destruction of our constitutional democracy by means of revolution and civil war. Their last resort only would be real war from the land, sea, and air. Revolution and civil war must be largely met from the ground.

There is no officer in the United States armed forces whose experience in any degree equals that of General MacArthur. The viewpoint of the average civilian on those subjects is to a greater or lesser degree theoretical. This is no time for theory. It is the time now for definite, practical action. Why does the Congress of the United States not order General MacArthur back to testify before it and give the country the benefit of his vast knowledge on these dominant, all-consuming necessities of today?

There is no man, civilian or military, who equals the practical knowledge of Douglas MacArthur as to international conditions, particularly as they apply to the all present subversive influences. He knows because he has lived through them. He by himself has had to meet these conditions, both as a military man and as a great civil administrator. The record of his civil administration in Japan is unequaled by any other man today in this tortured and torn world—tortured and torn because the issues and questions have not been squarely met and eliminated.

There is no man living who knows more about the cost of preparedness and the cost of meeting of subversive elements than Douglas MacArthur. Why? Because he has lived through these questions of costs both as a great and successful military commander in war and a great civil national administrator during times of most difficult peace.

Gentlemen, your duty to these United States demands that you summon Douglas MacArthur to appear before you immediately, and give our country the vast benefit of his unlimited practical experience and knowledge.

With kindest regards and best wishes for success, I am,

Sincerely,

J. M. WAINRIGHT,
General, United States Army, Retired,
Chairman.

Prayer of Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the prayer offered by the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, a resident of my district, in the House of Representatives on April 14, 1948.

It was most appropriate that Dr. Thorning offer prayer on Pan American Day. He has long been interested in and has worked untiringly for the good-neighbor policy. He was singularly honored by the Republic of Venezuela when he was the only ecclesiastic in the whole world invited as an honor guest for the inauguration of President Don Romulo Gallegos.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of "The Americas" and "World Affairs," offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty God, Father of light and love, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and bestow Thy benediction upon all the Members of the United States Congress.

Trusting in the merits of Thy Divine Son, Our Redeemer, we offer our devoted prayers, on this Pan-American Day, 1948, for each and every member of the United States delegation at Santa Fe de Bogotá, Colombia, as well as for all their colleagues from the other American Republics. Crown their work with complete success. Protect our Good Neighbors and ourselves, dear Saviour, from the deceits and violence of the Nazi-minded followers of Karl Marx; disperse the minions

of wickedness who would destroy the spiritual unity of the Americas; preserve, by Thy Grace, the ideals of truth, justice, and charity, which are the best pledge of freedom and democracy.

Bless, we beseech Thee, the deliberations of this body and the conference of our brother Americans, assembled under the banners of inter-American friendship. Grateful for Thy divine gifts, we implore a special blessing for the children of America that they may grow strong and happy in one world, peaceful, but with liberty. This we ask in the holy name of God, our life and our inspiration. Amen.

Do the Republicans Plan To Stab Reciprocal Trade to Death in the Dark?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 5, 1948, which analyzes very forcefully the dangers to democratic government from formulating such important policies as tariff and international trade in closed sessions:

STABBING IN THE DARK

A few Congressmen—members of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tariffs—are holding secret hearings on the bill for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The hearings concern momentous public business. But the public is not allowed to attend them. The press is barred. And the only citizens invited to testify are certain technical experts, most of whom seem to be chiefly expert at lobbying for high tariffs.

There have been many protests against the secrecy of these hearings. But the subcommittee's Republican chairman, Representative B. W. GEARHART, of California, has dismissed them thus:

"I can't see that any useful purpose would be served by listening to spokesmen for a bunch of ladies' sewing societies reading statements prepared by the State Department."

Mr. GEARHART'S utterance should be long remembered. It typifies an arrogant attitude toward tariff-making and international trade which, when assumed by Republicans in the past, has done their party—and the country—grievous harm; an attitude which, if the Republican majority in Congress assumes it now, will do far greater harm in the future.

The fact is that spokesmen for many farm, labor, business, industrial, and consumer organizations asked for the right to attend the hearings and to tell why they agree with the State Department that the reciprocal trade program should be continued without crippling amendment or limitation.

Denied that right by Mr. GEARHART'S obvious contempt for public opinion, they are to have a substitute opportunity for public expression. In Washington, on May 14, the Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade will conduct "the people's hearings" on RTA. These hearings will be open. The press can report them. And all Members of Congress will be urged to attend them.

The "people's hearings" will help to dramatize the issue. Through them more citizens will learn why full extension of the reciprocal trade program is essential to America's efforts for prosperity and peace. And why this country simply cannot afford to fail or falter now in its long-time leadership of a world movement to lower trade barriers by mutual agreements among nations.

But what ought to rally overwhelming support for the program are the secret hearings dictated by Mr. GEARHART and other high-tariff Republicans. They are convincing evidence of a desire and a plan to stab reciprocal trade to death in the dark. Men of good intentions do not fear the light.

Defense Analysis Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin, the New York Times military expert, which appeared in the Times of May 2. I commend this very timely and thoughtful comment to the attention of Members:

DEFENSE ANALYSIS URGED—PRECIPITATING OF WAR IS HELD POSSIBLE BY OVERBALANCING MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Political cross currents of an election year and confusion about the imminence of emergency continued last week to cloud the defense picture.

Congress, in its consideration of the programs for strengthening the armed services seemed to be galloping off in all directions at once, and its somewhat frenetic horseback actions were certainly not guided into the road of reason by shouts of "Giddap" uttered in a Babel of tongues by the armed services, each eager for the maximum amount of public funds.

The Senate and House seem to be on the verge of hasty and ill-considered action; it is high time Congress paused, stepped back and took a good long look at the entire defense problem to put the whole picture in perspective.

CONFLICT NOW JOINED

That perspective must include not only purely military measures, but the European recovery program, aid to Greece, Turkey, and China, the projected military lend-lease program for strengthening the armed forces of our friends in Europe, and all other measures which influence the conflict, now joined, between the United States and the nations of the western world, and Russia and her satellites.

We are, and have been for some time, in a cold war with Russia. If we lose that cold war we shall surely be in a hot war, or shooting war. If we win it we shall quite probably be able to avert, or postpone the shooting war, or at the very least, if the bombs start dropping, we shall be in a far better position to win a shooting war.

This very clearly means that purely military measures must be coordinated carefully with other measures; if we overbalance military preparedness at the expense of other preparedness we may well precipitate what we are trying to avert.

Nor must we make the mistake of trying to provide absolute security. The United States, even during this period of cold war, cannot possibly organize and maintain without disastrous results to our economy and our aims armed forces large enough—particularly an army large enough—to prevent by physical means the eruption of the Russian Army into western Europe.

Such an ambition would probably mean the maintenance of at least 1,000,000 American troops in Europe, backed up by hundreds of thousands in this country. The real deterrent to Russian aggression in the West is not, and cannot be, the forces we can maintain there.

The real deterrent is absolutely certain knowledge in the Kremlin that armed aggression by them will mean shooting war with us.

In other words, the yardstick of relative security in Europe is not merely the number of Americans in uniform there. It is that, in small part, but it is much more; it is also political guaranties against aggression to western Europe; it is also the economic rehabilitation of Europe and the rehabilitation of the military power of the west.

If France, for instance, had 100 well-equipped divisions, ready for instant mobilization today, the whole complexion of European politics would be different. Yet France can organize those 100 divisions only if we help her with equipment and in other ways.

Our own Army's estimates of the cost of equipping 25 divisions of our own with the most modern equipment reach $7,000,000,000 over a 4-year period; some estimates are more than double this figure. How much would the reequipment of 100 French divisions cost?

Congress has no idea, and yet clearly we cannot make plans to build up our own forces without correlating them with plans to build up the forces of our allies. To do so is to legislate blindly.

COST A MAJOR ELEMENT

Cost is—and must be—a major element in our defense calculations. Congress, so far, has blithely dismissed it. A great tax reduction bill has just been passed. Yet plans Congress is now considering will increase the cost of the Army alone to more than $8,200,000,000 annually by 1952.

The 70-group Air Force is going to cost at least $7,500,000,000 by the same year; the expanded Navy will add at least $6,000,000,000, probably much more, to these figures.

There is thus clearly projected an annual defense budget of at least $21,700,000,000 without inclusion of costs for atomic energy and other related military expenditures. Mr. Beardsley Ruml foresees defense budgets of $30,000,000,000 annually within a few years.

What are the implications to our national economy of such budgets? Are we to become a bankrupt state in our efforts to provide security? Too little noted was one passage in the testimony of Secretary of Defense James Forrestal:

"You cannot get a big military program unless you cease the making of motor cars and washing machines and refrigerators."

Production and raw-material controls, allocations and rationing will, in other words, be necessary. Where do they start and where do they end? Housing is a badly needed defense measure—no matter in what terms defense is judged—in this country. Will building materials be largely or entirely sequestered for military use?

What about trucks, machine tools, rolling equipment—all badly needed overseas and also needed for military production? Who gets what?

Has Congress faced up to the problem of what $20,000,000,000 to $30,000,000,000 defense budgets would mean to our whole economy and to the European recovery program? The answer is clearly "No."

There is, as part of the great fog of uncertainty which seems to have made the congressional course more bumbling than usual, the lesser uncertainty of the time factor of emergency.

Again, too little noticed, had been Mr. Forrestal's testimony that "the problem we have to face is that we set up a plan last year

based on the assumption of no immediate danger of war.

"We think now," he continued, "that you have to contemplate the possibility of war, and this is an effort to make an accommodation between those two assumptions."

But the plans Congress has been considering have been based on far more than the possibility of war; indeed, the services have backed their pleas secretly if not openly by flat declarations that war is inevitable and some think imminent.

But if war is indeed imminent, then obviously the sky is the limit and all the proposals Congress has been considering are "small potatoes."

If, on the other hand, we are facing an emergency of long duration—and most of the signs seem to point that way—then some of the programs Congress has been considering are exorbitant and if implemented over a period of years will prove to be a very severe drain upon the Nation.

It is quite evident that Congress is trying to make what Mr. Forrestal called an accommodation, but the compromises suggested, influenced as they have been by politics, do not appear to be altogether sound either from the military point of view or from the point of view of the broader picture.

DRAFT-UMT MERGER VIEWED

The hybrid draft-UMT merger now suggested is one evidence of this. Under its terms the Army will have in one uniform, in many cases serving side by side in the same units, and separated only by a few months in age, young men required to serve for different periods—some for 1 year, others for 2 years.

Those limited to 1-year service could not be sent overseas; they would have to be weeded out, therefore, of all units sent overseas before those units could be embarked. This is obviously an impossible administrative situation and one not calculated to maintain good morale in the services, because of the discrimination which the 2-year men would be certain to feel.

Yet the present need is for manpower—immediate manpower for which the straight-out selective draft to supplement volunteer recruiting, is the only possible answer.

There has been, therefore, little clear thinking in Washington about the kind of defense we need or about its correlation with other national security factors or about the implications of a large-scale defense program to the future.

But the greatest danger is the mental psychosis which the term the "inevitability of war" implies. If nations—or their rulers—think in those terms, a state of mind is created which does make war inevitable.

Moreover, the concentration upon purely military measures which this state of mind forces may reduce the effectiveness of the nonmilitary measures which, if successfully followed, might make shooting war unnecessary.

Such is the danger as it appears from beyond the glare of Washington's political klieg lights.

Mothers' Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Sunday is Mother's Day, a day set aside to meditate upon motherhood, the glories of motherhood, the responsibilities of motherhood, the sacrifices of motherhood, and the far-reaching influence of a good mother in a good home.

The following Mothers' Day message by Rev. C. E. B. Ward, executive secretary, the League for the American Home, Inc., 55 West Forty-second Street, New York City, is so appropriate and timely during these trying days of world travail that I include it as a part of my remarks for the consideration of my colleagues and the American public in general:

MOTHER'S DAY MESSAGE

(By Rev. C. E. B. Ward)

Mother's Day highlights mothers' unparalleled opportunity for molding youth.

I. CHILDHOOD IS THE TIME

Hitler taught the world Solomon's lesson given centuries before—"If you catch a child early enough you can teach it to hate or love as you please."

On this philosophy of "Early Enough" Hitler conditioned all Germany to hate and kill.

How early is early enough? The editor of an educational magazine says, the character of 50 percent of youth is formed before the age of 10. The Catholic Church sets the age at 7. A college president says the first 5 years. Modern psychology says the permanent bent is determined before the child is 2 years old. A world famous clergyman says child character begins forming from the day it is born. The head of the New York Psychological Center says the strategic time is when the child is too young to understand but not too young to accept—that unconscious period when the child, absorbing the world around it, is wax to receive but marble to retain.

The hand that rocks the cradle, tucks baby in bed, lifts it into its high chair and feeds it, does indeed rule the world.

Any effective youth program must regard childhood as the time. Later days may belong to other persons and institutions.

II. HOME IS THE PLACE

Childhood represents divine timing. Therefore, home is the place because God set the solitary in families where fathers and mothers can personally deal with their own children individually from infancy, the small group facilitating intensive moral and spiritual instruction.

Home is the universal agent. Every person getting into the world in a decent way comes through a home. More youth enter the career of homemaking than enter all other professions combined, thus demanding compulsory parent training. Home is the only agency reaching every child from infancy.

Home influences persist through life and these ramify through every phase of life: Faith, character, citizenship in a democracy, crime prevention; and when trained parents teach their children to have good will to peoples across all borders these homes become the indispensable factor for world peace. Our Secretary of State recently declared, "Our foreign policy has entered the home and taken its place at the family table."

Home is the place where America will hold its rendezvous with destiny. With 18,000,000 children between the ages of 7 and 14 on the loose, according to a Government bureau, without adequate parental guidance, the future is anything but hopeful.

III. RELIGION IS THE POWER

A house is a residence. Religion makes it a home. Three hundred years ago a young immigrant and his bride on their marriage day agreed to kneel and pray with and for each other every day of their lives. They put this agreement in writing and signed it. Their children growing up in this atmosphere followed their parents' example and did the same, and their children for 10 generations. There has been no crime, delinquency, or divorce in their descendants for 300 years. There have been distinguished clergymen, musicians, teachers, all descendants are law-abiding citizens. "Families that pray together stay together."

"I have no trouble with children from old-fashioned homes who believe in God," says a juvenile judge. The head of the FBI says, "The present lawless condition of youth can be cured only by old-fashioned homes and religion."

During the First World War boys of 30 nationalities and 8 major religions, to their constant amazement, lived in the spiritually inspired Marvel House homes in the unity of a perfect brotherhood, while their brothers and fathers across the sea were fighting each other.

Religion is the power that eradicates crime, prevents the broken homes of divorce, makes all nations good neighbors.

The formula for the spiritual atomic force needed to shake the world is spiritually inspired homes. It is just as simple as that.

Capitalism's Worst Foes Aren't Reds at All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post April 24, 1948:

CAPITALISM'S WORST FOES AREN'T REDS AT ALL

A few weeks ago Emil Schram, president of the New York Stock Exchange, told the Senate Finance Committee that over the past 2 years several of America's largest corporations had been forced to withdraw from the market issues of new securities representing an aggregate of $170,000,000, for lack of public demand. For one reason or another American savers and investors were unwilling or unable to provide the capital for new equipment and plant expansion for these vital industries.

Mr. Schram's testimony gives point to an article which William E. Robinson, vice president of the New York Herald Tribune, contributed to the March issue of the Clarkson Letter, published by Clarkson College of Technology at Potsdam, N. Y. Mr. Robinson presented the case of a wealthy entrepreneur who had been invited to invest $30,000,000 in a newsprint-paper mill. The prospective investor looked into the matter, and according to Mr. Robinson, came up with this result:

"For an investment of around $30,000,000, he and his associates could build a newsprint mill that would produce around 100,000 tons a year. At current prices that would give him gross sales of roughly $9,000,000. * * * On the $9,000,000 worth of sales there would be a gross profit, before taxes, of around $2,500,000. After taxes he would have available for dividends $1,500,000 net profit. Out of his $1,500,000 in dividends, the Government gets another $1,270,000 in income taxes—since my friend and his prospective partners would be in the 85-percent tax bracket. So that, in the first year of operation they have $230,000 net after taxes; and the Government has in taxes $2,270,000—$1,000,000 from corporate taxes and $1,270,000 from income taxes. * * * The owners have taken all the risks. The Govern-

ment has taken ten times the profit of the owners, with no risk, no responsibility."

The tears, as Mr. Robinson points out, are not for his rich friend, who, of course, can do better by buying the tax-free bonds of some States which is financing a bonus for veterans. The tears are for the men who might have had jobs in the newsprint mill that never got built, and for the American economy, which could have been steered a little further from inflation by this production that never got produced.

The tears are also for the capitalist free-enterprise system, which has never been so much as scratched by the Communists, but is being bled to death by its vociferous friends and alleged well-wishers. It is all very well to wave the atomic bomb at the Communists, but we shall not have much to save if some curb is not placed on those here at home who are responsible for the endless expansion of bureaucracy and the continual rise of Government costs.

Even within the present fantastic level of expenditure, the tax system can be reformed so as to remove at least some of its destructive effect on the ability of savers and investors to save and invest. Without an incentive for investors to provide new capital for our industrial plant, the new capital will more and more come from the Government—that is, from the forced savings of taxpayers instead of the voluntary savings of people who see a chance for profit. When that process has become the rule, free enterprise will have disappeared from this country. And when free enterprise is dead, the death of democracy won't be far behind.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Act Now More Important Than Ever Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth (Tex.) Press of March 4, 1948:

IMPORTANT NOW

President Truman has asked Congress for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This 14-year old law authorizes the President to make agreements with other countries for two-way cuts in tariff rates and other barriers to international commerce.

The act, Mr. Truman says, is more important now than ever before. His reasons for saying that seem to us unanswerable.

With other nations, we are engaged in a mighty endeavor to build a peaceful and prosperous world. Continued efforts to stimulate an increasing flow of trade among those nations are essential to success of that endeavor.

The reciprocal agreements recognize the fundamental fact that trade is a two-way business. We can't go on forever exporting more than we import. Other countries must be able to sell their goods to us if they are to get dollars to buy our products and to repay our loans. When we import needed goods we improve the living standards of Americans as consumers, and at the same time we make it possible to maintain foreign markets for our producers. And the lowering of trade barriers encourages private trading and free enterprise, as distinct from Government trading.

Noted Columnist Joins Growing Chorus of Those Endorsing Mundt Bill, H. R. 5852, as a Rational, Workable, Constitutional, and Constructive Method of Exposing and Controlling Communist Activities in the United States—Rules Committee Grants Rule—House Vote Scheduled for May 13 and 14—Early Senate Action Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, each mail brings new evidence of the growing chorus of voices endorsing the provisions and purposes of H. R. 5852, the so-called Mundt bill to control subversive activities in the United States.

Members of the House and Senate receiving post cards, letters, and telegrams opposing this legislation in the form it has come from the House Committee on Un-American Activities by unanimous action, would do well to squander a nickel on the newsstands any day and purchase a copy of the Communist Daily Worker published in New York City. Each edition of this Communist smear sheet and poison peddler is devoted in large part to hysterical attacks upon what they call the Mundt police-state bill. Evidently the writers of the Communist Daily Worker have been too busy reading radio bulletins out of Moscow and the pages of Pravda to study the provisions of H. R. 5852 since their entire tirade is in large part a disorganized array of misinformation. In all events, each article urges all whom they can influence or mislead to "write or wire your Congressman and Senator opposing this legislation."

Members of Congress can, in fact, get a fairly accurate concept of the number of Communists they have among their constituents by counting the inspired communications they receive in opposition to H. R. 5852 as a result of this Communist-inspired and financed "write your Congressman" campaign.

As against these shrill and frantic calls for help from the Communist camp, fortunately, Members of Congress can contrast the unprecedented amount of sound editorial comment supporting H. R. 5852. Such papers as the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Evening Star, the Washington News, the Washington Times-Herald, the Milwaukee Journal, the Hartford Courant of Hartford, Connecticut, and many others have given this legislation their editorial support. All but the Communists and their closest associates recognize that the time has come to take realistic, effective, albeit moderate and sound measures to circumscribe the treacherous activities of Communists in the United States. H. R. 5852 proposes action of that type.

Mr. Speaker, George E. Sokolsky is recognized as one of America's most talented and objective columnists. At this time, I would like to call attention to his analysis of the Mundt bill and the valid reasons he offers for its passage:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Usually, when a congressional committee or anybody else wants to determine whether a person is a Communist, he asks: "Do you believe in or plan to overthrow the Government of the United States?" or words to that effect.

That is a foolish question. No Communist wishes or plans to overthrow the Government of the United States. He desires to extend the power and authority of the Government of the United States or any other government.

He desires to expand its personnel; to develop its functions until the burden of taxes is so great that it produces revolution and confusion and then the Communists take over.

Once they do take over, they establish first a coalition of left-wing parties; then a dictatorship of the Communist Party, and finally the dictatorship of a politburo—or a small oligarchy which produces a proletarian dictatorship.

The correctness of the Mundt bill is that it meets just that situation. It defines the character of the Soviet Russian, the Polish, the Rumanian, the Yugoslavian, and other Communist governments as a totalitarian dictatorship. That is precisely what it is. It is not a democracy; it is not a social democracy, it is not a representative republic.

It is a totalitarian dictatorship, an oligarchy of a self-appointed elite which enslaves a people without mercy.

The Mundt bill places restrictions upon Americans which are ugly and should be unnecessary. But they are not unnecessary as much as we may find them offensive. The fact is that since 1917 the world has faced this horrible conspiracy; since 1933 this country has lived in a nightmare of corruption of every tradition of our people, of our literature, of our schools, of the components of our people, of our society.

The Communists have invaded our Government; they spoke for us, but against our interests, through the OWI; they managed to infiltrate our Army and Navy during the war and wrote a literature of falsehood which was distributed to our sons.

They have poisoned our industrial relations with the object of reducing the productivity of our Nation and so increasing the cost of government until the burden of debt and taxation becomes unbearable.

Obviously, existing law is inadequate to meet the danger of this fifth column. The fact is that many Communists still remain in public office and a Federal grand jury has been sitting in New York nearly a year without result; men and women who entered in 1934 into a conspiracy to invade our Government with the object of spying upon it and reaching high places to do it, are as free as the wind to continue their work of havoc.

The Mundt bill says:

"* * * One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon such Communist fronts."

Even more amazing is the fact that while communism is legally respectable, many well-intentioned persons continue to believe that this fifth column should be granted all the rights and privileges of a traditional American political party.

They are incapable of understanding that all Communists are agents, by consent, of a foreign government, who serve that government faithfully as a matter of creed.

The Communist front often consists of innocent persons who, favoring some cause, become affiliated with the Communists and thereupon are involved, sometimes unwillingly and often unknowingly, in the conspiracies of this vast international movement for the enslavement of the human race to a totalitarian dictatorship.

The period of probe and investigation is over; the time has come for strident action in defense of our institutions.

The Mundt bill is being and will continue to be attacked. Check the record of those who attack it. You will find that many of them have fought every effort, in this country, to safeguard the United States against the Soviet world revolution.

If those who attack the Mundt bill have such a record, it is not necessary to believe a word they say.

They have lied too long and too often. They have demonstrated their enmity to America.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's issue of the Washington News, the sprightly Scripps-Howard newspaper of the Nation's Capital, also carried a factual and effective editorial on H. R. 5852 which merits the reading of Members of Congress. I am including it herewith as a part of these remarks:

COMBATING COMMUNISM HERE

The Communist Party in the United States is a menace to the American people, not because it advocates unorthodox and unpopular political doctrines, but because it is an arm and agent of a foreign power.

It is part of a world-wide conspiracy, directed from Russia. Its present purpose is to undermine and weaken our country. Its ultimate aim is to establish here a Soviet-dominated dictatorship. In the event of war, it would undertake to serve Russia as a ruthless fifth column.

Our Government, by official policy, is opposing Communist aggression in other countries. It is our Government's right, and duty, to combat the Communist conspiracy here. How to do that effectively, by constitutional methods—by methods in harmony with our tradition of freedom for thought, belief, and expression—is the great problem.

Now, from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has come a thoughtful, useful contribution to solution of this problem.

The committee's so-called Mundt bill does not propose to outlaw the Communist Party, to make membership in that party a crime, or to forbid the preaching of communism as a political theory. "We are seeking rather," say the authors of this bill—

"To strike a body blow at the American cadre of the Soviet-directed Communist conspiracy. We believe that if its criminal activities are prosecuted, its false fronts exposed, and its foreign assistance and direction cut away, the movement in the United States, standing alone for what it is, will be overwhelmingly defeated. We are willing to permit the theories of communism and democracy to clash in the open market place of political ideas in America; but we insist that communism not be allowed to have the unfair advantage in this conflict of the unrestricted use of illegal means, the cloak of secrecy and fraud, and the assistance and direction of a foreign Communist dictatorship."

The bill would make it a crime to attempt, by any method, to establish in the United States a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control. It would require the Communist Party to file with the Attorney General each year a list of its officers and members and a detailed financial report, and evasion of this requirement could be heavily penalized. It would require organizations designated as Communist fronts by the Attorney General to list their officers, but not their possibly innocent members. It would penalize Government officials who employed Communists.

There are many other provisions in the bill, which is of necessity long and complex. We hope Congress will not rush this measure to adoption, as some of its members urge. Time should be taken to study it carefully, to consider sincere criticisms and suggestions, to make certain that, if enacted, it will be constitutional and can be enforced fairly.

But the screams of the Communist Daily Worker that the Mundt bill would mean a police state in America need not be taken seriously. Those screams, coming from people who worship and serve the most complete and brutal police state in the world, are a cynical false alarm.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the Rules Committee of the House gave a careful and judicious hearing to our presentation requesting a rule on H. R. 5852. As a result the rule was granted and Majority Leader HALLECK is scheduling this legislation for action on the House floor on Thursday and Friday, May 13 and 14. Three Members of Congress, KLEIN, of New York City; ISACSON, of New York City, and MARCANTONIO, of New York City, appeared before the Rules Committee in opposition to H. R. 5852 and in opposition to its being granted a rule. Congressman KLEIN stated he was authorized to state that Congressman BLATNIK, of Minnesota, shared his viewpoint and joined him in his opposition to H. R. 5852. Other than these four Members of the House, however, nobody was quoted in opposition to H. R. 5852 and nobody else appeared to oppose the legislation or the rule.

While the constituents who favor doing something realistic about the Communist menace in America, Mr. Speaker, may be slow to write their Congressmen, I venture the conjecture that 90 percent of the people of this Republic applaud this prompt action by the Rules Committee and will look with favor upon those Members of Congress who support this legislation in the votes to be taken on next Thursday and Friday.

Massachusetts Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, many veterans are not familiar with the various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions that have been extended to them by the laws of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It is, therefore, a pleasure for me to present a compilation of such laws as prepared by my good friend, Otis L. Farley, department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, room 517, State House, Boston, Mass.

While Comrade Farley's disabilities are such that he is confined to a wheelchair, his concern for the even less fortunate has led him to take an active part in service work in behalf of the DAV for many years. He is an inspiration to all of us who, like myself, are proud to be members of that organization.

The outline of such laws is as follows:

BONUS

Veterans who served honorably in World War II between September 16, 1940, and December 31, 1946, are entitled to $300 for foreign service and $200 for domestic service.

Allowances are paid to dependents of servicemen who died during World War II.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

An allowance is provided for the burial of indigent veterans, their wives or widows, dependent fathers or mothers and minor children. Burial may not be in a potter's field. Relatives may be allowed to conduct the funeral.

Cities and towns may appropriate funds to veterans' organizations to conduct funerals for World War II dead.

Any employee of a city or town who is a veteran may, when authorized by the mayor or selectmen, attend the funeral or memorial services of a veteran without loss of pay.

Death certificates shall set forth military record of decedent.

The dead bodies of veterans may not be turned over to medical schools for dissection.

Cities and towns may appropriate money for the care and decoration of graves by veterans' organizations. Veterans' graves are to be cared for at the expense of the town if no other provision for care is made.

Cities and towns may appropriate money for erecting headstones at veterans' graves.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgement is made of legal instruments executed by members of the armed forces.

Servicemen may dispose of their property by a nuncupative will.

Oaths of office of persons elected while in the armed forces may be taken before certain commissioned officers.

Procedure has been established for obtaining relief in certain cases.

The Civil Relief Act affords protection of interests under mortgage foreclosures.

Disability of minority of veterans qualified under the GI bill of rights has been removed.

No discrimination may be made against persons in uniform in public places.

Certain monthly payments to cooperative banks due and payable by men in the armed forces has been suspended or waived.

Temporary suspension of payments is provided on certain serial shares of cooperative banks owned by persons in the armed forces or their dependents and the transfer of their value to military share accounts.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

Absentee registration and voting are provided.

Any veteran in the soldiers' home at Chelsea has the same right as any other citizen of that city to be assessed and to vote therein.

No veteran, if otherwise qualified to vote, shall be disqualified therefor on account of receiving aid from a city or town or because of nonpayment of a poll tax.

CLAIMS, ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS, SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

The Adjutant General is authorized to procure from the United States copies of the records of Massachusetts troops in the War of 1812, to preserve such records in his office and to certify copies thereof and issue certificates relating thereto.

Copies of veterans' vital records are furnished free to veterans, their families, etc., for use in connection with claims against the United States.

Copies of certain public records are furnished free to servicemen.

The official in charge of veterans' matters in cities and towns records discharges upon payment of a 25-cent fee.

The commissioner of veterans' services is required to furnish, among other things, information, prepare papers, and expedite the adjudication of claims and assist claimants in proving their cases. Municipal and district departments of veterans' services have been established.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS, QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Vocational education in towns is authorized to be extended to include disabled veterans.

Educational requirements for admission to the bar or for registration as a pharmacist do not apply to World War II veterans.

State hospital, school, or workshop may be leased to the United States for the purpose of reeducating veterans and rehabilitating them into industry.

Courses of school instruction may be provided for a period not exceeding 2 years for the benefit of veterans.

Members of the armed forces and World War II veterans who served at least 60 days are entitled to take university extension courses, free of charge, for a period of 4 years from date of discharge.

Privilege of renewal of an expired license as an electrician is granted without examination within 4 months after discharge from the armed forces.

War service may be counted as practical experience for the purpose of qualifying as a plumbing inspector.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who served in the armed forces of the United States during any war and were killed in action or died as a result of such service. Amount—$350 maximum per year per child.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

A farm-aid bureau in the Department of Agriculture assists war veterans wishing to engage in farming.

Labor preferences are extended to veterans in construction of rural highways with Federal aid.

Leaves of absence are extended to officers and employees of the Commonwealth and of local units with preservation of seniority rights, retirement benefits, etc. and reinstatement upon termination of service in the armed forces.

Veterans under 50 years of age and otherwise qualified are eligible for appointment as teachers in State aided approved vocational schools.

Veterans are granted preference in the labor service of towns where civil-service rules do not apply.

Veterans are granted preference under civil service in State and certain local units.

Veterans may be appointed as State police officers without regard to age requirements.

Benefit rights of veterans are preserved under the Unemployment Compensation Act and Teachers' Retirement System.

Reemployment is provided for persons who left positions upon being called into active service in the armed forces (under the provisions of the Federal Selective Service and Training Act of 1940) and who were rejected for such service.

Reinstatement rights of war veterans public-school teachers have been established.

Retirement is provided for veterans in the service of the State.

Vacation pay is extended to officers and employees of certain counties and municipalities who enter the armed forces.

War-service credit in computing continuous service of certain municipal officers and employees is required as a prerequisite to promotions, etc.

Second-injury benefits are extended to employed disabled war veterans by the State.

GUARDIANSHIP

By order of the court, notice shall be given the Veterans' Administration of an accounting by a guardian if the ward is entitled to any benefit, estate or income payable through the Administration.

HOMES

The soldiers' home in Chelsea, Mass., became a State institution upon the conveyance of certain property on December 1, 1934. Admission is provided to that home. Ambulance service has been provided.

Authority has been granted for construction and maintenance of another soldiers' home at Holyoke.

Children of veterans may be placed in foster homes.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

Hospital care is provided for needy Civil War veterans, their wives or widows.

Insane persons in the armed forces may be detained temporarily in certain State institutions.

The Commissioner of Veterans' Services may authorize the payment of medical and hospital bills for dependent relatives of persons in the armed forces.

HOUSING

Cities and towns are authorized to provide housing for World War II veterans and their families.

State arsenal property at Framingham and certain parkland in Newburyport is being used for housing veterans.

Nonprofit corporations may be established to provide homes for veterans.

LAND-SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

A farm-aid bureau has been established in the Department of Agriculture to give assistance to veterans desirous of engaging in farming. The bureau operates in cooperation with the State college extension divisions and war veterans' organizations.

LAWS ON VETERANS' RIGHTS, ETC.

Provision has been made for the compilation of the laws of the State relating to veterans.

MEMORIALS

Provisions have been made for the improvement, care and maintenance of the Massachusetts World War I memorial at St. Mihiel, France.

Cities and towns may appropriate money for medals, scrolls, or certificates honoring World War II veterans.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Cities and towns may appropriate money for observance of Memorial Day.

Veterans in the public service of State and local units may be granted leaves of absence on Memorial Day.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

A Commission has been established to prepare a suitable history of Massachusetts' part in World War II.

Copies of the Gold Star Record of Massachusetts in the World War are distributed free to surviving parents, widows or heirs.

A military museum is maintained in the State House.

Provision has been made for the deposit of records, relics, etc., for safekeeping in rooms in the State House used by veterans' organizations.

Registration is provided of births, deaths, and marriages which took place on Federal reservations during World War II.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

A Postwar Rehabilitation Commission has been established with certain duties.

Disclosure of the names of relief recipients is prohibited except for official purposes or charitable organization work.

Towns may appropriate money for necessary aid to soldiers and sailors and their families. Names of persons aided may not be disclosed.

Trust companies, savings banks, cooperative banks, credit unions, and insurance companies may make loans to qualified veterans under the GI bill of rights.

War allowances for dependents, State or military aid, and soldiers' relief for veterans of World War II and their dependents are administered by a commissioner of veterans' services (formerly commissioner of veterans' aid and pensions).

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTIONS FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Veterans' organizations are exempt from the law providing for the licensing of clubs dispensing food and beverages to members and guests. (Not applicable to clubs where alcoholic beverages are served.)

Persons serving in the armed forces are exempt from payment of a license fee for their dogs. Exemption is available to a person having a kennel license and who is keeping such dog or dogs.

Special hunting and fishing license may be issued to persons in the armed forces; no fee may be charged a resident and nonresidents may be charged a nominal sum. Free fishing privileges are extended to veterans confined to Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Reservation and renewal of liquor license surrendered by reason of service in the armed forces or by order of the military authorities is provided.

Refund is provided of certain portion of motor-vehicle license fees when registrants surrender certificates and number plates prior to their entry into the armed forces. Renewal fee is waived if application is made within 6 months after discharge.

Veterans' organizations may be issued special licenses to sell flags, badges, flowers, etc. Disabled war veterans are exempt from peddlers' license fees.

Enlisted personnel of the armed forces in World War II are exempt from income tax. Commissioned officers have 3 years to pay the tax after separation.

Certain veterans are exempt from poll tax.

Certain professional and occupational licenses, permits, and certificates may be renewed within 6 months after termination of service in the armed forces. No fee may be charged for the period between the expiration and renewal dates.

Veterans of any war or blind persons are exempt from payment of a fee for insurance brokers' licenses.

Property of veterans' organizations to the extent of $100,000 is exempt from tax.

Property to the amount of $2,000 of certain disabled veterans, their wives or widows, and the property of other veterans, their wives or widows to the amount of $1,000 is exempt from taxation.

Veterans' organizations may sell certain tickets without license.

TRANSPORTATION

Street railways are authorized to make special rates for transportation of certain World War II veterans.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

State publication of the annual convention proceedings of veterans' organizations is provided.

Certain veterans' organizations are exempt from the law relative to registration of charitable corporations and the making of annual reports.

It is a penalty to exploit the uniform of veterans' organizations.

The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia, badges, etc., of certin veterans' organizations is punishable by a fine of not more than $20, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 month, or both.

Distribution of the compilation of veterans' laws is provided to veterans' organizations.

Armory privileges are granted to veterans' organizations.

Cities and towns may provide headquarters for veterans' organizations.

Rooms are provided in the Statehouse for use of veterans' organizations.

Drill and parade privileges with firearms are extended to certain veterans' organizations, with the right to have certain words inscribed on flags and the use of blank cartridges.

Appropriations may be provided by cities and towns for the observance of Memorial Day.

Free copies of the Gold Star Record of Massachusetts in the World War may be distributed to veterans' organizations.

Free copies of Massachusetts Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the Civil War may be distributed to camps of Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War and tents of Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

Towns may appropriate money for aid to veterans and their families.

Through the sponsorship and cooperation of the DAV and other veteran organizations, the above legislation has been enacted during past years.

At the present time the DAV, with some 63 chapters throughout the Commonwealth and annual membership dues averaging about $5, maintains volunteer or part-time service and employment officers in each.

The present department commander of the DAV, Anthony D. Tieso, 198 Manchester Street, Mattapan, Mass., has long been active in veteran affairs. He is also, at the present time, chairman of the Allied Veterans' Council of the State; former national commander of the Italian War Veterans and former Massachusetts Department Civil Service chairman. He has devoted, as evidenced by the many posts which he has held, a great part of his time to helping solve veteran problems, in addition to being a member of the United States Civil Service Board of Examiners of the first naval district.

In addition to service on a local level, the DAV maintains nine full-time national service officers, under the direction of Francis J. Henry, at the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, 17 Court Street, Boston; another national service officer, Howard W. Ford, maintains an office at the Veterans' Administration Branch Office, 55 Tremont Street, Boston.

These experts have been especially trained so that they are in a position to render all types of assistance to veterans and their dependents, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for various types of benefits to which they may be lawfully entitled under existing Federal and State laws.

The DAV was organized in 1920, and chartered by the Congress in 1932. It is unique in that it is composed exclusively of those who have given a part of their bodies or their health in defense of our country in time of war, and is primarily a service organization.

In order to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all handicapped veterans, the DAV developed a Nation-wide man-job-matching method program which has helped tremendously in solving this distressing problem. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war disabled veterans are totally unemployable. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled, and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a low turnover record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and to taxpayers generally.

It is definitely in the interest of all Americans that the fight for justice be made for those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies or their health in our country's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle. It seems to me to express concisely and accurately the proper approach to the related problems of our national defense and our contribution to the achievement of a greater measure of international harmony than now exists. In discharging our responsibilities as Members of Congress to protect and preserve the Nation, let us give heed to this wise counsel.

The editorial follows:

CALM JUDGMENT NEEDED

In the present state of public nerves, the remark of Gen. Omar Bradley before the Senate Armed Forces Committee that military men "are not sure that there is no war right away," is not precisely a sedative. Although cast in double negatives, the remark, coupled with the statement that "we are thinking a little differently about war" than was the case 3 months ago, will convey the impression, at the least, that world affairs are growing progressively worse.

On the other hand it will be remembered that General Bradley is a military man and that he was talking specifically about the need for immediate enlargement of our defenses. He would not be likely to minimize the war danger. His words will be weighed against the considered judgment of many other authorities that Russia does not want a war at present, that she will avoid any incident that might cause an explosion.

The net judgment of most Americans will be that the situation is so inflammable that common sense demands that we put national defense first on our national agenda. Most of the stories about Russia's enormous arms-building program may be set down as scare talk, but there probably is enough truth in it to warrant very serious consideration of our own resources.

From General Clay in Berlin and even from General Eisenhower, who spoke Sunday of the possibility of "some fool" causing an incident that might lead to war, come veiled warnings of danger.

Our military men and our new Department of Defense are as alive to the danger as anyone else. They can be trusted, we believe, not to exaggerate the danger. And we believe that steps immediately to increase our strength can be taken without causing the public to take its eye off the ball of peace.

If the danger is indeed acute and growing greater, the more reason to redouble efforts, through the United Nations and through the churches and other organizations, to seek the sane way of working out differences through compromise and negotiation. But always with enough visible strength to make our views respected.

Letters to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Globe of May 3, 1948:

QUICK LOOK

(By Joseph F. Dinneen)

I hear of new honors coming to President "Mike" Kelleher of the Chamber of Commerce—with some initials after his name and high-brow garb.

To clear the record and give credit where it is long overdue it should be revealed now that the persons primarily responsible for "letters to Italy," which stimulated the corollary "cables to Italy," originated in the mind of former featherweight boxer—he's far from a featherweight now—Luigi Polcari, more generally known as Eddie Williams, owner of Peter's cafe at 201 Watertown Street, Watertown. Congressman JOHN F. KENNEDY acknowledges and proclaims it, although Polcari says the idea never would have grown after it germinated had it not been for KENNEDY.

Born in Italy, Polcari was brought to East Boston at the age of 2 by his parents; attended Samuel Adams School, became a professional featherweight (delivering 17 straight knock-outs), and abandoned it for an automobile assembly line. Although over age, he served in the Marines in World War II, and returning to civilian life, opened the Watertown restaurant. An exceptionally intelligent student of Italian affairs particularly (he quotes Lippmann, Dorothy Thompson, Senators, and Congressmen accurately from memory), he was intrigued by Sumner Welles' column of July 9, 1947, in the Globe.

There ought to be a simpler way to meet Russian propaganda in Italy, he thought, than trans-Atlantic radio beamed to a people who either did not have short-wave radios or had no way of knowing when programs from United States would be on the air. It was expensive, he reasoned, and not too effective. He thought of writing to relatives and friends of his family in Italy, selling them democracy in a letter; and then it occurred to him that if all Italian-born or Italian descendants did the same thing, it could become effective propaganda.

He wrote to Congressman KENNEDY about it. KENNEDY took it up with the State Department. The State Department liked the idea, adopted it, and Polcari in an exchange of letters surrendered all rights to it. He became its first promoter, hopped a train to New York, went into a huddle with Generosso Pope, editor of Il Progresso, a nationally read Italian weekly. The idea was launched; picked up by newspapers, commentators, and columnists, and Polcari receded to the background. He is here projected into the limelight, saluted, and urged to take his bows.

President Truman's Address to National Conference on Family Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of President Truman's extemporaneous speech today to the National Conference on Family Life:

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, for that cordial introduction. I appreciate it. I also appreciate the privilege of being with you today to discuss with you some of your problems, as I see them, and to express my own point of view on a subject which is close to the heart of every person in the world—family life.

This National Conference on Family Life in this country, I am told, is also of vital interest to a large number of visitors which we have here; and I am informed that we have enough representatives of foreign nations to have a meeting of the United Nations here if we wanted to do it. And that is helpful and encouraging to us.

We are interested in the security and the welfare of the family, because that is the fundamental unity on which all governments are formed. Governments are formed for the purpose of being of service to the family as a unit in our conception of what government ought to be.

For that reason the welfare and the security of the family is vital to every government in the world.

GOVERNMENT'S RISE SKETCHED

I am very much interested in the history of government from its very beginning and I am more than interested in the Government of the United States and how it originated, and the way of its origin.

You see, people came to these shores, and they came in family units. North of us the French fur traders went to Canada for a purpose, for the enrichment of themselves, and to take things out of the country. Families came to the United States to build homes and to create settlements, and to live in peace.

Therefore today, when you look back on the settlement of North America, you wonder how it was ever done. I have been to Plymouth Rock, and I have been to Rhode Island. I have been to the James River's mouth at Jamestown, and I have been to South Carolina, and I have been to the coast of North Carolina, and I have been to Georgia. And when I look at some of the things that those ancestors of ours had to contend with, I wonder how in the world they ever did it.

I will tell you how they did it. They did it because there was an incentive. They brought with them ideals. They brought with them an idea of God. They brought with them the idea of liberty. And as a result, we have, I think, the greatest Republic on which the sun has ever shone.

I am interested, also in the opening of that part of the country west of the Appalachian Mountains. My ancestors had some interest in that and made some contribution to it. And some of the things they had to go through with then. And we think we have troubles.

WE HAVE TROUBLES RIGHT NOW

Well, we do, we do. We are having them right now in our modern family set-up. We are short of housing. We are studying health programs. We are working on the expansion of social security. All those things have their bearing upon the family and upon the Government of the United States—upon your Government. It is absolutely essential that we solve these problems, just as our ancestors solved them.

Our housing shortage is almost a fatal one. For 4 years I have been attempting to get a housing program. I was in the Senate of the United States when the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was first introduced, and the Senate passed that bill. It died in the House. Just recently, the Senate again has passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in wonderful form. I am wholeheartedly for that bill as it passed the Senate and I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will study that legislation and give us an opportunity to meet some of the shortages with which we are now faced.

That problem is vital. We have millions of veterans who have returned from fighting for the liberty of this country and of the world who are not able to find homes for themselves and their wives and their children.

Just recently, on this free parking lot in the great city of Washington, it was necessary to have people move on who had been living there indefinitely.

And I remember one case in particular, where a young man and his wife and their baby and the dog had to be ejected from the parking lot down here because they couldn't let them stay there any longer. And they had no place to go. They couldn't find a place in this great city of Washington who would let a baby and a dog come and live.

How are you going to raise a family under that condition?

CHILDREN AND DOGS NECESSARY

Children and dogs are as necessary to the welfare of this country as is Wall Street and the railroads, or any one of them.

We have to find a solution to that. And that is what you are here for, to see if you can't help us meet those problems.

I am only a servant of the people of the United States. I can only do what the law authorizes me to do as President of the United States. I am the enforcement part of the Government of the United States for the laws that are passed by the Congress. That is my duty. That is what I am sworn to do.

And people talk about the powers of a President, all the powers that a Chief Executive has and what he can do. Let me tell you something—from experience:

The President may have a great many powers given to him in the Constitution and may have powers under certain laws which are given to him by the Congress of the United States; but the principal power that the President has is to bring them in and try to persuade them to do what they ought to do without persuasion. That's what I spend most of my time doing. That's what the powers of the President amount to.

ASKS HELP FOR HOUSING BILL

And you can help the President with those powers if you tell these gentlemen on this housing bill—about which I was talking—what they ought to do. They will probably listen to you better than they will to me—at least some of them will. Some of them I can talk to with satisfaction and get something out of. Some of them are running for reelection next fall.

One of the worst things we are faced with this year is the fact that we have a Presidential campaign and all the Members of the House of Representatives have to be reelected. That is a part of our system, and it's all right. But with some of the problems with which we are faced now, it is too bad that that has to come along at this time. I hope that nothing in the world will interfere with our bipartisan foreign policy. That policy, if we expect to get peace in the world, must be carried to its logical conclusion. We are interested, as you know, only in peace in this world and in the welfare of the family units of the world as a whole, as well as our own. That is all I have been trying to get since August 14, 1945, when Japan folded up.

Everybody is interested in peace, and unless we have peace we can have nothing else about which I have been talking.

That we must attain. That we are going to attain. We are on the road, even if it looks rough and rugged and rocky. But we will overcome that situation as we have overcome a great many in our past history.

As we can't let this one stump us, we are going to make the United Nations work for peace. That's all we want.

FAMILY PROBLEMS TO BO SOLVED

Now you ladies and gentlemen can make a very great contribution to that by helping us solve our own family problems which have a bearing on the very thing I am talking about.

If this country is happy and prosperous and everybody is at work, and everybody can be happy in his situation, that will contribute to our help which we are trying to get for the recovery of Europe and Asia. And that means peace and prosperity for the whole world.

And there is room enough for everybody in this world, and room enough for everybody to have peace, and have enough to eat and a place to sleep.

If you will just make a survey of the continent and see the blank spaces where pioneering can still be done, it can be conclusively proved that if we solve the international problems with which we are faced, and if we keep working at the solution of our domestic problems, all of them can be solved.

I can't tell you how much I appreciate your taking time out and the trouble to come here and work on your own time for something that is of vital interest to the United States and to the world as a whole.

I hope you will furnish us with some solutions to some of the problems with which we are faced. You can do it, if you will set your mind to do it. And you can help solve them. That is the principal thing. The President can't solve problems by himself. The Congress can't solve problems, but the President and the Congress and the country can solve any problem that comes before us.

Now let's get this one done.

I thank you very much.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a talk to the doctors of America which I was recently asked to give over the Columbia Broadcasting System's network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very glad to have an opportunity to speak on the subject of health insurance. Particularly today when hundreds of our leading doctors and workers in the field of health are gathered in Washington for the National Health Assembly. Because you see, I don't have to tell the American people why we need national health insurance. They've told me. I didn't convert them—they have convinced and converted me to the need of

a national health program which can bring modern medical care within their means.

But I do want to talk to America's doctors; to the doctors throughout the country who are busy treating the sick; to the practicing doctor who usually hears of health insurance only from the political doctors who are obstructing an intelligent, practical program.

To these practicing physicians I want to say that I am for national health insurance because I am opposed to socialized medicine. Nobody wants to see in this country a socialistic system of tax-paid medicine, practiced by doctors employed and controlled by the State.

I repeat—I am for national health insurance because I am opposed to State medicine in any form.

I think it is a great misfortune to our country and to the great body of sincere, honest, hard-working doctors that they have been misled and deceived by the arbitrary action and leadership of Dr. Morris Fishbein and the National Physicians Committee. They have been led to believe, by propaganda methods, that the national health insurance bill is socialistic; that it proposes state medicine, and that if it is enacted it will cause a serious deterioration of medical care in this country. The truth is that it will improve and expand medical care and will result in much greater freedom for our doctors.

It is based on the well-tried, truly American principle of insurance. People would pay small amounts regularly on a budgetable basis into a national insurance fund. They would pay in proportion to their incomes. The collection would be made through our existing social security and tax mechanisms. No new bureaucracy would be created.

To this fund the Federal Government would add the difference between what our families can afford to pay and whatever you doctors tell us it will cost to give them high-quality medical care. The Federal Government does this and it also sets standards of quality approved by the medical profession. In effect the Federal Government stops right there.

All this talk of regimentation and Federal control which you hear of from Dr. Fishbein is so much nonsense. "Nonsense" because our bill provides that at this point the funds be turned over to the States and by them to the local communities. With extra funds, of course, in sparsely settled areas. The people in each local community—with the leadership of their own doctors—would then develop their own local plans—cooperative plans, medical-society plans, whatever plans they and their doctors thought best-suited to their local needs. The financing of those plans would be guaranteed and not beset with the difficulties constantly confronting our voluntary plans today.

The limitations on what the doctor can do; the maze of red tape through which he and his patients must plow in order to determine whether this or that treatment can be given under a limited, voluntary plan; the uncertainty of income and the necessity of accepting part-payments as payments in full; the friction between hospital plans and doctors' plans, the danger that work will more and more be concentrated in the hands of the specialist rather than of the general practitioner—all of these difficulties which confront physicians operating under limited voluntary plans result for the most part from the inescapably uncertain and inadequate financial resources of those plans. National health insurance guarantees the adequate financing necessary to remove all these difficulties—and it need in no way interfere with local control and local operation of local plans.

And—mark this well, doctors, because you have certainly been told differently—our bill specifically guarantees the patient's right to complete freedom of choice of his doctor. And it guarantees the doctor complete freedom from any lay interference in all professional matters. These guarantees are written into the national health insurance bill. No matter what you might have been told, no bureaucrat could change or violate them.

Those are the simple facts about national health insurance. All you need do is look at our bill and you will see that it is really so.

I believe the American people do not approve the attempts to defeat this bill by calling names and using labels instead of arguments. Calling a proposal of this sort regimentation or socialism or communism is sheer fakery. It is worse than fakery. It is downright dangerous to the doctors of America. It is dangerous because it keeps us in the Congress from receiving the help of doctors in framing a law that will make the best modern medical care available to a large section of our citizens now denied. We in the Congress have taken great pains in drafting this bill to make it possible for the people of this country to get better medical care, while, at the same time, protecting the freedom and dignity of American medicine. But through the action and leadership of the National Physicians Committee, we have been denied any assistance.

I have mentioned our efforts to guarantee the best modern medical practice by the doctors. If we have overlooked any provisions which would give complete assurance to doctors of our good intent and purpose, we would welcome the sincere cooperation of the medical profession in working out appropriate provisions. Thus far, that cooperation has been denied us. America's doctors, in their own interests, must realize that it is time to stop just opposing any program—time to stop being led around by sensational propaganda misrepresenting the truth—time to stop listening to certain political doctors who charge regimentation and socialism and are doing nothing to aid the American people in getting relief from an intolerable situation.

That is why a great American statesman—a man whose judgment has influenced opinion on many occasions, Bernard M. Baruch, says—and I quote his words:

"I urge the doctors to get in and pitch, not stand by on the sidelines. You need fear politicians or bureaucrats only to the degree that you fail yourselves."

Able editorials all over the country are urging the medical profession to abandon the leadership of the National Physicians Committee and to aid the American people in working out a program which will meet the recognized needs of our country.

The American medical profession is for a world health program which the American people will help pay for. Why can't we also have an American health program?

Before Goose-Stepping the American People Into a Peacetime Conscription, Congress Should Get the Answers to Many Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, recently Gen. J. Lawton Colins, Deputy Chief of Staff, United States Army, speaking before the Detroit Board of Commerce, stated, "We furnished to our allies $20,000,000,000 worth of military equipment which, expressed in terms of what an armored division costs to equip, is the equivalent of about 588 armored divisions; and, in terms of what an infantry division costs, the equivalent of about 2,000 such divisions."

Today the Army has on hand 10,000,000,000 tons of ordnance valued at $9,000,000,000.

This matériel, using General Collins' yardstick, is sufficient to equip 265 armored divisions for combat, or 900 infantry divisions. The same ordnance would supply 500 combat divisions including both armored and infantry units. Yet 89 divisions was the maximum number of American combat divisions ever assembled at one time in all theaters in World War II.

The balance of our 5,360,000 ground forces was required for supply lines and other noncombat service.

But with this stock plie of material on hand ready for quick use, the Army is sharply increasing its requests. Before these requests are considered, the following questions appear to be in order:

First. Under what conditions does the Army contemplate warfare with field numbers triple or quadruple the American combat forces in World War II?

Second. If such a war is on Pentagon blueprints, are not the American people entitled to a clear-cut answer to this question, For what reasons is the administration determined to go to war to enforce its ideas on either boundary or political issues abroad?

Third. What hostilities between nations, large or small, in any part of the world, will not be a signal for American military intervention? If reluctance ulitimately develops in America to the burden of continued military and economic assistance to various nations, could that not be a signal for one of them, either individually or in concert with others, to maneuver itself into a state of hostilities with Russia or a Russian satellite—feeling certain that this situation would compel all-out American assistance?

Before Congress adopts peacetime conscription or unlimited armament expenditures, is not a full disclosure by the administration on these questions imperative?

To summarize, the American people are asking this question, "Is the Government determined to go to war for any reasons outside of a direct attack on America or American garrisons? If so, where and for what reasons?"

Mr. Speaker, are we in Congress diligent enough and responsible enough to get clear and straightforward answers to all these appropriate foreign-policy questions?

Or will we accede to the administration's military demands in the "Don't blame us, we do not know nothing" spirit with which Tehran and Yalta have so long been alibied?

I suppose that in a totalitarian country the citizens do not get the answers to such vital questions. However, if the American people and their Congress are to have an intelligent and effective influence on any future decision involving

peace or war, they must be fully informed now of the exact commitments and views of the executive branch.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials dealing with the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1948]

TARIFF TRENDS—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Stout)

WASHINGTON.—Wet your finger and hold it up. A Republican wind is blowing. Will it blow America a new high tariff in 1949?

There is a faction in Congress that is out to beat the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It wants high tariffs restored. But it would be a little awkward to come right out and say so now in the middle of the election.

The Hull Act expires next June unless renewed in the meantime. A strategy has been hit upon to meet the problem. A 1-year's extension is being proposed. That takes the tariff out of the immediate campaign and postpones the problem 1 year. Then, if Republican victory comes, as is now widely expected, the party can reconsider its ancient approach to the great issue.

Almost since 1890, after Harrison beat Cleveland and the McKinley tariff was enacted, returning Republicans have written a new tariff.

When President Taft took office in 1909, he summoned a special session to boost tariffs. His Payne-Aldrich law included 847 tariff changes, 600 upward. The then Senator Lodge referred to that struggle of special interests for tariff benefits as surpassing in "ruthless selfishness * * * anything I have ever seen."

It was Woodrow Wilson, in 1913, who reversed a tariff policy which had been almost unchallenged for 50 years. He forced through the Underwood tariff slashing rates.

The war ended, Republicans captured Congress and promptly voted an emergency tariff bill. Wilson vetoed it.

Then came Harding. He signed the Fordney-McCumber Act, with rates higher than ever before in history. Historians say it had threefold consequences; it fostered monopolies, hampered Europe in repaying its debts, and brought quick reprisals.

Herbert Hoover was next. He summoned Congress to consider farm relief and "limited changes in the tariff." The old, sordid logrolling story was retold. The Hawley-Smoot law put a Chinese Wall round America. Within 2 years, 25 countries established retaliatory tariffs. It helped bring economic crisis to Europe; some blame it for World War II.

Now we come to our own day. For 14 years the Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (1934) has been a keystone of America's trade policy. America is now a creditor, not a debtor nation. The Hull agreements have steadily reduced tariffs. All this time Democrats were in control. Now, for the first time, America and the world are going to learn what the postwar Republican attitude is.

The Hull trade program has come before Congress five separate times with its original enactment and four continuations. Here is the Senate vote on these five occasions:

1934: Democrats for, 54; against, 5; Republicans for, 5; against, 28.

1937: Democrats for, 56; against, 9; Republicans for, 0; against, 14.

1940: Democrats for, 41; against, 15; Republicans for, 0; against, 20.

1943: Democrats for, 41; against, 8; Republicans for, 18; against, 14.

1945: Democrats for, 38; against, 5; Republicans for, 15; against, 16.

Here is the similar House record:

1934: Democrats for, 269; against, 11; Republicans for, 2; against 99.

1937: Democrats for, 278; against, 11; Republicans for, 3; against, 81.

1940: Democrats for, 212; against, 20; Republicans for, 5; against, 146.

1943: Democrats for, 193; against, 3; Republicans for, 163; against, 26.

1945: Democrats for, 205; against, 12; Republicans for, 33; against, 140.

The foregoing figures show a Republican majority in Senate and House against the act on every vote except one—that in the 1943 war year. The record makes all the more interesting what the ascendant party will do now.

Business is more divided about tariffs than formerly. Some elements fear a new global trade war. Gerard Swope, honorary president of the General Electric Co., heads the influential Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade that is advocating full continuation of the Hull pacts.

A subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee which writes tariffs has started hearings on extending the Hull Act under the chairmanship of Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Republican, of California. By a strict party division last Friday it voted, 5 to 4, to exclude press and public from these hearings. Redoubtable Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, protested. He introduced the original Hull Act in 1934.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 5, 1948]

THIS ISN'T 1900

The House Ways and Means Committee, dominated by, of all parties, the Republican, has barred both the public and the press from its hearings on extension of the reciprocal trade agreements—of all touchy questions, the tariff issue. It is reported that only critics of the agreements are welcome.

The chairman, Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, takes the position that there is no time or reason to go over ground well explored in the past. Every congressional committee dealing with old and controversial issues has had to suffer through some repetition. That is the price of a fair hearing.

He states his committee would have heard the State Department experts had they not been absent at international trade conferences. They have been back for 2 months.

He asserts that the trade agreements have been negotiated in "absolute secrecy," therefore, by implication, why shouldn't his committee behave likewise? On the contrary, open hearings have been the rule on the agreements.

Do the Republican leaders in Congress approve of these star-chamber proceedings? If so, what are they thinking of? Don't they know that the Republican Party has always had to combat the ever-recurring charge that its leaders take orders from big business behind closed doors?

Don't they know that the great evil in the old system of tariff-making lay in logrolling by special interests? Don't they know that of all the besetting sins peculiar to the Republican Party (the Democratic has a brand of its own) bungling on the tariff has returned more often than any other to discredit it at the polls? Don't they know this is 1948, not 1900?

If only for the sake of your party, Mr. GEARHART, let alone the sake of honest and above-board representative government in the United States, let the public know what's going on in that committee room.

[From the Denver Post of May 7, 1948]

THE CONVERT FACES A TEST OF FAITH

The action Congress takes on the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act may provide the tip-off to tell what way America is going in the immediate future in the matter of world leadership.

This is the first time since the Reciprocal Trade Act was born in 1934 that it has come up for renewal before a Congress dominated by Republicans.

The way the Republican Party, which often has been accused of killing whatever chance the League of Nations had to succeed, has turned from isolationism to full support of the United Nations has been one of the remarkable political reversals of our time.

Does that reversal represent a heartfelt conversion to new ideas? Or is it like the pledge which the chronic backslider gives under the influence of a momentary qualm of conscience?

The vote on the Trade Act will tell—because, since the end of the war and the creation of the United Nations, reciprocal trade has become an integral part of America's foreign policy.

It is the motivating force behind the effort, in which this country has taken a leading part, to form an International Trade Organization within the United Nations. It is a cornerstone of the European recovery program, whether it has been recognized as such or not.

The Republican Congress cannot claim that it is fully supporting this country's new role of leadership and cooperation in world affairs if it does not go along with the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

With the Reciprocal Trade Act as its principal tool, this country has been striving to break down the many restrictions to the free movement of international trade. The restoration of trade and the stabilization of currencies, if they can be accomplished, may prove in the long run to be more important to peace than some of the political settlements the United Nations is striving to bring about.

Acting on American suggestions, representatives of 16 western European countries are meeting today in The Hague to consider revolutionary political and economic proposals.

They will consider setting up a 16-nation parliament, the establishment of common citizenship for all their peoples, the abolition of customs barriers, the adoption of a common currency, and a united program for the development of all their industries. Under such plans, western Europe eventually would become 1 nation, to all intents and purposes, instead of 16. Even though they may not be adopted at this time, those plans show what might be accomplished with proper encouragement from this country.

If Congress should reject the renewal of the Trade Act, it would serve notice on western Europe and the whole world that the Republican Party, which hopes to take charge of the American Government for the next 2 to 4 years at least, has decided to go back to a policy of economic isolationism and will not attempt further economic international leadership.

If Congress should renew the Trade Act for only 1 year, it would be serving notice that the Republican Party is considering changing its mind if a Republican lands in the White House next January.

If Congress should write into the Reciprocal Trade Act a proviso that it must approve any and all tariff reductions, it will be serving notice that international policy is going to be subjected to domestic political wrangling.

Nothing short of a full 3-year renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act will assure other countries that the United States is steadfastly determined to use it all-powerful economic influence on behalf of greater prosperity for all peoples.

A Compilation of the Responsible American Officials at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a list of the responsible American officials at the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences.

OFFICIALS AT ALL THREE—TEHRAN, YALTA, AND POTSDAM

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army.

Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President.

Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief, United States Fleet.

W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador to Russia.

Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Services of Supply, United States Army.

Charles E. Bohlen, Department of State.

OFFICIALS WHO ATTENDED A LESSER NUMBER OF THESE CONFERENCES

President Franklin D. Roosevelt—Tehran and Yalta.

Harry L. Hopkins, Special Assistant to the President—Tehran and Yalta.

Maj Gen. John R. Deane, United States military mission to Russia—Tehran and Yalta.

Gen. Henry H. Arnold, United States Army Air Forces—Tehran and Potsdam.

James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State—Yalta and Potsdam.

Vice Adm. Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator—Yalta and Potsdam.

H. Freeman Matthews, Department of State—Yalta and Potsdam.

John G. Winant, Ambassador to Great Britain—Tehran.

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State—Yalta.

Vice Adm. Charles M. Cooke, Jr., commander, Seventh Fleet—Yalta.

Maj. Gen. John E. Hull, War Department, General Staff—Yalta.

Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, United States Army Air Forces—Yalta.

Alger Hiss, Department of State—Yalta.

President Harry S. Truman—Potsdam.

Joseph E. Davies, special ambassador—Potsdam.

Edwin Pauley, special ambassador—Potsdam.

Robert D. Murphy, political adviser, United States zone in Germany—Potsdam.

James C. Dunn, Assistant Secretary of State—Potsdam.

William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State—Potsdam.

Benjamin V. Cohen, special assistant to Secretary of State—Potsdam.

Wilder Foote, assistant to the Secretary of State—Potsdam.

Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., Foreign Service officer, Department of State—Potsdam.

Charles W. Yost, executive secretary, Department of State—Potsdam.

James W. Riddleberger, Department of State—Potsdam.

R. Borden Reams, Department of State—Potsdam.

J. Langdon Ward, Department of State—Potsdam.

The dates of these conferences were as follows: Tehran Conference, November 28–December 1, 1943; Yalta Conference, February 3–11, 1945; Potsdam Conference, July 17–August 2, 1945.

The information for the above compilation was secured from the Department of State documents entitled "Participation of the United States Government in International Conferences—July 1, 1941–June 30, 1945" and "Participation of the United States Government in International Conferences—July 1, 1945–June 30, 1946."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a powerful editorial in support of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and containing a noticeable warning to the Republican Party in the Congress, appearing in the April 27, 1948, issue of the Boston Herald, a newspaper that is fair in its news columns to the Democratic Party, but which is one of the strongest Republican newspapers of the country. In view of this, the editorial should convey on this legislation a significant message to the Republican leadership.

PRACTICE WHAT WE PREACH

The little group of Republicans who are most likely to embarrass their party, not to mention their country, are laying their plans for an attack on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. These are the men who still think in terms of the sort of economic nationalism which Russia practices, and which we have announced to the world we abhor. They think of the world in terms of the horse-and-buggy age, of high protective tariffs, which no one in his right mind associates with anything but a growing economy whose infant industries need protection. They think of the rest of the world as a market, but fail to ask themselves where the customers are to get the dollars to pay for their purchases here unless we buy what we can from them. They protest to the contrary, but what they really would like to see is a return to the old-fashioned logrolling congressional tariff making which has proved more of a political liability to the Republican Party than any other single GOP indulgence we can think of.

To oppose extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at this time would be particularly stupid. In the first place, it is an integral part of the Nation's foreign policy which the Republicans have supported in so many other respects.

Any high-school pupil can understand that there can be no effective political cooperation if, in the economic field, we are antagonistic to our would-be friends. What could be more provocative than to scrap a tariff policy which the whole world has hailed as a manifestation of America's good intentions? What could be more objectionable than for us to tell our friends abroad, much in need as they are, that we won't buy their exports? What could be more contradictory than to say in the Marshall plan that we want to help them to the tune of many billions only to turn around and deny them the markets here which would cut down their need for our aid and ultimately reduce our outlay under the Marshall plan?

Besides, ever since the United States took the initiative in promoting world economic cooperation at Bretton Woods in 1944, our Government has progressively sponsored programs, which depend upon lowering tariffs. Our widely advertised objective has been to create conditions of multilateral trade as freely as possible. We are the champions of freedom, in trade as in other areas of human activity. Not free trade per se, but trade as free as practical considerations make possible. No program has yet been devised which assures a progressive lowering of tariff barriers by the United States as fairly and effectively as that which has been conducted for 14 years under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, a law originated by Democrats which copied a principle inaugurated earlier by Republicans.

Finally, we must bear in mind that just as our country is the champion of a trade multilateralism, which is a term for freest possible trade, so Soviet Russia is the champion of the opposite and restrictive technique of bilateralism.

It is time that the Republican leadership in Congress made clear which side it will take in this old battle fought in a new and critical setting. The big men in the party must stand up and assert themselves before mice-like characters have nibbled away one of the foundations of America's program for freedom.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with the President's radio speech on housing, which was printed in the Washington Daily News of May 8.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD, PLAIN TALK

Mr. Truman's speech to the National Conference on Family Life read well and listened better. It was his first extemporaneous speech over the radio networks since he became President, and we'd rate it a hit.

Any President takes a chance when he talks informally. One unguarded remark, one sentence spoken without being thought through, might cause him and the country a lot of trouble. It's safer to read a prepared address, written and polished with the help of political advisers and experts and ghosts. But, in Mr. Truman's case, at least, it isn't as effective.

There was no hifalutin language in his speech to the Family Life Conference. Purists might complain that there were a few errors of grammar. It couldn't rank as great oratory. It was just good, plain talk which gave the impression of coming from a good, sincere man.

What, for instance, in all the millions of words various people have written and spoken on the housing problem, put it in more human terms than Mr. Truman's story about the family that couldn't find a home for a baby and a dog? Nobody could misunderstand him, and few could disagree with him, when he said:

"Children and dogs are as necessary to the welfare of this country as is Wall Street and the railroads, or any one of them. We have got to find a solution to that."

We doubt that a 10,000-word Presidential message, however carefully prepared, could do so much to rally support for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill as Mr. Truman's six simple sentences:

"Our housing shortage is almost a fatal one. For 4 years I have been attempting to get a housing program. I was in the Senate when the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was first introduced, and the Senate passed that bill. It died in the House. Just recently, the Senate has passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in wonderful form. I am wholeheartedly for that bill as it passed the Senate, and I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will study that legislation and give us an opportunity to help meet some of the shortages with which we are now faced."

The House has been far from cordial to the T-E-W bill. Some of the Republican leaders there have seemed determined not to let it become law. If anything could persuade them to give this measure a long new look, and perhaps to change their attitude, the fact that Mr. Truman said "wonderful" about a bill largely the product of hard work and hard thought by Senator TAFT might be that thing.

Women in Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Women in Defense," appearing in the Washington Post for May 7. I make this request for the reason that at this time the Committee on Armed Services is considering a bill for selective service, in order to get more manpower into our armed forces, to strengthen them from the viewpoint of security. For that reason, it seems to me that the editorial is peculiarly appropriate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN IN DEFENSE

What status women are to have in their country's long-term defense program is now up to a Senate-House conference. Senate conferees are expected to stand firm for their bill, passed unanimously, to make Wacs, Waves, Spars, and women marines a part of the Regular armed services. The House bill put them into a Reserve corps to which they would be called when needed. What caused the House to take this action after heads of the armed services had urged that the women be given Regular status remains a legislative "whodunit." The House Armed Services Committee sprung the first surprise when, by a vote of 26 to 1, it recommended the Reserve corps provision.

House discussion of the measure was fusty and evasive, abounding in tribute to the services of the women's corps in wartime, but falling back on such excuses as "not wise at this time"; "certain doubtful questions are involved"; "never been done before." One undercurrent of debate indicated that dislike of granting women commissions in the Regular armed services, since in traditional warfare they do not bear the brunt of combat, entered strongly into the House action. However, plans for future warfare are based on the assumption that virtually all citizens will be in danger. And future defense against bombs—atomic or otherwise—demands strong preparation on the home front. As heads of the armed services have stressed, a nucleus of trained women to be expanded in event of emergency is urgently needed. But the best personnel for a skeleton staff cannot be obtained unless the armed services are to offer women careers that have security and permanence.

Aside from the practical need of making the women's corps Regular and permanent is the fact that American women deserve such a gesture of recognition. In another war their role may be as arduous and possibly as dangerous as men's. In the defense program, which it is hoped will prevent war, their services will be needed for a long time to come, especially in performing many dull routine jobs. It would seem elementary strategy as well as justice to encourage them with definite recognition rather than shove them aside with a pat on the back.

TVA Steam Plant—Answer to Testimony of Power Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the statement of case of the private power lobby against the appropriation to begin construction of the TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville is full of inaccuracies, half-truths, and contradictions. Because of the way the hearings were conducted there was little or no opportunity to rebut or explain some or their charges and statements. I have prepared a digest of and comments on their testimony which I hope may be useful to those who have an open mind on this issue. The same is as follows:

1. Construction and operation of such a steam plant would be contrary to the purposes of the TVA Act and without authorization by that act.

This is the mean legal argument in the brief filed by utilities (pp. 991–1014 of the hearings). Although Mr. Swidler's brief (pp. 1050–1058) was prepared earlier, it provides an answer to the utilities' case which is simply a restatement of arguments they failed to win in the Ashwander and 18 company cases.

2. Construction and operation of the steam plant would be unconstitutional.

Also covered by respective briefs. It was also argued that Congress should be particularly cautious about appropriating for a steam plant if it has any doubts of its constitutionality, because if the appropriation is made, no one can then invoke a judicial determination of whether the action was unconstitutional.

3. The Government does not have, should not have, and cannot lawfully assume, any responsibility for supplying the power needs for commercial, municipal, or domestic purposes within any area.

Also covered by utilities' brief.

A hasty inspection indicates that the argument is that the Government has no more obligation to supply power requirements of the area than to supply needs for any other product; and that since, in the utilities' judgment, the steam plant is unlawful, there could be no basis for undertaking an obligation for power supply which might eventually require the steam plant.

4. Augmentation of its power business as proposed by TVA would be destructive to tax-paying utilities.

Mr. Smith expressed the belief that an undisclosed motive behind the request for the steam plant is to prepare TVA to expand still further the territory of its power monopoly (p. 965). In this connection, a utility map of the TVA power empire is included in the hearings (oppposite p. 964). The fact is, of course, that TVA's request for the steam plant is based upon the need for its output to meet the growing needs of the existing service area (pp. 434, 441, 449, 450, etc.).

5. Addition of the steam plant to the TVA system is unnecessary for its legitimate business of disposing of surplus power, with preference to specified customers.

Mr. Smith's claims here were that the ratio which sales to preference customers bears to total generation of TVA's plants is now substantially less than just before or during the early part of the war and that even if TVA has a responsibility to meet all needs of the preferred customers it is abundantly clear on any basis of measuring their needs and forecasting future load growth that TVA has an ample supply for them for a long, long time to come (p. 967). In support of these points two charts were included in the hearings. The first (opposite p. 965), which compares generation with sales to preference customers by years, is misleading for two or three reasons, one of the most important of which is the omission of governmental use from the use of preferred customers. The second chart (oppcsite p. 966, described p. 971) which compares capacity, present and projected, including possible additional units at existing dams, with energy output and sales, is also misleading, because future capacity is compared with present load and because due allowance is not made for the difference between peak demands and average loads.

On this point, a comparison probably can be made, within the limits of censorship regarding the power requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission, between the loads of all preferred customers and the available energy, particularly as projected to about 1952. The fact that a much more critical situation will exist for the central and western parts of the area than for the area as a whole also needs to be brought out.

It was argued that if the municipalities (or industries) will need additional power by 1951 or 1952, they could build their own steam plants by that time (p. 1017). This ignores the fact that TVA has completed its plans, prepared its specifications, and obtained bids, while it would take months for similar steps to be taken by anyone not presently contem-

plating construction of a plant before orders for a reasonably satisfactory installation could be placed.

6. The mere fact that some of the hydro power is not firm does not justify installing additional steam.

The point made here is both a legal point and an argument that as a matter of economics the non-firm power may provide more net revenues than could be earned, considering the steam costs, by making the energy firm.

Such argument misses the point that the growing needs of the preferred customers makes it essential that the power be made firm; furthermore, of course, TVA is in a better position to judge the economics of adding the steam.

On this point the claim was made that off-peak energy from the utilities would provide a better way of firming up TVA hydro than by a TVA steam plant (p. 1029).

Mr. Sporn said (p. 1030) that in his opinion there is not anywhere near the close coordination between utilities and TVA that there might be if willingness were present to bring about such coordination in order to make maximum use of the facilities available and under construction by the utilities. He said the possibility of firming TVA's hydro with off-peak steam needs badly to be explored, especially when the country is just starting to marshal its resources under the aegis of the National Security Resources Board. He said there is good reason to believe that much of TVA's hydro could be so firmed up and that until studies are made no one can say a new steam plant is in any way justified. (Nor, presumably, if utilities have not made such studies, can they say the plant is not justified.) He said his own system has offered to explore the general problems of coordination with TVA in the belief that there are many important mutual advantages in such arrangements.

Asked whether cooperation had been received from TVA, he said, "We have received some, but as to this problem, we have not been requested, and have not carried out any exploration." This testimony (p. 1930) is very misleading, for while TVA has not, of course, studied with the utilities the economics of the new steam plant, it is TVA who has urged the exploration of the general problems of coordination in the interests of the many important mutual advantages. TVA already makes every effort to make the greatest and most effective use of all off-peak energy available from utilities. In fact, a specific request by TVA some months ago that Mr. Sporn and his staff discuss with TVA contractual and other problems involved is still awaiting an indication of interest on the part of the company.

Mr. Sporn suggested that with turbine and generator manufacturing facilities loaded up for 3 or 4 years it is inconceivable that any national interest could be served by making any expenditure for steam by TVA until the explorations of greater coordination are undertaken and completed. The fact is that only by closing orders now can TVA hope to have the steam plant in operation by the end of 1951.

Smith said that if all possibilities for the use of off-peak steam had been exhausted then the feeding of firm power by utilities into the TVA system even at the time of peak loads would afford a reasonable solution (p. 974). The fact is that none of the neighboring utilities are in any position to promise TVA a supply of firm power at time of peak loads by 1951. Sporn practically said so in stating that facilities for manufacturing generating equipment would be entirely occupied for the next 5 years in providing for expanding loads and building up margins of reserve to somewhere near proper values (p. 1031).

Mr. Smith (contradicting Mr. Sporn) estimated that utilities ought to have an adequate reserve margin in 1951 unless the country embarks on a very, very large renewed defense program (p. 983). He said the utilities in the eastern area are adding 6,000,000 kilowatts most of which were held back by priorities during the war (p. 981). It is doubtful if either of these statements can be supported. It is not clear that there will be adequate margins in 1951 and the records of the Federal Power Commission will also show that the utilities did not proceed promptly after the war to add capacity as rapidly as possible. Some measure of his definition of an adequate margin in 1951 may be indicated by his statement that the utilities do not consider that there is a present shortage of power (p. 983). He conceded that there is a tightness but apparently chose to ignore the present instances in which industry is unable to obtain power in desired amounts in various areas.

7. Adding the steam plant would permit TVA to continue and to enlarge its supply of firm power to non-preferential customers, and to do so on a subsidized basis at taxpayers' expense.

Here the utilities magnified the size and distorted the character of direct sales to industries. They stated that such sales are largely on contracts cancelable on relatively short notice, in some cases as short as 12 months (p. 972), in the face of the obvious fact that an industry cannot build a plant without long-term assurance of power supply. They stated that a casual review of TVA's firm obligations to industry makes it obvious that other sales included in the category of sales to industries and Federal agencies are of no great consequence (p. 972). Here they have jumped to an erroneous conclusion as to the size of TVA's power deliveries to Oak Ridge and other Federal projects.

On this point they also argue that while industries in the Tennessee Valley have not added to their own generating capacity (Alcoa has added some), since subsidized power is available, that in the United States as a whole installations of power plants by industries have increased in approximately the same proportion as installations by utilities (p. 975). This is not so.

The Edison Electric Institute's own figures show a reduction in the proportion of industrial electric requirements supplied by industries' own power plants from 42 percent in 1925 to 33 percent in 1944. More recent data on generation of electricity in industrial power plans is presented in the Krug report on National Resources and Foreign Aid (p. 25). In 1940 such plants generated 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, about 27 percent as much as the total which utilities generated in the same year. But the estimated figure for 1947 showed that generation by industrial power plants increased from 1940 to 1947 by only about 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or less than 10 percent as much as the increase in generation by power systems.

The utilities argued that industries should build their own plants in the TVA area and claimed that industries often do so in the areas the utilities serve, sometimes with the utilities' encouragement (pp. 975, 989). Mr. Sporn indicated later, without trying to make the point very clear (p. 1027), that in speaking of actual installations by industries in other areas, he was really speaking primarily if not solely about cases where industries need a great deal of thermal energy (meaning that they need large quantities of steam in their process, with the result that power can be produced more or less incidentally).

8. Enlargement of TVA's sales to non-preferential customers would be injurious to the welfare of other sections of the United States.

The argument here apparently assumes that industry would grow in the Tennessee Valley only if it moved there from another area.

A claim that TVA financed State advertising luring industry into the area was shown by Mr. GORE to be unfounded (p. 1025).

In response to inquiries as to any specific industries which had been enticed into moving into the area from somewhere else, the utilities could cite no cases. Vague references were made to the Monsanto and Victor Chemical Cos., but it was pointed out to the utilities that the location of phosphate deposits was undoubtedly a controlling factor in the location of these plants. Finally, Mr. Smith said he was advised by one of the other utilities' representatives present that a West Virginia company had lost a prospective customer when the Wolverine Tube Co. located in the Tennessee Valley (p. 1027). Of course in the case of most projected industrial plants, a wide variety of locations are explored. If the reasoning in the Wolverine case is followed, it may be said that the TVA area has lost the great majority of its prospective customers to other areas.

9. The steam plant will establish a precedent to permit the Government to embark in any business anywhere in competition with its citizens.

Here the utilities express the fear that if TVA, with its obligation for serving its area, can build steam plants, all Federal agencies with any surplus power to sell would build steam plants. Then the argument is carried to the extreme by ignoring the fact that the supply of electricity is inherently a public business in which private utilities engage only by franchise and the claim is made that the steam plant would be a precedent for the Government's selling food, clothing, or any other article.

10. Authorization of the steam plant would be damaging to the national defense.

The foregoing nine points were listed (using a few more words) by Mr. Smith at the beginning of his testimony. This point is one which was added by Mr. Sporn. His argument on this point (p. 1031) is along the following lines: In 1939 the utilities had a margin of reserve of 26 percent. If this margin had been only 5 percent as in 1947 a totally different history of war production might have been written. The utilities will keep manufacturers of turbines and generators loaded with orders for at least 5 years to bring up margins of reserve to somewhere near proper values. The appropriations for the TVA steam plant would convince neighboring utilities that they should not build up margins because their areas might be encroached upon. Similarly, in other areas as the result of the precedent for steam in the TVA area the same reaction would take place. Hence adequate margins would not be realized. This certainly suggests that the utilities cannot be relied upon to undertake, come what may, the job of power supply. The statement also contradicts, of course, the testimony by Mr. Smith that the capacity already on order will provide adequate margins not only for reserves but to supply firm power to TVA.

Retirement Increase Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as one who strongly supported the Crosser bill in the last Congress, I have been giving some thought to the objectives embraced in two pending bills which carry the benefits of the Crosser bill a step further. I refer to H. R. 5875 and H. R. 5993, both introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. These bills, in a word, have for their objectives, first, increasing benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by

25 percent; second, increasing retirement annuities and pensions under the Railroad Retirement Act by approximately 20 percent; and third, fixing the contribution at a definite figure for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, in considering these objectives, it is well to bear in mind that practically every group in the Nation has been accorded increased pay. Conditions have brought on increases in practically all phases of our national economy. Just recently Congress passed a new retirement bill for all Federal employees under civil service and that bill provided for increasing the retirement for those who have already retired in a minimum sum of $300 annually. Wages have been increased, and properly so. Rates of common carriers have been increased. The Congress has before it right now bills to increase salaries of Federal employees. All of these increases are justified. I give these few instances, Mr. Speaker, and instances could be cited in great length, to show that most of our people have had increases. The Railroad Retirement Act was passed 11 years ago and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was passed 8 years ago. Although most other groups have had consideration and increases, the railroad men who have been retired and also those who come under the Unemployment Insurance Act have not been accorded any increases of monetary benefits.

In view of all this, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the railroad men have a just claim in urging these two bills. I am informed that the Railroad Retirement Board has given close study to these bills and has determined that they can be supported by present tax schedules.

The increases these bills would provide are certainly necessary. The retired people, especially, are in dire need; their average retirement income is only $70 a month and thousands of them get only $50 or less. I feel strongly that since the need is urgent, and the money is available, Congress should take immediate and favorable action on H. R. 5993 and H. R. 5875.

The Republican Party Must Nominate at Philadelphia the Best Vote-Getter in Its Ranks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. HOWES MEADE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, with its sound political philosophy, has long been deserving in assuming the position of directing our National Government. The voters in 1946 elected a sufficient number of members of our party to the House of Representatives and the Senate to give us a slight majority in the Congress. We have found it extremely difficult to put forth the full Republican program the country expects and deserves with a President of opposite political faith continually, by veto and otherwise, blocking our program. We must this year elect both a Republican President and a Republican Congress, so that these two branches of the Government may work hand in hand.

Too few of us realize, in view of the apparent popularity of our party, just how difficult at best it will be to win both the Presidency and the Congress in 1948. We can, unless we are farsighted in our selection of our Presidential nominee at the convention in June, perhaps win the Presidency and at the same time lose control of the Congress.

Here are the plain and simple facts: This year one-third of the Senators will stand for reelection. Of these 32 Members of the Senate, 18 are Republicans and 14 are Democrats. If the States involved were to reelect these same party members, the standing in the Senate would remain the same in 1949 as now. This, of course, would be 51 Republicans and 45 Democrats. A close analysis of the States with senatorial elections this year reveals that 14 are certain to return Republican Members and 13 are certain to return Democratic Members.

The apparent Republican States are Minnesota, New Hampshire, Illinois, Delaware, South Dakota, Kansas, Oregon, Idaho, Michigan, New Jersey, Wyoming, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Maine, and Iowa.

The equally apparent Democratic States are Mississippi, Louisiana, Rhode Island, Colorado, Arkansas, South Carolina, Montana, Texas, Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and North Carolina.

This leaves the Republican Party with the difficult ask of reelecting Republican Senators from three States south of the Mason and Dixon Line or the party will lose control of the Senate. These States are Oklahoma, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

In order to have a voting majority, not only must we win these three States, but we must capture a Democratic seat in addition to these three. Judging from the past, the most logical would be New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, coming from Kentucky, I think I know the political situation there. Only 7 months ago, in November 1947, we had a gubernatorial election. Kentucky went approximately 100,000 Democratic in that election. The other States involved did not have State-wide elections last year, so we can only consider the Kentucky results. I know we cannot hope to win in these four States with just any candidate. We must nominate at Philadelphia the best vote getter the Republican Party has in its ranks. We must nominate the Republican concerning whom the people in the several States have had the opportunity to express themselves as to their choice and have consistently chosen by overwhelming majorities. We cannot afford to take a chance on losing control of the Congress. We know from our experience that in order to put forth our full Republican program we must have both branches of the Government.

The Gallup poll that appeared in various Sunday papers on May 9, 1948, has long been recognized for its accuracy. This most recent poll gives ample evidence of the most certain way to gain the White House for our party and save the control in the Senate and House.

The figures showing Mr. Stassen's popularity in the South is particularly revealing. The South needs the existence of a two-party system for its future progress. All southern leaders know this and desire it. Mr. Stassen leads President Truman in this area. We of the party must not fail next month at Philadelphia to nominate the best the party has to offer to the voters of the Nation.

The poll above referred to follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—STASSEN FAR AHEAD OF TRUMAN IN NATION, NEAR DRAW IN DIXIE

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 8.—The first full indication of the extent of the anti-Truman revolt in the South can be seen in the latest survey of political sentiment by the institute.

In the traditionally Democratic South, a Republican candidate for President, Harold E. Stassen, runs neck and neck with President Truman in a Presidential trial-heat race. In 13 years of institute polling on political sentiment, nothing like that has ever been found before.

Throughout the Nation as a whole, Stassen runs considerably ahead of the President and shows a substantial increase of strength since February. Stassen's rise is reflected in three trial-heat races over a 4-month period, as follows:

If the Presidential election were being held today and Truman were running for President on the Democratic ticket against Stassen on the Republican ticket and against Wallace on the third-party ticket, how do you think you would vote?

	Feb. 15	Apr. 11	Today
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Stassen	41	44	56
Truman	45	39	33
Wallace	6	7	5
No opinion	8	10	6

The sectional results of the latest poll, showing the almost unprecedented situation of a Republican running as strongly in the South as the Democratic candidate, follow:

	Stassen	Truman	Wallace	No opinion
New England and Middle Atlantic	*Percent* 56	*Percent* 32	*Percent* 7	*Percent* 5
East Central	59	32	4	5
West Central	63	32	2	3
South	42	41	4	13
Mountain and Pacific	57	32	5	6

The significance of the southern figures in the poll can be appreciated when one remembers that only once since the Civil War has the Republican Party made any substantial dent in the solid South, in 1928 when Alfred E. Smith headed the Democratic ticket, the Republicans polled a majority (52 percent) of the major party popular vote in the 13 Southern States taken as a whole. On a comparable basis, with third party and no opinion vote excluded, Stassen's showing in today's poll closely approximates the 1928 performance.

In certain other years southern Democrats have voiced complaints about supporting their party's candidates—as for example in 1944 when there was a small revolt against Franklin D. Roosevelt, but they ended up loyal to the party on election day. That of course might happen again this year.

In analyzing the impressive showing made by Stassen in the latest trial heat, several qualifications should be borne in mind.

1. The survey was conducted at a time when President Truman's popularity was at a low ebb and when Stassen's star has been rising. Whether Stassen can continue to hold such a lead over Truman in popularity through the weeks ahead remains to be tested in future polling.

2. Once before, in the autumn of 1946, President Truman's popularity sank to a low point in institute polls, but the President made a phenomenal comeback. There is always the possibility that he will stage another political recovery. The defection of the South accounts for much of his low standing. Any tendency of southern voters to bury the hatchet and close up the ranks against the Republicans will strengthen Truman's position nationally in the public opinion polls.

3. Stassen's lead over Truman at present is not unique. Earlier surveys have shown Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, and Stassen all running ahead of Truman in trial heat races.

One significant sidelight in today's poll results in the comparatively low vote for Wallace.

With Stassen in the race he polls only 5 percent nationally as of mid-April. In the section where he is strongest in the poll, the New England and Middle Atlantic areas—Wallace's figure is 7 percent.

By occupation groups, Truman's strongest support comes from manual workers who, as a group, have been heavily Democratic. However, even in that group Stassen is shown with a small lead in the poll results.

The vote by occupation groups follow:

	Stassen	Truman	Wallace	No opinion
Professional and business	*Percent* 69	*Percent* 22	*Percent* 5	*Percent* 4
White-collar	65	26	6	3
Farmers	53	38	2	7
Manual workers	46	41	6	7

Revision of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely editorial which appeared in the Sunday Star dated May 8, 1948, on the question of whether or not it would be wise to attempt a revision of the United Nations Charter, which reads as follows:

THE BEST WE CAN HAVE NOW

Secretary Marshall's testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee should lead to a prompt shelving of proposals advocating a drastic revision of the United Nations Charter or the creation of some kind of world government. In terms of promoting international peace, the proposals simply do not make sense. Far from easing current tensions, they would in all probability intensify them and thus make an admittedly bad situation much worse than it is.

As Secretary Marshall has said, the world is suffering grave disagreements today not because of the structure or Charter of the United Nations but because of the obstructionism, the broken pledges, and the neglected obligations that can be charged against the Soviet Union. The UN is meant to preserve the peace and not to make the peace. The peace—through special treaties for Austria, Germany, and Japan—must be made by the major victor powers, and until they do make it no international organization can function with real effectiveness. Certainly, the Kremlin's behavior and over-all policy cannot be changed for the better by rewriting the Charter to place spectacular limitations on the veto right or to pave the way for a single global government.

Actually, all such proposals are extremely unrealistic at this time. Despite its small group of earnest advocates in the Senate and House, for example, the idea of drastically limiting the veto would almost certainly be rejected by Congress and the American people as a whole just as soon as they realized the curbs it would place on the Nation's own freedom of decision. Nor can there be the slightest doubt that the Soviet Union would refuse to have anything to do with it. The truth is, in fact, that at this juncture there can be no sweeping and fundamental revision of the Charter that would not have the effect of destroying the United Nations. And the only thing that would be left then would be a world irreparably divided into two vast military blocs arming against each other for a cataclysmic clash.

Moreover, as Secretary Marshall has pointed out, such a situation would have this effect: A number of countries near the U. S. S. R.—countries now cooperating with us—probably would find themselves in so awkward and dangerous a situation that they would refuse to join in any new international organization established without Russian participation. They would refuse because they would not want to take the risk of belonging to what appeared to be a grand alliance against the Soviets. Thus, in the Secretary's words, there would be a dispersal of the community of nations and a splintering of the UN that would expose free peoples to even greater dangers than they face now and leave them "in the unenviable position of losing a highly useful world organization with nothing to put in its place."

In sum, the revisionist proposals, instead of promoting peace, would tend to promote war. They would rub the sore, not soothe it. The United Nations, no matter how imperfect it may be, is the best instrument we have now, or can have, to keep the world from jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. Within its framework, we and other free lands have the opportunity to improve upon it gradually and to organize regional systems of collective security. We have the opportunity, too, to right the world balance of power in such a way that the Russians—as members—may yet be persuaded to cooperate. It is folly to suppose that this hope—a slim one, but reasonable—could survive the wrecking of the UN.

American Standards Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to grant a Federal charter to the American Standards Association, located at 70 East Forty-fifth Street, New York City.

The American Standards Association, at present an unincorporated body, is a federation of 72 technical societies, trade associations, and governmental agencies. To these are added 35 associate members and over 2,000 company members, from whom comes the major financial support. It was established as the American Engineering Standards Committee in 1918 and assumed its present form in 1928. Throughout its history its objectives have been as set forth in its constitution:

To provide systematic means by which organizations concerned with standardization work may cooperate in establishing American standards, to the end that duplication of work and the promulgation of conflicting standards may be avoided.

To stimulate the work of existing committees and other organizations competent to formulate standards suitable for approval as American standards and to bring about the establishment of committees or organizations for this purpose where they do not already exist but not to formulate standards.

To serve as a clearinghouse for information on standardization work in the United States and foreign countries.

To further the standardization movement as a means of advancing national economy and to promote a knowledge of and the use of approved standards.

To act as the authoriative American channel in international cooperation in standardization work, except in those fields adequately provided for by existing international organizations.

The basic principle on which the ASA conducts its standardizing activities is the reaching of a consensus of all parties having a substantial interest in the matter in hand through the thoroughly democratic process of consideration by their representatives. The consensus of principle applies to the initiation of projects for standardization, to the approval of the scope of any project, the approval of the personnel of the committee which will consider the project and, finally, to the approval of the resulting standard as "American standard."

A considerable number of the standards approved by the ASA as American Standards are developed completely by national bodies competent and recognized in their own fields. Most of these organizations are member-bodies of the ASA, but such membership is not necessary to secure consideration of a standard by the ASA.

The close cooperation of Government bodies in the standardizing activities of the American Standards Association has done much to insure a full and complete understanding on the part of both Government, particularly the armed services, and American industry of the standards which are desired on the one hand, and can be met on the other. Accordingly, the work of the American Standards Association is vital to the national defense. Legal objections have been raised to the participation of Government agencies in the work of the American Standards Association on the same basis as the representatives of industry and technical societies. Therefore, the early granting of a Federal charter by an act which makes clear the authority of Government agencies to participate in the American Standards Association on a full member-body status without payment of dues or other liability is of great importance.

The standardization activities of the American Standards Association range from standards affecting basic industries

through many phases of American life, to standards for consumer goods sold over the counter. Particularly important are the American Safety Standards which provide means for the protection of life and limb on the highways and in the plants and basic material producing facilities of the country.

Incorporation is sought at the present time to provide proper safeguards for the conduct of an operation which currently amounts to $600,000 a year. Incorporation under a Federal Charter is sought because it alone can insure the protection of the name "American Standard," and the continued full participation of Government departments and agencies.

Rio Grande Death Watch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the second part of the article written by Arthur W. Hamilton with respect to the Rio Grande flood-control problem in New Mexico, and which reads as follows:

RIO GRANDE DEATH WATCH—THE STORY OF A DYING RIVER

(By Arthur W. Hamilton)

II

Let us take a brief look at some of the things silt from the denuded ranges has done to the Middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico.

At the Colorado-New Mexico line the Rio Grande is a sparkling mountain stream. Two hundred miles downstream, at Albuquerque, the river is a sluggish, mud-laden serpentine trickle cutting ever-changing channels through a bed 300 yards wide in places.

Tributaries to the north of Albuquerque have disgorged their loads of silt washed down from overgrazed, barren foothills. Even heavier loads are dropped into the river from tributaries to the south, between Albuquerque and Elephant Butte Reservoir, at the southern end of the valley.

For long periods during dry spells the river above the reservoir is completely dry. Salt cedar and cottonwood, trees which flourish in the water-clogged silts of the clogged channel, grow jungle-thick over hundreds of acres of sprawling sediment plains, thirstily drinking up millions of gallons of precious water each year. And then sudden thaws in the snow-covered uplands bring rampaging floods to tear down levees and move tons of destructive mud yet another step nearer the sea. This movement of mud is checked, but only for a moment in geological time, by Elephant Butte Dam.

Each year about 326,000,000,000,000 gallons of water flow down the Rio Grande, carrying with it about 75,000,000,000 pounds of sediment. Sedimentation experts with a graphic turn of mind like to toy with these figures, and to convert them into familiar units. The annual sediment deposit of 18,000 acre-feet in Elephant Butte Reservoir alone, for instance, would fill 400,000 boxcars to make up a train stretching from New York to San Francisco and back again almost to Gallup, N. Mex. If it were piled on a city block, it would reach two and a half miles high.

This immense load of sediment is only a fraction of that deposited along 200 miles of river bed. The bed above the dam is rising at an average rate of more than 1 foot in every 12 years. Near San Marcial, just above Elephant Butte Reservoir, the bed rose 14 feet between 1895 and 1937.

Albuquerque, with its downtown section built in the old flood channel of the Rio Grande, is threatened with the worst flood hazard created by sedimentation in the United States, according to Government authorities. The river bed is even now 3 feet higher than the business area. Protected only by an inadequate system of levees already weakened by previous floods, downtown Albuquerque may well find itself wiped off the map should a quick spring thaw in the mountains after a winter of heavy snows bring flood waters surging down the wide, shallow channel of the Rio Grande.

The decline of irrigated acreage in the valley from a reported 124,000 acres in 1880 to 45,000 in 1910 was a disastrous illustration of the effect of this rise in the river bed. As the bed rises, so does the underground water level in the surrounding valley land, causing once cultivated acreage to become waterlogged and unproductive.

Today, because of an expensive, and not altogether successful, system of drains, the irrigated acreage of this area stands at about 65,000. These drains, however, are fast losing their effectiveness as rising sediment blocks their outlets. About 1,200,000 cubic yards of sediment are removed each year from ditches and channels, to be stacked on ditch banks and nearby land. A current problem lies in finding places to stack it. More land is being waterlogged each year. Sedimentation men say that it is only a matter of time until the valley will be useless for farming.

The space occupied by the annual silt deposit of 18,000 acre-feet reduces the storage capacity of Elephant Butte Reservoir by the amount of water needed to irrigate from 5,000 to 7,000 acres of land. The Rio Grande Compact Commission, a body organized to regulate water use by Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, and Mexico, has estimated that after 33 years of service approximately 20 percent of the storage capacity of the reservoir is taken up by sediment.

At this rate the next generation will find the rich areas below the dam—Rincon and Mesilla Valleys in New Mexico and El Paso and Hudspeth Counties in Texas—without a reserve supply of water during drought periods. When this occurs the parallel of the Upper Rio Grande with the tragic histories of the Euphrates, the Tigris, and the Yangtze will be complete.

What's to be done? The science and engineering boys—the water engineers, conservationists, geographers, and ecologists who spend their lives in calm contemplation of ruin and disaster—say that the situation, while interestingly deplorable, is by no means hopeless. They agree that the Middle Rio Grande Valley, its watershed and river system, can be brought back to a condition comparable to its pristine lushness. They agree, also, that, like the Red Queen, the people of the Middle Valley are going to have to run like hell for awhile just to stay where they are, and, furthermore, that the alternative is complete destruction of the land they live from.

Three things must be done to save the valley, according to those who have studied it from every angle. The grass cover that once held the soils in place on the range lands must be restored by such measures as reseeding and reforesting denuded areas and reducing livestock population. Small structures—plugs in large gullies, silt-detention dams on minor tributaries and in other places—must be built where needed to check the downrush of silt until range restoration begins to take effect. And, finally, a series of large dams must be erected on the Rio Grande and its major tributaries to contain sudden floods and to store the waters of these floods for controlled and beneficial release to the greatest advantage of all down-river water users.

It is emphasized that no one of these measures will do the job. All three things must be done, completely and concurrently, if the valley and its watershed are to be saved. Dams alone would provide merely a make-shift stay of execution for the doomed valley; the same forces of destruction by flood and sedimentation that are overwhelming the river system, the land, and Elephant Butte Reservoir would in time overwhelm all engineering works that might be built in the future.

Inevitably, of course, there is opposition to proposals that abuse of the land be checked by an integrated program of soil stabilization and dam construction in the Middle Rio Grande watershed. Water, in this country of little rain, is money.

The people below Elephant Butte Dam, protected from floods and favorably situated on a remnant of land still well-watered and highly productive, scream loudly that nothing should be done, except maybe to dig out the channel a bit to insure the river free passage into the reservoir that, for the present, at least, supplies Dona Ana County in southern New Mexico, and El Paso and Hudspeth Counties in Texas, with wealth-producing water. The suggestion has been made, presumably in jest, although not certainly, that the whole of northern New Mexico be paved with concrete in order to make a really efficient catch basin of it.

The barricades are manned to the north and south of Elephant Butte. Those north of the dam want to bring their country back to its former productiveness, and they think it possible to do so with no loss of water to anyone—and perhaps with some gain. They have fairly cogent arguments on their side, and the experts back them. But water users below the dam have their water now, and, by God, they don't want anyone messing around upstream.

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] for inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 30 the transcript of the testimony on trade agreements given by William L. Clayton, Special Assistant on Economic Affairs to Secretary of State George C. Marshall.

I found this testimony well worth reading. Mr. Clayton appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on March 28, 1947. This was some 6 weeks before we had any official inkling of the so-called Marshall plan. It was not until May 8 that Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson gave us the first hint, and it was another month after that that Secretary Marshall first asked our European friends to tell us what they wanted.

Page A2655 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that in March 1947 Mr. Clayton was worried very much about "industries and agricultural products that are dependent on foreign markets to

absorb surpluses that are produced here." He told the Committee that "we must export $1,500,000,000 worth of wheat." He also spoke about dairy products and eggs which were being exported to the tune of $500,000,000, and added:

There are many other things that we expect that we have got to maintain export markets for. Otherwise we are going to have those products in surplus which cannot be taken care of and the situation will have to be met in some other way.

Our able colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] pointed out that these exports could not be maintained once Europe got back to normal food production. It seems Mr. Clayton did not know that. He seemed to think that these very exports could be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Mr. Clayton and his colleagues in the State Department were not then looking for some way in which they could maintain our exports at the high level they had reached. Is it possible that these State Department employees felt that our prosperity depends upon keeping up domestic prices and maintaining a scarcity at home? What better way could they have accomplished this than by giving away enormous quantities of our food, clothing, and machinery? If that was their objective, there was one sure way to accomplish it. That was to give some of our taxpayers' money to our European friends so they could bid against American workers for huge quantities of American goods and thus keep up prices and the appearances of prosperity at least until after election day.

Mr. Speaker, such revelations make it very difficult for us to refute those charges made in Europe that the painful sacrifice of our citizens are only a selfish attempt to maintain domestic prosperity. I wonder how much of this type of thinking went on in the genesis of the so-called Marshall recovery plan. I think the American public should know, and I hope that our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will soon be able to give us the answer.

I make no objection to humanitarian efforts to help unfortunate peoples, but our efforts should be forthright and free from all possible abuses.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, before the fifty-seventh annual continental congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., April 22, 1948:

It is a great honor to appear before this Fifty-seventh Continental Congress of the organization whose fine patriotism has never been more needed than now. Its work is really appreciated in these days when enemies within our gates seek to weaken us at the bidding of foreign masters.

I like your convention theme: "A Strong America." It has a real message for all our people. Let me give you another to go with it. It is a slogan taken from the famous Rattlesnake Flag of the Revolutionary War. Many of your ancestors carried that flag into battle.

That slogan was "Don't Tread on Me." There is an American slogan for a strong America. It is notice to all the world that we are not an aggressive people but gives warning that we are ready to defend our ideals against aggressors.

In recent months, patriotic thinking seems to have gone out of fashion in the United States. Too many Americans take this land, its privileges and its rights, for granted. Too few remember that those privileges and rights were purchased in the blood and sweat of battle. Too few rededicate themselves to the basic principles which made America free and great. So many talk about their rights but so few consider their obligations.

Yours is an organization devoted to love of country. Today there is real work for people like you.

One way to win that strong America in which you and I believe, is to arouse the patriotism dormant in so many Americans. I believe that task requires a bigger, more widespread DAR, the encouragement of our vigorous service men and the creation of other patriotic organizations in these United States.

Our people are living in a period of fast moving history. This is a century of struggle for the souls and minds of men. Liberty and independence are on one side—regimented dictatorship is on the other. Which do we want? There is no middle ground.

In the terrible, devastating and bloody war just ended, we cleared one great hurdle of dictatorship. We shattered an evil thing that called itself nazism and fascism.

Just ahead there looms an even greater hurdle. It is more evil; it is more brutal; it is more subtle; and makes a shrewder appeal to many people. Communism is wrapped in persuasive colors. In our own country it has found foolish men willing to accept it as a cure-all for the world's ills when, in fact, communism is today the greatest disease poisoning the world. Yet there are knaves and misguided men and women who think it will bring them everlasting peace if they appease it and surrender to it.

Everyone wants peace, but Europe knows that the only peace to be found under communism is the peace of the grave. It comes to men and women in the slave camps of Siberia and in the purges of the vassal countries behind the iron curtain.

We shall clear this hurdle of communism if Americans do their duty. But, first, Americans must relearn the lesson of our blessings which so many have forgotten. That is the lesson the DAR should teach. Tell it from the pulpits. Tell it in the assembly halls. Tell it in the courthouses. Tell it in legislative halls. Tell it at the crossroads and in the big cities and wherever people live under our flag.

The message is that we live in a land of priceless privileges. They have never existed in such abundance in any country.

They are freedom of speech and press and worship. The right of trial by jury. The secret ballot. Equal protection under the law. The right to work at the job of our choice. The right to advance as our diligence warrants. God in his wisdom never intended that all men and women would be equal in ability. He did intend them to have equal opportunities.

These things are ours today because men and women were willing to fight and die to secure them. Other men and women were willing to fight and die to hold them and to hand them on to us. Now the torch is in our hands.

This heritage can be lost only by ourselves. The moment we fail to defend it, we shall lose it. And if we lose these rights in this generation we shall go the way of the people of Czechoslovakia and of other countries around which the iron curtain has been dropped.

With these privileges comes the responsibility of vigilance.

Equally, there is the responsibility of sharing these freedoms. You should make that better understood. People are living under the yoke of dictatorships today because they did not realize the great value of freedom. They thought they could divide indivisible things. The Nazis taught they could have freedom for themselves, and at the same time withhold freedom from others. More and more, at the end, they came to realize that all of Germany had become a vast prison camp. The Communists of Russia think that they, too, are especially chosen to have freedoms and rights and privileges which they can withhold from all who disagree with them. The result is that even the elite of Russia—the party members—are arrested without warning and imprisoned without trial for daring to speak or print something not approved by the dictators. Thirteen million Russians are in concentration camps. Other millions are in the armed forces.

Freedom must be shared. This is important. One part of America—one group of Americans—cannot have freedom of speech and press and worship—it cannot enjoy the right of trial by jury and a secret ballot—unless all Americans have the same rights.

Good Americanism is easy for the DAR. You are the old Americans and proud of your heritage. But there are millions of newer Americans in our country who are also good citizens. Everyone must be made to understand this. You can help to inform them.

This melting pot of ours still simmers and bubbles and produces grand Americans, as it has done in the past. After all, aren't we all products of that melting pot. Into the colonial melting pot, from which so many of our finest are descended, went British, Dutch, Swedish, Welsh, Scotch, French, Irish, and other bloods.

Those people came, seeking liberty and a better way of life for their children. God gave them that better life. And others have been coming ever since, also seeking liberty and a better life.

There is fine blood in these newer Americans. It is good for America to have them. We need them in our fields, our factories, our mines, our schools, and in our Government. But they must understand America. They must be Americans. We must be Americans.

And here the DAR has an important responsibility. It is one which your organization has recognized. You have helped to make good citizens of many of these newcomers. You must continue to help, both by teaching the new citizens and by teaching the older Americans that our priceless rights here are indivisible.

The DAR is secure and unchallenged in its patriotism. There can be no better organization to teach first generation Americans what America means. There can be no better organization to teach tolerance and understanding to the older Americans.

In this way you will help to fight communism, and make a stronger and better America.

Let us not forget that first-generation immigrants and the sons of first-generation immigrants were among those who died while wearing the American uniform in the Pacific, in north Africa, and in Europe. The

new Americans, too, can help in the struggle against communism.

It is for the DAR, to become more active in helping to spread the gospel of Americanism in America.

As a Pennsylvanian, I should like to talk for a moment about another project of yours which is close to my heart. The work of building the Memorial Bell Tower for the chapel at Valley Forge is a task worthy of this order.

Valley Forge is more than a place. It is a milestone and a turning point in American history. In that awful winter of 1777–78, the armed forces under George Washington fell to their low point of 4,000 men. That was not very much to stand against the might of Britain.

Cowards and weaklings would have cried "Enough." They would have surrendered to the yoke and the war would have been over. But they were men of oak and men of granite at Valley Forge. Through despair and sharp losses they held firm through those terrible months. From that point on, although there were to be trying times ahead, the fortunes of George Washington's army picked up.

Valley Forge got its name because a colonial blacksmith had set up his forge there.

In a much broader sense it was to become the forge of liberty. In that forge the steel was tempered and sharpened for victory. There in the cruel winter and in the spring which followed, the embattled farmers and artisans of the New World were fashioned by General Washington and Von Steuben, the latter one of the new Americans, into a victorious army. This army was later to march from victory to victory until the flower of the British Army surrendered at Yorktown to the might of the Colonies and France. This victory paved the way for the founding fathers to make a constitution and a nation. That Nation, God willing, will save the world from darkness and chaos.

Yes, what you are doing at Valley Forge will be a great work. This bell tower you have conceived and are building will be an inspiration for Americans everywhere. Hung with the singing bells from all the States, it will proclaim liberty and love of country. It will remind all of the history made at that place 171 years ago.

In the troubled times through which we are passing, those bells should sing out the great words of George Washington: "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

Those bells, in that tower, should sound, too, the message of Daniel Webster:

"Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country."

This is an inspirational project at Valley Forge. The whole Nation should know and appreciate this task of patriotic American women.

With the knowledge of the sacrifices and the prayers of Washington at Valley Forge let us move forward.

We want peace in the world. We want the people of the world to understand and enjoy liberty.

This can be accomplished only by a strong America—strong spiritually, strong financially, and with a strong national defense. We must produce more. Unselfishly we must build up a balanced armed force. To keep peace our Navy, Air Force, and Ground troops must work together. We must not forget that no nation is right enough to buy its security. We must remember that this is no time for appeasement. A paper curtain can never protect the United States. Our national security rests upon an aroused people—a people ready to sacrifice as we did at Valley Forge, in the Argonne, in the Philippines, in North Africa, in Italy, and western Europe.

We can have peace and good will in the world if we will fight and sacrifice for it.

Hon. J. Lindsay Almond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting editorials from various Virginia newspapers commenting upon the election of our recent distinguished colleague, Hon. J. Lindsay Almond, to the position of attorney general of Virginia:

[From the Roanoke World-News of February 7, 1948]

ALMOND AND THE ATTORNEY GENERALSHIP

It has come as a distinct surprise to most of his constituents in the sixth district that Representative J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., is to be nominated for Attorney General of Virginia Monday and that his supporters in the assembly have assurance he will accept if elected. He has been in Washington less than 2 years, having been chosen to fill the unexpired term of Clifton A. Woodrum in January 1946 and then reelected in November for a full 2-year term. Normally the casual observer would believe him entirely contented with Washington life without realizing the terrific strain under which Members of Congress labor all the time.

Those who know Judge Almond best are aware how seriously he regards his task, the tremendous amount of work he does to represent his people properly, and the hours of worry over problems introduced from all parts of the district. Only they could be aware also that with Judge Almond the business of representing his district is not just a sectional matter but a matter of concern to all the people of the United States. He is a deeply conscientious patriot upon whom the many crises of the day weigh heavily. Being a Congressman isn't what it used to be. There is little time to enjoy the honors—only a steady grind that saps the energy.

The average Congressman is a daily target for those who disagree with him and some of the dissenters can be very nasty. He has to listen to the personal troubles of countless people who either want help directly or who think the Government should do something for them. The business of looking out for veterans alone is a tremendous task. Then there are requests of all kinds for everything from seeds to copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The World-News recently carried a series of feature articles revealing that his lengthy summer vacation really was reduced to 7 days which he managed by disappearing into the mountains by a quiet lakeside. A Congressman belongs to the people, or at least they think he does.

Although he probably is the second most important official of the State, the attorney General's life can be comparatively simple and his work, while exacting, is not unusually burdensome. Certainly it is not less desirable than a seat in Congress and in many respects it has superior attributes with many of the blessings and fewer of the headaches.

Thus it is not difficult to see that Judge Almond can justify giving up the job in Washington for one at Richmond. "I am not a candidate for the position of Attorney General of Virginia," he hold the World News yesterday afternoon, "but if the representatives of the people elect me for that responsible position, I am willing to give my best in the service of my State."

Apparently all that remains to make definite his election to the post is favorable action by the Democratic caucus next Monday night. At this writing such action appears a foregone conclusion. His selection would bring to that post an eminently qualified man with a record of 13 years on the bench of Roanoke hustings court prior to his going to Congress. Furthermore it would mean presence in a key State post of a man usually regarded as a strong administration supporter, which is a paramount consideration. Since the choice apparently will be of a political nature the general assembly, in opinion of this newspaper, could hardly find a better qualified or more capable man. Lindsay Almond should make an excellent attorney general.

[From the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot]

JUDGE J. LINDSAY ALMOND AS ATTORNEY GENERAL

It would be hard to find among members of the Virginia bar a student of the law better qualified for the office of attorney general than former Judge James Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Roanoke. His nomination as successor to the late Harvey B. Apperson, his fellow townsman, appears certain to emerge from the general assembly's Democratic caucus this week. That prospect, plus Judge Almond's apparent willingness to relinquish his seat in Congress as Representative of the Sixth District to assume the office, virtually assures his election by the legislature to fill the 2 years remaining of the unexpired term of Mr. Apperson who died last week.

Judge Almond has been a Member of Congress since January 1946, when he was elected to the House in a special election (again for an interim tenure) to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Representative Clifton A. Woodrum. He has served with quiet efficiency through the unexpired term and the regular term to which he was elected 2 years ago. This sojourn in Congress has been Judge Almond's first experience in elective office. His previous career concerned itself, briefly as an assistant Commonwealth's attorney, then for 13 years on the bench, with the practice and application of the law.

As judge of the Roanoke hustings court, Judge Almond made a good impression upon lawyers and laity alike. He distinguished himself almost within the year of his elevation to the bench by his role in the embezzlement scandal which rocked the Roanoke city government in the early thirties. Later, in 1935, he summoned a special grand jury as a result of a hotly contested primary in Roanoke "to break up * * * the illicit and fraudulent traffic in mail ballots which (he wrote) has persisted here for years with flagrant contumacy." His vigor in denouncing abuses in the absent-voters law spotlighted the need for reforms subsequently written into it.

The State could well use a jurist of Judge Almond's attainments and a man of his forthrightness in an office so important to the interpretation and enforcement of its laws. His assiduous interest in honest elections, as shown in his sharply worded denunciations of mail-ballot crookedness, comes refreshingly to mind in the light of efforts now afoot in the legislature to water down the safeguards of the tightened voting laws. To all public questions, he has applied a schooled mind, a judicial outlook, and a political philosophy of enlightened conservatism. An alert, hard-working student of government, he could offer much to the State's administrative councils. The general assembly would make no mistake in putting him in the attorney general's office.

[From the Roanoke Times of February 8, 1948]

PROSPECTIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Representative J. Lindsay Almond's intimation of his willingness to accept if chosen by the general assembly to succeed the late Attorney General Harvey B. Apperson appears to have summarily ended

speculation as to the legislature's choice to fill the vacancy created by Judge Apperson's sudden death last week and in all probability no other name but that of the Sixth District Congressman will be offered for the consideration of the Democratic caucus when it meets Monday to nominate a candidate for attorney general. Since both branches of the general assembly are overwhelmingly Democratic, the nominee of the caucus is assured of election, if indeed the Republican minority even deems it worth while to propose a candidate.

While Judge Almond's willingness to exchange his seat in Congress for the office of attorney general has caused some surprise here, especially in view of the virtual certainty that he would have been reelected next November by his constituents, it is realized that the duties of the post which has become vacant as a result of Judge Apperson's death undoubtedly would be decidedly congenial and highly interesting to a man of Representative Almond's legal background. In the approximately 13 years he served on the bench of the local hustings court he demonstrated a capacity for hard work and won widespread acclaim as an able and painstaking jurist. A graduate of the law school of the University of Virginia, he practiced at the local bar 10 years before being elevated to the bench.

In the 2 years that he has served in Congress Judge Almond has labored tirelessly in half of matters affecting the Sixth District and the State and he is held in growing esteem by the house Democratic leaders and his colleagues generally. For that reason his decision to transfer his activities from Washington to Richmond, if summoned by the general assembly to fill the office of attorney general, is a cause of regret to his constituents and more especially his loyal supporters here in his home city. Nevertheless, it can and should be said that Judge Almond is eminently qualified to serve the State admirably as attorney general and, since the prospective action of the Democratic legislative caucus is agreeable to him, the contemplated action of the general assembly in designating him as the new attorney general will meet with general approval and satisfaction.

[From the Roanoke Times of February 12, 1948]

Judge Almond's exceptionally fine record as the judge of the Roanoke hustings court, a post he relinquished 2 years ago to make a successful campaign for Congress, is so recent as to be fresh in public memory and the people of Roanoke know, and are in a position to reassure their fellow Virginians on that score, that the general assembly has made a wise and discriminating choice in selecting the Sixth District Congressman as the new attorney general.

We are entirely confident that Judge Almond will grace the office and discharge its duties in a way that will thoroughly vindicate the action of Tuesday's Democratic caucus. He is able, conscientious, fair, and hard working, just as was his lamented predecessor, and he will be an attorney general of whom Virginia can be proud.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of February 11, 1948]

MR. ALMOND AND ABSENT VOTER FRAUDS

Representative J. Lindsay Almond, of Roanoke, is fully qualified for the post of the attorney general to which he was elected yesterday by the Democratic caucus, to succeed the late Harvey Apperson. It is a special tribute to him that he was chosen to a post which he did not seek. The fact that he has accepted, despite the substantial cut in salary which acceptance entails, is a happy omen for his dedication to the task.

Representative Almond has trained with the "organization," of course, but he is a man of strong convictions who has done his own thinking. We recall particularly the cleansing blast which he delivered in 1935 as judge of the Roanoke hustings court. At that time he summoned a special grand jury in order to "break up and blot from the escutcheon of this city the illicit and fraudulent traffic in mail ballots which has persisted here for many years with flagrant contumacy." The grand jury met, and the judge said in his charge:

"It is a notorious and disgraceful fact that in past elections political shysters, wardheelers, spurious notaries public, and even candidates for public office have paraded the streets with mail ballots in their possession, many of which were solicited and voted in violation of law * * *. If this condition is allowed to continue its nefarious progress unchallenged, a corrupt traffic of alarming and dangerous proportions will soon develop with its cankerous poison inoculating the integrity of our elective system."

The grand jury exonerated all the candidates in the Roanoke primary of 1935, and one lone notary public was indicted. Judge Almond had done his duty as he saw it in directing attention to what he believed to be the facts.

When one recalls his laudable effort to break up mail ballot frauds in Roanoke, and the widespread thieveries of a similar character that have occurred in other sections of the State over a long period of years, it is the more extraordinary that the Virginia Senate should have passed a bill last week seriously weakening the safeguards that were thrown around the mail ballot at the session of 1946. The principal change is the elimination of the affidavit which now must be filed with an application for a mail ballot.

The machine which has chosen so excellent a man as Representative Almond to the attorney generalship had best think twice before it opens the door to absent voter abuses which could become as flagrant as those which Judge Almond vigorously condemned from his Roanoke bench 13 years ago.

The house has not acted upon the dangerous suggestion for weakening the absent voter law that passed the senate. It should reject the proposal by a strong majority.

[From the Staunton News Leader of February 8, 1948]

NEXT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Information from Richmond that a joint Democratic caucus of the general assembly will on Monday nominate Representative J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Roanoke, to be attorney general of Virginia should be pleasing to the whole State. It is doubtful that a better choice could be made. Judge Almond practiced law for 10 years before going on the hustings court of Roanoke in 1933, and won a reputation on that court for a sound knowlege of the law and for true judicial temperament. He is 49 years of age, vigorous, forthright, and able.

As successor to another former Roanoke judge, Mr. Clifton A. Woodrum, in Congress in 1946, Judge Almond was fast becoming one of the outstanding men of the Virginia delegation, which has undergone an unfortunately high number of changes in the last few years. The Sixth District has consistently sent men of high attainments to the House, however, and if the incumbent Representative becomes successor to the late Attorney General Apperson, as now indicated, the Sixth may be expected to live up to its traditions in this respect.

[From the Roanoke Times of April 17, 1948]

THE NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL

Representative J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., completes his useful but all too brief service in the House today. On Monday he will be sworn in as attorney general of Virginia and will begin his duties in Richmond as the chief legal officer of the Commonwealth.

We deem it appropriate and altogether fitting to say this morning, as Judge Almond prepares to turn his back on Washington to assume an office for which he is extraordinarily well fitted, that the Sixth District is grateful for the fidelity, loyalty, earnest devotion and conscientious manner in which he has performed his duties as its Representative in Congress.

His stay there was of comparatively short duration, little more than 2 years, but in that time he had displayed marked aptitude for the work and had grown steadily in the confidence and esteem of his colleagues, who quickly recognized his integrity, courage, and ability, qualities which had won him the admiration and regard of the people of Roanoke during his service on the bench of the hustings court.

Judge Almond will make his mark as attorney general and the people of Virginia will speedily discover that the general assembly showed discriminating wisdom in selecting him to succeed the late Harvey B. Apperson, whose untimely death several months ago created the vacancy which was filled at the recent session by Judge Almond's election for the remainder of the unexpired term.

Lindsay Almond will be the third Roanoker in succession to fill the office of attorney general. Like Justice A. P. Staples and Mr. Apperson, he is well qualified for the post and we can confidently anticipate that he will make a shining record in the office which he is to assume 2 days hence.

Mundt Subversive Activities Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McDOWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

AN ANSWER TO CONSPIRACY

This country's deep conflict between national security and civil liberties moves into a more conclusive phase, we hope, with the introduction in Congress of legislation to deal with the problem of the Communist conspiracy.

This legislation, known both as the Subversive Activities Control Act and as the Mundt bill, meets the problem squarely. Contrary to Communist charges, it does not outlaw communism, though that is a course favored by many Americans. The bill does not propose to deal with so-called theoretical communism in the United States. It does seek to strike a body blow at the American cadre of the foreign-directed Communist conspiracy."

Under this bill, as we understand it, a man can be a Communist, but he must be a Communist under official surveillance, so that it can be determined if he is seeking to overthrow the Government. If the Communist operates underground, he is subject to stiff fine, imprisonment, or both.

The bill makes it a crime to attempt to establish totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. It provides for the registration with the Attorney General of Communist or Communist-front organizations, their officers, and their members. Such organizations would make full disclosure of the receipt and expenditure of funds. Members of registered organizations would be denied passports, thus cutting the threads that bind

the international conspiracy together, and would be denied Government employment. It would be illegal for registered organizations or their representatives to use the mails to disseminate publications unless the wrappers on such publications stated that they were sponsored by a Communist organization. Moreover, no deduction for Federal income-tax purposes would be allowed for contributions to registered organizations, nor shall such organizations be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax.

The greatest objection to this bill, as we see it, lies in the possibility that it is too sweeping in its definitions. Again, the effort to include so-called Communist-front organizations could conceivably subject falsely accused organizations and individuals to notoriety, embarrassment, and expense, even though legal safeguards are provided in the act.

These safeguards require that the Attorney General give suspects full public hearings, subject to review by the Federal courts. Under this procedure it would be difficult to force the registration of nonsubversive parties. Granted the possibility of abuses (which arise under any law), we believe that the good to be achieved for the Nation justifies a minimum risk of injustice to the individual.

This controversial legislation reflects long and serious study by legal and legislative minds. Perhaps subsequent study and debate of its many details will uncover remediable defects. We are reluctant to give blanket approval to the bill as it is presently written but, weighed over-all in the light of the intent of its authors, the act constitutes a practical step toward meeting a perplexing and urgent need—an effective method of dealing with an alien conspiracy against the Government.

Kermit Roosevelt Addresses American Council for Judaism on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Kermit Roosevelt is an authority on conditions in the Middle East. On last Thursday evening he addressed the American Council for Judaism at the Shoreham Hotel. His remarks on that occasion are worthy of their place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He has spoken with authority and minced no words as to his position regarding political Zionism. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including Mr. Roosevelt's speech herein:

It is time that the American people should recognize, as the rest of the world has done, that political Zionism is a purely nationalistic movement.

For a time Zionism hid behind the displaced persons of Europe, capitalizing upon their misery to advance its own purely nationalistic aims. But recently that cloak has been cast aside. In their plans for immigration to the proposed Zionist state in Palestine, the Jewish agency allocated only a very small fraction of the 75,000 yearly figure to displaced persons.

William Tuck, executive secretary of the International Refugee Organization, said on May 4 that Palestine must be ruled out as a haven of any importance of DP's. And on May 5 the New York Times reported from "unimpeachable sources" that "Whereas until 3 or 4 months ago a vast majority of these DP's wished to go to Palestine, 80 percent of them now say that they want to go to the United States, and they specifically add that they do not want to go to the Holy Land."

This was after Zionists, who had claimed that Palestine would solve the DP problem, suddenly announced that it could do no such thing.

Yet the Stratton bill, which would be a big step towards solution, still lacks Zionist support. Having used the DP's political Zionism now seems prepared to forget them.

Political Zionism is a dangerous anachronism.

It is dangerous not only because it is provoking war in one of the world's critical strategic areas, but also because of the threat it presents to internal relations in other countries of the world. These threats are increased by the over-powering emotions Zionism seems to generate, and the stultifying effect it produces upon the reasoning powers of its adherents. Logical argument with a convinced political Zionist is likely to be as unrewarding as logical argument with a convinced Communist.

Political Zionism is an anachronism because it is a reversion to the kind of racist nationalism above which progressive mankind has been trying to rise for generations. Moreover, political Zionism is imperialism, seeking to invade and rule in an area which has already had its fill of foreign imperialism of the Turkish, British, and French models.

Does it seem strange to describe Zionism as foreign imperialism in the Middle East? How else would you describe a movement of people from another continent, into inhabited land, with the goal of establishing their rule over that land, and over hundreds of thousands of its inhabitants?

And remember that many Zionists have openly laid claim not only to the land assigned to them by the General Assembly resolution, not only to the rest of Palestine as well, but to all of Transjordan and parts of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq. Is it any wonder that Arabs, more than once bitten by imperialism, are also more than shy—are in fact united in their decision to fight what seems to them the latest threat of foreign invasion, domination, and exploitation?

To return to the earlier language of Zionism, imperialism is the difference between a national home, promised to Zionists by the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations mandate, and a political state, which is now the immediate aim of Zionism.

It is not too late to return to the earlier idea—that Palestine can provide a national home for the Jews who are already there and also for others who may wish to go. But a choice must be made.

The Jews of Palestine must decide whether Palestine is more important to them as a home in which they can live peacefully and work productively with other Palestinians, or whether it is more important for them as a state which will have to be established and maintained, if that is even possible, by constant bloodshed and strife.

It must be clear to them now that this is a necessary choice—that they cannot have both the peaceful home and the sovereign state.

A similar choice confronts those interested in Palestine who are not inhabitants of Palestine. The question can be put in many ways. Do we, or do we not, believe in the principle of self-determination of peoples? Do we believe the Jews constitute a nation, homeless unless they obtain Palestine, or do we consider them a religious-cultural group, members of which, like other such groups, are nationals of the state in which they live and possess citizenship

For Zionists outside Palestine, the choice might be put this way: are you going to exert pressure for the establishment of a political state which will involve the people of Palestine in bloody conflict, may endanger the national interests of the state of which you are a citizen, which may split the United Nations, and will certainly constitute a growing threat to world peace? Or are Zionists outside Palestine going to use their best efforts for peace, for a settlement which, as a democratic compromise, might obtain the backing of a majority on both sides?

Such a settlement might be a federal state along Swiss lines, in which each community would have extensive powers of self-government, and the rights of all citizens, whatever their religion, would be guaranteed by UN. To obtain this state, Zionists would have to give up the idea of absolute sovereignty for a Jewish state. The Arabs in return should—and, I am confident, would—agree to further Jewish immigration. For 1 or 2 years, this immigration would be large, as part of a world-wide settlement of the DP problem. After that, it would naturally be smaller, and would always be subject to the economic absorptive capacity of the country.

Such a settlement could not only end the fighting in the Holy Land but would be just and humane, thoroughly in conformity with the democratic principles for which America stands.

New Skirmish in an Old War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARY T. NORTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malvina Lindsay, from the Washington Post:

NEW SKIRMISH IN AN OLD WAR—MEN VERSUS WOMEN

(By Malvina Lindsay)

The war between the sexes, always latent, seems now to be having one of its periodic flare-ups. Men's forces in Congress have grabbed the offensive in a recent series of moves and so far are holding it. These moves have included:

The Gearhart coup by which women's groups supporting the renewal of legislation for reciprocal trade agreements have been shut out of the closed hearings conducted by the House Ways and Means Subcommittee, of which Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART is chairman.

The WAC-WAVE rear guard action by which a House bill shunted women of the armed forces into a reserve corps after a Senate bill giving them regular status had been passed unanimously.

A reported effort in the Senate to block via the closed hearing the reappointment of Judge Marian L. Harron, only woman on the 16-member Court of Tax Appeals, who in her 12 years of service has never had a decision reversed by the Supreme Court.

Also for some time women have been meeting a sort of freeze-out in politics and public affairs, especially in places where policy-making has been involved. Just how far this has gone—or whether it has been reversed—will be revealed at the national party conventions in the number of delegates women have and the representation they are given on important committees.

What is back of this recent outbreak of the age-old man-woman tug of war? For one thing, it may be a reaction to the post-war habit of women to advance to new economic frontiers. As Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON said in his plea for making women

a regular part of the armed services, "war is inevitably a revolutionary force in the life of women."

Men's uneasiness over this is heightened, since this postwar period happens to coincide with a swing of the pendulum toward conservatism in social and political attitudes. There is widespread fear of change—oddly, more on the part of men than of women—and much longing, in substantial circles at least, for the days of Coolidge and even McKinley. Men of the old order are in the saddle in many places. They would like to think women were at home knitting, not trying to mix into the masculine world of tariffs and defense.

One of Chairman GEARHART'S excuses for closing the tariff legislation hearings revealed this attitude. His opposition to "listening to spokesmen for a bunch of ladies' sewing societies reading statements * * * prepared by the State Department" not only drew a volley of telegrams to Republican leaders, but also alerted many women to the fact that the presuffrage era had not been left behind.

It also revealed the growing masculine concern over the direct political action and lobbying activities of powerful women's groups and their tendency to line up with progressive economic and social forces. Many high-tariff exponents have not forgotten what an effective fight national women's organizations put up for the trade agreements the last time the legislation was before Congress.

Similar echoes of the past came from the House debate over the status of women in the armed services. There were the same pompous generalities, the same flowery tributes that were the stock in trade of antisuffrage orators. There was also revealed the same latent fear of women taking too much power—in this case commissions and prestige—a fear now reinforced by the fact that they exceed men in numbers and voting strength and have gotten hold of the moneybags. The strength of this feeling was shown when Representative DEWEY SHORT pointed out that the House committee had to be "realistic," that if the Reserve Corps provision had not been put in, the bill could never have been gotten out of the Rules Committee.

So widespread has this sex-war skirmishing extended that psychologists and sociologists have been looking into it. Hence, we hear increasingly of gynophobia, the exaggerated fear of the power of women, a feeling said to be engendered in some men because they have had feminine bosses from the cradle up.

We also hear of neo-antifeminism, a growing movement among writers and speakers to convince women that careers and interests outside the physical walls of the home are the cause of their frustrations and neuroses, and that they would be happier if they went back to their kitchens as well as their "sewing societies."

But it is not likely that this counterrevolutionary movement in any of its phases will succeed. For the big trouble is that the economy is not headed toward giving women "sewing society" lives.

Chrysler Workers Need a Wage Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following advertisement in behalf of the UAW-CIO:

CHRYSLER WORKERS NEED A WAGE INCREASE—CHRYSLER CAN PAY IT AND CUT CAR PRICES, TOO—HERE'S PROOF

THE CORPORATION'S PROFITS

1. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corporation in 1947 were—(fasten your seat belt)—50 percent higher than the average for all corporations in the highly profitable automobile industry.

2. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corporation in 1947, after taxes, came to 25.6 percent of its investment. The industry average was 17 percent.

3. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corporation in 1947 were so great that each Chrysler worker produced 68 cents in profit for the corporation every hour he worked.

4. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corporation in 1947 were so great that it could have cut retail prices $145 on every car it produced last year and still have made 8 percent on its investment.

5. Chrysler profits: Profits of the Chrysler Corporation in 1947 prove that the corporation can grant every Chrysler worker a 30-cents-per-hour wage increase and still make 14¼ percent on its investment, after taxes. It can cut prices, grant the wage increase, and still make a good 6 to 8 percent on investment.

THE WORKERS' NEEDS

1. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler workers, like other American workers, have taken the rap for the reactionary crime of destroying price controls in the summer of 1946. Since that time, profits after taxes have gone up 57 percent—but wages and salaries have gone up only 18 percent. Profits rose over 3 times as fast as the income of the workers. Industry wanted the profits of inflation—and got them.

2. The Chrysler workers: The family of the average Chrysler worker must live on an income of $13 below the minimum weekly income fixed by the United States Bureau of the Budget for a city worker's family of four.

3. The Chrysler workers: The average auto worker's earnings rose 12 percent between June 1946 and January 1948—but the cost of living went up 27 percent.

4. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler worker's family could afford less than 90 percent of the food, clothing, and other necessities which the breadwinner's pay check could buy in the month price controls were destroyed (June 1946).

5. The Chrysler workers: The Chrysler workers, through their union, repeatedly called on Congress and big business to roll back prices, and made it clear that they would prefer a price roll-back to a wage increase. Both Congress and industry ignored that call. Since prices were not rolled back, and since they will continue to rise, a wage increase is necessary. The Chrysler workers refuse to take the rap for the reactionary crime of inflation.

CHRYSLER'S OWN FIGURES PROVE UAW CASE

Here, from Chrysler's own 1947 annual report, are the figures that prove that the Chrysler Corp. can pay the wage increase asked by Chrysler workers and still make extravagant profits:

Fact 1. Chrysler's pay roll last year, including President K. T. Keller's salary, was $259,148,583.

Fact 2. Our 30-cent demand, with equivalent percentage increases for white-collar workers, amounts to 21.1 percent of the total pay roll, or $54,680,351.

Fact 3. Chrysler's 1947 profits before taxes amounted to $123,657,346. (This profit figure includes $5,166,126 charged by the corporation for extraordinary depreciation. The deduction is inconsistent with the corporation's past policy and probably will not be recognized by the United States Treasury for tax purposes.)

Fact 4 (fact 3 minus fact 2). After a 21.1 percent pay roll increase to Chrysler workers, Chrysler's profits before taxes would still be $68,966,995.

Fact 5. Income taxes would then take $28,614,406. (Chrysler figured its tax payments at 41.49 percent of its profits before taxes. We used the same percentage.)

Fact 6 (fact 4 minus fact 5). Leaving profits after taxes of $40,352,589.

Fact 7. Stockholders' total investment in the corporation at the beginning of 1947 was $282,912,028.

Fact 8 (fact 6 as a percentage of fact 7). Chrysler's rate of profit, after a 21.1 percent wage and salary increase and after taxes, would be 14¼ percent.

THE A, B, C OF THE CHRYSLER WORKERS' WAGE DEMANDS

A, the Chrysler Corp. can increase wages without raising prices.

B, the Chrysler workers need this wage increase to recover lost ground and make a little progress.

C, the issue can be settled peacefully, on the basis of the facts.

Will the Chrysler Corp. heed the facts? Chrysler workers want to know.

NATIONAL CHRYSLER DEPARTMENT AND CHRYSLER LOCAL UNIONS, UAW-CIO.

The Pick-Sloan Plan for River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Two Years of the Pick-Sloan Plan," written by John B. Quinn, executive director of the Missouri Valley Association, and published in Public Power for March 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO YEARS OF THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN—PRACTICAL, SUCCESSFULLY OPERATING AND CONGRESSIONALLY APPROVED PROJECT IS HOW ADVOCATES DESCRIBE PICK-SLOAN RIVER PLAN

(By John B. Quinn)

The propagandists who would junk the Pick-Sloan river development plan and substitute a superauthority are having considerable difficulty ignoring two highly successful years of Pick-Sloan construction progress.

In the face of broad popular support for the Pick-Sloan program in the Missouri Valley, a few minority groups—and they are mostly dominated by interests outside the basin—continue to raise their voices against what is being accomplished under a plan approved by Congress.

Some of these distant voices noisily urge that the people of the Missouri Basin scrap a practical, successful operating and congressionally approved project, and wait until such time as these outsiders see fit to supply the type of program they envision as the only thing that can possibly succeed—some kind of valley authority patterned after the TVA.

Fortunately for the valley and its people, neither the Congress, State officials, nor the

people themselves have shown any inclination to be diverted from the comprehensive basin development now under way. On the contrary, the floods of last June which cost the valley another $111,000,000 in property destruction and 26 lives, increased the public demand that the Pick-Sloan program be vigorously prosecuted.

Mr. Benton J. Strong, a spokesman for one of these propaganda organizations, recently referred to the Pick-Sloan plan as a "wasteful failure." In broad generalities, Mr. Strong condemns everything that the Congress, Federal agencies, State governors, and basin people have endorsed and are supporting to eliminate floods and develop the water resources of the Missouri Basin. He says in effect that the people of the Missouri Valley must either take his authority plan or stagnate until "another, braver, and more enlightened generation comes along to repair the damages which cannot be estimated."

Not very flattering to the intelligence of the citizens of the Missouri Valley. These valley authority advocates apparently would have this great agricultural belt forego flood control, urgently needed expansion of irrigation, development of electric power, river navigation, and other benefits of the Pick-Sloan plan, until they can change the minds of the Congress of the United States, the governors and State legislatures of the basin States and the great majority of the people.

P-S PLANS NOT REFUTED

Yet what specifically do these opponents offer? Not once have they outlined a concrete plan for harnessing the Missouri River and its tributaries. No responsible engineering data has been offered to refute the soundness of the Pick-Sloan plan projects or to set up an alternate plan.

Mr. Strong carefully ignores what is actually taking place in this valley. He studiously avoids mention of the great multiple-purpose reservoirs, flood-control levees, irrigation projects, and other works now under construction under the Pick-Sloan plan. But the people of the valley know that in 1947 broad-scale construction was going forward which is taking them a long step nearer complete control and utilization of their land and water resources. They know the construction schedules are being increased in 1948.

As the new year starts, the Pick-Sloan plan swings into increased construction schedules on nine reservoirs, a score of local municipal and agricultural flood-control projects and river channel work in the interest of navigation. The early 1948 program includes advanced planning on a number of irrigation projects and hydroelectric power installations for multiple-purpose dams. Federal and State agencies are moving their plans into high gear in cooperative efforts to provide maximum soil conservation, fish and wildlife conservation and recreational facilities—all a part of the Pick-Sloan plan.

The program which Mr. Strong condemns as a wasteful failure was approved by the Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act. It provides for 105 reservoirs on the Missouri River and its tributaries; for the use of impounded water to irrigate 5,000,000 new acres of land in arid and semiarid sections of the Missouri Basin; for the generation ultimately of 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power annually; for a 9-foot river navigation channel extending 760 miles from St. Louis to Sioux City, Iowa; for a broad, expanding program of soil conservation; complete flood control of millions of acres of rich bottom lands and for scores of towns and cities, and other important benefits for the people.

This is the program on which the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and other Federal and State agencies are at work today in the Missouri Basin. The Congress has appropriated more than $190,000,000 for construction of the more urgently needed projects in the plan.

PROJECTS ALREADY BEGUN

The great bulk of these funds already have been put to work building multiple-purpose dams, floodwalls, levees, power and irrigation projects for the benefit of the people. The Corps of Engineers, under direction of Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Missouri River division engineer, is building two key reservoirs on the Missouri River, the Garrison Reservoir in North Dakota and the Fort Randall Reservoir in South Dakota. They will provide a high degree of flood control downstream, will provide irrigation water and hydroelectric power. The engineers are building three other important reservoirs on tributaries, the Kanopolis Reservoir on the Smoky Hill River in Kansas, the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River in Nebraska, and the Cherry Creek Reservoir to provide flood protection for the city of Denver, the headquarters of Mr. Strong. Also they are at work on a score of local and regional flood-control projects.

The Bureau of Reclamation's broad basin program for irrigation, power- and flood-control benefits also moved into accelerated construction in the 1948 fiscal year. As the year started, the Bureau had four major reservoir units in the major building stage, two others just starting and several more about ready to advertise for bids.

Notable among these Bureau construction activities is the Kortes Dam on the North Platte River in Wyoming, a multiple-purpose project for hydroelectric-power production, irrigation, and flood-control benefits; the Boysen Dam on the Big Horn River in Wyoming, a power and irrigation project with flood-control features; the Enders Dam on Frenchman Creek in Nebraska, another multiple-purpose reservoir project designed for irrigation, flood control, and silt control; and the Angostura Dam on the Cheyenne River in South Dakota, planned for irrigation and flood control. In addition, the Bureau recently let a contract for construction work on the Heart River Dam in North Dakota and the Medicine Creek Dam in Nebraska, both irrigation projects with flood-control features.

The Department of Agriculture, cooperating in the broad basin program, is at work on the important Little Sioux River Basin soil-erosion control project in Iowa and is advancing its plan for other erosion-control and water-retardation projects in a number of other basin watersheds.

Mr. Stong implies that all this is "wasteful failure." What do the people of the 529,000 square miles which comprise the Missouri River Basin think? Six basin-State governors, meeting with the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee in a coordinating session last fall, expressed themselves highly pleased with the construction progress on the Pick-Sloan plan. They were meeting in Mr. Stong's headquarters city at the time. The Missouri Basin State Committee, composed of all the governors of the 10 States lying wholly or partly in the Missouri Basin, went on record with similar commendation last June. Meeting in Omaha, the committee adopted a resolution reaffirming its endorsement of the Pick-Sloan program and urging that sufficient funds be appropriated annually to insure an orderly, efficient construction schedule for early completion of the entire program. The legislatures of seven basin States are on record in support of the Pick-Sloan development.

In an undertaking so vast in scope and far-reaching in potential development of basic resources, divergence of public opinion was inevitable when the plan was originated 4½ years ago. The people of the basin were properly concerned as to what was to be done with their soil and water resources. Through the full exercise of democratic processes they were given opportunity to study it thoroughly in public meetings, official hearings, and through the press. Governors and other State representatives were consulted and the plan stood the test of congressional hearings which resulted in its incorporation in the Flood Control Act signed by the President on December 22, 1944.

Yet Mr. Stong is quoted as saying: So long as we flirt with interim plans, compromise plans, piecemeal plans, and bogus plans—we are wasting not just dollars, not just a few hundreds of millions on false starts—we will be wasting our heritage. He and his fellow opponents of the Missouri Basin river development program seem to face a big job convincing the Congress that it is wasting money on piecemeal and bogus plans.

CONGRESS COOL TO MVA

Senator MURRAY of Montana, who introduced a bill in Congress to set up a Missouri Valley Authority, has not had much success convincing Congress it is all wrong on the Pick-Sloan plan. His proposal twice has been reported upon unfavorably by congressional committees. He himself admitted at a congressional hearing that it was probable that a substantial part or all of the projects in the Pick-Sloan plan would be utilized if a valley authority were established in the Missouri Basin.

Does Mr. Stong mean to imply that the piecemeal, bogus plan of the Pick-Sloan program would be acceptable if incorporated in a valley authority administrative scheme? He is quoted as saying that the Pick-Sloan plan does nothing whatever about the Dust Bowl. The TVA had no dust bowls to conquer, no irrigation problem to solve. Let him ask any farmer or rancher in the so-called dust-bowl areas of Kansas or Nebraska what is being done by the Soil Conservation Service and the Bureau of Reclamation to hold the soil on the land and provide water for irrigation. These agencies are both cooperating in the Pick-Sloan development, along with the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Commerce.

Senator MURRAY's bill would take the Missouri Valley development out of the hands of responsible, tested Federal agencies and State officials and place it in the hands of a commission of three men appointed by the President. It would vest in these three men broad powers over the resources and development of this region which is 13 times the size of the Tennessee Valley and comprises one-sixth the land area of the entire Nation.

The Murray bill would turn back the clock of progress in the Missouri Basin. It would mean stopping altogether or delaying indefinitely all construction work under the Pick-Sloan plan. The people would have no assurance that any of the plan they now support would be kept and carried out. It might be 2 years or 5 or 10 before a valley authority could devise a valley program, even if it could get by a Congress that seems interested in no part of authority schemes.

Meanwhile flood and drought would continue to take their yearly toll in the valley of the Missouri. Is it any wonder that the basin people are skeptical of the rosy promises and utopian dreams of the valley authority propagandists?

Is it any wonder that they are supporting the approved and active Pick-Sloan plan which they helped to create and to which they look with confidence for sound and practical flood control and water-resources development in the interests of the entire Missouri Basin?

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening. Now and again, I get letters which ought to be answered publicly. Written by obviously sincere people, who are puzzled and ask questions, these letters command respect. Last week, for instance, I was talking about the surest cure for a Soviet-lover. It was to visit there or to live over there and to see it, for himself. I gave several examples of convinced friends of the Soviet Union, who had lived under the system, becoming disillusioned with it and seeking to escape. I cited the case of a Red Army officer, who—when he saw his chance to escape to the American zone of Germany—took it. He later wrote a piece in which he said that whole sections of the Soviet Union, particularly the Ukraine, are waiting for redemption of Soviet promises and millions of Russians would gladly rebel against the regime, if they thought they had a chance.

So, this week, I get letters asking me how it happens that the Russians fought so well in the last war? Why, then, did they not rebel against their own government when the Germans came into the Ukraine? That is a very legitimate question.

I might answer it best in this way: I know a man who had a conversation, shortly after the war was over, with General Halder of the German General Staff. He told me he asked General Halder to fix the event which, to the general's mind, was the turning point of the war—in other words—when the Germans lost the war. General Halder said, in effect, that it was when the German armies overran the Ukraine section of the Soviet Union and raised the Nazi flag over it, instead of the flag of the Ukrainian Republic.

The people of the Ukraine had been ready to greet the Germans as liberators from their Soviet bondage, but the Germans had been so obtuse, politically, that they did not take advantage of it. Also, the German armies committed excesses and outrages on the populace of the Ukraine which soon turned the people against them and they found themselves forced to fight rearguard, partisan actions, constantly, to keep their lines of communications free. Instead of making a part of the Soviet people their allies, they made them their enemies, and that was the turning point of the war and the thing that lost the Russian campaign for the German Army—according to General Halder.

I think it is excellent testimony—coming in the nature of a confession of error, by a high German official—to the fact that the Ukraine was ripe and ready for revolt, even to the point of going over to the Germans. Some Russian divisions actually did this, if you recall.

And a question which I have been asked dozens of times is why the Russians fought so well—for example, at Stalingrad. And of course, they did fight well. But when a people are invaded by a traditional enemy, when that enemy commits excesses, when the war is against Mother Russia, on Russian soil, then the tendency in Russia—as in any other country—is to defend the homeland against the foreign invader. They are fighting for holy Russia, the motherland—not necessarily for an ideological system. I think the following fact is of the highest significance, namely that when Germany invaded Russia, there was an instant switch of propaganda methods by the Kremlin. No longer was the emphasis on ideology, on international communism, and on the Communist Party, but upon nationalism. The almost totally suppressed heroes of the old Czarist days, such as Peter the Great, Catherine, and even Ivan the Terrible, were trotted out, in all propaganda forms, notably the motion pictures. This shows that the Kremlin realized that the best bet was to make the people fight, not for the Soviet Union and the Communist Party, but for their land and their heritage, as Russians. That was an eloquent move by the Kremlin. If the Kremlin thought that the people would fight for Russia better, as old-time Russians than as new-fangled Communists, why should it be stated now that communism was what the people were defending at Stalingrad? I sincerely believe that the Russian people fought so well for their country, in spite of communism, rather than because of it.

During the period before the Italian elections, when I was discussing that subject, I received quite a bombardment of queries. One of them, repeated quite often, was: "Are the Russians interfering with the Italian elections as much as we are?"

To which the reply is: Russian communism is the interference in Italy. The Communist Party, within Italy, is the Soviet party. Every move it made was in the interest of the Soviet Union and every major move was in response to orders or advice from the Kremlin. The Russians interfere in Italy only as much as the Communist Party in Italy interfere there—no more and no less.

And here is a query that I am constantly getting. My mail is burdened with this sort of thing: "Well, after all," my correspondents write, "whatever else bad you may say about the Soviet Union, isn't it true that the people are better off there, now, than they were in the days of the czars?"

The answer to that is that it is highly debatable if any system of economy can repay a people for their loss of personal liberties. Grant, for the sake of argument, that the Soviet Union does make good on its implicit promise that if people will give up their civil liberties and their political securities, then they will be guaranteed economic security. I say that it is highly debatable if it is worth the price. If it were worth the price, then a civil war to end slavery in this country was fought on the wrong premise. People would be better off, cared for and economically secure, as chattel slaves, or as prisoners in prison, than freemen who have to think where their next meal, or their next job, is coming from.

But when the Russian people trade in their civil liberties on the assumption that they are going to get economic security and then find that they are not getting it, the whole thing becomes the most monstrous fraud and humbug in human history. They have literally sold their birthright for a mess of pottage and even the pottage is withheld.

I can't tell you if the Russian people were better off now or in the time of the czars. But others, who are qualified to speak by experience under both regimes, can tell you. I am going to quote at some length from Victor Kravchenko's book I Chose Freedom. I have Mr. Kravchenko's permission to do this. I think the following passage is one of the most interesting in the whole book. It represents the viewpoints of the old and the new in Russia. It describes a conversation which Kravchenko had with his father. Kravchenko, you remember, was a Communist Party member, in charge of work for the Metal Trust.

His father was a workingman, under the Czars. He had been, in fact, a revolutionist, during the days of the last Czar Nicholas, and had brought his son up in the revolutionary faith. The passage I quote to you begins when the father reproaches the son for his part in perverting the revolution to its present sad state.

"Listen, father," says the younger Kravchenko, "Don't get the idea that I don't know what's happening or that I have knuckled under to the system. After all, you don't know what's going on inside my mind—and the minds of a million other Communists. But what can I do? Shall I go out into the street and shout 'Help! Murder!'? Besides, there are some positive elements, too—new factories, new mines, railroads * * *."

"Of course, Victor, of course—" the father says, "But revolutions are not made for factories and railroads. They're made for people. The essence of the matter is in personal rights and liberties. Without these, without human dignity, men are slaves, no matter how industrialized their prisons may be. When you Communists boast of new factories, the implication is that people live better lives. Well, now, do they in our country?"

And the son replies: "As compared with their miserable existence, under the Czars, I suppose they do."

"Victor," says the old man, "Why must you fool yourself? Do you recall your life at grandfather's and at home when you were a boy? We were not wealthy but we never lacked for bread and milk and ordinary clothes. You and your brothers even had a nurse. We lived decently. Looking back, our existence seems almost luxurious by contrast with the life of a working-class family today. How many workers nowadays have the kind of homes we lived in at that time? Only a very small minority, in the past, lived the kind of starved and hopeless lives now lived by the majority."

Then father and son go into the matter of wages and prices, 30 years ago and at the present time, and they find that money wages have risen from 3 to 5 times, while prices have risen 15 to 40 times higher.

Young Victor mentions the matter of free vacations, medical care, and children's nurseries. The old man forces him to admit that Victor, himself, refuses the free medical care—it is so bad—and calls in a private doctor when he is ill. The old man also forces the son to admit that, out of 1,500 workers in Victor's nikopol plant, only 57 of them had gone to rest home during the year—although all of them had paid for the privilege, out of their wages. And then the old man continues:

"Only innocent foreigners and young people without memory of the past believe the fairy tales, but to me, physical facts are not as important as the political and spiritual facts. But all of the emphasis in your propaganda is on material achievement. I'm measuring with your own yardstick."

"Well," says Victor, "if everything was so lovely, father, why did you go to prison and make a revolution?"

"Don't talk nonsense. You know that I regret nothing and would do it over again. We fought against evils. We risked our lives to overthrow political tyranny and economic oppression. That doesn't mean that we should be proud of the same evils, under different names. This business of justifying present injustice by reference to past evils is a low demagogic trick * * *."

"But, now," says Victor, "everything belongs to the people. There are no capitalists, no exploiters."

"Don't play the fool, Victor. The worker who's underfed despite the fact that he, and often others in his family, are employed, doesn't much care who exploits him—a private owner or the state. When he's dragged off to prison or exiled, it's small consolation to him that it's being done in his own name. After all, when the capitalist boss didn't pay me enough or failed to give me decent working conditions, I could change my job. I could propagandize my fellow workers, call protest meetings, pull strikes, join political parties, publish opposition literature. Try

any of that today and you'll end up in prison camp, or worse. Believe me, we had more chance dealing with a hundred thousand capitalist employers than we have now with one employer—the state. Why? Because the state has an army and secret police and unlimited power. All my life I have fought against capitalism and I am still its enemy, but that doesn't mean I must shout 'Hurrah' for police socialism * * *. At least we could think what we pleased. There were many political parties, factions, opinions. Harsh as the absolutism was, it now seems liberal by contrast. Sure, the Czar's police used to beat and sometimes shot strikers and often shot or exiled revolutionaries. But the whole scale was different. We counted our political prisoners by the thousand, not—as now—by the million. And every injustice evoked protests, demonstrations, mass meetings. Today we have only the silence of a cemetery.

"Take our so-called trade-unions. What are they but another instrument for enforcing the Government's decisions and pressing more work out of us? There was a time when labor organizations were really spokesmen for the workers. They were political schools in which we learned to demand our rights and to fight for them. Who dares protest against anything today? The press, which poses as the mouthpiece of public opinion, is now the property of the party and the State. It reflects only their opinion.

"Another thing, son. You know that I've never been a believer. But I always valued the right of people to worship God, if they wished. How little of that right has remained. What chance would you have of retaining your job and your career if you happened to be a churchgoer[None at all.

"Even in the worst Romanoff days, people could leave the country. Now we're locked in and those who try to cross the border are shot down like dogs. Not only they, but their families, are punished. Leave the country? Why, you tie workers to their machines and peasants to their land, like so many serfs."

William Henry Chamberlain, one of the most acute observers of the Soviet scene and one of the most profound scholars of the Russian past, says that it is scarcely open to denial that the Soviet repression is more severe than that of the Czars. The Czarist government severely controlled and repressed opposition newspapers; the Soviet Government forbids them altogether. The Czarist government crippled the effective functioning of opposition political parties, but the Soviet Government outlaws all opposition parties. Far more people, he says, were executed or banished to hard labor, without public trial and for political offenses, during the 5-year period, 1928–33, than during the last 5 years of czarism.

Russia offers fascination to some people because it seems to offer something new—a change from old, bad systems. But giving the new Soviet repressions the benefit of all possible doubt, it's still a case of that old French proverb: "The more things change, the more they remain the same."

This is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Administration of Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. CROW
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II,
DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 26, 1948.

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: The veterans organizations, and most certainly the Pennsylvania Department of AMVETS, are highly in favor of an efficient administration of the Veterans' Administration. Such an administration will benefit both the general public and veterans. We are also in favor of economy in the Veterans' Administration wherever such economy does not jeopardize the efficient operation of the "essential and necessary services" of the VA and does not react to the detriment of the rights given by the people to the veteran. Please, remember Mr. Gray that the Veterans' Administration was created for the purpose of service to the veteran in the administration of the various legislation enacted by the Congress. The veterans and the public are under the impression that the purpose of the VA is to insure the maximum benefit to the veteran and the public for every dollar spent for the veteran.

The people, through Congress, passed Public Law 346 giving to the veteran an opportunity to learn a trade or otherwise obtain vocational schooling to better enable himself to earn a living and to fit in as an asset in the public economy. The opportunity to the veteran is limited in the sense that the amount of training he may obtain is limited in time. It is essential therefore that he receive training in a field and school for which he is qualified and which will enable him better to pursue a livelihood and contribute to the country's economy as a producer. It is imperative therefore that both the school be competent and the field of learning be one with an opportunity for a job when the training is complete.

Congress has appropriated millions of dollars for expenditure under the vocational training provisions of Public Law 346. The cost of proper supervision is tiny in comparison to the amount to be spent. You have undoubtedly been informed by your subordinates of the early abuses of these features by "fly-by-night" schools, greedy employers anxious for cheap labor paid for in part out of the public funds and misled and uninformed veterans ballyhooed by such persons into entering the wrong schools and fields and selling their heritage under the GI bill for a mess of pottage.

Every experience has shown that more, not less, supervision in the fields of vocational training under Public Law 346 is necessary to protect the veteran and the taxpayer. The action of the Veterans' Administration then in ceasing almost if not all supervision is improvident and will lead to abuses and fraud of both the veteran and the public.

Economy in a public official is a virtue, but it is not economy to endanger the operation of existing laws which will result in the squandering of sums of money gigantic in comparison to the amount saved.

The blame is not that of Congress which we are informed offered to appropriate the funds necessary for supervision. You are placing Congress under a false light with the public and the veteran.

The time is still not too late. Supervision under Public Law 346 must be kept. Abuses and squandering of the veterans' rights and the public's money which will most assuredly occur without supervision must not be allowed. You are responsible for the administration of the VA. The responsibility for obvious abuses which can be avoided is yours.

Won't you act at once to prevent the cheating of the veteran and the public?

Sincerely,

JOSEPH MARTIN GELMAN,
Department Commander.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Jack Beall:

Good evening. It looks as though Italy is going to be saved from communism in tomorrow's election. But it doesn't mean that she is saved permanently. The commies will be back, and back again and again. They won't give up easily, you may be sure of that.

If communism was something that a nation could have, like a case of smallpox, then recover from it and be immune to it from then on, it might be a good thing to let European countries have their smallpox. That would be the only sure cure. But, as I said last week, the Italians can't vote the Communists in, as an experiment, and then, if they don't like them, vote them out again. That isn't the way Communist domination works. It doesn't retire with a bow. It just clamps on tighter and tighter holds. I see I am mixing my metaphors a bit, but this further mixing of metaphors expresses the situation pretty well: when a smallpox patient goes to Dr. Stalin's hospital he may rapidly recover from the smallpox and then want to get up from his bed and resume his normal life, but Dr. Stalin says "No"—and calls in his strong-arm boys and they sit on his head and tie him up to the bedpost and make him give blood transfusions to Dr. Stalin's other patients, while paying Dr. Stalin handsomely for the privilege. The patient may have recovered from smallpox, but he has got a bad case of anemia.

The ironical part is that there are so many visitors, on conducted tours, and people who get the wonderful illustrated pamphlets that Dr. Stalin sends out, who think that it must be wonderful to be in such a fine institution as Dr. Stalin's hospital, being cured of what ails them—having their capitalist appendix cut out and their depression tonsils removed. The wonderful literature doesn't tell about the real inner workings of the institution. Dr. Stalin doesn't ever let his patients out to denounce him as a quack and a fraud. One patient, a Russian, has been there for 30 years and has never been cured and never been allowed to take up life in the outside world. But the friends of Dr. Stalin who get his literature say that, after all, this is a great experiment. We should not expect anybody suffering from a bad case of czarism to get well short of 30 years. Pretty soon, now, the need for Dr. Stalin and his hospital will wither away and Russia will be on its feet again, all the better for having been in Dr. Stalin's hospital for thirty-odd years.

A few people have visited the hospital at the wrong times, and they have heard the screams from the wards and the operating rooms (before Dr. Stalin humanely knocks the patient over the head), and they have reported these things to the outside world. Some notes have been smuggled out, saying that this isn't a modern hospital but a charnel house. But people who get Dr. Stalin's wonderful literature don't believe it. They say it is just propaganda, probably started by some other doctors who are simply jealous of Dr. Stalin and his great success.

Occasionally someone jumps out of a window of the Stalin hospital, and this makes a lot of people think. But the true believers never falter. Besides, they have the word of

the good Dr. Stalin that the man was driven crazy by criticism from the western powers.

All of this little allegory adds up to this: That people see and believe pretty much what they want to see and believe, particularly if they have an emotional bias.

The people under communism, the great driven masses, know very well what it's like. They have no illusion about it. But the people far away from it, who want to believe all the nice things they have heard about it, foster their illusions and even fiercely resent those illusions being punctured.

One of the things which Victor Kravchenko noticed particularly about Americans, when he first came over here from the U. S. S. R., was the fact that Americans seemed intent on explaining everything in Stalin's favor, to the discredit of the democracies.

"An incredible thing seemed to have happened in the American mind," he said, in his book, I Chose Freedom. That incredible thing was that "the Soviet dictatorship was fully identified with the Russian people. What the Communists had not yet succeeded in doing in their own country—as the purges and the millions of political prisoners indicate—they had succeeded in doing in America. * * * The Stalinist propaganda in the outside world has been more successful than any of us in Russia suspected. The myth of a happy Socialist land is treated as a grim piece of totalitarianism ballyhoo inside Russia; it is accepted literally, solemnly, and in an almost religious transport of faith by a large part of the men and women who create public opinion in the outside, democratic world."

Isn't that a commentary? None so blind as those who don't want to see.

I am not saying that worlds of people who wanted to believe in communism did not finally come around, after they had visited the Soviet Union, and seen it for what it really is. They are able, after a struggle with themselves, to see the Soviet regime as the most reactionary in the world; with its people existing on a miserable standard of living, without freedom of speech and without the most elementary political and economic liberties. They even see that there is hardly a trace of socialism about it; that it's a state capitalism exploiting people as private capitalism would never be allowed to do, in modern times; that, in fact, it is a police state, largely based on slave labor. The realization comes hard to some who go over there with high ideals.

Many convinced Communists have gone to Russia to help it work out its salvation and have come away disillusioned and sickened by what they saw. They have returned as anti-Communists and written books and taken active political stands. One case I read about recently was of a man who had embraced the Communist faith, and had also converted his wife and children to the same belief. He next made his pilgrimage to the Communist mecca and had been completely disillusioned. He returned home and told his family and friends all about it, but he could not shake the faith of his family. They still had that will to believe that set all the facts at naught. The cure would have to come to these Russia-lovers the hard way. I am afraid that much the same psychology applies to nations, as well. People, in the mass, get fascinated by what they regard as a new idea, as they would a new toy, and they won't be happy till they get it—and, then, they can be very unhappy, but it is too late.

One of those who went to Russia as a true believer in communism, as the emancipator of mankind, was Frieda Utley. She married a Russian. She worked as a textile expert in the Soviet Union for 5½ years. It didn't take her long to begin having her doubts of a system, which, with a power more absolute than that wielded by any despot of ages past, treated its people worse than they had been treated under the Czars. She saw it to be a state in which people delivered up their political security and civil liberties on the promise that they would be given economic security. But there was not even economic security—so all was lost. Her disillusionment grew daily and was confirmed for her, personally, when her husband was seized by the Gay-Pay-Oo and imprisoned without trial. No reason was given her for his arrest. She never saw him again after he left, in one of those famous closed vans that go about their ghastly business all over Moscow, night after night.

Miss Utley has written a most poignant book, the Dream We Lost. In it, she gives some rather telling sidelights on how the people of Russia feel about their masters in the Kremlin.

She says that there was more than one reason behind the purges of 1937-39. Not only was Stalin afraid that the old Bolshevik—seeing what a horrible mess he had made of their country and their revolution—were plotting to get rid of him, but Stalin also wanted to offer the people some scapegoats, to divert wrath from himself.

"Discontent was so general," she writes, "that a scapegoat had to be found. Since the workers and the peasants loathed the Communist officials who dragooned them and who lived in comparative luxury, the execution or the imprisonment of thousands of party members was, in one sense, a human sacrifice to the outraged proletariat and peasants. The Kulaks, having already been liquidated, and the nonparty specialists, having already been purged, a new devil had to be found, responsible for the miseries of the people." The new devils were the diversionists of the left—the Trotskyites—and the diversionists of the right—the Bukharinites.

Miss Utley says that "there is little doubt that the falling of so many important heads gave satisfaction to the workers, who had come to hate the party bureaucrats with a bitter hatred." The purge involved the expulsion of nearly half a million party members and about half of the party candidates.

No exact computation of the numbers purged, killed, exiled, or imprisoned has ever been made, but experts place the figure in the millions. It was a case of the revolution devouring its own children.

Now it stands to reason that Stalin either felt himself threatened by the very people who made the revolution back in 1917—which means that these leaders were very seriously discontented with him, to say the least—or that the great mass of the people were so discontented that Stalin had to offer them the bloody sacrifice of a purge of the other leaders as scapegoats to save himself. Either one adds up to extreme discontent, somewhere in the Soviet structure.

Miss Utley says in one passage that the living conditions of the Russian people are "so miserable and their hate and mistrust of the Government is so profound that they have nothing to live for." They would gladly leave the Soviet Union and go elsewhere if they could. Miss Utley says that "it has been the assumption of the Soviet Government, since 1930, that every specialist and many peasants and workers would rush to leave the country with nothing besides the clothes on their backs" if they were not prevented by the laws of the country. No one is allowed a passport to leave the country, and "escaping across the frontier," as it is literally called, is counted as treason. The Soviet law takes savage reprisal against the family of the person who escapes across the frontier. A father, mother, brother, and sister of any such escapee is liable to from 5 to 10 years' imprisonment if they knowingly aided his escape, and even if they knew nothing of his intent to escape, they are subject to 5 years' exile to Siberia, with loss of citizenship. That is usually more effective than any penalty assessed directly against a person contemplating flight.

With so much hate and mistrust for the government, how is it that revolts don't break out? Maybe they do—we hear sporadically of some uprisings, chiefly in the Ukraine—but what can people do against machine guns and a perfect spy system? Stalin has held, as one of his great political discoveries, that any government can maintain itself in power, indefinitely, if it has the army and police with it and is sufficiently ruthless.

Even so, Miss Utley, who lived in the Soviet Union more than 5 years, says that Stalin needs to keep a large part of his army deployed throughout the country to keep the people in subjection.

I was much struck, also, by an article I recently read in the Saturday Evening Post by one Vasili Kotov—a pseudonym for a colonel of the Red Air Force, who parachuted from a transport plane just before it crashed near Paris. All in the plane burned to death—they were beyond identification. Kotov knew this was his chance to be listed as dead by the Soviet authorities. In spite of the fact that he had a good record and could look forward to favorable treatment in his own country if he turned up alive, he chose this chance of escape to the American zone of Germany. And he gave this as his reason: "For all Stalin's promises of a better life for the Russian people, for all Molotov's and Vishinsky's bravado, the Soviet Union today is materially and spiritually bankrupt and most Russians know it. The experiment in dictated socialism has failed the Russian people. Intellectuals live in terror of falling out of favor with the Kremlin and of hearing the rap of the MVD agents on their doors at night. Soldiers who have seen something of the west envy its abundance and its freedoms. Their stories of life outside the Soviet Union have been told to families and friends. Peasants and workers, as well as intellectuals, have been infected with discontent. Whole sections of the country, particularly in the Ukraine, are waiting for redemption of the promises made to them during the war—promises that they would be given bigger garden plots of their own and horses to help cultivate them. Millions of Russians would gladly rebel against the regime, but have no chance of doing so because the secret police system is so all-pervasive and so effective that revolution is impossible."

Another emigre Russian writer, in the Modern Review, goes so far as to say that "Stalin's totalitarianism has no greater enemy than the Russian people, and in the future war the Russians will side with America against the regime. * * * It is of utmost importance," he adds ,"that America make clear—by deeds, not just words—that she is hostile to Stalin's regime but friendly to the Russian people."

This probably is an extreme view. But the evidence I have presented surely points up the fact that there is very little illusion left within the Soviet Union, regarding the true nature of the despotism under which they live; that there seems to be far more illusion about it in the democratic countries, which haven't tried such a system. To try it would be fatal—otherwise it would be the perfect cure.

And now, this is Jack Beall saying good night from Washington.

Discussion of Issues Between United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig for May 4, 1948:

WILL STALIN PROPOSE IT?

It seems high time that there was a full, frank, and direct discussion of the issues between the United States and Russia. To discuss them with firmness and yet with a desire to reach an honorable basis of understanding is the need of this hour. It is reported that Stalin has already put out feelers in this direction. Will Stalin make the overture for a conference?

It seems unlikely. Yet he is the man whose position has grown weaker as ours has grown stronger. He must know by this time that we are determined to stay in Europe and help the western democracies all we can toward economic recovery. If his position has grown stronger in recent months he could afford to ignore pleas of the kind. But his position is deteriorating.

Some of the problems may lend themselves to settlement by negotiation, others by mediation through the United Nations, or otherwise, others may even be subject to an international arbitration tribunal. Perhaps an over-all formula can be reached—a synthetic peace built up before there is a holocaust and a genuine peace conference to follow it.

The importance of avoiding war dwarfs every other issue. It is due not only our own people but the people of the world.

Because of the uncertainties of an election year, the administration is unfortunately in no position itself to launch at this time negotiations which can command confidence or hold promise of continuity beyond the election. It might be wise to appoint a commission which would command the wide respect and support of the country because of the stature of its personnel. It should be beyond immediate political involvements and should be prepared to confer with Soviet officials. But Stalin himself is the man to make the overtures.

The Private Power Lobby Disregards Welfare of the Nation in Opposition to TVA Steam Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial from the Chattanooga Times dated May 9, 1948. The editorial is as follows:

"THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED"

The private power lobby won its fight to put a ceiling on the development of TVA in the House Appropriations Committee. The committee's report, issued yesterday, eliminated the $4,000,000 appropriation to begin construction of a $54,000,000 steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. It put more shackles on TVA in its report, but the steam plant is the main issue. It involves, also, national defense.

It is a temporary victory for a restricted, special privilege "free enterprise."

It seems that free enterprise does not apply to 3,000,000 people of the Tennessee Valley. It does not apply to farmers, whose hated cooperatives and wicked TVA fertilizer have brought a new life to southern farms.

Free enterprise is not for the small-business man, not even for the great industries of the Tennessee Valley.

Free enterprise, in fact, is a monopoly and its slogan is "the people be damned."

Every citizen of Chattanooga, every power user of the valley, should realize that this is the opening wedge to the whittling down of TVA's scope and the driving upward of its price for electricity.

The minority report, signed by Representative GORE and others, urges a vote by the full Congress on this great issue. We hope that such a vote will be secured, however slight may be the chances to halt the crippling legislation aimed at the greatest development of the South.

The public power lobbyists convinced the House Appropriations Committee, which suffers from the general ignorance about TVA which seems to prevail on Capitol Hill, that the steam plants mark a radical departure in the TVA system.

From the very start, steam plants have been recognized as a part of TVA. In 1933 TVA took over Wilson Dam and the steam plant at Muscle Shoals.

When the TVA bought the Tennessee Electric Power Co. system it brought the steam properties along with the hydro properties.

In 1941 Congress made an appropriation for a steam plant at Watts Bar. The TVA Act, passed by Congress, recognizes steam plants as a part of the system. Section 15 says: "In the construction of any future dam, steam plant or other facilities, etc."

The New Johnsonville steam plant is necessary if the TVA is to meet its obligations to furnish power for the prosperous Tennessee Valley and to provide power for this arsenal of democracy in any future war.

The progress of the Tennessee Valley is under attack. The TVA's sin is that it has succeeded in the purpose for which it was created by the Seventy-third Congress in 1933—to develop the area's resources for the benefit of the people, to promote the prosperity of industry, to raise the level of the people's income, to revive agriculture, to increase navigation, to prevent disastrous floods.

In order to stop this trend, the lobby is attacking any future expansion of TVA to meet expanding prosperity in the Tennessee Valley. King Canute demands that the tides recede.

Not only does the House Appropriations Committee try to stop the progress of the Tennessee Valley, it jeopardizes the future safety of the United States. The great blunder made by the House Appropriations Committee must be corrected in the interests of fairness to the people of this country and in the interest of the safety of America.

Letter of Rev. Arthur M. Stevenson, D. D., of Greencastle, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Greencastle, Pa., May 7, 1948.

Congressman CHESTER H. GROSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This letter is to express to you the hope you will continue your opposition to the militarization of our country, and your struggle to maintain those basic freedoms of our country which put iron in the character of the individual citizen.

Events are taking place which cause the private citizen who is trying sincerely to serve his God and his country to question the sincerity of powerful interests involved and to be fearful of the consequences of these events.

For instance: Shortly after the strong insistence that a large loan of money be extended to Turkey in order to strengthen Turkey in her battle against Russia there appeared in the New York Times a picture of a fleet of new trucks which had just been delivered to Turkey from General Motors. There are literally tens of thousands of very usable trucks standing, row upon row, in the ordnance depots of our country. I am told that many of them have never been used.

Again: those 19 ships which lay tied up at the piers in New York harbor, laden with war materials and bound for Russia. I have not heard whether they are still there or whether long since they have reached their destination.

Today we read that the wine makers in our country are asking that a very sizable sum of money for the Marshall plan be invested with them for the purchase of some 140,000,000 units of wine to be sent to Europe. The tobacco companies, likewise, asking that huge quantities of tobacco products be purchased and sent to Europe.

It would seem from these few mentions that greed for money is playing a large part in directing the policies of our country.

In my judgment, a very sinister thing is being done, namely, the continual arousing of fear in the hearts of our people. Fear is an emergency weapon stored within the potentials of our nature. It is for the purpose of calling forth extra energy for extra duty for self-preservation. It is very expensive. Continued for any length of time it is exhausting and, as is known to the doctors, a cause of much illness. Any one who is afraid is dangerous. The present campaign of fear is already taking its toll in the lives of our people. I am much impressed with the irritability of people. A bit of news will cause friends to argue with bitterness and loss of friendship. People are wearing to the condition of jumpy nerves. There are other reasons, but scaring the daylights out of people day after day is one of them.

This present campaign to make the United States so strong, militarily, as to scare Russia into being docile and nice, is very false and very wicked.

It defies everything that history has to offer on the subject. No nation has gone military and lived long. Rome made quite a record, yet all the more impressive in the dismal collapse and failure. The recent stories of Germany, Italy, Japan can be read by anyone who wants to read them. The last 5 years in the history of Great Britain tells very well the cost of the military upon the life of a nation.

The present campaign for mountains of money for military strength will not make our country strong, but if successful it will make it weak. The great number of men and women in the armed services of our country have to be fed and clothed and furnished expensive weapons and ammunition, barracks and hospitals, salaries, and pensions. All this means a crushing load upon the citizens who farm the farms and run the mills. When the citizens who farm the farms and run the mills become weak, the country is weak, no matter how great the military. Inflation is a wild new word for poverty. Most of the world is desperately poor. And this same gaunt destroyer is steadily dragging down the standard of living across our own country. I know something about people in their homes. Twice within a few days have men told me how the pinch was getting them. At our house, we are calling upon precious

reserves to supplement our income as pastor of a very worthy church, though small in number. Our three children are grown. There are just the two of us.

You know far better than I that, though the last war has stopped so far as the shooting is concerned, it has not stopped so far as the land of the farmer is concerned. To me, the material which the Agricultural Department sent to us ministers for Miracle of Food Day, was very impressive. The military is asking the soil to keep up a production of grain which cannot be kept up. Wide areas of farms in the Midwest have not had a legume crop in 8 years. Soil cannot take this beating indefinitely. It is now seriously impoverished, and is being washed and blown away.

To my mind, universal military training and peacetime military conscription will result, not in the strengthening of our country, but in weakening it. Historians tell us that the nations which have adopted these measures have survived but a short time after that course was adopted. All due allowance for the sincerity of many people who think these measures are for the good of the country, but I think the facts point in the other way. The training, as being given at Fort Knox, and as proposed for our young men, is declared by our leading scientists and many military men to be as obsolete as the famed dodo. The cost of it in money is back breaking. I can think of only two reasons why these measures are so diligently sought: The one is to get hold of the minds of the young men, and young women; the other is to get hold of the money of all of us.

A strong international police force is the only military power which, in my judgment, will meet the demands of our world situation. And back of this strong police force there must be a sincerely supported and strong United Nations Organization. There is a spirit in the world. This spirit draws men together in brotherhood. This spirit is the spirit of God. There is also a spirit which draws men apart. It is the spirit of selfishness—the spirit of the destroying Satan. I believe we may have wisdom from on high sufficient to our needs. I believe the way of the military in separate sovereign nations is in defiance of the way which brings men together and will lead only to ruin. I believe in the costly ways of peace as being more in harmony with universal good.

I, therefore, quite at length, submit to you some reasons why I think the trend toward militarization is dangerous to our country, and why I express the hope that you will continue to oppose militarization and work for the things of enduring peace. Thank you. With good will.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR M. STEVENSON.

The World Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address I delivered recently before the Kiwanis Club of New Castle, Ind.

Mr. President and fellow Kiwanians, only those who of necessity have been forced to miss our regular meetings can fully appreciate the privilege of attending, and I am most happy to be able to be with you this evening and even more privileged to have this opportunity to say a few words.

If I were to express my most outstanding reaction on my return, it is that folks here in Henry County are more worried, and in a few instances, I might say, hysterical, over the world outlook. This places me in a most difficult position for I would not want to pooh-pooh the thought that there is a possibility of war, and yet it does seem to me that we should hold the issue up and take a critical look at it.

Andrew Cordier, executive secretary to Mr. Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, sat in a small closed forum recently, as did also John Foster Dulles. Both sessions were a privilege to attend and it is largely from these forums I will attempt to draw for my brief discussion tonight.

First of all, there are three fundamental facts which seem of primary importance in approaching the problem.

One is that there is only one nation at present or in the foreseeable future of sufficient importance in war capacity as to present a challenge to our efforts for world peace.

We may then turn our attention to this one possibility (and, mind you, I say possibility) and further reason that Russia has never been historically a war monger.

It should, at this point, however, be prudent to concede that the Communists, while composing only about 10 percent of the Russians, are in absolute control of all Russians. Suppose, however, that we analyze the Communists' tactics.

They do have a definite pattern for action. It is one of infiltration, or peaceful penetration not only physically but morally and spiritually. And they further embed by worming into predetermined places of trust and responsibility within the structure of Government itself.

The third fact is that the Communists are smart enough to know that it is much cheaper to occupy by these tactics than by war. In fact, so immeasurably cheaper that war should be resorted to only as a final extremity after years of failure of the other tactics.

Then you say, if this be true, why all the talk of war, preparation for war, rearming, selective service, etc.?

Realizing that my comparatively brief service in Congress does not entitle me to speak with the authority of others of longer service, nevertheless it seeems to me that there is a definite explanation for this apparent enigma.

First, let us remember that we have just emerged from a total war, the outcome of which was in doubt for months while we were converting from peace to war. The armed services and many of our citizens saw the tragedies accruing to our lack of preparation and are determined not to let it happen again. They also realize that the American people are naturally not war-minded, so have clouded the skies in their effort to make sure we do not repeat the mistakes of the past. Some of these, the overzealous, are being aided and abetted by certain well-known radio commentators and newspaper columnists. My own office mail is indicative of the effects of their efforts.

Then, too, most people who have had to deal with the Soviet have come to the conclusion that the only way to talk to Russia in terms she can understand is in terms of force. The State Department, I am sure, is committed to this philosophy. So that the Marshall plan, plans for rearming, and other suggestions fit neatly into the pattern to convince Russia that we are no longer the peace-at-any-price people they have found us to be in the past.

For want of a better term, it has been referred to as the "cold war." These manipulations by the administration and the State Department in Washington, of course, are grist for the radio and newspapers.

From my observations as a Member of the Congress, there are a few conclusions I would hope to leave for your consideration.

Congress, through a series of constructive measures, has started upon a program which, without again placing us in a deficit financing position, will utilize our resources so that we will not be caught flat-footed. We are doing this with full appreciation that we might not again have the months of immunity from invasion while getting the materials and manpower with which to defend ourselves.

Some of the most important steps are as follows: (1) Establishing an attractive reserve corps for the Army and Air Force, the equal of that the Navy has had for a long time; (2) implementing our research scientists with adequate funds so that we may keep abreast of progress both for offensive as well as defensive warfare; (3) increasing our Air Force under the theory that any war of aggression on our shores could, and in all likelihood would, come by air, and that we should be prepared to defend ourselves at all times. There are other less important items with which I will not burden you.

The main bone of contention seems to be the personnel to man our various armed components.

There is much difference of opinion as to the actual need and more as to the best manner to acquire them. This question is still being hotly debated in Congress and is of vital interest to us all.

There are charges, particularly directed against the Army, that they have not put forth their best efforts to fill the National Guard quotas, so that they can more effectively press their demands for universal military training. True or not, and frankly I have serious doubt that it is, it is a fact that the unification act has not as yet brought about a harmonious presentation to Congress by the three groups as to their needs.

There are those who reason that since we have the atom bomb and Russia is bent upon disturbing the peace of the world, why not go over, lick her, and have it over with. With this I do not believe the majority of American people are sympathetic. Aside from the fact that we are just not naturally an aggressor nation, there are practical objections. We cannot kill the communistic idea with guns, whereas in truth communism thrives on the conditions following all wars. So we might even win the war and lose our objective.

May I say in conclusion that while Congress is not scared, it is carefully weighing all the factors in an effort to keep our republican form of Government safe from invasion from abroad, and at the same time fundamentally sound and prosperous within.

There are many problems to be solved, but most of them will be solved in the manner provided for in our Constitution, which means by the will of the people. After all, the seat of our Government is right here in New Castle, and the thousands of New Castles all over the land.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

Record, I am pleased to include herewith a letter that I received from an eminent educator of my congressional district, with which I fully agree, opposing S. 472, the Federal aid to education bill. The letter is as follows:

NORTH KANSAS CITY, MO.,
April 23, 1948.

Hon. W. C. COLE,
United States Representative,
District No. 3, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my objections to the passage of bill number S. 472.

I am a teacher and have been for 20 years. It is needless to say, I am deeply interested in good schools in Missouri and the other States. I am a member of the school board in my district and have always worked for a good school and higher teacher salaries. Our district is building a new central elementary school building that will cost about $70,000 when completed. We are providing for the money by raising the money ourselves. We voted a $35,000 bond issue (all the constitution would permit) and voted a $1 levy on the $100 assessed valuation for a period of 4 years (all the constitution would permit). We have only our homes to tax.

I sincerely believe if all districts in the State and all the States would help themselves and cry to the Government for less this great country of ours would be still better.

If Missouri must pay into the United State Treasury twice as much in taxes as it receives back from the Government in school aid, we had better strive a little harder and pay our own bills. Perhaps many of the Southern States could cut out some of the waste in their own governments and improve their schools by the savings.

I hardly see how education can be construed to be a function of the Federal Government, unless we have come to the conclusion that all the functions of State governments are the responsibility of the Federal Government. If this is true we do not need State governments any longer and should do away with them entirely. I do not believe we desire to go that far.

Our national debt is extremely high at the present time. We may be forced to raise it still higher because of world affairs beyond our control. At least we can keep it down as low as we can until the world is more stable.

In conclusion, I urge you to use your good offices to defeat passage of this bill when it is considered in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL L. NAIL.

Postal Workers' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, May 9, 1948:

POSTAL WORKERS' PAY

Some 375,000 Government postal workers receive an annual average salary of $2,600. These workers now seek a permanent addition of $800 a year. Senator BALDWIN'S bill calling for such an increase has been approved by the Senate Civil Service Committee, and a House bill specifying a temporary increase of $585 has also been approved. There is still time for the two Houses to join in a grant of the full amount.

The postal employees cannot strike. They can only plead their case. It is a persuasive one, and Congressmen generally recognize its merits. But in the rush of other business they have not pressed the issue to a final vote. Thus, the men and women behind the mails are left in a position of having earned an increase they cannot collect. They are loyal, intelligent, and industrious workers and should be rewarded without further delay. In simple justice, Congress should see that this matter is not postponed to the next session.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse everything said in that editorial. I have repeatedly urged that this Congress enact legislation which will begin to do justice by these Federal employees. I again express the earnest hope that this Congress will not adjourn without having passed such legislation.

Mundt Subversive Activities Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MacKINNON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley and a release from the national public relations division of the American Legion:

DISCLOSING THE COMMUNISTS

(By Ramond Moley)

The brief flurry of controversy between Stassen on the one side and Taft and Dewey on the other about outlawing communism in the United States will probably have little effect on the result of their contest for the Presidency. It is reported, however, that Stassen has received enthusiastic applause when he makes his plea for outlawing the Communist Party. This confirms the evidence of polls that a large majority of people favor outlawing communism. The difficulty is in method, and that problem is too technical to be decided in a political debate.

Meanwhile, the Thomas committee has reported the Mundt bill to the House of Representatives. The bill apparently goes as far toward outlawing communism as the committee feels is legally possible. It must be remembered that, under our system, the States determine who shall vote and under what circumstances a party gets on the ballot. The Federal Government is primarily concerned with communism as a foreign agency or influence. In that field, Federal power is very broad.

Probably for that reason the Mundt bill aims in the main at disclosure in order to make reasonably certain that treasonable, subversive, and foreign organizations will be identified and rendered harmless. It is good, as far as it goes. Real blotting out of Communist political parties and activities depends upon the States and upon what unpredictable courts may ultimately sustain.

A large part of the bill is a preliminary statement of facts which the committee has deduced from hearings before the Thomas committee. It points out that the establishment of totalitarian government destroys free goverment; that there is a world-wide Communist movement which seeks totalitarianism by force, violence, and secrecy; that it is foreign directed and controlled; and that Communist political organizations in the United States are thus a menace, properly subject to legal action. Since the present Communist Party can easily change its name, the bill is not directed at any named group. It seeks to provide legal means of regulating any group or person who fits its definitions.

Having defined with great precision the ideas and activities which are deemed objectionable, the bill declares them to be unlawful. It directs its prohibition upon activities that seek to establish a totalitarian government under the direction or control of any foreign agency or person. This part of the bill is directed not at members but at officers and managers of organizations.

The bill then requires full disclosure of members, supporters, contributors, and all financial accounts of front organizations.

No one can predict with certainty the attitude of the Supreme Court toward such a piece of legislation. After the fantastic majority opinion of Mr. Justice Murphy in the Schneiderman case in 1942, almost anything could happen. But it seems clear that Congress can prohibit or punish (a) any secret action on behalf of a foreign government, (b) any active conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force.

If the Murphy opinion is followed there might be some doubt about prohibiting a movement to establish a totalitarian government. And it is clear that a person's membership in a "front" organization cannot be made by legislative act a presumption that he shares the criminal responsibility that attaches to the organization. The Court may well require that in a prosecution the Government produce evidence directly involving the individual concerned. However, the Court might now follow Chief Justice Stone's dictum that it is a sensible inference that a man can be known by the company he keeps.

However, as Mr. Dooley said, the Supreme Court follows the election returns. It may also be following the news from Europe. And the personnel of the Court has changed since 1942.

In any event, the Mundt bill is an excellent attempt to deal with a grave problem within constitutional limits.

The brazen threat of William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, to ignore the law if the bill is enacted should be the strongest argument for its passage. If his outfit chooses, as he says, "to go underground," it can then be unearthed. All crime is underground now, and it is the purpose of police to dig it out.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—The American Legion by unanimous action of its national executive committee today was committed to all-out support of the Mundt bill, H. R. 5852, known as the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948.

Introduced by Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, the measure would make it unlawful to take part in any activity aimed at installing a foreign-controlled totalitarian government in the United States. It declares that Moscow directs a conspiracy to dominate the world. It has been designed to put a crimp into activities of Communists in America by requiring among other provisions that the Red party file a complete list of its membership, that all front organizations register with the Attorney General each year, that Communists be barred from Federal jobs and be denied American passports.

The legislation already has been approved unanimously by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which MUNDT is a member.

FULL LEGION BACKING

The national executive committee adopted the following resolution on the Mundt bill:

"Whereas the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, on April 29, 1948, unanimously reported out H. R. 5852, to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations, and for other purposes; and

Whereas in principle this bill conforms to the long-established American Legion policy of combating subversive influences: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion enthusiastically endorses H. R. 5852 and authorizes the immediate mobilization of all the resources, membership, family and friends of the American Legion to aid in its prompt enactment by the Congress of the United States and we further urge that the pertinent provisions of H. R. 5852 be published in National American Legion publications as quickly as possible, so that the entire membership may be immediately apprised of the nature of the bill."

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by S. W. Nelken, of Natchitoches, La., before the House Agriculture Committee on May 10, 1948:

I am from Natchitoches, La., the oldest town in the Louisiana Purchase area, the third oldest town in the United States; I am a supervisor in Lower West Red River Soil Conservation District, and am the owner and operator of a cotton and livestock alluvial farm. I am here to speak in behalf of the 125 soil conservation district supervisors who govern affairs in our 25 districts, and for the thousands of farmers cooperating with us in those districts. Mr. W. T. Nolin, our most capable president of the Supervisors Association in Louisiana, was unable to attend.

A majority of our farmers in Louisiana and many of our businessmen realize that permanent wealth and prosperity stems from the soil. A country cannot be permanently strong unless it has good, productive land to support it. While we may have been slow to realize this, the important point is that we awakened and began to take action before it was too late. The proof of our interest and determination is shown by the creation of soil-conservation districts covering more than 92 percent of our State. All of Louisiana except that territory immediately around New Orleans is in districts. These, as you know, are farmer created, farmer operated, and offer the most democratic approach for farmers to administer their own programs that has ever occurred in American agriculture. More than 99 percent of the votes cast were in favor of the creation of districts—less than 1 percent opposed their creation. We feel, gentlemen, that from our end of the line we have taken proper steps to set up necessary local organizations to handle the problem. We want to urge that you pass appropriate legislation at this session that will enable us to do the things which need to be done in soil conservation, in the public interest, which we cannot do for ourselves.

As supervisors, we are naturally interested in any legislation pertaining to soil conservation. We have given careful study to every bill that has been introduced that would affect our operations. We disapproved the Cooley bill and the others identical to it. We gave our approval to the Jensen bill, although it was not as complete as we thought it should be. In studying the bills introduced this year, S. 2318 and H. R. 6054, we have taken a solid stand in opposition to the former and have given our full approval to the latter. The bill which was developed by Chairman HOPE and his Agricultural Committee, in our opinion, provides for the most progressive agricultural step in the history of our country. We want you to know that we appreciate what this committee has done thus far and to tell you that you have our full support in getting this bill enacted into law.

A great many leading citizens and organized groups have given their full endorsement to H. R. 6054. I have in my possession resolutions passed by the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, the Louisiana Junior Chamber of Commerce, and the Louisiana Wildlife Federation. All of these and many others have voiced their complete approval of the bill introduced by Chairman HOPE.

Some of the main reasons why we are for the Hope bill are:

1. It channels the soil-conservation program through soil-conservation districts. These districts are legal subdivisions of State created by vote of farmers for the specific purpose of administering soil-conservation programs. There certainly is no group closer to the grass roots or who understands better the farmers' problems than do the supervisors. The bill also offers ample provisions for giving assistance to farmers outside soil-conservation districts.

2. The Hope bill brings together all the soil conservation functions of the Federal Government into a single agency to give assistance to farmers in planning and applying soil conservation measures on their land. This is highly desirable from the standpoint of economy and greater efficiency. Your bill leaves the administrative details of organization to the Secretary of Agriculture. I think this is sound. In contrast the Aiken bill goes so far into program administration as to suggest the elimination of Soil Conservation Service regional offices. I should like to give you the results of a study I recently made of one regional office. I was sent to Fort Worth, Tex., last February by our State supervisors association to make a study of the regional office there. At the request of Mr. Nolin, our State president, I made a verbal report to our association and a written report to our Louisiana delegation in Washington. In my letter to Senator ELLENDER I stated: "A very careful study was made of the regional office as to its personnel, its functions, and its organization. My visit has convinced me that it is staffed with capable, sincere, and honest personnel; that its work in relation to the field is sound and is doing much to aid in the dissemination of excellent soil conservation practices throughout region four.

"The organization of the region on a zone basis is absolutely sound and assures a practical set-up predicated on similar land problems.

"In studying costs it is very apparent that if the regional offices are destroyed and a State set-up substituted over-all efficiency will decline and administration costs will rise tremendously. The seven regions in this Nation are now doing the work that would be required by each State if it were set up on a State basis."

Even though I am convinced of the merits of the regional plan that is followed by a number of Government agencies and many private business organizations I am glad to see that the Hope bill has left this and other administrative decisions to those who will administer the act.

3. The Hope bill contains a satisfactory provision for careful planning of the entire conservation job. It provides for land conservation and development which not only includes measures affecting hill land but also drainage, irrigation, flood control and the wise use of water on alluvial agricultural lands. It provides that a land conservation and development timetable would be drawn up by the United States Department of Agriculture that would show the rates and extent of land damage. It would estimate the cost of repairing the damage, and the time required to complete the job. This we believe to be of paramount importance.

4. The bill would continue conservation payments that are geared to a soil conservation plan. This certainly is essential for the wise expenditure of funds and the proper application of needed conservation measures.

5. It continues the county agricultural Adjustment Administration committees to handle conservation payments and other phases of the agricultural program not related to conservation. It is our definite feeling that price supports, acreage control, crop insurance and other activities of that type should continue to be the responsibility of Triple A (PMA).

6. The bill provides that the Agricultural Extension Service will have responsibility for the educational part of the program. We feel this is proper. It is very gratifying to note the provisions in the bill that require the Extension Service to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the district setting forth in a definite way what is to be furnished. The Soil Conservation Service is the only agency that has done this in the past and it has proven most helpful in planning our district activities.

On the whole, I think this is the soundest legislation in behalf of agriculture that I have seen. If there is a single item in the bill to which I would object it would be the changing of the name of the Soil Conservation Service.

In business the name of a going concern is worth money. I am glad to note that you would retain the names of the Forest Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service. They have come to mean something to the public. The name Soil Conservation Service has likewise come to be recognized nationally and internationally as representing a highly skilled organization. Since the agricultural land service functions would be geared to land capabilities and technical assistance, things the Soil Conservation Service has been noted for. I suggest that "Soil Conservation Service" be substituted for "Agricultural Land Service."

In conclusion may I say that we do not expect the Federal Government to do the whole job of soil conservation. Our farmers should and are bearing their proportionate share of the cost amounting to two-thirds to three-fourths of the total. In addition, our State legislature is appropriating $250,000 per year to soil conservation districts to help speed up and carry out the program. We are going to ask them to double that amount for the next 2 years. We are asking the Federal Government to provide the national guidance on this national problem—to give us needed technical help in a larger amount—to provide some type of conservation payment and to get the legislation worked out and into action this year. Soil conservation is a "must" and we believe the Hope bill should be passed by both Houses in its present form at this session of Congress.

Can Russia Win a Shooting War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Junius B. Wood, from Nation's Business for May 1948:

CAN RUSSIA WIN A SHOOTING WAR?
(By Junius B. Wood)

The Soviet Union insists that it does not want a war with the United States. Under Moscow's definition of war, its insistence is truthful as of this date. Only shooting, and on a grand scale, is war as Moscow uses the word. The Soviet Union does not rate itself strong enough at present for a shooting war.

It is strong enough, and its tactics have been perfected over the years, for a political war. It is waging that sort of war with the United States as its chief enemy.

Washington was slow to admit that a war of politics was being won behind a barrage of words and broken agreements. That role of futility and frustration is ended. On the day President Truman addressed Congress, Britain, France, Belguim, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg formed a 50-year economic and military alliance.

Western Europe and the democratic world are meeting the challenge. The costly lesson of other wars is not forgotten. Germany and Japan professed peace while their armaments were made ready. If their diplomatic aggressions had been met, the rest of the world would not have been caught unprepared. This time the weapons of peace and economy will be used in the political war to prevent another world conflagration.

So far, the Soviet Union has won every battle: 1940, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; 1944, Yugoslavia and Karelia; 1945, Poland and Albania; 1946, Rumania; 1947, Hungary; 1948, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia.

When Asia is included, some 750,000 square miles and 200,000,000 persons have been added to the empire where a picture of Stalin and the hammer and sickle look down on public meetings.

This political conflict locks the world in a social death grip between democracy and dictatorship, between free people and people who are ruled, between those who have a comfortable and safe living and others who follow a will-o'-the-wisp of false promises.

Democracy, as we know it, demands that individuals and nations be strong for their mutual prosperity and happiness. Democracy, as Moscow misuses the word, means that one nation shall be strong and all others weak and obedient to its orders. Under the first, the weaker are helped until all can stand alone. That is the American goal. Under the other, the program will not be complete until all are subjugated. That is the Soviet goal.

The World War, which others fought to end all wars, was for Russia but another step in the greater program which stretches on through future years. America's thoughts and efforts were centered on finishing the big job. Communist eyes were, and still are, fixed on a more distant goal.

They do not fight the cold war with words alone. Under the clamor Moscow has trained agents for revolution who work in their home countries, including the United States. They foment—underground in some countries, openly in others—strikes, riots, sabotage, and trouble. Moscow and the Red Army are shadows in the background.

But the United States has learned fast in a few months. It realizes that communism and democracy cannot be mixed.

This wakening means that Communists will not be entrenched in American organizations to continue their war of words and wrecking. The party faithful who obey orders from Moscow must work under their true colors. Light has been turned on them in Government departments. Labor unions have decided that Moscow's policies are not for the good of the American workingman or American industry. Civic, social, and political groups now identify the voices which echo an alien master.

Moscow professes to see this domestic housecleaning and our efforts to rehabilitate Europe as acts of aggression. For years it has dinned into the ears of its own people and the rest of the world that the United States is preparing for war. When that war comes, says Moscow, it will find the American people divided, and partisans of the Soviet Union will take over the Government.

Moscow's Kremlin glories in an army of 3,000,000 and counts an additional 1,000,000 from its satellite states. Its field marshals declare that they could march to the English Channel and occupy all of Europe in 48 hours.

Moscow does not permit the world to see what is behind this immense army but facts which do leak out—differing from what Moscow distributes to frighten the world—are informative.

In spite of all the boasting and swaggering of the Soviet leaders, is Russia really in a position to wage a shooting war with the United States? Is her industrialization far enough along to allow her to do so? Let's see how the record stacks up.

Materials and men must be mobilized to fight a war. More millions are needed for production than for fighting. In World War II, the United States shouldered much of the production burden for the Soviet Union. Lend-lease gave the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics a boost in the war, and reparations have primed the pump since then. The Soviet Union received around $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease and has collected an estimated $12,000,000,000 worth of material and equipment in reparations. In the same years, the United States distributed $15,000,000,000 for rehabilitation in addition to lend-lease.

The Kremlin does not expect this performance to be repeated.

As for the countries brought into the Soviet orbit, less remunerative trade agreements have replaced reparations. Although Moscow can specify what it wants from them, none is likely to have such a reservoir of materials as the United States provided, and any cash trade with the rest of the world depends on Moscow's approval.

None of them is likely greatly to increase Russia's strength in the necessities for a modern war. The necessities include efficient workers, ample food supplies, smooth-running industry, sufficient output of iron, steel and oil and, above all, transportation.

Although the Russian people do not know, the Kremlin leaders have no illusions about Russian potential in those fields.

WORKERS

Efficiency of the individual worker is a controlling factor in national production. The number of men or machines does not tell the story. Output is what counts. The doubtful efficiency of Soviet workers is a daily topic in the Government-controlled press. Peasants and factory workers, supervisors, managers, and even high commissars are pilloried as cheats and failures.

Nor do population figures indicate the number available for work as in other countries. In addition to meeting material shortages in the last war. American lend-lease is credited with releasing 4,000,000 men from Russian farms and factories for military service. Moscow cannot count on them for another conflict.

Also, in normal times about one-fourth of Russia's adult males are eliminated from the productive labor field. Millions are in the army, several times as many in concentration camps, and inefficient forced labor. Swarms of functionaries necessary for a police state and many thousand uprooted exiles from satellite countries are a direct loss in Soviet manpower and a heavy burden on the country's national economy.

FOOD

Without food the human machine stops quicker in war than in peace. Crops in fields or on the backs of animals must be processed to meet consumer needs or to supply armies. With every 5-year plan, the workers and peasants are told that they are the most contented people in the world and that all their needs will be supplied when the brief program is finished.

The promised plethora of consumer goods never is realized and the ballyhoo starts for another 5 years of sacrifice. The present admonition to continue doing without is stimulated by hysterical official alarms that the United States is preparing to attack their homeland.

Consumer production in Russia is always sidetracked for heavy industry. First, because of fighting a war, and now by a drummed-up fear of one. Last December 13,000 new stores were opened with much fanfare. Yet, the shelves of the old ones were never full. Bumper crops are officially reported but food is scarce in the cities.

A diplomat who left Moscow after ration cards were abolished and the ruble was revalued quotes the price of one egg at 32 cents in state stores and 50 cents in consumer cooperatives. These stores did not have eggs but one could be had for 80 cents in the so-called open stores. The official price for milk was 80 cents a quart but the only supply was in the open stores which charged $1.60 in December and $2.80 in January. Turkey was $4.55 a pound.

PRODUCTION

Industrial production to "outstrip capitalist United States" is the hope of the Soviet Union. Though contradictory, its people also are told that Communist economy is self-sufficient and more efficient than capitalism. They were not told about the aid received, and still received, from the United States—tanks, trucks, munitions, railroad equipment, tractors, and other supplies. The American Ambassador protested at the silence.

Since then, the national glorification has improved on silence and Moscow now informs its people that American armies fought in Russian-built tanks and airplanes. Soviet citizens are told that they, alone and unaided, are rebuilding their industry. They are not told that the turbines for the big Dnepropetrovsk hydroelectric plant are being built and installed by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. or that the three giant generators of the intended nine were put in by International General Electric.

They are told that Russians invented or discovered penicillin, the steam engine, lightning rod, arc and incandescent lights, combustion motor, ship propeller, winged transportation, the processing of iron and steel and finally nuclear fission. No explanation is given as to why making the ideas practical was left to others.

The big effort of the present 5-year plan which ends in 1950 has been to restore the wrecked industries in the Ukraine and western Russia and to erect new ones east of the Urals. German destruction was thorough and the rebuilding is impressive, but industrial production has not reached the 1940 level. The share for civil industry has actually decreased in many lines.

Under Soviet law, disclosing economic information is treason and denounced as "antipatriotic sycophancy." Reports of Gosplan (State planning commission) are the only permissible source of information. That for 1947, just released, is informative and illuminating.

The year's quota was exceeded by 3.5 percent. Details are given for 22 ministries which went over the top and for seven that lagged or just made it. No figures are given for the ministries of aviation, armament, or shipbuilding which are military secrets.

Other omissions are significant. The automobile and tractor ministry, for instance, came within two points of par but the output of automobiles was only 82.8 percent and tractors 72.8 percent of what had been planned. The Ministry for Agricultural Implements hit 100, but its output of agricultural machines was only 74.1 percent of its quota. The obvious inference is that these ministries, as well as others, brought up their average by greatly exceeding their allotted production of military items which are secret.

IRON AND STEEL

Iron and steel are the backbone of every country in war or in peace. From 1928 to 1937, steel production increased until only Germany outranked the Soviet Union in Europe. The United States was far ahead, and per capita output in Germany, England, and France was several times that of Russia. By 1937, the Soviet Union no longer depended on American engineers and machines to erect its modern mills. But war destroyed 60 percent of its plant capacity and present production has not reached prewar levels.

"Even the prewar capacity was inadequate to support a modest program of consumer production nor was it geared to that type," L. M. Herman of the U. S. S. R. division of the Commerce Department writes. "Optimistic Russian planners do not expect enough steel to supply all types of domestic needs before 1965."

In 1940, the Soviet Union produced 18,300,000 tons of steel. It is shooting at 23,400,000 for 1950, less than the United States produced in 1913.

The contrast between the two countries in their use of steel is even greater. In U. S. S. R., 35.1 percent went to heavy industry and 37.3 percent into machine building whereas the United States used only 22.2 percent for both. U. S. S. R. allowed 2.5 percent for automobiles and tractors and the United States used 12.5 percent for automobiles alone. Farm machinery got 5.3 percent in one country and twice that in the other. Local industry rated 3.4 percent in U. S. S. R. and 19.1 percent in the United States. Light industry and food took only 1.2 percent in U. S. S. R. but absorbed 21.4 percent in United States. In addition, the United States exported 6.2 percent of its production.

PETROLEUM

The Soviet Union also is short of oil though claiming half the oil reserves of the world. Oil production was 31,200,000 tons in 1940, and states the American Review of the Soviet Union, 27,300,000 tons in 1947. Installations were destroyed in the war but the United States donated four complete refineries and the engineers to install them at Orsk, Ruibishev, Krasnovodsk, and Gurev.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation is the heartblood of a nation. It measures a country's capacity for sustained effort. This is particularly true in one with industry and people as widely scattered as in the Soviet Union. While the United States averages a mile of railroad for every 13 square miles of territory or for 631 persons, the ratio in the Soviet Union is one to 148 square miles or 3,687 persons. Rolling stock and equipment are in proportion. In 1944 and 1945 the United States supplied 219,000 and 208,000 metric tons of rails, roughly 40 percent of the Soviet Union's requirements.

The only considerable highways, outside of city streets, are from Moscow to Leningrad, Minsk and Kharkov. Roads and city pavements are so rough that actuaries limit the life span of an automobile to 8,000 miles.

When ice melts, rivers which flow into the Arctic Ocean are transportation arteries. New canals have been dug by slave labor while other countries are abandoning that slow transportation of departed generations. Old wood burners of Czarist days still wheeze on the rivers but few new ones move on the inland waterways. For a country of its size, its commercial shipping and fleet are negligible.

The Soviet Union is rich in material resources and population but extremely poor in production compared to these potentials. Its newspapers are enlivened with announcements of new factories and discoveries of new resources and daily complaints of shortages, shoddy goods, and inefficient management and work.

FOREIGN TRADE SMALL

Though the Soviet Union looms large in world politics and problems, its role in world trade is small. Our exports to that country, last year, were valued at $149,129,000, slightly more than 1 percent of the total exports from the United States. As one-third of these exports were the last trickles of UNRRA and lend-lease, Soviet purchases actually were only seven-tenths of 1 percent. Purchases exceeded gifts for the first time in several years.

In 1944, U. S. S. R. paid the United States for $4,000,000 worth of supplies and was presented with $26,000,000 worth from UNRRA and $4,443,000,000 by lend-lease. Its sales to the United States, last year—mostly furs, manganese, chrome, and platinum—were $77,000,000 or 1.3 percent of our total imports. Foreign aid gives the United States a highly favorable trade balance, mostly at our taxpayers' expense.

The Kremlin skirts as close to the dangerous border of a shooting war as possible. It wages a war of ideologies whose spoils of victory can be substantial. It enforces unity at home and fosters dissension in all other countries. It delights in trying the patience and good nature of the United States. Its diplomacy is skillful but, now that the pattern is known, is not mysterious. Knowing a clever opponent's game, we should be able to call the plays.

The Christian Science Monitor Favors the Proposed Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks an editorial of the Christian Science Monitor appearing therein on April 16, 1948, bearing on the measure that will be debated in the House within a few days pertaining to the control of communism in the United States. Following is the editorial:

KEEP THEM IN THE LIGHT

Is there anything legislation can do to disarm Communist activities within the United States without smothering the vital spark of a free society—self-criticism and the liberty to adapt to changing needs?

This newspaper believes there is, and from time to time has suggested some of the outlines. Briefed and brought together, here they are:

1. Keep communism above ground as much as possible. Don't outlaw the Communist Party—challenge it to debate its cause in public.

2. Subject the party, however, and every possible fringe organization to the principle of self-identification—that is, require them to register and to reveal periodically their officers, their connections, and the sources of their support.

3. Permit any individual or organization officially named as Communist or otherwise subversive the right of judicial review. In the atmosphere of today, the consequences of such naming demand the protections of the right to good repute.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has come up with a bill which, in many respects, conforms to these specifications.

In rejecting the idea of outlawing the Communist Party, this committee goes along with the views of such public figures as Morris Ernst, Donald R. Richberg, and Louis Waldman on the liberal side, and of J. Edgar Hoover and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey on the more conservative.

The bill would make it possible to prosecute Communist leaders, not as officials of a political party, but insofar as it might be proved that they knowingly and willfully advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States, by any means.

If the bill proves free from hidden jokers, those who oppose communism, but have been alarmed at the way this committee has tried to get at it, should rejoice. Here at last, may be something constructive.

Four-Year Term for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to increase the term of the Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years. Much interest has been manifested in this proposal.

Mr. Alex H. Washburn, editor of the Hope Star, a daily paper at Hope, Ark., has written a very fine front-page editorial in his column, Our Daily Bread, which appeared in the daily edition of May 5, 1948.

For the information of those interested, I include the editorial:

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR CONGRESSMEN?

On of the major costs of government under a republic is the holding of thousands of elections, necessary if the people are to rule—a vital link in the preservation of liberties that were won by the hardest from absolute monarchs and dictators.

But as government spreads out in America to encompass more phases of civilian life the Federal organization, in particular, becomes increasingly sensitive to local issues and a defect appears in the great structure: Congressmen are in office but 1 year before they have to lessen attention to government in order to prepare for a new election back home.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that if local issues are to continue to interfere with truly Federal business, and no additional protection is given the men who represent us in Washington, then the quality of government will be no better than the absolute minimum.

When the Constitution established the congressional term at 2 years the term itself was not particularly important. All that the founders intended was to make sure that while the entire Nation voted for President the Senate and House should represent a cross section of local sentiment—the Senators by States, the Representatives by districts within each State. Thus there would be a proper balance between local and national interests in determining the course of Federal legislation.

But the Senators with their 6-year term are better able to show a concrete record of accomplishment than are the Representatives, who, elected for only 2 years, are at the mercy of every heated controversy that may spring up back home, however brief. So long as the people do finally vote for or against a man does it matter a great deal, under our basic principles of government, whether that voting is done every 2 years or every 4? Some States elect a governor for 4 years, others choose the chief executive every 2 years, usually honoring him with a second term. But it is the general opinion over the country that the 4-year gubernatorial office makes for a more stable government—and we may be ready to entertain a similar thought with respect to Congressmen.

Anyway, our own OREN HARRIS, Seventh Arkansas District Congressman, has brought the matter up in Washington with a resolution looking toward a constitutional amendment to establish the 4-year term for Representatives. It doesn't affect Mr. HARRIS, of course. Constitutional amendments take years for enactment. But it is a beginning—and considering how complex our Federal Government has grown in modern times it seems to me to be a step in the right direction.

Mundt Subversive Activities Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, most every American citizen would do everything he could to prevent the activities of any organization which had for its purpose the overthrow of this Government by force or violence. However, it occurs to me that within the last few years we have lost our perspective and are inclined to see ghosts in every corner. In our efforts to prevent subversive activities we have even gone so far as to attempt legislation which would restrict the rights of the entire citizenry. It is a case of burning down the house to get rid of the rats.

The House will have before it in a few days the Mundt bill, which is an attempt to destroy the Communist Party and any front which that party might set up. But in so doing we would place a great deal of power in the hands of the Attorney General, power which could be used to destroy the liberties of other groups of people in this country. The definition of subversive could be applied to other organizations besides Communists.

Under permission to include extraneous matter, I am submitting an editorial on this subject from the Washington Post of Sunday, May 9:

REGISTERING COMMUNISTS

In the aftermath of World War I, when this country endured its first spasm of commiphobia and when A. Mitchell Palmer's Red raids and deportation delirium were at their height, the late Senator Borah made a wise observation worth remembering:

"The safeguards of our liberty are not so much in danger from those who openly oppose them as from those who, professing to believe in them, are willing to ignore them when found inconvenient for their purpose; the former we can deal with, but the latter, professing loyalty, either by precept or example, undermine the very first principles of our Government and are far the more dangerous."

Nowhere have the safeguards of our liberty been professed more vociferously than in the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Yet nowhere have they been so feared as sources of weakness rather than of strength; nowhere have they been so ignored and undermined. The legislation now recommended by that committee "to protect the United States against un-American and subversive activities," framed with unwonted care and with indubitable sincerity but framed nevertheless in fear and in doubt of the resiliency of American institutions, is directly in point.

The committee bill, in effect, sets up new standards of treason, circumventing the careful safeguards against prosecution for that crime specified in the Constitution. After asserting, as a legislative finding of fact, that individuals who willfully participate in the world Communist movement "repudiate their allegiance to the United States," the bill provides for a $10,000 fine, 10 years' imprisonment, and loss of United States citizenship for those who "attempt in any manner" to establish here a foreign-controlled totalitarian dictatorship. Thus mere advocacy of such a change would be made a crime—in plain contravention of the First Amendment if not of the treason clause itself. Advocacy of a foreign-controlled dictatorship is, of course, thoroughly odious. But does it actually constitute so clear and present a danger to the security of the United States Government as to warrant a gag upon the freedom of expression which is that Government's greatest source of strength?

The bill, after reciting tediously vague and involved definitions of Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations, empowers the Attorney General to place voluntary associations of American citizens in one or the other of these categories. It does, to be sure, provide for hearings and for judicial review of his decisions—a greater deference to due process than the President's loyalty order now affords. But this is still an authority altogether incompatible with a government of laws. It is an authority to stigmatize whole groups of citizens as disloyal, to inflict on them, without trial, extremely stringent penalties, and effectively to limit their freedom of expression. Under the terms of the bill, an Attorney General might well feel warranted in classifying Henry Wallace's third party as a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization. Either classification would be tantamount to proscription.

In his report on the bill, Representative MUNDT, who was its principal author, observed that "we cannot consistently criticize the Communist governments of Europe for suppressing opposition political parties if we resort to the same totalitarian methods here." How very true. Exposure, he says, is the primary need. But when exposure takes the form of official stigmatization and is attended by the imposition of severe handicaps, it amounts to suppression. And once this sort of suppression is permitted, it is bound to be applied not alone to actual Communists but to dissenters and nonconformists of every kind. The end is a suppression of liberty in the name of security.

The tactics of the Soviet dictatorship and, in particular, its use of Communist parties as fifth columns present a real and grave problem to free societies. But since the essence of the problem is how to remain free, it will not be solved by sacrificing freedom. There are measures now on the statute books which, in the circumstances of the times, should be strengthened or extended—the McCormack Act, and the Voorhis Act—requiring registration of agents of foreign principals and of organizations serving foreign governments. This newspaper has also indorsed a proposal of the President's Committee on Civil Rights to require all organizations soliciting funds from the general public to publish their membership lists and render a financial accounting as to the sources of their funds and the nature of their expenditures.

Unlike the Mundt bill, these requirements are general in application, not invidious. "There is incontrovertible evidence," said Mr. MUNDT in his report, "of the fact that the Communist Party of the United States is dominated by such totalitarian dictatorship and that it is one of the principal instrumentalities used by the world communist movement, directed from within that totalitarian dictatorship." If this be indeed a fact, let the Department of Justice proceed forthwith to prosecute Communists under the McCormack Act and the Communist Party under the Voorhis Act and test the issue, as it should be tested, before a court of law.

The ancient right of Americans who are not foreign agents, who are voicing only their own independent convictions, to advocate a change in their Government—even, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, "to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness"—is no mere luxury to be enjoyed only in untroubled times. It is the real reason why this Government has never been successfully assailed. It is what makes America unconquerable.

National Catholic Welfare Council News Service Comments Favorably on Proposed New Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 and Exposes the Misrepresentations of the Communist Press and Fellow Travelers Who Oppose It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend John F. Cronin, of the NCWC, points out the flood of misrepresentation now forthcoming from the Communist press with regard to the proposed Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948. As the Communists have tricked Henry Wallace into forming a third party for them in the United

States, so now they are seeking to trick some liberals into opposition to the measure by their well-known technique of misrepresentation. Following is the article:

COMMUNISTS SET TO LAUNCH ALL-OUT WAR ON MEASURE TO CURB SUBVERSIVE GROUPS

(By Rev. John F. Cronin, S. S., written for NCWC News Service)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The American Communist Party has announced a major campaign against the enactment of the proposed Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948. Its national board has announced that it "will fight to the last ditch," and top-flight officials of the party have said with evident determination that "one thing we will not do is register." A major provision of the bill is to require the Communist Party to list with the Department of Justice the names and addresses of its members.

The Communist attack upon the bill reached an all-time high for vilification and misstatement. They charged that the bill would turn America overnight into "a police state," prohibit strikes, and make the slightest liberal activity a criminal offense.

On the basis of these distortions, Communists plan to rally misguided liberals and innocents to flood Washington with protests against the proposed law. To the Reds this is a struggle for survival and they intend to leave no weapon unused.

A study of the text of the bill shows how complete is the Communist misrepresentation of its contents. There are three important points in the bill. The first is a finding that world communism seeks power in every country, and uses secret and conspiratorial means to effect this. It is stated that a domestic Communist Party and its front organizations are tools of world communism.

The second major section makes it a crime to seek to bring about a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the United States, as a part of the world Communist movement. This section is so phrased as to cover only clear Moscow agents.

The third main point forces the Communist Party to register and list its members. Communist-front organizations must also register, but need list only officers. Both groups must indicate the sources of funds and purposes of expenditures.

The registration provision is the key to Communist hysteria. It removes from the Communist Party its main weapon, secrecy. Communists know that if they are labeled as such, they will be unable to deceive millions of innocents through front and infiltrated groups. Their power in the labor movement, radio, and motion pictures would shrivel away. They would be less successful in deceiving minority groups.

Furthermore, the registration clause is likely to receive public sympathy. If the party were outlawed, it would be made a martyr in the minds of many. Furthermore, it could continue its secret work under other guises. But few Americans will quarrel with the requirement that a secret conspiracy be exposed.

In view of the tremendous Communist pressures generated against the bill, various religious and patriotic groups are mustering support to ensure its passage. A barrage of letters and telegrams in its favor is expected, as the public learns the facts of the case.

Impartial observers view the proposed legislation as the most important control measure against communism ever contemplated here. If properly enforced, the law would effectively stifle Communist activities in America. In view of public sentiment today, exposure of secret Red activities would be fatal to the party. Hence the present struggle is really one of life or death for American communism.

An Atlanta Surgeon in Japanese Prisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, having served more than a year in the United States Marine Corps during the First World War, and having been a member of the American Legion since 1921, I have read with keen interest many of the books and writings relating historical and personal experiences of those who participated in World War II. One of the most interesting and descriptive accounts of wartime experiences has been written by a veteran of the Pacific, who is a resident of the district which I have the honor to represent. This is the book, Barbed-Wire Surgeon, written by Dr. Alfred A. Weinstein, who was on active duty with the Army in the Philipines, when the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

As the title implies, Dr. Weinstein was a prisoner of the Japanese during a great part of his war experience, which covered the entire period of the war in the Pacific, from the bombing of Pearl Harbor, to the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with atomic bombs, leading to the surrender of the Japanese, officially taking place on the battleship *Missouri* on September 2, 1945. It is impossible, of course, for the reader to feel the pain, the hunger, the misery and the horrors which were a part of the daily life of those who were prisoners of the Japanese. Dr. Weinstein, however, has so vividly portrayed life as it was experienced by him and his fellow prisoners, that the reader almost has the feeling that he lived with them among the sights, sounds and smells of the barbed-wire enclosures.

This book is a graphic presentation of war experiences. It is a powerful argument for preparedness.

This book was recently reviewed by a fellow member of the author's profession, Dr. Frank G. Slaughter, in the Atlanta Journal. Under leave previously granted, I insert herewith this review of Barbed-Wire Surgeon.

AN ATLANTA SURGEON IN JAPANESE PRISONS—THE AUTHOR OF THE GOLDEN ISLE AND MEDICINE FOR MODERNS HIGHLY COMMENDS DR. WEINSTEIN'S BOOK

Barbed-Wire Surgeon, by Albert A. Weinstein, M. D. Reviewed by Frank G. Slaughter, M. D.

A lot of professional fiction writers are going to feel pretty frustrated (as this reviewer does) when they read Dr. Weinstein's account of his experience behind the barbed-wire of Japanese prison camps during some 40 months of confinement. We rack our brains for exciting plots, for interesting and picturesque characters, for suspense, description, and all the other ingredients that go to make an exciting fiction story. Then along comes a book like Barbed-Wire Surgeon with a true story that puts all our efforts to shame, written with all the gusto and skill of Jack London or Conrad, boasting characters far more alive and interesting than any fictional characters could be, with a plot that could be lifted by Hollywood almost verbatim, a love story as tender and as thrilling as the veriest romantic could wish, an interesting and well-described background and a sheer continuity of interest and suspense that keeps you on the edge of your chair until the wee hours. Anyway, it should be apparent by now that this is a wonderful book and if it doesn't top the nonfiction best seller lists in the months to come it will be because the American reading public has become so surfeited with psychology and historical trappings that it can no longer recognize a good thing when it sees one.

Manila was a lovely city that morning of December 8, 1941, when Dr. Weinstein begins his story. An Atlanta surgeon, on active duty with the Army at Fort McKinley, his first taste of war came when the Japs started bombing nearby Nichols Field and a couple of Filipino infantry regiments camping on the adjacent golf course opened up with tracers and sprayed his barracks with green and red bullets in the excitement of trying to shoot down Japanese planes. That's page 1. Page 2 plunges into all the excitement, horror, and drama of a front-line hospital swamped with casualties. The medical detail is told without embellishment, for none was needed and that is one of the best parts of the book.

Dr. Weinstein is a doctor and naturally his interest even through the months and years that followed, including one period when he ceased becoming a doctor at the orders of the Japanese and became a common laborer instead, was in the health and welfare of the men who were under his care.

Nothing could be more fascinating to lay and professional reader alike, than the way in which Dr. Weinstein and the doctors with whom he worked managed to perform literal miracles of surgery with practically no equipment, often operating in the middle of the night in order to keep the Japanese butcher-surgeons who were their superiors from botching the jobs themselves, and as likely as not being knocked down in the morning for their pains. Equally as important as the surgery, too, was the fight to maintain some semblance of health under living conditions which were indescribable, when all other emotions were submerged by the single need for enough food to preserve life, a need so strong that in the end when he and his confreres stumbled aboard a Navy hospital ship he downed 32 poached eggs, only to lose them at once.

But this isn't entirely a medical story, in fact, it could stand alone quite well without the medicine, although for most readers that will be the most interesting part of the account. There is a drama of the people themselves, the everyday acts of heroism—and cowardice, too, for there was some of that.

The most surprising thing of all is the tender love story that runs through this account. Separated from his sweetheart, Hanna, in the early days of the fighting in the Philippines, Dr. Weinstein occasionally received notes from her through the elaborate underground that existed there, and once saw her for a few precious minutes in Manila when neither could show any sign of recognition. A pair of red socks which she had knitted for him became a symbol of their love, sustaining them in the belief that they must meet again, even when each thought the other dead.

Barbed-Wire Surgeon is by far the best of the factual accounts that have come out of the recent war. A thrilling adventure story, a tender romantic theme, and a powerful argument in favor of the kind of preparation that will prevent this sort of thing in the future, it offers everything the reader could wish for in satisfying reading, plus a big lump in the throat at the end.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, during these days when Members of Congress and the people of this country are considering the road we should take in furnishing leadership for peace, it is heartening to find clear and thoughtful expressions in the various newspapers of our Nation. I was much impressed with an editorial of the Ashland City Times, of Ashland City, Tenn., which, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein.

WAR OR PEACE—WHICH SHALL IT BE?

The tense situation in Berlin has been touch and go. Any unforeseen happening can precipitate a war. This situation is entirely of Russia's making. She is determined to go just as far as she can, short of actual hostilities, we believe. That impression is based on the fact that the Soviets immediately and as quickly as possible offered an apology and an explanation for the act of their fighter pilot who wrecked the British transport plane in Berlin recently, with heavy loss of life.

The Soviets termed the crash an accident. It may have been such but it appears that the fighter-plane pilot was attempting to see just how close he could come to the transport, possibly without actually crashing. That he actually did cause the crash may have been unintentional, but he had no business there in the first place. All these incidents are a part of a well-defined plot on the part of the Soviets to discredit the United States and the western European powers in the eyes of the people of the world. We cannot withdraw from Berlin or Europe even if we wanted to do so. Such an act would at once proclaim to the peoples of the world that we had abandoned them to the terrible rule of the Red Fascists.

Once again the United States must take up the gage of battle against a gangster group which has seized power in an otherwise peaceful nation. The Soviet leaders in the Kremlin know that their hold on the people of Russia is precarious and that if the Marshall plan works, that the whole crew will be tossed out on their collective ears. We cannot depend on that just happening. We must do everything possible to spread the benefits of the free enterprise system so widely that the people will be won to its banners. By so doing we shall insure the downfall of those who plot and plan for war. We shall insure the peace of the world for a long time to come, for no human being in his right mind wants war, if it can be avoided.

What will be the consequences, if we fail to deliver the goods? First, Europe and Asia will in all likelihood go communistic and we shall find ourselves an island in a "red sea" of intrigue and hate. Second, we must, as a consequence of this fact, submit to a regimentation such as we have never known in all history. We shall have to maintain an enormous military establishment and what is even more drastic, we may have to rearrange our cities and industrial plants so that they will be buried in the ground to escape destruction by the atom bomb. Fantastic? Yes, but not any more so than the things which have already happened would have seemed to our grandfathers.

The thought of how education, health, and the general welfare of humanity could have been advanced if we had spent only a part of the wealth we have squandered in fighting two world wars is enough to cause us to weep. It has become a commonplace expression to say that man's spiritual growth has not kept pace with his mechanical and scientific achievements, but its truth seems not to have been recognized by the majority of the people. We must find some way to teach the principles of Jesus to men or we all perish in the dust of an atomic bomb.

One Thing or Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have just noticed an editorial in the Daily Oklahoman, the leading Democratic newspaper published in the State of Oklahoma, with the largest circulation of any newspaper in our State, entitled, "One Thing or Another." This editorial appeared in the regular edition of the Daily Oklahoman Monday, April 26, 1948. It is a subject which interests many people in my congressional district. This article certainly shows the bitter battle that is waging there between private enterprise and public ownership and operation of our utilities; and demonstrates the lengths to which the people who advocate Government ownership, and the socialization of utilities, will go, and the insidious methods employed to get a stranglehold upon, and destroy, private industry.

I am not ready, and I do not believe the people of my district, northeastern Oklahoma, are ready, to socialize our utilities. I am thoroughly convinced that they do not want me to participate in programs that will enable the Government to go further into business in competition with private enterprise. I have always advocated that we have too much Government in business, and too little business in Government. I have consistently opposed the socialization of our industries, and the people of my district elected me on that premise, and I shall remain true to their mandate.

The article in the Daily Oklahoman, above referred to, follows:

Acquisition of the surplus steam power plant at the Oklahoma ordnance works by the Grand River Dam authority is just another phase of the chain reaction which was set in motion when the big reservoir was built as a so-called dual purpose affair.

When the planners went into action there they promised both flood control and a vast reservoir of electric energy. Both promises have proved at least partially phony. The worst flood in the history of the lower Grand River Valley came after the dam had been built and dry years and seasons have actually forced GRDA to buy steam-generated electricity to supply its commitments. The final confession of bankruptcy of promises came when GRDA acquired the surplus steam plant at a cost of $3,500,000 to "firm up" its supply of energy which, in other words, means guaranteeing a steady flow of electricity regardless of the state of the weather or the ability of the hydroelectric turbines at the big dam to deliver.

Had a privately owned electric company cajoled the public into buying its stocks or bonds with the same phony promises the Government did, its officials would likely be wearing striped suits. But what's sauce for the goose apparently is not sauce for the gander in the book of bureaucracy. Taxpayer money or taxpayer mortgage simply was extracted by compulsion in the first instance and another $3,500,000 is added now to cover up the original mistake and make good, in some measure, the original distortions of truth.

One thing always leads to another, it seems. And it is particularly and peculiarly true when the agencies of Government stick their foot in the door of private business with glib and unfillable promises.

Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am moved to point out that yesterday in the observance of Mother's Day we paid homage to her to whom we owe more than to any other mortal. To some of us who are blessed by still having our mothers spared to us the day was an opportunity for showing our appreciation and love; to those whose mothers are resting in a sunnier land it was a day for rededication to the ideals learned in youth at her knees. Certainly, for all of us it was a day for prayerful hope that all the mothers throughout the world may be strengthened as a mighty force for the advancement of world peace. And in the reverent mood inspired by this anniversary I would like to include the following verses taken from the current issue of Signs of the Times, entitled "My Mother," by Lois Evans-Hansen:

MY MOTHER

(By Lois Evans-Hansen)

She taught me all the lovely things I know—
She wove for me a web of shining days,
She built my life with courage strong, and skill,
And taught the meaning of its puzzling maze.

She gave to me to hold through all the years
Memories of beauty from each passing hour.
From her I learned how sweet the song of birds,
How rare the perfume from each wayside flower.

She taught me faith, and love for all mankind;
Forgiveness for the weaker in the way.
Her hand beneath my cheek, when stars appeared,
Seems like a blessing, with me to this day.

She brought to me the finer things of life,
She helped me shun its evils and its fears;
To me the loveliest of the things I own
Are memories of mother through the years.

Crosser Bill Increasing Retired Railroad Employees' Benefits Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly disturbed by letters which keep coming in from the retired railroaders among my constituents. These are men—and women, too, for that matter—who have been faithful servants of the railroads and pillars of their communities for more than 30 years. They expected—as they had every right to expect—that when their working days were over they could settle down and enjoy life. They knew they would not be rich, but they looked forward to a retirement income that would at least allow them to maintain a decent standard of living.

But what happened? Prices went shooting skyward and these old people found themselves trying to get along on pensions that looked pitifully, ridiculously small by comparison with what it costs two people to be fed, housed, and clothed for 30 days. I investigated and found that the average retired railroader gets only $70 a month. That means that there must be hundreds, or more probably, thousands, of them who get as little as $50 a month or even less.

One old gentleman wrote me a patient, courteous letter which made me actually ashamed that Congress has thus far failed to act to improve this situation. The gentleman explained that, besides having been a railroad brakeman for all his working years, he had been active in community projects all his life. He had served a couple of terms in his town council and belonged to several lodges, served on local committees, and so forth. In the past few months of his retirement he has had to give up all those community activities. Why? For two reasons. First, he simply cannot afford the carfare it takes to go to meetings; and second, he is embarrassed by the shabbiness of his clothes and he has not the money to replace them.

This is not just a situation which arouses our sympathy, but which we can do nothing about. We can do something about it. The remedy, or at least a palliative, is ready at hand. I refer to H. R. 5993, a bill which was introduced by the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER on March 24 and which has been gathering dust ever since in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

This bill would not require any additional tax or assessment. The increase which H. R. 5993 proposes to make in retirement pay is such a modest one—ranging from 20 percent in the higher brackets to 25 percent in the lower—that it can be financed out of present funds. No additional taxes would be necessary.

The need is there. The means are there. A majority of Congressmen, I feel sure, are eager to act to relieve the plight of these retired railroaders. It seems to me that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee can have no legitimate excuse for further delay. H. R. 5993 should be reported out at once—and favorably—and passed by the House without further delay.

Perspective for World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the May 8 issue of America:

PERSPECTIVE FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT
(By John LaFarge)

(As the hopes invested in the United Nations become more tenuous while recognition of the need for world economic and political cooperation becomes more pronounced, America's editor analyzes the factors involved in a practical development of world government.)

Had the proverbial man from Mars dropped in on the recent events in Italy, he might very well have asked whether these were Italian elections at all. They would have looked to him much more like some kind of international voting, where the contending candidates were really Russia and the United States. The issues that were being fought out in Italy concerned not Italy alone, but all of Europe and, to a considerable extent, the entire world. It is surprising to see how readily this was grasped by the American press and by a large percentage of the American people. Certainly no foreign elections ever aroused a tenth part of the popular United States interest that the contest in Italy did.

If a world government existed, voting on world issues would be one of its normal features—supposing, of course, that the government were of a democratic nature. The internationally related voting in Italy, therefore, is simply part of a pattern which has been given a tremendous impetus by the rapid development of world communism. The unfolding of the strategy of Soviet conquest in eastern Europe, with the terror and confusion which it aroused, has led to a steady movement toward supranational unity in western Europe and in the Western Hemisphere as well.

The newly formed Organization for European Economic Cooperation of the 16 ERP beneficiaries and the Brussels 5-nation group for economic and military security are a direct response to the iron curtain's advance over eastern Europe. Communists threats in France and Italy brought about the rapid and unexpected rapproachement of those two countries. The drama of the Italian elections has given Italy a sense of kinship with the entire Western World, and of the Western World, with Italy. As the Communist pattern of infiltration and violence has developed in Latin America, the countries of the Western Hemisphere have drawn together with one another and with the United States.

Though these recent developments have, for the most part, only limited and immediately urgent aims in view, they are in the line of a much more far-reaching movement that sooner or later must lead to a degree of international organization surpassing in its effectiveness anything that we possess at present.

Two elementary considerations are driving the nations to find ways and means of working together and to seek some new institutional forms which will keep them working in regular and efficient fashion. One impulse is that of physical self-preservation, preservation of the human race as such; the other is the menace of poverty and indeed total destitution. "Only by close and lasting cooperation," said the convention for European cooperation set up by the 16 ERP nations, "between the contracting parties can the prosperity of Europe be restored and maintained, and ravages of war made good." The nations were determined to combine their economic strength to these ends.

The problem of self-preservation was bluntly stated by the six leading atomic scientists who issued a formal warning at Princeton, N. J., on April 11, to the effect that the only way to avoid war was to create a powerful world government, if necessary without the Soviet Union at first. The scientists saw only three lines of policy emerging in the west: a preventive war against Russia that would devastate Europe; an armed peace that would push down the standard of life under heavy military expenses; or a potent world organization. They agreed that there would have to be a tremendous campaign of mass education before the public would accept surrender of national sovereignty to a supernational world government. But unanimously they said that now was the time to begin that campaign, and that if the west reached the point of accepting it before the east, then world government must be formed without the Soviet bloc of states. And a world government, as Dr. Urey, the spokesman, stressed, could not be formed without substantial and concrete surrender of national sovereignty, something which would have to be accepted by 80 to 90 percent of the people in the participating states.

The idea of world government, such as the scientists proposed, is one through which great good or great harm may be effected, according to the manner in which the idea is approached. Certainly nothing but confusion can result from mere spinning of idealistic schemes.

At the root of our troubles today is a singular paradox: that the organization which was created, at San Francisco, to give us the maximum of security, is unable to afford us security any longer. The United Nations stands as an apparent obstacle to the one type of institution which could afford us (as far as weak human efforts can, under God, constitute such things) some degree of security against the conflicting passions of nations and peoples and the ever-present menace of war; a genuinely supranational institution, which would be based upon a complete acceptance of the idea of an objective and supremely normative world order.

According to a distinguished international jurist, Prof. A. de la Pradelle, of the University of Paris, writing in a symposium on world government (La Bataille de la Paix, Monde Nouveau, 1947), there are two great obstacles to such an acceptance. One of these is psychological. The selfish passions that beset human nature revolt against any transfer of powers to authorities which would control them, and refuse to accept any outside norm which would bridle them. The other obstacle is of a juridical nature. The imperious principle of national sovereignty sets itself squarely against any effective acceptance of a world order or of a world organization.

In view of this, it is a distinct temptation that has already shown its appeal to many minds, to pronounce simply a verdict of despair against the United Nations. As long as the principle of unlimited national sovereignty, symbolized by the veto, holds the organization in its grip, there seems to be

no hope of creating an effective barrier against those passions which in theory it is designed to control. But as the United Nations has become better known, as its different branches and their several committees have shown their extraordinary power of resistance to even the most violently disruptive tactics on the part of the Soviet delegations and the Soviet satellites, as the organization has become less of a mere project and more of a historic reality, the perspective of the whole question has become clearer. It has become increasingly evident that the real solution of the question of creating a genuine world organization, which would from its nature take on many of the functions of a world government, must come not through some action taken in total disregard of the United Nations, but rather along the paths opened up in and by the UN itself.

The immense practical merit of the United Nations lies, among other things, in the fact that it has cleared the paths by which some approach can be made toward its own transformation. It has helped to make us understand, first of all, that a genuine world organization cannot rest content with being a mere scheme, but must be a growth along many diverse, even if ultimately converging, lines.

A supranational governing body—be it regional or be it world-wide—must be a genuine juridical growth. It must spring from a concept of international law which in turn is based upon the eternal laws of justice and international charity, and thus be distinguished from a mere alliance based upon the maintenance of the status quo or upon the participants' uneasy fear of one another. It must register a growth in the concept of international penal and criminal law, such as we have seen so grandiosely—even if somewhat inconsistently—mapped out by the trials of Nuremberg.

It must be a growth in economic unity, not for the purpose of constructing a common war machine nor for the common welfare of governments as such, but for the good of the peoples whom the governments serve. This means a growth in numberless details of economic relationship—industrial, agricultural, commercial—with new institutions and organisms and a far-reaching network of economic intercourse between the lesser as well as the greater economic units. For a genuine supranational organization is based primarily upon the interests of individuals and their families, not upon those of the states or governments.

It means a growth in social unity and cooperation such as is envisaged by the various departments of the United Nations' Economic and Social Council, with fundamental agreements on human rights, and a growth in unity in the cultural field, with a corresponding balance of the national heritage as against the claims of world welfare. And all of this means a development of new political thought on new levels of the local and international community. It means not an abolition of the equal rights of small nations; but a new and more vital and organic perspective of the nature of those national rights which have their function in the interests of the individuals who compose the nations.

The greater the degree to which such a growth has taken place the greater will be the reality of the ensuing governmental structure. Hence the immense significance from a world government point of view in the developments which are now occurring in Europe. The European Economic Council, although it affects Europe alone, is, as it were, a laboratory in which the substance—even more than the form—of world government is being constructed.

The other capital problem, as is obvious from what has already been said, is that of federalism, the proper harmonizing of greater and lesser structures into a single organic structure. How far shall authority, political, economic and social, juridical and penal, be transferred from lesser bodies to greater ones if the lesser bodies are not to "hang separately"? How far must a lesser unit, whether local, national, or regional, refuse to yield such a transfer and keep its own administration as a condition not only of its own integrity but of the integrity of the whole?

Any world body that undertakes to deliberate these questions today carries on its shoulders an enlarged form of the task that confronted the framers of our own American Constitution. They will have a vastly greater and more detailed task to accomplish, but on the other hand they will be aided by infinitely more precedents and examples.

The nature of this federalist problem is summed up by Prof. H. Brugmans, Dutch Member of Parliament, president of the European Union of Federalists (La Bataille de la Paix, ibid., p. 196):

"Every generation has its own problem; ours is that of transcending the limits of the nation-state. In a wider space international planning would become more efficacious as we allow full liberty to creative initiative * * * For we believe that federalism is not simply a means of resolving certain problems of international law, international politics; we see in it also a possibility of actually bringing into existence the pluralist society which we desire. This would be a society where every isolated problem would be resolved on its own level, whether it be the level of the family, of the community or the enterprise or branch of industry or an European regional federation or a world institution. In such a federalist order those who are concerned would be in a position to direct and control that which properly belongs to them. But they would work through the agencies of greater communities before which they would have to render an account of their own mandate.

"Federalism is the "middle path" between centralization and anarchy, between the selfishness of vested interests and bureaucratic anonymity, between atomization and molochism. It would institute the regime of democratic solidarities and freely coordinated autonomies. Only in the perspective can the democracies of the East and the West, those of the liberal and those of the social type, meet and make progress to a multiple synthesis."

Prominent citizens are being asked to mobilize on behalf of various plans for the revision of the United Nations, such as the project proposed by Ely Culbertson and sponsored by a group of Senators and Congressmen. Every reasonable person will naturally favor a revision of the charter of the UN, but the Culbertson plan does not appear to be in line with the series of developments tending toward a world government which have been mentioned above. In its initial article the plan preserves the full sovereignty of member-states except for certain acts of aggression or armament. Essential, however, to an organic world government is the yielding to a supranational body of a degree of national sovereignty in all fields—economic and social, as well as juridical and political—according to norms that are determined not by selfish national interests but by universally accented moral standards.

Unless and until such a comprehensive development occurs, proposals for mutual disarmament and the internationalization of armed forces would appear to many students of the problem to be no better guaranty of world peace than is the present structure of the United Nations, with the added disadvantage that it would lack the UN consistency.

The important thing is not to elaborate further ideal schemes, but to make sure that in whatever steps we take we are operating on the proved basis afforded by the existing agencies and structures of the UN on the one hand and by the European and pan-American experiences on the other, with a maximum of certainty as to what we do want in the nature of a practical and organically conceived structure.

Cradling a New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Washington-Lewis Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution at Fredericksburg, Va., Sunday, May 9, 1948:

CRADLING A NEW WORLD

How fortunate we are, friends, to have come to this sacred spot on this Sabbath afternoon when, as a country, we pay our respects to motherhood. Where in all this great land could we lift up our hearts in gratitude with deeper emotion than on this little porch. Surely, the spirit of the woman whose closing years were spent under this roof is with us today. Let us, for the short moments that are ours, lift up our hearts and minds and sharpen our perceptions that we may feel her presence that we may make contact with the stream of life from which she drew her strength renewing our own spirits in this hour, remembering also the great man whose strength and fortitude, whose disciplined faith, whose indomitable courage, and never-failing hope made us a Nation.

Those were days that tested men's souls. How often we hear that said. How much more deeply did they test the stuff of women. It is one thing to fare forth to adventure with the fervor of one's own desire as men have done since time began. It is quite another to share that adventure, not because of an inner urge to go forth to conquer, but because love takes you, or necessity carries you out, as has been the way of women. In no country have women played a stronger pioneer role than in this great country of ours. Their fundamental strength, their tenacity, their rich womanhood is perhaps the keystone of the arch of our national structure.

Mary, mother of the most revered of men, we have come here to bring you our homage, to renew ourselves within the simple house that was your home. We come to thank you for the magnificence of the courage with which you met an aloneness filled with the clamoring needs of five little children to whom you gave example of an unconquerable spirit, an inflexible will to achieve, and the habit of restraint and self-discipline. On this day of reminder we bring you our grateful hearts.

To this house which he in his love and care for her had fashioned he came often, this man who had been her little George, the boy, the lad, the strong young man for whose great soul she had been the gateway to life, the course of whose living she had shaped with the simple verities of respect, restraint, duty. Very possibly they never spoke of the strength of their love for each other, there was no need. Yet, I like to think that there were moments when the tired man slipped off his burdens with his cloak, and smilingly recalled a childish prank, a youthful escapade. To him she was

his revered mother to whom he owed much, for whom he cared until her days were done.

Now it is we who come to the little corner house with its lovely garden. Am I wrong if I suggest that deep within the heart of each of us today is the hope that we may find here in this short hour a new strength, a new courage, a new faith not only in ourselves as individuals but in ourselves as responsible citizens in the Nation built on the dream of this Mary's son, the Nation born to be clean, to be clear-eyed, to be stronghearted, the Nation needed by the Infinite One to lead the world back to Him?

We have come here to Fredericksburg to the home of Mary, mother of Washington. Yet every heart in America today is making a pilgrimage back, back, back to the heart of life itself. What a flood of mixed emotions is being released today. Gratitude, love, blessing is pouring out into the universe from many hearts. But shall we who are so privileged, we who have such wonderful experiences of motherhood fail to remember the thousands upon thousands of children all over this war-torn world who do not know the meaning of the word "mother?" Shall we fail to face the cold, dark fact that in this great land of ours there are thousands upon thousands to whom the sacred word means only bitterness and tragedy?

What a challenge meets us today in beautiful old Fredericksburg so filled with the sense of this woman whose son fathered a nation. His dream was of a land where all people should be born with strong bodies and valiant hearts, with clear minds and vivid perceptions. His dream was of a land where there might be an equal chance for all to fit themselves for a life that would permit development to capacity and work adequate to need. His was no dream of idleness. He laid the responsibility upon the shoulders of the individual and he set the example every day of his long and arduous life. To him his country came first.

Standing here on his mother's porch today we can almost catch the words she must have spoken many times as he went forth. "Your country needs you, George—go with my blessing."

The dream he dreamt in those first days, my friends, can fail to be brought into being if we forget, if we refuse our heritage. Strong blood runs in our veins pressing us to be faithful, to have the courage to look at ourselves from this simple porch with the clear eyes of the woman whose son went forth to do. It will take courage—but has our blood run so thin that we dare not examine ourselves, and having seen the shadows flinch from the strong light of truth?

What shall we see? A young, brave, impulsive country, rich beyond all the fantastic tales of long ago—rich in material things until now, when she awakens to the sad knowledge that she has despoiled her forests, her streams, her plains—the very earth itself; when she awakens to the startling fact that she has despoiled the greatest riches any land can have—her children—for she has failed to show them that this they call freedom is but license; that she has permitted them to come into being and to grow into youth and maturity without the restraints and disciplines that all mothers such as Mary, mother of Washington, know are fundamental to strength, judgment, wisdom, and ultimate leadership.

Where are these great principles of sound living taught, where are they truly lived? In the millions of broken homes that spell insecurity to our most precious of all assets—our children? In the schools where teachers are subject to parental demand for their dismissal if they attempt to discipline, if they attempt to show children that preparation for the living of life fails utterly if it omits the knowledge that life itself takes place upon a planet which in its turn is subject to the disciplines of the Eternal Laws of give and take, of stress and strain, of being part of a great whole?

Mother's Day—A wonderful day indeed! A day whose message should go far and wide—a message pregnant with meaning not only for today, but for the great tomorrow standing expectantly poised on the threshold of the womb of time. Mothers of yesterday, of today and of tomorrow—in your hearts, in your minds, yes in your bodies is the future of mankind. Only as you fulfill God's need of you with purposeful, joyous acceptance of your responsibility to yourselves, to your families, your communities, your States, your Nation and to the great new world that waits to be born will this, our beloved country, take hold upon her destiny.

Here from the home of Mary Washington, mother of the man whose dream conceived us, whose courage, capacity and faith brought us to being in the firmament of nations, with a very full and humble heart I charge every woman to go deeply within her own soul and ask the God Who awaits her there, to give her the courage to look upon the anguish of mothers everywhere with fresh understanding and deep insight, and having looked to set her own life in order that she may not fail herself, her country or the world.

Give Voluntary Enlistments a Fair Trial Before Enacting Drafting Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from clear-thinking and patriotic citizens of my district, who think that those in charge of our Army have not given voluntary enlistments a fair trial. They agree that the requirements have been raised by the Army, and many think it has been done on purpose in order that a poor showing of voluntary enlistments will result. We all know of instances not too long in the past, where individuals attempted to volunteer and were rejected, only to be drafted a few weeks or months later, and pass satisfactory physical examinations. These facts have been brought out on the floor of Congress many times. The people do not like that attitude and that sort of performance on the part of those in charge.

On the other hand, it is frequently stated that the Navy and Marine Corps experience no difficulty in getting sufficient men to enlist in their branches of the service. Only a few days ago, I heard it on the highest obtainable authority that the Air Corps has had to decline voluntary enlistments.

Why should it be comparatively easy for the Navy and Marines to get all the voluntary enlistments they need, and for the Air Corp to have more volunteers than they can accept, while the Army claims it cannot secure a sufficient number of volunteers? Something must be wrong, and the people think they know where the trouble is and they are not at all sympathetic to the appeals of the Administration and the Army on this score.

An example of how some of them out our way feel, is expressed in the following letter, which I received from one of my constituents, whom I do not know personally, dated May 5, 1948, addressed to me in the following language:

Before Congress votes a peacetime draft, I would like to add my name to the long list of Americans who want to see some effort made to induce volunteer enlistments to our Army. It must be plain to Congress that the reason our Army is not up to par in enlistments is that there is something wrong with the Army regulations, or the advantages offered to volunteers.

The mothers of America do not want their sons taken out of school, especially those under twenty-one, who are not old enough to vote, to be drafted into a peacetime army. Education is vitally necessary for America's advancement in the future. Engineers are essential to the new developments in science.

If we draft men in peacetime, every country will feel they must do the same and the final outcome will be war. We will be placing our country on the level with Hitlerism and communism and lose the spirit of democracy which America has so long treasured. Let our youth learn to construct a free country through the medium of education and see that Congress excludes them from any draft, if they are in college. If war should ever come again, these educated men would be of far more use to their country than to draft them into a peacetime army now. The youth of today is uneasy, not knowing what to plan. So are their mothers and fathers. We all know that a peacetime draft would be very unsatisfactory in the way of morale, for the men who want to continue in school will not be content to be drafted when they feel sure that enlistments could be encouraged, thus avoiding a draft.

Again may I urge you to induce Congress to encourage voluntary enlistments and that no draft law be passed until this has been fairly tried.

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the case of the need, necessity and authority for construction of the New Johnsonville steam power plant in connection with the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority is well presented in an editorial from Public Power magazine of May 1948. I commend the reading of this editorial to the Members of the Congress and the public and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

"YES" ON NEW JOHNSONVILLE

TVA has asked Congress for funds to build a steam generating station at New Johnsonville in West Tennessee. More power is badly needed in the western part of the system, and engineers have determined that the needed power can be obtained most economically by a steam plant located there.

Public distributors of TVA power-municipalities and cooperatives—are bound by con-

tracts to depend upon TVA for their entire power supply. The Government has assumed sole responsibility in the area for an adequate supply of electrical energy to support a rapidly expanding economy. Having done this, it owes a solemn duty to the people and industries of the valley to so manage the system that power will never fall in the category of too little and too late.

Last month Purcell Smith, $65,000-a-year head of the National Association of Electric Companies, appeared in person before a House subcommittee considering this project. He and his associates took 3 hours in closed sessions to tell the subcommittee why TVA should not have its steam plant. Presumably his arguments were similar to those already presented by other opponents. These arguments were to the effect that this is a new policy, without precedent, and perhaps actually beyond the scope of the TVA Act. Is it?

Let's look at the record.

1. In 1933, when TVA took over Wilson Dam, it also took over the steam plant at Muscle Shoals.

2. In 1939, Congress provided funds for TVA to purchase its part of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. system, and no distinction was made between hydro and steam properties.

3. In 1941, a specific appropriation was made for a steam plant at Watts Bar.

4. Section 14 of the TVA Act says, in connection with cost allocations, "In like manner, the cost and book value of any dams, steam plants, or other similar improvements hereafter constructed." Section 15 says, "In the construction of any future dam, steam plant, or other facility. * * *"

When one considers:

1. The present attempt to restrict the corporate freedom of TVA and seriously limit the control which the Board of Directors has over operating funds;

2. The propaganda spread around the Nation—much of it false and misleading—about TVA's performance;

3. Present efforts to oppose normal appropriations for the coming year,

it might safely be concluded that opponents feel they have accomplished little so long as TVA is successful.

The fact that the national power lobby has taken this occasion to oppose an addition to the TVA system also clearly indicates that New Johnsonville is more than a regional issue. It is an attempt to discredit public power by restricting the normal growth of one of the most successful public power systems. For there is surely no better way to discredit TVA—and public power generally—than by preventing TVA from meeting its obligations to the people of the Tennessee Valley.

Public power everywhere will be affected by what happens to New Johnsonville. The issue is clear and it is joined. It is time we lend a hand.

VFW Supports H. R. 6258, a Bill To Take the Profits Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced H. R. 6258 on April 15, in a statement I mentioned that it was designed to take the profits out of war. I also stated that the provisions of the bill were similar to a bill introduced by me in the Seventy-sixth Congress, and which was identical to a bill introduced at that time by 50 Members of the Senate and by 11 Members of the House.

The sponsor of this legislation in the Seventy-sixth Congress was the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I am pleased to report that the VFW is supporting H. R. 6258 in the Eightieth Congress, as evidenced by the following statement issued by the department of public relation of the VFW to all posts of that organization:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPPORTS H. R. 6258, TO TAKE THE PROFITS OUT OF WAR

Speaking in terms of money alone, World War II cost the American taxpayers in expenditures and pyramided debts, in excess of $330,000,000,000. This figure is five times the total national income during 1939, the year in which the war began in Europe.

During the period 1941 to 1943, inclusive, corporation net profits alone increased more than 100 percent over the preceding 3-year period during which there was little preparation for and no prosecution of a war. The vast bulk of this tremendous increase represents excessive war profits.

There was another kind of debt incurred during the war which cannot be repaid. That debt is owed to the one-third of a million Americans who gave their lives and to the million others who became casualties. The resultant grief of the survivors and disrupted lives of those who served cannot be compensated for in dollars.

Such figures as these tell a simple, yet highly indicative story. In their essence they mean that for some—a small minority we like to think—war is a highly profitable venture, and therefore a desirable one. For others it means sacrifices far above and beyond any monetary value.

Were I to advocate that taking the profits out of war is the sole remedy needed to abolish it I should defeat my purpose in talking to you today (tonight). Obviously it is not. Yet it is an irrefutable fact that most wars in recorded history have been fought purely for selfish, material gains. Whether openly mercenary or under the cloak of an ideology, the profit motive invariably exists to some extent in all wars. I repeat that taking profits out of war will not guarantee its abolition, but I emphasize strongly that it would be one of the greatest deterrents to war yet devised.

With these profits outlawed, any future war in which America might become engaged will truly be a war of purpose—a war fought solely for the preservation of the American way of life.

Constitutionally, the Federal Government cannot confiscate privately owned property to aid in the prosecution of a war in which it is involved. It may, however, appropriate human lives by use of the military draft and use them to the fullest extent if necessary to bring about a successful termination of a war. Manifestly this is essential in times of emergency. But it is no less essential, no less democratic to appropriate excessive profits of war for the common defense. The most iniquitous quality invested in man during time of war is that he should profit from the blood of others. It is totally against the precepts of Christianity.

The one democratic way of utilizing the full productivity of property in time of war without actual confiscation is through a steeply graduated personal and corporation war-profits tax. Thus would be abolished all monetary incentive for war; and those who foster it for its profits would be less belligerent knowing that they stood to lose by it. Those excessive profits which would otherwise go into the pockets of the individual or corporation would, under such an arrangement, revert to the United States Treasury to be used in defraying the expense of the war. With a postwar debt held at a minimum by an excess-profits tax operative during hostilities, there would be created a salubrious condition for a stabilized postwar economy. What war debts might be incurred could quickly be liquidated thus sparing a burden for succeeding generations to shoulder. Of no little consequence is that excess-profits taxes during war would do much to avert years of economic depression and widespread unemployment which follow in the wake of war and the disruption of world markets.

The drafting of excessive income of individuals and corporations during war would cause all Americans to realize that any future war would result not only in the loss of human life and misery to millions of citizens, but it would also mean the sacrifice of all profits above living expenses. The burdens of war would then be more equally distributed. To certain extents we would all be in it together—not just those who do the actual fighting. Potential profiteers of any possible future war, realizing that net profits, after payment of war taxes, would be less during time of war than during time of peace, would very probably be instilled with a strong desire for a policy by our country of doing all possible to stay out of war. With war profits gone, we should have to have an impeccably moral and worthy cause before entering another war.

For many years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has urged upon Congress the enactment of legislation outlawing discriminatory war profits. Under its auspices such a bill was introduced into Congress on Americanization Day, April 27, 1938 along with the signed endorsement of 4,000,000 American citizens. Similar bills under VFW sponsorship were presented the following year under joint authorship of 50 Senators and 4 Representatives. These bills clearly had the backing of the American people. However, opposition and criticism of the bills by those who would be most affected by it prevailed, and shortly thereafter we entered World War II. As a result, fabulous personal and corporate fortunes were made just as they were made in World War I, and our war debt went up into astronomical figures. And so even after the war, the little man, the man who endured the rigors of war at $60 a month, the man who lost his son on Iwo Jima or at St. Lo must keep on paying and paying. Those who stayed at home to reap the harvest will pay too—but how well they can afford it.

Today, hostile acts and aggressive tactics abroad are again threatening to embroil us in another and even more devastating global conflict. It is not my purpose today (tonight) to dwell upon the present international situation, or to offer solutions to the grave problems confronting us. I do wish to emphasize, however, the urgency of considering now a strong restraining influence on those who would compromise our national security by the greed for profits by which they are dominated—even at the expense of human life and abject misery.

To prevent, in the event of a future war, a repetition of the creation of war-made millionaires, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is again sponsoring a bill designed to eliminate those ill-gotten gains by steeply graduated income and other taxes during hostilities. This is House Resolution 6258 introduced on April 15, 1948. Its provisions will equalize the financial costs of war and provide for an effective defense at a time when it is most needed. It will do all possible to insure peace, but in case of attack by a foreign power, it will direct the entire resources of the Nation impartially toward the war's speedy and successful conclusion.

It must be understood clearly that H. R. 6258 is in strict conformance with our present tax laws and violates no constitutional provisions. It is applicable only in time of war and ceases when Congress declares war to be at an end. It makes no

attempt to confiscate property nor does it violate the individual rights of any citizen. It bestows no unusual powers upon any one individual. It establishes no vast political machine, for it operates, when effective, with our existing tax-collecting agencies. Its provisions have been studied and approved by the country's leading tax experts. Its enactment would do more to prevent a world catastrophe than any other statute now in effect. It is written to aid the common man who is always the big loser in any war. It is the epitaph of the war profiteer.

One of the principal objections that has been voiced against this proposed measure (and you may be sure that those who stand to profit by war are the most vociferous against it) is that it is not in line with the principles of American democracy, and that it smacks of communism and socialism. I maintain that such an accusation is absurd in the face of those very principles upon which our democracy operates. If 100 percent of the bodies and minds of our finest young men are democratically drafted for national defense, it would be utter stupidity to assert that the wealth represented in the form of dollars which these same men helped to create is exempt from doing its part in the preservation of the system by which it came into being. In time of war our people fight, and often die for the continuation of the American form of government. Is it fitting then that huge individual and corporate war profits stand idle and later become a burden upon those who fight?

I do not maintain that H. R. 6258 would or could equalize all the sacrifices necessary to successfully wage a war if forced upon us. But it most assuredly will bring about a financial equalization, and will mimimize to an extent hitherto unknown the sufferings that go with war. It would be a major factor in securing the earliest possible termination of war. Certainly it would spare the burden of huge war debts such as we now have. No—legislation alone cannot compensate those who bear the brunt of battle. They have ever been on the short end—their sacrifices cannot be equalled. H. R. 6258 is, however, the nearest thing yet devised to equally distribute the total costs of war. Under its provisions every person not in uniform, and every company and corporation would contribute any excess wartime profits to the financing of a war while it is still in progress. On the basis of actual income, every citizen and every business firm would pay their proportionate shares of the expense of war. With this bill made into law, there will be no more wartime profiteers in the United States.

It is generally accepted that America is a Nation that abhors war and holds to the tenets of peace. Our potential enemies today realize this fact and have, and will in the future, exploit it fully to gain their own ends. It is unfortunate and ignominious that we have in this country certain groups and individuals who play along with these adversaries of freedom. These people would risk not only American security and human lives in another calamitous conflict, but even their own properties for an upsurge in profits from war. Such is their greed—such is their lack of foresight.

This Nation is now in one of the most crucial periods in its history. International tension will probably increase before it can abate. To resist the hue and cry of the forces leading to war will require a fortitude of the utmost degree. Let us not be misled by the wartime promise of a fool's gold which in the end can benefit only the few and bring but sorrow, privation, and despondency to the many. We must guard against propaganda for war by all those who would profit from it. But more than that, we must take all excess profit away from war—and then that propaganda will cease.

I call upon every person with a conscience to support H. R. 6258 and to make his support known to those who will be responsible for its enactment. Surely no person with a sincere belief in the justice of mankind can defend the wartime profiteer. No man with honor can conscientiously oppose a plan which guarantees equal division of the financial burdens of war. No American, worthy of the name, can condone the usury of the few imposed upon the blood of his fellow men.

I leave you with this thought: To help prevent war, let us have no fear of it and be ready for it should it come. If it must come—let it be untainted with the lust for profit. Let it be for the common cause of freedom.

More Revelations About Our ERP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal claims to have won a foreign election. They claim to have won it with our own taxpayers' money. I suppose that they did this on the theory of "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." This has caused considerable comment on the part of reputable observers, and especially those who feel a deep concern about our own country and its security under such a program as that of the ERP which was known as the Marshall plan, and is now baptized by the new socialistic promoters as the Economic Cooperative Administration program. It is a case now of going all out to finance the socialistic government of Great Britain, and fasten upon her people a type of government that day by day is further enslaving them. It will be our money which will prevent Great Britain from returning to a free enterprise system, and which also will send her people down the highway to a socialistic servitude.

As a part of my remarks, I wish to include the following excerpt taken from the May issue of the National Republic:

The proponents of ERP are claiming the results of the Italian election as the first victory for the Marshall plan, although its only effect in Italy was purely anticipatory. If this claim is true, and undoubtedly it has some merit, then it somewhat beclouds the Italian verdict, for it would mean that the issue in Italy was not purely communism versus democracy but American relief or no American relief. If this interpretation is accepted as true, then it was another New Deal election all over again with the Government at Washington expected to furnish the funds.

But while we are trying to stop communism let us not forget that we are aiding a socialism which is little less than a slow-motion form of communism since it, too, would destroy individual enterprise. In Great Britain, for example, the Socialist Government has taken over six major industries during the 3 years in which it has been in power, and is reaching for more. A few weeks ago the government absorbed all electric-power plants, and in July it will take control over all doctors, making them virtually employees of a bureaucratic government. The gas industry and other important industries will be absorbed soon. Even a capitalist levy is being considered. That is the kind of government we are perpetuating in Great Britain with our taxpayers' money. Perhaps it is worth it. But are you sure?

And while we are fighting communism abroad, let us not forget to scotch it at home. The compromise resolution against it, adopted by the Pan American Conference at Bogota, is a good beginning, but it is only a starter. Let's look even nearer home. Some more housecleaning is overdue in our own country.

But there is some good news. During the time the Marshall plan was being debated we got doleful pictures of the millions of hungry and starving people in Europe with the accompanying statement that all of Europe would go Communist unless we could stop it by pouring money into the dark and bloody continent.

Now that there is no longer necessity for such propaganda, we are finding that things may not be so bad after all.

Curiously enough, we didn't hear much about the statistics gathered by the Economic Commission which has been studying European conditions until the relief plan was enacted by Congress. Now we are being given some reassuring facts which do not fit in with the propaganda we were getting a few weeks ago. For instance, we are told that steel production in Europe this year will be almost large enough to provide for Europe's needs. The production would be large enough except that some European countries must export some of their steel in order to obtain imports they badly need.

Furthermore we are now told, by this report, that outside of Germany total commodities in Europe have reached 96 percent of the prewar level on a per-capita basis and that, when surveyed, it was found six European countries had more goods per capita than they possessed in 1938 before the war started in Europe. As Henry Hazlitt stated in Newsweek:

"All this did not prevent the cartoonists who were supporting the Marshall plan here from invariably picturing present-day Europe as a starving old woman in rags, waiting to be rescued from death while pompous Congressmen had the callousness to debate the problem."

In Germany, of course, the economic situation is not so good due to the destruction and dismantling of German factories which now could be producing goods needed in Europe. But under the Marshall plan Germany will receive about two billions, and the factories so recently dismantled—many of them shipped to Russia—can be rebuilt with our taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, a soft pedal has been put on the dismantling of the German industries which are so sorely needed to supply the people not only with a pay roll in these over 900 plants, but the cost of reestablishing them will fall upon our taxpayers. I deplore the fact that our farmers will have to be short of nitrates and phosphates and of the farm machinery which could have been built, of course, in these dismantled German plants. The tragedy of the whole program is that the starving will get practically no benefit from this huge spending of our taxpayers' money, but those who are well enough off to buy any such food as we do send, will be able to get it.

We are told, however, that unless one country gets tobacco in vast quantities, paid for by our taxpayers, the morale of

the people of that country will go down. It is claimed that unless another country in Europe gets vast quantities of our farm machinery the morale of the people of that country will go down—and so on down the list.

I know what the Marshall plan—later known as the ERP, and now as the ECA—will cost each of my communities at home.

I have maintained all along that the people of my district are warm-hearted, generous to a fault, and would raise unlimited amounts of money for the starving if given the opportunity to dispense their charity through the Red Cross, both national and international; the Salvation Army, the Friends, and the churches of all denominations, if permitted to do so. There is one fact that ought to be thoroughly understood by everybody, and that is that no government can carry on a charitable program for the hungry and destitute people of the world. It ought to be well known to every person in this country that anything that goes to a foreign nation has to go through their respective rulers, and not direct to the destitute people. We should have learned this lesson after the sad and tragic experience and utter failure of UNRRA.

Food Prices, Whether High or Low, Are Largely the Responsibility of the President—He Can Do Something About Them if He Selects a Secretary for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the Washington Round-up by Fred Bailey, in the May 1948 Country Gentleman:

Farmers' plans to plant 4,200,000 fewer acres than Department of Agriculture goals called for are interpreted as indicating their dubiousness about prices next fall and a desire to return to a better-balanced farming. Behind the scenes some of the Department's farm-management experts feel that the farmers are using good judgment. Others, remembering 1941, would like to see some surpluses of grains built up as a national-defense precaution.

Milk production in the United States has shown a decrease below the year previous every single month since June 1947.

Cheese production in the United States has shown a decrease in production every month since December 1947 and is running 20 to 25 percent below the 1947 production at this time.

Evaporated milk production has been running below the previous years monthly production every month since October 1947. The March 1948 national production was 270,000,000 pounds in comparison to 340,000,000 pounds in March 1942; 326,000,000 pounds produced in 1945; and the 270,000,000 pounds produced in March 1947 and in March 1948.

The United States dried skim milk production for human consumption has decreased every month since November 1947. The production from December 1, 1947, to April 1, 1948, was only 161,000,000 pounds in comparison to 216,000,000 the corresponding 4 months of a year ago.

The gradual decrease in national milk production naturally will result in corresponding decreases in the production of of the various products made from milk.

With the increase in national population, including the 58-percent increase in the baby crop, together with the increase of dairy exports, it is evident that the American people will have less consumption per capita of dairy products—although it is recognized as a protective food and the greatest single food known to man—in 1948 than has been available to the American people since the Agriculture Department kept records on the subject.

Although some butterfat is being exported, it is a significant fact that the national school-lunch program is using dried skim milk, and that this skim milk is not even fortified with vitamin A and not even fortified with vitamin D either.

California in Review After a Century of American Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a lecture by Dr. Rockwell Dennis Hunt, as follows:

ACQUISITION BY THE UNITED STATES

(Third in a series of eight public centennial lectures by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.)

Dr. HUNT. Now we come to the great subject which begins to reveal the significance of our centennial celebrations: The acquisition of California by the United States.

First, a few thoughts about the great westward movement. The westward movement may properly be said to have begun way back with the fall of Constantinople in 1453, even before the discovery of America by Columbus. When the Europeans were bereft of their opportunity for shipping goods in the old routes, they had to turn west and look wistfully out on to the broad waters of the Atlantic Ocean, and there began the world movement which we call the westward movement. It has been going on, you may say, in some form, ever since that great date. At first the Atlantic seaboard was the frontier, but it was rather more the frontier of Europe and of England than America. Then the Appalachian Mountains were the frontier, and little by little pressure was made toward the west, and the westward movement proceeded in the northern continent of America.

I wish to refer to two or three books, because you are interested in carrying this subject forward a little further. I mention just one that is listed in the bibliography that has been placed in your hands and that is Turner's—The Frontier in American History. If I were to select one book about the frontier, it would probably be that book by Frederic J. Turner. Two other books, not on the list, are worthy of special mention. Frederic Paxson, professor emeritus of the University of California now, has several books, but one is, the History of the American Frontier. Edwin Sparks wrote a book on the Expansion of the American People. Many other titles might be given, but those three I call special attention to. One other book that I brought with me tonight that is appropriate to make some mention of in connection with one of the principal thoughts regarding the conquest and acquisition of California is, the Power of Ideals in American History, by Ephraim D. Adams. This book consists of a series of essays or lectures, the Yale University Lectures for that year, 1913. One of these lectures is entitled, "Manifest Destiny and Emotion." Very appropriate, indeed, to the subject of westward expansion and to the conquest of California.

It was an epic movement, the greatest event in American history for the nineteenth century. We may even say it was a task of the nineteenth century to conquer the continent. Beginning with the acquisition of Louisiana, purchased by Thomas Jefferson for a comparatively small sum in 1803, we note the explorations of Lewis and Clark into the Rocky Mountains and Northwestern Territory a few years later. And these were but the beginnings from the eastern standpoint of this great expansion to the west. The Boston ships had already begun to land on some of the California shores, especially Monterey, with their wares, their merchandise, taking on as cargo hides, tallow, soap, and a few other articles produced by the Californians. That was the beginning of a break-down of the isolation of the Californians as they had known life. It was not very long until that was followed by the actual coming of the Americans into California overland. The first great epoch-making overland expedition was that of a man who is sometimes called The Bible Toter, Jedediah Smith, who came as early as 1826 overland into California with a band of hunters and trappers. I wish you could all read the story of Jedediah Smith. It is certainly a thrilling tale. Coming up through the San Joaquin Valley, clear on to the northern limits of what we call California, and across Oregon to the Columbia River, and returning, with many sinuosities, exercising a great deal of activity, learning many things about the territory, blazing new trails, Jedediah Smith was one of the path-breakers of the early history of this territory. A notable character. Unfortunately, by treachery, he was killed by the Indians while yet a young man. A man who might be called his successor was James Ohio Pattie, who made a somewhat similar expedition into California just a few years later; and he had marvelous experiences of a somewhat different kind which I cannot go into now. He, in turn, was followed by another who did perhaps more from the standpoint of trail-breaking and trapping and hunting than any other one, and that is Ewing Young. So those are sufficient to mention in this connection: Jedediah Smith, James Ohio Pattie, and Ewing Young.

Then it was not long after that until there came those who sought their homes in California. These came as not simply trappers and traders, to go back again, but one after another they came to find a place to abide. Settlers. The Mexicans would call them pobladores. And there again we have a factor, an element, in the penetration into California that is very meaningful, very significant, not only in California history but in all the western history of the United States. These settlers, they came rather early— Gilroy, an English boy; John March,

who had his ranch near the base of Mount Diablo; Peter Larsen and John Bidwell in the northern part; Abel Stearns in the south; William Wolfskill; and many others, who came one by one, and sometimes in groups until here and there from beyond Sutter's Fort in the North (Sutter becoming one of the best known leaders of all) down to the southern part of the territory, we have these pioneers settling down and in a good many cases intermarrying with the people of high Castilian blood of the best families of California. That is a very interesting phase of what we now may call the peaceful penetration into California.

When we come to the acquisition or the conquest of California, we may well consider it under these three heads: First, this peaceful penetration, already alluded to; secondly, the national policy; and, thirdly, the actual military operations.

In order to get a clearer view of this peaceful penetration, and what that really was, we ought to remember there was a man of great importance and significance at Monterey, Thomas O. Larkin, who had come in the thirties and had set up a store there, but more important than that, he was American consul, regularly appointed, the only American consul to California.

Thomas O. Larkin was an important character in our early history. Why mention him? Because in this matter of peaceful penetration he was a very significant factor. He foresaw that California was destined to fall into the hands of some other power than Mexico. He was not the only one that had that feeling, but he saw it rather clearly, and he desired very earnestly that when the change came California would fall into the hands of the United States and, moreover, that it would be done in a peaceful, warless manner; and he was making progress in that direction—very substantial progress. He was friendly, sincerely so, with General Vallejo and with others, some of them the leading men of California of that day; and they, too, foresaw that something was about to happen to California. We must remember that Mexico held a very, very slight tenure upon California during those years, the 1830's and 1840's, and it was rather obvious to a keen observer that that could not go on indefinitely. There were others besides the Americans who were looking upon California as a prize to be won. These particularly included England, and for a time France and Russia.

A moment about Russia. It was very early in the nineteenth century when Rezanov came down under stress of circumstances and desired help, food, and supplies, at Yerba Buena, or the Presidio of San Francisco. You know the story. It is the most romantic story probably of all the romances of early California—how he fell in love with young Dona Concepcion, the daughter of the comandante; how they plighted their troth; how he pledged when he returned he would marry Dona; and then how, after an injury from a fall from a horse, he died in Siberia and never returned, it being many years after that before his Dona realized just what had happened while she had waited for him to return. Now if he had returned we can speculate a great deal about what might have happened.

A few years after that episode of Rezanov the Russians came down about 1812 and established a fort, Fort Ross, 40 or 50 miles north of San Francisco, near Bodega Bay. They established several institutions there, including the Greek Orthodox Church, the chapel of which has been restored and is a landmark today. That caused a great deal of uneasiness on the part of the Mexican authorities, to have the Russians so near at hand actually settled on California soil. They raised their wheat, had various industries, and supplied some things for their neighbors up in Alaska, but they did not stay very long. What a relief it was to the Mexicans when Captain Sutter bought them out, and they set sail and went away, never to return to California. That was a great relief from the standpoint of the Mexican authorities in California at the time.

The French were active, not exceedingly so, but there were different indications here and there when La Perouse and de Mofras and others, leading members of the French nationality, had come to California. They had looked into the situation and made reports on the beauty and richness of the land and the resources to be found here, and there was an interest on the part of France—not very widespread, perhaps, but nevertheless an interest—so that France may be regarded as, for a time, one of the competitors for this prize which we call California.

More prominent, however, than either of these was England as a competitor. There were a good many Englishmen, not as many as Americans in California at that time, but there were numbers of Englishmen and there were officials in Lower California and Mexico representing Great Britain, and the tendency of the British Empire was to expand. There were a good many Americans in California who earnestly thought and believed that England was set upon acquiring California. They had reason to believe that. They might have been mistaken in many instances, but the indications were that England was vitally interested in acquiring California. On the other hand, the United States was deeply interested in seeing to it that England should not acquire California. In the meantime you will remember the Monroe Doctrine had been promulgated in 1823, and according to the Monroe Doctrine it would not be possible for any European power to gain a foothold in California, or in the western part of the United States, unless it should be looked upon as an unfriendly act. There was that to contend with.

It was really quite a contest, although much of it was entirely under the surface, but I ought to say, in all honesty with reference to England, that when it came at the last for what we call a show-down, the higher authorities in the British Parliament and in the Cabinet did not pursue an aggressive policy with reference to acquiring California, even though the local officials in California and hereabouts did so believe, and many Americans were most surely of that opinion. So the thing that actually happened then was to leave the way open for the leadership to the United States and the peaceful penetration, of which I spoke, was a first big factor in that acquisition. Three or four times, maybe five or seven times, as many Americans had come into California during the 1840's as men of any other nationality. There were more Americans in California in 1846 than all the other nationalities put together. There were three or four hundred, perhaps, by 1835; by 1845 there were eight or nine hundred; and then came the great invasion of 1846, not great from our standpoint today, but nevertheless an invasion of about some 2,000 Americans into Oregon and parts of California. So that from the standpoint of peaceful penetration, Americans were far in the lead.

Now, in the meantime a policy was being arrived at in Washington, and that brings us to the second big factor in that American conquest. The policy of expansion was already illustrated, going clear back to the time of Jefferson, although he was not thoroughly consistent in that policy. Coming on down we reach the time when Polk was elected President, 1844. When Polk was elected he set before himself four specific objectives. He desired to accomplish, during his administration, the establishment of a lower tariff rate. He wished to see the Oregon question settled. It was a very difficult and perplexing question for years. He wished to see an independent Treasury established. And he wished to see California acquired by the United States. We do not hear very much about James K. Polk, but it is worthy of mention that all four of these objectives were accomplished, realized, during his 4 years' administration.

What was the cause of this policy on the part of the United States? Partly the settlers, those trappers and those hunters, who had been preceding; partly the westward movement which was well known and patent to all keen observers and statesmen in the eastern part of our country, because of an ideal—an idea which shaped itself into an ideal, and had great weight, although many of those who exemplified it were largely, themselves, unconscious of the ideal. I refer to "manifest destiny." Manifest destiny, you may say, had a twofold aspect. The United States is destined to be higher and better than other nations. That is a sort of a general attitude on the part of many nations, thinking of themselves as favored ones. And, secondly, and more important for our purpose, the expansion to the West must not stop at the Rocky Mountains, or the Missouri River, but must go on and on until it reaches the vast Pacific, the greatest of all seas, and thus there must be presented a continent-wide boundary from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That is what manifest destiny came to mean at the times of which I speak, beginning as early as the 1830's and continuing down to the actual conquest culminating in 1848; and even since that time I can refer to the ideal of manifest destiny.

I do not think that most of our people, even most of our students in colleges and universities, give sufficient weight to the ideal of manifest destiny as a real factor. Many of the factors in history are not the tangible things we can see and feel but the imponderable things that get into the minds of leaders and into the minds of the people; those are the things that sometimes count more than all the material things we can mention.

I have now mentioned the quiet sort of peaceful penetration into California, and I have explained, all too briefly, the meaning of manifest destiny and the great power that was exerted in this matter of pushing a boundary to the Pacific and toward the culmination of the California conquest. It remains to speak of the actual operations, and there one must necessarily be very brief, because there are so many complicated situations and events and incidents that they cannot be possibly comprehended in one short lecture.

The first expedition of John C. Fremont did not bring him into California, but the expedition in 1844, the second expedition, did bring him into California, and he came to Sutter's Fort which was naturally a sort of headquarters, or rendezvous, for all such expeditions, and he came with a considerable force. He made a report, and this report made a great impression upon Congress and the people, very largely because of the splendid literary worth shown by Jessie Benton Fremont, his wife, because she was much more gifted from the standpoint of letters and literature than her husband. Jessie Benton Fremont is called "the woman who made history." Well, you may look that up at your leisure and perhaps read that fine piece of fiction by Irving Stone called Immortal Wife which is a great story in itself.

Fremont came on his third expedition into California. He made demands at Sutter's Fort for a large number of mules. John Bidwell, who was there as the right-hand man of Sutter at the time, told me many years ago personally that he did not like the attitude of Fremont, especially at that time when he was making demands for a considerable number of mules and they were not immediately to be had, and so he (Fremont)

believed, or pretended to believe, that Sutter was hostile to him. Sutter could not immediately get the mules to supply Captain Fremont. That is by the way, but it has a bearing upon the many criticisms that came upon John C. Fremont later. When he came along with his band of 60 men, with 1 little cannon—which was a strange instrument for a surveyor's band to have on a peaceful mission to explore the better and shorter route to California over the mountains—he was told that he would be permitted to leave the country peacefully if he kept out into the valleys and away from the settled portion near the coast. He did not pay proper attention to that injunction. He moved about with that rather hostile-looking and warlike band of his down to where the settlers could see him and be duly impressed, and he made a very unfavorable impression. They arose in arms and the comandante said, "You must leave the country at once—immediately." speaking bluntly. "Get out of here." Well, that was an insult to Fremont and his American followers. He fortified himself on Gavilan Peak, raising the American flag there for a little while—a very daring thing to do—and he could see below that the Californians were marshaling their forces with a view to try and dislodge him. After a few days he decided to move on, and he marched to the north and left the country grudgingly and growlingly, as he expressed it. He moved to the north with his band and kept going until he reached Klamath Lake on the border of Oregon. Then what happened? The Gillespie mission.

Lieutenant Gillespie had been sent out with orders from Washington to deliver to Fremont, Larkin, and one or two others, but particularly to Captain Fremont. Gillespie hurried as best he could to overtake Fremont, learning where he was as best he could. Everything moved slowly compared to our day, of course, and we must make proper allowances for all the delays we recognize in those early days; so it was near the northeastern border of California that Fremont was finally overtaken by Gillespie.

There has been much controversy over that little topic of what was the Gillespie mission, just what was he instructed to say to those officers, and particularly the secret mission to Captain Fremont. I cannot go into all the speculation on that subject, but let me say this, because it helps to make history personal and audible. One day more than 50 years ago, I was talking with General Bidwell about some of these early events in which he lived and had a share, and he told me substantially this: "One day I was fishing for salmon at Sutterville (Sutterville was a little start of a town 3 miles below Sacramento on the Sacramento River, which for a little time bade fair to displace the importance of Sacramento itself), when an American came along. He proved to be Lieutenant Gillespie. Naturally, we sat down on the river bank and began talking." Gillespie was not at liberty to tell Bidwell what his mission was, in so many words, but Bidwell said, "I got a pretty fair idea of what it was all about and why he came out here." I suppose that is true, he got an idea. What was it? Without going into detail I may say the order to Fremont was, practically, "Stay out there; hold yourself in readiness in case of any eventuality. Hold yourself in a convenient location in case of war."

Now in the meantime Fremont knew very well war with Mexico was imminent, even before he left Washington, and he had been given some instruction to use his judgment in certain matters because he could not get messages back and forth in quick order as we might now. So he changed his plan of operation and came back and made camp up near the Buttes in the Sacramento Valley. Naturally the settlers were all excited when they heard about Fremont's returning. What does it mean? And they blocked around and looked to him as sort of a leader. "What shall we do?" they asked. And things led on, one step to another, and then came the episode of capturing several hundred Mexican horses that were being moved around from Sonoma to San Jose or vicinity by a very roundabout route. The horses were captured by a band of Americans. That was a warlike act. Now I cannot go into all of the details. We come next to the Bear Flag episode. Some call it a drama; some call it a farce; some call it an incident; and some call it the basis of a republic.

I would like to be as fair as I can about the Bear Flag episode and about these other matters, because I am well aware that many writers of history have not been entirely fair—they have been biased, perhaps unconsciously in some cases—in one way or another. In this case of the Bear Flag episode, it had its comic side, no doubt. There was the band of Americans who came at dawn, or before dawn, that early morning at Sonoma, because they felt General Vallejo had to be arrested and made prisoner, and then his relative, and Victor Prudon; that all three of them had to be arrested. Surrounding the General's home, a beautiful place there at Sonoma, they sent in two men to tell him what it was for. Those men stayed in instead of coming back to the band with their prisoners. And then the band sent two more in and they also remained. General Vallejo had a very large and fine store of California wines. Naturally, the General being very hospitable, and in view of the cold morning, those men were detained with the idea of having something to drink. Finally they sent in a third delegation, and they meant business. It is an interesting episode, with a comic side. The good wife of General Vallejo was amazed and filled with wonder and could not understand what it was about, and she asked, "To whom shall we surrender, and why?"

There was nothing hostile, nothing warlike in the act at all, but General Vallejo and the others were sent up to Sutter's Fort as prisoners and put into the captain's parlor and placed under guard. For a while John Bidwell was set over them as guard; but it was not long until he found he was being watched, or the prisoners were being watched, by another man, and he said, "I will go over to Sonoma, where things are active and happening." So he went to Sonoma. At Sonoma they said, "We will have to go forward. We cannot stop now." And so they prepared for what they called the California republic. Very crude; very imperfect. Some of the men at least did not understand what it might lead to. Nobody understood fully what it might have ended in. But there on the 14th of June they raised the Bear flag, which had been crudely painted by Bill Todd with materials that were at hand, and some of the Mexicans looking up at it could not understand what it was, and said, "Pig, pig." They thought it was the picture of a pig instead of a bear, crudely done. It was not until a comparatively recent date that the Bear flag was made the State flag by the State Legislature of California, and now it flies over the public buildings in the State of California with the United States flag. Then they said, "We must have a constitution. We must do one thing or another and go forward." I think it was not altogether a humorous thing, it was not a farce, and yet no one there probably fully understood the significance of the step that they had taken. As a small band of settlers they started out to make the conquest, because war of some kind was brewing just then; not war with Mexico, but war against the Californians.

In the meantime, Commodore Sloat came sailing up the Pacific to Monterey with his fleet, anchored, and remained for a few days out there in the harbor, and then sent in a detachment of men, having been told about the activities of Fremont and having been told about the Bear Flag episode, to raise the American flag at the old customshouse in Monterey. The flag was raised July 7, 1846.

One of the questions that was debated for a long time is this: Did Commodore Sloat know at that time that there was war between the United States and Mexico? I would say now it is quite certain that he did know there was war; that he did have information of the first engagements in that war; and that he acted advisedly after having this delay and possessing this information.

Then the raising of the flag on the 7th day of July was an act that was to stand. Commodore Jones had raised the flag in 1842 but had decided a day or two later that was a mistake, that there was not war between the United States and Mexico; but Commodore Sloat knew of war from some officers, though not directly from Washington at that time, and hesitated partly because he did not have official information. He raised the flag and said, "It is not to come down." He has been criticized a great deal for his hesitation, for his trepidation, and no doubt he was quite willing to surrender his command to Commodore Stockton, who arrived not very long after the flag was raised. Commodore Stockton was altogether a different type of man. He was militant; he was aggressive; and he was inclined to heap abuse upon some of the leaders of the Californians. He proceeded at once to complete the conquest of California.

It is interesting, of course, to try to make a character study of men like these—Fremont, Sloat, Stockton, and later Kearny.

The California battalion of mounted riflemen was formed and a good many came under the colors of Fremont and he was sent down through the valley, almost the length and breadth of the land, from Sutter's Fort down to San Diego. General Bidwell—not general at that time—acted in the capacity of an officer in that battalion. He wrote about it afterward. He said, "We marched all over California and had no hostility; we looked for an enemy but we could find none."

The year 1846, in spite of the fact that some of the territory had to be retaken, particularly Los Angeles, must be thought of as the real year of the conquest so far as the local activities are concerned. The actual completion and culmination of the conquest did not occur until the 13th of January 1847, by the Capitulation of Cahuenga, signed between Fremont's officers and the Californians near Universal City; just out of Hollywood. That ended the warlike activities connected with the conquest of California, and yet did not end the war with Mexico. The war with Mexico, which was confusing in many of its characteristics, did not officially end until the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848. It was by virtue of that treaty, which was afterward ratified by the Senate, that California became a part of the territory of the United States, as much a part as any other portion of the territory of this country.

One consideration which people do not generally know about was the payment of $15,000,000 as one article of that treaty to Mexico by the United States; and the California that was annexed to the United States by virtue of the treaty was not the California we know by the present boundaries but had a vast extent of several hundred thousand square miles, reaching over to Utah in the Rocky Mountain area and including what we now call Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico. The defining of the present State of California came only at the time of the convention of 1849.

So in this rather brief outline we have brought the subject of the acquisition of California before you, and have tried to stress that there were these three main factors: the peaceful penetration; the national policy; and the actual military operations. And we must always remember that

the acquisition or conquest of California was an act in a drama of our war with Mexico. Almost at the moment when this Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was being signed, some startling event was taking place, and that startling, momentous event was the discovery of gold at Coloma by James Marshall.

The study of gold, one of the most interesting of all, of course, in our California annals, must be taken up in a separate lecture. But now California belongs to the United States. [Applause.]

Minnesota Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DEVITT

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, most veterans and their dependents are misinformed or uninformed of their legal rights to various benefits, privileges, preferences, and exemptions which have been extended to them by the laws of the great State of Minnesota.

I am pleased, therefore, to present a résumé of such laws as compiled by my good friend, James L. Monnahan, past national commander and present department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, who has his offices with the Veterans' Administration regional office, Buzza Building, Minneapolis, Minn. I am a member of the DAV and know of Mr. Monnahan's splendid work for veterans.

Comrade Monnahan has been active in veterans' affairs for many years, and devotes his entire time in helping to solve various types of veteran problems. He, with one other national service officer, renders expert advice and assistance to veterans and their dependents, without charge, particularly in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their justifiable claims for every type of governmental benefit to which they may be lawfully entitled.

The outline prepared by Comrade Monnahan is as follows:

BONUS

The 1947 session of the State legislature has submitted to the voters in the 1948 general election the question of whether a State bonus shall be extended to World War II veterans. If the voters approve, the 1949 session must provide for administration of the program.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

State allowance is provided for burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in a Potter's field. Relatives or comrades of the deceased may be allowed to conduct the funeral. Allowances are provided for a flag for each grave.

Counties have power to establish a soldiers' rest. No charge may be made for space therein.

Provision has been made for a burial lot near a State hospital for the insane for the burial of certain indigent veterans dying in such hospital or in that vicinity, and for the wives or widows of such veterans. Appropriations may be made to the nearest post of the Grand Army of the Republic for care of such burial lot.

Cities, villages, and towns are required to decorate veterans' graves not otherwise decorated on Memorial Day.

A commissioner of veterans' affairs has been created with certain specified duties.

Reports are made to the commissioner of veterans' affairs of the burial of a veteran, giving the name of the veteran and the location of his grave in the cemetery by lot number.

The commissioner of veterans' affairs shall apply to the Federal Government for a headstone. State allowance is provided for having such stone set up, or for having a stone, furnished other than by the State or Federal Government, engraved with the designation of the organization to which the person belonged. A separate State allowance for a headstone is available if the application to the Federal Government is unsuccessful.

The commissioner of veterans' affairs shall furnish, on petition, markers for veterans' graves to designate such for memorial purposes.

CIVIL RELIEF AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Acknowledgment is provided of legal instruments and the administration of oaths.

A civil-relief act has been enacted.

Contracts on the installment plan for the purchase of tax-forfeited lands are not to be terminated or canceled for nonpayment during military service.

Extension of time is granted for commencing certain actions for damages whenever the claimant or his attorney is in the military service of the United States.

Minority of veterans of World War II shall not impair or invalidate a contract for loans made and guaranteed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to any Federal law.

Rights are preserved under a confession of judgment during military service and 6 months thereafter. Affidavit and payment of real property taxes or exemption from such taxes are required.

Requirements have been set up as to filing of affidavit giving military status to the owner of mortgaged premises at time of foreclosure sale.

Fiduciary powers are suspended during war service.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee voting is extended to electors serving in the armed forces.

Servicemen are exempt from payment of the fee required of absent voters. An affidavit may operate as reregistration.

CLAIMS; ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

County board may appoint a resident veteran as veterans' service officer, and assistants for 2 years, to aid all residents in securing veterans' benefits.

County veterans' referral centers have been set up.

Free copies of birth, death, marriage, or divorce records may be furnished to war veterans for use in presentation of Federal claims or in connection with a veterans' organization or the State department of veterans' affairs.

The fee of the register of deeds for recording discharge papers is paid by the county.

Annual appropriations are made for the use of the DAV and VFW in assisting veterans with Federal claims.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Contracts have been made between State teachers' college and the Federal Government for instruction of veterans.

Expenditures from the war veterans' funds for tuition of veterans or the children of veterans are limited to $1,250,000.

Reimbursement of tuition paid by students is provided.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is extended to children of veterans who were killed while serving in the armed forces between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or died as a result of such service. Amount—$200 maximum per year per child. Four thousand dollars was appropriated annually until June 30, 1942. Free tuition is available at State institutions of secondary or college grade.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

War service is included in period of service qualifying for pension from the Firemen's Relief Association in cities of the first class, as well as under the Police Retirement Act.

Leaves of absence are granted for State and municipal reemployment without loss of seniority rights, insurance benefits, etc.

Veterans of any war have been extended preference rights and privileges under the State or local civil-service acts.

Preference is extended to veterans in appointment of employees in the department of veterans' affairs.

Preference is extended to veterans in appointments of trustees, officers, and employees of the soldiers' home.

Preference is extended to World War II veterans, their wives or widows, in public departments and on public works in the State or local civil-service acts.

Preference rating of 5 points is extended in civil-service examinations in certain counties.

Benefit rights are preserved under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

Retention of position on the eligible register of the police department is provided.

The soldiers' welfare agent may establish and provide an employment placement and advisement service for disabled veterans.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Exemption is granted from garnishment, etc., for 1 year after receipt of all money received by veterans as a pension, bonus, or compensation.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

Disabled veterans of all wars and their dependents are entitled to the same privileges formerly extended to disabled veterans of specific wars.

GUARDIANSHIP

The commissioner of veterans' affairs shall act as guardian for minors and incompetent persons receiving moneys from the United States Government when no other suitable person will consent to act.

Notice of a hearing on an account of a guardian shall be given the regional office of the Veterans' Administration.

HOMES

Veterans of any war, their wives, widows, or mothers may be admitted to the soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

County and city extends aid in operating rest camps for disabled veterans and their families.

Emergency hospitalization is available from the State soldiers' welfare fund.

Provision has been made for a State veterans' recreation and recuperation camp.

Veterans may be admitted to State institutions.

MEDALS, CERTIFICATES, ETC.

Service medals or service ribbon bars may be awarded to members of the armed forces for services for which no medals or bars are authorized by the Federal Government.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Cities and counties are authorized to expend money for observance of Memorial Day.

PENSIONS

Any woman unheard of for 20 years who deserted her husband prior to his enlistment in the World War, if he died in the war, is presumed to have predeceased him and his next of kin at time of his death shall receive his war-risk insurance.

Indian War veterans have been awarded pensions.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

The adjutant general is authorized to maintain individual records of veterans' war service.

The attorney general is authorized to keep an alphabetical list of Minnesota volunteers in the Civil War and to compile and maintain individual records of those who served in other wars.

Compilation of individual records of Minnesota residents who served in World War II has been authorized.

Military record and place of burial must be entered on death certificates.

Flags and colors carried by Minnesota troops in time of war are preserved.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

The soldiers' home board is authorized to extend relief outside the home to soldiers' widows, deserted wives, children, or parents.

Direct relief is extended disabled veterans and their families.

Emergency relief may be extended from soldiers' welfare fund to veterans and their families.

Two million five hundred thousand dollars has been appropriated for relief and assistance to World War II veterans.

Villages extend aid to veterans.

TAX EXEMPTIONS; EXEMPTION FROM LICENSE FEES, RENEWALS, ETC.

Hunting and fishing privileges are extended to those in military service.

Gifts to or for the use of veterans' organizations are exempt from the gift tax.

The first $2,000 received as military compensation is exempt from the State income tax. This is applicable to taxable year 1942 and subsequent taxable years, but not beyond 2 years after cessation of hostilities. Time has been extended for filing returns. Mustering-out pay is exempt.

Drivers' licenses are continued in effect without renewal until 60 days after discharge from military service.

Motor vehicles are exempt from taxation during military service of the owner and may be operated by him while on furlough or leave.

Operation of foreign motor vehicles by soldiers and sailors while in active service is permitted.

Chauffeur's license may be renewed without payment of fee.

Veterans are exempt from peddler's license fee.

Servicemen are exempt from renewal requirements and from payment of renewal fees on professional and occupational licenses while in the service and for 6 months thereafter.

Watchmakers are exempt from examination upon application for certificate within 1 year after discharge from military service.

Homestead exemption is granted to members of the armed forces.

Householder enjoys preservation of status in relation to exemption of personal property during service in World War II and for 6 months thereafter.

Protection is extended to persons in the military service owning lands on which time of redemption from delinquent taxes has expired.

Tax-forfeited lands may be sold to veterans of World War II.

Stay of proceedings is granted for the enforcement of delinquent taxes on real estate during military service, effective until May 15, 1945, or for 6 months after peace is declared.

TRANSPORTATION PRIVILEGES

Common carriers may provide free transportation to inmates of soldiers' homes.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Corporate rights have been granted for the formation of corporations of veterans.

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is declared a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 60 days, or a fine not to exceed $50, or both.

Quarters are available in the State Capitol or other State office buildings for the American Legion and certain other veteran organizations.

County appropriations are made for the observance of Memorial Day through veterans' organizations.

Veterans' headquarters in the State Capitol are to be used for the deposit of their records, relics etc., for safekeeping.

Annual appropriations are made for the use of the DAV and VFW to assist veterans and their dependents with Federal claims.

The adjutant general may issue to any camp of the military organization known as the Sons of Union Veterans and other organizations composed of veterans of any war, arms and accouterments owned by the State and not in use, bond for the safe return of such property to be given by some members of the organization.

Formed in 1920 and chartered by the Congress in 1932 to render service to, for, and by disabled veterans, the DAV has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled war veterans.

According to its congressional charter, active membership in the DAV can be secured only by those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of disease or disability incurred by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

Increasing numbers of World War II veterans are becoming active members of the DAV.

Having incurred a disability while serving with our armed forces during World War II, I am personally proud to be a member of this select outfit.

During its more than 28 years of constructive activities, the DAV has many times pressed for liberalizing legislation on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents, and for more liberal application of such laws by the Veterans' Administration, too numerous and too technical here to set forth.

DAV NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Its national headquarters, located at 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati 6, Ohio, takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper, containing information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The present national commander of the DAV is John L. Golob, of Hibbing, Minn., a severely wounded World War I veteran, who has had a broad background of experience in various local, State, and National DAV activities which qualify him to lead an organization composed exclusively of America's disabled war veterans.

Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-treasurer (business manager) of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is able assistant.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The national service headquarters of the DAV is now located in a beautiful building at 1701 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington 9, D. C., which was acquired by the organization in 1945.

In this Washington office are located the department of claims, headed by William E. Tate; the department on legislation, headed by Francis Sullivan, and the department of public relations and employment, headed by my good friend and fellow-Minnesotan, Millard W. Rice. As office manager and assistant national adjutant the headquarters are properly taken care of by John E. Feighner. All of these various departments are staffed by trained experts, all of whom are wounded or disabled war veterans.

EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

The DAV has adopted, on a Nation-wide basis, a man-job-matching method program to provide suitable, useful, gainful employment for all disabled veterans. Less than 7 percent of the Nation's 2,200,000 compensated war-disabled veterans are totally disabled. The remaining 93 percent are less than totally disabled and must, therefore, supplement their inadequate compensation payments with income from employment.

This scientific approach to a most distressing problem has produced some worth-while results thus far. The handicapped veteran's remaining abilities have been matched with the requirements of the job, rather than stressing his disabilities. It has been demonstrated by the employment record of such disabled veterans that they have a low absentee record, a law turn-over record, a low accident record, and a higher efficiency and production record. It has thus been proven that to hire disabled veterans is just plain, good business, bringing benefits directly to them, their dependents, their communities, their employers, and taxpayers generally.

STATE SET-UP

At the present time there are some 25 local chapters of the DAV in the State of Minnesota, with Walter L. Cairns, Stearns County Veterans' Information Bureau, corner Fourth Avenue and Second Street South, St. Cloud, Minn., as department commander.

Most of these chapters have volunteer or part-time service and employment officers. Membership dues approximate $5 annually.

The determination of the DAV to see to it that America's disabled veterans are adequately provided for should be generously supported, as a public investment in the future patriotism of our youth, and as practical patriotism, which brings huge humanitarian and financial dividends to every community, to every State, and to our country.

California in Review After a Century of American Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a lecture by Dr. Rockwell Dennis Hunt, as follows:

GOLD, THE IRRESISTIBLE MAGNET

(Fourth in a series of eight public Centennial Lectures, by Rockwell Dennis Hunt, Ph. D.)

Miss COOKE. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Dr. Hunt is going to discuss for us the topic, Gold, the Irresistible Magnet. [Applause.]

Dr. HUNT. It is always precarious for an historian to try to appraise and compare different historic events, and yet it seems to me to be the function, one of the chief functions, of the true historian to do that very

thing. I therefore would begin tonight by stating as my opinion that the Marshall discovery of gold in 1848 was probably the most far-reaching and significant historic event, if one should single out one happening, in the entire history of California. Reasons for that opinion would be easy to state but will appear from time to time during the course of the discussion.

We are very well aware of the fact, as it is a fact, that gold was known to be present in California long before 1848. There is no doubt in my mind that the Indians saw it but had no great use for it and did not think of it as anything specially precious; and it is quite possible, if not probable, that some of the padres of the Franciscan missions were acquainted with the fact that gold was present in California. But, there again, it was not startling. They did not develop the thought, nor did they explore for the purposes of finding quantities of gold. They could state that they were not here for commercial purposes in any event, but for the good of the Indians, for the conversion of their souls, and civilizing the native peoples. Some have said that they believed that Jedediah Smith discovered gold. There is no good authority that I know of to substantiate that thought or claim, but there is a report, or at least a rumor, to the effect that gold had been discovered in the year 1828. Then 2 or 3 years later there was another report about gold, nothing startling.

But when we come to 1842, there is undoubtedly authority for the statement that gold was discovered in appreciable quantities; first, of course, discovered; then produced to the amount some think of approximately twenty-eight or thirty thousand dollars. Francisco Lopez was the discoverer and the place was San Francisco Canyon, not very far from the town of Newhall in southern California, and only about 40 miles from the city of Los Angeles. That is a well-authenticated discovery of gold. Following that for the first time a considerable quantity of gold was sent to the mint in Philadelphia for the purpose of coining. Probably there might have been as much as thirty-five to thirty-eight thousand dollars worth of gold mined as a result of the discovery of Lopez, who seemed to have been out looking for a horse that he had lost. When he stopped to rest and started digging up a few wild onions with his pocketknife, he noticed the glittering material, particles of it attached to the dirt and the roots of these wild onions, which proved to be gold. The interest in that discovery had waned after a comparatively short time and did not amount to a great deal, and certainly did not start any great mania, although it did start up a considerable, temporary interest. It was one of the leading American settlers, Abel Stearns, who is said to have sent the gold to Philadelphia. That is an interesting event, but not spectacular, not significant compared to what occurred several years later.

Marshall's discovery is rather well-authenticated for the date of the 24th of January, 1848, although I would not go so far as to say that there is not even a shadow of doubt as to the correctness of that date. He, himself, as he remembered it some years afterwards, thought it was on the 19th or somewhere between the 18th and 20th of January; but the point I make here is that this discovery by Marshall was not like these earlier discoveries, or earlier knowledge, of the presence of gold. This was the beginning of something that did not end and while the others were like striking a match in the dark—the match went out and there was nothing there but darkness again—it was far different in the case of Marshall's discovery. When Marshall discovered gold he lit a torch that started a great conflagration that became world-encircling, and really changed the current of history. It was an epic in the annals of mankind. That makes it stand out entirely different in its significance from the earlier discoveries by Lopez and any others.

Now the place where gold was discovered by Marshall is also quite well authenticated. Many of us have been up to Coloma within very recent weeks, and have been permitted to look upon the whole area where historic research has been done and where archaeological excavations have been made to locate the exact corner, site, and dimensions of Sutter's Mill, and also, as nearly as possible, to locate the exact spot where the first flakes of gold were found by Mr. Marshall. The date, the place, and the significance of the event are now well authenticated. As to that I can read you a brief statement from Marshall, himself, which will be illustrative of his view of what had happened:

"While we were in the habit at night of turning the water through the tail race we had dug for the purpose of widening and deepening the race, I used to go down in the morning to see what had been done by the water through the night, and about half-past 7 o'clock on or about the 19th of January—I am not quite certain to a day but it was between the 18th and 20th of that month, 1848, I went down as usual, and after shutting off the water from the race, I stepped into it, near the lower end, and there upon the rock about 6 inches beneath the surface of the water I discovered the gold. I was entirely alone at the time. I picked up one or two pieces and examined them attentively; and having some general knowledge of minerals I could not call to mind more than two which in any way resembled this—Sulphuret of iron, very bright and brittle; and gold, bright yet malleable. I then tried it between two rocks, and found that it could be beaten into a different shape, but not broken. I then collected four or five pieces and went up to Mr. Scott with the pieces in my hand, and said, 'I have found it.' 'What is it?' inquired Scott. 'Gold,' I answered. 'Oh, no!' returned Scott, 'that can't be.' I replied positively, 'I know it can be nothing else.' Mr. Scott was the second person who saw the gold. W. J. Johnston, A. Stephens, H. Bigler, and J. Brown were then called up to see it. Peter L. Wimmer, Mrs. Jane Wimmer, C. Bennet, and J. Smith were at the house. E. Parsons and John Wimmer, a son of P. L. Wimmer, were out hunting oxen at the same time. About 10 o'clock the same morning, P. L. Wimmer came down from the house and was very much surprised at the discovery when the metal was shown him, and which he took home to show his wife, who, the next day made some experiments upon it by boiling it in strong lye, and saleratus, and Mr. Bennet by my directions beat it very thin."

That is a good part of the statement by Mr. Marshall, when he depended upon his memory after a lapse of a number of years.

Now you are familiar with the fact that after Marshall reported to Sutter, both he and Sutter desired to keep the matter a secret. They were anxious to complete the mill and go forward with the work, and he had promised some of the men if they kept the matter secret for a while, keeping their eyes open in the meantime while at work, then they might spend a week or two searching for gold after they got the mill completed. Well, the secret was entrusted to just a few too many to share, and the secret did not keep very long.

It is not necessary to try to trace all of the steps by which this secret got out, but it got out, and the big booster for the mania, for the excitement that followed, was Sam Brannan.

Sam Brannan, one of the most energetic of all the early pioneers, who was interested at Sacramento and also in San Francisco and was a very enterprising man—and by the way the first California millionaire—when assured of this and had it verified, obtained a small quinine bottle, I think it was, of the dust, or small nuggets and gold dust, and strode down the main street of San Francisco full tilt, full of excitement, and said something like this: "Whoa there, everybody: Look here! Gold; gold; gold; gold from the American River!" waving that bottle in one hand and perhaps his hat in the other; and that was what really started the gold fever excitement. How that affected the people is as well illustrated probably in the book I hold in my hand as any other. This is Three Years in California by Reverend Walter Colton. Let me read just a few extracts from his writing, which was kept almost in the form of a day-by-day diary.

"Monday, May 29, 1848: Our town (Monterey) was startled out of its quiet dreams today, by the announcement that gold had been discovered on the American Fork. The men wondered and talked, and the women, too; but neither believed. The sibyls were less skeptical; they said the moon had, for several nights, appeared not more than a cable's length from the earth; that a white raven had been seen playing with an infant; and that an owl had rung the church bells.

* * * * *

"Monday, June 5: Another report reached us this morning from the American Fork. The rumor ran, that several workmen, while excavating for a millrace, had thrown up little shining scales of a yellow ore, that proved to be gold; that an old Sonomian, who spent his life in gold mines, pronounced it the genuine thing. Still the public incredulity remained, save here and there a glimmer of faith, like the flash of a fire-fly at night.

* * * * *

"Tuesday, June 6: Being troubled with the golden dream almost as much as the good lady, I determined to put an end to the suspense, and dispatched a messenger this morning to the American Fork. He will have to ride, going and returning, some 400 miles, but his report will be reliable. We shall then know whether this gold is a fact or a fiction—a tangible reality on the earth, or a fanciful treasure at the base of some rainbow, retreating over hill and waterfall, to lure pursuit and disappoint hope.

* * * * *

"Monday, June 12: A straggler came in today from the American Fork, bringing a piece of yellow ore weighing an ounce. The young dashed the dirt from their eyes, and the old from their spectacles. One brought a spyglass, another an iron ladle; some wanted to melt it, others to hammer it, and a few were satisfied with smelting it. All were full of tests; and many, who could not be gratified in making their experiments, declared it a humbug.

* * * * *

"Tuesday, June 20: My messenger sent to the mines, has returned with specimens of the gold; he dismounted in a sea of upturned faces. As he drew forth the yellow lumps from his pockets, and passed them around among the eager crowd, the doubts, which had lingered till now, fled. All admitted they were gold, except one old man, who still persisted they were Yankee invention, got up to reconcile the people to the change of flag. The excitement produced was intense; and many were soon busy in their hasty preparations for a departure to the mines. The family who had kept house for me caught the moving infection. Husband and wife were both packing up; the blacksmith dropped his hammer, the carpenter his plans, the mason his trowel, the farmer his sickle, the baker his loaf, and the tapster his bottle. All were off for the mines, some on horses, some on carts, and some on crutches, and one went in a letter. An American woman, who had recently established a boarding house here, pulled up stakes, and was off before her

lodgers had even time to pay their bills. Debtors ran, of course."

And so the story continues. Walter Colton, you will remember, was the first American alcalde in California with headquarters at Monterey, very reliable and honorable, and one of the most distinguished and reputable pioneers of those times. Going a little bit further into this same subject, there was the first report of the gold discovery in a California paper, published in the first paper of California, namely, the Californian. That was the 15th of March 1848, and in that short publication, not sensational at all, the Californian, you might say, scooped the other paper, which was controlled by Sam Brannan—the California Star—which was the second newspaper to appear in the Territory of California. Those items are of interest, but perhaps not of as much interest as what followed almost immediately, after a reasonable lapse to be sure, in an eastern paper.

The first eastern paper in New York that published a statement regarding gold in California was the New York Herald. That report was taken almost bodily from the issue of the California Star of April, which preceded. But when the New York papers—first the Herald and then others—began to take it up there was no longer any question about the excitement, both in the East and in California itself. So as the news spread from place to place, like all such stories, it was likely to be greatly magnified. One story put it this way: "A grain of gold taken from the mines became a pennyweight at Panama, an ounce in New York and Boston, and a pound nugget in London." So California becomes El Dorado—the land of El Dorado—and the motto, "Eureka, Eureka. I have found it," becomes extremely applicable to the Territory soon to be the State of California.

Now, before the end of that year, 1848, there were probably at least 5,000 persons mining for gold and a considerable amount of gold had been produced, and yet the great mass migration into California had not really begun. All of this takes time. One of the subjects to keep in mind constantly is long delays and difficulties of travel, transportation, and communication. So there was great preparation for coming to California during the late autumn and the winter of 1848–49, but not many had arrived yet. The first steamer to arrive in California through the Golden Gate with an overload of passengers—gold hunters—was the *California* and the second was the *Oregon*. The California arrived February 28, 1849, being the first Pacific mail steamer to come into San Francisco Bay. The *Oregon* arrived on the last day of March, the same year. Both steamers were badly overloaded with their crowds of passengers. What happened then? This began the memorable migration to California.

In the migration, as we well know now, there were three main routes in general: First, around the Horn; second, across the Isthmus, by which we mean Panama; third, overland across the plains. So the various means of transportation were employed, most distinguished of which by water were the clipper ships, and then the early steamers, and the most memorable to come across the plains being what we know as the covered wagon, or prairie schooner. They began to come. It is rather interesting to glance at some of the reports given in the early papers that were spread in the East. These reports in some of the papers told of the preparations that were being made, and of the crowded conditions, and of the general state of excitement that prevailed during that fall and winter, 1848–49.

If I may, I will take just a moment and refer to two or three of these reports. Here I have a quotation from the New Orleans Picayune of December 19, 1848, which, in part, reads:

"The noble steamship *Falcon*, Captain Thompson, left her berth at Lafayette a little after 5 o'clock last evening and passed down the river in splendid style, bearing away with her on her trip to Chagres, Gen. P. F. Smith and several other officers, in all over 200 passengers, bound for the wilds of California, and reveling in golden visions, which they expect to realize in that distant region. The *Falcon* being the pioneer steamer in the route to Chagres, her departure created considerable interest, and a crowd of from 300 to 500 people thronged her wharf until the last plank was hauled in and she swung into the stream. A large portion of the crowd came to bid good-bye to friends who were to leave, and the rest were drawn thither partly by curiosity and partly to give an encouraging cheer to the adventurers. The scene on board just before the steamer left the wharf was one of much interest, and a striking commentary on the enterprise and impetuosity of American character. California was talked of as though it was but a day's sail from the Balize; and from the manner in which friends parted, one would have supposed that they expected to meet again in a week at furthest. We could not but remark that the passengers almost to a man seemed to be of the better classes in society, and in circumstances which would by no means drive them to start on a desperate adventure. All seemed full of hope and anxious to be on their way, and on looking at them we felt assured that with such inhabitants California must go ahead. We noticed that the most extensive preparations had been made on board to accommodate the passengers in the most comfortable manner; and from the numerous suspicious-looking black bottles and little boxes we saw going on board, we judged that a liberal supply of the good things of life had been privately laid in. The *Falcon* had on board about 350 tons of freight and 600 tons of coal, being calculated to last her on the return trip. With favorable circumstances it is expected that the trip to California will not occupy more than 20 days, and we trust that we shall soon hear that our adventurous friends are all making their fortunes."

One other brief quotation, and that will suffice. This comes from a Monterey correspondent to the New Journal of Commerce, New York, and is partly as follows:

"At present the people are running over the country and picking the gold out of the earth here and there, just like 1,000 hogs let loose in a forest would root up groundnuts. Some get 8 and 10 ounces a day, and the least active 1 or 2. They make the most who employ wild Indians to hunt for them. There is one man who has 60 Indians in his employ. His profits are a dollar a minute. The wild Indians know nothing of its value and wonder what the pale faces want to do with it; they will give an ounce of it for the same weight of coined silver, or a thimbleful of glass beads, or a glass of grog. And white men themselves often give an ounce of it, which is worth at our Mint $18 or more, for a bottle of brandy, a box of soda crackers, or a plug of tobacco. As to the quantity which the diggers get, take a few facts as evidence. I know seven men who worked 7 weeks and 2 days, Sundays excepted, on Feather River. They employed on an average 50 Indians and got out of these 7 weeks and 2 days 275 pounds of pure gold. I know the men and have seen the gold. So stick a pin there. I know 10 other men who worked 10 days in company, employed no Indians, and averaged in those 10 days $1,500 each. So stick another pin there. I know another man who got out of a basin in a rock not larger than a washbowl 2½ pounds of gold in 15 minutes. So stick another pin there. No one of these statements would I believe if I did not know the men personally, and know them to be plain matter-of-fact men—who open a vein of gold as coolly as you would a potato hill."

The men of 1848 for the most part were those who had been in California for a greater or less length of time. They were honest, industrious, and many of them men of sobriety. Nothing very startling about them—that part of the migration. Almost all of them were good, honest men. There were very few white women among them. But when 1849 came and people began to flock into California from all directions, we then witness the coming of a great heterogeneous mass of people, not only from the United States but from various other countries. Some were Englishmen, some were Germans, some were Frenchmen, a good many were Chileans or South Americans, some were from Australia, and a great many were Mexicans coming over from Sonora. Thus it was sort of a cosmopolitan crowd, and it was inevitable—even though many of those men were honest, industrious, and upright—that a good many who would come would be those whom we would call bad whites and who would seek to reap where they had not sown and to gather and exploit the labors of the other people. You would hardly expect it to be otherwise. It was a stampede, and it was largely American, but by no means altogether American.

Going back then and referring to the routes I mentioned, the one around the Horn had its perils and many argonauts lost their lives; dangers were encountered, especially in the south. Coming across the Isthmus had more dangers from the standpoint of the health conditions because in many instances, I dare say in most instances, in the years 1849, 1850, and 1851, the pioneers had to wait anywhere from 2 to 4 or 5 or more weeks on the Isthmus before being able to find a vessel to carry them on to San Francisco, and you could well imagine the conditions that prevailed on the Isthmus during that time. A mass of people together without any home accommodations, without any houses practically to live in, without any sanitation of any kind, without any medical services or hospitals, meant that many gave up their lives there. As a moment's digression, I may report to you my own father came by that route across the Isthmus in the year 1850 and had that experience of waiting 3 weeks on the Isthmus. Usually a miner or gold hunter had a partner. My father had a partner whose name was Alonzo Hamilton. Hamilton took sick, having got the fever. It might have been cholera; it might have been malaria, or some other form of fever that was prevalent among many of the passengers; but Hamilton became very sick. My father went in to him one day, while trying to take care of him, and said, "Lon, you are a pretty sick man; maybe you would like to go back home. If you would, just say so and I will turn around and take you back to New York." What did Alonzo Hamilton say? He said, "If I can live to get back to New York, I can live to get to San Francisco—we are going to California." Both my father and Alonzo Hamilton came to California and both lived to be well beyond 90 years of age. It makes it a little more graphic, I think, to mention an actual case that comes within one's own knowledge.

During that year, 1849, there was a total estimated at least of 35,000 who came by sea to San Francisco. Of those 35,000, some 23,000 were Americans. The other great means or route for coming into California was across the great western desert, across the Plains, by means of the prairie schooner. By that method there were also difficulties, dangers, and all manner of experiences, not all, however, of the sordid character, not all grievous, because many of those parties had a jolly time, especially the young people, the children, who were well cared for in coming across the Plains in those staunchly built covered wagons, or prairie schooners. That year there were 42,000 who came overland

into California, as nearly as we could estimate them, and of the 42,000 coming across the Plains, 33,000 were Americans. Thus it is plain to see that the predominant influence and the great dominating factor in the population of these immigrants to California, both by sea and by land, were Americans, though not free by any means from a foreign element, some of which was very undesirable, even as some among the Americans were undesirable. California then by the end of the year 1849 had a population quite surely of 100,000 more or less—perhaps more. The census for 1850 gives less than that by several thousand, but everyone knows the census is very inaccurate and incomplete. Under the circumstances it could not be otherwise. There certainly were more than 100,000 people in California, excluding the wild Indians, in that central year, 1850. I shall not go further into the details of the trip to California either by land or by sea. It is a very familiar story to us and need not be repeated here.

It is unnecessary to spend a great deal of time in trying to describe the mining methods that were used, but I may review a few of the terms, that are quite familiar. We speak of a claim and mean a parcel of land that is owned or claimed or possessed by a miner. We speak of pay dirt, meaning that which contains gold in paying quantities. It would pay to work that and get the gold out of it. We speak of "dry diggin's," or "diggin's." They never sound the "g" as a rule among the early miners. Dry diggings were found in the flats or the gullies where there was not any water supply, and thus they were called "dry." The wet diggings were in the river beds or along the sand bars. A bar, referring to the sand bar in the river, is made by the deposit of sand, and sometimes mud, around the bends of the river, and there are many places called bars because of that fact. Then there was a term used by the Mexicans for an implement which takes the place of the pan to a large extent, and some of them imagined they had to have this in order to get the gold; that is the batea. Probably one great reason why John Bidwell did not become the discoverer of gold was because his Mexican friend said, "We have to have a batea, in order to get the gold." They did not have any bateas then, so the matter was postponed. After the postponement took place, Marshall's discovery had occurred. Then there was the arrastra. The arrastra was simply a crude device, hand-made, for the crushing of the ore, using mule or ox power to pound the ore, and thus make it possible to gather the gold from this ore instead of losing it as otherwise might happen.

There were a great many different implements used, but all of the miners practically at the first were amateurs. They knew very little about mining from any scientific point of view. But there was a standard list of things that soon became of use: a butcher knife or knife of some kind; the pick and the shovel; the pan; and then, if they could get one and carry it along, would be the crowbar, and, of course, they early developed what is known as the cradle, which you know about, and the elongated implement called the long tom, and they developed the flume and other implements that were all simple in character and enabled them to garner in the gold for the most part, although none of the simple methods succeeded in getting the entire amount of gold.

There were no flumes, and the water supply was extremely important and had to be there, and the work was very difficult. There was the broiling sun during the hot days of the summer and the autumn, and often the miners were standing knee-deep in cold water while at work. After they worked during the day, hard work that a weakling could not stand up under, they had no home comforts, for the most part, and they went to the crude cabins, if they were lucky enough to have a cabin, and had to prepare their own meals. The diet was extremely limited and very poor. Sometimes the diet was "beans for breakfast, beans for dinner, and beans for supper," and that illustrates the very limited kind of diet they had. They would need their big boots and flannel shirts and some kind of big hat, or sombrero.

There they were, working away, but prospectors were amongst them all the time, and a prospector was on the go. He wanted to find something better. If he heard of a "strike" over there 10 miles or 30 miles away, more than likely he would give up his present claim and strike out for the new claim as a prospector. There was prospecting over the ground everywhere, so that there was scarcely a foot of the ground in much of the mining regions that has not been worked over by prospectors long, long ago. That is just a partial picture of that situation.

As to a miner's life, much might be said. I would like to refer to the other book I brought with me tonight for a quotation or two on that general subject. As to the character of the miner, it is hard to make a generalization. There were those who were as truthful and upright as any could be; others who were shiftless. There was constant gambling in the camps and in the towns. There was entertainment of the questionable sort, and every kind of inducement. Being so far away from home and away from the homeward stretch, many used their leisure time in a very dissipating manner. It was said by someone that when they crossed the Missouri River, California bound, the people left their morals behind them, which, of course, is not exactly accurate.

This book of Bayard Taylor is called Travels. He is also the author of the book containing much of the same materials—El Dorado. I quote: "Abundance of gold does not always beget, as moralists tell us, a grasping and avaricious spirit. The principles of hospitality were as faithfully observed in the rude tents of the diggers as they could be by the thrifty farmers of the North and West. The cosmopolitan cast of society in California, resulting from the commingling of so many races and the primitive mode of life, gave a character of good fellowship to all its members; and in no part of the world have I ever seen help more freely given to the needy, or more ready cooperation in any humane proposition. Personally, I can safely say that I never met with such unvarying kindness from comparative strangers." And that is the way the camp visited by Bayard Taylor impressed him.

Here is another quotation from the same author, about society in California: "The direct effect of the state of things growing out of the discovery of the placers, was to develop new qualities and traits of character, not in single individuals, but in every individual of the entire community—traits frequently most unlooked-for in those who exhibited them in the most marked degree. Society, therefore, was for the time cast into new forms, or rather, deprived of any fixed form. A man, on coming to California, could no more expect to retain his old nature unchanged, than he could retain in his lungs the air he had inhaled on the Atlantic shore."

The miners had their recreation, some of it very high and ennobling; some of it quite the reverse. Perhaps there were more saloons in a mining town or camp than any other kind of buildings. It came to be sort of proverbial that all of the miners were heavy drinkers. That, of course, is not the case. Quite early in the mining days there was distinct evidence of attempted reform and there were those, as early as 1849 and 1850, who, as Christian missionaries and preachers went into those camps, and while they were sometimes treated in a gruff manner, they were well-supported and they were well-respected in general. Some interesting stories were told along that line about some of the pioneer preachers.

Then there developed among the diggers a sort of order. A good deal of the law of California has developed from regulations that were formed by the miners themselves. They were practically a law unto themselves in many of the camps. They would hold their meetings; they would make their decisions, and they would execute their judgments with very little delay. The camps had a degree of uniformity in the administration of justice. It was not perfect in quality. Later there came to be what we call vigilance committees, not only in San Francisco but in many of the mining towns. Struggle for law and order was there. Many a person has written down his impression to the effect there was no more stealing, no more vice, no more crime committed in many of those mining camps than anywhere else; but there was a good reason in addition to the fact that the men were of the right type. The other reason was that justice was swift and sure. Then they developed what was known as the Miners' Ten Commandments. I have a copy of the Miners' Ten Commandments here, which would be too long to read, but which suggests something of great interest and present a timely document. The first commandment is a brief one: "Thou shalt have no other claim than one." And the last, or tenth commandment, reads in part: "Thou shalt not commit unsuitable matrimony, nor covet single blessedness; nor forget absent maidens; nor neglect thy first love; but thou shalt consider how faithfully and patiently she awaiteth thy return * * *." And at the end, "A new commandment give I unto thee—if thou hast a wife and little ones, that thou lovest dearer than thy life, that thou keep them continually before thee, to cheer and urge thee onward until thou canst say, 'I have enough—God bless them—I will return.' Then as thou journeyest toward thy much-loved home, with open arms shall they come forth to welcome thee, and falling upon thy neck weep tears of unutterable joy that thou art come; then in the fullness of thy heart's gratitude, thou shalt kneel together before thy Heavenly Father, to thank Him for thy safe return. Amen." That is the last of the 10 commandments of the miners.

Another document that is of some interest, and not perhaps very generally known, is this: The Idle and Industrious Miner, a copy of which I hold, containing illustrations or cartoons by the ablest painter of the mining day, Charles Nahl, and written in the form of verse, or so-called poetry. It makes an interesting document and it is sort of a moral warning for the miners to keep the moral code and not go astray in any manner. It tells the story of the idle and industrious miner and begins like this:

"Two schoolboy friends, with buoyant hearts,
And grown to man's estate,
Repaired to California's shores,
To fill their cup of fate;
Endowed with noble gifts of mind,
And vigorous in health,
Their future seemed a harvest-field,
Abundant in its wealth,
Lured by a hope of rapid gain,
The mines at once they sought,
Contented with a cabin home,
In a secluded spot;
Their start in life was equal, and
At first the race was fair,
But soon resembled that between
The Tortoise and the Hare."

And it proceeds step by step to show the grief and the misery of the one who went downhill, and the progress and uplift of the man who was called the industrious, sober miner. It is an interesting document in itself and not as widely known as it deserves to be.

I will hasten rapidly to a close; but first, give you an idea of the amount of gold that was produced. These figures are taken from the report of the State mineralogist of California.

1848: $245,301 reported (but the actual amount was more like $10,000,000 if we had the official figures).

1849: $10,150,000 in round figures.

1850: $41,273,000.

1851: $75,938,000. (See how it is on the crescendo each year more than the preceding one during those times).

1852: It reaches the peak of production, $81,294,700 reported.

Then some decline and the decline is for more or less obvious reasons, just about that time and a little later. Then the year 1939, after so long a time, proved to be the highest for many years in the production of gold, something like $50,000,000 in gold having been produced that year.

One of the reasons for the decline in the amount of gold, of course, was the wearing out of the placers and the using up of the surface gold; and simple methods no longer obtained; they would no longer bring success. This early panning out of gold from the placers, from the gravels, and the creek beds, etc., came to an end. Simple methods could no longer suffice. Beginning in 1850 there was the quartz mining. Nevada City opened the first quartz mine and has been prominent in that field ever since. That called for a larger kind of operation, more capital, heavier machinery, so that the small miner who could go from place to place and pan out some gold had no part or lot in the large-scale production of gold in the quartz mill.

Later came the hydraulic mining. The hydraulic mining is extremely interesting in itself, and there again in the vicinity of Grass Valley and Nevada City are great hillsides, mountains, you might say, that have been opened up and washed away by the terrific force of water from the nozzles in the hydraulic mining. Sometimes a nozzle would be anywhere from 4 to 9 inches in diameter and would send a stream out at tremendous velocity which would bring down the boulders, and gravel, and dirt all together. That brought a great story in the history of mining and in the history of agriculture in California.

Briefly that means that the streams began being choked up. The larger boulders did not go so far; the smaller rocks were carried farther; and the sand and silt went on and on, forming debris, and then the "slickens," and went on down in the river and began to clog up the rivers, especially the Sacramento River, and to some extent the San Joaquin River, and thus presenting a great problem, destroying navigation for larger vessels for many miles. That navigation has never been resumed to this day by the steamers that used to ply up and down the rivers.

The result of that was tremendous opposition, which is a big story by itself, bringing opposition from the standpoint of the farmers, because it brought floods and poured this great mass of debris, or slickens, over their holdings and created havoc. I can easily remember, and many of you can remember, some of that actual experience. And then there was long litigation, and complex problems. The result of that was hydraulic mining was forbidden in those streams that were navigable, where it was a menace to navigation; and thus there came the dredging of the Sacramento and the other rivers, but there have never been restored the fine river beds that were found in the early days. The hydraulic mining had been called to a halt in most of the locations of the State, but far up in Trinity County and Siskiyou County, where the menace did not occur, and where the streams were not navigable, there still continues at certain points a considerable amount of hydraulic mining.

Then last of all came the great mining process of the dredger. Just to mention it is sufficient. Thousands of acres have been devastated by these huge dredgers, and thousands of acres have been made unusable probably for generations to come. There again some restrictions have been placed. Large damage, however, has been done, although a great deal of gold has been produced, because even at 10 or 12 cents per cubic yard gold can be made a paying product by these huge behemoths of mining operations.

Thus we come to this end: Mining gold, the great irresistible magnet in California. It has drawn people from the ends of the earth and it started California on its career as a populous State, and it is responsible for so much by its implications that we say now that this has been the most important single event in the history of the State of California. There are many of the references that might easily be given that will verify that particular statement.

I close by calling your attention to The Poet of the Sierras. The days of '49 are really the culmination of all the history of California up to that time—not the founding of the missions; not the founding of the pueblo; not the life at the ranch—all interesting and romantic as they are—but here comes the real culmination in the days of 1849. And we have those pictures immortalized by Joaquin Miller, who sometimes played the part as a prophet as well as a poet. Here are a few lines that I quote from him to indicate what he saw in the future:

"Dared I but say a prophecy,
As sang the holy men of old,
Of rock-built cities yet to be
Along these shining shores of gold,
Crowding athirst into the sea,
What wondrous marvels might be told!
Enough to know that empire here
Shall burn her loftiest, brightest star;
Here art and eloquence shall reign;
As o'er the wolf-reared realm of old;
Here learn'd and famous from afar,
To pay their noble court shall come,
And shall not seek or see in vain,
But look on all with wonder dumb."

And so I would suggest we honor these "bricks," as he called them, these men of '49, these men of gold, and with Mr. A. J. Waterhouse say:

"I have no words to speak their praise.
Theirs was the deed; the guerdon ours.
The wilderness and weary days
Were theirs alone; for us the flowers."

[Applause.]

Must Remedy UN Defects or Abandon It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article written by me entitled "Must Remedy UN Defects or Abandon It." This appeared in the New Hampshire Sunday News, Sunday, May 9, 1948, which is published in Manchester, N. H. The article follows:

MUST REMEDY UN DEFECTS OR ABANDON IT, MERROW ASSERTS—NEED AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION WHICH WILL NOT BE BLOCKED BY STUBBORN SOVIETS

(By Representative CHESTER E. MERROW)

In a speech on bipartisan foreign policy delivered in the House of Representatives on April 1, 1948, I stated that both the Republicans and the Democrats should adopt platforms at their national conventions including identical principles on United States foreign policy. In reference to the United Nations I said that the United States must continue to exercise leadership in the establishment of a real, workable, and effective world organization. The defects of the UN, chief of which is the veto, must be removed. If this cannot be accomplished and if the Kremlin continues in its refusal to cooperate, we must abandon the UN and form at once a new international organization of liberty-loving democratic states without the presence of the impeding Soviet Union.

Each crisis that confronts the United Nations emphasizes anew certain fundamental defects in this organization as it is now constituted. At the inception of the UN, people everywhere, eager to endorse the new organization, overlooked the weaknesses of concept and the weakness of structure in the Charter. At that time the world was just emerging from a terrible conflict. The nations grasped avidly at any promise of an enduring peace. In addition an excessive optimism existed. Overenthusiastic supporters of the United Nations fed the universal yearning for peace with glib assurances that in some mysterious and miraculous manner the organization could prevent future wars.

The illusion that the UN is capable of preventing future wars has now been destroyed. The constantly increasing deterioration of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union has clearly demonstrated that the present machinery of the United Nations does not and cannot ensure automatically the permanent peace of the world.

DEEPENING SPLIT

The deepening fissures between the United States and Russia, which the United Nations has been utterly powerless to bridge, compel us to make a searching reexamination of the United Nations Charter. Its conceptual and structural defects must be brought out for a full and frank consideration by the world. Past failures must be carefully analyzed with a view to preventing their repetition. Essential changes in the structure of the organization must be made before the present drift toward war becomes irresistible.

The helplessness of the UN in the present international crisis stems from the fact that the organization was conceived more as an instrument to preserve peace than to create peace. The assumption was that Russia could live in harmony with the other victorious powers. In the absence of accord among the wartime allies, the function of the United Nations is reduced to simply the examination of the long-range economic, social, and philosophical problems of peace. The UN provides a forum for the free expression of vituperative utterances. Andrei Gromyko incessantly employs the UN day in and day out to utter blasts against the United States.

As it is now constituted, the United Nations has a much more elaborate and scientific organization than the old League of Nations, but it is certainly no better able to preserve the peace. It is not a world government enforcing world law.

The great powers do not yield the slightest irrevocable measure of their sovereignty by adherence to the Charter. UN certainly cannot coerce them into the ways of peace. The organization could conceivably function effectively if there existed harmony among

the Big Five on every major world question. Such a condition has not existed and by the very nature of human affairs will not exist. The Un fails miserably since the Big Five seriously disagree on all issues of major importance.

COUNCIL VETO

Primarily responsible for the ineffectiveness of the UN is the right of veto held by the great powers in the Security Council. The decisions of the General Assembly have only the force of recommendations. Consequently they are not binding on any member state. It is significant, and it should be emphasized that positive action on the great majority of important political issues which have come before the United Nations has been blocked either by the use of the veto or by the ignoring of a recommendation by the General Assembly.

The Russians have invoked the veto power 23 times, and the French twice. The Soviets have written an unparalleled record of obstruction in the UN. The reasons have varied. At times an almost facetious quibbling over the wording of a proposal has been responsible. More seriously, the Soviet Union has used the right of veto to conceal the illegal actions of its satellites in the Balkans. For political reasons Moscow has repeatedly blocked the admission of certain states to the UN. Austria and Finland have each been rebuffed once. On two occasions, the Soviet has prevented the admission of Transjordan, Ireland, and Portugal. In the case of Italy, the Soviet veto has been cast three times.

The crippling effect of the indiscriminate use of the veto power is seen most clearly in the case of Greece. Following a complaint by Greece in 1946 that the Communist-led guerrillas of Greece were receiving aid from Bulgaria, Albania, and Yugoslavia, the Security Council sent a commission into the Balkans to investigate and make an examination of the situation. When this commission, after an exhaustive probe, reported to the Security Council in May 1947, it was found that the three Soviet satellites had aided and abetted the rebellion in Greece.

To deal with the dangerous situation on the Greek border, the United States tried to obtain decisive action through the Security Council.

The Soviet Union vetoed an American resolution in July 1947. Another American resolution was vetoed in August 1947, and still another introduced by Australia met the same fate in the same month. The Soviet veto completely stymied enforcement of peace on the Greek border by the Security Council.

In the fall of 1947 the Greek case was placed before the General Assembly. Although another investigating committee was established in the Balkans, it has been handicapped by the limited authority which the General Assembly could bestow upon it. The commission has not had the cooperation of the Soviet Union or its satellites.

UNITED STATES FORCED TO ACT

The United States had to come to the economic and military rescue of the Greeks whom the United Nations could not assist. Through the Greek-Turkish bill which became law May 22, 1947, action was taken to prevent Greece falling to a combination of internal conspiracy with the external pressure of international brigands.

It soon became clearly evident that any effort on the part of the Security Council to establish peace and security not only in Greece but in various other trouble spots of the world would be jeopardized at the outset by the Soviet veto. The Russians have clearly demonstrated that they are not interested in peace or stability but only in fomenting those conditions of unrest and chaos which are necessary to the growth and spread of communism.

Checked by the Soviet veto in the Council, the western powers have turned increasingly to the General Assembly, where the majority rule prevails, in an attempt to get action on pressing issues. But despite the marshalling of the moral opinion of the world in the General Assembly, it has produced no more tangible results than the Security Council. The Russians remain utterly impervious to all recommendations. In fact they frequently greet them with outright hostility.

As an example, the Korean case may be cited. For 2 years the United States sought agreement with Russia on the creation of an independent democratic and unified Korea. The Soviet Union refused to discuss any settlement which would not insure Communist domination of that most unfortunate country. Finally on September 17, 1947, Secretary Marshall called on the General Assembly to consider the problem. The body established a commission to make an on-the-spot investigation. The Soviet Union not only denounced this action in violent terms but promptly announced a boycott of the Commission.

The UN-Korean Commission was welcomed in the American occupation zone of southern Korea. It was permitted complete freedom in the conduct of an investigation in the American zone but was barred at the thirty-eighth parallel from entry into the Soviet-dominated north. On further recommendations of the Assembly it was decided to conduct elections in Korea preliminary to the establishment of representative government. These elections under UN supervision will be held in the American zone on May 10. There will be no elections in the Soviet zone. Once again the Russians have chosen to ignore a decision of the Assembly and there is nothing the UN can do about it.

GROWING DEMAND FOR REVISION

In view of the repeated demonstrations of the inability of the United Nations to deal with the present international crisis, it is little wonder that the reservoir of public confidence in the organization is now practically empty. Conversely, there is a growing demand on the part of the State Department, the Congress, and the American people for a change in the UN which will enable it to deal effectively with the problems of world peace.

The State Department recognized this demand when it proposed the establishment of the so-called "Little Assembly" and the limiting of the veto. The value of this suggestion is questionable. The Little Assembly has added no effective power to the UN, and it is a foregone conclusion that the Soviet Union by the use of the veto will block any amendment seeking to alter the veto.

Nevertheless, the demand for reorganization and change of the UN remains. It is reflected most sharply in the Congress. During the current sessions, at least 28 resolutions have already been offered in the House and 5 in the Senate with the objective of amending the charter and improving the ability of United Nations to maintain the peace. These measures have been sponsored by about 50 Members of Congress, and others have signified their approval.

The executive branch of the Government must respond to this growing sentiment. It must initiate the measures for establishing an effective world organization capable of preserving the peace. For years I have been stating that somehow we must in some manner develop an international organization with sufficient strength to prevent future conflicts and world conflagrations. Being firmly convinced that the nations should create such an organization, I have suggested that both parties should pledge themselves at their conventions to exercise leadership in establishing a real, workable, effective world union of nations. Here is a destiny-given opportunity for the United States to display effective leadership.

At last, those who are recognized as leaders in the development of foreign policy have been forced by the movement of events to give some consideration to changing the ineffective United Nations organizations. We must admit that the United Nations, the way it is presently constituted, cannot hope to be effective in settling world problems. If the Charter cannot be rewritten in the immediate future, we must form a new organization beginning with the 16 ERP countries and the nations who have formed the Western Military Union. Such a course of action will do more good to solve the present difficulty than any suggestion which has to date been offered concerning the UN.

MUST REMOVE BARRIERS

Measures for improving the UN and for developing a workable international organization should be proposed as changes in the United Nations Charter to eliminate the existing barriers to democratic action. Such an approach will demonstrate to the world that the United States harbors no desire to isolate any nation willing to live in cooperation and peace with its neighbors. If Russia insists upon employing the veto to block the imperative need for the reform of the UN, then we must collaborate with other peaceful democratic states, proceed to form at once either a regional organization under articles 52 and 53 of the Charter, or an entirely new world organization without Russia.

Whatever course we may choose in this matter, it is imperative that it be an American decision and not a party decision. It must be an all-Government position in which the Congress is fully consulted and not simply an Executive fiat.

In this period of continually deepening world crisis, it is essential that the United States reaffirm its bipartisan approach to foreign policy at the coming party conventions. Both parties should write identical planks on foreign policy so the world will know that this is a completely unified Republic demanding an effective world organization to create and maintain the peace.

Nat Finney—Minnesota's Pulitzer Prize Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MacKINNON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star of May 4, relating the circumstances under which Nat Finney was awarded the Pulitzer prize for distinguished national news reporting. It is significant that this award was granted for his courageous disclosure of the attempt by the Truman administration to impose peacetime secrecy rules on ordinary governmental activity. There is still a great amount of secrecy in governmental activity that needs disclosure. Nat Finney exposed the formal attempt to legalize secrecy, but the same evil persists on an individual departmental basis. Let us take off the wraps and let Congress and the American people know what their Government is doing. Even if the truth may hurt some governmental de-

partments, the American people have a right to know the facts. It is their Government. The editorial follows:

NAT FINNEY'S AWARD

Naturally these newspapers are proud that Nat Finney has been awarded the Pulitzer prize for distinguished national reporting. The new honor is for uncovering a plan for peacetime censorship, an accomplishment which previously won him the Raymond Clapper award.

Yet his colleagues are not surprised at these acknowledgments. Ever since Finney went to the Washington bureau from the newsroom of the Star, he has worked diligently and alertly at important assignments. He has shown a particular facility for taking involved subjects and turning them into understandable news stories. In freight rates, atomic energy, agricultural economics, and many other matters he keeps readers informed of new developments.

When President Truman, on behalf of the White House correspondents association, handed the Clapper award to Finney some weeks ago, the President remarked that the news writer had set up a straw man and knocked him down. But Finney's fellow correspondents—who know the national capital as well as anybody—recognize that he nipped in the bud a project to put peacetime censorship and news classification into effect. The Veterans' Administration already had issued a directive about the new policy, which had been prepared by the President's security advisory board.

Since Finney's disclosure, some proposals have been advanced for some kind of a voluntary plan of press and radio censorship. Every responsible newspaper and radio man agrees that information which would give essential technical aid to a potential enemy should be withheld. Obviously the details of atomic bomb development should not be published.

But it's pretty hard to make out a case for suppressing other Government news in peacetime. Perhaps potential enemies learn something from news stories. More important, so do our own people.

Officials who might act as censors in Washington would be inclined to cover up mistakes. Democracy may not be able to move as quickly in some respects as a dictatorship, because Congress and the people join in the debate and settle most questions in the end. But that participation is a safety valve of utmost value. It prevents many costly mistakes and removes incompetent men from office.

In a dictatorship, whose movements are shrouded in secrecy, mistakes may go unrecognized for a long time. A purge is the dictator's way of telling the world that blunders have been discovered.

Nat Finney performed a valuable service to his country in presenting the news about impending censorship. The haste with which the plan was withdrawn shows how right he was in pursuing and publicizing the story.

Governor Green, of Illinois, the Republican Keynoter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Times Record, of Aledo, Ill., on April 28, 1948:

DWIGHT H. GREEN LOGICALLY THE REPUBLICAN KEYNOTER

The selection of our Governor, Dwight H. Green, as temporary chairman and keynoter of the Republican National Convention in June, may have been a surprise to some of the voters of this great State, but to those who have been closely associated and worked with him in Springfield, such a signal honor was not unexpected.

Governor Green is a 14-karat Republican and his record is emphatic in its soundness in every respect. It has earned for him the esteem and admiration of the observing Republicans across the Nation.

During the critical period of the past 7 years, Illinois, with Green at the helm, has strengthened its position as the keystone of the Nation. In agriculture, commerce, and industry, the recent accomplishments of our State surpass a press agent's fondest dreams.

Our State is sound financially and culturally, and its postwar-planning program, already well under way, promises even further advancement, for under Governor Green's stewardship, Illinois has grown like its corn in July.

This is the background that takes our Governor to Philadelphia in June. In court he whipped Al Capone; politically, he earned Republican leadership with his 1940 electoral victory.

Industrious, far-sighted, and conscientious, Dwight Green is a prediction of things to come as convention time nears. His selection as keynoter was as natural as flowers in the spring.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein copy of a resolution which I have received from the United Polish Organizations in Lackawanna, N. Y., which was adopted on May 2, 1948, the day before the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary celebration of the signing of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. I congratulate these citizens of Polish descent on their pledge of allegiance to the principles and ideals of our fine Government, and I hope that the day may soon come when the people of Poland will enjoy the freedom from which they have long awaited.

Hon. JOHN C. BUTLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

At a mass meeting held in the Polish home on Sunday, May 2, 1948, by the United Polish Organizations in Lackawanna, N. Y., at the one hundred and fifty-seventh anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the history of Poland shows that the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, signed and adopted by the Polish people gave equal rights to all its inhabitants and forever accentuated man's position and rights, and strongly opposed the czarist tyranny and other aggressors;

"Whereas, although 3 years have elapsed since the termination of World War II, there is no sign or evidence of a true and lasting peace due to the brutal opposition and aggression of Soviet Russia;

"Whereas the Allied victory means only the abolition of German nazism to be supplemented by Soviet communism;

"Whereas the beginning of these bloody incidents had its roots in the unfortunate agreements at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, where the freedom of Poland and other free nations was granted, without their consent, to communistic Russia;

"Whereas to this day, the Polish soldier, who fought, 'for our and your freedom,' together with thousands of Polish orphans and displaced persons still treads foreign soils;

"Whereas now, Soviet Russia prepares herself for the conquest of the hemispheres and constantly endangers our American freedom, as is evidenced from signed statements by her with Hitler in 1939; rearms herself daily in the latest of military weapons and maintaining its military strength of 5,000,000 soldiers, and by infiltrating our ranks with spies and fifth columnists to spread the evils of communism: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this assemblage, That we pledge and solemnly swear as American citizens of Polish descent our faith to the United States of America, always to safeguard and protect our freedom so that communism never finds its roots amongst our fold; and be it further

"Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States and to the United Nations Assembly so that the agreements made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam be immediately repealed to check any further aggression of Soviet Russia, and that the agreements of the Atlantic Charter be upheld, which guaranteed freedom and independence to all nations; and be it further

"Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States so that steps be taken in order that the government in Poland be its own, and not one designated by Soviet Russia, and be it further

"Resolved, That we appeal to the Congress of the United States to immediately sponsor legislation to permit a certain number of Polish soldiers, orphans, and displaced persons into our country; and be it further

"Resolved, That we appeal to the Congress of the United States that immediate and proper legislation be enacted for the military defense of our Nation on land, sea, and in the air to avoid the insidious attacks of 1917 and then in 1941 at Pearl Harbor; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States of America."

Dr. A. S. CULKOWSKI
H. J. GLOWOCKI
STEFAN GOZ
JULIA MOLENDA
WILLIAM M. STYPOWANY.

The Starving Ask for Bread and Are Given Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed under the Marshall plan to give away some $265,000,000 worth of tobacco the first year and a total of a billion dollars' worth in the 4-year period.

Does it make sense to use the fertilizer, the manpower, and the land raising a crop that is to be given away, rather than exerting our energies to producing crops to feed the people? The cost of living for foods is rising and it is largely due to the misuse of our lands and by diverting land from crops that produce food to crops that are a luxury item to be given away.

The taxpayers of our country should not be asked to pay Federal taxes to furnish luxuries to peoples of other lands, even though the proponents of the legislation claimed the money was to be used for the starving.

I submit the following authentic article from the United States News and World Report of May 7, 1948. A picturegram which accompanied the article showed graphically that $119,000,000 worth of United States tobacco skyrocketed to $2,500,000,000 for the British Treasury. The article is as follows:

SURPRISE USES OF THE DOLLARS GIVEN TO EUROPE

(Reported from Washington and London)

(Marshall plan dollars, starting to flow, are to have some strange and interesting effects. Tobacco from the United States is to help balance budgets, help fight inflation, provide profits to tax. United States is to pick up bills for food in Canada, Argentina. Taxpayers have yet to learn the uses for all their dollars.)

Some strange and interesting results are to flow from the billions of dollars in aid that the United States is giving to nations of Europe. Results are not all to be of the kind that taxpayers may have thought about when putting up the money.

Tobacco, for example, is to play an important part in the reconstruction of Europe. Congress decided that Europe should get 458,000,000 pounds of United States tobacco in the first year of the Marshall plan, or about 2 pounds for each man, woman, and child in the cooperating countries.

Surprising events are to flow from that fact. Britain, to illustrate, is down for 218,260,000 pounds of tobacco, or about 5 pounds per person. This tobacco costs around $119,000,000, an important part of which is met by United States taxpayers, who contribute the tobacco. The British Government, taking the tobacco, imposes an import tax of $11.74 per pound.

All of a sudden the $119,000,000 worth of United States tobacco becomes the equivalent of $2,500,000,000 to the British Government for budget-balancing purposes. The tobacco given by the United States is sold for pounds to the processor by the British Government at the Government's price plus the import duty. The processor, in turn, sells to the distributor, who sells to the public.

In starting this train of events the United States taxpayer, contributing tobacco, does many things. He takes surplus tobacco off the hands of United States tobacco growers so that the price at home can be held up. He gives the British Government tobacco that it can use to draw a very large amount of money out of the pockets of the British people. He enables the tobacco processor and distributor in Britain to realize profits of their own. And he gives the Briton a smoke.

A Briton pays the equivalent of 70 cents for a package of cigarettes that cost 15 cents in the United States. He pays for tobacco that, as likely as not, was given to his Government by the United States taxpayer in the interest of European reconstruction.

What happens in Britain is to happen in varying degree in France, Belgium, Ireland, Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, Western Germany. Tobacco contributed by the United States is helping to balance budgets, to dampen inflation, to satisfy people.

Food offers some interesting twists of its own, too. Britain, needing food in large amounts and unable to pay for all she needs, is buying heavily in Canada. United States taxpayers, under the new program of Marshall plan aid, are set to pick up the bill once the deal is concluded. In this way Britain gets the food she needs from Canada free. Canadians get dollars from the United States American taxpayers, who put up the dollars, help both Britain and Canada. Taxpayers also enable Canadian farmers to supply much of Britain's food, leaving more in the United States for home consumption. Canadians then have dollars to buy the things they need from the United States.

Food, like tobacco, goes into the channels of private trade in Britain so that the food-processing and distributing industry gets its profits, which the Government taxes, helping again to balance the budget. And the British-Canadian experience is to be repeated on a smaller scale in British-Argentine experience.

Oil offers another interesting example of the postwar world. The United States is to give away a great deal of oil, bought largely in Latin America or the Middle East. Taxpayers, for example, will put up dollars to buy Venezuelan oil to be given to Norway. Norway will get this oil free, relieved of the need for putting up dollars to get it. The United States will have paid for the oil. Norway will get it. Then the time will come when United States ships will need to refuel in Norway. They will pay dollars, in that event, to get oil that United States taxpayers previously had paid dollars to obtain in order to give to Norway.

All kinds of interesting situations of that kind are due to develop over the months ahead. These situations will be more unusual and more numerous than were the somewhat comparable situations that grew up under lend-lease. This time, the United States is contributing civilian goods that move through normal channels of civilian trade, where there are profits to be made and tax revenues to be realized. Under lend-lease most contributions involved military weapons of limited usefulness.

An official game of the future will revolve around the problem of following the Marshall plan dollars as they start moving around the world.

Palestine as Rabbi Morris Lazaron Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, all Jews do not favor the partition of Palestine. Many of them deplore it. Rabbi Morris Lazaron, noted author, religious leader of Baltimore, is one of them. So also are the members of the American Council for Judaism. On last Thursday evening, at the Shoreham Hotel, this group held a spirited rally and in addition to Rabbi Lazaron, two other national speakers addressed the group, Rabbi Irving F. Reichert and Kermit Roosevelt. As part of my own remarks, I include the address by Rabbi Lazaron. In it he gives the answer to the Zionists' demand for a Jewish state and charges that if Zionist politics is not checked it will destroy every good thing that has been built in Palestine through labor and sacrifice and in addition it will vitiate the sympathy for Jews the heart-breaking years have evoked for them through the Christian. He has spoken out as an American citizen with courage and thereby has rendered a great public service on a matter of considerable importance to the world. It is his opinion that our Government should not reverse its last decision on Palestine:

I speak with hesitation on the complex and explosive problem of Palestine. Worthy, tender, and deep sentiments of Christian, Moslem, and Jew attach to that little land even though it lies far away on distant shores. But chauvinistic nationalisms, racial, cultural, and religious passions have moved on the scene with fanatic emotional intensity that have created a problem of such potential danger that the peace of the world is involved. It is therefore of importance to all Americans, gentile and Jew, that we must see and think clearly. We must speak and act with restraint and wisdom, with courage and firmness, if we would prevent major catastrophe in Palestine and here.

No one group is to blame, Zionist and Arab, the British and our government, Jews, Christians and Moslems, all of these have contrived to create a situation which may bring catastrophe to all concerned.

I speak as an American to my fellow Americans; I speak as a Jewish teacher to Christains and Jews. My sole desire is to bring some light into confusion and to offer some ideas which I trust may be useful.

The future of Jews in Palestine is inevitably bound up with the future of their Arab and Christian fellow Palestinians. The future of Jews in our own country, the wholesome atmosphere and unity of the United States are inevitably bound with the need of Jews and gentiles to live together here in sympathy and understanding. That future in Palestine and here is at least uncertain unless some brake be put on the forces that now have the reins.

I yield to no Zionist in my concern for my brother Jews in Palestine. I share the desire of all Jews—of all decent people—that the hapless innocents who still languish in displaced-persons camps 3 years after the war is over shall find haven in Palestine and elsewhere. I proudly claim membership in the world religio-cultural community of Israel—just as you my Christian friends claim membership in the world-wide religio-cultural community which is Christianity. I say to you, in all sincerity, did I believe the current Zionist agitations and pressures for a Zionist state in Palestine would lead to some measurable surcease for my brethren, some healing for peoples in the unhappy Middle East, I would be constrained to silence. On the contrary, I believe that to support the present Zionist determination to set up a Zionist state by war will destroy what has been built in Palestine by Zionist and non-Zionist, will make extended Jewish immigration into Palestine impossible. It will place the 800,000 Jews living in other Arab or Moslem lands in jeopardy; it will prejudice the position of American Jews; it will threaten the security of our own country and endanger the peace of the world.

I have no desire to pour salt in open wounds. The disillusionment of my brethren in Palestine is epic in its pathos and tragedy. I do not relish hurting people. so many of whom are my friends. But I believe it is better and necessary for a Jew to say these things than that a gentile should whisper them.

For a few brief years I was a member of the Zionist organization because I believed that Zion could be an enriching, exalting ex-

perience I was never a political but a cultural Zionist. I left the Zionist ranks because the work of economic reconstruction and cultural rebuilding was being swamped in the dangerous currents of a chauvinistic nationalism, foreign to the spirit of the faith of my fathers, a nationalism whose political goals overrode every other consideration, brocked no interference and led inexorably to the tragic empasse in Palestine. No one will deny that in its economic, humanitarian, and cultural manifestations, Zionism has wrought greatly. But Zionist politics if not checked will not only destroy everything that has been built through labor and sacrifice in the Holy Land, it will vitiate the sympathy for Jews these heart-breaking years have evoked for them throughout the Christian world. That is already happening in England and there are unhappy shadows here on the American landscape.

Last fall the United States supported the partition of Palestine into Arab and Zionist states. Our country has retreated from that policy for reasons which are obvious to all save those who will not see. We now call for a truce in Palestine. Yet attempts are being made not only by Zionists but by some non-Zionist Jews and by some Christians and Gentiles to force our Government to return to a support of partition. While I can understand the motives which prompt these misguided efforts—earnest desire to help the stricken and the put upon—sentiments I profoundly share—I do not believe our Government can or should reverse its position. I believe it to be of the utmost importance for all Americans to work for truce in Palestine as condition precedent to any final solution of the situation in that tortured land.

Meanwhile the Jewish agency, at present apparently dominated by Zionist extremists, has declared unilaterally that the Zionists will establish their state with or without United Nations' help, May 15 when the British relinquish their mandate. Such a proclamation is a challenge to warfare. It has a plausible basis in the November 29 vote of the United Nations Assembly which favored partition. But it must be remembered that the Assembly vote was not a decision, it was a proposal; that no machinery to implement it was established and that the Security Council thus far, though it had the opportunity to do so, has failed to confirm the partition proposal.

What caused the change in our national policy? Our own security in a world of heightening tensions. We must have friendly governments and peoples in the Middle East, we must have stability in that strategic area for our own safety. Zionists speak with scorn of oil. Surely it is no disgrace for a nation like ours to safeguard access to those natural resources deemed essential to its existence. The continued flow of oil from the Arabian peninsula is vital, if our effort to help the free peoples of western Europe stabilize their economy, set the machinery of industry going, and protect and defend their liberties, is to succeed.

It is alleged that to fail to implement the partition proposal will destroy the United Nations. I believe, on the contrary, far from saving face or credit for the United Nations, an attempt to impose partition against the will of the majority of the inhabitants of the land will destroy the United Nations.

It is asserted that the change in our position represents a back-down before Arab threats. This is not so. Zionists have always ignored and underestimated Arab opposition to the proposed Zionist state. What is new is organized threat and violent opposition. With the exception of sporadic outbreaks Arab and Jew lived in comparative peace for a quarter of a century until the partition issue was raised. Arabs now use violence because Zionists insist on statehood.

Are we justified therefore in the light of these facts in urging our Government to return to partition or to recognize the Zionist state to be proclaimed May 15? Are we prepared to follow irresponsible leadership of extremists or by our silence to support them when we know where it will inevitably lead?

But you may rightly ask: Is there any hope for a truce; are there any moderates among Arabs or Zionists?

On March 26, when President Truman first called for a truce, Dr. Magnes, chancellor of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, speaking in the name of moderate Zionists and Arabs cabled: We wholeheartedly support this appeal to stop the blood-letting * * *. There are thousands of Jews and Arabs who look upon continuance of this civil war with dread and anxiety for the fate of the Holy Land. The claims of the extremists are indeed irreconcilable but the common Jew and the common Arab are not extremists. They yearn for the opportunity of building up their common country through labor and cooperation.

There is sound reason for believing, if a free and unpressured election could be held among Jews in Palestine today, the great majority of them would vote against statehood. If the voices of moderate Arabs were heard, it would favor reasonable Jewish immigration into Palestine and some form of compromise.

Suppose, however, the proposed state were set up, it could neither defend or maintain itself for any length of time. Zionist fighting forces probably would be successful for awhile but Arab and Moslem opposition would grow stronger in time while Zionist strength would gradually diminish. The Zionist state would be surrounded by the implacable enmity of millions of Arabs who would choke and starve it by economic boycott and persistently attack it. It would be fighting for its life in a war of attrition against the religious fanaticism of the Moslem peoples. The land would be a shambles. All the antiquities and holy places would be destroyed. No substantial immigration could enter any country under such conditions. Indeed the best way to stop Jewish immigration into Palestine is to persist in trying to set up the Zionist state.

The Zionist state would be compelled to appeal constantly for outside help. It could never stand on its own feet. Every Jewish community in the world would be constantly invaded by Zionist politics and every capital badgered by Zionist pressures. This is happening now before the state is established. It would surely continue were the Zionist state created. They are naive who believe Jewish nationalism can and will be contained within the borders of Palestine and who dismiss Jewish nationalism outside Palestine with well-intentioned declarations. There is real danger that some great power, seeking to take advantage of the troubled situation, may recognize the Zionist state. We will not recognize it. The British will not recognize it.

I doubt if the majority of the United Nations will recognize it. But the civil war will continue; another Spain might be created, and the makings of a third world war. Such is the position which the Jewish Agency will force upon Jews and upon the world if it persists in its decision to set up a state. I want none of it. I am convinced the majority of Americans—Jews and Christians—want none of it. But unless we make our voices heard all of us may be faced with this explosive situation.

Behind all the rhetoric and emotion is the simple fact that extremist Zionists in Palestine are determined to establish a Zionist state and that a majority Arab population in Palestine opposes it. Our hearts are stirred by appeals for the distressed, and we want to help them. But do not let us confuse the issues. What is being fought for now in Palestine is not a home for the forlorn and distressed, but a state. The fighting would stop if the Zionists would drop the state issue.

Is it not time for us to bend our efforts to the real problem—homes for the homeless, Jews and all other people—not only in Palestine, but here and in other lands? Let our slogan be: Empty the displaced-persons camps this year. Jew and gentile can unite on that platform. Had we put half the effort into such enterprises as has been put into propaganda for a Zionist state it is very probable that the Stratton bill would long since have been passed and homes would have been found for the 700,000 displaced Catholics, the 100,000 Protestants still in the camps, and thousands of the displaced Jews could have gone to Palestine, here, or elsewhere. Something has happened to the conscience of the world that we could permit such a situation as now obtains to continue so long. So far as the Palestine situation is concerned, this should be our position—relief and rehabilitation in Palestine and everywhere, not Zionist politics. Zion can be a civilizing and exalting ideal for Christian, Moslem, and Jew. Let it not become tragic example of a great spiritual dream distorted and degraded by ecclesiastical politicians and false messiahs.

The only hope of preserving what has been built in Palestine, the only hope of extending it, lies in cooperation with the Arab majority. Zionist and Arab have tested each other's strength. Both have found that reliance upon the nations is of no avail. Let us strengthen the moderates so that they shall have the chance, through truce, to reach honorable, just, and democratic compromise in the land where they live side by side as neighbors. Such a compromise is still possible and necessary. It would come after a war. Why should it not come before? Surely Americans—Jews and Gentiles—must see that not life but death will result if, by our failure to state frankly and firmly where we stand, the extremists on both sides are encouraged to sacrifice everything for the fulfillment of their political ambitions. All Americans who urge or support force in Palestine are doing a disservice to Arabs, Christians, and Jews, to the national interests of our own country, and to the peace of the world.

This is the position I would have our country take and urge its acceptance by the Security of the United Nations.

To the Arabs: Lay down your arms! There is no danger of Zionist domination. You now outnumber the Zionist two to one. Your birth rate is much higher than theirs. You have gained by Zionist effort in Palestine and stand to gain by further Zionist immigration and development of the country.

To the Zionists: Lay down your arms! Give up the idea of a Zionist State. We have no intention to recognize it. A State was not contemplated in the Balfour Declaration which favored a homeland in Palestine for Jews who wished to live there. The Balfour Declaration also contained two provisos which seem to have been forgotten in all the discussions: One—that nothing should be done which would prejudice the civil and religious rights—and we should add the political rights—of the existing non-Jewish population of Palestine; and two—that nothing should be done which would endanger the civil and political status of Jews living elsewhere in the world. Under the British Mandate the Jewish population of Palestine has grown from some 72,000 in 1921 to cover over 600,000 today. We believe there should be measureable and continued Jewish immigration and the right of land purchase.

Peace will come to Palestine only as Arab and Jew, each autonomous in the cultural

area, working together on great economic projects for the reconstruction of the land, developing habits of cooperation in self-government, in the end erect together the democratic commonwealth of Palestine, a bastion of freedom in the Middle East. All Americans, Jews and Gentiles, can and should call for and support this program. The clashing Arab and Zionist should be told that support for their extremist aims will not be forthcoming from this country and our Government should call upon all our citizens to stand behind such a just, honorable, and democratic compromise.

We should declare and support in the United Nations the following position: If the fighting continues, if the Zionist extremists persist in their determination to set up a Zionist state, if the Arab extremists persist in their plans for invading the land, murdering the Zionists or driving them out, we believe the United Nations should give no recognition to either Zionist or Arab claims; should put an arms embargo on the entire area: should blockade its ports and thus limit the fighting; persistently urging the necessity for truce and compromise. Such a plan may work hardship on the population for a time, but it will weaken the extremists, strengthen the moderates, and disillusion those who have hitherto supported them. It would not be long before the extremists, Arabs and Zionists, would lose stomach for the fight and the conditions for equitable solution would be present.

The time has come to let Arab and Zionist extremists know that they will receive no support from the United States and that the moral conscience of the Jewish, Christian, and Moslem world is not behind them.

This is the policy I lay before you, my fellow Americans, Christians, and Jews, and for which I ask your support.

Our Policy in Japan and Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech which I delivered today over radio station WWJ in Detroit, Mich.:

I had previously spoken in opposition to our new policy of rebuilding, rearming, and recreating a mighty and powerful Germany. Today I want to bring to your attention our policy in the Pacific.

I am alarmed that the same American industrialists and financiers who worked hand in glove with the Germans before the war, and who made agreements with the Germans, which threatened the very success of our war effort, are resuming their German connections again. They are also trying to play the same game in Japan.

First of all, on the question of whether there will be war or peace, a very interesting statement was recently made by a French Minister. He stated that there is no danger of war with Russia unless western Germany is permitted to rearm. In such case not only Russia, but all the nations of eastern and central Europe would consider such rearmament a hostile act. There are many men in Government and big business and big finance who are today strongly urging a program to build up Germany as a strongly armed buffer to Russia. These people should understand that the nations of Europe who have suffered so much during the last two wars simply will not permit a powerful military Germany to rise again. An armed and powerful Germany cannot be trusted. The small nations of Europe are determined to prevent a third world war which would leave nothing worth having to the survivors. Not only are the European nations alarmed and suspicious about the moves we make in Germany, but we are now receiving protests from Australia and the Philippines against MacArthur's plan to rebuild Japan. The people in the Pacific area fear the resurrection of the Japan military. Just recently General Draper, formerly the vice president of the Dillon-Read Co., international bankers, and who is now assistant Secretary of Defense, made a trip to Japan. Upon his departure the Japanese Minister announced that they had a very successful conference with General Draper, and that Japan was to get $1,000,000,000 from the United States. Also, just recently, the War Department had given $650,000 to Mr. Clifford S. Strike and his Overseas Consultants, Inc., who now seek to bring out a report for the rebuilding of a powerful Japan and to discredit and nullify the work of Mr. Edwin W. Pauley. The basic principles of the Pauley report were accepted by the Allies who made up the Far Eastern Commission. They decided to eliminate the huge Japanese war potential, to smash the Zaibatsu monopolies, to demilitarize Japan and to decentralize the economy of Asia and Japan in such a way that her neighbors would be given a chance to make their own goods, and not to depend for their industrial equipment on the good will of the Japanese.

The Pauley report is the carefully prepared document of some of the most outstanding experts on the Far East. The basis of the allied program as outlined in the report was to whittle down Japan's capacity to wage war. It provided also for the allocation of certain surplus Japanese industrial potential to countries entitled to reparations, especially neighboring Asiatic countries, so as to shift the economic balance and contribute to the stability of eastern Asia as a whole. This policy also provided for the complete control of Japan, especially her economic and industrial life. It called for democracy in her politics and the encouragement of all democratic forces of labor, industry, and agriculture. In order to accomplish these aims, all of the 11 nations agreed that the Japanese economy should be basically reformed, and that the direction of the economic institutions be completely changed. They agreed on control of the Japanese industrial capacity which could be easily converted to war, and they called for control over the Japanese competitive potential and her future export markets. They also agreed that Japan's steel industries were to be substantially reduced to peacetime requirements, as well as her heavy electrical machinery, machine tools, chemicals, shipbuilding, etc. These decisions were unanimously adopted by the 11 members of the Far Eastern Commission on Japan. Every one of these nations was a victim of Japanese aggression. Each nation had an opportunity to discuss the plan, to analyze it, and to express its own views. All this was done, and the final product represents the combined opinion of 11 nations, including the United States; but it seems that Mr. Strike and his associates, who were paid $650,000 of the taxpayers' hard-earned money by the War Department, are out to flaunt these decisions and hope to scuttle the program.

We know very little about the Overseas Consultants, Inc. Nor do we know whether the War Department checked the prewar connections of Mr. Strike and his associates with Japanese heavy industry, or the tie-up that these big engineering firms had with the big business monopolies, who it appears are already investing again in Japanese industry. These latest actions for the rebuilding of Japan are naturally upsetting and frightening our neighbors and allies.

The lessons of Japan and Germany have been learned by millions the world over, and when these two countries surrendered, their victims in the Far East and in Europe were confident that the Allied Powers, particularly the United States, were determined to eliminate the possibility of future German and Japanese aggressions. Now it appears that our big banking interests and our big international businessmen are wringing their hands and shouting about the spread of communism, and under this guise, they are setting the wheels in motion to rebuild Japan as a gendarme in the Far East, and to recreate it as an industrial giant of Asia. At the same time they expect the Chinese, Australians, Indonesians, and Philippines to support this kind of a policy. It is the same program that they have recently put over in Europe whereby a powerful and mighty Germany is being rebuilt.

They expect to have Germany remain the economic master of Europe, and at the same time they expect the allegiance and support of Germany's victims. These powerful banking and business leaders have already dumped $3,000,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money into Germany since VE-day. From the War Department and the ERP appropriations they expect to dump another $1,500,000,000 this year into Germany, and this is not the end.

Because of the bipartisan foreign policy program, these big banking and big business interests are now in the saddle, and they are confident that they will be able to raid the United States Treasury of many more billions of dollars. They tell us that we will have the friendship of the German and Japanese warlords, but what will that gain us if we lose the friendship of all our allies, and all those people who have always been our friends throughout the history of our country.

These strange policies that we are now pursuing are born out of the greed and selfishness of the big cartellists and monopolists who try to have our national interests conform with their special privileges. This program will not work, and it will not give peace. We cannot follow a policy of preserving and strengthening the war potentials of Germany and Japan. We cannot pursue a policy whereby Germany and Japan will continue their dominant rule in the political and economic life of their neighbors. To do so we are only repeating the very same things which occurred after World War I, and which laid the basis for the most terrible war in history; and worst of all, we are isolating ourselves from all our friends in Asia and Europe.

For example, how could we convince the Chinese that we are rebuilding a strong Japan in order to save the Chinese from Communism? The Chinese know full well that the real victory over communism will be won in the rice fields rather than on the battlefields. We cannot ignore the Chinese demands for agrarian reformation. In Korea we have never had a program that offered more than just opposition to communism. This past week, Kimm Kiusic, Korean elder statesman, a rightist, and considered to be Korea's most influential politician, denounced our policies and compared us to the dishonest Japanese who ruled the island for 40 years. He criticized the corruption that exists and charged that we are supporting the old reactionaries. The Koreans expected land reform. In Korea vast areas of land had been controlled for years by the Japanese or by Korean puppets of the Japanese. There was a clear chance to win the sympathies and everlasting gratitude of these

people by complying with their demands. Still we postponed any action in this respect.

In Greece we hear that thousands are being executed in the civil war that is going on. We have dumped hundreds of millions of dollars in military supplies and armaments, but the Greek guerrillas seem to be increasing. When one Greek guerrilla is killed all of his brothers, cousins, and nephews join in the fight to avenge his death. There will be no peace in Greece until the reactionary government abdicates or unless we force it to give to the Greek people the economic reforms that they are demanding and are entitled to receive.

In Palestine we may witness one of the worst slaughters since the war. The five Arab states, Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Transjordan, are preparing to defy the United Nations Charter and to invade the Holy Land.

Here again, the big oil interests have joined up with the feudal Arab chiefs, and with the support of Loy Henderson and James Forrestal, they were able to upset policies that were agreed on by the United States and the United Nations.

In Italy the De Gasperi forces have recently won a great election victory. Whether the victory will be temporary or lasting depends upon the sincerity of the Italian Government in carrying out the pledges made to the Italian people to bring about agrarian and industrial reforms. Here we have a great opportunity to support the democratic forces and to make a clean break with the old reactionaries and the Mussolini Fascists.

I think that the greatest error that we can commit is to fashion our foreign policy merely in terms of anticommunism. We will fail miserably if we do no more than that. It is folly to shout and rant at communism and to do nothing to eliminate the conditions on which communism thrives. Our foreign policy must be designed to espouse and promote liberal humanitarian programs for the masses of people of the world. It must strengthen the democratic forces in other nations and not entrench reactionary interests that thirst for power.

Most of the areas of the world are bleak and desolate when we see the conditions under which the people live. In many places the people still work under conditions of serfdom in dire poverty and disease. To many of these people even a revolution may seem a welcome relief. To men in such desperate conditions a revolution may have the appeal of a swift and cleansing purgative that sweeps before it all the rot and filth of the old tyranny that has oppressed the people. To many people in the world who have been living under such desperate conditions our talk and promises of vague and remote democratic ideals have no meaning. We can talk about the glories of democracy, but those people are thinking about rice or bread. If we want the hundreds of millions of people of the world to be on our side, we must show them the way with practical programs of social reconstruction. We must stand ready to support the liberals of any country who have programs of social reconstruction for their people. There are in many countries men who may not be in the government, but who have the inner strength and vitality to formulate programs for their own people. We should support a liberal program for mass education and rural and industrial reconstruction that would uplift their living standards. We should not support reactionary elements anywhere if we want to gain and retain the confidence of the people of the world.

For 25 years before the war we witnessed the sinister growth of huge propaganda machines which slowly but gradually crushed free expression in the press and on the radio, and eventually destroyed or completely muzzled all democratic leaders. In Japan, Russia, Italy, and Germany the huge propaganda machines controlled the press, radio, public platform, motion pictures, the theater—yes, even music, art, science, and the pulpit.

This was intended to make the parliamentary system incapable of independent action, and the plan succeeded. If free debate of government policies had not been crushed, it is wholly possible that Hitler would not have been able to plunge Germany into a war.

This is a lesson that everyone of us must learn and remember.

The beginning of such controls have recently popped out under Republican administration in Lansing and in the Congress in Washington. In Lansing they enacted the Callahan bill; in Washington the Republicans are sponsoring the Carl Mundt bill. These bills, which are aimed to control thought and speech, must be opposed. This Republican administration and the Committee on Un-American Activities and its big-business backers are treating with contempt the ruling of the United States Supreme Court, which held "if there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

And if the Supreme Court decision is not enough, then let us read from the Constitution of the United States:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of its grievances" (first amendment, U. S. Constitution).

Why Not Let the British People Stand on Their Own Feet as Their Soundest Leaders Suggest?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, instead of permitting the British people who believe in free enterprise to restore themselves from the destructive grip of socialism the New Deal is supporting socialism in England with our taxpayers' money: that is, under ERP, formerly known as the Marshall plan, and now called the Economic Cooperative Administration. Our taxpayers are prolonging the agony of the British people by underwriting the socialistic regime in Britain. Our first $3,700,000,000, already wasted, has caused a program of regimentation such as the world has never before seen. Twenty-five thousand regulations, removing every vestige of individual liberty, have been promulgated. Why should we, living under a free economy, with a high standard of living, insist upon destroying a free-enterprise system in Great Britain?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of May 8, 1948, which pertains to what I have already said:

CHURCHILL'S CALL TO EUROPE

Winston Churchill, the greatest living British statesman and one of the greatest that ever lived, has recently been making some uncommonly blunt remarks to his countrymen on the subject of the Marshall plan.

Mr. Churchill's freely voiced view is that the British people are living largely on the charity of the Americans; that this is neither wise nor seemly, and turns the Churchill stomach whenever the Churchill brain thinks about it; and that the thing for the British people to do is to get off the Marshall dole as fast as they can and take to standing on their own feet as of old.

Yesterday at The Hague, capital of Holland, Mr. Churchill got up in an important meeting and told the nations of western Europe much the same thing as he has been telling his fellow Britons. He talked more politely, more suavely, than he has been talking among the home folks, but his speech added up to: "Be men, not mice."

The meeting was the unofficial Congress of Europe, attended by delegates from all 16 of the Marshall-plan countries, by exiled leaders from Czechoslovakia, Finland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, and by delegates from Spain, the Saar, and the French occupation zone in Germany.

It was called (over the opposition of the British Labor Party, which apparently would be quite content to have England and western Europe live forever on United States largesse) to consider the possibility of forming some kind of European federation of nations.

Mr. Churchill has been fighting toward this goal ever since the war ended. The idea of a United States of Europe is not new—has been talked about for 75 years or more—but never has it seemed so close to coming true as it does now.

The keynote of the Churchill speech was this sentence:

"After all, Europe has only to arise and stand in her own majesty, faithfulness, and virtue and confront all forms of tyranny, ancient and modern, Nazi or Communist, with forces which are unconquerable and which, if asserted in good time, might never be challenged again."

The wartime British Prime Minister's advice to western Europe is to get busy and do exactly that—knock down its tariff barriers, forget some of its age-old hatreds and prejudices, consolidate its defense forces as best it may, and quit breaking into a cold sweat every time it thinks about Soviet Russia.

Into such a union, said Mr. Churchill, would be welcomed "any country where the people own the government and not the government the people." He specifically and emphatically included western Germany.

We don't see how this speech can fail to make a terrific hit in the United States.

Twice in a generation, this country has gone—or been dragged by warmongering politicians—to the rescue of a western Europe which couldn't have saved itself from the German power. The business is getting monotonous, not to mention the way in which these two gigantic wars have sapped our resources and stirred up hatreds and divisions among us.

STAND ON YOUR OWN FEET, BOYS

To see the leading British statesman advise western Europe, as urgently as he knows how, to struggle to its own feet and stand there, is most refreshing.

Of course, the great question under this head is what Russia will do next.

Stalin certainly has the manpower to overrun Europe to the Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts. Whether he has the transport and the weapons to supply his forces

and guard his lines of communication in case he should undertake such an adventure is something else again.

If "Bloody" Joe should, however, start moving toward the Atlantic, and should kill or capture or injure any appreciable number of our occupation troops in the process, it seems a 100-to-1 shot that the United States would jump on him. We might be foolish to do any such thing—might be better advised to give the Kremlin enough rope on the probability that it would eventually hang itself—but the chances are that we wouldn't be as prudent as that.

Well, anyway, here's wishing a united states of western Europe an early birth, a swift and strong growth, and a lot of luck. We can think of few things which at the present time and in the present condition of the world would be of greater benefit to the United States of America.

The Arab Front in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1948

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting a number of news stories, or extracts from news stories, from New York papers of last week, together with a telegram which I addressed to the President, the Secretary of State, and to Gen. John H. Hilldring, the recently appointed special adviser to the Secretary of State on Palestine affairs.

There are two grave questions raised by these articles, which are accounts of the testimony offered by one Ben Freedman, of New York, and by other witnesses, in the course of a libel action in New York.

The first question: Why is Loy Henderson continued in office when it has been repeatedly shown that he has sabotaged officially declared American policy in the Middle East?

The second question: Why does not the Department of Justice proceed against Ben Freedman for his failure to register as the agent of foreign powers under the McCormack and Voorhis Acts?

HENDERSON SHOULD BE REMOVED

I am first introducing two news stories, one from the New York Post and one from the New York Times of last Tuesday, to give a summary of the court proceedings.

[From the New York Post]

HENDERSON OUSTER DEMANDED FOR HIS LINK TO ANTI-ZIONIST

Immediate suspension of Loy Henderson, head of the State Department's Office of Near Eastern Affairs, was demanded today by Representative KLEIN, Democrat, of New York, as a result of disclosure that a well-known anti-Zionist had made at least 17 long-distance calls to him.

Admission by Benjamin Freedman, founder of the anti-Zionist League for Peace with Justice in Palestine, that the telephone calls had been placed, indicated a "close liaison" between the two men, KLEIN charged, and "must surely prove Henderson's total unfitness" to operate the Near Eastern Affairs Division "in accordance with the true national interests of the United States."

Freedman, testifying in Mid-Manhattan Court in a libel suit, also admitted sending a cablegram to a business firm in Bombay last October saying "have negotiated immediate establishment Pakistan Thompson submachine gun factory equipment available here."

WANTS AIDES DROPPED, TOO

This resulted in a petition from the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League urging India's representatives at the United Nations to have the United Nations Security Council investigate this "step towards creating conditions apt to impair peace of world and patent device to evade present arms embargoes to Middle East."

KLEIN, demanding that Henderson's "immediate subordinates" be suspended as well, sent telegrams to President Truman, Secretary of State Marshall, and Marshall's special assistant on Palestine, Maj. Gen. Hilldring, urging a thorough departmental investigation "into the incredible web of Arabian and monopoly intrigue which has frustrated high American policy."

Freedman's testimony, the Congressman contended, "is but the last in a long series of disclosures of Henderson's bias in favor of the member states of the Moslem bloc, the murderous Mufti of Jerusalem * * * and the Arabian-American Oil Co."

LINKED WITH MUFTI

"The duplicity of Henderson's official actions is proved, in my belief," KLEIN said.

Freedman's testimony also linked him with the Grand Mufti. He admitted on cross-examination that he sent a cable to Cairo last September saying he was giving the Mufti "fullest cooperation" and extending best wishes for the Mufti's "continued vision, courage, strength, struggle behalf justice his people."

Freedman originally appeared as witness for Hallam M. Richardson, counsel for the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine, who had brought a criminal libel suit against the Reverend Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, chairman of the Anti-Nazi League's advisory board.

[From New York Times]

MUFTI MENTIONED AT LIBEL HEARING—ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE CITES CABLE BY FREEDMAN OF ORGANIZATION FOR PEACE IN PALESTINE

Evidence introduced yesterday at a hearing in Mid-Manhattan Magistrates Court sought to link Benjamin H. Freedman, founder and secretary of the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine, with the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and with the establishment of a submachine gun factory in Pakistan.

The hearing was on the application of Hallam M. Richardson, attorney for the league, for a criminal libel complaint against the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, 165 West Forty-sixth Street. Mr. Richardson charged that the Reverend Henry A. Atkinson, chairman of the advisory board of the Anti-Nazi League, had libeled the former in a 20-page bulletin submitted to the United Nations General Assembly last November.

Titled "Pan-Arab Propaganda—Its Pro-Facist and Pro-Nazi Aspects in America," the bulletin referred to the plaintiff as having long been known in the halls of pro-Fascist propagandists." Magistrate Hyman Bushel, after hearing more testimony, either will rule that there are no grounds for action or will recommend further inquiry by the grand jury.

CABLE MESSAGES CITED

In cross-examination of Mr. Freedman, Julius L. Goldstein, attorney for the Anti-Nazi League, read into the record two cable night letters that Mr. Freedman admitted having sent. One, to an associate in Cairo, read:

"Dearest brother. Letter received. Attending everything requested. Very busy United Nations situation. Extend His Eminence wishes for continued vision, courage, strength, struggle behalf justice his people. Giving him fullest cooperation.—BENJAMIN H. FREEDMAN."

"Whom did you mean by 'His Eminence'?" Mr. Goldstein asked Mr. Freedman.

"Amin el-Husseini, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem," the witness replied.

The second cable introduced by Mr. Goldstein was addressed to the Tri Ocean Corporation in Bombay. After several references to other business transactions, it read:

"Have negotiated immediate establishment Pakistan Thompson submachine gun factory equipment available here. See letter. Battle hard. UN recommendation full Islam equality. All political determinations. Writing fully. Success.

"BEN FREEDMAN."

Any association with the Grand Mufti was denied by Mr. Freedman, who said he would not "engage in any business having to do with killing people." He also declared that the Bombay message had nothing to do with machine guns, but did not amplify the statement.

RECORDS OF TELEPHONE CALLS

Using records of long-distance telephone calls obtained from the New York Telephone Co., according to Mr. Goldstein, the lawyer declared that Mr. Freedman had made or attempted to make various calls to Loy Henderson, head of the State Department's Division of Near Eastern and African Affairs. Mr. Freedman also testified that he had made calls to Maj. Gen. George Van Horn Mosely and Lady Astor.

As an outgrowth of the testimony and evidence, there were two developments outside the courtroom yesterday afternoon. The anti-Nazi league sent to P. P. Pillai, Indian delegate to the United Nations, a message acquainting him with the information in the cable to Bombay.

Signed by James H. Sheldon, the message read: "Suggest you consider advisability of calling this situation to attention United Nations Security Council authorities as step toward creating condition apt to impair peace of world and patent device to evade present arms embargoes in Middle East."

Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN of New York sent to President Truman, Secretary of State George C. Marshall, and his special assistant on Palestine affairs, Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring, telegrams urging suspension of Mr. Henderson and his subordinates on the basis of their "liaison" with Mr. Freedman. Mr. KLEIN called also for an investigation of the State Department for evidences of bias in the United States policy toward Palestine.

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT

On the basis of the information brought out during the cross-examination of Freedman, I sent the following telegram to the President, the Secretary of State, and General Hilldring:

MAY 3, 1948.

Disclosure made in a New York magistrate's court this morning before Judge Hyman Bushel by Ben Freedman, a notorious front man for the Arab office, indicating a close liaison between him and Mr. Loy Henderson, Chief of the Division of Near Eastern and African Affairs, must surely prove Henderson's total unfitness to operate that Division in accordance with the true national interests of the United States of America.

This is but the last in a long series of disclosures of Henderson's bias in favor of the member states of the Moslem bloc, the mur-

derous Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin El Husseini, and the Arabian-American Oil Co. and its affiliates and associates, demonstrating his unfitness to administer American policy in accordance with his instructions.

The duplicity of Henderson's official actions is proved, in my belief.

I urge you to suspend Loy Henderson and his immediate subordinates from their offices at once and to initiate a thorough departmental investigation into the incredible web of Arabian and monopoly intrigue which has frustrated high American policy, jeopardized the authority and the very existence of the United Nations, stultified our international moral position, betrayed the hopes of the desperate Jews of Europe and Asia, and endangered the peace of the world.

At the same time, I most solemnly implore you to restore at once the noble aims presented by the United States last November which resulted in the decision of the United Nations to enforce partition and make possible the creation of an independent Jewish state in Palestine under protection of the United Nations, and also to remove the arms embargo.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

TESTIMONY CONTINUES

Freedman's testimony continued to unfold more of the sordid story of how he had spent his own money—$100,000 to buy display advertising for the League for Peace With Justice, $15,000 for the Institute of Arab-American Affairs, among other disbursements—to help promote Arab propaganda in this country. The Arab office, the league, and the institute have all been tied up with some of the most unsavory anti-Semetic groups in this country, and links also have been traced into the ultra-respectable Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land.

Freedman admitted making many telephone calls to the Saudi Arabian and Pakistan Embassies here, of briefing high-ranking Army officers on Arab background, and of other unregistered activities in behalf of the Arab States.

There was read into the record of the hearing a translation of an article which appeared in El Mussawar, an Egyptian weekly, which praised Freedman for spending his money on propaganda for the Arab cause by publishing anti-Zionist advertisements in newspapers here.

FREEDMAN ADMITS ACTING AS ARAB AGENT

Continuing Thursday, Freedman admitted working as an unregistered agent for the Arab cause. In addition to the documents cited in the following story from the New York Times for Friday, May 7, I have in my possession photostatic copies of cablegrams sent by Freedman to the leader of the Young Egypt Party in Cairo, Ahmad Hussein, a cousin of the bloody murderer, the Mufti of Jerusalem. The Mufti was a military ally of Hitler and Himmler, and drew an allowance from the Reich of 50,000 reichsmarks monthly for the upkeep of himself and his retinue. The American Government has possession of full records of the Mufti's wartime alliance with our foes, including short-wave broadcasts urging the Moslem world to rise against the United Nations and kill the Jews.

WITNESS ADMITS AIDING ARAB CAUSE—FREEDMAN, TESTIFYING IN LIBEL CASE, COOPERATED ON NOTE TO STATE DEPARTMENT

Counsel for the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League offered evidence yesterday that Benjamin Freedman, anti-Zionist founder of the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, cooperated with an Arab publicist in preparing a memorandum for presentation to the State Department in behalf of the Arab cause.

Mr. Freedman was on the stand for the third day in mid-Manhattan magistrates' court, where his attorney, Hallam M. Richardson, is seeking a criminal libel complaint against the anti-Nazi league. Under intensive cross-examination by Julius L. Goldstein, the witness identified as in his handwriting several notes scribbled on a newspaper clipping telling of a meeting between Arab delegates and then Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

The article, which was published in a New York newspaper on May 11, 1946, had as its heading: "U. S. reassures Arabs on any Palestine shift." It went on to say that Mr. Acheson told his Arab visitors that no policy changes would be made without consultation with them and with the Jews.

In an adjoining column Mr. Freedman had written: "It was worth all the effort." Alongside a paragraph reporting that the Arabs had read to Mr. Acheson a memorandum outlining their position on Palestine, there was this comment, which Mr. Freedman admitted was in his handwriting: "Prepared by myself and Katibah, Thursday."

Later Katibah was identified by Mr. Goldstein as Habib Hatibah, editor for the Institute of Arab-American Affairs. In earlier testimony Mr. Freedman denied that he had anything to do with the May 10 conference or with the preparation of the memorandum. However, he admitted making numerous telephone calls to the State Department and to Ministries of the Arab states.

The hearing was interrupted frequently to permit other cases to be brought briefly before Magistrate Hyman Bushel. At one point, the magistrate broke in to inquire into the status of Mr. Freedman's religious affiliations.

"Let me get something straight," the magistrate said. "The other day you said you were born of Jewish parents but you also speak of studying to be a Catholic. Are you a Catholic?"

Mr. Freedman replied that he had taken instructions to become a Catholic but that certain pressure was brought to bear that kept him from being baptized. He suggested that the pressure was from Zionists.

"Oh, I see," said Magistrate Bushel. The Jews put you out and the Catholics won't have you." The audience laughed.

"I was too discreet to go back to the Jesuit priests under whom I studied and press the issue," the witness explained.

FREEDMAN PAID FOR CONGRESSIONAL ENTERTAINMENT

On Friday Freedman admitted that he himself had paid either $452 or $482, he could not remember which, for a dinner at the Mayflower, where he attempted to carry on his propaganda through social contacts with Members of Congress. I want to make it clear that I am not condemning Freedman for his lobbying activities, for that is the right of all Americans, but for his misrepresentations and his failure to comply with the laws demanding the registration of foreign agents and of lobbiests.

I repeat that there is an investigative job here for the Department of Justice, and for the Department of State in discovering to just what extent Loy Henderson and other officials were the willing or unwilling beneficiaries of Freedman's unregistered activities.

He also testified that he had turned over his own mailing lists, on cards in a shoe box, to one Nuqua, the delegate to the United Nations from the Arab Higher Committee. There is a possibility that testimony to be developed will show that the Arab Higher Committee was issuing its propaganda under the highest American privileges.

The New York Times for Saturday, May 8, said:

ANTI-ZIONIST TESTIFIES ON TALK TO CONGRESSMEN

Benjamin H. Freedman, founder of the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, testified yesterday that he arranged to speak about Near East affairs before 52 Congressman in Washington last December soon after he learned that the United States was to back the partition of Palestine.

An avowed foe of what he calls "political Zionism," Mr. Freedman said the idea for his talk resulted from conferences in November 1947, with Representative ED GOSSETT, Democrat, of Texas, who, Mr. Freedman said, had described the day that the American partition decision was announced as "blackest in American history."

Mr. Freedman said he appeared before the Congressmen in a private gathering at the Mayflower Hotel and told them, with the "aid of an atlas," about the history of the Near East, dating back to 5,000 B. C. He asserted that he did not discuss partition, "for or against it."

Mr. Speaker, I am necessarily limited by limitations of space, and cannot possibly disclose all the known activities of Freedman, his strange ties with foreign powers, and his links with the political underworld in this country. I believe that these things are known already to the departments involved; if they are not, I shall be glad to cooperate with the departments in anyway possible.

Meanwhile, I have pending before the House a resolution calling for an investigation of the State Department by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which could and should take cognizance of the certainly unethical and possibly illegal activities of the Arab office in this country.

Postal Workers' Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1948

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I, with various other Members of the Congress, appeared before a committee of the Senate and one of the House and gave testimony in support of a pay raise for post-office employees.

It seemed that about that time there was considerable interest in this matter, and that there was sufficient support for such a pay raise to get through at this

session of the Congress. We are now approaching the last weeks of the eightieth session of Congress, and so far as I know, the Republican policy committee of the Rules Committee in its wisdom has not yet seen fit to call up this important matter of legislation which so vitally concerns thousands of our most deserving Federal employees.

Through this medium, I would like to once again urge action by the leadership of this Congress on the pay raise bill. If we continue the present course of delay, it is not only possible but probable that pay raise legislation will be lost in the last minute shuffle and good American citizens, who do not have the right to strike, or otherwise protect themselves, will be caught in the middle.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, May 9, 1948, which will express my sentiments in this important matter:

POSTAL WORKERS' PAY

Some 375,000 Government postal workers receive an annual average salary of $2,600. These workers now seek a permanent addition of $800 a year. Senator BALDWIN's bill calling for such an increase has been approved by the Senate Civil Service Committee, and a House bill specifying a temporary increase of $585 has also been approved. There is still time for the two Houses to join in a grant of the full amount.

The postal employees cannot strike. They can only plead their case. It is a persuasive one and Congressmen generally recognize its merits. But in the rush of other business they have not pressed the issue to a final vote. Thus the men and women behind the mails are left in a position of having earned an increase they cannot collect. They are loyal, intelligent, and industrious workers and should be rewarded without further delay. In simple justice Congress should see that this matter is not postponed to the next session.